APR 1 0 1945

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 90—PART 9

MARCH 24, 1944, TO JUNE 12, 1944

(PAGES A1477 TO A2970)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1944

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

One Serviceman Wants Garage Business and Little Farm After War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present for the RECORD a letter which I think is indicative of the thinking and post-war desires of a number of men now in service. It is typical of many, many letters I have received from them, both from abroad and from home—a hope that they may be aided in the purchase of a small farm to augment their earnings from other sources and a hope that they may be afforded a fair opportunity to participate in the purchase of the huge stores of Government-owned surpluses that will be disposed of. Many of these men have received specialized training in the use of some of the equipment which will be sold as surplus; naturally, they are interested in acquiring some of this equipment if they intend to follow the work in which they have become skilled.

Last September I introduced H. R. 3200. The bill would give honorably discharged servicemen a number of benefits to which they are surely entitled. Among these benefits is a provision that these servicemen shall be eligible for benefits under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. This would give them the aid they seek in the purchase of farms. Also, it is provided that War bonds owned by servicemen and used in the purchase of farms will be increased 10 percent in redemption and maturity value. This feature has received enthusiastic endorsement from letters of comment from servicemen.

This bill also provides certain benefits to the servicemen in respect to the purchase of surplus war property. The 10-percent increase in value of War bonds also applies when these bonds are used for the purchase of surplus property. It stresses that a policy shall be adopted in the disposition of such property that will encourage and facilitate the establishment of small business enterprises by members of the armed forces.

Another bill which I have introduced, H. R. 4420, and which deals exclusively with the problem of disposition of surplus Government-owned property, also includes a provision for facilitating the acquisition of material and equipment for the establishment of business enterprises by veterans. Hearings on this bill are now being held before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

I believe that when so many expressions clearly indicate what a number of our servicemen wish to do upon cessation of hostilities or their discharge, it is our duty to make the realization of such plans and ambitions as free of obstacles as possible.

The following letter was received from First Lt. Charles L. Myers, of Philadelphia, Pa.:

In the January 1944 issue of Click, I read the article entitled "No Bonus March After This War."

I have been in the Army 2½ years, and I am seriously thinking of making plans concerning a garage business for after the war. Also, I have been turning over in my mind the prospect of having a small farm in a suburban location which I could take care of in my spare time. Then, too, I have put all my savings into War bonds; so your 10-percent premium idea appeals to me.

I should greatly appreciate any further information you could let me have in regard to the establishment of a garage business, including the procurement of necessary tools, and of buying a suburban property. Also, could I have a copy of the bill which you propose?

Thanking you in advance for whatever you can do to enlighten me concerning the above request.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES L. MYERS, *First Lieutenant.*

The Instability of Money Views of a New York Bank Adviser, 1934–44

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, among the various plans being proposed for establishing a domestic and international monetary system, it is interesting to consider the present-day views of one of our leading economists, the former financial adviser to the Chase National Bank of New York City—with the statements made in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House in 1934. Much monetary experience has been had by the American people in the 10 years that have elapsed since Economist Benjamin Anderson advised the Congress as to the plan best to be followed to give this country a sound, workable, adequate monetary system—and the plan he proposes now. It is to be regretted that the economists of his school seem to have learned little or nothing from the disastrous and distressing financial experience sustained by the American people in following the monetary plans they advocate.

For the information of the Members of Congress and the people of these United States, there is inserted herewith Economist Anderson's present-day recommendation in an address to the New York State Chamber of Commerce, February 3, 1944, followed by reprinting his testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, February 15, 1934:

INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY GOLD VERSUS BANCOR OR UNITAS

(By Dr. Benjamin M. Anderson, professor of economics at the University of California, Los Angeles; member, executive committee, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy)

Mr. President, gentlemen, and friends of the chamber, I remember one thing with pleasure about the time when I became a member of this chamber. That was the sponsorship. I was at that time the economist of the old National Bank of Commerce. James S. Alexander, president of that institution, sponsored my membership here and A. Bartin Hepburn, of the Chase Bank, seconded the nomination. I feel proud today of that sponsorship in this chamber.

It was before I went to the Chase Bank—but, by the way, there was an inadvertence in your statement which I want to correct. I was with the Chase Bank from 1920 to 1939—19 years—before that 2 years with the Bank of Commerce.

I began this study of post-war foreign-exchange stabilization about the end of January 1919, and I want to tell you about the studies forced upon us in the year 1919–20, because they are tremendously significant as giving the basis for interpretation of the proposals of the Keynes and White plans.

We had a startling figure for exports from the United States in January 1919, with a

balance of trade, I think, of $410,000,000. That trade balance ran up—it reached $635,000,000 in June. This great volume of goods going out reversed the business reaction that had started with November, the armistice, and turned business up about March into the beginning of a great boom.

What was doing it? Well, we were, for 4 months after the armistice, advancing money from the United States Treasury which was being used in pegging the foreign exchanges—precisely what these plans propose—francs and lire, but, above all, sterling.

And seeing the immense volume of exports and seeing the immense strength of those foreign exchanges, I looked into it rather carefully. I had as my tutor a man whom I shall always feel great affection for, Franz Meyer, the foreign-exchange trader of the old National Bank of Commerce—a very good trader, a man who knew foreign exchange, who got for me information from various of the other foreign-exchange men.

On March 20, 1919, J. P. Morgan & Co. suddenly unpegged sterling. They had been buying all the sterling offered, with dollars provided by the British Government, borrowed from the United States Treasury. They unpegged it.

I remember Franz Meyer that day coming into the officers' lunchroom of the Bank of Commerce, his face very grave. It was a stirring day in the foreign exchanges. And somebody expressed sympathy about the sterling picture. He said, "Yes; it is grave. It is serious, very serious."

But I didn't think Meyer was as unhappy as he seemed to be, and I ventured a question: "What is our position, Mr. Meyer?" And he answered, his face lighting up, "We are short." He had had no illusions.

Well, that afternoon—I am going to take a little time for this episode—I watched him. I think he had 10 telephones on his desk—maybe only 8.

"Yes, yes; I buy $4.26. Yes; I sell $4.29."

Then he looked at me and grinned. "I make $1,500."

He was a very good trader.

But the market was full of all kinds of disorder for a day or two until something like a level could be established. And he and other men, buying at $4.26 and selling at $4.29, were bringing order into it.

And don't let anyone tell you that the trader who makes a profit in a wild foreign-exchange market is doing anybody any harm. He is doing good. The bid and asked prices would have been very much further apart if he had not been there trading.

We spent billions of good American dollars in direct pegging of foreign exchanges. I say billions—let's get the figure rather exactly—something less than three billions altogether from the armistice down to June 30, in relevant Government advances, in pegging, and in supporting, after the pegging stopped, the foreign exchanges and the export trade on the basis of it.

Then I expected that the export trade would have to drop pretty soon. I thought those foreign exchanges could not stand the strain. The continent of Europe was going pretty badly to pieces -unbalanced budgets, printing more bank notes. I thought that the pressure on those exchanges would bring th thing to an end sooner than it did.

Foreign exchanges did go down, but here was the anomaly: Sterling went with the continental exchanges. And England was the one country over there, of the belligerents, who was improving her financial position—balancing her budget, working toward the resumption of gold payments. The thing was anomalous.

Then late in the autumn it began to be pretty clear what was happening. When our Treasury stopped, London stepped in. Britain interposed her immense credit, her immense financial prestige, between us and the weak Continent. They were buying goods here, giving us sterling, giving us dollar obligations, selling them on the Continent for francs, for lire, for drachmas. And then as we sold goods on the Continent for francs and lire and drachmas, we did not keep them. We sold them in London. London was the great center for all kinds of speculation. If you wanted to sell anything, you could sell it there.

But this time they got stuck. They bought all the drachmas, all the lire, all the Belgian francs, all the French francs, the depreciating exchanges that we created here through exports. And the strength of sterling had been bending, yielding, but sterling carried on that boom for another year.

Private creditors on this side, taking sterling, taking dollar obligations of England, giving also open account credits to the Continent, put up another three and a half billions.

Then we got fed up and our ability to give credit became restricted, and the thing crashed. We went through the great crash of 1920–21.

If we had had a reaction in 1918, when we were braced for it, it would not have done much harm. Everybody was braced for it. By 1920 a great many people had come to accept the idea of a permanently higher price level. A great volume of credit had been extended against commodities at high prices. Immense real estate speculation had taken place—great increase in farm debt for speculative purchase of farm lands. We were not in good shape for a reaction, but we went through it.

And meanwhile this six and a half billions we had given Europe—three billions from the Government and three and a half from private creditors—did no good. Europe was in far worse shape at the end of 1920 than she was at the beginning of 1919.

The point was that the finance minister of a European country, faced with pressure from his people—returning soldiers wanting pensions, wanting pay, people wanting food, pitiful, nobody willing to be taxed, nobody willing to buy bonds—he was taking the easy way, he was leaning on the state bank of issue, he was printing bank notes and more bank notes. And as long as the foreign exchange market would take the paper money which he created, his people could bring in food and luxuries from outside.

We sold them a lot of luxuries in 1920. We sold them everything but the raw materials they ought to have been using to work up and send back.

There was no industrial revival, there was no financial reform in Europe while this thing went on, while we gave an artificial support to foreign exchange.

Now, it is precisely this kind of thing that the Keynes-Morgenthau plan wants to do—to put the dollar behind the weak exchanges and support them, keep them pegged, so that goods may be sold, exports go out. We will have another boom—a very wild, unsound boom. We will get fed up after a while with pouring so many dollars into that great international machine that they propose. We will pull up and cut our losses, and have a crash.

This folly—our own Treasury, I think, has no financial recollection of this episode; Mr. Keynes has. And I want to read you a little passage from the Keynes plan which shows you that he has. The episode was pretty costly to England. She had stood in between us and the Continent.

The Keynes plan, section 14, says, as an argument for the plan:

"This would give everyone the great assistance of multilateral clearing, whereby (for example Great Britain could offset favorable balances arising out of her exports to Europe against unfavorable balances due to the United States or South America or elsewhere). How, indeed, can any country hope to start up trade with Europe during the relief and reconstruction period on any other terms?"

Very nice.

If we had had the Keynes-Morgenthau plan in operation in 1919, England could have bought goods here, sold them at a profit on the Continent, paid for them by putting francs, lire, drachmas into the international exchange fund, while we got credits in that fund, and England, by remaining not debtor to the fund, would have had her profits free and clear, and we would have had big credits in an international fund composed of deteriorating drachmas, lire, francs, and so on.

I don't propose to advocate that measure.

Now, I take it that there is general knowledge of the nature of these plans, and there is not time for me to explain the technical details of them. The big thing that they propose is to put the strength of the strong currencies behind the weak currencies to peg the exchanges. And we did it, we tried it—it was no good. We must not do it again. We wasted six and a half billion dollars doing it the last time.

Now, what is the right way to do this thing?

First: The thing we did last time—gifts for the weakest countries, Red Cross or the kind of thing that Governor Lehman is expected to do—but gifts, not loans. Don't call it loans. Don't expect to get the money back. Wipe it off. Limit it to what is essential. Most of it ought to stop after the first harvest after the war.

And even as you make those gifts, make demands upon the governments of the countries that receive them that they get their financial houses in order. Gifts, as well as loans, should do the recipient permanent good.

But, second: Stabilization loans—tens of millions to two or three hundred millions at the maximum, not the billions proposed by these plans—conditioned on drastic internal financial and currency reforms, conditioned on foreign supervision of the use of the proceeds of the loans.

SOME HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

Now, here we have historical precedents of a very definite sort. We did that for Austria in 1923. We straightened Austria out. We gave her a good start and the Austrians began to pull up from there.

We did it for Hungary in 1924 and we sent Mr. Jeremiah Smith, of Boston, over to sit on the lid, to countersign checks, to see that the money was used properly.

We did it for Germany in 1924 under the Dawes plan—$200,000,000. That was the biggest of these stabilization loans. There was foreign supervision both of the Reichsbank and of certain of the revenues. Germany started right up into a dramatic industrial revival.

We did it for Poland in 1927—$72,000,000, as I remember. The loan would have been a little bigger if I had not been critical. I did not want to make any more foreign loans at that time, but for some reason the Bank of England was said to have wanted my approval of it, and I carefully examined the figures. I was not satisfied with the figures on the floating debt of Poland and insisted on more information. I finally concluded that they were borrowing too much to use in buying silver for coinage. They had been so sick—their people—of a very inferior, shoddy silver coin that they wanted to give them a very fine silver coin. I persuaded them that the standard of the Swiss franc was good enough, and then took that difference off the face of the loan before I gave my approval.

Well, we put the Honorable CHARLES S. DEWEY, who was in the United States Treasury, over there in Poland to supervise that loan, to countersign checks, to see that it

was properly used. It worked; stabilization of currency, balanced budget, it straightened out.

I want to put in parentheses here that I spent Monday night with Mr. DEWEY who is now Congressman from Illinois working from about 6:30 to 1:30, going over a bill that he has since introduced, a copy of which I have, designed to provide a way whereby our Government can cooperate with other European governments or can cooperate with investment bankers in this country, or other countries for that matter, and go in on joint account up to 50 percent of credits.

That is a very modest sort of thing as compared with that $10,000,000,000 bank Mr. Morgenthau wants to establish for investment purposes.

DEWEY'S bill calls for half a billion as a revolving fund. And as it is going to be used on joint account up to only 50 percent, another half billion would be called for from the other participants in the credits. But you don't need more for these stabilization loans, if you see to it that they accomplish their purpose.

I won't go into the details of this bill, Mr. President, but I will say that I endorse this bill. And I am going to venture this request, that you refer it to an appropriate committee of this Chamber for study.

Let me describe the bill for the RECORD. It is House Joint Resolution No. 226, to provide for central reconstruction fund and so on, introduced by Mr. DEWEY February 1, 1944, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That German loan of $200,000,000 looks very small today, but it was amazingly effective. Germany got no benefit from it directly. The German budget was not relieved by it. The German Government could not spend it for domestic purposes. The German Government got $200,000,000 of gold which it put into the Reichsbank as a gold reserve. Then the German Government got from the Reichsbank, in exchange 800,000,000 in marks. But it was obliged to use all of that 800,000,000 in marks in buying goods in Germany for delivery in kind on reparations account: coal and other things. And it was obliged, moreover, to find, that year, 200 millions more, so that none of the proceeds of the loan could be used for internal affairs.

If there had been no reparations problem and if Germany had been able to use, under the supervision of the creditors, that 800,000,000 marks in putting working capital into the industries and perhaps some measures of relief, the thing would have been far easier.

But just the stabilization of currency got them back to a sound gold currency forthwith. They had been through a welter of inflation—money sinking, sinking; everybody losing confidence and hope. Just the sound currency and the balanced budget, themselves, were business-energizing factors. Business started right up, production started right up, full employment came about.

They were pretty helpless when that thing started. There was a desperate shortage of working capital. That shortage of working capital with other complications led to a sharp reaction in the winter of 1925–26; but there was prompt recovery. The thing went on strongly until 1929—early 1929. Then troubles began to come.

Germany would not have had these troubles, Germany would have pulled through and the stabilization would have lasted, had it not been for the complication of reparations.

Now, Germany is a special case after this war, of course. Investment bankers to whom I have talked say, "No; we won't sponsor any German bonds. We are not probably going to sponsor any Italian bonds. But bonds for Denmark, bonds for Norway, bonds for France, bonds for England—yes, we can do that, under the proper conditions."

Now, these conditions, to my mind, involve definite agreements about stabilization of currency on a gold basis.

NEEDED LEGISLATIVE ACTION

There is going to be need for some legislative changes in this country before our investment market can work right, either at home or abroad. We must repeal the Johnson Act, of course, before we can lend to foreign governments.

We ought to change one of these very humiliating provisions of the Securities Act, requiring a foreign government, in the prospectus which it signs, to confess repudiation. The bankers sponsoring such a loan ought to put that fact into the record, of course, but it is a little humiliating to ask a foreign government to submit to the Securities and Exchange Commission a statement like that and perhaps to have to revise it six or seven times to fit the wishes of the Securities and Exchange Commission. There is need for the legislation to be changed with respect to that as a matter of international good feeling.

But for either foreign or domestic freedom of American capital, in either foreign or domestic use, I think we have got to go further.

New capital for domestic purposes through the securities market is very difficult to get—there are tremendous hurdles. Since the securities and exchange legislation has been in existence, we once got up about 50 percent of new issues, as compared with 1923, in a part of 1936 and 1937, but most of the time it has been under 19 percent of 1923. I don't make the comparison with the boom years and the wild years of 1924 to 1929.

I recommend the abolition of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I recommend the substitution for that of a securities and exchange division of the Department of Justice, which shall not work in detail with every transaction, but which shall punish, under criminal law, violations of the securities and exchange legislation—certain criminal law.

There is no more reason for the detailed regulations of the securities and exchange business than any other legitimate business.

I recommend that there be created in the Department of Commerce a purely ministerial body to receive registration statements and prospectuses, so that there may be a responsible document, on the basis of which a man may be sued if he has misrepresented or omitted essential facts, on the basis of which a man may be put in prison if he has done the wrong thing, made the wrong statements.

We have got to do that or something like that to get our securities market free for either foreign or domestic post-war purposes.

Now, one thing that I would emphasize in connection with the measure of Mr. CHARLES DEWEY is that the board is a purely American board. The Keynes-Morgenthau plans and Mr. Morgenthau's investment bank—both have an international board in control. All three have an international board in control.

A bank, a majority of whose board of directors is made up of debtors to the bank who want to borrow more money, is not a safe bank. That feature alone of these three plans would damage any sound plan, I think. The lenders should control, not the borrowers, in a financial institution.

Both of these plans, the Keynes plan and the Morgenthau plan, propose to monetize the bad debts which England owes to the outside world. England, following Mr. Keynes, allowed sterling to get into a very perilous state. It ceased to be gold. It became paper—fluctuating paper, with not even a promise to be redeemed. The irredeemable paper was treated as a thing-in-itself.

Parts of the world followed England in that—in the belief that you can do that. But sterling got to a very perilous state. And the war broke out. Everybody wanted to get rid of it; they blocked it. You cannot even sell it now. It is blocked.

The balances are very great and they are growing. In the middle of August, the London Economist set them at over a billion pounds—around $4,000,000,000 at the official rate of sterling. But added to that, the part to India is increasing alone at the rate of 300 million pounds a year.

Well, if after the war England tries to restore a free pound, lets people sell their claims on London in the open market for what they will bring, sterling will go very low.

And so the Keynes plan proposed a sleight of hand by which all this blocked debt would be put into the international fund, and the Morgenthau plan worked out details. It is to be put in there for 23 years and no payments made for 3 years, and after that 2 percent a year for 20 years.

Meanwhile England's creditors would have credit with this fund for cash, bancor in the case of the Keynes fund. We are not sure in the case of the Morgenthau fund, because we are not sure if that institution will have deposits or not. They don't say anything about their liabilities.

Well, that is no way to help England.

The Federal Reserve Bank of the World ought not to take debts that people cannot pay into its portfolio and hold them for 23 years and create money against them. That is pretty bad.

We must help England, yes, but the way for England to help herself is to make a settlement with each of these countries that they owe separately—the most of them in the British Empire, the biggest part—and then come to us for four or five hundred millions which they will use in making payments to them, giving them some cash and some long credit—work things out as an embarrassed debtor usually does with his creditors. We will help with some cash and she will get that cash on much better terms here, at a much lower rate of interest, if she will definitely go back to gold—fixed gold sterling. I think she has got to do that anyhow in her own interest.

We cannot afford to stay with Mr. Keynes any longer.

GOLD REMAINS THE STANDARD OF VALUE

Gold remains the international standard of value, despite the efforts of governments to substitute irredeemable paper for it, because in the last analysis neither men nor governments will trust anything else. The Tripartite Agreement, involving the United States, Great Britain, and France, which immediately preceded the collapse of the gold bloc in late 1936, did not substitute paper dollars or paper pounds or paper francs for gold. The governments did not trust one another enough for that. If in the course of the day's trading in the foreign exchange market, any government accumulated a sizeable amount of another government's currency, the differences were promptly settled in gold.

GOLD AND PAPER MONEY

Gold needs no endorsement. It can be tested with scales and with acids. The recipient of gold does not have to trust the government stamp upon it, if he does not trust the government that stamped it. No act of faith is called for when gold is used in payments, and no compulsion is required.

Men everywhere, governments everywhere, and central banks everywhere are glad to get it. When paper is offered instead of gold, it will be accepted on faith if the government or the bank which has issued the paper has proved itself worthy of confidence by a satisfactory record of redeeming the paper in gold on demand. If there is a suspension of gold payments, the paper will still be taken on faith, at varying degrees of discount, so

long as there remains a general expectation that the government or the issuing bank will some day make good its promise. The amount of the discount will vary in a free gold market or in a free foreign exchange market with the circumstances that make it more or less probable that the government or the issuing bank will make good its promise, and with the circumstances that govern the probable time of the redemption.

IRREDEEMABLE PAPER AS AN INDEPENDENT STANDARD

Governments and loyal peoples have often been quite unwilling to look upon their irredeemable paper money as merely dishonored promissory notes. Always in times of currency disorders there arises the doctrine that "a pound's a pound" and not merely a promise to pay gold coin of fixed weight and fineness. There is believed to be some magic in governmental authority that can make something out of nothing. The prestige of a long-established and powerful government is very great. The habits of the people in accepting the long-established currency tend to sustain its value. The legal tender quality of paper money aids in holding it up, since creditors must take it in payment of old debts, even though they may try to avoid having to take it when new debts are created. When a currency which has had world-wide prestige as long as the pound sterling has, starts on a downward ccurse, it is difficult for the world to believe that the worst is going to happen, and at various stages in its depreciation it has foreign support as well as domestic support.

Thus we saw the unanchored paper pound, 1931–39, treated by British policy as "a thing in itself" and no longer a promise to pay gold, still accepted, though with growing distrust, by central banks of the Scandinavian and Baltic countries as a substitute in part for their own gold reserves. The financial prestige of Britain was very great. Value is a psychological phenomenon. But there are rational elements in the psychology of value, and hope too long deferred and too often disappointed will destroy value.

GOVERNMENTAL COERCION AND THE VALUE OF MONEY

Yet another factor can be invoked by governments to sustain the value of irredeemable paper money, and that is the power of the government over the economic lives of men. In the period of the French Assignats, the laws fixed penalties of the severest kind against transactions which recognized the depreciation of the paper. But despite the penalties, the French paper money dropped steadily in value and commodity prices soared. The Federal Congress in 1864, blaming the depreciation of the greenback on the manipulation of speculators in the gold market, passed an act forbidding gold futures. The results were disastrous and the Congress, without debate, repealed the law 2 weeks later.

It was prevailing doctrine among economists down to the First World War that governments could not coerce their peoples into accepting at face value a dishonored paper money. But war brought an immense revival and intensification of governmental power, and new governmental techniques for intruding intimately into the bookkeeping of the people. In Germany this power was intensified under the Hitler regime and these techniques were elaborated, and we have had the spectacle in Hitler's Germany of a paper currency, with a microscopic gold reserve and without gold redemption, circulating against commodities at fixed prices for the commodities or, at all events, at controlled prices. As faith waned, Germany substituted coercion, and as the Government was virtually omnipotent, and the people dared not assert their individual rights, and as the Gestapo was tremendously efficient, Germany made the system work.

COERCION AND FOREIGN-EXCHANGE RATES

Always the doctrine had been, moreover, that even though a dishonored paper currency might be accepted at home, nothing could prevent it from depreciating in the foreign exchanges, because the people would smuggle it out of the country and sell it for what it would bring to get good money. But we saw develop in Germany a system of control of the export and import of currency, as well as securities and commodities, so tremendously effective that very little German currency could get outside and that when it got outside, the foreign banks had little motive for buying it because they could not get it back into Germany again to use it. We saw rigorous control of all exchange transactions, and such a limitation in the volume of these transactions that the German Government and the Reichsbank could make the so-called official rate effective on the limited volume of transactions permitted, and the "official mark" in the foreign exchanges held firm at the nominal parity. Meanwhile a great multitude of different kinds of marks, valid for special purposes, sold at varying rates of discount in the foreign-exchange markets, but even these were regulated and controlled.

THE TYRANNY OF HITLER AND THE TYRANNY OF GOLD

The temporary success of the German monetary and economic experiment led to the superficial generalization on the part of certain opponents of the gold standard that gold had been proved to be unnecessary, that Hitler had found a way to do without gold, and that the long tyranny of gold was over. Parenthetically, I much prefer the tyranny of gold to the tyranny of Hitler. Gold is not capricious.

All it requires of men and governments and central banks is that they be honest, that they keep their promises, that they keep their demand liabilities safely within the limit of their quick assets, and that they create debts only when they can see how these debts can be paid. Gold has no intuitions, and gold has very little imagination.

In summary on this point: (1) Men, governments, and central banks will accept gold in payments because they want it for itself. (2) Men will take paper promises to pay gold as money without difficulty so long as these promises are kept and they believe that they will be kept. (3) When paper promises to pay gold are dishonored men will continue to take them at varying degrees of discount in the hope that the promise will later be kept, and because of the prestige of the issuing authorities, fortified by the legal tender peculiarities of money and by the habits of the people and of the world with respect to a long established currency. And finally, (4) when these fail, if your government is powerful enough and tyrannous enough, and your people are sufficiently submissive, and you extend the government into the details of the daily transactions of the people, you can make a dishonored paper circulate at controlled prices inside your country, and you can keep it out of the foreign exchange market. If foreigners happen to have deposits in your banks which they want to sell in the world's markets outside, you simply refuse to allow them to transfer these balances on the books of the bank, or you limit the uses to which they can put them in your own discretion.

THE LIMITS OF COERCION

The post-war world will witness, I have no doubt, the complete collapse of the Hitlerian monetary system. I venture the confident prediction that the forces of coercion which have been sustaining the value of the German mark will soon be sensibly abated, and that the controls which have upheld the mark in the foreign exchanges will work with diminished effectiveness.

And the British experiment of a pound anchored to gold, treated as a "thing in itself," can give us a very tragic picture. The prestige of that pound in the international markets is badly shattered. Foreigners who had entrusted their funds to London found them promptly blocked when the war came. The pound has ceased to be a serviceable tool in trade between Britain and other countries, and has almost entirely ceased to be a tool for conducting trade between two outside countries—which used to be one of its most important services. It has in general ceased to be a valid tool for trade among the units of the British Empire. In general it prevails only in the mother country itself. England has gigantic blocked debts to the outside world due on demand, but she does not allow her creditors even to sell their credit claims for what they can get.

But men and governments are still eager enough for gold. Gold is being currently used on British Government account to pull down the great discount on the rupee in India and to bring out hoarded food reserves in India. Gold is being used in Persia which is glad to get gold but reluctant to take sterling.

GOLD AS THE POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY

Now what is the outlook for an international currency in the post-war world? Men, governments, and central banks all over the world will take gold without question whenever they can get it. Most of the paper currencies of the world they will not take except at heavy discount and in limited amounts, and they will seek to hedge them if they can, and they will seek to pass them on quickly if they can when they take them. The American dollar they will readily take because of our practice of exporting gold when the dollars goes to the "lower gold point" in the foreign exchange markets. What else is there but gold to serve as an international currency? I think there is nothing else.

THE KEYNES AND WHITE PLANS REST ON COERCION

But this is not the view of the British Treasury represented by Lord Keynes, nor the United States Treasury represented by Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. White. Lord Keynes proposes an international currency not redeemable in gold, not based on gold, nominally fixed in relation to gold "but not unalterably." He calls it "bancor," apparently a compound of the two words "banco" and the French word for gold, "or." But it is not even gilded, much less gold. The international money is to be credit entries on the books of the international fund and overdraft privileges with that international fund. The assets of the fund are zero when the fund starts and its liabilities are zero, but as transactions multiply and the fund does business, its balance sheet swells on both sides, its liabilities being deposits in bancor and its assets consisting either of overdrafts in bancor or of a multitude of national currencies—dollars, pounds, francs, drachmas—and in time, presumably, German marks. Its purpose is to hold the different exchange rates together, to put the strength of the stronger exchanges behind the weaker ones. It would increasingly lose dollars and other strong currencies and increasingly acquire weak currencies or the bancor obligations of the central banks or exchange stabilization funds of the weaker countries. Its assets would progressively deteriorate. Indeed both Keynes and White plans contemplate this. They contemplate reductions in the exchange rates of the weaker countries, and in the nominal gold equivalent of the bancor or unitas.

Now, on what substance can the value of bancor rest? On gold? No. The Keynes plan has some ingenious devices to prevent situations in which bancor could be shown to be at a discount in terms of gold, which, however, could break down readily, even with

good faith on the part of all the participants in the fund, which would certainly break down if important countries remained outside the fund, and which would break down in the event of any failure of any country to comply with the requirements of the fund. But it does not rest on gold. The bancor is explicitly never to be redeemed in gold nor in anything else. On what, then, will it rest? On faith? On prestige? Maybe we can create a prestige for an international fund whose assets consist of the dishonored promises of governments and central banks which have lost their prestige. It is possible that the prestige of the United States would be so great that for a time we alone could carry the burden of sustaining the bancor, but I doubt that our generosity is sufficient for this, and I question that we dare risk our strength, already strained by our war finance, in so great and so needless a post-war task.

But neither the Keynes plan nor the Morgenthau plan proposes to rely upon faith alone. Both propose a great deal of coercion. Governments are to coerce their peoples in preventing the international movement of capital funds, which means, as Keynes himself recognizes, the control of all foreign exchange transactions. Now, here, I think, we find real difficulty. Who shall coerce the coercers?

Who shall force the Government of the United States, or the Government of Russia, or the Government of Britain, or the Government of Argentina to comply with the mandates of the governing board of the international fund? The provisions of the White-Morgenthau plan make it very explicitly their duty to do so, and section VII, 8, of the July 10 version of the White plan makes it the obligation of every member country of the fund "to adopt appropriate legislation or decrees to carry out its undertakings to the fund," and those undertakings are numerous and drastic. For either the Keynes plan or the Morgenthau-White plan to work, would require a world state with an authority over economic transactions as great as the authority which any national state has effectively asserted in peacetime.

Is it realism to suppose that the whole world can hang together in the support of bancor or unitas when the British Empire can't hang together in support of sterling within the British Empire?

The Keynes plan, moreover, definitely suggests international control of commodities and an international ever-normal granary, and an international control of investment. It sees the clearing union as facilitating these purposes as well as foreign-exchange stabilization. The document states, "We have here a genuine organ of truly international government." The White plan is not so frank, but there is much sympathy for these ideas in important Washington circles.

WAS THE OLD GOLD STANDARD A STERLING STANDARD?

There is a myth widely current which I wish to challenge. It is that, prior to 1914, the world was on the sterling standard rather than the gold standard; that London controlled the gold standard; and that it was only superhuman wisdom in London which made it work. The doctrine adds that when New York became the center after 1918 the gold standard failed because New York lacked London's wisdom. Now, the fact is that prewar London had far less control and responsibility prior to 1914 than New York did after 1918, and that policy played a much smaller role in the earlier period. There were many gold-standard money markets competing with London for gold prior to 1914, several of them very powerful, as New York, Berlin, and Paris, and many others of real influence, as Amsterdam, Vienna, Switzerland, the Scandinavian countries, and Japan. These all steadied one another. All would pull gold away from any country that was overexpanding credit and force it to pull up. It was not policy. As Mr. Woodward, of the Central Hanover, said to me one time, "it was nature." International cooperation came only in crises—and then at stiff rates of interest. Now New York lacked this steadying influence from 1918 down to 1925, and did not get adequate competition for gold till France got into the game—in an overdrastic way—in 1928. New York used policy in the 1920's—bad policy. But I must add that Benjamin Strong learned this bad policy from Montagu Norman. Both we and London overexpanded credit in the 1920's, but we had the semblance of an excuse in our overabundant gold, while London had no excuse at all.

I want to see a real gold-standard world again, with several powerful money centers competing for gold and holding one another in check. I don't want international monetary cooperation in ordinary times. It prolongs unsound tendencies, as in 1924–29, and then it breaks down in crises, as in 1931. I want competition in ordinary times, and cooperation only in crises—at a stiff rate of interest.

I have been too close to the centers of wisdom and power in governments and central banks to have any belief at all in the adequacy of their wisdom to do more than routine things. The more I see of governmental economic policy the more I trust the automatic forces of free markets. The more I see of public monetary policy the more I trust gold.

TO ESTABLISH THE FEDERAL MONETARY AUTHORITY

(Thursday, February 15, 1934, House of Representatives, subcommittee of Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D. C.)

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, Hon. T. Alan Goldsborough presiding.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The committee will come to order.

Our witness this morning is Dr. Anderson of the Chase National Bank. Will you please come forward, Dr. Anderson, and give your full name and your connection to the reporter?

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN M. ANDERSON, JR., ECONOMIST OF THE CHASE NATIONAL BANK, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. ANDERSON. My name is Benjamin M. Anderson, Jr., and I am economist of the Chase National Bank of New York City.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. How long have you been economist for the Chase?

Mr. ANDERSON. Since 1920.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. And prior to that time?

Mr. ANDERSON. The first part of my work in life was a teacher.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You were in Texas, weren't you?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I was born in Missouri and did my first teaching in Missouri colleges.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. In what subjects?

Mr. ANDERSON. Economics and history. Then I was instructor and assistant professor of economics in Columbia University, New York, from 1911 to 1913; then assistant professor of economics at Harvard from 1913 to 1918, teaching money and banking, among other subjects. Then I was economic adviser of the National Bank of Commerce in New York from 1918 to 1920, and then with the Chase National Bank.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Dr. Anderson, your time is your own, and if you will proceed in your own way, the committee will want to ask you some questions, I am sure. You are familiar with the bill we are considering.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have the bill before me, and I have gone over it. I have a statement which I would like to read. This is a brief statement which I want to amplify later.

Permit me first to suggest to your committee the inadvisability of any further radical change in the currency laws of the United States at the present time. The tentative stabilization of the gold content of the American dollar as a result of the President's recent action has already brought a very definite and very heartening revival of financial and business confidence, manifest especially in the bond market, manifest also in the return flow of American funds which had gone to foreign lands, and in a considerable volume of foreign money coming to the United States for investment not only in our stocks but also in our bonds. The process of the readjustment in the foreign exchanges to the new gold value of the dollar—a very violent and disturbed process in the beginning—has made very substantial headway, and the fluctuations have become very much more moderate. To inject new elements of uncertainty as to the gold value of the dollar into the financial situation at the present time by new currency legislation would be an exceedingly unfortunate thing.

The revival of economic activity and the reemployment of millions of men must be the work primarily of private enterprise. Wise governmental policy can help it. Unwise governmental policy can terribly retard it or prevent it. But the main work must be done by private enterprise seeking profit and having confidence enough in the financial foundation of it all to be willing to take normal risks. If the business and financial community are to find important changes in the basis on which they make their calculations at short intervals as they read the news from Washington, their ability to make intelligent plans is greatly lessened, their ability to persuade one another to join in these plans is greatly lessened, their courage is undermined, and their activities are retarded or reduced.

With respect to the currency in particular, it would surely seem that enough has already been done.

Now, I do not agree with you in your plan, but you invite me here knowing that and you want my frank opinions and here they are.

With respect to the specific bill in hand, H. R. 7157, I find only one provision that I can commend, and even there I must make a qualification. This is the repeal of title III of the act of May 12, 1933, which I understand to be the Thomas amendment to the agricultural bill of last year. I should gladly see that amendment repealed, but I should wish to save the final paragraph, which gives the Federal Reserve Board, with the approval of the President, authority to increase the reserve requirements of member banks against their time or demand deposits. This is a provision which was put in to make a barrier against an uncontrollable expansion of credit in case that should develop. It may or may not be an effective barrier, but it should be retained. The repeal of the rest of the Thomas amendment I should like to see. But I take it that the purpose of this bill is not to repeal the Thomas amendment, but rather to substitute something stronger, of a similar character, for it.

Moreover, the Thomas amendment sets a lower limit for possible debasement of the gold content of the dollar, which H. R. 7157 omits.

In testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in connection with the gold bill of 1934, recently passed, I expressed the following opinions: (1) That control over the credit situation should remain with the Federal Reserve authorities rather than with the Government, and (2) that, even if the Government saw fit to take over a part of the control of the credit situation, the powers involved ought to be lodged, not with the Secretary of the Treasury, but with an independent governmental agency, because the Treasury is a great borrower, the Treasury is almost always interested in cheap money, and Treasury policy would frequently conflict with what sound credit policy would call for, however, that credit policy might be

defined. I should, therefore, favor the proposal contained in H. R. 7157, the bill now under consideration, to transfer from the Treasury to an independent Federal monetary authority part or all of the new powers given to the Treasury under the recently passed gold bill of 1934, if the bill really did establish an independent Federal monetary authority. But I notice that it is provided that the directors of this new monetary authority "shall be subject to removal by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress." Such an authority would have no independence whatever, and I should prefer to see the powers remain where they are, with the Secretary of the Treasury, responsible solely to the President.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Assuming that was changed and this monetary authority was an entirely independent body appointed for a very long time, and appointed to represent, not some special interest but society as a whole, would you think it is better than to leave the management in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury as the law now provides?

Mr. ANDERSON. The difficulty there is that the present law is limited to 2 years, and by proclamation to a third year. During that time I would rather have the independent monetary authority than the Secretary of the Treasury controlling it, if it were an independent authority. But my thought is we want to get back to a time when we have the Federal Reserve authorities in control of the monetary and credit policy of the country.

With respect to the declaration of policy in the bill, that it shall "restore and maintain the normal purchasing power of the dollar, which shall, for the purposes of this act, be the average purchasing power of the dollar for all commodities during the year 1926," I wish to express the strong conviction that the bill proposes an impossibility. It is possible, by currency legislation, so to undermine the confidence of the people in their dollar that prices will rise rapidly and violently toward or far beyond the 1926 level. It is not possible, by currency manipulation, to bring them to the 1926 level or any other level, stop them there, and hold them there. It cannot be done by varying the gold content of the dollar, it cannot be done by regulation of the volume of currency and credit, it cannot be done by varying discount rates, and it cannot be done by any combination of these devices.

That is the only formal thing I am going to read, and I want to talk, if I may, amplifying certain of these propositions, particularly with reference to a number of the topics brought up in the bill.

The bill provides for the mandatory purchase of silver to the extent of 1,000,000,000 ounces with the limitation that it shall not exceed 25 percent of the value of the gold in the Treasury.

I have studied this silver thing a great deal and have tried very hard to find any grounds from the standpoint of the public welfare, and from the standpoint of monetary policy, why we should be talking about silver, legislating about silver, or doing anything about silver in this situation.

I think there is nothing behind the silver move but the selfish interests of the silver people. I think it is an abuse of the currency to bring this silver matter in, and that the proposal to buy a billion ounces of silver is simply using Government money to raise the price of silver for the benefit of the silver interests, and for no other benefit.

The notion that our foreign trade has been injured by the price of silver, I can find no warrant for. The one great silver country is China, and the figures will show very clearly that our exports with China fell much less rapidly than our export trade with gold-standard countries or countries that went off of the gold standard. The evidence is quite clear in that respect, that China did better in holding up her buying from us in percentage than almost any other country.

Statements have been made that all Latin America is on a silver basis and we must take care of them. Latin America is not on the silver basis. Mexico has recently dropped from gold to a silver basis but it was unintentional, she did not want to. I find nothing to justify the argument of the silver people in this connection.

The provision for changing the price of gold from time to time is a provision which with its continuous uncertainty merely continues an evil which has done more to make disturbance in this great trouble of ours than any other one thing.

We had a great licking coming to us as the result of the follies that took place between 1922 and 1929. The two great follies that made this terrible trouble were, first, the high protective tariffs which choked the trade of the world and prevented countries from paying for what they bought by sending in goods to people they bought from. Then the second is the gigantic expansion of bank credit in the United States, and in a less measure elsewhere in the world, which made it possible for us for 6 or 7 years to overcome those tariffs, getting goods out on credit but making payments impossible.

We received from Europe long-time bonds in the purchase of daily bread, the next year more long-time bonds to buy more daily bread and to pay interest on last year's borrowings. The process went on year after year with the necessity of steady expansion of foreign loans in order to keep going a constant volume of exports. The thing ought to be daily labor for daily bread, and it would have been if our tariffs had been low enough for Europe to send in goods to pay for her cotton, tobacco, and other things.

The bank expansion resting on the policies of the Federal Reserve banks, and resting on the inflowing gold that came to us because the rest of the world was off of the gold standard and could not receive gold, amounted to thirteen-and one-half billion of deposits in the United States in the commercial banks, leaving out the savings banks, and fourteen and one-half billion in loans and investments, which we did not need.

Commerce would not take it and would not use it, and it went into every other abnormal use which you can think of. It went into our vast foreign loans I speak about; it went into real-estate mortgage on a colossal scale.

The real-estate mortgages of the members of the Federal Reserve System stood at $500,000,000 in 1919, and were over $3,000,000,000 by 1928; these figures are roughly right.

It went into installment finance paper, rapidly growing and expanding; and it went into the stock and bond collateral loans, and the bank investments in bonds that wrecked so many banks when the market went to pieces in the last year or two.

We had a great licking coming to us as the result of those follies and as the result of the further folly of raising the tariff still higher in 1930.

But the worst troubles that came were at a later time, and as the result of another thing. We thought it was pretty bad down to early 1931, that we had had a great crisis, but if we could get back now to what we had in the first half of 1931, get back to the volume of unemployment we had at that time and get back to the volume of railroad traffic, we would be glad to do it. The railroads were solvent in the middle of 1931.

Mr. CROSS. You say the railroads were solvent in 1931?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about that.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. In 1931?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; you take the railroad traffic as it was in the middle of 1931 and give the railroads that traffic again today, the figures would look fine.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Don't you know the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was conceived by the banking houses of New York in order to save the stocks and bonds they held in the railroad companies?

Mr. ANDERSON. You are talking about late 1931.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was conceived prior to that time, and actually was launched in October 1931 at a conference which I happened to attend at the White House.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; something had come between the time I am talking about, the first half of 1931, and that time. It began in May, and it represented the beginning of fear regarding the standard of value. Austria cracked and Germany began to weaken, with the discovery that France, under political fears, was no longer supporting an international cooperation, no longer cooperating as we expected cooperation in financial trouble.

Then came the fear regarding the standard of value itself, first the run on England when she was pulled off the gold standard, then fears regarding the dollar and the run on the United States.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You speak of a run on the United States, will you illustrate what you mean by that?

Mr. ANDERSON. I mean the frightened foreign withdrawals of gold from the United States because they did not trust the dollar any more.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Weren't our gold reserves increasing constantly during that period, not regularly, but constantly?

Mr. ANDERSON. They increased in the early part of the year but withdrawals following the collapse of sterling decreased the reserves.

Mr. BUSBY. What year are you speaking about?

Mr. ANDERSON. 1931.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Do you object to saying what countries had no confidence in the dollar of the United States at that time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me go back a bit in speaking of the follies of 1929, to make this picture a little more clear before you.

One of the theories in this period of cheap money, and one that Professor Cassell, by the way, very much favored, was the substitution of gold exchange for gold in central bank reserves.

There grew up a very wide practice of central banks in Europe holding dollars and sterling instead of holding gold in their own vaults. The Netherlands Bank had a lot of sterling and dollars, and the Bank of France had a tremendous lot of both dollars and sterling.

In the collapse of sterling the Bank of France lost several times its capital, and the Government had to make good its capital. The Netherlands Bank lost its capital and the Government made good half of it.

In the trouble that followed they could not trust sterling, so what could they trust, and the foreign central bank began to pull gold out of us—they wanted it at home where they could trust it.

The Bank of France did not pull gold out of us in the autumn of 1931 when the first big run came, and I was told they had practically the same balance then that they had at the end. The Bank of France took its gold out in 1932.

The point I am trying to get at is this, that when that time came, when the fear regarding the standard of value came and men ceased to trust the standard of value, you got the worst smash, the worst part of this whole smash, and let me give you the figures.

The New York Times average of stocks of 25 industrials dropped from 80 to 34 during February to June and July in 1932. That is the biggest percentage drop of any period, it is a fearful percentage.

Your index of business activity, I haven't got the exact figures, but while it was not satisfactory in early 1931, it dropped incredibly from the middle of 1931 to the middle

of 1932, to the lowest in this period of distress.

Your turn in that tide came in June and early July of 1932 when two main things happened, both reassuring regarding the standard of value. One was that we could announce that we had beaten off the second great raid on our gold, that we had paid the foreigners all they could take, that our authorities said come and get it, we don't want it here, and they had taken all that they could, and we could announce that they had taken all they could.

The second was the vote in the United States Senate on the Patman bonus bill, whereby a great majority the Senate rejected that bill which was an assurance that the Senate would protect the standard of value. Then came our turn in the summer of 1932.

Mr. BUSBY. If I may suggest another element, don't you think it was Mr. Hoover's arrangement to take care of Germany rather than the Patman bonus bill that had more to do with the upswing in 1932?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Hoover was not doing anything for Germany in 1932. It was in 1931 he was trying to do something.

Mr. BUSBY. You skipped that upswing.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That lasted only about 2 weeks.

Mr. ANDERSON. It did not last very long because the thing was not carried through.

Mr. BUSBY. I remember differently but the records will clear that up.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I believe the records would be best to clear it up.

However, there was a third thing that helped out, in the middle of 1932, and that was the agreement at the Lausanne Conference between Germany, England, France, and other countries which, had we followed it up, as they were supposed to, would have gone far toward clearing the international atmosphere. But we had a political campaign on and nobody here was willing to follow it up.

I don't want to go off too far there, but I would put as one of the other follies of the period of 1922 to 1929 the very unsatisfactory arrangement made regarding reparations and Allied debts, based on the illusions that expanding bank credit had created. Everybody thought that more could be done than was possible, because credit was expanding and there was a lot of money, and that they could do things with money instead of goods.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I think the investigations of this subcommittee in the past several years justifies the opinion that the collapse in values was due to a want of world supply of gold, and that when these other governments and the central banks, as you have indicated, began to try to go on gold again, the world-wide scarcity was very largely responsible for the crash in commodity prices.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I, with respect to that point, put into your record a bulletin of March 15, 1931, called Gold, Some Observations on the Interim Report of the Gold Delegation of the Finance Committee of the League of Nations, of the Chase National Bank.

There were three reports of that commission, and this discusses the first two.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I believe the subcommittee is familiar with that bulletin, and I don't know whether we would be justified in putting the entire bulletin in the record. We will take it up in executive session if you desire but I think we are all familiar with the bulletin you have in your hand.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will call attention to one or two things in it with reference to this point.

By the way, let me say that the gold delegation of the finance committee of the League of Nations, Professor Cassell having the leadership, started out rather strongly with the view that the gold factor was highly important. In its second report they softened this a great deal, and the final report, Professor Cassell would not even sign, and he had a minority report, while the rest of them put emphasis, not on gold, but on other things.

I think it might be interesting for you to know the fact that Cassell is a dissenter in the last document, whereas he was the leader in the first two documents.

The contention in the first interim report of that committee, that there is a fixed volume of trade in the world and a fixed volume of gold production required to keep pace with it, that credit is fixed by the volume of gold you produce, and that if gold is not produced fast enough it would strangle trade and force the decline of prices and so on; it just is not so.

The first big flaw in the argument is in the post-war world; there has been no fixed relationship between the growth of credit and the growth of gold. Credit expanded far more rapidly than gold production, and far more rapidly than production or trade.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. We all agree that there is vastly too much credit in relation to the metallic base, if that is what you mean.

Mr. ANDERSON. I mean vastly too much credit in relation to the need for credit—in relation to the kind of things credit can properly be based on.

I do not want any credit unless I can see how the money is coming back. It is not a good thing to give a man credit unless you can see how he can use it to get money back.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Isn't it true—and I say this with absolute respect—but isn't it true that the great banking houses of New York are the institutions which were solely responsible for flooding the country with these worthless foreign bonds which you have so accurately described?

Mr. ANDERSON. The primary responsibility for the excessive security issues of all kinds lay not with the numerous independent banks and investment houses but with the central money market authorities who made money so excessive that it was splashing around inviting use, and that it spoiled the perspective of even conservative men—men who were very much troubled about the thing in 1925 and 1926 were often convinced by 1928 and 1929 that it was all right. However, you can find individual cases of great abuse.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Of course, the condition which I am about to describe, I am sure, existed all over the country: The great banking houses of New York sent representatives all down through Maryland and induced the country banks to purchase these foreign bonds, and it seems to me that the loading up of the banking institutions of the country with securities of doubtful value, or of no value, was almost entirely the result of the direct activity of the great New York banks.

Isn't that a fairly accurate statement, Mr. Anderson?

Mr. ANDERSON. You say of the New York banks, but I would say some of their affiliates and the investment houses, and I do not think you can say much about the evils of that period that I was not myself saying in print repeatedly at that time.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. One of the things you advocated, as I remember it, along with other bankers and representatives of bankers, for many years, which was constantly fought by men like Steagall, Busby, and myself, was allowing the national banks to engage in the real-estate mortgage business.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I never favored that.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I was under the impression you were one of those who did.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I never favored that. I can show you a bulletin I wrote in 1926 where I went on record as saying commercial banks ought not to take mortgages.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. And certainly I want to add this, that the great national banks of New York are the influence which made possible the passage of the law placing the national banks in the real-estate mortgage business, which you have stated this morning was one of the principal causes of the crash.

Mr. ANDERSON. As early as 1926, and before the McFadden bill was passed, I published in this bulletin a protest against the holding of real-estate mortgages in commercial banks, and set up the definite proposition they were not proper things for a commercial bank to hold.

Mr. CROSS. On that point of the major banks and their affiliates, who was the chairman of your board at that time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Wiggin.

Mr. CROSS. Don't you think those banks were largely responsible at least for the expansion of credit in stocks on the stock exchange? To illustrate, I don't know whether you are familiar with the testimony, but I presume you are, that was brought out in the Senate investigating committee on the exchange, in which Mr. Wiggin was involved, I believe it was in Fox Film at that time, in which they manipulated those stocks. I don't know whether it was Fox Film or Fox Theaters, but they had a dozen of those things, and he was in one of those pools, and for instance, we will say the stock was at 40, then they bid right along 40¼, 40½, 40¾, 41¼, and on and on up. Isn't it also true that the banks in New York, on account of the loans to that stock exchange or the brokers, sapped and drew from all of the small banks throughout the country money which was supposed to be the money of those communities and it was sent to New York to get the high rates of interest as the result of that performance?

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me see what I ought to say there.

Mr. CROSS. Did you agree with Mr. Wiggin during that time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I knew nothing about those transactions.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You may proceed with your statement, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now, then, as to the general responsibility for that "bad times" during which things were wrong and during which many normal things became abnormal, it is one of the invariable results that during a period of rising prices and speculative profits, many men go wrong—their fiber cracks.

If you will take any such period in the United States, for instance, the greenback period, you will find scandal and financial crookedness in high places; you know things came up under Grant's regime, and some of you may have seen the article by Professor Dunning in 1912 or 1913 in the Political Science Quarterly, giving an account of a memorandum by President Johnson which was not published until after everybody mentioned was dead, discussing the Alaska purchase.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Let me interrupt you right there to say, if we are going to get off on what took place during the greenback period and periods of that kind, it will be worth while, in order to keep the record evenly balanced, or in other words, to have it retain reasonable proportion, for us to accent the fact that the basis of the banking structure and banking management of this country which produced this collapse took place when the country was on the undisputed gold standard. You can call that a greenback period, but we did not go off of the gold standard until March 1933.

Mr. BUSBY. And I would like to remind you that my memory is that the greatest amount of gold this country ever held was $5,015,000,000, about the middle of September 1931, when you said gold was being rapidly withdrawn from the country, and people were becoming suspicious, or feared, rather, that a fall of the standard of value was setting in, and the call came mostly by France in 1932, which everyone might say was a bluff, and we did not go far below $4,000,000,000 at any time in gold.

Mr. ANDERSON. They took out hundreds of millions twice in a short period, in autumn of 1931 and again in the spring of 1932, two

great waves. There is no dispute about the fact, and if you will get the weekly figures of the gold monetary stock in the country for the month of September 1931 to July 1932 you will see what I mean.

Mr. BUSBY. You have reached a point where I want to direct some questions, and I think I will direct them to the collapse of credit rather than the withdrawal of gold as being the cause for the downfall, and that having been due to the unconscionable methods of the larger banking interests in furthering the issuance of worthless bonds and stocks, and underwriting issues on a project that would not stand and which was never calculated to pay dividends; yet the syndicate composed of all of these banks, such as, with all due respect, the one you represent, and the other institutions, the 12 banks that controlled $20,000,000,000 at the time you speak of—I think they were the culprits in the whole set-up. I will direct my examination to them when we get past the point where you have finished dealing with the gold situation and the collapse of this intolerable situation created by them in their underwriting efforts and their bond-floating orgies of worthless issues, which will indicate more reasonably the cause of the collapse, than the withdrawal by France of $3,000,000,000 of gold.

Mr. HANCOCK. Wasn't it generally understood about that same period your recent remarks were addressed to, that the supply of gold in this country was more or less unwieldy, and after this withdrawal there was really an actual feeling of relief on the part of those who were in charge of directing the money affairs of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; we were glad to have the French take that gold. I remember being asked by a Frenchman in my office at the time the Glass-Steagall bill was being passed, which permitted Government securities as collateral for Federal notes, why we were doing it. I said, "The reason is very simple; we have a nervous creditor on the other side of the water, and we want them to take the money home and quit disturbing our money market."

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes; I remember at that time I was quoted as having said we had created a condition where France could take her gold and go to hell with it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I didn't use quite that language, although I sympathized with it. I appreciate, too, their fears and the psychology behind it.

Might I say this, Mr. Busby, about your general proposition as to who is to blame? I think very frequently we look for culprits when it would be more profitable to look for causes, and that very frequently objective conditions are far more responsible than individual human beings, even though you can say these individual human beings are doing wrong or making mistakes.

I think, therefore, my best service to the committee would not be in helping you allocate responsibility of individuals, but in pointing out things I do about the kind of economic causes which bring about such a condition.

Now, you take a case like this, a country banker, we will say, loading up his portfolio, or any banker buying bonds in that period, if he bought high-yield Brazilian bonds, we will say, if anybody in New York advised him that was a good investment, I would blame that man.

But on the other hand, how about the man who in good faith bought New York Central bonds, rated in Moody's as triple A in 1929, and then in 1932, when he wanted to turn them into cash, found that they, too, were slaughtered in price? He is caught in a general situation.

I might say, what about the man who takes on a mortgage on the ordinary standards on a farm that is running and produces enough money to pay the taxes and interest and leave a surplus, and then in the general situation later he finds that mortgage no good?

The reason is that too much credit makes bad credit. The thing to do is to control the central market to keep from having too much money around over the needs of trade.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Could you explain at this point how you could expect the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks to adopt a policy which you have described, when pressure was being constantly brought on them by the great New York banks who really had their officers appointed to continue to expand credit?

That was thoroughly understood, and even papers like the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the Chicago Herald Tribune, papers which are well known to be allied in their dealings with the great banking interests, criticized that situation.

What we are trying to do is to get a board set up which will have no interest in anybody except the general public, including, of course, the banks.

Mr. ANDERSON. As to the New York banks, I think it is quite incorrect to say they were pressing for cheap money. My own bank certainly fought it.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Don't you remember the controversy about Mitchell going out and throwing $25,000,000 into the market when, as a matter of fact, it was at a time when conservative people were advised there was too much credit in the stock exchange?

Mr. ANDERSON. May I tell you gentlemen, not for the record, what I know about that episode?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Why don't you want it to go in the record? If you don't want it to go in the record, don't tell us about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I will not tell the confidential thing I know about it.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. At that time, you must remember, the National City Bank was the largest bank in the United States.

Mr. BUSBY. Funds could only be supplied through the New York banks, whether they were for the account of others, for outside banks, or for themselves, could they?

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me express this opinion with reference to the episode in the spring of 1929, when the call rate went suddenly to 20 or 25 percent and Mr. Mitchell made a statement that, the Federal Reserve authorities to the contrary notwithstanding, he had borrowed some money at the Federal Reserve bank to lend at the money post. I believe other banks did the same thing at the same time, and that the Federal Reserve authorities were in sympathy with that.

It is my belief they did not want the thing to run up to 25 percent, and they broke the rate down to 15 or 12, which was still a high rate, and that the episode was simply an action to steady the market and not to make it easy, but to prevent a violent cataclysm.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The people of the country were given to understand the New York banks were going to support the New York stock market and pour their money into it for that purpose.

You say other banks were doing it, and doing it with the cooperation of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. ANDERSON. The thing was not intended to make an easy market; it was not intended to make the stock market go up, but merely to prevent a violent catclysm that very tight money could create. The very same kind of thing was done at the end of the year when interest rates went to 12 percent, and when there was some borrowing, I think, speaking from recollection, by various New York banks to lend at 12 percent to keep the rate from going higher than 12; but that is a high rate.

Mr. BUSBY. If I remember correctly, the New York banks at that time were indulging in the practice of gathering in funds from all over the country from the various sources, for the purpose of lending for the account of others which has no stability at all, which is not backed even by an institution, but by private individuals; and that funds poured into the banks, and in 1929, when the crash came, 56 percent of the money passing through the New York banks to the exchange was from that unstable source for the account of others; that 29 percent of the amount came in from country banks, all kinds of banks, and was being passed out by the New York banks because they were getting a big difference between what they had to pay for funds and what they were getting on the New York exchange.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; the New York banks on money loaned by them for others only got one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. BUSBY. I don't mean the actual account, but I mean funds like your bank account as the correspondent for many other banks has it placed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Here is the process the New York banks were not running around to get that money to lend for the account of others; they did not like it—they were afraid of it and the New York Clearing House made a rule in the course of time—I have forgotten the exact date—limiting the amount that could be done to keep the small people from doing it.

Mr. BUSBY. That was after the crash?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; before the crash. They were so much concerned about it, I know, in the Chase Bank, that we were limiting the amount we ourselves would lend of our own money, knowing that when trouble came these outsiders would get frightened and that a heavy burden would be thrown on the New York banks.

Mr. BUSBY. Which happened.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; which happened. This one thing I want to tell you happened in the Chase Bank in that panic week. At the beginning of that panic week, October 22, 1929, we had loaned of our own money at the money post of the stock exchange, only $225,000. We did not like the situation, and we were lending for the account of others vast sums, not at our instance, but on their instructions, that is, if a customer told us to do a thing, it is our business to do it, and we were lending money for country banks and others, great corporations, private investors, foreign banks, who instructed us to debit their account and lend on call.

I may say further, on that day, October 22, we owed the Federal Reserve bank zero, and we had a great lot of Government securities; we were highly liquid; we had seen trouble coming, and had got ready for it.

In the week that followed, we got calls from these people, they did not wish to telegraph or to write, but they called by phone at the bank and said, "Call our money." We called it, and we loaned ourselves to the extent that we increased loans in that bank week $375,000,000, and for the whole country the loan expansion that week of the banks was $1,200,000,000, so that the Chase Bank did 30 percent of all of the work done that week in saving the situation from collapse.

There is a record where Mr. Wiggin and I worked together in doing that, and I am proud to have helped him get ready for it, and I want it put to his credit.

We expanded to meet the situation, and got it back quietly when the trouble was over. That was a good piece of work done by the New York banks.

The New York Clearing House, as early as 1928, began to take many precautions, began to make inquiries of the position of the banks with respect to liquidity.

You know when Radio was selling at 70 it was taken in the loan envelopes as collateral at only 40, and I went down into the loan department of our bank when this panic started, and the report came that Radio was quoted at 40. One of the clerks looked up at me and said, "It is down to our

loan value," and besides that we had 25-percent margin.

That amount of loans was vastly too big, but it was liquidated down from eight billion and a half to under three hundred millions by the middle of 1932.

Mr. BUSBY. That brings us back to a real point in our procedure here. It was not your money base, it was not your gold, it was not the amount of currency in circulation, because in 1929 it was much smaller than it is now; but it is the amount of credit that had been permitted, and, I say, eagerly encouraged by the banking set-up of this country, which had involved the people on promises to do things which it would be impossible for them to do with the change of circumstances. While your bank was increasing from $250,000,000 in round numbers to $350,000,000 in loans in a short time, there was, I will say, twenty billions of shrinkage in stock values which was being absorbed by the unsuspecting public, and your efforts to support the market were commendable, no doubt, but your efforts did not save the people who had gone into this great scheme of things where thousands and thousands of them were wiped out of house and home because of this uncontrolled expansion of credit through bank circulation, and that has continued down to this date so much so that the lending on the New York Stock Exchange bonds and stocks dropped from October 1929, we will say, a high of $136,000,000,000 down to less than $30,000,000,000 at the lowest point we reached in the depression.

Mr. ANDERSON. How could one bank control that?

Mr. BUSBY. I am not saying the bank can do it, but the banks created the condition which got the people into that situation, because we need something on the order this bill provides here to control an agency, and also that this country must have a media of exchange set-up if it is going to carry on and do business, and that is the occasion, as I understand it, for this bill, and for a new foundation being laid whereby the people can be protected in their property rights from the imaginary situation which you say makes even the finest bankers crooked.

Mr. ANDERSON. But not all of them by any means.

Mr. BUSBY. Not all of them, but they are all selfish, and I take it the selfish inclination to get gain is what you mean when you say they do things they ought not to do. Men are men, and big men just know more ways to do these things than the fellow of limited knowledge. The result is when the crack comes it opens up and exposes everything and we find the big ones like Mitchell, Wiggins, and all of them have done these things.

You will remember that Wiggins almost contemptuously replied to some questions I asked him in 1930 because I would approach this subject in which he was held a master. I thought of these same things then, but it took 3 years to realize the mass of the people are to be looked after. And while you have done things, or your banks have done things to the mass which has made our country suffer from the standpoint of hunger and starvation, we want a definite arrangement that can be controlled better for the good of the whole country, and that is why this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON I will agree with the purposes of the bill you have stated, that you want to have control of credit that will prevent undue expansion and prevent improper credit and prevent speculation or excess money and things of that kind, and the question would be where to find that control.

The ideal control, the control that has worked best, has never been Government control, it has been good central bank control.

The central bank should be free to apply the regular rules: the rediscount rate should be above the market so that if there is need for money other banks can go and get it, but they have got to pay for it; and they should employ open-market operations so as to tighten the money market and not make it easy. The central bank should lie back there with the reserves of the country to be used in an emergency. Central bank policy should be designed to protect the quality of the credit.

Had we been able to carry out the purposes of the Federal Reserve Act as originally drawn, we would have had that.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. How can you do that when the control of the Federal Reserve System is in the hands of private bankers, who are in the banking business for profit?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would have been very much better if the control of the Federal Reserve System had been in the hands of bankers, because they would have insisted on banking principles.

When the Federal Reserve System was first organized, it did not do a great deal, but followed the conventional orthodox lines; then we got into the war and the Federal Reserve System loyally bent to the fiscal needs of the Treasury and made money, I thought, too cheap at that time; and then, in 1919, after the war was over, went along too far with the Treasury until toward the end of the year, when it asserted itself, with W. P. G. Harding at the head of it——

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. He took cotton from 40 cents down to 7 cents in that year, and he is much loved in some sections of the country; and he took wheat from $2 down to 40 cents.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will put in the record also that the House of Representatives and the Senate investigated that thoroughly, with the exoneration of the Governor from the charges. I refer to Sydney Anderson's joint commission of agricultural inquiry.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. He came into this room and had a chart on the wall there and stood there for 3 hours, and he never answered a single question that we asked him during the entire period, evaded every single question that we asked him during the entire period, and undertook to say that agriculture had not been deflated.

Mr. BUSBY In connection with the point we were on a moment ago, you said you think the situation would have been better handled had the Federal Reserve Bank been more largely in control of the bankers and banker-minded.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes

Mr. BUSBY. Do you regard it as the duty of the Federal Government to furnish a media of exchange to business and the people of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I think it is, as far as the Government establishes the standard of value, controls the coinage and things of that kind, but in the provision of paper money and other media of exchange of a credit character, I think is done best through a banking machinery working rather automatically and adapting the volume of these credit media to the needs of trade and commercial transactions.

Mr. BUSBY. Legal tender is the currency issue of the Government of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't think there ought to be any legal tender except full-weight gold coin.

Mr. BUSBY. Of course, bank checks are not legal tender.

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. BUSBY. Bank checks and checking accounts, which serve for more than nine-tenths of our business transactions, are merely a byproduct of the banks to make profit for the investors in bank stocks—is it not—purely a byproduct, and it is not the objective of the bank to create checking accounts, but they are only incident to a move on the part of the banks to get a profit for the stockholders?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are the thing the bank directs its attention to. The banker is not thinking, as he does his business, of profits to stockholders primarily, but he is thinking of getting the business; here is a good account, I want it.

Mr. BUSBY. That represents profits to him?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. The checking accounts are merely byproducts of his effort to get the business and get a profit; are they not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I won't say byproducts, but they are the product by which he gets a profit.

Mr. BUSBY. They are not a consideration at all, but they are an incident to the methods of the bank getting business and making profits.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would you say that steel rails are an incidental byproduct of a steel mill?

Mr. BUSBY. They are the direct objective of the operation of the mill, while the banker is not interested in bank checks one way or another, except it creates a condition to bring profit into the bank, and that is what I am speaking of.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say it is no more true of the bank checks than of the steel rails. In the steel mill they are interested in the rails, and in the bank the banker is interested in the deposits of the customers.

Mr. BUSBY. I understand, but I am talking about the media of exchange to be used by business. It is none of the bank's concern to see that the people who do business in our country are supplied with a media of exchange, except as a profit comes to it by the transaction. Isn't that true?

Mr ANDERSON. Yes; and the theory of the thing is that you do it better that way, in the dealings between customers and bankers, the customer not borrowing money unless he needs it, because he has got to pay interest, bank deposit currency not being provided unless somebody will pay for it; then you keep it to what the needs are.

Mr. BUSBY. Now, because of your reputation and eminence as an economist, I would like to ask if you think it is possible in what we call good times, times of rising price levels, for our banking set-up to go along without inflating credit so as to cause these price peaks that ultimately must collapse?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is possible if you get a good vigorous Federal Reserve System which can function without fear, which is not afraid of raising the discount rate, and which is not afraid to tighten credit when there is pressure.

Mr. BUSBY. Where are you going to get that outfit you are talking about?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is political pressure. The heart of the Federal Reserve System was broken when President Warren Harding put W P. G. Harding off of the Board and put the other man in his place, Crissinger.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Harding had no character and Crissinger had no sense. That is the distinction.

Mr. ANDERSON Please put in the record that I dissent as to Harding's character.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH How about Crissinger?

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree.

Mr. BUSBY. Now, as to the other side of the proposition I presented awhile ago with regard to the banks in rising price times, do you regard it as being possible under our banking set-up, when falling price levels set in, to function and furnish checking accounts as a media of exchange so that business can carry on?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; but not so that prices can be forced up thereby.

Mr. BUSBY. I am not talking about them being forced up. Isn't it the practice of the banks, they see their security depreciate, for instance, as you spoke of the Radio stock dropping from 72 to 40, to begin to press those who have accounts with them, and that goes on all over the country, so much so that by the time price levels have fallen

as much as 15 percent, there is a general drive by the banks to make collections of accounts so as to preserve themselves from their depositors, and that this drive by the banks—and I am not blaming them for it, because, it is the only way they can exist—necessarily creates the intolerable conditions we call depression?

Mr. ANDERSON. A general drive, no. Let's analyze what happens. In a crisis period, and let us take 1920 as a case, where your crisis began in May, June.

Mr. BUSBY. I think that was a home-made crisis by the late Mr. W. P. G. Harding, but you might take the 1929 prices as a natural happening.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I don't think so, and I would be glad to take that 1920 period as one where the commercial banks acted on the whole very well, and where the process was this, that credit instead of contracting when the price decline began, expanded for several months.

Mr. BUSBY. That was not true in the section where I lived. What happened by and large was that the rediscount banks were called on to make payment to the Federal Reserve of loans they never expected to be called, and that was the condition all through the South. They were notified by the Federal Reserve, "If you make this loan again you will carry it in your own portfolio, because we will not rediscount that type of paper."

The result was that the lumber concerns, the automobile loans, and everything else were put on the black list for rediscount, and consequently in this country, you will find that a billion, eight hundred fifty million cash was squeezed out of circulation in the course of 15 months, and I believe about ten billion of credit. I have checked up on that.

Mr. ANDERSON. You are speaking of what period?

Mr. BUSBY. 1920–21. Instead of expansion of credit, there was a contraction of credit, and the reports and bulletins of the Federal Reserve will disclose that. There was a contraction of currency to probably $2,000,000,000 which was withdrawn and turned in by the Federal Reserve because they would not renew the loans. That brought prices down and brought destruction.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let's take the chronology of it. Your section of the country is what? I should know but I do not recall.

Mr. BUSBY. I am from Mississippi.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Dallas bank your bank?

Mr. BUSBY. No; St. Louis is, in the portion of the State where I am located.

Mr. ANDERSON. The general condition of the country would show an expansion for the first 3 or 4 months of that crisis period, down to the late autumn of 1920, although the price decline began earlier in May, but the expanding of credit kept up, not for the purpose of holding prices up, but for the purpose of letting men mobilize their slow assets to meet their quick liabilities.

I will give you an illustration of the credit policy in that period. I remember talking to my old chief, the late A. Barton Hepburn, about what could be done when I was going out to Iowa City to make a speech, as I remember in late November.

He said, "I will tell you what I am doing. I am getting disquieting reports about cattle being shipped out of the Panhandle of Texas and Montana and sold in Kansas City at 2 cents a pound on the hoof. People are cutting up their best herds to pay their debts, selling their she cattle and their lean cattle, and I am going to scurry around and get some money out there," and he said, "I wish you would have that in mind when you make your speech in Iowa City."

This is the speech I made:

"If you have a farmer customer who has corn and wants to hold it for higher prices, and wants to get money from you to hold that corn, tell him no, he had better sell it now; if you have a farmer who has fat cattle that he wants to hold for a better price and wants money from you to hold the cattle, tell him no, don't hold, sell now; but if you have a farmer who has corn and knows how to feed cattle, lend him new money to buy more cattle that are being sent out of the Panhandle of Texas and Montana, and get the corn and the lean cattle together."

There was what I thought was a good banking policy, lend money to a solvent good man and give him time, and lend him enough; if he needs $30,000 don't give him $20,000 but give him $30,000 or nothing. You want to keep agriculture a going concern, keep it going, let him have money for current production; but if a man just wants money to hold a stale position that will crack anyhow, don't give it to him.

Mr. BUSBY. I have taken too much of your time, but these questions have been aimed at this proposition, that I don't believe the banking set-up of this country can function so as to furnish business a dependable media of exchange, but that a more dependable organization ought to be provided.

I mean that first, because the banks will not let a good business condition alone, and they will enhance values by making credit available. They cannot function in falling price times, and they are all operated, as they ought to be, purely for selfish means and gains, and that is the reason they are set up.

Further, I believe that the Government ought not to have to depend, and the people ought not to have to depend, on that kind of a set-up. The experience through which we have gone for 150 years, having spent 40 years in depressions, 20 of which have come up as the result of this set-up, we are now looking for legislation to cure that condition.

That is all I have to say, and I wanted to suggest that, because to keep up the questions I have asked may have been seemingly without point.

Mr. CROSS. Do you think from an economic standpoint we made a wise or an unwise move in going off of the gold standard?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think a very unwise move.

Mr. CROSS. Do you think we made a wise move or an unwise move in reducing the content of the dollar?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it was unfortunate, although I am glad to have a settled figure, and hope it will stay settled.

Mr. CROSS. I thought you said a while ago we had improved wonderfully since we went off of the gold dollar?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no inconsistency in what I said whatever. What I am saying now, the process of coming down was hurtful and unfortunate, but the fixing of a figure instead of leaving it fluctuating was helpful.

Mr. CROSS. Your idea is we should have stayed where we were, sat still in March 1933?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think, if we had saved the gold standard then, which we could have easily done, we would have been far better off today.

Mr. CROSS. What do you think would have happened to the agricultural portion of the Nation? I believe you said a while ago in 1931, if we could get back there, we would be all right.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I said it would be much better. No; I want things back to a very much better situation, of course. And I want to say, in my opinion, the Government of the United States has been in the past very unfair to the American farmer, and has handicapped him very greatly by these high protective tariffs, which have lessened the farmer's foreign market.

Mr. CROSS. Don't you think that has been comparatively small? Of course, I am a Democrat and against the high tariff, but I don't put any great pressure or importance on a tariff that has to do largely with our conditions domestically, rather than a few things that we sell abroad.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I say, I think this Government has treated the farmer unfairly, and I am interested in the improvement of his condition. I think the tariff the most important single factor in the farmer's trouble.

Mr. HANCOCK. I regret very much that I did not hear Mr. Anderson's preliminary statement, but I want to say now that I attach more importance to the question of control of credit as a factor in bringing about a desirable price level than I do to control of currency.

Is there anything in this bill, Mr. Anderson, No. 7157, which looks to the proper control of credit?

Mr. ANDERSON. I find nothing definite. I find in section 4 (c) the powers of the Monetary Authority shall be exercised to such an extent and in such a manner as, in the judgment of the Authority, will best effectuate the declared policy of the act.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. They can conduct open market operations under the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but you do not tell them what to do, and I assume that means probably you cannot agree how to do it; and I do not believe it is possible to do it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Is there any way to effectively control credit other than by manipulation of reserves or the rates fixed?

Mr. ANDERSON. The total volume, you mean?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; both.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think not. You can do some little things at times, but I do not think you can control it. You might say that a bank shall not borrow from the Federal Reserve System to lend for speculation. However, that bank borrows from the Federal Reserve to protect its reserves, and the funds go to another bank, and then that second bank may loan for speculation, and it is not known where it goes.

Mr. HANCOCK. The printed money, including check money and credit money, will run sometimes 10 or 15 or even 20 times the amount of the actual currency?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. What kind of a dollar do we have today?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am hoping that it is a gold dollar of fixed gold content, but I don't know.

Mr. HANCOCK. What is the yardstick, which you could use today in determining the value of our dollar?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the measurement of anything, you use something of the same quality. To measure length, I use something that has length, and to measure value I use something that has value. You can measure money against a particular commodity, you can measure it against foreign currency, you can measure our dollar against gold. And I think, for the purposes in hand, if you are thinking of the dollar as against foreign exchange, it is one question, and if you are thinking of the dollar as against goods, it is another question.

Mr. HANCOCK. I had in mind the dollar value in this country.

Mr. ANDERSON. Goods are a measure of value of money, but a change in the prices of goods does not necessarily indicate a change in the value of money. It might indicate a change in the value of goods. For example, in the Great War time, the rise in prices was not a rise in the price of the value of money, but is rather a rise in the value of goods.

Mr. HANCOCK. To make myself a little clearer, for instance under our present set-up a paper dollar is worth a paper dollar.

Mr. ANDERSON. That wouldn't mean anything to me.

Mr. HANCOCK. An ounce of gold would be worth an ounce of gold.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it has the same identity, but it does not give you any new information Maybe there is something more in your mind than I am getting.

Mr. HANCOCK. I am just wondering by what unit you would measure the value of our dollar today.

Mr. ANDERSON. I measure it first by gold.

Mr. BUSBY. By weight only?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Which is not a constant buying force?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are no constant units of value for anything, for neither goods nor gold; they are not constant in value.

Mr. HANCOCK. We have a standard of weight, rather than a standard of value of gold, do we not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, because the value is the important thing, the value of a particular weight of gold.

Mr. HANCOCK. The only thing that is constant about it is its weight, and not its buying power or value.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree, and I say there are no constant units of value whatever.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You don't think anything can be done to help the situation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Much can be done yet, and I would like to make some suggestions.

Mr. HANCOCK. Do you believe in the soundness of the so-called automatic compensated index, or statistic dollar?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Mr. HANCOCK. You don't believe in the soundness of the theory that by having an unstable dollar you could have stability in prices?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am strongly convinced that you could not have it—you mean by varying the gold content of the dollar?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The very instability of that would generate forces that would make it impossible to control prices.

Mr. HANCOCK. If you are going to have stability, you have got to have some constant, dependable anchor to tie to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. If you had a system in this country whereby as your price level rose the gold content in the dollar would be lowered, wouldn't you sooner or later have two standards of value, one of the dollar and one of gold?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; you very easily would do that, and have people figuring both ways. You had that, of course, during the greenback period, with one paper dollar and one gold dollar, and they figured both ways, and even used both in exchanges.

Mr. HANCOCK. Don't you believe that debt is the common key today of our monetary confusion and is distracting perhaps the mind of the world? That is the thought I got from an article I read from Garrett recently published in the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't know how you mean. You mean the burden of debt has grown very heavy?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; and I think the people are thinking more about their debts than they are the kind and character of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Government would do well to do more thinking in terms of debts in this situation than in terms of currency. I was proposing last year striking directly at the farmers' debts by Government relief, where, if a man had mortgaged his farm and was in danger of losing his farm, to make efforts to keep the good man and the farm together. I thought Government money would help in that situation and would be justified. I urged, on the other hand, that tampering with currency would bring our money into a situation that it would be difficult for things to work.

Mr. HANCOCK. With all of our discussion of the monetary system, don't you think we have failed miserably to contemplate the reform of debt?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think at this moment we are setting in motion forces that will cause another crop of debtors, and that the debts will mount as never before to increase debts. Debit and credit are on the opposite side of the shield and I am afraid, as I contemplate another period of expanding debts ending in another grand smash worse than 1929, with the same outcry as we had then, for more credit.

Mr. HANCOCK. Do you believe in the quantitative theory of money as influencing the price level?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think that theory is a very fallacious theory which has led to many financial difficulties and to very much bad legislation.

Mr. HANCOCK. What, in your opinion, is the only sound theory of money?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a long story. It is in my book, The Value of Money.

Mr. HANCOCK. Do you believe that buying gold at a higher price from time to time will materially increase prices of commodities?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think we have had a striking illustration of how little influence that has had in the very small rise since February of last year, despite the immense depreciation of the dollar where it is down now over 40 percent and commodity prices on that theory should have risen 66 percent, while they have risen less than 20 percent.

Mr. BUSBY. You are operating in two fields. Your dollar is measured in foreign exchange by gold, and your commodity prices are held down, because there is nothing in this country by way of bank credit or currency to represent that cheap dollar. You have no quantity of money to represent it, and quantity has no bearing. That dollar is in relation to foreign exchange, but it is not cheap in relation to commodities here, there being no agency here to represent that cheap dollar in our domestic field. You are operating in two fields, and that is the reason you get two results.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Hancock asked me what I thought of buying gold at high prices, and I was answering that question.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. As a matter of fact, if the price of basic commodities did react exactly with the increased gold prices until it became fairly constant, then the Government could stop buying gold.

The Government or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on behalf of the Government are not buying all of the gold offered, because it has been only a month ago that Canada offered $8,000,000 gold at 32 and we refused to buy it.

Of course, you can cheapen your dollar by buying gold, but when it becomes unsatisfactory you are not taking any more gold than you happen to want. You are cognizant of that fact.

Mr. ANDERSON. I didn't know about the Canadian episode.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You knew we were not taking all of the gold offered at 35?

Mr. ANDERSON. It was supposed to be domestic gold and some little abroad. I must confess it is all very bewildering to me to see gold which used to be one thing become domestic gold, foreign gold, gold for jewelers, and so on.

Mr. HANCOCK. If prices would rise in the same proportion in this country as we cheapen money, we might have more export trade, so there is an advantage in the export trade.

Mr. ANDERSON. This notion of manipulating currency to get export trade, I think, is one of the greatest fallacies ever.

Mr. HANCOCK. Isn't it a fact that when England went off of the standard, that her devaluation only applied to foreign exchange rather than her own money?

Mr. ANDERSON. It applied to her own money. You could not get gold for bank notes in England. Gold in England went up as against bank notes. They had a free gold market there and you could measure it every day.

Mr. HANCOCK. Do you look for an appreciable increase in prices in this country as the result of the present monetary policy?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it may come, but I am afraid it will come so slowly you will do some more violent things to the currency in an effort to hasten it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Is there any point to devaluation unless you make more money; and is there any point to making more money unless you get inflation or reflation?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have the potentialities of all the money that anybody can use.

Mr. HANCOCK. You said we had that between 1922 and 1928, didn't you, when you testified before the Senate committee not long ago?

Mr. ANDERSON. We used it, too. In currency circulation you cannot make people use more than they want because they like to use the banks. A merchant doesn't carry his money in a till; he puts it in a bank at night.

Mr. HANCOCK. Nobody has worked out a formula yet which will prevent a banker from swapping a deposit slip for a roll of cash.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but they don't carry more cash in their pockets than they want; they put it in the bank; then, as they need pocket cash, especially on the Fourth of July and on Christmas, they take it out.

Mr. HANCOCK. Do you believe under our present condition, and in the light of the program some of us are able to understand and some are not, that private banking in this country is able to operate at a profit and adequately serve the needs of the consumers of this country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think there are some things that could be done to get bank credit more effectively used in certain areas. Bankers ought not to be expected to use depositors' money to make long loans to industry. They want the money to be turned over frequently—you can have it 6 months and somebody else must then have it, and then you can have it again.

Mr. HANCOCK. Who are to make the long loans?

Mr. ANDERSON. The long loans are to be made by bonds of the industries sold to investors.

Mr. HANCOCK. You mean capital issues?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; capital issues. Commercial money can be used temporarily in carrying the investment bankers in marketing new issues with the public.

I think the Securities Act, with the purposes of which I sympathize, ought to be changed in certain particulars so as to restore that capital market and get new issues coming again for long-term issues and refunding purposes.

I believe the act is right in calling for stringent information, and I believe it is right in making criminal responsibility for making false statement, and I believe it is right in putting in a civil liability. But in that last connection it has gone too far and put fear into the minds of the people who might issue the securities.

Mr. HANCOCK. In your experience, what percent of long-term loans are paid off at maturity and what percent are renewed?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the commercial banking business in a great city the line of credit to big, strong business, and a very high percentage of them are off of the books once a year, then there are many of them remain a long time.

Mr. HANCOCK. Don't you think the banks might save themselves and their customers a lot of trouble if they would resort to demand operations, instead of renewal upon renewal?

Mr. ANDERSON. Just on that, I remember 30 years ago out in my town there was a man named Newman who came in to borrow money—his credit was good—and when he made the note the banker said, "What date

shall I put on it?" and he said, "Make it payable on demand," and that meant Newman would not pay it until he got good and ready.

Mr. HANCOCK. I have enjoyed your statement very much, and I believe that is all I have to ask.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to call to your attention that this bill provides for the authority to take over a good many of the functions of the Federal Reserve banks, which I think is unfortunate.

We have a common purpose here. There ought to be a good control of the total of money and credit in the United States. There ought to be a good control of member bank reserves. The question is how to get it, and looking at the experiences we have had and the abuses that have come in the last few years, I reach one conclusion, and on looking back over decades of the history of the central banking in many countries, I still believe the best way is by a good central banking machinery.

Mr. BUSBY. At that point, you and Mr. Hancock awhile ago followed the process of putting money into the bank from the merchant. I am thoroughly convinced that there is no way to avoid using our bank set-up and their check arrangement as our media of exchange in this country, but how are you going to prevent these banks from using the funds that are deposited there by the merchant and the other depositors; how are you going to prevent that bank from sending that money to the Federal Reserve bank and making excess reserves?

Mr. ANDERSON. In no way.

Mr. BUSBY. If it is the policy of the banks, as at the present time, to refuse private loans and create excess reserves which are kept in readiness to exchange for Government bonds, don't you regard that as being a very great weakness in the management of our media of exchange machine, and a destructive thing?

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't think it is true that the banks are refusing private loans that are sound loans.

Mr. BUSBY. There is nothing safe, except a first mortgage on the country, which are the Government bonds.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the eagerness with which commercial paper, in my experience, is taken, you see the rate for it quoted 1¼ or 1½, or something like that. The lines of credit open and unused, to the businesses of this country, are enormous.

Mr. BUSBY. How do you account for the shrinkage of more than twenty billions in bank credits and loans, if in these howling times every institution in distress feels it ought to be able to go to the R. F. C. to present a petition for a loan? If the banks are doing what you say, why is the Government receiving such pressing insistence by home owners, by farm-loan organizations, by private institutions, municipalities, and business property owners at the present time for accommodations?

Mr. ANDERSON. You are talking now of mortgage loans, and I say it is not good business, sound banking business for commercial banks to take mortgage loans.

Mr. BUSBY. Doesn't that disclose the weakness in the system we have been talking about, which shows that the banks only feel safe in exchanging the depositors' credit for Government loans?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; you are forgetting commercial loans.

Mr. BUSBY. Let me give an illustration. In this city is the Riggs National Bank with $80,000,000 assets; its last statement showed $71,000,000 of deposits, and $49,500,000 were invested in Government obligations and cash. Where does business come in for any consideration by banks of that caliber throughout the country with that kind of a statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. What people are going to the Riggs and not getting loans? Did you see the statement of Dr. Burgess of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York with reference to the experience of the bank in taking loans that commercial banks were refusing? Here is his experience: They looked over some hundred applications and found 13 out of those that, leaning backward, they could take; and of those 13, 2 went into receivership very soon.

Mr. BUSBY. I realize we have no buying power in the people to whom you have to look when there is a foreclosure, and there is nothing that is safe to the bank.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; many notes are paid, and we are making commercial loans every day. This statement was made to me by a veteran banker recently, and which I think is a very good one, that we are always willing to finance a round trip, but we are not willing to finance a one-way trip.

Mr. BUSBY. I am not blaming the banks now, but it is overinflation of credit that we are after.

Mr. ANDERSON. This bill also carries the provision that the authority can be removed by the President or concurrent resolution of Congress.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. We have no idea of passing such a bill as that. If we bring out a bill, I am sure it will be independent.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why don't you try to make the Federal Reserve System independent? It has a set-up which is bad. You have now 12 banks, and a political board, and you have in the boards of the 12 banks 3 different types of directors, and you have lack of concerted purpose.

Mr. HANCOCK. May I right there ask this question regarding the point Mr. Busby was making. Mr. Busby and I have exchanged views a number of times on the question of the Government absorbing private capital through bond issues.

Would you mind explaining to me just what happens when the banks buy Government issues? The reason I ask that question is this, that I have understood, as, for instance, lately with respect to the $800,000,000 issue, they bought a portion at 2¼ and a portion at 3, and that the banks that bid for those issues actually put out about 5 percent in money, and they accept the bonds, then issue currency for the remainder. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't think so. In that case we would have had an enormous increase in national bank issues and the total of national bank notes, the last time I saw a statement, was around $900,000,000.

Mr. HANCOCK. Suppose your bank should buy a hundred million dollars worth of bonds and you decided at the time, instead of needing the bonds, you wanted currency, you could send those bonds over to the Federal Reserve bank and get currency?

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't believe we have more than twenty-five or thirty million of them.

Mr. HANCOCK. What would that million cost?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a tax on it, and a requirement of 5 percent reserve. I think they figure about one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. HANCOCK. In that case the Government would be paying you interest on the bonds it issues, and through the present system would be extending the bank that gave you the currency the credit with which to do it.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was the original plan at the time the National Bank System was established, to make a market for the bonds and make it profitable for the banks to do that, but today they don't do much of it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Why?

Mr. ANDERSON. The notes will not stay out. If you put them out they keep coming back for redemption, and the country will not absorb a great quantity. That would be an answer, and another is, of course, that this new circulation is only for a short time, anyway.

Mr. HANCOCK. Would you mind expressing an opinion with respect to whether the Government should use its own credit, or continue to lend its credit to private banks?

Mr. ANDERSON. Do you mean whether the Government should borrow, or print greenbacks?

Mr. HANCOCK. No, I don't mean print greenbacks, that is a contentious connotation today, but what would be the objection to the Treasury Department issuing its own bonds and hold them and, then issuing United States notes against them?

Mr. ANDERSON. That currency would constitute a reserve, it would go out of circulation; that is, go out and come back to the bank and be added to an already dangerous excess of reserve deposits.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is your same contention against the use of the funds provided in the stabilization fund?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. You contend any money used out of that fund will find itself back in the member bank reserves.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, and the proper policy is to use the general money market, funds borrowed from the public and from the banks, and then you do not tend to increase the member bank reserves which are already dangerously large.

Mr. HANCOCK. The point I am trying to get in my head is why as a practical and sound common-sense policy in the public interest should the Government lend its credit to private banks and then buy it back.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, the Government does that only to the extent they issue national bank notes against it. I would be willing to see you take away the privilege of issuing additional national bank notes. I think it would be a mistake to liquidate immediately the outstanding volume, but I would be quite willing to see you pass a law that there shall be no increase in the national-bank notes. This other thing you speak of is a matter of borrowing, and the Government has borrowed this year two vast issues, much more than twice the amount of all national-bank notes outstanding.

Mr. HANCOCK. Is it not possible today for Federal Reserve banks to buy long-term Government bonds, say 4-percent bonds, and then to have a demand for commercial loans equivalent to the amount of those bonds, and to issue its currency against the bonds to take care of the rediscounts, the result being, if those facts are true, and I understand such is done as a matter of practice, that the Federal Reserve bank is drawing interest on the Government bonds, and also receiving the legal rate of interest on the discounts at the same time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't know whether I have your question there.

Mr. HANCOCK. You can get 100 percent in currency for bonds today, can't you?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I think so—you mean Federal Reserve notes?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes. Suppose a Federal Reserve bank had a hundred million dollars of bonds, they could issue a hundred million dollars of currency?

Mr. ANDERSON. They can't issue currency unless somebody wants it.

Mr. HANCOCK. I am assuming, of course, there is a demand.

Mr. ANDERSON. The demand that comes to the Federal Reserve bank is not for note issues but for deposits.

The Federal Reserve can't put out currency just because it wants to, it is limited by what the people want. There are actually outstanding Federal notes far below what they could issue under the law. The law is one thing and the demand of the people is another thing, and they can't do it without the demand.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. This may have been covered before I came in, but I would like to

ask, Mr. Anderson, what is the significance or the cause, other than the profit to the seller, of this unusual amount of gold coming into the country, and what is its effect?

Mr. ANDERSON. The significance of what?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The significance, outside of the profit, of this flow of gold into the country, and what is its effect on banking, and particularly on commodity prices?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am hoping it will subside very soon without a much greater flow of gold. I have been checking carefully what the forces were in the market. Part of it is through covering of short sales of dollars by speculators on the other side while they were covering that position that held the dollar up. Then a further source is some American capital coming home, but that has been very greatly exaggerated, and the total is nothing like what was commonly supposed.

Then, thirdly, foreign money is coming in because they began to have confidence in us, and that was particularly shown by the fact they were buying our bonds as much as our currency.

The people who are the closest to it express the opinion things are going to quiet down very soon.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. In other words, it is a favorable rather than an unfavorable sign?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would indicate a return of confidence, yes, a confidence coming out of the fact the dollar was no longer expected to fluctuate but was expected to be fixed in gold, and that is one of the points I made when I came here, and I ask you, don't spoil that since it has been built up.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The movement of gold into this country is a general sign of increasing confidence in the soundness of the monetary system in this country?

Mr. ANDERSON. Usually it would be, but sometimes it is fear of other countries. And sometimes, like in 1928, 1929, it is because we were having an orgy of specultaion and other countries were sending in money. There were many foreign banks in 1929 sending money here, gigantic orders coming in from Vienna and other centers, to buy stock.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. There is no reason to consider this movement of gold as a preliminary step of foreign nations going entirely off of the gold standard?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think not.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It is no reason whatever?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say not.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If a new deposit of gold of considerable extent such as in California in 1849, or Nevada in 1860, should be discovered, would it have any marked or appreciable effect on the monetary level and the general stimulation or stabilization of business?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the course of years it would work toward a rise of commodity prices and expanding credit.

If you will look at the history of the United States after we settled the gold standard question in 1896, and the gold standard was saved, our prices began to rise. We gained over a hundred percent in gold, in 3, 4, or 5 years there, and bank credit expanded and commodity prices rose, and the same thing would be the natural expectation from another new gold discovery.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If you should add a material amount of silver to the base of the monetary structure, would that have the same effect, or not, as an increase in the amount of gold added to the base of our monetary structure?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it would have a very different effect, because it would undermine confidence. The big thing, after all, in determining your volume of media of exchange, aggregate purchasing power and so on, is a man's willingness to use credit, willingness to borrow at the bank, and the bank's willingness to lend, and that goes on smoothly as long as you have confidence in the standard of value and the quality of money.

On the other hand, when doubt comes as to the quality of the money, we get a terrible condition, as we saw in 1931 and 1932.

I should feel that the interjection of silver as a part of the ultimate standard of value would have a distressing effect.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Would it have that effect for the sociological reason it would create doubt in the minds of some people of the stability of the monetary base?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. As a matter of fact, a small boy recently made an adult remark in that regard when he saw the recent movement in silver. He said, "Well, Dad, money won't be so pure, will it?" That question of quality is all-important both to money and credit.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The time is too limited to go into a discussion of this subject now, but at some later date I would like to have an opportunity to present this particular phase in more detail before the committee. The hour is very late, and I would like to ask Mr. Anderson one or two questions, but I would like to ask for 1 day next week for a discussion of this particular phase more fully.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. If you will let us know, we will arrange it, with great pleasure.

Dr. Anderson, I want to ask one or two questions. You thought it was a mistake to go off gold in March 1933?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. And you think if we were to go back on gold at the same price as it was when we went off gold, it would improve the situation?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am a political realist. There is no use talking about that at all.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You would like to see it done, if it were possible?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it would be a good thing if we could work out a consistent policy. I would not want to jack it right up at once, but if it could be done gradually in a period of 2 or 3 years with a sufficiently careful policy, I think it would be a good thing to do, but I don't propose it, because it is politically impossible. My proposal is to sit where you are, and don't change it any more.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I think in one of your bulletins, probably the last one, you thought we should stabilize it at 62½?

Mr. ANDERSON. I used the exchange rate at that time, 65 I think, and I was thinking it would avoid going through what we have just been through.

We have been through a dangerous 2 or 3 weeks. Depressing the dollar suddenly from 64 or 65 to 59.06 meant a great disturbance in the exchange markets, and endangered needlessly the currency position of other countries. I wanted to avoid that.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I asked Dr. Tucker the same question, whether he wanted to go back to the valuation prior to March 1933, and he said "No," and he gave as his reason that capital would flow back into this country too rapidly.

Mr. ANDERSON. There would be that tendency, and that is one of the objections to the variation of the gold content.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Suppose this law was passed providing for a monetary authority responsible only to the people, disassociated from any political control, wouldn't that constitute permanent legislation which would restore confidence? Isn't it your subconscious theory that anything which is a departure from what you understand to be the traditional gold standard, however permanent it will be, will not inspire confidence, and it is only by going back to the traditional gold standard that confidence can ever be restored? Isn't that what you have in mind?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no; it is much more complicated than that, and much more technically involved than that.

I don't think there is a phase of this thing I have not at one time or another considered. I have been working at it for nearly 30 years now.

Might I put in one thoroughly noncontroversial point I think your committee would be sympathetic with? We want to tighten up one of the relics of the war which has made a lot of trouble. When you put the reserve ratio to member banks as low as you did in 1917, 13, 10, and 7 percent for demand deposits, and 3 percent for time deposits, you made possible extraordinarily rapid expansion of bank deposits. When expansion takes the form of time deposits, which it will do when there is an excess, because you get interest that way, you make a very dangerous banking situation.

The original Glass bill proposed last year called for raising the requirements for time deposits to the same level as demand deposits over a 5-year period. That would have forced liquidation of credits, putting pressure on the banks. I proposed as a compromise, to leave the requirements where they are for existing deposits, but provide that for future increases in time deposits in any individual bank, the rate shall be the same as for demand deposits, 7 percent for the country banks, 10 percent for the reserve cities, and 13 percent for the central reserve cities, and get that barrier in before these excess reserves get to be used too vigorously, because whatever the monetary authority, the pressure on whoever is involved will be so great they need protection, and I would like for you to consider that proposition.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You don't think one thing we should do is to try to get into circulation more active money relative to the amount of bank credit which we are using as money, do you?

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't see any advantage to that. What does it mean—that instead of drawing a check and mailing it, the housewife will keep the money at home, and then she will go down to the stores one by one and pay her bills with cash; so what is the advantage of that, and why should we have the worry of cash in the home overnight, as the housewife would do, if she had a large amount of money? Moreover, that would be a deflation, in a measure.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You think it is a good thing, do you, to have a condition in this country where it is even theoretically impossible for people to pay their debts?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think no debt ought to be created without a very clear understanding it will be repaid, and when it will be repaid, and how it will be repaid.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. All right, I want to ask you this, about nine-tenths of our circulating medium is bank credit, and one-tenth actual currency, so that if the country became prosperous and all of the debts were paid, where would credit currency be then?

Mr. ANDERSON. If all of the debts were paid there would be new debts created.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is what I contend, you can't pay your debts without creating new corresponding debts, without deflation, can you?

Mr. ANDERSON. This is the way bank credit ought to go, up and down.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I don't know whether you are in a position to answer or not, but what I mean is this. You said a few minutes ago that it ought to be possible to pay all debts, but my contention is under our system, while my debt may be paid promptly, if it is, you have got to assume a corresponding debt in order to prevent deflation of the circulating medium. You have got to keep your credit currency up under our system, in order to prevent deflation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not quite agree with the formula, but the general idea is we do not want all debts paid and new ones created; is that what you suggest?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I don't say you don't want debts paid and new ones created. I said under our system you can't pay the

debts of the country without creating new ones.

Mr. ANDERSON. You could liquidate a good deal in normal times without creating new debts.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. We have liquidated about $23,000,000,000 of bank credit by bankruptcies, that is what we have done, and the country is in a condition of collapse. We have got twelve or fourteen million people on the streets out of work. The point I am making, under our system there is no way to pay the debts of the country without creating a depression; in other words, if you are not going to have depressions, somebody else is going to assume the debts to keep up the circulating medium.

Mr. ANDERSON. To a certain extent you cover liquidation without bankruptcy.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. What is the necessity of having that situation at all. I do not mean to say we will not always have to make debts, and I believe in interest, and I believe when people borrow money they should pay it back and pay the legitimate hire of it in interest, but what I say is that we ought not to have a monetary system which makes it inevitable under all conditions that the producers of the country must continue in debt in order to prevent a deflation, and that they cannot get out of debt. I don't care how prosperous they get, as soon as they become prosperous our monetary system creates immediately a condition of nonprosperity because of the deflation which accompanies it.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not say that. I would say our troubles are so much less that have grown out of money and credit than out of other things. You speak of stability, and I will give you a figure; a gyroscope over one wheel of an automobile does not make for stability, it would make for instability, because the road may rise, and what you want to make stable in the automobile is flexibility, give and take, the whole thing moving and yielding.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Suppose you have a picture such as this one, that is the monetary base and this is the credit structure, all of it is circulating, and the monetary base practically does not vary, and suppose you were to get a prosperous condition in this country, producers became prosperous and they were able to go to the bank and pay up their debts, you would immediately have a deflation which would require the producers of the country to get in debt again. You can have no real prosperity in this country, because as soon as it comes, it immediately creates a deflation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can you give me any case in history where in a period of prosperity the total borrowings at the banks have gone down and produced deflation? It has never occurred.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. It is very easy to answer that question, because as soon as prosperity comes that debt burden has got to be assumed by somebody.

Mr. ANDERSON. Nobody does it, though.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Why not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because men do not borrow for amusement, they borrow because they see a chance to make a profit with the money.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. They borrow because in the last analysis their condition makes it necessary for them to borrow, speaking of the producer who is, of course, the debtor, because of the period of deflation which comes on and enforces borrowing.

If you had some means, and I don't say it must be the compensated dollar, but if we had some means whereby when we became prosperous the debt currency paid off could be replaced by actual money then it would be theoretically possible for all of the debts of the country to be paid and still we would not have deflation.

Mr. ANDERSON. What is the plan by which you could avoid that?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I haven't any plan, but I could suggest a plan. As a matter of fact, if the debts of the country were paid and a compensated dollar could be used so that gold certificates could be used by the Government in paying the Government's obligations, then actual money would go into circulation and take the place of the credit money.

Mr. ANDERSON. You get then a tremendous expansion of credit or idle reserves of the bank, which would be unwise. The banks would be buying investments, they would be making mortgage loans again, and one thing and another.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. You can have laws to restrain the banks from using the money of the depositors in that way.

Mr. ANDERSON. You can hardly pass laws to restrain an unwise use of credit that does not at the same time restrain wise and necessary uses of credit. The more you look at a plan of that sort the more difficulties appear. You try to see it all and work out the details, but it is too complicated. The best you can do is to get some good objective conditions and then let the man making the profits work under those conditions, and the way to keep banks from making bad investments is to limit the amount of money they have to work with.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That means nothing more than keeping the producing class under the bondage of debt all of the time, and you cannot have any prosperity if you restrict currency, whether credit currency, or actual currency, and the producing class can only reach the degree of prosperity which is permissible under such conditions.

You have said three or four times it is quality money that is needed. Don't you know in the Middle Ages when they pulled out their pouch and had a little gold, the quality was wonderful, there was no difficulty about the quality, but it was the quantity that kept the people throughout the Middle Ages in the terrible conditions they were in?

I think I have your point with reference to this new money you want to put out to enable the community to get out of debt, the Government to put out this extra currency in paying off the Government's debts. That does not put money into the debtor's hands, paying off the public debt, but into creditor's hands—it goes to the man holding the Government bonds. Their first thought is to put it in the bank, and when the bank gets it their first thought is to put it in the Federal Reserve. I don't think you will find any money-market students who will disagree with that.

I think we should say we are very grateful to you for leaving your work and coming down here and giving us the benefit of your very wide study and experience, and the committee appreciates very much the contribution you have made to the record.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to have the privilege of putting into the record one bulletin called Equilibrium Creates Purchasing Power.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Without objection, it will be put in the record.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I have an amendment to the silver clause on page 3 of this bill which was drawn in consultation with Senator Pitman and Senator WALSH, and I wish to offer it as a substitute for the silver paragraph in the bill, and bring up some witnesses in support of this amendment.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I understood a few moments ago this is the matter you wanted to bring out.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Would it be satisfactory to have next Tuesday at 10:30 a. m. for the time to consider your amendment?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; that would be satisfactory.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. And also to hear your witnesses?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; that is satisfactory.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Then we will hear your witnesses next Tuesday at 10:30 a. m.

The hearing is now adjourned to Tuesday, February 20, at 10: 30 a. m.

The President's Superhighway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope, by A. Q. Miller, dealing with post-war highway programs.

In this editorial Mr. Miller discusses intelligently and forcefully the objections to overemphasis on the proposed superhighways, "interregional highways," I believe the President called them in a message to Congress. It is my belief that Mr. Miller's views are in line with the views of a great majority of the people of the Nation who have made any kind of a study of our highway problems and programs. I recommend the editorial to my colleagues as being worthy of their careful attention.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S SUPERHIGHWAY PROGRAM

(By A. Q. Miller, Sr.)

The President's special message to Congress approving and emphasizing a four-lane superhighway system as a post-war work program, once again has revived the jurisdictional issue between the legislative and executive branches of government—and at the same time has brought sharp reactions from the country.

There is no disagreement throughout the country of the importance of post-war plans to employ labor and materials in doing post-war construction work—and there is no more important work ahead than the construction of highways, which have deteriorated during the past few years. However, the issue which shocked the country was the President's proposal to construct four-lane superhighways, connecting metropolitan cities at an approximate cost of $150,000 a mile, and representing but 1 percent of the total road mileage of the country. As an example of what such a program would be, according to a map submitted in the President's report, Kansas would get one east-west highway and no north-south highway, and there would be no north-south highway west of Des Moines and Kansas City and the Rocky Mountains.

Companion road bills are now pending in Congress (House bill 2426 and Senate bill 971) for a broad and comprehensive road-construction program. These bills are being studied by the Road Committees in both Houses, and doubtless will be approved by both the committees and Congress—and they will provide a real post-war road-construction program, placing superhighways, not at the top, but at the bottom of the program.

Unfortunately the President, in his special message to Congress, picked out section 7 of the bills (the section dealing with super- or inter-regional highways) and placed great stress upon this feature of the bills. A map

was issued showing tentative locations of these superhighways and Washington publicity men exploited the grandeur and glories of superhighways between metropolitan cities, where the motorist could drive 75 miles an hour without traffic lights or interruptions. This conception of a post-war road program was so far above the heads of the average taxpayer who lives in the wide-open spaces of the country, and who, as Bill Jeffers once said, "eats in the kitchen," that it brought a quick and resounding response, not only from the public, but also from Members of Congress.

Provisions of the road bills now pending in Congress provide for the appropriation of $1,000,000,000 a year for 3 years, the program to be worked out jointly by the Bureau of Public Roads and the various State highway commissions, on a basis of 75 percent Federal aid and 25 percent State funds. This sounds like a sensible proposal and is in line with the past cooperative plan under which our present Federal, State, and interstate highways have been built. The disturbing element in the President's proposal is his suggestion that $750,000,000 be taken out of the fund annually—three-fourths of the total amount—for the super-highway program. James D. White, Washington publicity man, exploiting the utopian idea, said: "The planners figure it would cost about $750,000,000 a year for a building period which might last 10 to 20 years—the program would make motoring safer and much more fun."

With this kind of publicity coming out of Washington, the impression was clearly created that the President's plan was to supersede or be an alternate plan for the pending road bills. The effect of the White House message has been to awaken new interests throughout the country in a post-war road program. Road associations, chambers of commerce, and individuals have held protest meetings and in resolutions, telegrams, and letters have petitioned Congress to give full consideration to a broad and comprehensive road-construction plan, which will give preference to the present Federal, State, and interstate highway system, as well as farm-to-market roads. Recognizing the fact that in certain eastern metropolitan areas traffic problems exist, which might properly become a part of the road-construction problem, sentiment generally expressed is that superhighways should be subordinated to the completion of the present unfinished system of highways.

As previously stated, it is unfortunate that the President "jumped the gun" while Congress is considering these post-war road bills instead of permitting legislation to take its normal, constitutional course.

Judicial Review of Administrative Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Lawyer Service Letter, published by the New York Bar Association, and reprinted in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, 1944. The article deals with what may become an epoch-making decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Stark et al. against Wickard. On the 28th day of February 1944 the Supreme Court reversed its former position on the right of those who are affected adversely by rulings of Government bureaus and agencies, and by directives, who have hitherto been denied a remedy in the courts unless that remedy was specifically provided in the law. Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote the dissenting opinion and Mr. Justice Reed wrote the prevailing opinion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINKING IT OVER

(By Thomas F. Woodlock)

The Lawyer Service Letter (published by the New York State Bar Association) in its issue of March 1 draws attention to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which it thinks "probably destined to be a landmark in the field of judicial review of administrative action." The present writer will permit himself the presumption, as a layman, of concurring in this opinion, and in the belief that the reader will also concur invites his attention to the facts as reported by the Letter.

The case (*Stark et al.* v. *Wickard*) arose over certain deductions made in favor of "cooperatives" by the market administrator in the Greater Boston area in connection with a settlement fund in the milk producers industry. Certain firms protested that the act did not authorize these payments, and appealed to the courts. The Secretary of Agriculture contended that the act did not permit a court review because it had not specifically authorized it, and that petitioners had no remedy in law for the damages they claimed to have sustained. The case was before the Supreme Court on this point alone. The majority decided that the Department of Agriculture was wrong; Justices Frankfurter and Black dissented. The opinions of both sides are interesting by reason of the importance of the principle involved.

The majority, speaking through Justice Reed, did not touch the question of the power of Congress to grant or deny the right of appeal from administrative decisions. It took the ground that silence of the statute on the point did not constitute a denial of that right. "The authority for a judicial examination of the validity of the Secretary's (Department of Agriculture) action," it said, "is found in the existence of courts and the intent of Congress as deduced from the statutes and precedents as hereinafter considered."

On the courts rests the responsibility of determining the limits of statutory grants of authority to administrative bodies. The powers granted to such bodies may be expanded or contracted at the will of the legislative and executive branches. "But under article III [of the Constitution] Congress established courts to adjudicate cases and controversies as to claims of infringement of individual rights, whether by unlawful action of private persons or by the exertion of unauthorized administrative power." Mr. Justice Reed answered the objections commonly urged against court review of administrative actions, but that part of his opinion is of subordinate importance and interest as being essentially obiter. The essence of the opinion is that the right of court review in such cases is not denied by silence of the statute on the point.

The dissenting opinion, written by Justice Frankfurter challenged this view. Where the text of a statute is silent he characterized "judicial review" as a "mischievous abstraction." He said: "There is no such thing as a common law of judicial review in the Federal courts. * * * In the numerous cases either granting or denying judicial review, grant or denial were reached not by applying some 'natural law' or judicial review, nor on the basis of some general body of doctrines for construing the diverse provisions of the great variety of Federal regulatory statutes. Judicial review when recognized—its scope and its incidence—was derived from the materials furnished by the particular statute in regard to which the opportunity for judicial review was asserted.

"This is the lesson to be drawn from the prior decisions of this Court on judicial review and not any doctrinaire notions of general applicability to statutes based on different schemes of administration and conveying different purposes by Congress in the utilization of administrative and judicial remedies for the enforcement of law. However useful judicial review may be, it is for Congress and not for this Court to decide when it may be used—except when the Constitution commands it. In this case there is no such command."

Down to the words "—except when the Constitution commands it" with the concluding sentence, Justice Frankfurter seems to assert the power of Congress to grant or deny at will the right of appeal from the acts of its administrative agents, but then comes in the "except." Are we to suppose that the Constitution protects only a certain class of individual "rights" leaving others open to public or private violation without remedy? And, if so, who is to determine which rights are which, if not the courts? Are we to suppose that Congress is the final judge of the constitutionality of its own laws? If not, what does Justice Frankfurter mean? To this ignorant layman's ear, his words have an ominous suggestion of the "new despotism" described by Lord Hewart of Bury some 15 years ago. Moreover, such phrases as "mischievous abstractions,'" "doctrinaire notion" and the sneer at "natural law" sound very like a modern "swing" rendering "by ear" of what once was accepted as a noble musical theme. Which is why this layman says "Amen" to the majority.

Votes for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Times of March 17, 1944, correctly, in my judgment, designating the action of the President in conducting a poll of the Governors on the soldier vote bill a political move. I believe the editorial expresses a correct understanding of the situation, and that time will show that the country as a whole has the same view that is expressed concisely in the editorial, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS OR THE LAW?

Like other administration tactics on soldier vote legislation, the President's call upon the Governors for an immediate opinion on

acceptability of the bill just passed by Congress is a political move. It is designed to build up a possible excuse for veto of the bill and at the same time to put the Governors on the spot, more than one-half of them being Republicans.

Some of the Governors, like Governor Schoeppel, of Kansas, could reply at once because their States have absentee voting laws that would take care of the situation. But others, like Governor Donnell, of Missouri, could make no such immediate reply because the legislatures of their States are yet to act with provisions for absentee voting by men overseas and thousands of miles away from this country. The Missouri Legislature and several others are now in session, while still others are scheduled to meet in forthcoming weeks or months.

Of course, the President knows all this. Yet he calls for an immediate response by wire, stating whether the congressional bill is now acceptable under laws of the several States; or, if not, whether the necessary steps will be taken to make it acceptable before July 15. In other words, what the President wants—right now—is a statement from various Governors guaranteeing what the legislatures of their States are going to do. It is not a question of what the legislatures ought to do. The Governors may have their opinions about that, along with the legislatures.

Some of the Governors and the legislatures might feel that absentee voting and control of elections generally were State functions altogether and that there was no legal or other necessity for conforming with the Federal bill.

But the President wants to know the whole business right now and by wire. He could not reasonably expect to obtain such information from all, or even a majority, of the Governors, within the 10 days he is allowed for passing on the congressional bill himself. But instead of reaching his own decision on that bill he would pass the buck to the Governors and use their replies or the absence of them as the basis for a veto if he should be inclined to that action.

This is in line with the New Deal political maneuvering on soldier votes from the outset. The scheme was to get control of those votes by short-cut and illegal methods, and if that failed then to shout that the servicemen had been deprived of the right to vote. There has been no such purpose behind the bill just passed by Congress and there is no such purpose in the States. The aim has been that the one form of voting, like all the others, should be proper and legal under the Constitution. Does the President want that kind of voting or some other kind?

Views of the Public on the Soldier-Vote Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from Indiana newspapers, all of which appear to shed light on the public's view of the soldier-vote situation in this country.

From the Indianapolis News of March 20, 1944, an editorial entitled "That Federal Ballot"; from the Indianapolis Star of March 21, 1944, entitled "Let the States Act"; and a third editorial on the same subject from the South Bend Tribune of March 17, 1944, entitled "Soldier Vote."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT FEDERAL BALLOT

Indiana's Republican General Assembly and party organization leaders seem to be worried over whether to enact an armed force personnel vote bill that will validate the Federal ballot provided for in the act recently passed by Congress.

The congressional act would recognize this ballot as valid only if the voter's home State had no provision for absent voting or he could not obtain an absent-voter's ballot from his home State. The Federal ballot would not be good, even under these conditions, of course, unless it complied with the laws of the voter's home State.

Indiana is well able to look after its own voting, as the Constitution and the safety of free government demand. It will see that its people in the armed forces have every opportunity to cast a lawful ballot as if they were at home and free to exercise their rights of citizenship at election time.

In principle, it would be a good thing if Indiana refused to extend any statutory encouragement to the casting of a ballot put out by a New Deal administration. The New Dealers have no conscience whatever when it comes to using public money and official pressure to carry an election. They should not be aided in any conspiracy to seize election control from the States, but the service voter who fails in a good-faith effort to obtain his home-State ballot deserves consideration.

The issue is well put in the question of who would refuse to count the vote of a man who has sent a Federal ballot in from the fighting front.

LET THE STATES ACT

An interesting feature of the Presidential appeal to the Governors of 48 States to find out what their States are prepared or will prepare to do in enabling servicemen to vote is that the replies reveal that State sentiment is pretty much the same as congressional. When Congress declined to accept as a "Federal ballot" his informal slip of paper on which soldiers and others could write in the names of those for whom they would vote, the President accused the lawmakers of "fraud." Now he is getting Nation-wide assurance that the only "fraud" involved is his unconstitutional proposal.

Apparently the Attorney General, or somebody in the administration, may have called the President's attention to the wording of the United States Constitution, which states explicitly what must be on a Federal ballot for the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents and how the responsibility is up to the States to determine the qualifications of their own citizens to vote. Evidently he has been impressed with the possibility that it may be necessary to take the States into consideration.

Governor Schricker was among those who assured the President that this State is anxious to see that the servicemen get a chance to vote, and he will recommend the enactment of any suitable legislation that may be needed. That was superfluous. There has been no doubt about Indiana. The Governor might have told the President, however, that there is not a chance in the world that Indiana will do anything that is in violation of the Constitution. There is no question about Hoosiers being able to vote if the Government will see that the ballots, legal constitutional ballots, get to the men and are returned in time.

Only 6 of the 42 Governors who have replied say their States will accept the Federal ballot he is urging. The answers from 13 States say no legislation is pending or proposed in an attempt to validate the suggested Federal ballot. The plain inference is that those ballots are looked on now as invalid and unconstitutional and would be so viewed in November. They would not be accepted and could not be counted.

The Presidential canvass of sentiment among the Governors of the 48 States should convince him that he was wrong in the first place when he tried to force his Federal ballot onto them. The sensible course, in fact, the only constitutional way, would be to leave the voting to the States, as the basic law of the land provides. Indiana and others may be relied on to give due consideration to their servicemen. The returns from some other States should not be vitiated or questioned because of unconstitutional interference with constitutional procedure.

SOLDIER VOTE

President Roosevelt's request for all State governors' opinions on the so-called soldier voting bill passed to him by Congress suggests that he is trying to create a certain political atmosphere. If he is not familiar with the various States' laws pertaining to voting by members of the military forces, he could easily become so by asking for information that is available in Washington. That information has been widely published. Without great effort he also could become personally familiar with the movements within the various States, including Indiana, to facilitate voting by military service members. Where the Federal voting bill specifically is concerned the President, as Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK of Indiana, points out, once "professed to know just what every State could do and could not do."

Most of the governors receiving the President's request for judgment of the terms of the Federal ballot measure are Republicans. Possibly their responses will be used by him as an excuse for a veto. Repassage over a veto would not be certain, judging by the division of votes in the two Houses of Congress on the measure emerging from the inter-House conference. Whether or not this measure becomes law, the apparent Roosevelt strategy will be to try to convince the armed service members that congressional opponents of the Administration's bob-tailed ballot scheme have "disfranchised" them. By late next summer, of course, the voting laws of the large majority of States will be more favorable for armed service members wishing to vote. They will be able to vote not merely on the presidency, as proposed in practical effect by the Administration strategists, but on State and local offices as well.

Science and a Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article taken from the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday, March 23, written by Waldemar Kaempffert, and published in the Herald Tribune as an advertisement paid for by the International Latex Corporation of my own State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SCIENCE AND A LASTING PEACE

"(By Waldemar Kaempffert)

"Despite the reluctance of the great powers to yield their ancient sovereignties in the interest of world unity the signs are plain enough that as science and technology sweep on, unification proceeds rapidly.

"It means something that an Englishman, a Frenchman, an American, an Australian are scarcely distinguishable so far as their clothes are concerned. It means something that automobiles are very much alike; that electric lights in millions of homes here and abroad glow in accordance with the same principle. It means something that Hottentots, Chinese, Americans, and Englishmen rock with laughter at the same film or thrill to a symphony short-waved from New York to London. It means something that in all advanced countries people travel in similar trains, steamers, or planes, cook by gas supplied by a gasometer, suck dirt out of carpets by electricity shot from a central station. It means something that mass production and standardization, which are the hallmarks of a developed industrial technology, have been adopted by every industrial nation. At the bottom of all this lies the conviction that science and technology are good in themselves and are worth cultivating for social and economic reasons.

"A WORLD-UNIFYING FORCE

"Clearly, we have in science a world-unifying force that should be systematically and rationally applied. Already there are in the world, perhaps, 250,000 first-class research chemists, biologists, physicists, and engineers. These men and women in normal times meet in international conventions and give freely of their knowledge to the world. No questions are asked about the race, nationality, or creed of these internationalists. We have here the nucleus of an organization that could weld the world psychologically and socially into a unit.

"Science ought to be discussed at the peace table and not just politics, spheres of influence, and economic rights—the kind of science that will really usher in a new order. Science has never had more than half a chance. It has had to develop in the face of frustration, even of downright suppression. Let us then at the peace table organize research on a world-wide scale with the intention of raising all countries to a single high intellectual and economic level, of giving all peoples a common outlook, and of thus preparing them for the acceptance of a single political order. We need experience in thinking and acting together if we are to convince ourselves that more is to be gained by regarding the land, the sea, and the air as a whole than by regions and countries.

"Suppose, therefore, we organize a world scientific commission and suppose that we finance it by contributions from participating nations. One-quarter of 1 percent of pre-war budgets would be enough.

"The commission would first map out what has been accomplished. Gaps in our knowledge would appear. The program of research would be framed to fill them as well as to advance existing knowledge. As the results poured in some of the major disgraces of our scientific record would be expunged.

"It is a disgrace that millions must still groan with arthritis. It is a disgrace that the conquest of cancer is not yet in sight. It is a disgrace that we have only the vaguest notion of what happens when a piece of beefsteak is chewed and digested. Because we know so little of the mechanics of heredity—why we inherit blue eyes or stub noses and some afflictions from our parents—it is a disgrace that we cannot pick out of the American population the 18,000,000 who are themselves mentally sound but who are believed to be the carriers of mental disease that can be passed on. It is a disgrace that millions of chemical compounds remain to be discovered—compounds of immense potentialities in medicine, agriculture, and industry. It is a disgrace that we cannot predict what the weather will be a fortnight hence in Chicago and New York.

"FRUITS OF ORGANIZED RESEARCH

"If we organize research to remove these and many other disgraces, we shall not only improve the lot of mankind, but change world outlook. Enlist the aid of the sociologist to predict the consequences of discovery and invention, so far as that is possible, and it lies within our power to direct social change, to imbue the world with new social purpose, to prepare the world for unit.

"No vast palace of research is necessary. Universities that accept grants under the plan would still conduct research on their own account. So would the great foundations and industries. The Commission would be fully aware of its social function, meaning that the unknown would be penetrated with no thought of profit, yet with the conviction that direct material and intellectual benefits would accrue. The Commission would concern itself not with inventions as such but with the discovery of principles that inventors, engineers, physicians, and farmers could apply.

"Year after year the work would go on. The lagging biological sciences would receive an enormous impetus, and the social scientists and psychologists would be able to make field studies and conduct experiments on a scale unprecedented. We want to accelerate the process of unification that has begun with steamships, radio, airplanes, motion pictures, and engineering.

"SCIENCE AND HUMAN PROGRESS

"The World Scientific Commission must concern itself with the broad pattern of education as well as with the organization and support of research. That pattern must be shot through and through with social purpose. What does relativity mean to me? Why are physicists bombarding atoms? What good will it do when they find out how matter and how the universe is put together? Such questions probe deep into meanings that are rarely revealed in the classroom. Both the social point of view and the scientific approach to any problem must be acquired by the masses of Asia, Europe, and the Americas. It may take decades but the project is worth undertaking.

"Give us international cooperation in science and soon there will be cooperation in other fields. For invariably change in science means social change, so that new discoveries in turn call for cooperation in government to make the most of them. With peace maintained by an international police force and experience in cooperation gained by the international organization of science (the one subject on which we can agree), the world will begin to think of unity not as something utopian, but as something necessary."

As a public service, we present this sound proposal for a lasting peace based on living knowledge.

INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORPORATION,
Playtex Park, Dover, Del.

British Air Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, some of the steamship companies in this country have been urging that the Congress should adopt a policy which would authorize steamship companies to operate air lines.

One of the principal arguments made by our steamship companies is the allegation that British steamship companies will be operating air lines and that, unless our Government takes the step suggested, our steamship companies would suffer a competitive disadvantage.

Aside from the fact that the conclusion does not follow from the premise, the premise itself is incorrect. The British Government has not decided to depart from its chosen instrument policy whereby a single company, as a practical matter, operates all of the British international air service. According to a dispatch appearing in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, 1944, the intention to adhere to the chosen instrument policy has been reiterated by Sir Archibald Sinclair, Secretary of State for Air, Air Ministry. This indicates no intention whatsoever of having steamship-operated air lines under the flag of Great Britain on the great international trade routes.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the article from the Wall Street Journal.

It follows:

LONDON.—Air Minister Sinclair told the House of Commons last night that some subsidized public corporation, or corporations, would continue to operate the long overseas air routes after the war. The Air Minister said a government instrument, such as British Overseas Airways which now represents British flag air commerce abroad, would have to fly the long routes which couldn't pay on a commercial basis. His statement, made during the civil aviation debate, pointed out that while there is no statutory bar against private interests operating unsubsidized services, the Government or Parliament could hardly be expected to let private operators fly the lucrative routes, such as from New York to London, leaving the Government to fly unprofitable mileage out to India.

Mr. Sinclair said he believed unsubsidized operation of the great routes across Asia, Africa, and the oceans were a long time off. He argued that even a government corporation would meet plenty of competition, requiring wise control. Such control, said the Air Minister, would be made more difficult if the principle of state-owned or controlled monopoly, to which other countries and dominions are committed, were abandoned.

The Air Minister also announced that in addition to converting four types of military aircraft, the Government plans seven new types of civil planes. First, the big Bristol trans-Atlantic pressurized land plane; second, a land plane weighing perhaps 100,000 pounds with a pressurized cabin, for the North Atlantic route via Newfoundland; third, a 70,000-pound pressurized plane for

medium-range trunk routes; fourth, a 40,000-pound pressurized 30-passenger plane for European and other short or medium services; fifth, a jet-propelled plane with a speed exceeding all existing craft; sixth, a 14-passenger feeder land plane for the colonies and United Kingdom; seventh, an 8,000-pound plane for feeder or taxi service.

If I Were President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening, March 21, I delivered an address on the lecture course at North Park College, Chicago, Ill., which has provoked considerable comment. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where it may be read by persons interested.

It is said that 96 Senators and 48 Governors secretly ponder the thought, "What I would do if I were President." Do not be alarmed. I am not a candidate. All rules have exceptions. I do not mean to be flippant or disrespectful toward the highest civil office on this earth; but quite to the contrary, I earnestly feel that it would be a good thing for America and the world if every voter this fall should most seriously ask himself that question. I am not trying to dig up more candidates, but I am urging that we do more constructive thinking about this all-important office and more constructive thinking about whom we select to fill it.

There is no office in all the world quite so important to 135,000,000 Americans and the other 2,000,000,000 inhabitants of the earth as is the office of President of the United States. Tonight insofar as I am able, I hope to keep away from the international aspects of the office and deal only with its domestic phases. And while I hope to be pointedly objective, I am not speaking for nor against any political party, neither am I speaking for nor against any candidate.

In the approaching election the people's liberty and the people's freedom will either regain some lost ground or slip a little closer to the apparently inevitable precipice of one-man rule. It would be wrong to say that this Republic stands at the crossroads tonight. It has long since passed the crossroads. It has already traveled too many miles down the wrong road. The choice in November will determine whether we shall keep going down that wrong road or retrace our steps and get back on the right road.

At the outset let me emphasize that there is nothing wrong with our glorious Republic, that an application of more and more democracy will not cure. The founding fathers weighed every danger and made every effort to forestall all hazards when they wrote the great document thenceforth known as the American Constitution. Even though many of its provisions were the result of compromise, Gladstone's classic observation has lost none of its poignancy with the passing of the years that it is "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Most emphatically there is nothing wrong with our basic law. Our trouble comes from an abandonment of its sacred provisions.

To avoid the possible tyranny of one-man rule the statesmen of 1787 created the trinity of separate executive, judicial, and legislative powers; and they devised a system of unique checks and balances among them. Many powers, too, were reserved to the sovereign States. In a check system, high-handed, arbitrary, and an obstinate attitude on the part of any one of the three branches would by virtue of this division result in stagnation and impotency. But the founding fathers preferred the risk of "popular incompetence to efficient tyranny."

It is difficult for 531 persons making up the Congress to practice extreme obstinacy for very long or for the 9 members of the Supreme Court to do so—but unfortunately it is relatively easy for one man in the office of Chief Executive either to seize the powers of the other coordinate branches or to stop completely the wheels of government. That is the dangerous element in our system. The only insurance that we may take against such a contingency is that the President selected by us be devoted to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, that he possess unusual qualities of leadership and that he be constructively cooperative.

With our country engaged in two major wars and American soldiers fighting on 72 battle fronts, we naturally think of the President as the Commander in Chief. Under the Constitution, the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. However, modern wars are waged by war experts and war technicians, and they are directed by professional warriors and not by civilians, including the President, so in reality the Commander in Chief is a war leader in theory only. Through this orderly arrangement between our civil and military authorities the United States has fought and won its many wars. Long ago we began training carefully selected young men at West Point, Annapolis, and in our numerous war colleges, for the grim task of directing war. Excellent progress in our two current wars is being made because the President has wisely left the making of war to the career men we have trained to fight war. The people themselves determine the war policies of the Nation and the President, as their chosen leader, carries them out. The inspired and eloquent Churchill has stated the American people's war policies perfectly. I quote the Prime Minister:

"You ask, what is our policy? I will say it is to wage war by sea, land, and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us.

"To wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalog of human crime. That is our policy.

"You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word. It is victory; victory at all costs; victory in spite of all terror; victory, however long and hard the road may be, for without victory there is no survival.

"I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

So spoke the mighty Churchill.

Now, may we pass on to the important current political domestic issues. For some time there has been a growing conflict between the Chief Executive and the Congress. Hardly a day passes that the executive department is not bitterly assailed by individual Members of Congress. On the other hand, the President loses no opportunity to assault, not the Members of Congress but the Congress as such as a whole. As a result the President's strength in Congress is shrinking. In a year in which the Presidency itself is at stake, control of Congress is held by the political opponents which he has in both political parties, who are determined to influence the handling of affairs at home and shape America's policies abroad.

All political observers regardless of their political predilections say that in the next election the minority party in the House will become the majority party and that the two political parties will be evenly divided in the Senate. They predict that the President's influence in Congress, already beyond repair, will approach the vanishing point after the November election, should Mr. Roosevelt be reelected. Therefore should the present running row between the Executive and the Congress persist, America will find herself in a war crisis and in a post-war crisis and her Government in a hopeless deadlock.

Only a fool would close his eyes to this impending crisis. It overshadows all of the other political issues of the approaching campaign. Unless the candidates for the Presidency—and all of them—give the people assurance that they can provide dynamic leadership and at the same time cooperate fully with Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government, the voters must reject them in the name of survival. Make no mistake; above all else there must be full cooperation between the Executive, the Congress, and the States, or the United States of America cannot begin to meet her staggering war burdens and her staggering post-war obligations. The consequences of further conflict in government are too awful to contemplate.

In the spirit of unified war effort and to promote speed and efficiency Congress has delegated much authority to the executive department. Congress is an awkward body with extremely heavy burdens outside the realm of passing laws and so, rather than work out the details of legislation pertaining to rapidly changing, complicated, and involved subjects, it has been content to lay down a general principle and leave it to administrative agencies to set up necessary rules and regulations. Good as were its intentions this has proven most unfortunate and has all but changed our democracy from a government by constitutional law into a government by unconstitutional Executive edict.

Executive administrative agencies, ambitious for arbitrary power, have stretched and expanded and enlarged the relatively minor authority delegated to them by Congress into a limitless and vast legislative operation. The office of Attorney General has searched days on end among the acts of Congress for some flimsy pretext upon which to base executive legislative powers. Many administrative agencies have been set up without any specific legislative authority whatsoever. Corporate government agencies have been created which Congress did not authorize and they have assumed the power to obtain funds from sources other than congressional appropriations, thus robbing Congress of its constitutional, traditional, and jealous power over the purse. The President has established, created, abolished, and consolidated countless bureaus without so much as consulting Congress.

A President, if he is to be trusted by the people, should display an honest patience with Congress. If individual Members make mistakes, if some of them quail before the threats of special interest pressure, if at times its leadership appears weak and ineffective, if it hesitates and moves with muddled uncertainty, be saddened but be patient because after all Congress is but a replica of the people. Congress can never rise far above their aspirations and their ability. Congress is not only an actual cross-section of the people, it reflects their moods and their inner selves. Let me make it plain therefore that a President or a bureaucrat or a private citizen who has no faith in the institution of Congress has no faith in the people. If he becomes irked and holds Congress in contempt you may be sure he holds the people in contempt also. A President's attitude toward the institution of Congress is a dead giveaway as to how he feels toward the people.

The founding fathers with their great faith in the people clearly indicated all

through the Constitution their determination that the Congress of the United States be the important department of this new Government. Too, they ordained that it be connected closely with the people, and they gave the people a check through biennial congressional elections to modify, change, or approve the policies of Congress. The men who wrote the Constitution made no lawful provision—war or no war, emergency or no emergency—for the Executive to seize the lawmaking and policy-making functions of government.

Ten days ago two very significant things occurred. The Baruch-Hancock report on demobilization and reconversion was filed. About the same time Senator GEORGE introduced a bill on this identical subject in the Senate. The Baruch plan and the George plan were strikingly similar in their approaches. Both recommended about the same procedure and about the same form of organization. The George bill was referred to a standing Senate committee where it is presumed hearings would be arranged and all provisions examined critically by friend and foe in accordance with the best democratic traditions. The ink was hardly dry on the Baruch report before the President began making appointments under it. Here is a program affecting every man, woman, and child in America, and the President brazenly denies the people or their representatives the right to modify it or approve it.

Volumes of Executive orders have been issued by this administration in the past 11 years. Last September the count stood 3,565 Executive orders assuming the force of law against 4,304 laws enacted by Congress. On September 7, 1942, the President delivered an ultimatum to Congress demanding a law that would fix prices, salaries, wages, and profits by the 1st of October, or else! He said, "In the event that the Congress should fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act. At the same time that farm prices are stabilized, wages can and will be stabilized also. This I will do." This sounds like Hitler in his best early Sunday morning form. It should be mentioned here that many Congressmen had been trying for a year to stabilize wages and had been prevented from doing so by this very same administration that was now giving them a dead line upon which to act.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution reads, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." It does not add to that section "except in time of war." It makes no exception. Article II, section 3, reads, "he (the President) shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Article I, section 1, should be respected by the President and he should faithfully observe Article II, section 3—war or no war, emergency or no emergency. The Constitution makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy in time of war; but it does not give him any additional power or authority over the civilian population.

This administration has disregarded consistently the specific charge of the Constitution to submit all treaties to the Senate for ratification, and it has persistently by-passed Congress in the field of foreign policy. Congress has not the slightest idea what assurances were given to foreign powers at Quebec, Casablanca, Cairo, and Tehran. The Atlantic Charter was never submitted to the Senate for ratification. The Constitution gives only Congress the power to declare war and only Congress the power to make a treaty of peace; and yet, on January 2, 1942, the President entered into the so-called 26-nation agreement pledging this Government "not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies." Doubtless the Senate would ratify this treaty overwhelmingly and promptly were it submitted, but it has not been submitted.

Too, the Secretary of State is going far beyond the provisions of the lease-lend statute in requiring lend-lease recipients to make specific post-war tariff and trade agreements. Lend-lease is a war measure pure and simple, and not a club in the hands of the administration to manipulate tariffs or create a United States bank or provide a United Nations stabilization fund, that will obligate the United States to expend vast sums abroad without check and without an accounting.

George Washington in his Farewell Address to his countrymen warned against encroachment and usurpation within the framework of our government.

"The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers, * * * and thus create * * * a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. * * * If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. * * * But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

It is noteworthy that not a single amendment to the Constitution has been submitted to the people since Mr. Roosevelt took office. An excellent prayer for any President would be "Oh Lord, give me the courage to undertake what needs to be changed, the strength to endure what cannot be changed, and the wisdom to know which is which."

As a general rule a veto message couched in dignified language does not antagonize Congress, but to the contrary wins respect for the President in Congress. It is a safeguard against hasty or otherwise objectionable legislation; a protection of the rights of the Executive, the judiciary, and the States from invasion by Congress and, moderately and wisely used, it is a check against the instability of legislation. If the President had the right of partial veto of appropriation bills now enjoyed by many Governors he would and could save the taxpayers billions of dollars by striking out items slipped into appropriation bills by congressional riders and congressional log-rolling.

Presidents Adams, Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, Van Buren, William Henry Harrison, Taylor, Fillmore, and Garfield never vetoed a bill passed by Congress. Washington vetoed 2, Monroe 1, Jackson 9, and Lincoln 3. Theodore Roosevelt 40 and Franklin Roosevelt 613. We have been accused of having a rubber-stamp Congress. Thank God that we do not have a rubber stamp President! In my opinion 99 percent of the bills vetoed by President Roosevelt should have been vetoed.

However, there is a question of propriety involved in his recent subsidy veto. Congress had never approved a general subsidy policy and when it repudiated by an overwhelming vote a general subsidy policy created by Executive order, the President preserved his unlawful legislative order by his veto. The recent veto of a revenue measure was stupid and was accompanied by a message which the President's faithful and loyal friend, Majority Leader Senator BARKLEY, described as a "calculated and deliberate attack upon the integrity of Congress." The Constitution requires that all tax levies must originate in the House of Representatives in order to keep the vital tax power close to the people. Chief Justice Marshall well said: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." Levying taxes is a peculiar power that the founding fathers kept far from the authority of the President. It is not surprising therefore that no other President has ever vetoed a revenue measure. I trust that no President will ever do so again.

Under the prevailing parliamentary forms of government in force in many foreign countries there can be no rift between the executive and the legislative branches. A vote of confidence can be taken promptly by the House of Commons or other similar legislative body in other parliaments with the result that the government either stands or the government falls on the outcome. Thus the people through their representatives are always in control. The advantages of such a system is possible under our Constitution if we had a President willing to apply more and more democracy to relieve the grievous and dangerous crisis facing the United States.

The President can, under the powers specifically granted him, place every function of the Federal Government under one or other of the Cabinet officers and make that Cabinet officer responsible for the operation of his whole department. Secondly, he can require him, since Cabinet officers are under his direction, to appear before the House of Representatives and give an accounting whenever the House desires an accounting. The President can invite the House to take a vote of confidence after such an appearance and if the Cabinet officer fails to receive a vote of confidence his services could be terminated forthwith. Such a simple innovation would bring whatever bureaucrats we have and must have under the complete control of the people. Furthermore, it would bring the Congress and the President into the fullness of mutual confidence so vital to orderly and effective government.

If such a system were in effect today doubtless three and perhaps four Cabinet officers would fall and all the other Cabinet officers would sit up and take notice. The departments would be revitalized, duplication would cease, and jurisdictional quibbling would end. Instead of chaos and confusion, responsibility and order would prevail in Washington. Under such a system an O. P. A. or an O. D. T. or a W. M. C. or a W. P. B. or a W. F. A. or an Economic Stabilizer or a War Labor Board or any other executive agency created with or without law could not persecute the people or kick them around one more time.

I recall that while Hitler and Japan were getting ready for this war a Cabinet officer, having to do with America's defenses, was a helpless invalid and totally incapacitated. How many American lives that cost cannot be estimated. To be soft-hearted is admirable, but soft-headedness should never be tolerated in a chief executive. How long do you think the court-martial trials of General Short and Admiral Kimmel would be postponed if Cabinet officers had to make an accounting to the House of Representatives?

I hope that no President of these United States ever tries to set himself up as a dictator, but if and when he does, his first act will be to obtain, one way or another, a subservient and rubber-stamp Congress, a la Hitler; or, failing in that, he will try to destroy the good name of Congress. Referring to the House of Representatives as the "House of Reprehensibles" would be an excellent beginning. I do not know how many rubber-stamp Congressmen have been appointed Federal judges, nor how many rubber-stamp "lame duck" Congressmen have been appointed to well-paid administrative positions in recent years, but the number is fairly staggering. Encouraging the hope of reward to a Congressman is the most dishonest, corrupt, and dangerous threat to free, representative government conceivable.

Now I want to talk to you about the evil of concentrating power in Washington.

The Governor of one of our great States in his inaugural address gave the people a

timely warning against the concentration of government at Washington. I quote:

"There is a present dangerous tendency to forget a fundamental of American democracy—the tendency to encourage consolidation of power at the top of a governmental structure alien to our system and more closely akin to a dictatorship or the central committee of a Communist regime. We have met difficulties before this and have solved them in accordance with the basic theories of representative democracy. Let us not at this time pursue the easy road of centralization of authority, lest some day we discover too late that our liberties have disappeared."

Later the same Governor, in a radio address, said:

"It was clear to the framers of our Constitution * * * that any administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation * * * would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself.

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by master minds has been too glaringly apparent in Washington during the last 10 years. * * * To bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government."

Perhaps you would never guess that the author of that admonition was Franklin D. Roosevelt when he was Governor of New York.

The trend, or more correctly speaking, the stampede toward centralized government in this Nation is a cause for grave concern and genuine alarm, and a hundredfold greater now than when Governor Roosevelt pointed it out as a dangerous tendency some years ago. It was a tendency then; it is a stampede now. Always in history as the processes of concentration of government have progressed, the freedom and liberty of the people have diminished; conversely, as government has been decentralized, liberty has gained. The Habeas Corpus Act, the Magna Carta, the Petition of Rights, and our own Declaration of Independence, were all instruments to decentralize government; in their wake came liberty and freedom. The growth of bureaucratic and concentrated government in the United States already has marked the decline of liberty. If that decline is to be halted, the people, the Congress, and the States, must be aroused from their lethargy and resist as they resisted King George III.

The people must realize that this is a fight to the finish between concentrated power and democratic government. The first line of defense in this fight is the preservation of the sovereignty of the State and the local units of government. One hundred and fifty years ago 13 bankrupt and weak but independent and sovereign States, in order to pool their onerous task of maintaining an army, a navy, and a common bureau to carry on relations with foreign powers and to bring about better unity, comity, and intercourse among themselves, established a federation to be known as the United States of America. These States created a Federal Government to do a few things requiring a united approach, the Federal Government to act as their agent; but now this agent, grown haughty with good credit, threatens to become their master. Already in this battle the former sovereign States have gone back almost to their original status of Federal territories.

We are an impatient people; we want things the easy way, the fast way, and to Hades with the consequences. We would rather live on borrowed money than earned money. We feel that the States are old-fashioned and provincial, and narrow and obsolete, so we acquire what we want with borrowed Federal money instead of through State taxes, and we imagine that that is progress. Many States have constitutions prohibiting the floating of debts, and all States use sparingly of their credit, largely because they are close to the people; so we charge them with being hopelessly backward, and we take up our abode in a fool's paradise of easy-credit money. While in this dazed and self-hypnotized condition of drunken exultation we fall easy victims to "federalitis," and before we can say Jack Robinson the bureaucrats have us tied hand and foot. We fell for their bribes of easy money, and now we are their vassals. It will be quite a shock when we discover that the bribe they used so successfully on us was our own credit and that we will have to pay it all back with a terrible burden of interest added thereto.

I do not subscribe to the fantastic theory that the huge public debt under which American taxpayers will groan for a century is a matter of small concern on the slaphappy pretext that "we owe us." It is true that the people of the United States do have the largest liquid assets of all history, but it is also true that the Federal Treasury itself is bankrupt and that the good credit of the United States must not be abused further. As soon as the war is over, we will have ten to twenty million unemployed workers in the United States unless a way be found by the people with money, encouraged by a government without money, to put that vast store of private idle capital to work.

Shrewd American capitalists are busy promoting an international police force to be supported by the American taxpayers to protect American investments all over the world. Such a scheme will promote the flight of American capital away from the United States to distant shores to exploit cheap labor, and seize the world markets and escape American taxes. If that happens, vital American jobs will be gone and the "we owe us" theorists will discover that both "we" and "us" will hold the sack at the snipe hunt. Any policy of internationalism that destroys American jobs must be rejected with a vengeance. America does not want "freedom from work." Tonight I want to make it crystal clear to the American capitalists that that is not what we are fighting this war for. America must have nothing to do with any brand of internationalism, however attractively attired, that does not mean more American jobs. Jobs are as vital to our people as is oxygen to life.

Perhaps the country needs a good 5-cent cigar. Since I do not smoke, I would not know; but I do know that America needs an exodus out of Washington. We should let the world know too that Santa Claus has migrated back to his old home near the North Pole and that he is going to remain there. The United States has had 32 Presidents. One of them in his occupancy in the White House has spent far more than twice as much money as all the other 31 Presidents together have spent, and may I whisper that practically all of it was borrowed money, too. That is not an enviable record. That is a rotten record. We must go to a balanced Budget the moment the war is over even if it means grass growing in every street in Washington, D. C. Unless we do so, not only will the Treasury be bankrupt but our credit will be destroyed also.

The greatest tragedy of American political history was the President's decision 4 years ago to seek a third term. His first term will ever be known as the term of great social and economic progress. In 1932 America had sunk to the lowest ebb of hopelessness and despair. Capitalism and the free-enterprise system had failed miserably. Government, bewildered and punch-drunk with the cross-currents of uncertainty, stood helpless while conditions went rapidly from bad to worse. In the economic world, the cruel law of "survival of the fittest" was relentlessly taking its deadly toll. Into that dismal picture came Franklin Delano Roosevelt breathing confidence and displaying bold, decisive action. He demonstrated that the Nation could be restored by putting the common man back on a job and the little businessman back in the black.

At the end of his first term he was looked upon as the great liberal leader who had saved his country by helping his countrymen discover how to save themselves. He was re-elected triumphantly. Only two small States by a scant margin failed to give him their electoral vote. Thus he came within a stone's throw of equaling Washington's singular and unique record of winning the electoral vote from every State.

Nearly every President has what is known as a "kitchen cabinet" or "palace guard" of trusted and confidential unofficial advisers. Accordingly, a small group of ambitious men, heretofore unknown, who had attached themselves to President Roosevelt, saw visions of a complete political, social, and economic revolution. They dinned into his ears that the 1936 vote was a mandate from the people to proceed along the path of social reform at a greater tempo. During the 1936 campaign I know from first-hand personal knowledge that the President never abandoned for one moment his firm determination to fulfill his 1932 pledge to balance the Budget. His better judgment told him to consolidate the social gains of his first term before attempting the conquest of new worlds. However, when he started to carry out this program, the slight economic recession of 1937 frightened him and he fell the victim to the constant chant of the "palace guard." He threw caution and his good resolves to the wind and began to organize an ill-conceived crusade to revolutionize society and the American economic system.

The Supreme Court had gotten into an ugly mood and through narrow interpretations was childishly declaring every act of Congress unconstitutional. The "palace guard" decreed that the Court be put in its place and brought forth the weird Supreme Court packing plan. Congress, with a better appreciation for American traditions and a better realization that time would shortly remove the recalcitrants from the Supreme Court bench, rebelled and refused to burn down the barn to destroy a few very temporary obstructionists. The President was furious at Congress. His "palace guard" countered with a high-handed attempted purge of all opposing Congressmen. In the election of 1938 the President, garbed in fighting armor, undertook to destroy every Congressman and Senator of his own party who had dared even in small degree to vote against his program. The result was a rebuff by the people such as no President had before suffered. One lone enemy Democratic Congressman in the city of New York was defeated with the help of the city machine. All Senators and all other Congressmen marked for slaughter were re-elected by tremendous majorities.

The President did not take this defeat gracefully. He was determined to have vengeance. His program of retaliation called for class to be pitted against class. Disunity, hatred, and bitterness became the order of the day. The "palace guard" chanted the theory of indispensability. Political observers said the President was all washed up politically, and the President demanded vindication. War broke out in Europe; and the President, who had long been an internationalist, saw in it a challenge and an opportunity. The unfortunate resolve to seek a third term was born.

Dulled by an overdose of "political spoils," it was easy to put over the third-term nomination blitzkrieg on the fat, lazy, and impotent Democratic Party. Unfortunately, too, the Republican Party had sunk to a low ebb. It had neither program, purpose, nor leadership. For 8 years it had been wander-

ing all over the lot bewildered and punch drunk with a "me, too" grin on its face. In its dazed dotage it was easy for the Wall Street barefoot boy from Indiana, registered in New York as a Democrat and a Tammanyite, to stampede the Republican Convention. Republicans everywhere blush a deep crimson over it now, but Wendell Willkie, with all his faults, did breathe life back into the G. O. P. elephant, and there is a fighting Republican Party once more in every county north of the Mason and Dixon's line.

Mr. Roosevelt's first term will ever be known as the "term of daring." His second term, starting out friendly and triumphantly, seemed destined to equal Monroe's "era of good feeling" but wound up in the gutter in an "era of bad feeling." His third term must be known as the term of "appeasement." It launched the 1940 campaign by appeasing the internationalists with the appointment of two old line Republicans as Secretaries of Navy and War. It appeased the nationalists by assuring them "again and again and again" that no mother's son would "be sent to fight in a foreign war." It appeased Japan by selling her all the war material she could pay for. It appeased China, who was fighting against Japan at that very moment for her life, with money and credit. After the election it appeased Britain by going to war on her side and it has been appeasing everyone everywhere ever since with lend-lease at a cost to the American taxpayers of billions. It appeased Russia by junking the Atlantic Charter. It appeased John L. Lewis and his miners, and A. F. Whitney of the Railroad Brotherhoods, with an increased wage at the back door of the White House, after scornfully turning them down at the front door amid a blare of trumpets.

Now a fourth term is accepted as a matter of course by the once traditionally independent Democratic Party. One-man control has reduced it to hopeless impotency. It no longer has the inclination nor the will to resist those who would rape it. The Democratic Party is no longer democratic. One man will name its candidate for President, its candidate for Vice President, and write its platform, just as was done in 1940. If it materializes, history will name the fourth term the "term of frustration."

While regrettable, of course, it would be a relatively small matter in human events if Mr. Roosevelt alone were to go down to defeat, but history must record that he dragged down with him the great liberal movement which he himself launched and the great Democratic Party which he himself revitalized. Had he passed up the third term, the liberal movement of the thirties, created by him, would have swept on to continued triumphant service. He forgot that Andrew Jackson and the other great Presidents reached the zenith of their power and influence after they were freed from the impediments of public office.

The strongest argument against a long continuation in the office of President is that it is the President's duty to appoint all Federal judges. It is perfectly natural for any President to appoint men vigorously supporting his ideological concepts. Mr. Roosevelt's earlier unhappy experience with the Supreme Court has made him especially sensitive on that point, and his court appointees reflect his predilections and the unorthodox political views of his "palace guard." In a short time every Federal judge the country over will have been appointed from one school of political thought, a school that is decidedly in the minority in this country. Since the Constitution is "what the courts say it is," too many appointments by one man are not wholesome.

Perhaps after Mr. Roosevelt's unhappy and unfortunate experience with more than two terms no future President will ever again be tempted to violate the no-third-term precedent laid down by Washington and observed by all American Presidents for 150 years. However, all of us who love this Republic and want to perpetuate it would feel safer if the Constitution restricted the Presidency to one term of 6 years. That is plenty long enough for one "palace guard" to rule the roost. America is not a one-man country.

Disunity among a people is a terrible thing. Too much satisfaction with things as they are is disastrous also, but reform and progress do not ride the wings of hate and bitterness. Political observers and historians will tell you that fascism, communism and other forms of tyrannical totalitarianism came into power throughout continental Europe on the heels of disunity, class conflict, and an absence of coordinated economic tranquillity. Any President who promotes disunity is playing with matches in a powder factory. The all-important spirit of cooperation, patience, and good will, cannot be overemphasized. Racial conflicts, labor and management strife, and manifestations of class hatreds, are bad omens and danger signals which should put us on guard that tyranny is just around the corner.

America must have a President who has a crystal-clear conception and a crystal-clear understanding of what makes America great. The basis for our progress is the power and dignity of freemen with the will to shape their own destinies by their own self-reliant efforts. America has achieved greatness down that road and can add to that greatness through that formula alone. Rights of freemen and their fitness to be freemen can only be determined by their ability to practice self-reliance and by their assumption of the responsibilities of freemen. Representative Government and a free economy can be preserved only by self-reliant and responsible individuals. America's President must believe in the people, in their wisdom, their judgment, and in their right of self-determination. It is his job to help develop an alert and informed public understanding and a spirit of voluntary cooperation that is based upon the religious and philosophical conception of the dignity and supremacy of the individual.

The President of the United States is more than a political officeholder; he is the chosen leader of 135,000,000 Americans. Within the framework of our system of representative democracy and free enterprise, he must lead his people forward to the new magnificent and exciting frontiers constantly being unfolded by science and invention which will enable them to produce a greater volume of better goods and distribute them at lower prices to more people. God has willed that without freedom there can be no development of the human soul and without cooperation there can be no social progress. Out of unity will come a stronger, finer, greater, better stabilized America.

In 7½ months, we, the people of the United States, will select a President for the most perilous period of our history. We must select a man who believes in a republican form of government, who is opposed to the concentration of power in Washington, and who hates despotism with all his heart. We must select a man who believes in the institution of Congress and especially who believes that we should have a people's House of Representatives. We must select a man who believes this Nation should be governed by written laws enacted by Congress and not by Executive orders issued by bureaucrats. We must select a man who believes in a sound fiscal policy and who fears public debt as he would the black plague. We must select a man who believes in the free enterprise system and who understands that our prosperity and happiness depend upon free men, a free agriculture, and an abundance of private jobs.

We need a President in the approaching crisis with the dignity, devotion, and poise of Washington, the creative instinct of Jefferson, the cooperative spirit of Monroe, the fire of Jackson, the humility and God-fearing piety of Lincoln, the courage and the honesty of Cleveland, the dynamic leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, the sense of humor of Taft, the learning of Wilson, the commonsense of Coolidge, and the daring of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In 1944, the decisive year of American history, may God, in His infinite wisdom, give us such a man.

Address by Senator Danaher at Republican Founders' Day Anniversary Celebration, Omaha, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on March 7 the State of Nebraska celebrated the seventy-seventh anniversary of the admission of Nebraska into the Union, and exercises were held at Omaha under the auspices of the Republican Founders' Day Anniversary Committee. The committee in charge invited as speaker for the occasion the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and Nebraska Republicans looked forward with great interest to his appearance, the more particularly since he is ranking Republican member of our Senate Committee on the Judiciary. We had an overflow meeting of enthusiastic Republicans who came from all over the State to take part in the celebration. It was an inspiration to note the enthusiasm with which the Senator's remarks were received, and, accordingly, for the information of the Senate and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD, the speech delivered by the Senator from Connecticut.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, nowhere but home could I have found a warmer welcome than has been extended to me tonight by the citizens of the great Cornhusker State of Nebraska. Coming to you as I do from the tiny State of Connecticut, I reciprocate in full measure as I address you at this celebration of Republican founders' day, for we have always looked with fond approbation upon the magnificent efforts of your founders and pioneers, and I extend heartiest congratulations upon your 77 years as a State.

Among your earliest settlers were many families from my own State. Perhaps your greeting instinctively reflects a link between that past and the present, for as I enter your State I cannot be unmindful of references of my great-grandmother to her son, John Malone, who emigrated to Nebraska nearly 100 years ago. "Uncle John," as we boys referred to him, remained only a few years in Nebraska. Perhaps he liked the open spaces. Maybe he thought Pawnees were too easy; perhaps he preferred the Cheyennes and Sioux. Anyhow, he later moved to Kansas whose 84,000 square miles gave him a little broader opportunity to rear a family

whose descendants have fulfilled an honorable role in the development of your neighboring prairie State. He was typical of thousands, intrepid, industrious, stalwart; to your founders a grateful Nation owes an eternal debt. Truly they were "pioneer souls that blaze their paths where highways never ran." Surely they proved themselves friends to man.

Nor are you without such people now. I see them in the persons of Senator HUGH BUTLER who most ably serves with me on major committees in the Senate, and of Senator KENNETH WHERRY who, after only 1 year, has been selected by his colleagues to be the Republican minority whip. Stanch and true Republicans, they suggest the pioneers of earlier days in their forthright and uncompromising opposition to the forces which would destroy our institutions. Nebraska has ever sent great sons to the Congress of the United States, and it is the source of great satisfaction to me to find that the splendid men you have sent to the House of Representatives are all Republicans. It required action by the Congress to override a veto of President Andrew Johnson to get Nebraska into the Union back there in 1867; you need have no fears that your Republican congressional delegation now in Congress will fail to keep Nebraska's place intact. You can scan the Constitution of the United States without finding the word "Democrat"—but the act of Congress admitting Nebraska to the Union expressly found that the people had adopted in Nebraska a form of government which is republican. With your twice elected Dwight Griswold as Governor, let's keep Nebraska Republican.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND THE SUPREME COURT

The Constitution of the United States provides that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion. * * *" Clearly, the founding fathers had in mind an invasion by a hostile force. They thought they had already amply protected the States against an "invasion" by insidious forces from within. It did not occur to them that the day might come when the people could so far succumb to the opiate of a central government as to become its vassals. The founding fathers, in adopting a Constitution which provided for the separation of powers, clearly expected that the people themselves would see to it that the guaranty of a republican form of government would be maintained. It did not cross their minds that one day the people of the Nation would continue in office a President who would appoint some 70 percent of the judges of the Federal courts, who would appoint seven of the nine Justices of the United States Supreme Court, and who if continued for a fourth term would possibly have the appointment of successors to the two remaining Republican Justices. As final arbiter between the people and their government, the Supreme Court of the United States has ever been thought by our citizenry to be inviolate. Yet recently members of that court have themselves charged other members of the court with violating precedent and formulating through what should be judicial opinion, their own notions of what the law should be. Indeed, within the past few months after an expensive and protracted trial, that Court found itself unable to function in deciding upon the rights of a litigant when four Justices were bound to declare themselves disqualified, because while members of the Executive branch of the Government, they had exercised official connection with the case in question.

The institution we know as our Supreme Court, which is a veritable treasure house of our most precious rights, should be preserved intact and safeguarded against domination by the Executive or any other interposing force. Yet, under our Constitution the Chief Executive must make nominations to that Court when occasion requires, and with a Senate filled with partisans of the President, confirmation of the appointees would be inevitable. Only through the people themselves in their power of selection of the Chief Executive can they have a voice at the source of the appointing power. There are those who say that Mr. Roosevelt intends to run for a fourth term as President. It is the right, in my judgment, it is the duty, of the American people to say him nay. The Republican Party can perform no greater service to the American people than to point out the dangers inherent in a situation where any President, no matter who he is, may have and exercise the power of appointment to our Judiciary of partisans of known political beliefs, chosen all too frequently as a reward for subservient following of the dictates of the Chief Executive while holding some political office under his aegis.

PLACING RESPONSIBILITY FOR EXTENSIONS OF EXECUTIVE POWER

In another field there is to be found additional evidence of the constant effort to exalt the Executive, and that is through control of the legislative branch of your Government. You know that down through the 1930's the control of the Congress was overwhelmingly vested in the administration. Blind zealots and coattail riders filled both Halls of Congress. They did not have unanimous control, to be sure. For example, when I ran for the Senate in 1938 there were still 15 Republicans among its 96 Members. There were still a few of what might be called real Democrats, as distinguished from out-and-out administration supporters. But the fact remains that the administration overwhelmingly dominated not only the Senate and the House, but every committee in both branches of Congress. Many of the legislative acts of which you are now feeling the consequences became law over that period. Even now we have only 37 Republicans in the Senate. Consequently, every committee is organized by those who bear the label Democrat. The Democrats, therefore, through their organization have controlled and still guide the course of legislation. There are people right from this State who have written to me saying "Why doesn't the Congress do something?"

In fastening responsibility where it belongs, you should know that the Democrats have what they call a steering committee. That committee, without Republican representation, decides what bill is to come up for a vote and when it will be acted upon. It makes no difference how meritorious some other measure may be. It makes no difference how necessary you and I might think the legislation is. If the Democratic steering committee does not wish to permit a given measure to come up in the Senate for a vote, it will not be voted upon. In the 5 years I have spent in the Senate there has never been a single bill introduced by a Republican, and having national economic impact, which has been permitted to become law. Not one! Meanwhile, over the past 11 years, bill after bill was passed by the administration forces which created one new agency after another, and bureau after bureau. To these there was given the power to make regulations having the force and effect of law. There was ushered in the era of government by directive. There was developed the interesting technique by which the populace as a whole at the same time was not permitted to feel the impact of a given directive or regulation. If you were in the securities business, you might feel the effect of a certain order, but the overwhelming plurality of the public felt no occasion for concern.

If you were a banker, you might find yourself in competition with dozens of Federal lending agencies, but for everyone so situated, there were a thousand people to whom the situation made no difference. If you were a farmer, the orders and regulations and directives intended for you caused no worries to the city dweller. Thus gradually, insidiously, a little bit here and a little bit there, controls were gradually extended over any and every field in which the Federal power could be asserted. As long as people thought that this creeping collectivism was intended to suppress monopoly and big business, that was all right with them. Now, when they finally wake up to the fact that they are included, they cry "Why doesn't Congress do something?" Well, on November 7, 1944, the people are going to have their chance, perhaps their last real chance, to elect a people's Congress.

LAW MAKING THROUGH BUREAUCRACY

"What has all this to do with your earlier reference to the courts?" you might ask. I am trying to show you how there has been developed the technique by which the controls of government have been established over the American people. Don't you see first you have a President with a purpose. Next you have a subservient Congress which will enact legislation in the form in which he wants it. Buried down in that legislation creating these bureaus and these agencies will be a clause which gives to them the power to make the rules and regulations, but in addition they will so interweave such legislative language as to give finality to the rules or the regulations or the orders the agencies may promulgate. In some instances they have actually inserted language which would forbid appeals to the courts, and deny access by American citizens to the courts of their own country to test their rights. In most instances, however, where the courts have become indoctrinated with the virus of absolutism, administrative finality is achieved through the court. It isn't even a year since one circuit court of appeals said:

"Numerous recent decisions of the Supreme Court leave no room for doubt but that the prerogative of an appellate court in reviewing a factual situation found by the Labor Board or any other administrative agency is of such limited nature as to have no practical value * * *.

"Moreover, many questions heretofore regarded as legal, or at least mixed questions of law and fact, subject to review, have been by judicial fiat shunted into the factual category so as to further limit the function of a reviewing court.

"So in the instant case, as in many others, any logic or reasoning which might otherwise appeal to our sense of fairness and justice, must be ignored in view of the extremely narrow limits of our authority as delineated by the Supreme Court."

HOW IT'S DONE

"How can it be?" you ask. Because of the nature of the controls of the administration, because of the scope of the controls, because of the purpose of the Chief Executive. I saw one administration supporter come to the floor of the Senate 3 years ago with the names of 57 Senators attached to a resolution. The Senator had heard the President make a speech in which the President seemed to the public, as well as to that Senator to come out in favor of a certain proposition, so the Senator made a 5-hour speech in favor of his resolution. That evening the administration spokesman took that Senator to the political woodshed, and the next day he withdrew the resolution for which he had argued so fervently. Thereupon, Senator Norris offered the original resolution, which the administration still opposed, and the Senator who first introduced it and spoke 5 hours in favor of it, voted against it. It was many months

before the gentleman made another speech. When the second war powers bill came to the Senate over 2 years ago, a Republican, Senator BROOKS, of Illinois, offered an amendment to permit men in the armed forces the franking privilege for their mail and the amendment received overwhelming support. An administration Senator notwithstanding offered his own amendment as a substitute, and although it accomplished identically the same thing as Senator BROOKS had in mind, it would never do to permit Senator BROOKS, a Republican, to receive public notice for so desirable a result. The administration substitute became the law.

Let's trace this technique a little further. Telling the public that a piece of legislation has an apparently laudable objective to enlist public support while actually the bill contains a very great deal of which the public is told nothing, is only part of the plan. Every department, every agency, every bureau, from top to bottom, for more than 11 years, has been filled with policymakers who have been appointed by the Executive. These people all have a common ultimate purpose in mind, they all know why they are there. If they don't go along, they go out. Ask Chester Davis, he lasted 4 months. Let a bill be introduced, by a Republican if you wish, for present purposes. (It is conceivable that at least once in a while even a Republican possesses sufficient temerity in view of the record, to introduce a measure which is in the public interest.) The bill will be referred first to a committee, controlled by the administration forces. By the committee it will be referred to the department involved. If the department should think well of it, may it so advise the committee? Perish the thought. It must clear through the Bureau of the Budget. Who is in it? You don't know. Is its complement responsible to your Congress? Not at all. These people are part of the executive agency, and they pass on the bill.

THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

How does such a situation come about? Because a supine Congress in the days of President Roosevelt's overwhelming domination gave him the power to act. Then he issues an Executive order, indeed he has promulgated nearly 4,000 Executive orders over the period of his incumbency. But let me emphasize my reference to this Bureau of the Budget which I can best do by quoting section 1 of a Bureau directive to the heads of executive departments and establishments, and reading:

"1. There shall be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, before submission to the Congress, or any committee or member thereof, two copies of each recommendation or report concerning proposed or pending legislation requested from or advanced by any department or establishment, or any officer thereof. The submitting department or establishment will then be advised by the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of the legislation, or of the report or recommendation thereon, to the program of the President; when such recommendation or report is thereafter submitted to the Congress, or to a committee or member thereof, it shall include a statement of the advice so received from the Bureau of the Budget."

I looked at three bills on the Senate Calendar recently, and I wish to read to you the concluding sentence from the reports which were filed by each of three great departments in your Government:

"The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANK KNOX."

"The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

"Sincerely yours,

"HENRY L. STIMSON,
"Secretary of War."

"I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANCIS BIDDLE,
"Attorney General."

It makes no difference how many lawyers there are in the Department of Justice. It didn't make any difference whether Henry L. Stimson is or is not competent as Secretary of War. They had to send their reports to the Bureau of the Budget!

Now, let's take the other side of it:

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised me 'that the enactment of the proposed legislation, either in its present form or if amended as suggested in your proposed report, would not be in accord with the program of the President.'

"Sincerely yours,

"H. L. ICKES,
"Secretary of the Interior."

THE "PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM"

The bill "would not be in accord with the program of the President." Would it pass? It couldn't even come up for a vote unless the Democratic steering committee so decided. If you find your daily concerns being controlled from Washington, there's how it's done. The orders which affect your lives so intimately must be in accord with the program of the President.

It is all planned, in fact the President told you, "We planned it that way." Step by step—it can't be said too often—there is being evolved the centralization of control over the American people and their affairs to the point where the people of Nebraska, who in 1867 were assured protection by the United States of their republican form of government, may well ask today, "Where is the program of the President taking us?"

In January 1936 the Chief Executive caused his puppet Congress to adjourn from its noonday meeting until 9 o'clock at night. Then having commanded the radio time of the country he delivered to you his speech on the state of the Nation, intended by the Constitution for the Congress. He told you that "it goes without saying that to create such an economic constitutional order more than a single legislative enactment was called for." He said:

"We have returned the control of the Federal Government to the city of Washington. * * * We have built up new instruments of public power. * * * In the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people. * * * I recommend to Congress that we advance, and that we do not retreat."

Shackles for the liberties of our people? You can see them, you can feel them all about you. Over the intervening years, ladies and gentlemen, the Congress and the President did "advance."

SIGNS OF POPULAR AWAKENING

Gradually our people are awakening to a realization of what it all means. A few of us ran for the Senate as Republicans in 1938 and were elected. A few more joined us in 1940, including your own Senator BUTLER. Then in 1942 came the nine, including your Senator WHERRY. Although those bearing the label "Democrat" still preponderated, and organized and controlled both Houses of the Congress, the President was by no means satisfied, for this Congress gave signs of restoring to the people a voice in their Government, and that would never do. There followed a series of efforts to discredit the Congress. From various of the hundreds of propaganda writers on the administration staff there came public statements, speeches, slurs, all designed to weaken in the minds of the people the influence of their own elected representatives. The President himself, in press conferences, radio speeches, and messages, continued the barrage.

Two months ago he charged the Congress with fraud, notwithstanding in the vote on the measure in question the Democrats in the Senate divided, 24 to 25. He strikes at all who run counter to the "program of the President." He seeks to defeat all those who assert their own proper place in the Congress as the policy-making body of our Government. But all prior efforts paled into insignificance compared to his veto message with reference to the 1944 tax bill. With fresh impetus he attacked the entire Congress in his efforts to bring upon that body the ire of the American people. He would seek above all a return in 1945 to that type of Representative and Senator who will do his unquestioned bidding. Who are in the "palace guard" who advise the President thus to strike for absolutism in our Government? You don't know and I don't know. Whoever they are, however deep-seated their "passion for anonymity," their purpose can no longer be doubted. The collectivist state which they would impose upon us you may have if you wish. The subversion of our constitutional processes can be yours, if you wish. The destruction of our most cherished institutions, a patriarchal government which would make you wards of the state, you can have. Control over your daily lives, over the education of your children, what work you perform, when you will perform it, under what terms and conditions, all these and more you may leave to people back of desks down in Washington if you choose. But, as for me, I want "to stand up and be counted"—I am for Congress—and the people.

SOME CONTRASTS

Nebraska's founders in the days of the Territory drew inspiration from the Nation's great. None phrased the issues more aptly than Daniel Webster, whose fight for constitutional government was their constant guide, and Webster even surpassed himself when he declared:

"Good intentions will always be pleaded for every assumption of (executive) power; but they cannot justify it, even if we were sure that they existed. It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions, real or pretended. When bad intentions are boldly avowed, the people will promptly take care of themselves. On the other hand, they will always be asked why they should resist or question that exercise of power which is so fair in its object, so plausible and patriotic in appearance, and which has the public good alone confessedly in view. * * * It may be very possible that good intentions do really sometimes exist when constitutional restraints are disregarded. There are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully; but they mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well; but they mean to govern. They promise to be kind masters; but they mean to master * * *."

In the past 11 years how often we could have repeated those moving words.

The American people, like a bird fascinated by a serpent, sat by while the coils were tightening around them. This government by bureaus had been gradually increasing its hold. Suddenly stirring, our citizens partially slipped away in 1942 from the grasp of autocracy. The facts, like Webster's "bad intentions" had become more widely recognized. The people were discovering that their last best hope was their Congress, and they rose in their latent might and undertook to elude that major force which is the Washington which would hold them fast. They wished to

be freed from a government by directive and to return to a government of laws. They wished our policy to be formulated by their representatives according to standards prescribed in legislative acts; in short they saw that they needed government of law and not of men.

As Republicans, we were perhaps the more aware than other citizens of what had been happening to all of us, in that we had never quite surrendered in the first place. We shared the belief that the public should be protected against fraud while we protested against the limitations upon lawful business which would render stagnant the pools of investment opportunity and eventuate in government operation of business. We favored necessary price controls as a weapon against inflation arising in part from the dislocations caused by war, but we protested against bureaucratic destruction of the profit system. We favored the elevation of the living standards of the American family through collective bargaining but we protested against a strait jacket for the American workman. We favored legitimate and necessary taxation but protested against efforts to utilize the tax laws to bring about for the individual and for business a state of dependency upon the Central Government with its inevitable controls. We favored reasonable measures for social security but protested against making the entire populace the wards of a central state. We believe that the individual as a member of our common society enjoys rights and must perform correlative duties. But we deny that philosophy of government which would make the individual a creature of the state, and we know as a part of this great American society, that our rights and our reciprocal duties can find their greatest expansion to our greatest good through a government achieved through constitutional means.

THE EXECUTIVE IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD

Just as you have witnessed the development of the Executive order and the directive on the domestic front, so you see the administration proceeding through executive agreements in the international field. Policies have been formulated and commitments have been entered into without reference to the Congress, without submitting the essential facts to the people's representatives; indeed, certain courses have been followed in derogation of the will of Congress and executive spokesmen have refused to testify before your Congressional committees. The President has proceeded on the theory that he is the sole organ to represent the American people in the field of external relations. It may well be, for all you know, that the tax dollars of the American people should be spent for the construction of an oil pipe line across Arabia, but your Congress is not even consulted. It may well be that we should undertake commitments to defend that pipe line against all possible interference or attack, from whatever source, and that annually every American boy physically and mentally fit should be put into the Army or the Navy for that purpose. But no such policy has been developed by your Congress. The President has not asked your Senate Committee on Foreign Relations even to meet with him for more than 10 long years. I mention such things because I believe that the American people, through their Congress, should have a voice in all such matters of policy. Denied the facts, not consulted, the American people, through their Congress, may refuse that support borne of widespread understanding without which unauthorized excursions in the foreign field will be doomed to failure.

As Republicans, as citizens of this great Republic who love our country, our course is clear. First, we must win the war and must work unrelentingly with all who share with us the common purpose to defeat our enemies. There is no more poignant cry in all American than when will our boys come home?

Second. We must strive in every way within our power to set our own house in order that we may preserve whatever will be left of our fiscal structure and our economic resources, to the end that they may be reorganized for successful adjustment to the conditions of the post-war world.

Third. Like the founders of Nebraska we must learn to live within our means. We must know that happiness for all our people can come only from trimming our suit to the cloth. We must recognize that government has no funds of its own, that it produces nothing, that a dollar given to a man who has none is a dollar taken from a man who has worked and earned and saved the dollar in the first place.

Fourth. There must be a reawakened realization that our rights in society, whether domestic or international, must be established in an orderly way through rationalization. We must assert and believe that if a central state can be said to confer rights, the state can take them away and we will be at its mercy.

Fifth. And finally, in God's good time, and we may pray that will be soon, there will be peace, a peace I hope, with justice which takes account of man's inherent sovereignty and his ineffable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Through collaboration with other nations? Yes. With due regard for the constitutional processes and the purposes of our own Government? Above all, yes.

A resurgence of the American people in November 1944 is the clearly indicated remedy for the ailments of our body politic. Only through the ballot can we exercise that franchise to express our will. No more priceless right exists than the right of the American citizen to vote. Through the Republican Party the citizen will find the best possible medium through which to insure victory in war, happiness in peace, the preservation of constitutional government, and collaboration in the post-war period with the desolated and ravaged peoples of the world. And as Republicans, as Americans, let us guarantee to all of our States, as was promised to the founders of Nebraska by Congress just 77 years ago, a republican form of government.

The Farmer and O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the radio talk by Hon. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, and Howard H. Williamson, O. P. A. farm adviser, delivered over the radio Tuesday night.

The address follows:

Mr. BOWLES. For some time I've been anxious to talk to you about the relationship between our farmers and O. P. A. price controls. Right now's a good time to do it because Howard Williamson, our O. P. A. farm adviser, is just back from a trip all across the country talking to farmers about their problems.

Howard is here on the program with me right now and in a few minutes I will ask him some questions.

But first of all I'd like to remind all of you that the problems which our farmers have faced in the past belong to all of us. The economic distress which so many of our farmers faced after the last war simply must not be repeated. Our country can never be wholly prosperous and economically secure after the war unless all of us are secure—our farmers as well as our businessmen and city workers.

Our farmers have always worked hard to provide us with our food. They deserve a good price for their efforts—not only now under war conditions, but permanently—as an essential part of our peacetime economy.

Today, under our O. P. A. price controls, our American farmers are breaking all records for food production. And today, under O. P. A. price controls, the Department of Agriculture tells me that the average farm income, after all expenses, is also at an all-time high—about 282 percent over the 1935–39 average. Remember, please, I didn't say all farmers. I said the average farmer, lumping together our hog growers, cattle raisers, poultry growers, corn, wheat, cotton, and vegetable farmers. Some farmers are, of course, doing less well than the average.

Our farmers have a very definite stake in effective price control as a protection of the balance between what they get for their crops and what they have to pay out.

They have an equally great stake in O. P. A. price controls as a protection against the same cruel collapse of their farm prices which followed the last war. For the dangers of deflation after the war are just as great as the dangers of inflation during the war.

The collapse in prices after World War No. 1 hit our American farmers harder than any other group. The depression which, for the rest of us, lasted 2 or 3 years, lasted 20 long years for our farmers. It is our job in the O. P. A. to help prevent any repetition of that after this war. And we at O. P. A. sincerely view our present price controls—and our subsidies—as the surest possible safeguard against such a post-war farm collapse.

Now, some farmers have been critical of O. P. A. Some of this criticism has been our own fault.

For some time we have been working closely with every kind of business through over 300 industry advisory committees. But when I came to the O. P. A. in Washington last summer, we had no such give-and-take relationship with farmers on price regulations affecting them.

To correct this—to develop a closer understanding between the O. P. A. and all kinds of farmers in all parts of the country—I called in Howard H. Williamson from Texas, last November, and appointed him as my farm adviser. Howard had been director of extension services for the Texas A. & M. College. He had done this extension work ever since he was graduated from there 32 years ago—in addition to running his own farm.

We had many long talks together, and Howard agreed with me that something should be done to bring the farmers and the O. P. A. closer together. His idea was to bring this about through farm advisory committees working closely with our various O. P. A. district offices. I agreed, and for the past several weeks Howard has been on a trip through the country helping to get these committees organized and our plan under way. He got back to Washington only 2 days ago.

He's here with me now to give a report on how the plan is working out and what the farmers think of it.

First, Howard, I think it's important that people know you're a real farmer and not just somebody with a lot of theories about farming in general. Tell us about that farm of yours down in Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well, if farming makes a farmer, I am one. I started out rather young, traveling south down cotton rows with my hands wrapped around the north end of a hoe handle. At present, I operate on a few hundred acres on Bedias Creek in Grimes County, Tex.—principally livestock farming and some feed growing. My little bunch of

livestock consists of white-faced cattle, Angora goats, sheep, and this past year, some hogs. In the past I have engaged in cotton growing and have had some little experience in poultry and dairy business. I am what would be classed in my section as a small farmer but you don't have to be a very big farmer to know what farm problems are, especially during the war period when there are shortages of farm labor, farm machinery, and an abundance of regulations which, of course, can't be avoided in times like the present.

Mr. BOWLES. Tell me, how did you get along with your farm operations last year?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Pretty well, with the exception of my venture into the hog business. That was my 1943 mistake. I got caught like hundreds of others—more hogs than feed. My feed gave out and my acorns washed away. I am now trying to get my hogs finished with high-priced grain so as to get the floor price. I am not sure I will make it, but I will confess it was my own idea in the first place. I understand Judge Marvin Jones, Food Administrator, is recommending some reduction in the 1944 pig crop. I think, for one, I will give him my full cooperation unless I can produce more feed than I did last year.

Mr. BOWLES. You have just made a trip through the country, talking to farmers and farm leaders first hand. What territory did you cover, Howard?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I attended a State-wide meeting of farmers in Rhode Island and conferences in the Southwest, Middle West, and the Pacific coast. At Dallas, I attended a six-State conference of leading farmers, representatives of farm organizations, and others interested in agriculture. This conference was called and conducted under the leadership of Mr. Maxwell McCullough, regional administrator, region V. It was a very fine conference.

Mr. BOWLES. What are some of the things you found farmers and farm leaders thinking about?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well, as you know, Mr. Bowles, farmers never hesitate to give expression to their thinking. They are courteous but frank. I did not keep a penciled memorandum of comments, but I can give you a general interpretation of some of their thinking as I understood them. First of all, they want price stabilization and rationing to succeed, and they want to help all they can. They don't like regulations any better than anyone else; neither do they like war and the many other things we have to do in war periods. Their attitude in general is that we have a tough war to win, and it is going to take sacrifice and hard fighting. They want to get on with the job and do what is necessary but not wear themselves down doing unnecessary things.

Mr. BOWLES. What about suggestions. Do they have any for O. P. A.?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes. The group of farmers and farm leaders from the six States that met in Dallas recommended to the 13 district O. P. A. directors that they arrange for a conference of farmers and farm leaders in their respective districts and give consideration to the creation of a district agricultural advisory committee. This committee would work with the district O. P. A. director on general farm problems affected by O. P. A. Such committees have already been created in several of the O. P. A. districts in various other sections of the country.

Mr. BOWLES. Did they have any suggestions for immediate consideration?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Not in a formal way, but they certainly hinted at several. One was that we should do everything possible to eliminate unnecessary delays in getting out rules and regulations and that they be well in advance of the season's needs. Of course, they understand it takes some time to go through with procedures in getting rules and regulations prepared and released, but they want us to make it as speedy as possible. Another thing about which they were very polite was in the suggestion that, in the preparation of regulations, and so forth, they be put in such language or at least explained in a way that people other than lawyers can understand them. They appreciate the fact that rules and regulations must stand up from a legal point of view, but it helps when the laymen can understand them and their application. They are also interested in knowing to what extent producers participate in conferences, when considerations are given to price ceilings, and regulations dealing with raw or processed farm products.

Mr. BOWLES. They are absolutely correct on all counts. You know—and we want farm people to know—that we are striving to do everything possible to prevent delays and keep programs and regulations simplified. Also, it is O. P. A.'s policy to have producer representatives on all industry councils in which farm products are involved. But now—how do the farmers feel about price control, Howard?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well—I think the experience of one farmer out West pretty well answers that question Mr. Bowles. He has about 2,000 steers, which means he uses several hundred bushels of corn a day to feed them.

A while back the rumor got started that the ceiling on corn was going up 10 cents—so right away the flow of corn stopped right in its tracks in the hope of the higher price for it. And meantime, this fellow's steers went into a tailspin. That was only a rumor, mind you, so you can imagine what would happen if there was an official report that price ceilings would go off everything tomorrow. As that Missouri farmer put it to me the other day, "We farmers not only want prices fixed—we want prices to stay fixed so we can know where we stand."

That seems to be the general attitude of the farmers I have been talking with on this trip. They want price control, and they want to help all they can to keep it.

Mr. BOWLES. Our farm problem as we look ahead is to hold good prices for farmers after the war. And to insure that we musn't let our price levels go any higher now or we'll get in trouble later. Unless we hold the general level of prices where they are, we'll have to face another farm depression.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Most people who were in the farming game 25 years ago remember the seriousness of that post-war depression. And today farmers well understand that, in general, agriculture is in a relatively better position than it has been in the past century, and they are, of course, interested in its staying that way.

Mr. BOWLES. Keeping it that way is one important objective of the price stabilization program today. That is why we at O. P. A. are anxious to work as closely as possible with farmers.

How many farm committees have you got organized so far?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I am not planning to personally organize any. Washington is too far from farm people. However, I am suggesting, with a little urge to it, that the eight regional O. P. A. administrators promote through their district O. P. A. administrative set-up, district conferences as recommended by the farmers' group in Dallas, with the view of creating, where needed, a district advisory committee. The farmers and farm leaders and the district O. P. A. director in each district know the best approach and means of working together. To keep our O. P. A. programs geared to the problems of the farm, there must be good understanding on our part of the wartime problems farmers are encountering. And at the same time, farmers need to know some of the problems that you, Mr. Bowles, and your O. P. A. associates encounter in administering such a gigantic program of price stabilization and rationing for 130,000,000 people.

Mr. BOWLES. Well, as I told you last fall, Howard, we want and need the benefit of the thinking and counsel of farm people on those phases of our O. P. A. program that relate to farming. It is extremely important that we exchange suggestions and counsel in a well thought out and organized manner. And I believe your plan for local farm advisory committees throughout the country is the answer. In that way, the O. P. A. and the farmers can work together, closely and constantly as a team.

The job of controlling prices is a big one. As I have said before, it cannot be done wholly for any group by us at O. P. A. in Washington. It must be done by all groups in all communities. Only through understanding and cooperation can we succeed in our vital fight against skyrocketing prices now—and the deflation which would inevitably follow after the war.

Thank you, Howard, for your comments and observations. And I would like to take this means of congratulating the many millions of farm men and women and the farm youth of America on the great food production job you are doing. You have, and are now doing, a big and important war job with many handicaps. O. P. A. wants to be as helpful as possible.

And now, good-bye to you all until next week.

Our Greatest National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, over National Broadcasting Co. stations, Friday, March 10, 1944:

One of the greatest contributions that this Nation has been able to make to our fighting allies has been food. Without the food that we were able to furnish, gallant old England might not have survived during the dark days when she stood practically alone between civilization and organized destruction.

A short while ago a Russian general who fought in the Battle of Stalingrad told me that but for the food and supplies American made available for the heroic Red Army, the advance could not have been carried out as it was.

Without our rich soils that food could not have been produced.

The capital stock of a nation is its soil resources. No business can stand a continuing drain on its capital; likewise no nation can endure long excessive drains on its capital resources.

We were able to furnish this food because we had a vast, new country, rich in natural wealth.

What are soil resources? They are food and clothing locked up in nature's warehouse against the time when man, through his efforts, takes them out. Our great soil resources in this country have enabled us to develop a great race of people. History shows that the character and strength of a nation goes up and down with its soil.

In our fast development of this new country we have not always been careful in the preservation of our soil, and much of this

valuable God-given birthright has been permitted to wash or blow away. We have cut down our timber on the watersheds and hillsides; and the rains have descended, and the floods have come and beat upon the soil, carrying it into the branches and streams and on to the sea where it is lost forever. There are only a few inches of top soil on which we must depend not only now but so long as we remain a nation. Man's destiny is linked to the soil. From it he came and to it he must return. From it he must draw his sustenance.

We stand aghast before the spectacle of destruction in so much of the war-weary world today—the devastated fields and gutted homes, the ruins of great cities now rubble and ashes and bones. But all this wreckage, even in the scorched-earth areas, can be rebuilt with time and work. North Africa is already able to produce most of its food demands. Well-directed efforts can restore production in the stricken areas. I do not minimize the destruction; but restoration can be rapid.

I am here concerned with an even greater destruction, of our own fields, not by the Nazi or the Jap, but a destruction of which we ourselves have been guilty, with our eyes open, our own hands stained with the dust and mud of our eroded soil.

According to H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, we have ruined more land in less time than any other nation in history.

More than 50,000,000 acres of land in the United States, once cultivated, no longer produce crops. That is nearly as much as our entire wheat acreage last year. And the best topsoil has been washed away from an additional crop acreage twice as large as that. Fortunately, we are learning of this danger before it is too late.

Today our Mississippi Valley—and I mean by that the whole great area between the Alleghenies and the Rockies—is the greatest potential food-producing area in the world. Properly used and preserved it can, for centuries to come, not only supply abundance for our own people but can help supply others with its products and bring back in trade additional goods for us to use and enjoy.

This great valley is full of abundance and plenty. We have the opportunity to use these resources fully and yet preserve them—or to use them fully and waste them. There is always a conservation use and wasteful use. In the past we have exploited our good earth with a prodigal disregard of its real value to our enduring life as a nation. We have sent the export crops down to the sea in ships and the soil down to the sea in mud. When the Mississippi overflowed at its mouth, we built levees. We tried to reverse nature, and when nature rebelled, as she always does, against such treatment, we built higher levees. We wasted both soil and water. Instead of using the water to our advantage, we tried to get it into the sea as fast as we could.

We have now learned that the wise way is to go back up where the water falls as rain and work with Nature instead of against her; to utilize water at the source and thus treat it as a blessing instead of a curse. Whatever system will retain that water and soil is worth any national effort, however great. Out in the dry country not a gallon of water should be permitted to reach the sea. All should be used on the land. In other areas where it is abundant, it can be channeled and utilized for power, for additional wealth.

After the war our available manpower will eagerly turn from destruction in war to construction in peace; our engineering and technical genius and skills will turn from their prodigious feats throughout the jungles and deserts of the world in making war, to the constructive challenge that awaits them here.

It is not for me here to spell out the technical blueprint of how this may be done. We have, fortunately, in this country those who have proven in this war that they are able to carry out any task, however big the job may be. Once made aware of the challenge, the genius of America will meet it without any specific directions from me.

We now know better than any other people have ever known how to conserve our soil resources. Great progress has been made. The Congress, with farsighted vision, has established a Soil-Conservation Service and made provisions for carrying out an extended program of preserving our greatest natural source of wealth. Millions of acres have been scientifically protected and are now producing an average of 20 percent more than they did before.

But I am told that about 90 percent of the conservation job lies ahead.

Just what is there to be done? How many men and how many years will it take to do it? What will it cost? Fortunately these questions have been anticipated and studied by the Soil Conservation Service. A Nation-wide survey has already been completed showing how much land needs treatment and where.

Here is some of the work that should be done. We need to build 6,000,000 miles of terraces across sloping land on 95,000,000 acres, to control water and protect the soil.

We need to drain about 30,000,000 acres of some of our richest land, which is too wet for full production.

We need to build thousands of stock ponds for better livestock production, particularly in the West.

We need to improve our farm irrigation and water use on 12,000,000 acres in our drier regions.

We need to plant soil-building and erosion-resistant crops on thousands of mutilated fields.

There is other soil-conservation work to be done by the farmers themselves and their neighbors. For example, 120,000,000 acres of our farm land needs to be plowed on the contour. There is a need for strip cropping on 90,000,000 acres and for improvements of about 110,000,000 acres of pasture. There are 40,000,000 acres of unfavorable land now in cultivation that should be planted to grass, legumes, and trees as quickly as possible.

Fortunately farmers have become so conscious in recent years of the importance of soil conservation to their prosperity and security that they have already developed much of the machinery necessary to carry out this work. Seven years ago farmers organized their first soil-conservation district. This enabled the farmers in that district to work together in a common effort to safeguard the land in that district. It worked so well that today there are nearly 1,000 of these soil-conservation districts. These include about two and one-half million farms and ranches that cover more than 500,000,000 acres. In other words, the people themselves on the land are already actively on the job, so that what I have suggested is no new scheme.

With victory in war we can look forward to an era of peace.

We can, if we will, look forward as confidently to ultimate success in our efforts to prevent the loss of our natural resources. What will that success bring?

Let us use our great Mississippi Valley as an example of what we might expect in our other great watersheds on both coasts. I believe it is not too much to visualize a system of effective control over our soil and water resources.

This would include using the rainfall on the plains and hillsides where it falls, instead of letting it run off in waste.

It would include the many additional soil-conservation districts that will then be joined in this common effort.

It would include an automatic form of natural crop insurance against drought; water stored in the soil during wet seasons would be available for crops in dry seasons.

It would include large dams on the rivers and thousands of small dams on tributary streams and in pastures and fields, to give us flood control.

It would include electric power generated at the dams and flowing out over the productive countryside to the millions of farm homes that need it.

It would include protecting these dams against destructive silt, to insure our hydroelectric power—increasingly important in the years ahead as we view our diminishing supplies of coal and oil reserves.

It would also include a decentralized industrial development so that the raw materials would be close to the heart of the business community.

It would include a suitable network of highways and railroads and air lines as a natural part in this development.

It would include millions of farm homes made more secure against the future.

It would mean our ability to survive, for regardless of what we do, what plans we make, or what genius we may possess, our Nation must perish unless we take care of the soil.

The soil of our country is our heritage. If wisely used its value, its strength, and its productivity are ageless. In peace or in war no nation can afford to waste its substance. The children of the future have a stake in this—our greatest source of national security.

Bills for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days there has been considerable attention given by the press to a bill reported out by the Senate Finance Committee, S. 1767, commonly known as the G. I. bill of rights, or the American Legion bill, which was introduced on March 13, 1944. This bill is a companion measure to H. R. 4357, introduced March 8, 1944, in the House by Congressman RANKIN. It purports to provide all the necessary legislation to cushion the returning servicemen and servicewomen and provide ways and means for their rehabilitation and reentrance into peacetime pursuits for which they are best qualified.

I should like to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that on September 14, 1943, I introduced a measure, H. R. 3200, known as the Demobilization and Surplus War Property Act.

The American Legion bill provides certain hospitalization features for returning servicemen. My bill does not include this particular provision because existing laws already cover this subject and any enlargements or expansions can appropriately be made through amendments to existing law. However, I have no objection to this provision.

My bill provides for the establishment of social-security credits to veterans for the period of their wartime service and does this on a basis of equitable consideration not otherwise provided for in any other legislation which I have reviewed.

In addition, my bill makes mandatory the employment of disabled veterans. Under the terms of H. R. 3200, at least 1 percent of the personnel employed by any firm working more than 100 persons must consist of disabled war veterans. I do not believe that the importance of this provision from a social and economic viewpoint can be discounted. In my view, no measure which purports to provide for returning servicemen in an adequate fashion should be without a clause of this type. H. R. 3200 provides a special fund of adequate size for the use by veterans under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Act. I am happy to note that S. 1767 also includes a provision of this type.

S. 1767 provides for low-interest loans to veterans up to $1,000 for the purchase of homes, farms and business properties. I commend this provision, although I respectfully call attention to the fact that the agency designated for the servicing of these loans is one which would conflict with others already established for a similar purpose. Smaller War Plants Corporation is set up to aid small business establishments. It would be my recommendation that Smaller War Plants Corporation be designated as administrator of these funds in preference to the Department of Commerce, which is named for that purpose in S. 1767. The experience of Smaller War Plants Corporation and its present duties in this connection would qualify it for this task and would avoid duplication of effort by another agency and effect a considerable saving in administrative costs to the Government.

Otherwise, these two measures contain almost identical provisions for the rehabilitation and educational training of veterans after their discharge from the services except for two very important provisions which are included in my bill, but which are not to be found in the American Legion bill.

In my bill, for example, I provide for an increased redemption value of War bonds in the hands of servicemen when used for the purchase of Government-owned surpluses and farms for their own use. War bonds purchased at least 3 months prior to the termination of the war are automatically increased in redemption and maturity value when used for the purpose of purchasing surpluses or farms under the terms of my bill. H. R. 3200 provides a prior claim by veterans upon certain Government-owned surplus goods, tools, and equipment which veterans might use in the establishment or conduct of their own small business ventures.

As is well known to many of the Members, this surplus-property question has been covered much more adequately and with full protection to servicemen in another bill which I introduced a few days ago, H. R. 4420, at the unanimous request of the members of the House Small Business Committee. H. R. 4420 adequately provides for returning servicemen in the disposal of surplus goods.

For the above reasons, I respectfully direct the attention of the Congress to the fact that the American Legion bill, although containing many excellent features should be amended in some particulars and this statement is inserted for the purpose of suggesting certain improvements but not in opposition to the measure. H. R. 3200 contains a number of absolutely essential provisions, none of which are to be found in S. 1767 and the companion bill, H. R. 4357, to provide for the proper demobilization and rehabilitation of veterans at the end of hostilities.

Following is a break-down of the features contained in S. 1767, the American Legion bill:

S. 1767 AND H. R. 4357—SERVICEMEN'S AID ACT OF 1944

AID BY VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

First. Veterans' Administration classified as essential war agency.

Second. Administrator and Federal Hospitalization Board authorized to utilize existing Army and Navy hospitals by agreement and construct new facilities with appropriation of $500,000,000.

Third. Mutual agreement provision for exchange of hospital and domiciliary facilities between Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration; transfer of commissioned and enlisted personnel to Veterans' Administration by agreement with Army and Navy up to 6 months after end of war.

Fourth. Veterans' Administration authority to place personnel in Army and Navy installations for advisory service and disability claims adjudication.

Fifth. Precludes discharge from service without receipt of final pay or because of disability until all claims filed with Veterans' Administration, unless claims waived.

Sixth. Statements signed by veteran in reference to service disabilities to be disregarded in adjudication of claims.

AID BY VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

First. Accredited Veterans' Administration representatives authorized to function in service installations handling veteran discharge or release under regulations promulgated jointly by Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration.

REVIEWING AUTHORITY

First. Persons dishonorably discharged, resigning under prejudice, ineligible for veterans' rating and benefits—with exception of National Service Life Insurance—unless judged insane.

Second. Establishment of separate Army and Navy Boards—five members each—for review of dismissal and discharge, except in case of court martial; rulings subject to final approval of Secretaries of Navy and War.

EDUCATION OF VETERANS

Veterans' regulations 1 (a) as amended by Public Law 16, June 24, 1943, further amended by adding part VIII, as follows:

First. Honorably discharged veterans eligible for training under this part who served after September 16, 1940, for 6 months, or less by reason of service-incurred disability.

Second. Appointment by President of Director of Servicemen's Education and Training; authority to utilize facilities of Federal and State educational and vocational agencies.

Third. Establishment of Advisory Council to Administrator consisting of Secretaries of War, Navy, and Agriculture, Federal Security Administrator, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, chairman, Commissioner of Education and eight public members appointed by President (Compensation: Travel expenses and $15 per diem).

Fourth. Eligible veterans to choose educational institution.

Fifth. Training for 1 year or equivalent in part-time training, beginning not later than 2 years from discharge or termination of war and extending not beyond 7 years from termination of war.

Sixth. Provision for 3 years continuous additional training upon satisfactory completion of first year but not to exceed length of active service, exclusive of 6 months' qualifying service or specialized training while in service.

Seventh. Federal payment to training institution up to $500 per year—not including board, lodging, or other living expenses.

Eighth. Subsistence allowance to trainee of $50 per month and dependency allowance of $25 for veterans receiving full-time training. Part-time trainees' compensation to be adjusted by Administrator.

Ninth. Administrator to arrange for educational and vocational guidance.

Tenth. Annual report to Congress by Administrator.

Eleventh. Governors to designate legally constituted State training facilities; if none, Board created to designate other qualified institutions.

Twelfth. Applicable to States, Territories, and possessions.

Thirteenth. Training facilities to include college- or State-supervised apprenticeships.

Fourteenth. Subsistence allowance to persons receiving benefits under part VII not to exceed additional pension payable under part VII.

Fifteenth. State training institutions or apprenticeship agencies not subject to Federal direction.

Sixteenth. Amendment to Public Law 16, section 3, to provide use of appropriation for Veterans' Administration and additional appropriation to implement part VII amended and part VIII.

Seventeenth. Return of training equipment by trainee upon unsatisfactory performance.

Eighteenth. Substitution of September 16, 1940 for December 6 and December 7, 1941, in Public Law 16.

LOANS FOR PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

First. Honorably discharged veteran eligible for loan by Administrator of Veterans' Affairs who has 90 days' service—or less because of service-incurred disability—subsequent to September 16, 1940, except when released by own request—unless having foreign service.

Second. Limits aggregate loans under title to $1,000, noninterest bearing after first year, 3-percent compounded annually thereafter, secured by lien subject only to lien covering balance of purchase or construction costs.

Third. Repayment subject to terms prescribed jointly by Administrator and approving agency.

Fourth. Loans for home subject to approval of agency designated by Administrator as to ability of veteran to pay and subject to cost appraisal by agency.

Fifth. Loans for home repairs, indebtedness—taxes, and so forth—also subject to same approval agency.

Sixth. No first mortgage shall be ineligible for insurance under N. H. A. by reason of this loan or secondary lien upon property involved securing such loan.

Seventh. Loans for farm lands, buildings, livestock, equipment, repairs, subject to approval of Secretary of Agriculture.

Eighth. Person eligible for farm loan, subject to approval of Secretary of Agriculture, also eligible for benefits under Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Ninth. Loan for purchase of business property or equipment subject to approval of Secretary of Commerce.

Tenth. Repayment of loans subject to terms prescribed by administrator and approving agency.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

First. Establish Veterans' Placement Service Board—within U. S. E. S.—consisting of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs chairman, Director of National Selective Service System, Administrator of Federal Security Agency; policies carried out by chairman through executive secretary—Chief of Veterans' Employment Service; records of Veterans' Personnel Division, N. S. S. S., and Veterans' Employment Service available to board.

Second. U. S. E. S. to assign to States and Territories a veteran as veterans' employment representative, attached to public employment service in States; administratively responsible to board for implementing veterans' placement policies.

Third. State employment service employees assignable by board to duties of veterans' employment representative.

Fourth. Federal agencies' information available to board.

Fifth. Funds to State employment services under act of June 6, 1933, to be withheld unless registered given employment preference.

Sixth. Cost of administration of title to be special item in budget of U. S. E. S.; during current fiscal year operating funds to come from W. M. C. budget.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR UNEMPLOYED VETERANS

First. Eligibility: Serving after September 16, 1940, honorably discharged, after or in 52-weeks period prior to enactment of act—except release by request unless having foreign service; must reside in United States at time of claim; earned for week less than allowance under this title, plus $3; registered and available for work.

Second. Payments for each week of unemployment up to 52 weeks which begins after effective date of act and within 24 months' period after final payment of mustering-out pay but not following any first 4 consecutive weeks following payment of mustering-out pay, increased pension under part VII or subsistence under part VIII.

Third. Disqualifications: Leaving work without good cause or discharged for misconduct, refusal to accept suitable work—defined—does not attend training courses without good cause, participation in labor disputes.

Fourth. Penalties: Allowance up to 5 weeks for disqualification or 9 weeks in case of successive disqualifications.

AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE AND PAYMENTS

First. Fifteen dollars weekly plus $5 for one dependent, $8 for two dependents, $10 for three or more, less wages received for that week in excess of $3.

Second. Veteran entitled to 8 weeks of allowance for each month of service—or fraction of month.

Third. Dependent—defined—must not have earned $5 or more in week.

Fourth. Other Federal or State benefits—unemployment or disability compensation or noncontributory benefit—to be deducted from allowance—except pension compensation or retired pay from Veterans' Administration.

ADMINISTRATION

First. Administrator to utilize existing Federal and State facilites; power to delegate administrative authority.

Second. Social Security Board to reimburse State agencies for their administrative expense.

Third. Claimant entitled to hearing and appeal to Administrator.

MISCELLANEOUS

First. Subpena and aid of court in administration of act.

Second. Claimant shall report change of status.

Third. Penalty for fraud under act up to $1,000 fine, imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

Following is a digest of the provisions of H. R. 3200, introduced by me on September 14, 1943:

H. R. 3200—DEMOBILIZATION AND SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY ACT

SPECIAL AID REGARDING REHABILITATION, READJUSTMENT, AND REEMPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES

First. Authority for appropriation for expenditure by Administrator of Veterans' Affairs such funds necessary to provide such special aid and counsel.

Second. To honorably discharged veterans serving after December 6, 1941.

REHABILITATION AND TRAINING

Amendment of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as follows:

First. Honorable discharged veterans eligible for vocational training—serving after December 6, 1941—prescribed by Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

Second. Vocational rehabilitation to disabled veterans—serving after December 6, 1941—as prescribed by Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Third. Training course limited to 4 years and shall not extend beyond 6 years after termination of war.

Fourth. Administrator may employ personnel and experts necessary in administration to provide training.

Fifth. Utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities.

Sixth. Utilize facilities of other Government agencies and facilities maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

Seventh. Contract with public or private institutions to provide additional training facilities.

Eighth. Administrator to prescribe payment of training allowances to trainees not entitled to pensions.

Ninth. Each trainee receiving pension in amount less than rate for total and temporary disability—including amount for dependents—to receive increase to equal such rates, deducting amount earned in training, if any.

Tenth. Benefits for injury incurred or aggravated in training same as if incurred in service.

Eleventh. Administrator authorized to use Federal and State employment agencies for placing trainees.

Twelfth. Appropriation of $500,000 for revolving fund providing emergency loans up to $100 to persons commencing training.

PURCHASE OF FARMS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

First. Amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to include individuals serving in armed forces after December 6, 1941, honorably discharged.

Second. Appropriation of $100,000,000 for each fiscal year prior to termination of war to carry out above.

Third. Appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year beginning first after termination and for each succeeding 4 years.

Fourth. Increase in redemption and maturity value of War bonds of 10 percent to be used as part payment on farms purchased under this title. Must be purchased 3 months' prior to end of war.

EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED VETERANS

First. Every employer having 100 or more employees shall employ for each 100 or major fraction 1 veteran serving after December 6, 1941, who has disability incurred or aggravated during service for which pension is payable under laws of Veterans' Administration.

Second. To provide special aid and counsel regarding readjustment, rehabilitation, and reemployment of veterans serving after December 6, 1941, Administrator authorized to spend such sums as may be necessary; authority for appropriation.

Third. Administrator authorized to use Federal and State employment agencies for placing trainees.

CONTINUATION OF SERVICE PAY

First. Every honorably discharged or released veteran serving in present war, upon request shall receive 3 months' furlough.

Second. Shall receive during such furlough pay and allowances received immediately prior to such period, with maximum of $100 per month.

Third. Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 in effect during furlough period.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

Amendment to Social Security Act to provide payment of unemployment compensation—effective July 1, 1944—to individuals (a) serving in armed forces after December 7, 1941; (b) honorably discharged or released from active duty; (c) registers with U. S. E. S. and State employment service.

First. For period of not less than 26 weeks following expiration of furlough, unless securing employment.

Amendment to section 1603 (a) of Internal Revenue Code on same basis as above.

Effect: After furlough, entitled to unemployment insurance up to 26 weeks; if still unemployed, to receive unemployment compensation payable within framework of system within State in which he resides.

SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

First. President to appoint, with consent of Senate, Custodian of Surplus War Property.

Second. Property declared surplus by any agency to be transferred to Custodian.

Third. Board of directors of Smaller War Plants Corporation to conduct survey with view of disposing of such surplus so as to encourage establishment of businesses by veterans, other individuals, and to strengthen existing small business.

Fourth. Custodian authorized to extend credit in purchase of such surpluses, interest at not more than 3½ percent.

Fifth. War bonds—purchased at least 3 months prior to termination of war—increased in maturity and redemption value by 10 percent in purchase of surplus property.

SERVICE CREDIT FOR OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BENEFITS

First. Honorably discharged or released veteran serving after December 6, 1941, granted credit on Social Security payments on basis of $1,700 annual salary.

Second. Applicable for each day in active service occurring after September 30, 1940 and prior to 3 months after termination.

Third. To anyone in land or naval forces of United States, including Coast Guard, W. A. C., Women's Reserve of Naval Reserve, Women's Reserve of Coast Guard Reserve, Marine Corps Women's Reserve.

Watch for Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous-consent leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including therein an editorial found in the Independent of Anderson, S. C., March 23, 1944. It is as follows:

WATCH FOR PROPAGANDA

Students of German warfare and tactics are warning the Allies that the new Nazi propaganda barrage is due to start shortly.

There is already working here in the United States a very insidious organization called the Peace Now Movement.

This outfit has been criticized severely on all sides, but it continues to function, crying aloud for a negotiated peace.

Unquestionably, it is a Hitler-loving group and may be paid by the Germans.

Collier's has a special writer who insists that the greatest campaign of lies, false rumors, and half-truths is planned with the opening of the western invasion.

This propaganda will be for the purpose of creating disunity among the United Nations.

There will be stories of a revolution in Germany.

There will be atrocity tales.

Hitler will be reported ready to sue for peace.

There will be yarns about secret Nazi weapons designed to cripple our soldiers, make them die horribly.

Americans will be told that the British are permitting the Yankees to do all the fighting.

There will be attempts—further attempts—to make the Allies suspicious of Russia.

And hundreds of other impossible stories, cleverly phrased, which will be aimed at creating distrust among the Allies.

These lies are going to be difficult to assimilate, but if the public is sufficiently forewarned, it can be understood.

There will be plenty of renegade Americans to play into the hands of the Germans in this campaign.

There are always some who in order to get into the limelight will take notice of these stories and help the Nazis.

Some will join in just to be critical.

Others will want a negotiated peace.

The public is therefore warned not to believe these stories until they are confirmed by military authorities, and duly printed in the newspapers.

Believe only official reports—not rumors, not lies, not half truths dressed up to look like facts.

The barrage will soon start—it is time now to begin doubting anything that comes out of Germany or any neutral country.

This will be the greatest problem American citizen civilians have to face.

So prepare for it.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important tasks confronting our Nation is to arrange for the orderly demobilization of our military forces after the war. Frequently, someone suggests that the millions of men and women in the Army and Navy be retained in the services when the armistice comes until jobs can be found for them. I am afraid that too little consideration has been given the desires of the men and women themselves. I doubt if the families of servicemen will support such a program.

Recently a soldier who comes from my district wrote a letter to the editor of the Stars and Stripes in comment on a suggestion by Major General Hershey which, I believe, clearly sets forth the viewpoint of the average serviceman toward plans for keeping him in the Army after the fighting has ceased. If any legislation is needed to carry out demobilization plans, I think it would be well to bear in mind the statements which are contained in this letter. The letter follows:

TO THE EDITOR OF STARS AND STRIPES:

I don't know whether it is insubordinate to express disagreement with the views put forth by a general; I hope not. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, was quoted in the January 18 edition of Stars and Stripes as saying, "Soldiers and sailors should be kept in uniform until jobs await them." I disagree, respectfully, but most emphatically.

If a law embodying the viewpoint expressed by General Hershey should be passed it would be a terrific blow to our morale in the armed forces. Practically all of us realize that this war must be fought until Germany and Japan are completely crushed. We know that nazi-ism and fascism must be destroyed if our democratic way of life is to be saved. But recognition of that fact does not lessen our desire to be home again. Among the important factors in keeping our morale high is the knowledge that the quicker the war is ended the quicker we return to civilian life. Under the present law we are in the armed forces for the duration, plus 6 months. We are all looking forward to that duration, for personal as well at patriotic reasons. To change the law at this stage would be a cruel blow to all our hopes and dreams for the future

Viewed from any angle the idea is utterly indefensible. In a democracy such as ours, the Army and Navy have only one reason for existing, to defend our country against its enemies. When this war is ended we shall require a standing army of only a fraction the size of the 11,000,000-man Army which we shall have on hand. There may or may not be jobs available in civilian life for all the rest. Whether there is will depend upon the intelligence with which our Government planned the reconversion of industry to peacetime production. But in any case, the problem of full-time employment is not a military problem; it is an economic question. To compel men to remain in the Army, merely, because jobs are not immediately available is a rank injustice. The men admittedly would not be needed for military service. Yet they would be denied the right to resume civilian life. Service in the Army under these conditions would be just another form of relief. And I feel certain that the vast majority of servicemen, if they had to depend upon the Government for temporary assistance, would much prefer to receive that aid as civilians, rather than remain in the "army of unemployed soldiers."

Compulsory military service for an indefinite period of time is regimentation. It is an ugly trend. Hitler used similar tactics to solve his unemployment problem. Ours is a free country. We can all do and say just about what we please. We want it to remain that way. Let us avoid any measures which endanger our American way of life.

Engle Answers Critics on Tule Lake Investigation

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Nevada City Nugget, a paper published in my district, on March 13, 1944, carried a front-page article in which it

charged that the inability of our Government to secure a further exchange of prisoners with Japan is a direct result of the investigation of the riots of the Japanese at the Tule Lake camp, and urge that as a ground for my defeat and the election of my opponent in the coming election.

My conclusions with reference to the W. R. A. handling of the Tule Lake camp have been concurred in by every official investigation which has been made, including that made by the committee of our own California State Senate.

The refusal of the Japanese Government to exchange prisoners was based upon the fact that their people here had rioted claiming to have been mistreated. Our finding was that the W. R. A. by coddling and inefficiency in the camp had encouraged power-seeking and disloyal Japanese to defy civil authority and riot on the most trivial and unreasonable of grounds. The Japanese Government can find nothing in our charges against the W. R. A. which will support the claim that their nationals were mistreated—in fact we claim that the W. R. A. has provided for these Japanese in some instances beyond the requirements of fair treatment and on a scale not enjoyed by our own people.

The basic fact is that the riots, themselves widely publicized, had occurred. Thereafter, a "do nothing" policy which the article seems to suggest, would only have aggravated the evil. The best way to clean up bureaucratic inefficiency is to bring it to the light and try to correct it. Anything less would have been a failure in my duty to the people I represent.

It's Official: Monterey Is World's Leading Fishing Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of the Members of this House and to the country as a whole the fact that this past year, the city of Monterey, Calif., became the leading fishing port in the entire United States. The extra effort made by the fishermen of that area increased production 16 percent over the preceding season, and constitutes, it seems to me, one of the most outstanding contributions to food production that has yet come to the attention of the American people. Those of us from this part of the country have long realized the tremendous effort that has been expended in this phase of the food-production program, and we have long suspected that Monterey had become the leading port of the Nation in this connection. The recent announcement of the Fish and Wildlife Service has confirmed this belief, and I include here as part of my remarks the Associated Press dispatch in which this is stated.

This announcement is additional justification for the survey of the Monterey Bay area, authorized in the river and harbor omnibus bill which passed the House earlier this week. I am convinced that this port will not only remain the leading fishing port in the Nation, but in years to come will develop into one of the great commercial ports of the country as well. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors deserves our sincere thanks for including Monterey Bay as one of the sites where the Army engineers are authorized to make preliminary explorations.

IT'S OFFICIAL: MONTEREY IS WORLD'S LEADING FISHING PORT

WASHINGTON, March 18.—The catch of America's No. 1 commercial fish, the pilchard, fell off to 486,816 tons in the 1943–44 season, which ended this month, compared with 501,114 tons in 1942–43, the Fish and Wildlife Service reported.

For Monterey, Calif., however, the season was all to the good. That town, the announcement said, became the leading fishing port in the country in terms of the weight of fish landed there, and was the leading port of the world with the possible exception of some of the Japanese ports.

UP 16 PERCENT

Monterey produced about 212,500 tons of pilchards, sometimes called California sardines. This was an increase of 16 percent over the preceding season. San Francisco increased its catch 9 percent, but Southern California, mainly San Pedro and San Diego, had a 33-percent decline.

The Los Angeles area, including San Pedro, was displaced as the Nation's No. 1 fishing port by Monterey. San Francisco, which in past years has led the rest, has been in third place for the last two seasons.

SHORTAGES CUT PACK

The over-all reduction in the pilchard industry, the Fish and Wildlife Service said, was partly due to lack of vessels and partly to a shortage of cannery workers. Though the goal set for pilchard canning was 4,500,000 standard cases, only 3,149,889 cases were produced. A large amount of pilchards are reduced to meal and oil and both these uses increased in 1943–44, 76,032 tons of meal being produced against 71,828 in the previous season, and with the oil production increasing from 12,508,958 gallons to 14,304,253 gallons.

Washington and Oregon have growing pilchard fisheries. These States landed 13,400 tons as compared with 500 tons in the season before.

No Time for Timidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

NO TIME FOR TIMIDITY

Republicans in the Senate have just completed a reorganization of their party machinery, designed to furnish the aggressive leadership that the voters have a right to expect if they are to support Republican candidates this fall. While this reorganization looks forward to the party's control of the Senate after the election, its benefits will not be deferred until that time.

House Republicans have been working on a party program of legislation, a labor that Republican Senators have also undertaken. The fruits of this planning cannot be expected in this Congress, however, since the initiation of legislation is normally the function of the majority party. Until November the most useful work that the present minority can do is to correct the mistakes of the administration and uncover its abuses of power.

In this endeavor the House Republicans have many stout privates in the ranks, but their generalship has been, to say the least, unimaginative. SHAFER, HOFFMAN, and ENGEL of Michigan, HALLECK of Indiana, MILLER of Missouri, BUSBEY, MASON, SUMNER, and VURSELL of Illinois, and other Representatives, particularly those from the Midwest, have been fighting valiantly to expose and end the maladministration of the new dealers. Unfortunately, they have had to fight more often than not as individuals, not as members of a team.

There was undoubtedly a time when good political strategy dictated that the Republican minority hold back and let the burden of criticism fall on the conservative Democrats. That strategy cannot be continued indefinitely. Its usefulness has already passed.

Timidity has ceased to be a virtue. If the Republican Party expects the Nation to entrust it with leadership in the present crucial state of our affairs, it must show its willingness to lead. If the Republicans in the House cannot bolster their present leadership, they must find more vigorous and courageous captains.

The Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is a real job to perform during this emergency in the protection of our forests, range, crop, industrial, and military facilities in the entire country. The State and fire protective associations are budgeted to about the full extent of their financial capacity at present and it appears that there never was a time when they had to depend more upon the help of the Central Government. I feel, therefore, that the Congress should give every possible consideration to a fire budget, both in and outside the national forest lands so that these areas will be given the ultimate protection possible.

During the fiscal year 1943 total expenditures for State and private land protection under the Clarke-McNary act were $142,200 for Montana. Of this amount, private owners paid $97,200; the State, $14,200, and the Federal Government, $34,100. Federal funds available to the Forest Service proved to be adequate. We can anticipate increased

needs for protection this coming year, however. Snowfall is light this winter and 1944 may be dry. Slash is accumulating and is becoming a fire hazard. There is a decrease in the quantity and quality of manpower available to cope with the fire menace. We will unquestionably need to train an increasing number of citizen volunteers to stand on call for emergency duty.

As you know, with war needs so acute there has been a decided impetus given to the lumber situation in this country. There has been a ready sale for most any kind of tree that will make lumber. What this may mean to the future of the Nation's lumber industry is difficult to forecast but if the lumber trade becomes accustomed to using secondary species we may discover this will have a beneficial effect on sustaining post-war employment. New developments also offer possibilities, especially in the field of plywoods, pulp, and other wood products.

In the matter of fires in the national forests you will recall that last year was a comparatively easy fire season, especially in the areas outside of the South. But it might be well to keep in mind that the weather has been exceptionally dry since last June and while we were lucky last year the prospects for increased danger from fire are many times greater at the present time. Out in Montana we have had no snow to speak of up to date, our winter wheat is being blown away, and the conditions for an acute fire season are all in the making. It is imperative, I feel, that this situation should not be overlooked but that every possible attempt to cope with it through making the necessary appropriations and getting together as competent a fire-fighting personnel as possible should be made.

The value of parachute fire fighters in combating fires in the back country was again demonstrated. Sixty civilian public-service men who volunteered for this work, as well as several others, were given special training. A new type nonoscillating parachute was developed and patented by Frank Derry, Forest Service parachute trainer in the northern region, and gave excellent results in actual use.

In the range areas, war demands for beef, mutton, and wool have stimulated added interest among stockmen in problems of range management. A majority of them are in fairly general agreement with the Forest Service on management plans for getting a better distribution of cattle through salting and development of more watering places, building of fences to get a more even use of forage, and seasonal distribution of stock on spring and summer ranges. But the extreme variations in forage yield on any given range due to rainfall conditions results in considerable discussion as to the degree of stocking. However, conservative stocking meets with majority approval.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a portion of a letter sent me by a friend in the Forest Service in whom I have the greatest confidence. I am sure that the House will find it of interest in helping them understand the problems confronting the Service in the intermountain region:

We have had a much more successful year than appeared possible last spring. Our September and October drouth prolonged a fire season which otherwise was easier than normal. The dry fall offered a real chance for bad fires. We had quite a few fires but we flew good trained crews rapidly to the place of need. We caught most of them while small. We used manpower in 1943 almost entirely made up of 16- and 17-year-old city boys who could not be useful on the farm without work experience and training, plus Italian internees who up to that time were remaining idle behind the fence at the Fort. We also used quite a few women.

The training and recruitment of these heterogeneous workers was made possible only because Congress did provide the money ahead of time. Your help in this was greatly appreciated. As a result of the kind of program made possible, we have the smallest bill for actual fire-fighting and emergency measures in our history. If the high wartime costs are at least in part discounted we have the smallest over-all cost in over 20 years. Small-fire-protection costs used to be accompanied by heavy fire damage. But this year our damage also is near an all-time low. True we were lucky and favored by an easier than average season but even so the costs and losses in many easier years were much higher.

It might be well to emphasize that the national forests during the past year have contributed greatly to our national needs for timber and livestock production. The Forest Service has collaborated actively with the War Production Board and other agencies in facilitating and stimulating the forest productions for war. Forest Service research has played a notable part in more efficient uses of wood, in increasing the yield of naval stores, and in the more efficient use of the western range for food production. All these activities have proved themselves indispensable in the war effort and will, of course, be continued to the best of the Forest Service's ability.

This additional load and responsibility has had to be carried, however, according to the Chief of the Forest Service "with constantly decreasing and shifting manpower. Activities not of first priority were so eliminated or reduced to a maintenance basis that personnel could be reassigned or released. By June 30, 1943, some 1,250 year-long personnel were in military furlough, as were an approximately equal number of temporary and seasonal employees on whom the Forest Service had relied for important services in the past."

Getting back to forest-fire protection, I should like to quote from the Report of the Chief of the Forest Service for last year:

Many factors necessitated more intensive forest-fire protection during the past year. Among these were the need to prevent diversion of men from war industries and farming to forest-fire fighting; the importance of uninterrupted operation and protection of power plants, transmission lines, railroads, industrial plants, and other facilities in forested areas; the need to avoid smoky atmosphere which might handicap defense against submarines, lower the efficiency of the aircraft-warning service, and interfere with air travel and pilot training; military installations and the presence of large numbers of soldiers in and near forested areas; and the threat of sabotage. Two instances of enemy incendiary bombing occurred in the forests of western Oregon. Fortunately neither resulted in serious fires.

One other thing that we should not lose site of is the fine work which has been done on the emergency rubber project which the Forest Service took over in 1942. This project has been responsible for the development of native sources of natural rubber, especially guayule, but including also Russian dandelion and golden rod. While this project has not as yet been able to develop much in the way of a supply of rubber which is so necessary for the war effort, it has at least started the foundation of a domestic supply which can, I believe, in time be grown to such proportions as to make us self-sufficient in rubber and not dependent on the Far East and other areas.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the Forest Service is one of the few agencies on which the Government during the war period has practiced such rigid economy. At the present time it has neither the money nor the men available as in ordinary years to fight fires or to carry on necessary research. The Forest Service could make a fine showing if it had the necessary appropriations to which it is entitled. However, what it lacks in money it tries to make up in the devotion of the men and women who comprise its personnel. They believe in their work and they are doing everything in their power to keep alive the policies and the procedures which have made the Forest Service the recognized protective agency that it is at the present time. Furthermore, we know that in the different parts of the country wherein the Forest Service has taken root it has achieved the cooperation of thousands of devoted citizens who realize the usefulness and worthwhileness of the Forest Service program, not only for today but for the years to come as well.

Senator Johnson Breaks Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

SENATOR JOHNSON BREAKS AWAY

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat from Colorado, delivered a dramatic speech night before last at North Park College, Chicago. Senator JOHNSON, hitherto a rather quiet and little publicized Member of the Senate, in this speech broke loudly and definitely with the Roosevelt administration.

JOHNSON was born at Scandia, Kans., January 1, 1884, got through high school at Lincoln, Nebr., and began his working life as a railroad laborer, being successively a telegrapher, train dispatcher, homesteader, and manager of a farmers' cooperative association.

He served four terms in the Colorado Legislature 1923–31, was Lieutenant Governor of Colorado 1931–33, and Governor 1933–37. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1936, and reelected in 1942.

This Chicago speech of his seems so significant that we quote liberally from it:

"History will name the fourth term, if it ever materializes, as 'the term of defeat and frustration.'

"The greatest tragedy of American political history was the President's decision 4 years ago to seek a third term—the term of appeasement.

"It (the New Deal) launched the 1940 campaign by appeasing the internationalists with the appointment of two old-line Republicans (Frank Knox and H. L. Stimson) as Secretaries, respectively, of the Navy and War. It appeased the nationalists by assuring them 'again and again' that no mother's son would be sent to fight in a foreign war."

The New Deal, continued Senator JOHNSON, appeased Japan prior to Pearl Harbor by selling Japan all the war goods it could pay for.

"It appeased China with money and credit and, after the election, appeased Great Britain by going to war. It has been appeasing everyone everywhere ever since, with lend-lease, at a cost to the American taxpayers of billions.

"It appeased Russia by junking the Atlantic Charter. It appeased John L. Lewis, the railroad brotherhoods, at the back door of the White House, after scornfully running them down at the front door with the beating of drums."

"One-man control" of the Democratic Party, said Senator JOHNSON, has reduced that party from power and greatness to hopeless impotence. He added that it would be "a relatively small matter in human events if Mr. Roosevelt were to go down to defeat." What alarms JOHNSON, he says, is that Mr. Roosevelt "has dragged down wih him the great liberal movement which he himself launched, and the great Democratic Party which he himself revitalized."

"In the approaching election, the people's liberty and the people's freedom will either regain some lost ground or slip a little closer to the apparently inevitable precipice of one-man rule.

"It would be wrong to say that this Republic stands at the crossroads tonight. It has long since passed the crossroads. It has already traveled too many miles down the wrong road. The choice in November will determine whether we shall keep going down that wrong road or retrace our steps and get back on the right road.

"Should the present running row between the Executive and the Congress persist, America will find herself in a war crisis and a post-war crisis, and her Government in a hopeless deadlock."

About Presidential candidates, Johnson said that unless they "—and all of them—give the people assurance that they can provide dynamic leadership and at the same time cooperate fully with Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government, the voters must reject them in the name of survival. The consequences of further conflict in the Government are too awful to contemplate."

And about Mr. Roosevelt's fondness for fanning up class hatreds, JOHNSON made these pregnant remarks:

"Any President who promotes disunity is playing with matches in a powder factory. The all-important spirit of cooperation, patience, and good will cannot be overemphasized. Racial conflicts, labor and management strife, and manifestations of class hatreds, are bad omens and danger signals which should put us on guard that tyranny is just around the corner."

Altogether a remarkable speech, and a significant breakaway.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on March 18, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, a few days ago I received one of the most interesting letters I have read during my 5 years in Congress. It was written by one I had not previously realized was a friend. The letter referred to the recent attempt on the part of a few political enemies of mine to discredit the Hall Furlough Club movement.

"Why is it, Mr. HALL," the writer asks, "that you, as Representative of the overwhelming majority of Americans in this section, have to submit to such insults, such innuendoes, and vicious insinuations at the hands of under-cover persons who could not possibly aspire to any public office? Do not these men realize that in questioning your motives and holding you up to ridicule they are slapping the Americans who elected you directly in the face?

"I was mad clean through," my friend continued, "when the women interested in the Hall Furlough Clubs were smeared as a political group. Isn't this a free country? Haven't those women the right to call their club by whatever name they wish? It seems to me an outrage that anybody who professes to be an America would dare be so hypocritical or to raise his voice against such a wonderful idea as the Rall Furlough Clubs."

Well, I was so pleased with this lady's reaction that I sat right down and answered her.

"Dear madam," I began, "you are absolutely right in calling those few persons hypocrites who have tried to smear the patriotic women of the Hall Furlough Clubs. But, of course, you can understand their objective. They were trying to scare the women out of the clubs. As usual, however, they missed fire. Their small-time plot collapsed. They got fooled. Not only did they fail to scare the women out of the Hall Furlough Clubs but they likewise failed to silence the people's demand for passage of the Hall furlough bill. So the whole scheme was a boomerang to them."

I noticed the newspapers played up the formation of what they called a rival club. The Hall Furlough Clubs are not interested in rivalry. What they want to see, they tell me, is legislation passed that is beneficial to the servicemen. They want to help the soldier. They don't care how many other clubs with different names are started if they too are helping the soldiers.

But they want the rival club or clubs, whoever they are, to be sure their motive in organizing is for service and not for allowing themselves to be used as a springboard from which to hurl vicious aspersions and mudballs at me which the men behind the scenes make for them.

"Do not be surprised," I continued in my answer, "that my enemies have resorted to these below-the-belt methods. They have always done this. Yes, of course, they are slapping the people of my district in the face when they try to belittle their elected Representative. But it is all a part of their plan to rob the people of their right to make their own laws by destroying, through deadly propaganda, the people's faith in those they elect and to transfer the people's power to a select and appointed few who will govern the country as their whims and fancies dictate."

The women of the Hall Furlough Clubs won their greatest battle last week when they resisted these insults and refused to be scared.

All of which is best summed by a verse from De Montford which runs:

"Think'st thou there are no serpents in the world
But those who slide along the grassy sod
And sting the luckless foot that presses there?
There are who in the path of social life
Do bask their spotted skins in fortune's sun
And sting the soul."

Air-Line Highway From Memphis, Tenn., to Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MARCH 22, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS H. MCDONALD,
Bureau of Public Roads,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER MCDONALD: We, the undersigned, are all Members of the House of Representatives and are interested in obtaining the development of an air-line highway from Memphis, Tenn., to Houston, Tex. This highway should proceed in a southwesterly direction from Memphis, Tenn., diagonally through the southern part of Arkansas, northwest part of Louisiana, and southeastern part of Texas, by way of Pine Bluff, Ark., and Shreveport, La.

Such a highway, when completed, will fill a real need in the Southwest and will bear a very heavy load of traffic, some of it moving from the northeastern part of the United States to our neighbor to the south—Mexico.

In your post-war plans, we are asking that the construction and development of such a road be included as a super-highway and an artery of commerce.

E. C. Gathings, W. F. Norrell, Oren Harris, Nat Patton, Albert Thomas, Martin Dies, W. D. Mills, Overton Brooks, Lindley Beckworth, Cliff Davis.

Iowa War Chest Makes Splendid Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa War Chest, Inc., affiliated with the National War Fund, has completed a remarkable campaign for funds. It raised a gross of $2,525,244, which amount was

only exceeded in two other States. I include as part of my remarks the following letter received from the secretary of Iowa War Chest, Inc., which gives a full résumé of the fine work accomplished by this organization:

IOWA WAR CHEST, INC.,
Des Moines, Iowa, March 21, 1944.

Congressman CHARLES HOEVEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: The Iowa War Chest was organized last May to conduct the money-raising campaigns for the national war fund in Iowa. The national war fund raises money for 17 agencies approved by the President's War Relief Board. U. S. O. is the recipient of approximately 50 percent of the money raised.

I thought you might be interested in learning first hand the results of the Iowa campaign.

Iowa's quota to national war fund was $2,127,500. To this was added $41,435 for administrative expenses from May 1, 1943, to September 30, 1944. Then a 4.8-percent safety factor was added to the original amount, giving Iowa a campaign quota of $2,272,779.

Iowa was organized on a congressional-district basis, with a vice president and two executive committeemen from each district; then each county was organized. If the local county had a local campaign organization that was used for other purposes that organization was used as it was not the purpose of the Iowa War Chest to interrupt existing county organizations that have proved themselves.

Iowa was organized from the top clear down to the local township and school district. When the campaign was completed, Iowa raised a gross of $2,525,244. There were only two States in the Union that did better than Iowa—namely, North Dakota and Oregon.

Of the $41,435 that was set up for administrative costs, $17,955.02 remains on deposit at the Iowa Des Moines National Bank & Trust Co. as of March 13; thus, Iowa campaign expenses were less than 2 percent of the gross amount of money raised.

The success of the Iowa campaign can be directly attributed to the excellent leadership found in each county, plus the willingness of a multitude of volunteer workers to call upon their friends and neighbors for a generous cash gift. It was gratifying to know how willing the people of Iowa were to give to such a worthy cause.

I am just passing this information on to you as I thought it would help keep you advised as to the events happening in Iowa that are directly connected with war programs.

With kind regards,
Very truly yours,
ROBERT H. CALDWELL,
Executive Secretary.

Water Hyacinth Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss a matter which is of much concern to my section of the country and perhaps to other areas.

I refer to the obstruction of waterways as the result of water hyacinths. This has been a steadily growing problem in Louisiana, which State has such a wide expanse of navigable streams, bayous, and canals.

While considerable has been done by the Federal Government to relieve the situation, there remains a great menace to navigation. It becomes increasingly difficult to carry on operations of lumber concerns, oil development, and other industries requiring the use of these streams. Hundreds of fishermen, trappers and others are dependent upon waterway transportation for their livelihood.

I have frequently called attention to the difficulty created by these water hyacinths and particularly their hindrance to commercial development. I greatly appreciate the aid the Government has extended, but I feel that the problem is so extensive it should be given special consideration in any post-war planning.

South Louisiana, and especially the Third Congressional District which I have the honor of representing, contains a virtual network of streams which serve a vital role in the economic and social life of our citizens. These streams are used to the fullest possible extent and are necessary to the maintenance and welfare of many communities. Funds to eliminate the hyacinths are justified from many angles, and, in fact, I know of no comparable expenditure that could add more to the prosperity, happiness, and general good of the large area involved.

The office of the Chief of Engineers of the War Department points out that Federal funds authorized for this work have provided for the extermination or removal of the hyacinth plants from the navigable waters of Louisiana insofar as they are or may become an obstruction to navigation. The first removal operations in 1900 were carried out by a mechanical crushing plant. In 1902 the use of chemicals was authorized and from that year until 1936 the hyacinths were controlled by spraying with a solution of arsenic and soda, by hand removal, and by booms. The use of chemicals has been abandoned and removal by hand reduced to a minimum. In recent years the methods of control have been by means of crushing plant, power-operated conveyors, and booms.

The Army engineers stress that the numerous waterways in eight parishes, or counties, comprising my congressional district, are a source of widespread hyacinth infestation. Under ordinary circumstances the greater portion of the hyacinth removal activities in Louisiana has been centered in that area, with preventative maintenance carried on in the feeder areas during the winter to reduce the quantity of vegetation which otherwise might find its way to the main streams during the peak of the hyacinth growing season. During the present emergency it has been necessary to schedule removal operations providing first for the destruction of growths detrimental to commerce and navigation using the main channels, with work in the feeder areas materially reduced.

I was recently assured by the Chief of Engineers that upon exhaustion of funds remaining available to the district engineer for hyacinth work in Louisiana, an additional allotment of money appropriated for river and harbor maintenance would be made for the continuance of necessary hyacinth removal operations in the principal navigable streams in order to insure the free movement of traffic of importance to the war effort.

We all realize that war conditions and needs make it necessary to curtail many projects developed during peacetime and postpone expansion of others. As great as the problem may be, the natural limitation of funds and manpower serves to render impracticable any attempt to reach a generally satisfactory solution at this time. However, the restricting of operations means that there will be that much more work to be done after the war in clearing up these streams and keeping them in satisfactory condition. Expenditure of funds for that purpose is a most wise investment with far-reaching returns.

I have always been greatly interested in waterway development and see untold possibilities for utilization of the waterways of south Louisiana. This, in turn, will mean much as a contributing factor in continued development of the Nation's waterway system as a whole.

I vigorously urge that in our post-war plans ample provision be made for solving the water-hyacinth problem through a survey of the needs and the carrying out of a general program. Whatever the cost, I am certain it will be small compared to the benefits that will follow. This is a matter in the best interests of navigation, health, commercial development and the happiness and contentment of our citizens.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is Greek Independence Day. On this auspicious occasion, let us pause for a moment to reflect upon the contributions of that geographically small but spiritually great country to civilization.

The very idea of democracy was born in ancient Greece. And in the words of Aristotle, all who live with the Greek culture are Greeks. Thus, nowadays in this great democracy of ours, we might consider ourselves the cultural brothers of Greece. The ideal of freedom has never been extinguished in the minds of the Greek people. In ancient times, they fought against the Persians who threatened their physical existence as well as the great culture of Greece. The people of Greece were the first to rise against the tyranny of the Holy Roman

Empire. In 1821 people from every phase of Greek life; goat herders, peasants, scholars, sailors, rose at the signal of Archbishop Germanos from the monastary of Patras. From Greece the desire for freedom spread throughout Europe, arousing the spark of revolt through the length and breadth of the continent. It even spread to the Western Hemisphere where the colonies of the Spanish Empire, grasping at the idea of freedom, freed themselves from the Spanish yoke.

For years the people of Greece, undaunted and ever hopeful, struggled to gain their independence. Finally, in 1830, almost 10 years since they had started the fight, the Turks were finally driven out of Greece. During this period the great powers of the world did not stand idly by and watch the struggle. Our country, Mr. Speaker, can point with pride to the role we played in helping the Greeks gain their independence. Daniel Webster supported the cause of Greek freedom, as did Henry Clay and others. Our President, James Monroe, sent words of encouragement and physical aid to the heroic people of Greece.

England shared in aiding the Greek people. An English admiral helped defeat the Turkish fleet in one of the decisive battles of the war.

Today the Greek people are again fighting for their freedom. They were attacked in 1940 by Mussolini and his Fascist henchmen, but the Antartes of Greece were able to withstand the onslaughts of the inglorious Italian Army. Finally, after 6 months in which the Greek soldiers had pushed the Fascist legions back into Albania, Hitler had to come to the assistance of his ally. Even the German Wehrmacht, which had already rolled through Poland and Czechoslovakia, was stopped for 6 weeks by that tiny band of valiant Greeks. This 6 weeks that the Greeks held out was 6 weeks for the British to fortify the Suez Canal and the Mediterranean sea lanes to defend the Near East. It meant that the Russians had 6 more weeks of peace in which to produce food, manufacture munitions, and arm her people for the coming struggle against the Nazis.

The Greek soldiers knew that eventually the German armies would overrun their beloved country but like another group of men, those heroic defenders of Bataan, they knew that every minute they held out was precious. And today, with German soldiers tramping through their land, the people of Greece have still not given up the struggle for freedom. They fight on through their underground movements. Despite Nazi terriorism, starvation, and exploitation, they have not lost hope. When an American flyer was forced down over Greece, Greek guerrillas picked him up and hid him from the Germans. The Greek people allowed their homes and villages to be burned rather than turn the American soldier over to the Germans. They helped the American flyer to escape and through him sent a message to the American people; a message of their hope in the future, a prayer for the liberation of their country.

Here in America, Americans who have emigrated from Greece are engaged in the great war effort that our country is making. Tomorrow, on the anniversary of Greek independence, these Greek Americans will purchase extra War bonds to aid in maintaining American independence. This is the type of people that helped make this country the great country it is. Let us work and strive to reconstitute the Greek nation, as well as all the other countries that Hitler has engulfed, so that they may rise again as free and independent nations with all the rights and privileges they so richly deserve.

A Soldier's Poem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a poem sent by M. T. Emberson, an American soldier in the South Pacific, to Mr. Max Hampton, editor of the Booneville Democrat, published in Booneville, Logan County, Ark., and which poem appeared in the March 16, 1944, issue of that paper. The poem is as follows:

Sitting on my G. I. bed,
My G. I. hat upon my head,
My G. I. pants, my G. I. shoes
Everything free, nothing to lose.
G. I. razor, G. I. comb,
G. I. wish that I was home.
They issue everything we need,
Paper to write on, books to read.
They issue food to make you grow,
G. I. wish I had a furlough.
Your belt, your shoes,
Your G. I. tie,
Everything free, nothing to buy.
You eat your food on G. I. plates,
Buy your needs at G. I. rates.
G. I. this and G. I. that,
G. I. haircut and G. I. hat.
Everything here is Government Issue,
G. I. sure am not going to miss you.

Wanted: A Simplified Tax Form—Tax Simplification Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, history records that taxes have been a fertile source of rebellions throughout the ages. In fact, the slogan, "Taxation without representation is tyranny" was one of the battle cries of the American Revolution that separated the Colonies from England.

Today we are confronted with a tax problem and rebellion that would make the "Boston tea party" take on the proportions of a Sunday picnic in comparison.

About 50,000,000 Americans have been required to file income-tax returns this month. Ten millions of these taxpayers will be seeing a tax form for the first time in their lives. Most all of them will condemn the complexity of the forms to be filled out.

It is plainly up to this Congress to consolidate and simplify the present tax laws; and to insist that the Treasury Department prepare income-tax forms which can be easily understood by every taxpayer. This should be a first order of business. Last January I introduced a bill in this Congress, known as House Resolution 220, which, if passed, would provide the machinery for the simplification of our present tax tangle. Since that time I have often contacted the staff and members on the House Committee on Ways and Means and offered numerous suggestions designed to aid them in their efforts to bring forth a tax simplification measure.

A few of my suggestions, some of them received from taxpayers of Minnesota, are as follows:

First. Combine the normal tax, surtax, and Victory tax into one simple computation, providing for an adjustment in exemptions and deductions so that the total taxes collected will remain approximately the same as long as the need for high taxes continues to exist. Very few people object to paying their full share of taxes.

Second. Eliminate the requirement that individuals earnings $5,000 or less file an income-tax return by the simple expediency of tailoring their withholding tax to fit their financial status. The employer and employee can jointly determine the amount of salary or wages to be withheld for taxes.

If the taxpayer feels that too much has been withheld, he may, at his own desire, file a return and apply for a refund. It is believed that 30,000,000 taxpayers may be relieved of the harrowing task of preparing and filing an income-tax return if this or a similar plan becomes law.

Third. At present the law requires that tax payments be made quarterly. I believe and propose that tax payments should be made no oftener than twice a year.

Dozens of letters have come to my office from constituents who rebel against the complexity of the tax forms. I think that their views and sentiments should be heard, so that we, the duly elected Representatives of the people will increase and intensify our efforts to bring about these much needed tax reforms. Following are a few paragraphs from letters received from tax experts, farmers, bankers, and others:

I am sure you know that the common man in your district is not objecting to pay what he owes—but he is just about driven to distraction in an effort to find out what that amount may be.

Only last month when it became necessary for our farmers to make an income-tax esti-

mate by December 15, I assisted a great many of them who came to me, and I want you to know that not one ever as much as batted an eye when the amount of payment which was required was disclosed, and many—yes, many—did not even want to take some of the deductions that were available to them.

I notice Congress is going to try to simplify the law, and that is certainly very much needed. Along that line I want to make a few concrete suggestions:

First, people are not complaining so much about the rate or amount of the tax. They all realize we are in war and will have to pay, but they do object to the complicated nature of the law.

Second, the estimating provision or declaration of income in the so-called pay-as-you-go plan is bad. Why should people be compelled to guess at their income. I just heard it announced over the radio that several millions of people will be entitled to refunds for over-payments of taxes which they have made. In plain words the Government has extorted money from the people to which it is not entitled. Further, according to the radio announcement these people will probably have to wait until fall before they get their money back. It should be quite evident to Members of Congress and to the Revenue and Treasury Departments that people cannot guess at their incomes. And then if they guess wrong they are to be penalized with a fine.

Third, this can be avoided, without any hardship to the Government. All that is required is to require semiannual income tax returns, and payment of the tax due on the income actually earned and received. This returns and the tax could be required as of say, July 1 and December 31 of each year. This would be much better than our present "guessing" declaration of income.

Why can't Congress pass an income-tax bill that people can understand, and don't have to go through a Turkish bath while making it out. Do away with the surtax, normal tax, and Victory tax and combine them all into one tax. The people are willing to pay, because they realize this war must be paid for. Do away with the earned income credit and all forgiveness features. A law could be made whereby the person on a salary would have no report to make as his withholding taxes would take care of that.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fourteenth Judicial District Bar Association of Minnesota, in conference assembled at Crookston, Minn., this 12th day of February 1944, That such laws be passed, regulations provided for their operation, and instructions issued, as to simplify the making of income-tax returns, and enable the average layman, required to make such returns and pay such tax, to understand the laws pertaining to the same, and make out his return with reasonable facility, and at the same time not reduce the amounts of income to be derived from that source by the Treasury Department of the Federal Government.

The present Federal income-tax report blank is so complicated and confusing that it is irritating the tax-paying public, and taking far too much time that should be used otherwise. The people expect and insist that Congress nullify the present form, and cause to be formulated, a simple, understandable, and just method or system. When experts need to attend meeting for the study of the return blanks, and then disagree; when our local bankers and attorneys are confused; when our commercial teachers have Federal agents call to help them complete their blank; then it becomes evident that a new, simple, clear-cut system is needed.

Why not have a simple statement showing the amount of income and the amount of outgo—the difference, less deductions, to be the basis on which to compute the tax.

I was glad to notice in the paper the other day, that you and others are trying to get Congress to simplify the income-tax reports. If you were out among your constituents you would hear plenty of complaining and headaches.

It is about the worst set-up anyone could conceive of, and I do not believe that even the parties that figured out this complicated income-tax report understood it themselves. I am sure that a lot of Federal agents do not.

Following is an editorial from the Red Lake Falls Gazette, dated January 6, 1944, which sums up the sentiment of the people in my district very well:

Representative CARLSON of Kansas, member of the Ways and Means Committee, calls the present Federal revenue statutes "a hodge-podge of language that cannot be correctly and definitely interpreted by a Philadelphia lawyer." He proposes to simplify procedure whereby most income taxes would be automatically deducted from wages and salaries, this making it unnecessary for millions of people to file any income-tax returns at all. Whatever the process, Congress should lose no time in simplifying the returns. Even the employees of the Internal Revenue Department are befogged by the provisions of the law. In place of making it as hard as possible for citizens to comply with the law, Congress should make it easy.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are glad that the members of the House Ways and Means Committee have assured us that they have now prepared a tax simplification bill, which the House will consider and act on in the very near future.

This will be a great relief to the American taxpayers and we compliment the members of the committee for their diligent and excellent work on this serious problem.

The Republican Party and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over the Columbia network from the studios of WTOP, Washington, March 21, 1944:

Last Tuesday evening over this network, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN charged that the Republican Party is the party of inflation. In order to justify this conclusion, one must find that the Republican Party is opposed to sound money; is opposed to a sound fiscal policy, and is opposed to price control. Mr. PATMAN erroneously bases his conclusion on the charge, which is far from borne out by the facts, that the Republican Party is opposed to price control. I do not presume to speak for the Republican Party but I am a Republican and am daily consulting with other Republicans in Congress in respect to party aims and policies so I believe that I can make the statement, without fear of successful contradition, that the Republican Party is heartily in favor of the extension of price controls. When Mr. Leon Henderson, the first Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, was testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee, we were discussing whether price controls alone could stop inflation.

While some of us disagreed with the manner in which price controls were administered under Mr. Henderson, we all gave him credit for having a broad, basic knowledge of economics. I asked Mr. Henderson, "You are of the opinion that the control of prices alone will not prevent inflation?" He answered, "Yes, sir; I am of the firm opinion that the control of prices alone will not do that (that is prevent inflation) and that there must be taken into account the fiscal and monetary policies." "It seems to me that (price control) is one of the main legs of this particular body, that is fiscal control, monetary control, and price control." So I think not only Mr. Henderson is of the opinion that price control alone will not prevent inflation but the majority of sound thinking economists treat this subject as if it were a three-legged stool. In order to successfully prevent inflation, we must have effective price control, we must have a sound money policy and we must have a sound fiscal policy.

No one has yet successfully charged the Republican Party with advocating unsound money policies. As a matter of fact, it will be recalled that on many occasions during the past years when Republicans have unsuccessfully fought the attempts of this administration to depreciate the value of our money they have been charged with being too conservative. When the Republicans have opposed what is commonly known as printing-press money they have been charged with being too sound. Likewise no one has ever successfully charged that the Republican Party has ever favored loose and unsound fiscal policies. When the Republicans were urging a balanced Budget; when they were opposing unnecessary expenditures by the Federal Government for projects of doubtful value; when they were warning that the creation of a disproportionately large national debt might result in economic chaos; when they were insisting that nonmilitary expenditures be cut to the bone, they surely were not reflecting the attitude of people who believed in a reckless fiscal policy which would result in inflation. No; I think any clear-thinking, unbiased person will agree that the monetary and fiscal policies of the Republican Party have been sound.

Now, then, let us look at the third leg of this three-legged stool—price control. Mr. PATMAN says in his speech, and I know that he is sincere in this: "In fact, the vitality of our democratic processes is based upon opposing viewpoints, and genuine partisan discussion is an important safeguard to the proper democratic decision." He does not think, however, that there should be any opposing viewpoints in time of war. He believes that everyone should follow blindly the leadership of the individual, or oligarchy of individuals, who are now managing our civilian as well as our war economy. That approach spells unity only to the many who would continue unsound fiscal and monetary policies. It is the kind of unity which, if indulged in to excess, might destroy the principles and ideals of government for which our men are fighting all over the world and might result in losing the war at home after our armed forces have won it on the battle fronts abroad.

We Republicans are very much in favor of continuing price controls as an essential part of anti-inflation machinery. Unless the Price Control Act is continued, there will be no

control over any prices, rents, wages, or salaries, starting at 12 o'clock on the night of June 30. The Republicans have been so concerned by this fact that we have insisted that committee hearings be held immediately so there would be no doubt about legislation being enacted before the dead line. Surely Mr. PATMAN presents a rather peculiar paradox when he erroneously charges in one breath that the Republicans are opposed to price contro' and in the next breath complains of Republican insistence on early action on legislation to continue the Office of Price Administration. In order to do the subject full justice, the committees of Congress should have started work on price controls weeks ago.

Speaking for myself, and for many Republicans with whom I have discussed the matter, it is our purpose to continue price-control legislation with all of the powers and authority which are necessary to control prices. It is quite generally admitted that the administration of price control is not without fault, in fact, Mr. PATMAN in his radio speech last week not only admits this but says he fully appreciates the irritations which have been caused, going on to say that "mistakes have been made—many of them." What we seek to do in price control is to continue the authority to control prices, but believing that many of these mistakes and faults and irritations have emanated from the attempts of O. P. A. and other administration henchmen to control business, agriculture, labor, and industry, in addition to the control of prices, we seek to clarify the language of the law sufficiently so that even the administrators of the act will understand that it has been and will continue to be the intent of Congress that the powers contained in the Price Control Act shall be used to control prices and for nothing else.

We gave the President the power to stabilize prices, rents, wages, and salaries. We gave him the authority to make adjustments in maximum prices to correct gross inequities. He seeks to use this authority to control business, agriculture, labor, and industry. Attempts have been made to use this power to socialize business, agriculture, labor, and industry clearly in defiance of Congressional intent. Last March the Congress had to step in and take from the President some of the authority which he arrogated to himself to set ceilings on wages and salaries, contrary to the standards set up in the act. He claimed to have authority under the act and did arbitrarily set a ceiling on maximum net salaries and wages below those which were guaranteed by Congress. The issue was not the amount which he decreed but was whether or not he should assume to have authority to amend an act passed by Congress. If he had had the authority to limit wages and salaries below that of the standards set by Congress, then it follows that he could have limited wages to as low as a thousand dollars or less per year. Had he been permitted to exercise this assumed authority, he could have effectuated the socialization of labor and industry. The thought was that the American workingman should have protection against this socialistic tendency—against this usurpation of power, and for that reason, the Congress found it necessary to repeal that part of the Price Control Act under which the President claimed to have this authority.

We all have in our files numerous evidence that the power which we have delegated to the President to control prices has been misused. Hundred of thousands of small businesses are not operating today because of the misuse of administrative authority or the arrogation of undelegated powers. Thousands of properties are now nonproductive because of mismanagement and misuse of these powers and authority. It was never intended by Congress that the powers contained in the Price Control Act would be used to enforce disciplinary action taken for the apparently reckless purpose of driving business, labor, and industry into economic oblivion, the natural consequence of satisfying someone's fancy in respect to untried, uncertain, and unsound social and economic policies.

We Republicans seek to continue the machinery essential to control prices but we seek to give the American businessman, the American laboring man, the American farmer, and industrialist at least an opportunity to review his grievances before he is "blacked out" of the economic and social picture. The Office of Price Administration is a law and a court unto itself. The only questions which can be reviewed by any aggrieved person are those involving the constitutionality of the act and whether the Administrator acted within the law in setting a maximum price or a maximum wage, and then only in a special Emergency Court of Appeals set up under the act. All other courts, State and Federal, are expressly denied jurisdiction. There is no opportunity for any effectual review of any of the orders or regulations of the O. P. A. in the constitutionally created courts of the United States or the courts of the several States. Many of the evils in the administration of price controls can be removed if the people are given an opportunity to review their grievances in their regularly constituted courts.

At the proper time, I shall introduce amendments to create a board of administrative review within the Price Control Administration, which, in addition to consulting with the Administrator, will have jurisdiction to amend, modify, or set aside any regulation or order which, upon review, appears to be not in keeping with the public interest or which does not appear to be fair or in keeping with sound business practices and which might result in bankruptcy or other hardship. This board will be authorized to sit and conduct hearings anywhere in the United States, either as a board, by subcommittee, or by commissioner, thus obviating the necessity of expensive trips to Washington by litigants from distant points.

The proposal provides for expeditious action in lieu of the present dilatory method of review which sometimes results in months intervening between the filing of the petition for redress and final decision. I shall also offer an amendment granting the right of recourse to the Federal courts for persons and concerns claiming injury by the unfair operation of the price-control program. This procedure shall be the same as that provided for in the case of any other agency of the Government. This will not interfere in any manner with the control of prices; in fact it should induce cooperation, because we shall be assured of fair and impartial enforcement.

Amendments will also be offered clarifying certain provisions of the act, including the authority to correct gross inequities so as to more clearly indicate the intent of Congress that the powers granted in the Price Control Act shall be used only for the purpose of controlling prices.

Amendments will also be offered, which, in effect, will outlaw consumer food subsidies. No law which Congress has ever passed has ever authorized the payment of consumer subsidies. Their use does not keep prices down nor can prices be stabilized by such use of the taxpayers' money. Consumer subsidies have nothing to do with the effectual control of food prices and make price control much more difficult because they are in themselves inflationary.

In summary, we shall insist upon removing the causes of inflation which we agree to be unsound monetary and loose fiscal policies. We shall insist upon a continuance of price control and a courageous and fair administration of the act. We shall insist upon these powers being used to control prices and shall attempt to prevent the use of these powers to socialize labor, agriculture, and business. In short, our program will result in the orderly control of prices under and in compliance with the American Constitution and not in spite of it.

Address of Hon. Richard M. Kleberg of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] before the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association:

Mr. President, distinguished visitors, fellow members of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, ladies and gentlemen, I was much interested in the talk that preceded mine, because of the fact that way back there, in a small way, I had something to do with setting up the great organization known as the National Livestock and Meat Board. Ideas began to congeal and take form, and finally one day, after these ideas had been partly whipped together, a meeting was held of cowmen and feeders, and butchers, delicatessen men, hotel men, packers, and everybody else that was interested, in Kansas City. I happened at that time to be honored with being president of this association, and its representative at that meeting, at which the National Livestock and Meat Board was organized, and to hear Mr. Pollock talk this morning concerning the path that has been followed, and the progress that has been made by our representatives in the distribution of the by-products of what this association produces, has been indeed a revelation.

I would like to make this comment, having been one of the members who has tasted this synthetic steak up here, that it might be taken in a sort of a double-barreled sense. I am not so sure that Joe Montague agrees with me on this proposition. We both tasted it, and I think we both like another product that Anheuser-Busch makes better than we do this one [laughter and applause], and another phase of it is that due to the peculiarly large amount of salt which is put into this product, and in view of the fact that indubitably it will be dispensed at places where another product, made by Anheuser-Busch, is served, I believe that it will result in an increased sale of the latter and more likable of the two products [laughter and applause]. It will make you thirsty.

I don't want to be too serious this morning, but we have come a long way in these United States under a system represented by those Star-Spangled Banners that you see in this room. A long time ago, before what that flag stands for came into being, some words were written by the guttering light of a candle on a drum head, where a ragged, tattered, cold and hungry army, following a matchless leader, was about to embark on the march at Valley Forge, where an army wide trail of blood was left by patriots who gave us what we have today. Those words were, "These are the days that try men's souls," and veritably, my friends, those days are here again. Tinkering and error, two of the major frailities of humanity, has brought

this condition upon us. Men learn, apparently, but to forget, and then learn all over again, and it is because we forget to remember as a Nation that we are confronted with the days we have today.

We are confronted with high concern for the ravaging confusion which envelopes this great Nation during the period of its greatest trials, and the period of its incomparable responsibility. Never before in the history of the world, as it is reflected in the chronology of human events, has any people shouldered the responsibility which the people of the United States shoulder today. This responsibility is no longer confined to the limits of our own fair land, but this responsibility covers the entire world. Every thoughtful Christian person in that world, wherever he or she is to be found, is looking toward us for the final solution and the final day when the drums of war will beat no more and men will live in peace again. [Applause.]

We Americans, yes, and some of those Americans, Texans, have been far too careless in permitting the inculcation of foreign ideologies and isms which have crept into this great system of ours. This laxity has brought the ravaging enemy confusion into our midst.

Attainment in the midst of confusion, my friends, is the most difficult of all objectives. In speaking to you today, I am cognizant of the fact that the most priceless thing we have in being able to discharge the obligations incident to our responsibility is the public confidence of the people of this Nation. I hope that by no word I utter I may shake your confidence, but may I rather arouse your determination to a rededication to that way of life we know as the American way of life, and the mile posts and the markers which have brought us thus far. We have reached a point where our common God has seen fit to place upon our shoulders the responsibilities of this hour.

Off the record here, please.

(Statement off the record.)

Since the days of our national nativity as the land of the free and the home of the brave, we Americans have functioned in this country with freedom of opportunity and the responsibility of the individual citizen for his own use of that opportunity without direction from cubby holes and great governmental centers. We assumed the responsibility at the time of the creation of the Government of the United States to support it. Never, in our glorious past, have we ever agreed that it was incumbent upon the Government of the United States to support us, or that we should be it wards, or the wards of any other group of men or any other man.

On last November 2d from the floor of the House of Representatives I called the attention of the Congress and the Nation to a certain book. This book was written by a man high up in the policy-making branch of our Government. He and certain other Harvard and Tufts professors collaborated in this work. The name of this book was, An Economic Program for American Democracy. Woven throughout the pages of this opus was a theme to the effect that American business is incompetent to chart its own future, that American business and the American people here depend upon the Federal Government for their salvation.

The author of this book was Dr. Richard V. Gilbert, at present Chief Economist of the Office of Price Administration in Washington. I disagree with the theory and theme of this book in toto. The American economic system which has brought us thus far is based on an entirely different set of principles. These principles were born of man's reason and the acceptance of certain great and inalienable truths upon which American rights are founded. The primary objective of our system of government was liberty under God and law as counter-distinguished to servitude under man and men. The economic principles generally speaking are expressed in freedom of enterprise and individual initiative. Our function under these develop creative and inventive genius and virile confidence in ourselves and our fellows and, may I add, our Government. It is, indeed, a far cry from this set of ideals once accomplished and in working order to the ideals proposed by the work I just referred to. Tragically, to a large measure, these latter have supplanted the former within our glorious system.

In passing, at this juncture, so we won't get too serious, I am going to plagiarize on an unknown author. I am going to read you a little thing here that I think will probably strike a happy chord. The title of this is "The Head of Division of Revision":

"As head of the Division of Provision for Revision,
Was a man of prompt decision—Morton Quirk.
Ph. D. in Calisthentics, P. D. Q. on Pathogenics,
He had just the proper background for the work.

From the pastoral aroma of Aloma, Oklahoma,
With a pittance of a salary in hand,
His acceptance had been whetted, even aided and abetted,
By emolument that netted some five grand;

So, with energy extatic, this fanatic left his attic,
And arrived in Washington, D. C.,
Where with verve and vim and vigor, he went hunting
For the nigger
In the woodpile of the W. P. B.

After months of patient process, Morton's spicular proboscis
Had unearthed a reprehensible hiatus,
In reply by Blair and Blair to his thirteenth questionnaire,
In connection with their inventory status.

They had written—'Your directive when effective was defective
In its ultimate objective—and what's more,
Neolithic hieroglyphic is, to us, much more specific
Than the drivel you keep on dumping at our door.'

This sacrilege discovered, Morton fainted—but recovered
Sufficiently to write, 'We are convinced
That sabotage is camouflage behind perverted persiflage—
Expect me on the twenty-second inst.'

But first he sent a checker, then he sent a checker's checker—
Still nothing was disclosed as being wrong,
So a checker's checker came to check the checker's checker,
And the process was laborious and long.

Then followed a procession of the follow-up profession
Through the records of the firm of Blair and Blair.
From breakfast until supper some new super follow-upper
Tore his hair because of Morton's questionnaire.

* * * * *

The file is closed, completed, and our hero, undefeated,
Carries on in some department as before;
And victory is in sight of—not because of, but in spite of—
Doctor Morton's mighty efforts in the war."

[Much applause.]

Now, as a matter of fact, when you get right down to the brass tacks of the situation that confronts us in this country, it is a pretty good idea to look back just briefly, because by looking back briefly we can see forward at least more clearly than we can if we follow the quick energetic process followed by Morton Quirk.

It is an interesting thing to note that the thing that we call democracy is a thing most peculiar in its entirety. I repeat that the thing we call democracy is peculiar to this soil and to this land. It came from the soil; it is agrarian in origin, and not urban. Looking back a little all you have to do is to remember that it was from a little band of men from the soil, all but two of them men of the soil, that assembled in grim determination, and it was from this little band that the shot which was heard around the world was fired. Don't forget that. The doctrine of the divinity of kings, and the doctrines which sprung from the facile and distorted principles of theorists like Marx, and which bring along their present-day by-products, nazi-ism and fascism, are urban in origin. They sprang from great centers of population, and not from the soil. Here almost within sound of my voice, on the fields at San Jacinto, Texas was born. In this room are men within the sound of my voice whose kinsmen, whose grandfathers, as did mine, served with Sam Houston when Texas was born at San Jacinto. Let us not forget. Particularly let us not forget to remember that the agreed-upon basis of our rules of the game, the Texas rules of the game, under the Republic of Texas, were more than document to us, and we should never forget it. By forgetting we slip into the lethargic acceptance which transfers our Government, which came out of the people, into a government which is over the people. A government which renders us other than supporters of the Government, and converts us into serfs and wards of the Government That is simple, and let us not forget. [Applause.]

And when you go into the amazing declarations, true in fact, that were made on this floor yesterday, from this rostrum, by my two loved friends, your Presidents, Claude McCan, and Joe Montague, it is astounding, and may I for a moment—and you remember those remarks—attempt to boil the thing down in the forum of American reason, let us say at a temperature of 325 degrees, so it won't be half baked [laughter], and face the facts gathered all of the way through.

Let us look at the subsidy program that is in effect today, and cook it for just a minute in our minds. What these men didn't tell you yesterday was the final proof of the pudding. They gave you the components of it. They commented on the fact that there was a great shortage of beef in sight. They gave you the picture that went to make up that shortage. I know it, and you know it, so I won't repeat it, but these are two things they didn't tell you.

They didn' tell you that this subsidy program was argued for and put into effect as a weapon to be used against inflation. The reason given for their fear, and when I say "their", I refer to those who insist upon the subsidy program, was that we had too big a pile of money to spend on too short a pile of consumer goods, of which meat is a part.

If we cut what we are cooking in our minds open, we can find out whether it is done or not. The facts are that the product is raw. This roll-back in the subsidy program, put into effect by directive not law, and administered by regulations with the force and effect of law not passed by your Representatives in the Congress is candidly to my way of thinking an unsavory dish. It is neither food nor fiber. It was forced upon us as a panacea to prevent inflation and this is what it does. By its own test, it has shortened the supply of meat which is a part of the pile of consumer goods and by paying part of the consumer's bill, it leaves the consumer a greater pile of money to spend. Does that make sense? Mr. Pollock just told us that one of the best ways

to conserve beef was to cook it over a not too hot fire. He told us that a roast cooked at 500 degrees lost about twice as much in weight and more in volume and quality than if cooked at 325 degrees. Even if we can't furnish chuck-wagon cooks with thermometers, God has taught cowboys this truth.

As an American, when you add up the effects of this subsidy program and the way it was born and must be administered, you can see its fallacy and its insincerity together with the patent untruth as to its stated objectives. Our birthright under a Government which rises out of the people is worth more than the $6.32 per head that we are offered by a proposal which converts our Government into one over the people. I say the price is too damned cheap.

Now, I have been one of you fellows for a long time. I was born that way. I was subjected to the influence and infection of what might be termed higher education quite a while ago, in a great institution which was mentioned today, the University of Texas, and at another institution which I claim just as much as my alma mater, even though I did not attend it, but because I have talked to the learned men there so much, and have visited there so much, and I read the reports and all of the little bulletins which have come out from the A. & M. College, I feel like I belong to that great institution too. At the University of Texas, where I went to school for 5 years, I studied law. Then I went back for another year and majored in constitutional law. One who majors in constitutional law is charged, at least, with a knowledge of the origin of the Constitution, the reasons for it, and the inimitable benefits which we, as Americans, know we have under it. To see that document ignored right at its outset is not in accord with my way of thinking. Article 1 says, and I quote: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

What does that word "all" mean? Does it leave anything out? And when you consider that this subsidy program is going to mean that it can, and will, and only can and will, be administered by and under directives and regulations with the force and effect of law, which are not written by your Representatives in the Congress, but are written by a bunch of Morton Quirks, that you don't know, and don't give a damn to know, what would you, as a Member of Congress, under oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, do if you had the respect for it and loved your country, and your land, but, oppose a proposal of that sort?

And then let's go further, where men who are found in violation—American citizens—of these regulations and directives, find themselves confronted with trial before a court not created according to constitutional means, a court not created according to law which the Congress passed creating the O. P. A., and a court which is dominated by the O. P. A.; where you have judge, jury, and all in one outfit, ignoring your right to a trial by jury, and all of the other constitutional rights under which we grew to the point where we can still at least be proud when they ask us where we are from and we can say we are Americans. That ought to mean something. But we won't be Americans in the sense that makes us proud unless we stop this foolishness; unless we get back to where we know how to walk along the tried and beaten paths which have brought us to the point where Almighty God Himself would select us as the bearers of world responsibility in this never before equalled war. [Applause.]

One of the greatest students of psychology as it effects men and peoples, one who probably devoted himself with a truer adherence to the rules of science than anyone in this field of research, wrote following his review and study of the British people, as follows: "The English have acquired in a high degree the three fundamental bases of the soul of a people; common sentiments, common interests, and common beliefs." He then went on to say that this safeguards a nation. Once its members find an instinctive agreement on all great questions, it is guarded against becoming prey to serious and destructive dissension.

Had we not become careless, had we not forgotten to remember briefly the postulates upon which our Government and system are based, there would be neither point or danger in the American people becoming involved in dissensions on issues of this sort. Certainly we would have long ago junked the Constitution, we would have long ago amended it into a shape and fashion completely foreign to that which it has today. Within that instrument itself it provides for ways and means for its amendment, but there can be no dissension between Americans on the point that certainly an elected representative of the people is charged at least with the responsibility of forever standing on guard against the destruction of the rights of those whom he represents by the violation and destruction of the Constitution by means other than those provided for its change or amendment.

What I rebelled against, and what I believe every American in accord with what the flag stands for rebels against, is the constant effort to pervert our Government by subterfuge, and by all kinds of misstatements and false promises. I am convinced that I am right in that. Whenever we reach a point in this land where there is only one man—and I am going to speak plain now—who can save us, or steer this great ship of state at any one given period, we have indeed exposed a great Achilles heel, which should be guarded, to say the least, as the greatest of military secrets in this hour of peril. [Applause.]

Speaking on this issue for the first time in public, I am going to mention a man's name. You will never find it in a past utterance of mine—I always referred to him as the President of the United States. Knowing that this association is nonpolitical, I am using this statement only as a means of emphasizing a point I desire to make before you today. Speaking of Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt not as President, but as a potential candidate for reelection, may I pray that his wisdom and his patriotism will prevent him from taking such a step.

May I say to you in all frankness that I can't help but feel alarmed by some of the statements of both of the head men in the executive branch of our Government in this good year 1944. I refer to their definite expressions of dissatisfaction with our American system of government. I cannot conceive how any man sworn to uphold it and defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic, could consistently and in honor have made such statements.

Not so long ago, Mr. HENRY WALLACE made a speech on the west coast. I copied a few quotations from it, and I am going to read them to you:

"Those of us," said WALLACE, "who realize the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be bloodless and gradual, instead of bloody and sudden."

Think those words over carefully: "Those of us who realize," mind you, and I don't know who the us are, "the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be bloodless and gradual, instead of bloody and sudden," but he doesn't say that he is opposed to its being bloody and sudden even.

He says, "We believe it can be bloodless and gradual if the makers of public opinion, if the politicians, if the pressure groups, will only influence their millions of followers on behalf of the public good instead of regional and class prejudice. We are not going to use the whole"—and thank God he said this—"We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here in the United States"—I am glad we are not going to use the whole of it, you understand. "It was made for Russia and not for us, but Russia is doing every day what we in the United States have only preached on Sunday."

Who in the hell is the "we" he is talking about? There are none of those "we's" in this room, I know. [Much applause.]

Now, let's see where this philosophy comes from. I am going to give you some quotations from a book called Where Do We Go From Here? The author of that book is well known to the author of the book which I just referred to you. He is one not of our inner circle, as such, at the present time, although he studied here, and although he dwelt here, but his name is Harold J. Laski, in charge of the policy making of the present rationing and O. P. A., and so-called anti-inflation movement in Britain. He wrote this book while serving our great mother country, and he says this:

He says that we must submit to a revolution, either as he, Dr. Laski, proposes it, or by violence. What did HENRY WALLACE say right at the beginning? He goes on, and I quote: "It poses precisely the same problems for us as it has posed for our enemies. We can meet them if we will by consent, or we can meet them as in Italy and Germany, in terms of bloody and violent conflict, but we still have to meet them."

He wrote on and said, and now listen to this—listen to this and mark it well:

"But I have argued"—from the same book—"that war is a condition technically adapted by its nature to enable the process of adaptation by consent to begin."

Is that a suggestion that during a great war, the adaptation of a great people to revolutionary processes is conceived to be a propitious moment? Let's see.

"For if victory comes more shortly than we expect, the problems of adaptation will remain, and on all of the evidence we shall shrink back into our wanted habits without the chance that the psychological convulsions of war impose to make the effort toward consent, when relatively it can be met at ease."

What do you think of that proposition?

We recently had a message to Congress, just antedating the veto message on the tax bill, wherein the conclusions of our Chief Executive are given, after stating that we have grown to our present size and strength under certain political rights—and he used the word "political"—"among these the right to free speech, freedom of worship, free press, freedom of assemblage and freedom from unwarranted searches and seizures, but as our economy has expanded we find these political rights inadequate (what does the word 'inadequate' mean?) to guarantee us success in our pursuit of happiness, so I would recommend a second bill of rights."

Have you read the second bill of rights? It is a reparaphrasing of the doctrine of defeatism, of self-satisfaction, of stagnation. It means frozen prices in its effect, and it means the junking of what that immortal flag stands for.

Now, when the Congress of the United States is confronted with messages from the Chief Executive in terms such as that, what would a dumb Texan like me be called upon to do, but stand by his guns? I am asking you. I don't know any different, and if I go back to the Congress of the United States following this election, where every Member of the House faces his constituency, and a decision is made as to his choice and selection by what we pray will be a free exercise of the right of suffrage, don't expect me to change between now and election. [Applause.] I still believe in what Uncle Sam with the gray whiskers stands for. I still believe in the immortal traditions, yes, in that

communion of sentiment, ideals, and beliefs that Texans believe in. I agree with what they believed in when they shook off the yoke of Santa Anna, and when again they made the greatest contribution to the United States that was ever made by any State in this Union or elsewhere, when Texas joined this Union.

Take the contributions of Texas men in the armed services. Take the traditional history of Texas and the background that stands forever enshrined in the minds of all true Texans, the Alamo, and San Jacinto, where we gained the incentive objectives that permitted us to live the American way of life. Do we find ourselves being thwarted, by a failure of what the Chief Executive pleases to call political rights? These were certain inalienable rights, and there is a difference between the term "political" and the one I just used, "inalienable."

And in passing for further cooking in the forum of American reason, may I make the suggestion that among those so-called political rights he mentioned the right to freedom of worship. It seems to me that neither he nor any other man will gainsay that our common God has had a lot more to do with mankind over a much longer period than has he or any other President of this country, and we fought to attain that right, which is one which came to us because we were men, and desired to worship our God according to the dictates of our own respective consciences, and that was one of the things we fought to gain when the immortal words with which I started my statement at the beginning, by Thomas Paine, at Valley Forge, and by request of Washington was read to that ragged army, "These are the days that try men's souls," were uttered.

The right to freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom from unwarranted search and seizure were rights, gentlemen, that had no politics in them but they had the bullets and the blood of Americans as an impetus to attain them, and if some folks think that there are among us some who won't fight to keep them, they are a damn sight wronger than they are in their philosophies, even in the O. P. A. [Much applause.]

I want to say in conclusion a few things that I think you ought to know. Personally there is no man in or out of the Congress of the United States to whom I yield in my personal desire to be of assistance to the Chief Executive of this Nation as Commander in Chief of our armed forces in this war. I mean it, just as I meant the other things that I have said. Next only to that desire would be my desire that one of these days, and I pray soon, I may be able to agree with him and our Democratic Party on the floor of the House and in the Senate on some vital matters, among which are going to be a decision as to whether or not we are going to keep the present O. P. A., or whether we are going to re-form it under and along American lines. May I say I hope they will agree with me, and give me a chance to go along with them. I would love to do it. [Applause.]

In this great Nation of 135,000,000 Americans are many men competent and able to steer this ship of state. Within the ranks of the Democratic Party, and I mean Democrats of the real kind, are many men who are competent, qualified, and patriotically able to do this job. I don't want to create the impression that I am afraid to name some of them. I will start with the great Democrat from Texas, the Governor of Texas, my friend, Coke Stevenson. Next, and by no means least or last, a true American, a stalwart Democrat, a great student of government, the Honorable HARRY BYRD, Senator from Virginia, and there are many others. If he were not too far along in years and could he even at that get rest enough to calm down, we could do far worse than our dear old friend, "Cotton" ED SMITH, from South Carolina. Even if such men after election could serve for an appreciable part of their time and die in harness, we would still live in America at the time of their death.

Now, on the matter of price control, and the Price Control Act, I didn't quite complete the drafting of the bill, but here is a brief synopsis of some of the major things that the bill contains, and I have written this thing out, so with your permission I will read it:

"The Economy Price Control Act of 1942 automatically expires on June 30 of 1944. As of the time this is written, it seems more than probable that this act will be renewed. If it is renewed, it is of the greatest importance that it be changed to prohibit all perversion of the 1942 act."

I want you to get that. Do you folks realize that since the O. P. A. was set up, that the provisions of the 1942 act have never been adhered to, and all you have to do is to look at the prices fixed affecting cattle, which have never been up to the point where the law said they should be in the 1942 act and since the O. P. A. was set up. Is that square dealing or not? Is that carrying out the intention of Congress, or not? Certainly not.

"When the act was passed in 1942, it was not the intent of Congress that the entire price structure should be frozen." Joe Montague spoke on that yesterday. "That the methods employed involve voluminous regulations, going minutely into detail, or that price control would be used for profit limitation." Get that.

And none of these perversions were necessary, but they have the effect of impairing and reducing production, and reducing the number of producing units, and of impairing and reducing the operations of those units, as well as reducing the number of distributing units.

"The longer such perversions continue, the more rapidly we approach and reach a completely frozen economy. Neither was it contemplated that the price level be rigidly held to the level of September 1942, or any other particular level. As a matter of fact, it is imperative that there be sufficient flexibility so that a vast and complex economy production may be maintained and moderately increased by allowing some fluctuations in price. The main consideration is that these price fluctuations do not have an aggregate effect which will increase the general price level more than, say, 12 percent in any 1 year.

"In drafting a revision of the Price Control Act to become effective July 1, 1944, I therefore propose that the following provisions be incorporated in it:

"First. The general policy should be declared to be that of fostering the production of basic articles. Follow this fostering of the production of basic articles with the fostering of the production of articles necessary for military or civilian use that are in short supply by permitting the necessary price increases in any one fiscal year of not to exceed 12 percent over or under the price for the article in effect on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, or the day nearest that date upon which the price was quoted, paid, or published.

"Two. For the few basic commodities which require more specific attention and regulation"—now follow this—"a Price Control Board of three persons"—that is a control board—"should be created with the necessary powers to consider the facts and set the limits of price rises for the articles enumerated in the act as basic commodities with directions, or, if necessary to maintain the increased production, rises in prices for the articles may be permitted during the fiscal year, but in no case shall the price be increased more than the 12 percent range over the price in effect at the end of the preceding fiscal year.

"Three. The Price Control Board should be authorized to name a committee of three from each of the industries producing the articles designated to be basic commodities within the meaning of this act, and delegate the power to these committees to follow production, present the facts to the Board, and propose changes in price when deemed necessary."

Now, I won't go on and call your attention to more than this, except simply to tell you this: That under a Price Control Act set up to operate the American way, that would be intelligible to the American people—and this may hurt my bill—the job can be done by one-fourth of the present employees operating under the Price Control Administration. It can be done because of a certain confidence which can be justifiably reposed in the American people, that they will do most of the work in these critical war periods.

Second, there will be no need for food subsidies, if the American people are given an opportunity, while they have plenty of money, to pay their own grocery bills, and it will not be necessary for them to stultify themselves by charging those grocery bills to future generations and to the boys over there when they come home. [Applause.]

This proposition will bring to an end any continuation of a battle for subsidies, unless the proposal to spend subsidies is supported by the only reason which it had at its incept, which was to bring the American people into hand and made them dependent upon the Federal Government for their salvation. I am opposed to that. [Applause.] I am going to stay opposed to it, too.

In short, this bill merely provides for the producers of other commodities in short supply, which shall be named as basic commodities, the fundamental principles, the basic principles, now contained in the meat management plan, which was so ably explained to you by your fine counsel and my beloved friend, Joe Montague, on yesterday.

I am not going to take more of your time, but I did feel that you had the right to know just what the one long time member of this association who happens to represent a great District in the State of Texas in the Congress of the United States thinks about the way we are going, and I have done my best to give you how and what I think, and why I think it.

I thank you.

Rehabilitation of Disabled Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is to take up immediately the so-called American Legion bill of rights bill which passed the Senate Friday, and that hearings will be held starting this afternoon.

Of course, I am in favor of the passage of the legislation without delay, but to my mind it does not go far enough. It seems to me we can avoid a great deal of criticism that has been directed at

Government agencies because of the delay in handling claims as well as the rehabilitation of the disabled. With that thought in mind, I introduced two bills, H. R. 4191 and H. R. 4227.

House bill 4227 is to take care of the disabled and to see that there is not a day that they are not actually receiving some financial assistance from the Government. It also provides for their rehabilitation. True, the American Legion bill provides for education, but first I am sure even those who will benefit by the American Legion bill would want us at the outset to care for those who have been returned disabled as a result of their service.

House bill 4191 is to likewise provide that there is no period when the dependents of those who have made the supreme sacrifice are not receiving financial assistance from the Government. For instance, there is no reason why the Veterans' Administration can not immediately pay death compensation when they receive word from the Department that a veteran has died as a result of his or her service provided the veteran was contributing toward an allotment for dependents. That should be accepted as evidence that they are legally entitled to recognition, under existing law.

There is a protecting clause in both bills both for the claimant as well as for the Government, where the papers can be reviewed at a later date if either is not satisfied with the award.

I have appealed to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to add a new title to the American Legion bill and include the language in H. R. 4191 and H. R. 4227.

Rehabilitation of our returning disabled soldiers is a sacred obligation of our Nation. With the numbers of injured rising as we continue with plans for the invasion of the continent of Europe, and as we increase our offensive against the Japanese, we must plan now in order that our fighting men on their return will not be forgotten and be required to live out hopeless lives on Government pensions, but rather that they can be restored to useful and contented existence. Those who have paid with limbs, with arms, with eyesight, and some with broken nerves and minds, for the democracy which we enjoy and the victory we must win deserve the best of medical treatment that science and man have been able to devise, but this is not all. They deserve another chance—rehabilitation—an opportunity for happiness and a decent livelihood.

How many thousands and hundreds of thousands will follow them while the war rages and after the peace is signed, we can only guess. The latest official reports place American combat wounded at 64,098 through March 15, 1944, and this does not include all of those who have been discharged from the armed forces because of physical disabilities. Many others who were discharged were not battle casualties, but were incapacitated for military duty in other ways.

We can only arrive at an approximation of the final casualties that this war will produce. The United States Army alone suffered over 200,000 wounded in the First World War. The Nation then had an Army totaling about 4,500,000. This time the country is figuring on a military strength two and one-half times greater than in the last war. Therefore, the casualties may easily total one-half million. And when it is recognized that this war is more terrible than the last one, it should be taken for granted that the casualties will be still higher. While it is true statistics are a matter of conjecture we must often resort to them in order to form a conclusion.

During the First World War 15 to 18 out of every hundred wounded succumbed to their wounds. Today statistics show that out of each hundred wounded by shot or shell, burned or crushed, approximately 3 die. Modern medical science is accomplishing today on the battlefields and in the military hospitals things which would have been regarded as miracles in 1917 and 1918.

From these statistics an idea of the magnitude of the problem of rehabilitation can be gained. When these thousands of disabled and mutilated veterans return we must do more than "be good to them" or give them menial jobs as a symbol of our gratitude. The great majority of these mangled veterans will still have a lot of ability and they should be rehabilitated and helped in being placed where their remaining skill may be utilized to its best advantage. In most cases by proper rehabilitation they will be able to take their places alongside able-bodied citizens in industry and the commercial world.

It is true to have a successful rehabilitation program employers too must be given a new conception of disabled workers. In the past employers have been reluctant to hire persons with disabilities because it was felt they could not compete with other workers. The war demands for workers have gone a long way in educating employers that men and women with disabilities are just as efficient as those who are able-bodied. This has been a wholesome experience for industry and a definite program of education should be advanced.

To the disabled service man and woman, rehabilitation begins where the work of medicine and science ends. Our present conception of rehabilitation is a very broad one. It is not just helping an individual to master some artificial device which has been substituted for a member of his body, but rather in its broad sense it is a system of treatment and care which will restore an individual to the greatest functional efficiency.

It is not enough to simply furnish the means of rehabilitation. Each disabled individual is a separate and distinct problem. There are no assembly lines in this work. The problem of rehabilitating one who has lost a limb is entirely different from that of rehabilitating one who has lost an arm. Methods of training and technique vary with almost every individual because no two temperaments are alike. Proper rehabilitation training can be furnished only by individuals especially skilled and trained in this work.

There are a few private institutions in the United States devoted to this highly specialized work. One of the most outstanding such agencies is the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, in New York City, which is often referred to as the school of another chance. I had an opportunity to visit this institution during Christmas week. Formerly they devoted their efforts exclusively to the rehabilitation of civilians, but they are now operating on a wartime basis. They have had over a quarter-century experience in the rehabilitation of the disabled which began with actual service to the disabled veterans of World War No. 1. This experience should be helpful to the Government in all phases of its rehabilitation effort.

As my colleagues and friends are aware, I have suffered the loss of both limbs above the knee, one amputated in January 1943 and the other June 15, 1943.

As a result of my contact with this institute I feel I can qualify as a competent witness on rehabilitation. At the outset of my visit to this institute I received appliances but what I really needed then and did get was proper instructions in their use. For 5 days, 5 hours a day, I was in school, so to speak. For 4 months prior therto I tried to learn the knack of walking with artificial limbs, making practically no headway. In those 5 days due to the instructions given me I learned more and progressed more than in the previous 4 months. I admit the progress is slow, but it is apparent and I honestly feel I am approaching the goal. When I do, I will owe it to the instructions and appliances I have received from this institute.

In view of my personal experience, I insist our maimed ex-service men and women will get nowhere unless the Government has competent instructors.

Naturally I am greatly interested in rehabilitation. I have been in contact with the Surgeon General of the Army, the Navy, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the head of the Rehabilitation Division of the Federal Security Agency, and the Maritime Commission.

My investigations disclose the Air Forces of the Army has a real rehabilitation program. Without casting any reflections, I am convinced it would be wise for every other agency of the Government charged with rehabilitation of the disabled to investigate the progress made by the Air Forces as well as their methods.

The Air Surgeon and his assistants made arrangements with this New York institute to train some of the medical personnel and likewise noncommissioned officers were schooled there in every phase of rehabilitation. Not one, but a number of groups of both types were educated in the methods which have proved to be so beneficial to thousands.

Too much credit cannot be given to Mr. Jeremiah Milbank, the founder, and his board of trustees for placing at the disposal of the Government this wonderful private institution. Always in the red, the deficit is made up by the founder, the trustees, and other public-spirited citizens.

In view of their past experience in rehabilitation the founder and his associates knew outside assistance would be necessary especially from the standpoint of training instructors if the disabled men and women of this war were to receive proper attention, so a War Emergency Committee which is composed of Richard C. Hunt, as chairman; George G. Deaver, M. D., Archibald A. Gulick, Sidney A. Mitchell, Charles Pratt, Col. John N. Smith, Jr., Roland H. Spaulding, Ph. D., and Walter E. Hope, ex officio, was set up. The officers of the board of trustees are: Walter Ewing Hope, president; George A. Sloan, vice president; Oliver B. Jennings, secretary, and Jeremiah Milbank, treasurer; Bruce Barton, Mrs. H. Lawrence Bogert, Jr., Mrs. Guy Fairfax Cary, Duncan S. Ellsworth, Mrs. J. Magee Ellsworth, Desmond FitzGerald, Mrs. Artemus L. Gates, Lewis Gawtry, Samuel M. Greer, Archibald A. Gulick, Will H. Hays, Richard C. Hunt, Sidney A. Mitchell, George M. Moffett, Charles Pratt, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Frank Russell, Frank P. Shepard, Lewis L. Strauss, and Miss Florence S. Sullivan.

The director of the institute is Col. John N. Smith, Jr., a former Army officer, a graduate of West Point, who is a member of the advisory committee on rehabilitation appointed by Gov. Paul McNutt, Federal Security Agency.

I cannot conceive of any words that can be expressed to bring to the attention of Government officials the tremendous responsibility that rests upon their shoulders, especially those charged with rehabilitating the disabled, than the annual report of the director to the board of trustees. Therefore, I include it as part of my remarks. This report starts with a foreword entitled "We Must Not Fail Them." It follows:

While we serve only those who have reached 16 years of age or over, never let us forget the brave procession of disabled children marching hopefully to manhood and womanhood. They, more than the fortunate able-bodied, as they graduate from childhood to the age when they must think of their places in the world, will need a helping hand. There will be advances in medical science to stem the tide of the crippling diseases, and the many great agencies devoted to helping crippled children will year by year learn to do more for them. But still it follows, as surely as day follows night, that in this year 1943 there are some 12-year-old boys and girls who will need our services in 1948. The institute will always be needed, and we go forward ever remembering there are children of today who will be coming to us tomorrow.

When they come, we must not fail them.

The report which gives a clear picture of the activities of the institute follows:

THE INSTITUTE ON A WARTIME BASIS

Last year's report told of the gift in December 1941 by Jeremiah Milbank, our founder and trustee, to enable us to engage to the fullest extent in wartime activities, and of the appointment of the War Emergency Committee, headed by Richard C. Hunt, to be in charge of these matters.

Our wartime objectives are based on this simple premise. We have had 25 years' experience in the rehabilitation of the disabled, which began with our actual service to the disabled veterans of World War No. 1. We believe that this experience should be helpful to the Government in all phases of its rehabilitation effort on behalf of both the civilian and the war disabled. This has been urged upon all Government departments in any way concerned, and it is believed that all of them now generally recognize that we have the knowledge and experience we claim; that our methods are worthy of serious study; and that we have a staff of experts who could be helpful in the instruction and guidance of the rapidly expanding force of men and women who will be engaged in the great work of fitting disabled servicemen to take their rightful place in the peacetime world. Many officials have visited the institute, conferred with our staff, and studied our methods. Thus the basis has been established for our active cooperation in various phases of the problem.

The first of these cooperative efforts already launched is with the office of the air surgeon of the Army Air Forces, in connection with its convalescent and rehabilitation program. The institute's part is that of training the medical and other professional and technical personnel involved, through a series of courses now being conducted at the institute building, utilizing the services of our staff and our equipment.

The air surgeon of the Army Air Forces has established eight convalescent and training centers throughout the United States, strategically located. War casualties returning from the front are first sent to Army general hospitals for definitive treatment. When this has been accomplished, the men are transferred to these centers for convalescence and retraining. The aim, while the war is still in progress, is to retrain the men where possible for other Army Air Forces assignments, particularly the Air Service Command. There are many types of military jobs in the Air Forces which are identical with those found in peacetime civilian economy. Thus, while undertaking such retraining, the men will also be fitting themselves for regular civilian employment after the war is over and they are finally discharged from the service. Some of these war casualties will be found not capable, physically, of any further assignment and service in the Air Forces. They will be discharged for disability. For them, the period under treatment in these convalescent centers will go a long way toward preparing them for the vocational rehabilitation program provided by the Veterans' Administration, or for entrance directly into civil pursuits. As a way of assuring the success of this plan, the Air Forces decided that all those to be charged with this responsibility should undertake special training and that the institute would be the best place to conduct it. The training program began on November 15, 1943, from which time until November 27 there was a seminar for a group of 20 medical officers chosen to head this new work in each of the 8 centers. Dr. George G. Deaver, our medical director, led in the conduct of the seminar under a curriculum submitted to and approved by the Air Forces. All the senior members of our staff participated in the program.

The week after this seminar was concluded, a course of training began for a group of 40 of the Air Forces personnel composed of psychologists, social workers, educators, and vocational counselors. The curriculum for the course was somewhat similar to that for the medical officers, but greater emphasis was given educational, psychological, social work, and guidance subjects. When this course was completed, it was given to another group of similar size and composition. Many of the men in both groups had had extended prewar experience in these various professional fields. Under present plans, this training program will extend for a considerable period and will include others in the categories of those already trained as well as nurses, physical therapists, physical educators, and other personnel.

There is a possibility, as time goes on, that the facilities of the institute may be utilized still further in other ways through the joint cooperation of the Air Forces and our instructional staff. We have also been asked to cooperate with other military and civilian governmental agencies in their rehabilitation programs. Just recently we had an inquiry from the Surgeon General of the Army, asking whether we would be prepared to undertake the training of artificial limb makers.

We believe this actual demonstration with the Air Forces of how we can help will lead to further opportunities of this nature with the same or other branches of the armed services.

Rehabilitation must not be thought of solely as a post-war problem. Men are coming back to the hospitals now and large numbers of the disabled are being returned to less active military service or discharged and returned to private life. The urgency of the whole problem seems only now to be fully appreciated in all responsible quarters. Hence the governmental programs are being rapidly completed, and shortcomings in legislative provisions are being remedied. While it is difficult even for the skilled observer of national happenings to see all that is going on, it is our belief that from now on there will be a strenuous and more definite effort to see that there are effective measures to deal with every disabled man in the humane and sensible way the country expects.

What we have been privileged to undertake in behalf of the Air Forces represents what we believe is but the beginning of useful wartime service. We are failing in no opportunity to urge that we be given other similar opportunities for service. We hope that before another year is ended we shall have gone further in the field of wartime service envisioned by our founder long before Pearl Harbor.

REGULAR ACTIVITIES

Last year's report told how employers were looking to the disabled as a possible source from which to meet the labor shortage. Thousands have been employed who in normal times would have found it difficult to obtain jobs and usually only after training and special guidance and placement assistance. Many who in normal times had to come to us for training have found jobs and had their training on the job. Most of those now coming to us have physical difficulties of unusual severity, in many cases complicated by psychological and social work factors. Men and women like this have heard on every hand that the disabled are being employed. Thus, there come to us or are brought to us, many grievously afflicted people who until this time were so disheartened and so conscious of their unfitness that they would not even think of asking an organization like ours to see what could be done. Case after pitiful case has been accepted despite an experience which tells us how very little can be done for some of them. About a third of those we serve today suffer from some form of cerebral palsy, one of the most distressing of man's afflictions.

These cases and many others call for special medical, educational, psychological, and social-work study and supervision, and patient trials in guidance in the hope of finding a kind of work leading to employment that they can learn. Results, small in themselves, are major achievements for people so badly disabled. We have had to learn new methods, and our service involves us in new fields of research. Hence, we have fewer than in past years who are fitted to enter our training schools and sheltered workshop directly. With the majority of those coming to us today, it is necessary that we keep them longer than the usual evaluation period of 17 days in the guidance-test class. Even with this longer period, we find that additional therapeutic treatment is necessary in many cases before they can enter our schools and

sheltered workshop. With this situation confronting us, we established an occupational-therapy program in January 1943, under a registered occupational therapist and it has proved very successful in its efforts. Our physical reeducation program was also enlarged and intensified. The gains, beyond what we can do for these poor people, are to be measured in terms of the new knowledge we are acquiring which we hope will be of help to the similarly afflicted in other parts of the country and other parts of the world.

THE OUTLOOK

We must build not only for today but for tomorrow. There are three great opportunities for institute service in the years immediately ahead:

1. Our wartime service.
2. New ways of helping the very seriously disabled.
3. Intensification of research and public education.

Our wartime activities will in all likelihood continue for several years after the war ends and will continue to take an important place so long as it is given us to serve in this field.

We believe that the physically disabled will have given so good an account of themselves in the war industries that it will never again be so hard for those with moderate disabilities to find jobs. But when the war industries are liquidated and there are the expected shifts of the industrial population, large numbers of the disabled will be released and will have to find new jobs at the very time when the Army and Navy are returning millions of men to private life. Some will have to make a new start and will come to public or private agencies like our own for rehabilitation service to acquire a thorough training in some new trade or vocation, and to find help and guidance in securing employment. We speak in our foreword of the disabled children who need help when they reach adolescent age, and year by year they are coming to us. Generally, however, we believe a larger proportion of those we shall be serving will be very seriously disabled men and women, and hence the development of our service to cope with cases of this sort is a major objective.

We are convinced that a great opportunity for service presents itself in broadening our research work and our public educational effort. There are signs of a greatly awakened national interest in the problem of the physically disabled, both veterans and civilians. We have an increasing number of visitors to the institute, our correspondence with interested groups in other parts of the country is growing, and we feel that we are among the private institutions in this field who are counted on to contribute to the advancement of the cause we serve. Hence we have already reorganized the institute with a view to strengthening our research work, steps are being taken to organize the knowledge we have gained so that we may be more useful to others, our library is being expanded and rearranged, we are steadily building up our file of motion pictures of interesting cases and their development, and the production of a scientific film with descriptive comment is being planned. There will be a series of publications based on our experience and research which should be of great value to others who are confronted with problems similar to ours. We are expanding the work we have been doing in the training of rehabilitation workers, in which field our staff has already been so successful. In these and other ways we shall be serving the disabled everywhere—an object that has been before us for many years.

ORGANIZATION

Reference has been made to a reorganization of our work. The chart of the new organization which was presented and discussed at a meeting of the board of trustees has created considerable interest on the part of officers of other philanthropic organizations to whom it has been shown. All who have seen it feel that it represents a sensible and logical subdivision of responsibilities in an organization of this character. We have a limited number of copies of this chart so as to be able to give it to those who have a serious interest in the organization of philanthropic endeavor.

While it was the purpose of this reorganization to apportion responsibilities in a definite manner, all of the staff understand that the end result is in the establishment of good team play. This after all is not a business organization and there must be flexibility in organization and management if there is to be any success in dealing with the complex human factors of these men and women to whose service the institute is devoted. All our departments contribute to this total effort. Each subdivision of our staff knows its place in the total picture and all at the same time strive for the end result of complete service. To effect the changes in organization there were a considerable number of changes in office and space arrangements which have been helpful. Chief among these was the establishment of the business administration offices on the ground floor and the rearrangement of the public reception space which is now very attractive. The reception and interviewing of applicants is now carried on on the fifth floor where offices are provided for the educational supervisory staff and the public-relations department. Visitors are also much impressed with the recently established arrangements on the third floor for the testing of the disabled to appraise their activities inherent in daily living. Here we find out how fast a disabled man can cross a street, whether he can get on a bus, what weights he can carry, and in many other ways determine exactly what he needs to be taught in order that he may travel to and from work, dress and care for himself, eat in public, and do other simple things that spell the difference between being home-bound and being able to go to work.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Institute exercises were held as usual. There was the outing up the Hudson in August provided as in past years by one of our trustees, and various parties and dances to high light the recreational program. The weekly parties given by the young women's auxiliary under the guidance of Mrs. Bogert, one of our trustees, again brought enjoyment into the lives of many. All these things have their part, no less important than teaching and training and work, in building up self-respect and fitting men and women to gain a livelihood and live better lives.

FINANCIAL

The treasurer has asked that the customary financial summary be appended to this report. For still another year, expenditures largely exceeded income from all sources. This statement deals only with the normal expenditures and income of the institute. The costs incident to our wartime program have been charged to the fund established out of the gift by our trustee in 1941. The donor of certain capital funds intended for endowment is permitting us to draw on the uninvested part of the fund to meet the current deficits, rather than curtail our activities.

Personal income taxes are mounting and there are continuing calls on the generous-minded to support special wartime drives. These and other circumstances have made it difficult to secure new gifts and even to hold all our regular contributors. Even so, we have realized that we have done less than we should to bring our story before a widening circle of friends and hence have taken steps to do more than we have in this direction. Our trustee, Mr. Bruce Barton, has been very helpful in this. His guidance was most helpful in the recent issuance of Thumbs Up in a new and more attractive form and in devising other means to widen our list of friends and supporters. There is a larger object in all this than the raising of money. Ours is a field of social endeavor that needs understanding friends if it is to be supported adequately by both public and private effort.

THE STAFF

I have conducted many distinguished visitors through the institute—many more than usual in recent months. All, as they part with kind words about what we are doing and about our building, our equipment, and our methods, end by praising our staff. Almost always I have found that this is the asset of the institute which most deeply impresses visitors in their brief hour's glimpse of institute life. And so wholeheartedly do I believe that there is truth in this, that as I write my report I feel, as in previous years, that it should be signed by all my associates, for the credit is theirs for the accomplishments we report. This is a businesslike place; yes; but we have a group here who in every action show a genuine devotion to the work, going far beyond the everyday loyalty men and women display to a business enterprise. The atmosphere here is rather that of a place of learning and this is but natural, for all, not only the staff, but the disabled, too, both teach and learn. All of us have a deep pride in our association with this great humane effort.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN N. SMITH, JR.,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no Member of this Congress, or in fact, no one who contributes to the upkeep of our Government would want private individuals to carry the financial load in donating the services of a great organization such as this to instruct Government personnel to properly care for the disabled. Ways and means should be provided to care for this expense although these good men and women do not ask it.

As I visited the various departments of the institute and saw how interested the personnel were in unfortunate people I agree wholeheartedly with Colonel Smith that he is surrounded by a group that show genuine devotion to their work. Dr. George G. Deaver is a leader in rehabilitation work, while Mr. Frank Sally, Chief of the Orthopedic Division, is really an encyclopedia on every phase of manufacturing appliances, proper fitting, and instructions in use.

Mr. Speaker, I am very enthusiastic about the activities of this institution, but why should I not be when in the space of a few months it has been so beneficial to me. What they have done for me they have done for others.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I express the hope that the work of these men and women will be called to the attention of public-spirited citizens throughout the country. What a great contribution those financially able could make if they would provide such an institution in every large city in the country. The Government must and, I am sure, will take care of the disabled who were members of the armed forces. There is still another job, taking care of unfortunate citizens not financially able to take care of themselves. To those who possess wealth, I say, try it. What happiness will come to them in the end. They will not be repaid in money but the knowledge that they have helped others will be

their reward and that is far greater than money.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We are going to make sure that the gentleman from Missouri has a hearing before our committee during these proceedings.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman.

Disposition of Food Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following commentary is on the bill (H. R. 4281) introduced by me to authorize the disposition of excess food stocks:

PREAMBLE

At the termination of World War No. 1, the various Government agencies disposed of food that was declared surplus in any manner they saw fit and with no consideration as to the season of the year and the conditions under which it was being disposed, resulting in the unnecessary breaking of markets and causing many cases of bankruptcy in the industry. The uncertainties of what foods were to be disposed of by the Army and Navy reacted to the disadvantage of the farmer, who hesitated to plant crops for fear of not being able to dispose of them without loss. In many instances, those farmers who did plant large crops suffered financially.

This bill has two chief purposes in view: The first is to provide an orderly means of disposing of excess stocks of foods that may be in the hands of Government agencies when the war ends, or when the narrowing of its scope may cause a marked reduction in the food requirements of these agencies. In view of the increasingly successful prosecution of the war, it is important that we settle promptly upon a program for liquidating such stocks that will avoid the speculative operations and the widespread dislocation of markets that occurred at the close of the last war.

No less important, however, is the immediate effect that the establishment of such a program will have upon current production of foods to meet present war needs. Producers, processors, and distributors of food, while anxious to make their full contribution to the prosecution of the war, nevertheless view with justifiable alarm the prospect that substantial proportions of the heavy production of foods they are called upon to achieve may turn out to be in excess of requirements, and that they may be left to stand heavy financial losses as a result of the disruption of markets through indiscriminate dumping of these excess foods. American farmers and the American food industry are entitled to the assurance that the passage of this bill will provide, and there is no question that enactment of it into legislation now will relieve them of serious worries and give them the needed encouragement in their wholehearted drive for all-out production.

In brief, the bill proposes to center responsibility for the disposition of all excess stocks of foods, regardless of the agencies holding them, in a single official, the War Food Administrator. Subject to consultation and advice from representative advisory committees of producers, processors, and distributors, he would be authorized to transfer excess foods between Government agencies or to establish the prices, terms, and conditions of sale in established commercial channels. Having given the original owner or vendor the first opportunity to buy, he would be required to provide equal opportunity to all established and responsible processors and distributors. To assure efficient and flexible operation of the program the War Food Administrator would be given wide discretionary authority in carrying out the intent of Congress; to assure responsible exercise of this authority and to enable Congress to keep continuous check on the success of operation of the program, he would be required to report to Congress on his operations at least once each calendar quarter.

The bill thus provides for sound and competent administration through centralization of responsibility and the granting of powers of administrative discretion consonant with the types of operations involved, while at the same time specifying clearly the purposes for which Congress grants this authority and providing continuous means for Congress to keep informed regarding the exercise of it.

The comments that follow are directed to the individual sections of the bill and are intended to make clear their separate purposes and their relationship to the measure as a whole.

Section 2 (a): "Food" is defined in this bill to include all those commodities that are now by Executive order made the responsibility of the War Food Administrator in the organization of the Nation's war program. The bill is thus made to cover not only those commodities usually included in the term "food" but also a considerable number of related commodities derived from foodstuffs and other agricultural commodities.

Section 2 (b): "Excess food" is defined to include all food held or contracted for by Government agencies, wherever located, at home or abroad, and which is excess to the needs for which it was acquired; authority to determine what foods are in fact excess to the needs of an agency is appropriately left to the discretion of the head of that agency.

Controls of this nature must be had to prevent the return of this food to the United States after it has been sold abroad.

The second paragraph of this section is intended to cover any merchandise that was packed or set aside at the request of the Government or under regulations ordering a certain percentage of the pack to be held subject to Government orders, and should be considered as a Government obligation.

Section 2 (c): This paragraph is intended to cover all branches of the Government, including the Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, and so forth.

Section 2 (d): The War Food Administration is an agency that has already been set up and is familiar with the details of administering this act, and it was felt that no new agency or commission should be created for this purpose.

Section 3: Centers in the War Food Administrator full authority over the disposition of all foods declared excess by any Government agency, and prohibits any other Government agency from disposing of excess food except by authorization from the Administrator. The centering of responsibility for operations of this kind in the hands of a single responsible official can hardly be questioned if the program is to be so coordinated as to assure proper consideration of alternative uses of the food disposed of and management of the sale of such food as is disposed of through established commercial channels in such a manner as to avoid disorderly and inequitable distribution, and otherwise to carry out the purposes specified in the bill. The delegation of authority and responsibility for this program to a single administrative official rather than to a board or commission is essential in a program of this kind, because day to day decisions must be promptly made and actions quickly adjusted to the changing conditions of the market.

The War Food Administrator is the administrative official in a position to carry out these responsibilities most competently. He has an agency with long experience in operations of this kind, with organization and personnel trained and experienced in them. His agency is currently engaged in the conduct of similar and closely related programs and he is in a position to coordinate the disposal of excess food with all other Government operations in the food field, including the general stabilization of markets and maintenance of prices to producers. Unless the disposition of excess Government food stocks is carried through with such coordination, it is likely not only to be unsuccessful as a separate program but also to endanger the success of other programs of the type mentioned.

Section 4: Food producers, processors, and distributors of food are vitally concerned in this program. They are entitled to and the best interests of Government are served by assuring procedures by which they shall be properly consulted in the conduct of the program, and it shall have the benefit of their knowledge and experience. This section, therefore, provides for the establishment of commodity advisory committees, representative of these groups and following closely the pattern of industry advisory committees currently established by the War Food Administration. This system of industry advisory committees

has served with notable success in bringing to the Government food programs the counsel and advice of members of the food industry and facilitating sound industry relationships in the conduct of the war-food program. In addition to the individual commodity advisory committees, the bill provides for a representative coordinating committee, to include also the chairmen of the several advisory committees, as well as interests representing possibly labor and consumer.

The section was designed to permit flexibility in appointing small committees which could study each individual commodity and which would work under the policies laid down by the coordinating committee. However, it was thought advisable not to spell this out into too much detail, as it was felt that if all were tried to be specified some other interests which should be on the committee would be precluded from participation because they were not specified in the bill.

Reference should be made here to sections 7 (a) and (c), which describe further the functions of these committees and their relationship to the Administrator. The coordinating committee is intended to consult with and advise him regarding general rules and regulations in the administration of the program. The individual commodity advisory committees are to consult with and recommend to the Administrator regarding the disposition of particular foods. To assure that any administrator who may be appointed to exercise the authorities granted by this bill will in fact give full and proper consideration to the recommendations of these industry committees, he would be required under section 7 (c) to explain to each committee, in case he does not follow its recommendations, his reasons therefor.

Sound administrative procedure requires clear definition of the status of advisory committees of this type. Either they must be definitely advisory in function, with clear authority to the Administrator to act according to his own best judgment after proper consideration of their advice and recommendations, or else they must be given responsibility coordinate with the authority for determination of action that is delegated to them. In the latter case, their operation would become essentially that of boards or commissions, with the consequent cumbersomeness in action inevitably associated with such a form of organization. This bill seeks to avoid such an unnecessarily ponderous and burdensome form of organization. It is at the same time designed to give assurance to those representatives of food production and distribution that real use will be made of their services and real consideration given to their advice.

Section 5 (a) and (b): It is apparent that to properly administer the authority delegated under this bill, the War Food Administrator and his advisers must be fully informed regarding foods that are in excess and must also have as competent information as possible from all Government agencies holding food stocks regarding probable future excess stocks of food that will need to be disposed of. These sections provide the authorities essential to obtaining such information, subject to the limitation that the security of our armed forces in prosecuting the war must not be interfered with.

It is essential that the Administrator have the proper information as to inventories so that if one agency reported a surplus he could then find out from the other agencies the quantities they had on hand in order to determine if more excess foods of the same type might be coming into the market. Without this information it would be impossible for any advisory committee to recommend the disposal of foods for the best interests of everybody, and with this information on hand, and passed along to the trade, both processors and farmers are in a better position to determine what their next year's pack and crops will be. With this information also, it would be possible, with merchandise that would last 2 or 3 years, to determine a policy of equal distribution over the period of time. With the assurance that there would be but a certain amount released, processors and farmers could then safely make their plans for a period ahead. It is conceivable that if there were a large surplus of canned peas or corn to be disposed of, the farmer would be inclined not to plant any for the ensuing year, but if he knew there would be only a certain amount released, he would then be able to plan his crops so as to conform with the normal requirements of the public, and over a period of 2 or 3 years possibly, absorb the entire surplus without disastrous effect of having the entire quantity released at one time.

Section 5 (c): Two different methods are specified for the War Food Administrator in disposing of excess foods. It is likely that in many cases foods excess to the needs of one Government agency can be used by another in carrying on its activities. It is obviously more efficient in such cases that the food be transferred directly from one agency to the other, rather than have the one agency disposing of food by public sale at the same time that the other agency is procuring similar food by public purchases. It will also prevent, as occurred after the last war, one branch of the Government selling a large quantity of surplus to a buyer, who in turn resold it back to another branch of the Government at a considerable profit.

Two important outlets within the Government for excess foods will undoubtedly be distribution for relief purposes at home and especially in war-torn countries, and distribution through the school-lunch and child-feeding programs that are now being carried on under authorization of Congress. Interagency transfers of food for these purposes are therefore specifically mentioned in the bill, although such transfers are not limited to these purposes.

In the customary procedures for disposition of excess stocks by Government agencies through public sale, receipts are not credited to the agencies in question but are covered into the general funds of the Treasury. The bill therefore provides that interagency transfers of food shall likewise be made without reimbursement. This arrangement will also facilitate utilization of foods within the Government rather than dumping them on commercial markets, since the burden otherwise imposed on appropriations for specific purposes might in many cases prevent desirable utilization of food in this manner. The second method of disposing of excess food is by sale through regular and established commercial channels; the procedures authorized here are further specified in sections 6 through 9.

Section 5 (d): Efficient disposition of excess food requires that the official responsible therefor be authorized to have such food inspected, packaged, processed, reconditioned, stored, transported, or to have other services performed in connection with it that will facilitate the most desirable utilization of it. Such authority, which is conferred by this section, will enable the Administrator both to make best use of the food and to prevent spoilage and deterioration of it and otherwise maximize the return to the Government through its sale or disposition.

This paragraph was deemed advisable also so as to give proper information to the committee and to the trade as to the actual condition of the merchandise when offered and also to permit repacking where advisable, in order to prevent unnecessary loss. For example, this paragraph would permit the Administrator to take some canned peaches, which, because of their age, could not go into consumption quickly, but which could be converted into a jam or some other wholesome product, possibly without any loss in value.

Section 6: This section requires the Administrator, in disposing of food through established channels, to provide proper advertisement and information regarding the food to be disposed of, and to give equal opportunity to all responsible, established processors or distributors who may have an interest in its purchase, subject to the restriction that the original owner or vendor or the owners of a trade-mark or trade-name appearing on the package shall be given a prior opportunity to purchase the food, and thus protect the value of his trade-mark, if he feels it necessary. It also prevents discrimination in price or favoritism shown to one processor as against another.

A special provision avoids unnecessary red tape in the disposition of small lots of food, or lots that must be disposed of promptly to avoid spoiling or deterioration.

Section 7 (a): See comments on section 4.

Section 7 (b): If excess Government stocks are to be disposed of in an orderly fashion, it is important that speculators and fly-by-night operators be prevented from acquiring them and disposing of them in irresponsible fashion. This section therefore provides for the voluntary

registration of processors and distributors who may be interested in food stocks to be disposed of by the Government and restriction of such registration to those who are responsible, established firms regularly engaged in the handling of such foods. Discretion is left to the Administrator in such registration to allow for special situations such as the return to business of men from the armed forces who might otherwise be debarred from a favorable opportunity for reestablishing themselves because of their inability to show that they had been continuously engaged in such business while in the service of their country.

Section 7 (c): As noted in the comments in section 4, this paragraph attempts to make the advisory committee an active one and not, as has happened in some agencies, a committee on paper only whose advice is not followed. Frankly, some groups in the food industry would like to have seen this wording strengthened to the effect that the advisory committee could overrule the Administrator, but after due consideration it was agreed that a committee of businessmen had no one to whom it would be responsible, and it was therefore deemed impractical. In addition, it was felt that a Government official would resent being subjected to any such control of this nature by the industry. It was agreed that if the advisory committees were used properly this wording would be acceptable.

Section 8: In normal times the customary method of disposition of excess Government property has, of course, been contract sale to the highest bidder. It is obviously undesirable that excess food stocks in the hands of Government agencies at the close of the war be disposed of by this type of dumping operation. On the contrary, it is most important that suitable restrictions be imposed upon the prices at which excess foods are sold and the conditions of their sale to assure orderly marketing and to prevent disruption of the current orderly distribution of food through established channels.

This section also relieves the Administrator of the provisions of Federal law regulating the normal procedures in disposing of excess Government property, while retaining the requirements that Congress has imposed regarding the maintenance of prices to agricultural producers.

Sections 9 and 10: These sections are self-explanatory.

Section 11: As previously described, the bill imposes upon the Administrator the requirement of reporting to Congress at least quarterly upon his operations in exercising the authorities and carrying out the responsibilities delegated to him. This procedure has been notably useful, for example, in connection with lend-lease operations, in keeping Congress and the public informed regarding the actions of administrative officials to whom important authorities and responsibilities have been entrusted. It places Congress in a position quickly to become aware of and make necessary adjustments in operations that in its judgment fail to properly carry out its intent.

Section 12: This section confers an immunity necessary if the interests of the Government are to be served by making available the full benefits of knowledge and experience of practical businessmen in the operation of the program.

Section 13: The tenure specified in the bill takes into account on the one hand the necessity of promptly assuring producers, processors, and distributors of food a stable and continuing program that they can count upon to protect them from the disastrous consequences of wartime developments over which they have no control and, on the other hand, the desirability of proper review of the program and opportunity for modification and improvement of it after it has been in operation for a reasonable period.

Excerpts From Speeches and Resolutions Introduced Bearing on Polish-Russian Relations and the Rehabilitation of the Overrun Smaller Nations

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Fascists, isolationists, and pacifists who opposed President Roosevelt's defense program are now active in disseminating propaganda to the effect that Russia and England are working for a separate peace, thus seeking to destroy the accord and unity existing between the United Nations. For the past several weeks especially they have been harping upon the Russian policy with respect to the boundaries of Poland.

Believing from the very inception of the war that Russia will eventually drive the Nazis out of their country, free the people of the countries overrun by the Nazi hordes and tremendously aid in the final defeat of the Nazis, I have had every reason to believe the statements made by Marshal Stalin and other official representatives of Russia that none of the smaller countries would be deprived of their rights, lands, freedom, and liberty. Under leave granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD excerpts from my speeches touching on Polish-Russian relations which include the pledge and assurance of Marshal Stalin to Poland and the Polish people I also insert a resolution which I introduced during World War No. 1 to exclude Poles, Bohemians, and other nationals residing in the United States from the classification of alien enemies as subjects of Austria-Hungary, and my reason for inserting this resolution at this time is to direct attention to the fact that today our Government, even though Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and other countries are occupied by the Germans and suffering under the heel of Nazi oppression, does not regard the alien nationals of those countries residing in the United States as alien enemies of this country. The second resolution which I am including in the RECORD is one that I introduced on February 8, 1919, which provided that the United States establish diplomatic relations with Poland and Czechoslovakia. Shortly thereafter the recognition of both Poland and Czechoslovakia became an accomplished fact when Congress passed resolutions which were signed by President Wilson.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that not only the United Nations but Russia will aid to rehabilitate Poland and those countries which have been so ruthlessly destroyed and deprived of their freedom and liberty and that Poland, when peace will come, will emerge a still stronger and greater nation to take its place among the nations of the world in maintaining a permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert the speeches and resolutions, as follows:

POLISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS AND THE REHABILITATION OF THE OVERRUN SMALLER NATIONS

(January 20, 1944)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 401, to make in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 192, to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization and ask for its immediate consideration. The resolution aims to provide for millions of unfortunates—men, women, and children—who have been driven from their homes and deprived of all their possessions and are now roaming the countries of Europe from one end to the other. As I say, the amount provided for is restricted, and is based on this, that each of the 44 nations will contribute 1 percent of its national income. * * *

I feel it is not necessary for me to call attention to the plight of millions of Poles, Yugoslavs, French, Belgians, Greeks, Hollanders, and the peoples of the smaller countries, saying nothing of the outrageous atrocities practiced on them, and especially on the Jewish people, believing that is generally known and recognized by all of us. Never in the history of the world has the need for relief been so great as in this instance. Therefore I feel that we should provide those who have escaped the murderous hands of the Nazi and who are half-starving and suffering tortures beyond description, should have sufficient food, clothing, medical care, and, yes, shelter. Any help that will alleviate their suffering will be repaid tenfold. It will serve to prevent future hardships and will bring about their rehabilitation in all of the overridden countries. * * *

PLEA FOR UNITY AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY AMONG EUROPEAN NATIONS WHO WISH TO DEFEAT HITLERISM

(December 14, 1943)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, * * * I am immensely pleased that my oft-repeated assurance that Russia will never be inveigled into a separate peace with Germany and will stand honorably and steadfastly with the United Nations, not only to accomplish complete destruction of the Nazi-Jap militarism, but also to bring about a lasting and just peace, and freedom and liberty to the Nazi-overrun nations. And, furthermore, that

there will be complete cooperation to reestablish their freedom and liberty and a real democratic form of government.

It should be remembered that since the two most despotic maniacs, Hitler and Mussolini, appeared upon the stage of world prominence, it has been Soviet Russia that has repeatedly and persistently demanded collective security and the formation of a protective alliance of the peoples and governments of European democratic nations to challenge fascism and nazi-ism and to stop the expanding and approaching danger of vicious aggressive conspiracy.

Had the alliance of European nations, as sponsored by the statesmen, been effected in time, and had President Wilson's plea been heeded by our Senate to enter the League of Nations, it would most probably have prevented this terrible global tragedy.

Those of you who have followed my activities in Congress will recall my activities in behalf of the independence of the smaller nations and my continuous and urgent demands for unity and collective security among those European nations who wished to defeat Hitlerism, and I am taking the liberty of repeating my remarks made on the floor of the House of Representatives on March 18, 1938:

"Three years ago (that was in 1935) I voiced the belief that a secret or tacit agreement existed between Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan, but my warnings went unheeded.

"* * * There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Hitler, Mussolini, and the raving-mad Japanese war lords are in conspiracy to divide the entire world among themselves, or at least as much of it as they can manage to grab."

Again I call attention to the fact that I made this statement in 1938.

Their pretended fear of communism served the Nazi propagandists as a camouflage to conceal their dastardy intention to create disruption and disharmony among the nations of the world, to strain friendly relations between the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia. They heralded all over America and in neutral countries the bug-a-bear that on the defeat of Germany the whole of Europe and America would be dominated by the international Communist dictators. This was answered by Stalin's dissolution of the Communist International Comintern. He made this statement:

"The dissolution of the Communist International Comintern facilities the work of patriots in freedom-loving countries in uniting the progressive forces of their respective countries, regardless of party or religious faith, into a single camp for national liberation, for unfolding the struggle against fascism, against the menace of world domination by Hitlerism, thus clearing the way to future organization of companionship of nations based upon their equality. I feel that the disssolution of the Communist International Comintern is perfectly timely because it is exactly now, when the Fascist beast is exerting its last strength that it is necessary to organize the common onslaught of freedom-loving countries to finish off this beast and deliver the people from Fascist oppression."

It is also timely to quote from Stalin's statement made regarding Russia's war aims. They are:

"1. Liberation of occupied European countries, including Poland, France, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Greece.

"2. Liberated countries must be allowed to choose their own form of government.

"3. All war criminals must be punished.

"4. Such order must be created that no future attempt at world domination can be made by Germany.

"5. Establishment of full collaboration among the nations of Europe on the basis of full mutual trust, which will make any future aggression impossible."

For years the Nazi-Fascist propagandists were spreading falsehoods and misrepresentations of facts in an effort to influence our people into believing that the Government of Soviet Russia is not founded upon democratic principles of justice, that freedom is brutally suppressed, and that only a small minority of the Russian people are loyal to the Soviet system of government. The facts are the exact opposite. No government enjoys the whole-hearted support of its people as does the Russian Government. I wish to God we had the unity the Russians enjoy.

There are no Quislings, no traitors, no fifth columnists in Russia. When the German Army treacherously invaded Russia it was met by the Russian people, 170,000,000 of them, united in courage, in spirit, and in determination. They are heroically ridding their beloved country of the barbaric invaders according to plan. Yes, the Russian plan!

Again, I wish to quote Stalin in connection with the pernicious accusations by the Nazis that Russia is secretly trying to communize the world and dominate the European continent and America:

"We haven't, we can't have, such a purpose in this war as the conquest of foreign territories, of foreign peoples in Europe, Asia, including Iraq. We cannot have such a purpose as to impose our will and Slavonic regime on the other enslaved peoples of Europe."

Of course we all know that Russia was compelled to enter into its treaty of nonaggression with Nazi Germany to gain time. She was not prepared for war, and she used the precious intervening time to mobilize her Army, organize her industry, and fortify her frontier. This, however, did not prevent her from giving continuous aid to stricken China.

President Roosevelt in acclaiming the results of the Moscow Conference expressed the belief that Soviet Russia is anxious to cooperate with the United States, Britain, and all United Nations in the war and peace. I am satisfied that the vast majority of our American people fully recognize the great achievements and progress made by the Soviet Government within the short space of 26 years, and that they, too, hail the Moscow conference as a harbinger of a new world cooperation and everlasting peace.

The hour of Russia's triumph over German greed and barbarity is not far distant. I am proud, indeed, to have been privileged to make some little contribution to the better understanding of that great and gallant people. They have earned the right to the fullest measure of lasting peace and prosperity. God grant that what is coming to them—and to the whole world—be not long delayed.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

(May 3, 1943)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker * * * I wish to commend our colleague from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] who, besides his diligent efforts in behalf of his constituency and his work as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, has striven to enlist the help and interest of liberty-loving Americans in the welfare and reestablishment of the Polish Republic. My congratulations are also extended to our colleagues the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], now presiding over the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHUETZ], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN], all of whom have so inspiringly expressed their views looking to the reestablishment of the Polish Republic in the near future. I am naturally especially interested that Poland should again obtain its freedom and liberty because I know that having felt the harsh hand of oppression it will inspire all other minority countries and they will help to cooperate to bring about the elimination of intolerance toward all.

As a Member of Congress I was proud in actively supporting and voting for a congressional appropriation for the erection of a monument in honor of our great Polish-American revolutionary heroes—Kosciusko and Pulaski—and to be present at the dedication and unveiling ceremonies. As one who aided and cooperated with the great Polish leaders of years gone by, Paderewski, Lechinski, and others in 1918, and as one who had the opportunity and the privilege to witness President Wilson advocating and urging the freedom of Poland and the liberty of all the small nations I was greatly inspired, but recently greatly grieved that finally, through no fault of Poland, the Polish Republic was overrun by the Nazi hordes, not because the people of that Republic were not desircus of defending their independence, but because of the unfortunate conspiracy action on the part of the Nazis, French-Nazi leaders, and British pacifiers who refused Poland the right to rearm and to defend herself as the people were desirous of doing. If they had permitted Poland to rearm in time and had agreed that Russia should be permitted to cross Poland to aid Czechoslovakia it is quite possible that Poland as well as Czechoslovakia and the other small nations would be free today or would not have been so wantonly attacked and their homes and lands so distressingly laid waste. Consequently, there is no one here or anywhere who regrets more than I that Poland and the smaller nations were so ruthlessly despoiled of their liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that in the near future the United States will again as she did under President Wilson, be helpful in bringing about the reestablishment of the great Polish Republic and thereby also aid in bringing about the independence and freedom of all the other peoples, not only in Europe but wherever they are seeking freedom and liberty.

POLISH LEADERS SHOULD NOT FORGET TREATMENT ACCORDED POLES IN PRUSSIA

(March 18, 1938)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to the war I was a staunch advocate of the League of Nations, which, I firmly believe, would have prevented international lawlessness or at least minimized all future danger of war.

Hitler, demanding the return of Germany's lost colonies, only cloaked his purpose of European aggression, and it was long ago clear that he would one day climax the years of planned propaganda in Austria by an invasion of that country. His seizure of Austria is but a prelude of more ambitious plans. Peace- and liberty-loving Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and the other small independent nations now see his shadow across their lands—Memel, Danzig, and the Polish Corridor, Alsace-Lorraine, and the much-desired Ukraine.

For the time being, engaged in consolidating his gains, he may utter reassuring words to Poland and Yugoslavia. But they have only to recall his utter disregard of treaties, and his oft-repeated statements as to his ultimate aims, to realize how necessary it is that they prepare to resist invasion, for invasion is bound to come.

Great Britain, rather late, is commencing to realize its danger. Does Poland realize her danger?

The leaders in Poland might well hearken back to other days, and consider the former treatment of Poles in Prussia. I remember in 1908 how Prussia prohibited, by edict, the teaching of the Polish language in their own schools, and how they proposed in their Parliament a compulsory dispossession of the homes of Polanders. For 2,000 years the Poles and their fathers before them had occupied this land, but notwithstanding and in contravention of the Congress of Vienna of 1815, and in violation of Prussia's organic laws prohibiting distinctions between citizens of the Kingdom, that Kingdom's Parliament even then showed its prejudice and discrimination against the Polish.

At the time I speak of, Congressman Arthur L. Bates, of Pennsylvania, was impelled to introduce into this House a resolution extending good wishes and sympathy to the Poles in Prussia in their efforts to maintain their property rights.

Recalling this, and viewing the present prejudice which governs in Germany, Poland should properly estimate the future insofar as her relations with that country are concerned.

[65th Cong., 3d sess.; H. J. Res. 408; In the House of Representatives, February 8, 1919; Mr. SABATH introduced the following joint resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed]

Joint resolution establishing diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia and Poland

Whereas Czechoslovakia and Poland have established permanent governments and have been recognized by the Government of the United States as independent states: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That diplomatic relations be established between the Government of the United States and said governments by the appointment by the President of the United States of an Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to each of the said states.

[65th Cong., 2d sess.; H. J. Res. 181; In the House of Representatives, December 7, 1917; Mr. SABATH introduced the following joint resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed]

Joint resolution providing that Poles, Bohemians, Moravians, Slovaks, Rumanians, Ruthenians, Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes, and Italians be, and are, specifically excluded from the classification of alien enemies as subjects of Austria-Hungary

Whereas this Congress, upon the recommendation of the President of the United States, has declared that a state of war exists between the United States and Austria-Hungary; and

Whereas certain states and provinces within the Empire of Austria-Hungary have been subjugated to its rule without their consent and against the wishes of the inhabitants; and

Whereas the peoples of these states and provinces, to wit, the Bohemians, Moravians, Slovaks, Ruthenians, Poles, Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes, Italians, and Rumanians, suffering from the persecution and oppressions inflicted upon them by the Empire of Austria-Hungary, have sought and been given the haven of these United States in very large numbers; and

Whereas these people gratefully appreciate the shelter and opportunities given them by the United States and are now eager and anxious to serve this country in its present grave crisis; and

Whereas throughout the breadth and length of this country thousands of men of these races have enlisted in the several branches of the armed forces of this country to sustain and aid it in the holy fight for democracy and the freedom of all nations, large and small; and

Whereas many more thousands of the men of these races have been called to serve and are now serving under and by virtue of the Selective Draft Act; and

Whereas the said Bohemians, Moravians, Slovaks, Ruthenians, Poles, Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes, Italians, and Rumanians are technically considered subjects of Austria-Hungary, which status is beyond their control and contrary to their wishes; and

Whereas by the declaration by this Congress that a state of war exists between the United States and Austria-Hungary these said Bohemians, Moravians, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenians, Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes, Italians, and Rumanians at present serving this country in the several branches of its armed forces who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, or who, having declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, have never become fully naturalized, are immediately considered alien enemies, thereby being restrained in their patriotic desire to serve this country whole-heartedly and devotedly and to give their all to aid the cause of humanity and democracy; and

Whereas they and all other people of these states and provinces who are noncombatants would be barred from entering, working, conducting business, or residing within certain territories prohibited to alien enemies; and

Whereas such condition would cause a grave wrong and irreparable injury to peoples whose loyalty and devotion to this country stands unquestioned and unchallenged, and who unselfishly and unreservedly have upheld the cause of the Allied Powers against the Central Powers: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the said Bohemians, Moravians, Slovaks, Ruthenians, Poles, Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes, Italians, and Rumanians, be, and they are hereby, specifically excluded from the classification of alien enemies wherever such classification now exists, as to the subjects of Austria-Hungary, by reason of any act of Congress of the United States or regulations established by the President of the United States and under such rules and regulations as the President may from time to time promulgate.

SEC. 2. That the said Bohemians, Moravians, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenians, Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes, Italians, and Rumanians shall not be barred from the armed forces of the United States due to their status as (unwilling) subjects of Austria-Hungary and that they shall be subject to the operation of the Selective Draft Act.

Smear Attacks by Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 26, 1944

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over the Blue Network Sunday, March 26, 1944:

My fellow Americans, I asked for time on this program because of certain false statements made about me and the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am chairman. I do not intend to exchange insults with Mr. Winchell. I do not question anyone's right to criticize Congress. While I am interested in replying to the false statements many times repeated on this program, I am more concerned to fix the attention of the American people on one of the most sinister forces this Nation has ever faced—a highly organized and well-financed enterprise to destroy by villification the character of any public man who gets in the way of the objectives of the groups who manage and finance this offensive.

It is difficult in a few minutes to describe the technique of these men. We are at war. Treason and sedition are ugly words. These specialists in villification would not dare charge reputable men with sedition. But they have found a means by which, through innuendo and indirection, they can select a victim and smear him with the odium of treason while skirting the edge of libel laws. Let me illustrate this.

First, they find an offender who is really guilty of sedition. Then, without charging you with that offense, they merely mention your name repeatedly in connection with his. They identify you with his guilt by indirection. Recently the Government indicted 30 people for sedition. Using these persons as a base, Mr. Winchell tells you about them in such a way as to leave with you the impression that I and my committee are protecting them. He infers that the committee had information about them which it deliberately withheld. Another time he says in his column that I am planning to investigate him and will time the investigation to coincide with the date of their trial in order to distract public attention from their guilt and create a reasonable doubt in their favor. Then he tells you our committee has done nothing to expose American Fascist groups.

What he is saying in all this, by innuendo, is that I am shielding Nazis and plotting to divert attention from their trial after deserting my sworn duty to investigate them.

Actually the facts are precisely the reverse. Our committee began its work in August 1938. Since then we have examined 178 witnesses whose testimony dealt wholly with Axis activities. That testimony fills over 4,000 printed pages. We have seized their files. Our records are one of the most extensive in existence on the subject. We have issued seven reports on Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese agents here. We have opened them to the press. Mr. Winchell himself has used them, and when he did I thanked him as I did other reporters and commentators. In the last 3 years 5,597 agents from the F. B. I., Naval and Military Intelligence, and other Government agencies have come to our Washington office for information. Our regional offices in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles have similarly aided thousands of Federal agents.

Mr. Winchell has talked a lot about the forthcoming trial of the 30 persons indicted for sedition in Washington. He has said this committee did nothing to aid the Government. No man knowing the facts would make such a statement. Prior to the indictment, Mr. O. John Rogge, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, came to our offices with his agents and worked for several weeks, and our committee turned over to them over 900 documents to be used as evidence. These consist chiefly of the files of the indicted persons seized by our committee in

1938, 1939, and 1940. An official of the Department of Justice recently stated that 75 percent of the evidence to be used in these trials was supplied by our committee. Our committee exposed Bund Leaders Kuhn and Kunze and they went to jail. We exposed a flock of German and Italian agencies, whereupon the Government closed their consulates and sent their agents to jail or out of the country. Our committee exposed, long ago, William Dudley Pelley, George E. Deatherage, James True, Parker Sage, William R. Lyman, Garland Alderman, and others now under indictment. Now, in the presence of these facts, why does Mr. Winchell say we are protecting these people?

Well, let me clear this up. These smearers are not interested in exposing Nazi agents here. That job has already been thoroughly done by the F. B. I., the Naval and Military Intelligence units and our committee. They are interested in using the exposure of these Nazi agents to destroy their political opponents by linking through innuendo the names of reputable and loyal citizens to these Nazi agents to punish them because of their opposition to the objectives of this "smear bund." My crime is not my failure to expose the Nazi and Fascist agencies, because the public records show I have exposed them. My crime is my refusal to join in the conspiracy of character assassination by using the power of our committee to smear loyal citizens. It is my insistence on investigating, as well, Communist Party members and fellow travellers and those who echo their party line.

Now, I want to say this, Mr. Winchell is not in himself important. For a number of years he has made a living peddling bedroom keyhole scandal to the American people. Now, of course, a man in that business can get an enormous audience on the radio. Mr. Winchell with his big audience also has a political value. He can be used as a transmission belt to deliver political propaganda, handing it on, sandwiched in between his collection of divorces, infidelities and other social derelictions. In this case Mr. Winchell is being used as a transmission belt to deliver into millions of ears damaging statements, half truths, cunningly slanted implications designed to impugn the loyalty and to destroy the characters of American public men who oppose the objectives of these groups and to break down confidence in the Congress of the United States.

I hope Mr. Winchell will not say that he is not being so used. Because he has freely, though perhaps unconsciously, admitted it. Only last Sunday he told us that someone had charged that he had been kicked out of the Navy. I do not know whether he was kicked out or not. I am not interested. But I am interested in his own account of his departure from the Navy. He said he had been removed from active to inactive duty "for reasons which cannot be told until after the war." Here are his own words: "When I demanded active duty for the fourth time, I was instructed to stay on the radio with the following words: 'Some men must go overseas to be shot and some must stay over here to be stabbed in the back.'" Now, I ask, who told Walter Winchell that? He says he cannot tell until the war ends. But he admits he is under orders from some powerful person, from whom he is willing to take orders, to stay on the radio. For what purpose? To sell beauty preparations as a part of the war effort? Of course not. He was ordered to stay on the radio to do what he is doing—to carry on the work of the "smear bund," to intimidate its opponents and to discredit the Congress. But who is this "smear bund"? Who is this great personage with so much power that he can reach into the Navy to keep Mr. Winchell on the air and off the sea for propaganda purposes; and who is so exalted that his name cannot be breathed until the war ends? Who are these other groups leagued with him in this strange, un-American enterprise of smearing men into silence? What are their objectives?

The President appeals to the American people for unity. But at the same time this man is busy weekly on the air, daily in the papers, hurling insults which impugn the patriotism and loyalty of the Congress and the various public leaders, and the people who elect them.

Typical of these insults which Mr. Winchell has broadcast in the past 2 years is the following: "The only trouble with the sedition indictments is that while the defendants are in court some of their supporters are still in Congress." Then, again, he said, "What the country needs are some more criminal trials or, better still, impeachments, especially among the men who make and break their own laws." A new low was reached on September 7, 1942, when he stated: "Many of Hitler's American pals have been arrested but too many have been renominated." Also on the air he has used the phrase "cheap and vulgar politicians in Congress" in reference to the Members of that body. He has been equally vicious and untrue in statements appearing in his column where he has written: "Congress includes some of the sorriest 'stumblebums' in the Nation." And only a few weeks ago he referred to the House of Representatives as the "house of reprehensibles." What, I ask, in the name of fairness, is accomplished for unity by such attacks? Who is responsible for this? I think the people want to know. If Mr. Winchell is a tool, who is handling that tool? It must be obvious to every fair minded and patriotic citizen that such false and malicious attacks tend to undermine the confidence of the people in the legislative branch of our Government. What could be a greater disservice to this country in time of war?

Mr. Winchell, you have had much to say about tolerance. What could be more intolerant than these un-American attacks? Such attacks are the chief characteristics of fascism and the very essence of intolerance. You, Mr. Winchell, seem to have forgotten that those who expect tolerance from others should practice tolerance themselves.

This would be serious if Mr. Winchell were the only Charlie McCarthy of the "smear bund." He is, however, only one of many. Who are they? Who is behind them? The American people would like to know, and I promise you that Congress will soon find out.

One word more. I have spoken of smearing men. That is the smallest part of this subversive offensive. Congress is the last bulwark of your freedom. Win the war for freedom and destroy the power of Congress and you will have lost your freedom. Now I warn you that there is in this country a carefully organized and integrated and dangerously intelligent and aggressive movement to undermine the authority and destroy the prestige of Congress in the interest of setting up an all-powerful central executive. This program of vilification is part of that. Our committee has already exposed many of the persons and organizations who form this movement. In a short time we will expose many others and before we get through we are going to tell you the full story. We are going to find out and tell you who is supplying the brains and who is paying the bills.

Fellow Americans, we are really fighting two wars. One is a war of men, guns, tanks, planes, and ships. The other is a war of ideologies, rumors, intolerance, character assassinations, subversive activities, and propaganda that seek to destroy representative government. We must win both of these wars to preserve our freedom and guarantee that when my boy and your boy and our loved ones return from this awful conflict they will find the same Stars and Stripes waving triumphantly over the same institutions of freedom for which they fought and bled and for which their gallant comrades died.

Faulty Distribution of Oilseed Meals

REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country are engaged in the biggest food production effort in the history of agriculture. The responsible governmental agencies are making daily appeals to the farmers to produce more and still more. The response evidences a desire to comply with this governmental request. There are, however, some things going on in connection with this program that the farmer cannot understand. He writes to his Representatives in Congress and says, "How can I produce more when you take my help from me? How can I produce more when you take my help and yet fail to offset this loss by refusing me adequate machinery? How can I produce more when the Government directs the flow of essential oilseed meals to areas where it will not produce as much as I can produce?"

Mr. Speaker, these are real and vital problems to farmers in the great Middle West, which is actually the bread basket for the world today. I shall deal with one of them.

The War Food Administration is charged with the responsibility of formulating this vital program. It has the power to regulate the distribution of essential feeds where it wills. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not doing a very good job at this time. The tables below have been prepared by me from information furnished by the Chief of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Mr. N. E. Dodd.

I make the charge that there is a serious default in the distribution of these feeds. At the present time they are not going into the best food producing areas as appears from the tables.

Table III shows the 20 leading States in livestock food production. Iowa tops the list in the big six, followed by Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Texas. Yet in the distribution of these feeds Iowa is fourth, Illinois is third, and Minnesota is ninth, Wisconsin is fourteenth, Missouri is eighth, and Texas is first. Why, this kind of distribution if the Department of Agriculture is interested in producing more food? Why not put it where it will do the most good?

Now examine table II. You will note that Mississippi ranks seventh in feeds received, yet it is twentieth in volume of food produced. North Carolina is thirteenth on list for receiving oil seed meals, yet occupies the nineteenth place of foods produced. Other examples of

faulty distribution can be seen by quick glance at the tables, so further citation is unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion, that this problem is charged with politics and if not corrected the food program for 1944 will be seriously impaired. The time to act is now. On December 2, 1943, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 59 which aims to correct the abuses indicated herein; it would order the War Food Administration to direct the flow of necessary oil meal feeds to those States where they will do the most good. Further, it will prevent Government politicians from playing politics with the feed business.

TABLE I.—*Distribution of oilseed meals, by States, March 1944*

	By processors	By War Food Administration	Total	Livestock products sales, 1942
Alabama	9,038	1,800	10,838	54,784
Arizona	2,456	1,200	3,656	40,181
Arkansas	8,296	2,400	10,696	77,601
California	16,496	9,000	25,496	361,715
Colorado	1,955	2,000	3,955	137,346
Connecticut	656	410	1,066	53,304
Delaware	1,906	300	2,206	47,835
Florida	4,052	90	4,142	36,933
Georgia	9,449	1,800	11,249	67,817
Idaho	260	1,000	1,260	84,285
Illinois	29,514	5,100	34,614	626,499
Indiana	8,313	2,500	10,813	411,313
Iowa	22,139	7,000	29,939	1,011,392
Kansas	6,782	6,000	12,782	348,132
Kentucky	4,220	1,500	5,720	143,817
Louisiana	4,833	2,000	6,833	43,704
Maine	130	150	280	35,561
Maryland	2,248	2,100	4,348	72,546
Massachusetts	1,575	500	2,075	70,233
Michigan	2,168	2,500	4,668	241,004
Minnesota	18,338	2,000	20,338	532,486
Mississippi	12,899	2,300	23,199	54,214
Missouri	14,935	7,000	21,935	442,669
Montana	570	500	1,070	88,524
Nebraska	8,018	3,500	11,518	333,427
Nevada		200	200	16,826
New Hampshire	572	300	872	23,988
New Jersey	1,903	900	2,803	85,201
New Mexico	1,700	4,000	5,700	55,117
New York	32,910	8,000	40,910	341,578
North Carolina	10,415	3,500	13,915	67,103
North Dakota	490	150	640	116,781
Ohio	18,262	6,000	24,262	399,171
Oklahoma	13,437	3,000	16,437	195,767
Oregon	1,748	2,000	19,748	100,429
Pennsylvania	8,598	4,300	12,898	287,126
Rhode Island	60	60	120	9,334
South Carolina	5,668	600	6,268	30,884
South Dakota	880	510	1,390	172,951
Tennessee	14,343	2,400	16,743	112,692
Texas	43,141	12,000	55,141	421,449
Utah	590	1,200	1,790	54,169
Vermont	1,830	1,620	3,450	51,209
Virginia	3,739	1,500	5,239	106,926
Washington	3,177	3,000	6,177	115,356
West Virginia	280	600	880	48,567
Wisconsin	8,432	5,000	13,432	515,925
Wyoming	180	1,800	2,600	47,726

TABLE II.—*Distribution of oilseed meals in 20 States, March 1944*

	Total tons received	Total livestock products sale, 1942
1. Texas	55,141	421,449
2. New York	40,910	341,578
3. Illinois	34,614	626,499
4. Iowa	29,939	1,011,392
5. California	25,496	361,715
6. Ohio	24,262	399,171
7. Mississippi	23,199	54,214
8. Missouri	21,935	442,669
9. Minnesota	20,338	532,486
10. Oregon	19,748	100,429
11. Tennessee	16,743	112,692
12. Oklahoma	16,437	195,767
13. North Carolina	13,915	67,103
14. Wisconsin	13,432	515,925
15. Pennsylvania	12,898	287,126
16. Kansas	12,782	348,132
17. Nebraska	11,518	333,427
18. Georgia	11,249	67,817
19. Indiana	10,813	411,313
20. Arkansas	10,696	77,601

TABLE III.—*Twenty States producing largest volume livestock products, 1944*

1. Iowa	1,011,392
2. Illinois	626,499
3. Minnesota	532,486
4. Wisconsin	515,925
5. Missouri	442,669
6. Texas	421,449
7. Indiana	411,313
8. Ohio	399,171
9. California	361,715
10. Kansas	348,132
11. New York	341,578
12. Nebraska	333,427
13. Pennsylvania	287,126
14. Oklahoma	195,767
15. Tennessee	112,692
16. Oregon	100,429
17. Arkansas	77,601
18. Georgia	67,817
19. North Carolina	67,103
20. Mississippi	54,214

[78th Cong., 1st sess.; H. Con. Res. 59; in the House of Representatives, December 2, 1943; Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency]

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the War Food Administrator or any other officer or agency of the Government, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation—

(1) in acquiring, selling, or otherwise disposing of protein meal; or

(2) in imposing upon processors, grinders, or other persons any requirements or restrictions with respect to the sale or other disposition or the shipment, delivery, or distribution of protein meal,

should so act as to insure distribution of protein meal among the several States on the basis of, and in proportion to, the livestock units in such States.

L. S. M. F. T.

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. L. S. M. F. T.—L. S. M. F. T. This well-known Lucky Strike selling radio slogan has been dinned into the ears of the American people for months past. The Hartford Courant suggests that the connotation of those initials be changed to stand for Less Spending Means Fewer Taxes. L. S. M. F. T.—Less Spending Means Fewer Taxes. American taxpayers would respond to this rallying call.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by adding this editorial from the Hartford Courant of March 18 of this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

"L. S. M. F. T."

It may be taking an almost unfair advantage of a citizenry still weakened by their bout with Form 1040, and still with that worn and palsied feeling as though they had been put through the wringer—in many instances, literally true. Nonetheless, this is as propitious a moment as any in which to speak of governmental expenditures to those who have just paid through the nose.

We Americans have become virtually caloused and shock proof when it comes to Government spending. Nobody begrudges for an instant the necessary war expenditures, which incidentally amounted in February alone, to more than $7,800,000,000, or better than $300,000,000 a day. But, aside from that, for the past decade or more, money has been dispensed from Washington with all the abandon of the fictional Mr. Brewster trying to throw away his millions—only nowadays we do it with billions. Reflect soberly on the fact that last year the Federal Government spent $88,000,000,000, a sum impossible to visualize.

Not all of this went for necessary or even desirable ends. Some of it went to pay the salaries of thousands of officeholders living fatly on overstuffed Government pay rolls. Other millions went for housing projects that will never be used. Blithely Government officials toss away a mere $135,000,000 on the Canol project in the Canadian wilderness. And even more recently Secretary Ickes speaks of another paltry $165,000,000 for an oil pipe line in Arabia.

Some of these fantastic expenditures in themselves would normally constitute a major national financial scandal. Such, for example, is the case of Basic Magnesium, Inc., on which the Government squandered $133,000,000 in a transaction that the Truman committee has described as "the most outrageous and unjustified contract proposed in connection with the war program * * * a wholly unwarranted gift of Government funds to a newly organized corporation that had no financial resources and only the most meager experience." Where this money went may be gaged by the fact that Basic Magnesium had 700 "executives" on its pay roll, of whom 100 received salaries in excess of $5,000 a year.

The list could be almost indefinitely extended to prove conclusively that our Government has gone hog wild in spending, so that not even Congress has any idea of how the money is spent or even who is spending it.

Some of the realities of this situation were confronted by the average citizen on March 15 when he went through the financial wringer. If the pain seemed great, remember—this is only the beginning. It would be well for the country if those in high places adopted for awhile the well-known, cigarette-selling radio slogan that has been dinned into the ears of the American people for months past. That is "L. S. M. F. T.," and by this time you hardly need to translate it for the average listener-in.

Our suggestion is that the connotation of those initials be changed to stand for: "Less Spending Means Fewer Taxes." This is a rallying call to which wide-awake American citizens would gladly respond.

Civil Aeronautics Board's Interpretation of Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, Strait-Jackets American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the interpretation which has been placed on the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by the Civil Aeronautics Board places the American merchant marine in a strait jacket which destroys its ability to compete with other maritime nations. This will ultimately stifle the American merchant marine.

The building and maintenance of a strong American merchant marine is as fundamental to our national defense as is the building and maintenance of a strong Navy. The merchant marine is one of the four main links in our chain of national defense, composed of the Army, the Navy, the merchant marine, and the air service. It is the link in this chain that provides the sinews to both our Army and Navy. Without an adequate merchant marine, our Army overseas and our Navy would both be helpless. It is therefore absolutely essential that we build and maintain the finest possible merchant marine to strengthen our national defense.

Before the war the United States produced at least 10 percent more goods than it consumed. The technological advances made during the war makes it now appear that we may produce even more when our peacetime economy is restored. These surplus commodities must be sold in foreign markets. Our merchant marine is the agency that finds these foreign markets and we must encourage this development of our postwar trade to give employment in this country. The limitations placed upon our merchant marine by the decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board must be removed and if the C. A. B. refuses to do this, then other administrative or legislative means must be utilized to overcome the decisions of the C. A. B. It should not be permitted to thwart national interests as a whole.

No right-minded person would seek to retard the development of American aviation, either domestic or foreign, by reason of what it means to our Nation's security in time of war, as well as to our economy in time of peace. By the same token this applies equally to our merchant marine, the efficiency of which must not be destroyed to benefit aviation.

Those who have the genuine interest of American aviation at heart will recognize the interdependence of aviation and our merchant marine in transoceanic commerce, in the same manner that aviation interests of friendly foreign maritime nations have, and they will encourage the removal of this strait jacket from our merchant marine. When the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was under consideration in the House of Representatives, amendments to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 were also being considered. At that time, the President of the Air Transport Association of America, testified before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—page 24 of the hearings of March 22, 1938—as follows:

> If the shipping or any other transportation companies wish to engage in air transportation, there is no reason why they should stand on any different basis from any other person desiring to enter this business.

It was generally understood at that time that our merchant marine would be able to compete in the field of transoceanic air transportation. Subsequently, however, the Civil Aeronautics Board chose to interpret the intent of Congress to suit its own views as indicated in an address made on November 11, 1943, by Mr. Harllee Branch, a member of the C. A. B., when he said:

> The Board has determined that the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act rigidly restrict the participation of the older forms of transportation in the air-transport field, and this determination is amply supported by well-established congressional policy.

Another member of the C. A. B., Mr. Oswald Ryan, has expressed his opinion by the statement:

> Thus, a construction of the Civil Aeronautics Act which rigidly limits the participation of a surface carrier in the air-transport field to cases where the surface carrier is enabled to use aircraft in its own operation to public advantage is in harmony with the well-established pre-existing congressional policy.

The complete indifference of these gentlemen with reference to international trade and its problems is clearly shown in these two statements. They have attempted to interpret congressional policy as laid down over a period of years on domestic transportation where complete Government regulation can be maintained, so as to apply to the transoceanic field where regulation by our Government cannot be maintained except as it applies to our own merchant marine.

There is no more highly competitive field of economic endeavor than international maritime commerce. Our merchant marine has survived this competition because we have attempted to overcome the handicaps placed upon us. But it is impossible to meet the competition other maritime nations will create by the operation of air-transport lines through surface carriers, unless we follow that same course. Our economy and our national defense demand that we encourage the development of air transport by surface carriers on parallel lines.

Federally Owned Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following declaration of policy as to federally owned lands by the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors. This declaration of policy clearly sets forth the position of the local governments in my district regarding what is undoubtedly the most serious single problem faced by the county governments of the mountain counties of California:

DECLARATION OF POLICY AS TO FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS

To all lovers of justice and the American way of life, whithersoever dispersed:

It is an unfortunate but peculiar trait of human nature that the average person seldom shows a sympathetic interest in the woes and tribulations of his neighbor until he unexpectedly finds himself afflicted with the same malady. But when that does occur, he often emits a lustier howl than the original sufferer.

This experience has been particularly true in the history of the Federal land problem. Small counties like Tuolumne, whose economic future have been seriously menaced by reason of an extremely constricted tax base, have struggled and fought for many years in an apparently vain attempt to gain two objectives—general recognition of their plight and Federal redress for their grievances.

Progress was painfully slow until the outbreak of the present World War. Then, with the tremendous acquisition of private properties for military purposes, other communities which had enjoyed an immunity from Federal "landitis" awoke to the realization that their tax rolls were being encroached upon to the extent of many millions of dollars. The former indifference has completely vanished and in its place a mighty clamor is heard from coast to coast for an equitable adjustment of the Federal land problem.

However, the smaller counties, who were the pioneers in the movement, again find themselves laboring under a disadvantage and in actual danger of being shoved aside in the process of obtaining Federal restitution for wrongs inflicted upon local government. This danger lies in the objection that has been raised to full compensation for counties in which Federal holdings consist mainly of national forest and park lands or other lands which have never been placed on the local tax rolls.

This objection, or contention, is based upon a false assumption, and is grievously unjust to those counties which, through no fault of their own, have been deprived of their potential tax bases. In humble imitation of a famous and historic doctrine dear to every patriotic American heart, we hold these truths to be self-evident, namely, that all the political subdivisions of these United States were created on an equal basis, and that they were endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights was the privilege and opportunity of expanding their tax bases until all the lands within their borders had gone on the tax rolls, thus forming an adequate and substantial revenue for the perpetuation of their local governments.

Practically all the States east of the Mississippi River exercised this right. By denying this privilege to western States, the people of the West have not only lost a birthright, but have suffered a rank discrimination.

There is another moral issue involved which many well-meaning people have failed to grasp. It is an established and accepted code of ethics that no person may be deprived of his rights or possessions without an opportunity to protest the proposed seizure. The same great principle should apply to political entities. By acts of Congress and without the consent of the people directly affected, many political subdivisions

were suddenly deprived forever of the opportunity to expand their tax base. In Tuolumne County, for example, 70 percent of the potential tax base was wiped out.

It is not our purpose or desire to quarrel with the conservation policies of the Government, but if these vast areas are to be held for the use and enjoyment of the people of the United States as a whole, then the Federal Government which represents all the people should make suitable amends for the injustice done innocent citizens whose only fault was in making the mistake of building their homes in a region abounding in natural resources and scenic beauty.

There are some who callously feel that Tuolumne County should be induced to wind up its affairs and die as a political subdivision. Such persons either forget or ignore the fact that it was this section which cradled California and made it possible for her to join the great sisterhood of American States while still an infant in years. Let no one imagine for a moment that our Union was preserved in the dark days of the Civil War because the Americans of the North were more courageous and intelligent than the Americans of the South. The northerners won because they had a bountiful stream of gold flowing into their coffers, and that gold came from Tuolumne County and the other counties of the mother lode—all little counties today.

These counties are proud of their past and hopeful for the future. They do not ask for pity or charity. All they ask is simple justice in order that they may continue to function as self-respecting American communities. To this end they invite the support and cooperation of every individual and group who believe in the perpetuation of local government as opposed to bureaucratic control, and who fully realize that the great chain of American counties is no stronger than its weakest link in a moral sense.

T. E. HUNT,
F. J. DONDERO,
ERNEST H. HODGE,
M. C. MERRELL,
W. F. KNOOP,
Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors.

Attest:

C. A. DAMBACHER,
Clerk.

The Next Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Glenn E. Bunnell, editor of the Stuart (Nebr.) Advocate. In presenting this eritorial I wish to say that Mr. Bunnell is a man particularly free from political bias. It is certain he reflects the thinking of a great majority of the men and women on the farms and in the smaller towns of Nebraska. It follows:

THE EDITOR'S COLUMN

(By Glenn E. Bunnell)

As we approach the coming Presidential campaign the people seem to divide themselves into three general groups. There are, of course, subdivisions of these groups, but for the present we will consider only the three large units of thought.

First. There is the group composed of New Dealers who favor Roosevelt for a fourth term.

Second. There is a group of conservative, old-guard Democrats who want to see the party stay in power under a new leader.

Third. The ever-growing group who favor the complete or clean sweep of the present administration and the election of a Republican President.

It is between the first and third groups that the main battle will be joined. The second group, while quite numerous, seems to lack any great strength.

The planks in the two platforms will be many, but for the most part they will have some bearing on the winning of the war, making the peace, and post-war readjustment.

The big argument of the first faction will be based on the old adage about it being unwise to change horses in the middle of the stream. However, the third school of thought will point out that while changing horses in midstream may not always be wise, it would be well to change if the horse you are on does not seem to be getting any nearer to the other shore. In such a case it may be most advisable to get on a horse that seems stronger and better able to breast the current.

I am not willing to say that the present administration is not doing all it can to win the war; but I will say that another administration might be able to do more. It appears that the present administration has committed itself to certain policies, which they know, or should know by now, are not the best; but which they cannot change or abandon for very good political reasons. A new administration, starting with a clean slate, could adopt or abandon all of the present administration policies on their merits, with no political strings attached. Our Government, like our homes, is good, but like our homes, Government needs a thorough cleaning every so often.

In addition to winning the war, the administration we put into power next November, will have to make the peace, decide this country's international policy, and guide us through the readjustment period after the peace is made.

A good-neighbor policy looks like a fine thing, and it is; but we should make these good neighbors our friends by sound, honest statesmanship and a wise and just foreign policy, and not by trying to buy friendship. No friendship worth having can be purchased like a load of coal or a bunch of bananas. I do not mean that we cannot render financial aid to a proven friend in need, but you cannot buy a friend or a neighbor's loyalty with money, even American money.

One more thing. If Roosevelt is reelected he will not have a Congress with which he can work in complete harmony, but if a Republican leader is placed in the White House, it appears that the legislative and executive branches of our Government will again be able to work together, not with one as a rubber stamp for the other, but in mutual respect of each other's ability and aims.

The O. P. A. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter written by Mr. J. Clyde Tomlinson, general chairman, Gregg County war price and rationing boards, to Mr. Chester Bowles. I commend the letter to the membership of this House:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Longview, Tex., March 22, 1944.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter making inquiry as to my appraisal of the O. P. A.

Under present wartime conditions, there is unquestionably a definite place for the O. P. A. program. This is particularly true with regard to price control, and the rationing of certain scarce and critical necessities. I do, however, feel that our regulations should be simplified and reduced to an extreme minimum, steering as far away from regimentation as possible. Furthermore, I feel that the organization should be streamlined and expenses reduced. Without an intimate knowledge of the organizational set-up, I can see little reason for regional offices and their staffs when district or State offices would suffice.

Next, it is most important that discrimination be avoided in all price-control measures, which has not been done in the past. As an illustration, the people of the Southwest fully realize that the rankest kind of discrimination has been shown in fixing raw milk, crude oil, and other prices. The milk price is locally being taken care of by subsidies, but the American people dislike subsidies. Now, there is a movement under way to subsidize stripper oil well production. The independent oil producer only wants a fair price for his product, and not in the form of a subsidy. Crude oil today is selling for less than in 1937, while production and discovery costs have constantly risen. Integrated or major companies have a distinct advantage through their operation of transportation, manufacturing, and marketing facilities, some of which, I understand, are subsidized.

In conclusion, I am of the opinion that all commodity prices, as well as labor, should have been frozen at the beginning of the war, thereby not permitting the war to increase the profits for anyone. You are doing a fine job and represent a great improvement over your predecessors in office, and I trust that you can succeed in revamping the organization and its functions in a manner that will completely restore the confidence of the people.

Sincerely yours,

J. CLYDE TOMLINSON,
General Chairman, Gregg County
War Price and Rationing Boards.

CC.—Congressman BECKWORTH.

Dollars Before Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick:

DOLLARS BEFORE HUMANITY

The attitude of the American Government toward the establishment of Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people is not

complimentary. The famous Balfour Declaration issued in the name of the British Government following the First World War was a joint policy of the Governments of Great Britain and the United States. It was hoped then by the Allied Governments that the establishment of a Jewish homeland would solve an age-old problem.

With this in view the British Government assumed a mandate over Palestine, but during the Munich period the then British Government adopted the so-called white paper restricting immigration, land purchase, and colonization of Palestine by Jewish settlers. While the British Eighth Army was fighting with its back to the Suez Canal the Jews of Palestine were performing heroic deeds as commandos and as other shock troops.

The overwhelming sentiment of the American people is expressed in the simple words of the Senate resolution:

"That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for the free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

There must be some place for the Jews of Europe and Asia to go. They have been dispersed and massacred in Germany, Poland, Russia, and other countries. Millions of them are fugitives. They were making wonderful progress in Palestine, building modern towns and cities and in the development of agriculture until the British policy changed.

Now there is another complication—this time a serious one. The natural enemies of the Jews in Palestine are the Moslems, whose faces turn to Mecca and Medina. Mecca is in Saudi Arabia. That country has a crafty, determined ruler in the person of Ibn Saud. Just now the American Government is showering Ibn Saud with gifts. They smell of oil.

Arabia has fabulous oil reserves—the richest in the world—and American capital is there on the ground floor. There is where Secretary Ickes of the P. R. C. wants to build a pipe line at a cost of $165,000,000 for the transportation of this oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean.

Is this why the United States Government has lost interest in Palestine as a Jewish homeland? Do dollars come before humanity?

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on March 25, 1944:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, imagine my pleasure when I read in the Binghamton Sun last week an account of the formation of another Hall Furlough Club, this time in the tenth ward of Binghamton. The account also carried the picture of the elected officers: Mrs. Janet Virgilio, president; Mrs. Joseph Gennarelli, vice president; Mrs. Dominick De Santis, secretary; and Mrs. Denny Lo Vuolo, treasurer.

Allow me to extend to Mrs. Virgilio and all her fellow officers and members of this new Hall Furlough Club my very best wishes for their future success. I know their enthusiasm will be a source of inspiration to other groups about to organize. These patriotic women know I am absolutely and wholeheartedly behind them in their fine work.

A central council was definitely set up this last week at a meeting held in Johnson City. Miss Septemia Morlando, president of the original Hall Furlough Club was elected president of the central council. Mrs. Virgilio was chosen vice president, and Mrs. Violet Grassi, president of Hall Furlough Club No. 3, of West Endicott, was elected secretary-treasurer. I know they will all do a good job.

And speaking of elections, Johnson City's Republican Women's Club reelected Mrs. Pearl Klingman president for another year.

Also reelected are first vice president, Mrs. Irene Excell; second vice president, Mrs. Jane Day; secretary, Mrs. Mona Landon; treasurer, Mrs. Grace Strickland. Members of the executive committee include these officers and Mrs. Ruth Vought, Mrs. Gladys Werts, and Mrs. Gertrude Walling.

The other day I received a letter from these Republican ladies, and I quote from it:

"MY DEAR MR. HALL: At a recent meeting of the Johnson City Women's Republican Club, it was voted unanimously to endorse your bill for free furloughs for men in service. If there is anything that we can do, either as a club or as individuals, we shall be very glad to do so.

"With appreciation for past favors and best wishes for the future,

"Very sincerely,

"MONA LANDON,
"Secretary.

"JOHNSON CITY, N. Y."

Endorsement of the Hall furlough bill by these ladies is most gratifying to me. I know it will be most encouraging to all concerned.

Recently, I have been sounding out sentiment from Republican leaders in Congress about what may happen this fall, which, as you know, is a Presidential election year. JOE MARTIN told me he feels certain that a Republican House of Representatives will be elected in November. Practically everyone in Washington is certain of a Republican President.

The manner in which the recent Johnson City and Endicott village elections were conducted is a tribute to harmony and concord on the home front. The victorious Republican candidates should be congratulated. They have certainly set an example for the rest of us to live up to. I feel sure the same party harmony which existed in their campaign will be followed throughout the remainder of the year. As Mr. Hill, our distinguished Republican leader in Broome County recently said, this is no time for family fights. I am in absolute agreement with him.

Address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey opening the annual exhibition of the Press Photographers Association of New York, held at the Museum of Science and Industry, Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, and broadcast over a coast-to-coast red network on Friday, March 24, 1944:

You do not know what a relief it is to be here tonight. This is really a night off for me, the first in weeks. As you know, the New York Legislature has just finished a session of 2½ months, probably the most intensive and constructive session ever held at Albany. Our hard-won State surplus of $148,000,000 has been locked up to provide post-war improvements and employment for veterans and war workers. Taxes have been kept down, every soldier and sailor from New York has been assured a simple, valid ballot, workmen's compensation protected from the chiselers and State services have been strengthened generally.

So, last Sunday began the 30-day bill period during which I must act upon some nine hundred new laws. This is the toughest 30 days of the year for the Governor of New York, so you will, perhaps, understand why I am doubly glad to have a night off with you, here tonight.

We are here to give fitting recognition to outstanding achievement in the field of news photography. The good reporter, whether he works with the camera and flash bulb or with notebook and typewriter, was never more necessary than he is today It is impossible for us here in America to realize what a precious thing we have in a free press until we start reading the unashamed falsehoods offered to most of the rest of the people of the world by what they call newspapers.

We in America have learned to distinguish between fact and opinion, between gossip and actual events. We have come to doubt a news report when fact is adulterated with opinion.

The news and camera men who report to us through the newspapers, the radio, and news reels are the eyes and ears of America. Under our system they have to report truthfully or else they gradually die from public disrespect. Thanks to that system, they make us the best informed people in the world. And it is through knowing the truth that we can keep ourselves free.

Unfortunately, there have been increasing signs of late that our newspapers are being denied the right to print all the news. Important matters have repeatedly been withheld for months until they leaked out and became the subject of such widespread gossip that they could no longer be suppressed.

Only now do we learn, because it leaked out, of the shooting down of 23 transport planes and the killing of 410 American paratroopers in Sicily 8 months ago. Even after a presidential broadcast, we still know precisely nothing of what really happened at the much-heralded conference in Tehran. We only know of the disquieting evidences of disunity which have since occurred in the Pravda attacks on the British and the Vatican, followed by the startling repercussions brought out by the President's announcement of the three-way division of the Italian fleet.

All of us understand the necessities of military censorship. We expect the military authorities to withhold all news, such as that of troop movements, that could be of any aid to the enemy. But the events of which I speak have not been suppressed to keep information from the enemy so much as to keep them from our own people. One such incident might be charged to blunder; two such incidents begin to lay the unpleasant suspicion of administration policy. When we find the State Department requesting the British censor to suppress political news sent to American papers by American correspondents abroad, it begins to amount to a deliberate and dangerous policy of suppression of the news at home.

Despite millions of dollars spent on War Information Service, we are constantly being surprised. Often we learn of important events through the pronouncements of foreign statesmen or by reading dispatches cabled back to this country from foreign papers. After making all due allowances for wartime conditions, it still remains that we know far too little about our own foreign policies and practically nothing about our diplomatic commitments.

The press of this country has cooperated unanimously in voluntary censorship. It will continue to do so. But the stakes in this war are too high for it to be fought in the dark. The issues are too momentous. It is time we had light as we fight for freedom.

In the days ahead we shall face severe tests. We have already grimly prepared ourselves for the coming invasion of the Continent which we know will be hard and bloody.

The mothers, fathers, wives of American soldiers who are to make that great effort will be brave and patient, as they have always been. But they will demand that they be told the truth and with reasonable promptness.

There seems to be too little recognition of the fact that free people cannot fight a war with blinders on their eyes. Knowing present dangers and the hardships ahead they will brace themselves to any task. They will sacrifice as deeply as the welfare of the Nation demands. They can do neither if they are not told where they they are going and why.

Our people can take the bad news with the good but they have a right to know the facts. We need a free, informed people to fight a war for freedom.

Whatever excuse may be made for the blunders of censorship in wartime, we must see to it that no vestige of censorship either voluntary or enforced, shall continue for one moment when the war is over. Then we shall face the hard task of building a just and lasting peace. That task cannot be successful without the aid of an alert, courageous, and unfettered press.

The building of a durable peace will not be simple. It will not be accomplished overnight by the mere signing of a treaty. It will certainly not be done just by an agreement made by a few men seated around a conference table. It will be achieved by the labor and willing sacrifice of people the world over for generations to come because they understand the conditions of peace and want them.

There have been studied efforts in recent months to nake people believe that Congress will obstruct the building of a lasting peace. That is not true. That is a part of a continuing effort to discredit the Congress of the United States. I have confidence in the Congress because it is close to the people. I have eternal confidence in the good sense and the character of the American people.

If the peace we build is to succeed, it must reflect the will and understanding of our people. That understanding can be fostered and that will expressed through a free press. Certainly in the years to come, the peace will succeed only if our people have the information and the will to make it succeed as a living reality. For the sake of our sons and our sons' sons, we must have the determined, abiding will to build a better world.

In this mighty undertaking you who represent the eyes and ears of America will have a major part. I am happy to join in the tribute tonight to those of your members who have won the honors this past year. Each of the working news photographers who receives his award tonight has achieved distinction in his profession. Each has passed the acid test of excellence, for the awards I present were voted by rivals to members of their own craft.

First is the award named after the late Harvey Deuel, the brilliant editor to whom belongs the credit for much of the advance made in press photography. It goes to the man who took the best spot news photograph of the year. This award, which rates as the grand prize of the show, I have the honor to present to Pat Candido of the New York Daily News.

Second comes the memorial trophy for the best sports picture in the show. The award, sponsored by Acme Newspictures, is named after the late Carl Thusgaard, who lost his life last September while photographing a bombing mission in New Guinea. I take pleasure in presenting this trophy to John Rooney of the Associated Press.

Among the most interesting exhibits in the show are the pictures taken with the new Speedlite camera invented by Professor Edgerton of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The best Speedlite shot of the year was made by Anthony Camerano, staff photographer of the Associated Press.

Until his death a couple of years ago the dean of press photographers in New York was the well beloved William Zerbe of the New York Herald-Tribune. For him is named the first prize for the best photograph in the pictorial class, which is won by Irving Haberman, staff photographer of PM.

The feature class means pictures which tell their own story, pictures requiring little or no caption. The first prize in this class was won by a photograph of Mrs. Emma Van Coutren, who has seven sons and four daughters in the armed forces of her country. The photograph was made by Arthur Sasse of International News Photos.

Finally comes the award of the first prize in the portrait and personality class, character studies with a camera. It is entitled "Portrait of a Hero", which fittingly describes the subject Sgt. Fred Quirus, who in one night of rescue work on a railroad wreck near Philadelphia, saved 8 victims who were seriously wounded, and carried out 16 dead bodies. This prize also goes to Irving Haberman.

It has been a pleasure to be here and congratulate you, not only the winners but the members of the Press Photographers Association of New York. You have struggled long, you have worked hard and intelligently for the position which you as a craft now hold and for the high standards you have reached.

Condensed Statement of Willard H. Dow, President and General Manager of the Dow Chemical Co., Before the Special Committee of the United States Senate Investigating the National Defense Program—the Truman Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, you are all too familiar with the tireless efforts of the past decade to take from the Congress its legislative power and transfer it to the Executive. There was nothing accidental about that movement. It was a deliberate attempt to break the link between Government and the people so that a change in our form of government might be made without the consent of the people—keeping Congress as a mere rubber stamp in order to give lip service to constitutional process.

The modern type of dictator, whether he be a Napoleon or a Hitler, always assumes power in response to what he calls the sovereign will of the people. He never bothers to mention that the representatives of the people who vote him absolute power were selected by him for that single purpose.

But, fortunately for the future of our Nation, our people have asserted themselves and, by electing to Congress Republicans and the kind of Democrats who refuse to be rubber stamps, have checked the transfer of powers. We of the Congress are now in process of getting back the powers which should never have been surrendered. Those who are content to remain supine marionettes of the Executive are now in tiny majority. Their constituents will soon have the opportunity to pass judgment upon them and their works.

The people, whenever the chance is offered to them, are sending to Congress men pledged to end the Executive tyranny that extends from the conduct of great affairs down to the pestering of individual citizens by petty, bumptious, dictatorial bureaucrats. We of the Congress are struggling to clean up the mess that Executive willfulness has made of both our domestic and our foreign affairs. We are driving out the fascism, which under another name has all but hog-tied us, and we are clearing the way so that our boys may achieve the kind of victory and the kind of peace that they are fighting for.

We are on our way to achieving an American freedom. We are calling things by their right names and junking, as fast as we catch up with them, those rules, regulations, and practices which were throttling real freedom.

Many of our citizens are so bewildered by the petty tyrannies in which they are enmeshed that it is doubtful if they yet fully realize what the resumption of power by the Congress means to them. They do not yet realize that in the Congress they can now find relief from Executive tyranny, and it is my proud privilege to tell you, so that it may be a matter of eternal record, that one of my constituents was the first to come to the Congress, and, opening his whole record, ask for justice.

I refer to Willard H. Dow, the president of the Dow Chemical Co. of Midland, which is in my Congressional district of Michigan. That company was organized half a century ago by a man the memory of whom I honor and revere as a great American patriot—Herbert H. Dow. He started from scratch. In the beginning he had only an idea, energy, a few dollars advanced by friends and the supposedly worthless salt brine that underlies so much of Michigan. He brought these elements together and, by putting earned brick upon earned brick, he built a great institution and a great community. I may remark that this building which was in our finest tradition would have been impossible under New Deal tax laws.

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

In the First World War this company served the Nation well. In the present war under the son of the founder, this company, because it is bigger and stronger than before, has served the Nation even better. I shall not attempt here to detail the extent of that service because I must be brief. I shall only tell you about magnesium.

This company, through 25 years, and at a heavy financial loss, pioneered in the manufacture of magnesium, with the result that this country had an independent magnesium industry and when the war broke out we were not, as in rubber, dependent upon a foreign source of supply. Dr. Willard Dow was so far ahead of the authorities charged with procurement of war supplies and equipment that nearly a year before Pearl Harbor his company, in addition to enlarging the plants at Midland, had gone down to the sea that laps the shores of Texas and there erected a plant to take magnesium out of sea water. The one inexhaustible source of supply for this vitally necessary war material. That is something which no one has ever done before.

While Dow was thus straining to meet the needs which at that time only he foresaw, the Department of Justice clanged into the scene with what has now been proven to be a rigmarole of charges brought under a perverted notion of the antitrust laws. They took advantage of the war to force a settlement. I shall not at this time attempt to go into the motives of the Department of Justice in seeking to attack business in the initial emergency. Be that as it may, the actions were settled under the specific agreement that none of the charges alleged were admitted.

Ever since then the Dow Co. has been the victim of a smear campaign which assumed that all the charges were facts and which has gone far beyond even the allegations of the Department. Dr. Dow finally turned to that committee of the Senate known as the Truman committee and asked for a day to present the facts from the records of his company.

The committee gave him his day, heard his testimony, and cross-examined him on it. The committee has filed its report and it not only completely clears the Dow Co. and its president of all the charges that have been made against it, but also sets out its war record of magnesium production as a great American achievement. I desire here and now to compliment the Truman committee on its courage and its fairness.

Since Dr. Dow's demand for justice and his securing of it at the hands of Congress is to me a historic event that presages a new era, I believe that Dr. Dow's statement before the committee should be made a matter of public record. Here it is, in slightly abbreviated form:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am before you today to present to you the war record of the Dow Chemical Co. in magnesium, in the hope that you will scrutinize that record in the most minute detail. You are, I believe, concerned solely with the war record. The Department of Justice has at various times and in various places tried to force into the Dow war record certain charges growing out of peacetime operations. It pretends these charges are proven facts. By deduction, it claims both the Dow Chemical Co. and the Nation were less able than they should have been to meet the magnesium needs of the war emergency.

We are not here to defend against these charges. We are here positively to demonstrate that the charges never did have and never could have had the least basis in fact. We intend to show you that, had it not been for the long, hard years of travail out of which Dow magnesium was born, this Nation would not have had a magnesium industry. We intend to show you that, had it not been for our foresight in extending our facilities more than a year before Pearl Harbor and going down into the seas off Texas, this Nation would not have been able to meet in magnesium the initial emergencies of war. We intend to show you that Dow worked to such effect that in the critical year of 1942 it produced 91.2 percent of all the magnesium produced in this country. And further we intend to show you that every act complained of by the Department of Justice as against the public interest was actually in the public interest and that, if anyone impeded the magnesium program, it was not Dow. In short, gentlemen, we believe that the Dow record in magnesium is one of the highest public service. We ask you to affirm or negate that belief.

If you will bear with me for a moment, I will give you a little of the background of our company. It was founded by my father, Dr. Herbert H. Dow, on an idea which he worked out as a student in the Case School at Cleveland. My father tried out his plan in 1889 in a shed at Canton, Ohio, with about $300 put up by friends. The money ran out in a few months and the little concern folded up. But my father learned something and in the next year came to Midland, Mich., and in 1890, with several thousand dollars, started what developed into our present company. He made his idea work and in 10 years was the principal American manufacturer of bromine.

The point that I want to emphasize is that we are a local, self-made company, and we have always been just that.

The company was becoming such a large factor in bromine and in bleach that it began to attract the attention of those European nations who regarded the American chemical market as their exclusive property. In 1905, my father was visited by a German representative of the European bromine cartel and informed that, unless he stopped all exports and came to some arrangement with the cartel, the Germans would undercut and ruin him.

He replied instantly that he would do as he pleased and believed he could hold his own against all comers. The Germans cut to less than anyone's cost, and the Germans had the funds to keep up the fight longer than Dow. But the Germans reckoned without my father's resource. He found that the Germans were selling at 20 cents everywhere except in the United States, and so he quickly opened offices in England and in Germany and, with a German agent and a German trade-mark, sold at 15 cents in Germany—undercutting their home market.

In a year the Germans withdrew from the market, acknowledging themselves licked for the first time in their chemical history.

Much the same thing happened with bleach, but this time British and German interests together tried to force Dow out as they discovered that the Midland concern was taking nearly half of the bleach business of this country. In 1903, the British cut. Dow carried on, ready to meet any price. By the fall of the year, the foreign interest withdrew.

It was the war that took America and Dow into magnesium. When the First World War broke out in 1914, all the magnesium used in the United States was imported from Germany. The market for magnesium metal—which the Germans sold at $1.65 a pound—was trifling. The metal had no structural use and was principally bought by the makers of fireworks and flashlight powders.

Let me emphasize that it is not difficult to make magnesium metal in a laboratory. The difficulty comes in producing commercially. And, although there has been a lot of talk about magnesium patents and I also shall talk about them, the really big thing is the "know how." That comes only from experience and, I may add, very expensive experience. Dow leads the Nation as a magnesium producer because we have through the years gained the "know how."

With the German supply shut off in World War No. 1, our Nation found itself short of magnesium as a deoxidizer in the manufacture of nickel and for flashlight powders, and the Allies found themselves short of powder for tracer bullets and flares. Let me call to your attention right now that the present great demand for magnesium arises from the war needs for powder, incendiary bombs, and other than structural uses. We and, I presume, the United Nations are using only about 25 percent of magnesium metal for structural purposes. That is an important fact to bear in mind when considering what will happen to our present magnesium facilities in the post-war world.

The Dow group had magnesium chloride and in the summer of 1916 they decided to get into making the metal and began experimenting. They had plenty of book knowledge but no commercial knowledge. The company had no money to spare and everything had to be done with the material at hand. The group worked out a small rectangular box of welded boiler plate. This cell was heated over a brick arch, molten magnesium chloride poured in and the current turned on during one of the hottest afternoons that Midland had ever known. Soon little globules of metal began to float on the surface of the bath. The group knew that at last they were on their way to success. They stood by all the night, anxiously watching and unconcernedly breathing in quantities of chlorine gas. In the morning, they had a 1-pound cake of metallic magnesium. That was the 20th day of July 1916.

The next step was to a cell six times as large, from which to learn the essentials of engineering to go on a production basis. This cell ran reasonably well and on good days produced a dozen pounds of magnesium. But also it began to introduce some of the difficulties that were to be expected in manufacturing.

Nevertheless, the unit was kept going, and in the winter of 1916–17 the group decided they knew enough to go into production. Plans were drawn for a real plant. On an autumn day in 1917, the plant was finished and ready to go into production. None of the group ever having operated such a big plant, there was some trouble in getting all the cells filled and the current turned on. Then things began to happen. Within 48 hours the plant had to be closed down as a failure.

That was a heavy—almost a staggering—loss. The group set about making a new cell, using the experience they had gained. This cell worked. It produced 50 to 60 pounds of magnesium a day and 16 other units were gradually installed. But on February 1, 1920, after the plant had been in apparently successful operation for 6 weeks, one of the melting pots broke, the molten bath gushed out

over the floor, set fire to the building, and in almost no time the whole plant was ablaze with a new kind of fire that nobody knew how to put out. The only salvage, curiously enough, was a pile of magnesium ingots that had been stacked on the floor. When the mass of twisted iron and steel was cleared away, the ingots were there unharmed.

The company had sold 3,852 pounds of metal in 1918 and 859 pounds in 1919. The loss was over $60,000. Of the several magnesium metal producers that had started business in the war period, by 1920 only the American Magnesium Corporation at Niagara Falls and Dow at Midland remained. The others had dropped out because they could not see any future in the business. My father had lost two plants and, without a plant, was in an excellent position to get out of business. He had no intention of doing anything of the kind, even though German magneisum was beginning to enter the country in an effort to reestablish the position lost by the war.

This time they set up only four cell units—in order to do some testing before going further. This plant was operated satisfactorily, but, as the depression settled upon the country late in 1920, the plant shut down and did not reopen again until 1922 when the depression was receding and a tariff bill had been passed giving the American chemical industry a chance to live. Then the group expanded the four cells and developed, as well as refined, the process. They had started with nothing except laboratory knowledge and, devising ways and means as they went along, at no step did they have a situation which could be covered by a basic patent. There were no basic patents in the magnesium industry. Anyone who chose could enter the industry.

The Dow intention had been to make magnesium metal and to sell it as such to processors who would do their own alloying and fabricating, for Dow had neither the personnel nor the means to engage in the new kind of business involved in the making and fabrication of alloys. The American Magnesium Corporation, their only remaining competitor in the production of magnesium, had gone into both alloys and fabrication. There was little hope for Dow to sell any metal unless there were processors to buy the metal. It became evident by 1918 that the processors would not grow of themselves and would therefore have to be grown. Dow knew nothing about making either alloys or castings and had access to no body of knowledge. Therefore they had to start from scratch. In 1918 they had opened a little metallurgical laboratory to develop and test alloys and a little foundry and shop for casting and machining. They had no intention of going into business, but wanted to accumulate knowledge so as to teach others how to go into business.

They ran into some patents held by the American Magnesium Corporation (which had been bought by the Aluminum Co. of America) and into others held by the German I. G. Farben—a post-war chemical trust that embraced pretty much the whole of the German chemical industry. Dow had to work out their own alloys and they called these alloys "Dowmetal." They really were Dow metal because they were evolved by the Dow group.

The largest outlet for magnesium was for use as an alloy with aluminum. That use was taken care of by the American Magnesium Corporation. But Dow steadily expanded production, jumping to 72,250 pounds a year in 1923 and to over 200,000 pounds in 1926 and steadily bringing down the price, in the hope of being able to compete on a price basis with aluminum. In 1922, before the tariff on magnesium was raised, it sold at $1.60 a pound, but by 1926 Dow was selling at 69 cents a pound. In every year up to 1927, Dow lost money substantially, except in 1926 when the sales netted about 5 percent and in 1927 when they netted about 1 percent.

It has been alleged that Dow restrained trade. From this it has been deduced—with complete unfairness—that Dow hindered the development of magnesium in this country. These allegations grow out of Dow's transactions with the American Magnesium Corporation.

Both the companies were in the fabricating field—the only two in the field—and, as was usual with a new product, taking out patents as they went along, there was bound to be interference in the applications, but it so happened that it was not until late in 1926 that a really important interference came up. Rather than have a contest which would be only one of many, the two companies on March 4, 1927, executed a license in which each party had the right to sublicense to such sublicensees as bought metal from one or the other. Since these two concerns were the only ones producing magnesium in the United States, the real effect of this clause was to exclude the licensing of the patents to people who bought imported metal.

A. M. C. had been investigating the Dow magnesium and had received a trial shipment of 2,000 pounds. This shipment proved so entirely satisfactory that A. M. C. began buying magnesium from Dow. Each purchase by A. M. C. stood on its own feet and generally A. M. C. as a quantity buyer, got about 10 cents a pound under the general market—which was highly profitable for Dow—for it cost on the average more than 10 cents a pound for Dow to sell and service others. There was no agreement or understanding that A. M. C. would buy any definite quantity except as ordered from time to time by A. M. C. on regular purchase orders.

In this same year, A. M. C. chose to stop producing magnesium and Dow was left as the country's sole producer. This was either a privilege or a burden. Up to that time neither Dow nor anyone else had succeeded in making any money out of the production of magnesium. Dow, in effect, was presented with a monopoly by default. Dow had the same kind of monopoly in producing magnesium as Henry Ford had during the early days of producing Model T—the monopoly which comes of course when anyone makes a thing better and cheaper than anyone else. The A. M. C. business gave Dow a sufficient backlog to warrant enlarging production and going forward with price reductions.

The Dow group was determined to make a position for magnesium in the United States by taking the metal out of the specialty and putting it into the commodity class. This could be done only through the price reductions of volume production and by intensifying research in the fields of production, fabrication, and uses. Magnesium production is peculiar, in that if a cell be started into operation it cannot easily be closed down without the feed in the cell freezing—that is, hardening—which may mean rebuilding a considerable part of the cell before operations can again be begun. Therefore it may be cheaper to let a cell run on, in the hope that the output can be disposed of, than to shut it down and take a certain loss.

After 1927 when Dow was presented with what is called a monopoly, we were able not only to reduce prices at a faster rate than before but also to increase production at a faster rate than before. It has been freely asserted as a fact that Dow kept the price of magnesium one and a half times the price of aluminum and this kept down the sale of magnesium. Dow made its own prices to sell the most magnesium it could and our prices were in no way related to aluminum prices.

The A. M. C. went out of the production of magnesium on its own volition and without any notice, much less any agreement with Dow and for the simple reason that it had a responsible producer who could sell them magnesium at a price below their own costs of production. This did not, however, prevent the A. M. C. from looking around to discover if a source cheaper than Dow could be found. The I. G. Farben people, during 1928 and 1929, began actively looking for a chance to get back into the American market which had been closed to them by the tariff, for they could not, in spite of their lower labor costs, meet the Dow prices with German-made magnesium after paying duty charges. Therefore they proposed to establish a plant in the United States, presumably if they could get the A. M. C. contract by underbidding Dow. That resulted in an investigation of the comparative costs of the I. G. and the Dow processes.

The report held that the I. G. process might be cheaper than Dow's. My father indignantly rejected the report and said that he would treat German competition in magnesium exactly as he had met it in bromine. He and his group made no effort to suppress the possible competition by any agreement or compromise. That was not their way. They were ready to meet all comers without fear or favor. That was their way. The I. G. did not enter the United States to build a plant and the magnesium industry was preserved as an absolutely American industry. It was preserved in the American way.

In 1930, upon the death of my father, I became president and general manager of the Dow Chemical Co. We organized a special sales division to handle magnesium and its products. The great trouble was the high cost of fabrication and this was further increased by the high spoilage rate. The customers, expensively nurtured by Dow, just would not stay put. The important quarry were the airplane and motorcar companies. Dow installed a squad to teach the Wright Aeronautical Co. how to make castings and did likewise with the Eclipse Aviation Co., which made airplane starters and had been buying its metal from Germany. The principal progress was with the Ford Motor Co. and the efforts at Ford's had the whole Dow Co. excited at prospects of an immense market.

Hopes went high and the contract with Ford in 1931 mentioned 20,000,000 pounds. But the project lasted only 3 years. Neither the Army nor the Navy could be induced to take any particular interest. They took no official account of the European experience with electron, which had been used to some extent in planes and in the Zeppelins during the First World War. By the thirties electron was in general use in German airplanes and the use had spread to other countries. In 1930 several thousand Isotta-Fraschini aircraft motors extensively using magnesium were in commercial operation, and in 1934 the catalog of one British firm listed 102 aircraft parts as regularly made out of magnesium alloys. As far back as 1927 De Pinedo made a round-trip trans-Atlantic flight in an Italian plane with two Isotta motors. On his way back he had to make a forced landing near the Azores and his motors were in the water for more than a week. When rescued they were found not to be corroded. An Italian air squadron under the command of Signor Balbo flew to America in 1933. It was found that their engine crankcases, cylinder covers, oil tanks, pump bodies, and a number of other parts were made of electron. The German planes used more and more electron, but for some reason the progress in the United States was very slow in the aircraft industry, where

price, which in other industries formed a primary obstacle, did not really count.

We retained an engineer at Washington to push magnesium with the Army and Navy. It is enough to quote him concerning a program that was set up: "Although this long-range test program was supposed to be cooperative, with the object of making available dowmetal to the Navy, there was little real cooperation. The Navy personnel was passive, leaving the actual pushing of the program to the industrial participants, namely, the Dow Chemical Co. and American Magnesium Corporation."

Now we come to another matter out of which has been created the serious charge that Dow was a member of an international cartel and that its production and prices were ruled by the I. G. It is an infamous charge. It is alleged, but I have no personal knowledge that is a fact, that the I. G. and Alcoa entered into an agreement by which an American company known as the Magnesium Development Corporation was formed. To this company the I. G. transferred its production and fabrication patents. A production patent has to do with the making of magnesium metal, a fabrication patent has to do with alloying and working the metal after it is made. None of us in our company ever heard of this contract between I. G. and Alcoa known as the Alig contract until we were charged in an antitrust criminal action with having agreed to limit our production to 4,000 tons a year. It then appeared that the I. G. had transferred its production patents to M. D. C. They were never used in this country until basic magnesium took them up for a defense plant corporation contract. But, regardless of that, Dow was not a party to the Alig contract and knew nothing of it and the limitation did not apply at all to the I. G. fabrication patents which are the only ones in which Dow was ever licensed. The charge, you see, is utterly baseless.

This is what did happen. There were broadly three sets of fabricating patents—those owned by Dow and those owned by M. D. C. and A. M. C. If we sold to a possible fabricator and gave the use of our patents, we could not guarantee that he would not be subject to an infringement suit by M. D. C. or A. M. C. That hurt business. M. D. C. sued us for an infringement.

The suit may have been only a talking point for a low price. A. M. C. had the choice of buying from Dow or paying more by importing from the I. G. or making its own metal. Dow needed a steady quantity purchaser in order to assure disposing of a part of its increased production. It was looking to Ford as the ultimate big buyer. But Ford was not yet in production. The result was a sales contract on June 24, 1933, in which A. M. C. agreed to buy not less than a million and a half pounds during 5 years.

On January 1, 1934, M. D. C. and A. M. C. and Dow settled their patent difficulties by a cross-licensing agreement under which all the then existing and future fabricating patents of M. D. C. were made available to Dow and its customers. Dow and the public thereby benefited by having access to the I. G. fabricating patents then owned by M. D. C. That is borne out by the fact that the number of fabricators which had been only 3 in 1930 rose to 13 in 1936 and kept on steadily rising thereafter. The purchase agreement with American Magnesium Corporation of 1933 expired in 1938 and was renewed on essentially the same terms in that year. All the agreements were canceled in 1942 after magnesium had been taken under allocation by the O. P. M.

Now we come to foreign sales. The first magnesium sale of 5,000 pounds had been made to an exporter in 1928, and this opening wedge produced sales to England and France in 1929 of 114,963 pounds. After a slight lag, the foreign sales jumped in 1933 to 438,974 pounds, about half of which went to England and the remainder to Mexico, Germany, and Russia. The inventory on May 31, 1933, stood at 2,931,427 pounds.

These foreign sales were evidently a matter of concern to the I. G., especially since in 1934 the United States devalued gold and gave to foreign holders of gold or gold exchange a discount of 40 percent on the purchase of American products. This made Dow the cheapest source for foreigners with gold exchange. I. G. concluded a sales contract in the form of a letter from the Dow sales manager to the I. G. manager in New York, dated September 5, 1934, in which the I. G. agreed to buy 350 tons of magnesium in 1934, and also 50 tons a month through 1935 at a price which, considering the quantity, was a good price for Dow, and, as far as the I. G. was concerned, it offered the opportunity to buy magnesium at probably less than its own cost of production and to resell at a substantial profit to its foreign customers, the largest of which was England. The letter contained this provision:

"Dow agrees to confine its sales in Europe solely to the I. G., with the exception that it reserves the right to sell the British Maxium or its successors not more than 300,000 pounds per annum at a price not lower than the price quoted to I. G. for the same quantities plus an extra charge of not less than 4 cents per pound for I. G.'s larger consumption. Dow further promises to use its best endeavor to keep British Maxium or its successors from reselling magnesium in ingot form and will try to limit its purchases to its own use in fabricating."

Dow has established a relation with British Maxium, but Dow had never sold as much as 200,000 pounds during 1 year in all England, and the sales to the continent had been small and sporadic so the limitations on the sales were apparent rather than real. The price stipulation of 4 cents a pound was approximately the discount which the British concern would have had if it had bought on the devalued dollar that the I. G. was buying on. That was the profit or brokerage which the I. G. hoped to make on its purchase from Dow.

That contract or agreement was for only 2 years and it lifted from Dow an inventory burden that might have been crushing. There were no orders from Germany after 1935, for the small deliveries in 1936 were on orders given in 1935 that could not be filled. From the shipping records, it appears that I. G. acted as a broker, for many of the deliveries were to England and some to Italy. Counting the Dow inventory on December 31, 1933, and the production in 1934 and 1935, Dow sold in those years less than 40 percent of its available magnesium abroad. The Germans in 1934 and 1935, by buying the metal that Americans would not buy, greatly helped Dow to get into larger production and thereby helped the Nation.

Now for the positive. We believed that magnesium was an inevitable metal for airplane construction. We appropriated $650,000 in 1937 to increase our capacity at Midland by 50 percent.

In the Dow expansion program, the goal had been set at 24,000,000 pounds of magnesium a year and 12,000,000 had been fixed as the reasonable quota for Midland. That left 12,000,000 to be produced elsewhere. It is to be remembered that Dow's was not a war program. The opening of the war in Europe had intensified the demand for the Dow metals, but chiefly it had assured Dow that magnesium alloys were coming into their own and that Dow had to be ready to meet the demand.

The Dow search for a new source of magnesium comprehended pretty much all of the mineral deposits. These were viewed solely from the standpoint of the cost of producing metal from the ore. The calculations involved the cost of mining, of power, and of transportation, as well as a consideration of the other products which would be manufactured along with magnesium, in order that the sole dependence would not have to be on the metal.

We had in 1933 successfully completed a plant at Wilmington, N. C., for the extraction of bromine from sea water.

Dow, because of the experience at Wilmington, knew how to handle sea water. The samples of sea water showed that it contained nearly 20 times as much magnesium as bromine, and therefore the job of successfully getting magnesium out of sea water was, on the face of things, simpler than the job that was already being done with bromine. In addition, the sea water offered a broader range of other products than did any of the minerals. The decision was reached that it was cheaper to pump sea water than to mine rock, provided a sea water site could be found that had cheap power and an abundant supply of limestone and salt. The Gulf of Mexico offered several such sites.

After a full survey by outside engineers of all the Gulf sites, Freeport, Tex., was settled upon as the best place to locate the plant. At Freeport there is a strip of land bordered on three sides by the ocean water of Freeport Harbor, with the opportunity to dispose of the waste liquor through a canal to the Brazos River, returning the used sea water to the ocean several miles from the intake. Natural gas insured cheap power in plenty, the oystershells at the bottom of Galveston Bay gave an inexhaustible source of limestone while a salt dome nearby could be piped for all the salt that would ever be required. In addition, sulfur and petroleum were near at hand and transportation was adequate.

The Dow plans—and every detail was worked out by the Dow engineers and chemists—comprehended what would eventually be a complete chemical manufacturing unit using sea water as the major raw material, just as at Midland brine was the major raw material.

The sea water is pumped from Freeport Harbor, at a depth of some 30 feet to avoid the possible dilution by rain water, and is taken through a series of screens. The pumps are capable of delivering 300,000,000 gallons of water a day—which gives an idea of the immensity of the enterprise.

Everything went according to schedule and the first ladle of magnesium was poured on January 21, 1941. We had to go into the market and get new money to build Freeport. We believe that we created a national asset.

It is notable that, with an assured market for magnesium only one private concern in 1940 chose to enter the field, and this concern was only nominally private, for the R. F. C. put up most of the money. They chose an unproven carbon reduction method in preference to the proven Dow method and started off with the promise of 24,000,000 pounds of metal a year—and later doubled their rated capacity. They actually produced 100,000 pounds in 1941 and 2,400,000 pounds in 1942.

I telephoned to Washington in February 1941, suggesting that provision be made for 100,000,000 pounds a year, and offered to increase the Dow facilities, with its own money, to produce that amount, provided the Government would take the full output. The offer was not accepted.

The official estimates began to rise. But they were only guesses. The best guess was 48,000,000 pounds required, but 100,000,000

pounds capacity was suggested in order to have a safety margin.

In March 1941, the Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the R. F. C., asked Dow to add an 18,000,000-pound addition for their account at Freeport on a rental basis which has worked out so far to about 5 cents a pound. This addition started production in November and was in full production the following January.

In the same month, the O. P. M. reconsidered magnesium because the British had just awakened them in a big way to the need for magnesium for incendiary bombs. The O. P. M. assigned 200 tons of magnesium for the British from Dow.

In June 1941, the O. P. M. went all out with a program to increase production to 400,000,000 pounds. This was later expanded to 600,000,000.

At the same time, the Government requested Dow to make available its know-how to any responsible company financed by the Defense Plant Corporation. Dow agreed.

But, with money and markets assured, only two groups took advantage of the opportunity. One located at Painesville, Ohio, with a rated capacity of 36,000,000 pounds, and the other at Austin, Tex., with a rated capacity of 24,000,000 pounds.

In October 1941, the Defense Plant Corporation asked Dow to construct for them a 72,000,000-pound sea-water plant at Velasco, near Freeport. The management and operating fee was fixed at one-half a cent a pound. This plant started production in June 1942 and was in full production 5 months later.

In March 1942 the Government asked Dow to find 72,000,000 more pounds of production away from a seacoast. Dow selected Ludington, Mich., as rich in magnesium-bearing brine and went through with the erecting and operating of a plant on the same terms as at Velasco. Because of a shortage of materials, a power plant as planned could not be erected at Ludington and the cells had to be located at Marysville, across the State, where power could be bought from Detroit. The Marysville plant began operating in April 1943 and the Ludington plant in June.

Ten concerns in all—other than Dow—contracted with the Defense Plant Corporation to build and operate magnesium plants for the account of the Government. Of those, only the two mentioned above benefited by the Dow experience. The others followed techniques other than Dow's. We were working day and night to increase the supply of magnesium.

But another branch of the Government, not charged with any service of supply, forced itself into the picture. The Department of Justice took upon itself the relieving of a shortage—which the O. P. M. officially said did not exist—by trying to put into jail the only group of men who were providing the means for more production.

From August 1940 until January 1941 the Department of Justice presented evidence to a Federal grand jury in New York City. On January 30, 1941, just 9 days after the great Freeport plant went into operation, the grand jury brought in its findings and an indictment was obtained charging Willard H. Dow, president; Earl W. Bennett, vice president and treasurer; the Dow Chemical Co.; the Aluminum Co. of America; the American Magnesium Corporation; the Magnesium Development Corporation, and certain of their officers with conspiracy.

In a press release, the Department of Justive gave these five reasons for its action:

"1. The existence of inadequate facilities for producing magnesium.

"2. That an alleged conspiracy between the American companies and the German firm had 'restricted, restrained, and discouraged' development and use of magnesium in airplane manufacture.

"3. A serious shortage of foundry facilities for fabricating magnesium products that has 'seriously impeded and delayed' aircraft production.

"4. 'The price of magnesium in the United States has been maintained at artificially, unreasonably high levels' in contrast to prices abroad.

"5. The alleged conspiracy had resulted in maintaining a single producer in the United States."

The fact is that there was never a real—as opposed to simply a theoretical—shortage of magnesium up to the time of filing the indictment against Dow by the Government. Every requirement was met by Dow in 1940. Every requirement was met by Dow in 1941. These were all met out of resources provided by Dow. Since then there have been no real shortages except as the actual supply is compared with the rated capacity, and that has been due to the failure of other Government-owned plants. Dow has operated at better than full rated capacity and has done the job assigned by the Government.

On October 15, 1941, I telephoned from Midland to Thurman Arnold in Washington. This is the substance of the conversation taken down at the time:

"Dr. Dow stated that he was disturbed over the fact that on next Tuesday, October 21, the Department is going to set the case down for trial next April unless all parties indicate their willingness to enter into a plea of nolo contendere assuming that a satisfactory decree and fines would be worked out. Dow said that it was impossible for the Dow Co. to make magnesium and at the same time defend an antitrust suit. Arnold said it is necessary to do both and that the Department could not nolle pros our case on the above grounds. Dow asked for an adjournment of our case until after the emergency. Arnold said that this could not be done. He said that if they did it for the Dow case, he would have to postpone all of the cases until after the emergency. Dow said why shouldn't they do this. Arnold suggested that his advice was for one individual to plead and no doubt satisfactory fines could be worked out at a later date."

The Department of Justice, in effect, said that the defendants had prevented the United States from having a fully supply of magnesium and that the best way to get more magnesium was to take the chief supplier out of his factories and put him in court.

Dow was given the choice of serving its Nation or serving itself. Dow chose, on April 15, 1942, to plead nolo contendere.

At the same time, it was agreed that an equity suit might be filed by the Government, reciting much the same charges as in the criminal action, and the defendants would consent to a decree.

No facts in the case were ever established by legal process. The defendants gave their consents on the understanding that the compromises were of convenience so that they might get on with their work.

I submit to you gentlemen, that the Dow Chemical Co. has been unfairly treated and that it has served the Nation and that deliberately inaccurate and malicious publicity has been and is being used to hurt the public interest. And in support of this contention I submit these facts:

The magnesium program of the Government, and consequently the service of supply to the Allies, was made possible by the foresight of the Dow Chemical Co. in having ready the facilities for production when and as the materials were needed.

In 1942 the critical year in magnesium production, Dow produced 84.2 percent of all the magnesium output in the country and the Dow know-how produced 91.2 percent.

The alloying and fabrication program of the Government, and consequently the use of the metal in airplane building, was made possible only because of the independent research and developments, through the years, of the Dow Chemical Co. and the American Magnesium Corporation and their cross-licensing of patents. Here are the facts for the year 1943:

Dow operated its own plants at Midland and at Freeport, as well as a Government addition to its own Freeport plant. A Dow wholly owned subsidiary operated for the account of the Government, the Government plants at Velasco, Tex., and Ludington-Marysville, Mich. Dow disclosed its process to the Diamond Magnesium Co. and the International Minerals and Chemical Corporation and, exactly as though they were Dow subsidiaries, followed through with its know-how as consultant, adviser, and engineer.

The rated annual capacity of all the magnesium metal plants in the country was 580,000,000 pounds.

The Dow group had 44 percent of this rated capacity, and yet during 1943 they produced 60 percent of all magnesium made.

The Dow group produced at 87 percent of its rated capacity (others 46 percent). Taking out Ludington-Marysville, which began production in June and April 1943, respectively—the Dow group operated at 107 percent capacity.

On the assumption that the Government has spent $400,000,000 on its magnesium program and that the Dow group had $150,000,000 of the total sum, the Dow group had 38 percent of the money spent. On this basis:

The Government has an investment of 80 cents for every pound of magnesium produced in 1943 by the Dow group.

The Government has an investment of $1.67 for every pound of magnesium produced in 1943 by the others.

The Government received 1.2 pounds of magnesium in 1943 for every dollar invested with the Dow group.

The Government received only half as much (0.6 pound) in 1943 for every dollar invested with the others.

Senate of Puerto Rico Opposes Diversion of Tax on Rum to Treasury of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a copy of a resolution adopted by the Senate of Puerto Rico unanimously on March 3, 1944. This resolution supports the position I have already taken on the floor of this House and reflects the desire of the overwhelming majority of the people of Puerto Rico to retain their right to control tax funds collected in Puerto Rico:

Whereas there is pending in the Congress in Washington, legislation to deprive Puerto Rico of the taxes collected on the sale of Puerto Rican rum in the United States;

Whereas for more than 40 years the people of Puerto Rico have enjoyed the right to use and dispose of these taxes in accordance with the laws of its legislature;

Whereas the increase in these taxes is practically the only favorable factor caused in Puerto Rico by the war, in the midst of the many sufferings which the war has caused our people and which our people are bearing in a spirit of sacrifice and comprehension in defense of the great democratic principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico: To express to the Congress of the United States its respectful and firm opposition to having the people of Puerto Rico deprived of the right, which it has enjoyed for more than 40 years, to dispose of those taxes through the legislature and for such purposes as the legislature, in representation of the people, believes of the greatest utility and benefit to Puerto Ricans.

Evolution of the Federal System of Mexico—Address Delivered by Sr. Lic. Carlos Sanchez Mejorada, President of the Inter-American Bar Association, Before a Special Meeting of the Federal Bar Association, Monday, January 31, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address delivered by Sr. Lic. Carlos Sanchez Mejorada, president of the Inter-American Bar Association, at a meeting of the Federal Bar Association.

Sr. Mejorada, one of the most eminent lawyers of the Americas, has incorporated in this address not only expression of fine sentiments with reference to the members of our bar, our Government, and our people.

He gives us a most interesting statement with reference to the evolution of the Mexican Government, interesting not only to the lawyers of the United States but of interest to our people generally. The Inter-American Bar Association has a great opportunity to render a unifying service to the peoples of this hemisphere. With devotion and intelligent effort that opportunity is being taken advantage of.

Madam President and members of the Federal Bar Association, ladies, and gentlemen: * * * You have heard from the three distinguished orators who have preceded me tonight the very same ideas which I expressed to you last Friday and which may be summed up by saying that there is no better way of dispelling the mistrust and misunderstanding that so easily arise between peoples of different countries than by personal contact which is therefore the natural way of promoting friendship between them. * * *

In expressing to you this feeling of friendship and common purpose, I am simply reflecting the attitude of my country toward international relations (an attitude shown not merely by words but by public actions) which has been expressed so brilliantly by our Ambassador here, Dr. Francisco Castillo Najera.

* * * * *

Since the object of my address is to acquaint you with some of the aspects of our life, in view of the special interest that you have, I thought that you, members of the Federal Bar Association, would like to have some idea of the evolution of the federal form of government in Mexico and its present set-up.

The first question that may come to your mind is: How does it happen that Mexico should be a federal republic? In the United States, you may rightly say, the federal form of government was a conditio sine qua non of its very existence, since the Thirteen Original Colonies were in reality different countries, with different peoples, different origins, and different laws, that agreed to sacrifice only that part of their own rights which was required to form a nation and to carry out the purposes of the War of the Revolution. But why should Mexico, which was, from the time of the Conquest, a single unified nation, under the centralized authority of the King of Spain, represented by the Viceroy, and which, at the time of the independence, had a tradition of three centuries of a central form of government, adopt a federal system? I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that this very question—whether Mexico should adopt a federal system or a centralized form of government—was the pivot around which revolved our civil wars during the first half century of our national life. Our first National Constitution of 1824—adopted 3 years after the winning of our independence, perhaps more from a spirit of imitation of the United States than a desire to satisfy any real and pressing need of our people—adopted the federal system which was supported by the liberal party in opposition to the conservatives and traditionalists, who advocated a central government. In that struggle, the liberal party was the final victor and, after several successes and defeats, including the final fight against the French intervention of Napoleon the Third and the Empire of Maximilian of Hapsburg, the Federal Constitution of 1857, which was promulgated by the liberal party before this French intervention, prevailed and continued in force until February 5, 1917, when our present Constitution was adopted, introducing many important innovations in our legal, economic, and social structure, but maintaining our federal system of government.

The Laws of the Indies were issued after the conquest by the Spanish kings for the governing of their new Indian subjects, giving these subjects a certain amount of local autonomy whereby each Indian village was really a miniature Indian republic in which the people elected their own leaders and preserved many of their customs and habits, some of which, although not legally recognized, have survived even to this day.

In these geographical, political, and social conditions may be found the origin of the tendency toward a Federal system of government. After the terrible shake-up of our wars of independence, and the state of anarchy which followed, the local interests, the quasi feudal chiefs and "caudillos," preferred the Federal form of government which interfered less with their local power and ambitions. Finally, the Federal form of government, which was sponsored by the victorious liberal party, was permanently established in Mexico.

When the Federal system of government, as originally established, was actually put to the test, it was not very successful. Each state began to pass laws on every conceivable matter and to enter into rivalry with other states in trying to collect the highest taxes, being concerned, not with the general national good but only with local interests. Each state had its own customs taxes which constituted a terrific obstacle to the development of interstate trade. With the advent of peace, the presidents of the republic became stronger and as a result there evolved a process of constitutional amendment giving more and more power to the Federal Government and removing whole branches of economic, social, and legal activities from the control of the states—a method that continues up to the present day and which in my opinion probably will continue for the good of the country. At the present time the following matters, among others, are under Federal jurisdiction: immigration and naturalization statistics, religions and cults, archaeological and artistic monuments, national waters, mineral resources, patents and trade-marks, copyright, labor, hunting and fishing, all types of interstate or international communications and transportation, banking, trusts, insurance negotiable instruments and all commercial practices and contracts, electrical utilities, the motion-picture industry, and many types of taxes. The states cannot legislate on all taxes, nor have they the power to enforce them except in certain cases when they act as auxiliaries of the Federal Government or are permittted by law to do so. There are other matters, such as health and education, on which both the Federal and State Governments can act.

With so many duties and powers, the Federal Government has grown enormously. The judicial branch is very much like your own: the Supreme Court of Justice of Mexico at the top, with 20 justices who each year elect the president of the court, the counterpart of your Chief Justice. The Supreme Court works generally in 4 chambers of 5 justices each (1 for penal legislation, 1 for administrative legislation, 1 for civil and commercial legislation, and the fourth for labor legislation). Next are the district judges and the circuit courts. The latter are, in all matters, except in our peculiar "amparo" institution, courts of appeal from the district judges. The Procurador General de la República is similar to your Attorney General and is the legal adviser of the President and the head of the large body of prosecuting attorneys and of the Federal judicial police.

The administrative or executive branch has developed a large and complicated machinery. In the first place we have, as you do, the different secretariats of state, which in Spanish are called secretarias: de Gobernación, somewhat comparable to your Department of the Interior; de Relaciones Exteriores, comparable to your State Department; de Hacienda, comparable to your Department of the Treasury; de la Economía Nacional, which handles all matters relating to commerce, statistics, electricity, mines, oil, patents, and trade-marks, etc.; de Comunicaciones y Obras Públicas, which deals with all matters referring to telegraphs, telephones, radio, railways, air transportation, highways, etc.; de Agricultura, which is much like your Department of Agriculture, but also includes all the large and small irrigation projects; de Salubridad y Asistencia, handling all matters of public health and of welfare institutions; de Educación Pública, which promotes the general advancement of culture and education throughout the country and administers the Federal schools; del Trabajo y de la Previsión Social, similar to your Department of Labor. There are, besides, the Secretariat of the National Defense, similar to your War Department, and the Secretaría de Marina which has to do, not only with the Navy and the merchant marine, but with fishing in both the inland waters and the seas. Then there are also the Agrarian Department, a big affair which distributes the lands or "ejidos" to the rural

villages and supervises the activities of these "ejidos"; and the Department of the Federal District, comparable to your District of Columbia, but with the difference that the inhabitants of the Federal District like those of the States elect Representatives and Senators to the National Congress.

The Peninsula of Lower California is divided into two territories governed by officials designated by the President of the Republic. Naturally, all of these secretariats and departments of the Federal Government have a complete organization extending throughout the country.

Besides these constitutional agencies we have what, in our administrative law phraseology, we call decentralized institutions. These are agencies of the Federal Government, but are not handled in the regular way, having an autonomous management similar, in certain respects, to that of a private concern. The purpose of such agencies is to provide a more flexible and commercial method of management of certain matters. Of these agencies, the two most remarkable examples—though there are today so many that I could enumerate them indefinitely—are the Petróleos Mexicanos or Petromex, which handles the entire Mexican oil industry, and the National Railways of Mexico, now operated by the workers themselves. Both of these are purely Government properties.

Further, we have what we call corporations or institutions of mixed economy, which are incorporated under the law of joint stock corporations. The Government owns 51 percent or more of the whole stock, the remaining portion being owned by private concerns or individuals. The Government generally appoints the manager and the majority of the directors. Of these, the outstanding example is the Bank of Mexico, though there are many others, also very important.

Finally, there are quite a number of different agencies, some of which were in existence before the war but most of which were formed due to the requirements and necessities of the war, which are made up of officials of various secretariats of state or other Government departments. They are: The Intersecretarial Board, handling the property of enemy aliens; the Rubber Commission, which allocates the very small available supply of rubber; the National Committee of Economy, formed by the Secretaries of Finance, Economy, and Agriculture, and so on.

The machinery of government is now so large and the laws and regulations so numerous that there is a tendency to codify and coordinate, in a single, comprehensive law, all provisions relating to a certain branch or to related branches of an activity. For example, we now have the Law of General Ways of Communication (Ley de Vías Generales de Communicación) which includes all the legal provisions relating to communication and transportation, the procedural rules and methods and the penalties for infractions; the National Electric Code which includes all provisions relating to the Electric Industry; the Fiscal Code, which sets up a uniform procedure and the general principles applicable to every kind of taxation, etc.

As to the judicial machinery, aside from the judicial branch of the government to which I referred above, we have a fiscal court, empowered to decide all controverted legal matters between the public and the government. This court, notwithstanding the fact that it is an administrative agency and its members are appointed by the secretary of finance, has been very satisfactory and can be favorably compared with a real court because of the open-mindedness and integrity of its components.

You might wonder, on contemplating this new growth of government agencies, whether they are mere excrescences that will disappear later, like those found on certain trees, or whether we are developing a new system of government not provided for in our constitution nor foreseen by its framers. We are worried by the increasing restrictions which these developments have imposed upon individual freedom, and particularly are we worried by the possibility of their continuance after the war is over. However, we must all recognize that law is an aspect of life itself and, therefore, is a changing, living thing. It is up to us lawyers, instead of merely becoming alarmed, to see to it that the new institutions, required by the new conditions and ways of living, develop without destroying individual liberty.

The National Legionnaire on Oil as a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed to be able to include with my remarks the following portion of the Capitol Comment column appearing in the National Legionnaire, official organ of the American Legion, for March 1944:

Secretary Ickes having announced a plan for the United States of America to build a pipe line to carry oil from fields in Iran and Iraq to the Mediterranean seacoast, at a cost of upward of $150,000,000, Representative JERRY VOORHIS, of California, delivered a carefully prepared speech in Congress declaring this to be a plan to aid a group of large American oil companies, and asserting that dollar-a-year men in the Government service had negotiated the deal. These Federal aides happened to be high officials of the oil companies who own the oil which the pipe line would carry. Mr. VOORHIS pointed out that while ostensibly a war measure, the pipe line would probably not be finished until after the war. He asserted that the oil companies refused to give to our Government any oil carried by the pipe line, although they propose to pay for the pipe line itself over a period of 25 years, from the proceeds of the sale of the oil it would carry. Mr. VOORHIS implied the whole deal is a benevolent gesture to the big oil companies in their postwar battle for sources and markets. Mr. Ickes had indicated it was a step in protecting American oil resources by opening up near eastern fields under American control.

This proposal, like the arguments about opening up Alaskan and Canadian oil production and the selection of places to be prospected in the far North, involves a major question of wealth and power in the post-war world. If we are to have oil developed by American companies in far lands, we must be prepared to defend those developments against the world. Britain lost much of her oil and other resources to the Japs in Burma and elsewhere. The Netherlands lost all of her oil and tin and rubber to the Japs when the East Indies fell to them. We lost what we had in the Philippines because we were unprepared to defend it. If we are to be a world economic power, we must remain the top world military power.

Whether the great oil companies, as indicated in the Elk Hills transaction last year, have controlled the Federal policy on oil through dollar-a-year men and lobbyists is something Congress suspects but does not fully understand. Mr. VOORHIS threw a lot of thought material into the congressional hopper.

Politics Is the Science of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sophocles once said that "to cast away a virtuous friend I call as bad as to cast away one's own life which one loves best." In Vermont vernacular, "Them's my sentiments!"

So, for what it may be worth, I say Wendell Willkie is my friend.

There are still some things in this world worth more than money or political aggrandizement.

A friendship established in or out of controversy and an intimate association with an individual over long months grows into an appreciation of the worth and value of a man as one to another.

Wendell Willkie stands high in the album of men I have met and known closely and intimately. To be brief, I am and always have been his friend, well knowing his great qualifications for leadership, appreciating but not minimizing his almost fanatical love of his country, such as he hopes to make it and is trying to make it while he preserves its fundamentals against those whose greed for personal political power is set and measured by the dollars they can contribute to that result and to defeat him. The people should know the truth.

God help him, for those who differ from him will not.

The people should be aroused to save themselves and help him to do it, for this is a crusade and not a petty partisan, political campaign. The historical writings of days to come will corroborate me.

The people today should cooperate.

If there ever were a time and a place and an occasion when the people of America should be heard for themselves, it is now. They should assist themselves by asserting themselves now, or forever hereafter, as serfs and slaves to a centralized, regimented, and totalitarian government, they should hold their peace. They have in Wendell Willkie a leader whom to ignore is to travel down the road to fascism.

It is not a question as between candidates, but among men, and principles; and as between those who have the courage to try to lead us out of our dilemma and those who wish for political preferment.

I do not have to stick my neck out, but as one citizen to another, let me dare to say to you now, once and for all, that at Madison, Wis., my friend Wendell Willkie made a speech which is and will be historic, campaign or no campaign.

Dogs will always bark at the moon. Those who are undertaking to serve selfish ends; those who put power in politics above patriotism; those who seek to save to themselves the control of a party against the future of the people, will not agree that it was a great speech. Those who will not take advice as against a situation they contributed to establish; those so jealous of petty political predominance in party circles as not to realize that their sun of dominance has set; all of these, and others I might name, might well seriously consider the fact that the people are satisfied that Wendell Willkie is no politician, but a patriot.

As a patriot he made a speech at Madison, Wis., which should have had national advertising but could not. You answer why. That it will eventually reach the people, I sincerely hope.

There is too much selfish politics and too little recognition of the situation which confronts the people to suit me.

It was a great speech. It was 100-percent American. So is the man who made it. He may be unschooled in cheap political tricks. He is nevertheless fearless. He has not told the people anything they should not know, though as a candidate he might well have refrained therefrom if he were only looking for votes.

He is courageous, far thinking, a leader, and careless as to what his forthright, honest statements may mean to him personally.

I am for him and the cause for which he stands. So, under permission heretofore granted, I submit the following article for the RECORD:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

POLITICS ON A HIGH LEVEL

MADISON, WIS.—Long after the present primary campaign is over, the speech that Wendell Willkie made here will be remembered. It may well become one of the vital documents in our political history. In a moment of bitterness and dissension, of cynicism and indifference, Willkie has with simple clarity defined the dilemma of the Republican Party. And more than that, he has defined the political crisis of our time.

If this sounds solemn, I mean it to sound solemn. No matter what his past mistakes, his blunders, his inconsistencies, regardless of all political mud-slinging, I believe history will record that he stood up and spoke the plain truth as no one else had spoken it.

As Willkie said, there are striking parallels with that era of 90 years ago when a little group of determined men met in Ripon to express their profound convictions through the medium of a new political party. One party, the Whig Party, was dying in bankruptcy; another, the Republican, was about to be born.

What may be at stake here in this delegate election is more than the future of Wendell Willkie, the individual. It may be a decisive turning point for the G. O. P. If Willkie is defeated, there will be strenuous efforts to make it seem that this is a repudiation of the things he stands for—true international cooperation, the necessary minimum of Government regulation to make a free enterprise system free. The successful Republican nominee—and it will not be Willkie if he loses the April 4 primary in Wisconsin—would be under constant pressure to pull back from any vital commitments.

The theme of Willkie's Ripon talk was that a political party, to survive, must stand up and speak out on the big questions of the day. Dodging, hedging, evasion will end in bankruptcy.

"A political party," said Willkie, "can never stand still * * *. Those leaders of a party who insist on applying old formulas to present problems merely because those formulas worked in the past are damaging the party and will eventually destroy it. For they are standing still, whereas the world around them moves."

In this, of course, was practical politics. It was aimed at Governor Dewey for his silence, his failure to declare himself on the Presidential race. The contest here is essentially between Dewey and Willkie, with possibility that some scattering delegates may go to General MacArthur and Governor Stassen, both of whom are on duty in the Pacific. But it was politics on a high level.

Of two rebellions within the Republican Party, Willkie spoke with implied approval. One was that of the "liberal Republicans" who rose in protest against the corruption of the Grant administration in 1872. The other was the Bull Moose revolt of Teddy Roosevelt.

Willkie may have been hinting that it was time to start another rebellion within the G. O. P. There have been intimations that he would start a third party. It is known that he investigated thoroughly the machinery for getting a third party ticket on the ballot.

But this year there isn't a chance. State laws have been deliberately drafted to make any third-party attempt all but impossible. Even the Socialists, who are veterans at the third-party game, will have difficulty this fall getting on the ballots of States with enough electoral votes to add up to a majority.

That is why it is all the more important for the two parties to give vigorous expression to the issues that touch the lives of every one of us. Otherwise we end in a blind alley of cynicism and frustration, and the marker pointing in that direction says fascism.

I don't know whether Willkie will bolt his party if the nominee is a cautious trimmer cut to get the votes of every possible group by saying as little as possible. I don't think he knows. At this point it isn't important.

It is important that he has spoken with simple forthrightness of the problem of our day. Read that Ripon speech. Our grandchildren may be reading it in history books 50 years from now.

Secretary Hull and His Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, critics of Secretary of State Hull and his foreign policy are more numerous and more critical than they would be if this were not election year. Unfortunately, some people's judgment is influenced by political considerations, and many of the critics have been unjust, and upon reflection their charges have been without foundation.

Secretary Hull's recent statement outlining our foreign policy and containing 17 points, should satisfy all reasonable Americans, and it is a disservice to try to cause the American people to lose faith in their Government at this time.

Mark Sullivan, the well-known commentator, could never be charged with being partisan or prejudiced in favor of the present Democratic administration, but he is always fair in his diagnoses and conclusions. His article in Sunday's papers entitled, "Mr. Hull and His Critics" is worthy of reproduction and is submitted herewith. I call special attention to the concluding paragraph, wherein he states that critics of Mr. Hull must bear in mind that he is acting in coordination with our military authorities and President Roosevelt, and has better facilities for determining the wiser course than have his critics:

MR. HULL AND HIS CRITICS

(By Mark Sullivan)

FOUR FUNDAMENTALS

Secretary of State Cordell Hull's conduct of foreign relations is assailed by critics. The criticisms have to do with many different actions and policies—our attitude toward Russia, toward Britain; about Poland, about Italy, France, Yugoslavia, Finland, Palestine, India. In nearly all cases, the questions involved are intricate and, as respects the average citizen, remote. Some of the questions are understood by not more than a very few Americans—including individuals and leaders of groups who have a special interest, and also earnest and disinterested students and the like.

In the din over these questions the average citizen is confused. Yet he feels instinctively—and correctly—that the way these questions are settled, the courses our Government takes, will deeply affect the fate of himself, his children, and the country. For some enlightenment of the puzzled citizen, there is here attempted, so far as space permits, a statement of some fundamentals of Mr. Hull's policies, as this column sees them.

1. Mr. Hull, in the spirit of first things first, believes in winning the war. To each question that arises, he seems to apply that test—would a given course help toward victory, or postpone victory; and would it bring victory with the least loss of American life? Among many examples, Mr. Hull for over 2 years, backed up by President Roosevelt, followed a policy of not breaking diplomatic relations with the Vichy government of France. Against this course, critics raged. They urged, among other actions, that we seize by force the French island of Martinique in the West Indies. In the end, we got Martinique without loss of life—enabling President Roosevelt to say with justifiable exultation, that we got it as a gift, as a "base on balls."

2. Absolutely essential to winning the war is the preservation of unity with our great military allies. Some actions of Russia disturb us. In handling such matters, the first requisite is to give Russia no occasion for any course other than to remain in unity with us until the war is won.

3. Toward countries and peoples conquered by Germany and about to be liberated by us Mr. Hull has a definite attitude. To such countries as Austria he has said in effect, "Help earn your freedom by fighting for it; help us win the war." Implied in this attitude is that such countries should avoid internal strife over ideologies or factional issues until their freedom is won.

4. The policy of first win the war cannot, of course, stand alone in a watertight compartment with all questions of future policy and ideology in other watertight compartments. Here arises a border line of extreme difficulty, and it is in this border line that most of the criticisms arise. Some actions

taken now, or other actions not taken, or failure to protest actions by our allies, while useful in winning the war, may embarrass us later when we come to the expected postwar effort to set up an international organization for preserving peace and other forms of cooperation. The embarrassment bears heavily on Mr. Hull, for creation of such international organization is fundamental in his policies.

5. Many critics of Mr. Hull are as sincere as he. Conceivably some may be as wise or even more farseeing. But some, at least, are passionately partisan on special points. Many of the criticisms have a common quality. They have to do with the internal affairs of European countries, the kind of government to be set up in a given country after the war. Some critics wish a certain group to head France after the war, and to that end wish our Government to recognize that group now, discriminating against other groups. Other critics have the same attitude with respect to Italy and other countries. Some such critics in their zeal go so far as to urge courses in the interest of European factions or ideologies which might handicap our winning the war or prolong the war.

In deciding between such criticisms and the course of Mr. Hull it is to be borne in mind that Mr. Hull, acting in coordination with our military authorities and with President Roosevelt, has the better facilities for determining the wiser courses.

Fulbright Selection Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read of the announcement made by Secretary of State Cordell Hull on Saturday that our honorable colleague, WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, had been selected to head a delegation of five leading educators and public men to a meeting of the United Nations Council on Education, which will be held shortly in London.

In the prevention of future wars the education of the other nations of the world is a matter of paramount importance. One reason we are a peace-loving people is that we have always been taught that peace is honorable and we have always sought peaceful means of settling disputes. One reason for the rise of the spirit of tyranny and aggression in Germany and Japan is that the children of those nations have been taught that war is honorable and that all personal freedom should be subjugated to the rise of the state.

It is a great compliment to our colleague, BILL FULBRIGHT, and to the Congress of the United States, that he was selected by Mr. Hull to head our delegates to this important meeting. He is not only a competent Representative, but he can bring back to the Congress the facts of the plans that may be agreed upon and he can interpret to the Congress the necessity of any congressional action that may be indicated.

For some time there has been the feeling in Congress, especially since the Food Conference at Hot Springs, that the House of Representatives should participate in the formulation of our policies regarding foreign affairs. By bitter experience we have learned that in order for the commitments of our Executive to be effective, they must have the support of the Congress.

I think the selection of Congressman FULBRIGHT to head the delegation from the United States to the conference of the United Nations on education is a fine move on the part of the State Department. His presence in this position will provide that link between Congress and the State Department which has often been missing. By his training and experience, Congressman FULBRIGHT is especially well qualified for this duty. His experience in business assures us that whatever the interests of this Nation may be, they will be protected and no unrealistic commitments made. Further, his experience in education is an assurance of an understanding of the problems involved. His activities in this House since he has been here are ample proof of his unusual ability to grasp and understand these great problems which are fundamental in building for peace.

It is obvious that the function of education in the process of creating a better world is not one that can come to fruition within a short time. We may not be able to notice in our lifetime the effects of sound policies. Nevertheless, we cannot deny that, unless sensible programs of education for the people are adopted, there is no hope for that understanding and discrimination which is indispensable to a democratic society.

The Nation's War Emergency Pipe Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor we were confronted with many huge problems. One was transportation of all commodities, and especially the transportation of oil of all kinds from Texas-Oklahoma area to the eastern seaboard. This problem became more critical when the Germans started sinking our tankers on the Atlantic and Gulf coast. The solution was to build pipe lines from Texas to the eastern coast. The biggest pipe-line construction in the world was undertaken almost immediately and completed ahead of schedule. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the Administration—to Mr. Ickes—his loyal and efficient group of assistants, such as Mr. W. Alton Jones, president, War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc., and Mr. George A. Wilson, Director of Supply and Transportation, Petroleum Administration for War, and, above all, to industry as a whole and to labor. They did a big war job in record-breaking time—in time to keep the people of the eastern seaboard from being chilly and also to furnish ample supplies across the seas for our fighting forces.

More than a thousand interested people gathered at pumping station No. 22, just outside of Rockwood, Pa., to witness the dedicating and christening exercises of these war emergency pipe lines.

The master of ceremonies was Hon. Charles F. Uhl, United States attorney for western Pennsylvania. Addresses by Mr. W. Alton Jones, President, War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., and Mr. George A. Wilson, Director of Supply and Transportation, Petroleum Administration for War, and Dr. Paul Stewart, president of Waynesburg College.

The christening of these pipe lines was of extraordinary interest not only to those who gathered there, but to the reading public throughout the Nation. The 24-inch War Emergency Pipeline was christened by Mrs. J. Buell Snyder, wife of Congressman SNYDER, by pouring into the machinery of the pump station a can of oil taken from General Doolittle's bomber which bombed Tokyo on April 18, 1942.

The 20-inch War Emergency Pipeline was christened by Mrs. Stanley W. Calkins, of Uniontown, Pa., by using a bottle of gasoline taken from a United States Liberator that helped to bomb Berlin on March 7, 1944.

The program was enriched by music furnished by the Rockwood High School band and the Somerset High School band and at Pumping Station No. 21, where an inspection was held later in the day, the North Union Township High School band welcomed the official party.

At each of these pumping stations there were flag-raising exercises. At Rockwood, Pa., a high-school girl was selected by her classmates to unfurl a beautiful American flag presented to the high school by Congressman SNYDER and at Pumping Station No. 21, a high-school boy was selected by the North Union Township High School to unfurl the same type of American flag, which was presented by the Connellsville Order of Elks, Connellsville, Pa.

Following is the address I delivered that day:

We are standing here beside two of the greatest oil arteries on earth—the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines—271 miles from the end of their 1,400-mile journey where they are steadily delivering fuel for the war program of the United Nations and for essential civilian uses.

I shudder to think how serious the petroleum situation would have been today, if the 24-inch and 20-inch pipe lines were not in operation.

I well recall that 6 months before Pearl Harbor, Petroleum Administrator for War Harold L. Ickes presented his plans for the immediate construction of a pipe line extending from the mid-continent Texas fields to the Atlantic seaboard. The petroleum industry was prepared to proceed. However, there were those who believed that a pipe line was unnecessary—tankers carried 95 percent of the east coast oil requirements, they said.

But Petroleum Administrator Ickes pointed out that many tankers were being diverted from the Gulf coast-east coast to run to trans-Atlantic service for the British. He also reminded the public that, in event of war, our tankers would be subjected to submarine attacks. He reminded anyone who would listen that "you can't sink a pipe line." The problem was approached on the assumption that it would be wiser to develop as quickly and expeditiously as possible, an overland transportation system that would insure continued delivery of petroleum to the east coast.

It was not until 6 months after the terrible catastrophe at Pearl Harbor that Mr. Ickes was given authority to construct these pipe lines. Justification was then obvious to everyone, because tanker after tanker was being torpedoed—tankers could no longer freely and safely ply the coastal waters from the Gulf of Mexico to the east coast.

In a letter to me, Secretary Ickes said, "Knowing, as you do, the indispensability of oil in this war, you will appreciate our interest in doing whatever gives greatest assurance that it will be moved where it is needed, in the quantities that are needed, at the time when it is needed—and with the least drain upon other essential phases of the war program. We dare not take a chance on anything short of this. I am aware that there have been sharply divergent estimates as to the length of time that would be required to construct the proposed trans-Florida canal. General Reybold, has, I believe, estimated that it would take approximately 3 years. This time element, alone, I should think sufficient to decide the issue. However, regardless of the time for construction, from a petroleum transportation standpoint, the canal would be ruled out on the basis of efficiency in the use of materials and manpower for pipe lines. Very careful calculations have indicated that barges and tugboats would use steel for the delivery of oil with only about 55 percent of the efficiency of a large pipe line.

"As to the manpower situation, I may point out that the present construction program for inland waterway expansion—which consists of 21 2,000-horsepower steam-driven towboats and 100 600-horsepower Diesel-driven tugboats—will require a total crew personnel of approximately 1,400. Of this number approximately 500 must be trained pilots and engineers. Indeed, it is feared that serious difficulty may be experienced in recruiting and training sufficient competent personnel to insure the successful operation of this program. The hazards involved, especially in the inland waterway transportation of inflammable and combustible products, make it imperative that at least the pilots and engineers engaged in such transportation possess a high degree of skill as well as considerable experience. Even the unskilled crew personnel must be thoroughly schooled in the basic fundamentals of this specialized and essential trade. On the basis of a movement of approximately 100,000 barrels daily of clean products in steel barges from Houston to Trenton, a crew personnel of approximately 3,000 would be required to man tugboats, of whom, 1,200 must be skilled pilots or engineers."

The 24-inch pipe line has now been in operation since February 19, 1943, at which time, oil first started flowing into the Norris City, Ill., terminal and tank cars speeded the crude oil eastward. The first direct deliveries of crude oil by pipe line from the Texas fields to the east coast took place on August 15, 1943, when the first batch of oil flowed into the Philadelphia terminal of the line. As shipments were increased more and more, the Big Inch soon reached its scheduled capacity of 300,000 barrels a day. Actually the line has exceeded that figure on many occasions.

The wartime facts of oil are simple and serious. All of the gasoline that we civilians use is derived from crude oil. All of the heating oil and kerosene and lubricants and other petroleum products that we use come from the same source. But that same crude oil must also yield the 100-octane gasoline that is fueling the bombing and fighting planes that are blasting our enemies with ever-increasing intensity. Yes, and the toluene to make the TNT for the bombs they drop. It must produce the 80-octane all-purpose gasoline that propels our tanks and trucks and jeeps and motorized artillery. It must furnish the fuel oil that runs our warships and merchant vessels. I have mentioned only a few of the many, many petroleum products which are required in enormous quantities by the military.

In May 1941 the amount of crude oil and petroleum products being moved overland from the Southwest and Midwest to the east coast was only 60,000 barrels a day. Today, more than 20 times the amount of petroleum is being shipped from the Southwest and Midwest overland to the East as was possible in May 1941. The two pipe lines beside which we now stand play a major role in this remarkable transportation record.

Today one-third of all the gasoline produced in this country is used for strictly military purposes. Another 14 percent is used directly in the production of war matériel, including food. Another 43 percent is used for essential transportation services and for essential driving necessary to get war workers to their jobs and to enable other citizens who have to travel by car to fill their jobs.

This new pipe line, the Little Big Inch, provides an added margin of assurance that the expanding military operations of the United States can continue to be fueled fully and on time. The Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, financed both pipe-line projects. The lines are being operated for the Government by War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., without fee or profit of any kind.

You may be interested in hearing some facts about the newer Big Inch line. The Little Big Inch is a 20-inch steel tube, 1,475 miles long. Somerset Station is No. 22 of 29 stations, each spaced approximately 50 miles apart. The centrifugal pumps of the stations are driven by huge 1,250-horsepower electric motors. Unlike the Big Inch which moves crude oil to the east coast refineries, the Little Big Inch pipe line moves finished products, such as gasoline and heating oil, to East coast storage, where it is used to help meet military, civilian and industrial requirements. Because of its greater resistance to motion, the heavier heating oil will, at full capacity, move into the east coast at the rate of 180,000 barrels per day, while gasoline, being a lighter petroleum product, will deliver at the rate of 225,000 barrels during each day of capacity operation.

Cost figures are not yet completely compiled on either pipe line. However, preliminary estimates indicate that both pipe lines will pay for themselves through the savings to the Government effected by this means of transportation compared with other overland transportation facilities.

A squealing pig passed through Somerset not long ago—it was in the pipe line—and when caught in a gate valve about a hundred miles east of here, it was necessary to shut down operation and release it. The pig was not the barnyard variety, but a pipe-line mechanical device used to swab out the pipe line. It is propelled by the same pressure force that moves the oil and is used for the same purpose as you would use a swab on the end of a ramrod to clean your gun—pipe liners call them "pigs."

We, here in Somerset and Fayette County, can justifiably take pride in our association with these two huge oil arteries—for these pipe lines are the same by which we can supply our soldiers overseas with more oil—oil with which to fight our battles—win our war—and much sooner bring back our boys—and return the world once more to peace and prosperity.

American Journalism—Two Men and an Ideal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., of March 26, 1944:

AMERICAN JOURNALISM—TWO MEN AND AN IDEAL

"If we can look out tonight upon America, troubled though it is, and find it exercising its liberties, a part of its safety must be attributed, not to its Constitution, its laws and its Government personnel, but to the individual standards of its journalists."

With this tribute to the newspaper profession, Raymond Gram Swing, noted radio commentator, last week accepted the $1,000 du Pont award for exceptional service.

Mr. Swing later turned over the $1,000 to the Raymond Clapper Memorial award, founded to honor the memory of the Washington newspaperman who died recently in a dive-bomber crash during the invasion of the Marshall Islands.

The Clapper award, announced by a group of Mr. Clapper's friends and colleagues, took the form of a gold medal to be given annually to the Washington newspaper writer whose journalistic contributions most closely approximate the outstanding reporting of Mr. Clapper. A plaque by a famous artist will hang in the National Press Club and the name of the winner will be added each year. As the fund grows a cash award will be added.

Mr. Swing's penetrating observations on the standards of American journalists, made when he accepted the du Pont award, follow:

"To some extent, all professions are both highly individual and highly interdependent. Law and medicine, for example, are a composite contribution of innumerable individuals. This is still more true of journalism. The gathering and distribution of news is the work of many myriads of persons, each one of whom must adhere to right standards if the truth of the whole is not to be impaired. Even what may appear as the most individual of all the journalistic functions, the analysis of news, is utterly dependent on professional cooperation.

"No man's judgment is his own, in a creative sense.

"It is a compilation of the judgments of many other individuals who in turn have compiled and adopted and modified the judgments of still more individuals. And what a man thinks becomes his own only in the sense that he accepts responsibility for it.

"That being so, an occasion like this one, is a recognition of the work of a great army of public servants. This army, being unofficial, does not come before the Nation at stated times for approval or disapproval. And it does its work, in the main, not for

honor or thanks, but for the happiness of self-expression.

"If we can look out tonight upon America, troubled though it is, and find it exercising its liberties, a part of its safety must be attributed, not to its Constitution, its laws, and its Government personnel, but to the individual standards of its journalists.

"In the war in which the continuation of our free life is at stake, the journalists of this country have gone about their work with the enlarged effort and the increased willingness to sacrifice which the crisis has called for.

"American correspondents have died at the front, many have accepted unspeakable hardships in the line of duty, not suffering for their newspapers or press associations or networks, but in the performance of their work as freemen, finding the service of this freedom being worth any cost whatever, the risk of life included. To them, then, is honor to be paid, as the bright heroes of their profession and of the Nation. They have demonstrated their responsibility.

"They have cared about individualism, personal initiative, and the service of Americanism with quiet, unadvertised devotion, and they are part of the conscience of the rest of us in the profession who will strive to be responsible like them."

The Finnish-Russian Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the House during the past few months I have urged that the United States come to the aid of Finland to help solve the dilemma in which that country finds itself.

The peace between Finland and Russia should be settled on the basis of the Atlantic Charter and subsequent agreements between our allies. For, if the Soviet Union is permitted to sidestep the basic principles of these agreements in her present dealings with Finland, then the chances of keeping permanent peace by international cooperation will be placed in great jeopardy.

The Washington Times-Herald of March 25 contains a very pertinent statement on this question by former President Herbert Hoover, which is as follows:

HOOVER URGES AMERICANS TO AID FINLAND

NEW YORK, March 24.—Former President Herbert Hoover today called upon the United States to "use our good offices to secure some way out of the impasse for Finland."

Though he "profoundly regretted" Finland's entrance into the Russian war on Germany's side, Hoover warned that "there can be no lasting peace in the world unless such peoples as the Finns are to have their independence and lands restored."

SITUATION DIFFICULT

Declaring that Finland's purpose in joining the German war effort "was not to spread nazi-ism but to preserve the liberty and democracy of the Finnish people," Hoover continued.

"Her situation in this war has been difficult. She had the option of joining Germany or of being raped by the Germans like Belgium, and in making her decision she was no doubt impelled by the hope of recovering her homelands again.

CLASS IS DIFFERENT

"Despite all that has happened, we cannot class her with the other allies of Germany. Finland wants to cease fighting. She cannot do the impossible by interning the German Army in her borders. Indeed she may need her forces to protect her from seizures such as have come to Hungary."

In asking that the United States take a hand in solving the Finnish dilemma, Hoover pointed out that "the United States, Russia, and Britain have agreed to collaborate in building self-government and freedom in the world."

Also, in that connection there appeared in the March 26 issue of the Washington Sunday Star a very well-written editorial on Mr. Hoover's statement which I include herein:

MR. HOOVER ON FINLAND

In the growing uncertainty over the war aims and policies of the Allied Great Powers, former President Herbert Hoover has just uttered a constructive note. His text is the problem of Finland and the part which the United States Government should play in its solution, but his thesis is applicable to other problems which are still in suspense.

Mr. Hoover begins by emphasizing the profound importance of the Finnish question and its proper solution in the future of freedom, because for 300 years Finland has been the symbol of the struggle for liberty. It is against that historic background, high lighted by the incontestable achievements of the Finnish people in creating and maintaining progressive democratic institutions, that its foreign policy in recent years should be considered. Regrettable and ill-advised as her action may have been in entering the war on the side of Germany 3 years ago, the purpose of the Finnish people was not to spread nazi-ism, but to preserve their liberty and democracy, as well as to recover the vital portions of her territory which she had been compelled to cede to Russia in consequence of a war waged against her by the Soviet Union only the year before.

Furthermore, the military situation in the summer of 1941 was such that if Finland had not entered the war against Russia she would have been "raped by the Germans, like Belgium." Therefore, Mr. Hoover contends that, "despite all that has happened, we cannot class her with the other allies of Germany. We cannot forget that her whole aspiration is democracy and freedom."

This leads up to Finland's present dilemma. She wants to cease fighting and get out of the war. But she cannot defy Germany without throwing herself on the mercy of Soviet Russia, and this she is unwilling to do without some definite assurance from the Western Powers. Is it not time, asks Mr. Hoover, for our Government to use its good offices to insure "the application of those ideals" to which Russia, as well as the United States and Britain, have formally proclaimed? "Does not our Government have an obligation to the future which must be exerted now?" Mr. Hoover ends by pointing out that "in the long view there can be no lasting peace in the world unless such peoples as the Finns are to have their independence and lands restored. Nor are the American people likely to accept any peace which does not extend the independence of nations, much less diminish them."

At an hour when many voices are urging the subordination of everything to military expediency it is timely that one who has acquired the reputation of an elder statesman should emphasize the necessity of adherence to basic principles, abandonment of which may lose us the peace even though the war be won.

Secretary Hull Outlines Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States is fortunate at this time in having as its Secretary of State the Honorable Cordell Hull, whose sound judgment, wide experience in international affairs, and far-seeing vision splendidly equip him for the important post which he holds in this world crisis.

Recently he issued a statement outlining the bases of the foreign policy of the United States, known as Hull's 17 points, and, under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

BASES OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

OUR FUNDAMENTAL NATIONAL INTERESTS

In determining our foreign policy we must first see clearly what our true national interests are.

At the present time, the paramount aim of our foreign policy is to defeat our enemies as quickly as possible.

Beyond final victory, our fundamental national interests are the assuring of our national security and the fostering of the economic and social well-being of our people.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Cooperation between nations in the spirit of good neighbors, founded on the principles of liberty, equality, justice, morality, and law, is the most effective method of safeguarding and promoting the political, the economic, the social, and the cultural well-being of our Nation and of all nations.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION BACKED BY FORCE

Some international agency must be created which can—by force, if necessary—keep the peace among nations in the future.

A system of organized international cooperation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the cooperating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose.

POLITICAL DIFFERENCES

Political differences which present a threat to the peace of the world should be submitted to agencies which would use the remedies of discussion, negotiation, conciliation, and good offices.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Disputes of a legal character which present a threat to the peace of the world should be adjudicated by an international court of justice whose decisions would be based upon application of principles of law.

REDUCTION OF ARMS

International cooperative action must include eventual adjustment of national armaments in such a manner that the rule of law cannot be successfully challenged and that

the burden of armaments may be reduced to a minimum.

MOSCOW FOUR-NATION DECLARATION

Through this declaration, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States, and China have laid the foundation for cooperative effort in the post-war world toward enabling all peace-loving nations, large and small, to live in peace and security, to preserve the liberties and rights of civilized existence, and to enjoy expanded opportunities and facilities for economic, social, and spiritual progress.

SPHERES OF INFLUENCE AND ALLIANCES

As the provisions of the four-nation declaration are carried into effect, there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or to promote their interests.

SURVEILLANCE OVER AGGRESSOR NATIONS

In the process of reestablishing international order, the United Nations must exercise surveillance over aggressor nations until such time as the latter demonstrate their willingness and ability to live at peace with other nations. How long such surveillance will need to continue must depend upon the rapidity with which the peoples of Germany, Japan, Italy, and their satellites give convincing proof that they have repudiated and abandoned the monstrous philosophy of superior race and conquest by force and have embraced loyally the basic principles of peaceful processes.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE BARRIERS

Excessive trade barriers of the many different kinds must be reduced, and practices which impose injuries on others and divert trade from its natural economic course must be avoided.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Equally plain is the need for making national currencies once more freely exchangeable for each other at stable rates of exchange; for a system of financial relations so devised that materials can be produced and ways may be found of moving them where there are markets created by human need; for machinery through which capital may—for the development of the world's resources and for the stabilization of economic activity—move on equitable terms from financially stronger to financially weaker countries.

ATLANTIC CHARTER—RECIPROCAL OBLIGATIONS

The pledge of the Atlantic Charter is of a system which will give every nation, large or small, a greater assurance of stable peace, greater opportunity for the realization of its aspirations to freedom, and greater facilities for material advancement. But that pledge implies an obligation for each nation to demonstrate its capacity for stable and progressive government, to fulfill scrupulously its established duties to other nations, to settle its international differences and disputes by none but peaceful methods, and to make its full contribution to the maintenance of enduring peace.

SOVEREIGN EQUALITY OF NATIONS

Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under law the equal of every other nation.

The principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, irrespective of size and strength, as partners in a future system of general security will be the foundation stone upon which the future international organization will be constructed.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms and details of its governmental organization—so long as it conducts its affairs in such a way as not to menace the peace and security of other nations.

NONINTERVENTION

All nations, large and small, which respect the right of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs.

LIBERTY

There is no surer way for men and for nations to show themselves worthy of liberty than to fight for its preservation, in any way that is open to them, against those who would destroy it for all. Never did a plainer duty to fight against its foes devolve upon all peoples who prize liberty and all who aspire to it.

All peoples who, with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind," have qualified themselves to assume and to discharge the responsibilities of liberty are entitled to its enjoyment.

DEPENDENT PEOPLES

There rests upon the independent nations a responsibility in relation to dependent peoples who aspire to liberty. It should be the duty of nations having political ties with such peoples, of mandatories, of trustees, or of other agencies, as the case may be, to help the aspiring peoples to develop materially and educationally, to prepare themselves for the duties and responsibilities of self-government, and to attain liberty. An excellent example of what can be achieved is afforded in the record of our relationship with the Philippines.

Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, March 20, 1944.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 8, 1944, as well as the joint letter dated March 7 of six Members of the House of Representatives from the New England States, submitting comments with respect to certain applications pending before the Board proposing additional air transportation services between New York and Boston, and with special reference to the report and recommendation of the Board's examiner thereon. In connection with the latter, you commend the recommendation for an additional New York-Boston shuttle route but seek earnest consideration of the granting of additional certificates of public convenience and necessity authorizing through trunk-line routes to New England from important cities in the south and west.

As you are aware, the proceeding covered by Examiner Wrenn's report involved, in addition to New York-Boston shuttle service, applications proposing through service to Boston from the west coast by Transcontinental & Western Air and United Air Lines through extension of their existing transcontinental routes from New York to Boston as well as a proposal of Eastern Air Lines to extend its route from the southeast to New York on to Boston. There is also another proceeding pending before the Board involving direct service from Boston to the west as proposed by T. W. A. and United which would connect with their transcontinental routes at Pittsburgh and Cleveland, respectively. The examiner's report in the latter proceeding was issued some time ago but, at the suggestion of several of the parties, consolidated briefs were filed covering the two proceedings and a single oral argument will be held thereon. As you know, the reports of the examiners do not represent the decision of the Board, which has not yet acted in these matters, but merely the recommendations of the examiners based upon the evidence adduced at the hearing. As permitted by the rules of practice, exceptions to the examiners' reports have been filed by all the parties of record and the oral argument, referred to above, is now assigned for March 27, 1944. Following oral argument the matter will stand submitted for decision by the Board. You may be assured that in reaching its decision on the above discussed applications the Board will give careful consideration to the transportation needs of the New England area as disclosed by the record.

In passing upon applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity the Board is acting in a quasi judicial capacity and its procedures in connection therewith accord with the usual practice of an administrative law agency. Although the Board's rules of practice provide that "any person, including any State, political subdivision thereof, State aviation commission, or other public body, may appear at any hearing and present any evidence which is relevant to the issues," in the interest of orderly procedure it has been necessary to restrict formal interventions. In the instant case the Boston Port Authority, the Massachusets Department of Public Works, and the State of Connecticut, among others, have been permitted to intervene and thus are entitled to participate in the oral argument. The parties, including the applicants and interveners, have been allotted a total of approximately 12 hours for the argument.

Your interest in the proper development of a sound national air-transportation system, and especially the relationship of the New England area to such a system, is appreciated. Instructions have been given that you be notified immediately of the release of the Board's decision in this proceeding.

Sincerely yours,

L. WELCH POGUE,
Chairman.

MARCH 8, 1944.

Mr. L. WELCH POGUE,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POGUE: Many persons of my State, including high officials of municipal and State governments, have protested to me against the recent ruling of your examiner limiting air routes into Boston and New England.

Whether well founded or not, the impression exists that this opinion virtually creates a monopoly and will bar the effective growth of Boston as an airport and stifle commercial development so far as air facilities are concerned.

If all this be true, it would indicate a very serious situation, which would profoundly and adversely affect all New England and I desire to urge that you review this entire matter with the view to liberalizing the opportunities for several other companies desiring to operate in our area.

Appreciating your interest and efforts and asking that you send me your views concerning the possibilities, and with usual best personal wishes,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

I Vouch the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered before the Ninth Virginia District Democratic Convention, which was held at Bristol, Va., on March 18, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, men and women of the convention, I know that we all feel inspired by the great message to which we have just listened. And I want the great Democrat who delivered the message and who so signally honored us with his presence today to know that we sincerely appreciate the great sacrifice he made in order to be with us. JOHN MCCORMACK, my friends, is not only a great Democrat; he is more, he is a great American that enjoys the confidence and respect of all Americans regardless of party. And after the great Democratic victory that we are going to win this fall which, I am confident, will elevate SAM RAYBURN to the Vice Presidency, I want my good friend, John, to know that beginning with the Seventy-ninth Congress I shall take pleasure, yes, genuine pleasure, in addressing him not as John, but as Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, once again I am the happy recipient of your love and confidence and respect. Once again I appear before you to thank you for that love and confidence and respect you have again today, as you have over the years, manifested for me. And once again I say unto you, as I have on former occasions, that I had rather represent the men and women of the mountains of Virginia in the Congress of the United States than to hold any other office within the gift of our people. I am proud of my people and I am proud of the commission I hold from them to represent them in national affairs. And my constant prayer during these tragic troublesome days is that the Master may give me the vision to see that which is best for our Nation, and, having seen, the moral courage, regardless of consequences, to stand for those things.

As I view national and world events today, there are but two issues in this campaign. Oh, I know that the opposition, afraid to face these issues and calmly and dispassionately submit them to the American people for decision, will use every device known to the skillful and adroit politician to divert the mind of our people from the true issues by stressing and overemphasizing the annoyances and hardships that our war efforts have occasioned, and then appealing to passion and prejudice. And while I realize that this will be their line of attack, I say unto you that it will be as unworthy as was a similar attack against Lincoln's administration during the Civil War which, you know, was the only national election contest ever held in this country during a period of war, with the single exception of the contest between Madison and Clinton, which was held soon after the beginning of the little skirmish we had with the British back in 1812. The American people resented the vicious and unscrupulous attacks against Mr. Lincoln, their Commander in Chief, in 1864, and if I correctly read and interpret the minds and hearts of the American people they are going to resent the vicious and unscrupulous attacks against Mr. Roosevelt, their Commander in Chief, in 1944. The American people separated the dross from the gold in 1864, and, mark my words, they will again separate the dross from the gold in 1944. While Mr. Lincoln was spared to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion, his tragic, untimely death, much to the hurt of the Nation, especially the Southland, prevented him from working out the just and righteous peace that was in his heart and mind. And, somehow, something deep down in me tells me that today just ordinary men and women here in America, and they constitute the backbone of this Republic, have the same confidence in Mr. Roosevelt that they had in Mr. Lincoln, and that the humble prayer of these ordinary, everyday Americans, and I am happy that I am down in that class, is not only that Mr. Roosevelt may continue as our Commander in Chief, but that his years may be extended until after the final victory has been won and a durable and lasting peace has been worked out. Yes, my friends, America, the whole world, needs the leadership and vision of Franklin D. Roosevelt in order to speed the victory and insure a righteous, durable peace.

Let me break through the maze of false, frivolous, and fictitious issues the opposition is trying to develop in order to confuse the people and put my finger on the real issues.

First. Can we best serve our war effort and thus the sooner bring the war to an end, so our boys can come back home, by continuing the present leadership, or by a change that will bring into power either the present Republican leadership, which is a combination of isolationists and obstructionists, or a new and untried, inexperienced leadership?

Second. Will we be in a stronger position to work out a lasting, durable peace by continuing our present leadership, or by a change that will bring into power either the present Republican leadership, which is a combination of isolationists and obstructionists, or a new, untried, and inexperienced leadership?

These are great issues, as important and far reaching as the American people ever considered, and demand straight thinking after careful, prayerful consideration. Issues that so vitally affect the lives of those we love, the security of our Republic, and the future peace of the world, cannot be settled down on the lower levels of life where passion, prejudice, and ill will hold sway; they call for the best that is within us, they demand that we free our hearts and minds of all hate and bitterness, and that we go down on our knees and ask divine providence to give us the moral strength and courage to consider them with a pure heart and with a mind single to but one purpose, and that purpose the welfare of our boys, the welfare of our country, and the welfare of a world that today lies bleeding and broken upon the wreckage of war.

After preparing ourselves mentally and spiritually to become unbiased, honest judges of the issues, the next thing we should do, of course, is to determine the true facts; because I am sure we are all in agreement that a correct decision depends upon a correct understanding of the facts.

Having drawn the issues, and made these preliminary remarks covering the consideration thereof, may I now be permitted to present the facts relative to the two great issues?

My friends, if the leader of any nation ever had a hard time awakening the people of that nation to impending national danger, that leader was Franklin D. Roosevelt. Back in 1935 when a madman, born to the name of Schicklegruber, but whose family cognomen was later changed to Hitler, conceived the idea that he was commissioned by the fates to become the master leader of a master race, Roosevelt had the vision to view with increasing alarm, first, the huge and uncalled-for increase of armament by the German Nation, and then, step by step, Hitler's boastful and challenging pronouncements, his occupation of the Rhineland in violation of the treaty of Versailles, and finally his ruthless and uncalled-for invasion of Poland. Seemingly, until the invasion of Poland, most of our people were insensible to the danger that Mr. Roosevelt so clearly foresaw. And, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Roosevelt, sensing the danger, set about preparing our country for the conflict he clearly saw in the making, the leaders of the opposition—isolationists then, and deep down in their hearts very few of these leaders have changed—called him a warmonger, an internationalist, a Don Quixote preparing for imaginary battles, a dreamer unduly alarmed over the safety of our country, an ambitious leader hunting an excuse to justify assumption of dictatorial powers, and every other name they thought would discredit his efforts and bring his preparedness program into disrepute with the American people. Ah, these isolationist leaders went farther, and either through ill will, or prejudice, or the lack of vision, or the courage to stand up like men and face facts, turned the ear of indifference to his warnings and, like the ostrich, stuck their heads in the sand, seemingly thinking that what they did not see and hear could do them no injury. Yes, having eyes to see, they saw not; having ears to hear, they heard not; having minds to comprehend, they comprehended not; but having tongues to wag, they wagged them with all the agility and vehemence of a common shrew, and preached a doctrine of isolationism so dangerous that had it been followed free Americans today would probably be the cringing, crawling vassals of Hitler and his master race.

Before Pearl Harbor there came before the Congress five measures that put to a test not only the alertness, sensibility, and perception of the Members to the dangers that threatened us from abroad, but likewise these measures put to a test their responsibility as Members to do all things necessary to preserve the safety and welfare of this Republic. Fortunately for America, a majority in Congress followed Mr. Roosevelt's leadership and put these measures through. Had Republican leadership been followed, every single measure would have failed and, after Pearl Harbor, we would have awakened from our slumber like the foolish virgins without any oil in our lamps.

Oh, for fear there are those who may think I am dealing in campaign talk, let me exhibit the record.

1. REPEAL OF ARMS EMBARGO, JUNE 1939

Back in 1937, under the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt, and in an effort to do everything humanly possible to keep America out of the conflict, we passed what is known as the Neutrality Act, prohibiting, among other things, the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations.

When it became apparent that the Neutrality Act was no protection against a madman, but on the contrary was keeping England from receiving American arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and that if England fell America would be next; and, moreover, that under the act Japan, who had never actually declared war against China and, therefore, could not be considered a belligerent nation, could still buy American arms, the President in 1938 recommended the repeal of the embargo against the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from this country to belligerents, provided they were transported in other than American vessels. The Congress failed to act on the recommendation. The President in 1939 renewed the request, and the provision in the Neutrality Act prohibiting the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations

came before the Congress for action. What, I ask, did the opposition say, and how did the opposition vote? I vouch the record: They said that a repeal of the arms embargo provision of the Neutrality Act would be construed by Germany as an unneutral act, because Great Britain could send her ships to American ports and Germany, due to British control of the Atlantic, could not. And how did they vote? In the House 159 Republicans voted, 134 against the repeal, which, in effect, was a vote in favor of Germany, and 24 for repeal, which, in effect, was a vote for Great Britain. In the Senate 23 Republicans voted, 8 for and 10 against repeal.

2. DRAFT ACT, SEPTEMBER 1940

Let us look into the record a little further. In September 1940, the Selective Service Act came before the Congress, accompanied by a strong recommendation from the President for its passage. Although the national danger was imminent, and it was apparent to all who calmly and dispassionately viewed the situation, that the time was, if anything, overdue in which to commence training our fighting men, what did the leaders of the opposition say, and how did they vote? Ah, my hearers, keep in mind that this was an election year. It is for you to say whether politics directed their talking and voting. I vouch the record: The opposition argued and argued in face of the fact that the evacuation of Dunkerque had taken place May 30, 1940, and France had surrendered to Germany on June 22, 1940, that there was no necessity for the legislation, that we were at peace, that due to our isolation—our remoteness from the scene of conflict—Germany would never make war upon us. My, my, does not such an argument show an utter failure to sense the impending danger and the necessity of preparing our Nation to face it? And how did the opposition vote? In the House 164 Republicans voted, 112 against the Selective Service Act and 52 in favor of the act. In the Senate 18 Republicans voted, 10 against the act and 8 in favor of the act.

3. LEND-LEASE, FEBRUARY 1941

In February 1941, what is known as the lend-lease bill came before the Congress. The bill fell heir to the number 1776, and was known as H. R. 1776, but even the patriotic, all-American title failed to stir in the breast of the opposition the spirit that animated our heroic, patriotic ancestors back in that eventful year. The object of the bill, as we all know, was to provide Great Britain with food and ammunition and implements of war so she could withstand the terrific onslaught to which she was being subjected at the time. England, at this time, remember, had gone through her Dunkerque, had lost her ally, France, and was being subjected to the most terrific bombardment from the air ever known up to that time, and it was apparent that unless she obtained aid, and immediate aid, would go the way of Poland and France. Well, what did the opposition say, and how did the opposition vote? I vouch the record: Oh, they talked about America being self-contained, our safety because of our remoteness from the scene of action, granting dictatorial powers to the President, and a little of everything except the bald facts that England was right up against it, fighting with her back to the wall, and that if England fell America, in all probability, would be the next nation Hitler would take on. And how did the opposition vote? In the House 159 Republicans voted, 135 against aid to Great Britain, and 24 in favor of such aid. In the Senate 27 Republicans voted, 10 for aid and 17 against aid.

My friends, had not the Congress followed the leadership of the President and granted aid to Great Britain she would have fallen, and today we would be either the vassals of Hitler, or waging a single-handed war against him.

4. EXTENSION OF DRAFT, OCTOBER 1941

In October 1941, less than 2 months before Pearl Harbor, there came before the Congress the extension of the Selective Service Act. The original act called for a training period of 12 months, but provided that in the event the Congress thought the national interest imperiled, the President was given the right to extend the period for such time as might be necessary in the interest of the national defense. What did the opposition say, and how did the opposition vote? Again I vouch the record: This time the opposition charged that we had led the boys to believe that they were only to serve 12 months, that if we extended the period of service we would be breaking faith with the boys, that the national interest was not in peril, and that there was no necessity for requiring our boys to remain longer in the service. How did the opposition vote? In the House 154 Republicans voted, 133 against extending the Draft Act and 21 in favor of the extension. In the Senate, 30 Republicans voted, 17 against extension and 13 in favor of the extension. Just stop and think, my friends, and cold chills will begin to run down your backs, because if the opposition had prevailed the Army of the United States, in the most critical period of its history, would have been practically disbanded, and Pearl Harbor would have found us with ships, but no sailors to sail them; guns, but no soldiers to shoot them; planes, but no pilots to fly them.

5. FINAL REPEAL OF NEUTRALITY ACT, NOVEMBER 1941

Less than 1 month before Pearl Harbor, namely, on November 13, 1941, we had before the House for consideration legislation to repeal the prohibitions in the Neutrality Act against American vessels carrying goods to belligerents and the passage of American vessels through combat zones. The President recommended the passage of this legislation because it was found that the armament we were turning out in ever-increasing quantities under lend-lease could not be transported to Great Britain, Russia, and China unless American ships could be pressed into service.

It also appeared that unless Great Britain, Russia, and China received the armament that they would fall under the accursed heels of the dictators. And if they fell only Divine Providence knows what would have happened to America. The situation was desperate, and the question was—would America in order to make it possible for Great Britain, Russia, and China to hold out and resist the onslaught of the dictators, come to the rescue by furnishing the ships, or would she let these great nations go down, and assume the risk of fighting the dictator nations alone? Wrapped up in that answer, in my opinion, was not only the preservation of Great Britain, Russia, and China, not only the preservation of America; but the preservation of Christian civilization. Well, in this tense, dramatic moment, when everything we hold precious and dear was at stake, what did the opposition say and how did the opposition vote? I vouch the record: Why, the opposition, with its head still in the sand, said that if we took such action we would get into the war—not realizing that it mattered little what action we took, in all probability we would get in the war, and if we did not take favorable action we would be in the war without allies—and some went so far as to openly state that because they did not like the President's labor policy they could not go along with him. Think of it, because they were peeved at the President's labor policy they could not go along with him in his effort to protect our very existence as a Nation. And how did the opposition vote? In the House 159 Republicans voted—137 against permitting American vessels to carry ammunition, armament, and implements of war to Great Britain, Russia, and China—and 22 for. In the Senate 27 Republicans voted—6 for and 22 against.

My friends, I have given you the record of the opposition on the five great issues, all involving our national defense, our safety and security—yea our very existence as a Nation—that came up for determination in the Congress before Pearl Harbor. The defeat of any one of these measures would have jeopardized our safety; the defeat of all would have made it possible for the dictator nations to have subjugated Great Britain, Russia, and China, and Pearl Harbor would have found us without allies, the helpless victim of misguided leadership.

Now, just one question, do you want to turn the prosecution of the war over to the leadership of a party with such a record?

Oh, I know that Pearl Harbor brought about unity and raised American patriotism to such heights that, for a season, the opposition was afraid not to follow the leadership of our Commander in Chief. But as I continue to give you the record—bless your souls, I haven't finished showing the opposition up—you will find that as soon as it became apparent that, due largely to the leadership of our Commander in Chief, we were going to win the war, and hence the fear of a defeat wore off, we find the opposition back at their old trick of playing politics with the war effort.

While I cannot go into all of the machinations of the opposition in their effort to embarrass our Commander in Chief and bring his leadership into disrepute, let me call your attention to a few things, all matters of record—yes, I am speaking from the record today—that have taken place during the recent past.

While we all hate controls, we all realize that without them we will have not only a shortage of food and clothing and critical war material, but inflation as well. No matter what the price we have to pay, or the hardships we have to suffer, every sensible man knows that we cannot afford to run the risk of having a food shortage, or a clothes shortage, or a shortage in critical materials needed for our war effort; and we all realize that this country cannot withstand the war if it is followed by inflation. Realizing these things, the Congress back on October 4, 1942, passed the Price Control Act in which it directed the President to hold the line. The line was supposed to cover our whole economy. One link in the chain is the cost-of-living link, another the salary link, another the wage link, another the rent link, another the price link, and so forth. The President advised the Congress that in order to hold the cost-of-living link he would have to employ the use of food subsidies, but if the Congress knew a better way, he would be glad to follow such a way. As a matter of fact the President does not think any better of food subsidies than the common run of us, but he simply knew of no other way to hold down the cost of living. And the Congress did not know a better way, or, if it did, it made no suggestion to the President, or anyone else, as to a better method. Instead, no doubt proceeding on the idea that food subsidies were unpopular, it went off on a tangent and abolished food subsidies, and it took this action knowing that the hold-the-line chain was only as strong as its weakest link, and that if the cost-of-living link was broken, the wage link, the rent link, the salary link, and so forth, would also break, and inflation would be upon us. How the Con-

gress could establish the line, direct the President to hold the line, and then refuse to give the President the tools he found necessary in carrying out the will of Congress, is one of those mysterious things that no sensible man will try to figure out.

Well, what did the opposition say and how did the opposition vote? I vouch the record: Read the debates and it is hard to tell just what line of reasoning the opposition followed, except they all seemed to be against the President. Like the geese, some flew east, some flew west, and some flew over the cuckoo's nest. But to give you some idea of what was said. I recall that some said food subsidies were not necessary, others that O. P. A. was a nuisance, and still others that the whole thing was simply a scheme of the President to corral the labor vote. You know, the opposition is getting a vote complex. They don't want the laboring folks to vote, they don't want the soldiers to vote, and before we get through with the election I believe they are going to kick on anyone voting unless he belongs to the opposition. In the House 191 Republicans voted, 177 against holding the line and 14 in favor of holding the line. In the Senate 20 Republicans voted, 17 against holding the line and 3 in favor of holding the line. The whole unhappy matter was ended by a Presidential veto, which the Congress wisely upheld, and inflation was thus averted.

Last year the President asked for a tax bill that would raise $11,000,000,000 of additional revenue. Now we are at war, and it is taking more money than the ordinary mind can comprehend to finance it. Surely the duty is upon us who stay at home to raise the money, if it is humanly possible for us to raise it, and not leave it to our boys to do the fighting and then come back home and do the paying. The Congress responded to the request of the Commander in Chief by passing a tax bill that will only raise around $2,000,000,000. The President vetoed the bill, and in his veto message, while he used, I am afraid, intemperate language, he set forth sound and potent reasons why he was forced to resort to the veto. When these reasons, which show up the tax bill for what it is, become generally understood by the people, I sometimes wonder if the American people will not come to the conclusion that it was these potent reasons which laid bare the iniquities of the tax bill rather than the intemperate language that really got under the skins of some.

Well, what did the opposition say? Oh, they said that the poor American taxpayer could not carry a heavier burden as he is already loaded down with a tax burden that is unbearable. This is an election year, you know, and taxes are unpopular in off years, much less election years, and no doubt they thought that such an argument would appeal to the voters. Well, in my opinion, they underestimated the patriotism of the average American. The average Americans, the kind we have here today, are more interested in winning the war so their boys can come home, than they are in dodging their responsibilities as taxpayers. They are not in this war to make a profit, they are in this war to back their boys up with everything they have, including their dollars, so they can, as Kipling would say, "beat the blooming boots" off of Hitler and Tojo and come on home. And let me tell you something else they failed to say. Every dollar we pay on the war today will relieve our soldier boys, who are the future taxpayers of America of just that much. Moreover, roughly speaking, our national income will run around 155 billions of dollars, of which amount around 85 billions will go into consumer goods and 42 billions into taxes, leaving a balance of some 25 or 30 billions, which, my friends, is nearly as much as the entire national income under Hoover. Now, it doesn't take a tax expert or a financial wizard to tell you that 25 or 30 billions of dollars is a lot of money to be left floating around, and if it is not siphoned off in taxes or forced savings, or in some manner, is, in spite of all our controls, going to bring about inflation. Well, here is how the opposition voted. I vouch the record: Neither in the Senate nor House was a record vote taken on the tax bill. A bad sign to begin with. The tax conference report was passed by the Senate without a record vote. Another bad sign. In the House we obtained a record vote on the conference report, and 177 Republicans voted, 144 for the conference report and 33 against. The veto vote was as follows: In the House 202 Republicans voted, 199 to override the President's veto and 3 to sustain the veto, and in the Senate 32 Republicans voted and every one of them voted to sustain the veto.

Recently we had before the Congress the soldiers' vote legislation. Upon the recommendation of the President legislation was introduced waiving registration and the payment of a poll tax and providing a simplified Federal ballot that both the War and Navy Departments stated could be transported to the soldiers and back. Now, when we send our boys away from home and make it impossible for them to register and pay their poll taxes, it is nothing but fair and just that these voting prerequisites be waived. And remember that both the War and Navy Departments stated that they did not have shipping facilities to handle State ballots. It is recognized by all who are acquainted with the facts that a simplified Federal ballot, based upon a waiver of registration and the payment of a poll tax, is the only means whereby a great majority of our soldier boys can vote. When this legislation came before the Congress for consideration, what did the opposition say, and how did the opposition vote? Why, the opposition boldly charged that the soldier boys, if permitted to vote, would vote for their Commander in Chief, and that the whole thing was just a scheme to corral the soldier vote in order to reelect the President. What else? Why the Republicans actually came out and championed the cause of the rights of the States. Oh, yes, they would be perfectly willing for the imaginary rights of the States to stand between our soldier boys and the ballot. Why? Because they seem willing to resort to any excuse or pretext to get rid of the soldier vote. Remember the same Republicans, when it comes to the repeal of the poll tax by Federal legislation, in utter disregard of the rights of the States, are willing to override the constitutional provision vesting in the States the right to determine the qualification of voters. And yet in view of this record, many southern Democrats fell for this Republican hypocrisy. In the House 193 Republicans voted, 175 against the soldier boys, and 18 in favor of the soldier boys. In the Senate, 32 Republicans voted, 22 against and 10 for the soldier boys.

Just here let me pause to answer the charge that the soldier boys, if permitted to vote, would vote for their Commander in Chief. You know, to me, that statement is one of the strongest reasons I ever heard advanced, if not the strongest, as to why Mr. Roosevelt should be reelected. Why, do you ask? Simply because if the boys who are doing the fighting are satisfied with their Commander in Chief and want to see him continued in command until they complete the job, I for one boldly proclaim that their wishes should be granted, and that we who stay at home, secure from danger, eating three square meals a day, and sleeping in warm, comfortable beds at night, should join hands with them and make his election unanimous. If the soldier boys are for Mr. Roosevelt, as the Republicans charge, it is apparent that they are satisfied with his leadership and think that by continuing that leadership victory will come quicker, which means they can come marching back home a little sooner.

Now, let me brush away some of the rubbish. Before I do this, my friends, let me make a general statement. I want to be perfectly frank. I am not contending that mistakes have not been made. I am not saying that I am satisfied with, or that I approve of, all that has been done. In an undertaking, the like of which was never before dreamed of in the world, in which speed and haste meant everything—meant the difference between victory and defeat—mistakes were but natural. Then, too, I know that the administration of some of the emergency laws has not been what it should be. Ofttimes our people have been unnecessarily annoyed with foolish or unjust rulings and useless and annoying red tape. When I ran across these things I have not hesitated to criticize and do everything I could to bring about the needed corrections. I have, however, tried to confine my criticism to constructive criticsm, realizing that while the objectives were good the administration was poor. Many corrections have already been made. Experience is a great teacher, and as we go along I am in hopes that we will be able to reduce the errors to a minimum. But, by and large, I say unto you that in spite of our mistakes and shortcomings, the accomplishments of the American people under the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt have been nothing short of a miracle.

The rubbish that is being injected into the campaign to throw the voters off guard may be grouped under the headings: "Food," "Labor," "Industry," "Home front," "Domestic policies," and "Fourth term." May I briefly refer to these things?

(A) FOOD

From some of the dire predictions the opposition has been making for the past 2 years, sometimes I wonder if there are not those in this country who hate Mr. Roosevelt with such a vengeance that they would go so far as to welcome a famine in order to discredit his administration. If there are such they are going to be sorely disappointed, because the great majority of the American farmers are in this war to win and are fighting as hard as any soldier on the battlefront to produce the necessary food to carry us through. I think I know something about what the American farmer has done and is doing, and some day I hope to have the opportunity to give you a detailed report. Suffice to say, whether or not you approve of Mr. Roosevelt's food program, I am here to tell you that, in spite of all dire predictions to the contrary, it is producing food, and the American people are the best fed people in the world today, and the American armed forces have more and better rations than any other army. And I want to further say that no segment of our population is more patriotic than our farmers, that they have made real sacrifices, farming early and late, oftimes without sufficient help, without sufficient machinery, and that they have produced more food in less time than was ever produced in the history of the world. The great majority of American farmers know that while mistakes have been made, that every effort has been made to see that sufficient help remained on the farm and that sufficient farm machinery was made available. The difficulty has been brought about by a manpower shortage and the imperative use of steel and other critical war materials for munitions of war. And, in my opinion, ordinary American farmers will resent the effort the opposition is making to place them in a false light. The opposition is simply

underestimating the patriotism of the American farmer. Let me say this to the opposition: No matter what sacrifice it takes, the American farmer will never let our soldier boys go hungry.

(B) LABOR

From some of the unjust, unfounded, and vicious attacks made against Mr. Roosevelt's labor policy, I sometimes wonder if there are not those in this country who hate Mr. Roosevelt with such a vengeance that they would go so far as to welcome a general strike in order to discredit his administration. If there are such, they are going to be sorely disappointed because the great majority of American labor are in this war to win and are fighting as hard as any soldier on the battle front to produce those things which are necessary to carry us through. Some day I hope to have the opportunity to give you a detailed report. Suffice at this time is to say, whether you approve of Mr. Roosevelt's labor policy or not, the record shows that no segment of our population is more patriotic, that proportionately they have furnished more boys to do the fighting than any other class, that they have suffered more casualties right here on the home front in mine and factory than the armed forces so far have suffered on the battle front, and that they have back of them, in spite of all criticism to the contrary, the greatest labor record ever made during any comparable period in the history of the world.

(C) INDUSTRY

Some day I hope to have the opportunity to give you the war record of industry. It is a great record. Oh, whether you approve of Mr. Roosevelt's production program or not, I am here to tell you that American industry is patriotic, that it has performed no less than a miracle in production, and can be depended upon to produce the tanks, planes, and guns necessary to bring the Axis powers to their knees.

(D) HOME FRONT

Oh, they tell you, "Yes, things are all right on the battle front, but my, my, how about the mess on the home front?" Now the American people, when they think this thing through, are not going to fall for that argument. You cannot, my friends, separate the fronts. The battle front depends, absolutely depends, upon the home front, and if the home front ever bogs down, and I want you to carry this thought home and ponder over it, our boys are going to be up against it on the battle front. Just stop and think: We have the best fed, the best equipped, the best cared for army in the world, and that army is supplied with the best implements of warfare yet devised and turned out. Now, the home front is furnishing the food, it is furnishing the equipment, it is furnishing the care, and it is furnishing the implements of war for the battle front, and in spite of all criticism, in spite of all abuse, I am here to tell you that the home front, under the leadership of our commander in chief, has done a splendid job and, because it has done a splendid job, the battle front has been able to do a splendid job.

(E) DOMESTIC POLICIES

Another thing I want to call to your attention. There are those in this country who do not approve of Mr. Roosevelt's domestic policies, and are constantly criticising and hammering on these policies, when they should be giving their time, their effort, and thought to the war effort. Whether you are for or against the domestic policies of Mr. Roosevelt, patriotism dictates that a settlement of these issues should not be mixed up in our war effort. We need unity, and trying to inject these domestic questions into the war effort is calculated to bring about disunity. Yet, some people, it seems, want to mix up a little of everything in the war effort except the fighting. What we should do is to keep everything out of the war effort except the fighting. Some things can wait, but we cannot afford to do anything that will hamper or delay our war effort. Let us keep our eye on the squirrel. The big thing is to keep the fighting going, and going in a big way, so we can speed up the victory and bring our boys home.

(F) FOURTH TERM

There are those who oppose a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt. Of course, some of this opposition is sincere and honest. Most of it, however, comes from those who opposed even a first term for Mr. Roosevelt. And yet, had not Mr. Roosevelt been elected back in November 1932, it is hard to say what might have happened right here in free America. Those were dark ominous days. Fearful things were happening in other parts of the world and, remember, a hungry stomach in America will have about the same effect as a hungry stomach in some other country. Why, on the night of the day Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated, I heard a great independent Republican Senator say that it looked like Divine Providence had put Mr. Roosevelt in the White House, because, in his opinion, this country could not have carried on 30 days longer under Mr. Hoover. Who can say that the same Divine Providence did not put him back in office for the third term? Let us just pause for a moment and calmly contemplate what might have happened if Mr. Roosevelt had not been elected for the third term. What, my countrymen, would have happened to the five great, all important, measures that came before the Congress before Pearl Harbor? Yes, what would have happened to repeal of arms embargo, the draft bill, lend-lease, extension of the draft, and repeal of neutrality? From the record I have cited it is apparent that everyone of these measures would have been defeated and Pearl Harbor would have found us unprepared.

Oh, I hate to see Mr. Roosevelt drafted for a fourth term. I do not like third terms and fourth terms, and under ordinary circumstances would oppose more than a second term. But, my countrymen, my hatred for third and fourth terms is overcome by my love for America. I believe the welfare of my country—yea; the safety and security of my country—demand that we reelect Mr. Roosevelt. Why? Well, to begin with, Mr. Roosevelt has a better grasp of the war situation and world conditions than any other man in America. It would necessarily take a new man in the White House a considerable length of time to find out what Mr. Roosevelt already knows. Moreover, Mr. Roosevelt seems to be able to work with our allies. There, too, a change would eliminate Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, Donald Nelson, C. E. Wilson, and many others, all of whom have been doing a great war job, from the war picture. Now, if we make a change, I do not know how long it will take the new occupant of the White House to acquaint himself with our war effort and world conditions, nor do I know whether or not he could work with our allies, nor do I know whom he would put in the places of Hull, and Stimson, and Knox, and Nelson, and Wilson, and others. The change, to say the least, would slow down our war effort, probably seriously cripple it, and I do not want this to happen. Our war effort is clicking and I want to keep it clicking so our boys can come on back home. To me it would be just as sensible for England to turn down her Churchill, or Russia to turn down her Stalin, as for America, at this fateful hour, to turn down her Roosevelt.

Now, to those who, in connection with the fourth term hollo dictator, let me say this: I have heard that cry against Mr. Roosevelt for a long, long time, and to me that cry is as empty today as it was when his enemies first gave voice to it. So long as freemen can freely participate in a free election there is no fear of dictatorship.

Yes, my friends, America is fundamentally all right. There is no fear of dictatorship. Our war effort is clicking in the right way, and if these alarmists, the political faultfinders, these isolationists, these obstructionists, these Roosevelt haters will only "pipe down" for a little while and quit their alarming, their faultfinding, their obstrucing, their hating, under the leadership of our Commander in Chief we will keep them clicking until the dictators are crushed and our boys come marching back home.

My countrymen, I have given you the record and I have tried to brush away the rubbish. That record clearly shows that the leaders of the opposition, from the beginning, have either been isolationists or obstructionists, and, in war, one is about as bad as the other. And the record reveals another thing; namely, that the rubbish is being thrown into the campaign by the alarmists, the political faultfinders, and the Roosevelt haters, for, in my opinion, but one purpose, and that purpose to wreak their vengeance upon Mr. Roosevelt and bring about his defeat. Now, let me ask you a simple question or two: Are you willing to turn the further prosecution of the war over to a leadership with such a record? Do you think final victory will be speeded, so our boys can come on back home a little sooner, by making a change and turning the further prosecution of the war over to such a leadership, knowing that that leadership will put in high position new and untried men? The fathers and mothers of America, be they Democrats or Republicans, cannot afford to let prejudice, ill will, or anything else, lead them into making the wrong answer. With the best interest of that soldier boy of yours in mind, think it over, Mr. American Father, Mrs. American Mother, and may a just and righteous God direct your thinking.

PEACE

Now, my friends, I come to the other issue that is wrapped up in this campaign, world peace.

Under the matchless leadership of our Commander in Chief, we have the war won if we will only quit our bickering, stick together, and keep it won. Oh, I know there is much fighting yet to be done. Oh, I know that in the winning we have yet to pay an awful price in life and property. Cold, clammy sweat breaks out on me when I think of the fine American boys whose lives will yet have to be sacrificed to bring the victory. What I mean is this: By the grace of God we are no longer fighting with our backs to the wall; we now have the men and armament with which to win. How long it will last, what price we will have to pay, I know not. The time may be long, and the price may be high, but I am now persuaded that a just and righteous God will give us the victory.

Will we throw that victory away, as we did in World War No. 1, or will we use it, as the Master would have us use it, to usher in a just and lasting peace?

My friends, I would not only be false to my innermost feelings and emotions, but I would be withholding my views, which you are entitled to know, and which honesty demands that I make known, if I failed to frankly give you my thoughts on the great question which today weighs so heavily upon the minds, hearts, and souls of all thoughtful people: The peace that will follow the present conflagration.

Let me first announce my thesis and then, as I proceed, in support thereof, cite a few passages from the greatest textbook on government ever written: If this generation, upon which will fall, at the conclusion of hostilities, the colossal task of working out the peace, fails to base that peace upon moral and spiritual ideals and values, which alone can insure its perpetuity, then the blood of our loved ones will have been shed in vain, and down through the years, in the eyes of the righteous, we will be looked upon as the accursed executioners of the untold millions who hereafter fall upon the field of battle.

Mr. Chairman, men and women of the convention, laws and statutes which, at best, are but rules of action promulgated by man in an effort to command that which is right and prohibit that which is wrong, while they have their place in government, have never been able to breathe into government permanency and durability. Many of the nations of the past, whose works of grandeur and art corroding time has consigned back to nature, and whose only evidences of existence are found buried in the bosom of the earth or recorded in the archives of the past, had codes of laws that, while they still command the respect and admiration of mankind, failed to endow their governments with perpetuity. Why has it always been thus, do you ask? And I answer, because those nations, instead of being anchored to the Cross, were founded upon the sand. Be not deceived, if the history of the nations of the past teach one lesson that stands out above all others we may glean from the rise and fall of empires and kingdoms, it is this: No nation, no government, devoid of moral and spiritual ideals and values can endure. It is an immutable law, attested by both sacred and profane history, as unchangeable as the everlasting hills that surround us, that respects not smallness nor is awed by greatness, and to which the smallest tribal kingdom of the land of Canaan and the great Roman empire alike, fell prey. Yes, read the record of the ages and you will find that when national, moral, and spiritual ideals and values began to decay, laws and statutes became impotent to save, and the blighting, withering hand of death has been laid upon that nation. Now, my countrymen, treaties of peace are but agreements or covenants among nations and can only have such moral and spiritual ideals and values as the contracting nations breathe into them. And if the contracting nations are devoid of moral and spiritual ideals and values, how, I ask, can they give birth to these things in their covenant of peace? My constant hope, yea, my constant and earnest prayer is that our Government may be drawn close to God and will take the lead in seeing that the peace that follows this devastating war will be founded upon moral and spiritual ideals and values. If it is not, it matters little who the signatories to the peace treaty may be; the treaty, at best, founded as those in the past upon shifting, treacherous earthly sands, will be but another treaty, the prelude to another and greater and more devastating conflict.

Think not, because I am pleading for a recognition of moral and spiritual ideals and values, that I am advocating that visionary and utopian provisions be written into the treaty of peace. Just the contrary. The Master was no dreamer. He was no crackpot. He was no long-haired, visionary theorist. He was a tender, compassionate, though stern and just, realist, that had the spiritual stamina and moral courage to look facts in the face, and He preached the realistic doctrine of love and fair dealings that no man can violate and lead a free, full, and abundant life, no nation ignore and live. Yes, my friends, our every-day experiences prove that there is more hard common sense in the teachings of the Master than the philosophers and publicists ever dreamed of, or the warped, scheming minds of statesmen and diplomats, bent upon the advantage, ever perceived or grasped. In His teachings the Master clearly laid down two fundamentals governing the conduct of man. And, as a nation is but a people as an organized body politic, or, to put it more simple, an aggregation of people owing allegiance to a common government, these principles likewise apply to nations. Let me charge your minds with these two great principles.

Toward the close of the Sermon on the Mount the Master made a great summation in these words:

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

Now, that is just plain common sense, because our human experiences teach that if we expect our fellow man to treat us right we must treat our fellow man right. And if this is true of individuals, it is true of nations, and it follows that if we expect other nations to treat our nation right, our nation must treat other nations right. Simple, isn't it? Yes, so simple that down through the ages it has confounded the wise.

On another occasion, in answer to a trick question propounded by some slick, hypocritical Pharisee lawyer as to which was the greatest commandment, He answered:

"Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

"This is the first and great commandment.

"And the second is like unto it. Thou shall love they neighbor as thyself.

"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Just another plain common-sense answer. We all know that malice, and ill will, and hate, and envy are the poisons that engender most of the ills of the world. And our every-day human experiences teach us that if we love our fellowman, if we are considerate of his rights and manifest an interest in his welfare, that 99 times out of a hundred he will respond to our attitude and treat us in the same manner. Now if this is true of individuals it is true of nations, and it follows that if our Nation is considerate of the rights of other nations and manifests an interest in their welfare that they will respond to our attitude in like manner. Simple, isn't it? Yes, so simple that down through the ages it has confounded the wise.

Now I crave your attention while I recite the concluding words of the greatest discourse ever delivered:

"Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock:

"And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock.

"And everyone that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand:

"And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the wind blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell; and great was the fall of it."

I have repeated to you the words with which the Master closed the Sermon on the Mount. Oh, my countrymen, following the admonition of the Master, may we become doers of the word; let those two great eternal moral and spiritual truths which I have cited, of love and doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, be the foundation upon which is erected the covenant of peace, and I defy the dwarfed, bigoted men that strutted upon the stage of action after World War No. 1—men whose intellects had been dulled by political passion and whose vision had become blinded by hate and ill will—to again bring on their hell-sent rains and floods and winds of ill will and political advantage. Anchored to such a firm foundation, it will withstand any assault that these moral and intellectual pygmies may be able to make, and will usher into a pilloried, plundered, wrecked, and ruined world a peace that will vouchsafe to our children and our children's children the peaceful habitation of a world prepared by God for the enjoyment of His people.

Now I come to the most serious question ever asked an audience in this country. What will America do? Will she act the part of the wise man, heed the teachings of the Master, and exert her influence and power to see that the treaty of peace has a moral and spiritual foundation, or will she again disregard the teachings of the Master, follow the leadership of moral imbeciles and intellectual neurotics and again build upon the sand? Upon that answer hangs the fate of a crushed, bleeding world.

Listen, my countrymen, while I depict, outside of the tragedy on Calvary, one of the darkest pages in the history of the world. A quarter of a century ago the fate of a war-torn world, eagerly, earnestly praying for peace, hung in the balances, the weight of America being sufficient to tip the scales either way; and the voice of Woodrow Wilson, truly an American prophet, was heard pointing the way. Yes, God in His wisdom had committed to our Nation, as if to test our moral and spiritual character, the decision of a great question, and He had raised up among us a great leader to point the way, and then what happened? Oh, I blush to record that in her hour of destiny America was found wanting and from the high spiritual plane the agonized prayers of our mothers and fathers, as they moaned the butchery and killing of their sons, and prayed that the fathers and mothers of succeeding generations might be spared the bitter cup which had been their portion, had lifted us, descended into a spiritual eclipse, and the fate of a frightened, distorted world was turned over to a vindictive few in high position who, forgetful of their trust to our people, yea, forgetful of their trust to the whole world played cheap ward politics with a bleeding, shattered world and paved the way for the present conflagration.

My friends, the echoes of that senatorial tragedy are the booms of the guns on the beaches of Italy and the islands of the Pacific as today they send forth their missles of death to mow down and kill the most precious flower of Christian civilization, American young manhood. But, I beseech you, place not all the blame upon those few vindicative, misguided leaders. Upon us, whether we relish admitting it or not, rests part of the blame. Had not the greater part of our people walked in spiritual darkness during those fateful, tragic days, American manhood and womanhood would have asserted itself and rendered impossible the betrayal by the vindicative few.

While the Master will not strive with men and nations forever, at the end of this conflict, I hope and pray He is going to give us another chance. What will our answer be? Oh, what will our answer be?

My countrymen, I charge you that with you and the other men and women of America rests the answer. And I am persuaded, and believe me when I say politics are not directing my thoughts, that if we re-elect Mr. Roosevelt we have taken a forward step in answering correctly. I say this because Mr. Roosevelt commands the respect and confidence of more of the peoples of the world

today than any other man. I say this because pronouncements that have been made by him, or in which he participated, such as the "Four Freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, and the Mascow Declaration, have the right ring in that they are all based upon moral and spiritual ideals and values.

May God give us a speedy victory and then guide and direct us in the working out of a just and lasting peace, is the prayer I leave with you.

Message of Secretary Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the splendid message of Mr. Ickes, delivered by his personal representative, Mr. George A. Wilson, Director of Supply and Transportation, Petroleum Administration for War.

This address was delivered Friday, March 24, 1944, at the dedication exercises of the War Emergency Pipelines, Inc. These exercises were held at one of the 26 pumping stations on the line, or in other words at pumping station No. 22, at Rockwood, Pa.

Mr. Wilson said:

The Petroleum Administrator would have enjoyed speaking to you on an occasion such as this. Unfortunately, he was unable to be present. He has asked me, however, to convey his keen personal regrets and to deliver this message to you on his behalf.

The completion and commencement of operation of the Little Big Inch pipe line may well prove to have been the turning point in the stupendous and arduous task of providing transportation for the enormous quantities of petroleum and petroleum products required to meet the ever-increasing military and essential civilian demands of the eastern seaboard.

How narrow the margin of safety was in providing the heating oil necessary to keep homes warm in the East is amply illustrated by the fact that at the time this pipe line began to deliver heating oil early this month the New York, Boston, and Providence areas were down to less than a 3-day supply of this product.

This second large-diameter pipe line from the great oil-producing area of the Southwest to the eastern seaboard is a petroleum products pipe line, as distinguished from the crude petroleum carriers—the Big Inch. It is as much a direct military facility as it is a civilian project, for it is designed to and will transport both military and essential civilian petroleum supplies. Like its bigger and older brother, it is literally a new additional river of oil—truly the blood plasma of mechanized warfare—pouring oil closer to the European war front and swelling the volume that will help to bring the victory more surely and swiftly.

The War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., constructor and operator of both the Big Inch and the Little Big Inch, is a nonprofit company organized by the oil industry to act as agent for the Defense Plant Corporation in the construction of the facility and for the Defense Supplies Corporation in its operation. These latter two Corporations, subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and agencies of the United States Government, which owns the line, supplied the many millions of dollars required to finance this tremendous undertaking.

The petroleum industry made available without charge its technical facilities, experience, and knowledge for the designing, construction, and operation of the line.

The pipe line could never have become a reality without the priorities obtained from the War Production Board, with the full cooperation of the Army and the Navy.

The Congress of the United States is responsible in no small measure for the achievement of this new war project. Through its passage of the Cole Pipe Line Act, it gave recognition to the importance of petroleum pipe lines as essential instrumentalities of national defense.

This line will stand as an enduring monument to all those whose sweat and toil have built it. During the peak activity of construction on the 2 large pipe lines a total of 16,000 men was employed by the 19 contractors. Each of these men has played an important role in the victory that is to come, for we can assure victory by such instruments of war as this great pipe line and its older partners, the Big Inch—the superarteries for the fighting strength that is impotent in the ground of Texas but invincible when delivered, via the eastern seaboard, to the machines of war across the Atlantic.

And so once again to W. Alton Jones, to his fellow directors of War Emergency Pipelines, to all of their colleagues in the petroleum industry who are fighting the battle of oil transportation, and to everyone who has contributed to the building of this pipe line goes our deepest gratitude for another powerful weapon in our arsenal of democracy to supply the necessary fuel to our armed forces and those of our allies. Particularly is credit well deserved in the realization of this second large petroleum carrier because of the many difficulties and unfortunate accidents that plagued construction progress almost from the beginning and delayed starting of operations for several weeks. Despite these heartbreaking difficulties, however, the job has been done and the line has taken one of the foremost positions in our vast overland transportation system to the east coast.

Skill and hard work have brought the "Little Big Inch" and the "Big Inch" to reality. Now they speed precious fuel—fighting fuel—to our fighting fronts.

We have won another round in the battle of oil.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter sent by Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, to a Mr. H. E. Bradstreet, who is the chairman of the War Price and Rationing Board at Butte, Nebr. I am also inserting Mr. Bradstreet's reply.

The Office of Price Administration is to be commended for asking the advice of a man like Mr. Bradstreet who is out there on the firing line and trying to do a good job in administering the Price Control Act. These volunteer boards are intimately associated with the administration of this act. It seems to me that the complaints made by Mr. Bradstreet are typical of those coming to other boards. The Office of Price Administration has been asking for information. They should follow the considered judgment and advice of the men who know the proper answers to the many difficult problems arising on the home front as it relates to the Office of Price Administration:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1944.

Mr. H. E. BRADSTREET,
Chairman, War Price and Rationing Board, Butte, Nebr.

DEAR MR. BRADSTREET: As you probably know, the bill extending O. P. A. authority is coming up soon; also, our appropriation bill.

In preparing our requests to Congress I feel that we should consult the men most on the firing line in contact with the public, our local board chairmen, as to what changes, if any, should be made in our plans and operations. I do not want a reply which just says we are doing a fine service to the people unless you sincerely think so. I want a real appraisal of our faults as well as our virtues.

Is or is not O. P. A. rendering a worthwhile service to the people of your community?

How could we do a better job?

Particularly, are there any changes in our powers which you personally would recommend to Congress?

A completely frank letter will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Butte, Nebr., March 17, 1944.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter requesting an appraisal of the O. P. A., as to its value to the public and its methods of operation. Here are my conclusions taken from my experiences and discussions with other board members and Mr. John Q. Public.

First. I believe that the theory of O. P. A. is good. I believe that price control should have applied to labor as well as food, rents, etc., but as it is, it resembles the tail of a kite; it is being whipped to pieces by the kite (labor). O. P. A. has not been able to function as it should because of this fact.

Second. The regulations of the O. P. A. cover too much territory. Some of the rules cannot be enforced in some parts of the United States, since people live under different environments and circumstances. The climatic conditions also vary. In spite of these facts, O. P. A. officials insist on enforcing these regulations without exceptions from coast to coast and from border to border. Tires, for instance, are rationed according to the number of registered cars in any given county. This is far from satisfactory, because here in the Middle West people live greater distances from the towns or villages where they do their business and must travel over roads that are not surfaced as they are in eastern Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, and farther east, and they consequently use and need more tires because of these distances

and road conditions. This will also apply to the consumption of gasoline.

Third. Absolutely too much waste of time and red tape. One-third of the personnel employed could be dispensed with and drafted for service, either in the military, defense, or other production plants. There is no need of one or more officials (or so-called experts) being sent here and there and elsewhere each week trying to explain to the local boards some new laws or the changes in the old regulations, without knowing too much about the matter themselves.

Procedure: A bulletin is sent out to all boards. In a few days an expert appears to explain the instructions. This certain expert tells you a certificate is not necessary to purchase a cook stove. In another few days another expert appears on the scene telling you a certificate is necessary from the A. A. A., the buyer drives to the A. A. A. office wasting gas and tires to obtain a certificate.

But to his disgust he learns that the A. A. A. never heard about such certificates. If the O. P. A. is so insistent on saving gas and tires let the so-called officials do less driving. It is a good motto to follow at any time: "Practice what you preach." Example speaks louder than words.

Fourth. The enforcement of O. P. A. rules have turned out to be a farce. Practically every application reads: "10 and 10 for any violation." From time to time a case is tried only as a deterrent. Hundreds of violations occur every day but they are ignored by the officials until the whole set-up has become a huge joks. If the O. P. A. is so necessary in every respect, then the enforcement of its regulations are also absolutely necessary. A law or a regulation without a sanction does not give sense.

Fifth. It has been said that the O. P. A. is unpopular because it takes something away from the individual. It is not the taking away that makes the O. P. A. unpopular but the inconsistent and red-tape methods used in doing so. Every local board I am sure is willing and desirious of assisting in any manner possible to carry on this program but I know some or most of them are quite disgusted with some of the procedure.

In conclusion every American I am sure would give his shirt to aid in any program that will help win the war but resents and will not tolerate his shirt being pulled from his back with impudence when his shirt is not needed.

In behalf of the local board of Boyd County, Nebr., we assure you of our continued cooperation and assistance in every manner possible regardless of the foregoing criticism.

Respectfully yours,

H. E. BRADSTREET,
Chairman.

War Production on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered Sunday, March 26, 1944, over stations WSOO, Sault St. Marie, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis.:

In these broadcasts each week, I have from time to time brought you stories from the production front here at home. As frequently as my legislative duties will permit, I have made it a practice to visit our war-production plants. I have seen things which cause me, on the one hand, to marvel, and on the other, to learn the partial reason for our phenomenal successes on the fighting front.

Let me assure every mother, wife, father, sister, and brother that your fighting men are getting materiél—the best materiél that can be made by Americans, for Americans, and on most fronts in the quantities they need. Such has not invariably been true in the southwest Pacific.

A few weeks ago, I visited the great plant of the Cleveland Diesel Engine Division of the General Motors Corporation in Cleveland, Ohio I can best sum up the whole trip by saying that, while in this great plant, the thought kept recurring to my mind, "The war at sea is being fought right here in Cleveland." Even to a layman, uninitiated in the secrets of production, the feeling of achievement, gained through production genius, is sensed. Here I stood in the midst of a great organization, hundreds of men, countless machines, completely coordinated to one end—more and more Diesel engines for our Navy.

This story at Cleveland Diesel is really the story of one man—George W. Codrington, vice president of General Motors and general manager of the Cleveland Diesel engine division. This is a story which goes back almost 30 years; 30 long years of industrial pioneering; 30 years of heartbreaking effort, which only came into its own when our Nation stood with her back to the wall. I am told that the first Diesel engine was completed there in 1913. There were many obstacles to the general acceptance of this engine. But these courageous men at Cleveland were undaunted and went ahead, because they were convinced that the Diesel engine would play an important part in the building of America.

To show you how much these men have achieved in a comparatively short time, it will suffice to point out that in 1934, the first Diesel engine of American design, built in Cleveland, was installed in a United States Navy submarine. This event means much to us today, because our submarines have sent such a vast amount of enemy shipping to the bottom of the sea.

In the years between 1934 and 1940, the year in which we seriously started our defense program, these same men were hard at work building and perfecting the powerful engines which today are playing such an important role in the war.

Came 1940, and every industry in the Nation was called upon to put forth the maximum amount of effort to insure the necessary materials we would need in the event of war. Of course, at this time, we hoped we would not enter the conflict, but we did feel it was best to prepare.

When I went through this plant in Cleveland, I could reconstruct the history of the years from 1940 to today. Here was a small group of men with industrial "know how." They had developed a product and they knew its worth. It was left only for them to be called by their country and they could do the job.

At the beginning of the defense program, I am told that the plant facilities at Cleveland Diesel comprised only 240,273 square feet but, today, this floor space has been increased to 691,030 square feet—almost three times that of 1940.

Then, too, the personnel of the plant was increased 787.73 percent. Men were brought in to work. These were not highly trained technicians for the most part, but they were the corner grocery boy, the salesman, the farmer—in fact, any man who was willing to put his shoulder to the wheel and help in the gigantic task that lay before him. These staunch Americans realized that everything they held dear in life was at stake, and they were more than willing to do their parts in insuring our way of life.

I stopped and talked with some of these production workers. It was the same story repeated over and over—they felt they were doing their job. One man summed up the whole idea in these words—"Sure, we're giving it Hades because this is our war, too." This is esprit de corps of the highest type. In these few words is the explanation why this organization has not lost a single man-hour of work in their plants because of any labor difficulties. This is a great, magnificent, coordinated team and the team starts at the top of the organization and goes down to the newest man in the shop. You can't come in this plant and not realize that teamwork is the essence of this business. And the essence of that teamwork is the fact that when I walked through that plant with George Codrington, it was "Hello, Frank," "Hello, Charley," "Hello, Pete," and the answer invariably was "Hello, George, how's everything going?" In other words, George Codrington knows every man in that plant by his first name and they know him by his first name. You don't have labor disputes when you have a mutual affection such as that. George Codrington would fight for every last man in that plant, and every last man in that plant would fight for George Codrington.

It appalls me when I think how much was asked of so few. The few in this case were those men of management, upon whom fell the whole load of planning and producing. The courage required of these men is no less than that required of the soldier on the battlefield. These men of foresight knew too well that not only their own very existences were in the balance, but the life of every man who went forth under arms was just as deeply involved.

The marvel of this program lies not only in the work done in the plant of the Cleveland Diesel engine division of General Motors, but in the extensive subcontracting program that was undertaken. Chronologically, the story will read something like this:

The initial order for defense material was received from the United States Navy in June 1940. It was immediately evident that the Cleveland Diesel engine division would be called upon to produce an unprecedented number of engines to satisfy the demand. Expansion was the order of the day. This order demanded the widest expansion of engineering ability to available productive facilities.

Subcontracting was not a new idea to these people—but subcontracting on the scale that would be required if they were to meet the demand seemed almost perilous. Now, there was no time to debate the pros and cons of the issue, but the job had to be taken in hand—come what may. The Navy needed engines, and the only answer was subcontracting. The record will speak for itself and will prove the wisdom of the men who so courageously undertook the job.

Within one year from the date of the first defense order, production had been stepped up 12 times. By December 31, 1942, this figure had been jumped to 24 times. At the end of December 1943, production was, unbelievably, 40 times that of 1940. I present this record to the highest court in our land, the court of public opinion. This tribunal can only find one verdict—a stupendous task well done, the American way.

The full and entire story of this subcontracting story will never be known. It is too vast and, too, it again is a page of Americana. I saw a large map in the office of Mr. Codrington. It was a map of the United States, and that map was dotted. The dots extended from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It looked very much to me like the kind of map with which we were so familiar in peacetimes, the map that was used by every selling organization. And I was surprised that such a map would survive the ravages of war, but this was not a sales map. It was a map of subcontractors. I was told that these dots represented more than 400 subcontractors and that the total number of people employed by these subcontractors was more than 94,000. These 94,000 people are wholly or partially employed in producing material which ultimately will go into engines for the Navy. Translating this story further, it means that for every person working at Cleveland Diesel, almost 20 others are employed by subcontractors.

Still the full story of subcontracting has not been told. In many instances, the responsibility of the prime contractor, Cleveland Diesel, did not end with the allocation of the order to the supplier. No, very often, new buildings had to be built and the prime contractor saw to it that the buildings were built. From time to time, employment problems had to be straightened out and, again, the prime contractor handled the problem. Then too, the prime contractor is continuously assisting the subcontractors in the procurement of material. In fact, the prime contractor could very well be likened to a mother who could and would ease the burden of her troubled child.

I said earlier that the force behind this great production effort was George W. Codrington. I can best illustrate this by a story that was told to me by one of his associates. It seems that the Navy was in need of a particular type of vessel, but it was difficult to find a builder. Mr. Codrington was asked for suggestions and his answer was, "I'll build them myself." Again, the record stands, the boats were built in record time.

Very briefly, I have outlined the task that confronted these people in Cleveland. I have told you how that problem was attacked, and there is left only for me to point out the result. The result is that 1,393 vessels, powered with Diesel engines manufactured at this plant in Cleveland, were accepted by the Navy in 1943. This figure does not reveal any military secrets. In fact, if the enemy should learn that almost 1,400 vessels were powered by one plant in this country, they would get little comfort. They would know that America means business. And we're in there until the end—the end being the way we specify it

When I left these people in Cleveland and left their great plant, I bowed my head and said, "Thank God, I am an American, and that I live in America."

Charles Philip Keyser

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Missouri in expressions of deepest regret at the passing of Charley Keyser. The oldest newspaper correspondent in Washington, and for many years the dean of the Press Gallery, he has sent his last wire, and his copy this morning is marked "30." For something like 40 years—the most eventful 40 years in the history of the Nation—he represented one of the great newspapers of the country, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. In that long and useful career he rendered a notable service, not only to his paper but to his profession. During his service on the Hill here practically every local newspaper organization had its origin, and the very ethics which now govern the fraternity were largely developed, and in both fields he was an active and helpful participant. Perhaps the greatest attribute of a reporter—after the fundamentals have been provided—is fairness. Few realize the extent of the plenary powers exercised by the established newspapermen who cover the House. By a single irrelevant adjective, in an otherwise impeccably accurate account, a newspaper article may contribute materially to the dismissal of a Member from the House and conversely, by the bare mention of his name in strategic association, elevate him to national acclaim. Charley Keyser never took unwarranted advantage of this prerogative. He was always fair, generous, and—our greatest need here on the floor—charitable. He was a great reporter, a great friend, and a great man. He will have a byline on the other side. Peace to his ashes.

"Back the Invasion" Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and pertinent speech delivered by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] at Baltimore last Sunday at a "Back the Invasion" rally.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I desire to congratulate those who are responsible for this meeting. I desire to congratulate those who realize that production is necessary to the winning of the war. I desire to congratulate the mayor of Baltimore upon his broad and patriotic proclamation calling for a spirit of national unity and for support of the Commander in Chief of the American Army and Navy in order to assure victory for the armies of liberation. The mayor has touched the keynote of this whole situation. There are those who apparently assume that this war is being won without plan, without guidance, and from some I gather the impression that it is being won without patriotism. I saw an article a few days ago entitled "The Morning After." That is a very suggestive and thought-provoking title. I thought of the morning after Pearl Harbor. I thought of the efforts which the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy had made before Pearl Harbor to persuade the Congress of the United States that it was necessary to prepare for the coming inevitable struggle. I thought of the exposed position of our whole western coast after Pearl Harbor. I thought of our shortage of airplanes. I thought of our shortage of capital ships. Seven out of eight of our battleships at Pearl Harbor had been destroyed or at least temporarily put out of commission. I thought of the mental condition of our citizens all over this Nation who had been told that there was no danger of war. There could never be an invasion of the United States. Our Territories were free from possibility of attack.

On the morning after Pearl Harbor the territory of the United States, including the mainland, was wide open to attack. Submarines at once began destroying our commerce in the Atlantic Ocean. Those who had sneered at the warning which had been given to America by the Commander in Chief were now utterly dismayed. We had our America First lecturers who had spread the seed of dissension in America. That title America First was intended as an implication that those responsible for the operation of the Government were considering some other nation before they were America and in preference to America.

We had seen the great struggle which the Commander in Chief had made for selective service in order that the United States might have an army drilled for actual combat. We had seen the great struggle for lend-lease on the floors of Congress. We had seen the attempt of the isolationists, some for party reasons, some for factional reasons, and some from personal hatred of the President, who had fought the passage of lend-lease. This law enabled democratic countries to continue the fight against the totalitarian powers until the United States became a participant in the war. We had seen the struggle in Congress by the isolation group to prevent American ships from using the high seas to carry articles of food to Great Britain. We heard the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy called a warmonger, an interventionist, a man crazy with personal ambition.

The increase in airplanes in the United States by 500 had been fought desperately by the isolation group. The fortification of American territory was opposed and prevented by the same group. It can be of little satisfaction to the American people at this time to be told that those persons who opposed the preparation of the United States for the inevitable world struggle were conscientious. It matters little whether the persons who opposed these preparations were from the State of Ohio or the State of North Carolina. It matters little whether they were Republicans or Democrats. As a matter of fact there were some of each. Their attitude, to put it mildly, is proof of their lack of foresight. What America should know is where these people have been in the present struggle. While you have been producing, where have they been? The fence sitters, chairwarmers, and obstructionists now want to take charge of America. Had they been entirely successful in their former efforts there would have been little of America to defend.

The Commander in Chief came to the Presidency at one of the lowest ebbs in American history. Thirteen millions were unemployed. American industry had caused a concentration of population in the large cities where they could be in close proximity to the factories and workshops of America.

But the factories were closed. Men do not eat stones, mortar, and bricks. Bread lines were the rule. America was discouraged. The administration offered no aid or helpful suggestions.

I stood in front of the Capitol on March 4, 1933, and I observed the outgoing President and the incoming President on that date. I heard the incoming President state that what America needed was leadership. Where were those vociferous critics of the Government of the United States at that time? There was a business stagnation. During the years from 1929 to 1933, inclusive, there were 391,500 farm foreclosures. During the same period there were 979,900 nonfarm foreclosures During the year 1933 there were 95,200 farm foreclosures. During the year 1943 there were 5,802, or about one-nineteenth of the foreclosures in 1933. There were during the year 1933, 252,400 nonfarm real-estate foreclosures, and in 1943, 25,699, or about one-tenth of the foreclosures in 1933. The President told us that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. America then had its leadership. America would have its recovery.

The total income of the United States in 1932 was less than $40,000,000,000. The income of the United States for 1943 was more than $140,000,000,000. I am not referring to the income of the Government. I am referring to the total income of the Nation. They tell us that we are spending in this war $100,000,000,000 a year. America is making all that it made in 1932 and $100,000,000,000 a year in addition

In other words, America is making its 1932 income in addition to the cost of the war in 1944. They tell us that this is possible because of the war. However, in 1940, a year before Pearl Harbor, the income of the United States had increased from less than forty billions to $77,000,000,000. This was not war. In fact, war conditions in Europe had curtailed in many respects our commercial output. The morning after March 4, 1933, America had a leader. American energy, American capital, American agriculture, and American labor have been victorious. The battle of the domestic front has been won. But the war clouds had been gathering over Europe.

Where were the critics of the American Government in 1932? They were less vociferous then. I'll tell you where they were. They were in their offices attempting to figure out their own solvency. Where were the businessmen who today shout about dictators? They were on their knees praying for loans such as that granted to the Dawes Bank in Chicago They were in the back rooms of their banks pleading for credit. They were in the offices of the sheriffs throughout this land begging for an extension of time before the sales of their homes and businesses.

In 1939, where were those critics? They had recovered their equilibrium then. American labor was employed. American factories were open. Smoke was coming from the stacks of American industry. American citizens were engaged in building homes, in buying automobiles, in educating their children, in building churches, hospitals, and all kinds of public improvements. America was in step. There were those who believed that there was no world outside of America. They were isolationists. Our banking system has been put upon a permanent basis. American citizens no longer fear to put their legitimate earnings in the commercial banks of America. Bureaus, mattresses, sideboards, and closets have ceased to be the depositories of America's earnings.

Under the new leadership America is safe, American savings are safe in legitimate channels. The S. E. C. protects people against swindling security operators. The N. R. A. of 1933 had given confidence that America could continue to exist from an industrial standpoint. The right of collective bargaining was guaranteed by the Wagner Act of 1934. The rights of labor were recognized by the Federal Government. Oh, we are told today that the Federal Government is being operated for the benefit of labor. They don't mean just this. What they mean is that the Federal Government is not being operated against labor. They mean that the laboring people of America are recognized as American citizens with right of petition guaranteed under the Constitution. And after all, the workingman of America constitutes a pretty large percentage of the people of the United States. We are told that by July 1 of this year there will be 53,400,000 of these people in America. They and their families constitute no small percentage of American citizens. The Truman report of February 7, 1944, estimated unemployment at 1,000,000 instead of 13,000,000. There are those who assume that these improvements in conditions were the result of some immutable law of economics. They don't think that this was the result of either intelligent planning or patriotic labor. The American Government is functioning for the benefit of the American people, and not for a limited number of its citizens.

But let us go back to the United States of America on December 8, 1941, the morning after. Our Regular Army had been allowed to dwindle between 1922 and 1933. Our Army had actually grown less by more than 11,000 men in the 11 years between those two dates. Our Navy at the end of 1921 had a tonnage of 1,304,513 tons of combat shipping. On December 31, 1932, the Navy consisted of 1,020,810 tons of combat shipping. If the number of tons of shipping under contract in each of those years is taken into consideration, the Navy had actually decreased 896,610 tons. Under the leadership of the present Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, every move for the increase of either the Army or Navy was fought by the isolationists until Pearl Harbor. But what is the condition now in America under the leadership of this same Commander in Chief? From an insignificant force of airplanes the Government expects during 1944 to manufacture approximately 10,000 planes per month. In 1944 the merchant fleet of the United States will reach 35,000,000 tons. Great Britain's Fleet will reach the total of 20,000,000 tons. The naval vessels of all sorts on July 1, 1941, numbered 2,136. On July 1, 1944, the naval vessels of all kinds of the United States Navy will reach the enormous total of 41,179.

In 1939 there was manufactured in the United States 53,000,000 tons of steel. In 1944 it is proposed to manufacture 93,000,000 tons of steel. In 1944 the manufacture of synthetic rubber will reach the enormous total of 850,000 tons. In 1939 passenger mileage on American railroads reached the total of 22,600,000,000 miles. In 1943 it reached the total of 85,000,000,000 passenger-miles. War plants constructed in America since the outbreak of the war totaled in value $20,000,000,000. We have between March 1941 and July 1943 furnished our allies with nearly $14,000,000,000 in either money or goods under the lend-lease law. We have today in all branches of the military service approximately 10,000,000 men, which will be increased by more than 1,000,000 during the present year. Agriculture has lived up to its requirements. It has increased between 1939 and 1943 by 24 percent. Agriculture has been able from year to year, notwithstanding the curtailment of its manpower, to increase production. Labor has produced its share of men in uniform and has produced as never before the world's requirements in food, war equipment, and the necessities of life. The tremendous accomplishment of America since December 7, 1941, can be only the result of unparalleled cooperation between labor and management, between labor, management, and government. I receive bitter letters of criticism against labor and labor unions. I receive bitter letters of criticism against the Government. I receive bitter letters of criticism against management of industry. I desire to remind those critics that things can't be entirely hopeless in America when we have come through as a nation since 1941 as no nation ever did progress before. No such progress could have been made without the intelligent cooperation of government, management, and labor. Yet, the progress of government even in this war has not been without constant, unremitting opposition. Members of Congress boast of their loyalty to the Government in time of war. They boast of the fact that they have voted for appropriations for war expenses. They voted for these belated appropriations, and then complained constantly to the American people because of the amount the Government is spending, because of the number of persons the Government employs, ignoring the fact that the Government must have more employees to handle the tremendous job it is handling at this time. They complain of the total indebtedness of the Nation when they have been the ones to vote the appropriations and to grant the power of expenditure to the Executive.

Within the last 3 months I have seen Congress pass legislation calculated to deprive American boys in uniform of their privilege of voting. These men and women in uniform constitute somewhere from a fifth to a fourth of the total probable voters of the Nation. Yet every imaginable argument was used which was calculated to deprive those boys and girls in uniform of the opportunity to vote. We have heard much about the State plan of voting and the Federal plan of voting. Senator EASTLAND, from Mississippi, who introduced a bill for the so-called State plan told the Senate that his purpose was to preserve white supremacy. Senator HOLMAN, from Oregon, another supporter of the so-called State plan, told the Senate that if the President of the United States would say that he would not be a candidate for reelection, the opposition to the Federal ballot would be withdrawn, and the Federal bill would be passed in 30 minutes. And we saw a combination of 24 Democrats and 18 Republicans pass the so-called State ballot bill through the Senate. Prior to the time this bill was passed in the Senate, the Army and Navy sent representatives before the congressional committees to acquaint the members of the committees with the fact that individual ballots sent to individual men in the armed service from the 48 States would have a very remote chance of being counted in the coming election. Those Senators who feared the colored vote in the South and those who feared the Roosevelt vote in the North combined to prevent the men and women in the armed forces from exercising their constitutional right of voting in an American election. There was no conflict between the Federal ballot and the State ballot. The Federal ballot provided that if a person voted both ballots, only the State ballot would be counted. In spite of this fact 15 Democrats from the South combined with 22 Republicans and 1 Democrat from the North and West to prevent as many as possible of the men and women in service from voting the Federal ballot which in all probability means the prevention of their voting at all in the coming election. The objective of these Senators had been clearly stated by Senators EASTLAND and HOLMAN some days before the vote. The purpose of preventing the vote to these service men and women is that there may be a government of a part of the people,

by a part of the people, and for a part of the people.

A few days ago in the Congress an appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission was cut. It was asserted, without any real contradiction in the Senate, that the Federal Communications Commission was instrumental in preventing and detecting espionage; that it had saved countless lives of men in the service by its activities. The chairman of the Communications Commission appeared before congressional committees and explained the functions of that Commission. The President of the United States asked for a continuation of the appropriation, but the Federal Communications Commission has been attempting to prevent a monopoly of ideas in the hands of special interests in radio programs. Congress cut the appropriation, notwithstanding the war necessity, notwithstanding the fact that this decrease will in all probability lengthen the war and increase the number of American casualties. One of the recognized principles of international law is that where armed forces are responsible for the destitution of civilian population, there is an obligation on the part of those forces causing the destitution to aid in the relief of such conditions which would result in starvation, riots, and pestilence. The United Nations have formed an organization known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The resolution authorizing an appropriation for this purpose was written principally by a member of the Foreign Relations Committee not a member of the President's party. When the conference report on this resolution came before the Senate it was opposed by 22 Senators because a useless amendment offered by a member of the opposition had been dropped in conference. These 22 men voted to recommit the resolution to the conference committee because of that omission. But this was not all. When the Senate refused to recommit, 9 members of the anti-administration forces voted against the resolution itself. By this vote they were opposing the relief of starvation in countries where such condition is caused by the forces of the United Nations.

Where are we going to be on the morning after the next election? This war is not yet won. Thanks to the management of Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek, it is being won. Under the American system of government who will manage this war after the next election? We shall have more than 11,000,000 men and women in uniform. In whose hands are we going to trust their lives? Are we going to trust them to those who opposed the war? Are we going to trust them to those who have voted to prevent their having the privilege of voting? Are we going to trust them to those who have while giving "lip service" to patriotism never hesitated to say or do the things that would arouse the greatest antagonism in America, and offer the greatest encouragement to our enemies? To whom is America to trust its tremendous business and war interests? Whom is labor to trust on the day after the November election?

In the third annual Truman report of March 3, 1944, we find the following language: "Labor has fought an up-hill fight to obtain recognition of its rights. These rights must be preserved, and it would be most unfortunate if they should be impaired by imposing upon labor Government regulations and restrictions." I don't need to tell this audience that the Congress of the United States is not at this time prolabor. The votes on the Smith-Connally bill and the vote on the requirement of labor organizations to file reports of their financial transactions discriminating against labor will show you not only the vote on labor but it will show you the personnel in Congress who are antilabor.

But where shall we be on the morning after an armistice has been signed? To whom is the world looking for cool management and intelligent foresight in after-the-war problems. Woodrow Wilson foresaw this war. He did all that it was possible for one human being to do to prevent the war. Personal animosities, factional hatreds, and partisan zeal after World War No. 1 guaranteed World War No. 2. We are paying in dollars, sweat, blood, and tears for those animosities, those hatreds, and that zeal. It requires no prophet to foresee World War No. 3 unless it is prevented by intelligent foresight. World War No. 3 will be guaranteed and assured if the American people stack the next Congress with isolationists and partisan zealots who prefer to fight their political opponents in America rather than totalitarian opponents in Europe.

Who is the man in America best fitted by experience, by knowledge of the history leading up to the present war to prevent its repetition? Unless America wakes to its danger, not only will the humanitarian laws of the United States, the laws providing for old-age relief, unemployment relief, and all of those humanitarian reliefs which come from social security be abolished, but all prolabor laws will be abolished; all laws for the uplift of America will be abolished or modified. Not only will these be wiped out, but World War No. 3 will be in its inception and well on its way toward consummation. If those who have consistently fought the preparation of the United States for war, have fought every act intended to strengthen the United States by expenditure of money, those who have criticized every move of the Commander in Chief in the war—if these men are placed at the head of the Government the morning after, we may as well resign ourselves to the sacrifices of an intolerable peace and the horrors of another general conflagration. But what can we do to prevent this situation? The only weapon which the American citizen has with which to preserve his rights is the ballot. The American soldier and sailor will in all probability be deprived of their ballots, to a very large extent. The rest of America, including the capitalist, the industrialist, the agriculturist, and the great army of labor will have an opportunity to vote at the coming election. In order to vote in most of the United States, one must be registered. Are you men and women registered for the next elections? Because of war conditions, thousands of men and women are in States far distant from their places of registration. It requires some sacrifice in order to register. You had better register. Without this registration, on election day and the morning after you will be helpless. The duty of registering and voting is one that you owe to yourselves, to your children, to your posterity, to your State, to your Nation, and to a war-torn world. Register and vote as your conscience may dictate for a continuation of intelligent management of the war, a continued production of the necessities for war, and for an intelligent planning for means of preventing a repetition of this World War. The duty is yours. The opportunity is yours. The credit or the blame will be yours the morning after November 7, 1944.

Washington, Mass., First Town in United States To Be Named After George Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time claims are advanced on behalf of various communities in the United States which bear the name of Washington that they were the first cities or towns to be named for the Father of our Country. Most recently, this distinction has been advanced in favor of towns in Georgia, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Kentucky, as well as for the Nation's Capital. However, information has lately come to light which conclusively proves all such claims to be spurious. The fact is that the first town in the United States to be named after George Washington is Washington, Mass., a community of unsurpassed rural beauty which nestles in the heart of the Berkshire Hills in the western part of the Old Bay State.

Miss Marguerite E. Schulze, of Washington, Mass., who has done extensive research into the history of her native town, has uncovered evidence which shows beyond dispute that this lovely old mountain town was the first to honor the first President of the United States by taking his name as its own. She calls attention to the fact that in 1927, when the town observed its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary with a program in honor of so distinguished an occasion, a well-known writer for a Boston newspaper said without equivocation that Washington, Mass., was the first to be named for the Father of his Country. In connection with the claim, this writer pointed out that 6 days before the town was incorporated, April 12, 1777, General Washington was having difficulties in holding his little Continental Army together and had issued an order granting amnesty to deserters if they would return to duty by May 15. In these dark days, the faith of the founders of Washington in the Commander in Chief of the Colonial Army shone like a beacon light, and I venture to say that the general found hope and courage in this act of loyalty and confidence when the news reached him that he had been so honored.

The little town of Washington, Mass., is one of the most beautiful it has ever been my good fortune to visit. In the October Mountain Forest, the town possesses without doubt the most beautiful natural forest in the eastern part of the United States. Its climate, delightfully cool in summer, adds to its attractiveness to visitors, who return year after year to enjoy the peace and simple grandeur of this mountain hamlet.

I am taking the liberty to include as part of these remarks the following excerpt from an account of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebration of the incorporation of the town, which took place on July 4, 1927. The account is taken from the Springfield (Mass.) Union and I have selected those parts of it which are devoted to a brief but highly interesting history of the town as given on the occasion by Philip Mack Smith, then a member of the staff of the Library of Congress. The excerpt follows:

WASHINGTON, July 4.—On one of the coldest Fourths ever known in this Berkshire Hills town 2,000 feet above the sea level, so cold that even in the railroad station in the valley a coal fire was kept burning all day, and so windy on the hill that the Welcome banner

was split in two, Washington, with its 231 inhabitants, successfully observed today the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its incorporation, April 12, 1777. Among the 500 visitors were people from Cleveland, Ohio; Knoxville, Tenn.; Paterson, N. J.; Washington, D. C.; Hartford and Middletown, Conn., while almost every town in western Massachusetts was represented, including quite a number from Springfield.

In his historical address, which was the main feature of the day, Philip Mack Smith, of Washington, D. C., of the Research Department, Library of Congress, portrayed the early struggles of the settlers of the town called successively Watsontown, Greenock, Hartwood, and, finally, Washington, the second town in America to be named for the Father of His Country. He told how the proprietors from Connecticut had to repurchase the land from the Indians owing to the trickery of Robert Watson, experienced trouble as to where the exact site should be, underwent a lawsuit with a candidate for the ministry when two ministers were called and accepted at about the same time, experienced a revolt of part of the settlers who wanted to be in a separate plantation, got into a row with town of Lee as to payment of the Province taxes, and suffered from the unrest caused by Shay's Rebellion.

But Washington, he said, emerged from its trials and at one time boasted 1,000 inhabitants. Though it now has only a little more than one-fifth of that number, Mr. Smith prophesied it will have an enviable record as a summer resort and even in agriculture and industry better times may be in store, he thought.

Mr. Smith portrayed the pioneer period of the town considering, first of all, the reasons why there was such a demand for the wild lands in the Berkshire Hills beginning about 1750. He showed the necessity which existed that the farmers of those days should have cheap lands where they could raise their large families. Hence the migration into western Massachusetts. The speaker noted that the wars that broke out, King George's War in 1744 and the French and Indian War in 1754 interfered with this migration but with the end of the French supremacy in Canada, western Massachusetts again became attractive as a homeland for young settlers. Such was the situation which led to the settlement of Washington.

Continuing, Mr. Smith said, "The trials of the founders of Washington were so unusual that they loom large in the records of the General Court. In 1757 Robert Watson, of Sheffield, bargained with certain Indians at Stockbridge for the purchase of their title to a large tract lying between Pittsfield and Becket and bordering west on the Housatonic River from Pittsfield's south line to the north line of Great Barrington.

"The same year Watson, assisted by his attorney, David Ingersoll, also of Sheffield, offered the tract for sale to Nathaniel Hooker, a banker of Hartford. Hooker and his friends purchased this tract as a speculation, and, arriving on the ground, were interrupted by the former Indian owners, who declared that Watson had paid only a part of the purchase price of the land. Upon investigation Watson was found to be insolvent and in jail; whereupon the proprietors repurchased the tract directly from the Indians for 179 pounds.

"The tract was now called 'Greenock' after a Scotch town of this name. Sixty-four lots of 100 acres each were laid out on both sides of the main street and along the northern boundary toward Pittsfield. There were 52 proprietors.

"In December 1760 the proprietors bound themselves within the next 10 months to clear 3 acres of land on each lot, girdle 7 acres, and build a log house 16 feet square. Before this could be done the provincial government at Boston informed the proprietors that the basic title to all wild lands was vested in the Province and not in the Indians. As a result, a payment of 800 pounds to the Province was necessary to establish their title. This was the third time that the proprietors had put up a substantial sum of money to maintain their title to the plantation. Arrangements for the payment of the money were made through John Walker, one of the leading proprietors, and the plantation was renamed 'Hartwood.' Other conditions also had to be fulfilled. Within 5 years 60 settlers must be living on the plantation and a learned Protestant minister settled. One lot must be preserved for the support of the ministry, another for the first minister, and a third for the support of 'schooling.'"

Mr. Smith gave the names of the original settlers of the town to whom in 1768, 25 acres were granted to recompense them for their early hardships and noted that these were the original founders of Washington. All of these were originally from Connecticut. Of the proprietors those from Massachusetts came chiefly from Westfield, he said. By January 1767 enough people were living in the community to make necessary the erection of a meeting house. But it was not until October 7, 1772, that the first meeting of the proprietors was held at the meeting house.

TOWN SUED BY MINISTER

Mr. Smith then noted that the lot for the minister on the main highway is now the site of St. Andrew's Chapel. He then told of the curious legal tangle which ensued when the town had to defend itself in an action brought by Rev. Aaron Bliss, of Springfield, called to be pastor in December 1773, but who found before he could begin his duties that Rev. William Gay Ballantine, of Westfield, had also been tendered a call to be pastor and had accepted. Mr. Ballantine was pastor in Washington for 46 years.

NEW TOWN NAMED

On April 12, 1777, after much delay, the General Court approved the bill incorporating the Hartwood tract as a whole, with the addition of the adjoining grants on the north. The new town was named Washington, in honor of the commander of the Continental Army, who had a few months previous redeemed the patriot cause from failure by his successes at Princeton and Trenton. At the time of its incorporation Washington possessed the largest amount of land in its history. In this large area there were living 750 people, according to the census of 1776.

Mr. Smith then related the circumstances attending the setting off of Lee, named for Gen. Charles Lee, and proceeded to describe Washington's contribution to the Revolutionary War and stated that the military services of no less than 75 Washington men have been identified. The difficult period of readjustment culminating in 1786 in Shay's Rebellion was described and the fact was noted that in spite of the troublesome times the migration from Connecticut continued with vigor.

Mr. Smith told of the havoc wrought by lightning in striking the old meeting house of 1792, and also the church erected in 1849, which was the victim of a bolt from the heavens in 1877. The speaker spoke of the present opportunity for worship on the hill through the gift by the Crane family in 1899 of the attractive stone chapel of the St. Andrew's Episcopal Society.

Reference to activities of Methodists and Baptists in the early days were referred to and the historian told of early schools and their records dating back to 1783. The opening of the Pontoosuc Turnpike was coincident with the period of Washington's greatest prosperity, it was stated, and due attention was paid to the sheep industry and the raising of fat cattle which were maintained with profit until after the Civil War.

LIST OF NOTED MEN

Due recognition of the migration of Washington pioneers to Ohio and other sections of the West and Northwest was given and in closing Mr. Smith told of Washington's part in later wars and concluded with a list of some of the men who have gone out from Washington to carve careers of conspicuous usefulness. On this point he said:

"Others more familiar than I am with the old Washington families can tell you of the many men who have gone out from Washington, achieved honor, fame, and fortune in other places. Among them were Amos S. Crane, a prominent railroad official in Boston; Edwin H. Eames, who was in the Engineer Corps in the Civil War; Robert M. Savery, well known for many years as deputy sheriff and court crier in Pittsfield; and John W. Crane, of Springfield, a successful businessman and gifted writer and speaker on the history of Washington. Much might be written of the prominent families of the town, the Eameses, Pomeroys, the Bills, the Chapels, the Congdons and Millikans, the Saverys, the Manleys, the Messengers, the Sargents, and others. Probably the most famous living descendant of an old Washington family is Robert A. Millikan, the distinguished physicist of Chicago and California.

"In the more recent past Washington has suffered severely from the loss of the farms in its western part which were absorbed into the Whitney estate. It seems likely, however, with the improvement of roads and trails through the reservation by the State, and with its wealth of natural beauty, Washington will eventually attain an enviable place as a summer resort town. Even in agriculture and industry better times may be in store. Forestry is an increasingly important occupation. Sheep raising may again become profitable. For all these and other reasons, those who attend the two hundredth anniversary of Washington 50 years hence, will find this old summit town transformed perhaps into a renowned summer or winter playground, but at all events a prosperous and happy agricultural community, still loyal to the best traditions of all who in the past have helped to make life in Washington pleasurable and worth while."

Otto, Carol, and Franco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over Station WMCA, Saturday, March 25, 1944:

Ten years ago our sleep was troubled with the knowledge that all was not well in the ailing corners of the world. We were fearful then that the isolated, seemingly unrelated, fires could blaze into an all-embracing conflagration, but apparently we had little difficulty in quieting our misgivings. We gave respite to our conscience by labeling the portents as "absurd," "pompous," "ridiculous." The color of shirts became a jest while Adolf and Benito screamed, spluttered, and postured.

Tragically, the absurd and ridiculous became real; signposts lined the road to hell, but we traveled along in their wake, unable and illtrained to see their meaning.

What lessons have we learned? That fascism and nazi-ism are infecting diseases that contaminate as they touch, that, if nurtured in one corner of the earth, they, like a cancerous growth unattended, spread and

entangled in all directions. That its cure is effected only with the guns, the tanks, the lives of the young, and with heartbreak. If these we learned, if the signposts now can be read, why in the name of suffering, war-torn humanity are we silent and inert in the face of all evidence that the disease exists among countries and men we have not dared call enemy? We have shed and are shedding our blood to stamp out this dread, but suffer its growth within the Americas and within the Spain of Caudillo Franco.

Nobody has done more to explode the myth of Spain's neutrality than Franco himself. His official pronouncements, his public addresses, his state publications left no doubt of where his loyalty lay. He proclaimed again and again the decadence of the democracies, the mighty power of the Axis. If today his words are softer—his deeds are not—it is no change of heart; it is the expressed fear like that of many another quisling that he guessed wrong.

What does the record show?

1. Spain, Tangier, and Spanish Morocco are nests for a multitude of Axis spies, who note and report every Allied ship that passes Gibraltar.

2. Spain continues and permits exports to Germany of certain vital war materials, particularly wolfram.

3. The Blue Division of Spanish volunteers continues to fight against our Russian ally, this despite Spain's specific promise to remove all forces from the eastern front by December last.

4. The Falangists continue to pour pro-Axis propaganda into the Latin-American countries.

5. Until very recently certain Italian warships and merchant vessels were interned in Spanish ports, despite Allied pressure for release. At present one such vessel still remains so interned.

6. Spain has agreed to a financial arrangement with Germany, enabling Germany to avail herself of substantial peseta credits, which, of course, means that Germany can buy much needed material in Spain.

7. Spain has an arrangement with Germany whereby she can be called upon to supply the Nazis with manpower.

8. Spain is helping to recruit Spanish seamen for U-boat service.

9. While Spain not so very long ago held out promise of the dissolution of the Falange, the fact remains that Spain has granted the Falange an increase of appropriations from public funds.

The list of grievances is long. Franco insulted us, wounded our hearts by sending a letter of congratulations to Jose Laurel, Filipino head of the puppet government set up by Japan in the Philippines. He thus alined himself with the unspeakable Japs, guilty of horrendous atrocities against soldiers and civilians.

The farce of Spanish neutrality is broadly played. We paid for that brand of neutrality with wheat and with oil. We said we were thus keeping Spain neutral. We paid Spain for doing exactly what Hitler bade her do—stay neutral. There was much greater gain for Germany in keeping open the Spanish embassies in enemy countries. There was much valuable information to be gleaned from diplomatic circles in helping the influx of fifth columnists that would otherwise find entry a bit difficult. It is revealing to note that it was the clerk of the Spanish Legation in La Paz who acted as paymaster for German and Argentine agents in arranging for the Bolivian coup. While Franco holds power in Spain, Hitler's work goes on in Latin America.

It has occurred to more than one observer of the Iberian Peninsula scene that the defeated Nazi chiefs can easily move underground, and where better than in Franco Spain, where the welcome is certain and the soil prepared for such husbandry? Indeed, it has been stated that many a Spanish estate is now secretly owned by a Nazi big shot, ready to receive him in escape and leave him in peace to plot and arrange and devise a new order, destined the next time to succeed in establishing the boasted thousand-year reign.

The open appeasement of Spain has sickened the honest and the stout of heart. Let it be asked, What excuse of military expedience remains now? Africa and the Mediterranean have been cleared, our hold on southern Italy secured, and our control of the Atlantic increased by agreement with Portugal.

True, the State Department on January 29, after long years of treading gently lest Franco be annoyed, finally announced that the loading of Spanish tankers with petroleum products for Spain had been suspended, pending a reconsideration of trade and general relations. But what do we now learn? On March 4, it was revealed that a quarter-million gallons of high-grade Pennsylvania lubricating oil in 55-gallon drums have been loaded at an east-coast port to be shipped to Spain. A State Department official, when questioned, stated that the embargo never applied to packaged oil, the embargo applies only to bulk oil shipped in tankers. Neat, isn't it?

The time is now to strain every resource in the final dash for victory. The time is now to avow by deed and not by word that we are bent on unconditional surrender of every tainted, rotten Nazi or Fascist, be he in Germany, Italy, Japan, Argentina, Bolivia, or Spain. The time is now to call every knee-buckler to Nazi ideology by his right name.

There are, here and there, little stagnant pools that are badly in need of draining. If we have recognized and named them, we have half conquered the foe. Let us glance at a few unhappy monarchs, or a little pretender or two to lost thrones. In Mexico, ex-King Carol of Rumania, through the expert offices of a paid press agent, one Russell Birdwell, makes ready to groom himself into a persona grata to the good people of the United States. He sought recently to find the ear of America by broadcasting his regeneration under the auspices of the Columbia Broadcasting Co. That the station finally concluded not to let us have the benefit of his sales talk in no way discouraged the ex-King, who in 1939 had signed a trade treaty with Germany, who, in March 1940, accepted Hitler's pledge for security in return for a monopoly on Rumania's produce. Carol looks very strange so suddenly dressed up in democracy's clothing. It will be recalled that when France fell, Carol decided to ally himself with Hitler openly. He formed the "party of the nation" whose announced program was nationalistic, Christian, and racial, a direct steal from the Hitler propagandists. He imitated the Nurenberg laws of Germany by instituting anti-Semitic measures, barring Jews from political office and cutting the Rumanian Jewish population of 1,000,000 to a third that number. He established the Iron Guard, now infamous for its barbaric cruelties, and handed over Rumania lock, barrel, and key to Dictator General Ion Antonescu, long familiar with the art of butchery—and then Carol fled.

This is the manner of man who seeks entry into the United States, seeks to convince our people that our support is due him for his acts of kindness, charity, for his democracy, and for his friendship and love of his people. But the subtle fingering of a press agent on the public instrument will not avail. We are armed to resistance with the knowledge of the facts. We can recognize the totalitarian, Jew-bating, Nazi-loving Carol, despite his new trappings.

Of like ilk is Otto of Austria, pretender to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It seems to be the newest fashion to pay lip service to democracy. He asks us to disregard the facts that he, until recently, held court in his hotel suite, bestowing titles like the Order of the Golden Fleece, ordaining a court chaplain, demanding oaths of allegiance from his followers. The feudal, oppressive reign of the Hapsburgs, in its decadent governing, offers no recommendation for the restoration of another Hapsburg to a throne that had been so gladly dismantled by all factions.

Neither the Empress Zita, his mother, nor the flitting Otto can boast that their peoples are behind their efforts of restoration. It is not difficult to recall the abortive Austrian Battalion which was to enlist in its ranks as part of the United States Army those Austrians who sought to fight alongside the United Nations. When it appeared that it would operate with the blessings of Otto, only 29 volunteers showed up, 3 of whom were the brothers of Otto. American soldiers of Czechoslovak and other central European origin, who had been transferred to the Austrian Battalian, protested bitterly. Six months following the first announcement of its formation, the Austrian Battalion was quietly disbanded by the Army. But Otto and his cohorts are not easily abashed.

Moreover, it is the boast of Otto and Zita that the declaration on Austria was included in the Moscow agreements "to accommodate the Hapsburgs." In substantiation, they point to their recent audiences with Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt. Oh, yes; they know how to make political capital out of their associations. It was Otto and his gang that sought like the Cliveden set to build up the cordon sanitaire and isolate Russia. They dismally failed. Otto now seeks by word and deed to drive a wedge between ourselves and our gallant allies, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Again he fails. He tries now in equal duplicity to placate Russia because he is another who guessed wrong.

Otto von Hapsburg drools in anticipation of a return to Austria. Carol of Rumania does his daily dozen of political handsprings to distract us from our contemplation of his immediate past. Franco, bigamous wooer of Allies and Axis, grows fat-bellied and sleek. We have not disposed of these papier mâché monarchs and pretenders. There will be plenty of empty thrones and a plethora of grasping aspirants. We must beware lest we have no choice but to place Otto on some sort of Austro-Hungarian dais. Carol might be reinstated in the Rumanian citadel. Don Juan might be rushed from seclusion in Austria to the Spanish throne, with El Caudillo attempting to act out the role of a modern Bismarck.

I have touched but briefly, here and there, on situations, intrigues and men that bear watching * * * if an armed victory is to spell peace, a true peace and for all peoples.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Light Is Needed," which appeared in the March 25 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

This editorial raises some pertinent questions regarding America's foreign policy—or lack of it—and I am sincerely hopeful, Mr. President, that immediate and continuous action will be taken by this Government to clarify these questions which are causing increasing doubt and concern, not only among our own people but among those other peoples of the world who look to us for sound and active leadership during the course of this war and in the peace which is to follow.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE LIGHT IS NEEDED

President Roosevelt's sarcastic reference to people who are wandering around asking bellhops whether we have a foreign policy hardly appears an adequate answer to the questions in the minds of many Americans about our Government's stand on certain vexing international problems.

Thoroughly commendable is the President's reaffirmation that "the United Nations are fighting to make a world in which tyranny and aggression cannot exist; a world based upon freedom, equality, and justice; a world in which all persons regardless of race, color or creed may live in peace, honor, and dignity."

But this high-minded statement of general objectives does not help materially to clarify America's attitude on specific issues.

The White House proposal that the free peoples of Europe and Asia temporarily open their frontiers to victims of oppression is measurably constructive. But, quite apart from its dubious effectiveness, it does not represent what most of us think the words "foreign policy" mean.

Even less impressive as a move in the field of foreign relations is Secretary of State Hull's demand that Hungary offer "firm resistance" to German forces of occupation in order to "regain the respect and friendship of free nations."

Considering that Hungary already has been overrun and dominated by Hitler's thugs this sharp call upon Hungary to resist is in conflict with reality. It seems more naive, in fact, than Secretary Hull's appeal to Finland a few weeks ago to throw off the Nazi yoke and get out of the war.

Furthermore, not much enlightenment on our foreign policy seems to have been obtained yesterday by the Republican Congressmen who conferred with Mr. Hull. Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, leaving the conference, asserted that "silence is still the settled policy of our State Department," although some of those present thought the air had been cleared a little.

But the American people should have more than a little clearing of the air surrounding their country's foreign policy, whatever it may be.

Our people are thinking, for one thing, about the Atlantic Charter, that misty adventure in idealism which will be 3 years old in August. They would like to know whether the Atlantic Charter holds good for all of the United Nations, whether it has developed serious inadequacies, and whether there are plans to revise it in the light of present realities.

They would like to know what the United States Government hopes can be done about France, Poland, Finland, the Baltic States, the Balkans, Italy and the Italian Fleet, Spain and Argentina.

They would like to know why, after its brilliant showing at the Moscow, Cairo, and Tehran conferences, American statesmanship has seemed to take a back seat.

They would like to know whether American foreign policy has come to be a "me, too" ratification of British or Russian policy. Certainly, at least, Premier Stalin has made it perfectly clear that he has a foreign policy which is, briefly, "Russia first."

The American people do not ask that their Government set all these questionings at rest with specified, detailed answers. All they want is some assurance that their leaders have definite policies, and that those American policies are being presented to other nations as clearly and as forcefully as possible.

Roosevelt Fourth-Term Political Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article by John O'Donnell which appeared in the Times-Herald March 28, 1944:

(By John O'Donnell)

American misfortunes and losses in our ill-fated Italian campaign are inflicting deeper wounds in F. D. R.'s fourth-term ambitions than his political reversals on the domestic front or the mounting physical weariness imposed by sustained White House duties.

In the Italian campaign, the capture of Rome by Anglo-American arms has been the pet project of the psychological warriors. Trained military brains, schooled at West Point and skilled by a lifetime devoted to the science of warfare, didn't like the proposal—but it was stuck down their throats by the top-flight politicians and the self-appointed civilian masters of global psychology.

Original political theory was that F. D. R. would make his fight for the fourth term on the grounds that he and his New Deal Party deserved sole credit for United States victories on the field of combat. Seizure of Rome and Vatican City, at suggestion of Commander in Chief Roosevelt, was launched with the psychological whoop-dee-do that this would at once bring the predominantly Roman Catholic nations in Central and South America, Spain, Ireland, France, Austria, Bavaria, etc., rushing to get behind F. D. R. and Winston Churchill.

The skilled strategists, the men who have devoted their lives to the science of arms, shook their heads. They didn't like the idea of invading the so-called soft underbelly of Europe and advised against it.

But the great political rulers and masters of global psychology and reelection politics ordered the boys in.

Now, at long last, the story is coming out. It's too hot for censorship to squelch. And it may well hit as hard at F. D. R.'s post of political power as the Gallipoli campaign of World War No. 1 hit at Winston Churchill.

Gallipoli, and the British losses in the Dardanelles during the fateful year of 1915, the tragedy of Suvla Bay and Churchill's political end as First Lord of the Admiralty in World War No. 1, are beginning to cast their shadows over the political future of Franklin D. Roosevelt as a world-master of military strategy.

Yesterday the Allied commanders on the scene lifted the tight censorship. The official United States Army paper, Stars and Stripes, declared our effort to advance from Cassino had ended "in bloody failure."

The Canadian infantryman's paper, The Maple Leaf, echoes the frank report—that Allied forces are now fighting a defensive battle with heavy losses.

And correspondents coming back from the Anzio beachhead, where we landed January 22, are now permitted to send through their dispatches reporting we tried "too much with too little" and denouncing those far behind the front who "speak glibly about keeping elements of 18 or 20 German divisions occupied in southern Italy and the Anzio beachhead" where, in fact, after "2 months of costly fighting," front-line correspondent Homer Bigart could see "little or no ground gained."

But of far more importance is the willingness to place responsibility for the whole show on the political leaders and make it clear that they, not the military, are to blame for the whole idea. Fundamental objection of the military brains has been:

"Even if we do take all of Italy, what of it? What will it mean to the defeat of German armies in Germany? We're not going to invade Germany over the Alps from northern Italy."

Against this was the more potent psychological warfare argument of the "Great Brain"—the importance of the capture of Rome because of the psychological effect on the Catholics of the world.

Hence the landing in Sicily back last July 10; the bombardment of Rome over the protests of the Pope, 3 weeks later; the landing at Salerno September 3, the entrance into Naples on October 1, and then the long bitter weeks of frustration and hope deferred with tremendous losses for a political victory still beyond reach.

From London, in his cabled dispatch to Newsweek, Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, retired, of the British Army, asks the "statesmen and generals" who planned the Italian campaign "what was its aim?"

General Fuller states the "plea that Germans are being killed and reserves exhausted savors more to me like an apology than an explanation. * * * The lesson of all this is that the strategy is execrable. * * * We should never have embarked on the Italian adventure. * * * Prestige now leaps into the saddle and willy-nilly lashes us on * * * this duplication of the Gallipoli campaign."

Here in the Capital, the Washington Star, under the byline of Constantine Brown, who is privy to some of our leading military authorities and often reflects their thoughts, repeats his earlier charge that the Italian adventure of F. D. R. and Churchill was "conceived against the better judgment of the American strategists. * * *"

Apparently, Roosevelt and Churchill thought their inside political information assured them that the Germans would put up only a token defense, abandon Rome and the Vatican City prize to the invading armies and retreat to the defensive line along the River Po.

"The Germans, however, offered a much stiffer resistance than had been anticipated by the political men who mapped this military adventure," writes Brown.

Prevention of Industrial Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by Fred W. Perkins, a prominent columnist, dealing with preventable loss of life and injuries to workers in American industry during the war period.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREVENTABLE LOSS

(By Fred W. Perkins)

The United States Labor Department today talked up as an evil to be corrected the loss of manpower through preventable industrial accidents.

The Department's figures, sponsored by Secretary Frances Perkins, were that 180,000 workers are kept from their jobs daily because of injuries suffered in their employment. On the basis of a 300-day year, this would mean an annual loss of 54,000,000 man-days.

These official figures show that the impact on war production from accidents that need not occur is several times the impact from strikes.

"Nine out of ten industrial accidents are preventable," said Verne A. Zimmer, director of the Labor Department's standards division. "It is the lack of safety thinking and safety action on the part of too many industrialists and workers which retards production of war material.

"While management has the primary responsibility for safety on the job, the worker—and particularly organized labor—plays an important part in accident prevention. I am glad to report that throughout the country groups of union officials, stewards, and business agents are enrolling in safety training courses sponsored by the United States Department of Labor, in collaboration with the United States Office of Education."

John M. Fewkes, Chief of the Industrial and Safety Section of the War Production Board, places the industrial-accident toll higher than the Labor Department figures—at 270,000,000 man-days a year, which he says is 10 times the loss of man-hours from strikes. He compares the industrial casualties with those of men on the fighting fronts, as follows:

"Industrial accidents from Pearl Harbor to January 1, 1944, total 37,600 killed, or 7,500 more than the military dead, with 210,000 permanently disabled and 4,500,000 temporarily disabled, or 60 times more than the military wounded and missing."

What is being done about it? "In the past 3 years," said Mr. Zimmer, "a task force of 600 top-flight safety engineers brought safety service directly into 25,000 war contract plants. Seventy-five percent of the firms accepting this service have materially reduced their accident frequency. Every day we learn of industrial plants which have operated 1, 2, or 3 years without a single lost-time injury.

"And yet, despite these outstanding individual records, the total number of industrial accidents last year was the highest in history."

Jesse Cottrell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, by the recent death of the able and very reliable correspondent, Jesse Cottrell, the newspaper profession has suffered a severe loss, as have the people of South Carolina and other Southern States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief editorial tribute to Mr. Cottrell, from the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JESSE COTTRELL

Readers of the Greenville News, who have been aided in following and interpreting news developments in Washington by the writings of Jesse Cottrell during the last several years, will join with this newspaper in its realization of loss in the death of its Washington correspondent.

Mr. Cottrell's career was one of distinction and broad achievement. His many years in public service, including diplomatic assignments, gave him a most valuable background for his work as a Washington correspondent for this and other newspapers. He had an unusually broad knowledge of public affairs and his reportorial and analytical dispatches were a contribution to broader public understanding of national affairs in this critical war period. In his death American journalism loses one of its outstanding members.

Problems of Demobilization in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the Outline of Problems of Demobilization in California, ably prepared by the research department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, under the direction of its general manager, Mr. James Mussatti.

I deem this one of the most useful and timely reports I have ever read. I do present it to the Members of this House, and in particular to my colleagues of the Post-War Planning Committee and of the Committee on Small Business, and of the standing committees before whom legislation for the post-war period will come, as an able and comprehensive statement of problems which may be anticipated in the great State of California, which in the past 3 years has proved not only to be the granary and the orchard of democracy but a great contributor to the total war production.

Of course our first concern is to win the war in the shortest possible time, but this does not prevent us from thinking and planning in terms of the post-war period. Unless we do and the war should terminate suddenly conditions would be chaotic in this country. This report should be of invaluable aid as similar conditions exist in the defense centers of this Nation:

OUTLINE OF PROBLEMS OF DEMOBILIZATION IN CALIFORNIA

1. THE EFFECTS OF WAR MOBILIZATION

A. Shifts in employment—National

1. Most recent national estimates of changes in the labor force due to war mobilization are as follows:

	April 1940	December 1944
Armed forces	200,000	11,000,000
Federal war agencies	100,000	1,700,000
Munitions industries (manufacturing)	4,100,000	11,000,000
Transportation, fuel, utilities	3,800,000	4,300,000
Food and tin cans (manufacturing)	1,100,000	1,400,000
Textiles, clothing, leather (manufacturing)	2,400,000	2,800,000
Trade, finance, service	10,100,000	9,500,000
Construction and building materials	2,800,000	1,300,000
Agriculture, forestry, fisheries	8,500,000	8,700,000
All other	12,000,000	8,500,000
Unemployed	8,100,000	1,000,000
Total	53,300,000	61,500,000

Source: The Brookings Institution.

2. At the end of this year the shifts and increases will be as follows:

(a) 12,300,000 to the armed services and Federal war agencies.

(b) 6,900,000 to "munitions" or war industries.

(c) 1,300,000 to other groups, such as utilities.

(d) 20,400,000 total increase or shift.

3. This 20,400,000 increase was made possible by:

(a) 8,000,000 women, youths, and retired workers added to labor force.

(b) 7,100,000 reduction of number unemployed.

(c) 5,300,000 shifted from other industries.

4. Of this total, according to the recent Brookings Institution study, some 17,800,000 will face demobilization during the two and a half years following the end of the European phase of the conflict, possibly 6,400,000 during the period between that phase, and final victory over Japan, another 6,900,000 during the first 6 months after final victory, and the remaining 4,500,000 spread over the following year.

B. Shifts in population and employment—California

1. Shifts in population:

(a) Civilian population of the United States has decreased 4,021,000 since April 1940, due to withdrawals of men and women entering the armed services. All Eastern and Middle Western States have had decreases of from 1 to 16 percent, except Connecticut, Michigan, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

(b) 6 Pacific Coast States have increased 1,595,130 in civilian population since 1940.

	Apr. 1, 1940	Nov. 1, 1943	Increase	
			Number	Percent
California	6,868,065	7,881,694	1,013,629	14.8
Oregon	1,088,284	1,172,674	84,390	7.8
Washington	1,719,143	1,905,239	186,096	10.8
Arizona	497,068	569,357	72,289	14.5
Nevada	108,761	130,637	21,876	20.1
Utah	549,722	583,572	33,850	6.2
Total	10,648,043	12,243,173	1,595,130	15.0

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

(c) California has had an increase of 1,013,620 in civilian population in spite of the withdrawal of nearly 600,000 entering the armed services and the relocation of Japanese. Over 1,600,000 persons are now living here who did not live here in 1940.

(d) This increase of civilian population has been concentrated in war-production and military centers. Some 26 rural and mountain counties have had decreases in civilian population, ranging from 1.8 percent in Butte County to 59.5 percent in Mono. The areas showing largest increases are as follows:

Civilian population

County or area	Apr. 1, 1940	Nov. 1, 1943	Increase since 1940	
			Number	Percent
San Diego	276,079	394,569	118,490	42.9
Los Angeles	2,782,998	3,138,797	355,799	12.8
Orange	130,760	153,253	22,493	17.2
Los Angeles metropolitan area	2,913,758	3,292,050	378,292	13.0
Alameda	512,467	621,485	109,018	21.3
Contra Costa	100,450	218,690	118,240	117.7
Marin	44,742	64,669	19,927	44.5
San Francisco	630,785	685,951	55,166	8.7
San Mateo	111,782	136,574	24,792	22.2
Solano	47,152	95,615	48,463	102.8
San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area	1,447,378	1,822,984	375,606	26.0
Napa	28,503	39,320	10,817	38.0
Sonoma	69,052	73,002	3,950	5.7
Santa Clara	172,201	191,811	19,510	11.3
San Joaquin	134,207	151,805	17,598	13.1
Sacramento	169,770	188,168	18,398	10.8
Monterey	71,144	84,802	13,658	19.2
Fresno	178,565	194,652	16,087	9.0

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

2. Shifts in the labor force and employment:

(a) In spite of the shift of more than a half-million men and women to the armed forces and the removal of 40,000 Japanese from the working population, the civilian labor forces in California increased from 2,905,000 in April 1940 to 3,435,000 in June 1943, an increase of 530,000. (Estimates of the California Division of Labor Statistics in cooperation with the State reconstruction and reemployment commission.)

(b) Employed wage and salary workers increased from 2,005,000 in 1940 to 2,993,000 in 1943, an increase of 888,000, or 44.3 percent. The number of men in this total increased from 1,460,000 in 1940 to 1,979,000 in 1943, a gain of 519,000, or 35.5 percent. The number of women wage and salary workers increased from 545,000 in 1940 to 1,014,000 in 1943, a gain of 469,000, or 86.1 percent.

(c) Most of this increase has been concentrated in the manufacturing industries, which rose from 409,000 in April 1940 to 1,145,000 in June 1943, a gain of 736,000, or 180 percent. Substantial increases also occurred in utilities and in government.

Distribution of civilian labor force in California

	April 1940		June 1943		Increase or decrease (number)
	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	
Agriculture, forestry, fisheries	268,000	9.23	260,000	7.57	−8,000
Mining	46,000	1.58	31,000	.90	−15,000
Manufacturing	409,000	14.08	1,145,000	33.33	736,000
Construction	138,000	4.75	130,000	3.79	−8,000
Primary industries, subtotal	861,000	29.64	1,566,000	45.59	705,000
Utilities	184,000	6.33	242,000	7.05	58,000
Trade and service	1,168,000	40.21	1,141,000	33.22	−27,000
Government	237,000	8.16	401,000	11.67	164,000
Industry not reported	32,000	1.10	25,000	.73	−7,000
Other activities, subtotal	1,621,000	55.80	1,809,000	52.67	188,000
Total employed	2,482,000	85.44	3,375,000	98.26	893,000
Unemployed	423,000	14.56	60,000	1.74	−363,000
Total labor force	2,905,000	100.00	3,435,000	100.00	530,000

(d) Annual average total employment in California manufacturing industries including clerical, technical, and other as well as wage earners in plants increased from 381,000 in 1939 to 1,111,000 in 1943, a gain of 730,000, or 191.6 percent. Wage earner employment rose from 276,300 in 1939 to 878,000 in 1943, a gain of 601,700, or 217.8 percent.

(e) Of the 601,700 additional factory wage earners in 1943, as compared to 1939, 425,200 were added in 2 war industries, aircraft and shipbuilding, and 116,500 were added in all other manufacturing activities.

Average number of wage earners employed—California

	1939	1942	1943	Increase or decrease since 1939	
				Number	Percent
War industries:					
Transportation equipment [1]	22,600	336,200	507,800	485,200	2,146.9
Iron and steel and products	26,900	43,400	53,900	27,000	100.4
Electric machinery	3,900	9,500	13,700	9,800	251.3
Other machinery	13,400	30,800	45,100	31,700	236.6
Nonferrous metals	5,800	13,600	18,600	12,800	220.7
Automobiles, trucks	6,300	4,100	5,000	−1,300	−20.6
Chemicals	9,900	12,100	15,300	5,400	54.5
Rubber and products	4,900	7,700	14,300	9,400	191.8
Subtotal	93,700	457,400	673,700	580,000	619.0
Nonwar industries:					
Food products	71,700	85,500	80,200	8,500	11.9
Apparel	22,400	23,900	22,200	−200	−.9
Lumber and timber	21,500	25,600	22,800	1,300	6.0
Stone, clay, glass	11,500	17,400	17,400	5,900	51.3
Furniture and wood products	13,200	15,100	17,100	3,900	29.5
Petroleum products	9,500	10,200	11,000	1,500	15.8
All other	32,800	36,100	33,600	800	2.4
Subtotal	182,600	213,800	204,300	21,700	11.8
Total	276,300	671,200	878,000	601,700	217.8

[1] Aircraft and shipbuilding.

Source: State Division of Labor Statistics.

(f) In contrast to these figures for California the comparable national totals show 8,192,000 wage earners in manufactures in 1939 and 13,831,000 in 1943, an increase of 5,639,000, or 68.8 percent. Of this, the war industries increased from 2,978,000 in 1939 to 7,931,000 in 1943, a gain of 4,953,000, or 166.3 percent.

(g) By metropolitan industrial centers the disproportionate increase in employment in the major war industries has been more marked than for the State as a whole.

Wage-earner employment in manufacture

	1939	1942	1943	Increase since 1939
San Francisco-Oakland industrial area, total	76,400	195,200	277,000	200,600
Transportation [1]	3,500	103,200	182,500	179,000
All other	72,900	92,000	94,500	21,600
Los Angeles County, total	127,900	331,000	440,800	312,900
Transportation [1]	17,200	181,200	264,600	267,400
All other	110,700	149,800	176,200	65,500

[1] Transportation industries include aircraft and shipbuilding.

Source: State Division of Labor Statistics.

2. PROBLEMS OF DEMOBILIZATION

A. Termination of war contracts

1. Cancelation of contracts at the end of the war will tie up $15,000,000,000 of private working capital in special inventories, tools, and plants. Terminated contracts will have an undelivered value of $50,000,000,000 to $70,000,000,000.

2. California's war-supply contracts, cumulative through December 1943, are:

(a) Aircraft and aircraft parts	$8,775,213,000
(b) Cargo and naval vessels	3,670,889,000
(c) Ordnance	320,975,000
(d) Other supplies	1,107,014,000
(e) Total	13,874,091,000

In addition, $893,150,000 in project orders to governmental establishments such as navy yards have been placed in California.

3. Aircraft company prime contractors and thousands of subcontractors have most serious problems, complicated by low ratio of private working capital to total volume of contracts.

4. Major policies recommended by business groups:

(a) Creation of an over-all governmental agency for uniform direction of contract termination.

(b) Delegation of clear-cut authority to contracting agencies to make final settlements with contractors within the framework of policies established by Congress and this agency, subject to review by Comptroller General only in cases of suspected fraud.

(c) Enactment of legislation to establish a clear and simple avenue for appeals to the courts by contractors for settlement of disputed claims, and establishment of adequate legal machinery for this purpose.

(d) That contractors and subcontractors be granted the right under proper safeguards to obtain mandatory loans from the Government equal to a substantial proportion of settlement claims.

B. Disposal of Government-owned plants

1. Approximately $20,000,000,000 has been spent for new industrial plants since 1940.

(a) $15,700,000,000 by the Federal Government, $4,300,000,000 by private industries.

(b) Government and private financing of war plants.

	Investment since 1940		Percent Government
	Government	Private	
Aircraft, engines, parts	$3,084,800,000	$241,800,000	92.7
Explosives, ammunition loading	2,856,400,000	11,800,000	99.2
Shipyards and repair facilities	1,991,500,000	95,000,000	95.4
Guns, shells, bombs, etc	1,869,700,000	227,100,000	89.2
Chemicals, petroleum, coal products	1,303,800,000	665,000,000	66.2
Chemicals			80.2
Petroleum, coal products			66.2
Iron and steel products	1,261,200,000	565,000,000	69.0
Nonferrous metals	1,126,300,000	302,100,000	78.8
Magnesium	430,000,000		92.0
Aluminum			50.0

(c) Government financed war plants in California represent investment of $848,626,000. Of this the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and R. F. C. have invested over $500,000,000 in shipyards, aircraft plants, the $100,000,000 Fontana steel plant, and other facilities. In addition, the Defense Plant Corporation has invested over $300,000,000, segregated as follows, as to major items:

Aircraft plants	$106,949,000
Chemical and synthetic rubber	50,897,000
Aluminum and magnesium	49,413,000
Gasoline plants	21,785,000
Iron and steel plants	14,919,000

(d) Government financed war plants in the 11 Western States represent a Government investment of $1,683,329,000, or 12 percent of the national total. Some of the major ones outside of California are: $146,628,000 for magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev.; $193,715,000 for steel plant at Geneva, Utah; $12,246,000 for gasoline plants in Utah; $14,190,000 for aircraft plant in Arizona; $68,929,000 for aluminum plants in Arizona; $212,907,000 for aluminum, shipbuilding, and iron and steel plants in Oregon; $284,935,000 for aluminum, shipbuilding, aircraft, machine tool, tank and engine, and iron and steel plants in Washington.

(e) By operating these plant facilities in the post-war period in competition with private industries in the same fields, the Government could completely throttle competing activities by private interests; by throwing them open to unrestricted purchase the Government might foster private monopolies, and by hasty disposal of them at salvage prices the Government would be forfeiting billions of dollars' worth of assets for which the taxpayers have not yet completed payment. Policies adopted with respect to the disposal or operation of these plants will be of paramount interest to the Western States.

C. Disposal of surplus war supplies

At the end of the war (or immediately in some cases) the Government will have on hand billions of dollars' worth of surplus stocks of war supplies, ranging from food, minerals, lumber, and other basic materials to finished products such as clothing, aircraft, or ships. It will also have for disposal surplus war housing, storage facilities, docks, warehouses, and real estate acquired for temporary use. The timing and method of disposal of these enormous surplus stocks will have a tremendous influence upon economic conditions.

D. Removal of economic controls

1. The timing and the method of removal of wartime emergency governmental controls, such as rationing of consumer goods, priorities on materials, manpower controls, price controls, and wage controls will be an important problem of the demobilization period.

2. There is general agreement that many such controls will have to be extended for some time after the end of hostilities. There are many different views as to which should be extended, the length of time, and the provision for their termination. Some views and suggestions expressed are as follows:

(a) The general view of businessmen in this State is that these war powers should be surrendered at the earliest possible date consistent with an orderly return to peacetime conditions, and that Congress should enact legislation placing definite time limits on their extension.

(b) Some economists, such as Dr. Benjamin Anderson, strongly advocate earliest possible removal of price (and wage) controls, in order that price levels may tell the truth and serve as a reliable guide to reconversion and readjustment by business management. Others fear that the combination of large liquid savings in hands of consumers, and scarcity of goods might led to inflationary price rises, unless rationing and price controls are continued.

(c) The recent Baruch report suggests advance planning for partial reconversion after end of war in Europe, with advance listing of priorities to be given different civilian needs in any opening up of civilian supplies; that highest priorities go to those things which contribute directly or indirectly to improved military efficiency; and as far as possible that all competitors be treated alike in the resumption of civilian production.

E. Demobilization, training, and reemployment

1. The general problem of maintaining high levels of production and employment in private enterprise during and after the transition period, of which the foregoing are key segments.

2. The specific human problems involved in actual demobilization, relocation, retraining, and reemployment of men and women released from the armed services and the war industries.

3. Demobilization of the armed forces:

(a) Reinstatement provisions for servicemen.

(b) Should war veterans have employment preference?

(c) Men and women have been drawn from all walks of life, and they must be helped to go back to or enter every sphere of economic activity. Limited programs will not be a solution.

(d) Education and training programs. The Thomas bill (H. R. 3846) provides 1 year of education or training at approved institution, with tuition, and $50 to $85 per month for subsistence.

(e) Mustering-out pay or bonus.

(f) Special information and other services. Surveys of skills and work qualifications.

(g) Controlling rate and order of demobilization. (Age and length of service, marital status, training, etc., are some suggested priorities.)

4. Transfer of war workers to peacetime jobs:

(a) Vast changes in the pattern of employment.

(b) Unemployment insurance—severance pay.

(c) Surveys of skills—potential job opportunities.

(d) Employment services.

5. The Carl Grey plan.

(a) Provides for the formal coordination of existing agencies into a broad organization, built around the United States Employment Service, but with operating control at the State level, and more localized controls.

(b) A research, reports, and planning department at the Federal level.

(c) Occupational counseling and the vestibule center are nerve centers of the Grey plan. Those not occupationally adjusted, for any reason, would go through "vestibule center" for occupational, educational, training, and apprenticeship guidance.

6 California's special problems of reemployment:

(a) Likely to be more severe than the national.

(b) Likely to be creeping unemployment, rather than sudden, but with sharper drop at end of war with Japan.

(c) Likely to have wave or continued migration to offset effect of youth going back to school, women withdrawing from labor force, and retirement of older workers.

(d) Seven hundred thousand to nine hundred thousand will be released from war industries, related services, and Government war agencies; 400,000 pre-war residents from armed services. Another 200,000 from immigrant inductees. Total of 1,300,000 to 1,500,000 to locate or relocate.

(e) Need for special policies based on peculiar status of this and other Pacific Coast States:

Encourage temporary out-migration?

Foster withdrawal of women?

Aid youth to return to educational institutions?

Promote redevelopment of trade and services?

Other steps to increase mobility of workers?

3. WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT THESE DEMOBILIZATION PROBLEMS

A. By the Congress

1. Senate Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning (Rept. 539, pt. 2, Feb. 9, 1944):

Cancelation of war contracts.

Disposition and sale of surplus property.

Industrial demobilization and reconversion.

(a) Believes that an agency should be created by Congress to devote its entire attention to working out and coordinating all demobilization problems, under broad principles laid down by Congress. This Office of Demobilization to be subordinate to the Office of War Mobilization until end of the war.

(b) Collect information on factories that will be affected by war contract cancelation, their manpower, inventory, and machinery requirements both for war and peace production, make advance plans for disposal of inventories, rationing, and allocation of materials, etc., to keep the economy on an even keel. Survey the potentialities of Government-owned plants and make plans for their disposition.

(c) The Congress should not overlook the fact that however unavoidable is the delegation of its policy-making powers in time of war, it is quite another thing to delegate its primary functions to an executive agency in time of peace. It should retain in its hands the settlement of the broad basic

problems of the demobilization program out of which the structure of the peace economy will arise. The nature of the economy of this country for many years to come will depend upon the policies and decisions which are to be followed in demobilization. Regional, State, and local considerations necessarily overlooked in mobilization for war cannot be overlooked in the reconstruction program for which we are now preparing. The economic life of this Nation must not be permitted to become dependent upon Washington directives for peace, as it has been for war.

(d) Paramount policy consideration in the handling of all demobilization problems should be the preservation and strengthening of the American system of free competitive enterprise."

(e) Government plants should be disposed of in such a way as to result in their greatest economic use, but the effect on the general economy should be first consideration. Plants suitable for production of peacetime goods should be sold where this can be done without creating ruinous overproduction. Leasing of plants should be authorized. No Government plant should be disposed of in a manner to create or strengthen monopolies. Authority should be withheld from any agency to dispose of plants in basic industries where Government holdings are preponderant until Congress has determined policy by express legislation, correlated with Nation's foreign policy. These include aircraft, aluminum, magnesium, shipyards, synthetic rubber, and steel mills.

(f) Surplus goods should be disposed of in manner to best utilize their economic value without unduly disturbing civilian markets. Should be kept out of hands of speculators and distributed through regular channels of trade.

(g) In settlement of terminated contracts the committee recommends that prime requisite should be speed and fairness, with advance payments, relaxation of traditional rules governing preaudit and payments of claims by the Government, strengthening post-audit and penalties for fraud, and mandatory advances or partial payments or guaranteed loans. Also, wherever possible, the filing of over-all company claims by contractors and subcontractors. Also provision for review and appeal of disputed cases outside the regular machinery of the courts, such as arbitration, umpires, or review boards.

B. By executive branches of the Federal Government

1. Office of War Mobilization—Baruch-Hancock recommendations:

(a) Getting us back to work in peacetime enterprise. Creation of new post of work director to work with Congress in development of a program of legislation and operations.

(b) Taking the Government out of business by quick settlement of terminated war contracts. Establishment of a joint contract termination board in Office of War Mobilization. Free working capital—remove surplus inventories.

(c) Centralize control and disposal of surpluses in a Surplus Property Administrator in the Office of War Mobilization, and creation of a Surplus Property Policy Board of heads of various war and Government agencies. Broad policies.

Sell as much as possible without unduly disrupting normal trade.

No sales, no rentals to speculators or promoters.

Use regular channels of trade.

No governmental operation of surplus war plants in competition with private industry.

No monopoly; equal access to surpluses to all businesses; preference to local ownership; but no subsidizing of one part of the country against the other.

(d) General tightening of Government war machine.

(e) Advance planning for X-day after collapse of Germany.

(f) Prompt extension of needed war powers.

(g) Tighten handling of cancelations.

(h) Encouragement of small business.

(i) Draft post-war tax law now, and make known the reductions in tax rates.

(j) Early engineering and planning of public works.

(k) "There is no need for a post-war depression. Handled with competence, our adjustment after the war is won should be an adventure in prosperity."

2. United States Department of Commerce:

(a) National economics unit is making studies of post-war markets and other subjects to aid business in post-war readjustment.

(b) Regional and district offices are extending these and other services of the Department to businessmen and commercial organizations.

C. By State and local governments

1. California State Reemployment and Reconstruction Commission:

(a) Coordination and stimulus of efforts of various departments and divisions of the State government to deal with problems of demobilization and reemployment. Advisory committees headed by Commission members, covering such fields as natural resources, agriculture, industry, trade and service establishments, readjustment, education, coordination of research facilities, etc.

(b) Cooperation with organized civic, commercial, and other groups, and with various interim committees of the legislature.

(c) Research by technical staff, cooperating with other State departments in State research pool, with general policy guidance from technical review committee.

2. California Commission on Interstate Cooperation:

(a) Dealing with problems, such as disposal and utilization of Government-owned plants, interstate compacts, trade barriers, unemployment insurance, and others in which there can be official cooperation between various western State governments represented in the Council of State Governments, western region.

3. Interim committees of the legislature:

Assembly interim committee on post-war rehabilitation.

Senate interim committee on post-war construction.

(a) Formulation of program of legislative action intended to remove obstacles to free enterprise and post-war development and of a State program of needed public works.

4. League of California cities:

(a) Seeking cooperation of business, labor, agriculture, and Government at the community level, in the development of community-action programs to meet post-war demobilization problems.

(b) Holding California community planning institutes in Los Angeles and Oakland during latter part of March, in cooperation with American Municipal Association and American Society of Planning Officials.

D. By private enterprise and by business-supported commercial organizations

1. National organizations:

(a) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Committees on economic policy, on surplus war properties, on termination of war contracts, and on education have made studies, reports, and recommendations on many of the problems of post-war demobilization. Also has made Nation-wide consumer and industrial surveys, and is working cooperatively with local chambers of commerce throughout the country.

(b) Committee for economic development. Objective is to aid private industry, trade associations, and community organizations plan for maximum employment and production. Its research division is studying various questions as to governmental policy which will provide a "favorable climate" for operation of private enterprise, and has issued recommendations on termination of war contracts and other demobilization problems. Its field development division has organized community committees throughout the Nation and on the Pacific coast, in cooperation with local chambers, to study and act on readjustment and reemployment problems.

(c) National association of Manufacturers: Post-war committee has made reports and recommendations on major problems of the transition period from war to peace, on long-range maintenance of jobs, freedom, and opportunity for Americans, on post-war distribution of goods and services and on international relations. (All three of these principal national agencies are working closely together on many post-war problems, where their interests are parallel.)

2. California State Chamber of Commerce:

(a) Committee on post-war economics has completed a report and recommendations on governmental policies affecting free enterprise dealing with immediate demobilization problems such as termination of war contracts, disposal of Government-owned war plants and surplus stocks of goods, termination of emergency economic controls, and retraining and reemployment of war workers and servicemen, as well as longer term questions such as taxation, labor relations, and social-security policies. Permanent committees and departments of the chamber in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, industry, transportation and highways, social security, taxation, etc., are working on details of these problems within that general framework of guiding policy.

(b) Research and planning section and steering committees have been organized to develop research and technical data needed. Survey of post-war research and planning activities in more than 200 agencies has been made and is being published in directory form. Survey of research needs of industry is under way.

(c) Research department is undertaking studies by primary trade areas of Western States and of California along two major lines. One, a resurvey of the major economic factors in industrial plant location, such as raw materials, power, fuel and water, labor supply and prevailing wage levels, and markets and distribution facilities. The other, studies of the economic feasibility or opportunity for development of specific key industries, such as textiles, light metals, chemicals, and so forth.

3. Local chambers of commerce and trade groups. Out of the great variety of post-war survey or planning projects carried on by local chambers of commerce, and closely related C. E. D. community committees, the following are those most general:

(a) "Work pile plans," or surveys of deferred and prospective private construction, repair, and remodeling activities that will be available at the end of the war.

(b) Studies of needed public works projects, financing, timing, and the direct or indirect employment provided.

(c) Studies of employment, reconversion, and financing problems of manufacturing or other industries in the community. (For Pacific coast industrial centers, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco is cooperating with C. E. D. committees and local chambers of commerce in the fact-gathering phase of this endeavor.)

(d) Plant inventories of the labor force in war-boom communities, to obtain both factual data as to changed composition in terms of age, sex, race, skills, source of migrants, and opinion data as to post-war intentions of remaining in the labor force and in the community. This is one of several necessary steps in determining post-war

demobilization and employment problems at the community level.

(e) Survey and action programs to discover new or post-war manufacturing opportunities, and to promote industrial expansion and employment.

(f) Programs for strengthening and expanding business in the distributive trades and service establishments in the community, extending its trade area, and fostering sound development of agricultural or other primary industries which are the economic supports of the community.

(g) Programs for the reabsorption, reemployment, training, and care of returning servicemen. (Many small communities where there is no local office of the employment services are providing for this function through the local chambers of commerce.)

(h) Study and action programs relative to the disposal and utilization of Government-owned industrial plant facilities in the community.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, on Greek Independence Day, in Boston, at Boston Symphony Hall, on Sunday, March 26, 1944, the address being broadcast over local stations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Annunciation Day, March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras and a little band of Greeks kindled the spark that started a revolution against tyranny. That is why we celebrate the anniversary of the independence of Greece, a day worthy of remembrance everywhere in the world.

The road to freedom is a long road and a rocky one. The pledge solemnly given by Archbishop Germanos and those who stood beside him to fight until Greece was free was the outgrowth of the relentless efforts of Greeks to regain their independence. They revolted 18 times before freedom was won. When men under the Nazi yoke wonder whether the struggle is worth while, they remember that Greeks throughout 2,500 years of history have always believed that there is no life worth having except a life of freedom. Sooner or later throughout all history they have thrown off tyrannies of whatever nature by whomsoever imposed.

We will never forget that Greece, which wished to live in peace, resisted a treacherous attack by the Fascist empire of Italy in 1940. With her ideas and with her arms she astonished the world and crushed the attack. Fascist Italy never recovered and Mussolini's dream of empire came to an inglorious end.

To save themselves from utter destruction the Fascists betrayed the glorious memories of Garibaldi, Mazzini, and Cavour and put the Italian people in bondage to the Nazis. Hitler then started his blitzkrieg against Greece.

We shall always remember that Greece met the assault of the Nazi army with impassioned skill. Greece again lighted a flame as bright as that which lit freedom's skies over Thermopylae. She delayed the German attack on Russia for several precious weeks and gave Britain time to defend the Mediterranean. Greece aided in the winning of this war and gained our everlasting gratitude. She went down under the power of overwhelming numbers and modern mechanical devices. But the darkness into which Hitler plunged her now promises soon to be lifted. Greece cannot be permanently enslaved.

Even as I speak women and children are dying of hunger in Athens, in Epirus, and in Thrace. They are dying because they would not yield. These dead shall not be forgotten. The men who are responsible for their deaths shall face the bar of justice. They shall be judged by free people—by the free people of Greece.

The invaders are seeking to break the spirit of the Greeks by enforcing a policy of terrorism and systematic extermination, but up in the mountains grave men carry on a warfare with whatever arms they can find. The whole population of Greece has refused to come to any terms with the oppressors.

You are the kinsmen of the Greeks. You are Americans. It is my understanding that as a part of the celebration of Greek Independence Day each American of Greek descent is purchasing an extra American War bond. Your fellow Americans and your sons who are in the armed forces of the United States will recognize your accomplishment as further proof that you remember the heroism of your own soldiers and those of all our allies.

Democracy is not a finished job. Less than one hundred years ago part of our population were slaves. Years ago signs in taverns read "No Irishmen Allowed." Today there are still inequalities and injustices but we have been moving and we will continue to move toward real democracy.

We believe in and we fight for the dignity and freedom of man. We know in America that each race has something of value to contribute to democracy. We must give to the minority groups among us the best that we have and they must show their appreciation by helping wholeheartedly to preserve for America the best that is in the minority groups.

As Americans we believe that all people have a right to enjoy the blessings of democracy. Let us teach our children that racial and religious minorities are part of the very life blood of this country. There are people here whose parents lived in Greece, in Africa, in Russia, in England, in Germany, in Ireland, in Italy, and in many other lands. They are a strength and not a weakness to our Nation. No racial or religious group is inferior because of its heredity. Members of a race may be inferior for many years because they have not had economic opportunities or proper food or because they have not been educated but these inferiorities can be overcome in America. We believe not only in political and economic democracy but also in the education and opportunity which will make genetic democracy a reality.

The Nazis hate genetic democracy. They believe that every race in the world except their own is genetically inferior. They believe that every American belongs to an inferior race and that every racial and religious group except their own should be enslaved. We believe that the New World is a chosen land, not for one race, but a chosen land in which all of us living together can preserve a democracy free from bigotry and oppression. We believe this chosen land should become an example which the whole world will want to imitate.

The other day a German immigrant wrote a letter to the New York Times. He said, "Thanks, Uncle Sam. Today I became an American citizen. Every immigrant from Germany knows what despotism means because he has personally experienced the loss of liberty. He fights against the Hitler mind, against the schemer and the psuedo-intellectual who is a pathfinder for Hitler, and whose idiom he knows from bitter first-hand knowledge. By this experience he can accurately forecast what would have happened if America had not girded itself to resist and destroy Hitler and what he stands for. Every American would have been compelled to bow to the commandments of Hitler. A 'gauleiter,' taking his orders from Berlin, would decide whether he belonged to the master race. Every step in the process of living and dying would be fully ordered under the watchful eye of the Gestapo. Yes; it could have happened here."

That is the end of the new citizen's letter. That which he feared must never happen here. Demagogues in Germany inflamed majority groups against all minority groups. There are demagogs here. When we hear them say "America for Americans," we reply, "We, too, believe in America for Americans—America for all Americans of every race and every creed." This is the miracle of America—her capacity to make Europeans into patriotic citizens by the compelling power of her freedom-loving ideals. Sometimes I think first and second generation Americans know and appreciate America better than those of us who have lived here for seven generations.

Some people say that democracy is impossible because part of our population is shiftless, lazy, and incapable of self-government. They point to the slum dwellers and the sharecroppers as proof that many people cannot rise out of their misery. I have seen the Ida B. Wells homes where families from the slums have become self-supporting, healthy, and proud of themselves and of our country. Let me give you another example of the ability of people to advance in America. In 1937 100 sharecropper families in 1 community, 60 white and 40 Negro families, lived in abject poverty. Their average net worth was $28. Some of these people could not read and write and they were all, judging from their records of achievement, shiftless and no account. The Farm Security Administration bought the land, helped them build decent homes, made them loans for tools, and aided them in marketing their crops. At the end of 7 years, the average net worth of each family was not $28, but $2,170. They had purchased their farms, loan payments were up to date, and the United States Government will get back every dollar it risked on these so-called shiftless people. They are taxpayers now. This also is the spirit of America. Seventh generation Americans are not past redemption, no matter how low they sink.

We shall fight until the people of Greece, France, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Norway, Poland, Belgium, China, and all the other countries which are under the tyrant's heel are free. Citizens of every land will again be able to say openly and proudly, "I am a Greek," or "I am a Frenchman," or "I am a Dane," or "I am a Jew." They will be able to do more than that. They will be able to say, "I am a person—I am a freeman."

Every man and woman has the right to earn a living, to live in good surroundings, to live in freedom, to live without fear. No man should be persecuted because he belongs to a minority race or a minority creed. We look forward in confidence and hope to the day when every child as he grows up will be proud that he and his parents are Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox, or Jews. Every child has the right to grow up feeling that he is a person, a unique and worth-while part of America and, therefore, part of a decent world.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am asked by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] to request unanimous consent for the printing in the Appendix of the RECORD of a speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on the occasion of Greek Independence Day celebration under the auspices of the Greek community in Washington, D. C., on March 26, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the midst of this global war for human freedom it is well to pause for a moment to pay tribute to Greece—a nation small in numbers but really great in service to humanity in love of liberty and devotion to lofty ideals.

During this world-wide struggle nations have been tested. Some nations have faltered, hesitated and even followed what appeared at the time to be the easy road to security. Those nations led by Nazi-dominated governments chose to sell their honor in exchange for a promise of security under the wing of the German destroyer.

Not so with Greece! The gallant Greeks, true to their centuries-old traditions—the traditions of Thermopylae, Marathon, Salamis, and Missolonghi, chose the path of honor in this world conflict the issue of which clearly is freedom versus slavery.

Today we celebrate the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the beginning of the Greek War of Independence. The movement itself was a revolution against the old Ottoman Empire as well as against the dark despotism of the notorious Austrian Chancellor Metternich whose system of congresses and alliances between monarchs aimed at stifling every spark of liberty on the European continent and suppressing every liberal movement.

Naturally, the Greek Revolution of 1821 received the support of liberal people throughout the world.

In America, Boston, and Philadelphia, the cradles of the American Revolution, soon became centers of Friends of Greece. Money, clothes, and food were continuously sent to Greece. These contributions were usually sent to the London Greek Committee and from there transmitted to Greece. At times however, American ships, loaded with food and clothing, were sent directly to the shores of Greece under the charge of faithful agents, who were directed to distribute them to the people.

A great American friend of Greece of those times, Dr. Samuel Howe, an eye-witness, informs us that thousands were supplied. I quote Dr. Howe: "Thousands put up prayers to God for their benefactors, and their children learned first to lisp the name of America with a blessing. The news of the distributions extending all over the country produced a still greater effect by the encouragement it gave to the people, who saw that they were considered worthy of having a helping hand stretched out to them from across the globe."

Young and vigorous America's statesmen and orators, Monroe, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay and many others openly defended the Greek cause.

The magnificent deeds of such heroes of the Greek War of Independence as Kolokotrónis, Bótzaris, Canáris and his brave followers, amazed the world of their times.

Finally, the deeds of heroism and sacrifice of the Greeks, combined with the efforts of the liberal Prime Minister of Great Britain, George Canning, broke the shackles of slavery and freed Greece.

Greece once again finds herself fighting on the side of liberty.

Three years and a half ago the dictator, whose name no longer attracts admiration, of Fascist Italy attacked little Greece aiming at subjugating a gallant neighbor country.

As one man the Greek people arose for the defense of the honor and independence of their motherland. And the world stood in amazement as the brave Greeks inflicted defeat after defeat on Mussolini's vaunted Fascist legions.

Then Hitler, coming to the rescue of Mussolini, launched his attack. The world then witnessed the amazing spectacle of two great powers of a combined population of 120,000,000 attacking a peace-loving little nation of only 8,000,000 people, whose only sin was its love for freedom.

The Allies had carefully avoided any action which might have proved likely to embroil Greece in the war. As Prime Minister Churchill said sometime ago, "We have most carefully abstained from any action likely to draw upon the Greeks the enmity of the criminal dictators." But the criminal dictators were bent on conquest and enslavement of the overpowered peoples.

The mechanized Nazi hordes, then at the height of their might, struck ruthlessly, and overwhelming the tenacious Greek resistance, flooded the Greek mainland with the miserable "Roman jackal's" beaten army following behind the Nazi panzer divisions.

But the purpose of Greek resistance had been accomplished. The German timetable for the attack on Russia had been upset. The contemplated attack on Russia was delayed by at least 2 months, and thus Moscow was saved by the winter of 1941–42.

Greece is paying for this great service to the cause of freedom.

German officers are reported to have told the Athenians: "We're going to make Greece pay for the delay which cost us the loss of men and matériel as well as the serious military reverses in Russia. We are going to make you so feeble you won't even be able to commit suicide."

Deliberate starvation and persecution have followed in the wake of Greece's forced capitulation.

Many of the brave people of Greece are dying daily under the so-called new order of the Germans and their satellites, the Bulgarians. The lack of proper food and medicines have brought influenza and pneumonia, with typhus and dysentery following in their wake to plague those who have managed to escape starvation.

Innocent hostages are shot by the hundreds. Entire villages have been wiped out by the German and Bulgarian oppressors.

German agents travel through starving Greece dangling food and life before the hungry and their loved ones if the Greeks will go to Germany and work for the Nazi war machine. But despite threats and tantalizing false promises, the Greeks refuse to enter the Nazi slave gangs.

The totalitarian war lords have looted the country. They robbed the churches, temples, and museums of famous and priceless statues and other articles of classic antiquity.

Under the auspices of the American, Canadian, British, and Swedish Governments some food and medical supplies are being sent regularly to Greece. The United States Foreign Economic Administration last week released the actual figures in tonnage of food sent to Greece monthly. According to this report, Greece receives monthly 20,200 tons of food.

The allocations to Greece as of February 15, 1944, were: 15,000 tons of wheat—the gift of the Canadian Government to the Greek Government—2,700 tons of pulse from the United States, from where also are sent monthly 1,000 tons of fish products; 600 tons of milk; 300 tons of soap powder; 300 tons of high protein spaghetti, and 300 tons of vegetable stew mix.

The present scheme of relief to Greece, originally organized by the Swedish Government under the auspices of the mixed commission of the International Red Cross, is now conducted in Greece by a Swedish-Swiss relief commission. Ten ships under charter expenses of shipping were covered by the Greek Government and the Greek War Relief Association, and the latter has made a contribution of more than $2,000,000 covering certain expenditures not provided under lend-lease arrangements. Since January 1, 1943, the charter hire is being borne by Lend-Lease to the Greek Government.

But this help is far from being sufficient.

Yes, spring has come again to the golden land of Hellas!

Warm breezes play over pastoral Arcadia. The red poppies of Attica bloom beneath gray-green olive trees, and in Thessalonian orchards branches are heavy with buds.

But laughter, songs, and folk dances have disappeared.

However, the determination of the people to regain their liberty remains unweakened. In that respect their morale is very high. The Greek people continue to resist the invaders. Patriot bands on the mountain fastnesses of Greece continue to harass enemy garrisons and to cut communication lines while the people sabotage the war activities of the oppressors.

The Greek Navy is in the forefront of the battle against the forces of darkness. Greek submarines have been sinking Axis supply ships. The fates must have smiled a few months ago when Augusta, Sicily, was captured by a destroyer of the Greek Navy. Greek warships have attended to the Allied landings below Rome.

The Greek Army has fought valiantly in Africa and now is poised in the Near East for further missions of liberation.

Together with Greece the United Nations are fighting for liberty, justice, the dignity of the individual, and international decency.

American armed forces are to be found on every continent and every sea and sky of the world—fighting for human freedom.

The American people are wholeheartedly behind their armed forces. Every available dollar is invested in War bonds.

I am glad to hear that the American citizens of Greek extraction have been buying War bonds in great numbers and amounts. I am also informed that this year, on the occasion of Greek Independence Day and in honor of the American friends of Greece, many Americans of Greek extraction are buying extra War bonds.

Our men and women are working steadily and grimly in the war plants, forging the weapons of war that will break the shackles of enslaved nations like Greece.

My words today, will be broadcast to Greece. Let these final words reach the tortured land of the gallant Hellenes: We know of your honorable and heroic stand in this global war for freedom and we admire you for it. We are aware of your martyrdom in the clutches of the German and Bulgarian oppressors. Stand fast, gallant Hellenes. The forces of slavery will be crushed. Greece will once again be free in a world of the "four freedoms"—a world of justice and liberty.

The Omnibus G. I. Bill of Rights for Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able address delivered by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on the G. I. bill of rights for veterans returning from the war.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, on March 18, I reported to the United States Senate from the Committee on Finance the Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944, more familiarly known as the omnibus G. I. bill of rights for the returning veterans of this war.

It was my pleasure and honor last week to see this fundamental bill of rights to facilitate the reintegration of our fighting men into civilian life pass the Senate unanimously. I am proud I was privileged to have had some part in its successful legislative journey. All who are interested in the subject hope and believe that it will speedily have a passage of substantially similar unanimity through the House of Representatives.

In completing legislative action upon the G. I. bill of rights, the Senate has done common justice for the men and women who are offering their lives for the preservation of our Republic. But it has done more than that. It has struck a powerful blow for the preservation of the very future of our Nation.

The bill of rights will be costly, yet its cost is trivial compared to the billions of dollars that we have spent upon the shooting end of the war. And we view the cost of the veterans' bill of rights as true economy. None can deny that it forms a part of the bare-bones cost of the war itself.

We regard it as the best money that can be spent for the future welfare of this Nation. The men and women who compose our armed forces not only hold the safety of our Republic in their hands on the battle fronts today; they will hold its destiny for a generation to come.

To the extent to which these men and women can be speedily reintegrated into the civilian population, the consummation of all of our hopes and our prayers for national security, stability, and prosperity depend.

By the time this war is over, we are told, more than 13,000,000 of our finest men and women will have seen service in our armed forces. They represent the cream of our human resources, the very backbone of our Nation. This Republic can ill afford to lose their skills and their leadership.

Yet that leadership and those skills have been rudely interrupted by war. Education has been halted, the men to whom we must look for the future of business, commerce, industry, and agriculture have been torn from their civilian posts at the formative time; at the time when they were beginning to assume the characteristics that have made America great.

We must recapture those skills and that leadership. If the trained and disciplined efficiency and valor of these men and women of our armed forces can be directed into proper channels, we shall have a better country to live in than the world has ever seen. If we should fail, disaster and chaos are inevitable.

These men will be a potent force for good or evil in the years to come. They can make our country or break it. They can restore our democracy or scrap it. They can promote permanent world order or World War No. 3. But in a very real sense, the responsibility rests not on their shoulders but on ours. If we do not fail them they will not fail us.

And that is why I regard the G. I. bill of rights, passed by the Senate last week, and which I hope will be speedily passed by the House, as one of the most important measures that has ever come before Congress. This bill—which is in all respects in line with the President's program—will go far to solve this very pressing and immediate problem. I do not contend that it is the last word on the subject. But I do assert that it is a fundamental bill of rights for service men and women in facilitating their return to civilian life, and I assert that it represents as little as we can properly do, both in justice to the veterans and in enlightened self-interest for the remainder of the country.

In this measure, we have attempted to state comprehensively and clearly the rights and benefits to which our veterans will be entitled, and to state clearly and simply the way in which these rights may be obtained.

As I see it, there have been two basic goals which we have achieved in this bill.

The first has been to throw every possible protection about the veteran, to bridge the awkward gap between release from the armed services and reintegration into civilian life. We recognize that the burden of war falls heavily upon the citizen soldier who goes forth to become the armored hope of mankind.

We seek to preserve his rights, to see that he gets a square deal, that he is not imposed upon—to protect him against the injustices which result from errors and human failures inherent in a large scale, mass demobilization—and to protect the community as well, insuring its stability, which widespread despair, confusion, and dissatisfaction would destroy.

And the second goal is to see that the veteran is not penalized by reason of his service, that he is given a fair break, winning for himself those traditional American opportunities which he has defended and preserved for all of us here at home.

His most immediate need, perhaps, is the first classification, the "bridge the gap" part of the program. He must be guided as he leaves the service, he must be apprised of his rights, and aided in obtaining them. He may need hospitalization. He most certainly needs money to carry him until he can find suitable employment. And he needs a single place, one concentrated agency, to which he can go for the solution of all his problems.

And in the G. I. bill of rights we have provided all this for him. We have, first, declared the Veterans' Administration to be an essential war agency, and armed it with the priorities in personnel and material so badly needed to enable it to meet all of the veterans' needs.

And, having strengthened the Veterans' Administration, we have given it over-all control of all the activities and benefits affecting the veteran. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will channel down through existing agencies in administering the program; but his will be the responsibility for its succes both to the veteran and to the Congress.

No longer may the wearied veteran be pushed from pillar to post among seven or eight Government agencies in a tragic search for his rights and benefits.

We have authorized and directed the Veterans' Administration to construct $500,000,000 in additional hospital beds, which will be badly needed when the flood of human casualties flows back home. We have provided that he may use suitable Army and Navy hospitals when they become available.

The Veterans' Administrator is authorized to place designated officials in Army and Navy hospitals to adjudicate disability claims of veterans about to be discharged; and the Army and Navy are directed, as well, to permit authorized representatives of accredited veterans' organizations to go into those hospitals to advise the veterans of the benefits available to them, and to aid them in preparing claims for compensation.

We have, we believe, included provisions that will make it impossible ever again for penniless, disabled, and discharged veterans to be left waiting for months before their claims are adjudicated by the Veterans' Administration and their compensation begin. The fact that little or no blame can attach to the Veterans' Administration for that delay has made it nontheless tragic.

And we have provided for boards of review, within the Army and Navy, to review the so-called blue discharges—discharges without honor—which have been given in far too many cases for trivial reasons. Men have been discharged without honor through no fault of their own other than what the Army calls inaptitude for military service. Beyond that we have provided that the benefits of the bill of rights shall be open to all veterans discharged under any conditions other than dishonorable.

We believe that we have thrown every possible protection about the men and women of our armed forces as they take the first steps into civilian life, and, through a generous scale of unemployment compensation or readjustment allowances, we have continued that protection through the difficult hunt for a job that will follow.

The bill of rights provides for unemployment compensation of $15 a week, plus $5 for one dependent, $8 for two dependents, and $10 for three or more dependents, for any 52 weeks during the first 2 years immediately following the last payment of mustering-out pay.

The veteran will be entitled to 8 weeks of unemployment coverage for each month in the service up to the maximum of 52 weeks' pay.

The unemployment compensation is generous, but it is hedged about with protections essential to the welfare both of the veteran and the community.

No man may collect pay who refuses suitable employment, as defined in the bill; though a veteran does not have to take any job that is offered to him. There is, as well, a just provision for disqualifications which would make the veteran ineligible for compensation under certain conditions.

Thus the immediate goal of amply protecting the veteran is accomplished. Next comes the problem of insuring to him a just share in the opportunities of American life.

The veteran may need education, vocational training, or refresher courses, beyond those already provided for disabled veterans. And the opportunity is here. Properly channeled, without stepping in any way on the toes of the States, the bill provides for 1 year's education for every veteran who has served 6 months or more; and for any veteran actually injured in service, regardless of his length of service.

Beyond the first year, the G. I. bill of rights provides for 3 additional years for those whose progress warrants it.

Tuition and fees not to exceed $500 a year will be paid; plus subsistence allowance of $50 a month, and $25 for dependents. Here, too, the provisions are limited by certain restrictions designed for the good of the veteran and of the public. Yet each veteran may pick his own school; and each school may accept or reject an applicant in accord with its own academic standards. Academic

freedom is amply preserved and the Veterans' Administration has only the responsibility of a parent to provide the boy and the money.

Education is of vital importance to these men and women if they are to share in the opportunity of America to the fullest.

But of equal importance are jobs—and the small loans they may need to buy, build, or repair homes, farms, and small business properties The G. I. bill of rights provides for loans not to exceed $1,000 for these purposes; loans which, again, will use existing channels and agencies, public and private.

There will be supervision to see that veterans get full value for their money.

On the job front, the bill stiffens and makes more efficient and effective the veterans' placement service; which hitherto has been a virtual "stepchild" among Government agencies.

Stiff penalties are provided for States whose employment services fail to give qualified veterans preference in job opportunities; and the responsibility for administering this program is vested in a board of which the Veterans' Administrator is chairman.

The United States Employment Service shall assign to each State a veterans' employment representative, who is required to be a war veteran, responsible to the veterans' placement board. He will be responsible for the supervision of registration of veterans in local employment offices; assist in securing and maintaining current information as to available employment; promote the interest of employers in employing veterans, and maintain regular contact with employers and veterans' organizations.

In short, he will be the man who, on the State level, will see that everything is done to give the veteran preference in search for a job; and to see that the job is available.

And thus, in education, in employment, and loans we have done everything possible to give to the veteran an opportunity for a full share in America.

A word on the history of this legislation. It was first drafted by the American Legion, which drew on its 25 years of experience in veterans' rehabilitation. I introduced it early in January, on behalf of several other Senators and myself. It was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the chairman of that committee, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, referred it to the subcommittee on veterans' affairs, of which he had done me the honor to appoint me chairman.

The committee held lengthy and complete hearings. Conferences were held with veterans' organizations, with other Senators, with various departments of government, and other interested persons. The bill was extensively amended. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] all made valuable and constructive suggestions. Certain technical amendments were suggested by the Army, the Navy, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Agricultural Department, as well as the Veterans' Administration itself.

At the same time, similar hearings were being conducted by the House World War Veterans' Committee, under the chairmanship of the Congressman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I then reintroduced the bill as perfected in the committee and was joined in the sponsorship by 80 other Senators—an unprecedented number which attested the importance of this measure. It passed the Senate without a dissenting vote.

As I have said, it does not represent the last word on the veterans subject. But America may well congratulate herself that this measure of justice to our fighting men and women has been accomplished.

Unity in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was printed originally as an advertisement and which I think is one of the most telling arguments with reference to the present war. It was printed at the expense of the Harrisburg Steel Corporation, and is headed "When duty whispers low, 'Thou must!'"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN DUTY WHISPERS LOW, "THOU MUST"
—*Emerson's Voluntaries.*

The four greatest nations of this earth are waging a life and death struggle with those forces of evil bent on the destruction of man's greatest treasure—freedom. Three times during this, the most devastating war of all time, destiny has tested, through fire and ordeal, three of the four champions of liberty.

Take China. The barbaric Japanese have all but destroyed her material wealth, not to forget for a moment the millions of Chinese who have been wantonly killed by land and air attack. Cities destroyed, huge parts of their homeland under the despot's heel, millions enslaved without benefit of aid or even comfort, China has withstood every trial—supreme in her hour of travail—hoping, praying, and fighting. Truly destiny has marked ageless China as one of its very own.

Remember Dunkerque. Proud Britain almost at journey's end. Unarmed but unafraid, the miracle happened. Three hundred thousand soldiers of the Empire brought home in the face of incredible odds, by the folks back home. And then, that immortal "blood, sweat, and tears" promise of the war's greatest symbol—Churchill. England looked squarely at the finger of destiny and through a unity unparalleled met the issue and in all her righteous wrath rose to the pinnacle of her greatness.

Russia at Moscow. With the German hordes at the gates of the city, with large areas of her country conquered, her important cities in ruins, millions of her men dead or wounded, Russia dared to look at the finger of destiny pointed her way, and, by a united effort of her soldiers, her men, and women—yes, even her children—saved Moscow and saved Russia. Never in the pages of history has greater courage been matched so nobly by sublime unity of purpose.

Each of our allies has had its ordeal, and in each instance has met and conquered when destiny placed their very existence in the balance.

But what about the greatest of these, America? Her sons and daughters have gone forth to do battle in the cause of freedom. Their exploits, their valor, their courage, bring tears to the eye and exaltation to the soul. These fine young people—softies, as they were referred to by our enemies—have learned discipline, have mastered tactics, have forged a unity that gives notice to all of the stuff of which democracy is made.

And now the hour of crisis is here. That hour when the finger of destiny points at us, at America. Will we, the greatest Nation of all, meet our crisis as have our brave allies? Will we, soldier and civilian, be united there on the beachheads of fortress Europe? The next hundred days will write history for a hundred years to come. Can a nation of free men, who enjoy free speech, forget petty things for these hundred days of crisis and unite in spirit and in fact to meet our great test? Can we forget that we are Democrats and Republicans, rich or poor, Jew or gentile, worker or manager—can we be Americans—united as never before in our glorious history? This is more than a battle for beachheads. This is the real test of a system of government that the world has been waiting for. Can we forget, during this short but crucial period, everything but one—that we are united Americans? God grant us, all of us, the wisdom to see, the courage to bear, and the unselfishness to unite in one glorious effort for our country.

Destiny has saved us until last, and history will record these next hundred days as a period in which the final victory will have been achieved by circumstance or by a profound, unselfish unity. Can we meet this last great obstacle humbly, reverently, and unafraid, but most important of all, can we meet it?

Our youth replies, "We can."

Statements by Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I notice from the public press that Mr. Wendell Willkie, the author of the famous phrase as to the solemnity of his own utterances, who described his solemn protestations to the American people as campaign oratory, not once but several times in hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the lend-lease bill, has been undertaking to make it appear that someone had maligned him and tried to pin that phrase on him. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, no one but Mr. Willkie originated that phrase for describing his own speeches as being simply campaign oratory. He did that both in response to a question which I asked him and later in response to a question which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] asked him. Nevertheless, Mr. Willkie claims that someone should apologize to him for pinning such an expression on him.

Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Times-Herald, went to the trouble to dig out of the record what Mr. Willkie had actually said in applying the epithet—if it be an epithet—of "campaign oratory" to his own solemn protestations to the American people. He sets out in great detail all the circumstances. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HE REALLY SAID

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Wendell Willkie has been stomping through lecture halls for some months now, getting away with something that we thought we'd clear up today, just for the record of accuracy.

He has been denying that he ever used the phrase "campaign oratory" to shrug off some of his 1940 remarks that jumped up in 1941 to bite him. He has even gone so far as to say that at least one United States Senator has apologized to him for ever saying he did use the fatal phrase.

Well, now, here are the facts:

In January 1941, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations called hearings on a bill (S. 275) entitled: "A Bill Further To Promote the Defense of the United States, and for Other Purposes." That was the celebrated lend-lease item.

Willkie, considering that he had run for President a few months before and had done a lot of talking, predicting, etc., was a natural to be called for testimony on the need for lend-lease, and so, in due time, he did appear.

Here, taken from page 892 of the committee record of hearings, is the first development in his "campaign oratory" remarks:

Senator CLARK of Missouri. "* * * In speaking of the President last November, you said:

" 'But I cannot follow the President in his conduct of foreign affairs in this critical time. There have been occasions when many of us have wondered if he is deliberately inciting us to war.'

"Is that still your opinion?

"Mr. WILLKIE. As to the statement about the President, in the course of the campaign I made a great many statements about him. He was my opponent, you know.

"Senator CLARK. You would not have said anything about your opponent you did not think was true, would you?

"Mr. WILLKIE. Oh, no; but occasionally in moments of oratory in campaigns we all expand a bit."

That was followed by a protracted wrangle between CLARK and Willkie in which Willkie said he didn't want to "rake over old coals" and have to discuss his 1940 campaign speeches in general or in particular.

Willkie was reminded that in 1940 he had said of Roosevelt such things as this:

"He (F. D. R.) has secretly meddled in the affairs of Europe and he has even unscrupulously encouraged other countries to hope for more help than we are able to give."

Willkie kicked all along at having this brought out.

Then, on page 905, Senator NYE (Republican), of North Dakota, takes up:

"Senator NYE. One more assertion of yours, that of October 30:

" 'On the basis of his (that is, Roosevelt's) past performance, with pledges to the people, you may expect we will be at war by April 1941, if he is elected.'

"Mr. WILLKIE. You ask me whether or not I said that?

"Senator NYE. Do you still agree that that might be the case?

"Mr. WILLKIE. It might be. It was a bit of campaign oratory."

In brief, Willkie in October 1940, in effect accused Roosevelt of the outrageous crime of deliberately leading America to war. In January 1941 he tossed that off as "campaign oratory."

Those plain words from the sworn record cannot be mistaken or misunderstood. There they are, as spoken and recorded.

But, of course, Willkie never expected them to fly up and bite him twice. And so, ever since the original happening, he has been bellowing that he never said it, or he was misquoted, or misunderstood.

For instance, in September 1941, Mr. Willkie was attorney for some witnesses before a Senate subcommittee investigating the motion-picture interests and war propaganda.

The chairman of that inquiry was Senator D. WORTH CLARK of Idaho, and Senator CLARK (page 388 of the printed hearings), offhandedly mentioned the "campaign oratory" episode, saying that Willkie had referred to some of his own "campaign pledges" as "campaign oratory."

Willkie denounced the Senator as a liar.

Senator CLARK promptly dug up the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee and found there the exact words of Mr. Willkie as you see them in this column.

Thereupon, he went to Willkie and said he had made a mistake in using the words "campaign pledges." He explained that he should have said "campaign statements," and that is the extent of the apology of which Willkie boasts.

But Willkie, even when shown the printed record of his own statements, kept on bellowing, "You're wrong, you're wrong, you're wrong," until a crowd of newspaper correspondents had gathered.

When he had a sufficient audience, he clowned loud and long to prevent the Senator from reading the facts into the record again.

And ever since he has roamed America, shouting, "you're wrong, you're wrong," at people who ask him what about that "campaign oratory" crack.

In case he ever tries it on you, hereafter, you'll know the facts.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the March 23, 1944, issue of the widely read and capably edited New York Sun there appeared an editorial entitled "Does the United States Really Have a Foreign Policy?" Some of the questions which have been posed in the editorial are so cogent, and the general treatment is such, that for the information of the Senate I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES THE UNITED STATES REALLY HAVE A FOREIGN POLICY?

Secretary Hull's memorandum on American foreign policy is designed to give the bases of that policy. Its familiar round of soothing but shop-worn phrases presents more base than policy. This is discouraging. The administration is still explaining and apologizing and still stops far short of any sharp, convincing, and unequivocal declaration of our aims, our methods of dealing with foreign powers until the war is over, our plans for the post-war period. Thinking Americans had hoped—nay, had had the right to expect—that after floundering all these years the administration could take the American people into its confidence, could formulate at last a statement which the American people could understand.

Most of the 17 points with which Mr. Hull's memorandum deals are like the storied song of the katydid in that they say such undisputed things in such a very solemn way. All of us are agreed that our paramount aims must be to defeat the enemy and look after our true national interests; that international cooperation in a spirit of neighborliness is a good thing; that political differences endangering peace among nations are bad things; that a workable system of adjudicating international disputes is desirable; that future reductions of armaments must be sought by international arrangement; that excessive trade barriers should be avoided; that the sovereign equality of all nations under international law is admirable in principle; that each nation should have the kind of government it prefers—provided that it conducts its internal affairs in such a way as not to jeopardize the peace of other nations; that each nation should mind its own business and not meddle very much in the business of its neighbor; that liberty is worth fighting for; that the advancement of dependent peoples should be a prime care of independent ones. But platitudinous recital of these truisms does not get anybody very far ahead on the road to practical solutions of the practical problems of today, nor does their reiteration, in language however pious, serve as more than the merest adumbration of a foreign policy.

The memorandum did touch, but lightly and hurriedly, on the Moscow Declaration and the Atlantic Charter. If there is anything in the current rumor that the Moscow Declaration has rammed and sunk the Atlantic Charter, Mr. Hull either has not heard of it or does not consider it worthy of notice. It does seem a little singular, however, that he should have dwelt so fervently on the Atlantic Charter without taking cognizance of questions raised about it in the British Parliament, to the obvious embarrassment of our great and good friend, Prime Minister Churchill. Indeed, Mr. Hull's memorandum preceded by less than a day a statement by the Prime Minister that further clarifications of that document are necessary and that this must be a subject of renewed consultation among the Allies. What everybody on both sides of the Atlantic is most anxious to know, of course, is whether the Atlantic Charter means what it says about the rights of all states, small and large, or whether at the peace conference it is to be interpreted—in respect of some countries—in a strictly Pickwickian sense only. As long as we are fighting in Europe and the President is a party to the Atlantic Charter, how do we stand on the Polish borders and the Baltic states? Or do we stand at all, despite the charter? As long as the Secretary of State was talking about our foreign policy, it does seem that he might have taken a little time to explain this important matter to the American public. It was certainly not less important than what he said about spheres of influence, supervision of aggressor nations, and international finance after the war.

Has this country really a foreign policy? If so, nothing in the developments of the last 10 or 12 years indicates it. We scolded Mussolini about Ethiopia and we scolded Hitler about Czechoslovakia and Poland, but we weren't prepared to do anything about either. Earlier we had scolded Japan about Manchuria, but did nothing about that. On the contrary, we kept up a policy of appeasement toward Japan—coupled, however, with finger-shaking and stern admonitions—right up to Pearl Harbor. On October 5, 1937, President Roosevelt made the famous speech at Chicago which was interpreted as threatening a moral quarantine of aggressor nations. When a few—this newspaper included—asked how this was to be made effective, we got no answer.

In a speech at Boston on October 30, 1940—1 year and 37 days before Pearl Harbor—President Roosevelt said:

"While I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. Yes; the purpose of our defense is defense."

What kind of foreign policy was it which at the end of October in 1940 either could not foresee, or else could not control, foreign developments that were to bring war upon us in December of 1941? Have we today a foreign policy that will work better for the United States, say, in another year and 37 days from the present moment?

If the Secretary of State would truly like to enlighten his countrymen in respect of foreign policy, he might take the public a little more into the administration's confidence. That public would like to know, for example, just what was—or was not—agreed upon at Teheran. It would like to know whether the off-again-on-again-gone-again policy pursued in respect of Darlan is again working in respect of the De Gaulle Committee and of King Victor Emmanuel and Marshal Badoglio. It would like to know what apple cart, if any, Marshal Stalin upset when he granted recognition to the Badoglio government.

It is the will of the American people that in time of war politics shall end at the water's edge. We should all be much more inclined to support the administration's foreign policy if only the administration would some day decide to tell us what that policy is. One good, informative speech, such as Winston Churchill occasionally makes in the House of Commons, would be more effective to that end than the whole flood of sugary words with which thus far we have had to be content.

Beryllium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in recent years I have often called the attention of this body to a new metal and particularly to new alloys resulting therefrom. It has been mentioned as the "wonder metal of World War No. 2," a name it has earned at least to some degree. This metal is beryllium.

It aroused my interest back in 1939, when I was a member of the Temporary National Economic Committee, and it was under investigation by that committee. One reason was because it seemed to be working wonders in engineering practice and it was revolutionary to learn that copper with a small beryllium content could be tempered and made as hard as steel, that a small amount of this metal in a copper alloy would increase the tensile strength more than five times and that an alloy of beryllium and other metals would produce springs that would last millions of times longer than a similar spring made of steel, virtually warranting its right to the title, "a metal that never grows tired."

Besides being interested in this new metal, for other important reasons I also felt alarm. First, it was alarming to learn that there was any group in the United States so well entrenched in its metallurgical activities as to cause it, for purely selfish reasons, to be conniving to put such a valuable war and peace time discovery out of the commercial running because it was tramping on the toes of other less efficient alloys. Second, I was deeply concerned that such throttling of new and valuable enterprises were countenanced in this country where all are supposed to be free to develop new ideas and industries without finding giants in the way when sufficient success enables them to become a competing factor in any line of business.

I have watched the adoption of beryllium and its alloys from that time on. I have known when the first piece of this metal was used by the aircraft industry and I have seen those uses expand until today almost 200 parts containing beryllium are found in every plane that is built for war purposes. Probably I do not know all of them because many secret uses have been found, but I do know that the metal is vital in radio application, in gyroscopes and in other equipment where no known metal will do as well.

Despite these uses and the war emergency where all should be working for a common purpose, the Beryllium Corporation of Delaware, which made this metal what it is today, has been continuously stabbed in the back from inside of Government as well as from outside, until its progress has been slowed down and its efficiency impaired because of the fights it has encountered from the enemy within while it was doing its part to destroy the enemy from without.

While beryllium has been known and its value suspected for more than 100 years, it took $3,000,000 of cash, raised from numerous American citizens and spent judiciously by the management of the Beryllium Co., before its uses were developed to a commercial stage. Even now not a dollar has flowed back to those who furnished money to complete its development. Even now not a dollar has been earned by the corporation itself, except in the year 1943 when it did break out of continuous red ink and demonstrated its ability to show earnings if given just half a chance.

Since its uses became better known and the facts well established that it was really a competitive metal, those opposed to its successful development have apparently lost no time in throwing obstacles in its way and I have heard so many conflicting, and to my own knowledge erroneous, reports about beryllium that my suspicions are constantly aroused as to what next would happen to thwart its progress. Through governmental agencies I have heard that it was too rare a metal to be of any commercial or military value. I have heard at other times that it was of such strategic value that even its name should not be mentioned above a whisper. From still other Government sources I have heard and read that beryl ore was a drug on the market and if any foreign countries so desired no restrictions should be placed on the free exporting of this material.

While stories were coming to me about its lack of merit, I have seen the Government invest several million dollars to produce more of these alloys and instead of encouraging the company, which merited full Government support, I have seen its management violently attacked as incompetent bunglers and I have seen Government requirements placed in the hands of totally inexperienced groups who somehow, someway got the ear of Government agencies while the parent company was being eased into the discard.

Truly it has been a metal of controversy.

Such gyrations do not just happen, but are brought about as a rule by some selfish influence working in a subtle manner to destroy a coming enterprise for ulterior purposes, and I think it is high time to find out what is happening in this entire industry, else other new enterprises will lag if it becomes known that after fortunes are spent in process and plant developments, no protection is given to those who have carried the ball to that point.

The Beryllium Corporation discovered 10 years ago that Germany was pretty far advanced along this line and that patents were being taken out in the United States by Siemens & Halske and the Heraeus-Vacuumschmelze, a subsidiary. These patents were interfering with and were competitive to similar discoveries under development here and in 1934 a contract was made between the American and German concerns, granting to the American company the right to use all of the combined patents in the United States, and this, in fact, really started the Beryllium Corporation on its way to important commercial developments. This contract was for a period of 10 years and it expires today. The contract, however, contains a clause to provide for its extension, by mutual consent, for the life of the patents.

Our involvement in war makes that extension impossible to negotiate, except through the Alien Property Custodian, who has now properly taken over the German interests.

Congress has not as yet adopted a policy for the handling of German patents and the present administrative policy seems to be to issue nonexclusive licenses to those who desire them, thus nullifying any advantages or protection further accruing to those who have heretofore practically exhausted their capital in the laboratory and who have not had an opportunity to recoup such investments before being thrown into ruthless and destructive competition with existing trusts and monopolies and with the mushroom concerns lacking the know-how, all of whom have cunningly awaited this opportunity to put us back, probably, into the bronze age when we have actually emerged into the beryllium age.

I have no quarrel at the moment with the policy of the Alien Property Custodian, nor do I suggest that the policy adopted is all wrong, but I do object

strenuously in this case to seeing the Anaconda Copper Co. and its subsidiary, the American Brass Co., slyly waiting at the door and, along with other similar interests, grabbing off nonexclusive licenses when for many long years that very group has been gunning for the life of this development because, first, it will use less pounds of copper to perform many useful operations; and, second, because regardless of the quantity of copper used it will excel in performance many articles made of bronze, which is an alloy so dear to the hearts of the copper industry.

To prevent such a calamity confronting the beryllium industry, which may easily result in snuffing it out entirely or burying it in a heap of confusion, as was the hope and efforts of this same group 6 years ago, and to clarify its standing in the world and insure its preservation for our future industrial needs, I have introduced a bill which I feel will offer some kind of relief to the Beryllium Corporation and prevent its slaughter and annihilation or else, and just as bad, its being turned over to a monopolistic group which will, in my opinion, fail to develop it for other than their selfish interests may elect

I feel sure, in the face of this pending legislation, that the Alien Property Custodian will not commit any irrevocable act and will hold matters in status quo until proper consideration is given this entire subject by the appropriate committee to which this bill will be referred.

This country has suffered because we have had no adequate way to encourage those who have made revolutionary discoveries or who have valuable ideas worthy of development by supplying Government funds for such purposes. It certainly behooves us to at least see that such discoveries, when important enough to pinch the toes of existing monopolies, should be protected against those who would, for purely selfish purposes, try to kill them aborning.

I also feel, in a case of this kind, that it is the duty of the Congress to assist the Alien Property Custodian in making a fair and just disposition of the beryllium contract.

If new metals, such as beryllium, are allowed to drift into the hands of known "killers" whose practices have heretofore been exposed, it will lose for our Nation this valuable discovery and impede the starting of new and daring enterprises—which, after all, have made America great.

America's Answer to the Civil Aeronautics Board

REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have extended in the RECORD remarks on aviation in the relation to aircraft. These extensions are Use of Aircraft in Connection With the Merchant Marine, March 9, 1944, and Post-War Air Transportation, March 14, 1944.

I am now extending my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on America's Answer to the Civil Aeronautics Board. As these problems are so vital to the post-war policies of the United States, I shall send copies of these speeches to the Secretary of State with the urgent request that they be considered by the State Department in relation to our post-war world with the hope that something may be done to enable the American merchant marine to meet the competition it faces in the post-war world and to overcome the terrible handicaps which confront it by reason of the policies and interpretations of the Civil Aeronautics Board which in my opinion are so completely at variance with the original intent of Congress, and with the best interest of its people.

AMERICA'S ANSWER TO THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Foreign commerce is being diverted from the American merchant marine to aeronautical commercial companies with the direct or indirect aid of our Government in a manner which augurs disaster for the maritime industry. The momentum of the political surge toward monopoly in international aviation is having present deterrent effect on our foreign trade. A baby industry, aviation, is gathering for itself all the new gifts an admiring and indulgent governmental parent can bestow, and the grandfather of our foreign commerce, the merchant marine, is being sabotaged as efficiently as the destruction of a single ship by inimical agents. A disservice to the American people will be accomplished unless immediate measures are now taken by our Government to prevent the demise of our merchant marine—America's greatest single instrument of foreign commerce and prime auxiliary of the Navy in national defense.

Prescinding from, but not unmindful of, the general overall perspective of our foreign trade relations with the nations of the world, the maritime industry notes with apprehension the proposals to allow the resources of our Government, financial and administrative, to be placed at the disposal of a single instrument of aviation to the exclusion of steamship company participation in aeronautics.

The question of the merits of a monopolistic creature of international trade, un-American as it is in theory, is secondary in importance to the fact that steamship companies have been deprived of the right to enter the aviation field, except under most unfortunate restriction limitations, imposed not by the words of a law but by an administrative interpretation of a supposed or alleged intent of Congress in enacting a particular section of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Section 408 (b) of that act has been applied by a quasi-judicial decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which grows in strength and importance with each passing day, that Congress intended therein to rigidly delimit participation by steamship companies in the field of aeronautics. Such is not the fact and the decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board in their restraint of the maritime industry and their refusal to recommend to the President, the ultimate arbiter of the issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity, the condition precedent for the right of any person to enter the aviation field, that steamship companies be allowed to enter aviation are given without citation of legal authority for the position taken by that Board. No steamship company can, under present law, appear before the tribunal of our Civil Aeronautics Authority and plead their cause, untrammeled by the prejudged prejudices of the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to their right of steamship participation in aviation, so necessary to the life of the merchant marine.

The problem is one of monopoly through a chosen Government-owned or protected instrument against free enterprise with the maritime industry enjoying equality of treatment.

History proves that the merchant marine, plying trade routes through weather fair and foul, under financial conditions which would have extinguished the life of another industry, has built the structure of our foreign commerce. Our Government has spent millions of dollars subsidizing steamship companies to develop these routes which form the source of our trade with the nations of the world. Common sense would seem to indicate that our National Government would seek to protect that which it has created rather than to destroy its investment in foreign commerce and national security which it has through the offices of the United States Maritime Commission nurtured and protected. The merchant marine of this country must be aided, not deliberately harmed. It is inconceivable that any department of our Government, legislative or executive, whether it be the Department of State, Interstate Commerce Commission, or Civil Aeronautics Board, could so close its eyes to the present disaster which faces the merchant marine if it is not allowed to participate in aviation, that constructive planned assistance will not be given to the merchant marine in this all-important crisis of its existence. There will always be ships on the ocean. If they will not be American vessels, due to lack of governmental foresight, there will be foreign shipping taking from our shores the export commodities which are the life of our national commerce.

There will be no American ships carrying American passengers under the American flag unless the American maritime industry is allowed to carry its own passengers in its own aircraft in the same way foreign shipowners are now allowed to carry American passengers and freight in foreign aircraft under certificates of convenience and necessity issued to foreign interests by our Civil Aeronautics Board—witness the K. L. M., a Dutch company, flying from Miami to Curaçao and other ports over routes denied American shipping interests who have spent their industrial lives in their building. Such an un-American practice is to be deprecated. American public opinion, if it were informed, would express its sentiment that such treat-

ment was, to speak colloquially, unsportsmanlike, and, to speak economically, a public financial fiasco.

This problem is not political. American public interest demands protection of its merchant marine. Men who do not know the intricacies of foreign-trade development through the instrumentality of the merchant marine are certainly not qualified to condemn its future by refusing the maritime industry equality among applicants before Civil Aeronautics Board for certificates of convenience and necessity. Men who know shipping and the problems of the industry are unanimous in the opinion that right to participate in aviation should be granted steamship companies.

There are presently pending before Civil Aeronautics Board applications for certificates of convenience and necessity filed by American Export Lines, Inc., Grace Lines, Inc., Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co., and Matson Navigation Co. These companies have received the following accrued operating differential subsidies:

Company	Period	Amount
American Export Lines, Inc.	July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1943	$5, 647, 219. 10
Grace Lines, Inc.	July 1, 1937, to June 1942	3, 940, 451. 01
Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.	July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1943	4, 841, 971. 66
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.	July 1, 1937, to June 1942	1, 775, 238. 61
Oceanic Lines connected with Matson Navigation Co.	do	2, 760, 948. 12
Total		18, 965, 828. 50

These subsidies were granted by the United States to maintain and protect its merchant marine as an instrument of commerce and national defense. The figures indicated do not include construction differential subsidies granted steamship companies for the same purpose. This money—public funds—was invested in public interest, not to help foster individual companies. The broad question of the public interest must be the answer to the question, "Shall we allow the merchant marine to be destroyed by the administrative rulings of the Civil Aeronautics Board?"

There can be but one answer. America needs and must have the strongest merchant marine in history, supplemented and aided by such aircraft as may be necessary to maintain its position in foreign commerce. The shipping industry asks no favors. It asks only equality of right.

McGregor Speaks in Behalf of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is our duty as a Congress to develop a program to assure just and equal benefits for those of our armed forces. Thousands of boys and girls are being discharged each month. Many need hospitalization, many need education, many need homes. They need immediate attention and assistance.

Being a veteran of World War No. 1 I fully realize the difficulties encountered when we attempt to rehabilitate ourselves to civilian life after service in the armed forces.

We have two bills before us for consideration—S. 1767 and H. R. 4357—which are companion bills and known as bill of rights for veterans which I think incorporate the findings of careful investigation and thorough study. I believe these bills will be of great aid to the returning veterans and I respectfully urge, Mr. Speaker, that they be brought up for consideration and passage as soon as possible.

The records will show that I have consistently supported all equitable legislation providing just and reasonable benefits for our fighting men and women of all wars, as well as for their dependents, and I hope that when the committee has hearings on these two bills—S. 1767 and H. R. 4357—relative to veterans of World War No. 2, the committee will also give some consideration to the needs of the veterans and their dependents of World War No. 1. Let us give immediate aid to these groups of patriotic citizens.

Farm Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news story from a recent issue of the Florence (Ala.) Times. It is a story of farm security brought about by the farm tenant purchase program of the Farm Security Administration. It is just one more case in justification of this program.

The article follows:

After an appropriate program at Florence State Teachers' College recently Thomas B. Chestnut, district supervisor for Farm Security Administration, presented to Mr. and Mrs. Grady K. Hammond, of Lauderdale County, their farm mortgage to the amount of $4,217. This farm is located in Grassy community in the eastern part of Lauderdale County. The opportunity for the Hammonds to own this farm home was made possible by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, an act which authorizes the making of loans to worthy tenant farmers who cannot otherwise finance the purchase of a family-sized farm. These loans cover not only the purchase price of the land but they also set up at the same time funds to cover cost of construction of whatever farm buildings are needed.

Payments are made on the variable plan, that means on the basis of income after all necessary expenses are deducted. The Hammonds liquidated their entire debt in 3 years.

When Mr. Hammond moved on his farm in 1940 he had two good mules, one cow, two heifers, a wagon and plow tools—all paid for. However, he needed a crop loan of $400 to finance his year's operations. Now only 3 years later, his farm is clear of mortgage; he owns, besides his team, a tractor and equipment, an automobile, feed and seed and livestock worth over $4,000. How has Mr. Hammond made such progress? By hard work, good management, and the opportunity to get proper financing at a low rate of interest, as furnished by the Farm Security Administration. The Hammond family has contributed immensely to the war effort in the production of milk, eggs, chickens, hogs, and peanuts. His farm operations have earned for him 41 units and he is planning to increase the production of specific food crops so vitally needed to win the war.

Lauderdale County has 108 farmers who have taken advantage of the opportunity offered by Bankhead-Jones Act and have purchased family-sized farms. The near future will find others in the county achieving the goal that Mr. and Mrs. Hammond are enjoying today.

In connection with the presentation of the mortgage to Mr. Hammond a short program was conducted at Florence State Teachers' College, March 11, when talks were made by Dr. J. A. Keller, president; W. Herschel Walker, county superintendent of education; A. H. Barnett, county agent, and M. Thornton, teacher of vocational agriculture at Lexington High School.

Mr. Hammond was the first Lauderdale County client of F. S. A. to retire his indebtedness in full; the first in the State was a Limestone County farmer, who achieved that distinction last year. However, Mr. Hammond is the second farmer in the State to reach that greatly desired goal.

After They Leave the Fox Holes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial entitled "After They Leave the Fox Holes," which appeared in the March 18, 1944, issue of The Pilot, published in Boston, Mass.:

AFTER THEY LEAVE THE FOX HOLES

Fathers and mothers have every right to feel optimistic about the spiritual welfare of their sons in the service. It is probably correct to say that never was so sincere and earnest an effort made to provide soldiers with the solace which religion signifies. In the service, religious opportunities vary with times and places. But parents may feel reasonably assured that, if their sons were well grounded in religious principle before they left home, they will not drift away—the church will follow them to camp, cross the ocean with them, and accompany them into combat areas.

But it is well to face sober realities. In the opinion of an experienced Air Force chaplain, an afternoon in a fox hole will not inevitably convert an atheist into a believer,

He notes that many soldiers turn to religion when they learn that a dangerous advance has been ordered. But "you don't find the same religious zeal or desire to learn after the danger has passed and the soldier is again safe in camp."

So the formula, "there were no atheists in the fox holes of Bataan," needs definition.

In the proximate danger of death every sane man is serious. He sees things in proportion. The money in his pockets is worth nothing; he cannot take so much as a penny with him. His decorations, the acclaim of his fellows—at this moment they are worthless, too. Then he realizes the infinite value of the prayers he found so little time to say, of the manly virtues he cultivated so ungenerously. He is rich, like the farmer of the parable, in things that do not count, because "this night do they require thy soul of thee."

Then the peril passes. This money, which he learned briefly to despise, is valid currency in the world to which he returns. His position means something once again; men respect it and want it for themselves; their envy warms him.

Can any man stand in the shadow of death and remain agnostic or atheist? Evading a direct answer, we can at least offer this comment: Many of such "conversions" fade with the danger which inspired them. The atheist in a fox hole is very liable to lapse into atheism when he leaves his fox hole.

This priest-chaplain has the highest respect for American soldiers. But he finds them religiously illiterate.

So the sound, inescapable conclusion is this: Generally speaking, Army life will not effect your boy's conversion to religion. But if he left your home well instructed, he has formed a strong affirmative habit. He will encounter temptations. But the priest is accessible. You have a reasonable guaranty that your patent work as parents, done in the years when your boy played with toy drums and leaden soldiers, will bear fruit. He will come back to you a stronger, manlier Christian than when you bade him good-bye.

The One-House Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has requested that I ask consent of the Senate for the reprint of an article on the subject, The One-House Legislature, by the Honorable George W. Norris, of Nebraska, appearing in The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science for September 1935, which was placed in the RECORD on October 13, 1941, by the late Hon. Charles L. McNary.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONE-HOUSE LEGISLATURE

(By George W. Norris)

A study of the history of civilization will convince any student of government that the legislature has come into existence as a curb upon the power of royalty. Originally there were no legislatures. As the people became better educated and as civilization advanced, various methods and means were adopted to curb the power of the king and to give the people some voice in government. Gradually, through the centuries, various devices were invented and tried with varying degrees of success. Eventually the legislature came into existence.

The first assemblies which had any resemblance to a legislature were called together by the king, usually for the purpose of advising with the monarch as to how best he could preserve all his authority from the demands of his people who were dissatisfied and who were complaining of alleged tyrannical acts. These assemblies had no representative functions whatever. They did what the king desired, and if they did not, their services were terminated. These assemblies were composed, of course, of single bodies, but they had no function that a democracy would confer upon a legislature as it is now understood. Gradually these assemblies, under various names, began to have some legislative functions, and the people had some degree of participation in their selection. They gravitated into two groups, one representing nobility and wealth, the other representing the people.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE STRUCTURE

In England, one group became known as the House of Lords, representing the nobility and people of wealth; the other became known as the House of Commons, representing the common people. Other countries had very similar experiences.

Although the American colonists rebelled against Great Britain and formed a government of their own, still, in setting up the new government they used the mother country as a model. At that time England was governed by a Parliament consisting of two houses, the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Each one of these houses had the same jurisdiction. The House of Lords, however, owed no responsibility to the people. Its members were appointed for life by the King. The two Houses of Parliament, therefore, represented two classes of people. They obtained their offices from entirely different sources. The members of the House of Commons received their source of power from the common people, while the members of the House of Lords received their authority from the King. Thus constituted, it was supposed that one would be a check upon the other, and the arrangement would prevent either one of these classes from getting any undue advantage in government.

When our forefathers adopted the Constitution, they placed the legislative function in a Congress divided into two branches, the Senate and the House of Representatives. Provision was made for the election of the House of Representatives by the people themselves. That is the only place in the Constitution, as originally agreed upon, where the people had a direct voice and vote in the selection of any Federal official. Provision was made that the legislatures should select the Senators. In the main it was intended that the House of Representatives, like the House of Commons, should represent the people and that the Senate should be elected from the wealthy, aristocratic class, to represent the aristocracy. This remained the fundamental law for more than a century, when the people amended the Constitution and provided for the direct election of Senators by the people.

It is worthy of note in this connection that Great Britain, as her people have become more democratic in their ideas of government, has gradually taken away from the House of Lords most of its legislative authority. In 1911 the House of Lords was shorn of practically all its legislative functions, and today Great Britain, for all practical purposes, is operating under a unicameral or one-house legislature. It is important therefore to observe that the pattern used by our forefathers in the formation of our Government has been abandoned by the mother country. We still adhere to the ancient form, while the substance of legislative authority has been entirely changed by the country after which we modeled our Federal and State Constitutions.

UNICAMERAL FEDERAL LEGISLATURE IMPOSSIBLE

In advocating the adoption of a one-house legislature by our States, I am often asked why I do not advocate a change in the Federal Constitution, providing for a one-house legislature. To this question there is an easy answer. Regardless of the merits or the demerits of a one-house legislature as compared with a two-house legislature, it is impossible under present conditions to secure a one-house Federal legislature.

The Constitution of the United States provides that each State, regardless of size or population, shall have two Members of the United States Senate. This gives to all smaller States an advantage over the larger and more populous States in the Senate. Delaware, with its small area and comparatively small population, is entitled to as great representation in the Senate as is New York. Little New Mexico, having a vast territory but not enough population to entitle it to two Members in the House of Representatives, is equal in the Senate to the State of Pennsylvania.

An amendment to the Constitution of the United States must have, before it can be submitted, a two-thirds vote in the Senate and also in the House of Representatives. The smaller and less populous States, which under our Constitution have an advantage in the Senate, vastly outnumber the more populous States. It would be an impossibility to secure a two-thirds vote in either House to submit the necessary constitutional amendment. But even if such an amendment were submitted, it would require approval by three-fourths of the State legislatures to make it effective, and it can easily be seen that securing such approval would be an absolute impossibility. It is therefore only a waste of time to attempt to secure the adoption of such a Federal constitutional amendment.

DUPLICATION OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

Members of the two branches of our State legislatures are elected by the people of the several States and from the same class of people and are given the same legislative authority. There is no division anywhere in the Union along aristocratic lines, and there is no qualification of wealth or property. There is no reason to give the two branches of our State legislatures the same authority to do the same thing, where they possess the same qualifications for office and where the work of the two bodies is identical. Our legislative system provides, insofar as the legislatures are concerned, that the work shall be done twice, requiring identical action by each branch, although each branch has the same jurisdiction. Such unreasonable and illogical action is not required in any other governmental activity.

This illogical procedure is well illustrated by what happens in our courts of justice. A case in court may involve a lifetime of savings. It may involve the liberty of one or more of the litigants. It may even involve human life. But, however important may be the issue, it is unnecessary to have more than one trial. Under the guidance and control of the presiding judge, each side offers all the evidence deemed important or relevant. When all the evidence is in, the attorneys argue the case to the jury. When the argument is over, the judge instructs the jury. The jury retires, and after deliberation, renders a verdict. The judge renders judgment upon this verdict. This determination of the issue is then settled. It is ended, unless the jury or the judge has violated some constitutional provision, in which case the entire trial is set aside and held for naught by the appellate court.

This same check would exist in legislative matters if we had the one-house legislature.

If the legislature exceeded its constitutional authority in the enactment of any law, it would be set aside by the Supreme Court. There would also exist the veto power of the Governor and referendum provisions of the State constitution, so that the people could by such referendum nullify any law passed by the one-house legislature, as they have the power to do now.

PRESENT LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

Let me illustrate the method of passing laws by a two-house legislature.

A bill is introduced, let us say, in the House and by the House referred to a committee, whereupon the committtee holds hearings at which all persons interested on either side of the controversy have an opportunity to be heard. When the hearings are finished, the committee debates the question in all its phases. After it has concluded its consideration and deliberation, it reports the bill to the House. Under the rules of the House, the bill comes up for discussion and debate. All Members of the House have the right to be heard. The bill is argued in all its phases, and then the House votes upon it. If the bill is passed, the House sends it to the Senate. The Senate refers it to the standing committee, and everybody again has the right to be heard. As a rule, the same people who have been heard by the House committee come again at their own expense and at a sacrifice of their time and are heard by the Senate committee. After they have exhausted the subject again, the Senate committee considers it and deliberates upon it. Then they report the bill to the Senate, and there the Members of the Senate debate it. They consider it from all angles. They go over practically the same ground that has been gone over by the House. Perhaps they amend it in some particular, and in this form they pass the bill.

The bill is then returned to the House for action upon the Senate amendments and, usually, as a matter of form, the House rejects the Senate amendments, and the bill is sent to conference. Practically all legislation over which there is any controversy goes to a conference committee. The conferees, usually three from the House and three from the Senate, take up the bill for consideration. As a rule their deliberations are held behind closed doors. There is no roll call. There is no provision of law for a record of any of the proceedings of the conference committee. The conference committee perhaps writes a new bill. The conferees modify it without any hearings, without any publicity, and without any record vote. If they agree, they report it to the House and Senate.

The conference bill comes up in the House and Senate, and it must be voted up or down without amendment. There is no such thing as the amendment of a conference bill. Members of the House and the Senate may find in it provisions which they think are wrong. They cannot move to strike them out. If good provisions have been left out by the conference committee they cannot move to insert them. They must accept the evil in order to get the good. If they want to reject the evil, they must likewise reject the good. This places the Members of the House and the Senate in a very unfavorable and unfair light. Modifications or changes in a bill, which have been made without public discussion, without the knowledge of the public, without any roll call, and without any record, must be approved as a whole or disapproved as a whole. If the House or the Senate reject the conference report it goes again to conference, and in the last days of a session especially, this means death to the bill.

THEORY AND PRACTICE

It is contended by those who oppose the one-house legislature that rules could be made for governing a conference committee by which a record could be kept of its proceedings and by which the proceedings could take place in public. It is also contended that the power of the conference committee to write any provisions into any bill can also be restricted by parliamentary rules.

In theory, under general parliamentary law, the conference committee is limited in its jurisdiction to actual disagreements between the two Houses. In the Federal Congress the rules of the respective bodies provide that if a conference committee writes any provision into a bill that is not in either the House or the Senate bill, or strikes out any provision which is in the same form in both the House and Senate bills, the report of the conference committee will be subject to a point of order. Similar rules prevail in some of the State legislatures; but I understand that the conference committee is not thus limited in a great many of the legislatures, and the practice often is to write an entirely new bill. In fact, it often happens that one House strikes out all of the bill after the enacting clause and inserts an entirely new bill. Of course, the effect of this is to put the entire bill into conference.

These parliamentary provisions are often the means of defeating legislation. Points of order are made on conference reports, and if the point is sustained, the bill goes back to conference. Thus delay takes place, and delay often results in the complete defeat of the legislation, in the end bringing about just the situation that is desired by the lobbyists who are trying to defeat the legislation.

It would be possible, by constitutional amendment or perhaps by statute, to provide that conference committees should do their work in public, and that a record should be had of their proceedings. This, however, has never been done, so far as I am aware, in the history of the world. No public record of the work of any conference committee, either in the Federal Congress or in any State legislature, has ever been made or kept. It is safe to say that no attempt ever will be made to keep such a record, because it would at once show to the public that the conference committee is in reality a third house, and that it is the most powerful one of the three.

It must be borne in mind, also, that a conference committee is not under the control of either one of the Houses. Either House can control to a degree its own conferees, but neither one of them alone can adopt any rules that will result in any control of the conferees of the other House.

I am not objecting to the conferenec committee in any legislature consisting of two Houses, because I know of no other method that has ever been devised that can handle a disagreement between the two Houses. I do not object, either, to the fact that the conference report cannot be amended. If amendments were permitted, such procedure would nullify the real intent of a conference committee and would make an agreement between the two Houses absolutely impossible. There is no way to get rid of a conference committee and its necessary evils except by the establishment of a one-house legislature.

CONTROL BY SPECIAL INTERESTS

In a one-house legislature there would be no such thing as a conference committee. There would be no such thing as legislation in the dark or legislation without a public record. Opponents of the one-house legislature claim that a two-house legislature makes it more difficult for special interests and monopolies to control legislation than would be the case with a one-house legislature. Experience shows exactly the reverse to be true. It must be observed that special interests, monopolies, and combinations do not as a rule propose legislation. They are interested in the prevention of legislation which in any way restricts or modifies their powers, and they employ shrewd and often corrupt lobbyists to defeat any legislation to which they object.

To prevent legislation it is not necessary to control both the House and the Senate. All that is necessary is to prevent action by either House, or, what is much easier, if the bill is in conference—and it usually is—to control the conference committee. Lobbyists are experts in such procedure. Where there is no public record and no way to tell just what happens, they are able to handle the conference committee so as to prevent action. Let us see how this can be done.

A conference committee of six, let us assume, has been appointed on some bill. Three of the members are appointed by the Speaker of the House and three by the Presiding Officer of the Senate. In order to get any agreement out of a conference committee, the House and the Senate conferees must agree to the same identical provisions. The three members from the House control the House vote in the conference committee. The three members from the Senate control the Senate vote.

All that is necessary to prevent action is to be able to control two of the Senate conferees or two of the House conferees. Either will prevent an agreement, or result in the laying down of conditions which will necessitate an agreement along lines desired by the two objecting members of the conference committee. These two members can insist on putting into the conference bill those provisions which are satisfactory to them, and can bring about the rejection of other provisions which are not satisfactory to them. Thus, either we have no conference report, in which case the bill is dead, or we have a conference report with a modified bill which is agreeable to the monopoly opposing the original bill.

But this is not the only place where special interests can prevent legislation. If, at the beginning of the session, they are able to control the election of the Speaker, it is possible to influence and sometimes actually control the appointment of all conference committees. It is a well-recognized fact that at the beginning of almost every legislature there is a contest over the election of the Speaker of the House. The public as a rule does not know all the in's and out's of the controversy and does not often understand what, if any, agreements have been made in secret that have brought about the election of some particular individual as Speaker of the House.

We, see, therefore, that special interests desiring to control legislation in a two-body house have several opportunities to accomplish their purpose: First, by control of the Senate; second, by control of the House; third, by control of two members of the conference committee representing the House; fourth, by control of two members of the conference committee representing the Senate; fifth, by control of the Speaker; and sixth, by control of the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

ADVANTAGES OF ONE-HOUSE LEGISLATURE

Nothing of this kind could happen in a one-house legislature. There would be no such thing as shifting responsibility from the House to the Senate, or from the Senate to the House. There would be no such thing as shifting responsibility to a conference committee. There would be no importance attached to the election of a Speaker. After the bill had been introduced and considered by the committee, after hearings had been held, after the subject had been exhausted in the one-house legislature, a vote would be taken. Any amendment which might be offered would there be fully discussed and voted upon. The vote would be in the open. Pitiless publicity would reign supreme.

Constituents of every member would know next morning when they read the papers, or that afternoon when they heard the radio, just what the record of their public servant was. It would not be necessary to follow the action of the Senate, the House, and then the conference committee. The constituents, without any great effort, would be able to see and understand every legislative step which took place. Not only would they be able to

punish the unworthy servant, but they would also be able to reward the one who had been faithful. And we should realize that not only is it important that we punish public servants who have failed to do their duty, but we should be equally anxious to reward those who have done their duty. With a one-house legislature the voters would be able to do this without any difficulty, whereas it is almost impossible to do either under the two-house legislative system.

It is perfectly apparent, therefore, that instead of one house being a check upon the other, the double-barreled system is a shield for corruption, concealing the record of unworthy representatives, making it impossible for a critical public to know just what the record is. In every two-house legislature, after the close of the session, if we post the checks and balances we shall find that the politicians have the checks and the special interests have the balance.

We must not overlook the fact, also, that the one-house legislature would save vast sums of money to the taxpayers. This would be done even though we increase (which in most cases we should do) the salary of the individual legislator. In many cases we could double the salary of the individual legislator and still save large amounts of money on the salary item alone.

IRRESPONSIBLE LEGISLATION

But this item of expense is probably one of the least. The truth is, there are a thousand ways in which a legislature will appropriate money for different political jobs in a two-house legislature, which are deemed necessary, especially if the members are elected on a partisan basis. The closing days of a legislature in practically every State in the Union disclose most disgraceful practices in the matter of making laws for the government of our people. Conference committees come in every few hours; members know that if a conference bill is defeated in the late days of a session, it will mean the complete defeat of the legislation. The inclination always is then to vote for the conference report. In this way, jokers innumerable get into our laws. Laws which the people of a State want are either omitted entirely or couched in such language, sometimes purposely, that the Supreme Court will hold them unconstitutional. Laws which the people want, which have been passed by one house, are indefinitely postponed or otherwise defeated in the other house, without a record vote.

Thus the tracks of unworthy legislators are covered up and no public record made. Log-rolling and the shifting of responsibility from one house to the other is a very common occurrence. Nothing of this kind could occur in a one-house legislature. Greater deliberation would take place, and yet less time would be consumed, if we take into consideration the time spent in the two houses and also in the conference committee.

Responsibility always makes a person more deliberate, more logical, and more careful. The same individual would be a much better legislator in a one-house legislature, where responsibility could not be shifted and where every official act must be performed before the eyes of the public, than in a two-house legislature, where all kinds of opportunities are offered to shift his responsibility, to share it with others, or to conceal his official acts from the public gaze.

EXPERIENCE OF OTHER COUNTRIES

There is no more reason for a State to have two branches of its legislature than there is for a wagon to have five wheels. The experience of our neighbor to the north demonstrates that the one-house legislature has given eminent satisfaction. The Dominion of Canada contains nine Provinces. All these Provinces except one have one-house legislatures. They have found that they get better laws at less expense, while the activities of corrupt lobbyists are cut to the minimum.

The little Republic of Finland has been so well governed that it is the only European power that has the financial ability to meet the installments of war loans due the American Government. Finland has had a one-house legislature for 17 years.

Announcement has been made by the public press that the Government of the Philippine Islands, the newest republic of the world, whose ship of state is being launched upon the governmental sea under the auspices and direction of the American Government, is to have a one-house legislature.

NONPARTISAN LEGISLATORS

Not only should the legislature of a State be confined to one house, but its members should be elected on a nonpartisan ballot. Our great parties are divided according to the beliefs of our people on national issues. The tariff, the League of Nations, ship subsidies, and a hundred other things could be cited to demonstrate this proposition. With these national questions the legislatures of our States have nothing whatever to do. They should be elected on State issues, which may be entirely different from national issues which divide our political parties.

Under present conditions we elect a member of the legislature because he bears the label of a national party, and those who vote their ticket straight vote for members of the legislature on the same ticket, regardless of the fact that the voter may not agree with the candidate on any of the State issues over which the legislature will have jurisdiction. We are therefore likely to have a legislature which does not represent the sentiment of the State's own people. Such an illogical condition could be avoided if the members of the legislature were elected on a nonpartisan ballot. They would then be free from the issues of national politics. They would not be subject to the influence of political bosses and party machines. They would not be responsible to any party on a false issue, but would be responsible to their own people upon issues which have a direct bearing upon the official duties of th members of the legislature.

A State should be a business institution and not a political machine. Its government should be conducted on business principles. It should transact its business much as does a great corporation, with the Governor as the president, the legislature as the board of directors, and the people as the stockholders. If politics were eliminated, the members of the legislature would not be handicapped by partisan considerations. Under present conditions, the sessions of nearly every legislature in the country are fraught with the game of politics from beginning to end. We cannot expect our legislators, if elected as partisans, to close their eyes to the power and influence of the party machines.

Most States elect their judges and their county and State superintendents of schools on a nonpartisan ballot. Why should we elect legislators because they give adherence to a particular party on an issue which has nothing to do with their official duties, and then elect judges, who interpret the laws enacted by those legislators, on a strictly nonpartisan basis? Why do corporations have but one board of directors? Why should not a city have two boards of aldermen? Indeed, why should we not have two Governors of a State instead of one?

To ask these questions is to answer them. Such a method would be illogical and unreasonable, and would make it possible for special interests to control legislation and make it impossible for the people to know just who was responsible for their laws. It is a fundamental principle of a democracy that we are sufficiently civilized and educated to govern ourselves. We should have servants who will carry out our will, and we should have a system by which we can tell whether our public servants serve us loyally or whether, instead, they serve special interests. The one-house legislature would clear the atmosphere and bring us nearer to the ideal of a democracy.

LEGISLATURES TOO LARGE

If every State is to be a business institution, if the evils of partisanship are to be eradicated from State governments, if the legislature is to be a real board of directors, if the people are to have an opportunity to know just what is being done by their public servants, then the legislature must not be so large in membership as to be unwieldy. Upon this question there will be a difference of opinion among honest men, but it is safe to say that the membership of a legislature should not be so large that it would be necessary at any time to confer upon a committee or a small number of members the right to guide or control its proceedings. If this principle is adhered to, it will be found that most of our legislatures are too large.

The important thing is that the members of the legislature should be responsible for their acts. There should be no way to shift their responsibility. There should be no way to cover up their tracks. If the membership is comparatively small, it will be easier for the people of the State to follow their work. Their positions will become more important, their individual power will be greater, and they will take a greater pride in seeing that their duties are well done and that their record is above reproach.

Burma: One of the Keys to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the news from India and Burma is disturbing. The Japanese drive into India is more dangerous than reports from that area would seem to indicate. It marks the first invasion of India proper since the middle of the eighteenth century and its psychological effect, in the Far East, is of tremendous value. After 2 years of great effort in solidifying our defenses and in sending men and material to that area, we find that the forces of Nippon are not only invading India from Burma but making steady headway as well. What will be the effect of this on our gallant ally, China, and the restless populations of India and other countries in that part of the world?

We can be sure that Tojo will play down his defeats in the Pacific and publicize to the utmost this indication of Japanese strength and Allied weakness. He will give added strength to the puppet Indian Government which has recognized and, in that way, further the spirit of unrest which exists in India today.

There has been too much delay and too many excuses in the Burma campaign since Pearl Harbor. On the basis of results to date it appears that our allies expect American forces to carry the brunt of the attack in Burma, and possibly the defense of India as well. The only effective assistance that we have received has been from China and today, Chinese and Americans working and fighting together are pushing the building of the

Ledo Road, landing air-borne troops behind Japanese lines in Burma, and clearing the skies over China. Under Chennault in China and Stilwell, Boatright, and Merrill in Burma we have been doing magnificently a difficult job in one of the toughest land areas on the face of the globe.

We must have the full assistance of all our allies to win this war. The United States has not the resources or the manpower to carry on operations all over the earth and we might just as well face that fact now. To avoid this fact is to lay the groundwork for obstacles which we will have to confront sooner or later. Pious wishing and empty phrases, charters, and declarations will do us no good, but solid thinking and realistic planning will.

The Indian policy has been a disappointment from the start and the relegating of old and defeated generals like Wavell and Auchinleck to command there has failed. Even Mountbatten, after a glorious publicity start, has not shown the promise expected. Allied military policy will have to be overhauled if we are to overcome mistakes and if we are to achieve success in the shortest possible time.

The Japanese invasion of India is not only a blow to us; it is also a blow to China, which has been fighting so magnificently for 7 years. The Chinese have done more than anyone ever expected of them, and with pitifully small resources. We cannot afford to continue to let China down and to relegate the Far East to a secondary status, because to do so will only lengthen the war and raise the cost of victory.

In the Far East we have many thousands of American prisoners to free. They are holding on grimly waiting for our arrival, and we must not, under any circumstances and no matter what cost, let them down. We have a brutal and a vicious enemy to defeat, and a terrible war to win. Time is not on our side in the Far East but, instead, helps the enemy. Let us, therefore, have a realistic policy about our war in the Pacific and the Far East and know that to win it will take everything we have.

The first step in such a policy is to drive the Japanese out of India and Burma, reopen the transport arteries to China, send in the needed supplies to China, and from there, using it as a base, bring about the final defeat of our enemy, Japan.

Why Organized Labor Opposes the National Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Matthew Woll, president, Labor League for Human Rights, reprinted from the New York Times:

The readers of our metropolitan press are accustomed to look to it for a consistent and able defense of the constitutional freedom of the press. They must be all the more perplexed, therefore, by the readiness of the New York Times and other papers of national circulation to endorse the proposed violation of another constitutional freedom—that of the person. Your editorials on the question of a National Service Act omit consideration of every vital question it raises; but no omission is so remarkable as that of even a passing reference to the fact that such an act would be in direct violation of the thirteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, which prohibits involuntary servitude.

Instead, your editorial welcoming the proposal fallaciously assumed an exact analogy between conscription of the individual for military service in defense of his country and his conscription for employment in privately owned and controlled industry. The duty of the citizen to fight for his country is discharged under the direct command of its military organization, with the President as Commander in Chief. For labor conscription to be analogous, the Federal Government would have to nationalize war industry, in order that the conscripted worker might produce under the direct command of his Government, with no profits from his labor accruing to private individuals.

VIEWED AS COERCIVE MEASURE

If the proposed National Service Act means anything at all it means coercion. It means that the Government shall be empowered to decide where and how every American required to register for service shall be employed and that the individual shall be forced to accept the work assigned at the wages fixed without regard to his personal interest or preference or his previous capacity to learn. And since there was not included confiscation of war industry among the conditions precedent to a National Service Act it means also that the conscripts would be forced by Government to work for private profit.

But forced labor for private profit is involuntary servitude, and has been repeatedly recognized as such by the United States Government. For example, when this country took over the Territory of Hawaii it was found that many laborers there were held to service by contracts. Therefore a clause was inserted in the Territorial Act declaring "null and void and terminated" all personal-service or labor contracts containing a time element. Another clause provided that there should be no remedy for breach of contract for personal services or labor other than a civil suit for damages.

Again in 1912 the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Bailey against Alabama rendered a decision clearly indicating that no man could be held to labor against his will even by indirect action on the part of the State. In 1929, in declaring its adherence to the International Slavery Treaty, the United States Government made the reservation that because of its Constitution it did not agree to a clause permitting forced labor, even though limited to public purposes.

CONSTITUTION HELD VIOLATED

Thus has the Government of the United States in the past upheld the constitutional provision prohibiting involuntary servitude. Now we see the Government coming before the Congress to demand a law in direct violation of that provision. One would expect such a demand to be supported by arguments of the most urgent and persuasive kind—of danger to the state, of peril to our armies and the whole war effort due to a total breakdown of the productive process.

Is it not reasonable to assume that if there had been more urgent and convincing arguments for a National Service Act they would have been adduced? After all, it was demanded that the American people be deprived of their constitutional freedom of the person in the field of labor. Not opinion, but proof was required that the surrender of their freedom was necessary to a speedy victory; especially since the available facts about American opposition for war all point in the opposite direction.

The fact is—and it is no secret to anybody—that free American labor has already so far outstripped the slave labor of the Axis that some nine billion dollars of war contracts have already been canceled and unemployment has succeeded labor shortage in certain areas. The fact is that the War Manpower Commission has already reported that the worst of the manpower shortage is over. The fact is that such high Government officials as Under Secretary of War Patterson and Donald Nelson of the War Production Board have borne testimony to the tremendous productive power of free American labor. The fact is that when our ally Stalin raised his glass at Teheran and toasted the American machines without which the United Nations could not have won the war he was toasting the achievement of free American labor.

The fact is, too, that Secretary of Labor Perkins has stated that wartime employment had reached its peak and that the coming months might bring a progressive decline in the total number of workers engaged in manufacturing.

With all the facts clearly proving that free American labor has outproduced the slave labor of the Axis countries it is astonishing and alarming to be confronted with this proposal to reward the American people who have wrought this miracle by depriving them of their constitutional freedom of the person on the ground that enslavement will make them more productive.

We have a fair sample of the way in which such a law would be administered in the doubtfully legal "job freeze" order of the Manpower Commission, which gives employers in essential industries the right to penalize quitting workers by refusing to grant them certificates of availability, without which they are debarred for 60 days from taking other employment.

That order has encouraged the hoarding of labor by firms with cost-plus contracts. It has deprived many workers of 2 months' wages, and the war effort of their services. Although the worker denied a certificate is supposedly protected by his right to appeal to the War Manpower Commission, the protection is theoretical, for it is the worker, not the employer, who forfeits his living while the Commission is making up its mind.

EXPERIENCE IN ENGLAND

But, it is argued, a National Service Act will prevent strikes. The argument is specious. The labor conscription which the British people accepted 3 days after the fall of France, and under threat of imminent invasion, has not ended strikes. On the contrary, England had more strikes in 1943 in proportion to its working population than the United States.

It is unjust and misleading to try to make organized labor the scapegoat for the confusion and unrest which have been created among our working population by the Government's failures in the fields of price, wage, and manpower control; its vacillation and confusion which have permitted living costs to soar; its improvisation, self-contradiction, and maladministration in dealing with labor. The leaders of the A. F. L. and the C. I. O. have adhered to their no-strike pledge. They have neither ordered nor condoned a single strike. At the same time, they have justifiably criticized the miserable failure to hold

down prices while insisting that wages, instead of being tied to the price index, be governed by the arbitrary Little Steel formula.

The failure justly and competently to use more power than the American people have ever entrusted to their Federal Government has unquestionably impaired the national morale. In spite of our military successes, in spite of our industrial miracle, there are confusion, bewilderment, and discouragement in the United States today. It will not be removed but deepened by condemning the American people to involuntary servitude. Not slavery but a clear proof of governmental good faith is needed to restore American spirits.

The assumption characteristic of those who fail in the exercise of power, that the remedy for their failure is more power can lead the American people into the totalitarian slavery against which they are embattled on all the fronts of this global war.

But what about the principle of universal responsibility for winning the war? The answer is that a free people does not have to be forced to discharge that responsibility by totalitarian methods—and 60,000,000 working Americans have proved it. They have bought War bonds, they have accepted a heavy burden of taxation, they have manned the production lines under conditions which often mean severe hardship. And they have done all this voluntarily.

VIOLATIONS OF FREEDOM

The Times speaks of the obligation "to do war work at home, in comfort and security." The picture looks quite different to the worker in an overcrowded defense center, living in a trailer or a miserable shack, or traveling 30 to 50 miles to and from work, because of the housing shortage; suffering from the breakdown of sanitation and an almost complete lack of medica. and hospital facilities. Note the Labor Department's recent anouncement that more than 2,400,000 persons were disabled by work injuries in 1943—the highest figure for any year in the past decade. Our total casualties on the battle fronts have not yet reached anything like that figure.

The Times has seen fit to criticize the leaders of organized labor for their opposition to involuntary servitude.

The leaders of American labor are proud to defend the constitutional guarantee of freedom from involuntary servitude, knowing that in so doing they are defending not only that guarantee but all others, including freedom of the press, of which the New York Times is rightfully jealous. Freedom of the press and freedom of the person are guaranteed by the same Constitution; and the person who condones violation of the one must be ready to bow before violation of the other. It is the nature of power to grow by what it feeds on; an axiom amply proved by recent history. Mussolini and Hitler began their totalitarian regimes by destroying the free labor movements of Italy and Germany and abolishing all guarantees of freedom of the person. And neither freedom of the press nor any other freedom survived.

Appeasement and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 23, 1944:

APPEASEMENT AND PALESTINE

Palestine is to be closed to all Jewish immigration April 1, 1944, ending hope for many of the persecuted people still left in bleeding Europe. Thus the last major act of that British appeasement which took place under threat of the Axis, the White Paper of 1939, will become completely effective.

The United States has never given approval to the closing of Palestine. Without approval, such closing violates a treaty (1924) between the British and American Governments. The White Paper does not merely interpret the 1917 Balfour Declaration, which called for the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish homeland. The White Paper wrecks that declaration, which, incidentally, was unanimously endorsed by Congress in 1922.

That, in brief, is the background of the White Paper; also, it is the reason why there are resolutions before Congress (sponsored jointly by men of such divergent political views as Wagner and Taft) asking that the British Government rescind the White Paper and remove the restrictions on Jewish immigration into the promised homeland.

Arabs and Jews were both beneficiaries of British promises in World War No. 1 after they helped Britain defeat Turkey, an ally of Germany. Largely by British arms, a million square miles were wrested from the Turks, six Arab kingdoms were set up. So the Arabs were pretty well rewarded. What the Jews got was only limited rights in tiny Palestine, containing 10,000 square miles.

Even this annoys the Arabs. They don't want their fellow Semites, the Jewish people, to have even equal rights or equal population in Palestine, although Arabs themselves are welcome, not only in the million square miles taken from the Turks, but in a total Middle East and north African area of more than 7,000,000 square miles.

The White Paper appeased the Axis-inspired Arabs by limiting Jewish immigration into Palestine to 75,000 (29,000 adults) from 1939 to 1944, when it is to cease unless the Arabs consent (which they won't) to further immigration. Jewish land purchase is limited to 2.6 percent of Palestine's area; that means 260 square miles or a little more than Milwaukee County.

The Arabs have made no appreciable contribution to the global war effort—except to the Axis. An Arab legion now fights with the Wehrmacht, the Mufti of Jerusalem is in Nazi territory helping Hitler, several Arab states have been held in line only by Allied arms. Yet the Arabs are rewarded. The Jewish people all over the world assist the Allied cause; 30,000 Palestine Jews (equivalent, proportionately, to 8,000,000 persons in the United States) have enlisted in Allied armies and are fighting on many fronts. Yet the Jews are penalized.

The Arab press threatens us, hints that our desire for Arabian oil will make us forget Jewish claims in Palestine. When President Roosevelt stated, recently, that the United States has never approved the British White Paper, the Arab Union of Cairo sent him a message saying, "Such repeated statements might give rise to tragedy which would by no means be advantageous to the Allied nations."

British censorship delayed publication of Mr. Roosevelt's statement in Palestine, and even Churchill's speech praising Palestine Jewry's war effort. That is how far Arab intimidation of Britain still goes. Military men, with a job to do, including General Marshall, do not want the White Paper torn up now. That is understandable. They fear sufficient Arab reaction to increase the war task.

Meanwhile hundreds of thousands of Jewish people face death, though many might be saved if Palestine—their promised homeland—were open to them.

We do not say when, but certainly as soon as is militarily possible, Palestine should be opened to them. They ask no help to defend themselves. If Arab threats should ever become action, Palestine is willing to defend itself. The Jews who would immigrate to Palestine ask nothing but the chance to live—and, if necessary, to fight to live.

Views of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News. I trust that this editorial will be read throughout the country because I consider the subject matter to be of vital importance. I have heard Mr. Boddy lecture at length on this subject and I can assure you it is not a passing fancy with him, as he has given considerable thought to this subject.

Before reading this editorial, we must bear in mind the fact that the war has definitely upset the economy of this Nation. In my opinion, it is idle folly to think we can revert back entirely to pre-war conditions. To meet this inevitable post-war crisis, we must begin thinking now of overcoming some of the obstacles which faced us after the last war and during the depression. This subject matter is handled very well in this editorial.

VIEWS OF NEWS

Yesterday we reported how fact, the dictator, had compelled the biggest landlord in the country—Uncle Sam—to collect rents from his tenants on a percentage basis; that is, to require a tenant to pay out for rent a percentage of his income rather than a fixed amount.

Fast, the dictator, is at work on other fronts, too. A news bulletin from Chicago advises us that the city of Flint, Mich., is adopting a new "uniform pay plan," based on the city's ability to pay.

This is not an emergency wartime measure. "Depending upon finances and conditions," says the report, "the rate of pay may be raised or lowered uniformly."

All corporations should pay dividends and retire capital investments on a percentage basis. Many do now. Common, and frequently preferred, stock pays out a percentage of earnings—not a fixed number of dollars. Only the "gilt edge" securities require payment of a fixed number of dollars over a future period of years regardless of war, depression, or any other circumstances.

Such debts have done more to force business, industrial, and utility concerns into bankruptcy than all other economic factors combined.

Life-insurance concerns should provide for benefits to policyholders exclusively on a percentage basis. Under such a system they would invest their funds in common or "percentage" securities instead of "gilt edge" paper that "guarantees" a fixed number of dollars through future years that may or may not permit such payments to be made.

All wages and salaries should come from a percentage of gross income.

All mortgages should be paid from a percentage of the mortgagee's income.

When all debt is thus but on a flexible basis there can be no such thing as ruinous depression or Nation-wide bankruptcy. There will be ups and downs. Our economic system must be like that because it is subject to the law of supply and demand, and by its very nature is always dynamic.

The very essence of capitalism is the employment of capital. But capital alone cannot run the whole show. It needs labor—skilled and unskilled. Suppose labor were to demand a fixed return—in terms of a specific number of dollars paid on specific dates over a period of 10, 15, and 20 years—regardless of anything and everything that might occur in the dynamic world of the future. And suppose in writing its contract, labor were to insist that in the event of failure to pay the property itself would be seized.

Well, that is precisely the deal that capital gets when it makes a "gilt edge, fixed payment over a period of years" contract.

When a man hires his money out on such terms he is betting that nothing will happen during the future term of years to upset his plans. That makes him fight change; it makes him a conservative—and unwittingly an enemy of progress.

Strangely enough, the very people whose money is invested in long-term, gilt-edge, fixed-payment securities are the very ones who are now pretending to fight regimentation. As a matter of fact, the very system they live by demands regimentation—freezing of the status quo—as the only means whereby their future returns can be protected against change.

The fixed-debt system has created one kind of regimentation which begets another kind that seeks to guarantee such things as social security.

The country can have complete regimentation or none at all. It cannot exist half regimented and half insecure.

Complete regimentation means a socialistic state. It means totalitarianism, collectivism, and dictatorship; it means a form of government unlike anything traditionally American; it means a governmental system precisely like the kind we are fighting in Europe and Asia.

To prevent all of this we must eliminate the regimentation that now exists. That means liquidation of the system that makes debt—or invested capital—a sacred cow whose entire future is guaranteed 5, 10, 15, and 20 years in advance.

To preserve the capitalistic system and avoid state socialism we must have a completely flexible capital and wage policy. We must allow the country to ride the waves of our dynamic economic sea.

MANCHESTER BODDY.

Prices of Gold and Silver in Foreign Markets Induce Confidence in United States Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev., of March 23, 1944:

PRICES OF GOLD AND SILVER IN FOREIGN MARKETS INDUCE CONFIDENCE IN U. S. ADVANCE

California gold-mining interests, according to the Wall Street Journal, have been keeping close watch on gold quotations in the few remaining markets where price limitations do not exist. Chief attention has been directed toward Cairo and Bombay.

In recent transactions in Egypt, handled through the Bank of Cairo, purchases and sales of bullion bars have taken place at levels as high as $73 to $79 an ounce in U. S. equivalents, as compared with the fixed price of $35 in the United States.

The Cairo market, contrary to the belief held by many speculators, is neither a black market nor a truly "free" market.

Dealings are perfectly legal and are a necessary part of commerce in that paper money frequently will not be accepted for goods transferred in the eastern Mediterranean, and consequently debtors must pay a premium for gold with which to settle their obligations.

On the other hand, bullion may not be exported without a permit, so that prices paid in Cairo do not necessarily reflect world opinion.

Another indication of the relative permanence of higher gold prices outside the United States is the 1942 annual report of the largest gold producer in India, with an average output of 100,000 ounces a year.

The average price received for that year was equal to $44.54 U. S. on the basis of the then prevailing cross-rates for exchange. In September of 1943, gold sold at $58.50 per ounce in the Indian markets, and since then has advanced to as high as $70.

Incidentally, recent silver quotations in Bombay were on the basis of 95 cents an ounce as compared with 71.11 cents paid by the United States Government to domestic producers for newly mined silver and the 35 cents paid for foreign silver.

California, normally, is the largest gold producer in the United States and in addition is one of the chief technical and management centers for the world's gold-mining industry.

In 1941, the last year for which approximate world figures are available, the total world gold production was about $1,287,700,000, of which the United States produced $208,433,000.

British Empire production in that year amounted to $812,000,000, of which British Africa contributed $564,000,000; Canada, $187,000,000; Australia, $51,000,000; and India, $10,000,000.

Light on O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the March 17, 1944, issue of the Boston Daily Globe:

LIGHT ON O. P. A.

Providing light ranks high in the services possible for a man to render. That is exactly what Mr. Chester Bowles, head of the Office of Price Administration, did at the Capitol before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, explaining the importance of extending the price-control law which will expire June 30 unless renewed.

That there is such a wartime measure is known to one and all. Yet there is much confusion concerning it. People buy a good deal of food and some other articles, with ration books in hand and an eye on price ceilings conspicuously posted. From time to time there are shifts in point values and other changes in the regulations. Rumors, explanations, speculations, and scraps of information and of misinformation have abounded. Charges of black-market operations have been frequent.

The natural disinclination of Americans for regulations affecting their daily doings has been stirred repeatedly by criticism and complaint. At times it has seemed that the favorite national indoor sport would be "crabbing."

To this murky atmosphere Mr. Bowles has brought light. His business experience in making complicated matters clear with facts and figures made him adequate to the occasion. On a 7-foot easel set up at the head of the committee table he exhibited specially prepared show cards big enough for everyone to see.

Comparison with World War No. 1 revealed how prices had risen in that period, bread from 6 to 12 cents, butter from 34 to 78 cents, sugar from 5 cents to 26. The upward spiral made a $2,000 income worth only $960.

During the 53 months of this war, prices have increased 25.9 percent, but much of that change came before price control was set up. With no such thing in 1917–18 the rise in prices was 65.9 percent.

While we have been at war this time, production has increased amazingly. On the farms it is up 21 percent, instead of 5. In the factories it is 131 percent, instead of 25. Yet industrial prices, which went up 78 percent in the other war, have been held to a 25-percent advance.

The demonstration was impressive and had a profound effect on a company of seasoned Senators who are never easy to move. They went out to lunch but returned afterward to ask more information. Mr. Bowles continued to give it for an additional 3 hours.

During the proceedings he freely admitted there had been many faults in O. P. A. administration. He also outlined plans for more effective management, with changes announced well ahead of time and more power in the enforcement division.

Many of this select audience came out with warm praise of the skill of the man who was presenting the work of his agency to them. He was asked to take his charts into the Senate for the impending debate and also to provide graphic information concerning the purpose and operation of subsidies when that question is put forward, as will come to pass when an attempt is made to get rid of them.

During this trying period, when participation in total war has brought new and strange restrictions into American life, there has been an enormous amount of fog in many minds. People felt they should cooperate with the official demands, but they heard many whispers suggesting that some were not necessary. There were also, it must be admitted, those who made charges and circulated rumors based only on political dislikes.

Much of the difficulty might have been avoided had there been among the administrators the skill which Mr. Bowles has shown in turning on the light. Legislators would not then have fallen out so easily with those in important new positions created by and for the emergency.

Mr. Bowles has given convincing evidence of the necessity for price control. It may be that this measure was safe before because of the support of the principle announced by Republican House Leader JOSEPH MARTIN, who has called on his party to hold the line.

But more than that is needed. If Mr. Bowles has marked the way to intelligent cooperation of Congress and the various agencies, he has set up a beacon that will do much good.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Who Is Seeking To Fool the Soldier?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Idaho Statesman of March 23, 1944, containing some pertinent comments and conclusions on the soldier-vote controversy:

FOUR ACES

In his question to the Governors of the 48 States, it is our opinion that the President was putting them on the spot and making another of his astute political moves. You don't have to take our word for it; we'll present some facts and statesman readers can draw their own conclusions.

First we'll quote from that great Democratic organ, the New York Times (March 12): "Behind the trouble in arriving at a simple voting system for servicemen most observers saw a struggle for partisan advantage. President Roosevelt and other administration leaders, confident that the soldiers would vote for their Commander in Chief, have fought for the widest possible soldier participation in the election."

In short, it is politics, and every candid person admits it. The President wants those millions of votes, many of them from men so young they have never known any President but Roosevelt. Roosevelt wants to win a fourth term, the Republicans want to defeat him. All right, that's politics, that's fair enough. But if Roosevelt had got the kind of Federal ballot he wanted, he would have held four aces, and his opponents at best would have had a couple of deuces. Here's a part of the evidence that proves it.

THE FIRST ACE

Of all potential candidates, the one who probably would stack up best against the President in his bid for soldier votes is General MacArthur. Recently the Army War College Library recommended that the soldiers read an article about MacArthur that appeared in the American Mercury. Declaring that the article was "a comprehensive and objective appraisal of the general as Presidential timber," it offered to our millions of fighting men a picture of MacArthur which, to say the least, was a vile attack on his character.

The article says, for instance, that "the worst elements on the political right, including its most blatant lunatic fringe, are whooping it up for MacArthur." What more than that would the soldiers have to read to decide that between Roosevelt and MacArthur they would take the former? Would they vote for a man who was objectively presented as the candidate of the reactionaries and lunatics? Well, hardly. The Army War College Library, then, is the President's first ace because the opposition has no way to recommend reading to soldiers.

THE SECOND ACE

Various books are being distributed among the soldiers at the expense of the taxpayer. One of them is a book by Louis Adamic who is generally regarded as a Communist. Another is a Pocket History of the United States written by two left-wingers. At least 50,000 copies of this book have been distributed among our soldiers; so let's see what it says.

We quote: "In 1930 the Democrats swept the congressional elections, and in 1932 they prepared to take over the Presidency. The Republican Old Guard, which had learned nothing from the depression, defiantly renominated President Hoover, who appealed once again to 'rugged individualism' for a solution to the national crisis. The Democrats presented the brilliant and magnetic Franklin D. Roosevelt who as Governor of the Empire State had revealed himself as a resourceful, courageous, and humane leader. One of the most heartening things about American democracy is that it has always managed to find great leaders in time of crisis."

We are still quoting from this book, at least 50,000 copies of which are now in our soldiers' hands, paid for by public taxes: "It can be asserted that few of those who so hopefully voted for him realized that in Roosevelt they had a leader who as spokesman for democracy and nationalism was the peer of Lincoln, as a leader toward a better world order the peer of Wilson." Well, if he's a greater President than Lincoln and Wilson, the soldiers would naturally vote for him, wouldn't they?

Now let's digress for a moment. Language is a powerful thing. You will observe the choice of words in the foregoing, as well as in what is to come. It reminds us of a Wisconsin election a few years ago. It was decided to smear and discredit a candidate, and so a reporter went to him and asked, "Is it true that you were drunk and discovered in a certain location with another man's wife the other night?" The man said absolutely no, it was not true. So the next day the propaganda came out in this headline: "Mr. Blank denies that he was drunk and caught with another man's wife." That licked Mr. Blank.

THE THIRD ACE

To millions of our servicemen no news from this country is sent except through O. W. I. Proof of that is a matter of record in the hearings of Sherwood before a Senate committee. Keeping that in mind, let's take a look at some of the "news" O. W. I. has been sending our men. In regard to the veto of the subsidy bill, we quote:

"Congress upheld the veto on the food subsidy bill—or, on second thought, it agreed with the President." It did nothing of the kind. It simply couldn't muster a two-thirds vote to override. Again we quote the "news" as sent to our men by O. W. I.: "Laws are made in the United States by joint action of the Executive—the President—and the legislative—the Congress." The President has nothing to do with making the laws—but our soldiers are being told that he has. O. W. I. presented the whole Barkley incident as nothing more than a slight misunderstanding between Barkley and the President that was quickly settled.

THE FOURTH ACE

With his eye on the soldier vote, Roosevelt put Congress on the spot. With his eye on the same vote, he is now putting the Governors on the spot. All that the soldiers abroad hear of the matter will be what O. W. I. sends them—and you can be sure that its wording will make it crystal clear to our servicemen that Congress and the Governors were against them and the President for them. The opposition party has no way of sending any material to our men abroad or of presenting their side of it at all.

So in this fight for millions of votes, who holds the aces? We have presented the facts and you are the judge.

Brand Names and Trade-Marks, Their Value in Our Economy, and Reasons Why They Must Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the Columbia network, from Washington, D. C., on March 25, 1944:

I want to talk with you briefly about an ominous threat to the quality of everything you eat, everything you wear, everything that goes into your home. This threat is an insidious campaign to destroy our time-honored system of brand names and trade-marks under which manufacturers produce with pride, stores sell with satisfaction, and purchasers buy with confidence. Broadly speaking, it is a threat also to our democratic way of life.

This danger of which I speak is the product of a certain cynical belief that the social and economic system under which we Americans live and under which this Nation has grown great has been worn out and must be supplanted by something else; and so there has been set in motion an attempt to chop that system away and, under the guise of reform, replace it piece by piece.

Now, at the outset let me urge that if our social and economic system be wrong, we proceed first with our No. 1 national job, which is the winning of the war. Then, with the war won, if our system does need doctoring, we can amend our National Constitution.

That, I submit, is the American way.

We can't do two major jobs at once. We can't win the bitterest and bloodiest conflict in our history and at the same time overhaul our home-front way of life.

To the war's successful prosecution, we Americans have dedicated all that we have and all that we are. In the fighting-front achievements of our Nation's naval and military leaders, we find reason for pride. Under the strictures of the emergency we stand ready to sacrifice many of the things with which in peacetime our lives have been enriched.

But meanwhile, we are less than true Americans if we stand silently by while forces inimical to individual freedom and opportunity—however sincere those forces may seem to be—unnecessarily encroach upon our liberties. We must resist the creeping advance of influences that would wrest from us our freedom of choice in the market place, impose upon us dictatorial standards for what we shall buy and eat and wear, and destroy the means by which we have become accustomed, traditionally, so to guide our market-place buying that for every dollar we spend, we get a full dollar's worth of value.

Let's examine these forces more closely. It isn't necessary, nor have I the time to review for you all the words and all the works of those who in recent years, from behind the scenes in Washington, have undertaken to master-mind governmental policy. For our present purposes, I shall remind you that one of these heavy thinkers, a highly placed spokesman for these forces, bewailed, in print, the fact that we Americans stubbornly adhere to what he called the theory of the value of competitive enterprise. He seri-

ously proposed that the Government of the United States engage upon a comprehensive program of testing products that are to be used by the public and educating the public—and that means you and me—in how those products are to be used.

I should like to remind you, also, that repeatedly these destructive forces within our gates—these forces that threaten your freedom of choice in your daily buying—have attacked what they call the profit motive. In passing, I ask you to observe that they call it, not an incentive, which is a respectable word, but a motive, which connotes something bad.

Over recent years I have seen them strike at our American economy in the same two spots—the trade-mark and the advertising of that trade-mark. And why always at those same two spots? Because the mentalities behind these forces have realized that if they could obliterate the trade-mark and strangle advertising, they could close the door to the opportunity for profit by crippling the whole economic system.

The workings of these forces disclose themselves in many places. As a member of a special congressional committee, I have observed their effects in the actions of a key Federal agency—the Office of Price Administration. In that one strategic sector of the wartime governmental front, I have seen revealed results deeply dismaying.

Now, of course, it is self-evident that no intelligent businessman, no sensible consumer, will so conduct himself as to bring about inflation. But, with my colleagues on that special committee, I have heard businessmen—producers of goods sadly needed on the fighting fronts and on the home front—testify about their bewilderment under the impact of Federal regulations and directives and edicts, and tell of their frustration as, doing their best to continue their production, they have labored, also, to obey their Government's capricious commands.

And here enters your interest as consumers. I have heard businessmen testify that if they are to comply with the regulations and grade downward the quality of their goods to the levels of arbitrary, Federal gradings, then common honesty and a decent regard for their responsibilities to the public will demand of them that they throw their trade-marks out the window.

Now, involved here, of course, is an issue of simple justice. In the establishing of their trade-marks, in the advertising of those trade-marks—advertising designed to identify their goods in your minds—American businessmen have invested many millions of dollars. Quite properly, and acting upon the age-old principle that "a good name is better than riches," our American courts have ruled that trade-marks are property, respectable property in the possession of which the owners of the marks are entitled to the law's protection.

Morally, even legally, the destruction of a trade-mark's value by Government action is wrong. And no amount of pseudo logic can make it right.

But involved, also, is an issue far broader—an issue of public service and of public well-being. And I mean your well-being and mine.

Over the generations, we Americans have become accustomed to look upon trade-marks and brand names as our direction signs to wise buying. We have come to recognize each of these marks and names as a pledge, behind which stands the integrity of one of our countrymen—a countryman who, of his own accord, has set his standards high and, also of his own accord, upholds them.

As a consequence, applied to the things we buy, trade-marks and brand names recur to us as readily, almost, as do the well-remembered names of tried and trusted friends. Think of hats: and straightaway there come to mind two or three brand names that we recall with respect—and thus with underwear and shoes and hosiery and shirts.

Such as these, then, are the pledges, the signposts, that always have guided us in the spending of most of our money. And now it is proposed by these mentalities that we tear down the signposts and tear up the pledges.

I ask you to consider the prospect. I ask you to visualize with me what would happen if manufacturers, in all lines or in any great number of lines, should abandon the reputations and the brand names that over the years they have been establishing. Assume that as substitutes for their well-known, high-quality goods, they brought out unknown, unidentified, except by alphabetical labels, governmentally imposed.

What then?

I'm sure you know the answer. Across this country, in thousands of retail stores, hundreds of thousands of items of merchandise that now stand honestly upon the retailers' shelves would become faceless nonentities.

Now, I may be old-fashioned. But I believe I speak for millions of other American consumers when I say that under rationing, I am willing, of course, to be told how much I may buy of this world's goods. But I object—and most strenuously—to being told what and of what so-called grade.

In recent years we have heard a great deal about what is called "grade labeling." By those who would obliterate the privately owned brand name it has been proposed that there be substituted a system of grading, governmentally imposed, by which all products within their respective groups would be produced to, say, three levels of quality and then labeled, respectively, A, B, and C.

All of which sounds absurdly simple. In certain areas of the United States the women know about grade A eggs. They know that grade A eggs are dependable. And so women wonder—or some of them do—why this same simple scheme of grading and labeling cannot be applied to many kinds of merchandise.

The answer lies in a fundamental difference between a hen and a manufacturer. For a hen, as someone before me has observed, an egg is a whole day's work. Furthermore, as far as the hen is concerned, an egg is a day's work that, when finished, is forever and irretrievably done. Let's say that, with all her heart, she hopes that what she produces will turn out to be grade A. But if fate and the uncertainty of mankind's system of distribution cause that egg to be a little late in reaching your table, then there's nothing either now or through all eternity that the hen can do about it. That egg is laid.

Now, consider the manufacturer. His product, unlike the egg, is a blending of materials and processes and skills that he, exercising a range of choice in the matter, can prescribe.

And throughout years of economic history, experience has demonstrated that, given the leeway so to do, producers have preferred to set their own standards and to set them higher than any law might demand and to constantly improve them.

Furthermore it has been found repeatedly that grade labels, however carefully devised, often fail to mean what to consumers they seem to mean. I have seen the results of a survey conducted to test public sentiment. Consumers were asked whether they thought it would be a good idea for the Government to grade all canned foods. Of those who answered "Yes," only one-fourth indicated any realization at all of the highly important fact that grading is not an index to vitamin content and general nourishment.

Let the Government establish standards for foods and for other kinds of goods that we consumers use, and you and I know what will happen. Those standards will remain frozen. Improvement is stymied.

And here's the other side of the picture. Under our freely competitive system mass-production methods—which serve a mass acceptance that has been created mainly by advertising—have cut production costs; and at the same time standards of quality and performance have risen higher and higher.

About the continuance of the competitive process under which this wholesome development has been permitted to unfold, I have found reason, fairly recently, for renewed hope. There are signs, encouraging signs, that the people of this country are learning to reassert their sovereignty.

I have said if our system be wrong and we desire to change it, then as our primary post-war job let us call a constitutional convention and adapt our Constitution to our national wishes. But I urge that before we scrap it we examine our system closely. Lest we forget, it is a system that has bestowed upon this country's people the world's highest standard of living. It is a system that over the years, so fostered and developed our national industrial plant that when war came to our shores our Government, in search of the implements with which war was to be waged, was able to turn to that plant and find in it a veritable arsenal of democracy.

As I look back over the way we have come, as I think of the social and material progress we have achieved, I cannot believe that Americans knowingly will forget all that they have gained and turn aside to follow any economic will-o'-the-wisp.

Our people have pledged themselves to win this war. Let us pledge ourselves, also, to this: That while our soldiers fight on foreign soil, here at home the American concept of democracy—including economic democracy—shall not perish from the earth.

As Americans we can do no less. And less than that, the American people, whose voice is being heard at last in high places—less than that the American people will not do.

Eugene T. Kinnaly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article, which appeared in the Democrat-of-the-Month column of the March 1944 Jeffersonian, published in Boston, Mass.:

DEMOCRAT OF THE MONTH

EUGENE T. KINNALY, SECRETARY TO MAJORITY LEADER CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. M'CORMACK

Washington's dean of secretaries, Gene Kinnaly, has seen them come and go in the Nation's Capitol for 27 years.

That was in 1917, the first year of the United State's participation in World War No. 1, and through the intervening years as secretary to Congressman James A. Gallivan and later to Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, he has won an enviable reputation among members of the Washington secretariat. "A secretary's secretary" is the tag admiring co-workers place on him.

Newcomers, "greenhorns", to the busy capitol secretarial field have no fears after meeting the genial Gene. They lay their problems upon the broad shoulders of this veteran and come away smiling. He has a tremendous capacity for work and can accomplish more in one day than the average man can in 1 week. He's at his never-ending task 7 days

a week, and yet still finds time to train many boys and girls who come to him for counsel. Many of these youngsters benefited by his training have gone far on the road to success.

Gene has a genius for remembering faces and names; knows all the heads of Government departments by their first names and shows a keen interest in their transfers and promotions.

His busy schedule does not keep him from taking a very active part in church affairs. He is prominent in the Affairs of the Massachusetts Society.

Our Democrat of the Month is a native of South Boston, where his family still resides. In addition to his other accomplishments, Gene is a brilliant lawyer, member of the Massachusetts bar and is entitled to practice in all the Federal courts.

Denies G. O. P. Upswing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the New York Herald Tribune of March 26, 1944:

DENIES G. O. P. UPSWING—CONTRIBUTOR THINKS GAINS IN CONGRESS DUE TO TECHNICAL DISFRANCHISEMENT CAUSED BY WAR

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Now that the echoes of the Barkley rebellion have died away in the distance, it might be profitable to examine in some broader perspective than the kaleidoscopic present scme of the implications of the widely acclaimed rebellion of Congress against Executive tyranny. This perspective is findable in the pages of history, and the lessons which it enforces are not ones easily findable in the press, nor are they, it must be added, ones which the average American, always prone to applaud rebellion on impulse, is likely to be keenly aware of in a period of confusion like the present one.

The present Congress, it must be said, is a default Congress, which owes its Republican strength to the technical disfranchisement of millions of soldiers and migratory workers. This fact has been established statistically by the Gallup Institute, and I mention it only to deflate at once the much touted Republican upswing which, if probably operative, is weaker than we have been allowed to imagine. That the power so arrived at is being used and will be used to advance political fortunes is, of course, both obvious and natural and within proper limits a normal feature of our political system.

It has, however, its proper limits, and even within them it has its definite perils to national destiny. Twice in the course of our brief history great historic wars have been brought to successful conclusion only for the post-war handling of their issues to be botched tragically and with lasting harm to the Nation. Each of these botchings, be it noted, was the work of a "rebellious" Congress; each ditched an Executive program which history has ratified as wise and judicious; each time the ground was laid for rebellion a considerable length of time before the full outbreak occurred and gave us one of these periods of congressional government of which the unreflecting are so admiring.

That the Republican leaders in Congress were prepared for war to the knife on Lincoln's wise and moderate plan for reconstruction, even before the bullet of John Wilkes Booth made Andrew Johnson, not Lincoln, the target of their wrath, is, of course, known to all readers of history. It has even been bruited that some of these men connived at or were privy to the assassination, a notion which, however preposterous, does at least accord with the intensity of feeling which actuated the later impeachers of Johnson. Out of this quarrel, of course, sprang the tragedy of the Reconstruction Era with its army of Federal carpetbaggers, and its permanent legacy of sectional feeling.

We turn now to World War No. 1, when the first note of national disharmony made its appearance with the promulgation of the famous Senatorial round robin intimating that Wilson and America were distinct entities and that Presidential commitments commit no one.

It is results that count and we often find in history that curious legerdemain by which first the handle of the knife is replaced with a new handle, then the blade, and without realizing it we have a wholly new knife, utterly unlike the original one. This, it seems to me, is a fair account of how a Nation, which by and large approved our entering the League of Nations, was imperceptibly led down a path which ended with the scuttling of the Versailles Treaty and inaugurated the now noisome era of normalcy followed by the Hoover tariff, the scuttling of our Navy, and a number of other tragic blunders whose fruits we are now reaping in the costliest war of our history. It can be said, of course, that emotional reaction played its role here; that Wilson and Wilsonism suffered the historic fate of Aristides; that the pendulum always falls back, and a number of other things of like tenor.

History is an affair of long interests. Political elections are affairs of short interest. To the anti-new dealer it needs to be said that we owe the New Deal to the botching of the problems left by and created by the close of the First World War. Whether domestically or internationally, the administrations between Wilson and Roosevelt piled up a load of unsettled problems so massive, so basic, so widespread in implications that from them came first, the worst depression in history; second, the New Deal; third, the costliest war in our history. To suppose, therefore, that ousting the New Deal will settle anything is to be guilty of short-sightedness, both hind and fore.

We took the wrong road in the twenties and we took our first step down that road in the congressional election of 1918, which, like our last congressional election, was radically affected by the absence of millions of voters. When we took this road we were undoubtedly, as has been said, actuated by weariness; we wanted to try the other side of the pillow. We did. And as Wilson informed us we would when we did, we finally discovered our error, and under the sledge-hammer blow dealt Pearl Harbor, awakened to the realities of our position.

There is no law written anywhere which forbids us to repeat this error.

The Presidency is a monarchy, the most powerful perhaps in all history. Each of our great Presidents has incurred vituperation as a would-be dictator; each in his lifetime has been a target for unmeasured hatred and vilification. This is inherent in a democracy, pehaps, where envy is always more rife than in a more stratified social system. It has its perils, however, and they need to be seen and recognized.

It was not Wilson who lost in 1918 and 1920. We did. Those who unseated him are today forgotten. The war he predicted as the fruit of their victory rages on every ocean. We shall do well to remember this in the days ahead as groups and politicians contend for position.

The whole is greater than any of its parts. Upon the proper ordering of the world hangs our domestic as well as our international felicity. If we forget this we may turn down the road we took in 1918.

C. R. GARRETT.

NEW YORK, *March 22, 1944.*

The New Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, from the Huntingburg (Ind.) Independent of March 24, 1944:

PETTENGILL, "THE GENTLEMAN FROM INDIANA" INSIDE YOUR CONGRESS

The new Bill of Rights

Mr. Roosevelt has just announced that every man has a right to a remunerative job, decent home, medical care, social security, education, etc. Does he mean that the doors of opportunity must be kept open to acquire these things, by giving value received?

If so, there is nothing new about it. America has been, and must be kept, the land of opportunity. Evidently he means something else. It can only be that every man has a right to all these blessings, whether he earns them or not.

If it is true that everyone has a right to a decent home, etc., whose duty is it to furnish it? There is no right without a duty.

Let us examine this new doctrine. A baby is born. He is helpless. Against his mother he has a right to his first food. God sees to that. Against his father he has a right to a home, medical care, education, and the things needful to make a boy into a man.

The boy grows up. Year by year his rights against his parents lessen, and his duties increase. He must help with the chores, run errands, begin to pull his own weight in the boat.

Eventually, he is 21. He is a voter. He reads Mr. Roosevelt's speech and announces to his family, "You must continue to supply me with a job, a home, medical care, security. F. D. R. says I am entitled to them."

His father answers, "Son, when I was 21, my father said to me, 'You are on your own from today on.' My grandfather said the same thing to him, and so on back to Adam. From now on, I have the right to save for the old age of your mother and myself. In an emergency, we will help you if we can. But this will be a matter of love, and not of right. You have no further 'rights' to assert against us."

Now if a grown son has no "right" against his own father to continued care, what right has he against other fathers? Or mothers? Or taxpayers? What Mr. Roosevelt is saying to this young man is simply this: "The world owes you a living."

This is false, no matter who says it. It is universal law that each individual must provide for himself. Witness the ant who "provides her meat in the summer," or the spider who "taketh hold with her hands, and is in kings' palaces," as the Good Book says.

There is of course a brotherhood among the human family to help those in undeserved distress. We are our brother's keeper. The strong have helped the weak and the well the sick, since society began.

But if Smith has a "right" to a home, job, etc., which he can assert against Jones, then why hasn't Jones the same right against Smith? If so, who is going to do the chores?

The Bible says, "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread"—not in the sweat of another man's brow.

Nothing is gained by removing the spur of incentive. "If any would not work, neither shall he eat." Relief wages in time of unemployment should never equal the normal wage. The inducement to get off relief for better pay must always be present. Otherwise, we encourage social parasites—"those who would vote us into earning their livings for them," as Booth Tarkington puts it.

All men have a duty to afford every man the opportunity to work and bring the bacon home to his wife and children. The right to work is the right to live. It is society's duty to secure that right to its weakest member against all monopoly, exploitation greed, fraud, or theft. When society does that it is up to the individual to do the rest.

The world's work must be done. No one has a "right" to have it done. But there is a duty to do it, or go without, and the duty rests on every man, according to his strength.

The Negro and the New Deal

In the special congressional election in New York City, the Negro vote in Harlem left the New Deal and voted Republican for the first time in 12 years. The same thing happened in a Negro ward in Philadelphia last November. Similar defection is to be noted elsewhere.

There are a number of reasons for this. One is that responsible Negro pastors and leaders see no hope for their race in nothing but relief. They witness its demoralizing influence on their own people, as illustrated by the following true conversation with a Negro maid in a Detroit hotel:

Question. How long have you been making beds?

Answer. I's only been makin' beds at the Statler six months now. I never worked before comin' here. Me and my husban' has always been on Mr. Roosevelt relief, an' Mr. Roosevelt wants us folks to work durin' the wah. Mr. Roosevelt he gonna put us all back on relief again and he don't want us folks to work no mo' after the wah.

Question. Doesn't your husband work?

Answer. No, Sah—we alls been married 9 years and we all been on Mr. Roosevelt's relief since we got married.

Question. Didn't either of you ever work at anything?

Answer. No, Sah; we folks don't have to work just so long as Mr. Roosevelt's livin' but he wants us to work durin' the wah—den he puts folks on relief for keeps. Dats all we have to do, jus' vote for Mr. Roosevelt and all those same kind of Democrats Mr. Roosevelt is.

Question. How do the Democrats know you vote for them?

Answer. O, dey knows. A white man he come 'round and show us how to vote every now and then. This white man he a Democrat too, but he works for Mr. Roosevelt—Mr. Roosevelt sho' one rich man—he likes us folks. He wouldn't ask us to work only for the wah. That's all we have to do, just vote for Mr. Roosevelt and those people who works for him.

Question. Don't you know it is the Government that pays the relief money and not Mr. Roosevelt?

Answer. No, Sah; youse is wrong—Mr. Roosevelt gives the Guv'ment the money for payin' to us folks—we all knows dat—youse never been on relief or you would know dat Mr. Roosevelt pays de relief money to us folks. I'll sure be glad when the wah is ovah—Mr. Roosevelt says soons the wah is ovah we all can quit workin'.

Question. How did you put in the time during the years you and your husband were on relief?

Answer. O, we jus' sit and muse an' loll around and I do a little cookin' and sweepin'.

Question. Did you get enough relief money to live on?

Answer. O' yes; Mr. Roosevelt he gives us mo' than enough—Mr. Roosevelt one rich man. We sho' likes that man, everybody had to work before Mr. Roosevelt come.

Question. Was there enough money to get a drink of gin now and then?

Answer. I'se a beer drinker—my husban' drinks beer and likker. Mr. Roosevelt brought likker back and he says it all right for us to have a dollah or two a week out of our relief money for likker and beer. When we votes for Mr. Roosevelt and his Democrats next he gonna pay us folks two times mo' relief money than we been gettin'. Mista, I can jus' hardly wait to vote fo' him because we all will have lots of money for nothin' jus' as long as Mr. Roosevelt's livin' and no work no mo', mmmm-mmmm!"

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Issuance of Priorities to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and affidavits:

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1944.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. POULSON: Upon reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 20, 1943, the letter written to you by Mr. Dan C. McKinney, secretary of the California Cattlemen's Association, we called your office and advised you that we were having this matter investigated. This was in connection with the charge by Mr. Loren Bamert, president of the California Cattlemen's Association, that in filing an application for a small gas engine with the farm machinery rationing committee in the San Joaquin County Agricultural Conservation office, he was required to signify his intentions to participate in the A. A. A. program as a condition for receiving a recommendation for the engine.

We asked Mr. Dave Davidson, chairman of our State committee in California, to make a thorough investigation of this situation. His report is rather lengthy, consequently, we will attempt to cover the situation in this letter. However, before going into details of this report we wish to state definitely that the policy and instructions issued from this office and A. A. A. State offices in the western region have never indicated in any way that participation in our program would have any bearing on any farmer's application for farm machinery. In fact, until this incident was called to our attention the thought had never entered our minds.

Mr. Davidson, as well as communications to the California Cattlemen's Association from various county agricultural conservation committees, points out that our farm plan was used as a means of recording information that is necessary to the rationing of any farm equipment; 1943 and 1944 acreages of various crops and livestock numbers are recorded on this farm plan as part of our arrangements to help all farmers work out their 1944 operations in a way that will be of the greatest assistance in our war food program. This plan is also used in assisting farmers to determine the best production practices in the 1944 agricultural conservation program for increasing production or conserving the soil on their farms. From the standpoint of efficiency you can see that it is desirable to use the record on this farm plan for as many purposes as possible. If this form were not used for recording information needed in farm machinery rationing, it would be necessary to develop and obtain Budget Bureau approval for an additional form, as well as increase our cost of operation in the county offices. Even though the farm plan has been used for many purposes, it must be emphasized that participation in our program has not been required in connection with the farm machinery rationing program. We wish to quote parts of a communication to Mr. Dave Davidson from Mr. George H. Clever, chairman of the San Joaquin County committee in regard to their use of this farm plan:

"The War Food Administration assigned the job of securing the 1944 farm plan WR–806 to the county U. S. D. A. war board. The local county U. S. D. A. war board assigned this job to the county agricultural conservation committee. It was agreed that the source of all farm data pertaining to acreage of land farmed and livestock numbers should be filed on the 1944 farm plan (WR–806) since this was the only form approved by the Budget Bureau on which to secure farm data. It has been the policy of the county committee to ask farmers to file the 1944 farm plan, WR–806, when the farmer calls at the county A. A. A. office regardless of the purpose of the farmer's trip to the office. The farm rationing committee was asked to ration farm equipment on the standards of need for the equipment in relation to size of the farm operation and amount of old equipment the farmer had on hand. Due to the scarcity of equipment the total requirement of all farmers could not be supplied. The farm rationing committee have always required a complete outline of the farming operations before they considered a request for a purchase certificate.

"The San Joaquin County committee and the U. S. D. A. war board have insisted on a policy of service to agriculture and farmers. At no time have we subjected ourselves to political approaches or devices to attain any objective. We have assigned many farmers on subcommittees who have volunteered many hours of their time to assist in carrying out the various programs. The resolution No. 3 passed by the California Cattlemen's Association has been reviewed and the complaints referred to in this resolution certainly are not in keeping with the services these committees are rendering to farmers. Since we have many committees throughout the county assisting in the various programs none of them has indicated that any of its approaches or discussions with farmers have been predicated on any mandatory prerequisite other than supplying the committees with a complete history of their farm operation and equipment owned so that accurate and fair distribution of ration equipment could be made by the committee.

"Growers who feel that our decisions have not been just have always been invited to meet with the committee and discuss their problems. We shall continue with this policy and are always glad to invite anyone to our meetings who wishes to make suggestions.

"Since Mr. Loren Bamert, president of the California Cattlemen's Association, has endorsed their resolution No. 3, we are inviting him in person to attend a meeting of the county agricultural conservation association committee so that he may become personally acquainted with the services we are rendering farmers and the procedure necessary to render this service. You will receive a letter explaining the results of this meeting with Mr. Bamert in the near future.

"Attached to this letter are the statements from the county office personnel who assisted

Mr. Bamert during his visit to this office and letter received from the San Joaquin County Farm Bureau livestock department.

"On behalf of the county office personnel who assisted Mr. Bamert during his call at the San Joaquin County office, we are submitting the following statements:

"On or about November 26, 1943, Mr. Loren C. Bamert of Ione, Amador County, Calif., was in the San Joaquin County Agricultural Conservation Association Office and requested authority to purchase a 1½ horsepower gas engine. Mrs. Partridge, an employee of this association, waited on Mr. Bamert and on being informed by Mr. Bamert that he operated approximately 1,200 acres of land, all being in Amador County except 121 acres which is a part section of the whole acreage and lies in San Joaquin County, suggested that he apply in Amador County for his engine as most of his operations appeared to be in that county. Mr. Bamert said he would like to apply for the engine regardless.

"Mrs. Johnson, who works with the Machinery Rationing Committee, took the application (on Form E-1 War Food Administration, July 1943) on which Mr. Bamert stated the engine would be used in San Joaquin County on the lower Jones tract to pump water for about 300 head of stock. After completing the application, he was asked to sign a 1944 farm plan. He signed this (Form WR-806 War Food Administration), completing part of it himself and a clerk, Miss Maravek, assisting him with the completion of the form. He did not appear to be unwilling to sign either the application for the engine (Form E-1) or the 1944 farm plan (Form WR-806). It was not our intent to infer to Mr. Bamert that if a farm plan were not signed, he would not be eligible for the equipment nor that the Rationing Committee would not consider his request but only that it would be of assistance to the committee to know the farm operations involved when making their allocation.

"MARY JOHNSON,
"LEDDY ANN PARTRIDGE,
"MARJORIE MARAVEK,
"Office assistants.

"JANUARY 4, 1944."

As an example of the appreciation many farmers and livestock producers express for the many different services of county committees we are furnishing you the following copy of a letter:

DECEMBER 29, 1943.

Mr. GEORGE CLEVER,
Chairman, Agricultural Adjustment Agency,
Stockton, Calif.

DEAR MR. CLEVER: The swine, dairy, and poultry departments of the San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation, at a joint meeting on December 22, passed a resolution commending the county committee, Mr. Charles Cooper, secretary, and the staff of the San Joaquin Agricultural Adjustment Agency for their efforts in aiding livestock producers ordering feed wheat.

Hoping your organization will be able to continue this worth while service to local livestock producers, I remain,

Very truly yours,
FRANCIS GRUPE,
Chairman, Swine Department,
San Joaquin Farm Bureau.

You may already be familiar with the fact that the California Cattlemen's Association furnished our county offices with copies of the resolutions adopted by them in San Francisco on December 8-9, 1943. Several of our county committees have taken exception to this resolution and have written the cattlemen's association; we quote from a letter by the Santa Cruz County committee:

"The 1944 Santa Cruz County committee takes exception to your resolution No. 3, ranchers' priorities conditioned upon participation in A. A. A. program. We affirm that, insofar as Santa Cruz County is concerned, your accusations are absolutely unfounded. Neither this committee, nor any previous committee, nor war board, nor the secretary, nor any office employee has ever insisted that any farmer or cattleman register under the agricultural-conservation program in order to receive recommendation for application to purchase farm or ranch machinery and equipment, or for any other reason. At all times registration under the A. A. A. program in this county is, and has been, entirely voluntary.

"It is not unreasonable to expect the farmer or rancher who is applying for the county committee recommendations for purchase of new machinery to supply the committee with precise information about his farm or ranch, so that the committee may determine each individual's need of the proposed equipment. In the event that a farmer or rancher does not intend to participate in the A. A. A. program for any year, the information concerning his farm or ranch may be supplied on the registration form, and the statement that he intends to cooperate or participate in the program may be deleted from the form before he signs. This certainly cannot be construed to suggest that coercive methods are being applied in farm registration procedure."

The following is quoted from a letter to the California Cattlemen's Association by the Alameda County Association:

"However, we were rather startled by the contents of resolution 3. We, of course, do not know how other county associations operate, but we wish to state that we have in no way ever coerced any farmer by forcing him into the A. A. A. program in order that he might obtain any assistance from us in helping on a priority problem. We do, however, in certain cases, ask for some facts regarding farmers' operations. This must be done under any rationing program, or at any time when critical materials must be allocated. This is necessary so that any committee can intelligently pass on the needs of applicants when they are competing for small supplies or available materials, and/or equipment."

From the Yuba County committee: "The committee disagrees very definitely with the statements made in resolution No. 3 and regrets the harm that might be done by the expression of such erroneous statements and by the action taken by the California Cattlemen's Association.

"The first statement in this resolution is not true since it has been determined that none of the county agricultural conservation associations in this part of the State have used any pressure or coercion whatever to induce farmers or cattlemen to sign a farm plan for cooperation with the association. Such action in any A. A. A. offices is the exception rather than the rule. It is the policy of this office first, to be of service to farmers in every way possible, and second, to secure their willing cooperation with the A. A. A. program. But any form of coercion is never permitted in this office, although a complete record of each farmer's operation would be a great help in giving him priority and other assistance.

"The third premise in this resolution which reads in part, 'Many thousands of farmers are of the opinion that the program is unsound, wasteful, and used for political purposes and social reform,' is a general misstatement which would be very difficult to verify if it were true. A large majority of the cattlemen and farmers in this county are willing cooperators in the A. A. A. program."

From the Riverside County committee: "For your information, a farmer can have a farm plan on file even though it is not signed. This gives us a record of his farming activities and his application for farm machinery and equipment can be considered at once. This farm plan is not a contract with the Government and is in no way binding. As the majority of farmers who file a farm plan follow their original plans, it gives us a rather accurate idea as to what crops to expect for the ensuing year. In the event he has not submitted a farm plan and we do not have a record of his farming operations, it is necessary that we make a field investigation before his application can be considered. Sometimes a week or 10 days will elapse before these investigations can be made as our county is approximately 200 miles long and some of these farmers are farming in out-of-the-way places.

"We believe that you have been misinformed when you state that this association is using coercive methods which are nothing short of blackmail in forcing the farmers and cattlemen to subscribe to the A. A. A. program or discontinue their operations. This may hold true in some isolated cases, but we are sure that in the majority of cases you will find that the Agricultural Conservation Association is working to full capacity with and for the farmers of their county."

We have not yet had a report from the San Joaquin County committee regarding Mr. Bamert's reply to their invitation for him to discuss this resolution No. 3 with them. Mr. Loren Bamert is no doubt rather familiar with the fact that participation in our program is voluntary, inasmuch as he participated in the 1940 A. A. A. range program, and his father has participated in our program each year from 1939 through 1943. We understand that Mr. Loren Bamert and his father own range land jointly but operate separately, one with cattle and the other with sheep.

We hope that this information is sufficient to allay any misunderstanding regarding the operation of our county committees, and we shall be very glad to discuss this with you further if you believe it desirable.

Sincerely yours,
G. F. GEISSLER,
Director, Western Division.

CALIFORNIA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., March 2, 1944.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: For the sake of the record which now contains the report of the California State A. A. A. committee to Director Geisler of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and for your use as you see fit, we enclose affidavit by Lewis W. Armstrong, chairman, Santa Clara County U. S. D. A. War Board.

The statements of the San Joaquin County A. A. A. committee as recited in Mr. Davidson's report, are not in keeping with the facts as set forth in Mr. Bamert's affidavit previously furnished you, nor with oral admissions freely made to Mr. Bamert during his personal conference with that committee.

Neither do Mr. Davidson's statements as contained in his report agree with oral statements made by Mr. Davidson and members of his committee to Mr. Bamert and the writer upon the occasion of our conference with them last January 26, in the committee's office in Berkeley. Upon that occasion, Mr. Davidson and members of his committee freely admitted the truth of Mr. Bamert's statements as to his experience in San Joaquin County. They made no attempt whatever to deny the facts as we have presented them to you, but did say that the fault was probably that of a minor employee in the county A. A. A. office.

In our opinion, much of the trouble lies in the use of the war-food program form for the several purposes of securing information as to a farmer's operations and a pledge by him to cooperate in the so-called war-food program, a hodgepodge of production goals having little resemblance to an intelligible program of any kind; in securing

identical information and a pledge of intention to participate in the soil conservation program, and in securing this same information in connection with farmers' applications for priorities for the purchase of machinery, supplies, and equipment.

In not only sanctioning but requiring the use of this form for the latter purpose, authority for requiring the applicant to sign it is inferentially given—otherwise the form is not complete. If it is not to be signed, then any blank piece of paper would serve the stated purposes just as well.

One of the first questions usually asked of applicants by employees of the A. A. A. committees is, "Have you signed a War Food program form?" When he signs it the applicant has signed either one or all of three different documents, depending upon the interpretation, which may at the time or later, be desired by the A. A. A.

This matter was discussed with Mr. Davidson and his committee by Mr. Bamert and myself. While they deny that any such unethical use is or has been made of the forms, they do admit the possibility of it, due to the multiplicity of uses to which the form is put.

It is our recommendation, that for securing the information required from applicants for priorities, a form be designed for this specific purpose, and approved by the Budget Bureau, such form to be so designed as to prevent its use or interpretation as a pledge, or in connection with any War Food program or Soil Conservation program.

We thank you for your interest in this matter, and assure you that our purpose in it is solely to see that the A. A. A. is administered ethically and within the intent of the law.

Sincerely,

DAN C. MCKINNEY,
Secretary.

AFFIDAVITS

To Whom It May Concern:

I, Loren C. Bamert, a resident of Ione, Amador County, Calif., own and operate ranch properties situated in both Amador and San Joaquin Counties. In addition to the properties owned, other properties are operated by me under lease from the owners. These properties are devoted to the production and fattening of beef cattle.

On the 26th day of November 1943, being in need of a water pump for furnishing water to cattle on certain lands leased by me in San Joaquin County, I located such a pump in the hands of the Turner Hardware Co., in Stockton, San Joaquin County, Calif. To enable the hardware company to replace this pump I was instructed to obtain and furnish to them a priority for its purchase.

On the above date I proceeded to the office of the San Joaquin County Agricultural Conservation Association where I made application for the priority. After completing the regular application forms I was instructed to sign another form called War Food Program, 1944 Farm Plan, Form WR 806, War Food Administration. This form required that I state my intention to cooperate in the 1944 war food program. Examination of the form indicated 1944 war-food program to be actually the original A. A. A. soil-conservation program in effect before the war. I so stated to the office employee who was requesting my signature. She confirmed, as a fact, that these programs are one and the same. I then expressed my objections to signing the contract. She informed me that unless I did so no consideration could be given my application for a priority to purchase the water pump. I then signed the contract, at the same time informing the office employee that I had no intention of participating in the soil-conservation program and was signing the contract under duress and only as a means of obtaining the necessary priority to avoid hardship and damage to my cattle.

After this experience, in order to determine whether my case was exceptional, I conducted an investigation among other cattlemen and farmers of San Joaquin County. Among the many whom I contacted, I found that all who had applied for priorities for the purchase of equipment to the office of the San Joaquin County Agricultural Conservation Association had been required, as I was, to sign the war-food program contract. This investigation disclosed that, as stated by the employee in the office of the San Joaquin county committee, the requirement was generally applied.

I swear that I have examined this statement, that it is made in good faith, and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it is true and correct.

LOREN C. BAMERT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Amador, ss:

On this 2d day of February in the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-four before me, M. F. Brooks, a notary public in and for the county of Amador, State of California, residing therein, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared Loren C. Bamert, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal in the county of Amador the day and year in this certificate first above written.

M. F. BROOKS,
Notary Public in and for the County of Amador, State of California.
My commission expires November 6, 1945.

On February 1, 1943, a meeting of the Santa Clara County U. S. D. A. War Board took place in the director's room at 60 North Second Street, San Jose, Calif. There were present the following: Lewis W. Armstrong, chairman Santa Clara County U. S. D. A. War Board; Messrs. Russell Henwood and David W. Dresbach, members Santa Clara County U. S. D. A. War Board; Earl Adams, of the San Jose Office of the United States Employment Service; Agricultural Commissioner L. R. Cody; Harvey L. Hansen, administrative officer Santa Clara County U. S. D. A. War Board; Chairman Dave Davidson, California U. S. D. A. War Board; Roland Ballou, member California Agricultural Conservation Committee; and Matthew Triggs, administrative assistant California Agricultural Conservation Committee.

During this meeting the matter of obtaining priorities for farmers came up for discussion. Mr. Davidson turned to Mr. Hansen, the administrative officer for the county U. S. D. A. War Board and said to him that when farmers appeared at the county A. A. A. office for assistance in obtaining priorities for various materials and equipment they were of course asked if they were participating in the A. A. A. program. Mr. Hansen stated that the only thing that he was concerned with when an applicant came in the door was whether or not he was a farmer. If the applicant was a farmer he was entitled to all the facilities of the county A. A. A. office in obtaining priorities. Mr. Davidson stated that farmers should be signed up in the A. A. A. program before being given priority assistance.

I stated in my capacity as chairman of the County U. S. D. A. War Board that we did not feel that any farmer should have to sign up in the A. A. A. program in order to obtain the materials or equipment that they needed in order to give maximum production during this war period. Mr. Davidson continued at some length regarding this matter although his idea was not put into effect in the county. No instructions contrary to Mr. Davidson's statement at this meeting of the County U. S. D. A. War Board were received from his office during 1943.

LEWIS W. ARMSTRONG.

FEBRUARY 11, 1944.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of February 1944.

EDNA BUCHHEISTER,
Notary Public in and for the County of Santa Clara, State of California.

Vermont Defends a Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a jurist, but anyone who reads the law not under duress of recent decisions ought to know as a matter of common sense that the United States cannot exercise powers not enumerated in the Constitution, which powers are reserved to the States, and still expect to be the United States of America.

While the opinions of John Marshall do not carry as much weight with an allegedly hand-picked court as they certainly do with the people whose vital interests the court formerly undertook to protect, it is nevertheless worth while to know that in the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheaton, 5 Peters), Justice Marshall said:

> In our complex system, presenting the rare and difficult scheme of one general Government whose action extends over the whole but which possesses only certain enumerated powers and numerous State governments which retain and exercise all powers not delegated to the Union, contest respecting power must arise * * *. This, however, does not prove that the one is exercising or has the right to exercise the powers of the other.

Now, Mr. Speaker, generally, under their reserved powers, the States have created water power and flood control commissions within themselves in order to protect and to preserve their rights with respect to this great natural resource for themselves, within their borders, excluding navigable rivers, independently of the Federal Government. In so doing they have exercised their rational constitutionally reserved rights and demonstrated the power within themselves to protect their interests and those of their people, who are the Government.

The undertaking to extend the wise provision relative to the power and control of the War Department over navigable streams for the purposes enumerated and at such length, to stretch it to such ends as have been accomplished by connivance of a court which has undertaken to legislate rather than to adjudicate is unfortunate, unwise, and can but spell the end of our Union. These decisions which undertake to interfere with the sovereignty of the States and with

the reserved powers thereof are deadly in their import.

The bill which I have introduced, H. R. 4179, seeks to correct a situation and to relieve all of us of judicial legislation by virtue of undertaking the repeal of the controversial provisions of a law which the Court has construed to tolerate and to permit such a destruction of the reserved rights of the States as is intolerable and devastating and can mean only destruction for all of the States and for us all.

The bill I introduced and to which I have referred has for its purpose to restore to the States the sovereign powers of local government, the right to control their valuable natural resources and the property interests which under the Constitution are their reserved right despite any unconstitutional legislation or any decisions of any court based thereon.

Under permission heretofore granted I am extending these remarks by including a recent article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of March 25, 1944, entitled "Vermont Defends a Principle."

I am also including a portion of an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of August 21, 1943. To both of these articles I respectfully direct your careful attention.

As somebody said to me the other day, the whole dam' trouble with the dam situation is found in the fact that we have tried to beat nature and have commenced at the wrong end of the program. Think that over.

The two articles follow:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of August 21, 1943]

VERMONT DEFENDS A PRINCIPLE

Opposition of southeastern Vermont to the construction by the Federal Government of a great flood-control and power dam in its West River Valley would deserve only a sympathetic interest elsewhere, if nothing were involved beyond the natural objection of residents to being driven out of their homes and to the inundation of a beautiful valley. Other things are involved, touching both fundamental principles of government and broad national policies.

The States' rights issue may well concern every State in the Union. It has application to many things other than the turning of a Vermont valley into a hydroelectric power reservoir, contrary to the State's wishes.

A system of reservoirs in the upper Connecticut River Basin is needed, for the protection, primarily, of towns and cities in Massachusetts and Connecticut—notably Holyoke, Springfield, and Hartford. The great floods of 1936 and 1938—the latter contemporaneous with the great New England hurricane—did direct and indirect damage of $144,000,000. Local works since erected protect down-river communities against ordinary freshets. To protect them against occasional great floods requires control of the upper river through storage basins.

Vermont agrees to that, is willing to supply necessary land, asks only that she be not required to go beyond flood control, that her lands be damaged as little as possible, and that her rights as a sovereign State be respected. That is fair enough.

Under existing law, however, there is nothing Vermont can do to stop the proposed power development, unless Congress can be persuaded to withhold an appropriation, estimated at $30,000,000, perhaps more.

Obviously, if this can be done to one Vermont valley against the State's wishes, it can be done to any and all valleys of that State, and to any and all valleys of any State.

Carried to its theoretical extreme, that puts it within the legal power of Congress to wipe out a State. A State may not be deprived of its representation in the United States Senate without its consent, but purely as a matter of legal theory under the existing flood-control law, Senators from any State could find themselves representing only great bodies of water, with a few mountaintop islands rising out of them.

That reduces the matter to absurdity, of course. However, the very exaggeration serves to emphasize that what the law permits to be done in one State may be done in any State, regardless of the State's wishes. That may well cause the representatives of all the States to think at least twice. Other aspects of the controversy have to do with the general national policy regarding flood control. There is much competent opinion that, with a few exceptions which need to be chosen with great care, flood control and power development, tied together, are incompatible.

Power development calls for full reservoirs, flood control for empty basins, or at least ample storage, when floods come, often without warning. Some years ago the Federal Government built the $25,000,000 Pensacola Dam in the Grand River Valley of Oklahoma. At the insistence of the Federal Power Commission and the power bloc in Congress, hydroelectric development was included. In the Saturday Evening Post for August 21, 1943, Elmer T. Peterson told what happened. When the flood of that year hit the Pensacola Dam the "reservoir was practically full and there was virtually no capacity to take up the excess flow. * * * The raging Grand River produced a flood in its lower valley and in the Arkansas River as if there had been no dam at all." Damage was $127,000,000, a vast food-producing area was ruined.

All this lends point to the Vermont contention that a power dam in its West River not only is unnecessary, but does not represent the best way, or perhaps even a good way, to protect Massachusetts and Connecticut cities.

Vermont has raised a pertinent issue, not only in regard to the fundamental principle of State rights, but also with respect to the national policy concerning flood control, for which it is proposed that the United States shall spend billions after the war.

[From Saturday Evening Post of August 21, 1943]

FLOODS ARE UNNECESSARY

"It doesn't make a lot of difference whether a dam is constructed primarily for power or flood control," said Doctor (Hugh H.) Bennett, diplomatically bypassing the glaring failure of the Pensacola Dam. "It will fill up with silt anyhow—in anywhere from 25 to 50 years in many instances—unless its watershed is adequately protected. Even Boulder Dam will face this siltation problem some day. There are 2,000 reservoirs in the United States already filled up with sediment. I remember one in Kansas that filled up during one rainstorm. In the remaining 8,000 major reservoirs of the country the rate of sedimentation is so great that about a third of them will fill up in 50 years."

One clincher to this phase of the discussion was furnished a few years ago by Dr. N. E. Winters, outstanding soil conservationist then connected with Oklahoma A. and M. College, who commented on the Denison Dam, on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas. This dam, now under construction, will cost more than $50,000,000, and its reservoir will receive a silt-laden output of the Red, Washita, and other rivers, which looks like thick red barn paint, its solid content sometimes reaching 15 percent or more. Some engineers predict that it will fill up within 25 years.

"I could take half the cost of this dam, and, by spending it on watershed treatment, completely stop floods on the Red River," said Doctor Winters in a public address. As a matter of fact, he could point to a small lake near Guthrie which has dried up because the watershed has been terraced and contour-farmed.

All of which should give us taxpayers something to chew on.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is fewer dams and more brains. What is now sought to be accomplished by the expenditure of many billions of dollars could have been achieved long ago at relatively small expenditure and the use of more gray matter. We cannot beat nature.

Congress and the F. C. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce into the Appendix of the RECORD, editorial comment by the Ohio State Journal, published in Columbus, Ohio, and headed "Congress and the F. C. C.":

CONGRESS AND THE F. C. C.

Over the bitter protests of the bureaucrats and their sponsors, Congress has lopped $1,500,000 from the Federal Communications Commission's budget. The F. C. C. claimed it needed this money to operate its Radio Intelligence Division, but, as Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, pointed out, our Army and Navy have ample radio intelligence set-ups which are adequate to the need.

The F. C. C. has itself to blame for this loss of operating funds and for what now must be the dropping of one of its divisions. It has concerned itself a great deal too frequently with purely domestic radio affairs, even to the extent that it has been charged with dictating types of programs for the air and being otherwise arbitrary. Like most other bureaus, the F. C. C. carried its activities and projected its authority beyond the point specified by the law. It was time it had its horns trimmed a bit.

Furthermore, the F. C. C. Chairman, James L. Fly, has been one of the most dictatorial little czars of all the army of bureaucrats who infest Washington. He has dictated to radio stations, to program sponsors, and even tried to tell Congress where its authority ended and his began. For this he is being given a lesson in where the authority really exists, and none too soon.

In controlling appropriations Congress holds the real key to command over our whole giddy system of bureaucracy. The trouble is the lawmakers do not use this power often enough. There still remains to be investigated matters in which the F. C. C. figured in a manner that has the public skeptical. The administration has tried to quash one investigation and may succeed yet in keeping it from an airing. But Congress seems to be

hitting a new stride and the hope is that it will accelerate its pace in the direction it has been moving. That is what the people want it to do, as attested by the trend in recent elections.

Address Before the Chelsea (Mass.) Zionist Emergency Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following address I made on March 22, 1944, at a mass meeting of the Chelsea Zionist Emergency Council against the British white paper of 1939, held in the Chelsea high school auditorium, Chelsea, Mass.:

The resolutions now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Congress of the United States provide: "That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

As a result of the action initiated at the Bermuda conference of April 1943, the expiration date of March 31, 1944, was indefinitely postponed by the British Parliament to enable the authorized remainder, approximately 30,000 Jews in number to enter Palestine whenever they should succeed in reaching that haven.

The new British policy, when formulated, must not be a repetition of the white paper of 1939.

The Balfour Declaration of November 1917 publicly recognized the right of the Jews to have a sovereign homeland. Over 50 nations endorsed these terms and they were unanimously approved by the Lodge-Fish resolution, passed by the Congress in 1922. Every American President since then has consistnetly supported this stand.

Under a mandate from the League of Nations, Britain was appointed guardian over Palestine, to regulate it until such time as the Jews would be in a position to administer their own affairs. But Palestine is a vital link in the communications of the British Empire. As the dictators grew in power, they seized upon Palestine as a fertile field for their propaganda and the Arabs were stirred to revolt. Then came the days of Chamberlain and the fatal policy of appeasement. Loath to antagonize the Mohammedan world, England compromised, and in doing so failed in its pledges to the Jewish people.

In 1939 the British issued the White Paper, which provided for (1) total stoppage of Jewish immigration into Palestine after March 1944; (2) rigorous restrictions on land purchase by Jews; (3) the ultimate establishment of an independent Palestine state in which Jews should constitute not more than one-third of the population. And Jews the world over were dismayed.

As of March 9, 1944, President Roosevelt stated that "the American Government has never given its approval to the British White Paper of 1939."

In 1939 Mr. Winston Churchill and others now leaders in the British Government condemned the White Paper as a "breach and a repudiation of Britain's pledges" and predicted that it could not endure.

Plainly this White Paper was an attempt to appease the Arabs at the sacrifice of the Jews, but it failed. In Britain's darkest hour the Arabs lifted not one finger in her defense. When Rommel, the "desert fox," was knocking at the doors of Alexandria the Fascist-minded Arabs prayed for Britain's defeat. Even today the former Prime Minister of Iraq and a prominent member of the Egyptian royal family are in Berlin doing propaganda work for the Nazis. But what were the Jews doing in this crisis? They were the only group in the Middle East loyal to the democratic cause. They begged for the opportunity to raise an army of their own to fight by Britain's side, but she refused. In spite of this, 30,000 Palestinian Jews are serving in the British Army, and today more than a million Jewish men and women are serving in the armed forces of the United Nations.

The Jews have been trained in the school of adversity. They are patient and persevering. The spirit of Zionism, which stands for the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine, will not be denied. For the last 2,000 years at Passover you have said, "Next year in Jerusalem." Because the currents of Jewish culture run deep and you have never betrayed your heritage.

After four centuries of slavery in Egypt, the Hebrews, under Moses, Joshua, and the Judges, established an independent national existence in Palestine. They conquered it in 1200 B. C. and maintained it for 1,300 years. It grew and prospered under the reigns of Saul and David and Solomon.

But, as the cross-roads of three continents, it had to face barbarian aggression from all sides. Before it finally succumbed to the crushing legions of Rome, it gave to the world the father of all religious faiths—the Bible.

That was a long time ago, before the great nations of today were born. And the point for all men to see and remember is that the Jews gave their greatest contributions to civilization when they were a nation.

Yet there are those today who say the Jews have no right to nationhood, which is a complete and deliberate falsification of history.

For many centuries now, Palestine has been a land of rock and marshland and sand dunes, that is, until the end of the last war when the Jews, filled with the promise of the Balfour Declaration, started back to their homeland. There, during the past 25 years we have witnessed one of the miracles of modern times. One of the lies we used to hear was that the Jew never worked with his hands. Yet out of the sweat of his brow, he lovingly tilled the soil; he built beautiful homes and factories and cities; he set up libraries and hospitals and universities.

Sand and marsh were transformed into fertile farmlands. The death rate became the lowest in the East. Even the Arabs came to Palestine because they found that they fared better under tolerant and progressive Jewish society than they did under the sluggish rule of their native chieftains. Palestine, an impoverished country, has come to life. In less than 25 years an astounding development has taken place on the barren coast of the Mediterranean. The all-Jewish city of Tel-Aviv was created, a community of 150,000 inhabitants which is one of the most modern in the world. All this was done, not by capital—but by Jewish labor. Furthermore, it was accomplished during a period when the world was suffering from an economic depression.

There is no compulsion about the communal settlements in Palestine, nor any State control (as in Russia). The farms are run by mutual agreement among their members and communal organization of the settlement's economic life does not interfere with the freedom of the individual or of the family. The labor movement in Palestine seeks to unite all workers in town and country who live by labor, without exploiting the labor of others. The Labor Party is so strong in Palestine that, if ever a Jewish state is set up, it will be a labor state because they will have built it by faith and toil.

To build the Kingdom of God, the Jews must not be dissipated among other nations, always as ineffective minorities. As the prophets preached, they must have their own nation, there to work and develop the ideal social order, as a model and example from which other nations may learn.

The suffering, shame, and persecution of the centuries must not condemn the Jews to an unending mission of martyrdom. As a liberal and peace-loving people they are needed today, needed as a nation in a world which has lost sight of the ancient virtues.

The Fascist terror, which has brought to the Jews of our time the most cruel persecution in history, will be exterminated. But what of the residue? What of the youth of Axis countries, who have been taught only to hate the Jews? What of the people who have taken over Jewish homes, businesses, and professions? All the sincere and humanitarian efforts of the Allies to remedy these abuses will not fully succeed. It will take many years to clean up the insidious poisons which Hitler will leave after him. In the meantime, what will become of the homeless and uprooted Jews? How can they return to countries which will have their own urgent economic problems? How will these disinherited Jews find a livelihood and recover their moral dignity? Jewish homelessness must be remedied by giving them a home. Only in this way will the fires of anti-Semitism, those fires that are fanned by agitators who are seeking ruthless power, be finally extinguished.

The Jewish people have the tragic yet proud distinction of being the first people to be attacked by the Fascist barbarians. Sacrifice is not a new experience in Jewish life, yet in the present crisis they have given up 3,000,000 of their lives because they would not lose faith in human decency.

Surely, if this great struggle in which so many Jewish men have given their lives, is to have meaning and direction, it must win sanctuary for the Jews. And in doing so, let us face the facts. There is racial and religious prejudice against the Jew. It rests on ancient and deep-seated lies. It cannot be remedied overnight. When social misery cannot be explained unscrupulous leaders seeking a scapegoat, blame the Jews. This is an old, old trick and we had hoped that most people would see through it by this time. But human intelligence is slow in developing and many misguided people still want to believe this. The scourge of Hitler grew to power on this emotional life. Even in our own country we have seen shameful instances of people who direct attention away from their own failings—by blaming the Jew.

The result of this has been that some Jews have leaned backward, fearing to come out openly for the establishment of a Jewish home in Palestine. They have feared that some people might accuse them of putting their interest in Judaism ahead of their interest in Americanism. True, the bigots will make this charge, but the great majority of Americans are in sympathy with the Zionist program. They want to see you work for the building in Palestine of a truly Hebraic civilization, with a different basis than ruthless

competition and greed. They want to see what you can do, by example, to help a sick world. They admire the fact that you are not asking for charity, but simply for land your persecuted brethren can call their own and on which they can work out their human destiny as freemen.

Jewish policy has consistently sought a basis of mutual cooperation with the Arabs. This was reflected in the fact that King Feisal, the chief spokesman of the Arabs at the peace conference, welcomed the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine. Jews and Arabs are both Semitic peoples. There is no reason why they should not get along together. As a matter of fact, the Arabs themselves showed very little interest in Palestine until the Jews, by their labors, brought such improvement to the country. The average Arab was glad to see this initiative because it raised his own standard of living. However, the effendi class of Arab landlords, feudal and dictatorial in character, resented the change. They saw their privileged position challenged. Poverty-stricken Arab peasants, working side by side with Jewish labor, were building a prosperous industrial and agricultural community. Such fraternization must be prevented at all costs. And so false issues had to be invented to mislead the ignorant Arab population. The cry was raised: "The Jew is robbing you of your land." Once more the country was swept by organized violence and destruction. Meanwhile the Arab landlords secretly kept on selling land to the Jews, so that if the wrath of the masses could have had any substance it should have been leveled at their own false leaders who were inciting them to riot against the Jews. The Jews did buy land, but they were careful to compensate the poor Arabs they found on the land of the effendis by buying them land elsewhere. This was often better land, which they could own outright, without having to pay four-fifths of the income from the land to grasping owners as they did under the old system.

But the world was told that this was a spontaneous explosion of Arab nationalist sentiment. Still the Arab peasant refused to join in the uprising. Finally, paid terrorists and gangsters had to be imported to keep up the lie of a revolt. Mussolini stepped in. Quantities of German arms and ammunition were smuggled in. Bands in the pay of the Fuehrer and the Duce kept up the agitation. Violence interrupted the creative work of Jewish national enterprise. Then came the white paper which restricted Jewish immigration to Palestine and prevented their legitimate purchase of the land. British imperial policy forestalled the natural growth of a Jewish majority. Kept as a minority, they would not be able to claim the right of self-government.

The Jewish pioneers had come to make the land of Israel not only a refuge for the persecuted of their own race, but a happier place for the poor and disease-ridden Arabs as well. They came, not as military conquerors, but as doers of the will of God. The first building on Zion's hill was not a fort, but a school of learning, the Hebre University. Zionism's object was to bring to a close Israel's 2,000 years of exile, to establish a haven where Jews might settle down to build "the world to come;" a world wherein not one man shall plow and another reap, not one man build and another inhabit, and not one man cause hurt or damage to another man.

What is England's policy toward Palestine going to be, in the light of the Atlantic Charter and the freedoms for which she has so gloriously fought in this war against tyranny? That is the paradox. The concept of empire and the concept of individual liberty. How can she reconcile them? Is she going to maintain the fiction that Jew and Arab cannot get along together and that, therefore, she must maintain supervision over them? Her concern for the stability of the Mohammedan world as it affected Britain's imperial security resulted in the white paper. That statement of colonial policy gave in to Arab demands and curtailed Jewish agricultural and industrial expansion in Palestine.

If that country were a colony, we might understand Britain's position. In reality it is a guardianship, for which Britain is responsible to the League of Nations and to the United States. This white paper was never approved by other nations and has yet to be legalized by an international authority. The exigencies of war alone support it. At the peace table it will not be exclusively for Britain to decide the ultimate fate of Palestine. The United States also has a right and interest in the solution of this problem which she has never forfeited.

Opposing the white paper, Winston Churchill said in a speech before the House of Commons in May of 1939:

"The triumphant Arabs have rejected it. They are not going to put up with it. The despairing Jews will resist it. What will the world think about it? What will our friends say? What will be the opinion of the United States of America? Shall we not lose more—and this is a question to be considered maturely—in the growing support and sympathy of the United States than we shall gain in local administrative convenience, if gain at all we do?"

As Churchill indicated, American public opinion will have much to do with the honorable solution of this problem. In this case I am reminded of the experience of the Irish people They are small in number. They have worked courageously and persistently for their independence. England did not have to grant it. She did, however, when she saw that the great weight of public opinion in America was in favor of it. England needs America, as we need England. We, who were so tragically unprepared, will never forget the perilous days of 1940–41, when England alone stood up against the ruthless might of fascism. Without England, where would we have been today? And without us—and Russia—where would England have been?

Tonight, in typical American fashion, you are helping to crystallize the sentiment which will inevitably influence British policy and succeed in establishing a Jewish homeland.

Arab Fascists have no case because Arab lands are 100 times the size of Palestine. Arab peasants and workers who wish to cooperate with Jews in the homeland will be welcome. The practice of Arab-Jewish collaboration in labor unions was eminently successful until the Fascists intervened. History has proved that these two people, if left alone, can work together in peace and harmony. For it was the successful cooperation of these two Semitic groups under the caliphs of Bagdad and in Spain that produced one of the nourishing developments of western civilization.

As for England, I feel certain that the peace will provide her with a security that will free her from the need of appeasement in Palestine. Then, her pledge, freely given to the whole world, will be kept, and the Promised Land will be opened to the tired and homeless people of Israel.

Statesmen, seeking to solve this ancient problem have suggested the jungles of Guiana, the barren tundras of Alaska, the forbidding shores of Ceylon and Madagascar * * * but none of these will do. The birthright of the Jew is Palestine. There the framework and organization have been set up by the Jews themselves. The economic, social, cultural, and religious fabric are there, set up by the pioneers. Large areas of land are available for settlement. Erets Yisrael is calling and the day is not far distant when they * * * her wandering children, will return. Gone will be the ghettoes and the badge of shame. And gone will be the tyrants who sought to crush the dignity of man in the person of the Jew. The conscience of the Christian world will, for the first time, be at ease. For an ancient wrong will have been righted.

By what the Jews have accomplished in Palestine they have proved their capacity for self-government. That is exhibit A.

Exhibit B is the consistent policy of the American Government. We have never given up the right to a voice in the disposition of Palestine, to which, as an associated power, we are entitled. And the moral influence of America will be even greater when this present crisis is over.

Exhibit C. This meeting of Americans who are determined that their suffering brethren, driven from pillar to post, shall at last find refuge in the country of their origin * * * as was promised.

The sacrifice of your martyrs, down through the suffering centuries will be vindicated. Humanity will be redeemed and the words of Isaiah will come true:

"The ransomed of the Lord shall return
And come with singing unto Zion."

Food for Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress were present at a recent meeting of the Food Forum here in the city of Washington and heard an interesting address by Dr. Theodore W. Schultz, of the University of Chicago.

Dr. Schultz's high standing as an agricultural economist and his wide knowledge of food production and distribution make this address significant and timely. Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a summary of Dr. Schultz's address:

I want to take up what are, in my judgment, the three basic issues in the problem of food for relief that confront us as a people:

1. The rating given to various foods;

2. The role of food in the relief period ahead;

3. The risk factor in food management.

My three R's are not 'riting, reading, and 'rithmetic, but rating food, role of food, and risk confronting food management.

Let me make explicit the large area on which we are probably all agreed; these are the things I, therefore, am taking for granted:

1. We are eating more food per capita and it is better distributed than ever before. This is also true in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and, for the most part, in the United Kingdom.

2. We have passed the peak in food production in this war.

3. The American people want to contribute generously and freely to the food needs of peoples when they are liberated—to aid children and mothers and more immediately to help the Army so that liberated peoples do not become a menace to the military.

4. The bulk of the food which Europe will need after victory must of necessity come from the fields and feed lots of Europe—fully 90 percent of it. (This means that we must

be prepared to make it possible for Europe to help herself as quickly as feasible.)[1]

Now, let me put before you the conditions we should, in my judgment, be prepared to meet. They are:

We should be prepared for a short crop: We have been blessed by nature with five bumper crops in a row. By all count a bad crop is overdue.

We should be prepared for a long war: We are consuming our surpluses as if this were a short war. Should the defeat of Germany take still another year and that of Japan still longer, we must be prepared for it on the food front.

We should be prepared for much more deterioration in the food situation within Europe and in the Orient before peace, order, and production are restored.

To meet these contingencies—a bad crop, a long war, and worsening of the food situation in Europe and the Orient—what about our high per capita consumption and our high hopes to help liberated peoples? This takes us back to the basic issues.

First. What about the rating given to various foods? It is my contention that we need to revaluate our food supply; priorities must be changed. Take cereals—these will be the least scarce, provided we check the feeding of wheat to animals and divert less to the production of alcohol.

Fats will be exceedingly scarce until the Southwest Pacific is rewon and in production again. We cannot afford to put edible fats into the soap kettle and to other nonedible uses. The food situation does not warrant this. Edible fats deserve a higher priority. (And when the war is over remember a big dislocation in American agriculture will be in the production of fats and oils.)

Proteins will also be exceedingly scarce. Here we have fortunately a great reserve in our high quality vegetable proteins. To serve the ends of nutrition in bringing health and strength and growth to malnourished people, we need to mobilize this valuable food resource at once, and do it fully.

Because the peoples of Europe have developed a taste and strong preference for animal proteins, some of these should be made available for them.

Instead of feeding our skim milk to our hogs we owe it to ourselves and to others to give this product a higher priority. Skim milk is a food and it is too scarce and too valuable for feed.

Second. What about the role of food in the relief period ahead? I must be brief; all I want to say is that relief cannot and must not be left as the residual claimant.

There is too much at stake—hungry people will be a menace to our Army, they will hate us for delay and neglect. Relief claims for food must stand on footing with other major claims in food allocations.

Third. What about the risk factor in food management? We are confronted with two major uncertainties: (1) The size of the forthcoming crop or crops, and (2) the duration of the war.

To prepare for uncertainty one turns to flexibility—reserves, stock piles, flows of food that can be diverted.

We must risk coming out with big stocks and carry-overs—it is the price we must pay for being prepared for contingencies. We must even risk having some food spoil and go to waste as we build and maintain stock piles. It is better to do this than to consume all of our abundance currently and be unprepared for droughts and floods at home and military reverses and difficulties abroad.

To recapitulate:

We must alter the ratings; save wheat for food, and use less for feed and alcohol; save all edible fats for food; mobilize our high quality proteins for war; save our skim milk for food.

We must recast the role, make relief a claimant on an equal footing with civilians, the United Kingdom, Russia, and others.

We must take new risks; prepare for the uncertainties that lie ahead by increasing reserves and stock piles.

[1] See National Planning Association pamphlet No. 29, Food for Europe After Victory, 1944.

Letter From Mother of Boy on Duty in South Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the mother of a boy in the South Pacific, which contained the following:

My son writes from the South Pacific, "the only news we get comes from the desk of F. D. R. and it makes me damn mad." Can't you make a speech? Stop the Stars and Stripes which are being made as propaganda for the fourth term. It is too outrageous to send our boys out to fight and die and fill them up with New Deal propaganda.

Operations of Social Security Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two informative articles by Stuart Chase and Jerome Beatty on the operations of the Social Security Board, appearing in the April 1944 issue of the Reader's Digest at pages 88 and 91.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STORY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

I. THIS BUREAUCRACY STREAMLINES ITSELF

(By Stuart Chase)

The Social Security Board conducts the biggest clerical job on earth. It has accounts with 76,000,000 Americans. In the past 2 years its work has increased 33 percent, while its pay roll has declined from about 12,300 employees to 9,800. Yet it is doing its gigantic task more smoothly than ever before. What has happened here to thwart the devils of bureaucracy?

Three things, I think, explain it. First, the high quality of Social Security's executive staff. Second, the fact that the Board was organized to do an entirely new job, and so was compelled to use creative ingenuity. Third, the use of a program called work simplification, derived from the job methods training of the War Manpower Commission, in which the rank and file of the organization play a large part.

From its start the Board has been known for its efficiency. In the 7 years of its existence it has turned back $24,000,000 to the Treasury in unspent appropriations. The time spent in settling a claim has been cut from 40 days in 1940 to 23 days in 1943, and is still being reduced.

Under the Board's job methods training, office work is broken down into essential steps and then each step is subjected to a salvo of questions:

Why is this necessary? What is its purpose? Where should it be done? When should it be done? Who should do it? How is the best way?

The regular job methods training for industry goes no lower than the supervisor, but the Social Security Board included every member of its staff. This is democracy with a vengeance, and it produces surprising results. Never in any other office have I found an entire outfit asking embarrassing questions about the efficiency of their own work. In effect they are saying, "Does this thing I am doing make any sense?"

Here is a big technical reference room in Washington, with stacks of documents, court decisions, and fat legal books. The supervisor has a dozen people under her—indexers, file clerks, stenographers.

The entire staff of the reference room take seats at a big table. In comes the "trainer," a specially chosen employee who has taken the JM course with the War Manpower Commission. He unpacks his box of stage properties and puts on a show—the case of a worker making radio shields, for instance, with "before and after" contrast.

The trainer has a talent for acting, and makes the "before" stage extremely funny, with the worker jumping up continually and running all over the shop for his materials. The faster he runs the more work he spoils. In the "after" stage the worker sits quietly at his adjusted bench, turning out three times as many shields. His job has been expertly analyzed, and its 30 steps have been cut to 14.

People around the table are fascinated. The trainer capitalizes this interest to drive home the application to their own work in the reference room. He shows how to break down any job into its essential steps, how to ask the six basic questions, how to develop a better way with fewer steps. Finally he asks for volunteers to bring a break-down of one of their tasks to the next meeting.

I talked with a girl who had been an early volunteer. Her task was to index certain documents coming in to the reference room. She showed me the neat typewritten form on which the old way is compared with the new way. The first had 18 steps, the second 11. "I never realized before," she said, "that people like me could think out improvements. I always thought the supervisor was supposed to do the planning. Now I feel it's part of all our jobs."

I crossed the room and asked a file clerk what plans he had evolved as a result of the round-table meeting. He used to vary his filing with operating the addressograph, wasting much time and effort in walking back and forth between his two tasks. Now he runs the addressograph in the morning and devotes most of the afternoon to sorting his material for filing. When he finally moves to the files he goes completely equipped, with everything prepared in advance. He saves hours a day by this organized attack.

In another office I tackled a plump, gray-haired, conscientious woman who for years has been preparing periodically a cumulative index. The work used to involve 27 steps and take 600 hours. She has cut the steps to 12, and can now do the job in 200 hours. She showed me what operations have been eliminated.

I asked, "Why didn't you think of doing that before?"

"Because I wasn't supposed to think like that before. I was told how to do it, and there were rules higher up that forced me to take those unnecessary steps. When the break-down showed how pointless they were, we got them changed."

When a plan is first submitted at the round table, everybody is encouraged to take a crack at it, especially the supervisor. Many plans overlap other people's work and have to be ironed out by group discussion. A group of 10 to 20 persons may need 5 or 6 meetings to discuss the proposals presented. So far, in the Washington office, 80 out of every 100 plans proposed have been adopted.

As the meetings progress, the trainer eases himself out of the chairmanship and the supervisor takes over. It is better for the supervisor to run the sessions, because one of the chief purposes of the round table is to bring supervisor and worker closer together. The trainer stays as a consultant as long as he is needed.

Every suggestion for improvement is passed up the line to supervisors. Top management acknowledges them by a personal letter. Without the active interest of top management, says Oscar Powell, executive director of the board, the project would fade out. A record of achievement is put into the individual's civil-service file, so that any future employer will see it. There is no financial reward—nothing but credit, honor, and a satisfying sense of participation.

Work simplification has been operating long enough to warrant the following conclusions. If you have anything to do with an office, they ought to interest you.

1. The program taps a vast reservoir of human energy which lies inert in most offices.

2. It helps the employee to share in management and to understand the importance of his job. His morale goes up.

3. It stimulates orderly thinking and gives the employee an effective method for analyzing his own work.

4. The program is democracy in action; it gets everyone in. It transforms the supervisor from a driver to a leader; from "do it and no back talk" to "let's see if we can work out a better way."

5. It opens up the horizon of the supervisor. The old attitude of feeling ashamed if employees beat one to suggestions for improvements becomes a feeling of shame if employees do not submit a flow of suggestions.

6. It shows up red tape.

7. Work simplification as a technique is applicable to other Government agencies and to all office work which involves recurring tasks. In fact, the round-table idea is now being adopted by unemployment insurance offices in almost all the States, by the United States Department of Agriculture, by the State of Minnesota, by the city of New York.

Here is an example of how the Board has used work simplification to get rid of several yards of red tape:

Jim White in the St. Paul office is being transferred to Boston. He is going to sell his house, take his family and his furniture with him. The Board is authorized to move his furniture, but to get it done under the old method shook the Republic to its foundations: 24 signatures, acknowledgments, permits and certifications were required, in St. Paul, Chicago, and Washington.

Then came work simplification and some pertinent questions. As a result, the whole thing can now be done in St. Paul, without Chicago or Washington sticking their noses in at all, and Jim can get his family established in Boston in good time.

Then there is the story of the clerk who asked why she should classify and file the third copies of some 4,000 social-security decisions sent in monthly by the States, when 2 copies were already in the works. Her superiors, horror-struck, could point to no answer except the barnacles of tradition. They stopped saving the triplicate copy. Instead they saved time, filing cabinets, floor space, paper, transportation.

Traditions fall, not only in Washington but in the larger Baltimore office. Old-age and survivor benefits are calculated here on the most fearful and wonderful machines in the world. I saw a whole building full of these clanking robots, automatically recording data from cards.

In the Baltimore office 2,400 workers have made 6,600 suggestions, of which 1,600 have been adopted. Some of the proposals have been spectacular. One of the building guards worked out a plan to eliminate 38 guards—half the force—with no loss of protection. Another employee's plan for eliminating the 76,000,000 ledger sheets, with the essential information retained in simplified microfilm listings, promises to save $350,000 a year and 20,000 square feet of floor space.

A remarkable feature of this bureau's program of self-improvement is that it has begun to analyze its technical language. The head of the Baltimore office has worked out a card that reminds employees to keep sentences to 25 words and paragraphs short. Avoid technical and legal terms, it advises. Do not hedge; be explicit. Use friendly, not frigid, words. Do not be afraid of idiomatic phrases. Concentrate on the meaning.

This is indeed a revolution among bureaucrats. It might even spread some day to the Internal Revenue Bureau, and make some sense out of the income-tax form.

Here is a significant letter received by Director Powell:

BLANKVILLE, TEX.

MY DEAR SIR: I am usually resentful when I receive an inquiry from State or Federal agencies, but I welcomed your letter as I invariably do when I hear from your office, because your agency is organized along sensible lines and is consistently courteous and inclined to help the employer rather than harass him.

Respectfully yours,

X. Y. Z.,
President of a local company.

The more human and efficient the Board is, the better for us all.

[Condensed from the American magazine]

II. WILL YOU GET YOUR SHARE?

(By Jerome Beatty)

One day recently a friend asked me, "How much do we get in social-security payments when we're 65?" I didn't have the slightest idea. "Neither have I," he admitted. Like most Americans, we carried social-security cards but knew very little about it.

So I went to the Social Security Board in Washington to find out. I went to Baltimore, too, where in a shabby loft building the records are kept in 20,400 filing cabinets. Here a sprightly girl, with nothing to guide her but my name, found my account number in 17 seconds. (She couldn't have done so well had my name been Smith, for there are 574,435 Smiths in the files.)

The basic idea of social security is to help aged workers who have never earned enough to save for old age. A tax, levied on wages up to $3,000 a year, is paid by both workers and employers. This provides a fund from which payments are made to eligible persons when they reach 65. It is not an insurance plan that gives every worker equal benefits for what he pays in. The poor generally will get much more than they and their employers have put in, and the man who makes $3,000 or more a year is likely to get less. The maximum paid to any one family is $85 a month.

Several large groups are not covered by social security. These include farmers, domestic servants, school teachers, ministers, the self-employed, and workers in Government service and religious and charitable organizations.

Generally, when the time comes for you to collect old-age insurance benefits, you must have worked in "covered" employment half the time since January 1, 1937, when social security started, or since your twenty-first birthday if that came on a later date. The years are divided into quarters, for figuring, and if you have credit for 40 quarters (they don't have to be consecutive) you are qualified as long as you live.

Girls who pay pay-roll taxes for a few years and then marry and quit work usually lose all they put in. Similarly, housewives who are in war work only for the duration probably won't qualify.

You will collect nothing at 65 unless you stop working then. But you can get benefits even though you draw money from investments, from your own business, or from a job not covered by the law. A New York man who worked for a florist reached the age of 65, and found he was due to receive $42.28 a month if he stopped working. He and his wife weren't able to live on that amount, so he stayed on the job. A social-security agent, however, explained to him that if he had a business of his own he would qualify for the payments. The man started a little greenhouse, makes about $20 a week from it, draws his social-security payments, and lives comfortably.

If your employer collects your tax and then fails to pay it, and his, to the Government, the Bureau of Internal Revenue gets after him; but in some cases it's almost impossible to catch a tax-dodging employer unless you write the Social Security office for a statement of your account and discover that you are being cheated.

The Social Security office in Baltimore encourages workers to write in and ask for statements of their accounts. Queries must bear the worker's signature, address, birth date, and Social Security number. These facts are necessary to make sure the request is not being made by some snooper who wants to find out how much money you're making.

Social Security records are absolutely secret. The Bureau of Internal Revenue would like to get its hands on them, in order to track down workers who are dodging their income taxes; but the law says "No." A wife can't find out how much her husband is making. Even the F. B. I. can't peek into the files.

If you lose your card, be sure to ask the nearest Social Security field office for a duplicate.

If you qualify for Social Security, it sends you a check every month after you become 65. It pays your wife, too, when she reaches that age. It pays something toward the care of children under 16, or under 18 if they are in school—if you have any when you become 65. No matter what your age is when you die, payments go to your widow if she is 65 or over or when she reaches 65. If there are dependent children, as above, she receives benefits at once. If you leave no widow or dependent children, wholly dependent parents receive benefits at 65.

If no relative is immediately qualified to draw monthly benefits as a result of the death of a worker, a lump-sum payment of $60 to $336 is made—this payment going usually to a widow under 65 who has no dependent children. She still receives benefits after she reaches 65.

Too many widows of workers don't know that social security may owe them money. Recently a young soldier married just before he was sent to north Africa. Five weeks later he was killed in action. His 19-year-old wife drew her Army benefits but didn't know

about social security until a friend mentioned it. Her young husband had not worked long before he went into the Army, and had paid in less than $20, but she got a lump-sum payment of about $150. A posthumous child is due, and when it arrives the mother will get about $32 a month until the child is 16 or 18. If she doesn't marry again, the widow will get about $19 a month after reaching 65.

No one seems to be sure how much money it will take to pay benefits as the pool of old persons entitled to them increases. There's a balance of $4,500,000,000 in the fund now, but payments will increase tremendously when the war ends. It is estimated that 625,000 persons now entitled to benefits aren't claiming them.

Retirement insurance benefits you may expect at 65

Your average monthly wage. [1]	Monthly payments to—	
	You	You and wife
3 years' coverage:		
$50	$20.60	$30.90
$100	25.75	38.63
$150	30.90	46.35
$250	41.20	61.80
10 years' coverage:		
$50	22.00	33.00
$100	27.50	41.25
$150	33.00	49.50
$250	44.00	66.00
20 years' coverage:		
$50	24.00	36.00
$100	30.00	45.00
$150	36.00	54.00
$250	48.00	72.00
40 years' coverage:		
$50	28.00	40.00
$100	35.00	52.50
$150	42.00	63.00
$250	56.00	84.00

[1] For average monthly wages under $50 the benefits are smaller; but they cannot be less than $10 a month for a single person, or $15 a month for a man and wife. The maximum benefit to any one family is $85 a month.

Work of the Truman Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who is detained by illness, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the American Observer entitled "The Work of the Senate Truman Committee."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORK OF THE SENATE TRUMAN COMMITTEE

In Washington's welter of coordinating, managing, and investigating agencies there is one group which stands out for its clearness of purpose, its efficiency of operation, and its fearlessness. It is the Truman committee, the 10-man body formed in 1941 to investigate the progress of the war effort. For 3 years this Senate committee has been at the same time successfully trouble shooting the home-front administration and demonstrating the way a congressional committee can, and should, function.

It began in February 1941, when Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, placed himself on record as particularly alarmed over the way defense contracts were being placed by the War and Navy Departments. Charging that favoritism and unfair practices govern the distribution of work on the Government's expanding war program, he called for an investigation. The next month he was installed at the head of a committee to take care of the matter.

Investigations by Senate committees were nothing new to the Capitol, and at first this one attracted little attention. Senator TRUMAN was assigned a number of freshman Senators and $15,000—a comparatively small amount of money for such an enterprise—and was promptly forgotten.

But it was not long before his committee began to make news. In August 1941 it issued a 98-page report prepared by TRUMAN himself with the aid of his chief counsel, Hugh A. Fulton. It outlined in well-authenticated detail the needless waste of $100,000,000 in the Army's billion-dollar-spending program. Then, attributing this waste to poor and inadequate planning, it proceeded to recommend more efficient practices.

Impressed by the thoroughness and logic of Senator TRUMAN's work, Army officials considered his recommendations. According to General Somervell, head of the Army Service Forces, which are responsible for most Army spending, the Truman inquiry resulted in Government savings of some $200,000,000.

Following this initial investigation, the Truman committee began to work on other aspects of the war program. Hundreds of people appeared to testify before it on such matters as rubber, aluminum, small business problems, and administrative practices in Government war agencies. In January 1942 Senator TRUMAN went to President Roosevelt with a new set of recommendations.

In surveying the work of agencies directing the war economy, the committee had found two major difficulties. One of them was red tape—the kind of inefficiency and confusion resulting from too many people trying to do the same thing without clearly defined powers and responsibilities. The other was the influence of dollar-a-year men. TRUMAN felt, on the basis of his investigations, that these officials, recruited from the biggest business interests in the country, were serving as lobbyists for their corporations and putting private interest before national interest. He recommended the appointment of one man to run the entire war program and also the end of the dollar-a-year man system.

One day later, Donald Nelson was appointed director of the Office of Production Management. Very shortly thereafter O. P. M. was liquidated in favor of the War Production Board, which largely conformed to specifications laid down in the Truman report.

Next the committee turned its attention to shortages of vital war materials. In the course of its study of the rubber and aluminum situations, it began attacking international cartels and their influence on American corporations.

Later other phases of the home-front effort were investigated with equal thoroughness. While the Truman committee has fallen far short of having all its recommendations adopted or all the abuses it pointed out corrected, it is conservatively estimated that its investigations have saved our Government close to a billion dollars.

What is responsible for this remarkable record? There is nothing unique in the make-up of the committee itself. Composed of six Democrats and four Republicans, it includes many young and relatively inexperienced legislators. Along with congressional oldsters—CONNALLY, of Texas, and JAMES MEAD, of New York—the committee is composed of such comparative newscomers as Senators WALLGREN, of Washington; FERGUSON, of Michigan; and BALL, of Minnesota. Other members are BURTON, of Ohio; KILGORE, of West Virginia; HATCH, of New Mexico; and BREWSTER, of Maine.

Nor is it to be found in the personality of Senator TRUMAN himself. Grayhaired, 50-year-old HARRY S. TRUMAN is much more a typical grassroots American legislator than an inspired leader. He does not pretend to have elaborate political theories or world-shaking plans. In his own estimation, he is "just a farmer who happens to be in the Senate."

In 1922, he was elected judge in the county court of Jackson, Mo. During the next few years, he studied law and worked with Tom Pendergast, the Democratic party boss of Kansas City. In 1930, as presiding judge of the Jackson County court, he was responsible for the construction of $60,000,000 worth of highways and public buildings in the county.

In 1934, with the help of the Pendergast machine, TRUMAN was elected to the United States Senate. Just before he came up for reelection, the Pendergast machine was broken as Pendergast himself was convicted of income-tax evasion. But TRUMAN'S reelection in 1940 demonstrated that he was a vote-getter in his own right rather than a pawn of the political organization in power.

The clearest reason for the Truman committee's profitable work of the last 3 years lies in its methods and its insistence upon expert staff help. The usual thing for a committee of this type to do is to appoint a lawyer for political reasons and build a staff of clerks and stenographers along with a few investigators borrowed from the different Government bureaus.

The Truman committee proceeded differently. Senator TRUMAN chose his counsel, Hugh Fulton, on the advice of the Justice Department and on the strength of Fulton's record with a highly successful New York commercial law firm. Then he hired three assistant attorneys—men with excellent legal records and no political connections. Six field investigators with long experience in fiscal affairs rounded out his staff. Today a few investigators with qualifications in particular fields have been added.

The committee's main working principle is cooperation. Although its members are of differing political parties, they work together harmoniously and have never been divided in their conclusions about an investigation. Each day they meet for a conference in the "dog house," a small office TRUMAN maintains. At these meetings current problems are discussed and plans made.

Some Truman committee investigations are started by the members themselves. Most, however, result from tips received outside. Plowing through the hundreds of letters it receives, the committee chooses its subjects for investigation from suggestions offered by people closer to the actual operation of the war program.

When evidence accumulates showing that a particular aspect of the war program should be studied, hearings are begun. Management of these is parceled out to the various members according to subject matter, as each man has his own specialty.

Businessmen, labor leaders, and Government officials are called to give testimony. After this has been presented, the committee members and their attorneys take over for a period of questioning. Then the results are discussed by the whole group, recommendations framed, reports issued.

Just as startling as the amounts of money Truman committee investigations have saved the Government is the small amount

of funds on which the committee has operated itself. To save Uncle Sam a billion, the Truman committee has spent less than $200,000.

What Is the "Issue"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Is the 'Issue'?" which appeared yesterday in the New York Sun, written by George E. Sokolsky in the column entitled "These Days."

Perhaps I might clarify the matter by reading a couple of lines of the article to indicate the general tone and purpose, so to speak, or theme of the article by Mr. Sokolsky:

Wendell Willkie chases about the country demanding that Republicans discuss the "issue." I have read Mr. Willkie's public addresses, God help me, these 4 years and have yet to discover any "issue" in them except an insistence upon the preeminence of Wendell Willkie.

I ask that the entire article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

WHAT IS THE "ISSUE"?

Wendell Willkie chases about the country demanding that Republicans discuss the "issue." I have read Mr. Willkie's public addresses, God help me, these 4 years and have yet to discover any "issue" in them except an insistence upon the preeminence of Wendell Willkie. For instance, the gentleman from Indiana is opposed to isolation. What is he for? Roughly, one gathers that he is for cooperation with Russia and China and England—in that order of significance. But cooperation among nations requires a mechanism, what the diplomats call a modus operandi. What kind does Mr. Willkie propose? He has been talking for 4 years on this subject but has made not a clear proposal yet. He complains that others are not facing the "issue." Is he?

On domestic questions, his outpouring is even more muddled. Each time I write an article calling attention to Willkie's plethora of words and poverty of ideas, I receive an enormous mail calling me names for questioning the man-god's perfections. Often I ask my complainant to state in clear, simple, printable English what exactly it is that Mr. Willkie proposes on a single issue. His followers end up by saying that he is the only Republican who can defeat Roosevelt. But is it necessary to defeat Roosevelt at such a cost?

Mr. Willkie has failed to indicate precisely how he would deal with a single domestic issue except taxes which he would raise beyond the people's ability to pay. He roughly doubled Roosevelt's figure—a figure so preposterous that Congress passed a bill over the President's veto and Senator Barkley delivered his famous oration of resignation. Beyond proposing an additional $16,000,000,000 tax, Willkie has limited his domestic discussion to the proposition that he can operate the Government more efficiently than Mr. Roosevelt and that all other Republican candidates, with special emphasis on Tom Dewey, just ain't no good.

Already Mr. Willkie has told off Harold Stassen and General MacArthur that they are soldiers and ought to stay out of politics altogether. In a word Willkie's single domestic issue is that he, Wendell Willkie, wants to be President and that anyone who opposes him or competes with him or so much as questions his wisdom, knowledge, or infallibility is just a plain, low-down bum.

In St. Louis Wendell Willkie was asked a series of questions so that he could explain in simple, understandable English what he believed about anything. Willkie refused to answer those questions; he insulted those who asked them. Let me, to remind you, repeat the first two questions:

"1. Do you believe that the United States should become a member of a world supranational state? If so,

"(a) Would it involve any limitation upon the sovereignty of the United States?

"(b) Would it mean that the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the United States and its technical equipment for war are to be placed under the control of the world state?

"(c) Would it mean that, except for domestic police purposes the United States is to have no independent military force of its own?

"2. If you favor a world state, what would you do about nations that refused to come in?

"(a) Force them in by military means?

"(b) Treat them as outlaws by not permitting them to trade with the members of the world state?

"(c) What other action would you favor?"

Let Willkie demand a discussion of the issue only after he has stated the issue in clear, positive language. He might answer a couple of these questions.

Members of House Want Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Baltimore Sun of March 27, 1944:

Secretary of State Hull must think with longing these days of that question-period proposal which is being backed in the House of Representatives by his fellow-Tennesseean, Representative ESTES KEFAUVER. What Mr. KEFAUVER wants is a regular time in the program of the House of Representatives when Cabinet members and heads of executive agencies can be invited to face questioning by the Members. Mr. KEFAUVER argues that this would help in many ways toward a more effective cogging together of the work of the executive and the legislative departments.

Certainly, such a provision in the rules of the House might well have saved Secretary Hull some time in the last few days. Remember that it was only last Friday that the Secretary entertained 24 freshmen Republican Members of the House at a conference on foreign policy that lasted 2 hours and 20 minutes. The meeting was private, but there have been press reports of what went on. The reports suggest that about all the relevant angles of foreign policy were discussed.

But now Mr. Hull faces still another questioning on foreign policy from a second group of first-term Republican Representatives. There are only 14 in this group, and they do not ask for a conference. But they do ask for answers to a series of questions submitted in writing. And we may be perfectly sure that many of the questions were raised in one form or another in the Friday conference. Thus, we may be sure that group 2 is asking Mr. Hull at many points to cover ground already covered for group 1.

Now, of course nobody wants to shield the departments and executive agencies from legislative questioning. But it is fair to protect their officers from the kind of time-wasting duplication of effort which Mr. Hull now seems to face. This was one of the main ideas behind Mr. KEFAUVER's plan. Under his plan, there would be a 2-hour question period at least every other week. Notice would be given to the Members as to the official to appear at that time. They would have a chance to get all their questions in order. The official would have a chance to answer all such questions with some hope that he wouldn't have to duplicate the performance almost at once. For all Members of the House would have their chance at hearing what was said.

It is true that some special matters involving secrecy or confidential relations could not be raised in a public question period. It is true, too, that the conference Mr. Hull has just had with group 1 of the Republican Representatives was closed apparently for this reason. So the question period might not obviate the need of conferences altogether.

But certainly it would go a long way toward cutting down the wear and tear on public officers. At the same time it would improve the information and the understanding of Members—all Members—of the House in the discharge of legislative business.

Half Million Barrels of Fuel Passes Through Big Inch Pipe Line Every 24 Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the interesting and thought-provoking address delivered by the president of War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., Mr. W. Alton Jones, at the dedication of these pipe lines March 24, 1944, at pipe-line pumping station No. 22, at Rockwood, Pa. His address follows:

Congressman SNYDER, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, everything in life, said a great philosopher, from marriage to manslaughter, depends on the speed and cost at which men, things, and thoughts can be shifted from one place to another.

Today we see the crucial problem of war is movement in all its forms. Getting there "fustest" is no idle phrase. Speed governs every effort on both battle and home fronts. It is a contest against time. In factory, it is to produce two guns to shoot where one shot before; in drafting room, it is to design a tank or plane that will move faster and

farther; in air and on sea and on land, the contest is to move men and death-dealing devices to the front and at the front more rapidly than the enemy.

We witness today the harnessing of a fourth dimension in transport. Before our eyes are war materials flowing to the front, without the use of wheels or wings or ships.

Since the war started better than 10,000 miles of petroleum pipe line alone have been laid, reversed, or converted. This is more mileage than has been so involved for any similar period in the last decade, and includes individual lines of greater length and diameter than any in history.

The Big Inch and the Little Big Inch, which we inspect today, are in the last category. Their part in the war effort is well known to you. So, perhaps, I can best use your time and attention in sketching the high lights of the undertaking. When you have heard it, I believe that you will forgive a feeling of satisfaction on the part of those of us who got our heads bumped and our shins rapped in bulling the job through.

It was away back in July 1940—18 months before Pearl Harbor—that Secretary Ickes stated that the building of large pipe lines from Texas to the East might not be sound in peacetime, but they might be necessary in an emergency. In May 1941, a year later, representatives of 7 oil companies met in New York to consider the possibilities of 1 or more such lines. After careful consideration, they recommended the building of a 24-inch crude-oil line, with capacity of 250,000 barrels daily. They appointed an engineering subcommittee; and they sent out reconnaissance crews to make surveys and recommend a route. It looked at that time—mid-May 1941—as though a big pipe line was well on the way toward becoming a fact. But it wasn't. A difference of opinion developed within the industry as to the relative value of pipe lines as against ocean tankers. There was also difference of opinion as to whether the proposed line should be a crude-oil line or a petroleum-products line.

But, a little later, representatives of 11 companies, meeting with Secretary Ickes, agreed to build a 24-inch crude-oil line from Texas to New York and Philadelphia, at their own expense. Your speaker was chosen as chairman of a committee to see the thing through, and, in an unguarded moment, I accepted the assignment. I give you my word that I had no idea what I was letting myself in for, but if my hair has become a little grayer and a little sparser, you will understand why.

One of the first jobs, of course, was to try to get the steel and other materials and equipment allocated. So, Secretary Ickes and representatives of the oil industry went to the agency then in charge of such matters—the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board. The answer was "no." But, Mr. Ickes is not a fellow who will be stopped by just one "no", so he went back again a few weeks later and asked again for the material. Again the answer was "no".

Then, the Supply, Priorities, and Allocations Board was superseded by the War Production Board, so Mr. Ickes had the the opportunity for a fresh start. He made it—with the industry representatives supporting his appeal. Another "no" was produced, but we kept plugging. There were meetings and meetings and meetings, and, on June 10, 1942, the W. P. B. approved the allocation of enough steel to build the first section of the Big Inch from Longview, Tex., to Norris City, Ill. Previously, the Honorable Jesse H. Jones had removed the other major obstacle by agreeing that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would now finance the job, for changed conditions had made it inadvisable for the industry to finance the line.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that was all we needed to start rolling up the mountain—or, more accurately, rolling up the plains of the Southwest. The job that has been done since that June day in 1942, when W. P. B. flashed the green light, is one in which, I must frankly confess, everybody concerned feels just a little pride. In case this doesn't sound very modest on my part, let me hasten to add that I claim very little credit for myself. The real credit goes to the steel-company workmen who turned out the huge pipe with almost unbelievable speed, the train crews who speeded it to the unloading points, and the five-star pipe-liners who dug the ditch and laid the pipe.

I wish that it might be possible to give specific recognition to every one of the thousands of men who built these two pipe lines, over country that would discourage an army mule and through weather that would depress an Eskimo. Obviously, there is not time to do this, as to mention by name all of those who have so ably and unselfishly contributed to the successful building and operation of the Big Inch lines would practically entail a roll call of who's who in the oil pipeline industry. However, I must not omit the name of the man who directed, through 2 grueling years, the spectacular race against time and the elements in completing these projects so that the old slogan of too little and too late would have no place in the history of these pipe lines. That man, ladies and gentlemen, is Burt Hull, vice president and general manager of War Emergency Pipelines, Inc.—(Burt, will you take a bow?). Also present are two vice presidents of the company—capable assistants who have shared Mr. Hull's burdens. I would like you to know these men—Major Horne and Charles I. Thompson. A third, Mr. J. M. Williams, is unable to be present as he is in Beaumont, Tex., devoting his personal attention to smoothing out operations of the Little Big Inch.

We must not forget, in our tribute to the builders, the men who made the blueprints, the men who worked out the plan. They did the surveying, they staked their reputation on the choice of design and route, they saw in advance and put on paper the plan of the longest and largest pipe lines in the world.

To mention this work, one must mention Cap Finney and his associates who not only took a leading part during the planning stage, but, followed through in the solution of problems during the construction and testing periods.

There is another contribution. Eleven oil companies are stockholders of War Emergency Pipelines, Inc. They have shown throughout a most admirable spirit. They have provided trained personnel from their own staffs, often at considerable inconvenience and sacrifice to their own welfare. They did this in order that the best talent might be available in discharging the obligation to provide our fighting forces and war industries with the products of petroleum, one of the most essential tools in realizing the victory which, I hope, will soon be ours. The fact that this obligation is so well discharged should be a source of gratification to the petroleum industry, and, indeed, to the Nation.

In exactly 29 days after W. P. B. had given its approval for materials, the first pipe rolled from the Lorain, Ohio, mill of the National Tube Co. Nine days after that, the first trainload of pipe line started on its way south. Sixteen days after that, actual construction work on the pipe line was under way. And, on the last day of 1942—just 150 days from the start of construction—the first oil was pumped into the line at Longview, Tex.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think you will agree that that was laying pipe.

But meanwhile other things had been happening. From the time that we got approval for the first leg of the line we knew that, while half a line was better than none, we really needed the whole thing. So not long after the line to Norris City was started the whole Petroleum Administration and the industry began pleading for steel and equipment to extend it to the east coast. On October 26, 1942, the War Production Board approved the extension.

But even then we were not satisfied. With Secretary Ickes, we were convinced that the enormous requirements of the military and the essential requirements of civilians were going to call for still another line. So we began again to make nuisances of ourselves at the War Production Board, and, to spare you the detailed account, we got approval for the first section of the 20-inch products line on January 26, 1943, and approval for the second section a little more than 2 months later.

Today we are here inspecting the completed lines. Even with me, looking at the finished job, there is now a tendency to forget that it didn't just happen. With those of you who had the good fortune to escape the pains of gestation and labor, I feel rather sure that there are no thoughts of what lies behind these two great lines. But please believe me, my friends, there were more times than one when the planning and the building of the Big Inch could have been accurately classified as the Big Pain.

The saving part of it is that the lines are proving themselves to be worth more than all the tribulations that attended their creation.

And, so, in addition to enjoying this opportunity to join with Congressman SNYDER in looking over the pipe lines and the pump stations, in addition to appreciating the chance to join with you in these ceremonies, and to meet and know you, I also am grateful for the chance to get out here on the line and see again the actual operations of these all-important projects. Certainly it is not necessary for me to call attention to the significance of these pipe lines in the war program. But I feel that you share with me the feeling that there is something of a thrill in the knowledge that the very oil that is flowing through these lines that we are viewing today is on its way to war. It is, in fact, the oil which, within a matter of days, will be powering airplanes over Germany, and propelling tanks across Italy, and—yes, fueling the very ships that take those instruments of war across the seas to the battle fronts. It is a fact, which I know that you appreciate, that in transforming Big Inch and Little Big Inch from dream to reality, the oil industry and the Government, working as partners, have made a major contribution to the speeding of victory and the shortening of the war. Thank you.

The Biggest War Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Sun of March 28. We from New York are, of course, proud of the important part that port has

played during the present period. Mentioning the port of New York prompts me also to call to the attention of the House the fact that in Brooklyn, N. Y., there is located the New York Port of Embarkation, one of the largest, if not the largest, such ports in the country. It is most efficiently run, and I should like to pay my respects to its personnel and to the Army Transportation Corps, under whose jurisdiction it comes, the chief of which corps, Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, is well recognized as an expert in the field of transportation.

The editorial is as follows:

THE BIGGEST WAR PORT

Those whose offices, homes, or routes of travel between the two, afford them a glimpse of New York Harbor are aware that it is a busy place these days. They may not have realized, however, that its activities have expanded to the point where Rear Admiral Stanley V. Parker, who commands the Coast Guard in this area, describes this as the greatest wartime port in the world. In his capacity as captain of the port, Admiral Parker says that its present volume of men and goods is twice that of the pre-war peak of 1926.

Declaring "We've never seen anything like it" the Admiral says that men and supplies are flowing here from all over the country, being loaded upon waiting ships and sent to sea like clockwork. He pays high tribute to the way the city, the pier owners, and especially the water-front workers have combined to make this possible. He gives special credit to the longshoremen, observing, "Labor is peaceful and splendidly efficient on our water front." And he furnishes to New Yorkers a special cause for gratification by concluding "The story of New York's water front in wartime is one of which the whole Nation can be proud." It is another example of what real teamwork can do.

The Relation of National Sovereignty to the Framing of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Relation of National Sovereignty to the Framing of the Peace", which I delivered before a citizens-for-victory luncheon at New York on September 24, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans, what is our main purpose in the framing of the peace? I believe it is the same purpose for which we went to war—that this country and its people may enjoy peace in the days to come, so that they may be left free to work out the happiness of the American people and the destiny of the American Republic. We went to war to make clear that national aggression cannot succeed in this world; to punish the aggression which has occurred and discourage aggression in the future. We went to war to prove that so far as the American Republic is affected, might in this world will not make right. I do not believe that we went to war to establish the "four freedoms" or any other freedoms throughout the world, except as such a world condition might result from the insuring of our own liberty through victory over the despotic aggressor nations. Our purpose in framing the peace must be to carry out the purposes of the war—to insure safety to our own people by preventing aggression in the future and the renewed tragedy of world war.

When we sit down around the council table to work out arrangements for that end, we are met at once by this question of national sovereignty. By some it is used as an argument against any covenants which will bind nations in advance to courses of action to be taken in the future. By others it is regarded as a mere bugbear, which can be waived aside and disregarded as an anachronism in a bright new world.

I don't propose to search for a correct definition of national sovereignty. The philosophers, from Aristotle to Kant, have argued on the nature of sovereignty, and lengthy volumes only leave the reader in greater confusion. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the popular view that a sovereign nation is one which runs its own affairs without interference from the outside.

I don't believe any modification of sovereignty is involved by covenants with other sovereign nations, unless the covenant gives those nations some right to come into our country and give orders to our citizens. I don't believe we are any less a sovereign Nation because we agree to submit disputes with other nations to arbitration or to a world court. I don't believe we are any less a soverign Nation if we agree to use our armies, navies, and air forces under certain circumstances to prevent world aggression. Since we remain a sovereign Nation in full control of our own country and our armed forces, we have power to break our promises, but we cannot honorably do so and we do not intend to do so.

On the other hand, to the extent that we give anyone the right to interfere in our domestic affairs, to enter our country, or compel our citizens to obey orders other than those of our own Government, there is an infringement of sovereignty. If that infringement is not material, we remain a sovereign Nation in spite of waiving some small part of our sovereignty. On the other hand, if we join an international state, and give that state direct power over our citizens, as for instance in the control of our seaports and airports, I believe we are no longer a sovereign Nation. The best view today is that while we call our 48 States sovereign States, they are not in fact sovereign, but only exercise some part of the national sovereignty which is assigned to them by the people of the United States of America.

In my opinion the permanent success of any peace depends upon this Nation and other nations retaining their sovereignty as I have defined it. A world set-up which gives to the citizens of one nation the right to interfere with the internal affairs of other nations would do two things: First, it would take away from our people the very freedom which is the object of permanent peace; second, it would be more likely to cause wars than to prevent them. The Republican Conference at Mackinac approved "participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations." Secretary Hull's speech of September 12 supports "organized international cooperation" between independent nations, each nation free to decide for itself the forms and details of its governmental organization and of its internal economic and social organization.

I am convinced that only by retaining sovereignty can we retain democracy. True democracy depends on local self-government, protected in this country by our independent States, and effective access of the people to their central government, so that the will of the majority does in fact prevail as to both local and national issues. Sometimes I question whether the United States has not reached the limit of size under which the people of a nation can have a real voice in its government. Certainly a world government at Geneva or Panama would listen more closely to the voice of cranks and pressure groups than to the voice of the majority of the American people. It is significant that the British Empire, because of its size, in order to maintain democracy, has moved towards decentralization of government, and has today no over-all legislative body, no over-all executive, and no over-all police force. If Canada and Australia and New Zealand and South Africa and Eire are regarded as too diverse to be consolidated into one government, what about China, Japan, Russia, and Ethiopia?

The very purpose of peace is to assure freedom to the people of this country. We do not have this freedom if a majority of alien peoples can direct our internal affairs. We know how our people would resent it if some foreign majority told us what we could import and what we could export, how we should handle our Japanese problem or our difficult Negro problem, or how we should operate our merchant marine. If we aren't willing to permit foreign interference, we can be sure that every other people will harbor the same resentment. We should not insist on interference with the internal affairs of other peoples in any field in which our people are unwilling to allow foreign interference here. If we wish peace, we must learn to treat with tolerance conditions and ideologies which we may not understand or sympathize with. I seem to see a tendency, especially among our New Deal friends, to make plans for the world as they made plans for us poor Americans. We can't crusade throughout the world for the four freedoms, or force milk on people who don't like milk, without making ourselves thoroughly hated. We can't force on the Russians freedom of speech and freedom of religion if Mr. Stalin doesn't approve of them, as apparently he doesn't. We can't force independence on India except as the British see fit to arrange it. We can be helpful throughout the world, but we can't be a meddlesome Mattie or try to boss the boots off the world if we expect to avoid war in the future.

In short, the maintenance of national sovereignty as I have defined it is essential to peace itself, and to the freedom of our people, which is the very object of peace. I believe this clearly rules out the international state of Clarence Streit and Harold Stassen. I believe their idea is fantastic anyway, and that such a state, with a supreme legislature, executive, and all-powerful military force, able to dominate all nations and control all trade, all seaports, and all airports within the various nations, would fall to pieces within 5 years, the very moment it adopted some policy unsatisfactory to a substantial minority. The difficulty of holding together such a Tower of Babel under one government would be insuperable. Furthermore, from a practical standpoint, I don't believe the English people, the Russian people, or the American people would agree for a moment to submit themselves to an all-powerful international state, the control of which would rest in a majority bloc of member nations, the composition of which bloc in the years to come would be impossible to predict. If you can see Winston Churchill liquidating the British Fleet, or Joe Stalin dismissing the Russian Army, or either of them turning over

their forces to President Whoozis of Worlditania, you are more clairvoyant than I.

On the other hand, I have stated before that I believe the sovereign nations should sit down together and enter into very definite agreements as to their future action in preventing world war. The United States in the past has pursued, not an isolationist policy as often charged, but a policy of retaining complete freedom of action to deal with any situation which might arise. That policy, after all, has succeeded, because we have retained our national liberty, and have not been invaded for 130 years. It is not a policy to be lightly dismissed. But because of the development of modern weapons of war, I believe we should go further. The day may come, if it is not already here, when any war may bring overwhelming destruction to this country; even if it does not deprive us of liberty. Therefore it is far more important to us today to prevent any war beginning in Europe or Asia. If we can prevent aggression by making definite commitments beforehand, I believe we should do so, and I do not see any loss of national sovereignty in doing so. If we can establish an organization based on national freedom throughout the world and national economic independence, I believe we should agree, under specified circumstances, to use our armed forces to prevent aggression, even though the determination of the fact of such aggression is left to an international body in which we are a minority member. Such an association of sovereign nations is the kind suggested by the Atlantic Charter, by Secretary Hull's speech, and by the Mackinac resolution.

Involved in this policy there is one modification of sovereignty which I should be willing to make. Such an association as I have outlined must prevent an armament race by nations and by alliances, or in time it will fail. It must undoubtedly seek a reduction of armaments and a limitation of armaments, imposed upon the Axis nations and voluntarily agreed to by the other nation. If we are going to use force against aggressors, we cannot permit any nation to build up a tremendous army, navy, or air force which might make aggression successful. I believe we should be willing as part of a general plan to agree to limit our own armament; and should be willing to permit an international body to inspect our armed forces just as they inspect the armed forces of Germany or Japan, to see that there is no violation of treaty obligations. We should be willing to have the construction and maintenance of excess armament as itself an act of aggression. The limitation of armaments would, of course, have to be the subject of a voluntary treaty in the first instance.

One of the proposals now made to maintain peace is a British-American military alliance, with or without Russia. Of course such an alliance would not modify our national sovereignty as I have defined it, even if we agreed under certain circumstances to go to war in the defense of Great Britain. On the other hand, the theory as advanced is certainly destructive of national sovereignty in the world. The alliance is to be so strong that it can never be successfully attacked. Since by hypothesis it is to be stronger than any possible opposition, it will have at least a benevolent control over the entire world. Fundamentally this is imperialism. Our fingers will be in every pie. Our military forces will work with our commercial forces to obtain as much world trade as we can lay our hands on. Potential power over other nations, however benevolent its purpose, leads inevitably to imperialism.

Technically such power may not destroy the national sovereignty of the rest of the world, but as a practical matter it does just that. The destruction of national sovereignty in the rest of the world is just as likely to lead to war as an attack upon it in this country. The determination of the human race to secure freedom will inevitably lead to a counter alliance and ultimately to another world war. It is a continuation of the old policy of balance of power, which certainly had no great success in preventing war. There are plenty of other reasons for opposing a British-American alliance as a solution of the peace, but basically it is inconsistent with a world based upon the sovereignty of independent nations.

It is amusing to me to see so many advocates of an international state, as well as those who believed in an association of free nations in a free world, suddenly abandoning all those ideals to adopt a policy which proposes a peace maintained by the armed forces of America, England, and Russia. It is utterly inconsistent both with the ideals of Woodrow Wilson and with Secretary Hull's "system of international relations, based on rules of morality, law, and justice."

In conclusion, I believe our thoughts are rather confused than clarified by the use of the term "sovereignty." What we mean is that nations must remain free if the world is to remain at peace. It is not inconsistent with freedom to go forward with an organization in which we unite to prevent and destroy the aggressor who would attack that freedom.

American Conscience at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article taken from the New York Herald Tribune of today entitled "American Conscience at Its Best."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AT ITS BEST—CONFESSION

(By Malvina Lindsay)

Yes, I feel guilty and sad every time I read a headline, "Bombers strike Berlin." I feel sick at soul every time I look at a photograph of a bomber crew—the fresh, boyish faces of those fated to be death's emissaries. And I think of myself as very humane and wonder if German citizens were as noble and compassionate when their young men were dropping death on Antwerp, Coventry, London.

But I feel less ashamed when I face my guilt forthrightly, and realize that in it I am trying in an easy, weak, and sentimental way to square myself with my conscience. I feel more honest when I admit that what is really preying upon me is my part in letting this incredible war with its blood and bombs happen. The truth is that I feel the cumulative guilt of 10 years upon me, 10 blind and selfish years, from Mukden to Pearl Harbor, during which I escaped into my own little concerns, vaguely hoping somebody would do something to quench the smoldering embers of war.

I remember Manchuria. Did I write a letter or even lift my voice when Secretary Stimson fought alone without support in his own Nation or in the League of Nations to invoke international justice for China? No, better patch it up. Don't let's arouse Japan. Might lead to trouble. Besides, that was the year of Rudy Vallee, Ben Bernie, the Eugenie hat, another drop in business.

I remember Austria, the murder of Dolfuss, Hitler and his blood purges, the growing power of the Nazis, the constant warnings of returned Americans about the European powder keg. Did I arouse myself, or my neighbors, to the implications of these things? No; I was only one. What could one do? Besides I was so busy, so rushed, so behind in my work. Why those were the hectic years of the early New Deal, the Chicago World's Fair (and Sally Rand), the Dionne Quints, Shirley Temple.

I remember Ethiopia—its rape by Mussolini. Did I protest because my country refused to collaborate in the League's sanctions against Italy? Did I bother to realize the import of Haile Selassie's dramatic prophecy to the League when it failed him: "God and history will remember your decision"? No; that was none of my—none of America's business. Were we not all busy with sit-down strikes. "Gone With the Wind," the suntan craze, the news about Edward and Wally?

I remember Spain—the try-out of the Axis war machine, the death of the republic, the secret beginning of World War No. 2. Did I write Congress about the Embargo Act, which prevented the Spanish Government from buying arms to fight the first round against Hitler and Mussolini? No; a ticklish situation. Better leave it alone. What was that the papers were saying about the long-hair bob, the Big Apple, The Women, the glamour craze?

I remember Munich—those tense September days when war hovered so near. Did I cry aloud over the sell-out of Czechoslovakia? Yes, but feebly. After all, peace any peace, might be better than none. "Peace in our time" * * * and maybe "they" could do something a little later. The leaves were turning—a good time for motoring. America was safe (for a while) to take vitamins, see Snow White and Hedy Lamarr, plan for Thanksgiving.

I remember China—devastated by the Japanese by the aid of the American Neutrality Act. I remember the Nazi blitz in Poland; the Quislings in Norway, Holland, Belgium; the crumbling of France; the radio blaring out on a quiet Sunday afternoon the attack on Pearl Harbor.

I remember all these, and it is for them I carry the load of guilt. Yet, you ask, What could I have done? How can I be such an egomaniac as to imagine that what I might have done would have mattered? Yes; I know that what I could or would have done seems trifling, useless, even hysterical to you. It might perhaps, from your viewpoint, have been the wrong thing. I also know that wars may be "inevitable," or that the most we can hope for between them is a "longer truce"—this side of the next 500 years. I know this torrent of blood could not have been dammed by me, possibly not by 130,000,000 people. Yet, if I saw it all again stretching ahead, would I not be on every soap box sending letters in every mail to Congress?

The whole point is that I didn't try to do anything. I was passive, futile, negative. I shirked. I cheated as a citizen. Therefore, can I expect to escape my share in the soul searing that bombings bring? Can I expect to find peace until I expiate the most inglorious of failure—that which knows no striving?

The Roosevelt Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 27, 1944, issue of Pathfinder:

THE ROOSEVELT JUDGES

This is as good a time as any to ask two questions involving the caliber and fitness of the 185 judges and justices appointed to the Federal courts since 1932. There has been considerable gossip during the past 6 months about the growing dissension and acidulous language between the nine Justices of the Supreme Court. Then, a few weeks ago, word began to get around that Randolph Paul, the "pinkish" General Counsel of the Treasury Department, will probably be appointed to fill an expected vacancy on the bench for the southern district of New York. Finally, an unidentified young woman pinched a Congressman's backside during a tea party at the British Embassy the other day. She apologized, hurriedly. "I thought," she said, "you were a friend of mine in the Supreme Court."

These are three incidents in a nation's history. They are, you might say, exceedingly trivial stuff. In one way, yes. But look at them again. Federal judges are appointed for life. In their hands rest the decisions that rule our civil liberties. They are the senior guardians of national justice and law, and the official interpreters of the Constitution.

What kind of men has President Roosevelt appointed to the Federal bench? The question is vital, for no other President ever appointed so many. To the United Supreme Court he has named 7 out of 9 members; to the 56 circuit courts of appeal he has appointed 38 judges, and to the district courts he has named 140 out of 224. Of all the Federal judges, he has chosen about 65 percent. Many of them were appointed because of political favor. Many are political candidates who failed to win public elections. There is no secret in the fact that the President expects "personal loyalty" from all of them.

Charles W. Smith, Jr., associate professor of political science, University of Kentucky, declared in the Kentucky Law Journal of May 1943 that Roosevelt's appointments to the Supreme Court "have been made with an eye on political considerations and on the social and economic views of the men appointed," and he pointed out that only one, Rutledge, had ever had any previous experience as judge of an important court. When in June 1936 the President appointed two Federal judges in New York to fill newly created positions, the independent New York Times identified them as supporters of "two local political bosses" and remarked, "It is painful to have to record that the President has again treated important appointments to the Federal courts as if they were ordinary partisan spoils." The city and county bar associations also made strong protests.

The assertion that the President "has viewed the courts as merely one part of the administrative machinery" was strikingly demonstrated in his Court-packing effort of 1937 when he proposed to add to the Supreme Court six new judges who would allegedly move it out of its "horse and buggy" ways and make it a "puller" instead of a "balker" in the "three-horse team" of the Government branches. "We must take action," he said then, "to save the Constitution from the courts," although he was also on record as saying that the Constitution was incomplete and always had been, "through which a team and horses can be driven on every page."

In its final report on the Court-packing bill, the Senate Judiciary Committee declared it "an invasion of the judicial power such as has never before been attempted in this country," that it was a "proposal without precedent and without justification," and should be "so emphatically rejected that its parallel will never again be presented to the free representatives of the free American people."

Bottom in the President's court appointments was reached, according to Professor Smith, when he sent to the Senate in July 1942 the name of Thomas F. Meaney as district judge in New Jersey—a man whom Governor Edison dubbed "a pawn in the hands of the boss of Jersey City [Frank Hague]."

Such appointments naturally affect the tone and quality of our courts and the character of our Government. They, too, reach down through our traditions to the constitutional roots of the Republic. The Constitution defines the powers of the judiciary and, at the same time, appoints each generation of the judiciary to its council of guardians. As the New York Times so wisely said, "Those having the power to appoint [Federal judges] ought to be more than usually scrupulous and painstaking in leaving nothing undone which may redound to the repute and reverence in which the Federal judiciary ought to be held by the people."

Now, again, comes the rumor of Randolph Paul's coming appointment. And that rumor has not been denied.

In view of the record, one question might well be asked Mr. Roosevelt. It would be asked, not as an insult, not as a political move but humbly and sincerely in the interests of the American Republic, and the Republic's future. The question would be, "If you do not hold our courts and our Constitution in contempt, Mr. President, what is your attitude?"

Ceiling Prices on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID J. WARD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. S. H. Rayner, Rayner Bros., growers of perishable fruits and vegetables, Salisbury, Md., who has made a thorough study of the effect of O. P. A. ceiling prices on fresh fruits and vegetables.

In my opinion, the O. P. A., before placing ceilings this year on perishable fruits and vegetables, should give the situation, as set forth in this statement, the most serious consideration:

It has now been clearly demonstrated to all, with unbiased prospectus, that O. P. A. ceiling prices on fresh fruits and vegetables only result in one of two extremes—serious scarcity and a flourishing black market or glutted conditions with serious waste of foods which should not and cannot be tolerated during this emergency. This may seem a broad statement; however, it has been proven true during the past year and is still true at this time.

In 1943, comparatively high ceiling prices were established for white potatoes. The acreage planted was so great that many thousands of bushels were purchased under the support program and has been so widely publicized in the newspapers, a very large quantity of these spoiled in transit and in storage, and were a total loss to the consumer. There are still more Irish potatoes in storage than can possibly be consumed before the new crop comes in, and, under such conditions, it must be expected that the growers will reduce their potato acreage drastically, which will, in turn, result in a serious shortage of this most important vegetable by 1945.

With onions the case was the reverse. Low ceilings discouraged planting, and as a result one of the most flagrant violations of Federal regulations followed. The legitimate retailer could not buy onions at anywhere near the ceiling price established by O. P. A. For practical purposes, as far as the average consumer was concerned, there were no onions. Had supply and demand alone, without artificial interference, held full play, there would have been sufficient potatoes and onions for all, and the cost to the consumer would have averaged much lower than has been the case, and the Nation, too, would have been assured a continued normal and adequate supply of these two important foods.

Another very serious problem confronting the Nation is the supply of strawberries, which, due to weather and economic conditions are now at the lowest point in many years. For example—the 10-year average acreage for the State of Florida was 10,000 acres, but for the harvest of 1944 there are 1,300 acres. In Maryland, the condition is almost as bad; with normal 10-year average acreage of 6,800 acres, there is now reported for harvest in 1944 in this State 2,800 acres. Of this amount, approximately 2,000 acres are from old beds, planted in 1941–42. Reasonably high prices which return the grower a decent profit on this desirable crop would soon return the national acreage to normal, but in spite of this deplorable condition, I understand that O. P. A. will issue price-ceiling regulations on strawberries during this week.

With the small acreage and poor condition of the strawberry beds of the country today, due to the very unfavorable weather in the strawberry section of the country last year, we can hope, at best, for only a very, very few berries, and regardless of the price ceiling placed by O. P. A. there will not be nearly sufficient fruit to go around. We understand that ceiling prices were established at the request of the Army, so that sufficient fruits could be diverted for canning and processing. However, this approach to the problem is comparable to that of the Mother Goose fable of "killing the goose that laid the golden egg." Without normal expectations and liberal cooperation to the growers, it is not to much to be expected that the strawberry industry of the United States will be wiped out entirely.

Even now, cabbage, spinach, carrots, and numerous other winter vegetables are spoiling in the fields because the wholesale market price is too low to cover harvesting, packaging, and transportation costs. These same crops were scarce last year and sold at abnormally high prices. One of the important reasons for this great waste can be placed squarely at the door of O. P. A. in its regulations governing retail ceilings, which base the retailers' current price upon his wholesale purchases made the preceding week.

Upon such regulations, with the rapid increase and decrease in supplies of these perishable commodities, the retailer cannot afford to lower his price, as, should he do so, and the wholesale market advanced rapidly, he would be forced to operate for 1 full week with a higher wholesale cost than his retail

ceiling price, and with the shortage of manpower and equipment, under which all retailers now operate, there is no incentive for them to increase their volume at a lower unit markup, as they are not in a position to take advantage of volume sales. The natural outcome of this is consistently high retail prices to the consumer and those crops in large supply, back up in the wholesale outlets and finally, on the farm. This was established beyond dispute in the necessity of the Pennsylvania Railroad embargo on shipments of fresh fruits and vegetables into the Philadelphia area last month; there were more than 400 cars of such commodities on track and arrivals averaging about 90 cars per day.

At a meeting before Mr. Harry Gindick, O. P. A. fresh fruit and vegetable branch, in New York, Saturday, March 25, Mr. Gindick stated that O. P. A. had neither expected, nor anticipated that it were possible for such over supplies of perishable fresh fruits and vegetables to be produced as are in evidence now. Therefore, it is clear in the interest of lower average costs to the consumer of fresh fruits and vegetables, of continued and balanced adequate supplies, and also to maintain high total production, these perishable commodities must be immediately removed from price control.

The millions of producers, the varied methods of harvesting, packaging, transporting and distributing, make ceiling prices impossible of inforcement. With the widely varied production costs between producing areas, regulations cannot be set up which do not contain many and varied inequities.

The normal variation in prices proves to be absolutely necessary to get proper distribution between seasons of the extremes of light and heavy production; for example, snap beans often sell from a high of $6 to $7 to a low of 25 to 30 cents within a period of a week to 10 days, and yet the weighted average return to the producer in such instances is scarcely cost of production. Under such conditions, to avoid waste of foods, supply and demand must be left unrestricted.

During 1943, the supply of fruits was very short, in fact, one of the shortest on record, which was due entirely to frost injury. Prices were high, and yet the industry as a whole operated at a very heavy loss. As a result of this 1 year's rest to the orchards, a very heavy crop must be expected, and is predicted for 1944, and to avoid waste of this prospective bumper crop, low consumer prices will be necessary, but under price control, retail prices will not fluctuate rapidly enough to stimulate necessary consumption. Therefore, at a time when consumers would normally be able to purchase an abundance of fresh fruit at nominal prices, if ceilings continue in effect, there will be only artificially maintained consumers' prices and heavy loss of fruit in the orchards.

The facts here set forth give clear indications that the Nation, the armed forces, the producer, and the consumer will not be relieved from the fear of food shortage and possible famine until price-ceiling regulations on perishable fresh fruits and vegetables have been entirely abandoned.

Labor for Victory Broadcast

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a letter addressed to Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader, from the chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. W. C. Hushing. I wish to read three paragraphs from the letter:

For a considerable period of time we have participated every other Sunday in the Labor for Victory program over the N. B. C. networks.

In furtherance of its nonpartisan political policy the American Federation of Labor will feature on its April 2 Labor for Victory broadcast at 1:15 p. m. appeals for the labor vote from spokesmen designated by the Democratic and Republican National Committees.

Representative GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, will tell why, in his opinion, workers should vote Republican next November. Representative MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, of Pennsylvania, will give the reasons why he believes workers should vote Democratic.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Hushing, of the American Federation of Labor, also called this matter to my attention. I join with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] in urging that all of the Members listen to this broadcast if it is possible for them to do so. I also at this time want to express my approval of the expression of the American Federation of Labor, regarding its traditional nonpartisan policy.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman. I think it will be interesting to all of us.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly want to congratulate the American Federation of Labor for the contrast in its attitude with that of Sidney Hillman, of the C. I. O., who is raising money to try to defeat Members of Congress whom he cannot dominate.

The letter referred to follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1944.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
United States Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JOHN: Numerous high-ranking Members of Congress of both political parties have made inquiry as to the political attitude of the American Federation of Labor. I have explained to them that for many years the policy of the American Federation of Labor has been nonpartisan and that this policy will be strictly adhered to in the coming campaign and election by order of our last convention which was held in Boston. We endorse our friends or oppose others on the records they make, regardless of their political affiliations.

For a considerable period of time we have participated every other Sunday in the Labor for Victory program over the N. B. C. network.

In furtherance of its nonpartisan political policy the American Federation of Labor will feature on its April 2 Labor for Victory broadcast at 1:15 p. m. appeals for the labor vote from spokesmen designated by the Democratic and Republican National Committees.

Representive GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, will tell why, in his opinion, workers should vote Republican next November. Representative MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, of Pennsylvania, will give the reasons why he believes workers should vote Democratic.

Our Weekly News Service of even date will carry a notice regarding the scheduled broadcast, but as most Members of Congress will probably be on trains or planes on their way home when it is issued I thought it would be a good idea if an announcement of the foregoing be made on the floor, and if you agree with this thought I should be very glad to have you make it.

I know—as I keep the records of Members of Congress and prepare letters of endorsement for President Green's signature—that the nonpartisan political policy of the American Federation of Labor is honestly and fairly administered, and I believe that the inauguration of the series of broadcasts next Sunday will emphasize our fairness, as the plan permits each national political committe to select its spokesman and present its case on our time.

With kindest regards and best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

W. C. HUSHING,
Chairman, National Legislative Committee, American Federation of Labor.

Heroism of Edward O'Brien and Other Seabees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am presenting a news article recently sent me through the thoughtfulness of Vice Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, which describes the heroism of Edward O'Brien, a Massachusetts boy, 19 years of age, who is with the Seabees of the Navy.

On one occasion this young man organized 10 other noncombatant Seabees and killed 320 Japs, holding the fort alone for 5 hours against what the writer describes as a "fanatical Nipponese attack."

The article in commendation of the heroic deeds of the Seabees also illustrates the glorious record being made by the Seabees of the Navy in the war in the Pacific.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN-MAN PATROL KILLS 320 JAPS

(By Lee Van Atta)

WITH AMERICAN FORCES ON LOS NEGROS ISLAND, March 6.—Edward O'Brien, 19, is a blue-eyed, blond youngster from Massachusetts.

He was a carefree high-school student 18 months ago.

Today he is bleary-eyed, gaunt, fighting mad—and a hero.

Three nights ago, Ed. O'Brien killed 16 Japs single-handed. Then, at the height of a Jap attack against the western side of the captured Momote Airfield, O'Brien organized a patrol of 10 other noncombatant Seabees and went out for Jap blood.

KILLED 320 JAPS

There were 320 dead sons of Japan when dawn illumined the scarred battle scene, where O'Brien and his companions had held

the fort alone for 5 hours against fanatical Nipponese attacks.

That terrible night of hand-to-hand war, O'Brien's .30-caliber machine gun blew up in his hands and his best friend was killed by his side.

But O'Brien came out unscratched—came out to find himself a fighting legend.

He told his story to me today on the edge of the Momote airstrip.

It was dusk that Saturday evening when O'Brien's commanding officer assigned the young Irishman and his companions to stand guard over secondary positions.

POSED AS AMERICANS

"But jeez, that was no place for us," O'Brien explained. "So Bill Driskell, of San Jose, Calif., and I pulled stakes and so did my friend. Driskell and I got back but the kid didn't. It was about 2:30 in the morning when the Japs started coming in. They were yelling, 'Don't shoot, we're Americans'—and because we knew the cavalry boys up ahead were having plenty of trouble we believed 'em.

"Then one got in the dugout we'd taken over—and from then on we knew it was nobody but our little Nip friends.

"The kid and I started firing. We told Driskell to try to get back and tell the rest what was going on.

"I never knew there were so damned many Japs in the world—they just started coming and never stopped—I just kept firing as fast as I could.

"We kept weaving our firing back and forth. You could hear those Nips screaming. It was enough to curdle your blood.

"Then they got the kid—right through the heart. My '30' blew up in my hands.

"I got hold of the fixed '50' and kept firing—I think I was more mad than scared."

O'Brien paused to wipe perspiration from his brow and Driskell took up the story.

"I got back to the secondary position and found 'Scotty' McKeon (chief carpenter's mate, of Spokane) in one of our coconut dugouts. I told him what happened and the chief stood right up.

"'Hey, you guys,' he yelled. 'We're in a mess. Let's get up with O'Brien and blow the brains out of every ——— ——— ——— on this rock.'"

When dawn came 320 dead Japanese lay in the line of fire of that 10-man defending force—and 1 American was dead by the gun he had manned

And that's the story of Ed O'Brien, carpenter's mate, third class, United States Seabees' temporary station, Momote airdrome.

The Spirit of the Chinese Christian Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently a translation of the radio broadcast on Christmas Eve, 1943, by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to the wounded soldiers in China's armies was reprinted in the Christian Century. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it below.

We who are brought up in the Christian tradition and take that religion for granted can perhaps profit from reading this message from one who was brought up in another tradition but who in his mature manhood, after careful study and calm decision, accepted the Christian faith.

It is, of course, not exactly the sort of thing our modern western leaders could or would be likely to say to our soldiers. Perhaps we would be better off if it were:

THE SPIRIT OF THE CHINESE CHRISTIAN SOLDIER

(By Chiang Kai-shek)

To wounded and sick officers and soldiers in all military hospitals: Your commander in chief does not for a moment forget the life and sufferings of you wounded and sick officers and men. Words fail fully to express my deep concern for you. I can only say: I should be bearing your sufferings for you. Why then are you suffering in my stead? Think, and you will understand what I mean. My mental anguish over your wounds and pain is more intense than any physical anguish you are enduring.

CARE FOR THE WOUNDED

On New Year's Day of this year I addressed a message to our splendid troops throughout the nation, pointing out certain important principles which should be observed. Another year has now passed. Soon we shall be celebrating the seventh New Year in our war of resistance. During this year we have fought many big and hard battles against the enemy. Not a few of our comrades have fallen upon the battlefield, carrying on the glorious traditions of the revolutionary army that founded our republic. Still more wounded comrades, old and new, have written by deeds of valor stories to make us sing and weep. Now they lie broken in body, maimed and crippled, in our Army hospitals, seeking restoration of their physical health.

I salute you with pride, loyal and brave soldiers; at the same time I sympathize profoundly with you in your bodily distress. I have ordered officials everywhere to fulfill their duties to you on my behalf, and I have instructed all our Army doctors to give you the best possible medical care so as to alleviate your sufferings and help you overcome your difficulties. Only thus can my concern for you be satisfied and my heart be comforted.

I have also decided, beginning with the new year, to invite earnest pastors from Christian churches in the land to visit you at your bedsides, to talk with you about the true way of life, to broaden your knowledge, to give you spiritual comfort, and to lighten your load of suffering.

I, myself, wish to take advantage of this broadcast to say something to you wounded officers and men about the truths by which we soldiers should live.

JESUS THE EXEMPLAR

This is Christmas eve. As we think of this Saviour of men and of the world, His spirit of sacrifice and His martyrdom for the truth, we cannot but be moved. As you know, Jesus was the son of a poor family, His father being a carpenter. Moreover, He grew up among an oppressed people at a time when they were suffering bitterly from foreign aggression, and yet for the sake of lofty and eternal ideals He served His own fellow countrymen and race and poured out His blood freely as a sacrifice for all mankind.

What was the secret of His power—such love of others, such fearlessness of death, such noble, imperishable character? Let me tell you. It was because He knew the meaning of life, because He understood the purpose of life, because He grasped the truth about life. Therefore His infinite spirit fills heaven and earth and rules the universe.

I once said that man born in this universe has a Heaven-given capacity to rise upward and to live for others. When this capacity is fully and creatively realized then man can stand erect and secure, unafraid and unashamed, in the vast universe and achieve the ideal of perfection. I have described this revolutionary philosophy in two sentences: "The purpose of life is seen in the advancement of life in all mankind; the meaning of life is found in the creation of ever-new life throughout the universe." If we comprehend this revolutionary idea and give ourselves to lifelong struggle for it, then with inner certainty of soul and unfailing strength of body we may be able like Jesus Christ to attain imperishable life and become perfect men revered by mankind through all generations.

Comrades, I have spoken before of your world-renowned valor. You have fought and bled for your country and your people. You have displayed the highest traits of character. You have suffered and lived through nine deaths for humanity, for fatherland, for fellow countrymen, and for principle. You have accomplished mighty deeds. But as long as you live on this earth, as long as we have not attained complete victory and freedom, so long does your responsibility remain; it is not yet fulfilled.

LIVE AND DIE LIKE JESUS

We revolutionary soldiers should live and die like Jesus. We should be ready to give our last drop of blood on a cross to cleanse humanity of evil and to create a shining new world of equality and freedom. Let every soldier, as long as he lives and with all the strength he possesses, perform his full duty to his country and to the world. For us soldiers the struggle cannot cease as long as any breath remains in our bodies. Looking at the innumerable heroes and martyrs that have gone before us and the unborn generations that will come after us, we cannot but strain every nerve to complete our sacred mission. Your commander in chief cares deeply for you in your physical distress and even more in your mental misery and depression of spirit. He also knows that you must submit to the discipline of truth if you are to find comfort of soul and hold fast your spirit of struggle and sacrifice. And so again I put before you some of the essential conditions of spiritual culture and well developed character.

First, in a true way of life comes faith. Faith gives life. What is the object of our faith today? The three principles—national independence, democracy, and the people's livelihood—which the father of our country bequeathed to us and which can save our country and people, mankind and the world. Dr. Sun Yat-sen left an important exhortation to our soldiers: "Let us with our perishable lives of a few score years establish for our Nation an imperishable existence of centuries and millenniums." Our individual lives are a part of the life of our race. Remember, heaven and earth and our parents have given us birth that we may be universal men who can transmit the past and create the future.

DEMOCRACY FOR THE WHOLE WORLD

Long life in ordinary speech means life of the physical body. But the physical body is simply a bundle of flesh and blood and bones. It is not our true life which is linked with the endless life of the Chinese Nation and the ever-living truth of the three principles. Only if our nation is immortal can we as individuals truly enjoy long life and immortality. As government of, by, and for the people spreads over the world our lives will be as immortal as these great principles and as indestructible as heaven and earth itself. Understand and live by this truth and you can forget your anxieties. You can meet whatever comes, happiness or suffering, peace or danger. Your whole view of life and death will be changed. You will struggle more bravely, and you will find peace of heart.

Next to faith I must point out the importance of love and patience. It is for love of

your country and people that you have been wounded in this war against the invader and are enduring such pain. It is for love of family and kindred and ancestors that you have sworn vengeance against the aggressors and are now lying upon beds of suffering. Remember your love of fatherland and fellow countrymen and your pain will be eased. Think of the victory that lies ahead, the recovery of our lost territories, the return to your homes and ancestral graves, the achievement of all that we are fighting for, and you will find health returning more quickly to you. With love you can endure all the sharp arrows of sorrow and misfortune, with love your spirits can be at rest whatever happens to your bodies.

Finally we need patience. Without patience it is impossible to realize life's high hopes. Hope cannot exist without patience. Patience enables us to strive on and not give up halfway until the goal of our hopes is reached. Our greatest hope today is for a free, enlightened world and for a China that can stand equal and independent among the nations. Because of our effective resistance this hope is nearer to being realized and the full consummation is now within our sight. I am sure that this great expectation will nerve you to overcome all our final difficulties and to forget all your own trials.

SPIRIT OF THE TRUE SOLDIER

All the military and party regulations and my various messages to the troops should be carefully studied and observed. While invalided you should endeavor to be just as good-natured and respectful as before to your medical officers, to your fellow soldiers, and to your teachers. You should deny yourselves, think of others, and help and encourage one another in the same way as on the battlefield. Be affectionate and sincere to all your comrades, share what comes in life or death. Steel yourselves to meet suffering with love of country and a patient spirit. Do not let feelings of depression or rage get control of you. I am sure that you have learned through your own painful experiences the value of love and patience. Faith, hope, and love—these are the three cardinal principles in the teaching of Jesus Christ. If you truly believe in these principles there will be no difficulty that you cannot overcome; you will have the power to realize your highest ideals and to help accomplish the revolutionary mission of our nation.

Comrades, I have mentioned only briefly these great teachings of Christianity. Later you will have opportunity to hear more about them from Christian friends and I am sure you will greatly benefit from them. This custom of visits by chaplains is not common in China as in western countries. There communities, Army groups, hospitals, all have pastors who speak to the people on occasion about the truths by which they should live and give them spiritual security and solace. When a person meets with suffering, sorrow, or depressing circumstances, the pastor is ready to give comfort and encouragement.

I hope that our church friends in China who are engaged in this noble service will minister also to our wounded officers and soldiers. Let them with good educational methods suited to each situation bring spiritual guidance and inspiration to our men, teach them self-control and self-respect, show them how to be strong in character and help them to live according to the teachings of Jesus Christ, which can save our people and the whole world. Then there will be hope for the realization of the three principles of the people and the great tasks of our revolution can be completed. Let us all strive earnestly toward that goal.

My beloved wounded soldiers, take good care of yourselves. I pray God and Jesus Christ to relieve you speedily of your pain and to restore you to health so that you may help win the victory and reestablish our nation.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great defense organizations of the country is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. While the Army, Navy, and Air Force are carrying the war to the enemy on the sea and in the air and on foreign battlefields, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is attacking with equal vigor enemies at home. When the history of this war is written, the accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under J. Edgar Hoover, will be recorded with honor and distinction. Therefore, it was a great shock to me, and I feel certain to other Members of the House, when a few days ago we heard the charge made upon the floor of the House by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that:

> Perhaps Jergens, if he took the stand, might disclose that the F. B. I., under J. E. Hoover, has in its files information to which Winchell has access, and might show that Jergens associated with individuals who were much closer to the Nazis than any of those who have been indicted for sedition.

That the Federal Bureau of Investigation should give access to its strictly confidential files to persons not connected with the Government and not entitled to inspect them was to me unbelievable. The confidence of the American people in the Federal Bureau of Investigation was not shaken by the charge. They were, however, dismayed by the recklessness of it, coming as it did from a Member of this distinguished body and uttered on the floor of this House. The charge did not long remain unanswered. No one expected that it would. With characteristic forthrightness, Mr. Hoover stated in unequivocal terms in a letter to our colleague [Mr. HOFFMAN]:

> I note, of course, that your statement was made in a conjectural manner, yet I wanted you to know the facts, and the facts are that no one outside of the official staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has access to its files. Any statement to the effect that a commentator has access to the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is wholly unjustified and is not based on fact. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2909.)

There is nothing ambiguous about the letter of Mr. Hoover. It is clear, distinct, and convincing. There is nothing of conjecture. There are no "ifs," "ands," or "buts," or "mights," or "maybes." It is just the kind of a statement that one would expect from Mr. Hoover. It is such frankness that has won for him the confidence of the American people and the respect of this House. No diversionary statement by our colleague from Michigan that there still might be information in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation showing a connection between a certain lotion manufacturer and the Nazis can detract from the plain, fearless, hard-hitting declaration of Mr. Hoover that no person other than those officially connected with the Federal Bureau of Investigation has access to its files and that any statement that a commentator has such access is wholly unjustified and contrary to the fact.

Apparently convinced, though neither pleased nor contented, by the direct unambiguous and unequivocal statement of Mr. Hoover, the gentleman from Michigan then sought to level the same charge at Attorney General Biddle and the Department of Justice. I hold no brief for the Attorney General. I only know him as a distinguished member of the bar, a fearless and courageous prosecutor, an efficient and faithful public servant, a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States and a gentleman of the highest ethics, who certainly would not improperly grant access, nor permit improper access to be granted, to the confidential files of the Department of Justice.

No disclaimer in my opinion is necessary from Attorney General Biddle. His reputation for integrity and courage is his best answer.

Need I remind the House, that the assistant to the Attorney General, Hon. James P. McGranery, was a Member of the House for 10 years immediately prior to his appointment to his present position last fall. Mr. McGranery enjoyed the respect and regard of every Member of the House.

With such men, as Attorney General Biddle, and the able assistant to the Attorney General, Mr. McGranery, in office, the American public need have no fear that the confidential files of the Department of Justice will be improperly disclosed.

On March 13 last our colleague from Michigan placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Day Spring, a newspaper published in Hartford, Mich. In that editorial the Federal Bureau of Investigation was erroneously charged with suppressing free expression of speech by implied threats that leave the investigated with the impression that he had better keep his mouth shut or run the chance of getting himself into trouble. I presume that the gentleman from Michigan keeps himself well posted with the editorial comment that appears in the newspapers of his home State. Therefore, I am at a loss to understand, when, having given wide publicity to the charge made by this paper that the F. B. I. was suppressing free expression of speech, he did not, with equal frankness and in fairness to Mr. Hoover and the F. B. I., make known to this body the editorial published in that same paper on March 16, 1944, only 3 days after he had inserted the previous editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

which reaffirmed the confidence of the editor of the Hartford Day Spring in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. So that the whole editorial might be before this body. I append it herewith and I call particular attention to that part which says:

With the wisdom and efficiency which have characterized his entire career, Mr. Hoover sent Assistant Director Louis Nichols from Washington to investigate the situation more thoroughly. Mr. Nichols was in Hartford last Friday and with intelligence and understanding assured the youngster, his parents, superintendent, and teacher that there had been no attempt to stifle free expression of opinion.

And again:

Mr. Hoover's direct and decisive answer will tend to eliminate any further anxiety on this point, "If at any time any representative of this Bureau should exceed the bounds of his authority and attempt to stifle freedom of speech, prompt and decisive administrative action will result."

And, lastly:

When we presented this story we did not intend it to be used as partisan ammunition or buckshot for personal feuding. That it was used in this manner could not be prevented.

[From the Hartford Day Spring, Hartford, Mich., March 16, 1944]

DID YOU SEE?

(By Joseph N. McCall)

"There has come to my attention an unwholesome condition in Hartford which appears to have arisen from a Nazi-inspired source." This statement made in a complaint to the Federal Bureau of Investigation started what has proved to be an unfortunate incident in the annals of the F. B. I. "We had no choice but to make a preliminary inquiry, which I am happy to say, revealed the complaint to be without foundation," so states Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I., in a letter to the Day Spring this week. The complete text of Mr. Hoover's letter appears on page 4 of this issue.

The complainant made these malicious and unfounded charges against a Hartford student. The impression conveyed by the investigator after he found the complaint to be without foundation cannot be dismissed unchallenged, for he left the student with the thought that the accusation was justified, that his critical speech had been unpatriotic. The Day Spring recalling the gravity of the charges and the subsequent unsavory indication, revealed the facts in this column 2 weeks ago. Thanks to Congressmen CLARE HOFFMAN, of Allegan, and FRED CRAWFORD, of the Eighth Michigan District, and Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, many Michigan newspapers, and loyal Hartford residents, the injustice of the complaint and the method of investigation were called to the attention of Mr. Hoover who promptly exerted every effort to correct the unpleasant situation. With the wisdom and efficiency which have characterized his entire career, Mr. Hoover sent Assistant Director Louis Nichols from Washington to investigate the situation more thoroughly. Mr. Nichols was in Hartford last Friday, and with intelligence and understanding assured the youngster, his parents, superintendent, and teacher that there had been no attempt to stifle free expression of opinion. He allayed the fears of those most familiar with the case who were deeply concerned about the extent to which representatives of the Bureau are allowed to go in circumventing speech and democratic rights. Mr. Hoover's direct and decisive answer will tend to eliminate any further anxiety on this point, "If at any time any representative of this Bureau should exceed the bounds of his authority and attempt to stifle freedom of speech, prompt and decisive administrative action will result." Accepting Mr. Hoover's statement as fact, we may conclude that the Hartford case was not handled according to the established principles of the Bureau and was in fact a flagrant violation of F. B. I. policy. We are convinced that such careless investigations as that at Hartford are not sanctioned or countenanced by the Bureau. We are equally convinced that only through the vigilance of the public, the press, and our elected representatives are the high standards of this governmental agency or any other maintained.

Our purpose in presenting the facts to the public has been achieved. We have reaffirmed our confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The poor judgment of an ill-advised informer and an overenthusiastic investigator cast a shadow not only upon a youth but a respected Government institution. In the light of the past week's events, facts have been revealed and the shadow has passed. The young man, his parents, in fact the whole community, is relieved. They are willing not to excuse the blunder but to accept Mr. Hoover's explanation. We trust that the repercussions in this instance will reach the ears of F. B. I. agents throughout the Nation and that those who are inclined to exceed their authority will profit by the experience of the Hartford investigation. When we presented this story we did not intend it to be used as partisan ammunition or buckshot for personal feuding. That it was used in this manner could not be prevented.

Necessity of Exempting Keymen in the Fishery Industry As Critical Under the Draft—Unless This Is Done Fishery Industry Cannot Survive, Food Shortage Inevitable, and Essential Fish Oil for Hardening Ball Bearings and Other Defense Materials Impossible of Production

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the matter which I have to take up is of peculiar interest to the commercial fishermen of the United States. The subcommittee on fisheries, headed by Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, has held several hearings on the importance of the seafood industry to the military services of the country and to the production of food for the Nation.

I understand that there is a committee headed by Mr. Paul McNutt, the War Manpower Commissioner, and several other appointees whose names I do not know, which is to meet on March 30 to consider various draft regulations or provisions in the draft regulations which will include draft regulations affecting the fishing industry. This matter has been the subject of interest and peculiar attention on the part of the fisheries subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and also on the part of the full committee. In addition to the hearings held by Mr. PETERSON of Florida last week, hearings were held yesterday by the full committee. The following telegram has been sent to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, by me, as chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

War Manpower Commissioner McNutt is heading a committee which will meet tomorrow, 30th, to deal, as I understand, with draft regulations affecting the fishing industry. Unless exemptions are made for drafting of keymen in critical occupations in the industry such as captains, mates, engineers, refrigerating engineers, stationary engineers, and others, it is going to be impossible to supply the necessary sea food and oils imperatively needed by the War and Navy Departments for military purposes.

Similar telegrams have been sent to Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy; and Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Abe Fortas. I also sent a letter yesterday to the President of the United States.

A delegation consisting of Hon. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Member of the United States Senate from the State of Maryland, Mr. HARDIN PETERSON, and I, representing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Dr. Gabrielson, representing the Coordinator of Fisheries, had an interview with Mr. Eugene Casey, Executive Secretary to the President, in which we discussed the importance of the fishing industry to the food of the Nation and also to the war service. We brought to Mr. Casey's attention the fact that the operation of fishing boats was now being prevented by the drafting of men who are critically necessary to the industry, such as captains, mates, engineers, mechanics, refrigerating engineers, retort operators, meal processors and processors of canned fish. We undertook to show him that without these critical men the industry could not continue and could not survive. We showed him that the draft boards are inclined to construe literally the President's statement to reporters that the industry can operate with 16-year-old boys and older men. We reminded him that the work was arduous and as we understood that Mr. McNutt was to hold a meeting to deal with these various problems on the 30th, it was essential that the industry should be protected.

A letter, similar to the one which we presented to Mr. Casey bringing out these facts, was written to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, Hon. Paul McNutt, War Manpower Commissioner, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, General Hershey, Selective Service Director, and the Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fortas.

At a meeting of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held on March 28, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Committee Resolution 10

Whereas at hearings of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it has

been developed that the industry, in presenting its manpower problems, is divided into two component parts, namely: production of fish and sea food, employing approximately 122,000 persons, and the processing of fish and sea food, employing approximately 91,000 persons; and

Whereas representatives of the industry and the following governmental agencies, through their representatives, have appeared and testified: War Manpower Commission, War Food Administration, Selective Service System, and the Office of Coordinator of Fisheries of the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas this committee finds that both segments of the industry, where manpower is concerned, are equally important, and one cannot survive without the other; and

Whereas this committee is of the opinion that there is a dire shortage of manpower at present existing in both segments of the industry and that this shortage is becoming more acute; and

Whereas it having been shown that—

(a) In 1944 sea-food production will approximate 4,250,000,000 pounds.

(b) The War Food Administrator has stated 5,329,000,000 pounds of sea food will be required in 1944 to supply the needs of the armed forces, lend-lease, and civilians, 1,000,000,000 pounds short of estimated needs.

(c) Approximately 50 percent of the annual sea-food catch is utilized as human food, the remainder being used as essential ingredients in animal and poultry feeds, for the production of human food, as well as certain critical war materials; and

Whereas a committee headed by War Manpower Commissioner McNutt is scheduled to meet at an early date to determine critical activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the committee headed by War Manpower Commissioner McNutt be and it is hereby requested and urged to take action as follows:

1. That the fishing industry (including the production and processing of fish and sea food) be proclaimed by the committee headed by Commissioner McNutt as a "critical activity" or "critical industry" necessary to the successful prosecution of the war.

2. That the Selective Service System and/or the War Manpower Commission be instructed to direct local draft boards that the following positions held by men in various segments of the sea-food industry are "critical" occupations: captain, fishing vessel; mate, fishing vessel; engineer, chief, fishing vessel; engineer, second, fishing vessel; oyster culturist; sponge gatherers, bleachers, cutters, and trimmers; commercial fishermen (including catchers of sea food), all around; fish pickler and/or salter (supervisor); foreman, food processing; machinist, maintenance; mechanic, maintenance; manager and/or superintendent, food processing; refrigerating engineer; retort operator; stationary engineer; oil processor; meal processor; chief processor of canned fish; be it further

Resolved, That local draft boards be given latitude to grant deferments for keymen in critical occupations, 26 years of age and under, where such deferments, if not granted, would cause a stoppage of production or processing: *Provided further*, That such deferments of men 26 years of age and under shall exist so long as men 26 years of age and under remain so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, copies of that resolution have also been sent to all of the above-named parties. The resolution itself shows the necessity for the deferment of critically needed keymen. It was brought out, and cannot be denied for it has already happened, that the taking of one keyman can tie up an entire boat, as for instance the captain of a fishing boat, mate, engineer, and/or refrigerating engineer. In the fisheries men engaged in occupations such as are specifically listed in the resolution of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries are essential and the industry cannot operate without them. Throughout the United States fishing boats are being tied up because of the drafting of these men who are critically needed not only for the production of food but for the production of oils and other things essential to the war.

While it is true that in many instances most of the crews of vessels of the commercial fisheries are over age or young boys, the drafting of one keyman will tie up the entire boat. Testimony of the National Research Council before this committee shows that the food production per man was higher in the fishing industry than any other class of food producers, even hog farmers in the Corn Belt ranking second to fishermen.

Testimony was produced to the effect that practically all of the menhaden oil produced from the menhaden fisheries and other fish oil had been commandeered by the War Department and is essential to the hardening of bearings in airplanes and other essential war implements. The testimony was to the effect that there was no known substitute for oil of that kind. Further, that fish meal and other fishery products were necessary as a food for poultry and animals for which there was no known substitute, and unless provided there would be a critical shortage of those essential food materials.

The following letter was presented to the Subcommittee on Fisheries during the course of the recent hearings:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee of Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PETERSON: It has come to our attention that your subcommittee is now examining the manpower problem of the fishery industry and is considering a plea that certain occupations in the industry be classified as critical occupations for guidance of selective service in evaluating requests for deferment from the draft.

Fishery products are considered by us to be a vital part of the food program, and in this connection Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, in a recent report to James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, stated that:

"Fishery products are being used freely as a main source of protein or as a supplementary protein to balance the deficiencies of the cereal proteins which are included in the average diet. The high nutritive quality and digestibility of fish proteins class fish among the more desirable food products. Besides being excellent sources of highly available proteins, some fishery products also are rich sources of vitamins. Furthermore, fish contain a variety of minerals in quantity and quality, and some species have high fat values.

"In 1943 war and civilian needs required a production of over 6,000,000,000 pounds of fishery products. Loss of vessels, lack of manpower, restricted fishing areas, and scarce materials combined to hold the final total to about 4,000,000,000 pounds, an achievement greater than that of the previous year, but far short of the goal."

The 1944 requirements for fishery products are greater than those in 1943 and are likely to increase still further as relief and rehabilitation programs will accelerate.

In view of these circumstances every effort should be made to assist the fishery industry in its endeavor to attain the enlarged production objective for 1944.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. KITCHEN,
Deputy Director.

At the hearings before the subcommittee there were present representatives of the War Manpower Commission, including several members of the Committee on Critical Occupations and Selective Service, who later expressed themselves as having obtained much material of considerable value to them, and that they had learned much about the fishing industry that they did not know. There were also present representatives of the War Food Administration and Office of Fishery Coordinator.

Mr. Fulton Lewis, the well-known radio commentator, in his address from California on March 28 over Station KHJ, Los Angeles, over the Mutual Broadcasting System, whose local station is WOL, to whom we are indebted for a copy of Mr. Lewis' remarks, made the following statement concerning the seafood industry:

Some 4 or 5 weeks ago in New England, and more recently in the Pacific Northwest States, I made an effort to get some information on the commercial fishing industry, whether it is living up to the hopes of the War Food Administration in Washington and helping to provide a substitute for meat in the national diet. In the last few days I have coordinated that information with Mr. Elmer Higgins, of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior in Washington, and it looks, frankly, as though the War Food Administration and the public is destined for disappointment.

The normal commercial catch of fish in this country is about 5,000,000,000 pounds, Mr. Higgins tells me. It dropped to 3,750,000,000 pounds in 1942, then came back to 4,500,000,000 pounds in 1943, last year. The War Food Administration was hoping that it would rise this year to 5,250,000,000 pounds.

The commercial fishing interests and Mr. Higgins in Washington tell me, however, that for various reasons, mostly attributable to the Government in Washington, we will be lucky if the fish production this year is as high as it was last year. It is not a matter of there not being enough fish; on the contrary, as in the case of wild ducks and geese which I mentioned to you a day or so ago, the reduced fishing over the past several war years has given the fish population a golden opportunity to stage a comeback, so to speak, which the fish have done in a very big way. The trouble lies in the fact that many important fishing grounds have been closed to fishing for security reasons. The Navy has taken many others for bombing and for other practice purposes. The supply of fishing nets is short because nets are needed by the Navy and Coast Guard for protecting harbors. All of which is perfectly fair and reasonable. Also, the Navy has taken numerous fishing boats for patrol work.

The most important factor, however, seems to be the fact that the Selective Service draft has cut heavily into the ranks of commercial fishermen. The new rulings of the draft

headquarters in Washington against the deferment of any person under 27 years of age for occupational reasons they say will take another 8,000 out of the remaining total of 122,000 men still engaged in commercial fishing. Unfortunately, commercial fishing is not something that a national service act can assist by merely shifting unneeded office clerks to fishing posts in Puget Sound or Gloucester.

Even if some provision is made to avoid the drafting of those 8,000 fishermen, this year's production will be a billion pounds under what the War Food Administration wants.

That is the top of the news as it looks from here, ladies and gentlemen, until tomorrow evening.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible within the limits of this extension to disclose fully the services and activities of the individual members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries who have all given their personal time and attention to activities for the fishing industry, who have been diligent in their attendance upon the hearings and in their personal contacts to remedy the evils and correct the conditions existing in the fishing industry.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida and his Subcommittee on Fisheries, consisting of Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KING, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan, Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio, and Mr. HERTER, have been constant and tireless in their efforts to secure relief and too great tribute cannot be paid by me to them for their efforts. All of the other members of the full committee have relentlessly supported the Subcommittee on Fisheries in their efforts.

The Subcommittee on Fisheries and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries feel that they owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Hugh Frampton, attorney at law, Washington, D. C., and Mr. William S. Snow, of Alexandria, for their diligent service before the committee on behalf of the fishermen.

Maj. Lansdell K. Christie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith enclose a letter which I have received from Mr. W. A. Kirk, president of the W. A. Kirk & Co., Inc., 50 Broad Street, New York, and my reply thereto concerning Maj. Lansdell K. Christie:

W. A. KIRK & CO., INC.,
New York, March 23, 1944.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
Member of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I read with interest an article in the New York Evening Sun of March 22 relative to the lighterage situation in New York Harbor, wherein it stated that you had made the statement that the Christie Scow Corporation had a monopoly in this port, that the Christie Scow Corporation had a contract with the Army at Port Newark for the transportation of airplanes and parts to the exporting steamers for delivery abroad.

It also stated that this lighterage company was owned by an officer in the Army and inferred that due to this officer's associations with the Army, the Christie Scow Corporation secured the contract for the moving of planes and parts.

It has been my good fortune to have been closely associated with this lighterage company in a business way and to have known Maj. Lansdell K. Christie for many years. A more loyal American citizen I have never yet met. I think the following information may help to clear up many erroneous impressions that have been gathered from the newspaper articles.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, Major Christie—who incidentally attended West Point Academy—offered his services to the Army for active duty in any capacity, and was immediately accepted and commissioned. In doing this he left a very lucrative and well-managed lighterage company and his absence is and has been a great personal sacrifice.

Some time after he was commissioned he accepted an important post in Africa and was stationed there for over 16 months. On two occasions he contracted some tropical fever and at his own expense flew back to the United States so he could get the proper medical treatment and returned to his post. The last time he arrived in the United States he was sent to a hospital in Georgia and was confined there, a very sick man, for some time.

While Major Christie was in Africa his organization, without his knowledge, bid on the movement of airplanes and parts from Newark, N. J., and the contract was awarded to Christie Scow Corporation only because their rate was a saving of at least 25 percent over what was paid to previous lighterage companies. I have personally seen the contract and can vouch for this statement.

I might further add that Major Christie's reputation in the transportation and lighterage business is and has always been far above reproach. He is one of the most respected and well-liked persons in the business, as all who have come in contact with him can vouch for.

Feeling that a grave injustice has been done to a very honest, loyal, self-sacrificing, and patriotic person and to the Christie Scow Corporation, I am submitting the above to you for whatever disposition you wish to make of it.

Respectfully yours,
W. A. KIRK, *President.*

MARCH 29, 1944.

Mr. W. A. KIRK,
President, W. A. Kirk & Co., Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KIRK: I have your letter of March 23, and I am very happy to receive the information you wrote me concerning Maj. Lansdell K. Christie.

It was far from my purpose to injure Major Christie in any degree. I simply set forth the facts that were given to me. The additional facts as set forth in your letter to me are highly important and I am placing your letter and my reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Same will appear in the Appendix of the RECORD of March 29.

I am indeed sorry to learn of Major Christie's hospitalization and I hope at this writing that he has greatly improved.

I trust that the placing of your letter and my reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will remove any injury or hardship that might have been visited upon Major Christie.

My interest in the lighterage situation in New York Harbor was because of the fact that all lighterage out of the port of New York was controlled by one company, and that company was contracting to do that lighterage without public bidding and without public letting.

Yours very sincerely,
EMANUEL CELLER.

Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by John Temple Graves appearing in the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald on February 24, 1944:

THIS MORNING

(By John Temple Graves)

"Faithful be to faithful friends * * *."

Jim Farley is in Birmingham today. Whatever he is (or isn't) up to, he is entitled to the welcome and good will of every member of his party and every friend of man. He is the Abou ben Adhem of modern politics, the man who has made his way by making friends and been able to make friends because he likes his fellow human beings. He is the political fair player of these times, too. Looking at politics quite frankly as a game, he has made it a fair one; a game with rules that are respected, obligations that are honored, loyalties that are served in devotion as far as public interest will permit.

The long and sad story which has lined Jim Farley up now against Franklin Roosevelt has not clouded his political judgment or his power to sum up. As he sums up the situation in the South, my guess is that he knows this section is going Democratic as usual, and that Roosevelt, as usual, can carry it if he tries.

But that does not mean there is no revolt here against excessive federalism and controlled economy carried too far, nor does it mean that our people see no menace in a fourth term. It means only that the South can't find a "better 'ole.' It sees no one but Roosevelt with much chance of winning the Presidency for the Democratic Party, and it sees the Republican Party as offering nothing sufficient yet to warrant a history-making break-away from Democracy. Maybe Jim will have some suggestions. Maybe he knows a "better ole."

Commenting on the Durham (N. C.) Herald's observation that anti-Roosevelt sentiment has lessened in North Carolina, Editor Santford Martin suggests in the Winston-Salem Journal that "most of the rebellion talk has come from officials and politicians" and that "the work-a-day folk of the State have not participated to any great extent." I can't quite agree on that. I believe, rather, that it is the officials and politicians who are turning back to party regularity and Roosevelt now as election time approaches and a Democratic victory becomes more important to them than anything having to do with Roosevelt or the New Deal. I believe that it is the work-a-day people among whom the revolt is most enduring and real, and that the tragedy of their situation is that they have no leaders. Maybe Jim can suggest some.

In the last few weeks this writer has been in 12 Southern States and talked to fellow-

newspaper people in each. Everywhere I have found revolt widespread against what I call the perpetual New Dealer, against those who, not content with what has been dealt, want to go on and on, threatening not only the fine things dealt but the liberties and individualities which are as much a part of our American dreams as the bread and welfare on which the New Deal was concentrated.

But there are no leaders. The people who are feeling this way are, for the most part, people who have been New Dealers once, who have loved and followed Roosevelt and who revere him still even though they know there has been just about enough of him now except for the war. Such people are not won to the old guard as it runs out of its dark corners and imagines itself called on to make a speech. They are not in a mood to fellow travel with ones whose blindness and selfishness in other days made a New Deal necessary. They are not charmed by the psychopathic haters of Roosevelt and the ones who have been bitter and implacable enemies of the New Deal from the start.

They have no leaders, Jim. What about them? They are in all likelihood a majority in the South, and in the Nation, too. Their point of view is much akin to Willkie's. Like him, they are for most of the liberal and progressive things accomplished in this country since 1933, and like him, they believe the time has come for next things, for an end to New Dealing, and to New Dealers who are caught that way and can't stop, a time for new emphasis on the liberties we want in America along with our bread.

They are kin to Willkie, but they don't want Willkie. In the South they don't want him because they rank him with Mrs. Roosevelt on the race question, and because, anyhow, they aren't willing to take a Republican yet. (Elsewhere, it would seem, they don't want him because liberalism and Republicanism are apparent incompatibles.)

If Jim Farley has come to town with an answer to this situation which has the South tired of Roosevelt and disgruntled with the Democratic Party under Roosevelt but nevertheless willing to string along with both for want of a "better 'ole," here's hoping he speaks up loud and long. For he has a speech that can make history.

Meanwhile Jim can be trusted to speak up for the South in the matter of a more democratic apportionment system at Democratic national conventions, I believe. He did it at Chicago in 1940 when we received that two-delegate tip for being the party's faithful heart. He will be on our side next summer when real justice is sought.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in the February issue of the Southern Agriculturist there appeared two editorials, the first entitled "Mr. Farmer, It Is Up to You," and the second "A Coherent Farm Group." These editorials, Mr. President, were answered by letter by a farmer from my State, Mr. F. C. Maxwell, of Hiram, Ark. His answer was so thought-provoking that the editors of this publication have given it the recognition of publishing the letter as an editorial in the April issue of the Southern Agriculturist.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three editorials to which I have referred, the last one being entitled "Freedom—Or Democracy and Dictatorship," be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southern Agriculturist of February 1944]

MR. FARMER, IT IS UP TO YOU

Every farmer knows that we are fighting this war for democracy and freedom. Every farmer is thinking in terms of whipping Germany and Japan, and no group of citizens in the United States is contributing more to the war effort. With the pendulum swinging in our favor, it is time for each farmer to give thought to the type of democracy and freedom that he personally wants.

Our conception of this freedom and democracy is not only the right to speak, worship, write, and vote as we please, but the right to do these things with a minimum of government. Some call it democracy, others the private enterprise system, and another name for it is free enterprise; but we call it preserving the dignity of man with the full right and authority to do what he wishes so long as he does not harm his neighbor. Summed up, it means personal freedom.

The trend of government in the United States is definitely toward more government in everything. We have brought it on ourselves by asking Washington to do something every time a dark cloud has appeared on the horizon. And what has been the result?

Farmers now find themselves swamped with Government questionnaires, red tape, forms, and Government employees. Property rights are limited by quota restrictions. Too much government is absorbing valuable time.

Personal freedom and constitutional government can be had by farmers and other citizens. But it can only be had if we quit calling on Washington to solve every major or minor problem we have, and if we elect and keep in office Congressmen who advocate and fight for constitutional government as set up by our forefathers.

[From the Southern Agriculturist of February 1944]

A COHERENT FARM GROUP

The January issue of Southern Agriculturist pleaded for a Baruch committee for agriculture. The subsidy fight, the differences on the food program for 1944, the lack of steel on the farm machinery front, the scarce farm-labor situation—all these call for thorough planning of both the 1944 food program and of post-war agriculture. No signs have appeared on the horizon to indicate that the answer to these problems has been found.

In stressing the necessity for the appointment of a group to make recommendations for agriculture, we find a dire need for a coherent group of spokesmen for all farmers. Admitting the wide diversity of farm interests, nevertheless the farmer badly needs a real group of outstanding spokesmen who would labor in behalf of all agriculture.

This brings up the question of how a group so widespread can obtain vigorous spokesmen who will not only fight for agriculture but fight for everything that is best for a harmonious relationship between agriculture, industry and labor. The time for serving the selfish interests of any one group has long since passed, but agriculture wants and needs men who will speak out forcibly in seeing that the farmer has and will hold a top place in the economic picture in this fine country.

Individual leaders representing various farm organizations, farm magazines, the Department of Agriculture, and State farm organizations have done yeoman service for the good of the farmer. We say "fine and well done," but who speaks for the great industry of agriculture in tones strong enough to be heard? Until and unless farmers and farm organizations can find the answer to this question, agriculture will not obtain and hold its fair place in the economic structure of our country.

[From the Southern Agriculturist of April 1944]

FREEDOM—OR DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

(By F. C. Maxwell, Hiram, Ark.)

In the February issue of Southern Agriculturist appeared an editorial, Mr. Farmer, It Is Up to You. As a farmer I wish to comment upon that editorial and the farm problem. * * * For the past 11 years the farmer has been blamed for every evil which has beset this Nation, and I for one feel it is time we be heard in our own defense.

When the present national administration came into power it charged that God and the American farmer had produced too much and destroyed the farmer's purchasing power and thereby brought on the depression. Under that mistaken assumption the farmer was taken into the charge of the Federal administration and politicians were appointed to manage his business affairs.

Up until that time this Nation existed as a constitutional republic and the individual was given the protection of the Federal Government in the management of his affairs. Under that long established and successful system, the Government had no power to submit the use of personal and private property to a vote of the public, so a campaign of propaganda was started and under it this Government was changed from a constitutional republic to an outlaw democracy. With the coming of outlaw democracy, freedom passed.

The laborer was forced to pay large fees for the privilege of earning his bread, * * * the farmer's right to manage his own farm was submitted to a minority vote largely controlled by political dictators, production was cut, farm jobs were destroyed by legislation, hogs and cattle were slaughtered—not for food—on the theory we had too much food, although millions were hungry.

That was the beginning of political control of food supplies. That was the first real taste of democracy as a form of government. * * * The outstanding democrats from Jackson down had a profound respect for the Constitution and seldom or never considered this a democracy but a constitutional republic—and there is a vast difference. * * * As now correctly termed, a constitutional republic has a wholesome respect for the rights of the individual. A democracy is only concerned with the powers of the majority, or more often the organized minority, regardless of the rights of everyone who does not agree with them.

THE ORIGINAL AMERICAN WAY

The framers of the Constitution studied for 12 years the form of government they should adopt to secure the freedom for which they had fought. They rejected both monarchy and democracy, considering democracy as "mobocracy" or legalized mob law, and in the Constitution they placed a guaranty of a republican form of government. Or in other words, a representative government, with only very limited and well defined powers delegated to the governing body; all rights of the individual were carefully reserved and protected, as were the powers of the States.

But such a government did not suit the self-appointed reformers. It did not permit them the power to force their fellowman to accept their wise or otherwise reforms, so it was changed to a democracy—not by amending the Constitution as provided therein, but by widespread propaganda. * * * Legislation was enacted prohibiting the growing of cotton on the untrue assumption that cotton was overproduced in the world and cutting production would bring the farmers bigger price and income. The facts are: For the first 4 years of crop control the price was about 1 cent a pound higher, but the income to the farmers from cotton staple alone was $197,000,000 less than in the last 4 years of free markets.

For the first 7 years under the A. A. A. and Hull trade treaties the Cotton South produced 43.8 percent of world production. For the last 7 years of free markets we produced 58.1 percent. There is one nice thing about the Hull trade treaties—the name. The American farmer gets the "hull" while the foreign producer gets the kernel of the nut.

Paragraph 2 of your editorial was splendid logic, except that you join "freedom" and "democracy." Freedom is a personal matter or it is not freedom. Democracy is a collective matter. Mr. HENRY WALLACE, speaking in this State in 1933 said, "Democracy is simply majority rule." That makes a very pretty picture, until you ask two embarrassing questions: What majority? And upon what is it ruling? The answers to those questions are important.

The Department of Agriculture on January 16, 1941, informed the Congressman from my district: "In the past quota election, which was held in December 1941, the records of the Department of Agriculture reflect that 790,000 cotton farmers voted for the quota and 50,000 cotton farmers voted against the program. At the time the vote was held, 2,400,000 cotton farmers were eligible to vote."

At the time that election was held there were more than 130,000,000 people in the United States. There was a shortage of frying fats, milk, and butter, which those people needed, yet that minority of 790,000, supported by the strong arm of the Democratic Federal administration, in plain language, said, "Regardless of your needs, we are going to prohibit the 1,610,000 other cotton farmers from producing a billion pounds of cottonseed oil and 3 times that amount of cottonseed meal for the production of milk and butter." One year later a smaller minority, notwithstanding we were in war and still in need of fats, milk, and butter, repeated the ultimatum.

We have millions of our boys in foreign lands dying for our protection, yet at home small minorities of organized labor say we will not produce the things they need for their and our protection, nor will we allow others to produce these needed things; yet this great democratic system of government, which you say we are fighting this war for, is impotent to end that condition.

THE FARMER WANTS NO CHARITY

You state: "We have brought it upon ourselves by asking Washington to do something every time a dark cloud has appeared on the horizon." That statement is misleading and incorrect. It is true that certain organized groups of farmers have asked, and are still asking, certain kinds of legislation, but the great mass of farmers wants only freedom; not gifts, but protection from the oppression of groups organized and backed by vicious special-interest legislation.

The farm population is one-fourth of the total population. The Treasury Department a few months ago stated we owned one-fourth of the investments of the Nation. Certainly we work more than one-fourth of the hours, * * * On Labor Day 1942 Mr. Roosevelt had a serious brain storm because the farm income had increased from eight and seven-tenths billion dollars to $15,000,000,000 for the year. A few days later Leon Henderson placed the national income at $113,000,000,000. If the farmers are one-fourth of the population, have one-fourth of the investments, and do more than one-fourth of the work, why should they not have one-fourth of the total income? Mr. Roosevelt could see our increased income, but he could not see the total increase of national income; neither could he see that under the rule of democracy and mismanagement of bureaucrats our income had shrunk to the low level of eight and seven-tenths billion dollars. Nor in this day has he been able to get his eyes open, for he is yet demanding that the Government tax the farmers and everyone else to pay the grocery bill of his political favorites—organized labor—by subsidies.

Paragraph five of your editorial is good logic, but incorrectly stated. You place the blame upon the farmers by charging them with imposing upon the Government. It is the other way around. We have tried for 8 years to get a divorce from this "democracy." Excepting the solid South * * * the farm vote in 1936 and 1940 was against the New Deal, but still they hold on to us, and are demanding we feed the gang regardless of the fact that they have a larger income. * * * and that income includes about one-half which belongs justly to the farmers.

Michigan Slavs Fight for Victory and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report to the third annual conference of the American Slav Congress of Michigan, March 12, 1944, by Dr. W. T. Osowski, president, and George Pirinsky, executive secretary:

MICHIGAN SLAVS FIGHT FOR VICTORY AND LASTING PEACE

(By Dr. W. T. Osowski and George Pirinsky)

With this conference our Michigan Slav Congress rounds up another year of intensive win-the-war activities.

It was an eventful and crucial year, a year of big battles and great decisions.

The Slav forces of Michigan, like all patriotic groups, were called upon to exert new and greater efforts to help prepare the country for its greatest war effort—the forthcoming Anglo-American invasion of western Europe. They were called upon to help master the battle of production and arm our boys with the best of tanks, guns, and airplanes to join the victorious offensive of the gallant Red Army on the eastern front and the magnificent Tito liberation army of Yugoslavia by smashing at Hitler from west and south.

I think we can say that this year, too—the year between our second and third conferences—the organizations and forces united in American Slav Congress of Michigan again demonstrated a deep understanding of the war tasks before the Nation and made a significant contribution to the war effort of this city and State, which rank first in war production.

We can say that in all of our activities we showed that we realize that in these fateful days the supreme duty of every patriotic American, of every liberty-loving American Slav man and woman is to stand by the Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, and help him lead the country to victory and a lasting peace.

The other day our Government announced that from March 1941 through December 1943 the United States produced 150,000 airplanes of all types, of which some 28,000—approximately 19 percent—were sent to Allied nations. Michigan Slav workers, organized in the ranks of U. A. W.-C. I. O., share substantially in Michigan's part of this miracle of production. We are glad that Detroit tanks, guns, and airplanes are helping not only our boys in the Pacific and in Italy to deliver crushing blows to Axis bandits, but they are helping, also, the Red Army men to drive the Nazi hordes from Soviet soil. We read with great joy that our planes are helping Tito in repulsing the relentless offensives of Hitlerite enslavers.

More than 1,000,000 American boys of Slav descent are serving with honor in the armed forces of our country. Many of them, like our John Yaksich, of Detroit, have already distinguished themselves as war heroes who are ready to give everything for victory. It was with a sense of pride that we presented the Army with a 30-ton General Grant tank at our Slav day rally at Keyworth Stadium last summer. The presentation of the tank was the highlight of our most active participation in the war-loan drives during the year of this report, which were conducted under the leadership of our friend, first honorary chairman of Michigan Slav Congress, Mr. Frank N. Isbey, director of Michigan War Finance Committee. It is to the credit of people of Michigan and the leadership of Mr. Isbey, that this State ranks among the first in the sale of E bonds. In the last Fourth War Loan drive many of the women members of the Slav Congress—Serbian, Ukrainian, Croatian, Russian, Polish, Czechs, and Slovaks—did an outstanding job in helping to make that drive a great success. The Russian group conducted a very successful campaign, both in the Third and during the Fourth War Loan drives.

We are proud of the splendid record of our Czech men and women in the blood donors campaign of the Red Cross. Many of them gave blood eight and nine times already.

When Detroit celebrated I Am an American Day last May, our Slav Congress was in the first ranks of the active participants. In fact, the rally on that occasion at State Fair Grounds, where nearly 50,000 people gathered, was opened by Dr. W. T. Osowski, president of our State committee.

Together with U. A. W.-C. I. O., A. F. of L., Free World Association, as well as outstanding community leaders like Mr. Abner Larned, our Slav Congress forces helped make the meeting of Vice President WALLACE last summer an inspiring demonstration of unity around President Roosevelt. Members of our board of directors met with the Vice President and expressed to him our complete solidarity with the war policies of the administration.

Mayor Jeffries and Governor Kelly issued special proclamations for our Slav Day on July 18, last year, commending the patriotic program and efforts of American Slav Congress of Michigan.

Through the publication of "Michigan Slav" we kept high the banner of American Slav unity, not only in our State, but throughout the country.

Through our paper and other American Slav publications we forwarded our message of fraternal solidarity with our brothers in Europe.

The inspiring American-Soviet friendship rally in Masonic Temple last November

found Detroit Slavs among the most enthusiastic participants in that splendid tribute to our great ally—the Soviet Union.

Liberal and progressive Poles of Detroit made this city center of a fighting movement to rally all democratic Polish-Americans in support of war program of President Roosevelt. The Polish Trade Union Committee, which was founded recently in Cleveland and which represents 600,000 trade unionists, is headed by our national president, Leo Krzycki. The Polish-Americans, who are united in the ranks of American Slav Congress, are proud of the fact that their brothers and sisters in U. S. S. R. and in Poland are fighting side by side with the soldiers of the Red Army in a great offensive to drive the bloody Nazi invaders, both from Soviet and Polish soil.

The fighting South-Slavic Americans—Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, and Bulgarians—made a great step forward in strengthening their unity, nationally and locally, by organizing the United Committee of South-Slavic Americans, under leadership of Louis Adamic, renowned American-Yugoslav writer, who spoke to us at our Slav Pearl Harbor Day rally in Cass Auditorium last December. Mr. Adamic's speech at that rally was a real contribution to the understanding of the true situation in Yugoslavia.

Winston Churchill, in his recent remarkable report to the House of Commons on the conduct of the war after Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences, already substantiated what Mr. Adamic said at our rally on the situation in Yugoslavia, whose people have taken up the fight against the ruthless German invaders and native traitors in the most epic struggle in Hitlerite Europe. Led by the amazing Marshal Joseph (Broz) Tito, the people of Yugoslavia built a tough people's army, whose glorious deeds remind us of our great American revolutionary traditions and immortal fighters of 1776, under Washington, as well as of those days of our Civil War, when Lincoln led victoriously the forces of progress against those of reaction.

Let me read to you briefly what the London edition of the Army magazine, Yank, wrote about Tito's army. I quote:

"The partisan army is open to all who are willing to fight Nazis regardless of their race, religion, or political color. It is an army with the broadest possible base, composed of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins, Jews, Christians, Moslems, Communists and conservatives. It includes an Italian division, a Czech brigade, a Hungarian battalion, a Bulgarian battalion, and even a German company. And it is an army that fights. It operates on the slogan, "Hit the Nazi wherever and whenever you meet him." It did not wait for the allies to come and kick out the Fascists. It began to do that for itself, with its own blood and brains and guts."

Mr. Churchill spoke about Tito in the most glowing terms.

At the meeting in Cass Auditorium, which I mentioned already, we expressed our complete support of Teheran Pact, just announced at that time. We greeted that pact, and the decisions of the previous conferences in Moscow and Cairo as great weapons for victory.

Much has been said and written on the meaning and significance of Teheran Declaration; much more will be said on this great document of our time in which Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill proclaimed to the world that the three mighty nations they represent "shall work together in the war and in the peace that will follow." In that history-making pact, the Big Three of the powerful American-Soviet-British coalition "reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the military operations, which will be undertaken from the east, west and south * * * for the destruction of the German forces." As to the peace they stated that they are sure that their "concord will make it an enduring peace."

Teheran Pact destroyed Hitler's hopes of dividing the United Nations. Its provisions, its implications not only guarantee that "victory will be ours", but they also lay the basis for "a peace which will command good will from the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations."

Teheran lights the path to victory and projects itself far into the future as a new hope for a better life. It is up to the people to make it a shining reality; it's up to the people's movements like our American Slav Congress to help crown it with complete and lasting success.

None other than Winston Churchill blasted the false contentions of the appeasers. The British Prime Minister emphatically declared in his speech before the House of Commons, that "none of the ground made good at Teheran has been lost." Churchill stated that "the three great allies are absolutely united in their actions against the common foe. They are equally resolved to pursue the war at whatever cost to a victorious conclusion and they believe that a wide field of friendly cooperation lies before them after the destruction of Hitlerite tyranny."

In the same spirit Marshal Stalin, in the order of the day on the twenty-sixth anniversary of the Red Army, strongly emphasized that despite the fact that "the fascist rulers are making desperate efforts to introduce disharmony in the camp of the anti-Hitlerite coalition" these efforts "of the Hitlerites are doomed to failure, for in the foundation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition there lie important Allied interests which aim at defeating Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe. It is precisely this community of interests which results in the consolidation of a fighting alliance of the U. S. S. R., Britain, and the United States of America in the course of the war. The hour for the final reckoning is approaching for all crimes committed by the Hitlerites on Soviet soil and in the occupied countries of Europe."

This is straight from two of the architects of Teheran, this is their reply to the appeasers. Both Churchill's speech and Stalin's order of the day show that real progress has been made since Teheran in the settlement of Allied policy toward Yugoslavia. They show that all problems arising in the process of application of Teheran decisions are being solved in the spirit of common understanding and unity.

We in Michigan have much to learn from the Teheran Pact, especially now on the eve of the invasion of western Europe, and in this year of the most crucial Presidential election.

Here, in this decisive war production State, we find some of the worst American appeasers and enemies of the agreements which were reached at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences. May I remind this conference of the anti-Teheran position and activities of pro-Fascist forces like Gerald L. K. Smith, Peace Now movement, and others? Some of these people preach negotiated peace with Hitler at a time when our boys in Italy are dying from German bullets.

Here in Detroit and Michigan we must take most seriously the recent warning of President Roosevelt that our country is threatened by rightist reaction and that if the reactionary forces are not checked in time, if they have their way, "then it is certain that even though we shall have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad we shall have yielded to the spirit of fascism at home."

Only the fullest mobilization and the broadest coalition of all democratic forces of our State and country can save the Nation from this danger. Only the most active support to the President can block the path of reaction.

Continuation of the leadership of President Roosevelt is essential for fulfillment of Teheran Pact and preservation of the Alliance of United Nations, without which there can be no victory nor a lasting peace. Therefore, our main job and the job of all other democratic forces on the home front this year is to help guarantee the continuation of that leadership, to make Michigan safe for democracy and victory.

The national committee, at its last meeting in Pittsburgh, decided to convene the Second American Slav Congress in early fall for the purpose of mobilizing all Slav forces for the crucial Presidential elections. It, also, decided that the third Sunday of June shall be celebrated by all patriotic Slav communities as all-Slav day as tribute to the Slav peoples of Europe.

Our board of directors proposes that on that day, June 18, we in Detroit stage a great Slav day rally at Belle Isle Park to back our boys, who at this very moment stand ready to fling themselves at the throats of the Fascist murderers of our Slav brothers and sisters in devastated native lands, which the Nazis have turned into virtual cemeteries.

In preparing for the American Slav day in June, and in all of our activities, we must work in closest cooperation with all win-the-war forces, particularly labor, always striving for broadest unity among the Slav groups and the Nation as a whole.

We are greatly encouraged at this conference by the large trade-union delegation—the fighting locals of fighting U. A. W.-C. I. O., in whose ranks there are tens of thousands of American Slav workers.

The support of the entire Wayne County C. I. O. council to the work of the conference is one of the many manifestations of the growing unity and closer cooperation between the democratic forces of Michigan. This people's unity, this constructive cooperation we must strengthen further. We must fight together in the present battle for a Federal ballot for our soldiers. We must fight together against race hatred, against bigotry. American Slav Congress stands four-square against any and all forms of anti-Semitism and Negro-baiting, which are contrary to the spirit of American democracy and the ideas for which our American soldiers and our Slav brothers and sisters in Europe are fighting for and dying.

Liberty-loving Michigan Slavs will not budge an inch from their most active support to the Commander in Chief for total mobilization of all the manpower and industrial and natural resources of our great country to speed the day of victory over fascism.

Yes, these are days that try men's souls, and we fighting Slavs of Detroit and Michigan are fully determined to do more than our share, hoping that some day when the history of the war effort of Michigan is written, the patriotic work of our American Slav Congress in this State will constitute one of its brightest pages.

Great trials and decisive battles lie ahead of us. But we face them with fullest confidence in complete victory and a lasting peace.

Long live our great Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, under whose fighting leadership we, 130,000,000 Americans, march to victory.

Long live American Slav unity and the unity of the entire Nation, of all Slav peoples, of all United Nations and anti-Fascist forces.

Death to fascism. Freedom to the people.

Forward to the invasion.

Forward to the Victory.

Let Us Face the Race Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Carey McWilliams delivered at Town Hall, New York, at America's Town Meeting of the Air, under the auspices of Town Hall, in cooperation with the Blue Network Co., Inc., broadcast on Thursday, February 17, 1944, over Station WJZ and the coast-to-coast hook-up of the Blue Network:

It took a war to make us realize that the race question involved some real issues and that these issues were vitally related to the question of winning the war. In all sections of the Nation, American citizens are facing this question—in their defense councils, their plant-production committees, and their inter-racial commissions. They are not being fooled or frightened by bogus statements of the question. After what happened in Detroit and Harlem, in Beaumont and Los Angeles, they know that the contamination of racism is spreading throughout the Nation; and they propose to stop it. Fully warned of the danger, the people have already demonstrated that they possess the good will, the creative enthusiasms, and the energy to solve this question; but their efforts need guidance, leadership, and direction. While these local manifestations of good will are magnificent, nevertheless the people will discover that they cannot finally solve this question even in their own communities until it is solved nationally. For measured by any standard, the question has become national in scope and effect and it now falls full square within the field of Federal action. A question that deeply concerns 13,000,000 American citizens, and that threatens the integrity of the democratic ideal itself, can no longer be regarded as the peculiar problem of any one region.

I would propose, first of all, that we enforce the Constitution of the United States, not in part of the Nation, part of the time, for part of the people; but for all of the people, all of the time, in every corner of America. To safeguard the Bill of Rights, to insure the integrity of Federal elections, to banish discrimination in the exercise of constitutional rights based on race, color, or creed—these are Federal responsibilities. The necessity is clear, the justification obvious, the remedies multiple. Apply the second section of the fourteenth amendment; outlaw the poll tax in Federal elections; enact the Federal antilynching bill, and enforce these measures equally, impartially, but firmly throughout the Nation.

Approached as a Federal question, other lines of action are clearly indicated. Make it a cardinal point of Federal policy that there shall be no discrimination based on race, color, or creed. Then proceed to put this policy into effect in the field of Government service and in all the agencies of Government. By way of additional implementation, we need: Legislative sanction and authority for the Fair Employment Practice Committee; an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, making it an unfair labor practice for a trade union to discriminate against any person by reason of race or color; and a Federal civil rights statute designed as a Fair Racial Practice Act providing for enforcement by an administrative agency as a matter of Federal policy rather than by individuals as a matter of personal privilege.

We should also recognize that it is the duty of the Federal Government to insure that no American shall be denied, solely by reason of race or color, the opportunity to become a responsible citizen. Why should citizens be denied access to public health services, to hospitals, to libraries, to schools and colleges, to the right to decent homes, solely because of the color of their skins? To prevent this denial, which is often occasioned by the States themselves, we need an agency in the Federal Government to provide these services and facilities wherever they have been discriminatorily denied. Give this agency the functions of research and education, of investigation and mediation, of organization and welfare. Authorize it to act through local and State agencies, but permit it to act in its own right whenever and wherever necessary. Provide it with the means to grant subsidies in furtherance of these purposes and expressly direct it to aid and to induce action on the part of local agencies of Government within the broad framework of Federal policy. Let such an agency bridge the gap between research and action; let it bring the full resources of the present-day social sciences directly to bear upon the problem.

Initiation of such a program can no longer be postponed. It is an indispensable step toward, and avoidance of, post-war complications, both foreign and domestic, which have already assumed major proportions. Isolation is a dead fact and isolationism is an obsolete doctrine. The manner in which we have isolated racial minorities in the United States has been closely related to the isolationism we have practiced in the field of foreign policy. The abandonment of isolationism in one field will, sooner or later, compel its abandonment in the other. We must recognize that we will need the maximum unity, not only to win the war, but to discharge the unprecedented responsibilities we have inherited and assumed in the post-war world. Formerly it was sectionalism that threatened to divide the Nation; today it is "racism." Since this war is in part a world revolution, it is folly to assume that it has not profoundly altered the relationships and factors involved in what we call the race question. The Federal Government, in the long run, cannot ignore these and similar considerations. It is precisely because two irreconcilable points of view are developing today on the race question that the Federal Government must be prepared to intervene, to mediate, to point the way to the future, and to prevent the lawlessness that, in the thirteen race riots of 1943, disgraced the Nation and encouraged its enemies.

It is perhaps well that we have waited, for we now possess the resources, both governmental and scientific, to undertake the task, as well as the necessary will to action. There is today in America a large and expanding area of good will, of creative enthusiasms, that can be stimulated and organized for the attainment of such a program and its objectives. If we permit this energy to dissipate, if we fail to act now to prevent the dangers that are so clearly foreseeable, we will invite consequences which may well be disastrous. For "racism" is not merely a threat to the minorities involved; it is a malignant disease that threatens the destruction of civilization and democracy. It carries the germs of future wars and endless domestic disorders. We cannot permit this disease to spread, for it is deadly and infectious. We must prepare now to stamp it out; to rid this Nation, once and for all time, of a scourge that threatens its national existence.

Our Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post of March 25, 1944:

OUR LAST CHANCE

The Nazi occupation of Hungary, the imminent occupation of Rumania and Bulgaria, have raised to critical urgency the question of saving the Jews of Europe.

For in these nations almost 2,000,000 Jews lived, and while some have already been sent out of Rumania to die in the gas execution chambers set up in the Polish ghettos, there are still close to a million and a half souls alive there.

Alive, but for how long?

Before the Nazis came, the Jews of Hungary were able to hang on. They were discriminated against, deprived of their livelihoods, forced to live in the most abject poverty, yet somehow most of them managed, growing a little thinner every day, dying off more quickly, but still existing.

Very much the same situation existed for the Jews in Bulgaria and Rumania.

These three Governments were aware that their side might lose; that if they dealt too harshly with the Jews they would pay off for it to the conscience of mankind when the reckoning came at the peace tables. They were even willing to let many of the Jewish women and children migrate. They didn't want their record to be too black.

Now the Nazis are in Hungary. They have ordered the Jews to stay put, not to attempt to escape. They have begun to arrest some. Within the next few months, unless we rescue the Jews of Hungary, they will all either be dead or on their way to execution in Poland.

Unbelievable as it may seem, that is the truth. There were 3,200,000 Jews in Poland when the Germans marched in. Today only about 200,000 are alive, 1 out of every 16. It can happen in Hungary. It can happen in Rumania.

THE PRESIDENT'S WARNING

The President's warning to every Nazi and to every person under German domination to help the Jews escape, shows that he is aware of this. It is a magnificent warning. It could not be stronger.

Yet, of itself, it is not enough. Where are the Jews to go? The only place near enough and the only place where Jews are welcome is Palestine. Yet its doors are still closed. Magnificent as the President's statement is, it has not opened these doors. The British White Paper has slammed them shut, so far as any major use as haven is concerned.

We have been critical enough on this issue before. Let us say just once more that had Palestine or any place else been open to the Jews of Hungary before the Nazis marched in, they would have gone there. It was the lack of Palestine or any other haven that kept the Jews in the Balkans and that now brings them closer than ever to a terrible fate.

There is no time for recrimination now. There are still a few minutes left until the circle closes. Efficient as the Nazis are, they do not have records yet on each of the million Jews in Hungary. It will be weeks before they get down to the towns and villages and comb the hide-outs. It takes time to organize a country.

The Hungarians themselves hate the Nazis now, more than ever. They will help the Jews. Some can escape.

Everything must be done to make that escape possible. That means we must send agents into Hungary, use large sums of money, bribe if necessary.

PALESTINE AS A HAVEN

It means that nearby Palestine must be opened to them as a haven.

It means that today, now, we must start to get the Jews out of Rumania and Bulgaria before the Germans march in, as they will. Later than today will be too late and all the finest statements in the world will not help.

If we do less than that, we ourselves will help to close the circle on these people.

We shall have become participants in the massacre, not because we did something, but because we did nothing.

To the degree that our officials helped the British and Arabs close the door to Palestine, we shall have become participants.

This is our last chance to save our conscience and our honor.

Multiple State Income Taxes on Salaries of Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER H. WENE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. WENE. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have strongly advocated the passage of legislation which would exempt from payment of the Philadelphia wage tax all persons living outside the city and State, who are employed within the city limits of Philadelphia. In the past few weeks I have had occasion to publicly express my views in this respect at various meetings held in South Jersey. I am very much gratified at the action of the House on Monday, March 27, 1944, in passing the bill which would exempt from payment of double taxation all persons engaged in Federal employment. I am of the opinion, however, that in the final enactment of a law of this kind, the provisions should be broadened to also include all persons employed by private industry. I feel that they, too, should have the privilege of exemption from this taxation.

With particular reference to the Philadelphia State tax, and speaking in the interest of my district, we have possibly some 20,000 or more residents of South Jersey employed within the city limits of Philadelphia, a large percentage engaged in private industry. Like Federal employees they are subjected to the same unjust treatment double taxation imposes.

While the bill which passed the House would relieve the situation to a great extent, I am very hopeful that we may be able to have the legislation as enacted into law include persons employed by private employers in the exemption of the tax.

Elect More Enlightened Democrats to the Next Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, after serving nearly 12 years as Representative in Congress from the Fourteenth District of California, I have decided not to stand for reelection.

I take this opportunity to thank all the friends who have so loyally worked in my campaigns and to say farewell and God bless you to the many thousands of voters who have time after time reelected me to Congress. Believe me, I hate to leave the firing line at this time, but age is creeping up on me and I feel that I should make way for a successor—one who will be blessed with the youth and energy that are no longer mine.

In Congress I have been a strong supporter of President Roosevelt and his program to bring opportunity to all the people. I have fought for progressive measures and have sternly resisted organized pressure groups whose well-paid lobbyists are continually trying to control Congress.

Before Pearl Harbor and since that tragic day I have supported every appropriation for our Army, Navy, and air force. I have insisted that the American people do not begrudge taxes spent to make our fighting forces the best-equipped in the world; we are willing to pay for victory but we abhor waste, red tape, inefficiency, and we insist that these must be cut to the minimum.

Right now our mighty task is to win the war as quickly as possible and with the minimum loss of life. To do this we need less politics, less hate at home, and more earnest effort to pass legislation that will provide just taxes based on ability to pay and not framed by dictation of pressure groups; to enact such measures as are needed to guard the Nation against inflation, and to provide for reconversion of our war industries to the needs of peace, with the minimum of unemployment and all the ills that go with lack of jobs. Always we must guard free enterprise under such controls as are necessary to prevent gross injustice and unfair practices, resulting in an unsafe concentration of power and wealth.

It is of paramount importance to elect more enlightened Democrats to the next Congress who will not bow to blocs and lobbyists, who will not play politics to the detriment of the war effort, who have such outstanding ability as to compel attention, and who are honestly dedicated to the cause of democracy as enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, nobly served by Woodrow Wilson, and stoutly maintained by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is my hope that the Fourteenth District will elect a Representative who is not merely an average office seeker of mediocre ability but a citizen of force and personality, who has the background and the ability to be a leader in the fight against special privilege and reactionary forces.

With an entirely friendly feeling to all candidates, I feel that it is my privilege and my duty to advise the voters of my district that the outstanding candidate who will win immediate recognition in Congress is Helen Gahagan Douglas, Democratic national committeewoman from California. She has pleasing personality, a trained mind, unusual skill in debate, understanding of the issues of this crucial war period, and an enlightened program for a just and lasting peace. The Democrats now have only one woman in the House; we need more. If Helen Gahagan Douglas is elected to Congress, I am confident that she will be able to render outstanding service to the Fourteenth District and to the Nation.

Achievements of the Army Service Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago a very distinguished member of the minority party, my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable LEO E. ALLEN, of the Thirteenth District of Illinois, made a memorable address to this body. So profound were his expressions that the speech won favorable comment in the cloakrooms, not alone from Members on both sides of the aisles but on both ends of the Capitol.

He told that it was the first anniversary of the Army Service Forces, recited the history of the old Quartermaster Corps—in which he served in World War No. 1—of its unfoldment and evolution into the S. O. S.—Services of Supply. He pointed out the great accomplishments of that branch of our armed forces in World War No. 2 under the leadership of its commanding general in the first year of organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to recall the many vexatious problems which confronted this body and the armed service a short 12 months ago. Problems of organization as well as problems of production; War Production Board problems of priority and allotments; the seeming failures of industry to effect rapid conversion, the failure of the old quota and allotment system to solve the problem of material distribution that arose out of the required production of tanks, planes, jeeps, and guns. The sinking of our merchant ships by German U-boats.

A memorable year has now passed. Listening to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell recently while he was delivering an address, I was reminded of the really great speech delivered by one of our leading

Republican Members, LEO E. ALLEN, about General Somervell's personal war record and accomplishments.

I am not going to address myself to the general or his work. The gentleman from Illinois, LEO ALLEN, has given to this House a good estimate of his worth to our country. Mr. Speaker, I am simply going to take a short excerpt out of the gentleman from Illinois, LEO ALLEN'S talk, paraphrase and submit it, together with another speech for publication in the RECORD.

On the occasion of that address, the gentleman from Illinois, LEO ALLEN, referred to a letter he received from General Somervell. He describes it as a simple, homey letter, abounding in frank expression, telling of contradictions and disappointments, reciting achievements and things yet to be realized. It tells of hopes and of ambitions that were to be achieved in the coming year.

It is not the kind of a letter that we would ordinarily expect from a so-called brass hat. It is such a human document, * * * replete with good tidings; * * * dealing with many problems * * * of such vital interest to us here in Congress * * * that I am submitting it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope every Member of this House will find time to read it. It will bring to your notice not only the accomplishment of a great soldier and executive administrator, but inspire recognition of the abilities he brings to the task with which he is charged.

That letter and this speech made a year later can in truth be construed as—

Constituting a personal report to the membership of this House by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Services of Supply, United States Army.

"Let others hail the rising sun,
I bow to one whose work is done."

Thus spoke the gentleman from Illinois, LEO E. ALLEN, to this House 1 year ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to include as part of my remarks another speech made by General Somervell only last week. It tells of what we have accomplished so far in this war, why we are doing them and that we are doing them all in the old American tradition and the truly American way. It was the expression of a truly great soldier, a great administrator, a great executive, and a great American.

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. BREHON SOMERVELL, UNITED STATES ARMY, COMMANDING GENERAL ARMY SERVICE FORCES, BEFORE MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, FORT BELVOIR, VA., ON MARCH 9, 1944

This anniversary of the founding of Army Service Forces, it seems to me, is a proper moment for self-appraisal. It is the moment to inventory our successes and our failures, to look backward and look forward, to reexamine our methods, and to ask ourselves pertinent questions.

How have we done?

How do we stand?

What does the future hold?

What can each of us in Army Service Forces do and what can each individual American do to hasten peace and assure victory? Is the purpose for which we are spending so much time and treasure and suffering worth all the effort and the agony?

Let us take up these questions, one by one.

How have we done? We have come a long way. I am proud of the men and women in Army Service Forces, our million soldiers and our million civilians here, and the service troops we have sent overseas. I am grateful to American industry and to American workers, to transportation and to agriculture, for their share in the arming of the Nation. Without united effort, military and civilian, the old cry of "too little and too late" would still be ringing in our ears. Thanks to you, to the soldiers and civilians in Army Service Forces, and to all those men and women who have joined us in our task, nearly everywhere today the story is "enough on time."

Our job is important, far-reaching, and complex. We feed, clothe, shelter, and transport the Army. We construct its roads, bridges, air fields, and port facilities. We operate its telegraph, telephone, radio, and electronic devices. We protect troops from poison gas and maintain our own supply in case of need. Except certain items peculiar to the Air Forces, we design and procure all arms and ammunition, all tanks and trucks, everything the soldier needs to fight and live. We keep the Army's records, pay its bills, pay each individual soldier and his allotments. We are responsible for morale of troops. Our Corps of Chaplains offers religious consolation. We administer military justice, handle prisoners of war, maintain law and order, keep traffic moving on the roads to battle. We carry the mail to soldiers around the world. We operate the service commands. We maintain the Army's health; we nurse the sick and wounded; we bury the Army's dead.

All this requires an organization so vast that the individual within it sometimes may forget how important his part is, or he may believe that his part transcends all others in importance. The engineer soldier drilling in the mud here must always remember that he is part of the Army that is marching up the road to Rome. The worker making nuts and bolts must constantly remind himself that these are not mere nuts and bolts, that he in reality is hurling high explosives at the enemy. The clerk must realize that those aren't just papers she is shuffling, that each paper represents a gun in a soldier's hands.

So far we have done well, but not well enough to relax for a single minute.

We have armed the largest army in our history with the world's best weapons. We have helped arm our allies.

We have housed and clothed and fed the Army well.

Our health rate is higher than the rates in civil life.

Our amphibious trucks, bazookas, rockets, signal equipment have changed the complexion of modern war.

We have shipped many million tons of equipment and millions of men overseas.

Today we set our sights on future targets. We must set them accurately. In order to find the range, we must measure carefully what it will require of effort, of suffering, of labor, of planning, of sacrifice, of unity.

We dare not lose our sense of urgency, dare not forget that each of us is a cog in a vast machine and that individual failure may lead to failure at some vital point far up the line. The soldier here at home, the shop worker, and the clerk can save American lives or by a thoughtless action bring death to our fighting men. The decision is ours on whether the war will be short or long.

How long it takes, how much it costs, is the individual concern of each of us. That little extra effort we all can give is vital. Each time we pause, each time we lay down our weapons or our tools, we help the enemy. No individual cause dare stand in the way of quick and final victory. Only through unity of action and mutual determination will we win.

Let us not be deluded by the happy thought that the war is won. Bitter fighting lies ahead. We have only dented the rim of Hitler's fortress and touched the outskirts of Tojo's empire. We haven't licked them yet. We dare not slacken our efforts. Rather we must redouble them. Victory is never cheaply bought.

Even victory is only a means to an end. What is that end? What are we fighting for? Why do we bury our sons and brothers in lonely graves far from home? For post-war wages or post-war profits? For bigger and better business? For softer comforts, new ice boxes, radios, cars? You know the answer. Our men are dying to preserve a way of life. The little luxuries are only byproducts. We are fighting for liberty, the most expensive luxury known to man.

We fight for simple things; for the little things that are all-important. We fight for the right to lock our house doors and be sure that no bully with official sanction will break the lock.

We fight for town meetings, for the soapbox in the public square, for the high-school debating team, for open doors to cathedral and church and synagogue.

We fight for schools built on a foundation of books, not bayonets.

We fight for the country editor and for the metropolitan daily and for the editor's right to say the wrong thing if he thinks it's right.

We fight for the right to organize for any decent purpose; for labor; for employers; for the Grange and the Legion and the ladies' literary club, and for lodge meetings in full regalia on Tuesday nights.

We fight for our candidate for sheriff and for the other fellow's candidate; and for the right to be sorry we elected him and to say so.

We fight for free radio, for the right to listen to what we want and to turn off what we don't want.

We fight for the right to work at jobs of our own choosing; to read the books we want to read; to listen to music that pleases us, without regard to the race or nationality of the composer.

We fight for the high privilege of throwing pop bottles at the umpire.

For these things we fight.

These rights, these privileges, these traditions are precious enough to fight for, precious enough to die for. They are not easily won. They cannot be acquired by half measures or on half time. Dollars will not buy them. They cannot be attained without sacrifice.

Let me remind you that Tom Paine's words are as true now as they were that snowy night beside the Delaware. Paine wrote them on a drumhead with a stub of pencil. Let us write them in our hearts indelibly.

I quote: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

Thus spoke Tom Paine. His words will give us consolation in our sorrow, strength to combat our weariness, courage to face each new, hard day till peace comes back to the world.

To my troops, to the generals and the captains, the sergeants and the privates, and to all our civilian workers I say, "Well done." In the year ahead we will strive for greater accomplishment. We can't win the war on the assembly line or the supply line, but we can lose it there. The men who will win this war are the fighting men, in the

air and in the mud. These are the men we serve. They will triumph in the end. It is our sacred duty and our high privilege to serve them. No matter what we give, no matter how we labor, we cannot approach their sacrifice. Their valor is a blazing torch to light our way.

Again the Jews Are Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 29, 1944:

AGAIN THE JEWS ARE VICTIMS

Two more blows have befallen Jews of the Old World. One is delivered by Hitler, as usual. The other is internal. Both make the problem of rescue more difficult.

In Palestine a Jewish terrorist group has resorted to dynamite and murder against British police. This invites British repressive measures. It plays into the hands of the Arabs, who argue that increased refugee immigration would jeopardize Palestinian order and security. And in other countries this unfortunate incident will be used to feed anti-Semitism.

We trust no reader of this newspaper is so uninformed or so unfair as to blame the Jewish community of Palestine for the crimes of that very small gang. The Jewish agency and representative organizations were the first to condemn this terror. Few, if any, people in the world can match the record of the Jews in refraining from civil violence regardless of provocation.

The other blow falls in Hungary. There the new Hitler puppet regime is extending to the occupied country the anti-Jewish laws and lawlessness which are the mark of Nazi barbarism. Persecution was bad enough under other Budapest Cabinets. It will be much worse under the Gestapo. Similar situations exist in Rumania, and to a lesser extent in Bulgaria, other "allies" of Hitler in process of occupation.

The magnitude of this calamity is measured by the large number of native Jews and refugees from Germany now in Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Hitherto it was possible to get refugees out of those countries. For that purpose President Roosevelt 2 months ago appointed the Secretaries of War, State, and Treasury as a War Refugee Board, along lines proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in unanimously approving the Gillette-Taft-Baldwin-Rogers resolution.

An estimated 2,000,000 or more Jews have been wiped out by Hitler. The problem is to rescue as many as possible of the three to four millions remaining, and to provide temporary havens for them in neutral and nearby Allied territories for the duration.

It should not be necessary to point out to the War Refugee Board, which was named only after years of unpardonable delay, that with these Balkan developments every day counts now. Unfortunately, the British Government has been none too cooperative, either in the general problem or specifically in providing more refugee facilities in Palestine. Its white-paper barrier should be lifted.

This humanitarian issue of relief should not be confused with the entirely different political dispute over Zionism and creation of a Jewish state. To save as many as possible of those singled out for Nazi torture, starvation, and death—of which the large number are Jews—is not a matter of religious sect or creed, of political party or policy. It is common decency.

Why Bomb Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pine Bluff Commercial of March 18, 1944:

WHY BOMB GERMANY?

A group of nationally known clergymen and writers has issued a protest against Allied obliteration bombing of German cities. Their statement points out that "hundreds of thousands of helpless and innocent people are being subjected to agonizing forms of death and injury comparable to the worst tortures of the Middle Ages."

Issuing a call for repentance, and urging Christian people to examine their participation in this carnival of death, the protest asserts that nothing less than absolute certainty that the bombings are shortening the war should permit the use of these dreadful expedients.

The concern of these obviously sincere and humane people for the innocent victims of bombings will be understood and shared by most of us. It is the same concern that we felt for the victims of the unprovoked Nazi raids on Warsaw and Rotterdam and London, and for the panic-stricken refugees who fell before the Nazi flyers' machine guns along French and Belgian roads in the summer of 1940.

Perhaps some Germans also felt sympathy for those victims. But they dared not protest in Hitler's Germany. So now they, along with their countrymen who applauded the blitzkrieg of defenseless cities, must reap the whirlwind loosed by the man whom Germany raised to power and almost to deity.

The bombing of cities is Hitler's creation, copied from Mussolini, rehearsed in Spain, perfected against Polish and Dutch cities, and halted by the English. And to say that the Nazis did not "obliterate" London because of any humanitarian motive is to be naive.

The protest quoted above obliquely questions "the absolute certainty" that Allied bombings of Germany are shortening the war. This raises the disturbing question: If the protesters doubt the absolute certainty, then why do they think these missions are continuing? Do they suspect that our bomber crews delight in the thought that they bring death and injury to civilians, or that the Allied Command has lost thousands of men and millions in equipment simply to spread terror?

The protest also stresses the fact that 18 months of mass bombings have not broken civilian morale. Such a consideration is wishful thinking. The bombing of Germany is a military campaign, aimed at the sources of supply and transportation, and at the vital nerve centers of enemy planning and authority.

If bombs had paralyzed German production and daily life by now, this costly campaign would be halted. They haven't, so the bombings continue.

Let anyone who thinks this war can be won by confining air action to front lines take a look at the stalemate in Italy? And let him try to count the American dead on the road to Berlin if Germany's ports and railroads and factories remained untouched!

Paying for Past Follies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are today, in the midst of this terrible war, paying dearly for the past follies of foolish politicians, selfish bureaucrats, and irresponsible, ill-advised theorists as well as would-be autocrats, who were determined to make America over in order that they might have jobs for the rest of their lives at the expense of the overburdened taxpayers.

The hardships and the privations which the American people are today undergoing; the vast confusion, maladministration, and the disruption of American lives caused by point pricing, food scarcities, and black markets—all these are the result not of a sudden emergency arising like some tornado over the land, but of 10 years of unwise political experimentation with the American economy.

In their heyday, the Tugwells, and the Wallaces, and the Hopkinses, and the Corcorans, and the Cohens, and the Ezekiels, and a score and more of other gleeful experimenters and planned-economy politicians, were going strong on their theory and practice of killing little pigs, wantonly slaughtering brood sows; plowing under cotton; paying farmers not to plant, and penalizing farmers for planting.

Back in those days, any citizen, farmer or otherwise, who attempted to point out that farm machinery had to be kept up, that farm land had to be worked for crops instead of being left to produce only weeds, that if men could not farm as a way of life they would leave the land and go to the factory, such worried Americans were contemptuously characterized as Tories, and Economic Royalists, and Copperheads, and worse.

Today, as the people are paying a terrific price in privations for these political and economic follies of the last decade, the Tugwells and the Wallaces, and the Hopkinses and the Corcorans, and the Cohens, and the Ezekiels are keeping pretty mum about those days when they slaughtered little pigs by the millions, and wantonly destroyed the brood sows

by countless thousands, and plowed under the cotton and the corn. They have come forward—one or two of them, at least—with new world panaceas which demand of the American farmer an enormous production with which these power-hungry politicians now pretend they will try to feed the world. But just remember that every time anyone has to stand in line at the ration board, and use scarce gasoline and scarcer tires to go back again and again, and every time anyone has to deny themselves some item of food or clothing to which they have normally been accustomed—just remember that they are paying the price which a good many of us warned that they would have to pay in those days of wanton destruction of animals and vegetable crops. The people are today paying the penalty for the foolishness and the political aberrations, and the bureaucratic arrogance and insolence of a decade of New Deal experimentation and disruption of the American economy by the Wallaces, and the Tugwells, and the Hopkinses, and the Corcorans, and the Cohens, and the Ezekiels.

The American farmer has not had an easy way of life in America. He has had, however, the best way of life of any farmer in the world, hard as it has been. He has had many long, lean years, and those who now point to the fact that farm income has risen to a high level, look only at the momentary returns; they are not thinking anything about the long, lean years that stretch behind the American farmer; nor are they thinking much about the long, lean years which may stretch ahead after this war is over.

All the American farmer has ever asked at the hands of his Nation has been a chance to be independent; to run his farm within reasonable limits as he saw fit; to produce under conditions where he had a fair chance to produce at a reasonable cost and sell at a reasonable profit. The American farmer is the most solid, independent, and soundminded citizen in the United States. He, least of all the citizens of this country, wanted to be a ward of the Government. He wanted to stand on his own feet and make his own way by his own efforts, asking nothing more than parity of opportunity and parity of price.

Of course, American farmers could not endure as a permanent proposition a condition in which the prices of everything they had to buy were rising while the prices of everything they had to sell were falling. No other businessman, no other industrialist, could endure and survive such conditions as those.

The farmer was perfectly willing to cooperate, and did cooperate, in soil conservation and flood control, and in erosion prevention. Those were and always will be proper governmental functions. The trouble in the last 10 years—the folly for which all the folks are now paying in point stamps, and ration stamps, in high prices and black markets—is not the price of soil conservation, and flood control, and erosion prevention. It is the price of the grievous mistakes, the deceptions, the miscalculations, the maladministration, and the conniving of those who would change our Government into a Communist dictatorship or a Fascist dictatorship—those connivers and plotters and conspirators who used soil conservation and flood control and erosion prevention as a cover-up and as an excuse to try to put the American farmer into a strait jacket; to handcuff and leg-iron him, and keep the keys in the political bureaus at Washington. That is where the damage was done; that is how the damage was done; that is the damage the people are paying for in privations, scarcities, point pricing, rationing, black markets, high prices and insolent regimentation and bossism by the O. P. A.—the same O. P. A. that a committee of the Congress within the last week has found far exceeded its legal powers and authority, distorted the directions of the Congress and usurped controls to which it was not entitled.

These experimentalists, these termites who were gnawing away at the pillars of Americanism and the foundations of the Constitution under the guise of setting up a planned economy, never seemed to think or to realize, as the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, recently pointed out, that "No one ever went hungry on a surplus." Instead, their great slogan was the "ever-normal granary." The tragedy was that under the Wallaces and the Hopkinses and the Tugwells, the ever-normal granary was allowed to be a granary which went empty in our first year of the war.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said by some bureaucrats that the American farmer is never satisfied. That is true, and it is that spirit of always demanding something sounder and better that has made America the greatest Nation in the world; that has made the American Government the greatest government in the world; that has put American living levels higher than any other in the world; that has given America the best wages and working conditions ever achieved in the world. If the American farmer had been satisfied, we would still be living in the days of the oxcart, the squirrel rifle, the ax and the hoe. The American farmer never will be satisfied so long as there is anything wrong with his Government or his country that he believes can be rectified by common sense and common effort. One thing the American farmer has been satisfied with, very satisfied, indeed, is our American Constitution and our American Constitutional republican form of government. I can tell you something else the American farmer has been vastly satisfied with, and that is the Bill of Rights.

It was only when a bunch of plotting politicians, scheming revolutionists, and starry-eyed theorists undertook to make the American farm and the American farmer over, and to jam him into a planned economy in which the Bill of Rights would be but an empty phrase, and the Constitution an outworn form, that the farmer began to fight back and demand that tinkering with his business and his way of life by irresponsible bureaucrats such as the fellow who advised the farmers to take the shoes off their horses at night to save metal, cease.

We are asking the American farmer today to help win the war, and to help save the peace by producing more and more and ever more goods and fibers. The American farmer will not fail his country if he is given half a chance, and anything like a fair deal, while he sweats and toils to serve his fellow men. But the American farmer will never consent to be a peasant farmer; to be a serf tied to the land; to be regimented for years after the war; to be made the tool and pawn of politicians plotting for places of power in world politics, as they plotted for places of power in American politics.

The American farmer will never consent to these New Deal schemers using the American economy—and wrecking the American economy—in their postwar world plots for some kind of an American socialized imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the students of affairs in the United States are convinced that the American farmers are turning back to the Republican Party to rescue this Nation from a clique, the members of which are more concerned with exploiting world affairs for their own purposes than in conducting our Government for the benefit of all the people.

It occurs to me at the moment that it has been four score years ago that Abraham Lincoln stood on that crude platform at Gettysburg and, out of the wealth of his wisdom as a man of the soil, said:

> Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.
>
> Now we are engaged in a great civil war; testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. * * *
>
> That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, 80 years from that distant scene among the hills of Pennsylvania, we are again engaged in a great war—a great world war—to determine whether this Nation can continue to endure under God, whether it shall have a new birth of freedom after this war, and whether it shall be perpetuated as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and not perish from the earth.

Bombing Raid Over the Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. W. L. White, Jr., of 181 Madison Avenue,

Clifton, N. J., in my district, is a freckle-faced tail gunner on a Martin bomber B–26, commonly described as a Marauder, in the Three Hundred and Twenty-third Bombing Group, Four Hundred and Fifty-fifth Bombing Squadron, somewhere in England.

Today I present a portion of a letter Sergeant White recently sent his father, W. L. White, Sr., describing one of his experiences in a bombing raid over the continent. It is as exciting as it is inspirational.

I am indebted to Ed Reardon, popular columnist of the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News, for bringing this letter to my attention.

Tomorrow I shall present copy of a letter Sergeant White wrote the father of one of his comrades, a 22-year-old Kansas farm boy, "just another top gunner," who was killed in action in a mission over France.

The letter follows:

Then the flak really began, and the freckled-face gunner didn't like flak—and a guy can't fight back at the stuff—and he felt that ugly, shivering sensation start in the backs of his legs and end up in the pit of his stomach. He rocked from side to side in his tiny compartment, taking the bounce with his shoulders as the plane convulsed in violent evasive action.

The flak burst close in the formation, black and businesslike, and it "har-oomphed" like an old man coughing in his sleep. The gunner huddled within heavy flying clothes and flak suit, rolled back and forth and warily watched the skies. He watched the large formation, behind, plowing doggedly through the black cloud residue of anti-aircraft explosives; fresh bursts appeared in the cloud like thrown-up handfuls of Smith Bros. cough drops, and around his own ship the freckled tail gunner saw and heard the flak viciously punching at the weaving, feinting medium bombers.

Finally the formation banked into its final run while the bellies of all the ships yawned in unison as the bomb bay doors opened. Now the evasive action ceased; now the pilot's nerves must be of steel as he holds a steady course for the bombing run. Cold turkey for flak, thought the gunner, and the flak did seem to increase—close and tense. Every few seconds the plane shuddered and rocked a little as flak concussions and fragments hit home. Noise and vibration increased because of the open bomb bay doors. Following a sharp lurch and a distinct "splat", someone rather gayly yelled over the intercom—"Anyone see any daylight showing through?" The bombardier's voice came through, strangely clear despite the rasping interference in earphones, "Hold it steady, skipper, yeah. Right about like that—'good'—oops—just a hair to the right—one skinny blond hair to the right—that's it!" A short pause, then, "O. K. boys, there they go." Bombs away!

Some of the noise diminished as the bomb bay doors closed, then it hit; the plane grunted with the impact. "Easy boys," came the pilot's reassuring voice, "right engine. I don't know how badly, but bad, I think! I'm going to feather the propeller—hold everything!"

The tail gunner saw smoke pouring past his left window. It trailed straight back in a slightly wavy ribbon. He thought it looked nice—sort of graceful, fluid-like. He watched the bombs tumble out of the planes in the rear formations. He remembered it was Sunday and thought that a lot of Sunday dishes were going to be broken that day. And then he noticed that his ship was dropping away from formation, and he began to get scared for the first time.

The Spitfires hovering around overhead, and behind saw it drop back too, and about six came in close to escort the straggler. Like swallows, thought the tail gunner, lovely, lovely swallows flitting and gliding in and out. Slowly, but very positively, they were dropping back and losing altitude. The ship was beginning to vibrate, causing a great many little noises that combined to make anonymous roar—ammunition in the tinny racks rattled loudly, loose parts on the machine-guns and windows rattled, too, as did tool boxes and other unfastened articles.

When the top turret gunner's voice suddenly screamed in the tail gunner's earphones, nothing was distinguished except, "fighters" and "two o'clock." The freckled tail gunner's pinched face peered out of his left window and his hands tightened on the machine gun grips. The fighter, as it went past was just a streak, and the gunner's fingers tightened on the triggers partly through instinct and partly from surprise. He saw his tracers sink into the Focke-Wulf across the nose and wing. Two Spitfires flashed by on the fighter's tail; all three planes were so close and the interval so constant that they looked tied together.

A short while later the two Spitfires spiraled lazily up again, looking like indignant hens who had just chased an enemy out of their chicken house. The English Channel was now in sight.

The tail gunner wondered, in a detached sort of way, if the water in the Channel was very cold that day. A detached sort of way until the increased vibration and noise made him realize again their position. But it was strange how he thought of the smell of burning leaves in the fall—back in Jersey; and how, when he was a kid in grammar school, he used to walk up his street on Saturday mornings and smell that smoke and see the misty air and the near-naked trees through the mist. He used to say the trees were stripped down to their shorts about then.

The smoke past his left window was heavier and it poured back with more body to it because of the lower, warmer altitude. He heard the left engine cough once—not exactly a cough, but rather a faint clearing of its throat, but that was bad enough. And elm trees like tall, graceful, haughty women—selfish, too, for aren't they the last to grow leaves in the spring and the first to lose them in the fall? Funny, trees have personalities.

The vibration had now increased so that it shook the tail gunner. His face was white and scared and pinched, and his freckles stood out like warts. Why these thoughts racing through his mind?—pictures. A desire to eat grapes, those big purple ones; should have sketched that old fellow in London; and reading Dickens when he was a kid and feeling the tears well up in his eyes over Little Dorrit and Oliver Twist. And the time he found himself caught on a ledge in the Paterson mountains. Just couldn't reach that handhold and couldn't retreat—and would God forgive a foolish 11-year-old if he fell and killed himself?

The Channel was cold-looking down below. They were all alone except for the few Spits that hung around, ever watchful, yet helpless to help. They held altitude well, but always they were dropping steadily.

The smoke no longer poured past the left window, but the vibration was worse. The plane now bumped and stumbled along—and a prayer was in the minds of all the silent crew. All waited for the pilot's order for ditching in the Channel.

When the tail gunner first began to sing he startled himself by hearing his own voice in his earphones. He saw that his knee had been pressing the interphone switch, but someone else began to hum the same tune. So the tail gunner pressed his intercommunication switch and sang the words slowly and quietly at first and then increasing in volume:

"Onward Christian soldiers,
Marching as to war."

Two other voices started to hum and gradually stumbled into the almost forgotten words—

"With the cross of Jesus
Going on before."

The vibration seemed to gather a certain rhythm; the rattle of ammunition racks became a tintinnabulation. The rest of the crew joined in, slowly, hesitantly at first, then full strength—

"Christ the Royal Master
Heads against the foe."

All the voices rose, strangely clear—strangely beautiful—and the usual interference and crackling over the wires was absent. The noise of the ship synchronized with the voices, combined to make a majestic symphony.

"Forward into battle
See His banners go."

The interphone switch was now in the gunner's hand. His whole body grew, swelled in strength. Tears ran down his pinched, freckled face, but he was grinning a huge victorious grin—and tears ran down his cheeks into the corner of his mouth.

Their ship was a great roaring tabernacle racing onward and downward. The vibration and engine thunder was the greatest organ pealing a mighty anthem:

"Onward Christian soldiers
Marching on to war,
With the cross of Jesus
Going on before."

The pilot's voice, usually quiet and clear, broke into the silence that followed. "England, right below us, kids. * * * we're in * * *." A small silence then, "O. K., let's have the second verse," and he started:

"Like a mighty army
Moves the Church of God!"

Americans Resent De Valera's Refusal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are very much upset by the refusal of the Eire Government to accede to the request of our Government to remove the German and Japanese diplomatic representatives for the safety of our armed forces.

Typical of the way the American people feel about this matter, I am submitting herewith an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of March 17, 1944, entitled "Hard-Headed De Valera":

HARD-HEADED DE VALERA

The things which the United States has at stake in this war are so important that this Nation, for the present and the future, can no longer regard as its friends those nations which give aid and comfort to its enemies.

In respect to Eire, the traditional Irish quarrel with the British, in which Irish persistency won first the indulgence and later the active aid of this country, is now of secondary importance. The Eire Government holds to its distrust, even its actual enmity, toward the Government of London, but now it is the safety of American troops which is endangered by De Valera's stubbornness. The Eire Government has been duly notified of the circumstance. If it now persists in the sort of neutrality which permits its territory to be used as a spy post by the Germans and Japanese it will have forfeited not only the sympathy but the possibility of future support of its aspirations.

The present situation is obviously insupportable. In the British Isles the United States has mustered, and continues to muster, great forces for the forthcoming invasion of Hitler's Europe. Military security demands that the fringes of the camp be cleared of spies. In the capital of neutral Eire the German and Japanese legations, carrying far larger staffs than the nominal importance of the posts would justify, remain open for business. Since Eire is cut off from commerce with Axis territories and since there are few, if any, Axis nationals resident there, the business of these legations can be nothing other than spying upon the Allied forces in England and North Ireland. Eire permits these legations to continue and allows German and Japanese attachés to move at will about the country where, almost with the naked eye, a spy can overlook the camps of our Army and make a record of military and ship movements. This sort of neutrality is not the sort that this country has a right to expect from a nation and a people which have received so much aid as well as sympathy from our Government and our people.

The southern Irish are still fighting Cromwell, who has been dead nearly 300 years. They are still fighting the Tudors and the Stuarts, the last of whom passed to his reward even earlier. They are still tilting at the windmills of British imperialism, which for centuries has refrained from wiping out the snarling obstruction in Ireland and which at last gave the Irish the independence they confused with freedom. But what is of more importance right now is that actually, if not ostensibly, covertly if not openly, they are fighting America and Americans.

Eire has played a paradoxical role in this war. Its neutrality has been possible only because first the British and then the British and the Americans have guarded it. Eire's position forced the British and Americans to divert a great force to Northern Ireland where it must be maintained so as to be ready to defend Eire should Hitler invade that country. Eire's gratitude for all these services, for the century-old support of the American Government and the American people, has consisted of making it as difficult as possible for these protective measures to be maintained. Now it has come to the fact that Eire's position has opened a dangerous threat to the Allied invasion of Europe and to the safety of the American troops moved up to participate in that invasion.

There are abundant proofs that every advantage has been taken by the Germans and Japs of the espionage facilities afforded by Eire's neutrality. American troops have reported that even in Northern Ireland, where Irish traitors are plentiful and where operatives of the ostensibly outlawed Irish Republic Army filter across the border from Eire in large numbers, there have been innumerable evidences of contact between spies ashore and German submarines and aircraft. Beacons maintained by Eire along the Irish Channel enabled the Nazi raiders to get their bearings and easily locate targets, such as Coventry, Liverpool, and Belfast. The point may be well made that Eire's neutrality has served only the Germans and to a lesser extent the Japs. This is the sort of treatment Eire offers its friends.

The demand going from Washington that Eire's spy holes be closed originated with General Eisenhower, who carries the responsibility for the Allied invasion of Europe and for the preservation of the lives of the American troops under his command. It is a logical and reasonable demand, and the most extreme measures to support it would be justified. Mr. De Valera and his Government should take notice that previous assurances against "invasion" of Eire by American troops could not in logic be absolute. In effect, Eire is now compromising the safety of the American cause and endangering the lives of American soldiers. If there is no way of ending that condition short of military invasion, it may be believed that the temper of the American people would sanction that extreme measure.

Obviously, our Government will try all experiences short of shooting, and the closing down of the lucrative trade which Eire has enjoyed may perhaps awaken the Irish people to the folly and venality of the present course of their Government. If the Irish people as well as their Government are so foolish as to believe that they can continue to maintain a spy hole from which enemy agents can overlook our movements and continue to keep going lights by which the enemy can see to assault us, they have a bitter awakening coming. This country has been sympathetic toward Irish independence. We have gone almost to the point of governmental representations to Great Britain in Ireland's behalf, and heads of our Government have in times past exerted every pressure to the same end. Vast funds were raised in this country to support De Valera in the final stages of the bloodless revolution which produced the independent status of Eire. But sympathy and affection can be worn out in time. That time has arrived. The case demands action. Either Eire throws out the Jap and German spies or stands the consequences. Whether blockade or more extreme measures will be necessary to bring Prime Minister De Valera to face realities is for him to decide.

Total Conscription for War Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of resolutions adopted by Local No. 252, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, urging total conscription of all men, machines, material, and money with national service from all and profits to none.

This resolution is unique because of the source from which it comes. Members of Congress have been flooded with telegrams, resolutions, and demands from labor organizations opposing total conscription.

The communication which I received is under the seal of the local, and is as follows:

LOCAL NO. 252,
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
Ann Arbor, Mich., March 20, 1944.

Representative E. C. MICHENER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This resolution was adopted by local union No. 252 (I. B. E. W.) at our regular meeting, March 8, 1944:

"Whereas for some Americans to gain wealth and economic advantage in war prices, war profits, and war wages, through the spilling of the blood of other Americans, is not in keeping with our traditions of liberty and justice for all; and

"Whereas there are powerful enemies of labor who are using the national emergency as a guise, under cover of which they would strike at the very heart of organized labor; and

"Whereas the internal strife which would inevitably result were we to strike back at these same forces in the conventional manner, would only hinder the Victory program and help our enemies, and realizing that to let those same forces continue this subterfuge could only lead to disruption of our productive processes and to ultimate chaos and thereby help to establish the very conditions at home which we are seeking to destroy abroad:

"Therefore, in our earnest desire to be free of all internal conflict, to establish unity, and to coordinate all our productive capacities to the fullest extent, this organization urges total conscription of all men, machines, material, and money with national service from all and profits to none."

We are sending you this resolution because we wish to express ourselves regarding the manpower-shortage problem. We believe with the adoption of this resolution our road to victory would be shortened considerably.

Yours respectfully,

C. O. DOCKTER,
Recording Secretary.

The Absorptive Capacity of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

THE ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY OF PALESTINE

(By Arthur Lowrie, of American Zionist Emergency Council)

COMPARATIVE ESTIMATES

1. Palestine, west of the Jordan, comprises an area of 10,000 square miles. It is characterized, despite its small size, by great diversity of climate, soils, altitude, and rainfall, and offers possibilities for many types of agriculture and varied economic development. Its population today is about 1,500,000.

2. Belgium, Holland, and Sicily are each of approximately the same size as Palestine. The population of Sicily, mountainous and without important industries, is 4,000,000; that of Belgium and Holland each, over 8,000,000. It is clear that area alone does not determine the absorptive capacity of a country; its material resources and the energy, skill, and character of its inhabitants must also be taken into account.

3. Archaeological and historical evidence indicates that Palestine, in Graeco-Roman times, supported a population of 3,000,000 to 4,000,000, or more than twice the present total. It is reasonable to suppose that with the aid of modern technology that figure will not only be reached once more but considerably exceeded.

AGRICULTURAL POSSIBILITIES

4. Increase in the agricultural population depends on an extension of irrigation. The present irrigated area of Palestine can be

increased at least 10 times. This is the conclusion reached a decade ago by 2 American experts (Professor Strahorn and Dr. F. Julius Fohs) who confirmed an earlier study by the late Dr. Elwood Mead, former United States Commissioner of Reclamation. At present less than 100,000 acres (1½ percent of the total area of Palestine) are irrigated.

5. Since the date of the above study, further new and abundant sources of water have been found in the subsoil of Palestine. An estimate of 1,000,000 acres of irrigable land must today be regarded as conservative. Development of such an area would make possible the doubling or even trebling of the present agricultural population.

THE NEGEB

6. For lack of water, the entire southern half of Palestine, known as the Negeb, is almost unpopulated. Archaeological remains throughout the Negeb bear witness to partial irrigation and marked prosperity in that region in ancient times. Sir John Hope Simpson, who in 1930 investigated agricultural possibilities in Palestine on behalf of the British Government, reported that "Given the possibility of irrigation, there is practically an inexhaustible supply of cultivable land in the Beersheba district (Negeb)." It is now clear that irrigation waters can be brought to the Negeb from northern Palestine, much as they are brought from the Colorado River to southern California. Plans for the irrigation of the Negeb along these lines are part of a comprehensive irrigation scheme of the type of the T. V. A. now being worked out for Palestine.

INDUSTRY

7. Palestine industries before the First World War comprised only a few handicrafts. By 1933 production had risen to $20,000,000, and by 1942 to $80,000,000. Today, Palestine produces an astonishing range of articles, including metal, textile, and chemical products, precision instruments, electrical equipment, machine tools and parts, cement, glass, and many specialized products. In addition, the Palestine Potash Co. has begun to extract the vast and hitherto untapped mineral wealth of the Dead Sea, whose products may well serve as the basis of a great chemical industry.

8. Jewish skilled workers and technicians have already proved the possibilities of developing flourishing industries in Palestine, based on local resources as well as imported raw materials. It is a commonplace of economics that many great industries have developed far from their sources of supply, and Palestine's central geographical position gives it easy access to raw materials.

9. Though Palestine lacks coal, great quantities of fuel from the oil fields of Iraq reach Haifa, the Mediterranean terminal of the Mosul pipe line. Moreover, plans are now under way for a great hydroelectric development made possible by the remarkable rift formation of the Jordan Valley and the Dead Sea, dropping from 3,000 feet above to 1,300 feet below sea level. On a small scale this rift formation has already been utilized for the production of light and power by the Palestine Electric Corporation.

PALESTINE, A TRADE CENTER

10. Palestine's geographical position is also bound to be a factor of prime importance in determining its economic future. Located as it is at the crossroads of 3 continents, Palestine is rapidly becoming a commercial center for the whole of the Near East. In the words of Prof. Arnold J. Toynbee, it has "a position in the twentieth century world * * * not incomparable to the position of Great Britain as an entrepot between Europe and the Americas." Already Haifa is the third largest harbor in the eastern Mediterranean. A second modern port has been built in Tel Aviv, a city of 200,000, where 30 years ago there were merely sand dunes.

PALESTINE'S BALANCE OF TRADE

11. Coincident with the growth of Jewish immigration and settlement, Palestine's trade figures have consistently shown a considerable excess of imports over exports. In the normal course of events dependence upon large capital imports would be dangerous as involving an increase in the external debt. But the case of Palestine is unique in that the great bulk of capital imported is provided by the immigrants themselves or by Zionist funds from abroad. As the Palestine Royal Commission pointed out:

"The most singular feature in the economy of Palestine is the vast amount of capital which has been invested in the country, for which no remittance for interest and sinking fund are required. This feature sharply differentiates the Jewish national home from other communities which have been created by a process of colonization and are burdened by charges on the capital obtained from overseas for their development."

A SELF-SUPPORTING SOCIETY

12. On the basis of this capital influx, assets of a permanent and constructive character in the shape of new farms and factories have been and are being created, and will provide the basis for a self-supporting society. It is significant in this connection that an increasing number of the Jewish settlements founded with the help of Zionist funds, have begun to make repayments out of income on the moneys originally borrowed by them. During the years 1922 to 1928 the sum total of these repayments averaged only about $2,000 a year. In 1939 alone they reached the sum of nearly $400,000.

CONCLUSION

13. As long ago as 1930, when Palestine was far less developed than it is today, Lord Samuel, after 5 years' experience as High Commissioner, said:

"I am confident that with proper agricultural and industrial development Palestine could * * * support a population of 3,000,000."

On the basis of the experience of the last 13 years and of the economic possibilities above indicated, Lord Samuel's estimate now appears conservative. It has become clear that Palestine may well be able to maintain a population of at least 5,000,000.

14. Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, Assistant Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Bureau, who in 1939 spent 8 months in a thorough study of land use in the countries of the Near and Middle East on behalf of the United States Government, has the following to say on the absorptive capacity of Palestine:

"I shall not attempt to estimate the final absorptive capacity of Palestine. That would be impossible, for the absorptive capacity of any country is a dynamic and expanding conception. It changes with the ability of the population to make the maximum use of its land, and to put its economy on a scientific and productive basis. It is clear, however, that there is ample proof of the assertion that full utilization of the Jordan Valley depression for reclamation and power will in time make possible the absorption of at least 4,000,000 Jewish refugees from Europe, in addition to the 1,800,000 Arabs and Jews already in Palestine and Trans-Jordan."

15. The experience of the last 25 years has proved that Jewish immigration and economic activity have led to a marked increase in the numbers and well-being of the Arab population. As Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, Secretary of State for the Colonies in the Chamberlain government, stated in the House of Commons on November 24, 1938:

"The Arabs cannot say that the Jews are driving them out of their country. If not a single Jew had come to Palestine after 1918, I believe that the Arab population of Palestine today would still have been roundabout the 600,000 figure (instead of over 1,000,000 as at present), at which it had been stable under the Turkish rule. It is because the Jews who have come to Palestine bring modern health services and other advantages that Arab men and women who would have been dead are alive today, that Arab children who would never have drawn breath have been born and grow strong."

16. Repeatedly our conception of the absorptive capacity of Palestine has had to be revised upward because of the achievements brought about by the combined pressure of Jewish need and of Jewish determination to rebuild the ancient homeland of the Jewish people. We believe that the prospects held out in this memorandum are, if anything, an understatement of the possibilities.

Expenditures for the Farm-Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief analysis of the expenditure of Federal funds for farm-labor purposes last year. I fear that not enough consideration has yet been given to the plight of small family-sized farmers who have been employing one, two, or three farm hands in their annual agricultural operations. I trust more consideration will be given this type of farmer in the future:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, March 16, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR LINDLEY: I am writing in reply to your letter of February 28, 1944. The funds appropriated under Public Law 45 for the farm-labor program last year were utilized as follows:

1. Approximately $4,700,000 was used by the State extension services under contract with the War Food Administration to recruit and make maximum utilization of all possible labor resources within the individual States. This included recruitment, placement, training, supervision, transportation, and housing of intrastate workers where these services were required in order to solve the needs for farm labor.

2. When all possible efforts to supply needed labor within a State do not fulfill the demands, labor is recruited in other States or from foreign countries. During 1943 approximately $12,600,000 was utilized for the recruitment, transportation, housing, and the furnishing of other necessary services to such interstate and foreign workers who were required to augment the local labor resources within the several States. A complete statement of the types of work, the areas of employment by States, the approximate wages earned, the sources of recruitment, and other related data of interstate and foreign workers transported during the period from January 1, 1943, to October 30, 1943, is included in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives beginning on page 109, if you are interested in more detail on this particular part of the program.

3. The administrative expenses under this appropriation during 1943, which covers all

the expenses of the program at the Federal level at the seat of government, approximated $373,600.

Approximately 45,000 prisoners of war were employed in various agricultural operations in 28 States during 1943. The majority of them were used in the Southern States, where they helped to pick cotton, shake peanuts, harvest rice and sugarcane.

The foreign agricultural workers were used by farmers in 31 States. They were employed by both large and small farmers, in connection with a wide variety of commodities, including vegetables, fruits, field crops, sugar beets, cotton, guayule, etc. A detailed statement of the types of work performed by the foreign workers is included in the House hearings on the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944, starting on page 109.

Both prisoners of war and foreign agricultural workers were employed by farmers at the rates prevailing in the locality in which they were employed. These prevailing rates were established by State extension directors on the recommendation of county farm labor advisory committees composed of local representatives of the War Food Administration and local farm leaders. No information is available from this source as to the average earnings of prisoners of war. The average hourly earnings of the foreign workers were as follows: Jamaicans, 55 cents; Bahamians, 45 cents; and Mexicans, 61 cents.

I hope I have given you the information that you desired.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Let's Face the Race Question!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Langston Hughes, author and poet at Town Hall, New York, at America's Town Meeting of the Air under the auspices of Town Hall, in cooperation with the Blue Network Co., Inc., broadcast on Thursday, February 17, 1944, over station WJZ and the coast-to-coast hookup of the Blue Network:

Some people bring up the doggonest arguments against doing something concrete toward solving the Negro question. Even some liberals declare the South would rather fight another Civil War than abolish the Jim Crow car and its attendant indecencies. Others profess a profound fear of intermarriage, as if permitting Negroes to vote in the poll-tax States would immediately cause whites and Negroes to rush together to the altar. Others, like David Cohn in the January Atlantic, say there is no solving of the race problem at all, evidently forgetting the examples of Brazil and the Soviet Union.

What puzzles me, an American Negro, is how we—and by "we" I mean all Americans—can put forth such profoundly broad and human war aims and can send men to fight in defense of those aims thousands of miles away to New Guinea or Italy, yet find it so difficult to put even the simplest of those principles into practice regarding Negro-white relationships here at home. We are perfectly willing to bear down—and with good reason—on Hitler and the Japs, dying across two oceans in defense of our ideals, yet unwilling to bear down on our own railroad brotherhoods and those railway companies that refuse to let American Negro firemen work on American railroads, even in this crisis of manpower shortage. We are perfectly willing to send tanks and planes to our heroic British, Russian, and Chinese allies around the world, but unwilling to provide more than inadequate Jim Crow cars or back seats in busses south of Washington for our own colored soldiers. We even permit returned heroes from the battle fronts to be so Jim Crowed.

When I say "we," let me remind you again that I mean the whole United States, North and South. But in discussing the Negro-white problem, there is no denying that although it is a national problem, its focus is in the South. In the South Jim Crow is legal, as Hitler's anti-Jewish laws are legal in Germany. In the South lynchers go unpunished. In the South, unfortunately, the spirit of the Ku Klux Klan still lives and spreads from there into northern industrial centers causing hate strikes, riots, and enemy provocations.

That is why the race problem is a pressing national problem now—because we are fighting a war in which men are dying. Those of us on the civilian front have no right to hold up war production and thus increase death on the battle lines by walking out rather than work beside Negroes on the production lines. Nor have we any right to undermine the morale of Negro soldiers by segregating them in our armed forces, and by continuing to Jim Crow them and their civilian brothers in public places, in war industries vital to the public welfare, and as workers or passengers on public conveyances.

Please note that I said "public places." As to social equality, nowhere in the whole civilized world, so far as I know, is anybody forced to invite anybody else to dinner in his own home, or dance with anybody undesirable, or marry anybody he doesn't wish to marry—nor should it be so—if that is what reactionary objectors to democratic rights for Negroes mean by social equality. To me it seems that individual social relationships have nothing to do with the broad problems of civil, legal, labor, and suffrage rights for all Americans. Some people seem to insist on confusing the issues.

"Would you want your daughter to marry a Negro?" is a stock question. That that Negro might not want to marry his daughter never seems to occur to the questioner. Or, suppose the Negro did? All the daughter has to say is, "No."

So let's face the race question frankly, without being afraid of each other. I can assure America its Negro citizens do not desire to rob its white citizens of any democratic rights. We merely wish, as Americans of long standing, those same rights. Since the race question affects not South or North alone but all of us, since it shames our war aims and embarrasses our relations with our colored allies in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, I feel that an over-all Federal program protecting the rights of all minorities, and educating all Americans to that effect, should be evolved.

It took Federal Order 8802 to open war industries to colored workers. John Temple Graves writes, "There was no need for this Federal interference in the Negro's behalf, and both the Negro and the war effort were helped." It took Federal housing to clean up slums, to some extent, in poor Negro and white neighborhoods all over the Nation. It took the National Labor Relations Board to protect the bargaining right of labor, white and Negro. It took the National Youth Administration Act to break down existing community patterns in regard to work for Negro youths—formerly limited in many localities to employment as bootblacks, maids, and elevator boys. The N. Y. A. gave them, often for the first time, a chance to learn and work at some form of skilled or semi-skilled labor heretofore denied them.

Some of our States have no intention of doing anything about racial decency. Anyway, almost 14,000,000 colored people should not be left to the short-sighted mercy of the same kind of State's rights that have acted so undemocratically in Congress of late regarding the soldier vote. That vote, by the way, some Congressmen have publicly declared, is a matter of white supremacy. White supremacy is one of Hitler's cornerstones. It has not helped him much. Certainly, it is a liability to a democracy. Negroes aside, as an example of what white supremacy does to white folks, consider the poll tax—which affects Maine as much as it does Georgia.

Democracy does not lose by sharing its privileges. It loses by denying them. In ratio to that denial, it approaches the very Fascist patterns we are fighting against abroad. "Free peoples cannot afford the luxury of minority oppression," Ward Shepard says in Common Ground. Let's leave that vice to the master races. It is no fun fighting and hating all the time.

Politics Still Grips Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Politics Still Grips Capital," by Robert L. Norton, which appeared in the March 19, 1944, issue of the Boston Sunday Post:

POLITICS STILL GRIPS CAPITAL—WITH THE WAR EFFORT ENGAGING THEIR ENERGIES, CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT ATTEND TO OWN INTERESTS

(By Robert L. Norton)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—There are many facets to the scene in the Nation's Capital today, all of them fascinating to the thoughtful observer, but the over-all impression is that of mighty and irresistible effort and energy. One senses and shares the evidence of the concentrated power of the Nation at war and there is something lacking in any American who fails to react with intensified pride in consciousness of his precious heritage of citizenship.

At the White House, in the Halls of Congress, in the huge office buildings of the Government, with their thousands of employees working at feverish pace, there is an atmosphere of cold determination and calm confidence that the war is certain to be won. And there is equal assurance that the future of America is secure.

To the casual observer the picture may be one of confusion. Coming from other sections of the country, where the war tempo is more restrained, many persons are heard to comment that Washington is a madhouse. On the surface this may appear to be true, but actually this seeming madness is pretty well coordinated toward the accomplishment

of a common objective. These mad Americans, for the most part, feel an individual responsibility for their part in winning the war. And if the visitor is somewhat bewildered, the inhabitants, mostly new to Washington and coming from every part of the land, readily adapt themselves to conditions and soon learn to take things in stride.

WORST PART OF WAR YET TO COME

One cannot but think of the contrast with other great capitals, their public buildings and homes in ruins, the steady rain of death from the skies, the shattered bodies of their women and children, victims of the dreadful inhumanities of war, and above all the deep conviction that the future holds nothing for them but travail and hardship. It's an ugly contrast and for Americans whose hearts are filled with human sympathy and tolerance, it can bring no great satisfaction in their own good fortune, but instead a deep compassion for these stricken millions, a desire to alleviate their suffering, and a firm determination to prevent it from happening again, if this be humanly possible.

Living in our small towns, peaceful suburbs, or great cities, the war sometimes seems nothing more than an ugly dream, since the normal pursuits of many are not seriously disturbed. We have food, clothes, and shelter in sufficient measure, and above all a feeling of security. In most of our homes there is a vacant chair at the dinner table. There is a stirring apprehension in our hearts as to whether Dad or Johnny will come back from the war. Many families are soul-wracked because their boys have made the ultimate sacrifice, but as yet war has not taken a great toll of lives. The great clash of arms, once our power is unleashed in all its fury, is yet to come, and with it the inevitable spilling of blood. Until we are fully up against it, the full and horrible consequences of this war will not be realized.

BAD MISTAKES CERTAIN TO BE MADE

Washington is the center of the war effort in the sense that it is here that the vital decisions are made. The Federal Government becomes the dictator of the national economy and the authority of the States and local governments is for the time submerged in the necessity for unified and coordinated action. The daily lives of our people are to a great extent controlled through the edicts of the war agencies. Congress sits as the direct representatives of the people in defining policies. The strategy of war, upon which military success or failure depends, is determined by our general staff and the military representatives of our allies.

It is to Washington that the eyes and ears of the population are attuned in these critical times. The Capital, with all its complicated and various war agencies, is geared to the job of administering the war. Unless the Central Government, from the President down, gets this job done with a minimum of friction and a maximum of efficiency, then all our efforts in this vast country are of little avail toward the winning of the war.

To the minds of reasonable men it must be obvious that this is the toughest kind of a job. Bad mistakes are made. No person, however eminent, can claim infallibility and the percentage of human error is bound to be pretty large. Bickerings and jealousies are common enough, even among those who are highly placed in their responsibilities. Men of inferior ability are accorded authority, often of an arbitrary character, which they abuse or fail to measure up to. Greed, extortion, and self-interest show their ugly heads. Lust for power and partisan politics are ever present.

PRESENT TAX PROGRAM INADEQUATE

Many of the critics of the war would have better character if their own motives were free from suspicion, if they contributed more to its successful conclusion and broad purposes, rather than engaging in petty disputes and recrimination. There is a certain latitude of criticism which is difficult to define. Much of the criticism which we hear is pure cant. "Is it in destroying and pulling down that skill is displayed * * *? The shallowest understanding, the rudest hand, is more than equal to the task."

There are persons who disparage criticism on the ground that it is destructive of national unity. But on the whole and so far as Washington is concerned, it is a pretty good thing, more particularly when it is based on facts, as in the case of the excellent job done by the Truman committee. There have been plenty of reasons and justification for attacks upon the domestic conduct of the war. But it is our observation, in Washington and elsewhere, that all of us must recognize the tremendous work of organization done by our Army and Navy. Nothing like it has ever been seen. No army has ever been so well equipped. No such navy has ever existed on the face of the earth. The output of shipping and airplanes is far beyond the wildest dreams of 5 years ago. It is true that the war has cost astronomical sums of money up to date and that this spending has only begun. While we cannot hesitate at the spending of money or the fullest use of the resources of the Nation, nevertheless there is an enormous wastage. Our few economically minded statesmen should therefore be given a full hearing and attention from the taxpayers of the Nation.

Whatever the merits of the controversy over the President's veto of the tax bill, it is perfectly plain that the present program will not suffice unless the country is to go on indefinitely with borrowings and the piling up of a national debt which could ultimately result in breaking down of national credit and repudiation of debts.

BREACH WITH CONGRESS NOT HEALED

For the time being the tax bill will be out of the way until the next session of Congress. There were many reasons for the inadequacy of the present legislation, but chief among them were political considerations with the approach of the presidential election and the influence of high-power pressure groups. From this time on every measure in Congress must be tinged with politics. Even the President cannot be freed from the suspicion of playing politics if he is to run for a fourth term. If the President sets out to win a fourth term, in the very nature of things and as politics are organized in this country, he must have political considerations in mind, since political considerations are translated into terms of votes.

Those who hoped that peace and harmony between the Executive and Congress would be immediately restored after the assertion of independence by Congress on the Presidential veto of the tax bill are doomed to disappointment. It is true that Mr. Roosevelt has shown some signs of responding to the chastening influence of this historical rebuke, but Congress still has a chip on its shoulders.

Perhaps another test will develop should the President decide to veto the compromise effected on the soldiers' vote legislation. Whatever the merits of this legislation—and there are excellent arguments on both sides—the compromise represents the only agreement possible in this session. If the President vetoes the bill and his veto is sustained, then the 1942 law waiving the poll tax and registration requirements as conditions precedent to voting will remain as the only legislation on the statute books.

FAVOR SOLDIERS' VOTE COMPROMISE

With some of the States adhering to the constitutional limitations imposed by registration and poll taxes, there appears to be something in the contention that more of our armed forces would be able to vote under the compromise plan, since it specifically reasserts State control of voting regulations.

The argument for the Federal vote plan sponsored by the President and the chiefs of our armed forces was that because of the simplicity of administration it would allow the largest number of soldiers and sailors to vote. But at no time in the debates was there any clarification of the contention that the operation of the Federal plan was unconstitutional and that therefore with the prospects of electoral-vote contests the election might be thrown into the House. This is an important consideration, since it would be a catastrophe of no mean order if the election of the President were in doubt at a moment when we presumably will be approaching the climax of the war.

Beyond question, as in other legislation pending and in prospect, political and partisan considerations have influenced this legislation. The South stood out against waiving the poll tax because it adheres traditionally to this limitation upon suffrage. Republicans voted almost solidly for the compromise plan because they feared the Federal plan was a scheme to influence the bulk of the soldier vote for a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt. It is somewhat significant that Democratic Senators who are up for reelection voted 11 to 10 in favor of the compromise measure.

Future of the School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of every Member of the House to an omission in the exercise of our legislative responsibility which will surely plague every one of us if we fail to correct that omission. That omission is this: For the first time since 1935 we have failed to authorize assistance by the Federal Government in assisting communities in making available school lunches at no cost to needy children, or at reasonable cost to those who are able to pay. We have failed to do this for the year beginning July 1, 1944, even though we have seen a program develop during the current year in which the communities, under the stimulus of Federal contributions of surplus foods, have put up $2 for every dollar made available by the Federal Government. Every one of us should remember this: Unless we take further steps to remedy it, the responsibility for discontinuance of the school-lunch program will be on Members of this House.

We cannot permit this to happen. Our responsibility to every segment of the population is too great. Those of us who are interested in agriculture cannot permit this excellent means of making use of commodities bought for purposes of price support activities to be weakened. Currently many of us are concerned about the decline in the farm prices of

eggs. We cannot have effective price support if we do not have good outlets. School lunches can become a major outlet. Those of us who are concerned with maintaining adequate incomes to farmers in the post-war world cannot idly stand by and see one of the strongest means for maintaining ample domestic markets hampered after years have been spent in building it up. Moreover, we have been able to get urban support for agricultural programs because people have believed that there is a close relationship between agricultural and urban welfare. The school-lunch program helps farmers, it helps children in rural areas, it helps children in urban areas. If we kill this program on the ground that some of the money spent reaches farmers indirectly through the market instead of directly, we endanger wide public support of price-support programs. That must not happen.

Those of us who are interested in the welfare of American children and in having able-bodied children, regardless of their income, cannot permit this direct attack on the health and vigor of our children to go unchallenged. It would indeed be a strange commentary on our efforts in international cooperation if we should cast aside the school-lunch program in this country when our allies, partly with the aid of lend-lease foods, are providing adequate lunches for their school children because of their importance in the war and their importance to the future of their countries.

I have had occasion to look over letters about the school-lunch program. Many members have received the testimonies of school teachers, parents, and other civic bodies. Here are some excerpts from some such letters.

From Madison Ohio, the president of North Madison Parent-Teachers Association writes:

We indeed appreciate your letters pertaining to greater use of potatoes, cabbage, and eggs. It enabled us to know what we could do to help and it afforded an opportunity for some of the farmers to sell us their produce at reasonable prices, and they were appreciative of this opportunity to unload some of their surplus.

Our project is a "rural" school, the children traveling distances by bus, so you can appreciate what a hot lunch means to them. In past years, without your aid we have not been able to always serve a balanced meal, but this year we are able to give them a seven-point menu. We all belong to the "clean plate" brigade, and after serving the entire school our garbage won't fill a pint container. There is a noticeable decrease in absenteeism this year and increase in the weight of the pupils.

From Newton, Iowa, the superintendent of Newton public schools writes:

There was a need for over 2,000 women workers to replace men in the war-production scheme. Where both mother and father were working, one on one shift and one on the other, it was impossible to provide any type of regular lunches at home without seriously disrupting what little rest schedule there was for the one who was off duty. Women who tried to work under those conditions had to give it up. If they did not, the results of the attempt to make the adjustment showed up in their children's attitude and health. We started up again, therefore, our school-lunch program with the assistance of the Federal Government. It would have been impossible to do this without such assistance.

The schools have assumed this burden as part of their war job. It has meant extra hours of planning and tiresome accounting work to make the thing go. The subsidy which we get ranges from 7 to 9 cents a meal. Too many of the youngsters could not afford to pay for the meals, but the 7- to 9-cent subsidy takes care of free meals which are served to youngsters from homes which have been handicapped by a change in conditions and where youngsters have to have this food if they are going to grow. In an industrial city like this we have children whose parents are physically unable to work for them. The increased cost of living has meant tremendous burdens. Our children have to be taken care of, and the 9-cent subsidy has made it possible for us to include these children in the program and carry them along.

Long ago it looked as if we would have to close one of the schools where lunches were served, because of plumbing difficulties which occurred in the afternoon session. The announcement was made early in the afternoon that there would be no school the next day. When the repairs were made in time to announce that there would be school the following day, we expected disappointment on the part of the children, but instead the children were happy that they could return to school. It developed that many of them were glad because of the prospect of a hot lunch, which represented the only warm meal that the children in some of these homes had during the day.

There is a great deal of money spent for a lot of bureaus employing a large amount of office help that does not get anything done, but it seems to me that this particular division has gotten a tremendous amount done that has affected vitally the health of children and the war production in factories in communities like ours. This Federal subsidy has made it possible for the school to go ahead on a shoestring and do this job. Without a Federal subsidy of some type, we could not do it. We would just have to close up. It seems to me that in communities where this program is a vital one in war production, that some provision should be made for its continuance.

From Creston, N. C., a teacher writes:

The children were pale and much underweight. Since we are serving hot lunches they have gained from 1 to 6 pounds and doing much better work.

I feel that it is one of the greatest steps ever taken toward developing healthy boys and girls. I only hope the Members of Congress will be able to see the benefits derived and continue to give aid.

The principal of Pine Point Indian School, Ponsford, Minn., states:

I speak mildly if I say that I am pleased with the hot-lunch program. I am thrilled about it. Never in the history of my teaching (and the years are many) has anything so impressed me as this noon lunch here among these Indian children. To many, if not the most of them, this meal at noon is the only one they have all day. By this I do not mean that they are actually suffering from starvation as far as filling their little stomachs is concerned, but I do mean to say that they are starving for the right kind of food.

The most beautiful sight anyone might wish to see is our lunchroom filled with a hundred or more happy, hungry Indian children—eyes sparkling with just waiting to "dive in."

I do not hesitate to say the hot lunch is helping our children physically, morally, mentally, and spiritually.

A big salute to those who have made this hot-lunch project possible.

From Hobbs, Ind., a civic group writes the following:

Our homes are farm homes; however, our child needs this hot meal at noon due to the extremely long day. Leaving their homes early and returning late, usually with a hasty breakfast, and tired evening meal.

Eating together gives us a chance to teach social graces, reverence and thanks, sharing, courtesy, appreciation, etc.

The milk, too, is a step toward the balanced meal. Many of these farmers sell every drop of milk from a herd of cows. Children go without milk and butter.

How could funds be spent in any more profitable manner than building the youth of the Nation—through health?

The following statement was received from a parochial school in Arcadia, Wis.:

I believe that the greatest asset of America is the children growing up in millions of American homes. It is the responsibility of the American people to care for the health of these future Americans. Good health means greater enjoyment of life and greater resistance to disease. We have noticed that these school lunches mean less fatigue in work and play, it means more vigor and pep, a more attractive appearance, better thinking, and better emotional balance. We noticed that our children, now that we have been giving them a warm meal at noon, do much better work in the afternoon. More than all this it means optimum growth and development. I believe that this school-lunch program is the best investment America has made in the last decade especially in our rural schools. We are really building future America.

From Delano, Calif., a district superintendent of schools has written:

The attendance at the Fremont School cafeteria has tripled this year, because of the excellent meal we can serve for 10 cents with the Government aid. These children could not pay the actual cost of these meals.

The Cecil Avenue School pupils come from better homes for the most part, but many are children of working mothers and need a hot, nourishing meal. Cafeteria attendance at this school has increased about 80 percent this year.

We can't express how much we appreciate the help received from the War Food Administration. Without this, we would be forced to charge prices that would exclude the very children who need the food, or close our cafeterias.

This House had some debate on the school-lunch program a short time ago in which the opponents had a field day. I would urge every Member to read the RECORD of March 7, and I am asking for permission to extend my remarks in order to discuss and answer every argument made by the spokesmen who condemned this program.

Careful reading of the statements of opponents of the school-lunch program as expressed on the floor of this House on March 7, indicates that their opposition was generally based on one or more of the following:

First. That this is a problem of local and community responsibility and the Federal Government should not be "barging in."

Second. Much of the program is in rural areas, and it is not necessary to supply children with school lunches in rural areas since these areas produce their own food.

Third. Federal expenditures on school lunches increase the national debt and now is the time to economize.

Fourth. There are no agricultural surpluses now and there is no point in having a program using section 32 funds.

Fifth. There are no needy people now and, therefore, there is no excuse to continue a program that was urged in the depression.

Sixth. This is an effort to regiment individuals who should be left to their own devices.

What are the facts with respect to each one of these allegations?

First. Is it true that communities can and will take care of this problem themselves without the aid of the Federal Government? Every member who will discuss this matter with local citizens will find that this is not true. I do not need to remind the Representatives from many of the States that their resources have not been adequate to provide lunches for all who need them and cannot pay for them. I do not need to remind Representatives from every urban area that the local funds available to communities are not always sufficient. Where they are sufficient, there is no reason why the Federal funds should be made available. The Federal contribution depends upon the requests for assistance by the local community and their own certification of need. That should be sufficient protection to all of us that the funds will not be spent unless and except where need of Federal assistance exists.

The reports from the War Food Administration indicate that on the average for every dollar the Federal Government is spending, local and State authorities are putting up the equivalent of $2 to cover all expenses of the school-lunch program. They are generally matching the food expenditures alone, dollar for dollar, and in addition are providing the funds for cooks, dishes, and other phases of the completely local management.

Second. What of the charge that this is an unwise expenditure since most of the children are in rural areas where they should be able to obtain their own food? First, it is correct that of the schools which are benefited under the War Food Administration program, not less than two-thirds of the children are from rural and farm areas. The reason for this is quite obvious. Since the Federal aid is offered where the need is greatest and in accordance with requests for aid, most of the applications come from rural schools.

Under the school-lunch program food is bought in the community from the total funds, including the Federal funds made available for the program. Estimates submitted by the War Food Administration indicated that about 26 percent of the total funds were for dairy products, 22 percent for vegetables, 17 percent for fruits, 13 percent for meats, 8 percent for eggs, 8 percent for cereals, and 4 percent for fats and oils. Many of these commodities were produced in the area in which they were used, but many others came from farm regions all over the United States.

It is unfortunately true that a large part of our low-income families are in rural areas. The fact that they are producers of cotton, wheat, dairy products, and other farm products does not alone make it possible for them or their families to buy or consume all of the food that they need for good health and truly adequate nourishment.

Third. What of the charge that the national debt is increasing and, therefore, we should economize and not spend this money?

Everyone agrees that there must not be any unnecessary spending of funds. But no man should risk the security of his country by arbitrarily striking off an item which has much to do with our own strength and future welfare. Fifty million dollars is a great deal of money. What it is enabling this Government to do is to give communities an average of about 6 cents per child for six to eight million children. From those who can pay, an additional 10 to 15 cents is obtained. For those who cannot pay, the same meal is served free and without any discrimination. It is no contribution to the war or the peace to cast off a worthwhile expenditure in the name of false economy. We have appropriated in this Congress hundreds of millions—in fact hundreds of billions of dollars—for many purposes. I can think of few regular or war emergencies in which the problem of national strength and future security is more at stake than our decision to help communities provide adequate food for school children.

Fourth. What of the point made that there are no agricultural surpluses and therefore there is no need to have a program? The term "surplus" is a tricky one. Farmers can have more of a products than can be sold at a reasonable price at the same time that city people cannot get all they would like to obtain. Every member with agricultural constituents knows that even now we have had and are likely to have many commodity situations in which the farmers will not obtain the price and incomes necessary for continuous production without market support by the Federal Government. Currently the Federal Government is supporting the marketing of potatoes, cabbage, eggs, beets, beans, and there will be others. Some may criticize the Government for not doing a more-effective job. I have done so myself. But certainly Congress will be criticized if it destroys or hampers the outlets which must be developed and maintained if price support is to be successful. It is an elementary matter that neither this Congress nor the country could or would tolerate any activity by which prices were supported while food that could be used was allowed to be dumped or destroyed.

School lunches are a major outlet for price-supported commodities. There has been some unfortunate interpretation of how much of our appropriation is spent for price-support activities under the school-lunch program as it is now operated. The figures, as they have been supplied by the Department, show that for 1943–44 egg and vegetable expenditures are expected to total $25,900,000. About $5,000,000 are being spent on commodities directly by the Government and $21,000,000 are being spent on similar commodities by the local schools using their own and Federal funds. In other words, the total price support expenditure for these commodities which currently require aid is equal to about 60 percent of the Federal expenditures on school lunches for the current fiscal year.

The appropriation, it is said, is getting the Federal Government permanently into a local activity and if extended will involve even larger appropriations. Let us remind ourselves again that the local communities themselves determine whether they wish to participate. The local communities and States are putting up more for this kind of activity than ever before in their history. There may well be a time when no Federal assistance will be necessary, just as there might be a time when no local price support of agricultural production is necessary. But those times have not been reached yet. The true facts are that, with the assistance provided by Federal Government at a very, very nominal cost, local groups are in fact providing more financial assistance than ever before in our history.

Fifth. What of the statement that there is no excuse for continuing a program that was urged in a depression because there are no needy people now? It is true that this program did develop in this country during the depression, though it was quite small then. It is true, also, that there are substantially fewer needy people now than there were in the depression. There is just no question that this country has the highest income on a per capita basis and in total in all its history. It is the worst kind of ignorance and blindness to argue from this, however, that all needy people and needy communities have disappeared. It is still unfortunately true that there are millions of people who have family incomes of less than $1,000 per year, many of them with family incomes less than $500. Some estimates I have seen show that over 6,000,000 families comprising over 20,000,000 persons have total family incomes under $1,000 per year, right now at the peak of our prosperity.

Sixth. Is it true, as has been charged, that the assistance of the Federal Government in this feeding activity is simply regimentation of individuals? This charge is utterly untrue. As the War Food Administration conducts its share of the program, the local communities run the school lunches, hire their own personnel, and do all their own food preparation. The end result is a fine community achievement, for the program offers all children the opportunity to get a nutritious meal regardless of

the amount of money that their parents may have. That is not regimentation.

We have talked about school lunches in terms of price support, in terms of marketing, and in terms of commodities. The activities have a meaning for all these. But it does not detract from these or make them any less significant, that the school-lunch program makes a substantial contribution toward assuring our children of health. It is still true, even though we have heard it many times, that our draft rejections are very large, and many are created or aggravated by malnutrition. It is still true that the Director of the Selective Service and other military leaders have warned us of this and recommended, as a matter of national safety, better nourishment for our growing children.

It is more true now than ever that with millions of women working on farms and factories, children are dependent upon a good hot meal at school to keep them healthy. Proper feeding of children is a first priority in our war economy.

It is very difficult to translate achievement of the school-lunch program into words. Many Members of this House may, as I have done, have gone to some of the schools to see how the program really works. When you have seen it in operation, seen the children thoroughly enjoy their food, and talked to the teachers about what the program is doing for attendance, discipline, and studies, you cannot fail to believe, as I do, that this is one of the truly great things that this Government has developed and which we cannot permit to be lost.

The Story of a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Philip Pearl which appeared in the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service of March 21, 1944, relative to Mrs. Paul Szymanski. Mrs. Szymanski and her family reside in the First Congressional District of Michigan. They are my constituents. Not only the people of my district but all the people of the city of Detroit feel highly honored and proud of this great American family.

This is the story of a great American. Her name is Mrs. Paul Szymanski. She is a member of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and she is employed by the American Lady Corset Co. at Detroit, making parachutes.

Mrs. Szymanski had seven sons. Two have died for their country, one in India, another in Africa. Four others are serving in the armed forces. Her youngest boy, Harold, has a few months to go before he joins the Army Air Corps.

We are indebted to Justice, official organ of the I. L. G. W. U., for the story of this frail, gray-haired war mother who is a little bewildered at the attention that has been showered upon her. She feels she has done no more than should be expected of an American citizen. Let us see.

She was born in Detroit and until she was placed aboard a train for Washington recently she had never been outside Wayne County. Her husband has been in a hospital for more than a year.

"I KEEP UP ALL RIGHT"

Her employers say she is one of the best of the sewing operators. She rises each morning at 5 o'clock and sees that Harold gets ready for school. She is at her machine at 7 o'clock and she works until 3.

Then she returns to her home at 7685 Helen Avenue and does her housework, prepares the dinner, and, when the dishes are washed, she sits down to write to her boys, the boys who are in Africa, Europe, California, and one whose only address is "Overseas."

The letters done, she cooks things that can be sent to the boy in California—cookies and cakes he loves so well. It is late when she finishes her tasks, and that leaves few hours in which to sleep.

"I keep up all right," she said. "I'm just doing what anyone can do. I don't see why anyone should be interested.

"I have lost two boys, and I pray each night that the war may end and the others come home.

"Raymond didn't die right away. Before he died he told his captain he knew he was going to die, and he wished—he wished someone would kiss his mother for him—I—guess that's why the President kissed me. He knew about it.

KISSED BY THE PRESIDENT

"I've never been away from Detroit before. I was so—so green about traveling. But the Red Cross looked after me. I was one of 57 Gold Star mothers who saw the President—mothers from all over the United States. It was comforting to talk to him. I don't seem to be able to remember what he said—just that moment when he kissed me—just a touch of the lips on my cheek. I can't ever forget that, of course.

"My oldest boy, Leonard, is in Africa. Robert, who's a sergeant, is overseas and so is Tony. Arthur is a Marine. Edward died almost 2 years ago in Africa—I have pictures of their graves—their buddies sent them.

"When Harold goes I'll be all alone. But I'll keep things going so when they come home there will be a home to come to and—What? Bonds? Of course, I bought bonds in every drive, including this one. I couldn't let my boys down."

Mrs. Szymanski's name may be hard to spell and even harder to pronounce. But she is the kind of American we of the labor movement can well be proud of. She is doing her job. She is doing her best to win the war regardless of sacrifices. She is not letting anyone down. May she be spared further suffering!

What We're Fighting For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 27, 1944:

WHAT WE'RE FIGHTING FOR

Astonishing at this crucial hour, is the letter in which 14 Congressmen, most of them from the Midwest, ask Secretary of State Hull the question: "What are we fighting for?"

Where, in the name of all that's sensible, have they been keeping themselves? It's pretty late in the day for Congressmen, whatever their constituencies, to be seeking this information.

There is much that remains to be clarified regarding our Government's attitude on France, Poland, Finland, the Baltic States, and other controversial issues.

But certainly there is no mystery, in the State Department or elsewhere, surrounding the fact that we are fighting this war to make a world in which American democracy can live and where, as the President, has said, tyranny and aggression cannot exist.

This startling letter is in a very different category from most of the recent pleas for more light on United States foreign policy. The other day another group of Congressmen conferred with Mr. Hull without, some of them said later, learning much about the Government's views on international problems now clamoring for solution.

But the 14 midwesterners appear less concerned with post-war settlements and foreign policy in general than with the phrase "unconditional surrender" and the future of the German people.

"If the declaration labeled 'unconditional surrender' is still the official objective," they say, "some elaboration of that phrase is in order. Does it mean extermination of the German people and utter destruction of their country? If not, what does it mean?"

It doesn't seems to us that the phrase "unconditional surrender," as applied to either Germany or Japan, needs any elaboration. It means just what it says—the unqualified capitulation of the aggressors' armed forces.

Unconditional surrender has nothing whatever to do with the future of the German people. The 14 Congressmen should know that the Allies have not the slightest intention of obliterating the German people. They are resolved to curb Germany's war-making proclivities, but the way in which it is to be done is, primarily, a peace conference matter.

Secretary Hull is reported to have taken to Moscow a plan for post-war Germany which Britain and Russia did not find acceptable. He is now said to have a program for an international peace organization almost ready for congressional discussion. Meanwhile the United States Chamber of Commerce is urging immediate formation of an international commission to draft a world peace plan.

These are constructive measures. But the point is that Secretary Hull and his Department right now have enough real worries and perplexities without having to take time out to answer the dubiously inspired query, "What are we fighting for?"

It is at least noteworthy that publication of the Congressmen's letter coincides with release of an open letter to President Roosevelt by the Peace Now Movement in which the President is urged to use his influence for an immediate end of the war.

This is, of course, a defeatist proposal. Any compromise peace at this time would be, in effect, a peace on our brutal enemies' terms. To the vast majority of Americans the mere thought of a negotiated peace with Nazi or Japanese barbarians is revolting.

By the same token the 14 Congressmen's concern over unconditional surrender and What are we fighting for? is defeatist in essence and utterly ill-advised.

We are fighting for freedom and justice. The enduring peace which we are determined to set up demands, first of all, an Allied victory on terms of unconditional surrender. Nothing less will suffice.

The Late Jesse Samuel Cottrell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the death of Jesse Samuel Cottrell in Washington at 6 a. m. on Friday, March 24, marked the close of a colorful career. Born on a farm, in what is locally known as "South America" near Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn., Mr. Cottrell was the eldest of the five children of Samuel H. and Telitha Anne (Simpson) Cottrell. His maternal grandfather was Jesse Simpson, the first man to string a wire across the Tennessee River for a water-current propelled ferry, which he operated for 40 years.

As a boy, he worked on the farm, attended the public schools of Knox County, was a student for 3 years in the academic department of the University of Tennessee, and then transferred to the law department of that institution, from which he was graduated in 1904.

As a young lawyer, in 1907, he was elected as a Republican to the lower house of the Tennessee Legislature from the counties of Knox and Loudon. Reflecting the views and carrying out the wishes of his constituents, he supported "dry" legislation against the opposition of the then "wet" Governor of Tennessee, Malcolm R. Patterson.

His legislative duties ended, he was successively reporter and city editor for the Knoxville Sentinel. Answering the call of the West, he went to Arizona, where, under Gov. J. C. Hughes, he was for a year, in 1908, the managing editor of the Arizona Daily Star.

Returning to Knoxville, he took up educational work. He made the race for county superintendent of public instruction of Knox County and was defeated by only 2 votes in the county court. In the qualifying examination for eligibility for the office, he made a grade of 95 in 19 studies and was issued a life certificate.

As a captain in the Military Intelligence in World War No. 1, he arrested Grover Cleveland Bergdoll as a draft dodger at Philadelphia.

His wife, the former Miss Mary Elizabeth James, of Knoxville, was with him at the time he was fatally stricken. He is also survived by a daughter, Miss Betty Ann Cottrell, of La Paz, Peru, and a sister, Mrs. Monroe Johnson, of Knoxville.

The pole star of his life was honor. He made friends by being honest, and he grappled them to his heart with hooks of steel, because they knew they could trust him. He enjoyed the friendship and confidence of many of the great men of the Nation over a period of more than 35 years, but he never lost the common touch. He delighted to meet and talk to his boyhood friends in Knox County, and his outdoor sport was working in his garden.

He was devoted to his wife, who was his coworker in their representation as Washington correspondents of the Nashville Banner, the Birmingham News, the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, Greenville (S. C.) News and Piedmont, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times, Troy (N. Y.) Record, and the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader. He was a reporter always, and in his work in Tennessee he covered the Fraterville explosion, which took a toll of 189 lives in a coal mine explosion at Briceville; the campaigns of Bob and Alf Taylor; and the Carmack-Patterson race for Governor, which took him into virtually every county in the State.

He was also secretary to United States Senato Newell Sanders, Tennessee's only Republican Senator. He was appointed by President Harding, who was his personal friend, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Bolivia. He occupied this post for 7½ years. While holding this post he was commissioned by Presidents Harding and Coolidge to represent them at the inauguration of seven South American presidents, to two centennials, and two boundary commissions.

His health impaired by the high altitude of Bolivia, he declined further appointment offered him by President Hoover. He then managed Frank Hitchcock's Tucson Daily Citizen for 4 years and engaged in writing on Latin-American life. He was the author of several books on Latin America, his most famous volume being Across the Andes From Ocean to Ocean.

Educator, legislator, diplomat, soldier, famed correspondent, a typical Tennesseean, and a great American, Jesse Samuel Cottrell traveled far in his journey from the red hills of South Knoxville to the Capital City at Washington where at the time of his death, he was vice chairman of the board of governors of the National Press Club and a member of the White House Correspondents Association.

He was buried in Arlington National Cemetery with full military honors on Monday of this week.

He fell asleep full of years and full of honors—a great Tennesseean and a great American.

The following editorial from the Nashville Banner sets his life forever in the "amber of memory" and is a just tribute to him:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner]

JESSE S. COTTRELL

To every reader of the Banner, the byline of Jesse S. Cottrell has been familiar for many years. It appears today—though Jesse Cottrell died this morning—because it was Jesse Cottrell's way to work to the last moment. Friends know, knowing Jesse, that when the summons came, it found his desk cleared; his daily task finished; his next assignment eagerly awaited.

The Banner has lost a friend, a faithful family member whose long and distinguished service earned for him a reputation among Washington's best-informed newspaper correspondents, whose sound political judgment was second to none in the Capital, who intimately knew every national political leader of the last 30 years, and whose high journalistic ethics were the pattern of his life. This broad acquaintance with men and events, and the qualities of its possessor, ranked Jesse Cottrell at the top of his profession. He was one of the last of the old-time newspaper reporters.

His was a varied career. Tennesseeans whose minds go back a generation will recall him as a State legislator. World War No. 1 recollections will identify him as a soldier in his country's service—the Army officer who led to capture of Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, draft-dodger. Diplomatic records contain the history of his long service as the American representative at Bolivia, and outstanding work in the realm of diplomacy in the South American field. Presidents sought his service and his counsel. They knew him as confidant, trusted emissary, and friend.

The Banner knew him as all of these, and as the man best entrusted with the important task of representing it, and reporting for it, at the seat of the National Government. It esteemed him for that accuracy, that personal integrity, that judgment, which marked every line he wrote. That was Jesse Cottrell's way.

His death shocks and saddens the Banner. Men of Jesse Cottrell's stature are not so plentiful that one can pass without being sorely missed. We salute the memory of a man who humbly walked the path of journalistic greatness, whose pride was in his profession, and whose career was the epitome of success according to the enduring standards.

Urges Single Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter from a constituent, Mr. Fred Whitmore, 339 West Maple Street, Kalamazoo, Mich., to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Whitmore is an ardent proponent of the single-tax system. He has been a student of the subject for many years. His letter follows:

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *March 22, 1944.*

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: According to a press article of March 19, I see your committee has drafted a plan of simplification of the tax return, eliminating the need of 30,000,000 people making a tax report next year; nevertheless, they do have to report the amount of their incomes in a fortune teller's guesswhat report. Naturally all these reports by individuals will require the attention of politicians.

Also, the withholding tax turned in with lengthy reports by private enterprise requires an endless study figuring out whether these individuals are entitled to refunds or if they have to make extra tax payment.

This complication is going to be a very costly set-up for business in general; it will

take thousands more personnel to make the extra red tape that this will create in private enterprise, and I believe it will be still more complicated for the Internal Revenue.

You certainly realize as well as I do, there are multiplied thousands of people working in this Department that could just as well be either in the channels of production or in the armed forces as to be making this unnecessary red tape, and if this present method goes through and is adopted and becomes law, you are going to find the same thing happening that did when the withholding tax of last year was adopted; you and your committee at that time thought you were simplifying the tax structure, and when it was adopted into law and began to function you admitted it was the worst complicated piece of legislation ever drafted.

Now in drafting this legislation to eliminate the necessity of 30,000,000 people making a tax report you have only shifted the burden from the individual to a bureaucratic agency which will bring a great deal more unnecessary red tape and a greater expense to the people, and the individual that has any intelligence at all will figure out for himself, if he has any extra tax to pay or a refund and the amount thereof, in order to know the honesty of these bureaucrats.

I don't have to tell you the plan I have already placed before you and your committee shows how I go back to 1913 when the present law was adopted and by statistics from the Library of Congress prove how we could of had one single tax to cover Federal, State, and local taxes and security benefits, eliminating every other kind of tax, giving security from that day to this, to every American citizen, from the cradle to the grave, and making it so simple a 10-year-old child could understand it, and no necessity for a tax return having to be filed by anyone from then on, this would eliminate millions from the pay roll of the Government, placing them in the channels of production and producing for the good of society.

I heartily agree it is impossible to simplify the tax structure by merely rewriting the tax reports, we would have to go into the tax structure itself and we must go to the fullest extent in rewriting the tax law and abolish every duplicating agency as every tax a person can pay must come from a source of income and have one single tax.

In order to accomplish this we must stabilize the national income and this plan accomplishes these very things and as an American citizen I plead with you, your committee, and the Congress of these United States to give me a fair and just public hearing so that this plan can be placed before Congress and the people before going ahead with this present bill you have prepared.

I am, yours respectfully,

FRED WHITMORE.

Federal Action Would Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

FEDERAL ACTION WOULD HELP

Tucked away in a river and harbor improvement bill passed by the House is a provision that might prove of vast importance in ridding the Schuylkill of its pollution.

This is the authorization of immediate surveys to determine feasible methods of eliminating coal wastes from the stream, in order to aid navigation, diminish flood dangers and help to improve the water supply of Philadelphia.

Government action in this matter would be extremely helpful. Washington now spends a considerable annual sum dredging the navigable portion of the Schuylkill below Fairmount Dam. It would be an economy in the long run to remove the silt from the whole stretch of the river, while at the same time, of course, making sure that additional coal wastes are not emptied into the Schuylkill at the mines.

Large-scale dredging operations and settling basin construction might have to await the cessation of the war, but the survey authorized in this measure could be undertaken without delay, paving the way for future post-war projects.

Town of Washington, Va., the First Washington of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion of which of the 28 communities in the United States named for the Father of Our Country was the first to so honor him prompts my correspondent, Mr. Henry P. Alden, to write me the following letter showing that Washington, Va., situate in Rappahannock County, of the Seventh Virginia Congressional District, antedated all of the other 27 by more than 27 years:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 28, 1944.*

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

In re: Town of Washington, Va., the first Washington of all.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTSON: The attached article, captioned "Dispute arises over first town named for George Washington," appeared Saturday afternoon in the Washington Evening Star. It is noted that the statements therein set forth are attributed to Representative BROWN of Georgia; STEARNS of New Hampshire; and BONNER, of North Carolina. The statements in this article are so at variance with the real facts, it is believed that you would be interested in correcting the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is a known fact, and having been verified from time to time, that the town of Washington, Va., in the county of Rappahannock, and your congressional district, is in fact the first Washington of all, having been surveyed and platted by George Washington July 24, 1749 (old calendar), and which, under the new calendar, would be August 4, 1749, and antedating any other town or city in the United States named Washington by more than 27 years. In fact, there is of record town lots in Washington, Va., which were conveyed and deeded by lot number, name of street, and the name Washington, Va., as far back as September 1752. There were land warrants issued and of record in the Fairfax surveys conveying lots in the town of Washington, Va., by lot numbers as far back as 1751.

Your special attention is directed to the September 1932 issue of the American Philatelist, the official organ of the American Philatelic Society, which issue, I am sure, is available at the Congressional Library, which contains an article of considerable length by J. A. Oettinger and captioned "The twenty-eight Washingtons." Mr. Oettinger is not only a philatelist but is a recognized historian. After years of investigation and at considerable length he has set forth a résumé of each of the 28 Washingtons, and in the order each was established or named. On a separate sheet I have copied from this article, which I have attached hereto, the names of the 28 Washingtons as listed by Mr. Oettinger and in the order that the same were laid out or named.

It is noted that in the attached list Mr. Oettinger sets forth that Washington, N. C., was laid out and/or named in October 1776, and that Washington, N. H., was likewise laid out or named in December 1776. In this connection it appears that John M. Maphis, of New York, some 15 years previous, likewise compiled a short history of the 28 Washingtons in the United States, and on or about the same time another historian by the name of Herbert or Huber Carter likewise compiled and printed a pamphlet with reference to all towns named Washington. Both Mr. Maphis' and Mr. Carter's articles were identical with that of Mr. Oettinger's, with the exception that Washington, N. H., was listed as the second Washington by that name, it having been first originally known as No. 8, which name was later changed to Camden and later still to Washington, N. H., under date of December 13, 1776 (old calendar), which would be December 24, 1776 under the new calendar. Both Mr. Maphis and Mr. Carter agreed that it was true that Col. James Bonner, who resided at the village known as Forks of the Tar, N. C., sold a few lots under date of December 7, 1776 (old calendar), which under the new calendar would be December 18, 1776, and which deed referred to the intended township as Washington, N. C. While it is true that Colonel Bonner and his wife Mary so deeded certain of said lots, it is further true that the Forks of the Tar, N. C., did not become known as Washington, N. C., until 1782.

Your attention is also directed to a pamphlet captioned "Common speech," volume V, first quarter, 1933. This pamphlet was apparently published by the English Speaking Union of the United States with national headquarters at 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, which contains an article on page 8 that refers to Washington, Va., as the first Washington and as stating that documentary evidence showed that George Washington surveyed the same himself in 1749.

Enclosed herewith is also a history of the town of Washington, Va., which was published by that corporation on or before 1931.

It is suggested that you obtain a copy of the issue of the September 1932 American Philatelist from the Congressional Library, and it is felt sure you will find that it is without question that Washington, Va., is the first Washington of all, having been surveyed, platted, and named August 4, 1749 (new calendar), the old calendar being July 24, 1749.

I feel sure you will take pleasure in correcting the attached article, which is absurd. Washington, Va., antidates all other Washingtons by more than 27 years.

Very truly yours,

HENRY P. ALDEN.

The following is from an article that appeared in the September 1932 issue of the American Philatelist by Mr. J. A. Oettinger, which said article was captioned "The 28 Washingtons—in the order of having been laid out, founded, or renamed as Washington:"

Virginia, 1749.
North Carolina, October 1776.
New Hampshire, December 1776.

Massachusetts, April 12, 1777.
Connecticut, January 17, 1779.
Georgia, January 23, 1780.
Pennsylvania, March 1781.
Vermont, April 8, 1781.
West Virginia, 1785.
Kentucky, 1786.
District of Columbia, 1791.
Mississippi, 1797.
Rhode Island, 1809.
Indiana, March 18, 1817.
Maine, January 31, 1823.
Arkansas, 1824.
Illinois, 1825.
Michigan, April 1827.
Louisiana, March 1835.
Texas, July 1835.
Missouri, May 29, 1839.
Iowa, 1839.
California, February 1850.
New Jersey, 1851.
Utah, 1857.
Kansas, 1858.
Nebraska, 1888.
Oklahoma, 1907.
(See the American Philatelist, September 1932, vol. 45, No. 12.)

Our "Friends" Glare at Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of March 26, 1944:

OUR "FRIENDS" GLARE AT US

Out of Washington comes a statement designed to clarify our foreign policy. Secretary of State Hull, with the Atlantic Charter before him, writes learnedly of our post-war objectives, but in aiming at the ideal we fear he has overlooked the practical and the realistic. In short, he leaves our foreign policy about where it was. He fails to answer questions that inevitably will arise at the peace table.

For example, he looks to the big four, to the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China, to keep the peace after arms are stacked, and adds: "The four-nation declaration eventually will end the need of alliances, balance of power politics, and other special arrangements common to international affairs in the unhappy past."

This is Mr. Roosevelt's view as well as Mr Hull's, we assume, but is it the Churchill view? And what will Josef Stalin think of it? No foreign policy will be worth the paper it's written on unless in accord with the policy of our allies.

The London Times, which often echoes British policy, last Monday remarked editorially: "The division of Europe into 20 or 30 sovereign independent units, owing no allegiance to any higher authority, is incompatible with the military security and economic well-being of the European peoples. This is a hard, irrefutable fact. To attempt to override it on the general theory of self-determination would be an act not of high political principle but of political madness."

So much for the English view of autonomous little states, but how are we going to reconcile this with the third paragraph of the Atlantic Charter, which provides that "they (signatory states) respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been favorably deprived of them."

Thus the Roosevelt-Hull idealism comes into collision with cold, hard facts. Even now Russia, one of our esteemed allies, is in the act of subjugating the little Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, and parts of Poland. What would the Washington administration have us do about that? Go to war with Russia to maintain an abstract principle? And if not, then what becomes of self-determination? Mr. Hull doesn't say.

Europe is a house of fear and of hate. The United States can't hope to recite rules of conduct and have those rules respected. Europe looks upon us as a smug and impertinent interloper. We go there, as we got into South America, with a program of paternalism. We talk grandly of uplift and culture. Our noblesse oblige is offensive. In our good-neighbor policy we try to buy friendship with money, and our good Latin friends resent it, just as Europeans will resent our telling them how they shall order their affairs when peace comes.

As Senator REED, of Kansas, says, "The post-war situation will be just about what Great Britain and Russia want it to be, and the United States will have to like it." We may expect little good will for America. Its Government will have so contrived its policies that it won't have a friend in the world. We came out of the other war in much the same condition, but it will be worse this time.

A Blow at Opium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the American edition of the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury of March 17, 1944:

A BLOW AT OPIUM

Congressman WALTER JUDD is so consistently right about the Far East, which he well knows by first-hand experience, that we have fallen into a sound habit of agreeing with him. This habit is strengthened by perusal of his House Joint Resolution 241, requesting the President to urge upon the governments of poppy-growing countries the necessity of immediately limiting production to strictly medicinal and scientific needs.

We hope Congress gives prompt approval to this measure. It would put teeth into the recent declaration by the British and Dutch Governments that they will not reestablish government opium monopolies in areas formerly under their control and now occupied by Japan.

While we are on the subject, another question may be raised. India is both a large producer and a large consumer of opium. Much of the consumption is classed as semi-medical; this is opium eaten, not smoked, and not classed with smoked opium yet similar in its effects. A royal commission some years ago estimated that 21 to 23 percent of India's gross revenues came from opium. Will not Britain, even though at some financial sacrifice, voluntarily limit India's monopoly sales to medicinal and scientific needs? Surely it should not be necessary that a territory go through a period of Japanese occupation to become eligible for cleansing from the opium habit.

Low Egg Prices Hit Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, many farmers and farmers' wives are writing and telegraphing me for explanations regarding the drop in egg prices. One telegram from Nebraska tells me that eggs there are selling for 20 cents a dozen. Some of the farmers say they were urged to raise more hens in order to increase the egg production. They also complained that the Government had stopped the purchase of eggs in the Middle West. I took this matter up with the Department and am informed that the Government will again start purchasing eggs in the Middle West at 100 percent of parity. This may relieve the situation slightly, but I do not believe it will be entirely effective due to several reasons.

One reason is that I have been informed that there just is not sufficient cold-storage space in the country to store the gigantic volume of eggs we have on hand and which are being produced. This shortage of cold-storage space is general over the country, I am reliably informed.

Another reason for the tremendous supply of eggs is that while the Department of Agriculture asked the farmers for an increase of 2½ percent of eggs, the increase in reality has been around 16 percent. That and the increase in egg production due to mild weather are contributing factors to this great supply of eggs.

Then, too, I am told ships for lend-lease have not been calling at our ports recently to take away the huge quantity of eggs and other farm products. Why these ships have not been calling has not been explained, but that may be a military secret.

However, somthing must be done to relieve the plight of the men and women who are producing our badly needed foodstuffs. These patriotic people were told to raise more eggs and they have done so. But they are now producing at a tremendous loss due to the high prices of feed. I urge that some better methods of distribution of eggs and other farm products must be devised. There is no reason why eastern eggs should be sent to the Midwest where we are smothered with eggs. As an illustration I include in my remarks an editorial published in a recent issue of the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald touching on this subject:

FREE EGGS

Poultrymen in Nebraska and Iowa have responded so nobly to the Government's appeals for more food production that the two States are surfeited with eggs. No one knows precisely what to do with all the output, although Government and the grocers are cooperating in a sort of eat-more-eggs campaign, and hoping for the best.

In the face of that situation it was learned last week that State institutions of Nebraska

and Iowa had been receiving free eggs from a Government bureau, shipped here from an Eastern State—probably Connecticut. One Iowa institution received a 3-month supply in one shipment. The purchasing agent of the Iowa State Board of Control is quoted as saying, "They give them to us and pay the freight, so we have no complaint to make."

And probably purchasing agents in Connecticut will have no complaint to make if the Government offers to provide free eggs from Iowa and Nebraska for their institutions. In recent years we have all become such beggars that few of us ever think to question anything that comes to us "for free" from Uncle Sam.

But tomorrow's Federal taxpayers may have a few questions to ask if they ever get to looking back over the books and notice the billions that were spent for food subsidies. It may seem strange to them that their money was used in the fabulously prosperous year of 1944 to buy eggs for State hospitals—and to pay part of the grocery bill of every man, woman, and child in the Republic.

What Shall Be Done With Surplus Industrial Plants?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when World War No. 2 broke out, no country on earth had a capacity for industrial production comparable with that of the United States. Under our system of free enterprise, the American people possessed an investment of almost $30,000,000,000 in industrial plants and equipment. These plants and this equipment poured out the abundance of consumers' goods which assured for the American people a standard of living unequalled by any people in the world. The success of the free enterprise system in developing prosperous industries and in creating for the American people exceptional comforts was a powerful barrier against the theories of foreign philosophers headed by Karl Marx that government ownership of capital, in which he included what we call plant and equipment, would assure to the common man a bigger share in the wealth of the nation. Socialism and communism found few adherents outside a small group of pink theorists at our eastern colleges. The American people, capitalists and wage earners alike, knew perfectly well that with its weaknesses, with occasional abuses, private enterprise was vastly more successful than any other system in operation in the world. It was common knowledge that the one big country that had staked its fate on Karl Marx's theories, namely, the Soviet Union, had a standard of living lower than any other country in the western world, and that this universal poverty was fully shared by the working people for whose particular benefit the communistic system was established.

It is an amazing, and greatly disturbing fact that, in the emergency of war, this Nation of free enterprise, our great, rich, America, has been carried along on the road toward state socialism. In order to make possible the staggering demand on industrial production, including numerous new items such as tanks, combat planes, guns, and ammunition, the Government has invested some $15,000,000,000 in new plants and new equipment. This is in addition to other billions expended on the building of merchant ships and the construction of airfields all over the world. Government-owned plants and machinery are now a very substantial part of the total industrial equipment of this country. It is obvious that this situation poses tremendous problems to be faced by our people at the close of the war, and that these problems must be faced squarely and solved on the basis of American principles. I feel safe in stating that the American people, or at least the vastly overwhelming majority in this country, want to uphold the American system of free enterprise, and want no experiment or experience in state socialism or communism.

Some war plants, but I am afraid it may be only a small part of them, will be able to continue right on with production for civilian consumption. Many more plants must almost immediately stop present production, because there will be no more need for additional tanks, bazookas, and parachutes. Some of these war plants will quickly be reequipped to produce civilian goods. It should not take such a long time to make and install new machinery for the plants which now build jeeps, to produce new automobiles for civilians. Factories now turning out flame throwers may conceivably soon be able to devote themselves to giving us new vacuum cleaners, or fire extinguishers, and so forth. There appears to be little disagreement that this kind of war factories, as far as possible, shall be turned over to private ownership. It is quite obvious that to do so in a fair way, and in a financially possible way, is a tremendously difficult and complicated problem. It can be solved and must be solved if the people of this Nation intend again to run their Government and terminate the present state of affairs under which the bureaucrats run the Government and the Nation.

Assuming that a program of reconversion has been executed successfully, and that all governmentally owned plants and equipment that can possibly be used in profitable production under private ownership has been disposed of by the Government, there will still remain on its hands a tremendous amount of factories and machinery, ships and military planes which will be a liability and a very serious problem. In the war emergency, the question of cost has been a very secondary consideration. In many cases essential production has had to be carried on regardless of cost. Mines have had to be opened and operated which, under peace conditions, cannot possibly be economically utilized on a commercial basis. There is no doubt that we must squarely face the necessity of writing off a huge amount of governmental investments as war losses.

Owen L. Scott, an outstanding Washington student of affairs, has recently made an interesting study on these problems, and I believe it to be very much worth while for us to study briefly some of his findings. There is, for instance, the question of the investment of $750,000,000 in synthetic-rubber factories. The President has announced that he will oppose any effort, after the war, of protecting this new industry by tariff barriers. The President is of the opinion that artificial rubber can never be produced as cheaply as natural rubber, although our occasional experience with the British and the Dutch who controlled our supply of natural rubber would seem to disprove his theory, and that it is more important that the American people buy tires at the lowest possible cost than it is to maintain the new artificial rubber industry. If the President has his way, this $750,000,000 must be written off as a total loss. It might well be doubted whether the problem is so simple as a calculation of relative costs, based on present-day technological achievements.

Who knows whether new inventions and new techniques may not in a few years make it possible to produce artificial rubber more cheaply than natural rubber can be obtained. Such a development has been experienced in many other new industries. I should certainly be hesitant in deliberately destroying a domestic industry which conceivably might make this Nation independent of foreign supplies which, as we now experience, may be cut off to the great inconvenience and perhaps the danger of everyone. It is true that the British and the Dutch are gravely concerned that we reappear as customers of natural rubber from their possessions in the Far East, but in this connection, also, I am convinced we should pay some attention to the interests of America.

Mr. Speaker, another difficult problem will be what to do with our vast new merchant marine. Before the war this country controlled only 15 percent of the world's merchant shipping. After the war we shall own one-half of the ships of a vastly greater merchant marine than that which existed before the war. Many of our Liberty ships are admittedly rush jobs, and of standards which cannot possibly compete on a commercial basis with modern, carefully built ships. We may scrap them or we may, as it has been suggested, try to give them away. Having disposed of these ships in one way or another, we shall still have a huge merchant fleet on our hands, and we shall again face the situation that this country cannot, in general, operate merchant ships in competition with other nations without subsidies. If we want to have these ships sailing the American flag on the seven seas, we must be ready to have the Treasury pay the deficit in the form of subsidies. What to do with our shipyards, large and small, and how to find other employment for hundreds of thousands of shipyard workers is a serious problem, but it must be solved.

Equally difficult problem confront us in connection with the vastly over-

expanded aircraft industry. At present we can produce some 100,000 military aircraft a year. Even if we are able to expand commercial aviation tremendously, say 10 times what it was before the war, we shall need only 5 or 10 percent of the present manufacturing capacity. Of course, we may hope that private enterprise will be able to use some of the buildings for other types of industrial production, but however that may be, staggering write-offs seem inevitable.

It has repeatedly been suggested that we might, at the end of the war, give away our surplus plants and machinery to other countries under lend-lease. It seems to me that this is a suggestion of very doubtful merit. It is most unlikely that any considerable amount of second-hand industrial equipment can be shipped any distance without incurring prohibitive costs. Even if it were possible on a limited scale, it would in no way eliminate or reduce the financial losses our people face or have to face. It is safe to say that all over this country, and particularly along the eastern and western seaboards and in the Detroit area, numerous idle plants will remain as tragic monuments of the most tragic event in human history. We shall face tremendous problems, much more difficult than that of winning the war, and we shall face those problems with a national economy shaken by some 15 years of continuous deficits in our national budget, by some 15 years of extravagant—yes, fantastic—public spending, and by some 15 years of growing public debt. It will take all the courage, all the ingenuity, all the enterprise of every American citizen to carry our Nation safely through the maelstrom, and to avoid being plunged into Marxistic state socialism or even communism. The one bright hope, however, is to be found in the courage, sound common sense, great resourcefulness, and energy of the liberty-loving American people. They will meet these issues—and overcome them.

T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the continued operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a nonpolitical agency of the Federal Government is of vital importance to the people of this Nation.

The people of this county are the owners of this $700,000,000 electric power generating and distribution system. Through this agency the T. V. A. is furnishing electric power to hundreds of vital war plants. That there should be no interference with its honest, efficient, and nonpolitical operation and contribution to the war effort is forcibly set forth in the following editorial from the New York Times of Wednesday, March 29:

THE M'KELLAR AMENDMENTS

The House of Representatives now has before it the $8,000,000,000 independent offices appropriations bill, to which the Senate has tacked two amendments proposed by Senator McKELLAR, of Tennessee. To get these amendments into place the Senate majority had to maintain that they were not new legislation, just as it might have voted, had another sort of parliamentary question arisen, that two and two do not make four. They are, in fact, by the layman's standard, new laws and were put in the appropriations bill because the President can't veto a big appropriation measure. One of them requires the Tennessee Valley Authority to turn its funds at quarterly intervals into the general fund of the Treasury, drawing money out of the Treasury only by specific appropriation. The funds are already amply safeguarded. There has been no scandal. The effect of the amendment can only be to make it difficult or impossible for the T. V. A. to carry on its business. The amendment is a drastic alteration in T. V. A.'s charter. The Senate also voted itself one of the biggest patronage grabs in history, by requiring senatorial confirmation of all appointments to executive agencies carrying salaries of $4,500 or more.

The Senate tinkered with the bill in other ways, but these were its shining contributions, made after long debate and with delicate attention to the parliamentary proprieties and absolute neglect of numerous important questions. The House is asked to "compromise" in conference. There is no respectable compromise on either of the two points mentioned. The one is legislation by indirection, intended to hamstring T. V. A. in the midst of its contribution of electric power to war industries. The other is devised to dilute the personnel of the executive agencies by putting "political hacks" ahead of qualified experts. The House ought to know what to do.

Four Freedoms at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the Hunterdon County Democrat, an independent newspaper dedicated to the principles of true democracy, and published in my congressional district, which is indicative of what the people in New Jersey are thinking about today.

It is my opinion that along with winning the war, the people of New Jersey are concerned about the safeguarding of freedom at home. This is evidenced by the crossroads meetings so ably described in the article quoted below:

Two hundred citizens who attended a meeting in the courthouse last Thursday night signed a statement aligning themselves with a fight for the four home-front freedoms that had previously been adopted at a similar meeting in the fire house at Washington Crossing 3 weeks earlier.

Speakers from the platform as well as from the floor, with two exceptions, supported the four home-front freedoms.

The home-front freedoms adopted at the first of the crossroads meetings in Mercer County and endorsed at the meeting in Flemington are as follows:

"Freedom from bureaucracy, red tape, and wasteful spending.

"Freedom from supergovernment by labor leaders.

"Freedom of enterprise and individual opportunity.

"Freedom of State and local rights from Federal fuedalism."

When the meeting was opened at 8:20 o'clock nearly every available seat was filled and many were standing in the back of the room. The crowd was estimated at between 275 and 300 people, representing persons of all political faiths and most every economic level.

Edgar H. Wilson of Flemington, chairman of the Hunterdon County Four-Freedoms-On-the-Home-Front Committee, said in opening the meeting that the Colonists who rebelled against England and signed the Declaration of Independence demanded the right to assemble for the redress of their grievances. He said that the Hunterdon County meeting had been called after a similar session had been held at Washington Crossing, where the four home-front freedoms were adopted. Mr. Wilson then presented William H. Blackwell of Washington Crossing, who sent out the letters summoning his neighbors to meet at that place to discuss what might be done to check the trend toward centralization of government in America.

BLACKWELL EXPLAINS MOVEMENT

Mr. Blackwell said that the New Deal is something that everybody talks about but nobody does anything about. He said that the time has arrived to try to effect a turning point in the way things are going in the Nation, and mentioned among the grievances taken up at Washington Crossing were the increasing trends toward regimentation, the evils of price fixing, unwanted subsidies, the overbearing attitude of racketeering labor leaders, and the federalization of State, county, and local government.

Mr. Blackwell read the call of the meeting at Washington Crossing on February 4 and said its objective was not partisan and the response had indicated that the people who took part were interested only in restoring their individual rights, and were ready to use any political party or vehicle to accomplish that end.

PROFESSOR MYERS SPEAKS

Prof. William Starr Myers, of Princeton University, introduced by Mr. Blackwell as the second speaker, declared that while leaders of political parties in America had differed about ways of accomplishing results, they had up until 1932 been in fundamental agreement about basic principles. Thus, he said, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Al Smith, and Herbert Hoover would all agree on the basic principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Professor Myers said that another set of principles had been introduced in America since 1932, based on the idea that the individual is the servant of the state. America, he said, had been founded on the principle that the state is subject to the will of its people.

Discussing the "four freedoms" recently enunciated by President Roosevelt, Professor Myers said that the inclusion of freedom from want and fear can be challenged because "the people have got to free themselves from want and fear." If the State undertakes to free its subjects from want and fear, it must by necessity make them slaves, Professor Myers declared.

"THE RIGHT TO FAIL"

Professor Myers said that an essential right under democratic government is the right to fail, because if a person has the right to fail he also has the right to take another chance and succeed.

Professor Myers said that from his observation the experts at Washington are only "farming the farmers," and are interested in continuing centralization of economic controls after the war.

Professor Myers stated that he had served on the faculty of the War College and knows many of the American commanders intimately.

"Don't worry about the men in command," Professor Myers said. He asserted that they can be depended upon to win the war and that what the American people must concern themselves about is keeping America American so that the boys who return will not find that their freedom has disappeared. To this end he challenged Americans to think things through and not to trade permanent freedom for temporary economic advantage.

VOORHEES SPEAKS

Herbert W. Voorhees, of Skillman, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau Federation, commended the farmers of Hunterdon County for their outstanding contribution to the war effort in the production of food. He also commended them for the ability to work out their own problems, as evidenced by the success of the Flemington Auction Market.

Mr. Voorhees said that by sticking to fundamental principles and laying by a reserve, the management of the auction had enabled it to withstand the hard times to which it had been subjected under war regulations.

Turning to the domination of labor unions by "notorious labor leaders," Mr. Voorhees said that at least one of these leaders had misunderstood farmer philosophy and thereby had been prevented from organizing producers of foods into a labor union. He said that it would be shocking to know what the world would be if the farmers had had the audacity to strike.

RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP NEEDED

Mr. Voorhees said that citizens will have to continue to be vigilant until something is done in the ranks of labor to require responsible leadership.

"Farmers believe in organization, but in a democratic sense," said the speaker in contrasting their organizations with those of industrial labor, which, he said, are dominated from the top.

Mr. Voorhees, turning to the news of the day, said that most people felt the President vetoed the tax bill because it requires labor organizations to file financial statements.

CITES CAMDEN "HOLD-UP"

Turning to New Jersey's contribution of manpower in the war effort, Mr. Voorhees noted that the State leads the Nation in the proportion of men in service. He said citizens must see that the place these men return to affords them freedom and opportunity. He then pictured the situation at Camden last summer when misguided labor leaders refused to let soldiers who volunteered to unload tomatoes do so without first joining their union. He said that the tomatoes would have rotted had not the men in uniform volunteered, as there were miles of loaded trucks backed up at the plant.

"We believe in the rights of labor to organize, but we cannot stomach the actions of some of their leaders," he declared, in calling upon citizens to demand, through the democratic process, laws which require responsibility from those in authority in labor unions.

FREEDOM OF ENTERPRISE

Wheeler McMillen, of Hopewell, editor of Farm Journal, speaking on Freedom of Enterprise and Individual Opportunity, said that almost nothing had happened to better the lot of the plain folks of the world until 1789, when our American Constitution was adopted. This charter, he said, had given to the people of the world more in the way of the comforts of life than anything that had happened in centuries before.

Mr. McMillen asserted that the worst tragedy that could befall the human race would be the decline of the United States. He pictured progress in this country up until 1930 and cited population and production trends to show that more wealth and more jobs were being created in each succeeding decade. The decade from 1930 to 1940, he declared, had shown the opposite trend. He expressed fear that the current period of war bringing death, destruction, despotism, and defeat will place further handicaps on freedom.

Mr. McMillen said that American freedom had produced engines which in turn have raised our production.

"Freemen can do more work and have more things," the speaker declared.

"Our freedom was won by a long, hard fight. It can be lost quickly or little by little by trading it for a bit of security, a bit of temporary advantage."

In closing, he cautioned against dividing our freedom up and trading it off as some in authority would have Americans do at this time, using the war as a means to that end.

JEFFERS PROTESTS RED TAPE

Mr. Wilson resumed chairmanship of the meeting and called upon Henry Jeffers, Jr., of Plainsboro, for some remarks. Mr. Jeffers recounted his experience in replacing a chlorinator at the Walker-Gordon dairy farm and pointed to the waste imposed by centralization of authority and red tape.

DIRT FARMER'S SON

Mr. Wilson asked for other remarks from the floor. A young man in the rear of the room rose and declared that he is a "dirt farmer's son." He charged that previous spokesmen had been beating around the bush, cracking funny jokes, and laughing.

He said that the comment had all been one-sided and apparently designed to influence votes in the forthcoming Presidential election. "The purpose," he said, "is to disrupt the people and get them to go against the President and the war effort."

The young speaker said that subsidies are helping the farmer who sweats in his fields and gets little for his labor.

Asked to identify himself, the speaker said he lives near Upper Black Eddy, Pa., on a 35-acre chicken farm and had attended Frenchtown High School.

Inquiry after the meeting revealed that the speaker was Peter Batkus, who is employed in the mill of the Delaware Valley Farmers Cooperative Association, Frenchtown. He attended Frenchtown high school for half a year in 1933–34. He formerly was discharged from military service.

LAUDERDALE DEFENDS MEETING

William J. Lauderdale, West Amwell Township farmer, said that the meeting was strictly nonpartisan and not "phony," as the former spokesman had declared. He said that he is "becoming tired of being told what to plant, when to plant it, who to sell his crop to, what I will get for it." He said he was privileged to do his own managing under the system he was brought up under and hoped for its return.

Lee Aars, another Pennsylvanian, residing in Tinicum Township, Bucks County, said the critics of the New Deal are part of a group who are "tired of the war" and want to "do it the easy way." He said he could not see how any farmer could have any objection to New Deal agricultural policies and pointed to efforts to conserve the soil as fundamentally sound. He challenged Mr. Voorhees' statement that the A. A. A. is dominated from the top.

Mr. Voorhees replied by citing the example of a New Jersey A. A. A. director who was summarily removed on orders from Washington as proof the A. A. A. is not democratically set up.

PEACE MEETING LEADER

D. H. Moreau pointed out that Mr. Aars, who now challenged the patriotism of persons critical of the New Deal, had himself taken a leading part in peace meeting in that same courtroom prior to the time Russia was attacked. Since Russia had been attacked by Hitler, the group had taken an "about face."

Aars replied that in America one has the right to change one's mind, which brought laughter.

Earl Hartpence of Stanton, challenged the statement of Aars that his group had been critical of shipments of scrap iron to Japan. Mr. Hartpence declared that other farm groups had done likewise, including the Farm Bureau and Grange of Hunterdon County.

A man from Monmouth County complained of the "runaround" he had encountered in trying to get a license to fish in tidal waters.

SCHLUTER REPLIES

Fred Schluter of Rosedale, member of the Mercer County "four freedoms" committee, replied to the "gentleman from Pennsylvania" by reading the set of principles adopted at Washington Crossing and subsequently adopted by action of the Hunterdon County meeting. Mr. Schluter called upon the 80 percent of peaceful citizens to organize and oppose "vociferous minorities and pressure groups."

Replying that the movement was not a Republican movement, Mr. Schluter said that the group in Mercer, including members of both parties, had endorsed the program of Democratic Senator BYRD, who recently had called upon the administration to get down to winning the war and keep politics out of it. He challenged the doctor-win-the-war theory which recently was sounded at Washington and said the job must be done by all people, not by any party. He expressed the hope that by arousing a greater awareness of the danger to the freedoms the people will exercise greater influence on the party conventions.

"CONSTRUCTIVE"

"We make no criticism that is not supported by a constructive suggestion," Mr. Schluter declared. He reported that interest in the Washington Crossing meeting had been Nation-wide and that requests are coming in daily for information.

On motion it was voted to continue the temporary committee in Hunterdon County, which includes: Edgar H. Wilson, of Flemington; Mrs. Herbert Van Pelt, of Readington; Clayton H. Stains, of Kingwood Township; Rudolph Burkhalter, of Ringoes, farm owner; Martin Smith, Raritan Township farmer; William J. Lauderdale, West Amwell Township farmer; Frank C. Dalrymple, Pittstown storekeeper; Luther Stothoff, Sr., Flemington contractor; and Mrs. Roy Hall, of Ringoes.

It was voted to send telegrams to each Congressman and Senator from New Jersey, setting forth in substance the principles adopted at Washington Crossing, as follows:

"By working together on the home front—by discussion and public meetings, by issuing pamphlets, through the press and radio—we believe that we can:

"Aid the morale of our men at the front by demanding action against strikes and labor leaders who hurt the war effort, as Secretary of War Stimson suggested recently.

"Demand that our Government cut out red tape and politics and get down strictly to the business of winning the war.

"Encourage our Senators and Congressmen to think and act independently for the good of the people.

"Enlighten the citizens who need to be aroused to the danger of Government's taking away our freedoms while we are anxiously watching the war and working for victory. Let's remember the words of George Washington who said: '* * * it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.'

"Influence both party conventions to support platforms with sound principles rather than political catchphrases.

"Make November 7 Judgment Day instead of a day of fear caused by 'created' crises."

Blanks asking for supporters of the organization's program were signed by about 200 people, representing 36 communities, which will in turn be organized.

A collection which it was announced would have $1 limit resulted in raising $80.12 for furtherance of the work. Clayton H. Stains was named temporary treasurer.

General Anxiety Grows on Both Sides of Atlantic as to Actual Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following article by John Griffin, entitled "General Anxiety Grows on Both Sides of Atlantic as to Actual Foreign Policy," which appeared in the March 26, 1944, issue of the Sunday Post, Boston, Mass.:

GENERAL ANXIETY GROWS ON BOTH SIDES OF ATLANTIC AS TO ACTUAL FOREIGN POLICY—ONLY RUSSIA BOLDLY STATES PURPOSE IN WAR—EVERY STRONG PRESIDENT HIS OWN SECRETARY OF STATE AS WELL

(By John Griffin)

It is very strange that 24 Members of Congress, all of whom have shown a consistent disposition to favor international cooperation, have found it necessary to ask Secretary of State Hull to give them an understandable idea of what our foreign policy is.

That is, it would be strange except for the fact that the bewilderment of the congressional Members is only a reflection of the uncertainty and confusion that prevails throughout the country.

Furthermore, this anxiety is not confined to this country, for in England there appears to be doubt among officials as to our position and doubt among Englishmen as to the foreign policy of their own Government.

Recent reports of another meeting of British and American and Russian leaders are probably a result of this uneasiness. Recent developments in England indicate that the Government leaders are not so enthusiastic over the Atlantic Charter as they were when it was devised.

CHURCHILL CHANGES VIEW

Mr. Churchill told the House of Commons that he did not regard the Atlantic Charter as an "inflexible document," and said "it is evident that, as the changing phases of the war succeed one another, some further clarification will be required of the position under the document which has become honorably known as the Atlantic Charter and that this must be the subject of renewed consultation between the principal allies."

In the meantime, Russia appears to have a very definite idea of what it is after and intends to get it regardless of the British or American interpretations of the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. Stalin decided suddenly to recognize the Badoglio government in Italy, much to the surprise of Britain and the United States. He thus served notice that the Soviet intends to have an important part in deciding the peace terms in western Europe.

But it is only a short while ago that he also served notice that Russia intended to handle the situation in eastern Europe without assistance from Britain or the United States.

Of course, the intentions of the Russians, as clearly put forth, do not jibe with the Atlantic Charter, which has as one of its cardinal principles "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

ANOTHER PRINCIPLE

The charter also lists as one of its principles respect for "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" and to have "sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Another principle is "to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

But Mr. Churchill says that while in his mind the charter stood as "a declaration of the spirit and purpose in which its signatories are waging war, it implies no pact or bargain with our enemies."

If anything is clear at all among these diplomatic phrases it is that Britain now has considerable doubt about the charter principle of equal opportunity to vanquished as as well as victor. Britain, or at least Mr. Churchill, apparently has something else in mind.

Obviously the Russian plans for Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland do not embrace the charter principle which calls for no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, or that principle which testifies to the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and calls for the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

RUSSIA HAS OWN VIEW

Thus it ought to be clear that Russia is not going to confine its policy to the terms of the charter, in fact, is paying little or no attention to the charter.

And it is evident that Britain does not want to be restricted to the strict interpretation of the charter principles.

That leaves the United States the lone full advocate of the Atlantic Charter, so far as anyone knows. But apparently nobody except the President and a few officials know whether or not we are still sticking to it.

The Moscow Conference distinctly called for joint discussions and recommendations regarding important questions that arise as they developed and the Allied Nations were said to be in agreement on Allied policy toward Italy.

The recognition of the Badoglio government by Russia would hardly seem to be an expression of complete agreement when neither Britain nor the United States is making any such recognition.

Thus we find 24 Congressmen pleading with the Secretary of State for some information that will help them in their official capacities and which would serve as a guide to our foreign policy.

No wonder they feel that some information ought to be forthcoming; the succession of events recently has been enough to cause bewilderment and uncertainty all around.

POSITION OF SECRETARY

There has been quite a lot of bunk about the situation caused by the request of the Congressmen, much of it based on the assumption that the Secretary of State is a great figure in creating a foreign policy.

Mr. Hull is, of course, a forthright individual with a mind of his own, but actually the foreign policy is the work of the President and not the Secretary of State. And that has always been true when there has been a strong President in the White House.

In this particular administration, the President has devoted most of his efforts to the foreign affairs and has turned the direction of domestic affairs over to others to a large extent. So he is actually the Secretary of State as well as President.

Perhaps he will tell the Congressmen all about it. But don't bet on that.

Fight for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Project Just Beginning in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Mobile Register of Mobile, Ala., of Saturday, March 25, 1944, concerning the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal project:

FIGHT FOR THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE PROJECT JUST BEGINNING IN CONGRESS

As the fight for the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, defeated in the House, moved over to the Senate, Representative JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi, made a statement in the Lower Chamber well worthy of emphasis and elaboration.

"This proposition is not dead and it will never die," Representative RANKIN asserted, "until this great link in our waterways system is completed." Mr. RANKIN's comment came Thursday simultaneously with an announcement from Representative FRANK BOYKIN, of Mobile, that he will seek a new United States Engineers' survey of the project.

Representatives BOYKIN and RANKIN have expressed confidence that they can muster enough votes in the House to reverse its stand on the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, if Senators BANKHEAD and HILL, of Alabama, can succeed in gaining the Senate's approval for the waterway. It would require a shift of 20 votes to obtain reconsideration of the proposal. The House rejected its inclusion in the omnibus river and harbor bill by only an 8-vote margin, but turned down a motion to reconsider by a vote of 195 to 156 before sending the post-war $400,000,000 river and harbor authorization bill to the Senate.

The never-say-die spirit with which Messrs. BOYKIN and RANKIN have waged the battle for the waterway must be carried to the floor of the Senate, if approval of the project at this session of Congress is to be obtained, for it undoubtedly has formidable opposition.

Representative RANKIN attributes the defeat of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project in the House to false propaganda of a few railroad lobbyists. We presume that Representative RANKIN has correctly analyzed one of

the principal causes of the project's rejection in the House.

The railroads, however, should realize the short-sightedness of their opposition to the development of the Tennessee and Tombigbee River systems to give the people of the Mississippi Valley a shorter, more economical waterways to the Gulf of Mexico. They have no more hope of permanently blocking the construction of a 20-mile canal to link those two waterways than they would of damming the Mississippi so that the railroads could take over the water-borne traffic on the Father of Waters. At best they can only delay congressional approval of an engineering project that men of vision conceived a century ago. The sooner the railroads withdraw their opposition to it, the better it will be for them and for the Nation.

Undoubtedly America's post-war role as the leading world power will call for industrial development and utilization of all the Nation's resources in a manner heretofore barely dreamed. That will mean the expansion of every form of transportation to the ultimate—air lines, truck lines, waterways, and railroads, included. There will be no need for cutthroat competition between the rival forms of transportation because there will be plenty of business for all.

The railroads ought to look to the future and support, not oppose, the Tennessee-Tombigbee project. A time will come when they, too, will be looking for favors from Congress. If they persist in a dog-in-the-manger attitude about the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, the railroads will certainly prejudice their chances of obtaining whatever Federal assistance they may need in time to come.

Order to Ireland Strikes Shattering Blow Against All Ideals of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following article entitled "Order to Ireland Strikes Shattering Blow Against All Ideals of America," by John Griffin, which was published March 19, 1944, in the Sunday Post, Boston, Mass.:

ORDER TO IRELAND STRIKES SHATTERING BLOW AGAINST ALL IDEALS OF AMERICA—RAISES POINT AS TO WHAT NATION CAN DO TO REMAIN NEUTRAL IN THIS WAR DESPITE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

(By John Griffin)

The United States is in a war of survival and it is natural to expect that anyone who steps in our way or refuses to get out of our way is going to get hurt. Any nation, large or small, that interferes with our chances of victory, or with our plans for victory, can be assured that it is courting trouble in large quantities and at frequent intervals.

Thus Eire can look forward to nothing but woe as far as her relations with the United States are concerned. It has been decided—by our military leaders according to a recent despatch—that by permitting the diplomatic representatives of our enemies to stay in Eire, that country is jeopardizing our invasion project and imperiling our troops.

So we are going to punish Eire for her refusal to help us. We have pointed out, with threat and warning, that she cannot expect anything from now on but trouble unless she does our bidding. And we even tell her that she can also anticipate very little at the peace table.

ISOLATED EIRE

We're going to see to it, along with our ally, Britain, that Eire gets not more than is absolutely necessary to keep her producing food for Britain. We are going to see to it that she gets no ships from us, as if we were in the habit of providing ships for her.

All right, if we've got to do it to win victory and safeguard American lives, by all means do it—without hesitation and without limit.

But is it too much to ask now that all the sanctimonious twaddle about "four freedoms" cooked up at a meeting between Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt, and all the big talk about the rights of small nations be immediately junked and placed in a position where they cannot be dragged forth to falsify a situation?

When we tell a nation that is honestly neutral—a fact admitted by the Allies—that unless she makes a warlike move against our enemies she will be subjected to punishment from us, we are shattering all the ideals of America.

When we tell a defenseless neutral that unless she makes a move against our enemies, which might subject her to destruction from the air, we will use economic weapons in punishment, we are throwing the rights of small nations into the ashcan.

CAN'T BE SURPRISED

When we tell a small, honestly neutral nation that she has no right to remain neutral and must enter the war on our side upon pain of immediate punishment and future discrimination, we can hardly be surprised if the neutral world looks astonished.

Of course, the neutral world should not be surprised at this event, for we have indicated before that the determination of the American people is to win the war at all costs; that it is a question of survival. But unfortunately at the same time we have been preaching to the world about freedom from fear and freedom from aggression, and other noble principles.

Have the people of Eire now been assured of a freedom from fear and aggression? Is it impossible for them to remain neutral because their neighbors want them to fight? Perhaps it is impossible from the practical and realistic viewpoint. But let's not talk about ideals and freedoms in that connection.

As for freedom, certainly Eire should be free to stay out of the war if that is the desire of her people. But, says one commentator and editorialist, Eire is only "technically right, but is morally and strategically wrong."

This is a view that might be presented to a man standing on his head. If Eire is right at all, she is morally right. And as far as being "strategically wrong" that must mean that she is unfortunate enough to be geographically situated "in the middle."

NO LEND-LEASE

Let's get a few things straight. In the first place, Eire has not been given anything by this country. The ships she got were bought from us and paid for, and were bought only after long months of negotiations in which we tried to bargain for the use of certain Irish ports, which we held were essential to our safety.

This argument was later dropped when it developed that the ports were not necessary for our safety. At a time when we were giving food and other materials to many nations, neutral as well as belligerent, on a lend-lease basis—that is, we were giving it away—Eire was unsuccessfully trying to buy from us.

The Eire Minister in Washington said publicly that the State Department assured him there "has not been a single instance of known leakage of military information through Ireland in the past 2 years."

And the United States note to Eire in which that Government was asked to break off diplomatic relations with Axis countries said: "We do not question the good faith of the Irish Government in its efforts to suppress espionage."

What, then, does a neutral nation have to do to remain out of war? Here is one that has been honestly neutral, that has done everything possible to prevent espionage within its borders, that has expressed the will of its people in its official policy, yet it is being told by two powerful nations that it must immediately take steps which would lead it into war or else suffer punishment for remaining at peace.

A PRACTICAL VIEW

We have been faced with situations in which idealism clashed with realism. There was the question of whether we would be realistic enough to deal with French leaders in north Africa who could save the lives of many American soldiers. From the moral standpoint, and certainly from the standpoint of idealism, we should not have had anything to do with them. But from the practical standpoint we would have been utterly foolish to refuse dealing with them.

Certainly the parents of thousands of American boys were happy that a deal was made that saved untold thousands of American lives.

If the measures to be taken against Eire also result in saving American lives, as the military men say they will, there won't be any outcry of protest from Americans.

But it is strictly a practical matter and sets aside all the brave talk about ideals and freedoms. As if they weren't shattered much earlier by the experience of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and other small nations.

Do what we have to do but let's be honest about it.

The Fight for Tennessee-Tombigbee Project To Be Carried to the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Mobile Press, of Mobile, Ala., of Thursday, March 23, 1944, concerning the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal project:

THE FIGHT FOR TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE PROJECT TO EE CARRIED TO THE SENATE—WATERWAYS PROPONENTS BEATEN IN THE HOUSE REFUSE TO GIVE UP THE BATTLE; ALABAMA-COOSA PROGRAM SOME CONSOLATION

Alabamans' disappointment over the deletion of the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterways from the omnibus river and harbor bill in the House yesterday was offset somewhat by the approval of the Alabama-Coosa project.

But of the two projects, the Tennessee-Tombigbee was far the more important, for it would provide a shorter, more economical barge route from points throughout the Mississippi Valley to the Gulf of Mexico by way of Mobile. The Alabama-Coosa waterways approval will, of course, be welcomed because it would give a vast section of the interior from Rome, Ga., southward to Mobile an outlet to the Gulf through a 9-foot navigable channel and also include electric power and flood-control developments.

—Representative FRANK BOYKIN, of Mobile, who with Representative JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi, led the fight for the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterways in the House, declares the battle will be carried to the Senate. This is as it should be, for the project is entirely too vital to the interest of the Nation to accept the result in the House as final. By all means let Senators BANKHEAD and HILL and all proponents of the important project unite and exhaust every effort to have the rejected waterway reinstated in the bill when it comes up for consideration in the Senate.

Messrs. BOYKIN and RANKIN waged a strong fight for the Tennessee-Tombigbee project in the House against formidable opposition, some of which was partisan and some selfish. Republican opposition, led by Representative DONDERO, of Michigan, was one of the factors in the elimination of the waterways from the bill. It was just such short-sighted opposition as this to worthwhile measures supported by Democrats that Wendell Willkie recently warned his party will react against the G. O. P. in November. Mr. DONDERO argued that the project had been rejected 5 years ago "and the picture is the same today." This, of course, entirely overlooks the increasing importance of inland waterways in moving the Nation's freight. The national picture alters, but the Michigan Representative and others like him do not see the change. They lack progressiveness and vision and when they carry their viewpoints the Nation suffers.

Of course, the fear that the opening of the Tennessee-Tombigbee would divert some traffic from the Mississippi undoubtedly influenced some Members in the House to vote against the $66,000,000 project. It was pointed out, however, that barge operators on the Mississippi would actually benefit because they could use the projected Tennessee-Tombigbee slack water routing on the return trip northward and save the expense of bucking the Mississippi currents on the upward tow.

Representative DONDERO and other opponents to the contrary, the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterways, carrying the endorsement of the United States Engineers, is not only feasible, but essential if the Nation's inland waterways are to be fully developed in the interest of more economical transport. In the end, progress will triumph over reactionary and selfish interests such as the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterways encountered in the House. Let us hope that it will be accomplished in the Senate, and that the House will subsequently concur in the reinstatement of the project so that the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterways will be included with the $60,000,000 Alabama-Coosa project as among foremost public works in America's post-war program.

Washington's "Ghost" Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Washington is a city of mystery. The Government is literally a mass of riddles. The investigator who tries to solve some of the inconsistencies, the contradictions, the impracticalities, and the apparent perverseness of many of the departments, bureaus, and commissions, seems to encounter a stone wall of resistance—an invisible but very tangible conspiracy of silence throughout officialdom. The latest, and I think, the most startling revelation is that there is, in the city of mysteries, a ghost committee of higher-ups, each, apparently, with a completely controlling passion for anonymity, who reserve to themselves the authority to overrule all the other departments of the executive branch of the Government, including O. W. I., on what information and facts shall be given the American people concerning any situation, either on the battle fronts or at home. This revelation is especially startling in view of the fact that it has always been one of the fundamental concepts of our American system of government that a government of, by, and for the people operated by and with the consent of the governed, can be a wise and just government only so long as the people, themselves, are kept informed of the facts concerning their government and their governors in order that they, themselves, may arrive at wise and just conclusions, based upon accurate information. It is, of course, true that military strategy renders it impossible for the Government to acquaint the people with all the facts concerning military operations—past, present, and future. There is ample evidence at hand, however, and it continues to accumulate rapidly, showing that various officials of the Government are hiding their inefficiency and, in some cases, their maladministration, behind the curtain of alleged military secrecy. There is nothing new about this, because in his day, Thomas Jefferson recognized such a danger in government when he said:

> You have seen the practices by which the public servants have been able to cover their conduct, or, where that could not be done, delusions by which they have varnished it for the eye of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the disclosure of this secret, super ghost committee in Washington, ready to decide in secrecy what the American people may or may not be permitted to know about their governmental affairs, was made in the Saturday Evening Post of January 29, last. It was made by Robert Ormond Case, who had served as assistant to the president of the Rubber Development Corporation.

He tells the story that early in September of 1943 it appeared that the rubber program was over the hump and that the goal of overcoming our perilous rubber shortage had actually been achieved in the first 9 months of the effort. Mr. Case, at that time, wrote a press release giving the figures as to the program, the accomplishments, and the fact that the rubber was in the bins. It was the kind of information that would break the hearts of the Axis Powers, which would have tremendously raised the morale of the American people, and which would have put an end to the sensational stories appearing in some of the newspaper columns at that time that our natural rubber was costing us $500 a pound.

President Douglas H. Allen, of the Rubber Development Corporation, approved the story. The Rubber Development Corporation Board approved the story. Leo Crowley, the head of O. E. W., approved the story. Then this information, continuing its journey through the Washington bureaucratic jungle, went over to O. W. I. for the routine purpose of being mimeographed and distributed. There, for some mysterious reason, the information was hung up. Upon inquiry by Mr. Case, of the Rubber Development Corporation, O. W. I. finally admitted that they had run into a committee of higher-ups. This committee did not think the people should be given this cheering information. Why not? Because this mysterious committee of higher-ups said it was contrary to public policy. The question was asked as to why and in what particular it was contrary to public policy, and nobody in the O. W. I. could answer that question.

Then the officials of the Rubber Development Corporation wanted to know who the chairman of this mysterious committee was. He was Mr. Stuart Rice, of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. CASE called Mr. Rice who calmly explained that while he realized the American people might be interested in the news that our perilous rubber shortage had been remedied, his committee had decided it should not be published. The publication was considered inadvisable. This "ghost" committee, Mr. Rice intimated, had established this principle of secret over-all decisions shortly after Pearl Harbor. An effort was made by the Rubber Development Corporation officials to determine who was on this mysterious committee. Mr. Rice was evasive. The Army, Navy, State Department were represented. Well, what was the committee called? Mr. Rice was not sure. "Really," Mr. Rice concluded affably, "it doesn't matter. Just call it the committee." By whose authority, the inquirer asked, does such a committee exist and function? The answer was, given in that attitude of benevolent confidence peculiar to Washington, "By Executive order of the President."

Mr. Speaker, certain Members of the Congress endeavored to ferret out this committee, and they learned from Palmer Hoyt, at that time domestic administrator of the O. W. I., that Mr. Hoyt had run into this committee many times and he did not feel that he wanted to undertake a show-down with it. Mr. Leo Crowley, for some reason, cooled off, and the result was that this supersecret committee got away with it and the American people were deprived of the information until a couple of months later a Senate committee hearing developed the facts. As the Post editorial aptly put it:

> Perhaps through lethargy rather than respect for antiquated theories of democratic government, the "ghost" committee failed to challenge the authority of the United States Senate to make the inquiry.

I need not tell you that no more dangerous situation could exist in your Government and in your Capital than just such an all-powerful secret committee as this. There it sits, or did sit, deciding on the basis of its own whims and prejudices and judgment whether or not the people may or may not have facts which they

are entitled to have about their Government, which they support, about the supply of rubber, which touches their daily lives at almost every point, and about the war in which their loved ones are fighting, and which they are largely going to pay for over the years. There could be nothing further from our fundamental concepts of free government than such a secret authority, unelected by the people, not even known to the Congress, sitting in secret, overruling the public agency, the O. W. I., and, by authority of the President, concealing facts of government and facts of the war operation from the American people which the people ought to have. In this particular case, such a story would not have aroused criticism of the Government, it would have aroused commendation for the Government. But even so, this hierarchy was narrow enough, was arrogant enough, and was stupid enough to deprive the American people of this ray of encouragement at a time when they were being told they might have to give up their automobile tires and lay up their cars because of a rubber scarcity which was getting worse, according to the newspapers. The refusal to give the American people that information unquestionably caused millions of Americans deep worry and sleepless nights, wondering how they could carry on their business, how they could get to their jobs, how their daily lives could go on if they had to give up their automobile tires to the Government and lay up their cars for the duration.

There apparently has grown up in Washington a general policy in the executive department to give out no information which might bring criticism of that department or any part of it. At the very time the O. W. I. was being pounded in Congress and in the press for not giving the people information to which they were entitled and which they could have had, this secret committee of higher-ups hiding in the mysterious maze of governmental bureaus and commissions, skulking far back behind the scenes, was pulling the strings which closed the avenues of information and denied the American people knowledge they were entitled to have had.

It is time for official Washington to recall some facts which still are facts. One of them is that a state of war does not preclude the citizen from exercising his right and privilege of criticizing his Government for doing something wrong or stupid. This principle was well recognized by Woodrow Wilson during the First World War when he said:

> We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. It is hoped that criticism will be constructive, but better unfair attack than autocratic repression. Honesty and confidence require no shield of secrecy.

The late Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, one of the greatest liberals who ever sat on the Supreme Bench, one of the most patriotic citizens ever produced in America, one of the keenest students of government the world ever knew, said concerning the same point:

> We do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war.

The very existence of this secret committee in Washington with its hands on the outlet valve of all information concerning the Government, operating that valve in secret, far back from the gaze of the public, far away from scrutiny by the Congress, hidden away from criticism by the press, is the very essence of tyranny. It is the dictatorial hand by which free government, free enterprise, free society will be strangled and destroyed unless it is brought out in the open light of day where it can be dealt with as it deserves to be dealt with. Whenever any Chief Executive lends himself to such a procedure by an Executive order, he has, then and there, departed entirely from the principle of free government and has started down the road to despotism.

The American people should rise up in wrath and demand of their Congress that this mysterious "ghost" committee which has set itself up as the judges and censors of what the people may learn about their Government and the operation of this war, be investigated, be brought into the open, its membership disclosed. If any such committee is going to function above the O. W. I., let the Congress and the people know who is on the committee, how it functions, why it functions, and by what authority it functions.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been, in my time in Congress, a clearer example than this of the sort of abuse, the sort of secret government by autocracy which exemplifies the wisdom of the injunction that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

We are in the greatest war of all time. We are under the most widespread bureaucracy, the most evasive bureaucracy in our history. It operates in the most secret fashion of any bureaucracy in our history, and I am frank to say that there are more aliens in it than there ever have been in any previous governmental bureaucracy in our history. It is shot through and honeycombed with people who would overturn our free constitutional government, our free enterprise economy, our free society, and who would substitute in place thereof the autocracy of a political monopoly operating under the secret manipulation of a bureaucracy designed to produce state socialism, communism, or fascism.

It is just this sort of secret authority exercised back in the dark recesses of governmental caverns that has resulted in a planned confusion which eventuated in what today is regimented chaos.

Naturalization of Filipino War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

NATURALIZATION OF FILIPINO WAR VETERANS—
UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Department of Maryland.

Whereas there is now a popular movement in the United States to grant the rights of citizenship to those Filipinos who have shown their love of democracy by their struggle by the side of the United Nations; and

Whereas the political and cultural attainment of the Filipinos under the guidance and protection of the United States for nearly 50 years has demonstrated their affiliation with American ideals and principles; and

Whereas our most distinguished member of the Disabled American Veterans, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, has cast his lot with the Filipino people in behalf of their advancement and military plans; and

Whereas the heroism and sacrifices of the Filipino at Bataan and Corregidor cries for a gesture of world-wide acclaim, so the action of the righteous may be awarded; and

Whereas the naturalization of those Filipinos who have fought on our home front and the battle front for the preservation of our ideals and principles, and who were formally entitled to be granted the privilege of naturalization from World War No. 1, together with those who are Allies in the present world-wide struggle, have demonstrated the finest example of democratic service and sacrifice, and have achieved the right of being called comrade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Col. Theodore Roosevelt Camp, No. 6, Baltimore, Department of Maryland, U. S. W. V., at our monthly meeting assembled this 17th day of March, 1944, That we endorse H. R. 4229 and commend the action of the American Legion, Department of California, at their department convention, August 12–16, 1939, and we hereby urge that the bill enacted in Congress permitting those who served the United States of America in the World War, be reenacted so those who failed to obtain their citizenship be allowed to regain the benefits thereof, and also, so those who have proved their worthiness of citizenship in the present struggle, shall likewise be granted similar benefits and privileges.

Done at the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland, this 17th day of March 1944.

Official:

JOHN H. GLAESER,
Commander.
HOWARD D. SOUTH,
Adjutant.

The above resolution was also endorsed by the following veteran organizations: Admiral Bob Evans Camp, No. 135, U. S. W. V., Department of California; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Glendale Post No. 1937, Department of California, Disabled American Veterans, REA Chapter No. 5, Department of the District of Columbia; Regular Veterans Association, Post No. 3, Department of Virginia, Maryland, and District of Columbia.

NATIONAL CATHEDRAL POST, NO. 10,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1944.

FILIPINO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention C. T. Elbo, president.)

DEAR MR. ELBO: This is to formally advise you that at the regular monthly meeting of National Cathedral Post, No. 10, American Legion, District of Columbia Department, held at the Legion clubhouse on Wednesday, March 22, the post passed a resolution endorsing H. R. 4229 to authorize the naturalization of native-born Filipinos permanently residing in the United States and Filipinos who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War No. 1. By such resolution, the post automatically endorsed resolution No. 39 of Department of California, American Legion.

I am very pleased to personally make this favorable report to you regarding this par-

ticular matter which is of such great importance to your organization.

Respectfully,

HERBERT J. JACOBI,
Commander.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA.
Resolution 39
Naturalization of Filipino World War veterans

Whereas there are many Filipinos in America who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War desirous of becoming citizens; and

Whereas the bill enacted in Congress permitting those who served the United States of America in the World War has expired; and

Whereas some Filipinos took advantage of said act, many did not know of or understand the significance of said act and thereby failed to gain the benefits thereof; and

Whereas the Filipino ex-servicemen are getting older and fewer and the greater number have every intention of remaining in the United States for the rest of their lives, they feel that there is discrimination against them in not permitting them to become citizens;

Wherefore the American Legion, Department of California, as a body gives its support to secure American citizenship for the herebefore mentioned veterans.

Seconded by Solon Beattie, East Hollywood Post; carried.

I certify that this is a true copy of the resolution above taken from pages 66 and 67, Summary of Proceedings Twenty-First Annual Convention, the American Legion, Department of California.

EDWARD J. KELLY,
Chairman, Veterans' Legislation Committee Council.

(Above resolution unanimously passed at a department convention of the American Legion held at Oakland, Calif., on August 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1939.)

The Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two addresses delivered on March 25, 1944, by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], one over Station KSD in St. Louis, Mo., and the other in St. Louis before the National Public Housing Conference be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this connection I wish to say that the Senator from Louisiana is chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Education and Labor which handles the housing measures which come before that committee.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FACTS ABOUT HOUSING

(Address delivered by Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator from Louisiana, on March 25, 1944, over Station KSD, St. Louis, Mo.)

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, for some time Fulton Lewis Jr., has been broadcasting a series of attacks against the housing program. I will take this opportunity of making answer to his unfounded charges. Unlike Commentator Lewis, my sources of information are official. I am chairman of a Senate subcommittee which has been handling the legislation for all of the housing programs to which Mr. Lewis is opposed. From time to time, our committee has reviewed these programs. When we have talked about them we have known what we were talking about. And when we have acted upon them, we have always done so on a nonpartisan basis.

I think that I might be most helpful in this discussion by calling to Mr. Lewis' attention just what he is attacking. He thinks that he is assailing slum clearance and low-rent housing. He thinks that he is criticizing public housing. Maybe he even thinks that he is discrediting the administration in Washington. I can understand why he might want to try to discredit these things. But the truth is that Mr. Lewis is really attacking something quite different, although he does not seem to realize it. He is attacking the war effort. He is demeaning war workers. He is belittling the Congress of the United States. He is questioning the competence of local governments and local communities. He is casting aspersions upon thousands of local citizens—real-estate men, businessmen, bankers, labor leaders among them—who are helping to do a patriotic job of providing war housing for war workers. He is dealing irresponsibly with the morale of the American people by talking to them about something directly related to the war effort about which he has not bothered to inform himself in the slightest.

Perhaps if Mr. Lewis were to realize what he is attacking he would quiet down a bit and give his audience truthful information.

Mr. Lewis says that he is not talking about the war-housing program. He says that this program is necessary and desirable. He says that he is attacking only what he calls the Federal slum-clearance and low-rent housing program. This program, he says, is now being built during the war to the tune of "untold millions of dollars' worth of new housing."

This assertion of Mr. Lewis is exactly 100-percent incorrect. Since the war started, the slum clearance and low-rent housing program has been stopped. The current housing, about which Mr. Lewis is talking and which he is criticizing so violently, is war housing for war workers. The statements which he makes about this housing are erroneous. The implications and conclusions which he draws from these assertions are even more misleading.

Now, here is the situation in a nutshell.

Before the war, in 1937, a program was started to provide low-rent housing for families of very low income, drawn from the slums. Before the war this program was proceeding successfully. It was rehousing families who lived in the slums. It was providing for the demolition of a slum unit for every new unit built. It was not housing a single family except those who could not afford to live in decent housing built by private enterprise. It was noncompetitive with private enterprise. It was achieving throughout the country an average rent, without utility charges, of $12.79 per family unit per month, serving families with average annual incomes, on a national basis, of $832. It was not a Federal program. All of the houses were built, owned, and managed by local housing authorities, composed of representative local citizens, generally appointed by the mayors of the communities under State enabling legislation. More than half the total cost of these projects—including construction and operation—was being paid in the form of rent by the occupants, although their incomes were miserably low. Less than half the cost was being contributed by the Federal Government in the form of annual grants-in-aid, and by the local governments in the form of tax exemption.

So much for the program before the war. Now let us see what happened when the war started.

First, the Congress passed a law, which provided in substance: If any of these projects which was started for slum clearance and low-rent housing are uncompleted, they may be completed and used as war housing for war workers for the duration of the war. If any of these houses have vacant units, these vacant units may likewise be used by war workers for the duration. If the war workers have higher incomes than the slum dwellers for whom the projects were originally intended, this higher income shall not prevent their admission. But they shall pay rents based upon this higher income. To that extent, they shall not receive subsidies. Because of the critical shortage of housing during the war, the requirement that one house shall be torn down for every new house built is suspended for the duration.

This, in effect, is the law that Congress enacted. In short, the Congress provided that the peacetime slum clearance and low-rent housing program might be converted to war use, just as many industries have been converted to war use. This was necessary because war workers from all over the country, by the millions, were in-migrating to centers of war production. They had to have shelter—to have it quickly.

But the Congress did not draft these projects for war use. The law was permissive, not mandatory. It was left to the local housing authorities, which owned and managed these projects, to make the decision. The decision which was made is a high tribute to the patiotism of these local housing authorities—these citizens in communities all over America. They proceeded, insofar as possible, to turn the vacant units and the uncompleted projects over for war use to war workers—for the duration.

It is this patriotic decision which has been the basis of the confused criticism of Mr. Fulton Lewis. He points out that in one unit, there may be a family paying $18 a month rent, and that in another similar unit there may be a family paying about $50 a month rent. He points out that there are some families living in the units who earn as much as $3,000 a year.

Now what is the explanation? It is very simple. The family paying $18 a month rent is a family of very low income, transferred from a festering slum to this decent low-cost housing before the war. This family is, as I have said, receiving financial assistance from the Federal Government and from the locality. The family paying about $50 a month rent, or anything like it, and earning $3,000 a year, is a family of war workers. To this family, the low-cost housing built ultimately for slum dwellers of low income has been temporarily given up for the duration of the war. This war-worker family is paying what is called a full economic rent, and is not receiving subsidy or aid from any source. The units which are occupied as war housing, and which are benefiting by this economic rent, are paying local taxes in large amounts.

This is the simple situation about which Mr. Lewis is complaining, and which he is unjustly criticizing from one end of the country to the other, creating confusion and distrust.

Mr. Lewis is casting a slur upon every poor family of former slum dwellers, now living in these decent projects, by implying that they are getting something cheaper than somebody else—without giving the true explanation.

Mr. Lewis is casting a slur upon all of the war-workers' families living in these converted projects, by insinuating that their incomes are so high that they should not be living there, or that they are not paying for what they get.

Mr. Lewis is attacking by indirection the War Production Board, which in view of the critical shortage of war materials has had to restrict housing construction very severely—thus making it obvious that some slum clearance and low-rent housing projects be diverted temporarily to war use.

Mr. Lewis is casting a reflection upon every mayor and every member of local government, in all the communities where this conversion to war use has taken place—because, as I have said, the projects about which he is talking are all local projects owned, controlled, and managed by these local authorities created under State laws. They were converted to war use by voluntary local action, after Congress gave its assent.

Mr. Lewis is ridiculing the Congress of the United States, which passed the enabling legislation making it possible to divert these projects to war housing.

And incidentally, Mr. Lewis is severely criticizing and attacking certain important policies of the Army and Navy. In one of his talks, he made much of the fact that the families of military personnel were not being provided with newly constructed war housing. This rests upon a decision of the War and Navy Departments.

War housing is not something to be trifled with, or treated as a political football by a well-paid radio commentator. War housing is necessary to provide a shelter over the head of the men and women who are making our planes and ships and tanks and guns. An attack upon war housing is an attack upon the boys who need the planes and ships and tanks and guns. It is an attack upon the war effort itself.

Mr. Lewis cannot squirm out of this by his carefully calculated statements that he is not attacking war housing. These statements only add to the confusion. For the figures and situations, which he cites, are the direct result of using for war workers the projects which were intended originally for slum dwellers.

I believe in as much private enterprise as feasible and possible, during the war and after the war. But private enterprise cannot fight the war alone. It needs the assistance of public housing, just as much as it needs the assistance of war contracts and guaranties for the expansion of plants, or for the job of reconversion after the war.

I look forward to a vast home-building program after the war, mostly by private enterprise. Such a program will help to rebuild our cities and our smaller communities, to bring better living conditions in rural areas, and to make more jobs for our returning heroes and for others who will be turned out of war work.

But this kind of post-war-housing program must be based upon intelligence and good will, upon a true appraisal of the situation and an accurate statement of the facts. Anyone who attempts to throw the housing situation into a chaos of misinformation and confusion, at the present time, is certainly not helping to build a sound foundation for the future. Mr. Fulton Lewis undoubtedly believes that he is a friend of private enterprise and of the home-building industry. But I contend that he is doing private enterprise and home builders the greatest possible disservice, by his unrestrained and unreflective misinformation.

Unfortunately, most people are so busy doing their war jobs that they have no time to answer these attacks. But somebody must answer them, before they do too much damage to all the things that we are fighting for, and too much damage to the war effort itself.

Therefore, I appreciate this opportunity to answer the attacks of Mr. Lewis upon the war-housing program—to answer these attacks because, upon analysis, they are attacks upon the Congress, the Army, the Navy, local governments, local housing authorities, war workers, families of low income, and upon all the people who are straining every effort to achieve national unity and to win the war.

COMMON SENSE IN POST-WAR HOUSING

(Address delivered by Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator from Louisiana, on March 25, 1944, in St. Louis, Mo., before the National Public Housing Conference)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have been asked to speak on the subject Homes or the Dole. In view of my long interest in public housing, I desire also to discuss with you some of the broader problems and more important considerations than this limited topic ordinarily encompasses. I think that before I conclude my remarks it will be clear to you why I am adopting this course. And I hope that you will agree with what I have to say.

My activities in behalf of public housing go back to its inception. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will indicate that I was in the midst of the battle on the Senate floor for the passage of the United States Housing Act in 1937. I have been in the fight ever since, and you may count upon me to continue to remain in the struggle, so long as I retain my membership in the United States Senate.

As some of you may be aware, I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which has handled slum clearance and low-rent housing legislation, as well as the publicly financed portion of the war-housing program. This subcommittee, as well as the full committee is heartily sympathetic with the aims and objectives of slum clearance and low-rent housing.

I am proud of the record of the low-rent public-housing program, although it has been the subject of harsh, unjust, and uncalled-for criticism. It has performed most satisfactorily in my State. It has done likewise, I am sure, throughout the country, in small places, in medium-sized cities, and in our largest centers of population. The main trouble with the program is that it has been inadequate. After the war we must continue and expand the program. To do this we must begin to get ready now, and it is imperative that the people be told the truth about the program of the past and what is in prospect for the future.

There is no need to tell this group that most of the attacks upon public housing have been unfair, unjustified, selfish, and based upon gross ignorance.

The most common attack has been that the program did not rehouse families of sufficiently low income. The facts refute this charge completely. Before the war the program as a whole achieved an everage shelter rent throughout the country of $12.79 per family unit per month. It housed families with average yearly incomes, on a Nation-wide basis, of $832.

You may be certain that, if the program had housed families of still lower average yearly incomes—that is, if it had housed only the worst relief cases—the opposition would have criticized it as a program solely for people who were indolent or shiftless or undeserving. Of course, I do not believe that families on relief should be so characterized. But I do say, that this is what the enemies of the U. S. H. A. program would have said about the housing program, if it had housed only relief families. In fact, the foes of the program are saying this anyway. They are consistently moving in two directions at once, half the time arguing that the projects should house lower income families, and the other half the time arguing that it should house higher income families. They are seesawing between the two groups in the hope of creating confusion and dissatisfaction.

My own belief is that the program has struck a wise and happy medium in this matter. It has not been administered as an emergency poor-relief job. It has been conducted in a manner to provide decent and dignified aid to families of low income—families who are industrious and deserving and a part of the working population, but whom our economic system has not provided with sufficient income in peacetimes to live in decent housing without public aid. Until our economic system can lift the incomes of these families to the point where they can afford to obtain decent housing entirely on their own, we must continue this public assistance. And we must continue it in the self-respecting and desirable form which it has already taken.

For these reasons, I am opposed to any proposal to abolish the present slum clearance and low-rent housing program, or to substitute any method of rent certificates or rent relief which would handle each family on a case-work basis, veiled in an atmosphere of charity. These suggestions should be placed in the same category as the proposals, made a few years ago, to junk the social security system and to substitute therefor the dole.

Furthermore, I am opposed to these rent certificates or rent-relief plans, because they would tend to perpetuate and subsidize the slums. They would provide no method for large-scale, well planned developments to remove the slums, and to rebuild the blighted areas of our American communities.

On the other hand, none of the attacks made upon the financing plan under the United States Housing Act has impressed me in the slightest. I have spent many hours analyzing in detail the method of financial operations used by local housing authorities, in clearing slums and rehousing slum dwellers.

The essence of this plan is that the development cost of projects is put upon a loan basis, with the Federal Government receiving repayment in full for all loans made, at the long-term Federal rate of interest plus one-half of 1 percent. Since the Government has thus far been borrowing money at a substantially lower rate of interest than the prevailing long-term rate, there has been a profit to the Government on the loan transaction. This profit, I am informed, has been about sufficient to cover the administrative expenses of the United States Housing Authority—now the Federal Public Housing Authority—for the slum-clearance and low-rent housing program.

This being the case, the only cost of the program to the Federal Government has been in the annual contributions to help achieve low rents. This annual contributory system, which some of the critics of the program have distorted and even called misleading, is one of the most honest and simple methods of grants-in-aid that has been devised. Anyone who takes the trouble to study the plan, instead of attacking it blindly, can find out exactly what the program costs each year. He will discover also that the amount of aid is measured exactly against the need, and can be decreased in any year when better economic conditions are made available to the beneficiaries of the program and when economies in operation reduce the amount of aid required.

Let me give a factual illustration of this point. The maximum annual contribution to achieve low rents permitted under the law is about 3½ percent. This would result in an annual contribution of about $25,000,000, during normal peacetime, on the 154,189 completed local authority family units under the United States Housing Act. But even before the war, by various economies, the annual contribution rate had been reduced to about

2.8 percent, which would involve annual contributions of about $20,000,000 for a program of the same size. When the war came along, the 154,189 family units under local authorities were divided into 100,355 continued as low-rent projects and 53,834 units converted to war use. For the 100,355 low-rent units, due to higher incomes during the war, the annual contribution rate has been reduced to about 2.2 percent, involving annual contributions of $10,339,356. For the 53,834 units converted to war use, the annual contribution rate has been reduced to twenty-three one-hundredths of 1 percent, involving annual contributions of $607,935. Therefore, at the present time the total annual contributions on the whole 154,189 units is only $10,947,291, contrasted with the maximum of about $25,000,000 which would be available under the law.

To state this another way: The people who are occupying these projects are paying about $14,000,000 more in annual rents than they would be paying if the Government extended as much aid as the law permits. They are paying about $9,000,000 more in rents than the normal pre-war rate. To state this in still another way, the occupants of the project are paying almost $45,000,000 in annual rents, as against an annual contribution of less than $11,000,000 by the Government.

Let these figures be the answer to those who talk about the occupants of these projects as if they were irresponsible people, unwilling to pay their own way to the last dollar of their capacity. Let this be the answer to those who claim that the plan now in use is uneconomical or unsound.

Of course, we know that after the war the incomes of the occupants of these housing projects will not be as high as now. Somewhat larger amounts of Government assistance will be necessary. But I think that the country will be more prosperous after the war than it was before the war, that we shall gradually raise our standards of living, and that the program will continue to advance in the economical direction that it was moving before the war began.

It has been particularly shocking to me, that the patriotic service which local housing authorities have rendered in turning 53,834 units in their projects over to war use, has been made the occasion for attack upon the program. When Congress passed the United States Housing Act, it contemplated slum clearance and low-rent housing. Later Congress authorized, but did not compel, the conversion of this housing to war purposes. The local housing authorities have voluntarily made this conversion, with regard to the 53,834 units that I have mentioned. Naturally, the war workers have fairly good incomes in these times, and, as I have indicated, the subsidies on these converted projects have been reduced to a nominal figure. And yet, we hear radio commentators and others berating and vilifying the local housing authorities and the public-housing program—because they have joined in winning the war instead of remaining on a peacetime basis—and because this war work has made the projects temporarily available to families with higher incomes.

A few days ago, I examined another one of the so-called plans which has been trotted out as a substitute for the low-rent housing and the slum clearance program. This is the so-called tax abatement plan. It rests upon the propcsition that the Federal Government should enable wealthy individuals to avoid Federal income taxes entirely as to that part of their income which they invest in land bonds and housing construction, and also exempt from taxation the income on these bonds and this housing. It is claimed that this would result in better housing at lower cost to slum dwellers—through a system which is attractively called "public housing privately owned."

Let us look at just a few figures as to how public housing privately owned would work, in comparison with the United States Housing Act plan. I have before me a table of figures which contrasts the two methods, but I will refer here only to the high lights. Under the United States Housing Act, a housing unit built on expensive central slum land, with the land costing $2,000 and the building costing $4,000, coming to a total of $6,000, might receive, for example, an annual contribution from the Federal Government of about $131 a year. This would achieve a shelter rent of about $16 a month, and would serve a family with an income of about $960 a year. Under the so-called tax abatement plan, in contrast, for the same unit, there would be involved a capital grant of $4,800 in the form of tax abatement (assuming that the taxpayer would receive income placing him in the 80 percent bracket), plus an additional contribution of $110 in the form of additional tax abatement. In addition to the tax abatement of $110, the Government would pay interest on the capital grant abated, which if paid, could be used to reduce the public debt. And these subsidies, so much larger than the subsidies under the United States Housing Act, would produce a monthly rent for the unit of $45, serving a family inome group of about $2,700. In short, despite much higher cost to the Government, this plan for public housing privately owned would serve the upper income half of the population, rather than the lower income third.

(See table marked "Exhibit A.")

So much for the opponents of public housing. I have come to talk to you, not as an opponent, but as a friend. But I would be less than a friend, if I did not tell you about your errors as well as your achievements—if I did not warn you of the difficulties which public housing faces—if I did not indicate what steps you should take to better your postition and strengthen your cause.

We must frankly face the fact that public housing before the war did not receive as much popular support as its merits entitled it to. In fact, 1938 was the last year in which the Congress approved the public housing program. This was only 1 year after the enactment of the original law and before any projects were completed. In the 3 years between 1938 and the outbreak of the war public housing gradually lost ground in the Congress. You know this to be true.

It is foolish to blame this trend on a few individuals. It is short-sighted to think that the situation can be changed after the war just by wishful thinking. There is only one sensible way by which this situation can be changed in a democracy—and that is by making public housing understood and popular in the communities throughout the country. When public housing is really popular and really wanted at home, Washington will respond.

If public housing is not sufficiently popular at home to gain congressional approval, that is not the fault of the people working in Washington for the Federal Government. There is very little that they can do about it. It is up to the local people, interested in public housing throughout the country, to create the urge. If the situation is remedied, these local people will deserve most of the credit. But if the situation remains as it has been in the past, they will deserve most of the blame.

For this reason I am particularly pleased with the reorganization that has recently taken place in the National Public Housing Conference. My understanding is that the conference is going to be a militant, aggressive organization. I hope that it does not confine its fighting to Washington or make the mistake of criticizing its friends. The housing advocates have already spent too much time criticizing each other. If the conference can work to stimulate the kind of local support and local action which I have mentioned, public housing will have a better chance to move forward. It is up to people like you who are here today to do this job.

A successful campaign for public housing involves something more than loud shouting, or agitation. The way to win this cause is to fight with the head as well as the heart. You must profit by your mistakes. You must conduct your fight in accord with the spirit of the times, and in the light of your past experience.

I should like to summarize some of this experience, and the conclusions to which it seems to lead:

The greatest handicap to housing, until 2 years ago, was the number of housing agencies in the Federal Government. Congress was first bewildered, and then antagonized—and may I add "agonized"— by 16 or more bureaus and agencies, each trying to aggrandize itself instead of making every effort to help housing. Even assuming the noblest motives on the part of all these agencies and bureaus, it was utterly impossible to work out an intelligent housing policy or program under such divided leadership.

The housing reorganization of February 1942, which put all of these 16 or more bureaus and agencies under the National Housing Agency, was long overdue. This reorganization has resulted in economy. It has led to increased efficiency. It has removed squabbling, wrangling, and much scuffling from the Washington housing scene. It has raised housing in the esteem of the Congress. My prediction is that, when Congress considers post-war-housing legislation, it will confirm and carry even further this consolidation of the housing activities of the Federal Government. Common sense makes this much certain.

It is my firm conviction that both public and private housing can go ahead most effectively after the war only as a part of this consolidated program, and under the roof of the National Housing Agency, or one similar thereto. The Administrator of the National Housing Agency, Mr. John Blandford, is a warm friend of public housing. He has utilized and helped to keep alive the local authorities during the war. He has used public financing for about half of the recent war housing construction. When he says that we cannot expect anywhere near so large a proportion of publicly financed housing after the war, he is merely stating a fact. From my discussions with Mr. Blandford, and from some of his recent talks which I have read, I believe that he is following a wise and balanced course, for now and for post-war housing, in terms of the over-all situation.

The Congress is tired of the fighting among bureaucrats. Mr. Blandford has about stopped the bickering and has achieved a more unified housing front. In his congressional relationships he has accurately sized up the situation and has won the confidence of the Congress. The National Housing Agency and the comprehensive approach which it represents is essential to a future in which the whole housing need can be met, private and public, each operating within its proper field.

Another reason why public-housing progress has been slow has been because the program has been too limited in its objectives. We can all agree that slum dwellers need help first, and need help most. But at the same time, we must realize that no community can solve its housing problems by public housing alone. Public housing should do only the part of the job that private enterprise cannot accomplish. Private enterprise should be encouraged and facilitated to do as much of the job as possible, in fact, to the limit of its capacity. Only in this way can we really rebuild our communities. Only in this way can we really succeed in obtaining decent housing for all groups of Americans. Only in this way can we raise the

post-war housing program to a magnitude through which housing can make its full contribution to post-war employment, prosperity, and high national income.

This means that in the communities private enterprise and public housing should work hand in hand. Local housing authorities, if they are to survive and prosper, must expand their activities and raise their sight. They must take the broad comprehensive view, at the local level, which the National Housing Agency is taking at the Federal level. They must concern themselves with helping to serve the whole housing needs of the community, through good land planning, through stimulation of private enterprise, and through public housing whenever necessary. They should not limit themselves to one narrow job, because the country wants to see the whole job done. In short, each local authority should view the housing needs under its jurisdiction through the small end of the telescope.

I have said that the National Public Housing Conference and the local housing authorities should work for public housing. But they must also work for something bigger than that. The National Public Housing Conference should not get into the role of a pressure group, fighting only to protect one particular housing formula, or one particular housing method, or housing only for one particular group, or one particular kind of local housing agency. If the conference gets into that kind of role, it will not command any more respect or support than any other purely selfish pressure group. The real job of people who call themselves public housers is to express the whole public interest in housing, and not just in public housing, and to work for all the kinds of housing which the people need. I say this to you as a friend of public housing. I know the congressional attitudes, and I think I know the temper of the country. Public housing should not try to go ahead on the old, narrow, limited basis. But if the local authorities, at the community level, adopt the broad and comprehensive approach to the whole job that the National Housing Agency has taken, under the leadership of the National Housing Agency, they will be very likely to succeed, and I know that the Congress will cheerfully respond.

I am extremely hopeful that before long there will be an opportunity to propose and enact comprehensive legislation dealing with post-war housing. This legislation should follow these broad lines:

1. The National Housing Agency, and the consolidation which it represents, should be improved and made permanent.

2. The National Housing Agency should be furnished with all the tools which may help and stimulate private enterprise to do as large a part of the post-war-housing job as it possibly can do.

3. The National Housing Agency should also have tools to assist communities to provide publicly aided housing for those whom private enterprise—with all the help we can give it—cannot serve.

4. The post-war-housing program should operate on an entirely decentralized basis, with the communities determining their own housing needs and requesting such financial assistance as they may require from the Federal Government. The Federal Government should not build houses or conduct direct housing programs.

I know that the National Housing Agency is also moving along this direction. If all those interested in housing will help the agency to continue to follow that course, the prospects for housing will be brighter than ever before.

In addition, I believe that the State enabling legislation, under which local housing authorities were established, should be broadened, to the end that there may be local agencies of Government to perform the role of the National Housing Agency at the local level.

I have tried to be very realistic with you, telling you exactly what the situation is as I see it. Public housing can be stronger if it does not try to move solely on its own steam. It can gather greater strength and go further if it joins hands with private enterprise in a comprehensive approach. Both groups must accommodate their views, avoid any appearance of being ideologists, and move toward housing unity. That is what the National Housing Agency symbolizes. That is what the Congress and the country want.

Permit me to thank you for this opporunity to address you. It is a great pleasure to be here with you and, may I repeat, you may count upon me to continue to help you in every capacity within my power.

EXHIBIT A

Assumption: A unit involving expensive central slum clearance, $2,000 for land, $4,000 for building; total, $6,000

I. Under United States Housing Act plan

Annual charges to be met:	
Interest and amortization (58 years, 2½ percent)	$197
Operating costs	110
Payments in lieu of taxes (5 percent of shelter rent)	10
Vacancy and collection loss (3 percent)	6
	323
Less Federal annual contribution	131
Annual rent charged occupant	192
Monthly rent charged occupant	16
Family income group served	960
Total annual subsidy cost:	
Federal annual contribution (total subsidy cost to Federal Government)	131
Value of local tax exemption	19
Total	150

II. Under tax abatement plan

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization on $2,000 land (100 years, 1¾ percent)	35
Amortization on $4,000 building (33 years, 3 percent)	120
Operating costs	110
Taxes	100
Vacancy, collection, and contingency loss (10 percent)	54
Profit (3 percent on $4,000)	120
Total annual charges to be met	539
Monthly rental charged tenant	45
Family income group served	2,700
Total subsidy cost to Federal Government:	
(1) Capital grant:	
By tax abatement to purchaser of land bond (80 percent of $2,000)	1,600
By tax abatement to developer of house (80 percent of $4,000)	3,200
Total capital grant	4,800
(2) Annual contribution:	
By tax abatement on profit (80 percent of $120)	96
By tax abatement on yield on land bonds (80 percent of seven-eighths percent of $2,000)	14
Total annual contribution	110

1. Total local projects under U. S. Housing Act

	Number of units	Total development cost
In use as low-rent	100,355	$465,010,000
Converted to war use	53,834	259,322,000
Total	154,189	724,332,000
Suspended	24,940	98,918,000
Total	179,129	823,250,000

2. Annual contributions on 154,189 units

	Percent of development cost	Total amount	Amount per family
Normal pre-war	2.8	$20,281,296	$131.54
Wartime:			
On 100,355 low-rent	2.2	10,339,356	103.03
On 53,834 converted	.23	607,935	11.29
Total		10,947,291	

3. Rental paid by occupants of 154,189 units

Prewar	$33,267,818
Wartime:	
On 100,355 low-rent	
On 53,834 converted	
Total	

4. Average shelter rent per unit and incomes before war

	Shelter rent	Family income
North	$14.73	$936
South	10.48	710
National	12.79	832

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made before the Banking and Currency Committee today by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, in relation to the extension of the Price Control Act, as amended.

On behalf of the Grange, Mr. Goss urged extension of the act for 1 year only, but with amendments which would cause the Government agencies concerned to use the act to balance the national economy, instead of unbalancing it.

The grange master reiterated his opposition to general subsidies, asserting that unless a halt is called they will continue to grow and to augment a most dangerous economic unbalance. Nevertheless, Mr. Goss added, we must be realistic.

He said:

We are already in so deep that any sudden cutting off of funds would create serious trouble.

We don't like subsidies but believe that it would be better to taper off their use than to make too drastic and sudden a change.

Mr. Goss recommended that subsidy payments should be restricted to three types. Type I, which he called the copper type, would include cases where it is deemed necessary to increase production for war purposes by bringing into production additional high-cost crops. Type II is the so-called sugar type, limited to commodities of which more than half are imported and where higher prices would redound to the benefit of growers in other nations, whether or not it was needed to maintain production. Type III, called the two-price type, would assist American farmers in moving surpluses into world markets.

Subsidies not falling under one of those three types should be reduced not less than 10 percent per month until they have been eliminated, Mr. Goss said. The ceiling prices should be increased at the same rate that subsidies are decreased, he said.

Thus—

Mr. Goss said—

we could gradually work out of a most dangerous situation which, if allowed to continue, will lead directly to chaos. To assure that no loophole is found permitting expansion, a limit of $1,500,000,000 for subsidies on farm products should be maintained.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Office of Price Administration was established primarily to aid in the prevention of inflation. The National Grange has pointed out to this committee on several occasions the serious dangers which lie in placing our chief reliance on price ceilings as a remedy for inflation. Neither will a combination of price ceilings and subsidies meet the issue. Before Pearl Harbor we laid down some basic principles which we may well pause to review. At the seventy-fifth annual session in 1941 the National Grange declared in part:

"The right to store up the results of skill and labor in the form of property is fundamental to the preservation of the American way of life. One of the greatest dangers this country faces is from inflation, which, unless controlled, may destroy the foundations of our democracy. There are two methods of control: First is the use of economic devices designed to lessen the pressure of surplus income on inadequate supplies; second is the arbitrary control of prices, labor, rents, commissions, etc.

"Among the economic devices are—

"1. Encouraging savings and building individual reserves, to meet the shock of post-war adjustments.

"2. Increase in income taxation, coupled with efficient and economical administration of government, which will serve to retard inflation and prevent the passing of an unnecessary debt burden to future generations.

"3. Encouraging investment (by individuals in preference to banks) in Government securities which finance the borrowing from which employment and excess income are derived.

"4. Maximum production of all consumer goods, which can be produced without hampering production of needed defense materials.

"5. Restricting credit to productive purposes and sound investments in order to discourage speculation.

"6. Voluntary reduction of selling prices, when increased volume results in lower costs and increased profits. This will promote the benefits of a cycle of plenty by reducing living costs, reversing the trend of the evils leading to inflation, and laying a firm foundation for post-war adjustment.

"If these measures do not serve to prevent prices advancing unreasonably it may be necessary to resort to measures of arbitrary price control. In that event certain definite principles should be borne in mind:

"First, some advance in price is a natural accomplishment of the great destruction of wealth as a result of war. This advance is not inflation. It is an unavoidable cost which all must bear. Any adjustments of prices, wages, rents, or commissions which relieve any group of bearing its share of the cost will result in increasing the burden of others, and are unsound.

"Second, any effort to increase profits because of the increased demands is inflationary. If arbitrary control is necessary it should be limited to profiteering.

"Third, if control is necessary, further than well-defined cases of profiteering, all should be subject to control so that equity among all groups will be assured."

You will note that stress was laid on those features designed to lessen the inflationary gap—production, taxing, and savings—while price ceilings were recommended only as a last resort. With proper application of the economic devices designed to close this inflationary gap, little need for price ceilings would exist. We have felt that not enough stress has been placed on such economic devices and too much reliance has been placed on ceilings, with the result that in some instances production has been curtailed, the gap widened, and the danger of inflation enhanced. This has led to the dangerous use of subsidies, in lieu of fair prices, in an effort to keep up production, and has started us on a perilous course which if long pursued will lead to the very disaster we are trying to avoid.

Our views on this subject are in the record of previous hearings. We will not repeat them. Our immediate problem is what to do with the O. P. A. Should it be allowed to expire, or should its life be continued? If continued, should its powers be enlarged, curtailed, or continued as at present?

While we believe that if sound policies had been pursued from the outset there would now be little need for price ceilings, we are faced with the fact that such policies have not been followed, and we have developed a system of regimentation extending far beyond the imagination of most of us 3 or 4 years ago. In our opinion, it would be disastrous suddenly to abandon all the arbitrary controls and expect our economy to right itself through natural processes. It is too badly warped by artificial rules, regulations, and directives to right itself easily. We, therefore, believe that the life of the O. P. A. should be extended, but that amendments should be made to the basic law designed to turn its activities to a sound course, so that gradually we may be able to dispense with practically all the regulations except those necessary to assure an equitable division of inadequate supplies and those designed to prevent profiteering. In the control of profiteering the O. P. A. has been of real service. This work should be continued and strengthened, while the uneconomic features should be curtailed and gradually eliminated. To that end we have some specific recommendations to make. In considering the suggestions to be made we debated whether we should recommend a minimum number of changes designed to correct the most glaring defects in the law and its administration, or should go into more detail. We determined that it would be best to express our views quite fully, realizing that the exigencies of the situation might make it impossible for the committee to adopt as far-reaching changes as we or the committee might desire.

STABILIZATION OF WAGES

You will note from the last sentence quoted in the Grange pronouncement that "if control is necessary, other than well-defined cases of profiteering, all should be subject to control, so that equity among all groups will be assured." This means everybody—industry, labor, and agriculture. If one group were allowed to escape control the others would have to pay the bill and we would develop an unbalanced economy. This is exactly what has been done. To start with, the Price Administrator vigorously opposed any control of labor, and we developed a great unbalance in our economy. The following table shows what has happened month by month for the past 4 years. You will note that the increase in living costs has lagged behind the increase in labor costs all the way and has been about one-fourth as large:

Economic trends—Corporate earnings based on average quarter, 1939—Others based 1935–39

	Cost of living	Retail food prices	Factory pay rolls per employed worker	Farm wage rates	Increase in corporate earnings after taxes	Increase in corporate earnings before taxes
1940					*Percent*	*Percent*
January	100	95	110.2	105		
February	100	97	106.5	------	5.8	10.8
March	100	96	105.4	------		
April	100	96	105.8	108		
May	100	97	106.0	------	2.6	21.7
June	100	98	108.0	------		
July	100	97	109.3	106		
August	100	96	111.5	------	15.0	34.9
September	100	97	115.6	------		
October	100	96	116.3	106		
November	100	96	117.2	------	62.4	88.3
December	101	97	120.2	------		
1941						
January	101	98	121.1	109		
February	101	98	120.4	------	29.4	98.6
March	101	98	119.7	------		
April	102	101	121.8	119		
May	103	102	128.5	------	67.4	156.5
June	105	106	133.5	------		
July	105	107	136.5	131		
August	106	108	135.9	------	97.4	200.5
September	108	111	138.5	------		
October	109	112	139.6	136		
November	110	113	142.0	------	117.8	230.4
December	110	113	144.9	------		
1942						
January	112	116	149.8	147		
February	113	117	151.7	------	60.0	221.1
March	114	119	155.6	------		
April	115	120	158.0	153		
May	116	122	161.2	------	74.1	249.3
June	116	123	163.2	------		
July	117	125	165.0	166		
August	118	126	169.3	------	89.2	272.2
September	118	127	171.2	------		
October	119	130	176.0	181		
November	120	131	180.8	------	98.3	288.8
December	120	133	182.6	------		
1943						
January	121	133	184.2	197		
February	121	134	186.6	------	85.8	296.9
March	123	137	189.5	------		
April	124	141	192.7	207		
May	125	143	195.7	------	95.02	320.2
June	125	142	196.0	------		
July	124	139	193.9	225		
August	123	137	196.9	------	101.1	333.0
September	124	137	201.2	------		
October	124	138	203.6	231		
November	124	137	205.3	------	------	------
December	124	137	202.5	------		
1944						
January	124	136	204.9	242	------	------
February	124	135	------	------	------	------

The Price Control Act was passed while the Price Administrator was still resisting any control of wages. The last sentence of Section 1 (a) ends with the words "to work toward a stabilization of prices, fair and

equitable wages, and cost of production." Section 302 (c) however, provides that nothing in the act should "be construed to authorize the regulation of compensation paid by an employer to any of his employees." Just why this should be in the section devoted to definitions was never clear, but it was very clear that labor was to be omitted. Reference to the table will show that advances in labor costs continued unchecked, at a rate four times as fast as the increase in living costs, while the advance in farm labor costs were nearly five times as fast as the increase in living costs. After some months of trial it became apparent that the price structure could not be stabilized with labor advancing so rapidly, so in September 1942, the President asked Congress for amendments to the Price Control Act. He asked for definite controls of farm prices and asked that labor be left to him. The amendment of October 2, therefore, provides that the President may suspend the provision which forbids wage control "to the extent that it is inconsistent with the act." The whole question of wage stabilization seems to be more or less ambiguous, and we recommend that the matter should be clarified by amending the last clause of the last sentence of Section 1 to read, "to work toward a stabilization of wages and a stabilization of prices at levels which will meet the cost of production."

EXTEND LIFE ONE YEAR

We recommend that section 1 (b) be amended by changing the termination date to June 30, 1945. We do not believe it wise to grant a longer extension for we believe that Congress should have an opportunity to review the situation carefully and make any modifications in policy or procedure at least once each year.

SUBSIDIES

Section 2 (e) authorizes the Administrator to buy or sell commodities or to pay subsidies under one condition only; namely, where necessary to obtain maximum necessary production. This is limited by the proviso that if the shortage is in a "strategic or critical material" the transactions shall be carried out only by corporations organized pursuant to section 5 (d) of the R. F. C. Act. The committee will recall that the question of making available vast sums for the payment of subsidies was discussed on the floor of the Senate, but the proposal was withdrawn. Because of the trend in this direction we called the danger to the attention of this committee on September 16, 1942, saying:

"Subsidies are not mentioned in the President's message. Subsidies are not mentioned in the bill, but all the powers are there for their use if the President so decides. Congress should not pass by such a vital issue without an understanding on it. We believe Congress should set forth the policy of meeting the costs of war dislocation now by assuring enough flexibility in ceilings to meet these unavoidable costs."

We then proposed definite language to make clear the intent to modify ceilings when necessary, rather than to resort to subsidies. The language finally adopted after setting up the September 15 base was: "*Provided further*, That modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purpose, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity, incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs."

It is difficult to understand how this clear mandate of law could be misconstrued or ignored but the fact is that it has not been obeyed. Apparently the position has been taken that it did not supersede or modify the subsidy provisions of section 2 of the January 30 act. Twice by an overwhelming vote in each House, Congress has expressed its intent and purpose. The law and amendment still stand and in our opinion are being evaded. To prevent further misunderstanding on this point, we believe that section 2 (e) of the January 30 act should be amended setting forth clearly just what would be permitted and what prohibited.

There are certain types of assistance which are justifiable as a means of securing an extra supply of a commodity for war purposes from a high-cost source. Practically everyone believes that it is a sound principle to pay some copper producers an extra 2 or 3 cents a pound in order to add 10 percent to our total production if such payments are needed to enable them to operate some high-cost mines. It seems obvious that this would be better than to raise the general price level of copper 2 or 3 cents, thus paying 90 percent of the producers an excess profit. This is a sound principle. The confusion arises from the fact that Congress has been asked to allow subsidies based on this principle, but subsidies have actually been used for an altogether different purpose. They have been used, not on a selective base to pay the high-cost producers, but straight across the board to both low-cost and high-cost producers for the sole purpose of reducing the cost of food to all consumers, rich and poor alike. In the one case a normal compensatory price level would be maintained and only the high-cost producers would be aided, while in the other case an artificial price level below cost is created and the high-cost producers receive no more aid in increasing production than the low-cost producers. The market is upset and becomes entirely artificial and dependent on Government aid.

There are three types of selective subsidies. Instead of permitting an unrestricted use of subsidies, these 3 types should be defined by amending section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, and restricting all subsidy payments by any agency to these 3 types. In addition to these 3 types is the support price which ordinarily is no subsidy at all, and which possesses none of the dangerous characteristics of a general subsidy. This should be defined and clearly outlined so that the Administration may have no doubt as to the purpose of Congress with reference to it.

Type I: This may be called the copper type and has been described above. It should be limited to cases where it is deemed necessary by the War Food Administrator to increase the production of crops for war purposes and when the following conditions are found to prevail:

1. That expanded production of such commodity would be possible only by bringing into production additional high-cost crops or high-cost producing units which can be clearly identified, defined, and segregated from the normal cost units for the purpose of subsidy payment.

2. It would be impossible to increase the sales price of the product of such high cost units without affecting appreciably the sales price of the whole commodity or group of competitive commodities.

3. The product of such high-cost units does not exceed 25 percent of the volume of the commodity or group of competitive commodities.

Type II: This may be called the sugar type. When we import in excess of 50 or 60 percent of a commodity, if we should raise the selling price to meet increased domestic costs, 40 or 50 percent of the increased selling price would redound to the benefit of growers in other nations, whether or not it was needed there to maintain production. In such circumstances special payments to domestic growers might be justified. They should be limited to commodities of which we import more than 50 or 60 percent or possibly even a higher percent.

Type III: This may be called the "two-price" type. For 20 years we have failed to meet our farm problems squarely with a two-price system for those crops of which we produce an exportable surplus. The portion used in normal domestic trade channels should enjoy the benefits of our protective economy in the matter of price, while the surplus should be sold in world markets or for less remunerative uses. Never having provided such a two-price system, we find it difficult to price such crops as wheat and cotton so as to make the maximum use of these commodities where they are most needed. In such circumstances a subsidy to make a long over-due two-price system effective might be justified. Subsidies to permit the use of wheat for feed, or short staple cotton for special war purposes, would fall in this class. This is more difficult to define, but consideration should be given to limiting this type of subsidies to those cases "where in the opinion of the War Food Administrator an emergency exists which requires the use of any commodity in channels of trade other than normal which will not support a price equal to that obtainable in normal channels of trade.

Support prices: A support price differs from a subsidy in that it is a device for preventing any commodity from being depressed to a figure below its cost or true worth. If properly used, it should neither cause too high or too low a price. It should stabilize the market and prevent dangerous and costly unbalances. In most instances it should cost the Treasury nothing because the market should eventually absorb any surpluses purchased thereunder. In connection with a sound two-price system this should universally be the case. Lacking a two-price system there may be occasional losses. Payment of such losses is justified as an insurance against the disaster which would follow if the losses were not met. The problem would be to prevent their use as a subterfuge for subsidies. This could be safeguarded by providing that when it is deemed necessary to sell a commodity acquired in support price operations at a price involving a loss, such loss may be paid where maximum prices and support prices have been established in good faith without any intent or expectation of selling the commodity below the support price so established. There should be a prohibition against etsablishing or maintaining a price ceiling below a support price.

Adjustment of ceilings: In order to prevent the general use of subsidies and to confine them to the types of cases described above, Section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act of January 30, should be amended by providing that before any purchase or sale is made of any agricultural commodity, or any commodity manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, for the purpose of maintaining, controlling, or modifying the price thereof; or before any subsidy is paid to the producers, processors or handlers of such commodity, any maximum price which may be in effect thereon shall first be adjusted, so as to reflect any increased costs arising from increased labor or other costs incurred since January 1, 1941, without the use of subsidies, except that losses resulting from purchase may be paid or subsidies may be used under any of the conditions outlined above.

Example of operation: If the law were so amended, most of the most dangerous use of subsidies would be avoided. For example take soy beans or peanuts. We need this excess oil for war purposes. It is our most practical source to obtain oil in needed volume, but the cost is excessive as compared with normal oil sources. These crops can be segregated from the whole vegetable oil group and since they can be so segregated

and do not compose over 25 percent of the total, a subsidy can be paid on them without increasing the general price level of oils and fats. The principle is sound and complies with that set forth in type III.

TAPERING OFF PRESENT SUBSIDIES

General subsidies are like taking dope. When once we start, the demand is for bigger and better subsidies and they are very hard to get rid of. A year ago Congress was asked for but a few hundred million. Last fall this was increased to $800,000,000. Now we are told it will take a billion and a half. They will continue to grow and continue to augment a most dangerous economic unbalance unless stopped. Nevertheless we must be realistic. We are already in so deep that any sudden cutting off of funds would create serious trouble. We don't like subsidies but believe that it would be better to taper off their use than to make too drastic and sudden a change. Subsidies now in existence should be reduced not less than 10 percent per month on all those commodities which do not conform to the principles set forth above until they are eliminated. It should be made perfectly clear that ceiling prices must be adjusted as subsidies are reduced in order to maintain production. Thus we could gradually work out of a most dangerous situation which, if allowed to continue, will lead directly to chaos. To assure that no loophole is found permitting expansion, a limit of $1,500,000,000 for subsidies on farm products should be established.

PROTECTING FLOORS UNDER PERISHABLES

Section 2 (f) prohibits any governmental agency from selling any commodity within the United States below certain limits imposed in section 3. These limits are designed to prevent injuriously low ceilings. It is impossible for any administrator to judge the volume of production of any commodity with complete accuracy at the time when floors are established to encourage production. To make a floor effective the Government must be prepared to buy whatever is offered to maintain the price. In the case of a surplus of a perishable crop, the supporting agency should be allowed to sell any surplus it has to prevent spoilage or waste. We suggest adding to the end of subsection (f) "except in the case of a perishable commodity upon which a support price has been established in good faith, such commodity may be sold at less than the limitations herein if necessary to prevent spoilage or waste."

PRICE LIMITATIONS

Section 3 (a) and 3 (c) have been modified by the amendment of October 2, 1942, which will be discussed later.

PARITY

Section 3 (b) provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and publish parity prices. Each year the legal definition of parity becomes more obsolete and meaningless. If Section 3 is to provide any substantial measure of protection for our food supply, the formula upon which parity is determined must be changed. This whole question needs comprehensive research for which there is not now reasonable opportunity, but the formula can be greatly improved and made to serve as a reasonably satisfactory makeshift device by correcting two glaring defects. Then we would hope the Congress would authorize a thorough study of the question for later action. Pending that time, let us continue to assume that the 5-year period 1909–14 is a reasonable base to which to tie, and correct the two glaring defects.

The present theory is designed to restore the farm purchasing power to that of the base period 1909–14. If production costs have gone up, and selling prices of farm products are increased by the same percentage, the theory is that the farm purchasing power will remain the same as in the base period. To determine the increased costs, a properly weighted index of practically everything the farmer buys is established. The costs of those items during the base period are known. Current prices on those same commodities are obtainable. If they show an increase of 50 percent in the index, farm prices should increase 50 percent to yield parity.

The first trouble lies in the fact that the cost of farm labor was omitted from the index of what farmers buy. Since this is the largest item of cost and since labor has gone up faster than almost anything else, it has thrown the whole formula out of kilter. In his message to Congress of September 6, 1942, the President correctly stated, "Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor." No one can defend the omission and it should be corrected.

The second trouble is even more far-reaching. In order to determine the parity price on any commodity, the present formula would require adding to the 1909–14 price of that commodity the percent of increased production cost as determined by the index as just explained. The difficulty is due to the fact that we have changed our production and consumption practices very radically during the past 30 years, while the formula attempts to freeze us to the conditions of 30 years ago. For example, cattle were worth about $5.42 then, making a parity figure of about $9.16 today. At the other extreme, we can illustrate with grapefruit which was selling at about $10 a box then, making a parity price of $16.30 today. Both prices are ridiculously obsolete. This can be easily corrected by employing an index on commodity prices. Let the base period 1909–14 equal 100, and develop a weighted index of crops farmers sell just as we have done on things farmers buy. Then let us take the average commodity prices of the past 3 or 5 years. This constitutes a modern base and reflects the change in production and consumptive practices. Let us assume that this modern base is 60 percent above the 1909–14 base, while costs are up 69 percent. To get an up-to-date parity figure on any commodity we would add 9 points to the price used in the modern base instead of adding 69 percent to the price of 30 years ago as we now do. These two changes are simple and just. They ought to be made.

VETO OF WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Section 3 (e) provides for approval of any ceiling on agricultural commodities by the Secretary of Agriculture (now War Food Administrator) before it can become effective. Technical disputes have arisen over what is a farm commodity. A hog is a hog until it is killed, then it is no longer a farm product. Other sections of the act include the words "or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity." These should be included in section 3 (e); otherwise the approval by the War Food Administrator is meaningless because the Price Administrator can name a price on a commodity as soon as it reaches the processed stage, and this price would immediately roll back to the producer and nullify any approval action which the War Food Administrator might have taken.

This confusion raises the whole question of control. There is now divided authority with reference to the problem of production and distribution of food. We recommend that the whole problem of food production and distribution of food be placed under the War Food Administrator, including price control and rationing. We will then get better production and lessen the need for control.

COURT ACTION

Section 204 (a) permits any aggrieved person to petition the emergency court of appeals for an injunction or set aside order. Subsection (b) limits this right to cases of law violation or arbitrary or capricious action on the part of the Administrator. Subsection (c) sets up the emergency court of appeals and then prohibits it from granting any such temporary or restraining action. Subsection (d) grants the emergency court of appeals exclusive jurisdiction of O. P. A. cases and denies any jurisdiction to any other court. The result is that citizens are prevented from having a day in court. We recommend striking from subsection (c) the words: "except that the court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order" etc., to the end of the sentence.

We also recommend striking the last two sentences in subsection (d) granting the Emergency Court of Appeals exclusive jurisdiction. Since section 204 (a) limits the right of action to aggrieved persons, and presumably denies the right to marketing or farm organizations which represent farmers, we recommend that the first sentence of this section be broadened to permit marketing or farm organizations to have a right of action. We also believe that the 60-day limit for filing protests (section 203 (a)) should be removed. Frequently the aggrieved person knows nothing about the issuance of an order or regulation until he attempts to market a crop some months or years later. If an injustice exists there should be no time limit imposed on its removal.

WAGE CONTROL PROHIBITION

While the October 2 amendment gave the President power to suspend section 302 (c) (1), which prevents wage control, we believe it should be definitely eliminated, for all should be treated alike. We therefore recommend striking section 302 (c) (1) from the bill.

PRICE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF OCTOBER 2, 1942

We have covered section 1 and section 2 in our discussion of the original Price Control Act. We have also discussed a just parity formula covered in section 3.

We believe the text could be simplified by adding after the word "commodity" where it first appears, the words "or commodity processed in whole or substantial part therefrom"; then omitting the similar reference after subparagraph (2). In order to avoid any further confusion, we believe that in the second proviso the words "without the use of subsidies" should be inserted after the word "President."

Section 7 (c) provides that nothing in the Price Control Act of 1942 shall be invalidated except as outlined in section 2. Section 1 changes the basic price level date from October 1941 to September 15, 1942. It would seem that this makes a conflict which could be eliminated by adding to section 7 (c) the words "(1) and" immediately following the word "section."

We are informed that section 8 (a) (3) means that a loan to a noncooperator would be made at 9 percent on that portion of his crop which is not subject to penalty and at 60 percent on that portion which is subject to penalty. We doubt if the language if strictly followed permits such interpretation, and recommend that the purpose be clarified.

If the changes which we have suggested are incorporated, the net effect would be to:

1. Limit any further use of subsidies to those types which will aid in increasing production and which will not further increase our economic unbalance.

2. Gradually eliminate any subsidies which do not conform to those principles.

3. Establish a sound price ceiling policy which will aid in obtaining maximum food production and thereby help to check inflation.

However, we wish to point out again that price control can have only a minor effect in a long-range program of inflation control

and no extensive reliance should be placed on it. We renew our recommendations made to the Senate Finance Committee that the program be supplemented by a sound and effective tax and savings program. We believe such a program is an essential part of any effective plan for curbing inflation.

George Washington's Political Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Political Creed of George Washington," delivered by George W. Maxey, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, at Congress Hall, Philadelphia, under the auspices of the Sons of the American Revolution, on Tuesday, February 22, 1944.

This message is an historical and timely one, and I am sure it will prove to be thought provoking and worth while to all who read it. The estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the cost of printing the address will be $135.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This occasion suggests a text: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standeth is holy ground." Here this Republic functioned for a decade. Here on March 4, 1793, Washington took his second Presidential oath. In this room in 1796 he gave out his Farewell Address and here in 1797 John Adams became President.

No other man has been so reverenced by Americans as has Washington. Our capital bears his name; before his tomb kings, queens, and statesmen have stood with uncovered heads; the world's loftiest monument is erected to his memory. When we compare this lip service to our country's father with our governmental acts since 1933 I am reminded of what Camille Desmoulins said to his countrymen during the Reign of Terror: "Ye worship the goddess of liberty not in principle but in stone. Liberty is not a nymph or a dirty shirt; liberty is governmental respect for the rights guaranteed in the constitution." The 1791 Constitution of France had declared: "The aim of every political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, and resistance to oppression." Within 2 years after that constitution was adopted there was no liberty and no security against spoliation and oppression. Desmoulins and his wife died on the guillotine. The French constitution had become a scrap of paper. Is this Nation now on Washington's Birthday worshipping him in principle or merely in stone?

If you wish to know the political creed of George Washington study the Constitution. He initiated the movement for it. He presided over the convention which drafted it and he was the first of 39 men to sign it. When he did so he said: "Should the States reject this excellent Constitution, the next one will be drawn in blood." The colonists were then "drifting toward anarchy," and anarchy always leads to bloodshed and a dictatorship. A good citizen wants neither anarchy nor chains. In Washington's 133-word second inaugural address he expressed two thoughts—gratitude for the honor of his reelection and absolute fidelity to the Constitution.

In creating the Federal Government the American people laid down four commands, and these are clearly implicit in the Constitution they ordained. They are: (1) The Federal Government shall keep to its sphere and the States to their proper spheres of government. (2) No official shall be entrusted with autocratic power. (3) Unrestrained power shall never be lodged anywhere, not in the President, not in the Congress, not even in a majority. (4) There shall be maintained an absolutely independent judiciary. That our first President clearly recognized these commands are revealed in his many utterances. In his Farewell Address he admonished his countrymen to be ever on guard against "the consolidation of the powers of all the departments of the Government into one," and he said: "Let there be no change by usurpation, for it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed." He declared that "to preserve the reciprocal checks" provided for in the Constitution "must be as necessary as to institute them."

An official who flouts any of the four commands so clearly implicit in the Constitution and so strictly adhered to by President Washington is a would-be dictator. Hitler's first act was to abolish home rule and to concentrate all authority in Berlin. When he was seeking power he declared the German states to be "the historical cornerstones of the German Empire," and he promised to respect them. When he got power he created a centralized autocracy.

How fares this first principle in this country? On June 7, 1938, Senator King, of Utah, declared that "if present policies continue, the States will become mere shells out of which all life has departed." Governor Lehman, of New York, declared a few years ago that the Federal Government is exhausting the sources of the States' financial support and reducing the States to vassals. At the present time Pennsylvania has 44,500 State employees, but the Federal Government has 215,000 employees in Pennsylvania. One hundred and thirty years ago, the Federal Government had 1 civil employee for every 5,308 of our population; today the Federal Government has 1 civil employee for every 45 of our population, or 3,132,600. James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, protested in 1798 against "extension of the Federal power to every subject falling within the idea of the general welfare" and declared that one consequence of such extension would be "an excessive augmentation of the offices, honors, and emoluments dependent on the Executive will" and that "This disproportionate increase of prerogative and patronage must evidently either enable the Chief Magistrate of the Union to secure his reelection from time to time or to regulate the succession as he might please." He further declared that by this extension of Federal power "the transformation of the republican system of the United States into a monarchy would be accomplished."

The second command is: Entrust no official with autocratic power. No such concentration of power in the Chief Executive as existed before Pearl Harbor, to say nothing of what exists now, has ever before been seen in this Republic. Washington in his Farewell Address warned us against "that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart," and he declared that the consolidation of "the powers of all the departments" of government "into one will create a real despotism." Washington never intended this to be a one-man government. The refusal of third terms by Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and later Presidents was based on the principle that we live under a government of laws and not of men, and that the well-being of the Nation does not depend on any one individual. In 1901, at the very height of his popularity, William McKinley declared that "under no circumstances would he accept a third term in the presidency." Jefferson declared that the two-term precedent set by Washington was "sound and salutary," and that it is as much a President's "duty to lay down his charge at a proper time as to have borne it faithfully." He added: "If some termination to the service of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution or supplied by practice, his office, nominally for years, will in fact become for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance." Fifteen years later, at the close of President Monroe's second term, Jefferson said: "The example of four Presidents voluntarily retiring at the end of their eighth year, and the public opinion that the principle is salutary, have given it in practice the force of precedent and usage, insomuch that should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust that he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views." For a score of years before his death, Jefferson urged the adoption of a constitutional amendment prohibiting a third presidential term.

When the American people believe that a finite human being, and not they themselves, is the source of all their well-being, they are slaves in their souls and are ready for their master. This has been demonstrated often in the laboratory of history. Porfirio Diaz ran in 1877 for President of Mexico on a platform of "no reelection." He served one term and in 1884 he was reelected and was continuously reelected until he had served a total of 27 consecutive years as president in name but as dictator in fact. In 1911 it required a revolution to drive him out of power. When the German people "hailed" Hitler as their savior they lost their right to life, liberty, and property, and got forced labor, concentration camps, prisons, firing squads, and headsmen in swallowtail coats and with uplifted axes. A great Democratic statesman, Champ Clark, said in Congress in 1908: "I congratulate Theodore Roosevelt on turning a deaf ear to those selfish flatterers who have endeavored to persuade him to violate the wholesome precedent of 111 years and run for a third term as President, for no President of the United States will ever be elected to a third term until this republic is on its last legs."

Jeremiah S. Black, said: "A republic with executive power and patronage perpetually wielded by the same person will soon cease to be a republic. When Caesar refused to lay down his consulship, as his predecessors had done, at the end of a year, and was reelected time after time with the acquiescence of the Senate and the people, all that was real in Roman freedom ceased to exist. Two republics in France were brought to an end in the same way. Napoleon began by being consul for a term, then was elected for life, and finally became Emperor, with the powers of an absolute despot. The last Bonaparte was President for 4 years, was reelected for 10, and ended, like his uncle, in grasping the imperial crown."

The third command of the Constitution is: "Never permit unrestrained power to be lodged anywhere, not even in a majority." Those Americans who want no curb on the majority are in accord with Lenin, who declared that "the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is not bound by any laws." Wherever this doctrine prevails no man's life, liberty or property is secure.

The fourth command is: "There shall be an absolutely independent judiciary." Where

courts are servile the people are enslaved. There was no liberty in England until the Revolution of 1688 made judges independent of royal favor. Hitler's first act as Germany's dictator was to declare all judicial power invested in himself. When he invaded Austria he revoked the commissions of every Austrian judge and put puppets in their places. Napoleon III reduced French judges to marionettes.

Too long a tenure in the White House enables a President to fill the Federal benches with judges who are imbued with his own elastic conceptions of constitutional limitations. It is only natural that many of these appointees should be ambitious for judicial advancement. Seventy percent of the present occupants of the Federal bench owe their appointments to the only President who has served more than two terms. Tens of thousands of bureaucrats, known as administrative officials, have invaded the province of the courts and pass arbitrarily on more competing claims than are now submitted to judicial decision, and from their edicts there is practically no appeal. The present Chief Executive has urged upon Congress the enactment of laws "regardless of well-founded doubts of their constitutionality"; and so contrary to the precedents of 150 years have been the present-day adjudications of the highest Court in the Nation that certain members of it recently declared that its decisions have become mere "games of chance" and furnish no reliable guide to lawful conduct.

Washington had convictions not only as to the decentralization and limitation of governmental power but also as to the restricted range of government. He knew that the more contacts government has with individuals the more their liberties are curtailed. Society and the body politic are two different things. Statesmen recognize that fact and always labor to keep government in its place; visionaries always invite government to encroach into the domain of private affairs. Government perverted from its legitimate purpose, i. e., government "out of bounds" is lawless, oppressive, wasteful, and futile. This was proved when for centuries it intruded into the field of religion. It was proved when it attempted to legislate total abstinence into individuals and make the sobriety of the American people dependent on the efficiency of sleuths. The Man of Galilee never preached salvation by statute. He spent no time in the antechamber of Caesar.

Our Constitution was wrought out by statesmen and ordained by the people to protect human beings from the meddlesomeness of government as they exercised their natural rights. The Constitution commands the Government: "You keep your hands off natural rights, administer justice among men, but do not attempt to administer the personal affairs of men." To men thus freed of governmental shackles this Nation owes the unparalleled industrial prograss Washington predicted. He wrote to Lafayette: "Many blessing attributed to the new Government are taking their rise from industry and frugality." The great American inventions: The cotton gin, the telegraph, the telephone, the electric light, the air-brake, the automobile, the airplane, all were produced by freemen working in free shops, to which no bungling bureaucrat ever sent his edicts. A bureaucrat is an official who has not a dollar invested in the business he is bossing from a far-off easy chair and who is not 1 percent as competent to manage it as is the man who has created it and owns it and lives with it. Nowadays tax-paying businesses owned by experienced men are being arbitrarily restricted by officials of no experience, who scorn the lessons of others' experience, who are under no restrictions and who are supported by the taxes paid by the businesses they are doing their best to destroy. Bureaucratic edicts have the same effect on enterprise as weeds have on growing grain.

Twenty-six billion dollars of the productive wealth of this country was created by the inventions of Edison and $7,000,000,000 are earned each year by persons employed by reason of those inventions. The Government had nothing to do with Edison's inventions or the management of his shops, except to protect the inventions for a limited number of years. The same was and is true of Henry Ford. Edison has gone and Ford will go but the creations of their brains and enterprise and management will shower benefits on the human race through all coming time. This Nation owes a thousand times more to the initiative of individualists than to the intrusions of bureaucrats.

We hear a lot today about some "new freedoms." They are "new," indeed, for the greatest thinkers and the greatest statesmen who ever lived never heard of them. These new freedoms are "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear." Any man who declares that government can and should provide these freedoms is either an ignoramus or a fraud. Freedom from want is not a gift of government at all, and it is a gift of God only to the extent the recipient cooperates, for God helps only those who help themselves. The Indians had all the natural rights but they had freedom from want only when they hunted and fished with skill and success. Life was intended to be a struggle—not a "donation party." The Creator gave man the good earth, but in order to subsist man must cultivate it, for weeds quickly claim a fallow field, and it was long ago ordained that "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." It was the creed of Washington that every man should "hoe his own row" and that he would hoe better if he felt the spur of want. President Washington never recommended that the American people should squander themselves out of want, borrow themselves out of debt, or regiment themselves into freedom. He was old-fashioned enough to believe that wastefulness was wicked, work the way to well-being, and that the chief function of government was to protect individuals in the exercise of their natural rights and in the enjoyment of the fruits of their toil. In his Farewell Address he admonished his countrymen to "cherish public credit" as "a source of strength and security" and he declared that the way to "preserve it" was to "use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense."

No government protected Washington from want. As a youth he worked amid frontier hardships. Before he was 21 years of age Governor Dinwiddie selected him to carry the ultimatum from Virginia to Fort Duquesne because he was trustworthy, intrepid, and "skilled in forest-craft." The government did not give him those qualities; he acquired them. Washington and Christopher Gist left Fort Cumberland, Md., on November 15, 1753, "in excessive rains and vast quantities of snow," but inclement weather did not daunt them. They believed with the old trappers that "hard winters make fine furs." They struggled on through snow and forest, and whatever "freedom from want" they had they achieved. Upon uncushioned ground they slept at night the dreamless sleep of exhaustion.

Whatever education Washington got he got for himself. The halls of higher learning never echoed to his footfalls, but from hardy, self-reliant ancestors he received the best of all inheritances, character, and in a youth replete with arduous toil and dangerous tasks he proved himself dependable and steadfast and gained what Tennyson called the wrestling thews that throw the world. The sturdiest timber is always found in oaks which on wind-swept hills have defied and survived the storms. Neither Washington nor any of his associates in war or peace had any illusions about establishing a government able to create either wealth or happiness. What they fought for and won was the right of men and women to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They were too honest and too experienced to make extravagant promises or raise vain hopes.

You can read everything ever said by Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, and all the other great men of this Republic and you will not find one word fostering the idea that it is the duty of the Government to guarantee any able-bodied individual freedom from want. Let any government promise freedom from want and there will spring up a multitude of languid loafers to prey on the posessions of those who are willing to work and save. For 144 years no President of the United States ever encouraged the taxing of the thrifty to support the indolent. Thomas Jefferson said: "It is the American way to find means within ourselves to surmount our difficulties and not to lean on others." Washington and Jefferson knew that if a government encourages leaning, the leaners will eventually so outnumber the lifters as to cause a complete collapse. Our first President's ideal American was not a "kept man." He preferred producers to takers.

Nor was it ever any part of the political creed of George Washington that the Government should be the administrator of individual enterprise, the planner of all business affairs and the director of the daily lives of the people. Washington and Lincoln were the two greatest men who ever served as Chief Executives of this Nation and neither of them ever claimed that he or the Government possessed such Godlike power that he or it could do any of the things that visionaries today declare it is the duty of the Government to do. Washington, like all great men, was a modest man and knew his own and others' limitations. Mrs. John Adams saw George Washington when he took command at Cambridge in 1775 and she wrote that "modesty marked every line and feature of his face."

Any man in public office or elsewhere who promises that through legislative magic the struggle of life will be abolished and that there will be equal rewards for the industrious and the indolent is not a leader but a misleader of the people. He is encouraging legislative hocus-pocus. He is catering to the people's wishbones and weakening their backbones. The baiting of electoral traps with political hokum is well known in the history of the fall of republics. Plato said: "Every tyrant made his first appearance as the friend and protector of the people." Alexander Hamilton said: "Of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying obsequious court to the people, beginning as demogogs and ending as tyrants."

No government can guarantee human beings freedom from fear any more than it can guarantee aviators freedom from falls by promising to repeal the law of gravitation. Fear is a useful part of the mental equipment of every human being. Salutary fear makes the general vigilant and prompts the soldier to take cover so that he will live to fight again. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and only those possessed of prudent fear are ever vigilant. Edmund Burke said: "Early and provident fear is the mother of safety." It was the absence of this provident fear that made it possible for the Japanese at Pearl Harbor to surprise our forces and in 2 hours kill 700 more Americans than were killed on either side in the battle of Gettysburg. It is fear of submarines that keeps our Atlantic patrol ever on the alert. It was provident fear that prompted Washington to conduct his masterly retreats in the face of overwhelming odds and thus save his slender forces for the crowning triumph at Yorktown. Fear of want and hope of gain have been the mainsprings of human ambition. They led your ancestors and mine to

make the dangerous journeys in sailing ships from the Old World to the New. Coal to be mined, forests to be felled, fields to be plowed and planted, beckoned them. They hoped to gain economic security by honest work and frugality. All they asked was a free field, a fair chance, and the protection of the fruits of their toil. They had no desire to become wards of a paternalistic President. They were expecting work-outs, not hand-outs. None of them had learned to walk by being carried.

Washington's conception of government was that it is an agency to protect life, liberty, and property. The Constitution promises that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation and the United States Supreme Court of 70 years ago in applying this principle declared that, "To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals is nonetheless a robbery because it is done under the forms of law."

In his zeal to protect life, liberty, and property Washington ever emphasized as an article of his creed the maintenance of law and order, and that by force if necessary. When during his administration large groups in Massachusetts defied the law Washington wrote to a Member of Congress: "You talk of employing influence to appease the present tumults in Massachusetts. Influence is not a proper remedy for disorder. Influence is not government. Let us have a government by which our lives, our liberties, our properties will be secure, or let us know the worst at once." In other words, his idea was that if the Government was too feeble to maintain law and order it should be abolished for a better one.

When the Whisky Rebellion began in western Pennsylvania Washington issued a proclamation saying that the issue was "whether a small portion of the United States shall dictate to the whole Union," and he summoned armed forces, took command of them himself, and was on his way to lead them into action when the lawless bands decided that George Washington was not a President to be trifled with and so laid down their arms and surrendered. In his Farewell Address Washington said: "All combinations and associations under whatever plausible character to overawe or control the action of the constituted authorities are destructive of the fundamental principles of government." In the same address he warned the people against what he called "cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men" who "usurp for themselves the reins of government." He also warned us against those "disorders and miseries which incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual."

An important article of Washington's creed was preparedness. In his first annual address to Congress on January 8, 1790, he said: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace. A free people ought to be not only armed but disciplined." From 1776 to his last message to Congress in 1796 he urged and worked for the establishment of a military academy. In his fifth annual address to Congress, in this very room, he said: "The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

If this Nation had during the 1930's been mindful of that portion of Washington's creed, there would be no global war today. When Hitler began his conquests in 1939 he knew that we could then put in the field only 60,000 well-armed, well-trained troops; and a number of our short-sighted appeasers in Washington had done their best to give Hitler to understand that no matter what brutalities he heaped upon the rest of mankind this country would not fight. We even agreed to keep American ships off the seas so that Hitler's pirates could roam and rob and kill at will. All honor to Senator CARTER GLASS who shamed by the cowardly action of his country declared: "To keep American ships off the seas at the behest of that arch-assassin Adolf Hitler is a blot on American history and a dishonor to our dead." In saying that, CARTER GLASS showed the spirit of the Virginia statesman the world honors today, for Washington said in his last message to Congress: "To secure respect to a neutral flag requires a naval force organized and ready to vindicate it from insult or aggression. This may even prevent the necessity of going to war by discouraging belligerent powers from committing such violations of the rights of the neutral party as may, first or last, leave no other option." Washington knew that wealth plus weakness invites aggression and that a nation which is not prepared for war is ripe for slavery; some Genghis Khan is always ready to begin its subjugation. "Around every Rome hover the Gauls, around every Athens some Macedon."

It will always prove less expensive for a nation to be well armed in peace than to be ill armed in war; and this Nation may some time make the discovery that it is too late to prepare for war after war comes. Thanks to our allies in two wars our lack of preparedness did not prove fatal to our independence and freedom but its cost can be computed only in tens of thousands of lives and in billions of treasure. Some time we may tempt fate once too often. Adequate American preparedness would have prevented this present war. A mental and physical readiness to fight usually makes a fight unnecessary.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about what Washington said in his Farewell Address as to our foreign relations. He never warned us against "entangling alliances"; he warned us against "permanent alliances" with foreign nations, so that we might at all times be free to act as our own interests should dictate. He declared that we could "trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies." That is what we did in 1778 when we temporarily allied ourselves to France, in our fight for independence. That is what we are doing now when we become one of the United Nations to save us and them from subjugation by barbarians. I think Washington would agree with William McKinley, who in the last speech he made said: "The day of America's exclusiveness is past," and that Washington would also agree with Woodrow Wilson, who said: "We are a part of the world and nothing that concerns the essential rights of mankind can be foreign to us. There is no 'entangling alliance' when all unite to act in the common interest and are free to live their own lives under a common protection."

There is nothing in Washington's character or in his career which indicates that he would be any more tolerant of international disorder in the 1930 decade than he was of domestic disorder in the 1790 decade. International peace, like domestic peace, is an order and there can be no order without compulsion. Organized force is a prerequisite not of war but of peace. Without international law backed by force, international order dissolves into anarchy, just as our cities when without police forces become the prey of criminals. The lawless hordes of the world are always ready to rise, and static right is never any match for dynamic wrong.

The United States has everything to gain and nothing to lose by its present powerful temporary alliances. Our Army and Navy will return from this war as they have returned from other wars, with new victories on our banners, new glories in our history, and our long record of heroic deeds will be enriched with new and shining pages. Then when peace comes and we are burdened with a debt of over $300,000,000,000, this Nation will be faced with the greatest crisis in its history, for while government can create debts they have to be paid by the labor and sacrifices of human beings. They cannot be liquidated by legislation.

To equip us to meet the crisis ahead of us let us begin at once to worship Washington not "in stone" but "in principle." Let us not commit the follies which in France led through wild extravagance and mob rule to bottomless bankruptcy and bloody festivals of destruction. That profound philosopher, Gustave le Bon, said of the French people of that period: "They resolved to break with the past, to establish a new era, and to legislate for the human race. They wanted to annihilate the past, but in the end they were annihilated. Their faith in the power of laws was absolute, but after 10 years of violence and destruction, of pillage and murder and massacre they fell into universal reprobation. The possibility of remaking society by laws has been given the lie by experience."

A so-called "planned society," or totalitarian control of all activities of human society, is only a new name for socialism, and socialism has never worked anywhere well and never worked at all except under a regime of slavery. The so-called "social democracies" of Russia and Germany were treadmills run by human beings under the prod of the bayonet, and with the mill's hum broken only by the salvos of firing squads. That clear-visioned labor leader, Samuel Gompers summed up socialism when he said to the socialists: "I have studied you and your doctrines; I have found them socially wrong, economically unsound, and industrially impossible." Samuel Gompers sensed the difference between statesmanship and political humbuggery. He knew that no government is able to guarantee any individual both civil liberty and economic equality. God did not standardize all human beings, and government cannot do it. When government attempts to make everybody economically equal, it ceases to be an administrator of justice between individuals and becomes an oppressive tyrant.

Ladies and gentlemen: In place of a totalitarian state controlled by a permanent occupant of the White House, I am for a Federal Union of 48 self-governing Commonwealths; in place of a tyrannical and enfeebling paternalism my vote is for a free and invigorating individualism; in place of socialism masquarading as planned economy, I make an appeal for the rugged Americanism of our forefathers; and in place of the myriad confusing edicts of a blundering bureaucracy, I propose the simple creed of George Washington: The Constitution of the United States!

Evacuation Day Speech by Senator Walsh of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Evacuation Day speech delivered by me at the South Boston Citizens' Association banquet on March 16, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 17th of March is a memorable day, not only in the history of Massachusetts and America but in the annals of the Irish people, for on that day 168 years ago an event took place here in the city of Boston that ended gloriously the first blow struck for freedom by the colonists of Massachusetts. And on this same date nearly 2,000 years ago there passed out of this life the saintly man who made the men and women of the Irish race Christians—followers and lovers of Christ.

It will serve no special purpose to enumerate the military events that took place prior to and following March 17, 1776. It is, however, important to realize and recall the inspiring objectives of the men who participated in those events and the heritage that they have bequeathed to us.

Our thoughts tonight turn instinctively to the great cataclysm which is rocking the very foundation of civilization—the present world war into which our country has been forced. Particularly in this crisis must we turn to Washington and the founders of this Republic as an outstanding example of the spirit of service, sacrifice, and courage that they displayed. We, too, during these days of anguish will march to a glorious victory if we emulate the band of patriots who witnessed 168 years ago the evacuation of Boston by the British soldiers.

We should be proud of our Massachusetts citizenship, for here the little flame burst forth that kindled the fire that finally set the whole world burning. This tremendous fact must never be lost sight of. Here was born the proposition which has leavened America and all the world—"Government of the people, by the people, for the people"; here was preached the inspiring doctrines that all men sowed in sweat, that every man could worship God according to his faith and conscience without let or hindrance from any man.

Every son of Massachusetts may well hold his head higher when he thinks of the glorious history of his native State and its contribution to freedom; yet to these splendid emotions the sons of the immigrant born on this soil add that of reverent gratitude; for here in the heart of this peaceful and well-governed community their fathers and mothers found that refuge and peace from enslavement which enabled them to labor in hope and security, build a home and bring up their children in the full knowledge that education and opportunity were free to all, and an unhampered future given to those who had the courage and industry to make a place for himself in this Republic.

Though of different racial stock, there were two common qualities of mind and soul between the colonists who successfully waged the Revolution and brought about the independence of the Republic, and the Irish immigrants who have come to America in large numbers. A strong religious faith and an intense love of freedom were characteristic of both.

The founders of this Republic never failed to turn to the Almighty for guidance and support in their conflict with the mother country, and particularly in their efforts to establish this, the Government of the United States of America. Washington never failed to recognize that religion was the main support of religious institutions.

"In God we trust" was their constant inspiration. In all their undertakings and pronouncements even before they first proclaimed those inspiring political truths which, like the shot at Concord Bridge, were heard round the world, they never forgot to place their reliance upon the Almighty. On the very first coins of the new Republic, as a check and reminder of the dangers of the materialistic philosophy of the Old World, they inscribed the words, "In God we trust."

Irish immigrants who came to this country, whether Catholic, Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, were deeply religious. Religion (their priceless bequest from St. Patrick) was their first and last consolation; their strength and their discipline in every avenue of life; their labors and hopes; their duties and their enjoyments. Their religion encouraged and consoled them when all else was lost in their fatherland. Exiled Irish who came to America clung to their reverence for and worship of the Supreme Being. Like the fathers of the Republic they had a devotion to freedom, an unshaking confidence in democratic institutions and a hatred of the tyrannical governments of the Old World. They, like the colonists, possessed a hatred of tyranny that permeated every fiber of their being. People who have a profound spiritual nature are naturally lovers of peace, haters of war, and can never countenance intolerance or persecution.

Let us preserve in this land of material plenty these two priceless heritages that have come down to us from the founders of this Republic and from our racial forbearers—religion and freedom. To the preservation and defense of these we pledge, as the signers of the Declaration did, our fortunes and our lives and our sacred honor.

As we meet here there is much discussion about the attitude of men and women of Irish ancestry toward the neutrality of Eire in this present war. First of all, let it be said that their Americanism is unquestioned. They are for America first and last. They seek no favors or special consideration for the little nation of their ancestors. Eire, like all other nations, has a right to decide her own domestic policies. It is in no conflict with the spirit of America, however, to ask that all neutrals in this global conflict who are honestly neutral and not officially interfering with or knowingly permitting their citizens to interfere with the war effort to aid the enemy should be treated alike by the United Nations. That is fundamental justice. Moreover, if any other course is pursued it is bound to follow that henceforth in any war there will be no neutrals—all small nations will be forced into war, regardless of sovereignty and the desires of their own peoples, by their more powerful neighbors. This would be the negation of every accepted and established principle of international law which defines and protects neutral rights.

There have been many plans proposed for a lasting peace at the end of this war. There is an almost universal belief among Americans that unless certain definite terms are incorporated in the peace our people will be greatly disillusioned. From the many suggestions made let me enumerate what seems to me and others to be fundamental principles necessary to obtain what seems to be essential to the future security of America and the peace of the world:

1. We must continue with the magnificent efforts thus far advanced to prosecute this war with absolute unity and determination to a victorious end.

2. Provide an Army, Navy, and Air Force for our own defense so strong that it will forever convince other nations of the futility of a successful attack upon us.

3. After the initial period of relief and reconversion we must keep out of the internal affairs of other nations; and we must learn to treat with tolerance conditions and idealogies which we do not sympathize with and which we do not want in America.

4. Following the establishment of a durable peace based upon charity and justice, we must whole-heartedly give our support to effective international cooperative action designed to prevent the recurrence of war anywhere in the world.

5. The peace treaty must remove some of the certain basic causes of war and this can be done only by acknowledging boundaries that will prevent any country being forced to remain poverty-stricken; that will assure necessary raw materials and trade opportunities to all small nations.

6. The peace terms should provide for the self-determination of nations that President Wilson so strongly advocated, avoiding the inequities of Versailles.

7. We must insist that those objectives named in the Atlantic Charter relating to self-determination be realized in order that no territorial changes should be made that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned and that sovereign rights and self-government be restored to each and every nation which has been forcibly deprived of them.

Let me recapitulate and reemphasize:

Before we abandon the old policy that we have pursued since the foundation of our Government—what is known as the free hand; namely, to make our decisions in regard to our relations with other nations as circumstances and events develop—we should be certain that we are entering a new policy that we believe will be successful in insuring freedom and peace for the future of the United States, in order that our people may work out their destiny at home without interference.

In considering our post-war foreign policy we must keep in mind some basic principles and truths. We should not forget that regardless of treaties and agreements and neutrality laws, which we ourselves rapidly repealed after the war broke out in Europe, a nation that does not pursue peace with the same zeal it is forced to pursue war, when war comes, will find soon enough that it is involved in the wars of other nations. Any nation that does not seek, plan, and cherish peace wholeheartedly cannot long resist war. Any nation that flirts with war, or is indifferent toward its neutrality, can easily find it.

Let it be clearly understood, however, that if the peace treaty is not founded on justice, then its terms can never be carried out except by force, and perhaps not even then. Certainly America will never join hands with other nations to enforce a treaty that fails to accord with the principles of justice and freedom.

Now a final word. Let us thank the Almighty that He has seen fit to preserve the American way of life for all Americans throughout the years. Let us strive for unity in America, not only during the war but after the war. We want no racial or religious prejudices in America. The people of South Boston, as all Americans should be, are opposed in any form to fascism, to nazi-ism, to communism. We want all races to be conscious of their racial dignity and to cooperate with one another for the preservation of America.

In memory of the founders of this republic and the gallant men who fought here at Dorchester Heights and later won for us our freedom, we pledge to America that we will ever live to defend her freedom, or, if called upon we shall die to preserve it against enemies at home or abroad.

Your Congress and Its Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

YOUR CONGRESS AND ITS NEEDS

(By Samuel B. Pettengill, Member of Congress, Democrat, Indiana, 1930–38)

When an American first visits the Nation's Capitol he sees the old Supreme Court chamber now restored as it formerly was when Webster and Clay and Calhoun and their colleagues of the Senate of a century ago met to debate the great issues of their time. The attendant will point out the very seats which these great men used.

"There were giants on earth in those days, mighty men which were of old." It is easy to see Webster, "the Godlike Daniel," standing by his chair as he made his magnificent reply to Hayne. It is said that when he finished someone asked Webster how long it took to prepare that speech, and his reply was "25 years."

This answer illustrates what has happened to Congress and parliamentary government everywhere in the intervening century. Twenty-five years. Men had time to think and brood and ponder a hundred years ago. In contrast, I recall former Governor Montague, of Virginia (then a Representative), telling me in my first year in Congress that "We don't have 15 minutes a day of uninterrupted time for the real business we were sent here for—to write the Nation's laws."

The contrast shows not only what has happened but how necessary it is for us to understand the difficulties and the hurried atmosphere in which a modern Congress meets. The independence and effective functioning of Congress is more important now than then to millions of Americans and to their children.

When Webster spoke in 1830, there were only 48 Senators in place of 96; 203 Congressmen in place of 435; a population of 13,000,000 instead of 135,000,000. The first locomotive was still scaring old dobbin; the first oil well had not been dug. The modern age of technology, chemistry, medicine, and power was just knocking at the door. It is probable that in the intervening century a greater advance has been made in technical progress than in all previous time. The span of life has been doubled; modern tools have quadrupled the productivity of worker and farmer; famine and pestilence have been abolished over great stretches of the earth. Only war, death, and taxes remain.

But while mankind has been scaling the peaks of science and invention, we have not only failed to climb—we have slipped downward in the field of constitutional government. That in part is the meaning of this World War No. 2. At home for the past 20 years at least we have seen the executive power grow at the expense of Congress, and the Federal Government at the expense of the States and local communities.

Here, as abroad, we have been moving toward one-man government. No one who loves his country—and his children—can view this trend without deep misgiving.

It seems, therefore, of the utmost importance for the average citizen to increase his respect for Congress—the sheet-anchor of his liberties—and for Congress to earn his increasing regard. And the beginning of that wisdom is understanding.

I think of great-grandfather, perhaps, listening to Webster, and you of today seeing Congress in action for the first time. How many times I have thought of the poor impression Congress must make on those who see it for the first time from the gallery. Yet, if the visitor followed his own Congressman around for 1 typical day, I am certain he would come home with a growing regard for one of the hardest working groups of men in America.

Let us look both at the appearance and the reality.

From the gallery one ordinarily sees few Members on the floor. Those present seem to be paying little attention to the proceedings. They are coming and going, talking with one another, reading the paper. Compared to the picture of Webster replying to Hayne, one is bound to have a distinct let-down.

But the visitor is there for only a few minutes, an hour at the most. He does not stop to think that the session he is witnessing began sharply at noon and will continue for 4 or 5, sometimes for 8, 10, or 12 hours. Long before such a session adjourns, even the visitor in the gallery would want to get up, stretch his legs, talk to his friends, and perhaps glance at the latest headlines.

The real work of Congress is done in committee. What the visitor sees from the gallery is actually a ratification meeting on some proposal that has been already thoroughly threshed out in committee.

Every session, thousands of bills are introduced. They are referred to some 40 committees of the House of Representatives and a corresponding number in the Senate. An important committee such as that on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I was a member, will have referred to it in a single session several hundred bills. Some of these are of the greatest importance. When a committee takes up one of these bills, hearings are held in which a "day in court" is given both to those who favor and those who oppose. This is the American way. No judgment is formed on the important matter until both sides have been heard.

BEHIND THE SCENES

These hearings are held in the forenoon; consequently, the Congressman has already done half of a day's work before Congress assembles at noon. On an extremely important bill, it is not unusual for hearings to last 2 months or more and then when they are concluded it often happens that the committee will spend another month in rewriting the bill. Some of these bills are in themselves 200 to 300 pages long. I recall one in particular which my committee considered practically every working day for 5 months. If the visitor in the gallery had ever been a member of a jury back home trying a case which lasted 5 weeks, to say nothing of 5 months, he would know better what his Congressman is up against.

When one of these 40 committees finally reports a bill for action to the full House or Senate, the subject matter will generally have already come to the attention of all of the Members, for the reason that, if the bill is at all important, each Congressman, even though not a member of the committee having jurisdiction of the bill, will have probably been bombarded for weeks with hundreds of letters and telegrams, both for and against its passage. Constituents from his district interested in the bill will have come down to Washington to present their claims to him in person.

The result is that by the time the bill reaches the floor, the average Member already knows a great deal about it and has probably made up his mind how he is going to vote. Occasionally, argument on the floor is fresh and new, but to a large extent it simply repeats what the Member has already heard over a period of weeks or months. This being the case, it is not strange that the Members are not in unanimous attendance when a bill is under discussion on the floor previous to the time it comes to a final vote, that they apparently pay so little attention to what is being said.

Each of the 40 committees is a little Congress in itself. Unless the work were thus subdivided, it would be impossible for Congress to consider a tenth or a hundredth part of the legislation that actually passes during a session. These committees have from 3 to 43 members in which both the majority and minority parties in Congress are represented, which again assures against arbitrary action.

All Members of Congress have a great deal of confidence in the members of various committees. When a committee, therefore, reports a bill favorably, either by unanimous vote, which is true in the greater number of cases, or by an overwhelming majority, it is natural that the other Members of Congress, who have been themselves busy on the work of their own committees, will accept the recommendations of the committee having charge of the bill. It is only in the exceptional case, where there is a strong minority report from the committee reporting the bill, that there is apt to be serious and heated discussion on the floor.

In addition to his legislative work, the modern Congressman often receives from one hundred to five hundred letters a day and sometimes an equal number of telegrams. The senders always expect at least the courtesy of an acknowledgment and most of them really desire a careful reply. In addition, he receives hundreds of requests to go up to one of the departments and plead the cause of a constituent. For example, in applications for pensions before the Veterans' Administration, the Congressman often participates almost as a lawyer in court, for which, of course, he makes no charge. Then there is the constant round of people dropping in from the district who want cards to the White House or some other courtesy.

It is a killing pace. The mortality of Members is much higher than the average in civil life for men in the same age limits. Sessions that formerly lasted only 3 months are now almost year-round affairs.

WHY BELITTLE CONGRESS?

A number of things contribute to put Congress in the mother-in-law class before the people. One is the general attitude of the newspapers, press correspondents, and citizens of the District of Columbia. The feeling between Washington City and Congress is seldom very friendly. There are many reasons for this. One is the old story that familiarity breeds contempt. More important, however, is the fact that the downtown departments wage a ceaseless war against Congress to increase the appropriations of public money for the departments to spend. No downtown department ever thinks of saving money. Congress, therefore, which has direct responsibility to the taxpayer—and you are one—is the inveterate opponent of downtown Washington. Congress is always a stingy old tightwad to the bureaucrats.

Moreover, the support of the municipal city of Washington, D. C., comes in part from congressional appropriations, and there is a constant struggle on the part of the people who own property in Washington to shift the tax burden from their own shoulders by getting larger appropriations for the District from Congress. All of this creates an unfriendly attitude toward Congress in the Nation's Capital, for which I think Congress is very little at fault, but with the unfortunate result that the news pouring out from the Capital concerning Congress is often tinctured with malice.

A certain type of Washington correspondent or cartoonist is never happy unless he is ridiculing Congress. I give two illustrations among many: One is the recent uproar about gasoline ration books for Congressmen. You would have thought that Congressmen were using most of the petroleum in the United States, whereas it was not a drop in the bucket to the tank cars emptying into the tens of thousands of automobiles in the executive departments. Another illustration is the furor against Congressmen using the frank to send speeches into their districts. Again, the amount of free mail franked out by the executive departments is 20 times

that sent out by Congress, yet these razzle-dazzle boys who make up so much of the alleged news never tell you that. To listen to them, you would think that Congress was sending you to the poorhouse on account of their franked mail. The congressional frank is sometimes abused but, on the whole, I thoroughly approve of its use by Members of Congress. It is often true that not a single newspaper in his district is friendly to the sitting Congressman, although he is actually there because a majority of his people want him there. If he were not enabled to state his position to his constituents by franked mail, he would often be precluded from any real chance to have them understand his position on important matters. Meantime, a rival back home who has no congressional duties could constantly undermine him.

OUR GREATEST SAFEGUARD

Congress makes the laws, the executive administers them, the judiciary interprets them in litigated cases. Our fathers intended each branch to be coordinate and independent from each of the others. They recognized the teaching of all history—that unlimited power can be trusted to no one, "not even to the largest majority," as the Constitution of Wyoming says.

This is our great system of checks and balances—perhaps the most important political idea that ever came from the mind of man. Incidentally, don't let anyone tell you that the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments—is the heart of the American Constitution. If I had to choose the chief safeguards of freedom, I would put in first place this great principle of checks and balances embedded in the original Constitution before it had been amended. Preserve that and "Liberty has still a continent to dwell on."

However, there have been times when Congress has encroached on the Executive, as in the reconstruction period following the Civil War, and times when the Executive power has put Congress in the shadow. Heretofore, however, the common sense of a great people has in time always put encroachers back in their places. Our soldier sons are doing that right now.

As you see, I am frankly a friend of Congress. It is historically true that no parliamentary body ever destroyed the liberties of a people. They may have finally ratified the destruction of the people's liberties, as did the German Reichstag, but they did not originate the destruction. The danger to constitutional liberty comes from other sources.

The huge bureaucracies which now administer Government, consisting of some 3,000,000 civilians, do not owe their positions to the people except indirectly, nor can they be fired by the people. The Federal judiciary holds office for life. The one agency of our Government at Washington that is close to the people is Congress. It is the people's champion, as has been fully demonstrated in recent months. It listens to the people's grievances and fights their battles against the bureaucrats.

It was to preserve the blessings of liberty "to ourselves and our posterity" that the Constitution of 1787 was written. A feature of the Constitution, the value of which is too little appreciated, is the fact that all Members of the House and a third of the Senate must submit themselves to the people every 2 years in elections that cannot be postponed. A body of Representatives over whom the people have such a close control can be trusted with the people's liberties. The people can dismiss them if they fail. Different from the law with reference to many minor officials back in the States, who sit until their successors are elected to actually qualify, no Congressman can sit for a single day after the expiration of the 2-year period for which he was elected unless, of course, he is reelected.

In England there is no such basic law. The British Parliament is supreme. It can vote itself indefinite tenure in office and there is no law to prevent Parliament voting itself office for life or to make the office hereditary to their own sons. As a matter of fact, the present British Parliament, whose term normally should have expired in 1940, has voted itself continuance in office without an election. In England there has been no parliamentary election for 8 years and no one knows when one will take place. It is probable that the British Parliament, or at least a majority of its members, have the continued confidence of their constituents, but there is no way to prove it. To me, it is a somewhat ominous thing that the chief legislative body of one of the few remaining democracies left in the world declines to submit itself to the people.

WHERE DANGERS LURK

Many Americans who are ignorant of our Constitution sometimes express the fear that a congressional election might be suspended in this country under some so-called unwritten law of survival in time of war or by the will of the Army under orders from the President. I have no such fear. The damage to our form of government will come in more subtle ways. Among them may be the following:

(1) Disparagement of Congress. We have seen signs of this, especially by left-wing groups in this country whose members could not win a single seat in Congress in any State, and therefore seek places of power by boring from within in the executive department;

(2) The gradual transfer of the powers and responsibilities of Congress to executive departments and bureaus, which in increasing fashion are writing rules and regulations having the force and effect of law;

(3) Another danger that confronts Congress as an institution of freedom, is the power of propaganda which has been so tremendously augmented in recent years by the silver screen and the radio. There is no one man who can speak for the 531 members of the House and Senate. There is no way for all of them to speak collectively over the radio. When the President or a Cabinet member presents his case to the people, the press, the radio, and the silver screen focus upon him as a single human being. In the use of propaganda, Congress is at a great disadvantage.

These new inventions in the field of mass communication have been largely responsible for the rise of dictators and the twilight of representative government in many hands. We must recognize them in this country for what they are—instruments capable of great good or immense harm. It is possible that we will have to devise methods by which Congress, or the "opposition" on every important question shall have equal radio time with the President on an equal number of stations. The American people are entitled to hear both sides. That privilege is enjoyed by few people on this planet today.

But Congress is itself at fault in failing to keep abreast of the stream of events. It has become too habit-bound. It needs to modernize itself. It needs a new set of tools with which to work.

DESIGN FOR NEW TOOLS

As a suggestion, Congress should cut off $100,000,000 or more to the Washington bureaucrats and vote itself $10,000,000 worth of expert help. That would save $90,000,000 at the outset and hundreds of millions, if not billions thereafter. You should insist that this be done. It would be one of the best investments you could make. Let me illustrate:

At the present time there are only two standing committees of Congress that have any competent full-time assistance in the necessary analysis and research on bills. These are the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Committee on Finance. They have a small but excellent staff of year-round technicians to help them prepare tax legislation. These men are not appointed by the President. They are appointed by the tax committees and generally stay on year after year regardless of changes of administration. They cannot be hushed or cowed by Treasury officials either through fear of losing their jobs or through ignorance of the subject. They can concentrate on tax legislation the year round and advise committee members what questions to ask the Department representatives, in the same way that a lawyer trying a poison murder case gets the competent advice of toxicologists, physicians, etc., to aid him in examining witnesses.

Every standing committee of Congress should have similar expert, year-round help—the committees dealing with interstate commerce, agriculture, banking, mining, Army, Navy, foreign affairs, judiciary, public lands, veterans, irrigation and reclamation, civil service, immigration and naturalization, pensions, Indian affairs, labor, merchant marine, patents, post offices, rivers and harbors, roads, etc. Without such assistance, independent of "downtown" influence, Congress is handicapped in analyzing legislation, finding the bugs in it, or where millions can be saved. Congressmen have to rely on the advice of the brain trusters in the Chinese maze of executive departments, commissions, and bureaus, or upon the views of outside pressure groups—both of which are colored by self-interest.

A CURB ON TAXEATERS

The executive departments always want money. They are the spending branch—and, believe me, they spend. They know how to dress up their recommendations to get more money to hire more pay-rollers. Congress is the appropriating and taxing branch responsible to you. It must take steps to insure its capacity for independent judgment.

Aside from executive pressure for appropriations, unwise legislation throws terrific burdens on business, and is constantly being amended by patchwork. Congress today doesn't have the time, nervous strength, or information to write legislation so thoughtfully that it will stand up for years. The important paragraphs of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1889 were studied so thoroughly and written so carefully that they haven't been changed in 54 years. And, paragraphs of the Judiciary Act written by the First Congress in 1789 have scarcely been changed by a syllable in 154 years. Then, men had time to think.

IN PLACE OF A POET

Don't blame Congressmen or Senators for not doing a better job today. They neither have time to carefully answer their mail nor run all the errands for their constituents, and certainly not enough to spend months of uninterrupted study of important bills. If they did take the necessary time to be legislators, as men could do in 1789 or 1889, they would be defeated at the next election for failing to answer letters.

In addition to a small staff assigned to each important committee, there should be available to Congress a research body under its control, something like the Brookings Institution or the National Industrial Conference Board—recognized economists, engineers, statisticians, library researchers, field investigators, etc.

The Library of Congress was originally supposed to be the expert arm of Congress. But it has lost its prime function and should be reorganized from cellar to garret. It is

just plain foolish that the Librarian of Congress should be appointed by the President and be responsible to him, rather than be appointed by the majority and minority leaders of House and Senate and be responsible to them. At the present time the Librarian is a poet, an appointee of the President, and that affects the attitude of his hundreds of assistants. During the fight to prevent the packing of the Supreme Court it was like pulling teeth for the opponents of that bill to get any real research material from the Library.

GET BEHIND THIS BILL

Senators TYDINGS, BYRD, GEORGE, and Congressmen DIRKSEN, of Illinois, LANHAM, of Texas, LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana, and many others of both parties are trying to get Congress to hire itself a set of modern tools. The country should tell Congress to go ahead.

Thomas Jefferson said to President George Washington that "If the equilibrium of the three bodies—legislative, executive, and judiciary—could be preserved, if the legislature could be kept independent, I should never fear the result of such a government; but that I could not but be uneasy when I saw the executive had swallowed up the legislative branch."

Congress is the great board of directors of the American people. It is the policy-forming agency of a free people. It can declare war. It can draft your sons. It can make money sound or worthless. It can make free enterprise flourish, or cause it to wither and die under execessive regimentation or by bleeding it to death through ruinous taxation. Its decisions for weal or woe affect every hearthside. Depending upon its wisdom and courage, your children will live to be free men in a free land, the masters of their government—or its slaves.

Whatever diminishes the authority of Congress impairs the security of your liberty. The lights of liberty have gone out all over the globe. Will they shine bright and clear from our windows when our soldier sons come home?

Agricultural Adjustment Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed an amendment forbidding A. A. A. employees to require farmers to join up with the A. A. A. as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity. This amendment was adopted as a result of the innumerable complaints that have come to Congressmen from farmers who did not belong to the A. A. A. that if they did not join up they would not be allowed to have any more gasoline or purchase farm machinery or be allowed draft deferment.

The letter which follows shows another arbitrary and tyrannical A. A. A. regulation. Here is a farmer who never took part in the A. A. A. program because he did not believe in it. Inasmuch as he could not get a fair price for his product in the market and along with the other farmers of the country is being forced either to accept a milk subsidy or operate at a loss to the amount of the difference between a fair market price and the O. P. A. ceiling price, he decided he had better take the subsidy. But upon making application for the subsidy he was turned down by the local A. A. A. officials because he had never filled out crop reports.

The farmers may well wonder what is going to happen to them should the A. A. A. continue increasing its interference with farming operations and issuing these arbitrary rules and regulations. Even the farmer who once believed in the A. A. A. is learning that it is not his friend. The A. A. A. is right now turning its back on the farmer in spinelessly standing by and allowing the Government to take farm machinery out of 1944 farm machinery production and give it away to peoples in far off foreign lands under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, U. N. R. R. A., when our own American farmers need it so badly to produce the necessary food for our soldiers and our food-rationed people.

ARLINGTON, OHIO, *March 24, 1944.*

Dr. FREDERICK C. SMITH,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard an incident which I think you should know about.

I am 35 years of age and have been a farmer all my life, and have never believed in the A. A. A. program and never participated in it at any time. This has led to a great many differences, as they have insisted upon sending their men to have me fill out this form and that, which you must know about.

When the milk subsidy was forced upon us in lieu of a fair price for feed, I considered it my privilege to collect the same as others. However, upon presenting my milk slips to the A. A. A. offices at Findlay I was definitely informed that I could not be given my payment because "I had never filled out my crop reports." I tried to explain to the member that I thought that the milk subsidy had no connection whatsoever with the A. A. A. program and that they were just acting as an agent for the C. C. C. in making these payments. I was definitely refused, however.

This was for the first month and I have never been back since, feeling that it would be of no use.

Yours respectfully,

THERON F. EDIE.

Collective Bargaining, 1943 Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Collective Bargaining—1943 Model," delivered by Hon. Edward R. Burke, a former Member of this body, at the annual meeting of the Operators' Association of Williamson Field, Williamson, W. Va., on February 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Few will be heard to challenge the theory of collective bargaining. It offers the only alternative to some form of collectivism. In an industrial age some means must be found for good-faith bargaining between management and workers for the adjustment of wages, hours of labor, and conditions of employment. Private capital and the profit system, as well as free labor, are dependent upon the success of the bargaining process. Otherwise organized society—the state—will dictate to both sides.

Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 to foster collective bargaining. The purpose of the act is beyond criticism. Not so much can be said for the means adopted to accomplish that purpose. The sponsors of this legislation frankly admit that it is heavily weighted in favor of one of the parties—organized labor. You will recall the imposing list of actions that constitute unfair labor practices. Upon whom do these restrictions rest? Upon the employer only. It is as if the framers of the act were of the opinion that there are no unfair labor practices that organized labor could, or would, commit. Every impartial person of any sense whatever knows that labor has a whole arsenal of such weapons. The most up-to-date weapons. Always loaded. And no hesitancy in using them.

There is a reason sometimes given in justification of the one-sidedness of the Labor Relations Act and in its administration by the first Board set up under it. On numerous occasions I have heard the first chairman of that Board say that it was his belief that through the years the scales had been weighted in favor of the employer. His conclusion was that since that was so, it is only fair now to put the weights all on the other side for a while. Even if we grant that employers did have the advantage, and did use it unfairly, it does not follow that the correct procedure now is to give an unfair advantage to labor. Far better for labor in the long run, and for the country as a whole, to strive now for even-handed justice. One of the imperative needs is to have enacted some fundamental amendments to the Wagner Labor Relations Act. On another occasion I shall give my views on that subject.

It is my purpose at this time to talk about collective bargaining in actual practice in the industry in which we are all vitally concerned. Just about a year ago your representatives went to New York in compliance with the contract requirement to consider with the U. M. W. A. what changes, if any, should be made in the contract then in force in reference to wages, hours, and conditions of work. That contract had been executed only about 18 months prior thereto. In it the union had been granted every demand that it urged, including a wage increase that amounted to 25 percent for most miners in the southern fields. The union was so well pleased with its efforts that when it secured the operators' signatures it declared that the contract was the best under which miners anywhere in the world had ever worked. That it changed into reality for the men who mine coal what had theretofore been only an idle dream.

With those thoughts in mind it seemed to your negotiators that the sensible thing for the parties to do would be to renew the contract for the duration of the war. Even that fulsomely praised agreement had been twice amended for the great benefit of the miners. The vacation clause had been changed so that workers received full pay for that period in addition to the vacation payment.

The workweek had been extended with payment at time and one-half and rate and one-half for all work performed on the 6th day.

The union scoffed at our suggestion. It was evident that they proposed to capitalize to the fullest extent possible on the imperative necessity for coal for the successful prosecution of the war. So they presented some 19 demands. Three of these were major items, and it is these only that I will discuss. (1) A straight wage increase of $2 per day. (2) Portal to portal pay. (3) Elimination of the exemption clause so that all supervisory officials could be taken into the union. We were told in plain language, and repeatedly, that no contract would be negotiated that did not grant each and every one of these three demands. Let us now discuss them, but not in the order stated.

I. UNIONIZATION OF SUPERVISORY OFFICIALS

Until October 1942 the constitution of the International Union, U. M. W. A. had expressly prohibited union membership for foremen, supervisors, technicians, or anyone connected with management. The wage agreements contained a like exemption. This was in accord with sound policy. Discipline, safety, efficiency, real collective bargaining, all require that everyone connected with management be primarily loyal and responsible to management. That is just another way of saying that a person subject to that requirement cannot belong to a union. For the union demands loyalty to it first and foremost. Some events of 1943 indicate that loyalty to union, in the minds of many, comes ahead of loyalty to country.

However, due to administration policy, labor in 1942 was riding the crest of a unionization wave. Organizers looked upon supervisory classes as a fertile field. What was called a mine officials union was formed at the Union Collieries Co. in western Pennsylvania. It demanded recognition as a collective bargaining agency. The demand was denied. Eventually the case reached the National Labor Relations Board. Your spokesman intervened. Argued. Filed briefs. It was of no avail. In September 1942, by a two to one decision it was ruled that such a union was an appropriate unit for collective bargaining purposes under the National Labor Relations Act.

The majority opinion called attention to the fact that it was dealing with an independent union. It emphasized that it was not giving its approval to one union composed of both a segment of management and of workers. The minority member, more realistic, expressed the fear that distinction was theoretical rather than real since the same bargaining representatives would undoubtedly speak for both.

As a matter of fact, scarcely had the ink dried on the signatures of the misguided majority in the Union Collieries decision when the organizers of this so-called independent mine officials union appeared before the high officials of the U. M. W. A., hat in hand, and petitioned for admission. With tongue in cheek, Mr. Lewis listened. You have already guessed the answer. He acquiesced. The independent union agreed to dissolve effective as of March 31, 1943. The U. M. W. A. agreed that on midnight of that day these new members would become regular members of its organization and thereafter would be represented by it in all matters. In a communication to all his district and local officers, Mr. Lewis bade them welcome with open arms—these 600,000 new members; $600,000 more for the already overflowing treasury by way of the initiation fee. Something like $120,000 a month additional regular income in the form of dues. But more than all that, a new and powerful club to use on the heads of an already distraught management.

No wonder Mr. Lewis and his associates would not agree to continue a contract that contained a clause forbidding this whole program. Nor is it hard to understand the extreme vigor of the attack on your negotiators to try to force them to agree to a contract with the exemption clause eliminated. It was an effort, however, that did not succeed.

Then in May 1943 there came to pass a miracle. The National Labor Relations Board reversed the Union Collieries case. Former Congressman Houston, of Kansas, had replaced Leiserson as a Board member. There came before the Board a new case, Maryland Dry Dock Co., involving the same question. Now, by a 2-to-1 majority, the Board ruled that a union composed of supervisory officials is not an appropriate unit for collective bargaining. That is the law today. No employer need engage in collective bargaining with, or recognize in any way, a union which contains any supervisory officials.

There was a hearing before the National Labor Relations Board on February 15, 1944. The sole issue in the case on appeal was whether it would be an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge a foreman because of his membership in and activities on behalf of a labor organization composed of supervisory officials. The matter was argued in a day-long hearing. Briefs are to be filed. In due course the Board will determine whether the Labor Relations Act affords protection in such a case. Whatever the decision of the Board may be on that specific point there is no indication that any consideration is being given to changing or relaxing the ruling that supervisory officials are not an appropriate bargaining unit.

II. WAGE INCREASE

Congress passed a wage stabilization act in October 1942. There were to be no general wage increases thereafter. Inequalities could be corrected. Substandard wages might be brought up to standard. The National War Labor Board had already promulgated the Little Steel formula, which allowed up to a 15-percent increase in straight hourly wages over January 1, 1941, to compensate for increased living costs.

Where do you fit into that program the union demand for a $2 a day over-all increase, an increase of 28.57 percent? It just doesn't fit in at all. Your representatives pointed that out over and over again. But Mr. Lewis insisted that he would have that increase or there would be no contract. We declined to join with him in a movement to break down the Government stabilization program. We urged that the case be taken at once to the War Labor Board. If he could convince the Board that he was entitled to the demanded increase, or any increase, we would gladly submit. The only reply he gave was a vituperative attack upon the Board.

Eventually the case reached the Board. Of course, the decision was that there can be no increase in the regular hourly rate of pay for bituminous miners. There could be no other decision until the Board is ready to discard the Little Steel formula. Until President Roosevelt is ready to break his hold-the-line order. Until Congress is ready to amend the wage stabilization statute.

Some of our own operators thought for a time that a mistake was made. That it would have been better to have yielded to Mr. Lewis and made a contract providing the increase he demanded. That view can be held only by one unfamiliar with the facts as stated herein, or one who has failed to think the matter through. On that ground, I exonerate the few operators who have expressed such an opinion. There is no such mantle of excuse available to cloak the erroneous statements repeatedly coming from Secretary Ickes. He persists in challenging the good faith of the operators by alleging that we could have negotiated a contract had we been so inclined. He knows the facts and he has had plenty of opportunity to think them through. He knows that we could not have made a contract with Mr. Lewis without giving him a straight hourly wage increase. He knows that to have done so would have been in direct violation of the order of the President in whose Cabinet he sits, of the ruling of the War Labor Board, which is a duly authorized agency of the same Government which he serves, and of the wage-stabilization policy established by the Congress of the United States.

It may be that Secretary Ickes will reply that he made a contract with Mr. Lewis that gave him the money he wanted and that was approved by the War Labor Board. There are two things to be said in respect to that contention.

The Ickes-Lewis contract assumes an extra hour of productive work and pays for it at time and one-half the regular contract rate. Had Mr. Lewis been willing to agree to an actual, instead of an assumed, extra hour at the face, he could have had a contract long before he laid one down for Secretary Ickes to sign. He can have such a contract today, and any day hereafter.

The other thing to be said about the Ickes-Lewis contract has to do with the now exploded fantasy that by legal requirement travel time in bituminous-coal mines must be considered as work time. That calls for a discussion of the last of the three major union demands at the last wage conference.

III. PORTAL TO PORTAL

If there was any one thing upon which the U. M. W. A. and every bituminous coal operator in the country were in complete and undeviating agreement throughout the years, it was that the proper basis for computing miners' pay was for hours spent at the face or usual working place. Of course, in determining the proper rate for those productive hours consideration had to be given always to the fact of travel time—the recognized fact that all underground miners of necessity spent varying amounts of time in getting from the portal to the working place and back again when the day's work was done.

What is a proper rate for mining coal depends upon a fair consideration of many factors: The difficulty of the work, dirt and unpleasantness, danger, also many other things, not the least important of which is that feature known as underground travel time. That is likewise of importance in determining the hours of work.

Why did the union and the operators always agree that travel time should not be paid for as such? First of all because it is not work and everyone knew that was so. Because also it varies between every mine and within the same mine. To pay for travel time as such would run contra to the union's policy of equal pay for equal work. It would disrupt wage schedules and result in constant friction between workers. It would so distort costs as to inevitably force the closing of older mines with longer travel time.

In 1938 Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act, popularly known as the Wage and Hour Act. Its purpose was simple. To provide a floor under wages, 30 cents an hour, to be generally increased to 40 on an industry-wide basis. To provide a ceiling over hours. Forty-four the first year. Forty-two the second. Thereafter 40. For all work above the specified work week there should be paid time and one-half the regular rate.

Mr. Lewis appeared as a witness before the joint Senate-House Committee. He testified that long since the U. M. W. A., by collective bargaining, had secured a minimum wage far in excess of that specified in the proposed act, and a work week of 35 hours instead of the longer maximum therein specified. His only concern was that nothing should be put in the act that would interfere with his right to get additional benefits both as to wages

and hours whenever he was able to do so by collective bargaining. The act was so written.

Not a word was said before the committee, in the debates in House and Senate, or in the act itself, that lends the slightest substance to the contention that Congress intended to lay down any rule as to what should be counted as work time. I can make the whole point in one sentence. Mr. Lewis did not ask that Congress so define work as to include travel time, and Congress did not attempt to do so.

The act went into effect October 24, 1938. In March 1939 the Appalachian Joint Wage Conference assembled and wrote a new contract. Not a word from Mr. Lewis or anyone else that the Wages and Hours Act affected the situation at all. Travel time was treated as it always had been.

Then in the spring of 1940 an inspector for the Wage and Hour Division in making a routine investigation of a coal mine in central Pennsylvania queried whether travel time should not be counted as work time in determining when the 40-hour limit was reached, after which overtime must be paid. Immediately there was a great hubbub. It is hard to tell whether the operators or the U. M. W. A. was more surprised and more alarmed over the suggestion and the disrupting influence that such a ruling would have.

The matter was taken up at once. Mr. Lewis himself made an appointment with the Wage and Hour Administrator so that the facts could be laid before him and he could be prevented from making so serious a mistake. At the suggestion of the Administrator, a written statement was prepared jointly by operator and union representatives on July 9, 1940. This was the famous Houck letter, a letter not equaled in fame until the apparently spurious Hopkins letter was made public. No one has yet questioned the authenticity of the Houck letter. Mr. Houck himself sat in Federal court at Roanoke last November and raised no question when the letter was read and commented on at great length.

The Administrator ruled, in the light of the facts presented, that in bituminous coal mines the face to face method of computing pay is in full accordance with the act.

In March 1941 another wage conference assembled. Again there was no contention that travel time is work time. Seven hours at the face, or usual working place, was declared to constitute the day's work; 35 hours at the face, or usual working place, the workweek.

Meanwhile, in the ore-mining industry the Administrator and a lower court had reached a different conclusion. There were reasons given for the distinction. Whether the ore mining ruling is erroneous or not, we will not argue. We do say with firm conviction that it in no way affects the decision in the bituminous coal industry.

We come to March 1943. The U. M. W. A. demanded portal-to-portal pay "in accordance with the legal requirement." However, it was stated that travel pay would be included in the general wage increase. At no time during the long extended conferences in New York was there ever the slightest suggestion that the face-to-face method should be abandoned.

When the negotiations resumed in Washington the War Labor Board had explicitly ruled that no wage increase could be allowed. The Board said that it was not its function to pass on the question of the applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act to travel time. If the parties considered there was a possible liability running back to 1938 and would submit an agreement the Board could approve, it said, if it were definitely related to settlement of a possible legal liability and were not a wage increase in disguise.

Mr. Lewis immediately seized on that language and wanted a contract giving him his $2-a-day increase based on this formula. Average travel time, he insisted, was one hour and a half. Since 7 hours was to be retained at the face, the travel time would be paid for at time and one-half. This would mean on the basic rate of $1 per hour, $2.25 per day for all underground men. By taking away the 25 cents and distributing it to the outside men, all workers would get a $2-a-day increase. The operators refused to make such an agreement, which was clearly a thinly disguised wage increase.

You will notice that Mr. Lewis was not yet talking about portal to portal as a basis for computing pay. He was not doing so when he made the first Illinois agreement. That provided for $1.25 per day in settlement of alleged portal-to-portal liability. The Board rejected the contract.

By this time Mr. Lewis was getting desperate. He was under the most severe criticism for his series of strikes that were interfering with the war effort. The War Labor Board was standing by its guns. He was having the unusual experience of not being able to bully and brow-beat the operators into submission.

The U. M. W. A. chief had still one ever-ready ally who was in strategic position to render him yeoman service. He had never failed to come through with just what Mr. Lewis wanted and subsequent events showed that Secretary Ickes could still be counted on.

So, the second Illinois agreement was submitted to the Board. For the first time in the history of coal mining in the United States the work day was to begin at the portal and end at the portal. They agreed that travel time is work time. The parties assumed that travel time average in Illinois 45 minutes. With 9 hours from portal to portal this would leave a certain extra work time that could be paid for at time and one-half. Forty dollars per employee was to be paid in settlement of an assumed past liability.

The Board rejected the contract because it called for a greater payment than the assumed extra work justified plus the payment arrived at by counting travel time as work time to reach the 40-hour limit.

Then followed the fourth strike. The mines were seized by Government. The Ickes-Lewis agreement was submitted to the Board. By ostensibly reducing the lunch period to 15 minutes the assumed extra work time that was required was found and Lewis got the payment he had been demanding. The Board approved the contract for the period of Government operation.

Immediately the effort started to unload the contract on the operators. The South refused to submit. We were unwilling to assume that an extra hour of work was provided and offered instead to pay for 8 hours at the face. We denied any basis for holding that travel time is work time, which is the basis upon which the proposed contract rests. Specifically we refused to agree that the industry should pay $20,000,000 in settlement of an assumed liability which we hoped would be disproved.

While all this was going on the Southern Coal Producers' Association had taken steps to have a competent court declare whether the Fair Labor Standards Act has transformed travel time in bituminous coal mines into work time. The suit was brought in Federal court in Virginia. One reason for going into that jurisdiction was to make possible the service of summons personally on Mr. Lewis at his Alexandria home.

The court proceeding went through all of the necessary stages. A convincing array of witnesses took the stand. Capable union attorneys, drawn in from Washington to Alabama, used every art at their command. The case was orally argued. Briefs were filed.

Then came January 25. Judge Barksdale handed down a decision. In clearness of statement and cogency of reasoning, you will search the books in vain to find a decision that excels it. The court sustained every contention of the operators. Travel time in bituminous coal mines is not work time. The workday and the workweek are to be determined just as if the Fair Labor Standards Act had never been passed.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the way is now opened for an agreement by collective bargaining. There is no longer any subterfuge by which a wage increase can be disguised. There is no longer any basis for assumptions as to travel time, either as to the amount thereof or its importance in fixing wage scales.

As long as the stabilization program remains unchanged there can be no extra wages paid to miners except for additional work. You may say, "Aye! There's the rub." Will the stabilization program remain unchanged? I do not know. It may well be that until that question is settled, nothing can be done in the way of reaching an agreement. Time alone can furnish the answer.

A Phi Beta Kappa Nisei Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most temperate and best-balanced statements I have seen regarding the problems of the American citizen of Japanese ancestry was written by one of them, a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Whitman College writing in the Key Reporter. It illustrates afresh that no race or nationality has a monopoly of any virtue or vice. There are good men and bad men in every country, faithful and treacherous, noble and craven.

Some of us who have worked longest and hardest and at times almost single-handedly against Japan's military clique and its dreams of world conquest have known many Japanese who are as loyal and devoted citizens of this Republic as are the descendants of immigrants from England or the Scandinavian countries or France or Russia or Germany. Some of them I think appreciate America even more deeply than some of us, because they are acutely aware of how different it would be in Japan. For us to deny each American citizen regardless of his origin the right to be judged on the basis of his own individual merits and character, good or bad, is for us to deny the foundation principles of this Republic in seeking to preserve it.

What America means to this young American citizen and his wife makes me realize afresh how much it means to me:

A PHI BETA KAPPA NISEI SPEAKS

(By Robert M. Hosokawa)

Minidoka is a community born of war, a city of drab tarpaper barracks with a population of 8,867. It borders an old irrigation canal on a rocky portion of sage-covered Idaho desert.

It is not a prosperous community, but has schools, a hospital, some stores, a weekly

paper, churches, and a cemetery. Minidoka's inhabitants are of all temperaments and trades. They are civic minded, aloof, selfish, dishonest, generous, and progressive. There are office clerks, doctors, coal shovelers, policemen, loafers, preachers, students, and housewives.

As in all America, the windows of Minidoka hold service stars. Some have two and three, even four, each representing an American soldier.

For all of this apparent normalcy, Minidoka is a lonely place, spiritually bleak, devoid of hope and warmth. It is surrounded by barbed wire, and watch towers punctuate the horizon. The only gate is guarded by military police. No one enters or leaves without credentials.

Yet this is an American community. More than two-thirds of its inhabitants are citizens. The remainder are aliens who have lived long in the United States but are ineligible for naturalization because of congressional legislation.

Minidoka is mono-racial and its inhabitants who look through the fencing are of Japanese descent. They were moved to Minidoka and to 10 inland centers in the summer of 1942 when mass evacuation from the Pacific coast was deemed a military necessity.

There is nothing lavish at Minidoka. Many inadequacies exist. However, most of its residents do not complain. They realize their discomforts are not serious. My wife and I often discussed how trifling our troubles were in comparison with those being endured by thousands of America's fighting men.

Subnormal conditions make home life and training of the young a difficult job. There is no privacy, for each family has only one room. There are central mess halls where residents stand in line thrice daily.

Recreational facilities are few, but the Nisei and the Caucasian staff members have made attempts at constructive activities. The depressing limitations of concentration are killing initiative and responsibility.

Younger children cannot recall their former homes. And to them the crowded existence as Government wards is normal. They eat in mess halls, often apart from their parents, and training in such little things as table manners is lacking. Their social contacts are wholly with other evacuees. It will take much readjustment when they are free to return to normal living.

Schools in the center are handicapped by lack of equipment. Textbooks are few and individual research is difficult. Zoology students finish courses without having dissected the earthworm or the frog. Incentive for study is often dulled in even the brightest students.

Classes are held in made-over barrack rooms with children sitting on benches. The physical handicaps are not as important as the effect they have on these young students. Most of them know only that they are being confined, "because we had the wrong ancestors," as one evacuee put it. They are conscious of the stigma and do not know what they can do about it. They wonder if America wants them when they read reports of "mass deportation," or at least permanent exclusion from the coast.

Some students are finding their way to schools in the Middle West and East, through efforts of the National Student Relocation Council and its supporting groups.

There are more than 5,000 Nisei now training in United States Army camps. Some are already fighting in Italy and in the Pacific. Those not yet in the service are hoping for early reinstatement to Selective Service so that they may execute their responsibilities as Americans.

In cooperation with military intelligence and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the War Relocation Authority has set up machinery permitting those residents who can pass stringent investigation, to leave the project. To date about 2,300 have secured their indefinite leaves and have passed through the gate for cities, towns, farms, and schools outside the Western Defense Command. The W. R. A. was created by the Government to carry out this resettlement and is doing a commendable job under trying conditions.

Most of those who leave the center are Nisei—American born, American schooled. Few return to Minidoka. The W. R. A., with offices in a dozen midwestern and eastern cities, is finding community acceptance the least of its worries. It is avoiding concentration in any area. Stories of successful relocation and assimilation are many, but the present egress is still a trickle.

Nisei are being employed in war factories and farms, in homes and offices. They are contributing to the victory effort in practically every State. They have relocated most heavily in the Middle West and least of all in the South.

Greatest blessing to loyal Americans of Japanese descent was the segregation recently completed in which 15,000 found disloyal or unworthy of Americanism were weeded out and transferred to the Tule Lake project in California.

The other 85,000 stand a better chance of having their faith in America recognized. They did not lose faith even though they had been sent from their homes and placed in camps. They want to be wholly American, to have a part in the American dream.

My wife and I were released from Minidoka last March when a news job was located in the Middle West. We passed Federal scrutiny and made the transition without difficulty. We have been happy and thankful for our freedom and we treasure it deeply.

Now that we have been here a year, we are hoping to move farther north or east, to greener and more permanent pastures, perhaps to New England, where we can try our roots in the soil which nurtured the first Americans. We believe in America and want it to believe fully in us.

What He, Also, Said

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop from the Washington Times-Herald of March 29, 1944:

WHAT HE, ALSO, SAID

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

This being a campaign year, politicians who have gone on the record in times past with large round promises are following out an old custom in trying to help the public concentrate on the new promises and just forget what has gone on before.

For instance, there is the case of Wendell Willkie who keeps on trying to deny that in 1941 he said he was only using "campaign oratory" in his 1940 declaration that many Americans suspected Mr. Roosevelt was "deliberately inciting us to war."

But Willkie did say that, and the official, public record of his testimony shows that he did.

Another candidate for the Presidency in 1940 whose campaign words have been clouded in controversy was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Most people remember vaguely that Mr. Roosevelt, in a radio speech, promised mothers and fathers of America something or other about keeping their sons out of foreign war.

But the ear is an uncertain recorder of radio or any other kind of promises.

And so it is possible now to start a pretty hot argument in the average American household as to what Mr. Roosevelt promised, or didn't.

Well, here are the facts of record. Mr. Willkie, with his cracks and charges that Mr. Roosevelt was a war monger, got the President's goat. Campaign oratory or not, his stuff was tough for any man to take, as when he said:

"The President's attacks on foreign powers have been useless and dangerous. * * * He has courted a war for which the country is helplessly unprepared. * * * He has secretly meddled in the affairs of Europe and he has even unscrupulously encouraged other countries to hope for more help than we are able to give. * * *

"But while he has thus been quick to tell other nations what they ought to do, Mr. Roosevelt has been slow to take the American people into his confidence. He has hesitated to report facts, to explain situations, or to define realistic objectives."

That kind of talk could get a rise out of a far less quick-tempered and imperious man than Mr. Roosevelt.

Willkie's needling of the President on foreign policy, Army, Navy, and such items finally brought Mr. Roseveolt onto the platform at Boston, October 30, 1940, for a full-sized declamation on the subject.

You can find the whole speech beginning on page 514 of volume 8 of the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Rosevelt, published in 1940 by the Macmillan Co., of New York City.

Herewith the controlling paragraphs. First as to the Navy:

"The construction of this Navy has been a monumental job. In spite of what some campaign orators may tell you, you cannot buy a battleship from a mail-order catalog.

"We have not only added ships and men to the Navy, we have enormously increased the effectiveness of naval bases in those outlying territories of ours in the Atlantic and Pacific.

"For our objective is to keep any potential attacker as far from our continental shores as we possibly can."

Then he reminded everybody of the destroyer-for-bases deal in which we gave Britain 50 destroyers in return for leases of air bases along our eastern coast, and repeated his declaration that all this was to keep any potential attacker as far from our continental shore as possible.

Turning to the Army, he reviewed its development, denounced the Republicans for their criticisms of Army equipment, housing, and so forth, and then he got off his famous promise (p. 517 of vol. 8 of his speeches and papers):

"And while I am talking to you, mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.

"I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again:

"Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

"They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

"The purpose of our defense is defense."

There, in full, is the promise as given at Boston, October 3, 1940. The President did not revise or extend his remarks later to qualify that promise. He didn't say anything about "in case we are attacked we'll fight." He just made the flat, bald promise. No American boys to foreign war.

But soon after his reelection for the third term he sent the lend-lease bill to Congress.

American warships began to convoy lend-lease goods to Britain, and the President is-

sued his historic order to the Navy to "shoot on sight" any Axis submarines that might cross the convoys' trails. Then he divided our naval power between the Atlantic and the Pacific, just when the Nation was struggling to build military power equal to the Administration's commitments.

You know how it all came out. Our divided fleet was smashed at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. Our unprepared Army was defeated in the Philippines. And now we are at war all over the world, no matter what kind of war you call it.

That is the record.

Nathaniel Bacon and the Cause of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, "victrix causa deis placvit"—"a victorious cause is pleasing to the gods." Nearly 100 years before the men of Concord fired the shot for freedom heard round the world, the torch had been lifted by a little-known but highly connected Virginia colonist named Nathaniel Bacon, a cousin of the Lord Bacon whom the Anglo-Saxon people could justly place in the hall of fame of immortal minds along with Socrates and Plato.

In 1916 the Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Virginia erected a beautiful marble tablet to the memory of Nathaniel Bacon which, by act of the General Assembly of Virginia, was placed immediately behind the speaker's chair in the hall of the house of delegates. The inscription on that tablet reads:

To the memory of Nathaniel Bacon; born in England January 2, 1647; came to Virginia 1674; a great patriot leader of the Virginia people who died while defending their rights, October 26, 1676. Victrix causa deis placvit sed victa catoni.

By a singular coincidence, that tablet was erected to the first great hero of the cause of freedom in America in the midst of a World War which we entered the following year for the purpose of preserving not only our democracy but likewise for the broader purpose of making it possible for all nations throughout the world who desired a democratic form of government to have it. On November 11, 1918, we engaged in a national celebration of what we then regarded as a victorious cause pleasing to the gods. We won the war, but we did not win the peace. We turned a deaf ear to the earnest pleas of Woodrow Wilson when he told us that we were in the midst of a world-wide struggle of the masses for a larger measure of personal freedom and that what happened to the struggling masses of the people of other nations would vitally affect us. We acted on the assumption that we could live unto ourselves and die alone. We ignored the warning of Woodrow Wilson that unless we cooperated with the other democracies of the world in the cause of personal freedom, the time would come when we would be forced to fight again to preserve our own freedom. When the democracies of Great Britain and France attempted at Munich to appease the German dictator, who was the sworn enemy of personal freedom, many realized it was the commencement of the fulfillment of Wilson's predictions. Even after Hitler's juggernaut had rolled over Poland and then over the lowlands of western Europe there were those in this country who refused to admit that what was happening in the rest of the world would affect us. On December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor that illusion was shattered.

On far-flung battlefronts the flower of American youth is again battling for the cause of personal freedom. While we have no doubts concerning the ultimate victory of our cause, a victory will not be won that is pleasing to the gods unless through international cooperation in the post-war era we win the peace. In the firm belief that this time we will win a victory at the peace table, as well as on the battlefield, I have asked the distinguished scholar and champion of personal freedom, Dr. Archibald MacLeish, the Librarian of Congress, to prepare for me the little-known story of the first fight in America for that cause, taken from material that came to the Library of Congress as a part of the library of Thomas Jefferson. The following is Dr. MacLeish's story of Nathaniel Bacon and the Cause of Freedom:

"About the year 1675," so begins a fading chronicle of Virginia, "appear'd three prodigies in that country, which from th' attending disasters were look'd upon as ominous presages.

"The one was a large comet every evening for a week, or more at South-west; thirty-five degrees high, streaming like a horse taile westwards, untill it reach'd (almost) the horison, and setting towards the North-west.

"Another was, flights of pigeons in breadth nigh a quarter of the mid-hemisphere, and of their length was no visible end; whose weights brake down the limbs of large trees whereon these rested at nights, of which the ffowlers shot abundance and eat 'em; this sight put the old planters under the more portentous apprehensions, because the like was seen (as they said) in the year 1640 when th' Indians committed the last massacre, but not after, untill that present year 1675.

"The third strange appearance was swarms of flyes about an inch long, and big as the top of a man's little finger, rising out of spigot holes in the earth, which eat the new sprouted leaves from the tops of the trees without other harm, and in a month left us."

Thus, prefaced by omens of disaster, opens the manuscript narrative of Thomas Mathews, planter of Stafford in Virginia, entitled "The Beginning, Progress, and Conclusion of Bacon's Rebellion," written thirty years after the events it describes, at the request of Robert Harley (subsequently first Earl of Oxford), then British Secretary of State for the Northern Department. It was purchased by Rufus King from the stock of a London bookseller in 1801 and came to the Library of Congress as part of the library of Thomas Jefferson in 1815.

But there were omens other than comets, and flights of birds, and swarms of flies observable in the Colony; there were, in addition, signs of political discontent. Professor Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker in his *Torchbearer of the Revolution* has given them historical emphasis:

"As it was the Sugar Act which brought distress to the merchant class in the colonies in 1764, so it was the Navigation Acts which undermined the prosperity of Virginia in the years from 1660 to 1676 and reduced the planters to poverty. As it was, the Stamp Act, which threatened representative government in America by wresting from the assemblies the control of taxation, so it was Berkeley's system of corrupting the burgesses and then continuing them on indefinitely without an election which turned representative government into a farce in Virginia. As the patriots of 1775 rose first to defend their liberty, seeking independence only when they found that they could not have one without the other, so the patriots of 1676 had no thought of breaking away from the mother country until they learned that English frigates and English redcoats were on their way across the Atlantic to suppress them."

And Professor Robert M. McElroy, in a paper read before the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of New York, on November 9, 1911, summarized the causes of increasing unrest under three heads:

"(1) A House of Burgesses of fifteen years' standing, whose Members no longer represented their constituencies; (2) The overthrow of their ancient freemen's suffrage by the enforcement of a property qualification; (3) the enforcement of navigation laws which were regarded as ruinous to the chief industry of Virginia. Added to these was the restriction of the people's share in purely local government."

At Jamestown a most royalist of royal Governors, old Sir William Berkeley, a man "more than a little addicted" both to passion and avarice, presided over a council which conducted the affairs of state on the principle that "the wise & the rich were prone to ffaction & sedition but the fools & poor were easy to be governed." Therefore they had excused themselves from taxes, claimed the fairest lands, and administered the Colony in agreement with their own fortunes, with the result that the more honest and timorous planters "never had inclinac'ons to tamper in the precarious intrigues of Govern't."

It began, so Mathews tells us, with murder:

"My dwelling was in Northumberland, the lowest county on Potomack river, Stafford being the uppermost, where having also a plantation, servants, cattle &c. my overseer there had agreed with one Rob't en to come thither, and be my herdsman, who then lived ten miles above it; but on a sabbath day morning in the summer anno 1675 people in their way to church, saw this Hen lying thwart his threshold, and an Indian without the door, both chopt on their heads, arms & other parts, as if done with Indian hatchetts, th' Indian was dead, but Hen when ask'd who did that? answered Doegs, Doegs (an Algonkin tribe) and soon died, then a boy came out from under a bed, where he had hid himself, and told them, Indians had come at break of day & done those murders."

The period of peace had been broken. The county militia under Col. George Mason, of the regiment of foot, and Capt. George Brent, of the troop of horse, was mustered and gave chase "20 miles up and 4 miles over" the river into Maryland, where they killed a few Susquehannas, who, as it happened, were a friendly tribe. The Susquehannas, "newly driven from their habitations, at the head of Chesepiack Bay," by the Iroquois, came down to the head of the Potomac, and sought the protection of the Piscataway Indians who had an old fort near the Maryland frontier. Thereafter outrages by the Indians were committed on both sides of the river; outrages which led in the autumn of 1675 to a joint expedition from Maryland and Virginia, and to the siege of the fort. "And allthough," so runs the account of the proceedings in the so-called Burwell manuscript, "it is saide

that the Indians doth the least minde their bellies (as being content with a little) of any people in the world, yet now their bellies began to minde them, and their stomachs too, which began to be more inclinable to peace than war; which was the cause (no more horseflesh being to be had) that they sent out six of their Woerowances (chief men) to commence a treaty." Despite the fact that it was "diametricall to the law of arms," the Indian commissioners were instantly put to death by order of the colonial commanders. Following this revolting messacre, the Indians, having "destroyed all things in the fort, that might be servisable to the English * * * bodly, undiscovered slip through the league * * * in the passing of which they knock'd ten men on the head, who lay carelessly asleep in the way." They had now "stowed up so much of mallize, entermixt with a resollution of revenge, for the affrunt that the English had put upon them, in killing their messingers of peace, that they resolved to commence a most barbarous and most bloody war."

"Forsaking Maryland," the Indians "killing whom they found" along the way, came to the head of the river James, devising "a hundred ways to torter and torment those poore soules with, whose reched fate it was to fall into their unmerciful hands. For some before they would deprive them of their lives they would take a great deal of time to deprive them first of their skins, and if their life had not, through the anguish of their paine, forsaken their tormented bodies, they with their clubs knock out their teeth * * * tear off the nails of their hands and their toes, which put the poor sufferer to a woful condition."

Mathews records that "frequent complaints of bloudsheds were sent to Sr. Wm. Berkeley * * * from the heads of the rivers, which were as often answered with promises of assistance." The people, however, "grew impatient at the many slaughters of their neighbours and rose for their own defence, who chusing" one of their own number "for their leader, sent oftentimes to the Govern'r, humbly beseeching a comission to go against those Indians at their own charge which his hon'r as often promisd but did not send; the misteryes of these delays, were wondred at and which I ne'er heard coud penetrate into." Some there were who laid "these protractions" to his greed, murmuring that "rebells forfeitures would be loyall inheritances."

The leader, chosen by the people, was Nathaniel Bacon, who had emigrated from England in the summer of 1764, and settled in Henrico. Born in 1647, son of a Suffolk squire, kinsman of Lord Francis Bacon, educated at St. Catharine's Hall, Cambridge, and at Gray's Inn, he had once taken the grand tour under the tutelage of the celebrated botanist, John Ray, and 4 years prior to their coming to Virginia had eloped with Elizabeth Duke, daughter of Sir Edward Duke, a disapproving baronet. On March 3, 1675, he had been appointed, perhaps through the influence of a well-placed cousin, to the Governor's Council of State. In appearance "indifferent tall but slender, blackhaired and of an ominous, pensive, melancholly aspect," even his enemies conceded that he was "fitt for such a purpose." The Indians had killed his overseer, "whom he much loved, and one of his servants whose bloud he vowed to revenge." Something of his character (and a possible reason for his selection) may be found in his own words: "I thought it my duty to discharge my conscience in it, by introducing & looking after ye wellfare of the people here, they being poor, few and in scattered habitations on ye frontiers."

That he had firmly established his popularity is obvious from an intimate letter, written by his wife to his sister in England:

"The poor people came to your brother to desire him to help against the Indians, and hée being very much concerned . . . for the losse of so many men and women and children's lives every day, hee was willing to doe for them all the good he could; so he begged of the Governour for a commission in several letters to him, that hee might go out against them . . . . you never knew any better beloved than hee is. I doe verily believe that rather than hee should come to any hurt by the Governour or anybody else they would most of them willingly loose their lives."

A group of three hundred men, composed of civil authorities, military officers, and inhabitants of the region, "taking Mr. Bacon for their coman'r met, and concerted together, the danger of going without a comiss'n on the one part, and the continuall murders of their neighbors on the other part . . . and came to this resolution viz't. to prepare themselves with necessaries for a march, but interim to send again for a comission, which if could or could not be obtayned by a certaine day, they woud proceed comission or no comission." The certain day went by, "& no com'n come," the frontiersmen "marched into the wilderness in quest of these Indians after who the Govern'r sent his proclamation, denouncing all rebells, who shoud not return within a limited day, whereupon those of estates obey'd; but Mr. Bacon with 57. men proceeded."

They proceeded, their provisions nearly spent, until they came to a fort of supposedly friendly Indians, and asked for food in exchange for payment, but, as Bacon himself told Mathews later, they were "put . . . off with promises untill the third day, . . . having then eaten their last morsells they could not return, but must have starved in the way homeward and now 'twas suspected, these Indians had received private messages from the Gover'r & those to be the causes of these delusive procrastinations; whereupon the English waded shoulder deep thro' that branch [of the James] to the ffort palisado's still intreating and tendering pay, for victuals; but that evening a shot from the place they left on th' other side of that branch kill'd one of Mr. Bacon's men, which made them believe, those in the ffort had sent for other Indians to come behind 'em & cut 'em off." What followed was the Battle of Bloody Run. The English stormed the fortifications, burned the cabins, and, with the loss of three of their own men dead, slew one hundred and fifty Indians. Having dispersed the enemy, Bacon's force returned to their homes, as heroes and as rebels.

During their absence the perfidious Governor had, on May 29, 1676, declared Bacon and his followers to be enemies of the crown and, with a small body of horse, had ridden forth to capture them. To his chagrin he discovered before he had gone forty miles that not all the rebels had accompanied Bacon, for the people rose in protest, and, in an effort to divert their wrath from himself to the Burgesses, while at the same time preserving his corrupt associates, he returned to Jamestown, dissolved the "Long House," and called for an election.

Bacon was unanimously chosen a member of the new assembly, and set out for the capital. While coming down the James, he was "commanded by a ship with guns to come on board, where waited Major Houe the high sheriff * * * ready to seize him, by whom he was carried down to the Govern'r & by him receiv'd with a surprizing civility," and paroled. But the Governor required a public, as well as a private, surrender, and the next morning summoned the Burgesses to the Council room, where Bacon "upon one knee at the bar" delivered "a sheet of paper [drafted by Cousin Nathaniel Bacon, 'a rich, politick man'] confessing his crimes, and begging pardon of god the king and Govern'r," whereupon Berkeley, after a brief pause, answered, "God forgive you, I forgive you," thrice repeating the same words; when Collon. Cole, [one of the councill], said, "and all that were with him, Yea, said the Governor & all that were with him, twenty or more persons being then in irons who were taken coming down in the same and other vessels with Mr. Bacon."

A minute later Sir William continued: "Mr. Bacon! if you will live civilly but till next Quarter court [doubling his words] till next Quarter court, Ile promise to restore you againe to yo'r place, there pointing with his hand to Mr. Bacons seat, he having been at the Councill before these troubles." That same afternoon, Thomas Mathews, himself recently elected a Burgess, saw Mr. Bacon on his "quondam" seat, in session with the Council, "which seemed a marveilous indulgence to one whom he [Berkeley] had so lately proscribed as a rebell." It is apparent that "there was cool reason, not generosity," behind this action, simply because Bacon could do less harm as a member of the Council than as a Burgess, for under the watchful eye of Berkeley's henchmen he would be unable to play upon "the distempered humor predominant in the Comon people," nor could he insinuate into and "possess the people with Lyberty and free estate from Bondage."

Some days later "a bruit ran about the town Bacon is fled, Bacon is fled." Berkeley, the "old treacherous villain," had caused his house to be searched at dawn, and had discovered that Bacon had "escaped into the country, having intimation [probably from his influential cousin] that the Govern'rs generosity in pardoning him and has followers and restoring him to his seat in councill, were no other than previous wheadles to amuse [i. e. to beguile] him & his adherents & to circumvent them by stratagem, forasmuch as the taking Mr. Bacon again into the councill was first to keep him out of the assembly, and in the next place the Govern'r knew the country people were hastning down with dreadful threatnings to double revenge all wrongs shou'd be done to Mr. Bacon or his men, or whoever shou'd have had the least hand in 'em." The "country people" had made three great discoveries: their rights, their champion, and their power. The had discovered, too, that Berkeley had issued private warrants to re-arrest Bacon, and planned "to raise the militia and so to dispose things as to prevent his friends from gathering any more."

Within three or four days thereafter, word reached Jamestown that Bacon, at the head of four hundred men, was some thirty miles up the river, intent on securing a royal commission to prosecute the Indian war. Berkeley, thoroughly and properly alarmed for his personal safety, called up the militia to reinforce his guards, but his authority had so deteriorated that only four ensigns and less than a hundred soldiers reported at the rendezvous, "and not one-half of them sure neather, and all so sluggish in their march that before they could reach towne, by a grate deale," Bacon and his little army had "entred the town, without being withstood, and form'd a body upon a green, not a flight shot from the end of the State house." The encounter of the arrogant Berkeley and Bacon's yeomen is vividly and dramatically related by Mathews:

"In half an hour * * * the drum beat for the house to meet, and in less than an hour more Mr. Bacon came with a file of fusileers on either hand near the Statehouse where the Govern'r. and council went forth to him; we saw from the window the Govern'r. open his breast, and Bacon strutting betwixt his two files of men with his left arm on Kenbow flinging his right arm every way both like men distracted * * * in this hubub a servant of mine got so nigh as to hear the Govern'rs words, and also followed Mr. Bacon,

and heard what he said, who came & told me, that when the Govern'r opened his breast he said 'here! shoot me, foregod fair mark, shoot; [']often rehearsing the same, without any other words; whereto Mr. Bacon answered 'No may it please yo'r hono'r we will not hurt a hair of yo'r head, nor of any other mans, we are come for a Co'mission to save our lives from th' Indians, which you have so often promised, and now we will have it before we go.' "

Bacon carried his demands to the House and addressed that body for half an hour "on the preserving our lives from the Indians, inspecting the publick revenues, th' exorbitant taxes, and redressing the grievances and calamities of that deplorable country."

Naturally, with the Governor a virtual prisoner, and the reform Assembly not unsympathetic to his principles, Bacon had his way. He was commissioned a General, and in the month of June 1676, nearly one hundred years before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia legislators repealed the law which limited suffrage to property owners, and passed in its stead a new statute specifically extending the franchise to all freemen.

Dr. Wertenbaker has summarized the series of acts which swept away many of the abuses of which the people had for so long complained:

"Councillors were no longer exempt from taxation; the secretary of the colony, all clerks of courts, sheriffs, surveyors, collectors, and other officers were forbidden to charge more for their services than the sums prescribed by law; the voters in each county were to select representatives to sit with the justices of the peace in assessing the county taxes; vestries were no longer to be self-perpetuating, but were to be chosen every three years by the voters of the parish; no person would be sheriff 'for more than one year successively,' the office devolving on the justices in rotation; no two of the offices of sheriff, clerk of the court, surveyor, and escheator could be held by any one man simultaneously; no member of the Council could sit with the justices of the peace."

Then General Bacon and his men marched out of the Capital, and headed for the frontier, while the Burgesses turned homeward, "little expecting to hear of more intestine broiles." Mathews returned to his "dwelling" in Northumberland, where "reports were afterwards various; we had account that Generall Bacon was march'd with a thousand men into the forest to seek the enemy Indians, and in a few daies after our next news was, that the Govern'r had sum'oned together the militia of Gloucester & Middlesex counties to the number of twelve hundred men, and proposed to them to follow & suppress that rebell Bacon, whereupon arose a murmuring before his face 'Bacon Bacon Bacon,' leaving the Governor and those that came with him to themselves, who being thus abandon'd wafted over Chesepiacke bay 30 miles to Accomack."

When this intelligence reached Bacon, he turned about, "and sent out parties of horse patrolling through every county, carrying away prisoners all whom he distrusted might any more molest his Indian prosecu'on yet giving liberty to such as pledg'd him their oaths to return home & live quiet." Sir William's flight had left Bacon master of all the colony from the Potomac to Lower Norfolk and from the Chesapeake to the frontier. It was now his duty to preserve order, and to assume some measure of civil authority.

But the fugitive Governor, repudiated by the "comon people" retained some rich and powerful friends among the planters of the Tidewater, and made "a 2d. attempt * * * with what men he coud procure in sloops and boats, forty miles up the river to Jamestown, which Bacon hearing of, came againe down from his forest pursuit, and finding a bank not a flight shot long, cast up thwart the neck of the peninsula there in Jamestown, he stormed it, and took the town, in which attack were 12. men slaine & wounded but the Govern'r with most of his followers fled back down the river in their vessells." That was on September 19, 1676.

But although Bacon had captured the town, he was quick to realize that he could not hold it. He knew that one of his principal lieutenants, Col. Giles Brent, had deserted to the Governor's cause, and was advancing on him with a force of a thousand men. He knew also that were Sir William to return with his fleet to bombard the town from the water, while Brent closed in by land, he would be helplessly trapped. Accordingly, when his troops had rested "a few daies they concerted the burning of the town, wherin Mr. Laurence (i. e. Richard Lawrence) and Mr. Drumond (i. e. William Drummond) owning the two best houses save one, sat fire each to his own house, which example the souldiers following laid the whole town with church and State house in ashes, saying, the rogues shouud harbour no more there."

But the episode of freedom was nearly over. Berkeley, secure on the eastern shore, had sent for help to England. Bacon previously had summoned the most influential men in the province to meet with him at Middle Plantation—the site of Williamsburg—to confer with him on the prosecution of the Indian war and the maintenance of law and order. There, writs had been issued for an Assembly and, in a proclamation, Bacon had commanded "all men in the land on pain of death to join him, and retire into the wildernesse upon arrival of the forces expected from England, and oppose them untill they shoud propose or accept to treat of an accom'odation." But those gentry, "who lived comfortably," "had demurred, believing that in the event of such an undertaking "the whole land must have become an Aceldama."

Bacon did not share these doubts. He was of the opinion that 500 Virginians could overcome an army of 2,000 "Red Coates," "wee having the same advantages against them the Indians have against use * * * wee acquainted with the Country, can lay Ambussadoes and take Trees and putt them by * * * and are doubtlesse as good or better shott than they."

And so he marched his army from Jamestown to engage the forces under Brent, but there was no battle, for Brent's men "haveing heard that Bacon had beate the Governour out of the towne they began to be afeared (if they should com within his reach) that he might beat them out of their lives, and so resolved not to come nere him." To effect their resolution, Brent's men deserted, leaving the vacillating colonel "mightily astonished."

Late in September, or early in October, the trained bands of Gloucester assembled at the courthouse by Bacon's command. They consisted of "som 6 or 7 hundred horss and foot, with their arms," and after a long "Harange" by the general they were urged to take the oath of union. In reply, their spokesman, Col. William Cole, "offered the sence of all the * * * men there present: which was summed up in their desires, not to have the oath imposed upon them, but to be indulged the benefitt of Neutralitie: But this he [Bacon] would not grant, telling of them that in this their request they appeared like the worst of sinners, who had a desire to be saved with the righteous, and yet would do nothing whereby they might obtaine salvation; and so offering to go away, one Coll: Gouge (of his party) calls to him and told him, that he had onely spoke to the Horss (meaning the Troopers) and not to the foote." But Bacon "in som passion replide, he had spoke to the Men, and not to the Horss; having left that servis for him to do, because one beast would understand the meaning of another." But the Gloucester men stood steadfast in their refusal.

It was a cruel blow, a fatal blow to Bacon, for he realized, perhaps for the first time, that he did not possess the complete support and confidence of the people.

His hopes diminished, and fever wracking his body, he withdrew to the plantation of Thomas Pate on Portopotank, where, a victim of dysentery contracted during the Indian campaigns, he died on October 26, 1676. With him, for a time, died the Virginia cause.

Comets and flights of birds and swarms of flies had presaged an Indian uprising, but Bacon and his "insinuations" of Lyberty were omens of another uprising of free men which would follow in a century. It is not known just when the idea of independence first occurred to him, but a few weeks before his death he had admitted "a total defection from Majestie, and our native Country." He was confident "that it is the mind of this country [Virginia], and of Mary Land, and Carolina also, to cast off their Governor and the Governors of Carolina haue taken no notice of the People of them, a long time; and the people are resolv'd to own their Governour further; And if wee cannot prevaile by Armes to make our Conditions for Peace, or obtaine the Priledge to elect our own Governour, wee may retire to Roanoke." And shortly after his death, his enemies having regained control of the assembly, sent "an humble address to his most Sacred Majesty," indicating "Nathaniel Bacon, Junior," for "desiring Noveltyes, and having designes to Allienate this County, from his maiestyes Royall dominion."

It is reported that "Bacons body was so made away, as his bones were never found to be exposed on a gibbet as was purpos'd," but there remains for us his epitaph, said to have been written by an attendant who loved him well:

"May admireation strike
Into his foes; while they confess with all
It was their guilt stil'd him a Criminall.
Onely this differance does from truth proceed
They in the guilt, he is the name must bleed.
While none shall dare his obsequies to sing
In desarv'd measures; untill time shall bring
Truth Crown'd with freedom, and from danger free
To sound his praises to posterity."

That time has come. We now have proof that Nathaniel Bacon was, and he certainly was, the first great hero of the cause of freedom in America.

New Deal Winks at Reds but Hunts Down Crackpots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 25, 1944:

NEW DEAL WINKS AT REDS, BUT HUNTS DOWN CRACKPOTS—COMMUNISTS IMMUNE TO SMEAR CHARGES, FOR THEIR AIMS ARE SAME AS SMEARERS

(By Frank Hughes)

The Communists and internationalists are toiling ceaselessly to make America over to their own plan—to destroy her capitalist system, incorporate her in a superstate, open

her gates wide to war refugees, distribute her remaining resources to other nations, and establish an international W. P. A. at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

The New Deal administration has started indictments and prosecutions against a few Naziphiles, anti-Semites, and an assembly of noisy crackpots without a tinge of seditious intent, but the Communists, who are working the other side of the street, are immune.

F. D.'S PROGRAM COMMUNISTIC

This is because the Communist program to remake America is the program of President Roosevelt and the New Deal party, currently in control of the Department of Justice.

The plans of the few Fascists and the many Communists in this conspiracy are equally totalitarian and equally dangerous to the American Republic, but the New Dealers choose to castigate and imprison the Fascists and their associates as defeatists and traitors, allowing the Communists to go free.

Through the smear and purge they seek to link all freedom-loving Americans who want to preserve their country as a republic to the Fascist cause.

Through the internationalists, the New Dealers control not only an influential section of the American press, but also dictate the editorial policy of the newspapers in Canada and Great Britain on American affairs.

These foreign newspapers are run by the international bankers and British politicians who want to Europeanize America and who gave the American internationalists their political Baedeckers.

EDEN'S NEWSPAPER CITED

An example is the Yorkshire Post, English journal owned by Anthony Eden, British foreign minister, which is booming Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term. The Canadian papers likewise give Mr. Roosevelt, or his stooge, Wendell Willkie, strong support in nearly every discussion of American politics.

These newspapers want Mr. Roosevelt reelected to a fourth term, or Willkie elected to succeed him, because in either case the internationalists couldn't lose.

Communists, internationalists, and New Deal party chiefs are attempting to discredit the nationalist movement in America, because the growing nationalist strength threatens to overthrow them.

The nationalists, who include patriotic Republicans and Jeffersonian Democrats in Congress, are attempting to halt the socialization of America, the loss of her sovereignty through world government alliances, and the depletion and ruin of her resources for Europe's general benefit.

"UNDER COVER" SMEARERS' TOOL

One of the most highly touted smear schemes through which the New Deal bedfellows are attempting to discredit nationalists is by associating them with Nazi propagandists who operated here freely before Pearl Harbor.

The smear gang is ballyhooing a book entitled "Under Cover," the work of a Greek-born Armenian, Avedis Arthur Derounian, who writes under the name of John Roy Carlson. Derounian has several other aliases, among them George Pagnanelli, Thomas L. Decker, John Correa, and Rudolph Keibers. At one time he published a scurrilous anti-Semitic weekly called the "Christian Defender."

Derounian says he got his assignment to look into subversive activities of "Fascists" from Russell W. Davenport, the Wendell Willkie political adviser and editor of Fortune Magazine, the property of Henry Luce.

UNDER BIRKHEAD AEGIS

The $50-a-week Luce employee also investigated under the sponsorship of the Friends of Democracy, an organization headed by the Reverend Leon M. Birkhead, a dissident Methodist preacher with a flair for publicity, who first came to public notice in Kansas City in 1927 by performing companionate marriages.

Derounian, who is in his thirty-fifth year, says he is IV–F in the draft. Apparently, he joined every Fascist society and front organization which would accept his proffer of an initiation fee. He attended the meetings of these groups, passed out their scurrilous literature, drank beer with the bosses, and ingratiated himself.

He then proceeded to interview leaders of the noninterventionist movement who, before Pearl Harbor, were opposed to the entry of the United States into the war. He also buttonholed several noninterventionist Representatives in Washington.

Derounian asked the nationalists and pro-American representatives he claims to have talked to, a stock question—did they know, or had they heard from certain known Fascist agents of his acquaintance? Invariably, he got an affirmative answer, because anyone in public life and anyone opposing intervention actively was bound to have received visits or communications from the Fascists who were attempting to cover their treason with the honest cloak of patriotism.

This association of the loyal with the disloyal was enough for Derounian, and he proceeded to repudiate as Fascists anyone who wasn't willing to draw America into the European war as of the summer of 1941. He was a crude detective of vast ignorance, as is evidenced by his reference to the late Henry L. Doherty, utility magnate, as Harding's Attorney General.

LAUDS REVOLUTION

Derounian proved himself to be a Communist or Communist fellow traveler when he wrote an article in the November 1936 issue of Soviet Russia Today, lauding the Communist revolution in Armenia, and again, in June 1941, when the New Republic printed one of his attacks on the capitalist system.

This explains why the history of his 4-year "undercover" investigation fails once to mention the sabotage worked by the Communists on the American defense and war program between August 1939 and June 1941, while Russia was an ally of Hitler.

The Communists staged strikes and slowdowns which really prevented the production of war materials, and picketed the White House as well. The bundists and other Nazi front groups "exposed" by Derounian were marching, drinking beer, and passing out tracts during this time, according to his story.

ACCUSED PATROLMAN DREW

Derounian is the man who attempted recently to convict Patrolman James L. Drew of the New York police for anti-Semitism. He accused Drew, who is a Roman Catholic, and because he is a Roman Catholic, of associating with Joseph McWilliams and other anti-Semitic agitators.

Derounian, in turn, was accused of bringing Drew together with such anti-Semites in order to frame Policeman Drew, who was exonerated of all the charges by Police Commissioner Lewis J. Valentine. A commission appointed by Mayor La Guardia unanimously upheld Drew's exoneration.

Derounian's book, rejected by several publishers and finally accepted by E. P. Dutton & Co., is the target of several libel suits. The Dutton Company, which used to bear a good reputation, fails to tell what influence led it to print so vile a book.

ANOTHER SMEAR VOLUME

Another smear book, "Sabotage," by Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahan, was published by Harper & Bros., who withdrew from the venture when Representative DIES pointed out that a large part of the material in it had been lifted from hearings of his Committee on un-American Activities.

The book was reissued by another publisher with the lifted material omitted, but it retained, understandably enough, a smear of Representative DIES for exposing the Communists in Government office.

A Plea for Aid to Critical War Production Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my request for permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I want to include the testimony I gave before the Appropriations Committee of the House on February 23, 1944. The testimony follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am appearing here today as chairman of the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas. The subcommittee was appointed by Chairman Vinson on February 23, 1943, and directed to investigate congestion in certain critical war production areas and centers of naval activity of this country. It was our task to determine the causes contributing to the congestion in these areas and the necessary action to remove conditions impeding the war effort. We made an intensive inquiry of the problems of housing, health, recreation, transportation, manpower, police and fire protection, food, and education. Our findings and recommendations, summarized in 9 reports, were based upon visual inspections of the areas and "local level" information gained from approximately 400 intelligent, representative, and well-informed witnesses appearing at our hearings. These hearings covered 8 areas and 39 municipalities on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of this country.

In order to prosecute the war, the Federal Government has had to avail itself of the geography of the various States and the manpower and facilities of municipalities in all parts of the Nation. Because of their strategic location, certain municipalities have been the centers of concentration of war effort activities. The tremendous increase of population, caused by the influx of war workers and members of the armed forces, and the augmented war activity experienced by these war production cities, have greatly strained their limited municipal facilities and compelled such cities to expand quickly their facilities. This has required money and in most cases it was a financial burden greater than they could carry. The Subcommittee on Congested Areas found that the municipalities were carrying an inordinate share of the war burden—that in most cases where the absence of vitally needed facilities has impeded the war effort, this condition has resulted from the limited finances of these municipalities and inadequate Federal assistance.

I must admit that we found that the Federal Government and the local communities both are shouldering an overwhelming load, while the States, in most instances, are giving very little in the form of relief to the municipalities. But let us face the situation with realism. Are we primarily interested in economy or in winning the war? To those who might place undue emphasis on economy let me direct these observations. Appropriation of Lanham Act funds in the realistic

amount required by the effective execution of the war effort is an investment in the future of this country. Unwise saving of dollars on school and child-care facilities is sowing a whirlwind of juvenile delinquency. This is but one observation made by my subcommittee of the destructive results of fallacious economy. To those who view the appropriations for Lanham Act funds on a short-term expenditure basis, may I point out that the facilities made possible through Lanham Act funds have increased the productivity of war workers and are directly speeding the end of this costly war. Each day that this war is shortened prevents immeasurable expense of money and lives. To those who share my concern over the lack of sharing of the war burden by the States may I urge a realistic acceptance of the situation. The war effort, which is undeniably Federal in character, requires the facilities made possible by the Lanham Act funds. Do not allow the lack of financial ability of the municipalities or the failure of the States to accept their just share of the costs to prevent the Federal Government from authorizing appropriations for these facilities. If the Federal Government does not, then it simply won't be done.

As chairman of the Congested Areas Subcommittee, I feel that I should give this committee the benefit of the impressions of a group that has witnessed the excellent results of Lanham Act funds in providing facilities so vital to the war effort. We have found that in areas where recent large increases in population have occurred, one of the most important causes of high absenteeism and turn-over in war plants and military installations has been the lack of adequate community facilities and services. There is a desperate need for Lanham Act funds for these war communities which have been expanding and will continue to expand.

On behalf of the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas, I submit this most serious, sincere and urgent plea for favorable action by the Committee on Appropriations on the present request of the Federal Works Agency for Lanham Act funds.

Yugoslav Americans of Pacific Northwest Urge Recognition of Democratic Forces in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently a mass conference in my home city of Tacoma, Wash., was held under the auspices of the American Committee for Free Yugoslavs. Present were more than 500 persons, representing several thousand members of the committee. At this important meeting, the audience heard read and discussed the proposed eight-point plan, allegedly prepared by King Peter, of Yugoslavia, to unify the Yugoslav war effort. Thereafter, the conference unanimously voted to adopt a resolution, which is self-explanatory, and which is appended herein, below, and which I commend to the Congress for its careful consideration. The resolution urges the right of self-government within Yugoslavia, free from outside power politics. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the eight-point program prepared under the name of King Peter to unify the Yugoslav war effort is designed to do quite the opposite; and

Whereas Yugoslavia may soon become an invasion point for the drive toward Berlin from the Mediterranean; and

Whereas, if adopted, the Peter program would give aid to Nazi resistance by hampering the movement of Tito's troops in areas to be defended, under the Peter plan, by Mihailovitch, whose forces have never fought the Nazis or Fascists, but only against Marshal Tito and the patriotic Yugoslav Partisan Armies; and

Whereas the Peter plan is designed not only to delay victory over the Axis, this costing additional American lives, but also if adopted would menace our heroic Yugoslav allies, whose sacrifices in our cause already beggar description, with the threat that when the war is won they will be deprived of the one reward that their present sacrifices entitle them to, the right of self-government free from outside power politics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we condemn the Peter eight-point plan as a plot to delay victory, sacrifice time and life in the coming offensive, and shake the confidence of our allies in Yugoslavia, the Balkans, and the underground in Hitler's Europe; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the State Department to withdraw the right of representative of the Yugoslav people from Minister Fotich, of the Royal Yugoslav Government in Exile, and invite Foreign Minister Smadlaka, of the Government of Liberation, to Washington, D. C., to arrange for the appointment of a representative of Marshal Tito at our Nation's Capital; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President, our State Department, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Foreign Relations and Affairs Committees, the Washington State congressional delegation, and to the press.

The White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Independent Jewish Press Service, Inc.:

March 31, 1944, is a day to shake the confidence of those who believe in the high principles for which this war is being fought. March 31 is a day contradicting the Atlantic Charter. For this is the day which was to have decided whether the white paper goes into effect or is suspended. We had all hoped that it would be suspended. We had hoped that this would be done automatically, for breaching the white paper policies is no less important than breaching forts in Hitler's Europe. It is a part of the same fight for justice, for racial equality, for a better world. The white paper is a document not merely of appeasement, and even that would be unforgivable. It is a document of injustice and racial discrimination. It is a hangman's document. It has been a contributing factor to the death of millions of Jews that have perished in Hitler's Europe. It will be the cause of the death of many more if not abolished.

The developments around the white paper are almost incredible. Denounced by Winston Churchill, before he had become Prime Minister of Britain; condemned by the leaders of public opinion and spokesmen for right in all countries; described by the President of the United States as a document which has never been approved by the United States; it seems to have a charmed life all its own, and continues to exist, and continues to be part of our horrible present and a decisive factor in Jewry's fate. It decides life and death. Its powers in affecting the numerical strength of Jewry are incredible.

Put a black border on your calendar around March 31, 1944.

Better Men for Better Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of March 19, 1944, commenting on a splendid book entitled "Better Men for Better Times."

For ideals such as are expounded in this book, Better Men for Better Times, we are fighting this war. Our enemies scoff at them and give them the lie; and even in our own midst there are cynics who question their sincerity. Yet Americans know that these ideals are real and genuine for Americans know that they could fight for nothing else. The lives of our soldiers, sailors, and all in the forces of our country are too precious, too sacred, to risk for anything short of this. The men and boys who have gone away from our farms and factories, from our banks and our business establishments, from our schools and colleges are ready to risk all and sacrifice everything, as are those who have been left behind, in order to eradicate from the face of the earth all the stupid and unholy things which foster wars and carnage. Here in America we have discovered from happy experience that human beings of all kinds and classes can live together in peace and harmony and find mutual happiness under conditions that befit human dignity; we go forth to battle with the purpose of destroying those things that prevent people in other lands from making the same discovery. This book is a veritable statement of principles which if practiced and lived would make better men for better times.

The editorial follows:

GREAT AFFIRMATION

The commission on American citizenship of the Catholic University of America has issued a report on its purposes and ideals which should have the attention of thoughtful citizens of all denominations. It is entitled "Better Men for Better Times" and is the work of two acknowledged scholars of distinction, the Right Reverend Monsignor George Johnson, of the department of education and Dr. Robert J. Slavin, O. P., of the department of philosophy.

But the volume is not difficult reading. Very simply and plainly written, it aims to interest the average man or woman who has realized the existence of dangers to "our own democratic institutions" and wonders confusedly what to do at an obvious "turning point in the history of the world." The commission, under the mandate of the American hierarchy by which it was instructed in 1939, answers in terms of civics, sociology, and economics as well as in terms of religion and ethics. It sets forth without qualification:

"Our Government and our institutions are based on the acceptance of the fact that there is something sacred about individual men and women; that before the law they are equal and are not to be deprived of that measure of life and freedom and opportunity for happiness and content that is their endowment from their Creator."

Political liberty, however, is not enough. The commission calls it "a hollow sham when it attempts to function in the midst of economic bondage" and declares:

"Since the turn of the century, there has been a growing realization on our part that our zeal for the preservation of individual liberty must be matched by our devotion to the cause of social security. These ideals are not necessarily exclusive; as a matter of fact, they complement one another, and neither can be achieved at the expense of the other. * * * We are convinced that it is possible to bring our economic system into conformity with the principles of sound reason and justice without doing violence to the essentials of democratic government."

Certainly, the problem thus expressed is not new. It has been part of the picture of American community life for more than a hundred and fifty years. The question is: How can the people be at once free and secure? Monsignor Johnson and Dr. Slavin reply with a great spiritual affirmation phrased in these compelling words:

"What America professes to stand for, what America strives for, what America is fighting for, what America dreams, has neither reality nor substance apart from belief in God. We talk of the brotherhood of man, but men are brothers only because there is a common Father in heaven. We dilate on the sacredness of the human personality; but human beings are sacred, not because we say so, but because they are creatures whom God has fashioned according to His image and likeness, redeemed by the precious blood of His Son and destined for eternal union with Him. * * * 'There is only one Name * * * in which men can be saved.'"

Not only in Lent is such a pronouncement worthy of deepest consideration.

Rent Control Should Be Fair to Both Tenants and Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my request for permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the testimony I gave before the Select Committee of the House to Investigate Executive Agencies on March 15, 1944. The testimony follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as chairman of the Congested Areas Subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I have had an unusual opportunity to study at first-hand the operation of rent control in many of the areas throughout the country where housing congestion is most acute. In addition to this I have a rather complete picture of the rental situation in my own district, one of the worst congested in the country.

Now I contend that no law passed by Congress is passed with a studious attempt to be unfair. Sometimes, however, the law works that way or is made to work that way because of interpretations outside the intent of Congress. When I found how unfair the present law was to both tenants and owners I endeavored to do something about it. Everyone knows we must have price controls and rent control in time of war. The people generally feel that way, though being Americans, they are restless under any kind of restraint. However, there is one thing they will not tolerate and that is injustice. Treat us all alike even though we're treated hard and we will all accept it like good soldiers. But I am compelled to state that the way the Rent Control provisions of the Price Control Act are administered, some are treated well and some are discriminated against.

So last year I introduced a bill, H. R. 1877, to amend the Emergency Price Control Act in an effort to improve administration of the rent-control program and correct serious injustices that had become apparent in the course of my investigations.

I am even more convinced today that my proposals for changes in policy were sound and had they been written into the law much of the criticism of this program would have been prevented.

Therefore, I welcome the opportunity to meet with this committee to suggest changes which properly should be incorporated into the act, since the Administrator has failed, in nearly 2 years of rent control administration, to correct these injustices.

In my proposals presented more than a year ago I suggested that certain policies included in the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as passed by the Congress but which do not appear in the act applicable to the remainder of the country, should be incorporated into the national act. These policies apparently have resulted in an unusually equitable administrative record in the District. Neither does the District administrator complain of unbearable administrative burdens nor is there widespread criticism from either landlords or tenants.

Therefore, I suggest that you recommend changes which may be modelled after provisions in the District act in the following respects:

First Require adjustment of rents which due to peculiar circumstances (see Sec. 4 (a)—District Act), are frozen either substantially above or below rents for comparable quarters.

I have investigated situations in my district in which the rent of a house was frozen at less than one-half the rent for a similar house nearby and for other similar houses, yet the area rent director has advised he could do nothing about it since it did not come within certain adjustment provisions already incorporated into the rent regulations. I see no reason why the area rent director should not adjust these hardship cases promptly on a fair and equitable basis.

Second. Provision should be made for adjustments to offset increases in taxes and other operating and maintenance expenses in individual cases (as provided in sec. 4 (b)—District Act).

The national regulations fail to permit adjustments in individual cases and restrict any adjustment of this kind to situations in which there have been broad changes of "general applicability" within the area. This virtually prevents any possibility of such adjustments as costs do not change uniformly or "generally" in all types of housing accommodations.

Third. The established Federal courts should be open to all citizens to appeal from adjustments ordered by the area rent directors.

In the District, landlords and tenants aggrieved by orders of the Administrator have the right of appeal to the municipal court. Throughout the country the present appeal procedure is a lengthy administrative process in which the Administrator, in effect, is asked to reverse his own findings. Local citizens are entitled to court review—locally—of the Administrator's acts. Of necessity, this court must be a Federal court. But any complaint that such right of appeal will unduly congest the Federal courts is not borne out by experience in the District, where in more than 2 years only 60 rent cases have been appealed to a court which is even more accessible than would be the Federal courts.

Fourth. Tenants whose conduct is objectionable, abusive, or destructive to housing accommodations should not be protected in their right to possession.

The Administrator, or some of his subordinates, is subject to criticism for rules and interpretations severely restricting the conditions under which a landlord may regain possession of his property. There has been much complaint that undesirable tenants have unduly interfered with the right of other tenants to peaceful possession, yet the management has been stripped of its power to reasonably restrict the conduct of such persons. The eviction restrictions in the District act are similar but less restrictive than in the national act, yet there seems to be no complaint against them. The Administrator's powers in this respect should be more carefully circumscribed.

Fifth. More encouragement should be given property owners to expand the use of existing housing in congested areas.

In my committee investigations it became apparent that housing facilities in some areas were being restricted to the use of a lesser—rather than greater—number of persons. It appears that the landlord ordinarily may receive the same rent irrespective of the number of occupants. Therefore, he tends to restrict occupancy. O. P. A. has provided some adjustment in these cases, but evidence has indicated that the procedure is so limited and complicated as not to invite widespread landlord cooperation. A more practical approach might lessen housing congestion in some areas without endangering the rent-control program.

It was testified before our subcommittee that in the Los Angeles area one-third more people could be housed in present facilities if, rather than discouraging added occupancy, the rent-control administration would encourage it by more liberal allowances in rental charges, which incidentally would redound to the advantage of the war effort and of the war worker too.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose, like the rest of us, you have received numerous complaints from your constituents about the various features of other parts of the Rent Control Act, haven't you?

Mr. IZAC. And I intended to bring them up. I have a stack about like this [indicating].

Mr. FORD. About how high is that, Mr. Izac?

Mr. LZAC. I can tell you roughly. I had 12,000 complaints in the first 2 months on rent control alone. I mean after the act went into effect. There were 8,000 petitions filed in the first month in my district against the rent control conditions as laid down by the Administrator. Of those 8,000, I could not go through all of them, but I asked permission and I picked out at random 100 sample petitions. Of those, I found that 70 came within the $5 limitation. In other words, if the local director had the authority, he could have wiped out 70 percent of all

of that 8,000 by simply raising or lowering to a maximum of $5—from $1 to $5.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Per month?

Mr. IZAC. Per month; included in that whole number, and still they went along for almost a year before they got rid of those 8,000. In fact, I think some of them are not satisfactorily disposed of yet.

Mr. DELANEY. I might suggest to you, if you read the hearings on that rent situation and the testimony given before this committee, I think it will enlighten you greatly and give you an opportunity to answer people in a very constructive way just what this committee has been trying to do along those lines.

Mr. IZAC. I think the people generally understand that since this committee was formed and since it was your first piece of business, that you were the only committee of Congress that has investigated the rent control situation as it affects the people who have migrated and have come in great numbers to congested areas. And they are the ones that are most vitally affected. It is not the great mass of the people in our country; they do not know there is such a thing as rent control; it is only those few areas such as San Diego, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Detroit, and places like that, where you have thousands of people coming in and finding no place to sleep. That, of course, is where our great productive enterprises are located, as well as our ports of embarkation, and it all adds up to the congestion and it is not getting better, it is getting worse.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did your complaints come as a class from the tenants or landlords?

Mr. IZAC. I would say about one-fifth from tenants and about four-fifths from owners. But, there is this to be said about it; when rent control first began we found that landlords who had good business agents in charge of their properties had advanced the rentals of their clients and were in good position when these freezing dates were set, and they were able to retain the excessive rents they had advanced on their properties.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But to the small individual property owner, as far as he is concerned, he was caught napping.

Mr. IZAC. That is right. In places such as many cities of the west coast, we have very few apartment buildings and it does not affect big owners of apartments very much, because it is not like New York City or Philadelphia or Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. What you mean to say from your observation and experience in your part of the country, it is the little fellow who is getting stepped on and not the big real-estate man?

Mr. IZAC. That is correct; the little man of organized labor, let us say, who is now 60 years of age and has put his savings aside and bought a duplex and who lives in one-half with his wife and the other half he rents. Those are down to about $18 a month, whereas the similar rentals right across the street are permitted $45 and $55. I cannot justify that to my constituents and I do not believe anybody else can.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The widow maybe, who has rented part of her home.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what happened in my district.

Mr. IZAC. That is right; they are the ones who are most adversely affected. They are the ones I am appealing to you members of this committee to do something for, because we have never been able to get the Banking and Currency Committee to go into this bill of mine, for instance, or any other bill introduced.

Mr. FORD. Does your bill contain the suggestions you have made to the committee?

Mr. IZAC. Yes.

Mr. FORD. H. R. 1877.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct; and I would like to file a copy with the committee.

Mr. FORD. We have a copy.

Mr. IZAC. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. We will call the next witness.

Surplus Goods Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Surplus Goods Problem," from the Underwear and Hosiery Review for February 1944. In this article Mr. Carleton, a New Hampshire wholesaler who recalls the hectic conditions following World War No. 1 regarding Government surplus merchandise, submits the plan presented as a means of preventing similar grief when peace is won after the present war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUS GOODS PROBLEM—L. J. CARLETON, NEW HAMPSHIRE SPECIALTY WHOLESALER, HAS A PLAN FOR POST-WAR DISPOSAL OF EXCESS GOVERNMENT MERCHANDISE

That surplus Government merchandise should be distributed, after the war, through the Nation's wholesalers is the belief of L. J. Carleton, head of L. J. Carleton Co., Inc., New Hampshire distributors of hosiery and underwear.

Mr. Carleton has worked out a detailed program which reads as follows:

"The sale of all surplus merchandise of a textile nature should be governed by representative businessmen competent to pass on the desirability of such goods for civilian use, and control the sale in an orderly fashion in order not to disrupt domestic market. The sale of desirable goods for domestic use should be governed by men now experienced in textiles and a board or commission made up of enterprising men should be appointed. I suggest that such board consist of three or five representatives from various wholesale concerns in allotted territories. It is important that no two members be selected from any one wholesale concern.

"All surplus goods not acceptable from the standpoint of styles and colors for civilian use, or so-called "Victory" merchandise that the domestic public may not be interested in, when they can doubtless get a supply of up-to-date goods, should be disposed of through lend-lease. Lend-lease goods could be disposed of through regular governmental channels, as the sale of such merchandise should not be allowed in any way to disturb our normal civilian market.

"I suggest that on various lines other than textiles, such as groceries, hardware, and other items of surplus goods, that the disposal of same should be controlled by boards or commissions of businessmen with real experience in these varied lines, and in similar manner to above procedure outlined for sale of textiles.

"I recommend that boards or commissions to cover sales of domestic surplus goods should be appointed in various regional territories; for example—New England should be zoned as one regional territory and various boards or commissions for this territory should be made up of New England businessmen who are familiar with local market conditions appertaining to each of the various lines. This would obviate the complete control by any one central board located in Washington with a program set up for business to be handled by field men sent out from that point (at great expense) and definitely dictated to by "brain trusters" with no practical experience in merchandising.

"After territories are mapped into regions, and boards or commissions are selected to serve in those individual regions, the representatives from each zone should be called to Washington to discuss in detail, with proper Government officials, all angles and matters relative to the sale of surplus Government goods. Such a discussion and study of a program by a selected and Nation-wide body of businessmen together with Government officials should help materially to bring this problem to a practical and, I hope, prosperous solution.

"The War Production Board should allot surplus merchandise simultaneously to each regional territory its share of such surplus goods based on population in each region. Each region should be allotted 30 or 60 days time to furnish detailed sales orders to take up their allotment. Any unsold allotment, or portion thereof, must be automatically offered to some other region or regions by the W. P. B. at the expiration of the 30- or 60-day limit. Furthermore, should an enormous amount in certain lines of surplus goods become available at any one given time, the Government should use business judgment where such quantities are excessive and release a reasonable portion only of such lines, in order to avoid speculation, or the possibility of disrupting the domestic market temporarily on like or similar merchandise.

"All sales in any one zone should be governed by the board or commission in control of sales in their allotted zone. In other words, any board or commission must limit their sales, also shipments within the confines of their allotted territory or zone. Any inquiries to a board or commission received by them from parties outside their zoned territory should be referred to the board or commission governing the zone from which such inquiry may be received. It should be definitely understood that no orders should be detailed by any board for shipment or reshipment to a point outside their regular zoned territory.

"GET BUSY NOW

"The major thought from any standpoint is to get busy now and formulate some definite plan with reference to the disposal of surplus Government goods in order that we may not have a repetition of the conditions of the last World War whereby a much too large percentage of war surplus goods got into the hands of speculators. It is good business to start now and formulate a program that may benefit, in real measure, the wholesalers who are already locally set up to handle the distribution of merchandise from coast to coast and in an orderly manner. Let's have a program designed to give the small businessman the opportunity to secure his rightful share of Government surplus goods.

"From a textile standpoint, a wholesaler must be classified as an establishment presently engaged in the business of selling hosiery, underwear, or goods of a textile nature to retailers generally, with at least a 50 percent volume of sales from out-of-stock merchandise (not considering drop shipments). Furthermore, it should be definitely understood that every wholesaler in each zone

should have advance notice from his board, stating the date, also item or items of surplus goods that are to be released for sale—this procedure in order that merchandise may be offered in a fair and impartial manner. In further reference to distribution: Should orders result greatly in excess of the amount available in any zone, quantities should be allotted by the board on a fair and equitable basis.

"Some method by businessmen should be designed without delay—let's make a strenuous effort to obviate as much as possible, the possibility of politics entering into a program for the distribution of surplus goods. In order to protect the taxpayers' money to the fullest degree, I again suggest that the big job of disposing of millions of dollars worth of surplus goods should be handled by businessmen who are experienced in handling this project in a businesslike and practical way, rather than let the program fall into the hands of political 'business busters' who may handle the matter in an impractical manner."

Governor Sharpe Proclaims Teacher Appreciation Week in South Dakota

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, the great and good Governor of the productive and progressive State of South Dakota, has designated the week of April 10 to 16 as teacher appreciation week in the State of South Dakota. I rise to call this to the attention of the Congress and the country, to commend Governor Sharpe on his action, and to recommend that other States should likewise recognize the service which the teacher in the classroom is rendering to this Republic during these trying times.

I think that when the records of the war are written, among the unsung heroes who will be discovered are the teachers in the classrooms, operating at financial sacrifice to themselves, standing by the colors and doing the work necessary to continue the educational program of America. Every Member of this House owes a debt of gratitude to the classroom teachers who helped instill in him the inspiration and information which provides the background from which present day decisions in Government are being made. These teachers, frequently underpaid and many times not fully appreciated, devoted many patient, persuasive, and painstaking hours to the development in each of us of an appreciation of the functions of freedom and the utility of learning.

South Dakota has set a splendid example in setting aside a week in which to give recognition to the services of its classroom teachers. They serve us well in peace and in war. With their incomes usually lagging behind those of other professional people and their purchasing powers reduced by rising prices and larger taxes, the teachers of this Republic are inculcating in the minds of the children of America the sparks of patriotism and the reservoirs of knowledge which are manifesting themselves so brilliantly in slightly older Americans who are fighting with successful valor in almost every section of the world today.

The teachers who have helped so significantly to produce the quality of manhood which is today America's, deserve the plaudits of the country and should not be forgotten when we give recognition to those who produce the machines of war, the foods for freedom, and the other great civilian contributions which support the sacrifices and the heroism of service men and women.

The proclamation issued by the Governor of South Dakota reads as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas education is one of the most important factors contributing to successful government by the people; and

Whereas the teachers and educators in all schools and in all grades, from primary grades through the colleges, are the quiet, effective, self-sacrificing, and loyal workers who make possible for the general public the manifold benefits of methodical education: Now therefore,

I, M. Q. Sharpe, Governor of South Dakota, do hereby proclaim the period from April 10 to April 16, 1944, as Teacher Appreciation Week in South Dakota and I do urge all our citizens during that time to consider and practice appropriate ways and means of expressing our appreciation to our teachers in all schools for their public-spirited work, and to give them our encouragement by visiting their schools and classes and cooperating with them always for the production of the best grade of citizenship for our country. I would recommend to all student bodies and organizations, including the Young Citizens League, that they put on some kind of appropriate school program or exercises during Teacher Appreciation Week.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, this 21st day of March 1944.

M. Q. SHARPE,
Governor of South Dakota.

[GREAT SEAL]
Attest:

MRS. L. M. LARSEN,
Secretary of State.

South Not as Friendly as Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Boston Post, entitled "South Not as Friendly as Boston":

SOUTH NOT AS FRIENDLY AS BOSTON—SOUTHERN SAILOR TELLS DAD HUB FOLK MATCHLESS

A sailor aboard a warship which has docked in Boston several times wrote home to his father, the editor of a newspaper in Albany, Ga., that the people of the South don't know what real hospitality is, declaring that Boston's citizens "are matchless in their friendliness and hospitality."

SENDS HIS THANKS

This was disclosed when Mayor Tobin received a letter from John H. Crouch, editor of the Albany (Ga.) Journal, expressing his thanks to the people of Boston for the hospitality shown his son and other servicemen from homes in the South. His letter follows:

"Permit me to express through you to the city of Boston, sincere and everlasting appreciation for the kindnesses heaped upon my sailor lad. He has docked in Boston several times, and his letters home tell of the warm reception always accorded sailors."

On one occasion he wrote: "Dad, you have been wont to write how hospitable, friendly southern people are as compared to the people of other sections. Well, I want to tell you that we southerners don't know what real hospitality is. The people of Boston are matchless in their friendliness and hospitality and, believe me, they hold a warm spot in the heart of every Navy man."

NOTHING GREATER

Boston may lay claim to many outstanding accomplishments, but to my way of thinking there is no attainment more to be desired than that of holding the love and good will of people everywhere. It is an achievement that your chamber of commerce or other civic bodies may strive for through printed booklets but never attain.

It has been my great pleasure to reproduce in my newspaper portions of letters from my son, praising Bostonians for their friendliness to servicemen, and if ever there were impressions in this section of the "deep South" that Boston was an "arrogant, cold city," I trust that these false representations have been righted.

Again thanking you and the people of Boston for their patriotic hospitality, and assuring you of the deep appreciation of parents as well as servicemen, I am,

Yours truly,

JOHN H. CROUCH.

Crackerland in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fair and illuminating article by Mr. Ralph Smith, on the T. V. A., a controversy recently before the Senate. The article was published in the Atlanta Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRACKERLAND IN WASHINGTON—SUPPORTING M'KELLAR'S VIEW OF T. V. A.

(By Ralph Smith)

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 28.—A great deal has been written these last few weeks about the controversy in Congress over the annual appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, yet little that's been published has shed light upon the basic issue involved. One would mistakenly suppose, from what he's read,

that the row in the Senate was rooted in a "diabolical" determination to destroy the effectiveness of the great public power project that harnesses the horsepower stored in a dozen or more man-made reservoirs in the valley of the Tennessee River.

What, then, is the basic issue, on which the Senate divided conclusively?

Obviously, out of 18 southern Senators present and voting would not support a "diabolical design" to cripple, aye, destroy the Nation's greatest power development located in their midst * * * Such Senators, for example, as GEORGE and RUSSELL of Georgia, MAYBANK and SMITH of South Carolina, McKELLAR of Tennessee, EASTLAND of Mississippi, CONNALLY of Texas, BAILEY of North Carolina and BYRD of Virginia among the number.

What was the other side of the question anyhow?

In a broad sense, the T. V. A. controversy in the Senate grew out of the purpose of the Appropriations Committee, under Acting Chairman KENNETH MCKELLAR, to reassert the rights vested in the Congress by article I of the Constitution, section 9, clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement of accounts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

In a more definite sense, the row raged over the insistence of T. V. A., speaking through Chairman David E. Lilienthal, upon retaining and expending without the sanction of the Congress $10,000,000 annually of its earnings.

Other agencies of the Government enjoy no such privilege. None asks it. The Postoffice Department, for example, converts into the Treasury every cent it collects from its farflung activities, and in turn it spends not a dime that isn't covered by an appropriation by the Congress.

Budgetary control of Federal funds has never interfered seriously with the operation of Federal agencies. They are always protected by deficiency appropriations voted by the Congress upon satisfactory showings by the agencies that overspend.

The Tennessee Valley Authority controls reservoirs and dam sites located in Alabama, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Probably fifteen of these sites have been developed through congressional appropriations exceeding a billion dollars, exclusive of the original Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, named in memory of President Wilson, who was first to visualize the potentialities of the Tennessee Valley for the development of hydroelectric power.

Senator MCKELLAR, central figure in the current controversy, was a Member of the House during the First World War, and sponsored the initial development with the endorsement of President Wilson. He is now revealed by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as having proposed and battled through the Senate amendments that provided funds for at least nine of the dams constructed since the advent of T. V. A., under the leadership of President Roosevelt.

I say "sponsored," because the appropriations were actually initiated by him in the Senate, the House having failed to provide the funds, and as respects at least three of the developments MCKELLAR was vigorously opposed by members of the T. V. A. Board, which lobbied actively against the dams he sought and which now are integrated in the system.

The Authority is now out of the red, as the saying is. It earned a handsome profit last year, but these earnings were not converted into the Treasury. On this year's operations the income will amount to $68,000,000, and every penny of this is being returned to the Authority under the independent offices appropriation bill. In addition, it is being given $10,000,000 in addition, but demands still another ten million as a revolving fund.

Thus, instead of accepting or being satisfied with $79,000,000, which covers its budget estimate, the Authority insists upon $89,000,000, for the expenditure of which it will have no accounting to make of $10,000,000.

And that is the nub of the controversy in Congress.

T. V. A. does not, and has not, confined its activities solely to the production of hydroelectric power. It has experimented with phosphate and has expended $700,000 in Williamson and Manry Counties, in Tennessee, for phosphate lands, the sale of which represented a profit of $500,000 to the owners of the land.

The Authority also has planned the construction and operation of a phosphate plant at Mobile, but the War Production Board has withheld priorities and this enterprise has not materialized, albeit its construction is believed to be on the program contemplated with the use of the revolving fund.

What may be the outcome of the revolving fund controversy is problematical. The House has the final say, or, at least, the last say in the row, since it approved the revolving fund and the Senate struck it out. The bill goes to conference, and it will be in these meetings of representatives of the two branches that the issue will be settled finally.

As chairman of the Senate committee, MCKELLAR will head the conference committee from that branch. Obviously, he will make a determined fight to have his amendment retained in the bill, but there is a question as to the reaction of the House conferees, notwithstanding the growing insistence in both branches of Congress upon the reassertion of the right of the legislature to control all expenditures of public moneys.

Our Foreign Policy

REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, I have given considerable thought to the subject matter I am about to discuss but hesitated long for fear that its discussion might be misunderstood and possibly interfere with our war effort. Events of the recent past, however, and a visit to my district have convinced me that it is imperative to make a statement on this subject now.

Prior to my coming to Congress and ever since I have had the privilege to serve in this honored body, I have been a strong supporter of the President's foreign policy. During the past several days we have heard repeated charges made by administration critics, and even some of its supporters, to the effect that we have no foreign policy. It is my opinion that our Commander in Chief, in public statements made before the publication of the Atlantic Charter and since then, has set forth broad policies, which in effect constitute the foreign policy of our country. If we have erred in our foreign policy, it is not because of our lack of a program but, rather, because of our hesitancy and failure to apply it to practical situations—to put it into action.

Long before the adoption of the Atlantic Charter, the President had, on a number of occasions, set forth in clear terms our policy and belief in the autonomy and self-determination of the peoples of nations—big and small; that no nation should be permitted to aggrandize itself at the expense of its neighbor; that might does not make right and that seizures by force do not contribute to the peace of the world. Our leaders have stressed repeatedly before we were drawn into this war and since that we seek no aggrandizement of our possessions, no new territory in the victory we shall ultimately attain.

Today we are engaged in a war in scattered theaters of the world. Our allies are nations from all corners of the globe. Our greatest source of difficulty at this moment, aside from our conflict with the Axis, comes from the eastern European theater. There, Russia, one of our allies, announced her intention to snuff out of existence at least three small countries, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, badly maim and cripple Poland and to dominate the internal affairs of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. It seems paradoxical that our ally should seek to destroy nations which are also our allies. Russia's political aggressiveness in foreign affairs, in contrast to our apparent passiveness, has been a cause for alarm both at home and abroad.

Some months ago, the nations affected by the designs of our eastern ally have sought the aid of Great Britain and the United States who agreed to act as mediators. Russia, however, informed us that this was her internal problem and, therefore, no concern of ours. Subsequently about the time of the Tehran Conference, Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Minister, announced that Great Britain would recognize no unilateral changes in the boundaries of any nation. Our Government took no stand—offered only silence. Winston Churchill upon his return from Teheran stated that while Great Britain had guaranteed freedom and independence to her allies in Europe she did not guarantee their boundaries. What sophistry! To this our country's spokesman again offered only silence.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill's statement and our failure to protest shocked not only the people of Europe but also all thinking Americans. Our silence was interpreted as mute acquiescence. The question of the boundaries in this matter is secondary. The disturbing factor about the whole situation is that we apparently have recognized and permitted power politics to control. Thus it appears to the outside world that we have abandoned and cast aside our democratic ideals and principles in the settlement of international disputes. Without a hearing and without due process we have permitted one country to dispossess others of their territory. Is this to be a precedent and pattern for future settlements? If it is, then our hope for a lasting peace after victory is shattered before the war is won. If the old power politics and intrigue are

to reign in the days following this war we shall most certainly be involved in a third bloody conflict before a generation passes.

To hasten the day of victory, Russia, as well as the other United Nations, needs the wholehearted cooperation and collaboration of all the underground forces in Nazi-occupied Europe. If freedom, autonomy, and self-determination are guaranteed the people that are now suffering under Hitler's heel, they will fight to death. However, if all they have to look forward to is subjugation and another yoke, it is unreasonable to expect them to extend themselves to any degree. And we can look forward to a long, drawn-out war.

In my humble opinion a statement on the part of our Government that we will not recognize any unilateral boundary changes would give hope and incentive to the underground forces in the occupied countries to bring their wholehearted cooperation into the war effort and accelerate the day of victory. The morale of our own people, as well as our allies, will be raised immeasurably upon our assumption of leadership and responsibility not only in the battle to bring the war to an early victorious conclusion but also in the formulation and establishment of the principles and foundation of the lasting peace that is to follow. It seems as though we have momentarily lost leadership in the diplomatic field because of our silence and inactivity. It is now high time to take a firm and resolute stand and assume the duty, obligation, and responsibility that is ours as the greatest and strongest Nation in the world.

At this stage of the war we are all tired of it. We are irritable, anxious to have it over with. Let us remember that similar conditions toward the close of the last war in a large measure caused us to lose the peace and eventually brought us into the present conflict. We have repeatedly given pledges to our men and women in the services that we will win this war and make certain of a lasting peace. We must make good our vow. We must not let them down. We will have failed in our trust if a generation hence the sons and daughters of these men and women are obliged to go to war again.

It, therefore, appears that it is time that our leaders effectively put into practice the principles upon which and for which we are fighting so that there may no longer be any question in the minds of our allies or our enemies just where we stand. By doing so we will reassure our own people and the people of the entire world of the sincerity of our purpose. We will thereby give them new heart to fight and speed up the day of victory. Further than that we will begin laying the foundation for the peace that is to follow. Our silence during these momentous days and weeks has been accepted as acquiescence. Our silence has dimmed the hopes for freedom of peoples of many lands. With the Nazi propaganda telling these peoples "we told you so" we are undoubtedly the most unpopular Nation in Europe today. It is, therefore, necessary that our country take a firm stand and make its position clear in no uncertain terms. Lasting peace cannot be maintained in a world dominated by any one nation. Collective and individual security requires united action under the leadership of a nation that has no territorial ambitions and enjoys the confidence of the world's peoples. We can assume that leadership when we fulfill our duty and responsibility as the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world.

The need now is not the formulation of a foreign policy. We have that. What we need is an effective and fearless execution and putting into action of that foreign policy which we have repeatedly stated and restated and which our people have continuously and enthusiastically approved.

Gov. Leverett Saltonstall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Floyd Bell which appeared in the March issue of the Bostonian. This is a very readable, human-interest story of the very human, yet forceful Governor of Massachusetts, Hon. Leverett Saltonstall. The article follows:

GOV. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

(By Floyd Bell)

It could be a scene from the next Republican National Convention. Mark this, we say it could be. There comes a time when the balloting is tense, the delegates are tired and worn with the continual bickering, the trading here and there, the smoke-filled rooms.

For many ballots now Massachusetts has called out resonantly "Massachusetts casts 35 votes for Gov. Leverett Saltonstall." Suddenly on this, the twenty-first ballot, there comes an unexpected break. A Southern State whose delegates have been pledged to another candidate have been released from their pledge and like a bolt out of the blue comes their chairman's call, "Florida casts 14 votes for Saltonstall." There's a cheer, it becomes a roar, and the landslide has begun. State after State follows.

That's the picture that could be painted at the next national convention. Bay State folks, the folks back home who know Leverett Saltonstall, still earnestly hope that such a picture may actually be thrown upon the screen.

Long, lanky, lean, and laughing, Leverett Saltonstall is not "another Lincoln" because truth to tell he has more background, more executive ability, more genuine appeal to the masses than Honest Abe ever possessed. Leverett Saltonstall's appeal is to no one section, no class, no party actually, but to Americans who believe in America first, last, all the time, but an America which can never again be permitted to hold aloof from the problems of its neighbors, whether here or across the seas.

He's a strange man and yet a very average one, this Governor of Massachusetts. He is possessed of an innate ability and a native intelligence far beyond the scope of most, yet he is so modest, so self-effacing that it's actually a bit of self-inflicted torture when he consents to pose for a moment in the spotlight of public attention. He has a great deal of boyish appeal about him, this man who stands several inches above 6 feet and whose face bears always the creases of a smile which never quite fades, except on those rare occasions when the Governor knows that he has before him a fakir, or one who does not stick to the truth. Then the smile can be erased, there can be a sternness settle about those closely drawn lips, the twinkle can disappear from the eyes, and it's a brave man who would then venture to attempt to impose upon the intelligence or impugn the motives of His Excellency.

Leverett Saltonstall lives in a house out on Chestnut Hill. In normal times, he is there surrounded by his very lovable family. Evenings, residents of Chestnut Hill and members of nearby Longwood Cricket Club often see the staid Governor of the Commonwealth in collarless disarray, playing baseball with his own or the neighbors' boys and girls. Right now, most of the family have gone to war. But there's still a home there, a home that has the atmosphere not of just another house but of a real New England home.

Out in Dover, a pretty litle suburban district which nestles in the Blue Hills or their foothills, the Governor has his best moments. There is his farm and there he loves to cut weeds, chop wood, run the big mower, help harvest the crops, feed the blooded stock. No gentleman farmer is he, but a very practical—a very thorough—farmer who knows to a penny the profit or loss on each item, yet he has none of the New England characteristics of his friend Calvin Coolidge in hoarding.

Governor Saltonstall is not one of those men who ever could be another Lincoln, nor another anybody else, for this Massachusetts statesman—and he is that—is so individual, so original, that he has built, all unconscious of it, for himself a personality stronger than any of those who have gone before. Here is the type of man one thinks of when reading of the early days of our American history. In Governor Saltonstall one sees the ancestor of colonial days—the man who bore the savagery and the trials of those days and emerged superior to all these—for this man Saltonstall has an iron jaw which discloses at first glance the character, the integrity, and the power of the man. His very appearance signals the strength which is his. Leverett Saltonstall is one of those rare men who dominates any gathering without actually ever intending to do so. Modest to the point of shyness at times, afraid that he will be occupying the spotlight intended for someone else, there are times when this likable, lovable arbiter of Massachusetts policies of the present day is actually * * *.

Leverett Saltonstall is "regular." He walks into a place like the sportsmen's show, for example, and everyone turns to look, not because they know it's the Governor of Massachusetts—for this man is attended by no panoply of servitors, no gathering of the clans to herald his coming—but because the crowd instinctively realizes that a man has appeared.

He reads avidly, likes detective stories, mystery stories of any type, and doesn't lay a book down until he has finished it from "kiver to kiver." Retains well what he reads. Likes the serious stuff, too. Reads essays and biographies but confesses that he likes nothing better than to sit before the radio, when he has the time, and hear Sherlock Holmes or the Shadow do their stuff.

He likes baseball, football, hockey, in fact, all types of sports. He never would be caught posing with a 10-gallon hat and a 10-inch trout, not this Governor, unless he actually

had caught the trout. He doesn't believe in subterfuge or dissembling anything anywhere.

He believes in the future of air transportation and wants to see Massachusetts have the greatest airport in the world. He believes, too, in rail and sea transportation, and one of his fondest dreams, one that he expects to come true, is to see a post-war development in which his home town of Boston—for Chestnut Hill really is a part of metropolitan Boston—will come forward as first in transportation, with the greatest outgoing and incoming port facilities in the world.

Never a hide-bound partisan, if he believed that the State could be served best by deviation from such a course, he has not hesitated to name prominent men of the party which opposed him at the polls to high offices, and not in a single instance have they failed to justify his faith and his confidence.

A soldier of the last World War, and a soldier, too, of this one, he, as Governor of the Commonwealth, has had before him greater problems than confront many a military man on the field. Massachusetts was so far in advance of other States in preparedness for this present World War that it seemed almost like another nation for a time. It was Saltonstall who developed, originated, and put into effect the wonderful civilian defense project which the Bay State now enjoys and of which it boasts.

In his office at the State House he is easily approachable, always "at home" to any man or woman who deserves even a moment of his attention. No iron walls nor stone fences are built around his offices, and he is as likely to stalk out into the reception room, with a crowd awaiting, to greet everyone by name as he is to eat dinner tomorrow night. Incidentally that reminds us he likes good food and is not one of those who pretend not to like dinners and good luncheons. He likes nothing better than to sit down at lunch with a friend. But he seldom gets time.

Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following letter, entitled "Communication," addressed to the editor, Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., by Mr. Everett R. Lawrence, 4 Lewis Street, Andover, Mass.:

ANDOVER, MASS., *March 23, 1944.*

EDITOR, EVENING TRIBUNE,

Lawrence, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Last Saturday, March 17, you published an article by Roger Babson which I feel deserves criticism that I shall be pleased to have you publish in its entirety as an open letter. As it reads of itself, it has served a harmful rather than a helpful purpose, because the writer generalized too freely and because he has left too much unsaid.

In spite of Mr. Babson's residence in the South for limited periods over 20 years and his belief that he knows the colored people's good and bad points, he does not know as much as he believes. He has not yet learned that the colored man has sense enough not to let him know that he does not know him. He's too diplomatic for that.

I, too, lived in the South for 17 years, and as a colored man. I am convinced that some of these things he has written must be clarified to make intelligent reading.

He speaks of the "utter disregard of their knowledge of finances and economics." Both these scholarly fields have been carefully and continuously closed to him, practically as well as theoretically. The colored man has not had either political, social, or economic justice in the last 300 years, Yet Mr. Babson laments the lack of interest in the war effort at this crucial time, their reluctance to save money, and their "saucy moods."

The fact is that the Negro is not particularly anxious to fight for restoration of the status quo as he has known it. What with discrimination, prejudice, and segregation even in the armed forces, it is of little comfort to him to say things will be worse for him if the Axis win. If he is told tomorrow that he will be granted the privileges of a full-fledged American if he fights for it, this attitude would be entirely different.

Many of the South's 9,000,000 colored have more money now than they have ever had before and they are getting the first chance of their lives to buy what they have always wanted, and more often desperately needed. This taste of partial economic independence has produced a change in them—hence the complaint about "saucy moods."

"Get all the work you can," he says. He did not mention—though he knows—that in many places, men like Tilman, Talmadge, Arnall, Rankin, Dixon, Bilbo, and Ethridge see to it that they positively do not get work. Of 26,904 defense plants in Michigan, 22,042 barred Negroes; of 17,435 in Texas, 9,117 barred Negroes; 56 war plants in St. Louis averaged 3 Negroes each; of 85,000 unskilled jobs, 35,000 were barred to Negroes—and so we might go on.

It is true that many colored people are not good citizens; this would be true if they were of any other color. But the colored man has long been led into corruption because of corruption. He does not in many cases respect law and order because law and order have in many instances shown no respect for him. As an example, while we were trying German saboteurs in our Federal Courts with so much fanfare about fairness, Negroes were being lynched and beaten in Sikeston, Mo. He has taken no interest in the affairs of the Government, because in thousands of places he faces the threat of bodily injury if he tries. It is a matter of but small concern to thousands upon thousands of these people who wins the war. It is a matter of peonage under one and slavery under the other.

As a statistical expert, the writer knows the small number of Negroes trained under the N. Y. A. for defense jobs; the comparatively small amount they received under W. P. A., or any other alphabetical agency; he is acquainted with the discrimination in our Federal departments; the low earning power of the masses in the South; their problems in obtaining work, and the type and restrictions of their labor; their lack of adequate schooling and medical care; their superabundance of poverty with its subsequent despondency, disease, delinquency, and crime. He knows all this and more, yet he says he cannot agree that they are mistreated. Is he kidding?

"This crucial hour," did he say? What will he call it if the members of the so-called colored races—many of whom are more white than colored—rebel against this racial dominance—the people of India, Burma, Malaya, Africa, China, and other nonwhites, including Russia, who boasts that she knows no color problem, and tolerates no racial prejudice? Does he honestly believe this can and will go on forever simply because he refuses to recognize its existence? Can he expect cooperation from a dejected, bitter, mistreated human who has been cheated, and beaten, and lynched? And while the rest of the world looks on, does he hope for hemisphere solidarity, or any other, as long as this type of democracy exists?

Neither do I accept his generalization that most white people are saving their money. Prior to March 15 the cry was simply "I don't know what I'm going to do"; then they cashed in their War bonds and another crisis was met.

Granting that the article was a gesture at friendliness and helpfulness, the author, by his omissions left such a distorted picture of the average Negro in the mind of the reader it would have been better if he had not written anything.

With one thing only do I agree; the colored people should have their money, but everyone else should, too.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT R. LAWRENCE.

Pertinent Questions on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the seventh district Zionist organization, Monday evening, March 27, 1944:

BRITAIN'S ATTITUDE ON PALESTINE ILL BECOMES HER MAGNIFICENT WAR EFFORT AND ACHIEVEMENT

American sentiment coalesces in favor of the opening of the doors of Palestine. Meanwhile opposing forces gather ominously in strength, in seemingly unrelated activities, but, throughout, in bold relief, is clearly revealed the grave pattern of the contemplated dissolution of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people.

The proponents for the national homeland in Palestine have advanced logical, unanswerable, indisputable arguments which the anti-Zionist forces cannot challenge. The evidence, in law and in equity, is so clearly in proponderance for the national homeland that the resisting forces must resort to all manner of subterfuge, puppet-pulling maneuvers, and manufactured propaganda to counter the just claim.

Legally, the Balfour Declaration was issued with the full strength of the British Government behind it. The Palestine mandate, incorporating the Balfour Declaration, was ratified internationally by 52 nations. The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations placed as the primary purpose of the Palestine mandate the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people. Indeed, it was the raison d'etre of the mandate. The United States, not being a party to the League of Nations, knew it to be of material significance to enter into a separate treaty with Great Britain in 1924, reiterating therein the Palestine mandate, and agreeing that nobody would be precluded from entering Palestine on the ground of race or religion and that, furthermore, no changes in the terms of the agreement could be made without the consent of both signatories. In 1922, the Congress of the United States had by resolution voiced its approval of the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jewish people.

One further fact. France, who after the World War had sought eagerly to widen her sphere of influence in the Near and Middle East, refrained from claiming Palestine on the condition only that the mandate be concerned with the establishment of the aforesaid national homeland.

So much for the legal aspect. While the legality of a deed does not, oftimes, justify its existence, here we have justice combined with the spirit of mercy and the letter of the law. Certainly, if no other reason existed today but that of the horror of uprooted, homeless, defenseless European Jewry, that alone should be sufficient impetus to crash down the doors of Palestine. But if that is not enough, let us tell them of how in reliance on the word of England, the Jews of the world since 1917 by the amassing of dimes, pennies and quarters redeemed the land of this small country, rehabilitating thousands of refugees, created over 200 new industries, built the Hebrew University, the finest of its kind in all of the East, developed the Medical Center through Hadassah, contributing its science and skills to the war effort of the Allied nations. From the marshes sprung colonies, towns, cities, modern and progressive. Agriculture and industry flourished. Little children that the rest of the world forgot were given new life and new dignity through the work of Youth Aliyah in Palestine. And if England would but pay heed to what Lord Wedgewood said, it would not talk so glibly (in the face of its own past imperialistic activity) of the Jew replacing the Arab. Lord Wedgewood said:

"The Jews of all the world have done their part nobly in Palestine. Five hundred thousand of the best intelligence and morality have converted a wilderness into a garden. For the first time in history colonists from a higher civilization have neither robbed nor exploited nor exterminated the wilder native race. The Aztecs and Incas of Mexico and Peru, the Redskins on the Great Lakes of North America, the aborigines of Australia and Tasmania, the Hottentots and Kaffirs of South Africa—all have been enslaved or exploited and gradually exterminated. Wherever settlers have come, they have taken the land by force or fraud under the plea of necessity and expediency. Only the Jews of Palestine have paid for barren lands at a blackmail price and labored to make such lands productive."

The MacDonald white paper of 1939 continues in force and effect. After the 20,000-odd certificates of entrance are exhausted, all doors will be officially barred to the stricken Jewish people of Europe, even Palestine which is historically, legally, and equitably theirs, which is theirs by right of labor and loyalty, which is theirs by reason of humanity.

It is well to examine into the alleged causes for the maintenance of the policy of the white paper. What makes this betrayal of Palestine so firm that neither official Washington nor Great Britain dare reveal it for what it is and confine it to the dust heap, together with other great blunders of that period, such as the Munich pact? Let's examine them one by one carefully and without prejudice.

1. We cannot permit, we are told, untrammeled Jewish immigration into Palestine because of the limited absorptive capacity of Palestine. Nonsense. All experts agree, including Walter Clay Lowdermilk of the United States Soil Conservation Service, that Palestine can absorb 4,000,000 additional people, including, mind you, the 1,500,000 Jews and Arabs already there. Absorptive capacity depends not upon the measurement of square miles, but the intensive cultivation of the land, the development of water and electric power, the industries that can be established. The successful colonization, thus far, by the Jews of Palestine have proven that no fears need be had in that direction. Not only has Palestine within the past 25 years seen the settlement of almost half a million Jews, but the doubling of the Arab population in the same period, this despite the fact that a quarter of a century ago the same old "absorptive capacity" bugbear was pulled out of a hat and flung at the people. Palestine has skilled engineers, technicians, colonists determined and intrepid in face of all opposition of politics, soil, and space. Sir Charles Warren as early as 1875 stated: "Give Palestine a good government and increase the commercial life of the people and they may increase tenfold and yet there is room * * * it may be said that the more people it contains, the more it may accept. Its productiveness will increase in proportion to labor bestowed on the soil until a population of 15,000,000 may be accommodated there."

2. Palestine is the stumbling block to Arab unity. Nonsense, again. Palestine is 10,429 square miles, about the size of Vermont. The Arabian world is 7,000,000 square miles. A belief in the mirage that was and is pan-Arabian union had long been assiduously fostered and nurtured and offered as a palatable dish to the Arabs by the British Colonial Office, which had all the while been aware of the impossibility of achievement. It was but another manifestation of British colonial policy of obscuring the issue under the pretense of sympathy in order to continue in control.

The British Colonial Office knew as well as did all other mandatory powers in the east that the rival jealousies, the mores and schisms inherent in the tribal lives of Arabia would halt any endeavor to consummate a real Arabic alliance. It is obvious that no encouragement for such a union would have been given by Great Britain had she for a moment believed that it would come to pass. Lawrence of Arabia's words are not unknown to the erudite British Colonial Office. He said, "The Arab-speaking peoples are as diverse as the English speaking and equally distinct. From Morocco to Mesopotamia is as far spiritually as from San Francisco to Aberdeen. Further, there is a world between the Bedouin of Azrak and the peasant of Amman, though the journey is only 50 miles. Only a criminal would wish to make them all alike. When people talk of Arab confederations or empires, they talk fantastically. The nearest approach to an Arab empire at present is Ibn Saud's. It is a figment built on sand. Nothing static will rise in the desert, which has seen hundreds of such tyrannies as his, all cemented with blood. It will pass."

Does the British Colonial Office actually believe that Ibn Saud will consent to give up part of his sovereignty to unite with chieftains, emirs, and pashas of lesser power? Will the nomads unite with the soil tillers? It is absurd to speak of Palestine as the sore thumb on the hand of unity. Such a statement strains our credulity to the breaking point.

3. Then we are told we must win the friendship of the Arabs and cause no military disturbance in the Near East lest we impede the progress of the war. Appease and appease and the result is blackmail. In 1939, following the pattern of Munich, Great Britain promulgated the white paper. The British Foreign Office, thus, was high in glee. They had bought the friendship of the Arabs. But what did actually happen? The hostility of the Arabian leaders to the allied cause was no secret, when Hitler's victory seemed imminent. Iraq had to be beaten into submission the Egyptian prime minister was caught betraying British military secrets to the Axis; the grand mufti of Jerusalem fled to Berlin to continue his nefarious activities of pro-Axis propaganda. All the while, the Jewish Palestine produced, worked, fought and bled in the Allied cause. The Jews did not have to be paid for a dubious, to say the least, loyalty. They were firm, unbending, in their determination for an Allied victory. Among many, one bitter indictment against Britain's policy cannot be left aside.

On the British island of Mauritius, 1,400 Jewish refugees have been interned by deed of the British colonial administration in Palestine. Even in these dark days of death and ravage, this callous, brutal evidence of the British colonial office's indifference to the suffering of the helpless and martyred, cuts like a lash.

Out of Festung Europa, those now interned had fled, seeking life and dignity. Their long, bitter journey led them to Palestine where they thought they would be safe and where they could find welcome in the national homeland. On the steamship *Patria*, 1,900 helpless Jews off the coast of Palestine pleaded for admission. Admission was denied. The steamship *Patria* exploded and out of the 1,900, 150 survived. Some of the survivors were deported to the island. Others are survivors of the ill-fated steamship *Atlantic* who, likewise, were denied admission into Palestine. Others are those who were herded out of Palestine because in their desperate plight, when each moment meant the difference between life and death, had entered Palestine without stopping to secure a certificate of entrance. Like Moses at Nebo, they could see but did not enter the Promised Land.

It must be kept in mind that even under the base policy of the Chamberlain-MacDonald white paper which limited the entry of Jews into Palestine there remain some 20,000 entrance certificates still unused. Even within the framework of the strangling colonial policy of Britain, those victims of the steamship *Patria*, the steamship *Atlantic*, could have been saved; and thousands more, seeking refuge from the Nazi butchers, could have begun their shattered lives anew in Palestine.

Now they languish in malaria-infested, lice-ridden Mauritius where cholera and dysentery abide, within the shadow of its leprosarium. What is their guilt that they are so stricken?

In the name of decency, of common humanity, why are they left on this devil's island? Why are British and American officialdom silent? Neither the British colonial office nor our State Department can fall back on the excuse of military expedience. The island of Mauritius is in the Indian Ocean, far removed from all lines of military communication. Ships can readily be availed of to take these victims of Britain's colonial inhumanity to Palestine.

Our State Department has a glorious opportunity to serve the best humanitarian instincts of our country. The British colonial office must reverse its previous stand. It must prove that it is strong enough and sufficiently mature to admit and right the great wrong it has done.

The interned in their hopelessness and helplessness have just proclaimed a day of fasting and have stopped work as their only means of protest. They cannot go unanswered. Palestine must be opened to them. The State Department can act on the authority of our treaty with Great Britain in 1924, wherein it was specifically agreed that no one shall be barred from Palestine on the ground of race or religion. This is our test of sincerity.

"Honest and sincere criticism among the Allies," said Brendan Bracken, British Minister of Information, "even during the heat of war are not out of place. Fair criticism is the life of democracy." Thus, it is no contradiction, nor is it in any sense insincere, to say that I yield to no man in my admiration for the British men and women and their magnificent efforts in this tremendous crisis. The common man in England has performed heroically the superhuman tasks occasioned by the greatest scourge in civilized history. I repeat my avowal of

admiration for England's saintly sacrifices. Certainly, it is not my purpose to drive a wedge between two great Allies. We cannot, however, overlook a wrong, even more so when we are fighting side by side to crush the forces of evil.

With the introduction of the Wright-Compton resolution into the House of Representatives and the Taft-Wagner resolution in the Senate which reiterates the congressional approval of the homeland of 1922 and which demands the abrogation of the MacDonald white paper, widespread hope was born. But behind the closed doors of committees Secretary of War Stimson and General Marshall gave testimony opposing the passage of the resolution. Military expediency must rule, they said. But I say the situation in Palestine is purely political.

In due deference to the military I fail to see how passage of the resolution can affect the progress of the war. Our lines of combat and supply have nothing to do with Palestine. We are in absolute control of the southern and western shores of the Mediterranean. Once before the excuse of "military expediency" was used as a stopgap in the unjust abrogation of the Cremieux decree in Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco following Allied victory. Those of us who protested to our State Department for this unwarranted, illegal flaunting of the very purposes for which we fight this war were told, "Now, behave; military expediency, you know. We must not disturb the Arabs." But with the formation of the National Committee for French Liberation the decree of abrogation was set aside and the Cremieux decree of 1870 was reestablished. Did we witness then any Arab revolt? Did the restoration of the Cremieux decree result in Arab uprising, in foment and disorder? Certainly not. Witness again the recent statement of President Roosevelt concerning the white paper wherein he stated that the American Government had never given its approval to the white paper, and that "when future decisions are reached, full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish national home." Is not such a statement tantamount to a passage of at least one-half of the proposed resolutions? Did Arab-land flame into revolt? Was there any necessity to divert any of our forces from other plans? Certainly not. The calm prevails. But we are told to hush-hush lest the lullabied Arabs rise in wrath from their sleep. That in one breath and in the other from the White House comes the statement, "The white paper has never been accepted." What is this—a merry-go-round?

We were not at war in 1939 and the State Department, though armed with the authority of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, did not protest. Today we are at war and the State Department still is silent. Was its silence justified then or justified now? Was it wrong then or wrong now?

I suggest that in the interest of all parties, it might be well—indeed, I deem it essential, that a select group of interested Congressmen gather in the committee room of the House Foreign Affairs and be permitted to question General Marshall. There is much fog to dispel. What is military expediency? What is its relation to Palestine? Who, if anybody, in the State Department has spoken to the general? These are some of the pertinent questions that need answering, and need answering badly, if justice is to be done and a wrong righted.

Even when it comes to the military authorities, Congress must not be spineless nor put blinders on its eyes, plugs in its ears, and gags in its mouths. Nobody questions the need for military expediency, or national security, and all the clichés that come to the minds of generals when defending a position or other, but it must be crystal clear that such military expediency is essential and that such national security is actually involved. General Marshall not so long ago appeared in camera, in executive session and explained in detail the military situation to the Members of Congress. Why should he not come before a segment of the House, before those Members who are interested in the question of Palestine, and give his reasons for his conclusions.

In all this, it is not my purpose to question unduly the authority of the military, but, nonetheless, we have a right to be informed so that our mental processes might not be bogged down with mere phrases like "military necessity" or "national security." They must be meaningful. They should not be mere words.

President Roosevelt, however, came smack to the point.

The President's statement concerning the plight of the victims of Hitler's outrages which emphasizes the acute need for immediate action of rescue and the threat of punishment to all who aid in committing the outrages was a ray of light in the darkness surrounding these unhappy people. He has called upon the "free peoples of Europe and Asia temporarily to open frontiers to all victims of oppression." His appointment of John W. Pehle, previously acting executive director, to full directorship of the War Refuge Board reveals his determination to stand by his statement.

In the strongest language he has used to date, President Roosevelt characterized the brutal massacre of Jews as "one of the blackest crimes of all history." Casting back a few days ago to President Roosevelt's earlier statement that the MacDonald white paper has never been accepted by the United States and coupling such statement with his humane pronouncement of Friday it appears evident that Mr. Roosevelt had Palestine as one of the "frontiers" in mind. Indeed, what "free peoples of Europe and Asia" can better insure welcome to and absorption of refugees than Palestine?

Close to a million Jewish lives are imperiled in Hungary and double that number in all the Balkans. The scene in Hungary is already one of despair. Nazi propaganda boasts that over a million Jews will disappear from the economic and political life of the country. Already thousands of Jews have been arrested by the Gestapo. They are being thrust into concentration camps, cesspools like Ersekuyver, Ipolysag, and Fuelek. Others are being deported to Poland for extermination in gas chambers or forced to labor in the Upper Silesian coal mines. All highways are choked with fleeing Jewish men, women, and children. They are mown down by machine guns. There are instances where refugees are being used as spearheads for advancing troops.

The tragedy is all the weightier when we consider that the Jewish Agency in Palestine reports that thousands and thousands of Jews could have been saved if the doors of Palestine had been open. President Roosevelt's appeal must surely act to crack the brutal indifference of the British colonial administration in Palestine to human suffering.

But what are the reasons, the real ones, not the obscuring makeshift statements, that lie behind the opposition to the opening of the doors of Palestine? It does not take an astute mind to see the hand of the British Colonial Office throughout. The Near East land is too strategic to lose; the experiment in Palestine was too successful beyond wildest dreams. As a mandatory power, Great Britain can retain control. A national homeland will weaken that control. The position of the Near East at the crossroads between three great continents and the existence of vast oil fields and certain other materials vital to modern industry make control of Palestine a most desirable object for foreign domination and rivalry.

It is a known fact that the development in Palestine has resulted in the highest standard of living in the Near East, for Jew and Arab alike. Further development might so raise the standard of living that the miserable pittance which is the Arab's pay might of necessity be raised. While that would suit the Arab fellaheen or peasant, this cannot be to the liking of the effendi, the emirs and pashas, the absentee landlords who for so long have thrived on the unrewarded toil of their lowly subjects.

We come now to the subject of oil in the Near East which has furnished of late much talk in the newspapers and on the radio. How well is the American oil man set up in this Middle Eastern oil field? He is set up in the vast Saudi-Arabian concession owned by Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co., in the Kuwait concession, half of which is owned by Gulf Oil, and in the Iraq Petroleum Co. Through the California-Arabian Oil Co., the Standard Oil Co., and Texas Oil Co. have received concessions from King Ibn Saud of one-quarter million square miles. Ibn Saud has made no secret of his distaste for a national homeland. Such a homeland threatens his control of subjects who envy the Palestinian Arabs their way of life; it threatens his reputation as a progressive empire. Might not American oil interests be interested in using Palestine for baksheesh or bribe to curry favor of King and Conqueror Ibn Saud.

Ibn Saud on the radio last Saturday night a week ago said the President's statement to Drs. Wise and Silver wherein he stated that the United States had never accepted the white paper was a stab in the back. Which only proves that no matter what we do for the man he is insatiable. We have given him lend-lease. We have given him 20,000,000 ounces of silver for coinage purposes. We have given him guns and rifles. Lord knows to what purpose the guns and rifles would be put. Will they be used to attack the Jews as was the case in the pogroms of 1921, 1929, 1936, and 1939? May I respectfully urge that the Jews of Palestine, that is, the Representative Jewish Agency, be given rifles and guns as well. What is Ibn Saud going to do with these weapons? He is not threatened in any way by any foreign power.

I would like to ask why Palestine as a national homeland for the Jewish people is being liquidated by the British and with our connivance? Why have we given lend-lease aid to Ibn Saud? Lend-lease was primarily intended for those who had aided in the conduct of the war. While the Allies were in the death throes and Rommel stood at the gates of Alexandria, while the jugular vein of British communication lines (Suez) was in serious jeopardy, Ibn Saud couldn't spare a camel or a donkey for the Allied cause. After giving him all that baksheesh (bribe), he now calls Roosevelt's statement a stab in the back. That is indeed biting the hand that feeds him. "Appease a rascal as you will; he was and is a rascal still."

I think it is high time I asked some very pertinent questions:

1. What part did Ralph K. Davies, vice president and director of the Standard Oil Co., receiving an annual salary of $47,000 a year, and now Assistant Petroleum Administrator for War at an additional salary of $10,000 per year, play in the granting of such concessions and in the agreement of our Government's participation in the oil of Saudi-Arabia to the extent of payment of $25,000,000 to the royal household?

2. What part did Brig. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley play in selling Palestine for oil? How does his pronounced opposition to the national homeland tie in with the fact that General Hurley may have been, and may yet be, general counsel of the Sinclair Oil Co.? How well has he served his mission in the Near East?

3. What part did Max Thornberg as Petroleum Adviser to the Secretary of State play in the negotiations for the granting of the oil concessions to the California-Arabian

Standard Oil Co? What relation exists, if any, between the fact that Mr. Max Thornberg is Vice President of the Standard Oil Co. of California and up to about a year ago was Petroleum Adviser to the Secretary of State?

I'd like to ask as well:

1. How great is the influence of Col. Harold B. Hoskins of the Near Eastern Division of the State Department who was born in Beirut and is politically a Syrian nationalist? Why did he take the pains to circulate confidentially among Congressmen his views after his return from the Near East on a special mission of inquiry? How impartial is he and how close to justice has he been in his opposition to the national homeland for the Jews in Palestine?

I'd also like to know:

Who pays Freya Stark for her pro-Arab propaganda in the United States? Is she or is she not on the payroll of the British Ministry of Information? We have a right to know from what source any propaganda flows?

And will somebody tell me who is this George Murray who writes for the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail? Why in his outbursts does he dwell only and exclusively on the Arab claims, leaving out of his columns any picture that might possibly augment the cause of Zionism? Who has robbed him of his objectivity?

We will and must get behind the scenes of these public-shy governors of human destiny. Who are these that they shall outrage the canons of honor and condemn a defenseless people to death and degradation?

Brazil: Our Good Neighbor and Good Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the welcome presence in the United States of the distinguished statesman, Senhor Valentim Boucas, economic adviser to President Getulio Vargas and head of the Inter-American Development Commission's Brazilian board, recalls once again Brazil's vital role in the fight for freedom.

Brazil's notable accomplishments in peace and war need no recounting here. For years you and I and other liberty-loving peoples have followed with considerable interest the progress and achievements of our great sister republic. The largest country in South America in area and in population, this fabulously endowed nation of abundant raw materials has truly lived up to her obligations as a champion of inter-American unity and cooperation.

Our friendly associations with able Ambassador Carlos Martins, who has long represented his country in the National Capital, and our fruitful discussions with Foreign Minister Oswaldo Aranha, one of the New World's most brilliant and farseeing statesmen, have contributed much to the well-being of the two largest hemisphere republics.

The Congress and the citizens of the United States also have had the distinct pleasure of meeting and knowing many of Brazil's leaders in the war effort. During the past few months, for example, several of them have come to this country to witness our vastly expanded production; to inspect military and naval installations, and to obtain at first-hand, the inspiring story of a democracy at war.

Outstanding Brazilians who recently journeyed north to see a united America Back the Attack have included Maj. Gen. Eurico Gaspar Dutra, Brazil's Minister of War; Dr. Joaquim Pedro Salgado, Brazilian Air Minister; Dr. Alfredo Pessoa, head of the Brazilian Department of Information; Dr. Luthero Vargas, the President's son and charming Anesia Pinheiro Machado, Brazil's noted aviatrix. And now we have Senhor Boucas.

These visits to the United States—and they are only typical of scores of others by distinguished scholars, educators, journalists, scientists, technicians, medical experts, and graduate students—have enabled us to learn more about the American republics.

But even if we had not had the pleasure of meeting a single guest from Brazil, which would be most lamentable, we would have been fully cognizant of our neighbor's role in the war.

Her actions on behalf of freedom; her measures to further continental solidarity; her war record against our common enemies have been heralded by fighters for liberty everywhere.

That total effort has well merited the honor, respect, and admiration of all who wage the battle against aggression; of all who challenge Nazi ruthlessness and Nazi treachery on land, on sea, and in the air.

Long before Brazil declared war on Germany, after the wanton destruction of her merchant ships and the loss of lives, she had taken an active part in defense of the hemisphere.

In conference after conference; in Lima, Panama, Havana; in discussions at the Pan American Union; in informal meetings in joint boards and commissions, she eagerly conferred with delegates of the other American republics—and with our leaders in the White House and State Department and Congress—to map out coordinated plans for mutual assistance and for mutual cooperation.

I need not remind the Members of this House of Representatives of Brazil's actions at the history-making meeting of foreign ministers of the American republics at Rio de Janeiro a little more than 2 years ago. Then, as now, President Vargas and the Brazilian government and people proved in deeds their wholehearted support of the cause of inter-American collaboration.

Since January 1942 Brazil has constantly implemented the far-reaching resolutions of that conference.

She placed strategic bases at the disposal of the United Nations. She pledged full resources in manpower and materials. She rounded up Axis spies, saboteurs, and foreign agents.

Her armed forces have collaborated with those of the United States and the other American republics in smashing Nazi U-boats, patrolling long coast lines, and safeguarding vital invasion routes to Europe and Africa. Today her airmen are preparing for action overseas. Many of her aviation cadets are in training at United States Army Air Forces fields and schools, learning and studying with United States youths to become pilots, bombardiers, navigators, gunners, aeronautical engineers, and for other important tasks.

Her home front workers are speeding guns, ships, planes, motors, tanks, and other weapons of victory. No less important are their economic contributions. Brazil is sending us an ever-increasing supply of rubber, chrome, industrial diamonds, quartz crystals, manganese, vegetable oils, and other critical materials.

I am happy to add that the most prized, and the most sought for, and the rarest mineral—the war-vital material with the highest priority rating—also comes from our good neighbor, Brazil.

That strategic pitch-black material is called "tantalite."

Some experts praise it as the "new black gold of the United Nations' war effort," for tantalum, the metal derived from tantalite, gives power and range to United Nations war weapons.

The exact uses of this natural resource with the A-1-a priority rating are, of course, highly guarded military secrets. But I can assure you that the Allied war effort needs tantalite, and needs it badly. It is of the utmost importance that sufficient quantities of this critical material arrive in our war plants, and, indeed, in war plants throughout the United Nations.

Brazil is meeting those goals. Brazil is going all-out for tantalite.

In a wide area of 3,600 square miles in the States of Paraiba and Rio Grande do Norte, more than 8,000 workers—aided by United States technical assistance and mining equipment—are toiling beneath the hot Brazilian sun to win this battle of production.

True to the spirit of pioneers, the workers are waging a dogged up-hill battle against nature and the elements, and are overcoming the greatest possible handicaps to mine this rare, precious metal of victory.

More than 400 mines now are in operation in Brazil, despite the fact that an estimated 3,000 tons of rock must be mined to get 1 ton of tantalite, and it takes one man 130 days to crush, wash, and prepare a single ton of ore for shipment.

These multifold difficulties long ago would have discouraged a less sturdy people. But not Brazilians. They have pledged their total resources—men and mines and brains and brawn—for liberty. And Brazil's 1944 production of tantalite, I'm proud to announce, is expected to be double that of last year.

By an agreement with the Brazilian Government, the United States Purchasing Commission of the former Board of Economic Warfare, now a part of the United States Foreign Economic Administration, buys all of Brazil's tantalite output and aids in the development of the mines.

The battle of production is evident in all stages, from the exhaustive search

for the rare mineral until its final shipment to the United States.

Once or twice a week, I'm told, the Brazilian miners gather together their tantalite ore, pack it on burroback, and set off for the nearest town, where dealers weigh the mineral and judge its quality. These dealers, in turn, ship the ore by truck to the town of Campina Grande, where it is graded, washed, sundried, and bagged.

The last step in the tantalite cycle in Brazil takes place at the great Parnamirim air field in Natal, where the vital material is loaded aboard United States planes and rushed to war plants in this country.

The little-known story of tantalite is only one of many which Senhor Boucas can tell you about Brazil's role in the war effort.

There are more. Many more. Brazil's development of the rubber areas in the Amazon River Valley; her vast industrial development, including the establishment of the United States-aided National Steel Mill at Volta Redonda and other important manufacturing facilities; the cooperative United States-Brazilian airplane and motor factories; the cooperative health and sanitation program; and other United States-Brazilian joint projects will outlast the war. They will be lasting evidences of our mutual friendship and cooperation.

The 2-months visit of Senhor Boucas to the United States has been a happy event for me and for others who have witnessed the growing development of amicable relations between these two great republics. When I meet the distinguished statesman and economist, I shall say, "Senhor Boucas, I am proud indeed to shake the hand of one who symbolizes the true spirit of Brazil today. For Brazil is our good neighbor and good friend."

A Soldier's Tribute to a Fallen Comrade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I presented to the House a portion of a letter recently received by Mr. W. L. White, Sr., 181 Madison Avenue, Clifton, N. J., in my district, from his son, Sgt. W. L. White, Jr., who described himself as a freckle-faced tail gunner on a Martin Marauder bomber B-26 somewhere in England. The letter described a bombing raid over the Continent and vividly portrayed the character of our men who fly on these rather tough assignments.

Today I present, in full, copy of a letter written by Sergeant White to the father of a young Kansas farm boy whom Sergeant White saw killed in action in a mission over France.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. BROWN: You have just received that ominous message, "The War Department regrets to inform you * * *." We, his buddies, will feel better if we can pass on to you a sincere heartfelt tribute, it comes from down deep. This is not a requiem, this is a salute.

We knew Jake as only men who live and fight and die together know each other. On the records he was just another 22-year-old boy. In the Air Force he was just another top gunner, and a good one; but on a farm in Kansas, he was your son and in our barracks he was a respected comrade, friend, and fellow-in-arms.

He talked a lot about you, Mr. Brown. He always called you "Daddy." The first time he referred to you as "Daddy" someone snickered. Jake never said a word, but just quietly drew that burly frame of his to its full height and looked—just looked. No one ever grinned again. In fact we sort of developed a silent pride in the fact and the way he said "Daddy." We loved to hear him say it.

One time someone called him a "plow jockey." We rather expected he might resent it, but he didn't. He just spoke slow and easy-like, not to anyone in particular: "Yep; I guess I am a 'plow jockey.' Maybe I am better fitted to be a farmer than anything else. You see, I love the smell of dirt, fresh dirt, damp—smelling of God's own perfume." There's just got to be farmers, and we could see in his eyes the rolling prairies of golden-haired wheat; we could see the sun shining down on those fields of his, warming and giving life to sod and seed. Yes; we could even smell "God's own perfume." We envied Jake Brown.

We've had some pretty rough missions. A common catch phrase, after a tough one is: "Boy, they made a Christian out of me that time." Someone said, "How about you, Jake?" He just grinned (you know that grin, like a door slowly opening wide to a world full of sunshine); then slowly he drawled, "Yes, God was there and that helped, but shucks, I always was a Christian. My daddy taught me that."

A frequent topic of conversation in the barracks is "Why are we fighting?" You know the boys are rather touchy on this subject, they just have to talk about it but they never say what they really think. They cover up and say: "Me? I was drafted and it took 6 strong men to drag me away." But Jake was different; he simply told us what he thought, as we knew he would. "Why, I enlisted," he said. "You see it's like this, I've got a brother, a little bitty kid with a lot of curly hair and freckles. One time I saw that kid get burned with a hot iron. It was a nasty burn and it left a long slick scar. He didn't cry, not that kid, but there was something in his face, part pain, part scaredness and part, well, with his big eyes he was asking me why I let that hot iron burn him. I never forgot that. I don't want that kid to ever look at me like that again. I know I am only one, a plow-jockey at that, but I guess I better do what I can do to stop a couple of guys, who don't mind seeing kids get burned." This was a pretty long speech for Jake, we expected him to sit down, but he didn't. He just kept walking up and down rumpling up his curly hair with his big hand and kept on, almost as if he were talking to himself. "Every soldier talks about his mother, best mother in the world, but somehow my mom is different; dad, he is big like me, but mom, she's little, she's got the whitest hair you ever did see. She's got the nicest hands, tiny little hands, seems almost too small for farm work. They are kind of red and gnarled but they are the gentlest hands. Honest fellows, she's awfully sweet. I just couldn't think of my mom keeping house for a bunch of iron-heeled Jerries. Not my mom (and a big tear trickled down his cheek, he blew his nose and blustered around a bit, we waited, and he went on). I guess I'm always shooting off my mouth about daddy. You guys would like my daddy; he ain't so young any more but he will never be old, you see, he thinks young. My daddy's stout—I don't mean fat, he's stout inside—he's big, he has a big heart. The way I figure it out, the bigger the heart, the bigger the heart break. I wouldn't break my daddy's heart, not for the whole of God's world—not my daddy's heart."

He said all this very simply, Mr. Brown. We loved him for that. You see he easily and simply said what we would like to have said but couldn't find the words.

I was on the same mission with Jake; I guess you would like to know about it. When I first noticed that Jake's ship was in trouble they were beginning to lag behind. One engine seemed to be smoking, then the other one conked and the ship went into a fast flat spin. The Jerry fighters dove in for the kill. They didn't have it too easy, for the "Spits" were intercepting; but the Jerry fighters kept coming in. I am a tail-gunner and I kept watching Jake's ship as she spun down, down. Suddenly I saw her pull out and level off for a few seconds and out popped the parachutes, all at once. I saw a Jerry fighter explode and another slide off smoking badly; it was odd, because at that moment the "Spits" were not near. Then I saw the top turret slowly revolving, spitting tracers from its twin guns.

Jake was still in that ship. He never thought of jumping when his comrades in chutes needed protection and he had two guns in his hands that would shoot. When his ship hit the ground, it sort of spread out, shivered, seemed to hold her breath for a minute then blew up. It seemed that in that last final gasp she said: "Jake Brown, you and I have fought a good fight, we have finished our course, we have kept the faith."

Mr. Brown, we are not weeping, we are proudly saluting Jake Brown, your son, our comrade. We would like to salute you, too, Mr. Brown. It was the teaching guidance and inspiration of a daddy who "thinks young" that made Jake great.

Bomb group No. 323: Attention!

Mr. Brown and every daddy who receives "The War Department regrets to inform you * * *", we salute you.

Staff Sgt. W. L. WHITE 3d.

Public Health Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from the Medical Society of the State of New York and my reply to the letter:

LEGISLATIVE BUREAU
AND EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, N. Y., March 27, 1944.

The Honorable MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are informed that there is pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill to codify the laws of the United States Public Health Service—H. R. 3379.

The osteopaths are urging that there be incorporated in the bill provision for the appointment of osteopaths as commissioned medical officers of the United States Public

Health Service. In New York State we have, through process of elimination, finally raised the standards of the osteopaths to almost the equal of the educational standards required of physicians. There is only one school of osteopathy that is now recognized by New York State, and that is the Philadelphia school. There are a number of other schools that are turning out men with very inferior educational qualifications and we certainly believe that it would not be in the interest of the public of the United States to have such men commissioned as medical officers of the United States Public Health Service.

We know that you shared this point of view some time ago and we hope that you are still of the same mind. The portion of the bill which we believe is particularly undesirable is found on page 18, lines 15 to 17, inclusive, which read: "No regulation relating to qualifications for appointment of medical officers or employees shall give preference to any school of medicine." Of course, this could be interpreted as authorizing the appointment of chiropractors as commissioned officers of the United States Public Health Service.

If you think of anything else we can do to help prevent the inclusion of this or such provision, I should be very grateful to you for your suggestion.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOS. S. LAWRENCE, M. D.,
Executive Officer.

MARCH 29, 1944.

MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, N. Y.

(Attention Joseph S. Lawrence, M. D., executive officer.)

DEAR SIRS: I wish to acknowledge your letter of March 27 concerning H. R. 3379, a bill now pending before my committee. The stated purpose of this legislation is to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service.

As you know, I have always taken an active interest in legislation of this character both at the State Capital in Albany and here in Washington. As a result of my long association with the local school board and my work in the field of housing, child care, and public health, I have given close attention and intense study to the bill, H. R. 3379.

As a member of the Senate of the State of New York from 1924 to 1930, I acted as chairman of the Public Health Committee. During those years I had the assignment of preparing the legislation, presiding at the public hearings and presenting the bills from the Public Health Committee to the Senate.

It was my privilege to have sponsored and to have seen enacted into law most of the constructive and progressive legislation on the subject of Public Health. This legislation is now part of the existing law of the State of New York.

Today, after 20 years of legislative experience and knowledge of public health problems, I am determined that there shall be no further tampering with these laws which were framed so carefully to guard the health and general welfare of our citizens.

As one member of the committee, I assure you and the people of New York that I shall continue my fight to maintain and advance the requirements for appointment as a medical officer. In my opinion, changing the present law, especially in the manner suggested, by H. R. 3379, would be grossly unfair to every boy and girl wearing the military uniform of our country.

As my efforts in public life have been devoted to obtaining better homes, improved working conditions, and higher standards of living for my constituents, I realize that in order to perpetuate these gains, the State and the Nation must insist upon and furnish the best equipped and most thoroughly trained men and women in all branches of medicine, especially in the Public Health Service. Any lowering of professional requirements, any compromise of basic training would, I feel sure, spell ruin to the work and accomplishments of the past quarter century in the vital sphere of public welfare and health.

Because of these reasons, I shall do everything possible to keep our present laws intact and free from harmful amendments.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
Member of Congress.

Farm Labor Deferments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from very reputable and sound farmers in Cambria County, Pa. Knowing these people as I do, I can vouch for their soundness in problems pertaining to agriculture for which they are well qualified through years of experience and learning to discuss. The subject matter is of very vital importance to our Nation.

EBENSBURG, PA., *March 22, 1944.*

MR. HARVE TIBBOTT,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We farmers of Cambria County, Pa., wish to call your attention to the fact that Selective Service System headed by Gen. Louis B. Hershey has recently issued a directive to local draft boards which, we believe, is unfair to the people of the eastern United States. We refer to order No. 164 of February 14, 1944. By this order the minimum requirements for a farm laborer's deferment has been raised from 8 war units to 16 war units per man. The objection to this change is twofold:

First, the war units are still computed without consideration for the relative amount of work required to produce a war unit by different methods. For example; it is possible for a man to feed, milk, and care for 16 head of dairy cattle thereby producing his 16 war units of production and being eligible for deferment on those grounds. However, feed must be produced for those cattle and war units are also computed for feed production. The man who is raising the feed crops would have to produce on the average the following acreages of hay and grain to earn his 16 war units to be deferred (divided evenly between the four types of credit allowed for feed crops under the war units schedule):

Corn, 4 units, 20 acres.
Hay, 4 units, 40 acres.
Oats, 4 units, 60 acres.
Wheat, 4 units, 80 acres.
Total, 16 units, 200 acres.

All this is required for the deferment of one man, but actually it represents more work than any three men could do with the type of machinery available in this section of the country.

Likewise, the war units allowed for vegetables is not sufficient for the manpower needed in their production. The best agricultural authorities say that one man cannot care for more than 3 acres of vegetables. According to present selective-service regulations, 1 acre of vegetables is rated at one unit. A vegetable grower would therefore have to care for 16 acres of vegetables to earn deferment. This is an impossibility in this section where vegetables are grown for fresh consumption. The loss of these vegetable growers in this heavily populated section of the country would be a serious blow to the food supply here.

A second objection to the recent directive is that under former eight-unit minimum it was possible for draft boards to grant deferments where a registrant was producing at capacity and doing a good job. Now, however, a registrant must produce at least "16 war units by his own efforts." This, in spite of the fact that according to statistics supplied by the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the average number of war units produced in 1943 throughout the New England, Atlantic, and South Central States was less than 10 per man.

The unbalanced condition between war units allowed for livestock and those allowed for field crops will have the result of taking many necessary men from the farms of Pennsylvania and neighboring States where the same general conditions apply.

Our specific recommendation would be that the conversion table for converting crop acres to war units be revised sufficiently to make it possible for the producer to earn deferment when they are producing necessary feeds in quantity. Until this revision is made there should be no requirement that 16 war units be produced in every case, because that is impossible for feed growers, as we have shown.

If this revision in the war-unit schedule is not made, the effect will be to defer those men engaged in the care of livestock but not those who are growing the feed crops. The immediate result of such a policy would be that many of our farms would shut down completely or reduce to the capacity of those employables remaining on them, because it is not possible to keep livestock without growing a substantial part of its feed on the farm.

The local draft boards began to reclassify those registrants who were deferred in agriculture, and if these first reclassifications are a true indication of the severity of the new regulations, then approximately one-half of previously deferred farm labor will be drafted in some areas.

As we see the problem, it is a question of whether the Government wants food or doesn't want food. If food is not a serious consideration, then the present selective-service regulations will surely reduce production very rapidly. If food is really essential, then young farmers who have been doing a good job producing it should be kept on the farms by making the required number of war units conform to what a man is able to do.

We hope that you are able to bring these views to the attention of selective service and to the attention of such other officials as may be unaware of the effect of the new selective service regulations.

War Housing Projects of the Federal Public Housing Authority in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY,
Washington, March 30, 1944.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: I should like to direct your attention to serious errors and distortions of fact in the charges raised by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Associations concerning the war housing projects of the Federal Public Housing Authority in Massachusetts and throughout New England. As you are no doubt aware, these charges were reproduced at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1944.

After a careful check, we find that inaccuracies are as prevalent in the allegations the Federation says it has "verified" as in those which the Federation says it has not verified but has secured from "reliable sources."

The following are the true and incontrovertible facts of the situation:

CHICOPEE, MASS.

The Federation describes the site chosen for the Curtis Terrace project as a clay bank which had already produced foundation failures in a city school built in the same area, and declares the site was chosen over the protest of Chicopee officials.

The facts are that the damage to the school resulted from faulty rtructure design; as is well known in the construction trade, clay is a perfectly suitable foundation material if footings are correctly designed. Both the mayor of Chicopee and the Chicopee Housing Authority recommended strongly the present site; consideration of an alternate site, easier to build on but farther from the center of the town, was abandoned, in deference to local wishes.

The Federation asks: "Who was the owner of this site previous to F. P. H. A. occupation? How long did he own the premises? How much did the United States Government pay him for the site? Every taxpayer in Massachusetts is interested in the answers to these questions."

The answers are that the city of Chicopee owned over a third of the area and that most of the remainder was owned by the Curtis Brick Co. and had been in its hands for over a generation. The price of $10,000, or $500 an acre, was extremely reasonable for land in the center of a city.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

The Federation contends that the manner of awarding the contract for construction of the Riverview Apartments is such as to warrant investigation by a congressional committee.

The matters referred to by the Federation obviously involve a permanent war-housing project—Lucy Mallary Village—and not the Riverview Apartments. After construction bids for this project had been received, with the Walsh Construction Co. as low bidder, it was decided to revise the plans in response to local requests in order to include basements. An effort was made to negotiate this change with the Walsh Construction Co., but its quoted price of $140,000 for the change was considered excessive. The low bid on revised plans, including basements and additional roadwork, amounted to only $68,285 more than the original Walsh bid and showed a saving of $68,715 over the price quoted for the change by the Walsh company.

HOLYOKE, MASS.

The Federation charges that the F. P. H. A. refused to pay the same Walsh company for certain on-site improvements at the Liberty Park project.

This project was originally scheduled for 110 family units. Because of a change in the in-migrant labor need in the locality, the project was cut back to 44 units in course of construction. By that time the contractor had completed about 90 percent of the entire on-site improvements and had been paid in full for all this work. At no time was there any intimation that the contractor would not be paid for the work done prior to the cut-back.

SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS.

The Federation asserts: "In Southbridge the F. P. H. A. spurned an offer of an unused factory for a women's dormitory rent free for the duration and insisted upon paying the owner $15,000 for the building."

The American Optical Co. offered to lease this property at $1 per year with the stipulation that the lessor would have reversionary right in the improved property. Since the improvements required would run between $80,000 and $90,000, it was definitely to the advantage of the Government to reject the offer of lease and to purchase the property.

The federation asserts: "Recently the F. P. H. A. autocratically ordered the Southbridge Authority to reduce rentals for rooms in the dormitory. The authority refused to do so. The members charge that the F. P. H. A. was attempting to subsidize defense workers who occupy the dormitory to the detriment of other workers."

This statement is the exact reverse of the truth. The F. P. H. A. has never clashed with the local authority. It was not the F. P. H. A. but the American Optical Co. which requested that rents in the dormitories be lowered for its trainees. The F. P. H. A. declined to do so in order to avoid competition with private accommodations and because it felt that if the trainees were to be subsidized, this should be done by the employer, not the Government.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.

The federation charges that the F. P. H. A. chose the highest hill in Pittsfield as the site for its Victory Hill project; that Pittsfield officials bitterly opposed the site; that the houses are flimsy cigar boxes representing a waste of the taxpayers' money; that the F. P. H. A. held up payments in lieu of taxes to the municipality because of the city's refusal to maintain the project streets clear of snow; and that the F. P. H. A. thereupon purchased its own snow plows.

The elevation of the Victory Hill site is 1,225 feet; the elevation of the central part of Pittsfield is from 1,000 to 1,100 feet; there are six other hills in Pittsfield higher than the one on which this project was constructed. Commitments for purchase of the site had been made before the project was transferred to the jurisdiction of the F. P. H. A. The F. P. H. A. at that time consulted the Pittsfield defense housing committee, which recommended consideration of another site if no commitments had been made on the Victory Hill site, but stated there was no local opposition to the site previously selected.

The committee also recommended that if the project was to be temporary, demountable units of the type installed be used. These demountable houses were built by a reputable New England firm, experienced in prefabrication; they provide comfortable quarters and should have considerable salvage value after the war.

The F. P. H. A. did not hold up payments in lieu of taxes to the city of Pittsfield because of the city's refusal to accept the streets of the project. Full payments in lieu of taxes were made on the basis of the valuation by the local assessor. Neither did the F. P. H. A. purchase its own snow plows; instead it engaged the same snow plowing contractor employed by the city.

BATH, MAINE

The federation declares that the site of a 400-unit war-housing project should never have been selected.

This project was originally assigned to the Public Buildings Administration which selected the site after a thorough survey of all available sites and test borings. After taking over the project, the F. P. H. A. reinvestigated the site situation and concurred in P. B. A.'s choice. It was virtually impossible to secure a large site in Bath without encountering ledge or other difficult subsoil conditions. The selection of this site was influenced by the availability of water and the construction by the Federal Works Agency of a large trunk sewer which transverses the site.

SOUTH PORTLAND, MAINE

The federation charges that the Red Bank Village project exceeded estimated costs by $1,500,000, that more than $200,000 was spent on extras, that heavy equipment hauled to the site was not used, that surplus materials and tools were purchased and that 14 skill saws were stolen on the project at a cost of $250 each to the Government.

Red Bank Village, built at the urgent request of the Maritime Commission to provide housing for workers at Portland shipyards, was constructed on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract because of the inability to obtain satisfactory bids and the urgent time factor involved. Construction was started in the summer of 1942 and proceeded satisfactorily until serious delays occurred in deliveries of materials and equipment and difficulties were experienced in securing sufficient construction labor. These difficulties—combined with the need for pressing forward with the construction under severe winter conditions and for payment of a large amount of overtime at time-and-a-half pay—raised the final cost of less than $1,000,000 above the original estimate.

This job was in no way typical of F. P. H. A. performance. Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts have been used in less than 10 percent of F. P. H. A. projects and only when conditions precluded obtaining competitive bids. In all of the cost-plus housing contracts, the average over-run, including Red Bank Village, was only 5 percent—and many jobs ran under the estimates. I believe the Red Bank project will show a fair amount of eventual salvage to the Government.

Cost of change orders on the project was $63,000, rather than $200,000 as charged by the federation. All heavy equipment hauled on the site was used and was paid for at rates in accordance with O. P. A. rulings. Materials and equipment were purchased on a normal basis, with the customary margin of safety for breakage, damage, etc. The surplus remaining out of this margin, upon completion of the project, was used by the F. P. H. A. on other projects or sold. A total of 29 skill saws were purchased for use on the project at $119 each (not $250) and were kept under lock and key when not in use. One (not 14) was stolen. The 28 remaining were sold with other surplus material, 13 for $119 each and 15 for $75 each.

The federation asserts that the Long Creek Terrace project at South Portland is only 20 percent occupied and the Mountain View Apartments only 10 percent occupied. Actually Long Creek is approximately 80 percent occupied, the vacancies being in one-bedroom units. Mountain View Apartments are more than 50 percent occupied, with the expectation that the vacant units will be filled as soon as necessary heating changes are completed.

GROTON, CONN.

The federation charges that the Fort Hill project, built to house workers in the Electric Boat Co.'s submarine plant, exceeded estimated cost by about $1,000,000, that the project will never be fully occupied because of poor site development, and that the demountable dwellings "were designed by an Alabama architect who apparently had no conception of New England climate in winter."

The Fort Hill project consists of 1,100 demountable family dwellings on a site of 300 acres, adjoining the property where the high school and town hall of the town of Groton

are located. The final contract cost of site improvements was $1,687,307 against an original estimate of $1,291,030. At present, 976 of the 1,100 units are occupied, with the expectation that the remaining units will be filled in the near future because of increasing employment at the Electric Boat Co. The demountable dwellings in the project are sturdy and well insulated, and have provided comfortable living throughout the winter. These houses were designed and built by three firms of prefabricators: the Bush Lumber Corporation of New York City, the City Lumber Co. of Bridgeport, and the Prebilt Co. of Revere, Mass.

WEYMOUTH, MASS.

The Federation charges that the F. P. H. A. is incurring costs of $50,000 to correct water conditions from underground springs on the project site, which could have been discovered if soil tests had been made.

The actual cost of these corrective measures was $12,500. Test pits had been dug prior to start of construction and indicated little water. However, underground springs were encountered in course of construction.

CONCLUSION

While further recitation could be made of the inaccuracies and distortions contained throughout the Federation's statement, I believe the examples I have cited at this length are sufficiently indicative of the general quality of the Federation's charges.

Moreover, I would like to add that I have complete confidence in the integrity and ability of John Dobbs, regional representative of the National Housing Agency, who was responsible for programming war housing in New England; and Sumner K. Wiley, regional director of the Federal Public Housing Authority, who has carried out the F. P. H. A. program. I am sure, moreover, that both Mr. Dobbs and Mr. Wiley acted in full consultation with the proper community authorities and groups concerned with the war effort.

I do not contend that the F. P. H. A. has been free from mistakes in New England or any other region. However, with recognition of the difficult wartime problems, operating conditions and requirements that have been faced, I believe the F. P. H. A.'s record can stand on its merits before the scrutiny of any fair-minded observers.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT EMMERICH,
Commissioner.

Distinguished Lawyers and Judges Pay Tribute to the Late Judge Edward E. Cushman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the late Federal Judge Edward E. Cushman, who died at Tacoma, Wash., at the age of 78, on January 25, 1944, had endeared himself to the laity and legal profession by reason of his integrity, his scholarship, his kindness, and his ideal family life. Memorial exercises in Judge Cushman's honor were held under the auspices of the Tacoma Bar Association on February 5, 1944. At that time three surviving Federal judges, to wit, the Honorables John C. Bowen, Lloyd L. Black, and Charles H. Leavy, paid eloquent tribute to the character and career of the lately departed luminary of the bench and bar, Edward E. Cushman. It was recalled with affection that the late Judge Edward E. Cushman was a brother of the former Congressman, the distinguished statesman and wit, Frank Cushman. Frank Cushman was one of the very few Members of Congress in a century and a half of American history, who was astoundingly gifted with a profound and infectious natural wit and whose stories are still retold with relish within these ancient walls of the national capital.

Mr. Speaker, I have already inserted in remarks previously made on the floor the eloquent address made by my warm friend, Federal Judge John C. Bowen, at the memorial exercises for Judge Cushman.

I am sure that my colleagues of the House will be pleased to read also the very appropriate remarks made by the Federal Judges Lloyd L. Black and Charles H. Leavy. Particularly, will they be intrigued by Judge Leavy's apt observations, because of their affection for this former colleague of ours who voluntarily quit the House of Representatives for the Federal bench. Here is the speech of Judge—former Congressman—Charles H. Leavy:

Hon. CHARLES H. LEAVY. This court has convened in special session this morning for the purpose of paying a deserved tribute to the memory of a much beloved and a great and distinguished jurist, who presided over it for many years—more than a quarter of a century—and it was in this court room where the major part of his labors were performed. It was here, in this city and in this court room, where he administered justice with an even hand and with rare distinction.

It has been my good fortune, and I consider it a great privilege, not to come as his successor, because that was beyond my capacity and ability, but to follow on the bench over which he presided, and by reason of his excellent work here, I feel that I have been made a little more capable in the discharge of the great responsibility by the fine standard and example that he has set.

Ordinarily, in a session of this kind, the senior district judge would be in charge of a program of this nature, but he has requested, by reason of the fact that this is the court room where Judge Cushman so long and ably labored and over which I now preside, that I open and close these ceremonies.

This exercise is under the jurisdiction of the local bar—a beautiful tribute I think they pay to a former distinguished member of the bar.

The bar of Tacoma has long borne the reputation as being an outstanding bar in the State of Washington, both in learning and in high standard of professional ethics. I cannot help but feel the fine foundation laid for that splendid reputation which they now bear is, in a large measure, due to the great work that the man whose memory we honor today, did among them.

The judges of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington appreciate the action of the supreme court of this State in sending a majority of its members to this service, and I am sure the members of the family of Judge Cushman likewise appreciate that fact.

We are glad, too, to have with us in honor and respect to the memory of this distinguished and departed colleague and jurist, the judges of the superior court of this State.

It is not my intention to dwell at great length in attempting to pay personal tribute to the deceased. I know his work rather than having known the man, but I think that in a world torn by war and everyone deeply engaged in their own affairs, it is a splendid tribute not only to the memory of the deceased, but to the bar and bench, that we pause for a little while to pay a bit of respect to a great man.

The judges of the district court for the district of Oregon have expressed their regret in being unable to attend and sent a telegram to that effect.

I am going to offer and make a part of the record of this court a resolution, which reads as follows:

"Whereas when a distinguished, esteemed, and eminent jurist, long a loyal and faithful public servant of the Nation, has passed to his reward, it is appropriate that those who are the beneficiaries of his noble efforts should pause and pay a tribute of homage and respect to his memory: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That in the death of Edward E. Cushman, an upright citizen and eminent jurist, whose 30 years of unselfish public service as an outstanding member of this court, commanded and received the universal respect and confidence of the bench and bar of this judicial district, as well as that of the entire United States, we have suffered an irreparable and grievous loss; be it further

"*Resolved,* That this resolution be made a permanent record of this court, and a duly authenticated copy be transmitted to his grief-stricken widow and family.

"Done in open court this 5th day of February, 1944.

"JOHN C. BOWEN.
"LLOYD L. BLACK.
"CHARLES H. LEAVY."

I do want, in conclusion, to make this statement, because it exemplifies a full, complete, fine, and beautiful life well lived, I think so well, and it is probably somewhat of a reexpression of a thought all of us have heard so much:

When the summons came to Judge Cushman he went certainly like one who wraps the draperies of his couch about him and lay down to pleasant dreams.

Hereinbelow I am inserting the touching and feeling speech made by my warm friend, Federal Judge Lloyd L. Black.

Hon. LLOYD L. BLACK. Friends of Judge Cushman, all of us agree with the tribute that has been paid to Judge Cushman's memory by the words of Judge Leavy and Judge Bowen, and I am certain that the resolution bespeaks our confidence in him and our honor of him.

Almost 4 years ago the Bar of Pierce County paid a tribute to Judge Cushman in his lifetime. Here on my right, on the wall of this courtroom is that tribute—the picture of Judge Cushman in the room in which he loved to serve so well. It was my privilege at that time, because I then was somewhat in the place of Judge Leavy now, to preside over the ceremony of the Bar Association. Judge Bowen then as senior judge, accorded me that opportunity, as today he has asked Judge Leavy to appropriately conduct this meeting.

The members of the Bar of Pierce County and of others who came from farther places, spoke their words of tribute and confidence to Judge Cushman in his lifetime. I am delighted that that was so. It is a wondrous thing indeed, when one deservedly receives flowers while they live, and the members of the bar of Pierce County can keep in mind forever that on that day they brought flowers to Judge Cushman while he knew about it, and he did deserve those flowers then—the words that were said in affection and esteem, as his memory deserves what has been said, and will be said, this morning.

Judge Cushman's theme of life was devotion to his ideals and to his code, and to his private and his public obligations.

Judge Cushman unfalteringly made every sacrifice that he considered necessary to do the things that he was expected to do. He

felt that his prime object, once he was selected as the United States district judge—that his prime object was to do that work and allow nothing at any time to interfere.

Judge Cushman's private life, his citizenry, his services as a judge, all bespeak the desire he had to do his best. Patience, ability, conscience, integrity, high honor, are the things that accompany him in our memory. He needs no words from me. Judge Cushman's upright private life, his fine and splendid service as a judge, are his enduring eulogies.

Because of the great interests in these memorial exercises I am inserting excerpts from the summary of the exercises approved by the three Federal judges, Bowen, Black, and Leavy:

TRIBUTES TO THE MEMORY OF JUDGE EDWARD E. CUSHMAN

IN MEMORIAM

United States District Judge Edward E. Cushman, retired, died at Tacoma, Wash., his home city, on January 25, 1944, at the age of 78. He was born in Iowa of pioneer stock and, with his brother, Francis W. Cushman, and his widowed mother, settled at Tacoma in 1893.

After several years of successful private and public law practice, Judge Cushman in 1909 became district judge in the Territory of Alaska. In 1912 he was appointed United States district judge for the Western District of Washington, and held that office with great honor and distinction for the remainder of his life.

Memorial exercises in Judge Cushman's honor were held under auspices of the Tacoma Bar Association on February 5, 1944, in the court room where he presided so long. There was gathered a large assemblage of his friends, including judges of the Federal and State courts, Federal and State officials, members of the bar, and other citizens, a number of whom paid high tribute to Judge Cushman's distinguished private and public career.

Judge John S. Robinson, of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, in behalf of the members of that court and as spokesman for five of its members who came from Olympia to attend the memorial services, stated that he was bespeaking the high respect of the State Supreme Court for Judge Cushman, and eulogized Judge Cushman's "tremendous sense of responsibility," his feeling of obligation "to represent the majesty of the courts of the United States" and "his great eagerness to do his work worthily and well, and with great dignity * * *." Those qualities, said Judge Robinson, were among the outstanding characteristics which "produce that great veneration and respect" we all feel for the life and work of Judge Cushman.

Judge Ernest M. Card, of the Washington State Superior Court for Pierce County at Tacoma, in a resolution signed by himself and his three fellow judges, said: "Judge Cushman was a pioneer lawyer in Tacoma. His life has been identified with the development of the great Northwest. He brought to his judicial service a wide experience as a lawyer and as an assistant United States attorney. He was of a studious mind and untiringly devoted all his energies to his judicial duties. The outstanding character of his judicial work was early recognized and he was frequently assigned to other Federal districts for the trial of important cases. * * * On and off the bench he was always calm and considerate of others, and, above all, he was absolutely fair in his decisions."

Mr. Scott Z. Henderson, of the Tacoma Bar, formerly president of the State Bar Association, said of Judge Cushman: "He gave intellectual efforts to the service of his profession. He was an exemplar of manhood, devoted to his family, to his country, and his fellow man. He would appreciate no greater encomium. His life and his work will be revered in the realm of fond memory."

Judge George Donworth, of Seattle, formerly United Sta s district judge for the western district of Washington, who resigned from that bench about the time of Judge Cushman's appointment to it, said of him that: "As a judge he achieved, and throughout his life held, the confidence and respect of his fellow citizens. He did not believe that the law is merely what the judges may from time to time say it is. He believed that there is a law that is greater than the judges and he was zealous to avoid its misapplication merely because the end in view appeared at the moment to be desirable. * * * He was steadfast. The roots of his convictions went deep; they were founded on principles. In his judicial philosophy he satisfied the requirements which Chief Justice Marshall expressed in these words: 'A judge must be perfectly and completely independent with nothing to influence and control him but God and his conscience.' * * * His mind was vigorous and direct, going straight to the mark without aiming at ornament or effect, a common characteristic which distinguished all his deliverances from the bench."

Mr. Charles T. Peterson, of the Tacoma bar, who has been a close friend of Judge Cushman's family for many years, in concluding the memorial exercises, said: "In the tenderer emotions of life, Ed Cushman was as gentle and sympathetic as a child. In the sterner affairs of life, he was rock and steel—a giant crag towering out from the mountainside. His devotion to his family was immeasurable. I rarely visited with him for any length of time that his thoughts did not turn to home, family, and fireside. * * * The gentle breezes which shall be wafted through the branches of the lofty firs which stand like silent sentinels over his tomb, shall never sing requiem over one who filled better than he the full measure of devoted husband and father, loyal friend, and faithful public servant."

The Late Honorable J. Y. Sanders, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week it became my sad duty to announce to this House the death of former Gov. J. Y. Sanders, Sr., of Louisiana, a former Member of this House.

At that time I attempted to pay tribute to the memory of one of Lousiana's most colorful and attractive political figures. Of course, in my limited manner, those remarks and tribute were most inadequate to bring before you the complete appreciation in which Governor Sanders was held by his own people in his native State.

Editorials from the three New Orleans newspapers, which are in my district, have just reached my desk and under leave to extend my own remarks, I direct your attention to them in connection with the passing of former Governor Sanders.

The editorials give you a clear concept of the esteem in which J. Y. Sanders, Sr., was held by his fellow man in the State of his birth.

I suggest you read these tributes to better appreciate a splendid citizen:

[From the New Orleans Item of March 25, 1944]

J. Y. SANDERS

The elder Jared Sanders had been so long retired from active affairs and latterly so completely removed by sickness that many younger Louisianians don't recognize in his death the departure of one of the State's most important public men during the passing generation. He was a politician by instinct, a good lawyer, an exceptionally good speaker, very resourceful, and highly courageous in pursuit of his objects. Yet he failed to achieve his ruling ambition—which was to sit in the United States Senate.

He really attained that object by legislative appointment, but he surrendered the seat in response to a call to apply his talents just then to a Panama exposition for New Orleans. He thought to realize his ambition afterward. In that he was thwarted by the vicissitudes of politics, being narrowly defeated for election to the Senate by the late Edwin Broussard. The whirligig never restored him to a position to recoup; in particular, he was crippled from then on by Huey Long's intrusion. This he fought as long and as hard as his health permitted.

Sanders entered politics young and distinguished himself in the successful fight to abolish the old Louisiana lottery. He advanced steadily through the legislature and the lieutenant governorship to become Governor in 1908. He was then affiliated with the Orleans Regular Organization. The influence of his office and his outstanding talents for organization and leadership, along with his force and vitality, soon made him the head of a country machine of his own. And for quite a time he remained the strongest political personality in the State.

He was among the first to realize the threat which the younger Long presented to other politicians. A sort of professional jealousy made the two enemies, and their feud lasted as long as Sanders' physical powers did. His methods were often hard and sometimes ruthless but he was restrained by certain moral inhibitions of which Long was entirely innocent. There were things he would not do, at which Long never hesitated. This freedom from all such restraints was one of the prime factors accounting for more of Long's progress, in our judgment, than any fabled shrewdness or intellectual qualities that have been attributed to him. Long's loudest gospel was against Sandersism. It was not Sanders' fault that the State was afflicted by something vastly worse—in Longism.

To summarize the good, bad, and indifferent chapters in Sanders' long and hectic career would require a newspaper page. We can refer to only a few. He established the first State highway system—strictly on the pay-as-you-go basis. Long used later to sneer at those roads because they were made of gravel. But later Governors had extended and improved them, and the gravel roads had to be laid as foundations for permanent paving. Sanders contended for the pay-as-you-go plan ever afterward. If it had been followed, we would have as much paving as we now have, but not be encumbered by our crippling bonded debt. Virginia and other States had shown the way.

Back in 1912, The Item, inspired by George Maxwell, an unappreciated genius, was opening its 20-year fight against the ancient and deep-rooted fallacy of levees only for flood control, in favor of the spillway control which is now exemplified at Bonnet Carre, with

New Orleans safe in consequence. Every other newspaper in hundreds of miles fought the new notion as silly heresy, along with the levee boards and other politicos who kept fat on levees only. The few who joined us at first were bracketed by the old false prophets as eccentrics, crackpots, or cranks. Sanders was one of the first public men of large size to line up with us.

It was a queer coincidence that John M. Parker, with whom Sanders was almost always at loggerheads, joined us at the same time. Truth has prevailed, nature has taken its course, and New Orleans is safer from the river than it ever was before.

Governor Sanders, by the way, also organized the State conservation and set it well on its course.

There were other such incidents in Sanders' career. We wish we could recount also some of his personal characteristics. They were a rich mine for humorous recollection. Jared worked hard, fought hard, but had a sad finish in years of bedridden helplessness. He leaves a large balance of good in his account with his people.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of March 24, 1944]

J. Y. SANDERS, SR.

Ex-Governor J. Y. Sanders, who died Thursday night in Baton Rouge at the age of 75, was a notable figure in Louisiana's political life for something like a half century. Elected to the legislature from St. Mary Parish in 1892, he was chosen speaker of the house in 1900, Lieutenant Governor in 1904, and Governor in 1908. Thereafter he served two terms in Congress as Representative from the Sixth District—later to be represented by his son, J. Y. Sanders, Jr.

That impressive array of public offices held over a 30-year period attests Mr. Sanders' uncommon political abilities. He had the gift of winning and holding friends, but the very qualities which made him a forceful leader raised up enemies, too. He figured in some of the most spectacular political controversies of his time and in or out of office was a factor to be reckoned with in State campaigns until age and declining health forced him to the sidelines.

One office to which he aspired—that of United States Senator—repeatedly eluded him, though the legislature named him, on Senator McEnery's death in 1910, for the latter's unexpired term. He declined the place, electing to serve out his term as Governor—only to be defeated in two later tries for nomination in senatorial primaries.

Governor Sanders was a pioneer in Louisiana's good roads movement. He served in two constitutional conventions. An able lawyer and an eloquent speaker, he was influential in Louisiana's public affairs over a long period, marked, as we have noted, by bitter political struggles in which he usually took an active part. The feeling aroused by these conflicts tends to color present-day appraisals of his public service. But many loyal friends acclaim him one of Louisiana's most distinguished public servants, and all Louisianians will remember him as one of the outstanding political leaders of his time.

[From the New Orleans States of March 24, 1944]

J. Y. SANDERS, SR.

In the death of J. Y. Sanders, Sr., Louisiana loses one of its most forceful as well as useful political leaders. This man had been in public life for more than 50 years. He was first elected to the Louisiana Legislature in 1892. Since that time he had been speaker of the house, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and Congressman.

He was a fighter for those things he believed to be right from the time he entered public life. He began his career battling to expel the lottery from Louisiana and was incessantly the center of political controversy. More often than not, he was right, standing for decency and honesty in government. While a member of the constitutional convention, he worked for and originated the present suffrage features of the Louisiana Constitution.

Mr. Sanders was an ardent advocate of good roads and formulated a gravel highway system when good roads were a luxury. He was one of the first public servants in the United States to realize the necessity for improved highways. His gravel system was later improved by John M. Parker, who pioneered in paved highways. Both of these men believed in the pay-as-you-go system of financing. Governor Sanders bitterly opposed throwing Louisiana into debt by bond issues, which method was adopted in later years.

Governor Sanders turned down a seat in United States Senate to aid Louisiana's unsuccessful fight to bring the 1915 Panama Exposition to New Orleans. He did this at the urging of New Orleans citizens of all classses He had been elected to the Senate by the legislature. It would have been the culmination of his greatest ambition, but in order to help his State and New Orleans in particular, he remained as Governor and led the fight to secure the exposition.

In turning down the Senate seat, Governor Sanders said:

"It long has been an ambition of mine to occupy a seat in that great deliberative body (the Senate) but no man's ambition and no personal predilections should govern in a matter of this kind.

"The exposition means more to the people of Louisiana than anything else, and, if I can better serve the cause by remaining Governor, I stand ready and willing to forego the election to the United States Senate and devote my energy to this movement as Governor."

So vigorous a fight did Mr. Sanders make that New Orleans was conceded an edge in the battle, but San Francisco pledged $12,500,000 and New Orleans could not match it and lost the exposition. He later ran for the Senate but was defeated by the late Senator Edwin S. Broussard by a very narrow margin.

Governor Sanders was always an opponent of the Huey P. Long machine and lived to see the day that its successor was crushed by the election of Sam Jones as Governor and later by the victory of Jimmie Davis.

Governor Sanders never relinquished his interest in public affairs. He was the author and the proponent of many measures that have made for the betterment of Louisiana. He started life as a poor boy and worked to support a mother who had been left with eight children. By his own efforts, he graduated in law and became one of the outstanding members of the Louisiana bar. He was one of the best orators in the South, as well as one of the clearest thinkers and hardest fighters. He had a national reputation, both as a lawyer and as a Congressman. No man in Louisiana was more greatly loved or more violently opposed than Governor Sanders. His friends swore by him and his opponents swore at him. He was a pleasing companion, a great story teller and entertainer.

Altogether, the life of Governor Sanders was a useful one for his State and his country. When the final record is made, his name will stand high in the list of the great citizens of this State.

To his splendid son, J. Y. Sanders, Jr., to his widow, his relatives, and those close to him, this newspaper expresses its condolences, and it knows that in this it is joined by the people of this State and this country.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Winchell will be scent to the Dies committee.

If Wendell supports the Republican ticket this fall, then the moon is full of green cheese.

A train of soldiers going east and a train of sailors going west stopped in Emporia. One said to the other, "Where is Hitler?"

Tully Bukey, of Roxbury, one of the last of the first party workers living, mourned and moaned at the fourth district convention because "there are no more Penroses." Tully cannot see the forest for the trees.

At the Emporia meeting, Chief Haucke returned to Irvin Platt a necktie the latter failed to pick up in a hotel room a year ago—which all goes to prove that there is honor even among politicians.

It is patent to anyone who follows Winchell closely that he always has at hand the Roosevelt family incidents of the past week, and airs them on Sunday evening as though they were copyrighted.

As I sat with the second district delegates at Ottawa, my memory went back to the convention that named Justin Dewitt Bowersock to Congress in 1898. Cy Leland and Curly Harrison sat in the gallery planning the ground operations.

Speaking of Ottawa, 3 years before 1898, I recall J. L. Bristow riding in an open hack with Maj. and Mrs. William McKinley to attend chautauqua. A month ago the Senator was alert and happy on his Virginia plantation.

"I will not tell you exactly how all the problems of mankind in war and peace are going to be solved. * * * I thank you for all the kindness with which you have treated me in spite of my many shortcomings."—Churchill, not Roosevelt.

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Day We Celebrate," delivered by me at the Clover Club banquet in Boston, on March 11, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

To many of us, who have seen other days, there is a tinge of regret in connection with present-day celebrations of The Day We Celebrate. One who has witnessed, as I have, these celebrations during the years when the participants were the first and second generations of Irish-Americans, notes the absence of the deep emotions that were inherent in those earlier anniversaries. The celebrations to which I refer were characterized by outbursts of real Irish enthusiasm and were the annual occasion for publicly recalling not only one's pride in the race and its accomplishments, but the personal link of attachment to and personal memories of the old land that passing time has considerably weakened.

I can readily recall the days of my youth when practically ever city or town in New England had its religious services, its parade, and its musical and oratorical exercises on St. Patrick's Day. I witnessed, year after year, halls crowded to the doors, with men and women of the first generation of Irish immigrants and their children, deeply moved as they listened in rapture to the music of their fatherland and as they heard retold the struggle of the race through the long, dreary winters while watching and praying for the springtime that never came. I have seen vast audiences moved to tears as they recalled the sufferings, hardships, trials, and tribulations of the race.

Among the leaders of the race during these years, aside from the clergy, were a coterie of prominent lay leaders among whom were Patrick Donahue, T. B. Fitzpatrick, John Boyle O'Reilly, Thomas Gargan, Patrick A. Collins, and hundreds of other talented Irish-Americans who occupied civic positions of trust and responsibility in the seventies and eighties.

St. Patrick's Day awakened in the Irish not only their racial pride, but also aroused a real sense of loneliness. There is no grief so poignant, that crushes the human heart like lonesomeness. It is one of the most grim and harrowing pains to bear—the long, lonely vigils of mothers, wives, and loved ones for those who are absent fighting for the country. It is being borne in silence and with patriotic resignation in every home in America today where there is an absent son in the armed forces. The song I will now recite portrays touchingly the lonesomeness of the Irish mother parted from her emigrant son:

DANNY BOY

Oh, Danny Boy, the pipes, the pipes are calling—
From glen to glen, and down the mountain side,
The summer's gone, and all the roses falling—
It's you, it's you must go, and I must bide.

But come ye back when summer's in the meadow,
Or when the valley's hushed and white with snow,
It's I'll be here in sunshine or in shadow,
Oh, Danny Boy, Oh, Danny Boy, I love you so.

But when ye come, and all the flow'rs are dying,
If I am dead, as dead I well may be,
Ye'll come and find the place where I am lying,
And kneel and say an Ave there for me;

And I shall hear, though soft you tread above me,
And all my grave will warmer, sweeter be,
For you will bend and tell me that you love me,
And I shall sleep until you come to me.

I will not attempt tonight to unfold the long historic story that has made March 17 so dear to the Irish people. It has been said that the history of Ireland is a drama of seven acts, every act a century and every scene a tragedy. We would like to forget it—the story of woe, want, poverty, and enslavement. If the world would understand the progress of the race, the qualities that have made the men and women of Irish blood what they are and what their contribution to human welfare has been, the past could not be obliterated. It is the qualities that have been molded and fashioned through the tears, sweat and blood, famine and privation that have largely contributed to the sturdy character of the race. That the race endured and survived is one of the miracles of the ages; and the fact that in spite of its almost extermination, her exiled children have reached commanding positions throughout the world today, is indicative of the courage and indomitable perservance of the race and its capacity to suffer and sacrifice for spiritual and democratic ideals.

Therefore, on this, the day we celebrate, we pay tribute to the men and women who have won for us the qualities of heart and mind and soul, that have made our existence and our position of influence in the world possible—the saints, the scholars, the impoverished men and women, who, while enduring forced illiteracy, were denied the opportunity to worship God, to possess a home and to breathe the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We all hope and seek for world peace, but let those who indulge in theories of world peace through instruments of force, find in the history of Ireland the absolute futility of such a policy. The Irish people, deprived of arms by her oppressors, has fought her fight for centuries with brains and her challenge to the world was made almost alone by voice and pen. The patriots that led the Irish people in their aspirations have demonstrated to the world that the sons of a race dedicated to freedom can be brilliant on the platform as they can be brave upon the field. There is not one of her noble sons who fought her battle with voice and pen during her long struggle who did not stand in constant danger of physical violence. No need to mention by name—the roll is too long—those who faced throughout their lives storms of hate, and at one time or another nearly every one of them were marked for murder. Some of them spent years in the gloomy confines of dungeons. Others were sentenced to be hanged; others lived daily within the shadow of the assassin's dagger.

Tonight in particular, I want to recall and pay tribute to the Irish exiles who came to America in such large numbers during the famine days of the middle of the last century. Between 1848 and 1850, 250,000 Irish families were evicted, and between these years 750,000 were killed with famine, and 1,250,000 Irish souls were sent, exiles, from their native land.

How shall I describe those exiles that America lifted from the valley of their Gethsemane to illuminated heights so that all the world could see and understand the genius of the Irish race?

How shall I describe those exiles?

"He was born in a land which no longer was his,
He toiled for a landlord whose face he never saw,
In the midst of plenty, his children ate the bread of poverty."

Hearing of a land across the sea where they and their children might find an opportunity to live in freedom, thither they came bearing within their breasts "the deep, unutterable woe which none save exiles feel."

Irish-Americans have many reasons to love America. We should love her not merely because she has been a beacon light of hope and opportunity to mankind everywhere, but especially because she gave welcome and innumerable opportunities to our emigrant ancestors when there was nothing for them to live for in the land of their birth except starvation and death. What did they bring with them to America? John Boyle O'Reilly has given the answer:

"No treason we bring from Erin—nor bring we shame nor guilt.
The sword we hold may be broken, but we have not dropped the hilt.
But the hearts we bring for freedom are washed in the surge of tears,
And we claim our right by a people's fight outliving a thousand years.

"Oh, willing hands to toil;
Strong natures tuned to the harvest song and bound to the kindly soil;
Bold pioneers for the wilderness, defenders in the field—
The sons of a race of soldiers who never learned to yield."

With no name that gave them place or prestige, into the lowliest and humblest walks of life they entered. Their heartstrings throbbing with the grief of a sensitive race, they toiled unceasingly, established homes, built churches, and made tremendous sacrifices to give their children the education, civic and religious, denied themselves.

Well they knew that no race could be an influence in contributing to the progress and welfare of the human family unless they produced, trained and educated courageous men and women to fight for the preservation of those rights and privileges that America generously gave them and which were denied mankind in nearly every other part of the world.

In one generation, these exiled emigrants sent into the professions, into the schoolrooms, into the commercial, public, and religious life of America their sons and daughters who from that day to this have made and are continuing to make a strong, powerful and patriotic contribution to American life.

Be it never forgotten, the bones of the children of these exiles are on every battlefield of the Republic; their names are written into its history with their sweat and their blood; their loyalty and their honor are incontestable.

What shall I say of the Irish exiled women? The contribution by the women of the Irish race is one of the most glorious pages in Irish history. I have seen in my own day thousands of Irish-American youths whose higher education has been made possible only by the toil of their Irish mothers and sisters over the machines of the cotton mills of New England. The bent backs and gnarled fingers that I have witnessed as a youth at the mill gates of New England are silent testimonials of the undying devotion of the Irish women to their homes and loved ones. Yes; it was largely the contribution made by the Irish exiled mothers throughout every section of America that opened the way, made the opportunity, and gave the inspiration by which their sons and daughters have since risen from poverty and misery to a position so commanding that it would seem almost inconceivable. Fitting it is that on this, the day we celebrate, we pay a loving tribute to those ancestors of ours who were the pioneers in opening up the trials that have led to our present position in American life.

There are two priceless heritages that our ancestors brought to America in their empty hands which we must cherish and preserve at any cost. We shall be unworthy of the inheritance of our forebears unless we expand and improve what has been bequeathed to us. The first is the gift of religion. This was their first consolation;

their strength and their discipline. In every avenue of their life, their labors, their hopes, their duties, and their enjoyments, their religion encouraged and consoled them. When all else was lost, the Irish clung to and preserved their reverence for and their worship of the Supreme Being. Their gifts to us and to the New World were spiritual rather than material. The Irish people were a deeply religious people, not only the Irish Catholic, but the Irish Presbyterian and the Irish Episcopalian. The spiritual aspirations and the religious fervor of the race which sprung from its poverty and sufferings must never be lost.

Next to their love of and explicit trust in the Supreme Being was their unyielding devotion to freedom, their unshaken confidence in democratic institutions, and their hatred of the class caste and often tyrannical aristocratic governments of the Old World. They developed a hatred for tyranny that permeated every fiber of their being.

There never has been a blow struck in the cause of liberty or in behalf of human rights throughout the world that was not strengthened by Irish valor and sacrifice. A people who have furnished so many defenders of faith, justice, and liberty can never support intolerance or persecution.

To anyone who knows the history of Ireland, it is not difficult to understand the caution with which the people of Irish blood approach the consideration of any world-wide proposals that would maintain the status quo or the territorial domination of subject peoples by the use of force. The suffering and injustice caused by the policing of Ireland by an alien government for a thousand years is too recent to lead the men and women of the race to view with enthusiasm any plan for a combination of nations that would impose upon small nations, like Poland, Lithuania, Finland, and other small nations, the preservation and protection of the rights of an imperialistic nation.

The inalienable rights that our American founders proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence have no more devoted or loyal supporters than the men and women of the Irish race. Their deep sense of national justice has led them to cherish the institutions of this Republic not one iota less than their religious sanctuaries, and to fear communism as the most dangerous movement in our day to destroy free democratic institutions and traditions.

Let us preserve in this land of plenty these two precious heritages, these two most consoling and beneficent influences in the progress of mankind—religion and freedom.

Post-War Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, within the past 2 weeks the Canadian Government has announced its plan for meeting the complex problems of post-war international aviation. During the third week of March an international conference of British, Russian, Canadian, and United States aviation experts was scheduled to be held in Washington. The meeting did not take place. Meanwhile, the future of post-war aviation in the United States, the world's leading air power, has been entrusted to men whose knowledge of aviation is academic.

Our Government only a few weeks ago named Joseph Clark Grew, formerly our Ambassador to Japan, to hold the United States delegation to conferences which may take place in the near future. Our State Department has a series of reports prepared for it by members of its staff. But the vital importance of air transport in the world today, and the equally large role which it must inevitably play in the post-war era, is being substantially ignored by the failure of our Nation to give aviation the recognition it deserves.

Our aviation industry has turned out the biggest and best planes in use today. By the time the war is over, we shall have the machinery for producing planes and the personnel to man them on a scale undreamed of 10 years ago. But we shall not command the prestige to which our productive capacity entitled us if we do not use the outstanding aviation leadership which we have also produced to head our aviation department. Our Navy would not permit itself to be represented at an international conference by men without intensive naval experience. Neither should aviation be represented in such a way. Our Government is surely destined eventually to set up a separate cabinet position for aviation. The time to do that is now.

Preservation of Historic Sites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the ravages of war in Europe have destroyed, perhaps forever, some of the most treasured historical edifices of all time. It is to be hoped, however, that after hostilities have ceased some of these shrines, such as the Benedictine Monastery, on the hills outside pulverized Cassino, will be restored. It will not have been the first time that this monastery was destroyed and restored, and perhaps it will not be the last. This is a tribute to those people who have refused to allow a permanent death to even things of brick and mortar.

Following World War No. 1 many historical buildings and churches of France, Belgium, and Germany which had been razed by the implements of war were restored to their former glory and beauty by the machines of peace.

Such has been the epilog to all wars.

We in this country have been more fortunate. With rare exceptions, our historical buildings, monuments, and shrines have been spared the rapier and the torch of warring elements.

The White House, it is true, was once burned by the British, but it was not long before the present imposing structure rose out of those ashes.

The ravishes of time, however, have not dealt as kindly as the onslaught of war. Of course, this country is not as steeped in the tradition of Europe insofar as its buildings and structures are concerned. A country so young by comparison could not possibly be as covered by age-old structures. There have been, however, many historical buildings and sites, dear to the heart and soul of America and Americans, which have been blotted from the picture of today which should be restored.

In this time of war and destruction, when we are talking about post-war plans and building, we should take full cognizance of the importance of restoring and maintaining historical shrines in this country.

There is going to be a great public-works program, sponsored and financed by our Government, following the ceasing of hostilities. There is no doubt about that. The Government, of necessity, must contribute its share to prevent a recurrence of the depression which followed the lush days of the last war. The Government, however, must make plans which will also prevent veterans selling apples on street corners and otherwise unemployed citizens listlessly cutting down weeds in ditches in return for a Government hand-out of subsistence.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this post-war planning, the Government should be able to come forward with a plan of permanent construction and continued life. It is just as easy to make a substantial, lasting plan as it is to make a momentary wisp-of-the-wind plan for the moment with no lasting benefits.

I am in favor, first, of a Nation-wide roads and highway program supported proportionately by Federal, State, and municipal funds. Such a program would be not only permanent but beneficial to the entire country. Those participating in such a building program would have the satisfaction of seeing the permanent effect of their handiwork and the full realization of the knowledge that they had contributed to the advancement of the Government which had allowed them the opportunity of contributing.

There would be no feeling of the emptiness which followed after the last apple from the basket was sold or the last blade of grass was cut.

If Government funds must be spent, let them be spent in a direction which will redound not only to the good of the individual but to the good of the Government itself.

Second only to the far-flung good roads and great highways to be constructed by the States and cities with the help of the Federal Government in the post-war period, Mr. Speaker, I suggest a great building program which would include not only the construction of public buildings, Federal, State, and municipal, but also the restoration, as far as possible, of shrines and buildings of great historical value.

The Rockefellers set a pattern for us to follow when they restored Williamsburg, which I am sure many Members of this House have visited. Except for the private enterprise and initiative of the

Rockefellers, this cradle of American liberty would have been lost forever to America. As a result of the efforts of the Rockefellers, we can walk among the buildings where the eloquence of Patrick Henry rang out and where was first planted the seeds of American freedom.

If private initiative and industry can accomplish these things through purely patriotic motives, why cannot the peoples of all sections of the country be moved to similar accomplishment under Government sponsorship in the post-war plans?

There is no doubt in my mind that the peoples of some of the smallest communities in this Nation would like to do their share in such a program. There is hardly a community in the broad expanse of America today which does not hold some building or some shrine close to its heart.

Preserving buildings and shrines of a historical nature is not entirely new to the Government, but it has been done in only too few instances. For the better part the initiative has been taken by the interested individual or groups of individuals, but, unfortunately, the necessary funds have not always been available and many worthy enterprises have fallen by the wayside. Individuals, not the Government, have saved and preserved Mount Vernon.

Government funds could not be expended in a more worthy manner following this war than in restoring and preserving those shrines, buildings, and sites so dear to the heart of America and the American people.

I am proud of the people of New Orleans and Louisiana for the manner in which they have attempted, in their own way, to preserve some of our more historic shrines. Individuals have preserved the home of the famous Confederate General Beauregard. The city of New Orleans has purchased and restored the Napoleon House, built as a retreat for the Little Corporal in what was supposed to have been his deliverance from St. Helena.

There are many other historical sites in New Orleans, which, similar to many other American cities, have been preserved because of the pride and devotion of the people in the community.

As a post-war plan, however, the restoration and preservation of such places throughout the Nation is almost limitless, and at the same time beneficial to the Nation as a whole. As a specific example of what could be accomplished under such a plan, I direct your attention to the reconstruction of the glorious French Opera House in New Orleans.

This building, probably one of the most famous in all America, was destroyed by fire. Grand opera in America was given birth in this building yet the present generation only knows of the edifice from history. A vacant lot sprawls in the French quarter where once stood the gallant French Opera House.

There has been agitation for many years to rebuild the French Opera House but nothing tangible was done until one of New Orleans' leading civic-minded citizens, Walter Loubat, called a group of citizens together and made definite plans for the future. Walter Loubat, Mr. Speaker, deserves the gratitude and thanks, not only of the citizens of New Orleans but of the music-loving people of all America for what he has done in the interest of restoring the French Opera House in New Orleans.

Organizing the New Orleans Opera House Association for the sole purpose of one day seeing the old French Opera House rise again from the ground, Walter Loubat and his splendid group around him, are indeed headed in the right direction. Theirs is a nonprofit organization. They conduct a civic opera in the great City Park Stadium of New Orleans not for profit to themselves but for the profit of the entire community and with the objective being the raising of funds to reconstruct the French Opera House.

But they need help. Others throughout the Nation working for similar purposes will also need help. After this war the Government should, in its post-war program, help not only these folks of New Orleans, but the people of any community anywhere in America who are in a like position and who are equally desirous of restoring American shrines for future generations.

The people of each community are anxious to assist in such a plan. They will have a personal interest and a personal pride in the knowledge that they are assisting their Government in building permanently for the future generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I have not attempted to discuss this plan which I offer in detail. I have merely thrown out a few thoughts in the hope that they will cause others to think. If spend our money we must, then let us spend it in something tangible and constructive. Let us not have a repetition of the apple-selling, grass-cutting era which benefited neither Government nor citizen.

In New Orleans, Mr. Speaker, we feel very keenly about such a program. I am sure such a feeling generates throughout America where local people are filled with local pride.

We in New Orleans want to help. We want to assist in building a post-war America.

The rebuilding of the French Opera House would be a step in the right direction. Of course, the French Opera House is dear to our hearts. There are other such structures throughout America, Mr. Speaker, just as dear to the hearts of those people who dwell in the respective communities, but we of New Orleans know the French Opera House best.

We feel, however, that the French Opera House of New Orleans belongs not only to New Orleans, but to America as well.

I have asked Edward Alexander Parsons, president of the Louisiana Historical Society and executive vice president of the New Orleans Opera House Association, to write a memorandum of the old French Opera House of New Orleans, in order to bring to the attention of the Members of this body the great historical value of this building. Mr. Parsons is undoubtedly one of Louisiana's most informed citizens.

Mr. Parsons has contributed a most excellent paper on the subject, which I submit to you for your perusal:

The historic music of New Orleans has always been the opera.

New Orleans, founded in 1717, and Louisiana—Province, Territory, and State—have the unique position among all the cities and States of the New World in having experienced complete French and Spanish regimes, and Anglo-Saxon (Florida Parishes) and American dominations. It was an act of audacious genius for the French to found, in the crescent of the Mississippi, at the gateway of the world's greatest valley, a city that was destined to be the southern outpost of these United States. From the beginning, the settlers clung to the river's lip with great tenacity, overcame the almost insurmountable difficulties of the times and place—of floods, fever, wars, and penalties of war—ever building the stones of the beginning of the metropolis of the South.

France ruled de jure to 1763, de facto to 1769; Spain until 1803; then Napoleon had 20 days of sovereignty; and finally the wisdom of Jefferson, through the Louisiana Purchase, made of these United States a world power.

Amid these historic backgrounds, New Orleans was born, and grew through the years. Her original genius was Latin. In spite of her vast economic development and modern industrial progress, she still keeps alive the flame of Latin culture and civilization in our country, and in this performs an important service for the Nation.

As you walk in the devious streets of Boston, true Athens of America, you think of old London; so, as you walk the straight streets of the Vieux Carre (the original old French-Spanish city) in New Orleans, you see vistas of old Paris.

In this old original city of New Orleans (the Vieux Carre, literally the "old square," so-called, I assume, like Roma Quadrata because it was not a square, but a rectangle), there grew, after the hard beginnings of discovery, settlement, and frontier existence, a colonial intellectual life, rich in all the color and the romance of the Latin spirit. We know little of this in America because, unfortunately, it spoke in a different tongue, and with our Anglo-American self-sufficiency, we missed its finer import.

Poetry, oratory, and the intellectual arts were cultivated. Lovers of beauty, they affected the drama; writers of poetry, they sang not only in their hearts and minds, but vocally to their friends and neighbors in concerto, and what more natural, then, that the music drama, the lyric drama, in which the musician goes one step further than the dramatist who has his characters speak in verse, whilst the musician has his express their life in song, all this readily appealed to a gay and brilliant people, carnival-minded, with music in their hearts, and a perennial zest of life.

And so opera naturally came early to the joyous Latin city near the mouth of the great river. Thus opera came originally to New Orleans, not as an exotic form of art for the tired businessman, but as a natural, reasonable, and poetic musical expression of the ideal life of the people.

How true this is, we may easily learn in remembering the history of man wayfaring throughout the ages. The Greek created beauty. Out of the dithyramb sung around the altar of Dionysius, out of the chorus of ancient classical Greek tragedy, the germ of opera was born. Indeed, it was a little group of scholars and musicians at Florence, during the Renaissance, who, trying to rediscover this lost art of musical song, which, it is true, they failed to do, but out of their labors grew the magical beauties of the lyric

opera—the wonders of Bizet, Verdi, and Wagner. So, curiously we may comment, in this same age of the Renaissance, Columbus, who sought to discover a new way to the Indies, failed, but discovered America instead.

And so out of Italy into France and the rest of Europe, the spirit of opera journeyed, and the great musical dramas of modern times have entertained and added to the cultural growth of not only Latins, but to that of all men of good will everywhere.

One might ask, why this thesis in favor of opera? Of music? Why not?

Remember, the greatest singer of our race, the poet of England and America, who had not a drop of Latin blood, reminds us:

"The man that hath no music in himself,
Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treasons, strategems, and spoils;
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus:
Let no such man be trusted. Mark the music."

—*The Merchant of Venice.*

And so joyously opera was received in New Orleans.

We believe that late in the eighteenth century solos, concerts, and scenes or sketches from opera were given in the solons or parlors of private homes, and in improvised halls, and even tents, in public. We know that as early as 1791 a troupe of players from Paris gave comedies in New Orleans; in 1791 appears the first theater, Le Theatre St. Pierre; on January 30, 1808, opened the new Theatre St. Phillippe; and on November 30, 1809, the handsome Theatre d'Orleans, which latter house is so intimately connected with the traditions of the opera in New Orleans.

The first operatic company in the United States was supported in New Orleans. Regular opera was given here at least from 1809. However, it is from 1837 to 1919 that the stream of operatic history flows; from 1837, when Mlle. Julia Calve sang, to the fateful December 1919, when the famous French Opera House burned.

On the pages of the Book of Opera in New Orleans during nearly a century may be found the inspiring story of the efforts of intellectual and musical-minded citizens organizing and bringing from Paris and other musical centers of Europe, groups of distinguished artists, including all the great singers of the times. Every grand opera of the period was rendered during this time, and many unusual and little-known works were presented. Not only grand opera, but the opera comique and opera bouffe were fully represented.

To name the great artists who have appeared in New Orleans during the period would be to copy the roster of the greatest singers of these years. Any commercial book on opera will give the dates of New Orleans presentations.

Many American premieres stand to the credit of New Orleans: Les Huguenots (Myerbeer), 1839; Lucia di Lammermoor (Donezetti) 1841; L'Elisir d'Amore (Donezetti), 1842; La Favorita (Donezetti), 1843; Lucrezia Borgia (Donezetti), 1844; Le Prophete (Myerbeer), 1850; Mireille (Gounod), 1885; Queen of Sheba (Gounod) 1889; Le Roi d'Ys (Lalo), 1890; Herodiade (Massenet), 1892; Samson and Delilah (Saint-Saens), 1893; etc.

The French opera house which burned in 1919 was among the very few first opera houses of the world. Its interior was a masterpiece of theatrical architecture, with very few rivals in symmetrical beauty. Its acoustics were second to no theater. The architect was James Gallier. It was built by Gallier & Esterbrook in the incredible time of 233 days, working day and night, at a cost of $118,500. It was finished November 28, 1859, and opened with William Tell on December 1, 1859.

This New Orleans Opera House was the civic, social, and artistic center of her people. Here, not only opera and drama were performed, but Presidents of the United States and distinguished men and women from America and the world have been received and have appeared. The opera house is a vital part of cultural New Orleans. Its rebuilding is not only a civic, but a national necessity.

If New Orleans is to continue her role of receiving within her gates our friends and neighbors of Central and South America, then it is imperative that this great monument of her culture, her temple of song, so dear to the hearts and minds of the Latin peoples, should be restored through a national post-war project.

The time has come when we Americans of these United States, in taking our great place among the nations of the world, must consider and support the finer things of civilization and culture, as well as our unrivalled economic and industrial supremacy.

"All passes; Art alone
Enduring stays to us:
The bust outlasts the throne,
The coin, Tiberius."

—*Austin Dobson.*

Cost-Plus Contracts

REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, one of the glaring faults in our economic system today is the continuation of the cost-plus system of contracts let by the Government. This system is not only extremely wasteful but it has also caused a great deal of the trouble connected with the so-called manpower shortage in various parts of the country. It has been responsible for hoarding labor which could have been used more directly in the war effort elsewhere. It has created inefficiency by releasing management from responsibility as to production or pay-roll costs. It has added to the possibility of inflation, and it has also, in too many instances, created a doubtful value of money in the minds of those actually doing the work.

The responsibility for the cost-plus type of contract rests squarely with the Government of the United States, not with the employers or the employees as such. Cost-plus means that the percentage of profit is figured on over-all costs of production. Under this system industry is under no pressure to hold costs down or to employ only such labor as it can use efficiently. The larger the pay roll the larger the "costs" and also the larger the gross profit.

We should have been educated to the results of the cost-plus system because of our knowledge of its use during the First World War. However, that was not the case, and while something of this sort may have been necessary in the first part of the present World War certainly the need for its continuation should be almost completely done away with by now.

With our production up, with stock piles being created in formerly scarce materials, and with plants being shut down, there surely must be a way to end this wasteful system and restore our economic system to a more secure foundation. Whatever needs may have existed for the cost-plus system should certainly have been overcome by now.

I am happy to note, on the basis of information given to me by the W. P. B., and the War and Navy Departments, that they realize the dangers inherent in such a system and are doing their utmost to convert cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to fixed-price contracts wherever possible. The sooner the cost-plus system is done away with, the better it will be for the country as a whole.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It has been my impression that we were not at the present time using any of the strictly, so-called cost-plus contracts, but instead all of the contracts of that nature during this war have been cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract. In other words, the fee was not at all dependent upon the total cost of the contract, but the fee was fixed regardless of what the cost might be.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker. if the gentleman will allow me to continue and will read some of the material that I am going to put in the RECORD, I think the situation he calls to our attention will be fully answered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the gentleman from Montana that I will read it with great interest.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's opinion also there is considerable waste of manpower as a result of the cost-plus arrangement?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is my opinion, and I thank the gentleman for emphasizing one of the dangers in this wasteful system.

JANUARY 13, 1944.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been receiving correspondence from my State relative to the cost-plus situation on the Pacific coast. I am very much interested in this matter because of the costs of these projects and the evident waste connected with them. I should like to know if it is now the policy of the Army to continue letting contracts on a cost-plus basis or if a change in the situation has brought about the elimination of this wasteful type of spending.

Because of the fact that cost-plus contracts are purely governmental contracts and also because the tremendous cost has to be borne eventually by the taxpayers, I am very much interested in having a definite statement as to how many of this type of contract are still in operation and what the policy of your Department will be in such matters in the future. Personally, I think the cost-plus system is responsible for a depressing

effect on our economy, especially in relation to areas located close by.

I would appreciate in detail all the information available on this particularly important subject.

Thanking you and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Reference is made to your letter of January 13, 1944, requesting information as to the use by the War Department of contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis and as to present War Department policy on the subject.

The War Department policy, ever since it was first authorized in 1940 to make cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, has been to limit the use of this type of contract to those cases where such use was absolutely necessary. This policy, which is still in force, was adopted in recognition of the fact that this type of contract does not provide direct financial incentive to the contractor to control costs and that it requires considerable manpower for auditing and administration.

Our wartime methods of contracting necessarily must be adapted primarily to obtaining needed munitions, equipment, and services in the quantity, of the quality, and at the times required. The fixed-price contract generally is the best instrument for doing this efficiently and accordingly the War Department has sought to use fixed price contracts werever feasible and has developed modified forms of such contracts to adapt them to the abnormal conditions of war procurement. Examples of such modifications are (1) the arrangements for fixing tentative original prices and adjusting this price after part performance, adopted soon after the war started; and (2) the use of periodic price adjustment articles, adopted in January 1943 to provide a method of relieving contractors from making commitments too far ahead while preserving incentive for reductions in cost during each period.

The fixed-price contract is not suited to all the conditions and problems of war production. Under certain circumstances the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract is the most feasible alternative, as for example, in the case of developmental or experimental contracts, contracts where plans and specifications are not complete or final when the contract is executed and contracts where the item to be manufactured is completely new. In other cases, the contractor may lack previous production and cost experience on which to base his fixed price. Frequently, too, insufficient capital overexpanded volume of business, fears of termination losses or other reasons may make the contractor unwilling to assume the risk of loss under a fixed-price contract. Of necessity, certain types of combat equipment are subject to reduction, changes in specifications, and to rapid variations in the quantity or rate of production, as strategic needs shift. In many such instances the contractor cannot make a fixed-price contract at all or can do so only at a price which includes allowances for contingencies so large as to remove many of the advantages of a fixed-price contract. In these cases where fixed-price contracts on a sound basis cannot readily be made, the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or some other method of protecting the contractor against loss is essential to war procurement.

Despite their inherent defects, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts are not necessarily inefficient instruments of procurement. The War Department at all times has endeavored to maintain standards of efficient performance under these contracts. To this end it has adopted administrative measures for supervising expenditures and operations. A high degree of efficiency has been obtained under many of these contracts, especially in the case of Government-owned contractor-operated plants of the Ordnance Department. Studies of these operations have indicated that administrative controls in these plants have obtained results which compare favorably with records under fixed-price contracts for comparable items and lead to the conclusion that sound administrative methods under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, where these contracts must be used, can control and increase efficiency despite the lack of direct financial incentives.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts are used primarily by the Corps of Engineers, Ordnance Department, and the Army Air Forces. The Corps of Engineers limits its use to construction and architect-engineer contracts; and these are rapidly being reduced. As of August 31, 1943, the engineers had outstanding about 120 fixed-fee contracts under which work was uncompleted; and three-quarters of these were expected to be completed or terminated before December 31, 1943. In the aircraft field the great expansion of business, the relatively limited capital of many companies, and the conditions of production have necessitated considerable use of this type of contract by the Army Air Forces. As of September 30, 1943, Air Forces contractors were working on 188 fixed-fee contracts and 66 letter contracts in anticipation of fixed-fee contracts, primarily for aircraft, engines, and parts and modification work, transport, and other special services. The Ordnance Department had outstanding 185 cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts on August 31, 1943, in the following categories: Research and development, 33; special services of various kinds, 15; equipping of plants, 17; supplies and munitions, 49; and operation of Government-owned new ordnance ammunition and small arms facilities, 71. Thirty-five of these outstanding contracts were expected to be completed, terminated, or converted to a fixed-price basis before January 1, 1944. Many of these Air Forces and Ordnance contracts are for equipment and services which are subject to frequent changes in character and quantity to reflect combat experience and strategic decisions.

Serious obstacles have been encountered in the attempt to convert outstanding cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to a fixed-price basis. Among these obstacles are the following factors which continue to affect the attitude of contractors holding cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, even after there has been a substantial production experience:

1. The rate of production of certain items fluctuates so rapidly and so widely according to strategic and military factors and specification changes that the resulting variations in the costs of production make it almost impossible to fix a reasonable price without heavy contingency allowances or constant adjustment of the price.

2. Many of the fixed-fee contractors, especially with the Air Forces, have so little previous experience with production of their present products or depend so heavily on subcontractors in this condition that they are unable at any time to estimate their future costs with reasonable accuracy.

3. Many of the contractors under fixed-fee contracts have only moderate amounts of capital but are doing an enormous volume of business totally disproportionate to their capital and are entirely unwilling to assume the risks inherent in the fixed-price contract for fear that even small errors might ruin the company entirely.

4. With the tremendous expansion of business, management, and engineering personnel in some companies has been spread so thin that they are either unable or unwilling to divert their time and energies to the computation and negotiation of prices instead of to production.

5. The instability of labor conditions in certain areas involving heavy turn-over, shortages in personnel, large training costs, and low efficiency makes estimates of labor costs extremely uncertain.

6. Certain of the fixed-fee contractors, especially with Ordnance, have undertaken to manage plants producing articles totally different from their commercial business, primarily as a public service and without desire for substantial or any profit; often they are not willing to embark on a business venture in such fields, desiring neither the attendant profits nor the risks.

These and other factors lead many cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractors to refuse to consider a fixed-price basis at all or to insist on allowances against contingencies so substantial as to make conversion of doubtful expediency. Obviously, the advantages of conversion will largely be lost if the fixed price under the converted contract is so high as to remove substantial price pressure for efficiency. Nevertheless, despite the various obstacles which have been encountered, the War Department proposes to press diligently for conversion of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to fixed prices wherever the circumstances which led to their use in the first place have so changed that such contracts are no longer necessary.

I trust that the foregoing statement answers your inquiry and gives you the information which you need to answer your correspondents on the Pacific coast. This matter is one of primary interest to the War Department, and I shall be grateful to you for bringing to my attention any information or views bearing upon the problem which you may consider helpful. I shall, of course, be glad to furnish you any further available information which you may require.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

FEBRUARY 21, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I am in receipt of your letter of January 13, 1944, with reference to cost-plus contracts on the Pacific coast. As you are aware the Navy Department is not permitted by law to enter into cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost form of contract. The only cost-plus form of contract is the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form. The Navy Department is in full accord with the position indicated in your letter that cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts be used as sparingly as possible. It is our belief that the objective of cutting down the amount of such contracts is being accomplished by constant administrative pressure within the Department.

I believe that the Navy has already made substantial progress in limiting the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. Current Navy supply contracts show that the percentage of the fixed-price type is increasing in current procurement. Between March 15 and September 15, 1943, the dollar volume of uncompleted cost-plus-a-fixed-fee supply contracts was decreased by about $1,250,000,000. To the best of my knowledge, the Navy Department is today entering into contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis only in those cases where it is impossible to negotiate a contract on a fixed-price or modified fixed-price basis.

I am further informed that as of the end of January cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts constitute about 16 percent of the total outstanding dollar volume of contracts made by the Bureau of Ships. It must, of course, be recognized that opportunities for making large profits and for failing to limit costs are present in fixed-price contracts as well as in

cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. In general, it does appear to be true that the contractor does not have the same spur of incentive under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract to achieve the most efficient and economical performance of his contract as is the case under a fixed-price contract. The Secretary of the Navy has urged all Navy contracting officers to replace cost-plus contracts with fixed-price contracts and, wherever possible, to change the existing cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to modified fixed-price contracts.

Nevertheless, there are instances in which circumstances practically dictate the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts; e. g., when precise specifications cannot be issued at the time of contract negotiation, when the full scope of the work cannot be known until an advanced stage in production, when new manufacturers start on the production of an item familiar to others but unfamiliar to them, when the lapse of time between contract negotiation and completion of production is so long that satisfactory estimates cannot be made of labor and material costs, etc. To endeavor to use fixed-price contracts in many of such instances would be to attempt the impossible and to make necessary the use of an exaggeratedly high fixed-price in others.

The implication in Mr. Monson's letter, enclosed with your letter, that cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts result in the payment of higher rates of wages is not justified, as the wage rates in any locality, whatever the type of contract involved, are determined by central agencies of the Government and generally result from War Labor Board rulings.

There is a good deal to be said, I think, for the proposition that the undesirable results arising under certain cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts are due to a failure of management to perform the contract adequately and not to the form of the contract itself. However, we are constantly seeking to have our supervisory personnel impress upon the contractor the necessity for keeping costs under the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to a minimum.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: This is in reply to your letter of January 13 requesting a report on the extent of cost-plus contracts in the war program and a summary of the policy of the War Production Board in regard to the continuation of their use.

In general it is the policy of the procurement agencies to award cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts where time does not permit adequate preparation of plans or specifications, when the production of new types of munitions is involved, or when the contractor lacks cost data or production experience and is unable to assume the risks of firm-price contracts. It is recognized, however, that cost-plus contracts are not desirable since they do not provide direct financial incentives to the contractor to reduce costs and since they require considerable manpower to audit and administer. Both the Production Executive Committee and the Procurement Policy Board of the War Production Board have continually requested that the use of cost-plus contracts be limited to the greatest possible extent.

There are attached two sets of three tabulations each, showing the extent and trend of cost-plus contracting in the war procurement program through June 1943. The first set is limited to contracts of $10,000,000 and over; the second tabulates all contracts of $50,000 and over. A comparison of the two sets of tabulations reveals that both indicate the same general trend in cost-plus contracting—a peak in the period January–June 1942 and a subsequent decline. For the four agencies included in the tabulations, in the whole war program through June 1943, 1.1 percent of the number and 30 percent of the dollar value of contracts of $50,000 and over were cost-plus. There has been a reduction from a maximum of 39 percent in January–June 1942 to 20 percent in January–June 1943. The extent to which cost-plus contracting is confined to larger contracts is illustrated by the fact that, while the average value of all contracts of $50,000 and over is under $1,500,000, the average value of cost-plus contracts is about $38,000,000.

The tables show that since June 1942 the use of cost-plus contracts by Army and Navy has declined considerably. This coincides with Army directives dated September 30 and December 16, 1942, specifying that cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts were to be entered into only as a last resort when it was impossible or impracticable to write a firm-price contract. Maritime Commission cost-plus contracting has remained fairly constant. In this connection it should be noted that for ship construction the Commission uses an incentive contract which adjusts the fee inversely to the cost. Although the Commission does not consider these to be cost-plus contracts, they have been so included in these tables because, except for the incentive clause, they are identical to the fixed-fee type of award. Treasury Department (lend-lease only) does not use the cost-plus type of contracting. For the above four agencies, 45 percent of the dollar value of contracts $10,000,000 and over awarded through June 1943 has been for fixed-fee contracts. Cost-plus contracts accounted dollar-wise for 53 percent of the large awards in January–June 1942, dropped to 43 percent in the next 6-month period, and to 33 percent in the half-year ending June 1943. In all periods the proportions applicable to the number of contracts have run considerably less than those applicable to the value, indicating that even among this select group, cost-plus contracts are more prevalent in the larger areas.

In conjunction with their policy of awarding cost-plus contracts only where it is not feasible to do otherwise, the Army and Navy have also replaced existing cost-plus contracts with fixed-price awards as soon as production was on a recurring basis and costs could be determined. Also, where fixed-price contracts could not be substituted, reductions in the fixed fee have been secured. Thus, the 1941 contracts with Boeing for Flying Fortresses called for a fee of 6 percent of the estimated cost; January and August 1942 supplements specified a fee of 5 percent; and the December 1942 supplement, a fee of 4 percent. Similar types of reductions were made in contracts with American Locomotive for tanks, and with Grumman Aircraft and Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft for planes.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON.

Twenty-three-Cent Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a letter regarding the terribly low price that farmers are receiving for eggs and the price of feed to keep the hens producing. This letter was written by a farmer's wife, who is one of the thousands of farm women who are trying to feed the Army and the home front. This is only one of many such letters that I have received in the last few days. With eggs selling at 55 cents in Washington, D. C., something is wrong somewhere. While we are asking the farmers to produce more eggs and poultry, we should protect them with a floor price in order that they may meet the cost of production.

The letter follows:

FRANKFORT, KANS., *March 26, 1944.*

Representative W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LAMBERTSON: Yesterday I took eggs to town and received 23 cents per dozen. I'm just a farmer's wife. I have a farmer (our dirt soldier) and 2 children to feed. I have a small flock of hens (160) producing over-average eggs. Half of these are pullets which began laying in January. I have been feeding these bran at $2.25 per hundredweight, meat scraps at $4.25 per hundredweight, and grain at $1 a bushel, and oystershells. How can we continue to feed these hens and receive only 23 cents per dozen for eggs?

The Government is calling for us to produce more. Does the Government expect us to produce chickens and eggs for the Army without cost of production? We can't coin money (and tax people) when we fail to have enough cash to buy baby chicks or feed. Our hens will "scratch" for a living but not produce. Arrangements have been made to control all farm products but do they call this control—23 cents per dozen for eggs?

Excuse made at poultry houses is that not enough help is available to care for the eggs. Therefore, they cannot pay more. Yet they do not refuse to take the eggs. Do they dump them in the rivers when they spoil? (due to the lack of care), or do they use that for an excuse for the middleman to profit? When we farmers haven't enough help to care for our stocks and crops we put in 14- to 18-hour days. We women take the milk bucket in hand or take our children to the fields to get the job done.

Now I don't ask for a 48-hour week, or overtime wages. Nor for a Jamaica maid or an airplane and pilots so I can see the world, or an expensive evening gown so I can go to some high-class night club and spend money that could go into War bonds. All I want is the cost of production so we farmers can feed the soldiers.

We have to rely upon our Congressmen to back us up and fight for our rights. We can't go and ask our hens to hold up production for a week or two for someone to do something about the situation. So, Representative LAMBERTSON, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, here's hoping you'll live up to your fighting spirit and bring justice to the American farmer.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. R. LILLEY.

Funds for Civilian War Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting a letter I have

received from Mrs. Florence Kerr, assistant to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, March 30, 1944.

Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANHAM: I request that you insert the following explanatory statement in the RECORD.

During the debate on the first deficiency bill of 1944 in the House of Representatives, March 9, 1944, Representative JUDD inserted in the RECORD a copy of a letter signed by Kathryn H. Starbuck, chairman of civilian war services, and Alice P. Reeves, chairman, child care committee, Saratoga Springs, N. Y. This letter was also used by Mrs. Harriet Ahlers Houdlette, chairman, legislative committee on War Area Child-Care Act of 1943, in her testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 22. It stated that although the requisition for funds was submitted to the F. W. A. regional office in October, the full amount of the 1943 allotment was not paid until January 1944.

Our records show that a requisition requesting $3,252.52 for the period October 1, to December 31, 1943, was received in the F. W. A. regional office on October 18. The information submitted by the applicant established a need during that quarter for only $1,857.53. Approval for this amount was given by the F. W. A. regional office on November 9, and the check was issued by the Treasury disbursing office on November 11. It later appeared that the applicant had omitted, in error, expenses for the month of October and a requisition for an additional amount was received in the F. W. A. regional office on December 14; on December 29 the Treasury disbursing office issued a check for $862.88, which completed the amount required by the applicant for operations during 1943. Payments for operations during 1944 were made in the amount of $798.96 on February 3 and $4,551.31 on February 21.

It will be seen from the above information, all of which can be verified from an inspection of the F. W. A. and Treasury disbursement records, that Federal funds due were paid promptly when the justifying information was submitted by the local applicant, which in this case was the public-school system.

It is interesting to note that the writer of this letter is connected with the Civilian War Services of Saratoga Springs, N. Y. Last year an appropriation for State aid to wartime child-care facilities was made by the New York State Legislature and the administration of the funds turned over to the State war council. Saratoga Springs is eligible for such assistance. The committee on child care, development, and protection of the State war council approved the amount of $734.25 for the quarter beginning October 1, 1943, and $882.52 for the quarter beginning January 1, 1944. To date none of these State funds has been received by Saratoga Springs although months have gone by. It may be that there is some good reason for delay by the State authorities. But the charge of delay against this agency is not borne out by the record nor does it furnish a reason for the transfer of the control of these funds to the States which was proposed by the writer of the letter referred to by Mr. JUDD.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE KERR,
Assistant to the Administrator.

We All Know Lindsay Warren Is a Responsible Public Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the April 1 issue of Labor indicates what is taking place during this war. Certain agencies are continually calling the attention of the public to the profits of farmers when their total average income is only $3,000 to say nothing about the net income. The official study of Dr. Wylie Goodsell showed that a rather large percentage of the farmers of America made from 19 cents to 47 cents per hour in 1942.

Certain other groups and individuals that have accepted a 21.6 percent cost-of-living bonus on an overtime basis themselves on the first $2,900 of their $2,900 to $15,000 Federal salaries at the same time have insisted on freezing the below-average-income groups with 40 to 50 cents per hour wage. They even protested the 15-percent advance in wages provided by the Little Steel formula, for this below-average-income group.

The article follows:

PROFITEERS ARE GETTING AWAY WITH MURDER, WARREN SAYS—AIDED BY "CROOKS AND THIEVES" IN GOVERNMENT, COMPTROLLER CHARGES—BLASTS COST-PLUS CONTRACTS AS "DAMNABLE"

"A Government official, wearing the uniform of his country was arrested in New York recently with $15,000 in marked bills in his pocket."

That startling instance was recited by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, in testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee this week as proof of his contention that Congress must keep a sharp eye on administration if war profiteers are not to bleed the taxpayers white.

"Some of these officials," he charged, "have been found to be just plain crooks and thieves. We have been assured that the bad and the inefficient have been weeded out, but that is just not so."

Warren's statement was one of the most sensational yet made before a congressional committee—and that is saying a mouthful. He declared that profiteers "are on the loose" and are milking Uncle Sam for all he is worth. Worse still, he added, many are getting away with it.

Warren, before taking over the Comptroller job, was a Member of the House from North Carolina and was respected as a hard-working, conscientious, and extremely able conservative. The General Accounting Office, which he heads, was set up before the sorry experiences of the last war had grown cold, to check disbursements and to see that the Government got something like an even break in ordinary business dealings.

G. A. O. OUT OF PICTURE

As far as war contracts are concerned, however, the G. A. O. is out of the picture, and will be kept out if bills now before Congress are approved. They provide for the settlement of the war claims virtually on the say-so of the contractors.

Although billions of dollars are involved, the G. A. O. is restricted to a mere comparison of the figures on vouchers and the amounts agreed upon by contractors and Government officials with whom settlements are made.

It was to protest against this proposed set-up that Warren appeared before the committee, and he confronted a rather hostile audience. The committee seems to take the position that it is more important that contract settlements be made speedily than that the taxpayers shall be protected.

BLASTS COST-PLUS PACTS

"Ruthless gouging," Warren declared, is going on under cost-plus contracts, which were branded as "the most extravagant, the most vicious, and the most damnable form of business skulduggery."

"Of course," he conceded, "war itself is wasteful and large expenditures are to be expected, but that," he contended, "is no reason why ordinary prudence should be thrown to the winds. Even on the battlefields," he emphasized, "army generals try to spare their men."

"Like these generals," he asserted, "the contracting officers of the Government should make an effort to spare the public's money. Every dollar spent should show a dollar's worth in return."

JUST PLAIN CROOKS

Warren insisted with great vehemence that every contract settlement should be audited. He cited huge payments already made by "officials who made the contracts sitting across the table from the contractors."

It was at this point he declared that some of the officials were "just plain crooks, more interested in fattening the profits of contractors than in safeguarding the taxpayer."

"The tragedy is that no one seems disturbed about it," Warren said, explaining that when such matters are brought to public attention they are met with a "shrug of the shoulder and condoned under the specious plea that we have got a war to win."

LIKE OLIVER TWIST

Driving home the matter of laxity, Warren revealed that in cases where his office has had power to toss out illegal claims the contracts have been revised and the Government recovered large sums.

"If somebody would come to us and say the Government shouldn't pay for something, we would be the most surprised people in the world," Warren declared. "However, with the audacity of Oliver Twist, they come and say, 'Please, sir, we want more.'"

Warren hasn't concluded his presentation. When he again appears before the committee he promises to give chapter and verse details of how Uncle Sam is being hornswoggled on both sides of the bargaining table.

Commander Corydon M. Wassell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for me. This war has produced many heroes and heroines, but I am especially proud of the outstanding

record of heroism which one of my constituents has made.

Commander Corydon M. Wassell of St. Charles, Arkansas County, Ark., after graduating from medical college entered the practice of medicine at Tillar, Drew County, Ark. Tillar is in my home county.

It has been my privilege and honor to have been acquainted with Commander Wassell, therefore, for a good many years, during which time he has been one of my very warm personal friends. It has been my pleasure also to meet Mrs. Wassell and their children. He has two sons in the service and his daughter is married to a major presently stationed in the State of Texas.

You may recall about 2 years ago when the President referred to the outstanding acts of heroism of Commander Wassell. I listened to the President's address that evening and it was a source of pleasure and pride when I heard President Roosevelt tell of the commander's heroism. He stated that Dr. Wassell, a former missionary to China, was a "simple, modest, retiring man who was assigned to care for wounded men from the cruisers *Houston* and *Marblehead* in Java. Twelve, he said, were so badly wounded that they could not be removed when the Japanese came, and Dr. Wassell refused to abandon his men, remaining with them knowing that he would be captured by the enemy. The President further said:

But he decided to make a desperate attempt to get the men out of Java. He asked each of them if he wished to take the chance, and every one agreed.

He first had to get the 12 men to the sea coast, 50 miles away. To do this, he had to improvise stretchers for the hazardous journey. The men were suffering severely, but Dr. Wassell kept them alive by his skill and inspired them by his own courage. As the official report said, "Dr. Wassell was almost like a Christlike shepherd devoted to his flock."

On the sea coast, he embarked the men on a little Dutch ship. They were bombed and machine gunned by waves of Japanese planes. Dr. Wassell took virtual command of the ship, and by great skill avoided destruction, hiding in small bays and inlets. A few days later, Dr. Wassell and his little flock of wounded men reached Australia safely. He now wears the Navy Cross of Honor.

Dr. Wassell's friends were not surprised when they heard the President utter these words, because we knew that he was not only a great physician and surgeon but that he was courageous, kind-hearted, and that under no circumstances would he leave a post of duty, but would always go far beyond the line of duty for his fellowman and his Nation. I am told that his superior officers insisted on his getting out of that theater of war, as they expected the Japs to close in at any minute, but as above stated he refused to do so, remaining with his men.

On May 6, 1942, I had something to say with reference to Commander Wassell's heroism, and it would serve no useful purpose to review at this time what I said then, as recorded at page A1656 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, during the past 2 years a book has been written on the life of Commander Wassell entitled "The Story of Dr. Wassell," by James Hilton and Paramount Pictures, Inc., under the able direction of Mr. Cecil B. DeMille, has made a moving picture of the life of Commander Wassell bearing the same title. This picture was shown to the Arkansas delegation in Congress on March 22, and I believe it is the finest war picture I have ever seen. That picture is to be shown at Constitution Hall on April 1, and no one should fail to see it who can secure tickets. I understand that the proceeds of the sale of tickets will be given to worth-while public causes, no part going either to Commander Wassell or Paramount Pictures.

The first commercial showing is to be at Little Rock on or about April 26, and I am sure that Commander Wassell will be present on that occasion with many who took parts in the picture. This will be a great occasion for the people of Arkansas.

We are having a luncheon in the Speaker's dining room at 12:30 today in honor of Commander and Mrs. Wassell, presided over by Senator John L. McClellan, of Arkansas. Our senior Senator, Hon. Hattie Caraway, will be present. The luncheon is being given by the entire Arkansas delegation, and our guests will include Vice President Henry A. Wallace; Senator Alben Barkley, of Kentucky, the majority leader of the Senate; Hon. John W. McCormack, majority leader of the House; Hon. Eugene Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President; Mrs. Joseph T. Robinson, widow of the late Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, and former majority leader of the Senate; Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, formerly of Little Rock, commanding general of the Army Service Forces; Admiral C. M. Cooke, Jr., of Fort Smith; Gen. Roy Porter, of Fordyce; Mr. and Mrs. Cecil B. DeMille; wives of the Arkansas delegation; and others. Speaker Rayburn was invited to attend, and has expressed his regrets that he shall not be able to be present.

They Do Their Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very revealing letter from an enlisted man now serving in the Solomon Islands. I do not recall when I have read anything more timely and pungent. A reading of this letter should bring home to each and every one of us a further realization that all is not well on the home front. Since Pearl Harbor, I have received scores of letters from men in the service. Those writing from Italy complain that there is too much politics in the conduct of that campaign, while those who write from the far Pacific complain that they do not have enough to do with. It would seem that the time is rapidly approaching when Congress must take a hand. The letter follows:

SOLOMON ISLANDS, *February 25, 1944.*

DEAR FRIEND: You ask me to give you some idea as to how the boys over here feel about the strikes in industry at home. I shall try to give you a fairly accurate picture, as gathered from asking about 75 men their feelings on the matter.

The truth is that many here are inclined to be more worried about the home front than we are about activities here at ringside. We know, positively, that we can take care of our end. We have proven that on many occasions, to ourselves, to our leaders, and to the home folks as well.

We also know that the production forces at home can, if they will, give every overseas unit all the help necessary for victory. But what gives us occasional worry is the news of strikes and shut-downs on the home front. We can't seem to understand such things. We can't conceive of our home fighters dropping out on us. It seems to us like an ammunition passer refusing to pass the ammunition to the ack-ack operators. It's comparable to an air unit neglecting to give support to advancing ground troops. Or truck, jeep, or ambulance drivers refusing to carry out their assignments during an attack.

Of course, things like I just mentioned could not happen here—or elsewhere on the fighting front. Not a man over here would even think of doing such a thing. His pride, his patriotism, his sense of duty to his mates and his loved ones at home, his manliness and courage, his training—in short, his Americanism—would never permit him to betray a comrade. We all know that every man who shirks here not only betrays his comrades in arms but also the loved ones at home for whom he is supposed to be fighting.

So every man on the fighting front overseas just naturally does his share, and more too, with only two thoughts in mind—victory and going home.

We cannot understand why this same all-out spirit does not prevail at home just as it does in this forsaken part of the world.

In our branch of the service we have a word which is used to describe any group, or mass, insubordination. The word is mutiny. A group is two or more. The penalty for mutiny is death. The same unpleasant penalty may be carried out against any man who neglects duty in various other ways. These crimes carry the extreme penalty because they are extreme offenses. They may easily result in the loss of a battle, a ship, a plane, or cost the lives of many other men.

A shut-down of the factories producing war material may, just as easily, result in the same consequences. We believe there is no difference between neglect of duty here and neglect of duty on the equally vital home front. We see no difference between mutiny out here and mutiny at home. We do not think there should be mutiny on either front.

It is certain that the home front would be in a nasty mess if it did not have the fighting forces in front. It is just as certain that we would be in a just as nasty a mess if we did not have the home front to give us backing. Sometimes we feel that this end of the deal is just a bit more difficult—just a mite more discouraging. But neither front

can long hold up without the full support of the other. As far as the ultimate result of this horrible war is concerned—the home front is equally important with the battle front.

We do not believe that the home fighter should be permitted to let down any more than the war-zone fighter.

We are fully cognizant of the fact that one of the things we are fighting for is the privilege of labor to strike. We know, too, that another thing we are fighting against is the abuse of power. We believe that the loss of production of war materials due to strikes is a result of the abuse of power by organized labor.

Men in military service have no privilege of striking—in wartime or peacetime. They do not want such a privilege. All they want is victory—and to go home. We have the idea, and we may be mistaken, that men on the home front should be denied the strike privilege while our country, homes, and our freedom are in jeopardy.

We believe that it would do our workingmen little benefit to win a strike now only to lose the privilege of striking later.

We all agree that something should be done to increase the wage of every worker so that he may be able to adequately meet the rising cost of living. But we think it should be done by other means than strikes.

In short, we believe that no American has the moral right to go on strike at a time when such an action definitely imperils the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

The loss of a tank, a plane, a gun, a ship on the home front is even worse than such losses here. Any equipment lost here has at least had its chance to get in a few licks at the enemy.

The working hours of the servicemen run around the clock. Seven days a week, month in, and month out. We never hear of overtime, time and a half, or double time. Frequently we are on duty 24 or more hours at a stretch. We may gripe about it but we do it and are happy to have done it for the cause—for the general benefit of humanity.

We know that prices have risen in the States, perhaps considerably more in proportion than have wages. But if that is true for the man in industry, so is it also true for the man in service.

The men who are in the combat service would like to ask some of the discontented men in the production service the following questions. These questions are specially meant for those who would vote to go on strike in time of war:

Have you, in line with your industrial duties, spent 50 days at sea, jammed in the stinking, steaming holds of a ship, with 8 men sandwiched into a space smaller than husbandrymen recommend for 1 chicken?

Have you stood, suffocating in a life preserver, waiting, waiting, in the dim light of dawn or dusk, for the torpedo to strike; or with grim and anxious faces turned skyward—waiting, ready to jump if yonder plane turns out to be the enemy?

(Let me say right here, that all of the stars in azure skies, there are none so lovely, so brilliantly beautiful, so downright gorgeous and friendly, as that grand star painted on the underwing of Uncle Sam's aircraft.)

Have you landed at night, on a lonely isle, not knowing what to expect—in a driving rain, and set up your pup tent in pitch-black darkness—and had the rats, lizards, and pests of all kinds, run over and around you all night?

Have you awakened in the morning to find that wild cattle and men had been there before you, and the nasty evidence of their being there was smeared on your poncho and your clothing?

Have you pitched your tent within a few feet of a long-dead animal carcass and been too busy with other matters to move either the tent or the rotten remains?

Have you gone many long hours with no water for drinking or bathing?

Have you gone to bed only to find that rats and lizards had moved in before you, some of which were large enough to dispute your right to be there?

Have you been jarred from the deep sleep of exhaustion and run naked, to a muddy, slimy, pest-infested foxhole?

Have you carried your food to a pigpen and eaten, standing or sitting in ankle-deep mud?

Have you felt so hungry that you were sure you could almost eat a horse muffin—and almost like it?

Have you gone about the area with a sharp nail fixed in the end of a stick and with it speared up the pitiful remains of your mates?

Have you gone week on week with no word from your loved ones?

Have you kept right on working and doing your share when you knew that thousands of men at home, who should be also doing their share, were not doing it?

There are many other similar questions we could ask, but surely these are sufficient to put over our point. We are not complaining about our lot in this war. Not in the least. In fact, we all think that our outfit is quite lucky as we have it very pleasant as compared to many others.

Finally, we feel we should remind any powerful group that power is a very dangerous thing. Hitler was a great guy, for Germany, until he went nuts with the power he had and abused that power. The same thing goes for pickle puss Mussolini, and for the yellow man of Tokyo and, for some others I could mention, disaster is in the offing simply because of abuse of power.

We know that the unions—organized labor—have been the finest of boons for labor itself.

We also know that all which has been won for the workingman may easily be lost through the improper and unpatriotic use of power

Power is a disastrous thing in the wrong hands.

Signal Honor Conferred Upon Elmer H. Davis, Director of the Office of War Information

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor was bestowed today on Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, when the Sons of Indiana of New York City conferred upon him their distinguished service award for being "the outstanding Washington Hoosier in the United States of America Government." The selection of Mr. Davis for this honor was made in a voting contest in which he ran away from all competitors.

Mr. Everett Watkins, representative of the Indianapolis Star and a prominent member of the corps of Washington correspondents, and I were chosen by the Sons of Indiana of New York to present to Mr. Davis a scroll testifying to the action taken by the society in designating him as the favorite of the Indianians residing in New York and the presentation took place at Mr. Davis' office in the Social Security Building, this city, at 10:30 o'clock this forenoon.

My address in presenting the award was as follows:

Mr. Davis and ladies and gentlemen, my friend and comrade of the fourth estate, Everett Watkins, and I are here to perform one of the most pleasant assignments ever given to us. Back in 1942 the Sons of Indiana in New York conducted a contest to select the Hoosier who had done the most for his State and country while living in Washington. Elmer Davis led the field with 4,400 points, with Admiral Ingersoll a good second and Bill Batt and Paul McNutt fighting it out for third place. Voting in the contest were 650 Sons of Indiana in New York, 200 Hoosiers in Washington, and 675 editors of newspapers back in Indiana.

An ornate scroll recording the result of the contest was prepared for presentation to Mr. Davis but, as we all know, Mr. Davis had been rather busy in Washington in recent years—too busy to go to New York to have the scroll presented to him there—and since Mahomet could not go to the mountain the mountain has been sent over to Washington with instructions to Mr. Watkins and me to present it to Mr. Davis.

One of the conditions of the presentation, explicitly set forth in the letter of instructions from Col. William H. Rankin, president of the Sons of Indiana of New York, was that I must make a speech. Now in order to be entirely fair to Colonel Bill I will say that he never heard me speak. If he had he probably would have modified that instruction and saved you all from the punishment that is now about to be visited upon you. Whatever your reaction to my speech may be I beg you not to hold it against Colonel Rankin, but you may well say, "Lord, forgive him for he knew not what he did."

I have a very vivid recollection of the voting contest referred to, for I was an "also ran." Come to think of it, I was an "also also ran." There were numerous "also rans" and still more "also also rans," but among all of them I have not heard one word of dissent or disapproval over the fact that the award went to that sturdy, sterling, Spartan son of Indiana, whom we hail as chief.

When I think of the panorama of exciting and turbulent events of the last few years in which Mr. Davis has been a storm center I am reminded of Spartacus at Capua:

"Ye call me chief, and ye do well to call him chief who for 12 long years has met upon the arena every shape of man or beast the broad empire of Rome could furnish and who never yet lowered his arm. If there be one among you who can say that ever in public fight or private brawl (of course the 'private brawl' part does not apply to Mr. Davis) my actions did belie my tongue let him stand up and say it. O Rome, Rome, thou has been a tender nurse to me. Aye, thou hast given to that poor, gentle, timid shepherd lad who never knew a harsher tone than a flute note, muscles of iron and a heart of flint; taught him to drive the sword through plaited mail and links of rugged brass and warm it in the marrow of his foe, to gaze into the glaring eyeballs of the fierce Numidian lion even as a boy upon a laughing girl."

With a few amendments, such as changing the word "Rome" to "Washington" this ancient classic of literature fits Mr. Davis like a glove. I have seen him gaze into the glaring eyeballs of fierce antiadministration

Congressmen without twitching an eyelash and I have many times witnessed the iron determination with which he stood for what he believed to be right without even a thought of compromising a hair's breadth on principle.

Mr. Davis has met every challenge with honor and forthrightness and the arrows of his enemies have crashed and broken on his shield. The attacks on him have been like ocean spray dashing on a rock-bound coast. When the spray vanishes into nothingness, the rugged outlines of the rock-bound coast still remain. Or we might liken these attacks to a gust of wind and snow beating upon a high peak of the Alpine range. When the gust dies down the peak remains.

"Or like the snowflake on the river, a moment white, then gone forever."

When the snowflake disappears on the bosom of the river, the river continues to flow in majesty to the sea. (In parentheses let me say that the only trouble with this latter simile is that a large part of the flake that has been hurled at Elmer Davis is not exactly white, but much of it has been considerably discolored.)

I shall not attempt to present a biographical sketch of Mr. Davis on this occasion. You will find plenty of those in Who's Who and other books of reference. I feel especially warm toward him because he and I are both products of the White Water Valley of Indiana which I think both of us will agree is one of the most divinely entrancing and beautiful locations on the globe, especially in the fishing season. The town of Aurora is his honored birthplace. I was born in a log cabin farther up the valley and was raised amidst the tall corn of Fayette County. So in a manner of speaking he and I are brothers in the same lodge and like all Hoosiers I am immensely proud of Elmer Davis. If I had time I might dwell on some of the high spots of his life such as his winning a Rhodes scholarship, his perfectly admirable accomplishments as reporter, correspondent, editor, and broadcaster; the books he has written, etc., and I might weave from his highly successful career one of the real romances of American achievement, illustrating what a boy can do in this free country of ours when he hitches his wagon to a star, but for the purposes of this speech I shall content myself with a brief reference to what he has done successfully, what he is still doing successfully and what he will continue to do successfully, if Congress gives him proper support, to serve humanity in this most crucial period in the history of the world.

The Director of War Information is America's minister of propaganda. It is as America's leading propagandist, the generalissimo of the propaganda forces of this great Nation, that Mr. Davis is rendering a service of inestimable value to humanity.

Wars are not won entirely by bullets and cold steel. The right sort of propaganda, in which the rule of kindness is a predominant element, may be a great factor in winning wars. The sort of propaganda to which I refer as the right sort is the sort that has its wellsprings in the warmth of our humanitarianism, in our honesty of purpose, and our sincere earnestness to serve mankind. Propaganda of the right kind is often more effective in winning wars than big guns and battleships.

The main difference between the propaganda of the Axis Powers and the propaganda directed by Mr. Davis is that the Axis propaganda is a propaganda of falsehood and deceit, while Mr. Davis' propaganda is a propaganda of truth and as surely as God is in His Heaven the truth will finally prevail.

As rapidly as he can do so with the means at his disposal Mr. Davis is getting across to the grief-stricken, war-strafed people of the world the idea that there is the prospect of the dawn of a better day if they will unite on the principles of mutual helpfulness and understanding which are offered by the United Nations as a basis of world readjustment. Every step of progress he makes in that direction gives moral strength to the Allied cause and hastens the day of the collapse of Axis tyranny. Anyone who has the slightest doubt on this point should take note of what happened in Tunisia when hundreds of Germans who surrendered stated that they had been influenced to do so by O. W. I. leaflets which they had on their persons when they came into our camp.

The essence of military power is its destructiveness. It is created to destroy. It reduces to rubble the priceless heritages of the ages and in its relentless path the flower of youth withers and fades.

Propaganda is constructive and not destructive. It never widowed a single wife nor orphaned a single child. Every dollar judiciously invested in propaganda is a dollar invested to save the lives of our precious boys.

To General Eisenhower and the other commanders in the field is committed that grim part of the war that depends on the arbitrament of arms. To Mr. Davis is committed that part of the war that appeals to reason and conscience and all of the hopes and aspirations of the human heart. In this great global war, with the destiny of civilization trembling in the balance, both approaches are necessary and both are mighty and impelling. While we are spending billions upon billions to kill people I feel that it is desperately short-sighted to deny or begrudge to Mr. Davis the relatively few millions necessary to carry on his fine endeavors in the service of humanity. The Sons of Indiana who present this scroll have sensed his true worth. The State of Indiana, from which he sprang, is proud of him and I have no doubt that when the moving hand of time records its endorsement he will be given his true place in history.

The text of the scroll, presented in a beautiful framework to Mr. Davis, is as follows:

THE SONS OF INDIANA OF NEW YORK

PROCLAMATION

*1942 distinguished service award for leading all other Washington Hoosiers in the United States of America Government**

Quite some years ago, the exact time not being essential, a tall, gangling youth began making himself useful in the office of the Dearborn Independent at Aurora, Ind.

He has continued to make himself useful since that time—so useful, in fact, that our great President and Commander in Chief has seen fit to take this Hoosier and entrust to him the full responsibility of keeping the people of the Nation informed on war news and developments.

From the banks of turbulent Laughery Creek to the banks of the calm Potomac; from the common schools of southern Indiana to the diploma from Oxford (England); from printer's devil to a Nation's editor, he remains a Hoosier. We salute you, Elmer Davis, Director of Office of War Information.

Your fellow Hoosiers honor you. They wish you well. Continue to give the news and publish the truth to the world until every man joins with our own immortal James Whitcomb Riley to say—

"For them 'at learnt at last what's right and fittin', it's a good world."

The Sons of Indiana of New York: William H. Rankin, president; B. K. Moffitt, vice president; H. M. Schackelford, chairman, War Service Committee; John W. O'Harrow, vice chairman; George B. Wellbaum, founder; Robert G. Spencer, treasurer; Jerry K. Brennan, secretary; Everett C. Watkins, Washington correspondent.

Written by Claude Brodhacker (Brownstown, Ind.)

Lay-out by Walter R. Peters.

Illustrated by Franklin Booth.

Typography by E. M. Diament.

* This 1942 distinguished service award is given to you as a result of a poll of 650 members, Sons of Indiana of New York, 200 Hoosiers in Washington, and 675 editors of newspapers back home in Indiana. You led by a large margin—all other Hoosier nominees now in the service of United States of America in Washington.

The American Federation of Labor Stands Foursquare Behind the Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid article which appeared in the recently released March issue of the American Federationist, the voice of organized labor, under the title or caption of "Labor Fights for the Serviceman," an article from the able pen of the well-known writer, Harry Malisoff.

As this article, if widely circulated, as reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will insure, will do much to clear away a misunderstanding in respect to labor's real attitude toward the serviceman, to bring a somewhat belated credit to those to whom credit is long overdue, its inclusion in the RECORD, this in the light of organized labor's magnificent performance in the production of munitions, materials, instrumentalities, and engines of war, would constitute a most gracious tribute to one of the greatest and most effective of our patriotic groups, the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, the unanimous consent of the membership having been accorded me, I am happy to be able to hand the article to which I have just referred to the Public Printer for reprinting in compliance with my request. It is the following:

LABOR FIGHTS FOR THE SERVICEMAN

(By Harry Malisoff)

By all current signs American labor intends to stand second to none in helping our returning ex-servicemen obtain jobs and other needed benefits. Trade unions everywhere are announcing their determination to back the ex-servicemen without reservation, and have already taken action on their behalf in many ways. Such action cannot be too soon, for already more than 1,300,000 men have been mustered out. Half a million of these have been released on certificates of disability.

Last year the executive council of the American Federation of Labor stated that

"every possible aid must be given to the returned soldier." More recently the teamsters' organ of Washington State insisted that the men who have served their country must be returned to good jobs when the shooting ceases. "If jobs are not available at once," said this labor publication, "the veterans must be given whatever benefits are necessary; they must not be forced to sell apples on the streets corners. * * * This is a teamsters' union policy—second only to the winning of this war."

At its meeting last December the executive council of the International Association of Machinists decided that "any veteran of the present war who is seeking entrance into the International Association of Machinists, whether previously a member or not, who has accumulated experience and now enters industry" will be accepted into membership without being required to pay any initiation fee. All the veteran will have to do is present evidence of his honorable discharge. In addition, the I. A. M. "will give sympathetic cooperation in the retraining of veterans and assist in fitting them into industrial life."

Last month the boilermakers' convention called for legislation to insure that jobs at standard wages and working conditions are provided for ex-soldiers. This would prevent repetition of the bitter experience of so many veterans of World War No. 1 who, when offered their old jobs, were told that their wages would be lower than what they had been.

Collective-bargaining agreements contain provisions for the protection of wage earners inducted into the armed forces. Labor has insisted upon the inclusion of such protective clauses. Usually these specify that the demobilized soldier is to be restored to his job promptly and with full seniority and other rights.

While the returning serviceman can be sure that labor will go all out to help him fulfill his supreme need—a job—many of the veteran's needs are a recognized responsibility of government. Such needs as social security, disability pensions, hospitalization, education, medical care, and others can be met only by the Federal Government.

Labor saw early that legislative action on these matters was vital and has stood out as one of the foremost supporters of such action. The American Federation of Labor Convention of 1942, which came when this country had been in the war but 10 months, called upon the Federal Government to make provisions to "finance unemployment benefits to be paid demobilized soldiers pending their hunt for jobs." The convention also insisted that Washington see to it that the old-age insurance equities of workers who had gone into uniform were maintained.

Following through, the federation secured the introduction of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, under which ex-servicemen as well as civilians would be given the benefits of a far-reaching social-security program.

In coming out wholeheartedly for the returning serviceman, labor manifests its resistance to ill-intentioned efforts to create a cleavage between those on the home front and those on the battlefronts. Persons who seek to pit Americans in uniform against Americans in mufti argue that soldiers and civilians are unrelated groups with different interests. The official journal of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers answers as follows:

"In a democracy, civilians left at home may accurately and frankly speak of the men at the front as 'our' soldiers. With 11,000,000 in the armed forces, there is no family in the United States untouched by the costs of combat. It is for this reason that there should be no division of idea or of sentiment between soldiers at the front and the soldiers at home. Persons who undertake to widen the gap between the two arms of the population are performing a disservice to the public. Our soldiers are still our boys. They are performing proudly as the sons of freemen should perform."

A recent computation disclosed that the total number of American Federation of Labor members in uniform exceeded 1,350,000. The other branches of organized labor surely have at least another 1,000,000 men in the service. With rural people—even those who are single, healthy, and decidedly young—exempt from the draft, there can be no question that the armed forces consist chiefly of city wage earners—organized and unorganized, industrial and white collar—and the sons of wage earners.

Those who seek to create artificial divisions between soldiers and civilians often insinuate that it is unfair to give special attention to the problems of ex-servicemen. They accuse disabled veterans of exploiting their status, of seeking privileged treatment. The hope is that such talk will stir up mutual hostility and block, delay, or curtail Federal pensions and other benefits for veterans.

However, labor refuses to go for this bait. Labor knows that the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make great sacrifices and that they have special problems. Labor understands that there is no truth to the charge that either soldiers or civilians are selfish. Labor sees clearly that both soldiers and civilians have real needs which must be met.

Often overlooked is the fact that the success of veterans in securing pensions from the days of the American Revolution onward encouraged the development of social legislation for the rest of the population. Perhaps that is the real reason why veterans are condemned by peacetime critics. Their crime is not that they tried to satisfy their own needs but that they set a precedent for the country as a whole.

As the war proceeds, increasing interest is being manifested in legislative action on behalf of the returning soldiers. Already 1,500 bills on this subject have been introduced in Congress. These bills would amend old provisions for the ex-serviceman and also introduce new ones. Alert labor organizations are following these developments closely. This discussion will consider the needed legislation along with a brief description of the provisions for veterans now on the statute books.

The World War No. 2 veteran is entitled to disability pensions, mustering-out payments, vocational rehabilitation, hospitalization, medical care, and other benefits. His survivors are entitled to death gratuity benefits, death pensions, national service life insurance, and other benefits. Let us consider these provisions in some detail.

Consider first the chief worry of the serviceman: "What will happen to my family if I am killed in action?" In that event, his survivors at home receive a death gratuity payment and a monthly service-connected death pension. The amount of the death gratuity is 6 months of the soldier's pay. The monthly pension is payable to the widow and dependent parents during their lifetime and to children until the age of 18 (to 21 if they remain in school). A widow gets $50 a month and a motherless child $25, with additional amounts for other children up to a total of $100. A dependent parent gets $25.

Survivors of a deceased soldier are also entitled to national service life insurance carried by him. Over 11,000,000 servicemen have purchased this insurance, which is sold by the Government. They pay premium rates that are very low compared to private insurance. From $1,000 to $10,000 worth of insurance may be bought. The average policy is about $9,000 in value. Beneficiaries are paid the insurance in monthly instalments.

A second concern of the World War No. 2 serviceman is expressed in the question, "Suppose I return home disabled and cannot earn my living as before?" In that event he is entitled to a service-connected disability pension. Service-connected means that the disability occurred during active military service. Disabilities present before induction are also service-connected when aggravated in active service. Pensions for disabilities of a general nature vary from $10 a month for 10 percent (partial) disability to $100 a month for 100 percent (total) disability. When there are specific disabilities, such as the loss of a hand or foot or eyesight, additional amounts are received up to a total of $250 a month. A pension of $150 a month is paid to ex-servicemen who are so helpless as to require regular aid and attendance.

Disabled World War No. 2 veterans who are eligible for pensions are also entitled to vocational rehabilitation under a law passed in March 1943. The law aims to help ex-servicemen get jobs by training them to overcome the handicap of their disability. During training the pension amounts are at least $80 a month for single men and $90 for married ones, with $5 extra for each child and $10 for each dependent parent.

A third concern is, "Will I get my job back?" Some of the steps taken by labor to assure that the ex-serviceman gets his old job have been touched upon. The Selective Service Act calls for reemployment of the ex-serviceman if he applies for his old job within 40 days after discharge and is able to perform his duties.

Unfortunately, some employers are seizing upon the ability clause as an excuse to refuse to rehire ex-servicemen discharged on account of various disabilities, among which psychoneurosis is very common. Psychoneurosis is just a fancy name for an individual's inability to adjust to the rigors of Army life. Yet workers discharged for this reason are met upon return with the question, How do we know you can do your old job? Nothing is more unfair than the attitude of employers and employment interviewers that a man's unfitness for the severe Army duties demonstrates his unfitness for his former civil work. It is vastly to labor's credit that already in many such cases it has vigorously "gone to bat" for the veteran whom the employer sought to turn away and persuaded the latter to change his mind.

Soldiers' fourth concern is: After I am discharged, how will I support myself and my family until I can start on a job? This is a serious problem. There have been many cases where even crippled soldiers were discharged and placed on trains bound for home with no money in their pockets. Since their service pay and family allowances ceased at the same time, they were totally unable to meet family expenses or even to buy civilian clothes. Many ex-servicemen have been forced to seek public or private relief.

This situation has now been partially alleviated by inadequate mustering-out payments which Congress adopted a few weeks ago. Mustering-out payments merely help the ex-serviceman to get started in civilian life, and cannot meet the needs of ex-servicemen who suffer unemployment of any duration. Veterans of less than 60 days' service receive $100. Veterans of longer service get $200, or $300 if they were overseas. These payments are inadequate. Most unjustly, they are denied to veterans discharged because they are over 38.

Ex-servicemen with service-connected disabilities are also entitled to hospitalization and medical, surgical, and dental services, in facilities of the Veterans' Administration. They can receive artificial limbs and other appliances for cripples. All veterans are eligible for hospitalization or care in a veteran's home if they cannot pay for private treatment.

It should be borne in mind that these veterans' benefits are noncontributory. Except for his life-insurance premiums, the serviceman makes no monetary contribution for the benefits. In order to be eligible for the benefits, the serviceman needs only his veteran's status or the service connection of his injury. But his right to all the benefits is nonetheless firmly established.

What are the shortcomings of these provisions?

It is not enough to have a disability pension law on the statute books. The law is worthless if it is not properly carried out. Labor people, who have seen progressive labor laws in certain of the States virtually nullified through failure of legislatures to appropriate sufficient funds to enforce those laws, will appreciate the situation.

Recently the country was stunned by disclosures made in a survey of claims for disability pensions pending before the Veterans' Administration. It was revealed that 1,500 cases of battle casualties were without adequate provision as to compensation, medical care, training, and other needs. Though without income and unable to work, veterans have had to wait 6 months or more before their pension claims were acted upon. The excuses advanced were that the Army was slow in sending over the soldier's service papers and that the Veterans' Administration was unprepared to handle the unexpected avalanche of 250,000 claims.

The only solution to this problem now offered is to keep the disabled soldier in a service hospital until his claim is adjudicated, so that at least he will continue to receive his service pay, medical attention, and family dependents' allowances. This is a makeshift solution and evades the question of responsibility for the sloppy administration that causes the trouble. The disabled soldier does not want to lie around in a hospital far from home while office functionaries tangle themselves up in red tape.

Administration as usual is persecution of the disabled soldier. In these days when social security handles millions of claims in short periods, is there any reason why the Veterans' Administration should not be able to process the 30,000 disability claims now filed each month? Whatever is needed to bring this about—more rating boards, congressional appropriations, better cooperation between the Army and the Veterans' Administration—should be forthcoming immediately.

Similarly, although there are laws granting hospitalization to the ex-servicemen, there are not yet enough hospital beds to meet wartime needs. At present the Veterans' Administration has some 67,000 hospital beds, of which about 10,000 are vacant. These facilities were designed for the use of veterans of former wars and our peacetime forces of less than 300,000. Today there are already well over 10,000,000 in our armed forces. And the impending invasion of Europe will undoubtedly bring large-scale casualties. Yet the Veterans' Administration now plans to expand the number of hospital beds to only 100,000 and is on record with an estimate that an ultimate total of 300,000 beds, including those in service hospitals, will be quite sufficient.

In 1935 the national commander of the American Legion told the American Federation of Labor convention of that year that when World War No. 1 ended the country was without facilities to hospitalize the wounded or domicile those whose minds had been shattered by the shock of combat. Must history repeat itself?

No American wishes large-scale casualties, but they have been predicted by our highest military authorities. Hospitals cannot be put into operation overnight. "Too little and too late" does not characterize our war-production program; for the sake of safety, our production quotas call for more than enough ships, planes, guns, and tanks, regardless of expense. Why then should a pinch-penny policy be followed toward disabled soldiers? Must thoughts of economy suddenly be injected where human beings are involved?

Administration of disability pension claims should be liberal as well as speedy. Demands are being made for discontinuance of the practice whereby, at the time of discharge, disabled soldiers sign statements to the effect that their disabilities existed prior to their induction. Although they may compromise just future pension claims, soldiers sign such statements, even though untrue, because they fear that refusal to sign will delay their return home. The practice is reminiscent of the high-pressure methods employed by unscrupulous adjusters to induce injured workers to sign away their rights to workmen's compensation.

Of obvious importance is the necessity for preparing now to meet the educational needs of the young soldiers whose schooling was interrupted by the war. They should be given every opportunity and encouragement to continue their education under Federal Government auspices after they are demobilized. Even those who had already left school prior to induction should be encouraged to perfect the skills they acquired while in service or to continue former education. The educational prcgram, by deferring the entrance of many ex-servicemen into the labor market, will be helpful during the demobilization period when millions of men will be seeking work.

Another important need is for financial assistance by way of loans and credit to ex-servicemen so that they may reestablish their homes, farms, and businesses or purchase essential tools and equipment. Many servicemen have had to give up their homes and move their families in with relatives. This disruption of normal American home life must not endure after the war. Many servicemen have had to liquidate their businesses. It is undesirable that the community should lose permanently the valuable assets represented by such small businessmen.

The question of mass unemployment of ex-servicemen is not yet touched upon by the present laws. After the last war many veterans were unemployed. Some of them were forced to beg for the price of a "flop" and to stand in line for free soup. The new generation of fighting men must not be subjected to such misery.

Following the close of the war, there is bound to be a measure of unemployment among the demobilized men as among demobilized war workers. It will take time to absorb the veterans into employment, especially when large numbers enter the labor market more or less together. Unemployment allowances should be provided until the ex-servicemen can be given jobs. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, sponsored by organized labor, provides for Federal benefits to unemployed ex-servicemen of from $12 to $30 a week for 26 weeks.

For the unemployed ex-serviceman, State unemployment compensation is no solution and is rapidly becoming a mockery. Most States froze the benefit rights of servicemen as of the time of induction. What did this mean? First, even if servicemen had enough earnings to qualify for unemployment benefits, the weekly amounts would vary greatly from State to State and generally prove inadequate. Second, by a new wrinkle in the compensation laws, servicemen can be disqualified from benefits because they left their employment not for a cause "attributable to the employer." Third, many servicemen will not have enough frozen rights to qualify for benefits at all. Fourth, large numbers of servicemen are not even covered under the laws.

Another gap in the provisions for ex-servicemen is the failure so far to protect their rights accumulated under old-age and survivors insurance. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill grants servicemen credit under old-age and survivors insurance for their period of military service. This means that they or their survivors will not find themselves disqualified from benefits or in receipt of reduced benefits on account of the loss of wage credits during service. Such protection was won by railroad labor through a 1942 amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act. Congress has no reason to delay similar action for those covered under the Social Security Act.

Of course, this raises the question of the many servicemen who are normally self-employed or agricultural, maritime, or domestic workers and who, therefore, are not covered under old-age and survivors insurance. We cannot give them credit, but let's give them coverage under social security. This, too, can be accomplished through the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

In fact, the wartime issue of adequate aid to the returning soldier has greatly emphasized the urgent need for immediate enactment of this measure. The extension of coverage to servicemen not now covered would be most timely. So would the bill's provisions for expanding the social-security system to cover the risk of disability.

There is a very close and important connection between disability insurance and disability pensions. The veterans of every former war have been entitled to non-service-connected disability pensions, which compensate for disabilities incurred after the veteran's period of military service. There has been considerable opposition to non-service-connected pensions, especially on the part of those who fought the introduction of social security. The veterans of previous wars were branded as raiders of the Federal Treasury. But their ability to secure these pensions was due to the fact that, in the absence of social security, there was always a real need for protection against invalidity of the wage earner. Since social security was as remote as a dream in the days of the veterans of former wars, they naturally sought action on their own behalf.

Today the situation in regard to World War No. 2 veterans is different because the foundation of social security has already been laid, and if extended to cover all risks will meet the basic minimum needs of veterans and civilians alike. Enactment of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill will give World War No. 2 veterans protection against peacetime disability along with civilians under the social-security system. In the meantime, the House of Representatives has voted to grant non-service-connected disability pensions to the ex-servicemen of this war. The proposed pensions would start at $50 a month and increase to $65 after 10 years of disability, or upon reaching the age of 65.

Obviously, then, full provision for the needs of both civilians and ex-servicemen requires the immediate expansion of the veterans' and social-security programs. Of course, opponents of liberalization view with alarm the cost that such expansion would entail. It is appropriate to recall that when social-security legislation was pending in 1935 these same people made dire predictions that social security would bankrupt the country. Other horrendous bogeys were conjured up. These bogeys failed to appear. Now they say that expansion of the programs will bring the bogeys. Therefore, they propose to keep the cost down by preventing expansion and denying needed benefits.

But reducing costs by ignoring needs and suffering is a solution which the American people no longer accept. The problem must be met in a manner worthy of our position as the foremost industrial nation; that is, through a program of jobs for the veterans of military service as well as for all veterans of war service at home. In other

words, the solution is full employment in the post-war period, plus expanded veterans' benefits and expanded social security. That is the challenge. Will the people at home face it with battlefield courage and determination? Labor says "Yes."

Eulogy to Mrs. Annie Bates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following item, which appeared in the Sunday Telegram-News, of Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, March 26, 1944, concerning one of the finest mothers that ever lived, Mrs. Annie Bates, who recently passed away in the city of Salem, Mass., the mother of our able and capable colleague, Congressman GEORGE J. BATES, of Salem.

She was held in high admiration by her friends, neighbors, relatives, and asscciates not only in her home city but through the length and breadth of the entire Sixth Congressional District.

We, the Members of Congress, whether we are Democrat or Republican, or whether we are from the North, South, East, or West, extend to this popular Congressman from Massachusetts our sincere and heartfelt sympathy in this hour of bereavement with a sincere wish for courage and strength to sustain and comfort him in his great sorrow.

MRS. ANNIE BATES

"All that we are, and all that we ever hope to be, we owe to our sweet, lovely, little Irish mother," were the beautiful words of praise paid to his deceased mother by Congressman GEORGE BATES, of Salem.

There are volumes contained in that simple but sincere statement.

There is love and appreciation in every word.

It is a tribute paid to the memory of a devoted mother by a son who is aware of the tremendous part that his mother played in moulding his life into one of America's leading statesmen.

At the altar of her knee she murmured those priceless personality traits which blossomed into noble character in her children.

In their youth, she guided them skillfully and gently over the many hazardous obstacles strewn along life's highway.

In their childhood, she became the inspiration that made possible attaining their respective goals in life.

And now that her work on this temporal coil is done, she has gone to that reward which the Heavenly Father has prepared for those dear mothers who lived a life fashioned after the example left by the Mother of mankind.

Mrs. Annie (Burns) Bates was born in Ireland more than eight decades ago. She came to this country as did so many other Irish men and women because they saw in this new world the answer to their most cherished ambitions and heartfelt aspirations.

They came to America because they saw in this new land the opportunity to enjoy to an almost unlimited degree those God-given rights which were either denied or restricted in other countries throughout the world.

They came to America and enjoyed to the utmost those rights, and in return gave to America Ireland's greatest gifts of courage, ambition, love, loyalty, humor, faith, tenacity, and hope.

Mrs. Annie Bates will be missed by the citizens of Salem to whom she was endeared.

She will be missed by the citizens of her son's district who had come to know her and admire her.

She will be profoundly missed by her family who will never forget the loss which they have sustained.

But in their hearts have been erected monuments of love and appreciation that will become more beautiful and precious with the passage of time.

For in those monuments she will continue to live, for she "is not dead who lives in the hearts of those whom she leaves behind."

Ask the Bellhops?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week President Roosevelt when asked to make a definite statement as to our foreign policy, facetiously told the reporters to ask the bellhops in the Washington hotels. That answer the reporters and public were forced to accept.

A local paper brings notice of the death in action of Second Lt. Lisle P. Pullin, of Dowagiac, Mich. He, Corp. Gerald Turner, and Corp. Ernest Dohm gave their lives in the same week on the Italian battle front. Two other Dowagiac boys, Pvt. Vincent Aronld and Lt. Charles Bolton, were seriously wounded in the same battle area. I mention these names because all came in 1 week—from one small city.

Copies of the 6 dailies and of the more than 35 weeklies published in the district give other casualties listed, bring out with shocking force the hideousness, the terrible cost in young manhood, of this war.

Reading of where these young men were born, where they went to school, where they worked, of their parents, and of the wives and children of some, recalling my own boyhood, my school days, the birth of my children, my opportunities, I am forced to wonder why it is that these young men and hundreds of thousands of others like them throughout the country must die so far from home, in a strange land among strangers. Prayer is in my heart that soon some way, through victory, may be found to end this and all wars.

This is no time for frivolity and the President's light reply to the query as to what our foreign policy is to be, is no answer either to the 24 Republican Congressmen who have vigorously supported his interventionist foreign policy, nor to those who must do the fighting, to those who support them here at home.

We have sent billions of dollars' worth of materials to Russia, our ally in the war against the Germans. We have sent millions of men to Britain, our ally, against the Nazis and the Japs. We have sent some men, some materials to MacArthur in the South Pacific, to aid him in avenging those who were lost, those who were tortured by the Japs, to make sure that Japan will be conquered. We have been told that after the war is over we must join other nations in a super United States of the world where all will be harmonious and peace prevail.

Unfortunately, today, before the victory has been won, we find the war partners unable to agree among themselves. This week Russia entered into a new treaty with Japan. Though the Atlantic Charter promised all peoples the right to determine their own form of government, Russia apparently, without consulting either Britain or the United States of America, recognized Badoglio as the head of the Italian Government. That was a disappointment to Britain and to us.

Though the Atlantic Charter guaranteed the post-war freedom of Poland, it is evident that Russia intends to retain the major portion of that country.

The United States wants to feed the starving women and children of occupied conquered lands—Great Britain prevents. The United States first wanted to open the doors of Palestine to refugee Jews, but later Great Britain and those in control of our military policy decided against it. The controversy here and in Britain still goes on.

The foregoing is just a glimpse at a small part of the picture. It is sufficient to show, beyond question, that it is time that Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt get together, if possible agree upon the war's objectives, the demands which will be made by each nation when the conflict is over. Tell us what happened at Teheran.

MacArthur has recovered some of the islands which will be given back to Britain, to the Netherlands. We furnished some of the munitions which aided in retaking parts of Poland, which aided in carrying on the war against the Finns. We ask for no territory for ourselves, no reimbursement for the billions spent. Nothing can repay us for the lives lost. This war is being carried on throughout the world from three to nine thousand miles from home.

Rickenbacker, who should know, who has seen more of the battle front than any other man, tells us our casualties will exceed a million men. There is talk of drafting not only men but women for service here at home, requiring them to work wherever they may be sent. Our people are a free people, they have willingly paid their taxes, purchased War bonds, given their loved ones. They have the right to know now the objectives of this war and what is to be their part when victory has been won.

Our people, our men and women in the service are not asking the bellhops about our foreign policy, they are asking this administration and the President who heads it and who is asking for a fourth term.

Two Seminars Set To Knit Americas—Cultural Ties Group Sponsors Summer Sessions at Habana and Mexico Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday, March 19, 1944, New York Times. I wish to add that Msgr. William Barry and Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, who for 4 years have been leaders of the Inter-American Seminars, are doing a patriotic service in introducing the young people of the United States to the values of university education in the good-neighbor republics. Monsignor Barry, chairman of the Committee on Cultural Relations with the American Republics and Canada, has recently been honored by an appointment to act as codirector of the Cuban-American Council of University Studies, while Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of sociology at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and visiting professor of social history at the University of Habana, is the only living United States citizen who is an honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil. Since I know these two scholars personally and have been following the constructive nature of their work in the inter-American field, I take this occasion to emphasize the long-range, permanent value of this project, the inter-American Seminars:

TWO SEMINARS SET TO KNIT AMERICAS—CULTURAL TIES GROUP SPONSORS SUMMER SESSIONS AT HAVANA AND MEXICO UNIVERSITIES

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., March 18.—The fourth annual Inter-American Seminar of the Inter-American Institute will be held at the University of Havana for the 1944 summer session, Msgr. William Barry, Chairman of the Committee on Cultural Relations With the American Republics and Canada, and head of its university extension committee, announced here today.

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of sociology at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and a member of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, has been named as seminar director. Dr. A. Lorenzo M. Danis, professor of social science at the University of Ottawa, has been invited to lead the Canadian delegation.

As in the past 2 years, the Cultural Relations Committee, composed of Protestants, Jews, and Catholics, will sponsor a similar seminar at the National University of Mexico.

The lay professors and students at Mexico City will be under the direction of Dr. Cyril Burke, professor of philosophy at Barry College for Women, while the religious teachers will be guided by Dr. Alcuin Heibel, former president of Mount Angel (Oreg.) College.

Monsignor Barry and Dr. Joseph B. Code, an alumnus of Louvain University, who is director of the Institute, are expected to inspect both seminars during tours that will take them to the National University of Costa Rica and the Inter-American University of Panama, where they will explore possibilities for extending the program.

Commenting on plans for extension of the seminar method as a means to promote "the spiritual phase" of the good-neighbor policy, Dr. Code termed it "the first step toward a deeper inter-American understanding."

"The current crisis in inter-American affairs demonstrates the value of a permanent, long-range policy," he said.

"Our objective is to establish organized nucleuses of scholars versed in Spanish, Portuguese, and French at the principal universities throughout Central and South America, including republics of the Caribbean such as Haiti and Santo Domingo.

"There is an acute need for centers of this character in Brazil, especially at Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo."

Cook County Leads State With 4-Cent "Penny" Milk for Its Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily News of March 29, 1944:

COOK COUNTY LEADS STATE WITH 4-CENT PENNY MILK FOR ITS SCHOOLS

In line with the demand on Monday by Representative RALPH CHURCH (Republican, Illinois) for a congressional investigation of the "overpayments for penny milk" in Chicago schools, examination of the records of the War Food Administration reveals that Cook County is the only large area in Illinois where 4 cents is the predominant price paid to dairies for school penny milk. With the exception of Winnebago, which has only 7 school milk programs at 4 cents, the other 56 counties in which the project is maintained show a predominant price ranging from 2 to 3.75 cents.

Cook County has 379 penny milk programs, and most of these are sponsored by the Chicago Board of Education. The price here to school children is 4 cents. The 27 school milk programs sponsored by the back-of-the-yards council get milk for 3 cents in Chicago and 9 other schools under the same sponsorship purchase milk for 3.5 cents. The Federal-State subsidy covers 3 cents of the basic cost; where half-pints of school milk cost 4 cents, the children have to pay the extra penny.

2 TO 3.75 CENTS

Federal records reveal that in the other industrial counties of the State where union wages are paid the predominant price of penny milk varies from 2 cents to 3.75 cents. In Kane County 13 school programs are able to buy milk at from 2 cents to 3.5 cents. Only 1 school in Kane had to pay 4 cents.

In Lake County the same W. F. A. records show that 7 schools buy milk for 3 cents a half-pint, 7 schools pay 3.6 cents, 13 schools pay 3.7 cents, 10 schools pay 4 cents, and 4 schools pay as high as 5 cents. Federal authorities had no comment to make on this distribution of prices within 1 county.

W. F. A. records for Peoria indicate that all penny milk is bought for 3 cents. Rock Island, with its 38 milk programs, shows a uniform cost of 3 cents, the same source revealed. In St. Clair County, which reflects the wage and labor condition of St. Louis, the price of penny milk is 3.7 cents with 2 schools being able to buy milk at 3 cents.

LESS THAN 3 CENTS

A number of counties showed penny milk being bought at less than 3 cents—Coles at 2.5 cents, De Witt at 2.7 cents (two schools paying 3.2 cents), Fulton at 2 cents (one school pays 3 cents), Hamilton at 2.7 cents, Hancock at 2 cents, Iroquois from 2 to 2.6 cents, Jersey at 2.5 cents, Kankakee at 2.3 cents (one school paying 3 cents), McLean with 14 schools buying milk at 2 cents (two pay 2.7 cents), Marshall at 2.7 cents, Mercer at 2 cents, Perry at 2 cents, Richland at 2 cents, and Tazewell at 2 cents (with two schools paying 2.7 cents).

In his address Monday in Washington, Representative CHURCH accused the Kelly-Nash machine in Chicago of snatching pennies from school children in the form of overpayments on penny milk. He said that where milk costs 4 cents a half pint, the child had to pay 1 cent, and this worked contrary to the aims of the school milk programs, since only about 60 percent of the children bought penny milk if they had to pay anything.

SEES POLITICAL PAY-OFF

According to Representative CHURCH'S speech on the floor of the House, 1-cent overpayments throughout the 10-month school year amounted to $250,000, and the Illinois Representative indicated that a slice of this money found its way from the dairies to the coffers of the Cook County Democratic Party in payment for the privilege of permitting the dairies to charge 4 cents for their half pints of milk when 3 and 3.5 cents were the true competitive prices.

Representative CHURCH called for a Federal investigation on the ground that Federal funds are involved.

Oklahoma Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an editorial from the Washington Evening Star which I believe is a very good analysis of the recent congressional election in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma.

The editorial follows:

OKLAHOMA VERDICT

Since the Republican political strategists saw fit to make the Roosevelt administration the principal issue in Tuesday's special election in Oklahoma's Second Congressional District, they will have to make the best of the verdict returned by the voters.

That verdict was clearly an endorsement of the President and his policies, the Democratic candidate winning by a margin of about 4,000 votes in a total of some 40,000. Nor is there anything to suggest that local rather than national considerations were the controlling factor in the balloting.

There is room for doubt, of course, as to the extent to which this result in Oklahoma in a traditionally Democratic district may be indicative of national sentiment. In 1936 the total vote in the district was 72,034, the Democrat winning by 19,414 votes. In 1938

the vote was 53,393, the Democratic majority being 22,723, and in 1940 the total vote was 80,891, with a Democratic margin of 19,721. By 1942, however, with a total vote of 42,934, the Democratic margin had shrunk to a mere 388 votes.

This formed one of the principal grounds of the anti-Roosevelt preelection trend forecasts, and now the Republicans have lost by 4,000 votes in the lightest total vote of recent years. If that is evidence of a trend, it is not of a kind to bring joy to the hearts of the G. O. P.

The Late Honorable James A. O'Leary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House, I am sure, will grant me the indulgence of this moment to pay tribute to the late JAMES A. O'LEARY, one of our most beloved Members, who departed this life leaving a permanent record of accomplishment for and service to his country upon the journal of our proceedings during one of the critical periods in our history.

Jim, as he was universally known to us, had a genial, buoyant disposition, a ready smile, and lived up to his Irish inheritance with a fund of philosophical wit and humor. He was a true American, his patriotism reaching down to the soil and roots of our fatherland.

He served with my late esteemed predecessor, George N. Seger, and myself on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and was religiously devoted to the restoration and expansion of our merchant marine. Frequently Mr. Seger and myself rode with him back and forth to New York, discussing the future of our merchant marine in the pre-war days when the pioneering was being done for the great expansion program that made possible our present vast communication and supply lines reaching to every part of the globe.

Back in 1936 they, under the leadership of our distinguished chairman and other esteemed colleagues, laid the foundation for the winning of the war in peacetime commercial expansion.

Representing the maritime district of Staten Island and lower Manhattan, JIM O'LEARY fought mightily and successfully for the expansion of the shipbuilding industry in his community, but never at the expense of the national objective of the expansion program, only as a contribution to the greater cause.

The House, and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries particularly, has lost a valuable Member. His children have been deprived of a devoted father, but their grief will be assuaged in the remembrance of the distinguished public service he has rendered his country.

Arizona Has Cooperated—Now We Hope All Others Will on Soldier Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] moved today to adopt the resolution concerning adjournment with an amendment, I sought to ask him the question whether the effect of it would not be to decrease the length of the recess period. I favored the adoption of the resolution in its new form because I see it does have the effect of shortening the recess period, which I think is desirable. Several gentlemen expressed the view that we should recess for only 3-day intervals and remain on the job because of the many important things to be taken care of. I appreciate that view, although I do want to get out home.

There are many weighty matters on which we need legislation, and some of these need to be acted on quickly. On my own part, I am concerned about the immediate consideration of the veterans' omnibus bill. I believe early action is demanded on it, and for that reason I have gone before the committee to propose an amendment which is in substance the same thing as the bill H. R. 3179, which I introduced months ago and on which I have scheduled hearings within less than a month. It was only recently that I was named chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to hold hearings on H. R. 3179. Because the Bureau of Reclamation officials have up to this moment been before the Appropriations Committee on the Interior bill, I had delayed hearings which would call for those same witnesses from the Bureau until after the current hearings had been closed. However, I have no pride of authorship, and if my proposal could be made an amendment to the "G. I. bill of rights," it would serve the same purpose as if separately enacted.

We have just listened today with great interest to the President's message concerning the recently enacted soldier vote bill which he has permitted to become law without his approval. In that message the President suggests some deficiencies in the measure which makes the law, in his judgment, inadequate, and he also calls on Congress for additional legislation to make it more effective. Now it happens that the additional legislation which the President calls for is exactly the same that I would favor and did favor several weeks ago. I would also like adequate provision made for permitting the soldiers to vote in the primary elections if other conditions make it possible. Ballots for the primary elections will be carried air mail, postage free, and every facility offered by the Federal Government within reasonable time limits to facilitate voting in the primaries. Appropriate cooperation on the part of every State is to be hoped for.

Again I may say to the House that Arizona by a special session of the legislature has cooperated by moving our primaries from September up to July. My State believes strongly in the States' rights ballot, and that idea includes a vote in the primaries. Now, we have in Arizona a petition system of nominations. Previously candidates must file their nomination petitions 60 days prior to the primary election. However, so anxious is Arizona to make it possible for our men and women in uniform to vote in the primaries as well as the general election, candidates must now file their nomination petitions not 60 days as previously but 90 days before the Arizona primaries. Arizona has long had the absentee ballot provision, and now, in addition to the steps already taken by the State, the Federal Government will transport the ballots by air at Federal expense and see to it that they are delivered both ways in time to be cast and counted. This is another matter of legislation which I had intended to ask for in case this latest soldier vote bill had been vetoed. Whichever Federal law—that of 1942 or of 1944—prevails, Arizona has done her duty toward making it possible for her citizens in uniform to vote.

Canadian Air Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a very important step has been announced by our neighbor, Canada, in regard to the future of its air transportation.

According to the New York Times for Saturday, March 18, 1944, Minister of Munitions C. D. Howe, the Government spokesman on matters affecting air transportation in Canada, announced that:

> Steps would be taken to require railroads to divest themselves of ownership of air lines so that within 1 year from the end of the European war transport by air would be entirely separate from surface transportation.

Since this relationship between air and surface carriers is a matter in which we also are very much interested and upon which we must formulate a definite policy, I desire to include here, under leave to extend my remarks, an article from the New York Times.

It follows:

> OTTAWA, March 17.—Defining Canadian aims and interests in international air transport as calling for a liberal course of cooperation with other nations, Munitions Minister C. D. Howe today tabled in the House of Commons the Canadian tentative and

preliminary draft of an international air-transport convention.

In brief, the proposals that the Canadian representatives will be authorized to support or initiate in international discussions, Mr. Howe said, will be as follows:

Establishment of an air-transport authority with effective powers, supported by all the Governments concerned, to further international cooperation and good will, insure that international air routes and services are divided fairly and equitably among all member nations, meet the needs of the peoples of the world for efficient transport, and contribute to the establishment and maintenance of a permanent system of general security.

Mr. Howe announced that steps would be taken to require railways to divest themselves of ownership of air lines so that within 1 year from the end of the European war transport by air would be entirely separate from surface transportation.

BUILDING PROGRAM NEEDED

Points stressed by Mr. Howe were that wartime developments would create no vested interest in air transport or air facilities in Canada for any other Governments; that Canada did not consider applications from air lines of another country unless forwarded by the Government of that country through diplomatic channels; that a vigorous airplane construction industry was an essential complement to Canada's post-war aviation plans.

Also that rivalries and disputes between nations and the establishment of uneconomic national services necessitating large subsidies had to be avoided; that each country had to decide for itself whether its companies operating international air services were to be privately or state owned, and whether there was to be one single national company or several, and that failure to devise a working system of cooperation and collaboration would lead to endless friction.

"I think," the Munitions Minister said, "that we must be prepared to subscribe to the granting of general freedom of transit for international air services on a universal basis so that national air service will automatically possess the right to cross the territory of other nations en route to their destinations and to land in other countries for refueling and reservicing without having to request the specific permission of each Government concerned.

"However, in order to prevent misuse of this freedom, it would appear necessary to grant to some international authority power to supervise the manner in which it is carried out."

IN POSITION TO HELP

In granting this freedom, countries like Canada, strategically placed athwart great traffic routes, would be making a great contribution to an effective international system, Mr. Howe observed.

"It would seem reasonable, therefore," he continued, "to suggest that freedom of air transit should be extended to cover as well a certain amount of freedom of carriage of goods and passengers in order to enable all nations to share in a proportion of the international traffic available without having to go in for all the bilateral bargaining which so confused the pre-war situation.

"It would seem necessary that each nation should at least possess the right to carry passengers and cargo from its own territory to other countries and to bring back from these other countries passengers and cargo which are intended for its own territory."

One provision suggested in the constitution of the international air transport assembly is that the number of votes each member state can cast will vary from 1 to 6, depending on its importance in international air transport. The board of 12 members must include at least 1 national of each of the 8 chief member states.

What a Fourth Term for Roosevelt Might Mean to American Freedom and Judicial Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days about the manipulations being handled by the palace brigade which has already started the 1944 Presidential campaign by launching its phoney fourth-term draft for President Roosevelt. Already the time-worn slogan "Don't change horses in the middle of a stream" is being worked overtime by radical left-wing theorists for whom precedent and tradition have no appeal except when they can be utilized to serve the selfish political ambitions of their little coterie of bureaucratic overlords.

Since the "don't change horses" slogan is being so vigorously emphasized by the "we must have him again" politicians, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it might be well to analyze just what is meant by the term "horse" in this connection. If the slogan sounders refer to some mortal man when they use the equestrian term, they are either ignorant of history or they are pleading for permanent one-man or one-family rule in this country fashioned after the royal houses of Europe. The stream of progress never stops, and if they now argue that we should keep the same horse under the same man sitting in the same saddle—sic—always, they argue for permanent tenure, whether it be conceived as a dictatorship, a royal monarchy, a hereditary ruling house, or some other form of imported European concept to replace the traditional American self-government.

IS THE CONSTITUTION THE "HORSE" THAT THEY MEAN?

However, if by the term "horse" is meant some gallant steed, such as the Constitution of the United States, or the Bill of Rights, or our American traditions of self-government and limited tenure in office, then Americans generally can agree that we should not "change horses in the middle of a stream." We should not indeed corrupt our Constitution, nullify our Bill of Rights, or destroy our American traditions of self-government and limited tenure in office during our progress through the stream of blood and sweat and tears called war nor during our travel across any other aspect of the perpetual stream of human progress. Perpetuity and permanency in the Executive office is not an American ideal, but the perpetuity and permanency of American institutions is a sacred ideal in this Republic. The election of President Roosevelt or any other mortal man to 16 consecutive years of tenure in the office of President would do violence to our American system and most dangerously provide for a "change of horses in midstream" by discarding the basis of our American way of free government in the middle of a war being fought to preserve it.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the committee for political action of the C. I. O., the officials of the Communist Party, the editors of PM and the Daily Worker, and others who are loudly calling for the election of President Roosevelt to a fourth term because we should not "change horses in midstream" would do well to consult a thesaurus or a lexicographer's code book to be sure they understand how the term "horse" is to be interpreted by the great bulk of American voters who have long been famous for their horse sense. There are growing indications that level-headed Americans have in mind that they will avoid "changing horses in midstream" by electing a Republican President in 1944 and thus continuing to keep in the tugs or under the saddle the real "horse" upon which the United States depends for motive power and a firm foundation in this and every other national crisis, namely, the Constitution of the United States and our traditional policies and principles of American self-government.

WHAT ANOTHER TERM OF ROOSEVELT MEANS TO THE COURTS

Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about what the third term—to say nothing about the consequence of a possible fourth term—has done to reduce the independence and authority of our several States, to curtail the effective functioning of Congress, and to centralize in Washington bureaucrats economic and political functions formerly reserved for the individual or his local government. Grave as these consequences have been, however, an even more serious menace faces our courts of law and the whole functioning of freedom in this country should we have fastened upon us another 4 or 8 or 12 years of the same family rule.

It should be remembered that the last great safeguard of freemen is found in their free and independent courts in which justice should function without intimidation or interference or imposed interpretations by any higher human institution or individual. When the courts falter, freedom fails. In Germany Hitler told his courts to decide their cases on the basis of "the general sentiment prevailing in the communities" where his victims were being tried. Hitler then proceeded by the powers of propaganda over the radio and through the press, supplemented by the powers of patronage and purse, to see to it that "the sentiment prevailing in the communities" was always favorable, or at least amenable, to Hitler's point of view. Thus the German courts became mere nesting places for elderly members of the party's faithful where they could draw their pay and receive their pensions for writing into judicial decisions the party line and philosophical position conceived by Hitler and circulated by his great army of political appointees.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to have 4 more years of the Roosevelt regime in this country, undoubtedly well over 90 percent of all our Federal judges would be

the personal appointees of a single individual. They would be chosen as those already selected have been chosen—on the basis of faithful service to the party and of abject devotion to the party line. They would represent a single point of view. The dangers of such a situation are so obvious and so far-reaching that just to record the fact is to reveal its tragic consequences.

Mr. Speaker, if every current argument for a fourth term for President Roosevelt were valid and such is far from being true, the very fact that another 4 years of the same regime in power would put our entire judicial system under the influence of a single individual is sufficient to merit the overwhelming defeat of any fourth-term effort. It seems inconceivable that a free Republic such as ours would voluntarily vote itself into the shackle-inviting situation which inevitably arises when a country loses its system of free and independent courts.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a thought-provoking editorial appearing in the March 27 issue of Pathfinder magazine—said to be by many times over the most widely read publication printed in Washington, D. C. This editorial, entitled "The Roosevelt Judges," merits the careful consideration of the Congress and the country. When changing horses is being considered let us by no means change the tried and tested steed represented by an independent judiciary for a broken-down mare of European origin, which could neither walk nor move without waiting for the commands from a master to whom it has already listened too well and too long.

The editorial follows:

THE ROOSEVELT JUDGES

This is as good a time as any to ask two questions involving the caliber and fitness of the 185 judges and justices appointed to the Federal courts since 1932. There has been considerable gossip during the past 6 months about the growing dissension and acidulous language between the 9 Justices of the Supreme Court. Then, a few weeks ago, word began to get around that Randolph Paul, the "pinkish" general counsel of the Treasury Department, will probably be appointed to fill an expected vacancy on the bench for the southern district of New York. Finally, an unidentified young woman pinched a Congressman's backside during a tea party at the British Embassy the other day. She apologized, hurriedly. "I thought," she said, "you were a friend of mine in the Supreme Court."

These are three incidents in a nation's history. They are, you might say, exceedingly trivial stuff. In one way, yes. But look at them again. Federal judges are appointed for life. In their hands rest the decisions that rule our civil liberties. They are the senior guardians of national justice and law and the official interpreters of the Constitution.

What kind of men has President Roosevelt appointed to the Federal bench? The question is vital, for no other President ever appointed so many. To the United States Supreme Court he has named 7 out of 9 members; to the 56 circuit courts of appeals he has appointed 38 judges, and to the district courts he has named 140 out of 224. Of all the Federal judges he has chosen about 65 percent. Many of them were appointed because of political favor. Many are political candidates who failed to win public elections. There is no secret in the fact that the President expects personal loyalty from all of them.

Charles W. Smith, Jr., associate professor of political science, University of Kentucky, declared in the Kentucky Law Journal of May 1943 that Roosevelt's appointments to the Supreme Court "have been made with an eye on political considerations and on the social and economic views of the men appointed," and he pointed out that only one, Rutledge, had ever had any previous experience as judge of an important court. When in June 1936 the President appointed two Federal judges in New York to fill newly created positions, the independent New York Times identified them as supporters of "two local political bosses," and remarked: "It is painful to have to record that the President has again treated important appointments to the Federal courts as if they were ordinary partisan spoils." The city and county bar associations also made strong protests.

The assertion that the President "has viewed the courts as merely one part of the administrative machinery" was strikingly demonstrated in his court-packing effort of 1937 when he proposed to add to the Supreme Court six new judges who would, allegedly, move it out of its "horse and buggy" ways and make it a "puller" instead of a "balker" in the "three-horse team" of the Government branches. "We must take action," he said then, "to save the Constitution from the courts"—although he was also on record as saying that the Constitution was incomplete and always had been—"through which a team and horses can be driven on every page."

In its final report on the court-packing bill, the Senate Judiciary Committee declared it "an invasion of the judicial power such as has never before been attempted in this country," that it was a "proposal without precedent and without justification," and should be "so emphatically rejected that its parallel will never again be presented to the free representatives of the free American people."

Bottom in the President's court appointments was reached, according to Professor Smith, when he sent to the Senate in July 1942 the name of Thomas F. Meaney as district judge in New Jersey—a man whom Governor Edison dubbed "a pawn in the hands of the boss of Jersey City (Frank Hague)."

Such appointments naturally affect the tone and quality of our courts and the character of our Government. They, too, reach down through our traditions to the constitutional roots of the Republic. The Constitution defines the powers of the judiciary and, at the same time, appoints each generation of the judiciary to its council of guardians. As the New York Times so wisely said, "Those having the power to appoint (Federal judges) ought to be more than usually scrupulous and painstaking in leaving nothing undone which may redound to the repute and reverence in which the Federal judiciary ought to be held by the people."

Now, again, comes the rumor of Randolph Paul's coming appointment. And that rumor has not been denied.

In view of the record, one question might well be asked Mr. Roosevelt. It would be asked, not as an insult, not as a political move, but humbly and sincerely in the interests of the American Republic and the Republic's future. The question would be, "If you do not hold our courts and our Constitution in contempt, Mr. President, what is your attitude?"

Critical Manpower Shortage in the Fisheries Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein certain telegrams that I have received on the subject of the critical manpower shortage in the fisheries industry:

TILGHMAN, MD., *March 31, 1944.*

Judge OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Marine Fisheries,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate anything you can do to have all-around fishermen and keymen in sea-food-producing plant put on critical list. Most young men, 18 to 30, in the industry have already enlisted in Coast Guard, Navy, and been drafted. What few young men are left are absolutely essential and needed to maintain sea-food products. We do not feel that there are more than 100 men left in Maryland between 18 and 26, who are fishing large pound nets, and keymen in sea-food-processing plants. Most pound-net rigs are owned by old men that obtained the services of all IV-F's and old men they can get. Each rig certainly needs 1 young man who is experienced and able to handle pound-net poles as long as 65 feet. Young men under 18 do not have the experience, old men not enough strength to do the job.

Respectfully yours,

DEPARTMENT OF TIDEWATER FISHERIES,
GEORGE T. HARRISON.

LUBEC, MAINE, *March 30, 1944.*

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our industry has approximately 120 men 18 to 25 years of age. Approximately two-thirds of these 120 men are in IV-F; the remaining one-third have not been called due to dependents or occupational deferment. The industry has approximately 200 men ages 25 to 38. Approximately one-third of those are keymen who have been granted occupational deferment. Out of a total of 26 sardine canneries in Maine two were unable to operate the season of 1943 due to lack of manpower. I estimate if the keymen for the industry and those who have been granted occupational deferment are drafted this season, the production of Maine sardines, either through closing down of canneries or lessening capacity, will be reduced by 20 percent.

MAINE SARDINE PACKERS ASSOCIATION,
MILROY WARREN, *President.*

NORFOLK, VA., March 30, 1944.

HON. S. OTIS BLAND, *Chairman,*
Committee Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Manpower situation most critical among sea-food industry within this area. Production already subnormal because sufficient manpower not available to man fisheries processing plants, fish freezers, and primary distributing houses. United States Employment Agencies unable furnish additional men needed because shipyards defense projects,

etc., seemingly have already absorbed all available men. Consequently the prospect of further skilled men being absorbed by draft is truly alarming because it would mean further decrease in supply of food fish, fish products, and fish oils, all of which are urgently needed. Although definite figures not available, believe number skilled men under 26 engaged in sea-food industry comparably small, perhaps less than 300 in critical key positions within State of Virginia. Considering volume produced and importance of sea-food as vitamin food, believe number men involved is small in comparison with any other food-producing industry. Feel sure you realize and will agree that the sea-food industry from standpoint of food production is equally vital and should be accorded identically the same consideration as farming.

VIRGINIA FISHERIES ASSOCIATION,
V. L. HODGES, *Secretary.*

Golden Gate International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. TOLAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include herein a powerful editorial from the Post-Enquirer, of Oakland, Calif., my congressional district.

Last August when I was home I personally inspected the proposed Golden Gate International Airport on the shallow tidelands of the Berkeley and Albany water front. It is an ideal location for an international airport and I am wholeheartedly in favor of it.

This editorial sets out facts which are unanswerable, for there is no question but what this Nation and the whole world is air-minded. The West needs such an international airport as is so fittingly described in this editorial from the Oakland Post-Enquirer:

IN THE COMING AIR AGE, OAKLAND AREA MUST BE WEST'S BIG AIR CENTER

Juan Trippe, president of the Pan-American Airways System, talked yesterday in the Hearst Greek Theater of the University of California on America in the coming air age.

If this preview of the world of tomorrow seems in some ways a rose-colored dream, remember that it is a dream based on the earthy realities and solid achievements of today.

Remember also that it is less of a dream than Henry Ford's prediction of a generation ago that America would soon be a nation on wheels—how the practical people of that day hooted at him for that. Among the conservative bankers it gained him the reputation of a dreamy, eccentric fellow, and a bit of a crackpot.

In his charter-day address Mr. Trippe told the story of how his ocean-spanning air clippers had blazed the trails from America to all the continents of the world. In air transportation that is already ancient history.

CHEAP, UNIVERSAL AIR TRAVEL

The first China Clipper cut to 7 days the travel time from California to Hong Kong. Steamer time was 21 days.

"But that achievement of 8 years ago will not meet the requirements of the post-war years ahead," says Mr. Trippe.

"Then you will again stand at the citadels of this western coast and watch new clippers take off to deliver their passengers, mail, and cargo to the Orient in 23 hours instead of 7 days. They will provide efficient, low-cost transportation over the trade routes of the world.

"The future is in the air. In the air age we are entering no American who works will find world travel beyond his means. His vacation in Europe or Asia will be lengthened by speed of transport, as well as enriched by lower travel costs. This is one—and not the least—of the stakes that the average American has in the development of aviation."

Five years ago there were 23,000 licensed civilian air pilots in the United States. Three years ago there were 100,000. Now the Army and Navy are training more than 100,000 skilled flyers every 12 months.

In 2 years the number of airports in the United States with concrete runways of 3,500 feet or more in length has increased 1,000 percent.

The new air age is not something in the remote future. We are entering it now, and with bewildering speed.

WORLD AIR CROSSROADS HERE

This metropolitan Oakland area, in the center of the western seaboard and not off in a corner, should be the great crossroad of air transportation in the Pacific world.

If we make intelligent, courageous use of our advantages and opportunities, it will be.

But there is no time for endless talking. There is no time for bickering—for the airing of little provincial and intercity jealousies. Other cities are acting, and acting fast.

There is a proposal for the development of a great central airport, to be called the Golden Gate international airport, on the shallow tidelands of the Berkeley and Albany water fronts. Its estimated cost would be $20,000,000. It would be planned and built for the needs of tomorrow, as well as of today.

The plan has been endorsed by many of the most distinguished and responsible leaders of the community, of the armed forces, and of the aviation world. It is a challenging proposal that should interest every intelligent person awake to the realities of the world of today and tomorrow.

At the same time the continuing progress of Oakland's great municipal airport is being pressed. It remains the great air center of the west coast, with a wealth of aviation history and prestige behind it.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has granted it a new appropriation of $1,400,000, the largest given in the West since the war began. That is a recognition of its intrinsic importance.

Its runways are being strengthened and lengthened to handle aircraft weighing up to 210,000 pounds. An instrument landing system is being completed to keep the airport open in all kinds of weather. Many other big improvements are coming up.

MORE THAN ONE AIRPORT NEEDED

And yet, the total investment in the Oakland Municipal Airport has not yet reached $10,000,000. It is the second biggest in the Nation; the biggest, the Idlewild Airport of New York, cost $165,000,000.

In the new air age into which we are now entering we will need more than one great airport if we are going to be the real air transportation center of the West, if we are going to be more than a way station of the air routes.

This is important to this city. We need to think about it. We need to act on it. Juan Trippe's charter-day speech should help us to do both.

American Aviation Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a luncheon on Air Cargo Transport sponsored by Detroit Board of Commerce and Wayne University, under the Edward S. Evans grant for air cargo research, Thursday afternoon, March 23, 1944, Book Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich.:

For years the Englishman proudly said, "Britannia rules the waves," and in doing so gave expression to the fact that British seapower, as manifested in her mighty Navy and merchant marine, made possible the world-wide, closely knit British Empire and its commanding position in world affairs.

It is my fond hope and sincere belief that in the days that lie ahead after the conclusion of the present horrible war, people the world over will say "America rules the air." Not that I want this rulership to be expressed in mighty fleets of passenger and cargo airplanes hogging world-wide civil aviation; not that I want this rulership to be expressed in mighty armadas of battle planes capable of enforcing the political opinions and demands of the American people wherever they may be challenged on this globe.

On the contrary, when we can truly say "America rules the air," I want it to mean that she does so in behalf of the ideals of democracy for which this country was born and for which it is now so lavishly pouring out its blood and treasures for freedom, equality, and security for men within every nation everywhere.

To these ends let there be the keenest rivalry and competition between America and other nations of the world for leadership in the air just as there is and should be the keenest rivalry and competition between Michigan and Detroit in the race for State and city air leadership over the other States and cities of the United States.

I cannot tell such a gathering as this anything about the technical aspects of aeronautics. The members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Michigan Aeronautics Commission, the executives of the air lines who have been doing an almost miraculous job in their wartime activities and services, and many others, some of whom are here today, can advise you far better than I in the manner in which Detroit, Mich., and the country can go about obtaining the kind of air leadership which I have in mind.

Likewise, the experience and glorious achievements of our airmen of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, are an invaluable contribution to the progress of all aviation.

My role in the cause as a Representative from Michigan is that, consistent with my obligations to my country first, and then to Michigan and Detroit, I pass such judgment on the aeronautical bills introduced in the Federal Congress as will be most conducive to the realization of the kind of air leadership which I visualize and believe in for my country—locally, nationally, and internationally.

The airplane is increasingly becoming a potential instrument for world domination.

If, after this war, it is developed and used for such domination by an aggressor nation or a group of aggressor nations which, like the Axis Powers, would enslave all peoples and steal or control all things for their own selfish ambitions, such rule will be one of terror, and civilization as we know it and love it may indeed go down to destruction.

God forbid that this shall ever happen. To prevent it from happening I shall think and plan at all times to speed the day when America rules the air, not in a narrow, selfish way, not alone and unaided, but with the help of all our allies in the present ruthless conflict.

Such rulership of the air will in reality be leadership, leadership toward a better world. Undoubtedly that concept can be accepted and cherished by the leaders and peoples of all nations who surely must know, on the plain evidence of facts, that in the foreign relations of America ours is a sincerely good-neighbor policy in a community of the world.

Ninety years ago, a half-century before the Wright brothers launched their frail craft at Kitty Hawk, Alfred Lord Tennyson expressed this thought in his poem, Locksley Hall:

"For I dipt into the future,
Far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world,
And all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce,
Argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight,
Dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting,
And there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies
Grappling in the central blue;
Far along the world-wide whisper
Of the south-wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples,
Plunging thro' the thunder-storm;
Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer,
And the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man,
The Federation of the world."

An Old-Age Pension Eliminating All Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should give due consideration to the matter of equalization and simplification of old-age assistance payments under the Social Security Act. Our old people deserve this consideration and are looking to the Congress to end the confusion and restrictions imposed upon them by the administration of the old-age assistance set-up.

It is my contention that, under the provisions of House bill 4545, which I have just introduced, the matter of payments to our old people will be simplified and clarified to such an extent that administration thereof will be made much easier and the work expedited, and the people who have suffered abuses under the present system will be freed from abuses in the future.

Mr. Speaker, only two requirements should exist as to the eligibility of a person to become a recipient of old-age assistance. One of these is United States citizenship, and that is indeed an important one. The other is the age requirement.

All other provisions or restrictions which are or might be imposed on eligibles for old-age assistance are needless and not in conformity with good business practices, nor for the best interests of the recipients. All other requirements and restrictions are wholly unnecessary and only serve to use money in this fund to employ entirely too great a staff of workers, which money, by rights, belongs to the old people.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is simple and understandable, and I earnestly hope the House will take speedy and favorable action on it. Surely we owe it to the old folks to end the confusion existing in the old-age assistance set-up, and let us free them forever from the bureaucratic red tape from which they have so long been suffering. In other words, under H. R. 4545 the old people would have a pension in lieu of old-age assistance. The bill is as follows:

A bill to equalize State old-age assistance payments under the Social Security Act

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury to any State under title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, unless the State plan for old-age assistance provides that the only limitations with respect to eligibility for old-age assistance are (1) an age requirement of 65 years or more, (2) United States citizenship, and (3) a residence requirement complying with the provisions of such title I. Such old-age assistance payments within such State shall be equal in amount for every person eligible therefor, and shall be made by check to be received by every eligible person at his or her post-office address on the first day of each calendar month.

The American Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein a splendid, timely, and appropriate radio address recently made by Hon. John E. Kerrigan, president of the City Council of Boston, Mass., speaking on a Brotherhood Week program over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass.

We have no place in America for bigotry in any form.

The Constitution of the United States of America is the consummation of all the centuries of man's dreams to be free—to be free in mind, to be free in body, to be free in soul. However, that Constitution would have been powerless to build this mighty Nation if the Bill of Rights had not been added to it. It is in the Bill of Rights that we find the finest expression of all of our liberties.

The most important provisions of the Bill of Rights are to be found in the first of the 10 articles. The first article was put first because it is the most important of them all. Take away from free government freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech, and no freedoms at all will be left. All that will be left will be a golden opportunity for tyrants and organized mobs to trample upon every human right and to reduce mankind to brutal slavery. So long as the press, speech, and religion are free America will be strong enough to resist any native or foreign dangers that may challenge them.

It wasn't by accident that freedom of religion was the first freedom to be mentioned even before the mention of freedom of the press and freedom of speech. These men who drew up this document were God-fearing men. They knew that man's most sacred possession is his conscience. They knew that into his soul has been breathed the majesty of God himself. They knew that whoever trifles with it, whoever plots to stifle, to crush, or to persecute it throws his foul hands into the ve· face of God. They knew that its substance is not material. They knew that this substance is divine. They knew that it is incapable of destruction. You may disease man's body, you may strangle, twist, and cripple his mortal frame, and you may destroy his very life, but you cannot destroy his conscience. Churches have been burned to ashes, religions have been oppressed, men and women have become martyrs of their faith, but after every succeeding outrage the church has grown stronger, religion has become more widely accepted, and the conscience of man—the will of God—has taken a more commanding place in the molding of civilization. Prejudice, hate, persecution, and wars have temporarily halted the onward march of civilization, but the halt has been only temporary; and when man has again emerged from the chaos into which these assaults have hurled him, he has taken on a higher nobility and he has dedicated himself more actively to the practices of tolerance, of justice, of peace, and of brotherly love.

The brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God have always been, and always will be, trumpet calls that will summon righteous men to action when attempts are made to divide our people and to overthrow our Government through the instruments of hate, bigotry, and prejudice. One week ago tonight St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, the foremost Catholic cathedral in America, was desecrated. Impious hands painted the outside walls of this temple of God with red paint, and then, displaying their cowardly nature, those who did this disgraceful act slunk away into the darkness of the night. On that same night several Protestant churches were outraged and violated by a band of religious bigots. A few nights before a score of Jewish synagogs of that same city were pelted with sticks and stones. These scenes were not new when they occurred last week in New York City. They have been enacted repeatedly in many other large cities of the country.

You cannot run away from the truth without running into the face of danger. You cannot cure an evil by ignoring it. You cannot safeguard the Bill of Rights by leaving it to be defied and defiled by those who are its sworn enemies. Freedom of religion cannot be guaranteed to any man while it is openly and secretly attacked.

There are mad currents of bigotry in America. Tongues of hate and prejudice are spreading many vicious and un-American doctrines. These truths are known to all persons who will open their eyes and their ears. Many well-meaning citizens, admitting that these evils prevail, dismiss them with a careless gesture and declare that they are too petty for serious thought. There-

fore, I would remind these well-meaning citizens that one rotten apple can ruin the entire barrel; one small germ can bring death to the entire human body; and one spark of prejudice can set the entire Nation on fire and bring to America the cruel wars of religious persecution that have ravaged nearly every nation of Europe and Asia for more than 1,500 years.

You cannot have peace in other parts of the world unless first you have peace at home. You cannot free the other parts of the world from the injustices that bring on wars unless you first free America from these injustices. These self-evident truths are known to the President of the United States, the Governor of this Commonwealth, and the mayor of the city of Boston. That is why they have joined with this committee on Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths in setting this week apart to be known as a week of brotherhood. All of these responsible people know that grave errors of thinking and acting are present in American life. They have fears that these actions and this thinking may lead to the same discords and strifes that have followed such actions and thinking in every nation where they have occurred since the beginning of time. And so while they look upon this week as one of dedication to the spirit of brotherhood, they also call upon their fellow citizens to arm themselves with the intellectual forces that are needed to penetrate into the dark places where bigotry is generated and from which these dangerous blows are directed at our Government and at our churches.

In joining in this movement of brotherhood I am conscious of the fact that I am privileged to ally myself to the holiest cause to which a free people can be called. It is a cause that did not begin yesterday. It was inaugurated at the time when this Nation was born. If it ever dies America will die. But it will never die. When the necessity demands, the American people will not be found sleeping. Now and in the future, as it was in the beginning, when this Nation was born, when the Bill of Rights needs their defense and protection we know where the American people will be standing. They will be standing at the temples of God. They will say to all men and women of this land, enter into those temples. Enter into them in peace. Enter into them with the full assurance that so long as America is firm and steadfast, freedom of religion will not be denied to any man, the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God will prevail. This Nation will be preserved in all of its original glory. God is in His Heaven, and the American Bill of Rights is in His safe and secure keeping.

Rural Electrification—Statement of the R. E. A. Concerning Remarks of Hon. Lyle H. Boren, Printed in the Congressional Record of March 2, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1944, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement covering seven and one-third pages attacking the Rural Electrification Administration.

That statement contains so many fallacies and received such widespread comment by those interests that were continuously opposing and attempting to handicap and destroy our rural-electrification program, that Hon. Vincent D. Nicholson, Deputy Administrator and Associate Solicitor of the Rural Electrification Administration, has prepared an answer, which I am inserting as a part of these remarks.

Our rural-electrification program has been the greatest blessing the farmers of this country have ever known. It has brought the greatest good to the greatest number, provided the farmers with the comforts and conveniences of life they never knew before, and lifted from the farm men and women the burdens of drudgery under which they have struggled throughout the centuries.

To those of us who have carried on this battle for rural electrification and for its extension to every farm home in America, so as to provide electricity at rates the farmers can afford to pay, it is alarming to see these attacks made by a Member of Congress, and given widespread circulation through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For that reason I am inserting Mr. Nicholson's reply, which I hope every Member of Congress will take the time to read. I wish it were possible to send a copy to every farmer in America.

We are not going to permit our rural-electrification program to be discredited or destroyed by propaganda of this kind.

We have started in to electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay. We are making progress undreamed of by the most enthusiastic advocates of rural electrification when we began.

This program is not a financial burden to the Federal Government. Every dollar of this money will be paid back with interest, every farming community will be made richer, and every farm home reached will be made brighter as a result of this very program, which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] has seen fit to attack.

He talks about the farmers being robbed by this program. No such complaint has ever come from the farmers themselves, but such insinuations are constantly coming from those private utilities that have fought rural electrification from the beginning.

As a matter of fact, the farmers own and control these cooperative associations themselves. Is it robbery of the farmer for the Rural Electrification Administration to advance these cooperatives money to build lines and supply their homes with electricity, and to render them every assistance possible in working out their program?

Is it robbery of the farmer to make it possible for him and his wife and children to enjoy the comforts and conveniences available to the city dweller, without the noise and city taxes?

No, Mr. Speaker, this program has never robbed the farmer, except to take away from him and his family the dreariness and drudgery that in many instances have made farm life almost unbearable, and to bring into their homes light, and life, and hope and inspiration, comforts and conveniences, and relief from drudgery that really makes farm life worth living.

Mr. Nicholson's reply to Mr. BOREN follows:

STATEMENT OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION CONCERNING REMARKS OF HON. LYLE H. BOREN, PRINTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MARCH 2, 1944

This statement of Mr. BOREN, Member of Congress from Oklahoma, was presented to the House Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture Appropriations in the form of a 33-page document. It was printed as an extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, page A1022.

It appears that Mr. BOREN is under many misapprehensions concerning the character, scope, purposes, and results of the limited R. E. A. financing of acquisitions of electric properties by cooperatives. He has indicated a strong interest in the R. E. A. program and we are sure that he will be glad to be reassured that things are going well in R. E. A. and that there has been no change of policies or purposes.

The following statement is a dispassionate, factual examination of the many issues raised. We shall not engage in an elaborate discussion of the charges that the administration of R. E. A. represents "government by the worst of men," that is "nothing more than a conspiracy to capture rural America and perpetuate it in economic serfdom," and the considerable number of other expressions challenging the motives and the personal integrity of members of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Solicitor's Office of the Department. However, we cannot idly ignore such utterances, formally made to a committee of Congress and we wish to record at the outset of this statement a complete and vigorous denial of each and every one of these accusations.

At the outset of the following statement we present a summary of the major issues raised by Mr. BOREN and the relevant facts as we know them and interpret them. This summary is followed by a complete, detailed discussion of Mr. BOREN's statement, page by page.

1. The charge that R. E. A. has been using its loan funds improperly in financing the acquisition by cooperatives of certain electric facilities in towns and small cities. The legal questions are fully discussed in the opinion of the Solicitor dated November 24, 1942, which was filed by Mr. BOREN with his statement, and there would seem to be no need for any extensive argument here by way of repetition. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves largely to a discussion of questions of fact and policy.

At the outset it is important to emphasize that each acquisition financed by R. E. A. (comprising approximately 4 percent of all R. E. A. loans) has been for the purpose of enabling the borrowing cooperative to reach a considerable and significant number of unserved persons in rural areas who could not be served feasibly except through the means of the acquisition, and therefore the loan was in accord with the legal position taken by the Solicitor and the Comptroller General. It is true, as Mr. BOREN states, that some of these acquired facilities have been in small urban communities. With respect to such communities, a study of our records, made this week, indicates that there have been only a few towns or small cities having populations of more than 1,500—most of them under 2,000, and the largest approximately 3,500. In every instance, however, the acquisition was incidental and contributory to the sole purpose of making possible

more extensive service to unserved persons in rural areas. In each case the system acquired was not an "urban" system as that term is usually used in the utility industry, but was a system which fitted into the rural economy and was essential to an optimum program of rural electrification in the area.

In the construction of certain small privately owned systems the rural areas were largely ignored and the power company lines "jump" from town to town picking up only the areas of greater consumer density. To accomplish adequate coverage of such unserved rural areas, an acquisition of the existing facilities by the cooperative has been necessary. These facilities, in most instances, have had to be acquired in their entirety or not at all and from the standpoints of engineering and economics it was necessary to incorporate all of the acquired properties in the combined cooperative system. By this term "combined cooperative system" we have reference to an adequate integrated system consisting of the lines already owned by the cooperative, the lines acquired, and the new lines to reach unserved persons made possible by the acquisition.

2. The charge that acquisitions of existing facilities are being imposed upon electric cooperatives against their wishes and interest and for the benefit of utility holding companies. The facts are that there has been a strong and widespread farmer demand throughout the country for this type of R. E. A assistance. In many cases the acquisition has been fought for aggressively by the cooperatives and their farmer members against the vigorous opposition of the utility industry. This opposition has expressed itself in proceedings before Federal and State regulatory bodies, the public press, in publications of the industry, and in other forms of propaganda. The companies that oppose these acquisitions are frequently the same companies that have opposed every aspect of the R. E. A. program and have tried to destroy or cripple the efforts of farmers to serve themselves with electricity. These acquisitions, as we shall indicate later in more detail, have resulted in strengthening the cooperatives, rendering them more capable of serving unserved areas, and improving their financial position.

The opposition has not, in any instance, come from the farmers. It has been chiefly of two kinds. In some instances, it has been on the part of private interests which sought to purchase the facilities in question, usually after the cooperative had commenced negotiations. This was the situation in the Oklahoma case referred to by Mr. BOREN and discussed later in this statement. In other instances, the opposition has been on the part of companies which had no desire to purchase the properties in question or to serve the unserved areas which the selling company had failed to serve. Typical of such a situation was the Sho-Me case in Missouri, also refered to by Mr. BOREN and discussed later in this statement.

3. The charge that the financing of acquisitions is a radical change in R. E. A. policy. The facts are that R. E. A. financing of acquisitions has shown no significant variation during the past 6 years, except for fiscal year 1942, as indicated by the following table:

Loan allotments for acquisitions

Fiscal year:	
1937	$77,289.72
1938	43,515.75
1939	2,787,960.46
1940	1,825,849.37
1941	3,009,217.72
1942	8,697,892.64
1943	1,858,659.05
1944 up to February 29	3,027,338.26

It should be noted that these properties must be purchased, if at all, when they are on the market and the divestiture orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission have necessarily affected the timing of these cooperative acquisitions. This explains the bulge in the allotments in the fiscal year 1942, when several such acquisitions of considerable size happened to develop at that time. The above table shows that acquisition loans in the fiscal year 1939 were considerably greater than in fiscal 1943.

R. E. A. loans for the purchase price of acquired facilities have been about 4 percent of total loans throughout the entire R. E. A. program. It is true, of course, that such transactions now constitute a greater percentage of current loans than was the case before the war, but this is only because of war conditions affecting new construction and not because of any change in R. E. A. policy.

4. The charge that acquisitions are imposing upon the cooperatives a burden of debt that has adversely affected their financial position. The facts are that these acquisitions, in addition to the primary purpose of enabling the cooperatives to reach unserved persons in rural areas, have greatly improved their financial position. We have made exhaustive studies of each acquisition costing more than $50,000, in instances where we could compare the cooperative's financial condition 1 year before the acquisition with the financial condition 1 year after the acquisition. The following table, taken from these studies, gives the ratio of net earnings to total indebtedness in the case of every such cooperative. In practically every instance the financial condition was improved as a result of the acquisition, and in more than half of the cases this improvement was marked and considerable. In many instances, cooperatives which showed a net operating loss a year before the acquisition showed net earnings 1 year after the acquisition sufficient for successful operation, including provision for the current debt service. In certain instances, as a direct result of the acquisition, the cooperatives were able to earn the maximum debt service several years before such maximum payments were required.

Rural Electrification Administration project designation	Percentage of net operating income to total indebtedness	
	Year preceding acquisition	Year following acquisition
Alabama 18	1.7	5.3
Alabama 21	[1]—1.24	3.2
Arkansas 10	1.2	2.1
Arkansas 21	1.7	3
Georgia 7	[1]—.1	5.1
Kentucky 18	2.6	7.7
Kentucky 26	1.3	6.2
Kentucky 33	4.2	7.2
Kentucky 35	4.2	3.1
Kentucky 50	1.3	4.3
Louisiana 17	.8	2.4
Michigan 28	.4	3
Minnesota 32	4.6	7
Minnesota 37	5.2	7.8
Missouri 38	.6	2.2
North Carolina 23	1.2	3
North Carolina 46	—2.3	3.3
North Dakota 8	1.4	2.8
Ohio 56	5.9	7.2
Ohio 83	4	3.1
Oklahoma 22	1.5	3.4
Oregon 26	1.5	2.7
Tennessee 1	.3	7.1
Tennessee 9	[1]—3.1	1.4
Tennessee 19	[1]—.6	6.8
Tennessee 21	.5	5.6
Tennessee 24	4.3	5.4
Texas 92	[1]—.2	6
Virginia 30	.7	3
Washington 9	[1]—1.6	.6

[1] Deficit.

The following table represents situations where the operating experience is for 6-month periods only:

Rural Electrification Administration project designation	Percentage of net operating income to total indebtedness	
	6 months before	6 months after
Colorado 29	0.3	0.8
Florida 29	.4	2.6
Ohio 31	2.4	2.8
Ohio 39	1.9	2.3
Ohio 68	.7	2.2
Ohio 87	1.5	2.9

The studies also showed, in almost every case, that the indebtedness per consumer has been substantially reduced, the operating ratio has been reduced, and the average revenue per mile, average number of consumers per mile, and average kilowatt-hour consumption per consumer have been greatly increased.

5. The charge that R. E. A. is financing the purchase of "obsolete and junk-pile properties" at inflated values. This charge is answered in part by the discussion under the preceding point 4. We desire to record an emphatic denial of any such practice, but it would be quite impracticable in this statement to enter upon any exhaustive presentation of data.

The R. E. A. acquisition in Oklahoma, discussed at length by Mr. BOREN, has an interesting relevance to this charge. It would seem obvious that the cooperative in this instance did not purchase a poor property at an inflated price. The Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co., which offered $13,000 more than the cooperative paid, is one of the most successful operating companies in the country, and it can be assumed that the cooperative made a good bargain and a good business decision.

This sound business judgment on the part of the cooperatives and R. E. A. has not been confined to the State of Oklahoma. R. E. A. approval of all such loans is made upon the basis of careful studies, valuations, and appraisals by competent engineers, taking into account all of the factors which bear upon a sound determination of value, with special reference to the utility of the property to the needs of the particular cooperative. It is true, of course, that many of the properties available to these cooperatives are not among the most prosperous electric properties in the country. That, however, is entirely beside the point. These cooperatives operate, for the most part, with respect to all of their business, in areas in which private capital has been unable or unwilling to serve, and these acquired properties fit into the picture of adequate rural electrification in the areas in question. In each case provision has been made in the loan for such rehabilitation as may be necessary, and the advantages of the acquisition at the prices paid, together with the economies of cooperative operation, have resulted in an improvement of financial condition.

6. The Grimes Pass case. Without commenting in tedious detail upon the so-called Grimes Pass case, which is one of the four loans discussed specifically by Mr. BOREN, the following explanation of this loan may be helpful to the committee.

The electric facilities of the Grimes Pass Power Co. were acquired by the Long Valley Power Cooperative in Idaho for $42,500. The property consisted of a dam, hydroelectric generating equipment, and 40 miles of electric lines. This cooperative, contrary to its expectation, had been unable to purchase energy from any source and had been sup-

plying its consumers through mobile generating equipment—a temporary method of providing power. One purpose of the acquisition was to acquire a more adequate and less costly source of energy, and for this reason the property had a special utility and value for this particular cooperative. This would have been accomplished by building a connecting line of 22 miles. The other purpose of the acquisition was to serve 87 unserved consumers who could not feasibly receive service except as a result of this transaction.

Originally, negotiations for the acquisition had centered about an asking price of $75,000. However, when orders of the War Production Board caused the closing down of the mines which the Grimes Pass Power Co. had been serving, negotiations were dropped. The letter of Mr. Falkenwald, dated November 23, 1942, to which Mr. BOREN refers, was based upon the price originally contemplated and, furthermore, was written at a time when other arrangements for a permanent source of energy were under negotiation. When efforts to obtain wholesale energy at a reasonable price were unsuccessful, the Grimes Pass transaction was reopened by the cooperative and finally closed on the basis of a greatly reduced price, to wit, $42,500. The financial and operating studies indicated that this method of solving a critical power problem of this cooperative would be economically feasible under R. E. A. requirements. Mr. Falkenwald, by memorandum dated February 10, 1943, stated his approval of financing the acquisition at a price not to exceed $42,500, and the directors of the cooperatives at a meeting held April 27, 1943, indicated a strong desire to acquire the properties.

The implication that the dam was inadequate and not constructed according to sound engineering principles is not substantiated by a careful study of the facts. Dams made of wood are recognized as an efficient type, particularly under the conditions here prevailing. An engineering report, after inspection and studies of the cost of certain repairs, indicated that the property was worth the price paid.

Our investigations indicate that the flood was a flash flood and unforeseeable. It is not true that the washing out of the dam will ruin the cooperative or seriously impair the security for the Government loan. On the contrary, it is estimated that the salvage value of the generating equipment is $20,000 even if it is decided not to restore the plant. This leaves a balance of $22,500 of the purchase price to be allocated to the lines. As stated above, the acquisition included 40 miles of distribution line and $22,500 is a reasonable price for such property. In connection with this matter of financial condition it should be noted that there is the prospect that the gold mines will again become consumers after the war.

7. The Sho-Me case. This was an acquisition by the Sho-Me Power Cooperative in Missouri, which Mr. BOREN discusses from the standpoints of legal power and policy determination. It is our unhesitating opinion that this loan qualifies under the powers conferred by the Rural Electrification Act as interpreted by the Comptroller General and the Solicitor's opinion, discussed later in this statement.

From the point of view of policy determination, it is opinion that this transaction will constitute a godsend to several thousand unserved farmers in southern Missouri who will ultimately be reached as a result of this acquisition by the local cooperatives which are members of the Sho-Me Cooperative. The system of the Missouri Electric Power Co. is typical of those utility systems which have served chiefly the more densely populated areas and neglected the farmers in more sparsely settled areas, the service of whom is the primary function of R. E. A. and the cooperatives. In these Missouri areas, as in many other States, the only solution of the problem of adequate rural electrification is the combination in integrated systems of the better areas with the poorer areas, because of the resulting advantages in physical lay-out, engineering design, efficiency of operation, and solution of the economic problem of electric service in sparsely settled areas.

These farmer cooperatives fought aggressively for the right to consummate this purchase in the face of vigorous opposition of 14 utility companies which intervened in the proceeding for approval of the transaction before the Missouri Public Service Commission. We emphasize the fact of this opposition because it is highly significant with respect to one of the basic issues in this matter of cooperative acquisitions. Not a single one of these intervening utilities desired to buy the system, all of which had to be sold under an S. E. C. order. Two of them had offered to buy certain portions of the system, but very small portions only. Their case before the Public Service Commission was an amazing attitude of "dog in the manger." They had no interest in serving the unserved rural population of the areas through which the lines of the Missouri Electric Power Co. had been built. It is an absolutely fair characterization of their attitude to say that their case boiled down to this—namely, a feeling that there is something presumptuous in a group of farmers seeking to do business in the normal fashion in the electric light and power field. This point of view was reflected throughout several days of hearing in the sarcastic—and, at times, sneering—attitude of the many lawyers for the utility companies and in their 125-page brief. The Public Service Commission by a unanimous decision of all the commissioners who participated in the proceeding, reached the conclusion, in a careful 22-page opinion, that this purchase by the cooperative was in the public interest.

This is a good example of the value to the rural electrification program of the acquisition by cooperatives of properties which had served largely a succession of towns and had neglected the farm population.

8. The Indian Electric case: As indicated previously in point 2 of our statement, this acquisition by an Oklahoma cooperative was vigorously opposed by the Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. which was a belated competitor for the purchase. The cooperative purchase was approved by the Securities and Exchange Commission over the vigorous opposition of this power company despite the fact that the power company offered $13,000 more than the price already contracted for between the cooperative and the seller. The Commission, in approving the cooperative purchase, referred to the fact that the Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. had shown no interest in the purchase of the property until after the contract with the cooperative had been closed.

The interest of this farmer cooperative in acquiring the property against aggressive opposition tends to answer the point made by Mr. BOREN with respect to the fact that the urban consumers will outnumber farm consumers. As this cooperative expands in the future this ratio will probably shift, but the fact would seem to be unimportant. The acquired properties fit definitely into the rural economy of this area, and it is obvious that the farmers themselves have sought and welcomed this integration of facilities.

Mr. BOREN'S point with reference to two towns of approximately 2,500 population has been discussed in point 1 of our statement, where we pointed out that such an acquisition is sound policy for the benefit of unserved farmers and that its financing is within the legal power of R. E. A.

Mr. BOREN refers to this fact of purchase by the cooperative at $13,000 less than the offer of O. G. & E. Co. as an odd factor that has never been satisfactorily explained, and infers that there was something sinister in the motives of the seller. We cannot see anything in this fact that is odd. On the other hand, it tends to indicate that this cooperative and R. E. A. were conservative in their business judgment in the transaction. The simple explanation of the attitude of the seller is the fact that it had accepted the cooperative offer, and being bound by the resulting contract, was not free to accept any other offer. There is certainly no undisclosed secret deal" involving the sale of additional properties to R. E. A.

9. A legal argument challenging the soundness of the legal position taken by the R. E. A. legal staff and the Office of the Solicitor of the Department: A comprehensive opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture which has been filed with the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, speaks for itself and there would seem to be no necessity for repetition here. It is our well-considered, honest, and definite opinion that each R. E. A. acquisition loan has conformed to the principles and standards set forth in the letters of the Comptroller General which are discussed by Mr. BOREN. We have disapproved many proposed acquisition loans on legal grounds, including some which we felt would qualify, but which we elected to disapprove because in doubtful cases we decided to maintain a considerable margin of precaution. We claim no infallibility, of course, with respect to the legal decisions that have been reached. We state, however, with the utmost earnestness that the decisions were carefully and honestly reached and represented the unanimous conclusions of a considerable number of attorneys of ability and experience having responsibility in the matter.

In his statement Mr. BOREN refers to the Solicitor's opinion in 1942 as an "afterthought opinion" coming after R. E. A. had made 245 acquisitions without any legal consideration of this question. The facts are that every acquisition loan had been supported by a carefully considered legal opinion, as shown in the first paragraph of the solicitor's opinion. When acquisition loans were first made R. E. A. was an indipendent agency and legal opinions were given by the general counsel and his staff. Even after the transfer of R. E. A. to the Department of Agriculture in July 1939, the legal division continued to be a part of the R. E. A. organization and was not incorporated in the office of the Solicitor of the Department until later. The Solicitor's opinion on this subject, issued in November 1942, was merely a part of a policy of the Solicitor to review a number of major matters that had received R. E. A. legal attention in the past. This problem first emerged in June 1937 and has received extensive consideration by the ablest members of the R. E. A. legal staff in connection with the general principles involved, and in connection with each particular fact and situation as it was presented. The Solicitor's opinion, instead of being an afterthought opinion, was merely a compendious treatment of the subject, embodying the legal principles which had governed R. E. A. action in this field from the beginning.

The above summary covers the matters which are chiefly emphasized in Mr. BOREN'S 33-page statement. We desire, however, to be as helpful as possible in a comprehensive consideration of every question that has been raised and the following is a discussion of Mr. BOREN'S statement, page by page.

PAGE 1

The policy of making loans to finance the acquisition of existing electric facilities is

not a change of direction and policy within the past 2 years. Allotments for these purposes have been spread fairly evenly over the past 6 years as appears from the table on page 3 of this statement.

It is not a fact that any of the funds earmarked by Congress for the extension of electric service to unserved persons in rural areas have been diverted to any other purpose. The sole purpose of every acquisition has been to make it possible for the cooperative to reach a considerable and significant number of unserved farmers who otherwise would probably be denied the benefits of electricity. There are many sections of the country where the only possibility of reaching unserved rural areas is by means of the incorporation into a cooperative system of facilities previously constructed by utility companies. In other words, the cooperative, by means of the acquisition, accomplishes what should have been accomplished by the utility company in the interest of the widest possible service to unserved persons. The only reason for the rural electrification program in all of its aspects has been the fact that private capital has been unable or unwilling to solve the problem of rural electrification in the United States. Exactly the same reasons which have justified the construction of new lines to reach unserved persons justify the acquisition of existing properties which have not adequately served rural areas in order that thereby such adequate service may be extended as widely as possible.

PAGE 2

It is not a fact that "stock-market speculators, electric-utility holding companies, and political middlemen or brokers" are the beneficiaries of these loans. Unserved persons in rural areas who receive service as a result of the acquisition are the essential beneficiaries under the controlling purpose of the R. E. A. loan. The cooperatives have employed no middlemen or brokers in the negotiation of any of these loans, and we have no knowledge of such arrangements on the part of the selling companies. In all instances, the negotiations have been directly between the cooperatives and the executives of the selling companies. In any event, the matter in which the cooperatives are interested is the obtaining, at a fair price, of properties highly desirable for the furtherance of the rural electrification program. They are not concerned, naturally, in the distribution of the proceeds. This distribution in practically every instance is governed by State or Federal regulatory bodies. Instead of this program being for the benefit of utility companies, the fact is that there has been a widespead opposition on the part of utility companies to these acquisitions for the reasons set forth in point 2, page 2, of the preceding summary.

It is not a fact, as disclosed clearly by the financial record of the cooperatives involved, that these acquisitions have imposed a burden of debt which will "perpetuate economic enslavement of rural-electrification cooperatives." Exactly the opposite is true, as indicated by the financial studies to which we have previously referred in point 4 (p. 4).

There has been no ex post facto explanation or justification by the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture with respect to R. E. A. loans for acquisitions. As set forth in the preceding summary (point 9, p. 10), every acquisition loan from the beginning has received careful legal attention and the legal policies applied have been consistent throughout.

PAGE 3

It is not a fact that financing of electric facilities in towns or cities has been a major activity of R. E. A. To date the entire amount of the purchase price of all acquired facilities financed by R. E. A. has represented only about 4 percent of total R. E. A. allotments. The total allotments have been approximately $480,000,000 and the total amount of loans for the financing of acquisitions has been approximately $21,350,000. This figure represents all such acquired properties, the greater portion of which have been distinctly rural. It is a fact that there have been a few very small cities, such as the two in Oklahoma mentioned by Mr. BOREN, but these acquisitions have had the same purpose and result as all acquisitions, namely, the service of unserved persons in rural areas. (See our summary, point 1, p. 1.)

We desire, emphatically, to disclaim any statement by way of half truth, and therefore actual falsehood, in the testimony before the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations last year. We insist now, as was stated then, that the 4-percent ratio between loans for acquisitions and total R. E. A. allotments is a significant figure indicating that this so-called acquisition program is a minor part of the whole R. E. A. program. We are in no sense apologetic with respect to these loans and have no desire to belittle their importance. In many communities such loans have been highly important and indispensable for the achievement of adequate rural electrification in line with the responsibilities imposed upon R. E. A. by the Rural Electrification Act of Congress. We only wish it were possible for a larger number of cooperatives to avail themselves of this means of reaching thousands of unserved farmers who probably will not be served otherwise, at least in the near future. The fact is, however, in the broad perspective of the entire R. E. A. program that these loans in dollar volume play a minor and wholly incidental part.

It is not a fact that, in the fiscal year 1943, 66 percent of all R. E. A. loans were for the purpose of financing acquisitions. The total allotments for that year were $8,225,379.55 and allotments for acquisitions were $1,763,550, or 21.4 percent. It is not clear whether Mr. BOREN is referring to allotments or to moneys actually disbursed, some of which were under allotments for prior years. The figures on actual disbursements in fiscal 1943 are: total disbursements—$14,357,155; disbursements for acquisitions—$3,946,142 or 27.5 percent. Total allotments which involved acquisitions were, of course, considerably larger than the purchase price of the acquired properties and the greater part of such allotments was for new construction. This fact may be responsible for Mr. BOREN'S confusion on this matter.

It is a fact, of course, that loans for acquisitions during the war period have represented a larger percentage of total loans than was the fact before the war and will be the fact after the war but this is not because of any change in R. E. A. policy. Loan applications for new construction, totaling approximately $100,000,000, have been processed and are awaiting allotment when war conditions permit.

PAGE 4

It is not a fact that the genesis of R. E. A. acquisition loans was in the fall of 1941. The first such loans were made in the fiscal year 1937 and some of the largest and most important acquisition loans were made in fiscal year 1939. For example, one of the most important of these transactions involved the purchase by several cooperatives in Tennessee and Georgia of the rural systems of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. for which allotments were made in May 1939. These allotments totaled $2,640,100.

We deny, completely and emphatically, the charge that R. E. A. "hoarded copper" and "recklessly ignored War Production Board orders." Mr. BOREN'S statements in this regard are based upon a report of certain members of Special Committee No. 3 of the House Committee on Military Affairs, commonly known as the Faddis Committee. The issues and the facts concerning these matters as we see them are set forth in the "additional views" of seven members of the House Military Affairs Committee and the minority report set forth on pages 185–197 of the printed report submitted under date of June 23, 1942. These matters were considered at length in several quarters, including hearings before the House and Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations. We feel that no useful purpose would be served by further detailed discussion of matters that have already been thoroughly canvassed and charges that have been completely disproved.

We desire, however, to deny with the utmost vigor any policy or action inconsistent with the war effort or the orders of the agencies primarily charged therewith. R. E. A. has never hoarded any materials for the simple reason that it has never owned any materials. With respect to the instance referred to on page 4 of Mr. BOREN'S statement, the copper conductor in question was not even owned by the cooperative. It was owned by the contractor who had purchased it in normal business practice before Pearl Harbor. It is true that further construction on many R. E. A. projects was ordered to be discontinued by the War Production Board just as was true of a large amount of construction by private-utility companies and by government agencies. These orders were duly observed by the cooperatives and R. E. A. cooperated to the full with the War Production Board. The inventories of the cooperatives at the time of Pearl Harbor (vastly less than the inventories of most utility companies) have been made available to the war effort to the extent that the War Production Board and other agencies directly responsible for the war effort have desired.

PAGE 5

Mr. BOREN makes adverse comments with respect to the financing of cooperative generating and transmission facilities and to the development of central cooperatives which he refers to as the "holding-company type." At this point he departs from a discussion of acquisition loans and deals with an entirely different aspect of the rural-electrification program. The facts are that loans for the construction of generating and transmission facilities have been approximately 7 percent of total loans. It is not the fact that such financing is the result of any new policy within the last 2 or 3 years. Some of the most important of such central cooperatives supplying a group of local cooperatives with generating and transmission facilities were financed 4 and 5 years ago, involving particularly such facilities in the States of Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

There have been two reasons for the desire of these cooperatives to have their own generating and transmission facilities, and these reasons are exactly within policies that have prevailed generally in the successful development of the electric power and light industry. The first reason was inability in many cases to purchase wholesale energy at reasonable rates and the other reason was the desire to be independent in their business operations. In connection with this second reason, we might cite a typical example involving a number of cooperatives in Texas. The power company which had been serving these cooperatives insisted upon a clause in the contract preventing the cooperatives from serving any industrial or other loads in excess of a 25-kilowatt demand, even though these loads represented new consumers located along the cooperatives' lines. These farmers felt that they had just as much right to do business in a normal way in the State where they lived and worked as a utility company, most of the stock of which was owned outside the State. If the utility company did not want to sell electricity at a fair rate and under reasonable contractual conditions, it had a right to refuse, particularly in a State where an electric utility is not subject to the orders of a regulatory body. The farmers, however, on their part, had an equal right, in the face

of such refusal, to do business in the normal way and to own and operate a self-contained electric system. It is not only the right, but the duty, of R. E. A. to honor such loan applications under appropriate fact conditions and to exercise the authority conferred by section 4 of the statute, "to make loans * * * for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission, and distribution lines, or systems."

These central cooperatives are exactly the opposite of a holding company set-up. The central cooperative does not own the stock of the member cooperatives but, on the contrary, the member cooperatives own the central cooperative and are in control of its management. These cooperatives have always preferred, and still prefer, to purchase energy at wholesale when such can be accomplished at a fair price and under reasonable contractual conditions. They have the same right, however, as all other citizens to do business in the best interest of their enterprises under such State regulation as may be applicable.

It is not a fact that the production costs of these cooperative generating plants have been greater than the cost of energy available at wholesale purchase. In this connection it is important to note that the cooperatives in building their own generating and transmission facilities are thinking a long time ahead. As the demand increases the cost per kilowatt-hour of energy generated and transmitted by central cooperatives will correspondingly decrease. In this connection we cite the highly successful record of the Federated Cooperative Power Association which generates power for six local cooperatives in northern Iowa, serving about 10,000 rural consumers. Over a 6-year period it has provided power to the local cooperatives at a lower average cost than would have been the cost of purchased power from any available source. In addition to these savings the association, on March 1, 1944, had an earned surplus of $98,673, which of course, is an asset of the member cooperatives. This power association, as of January 1, 1944, had repaid the Government $106,775 in principal and interest, including $39,600 advance payments of principal. It has $20,899 invested in War bonds.

Mr. BOREN expresses disapproval that R. F. C. has no discretion in passing upon the loan policies of R. E. A., followed by a statement that the cooperatives and their farmer members are being loaded down with debts which they will have difficulty in paying off. The fact is that borrowings from R. F. C. have been merely a device chosen by Congress under several appropriation acts for supplying the R. E. A. program with funds rather than appropriations directly from the Treasury. R. F. C. has been well content with the soundness of the cooperative obligations pledged as security for R. F. C. loans to the R. E. A. Administrator as indicated by recent public statements of representatives of R. F. C.

Mr. BOREN refers to the "very satisfactory record in financial statements of existing cooperatives" but expresses a fear that future operations will not be so satisfactory. The fact is that every single trend constituting an index of financial condition indicates an increasing improvement. Such indexes include ratio of operating expense to gross revenue, ratio of net earnings to total indebtedness, density of consumers per mile, average kilowatt-hour consumption, percentage of minimum bills, and average revenue per mile. Under all of these indexes the trends continue to be consistently upward (even with respect to cooperatives that now have a life of 6 years or more) and there is no indication as yet of a leveling off.

PAGE 6

Mr. BOREN states, or implies, that the War Production Board halted certain construction on R. E. A. projects in the Southwest because of a report by the Military Affairs Committee. The fact is that the action of W. P. B. had absolutely no relation to the report of this committee. The R. E. A. project which received the principal attention of this committee was one located in Arkansas for the purpose of serving a Government aluminum plant at Lake Catherine, and the War Production Board, after extensive study, ordered this line to be built by the cooperative. This action was concurred in by the Defense Plant Corporation and the Federal Power Commission. The two projects to which I assume Mr. BOREN refers are located in Texas. One is a transmission system to connect a number of cooperatives in the Brazos River Valley and to distribute power purchased from the agency owning the Morris Sheppard Dam. The other was a generating and transmission system to serve a group of cooperatives in east Texas, centering around Upshur County. The construction of these projects was halted merely as a part of a W. P. B. policy applicable to the entire electric industry throughout the United States. Projects that were not more than 40 percent completed as of Pearl Harbor were halted, and there were hundreds of such projects among cooperatives, public agencies, and private utility companies. There was nothing special or unusual with respect to the R. E. A. projects in the Southwest. These had been begun before the war and, after a finding by W. P. B. that construction had not progressed to a completion of 40 percent before Pearl Harbor, further construction was halted, except for certain facilities to serve war industries.

Mr. BOREN refers to alleged efforts of R. E. A. to avoid any shrinkage of the agency. The fact is that the R. E. A. program during the war has been subject to the policies and regulations of the agencies directly responsible for the war effort, particularly W. P. B. The Bureau of the Budget and the Congress have approved loan funds and administrative funds necessary to continue the R. E. A. program within the limitations imposed by the war effort, and R. E. A. has adjusted itself with the utmost cooperation to these limitations. The R. E. A. staff, at its maximum, on December 11, 1941, comprised 1,092 persons. Since that time the agency has reduced its personnel to a present number of 646, including 9 on terminal leave.

We have already discussed the charge that R. E. A. has been financing the "cats and dogs of the utility industry" representing "obsolete and junk-pile properties" (p. 6 of this statement).

PAGE 7

With reference to the charge that the "present group running the R. E. A. is nothing more than a conspiracy to capture rural America and perpetuate it in economic serfdom," we feel that it is unnecessary to burden this statement with anything more than a simple but emphatic denial of any such purpose or result. We wish to avoid any spirit of boastfulness, because we are just an average group of people inspired, however, with more than average devotion to the program for which we are responsible. There seems to be ample evidence to support a belief that public opinion generally, in private and in public life, warmly endorses this program conducted now, as at all times, under policies which have prevailed from the beginning.

PAGES 7–10

The Grimes Pass case: We have already discussed this loan in point 6, page 6.

PAGES 10–16

The Sho-Me case: We have discussed this loan in point 7, page 8. Certain cooperatives in Missouri desired to purchase this property in order to do a good job of rural electrification in farm areas which the former owner of the property had neglected and failed to serve. Mr. BOREN suggests that this acquisition will be prejudicial in some way to these cooperatives and their farmer members. The farmers certainly have had no such thought. They fought vigorously for their right to consummate the purchase against the bitter opposition of 14 utility companies in proceedings before the Public Service Commission of Missouri. The commission, which had the responsibility of deciding the question, had no such thought. It decided that the public interest (including the interests of the cooperatives and the consumers on the acquired lines) would be served by the purchase.

Mr. BOREN speaks with great concern of the interests of the existing consumers along the acquired lines and refers to them as "captive customers." We wish to say just three things in connection with this matter which we did not discuss in our summary. First, this property was on the market for sale under orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Although no other firm offer had been made, it is a matter of record that certain other interests, representing undisclosed principals, had negotiated with the seller at a price just slightly under the price paid by the cooperative. In the hundreds of transactions of sale and purchase in the electric light and power field duly approved by regulatory bodies, it has never been considered as a matter of consequence that consumers are served by a new ownership provided the service continues to be adequate. Second, it was clearly established, and so found by the Public Service Commission, that the properties in question under cooperative ownership would have a more sound financial structure and that the service would continue to be as good or better. Third, the record does not indicate that these existing consumers considered themselves to be "captives." The record shows exactly the opposite. Those consumers who do not join the cooperatives will continue to be served as nonmembers.

Mr. BOREN refers to the fact that there was no vote of the existing consumers and states that R. E. A. "either dared not trust the electorate of these communities for a simple expression of their will, or they just didn't give a damn." The fact is that ultility companies, not R. E. A. or the cooperatives, have opposed any resort to "consumer preference" as a criterion in determining what agency should own electric facilities. They have built "spite lines" in many areas where the overwhelming preference was cooperative service, in order to wreck or handicap the cooperative. In many States, these same utility companies have objected to evidence of consumer preference in Commission proceedings with respect to acquisitions. R. E. A. would welcome consumer preference as an important factor in all competitive situations but this doctrine is very unpalatable to utility companies. It is a doctrine that could have had a very wholesome effect in purchase and sale transactions between utility companies during the past 20 years.

The small water system and the three small ice plants were not included in the appraisal of the property for the purpose of determining the feasibility of the acquisition and of the R. E. A. loan. The value of these small collateral properties was less than 2 percent of the purchase price and the electric properties alone were well worth the price paid. The properties of the Missouri Electric Power Co. had to be acquired in their entirety or not at all and these insignificant water and ice plants were merely excess items that did not enter into the essential appraisal studies. The sole purpose of the R. E. A. loan was the solution of the problem of rural electrification in southern Missouri and the reaching of unserved farmers by means of this acquisition.

PAGES 16–17

The Indian electric case: This is the Oklahoma acquisition discussed in point 8, page 9, of our summary statement and we shall

deal here only with one matter not previously covered. Mr. BOREN in his statement inquires whether S. E. C. was informed of the existence of a higher offer from the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. The fact is, as the record of the S. E. C. proceedings indicates, that the Commission not only knew about it but approved the cooperative purchase in the face of the vigorous opposition of this power company. The Commission, in explaining its action stated:

"The record indicates that after entering into a contract to sell its electric properties to the said purchaser, Oklahoma received a bid from Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., a subsidiary of Standard Gas & Electric Co., a registered holding company, to purchase such properties for a base price of $250,000, or $13,000 in excess of the contract price. The record indicates that the sale of Oklahoma's electric properties has been discussed since 1939 with neighboring utilities, including Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., but no interest was evidenced in their acquisition until the offer made by Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. subsequent to the close of the contract with the said purchaser. Since it appears that competitive conditions have been maintained in the sale of these properties and that the sale price is favorable, we do not believe that the existing contract arrangements should be upset because of this late offer. We see no basis, therefore, for adverse findings under section 12 (d) with respect to the proposed sale." (Securities and Exchange Commission Release No. 4613, dated Friday, October 8, 1943, on p. 2, par. 5.)

PAGE 18

The Maupin River case: This is the last of the four acquisitions specifically discussed by Mr. BOREN. He charges that the Wasco Electric Cooperative in Oregon bought the property of the Maupin River Co. at a price $18,000 too high and that the cost of electricity to the cooperative members will be increased. The price paid was based on earning power and on careful appraisal by engineers of the Bonneville Power Administration and R. E. A.

The cost of delivering electricity to the cooperative members will be decreased and the transaction has other important values as follows: The acquisition was made to enable the cooperative; (1) to serve 70 unserved persons who were situated too great a distance from the cooperative's existing source of power to be served without the acquisition; (2) to extend service to the Warm Springs Indian Agency under a contract guaranteeing the cooperative a minimum revenue of $500 per month; and (3) to bring cheap Bonneville power to the cooperative's entire enlarged system which it would not have been able to do without utilizing the Maupin hydro system for voltage regulation.

In addition, this cooperative will be able profitably to furnish a neighboring cooperative, Central Electric Cooperatives, Inc., with power at wholesale for approximately 1 cent per kilowatt-hour as compared to 1.32 cents per kilowatt-hour, which the latter would have to pay if it were compelled to purchase power from the Pacific Power & Light Co., the only other available course. Thus not only will the acquiring cooperative add greatly to its revenues and its ability to reach unserved persons, but it will also be able to improve the financial condition of a neighboring cooperative.

PAGES 18–20

We have already discussed all of the six summarized points contained in Mr. BOREN'S statement with the exception of one. In his point 5, reference is made to the fact that the purchase of these properties by cooperatives removes them from Federal taxes and most local taxes. This matter, of course, is wholly one of legislative policy in a field in which the Rural Electrification Administration has no responsibility. It should be stated, however, that there has been little change in tax status with reference to most of the properties which cooperatives have acquired. With respect to State taxes, these properties in most instances have been assessed to the cooperative for taxation at the same value as under the prior ownership. There are a few States where under State law the tax situation was changed by the acquisition but, as stated above, this is a matter for the States to determine and is entirely apart from the responsibilities with which R. E. A. is charged.

PAGES 20–22

The resolution adopted by the Cooperative League of America quoted at length in Mr. BORENLS statement has no relevancy whatever to any of the issues here under discussion. This resolution, in its broad generalizations, is concerned with just one thing, namely, the necessity in the public interest that no loans by Government agencies shall be made for political purposes. The R. E. A. staff, in common with all good citizens, is in complete accord with the lofty sentiments of this resolution, but it has no relation whatever, in its language or in its background, to the matter of acquisitions by cooperatives. So far as we know, no one has ever even intimated that any R. E. A. loan to finance cooperative acquisitions was motivated by political considerations.

PAGES 22–23

This portion of Mr. BOREN'S statement has to do with the legal problems involved in R. E. A. financing of acquisitions under the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act. As we have already stated, it would seem that no useful purpose would be served by discussing at length the Solicitor's opinion on this subject. The opinion speaks for itself and any discussion here would be merely by way of needless repetition.

We wish, however, to correct certain misapprehensions. As we have indicated in our initial summary statement (pp. 10–11) this was decidedly not an "afterthought opinion." It was issued by the Solicitor merely as a part of a policy of reducing to the form of Solicitor's opinions many of the major legal questions which had been receiving the attention of the R. E. A. legal staff before its incorporation in the Solicitor's office. This matter received the careful attention of R. E. A. attorneys at the time of the very first loan application for such financing and each acquisition has received legal approval after careful study. We are very sorry that Mr. BOREN was led to reach the conclusion expressed in the following statement which appears on page 23: "The very fact that this policy had proceeded apace for 4 years without a legal peg to hang on reflects contempt for the law and for the will of Congress that is hardly compatible with sound administrative practice—if I may understate the case." We are sure that he will be glad to learn of the true situation as indicated above.

Mr. BOREN is also mistaken in his conjecture that there never would have been a legal opinion by the Department of Agriculture on the subject had not the Comptroller General requested it. The fact is that the preparation of the opinion signed and issued by the Solicitor under date of November 24, 1942, had been under preparation for some time prior to the inquiry addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture by the Comptroller General under date of October 12, 1942. Our files indicate that the first draft of this opinion was submitted to the Solicitor August 24, 1942, under his request for a compendious opinion embodying the essential legal principles that had governed the actions of the R. E. A. legal division prior to its incorporation into the Solicitor's Office. The Solicitor had requested the opinion several weeks prior to the date the first draft was submitted to him.

We do not know what importance Mr. BOREN attaches to his statement on page 23 that the Solicitor's opinion "has never been made public in full," and the reference to "the obscurity in which it has languished unseen in the archives of the Department of Agriculture for more than a year." The fact is that this opinion received exactly the same distribution as all other Solicitor's opinions. There is no public distribution of any of these opinions and the distribution is limited to the members of the Solicitor's Office and appropriate persons in the Bureau having responsibility for the matters involved. Speaking for the attorneys, we should also like to say that their feelings are hurt by Mr. BOREN'S reference to the good faith of their opinion and his characterization of the opinion as a "classic of legal casuistry" and "an ex parte tissue of legal sophisms and special pleadings." We can meet these accusations only by a reference to the opinion itself and by an emphatic assertion of our completely honest belief that it is a good opinion and represents a thoroughly sound exposition of the applicable legal principles.

VINCENT D. NICHOLSON,
Deputy Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, and Associate Solicitor in Charge of Rural Electrification.

Subsidies and Food-Allotment Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. WORTH CLARK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] by Mr. Bennett, which was broadcast over the network of the National Broadcasting Co. on Friday, March 17. The interview was on the subject Subsidies and the Food-Allotment Plan.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. BENNETT. Hello folks. This is Dana Bennett, your Washington farm reporter. Here in the studio with me is an outstanding Member of the United States Senate. He is loved by many and deeply respected even by his opponents. His knowledge of government is surpassed by none. His sympathy for labor and for agriculture is a matter of record. Personally, he is one of the finest Americans I know. It is a real pleasure to have Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., of Wisconsin, to interview.

He is going to discuss with you the Aiken-La Follette food-allotment bill. You will undoubtedly be hearing more about this important piece of legislation in the near future.

Senator, will you tell us just what the food-allotment plan is?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to, Dana. Briefly, it is a bill to provide assistance to consumers in those low-income groups who cannot afford an adequate minimum food diet. This assistance would be offered in the form of food-purchase stamps. The stamps would be available to each family in whatever amount is necessary to provide enough additional food to meet minimum nutritional requirements. The stamps could be exchanged for food only, at grocery stores

and meat markets. The Government would redeem them in cash when turned in by the storekeepers.

The Aiken-La Follette bill takes the findings of the Department of Agriculture as to what constitutes an adequate minimum diet as the standard. It provides that each family will be afforded whatever assistance is necessary to bring its diet up to that standard, or its equivalent. Those families who can afford such a minimum diet or a better one out of their own income will not be eligible for any aid from the Government under this plan.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator, what has prompted you and Senator Aiken to propose the food-allotment plan at this particular time?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. As you know, Dana, there has been a great deal of confused thinking about the cost of living in this country. It is a fact that the cost of living in terms of prices paid for food, clothing, and the other necessities of life has increased as we have gone on a war footing. It is a fact that many people with low or relatively fixed incomes are suffering seriously from this rise in prices. The more the necessities of life cost, the less these people can buy.

The problem is to provide assistance for these people without committing the Government to a general consumer subsidy program which benefits the rich as well as the needy. In fact, it benefits the rich more than the needy. The Aiken-La Follette food-allotment bill will provide the assistance where it is needed most, and at the smallest cost to the taxpayer in proportion to its benefits.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator, just exactly how would the rich benefit more than the poor under a general subsidy program?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Studies indicate that the total consumer benefit from the present food-subsidy program ranges from approximately $5 a year in the lower-income brackets to $5 a month in the top-income brackets. The benefit is trifling for most consumers. The scheme so operates that benefits are least for those who need them most and most for those who need them least.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator, how would your food-allotment plan stop what would appear to be this most unfair procedure?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. It does not extend any benefits to those consumers who have sufficient income to absorb the increased cost of living.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator, how would you determine how much each family is entitled to in the form of stamps?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. It is estimated that the dietary standard established in the bill would require an expenditure of approximately $650 a year to feed a family of four. Under this plan the Government will, in effect, make up the difference between this amount and what the family is able to spend out of its own income for food.

This estimate of $650 would vary in different sections of the country. It would depend on local food prices.

Mr. BENNETT. But, Senator, as your bill uses the Department of Agriculture's basic standard for nutritional requirements, won't it have the effect of compelling everyone participating in the plan to eat the same thing, whether they like it or not?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Absolutely not. The bill provides that the basic food allotment shall consist of those foods and amounts contained in the Department of Agriculture's basic diet, or its equivalent.

Mr. BENNETT. So our meals would not be determined by daily bulletins out of Washington?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. No, sir.

Mr. BENNETT. The plan, Senator, I take it, should result in a higher standard of American health. I believe selective-service figures show a startling number of our fellow citizens have physical defects due to malnutrition.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. You certainly have touched upon a very fundamental consideration in this whole cost-of-living discussion. You are all finding out now what many of us warned against throughout the thirties, when unemployment was rife. It is not sound national policy to undermine the dietary standard of our citizens.

The records of the Selective Service System indicate that between 40 and 45 percent of the men called for military service have been rejected for physical reasons. The Surgeon General of the United States points out that a substantial proportion of these rejections are due to the effects of malnutrition as well as the lack of proper medical and dental care.

In this rich country, possessing vast productive capacity, there is no excuse for allowing people to suffer from malnutrition. We do not want to repeat the dismal picture that was presented in the thirties. Then farmers were being paid by the Government to plough under corn and slaughter little pigs. At the same time millions of people were living on a horribly inadequate diet in our great cities. When we faced the crisis of war this had produced young men who were unable to serve their country because of malnutrition.

Mr. BENNETT. But, Senator, don't we face a different situation now? Can we produce enough food to provide everyone with an adequate diet?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. The American farmer is anxious, willing, and able to produce all of the food necessary to feed our people, and tremendous quantities to help feed our allies. We need only give him the green light for full production and clear the present obstacles out of his way.

Mr. BENNETT. What are those obstacles, Senator?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. The major requirements for full production are manpower, machinery and supplies, and a fair price at the market place to cover production costs.

I want to make it clear that I do not think a Government subsidy is an acceptable substitute for a fair price.

Mr. BENNETT. Why not?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Of course, Dana, it is difficult to generalize about subsidies. There are many kinds. There are some instances in which it is possible to subsidize a small part of the supply of a commodity. This saves the consumer not only the difference in price on that small part of the supply, but on the entire supply. The subsidy on copper is a spectacular illustration of this. For the most part, food subsidies are not of this variety. Practically all of the food subsidies are applied to the entire supply. Consequently consumers generally will, in the end, pay more in taxes to support the program than they save in lower prices.

To the farmer the general food-subsidy program is a sham. It establishes fictitiously low prices in the public mind which will rise to plague him in later years.

Mr. BENNETT. But again, Senator, what about the consumer?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. To the consumer generally, the benefits of the present food-subsidy program have been grossly overrated. The consumer is getting at the most a 3½-cent benefit on his food dollar.

For the amount being expended currently for general food subsidies, the food-allotment plan would guarantee a minimum nutritional diet to at least 40,000,000 Americans.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator, you seem to feel that the general food subsidies paid up to the present time have had little or no effect upon the general food price level. Is that right?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. That's right. The present food-subsidy program is not the backbone of the stabilization program. The price-ceiling machinery, rationing, and the over-all fiscal policy of the Government should be the real backbone of price stabilization.

In connection with price ceilings, let me say that O. P. A. could save the consumer money on his food bill by going after the tremendous profits that are being made by some food processors.

I certainly am not one to begrudge the food processors or any other businessman a fair profit. However, it is a fact that food processors have been reaping unprecedented profits. This is due largely to increased demand for foods and increased volume of business, coupled with the reduction of sales and promotional expenses. It is estimated that the aggregate profits, before taxes, in 1942 for one group of 53 meat packers were over four times the pre-war level of 1936 and 1939. Wholesale food grocers are reported to have realized twice as much on every dollar of sales, before taxes, in 1942 as in 1939. Profits before income taxes realized by fruit and vegetable canners were found to be five times as great in 1942 as in the years 1936–39.

Mr. BENNETT. I've heard it charged that this whole subsidy question is being used by certain powerful factions in this country for purposes of their own. Skip that one if you want to, Senator.

Senator LA FOLLETTE. I don't want to skip that at all. I am sure that there are forces at work trying desperately to use this subsidy issue as a political wedge to separate the great mass of city wage earners, from the farmer, and to turn one group against the other.

The farmer is no war profiteer, and anyone who understands his problem will be compelled to acknowledge that.

I sincerely hope this trick will not succeed. For, in the long run, the producers in the factory and on the farm are dependent upon one another. They will prosper together or they will go down to ruin together. The events of the last 3 years have proved that if the workingman is getting a good wage he can buy all of the food the farmer can produce. And at a fair price the farmer can produce all the food the Nation needs.

There has been violent disagreement in Congress and elsewhere on the policy of general food subsidies. But Congress has given the President every dollar he has requested for subsidies. The meager results, therefore, cannot be blamed on the opposition. They must be traced to the shortcomings of the general food subsidy scheme itself.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator LA FOLLETTE, will you sum up our discussion?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, Dana. We are concerned at the moment with the impact of the increased cost of living on the people who cannot afford to absorb these rising costs. General food subsidies are not the answer. They attempt to subsidize everybody whether he needs it or not. As a result, the benefits are spread so thin that the program does not give substantial assistance to anyone. The Aiken-La Follette food-allotment plan will concentrate the help where it is needed most, among those with low and relatively fixed incomes. At the same time the farmer will, in the normal course of trade, get his fair and necessary prices.

If, after the war, we should be confronted with another overproduction-underconsumption crisis similar to the thirties, this same machinery will be available to stabilize the market outlets for agricultural commodities. It would protect then, as now, the diet and the health of the American people.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator LA FOLLETTE, we have a few minutes left to go into a little ad lib conversation. I wonder if, in your opinion, the Aiken-La Follette bill will take the place of general food subsidies? Will it handle the situation completely?

Senator LA FOLLETTE. It is my feeling it will handle the situation, Dana, much better than general food subsidies for many of the reasons discussed here tonight. The main point here is that general food subsidies do not give the consumer substantial benefit. The Aiken-La Follette food-allotment plan would concentrate whatever money Congress is willing to appropriate for this purpose and give it to those who need it most and provide for them a real substantial benefit in the form of a minimum nutritional diet to protect health now and in the future.

Mr. BENNETT. Senator LA FOLLETTE, that seems fine to me, and I am sure the folks have been very much interested in your discussion of the Aiken-La Follette food-allotment bill. Thank you very much, Senator LA FOLLETTE.

Hull's Efforts Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

HULL'S EFFORTS PRAISED
(By David Lawrence)

For the last several months there has developed in this country a sort of heckling compaign against the State Department. Some of it originated with the left-wing groups that didn't like our cautious policy with respect to General de Gaulle. Some of it comes from the elements which like to believe that the United States "has no foreign policy" and never has had any, which is inaccurate, because America has had a foreign policy as far back as 1917—one that was applied specifically as recently as November 1939 when the Congress repealed the arms embargo and took the first step toward helping the Allies. And now some of the criticism is coming from Republicans who themselves have never made clear what they want by way of foreign policy, but who insist that whatever our policy happens to be, it is not clear enough or something.

Much of the attack centers on the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, whose patient labors over the last several decades in favor of international cooperation and as against economic nationalism ought to be clear to anybody who is fair in examining the record. One of the mistakes President Wilson made was not to consult congressional committees on foreign policy, though few people realize how many of the suggestions made by the Republican leaders were actually accepted by Mr. Wilson in 1919 and embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Today Mr. Hull is trying to cooperate with Congress. He has received 22 Republican Congressmen and discussed foreign policy. He has made arrangements to discuss the future international organization for world peace with congressional committees. It is important that the record be made of this effort to bring about nonpartisan consideration of foreign policy, though it may turn out that present-day Republicans are as partisan as were their brethren of yesteryears.

Some of the criticism which emanated from the conference the other day with the Republican Congressmen shows the difficulties. If Mr. Hull talks off the record about delicate matters, the callers do not observe his confidence and the newspapers are given by the Congressmen fragmentary reports which can lead to embarrassing relations with Allied Governments. Why talk off the record, why not discuss everything in public, it is asked? Much as some Americans may be inclined to nurture the thought, the fact is that the United States Government is in no position to dictate to the other sovereign governments of the world. Incidentally, the other day Anthony Eden found himself denying vehemently in the House of Commons the insinuation of one of its members that the United States was dictating the foreign policy of Great Britain.

Neither the President nor the Secretary of State can tell Russia or Britain what to do. Each is an independent nation with a leader who has a mind of his own. The suggestion, sometimes made as a threat, that unless the Allies do what America wants done, the United States should withdraw and go isolationist, is one that ignores the fact that the war is not yet won and that if any nation begins to fight the war its own way or to relax its efforts, Germany and Japan will be the beneficiaries.

The Republican Party has a grave responsibility the moment it begins to heckle the administration on foreign policy. For it may turn out that the administration will be the beneficiary at the polls in November of such tactics. The one thing the Democrats probably want to see happen more than anything else is the raising of the issue of foreign policy in the coming campaign. This is because foreign policy and war will then become interwoven in the public mind, and it will be to the advantage of the Democrats to subordinate domestic irritations and issues and let the country become agitated over what our foreign policy is going to be. This, in turn, will bring a debate on what our war policies are to be. In the end, the argument will be made by the Democrats that there must be no change in the Presidency and that reelection of Mr. Roosevelt is essential to continuity of our war effort. This would be asserted so as to create such fears as to make many voters afraid to risk a change.

If the Republicans are so foolish as to be caught in that political trap or rather to put themselves into that kind of a net through their own behavior, they will deserve to lose the election. The advice given by some thoughtful Republican leaders several months ago that the two parties avoid making either foreign policy or the war a major issue and that the Republicans concentrate on the shortcomings of the New Deal is still sound political judgment.

The Merchant Marine As an Instrument of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered before the Export Managers Club of New York, March 22, 1944, by R. Earle Anderson, Director of Finance, United States Maritime Commission:

Some months ago the world was startled by the news that one of our newly created shipyards on the Pacific coast had built a 10,000-ton Liberty ship in the almost unbelievable period of 11 days. The news of this astonishing performance rang from one end of the country to the other, and people suddenly awakened to the fact that the United States was creating the greatest fleet of merchant ships the world has ever seen. The fact began to stand out that when the war ends the United States would find itself with newly built tonnage equal to more than half of what had been the pre-war tonnage of the whole world.

What to do with this vast fleet of ocean-going vessels when the dove of peace begins to flutter its wings?

Some would have us give away our entire merchant fleet to the British, with perhaps a few ships for the Norwegians and the Greeks.

Some have urged that the day after peace is declared a fleet of 50,000,000 tons of American ships, flying the American flag and loaded down with American goods, should start out to sail the 7 seas.

These ideas, of course, represent the extreme of hysteria. Actually, we shall have, post-war, a great merchant fleet. We shall, for the time being, at least, be the leading maritime nation. We intend to remain a maritime nation. Our post-war obligations, both to ourselves and to other nations, will require us to remain a maritime nation. We shall have before us both an opportunity and a problem. But unless our shipping policy continues to be founded on solid financial and political considerations, our ascendancy will be short lived, and both our commerce and our national defense will suffer.

You gentlemen, who handle our export and our import trade, and who find both your means of livelihood and your opportunity for service to the country at large in furthering the movement of goods in our foreign trade, have a very real interest in what happens to our merchant marine. Is it to be a national asset, or just an expensive toy left over from the war? Are we going to force our ships into world-wide service simply because we have them and attempt to make our commerce serve our ships, or are we going to make our ships serve our commerce? And shall we forget the lessons which two wars should have taught us as to what ships mean to our national safety?

The answer lies, I believe, in viewing the matter objectively; in determining what we really shall need, post-war, as a merchant marine; what constitutes a sound national policy with respect to our shipping from the standpoint of both commerce and the national defense; implementing that policy with the ships we shall have, supplemented if need be by some further construction for special purposes, such as passenger vessels (of which there will probably be a post-war shortage) and then disposing of the remainder in such manner as may be consistent with sound relations with other friendly maritime nations and a policy of parity in the operation of vessels under the American flag in world competition. If there be still a surplus of tonnage, a reserve fleet of slow but stalwart Liberty ships, permanently withdrawn from commercial use, may well serve as insurance against a future national emergency.

From such a program there should emerge an American merchant fleet adequate to serve and develop our water-borne commerce, made up of ships unequaled by those of any other nation—fast ships, well-equipped, the safest that the science of naval architecture can produce, and ready for instant use in the support of our armed services in maintaining peace or if need be in waging war.

Now, there are those who argue that we should not attempt to remain in the business of carrying any substantial part of our water-borne commerce; that all ocean-carrying should be done by those who offer the lowest cost, and that every dollar taken out of the

pocket of the American ship operator or the American seaman is a dollar added to the purchasing power of our foreign customer, and hence increases our export trade.

At first blush this theory is plausible, provided, of course, that we are willing to forget the part that merchant ships play in the national defense. It is widely accepted as a sound theory. Our British cousins, who are not at all complacent about the possible future place that America will have in world commerce, never lose an opportunity to implant and nurture this theory in the American mind, and the British are by no means unskilled in the use of subtle commercial propaganda.

This idea that a dollar paid to a foreign ocean carrier is a dollar added to our foreign trade probably grows out of the conception of foreign trade as something static—as a stream of limited flow, dependent upon some fixed volume of available foreign exchange. It overlooks the very basic fact that foreign trade is a two-way traffic; that it involves imports as well as exports; that the foreign exchange through which money settlements are made is the result, not the source, of such trade, and that the extent to which producers of materials and goods throughout the world find it advantageous to exchange such goods and are willing and able to do so is the prime factor that determines the volume of international trade.

The notion of a fixed volume of trade limited by some fixed amount of foreign exchange finds its counterpart in the theory, often expressed in soap-box oratory, that there is a fixed amount of money available for wages, or a fixed amount of work to be done, or a fixed number of jobs in the country to be given out to workers, and that a dollar more or a job more comes out of someone else's pocket or pay roll. All American experience is to the contrary. The extraordinary rise in real wages and in the standard of living in this country over many decades is evidence of that fact. Neither wages, nor jobs, nor trade, are static. Activity breeds activity in industry and in commerce, and it may well be that a dollar wisely spent in the American carriage of our commerce will accumulate many dollars in volume of trade; that instead of subtracting from our exports, it will stimulate our exchange of goods and thus tend to increase imports and exports together.

The thing that the statically minded economists fail to recognize is the function of our merchant marine as a builder of foreign commerce.

During the second half of the last century our country underwent a tremendous internal expansion. It was an era of an advancing frontier during which the railroads, stimulated and supported by Federal subsidies in the form of land grants, knit the country together with a great network of transportation that became the very foundation of our growth as an agricultural and industrial nation. The part that transportation played in pioneering the development of America is so much a matter of common knowledge that its significance is readily overlooked.

Today it is a matter of pretty general agreement that when peace comes there will ensue a period of expanding world trade. Our sea lanes, supplemented by airways closely integrated with our surface shipping services, must carry the great bulk of the international exchange of goods. The function of our merchant marine in the post-war era of world development can be likened to that of our railroads in our domestic development. Of course, we cannot monopolize the world carrying trade even if we would, but we should certainly not contemplate turning it over bodily to competitive nations because of some pinchpenny economic philosophy that fails altogether to recognize the true function of our ships, traversing both sea and air, as a means to promote our foreign commerce, increase our exports and our imports, and so add to our domestic prosperity.

Our American farmer, our American manufacturer, our trader, and our workman must come into this post-war period of world-wide expanding commerce with every means at hand for stimulating our foreign trade and so insuring our own ability to utilize to the utmost the productive capacity of our farms and workshops.

The task is not performed, the problem of trade is not solved when an export bill of lading is written and a ship of whatever flag is found on the appropriate berth. The activities of you gentlemen as exporters will be bound in shallows and in miseries, miseries that will be shared by all your compatriots, farmers, manufacturers, workers, and tradesmen, unless there is a full and effective realization of the character and scope of our problem of foreign trade.

Historically, the United States is export minded. Its businessmen and its politicians think of foreign trade principally in terms of exports rather than in terms of imports. It is not surprising that this is the case.

Until very recently we have been a debtor nation. Throughout our early years, throughout, that is to say, the period of our youth, we used foreign capital for the development of our resources. British and Dutch money, in particular, found a profitable field for investment in our railroads and mines.

But we have been buying back from foreign ownership our mines and factories and railroads, and we have been paying for them with the difference between our imports and our exports. So long as this condition of our owing money abroad continued, a balance of exports over imports was favorable. We were, in effect, investing the excess production of our farms and factories in acquiring a free-and-clear ownership of our facilities. Because we were producing more than we were consuming, we were creating wealth, and in transferring our surpluses to foreign countries we were paying off debt and thus, in effect, plowing back into our own national economy wealth that had previously been obtained abroad. It was not without reason, therefore, that the excess of our exports over our imports was referred to as a favorable balance of trade. It was favorable, very favorable, so long as it enabled us to refinance our phenomenal growth by returning to the foreign financiers and promoters the capital they had put into our hands while America was in course of development.

Today such an excess of exports over imports can no longer properly be referred to as a "favorable balance," at least not in the old and historic sense. For we are no longer a debtor nation, nor have we been for more than a quarter of a century.

If our foreign debt has been paid off; if the investments of the British, the Dutch, and others in our mines and railroads have been retired; if the world now owes us more than it can repay, what is the function today of our export trade? Can we continue to have an excess of exports over imports without merely squandering the wealth that we have produced?

Why, in fact, should we carry on foreign trade at all if by so doing we merely pile up more and more credits that cannot be paid by the nations that have now become debtors to us? Why must we concern ourselves with such expedients as hiring our creditors to carry our goods on the theory that we can thus give them funds for them to use in buying our excess automobiles and typewriters and cotton and wheat?

There are those who advocate just such a deliberate shrinkage of our foreign trade; who argue for self-sufficiency; who point for example to synthetic rubber as proof that we can do without the products of other lands if we will but put our minds to it, and who, reminding us that our exports are, after all, only about a tenth or less of our production, would abandon our efforts to sell abroad, because they envision an America that will have no further need of foreign exchange.

For the answer to the questions we have just been posing, we must look at our foreign trade from the standpoint not of exports but of imports. In the final analysis, our exports, our surplus production that we can send to foreign shores, represents our own purchasing power in the markets of the world, whether that purchasing power be used to pay off debt, as we have done in the past, or to bring to our homes and factories, as we can now do, those things that we do not naturally possess or which we can obtain abroad more advantageously than we can produce them ourselves.

For example, and at the possible risk of oversimplifying what is really a very complex problem, let us assume that you and I go into the business together of manufacturing automobiles. And suppose that working together we can between us produce three automobiles. Now let us say that you and I each need only one automobile and so we have been spending our energies to produce an extra automobile for which we ourselves have no use. We can sell that automobile to someone else who might give us some shoes and clothing for it, or we can send it to some foreign country where it can be exchanged for coffee, or for some of the manganese that we used in making it, or maybe for some of the fruits that cannot be grown in this climate.

If we send it to the foreign country and do not get something in exchange for it, directly or indirectly, we have just had all our work of building that third automobile for nothing. We have given it away. We might just as well have sent it to the automobile junk yard. We might a great deal better not have wasted our energy making three automobiles instead of two. We have accomplished nothing by exporting our surplus except to deceive ourselves for a while into the belief that we are businessmen engaged in the export trade.

This crude illustration of the relation between imports and exports might be expanded indefinitely. The fundamental fact is that our real interest lies in our imports; that our exports represent our international pocketbook out of which we buy in the markets of the world. If we try to build up an export trade in any other way, we shall find ourselves giving away our third automobile and getting nothing for it.

Every time milady buys a pair of silk stockings (Chinese silk hereafter) she not only feels and looks the better for it—she actually helps to keep some American steel mill or typewriter factory busy; she helps some foreigner to buy our wheat. When she buys coffee, tea, bananas, or pineapples for the family table, she does the same thing. Her husband's suit of Harris tweed, or his overcoat, woven in a New England mill from Australian wool, adds its bit to our volume of imports and makes it possible to dispose of just that much more in our export trade. Tea and coffee, wines, cocoa and chocolate, sugar, spices, gloves, furs—these are some of the familiar things we buy abroad, and in so doing add to our personal comforts while we are at the same time indirectly helping our own mills and factories and farms to dispose of their surplus production.

There are other things less visible to the average man on the street or to the busy housewife—tin, copper, manganese, bauxite, hardwoods, copra, and a large proportion of our nitrates. All of these things are the currency with which the nations that produce them are able to buy our American goods and produce.

Not only must we accept that currency, not only must we be willing to import foreign goods in payment for our own exports—if

we are to have a healthy and expanding export trade, we must have an expanding import trade—we must have, that is to say, expanding two-way commerce.

It is hardly necessary to argue before this group that this country should produce for export. Every alive American wants to see our factories and our farms producing more than we need for our own consumption. Full employment of our great productive capacity is necessary to prosperity here at home. Unless we are to live in an economy of permanent depression, therefore, we shall have goods for export, great quantities of goods. We can find prosperity in our exports if we are paid for them. We shall end up in national impoverishment if we are not paid for them. An expanding export trade, therefore, means an expanding import trade. In other words, it means expanding our business with the other nations of the world.

Now business does not grow just by sitting down and waiting for it to do so. No American manufacturer or merchant would last long among his competitors if he followed such a business policy. We cannot last long in world commerce if we just wait for it to come our way.

If we look forward nationally to an expanding economy, to the building up of our commercial relations with other nations, to the buying of their products whenever, wherever, and to the extent that our own welfare demands, then we must think of our foreign trade as a great, world-wide, commercial undertaking, involving the judicious use of our exports to pay for wise purchase of imports, and the building up of this volume of trade by every available means, just as any company engaged in domestic business seeks by every available means to build up its volume.

It is from this standpoint of an expanding international trade that we should examine the function of our merchant marine and determine our national policy with respect to it.

This war has brought home to our people a realization of the existence and importance of other lands and nations concerning which we had but a hazy idea. China now looms up as a country with a future as well as a past. India, with all its difficult problems, must some day join more fully in the upward movement of mankind. Russia, emerging from the bloody era of revolution, is in all probability on the verge of a great period of development during which its people will continue to create for themselves and to extract from their soil and mines those necessities and finally those luxuries that we enjoy. A great group of nations, historically old but economically in their childhood, lies between Russia and India. Africa is just in process of being discovered by the American businessman. And south of us lie the great areas of Latin America whose people within the last decade or so have themselves begun to bring toward fruition the great resources of their lands.

If we are to direct our national policy to the building up of trade among the nations of the world, we must develop to the fullest possible extent every implement that can be made effective. Particularly with respect to the undeveloped nations must we be able to offer all the facilities for doing business. We must produce the goods needed by them, to use as our purchasing power. We must furnish engineering services, assisting in the design and construction of roads, factories, mines, and public works. We must offer banking facilities, both for current needs and for long-term investment. And we must establish and maintain means for overseas transportation, both in the air and waterborne.

Particularly must we establish and maintain the organization throughout the world that is necessary to the operation of a merchant marine and that serves as our intimate commercial contact with the commerce of the world. For a merchant marine consists not only of ships but of men—men on the ships and men ashore; agents and representatives and offices, whose business it is to build business.

If there is any one lesson to be learned from the effective way that other maritime nations, particularly the British and the Germans, have used their ships and their shipping organization to foster trade and to divert it into their own commercial channels, it is the lesson that we cannot afford to turn our international delivery system over, lock, stock, and barrel, to competitor nations. While we cannot attempt to monopolize the business of overseas transportation, no matter how many ships we may have available for such use, we must work out, with reasonable regard to the legitimate interests of other maritime powers, a rational and sound policy for our merchant marine that will be an integral part of our world-wide commercial policy that will serve as a positive and constructive element in building up our foreign trade, both export and import.

How can the merchant marine be made to serve and make possible an expanding foreign trade? The answer does not lie in any jingo waving of the flag. However, our pride may swell when the Stars and Stripes are seen floating from the ensign staffs of American ships in foreign ports, it is not upon any idea of merely creating prestige that our merchant marine must rest.

The task of prime importance to be performed by our merchant ships is definite and important. It is to provide, year in and year out, dependable and efficient service upon regular schedule covering all trade routes throughout the world that are necessary to the handling of our foreign trade, both exports and imports. This means maintaining services that were in existence before the war, improving some of them with new and better and perhaps more ships, and it very definitely means the establishment of new routes and services where trade is in prospect and where the development of our foreign commerce in the broader aspect that has been emphasized requires that such services be made available. Moreover, it means the close integration of ships and airplanes so that our merchant marine may have available at the command of our commerce combined facilities for world-wide overseas transportation on the surface and in the air.

This establishment of shipping services cannot always be left to the course of nature. Our shipping facilities must in many instances be established in advance of adequate trade for their support, just as our railroads pioneered our domestic development. If our commerce is to be an expanding one, if we are to seek out those things that will add to our American welfare and bring them to our shores, and if we are to export our excess products in payment for these incoming necessities and luxuries, we must envision the whole problem and look upon our merchant marine as a very necessary means to an end.

It will cost us something to do this. But the cost must be regarded as a necessary part of our commercial overhead. No one, not even an economist, would attempt to argue, with respect to domestic business, that every expenditure necessary to such business must stand on its own feet. Our great department stores have almost without exception found it good business to maintain their own fleets of delivery trucks. Doubtless many such businesses could effect apparent savings by having some trucking company make deliveries for them; some have done so. But in general volume of business is helped by accepting this expense of house-operated trucks because the customer can be better served. Our dairy companies and our laundries have found it good business to keep their contact with their customers through their milk and laundry routes.

That it often pays to spend a dollar in the interest of increasing volume is amply borne out by American experience with advertising. In like manner, a dollar spent in carrying our foreign trade, if it be spent constructively, may produce many dollars of increased volume.

Our merchant marine is or can be our great international delivery system. It is more than a delivery system, just as the laundryman is more than a carrier of shirts and collars. The operators of ships have offices and organizations throughout the world. They are live businessmen, business builders. They are as keen to develop imports as they are to deliver exports. They seek to build up business coming and going, to be carried in their ships. These men, these organizations that operate our merchant ships not only run our delivery system, they are our go-getters.

We have been developing commercially our good-neighbor policy in South America. We have been doing it with American ships. It could not have been done by employing the English or the Norwegians, the Danes or the Greeks to do it for us, no matter how cheaply they might run their ships.

Before the war broke out in Europe American shipping people were building up a previously nonexistent import trade from the Baltic. The imports they developed increased our exports. They did it with American ships. It could not have been done by foreigners who had very different interests to serve.

We are on the threshold of vast opportunities and vast responsibilities in the Far East, especially in China. Are we to meet those opportunities and those responsibilities by turning over our proxy to our competitors? Or are we to send American goods on American ships through American organizations who will develop the possibilities, many of them latent, for imports to pay our American farmers and workmen for the goods they send abroad?

This matter of an adequate merchant marine really to serve our foreign commerce can be a very vital one.

The effective use of our merchant ships and shipping organizations as an instrument of an expanding commerce has a much closer relation to our future national prosperity than many of our people realize.

You gentlemen, who handle so much of our foreign trade, who direct so much of its movement, and who are so much closer to our problems of export and import than is the average man on the street, have, I believe, a correspondingly great responsibility to your fellow citizens. You can see and understand the problems of our foreign commerce as national problems.

You have a great opportunity for constructive leadership in this great field. If our future place in world commerce is to be based upon a broad understanding of its problems and its possibilities, it will need such leadership. Our merchant marine is a tool for use in creating the basis of national prosperity. It is only part of the whole kit of tools that the builders of our future world trade must use. It is, perhaps, the most important tool and, perhaps also, the tool whose usefulness is least understood by the average American businessman.

Our business leaders are today studying the post-war problem in all its aspects with courage and with vision. You export managers have a major role to perform in recreating a healthy domestic and international trade. Much will depend on how you, yourselves, utilize the American merchant marine as an instrument of American commerce.

The Republican Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon at the Republican State convention held at Topeka, Kans., on March 31, 1944, the title of his address being "The Republican Job."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A political campaign in the midst of war raises many difficult and perplexing problems for the citizens, press, and politicians alike. It is an abnormal condition. Bad news is kept from the public. Therefore, doubt and apprehension are fermenting.

The press and the radio are under self-imposed censorship. In modern all-out war to a certain extent, they become an arm of the Government. We Americans understand that the Government is not the same as the administration in power. The matter of freedom of speech and freedom of the press is especially important in a campaign that may establish the foreign custom of a life term for our Presidents. It may be difficult for other nations to grasp the distinction. But here in America we have developed the ability to change leaders and at the same time support the Government.

The British have worked out a similarly effective system. They describe the opposition to the administration in power as "loyal to King and country" whose very loyalty compels their opposition to what they conceived to be the blunders and the dangerous mistakes of the administration.

Here in America the administration in power must stand or fall on its record. Therefore, it is the particular function of whatever party happens to be in the minority to tell the people the truth, even when the picture is not as rosy as the administration would have the people believe.

Now, with our country at war, we must guard against unreasonably inflaming public opinion by flinging about loose abuse, even though candidate Roosevelt has not observed that principle and in his recent veto messages to the Congress, resorts to his customary tactics of giving the country something to hate. Two wrongs do not make a right. In peacetime such tactics—which are the first principles for leadership of the mob—are bad enough, but in war they are reprehensible. In a time of immediate national danger, the President should lead the way in setting the example of mutual political forebearance. Instead, he attacks the good faith and distorts the motives of the Congress.

The Washington reporters almost unanimously credited the wording of the President's recent veto messages to his deliberate attempt to lay an emotional basis for his 1944 campaign of "hate" against the Congress.

That is a much more serious situation for the country than his emotional campaign of hate against Mr. Hoover or against the economic royalists and tories, etc. There is no surer way to help the enemy than for a commander in chief to stir up factional hate in the rear of his country's armies.

The President reveals with the utmost nakedness, in his fourth-term-campaign strategy, both his secret antipathy for our system of government and his ruthless determination to use any means, regardless of the country's welfare, to establish himself in the White House for life.

He has done that so brazenly, so contemptuously, and so ruthlessly that his own personally selected party leaders have revolted, one after another.

It is true the President backed away temporarily from the most recent fight and sent his Senate leader a telegram that he didn't mean to impugn the motives of the Congress. But it gave the American people a prophetic warning that if they continue a leadership in the White House that has created a hostile Congress they will by their own apathy and complacency be contributing to a break-down of government itself.

The battle for power between the President and Congress is a crucial contest and one that has far-reaching implications.

Power in government, business, or labor never must be too greatly centralized. In the roaring twenties there was too much power in Wall Street. Business was too greatly centralized. It was right that this power was dispersed.

But today in our Government there is rapidly developing a centralization of all power, politics, business, and labor in the hands of one man. This is abhorrent to our philosophy of government.

That is the real meaning of the struggle now going on between Congress and the President. Even now the palace guard is preparing the way to continue the Roosevelt dynasty in office for 16 years.

Devious are the ways of a President who would perpetuate himself in office. Men in Congress who become puppets of the President when they are defeated in election know they will be appointed to lucrative Federal jobs. In the last 11 years there has been such a gathering of "lame ducks" in Washington jobs that it is little wonder we have a quack administration.

This process of rewarding faithful puppets is one that will break down any democracy so long as the Executive is kept in power indefinitely.

Now, the President insists on fully and completely taking away the purse strings from Congress. Already Congress has given him billions in blank checks. Yet the President's quest for power is insatiable, just as men possessed of wealth are never satisfied. Both must be checked and held in restraint.

Those American patriots of colonial days, Jefferson, Madison, Washington, Hamilton, and Franklin, who helped to chart the American way, realized that our Government would need checks and balances—hence the three coordinate departments, with none supreme in itself. They had studied history and they sought to guard against the cruelties they and their fathers and their fathers' fathers had experienced.

As far back in time as man's action is lighted in the pages of history are the signs for those who will heed. Daniel in Holy Scripture tells us: "I saw, and, behold a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth; the leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all; the beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of the heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it."

If a country or a nation is to be as a tree by the living water and it is to be fruitful there must be a balance with branches great and strong enough to hold the fruit. When the tree or nation becomes all trunk the tree dies—so it is with nations.

It is absolutely essential under our system of government that the Chief Executive of the Nation and the Congress work together just as it is for a Governor and his legislature to work together. On the farm when we have a headstrong horse, that won't team up, we swap him off. That is what we are going to do next November with candidate Roosevelt.

It is of the utmost importance for the American people to correct the dangerous and unprecedented strife, now existing between the Congress and the President. Such discord between these two important branches is interfering with the transaction of the Nation's business.

It will gravely imperil the national welfare in the coming 4 years of war, peace settlements, and reconstruction to be subjected to a President who demands either a rubber-stamp Congress or is in conflict with it. That is another factor in the conflicting and confusing babble of voices, weakening our leadership in the world. Arthur Krock, within the last few days said: "For the first time since the war began, in the entourages of Allied diplomatic and military missions to Washington, the observation was heard that maybe it would be more serviceable to the cause of the United Nations if the 1944 American elections should produce a President and Congress in political harmony, even if that President were not Mr. Roosevelt."

It is a fortunate circumstance that an election occurs this year. It gives the voters an opportunity to correct that intolerable situation. They will bring into the White House a new leader with the ability to give the required measure of direction with due respect for and cooperation with the able, hard-working, experienced Members of the Congress.

That is not a matter of party. It is a well-known fact in Washington that the feeling toward the administration's blunders and wasteful policies is as bitter on the Democratic side as it is on the Republican side.

The President has repeatedly expanded and enlarged upon the powers delegated to him. Congress now fears to trust him any longer, and therein the representatives of the people reflect the fears of their constituents.

It is essential to have in the White House at all tims a President whom the Congress can trust. It is imperative now. It is impossible to get a wholly new Congress at one election. Therefore, we must either elect another President, abandon our system of government with its divided responsibility, or face a break-down in our national administration.

The President has now abandoned the New Deal label. There is no longer anyone to claim this doorstep baby, except HENRY WALLACE. The life-term candidate clings to no lasting principles of government or truth. He changes with the shifting winds of public opinion. He is ready to alter his window dressing from day to day with the shifts of public taste, from the left to the right.

Today he is seeking to restyle himself as a great conservative. He is shoving Baruch and Jesse Jones, Clayton and Crowley, to the foreground, hoping they will make the public forget Henry Wallace, Milo Perkins, Tugwell, "Harry the Hop," "Henry the Morg," and "Sammy the Rose."

Someone is being sold down the river.

God forbid that our post-war reconstruction should be handled by the "palace guard." Neither do I want to see it in the hands of big business and speculative finance. I want to see it administered by practical progressives.

The temporarily ostracized new dealers are assuring themselves that the competent, able, but conservative administrators are simply decoys intended for campaign expediency in catching the sucker vote.

We have no outright statement as to what policies the administration intends to put into effect to facilitate our conversion to peacetime basis.

To obtain true knowledge of facts in war is difficult. Therefore, we are entitled to place our own interpretations on as much of the

record as is available. To do anything less would be contributing to a dangerous lethargy of national spirit. Therefore, by the very nature of the times, criticism becomes constructive. The reports of the congressional committees and the speeches by Republican leaders have been of the greatest value in correcting waste and inefficiency in the conduct of the war.

With the country facing debt and exhaustion, the administration in Washington continues profligate spending of public funds and will continue until we change horses, as England did when Chamberlain was dropped.

When the facts are uncovered, I say there will be found exorbitant and pure waste in the handling of lease-lend.

In the early days of the Roosevelt administration when it was scattering money to the winds with its pump-priming claptrap, if you dared criticize waste of public money, some crackpot would ask in a horror-stricken voice, "Do you propose to let people starve?"

Today, if you dare criticize the same wanton waste, the same disregard of the "silly old dollar sign," to quote the President, you are interfering with the good-neighbor policy, which incidentally does not seem to be working so effectively. Lest I be accused of being prejudiced, let me quote from an article by Sumner Wells, until recently Under Secretary of State: "To those of us who are convinced that the security and progress of the Americas depend upon the maintenance of inter-American solidarity, steps taken recently by the Department of State are profoundly disturbing. * * * What is happening may well bring once more into being conflicting blocks within the American family of nations—a calamity which has been avoided more than 10 years."

Unless you believe in the New Deal theory, that waste is a virtue, you are smeared as indifferent to all moral and patriotic considerations. By such tactics, men who are familiar with the scandalous waste going on in lease-lend operations, are intimidated from revealing the facts.

But we do not need to go as far away from home as lend-lease to see wanton and reckless waste of public moneys. It is visible to every eye. And again lest I be accused of being a wee mite prejudiced, let me quote from the junior United States Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD. This great Democrat says: "At the close of 1942 the Byrd committee, after an exhaustive inquiry into recent bureaucratic expansion, reported to the Senate: 'It can be said unequivocally that our own Government is the chief offender in the entire country from the standpoint of wasting and hoarding manpower. The statement may be made advisedly that at no time in history has there been so much waste, so much inefficiency as now exists in the multitude of bureaus which sap the strength of our Nation.'"

It is an outrageous performance to subsidize mining companies one way or another for the production of copper, zinc, and lead, beyond our war requirements. It's a waste of manpower, when we already have ample stock piles for our war needs, to continue to build them still larger.

There is a long list of vital and important matters on which the American people are being kept in the dark.

We know nothing about the present post-war agricultural policies. The New Deal record is zero as far as curing of the unhealthy and distressing situation of 1,234,000 farm families with an income before the war of less than $250 per year. The Republican Party must not allow that big group to fall back into such a sub-existence level after the war.

In agriculture after we were in war, when all-out production was demanded of industry, administration edicts still forced millions of idle acres. We were in the war over a year before the administration policies permitted unrestricted seeding of wheat and all-out production of other agricultural products. Yet during that same period, the President was calling the farmers a lot of uncomplimentary names for not making greater efforts to produce more food.

There are limiting factors in the production of foods other than the triple-A restrictions on the farmers the first year of the war. There was the confused and muddled handling of manpower. It took the President over a year to decide who was going to administer the question of deferment of essential workers. Even now the reports show they haven't yet decided how to do it. And in addition to the muddling of manpower, there comes the question of the physical facilities needed for all-out production. Government red tape in this field has delayed production in thousands of cases. Requests for priorities on new equipment or for repairs are passed from one agency to another and it frequently requires many months, and sometimes almost a congressional investigation to overcome the bureaucratic inertia, and secure action.

Another matter we are in the dark about is our foreign policies. Also according to news reports, our allies are as much puzzled as we are. If the President had grasped his opportunity, he could have made an epochal contribution to building a stable world that would have answered the age-old longing in the hearts of mankind for peace forevermore. Instead, he indulged in a lot of "hallelujah" shouting and impulsive off-hand comments that discredited American leadership. No one is left to do honor to the Atlantic Charter.

In 1936 I said, "The conduct of foreign relations was placed by the Constitution in the hands of the President. The policies are his." But in my judgment, those Presidents have been well advised who have made it their practice not only to consult the Department of State, and the majority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but the minority members as well.

The carrying out of these policies, the actual negotiating is done by the Secretary of State. This is because in the eyes of the outside world the President's decision is final. In consequence, if the President talks directly with foreign officials any careless remark may lead to international misunderstandings. As Mr. Coolidge once said: "One of the first lessons a President has to learn is that every word he says weighs a ton."

The wisdom of that policy is clearly demonstrated by the world-wide shock of the President's announcement in an off-hand reply to a question in a press conference—that he intended to turn over one-third of the Italian fleet to Russia. Now the New Deal writers are busy with all kinds of rumors and reports in the attempt to "cover up" for the President. When the storm broke, the President claimed he wasn't quoted correctly and that he said "one-third or its equivalent."

Well, Where does the equivalent come from? Is it from the American Navy as is being intimated?

Regardless of what he meant, this is just a dangerous repetition in foreign affairs of a frequent occurrence in domestic affairs, in the history of the Roosevelt dynasty. It is a matter of common knowledge that the President's frequent off-hand comments in press conferences were a shock to recovery of the country before the war and to an efficient administration of our national affairs.

The Secretary of State and the Secretary of War advised the Congress that the Zionist resolution pending in the United States Senate, was a threat to our national interests. A few days later the President played politics with the subject. Who is right? Is the President willing to sacrifice the conception of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War of our national interest on the altar of his fourth-term candidacy? What a spectacle this administration is making before the world! No wonder our foreign relations are in as bad a mess as our domestic affairs. The sin, the shame of it all, is that fourth-term political timidity is causing us to lose our great prestige and isolate ourselves from the opportunity to throw our influence behind a lasting peace.

We are drifting into imperialism or isolationism or a vicious combination of both, in foreign affairs. The quarterback theory of the President is as destructive in the foreign field as it was in the domestic field. The sudden shifts for which Candidate Roosevelt is notorious, simply have been a tremendous millstone around the neck of Uncle Sam, both at home and abroad.

We see the same babble of voices confusing our foreign relations that confused our domestic relations. As a result of the President's off-hand comments, the confusion between Government agencies, and the vagueness of their policies affecting our foreign relations, our war efforts are weakened.

The ballyhoo that surrounded the President's return from Teheran is almost unpleasantly reminiscent of Dr. Cook's return from the North Pole.

So much for a brief summary of some of the important and vital parts of the record of Candidate Roosevelt.

Now in contrast, What is the Republican position?

In the first place, it is almost impossible for the minority party—and the Republicans are in the minority in both the House and the Senate—to make much of a record. If a Republican Member of the Congress offers constructive legislation that strikes a popular note, his proposal is never passed under his name. Some Democratic committee chairman will change it slightly and introduce it under his own name or as a committee bill. That is the custom whatever party is in power.

But even so the Republican leadership in the Congress is not passively waiting to simply drift into power.

Under the able and far-sighted Republican leader representative, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, committees composed of Members of the National House of Representatives, have been appointed on the most vital questions of taxation, post-war conditions, food, and powers of the President.

Republican National Chairman Spangler has not been content to simply perfect a party organization for the next campaign. He has seized time by the forelock and named committees composed of Republican Governors and Members of the Congress, to prepare for post-war legislation on many vital subjects. Here are some of them:

1. Foreign policy and international relations.
2. Post-war enterprise, industry, and employment.
3. Social welfare and security.
4. Finance, taxation, and money.
5. Reform of Government administration.
6. Labor.
7. Agriculture.
8. International economic problems.

Therefore, we are boldly preparing to meet our responsibilities. There are two essentials that the Republican Party must meet in order to justify the confidence of the American people in the coming election.

1. We must have a platform that is definite, unequivocal, courageous, and forward looking. It seems to me it must include as its minimum requirements:

(A) An assurance that we will exert every effort toward the war. No temporary political expedience will be permitted to jeopardize or delay 1 hour, the winning of the war.

(B) Definite plans for reconversion from war to peace, and for returning soldiers and sailors. A blueprint for free industry and not a socialistic state so that business men

are assured of a fair profit, labor will be assured full employment, good pay, and higher standards of living and farmers are assured of a better price for their crops.

This will include a simplification of our tax structure to enable all taxpayers to know what they will be called upon to pay, eliminate the need for a lawyer and an accountant to help prepare every tax return and also to restore once again an incentive for idle capital to found new businesses, new industries, and create new jobs.

Most important of all is the removal of ancient artificial barriers that restrict the free flow of commerce at home and abroad.

(C) Broadly speaking, the American people are all of the same mind. The war and the way to lasting peace must be pursued with unrelenting vigor. Because Candidate Roosevelt has struck out is no reason we should give up hope of building a stable, prosperous, and peaceful world.

2. The second essential for confidence in the Republican Party is the choice of a candidate who can bring some order into the war effort and to the peace to follow.

In order to command confidence abroad, and at home, our candidate must—

(A) Be able to inspire trust at home and abroad in his ability to do teamwork with the Congress. Any Government is weakened without the whole-hearted cooperation of the legislative representatives of the people.

(B) Command overwhelming confidence in his determination and ability to end promptly the confusion of red tape, bureaumade laws, bureaucratic control of business, farming, and labor that are interfering with our war efforts. After all, the greatest reform we need in America today is in the matter of administrative efficiency and departmental order in Washington.

(C) By meeting these two essentials of platform and candidate honestly, openly, and with our eyes on the future, the Republican Party will justify the confidence which has been manifested in the recent elections in all parts of the country. We will provide an agency for good government to the vast majority of the people who are nauseated with the repudiation of American traditions under the New Deal and insure the election of a national administration which will lead us to new and undreamed-of prosperity and lasting peace.

Views of Former Governor Cox on Peace League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch including an interview with the Honorable James M. Cox, former Governor of Ohio.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COX URGES UNITED STATES TO JOIN WORLD PEACE LEAGUE—CALLS WILSON'S FOREBODINGS A PROPHECY FULFILLED—ASSAILS ROOSEVELT CRITICS

MIAMI, FLA., March 31.—James M. Cox, former Governor of Ohio and Democratic nominee for the Presidency in 1920, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was his running mate, said today in an appeal for United States adherence to a world organization such as the League of Nations that "the star that Woodrow Wilson followed is still my light and guide."

Supporting the league as an instrument of peace, now as in 1920, Mr. Cox, 74 years old today, said that President Wilson "warned us in words that are now prophecy fulfilled. I cannot believe, following these years of torment and suffering that a civilized world will permit to be destroyed the noblest project conceived by mankind. Nor can there be in the face of our tragic history, another triumph in this country for a political cabal such as blasted our hopes a quarter of a century ago. But there is a task to be completed first. We cannot insure the future without first dealing with the present.

HOME FRONT SEEN LAX

"There is much to be done at home," Mr. Cox said, "and the gravity and extent of the things to be done here will become more apparent with each day. I wish I had the facility to tie thought into phrase in such a way as to convey to all of us what is deep rooted in the minds and the souls of the brave men and women on the battle fronts. We have not been as faithful to our defenders as they have been to us. There are countless numbers of individual exceptions, but by and large we can't be proud of ourselves.

"We have feasted so long at the table of the gods that we cease to regard our fortune as a gift but take it rather as a right. When emergency compels any trespass upon our bounty, we do not respond with our better selves. We complain and criticize. As our comforts and conveniences are disturbed, demagogs try to take our minds from the Nation's great achievements of war to things so little and so relatively unimportant that we should reproach ourselves for even thinking of them. This leads us nag and hamper our leaders with energies that might better be employed against the enemy.

HITS ARM-CHAIR GENERALS

"Thousands of us presume to know more about the direction of armies than General Marshall and of naval strategy than Admiral King. We should long ago have learned the dangers of such back-seat driving. Our assumption of superior knowledge runs in other directions too. We are reading in the press and hearing over the radio a continuing inquiry into the necessary secrets of the war movement. What went on at the conferences at Cairo and Teheran? What did Roosevelt say to Stalin? What did Stalin say to Churchill? and so on and on. A man from Mars might easily assume that we think these leaders are stupid or unfaithful when the facts are obviously otherwise.

"We need to remember that a very delicate situation existed with respect to the relations among our allies. Russia trusted no one because no one trusted Russia. We have advanced far from that state of things, and can anyone deny the vast military advantages that have accrued from the agreements which have been reached? There will doubtless be future differences to adjust but I have never known a personal quarrel to be bettered by neighborhood meddling. Too many editors, columnists, and commentators demand the details of the most confidential situation. What could they do about it if they knew? There would be wide differences of opinion not only as among them but their readers and hearers as well. There would be no agreement, no solution, only worse confusion. We must trust our leaders. A million commanders cannot win a war."

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Streamlining Congress," which appeared in the Easton (Pa.) Express.

At the same time I should like to call the attention of the Senate to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which makes provision for the appointment of a joint committee on the organization of the Congress, and which is now before the Rules Committee of the Senate.

I should also like unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Self-Rescue," which appeared in the News of Greensboro, N. C. This editorial also deals with the very urgent need of a reorganization of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

Certain indexes warrant the hope that Congress is beginning to be apprehensive of the growing discontent of the public with the cumbersome procedures of that body in thwarting instead of promoting the public will and the public good in many instances.

Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and Senator DANAHER, of Connecticut, Republicans, have envisioned the reorganization of the Congress by the Republicans in January—if their hopes are achieved in the November election—and have promised some of the cobwebs will be wiped off the slow, old-fashioned machinery of Congress.

Two streamlining proposals are now before the Senate Rules Committee. Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, Democrat, has proposed a committee of 12 Senate and House Members be set up to recommend modernization. Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, Progressive, would abolish 20 of the 33 standing committees of the Senate and limit Senators to membership on only one major committee.

Even these small tentative suggestions give hope that some Congressmen are alert to the fact, which is glaring to all outsiders, that present congressional machinery is outmoded, cumbersome, slow, and actually dangerous in a time of great stress and strain when speed and action spell success and lack of them means failure.

What about the seniority rule? That antiquated and anachronistic custom that elevates political hacks to places of prominence and leadership for which they are ill-fitted because they happen to hold on to their seats a long time should be shoved overboard when at last Congress creaks around to housecleaning.

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) News of March 23, 1944]

SELF-RESCUE

Revelation that Congress is devoting serious study to the overhauling of its own structure, procedure, and operating methods is welcome news. Here is a field which is loaded with possibilities for greater understanding

and cooperation between the legislative and executive and for modification, if not elimination, of the causes for much of the growing criticism which is delivered against the former branch of the Government.

In contrast to the talk that constitutional changes affecting the form of our Government should be made to remove existing deficiencies, especially as relating to deadlocks and delays, it is meet to remember that the Constitution itself, while setting up the governmental structure and staking out the bounds of each branch of the Government, leaves to the Congress the filling out of the details of its own organization and procedure. The set-up of congressional committees, seniority and other rules, and the great body of precedents and prerogatives represent the decisions and the formulations of the Congress itself. It thus becomes increasingly incumbent upon the legislative to examine this body of rules, regulations, and practices—its whole machinery—to determine whether they have outgrown their usefulness and injure or retard rather than aid the common weal.

A certain amount of cumbersomeness will always be necessary in the democratic process and will doubtless serve the public interest as a safeguard against undue haste or ill-advised action. But it is our considered opinion that an overhauling of this machinery is long overdue and that Congress itself faces a grave share of the responsibility for the popular disfavor into which it has, like it or not, fallen. It devolves upon the legislative branch, still the very crux of our democratic system, to take the initiative in rescuing itself. In fact, no other agency can.

Our Irresponsible Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Irresponsible Government," by Charles A. Beard, published in the Progressive of March 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

(By Charles A. Beard)

Two things the American people have long taken for granted, like the air they breathe: the liberties and the rights of self-government which they enjoy under the constitutional system of the United States. They have seemed to imagine that no matter what they think, say, and do, these liberties and rights will endure forever, like the hills and the stars.

Yet they have, within the past 25 years, witnessed the destruction of civil liberties and the collapse of popular governments far and wide over the surface of the earth. They have seen parliament after parliament paralyzed by incapacity to legislate and control executive aggression, and then either disappear entirely or sink into utter futility.

They have seen great nations disgusted by factionalism and negationism in legislative chambers and willing to surrender to demagogs prepared to promise them peace, action, and security.

Is it possible that the American people actually regard themselves as utterly and forever immune to the calamities which have marked the march of despotism in Europe and Asia?

Is it possible that the Congress and President of the United States can pursue unscathed in the coming half century the methods they have followed during the past 25 years? Are they prepared by organization, procedure, knowledge, and spirit to cope successfully with the pressing and complicated issues of government already crowding in upon them—issues almost certain to become more pressing and more complicated in the years immediately ahead?

THREE SLEEPING RESOLUTIONS

That a few Members of the present Congress are disturbed by such questions is made evident in three resolutions which have been introduced since it opened in January 1943.

The first is a proposal by Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., Wisconsin Progressive, for reducing and streamlining the committees of the Senate in the interest of a more efficient transaction of public business.

The second is a resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER to amend the rules in such a way as to make it possible for the House to invite heads of departments and independent agencies to report and answer questions on the floor of the House.

The third is a joint resolution sponsored by Representative MONRONEY and Senator MALONEY, which calls for the creation of a joint committee empowered to investigate and report on the whole problem of efficient congressional procedure and efficient methods for conducting the relations between Congress and the President.

But at the moment these resolutions seem to be sleeping in committee rooms and there are few overt signs that a majority of Senators and Representatives are looking beyond their noses in this respect or ever dream that the deluge may come in their own time, instead of after they are safely interred in their graves.

After all, aren't they working hard in committees, answering letters and telephone calls, running errands for constituents, making speeches on the floor, talking fast and furiously in cloakrooms and caucuses, and answering back when the President tells them that they are trying to commit a fraud on the people of the United States? Yes. But is that enough?

Meanwhile questions asked in Congress and by citizens seeking information concerning their government remain unanswered. Meanwhile, save on rare occasions, debates in the House and Senate are as desultory as ever, grave issues continue to be undefined, to say nothing of joined, and an air of irresponsibility seems to hang thickly over the Capitol Hill as well as the White House.

Now, exact information and a sense of responsibility on the part of public authorities are certainly indispensabe to the conduct and maintenance of constitutional government, at least in the long run. Surely none will deny the essential truth of this proposition. Nevertheless it is repeatedly flouted in Congress and by the President.

In order to make this point clear and explicit, let us take a single illustration out of the many available to anybody who studies and observes the transaction of public business in Washington.

On November 26, 1943, Senator HUGH A. BUTLER of Nebraska made a report to the Senate on our financial operations in Latin America. Now, I do not know Senator BUTLER. Nor do I pretend to judge here the merits of his argument or the case he raised, although I have probably given more time to the matter than the average busy American citizen. Nor do I here pass upon the motives of Senator BUTLER or his critics. All I want to do is to call attention to the way in which a piece of public business is handled in Washington.

In the course of his report, Senator BUTLER stated: "Our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit in or for Latin America during the 3 years, 1942, 1943, 1944 total more than $6,000,000,000." The Senator went on to say that a considerable part of this money was being spent in ways that did not advance good relations between the United States and Latin America.

ALL IS CONFUSION

Leaving out of account the rhetoric of the business, there stands the Senator's statement about the $6,000,000,000. Surely Congress and the people have a right to know whether the figure is approximately true or is grotesquely false.

The Constitution provides explicitly: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time." Since no military secrets were involved in the mere fact of the $6,000,000,000, Congress and the people were entitled to know about it. Well, what did they learn?

According to the Associated Press, Nelson Rockefeller issued a statement as follows: "Spending and commitments to spend in Latin America in the last 3 years by all Government agencies, including military and naval installations, total less than $6,000,000,000." In other words, it seemed that Senator BUTLER was 10 times wrong, absurdly wrong.

On the same day, Senator MCKELLAR, acting chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who, if anybody, might be supposed to know, declared cautiously: "If I understand correctly, $2,207,000,000 is all that has been spent down there for every purpose, including the purchase of war materials." So it looked for a moment as if Senator BUTLER was either careless or frightfully ignorant, and trying to make trouble for the administration. Either that or the three gentlemen did not know what they were talking about or were talking through their hats.

In any event that queer bird known as John Q. Citizen, who has to pay taxes to meet the bill whatever it is, must have felt more cross-eyed than ever. For his edification, newspapers, magazines, and columnists poured out ink like cuttlefish, making the air thicker than a London fog. After reading a bale of clippings I felt like old Ben Turpin himself, and awaited more enlightenment.

On January 20, 1944, Senator BUTLER opened up again. He presented to the Senate a long and detailed schedule, checked by certified public accounts and citing the documentary sources of each major item. According to this schedule, the total figure in the case in question was $5,733,953,534, as far as independent Latin American countries alone were concerned. That is not far from the original claim: $6,000,000,000.

Some debate then took place. There seemed to have been some confusion among Senator BUTLER's critics over the period covered. But his figures were not refuted. Senator MCKELLAR, instead of tearing them to pieces and giving the facts if he could, laid special emphasis on the importance of maintaining the good-neighbor policy. Senator BUTLER agreed with him on that policy but wanted to know whether the methods of expenditure pursued were actually doing good or harm.

After Senator BUTLER's new accounting was made public, a person supposed to be speaking for the State Department deplored the incident as injurious to the good-neighbor policy, but did not, perhaps could not, tear

into Senator BUTLER's schedule item by item and give the correct total.

The story could be extended indefinitely, but that figure of $6,000,000,000 still remains a mystery.

My point is made. There is something fundamentally wrong and irresponsible in a legislature and an executive department which cannot settle such a question on the basis of positive knowledge within 24 hours. In any efficient and responsible government it could be so settled and would be. No military secrets are involved—just the brute fact of a $6,000,000,000 bill which taxpayers will have to meet or not.

Here the case is rested and I submit to candid readers the proposition that the methods and machinery of the legislative and executive departments at Washington need a drastic overhauling in the interest of safety for constitutional government.

O. P. A. and Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of patriotic Americans have served without pay for long periods on war price and rationing boards. The Nation's debt to these is great. Theirs is today a hard task and in many cases a thankless one.

The following letter by Rev. J. G. Steinmeyer of Pipestone, Minn., to Chester Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A., so vividly portrays the problems facing men such as he that I highly commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

In his capacity as chairman of the Pipestone County War Price and Rationing Board, Reverend Steinmeyer sees the necessity of rationing and price fixing, but he also can see how it can and is being overdone.

O. P. A. here in Washington would do well to draw on the fund of knowledge gained by many hard months of work by such men. Congress and the Nation would welcome a little more common sense being mixed in with the profound theories of official Washington, theories which when put into practice affect the lives of every American man, woman, and child.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD, No. 6459,
Pipestone, Minn., March 21, 1944.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Replying to a letter submitted to us through the O. P. A. district office, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in which you ask for a real appraisal of O. P. A.'s faults and virtues, proposing also three direct questions concerning the functions of O. P. A.

We shall try to comply with your request. Our qualifications for such a task have well-defined limits, but we have grown up with this O. P. A. baby, we have nurtured it through difficult times and, naturally, necessity has compelled us to change diapers at various times, but we believe that we have now developed a rather rugged individual, a little over 2 years old, which we think will live and should be permitted to live. Thus, today we are still on the firing line, daily facing a questioning public. We know the questions, we know the trials, we know the needs, we see some hardships. To you and also to any dissenting Congressman we out in the sticks would say extend the O. P. A., grant the required appropriations. And here is why:

1. Price control: Our citizens are practically unanimous in their opinion that price control stands second only to the military forces in winning this war. Price control must be retained or chaos results. However, the thought is repeatedly expressed that price control should be far more rigid in the matter of commodities directly affecting our living, but that we are wasting time on nonessentials. It certainly can have no bearing on the war effort if the fool and his money are willing to part whenever he finds nonessentials which would add to his delight or pleasure. We would rise up in righteous indignation if we were forced to pay a dollar for a loaf of bread or 25 cents for a bottle of milk; in fact, we would be inclined to do violence to persons suspected of perpetrating such crimes upon a hungry public, but we refuse to get excited when someone with more money than brains is willing and even anxious to pay $150 for a $17 wrist watch; in fact, we could point out many reasons why it would be good that such fools be accommodated in and be assisted in getting rid of their money before more, and perhaps, dangerous harm results. By all means, let's have price control, but let's not get foolish on the things which have no value, and no direct bearing on necessities of life.

2. Rationing: Rationing is a sort of stepchild which has been very hastily tossed into the lap of O. P. A. Dreamers and persons obviously without practical experience have drawn up regulations which reach the very heights of ridiculosity. Even so, we believe that rationing in general has rendered a worth-while service but in the specific items we have the hardships thrust upon us which certainly have been and still are available. We can understand that specific needs differ in various areas, even in the various counties throughout this great Nation; we can quite readily understand that in such instances sauce for the goose may be poison for the gander; we can also understand that we locally are not in a position to obtain a true picture of existing conditions as to available supplies, raw materials, etc., and that we do not have the opportunities to investigate the possibility of industry to manufacture commodities which are apparently becoming scarcer and scarcer. And yet with all these known limitations we shall be glad to answer your inquiry so that you may look at the picture through our eyes, since it is quite true that the dwarf sitting on the giant's shoulder can see farther than the giant. Here, then, are the items with our comment:

A. Gasoline: We have been led to believe that the supply of gasoline for civilian use is dwindling, that the danger is threatening that even the more essential needs may not be met. The thought comes to us repeatedly, and is also expressed by many thoughtful patriotic citizens, that responsible Government agencies have not conscientiously tried to solve this problem. How great is the effort on the part of the Government to encourage any discoveries? What steps have been taken to make full use of existing production facilities? How much additional gasoline could be stored by means of importation? What effect would a price increase to independent producers have on production? We believe that the old trite answer of big companies that they are making too much money is not an acceptable answer when independent companies and small producers are forced out of business. It is our conviction that the Government with its many agencies is in position to know the conditions, and can and must meet this problem.

It is also rather difficult for us to understand why, when and if an emergency exists and our gasoline supplies are threatened, nonessential users are still permitted to use their cars, using up precious gas and oil, and that this class is ever ready to purchase black-market gasoline or "to borrow" enormous quantities of the farmers' tractor barrel.

We believe that the reduction of the value of A coupons, from 3 to 2 gallons a week, is a step in the right direction; in fact, we see no reason why the value of the A coupon could not be reduced still more, to 1 gallon or even less. Such reduction certainly could have no evil effect on the war effort, as all trades, professions, occupations, and workers essential to the war effort may apply to their local boards for an amount of gasoline actually needed to carry on essential work. Where there is no need, no gas. "Pleasure cars" sounds a bit incongruous, a sort of a jarring note, when our boys and girls by the millions are going through a veritable hell to preserve our liberties and our way of life. We all know that thousands upon thousands of cars with A stickers are rolling up and down the highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the northern borders to the Gulf, with an apparent unlimited supply of gasoline, oftentimes involved in serious accidents, still slaughtering our citizens by the thousands, taking annually a greater toll in lives than any battle fought thus far. Such nonessential vehicles might well be put up for the duration. Tough? My boy, your boy, had no pleasure care at Tarawa, Rabaul, Guadalcanal, or in the European theater, etc. Let's have the gas where it is needed—and let's eliminate the waster. As an afterthought we might add most of these wasters are not old enough to vote.

B. Tires (truck and passenger): Serviceable tires are as essential to this agricultural Midwest as are bullets to our armed forces. The farmers rarely live in cities; the farms are usually quite distant from their trade centers. No transportation facilities are offered them; they must provide for themselves to transport most of their products and needed supplies to and from market. There is no need to kid these people any longer that they are eligible for grade 3 tires. A serviceable grade 3 tire is as extinct as the well-known dodo bird.

We pride ourselves on our tremendous production, justly so; unbelievable records have been established, but must we now admit that we are unable to produce a tire? Do we have reason to believe that the Government and its agencies is letting us down? Are we perhaps correct in our opinion that sluggards are at work? We know that tires can be produced; so let's have tires in place of silly excuses and a ridiculous shifting of responsibility. We are of the opinion that the men are available who know how to produce tires. Failure here is as reprehensible and costly as when a sentry falls asleep on the post of duty.

C. Automobiles: A very scarce article. We believe that all quotas should be held by the district office only; all applications should be sent direct to the district office and could there be reviewed and passed upon as need is indicated throughout the entire district rather than on the basis of a mere local condition.

D. Bicycles: Bicycles no problem, no complaints; dealers appear to have sufficient stocks and applications are very limited.

E. Sugar, particularly canning sugar: The local board's pain and headache. We believe that one or more stamps in war-ration book should be designated to purchase canning sugar to meet the average need; we would suggest 10 pounds. Experience has shown that this system eliminates the necessity of having every prospective canner apply at the rationing board for canning sugar. A large part of our people would have sufficient sugar for their needs and can purchase it whenever they desire. In such areas and communities where home canning is, and has

been, done on a larger scale, where people grow their own fruits, local boards should be given full authority to issue sufficient additional canning sugar which would encourage the greatest amount of home canning possible. Experience has shown that the present system, which is being followed again this year, results in too much wastage of home-grown fruits. The district office could, because of their knowledge of local conditions, be relied upon to cooperate with local boards.

There is no need to say anything about the amount of labor saved for local board clerks if the above suggestions could be adopted. We have reason to believe that the average O. P. A. director wouldn't be concerned about this item inasmuch as he is still of the opinion that volunteer workers are still crashing our doors hoping to be able to do something for somebody! To such we would say, "Come and see".

F. Processed foods. Most families in rural districts unable to use up points allotted to them. For them, naturally, rationing of this item is a bit of a nuisance.

G. Meat. Average consumer unable to meet daily needs with present allotment. Unable to make suggestions because of lack of information on the actual condition throughout the country. We have a tremendous supply of meat here.

H. Fuel oil. No problem. Reasonable caution and careful attention to make full use of allotment granted carries the consumer through the season. No suggestions to offer but would let well enough alone.

I. Stoves. Coal and wood heating or cooking stoves should be removed from the ration list. No hoarding or abuse discovered in this item. Would, however, retain all types of fuel oil stoves on ration list because of the tendency, chiefly for reasons of convenience, to convert from coal to oil.

J. Rubber footwear. No problem, no complaint, no suggestions!

K. Shoes. Children's shoes, school shoes, work shoes could be removed from ration list. There has been some dabbling around with these items, leading us to believe that this particular administrator is not acquainted with the situation. Would suggest that these items be rationed only when and if need arises. Quite obviously, there is no hoarding of such items, and under present system, applicants may, although with a great deal of inconvenience to themselves and others, get what they need. Sizable stocks are at hand and this type of shoe is quite generally available.

L. Typewriters. No problem, no complaints, no suggestions.

M. Industrial users. We will pass that by for the moment. This subject is too involved to be covered by one short paragraph in a letter of this kind.

We conclude expressing our thanks and admiration if you have read this letter thus far.

Yours truly,
WAR PRICE AND RATIONING
BOARD No. 6459,
By Rev. J. G. STEINMEYER, *Chairman.*

Address of Hon. Edward C. Carroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by Hon. Edward C. Carroll, of South Boston, on the occasion of Evacuation Day exercises held at Dorchester Heights, South Boston, Mass., March 17, 1944. Former State Senator Carroll's address is a powerful presentation of the support and of the intent of the Constitution of the United States:

Friends and neighbors, we are assembled here to do honor to the day we celebrate. However, I sometimes feel we are lax in that all too many people are prone to forget the principles for which our forefathers fought and gave their very blood—on this day—March 17, 1776.

The principle, the Declaration of Independence, was issued out of "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind." It asserted in the opening paragraph that all men are created equal and endowed with certain rights such as life, liberty, freedom to worship God in one's own religion, and the pursuit of happiness, which is the purpose of all free Governments to secure.

We are conscious of the fact that on this March 17, we are at war. Our hearts are filled with prayers for our loved ones in the services of our beloved country, so valiantly fighting for the preservation of the same principles our forefathers fought for.

There is about today a sinister influence that would try to divide us. I speak of that un-American and un-Christian feeling of bigotry and race hatred which is being fostered by a small group, and mind you, I mean a small group. Oh, I say to you, it would be a sad commentary to our honored dead to whom we pay tribute this day and to our brave boys who are out there fighting, if intelligent people fail to rise and stop this cancerous un-American and vicious group which is trying to spread bigotry and race hatred. This country since its founding has been the haven of freedom for millions of persecuted people who become good citizens and helped build their adopted land materially and spirtiually. This has been the American way, thank God.

I was born the son of humble Irish immigrants, who fled from persecution to these very shores, that they might have the right to freedom of speech, to worship their God without molestation. I was taught as a youngster, at the knees of my mother, to love my fellow man, to have no hatred for those of a different race, color, or creed, and to respect other people's religious beliefs, and the laws of our beloved country.

Let us, therefore be determined to keep faith with our honored dead and our boys now fighting, and resolve as American citizens to protect our Constitution guaranteeing any person, be he Jew, Protestant, or Catholic, the right to religious freedom and the pursuit of happiness.

Day of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution providing for the designation of a national day of prayer, Sunday, May 21, 1944:

Whereas the Protestant Chaplains Association, Inc., a national organization of Protestant clergymen founded in 1938, and dedicated to God and country, and to the welfare of the men and women of the armed forces of these United States, to the rehabilitation of all our veterans upon their return to civilian life, is asking that Sunday, May 21, 1944 be designated as a day of prayer for all Americans who believe in Almighty God and in our American Republic, its Constitution, and its institutions—regardless of race, color, and creed; and

Whereas for some years past there has been a highly organized campaign of ridicule, slander and abuse by certain subversive elements within this Commonwealth against the people's elected Representatives in the Congress—which subversive elements have no love for America, the American form of government, its Constitution or its institutions, or the principles and ideals upon which this country was founded; and

Whereas this campaign of villification against loyal, patriotic Americans in the Congress was a direct attack upon a vast majority of loyal Americans who still believe in the fundamental principles of this form of government; and

Whereas in asking that this day of prayer, Sunday, May 21, 1944, be designated by the Congress for the brave men and women who have made the supreme sacrifice; for those who are now lying sick, maimed and wounded in hospitals at home and abroad; for the speedy return home of those gallant men and women who are separated from their dear ones and from the country they love so dearly, on the far-flung battlefields of the world; and for the preservation of our American Republic, attention is called to the words of Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin of Connecticut, in proclaiming Sunday, May 21, as a day of proyer: "Prayer is man's method for self-transmission of personal needs and beliefs to Almighty God. It gives strength to the weak and brings humility to the strong. Prayer is a denominator of good for all peoples in time of war. As the divine method for establishing relationship between man and his Creator it deserves special recognition in our religious life. I urge the people of Connecticut to make special observance of Sunday, May 21, as a day of prayer. In this holy way may we ask God's blessings upon our Nation and our people."

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating Sunday, May 21 of this year, as a national day of prayer for the preservation of this American Republic; and that the third Sunday in the month of May thereafter be designated as a national day of prayer for this American Republic and in commemoration of the American men and women who have given their lives in the service of their country—not only during the present war, but in all the wars in which this American republic has participated.

This act or resolution to be extended throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions, on the day so designated, as well as to the United States Army posts, naval stations, ships at sea, or wherever the men and women in the uniform of the United States are stationed.

How We Can Keep America American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am en-

closing herewith a letter written by a young lady from my district, Miss Jane Emily McMath, of Waynesboro, Miss., a student at the Mississippi Southern College, at Hattiesburg, Miss.

Miss McMath's letter was adjudged to be 1 of the best 10 entered in the students' contest sponsored by the Mississippi Central Railroad Co. on the subject How We Can Keep America American. The letter is most interesting and provocative of thought.

The letter follows:

HATTIESBURG, MISS., *February 14, 1944.*

Hon. WILLIAM COLMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If we are to keep America American, we must keep alive the ideals and the principles upon which this country was founded. James Russell Lowell once said, "The American Republic will endure as long as the ideas of the men who founded it continue dominant." Our forefathers came to this country to escape the merciless oppression of the European monarchs. They came for freedom and liberty and for the individual's right to pursue happiness and live his own life. The American ideals and principles are the highest of any country in the world. George Washington said, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God." Our founding fathers successfully raised such a standard and we must continue to uphold this standard.

Our country is a democracy founded on democratic principles. The people are the Government. As Abraham Lincoln said, "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Ours is a representative democracy, but all the powers not needing special attention are left to the people. The Constitution provides for that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

If America is to be kept American, labor must be better informed and led. It is easy to get up and denounce labor, but it is far more difficult to face the facts. Only by facing the facts can the situation be cured. Labor should wake up to the fact that its big trouble is the administration of labor.

In his effort to produce friendship with labor, Mr. Roosevelt has not hesitated to undermine his own boards and appointees with the result that an atmosphere of uncertainty has been created, in which sane and solid judgments are almost impossible to make. No labor leader knows what he can get out of the White House and each leader connives against the other to get all he can. Politics and labor have been mixed together so much that the result is utter chaos. The leaders of labor should try doing some straight, honest thinking instead of relying on the political machine to do it; the political machine of the country works for its own good and not for anyone else's.

It is time for the liberal friends of labor to make a realistic analysis of labor's recently acquired power. Some unions are taking on the color of the old antisaloon crowd before repeal. They have the same kind of political and financial power to coerce Government agencies, to threaten Congressmen, and scare liberal critics by labeling them as opponents to a great moral cause.

Labor's present power was acquired as a result of a series of Supreme Court decisions which completely reverse the Department of Justice's interpretation of the antitrust law. The antitrust law stated that unions were subject to penalty when they used their power coercively for an illegitimate labor objective. Under this interpretation effective prosecutions had been made. Many labor leaders agreed that this curb was necessary. The Supreme Court's decision completely changed the picture. No Government agency has power to act now, and labor can get away with anything. The situation even handicaps labor from cleaning its own house.

The remedy to this situation lies in directly prosecuting abuses of union power. Industry will be freed from indefensible labor if we prosecute those who use union power to restrict production or destroy independent industry. We need unrestricted post-war production to give labor more jobs and to pay our national debt. If present labor management keeps up, it may feed the present popular resentment against unions until the cause of collective bargaining itself is in danger. We must reestablish the power in the Department of Justice to prosecute those who abuse the privileges of organized labor to gain ends which are not only against the public interest but against the interest of labor itself.

Thomas Jefferson once made this statement, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we would soon want bread. I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple—and not a multiplication of offices and salaries merely to make partisans and for increasing by every device the public debt on the principle of its being a public blessing." One of our American freedoms is freedom of enterprise, but if the present tendency of our Government is developed, we may be deprived of that freedom.

Our Government can help or hinder us in our progress as the greatest country in the world. Our American system is founded on individualism, and private enterprise is individualism. We are not in immediate danger of losing our freedom of speech, press, or worship. Our greatest threat comes from the effort to restrict free enterprise. Only with the help of private enterprise can we make a complete economic recovery after the war. One of our founding fathers said, "We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges."

After the war the Government should return to its normal functions and get out of the way of free competitive enterprise. Abraham Lincoln said, "Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable, it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise." Seeing other individuals succeed, makes a person want to succeed too, but if the Government is competing so heavily with enterprise he would have no incentive to spur him on. Instead of a rich prosperous people there would only be a rich National Treasury and administration.

The right of liberty means man's right to individual action, individual choice, individual initiative, and individual property. The Constitution guarantees this: "Nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Without the right to private property no independent action is possible. The founders of our country placed individual rights above any and all collective claims. If we are to keep America American, we must not allow the Government to restrict private enterprise in any way.

Our American system of education has vast potentialities of which we little dream. We are just now learning how to operate our secondary schools for the good of the public. Not only must the future citizens be equipped to step on to the first rung of whatever ladder of opportunity seems most appropriate, but they must be educated as members of a political democracy. One reason that Hitler has been so successful is that he has educated the young people of Germany to believe what he believes. They have been taught the doctrine of the Nazis since they were old enough to say a few words. Democracy and freedom must be taught to the future citizens over and over again. The German boy's cry is, "Let me die for Hitler." Our slogan must be, "Let me live for America and the principles America stands for."

Sincerely,

(Miss) JANE EMILY MCMATH.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter on price control, dated March 30, 1944, received by me from Carroll R. Miller, secretary of the West Virginia Horticultural Society, which, to my mind, contains some pertinent thinking relative to this important subject.

The letter follows:

MARCH 30 1944.

Hon. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH,
Member of Congress, House
Offices, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROHRBOUGH: The Emergency Price Control Act will be before you for recharter soon. From our experience may we place before you these thoughts:

I think we all join in feeling that a measure of price control is necessary. None of us want to be robbed; don't want to be victimized by profiteers. It would happen without price controls. So controls must be.

Our quarrel is not with the principle, but with the machinery and methods. We believe this to be fundamental—controls that fit half a continent and 130,000,000 people must be simple, must be understandable, or they are doomed.

O. P. A. and its policy-making higher-ups hold the opposite viewpoint. Their basic plan has been to take controls at the most possible points. First with the grower; then controls for the first handler; then the first terminal market buyer or receiver; then the second terminal receiver; then the retailer.

Every control point set up is a well spring of evasion, of confusion, an invitation to black marketing. Every control point throws askew to some extent the following steps until, at the end of all these, the thing is hopelessly jumbled. I doubt if 15 percent of retailers today know what their purchasing ceiling on apples really is. It is all too confused. Each shipment of apples has a different ceiling, depending upon what town it was shipped from, what zone, who handled it en route, and so on.

We (the apple industry nationally) have urged steadily a simple, protective ceiling, a single national ceiling placed where the consumer purchases only, low enough to protect the consumer against gouging and high enough to encourage fullest production, then let apples move as nearly in their normal course as possible. The consumer could be told, "Don't pay more than —— for apples" and the retailer that he must not sell apples

above that figure. Such a system could be made largely self-policing.

Last August the apple industry urged a single, Nation-wide consumer ceiling of 12½ cents per pound. O. P. A. wanted it 8½ cents, as you remember; and we joined forces to have another cent added.

Consumer ceilings on apples now are approximately the 12½ cents per pound we requested; will be exactly that after April 1 in zones 3 and 4. So we were not far out of line in our request for 12½ cents. It is, and would have been, sufficient protection for the consumer.

To requests that this single ceiling be given a fair trial, O. P. A. says it is legally responsible for preserving the existing system of distribution; that these etablished intermediates would be wiped out unless specifically protected.

Actually the intermediates have always operated under a tight, if intangible, ceiling—the prevailing market price, which is set by consumer resistance or by supply. Intermediates have had no protection—and have survived, if they deserved to. They would have the best protection under the closest approximation to this normal order—the single consumer ceiling—providing that ceiling was set at the proper level.

In fresh fruits and vegetables, we have one other major difference with O. P. A. Fresh fruits cannot be stored or hoarded. It must be marketed, mostly within a very short period. It does not lend itself to profiteering or soaring prices. When prices get too high, the public simply lays off for a while. Since the fruit has to be marketed, this quickly brings down the price. So * * * we need less price control in fruits and vegetables than in staple articles which can be held for months and years. This buttresses our conviction that a single consumer price ceiling for fresh fruits is the best.

This all boils down to about this:

O. P. A. insists upon complexity. Our request is for simplicity.

O. P. A.'s results have not been too good. Prices have been restrained; but the effort, injury, and confusion among producers, distributors, and consumers has been a national scandal.

The same restraining results, or better, would have been obtained by the simple, single ceiling; without an O. P. A. army; without comparable, scandalous hullabaloo, confusion, injury, and resentment. The saving in paper, and phone, wire and travel expenses to Washington and regional O. P. A. by many thousands of harassed growers—the savings on these alone would be quite respectable.

In the coming renewal of O. P. A.'s franchise, can simplicity be written into their charter?

Sincerely,

CARROLL R. MILLER,
Secretary, West Virginia Horticultural Society.

Eggs and Other Woes of the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two telegrams from Mr. J. F. Percy, secretary of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., on the subject of the marketing of eggs. Mr. Percy's telegrams are as follows:

UNIVERSITY, LA., *March 28, 1944.*

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Member of Congress:

No market for Louisiana eggs. Heavy surplus available. Situation crucial. W. F. A. has program in Texas allowing eggs sold without grading. This program should be immediately extended to Louisiana. Grading feature prevents complying with W. F. A. regulations as facilities are not available. This needs immediate attention. Practically all Louisiana farmers are affected.

J. F. PERCY,
Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation.

UNIVERSITY, LA., *March 31, 1944.*

Congressman H. D. LARCADE, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Louisiana egg market deplorable; farmers disgusted with lack of support price for current receipt eggs. Urge you make available to Louisiana farmers the 10-case egg-purchase program same as in Texas; purchase eggs on current receipts. People selling out entire flocks. Immediate action imperative. We want relief at once.

J. F. PERCY,
Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I further request permission to have included in these remarks a copy of a letter from one of my constituents addresssed to Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, United States Senator, on the same subject. The letter follows:

MARCH 11, 1944.

Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In pursuance of my efforts to encourage you and the other Members of the Louisiana delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives to interest yourselves in some way in securing a flooring, stop loss, or minimum prices on agricultural products, I am enclosing you herewith page 3 of the Times-Picayune of Friday, March 10, 1944, showing a farmer plowing under his cabbage because he was unable to sell the product at a reasonable profit, alongside of another picture showing two well-dressed individuals from the association of commerce plowing and preparing the land for a victory garden in the city of New Orleans.

I am sending you this because I am afraid that even you and the other Senators and Members of the House from the South fail to grasp the real situation, and this picture so aptly brings out the point that I have been trying to get you to grasp actuates me in sending it to you.

I really do not believe that any of you realize the absurdity, if not the downright shamefulness, of the situation that exists today. We have here a county agent with secretaries and stenographers, as well as a triple A with a triple number of secretaries and stenographers, clerks, field agents, as well as ward committeemen, all under pay from the money which Congress appropriated for so-called incentive money for the farmers who comply with Government regulations in the raising of crops.

The triple A organization busies itself in sending out circular after circular to the farmers telling them what they must and must not do, and when the time comes for the farmer to get something the expenses of the office eat up nearly all that the farmer can get. In other words, after the farmer has had to buy the fertilizer he is required to buy, or to do the different things required of him, the incentive that he gets simmers down to about $15 to $25 on an 80- to 100-acre farm.

Further, a political organization is being built up, which along with the rationing board works, is going to threaten, if not destroy, what we are supposed to be fighting for namely, free enterprise and the right to decide for ourselves what we want.

I bought eggs yesterday at a country store between Opelousas and Ville Platte at 22 cents a dozen, and the merchant from whom I obtained them, Mr. Gilbert Joubert, rural free delivery, Opelousas, La., told me that he paid that same price to the farmer but in trade, and that his profit came from his merchandise.

I am enclosing you the menu card of the Hotel Monteleone coffee shop where I took breakfast on February 4, 1944, and paid 29 cents for two eggs, soft boiled. You will note under the heading "Eggs and omelets" that eggs are 17 cents for one and 29 cents for two.

As I have tried to point out to you before, the whole trouble is that the producer does not get anything near a fair share of what the consumer pays.

When eggs were selling at 60 cents a dozen here at Opelousas there was some defense for the O. P. A.'s ceiling price, but when the O. P. A. permits eggs to go down when the farmer has some for sale to 20 cents to 22½ cents a dozen, and then after the eggs are gone into cold storage or the hands of the speculators to permit them to run up to 60 and 70 cents a dozen makes a mockery of the so-called stabilization of prices by the O. P. A.

As I told you in one of my other letters on this same subject, the masses of the people in the South want to remain in the Democratic Party and further, the masses of the people appreciate what the Roosevelt Administration did in the past, but they begin to feel that something has happened at Washington which has caused the administration to shift its position from what it was when the President was talking against anyone making over $25,000 a year, after all taxes were paid.

It seems now that he has permitted the whole matter to run away, and that all of the orders of the O. P. A. are used for the benefit of the shippers, packers, speculators, and transportation companies.

It is true that the O. P. A. has undertaken to declare itself in favor of minimum, or flooring prices, but the "joker" is that they have provided no method by which the flooring prices are high enough to give a profit to the producer or even to afford an opportunity to the producer to secure the flooring price when his product is ready to be placed on the market.

Take the egg situation which is just as bad as the cabbage situation. The producer is cut off from receiving the flooring by restrictions which deny to him all opportunity of receiving a fair share of the product he produces. Either the prices are fixed in Chicago, or some other city, where the producer is unable to sell except through a middleman. Further, the changes in the orders fixing the prices change so quickly for different communities that the producer would prefer now as heretofore to deliver his product to the country merchant in trade, rather than undertake to become a shipping merchant himself.

The remedy, as I have told you in several of my previous letters on this same subject, is to make it a criminal offense for anyone to buy or sell below the flooring price, and that to secure a market let the Agricultural Department or the O. P. A. or the triple A, or the county agent act as the shipping agency as well as the local inspectors and handlers when anyone else pays the minimum price.

I certainly would like to see you, or Senator ELLENDER, get busy on this and see what can

be done. It won't be long before our Irish potatoes will be on the market. We have paid $5 per hundred pounds for the seed potatoes recommended by the triple A as well as $1.80 per sack for six sacks of fertilizer for every four sacks of potatoes, and our people should not be placed in the position they were last year when potatoes from Texas, Oklahoma, and other States were selling for twice as much as Louisiana potatoes.

Of course, they will possibly point out to you that cotton is selling at a high price, and that feed is selling at a high price, etc.

It is true that feed is high and that's why eggs should be higher than they are here as eggs can't be produced without feed. Our people were encouraged—and almost bulldozed—into going into the poultry business, and they find themselves with chickens on hand which necessitates using high-priced feed with a low price for their eggs with full knowledge of the fact that when the eggs are out of their hands, it will not be long before the eggs will be selling, even here, at more than 50 cents a dozen.

It is the same with the other products that we raise, and while it may be true that cotton is selling now at a price that is considered good, and that seed is selling at a good price, but yet it is equally true that our farmers have no cotton or seed at this time. When we had cottonseed for sale we received in this section $44 to $45 a ton, and now when we have no seed we are paying about the same price we sold our cottonseed for the meal needed for hogs and cattle.

All of the money that certain people are asking for drainage so that new lands may be put in cultivation in Louisiana, where we already make more crops than we can profitably sell, is ill-advised unless and until those who produce the farm products are given a fair price for their work and investment necessary to make the crop.

This picture from the Times-Picayune of Friday, March 10, 1944, should be in every Senator's and Congressman's office from the South and West, and this menu card from the Monteleone Hotel Coffee Shoppe, one of the cheapest places in the city of New Orleans, should be studied by those who really have the interest of the farmer at heart. In one of your letters to me you mentioned that you had sent one of my complaints to Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A. We here do not know enough of Mr. Chester Bowles to form any judgment as to his purpose in placing the prices he places on agricultural products.

Further, none of us believe very much in the authority and power of Chester Bowles, Administrator, and Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, to fix any price for anything, and we base our objection not on any animosity to them as individuals, but to the fact that we feel that the laws of this country should be passed, or enacted, in the manner and form set out by the Constitution of the United States of America and by the duly constituted officials elected by the people of the United States of America.

Chester Bowles and Marvin Jones are appointed, not elected, by the people. They owe their places not to the people, but to someone responsible for their appointment. If they were elected by the people, they would then find out what the people want, and it would not take them long to realize that it is the people of this country who should run this country, and that all laws should be in the interest of the people as a whole, and not of any particular group making up the citizenship of the country.

Sincerely.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the officials of the O. P. A. will give Louisiana some relief in this matter at once. I think the telegrams and the letter herein cover our situation without any further discussion by me.

Morrison Thanks People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following letter which I am sending to my friends in Louisiana:

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I take this opportunity to write this letter and express to you my deep appreciation for your kindness and your support in the recent Governor's race. Out of eight candidates, with your help I was extremely fortunate in running a swell third. Your cooperation and kindness helped to make this possible, and I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your sincere efforts.

If I can be of any assistance to you here in Washington, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Prohibition Will Only Serve to Disrupt American Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, there has just been held in Baltimore City a convention by the Prohibition Party of Maryland. The purpose was to select eight persons to fill vacancies as electors on the prohibition ticket. According to the papers, the convention experienced a great deal of trouble securing the electors, as one was selected when someone in attendance said "he knew someone from Worcester County who would run if the party could get someone to run from other districts." The convention confirmed the nomination of this unnamed someone.

The convention had as its guest the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], author of the wartime prohibition bill. He made the principal address.

Mr. Speaker, with millions of our men and women in the armed forces, fighting to preserve the freedoms we enjoy, we find a small group who would deny them a glass of beer if they had their way.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I have information that shows beyond question that the Anti-Saloon League, which was responsible for the "noble experiment," does not even favor the Bryson bill.

At the seventeenth annual convention, held last month at St. Petersburg, Fla., for 3 days orators expressed their views and not one endorsed the Bryson bill or advocated prohibition around camps and war plants, as provided in Senate bill 860.

Bishop James Cannon, Jr., member of the executive committee, and formerly the most powerful individual leader of the league, came out boldly against the Bryson bill or any other prohibition legislation at this time. The reasons given by the bishop were that, in the first place, Congress would not pass such legislation, and, in the second place, that, if passed, it would not be enforced as long as Mr. Roosevelt is President. Bishop Cannon's speech indicated clearly that until public sentiment demanded it he was against national legislation.

A few days before the House Judiciary Committee hearing on the Bryson bill the National Antisaloon League issued a statement signed by George W. Crabbe, general superintendent, and Edward B. Dunford, attorney, stating that the league is not uniting with other prohibition organizations at this time in an appeal for the enactment of wartime prohibition by Congress.

I will include as part of my remarks an excerpt from this statement. In pursuance of the policy enunciated the Antisaloon League took no part in the Judiciary Committee's hearing.

That the league has changed its views was indicated by the statements made showing that several superintendents attended the Yale Summer School on the alcohol problem last year, and some seemed convinced that the scientists are right—that alcoholism is a disease, that the cure lies in hospitalization and medical treatment, and education, rather than in attempted prohibition.

There were superintendents who declared their opposition to legislation as an attemted solution of the alcohol problem. This attitude is very much in contrast to the former policy of the league, which was the most influential factor in propagandizing the eighteenth amendment into the Federal Constitution, and keeping it there for nearly 14 years.

For example:

Mr. High, of Nebraska, father of Stanley High, a well-known writer:

"I would not vote for another eighteenth amendment. I do not want it."

By Rev. Wayne Wakefield Womer, superintendent of the Connecticut Temperance Foundation:

"The inebriate is a diseased character. Unless cured he would become a customer of the bootlegger under prohibition."

By Dr. George A. Little, of Toronto, member of the Canada Temperance Federation:

"Education and not legislation is the remedy. I am opposed to legislation. You can make people drunk by legislation."

Many months ago Bishop Ralph Cushman, president of the National Anti-Saloon League, said in a written statement in the Christian Advocate, a religious magazine:

"I, for one, am not interested in the return of a national prohibition amendment in this generation; and, I think that the sooner we tell this to the world—and especially to the liquor-subsidized press—the sooner we will rob the liquor manufacturers of their pet ammunition against us."

Under the subhead "Country is not ready for national prohibition," Messrs. Crabbe and Dunford, said in their joint statement of January 6:

"The Anti-Saloon League has not altered its belief that the people will ultimately adopt prohibition as the best solution to

the liquor problem. But prohibition should be attained through the democratic processes with the people back of it in substantial majorities. In our judgment, the counry is not ready for national prohibition. In the present state of public opinion, with liquor legalized in 45 of the 48 States, too many difficulties of enforcement would be encountered to make the successful operation of national prohibition possible.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this ccuntry, having had one experience, will never want to return to prohibition.

The American Issue, official publication of the Anti-Saloon League, published the following:

Since the war powers already conferred upon the President are sufficient to enable the Government to cope with unsatisfactory liquor conditions, we deem it unwise and unnecessary to raise the controversial and divisive issue of national prohibition at a time when unity is most needed. A decision upon such a far-reaching Federal policy should, in our judgment, be left for determination after millions of men now in the armed forces, can participate fully in the decision.

For these reasons the league is not uniting in the appeal for the enactment of war prohibition legislation by Congress at this time.

This supports my statement as to the attitude of the league.

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to prohibition and urge the Members of Congress to defeat the Bryson bill. Prohibition will only serve to disrupt American unity and bring back the horrible bootleg days, which the American people deplored.

Our Mineral Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am glad to include some remarks by Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash.

With the industrial revolution still going on, with mass production and mechanical advantage no longer a purely American trait, it seems to me to be downright short-sighted to sell mineral America short.

In a recent address to an eastern bond club, Mr. William L. Batt, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, is reported by the Foreign Commerce Weekly as having made the following statements:

"Traditionally, we have thought of ourselves as people of great natural resources. We have thought of ourselves as possessing unlimited quantities of everything which our economy needed—iron and steel, zinc, copper and tin, and so on, and, generally speaking, that has been true. The American economy has been built on these large natural resources of more or less low-cost materials.

"Our high-grade iron-ore deposits in the Mesaba Range have not many years left; at the present rate of usage I am informed that we shall be reduced to low-grade deposits within another 10 years. Our high-grade zinc is practically gone. Our good copper deposits will be a thing of history in another 25 years.

"We never had much high-grade bauxite—the familiar base of aluminum—and we have used up a good part of those limited reserves in this emergency. The United States has no nickel and, for practical purpose, no tin.

"I could give many more examples, but this will be enough to emphasize the point I want to make, and that is that the United States is passing from a country of plenty to a country of scarcity in the field of metals and minerals, and other critical supplies. It will be said, of course, that we have reserves of low-grade materials which we could fall back on, and to some extent we could, but at much higher cost and with great difficulties.

"It may not be stressing the point too far to suggest that we are moving in the direction in which England has found herself—that of having to depend on imports of materials from abroad in ore to maintain her very lifeblood of existence.

"It is this line of reasoning which has made me so keenly interested in the proposal advanced by a few of our soundest thinkers in this field; that is, that we make every effort to import all of the critical materials which we can from abroad and use as 'ittle as possible of our own previous remaining supplies."

Such statements and such a plea coming from a man occupying such a high position in our Government cannot be taken lightly. If the statements are true, we mining men must admit it; if they are not true, the statements should not go unchallenged.

I for one am challenging them as just so much "globaloney," "bunk," and "poppycock"; and unfortunately these words do not adequately express what I think. Like the little colored boy who fell into the molasses barrel, I wish I had a tongue to fit the situation.

How did Mr. Batt get this way?

The most charitable position that can be taken on Mr. Batt's unfortunate statement, is that he was not informed, but ignorance in this case and in his position is inexcusable.

Seeing is believing! If Mr. Batt will come out West, I will personally show him enough mineral resources to convince anyone that there is plenty of all of the principal metals to meet this country's needs for generations to come. The truth is that we have barely scratched the surface of our mineral possibilities, and this is particularly true of the Northwest.

Mr. Batt cites no authorities for his statement on our metal scarcity, but he does say that the proposal that we make every effort to import the critical materials, specifically iron, zinc, copper, nickel, tin, and bauxite, was advanced by our soundest thinkers—no names mentioned.

One wonders where these soundest thinkers were and why they didn't say something along this line when you and I were protesting against the shipments in a steady stream to Japan of our copper, scrap iron, and other metals. I shudder at how accurate our forebodings were about how these metals might come back to us.

In our mineral resources lie the chief strength of the United States, because metals are not only the muscles of war but also the bone and sinew of the peaceful industry we are now fighting for. Without our metals we would be as powerless as Samson after being shorn of his locks by the glamourous and traitorous Delilah.

To me Mr. Batt's statements and import proposal are merely the voice of Mr. Batt using the high-sounding words of conservationists and those good-neighbor boys who would provide not only a quart of milk a day for the Hottentots but also a doorstep where the milkman could leave it each morning.

My greatest fear is that the hands are not the hands of the conservationists or the hands of the good-neighbor boys but the hands of a wily Delilah group of selfish interests with large foreign mineral holdings—much the same group as engineered the cartels who controlled world metal production and prices in the old days before the war. This is my guess. What is yours?

It is evident, I think, from several of Mr. Batt's remarks that he was "taken in," so to speak. For example, he speaks of high-grade and low-grade ores in a way that would indicate that he did not know that most highly successful copper, gold, zinc, and lead mines of this and other countries are low-grade mines. The most and greatest mining failures have been, as you know, in high-grade properties. Utah Copper and Homestake in the United States; Chile Copper in South America; and the Sullivan mine of Consolidated Mining & Smelting in Canada are only a few of the many and highly successful low grades that could be cited.

Another indication that Mr. Batt was probably "taken in" is found in the fact that he does not name the two metals in which there is a probable scarcity. These are lead and silver. Despite an increase in United States base-metal output last year there was a big decrease in the silver byproduct. Mr. Batt should know that in all of our big lead-zinc mines, the percentage of lead decreases with depth while on the other hand the zinc content increases. Incidentally, United States lead output accounted for only 40 percent and silver output for only about 20 percent of our consumption of these metals in 1943.

Mr. Batt would have been right if he had limited his statements to cover indicated future metal production, because if the mining industry and mining men are to continue to be hog-tied, hamstrung, and maliciously maimed; directed, regulated, and outrageously taxed; punched in the nose by one Government bureau, kicked in the pants by the various State bureaus, and its pocket picked by both State and Federal Governments and labor; spied upon, threatened, and maligned by every government Tom, Dick, and Harry employee, we will presently have a metal scarcity that will be a scarcity.

Mr Batt, unwittingly I believe, hurt the mining industry immeasurably with his unfortunate statements, because they will have the effect of discouraging mining development. Most people, especially in the East, will accept his statements as literally true, and this fact is likely to shut off in large measures the venture and investment capital needed to develop new mines in the millions of acres of virgin mineral lands in our Western States.

Incidentally, there are large areas in the East which offer possibilities as indicated by the fact that one of the world's largest zinc deposits is practically within sight of New York City's Empire State Building and that a large lead-zinc producing area has been opened up in northern New York State during the last decade.

If by any chance the proposal that we import all of the metals that we can, should be put into effect, great harm would be done to the boys now overseas who will want jobs when they come back. If we buy metals abroad we will also be buying in effect jobs which by right belong to American citizens and particularly to those who are now fighting to preserve the American way of life under which our big mines of today were developed from prospects that offered no better showing on the surface than the prospects of today.

It is within the power of the able and conscientious Mr. Batt to render his country and mining a great service by lending his talents and using his position in a constructive effort to remove the bureaucratic shack-

les that are hampering proper development of our enormous mineral resources, which are greater than that of any other country in the world. Untie the hands of mining men, make it possible for them to secure by private financing only an amount comparable to the cost of the running of the bureaus and agencies that are now ruining the mining industry and there will be no scarcity in any of the metals with the possible exception of nickel, tin, lead, silver, and gold—and we can if given a Chinaman's chance produce more of each of these than is generally believed possible.

Oklahoma Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Star. It follows:

Since the Republican political strategists saw fit to make the Roosevelt administration the principal issue in Tuesday's special election in Oklahoma's Second Congressional District, they will have to make the best of the verdict returned by the voters.

That verdict was clearly an indorsement of the President and his policies, the Democratic candidate winning by a margin of about 4,000 votes in a total of some 40,000. Nor is there anything to suggest that local rather than national considerations were the controlling factor in the balloting.

There is room for doubt, of course, as to the extent to which this result in Oklahoma in a traditionally Democratic district, may be indicative of national sentiment. In 1936 the total vote in the district was 72,034, the Democrat winning by 19,414 votes. In 1938 the vote was 53,393, the Democratic majority being 22,723, and in 1940 the total vote was 80,891, with a Democratic margin of 19,721. By 1942, however, with a total vote of 42,934, the Democratic margin had shrunk to a mere 388 votes.

This formed one of the principal grounds of the anti-Roosevelt pre-election "trend" forecasts, and now the Republicans have lost by 4,000 votes in the lightest total vote of recent years. If that is evidence of a trend, it is not of a kind to bring joy to the hearts of the G. O. P.

Simplified Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, those who listened to the radio talk of our distinguished colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, and ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives last night were encouraged with the prospect of simplified tax-return forms.

People generally will be very glad to know that legislation providing for this result will be presented to Congress shortly after the Easter recess.

Considerable correspondence has come to my office on this subject, and it is really one of the important problems of which Congress and for which Congress must find a solution.

I quote from a letter received sometime ago from a very reputable businessman in my district, and it is interesting to note what he had to say on this subject:

I do not object to paying income taxes, and I realize the tax must be higher than heretofore, and must continue to be higher than heretofore. However, when I got home last night I found the blanks for 1943 return, and I honestly feel that if the American public does not very soon cut loose and say to hell with the whole business—so far as making those returns is concerned—it is because we are a long-suffering crew. It is true we would be subject to penalties, but when enough people are subject to penalty it will not be easy to enforce.

There are thousands in this country that do not have as much to do with figures as I do, and I doubt very much if I can make that return without either hiring someone to tell me how to do it or else spend a lot of time waiting at the revenue office for advice, and then not being sure that there is not a better way to make the return. Between making returns, estimated returns, and all the other reports to the Government now called for we will soon have no time for our own business, unless there is a change.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House is to be congratulated in giving this matter prompt and early attention. Without discussing the question as to who was responsible for these complicated returns I do want to say reforms should be made and it should be done right away.

The Soldier Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial on the soldier ballot recently appearing in the Glenville Democrat, of Glenville, W. Va.

The writer, and editor of this newspaper, Mr. C. W. Marsh, was a captain in our army during World War No. 1, was formerly a member of both the House of Delegates and the State Senate of the State of West Viginia, was for many years chairman of the Democratic executive committee for the county of Gilmer, and is now a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the office of State senator in that State.

The editorial follows:

THE SOLDIER BALLOT

Were William Shakespeare living at this time he probably would conclude that the recent prolonged fuss in Congress over the soldier ballot bill was much ado about nothing. Which side was right, the side that advocated a Federal short ballot, or the side which contended that the soldier should have his full State ballot as well, is not for us to determine. We could not if we wanted to, because we do not know exactly what issue or issues were involved. This, we do know, that the West Virginia ballot law is working effectively, thanks to the foresight of Governor Neely and the splendid work of the recent session of the legislature. On our Main Street, a few days ago, we met a sailor, W. H. Rhoades, formerly of Cedarville. He informed us that he received his soldier ballot on March 3, voted it the same day, put it in an envelope provided and dispatched it to the clerk of our circuit court. Mr. Rhoades was stationed at Trinidad, off the coast of South America, at the time. This is ample evidence that West Virginia's soldier voting law is working. This particular ballot had been dispatched, received by the sailor, voted, returned, and received in Glenville at least 60 days before the date of the primary. And the ballot Mr. Rhoades voted is identically the ballot his father, his mother, his sisters and his brothers, and the rest of us will vote on Tuesday, May 9.

If the proper effort is being made, and the Democrat has reasons to believe it is, every Gilmer County man and woman in the military service, wherever he or she may be stationed, should receive a full West Virginia ballot—containing the names of all candidates of his party from the Presidency down—in good time to vote it, return it and have it counted by Tuesday, May 9. Gilmer County servicemen and women stationed anywhere in West Virginia may request a soldier's ballot, and this ballot may be voted without the applicant returning to his home precinct. Parents, relatives, or friends of servicemen and women can expedite soldier voting by turning in the names and addresses of members of their families now serving in any branch of the military service.

Simplification of Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the near approach of April 15 reminds us and the fifty-odd-million taxpayers of the United States who must file returns for 1944 at that time that our laws levying income taxes are still in a chaotic and complicated condition and our tax forms are so intricate and abstruse that only an expert can understand them.

The need for simplification of our tax returns is apparent to all. I sincerely trust that the Ways and Means Committee which, of course, has all tax legislation in its control, will bring out a tax law so drafted that the tax returns of the average taxpayer will be so simple that even the most untutored can understand them.

To that end, I should like to suggest that there are but a few items of information necessary. One should be the total amount of income for the year. Two, the amount of tax withheld at the source during the year. Three, the number of dependent children. Four, the amount or percentage allowed as deductions. Five, the amount of the tax. Those five items, Mr. Speaker, are all that any taxpayer should be required to furnish on a tax form, and sincerely trust that the Ways and Means Committee, without delay, report out such a bill and that the House will promptly enact the same. If we do this, we will have met the insistent public demand for simplified tax returns, and will have removed one of the sources of perennial irritation from the fifty-odd-million taxpayers of this country.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me today over Station WNBF:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, while I am here in Washington trying to do the job you sent me to do, about the only way I have to keep track of what goes on back home is by reading the local newspapers. Lately, I have been somewhat annoyed by inaccurate and deliberately twisted stories in Triple Cities papers giving to the public a wrong impression of the Hall furlough clubs.

When the patriotic women of these clubs have requested space for stories in the newspapers to tell the public what they are doing for their men in service, they have been denied on at least two occasions I know of the use of a free press.

However, when one Cerinetti, who was kicked out of the clubs because he abused several of the women verbally and who I am told has hung around outside several Hall furlough club meetings to the dismay and terror of the members, goes to the papers with almost any sort of smear story, questioning the motives of these women, he is accorded cooperation and plenty of space in these papers.

So I repeat, I have been annoyed, and when I hear of these good women denied newspaper space, yet Cerinetti being given space profusely to disparage them, I become aroused. I ask myself, what is behind this?

What is behind all this? Who is egging on Cerinetti to throw his dirt at these women? How long since have Americans had to explain the reasons they are organizing patriotic groups to help their boys in service?

I promise the women of the Hall furlough clubs and the people of this district that I will find out before long who is behind Cerinetti and his insults to these mothers, sisters, wives, and children of our soldiers.

I promise to expose this undercover crowd, to name names, to talk plainly to them, to brand them as an unholy, un-American, and subversive bunch. And they know I am able to get their names to every American in my district whether the newspapers print my story or not. Yes, they are un-American when they try to misrepresent the lofty and patriotic motives of these women of the Hall furlough clubs, especially when these women have given their beloved sons and husbands and brothers to the service of their country.

These people who are using Cerinetti because they are too yellow themselves to come out from their hiding places of false respectability must know I have friends who are keeping me up to date with their dirty work. They must also know that I will protect my good name in this section by exposing them for what they are.

They must know that their bullying and their persecution of my friends are getting them nowhere but driving more people to support the Hall furlough bill every day.

They must realize that every time they attempt to stir up trouble on the home front, they are hurting the war effort, they are interfering with my work in Washington in the interest of the people of this district and their soldier boys.

They certainly must realize that in trying to ridicule and make light of the Hall furlough bill, they are hindering millions of boys from getting home to see their families, who haven't the money to travel which these behind-the-scenes people have.

They must know that in slapping these women down they are building up an unhealthy attitude among people with sincere motives, an attitude which is bound to kick back if they continue these tactics.

Remember this, boys, and let's get this straight, a slap at the Hall furlough clubs and their patriotic members is a slap at me. I am ready to fight.

And to you women of the Hall furlough clubs, if at any time you are annoyed, abused, irritated, or harassed in any manner by any of the hypocritical and overbearing men I have referred to this evening, I ask you to get in direct touch with me. You may expect immediate action.

Address at Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD an address I delivered at the Jackson Day dinner, Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston, on March 25, 1944:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mayor Tobin, Chairman Hannegan, Governor Murphy, distinguished and invited guests, my fellow-Americans, a continuance of the Democratic Party to conduct our Government for the next 4 years is necessary for the best interests of our Nation and our people.

This splendid gathering is the best evidence that next fall Massachusetts will again be in the Democratic column.

During the past 12 years—years of pain and suffering as a result of the terrible depression—years of pain and suffering as a result of the present war—we have been fortunate in having as our pilot—steering our ship of state—a brilliant, humane, and courageous man—one who had to do new things to get the results necessary for our welfare. And who did these things? The leader who is winning the war—the leader who, with the help and guidance of God, will win the peace—that man of destiny—our Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In 1932, 1936, and 1940 his opponents and enemies tried to defeat him by employing the lowest and foulest methods possible. They failed. In 1944, if President Roosevelt is a candidate, his opponents and enemies will again fail.

President Roosevelt typifies the kind of leadership—dynamic, affirmative, courageous—that America needs today. There are enough persons in the homes of the United States—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—whose sound judgment tells them that President Roosevelt is the best man to lead us during the next 4 years to assure his reelection—if he is a candidate again.

I do not know if he will be a candidate. I do not think that he wanted to run the last time—preferring to return to Hyde Park, like Jefferson returned to Monticello, and live the remainder of his life in peace, in study, and, when sought, in giving advice to his fellow Americans.

I have no doubt that President Roosevelt ran in 1940 because he realized the danger that confronted our country and that if he did not run he would feel himself a deserter to the duty he was destined to perform—to lead our country to national security and safety.

I do not think President Roosevelt wants to be a candidate this fall. One thing I do know—he will perform his duty as his judgment and conscience dictate is necessary for one objective—the preservation of the United States of America.

With the war situation as it is—and will likely be next fall—I cannot conceive of President Roosevelt leaving what is clearly his post of duty.

It is not a question of an indispensable man—the straw man built up by the Republican leaders to try and knock down. We make no such claim. The issue is, however, a clear and important one: "Who is the best man to lead and guide our Nation during the tragic days to come?"

There is no difficulty in answering that question. The best man in the American life of today is Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Let us quickly examine the record.

President Roosevelt took office for his first term in 1933—with economic distress existing, the result of the negative and inept Republican leadership of the Hoover administration. Do you remember those days? Former President Hoover failed to understand and meet the problems of our Nation and our people. You remember the promise of a chicken in every pot—or was it two—and two automobiles in each garage. You remember his refusal to permit Congress to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury to relieve human suffering and distress. You remember what he told the millions of unemployed to do—sell apples. Over 6,000 banks closed their doors during the Hoover administration. Industry, finance, agriculture, and labor were prostrated. Fear ran rampant throughout the country.

In 1932 the people repudiated vigorously the inept, do-nothing leadership of the Hoover administration. Have you forgotten those days? Twelve or fifteen millions were unemployed, with their millions of dependents facing starvation.

Our banking system, with the life earnings of more than twenty million of our people, was threatened.

The people—yes, business, finance, banking, agriculture, labor—sought new leader-

ship. New leadership was needed. We turned to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He had to do new things. The New Deal was simply a characterization to distinguish between the Old Deal of former President Hoover and the new leadership of President Roosevelt.

To save our institutions from economic disintegration, to meet and solve the problems which existed in 1933, he had to act quickly, decisively, and with judgment and courage.

Do we remember his first act? It was the saving of our banking system—the economic lifeblood of our Nation and the life savings of more than twenty millions of our people.

From that moment on our people took new vigor, new confidence, new life. The despair under Hoover quickly changed to new hope and faith under Roosevelt. It was that act that constituted the turning point in the war against the depression. The depression was then licked. It was due to the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He next turned to agriculture which was prostrated. Tens of thousands of farms had been foreclosed during the Hoover regime. He quickly changed that situation and with the Democratic Congress saved the farmers of our country.

At the same time he saw the problem confronting the unemployed workers and the home owners of our country. Tens of thousands of homes had been foreclosed during the Hoover administration; tens of thousands more were facing foreclosure unless something was done. President Roosevelt acted.

Local governments, religious and private charities had carried the load for 3 years. Their means to carry on were exhausted. They knew that—so do you—as we look back. There was only one agency which could act to meet this terrible situation and that agency was the Federal Government. Mr. Hoover had failed to act President Roosevelt did not hesitate to act. Remember we were faced with a condition—not a theory. He recommended to Congress, and forced quickly through Congress, legislation to bring necessary economic relief to the innocent victims of the depression—to save the homes and family life of America.

In the meanwhile business and financial interests were going to Washington saying to President Roosevelt: "We are helpless. We do not know what to do. Give us the benefit of your courageous leadership. Have Congress pass legislation which will put new blood in the business and financial life of America." And he did. It is amazing to witness how many his leadership saved who have forgotten and are now numbered among those who are known as his political enemies. Fortunately not all are of that school. The m jority of our fine people, in all walks of life, remember his sterling leadership of those dark days. They have not forgotten. Neither have they forgotten the do-nothing leadership of the last Republican administration.

President Roosevelt also thought of the aged, the blind, and the handicapped.

He fought the battle of the people against the abuses of certain stock exchanges and certain public utilities. In the interest of the people he fought them and then certain big interests turned on him and ever since they have tried to destroy him. My warning to these business and financial interests who are trying to destroy him—and, mark you, I do not say all, but certain powerful money groups—is to stop mixing business with politics. The campaign of hate which is being carried on by some will not be tolerated by the people.

In 1937–38 signs of another world crisis came across the horizon. President Roosevelt saw the approaching danger and warned our people to prepare. Austria was taken over. Czechoslovakia was invaded and quickly conquered by the Nazi hordes. Then followed brave Poland and the actual outburst of the present war.

On December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor happened—bringing about our entry into the war in defense of our country.

In 1940 the great majority of our people recognized the approaching danger and turned again to President Roosevelt as they did in 1932.

To the man who led us through the economic crisis they turned with confidence to lead the ship of state through the trying days ahead.

Prior to Pearl Harbor President Roosevelt recommended to Congress the passage of legislation essential for our defense in case of attack. Members of Congress are in position to study world conditions and what they mean—or they ought to be able to do so—and to obtain from the War, Navy, and State Departments information to assist them in the passage of legislation. Republican Members have the same opportunity as Democratic Members. And yet, with that opportunity, the record of the Republican Members in Congress, with a few exceptions, before Pearl Harbor is a sad and dismal one.

The courageous leadership of President Roosevelt has evidenced itself throughout the war to date.

From the despair that followed Pearl Harbor, recovery has been made. The greatest war production in the history of man has been accomplished—the most powerful Navy the world has ever seen built—an Army, Navy, and Air Corps built up and thoroughly trained, the free people of an aroused democracy courageously responding on the battle front and on the home front, America on the march to victory under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Let us hope that after the war is over there will be no Republican administration to scrap our great Navy as the Republican administration did in 1922—after the last war.

In connection with this we should also remember that in addition to scrapping our Navy in 1922 the Republican administration of Warren G. Harding committed the United States not to fortify the Philippine Islands or the island of Guam.

Even those who oppose some of the domestic policies of the present administration admit that President Roosevelt's leadership of our war effort is expert. This is admitted by practically all of our people. The Republican leaders themselves publicly admit it.

The winning of the war is our first essential task.

Before Pearl Harbor there were important bills in Congress which were directly connected with the preservation of our country—and on all of these measures the great majority of the Republican Members in Congress voted against them. They voted contrary to the wishes and views of the great majority of our people who, as Americans, saw the coming danger.

To illustrate, let me refer to the bill to extend the Selective Service Act. If that bill had failed to pass—and we all know it now in the light of what happened later—it would have been fatal to our country's best interests. That bill passed by 1 vote in the House of Representatives. And yet, on that bill which meant so much to the preservation of our Nation, in the House 133 Republicans voted against the bill and only 21 for its passage. In the Senate, 17 Republicans voted against that important bill and 13 voted in favor of it.

And this is the party that asks you to entrust to it the control of our Government during the next 4 years.

I do not question for a moment the patriotism of any of my Republican colleagues or the few Democrats who voted wrong, but I do question their judgment. If the way the big majority of the Republicans voted before Pearl Harbor had prevailed, our country would have been defenseless when Pearl Harbor took place.

It was due to the leadership of President Roosevelt, supported by the great majority of the Democratic Members of the Congress and a small group of sound-thinking, courageous Republicans, that our country was able to carry on.

In this connection, the flower of our manhood and youth are fighting, and dying, to defend America and preserve our institutions of government. They are thinking of home, of loved ones. They are looking to the future, to the early termination of the war, to living peaceful lives thereafter. They are thinking of the future, too, of a grateful government to look after the disabled, to assure them employment, to give them what they are fighting for—"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." They know a change of administration would mean a lengthening of the war, and that would mean more casualties, with less chance of our loved ones returning.

They know that Roosevelt has looked after their best interests during the war. They know that President Roosevelt is the best man to look after their interests after the war.

With the winning of the war, the winning of the peace is necessary for our national interest. It is necessary in order that the next generation of Americans—your children or your children's children—may live a normal life of peace.

As in the black days of the depression President Roosevelt performed his trust, so, too, in the crucial days of war has he performed the trust we reposed in him by the 1940 election.

Grave problems of concern to us will exist during the next 4 years. We will need his type of leadership and the character of service rendered by the Democratic Party.

I have said that I have no knowledge of President Roosevelt's intentions next fall That is so.

Speaking as an American, with my country's interest foremost in mind, and expressing my personal opinion, the world conditions will be such that President Roosevelt should be a candidate next fall. His courageous leadership will be needed during the next 4 years.

President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party have performed their trusts during the past 12 years—their trusts to the American people.

The positive record of the Democratic Party consistently received the opposition of the negative actions of the Republican leaders. The inept actions of the Republican leaders entitle the Democratic Party to be continued in control of our Federal Government.

Based upon that great record of service and of achievement, and based upon his sound and courageous leadership in time of depression and in the period of the war, I confidently predict, if he is a candidate, the reelection of President Roosevelt and the election of a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House of Representatives.

Amendment to Lend-Lease Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable

misapprehension as to the nature and extent of the amendment recently adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee in reporting out the extension of lend-lease for another year.

Some newspapers and commentators do not seem to have grasped the purpose or effect of this amendment.

There appeared in the issue of March 25 of the Baltimore Sun an editorial which is a clear and accurate statement with reference to the scope of this amendment, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

LEND-LEASE AND OUR POST-WAR ARRANGEMENTS

The so-called "restrictive" amendment to the lend-lease extension bill unanimously approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee is primarily a precautionary device to forestall certain possible, but not necessarily probable, future difficulties.

It does not, and wisely so, imply any new check whatsoever on the power granted the President by Congress to give, at his discretion, American economic aid to any of our allies or to "any country whose defense * * * [he] deems vital to the defense of the United States." It does not touch his authority to set the terms and conditions of lend-lease transactions for the effective prosecution of the war and to determine whether repayment shall be "in kind or property or any other direct or indirect benefit."

What it does do is assert that in the framing of final settlements no commitments shall be made imposing "any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure."

The bill as it stands, that is, would leave lend-lease intact as an instrument for the waging of war against our enemies and a wartime protection for the United States. The amendment would simply add a warning against the use of lend-lease as a means for effecting post-war commitments without the specific approval of Congress. Now that the war effort has progressed to a point at which the United Nations have seized the initiative, it is proper for Congress to be interested in asserting its position on the manner in which our post-war policies shall be formulated and adopted.

Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted therefor, I wish to have included in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and copy of letter addressed to Hon. Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration, signed by Senators and Representatives from the rice-producing States, protesting the placing of a ceiling on rough rice, and giving the reasons therefor. The letter follows:

MARCH 28, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food Administration.

GENTLEMEN: The Office of Price Administration has issued MPR 518, dated March 7, 1944, to become effective April 15, 1944, in which order there is established maximum prices on rough rice. This regulation bears the approval of the Administrator of the War Food Administration as of February 26 1944.

The representatives of the rice-producing States have consistently opposed the establishment of maximum prices on rough rice, and have filed written protests and objections with the Office of Price Administration, and from time to time have participated in many conferences with the officials of that Office, and do now further protest this action and reiterate our reasons therefor, to wit:

1. The placing of a maximum price on rough rice is unnecessary as there has been placed a maximum price on milled and cleaned rice, which maximum price on milled or cleaned rice, if enforced, protects the consumer.

2. The 1943 crop of rice under the maximum price under which the same was produced, harvested, milled, and distributed, was handled with a fair return to all concerned.

3. It is unfair to the producer to place a maximum price on rough rice for the reason that under the proposal there is a scandalously wide spread between the maximum price on rough rice and the maximum price on milled or cleaned rice.

4. The proposed maximum prices for rough rice are below the levels of the year 1942, and violate the 1942 Emergency Price Control Act, as amended. The term "gross inequity" was never intended to confer authority on your agency to place maximum prices at levels below the standards contained in the law but rather to permit prices to be fixed at levels above the standards when justice dictated this action. Thus, clearly, MPR 518 violates the law and intent of Congress. You cannot expect support of your program unless you administer it in accordance with the letter of the law.

5. The proposed maximum prices for rough rice, we are informed are below the cost of production at this time (see testimony of hearing of O P. A. held in New Orleans, La., on March 20, 1944) and instead of encouraging the production of this important food, will not only reduce the crop for 1944, but will practically ruin the rice growers.

6. We are further informed that it is the intention to amend the above-mentioned MPR 518 Regulation to provide for Federal grading of rough rice, and that the total rice production be allocated to the various rice mills and that the value of the individual rice crops be determined by "valuation committees" in order to eliminate all competition in the purchase of rice. The effect of this would be that the producer would have completely destroyed his privilege to trade in the sale of his crop, and would be entirely unable to protect himself against unfair grading, and so forth.

7. Our constituents advise us that all of the producers and a majority of the rice mills are opposed to the placing of this proposed maximum price on rough rice, as the same is unnecessary, unfair, unreasonable, and that the only result would be to create unknown hardships and unnecessary confusion on the part of the producer and in no way help the consumer, and that they are all further opposed to any such regimentation on the part of your agencies as is suggested in the above and foregoing paragraph.

Therefore, in view of our sincere opinion that the facts do not justify MPR 518, no other alternative is left us, except to demand that you rescind and abrogate MPR 518 before it destroys the rice industry and reduces this source of food.

We expect to be advised as to your intentions in regard to our request.

Sincerely yours,

Louisiana: JOHN H. OVERTON, United States Senator; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator; HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., Member of Congress, Seventh District; JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Member of Congress, Third District; JAMES H. MORRISON, Member of Congress, Sixth District; PAUL MALONEY, Member of Congress, Second District; Arkansas: HATTIE W. CARAWAY, United States Senator; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, United States Senator; W. F. NORRELL, Member of Congress, Sixth District; WILBUR D. MILLS, Member of Congress, Second District; E. C. GATHINGS, Member of Congress, First District; BROOKS HAYS, Member of Congress, Fifth District; Texas: MARTIN DIES, Member of Congress, Second District; J. J. MANSFIELD, Member of Congress, Ninth District; California: HIRAM W. JOHNSON, United States Senator; J. LEROY JOHNSON, Member of Congress, Third District.

Why I Would Like To Be a WAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, cooperating with Gov. Dwight H. Green, of the State of Illinois, in his Illinois civilian WAC recruiting campaign, it has been my pleasure and privilege to present a $25 War bond as a congressional district prize to Miss Marie Romeo, 511 South Jefferson Street, Du Quoin, Ill., for the splendid essay which she has written entitled "Why I Would Like To Be a WAC." I include the essay written by Miss Romeo:

WHY I WOULD LIKE TO BE A WAC

There are several reasons why I would like to be a WAC.

First of all, a WAC takes the place of a soldier and will help bring him home sooner to his parents, wife, family, and sweetheart.

A second reason is, a WAC releases a man for active service and may keep a father or a defense worker from being called.

A third reason is that General Marshall is asking for 70,000 additional volunteers for the WAC's to release 70,000 men in order to take the place of that many casualties.

A fourth reason is to secure more education.

A fifth reason is that a WAC gets to see the world and is entertained by movie actors and meets people from all over the world. Also, it helps to make one more friendly and brave.

A sixth reason is that I would be proud to wear the WAC uniform.

A seventh reason is that one gets to choose any kind of professional position.

Last of all, it is to be one of Uncle Sam's nieces and have the opportunity to pitch in and help our American boys smack those Japs.

MARIE ROMEO.

Critical Shortage of Keymen in the Fishery Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, further supplementing the efforts of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to relieve the critical condition in which the fishery industry finds itself, Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries; Mr. Hugh Frampton, attorney at law of Washington, D. C.; and I, as chairman of the full Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, were graciously granted, on Friday, March 30, a hearing before a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, headed by Hon. JOHN M. COSTELLO, of California, investigating operations of the Selective Service Draft Act.

The effect of the present operation of the Draft Act on the fishery industry was discussed before the subcommittee and the letters, resolutions, and matter presented by the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in his remarks on the same subject in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A1714, were presented, together with a copy of the resolution adopted by the full committee on the 28th day of March and included in the aforesaid extension of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There were also presented to the subcommittee headed by Mr. COSTELLO, the telegrams received by the chairman, from Virginia, Maryland, and Maine, outlining the present plight of the fisheries industry in those States, copies of which were extended in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 31, 1944.

The situation was fully explained by Hon J. HARDIN PETERSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, and there was made a part of the proceedings the following paper which seeks to clarify the situation as related to the seafood industry and shows the imperative necessity of greater protection to the seafood industry if those engaged in that industry are to produce the seafood, proteins, fish meal, and fish oil needed to carry out the war program outlined for the fisheries. This plan is designed to bring out in concise form the serious situation which now confronts the Nation:

"Food will win the war and write the peace." (Secretary of Agriculture.)

Congress has decided that food production (agriculture—by passage of Tydings amendment) is a critical activity. The Tydings amendment to section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act, by adding a new subsection (K), reads:

"Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

Following the passage of the Tydings amendment the war units plan was adopted, but even this has now been abandoned in the interest of food production, according to an article appearing in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., March 29, 1944, which reads:

"HERSHEY WILL LEAVE FARM DEFERMENTS UP TO DRAFT BOARDS

"Instead of the unit system, under which farm worker deferments are based on the extent of production of livestock or commodities in which the employee is engaged, the so-called Tydings amendment, passed by Congress 2 years ago, will be the new yardstick, Senators RUSSELL and TYDINGS reported."

We have but two sources of food supply (a) from the land and (b) from the water.

While farmers, who produce on the average about 33,000 pounds of food per man-year, are protected by an act of Congress, and properly so, highly trained fishermen, who produce on the average 54,800 pounds of food per man-year have no protection. Even if the present number of fishermen is retained in the industry it will be necessary for each fisherman to produce about 80,000 pounds during 1944 to bring production up to the requirements for 1944 as determined by the War Food Administrator.

Food production, expressed in pounds, by the seafood industry per man-year is outstanding.

EXAMPLES

1. Otter trawl fishery of Massachusetts: The average catch per man engaged on large, medium, and small boats is 126,000 pounds per man-year. One boat produced 235,289 pounds per man during 1943.

2. Purse seine fishery in Virginia averages 142,000 pounds per man-year.

3. Purse seine fishery in New Jersey averages 293,000 pounds per man-year.

4. Purse seine fishery in California averages 627,000 pounds per man-year.

Fish and shellfish are an essential source of high-protein food. The industry constitutes a major source of fats, oils, and meal for industrial uses and for animal feeding. The industry is the primary source of vitamin concentrates and other indispensable commodities.

Normal per annum sea-food production, 5,000,000,000 pounds; 2,500,000,000 pounds (per annum) of high-protein food for humans; 2,500,000,000 pounds (per annum) for animal feed; fish and shellfish in unlimited quantities available for the taking; not waiting time to grow or fatten.

Production goal for 1944 set by War Food Administrator 5,300,000,000 pounds (for armed forces, lend-lease, civilian population).

United States Fish and Wildlife estimates probable 1944 production not to exceed 4,300,000,000 pounds. Short of 1944 War Food Administrator's requirements, 1,000,000,000 pounds.

Estimated 1943 sea-food production 4,000,000,000 pounds.

The estimated 1944 sea-food production of 4,300,000,000 pounds is based on following assumptions:

(a) That some fishing boats will be returned by the Navy to industry.

(b) That men will be available to operate boats returned by Navy to industry.

(c) That present available manpower be not disturbed.

(d) No strikes.

If above assumptions upset, then instead of the estimated 1,000,000,000-pound sea-food shortage in 1944, such shortage will be much larger than estimated 1,000,000,000-pound shortage.

Estimates of U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

	Estimated total	Estimated number in draft age, 18-37 years	Estimated number already drafted	Estimated number in draft age, 18-37 years, remaining	Estimated number under 26 years remaining
Commercial fishermen	84,000	39,000	20,834	18,166	8,683
Key shore workers (male)	8,558	3,935	2,102	1,833	876

Above estimates are conservative.

Leaders in industry believe above figures are high.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO COSTELLO COMMITTEE

Since there are but two sources of food supply (land and water); since fishermen produce more food per man-year than farmers, amend subsection (k) of section 5 of Selective Training and Service Act by adding "Fishery and Seafood" after the word "agricultural," so that said subsection (k), as amended, will read:

"Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural, fishery, and seafood occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

Pending passage of such legislation to prevent stoppage of seafood production and/or processing, committee to issue statement recommending that General Hershey issue statement to all local draft boards leaving to such board right to grant deferments to those engaged in a fishery or seafood occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, so long as satisfactory replacements cannot be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, this statement and others of similar purport are being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of all concerned.

I include, also, a resolution adopted by the Commission of Fisheries of Virginia at its meeting March 28, 1944:

Whereas the sea-food industry is the largest producer of food in eastern Virginia, as well as one of the most important economic elements in this area; and

Whereas the continuance of this industry is threatened by the inability of those engaged in it to secure labor and particularly by the shortage of essential men experienced in its conduct; and

Whereas the shortage of experienced men will be made even more acute than it now is by the drafting of all men under 26 years of age unless the importance of this industry to our wartime economy be recognized and the essential men in said industry be granted deferment from the draft; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this Commission that as a large producer of food vital to the war effort at this time the sea-food industry is entitled to have those engaged in it deferred upon the same basis as deferments are granted to other food-producing industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commission of Fisheries of Virginia this day assembled in the city of Newport News, Va., That those in charge of selective service be, and they are hereby requested to grant to those engaged in essential functions in the sea-food industry deferments on the same basis as those granted to persons engaged in agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be certified to each of the Members of the United States Senate, and the House of Representatives from Virginia, and to the United States Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, Washington, D. C.

Insurance and Air Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that insurance is an integral part of commercial air transportation is a conclusion to which the Civil Aeronautics Board has come in a study of aviation insurance which has just been made public. I desire, Mr. President, to call attention to one or two significant statements made in this report, and to ask that the conclusion reached by the Board may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The study was undertaken because the Civil Aeronautics Board has found that the cost of insurance is an important factor to be taken into consideration by the Board in fixing rates.

Now that we are about to enter a new era of international commerce by air, it is important to learn from this report that reinsurance with respect to air commerce is largely controlled abroad, just as reinsurance with respect to seagoing commerce has been controlled. The Civil Aeronautics Board reports that during the period from 1938 to 1942 the three underwriting groups which had 96 percent of all aviation insurance business paid out $20,911,131 in premiums for reinsurance abroad, while foreign insurers paid to these same three groups only $6,471 in reinsurance premiums. Twenty million dollars as compared to $6,000 can scarcely be regarded as a balance of commerce in favor of the United States; nor can this discrepancy be overlooked in the consideration of the encouragement of American enterprise in the post-war world.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed a few extracts which I have marked in the report, and I should like to say to those who may be interested that the Civil Aeronautics Board doubtless has copies of the study which will be available to those who may care to apply for it.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the study and the conclusion thereof were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Insurance is an integral part of air transportation as it is of all commercial enterprise. Air lines buy insurance to protect their investment in aircraft and other equipment against numerous and varied risks. Bankers financing the purchase of aircraft and other equipment require that it be insured. Shippers and bankers financing shipments also demand the protection of insurance for their goods while in transit.

* * * * *

The three leading underwriting groups reinsure among themselves and with foreign reinsurers. The amount of reinsurance among the three groups, however, has not been large, and some of it is placed for the purpose of achieving an approximately equal division of non-air-line business among themselves.

On the other hand, reinsurance abroad has been substantial, and, in fact, the British insurance market has been the primary source of reinsurance for our aviation insurance market. Table VII on page 20 shows that the percentage of premiums for reinsurance with foreign insurers has averaged 48.1 percent of the total premiums of the three groups during the 5-year period, 1938–42. During this period the three underwriting groups paid $20,911,131 in premiums for reinsurance abroad, while at the same time these groups have reported only $6,471 of reinsurance flowing to them from foreign insurers.

* * * * *

The use of this insurance power as a commercial weapon was summarized in a report by a committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, headed by Gen. J. G. Harbord, as follows:

"Marine insurance has for years been regarded as a national commercial weapon which, when properly coordinated with banking and shipping, can be effectively used in acquiring and controlling important channels of trade. * * * In foreign countries the importance of team play between marine insurance companies, exporters, and shipping interests is recognized. Because of this it is possible for marine insurance companies to offer such differentials in insurance rates as to throw the imports and exports to vessels of their own nationality."

* * * * *

As a general rule, reinsurance contracts (treaties) give the reinsurer the right to information concerning the nature of the risk insured. Such information could endanger our national security if it became known, directly or indirectly, to a foreign country which then is or later becomes hostile to our interests. The problem is not only a matter of revealing the facts concerning individual projects insured, but also of the possible accumulation of large amounts of detailed data from a number of risks insured over a period of time which could be pieced together to yield information of great value to such a foreign country.

With regard to the use which might be made of such information, the experience of the French as stated in the following excerpts from an official French report is revealing:

"Germany does not need to take recourse to a mysterious organization of spies in order to be informed of our business concerns and to learn their resources and their means; she has only to consult the bordereaux and bulletins which the insurance and reinsurance companies pile up in their offices through their brokers. * * * These bordereaux and bulletins state the output of our factories, the machinery, the turnover, the rural production, what our vessels transport, and whereto they transport. It is easy to guess what advantage our enemy with its own methodical spirit, can draw from those materials."

* * * * *

CONCLUSION

The Federal Government has had, and without question will continue to have, a well-defined interest in the promotion and development of all aspects of aviation. Since aviation insurance can have an important influence upon the development and expansion of aviation, the Federal Government naturally will have an interest in seeing that the American aviation insurance market so functions that it makes the maximum contribution to that development and expansion. Accordingly, in order to serve as a foundation for an intelligent appraisal of the situation at all times, the Civil Aeronautics Board believes that there should be readily available to those agencies of government which have an interest in one or more phases of the national aviation program complete and current information regarding the functioning of the aviation insurance market. The unavailability of such data at the present time was clearly disclosed in the course of the Board's investigation, and necessitated the seeking of much specially prepared material.

As already pointed out, the investigation conducted by the Board does not purport to have been exhaustive. The Board has concluded that the information available to it as a result of such investigation does not permit of any final conclusions as to whether there are any respects in which the functioning of the aviation insurance market has not been consistent with the public interest in the development of aviation. In particular, the Board has decided that it cannot at this time determine whether the premium rates which have existed or now exist in aviation insurance are fair and reasonable. The experience during the periods examined revealed a high rate of profit during those particular periods, but there were factors which, when taken into account, made a final judgment impossible at this time. Consequently, it is believed that continued observation of the aviation insurance market is in order to ascertain whether that market is adjusting its rates as rapidly and as fully as is reasonably possible in relation to the progress made in the reduction of aviation hazards, and is otherwise accommodating itself to the development of aviation. It is believed that such observation can best be accomplished by providing for the power to obtain periodic reports of appropriate data disclosing the underwriting results of the American aviation insurance market.

It seems quite evident that the only efficient way to collect such information is through vesting appropriate authority and responsibility in a single agency of the Federal Government which can periodically collect reliable information from all companies or groups which are participating in the underwriting of aviation risks throughout this country. The necessary information which might be collected includes premiums earned, losses sustained, amount of overhead and general business expense assigned to the respective classifications of risks underwritten, and the amount of insurance or reinsurance placed abroad. The

reporting of such information on a Nationwide uniform basis is necessary if a proper appraisal of the aviation-insurance market is to be made from time to time.

Such information should be available not only to the governmental agencies interested in aviation, but to the various classes of purchasers of aviation insurance. The information collected concerning the aviation-insurance market should, therefore, periodically be published in appropriate summary form so that it would, in the aggregate, at least, be readily available to such purchasers. It is believed that the possession of reliable information by purchasers of insurance regarding the over-all underwriting results of the aviation-insurance market with respect to the general classifications of risks in which they were interested could make a substantial contribution to the self-regulation of this market.

Voting Strength of States at National Conventions and Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, when the National Committee of the Democratic Party met in Washington some weeks ago, I stated that I believed that the two-thirds rule should be restored. Its repeal was opposed by me in 1936. Since that time there have followed some editorials in the newspapers, many of which I have seen, suggesting that perhaps the fairest method of selecting delegates was under the present procedure. In view of the South's great interest in the Democratic Party and in view of my unfaltering belief in our party, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD page 11 of the document Factual Campaign Information in which there appears a table showing the voting strength of the States at national conventions and in the electoral college.

Mr. President, at this time, without criticism, because it is entirely correct for the Republican Party to choose its delegates as is in their interest, I wish to call attention to the fact that the State of South Carolina, with a population of nearly two million, has only four delegates to the Republican convention, whereas States perhaps with only a few hundred thousand population have nine, ten and even more delegates. My purpose in calling attention to this matter is not to indulge in criticism but to inform those who contend that the present method of choosing delegates should not be changed, and that the two-thirds rule should have been abolished because now everything is right and just.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed ir the RECORD, as follows:

Voting strength of States at national conventions and electoral college in 1944

State	Population, 1940 census	Delegates, Democratic convention	Delegates, Republican convention	Electoral college
Alabama	2,832,961	24	14	11
Arizona	499,261	10	8	4
Arkansas	1,949,387	20	12	9
California	6,907,387	52	50	25
Colorado	1,123,296	12	15	6
Connecticut	1,709,242	18	16	8
Delaware	266,505	8	9	3
Florida	1,897,414	18	15	8
Georgia	3,123,723	26	13	12
Idaho	524,873	10	11	4
Illinois	7,897,241	58	59	28
Indiana	3,427,796	26	29	13
Iowa	2,538,268	20	23	10
Kansas	1,801,028	16	19	8
Kentucky	2,845,627	24	22	11
Louisiana	2,363,880	22	13	10
Maine	847,226	10	13	5
Maryland	1,821,244	18	16	8
Massachusetts	4,316,721	34	35	16
Michigan	5,256,106	38	41	19
Minnesota	2,792,300	24	25	11
Mississippi	2,183,796	20	6	9
Missouri	3,784,664	32	30	15
Montana	559,456	10	8	4
Nebraska	1,315,834	12	15	6
Nevada	110,247	8	6	3
New Hampshire	491,524	10	11	4
New Jersey	4,160,165	34	35	16
New Mexico	531,818	10	8	4
New York	13,479,142	96	93	47
North Carolina	3,571,623	30	25	14
North Dakota	641,935	8	11	4
Ohio	6,907,612	52	50	25
Oklahoma	2,336,434	22	23	10
Oregon	1,089,684	14	15	6
Pennsylvania	9,900,180	72	70	35
Rhode Island	713,346	10	8	4
South Carolina	1,899,804	18	4	8
South Dakota	642,961	8	11	4
Tennessee	2,915,841	26	19	12
Texas	6,414,824	48	33	23
Utah	550,310	10	8	4
Vermont	359,231	6	9	3
Virginia	2,677,773	24	19	11
Washington	1,736,191	18	16	8
West Virginia	1,901,974	18	19	8
Wisconsin	3,137,587	26	24	12
Wyoming	250,742	8	9	3
Alaska	----------	6	3	-------
District of Columbia	----------	6	3	-------
Hawaii	----------	6	5	-------
Philippine Islands	----------	6	2	-------
Puerto Rico	----------	6	2	-------
Canal Zone	----------	6	-------	-------
Virgin Islands	----------	2	-------	-------
Total	----------	1,176	1,058	531

Italian Legal Codes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to an article entitled "Italian Legal Codes on the Eve of the Allied Invasion," appearing in the Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions, published by the Library of Congress. A translation of the Italian legal codes is under way for the use of the military and now in the belief that the article may be of use to other branches of the Government, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALIAN LEGAL CODES ON THE EVE OF THE ALLIED INVASION

The fall of the Fascist regime in Italy left a complex and confusing legal heritage. Fascist law will doubtless be revised, but before the revision an inventory must be taken. Not only were numerous individual laws enacted to carry out Fascist principles, but an attempt was made to recodify completely all the major fields of law. Old codes were abrogated and new codes, like the Civil Code of 1942, were introduced on the eve of the fall of the regime. Some of these were printed in the edizione straordinaria of the Gazzetta Ufficiale, others as supplemento ordinario to individual numbers, frequently interrupting the pagination of the Gazzetta Ufficiale, which otherwise runs continuously through the year. Each code is usually accompanied by a report (relazione) stating the basic principles and the official reasons for the new provisions.

Some of the newly enacted codes, apart from a few Fascist provisions, represent, in the opinion of the Italian jurists in exile, an improvement upon the old codes. There is reason to believe that in substantial parts they may survive the fall of fascism in Italy. Their study cannot be neglected.

Recent acquisitions of the Law Library supply ample material for the study of Italian codification on the eve of our landing in Sicily. A survey of source material is offered below with the hope that it will pave the way for study and critical analysis:

1. Penal code. As early as October 19, 1930, a royal decree approved a new penal code to take effect on July 1, 1931. This code has remained in force except for a few unimportant amendments. An English translation of it was issued in London by His Majesty's Stationery Office in 1931. Several Italian editions are on the shelves of the Law Library, the most recent being that by F. Carnelutti in his collection, I Codici per l'Udienza (Padova, 1941). The most recent annotated edition is that by Luigi Valentino (6th ed., 1937). The latest commentary is that by Saltelli and Romano di Falco, Commento (2d ed., 4 v., 1940). The latest comprehensive treatise is that by Giuseppe Maggiore, Principi di Diritto Penale, Parte Generale (3d ed., 1939).

2. A new Code of Penal Procedure was enacted simultaneously with the penal code and was amended in 1937 and 1939. The latest edition available in the Library of Congress is the one by Carnelutti (supra). The latest annotated editions are by Parpagliolo (1936) and by Leone (1937) and the one by Ugo Conti (1937—vol. I only).

3. Military penal and courts-martial laws were revised during the war. Two new military penal codes, viz., one for peace and one for war, were promulgated by the royal decree of February 20, 1941.

These penal codes were followed by a reform of the courts martial by royal decree on the organization of military tribunals, which provided for different organizations in time of peace and in time of war. Excerpts from these enactments were translated and mimeographed by the Law Library in Courts Martial Law of Russia, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Japan, and the Disciplinary Code of Soviet Russia (Washington, D. C., 1943, pp. 41–58).

4. Judiciary Act (Ordinamento Giudiziario). The first Fascist regulation of the judicial system, embraced in the decree of December 30, 1923, No. 2786, was later considered to be insufficient by the Fascist leaders because it was a mere amendment to the old law of December 6, 1865, No. 2626, which antedated the formation of modern Italy.

Work on the preparation of a new Judiciary Act was begun in 1925 and a new Ordinamento Giudiziario was enacted as recently as January 30, 1941. It was put into effect on

April 21, 1941. The Law Library has only this edition. A table listing all courts in Italy by region is appended to the act.

5. Civil procedure was also revised recently and a new code (Codice di procedura civile) was approved by the royal decree of October 28, 1940. It took effect on April 21, 1942, being slightly amended on April 20, 1942. These official editions are in the Law Library.

An outstanding feature of the Italian judiciary, namely, the special sections of the courts of appeals for deciding labor cases (magistratura del lavoro), has been retained with minor changes in the new codes. This special judicial set-up is well described by Manyon in The Italian Magistracy of Labor, 27 Michigan Law Review, pp. 869–920. There is no material in English on the new Code of Civil Procedure. The Law Library has a small monograph, by Bonini (1943), on execution under the new code.

6. Civil and commercial codes were also extensively revised. A new civil code was promulgated and put into effect in instalments. No completely new commercial code was enacted but several fields of law, hitherto embraced in the commercial code of 1882, were either treated by separate laws or were incorporated into the new civil code.

The civil code was enacted in separate books during the period from July 1, 1939, to April 2, 1942.

It is interesting to note the opinions voiced by Italian jurists in exile. Two articles, one by Alberto Montel, formerly professor of law in Turin, the first book of the New Italian Code, and the other by Mario Sarfatti, formerly of the University of Turin, the New Italian Civil Code, give a comprehensive survey and analysis of the first two books. These authors stress that the books on persons and on successions, except for a few provisions reflecting peculiar Fascist ideas of nationalism and racial discrimination represent in all other aspects a "noteworthy advance on the Civil Code of 1865." In the opinion of Mr. Sarfatti, "This code follows the line of the one of 1865, but it constitutes a great improvement as it completes, so far as possible, the rules that up till now had to be sought in the judicial decisions. * * * Each chapter is the result of elaborate research by some of the most respected Italian jurists; all parts have been discussed in committee and the code may be considered as the latest modern abridgment of Italian science of law."

Of the second book on Successions and Donations, Mr. Sarfatti writes: "A special decree relates it to the first part, so that the racial legislation which does not appear therein will equally apply as regards the limitation of the capacity of Jews. This is the only political touch; otherwise the whole work is the result of the development of juridical science in general in the various countries, notwithstanding various references in the report to Fascist morals as the foundation of the reforms. This part of the code does not contain new principles but the subject has been thoroughly revised so as to give a complete body of rules on wills and intestacy, many of them in a much-improved form." Mr. Montel agrees with this opinion.

The method of promulgation and putting into effect of the new civil code was perplexing. The individual books, each with sections separately numbered, were enacted. Thus the first book on Persons was promulgated on December 12, 1938, and took effect on July 1, 1939. The book on Successions and Donations was promulgated on October 27, 1939, and put into effect on April 21, 1940. The book on Property was promulgated on January 30, 1941, and took effect on October 28 of the same year. The rest of the code, containing the book on Obligations, the book on Labor, and the book on Protection of Rights, was enacted simultaneously on January 30, 1941, to take effect on April 21, 1942.

Thereafter the separate books were consolidated into a unit of 2,969 consecutively numbered sections (the old code had 2,147 sections) and some discrepancies were ironed out at this time. In this revised form the civil code was promulgated again by the royal decree of March 16, 1942, No. 262, and beginning with April 21, 1942, superseded the individual books of the code previously in force. The noted carta del lavoro, the declaration of the principles of a corporate state announced in 1927, was repromulgated in toto as a kind of preamble to the text of the code.

An analysis of the provisions of the new code cannot be given in this short note; yet a brief comparison of the new civil code with the old cannot be omitted.

The new code is wider in scope than the old. It has six books instead of three. The first book of both codes deals with the same subject matters—persons and family. A new distribution of material begins with the second book of the new code which covers successions and donations to which only a part of the second book of the old code was devoted, viz titles II and III.

Property, which was treated in the second and partly in the third book of the old code, constitutes now the contents of the entire third book.

Some provisions of the book on Property deserve special attention as an obvious attempt at a totalitarian approach to private ownership. The compilers of the code as it is stated in Relazione were inspired by the idea that the Fascist state "does not recognize the protection of private ownership as an innate right of the individual. Like all other rights, ownership has a social purpose and the legal order confers rights upon an individual because of such purposes."

This trend, which may be traced to the teachings of the French jurist, Duguit, who regarded rights as mere social functions, was expressed in section 811 of the New Italian Civil Code. This section stresses the view that property "is subject to the regulations of the corporate state with regard to the economic function of property and demands of national production."

Likewise, section 838 opens a possibly for administrative authorities to expropriate (with compensation) property of interest to national production if the proprietor "neglects the conservation, cultivation, or use of such property in a manner causing substantial harm to the demands of such production." Such expropriation goes far beyond the concept of eminent domain.

These provisions should be reconsidered after the fall of the Fascist regime.

The provisions on obligations which were treated in the third book of the old code were redistributed in the new code between the fourth book on obligations and the fifth book on labor. Out of the remainder of the provisions of the third book (evidence, statute of limitations, etc.), the sixth book of the new code was made.

The fourth book on obligation and the fifth book on labor are undoubtedly an innovation in Italian law due to the nature of subject matter treated therein. Alongside the contracts hitherto regulated by the old civil code and the strictly labor law topics, such as master and servant, collective bargaining, and so forth, these books regulate some fields which were traditionally considered as belonging not to civil but to commercial law, and were treated in the old commercial code.

Unlike the Anglo-American and Swiss legal systems, but more like the German and Austrian, the Italian law had no uniform rules for some contracts. In many instances there were two parallel sets of rules, one of civil law and another of commercial law, which remained to a large extent Lex Mercatorium i. e., a body of rules used in the trade. If a party to a certain contract was a merchant or if the purpose of a contract was commercial, e. g., if a purchase was made for the purpose of resale, the contract was considered a commercial transaction; it came, therefore, under the commercial and not under the civil code. Some contracts were considered commercial per se; e. g., insurance and banking transactions. Moreover, labor law, especially under the Fascist regime, developed into a separate branch of the legal system.

Now, in the drafting of the new civil code, the legislators intended to do away with the duality of the commercial and civil law, on the one hand, and to abolish, on the other, the separate treatment of labor law as a branch distinct from the others. These special fields were covered by the civil code and were treated jointly with other topics of civil law proper.

The laws enacting the fourth and fifth books do not specify the sections of the commercial code which were repealed by the new civil code. They state in a general way that those provisions of the commercial code are repealed "which are concerned with the subject matters dealt with" in the fourth and fifth books. Therefore, the repealed portions of the commercial code must be identified by a scrutiny of the topics treated in these books of the civil code.

Thus, in addition to the contracts to be found in the old civil code, the fourth book regulates agency, insurance, current accounts, and banking transactions, shipping, warehousing, brokerage, and so forth. This enumeration affects virtually all the "commercial" transactions provided for in the commercial code, and secs. 59–75, 345–479 of this code regulating such transactions may be considered repealed.

The Fifth Book on Labor deals not only with the usual topics of labor law, such as master and servant and collective bargaining (titles I–IV), but also with corporation law (titles V and XI, which have replaced provisions of title IX of the First Book of the Commercial Code). Thus the new regulations of partnership (secs. 2247–2324) are substituted for sections 76–125 of the Commercial Code; those on joint-stock companies (secs. 2325–2471), companies with limited liabilities (secs. 2472–2510), and cooperatives (secs. 2511–2574) replace sections 126–238 of the Commercial Code.

The remaining part of the Fifth Book on Labor treats copyright and patents (title IX) and unfair competition (title X). Some of these provisions have not been put into effect yet.

The Sixth Book on Protection of Rights deals with deeds and public records (formerly Book III, title XXII); evidence (formerly Book III, title IV, ch. V); responsibility for debts, mortgages, and pledges (formerly Book III, title XXIII); enforcement of claims (formerly dealt with partly in Book II, title XXVI). Title XXVI, like the last title of the old Code, is devoted to the statute of limitations.

The Law Library has the official editions of the separate books and of the entire code as it appeared in the Gazzetta Ufficiale, as well as several treatises and annotated editions of the first three books. Here belong commentaries by Pandolfi, Scarpello, Stella Richter, and Dallari on Books I, II, and III (1940); commentaries on Book I by N. and F. Stolfi (1939), by Azara and others edited by D'Amelio (1940); a commentary on Books I and II by Butera (1940); and a treatise by Azzariti and Martinez on Book I (1940).

A complete translation of the new Civil Code is now being prepared by Prince Guido

Pignatelli in cooperation with the members of the staff of the Law Library.

An extensive bibliography of Italian writing on the new Civil Code is to be found in Arrigo Solmi, L'idea fascista nel nuovo codice civile (1940, pp. 177–187).

The Civil Code was not the only piece of legislation that affected the commercial code. New laws on negotiable instruments, that is, on bills and notes of December 14, 1933, and on checks of December 21, 1933, were put into effect on January 1, 1934. They were compiled in conformity with the international drafts prepared in Geneva in 1930 and 1931. The English texts of these drafts were printed in Geneva by the League of Nations at that time.

The Codice della Navigazione was enacted by the royal decrees of January 27, 1941, and March 30, 1942, and it took effect on April 21, 1942. This code supersedes the second book of the commercial code dealing with maritime law and the merchant marine code of 1877, with the subsequent regulations of 1879.

A striking feature of the Codice della Navigazione is that it not only regulates the maritime and inland waterways trade but also contains the air law. Therefore, it replaced the regulations on air navigation issued prior to the enactment of this code such as those of August 20, 1923, January 31, 1926, January 11, 1925, and others. Thus the code is the first attempt at a joint treatment of maritime and air law in a single piece of legislation.

The Disciplina del Fallimento of March 16, 1942, replaced the bankruptcy law included in book III of the commercial code.

Under such circumstances the commercial code, though not repealed, was so to speak, dissolved by the new legislation. Parts of the general provisions of the commercial code on merchants, books of accounts, and so forth, embraced in the first 57 sections are still in force. Beginning with section 58, however, the commercial code should be considered inoperative.

ELIO GIANTURCO,
Research Assistant, Foreign Law Section, Law Library.
VLADIMIR GSOVSKI,
Chief, Foreign Law Section, Law Library.

Shipping and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shipping and National Defense," published in the February–March 1944 issue of the Grace Log, a magazine published by the W. R. Grace Co.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The current active discussion of the future of the American merchant marine has not yet come down to details. The exchange of ideas remains quite general and for the most part has been confined to mere assertions of opposing points of view, without going very deeply into the reasons why a merchant marine is or is not desirable for this country. There are given below certain considerations which should be in our minds when we begin a serious discussion of post-war shipping.

The primary functions of a merchant marine are to meet promptly and adequately the needs of commerce and defense, and its desirability to a nation depends upon the relative strength of these two needs, the possibility of using the ships of other nations, the direct and indirect costs of maintaining adequate national tonnage and the economic and military benefits to be derived therefrom. Manifestly, these factors must have different weight with different countries, for a small nation must in general depend upon larger nations for defense, and may also be unable to afford independent shipping services to carry its overseas trade. The United States is not in this category.

The United States is a major world power, having only one-fifteenth of the area and population of the earth but nearly one-half of its wealth and manufacturing facilities, the largest export trade and second largest import trade and a general standard of living that is the envy of other lands. It is fortunate in its neighbors and has not needed to maintain armies against them, and, in fact, ranked in 1938 well below many Balkan nations in army strength. It was in 1938 the major "have" nation since it had put its resources into the production of wealth rather than weapons and had depended upon the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, its navy and its friendship with the British Empire and France to see that those who preferred to loot rather than build were kept at a safe distance.

It considered the ocean a moat preventing access by potential enemies, but failed to make sure that shipping—the drawbridge across the moat—was hinged on our side, and could be let down or pulled up at our pleasure. On the west, the drawbridge belonged to Japan and on the east to Great Britain, Germany, Norway, Italy, and the other European maritime nations. We had in name a fairly large Merchant Marine, due to inclusion of huge tonnages of old coastal vessels, Great Lakes ships and laid-up craft remaining from the last World War, but in world overseas trade our ships were outnumbered about 12 to 1, and our proportion was decreasing year by year. Our naval position was better, since we had a fleet only slightly smaller than that of Great Britain and amounting to almost 25 percent of the world total, but in essence our future was dependent upon the active assistance or at least benevolent neutrality of the British merchant and naval fleets. In like manner Great Britain depended upon the French army and the armies of France's European allies.

This dependence on others was based on two considerations: First, that maintenance of adequate armies by Great Britain, and of an adequate merchant marine and armies by us, was expensive in time of peace; second, that time would be available in case of war to build up to the necessary level. But others were also doing their own calculating, and the Axis noted that while in commerce time may be money, in war money is not a substitute for time.

There was not time to go to Poland's aid, nor time to counter the German coup in Norway. The time lag between German construction of planes and tanks and counter-construction by the Allies was such that the Axis force—already in being—struck down the Anglo-French Armies before the greater resources of the Allies could right the balance. There was a period of many months when it looked as though Great Britain would go the way of France and leave the United States to face alone a probable attack by enemies many times stronger in armies, air forces, and merchant ships, and somewhat superior to us in naval power. If Great Britain had been forced to surrender and deliver to the Axis even a part of the British Navy and merchant marine, the Axis would have been able to invade this hemisphere at will and quite possibly such an invasion could have succeeded. In fact, it looked as though even a flight of the British Navy to Canada would do no more than postpone matters, for, due to our peacetime neglect, the shipyards of Europe and Japan were so far in excess of our own in capacity that they could outbuild us in a year or two, and then attack before we could expand our facilities and catch up with them. At the least, the Axis could hope to hold the Old World and perhaps much of South America indefinitely from mere lack of ships in our hands to transport our armies before the enemy dug in.

When the air campaign against Great Britain failed the submarine campaign began, and it was Axis calculation that the small merchant marine of the United States, and our smaller shipbuilding capacity, would render it impossible for us to prevent eventual starvation of the British and the occupation by the Axis of at least the British territories in Africa and the east.

That campaign came uncomfortably close to succeeding. To defeat it and to move our armies abroad the United States has been building 50,000,000 dead-weight tons of new merchant ships at a total cost of over $12,000,000,000. Adding in the many more billions which have had to be spent by our Navy and Army, and in the future will be spent, to make up for time and opportunity lost by inadequate overseas transportation, it becomes evident that we are paying an excessive price for our peacetime shipping economies.

Putting aside the nearly fatal loss in time, caused by not having adequate shipping in being or adequate shipbuilding facilities already built, let us consider for a moment this matter of direct money loss caused by forced emergency construction. As everyone knows, the cost of constructing merchant vessels is much higher under emergency war conditions than it is in time of peace, and the standardized ships being turned out for war purposes are not of as high quality as those which we could have previously constructed had we been more foresighted. We thus lose both time and money through our mistaken economy and our reliance on the more economical transportation furnished by others. It would be just as sound by abstract economics and as foolish by considerations of common prudence to hire Japanese at a few cents a day to man our battleships as it has proven to be to depend upon the more economical merchant fleets of others in a world where wars may come again and where ships not in our hands may be used against us.

But, returning to direct costs, we can calculate that if the ships now being built had been constructed in time of peace they would have cost not over six to eight billion dollars. Of course, we could not have operated any such fleet in time of peace and therefore the direct saving of four to six billion dollars indicated is hardly realistic. We would, however, easily have operated an additional 10,000,000 tons of merchant shipping and the construction saving on this would have been of the order of $1,000,000,000. Further large sums would have been saved on emergency shipyard construction, and we would have had much less of a strain in the last 2 years on our labor supply and steel, so that munitions would have been produced faster and at lower cost.

COMPARISON OF COSTS

To operate the additional 10,000,000 tons in time of peace would have cost us perhaps

as much as $40,000,000 per annum in operating subsidies, but over the whole 20-year life of a ship this would not equal the total amount which we now waste in additional construction costs, and we would have had the tonnage available for instant use, manned by trained sailors, and thus would have saved months of time in bringing this war to an end. Every day the war lasts costs us $250,000,000, and the cost in soldiers' lives of our initial maritime weakness can only be speculated upon.

Also, a larger merchant marine under American control in time of peace would have implied a smaller merchant marine under Axis control, for in the 15 years preceding 1938 it was our merchant marine which decreased year by year and it was predominantly Axis shipping which moved into the gap which our tonnage left. A smaller Axis merchant marine would have greatly weakened the war potential of these aggressor nations, and this should be borne in mind in assessing the cost to us of maintaining ships in future. If only a fair part of the postulated 10,000,000 tons of American shipping had been operated in the Pacific, the great commercial fleet developed by Japan largely out of United States trade profits would have been relatively smaller. Japan would probably have never struck at Pearl Harbor had the disparity in merchant fleets not been so strongly in her favor.

This somewhat lengthy review of the war is given solely to bring out points which have been much neglected in current discussion of post-war shipping plans. It is true that the United States must depend in part for its future security on cooperation with the United Kingdom and with the other maritime nations of western Europe, but it decidedly does not follow that it is to our interest—or fundamentally to the world interest—to see the preponderance of naval or maritime strength in British or continental European hands. With development of rocket planes and other devices now merely hinted at, Great Britain is no longer a secure base and it might be overrun in any future war as easily as Norway, Netherlands, and France were in this one, or as Belgium was in the war preceding. In such a case the only hope for the British would rest in having power instantly available in the hands of the United States to control the sea and thus be able to move its forces to the rescue.

A TWO-WAR LESSON

The history of two wars shows that the democratic world no longer can rely primarily upon relatively small countries adjacent to potential aggressors as sources of shipping service or naval power in time of war. Also, even in World War No. 1 we found that British shipping and shipbuilding were not adequate to serve the commerce and war effort of the Allies, and that a very large and expensive emergency shipbuilding program had to be undertaken by this country. In an even more serious war we find the British and other foreign merchant marines and shipbuilding capacity even less adequate, due not to any unwillingness to build or operate, but to the fact that Great Britain, Netherlands, Norway, and so forth, simply are not big enough in population or industry to be any longer the primary workshop in any modern war, and with the growth of air power, are exposed to bombing and to "blitz" capture by European enemies.

In spite of considerable efforts, the British Empire has been unable in this war to do more than replace its naval losses. In merchant shipbuilding it has fallen considerably short of such replacement. For obvious reasons the other Allies, of course, can build little in this war. This means that the United States has had to carry by far the greater part of the burden of needed merchant and naval construction and operation, and it has been admitted by British representatives that without our construction, the war must have been lost before now. Fortunate indeed for this country and the United Nations, that due to the broadly conceived Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the United States did have a pattern, its shipbuilders were launching fine modern liners and freighters and these were being ably operated by the American Flag Lines. It was this vital nucleus of experienced management and seagoing personnel that enabled the lines to accept and so creditably discharge the great task so suddenly thrust upon them by the war. For it is a fact, not even yet generally known, that our enormous overseas merchant marine today is being operated for the War Shipping Administration by the private steamship companies.

INFLUENCE IN TIME OF WAR

If we had previously maintained as a national policy a larger active merchant marine and a larger shipbuilding industry, the war might have been won by this time, since it has been the shipping shortage which has until recently prevented full exertion of our strength and allowed our enemies to fortify their conquests so as to make recapture costly in dollars, time, and lives. Of course, as we have pointed out, we could not have maintained, in time of peace, all of the shipping and shipbuilding required to win this war, nor could any other nation maintain this, but we could have gotten off to a running start rather than a walking one and have saved many months in attaining maximum building output and in training crews. Even a month cut off the length of the war would save the Treasury nearly $8,000,000,000.

The primary consideration for the United States is the need for a large merchant fleet in time of emergency. The weak geographic location, relatively small population, and dispersed power of our potential democratic allies in any future war is such that we cannot afford to rely upon them for our defense upon the sea. In any future war the tonnage and shipbuilding facilities of our present allies might easily be seized by an aggressor, and hence considerations of national policy should dictate that the United States maintain in the future, a navy, an air force, and a merchant marine fully adequate in themselves to maintain us successfully in any emergency which might arise.

EFFECT ON FOREIGN SHIPPING

By maintaining a large share of world shipping and shipbuilding in the future we will, of course, decrease the potential shipping and shipbuilding of other countries. Had this been done in previous years, both our present allies and our present enemies would have had less tonnage, but on net balance our allies would have benefited because a larger proportion of world tonnage would have been in United Nations hands. There is an apparent conflict in this matter between the short-term interests of the British, Norwegians, Netherlanders, and other allies and their long-term interests. A smaller American merchant marine in time of peace means more dollars to foreign shipping interests, and yet in time of war it may mean ruin to our allies and ourselves not to have the United States strong at sea. This dilemma has been frankly faced by Sir Arthur Salter, head of the British Shipping Mission, who recently reminded Parliament that the American merchant marine should not be looked upon as something which threatened British interests but as an instrument which had three times in this war saved the British Empire from destruction.

We believe that if our own statesmen and our foreign friends bear in mind that this world is not yet perfect and that some other Hitler may arise in the future, they will scarcely desire to limit the American merchant marine. Unless we maintain powerful naval forces, and a merchant marine large enough to make such forces effective, any major war which may be fought in the future may either be fought on our own soil or else may see the destruction, one by one, of our Allies and friends elsewhere, for lack of ability on our part to reach them in time. A larger American merchant marine is necessary as national insurance and what we will have to pay to keep the policy effective is only an insignificant fraction of the sums which our neglect of American shipping has cost us twice in 25 years.

This war has shown that at sea in any future conflict we must depend upon ourselves rather than upon allies; that maintaining a large merchant marine in time of peace is cheaper than improvising one in a national emergency, and that the high cost of building and operating American tonnage as compared with foreign tonnage is something which we will simply have to endure in the same fashion that we endure the cost of maintaining a preponderant air force and navy.

NEED TO INCREASE WORLD TRADE

We realize that to maintain a large American merchant marine will involve expense to the American Government, since we pay our sailors and shipyard workers much more than similar workers get abroad. We also realize that we must operate our ships in order to have them effective for emergency use, since although it is possible to lay up tonnage it is not possible to lay up skilled sailors. This means that we must carry a larger amount of world trade than in 1939, and unless means can be found for increasing the total of world trade—which is the statesmanlike thing to do—that this will mean fewer dollars earned by foreign shipping companies.

A calculation prepared by the Department of Commerce shows that foreign countries had average net earnings of only some $40,000,000 per annum from the United States through shipping services in pre-war years. This is mentioned here to show the insignificant nature of this economic factor as compared with the costs incurred in national defense. A slight increase in American tourist travel abroad or a decrease in our tariffs would easily make up for any loss experienced by foreign countries through our maintenance in future of a merchant marine adequate for our defense and the general defense of the democratic world.

The Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Forty-Million-Dollar Lesson," by Alvaro Facio, published in the March 1944 issue of the Inter-American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY-MILLION-DOLLAR LESSON

(by Alvaro Facio)

A COSTA RICAN TELLS HOW UNITED STATES ARMY ENGINEERS WASTED MONEY, MEN, AND MATERIALS WORKING ON INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

(The editors are convinced after careful and thorough checking that the picture pre-

sented is accurate. The article is not being published for the sake of sensation, but rather in an effort to point out some of the dangers to be avoided in our growing program of hemisphere collaboration.)

Up to June 1942, most of the people of Costa Rica had a warm regard for the democratic principles of the good neighbor to the north, and a high respect for the almost legendary efficiency of the norteamericanos. Since that date, when the United States Army Engineers took up the task of rushing completion of the Inter-American Highway, from the Panama Canal to southern Mexico, my countrymen's faith in the good neighbor policy has gone steadily downhill. General respect and admiration for the norteamericanos, based on hearsay, has been changed by first-hand contact to bewilderment, to contempt, and in some cases to hatred.

There are only two reasons for this situation, both simple ones. The first lies in the kind of men who were brought from the United States to work on the highway; the second, in the colossal waste which was part of every operation, every cost sheet that I saw, every report that I heard, during my employment by the Army engineers.

When military necessity demands speed, it is not possible to find a diplomat to drive every tractor. Yet it would not have taken much time to impress on each man that he was being hired for work in someone else's country, and that he would do well to observe at least the fundamental customs of the land. That simple step would have speeded up the job tremendously by insuring good morale among the Costa Rican laborers, who are not unique in working better under reasonable and humane conditions than under rough treatment.

Instead, most of the United States contractors to whom the Army gave contracts for various stretches of the road hired anybody who would walk into their offices in the United States and say he was a truck or tractor driver, mechanic, welder, dragline operator, or carpenter. Apparently little effort was made to check the records of the men hired. I was told by one man on the job that he had been a soda jerker and had never been on a tractor in his life until he was landed in Costa Rica. That man and many like him were getting $1.80 an hour (plus time and a half for about 30 weekly hours of overtime), and food and shelter for learning to drive a tractor while the United Nations waited for the road to be finished. Most of the foremen and some of the superintendents I came in contact with seemed to have no greater knowledge of highway construction than the soda jerker.

This type of incompetence, being widespread, caused bewilderment and first doubts of yanqui efficiency among my countrymen. But the contempt and hatred grew from the attitude of the norteamericanos toward the Costa Ricans. The laborers were generally treated as a low species of animal. If an order spoken in English was not understood, it was shouted, presumably on the theory that any man can understand English if the speaker yells loud enough. When the yells failed, the laborer was sometimes shoved roughly toward his task.

Though there were available many experienced Costa Rican truck and tractor drivers out of work, the contractors on the highway would not hire them except as common labor. The reason? The good neighbors from the north refused to work with the inferior "natives."

A number of my friends and I were employed in professional capacities such as office engineers, surveymen, radio operators, draftsmen, auditors, paymasters, but to most of the norteamericanos we were "spicks" and "jigs." Though all of us had college educations and thought ourselves fully the social equal of the average United States truck driver, we were forced to eat at separate mess tables, to use different bunkhouses and washrooms. It was not uncommon for one of the truck-driving aristocracy to yell at us in the mess hall to "stop talking that damn spick and talk English."

The Army engineers, who were in charge of all jobs, apparently never made any serious or consistent effort to control this discrimination. Since that year of work on the Inter-American Highway represented the only contact of hundreds of my countrymen with people of the United States, perhaps they may be pardoned for feeling skeptical about their good neighbors.

The waste of time, money, and material might be considered none of my business, since the Army engineers were spending North American money. However, that waste so influenced Costa Rican popular opinion about the United States that I feel it should be discussed. Moreover, as an engineering student I was taught that an ethical engineer does the best possible job with the least possible waste, and I protest against any operation reflecting discredit on my profession.

Each contractor was given a cost-plus contract, which would enable him to spend any amount of money on his section of the road and still make a profit. He was also given a high priority to buy any equipment he wanted to build a road through country he had never seen. Every piece of equipment was to draw a high rental from the Army. Naturally the contractors bought every conceivable type of machinery, since they didn't know what they might need. There was no evidence that the Army engineers made any effort to supervise the type or amount of equipment purchased. In addition, some of the contractors sent down equipment that was completely worn out and unusable. Rental was paid on such equipment as if it were new.

There is no reliable estimate of what percentage of the equipment shipped was excess or unsuitable; but at El Volcán, Panama, where I last worked on the highway, there was much brand new road-building machinery which had never been uncrated, on which the Army had paid rental for many months. Specific examples are two large Euclid dump trucks which were towed to the job site in February 1942. Neither of these trucks turned a wheel until the last of September. Their original price was about $14,000 each, and during their months of idleness each one drew a total of about $11,000 rental. Wheeled road scrapers, which were rarely used, drew rental at about the same rate. Tractors, many of which were used, cost $4,500 originally, drew up to $9,700 in rental, to which was added approximately $2,000 for an overhaul job. It must not be forgotten that in addition to these rates, the Army furnished all fuel, oil, repair parts, and labor, and shipped the machines down in the first place.

In the section of the project with which I was familiar there were four divisions, San Isidro and Golfito in Costa Rica, and El Volcán and Concepción in Panama. Equipment rental alone for one division came to about $22,000 a week.

A surplus of material is, of course, desirable in any operation of military necessity, and one could feel more complacent about idle labor and machinery if that in use had been used efficiently. That it was not, seemed to be equally the fault of the contractors and the Army engineers.

A good example of inefficient distribution was the use of men at San Isidro. Twenty-odd truck and tractor drivers, electricians, mechanics—a full maintenance and operating force—arrived at San Isidro during the latter half of 1942. No equipment was sent up to them until the middle of May 1943. During that time they worked, not very enthusiastically, as laborers. Most of these men were getting $1.55 an hour. Some of them got $1.80. A few drew $1.05, the minimum pay for North Americans. Costa Rican labor would have done the same work at 50 to 60 cents, United States, per day.

Southern Costa Rica is chopped up into a crazy pattern of steeply rising mountains, deep valleys, hills, ravines, and gulches which can hardly be imagined by anyone who has not seen the country. The whole is covered with dense forest and jungle. Nevertheless, inland from Golfito, where a feeder road was being built eventually to connect with the highway, the contractor was trying to use a great 18-cubic-yard 6-wheel dump truck. Rental was about $1,800 a month on the 40-foot monster, which could no more maneuver in that region than a horse can turn around in a filing cabinet. The machine spent about half its time in the ditch, most of the other half being slowly filled by the tiny three-fourths-yard shovel, which took 22 minutes to load it.

Capt. Mariano Menaza chartered his 500-ton steamer *Don Rafael* to the Army in the middle of September 1943, at $500 a day plus expenses. The *Don Rafael* lay at Puntarenas for 1 month and 4 days without lifting anchor. It then made one trip with virtually no cargo to Puerto Armuelles, Panama, about an 18-hour trip. On the return trip the ship carried around 30 contractors' men and Army engineers—no cargo. Captain Menaza obtained release from the charter so that he could put his ship back in the island trade.

The San José office force, including officer engineers, draftsmen, bookkeepers, clerks, stenographers, and so forth, consisted of more than 175 people. Most of these individuals did very little work, simply because there was not enough work to keep so many people busy.

When it became evident that many more men had been imported than could be used, neither the Army nor contractors made any attempt to weed out the troublemakers, loafers, drunks, and incompetents, and send them back to the States, though the 6 months' contracts stated that drunkenness, insurbordination, or incompetence would cancel the contract.

Urged to send certain men home for the good of the job, the Army engineers said that it was "too expensive." Fare to Los Angeles or New York is under $150. Yet most of these men averaged more than $125 a week, not counting the expensive tinned food which they consumed.

Despite this extravagance with money, equipment, and men, the Army engineers would have had much to show for their efforts if they had been willing to ask advice of engineers, both North American and Costa Rican, who had studied local construction problems for years and who knew the region intimately. But the Army engineers, few of whom knew anything at all about the country, not only did not seek advice, they generally scorned it when it was offered.

The United States Public Roads Administration has been working in Costa Rica since 1932, and rare indeed are cases of bad feeling between their staff and my countrymen. They employ in their San José office around 30 people (to the Army's 175), mostly Costa Ricans. They have accomplished excellent results, building slowly, because they have lacked money and equipment. But the roads they build stay built, and when they spend money, there is more road to show for it. It is unfortunate that among many Costa Ricans the United States is judged by the Army's much larger operation.

The Army did accept the maps and surveys of the United States Public Roads people, who have done a thorough and efficient job of mapping the area, but these maps were disregarded as often as not. The Public Roads people even sent a man to flag, or mark with stakes, the line they had decided upon after years of work in the region. The Army surveyors followed the Public Roads line only when it pleased them. They tried to take the road over mountains when it would have been cheaper, easier, and quicker

to take it around. They got little stretches of road partly finished, only to have the rains wash them away. In flat country, sometimes they built the road in unnecessary curves when a straight line would have saved time and money.

All this might have been justified if the Army had finished the highway. But in southern Costa Rica, in the 99 miles from San Isidro to the Panamanian border, there is not one mile of usable road. There is not even a roadbed which the public roads engineers can use in continuing their painstaking work. Road engineers with more experience than I have and whose opinions I respect, estimate that the Army spent about $10,000,000 in this region. No one but the contractors and the imported North American labor have benefited.

The approximately 100 men who were working out of Golfito built in 1 year 5 miles of all-weather road. This starts 10 miles inland at the railhead of the United Fruit Railway. The road, which was to connect with the highway, ends abruptly in the jungle, and within a year of the time this is written the jungle will have reclaimed every foot of it.

There is ample proof that all these errors of operation could have been avoided. For example, the United States Air Forces rushed to completion installations in Central America a few years ago. Men of the Army Air Forces, both enlisted men and officers, are constantly in and out of San Jose, and relations between them and the Costa Ricans are excellent.

It is true that I saw the darkest possible side of the picture, for the stretch of country where I worked is the worst part of the entire Inter-American Highway route. I understand that the Army and the contractors did much better in Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and northern Costa Rica, where the going is not so tough. They are said to have built some stretches of road within a reasonable figure, if not always on a reasonable line.

When the Army went into the job, there were 625 miles of road to build. The Army Engineers' office claims to have completed 311 miles of standard, all-weather road and 137 miles of substandard all-weather road, plus considerable clearing of the right-of-way and grading.

North and Central American engineers tell me that of the Army's construction, more nearly 200 miles are usable and possible to link up with the rest of the highway. It is problematical how much of the clearing and grading can be salvaged by the Public Roads Administration, since a good deal of it is off their line. In addition, much of the grading done by the Army on the highway line will be washed away during the approaching rainy season, before the Public Roads people can complete these stretches.

The Army Engineers spent about $40,000,000 on the project. Arbitrarily allowing a generous ten million for the salvageable clearing and grading, the cost of the remaining 200 miles of completed useful road comes to $150,000 per mile.

Road construction is high in Central America, but not that high. A good average figure, including the worst and best stretches, is about $40,000 per mile. Experienced engineers have estimated that the terrible 99 miles from San Isidro to the Panamanian border should cost about $7,500,000, or $75,000 per mile, for a 19-foot wide, all-weather oiled road.

It is difficult for a North American to realize what that highway means to Central America. We are five little countries, and only two, Guatemala and El Salvador, are connected by road. The rest of us sit isolated in our mountains, dependent on slow transportation by water or expensive transportation by air. Our country people have no quick way of getting their produce to market, and cattle from our grazing regions lose much of their weight and value before they arrive at a selling place.

Education of our rural populations is difficult and slow because we cannot reach them except at great effort and expense. There is no true interchange of ideas among the remaining three nations because the air and shipping lines are North American, bringing mostly North American ideas. It can perhaps be understood that we are deeply disappointed to see our dream again dissolve when it could so easily have come true.

I am more fortunate than most of my countrymen in having been able to live and study in the United States. I know that most of the North Americans are friendly, generous, and democratic. I know that the fabulous yanqui efficiency is no myth, for I have seen the tremendous things it has accomplished in your country. I have brought up these unpleasant things about the highway not to be a sorehead, but in the hope that some of those who read this article will investigate the facts and take steps to see that the North Americans will not again have their money needlessly wasted and their reputation damaged by irresponsible people.

Letter From Constituent Serving Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I know every Member of the House likes to have first-hand information from men and women now serving in our Army and Navy. The following letter is from a constituent of mine now serving overseas. His letter contains food for thought:

ENGLAND, *January 20, 1944.*

DEAR FOLKS: How is everything at home? No letters for a couple of days, now. I suppose it is this damnable dock strike. They sort of picked a tender place to put their knife this time, didn't they? It sure does show their friendship for the services. Boys in camp get as many as 20 letters at once, after waiting a week or more. I suppose the strikers will get a pat on the back instead of a couple of months in clink. Oh, well, it's none of my business, I suppose. I just make 60 bucks a month, and the United States Government doesn't like us to strike. Why should I get peeved if a bunch of men(?) who make that, and a good deal more, a week back in the States feel they have the right to stop mail delivery to get a few more dollars a week? Tell me, do they put the extra money into bonds?

Also this: What are you going to do about it, and the hundred of circumstances like it? The fishing strikes in Massachusetts, the coal strikes in Pennsylvania. We can't do anything except sweat out the next one. You people at home are the ones that have the power to make it a capital offense. We hear that the public kicks about being called complacent. All right, if they aren't that, they must have the well-known "don't give a damn" attitude. Well, if they don't care, we do. God knows our position here in E. T. O. isn't tough like the boys in Italy or the ones fighting Tojo. Still we do have one thing in common—we want to come home. It's the folks back there that will bring us home quickly or keep us away indefinitely. Our squawk can only reach home on paper. Yours can go as far as you want to push it. My feeling in the matter is just exactly this: If any member of my family was involved in a strike or a let-down in production, I would never recognize him or her as a relative again. I'll close now, and pray that the board of censors will let this pass to where it will do some good.

Please, sir, let this through.
All the love in a son's heart.

DICK.

St. Lawrence Seaway Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is very significant to note on March 15–16, 1944, the State Legislature of the Empire State of New York adopted a resolution by unanimous vote declaring for the prompt development of the St. Lawrence River.

This resolution refers to the bill introduced by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont—S. 1385. Senator AIKEN's bill is a companion bill and identical in its language with a bill introduced on March 23, 1943, by myself, and the number is H. R. 2280, which bill is now pending before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the House of Representatives.

Many, of course, recall that in the Seventy-seventh Congress the Rivers and Harbors Committee acted favorably on this seaway power project after hearings extending over a period of many months.

For reasons I do not here relate the St. Lawrence seaway power project, which was included in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill, was never permitted to come on the floor of the House for a vote.

I am very glad to note the action taken by the New York Legislature. This resolution was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator AIKEN on March 22, 1944. In this connection, I wish to call attention to resolutions adopted unanimously at a meeting held at Massena, N. Y., March 30, 1944, attended by mayors, individual members of boards of supervisors, the legislature, and the chambers of commerce in northern New York. Those resolutions are as follows:

Whereas the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce and its membership are vitally interested in the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project; and

Whereas the welfare of the people of the State of New York is directly concerned in the successful completion of the project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will remove the last major obstacles to deep-draft navigation throughout the Great Lakes system to the Atlantic Ocean and the ports of the world; and

Whereas the same development will simultaneously make available 1,100,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity, under a self-liquidating State power project; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15–16, 1944, by unanimous vote adopted a resolution declaring that this State urgently requires the prompt

development of the St. Lawrence to furnish low-cost power to millions of industrial, rural, commercial, and domestic consumers; and

Whereas the Aiken bill, S. 1385, is now pending before the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, under which those benefits may be realized without further delay: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the State of New York, representing a score of separate communities and civic and trade organizations throughout the St. Lawrence Valley, declares its unqualified support of this project as an imperative necessity for post-war reconstruction in this area, and for the future balanced growth and development of the entire Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we appeal for the immediate enactment of the Aiken bill, S. 1385, authorizing the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development, as a post-war project, and strongly urge the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of New York and the Congress of the United States to give this measure their active support.

Mr. Speaker, it is to the everlasting credit of the people of northern New York to continue the fight which they have carried on over a long period of time in support of a project that will contribute to the welfare of every man and woman not only in New York but throughout the country.

I also wish to quote the address of Senator Rhoda Fox Graves, chairman of the committee on agriculture, in the New York State Legislature, March 15, 1944, in support of the Graves-Daniels concurrent resolution recommending prompt measures for development of the St. Lawrence River:

The adoption of the concurrent resolution will simply place the Legislature of the State of New York on record in favor of the prompt, post-war development and utilization of our unrivalled water-power resources.

The State's program for the conservation and use of these rich resources, under the inalienable ownership of the people of the State of New York, had its inception under the administrations of Gov. Theodore Roosevelt and Gov. Charles E. Hughes. We now have an opportunity to carry that program to a fruition—which has been long overdue—under the broad policies of post-war reconstruction outlined under the leadership of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

Development of our water-power resources on the St. Lawrence River is today a matter of urgent public need, recognized and confirmed by every wartime experience of production in this section and in other sections of the United States and Canada. We must carry this program forward to serve the following purposes:

1. To bring cheap power to the industries and to the farms of the State so that we may maintain profitable production after the war on a parity with other areas which have already greatly expanded their water-power development.

2. To bring low-cost hydroelectricity to the more than 4,000,000 domestic, rural, and small commercial consumers in New York State, who are today paying charges for electric service running, in some cases, more than 100 percent above the charges for the same service in other areas.

3. To make available to our people a sufficient supply of hydroelectricity at a cost low enough to encourage increased consumption and bring electrical appliances within the reach of millions of homemakers in the cities and on the farms of New York State.

4. To place an abundant supply of low-cost hydroelectric power at the disposal of new industries and new enterprise, so that our returning service men and women will find enlarged opportunities for profitable employment here at home, and will not be obliged to follow out of New York State the industries which have been transferring their expansion programs to areas which have enormous blocks of low-cost power to offer from their developed water-power resources.

5. To put a stop to the prodigal waste involved in letting 1,100,000 horsepower on the St. Lawrence River rush unharnessed to the sea, while we continue to import immense quantities of coal, oil, and other exhaustible natural resources into this State for consumption as fuel in steam power plants, thus contributing to recurring fuel shortages and high fuel prices.

There is another urgent reason why the Legislature of the State of New York should at this time go on record in unmistakable terms in favor of the development of our great water power resources.

A bill has been introduced in the United States Senate (S. 1385), by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN of Vermont providing for the development of the St. Lawrence River in cooperation with our neighbor and ally, the Dominion of Canada. This bill provides for construction of the power development in New York in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, as a State project under State ownership and control. This project will be entirely self-liquidating. Every penny of the cost of the development will be paid out of revenues from the sale of power, without any burden whatever upon the taxes or credit of the State, under the terms of the Aiken bill. This bill, moreover, fixes a ceiling of $93,375,000 on the costs to be assumed by the power authority of the State of New York, so that it will be possible to make this hydroelectricity available to our people, on a parity with the costs enjoyed today on the Pacific coast, in Canada, and in other areas.

The Aiken bill is based upon an agreement with the Dominion of Canada which provides for the completion of the St. Lawrence development by 1949. This agreement and the pending bill carry out the terms of earlier accords recommended and initiated by President Coolidge and President Hoover and both have been approved by a nonpartisan vote of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the last Congress, after extended investigation and public hearings.

The adoption of the pending resolution will serve notice that New York desires, and is determined to obtain, the full benefit of the development of its water power resources, as a State project, under State ownership and control. In 1940, again in 1942, and in subsequent public statements Governor Dewey has consistently gone on record in favor of the St. Lawrence project. In 1942 its completion was pledged in the Democratic and American Labor Party State platforms. We should act, and act now, consistent with the redemption of these pledges, to give New York State parity in cheap power supply with other areas, to insure a place for our great water power resources in the Nation-wide programs for post-war development now in the making, in the interest of our agriculture, our manufacturers, our service men and all our people.

Warning From Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Missoula Sentinel, Missoula, Mont., of March 25, 1944:

WARNING FROM FARLEY

"Liberty and good government," said James A. Farley, erstwhile chairman of the Democratic National Committee and former Postmaster General, in a St. Patrick's day address, "are not lost in sudden cataclysms. Political cave-ins occur only where the ground is soft. It is the erosion and rotting of the ground that really do the damage. And the pity of it is that few are sensitive enough in eye or ear to perceive what is going on. * * *

"One symptom is carelessness with the truth. Political adventurers are past masters on the art of manipulating language so that the false that serves their purpose is presented to the people rather than the truth that does not serve them so well. It is not only a matter of direct falsehood, but of suppression of truth, and the suggesting of the false by adroit phrasing and implication. * * *

"Another symptom is lack of moral scruple—a lax willingness to let expediency be the guide to all political action. If there is an advantage to be gained, do not be restrained by any moral principle binding in conscience, for there is no such thing. Take whatever action will gain your end. Here I remember one example so apt that I cannot resist the temptation of citing it. A former official who represented the Government in tax matters said that if to win a tax case for the Government on Monday he had to claim that a certain principle was true, and if, to win another tax case on Tuesday, he had to protest that the same principle was completely false, he would not hesitate to do both.

"A third symptom: Abject reliance of the citizen on the state. To put it in Biblical terms, a willingness to sell your political soul for a mess of economic pottage. This is beyond question the most serious of all discernible tendencies in modern states, including our own. The hard fact is that nowhere, in politics, economics, or anywhere else, do you get something for nothing. It is the third temptation of Christ all over again.

"Thus it happens that the public conscience becomes debauched and whole peoples sell themselves, imperceptibly but irrevocably, into bondage. We have seen it happen in our own time."

And there is danger that it will happen in our own America. There are those who are tempting us with the kind of promises that Hitler held out to his own countrymen to sell our birthright for security—most likely the security of the politicians. Mr. Farley knows probably as well as anyone the mechanism and the working processes of the particular kind of government under which we are operating at present and have been in the immediate past. He is warning us against acceptance of the pottage that is being offered. Bondage to the state lies at the end of the road.

Farm Security Administration Activities in the State of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit some very interesting information relative to the Farm

Security Administration activities in Michigan.

The following schedule is broken down into congressional districts, and shows the number of families that Farm Security Administration has helped, the amount of loan funds advanced, the repayments made, and so forth. No reference is made in these compilations to the five-hundred-odd families in Michigan that have been able to join cooperatives through Farm Security Administration participation loans, nor to the families helped through feed and seed loans during the drought years.

Report as of Dec. 31, 1943, on Farm Security Administration activities in region II (Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin)

MICHIGAN

Congressional district	Number families helped through rural rehabilitation loans [1]	Rural rehabilitation loan funds advanced	Principal repaid rural rehabilitation	Number farm ownership loans made [2]	Farm ownership loan funds advanced	Principal repaid, farm ownership
1, 13, 14, 15, 16	269	$125,491	$73,342	0	$2,490	$19
2	950	756,897	443,087	21	188,233	24,477
3	1,570	1,721,479	958,368	86	381,186	24,124
4	2,363	1,877,177	1,032,216	42	252,515	26,681
5	706	374,799	233,517	8	48,914	3,967
6	652	619,877	327,075	32	159,110	22,990
7	1,311	1,250,040	720,065	47	390,995	34,211
8	1,758	1,690,773	971,276	113	711,767	76,481
9	1,863	1,180,807	742,370	35	70,473	1,801
10	2,919	1,519,451	881,739	35	169,607	28,737
11	2,468	2,272,348	1,179,299	126	357,141	25,225
12	1,082	687,075	421,634	50	80,721	12,592
17	293	225,981	128,003	0	0	0
Total, Michigan	18,204	14,302,195	8,111,991	595	2,813,152	281,305
Total, Region II [3]	105,485	59,299,220	34,159,397	3,421	13,343,870	1,606,538

[1] Rehabilitation (chattel operating loans).
[2] Farm ownership (real-estate loans).
[3] Region II comprised of States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, Milwaukee, Wis.

Adjudicating Claims by the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made on more than one occasion to the delay by the Veterans' Administration in adjudicating claims. The Administration has done its best to speed up all settlement of claims referred to it. The following remarks by Mr. Fulton R. Lewis, Jr., made over the Mutual network on March 27, will be encouraging to Members of the House who have been concerned about this problem for the past several months. After listening to Mr. Lewis' broadcast, I cannot help but feel that while there may be some isolated cases of unnecessary delay, on the whole the Veterans' Administration is to be commended for the way it has cleaned up the huge backlog of cases on file just a few short months ago.

I told you on leaving Washington 3 weeks ago that there were two subjects into which I wanted to do some first-hand probing on this trip. One was the question of Federal Government housing, and on that subject I have given you almost continuous reports all the way from Washington, D. C., to Washington State, thence on down the Pacific coast to the city of Los Angeles. The other was the question of how the Government is treating the men who are injured and disabled in this war which we are now fighting, what is happening to those men when they are mustered out of actual service back into private life, whether they are being taken care of promptly and their cases being settled by the Veterans' Administration in Washington, whether their pensions and disability allowances are being paid to them promptly by the Government so that they can have a chance to get themselves reoriented in the world of private enterprise, or whether, on the other hand, some Washington red-tape expert is holding up allowances, making them shift for themselves while Washington makes up its mind at leisure to settle their cases.

Some 4 or 5 months ago I mentioned that problem over this microphone, and I asked that any listeners who had personal knowledge of such cases write in and let me know about them, and we would see what we could do. I was rather surprised, frankly, at that time, that there was no appreciable response to that offer. In later conversations, however, with representatives of various national veterans' organizations I was told that there were many cases of that kind actually, and on this particular trip I arranged to have certain veterans' organizations in the various cities in which we were planning to stop prepare some material in advance and to dig out some sample cases, and it was my intention if those cases proved to be true and legitimate on careful investigation by me and my assistant, Fred Morrison, to present those actual cases, perhaps the actual men themselves to you on the air for what they were worth.

One of the veterans' organizations very kindly and cooperatively actually sent an advance man along a large part of the route that we took to coordinate the information that his organizations gathered before that information was turned over to us.

I am very happy to be able to report to you that when it came to the point of actually producing any material and any real cases in which disabled veterans of the war have been unable to get their settlements within a reasonable period of time there was not one single case to be found. The veterans' organizations were not able to produce any; various other sources to which Mr. Morrison and I went on our own responsibility to make our own individual inquiries were unable to produce any cases. There have been plenty of second-hand rumors, but when those rumors were traced down they proved to be otherwise than represented.

I do not mean to say, of course, that that closes the matter. We still are open to all the information that anyone wants to send in and we will investigate every case fully, but it does mean to say that so far as we have been able to establish thus far, the Veterans' Administration in Washington under Gen. Frank T. Hines does most definitely seem to have done a remarkable and highly admirable job, particularly in view of the fact that for many, many months that organization was sorely understaffed and undermanned.

Voting by Milwaukee Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to permit all Members of the House to extend their remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 31, 1944:

VOTING BY MILWAUKEE SOLDIERS

Wisconsin's satisfaction in the fact that it has its own law to register votes from citizens in the armed services, here and abroad, is likely to be seriously disturbed when this spring's election is over. The State's system just cannot take the place of a Federal ballot plan, if such a plan functioned properly, so far as men in overseas service are concerned.

Ballots were mailed out to 30 men in the armed services overseas for the city primary election recently held. Only one of the ballots has so far been returned and that ballot arrived in Italy where the soldier was stationed, 3 days after the primary. Since the law requires that the ballot, properly filled out, be received here before close of the polls on election day, the lone ballot from Italy was of course not counted.

The same thing will probably happen in connection with the election to be held Tuesday. It may be doubted that it will be very different in November. Few soldiers serving overseas will really get to vote for President or anybody else.

A good Federal ballot law would at least have served to guarantee to the great body of servicemen the right to a valid vote for President. The muffing of that law by Congress is one of the unpardonable mistakes of recent months.

There Is a Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for months over the radio, Walter Winchell has been creating class hatred, disunity, giving utterances to false, malicious charges, all designed to create a lack of confidence in the people's Government. Some time ago he sent to Members of Congress a Communist book, perhaps thinking that Congressmen would fall for it. He learned they did not. More recently he has been following the Communist Party line by intimating that Members of Congress were guilty of sedition; that Congress as a whole was not entitled to the people's respect. He called it a "House of Reprehensibles."

Nothing but his egotism and the support of the Jergens Co. which employs him to sell its cosmetics and the curiosity of some members of the public keeps him on the air, unless it be that payment for the radio time he uses is made by interested persons who hate America, its prosperity, the happiness of its people, and its republican form of government.

The fourth-termers, headed by WALLACE, who tells us that a revolution is on its way, have been smearing everyone who showed any signs of effectively criticizing the New Deal.

One division of the smear brigade put its foot in it this week. One of them went a little too far. Some bright man in the War Department thought it could get away with sending to the libraries which furnish books to the men in the Army a certain magazine article which belittled General MacArthur.

MacArthur's gallant defense of the Philippines, his successful campaign to save Australia, the brilliance of his strategy in retaking so many of the Japheld islands in the Southwest Pacific, despite the meagerness of his supplies and his lack of armed forces, has aroused the envy and the jealousy of the New Dealers.

Even the President in his radio talks has withheld deserved commendation which was due MacArthur.

While our boys fought and died in the southern seas and on the islands of those seas, the bulk of our equipment, the majority of our men, were dispatched to the battle of the Atlantic, Africa, and Italy. As Churchill so well said, our sacrifices, our losses, our inability to rescue our men in the Philippines, were due to the diversion of our forces to aid Britain.

But this smear of MacArthur was a little too much and it was promptly in the Senate challenged by Senator VANDENBERG. The New Deal smear artist, caught with his fingers in the wringer, was rebuked by Secretary of War Stimson, who issued an order putting an end, at present at least, to the dissemination of smear literature by those connected with the Army.

It is about time the Navy, having stripped Winchell of his uniform, his pay, and his duties, ousted him from his position as a Reserve officer of the Navy.

The smear artists and some of their gullible listeners and readers have gone too far, and some of those who repeat their sayings, recommend their books and pamphlets, will ultimately hang their heads in shame to think they listened to and passed on such trash.

Senator VANDENBERG performed a signal service when his action forced Secretary of War Stimson to rebuke those who were smearing General MacArthur.

Brumidi's Handiwork in the Capitol Building as Described in Verse by Horace C. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under general permission to extend my remarks, it gives me pleasure to make this statement:

The room in which the Military and Naval Subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations conduct their hearings is the first room in the Capitol Building which the noted Italian artist, Brumidi, decorated with his handiwork. That was back in 1855, and I am sure there is no finer work of its kind to be found in this grand old structure.

The President's room in the Senate side of the building stands also as a monument to this great artist, as do also the receiving room of the Senate, the District of Columbia room, rooms occupied by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, certain of the corridors, and "inside the high top of the dome."

These great works of art have been described and eulogized in verse by the widely known poet, Horace C. Carlisle, a member of the staff of the Architect of the Capitol, and who often has been spoken and written of as the Poet Laureate of Congress.

I have a copy of seven poems Mr. Carlisle has penned on these noted works of Brumidi. I shall include them as a part of these remarks, and express the hope that they may be examined by the Joint Committee on Printing with view to publication as a public document or as a pamphlet for free distribution to the visiting public:

BRUMIDI

(By Horace C. Carlisle)

BRUMIDI'S FIRST EFFORT IN CAPITOL ART

The exiled Italian Brumidi,
Past master in creative art,
Found in this Republic a speedy
Response to the call from his heart—
The Capitol of our young Nation
Was needing a talented man,
One gifted to put in creation
A marvelous artistic plan.

So he, with an urgent ambition
To sing from the walls with his brush
The songs of triumphant tradition
Too richly for hist'ry to hush,
Began, in the southwestern corner
Of our Nation's Capitol, where,
Above the rebuke of the scorner,
He climbed to the glory heights there.

With nature's and history's flowers,
Of which he delighted to dream,
Brumidi spent many grand hours,
Bewildered by their glory gleam,
Until, on the walls and the ceiling
Of this ageless Capitol room,
He lastingly placed them, revealing
American life in full bloom.

He, while learning life's living story
By living so close to the sod,
Caught inspiring glimpses of glory
By lifting his eyes toward his God,
By whom he had been educated
To use his expressible brush
In making what God has created
Sing on, after death whispers "hush."

As long as in grandeur and beauty
The National Capitol stands,
As long as devotion to duty
Stands first in our country's demands,
Brumidi, whose rare art creations
Yet live, to be never outclassed,
Majestic in time's estimations,
Will silently speak from the past.

Like Lincoln, enshrined in the pages
Of history, and in our hearts,
Brumidi "belongs to the ages"—
And his recognized greatness starts
With his first, unfading creation,
In Washington, tactfully planned
To be, throughout time's whole duration,
The Capital of our great land.

THE PRESIDENT'S ROOM IN THE NATIONAL CAPITOL

The gifted Italian Brumidi stands high,
As master of creative art—
He's gone, but those pictures of his occupy
A place in America's heart,
Symbolic of all that's majestic and grand
In our Nation's Capitol, where,
In artistic excellence, with his own hand,
He's written his epitaph there.

The President's room, in the Capitol, is
A monument that has endeared
Brumidi to us, thru those paintings of his,
Which always will make him revered.
The ceiling and walls of this historic room
Here picture America's past,
'Mid rainbows of promises, bursting in bloom,
Whose fragrance is destined to last.

Intelligence, purity, power, and charm,
With faith, hope, and charity, speak
A noble significance, sweet as a psalm,
From faces inspiringly meek,
Creating more hope in America's heart,
Supported by justice and truth,
Suggesting that wisely, thru picturesque art,
She cherish the days of her youth.

The President's room is a choice beauty-spot,
Much prized for its jewels of art
Whose marvels of int'rest are never forgot,
But live, like love's vow, in the heart—
And every American that's ever come
To visit his Capitol, who
Has seen this inspiring, historical room,
Feels Washington's dream coming true.

While manhood and womanhood are pictured there,
Childhood justly predominates,
And Nature's first fruits, as an answer to prayer,
Which she in abundance creates,
Add multiplied beauty and charm to the scene,
That could not by words be expressed,
Inciting emotions, as calm and serene
As hope for the heart that's at rest.

Those wonderful pictures were aptly designed
In every detail in the heart
Of this master-craftsman, who's really enshrined
Himself in his treasures of art.
He lives in his pictures, on Memory's walls,
Which proudly the Nation reveres,
And will, till the curtain of destiny falls
Upon the last vanishing years.

RECEIVING ROOM OF UNITED STATES SENATE

In the National Capitol's northeastern part,
And adjoining their guarded retreat,
Is the mem'rable room, rich in picturesque art,
Where the Senators purposely meet
Their constituents when they inquiringly come
To discuss the great problems that lay
On their minds, in the Land of the Free and the Home
Of the Brave, in this uncertain day.

This Receiving Room owes its American charm
To the tactful Brumidi, whose art
Has inspired proud America to keep a warm
Place for his wonder works in her heart.
No one ever comes into this room, and looks up
At the colorful scene, so sublime,
Without feeling its pictures fill his hopeful cup
With a gratitude that grows, with time.

Tho' Brumidi has long since passed on, still he lives
In his pictures, of national thrift,
As apparently thru them he purposely gives
Aspiration an inspiring lift.
Until Washington fades from America's mind,
And his influence dies in her heart,
And his hopes in oblivion's tomb are enshrined,
Will Brumidi live on, through his art.
Just as actions speak louder than words, to us all,
Pictures tell more than mere letters can,
As they silently speak from the ceiling or wall
To the subconscious heart of a man,
And implant in his mind such historical truth
As should therein be fixed, firm and fast,
To remain, like the things learned in childhood or youth,
Unforgotten on through to the last.

That Brumidi was partial to children we know,
From the fact that they predominate
In the most of his Capitol pictures, which grow
On us there, as beneath them we wait;
But, methinks, next to children, he justly admired
Lovely women, as his pictures prove,
Whom, with his humble brush, he has richly attired
In a beauty that age can't remove.

At the right to the entrance to this royal room,
Overhead, upon its southern wall,
Three immortal Americans seem to assume
Supervision, there, over it all.
Since Brumidi was such a past master of art,
All Americans ought to take pride
In the wonderful works of his mind and his heart,
Which will down through the ages abide.

BRUMIDI IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ROOM

A quarter of a century Brumidi proudly spent
In decorating, in his special way,
The Capitol in pictures, with one purposeful intent
Of painting scenes, to live beyond his day.
His heart within him yearned to leave no stone unturned,
As daily toiled he, with determined zest—
And every small detail he wrought with great concern—
For he did nothing that was not his best.

The District of Columbia Room gives ample evidence
Of his unquestioned mastery of art,
There painted on the ceiling, proving clearly his intents
To fix his pictures in the human heart—
He wished them to remind the wide world of mankind
How great a debt of gratitude we owe
To this great Government, so wondrously designed
That no dictator's voice can overthrow.

"A little child shall lead them" must have sunk into the mind
Of great Brumidi, for the children play
A large part in his paintings, and are artfully enshrined
In District of Columbia Room, where they
Look down on us in love, it seems, from up above,
And lift the meditations of our hearts
To planes of thinking which Brumidi would approve,
For he admired admirers of the arts.

Beneath the paintings on the ceiling, just above each wall,
Of this historic room, one word appears,
Just half-way 'twixt the corners, at the center of it all,
Which widens in its meaning, with the years.
These tactful pictures tell to human hearts quite well
The truths that he determined to impress
There on the people's hearts; for pictures do excel
The printed words whose purposes they stress.

While Physics on the northern wall, expertly painted, shines,
Geography adorns the eastern wall,
Telegraphy the western wall becomingly enshrines,
And Hist'ry tells the story of it all.
No one now living knows just why Brumidi chose
These words, and for what cause he put them there,
And history, till time shall come down to its close,
May never to the wond'ring world declare.

The District of Columbia Room belongs to all the States,
And yet it does, in fact, belong to none—
Herein the District laws are planned, but from it emanates
The rule of conduct for none but its own.
The artist, we presume, resolved to give this room
The very best that it was his to give—
And, through the coming years, down to the day of doom,
In these, his pictures, will Brumidi live.

BRUMIDI'S GONE—HIS WORKS LIVE ON

The Senate's great Committee on Appropriations holds
Its sessions in a chamber which
Unconsciously unfolds
Whole chapters in our history,
As great minds dwell upon
The priceless art productions that
Brumidi's brush has done.

As elsewhere in the Capitol,
Brumidi's works in art,
In many noted places, play
A meritorious part—
The purposed pictures that his hand
Has left upon these walls
Will, in all likelihood, be there
Until time's curtain falls.

Some great historic events
He's pictured with his brush
Upon the walls too feelingly
For time to ever hush—
Yea, pictures speak a language which
The wise and unwise know,
For which Americans praise God
From whom all blessings flow.

Brumidi's wonder works in art
Need no interpreter—
They're understood by every one
Who is a worshipper
Of nature's great creative God,
On whom the great and small,
As they bid life on earth farewell,
Are more than apt to call.

Our military solons were
The favored ones for whom
Brumidi decorated this
Unique committee room—
That's why war scenes predominate,
To signify the fact
That we'll be ready for our foes
Whenever we're attacked.

Brumidi on this masterpiece
Of his could not have smiled
Unless he'd glorified it with
The beauty of a child;
For art, to him, fell short of art,
Unless he found a place
To paint the idol of his heart,
A child's inspiring face.

YES, BRUMIDI IS GONE, BUT HIS PICTURES LIVE ON

Amongst the majestic, immortal productions,
In pictures, by Brumidi's hand,
Adorning the Capitol, none in constructions,
Or beautiful sentiments stand
Above those portrayed in the corridors, reaching
Across it, upon the ground floor,
From its northern entrances, justly beseeching
That we love America more.

Brumidi was master of natural hist'ry—
Through pictures, he, rather than words,
Described, in a manner that still is a myst'ry,
Profusely, the flowers and birds,
And reptiles, and many of God's living creatures,
In whom every scientist prides,
Which elevates him amongst history's teachers
In whose hearts his mem'ry abides.

The walls of these corridors, gleaming with glory,
And ceilings, of perfected hue,
Tell silently there, in his pictures, the story
Of Brumidi's dream, coming true.
What we have achieved, and today are achieving,
And will yet achieve, he has told,
In pictures, from which he'll continue receiving
Just praise from the young and the old.

Brumidi has painted the great occupations
Of men, through the tools they employed,
By which they attained their desired expectations,
Or whereby their foes they destroyed—
These historic pictures nobody can question,
As true as the instinct of birds—
Whole chapters of hist'ry they teach by suggestion,
Through pictures more welcome than words.

He studied the Acts passed by God's Legislature,
And was versed in Natural Law—
By instinct, he followed the teachings of Nature,
As he, with prophetic eye, saw
Far into the future, whose coming expanses,
In this way, he loved to record—
For our works are making us, as time advances,
A Nation whose God is the Lord.

Through Nature, Brumidi beheld God in action—
Her law he resolved to obey;
But God's Divine Law shaped his every transaction,
And kept him from going astray;
While Nature's law guided him in his endeavor
To paint pictures on the stone walls
Of yesterday—and of today and forever—
To live, until time's curtain falls.

BRUMIDI STILL SPEAKS FROM THE CAPITOL DOME

Some things cannot be, irrespective of cost,
Replaced, hence Brumidi's sublime,
Much treasured creations must never be lost,
Nor dimmed by the tarnish of time—
As long as the National Capitol stands,
To which multitudes daily come,
They'll worship the wonderful work of his hands,
Inside the high top of the Dome.

The top of the Dome, through this painting so rare,
Apparently bids us behold
"The glorification of Washington" there,
Uniquely, but graciously told;
For this work of art, representing the birth
Of this great Republic, whose vast
Resources have made it the greatest on earth,
Illumines its pioneer past.

Surrounded by virgins that there represent
The Thirteen Original States,
George Washington, ready to spend and be spent
For his Nation's welfare, awaits
The growth of its Government which, as he'd planned
And hoped for, at some future day,
Would meet every need of this law-loving land,
In justice's peaceable way.

When he had completed the scene 'neath the Dome,
Brumidi instinctively felt,
Perhaps, that his masterpiece was yet to come,
As he went to work on the belt
Around the Rotunda, there on the inside,
Half-way from the circular floor,
Methinks, with a feeling of national pride
That he'd never felt theretofore.

Brumidi, when he had perfected his plan,
And on his new task had begun,
According to trustful tradition, began
To meditate proudly upon
The perfect fulfillment of his master-dream—
But fell from his scaffolding there,
Yet caught and held on, with a power supreme,
Till rescued from his fatal scare.

His artist-assistant was then deputized
To finish this great work of art,
Which brilliant Brumidi had aptly devised,
And made a most promising start;
But he left the work—when death folded his hands—
Unfinished, just as it appears,
Which may stand unfinished, as it today stands,
Unchanged, through the challenging years.

Here and There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to typical New Deal waste, inefficiency, and disregard for constitutional government has been so often expressed that some folks consider my statements biased. So, once again let me quote a New Dealer who has never wavered in his unquestioning support of the President's words and acts.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is 78 years old; he has served in the House 38 years; he is a vigorous, persistent advocate of a fourth term. On April 3 he just could not take it any longer. The press quotes him as stating that Secretary of War Stimson and high military officials have "30,000 officers sitting around in cocktail lounges with nothing to do."

Then he made this assertion:

They were appointed to give them some kind of prestige, but the Army cannot find jobs for them. * * * The cocktail lounges all over the country are full of them.

An unequivocal charge made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that 30,000 individuals were given rank, uniform and compensation for no purpose other than to add to their standing and importance.

Never once has any criticism of the Army or the Navy been uttered by me. But here is a man who insists we must give the Commander in Chief, who is responsible for the conditions which exist, a fourth term. Nothing will be gained by discharging the subordinates, keeping the big boss. If the gentleman's charge is true, then we need another Commander in Chief.

TOO FEW THERE

There may be too many high ranking officials hanging around the cocktail lounges in Washington. I do not know. There are too few fighting men on some battlefronts. MacArthur never has had either all the men or the munitions he needed, though he has fought, if the press statements be true, a winning battle.

Here in Washington a wife just let me read part of a letter from her husband who is with the Coast Artillery, antiaircraft division, at Anzio. He enlisted in 1941 as a private; he is now a first lieutenant. As his unit was being shelled he wrote:

You know I've changed so much I don't even like myself any more. Sat in a beat-up chapel today and tried to figure myself and the world out. Got nowhere; sometimes wonder if I'll ever finish these letters I write to you. Shell just landed and shook the place up. This living so close to death for long periods does strange things; some crack up and go back as neurotics; some think it out and say "What the h——" and start to ignore the whole thing; don't decide anything—just wait and believe that it can't happen to them. Most, I believe, fall into a class with me; I hate it; I want to live, and at times I'm desperately afraid—and I know that I can be hurt or killed—that's a lot of nonsense about believing that it won't happen to you. We just go on and do our jobs hoping that it will be someone else. You feel sorry for the guys when they get it, but in the back of your mind you're saying "Thank God, it wasn't me." Damn, another close one; thought it was coming right in with me. Anyway, I look a little different. I'm thin now, much thinner than you have ever seen me. At times I look at myself and it scares me. Little lines here and there, and my eyes are old; and my mind, God, I don't think the same about anything. I have no respect for property; I've taken an ax to furniture for firewood; and, oh, I'm mixed up. You are about the only thing that remains the same.

Another boy just back from the Italian front, war-shocked, said there were five Germans to every Allied soldier on that battlefront. If his statement is true, if there are 30,000 officers in cocktail lounges, then there are too many in uniform here, too few aiding those who are doing the actual fighting there.

Let me repeat a previous statement. There is too much "playing at war"; too much make-believe here in Washington; too much government by men, rather than by law; too little "equal justice under law." At least a little more effort on our part is needed.

Investigation of Small-Loan Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in the San Antonio, Tex., division of the United States district court a secret grand jury session, which started November 29, 1943, is being held under the antitrust laws of the national chain small-loan companies that operate under the Uniform Small Loan Act of the Russell Sage Foundation, as well as those that are operating under any illegal scheme or device that can be found for them to operate under. What is hereinafter said is not to be construed to be in criticism of the just-mentioned investigation. However, it does seem cogent to inquire why such an investigation should be circumscribed to the narrowness of the antitrust laws and isolated in Texas.

On June 27, 1941, I introduced House Resolution 251 for the purpose of investigating the small-loan racket. Another such resolution will be introduced by me. The following facts are part of those upon which I shall ask the approval of the Rules Committee and the House for the said resolution.

The only persons that can explain the condition and the facts that have led up to it are those that are solely responsible for them. These persons are: Mr. Leon Henderson, former Price Administrator; Mr. Rolf Nugent, former O. P. A. official; Mr. Frank Hubachek, the law firm of Hubachek and Kelly, attorneys for the Household Finance Co.; Mr. Byrd Henderson, president of Household Finance Co.; Mr. Charles Watts, president of the Beneficial Industrial Loan Co. of Newark, N. J.; Mr. Jackson R. Collins, attorney for the Beneficial, and Mr. Edmond Ruffin Beckwith, former attorney for the Beneficial of New York and now the "Moses" for the Beneficial and the small loan interests in the American Bar Association; Mr. P. B. Leverich, western director of the Beneficial located in Los Angeles; Mr. L. J. Styskal, sometime attorney for the Household Finance Co., local loan company of Chicago; and the King, Ogden, Taylor group of Atlanta, Wilmington, Nashville, Miami, New York, and Boston; Mr. Rufus Dewitt King, Miami, Fla.; Mr. John M. Ogden, Miami, Fla.; Mr. Jerry H. Taylor, Atlanta, Ga. These three men own or control the Family Finance Co. of Wilmington, Del., the Miller Management of Nashville, Tenn., the Security Bankers Operating Bureau, the United Operating Bureau and many other so-called management

companies, all of which are engaged in the small-loan racket. Mr. Fred Snite and Thomas Griffin of the local loan company of Chicago; Mr. Licthenstien of the loan company of St. Louis; and Mr. Snow, their attorney.

The Remedial Loans Division of the Russell Sage Foundation has had as its directors for the past many years, Mr. Leon Henderson and Mr. Rolf Nugent. Actually, the Russell Sage Foundation is not in the loan business. It only sponsors the so-called 42-percent per annum uniform small-loan act and specifically and generally its attitude is that it is the only authentic and recognized factual and statistical agency for the small loan and consumer credit business of the Nation.

The national regulation of small loans is at the present time, and has been since the middle of 1941, under the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board under regulation W. Whatever type of small loan a loan concern makes, the Federal Reserve Board licenses them. Mr. Frank Hubachek, Mr. Leon Henderson, and Mr. Rolf Nugent are purportedly the authors of the Executive order that created the Federal Reserve Board as the licensing and supervising agency. Likewise, they and the others heretofore mentioned were largely responsible for the rules and regulations thereunder. If not actually so, their attitudes and opinions were reflected through Mr. Leon Henderson, Mr. Hubachek, and Dr. Rolf Nugent.

In the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 1941, and September 16, 1941, entitled "Consumer Credit Loan Conditions," I set out in detail how borrowers were manipulated both under the Uniform Small Loan Act and under the high-rate or 250 percent per annum scheme then, as now, being operated widely throughout the United States. King, Ogden, Taylor, and at least some of the aforementioned firms are still operating under this method, and are licensed to do so by the Federal Reserve Board. Returning now to Mr. Leon Henderson, when he was director of the Remedial Loans Division of the Russell Sage Foundation: In the late 1920's Mr. Leon Henderson brought about the arrest in Raleigh, N. C., of one Harry Drake of Chicago, who was operating somewhere around a hundred 240 percent per annum offices throughout the Nation with the total capitalization of around a million dollars. On this million dollars, Drake was netting over a million a year. Drake received a year's jail sentence for violation of the laws of North Carolina. This sentence was suspended, it is understood, due to negotiations of Mr. Leon Henderson, which provided in substance Mr. Drake retire from the loan business and the further condition that Mr. Drake was to sell out his national chain of offices to Rufus Dewitt King, John M. Ogden, et al. It was further required of Mr. Drake that he not oppose the passage of the Uniform Small Loan Act in any State, nor was he to engage in the small loan business, nor was he to molest King and company in the continued operation of the 240 percent per annum offices purchased from him. Mr. Leon Henderson and the gentlemen just mentioned in Household and Beneficial Industrial Loan Co. were all a part of the agreement to let Mr. King so operate the old Drake offices for a specified period of time. As late as the latter part of 1943, Mr. King et al. was still operating the offices and is now operating a goodly number of them, and under the same tactics and charges as Drake used.

Under some guise or another, these same offices are being operated nationally in Missouri, Nevada, Montana, Kansas, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Oregon, and many other States. In the latter part of 1943 the attorney general of the State of Texas secured a judgment against the Miller Management—name under which old Drake offices are being operated—of Nashville, Tenn., for $50,000 for violation of the Texas laws. Mr. Leon Henderson and Mr. Nugent and Mr. Hubachek were all in a position where they should have taken official notice of this and other of King's operations. It is a matter of common knowledge, the attorney general of Texas found it out, I have known it for the past 4 years. Mr. Henderson and Mr. Nugent and the Federal Reserve Board have been informed of it, yet no action nor explanation from either or any of them, nor from the Russell Sage Foundation nor from any of the men hereinbefore mentioned. It is to be remembered that all of the foregoing gentlemen hold themselves out as the guardians of the public welfare in everything that has to do with the making of small loans. To clarify the 240 percent per annum charge a little more, it is the old $6 for $5, $2 for $10, $4 for $20 scheme.

On September 2, 1939, King, Ogden, Taylor's Family Finance Co., of Tennessee, a subsidiary of the Family Loan System, Inc., of 200 West Ninth Street, Wilmington, Del., filed a registration statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Family Loan System is the Dr. Jekyll side of King et al. loan operations. At the time of the filing of the statement with the S. E. C., Mr. Leon Henderson was a Commissioner and at the time of the filing of the statement King et al. were operating the Miller Management Co., the United Operating Co., and many others under the 240 percent per annum scheme. On the date of the filing with the Commission none of the King et al.'s nefarious operations were revealed. On that date King had loans outstanding in California, somewhere between $600,000 and $1,000,000, upon which they were netting 100 percent per year, part of which was owned by the Miller Management Co. These operations were felonious. I have documents in my file that reveal that they were. It was a felony for Family Finance Co. to omit their California operations in their statement to the Securities and Exchange Commission. In the month of August 1941 the S. E. C. was given a copy of a complete statement setting forth all these matters just referred to. The men to whom these facts were revealed took no action. The grapevine had it that they were afraid of the political power of Mr. Leon Henderson. Unless the continued failure to reveal this information to the Commission takes this felony without the statute of limitations, King and his cohorts are without the pale of the law even now. It was well known in loan circles that the Family Loan System had filed the registration statement and there is little doubt that Mr. Hubachek was one of Mr. King's legal advisers in this transaction.

Come now to the political machinations, the meetings in the Household's Waldorf-Astoria suite between King, and others, and his attorney; Byrd Henderson of Household Finance and Hubachek and Kelly; Mr. Watts of the Beneficial and his legal advisers; Snite and Griffin and their legal advisers, at which meeting States are divided up between them, like pawns; they agree among themselves to let each other alone in certain given territories and to manipulate borrowers into certain individual loan balance averages in certain localities; and also agree on who is going to put how much in the bag for what State and for whom in reference to legislation. It was at one of these meetings that a $500,000 "kitty" was made up for the passage of national tax legislation which put the national chain loan companies under the business management tax exemption laws. This act became law in 1935. Congress should find out and the people should know who received the $500,000 and what was done with it. Within the last 2 months, an employee of the Beneficial Industrial Loan Co. admitted to a judge in Lansing, Mich., that he bribed legislators and that the money was given to him by the Beneficial for the express purpose of bribing said legislators. The following is an Associated Press story, under the date of January 22, 1944, in reference to this bit of corruption:

Circuit Judge Leland W. Carr's one-man grand jury today ordered the arrest of 20 members and former members of the Michigan Legislature and 6 officials of finance companies, charging they corruptly conspired to influence legislative votes on bills in the 1939 session of the legislature.

The warrant charges a common-law conspiracy by making and fulfilling promises of bribes.

The warrant charges that bribes were paid on three different pieces of legislation, one of them regulating small-loan interest rates, a second providing procedures for foreclosing chattel mortgages and limiting deficiency judgments on such mortgages, and the third a bill to regulate retail and installment contracts covering motor vehicles.

Among those for whom warrants were issued are 3 State senators, 10 State representatives, 7 former legislators, and 6 finance company officials.

Arrest of all those named in the warrants was ordered immediately and Judge Carr said most of them would be arraigned Monday.

Judge Carr's grand jury was created for the purpose of investigating alleged corruption

in the Michigan Legislature in its sessions of 1939-41.

Right under the nose of the Federal secret grand jury investigation in San Antonio, Beneficial, Household, and King have their antiusury societies with their high-sounding names which are made up of representative lawyers of the State of Texas. Texas at this time has no so-called uniform small-loan act. King has several million dollars still out in small loans to needy borrowers at 240 percent per year in the State of Texas. Legislative activity is going on in the States of Missouri, Indiana, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and other States.

Considering Mr. Leon Henderson's former high position in the O. P. A. and many other Federal agencies and that of Dr. Nugent and Mr. Hubachek, it seems only reasonable to ask why the O. P. A. has neglected to give any consideration to ceiling prices on small amounts of credit extended on small loans. Is it possible that these gentlemen know nothing of the manipulations of borrowers of the Uniform Small Loan Act of the Russell Sage Foundation and also the operations of Mr. Rufus Dewitt King and his gang? Also is it possible that Mr. King's continued operations of the Drake chain of offices was unknown to them? When all of the foregoing, plus many other corrupt facts not mentioned herein, are supported in evidence by public records, documents, and an indelible cumulation of events they speak for themselves.

In closing I go on record that the presumed battle between the 240 percenters, the Sage Foundation, and those lenders operating under its Small Loan Act, has been, and is, a sham battle perpetrated upon the legislatures of the many States that have passed the act. In this sham battle and scheme of deception of the American people and their National and State Governments, this crowd has duped many Members of Congress, Governors of many States, State legislatures, the American Bar Association, the Better Business Bureau, the Legal Aid Society, some of the Nation's outstanding colleges and universities, national labor groups, and many other outstanding people and organizations, including a large segment of the publications.

Nothing herein contained should be construed in criticism of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice nor the secret grand jury investigation at San Antonio. But it does seem reasonable to inquire why, due to my 1941 resolution to investigate this racket, I was not consulted. However, those directly in charge of the investigation should not be impugned or criticized. It is my sincere hope that Mr. Henderson, Mr. Nugent, and Mr. Hubachek can satisfactorily explain the condition that exists within and without the Government in reference to small loans. For the information of Congress and the public, I refer to my extension of remarks, entitled "Consumer Credit Loan Condition," in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of September 16, 1941.

The Veterans' Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting a speech made by me over the radio. This legislation is of tremendous importance to the men and women already in, or to be inducted into the armed forces, as well as to their families. This has been indicated by numerous inquiries directed to my office. I have taken this means to acquaint my people with the provisions of the bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is singular to note that for the first time in the history of Congress, in the United States Senate, the veterans' bill of rights was endorsed by 81 Senators, and passed that body unanimously. It is now before the House of Representatives and should become law during the week of April 12, 1944. Personally, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this bill.

I will now give you a brief digest of the bill as proposed; and then explain these provisions.

1. It provides for hospitalization, review of claims and adjudication thereof, and parliamentary procedures; prevents discharge until provision has been made for adequate rehabilitation into civilian life.

2. It permits aid given to discharged veterans by recognized veterans' organizations.

3. It authorizes a reviewing authority to pass upon nature of discharge and to correct or modify that discharge in accord with facts presented.

4. It provides for the education of veterans who have disrupted their schooling and to continue study of their chosen vocation.

5. Provisions are made for loans for the purchase of homes, farms, and business property to be made by Veterans' Administration to an honorably discharged veteran.

6. There is established a job-counseling and employment service for veterans.

7. It provides for a maximum of unemployment compensation to veterans payable within first 2 years after discharge.

8. Provisions of disqualification for unemployment compensation in accord with stated regulations.

9. Provides unemployment compensation ranging from $15 a week for single men to maximum of $25 week for veteran with three or more dependents.

10. It sets up safeguards against duplicate benefits.

11. Responsibility is placed in the hands of the Veterans' Administration for carrying out unemployment provisions of law.

12. It provides for the authority of enforcement of unemployment regulations.

13. It requires claimants to make honest reporting of all pertinent facts and developments.

14. There are penalties for making false statements and fraudulent receipt of compensation punishable by fine of not more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

15. It defines exact meaning of terminology used in the unemployment compensation provisions.

16. All laws are to be administered by the Veterans' Administration applicable to this act, and appropriations shall be made for carrying out provisions of act.

When this bill is passed, the Congress has done common justice for the men and women who are offering their lives for the preservation of this Republic. But, it will do more than this. It will strike a powerful blow for the preservation of the very future of our Nation. Now is the time to pass this bill. Not wait like we did in World War No. 1 and again have a bonus march on Washington.

This bill of rights will be costly perhaps, probably around $3,000,000,000. Yet its cost is trivial in comparison to the shocking cost in lives at the end of this war. It was a terrible cost and a sacrifice for millions of our girls and boys to give up their education, jobs, and ambitions to become human targets for the enemy; to live in squalor, disease, and with death everywhere so that we may be safe at home. We must, and will, do our share on their return, not necessarily with bands, but by economic security for them and their dependents. Nothing short of this will do, for the very life of this Nation will depend upon how we treat approximately one-tenth of our population when they return home.

I think it is the best money we can spend for the future welfare of this Nation. The men and women who compose our armed forces not only hold the safety of our Republic in their hands on the battle fronts today; they hold its destiny for generations to come.

By the time this war is over, we are told that 13,000,000 of our men and women will have seen service in our armed forces. They represent the cream of our resources, the very backbone of our Nation, and this Republic can ill afford to treat them shabbily and consequently lose their skills and leadership.

As I see it, there have been two basic goals which we achieved in this bill.

The first has been to throw every possible protection about the veteran—to bridge the awkward gap between release from the armed service and reintegration into civilian life. We recognize that the burden of war falls most heavily upon the citizen soldier who goes forth to become the armored hope of mankind.

We seek to preserve his rights; to see that he gets a square deal; that he is not imposed upon; to protect him against the injustices which result from errors and human failures inherent in a large-scale, mass demobilization; and to protect the community as well, insuring its stability, which widespread despair, confusion, and dissatisfaction could destroy.

And the second goal is to see that the veteran is not penalized for reasons of his service; that he is given a fair break; winning for himself those traditional American opportunites of achievement and fair play, which he has defended and preserved for us all here at home.

His most immediate need, perhaps, is the first classification—the "bridge the gap" part of the program. He must be guided as he leaves the service; he must be apprised of his rights and aided in obtaining them; he may need hospitalization; he most certainly will need money to carry him until he can find suitable employment; he needs a single place—one concentrated agency—to which he can go for the solution of all his problems.

In the veteran's bill of rights we have provided all this for him. We have, first, declared the Veterans' Administration to be an essential war agency, and have armed it with priorities in personnel and material so badly needed to enable it to meet all of the veterans' needs.

And, having strengthened the Veterans' Administration, we have given it over-all control of the activities and benefits affecting the veteran. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will channel down through existing agencies in administering the program; but his will be the responsibility for its success both to the veteran and to the Congress.

No longer may the wearied veteran be pushed from pillar to post among several Government agencies in a tragic search for his rights and benefits.

The bill authorizes and directs the Veterans' Administration to construct additional hospital beds, which will be badly needed when the flood of human casualties flows back home. We have provided that he may use suitable Army and Navy hospitals when they become available.

The Veterans' Administrator is authorized to place designated officials in Army and Navy hospitals to adjudicate disability claims of veterans about to be discharged: The Army and Navy are directed, as well, to permit authorized representatives of accredited veterans' organizations to go into those hospitals to advise the veteran of the benefits available to him, and to aid in preparing claims for compensation.

We have, we believe, included provisions that will make it impossible ever again for penniless, disabled, and discharged veterans to be left waiting for months before their claims are adjudicated by the Veterans' Administration, and to have their compensation begin. The fact that little or no blame can be attached to the Veterans' Administration for that delay has made it nonetheless tragic.

We have provided for boards of review, within the Army and Navy to review the so-called blue discharges; discharges without honor, which have been given in far too many cases for trivial reasons. Men have been discharged without honor through no fault of their own other than what the Army calls inaptitude for military service. Beyond that, we have provided that the benefits of the "bill of rights" shall be open to all veterans discharged under any conditions other than dishonorable.

We believe that we have thrown every possible protection about the men and women of our armed forces as they take the first steps into civilian life. And, through a generous scale of unemployment compensation or readjustment allowance we have continued that protection through the difficult hunt for a job that will follow.

The "bill of rights" provides for unemployment compensation of $15 a week, plus $5 for one dependent, $8 for two dependents, and $10 for three or more dependents, for any 52 weeks during the first 2 years immediately following the last payment of mustering-out pay.

The veteran will be entitled to 3 weeks of unemployment coverage for each month in the service, up to the maximum of 52 weeks' pay. The unemployment compensation is generous, but it is hedged about with protections essential to the welfare both of the veteran and of the community.

A word on this history of this legislation. It was first drafted by the American Legion, an accredited veterans' organization, which drew upon its 25 years' experience in veterans' rehabilitation.

It does not represent the last word on the veteran subject. But, America can well congratulate herself, as well as the American Legion, that this great humane, necessary measure of justice will soon be enacted into law.

It must not be forgotten, however, that with all our talk about the proposed wonderful projects scattered throughout the Nation after the war not one dime has, as yet, been appropriated by the Congress for the post-war period; and, lest we forget in the excitement when the war is over, now is the time to remember and provide to pay back to our brave boys and girls the terrible price and sacrifices they made and endured so that we might live as free men and not as slaves.

Legislation of Interest to Mining Men—Prospective and Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and basic industries of our modern life is mining. Economists speak of mining as an extractive industry because it consists of taking valuable material from the earth, not as food and fiber are taken in agriculture, but as raw minerals or metals for industry. I regard mining as ranking alongside farming and about as basically important to modern civilized life. In time of war, especially a mechanized war as of today, mining is as important to the winning of the war as is the production of food and fiber, and yet, strange to say, it is not apparently so regarded. I am the representative of a State which is outstanding both in mining and agriculture. I am interested in the development of both these great extractive industries, and accordingly I am amazed to see the different attitude on the part of Government toward these two fundamentally important fields of production.

MINING RELATIVELY NEGLECTED

Government has done much less, a great deal less, for mining through the years than has been done for farming. One of the most prominent departments of our Government, with massive buildings and thousands of employees here at Washington and tens of thousands throughout the country and with its numerous staff of highly trained scientists, administers to the need and fosters the development of agriculture. There is an agricultural agent in every county to be as helpful as possible to farmers. Of this I approve, but I can't help contrasting such solicitude for one basic industry with what I feel is neglect of another equally important industry.

The mining man is the forgotten man, although in this mechanized war in which we are engaged, he is vitally important. The Government has done less to encourage mining than it has done for other producers of needed material. I have continuously raised my voice to change this situation and improve this indifferent attitude. Much has been done but, in my judgment, not enough.

A SIGNIFICANT BILL PASSED

Most of the members of the House Committee on Mines and Mining are Congressmen interested chiefly in coal. While there is coal in Arizona it is largely on Indian reservations and not produced commercially; therefore, my interest in coal has been a national one rather than a local one. I was a member of a subcommittee, with Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, chairman, interested in producing liquid fuel from coal, shale, and other substances. Our committee reported out a bill, and it has recently passed and become law, authorizing an appropriation of $30,000,000 to establish pilot plants to obtain liquid fuel from coal and other substances by the use of certain formulas, some used in Germany for the production of synthetic gasoline.

These formulas are patents and, of course, the German formulas are enemy property now held by the Alien Property Custodian of the United States and those patents are thus subject to our development and use. In view of the fact that Germany's supply of gasoline is from the lowest-grade coal, we would do well to begin to use that source in this country, considering our great wartime need and our dwindling oil supplies, and that we can now do with this recent act. Only a short time ago our chairman, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, flew into Washington Airport on a plane fueled by gasoline made from coal, which was the first plane to arrive at the Nation's Capital using that kind of fuel. The West has much coal and shale from which high-grade gasoline and smokeless fuel may be made for cleaner cities of the future.

LEGISLATIVE STEPS SOON TO BE TAKEN

I am a member of the House Committee on Mines and Mining. True, I sought membership originally on this committee to get certain bills passed from time to time, granting relief to ex-servicemen who had unpatented mining claims when they entered the armed services, or relief for prospectors during the depression, and later during the war, who needed to be freed by law from using manpower and vital critical war materials called for in doing annual assessment work. In fact, I have at this moment a bill, H. R. 3579, suspending certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites, which bill I am assured by my colleagues on the committee will be reported favorably at the next meeting of that committee, and should soon become law. However, I now prize my membership on this mining committee for more significant reasons.

At the first meeting after the Easter recess the House Committee on Mines and Mining will divide itself into certain subcommittees according to the plan agreed upon in the latter part of March. It is understood that I am to be chairman of the subcommittee on nonferrous minerals and metals. I believe this arrangement will make it possible to sponsor and further mining legislation better than has been done heretofore. I am not sure that there will be a subcommittee on the precious metals, but if so there are three westerners, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], as well as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]—all very much interested in the production of both gold and silver.

PRECIOUS METALS FOR MONEY

As for myself, I am interested in both of the precious metals, and my interest in silver is not alone because of its industrial uses but also because of its proper place in our monetary system. Perhaps it is too much to expect bimetallism as a national program, such as Bryan advocated in 1896, but I seriously believe it is not too much to expect international bimetallism following this war. From the interest that I can notice by both political parties and the increasing interest by some of the leading commercial nations, international bimetallism seems more and more logical, and, to my mind, inevitable.

My voice shall be raised in favor of international bimetallism at any and every opportunity which I may have in post-war economic policy and planning, of which special committee in the House I am now a member. Never before in my opinion has the need been so great or America's opportunity so paramount to speak out for international bimetallism as at the present time. This is a big subject and many minds are working on it at this moment, and about it I hope to have much to say at a later date.

WAR METALS IMPORTANT

Senator JAMES SCRUGHAM, of Nevada, has taken the lead in the fight for home development and production—and later the protection—of the strategic and critical minerals and metals. I have worked hand in hand with him during all the time I have been in Congress. That was particularly true when he was a Member of the House.

We were able to accomplish much as a part of the defense program before the outbreak of the war. This was done by way of aid to the United States Bureau of Mines for work of exploration, by the establishment of the Metals Reserve Company to aid in procurement of the most needed war metals and later in the encouragement of the mining industry through higher pegged prices and bonus payments to bring out production. I think the prices have not been pegged high enough on copper, lead, and zinc but we did succeed in getting them raised above the original pegged prices in the case of lead and zinc, and we did succeed in getting bonus prices to increase production, especially in the case of copper.

Now we are trying to provide for stock piling so as to have safe reserves and yet protect the market price on these minerals. Senator SCRUGHAM'S bill—and I have an identical bill which is H. R. 2895—has met with enthusiastic support by the mining West but with much opposition here at Washington. At every meeting of the special committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, I attempt to drive home a point with respect to mining policy. For instance, on March 16 I questioned William Clayton regarding the stopping of foreign importations as a first step in disposal of war surpluses. The mining industry has contributed greatly to the winning of the war and must be protected as best it can be at the conclusion of the war.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I wish to insert two recent editorials from the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune. While it is fully realized that we are at war and that it is therefore impossible for governmental agencies to function normally, it is sincerely hoped that the condition outlined in these editorials can and will be remedied.

[From the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune of February 28, 1944]

ASTOUNDING OBSTRUCTION TO FOOD PRODUCTION

Not long ago the News-Tribune carried an editorial describing the plight of several farmers who are finding it difficult, if not impossible, to carry on their operations under existing conditions, particular reference being made to the situation facing the owner of a 1,500-acre farm on the Coosa River near Pell City.

This owner had been working from 10 to 20 German war prisoners in an effort to keep production going, but was in great difficulty because the truck with which he had to haul the prisoners between Camp McClellan and his place had fallen to pieces and he could not get another one.

Immediately upon publication of the editorial the farmer in question was called to Fort McClellan, where there are some 400 abandoned trucks, and was assured that the Army would cooperate fully in trying to remedy the situation, though it was explained that since the Army no longer had use for the machines, they had been turned over to the Treasury Department for disposal.

Much encouraged, the farmer then obtained from the O. P. A. in Pell City approval of his request for a truck. The application also was approved by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency at Auburn and by the Office of Defense Transportation in Birmingham. Then it went to the Office of Emergency Management in Washington—and was promptly turned down with the suggestion that he renew it after the expiration of 3 months.

This action has forced the abandonment of operations on this fruitful 1,500-acre farm, though 400 trucks stand idle at Fort McClellan, while the prisoners who were at work producing food and other essentials on the farm also are idle.

Now, the irony of this amazing situation is emphasized by the fact that on the very same day, February 21, that the farm owner received notice of the rejection of his application for a truck with which to carry on he also received a letter from the United States Department of Agriculture, through his county agent, urging him to put forth maximum efforts in the production of food. This letter opened with an underscored statement reading as follows:

"The need for foods produced on the farm for our fighting men, our allies, and our war workers not on farms is greater than at any time in the history of our country. Every farm person in our country has a real responsibility to do an important job for our great cause—the American way of living."

So there you have it; one agency of Government denying a large grower a truck that is essential to the operation of his farm and another agency urging him to produce upon the maximum scale.

This situation would not be of great importance were it an isolated instance, but such things are happening all over the country and threaten seriously to reduce the production of food in this year of supreme need.

Another angle to this case is the fact that while he had the war prisoners working for him this owner caused some two carloads of pulpwood to be cut because of the imperative need of this material—and now he has no way to get it to town. He also produces livestock on a considerable scale, having a herd of 250 beef cattle. If he can't get transportation for his workers, he will have to sell his herd and give up cattle raising at a time when beef is of tremendous importance.

It would seem that there should be enough common sense somewhere to prevent such astounding and alarming futility from being practiced by those who are shaping agricultural policies.

[From the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune]

NEWS-TRIBUNE EDITORIAL BRINGS CONFESSION OF FUTILITY

A recent editorial in the News-Tribune calling attention to the plight of a Pell City farmer who is having to abandon the operation of a 1,500-acre Coosa Valley farm because he cannot get a truck to haul prison workers from Fort McClellan has attracted wide attention and efforts are being made to correct the situation. However, responsible officials in Washington confess their inability to surmount the red tape involved.

A copy of the editorial referred to was sent to Secretary Wickard by Congressman PETE JARMAN, of the Sixth Alabama District, and a friend of the farmer in question, and in reply Mr. JARMAN received the following communication:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 24, 1944.

Hon. PETE JARMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR PETE: Secretary Wickard has asked us to reply to your letter of February 5, with which you enclosed editorial on the farmers' truck problem.

For nearly 2 years we have tried to secure a short procedure for obtaining Army trucks for the use of farmers. Surplus trucks in serviceable condition must by law be sold to the highest bidder through Treasury Procurement. The highest bid necessarily is the price ceiling placed upon such equipment by the Office of Price Administration. We understand that where higher prices have been bid and paid, the bidders afterwards filed claims for refunds on any amount above the ceiling price and that these refunds have been granted. Any farmer who conforms to the conditions of sale is eligible to bid on surplus equipment.

The War Food Administration, through its field organization, has been calling attention to scheduled sales of Army equipment. We understand some farmers have made purchases of Army trucks, but that the complicated procedure of competitive bidding is confusing to most farmers who are unable to make trips to attend sales. We have worked with the Office of Defense Transportation endeavoring to channel surplus Army trucks to farmers, but laws covering the disposal of surplus Government property make all such proposals very cumbersome.

The stock pile of trucks still remaining from those manufactured before February 1942, when production was stopped, contains very few trucks suitable for farm use. The production program for trucks is very largely taken up with military requirements with

only a small production allocated for civilian use. Of this latter, there will be very few trucks available for farm use. The situation is serious, particularly as regards additional truck equipment, but a great deal can be done toward solving the problem through cooperative pooling of trucks among farmers and other such conservation methods.

We shall continue to do everything to make more transportation available to the farmer.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Note the observation, "For nearly 2 years we have tried to secure short procedure for obtaining Army trucks for the use of farmers." That is an abject confession of futility. Red tape has been piled upon red tape until the whole appears to be absolutely insurmountable, and in the meantime farmers must, in many instances, curtail operations, though abandoned Army trucks may be close at hand, as is the case in reference to the farmer down the Coosa River, who is only 50 miles from Fort McClellan, where some 400 trucks stand idle.

As to the "pooling of trucks," to which reference is made, that is utterly fatuous in most instances. In the case under discussion, the full-time use of a truck is absolutely essential in hauling the workers on a 100-mile round trip daily, and in performing other functions on the farm.

Meanwhile, the Agricultural Department is strenuously insisting upon increased farm production and the needs for the armed services, for the Allies and for the people at home become increasingly acute.

As the News-Tribune said in the editorial which brought the above observations from Mr. Jones: "It does seem that there should be enough common sense somewhere to prevent such astounding futility from being practiced by those who are shaping agricultural policies." But thus far such common sense has not appeared.

If some means of surmounting the towering stacks of red tape is not discovered without waiting another 2 years, hunger will face millions of persons whose needs could be met by intelligent handling of the farm problem.

The Enemy of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a radio address delivered by me over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System from Boston, Mass., Saturday, April 1, 1944:

I have a message from Washington tonight for the home folks of 10,000,000 young men and women who are wearing the uniform of the United States.

It is not a pleasant message. But it is a message which, in fairness to them, I feel ought not to be held back.

To you—the mother and father of that boy in Italy, the wife of that sailor who is tonight somewhere out on the Pacific—it is to you that I address this message, for you know, as only you can have learned, the full meaning of sacrifice.

Most Americans, whether they have sons and husbands in our armed forces or not, are willing to undergo such privations as this war makes necessary. Your friends and neighbors, though some of them may be spared the anxiety that you are going through, are for the most part willing and eager to do all they can to hasten the day of victory.

Most of them stick faithfully to the rules of rationing because they know that those rules are essential in the conduct of the war.

Most of them cooperate voluntarily in the effort to keep prices down because they know that that effort is an integral, vital part of their country's total war effort.

They realize that a nation with an uncontrolled or upset wartime economy on the home front would be handicapped in producing the supplies that are needed on the fighting front. They understand that gasoline and tires and critical war materials have to be rationed here so that our fighting men will get all they need over there.

And they are doing their part.

Of course, it is true that we have among us a scattering of people who are still not willing, or who still do not understand the need, to do their part. I know that we still have some dealers who violate price controls, we still have some consumers who try to get around the rules of rationing.

Perhaps you, too, have known people of that sort. No big country ever existed without them. We should not be shocked that we have them with us, and we may hope that as this war goes on, they will learn better.

But what is shocking, what is more directly and more seriously endangering the safety of your son or your husband in this war and jeopardizing his future in the time of peace to follow, are the activities of an even smaller minority, a political minority of men who should and do know better.

This group, which is made up of leaders of the Republican opposition in Washington, has adopted tactics which strike at our country's security against the greatest enemy we shall have to face on the home front of this war—the enemy of inflation.

Do not be deceived about this danger. Inflation can lengthen the war your boy is fighting. It can invalidate the peace on which his whole future depends. That is why I have felt it my duty to address this message to you.

Do not be deceived, either, about the cause. Inflation is caused by the acts of those who are unwilling to make sacrifices to meet the wartime needs of their country. And that is why it is necessary that you should be taken behind the scenes for a moment in our Nation's Capital and shown what is going on there, and why you must be warned of its effects.

Two years ago the cost of living in America was on its way upward at a rate that spelled danger to business, danger to labor, danger to the farmer, danger to war production, and above all these, and because of them, danger to the soldier.

Under the leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Congress enacted on January 30, 1942, a law to stop it. That law was the Emergency Price Control Act. An act to amend it, known as the Stabilization Act, was passed later that same year.

By the authority of these acts, your Government was enabled to set up the machinery with which we could fight off inflation. That machinery was given the name of Office of Price Administration.

Now, everybody knew that O. P. A. was plunging into a pretty thankless job. We Americans understood that our boys across the sea needed gasoline for their planes and we wanted them to have it. We were willing to go without. If inconvenience and sacrifice were part of war, we could take it. But some of us—yes, many of us, at first—saw no need to take it and like it.

Some of us, from time to time, said so. And O. P. A. became just what it was expected to be—a big headache.

But the threat of inflation was checked and that boy of yours overseas got the gasoline he needed and he was—and is today—giving the Germans and the Japs something worse than headaches.

So it was worth it. O. P. A. could stand the headaches, even the stomachaches, for that. And if people complained, and if politicians tried to make their own kind of capital out of these complaints, well, that just couldn't be helped. Price control and rationing, if they helped that boy of yours who is winning the war, were worth it.

Let me tell you tonight—you parents of that boy—they did help. They are helping now. The pressure for inflation in this country has been and still is terrific. Yet for the past year, the line has been held. In the spring of 1943 the increases in the cost of living were stopped by O. P. A. Today the general level of price stands where it stood then—which is less than half the level reached in World War No. 1.

Where we would be today without those controls, what our supplies of material for the job ahead of our armed forces would be today without rationing, only the God who watches over that boy of yours knows.

But on June 30, 1944, the term of legal authority for those controls runs out. Either the acts were renewed before that date or our main, frontal barriers against inflation are dropped. Therefore a bill has been introduced to continue the acts for 1 year, and that bill is now before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Meanwhile, we face an election in November of 1944. And this brings me to the heart of my message to you parents and kinfolks of those who are fighting our battle abroad.

It brings me to the distressing picture of men who have given themselves, for political advantage, to a wholly partisan attempt to undermine those controls against inflation. It brings me to an unseemly story of political maneuverings, of grudge fighting, of men who see temporary gains for themselves in taking potshots at a target that has shielded the Nation and those who are fighting to preserve it.

The administration, being in office, is responsible for doing that job of holding the line against inflation. The Republican opposition, not being identified with the Executive, is not responsible, as a political entity, for that job.

But there is a difference between being not responsible and being irresponsible. And within the Republican Party there are forces, there are men who, with an almost unbelievable disregard for the consequences to our Nation in these perilous times, have taken the political course of attacking the mechanics of price control for such political advantage as they may derive for themselves out of such attacks.

I charge these men in the Republican Party with irresponsibility, for it is irresponsible to exaggerate, in time of war, the small sacrifices that people must make so that your boy in uniform will be well found in his grim assignment.

I hold those Republicans irresponsible who play on the minor irritations of a war-beset citizenry, who deliberately encourage grudges among them, grudges against the Government workers and volunteers who are charged with the task of making our economic controls stick.

I hold those Republicans in Congress irresponsible who have sought and are now seeking special exemptions from control for those private interests from whom they hope

to gain political support in return for the favor.

I hold those Republicans irresponsible who have urged us to blame our own Government for that which we ought to blame on the governments of Germany and Japan.

I deem it a tragic show of irresponsibility on the part of that opposing minority of Republicans to indulge in this critical hour in attacks of mud, threats, and smears against Government agencies which have proved, in action, their worth in helping to prosecute this war to the earliest possible victory.

And I charge that Republican leadership with such irresponsibility and a reckless disregard for the future of our people when, after giving lip service to the general principle of price control, they proceed to welsh on the specific: when, after reaffirming by word and avowal the general stand we have taken against inflation, they proceed to undermine that stand by punching holes in the specific authority that we set up.

The long history of such attacks by the Republican leadership may be found in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over these months past. Their outcries against O. P. A., their moans and groans against what they call the bureaucracy, are there in profusion.

To you, the mother and father of an American soldier now fighting for his country, a perusal of those columns may bring some rather rude shocks. But I do not think you should be spared those shocks. I think you ought to know. I commend that publication to your most careful attention. If some of it does not make pleasant reading, remember it is your son's future that is at stake.

I would suggest that from now on you follow as closely as you can the progress through the House and Senate committees of the bill to continue price controls.

I would suggest that you make note of any effort to nullify the controls by plastering on crippling amendments to the bill. For as I have said, the Republican leadership gives only lip service to the principle of price control. Oh yes, they will say inflation is dangerous. But the amendments they propose to make in our laws are viciously inflationary.

I would advise you to be especially alert, for example, for amendments that would limit the power of price control to basic commodities and exempt so-called luxury items. Such an amendment would encourage our farmers to grow less corn and wheat and potatoes—the low-priced foods we need for war—and more of the high-priced foods we can get along without while war lasts. It would fill our stores with dress shirts instead of work shirts. It would give us orchids when what we need is cabbage. It would tell us, when our people want bread to let them eat cake.

I suggest that you be on the lookout for an amendment to take jurisdiction in price control cases out of the Emergency Court of Appeals, which was created for this purpose. Such an amendment would throw the whole question of price control into the general courts. It would bring chaos and conflicting decisions and end in making price control impossible.

I suggest that you watch out for an amendment to allow a profit on every product regardless of how high its cost of production may be. The controls of no other warring power allow this. For it would mean that our whole market would be geared to high-cost production, and the end result will be inflation without limit.

I suggest, further, that in all such attempts to cripple our controls, while this bill is before the House and Senate and their committees, you observe whether the Republican leaders attempt further to stir up public resentment against rationing and price control, whether they attempt to use this opportunity to make Congressional debate a sounding board for the purpose of turning minor irritations into political capital.

Yes, it is your son's future over the arduous weeks and months of warfare that are still ahead of us and over the years to follow, when, God willing, he will have come back to you

The question of whether we have more boom now in our markets will decide whether we are to have a crash later on. Time and again, this has been borne out in history. If your boy hopes to come home to a job in business or industry, the actions of your Senator and your Congressman at this time can help to make or break that chance.

If your boy hopes to come home and go into business for himself, his opportunity can be made or broken by what the Members of Congress do now. For there can be no triumphant peace, and all will suffer—the businessman, the farmer, the industrial worker, and the returning soldier—if we let inflation get out of hand while we are at war.

I have made this message, this warning to you, as strong as my power of words permits. Believe me, I have not overstated the danger. I know I have not overstated its importance to you, for that which is at stake means more to you than your own future, as it means more to me than mine.

A Threat to Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, newspapers and radio commentators headline our national manpower problem. It is the number one domestic issue facing ou Nation today. It is easy to headline the needs of thousands of workers in shipbuilding, aircraft, synthetic rubber, and other critical industrial production. Equally important, but not so easily dramatized, is the need for deferring workers in special services in the rural areas of the Nation. I have particularly in mind the deferring of farm mechanics, blacksmiths, and others who are so vitally needed if we are to maintain full farm production. Action must be taken on this problem or it will be too late. My mail indicates that many communities are now without a blacksmith or machine shop. Farmers are more dependent than ever on machinery because of an acute farm-labor situation. Their machinery is wearing out rapidly and parts must be replaced and repaired. Only a small percentage of needed new machinery is available. The only answer to the farm machinery problem is sufficient mechanics and blacksmiths to keep this machinery in operating condition. Farmers who have bought new combines from their county allocations have been advised by the dealers that they must expect to set them up with their own help and will receive no mechanical service whatever. A combine is an expensive piece of farm machinery and its successful operation depends largely on proper adjustments that must be made by someone familiar with the machine. This same situation applies to every other piece of farm machinery.

Recently the Salina Journal, of Salina, Kans., ran an editorial entitled "A Threat to Agriculture" which I am including as a part of my remarks:

A THREAT TO AGRICULTURE

Farmers this spring are threatened with a problem that easily could become one of the most serious they have faced. A late spring has delayed plowing and planting, with the result that when weather permits it will take long hours and continuous activity to produce the crops that are essential if the food is furnished that is necessary to win the war, and to protect the civilian population at home.

At the request of the Journal, a memorandum has been prepared by a man who knows whereof he writes. His statement is so clear, and the dangers he outlines so real, that the attention of Governor Schoeppel and others who may be able to help solve it, has been directed to the problem that has been created. Here it is:

"A situation has developed with reference to food production in this territory which I would like to bring to your attention. In several communities there is a shortage of farm mechanics who are competent to repair the old farm machinery which is necessary for farmers to use in the production of spring crops and later in the harvest because it is impossible to procure new machinery under present conditions. Several farmers have asked me to try and assist them in procuring a limited deferment for young men in their communities who are engaged in this work.

"Among the specific instances are the following—Dauer Bros., Falun, were carefully investigated by the county war board and both of them were recommended for deferment. Ralph Bogart of Gypsum is the only man in the only machine shop who is competent to repair farm machinery over a territory including portions of four counties, but he is under 26 and has been classified in I–A, which classification is now pending before the appeal board. Louis William Hubele, employed in the Fordson shop at Abilene, is registered and his employer states that while Hubele's occupation is partly that of a parts man, still he is very necessary in procuring parts for farmers over a wide territory and does considerable mechanical work in setting up and delivering new machinery and it has proved impossible for his employer to replace him. Upon appeal his classification of I–A has been sustained and it will be impossible to continue this service to farmers if this registrant is inducted. The local United States employment service which is in charge of such replacements, subject to the regulations of the War Manpower Commission, advises that farm machinery mechanics and car mechanics are listed as critical in a four-State area of which Kansas is one, and that they do not have in their files any men listed as qualified to replace any farm mechanics which would be inducted throughout the six counties of Saline, Dickinson, Ottawa, Ellsworth, McPherson, and Lincoln.

"Farm mechanics are not listed under the list of critical occupations. The U. S. D. A. war board requested postponement of induction of Mr. Weeks of the Weeks Implement Co., here in Salina, until after harvest, but was advised by Colonel Montgomery at Topeka that due to the urgent demand for men qualified for military service and the fact that he had been ordered to report for his induction, it would be impossible to grant their request. This man has been inducted. This leaves this firm with only one full-time

mechanic to service a large territory which handles their type of farm machinery.

"As older farmers are not usually skilled in the operation and repair of power machinery, and the younger men who are familiar with this work have been inducted into the military service to a large extent, it has been necessary for farmers to endeavor to have their repair work done by paid mechanics and if these are taken out of the communities, it may result in the abandonment of a large acreage of farm land and a loss of production. This situation is now critical and it appears necessary for everyone interested to cooperate in an effort to meet the emergency in view of the requirements made for food production. We believe that if this matter is brought to the attention of those in authority it may be possible to procure some action to relieve the situation."

The Basic Cause of War: Monopoly, Limited Production, Unemployment—The Basic Hope of Peace: Independent Business, Full Production, Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we, the people of America, are engaged in the most terrible war ever waged by man against man—a war whose scope is global and whose victims are counted among all the races and nations in existence. Why are we cursed with the periodic scourge of war? Why cannot the races and nations dwell together in peace and harmony? Why are the masses of common people tricked by their leaders into aggressive warfare? Do the physical and mental traits of human nature force the men of one nation to seek the lifeblood of their fellows? I do not think so. Is it the unbridled lust for power and wealth among their leaders? Undoubtedly this factor is involved. But is it the basic cause for war? I do not believe it is.

Every tyrant or conqueror of ancient history has used the misery and desperation of his people as the base for his rise to power. The modern dictators—Mussolini, Franco, Tojo, and Hitler—built their aggressive military machines on the misery and starvation of their national subjects. No responsible person will deny this fact.

Let us investigate this factor of national misery and starvation. Why have these great masses of people become so impoverished and miserable, so desperate from an economic standpoint, that they have fallen victims to the siren songs of the dictators? Why were they willing to exchange their few meager personal liberties which they still possessed for the grandiose goals of the dictators?

It is said that a drowning man will grasp eagerly for a straw. These people were drowning in poverty with all its attendant evils of disease, misery, and starvation. The economic systems of Italy, Spain, Germany, and Japan had failed to satisfy the needs of a decent human existence to their people. When a man sees his wife and children starving before his eyes, he becomes desperate. He may not understand economics, but his own stomach cries for the answer and the sight of his loved ones suffering goads him into a state of desperation where he, like the drowning man, grasps for the straw of security. This, then, is the basic reason for the rise of power-crazed dictators. This is the basic cause of war. Economic desperation of the masses of the people.

CAPITALISTIC (FREE ENTERPRISE) SYSTEM USED BY AXIS AND ALLIED NATIONS

What type of economic system existed in Italy, Spain, Japan, and Germany before their collapse? Their economic systems were very much like our own. We can classify their systems before the totalitarian era as that of private capitalism, private ownership of land and improvements, private capital, private or individual enterprise. Yes, they were even known as "free-enterprise economies." I am speaking, of course, in general terms. The different nations' economies which we are discussing had their minor differences, but even as our economy differs in detail from that of Great Britain, we still observe the same general rules of private ownership that obtains in their capitalistic economy. Now among the great capitalistic nations of the world there have been varied amounts of natural resources and population. Each nation has shown different abilities for ingenuity and progress. This is commonly expressed in the term "have" and "have-not" nations, and numerous reasons are given for their respective positions in the register of nations. Attempts are made to justify or condemn each nation because of the basic causes contributing to its particular position. I do not intend to develop a thesis of either justification or condemnation of any particular nation at this point in my discourse. I merely accept their positions as an established fact and point out that the unsatisfactory conditions within four of the great capitalistic, free-enterprise nations have provided the human misery which is the basic cause for this global war—a war which has swept the more successful "have" nations into the same holocaust of war as the "have-not" nations.

In the past 100 years, I might almost say the past 50 years, momentous changes have taken place in our own Nation and in the society of nations. The impact of scientific and mechanical discoveries and inventions have literally brought into being a new conception of human existence and relationship. That new conception must be realized and its blessings made available to mankind. The knowledge we now have must serve humanity and must not be used to enslave humanity. Our present involvement in a global war is a result of improper and unjustified attempts on the part of individuals and nations to control and limit the use of our new-found techniques for their own selfish gain.

SECURITY OF INDIVIDUAL OR NATION IMPOSSIBLE IF SELFISHNESS OR ISOLATION PRACTICED

History proves that the security of the individual or the nation can never be established on selfishness or isolation. The scientific discoveries and mechanical inventions which have made possible an era of plenty that makes selfishness unnecessary have also produced an imperative. That imperative is *universal security*. We as individuals or as a Nation cannot live or die within ourselves. World security must be established when this war is over, in order that our Nation as an interdependent unit in the society of nations may have its separate security. The hopes of humanity and civilization are dependent upon the general acceptance of these undeniable facts. Will our political leaders and the political leaders of other great nations rise to the level of statesmanship necessary to plan on this basis? Will individual and national selfishness be sublimated to the prime consideration of world security?

Upon the answers to these questions depend the hopes of suffering millions for a just and lasting peace. International cooperation in the establishment and maintenance of world peace must be the prime demand of every citizen of every nation. I believe the leaders of the nonaggressor nations are agreed upon the broad general principles of world cooperation. I believe that a world organization will be formed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining peace in the society of nations. The first steps will undoubtedly be taken, but unless the basic cause of war is solved within the individual nations, it will be another Versailles, another experiment in futility. We will sow again the seeds of future wars. This must not happen.

SECOND STEPS MUST FOLLOW FIRST STEPS

After the first steps of world organization are taken, we must take the additional steps to provide stable, decent standards of living for the common people of the respective nations. We must help establish relative economic security among the have-not nations to insure our own security. Remember and never forget this undeniable fact: The security of the individual nation cannot be established on selfishness or isolation.

The factors of time, space, and transportation, through modern technology, have reduced distances between nations and will continue to bring the far places nearer and nearer, as science and invention progresses. I recall to you the statement, "We must help establish relative economic security among the 'have not' nations to insure our own security." By the phrase "relative economic security" I accept the premise that there will be a different level or standard of living in the different nations, but there must be a minimum standard, below which a nation's people should not be asked to live. A level must exist well above the line of economic desperation. Sufficient food, clothing, and shelter to prevent the desperate grasping for the straw of security. We must eliminate the misery

of the masses upon which every dictator has "demagoged" himself into power. This means that commerce must flow between the "have" and "have-not" nations. It means that raw materials must be made available to the people of all nations. The surplus materials of the "have" nations must be made available to the "have-not" nations. This involves tremendous problems and complexities. I am confident the problem can be solved, in view of the fact that it must be solved—and that the alternative is bloody, global war.

What part can we, the people of the United States, play in this world problem? Of necessity we must take a leading part in the first steps of world organization and cooperation. We must play a major part in the succeeding steps of freeing international commerce from its previous bonds of selfishness and isolation. We have a greater duty and a more serious obligation, however. We have the opportunity to solve within our own Nation the major defects of the capitalistic system. I have stated before that of the six great capitalistic nations, four have failed to function well enough to prevent national economic desperation. The two nations whose free-enterprise system at the beginning of World War No. 2 were still functioning—Great Britain and the United States—however, were also having their troubles. Cycles of depression, unemployment, and deficit financing were also threatening our stability of government and reducing many of our people to economic desperation. True, the condition of our people did not approach the miserable status of the people in Italy, Spain, Japan, and Germany. Our people were more fortunate in many ways. Our natural resources were greater—lands, mines, and forests were still available for development. The energies of our people were practically unhindered in their activities. A greater degree of religious and political democracy obtained, and until recent years economic democracy came nearer to being the possession of our people than had ever been experienced by the people in the older capitalistic nations. Under these favorable conditions of free enterprise and individual initiative, we developed a great nation and the highest standard of living known to man.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM OF SO-CALLED FREE ENTERPRISE?

But something was wrong in our economic system. With all the blessings of natural resources, boundless energy, and individual ingenuity and initiative, we were faced with constantly recurring depressions—actually a stalling of our economic system, a refusal to function reoccurring every few years. When these depressions occurred, millions of our people lost their jobs and were soon faced with the same problems of subsistence that faced the unemployed people of Italy, Spain, Japan, and Germany. Someone will immediately ask, "Why did not our people fall victims to a dictator during the last great depression, as did the people of Europe?" and the question is justified. Two great factors, in the opinion of students of history, undoubtedly influenced our Nation's destiny at the critical moment. The percentage of desperate people was lower than that of the European nations and the leader who arose during our crisis, President Roosevelt, believed in democracy, and led the people back to employment through democratic procedure. It is my firm conviction that the American people at that time were in a dangerous mood, and a totalitarian-minded leader might have tipped the scales toward an American brand of fascism.

But whether we deserved our good fortune or not, we weathered our latest and severest depression. Deficit financing started the wheels of our economic machine turning and the total production demands of war are keeping them turning. The student of economics knows that neither deficit financing nor war can be continuous. We know, therefore, that the problem of unemployment in our free enterprise society has not been solved. A temporary expedient only is involved in our present full employment. The war's demand for goods will stop when the war ends. Our national debt will exceed $300,000,000,000. Only a full production, full employment economy can pay the service charge on this tremendous debt, plus the current cost of government. Further deficit financing then cannot be the answer.

IS FREE ENTERPRISE AS NOW PRACTICED REALLY FREE?

What is the answer? Are we to be told again that "free enterprise" as it now functions will lead the people into full employment? And, if so, what reason is given to the people that would cause us to have confidence in this promise? Was not the "free enterprise" of big business in control, without Government interference preceding the crash of 1929 to 1932? Have the champions of "free enterprise" changed their methods of operation or solved the cause of periodic depressions? Is there a blueprint of full production and therefore full employment which our business leaders subscribe to and advocate? Unfortunately for the American people, the answer is an emphatic No!

Oh, I realize there is a well-financed campaign, traceable directly to the centers of big finance and big business to sell the American people a bill of goods under the banner of "free enterprise." Millions of dollars will be spent to advertise those two words through newspapers, radio commentators, and all the various propaganda approaches. The selfish leaders of big business refuse to see the handwriting on the walls of international history. They have no new plan; they advance no blueprint for full production and full employment. They offer nothing different from the methods and procedures they used preceding every depression up to and including the crash of 1929. Let us not be tricked then by their slogan "free enterprise." Let us analyze this phrase: Does big business really believe in free enterprise? Has the unrestrained practices of our capitalistic system reached the point where real free enterprise and individual initiative are still possible? The answers to these questions will help us to gage the sincerity of these vociferous advocates of free enterprise. One of the troubles with the phrase "free enterprise" is that so few people agree on what it means. If it is as important as most of us believe, the phrase should be susceptible to clear interpretation.

REAL FREE ENTERPRISE—FREEDOM OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

I happen to be a sincere believer in real free enterprise—the kind of free enterprise which has been the backbone of our Nation, until recently. Before giving you my interpretation of real free enterprise, I wish to lay a logical foundation. Our democracy was founded on the rights of an individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In order to insure those inherent rights we guaranteed to our people either specifically or by implication three great principles, without which our Nation cannot endure: religious freedom, political freedom, and economic freedom. Religious freedom, the right to engage and participate in the religion of our choice; political freedom, the right to engage and participate in the political belief of our choice; economic freedom, the right to engage in the work or business of our choice.

Upon these three principles of freedom, our democratic society depends. If you destroy any one of the three, our democracy as we have known it will die. I believe sincerely in these three principles. My sworn duty is to protect them to the best of my ability. I believe that the American people have retained and are exercising to a satisfactory degree the first two freedoms—religious and political. I believe and I shall prove that we are swiftly losing the third freedom—the economic freedom which embraces the principle of real free enterprise. I shall define real free enterprise a little later.

When our founding fathers established the three principles of political, religious, and economic freedom, our commercial system was very simple and rested entirely upon the personal participation and ownership of the individual. Every man had the right legally and also the economic opportunity to engage in the business of his choice. Competition was on the basis of personal service and efficiency. Success or failure depended almost entirely upon the ability of the individual manufacturer or retailer. Thus the avenue of business enterprise was open to anyone who could raise a small amount of capital to finance his own enterprise. This was the environment of early American business. This environment no longer exists. Our business world today is no longer simple and independent. It has become very complex and interdependent. As our Nation developed and changed, the scope of all our operations broadened. Scientific discoveries and mechanical inventions multiplied our possibilities for production and distribution. Capital tended to accumulate in the hands of a few powerful financiers. It is because I believe that the development of great corporations, monopolies, and cartels

threaten the economic freedom of our people that I feel impelled to point out the evolution of our business system away from economic freedom and "real free enterprise."

THOMAS JEFFERSON DENOUNCED MONEYED CORPORATIONS AT THE TIME OF THEIR BIRTH

Even as far back as Thomas Jefferson this change in our economic system was beginning and it caused that great believer in real free enterprise to say:

The masses of the people were not born with saddles on their backs, nor were the favored few born with spurs with which to ride them. * * * I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracies of our moneyed corporations * * * which already bid defiance to the laws of our country.

From the time of Thomas Jefferson to the time of Abraham Lincoln great strides were made in business development. The industrial revolution was beginning—the steam engine, the cotton gin, the first great railroads, the development from a simple agrarian economy to a complex industrial economy was changing the face of our country and the habits of our people

ABRAHAM LINCOLN FORESAW THE DANGER TO OUR REPUBLIC IN GREAT CORPORATIONS OR AGGREGATIONS OF WEALTH

In the midst of this great development our Nation was rent asunder by the War between the States. Following this war, one of our great Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, said:

As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war.

Those words, so pregnant with meaning, are just as applicable today—and sound the same note of warning in the midst of World War No. 2 as they did following the Civil War, 80 years ago. Lincoln was assassinated shortly thereafter and the people lost a great champion of real free enterprise. Combinations of capital and industry were rapidly forming themselves into powerful groups known as trusts in the post-Civil War era.

BENJAMIN HARRISON: "COMBINATIONS OF CAPITAL (TRUSTS) ARE DANGEROUS CONSPIRACIES AGAINST THE COMMON GOOD"

Many fortunes made during the Civil War formed the nuclei of these trusts, and in 1890 another President, Benjamin Harrison, gave this message to the common people:

Earnest attention should be given by Congress to a consideration of the question, how far the restraint of those combinations of capital commonly called trusts is a matter of Federal jurisdiction. When organized, as they often are, to crush out all healthy competition and to monopolize the production or sale of an article of commerce and general necessity, they are dangerous conspiracies against the public good, and should be made the subject of prohibitory and even penal legislation.

It was not until the beginning of the twentieth century, however, that a real attempt was made by government to check these great trusts in their antisocial and greedy development.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT USED THE "BIG STICK" ON THE MONOPOLISTIC CORPORATIONS

Theodore Roosevelt was inaugurated in 1901 and during his term in office made a partially successful attempt to break up these great trusts. The Sherman Antitrust Act had been passed July 2, 1890. Roosevelt tried to enforce it. In denouncing these great combinations of economic power, Theodore Roosevelt said:

A combination should not be tolerated if it abuses the power acquired by combination, to the public detriment. No corporation or association of any kind should be permitted to engage in foreign or interstate commerce, that is formed for the purposes of, or whose operations create, a monopoly or general control of the production, sale, or distribution of any one or more of the prime necessities of life or articles of general use and necessity. Such combinations are against the public policy; they violate the common law, and I believe the Congress can close the channels of interstate commerce against them for its protection.

Although he was successful in dividing into separate legal units most of these great trusts, we know that it was only a temporary check in their development.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT DENOUNCED MONOPOLY AND SUPPRESSION OF COMPETITION AS CONTRARY TO PUBLIC GOOD

Many of the divided units soon became greater in wealth and economic power than the original parent trust and Theodore Roosevelt's successor, William Howard Taft, had this to say about this grave question:

Through all our consideration of this grave question, however, we must insist that the suppression of competition, the controlling of prices, and the monopoly or attempt to monopolize in interstate commerce and business, are not only unlawful but contrary to the public good, and that they must be restrained and punished until ended.

The Attorney General, at my suggestion, has drafted a Federal incorporation bill, embodying the views I have attempted to set forth, and it will be at the disposition of the appropriate committees of Congress.

Congress did pass laws, but the powerful monopolies and corporations continued to grow in financial and political power. They either ignored or circumvented the laws which had been enacted to curb or control their operations. These great monopolies moved behind the State and National Legislatures and through their campaign contributions and control of newspapers they elected to public office, in too many instances, men who either openly fought the corporation's battles or silently acquiesced to their program of economic fascism.

WOODROW WILSON FORECAST CONTROL OF THE POLITICAL STATE BY GREAT CORPORATIONS

Woodrow Wilson, another great President and a true believer in democracy and real free enterprise, was inaugurated as President in 1913. He, too, as a great student of the history of economic development of our Nation, saw the danger to our traditional structure of government. He realized that a powerful economic state within a political state would soon dominate the political state, and here is his warning to the common people.

The corporations now overshadow partnerships altogether. Still more do they overshadow all individuals engaged in business on their separate responsibility. * * * A modern corporation is an economic society, a little economic state—and not always little even as compared with States. Manufacturers have been observed to develop a score of subsidiary industries. * * * Society in short * * * is building up bodies economic outside its bodies politic which may, if we do not find means to prevent them, dominate bodies politic themselves.

But Woodrow Wilson's crusade of domestic reform was interrupted by World War No. 1. Again national economic welfare and security were postponed because of war. This time it was a war 3,000 miles away, but by that time the development of commerce and transportation had reached such international importance that against our will, we became embroiled. During World War No. 1 our production of food and equipment soared to heretofore unknown heights. Our unemployed went to work. We operated on a full production, full employment basis.

FREE ENTERPRISE OF THE 1920'S—OUR GREAT BUSINESS LEADERS ADVOCATE A REPEAT

Over 1,700 millionaires were made during the war and big business entrenched itself more firmly than ever. The industrial plant was expanded due to the war demands an orgy of speculation and crooked finance followed. The great corporations expanded their fields of endeavor, ruthlessly eliminating or purchasing their competitors. They practiced during the Harding, Coolidge, Hoover regime their type of "free enterprise"; their brand of "rugged individualism"; their "freedom from interference and regulation by Government." The ruthless warfare of the jungle, the law of fang and club, was waged in the business world. If ever unrestricted, unrestrained free enterprise had its opportunity for full play, it had it during the years following Woodrow Wilson's death—a death which was hastened no doubt by the realization that these great financial forces he had fought before the war, had, during the war, obtained greater power; a power which they selfishly used after the war to defeat his plan for world peace. Yes, under false slogans, these great interests confused the people, brought pressure to bear upon their friends in the United States Senate and wrecked Wilson's plan for a World Court where the differences between nations could have been settled by arbitration. The events of the past two decades have vindicated Wilson and damned forever his opponents. The orgy of inflation and crooked finance brought our economic system to an almost complete stop in 1929. The "free enterprise" boys had overplayed their hand. Their oracles of business wisdom proved to be false prophets. Their great business leaders were discredited in the eyes of the American people. Some of them committed suicide. Others like Insull, the great utility magnate, and the oil tycoons, Doheney and Sinclair, were indicted. Some went to jail. Their crooked trails

ran throughout the Government—even into President Harding's Cabinet. Their Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall, was convicted and sent to prison for collusion with a great oil company in the Teapot Dome scandal. There was no cry during this period of "too much Government in business," but the common people know by the record which Big Business wrote that there was too much "business in Government"!

And what about the common people? The crash came in October of 1929, a depression descended upon the American people which made previous depressions resemble picnics. Our "free-enterprise" system failed to function. Over one-third of our people were thrown into economic insecurity. Fifteen million wage earners lost their jobs. Our discredited business leaders were panic-stricken. They had no plan then and they have no plan now.

Our present President came into office in January 1933 and through deficit financing started the wheels of our economic system turning and, as I stated before, World War No. 2 has kept them turning. When the war ends we face disaster if we depend upon the discredited theory of laissez faire, as advocated by big business. The development of trusts, great corporations, monopolies, and cartels has created a condition in our economic world which precludes and effectively prohibits the practice of real free enterprise.

What do I mean by "real free enterprise"? A society that operates on a real free-enterprise basis encourages the maximum number of independent business units possible, compatible with the need of society and their economic justification. The tendency of monopoly is to eliminate business units and limit production without regard to the need of society. Its sole concern is monetary profit. Therefore, monopoly eliminates real free enterprise.

Does that condition of real free enterprise, as I have interpreted it, exist today? I have given you the comments of Jefferson, Lincoln, Harrison, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and Woodrow Wilson, as they lived and analyzed the changing nature of our economic system. Let me now give you the final Presidential comment by our contemporary President—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT SUMMARIZES PRESENT STATUS OF FREE ENTERPRISE

He gives a powerful summary of our present status and a damning indictment against those vociferous leaders of big business, those hypocrites who blare the trumpets of free enterprise to confuse the people and, in their corporate, monopolistic power and practices, prevent its operation. I quote the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

> In place of the independent businessman we have the managing clerk of a chain store who cannot even make a credit sale, and a superintendent has taken the place of the factory owner. The small businessman has been crushed, merged, consolidated, or otherwise retired. * * * Local independence has been sacrificed to balance sheet values. * * * Private enterprise has become half regimented and half competitive, half slave and half free, which was as fatal to those who manipulate it as to those who suffer under its impositions.

The "free enterprise" which big business practices is the freedom for the biggest fish, who gets there first, to eat all the little fish in the pool. It is the freedom which allows all of the big fish (corporate monopolies) to form a trust or monopoly so they can more effectively eliminate the small fish (independent businessmen). The "free enterprise" big business advocates is for the right to continue its process of eliminating the independent grocer, druggist, clothier, movie owner, oil-station operator, and even the independent banker. Twenty-five years ago I started my career as a small independent businessman. During those 25 years I "was there." I have experienced the competition every independent businessman experiences. I have seen the change take place in my home town, a change that prevails throughout America. The bulk of the retail and wholesale business in my town and yours is done by local units of the great corporations and monopolies which dominate American business. We call them chain stores, chain groceries, chain drugs, chain movie palaces, chain banks, and so forth. And the word "chain" is more apt, more descriptive than most of us realize, for they are the economic chains of slavery which stifle individual initiative and prevent real free enterprise, the free enterprise which was envisaged and practiced by the founding fathers—the free economic opportunity which goes with freedom of religion and freedom of political choice; the economic opportunity for the boy and girl of today to enter a profession or independent business career of his own choosing, when he arrives at the point of entry into the business world.

The economic opportunity afforded our people in the development of our Nation was the dynamic force which built America. It gave full play to the instinct of personal adventure, the instinct of self-fulfillment, the hunger to build and manage one's own business. When business classifications are closed one after the other by the domination of great Nation-wide chains, this opportunity is gone. The intelligent man realizes that his chances for success are very small and he loses that dynamic urge to build his own business. His only alternative is salaried employment in an impersonalized corporation, where too often his personality is submerged and his initiative and ideas are regimented to the pattern most profitable to corporate procedure. Thus we see the present status of our economy completely changed from the American tradition of real free enterprise—rapidly approaching the end of individual initiative as we have known it—rapidly displacing the widespread independent ownership of farm, home, and business enterprise.

I contend that any force which unnecessarily destroys the independent farmer and independent enterprise also destroys home ownership, giving birth to some form of economic and political fascism, leading inevitably to revolution! If we here in America fail to recognize this truth and fail to take steps to reverse our present trend toward chain stores and monopolies, I say to you with no fear of an intelligent contradiction, that within a few years this country will be faced with the most vicious class war in the history of the world. I base this prediction on the known fact that any nation which liquidates its middle-class farmers, workers, professional men, and other enterprises, liquidates its economic liberty. You cannot liquidate economic liberty without destroying political liberty. When you have accomplished the latter the people revolt. For the past 25 years the small independent businesses of these United States have suffered an epidemic of liquidations on a scale unparalleled in our history and we must now repair the damage and prepare the cure. Where to start is, of course, the problem, but a start must be made—and at once.

I believe that "little people" should own little farms and little businesses, and that "big people," as they are commonly called, should be kept to those fields in which they do the best job toward making this a better life for everybody. The perpetuation of democracy depends upon the protection of "little people."

RESTORATION OF REAL FREE ENTERPRISE THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE TO COLLECTIVISM OR TOTALITARIANISM

This real free enterprise was supplanted in Russia by state collectivism, which means the operation of all business for the profit of the state. It necessarily eliminates the political, religious, and economic rights of the individual as we have known them. This real free enterprise was supplanted in the Axis nations—Italy, Spain, Japan, and Germany—by totalitarianism, which means the operation of all business for the profit of certain favored individual owners of great corporate monopolies and enterprises. This national plan also eliminates the political, religious, and economic rights of the individual.

In my opinion we will face the choice of these two philosophies of government during our next economic collapse—depression—unless we restore real free enterprise.

How are we to do this? In my concluding statement I intend to give my suggestions as to how we can restore real free enterprise.

In closing I wish to reemphasize my belief in the real free enterprise which built America. I believe that the traditional procedure of real free enterprise is the solution. I believe that economic opportunity which we once enjoyed should be restored. I believe that the cancerous growth of unchecked corporate holdings and monopoly power must be removed from our economic system. Unless this is done we face an impossible situation when the war is over. We will be required to find 10,000,000 more jobs than ever before, if our demobilized soldiers are not to walk the streets. We will need 15,000,000 more jobs if the millions of newly trained workers are not to displace every man over 45 years of age. This job-making problem cannot be accomplished by big business under its present procedure of monopoly control

of production. They cannot meet the employment demands of the post-war world if they insist on tightly controlled and limited use of the newly increased plant facilities, which have cost the people of America $50,000,000,000 in public funds. Only full operation of our plant facilities, bringing full production of goods to our people, can furnish the full employment we must have. The shouting of "free enterprise" may temporarily confuse the people, but it will not prevent the collapse of an economic system that fails to serve its people. It will not prevent a greater depression than the depression of 1929. The people of America may not be so fortunate in their next crisis. The leader who emerges may have the ambition and ruthlessness of a Hitler.

DECENTRALIZE CORPORATE MONOPOLIES: FULL PRODUCTION AND OPERATION OF EXISTING PLANT FACILITIES, FULL EMPLOYMENT OF OUR PEOPLE

The time is closer than you think. Our only hope is in the intelligence of our people. Our only plan is to move fast and decentralize the monopolistic economic empires within our business system. Chain stores must be limited to a reasonable minimum of units. Additional units can be prevented by excise taxation. We must insist on full operation of our plant facilities in order that full employment may bring the blessings of full production to our people. We must restore the economic opportunity that is inherent in real free enterprise and give the independent businessman a chance to operate successfully again in our society. Our only chance to save religious and political democracy is to restore and perpetuate economic democracy.

May God give us the clarity of vision to demand the restoration of the real free enterprise of our fathers, and protect us from the fraudulent brand of "free enterprise" as advocated by the great corporate monopolies of big business.

Soldier-Vote Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of the House in appreciation of the fact that the soldier-vote bill is now law. This is brought about notwithstanding the noncommittal attitude of the President. The Senate passed the bill 42 to 37. The House passed the bill 328 to 69.

Three options were open to the President. He could have approved the bill, thus making it law. He could have vetoed the bill, thus requiring a two-thirds vote by the Congress in order to make it a law. He could take no definite position and not be counted for or against the bill for a period of 10 days, whereupon it would become a law without Presidential action. He elected to pursue the latter course.

Mr. Speaker, this was surprising to many, in view of the message sent to the Congress on January 26, wherein the President condemned the Senate bill, the purpose of which was to furnish our service people with the complete State ballot. That message was delivered to the Congress after the bill had passed the Senate and while it was being considered in the House. The President said, in part:

I consider such proposed legislation a fraud on the soldiers and sailors and marines now training and fighting for us and for our sacred rights. It is a fraud upon the American people.

That is pretty strong language. Possibly the President did not mean it just that way, or possibly he has received additional information. Be that as it may, in a message delivered to the House on yesterday, advising that he would take no position for or against the bill, among other things, the President said:

The bill is, in my judgment, wholly inadequate to assure to service men and women, as far as is practically feasible, the same opportunity which they would have to vote if they were at home.

I quite agree with the President that, regardless of the kind of ballot used, it is not practically feasible to give to all of the service people all over the world the same opportunity to vote which these people would have if they were back in their home precincts; at best, the Congress can only make the effort. Nothing can be accomplished without State and Federal cooperation.

Again the President assures us that:

The Federal Government will and should do everything it can to get the State ballots to our men and women in the service.

Again I agree with the President. That promise means much to the soldiers who want to vote.

The President also says:

The Federal Government can insure, and in my judgment it is the duty of the Federal Government to insure, that every service man and woman who does not get his State ballot in time shall have the right to use a short and uniform Federal ballot.

Again I agree with the President. An official declaration of this kind on the part of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is assurance that either the Federal or State ballot, as provided in this law, will be placed in the hands of all of our service people.

It is generally agreed that any State absentee ballot can be furnished to all service people within the United States. This being so, there is no necessity for the incomplete ballot in this country. Under the law, the Federal ballot can be used only by overseas service people, and by them only under two conditions: (a) That their States have certified their willingness to accept votes cast by the Federal ballot; and (b) that the overseas service voter has applied for but not received his State ballot; that is, it is the purpose of this law to place into the hands of our service people the State ballot when possible, and the bobtail ballot can only be used when the other ballot is not available. Is not that reasonable and just?

The Legislature of Michigan has amended our State law making it absolutely certain that Michigan service people will receive the State ballot and that this ballot will be counted. This is conditioned only on the desire of the soldier to vote and the ability of the Post Office Department, the Army, the Navy, and the merchant marine to deliver the ballots. It would seem that this should be ample assurance. It is gratifying to note that the services are already organizing and making preparations to carry out the President's promise as to delivery.

It must be remembered that no ballots—soldier or otherwise—can be legally counted in any State unless they find their way into the ballot boxes. Therefore, regardless of how many Federal ballots are sent into a State, those ballots only have vitality if they are placed in the State ballot box and counted along with State ballots. This of necessity requires State cooperation and approval.

This soldier-vote matter has been before the country and the Congress for many weeks. Under the original Green-Lucas bill, the President would have named a commission to deliver these bobtail ballots to service people in this country and abroad, under such rules and regulations as the commission might make. Later the commission would deliver the voted ballots to the States. There was no assurance that the States would count them. There are those who protested against the Commander in Chief, who probably will be a candidate in the election, naming this commission to conduct an election where he might be personally interested. On the other hand, it has been charged that some of those who opposed the Green-Lucas bill did not want these ballots handled in this way because they felt that it might aid a fourth-term election. All such charges should be ignored. Politics has no place here. There should be no compulsion or influence. Nevertheless, legislation should provide against any such contingencies. This new law does that very thing.

There has been much talk about giving the soldier the right to vote. That right is inherent in the qualified citizen. The purpose of the Congress has been to furnish the opportunity to the service people to exercise their right to vote. The real controversy has been as to method and not as to objective.

Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous letters asking for copies of the Federal ballot. Therefore, I am including herein a copy of the official ballot just as it will be delivered to those who are entitled to receive it. It is as follows:

OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT

Instruction: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office.

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party, and shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates by name for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for President _____

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

UNITED STATES SENATOR, UNEXPIRED TERM

(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State for an unexpired term)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district _____

REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS

(Only in the States entitled thereto)

Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large _____

(Vote for one or two as the case may be)

It will be observed that where the Federal ballot is used, the soldier can vote only for President, Vice President, Senator, and Congressman.

It will be further observed that where the Federal ballot is used, the soldier must know the names of his candidates, must be able to spell the names correctly, and must write them in the ballot. How many servicemen will have this information?

Where the State ballot is used, the soldier will have before him the names of all the candidates running for all the offices in the election. All he will be required to do is to place a cross in front of the names of the men for whom he wants to vote, just the same as if he were voting in his home precinct.

If the soldier were given his choice of ballots, which one would he choose?

No, Mr. Speaker; there is no comparison.

To summarize the argument, the Federal ballot is opposed primarily because—

First. It denies the service man and woman the same full participation in the November election that the civilian here at home enjoys.

Second. It restricts the service man and woman to a vote for Federal officers—President, Vice President, and Members of Congress—only.

Third. Voters in the armed forces would be partially disfranchised in that they could not participate in State, county, and local elections. They would not be permitted to vote for any of the 34 Governors who will be elected in November.

Fourth. The ballot carries no names of candidates, thus preventing the casting of an intelligent ballot.

Fifth. The ballot is clearly illegal and unconstitutional, standing alone. It ignores the requirements of State election laws. Therefore, it could not be counted by election judges in many States.

Sixth. In the event of a contested election, which the Federal "bobtailed" ballot clearly invites, the Nation would face a chaotic situation.

The Congress has done its part. A proper and adequate method of soldier voting has been provided. If a State refuses to cooperate and the soldiers from that State are not permitted to vote, the responsibility rests entirely upon the State. The President's promise, to which I have referred, should remove all doubt as to Federal cooperation.

Of course, this law is not as those who favor the short ballot only would have it. It is not as those who favor the State ballot only would have it. Like most legislation in a democracy, it is a compromise at a point where the minds of both groups can conscientiously meet. It is the result of the sincere effort of the Congress to permit these service people, now scattered all over the earth, to vote for their public officials from President to coroner.

In the final analysis, the success of this law depends upon two factors: First, the cooperation of the States, and, second, upon the cooperation and ability of the administration, through the War and Navy Departments and the merchant marine, to deliver the State ballots, where practical, and the short ballots in other cases. I am convinced we will have this cooperation.

Senator Swan, Democratic Leader of Sacramento, Endorses the Candidacy of Hon. J. Leroy Johnson for the Democratic Nomination for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, for over 25 years my predecessors in office, Hon. Charles F. Curry, Republican, and Hon. Frank H. Buck, Democrat, have, each time that they sought reelection, filed as candidates in both the Republican and Democratic primaries.

These gentlemen rendered distinguished service for the Third District of California and each of them died while in office. Each time that they sought reelection they were given the nomination of both parties. Instead of serving as rabid partisans they tried to serve all the people of their district.

During my present term as the Representative of the Third District of California I have tried hard to emulate the distinguished service of these two able Members of the House.

I, likewise, have filed for the nomination of both parties. My party affiliation is Republican. Consequently it is very gratifying to learn that Hon. John Harold Swan, State Senator from the Sacramento district, and a distinguished Democratic leader and progressive thinker, has endorsed my effort to obtain the Democratic nomination. Under the rule permitting an extension of my remarks, I am making a part of this statement a letter which Senator Swan sent to the Sacramento Bee, without my knowledge or request. I hope my friends in the Third District of California will carefully read Senator Swan's letter, which reads as follows:

SACRAMENTO COUNTY, *April 2, 1944.*

EDITOR, SACRAMENTO BEE,

Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR EDITOR: A somewhat sinister note is injecting itself into the campaign for Congress in many of the California districts. I urge that in our Third District the highly unpatriotic appeal of blind partisanship be rebuked and discredited. I denounce as entirely improper in wartime the attack frequently made upon able Congressmen by minority groups that such Congressmen should be defeated for reelection because they have not in every instance followed the desires of such groups when such desires happened to coincide with the desires of the President. The basis of the attack is that the individual Congressman is not following the leadership of our Commander in Chief and therefore is almost guilty of treason and under no circumstances should be returned to Congress.

It is axiomatic in a representative democracy that a Congressman's first duty is to his constituents. If he does not vote their will insofar as it can be learned or insofar as he by his election platform has expressed it, then the people of his district have no voice in the Government and are completely and effectively disenfranchised. Before any political critic condemns a State or National legislator, he should first ask whether or not the legislator has voted the will of his district. If the legislator has expressed the sentiment of his constituents, then democracy is functioning, and no attack on the legislator is soundly based or justifiable.

In wartime all must make sacrifices. Organized labor has made great sacrifices, and perhaps in order to keep the good will of all Americans, must make, as labor usually has done, greater sacrifices than any other group.

My public voting record in committee and on the floor of the State senate clearly shows that no other member has been a better friend of labor than have I. In 1941 the American Federation of Labor tabulation of votes showed that my voting record was the best in the senate. The American Federation of Labor made no tabulation of votes for the 1943 session, but the C. I. O. tabulation, just released, for that session shows that I am the only member of the senate with 12 "good" labor votes and no "bad" labor votes. What I say, therefore, I say as a proved friend of labor.

I regret that some of the leadership of organized labor seeks to defeat our capable and distinguished Congressman, LEROY JOHNSON, because some of his votes have been displeasing. I believe that he will prove in the long run to be a better friend of organized labor than many of those who profess to doubt his friendship for all who work for a living. I urge that the membership of labor support the candidacy of Congressman JOHNSON. He is honest, intelligent, and courageous, and will always give fair consideration to the needs of every group.

Congressman JOHNSON does not know that I am writing this letter. I have endorsed his candidacy because he has demonstrated great ability and because I resent the narrow partisanship that seeks his defeat on the ground that he has not been a rubber stamp for the Chief Executive.

I cannot as a Democrat be a party to an attempt to defeat a capable and efficient public servant merely because he is a Republican. We must place country first and party second.

All of my friends in the Democratic Party and in the ranks of organized labor will benefit our country and our district by voting for Congressman JOHNSON's reelection. Neither of his opponents, and one of them I count as a personal friend, an individual of demonstrated leadership ability, can hope to accomplish at this time what Mr. JOHNSON's experience will enable Mr. JOHNSON to achieve.

May we in the Third Congressional District decisively rebuke the sinister contention that

our country's welfare needs now in Washington only rubber stamps of the Chief Executive and his bureaucrats.

Respectfully,

JOHN HAROLD SWAN,
State Senator, Nineteenth District.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas farm women agree that the O. P. A. operation of poultry and eggs has been "fowl."

There is a thrill about the sowing of oats—it is always the first planting of the new year.

Oh, Lord, please roll away the stone from the tomb of blood and tears. We don't mind the sweat.

The most constructive thing the Republican Party could possibly do this year would be to destroy politically the destroyers.

Unlike the long-promised second front, a definite and tremendously important battle is set for the first Tuesday in November.

The farmer works eternally with nature—he never knows for sure what he is going to do tomorrow, but there always is something that he can do.

We love the memory of Jackson and Lincoln because they had seen and felt and experienced personally the rough and tumble of life. They knew what it was all about.

We revere the first President for three things in particular: as military leader of the Revolution, as the first President, and as the author of the Farewell Address.

Aside from the annual supply bills, Congress is not so busy. The war is getting set. While a military victory is coming, we will be chiefly concerned with extending or executing O. P. A. and planning the party conventions.

Two undecorated heroes at home—Johnnie Corrigan of Powhattan, for 19 years a great leader of youth in a small high school, and Mrs. Ivan Clements of Jackson County, mother of 11, a correspondent of note, who drove 40 miles in a snowstorm to attend her district convention.

Montana's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the press in recent weeks has carried statements to the effect that nearly every State has lagged in meeting its draft quotas. I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that Montana is one of four States which has not been deficient in furnishing its share in fulfilling its quota. This means, of course, that Montana has had to continue on an increased scale the induction of fathers, and it also indicates that in proportion to our manpower we are in this war, as in the last, being asked to carry more than the national load. Out of a total of 127,958 persons registered for the draft in ages 18 to 44, inclusive, we have sent, up to December 9, 1943, 47,388. This figure indicates a tremendous drain on our manpower, and when one considers the loss that Montana has suffered, not only in the draft but to defense industries as well, one can begin to comprehend the potentially dangerous situation in which we find ourselves at the present time.

The First World War left Montana bankrupt in land, men, and money, and unless something is done the Second World War may leave us in a worse condition. On the basis of what information I have been able to gather, Montana's contribution to the armed forces has been proportionately greater than that of most of the other States, and the Army Selective Service officials admitting this during the first year of the draft said that the situation was caused by the fact that it took so long for credit for enlistments to get back to Montana draft boards. The result was that the draft quotas were not reduced in proportion, and it seems logical to assume on the basis of facts enumerated that when this war is over we will again be found to be one of the States contributing the most in proportion to population in carrying on the war. Now we are being called on to produce more food with less men and less machinery; to produce more materials; to contribute to every drive connected with the war, and to place all our resources at the beck and call of the Nation in its hour of emergency. These we are glad to do, but we want it done on an equitable basis and we want Montana to be given every fair opportunity along with all the other States in the Union.

There have been no draft rejections in Montana on account of illiteracy and there have been very few rejections on the grounds of physical disability. We are not asking for any special favors, but we are asking for the opportunity to be treated as an equal and not as an orphan whose resources can be used at will with no thought for the future. In this respect it might be well to point out that we are now trying to bring about the development of our water resources on the Missouri and Columbia River basins. We hope that when the bill for the authorization of the Hungry Horse comes up after the recess that the Congress will keep these factors in mind.

Montana is one of the two States in the war which has not received a war industry. Montana has lost in population since 1940 a total of 88,237 people out of a 1940 population of 559,456. Despite this we have not only met every draft quota and exceeded some, but we have also, according to press reports which I have gathered from Montana papers, been one of the few States to exceed its 1943–44 quota of student nurses. Our quota was 442 and our enrollment is 525 student nurses enrolled in State nursing schools to date. Although we have exceeded our quota in student nurses, the national average on January 1, 1944, was 37 percent behind its quota.

In the 1943 industrial salvage campaign, Montana passed its State quota by 80 percent and according to Mr. E. G. Nelson, of Minneapolis, regional and general industrial Salvage chief, our State recorded the highest percentage of any State in the Nation last year.

In the matter of bonds, Montana has oversubscribed every campaign to date. During the Fourth War Loan campaign we oversubscribed the quota set for Montana by over $10,000,000 and many of those bonds were the "E" group which indicates that they are being bought by the ordinary folks, and it also indicates our confidence in our country. Fifty-two and five-tenths percent of the State's total sales in the fourth campaign was in "E" bonds compared to the national average of 32 percent. There were $220,172,000 E, F, and G bonds sold, which is more than one to every Montana family. In the Fourth War Loan drive Montanans purchased $124,968,900 in bonds with total quota of $97,300,000. This is $27,668,000 over our quota.

These facts, and they are only a few of the many which I could call to your attention, have been accomplished in one of the States which has enjoyed the least in war contracts. It demonstrates that there is among the people of Montana a loyalty, a desire to do their full part, a satisfaction in assuming the burdens as well as the benefits of free government, that is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. It shows also that Montanans are standing right behind their boys on the fighting fronts and is living proof that Montana has been exceeded in patriotism and sacrifice by no other State.

My purpose in calling this to the attention of the House is to show that Montana has done its full share in carrying on its part in this war in which we are all engaged. You may rest assured that Montana will continue to do its share, and more, until final and complete victory is won against our enemies and until a peace is assured which will do away with this system of barbaric struggles which has been our unfortunate lot in recent decades.

Repeal of Daylight Saving

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the surprising features of

the Second World War is the change it has wrought in established methods of warfare. The reversal in tactics, weapons, engineering, and practically every phase of military procedure amounts to a revolution. The reversal in preconceived notions extends to measures affecting civilian economy, and includes such items as rationing, price control, civilian defense, lend-lease and, last but not least, daylight saving.

Daylight saving was adopted with general approval and acquiescence and on the plausible representation that it would save electric power, contribute to health, and accelerate factory production. The critical and conclusive test of experience has demonstrated that it accomplishes none of these objectives. On the contrary, it wastes power, is deleterious to the health of young and old, and is one of the prime factors in absenteeism.

The rapidly rising tide of sentiment against artificial time is indicated in the many letters received on the subject. Here are excerpts from some of them received in the last 3 days. They are widely distributed both geographically and industrially.

Some are from physicians:

CARRUTHERSVILLE, MO.

Please rid us of this farcical and nonsensical regulation, the so-called daylight saving time. This attempt to regulate our personal lives, by moving the clock up an hour, is one of the damnedest fool things ever forced on the general public. To me, a public health officer, the greatest objection comes from the standpoint of the school child in the rural districts.

Certainly in the administration of any public health program, there can be no excuse for arousing 6 or 7 year old kids at such an early hour and exposing them to the elements, while they are still half asleep and unable to protect themselves. The wait in the cold until the bus arrives is not conducive to the prevention of diseases brought about by exposure, to which this age child is very susceptible.

FRED L. OGILVIE, M. D.,
Medical Director, Pemiscot County Health Unit.

MEXICO, MO.

Get this nonsensical "daylight savings" repealed. Not one reason for it and many why it should be abolished. Get this job done and earn our undying thanks and gratitude.

R. S. WILLIAMS, M. D.

EUREKA, MO.

Do away with this useless and most harmful "war saving daylight time." I have talked with many people in this part of the country and they are all for going back to our regular time.

It is time that the parasitic "time" bug that got in someone's bonnet was squelched.

JESSE S. SARGENT, M. D.

COLUMBIA COUNTY, GA.

Let us return to standard time. This war time has caused so much unnecessary confusion, loss of time, expense, and suffering.

Yours truly,

J. L. WEEKS, M. D.

Letters from clergymen and pastors of churches:

UNION, MO.

In the morning paper I notice there is a bill before Congress to change the time back to the standard schedule.

I do not know how much the time affects business and the farming industry, but I feel sure the change of time had mitigated against the work of the churches, and that I am voicing the reaction of many other pastors. So I am sincerely hoping to see the change back to the standard time.

The St. Louis Globe Democrat made a favorable comment on the proposal on its editorial page this morning.

R. A. HUTSON,
Pastor, First Baptist Church.

BOYD, MINN.

We have had too much tinkering by New Deal theorists with the calendar, the clock, and the unchangeable law of supply and demand. To say the least, the war time is a nuisance in farming communities. Get us back to safe and sane government before we have complete regimentation.

ST. JOHN'S LUTHERAN CHURCH,
A. W. FUERSTENAU, *Pastor.*

ST. JOHN'S RECTORY,
Summerville, S. C.

Work to have a bill passed so that the Nation can return to rational clock time and get away from this abnormal way of living.

I have written our Senator relative to the bill and will be pleased if all Congress will make it so we have normal conditions and do away with all this tampering with old institutions that have served this Nation all these hundreds of years.

JAS. A. MCELROY,
Pastor.

PERRYVILLE, MO.

Bravo—set the clocks back. None of our people here like it in wintertime.

Rev. F. G. WIEBERG,
Pastor, St. Boniface Church.

PLAINFIELD, N. J.

Mr. Robert Garland, of Pittsburgh, was, as you know, the prime mover in the agitation that resulted in the national adoption of this fast time in 1918. He is generally regarded as the father of daylight saving time in the United States. Last winter I wrote to him and asked him if he approved of it for winter as well as summer. He wrote back:

"Please understand that I never advocated a change of the clock in wintertime. This simply amounts to a change of the clock and cannot properly be called daylight saving time."

You say it helps factories in defense work by saving 500,000 kilowatts a day of electric power needed by the factories. But as they are now working 24 hours a day, the advanced time does not give them 1 minute more to make ammunition to smash Hitler. While the defense work is going on without stop, it is not hastened by the different shifts of men coming in and going out an hour earlier. The work is being done regardless of who does it and regardless of whether the clocks on the wall are right or an hour fast.

Consider another proof of the truth of Mr. Garland's declaration that "a changing of the clock in wintertime cannot properly be called daylight saving time."

Representative J. W. WADSWORTH of New York says that recent estimates of power authorities showed that only 2 percent of electrical energy could be saved by advancing the clocks during the winter. And that, he says, does not take into account the extra voltage used by farmers in the very early morning hours. Hence, the saving is less than 2 percent.

In view of this negligible amount of electric energy saved by this device—less than 2 percent—there is no justification for the cruelty inflicted on people by this so-called winter daylight saving.

The effect of this scheme on the morale of the people is bad, and morale is a tremendous factor in winning the war. Why cruelly compel those who must rise at 5 o'clock on a cold, dark winter morning to rise at 4? Or those who rise at 7 to get up at 6, still cold and dark and lonely? The best rest and sleep come to us in the early morning hours, and being compelled to get up a full hour before we normally have to get up unfits one for the day's work.

You say that if an air raid and consequent black-out came in the early evening, the fast time would enable folks to get home before the alarm. But an air raid might as well come in the dark early morning. No one can tell when the planes will come. We have to take our chances at both ends of the day.

The people will gladly make all necessary sacrifices, but please don't ask for unnecessary ones.

CHARLES HILLMAN FOUNTAIN, D. D.

Letters from schoolmen:

HANNIBAL, MO.

Eliminate daylight saving time. Restore the country to standard time and sanity. I have yet to find one person who can present one provable argument that daylight saving time is any advantage whatsoever or that it contributes in any way to winning the war. I hope the Congress passes this bill and thus eliminates one of the most asinine pieces of legislation that has been thrust upon a helpless public.

A. E. PRINCE,
President Hannibal-LaGrange College.

TROY CENTER SCHOOL,
Columbia City, Ind.

I am principal of a school which embraces the entire township. Every child is transported by bus. We are forced to take up school one-half hour later because our children are having to stand at ends of lanes or major road connections waiting in the dark for the bus. Then again, we're losing an hour of rest because who wants to go to bed at 8 or 8:30 when it isn't even dark, but the clock necessitates getting up that extra hour in the morning. Farmers to transact business in town must stop work and go early in the afternoon or everything is closed.

ROXIE BARCUS,
Principal.

FULTON, MO.

Much gratified to note from the newspapers the introduction of the bill to change the time back to the old basis. I greatly approve.

H. L. SMITH,
President, William Woods College.

CANTON, MO.

Wars aren't won by twisting the hands of a clock.

Sentiment here is almost unanimously in favor of a return to standard time.

L. S. HOPKINS,
Dean, Culver-Stockton College.

BONNOTS MILL, MO.

We don't like the system of daylight saving time.

The daylight saving time keeps farmers from accomplishing a full day's work.

If the time goes back to central standard time, many people will be pleased. I know our teachers will be.

SCHOOL SISTERS OF ST. FRANCIS,
Frankenstein High School.

QUINCY, ILL.

Return to original time. As a teacher, I realize the disadvantages to children during the winter months. It is better also for our rural population and our churches. I cannot see that daylight-saving time is of any

advantage to industry during the winter months at least.

MARY B. INGMAN,
Teacher, Quincy Senior High School.

Organizations and officials are represented:

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS.

I am enclosing a copy of an editorial which we had written in one of the local papers, also a sample petition which has appeared in both newspapers. We have asked the citizens of Arkansas City to sign these petitions and send them to the schoolhouses where they are collected by the different P. T. A. units.

Steps have been taken to contact our Congressmen and Senators and ask them to support your bill.

Needless to say we are very anxious that your bill receives enough favorable support to pass it.

MRS. E. S. BERRY,
Chairman of Committee on Time Change, Parent-Teacher's Associations.

ERWIN, TENN.

I am very much interested in House Resolution 4428, to restore standard time during the months of January, February, November, and December.

In my opinion the standard time should be restored during the entire year, but if that cannot be done I am heartily in favor of your resolution and hope it will pass.

Yours very truly,

JAMES J. MCLAUGHLIN,
General Solicitor, Clinchfield Railroad Co.

GRAFTON, N. DAK.

Board of governors, Grafton Civic Club, supports eliminating daylight saving time. This board definitely approves action that Nation's time return where belongs. The rural people want to avoid time arguments with townsmen when daylight saving time is an injustice and handicap to farmer and labor problems of this great Northwest, especially among potato, beet, grain growers. We Americans of standard quality should abide by standard time. Therefore approve measure and accordingly likewise request our Representatives in Congress.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
GRAFTON CIVIC CLUB,

ATLANTA, GA.

I saw an article this morning in the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution where you had introduced a bill to eliminate daylight saving time and restore the country to standard time. In other words, to return to "horse-sense" time. I am 100 percent on anything to abolish these "crack-pot" laws and ideas that have been forced on the people. More power to your undertaking.

N. L. CAMPBELL,
Editor and Manager, the Railroad Journal.

Have Congress set the timepieces back to standard time. We lumbermen cannot have electric lights in the woods and still they work on this fool time so we have to get along the best we can in the dark.

Hoping you all will have some sense and do the right thing is the prayer of committee A of the Lumbermen's Association Eastern States.

EVERETT, WASH.

Whereas the daylight saving time has been tried and never found to serve the purpose; does not save fuel, light or other claimed savings; has worked a hardship on the farmers of the United States of America, and the farmer loses by trying to feed earlier; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record as opposing the daylight saving time and petition the President of the United States and all public officials to restore standard time as soon as possible.

JOHN VAN METER, *Master*,
FRANCIS R. BALES, *Secretary*,
Sunnyside Boulevard Grange.

OFFICE OF THE CITY COMMISSION,
Dayton, Ohio.

There have been much confusion and dissatisfaction within the State of Ohio each spring and fall because of the recurrent time change.

Within our own city there is a very large segment of the population who find through experience that the so-called fast time accomplishes nothing for the war effort, but proves to be, according to their conviction, a definite drawback. Factory workers complain to us that they are not able to get their required hours of sleep during the summer months when we operate on fast time. Farmers in our vicinity make similar complaints against fast time. As a consequence of loss of sleep defense workers tell us that production suffers.

The city commission has unanimously authorized me to write that the situation in our city would be better by the enactment of the bill.

OSCAR F. MAUCH,
Clerk of the Commission.

Letters from attorneys at law are included:

LON B. ROGERS, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Pikeville, Ky., April 5, 1944.

Congressman CANNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice in a paper, under an Associated Press date line, that a bill is pending to restore standard time in the United States.

We discussed this matter at the board of directors' meeting of our local Kiwanis Club just before we saw the clipping mentioned, but felt there was nothing we could do about it. If there is anything we can do about this, I feel sure that our club would be glad to help in any way possible.

LON B. ROGERS.

STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

Put the clocks back on standard time.

This tinkering with time twice a year is certainly a nuisance.

FRED M. COLEMAN.

INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.

I note that a measure is under consideration to restore the country to standard time and to eliminate the so-called daylight saving time under which we have been operating recently.

This measure meets with hearty approval. I can see no useful purpose served by the present time arrangement. It is not suited to this part of the country at all.

I trust Congress will be successful in eliminating this nuisance.

M. M. ABBOTT.

Letters from all sections and all industries of the country:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO.

I know of nothing in the New Deal propaganda that has caused more trouble and inconvenience than this war time. We cannot begin work earlier than daylight. Our help does not start any earlier and wants to go home after 5, which is only 4 p. m. standard time, the middle of the afternoon. I will be surprised if we do not have a shortage of many farm crops and if weather happens to be against us it might be serious.

GEO. WHITING.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Change this war time. Last summer I was in a hospital, had an operation, and you can well imagine the long evenings till dark.

MRS. DAISY FREIER.

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

There are lots of nonsensical things to come up, but this war time leads all. Agriculture works from daylight until after dark at all seasons and if the city guys want more time off they can start an hour earlier in the morning and not have to disrupt the whole fabric of time by the foolish idea of setting the clocks forward 1 hour.

I have never yet talked to a single person who could see any sense in it.

H. O. LAMBETH.

GRASS LAKE, MICH.

The clocks must go back to standard time in order for the farmers to raise food for the nations.

F. J. HELM.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Dayton is to change time April 30, to eastern war time, and I surely don't approve of it. It seems like getting up in the middle of the night and retiring when it is still daylight.

More electricity will be consumed when we are told to conserve it.

Miss VERNA GLUECKERT.

HILLSBORO, TEX.

We, the pupils and teachers of Union Bluff School, Hill County, Tex., would like to add our names to the long list having already asked that our clocks be set back to standard time. We find that it works a great hardship, particularly through the winter months, to go to school before it is light.

UNION BLUFF SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PUPILS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

We of this community have twice voted down the so-called daylight saving. All winter long we get up in the cold, bleak predawn hours, and all summer we fight the youngsters to get them to bed in broad daylight. It is a vile and abominable arrangement.

E. N. HUTCHISON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The time has worked great hardship on working people and farmers, not only in loss of rest and sleep, but in added dollars of expense for heat and electricity used. Please get us back to God's time.

M. J. H. HUBER.

RICHMOND, VA.

I read with a great deal of pleasure of your proposed bill to restore standard time in the United States of America, and I surely hope you will be able to get it to become law.

In this section of the country it is hard to find any daylight saved by this so-called daylight saving time between the months of October and March. We arise before daylight, often in the cold rain, snow, and sleet and have to burn lights which could be unlighted if we were allowed standard time.

(Mrs.) GERTRUDE WILKINSON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

The men and women of our city and county are wrought up over the confusing time,

changed every 6 months, for what purpose no one seems to know. It serves no real purpose. It is detrimental to farmers, war workers, and industries. Last week our city commission passed an ordinance advancing the time 1 hour for the summer. Today, labor unions and others are circulating referendum petitions to have the voters rescind this action.

JOHN F. AHLERS.

PINE BLUFF, ARK.

I am a railroad shop worker. Ever since the change, or most of the time, we are required to start working at 6 o'clock sun time—7 war time—and working only 8 hours a day we get off at 3 sun time—4 war time—in the evening, which is about the middle of the evening. It forces us to get up 2 hours before daylight, burning electricity, get to our jobs an hour before good daylight, and burn electricity another 1½ to 2 hours until it gets light enough to see how to work, and then quit work when the sun is 2 to 3 hours high in the evening.

We ought to elect a Congress that has sense enough to let God's sun time alone.

M. M. HAMILTON.

During the winter months I go to work in the dark and return in the dark, where if we were on standard time I would go to work in daylight.

We were told that it was done to conserve electricity, but such statements are not borne out by the facts.

J. S. HOLMES,
Albany, N. Y.

GEORGETOWN, TEX.

This law is one of the worst blunders our representatives in Washington have made. If you will trace just how and where this idea started, you will find it was in some of our large plants where the office personnel and the golf players wanted more time in the evening for sport. Small plants have to work at a loss in this way; they have to go on peak load in the early morning hours, where formerly they usually are able to reduce their power and loads by, say, 12 o'clock midnight or even much of the time can start cutting down the loads by 10 p. m. Millions, with school children to get off to school, have to get up as early as 4 a. m. I firmly believe four-fifths of our people would vote for a repeal of this law, and the same with the soldiers that are in training. I heard a man say the other day his boy writes he has to get up at 4 a. m. Just take a look at this and see if you can find any class of our people that this law really benefits and helps in any way.

W. I. STUMP.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

This new time is most inconvenient, confusing, demoralizing, and depressing. How we look forward to eastern standard time once more.

A SOUTH CAROLINIAN.

MAUMEE, OHIO.

In a 59-mile radius from here we have to contend with three different times.

Have noted a good many railroad accidents. Could we not suppose these employees working by one time, they and their families living by another, could cause accidents; clocks in hotels with two time hands, one city time, one railroad time. Then here is the home life—twice a year the thousands of babies must be adjusted to change of another time, plus habits of adults.

Let's get back to sane living conditions.

H. T. HATTON.

TREMPEALEAU, WIS.

In operating a large farm and hiring considerable help, I have found this "Roosevelt time," as we call it, the worst handicap that could be imposed on me. Millions of hours of manpower time have been lost on account of this foolishness, as a farmer's work must conform quite closely with sun time.

W. NICHOLLS.

NEW FRANKLIN, MO.

We don't mind working hard and long hours on standard time and doing the best we can. Where we have to pick up extra help, which is hard to get, and they work daylight saving, and our regular help work standard time, it upsets things and is very unsatisfactory for us.

And for the country children standing on the roadside in the cold and darkness waiting for a school bus, it is very unsatisfactory.

I have talked to many people in different lines of business and I have yet to find anyone that favors daylight saving time.

C. ALBERT SMITH.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Since the advent of the so-called contradictory daylight saving, I've never heard one person approve it.

It—the daylight saving—is not a saving in any sense of the word, at any time of the year, only a drain on one's health and nerves, to say nothing of the increased fuel and electric bills when it is preached on all sides to conserve both.

During the administration of President Harding, so strong were the protests against daylight saving here in Washington, he said never again would there be daylight saving in the District of Columbia.

EDITH M. GALLANT.

WABASH EMPLOYEES' HOSPITAL,
Decatur, Ill.

Hospital days start at 7 a. m. under this silly war time. Nurses and other hospital employees get up, have breakfast, and walk to work before dawn, about 8 months of the year. During half the year there is a tremendous waste of electricity while the morning work is being done. The long afternoons are not a boon, as supper in hospitals is early.

RUTH E. ROBERTS,
Registered Nurse.

ESSEXVILLE, MICH.

Eliminate daylight-saving time and restore the entire country to standard time. We are entirely in favor of setting the time back.

N. F. BEECKMAN.

MANAKIN, VA.

We have never liked daylight-saving time and have never been able to see how we saved anything by it. The truth of the matter was, we had to burn lights much longer in the morning, still they preach, save electricity.

L. C. CLARKE.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Put forth every effort to see that the bill is passed. Daylight saving was never designed to be helpful to working people; it means their getting up in the dark early hours of the morning and going to bed during daylight.

For anybody who can sleep late or for those who have leisure for playing golf, daylight-saving time is a great boon; but the majority of Americans are working people, and should be considered. They were certainly overlooked when this bill was made effective. They were punished (penalized) by the passing of this wartime measure. Please do something about it real soon.

HELEN BRELSFORD.

DALLAS 1, TEX.

This daylight-saving time has been a terrible mistake and ought to be abandoned. If this bill is brought to the attention of enough voters, the reaction will be overwhelmingly in its favor.

M. H. GUILLOT.

CULPEPER, VA.

To eliminate daylight-saving time has appealed to the heart of every farmer and school child in Virginia. Children are compelled to rise before daylight and stand by the roadside, in all kinds of weather, awaiting a bus to take them to school. Children 6 and 7 years old have to submit to such cruel treatment.

A MOTHER.

LOVETTSVILLE, VA.

Restore standard time. I trust efforts will be successful. I have written my Representative to support the measure.

HARRY C. FILLER.

PACIFIC, MO.

Remove this eclipse that has obscured our normal course in life for the past few years, namely, the so-called daylight-saving plan.

This annoying regulation never had any merit and has cost us heavily.

JAMES MCCAUGHEY.

MILLERSVILLE, MD.

Small city houses are almost uninhabitable in summer till 10 or 11 p. m. sun time. An hour's sleep in the cool of the morning is worth more than an hour for amusement in the evening.

MARIA BALDWIN.

HOLLY HILL, FLA.

Let us have God's time again in this beautiful world that man has almost ruined. The harm it has done children. Save electricity; what a joke that is. The cost is just the same no matter what the clock says.

MRS. J. H. ARMSTRONG.

BLUEMONT, VA.

I wish to endorse bill to restore standard time; the present fast time is a sample of the laws sponsored by the New Deal.

WALTER I. PRIEST.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

May I too add my protest against daylight saving. It is one of the worst things people have had to endure outside of the war. I am the mother of several children—some of which go to school. I get them up in the dark; they eat their breakfast in the dark; go to school in the dark.

MRS. BUTLER.

BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Keep the clock where it belongs and not an hour ahead, as it is with the present crazy idea of daylight saving time which does not save a thing, and we have to use electricity to see to wash our faces. That's one of the craziest ideas and was originated for the benefit of the golfers. Daylight saving time does not save a darned thing. What a crime to have to stop work at 3:30 p. m. instead of the correct time, 4:30 p. m.

G. J. HEINTZ.

BUTLER, OHIO.

War time is a mistake. Rationing may be a nuisance but as a handicap to the producing farmer it cannot compare with war time.

Farming is tied to the sun. It cannot be otherwise. The nearer a standard time can be to sun time the better. The net effect of war time is you start on sun time and quit on war time. We lose that hour.

War time is a handicap to farming and benefits no other producing industry.

Do your darndest to get the bill through.

PAUL D. LEEDY.

LAWRENCE, KANS.

We in the Middle West want the clocks set back to where they should be.

Yours truly,

L. B. READ.

DAYTON, OHIO.

As a war worker in the city of Dayton, and one who sees so many disadvantages of fast or war time, I heartily approve of the bill for establishment of standard time for the Nation. About 95 percent of the employees where I worked are against war time.

HAROLD DAGANHARDT.

GRAY SUMMIT, MO.

We live on a large farm and are willing to help in any way we can to help win the war, but feel that daylight saving time has worked unnecessary hardship on the farmers and school children. Children have to meet the school bus at 7 o'clock. The farmers need all the help they can get this year. Setting our clocks back will help a lot.

MR. AND MRS. WILFRED BEUMER.

PACIFIC, MO.

In advocating the change of time I am voicing the sentiments the businessmen, farmers, and laborers in this community.

We hope and pray you will accomplish this move. It has been one of the most detrimental and inconvenient laws ever enacted.

L. A. BROWN.

COLUMBIA, MO.

I have lived in St. Louis, which is one of the big cities supposed to be affected favorably by the use of the extra hour of sunshine, and have lived in smaller towns, and as yet I fail to see the benefit of it. Certainly there are inconveniences. Everyone does not get up at 7 a. m. (or later) and for the ones (most people, I think) who get up between 5 and 6, a light has to be burned in the morning 365 days of the year. On the other hand, before the daylight saving time there are a few months of the year when one can get up and do without lights if we use the "Lord's time" for our clocks.

Mrs. C. H. PRAGER.

NEW HAVEN, MO.

Set our clocks back to the old time. We are 100 percent for the bill.

OSCAR RUEGGE.

WENTZVILLE, MO.

This so-called daylight saving time is certainly a disgusting thing.

Just because the clocks are pushed up an hour is no sign that the dew will be off our crops an hour earlier. When we hire help they want to quit for the day when the sun is still way up and when we have business which needs our attention in town we must go in the middle of the day or else everything is locked up, way before the day is past.

We're using more oil for lights than before, just because we have to be up in the morning long before daylight.

EDWARD SCHROEDER.

[Telegram]

[The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is standard time at point of origin. Time of receipt is standard time at point of destination]

PADUCAH, KY., *March 29, 1944.*

We heartily endorse efforts in regard to the time bill. We farmers have been heavily handicapped by this war time.

J. A. COLE.
FREDERICK BEYER.
HARVARD ROTTGERING.
HARRY ROSS.

BOSTON, MASS.

I was delighted to read in the newspaper that you had introduced a bill in Congress to eliminate daylight-saving time and restore the entire country to standard time.

Daylight saving is the most ridiculous, useless, inconsistent, and irritating law Congress ever thought up to plague us working folk.

At first it was stated that on account of the war plants, it was necessary. If the war plants are working 24 hours around the clock, then how could daylight-saving time be necessary or consistent?

Later it was stated England was on this time and therefore it would be best for us to be on the same time. How long since the United States has had to do as any other foreign power? We Americans have always in the past given and done for England but why should we copy her? Are we not capable of running our own country without any advice from outside?

Thirdly, why change the clock? If certain business desires to open an hour earlier all well and good, but what is to be gained by forcing others to change their time?

Fourthly, electric-light bills are far higher since the change, as for 7 months those of us who rise at 5 a. m. standard time leave nome when dark and arrive home when dark. Also, in the North, most apartment houses do not have the heat on so early and, of course, there is no sun to help warm up.

It's most difficult for one to live most of their life on standard time and suddenly change over to life an hour or two ahead without physical discomfiture. Those of us who may suffer from sinus, asthma, or bronchial ailments find the early morning air an aggravation to those symptoms.

Yours for repeal of daylight saving time.

RUTH LOUISE LEIGHTON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

The bill to set the Nation's clocks back to where they were before all this silly meddling with daylight-saving time, deserves prompt enactment into law.

Because school children here had to get up in the dark during the winter months the State of Ohio compromised the time back and forth. We now go back to some other time tomorrow, April 30. We have railroad time, city time, daylight time, and State time. For sheer nonsense and utter confusion this variable time business is about the most stupid mistake that could be inflicted on the Nation. All talk about saving electricity is just poppycock. What you save in the evening you burn in the morning.

C. STEVEN GOBY.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Eliminate eastern war time and go back to standard time.

We have saved no electricity and can see no value whatever in doing away with standard time.

C. HARRY KELLER.

EDINBURG, IND.

Changing of time to fast time costs us hundreds of dollars. It is just another New Deal brainstorm. Men want to get up on old time, quit at noon on new time, and quit in evening on fast time.

Mrs. HENRY E. BREEDING.

NORMAN, NEBR.

We are interested in having the Nation's clocks set back again. Do all you can to bring this about.

RAY E. NEEDHAM.
WALTER J. SCHMIDT.
PERRY BECKER.
EARL WOOLEVER.

ALBANY, N. Y.

I was pleased beyond words when I read an article on setting back the Nation's clocks. It's tough to get up and out in the pitch dark in the cold. The earlier it is the colder it is, and the school kiddies are out all winter at 8 o'clock in the pitch dark in wintry weather. If there were one ounce of sense to the measure or it kept boys from suffering over there we wouldn't mind. But it's no sense at all. It doesn't even save electricity, as it was supposed to. All the houses are lighted up till 8 and 8:30 on dark mornings.

I do hope with all my heart the clocks will be set back and let's have the ordinary time we always had.

This new time is just about as sensible as if we wanted to lengthen a skirt, so we cut some off the top and sew it on the bottom.

Mrs. FLORENCE B. WILSON.

ATTICA, IND.

The farmers will owe a debt of gratitude, that can never be paid, for your efforts to set the clocks back. Let us say the clock says 7 p. m.—the time really is 6 p. m. Farmer goes to milk and cannot milk because the flies are so bad. It is 8 p. m. by the clock and I go to shut up the chickens so we can go to church; they won't go in because they know it is only 7 p. m. I could go on and on—you just have no idea the nuisance it is.

MARY SHUPP.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Please eliminate daylight-saving time. It is silly, unnecessary, and profits no one. Do help us get rid of it forever.

ELISABETH V. CLARK.

GRAND HAVEN, MICH.

It is about time you fellers down there waked up to the fact that there is no use setting the clocks ahead. It is bad for the farmers and for outside workers, such as carpenters, bricklayers, and painters, and for school children. In the summer it is light until 10 o'clock and the children want to stay out until it is dark and it is about 11 o'clock before they get to bed and that is not enough sleep for them; in the morning it is so wet the farmers can't get to work on time; the only ones it is any good for is the golf players and that don't earn the common man a living; and the sooner the clocks are put back to central standard time where it belongs, the better.

DIRK VAN DOORME.

ABILENE, TEX.

I cannot resist writing to encourage the move to return our clocks back to normal. I am so thankful someone in Washington has realized the terrible disadvantages of this thing, we cannot see that changing our time has helped the war effort in one single instance. Instead it has proved to be only an irritant.

The time has come when even cowhands quit work according to the clock. Many good daylight hours are wasted in these abnormal afternoons. The sun is high when they stop. It is the same thing when we try to harvest wheat.

We were told in the beginning that it was necessary to change clocks to conserve electric power in cities. Now, when we know factories are run 24 hours daily, swing shifts, and so forth, we wonder, where is the saving of electric power? Certainly not in our homes. We retire an hour early by the clock, but next morning, because it is still dark, we burn lights an hour. There is no difference.

But I am writing to present the difficulties of mothers and school children, particularly.

With two boys in grade schools, consider my plight. Especially the 9-year old son. He needs 10 hours sleep each night. So every night it is a struggle with frayed tempers resulting, to make him come in from play, with lots of pleasant daylight playtime left, and command him to go to bed. Next morning, he has to be awakened while it is still

dark to reach school on time. For the 3 winter months, what's worse, he has to go to school in the dark.

We Texans like to think we are as patriotic as the next ones. If we could see that all this worry and trouble were actually helping the war effort we would never complain. But for 2 years of it now, we fail to see any good at all. May the bill be successful and soon.

"Thanks for listening"—

MRS. H.

PERU, ILL.

About daybreak usually occurs the minimum temperature during the 24 hours; therefore, we may deduce that Nature herself attaches significance to that time of day.

Consider (December, 1942–January, 1943) clocks reading 8:18 a. m. at the hour of sunrise. This necessitates consuming electricity or using other means of artificial lighting.

The writer finds himself at a loss to understand why avoidably consuming electricity for this purpose, can effect a saving for war effort; or any other use.

The sun does not shine through (December, 1942) until nearly 9:00 a. m. Clocks indicate noon hour only a few hours after actual daybreak.

Changing the setting of clocks will not disrupt Nature nor cause her to change the cycle of daylight and darkness.

At any rate, this winter is proving unsuitable for this situation that has been arbitrarily created necessitating having artificial light. And which latter could otherwise have been avoided.

LISZT LENZEN.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

In these trying times, why must we have unnecessary hardships heaped upon us? Setting the clocks ahead is an unnecessary hardship and a detriment to us at all seasons of the year.

If setting the clocks ahead in any small way helped the war effort, everyone would be resigned to the change, but it does not help the war effort. All war plants work the clock around, three 8-hour shifts.

I have talked with dozens of women about their gas and electric bills and all agree that never in the history of their housekeeping have the gas and electric bills been so high.

We are burning lights hours longer each month than is necessary on account of setting the clocks ahead, and it is a deplorable condition to have our children going out into the darkness to school all fall and winter.

In the summer the nights are hot and it does not cool off much before midnight. The early morning is cool enough so one can sleep but, if we are forced to retire before it has cooled off, and forced to get up while we could sleep, think how little real sleep and rest we have had to start the grind of a hard day's work.

I want you to know how very much I, and my family, and my neighbors, and friends appreciate the effort to restore standard time. We thank you from the depths of our hearts.

MRS. JOHN L. MORTON.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Glad to note in our papers for the 27th the introduction of a bill for return to standard time.

Believe this would be generally helpful to industry and to the country at large.

ISLAND CREEK COAL CO.,
JAMES D. FRANCIS,
President.

SHENANDOAH, IOWA.

I'm sure if I had the time to visit my Iowa farm friends I would get 100 percent vote for your measure. I have never heard anyone claim any advantages in favor of war time.

MRS. A. L. RODGERS.

COATS, KANS.

I am a wheat and stock raiser. Have six tractors and understand the help problem. In the busy farming season we try to use all our daylight but what a curse it is for our boys to switch the tractors off when the sun is high, the moisture rapidly leaving your soil and telling you to please remember the shows and other attractions all start on war time. In harvest the dews keep our combines out of field in morning and with war time our help just won't stay with us late in evenings because it makes too long a run. In the schools in winter our kiddies go to school before daylight, study in their classrooms by artificial light, using our electricity, then in order for our children to get their needed rest we must send them to bed in daylight, but neither we, Congress, nor Roosevelt can make them go to sleep.

Restore the Nation to standard time.

BEN SCHREPEL.

DAYTON, OHIO.

This business of changing the time is a pain in the neck and not only that but in the summer when a hard-working man is able to get a little sleep in the morning when it's cool up comes this ridiculous business of changing the time so that when it's hot in the evening the workingman must go to bed in order to get sleep; next morning finds himself tossing all night because of the heat.

Being a workingman in a factory, I am asking you to see that bill No. 4489 be passed.

M. VIDA.

ELLINWOOL, KANS.

Time of day is by the sun and you cannot do any thing to change the sun and I don't think anything should be done to change the time, and I hope it will be changed back. I have talked to dozens and none like it.

I have three sons in the service. All in the Navy, and I sure want this war to get over. I just feel that changing back to God's time will help.

MRS. GEORGE CECIL.

PIGGOTT, ARK.

We farmers of this community will surely welcome the day when Congress sees fit to turn back the clock to where it belongs—with the sun. It does work a hardship on farmers who are trying to help feed the Nation.

MATTIE KERSHAW.

GALVESTON, TEX.

We hail with delight and approval the bill to set the Nation's clock back 1 hour and once more recognize the fact that it is the sun and not the law that fixes the time.

The effort to adopt the so-called wartime to our private lives and business has produced only confusion and inconvenience.

Our schools had to change the hour of opening during the winter because it was not yet good daylight when the children reported at schools. Our merchants changed the hour of store openings.

While the inconvenience and confusion due to the change has been great, there has been positively no real benefit. It was in line with changing Thanksgiving Day.

E. R. CHEESBOROUGH.

DAYTON, OHIO.

The result of this change of time as experienced last year is very confusing.

I am in sympathy with the bill calling for establishment of standard time throughout the Nation. I have written our Representative urging him to use his influence so that the bill will be passed.

CHESTER STIDHAM.

PLATTSBURG, MO.

I am certainly glad that some person in Congress at last appreciates the need for a return to standard time. The present arrangement works a hardship on the farmer, lessens production, increases the use of electricity, and makes it difficult for children to catch a school bus at 6:30 a. m.

Don't give up; we are for you.

R. A. SHOEMAKER,
County Chairman, Clinton
County Finance Committee.

PADUCAH, KY.

This daylight saving time is such a nuisance half of the people have never pushed their clocks forward. Farmers can work only by sun time.

The Catholic school here which has a large attendance goes by the old time. Their studies begin at 9:30 new time. So please do everything you can so our light bills will be less.

Mrs. J. B. SMITH.

FAIRFIELD, OHIO.

According to a 3 to 2 vote of the commissioners of Dayton, Ohio, the time will be advanced 1 hour April 30, 1944, and turned back October 1, 1944. The result is very confusing.

You recently introduced bill No. 4489 in the Federal House of Representatives calling for establishment of standard time throughout the Nation.

I believe we should all be on standard time and I have written our Congressman to do what he can to see that the bill will be passed.

DUFF G. ROMSPERT.

MIDDLEBROOK, VA.

Nearly everyone in this section has expressed dissatisfaction with this war time, and wondered how to best start a move to have the clocks set right.

If there is anything we can do, please let us know how we can help.

MRS. L. A. TYLER.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Please do all you can to get all the States back on eastern standard time.

A. D. W.

AUGUSTA, KANS.

Put the clocks back where they should be. Congratulations, thanks, and the best of luck. I'm glad someone is making a fight on this sort of foolishness. The Nation has never gained 5 cents from it.

EARL W. WOLF.

EMPORIA, KANS.

Congratulations on the bill to eliminate war time. This should not have been passed in the first place. Return to eastern standard.

LEONARD G. FORT.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Set the clocks back to standard time. If you succeed in getting it through, you will have earned the eternal gratitude of the people of the Nation.

It is not only a menace to farmers and country people but to city dwellers as well. All this winter children were starting for school long before daylight. There is no light saved by this practice. What little is saved in the evening is used up in the morning.

If some like to get up early so as to have time off in the afternoon, their work schedule should be advanced so as to suit them; but they should not expect the whole Nation to be inconvenienced because they so desire. The powers that be who make these changes do not have to leave their beds until the sun is well up; but they seem to care nothing for the annoyance and trouble they cause others. For a long time I have hoped that

someone would bring this matter to the attention of Congress.

KATHERINE R. AMES.

CARROLL, IOWA.

The bill to change the clocks back is in full accord with the wishes and desires of all midwestern people. Eliminate daylight saving and restore the entire country to standard time.

A. J. HODGES.

STACYVILLE, IOWA.

Set the clocks back. It is a handicap for farmers.

With the help as short as it is, we lose one hour on quite a few days in the year. We all stand back of the bill to get our standard time again. With the manpower shortage, we need all the sun hours we can get.

BERNARD J. MAY.

EOLIA, MO.

I notice from my paper that you have proposed a bill in the Congress of the United States. We are very much pleased that there is someone in Washington who is interested in setting the clock back. That has always been an inconvenience to us farmers of this country, and if it doesn't interfere with the war effort we can assure you that we are in accord with you in regard to this bill. So I hope you will be successful in passing it.

With best wishes for you and your family.

Yours very truly,

ROBT. L. BERRY.

WELLSVILLE, MO.

Of all the wartime controls, this so-called daylight saving has been the most senseless and disastrous. The average person has never seen where it helps to win the war.

ROGER Q. SHAW.

DAYTON, OHIO.

We favor the bill to put the country back on standard time.

L. G. SCHNEBLE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

The daylight saving law is really nonsensical. It saves nothing. It affects the health of the people. Changes habits of going to sleep and to work. We are 1,000 percent for standard time.

A. C.

DAYTON, OHIO.

I cannot for the world understand how we can save electricity by changing the time to an hour ahead. Taking, for instance, a worker leaving for work at 6 in the morning must at least get up at 5 or 5:30? Where is he saving electricity; it is still dark. If there are four or five people in the household going to work at that time, there will, at least, be four to six different rooms lighted, including the kitchen.

I cannot agree with the people who play golf, etc.; there is a war on and who should be given the right to have some rest in the summer morning when it isn't too hot to sleep. Let the golfers, etc., sacrifice their recreation. We workers are not having much and we're not squaking, therefore I am asking you to see that the Cannon bill No. 4489 is passed.

MRS. M. VIDA.

RICHMOND, VA.

The so-called daylight saving law was enacted for the intent and purpose of using less artificial light, thereby saving electric current. Having kept tab on this during the First World War. I found there was a definite loss instead of a saving for 7 months, and during the other 5 months, there was neither gain nor loss. Of course, we only had it in effect then from the first Sunday in March until the last Sunday in October, and all of us were glad when it was over. Our present law being a year-round proposition, the loss is greater and the aggravation worse.

No businessman can roll out of bed and take a seat at his desk in his office; no workingman can roll out of bed and take his place at his bench or lathe in the factory. Someone must be up an hour ahead of him to prepare his breakfast and his lunch to take with him, but more than this of the attending disadvantages, I found during the long days in the middle of the period, there was a long afternoon of idleness, which filled the highways with joy riders and dissipaters, and filled the alleys with crapshooters, idlers, loafers and troublemakers. The records show that the above condition during that period resulted in a substantial increase in accidents and crime. I find the fewest number of people wanted this condition thrust upon us, and nearly the whole population is looking eagerly forward to its discontinuance.

We do not want any amendments. We want a repeal; we want a national observance of standard time.

A RICHMOND BUSINESSMAN.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., *March 29, 1944.*

Representative CANNON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I was so happy to see that Congress is considering abolishing that—most of all, diabolical laws, known as daylight saving. It has worked a hardship on both old and young, and has done no good anywhere. In the North and West it is very cold to get up an hour earlier, and sit around waiting for it to get light enough to see how to work. In the South, the dew is so heavy, they cannot even pick cotton, till the sun comes out. I have been a southern Democrat for 60 years. But too many unnecessary things have been meddled with. Set our clocks back so we will not have to prepare dinner in the middle of the afternoon, the hottest time of the day.

MRS. FRANCES MACKEY.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Change the time back to its original setting.

This change in time has cost most building contractors money on all their work. The standard time of work is from 8 a. m. to 4:30 p. m., and with the change of time it is generally too dark in the winter to start work at that time in the morning unless you have facilities for lighting. Therefore, it is necessary to start between 8:30 and 9 a. m. If you set your time at 9 a. m. and the quitting time is 4:30 p. m., this requires the workmen to work till 5:30 to make the 8-hour day.

Further, it is a cost to communities, for schools and people. They have to light and heat buildings earlier when the weather is colder in the mornings and carry on to later in the evening when most personnel works a little later. Families have to heat and light their homes longer hours and use more fuel.

With some States on regular time and others with advanced time it is confusing to everyone. I have never seen any good come of it since it has been in effect.

W. A. ABBITT.

WILLARD, MO.

Of all the silly things that I ever heard of, I believe daylight saving is the worst. We dairy farmers were asked to save on electricity, yet when they moved the clock up an hour we were forced to burn from 1 to 3 more hours of electricity.

If I had the gas to get around, I could get several hundred farmers that would sign the petition to turn back the clock, so do the farmers a favor by getting the job done.

H. E. BRAY.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Speed the day when House bill No. 4489, calling for the establishment of standard time throughout the Nation can be brought to a favorable vote. War time has been a sad mistake. No one has ever been able to show enough saving to make up for the inconvenience and the confusion it has caused farmers and war workers.

CARLOS D. CARNEY.

HILLSBORO, OHIO.

Let us have standard time for Nation.

Let's go back to the old time.

HENRY B. WILLIAMS.

SOUTH BEND, IND.

Please add my protest against this fast time. It brings undue pressure and a nervous tension which is undesirable in wartime or any other time.

MRS. LOREN SCHAFER.

SHELBYVILLE, IND.

I am very much in favor of your measure going back to regular time. The law is a great hindrance to the farmer and the man who labors from daylight until dark.

SYLVESTER TOWNS.

SANTA FE, MO.

Turn the Nation's clocks from daylight saving time back to God's time. Of all the rations and war worries we've had there is none that compares with this daylight savings time. It has cost us a greater fuel bill; also kerosene bill for our lighting. And above all has been nerve wracking. I sincerely hope the time will be set back.

MRS. EUGENE SHARP.

DAYTON, OHIO.

The bill calling for standard time throughout the Nation is 100 percent correct and should be passed as quickly as possible.

D. D. CERRETA.

SOUTH CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Daylight-saving time has disrupted practical working hours for the entire country. It has not saved or gained anything. Many plant workers ive many miles from their places of employment and therefore must leave their homes at an unreasonably early hour to get to work.

The darker hours are simply moved from the evening to the morning, so there can be no saving of electric power. Most plants are operating on a 24-hour basis anyway. Those who promulgated this change in an age-old custom perhaps go to work at a late hour while most wage earners go to work at 7 or 8 a. m.

J. W. KEADLE.

GURDON, ARK.

Restore standard time. We have been handicapped too long with this senseless war time. Am truly glad others have the grit and good sense to try to have standard time restored.

S. E. SIMONSON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Discontinue war time. I can understand how the bureaucrats need some impetus to get them to work an hour earlier, but we don't need it out here. War time has only meant confusion and unnecessary hardship.

S. H. ANKENEY.

ARDMORE, OKLA.

I have heard more complaint on the daylight-saving time than any other one thing connected with the war. These complaints come from every place. People who work in rural districts, especially, claim that any entertainment in the towns under daylight-saving time forces their hired help and themselves to quit work so early that it is

almost impossible to get in a day's work. Especially is this true when there is a heavy dew.

Please do all you possibly can to get this bill through and have at least that much of our life normal.

J. L. MURPHEY.

CULLISON, KANS.

Change the time back to where it should be. I haven't words in my vocabulary to say what I think of this war time, and if I did I would ruin the English language.

WARREN E. MILLS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Our whole organization, as well as our friends, would like to have standard time back again.

ROBERT C. SHADDICK.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Certainly hope we can get standard time back again as we would like to have an extra hour in which to rest.

Z. WHITEFORD.

DEERFIELD, MICH.

Set the clocks back. In the spring when a farmer is putting his crops in, the ground is frozen till about 9 o'clock; then when you harvest you can't combine till about 10 o'clock. Then everybody is ready to stop work in the middle of the afternoon.

FRED MCMAHON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Abolish this nonsensical, idiotic, and utterly useless war time forced upon us 2 years ago by somebody who doesn't have to go outside their door for one earthly thing, who have lovely electric lights inside and out at all and any hour.

We farmers have to till our land by God-given daylight that comes and goes at the same time it has for ages, regardless of how you twirl the hands of the clock.

It is my fervent prayer and hope that the bill will be approved.

MRS. CLARA JAMES EBY.

HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Representative CANNON of Missouri,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to see that Congress is considering a bill to relieve the country of one of the worst curses that has been forced upon us during this crisis, the so-called daylight saving time. The public did not want this in the beginning and have never been satisfied with it, but have been forced to abide by it, though it has never been of advantage to the country or any class of business. You can see all types of industry going to work in the morning under a flood of electric lights, in order to finish their day's work little past the middle afternoon.

W. A. DAVIS.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Please get the daylight saving time changed back to the old schedule. While I am a city dweller, I find it a great disadvantage to me and my business.

LOUIE REESE.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Aside from the fact that advancing the clock has increased the use of electricity by at least 10 percent it has deprived hard-working war workers of hours of much needed rest thereby contributing to absenteeism. It depletes the strength of the women causing many of them to withdraw from war work. I do not know of a single woman who does not find it necessary to work at home as long as there is daylight. No wonder the women are breaking down under the strain.

GLADYS STREENZ,
War Worker.

BOYDTON, VA., *March 30, 1944.*

Representative CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Rid the country of the so-called daylight saving time. It has always been an absurd thing. It interferes with our whole economic system.

Let us get away from the fallacy of daylight saving. There is no truth in it—never has been and never will be.

J. H. BAPTIST.

PADUCAH, KY.

How happy you would make us people here if we could get Congress to set the time back.

In the winter we get up in the middle of the night, and in summer go to bed with the sun shining. We have to burn lights half of the morning. The farmers don't like it either. Cattle go by the sun and they can't change them. I am just one in this town who is dissatisfied.

MRS. NEVA LEIBEL.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

Please eliminate daylight saving time and restore the country to standard time.

TOM CHAPMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

If you can get Congress to see the folly of this daylight saving nonsense it should call for a medal of highest honor. I am confident our Senator TYDINGS will back you up on that. He's level headed.

PERRY F. SKINNER.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Please, I beg of you to make the Congressmen understand that we are not saving any electric power by the clock being 1 hour fast here in Minnesota. My light bill is twice as high; it's a very expensive act for the laboring class. So please give us back our standard time.

MRS. WM. ROCK.

PLATTSMOUTH, NEBR.

I read in the Omaha World Herald, and also heard on the radio, that a bill has been introduced to abolish daylight-saving time. I wrote to a State representative a year ago and he said that law was useless, but was made in Washington and would have to be changed there. I don't know why they keep it up, for the help don't like it either.

MRS. JOHN MCLELLAN.

BAY CITY, MICH.

Of all the foolish ideas, changing the time of day is one.

Here it has caused many a hardship on people, young and old. It was perfectly terrible. It did not save any time or electricity either, as the lights were burned in the morning way up until 10 and 11 o'clock in lots of offices and factories, so instead of making things better it made them much worse.

MRS. GEORGE DAVIS.

PANA, ILL.

Daylight-saving time is so uncalled for. Our children had to go to school in the dark, and these old men that work at the mine had to go to work in the dark, and our greenhouse workers couldn't go to work till 8 o'clock because they have no lights. If a petition will do any good we will send one. The whole town is for the old time. We are so glad somebody has taken it up.

MRS. C. A. WRIGHT.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

By all means turn back the clocks to standard time. The world has been all wrong since we had daylight saving.

D. C. W. V.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

The undersigned, all residents and qualified voters in the Birmingham area, use this method to convey to you that we are desirous of a bill being passed by Congress that would return the country to standard time.

(Many signatures.)

MECHANICSVILLE, MD.

The quicker daylight saving is abolished, the better. The time we have now does not accomplish anything but confusion and annoyance.

BENJAMIN C. WOOD.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Putting the clock back to normal would certainly be a godsend to people in Missouri where it is so hot in the summer.

MRS. CORA J. HELTZELL.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Three cheers for the bill to set the time back to standard, as it makes it very bad having to go to work in the wee hours of the morning. One of the girls was knocked unconscious and her purse taken away from her coming to work. If this bill passes, there will be many grateful women.

VIRGINIA MARSHALL.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Repeal the Daylight-Savings Time Act. Since its enactment I have talked with people in all walks of life and all agree it has not benefited them. My friends who operate a farm in Illinois have also expressed their disapproval of it.

Today the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in an editorial said it was a good move and that it was nonsense to pass it in the first place.

JOHN J. JARVIS.

CLIFTON SPRINGS, N. Y.

Restore the clocks to standard time. That would be one of the best things that could be done. People will tell you their electric bill is higher than ever before. And there are so many accidents with people going to work before daylight.

P. LINEHAN.

MORRISON, ILL.

Abolish daylight saving. I trust the bill will receive favorable consideration. Thanks and God bless you.

ALBERT O. OLSON,
An old ex-marine.

TEXARKANA, ARK.

Am glad to know this crazy time we have had for the last year or so bothers other people beside hundreds of people down here. Please help us out.

D. G. BURCH.

DALLAS, TEX.

This is to voice hearty approval of the steps being taken to have the time set back to normal.

Considering the adjustments we are constantly called upon to make at a critical time like this that are vital such an absolutely worthless change has been the height of folly.

CAROL COX.

MEXICO, MO.

Work is done all around the clock in essential industries, so why tamper with time? The sun pays no heed. And we must work by the sun.

Here's hoping everyone will vote to turn back the clocks and get along with the war.

MRS. Z. E. TATON.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

By all means end this fool daylight-saving time.

C. E. BROWN.

LOUISIANA, MO.

In order that we may get the work done on the farms, and produce the crops essential to winning the war and to relieve the shortage of farm labor, get central time restored and our clock set back 1 hour to the old time.

P. E. RICHARD.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Give us back our real time once more. We believe in running America the American way and not the way of England. Those responsible for this should hear the complaints from these people. Let's have standard time.

A. B. WILLIS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Keep the good work up. Rule out this daylight law.

JOE CARTER.

HERMANN, MO.

Set the Nation's clocks back to God's sun time. It cannot be estimated in dollars how much it will help to produce and save crops. The same is true in town. It is waste instead of saving. From October to February the homes burn 1½ hours electricity to get breakfast and be ready at 7 for shoe-factory advanced time when it really is only 6 and the factory burns another hour of electricity.

If we have to face another manpower shortage on the American farms this year, it will be an immeasurable salvation of time if the clocks are put back to sun time.

G. GUMPER.

DAYTON, OHIO.

There are thousands of war workers here in Dayton, including factories and the two airfields, and we certainly want the slow time, our usual time, instead of the fast time which makes us get up in the dark and go to work in the dark, go to bed in the summer in the heat of the evening, and burn more electricity all the time.

CHAS. C. GRAY.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Abolish war time and restore standard time. It is important.

As a letter carrier in the post office in New York, war time presents a number of problems during the winter months. In New York we commence work at 6 a. m., and in the residential areas we letter carriers leave for the first delivery at 7:15 a. m., a time when the streets are totally dark. Because mail boxes in apartment buildings are in many instances located near the street, it is difficult to see these mail boxes in the darkness in order to effect delivery of mail.

Keep up the good work to the end that war time shall be abolished and eastern time restored. As previously, each State will decide for itself as to how many months of daylight time it desires.

LEON SAMIS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

I do not know when I have read anything that pleased me so much as the bill to set our clocks back.

I understand the clocks were advanced 1 hour to save electricity. I want to tell you how it worked in my home this past winter. As you know, Ohio went back to central time. My daughter would sit up from 1 to 2 hours after I retired, studying her school work, then I got up 1 hour and 30 minutes before she did in order for me to get to work at 8 a. m. on the railroad (fast time), while she went to school (slow time).

This ran my electric bill up about 65 to 70 kilowatt-hours a month. To save electricity, restore the clocks to normalcy.

I pray that the bill will go through.

L. B. CAILEY.

RICHMOND, VA.

I was gratified and pleased to read in the morning paper of a bill to eliminate daylight saving time and restore the country to standard time. For the South, particularly, the daylight-saving time has been a menace to health for children as well as grown-ups—the bedrooms not cooling off until after midnight. Then in winter it is so dark at 8 a. m. (really 7 a. m.) that women are afraid to go to work. It certainly does not save electricity as lights have to be turned on to get breakfast.

MARIANNE E. MEADE.

HILLVIEW, ILL.

School children, farmers, everybody tired daylight-wasting time.

HARRY C. DUFF.

SCHENEVUS, N. Y.

Every farmer and American backs the bill to discontinue war time. The sooner the better.

JOHN WILSON.

JACKSON, MICH.

The most sensible thing I have heard of in a long time was the badly needed bill to put the country back on standard time. I have heard more people complaining about going back to wartime than I have about the war. The fast time has never really helped anybody except the soft-ball players and golfers. I think if we were on standard time we wouldn't have so many young children out on the streets at 11 or 12 o'clock or later, because if it got dark earlier the children would get sleepy sooner and go to bed at 8 or 9 o'clock,—when they should—instead of staying out till all hours of the night. Please put this bill through.

MARION D. MCCLURE.

RAHWAY, N. J.

Please add our names to those protesting daylight saving time. It has been a real hardship. It has been the cause of waste of fuel and electricity during the fall, winter, and spring months. Please end this unnecessary inconvenience.

(Mrs.) MARY M. BROPHY.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

I have just read an article in our local paper on a bill to put the Nation back on standard time. Regardless of the importance of the many war measures before Congress, this is one of the most sensible things I have heard yet. In all my years I cannot recall any measures passed by our Congress that have upset the American apple cart so much as this thing called saving time, daylight.

EDWIN J. DREISBACH.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH.

I hope you will press this bill with all your might.

In the Detroit area we were told that eastern war time would be a valuable contribution to the war effort, in that it would cut down on the use of electric power. What a fallacy. In our household we arise at 6 a. m. and in winter our lights have to be on until at least 9 o'clock.

Our electric bills for power have been double that of previous years. I checked with the Edison Co. on this.

In war plants the lights are left on all day, regardless of the time, so there is no saving of power there.

On the side of health, the condition is not normal. In summer, to be sure, we do have daylight until about 9 o'clock, but after men and women have put in 8 hours of hard work in a war plant, they are not physically fit to use the hours in which they should be getting adequate rest in other pursuits. You know, and medical men know, that a working man or woman cannot do good work without sufficient rest. The additional daylight offers a great temptation to many to added strain upon their physical strength, with the result that they get but 5 or 6 hours' sleep. The result is a lagging of production, and a much greater incidence toward accidents. I think if a check could be made on this in war plants it would give you a powerful argument for the return to normal time. From my own standpoint I find no argument, whatever, either from a saving standpoint on power or health.

(Mrs.) MARTIN WENDELL.

AURORA, ILL.,

Am so glad to learn of this advanced time repeal.

Am a teacher, and all winter we had to burn electricity from 7:30 to 9 a. m. in our high school. People who come to our high school from the country and smaller suburbs are just full of grief about the hardships this advanced time causes. Dairy farmers cannot get men to do their work because of the early milking time when the milk must be cooled before it can be set out for collection at 6 a. m. The milker really has to milk about 3 to 4 a. m. and the cows do not respond. Do push the bill hard so we will again be able to operate on time suitable to man and animals.

Schools will do much better on standard time. Children do not go to bed in daylight, and are out just that much sleep and are drowsy next morning in classes.

(Miss) CLARA BOHNSTENGEL.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Bill to return to standard time a good one. Sure hope Congress puts it over. We have had enough foolishness for awhile.

J. S. ROBERTSON.

KEWANEE, ILL.

I am very much interested in the movement to return to standard time and hope that you will be successful.

The present arrangement has no advantage over standard time in our effort to produce more manufactured goods or farm crops. Farmers are compelled to conform to it by circumstances over which they have no control.

Manufacturers gain nothing, in fact they lose by the daylight saving, or I should say daylight slaving, because most factories have men who are over 40 years of age and to deprive these older men of that extra hour of rest in the morning is a terrible strain on their tired bodies. Younger people can stand the strain for awhile but the older men and women cannot.

For people who can stay in bed as long as they care to it doesn't make any difference what time is used.

Victory gardeners will be able to accomplish more in their gardens because they will not be so tired. We raised good gardens before we had daylight slaving.

Like the Jap general who said that his men knew how to sleep, what he wanted was to teach them to stay awake. That is what our Government is trying to do to us.

ROY L. WOOLHEATHER.

DANVILLE, VA.

Was so pleased to see from the paper yesterday that Congress is considering a bill to do away with daylight saving time. It is such a foolish measure. As much light is used in the dark mornings as would be saved at night. If the administration would use more time for constructive things and less in upsetting old established customs, they might be more pleasing to the voters.

MRS. J. E. PERKINSON.

BENNETTSVILLE, S. C.

The bill to go back to standard time is highly approved by us.

"Fast" time never has suited this area. We waste more electricity than we save.

H. D. HARRALL.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

It's good to know that somebody has courage enough to try to give back the old time.

We hope the next Congress will not try to change everything, including the sun.

D. D. METCALF.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

There are 6,500,000 Texans besides myself who approve the bill to do away with this ungodly daylight savings and hope it will go through at the earliest possible moment.

Of all the damnable, inconvenient, idiotic legislation that was ever foisted upon a suffering humanity this is about the worst that ever happened. The instigators of this inane and childlike legislation ought to be boiled in oil. Instead of saving anything it has doubled our light and heat bills and caused an untold amount of profanity.

W. B. WILSON.

PROSPECT, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN, SENATORS, PRESIDENT, TOO: Give ear to a pitiful rhyme. And pity the farmers that fell in the soup when the Government doctored the time. I'm a man of few phrases, me learnin' is scant, and I'm longin' to make meself clear. It's bad in the summer, it's worse in the spring, and it's fierce in the fall o' the year. In balmy Sptember I rise from me bed and I dress be the light o' the stars. And I finish me dreams as I wait for the cows, with me head hangin' over the bars. The cock on the roost sees me lantern go by and he thinks it the morning's first gleams. But e'er he's done crowin' he's left in the dark, and the chickens all laugh in their dreams. Me pigs are reposin' on pillies of mud and me horses are sprawled in the stall. And I question the wisdom that sent me abroad an hour too soon in the fall. I'd willingly go to me bed with the birds and be up with the song o' the lark, but curs'd be the notion of savin' the day by blundrin' about in the dark. I hope when the guilty one knocks at the gate, for Peter to open the lock, he'll say. Step aside, you've an hour to wait. You're the buckoo that twisted the clock.

J. WARD WILLIAMS.

HAWK POINT, MO.

Every citizen in this community is opposed to daylight saving time. It is a nuisance. It is wasting time.

County school children have been forced to stand in darkness, shivering in the cold morning hours, waiting for a bus. Day workers are forced to do the chores around home in darkness before going to work. Farmers find it inconvenient from every standpoint.

A. K. Schaper, cashier, Peoples Bank of Hawk Point; Otho Barley, Joe Tomek, W. H. Dunard, Ed Kliene, Oscar Beck, Charles J. Brozi, Sr., C. H. Prior, R. G. Logan, directors.

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding feature of these letters is their spontaneity. It is not unusual to receive half a bushel of letters or telegrams in one morning when legislation sponsored by some pressure group is under consideration in the Congress. But there is no group, no organization back of these letters. They are from the heart. The writers saw an obscure item in the newspapers telling of the unheralded introduction of a bill to repeal a useless, obstructive, and obnoxious law, and out of a deep conviction on the subject sat down and wrote these letters. They express the overwhelming sentiment of the Nation at large. If there are communities which prefer artificial time, let them adopt it locally. Surely no such community will insist on the inconvenience and loss and suffering this law entails on the entire country merely to serve personal and provincial needs.

Poland's Post-War Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on the evening of April 2 I made an address in the city of Detroit dealing with Poland's post-war status, using Poland as a symbol for the problems presented by all the smaller European countries. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I have flown here from Washington tonight, my fellow citizens of Michigan, to do three things: (1) To pay my tribute of personal respect to an old and deeply cherished friend; (2) to join in the birthday celebration of a great daily newspaper which is an everlasting credit to itself and to its Polish-American constituency; (3), and chiefly, to tell my Polish-American friends that as their representative in the United States Senate, and as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I shall contribute every effort within my power to put America's voice and America's influence and America's effort behind the unimpaired rebirth of the great and heroic Polish Republic.

I think I know whereof I speak when I assert that while this noble aspiration particularly grips the anxious hearts of those of you who look back with abiding love to the stricken land of your brave fathers, it no less grips the hearts of all Americans who want this war to justify itself in the fruits of its ultimate and inevitable victory. Poland is the symbol of a cause which is greater even than she is herself. We desert the cause if we desert the symbol.

* * * * *

The fact that this is the fortieth anniversary of the Polish Daily News—and that Poland once more suffers from tragedy and disaster—presents me with the theme which I wish briefly to pursue. And so, my fellow citizens, I discuss the war in which we are engaged and the peace aims for which we give our blood and sweat and tears.

In the final analysis, we are Americans, all; and, regardless of original nativity, we wage this war to conclusive victory primarily and dominantly in behalf of the freedom and the welfare and security of our own United States. Without regard to race, birth, color, or creed, we salute the Stars and Stripes; and we respond to no other allegiance.

But we would be lacking in enlightened self-interest if we did not recognize the fact that, for the sake of America as well as for the sake of humanity, we also fight for a better and a safer and a happier world, and for organized international justice and fair play and security for big and little nations. We fight to unchain liberty in a free world from which international pirates shall be permanently barred by the organized conscience and the united vigilance of freemen. And, Mr. Chairman, I know of no better typical test to apply to the progress which we make toward this emancipation than to apply the test to Poland. This World War No. 2 started on Polish soil in defiance of cruel aggression against outraged Polish independence. It cannot end in equity or honor except as independent Poland once more takes her exalted place among the free and sovereign nations of this chastened world. If hope for Poland ever dies, hope for all continental democracy will lie in the same grave.

I want to be as realistic as possible in my discussion of this scheme tonight. I want to be as frank as the necessary restrictions and the inevitable uncertainties of war will presently permit. If we have erred at all along this line in recent months, I fear we have erred on the side of too much strategic silence in the face of danger signals on these new horizons of our destiny.

First let me say that I agree emphatically with American statesmen in high places who appropriately counsel us that we must not jeopardize the winning of the war by splitting apart the essential fighting unity of the United Nations through prematurely quarreling among ourselves over the nature and the definition of the peace to come. I agree that we must be patient and tolerant with one another, that we must ever subordinate the lesser to the greater current needs, and that we serve no useful end by dangerously disagreeing among ourselves over such things, for example, as future national boundaries before we have won the united victory which alone can give us the right to control the answers to such questions. The first and paramount necessity is to win this military war with maximum speed and minimum casualty. Dominating every other impulse, we want victory—and then we want our soldier-sons back home.

On the other hand, we cannot too often remind ourselves—and our allies—of the solemn promises which we have exchanged with each other, of the ideals and objectives which we have mutually sworn to defend—all for one and one for all—and of the obligation which our statesmanship owes to these soldier-sons to match their courage with our own in clinging relentlessly to the winning of a just and lasting peace. We cannot too often search our souls to find if we are keeping faith, or whether we are drifting, or whether we are compromising with expedient appeasement. At least, we of America certainly have the right to discuss events as frankly as do our major allies. We do not have to be the only silent partners in this enterprise.

And so, upon this occasion, I speak of Poland, typifying other conquered lands; and necessarily I speak of Russia. I would not withhold from Russia any measure of exalted credit for the magnificent and invincible battle, at awful cost and against awful odds, which she wages against our common foe. On the contrary, I proclaim the tremendous fact. I would not withhold full and free and grateful acknowledgment of the cumulative debt which all the United Nations, ourselves included, owe to the Soviet Socialist Republics for the indispensable and intrepid heroism with which they have hurled back the Hitler Huns and brought the hour of our common victory infinitely nearer. I would not withhold the expression of our prayerful hopes that, despite the basic difference in our ideologies, these bonds of war shall be cemented in the subsequent bonds of a friendly and cooperative peace.

But neither, Mr. Chairman, would I withhold the equally candid disclosure of our anxieties that we may be drifting toward misunderstanding and bitter disillusionment—which cannot possibly be good for either one of us or any of our allies—unless

we speedily restore a better understanding of what we thought we meant when, at the altar of our common sacrifice, we swore to each other to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

I have said that Russia fights magnificently. So do others in full and equal measure. So does intrepid Britain and her indomitable commonwealth. So does China, against incalculable odds. So does our America, with a prodigality and devotion unmatched in martial history. So do the nations that have felt the tyrant's heel. Poland, for example—Polish legions at the battle fronts, Polish aces in the air, Polish underground resistance in the stricken homeland, the most dangerous belligerence of all. It is a fraternity of combat. It must be followed by a fraternity of peace in which all shall share the decisions and the blessings for which they strive and die.

I do not mean that we should turn aside now from the war itself to attempt now to settle many definitive questions which must necessarily remain more or less fluid pending victory. But I do mean that we should never for an instant retreat from a firm restatement of our understanding of our mutual pledges; and we should never, by our silence, invite the presumption that we do not intend, at the right time and in the right place, to urge every reasonable and practical achievement of a peace that shall be permanent because it shall be just. Our real war aims should never become a mystery to us or to our allies.

This leads me to quote from an anxious appeal made to Soviet Russia 3 weeks ago by a group of unimpeachable American patriots, all of whom were vigorous pioneers in the cause of aid to Russia, and none of whom by any stretch of the imagination could be accused of domestic, partisan malice:

"The apparent determination of the Soviet Government to insist upon a unilateral settlement of the Polish problem, without mediation or consent either of Russia's allies or the Polish Government, has come as a shock to American opinion. * * * The American and British peoples cannot forget that Poland was the first nation to stop Hitler's procession of bloodless victories. The Poles determined to fight even though war meant the temporary conquest and enslavement of Poland because they believed that the justice of Poland's cause and the loyalty of her allies would insure her resurrection in the end. * * * They made this decision at a time when Russia thought it necessary to collaborate with Hitler; and yet Poland, after suffering untold agony, is now asked to surrender far more to Russia than she refused to give Hitler. * * * We appeal to our Russian allies to take cognizance of the legitimate disquiet of the American people. We ask this not only because it would strengthen our unity in the war and hasten the day of victory, but because it would cement the friendship between the Russian and American peoples in the crucial years to come."

Mr. Chairman, that is a friendly and temperate statement. Also, it is an understatement. It is devoid of threats—as it should be. But it is packed with wisdom and with truth. I fully understand that there must be many major readjustments in the peace to come, and that we cannot hope to anticipate the details of these readjustments. But we can hope to preserve the spirit of democracy and self-determination when these readjustments are made. And whether it be at Quebec, or Moscow, or Tehran, or whether it be in the Kremlin or in Downing Street, or in our White House, we can, if we will, keep this precious spirit alive.

I repeat that I am using Poland tonight as an example. Other conquered peoples invite a similar prayer in their behalf. I repeat, also because it cannot be repeated too often, that the security and welfare of our own United States is always and forever the first charge upon our hearts and hands. Whatever is necessary must be done. It is declared in Holy Writ, "He who provideth not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." But we can be safe and happy only in a safer and a happier world. Whether we like it or not, we cannot live wholly unto ourselves alone. Whether we like it or not, we face external obligations. Whether we like it or not, we must exert our total influence in behalf of peace with justice.

And so I ask, What would peace with justice for Poland be?

Obviously I cannot expect to answer with intimate specifications. No one can today. We have not reached that point. For example, when new Poland shall again arise either as a separate unit or as a sovereign state in what might well became the United States of Europe, there is room for considerable, legitimate difference of opinion as to precisely where new Poland's boundaries should be drawn—although certainly they cannot honestly be drawn along the line of the criminal czarist partition of Poland more than 150 years ago, or the line of the no-less-criminal partition of Poland in 1939. As for the so-called Curzon line—it is merely the consultation of authentic history to remember that it was only an armistice line proposed originally by the Supreme Allied Council in 1919 and again when Britain intervened in the Russo-Polish war in 1920, and that it was declined by Russia. The question was settled by the peace of Riga in 1921, representing a reasonable compromise between extreme Soviet and Polish aspirations; and Russia subsequently pressed for treaties of nonaggression based on mutual respect for these existing borders. Let that paramount fact never be forgotten. Poland and Russia concluded such a treaty in 1932 and, at Soviet initiative, extended this pact for 10 years in 1934. Yes, and Poland loyally lived up to these obligations and rejected three offers from Hitler to cooperate on the basis of surrendering territory to Germany in the west at Russia's expense in the east. I simply recite unemotional facts—omitting many other bitter facts—which will deserve full credence when the time to mark new boundaries comes, if we are still wedded to a peace with justice.

As I have said before, I concur in our own State Department's plea that this is no time—until we have won the war—to start the reallocation of innumerable controversial boundary lines. But if it is no time for us to do so, then it is no time for others to do so either, and I know of no reason why our Government should not persistently and relentlessly say as much. It is a poor rule which does not restrain all the United Nations alike and in equal measure; or which, by the same token, does not permit as great a candor in Washington as is enjoyed by Moscow.

But I speak tonight upon a broader and more basic phase when I deal with the question, What would peace with justice for Poland be? Our State Department said, on July 23, 1940:

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one State, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign State, however weak."

That was sound and brave in 1940. It is sound and brave in 1944. It will be sound and brave and right when peace comes to this distraught earth. Let's say it again. Let's keep on saying it so that none may misunderstand our foreign policy. Admittedly we cannot always have our own way about these things because we are not the sole dictators of global destiny; and I do not believe we ever intend, upon our own responsibility, to police the whole, round earth to force our judgments upon others. But we can always assert our ideals and our purpose to cling to them as best we may. Therein lies peace with justice for Poland and for kindred victims of this Axis crime.

On August 14, 1941, we promulgated the so-called Atlantic Charter. There is plain language in its first three points to which the signatories unreservedly subscribed:

"1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

"2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see soverign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Apply that rule to new Poland and new Poland will be content.

On September 24, 1941, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics endorsed these objectives, and on January 1, 1942, joined the other United Nations in dedication to "the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter." We signed, too. So did Poland. These "purposes and principles" mean much to Poland, or they mean nothing at all to anybody else. I'll agree that the cruel circumstances of war often alter the best intentioned plans. But they need not alter purposes and principles. Our purposes and principles are not supposed to be the object of unconditional surrender. Yet, if we are to accept, by our silence, some of the unilateral decisions which appear to have already been pronounced by one of our allies—without consultation and without the consent of other allies—we have already mortgaged this portion of our program, regardless of the ultimate triumph of our united arms.

I go on with the record. Now comes lend-lease. Why did we extend billions of dollars of critical and indispensable lend-lease aid to Russia? To help us win our war. For that purpose, I do not hesitate to say that it has been worth all it cost. But "our war" is something more than the military defeat of Hitler and Hirohito. That would be only temporary victory. No one need to grope in doubt upon this score. It is written in our lend-lease agreements. For example—and it is a very pertinent example—it is written in our standard master lend-lease agreement with Russia. It was signed on June 11, 1942. He who runs may read. We are extending "mutual aid in the prosecution of the war against aggression." We are laying the bases "of a just and enduring peace." We are mutually subscribing to the "common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter." We are asserting that "the defense of U. S. S. R. against aggression is vital to the defense of the United States of America."

Fit those specifications to Poland, my fellow countrymen, and all will be well. No aggression. A just and enduring peace. Withhold them from Poland—and from other victimized nations in this tragic war—and we shall find that we have merely won another Versailles, then another Munich, and then World War No. 3.

The record is clear. The future is not. Our promises are clear. Our prospectus is not. Our American "foreign policy," as of

today, is sound when it puts military victory in this war ahead of every other consideration. Beyond that point, our American "foreign policy," as of today, is a vague and often mystifying generality. Frankly, it is largely locked up in the White House—across from which Kosciuszko still dominates Lafayette Square. The poet righty said of him:

"Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell,
And Freedom shrieked, as Kosciuszko fell!"

Hope will similarly bid this world farewell if this war does not terminate in a just peace. I have touched but one of its pregnant factors here tonight. I repeat Poland is a symbol. I repeat that I would not disunite the war effort by premature efforts to organize the subsequent peace—particularly on the eve of what may well prove to be the most important military movement in the history of civilization. But I also emphatically repeat that I would never for an instant let the world forget what we think we are fighting for. I would never accept voluntary bankruptcy for our ideals. "No aggression. A just and enduring peace." Ah, yes; it is easier said than done. We cannot dictate the charter for the world's tomorrow. Our major allies have earned the right of consultation—and this obviously includes indomitable Moscow. But God knows that we have earned the right of consultation, too. So has suffering, sacrificial Poland. So have others who have flung their naked hearts and lives into this global defiance of a global plague. My prayer—my challenge—is that none shall be forgotten, exploited, or ignored when the great accounting comes.

"No aggression. A just and lasting peace."

Then free Poland in a free Europe—a symbol of the world's emancipation—shall rise again.

Freedom of Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on freedom of speech, delivered by me on the America's Town Meeting of the Air program, broadcast from Cincinnati on April 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Freedom of speech is guaranteed under our Constitution. Just how that can be adapted to radio is, as I see it, the question before us tonight.

There is not enough actual time on the radio for each and every one of our 130,000,000 people to state their ideas on every question over the radio, so let's be practical about it, and instead of talking about freedom of speech, let's talk about fairness—fairness by first, the actual operators of the radio stations of the country—fairness of the listening public—and fairness, yes, of the business world that uses radio as a medium of advertising.

It is my sincere judgment, first, that radio—with a very, very few exceptions—has handled their radio programs in a mighty fair, clean way. If they had not in, say, the 10-year period just past, they would not now be on the air, for our American people have a way of doing away with any concern that does not treat them fairly. They just do not patronize that concern and it goes out of business.

So, briefly, the complete answer is that radio as a whole has been fair or there would not now be radio, as we know it, in the good old United States of America.

I say definitely that the listening public will regulate radio in an American way. They will regulate it by the simple mechanical movement of turning off the dial if they don't like what is offered to them.

We must recognize that radio is different than the newspapers, in that the broadcaster—by the tone of his voice—by his inflection—can make an ordinary remark sound very beautiful—or can even leave the impression, just by the tone of his voice, that he is talking about a scoundrel.

Freedom of speech is fundamental—made a part of our Constitution—because of a profound belief that the collective mind of the whole people is greater than that of any individual. We Americans have a strong conviction of our ability to govern ourselves. Our problem is to apply this freedom of speech—or shall I say, fairness of speech, basic in our law—to the radio. And right there I might remark that we must not become disturbed because we see some rabble-rouser gain temporary influence by the use of this new medium of communication.

So, let's talk about fairness in presenting controversial public questions and the broadcasting of news.

The broadcasters themselves first enunciated the principle that controversial public issues must be handled fairly. They decided this because of their recognition of their own responsibility to the public, plus intelligent self-interest. Their own well being and continuance in business impels broadcasters to see to it that the principle of fairness is advantageously followed in actual practice, and in my opinion, this is just what has happened in all but a few isolated instances.

The second phase of freedom or fairness on the radio is the handling of news. The American public wants their news by radio so that they will be informed as to what is going on as speedily as possible. I say they should be allowed to form their own conclusions. Here again, by far the greatest number of radio stations and networks, are now presenting the news with fairness and accuracy—determined that the news shall not be selected for the purpose of establishing an editorial position.

I hesitate to see laws passed that would put restriction on, or limit the broadcasting industry, whether by law or by managerial edict. You must remember that regulation by law takes away from the industry the sense of responsibility, and leaves in the hands of a few, that power which if placed in the hands of central government or its agency, could be used to gradually encroach upon freedom of speech via the radio.

We Americans should be concerned now about the ever-increasing encroachment upon the radio industry by the Federal regulating bureaucracy. What we need in this country is a new law which clearly and explicitly tells the Federal regulating body what it cannot do, rather than a law outlining a program of what it can do.

We Americans intend to keep our freedom of speech, be it in the newspaper, on the public platform, or what we may or may not hear over the radio.

Of course we have our day-to-day problems, but we should not quickly go to Congress and say "pass a law to prevent this" or "pass a law to prevent that". We must bear in mind that in the end, most of them will be solved by the broadcasters and the listening public through their own voluntary action, so necessary to assure themselves that they can and will stay in business. We must place squarely on the whole industry—the broadcast owners, the radio advertisers, the commentators, the full responsibility for its own conduct, and I say what we must give broadcasting is freedom from fear, for I hate to see regulations issued or laws enacted, aimed at a very small minority. A little regulation of this sort is a dangerous thing, because it only invites further regulation in the future, leading to complete control and the elimination of freedom of speech in radio.

We must be very careful in our decisions affecting this highly important industry, because a wrong decision now may mean that we will not long have American radio as we know it, which is, after all, the only fair and free radio now in existence in the world.

Nazi Persecution of Small Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio talk made over Wisconsin stations by me during the week of April 4.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Easter Sunday, April 9, humanity receives again the answer to the question—If a man dies, shall he live again?

In Washington it will be a day of cherry blossoms, of magnolias, and forsythias in bloom—of sunrise services.

In the occupied nations like Norway and Denmark it will be a day of renewal and hope.

It has been 4 years since, on April 9, 1940, the peaceful nations of Norway and Denmark were visited by Nazi ruthlessness. The invading Nazis immediately began a planned campaign to exterminate civilization within these lands. The Nazi campaign has failed. It has never attained its fixed goals. In Norway and Denmark, the light of freedom still shines, undimmed, eternal.

We of America, especially those of us whose homes are located in the great Middle West, know and appreciate the sterling qualities of the Norwegian and Danish people. Their contributions to science, industry, finance, literature, and the arts have been recognized in this country. Innumerable Americans of Norwegian and Danish descent have become vital parts of the American community, State, and Nation. Americans of Norwegian and Danish origin have exerted powerful influence upon the progress of our schools, our free press, our churches, and our business and agricultural life.

It is the wide, general knowledge of Norwegian and Danish character which prepared Americans for the manner of Norwegian and Danish resistance to the Nazis. Generations of law-abiding citizens had passed on a heritage of staunch devotion to liberty; and, above all, a sense of humor. The Norwegians and Danes have utilized these qualities to the fullest possible extent.

When the Nazis considered themselves fully established in Denmark, they launched a

concerted attack against Danes of Jewish ancestry. That attack, far from gaining them support, made every honorable Dane an implacable enemy of Hitler. The Nazis, following their usual procedure, threatened to make every Dane of Jewish descent wear the Star of David. In reply to this, King Christian said that the answer was simple: All Danes would, then, wear the Star of David. This expressed determination on the part of King Christian to make no distinction between Danish citizens extended to his most unimportant subjects. When the persecution of the Jews attained the proportions when wholesale deportations were involved, thousands of Danish citizens risked their lives to help their hapless fellow countrymen across to the haven of Sweden.

It is a paradox that sabotage should appear among a people famed for their close observance of law. Yet, sabotage has appeared; organized sabotage. The humorless Nazis have not only suffered from the efforts of these Danish patriots; more—they have been made ridiculous. Notices announcing that a bomb would explode in an industrial plant have been posted by the underground. Even the hour of the explosion is announced. Danes are warned not to come to work. Perhaps the explosion takes place; perhaps it does not. In either instance, work stoppage has occurred that will hamper the Nazi war effort.

I could continue to cite other numerous instances of Danish resistance. But one such instance tells the story of all the rest. Danish people are a sea people. They need their ships and, as a sea people, they love their ships. Still, officers of the Danish Navy have scuttled their ships rather than to have them fall into Nazi hands; and captains of Danish merchant vessels have sent their ships to the bottom in the same way.

In view of the steadily growing trend of Danish resistance, the United Nations look forward with confidence to the massed support of the people of Denmark.

Just as the Nazis tried to make an example of Denmark by attempting to develop that nation into a showcase of the advantages of Hitler's so-called new order, so did they try to make an example of Norway—an example of a nation under Nazi terror. They failed in Denmark. They failed in Norway.

When the Nazis—after 2 months of bitter fighting—temporarily subdued the heroic efforts of the Norwegian Army—resistance in Norway did not cease. It went underground. A large portion of the Norwegian Navy and the Norwegian merchant marine eluded the Nazis and made their way to neutral or Allied ports. Many Norwegian ships and thousands of Norwegian sailors are serving the cause of world liberation today. Scores of Norwegian pilots, trained in Canada, have taken their places beside their comrades of the U. S. A. A. F. and the R. A. F. in the stepping up of the air war against the heart of Nazi war industry and transportation. Units of Norwegian ground troops eagerly await the coming Allied invasion of western Europe.

Of equal importance to the military accomplishments of the Norwegians without the boundaries of Norway are the accomplishments of the Norwegian underground and the manner in which the Royal Norwegian Government has established and maintained the best of relations with the governments of the United Nations.

The Nazis sought through pressures applied over long periods of time to control every phase of Norwegian life. But they reckoned without the determination of Norwegians to retain their national characteristics, unaffected by the cruelty of barbarous enemies or by the kindness of trusted allies. No more striking instance of the independence of Norwegian thought exists than in the matter of the conscious successful attempt at preserving the purity of the Norwegian language. At home, the Norwegian underground has effectively prevented the Nazis from Germanicizing the Norwegian language by the planned popularization of certain Germanic terms and phrases. In Great Britan and in the United States, where the English language prevails, I have had occasion to observe the manner in which free Norwegians have carefully, courteously—yet firmly—preserved the lingual practices of their Nation. Americans admire and respect the Norwegians for their determination to retain every attribute of their nationality.

Within Norway, the Nazis have followed their old technique of using all possible measures to turn individual against individual, profession against profession, and class against class.

How miserably Hitler has failed.

The Nazis sought to turn the Norwegian people against their clergy. By promises of special privileges, and when that failed, by threats of concentration camp and death itself the Nazis vainly tried to identify the Norwegian clergy with their degraded standard. The Norwegian clergy was impervious to pleas and punishment alike. They not only retained their integrity as a group but they won the eternal loyalty of their parishioners by their unwavering stand for freedom.

Like assaults on the honor of Norwegian athletes, lawyers, doctors, legislators, labor, and businessmen met with the same results. Cold contempt. Studied lack of cooperation. Meanwhile, no Nazi or no Nazi military installation or factory or railroad was secure from the organized sabotage of the Norwegian underground. Norwegians received information on the true state of world affairs from Allied radio. Norwegian underground newspapers continue to publish facts. Norwegian sources keep an unabated flow of information in motion to Allied military leaders on the situation within Norway. The Allies often learn of Norwegian events before the Nazis and the Quislings know that they have taken place.

For 4 long years there has been no slackening of the hate of Norwegians for the Nazis. When Norway is liberated—and Norway will be liberated—each Quisling will be meted out just punishment. There are comparatively few Nazi collaborators among the Norwegians, but each and every one of them is known to the underground. Moreover, when Norway is free, every Nazi soldier on Norwegian soil will find himself a prisoner of the people.

Norway has endured much from the Nazis. Norway has contributed much toward the certain United Nations victory. Norway has earned—and Norway will receive—an honored place at the peace table.

April 9—the day when peaceful Denmark and peaceful Norway were ruthlessly invaded by the Nazis—will not always be a day of sorrow. When the militarists of Germany are brought down to defeat, April 9 will be an emblem of endurance, a symbol of the spiritual strength of the great and respected peoples of Denmark and Norway.

In America we must see to it that we are not tainted in this critical period by a weak faith, a skepticism as to America's ability to meet the issues of war and peace. A period of trial is up ahead, but America knows how to meet trials.

We are Americans, creatures of independence. We—sons and daughters of pioneers, shaped and made self-reliant by the atmosphere of America—hate regimentation. We face the future expectantly, willing to adventure, take a chance. We can smile at tough circumstances, crack a joke in danger.

We love freedom and want to live as individuals. We are practical, but have great dreams. We are a young Nation, full of ingenuity and strength, and rich in resources, and we are dedicated to make our dreams of peace come true.

This Easter we are looking hopefully toward the future—toward a resurrected world of peace and good will among the peoples of earth.

Flight Instructors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Those Flight Instructors" published in the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat and Leader, of March 28, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE FLIGHT INSTRUCTORS

"Too many pilots in prospect for Army and Navy." So we read in recent news reports, and other unexpected items like: "Thirty-six thousand soldiers who had volunteered for flight training and been transferred to the air forces are now being transferred back to their old organizations," and "the civilian pilot training program is to be junked—authorizations and appropriations for it expiring June 30." Its discontinuation would be the highest compliment Congress could pay it, as it would mean that the 200,000 pilots it has trained have met the Nation's need in record time. A grand job finished with the war perhaps half over.

Elsewhere we read that airplane manufacturers need thousands of skilled workmen to meet the year's production quota. And on hundreds of flying fields the little army of flying instructors who have trained those 200,000 pilots are wondering if this need for skilled craftsmen may not open to them another field of worthwhile service as their job under C. P. T. is closed down.

It would seem to make sense—the suggestion that these pilot trainers be transferred from field to factory. Our information is that they stand ready to be commandeered. The manpower boss can place them where they are most needed. They volunteered for the job they have done so well. Back before Pearl Harbor they rallied to the C. A. A. program. "Use us," they said. No pay was in sight. They got orders like this: "Report on 13th at St. Louis" or Miami. They paid their own travel expense and lots more. Eventually, Congress found out what they were doing—training 200,000 pilots—and fixed their pay at $50 a month.

At that, they carried on. Out on the fighting fronts, their students were winning decorations and commissions. Now the instructors, skilled and experienced pilots, with thousands of hours of flying to their credit in most cases, are soon to be on their own, except as the draft board calls them, says "Take a lot more training and you can carry a gun, earn a stripe or two perhaps in the infantry, and live or die on the ground"—that, because we don't need more pilots.

But how about those aircraft factories? This is no plea for sympathy for this large group of loyal Americans soon to be cast loose from their jobs. It is simply a suggestion

that here are thousands of skilled men, who know planes and engines from top to bottom and from inside to outside. Why not head some thousands of them—when their present job is done—for the airplane factories.

The aircraft companies ought to be eager to grab them. Congress, the War and Navy Departments, even the White House, ought to see in them an army of potential craftsmen much too valuable to the national effort for victory to be dispatched to camps for months of training which would make them good privates for the infantry.

Moreover, they may be needed again in the role in which they have been so valuable. The Government would not lose track of them if they were building or assembling planes or engines in Seattle or Los Angeles or Detroit.

What is about to happen to these men has figured in various news reports, but we have yet to read of any attempt to solve the problem presented by the termination of their jobs. Why not put them where their outstanding ability, experience, and training will yield the fullest results in supporting the national war effort?

Forgotten Man—The White-Collar Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask consent of the Senate for a reprint in the Appendix of the RECORD of a brief talk entitled "Forgotten Man—The White-Collar Worker," which I delivered over Wisconsin radio stations December 4 last, and which appeared in the RECORD of December 8, 1943. I ask leave to have the address reprinted because of the numerous requests I have received for it. It comprised less than one page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, what has happened to that phantom figure, the forgotten man, society's specter of neglect for the past 11 years and some months? He is still with us, but as a new group, the white-collar worker. Forgotten? He is, indeed. Recalled to our attention some months ago, with great sympathy by the President in his veto message on the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidies bill, again he is in limbo.

To my mind, we no longer can call him the forgotten man. He has been disinherited, abandoned. Ye have cast him aside. This group constitutes one of the greatest sections of our consuming purchasing public. Fifteen million heads of families are involved, but to this moment none of them, or at least a very few, have found any, or but little, increase in the weekly pay envelope.

Since they are clerical, white-collar, and unorganized employees, they are unable to take advantage of the National War Labor Board's good offices. They are victims of prosperity, unable to compete as individuals for the better things of life or to voice their demands as a group. They are penalized for their own individuality, and we are allowing a growing problem to get beyond control.

This group is slowly being forced to write its living standard downward, and in the meantime they are being forced into debt to maintain even their present standard, while their laboring brother climbs higher and higher, day by day, into the brackets of high incomes and proportionately higher living.

What we do not realize is that it is not alone the white-collar classes which will suffer. We reduce their purchasing power and what happens? Obviously labor is affected; agriculture, industry, commerce are affected. Everyone, including Government, is eventually affected.

The farmer does not sell his products to another farmer, nor labor the result of his toil to a fellow worker. They may interchange it, but in the ultimate end it is this much-forgotten, unorganized group which furnishes the real profit margin.

But theirs is a lonely, divided cry for help, dimly heard against the united cry of agriculture and labor, industry and commerce, all those groups fortunately so constituted as to allow of organization.

There have been rapid and constant increases in the pay and compensation of organized labor. The average earnings in this group increased between August 1939 and August of this year by 41.8 percent, and their weekly earnings by 69.3 percent. Labor has fared well indeed under war conditions, with these increases. Compare them with the rise in cost of living which has been estimated at approximately 22 percent.

The forgotten, neglected, abandoned clerical or semiprofessional white-collar worker, largely unorganized, can cite no remotely comparable rise to offset his equally increased cost of living. Yet, he is paying the major portion of the tab on increased living costs, costs largely traceable to this 69.3 percent increase in the wages of his fellow employee, the worker in the industrial plant. He must pay not only his own additional costs but those of his fellows.

As it now stands, it might be said that the white-collar worker and other unorganized groups are virtually subsidizing the workers of the organized groups. They are paying a penalty for their specialized skilled knowledge and, in many instances, their higher educations. By our very Government, or rather let us say, by the administrations of the War Labor Board, we have adopted a procedure prejudicial to the unorganized forgotten man who, in the past, relied upon his individual efforts to gain for him an increased standard of living. We know the difficulties of obtaining rulings from this Board on matters pertaining to large organized groups. Imagine, then, the difficulties attendant upon obtaining the settlement of questions involving only the individual. The War Labor Board is chronically and notoriously behind in its docket.

What chance has Mary Jones, the school teacher; Pete Smith, the bookkeeper; Carl Brown, the clerk; or Susie Brown, his sister, in a city, county, or State office to receive prompt attention to her or his individual problem? The far-reaching effects of the neglect of this class will soon become apparent.

We have already pointed out that industry, labor, and agriculture will feel the backbite of these neglected millions whose only fault is lack of organization.

If there is a concrete incident of this situation required, look to your educational system. Many teachers throughout the country are leaving their schools for jobs in war plants. Normally, the turn-over is approximately 10 percent a year, but the turn-over in the past 12 months has been more than 20 percent. This is particularly true of the rural areas where Government figures show that of school staffs of 894,000 persons, from janitors to principals and supervisors, about 360,000 earned less than $1,200 a year in 1942–43.

During the period 1939–43, salaries of teachers increased less than 8 percent—based upon the fact that 66,000 teachers received less than $600 a year—while the wages of industrial workers increased during the same period 37 percent.

It might be pointed out, too, that Government is defeating its own purpose by not taking immediate steps to ameliorate the condition of the white-collar worker. We are urging higher and higher education, but in taking from this class, which includes the highest percentage and the highest average of education and intelligence, we are depriving them of the means to continue their children into higher brackets of learning—and of the incentive to do so.

What is the cure, the solution? From our seeming inability to face it, it must be an obscure one. But in reality, it is not.

Will subsidies for the stabilization of wages of the white-collared worker do the job? No. Not food nor wage subsidies will do it. Only one thing will do it—a fair and equitable additional increase in their weekly pay envelope. They are wage earners, just as labor, and they are entitled to a just, and adjusted, wage to give them their full share of the earth's bounty in return for their toil. That, after all, is the measure of a man's value—his equity in the world's bounty. Increasing the wage of an underpaid person to where he gets reasonable and fair compensation, does not make for inflation. The laborer is worthy of his hire. The white-collar worker is worthy of his hire.

My own State of Wisconsin does not look too happily on the fact that they must withhold their cheese and butter from a civilian market while their potential market is destroyed by substitutions which the public is being taught to accept as just as good.

Whatever our plan, our post-war economic security depends upon immediate action. The problem of the forgotten man cannot be solved by forgetting it. No one is to profit if this great important group in our economic fabric is to be ignored, resulting in a very low standard of living, or else a greatly increased individual debt. Billions of dollars in savings and war surpluses will be of no value if we are to destroy one of our greatest purchasing markets or destroy within them their self-respect as a class because they cannot hold their heads high with their fellow citizens—the laborer, the farmer, and the industrial worker.

The square thing, the fair thing, to do is to permit the white-collar worker to get reasonable compensation for his labor.

This is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, signing off and saying thank you.

Dewey and Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Dewey and Internationalism," by Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday.

I call special attention to the foreign plank in the Republican State platform of New York in 1942, for the drafting of which Dewey was responsible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

DEWEY AND INTERNATIONALISM

NEW YORK, April 10.—You sometimes learn more about a political candidate from his friends than from the man himself. One of

Governor Dewey's intimates is a man whom the average American has never heard of—John Foster Dulles.

When Dewey speaks of his friend Dulles it is with affection and admiration. Dulles is his closest adviser on foreign policy and, if Dewey should be elected President, he would probably name Dulles as Secretary of State.

I went to see Dulles to get some idea of his views. He is senior partner of Sullivan & Cromwell, which is perhaps the richest and most powerful law firm in downtown New York. To see him, you go to the nineteenth floor in downtown New York. You step into a handsome foyer done in the dignified tradition of the eighteenth century. Dulles' private office is at the head of an Adam stairway going to the twentieth floor.

While he has played an important part in the direction of some of America's greatest corporations, Dulles' dominant interest is foreign relations. His grandfather was Secretary of State under Benjamin Harrison and he grew up in an international atmosphere. At the age of 19 he was secretary of one of the delegations at the 1907 Hague Peace Conference.

Apart from his friendship with the Governor, who is 14 years his junior, Dulles has an important influence on foreign policy. He heads a group with the imposing title of the committee of direction of the commission on a just and durable peace, which was established by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ.

In a recent statement, the commission urged not only a general world organization and the regulation of armament but a far-reaching program of financial and economic adjustment. The basic choice, said the statement, "must be made between international organization designed merely to perpetuate by repression the particular structure of the world which will emerge from the war" and an international order which, "in addition to such use of force under law as is a requisite of order, discharges tasks that are curative and creative."

When Dulles talks about these things, it is with reasonable common sense. He is skeptical of what can be done by arbitrary flat—by the stroke of a pen.

That, in his opinion was the error of the 1919 peacemakers—and he was one of them. They leaned too heavily on a formal treaty. Any world organization, Dulles believes, must begin with fundamental realities such as the friendship existing between English-speaking peoples around the world.

Above all, Dulles holds that we can show the way to a decent world order only if we continue to set a dynamic example of what democracy can do. Here, in his view, Roosevelt has failed.

His tone is one of scholarly seriousness, his few public speeches dull. But when he speaks of Dewey, his face kindles. The Governor, according to his friend, is a quick learner.

Whether as the result of this friendship or on his own, Dewey is on record for positive international collaboration. In three or four speeches in the first half of 1942 he went a long way. And he is especially proud of the foreign plank in the Republican State platform which he drafted. That plank said:

"The United States must be prepared to undertake new obligations and responsibilities in the community of nations. We must cooperate with other nations to promote the wider international exchange of goods and services, to broaden access to raw materials, to achieve monetary and economic stability, and thus discourage the growth of rampant nationalism and its spawn, economic, and military aggression. As a further safeguard, we must join with other nations to secure the peace of the world, by force if necessary, against any future outbreaks of international gangsterism."

The isolationists dancing around Willkie's political corpse will find that hard to swallow. Moreover, I believe Dewey will stand by it.

The Size of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Big an Army," published in the New York Daily News of March 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW BIG AN ARMY?

The size of the United States war effort is much clearer to all of us than its ultimate objectives are to most of us.

We are raising an armed force—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Forces, etc., etc.—now planned to total 11,300,000, with some 10,700,000 now enrolled.

Our Air Forces total something over 2,000,000 men, our air fleets are record-breaking and are growing by leaps and bounds. Our Navy, long past the Pearl Harbor disaster—though not its disgrace—has a reported 23 battleships plus auxiliaries in proportion.

TOP-FLIGHT WAR EFFORT

We have been carrying the heat and burden of the war against Japan since the fall of Singapore, and are pouring troops into England at an unprecedented rate. It is expected that when the Allies have mopped up in Europe the United States' contribution in men will have been about 75 percent to Great Britain's 25 percent. We have been committed by our ruler to recovery of the British, Dutch, and French imperial holdings in the Pacific and restoration of those territories to the British, Dutch, and French.

AID TO RUSSIA

Nor is that all. Foreign Economic Administrator Leo T. Crowley a few days ago released a detailed report on how much and what we sent to Soviet Russia via lend-lease between October 1941 and January 1, 1944. From any angle, we have not done too badly by our Russian semially.

Dollar value of these supplies was $4,243,804,000. Tonnage of shipments in 1943 was 5,400,000; in 1942, 2,800,000.

Up to January 1 of this year, we had sent Russia 7,800 planes—a neat little air fleet all by itself.

Other combat equipment included 4,700 tanks and tank destroyers, more than 170,000 trucks, 33,000 jeeps, and almost 25,000 other military motor vehicles. We also sent the Red Army 6,000,000 pairs of United States Army boots.

The Red Army, like other armies, fights on its stomach as much as in its pillboxes, tanks, and planes. Here again, Uncle Sam has not been niggardly. United States food shipments to Russia from October 1941 to January 1, 1944, aggregated 2,250,000 tons—mainly wheat, flour, dried peas, dried beans, sugar, meat, powdered milk, dehydrated vegetables, and fats. That fat category is especially interesting to butter-short Americans, inasmuch as we donated 50,000 tons of butter to Russia; also more than 580,000 tons of oleo, lard, pork fat, and vegetable oils.

Other war materials sent to Russia in the above-named period included 177,000 tons of explosives, 1,350,000 tons of steel, 384,000 tons of aluminum, copper, and other metals, 740,000 tons of aviation gasoline, and $400,000,000 worth of machinery to make weapons of war.

Not content with all this, we topped off our contributions to wartime and post-war Russia by blowing the Soviet Union to a set of machinery for a complete tire factory which, says Mr. Crowley, "can produce at least 1,000,000 military truck tires annually from the Soviet's own synthetic and natural rubber supplies."

In 1943, we about doubled the proportion of our 1942 food shipments to Russia, so that in that year Russia got 51 percent of our lend-lease food, the British Empire got 42 percent, north Africa got 5 percent, and Greece, west Africa, and the Dutch got 2 percent.

THE SILENT GREAT BRAIN

The American people, thus, are putting out a tremendous war effort of their own, and are feeding, clothing, and equipping large numbers of fighting men in other Allied Nations.

The American people, we believe, have a right to know what this is all leading to—this bleeding of themselves, of their sons, and their substance. Is it planned to conquer Germany and Japan, and then police large areas of the world for years afterward with several million American boys who would otherwise come home, have families, and strengthen the fabric of American life?

Are we to give everything we may win in this war to somebody else? Is it not even intended to ask for a suitable screen of island air bases for North American continental defense in the Pacific and the Atlantic? The British flag flies again in Guadalcanal and Tarawa, though American fighting men are still policing those British colonies.

To these questions, the great brain at Washington has yet to give a clear answer. The great brain merely demands that we keep fighting, keep working, keep our mouths shut; and assures us that "poppa" knows best.

The answers to these and related questions are of the gravest concern to the American people. It is the job of the American Congress to find out the answers to them.

Analysis of Republican Presidential Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an analysis of the Republican presidential situation, written by Roy A. Roberts, managing editor of the Kansas City Star, and previously for many years the Washington correspondent of the Star. Mr. Roberts was one of the best newspaper reporters I ever have known; he is doing equally good work as managing editor of the Kansas City Star. He knows whereof he writes, and also knows how to write it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY "GO" SIGNAL—WILLKIE WITHDRAWAL LEAVES REPUBLICAN PATH CLEAR FOR NEW YORKER—SEE QUICK NOMINATION—EMPIRE STATE GOVERNOR MAY BE PUT OVER ON FIRST BALLOT AT CHICAGO—SWING IS EXPECTED TO COME AFTER STATES COMPLIMENT FAVORITE SONS

(As a long-time observer of the American political sense, first as Washington correspondent of the Star and later as managing editor, Roy A. Roberts has prepared this analysis of the Republican Presidential situation as it emerges from the overwhelming victory of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, and the corresponding defeat of Wendell Willkie, in the Wisconsin Presidential primary.)

Wendell Willkie's withdrawal from the Republican Presidential race last night following his staggering defeat in the Wisconsin primaries will give momentum to a stampede—already on—to the candidacy of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York. It makes Dewey as certain of being the G. O. P. nominee as President Roosevelt is to be the Democratic candidate.

To those who have followed the rather unspectacular Republican nomination picture, it would not be surprising now if there were only one ballot at the Chicago convention in June.

Dewey has taken such a commanding lead over the country he will be within shooting distance of the goal if not way past it by the time the convention assembles, unless there would be some miraculous change in the picture. And miracles seldom happen in politics unless they are planned.

PLANNERS FAVOR DEWEY

This time most of the effective planners on the Republican side are openly or privately for Dewey—not all of them happy over it, but regarding his nomination as inevitable. If the tide should continue to run toward Dewey as it has been, strategy would call for a first-ballot nomination, if possible.

So the picture now looming is one of the States casting their usual complimentary favorite-son ballots on the first roll call. Then if Dewey is close to the nomination mark or over it, enough shifts likely will be made to put him over on the one call, with a bang. And the draft will have been made. That this is about what will happen when the Republicans gather to select their opponent to Mr. Roosevelt is at least a 3-to-1 money bet right now.

Seldom in political history has a candidacy been deflated as quickly and thoroughly by the balloting in one lone State as that of Wendell Willkie and his misadventure in Wisconsin. Willkie himself made this possible by more or less making Wisconsin the test. Since the first of the year all the national polls have indicated that Willkie was slipping fast. The standard bearer of 4 years ago just couldn't get going, although he has had the biggest press, especially the magazine press and most of the New York papers, of any candidate in years.

WILLKIE PLANNED A BLITZ

The strategy apparently behind the Willkie campaign was to blitz the party again by a barrage of publicity and the supposed hold he had on the voters. All along the claim had been made that only the politicians were against Willkie and that when he once got to the people there would quickly be another story told. In fact, it has been one of the mysteries of the Willkie campaign why he always seemed almost to invite the hostility of the State leaders rather than try to placate them.

Ordinarily Wisconsin would have been a tough State for Willkie. It is in the shadow of the powerful Chicago Tribune, which hates Willkie second only to Roosevelt. The Wisconsin delegation in Congress probably deserved being characterized as isolationists more than any other State delegation in Congress, voting against practically every move proposed by the President before Pearl Harbor. The State had been strongly for Dewey in 1940.

Against this picture, however, and destroying any alibi the Willkie supporters might advance was the fact the anti-Willkie vote was split three ways. None of the three opposing candidates for whom delegation slates were entered was in position to campaign the State.

STAYED ON FOR DEWEY

Dewey not only refused to enter the State but sent two telegrams demanding that the delegations entered in his name not be filed. Some even accepted the situation and withdrew. A majority did not. MacArthur and Stassen both were in the far Pacific fighting their Nation's battles and their backers could do little for them.

Seemingly, with the opposition vote split three ways, it was a situation made to order for Willkie. His backers thought it smart politics for him to go in and gain a moral victory and demonstrate to the country that the voters down at the crossroads were for him.

Willkie made the most intensive fight a Presidential candidate has ever undertaken for one single State, campaigning for 13 days and making more than 50 speeches. No candidate for State office could have tilled the political soil more thoroughly. Yet he ran a bad fourth.

Willkie's one hope, as party leaders generally in Congress and in the States refused to accept him, was to demonstrate there was popular demand for him down in the rank and file of the voters. He staked all on a throw of the dice, and they rolled him out. The Nebraska primary next Tuesday—he was campaigning the State when the knock-out came—offered him little chance for a comeback, because the test on the preference vote was only between himself and Stassen of Minnesota. The inside dope from Nebraska was that Dewey had a big majority of the delegates on both the slates in the field, regardless of the preference vote.

So Willkie made his surprise announcement last night abandoning his candidacy, probably with the thought that he would have more influence in the convention on the foreign affairs plank by not coming into the convention a badly beaten and scarred candidate with only a few delegates behind him.

Making little noise and refusing to go into primary tests, Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, really has stood for weeks in second place in the Republican picture rather than Willkie, Willkie, even though the limelight shone on Willkie.

Bricker has been campaigning the country assiduously, making straightout anti-Roosevelt, anti-New Deal speeches and praising all Republicans. The result is he has made a lot of powerful friends and picked up considerable delegate strength here and there. He had more delegates in sight than Willkie.

Many of the eastern leaders like Joe Pew of Pennsylvania and some of the big industrialists really prefer Bricker to Dewey. But the point is most of the Bricker strength could and would go to Dewey easily if party strategy dictated an early nomination. And it now does.

With Willkie definitely out of the race, Bricker and all the others mentioned are apt to have tough going. Republican politicians generally have very acute hearing when a bandwagon begins to roll and with Wisconsin knocking Willkie out of the race, Governor Dewey is perched high on the bandwagon seat and it has started to rumble.

Willkie's chief strength was in New England where he was generally credited with having a majority of the delegates in sight. Also, he had some strength on the Pacific coast. But Dewey, not even an active candidate, was second choice if not first choice in all this territory. It unquestionably will swing to Dewey now and make the Chicago convention a ratification and platform convention rather than the customary candidatorial squabble.

Alaska and Hawaii Sometimes Lead the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, newspapers are usually dependable as to all factual statements. But there are exceptions. One such nonfactual exception appeared in a Washington Star headline on March 5, 1944. Here it is: "Mississippi leads Nation in percentage of War bond quota." The article which followed the headline embraced a tabulated statement showing the amount of the Fourth War Loan quota assigned to each State and Territory and the percentage of subscriptions thereof. As indicated in that headline, Mississippi led the States by subscribing 154 percent of its quota. But way down at the bottom of the list Alaska and Hawaii are included, and it appears by this same article that Alaska subscribed 202 percent of its quota and Hawaii 175 percent.

As great and glorious as is the State of Mississippi in this as in many other things, that State did not lead the Nation in percentage of War bond quotas, because, upon the august authority of the Supreme Court of the United States, Alaska and Hawaii have been declared, and by indisputable fact are, a part of the Nation.

So, in the interest of accuracy, and not at all to bring any further glory to Alaska or Hawaii, I venture to rewrite the headline and to say therein, in capital letters, if I may, "Alaska and Hawaii lead the Nation in percentage of War bond quota." The article in its entirety follows:

MISSISSIPPI LEADS NATION IN PERCENTAGE OF WAR BOND QUOTA

Mississippi, with 154 percent of its quota, led the other States in the Fourth War Loan drive, the Treasury reported last night. North Dakota was close behind with 153 percent.

Bond sales in the District totaled $110,014,000, or 116 percent of the city's $95,000,000 quota. Included were $34,488,000 in Series E bonds—the so-called people's bond. This total was 15 percent above quota. However, total purchases by individuals amounted to $51,334,000, 3 percent short of quota.

In a separate report last night detailing results of the local phase of the drive, John A. Reilly, chairman of the District war finance committee, said the results "sustain Washington's performance of never having failed

to meet its obligations to the Nation and to our valiant fighting men."

The Treasury released the following State table on the month-long campaign which ended February 15 with total sales of $16,730,000,000 as against a national quota of $14,000,000,000.

NOTE.—The figures are in round millions of dollars; Series E bonds are those purchasable only by individuals.

State	Series E	All sales	Quota	Percent of quota
Alabama	$42	$123	$93	132
Arizona	13	36	30	118
Arkansas	22	60	48	125
California:				
North	129	409	408	100
South	141	489	436	112
Colorado	25	88	70	125
Connecticut	61	467	426	110
Delaware	7	48	43	111
District of Columbia	34	110	95	116
Florida	41	162	121	134
Georgia	42	164	129	128
Idaho	13	29	24	122
Illinois	204	1,209	905	134
Indiana	81	292	233	126
Iowa	82	229	177	129
Kansas	51	137	112	122
Kentucky	36	127	104	122
Louisiana	38	127	96	132
Maine	16	66	59	113
Maryland	40	280	191	147
Massachusetts	112	827	794	104
Michigan	184	585	440	133
Minnesota	72	289	200	144
Mississippi	28	82	53	154
Missouri	79	360	282	128
Montana	17	42	31	135
Nebraska	40	110	94	117
Nevada	4	12	10	119
New Hampshire	10	52	41	127
New Jersey	110	781	600	130
New Mexico	9	21	16	129
New York	364	4,665	4,198	111
North Carolina	45	127	126	137
North Dakota	20	37	24	153
Ohio	178	896	672	133
Oklahoma	42	114	90	127
Oregon	44	129	99	130
Pennsylvania	224	1,069	978	109
Rhode Island	17	106	80	133
South Carolina	21	66	54	122
South Dakota	17	40	28	144
Tennessee	40	161	126	128
Texas	145	479	395	121
Utah	16	49	40	121
Vermont	6	34	27	125
Virginia	54	185	143	129
Washington	69	223	183	122
West Virginia	26	102	75	136
Wisconsin	70	336	258	130
Wyoming	8	17	12	140
Territories and possessions:				
Alaska	2	4	2	202
Hawaii	11	33	19	175
Other	3	6	10	63
Subtotal	3,202	16,734	14,000	120
Unallocated	15	4	-------	-------
Grand total	3,187	16,730	14,000	120

Educational and Training Courses for Honorably Discharged Veterans of This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed and the House will very shortly be asked to pass appropriate legislation designed to provide educational and training courses for honorably discharged veterans of this war. This subject will logically be taken up in connection with pending bills covering a broad demobilization program for returning servicemen.

There are three important considerations which should govern our thinking in the passage of any such legislation as is now contemplated in this direction, as follows:

First. Will such a program be so devised that the extra costs involved in adequately providing for these veterans be borne in an equitable fashion by all of us, or will we expect our colleges and universities to absorb large portions of this financial burden?

Second. Will we arbitrarily direct the footsteps of these servicemen to the nearest school or college, regardless of the type of training specialized in at that institution, or will we take pains to send these men and women only to those institutions which can provide the type of training to which their previous training and experience entitles them?

Third. Will we leave this vital matter of educational direction and advice up to some agency, heretofore unqualified by experience or training, or will we place this power of assignment in the hands of the agency or bureau best qualified to handle it?

In connection with the above vital considerations, I wish to direct our attention to a letter recently received by me from the Honorable E. E. Davis, dean of the North Texas Agricultural College at Arlington, Tex. Dr. Davis has not only had long experience in just such problems as are discussed in his letter, but has also sought and secured the advice of others equally competent to comment on this subject. You will note that the letter is a summary of the findings of a special committee appointed to study and report on the various bills now pending before the Congress on this vital question. The letter is as follows:

NORTH TEXAS AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
A BRANCH OF THE AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE OF TEXAS,
Arlington, Tex., March 22, 1944.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: After receiving your letter of March 8 stating that it might be helpful to you if a careful examination were made of certain measures now pending in Congress with the aim of providing educational and other benefits for members of the armed forces upon their discharge from active service, I appointed a committee of three of the ablest members of the N. T. A. C. staff to make a study of the educational features of H. R. 3200, by PATMAN; H. R. 4057, by RANKIN, and S. 1509, by THOMAS of Utah. I now have the report and recommendations of the committee before me. May I add that two members of the committee are veterans of World War No. 1 and one of them, Dr. C. C. Mason, was a rehabilitated student at the Texas A. & M. College because of the loss of an eye and an arm in the battle at St. Mihiel. The high points in the committee's report, with which I am in thorough agreement, run as follows:

1. Instructional costs: For the first 2 or 3 years after the war the American colleges and universities are going to have demands far in excess of their normal physical and financial capacities. They will have to provide for the education of two generations of students at one time—the normal current generation for that period and the generation returning from the armed forces. To be specific, the A. & M. College of Texas, a noncoeducational institution with an outstanding military program at all times, will probably have 4,000 returning veterans the first year or so after hostilities cease. Take, for example, the little institution that I represent, the North Texas Agricultural College, a branch of the Texas A. & M. College, with a peak enrollment of 1,776 and a probable 1,000 of its former students now in the services planning to return as veterans and finish the courses they had under way when called to active duty.

According to Gen. Frank T. Hines of the Veterans' Administration, a requirement of the Comptroller General of the United States is that institutions of learning shall not be permitted to charge the Federal Government for veterans in attendance sums in excess of charges ordinarily assessed by them against other students taking the same or comparable courses.

This policy will make it very difficult for some institutions to operate when the veterans come rushing home to complete the college courses they had under way when interrupted by the war. In this State the available instructional revenues for veterans will be limited to the collectible tuition of $25 per semester. The actual cost of instruction is several times that amount. I am presuming that you understand that appropriations for the State-supported colleges and universities in Texas are made on the per capita norm basis, that is, each institution is given a sum for instructional purposes equivalent to $175 per year for each full-time freshman and sophomore, and $225 per year for each full-time junior, senior, and graduate student enrolled for the year immediately preceding the session of the legislature by which the appropriations are made. You can readily see why the forward-looking executives of the State-supported institutions of higher learning in Texas are viewing with much concern the budgetary and enrollment problems due for the ensuing biennium, 1945–47.

The total instructional cost for the returning war veterans should constitute a charge against the Federal Government and not against the individual States. As the matter now stands, according to the holding of the Comptroller General, it constitutes a charge against the general government only to the extent of the tuition fee collected, which in the case of this State, amounts to only $25 per semester. As I indicated to you in a previous letter, there is a strong likelihood that the Texas institutions will receive more than their proportional share of the returning veterans since so many of them sent to Texas for training have indicated that they are going to return to Texas after the war for permanent domicile. This makes it all the more imperative that the Federal Government contribute more than the tuition fee of $25.

2. Approved institutions: The matter of determining whether a trainee should attend a college, a secondary school, or a trades school is very important. Many veterans of World War No. 1, like the proverbial square peg in the round hole, got into institutions where they did not fit. I bore witness to some very tragic examples of that sort in the early 1920's. Veterans with delusions of grandeur were allowed to enroll in professional courses for which they had no adequate background of previous experience or scholastic rating. The outcome was failure and disappointment—the result of their Government's misdirected good intentions. We must not permit a recurrence of mistakes like that this time. Vocational and professional guidance should have a very definite place in the administrative plans.

3. Administration: Section 2 of the Thomas bill provides that the administration of servicemen's education be concentrated in the United States Office of Education, in an administrator appointed by the President, and that this administrator utilize the services of any legally designated State educational or vocational agency in the execution of this act.

It is the sense of the committee, and I concur with them, that this provision is administratively sound. It concentrates the responsibility for the war veterans' educational services in the department of government where it logically belongs and it provides, at the same time, for the full use of existing agencies maintained by joint Federal and State contributions for the educational rehabilitation of disabled persons. It creates no additional Government bureau or agency with divided or overlapping responsibilities of the sort that usually result in confusion and inefficiency.

Assuring you that we appreciate the interest you have always shown in the welfare of the war veterans, I am, with every good wish,

Yours very truly,

E. E. DAVIS, *Dean.*

The Arabian Oil Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Felix Morley entitled "Strong Imperialistic Tinge Seen in United States-Saudi Arabia Oil Project." The article was published in the Wall Street Journal of February 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRONG IMPERIALISTIC TINGE SEEN IN UNITED STATES-SAUDI ARABIA OIL PROJECT

(By Felix Morley)

Indications that the post-war policy of the United States will be strongly imperialistic are accumulating. Plans revealed up to this month have not gone beyond acquisition of protective islands and strategic naval bases. Now the issue has been sharply posed by Secretary Ickes' announcement of long-range commitments in respect to Arabian oil.

This announcement was obscured in the daily press by more spectacular news of military operations. But the first paragraph of the release issued from the office of the Secretary of the Interior on February 5, indicates its significance:

"The United States Government will construct a pipe line for transportation of petroleum products from the Persian Gulf area to a point on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and will obtain in that area reserves of 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today on behalf of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, of which he is president. The directors of Petroleum Reserves Corporation are the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior, and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration."

Agreement in principle for these purposes has been concluded between P. R. C. and two American companies operating on the western shore of the Persian Gulf. These companies are the Arabian-American, owned by Standard of California and the Texas Co., and the Gulf Exploration, owned by Gulf Oil. The presidents of the three parent companies have signified their agreement, following strong and protracted governmental pressure. The undertaking now awaits approval of the boards of directors of the companies and its sanction by the shadow governments of the Arab States of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

This agreement in principle, whereby private business is coerced into becoming the active agent of the Government in imperialistic expansion, is something new in American diplomatic history. Certain points in the arrangement are worth close attention:

1. The Government "agrees to construct and to own and maintain" the pipe-line system, "including requisite facilities," which is to be built across the Arabian desert. (2) The companies will "maintain a crude-oil petroleum reserve" of 1,000,000,000 barrels "for the account of, and purchase by, the military forces of the United States." 3. "The commercial and other policies and practices of the companies" are to "conform to the foreign policy of the United States," whatever that may be. 4. Government purchase of the reserved oil shall be at a discount of 25 percent below the market price in the Persian Gulf region, or below that governing in the United States, whichever is the lower at the time of delivery.

II

The precise terms of the projected agreement, however, are of less concern to the average American than the implications arising from conditions in the area where it promises to become operative.

In this district, between the eastern Mediterranean coast and India, lie the seeds, which oil can readily help to germinate, of at least two potential conflicts. One is the always latent rivalry between Russia and Britain, which even today simmers around those waters of the Persian Gulf where the oil is to be extracted.

The second potential conflict is that which is shaping up as a result of the growth of Arab national consciousness. Present antagonisms are not far from the explosive stage in Palestine, where the port of Haifa is named as a possible terminal and refining point for the oil which is to be brought to the Mediterranean over the proposed pipe line.

It is not merely the American oil companies, but also the United States Government, which under the proposed agreement would be immediately involved if trouble should break out either between the British and the Russians in Iran, or between the Arabs and the Jews in Palestine. Any intermediate tribal vandalism against the suggested transportation system, stretching across some thousand miles of desert, would similarly become an attack on the American flag; an act of aggression against the United States.

There may be more than coincidence in the fact that, as this issue focuses, pressure intensifies for military conscription as a permanent policy. The project of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is to be located in a political cockpit where future international and interracial clashes are all too probable. And the project is concerned with an indispensable commodity which has frequently proved itself inflammable in more than the chemical sense.

III

Propaganda in behalf of the P. R. C. project will center upon the alleged exhaustion of our oil reserves. Secretary Ickes has for some time been hammering on the theme: "We're running out of oil." In an article under that title in the January American magazine he placed the life expectancy of our known oil reserves at 14 years, adding "it is up to us to take out some form of mutual insurance."

In a report on petroleum matters, made public February 16, the Senate (Truman) Committee Investigating the National Defense Program substantiates Mr. Ickes to the extent of supporting his statement that the United States is no longer in a position where it can oil another war. This report points out that the United States is currently producing about 70 percent of all the petroleum used by the United Nations, and has contributed upward of 85 percent of the aviation gasoline, observing:

"It would seem fair to ask our allies, particularly Great Britain, to recompense the United States for this excessive depletion by transfer to us of a compensating volume of proven reserves outside this country."

Three distinct arguments can therefore be expected in behalf of the P. R. C. Arabian oil project:

1. Without some such development, drastic gas rationing may become a permanency with shocking results for a society which has taken the automobile as a matter of course.

2. Unless oil concessions overseas are protected by the Government, the United States will be dangerously handicapped in the event of a third world war.

3. Official development of the Arabian concessions, an area where British interests dominate, are particularly logical because from this area Great Britain, perhaps also Russia, could most readily repay in kind the tremendous quantities of oil lease-loaned to them during the present war.

IV

Substantial opposition to the provisional Arabian commitments is nevertheless apparent and is likely to increase as the alarming political implications become more clear.

The oil industry itself is strongly antagonistic, asserting the reports of exhaustion are grossly exaggerated and new reserves will be found as soon as the administration permits a rise in crude-oil prices to a level at which it will be possible to drill exploratory wells. The American Petroleum Institute announces that even in 1943 production scarcely exceeded the increase in the volume of our estimated reserves.

Leaving aside the extravagant use of public funds, it is asked why, if the Government needs to go into the oil business, it does not do so in the adjacent territory of Venezuela, Mexico, and Colombia. Here oil reserves, if not as fabulous as those of the Middle East, are still enormous. The answer is that these countries have prohibited just such exploitation by governmentally controlled corporations as the Roosevelt administration is now proposing to impose on the more distant Arab states.

It is further asked why, assuming the desirability of establishing military oil reserves on the Persian Gulf, it is necessary, in view of our huge and growing tanker fleet, to move this oil through Government-owned pipe lines across Arabia to the Mediterranean. The absence of any satisfactory answer to this question has given rise to speculation that an American naval base is projected in the eastern Mediterranean, balancing the one said to be contemplated for Borneo after the defeat of Japan.

In its current report, publication of which was expedited by the disclosure of the Arabian agreement, the Truman committee charges that irresponsible administration is our present means of approach to as delicate and complex a diplomatic and economic situation as can be found in the world.

Before the United States is permanently involved in the perils of this Middle East entanglement it would be well to heed the Truman committee's warning as to the imperative necessity of an early determination of a

national policy on petroleum by the Congress.

Such determination should include inquiry as to why the Secretary of the Interior, rather than the Secretary of State, is taking leadership in a diplomatic undertaking about as remote from the interior of this country as terrestrial geography permits.

Price Control Has Worked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the testimony of the Honorable Chester Bowles, which is self-explanatory:

STATEMENT OF PRICE ADMINISTRATOR CHESTER BOWLES BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1944

Mr. Chairman, it is my earnest recommendation that the Emergency Price Control Act be renewed, substantially in its present form.

There is no questioning the fact that the law passed by Congress more than 2 years ago has served most effectively in stabilizing prices and rents. Under the present law the cost of living for the average American family has risen only 6½ percent since price control was first introduced at retail in May 1942.

For the past year, the average cost of living has been held in check with no over-all rise whatsoever. The level of wholesale prices, too, stands today almost exactly where it did a year ago.

These figures are not ours. They are the regular published figures of the United States Department of Labor, secured through techniques and methods which have been in use for the past 40 years.

Thus for 1 entire year, in the midst of the greatest war in our history, and in spite of the most powerful inflationary pressures, the average American family has been protected against any over-all increases in its cost of living. For 1 year, too, the average businessman has been protected against increases in his cost of raw materials and equipment.

Has this record of level prices been established at the expense of farm and industrial production? Certainly there is no such indication.

On the contrary, production under wartime price control has increased by leaps and bounds. Both farm and industrial production have increased during this war four or five times as much as they did during World War No. 1.

Profits during the present period of wartime price control are also at record levels. Corporation profits during 1943, even after all taxes, were twice what they were in 1939. Business failures were at the lowest point in 50 years. The net income of our farmers, after all expenses, were 45 percent over the most profitable previous year in all farm history—1919.

However, the administration of price control is a vast and complicated procedure involving the control of more than 8,000,000 individual prices. It is inevitable that there would be a certain degree of inequity and hardship.

During the next 2 or 3 weeks various individuals will come before you to recommend many different amendments to the present law in the hope that every economic hardship can be in some magical way eliminated.

Whenever individual hardships today can be relieved by price increases, without endangering the price line or raising the cost of living, we will, of course, grant them. During the last few months we in the O. P. A. have taken step after step to fit individual regulations to the complexities of different industries and even individual firms.

But an amendment to the present bill, legislating the relief of all economic hardship on a broad scale, regardless of the over-all consequences to our economy, would be a disastrous blow to the entire program of price control.

A second type of amendment which will be suggested to you, deals with the exclusive jurisdiction of the Emergency Court of Appeals. This court was established by Congress as an emergency wartime body to establish the legality or illegality of all O. P. A. regulations on a national basis. It has served its wartime purpose admirably.

However, there are certain groups which are recommending that this exclusive jurisdiction feature be scrapped, and that any individual or firm be allowed to challenge the legality of an O. P. A. regulation in any one of our 93 Federal district courts.

On a basis of ordinary peacetime legal procedure, this suggestion is most appealing. But it will not, in my opinion, bear analysis, when judged against the background of wartime conditions under which we are now forced to operate.

If each individual O. P. A. price regulation could be challenged in each individual Federal district court, it is not an exaggeration to say that instead of price control we would soon have price chaos. Court decisions would conflict with one another on the same regulation in various parts of the country. Months would go by while appeals were taken to the higher courts. As one court has recently pointed out "the Administrator would spend his time fighting litigation instead of fighting inflation."

In the meantime businessmen would be in a state of widespread confusion. Distribution would be thrown out of gear. Enforcement on the particular regulation in question would break down completely.

Such an amendment added to the present bill, regardless of the good intentions of its advocates, would be good news indeed for the black marketeers. It would spell higher prices on dozens of items and place a further strain on the pocketbooks of our citizens.

A third type of amendment which will be suggested to you is designed to split up the price-control functions of the O. P. A. among the various so-called production or supply agencies. Thus, the War Food Administration would assume control over food pricing. The War Production Board would establish all prices for industrial materials. The Petroleum Administrator for War would establish petroleum prices. The Rubber Director would decide the price of rubber. And so on.

It is difficult for me to see how anyone could propose such an amendment who actually believes in the control of prices and in the over-all anti-inflation program. This amendment has been advanced quite frankly on the theory that the agencies whose major responsibility is oversupply, would be more readily susceptible to pressure for higher prices than an independent agency such as the O. P. A., responsible to the Congress and the people solely for effective price control.

These three types of amendments will be recommended to you in various forms. Perhaps most of those who advocate them will sincerely feel that they, too, believe in the wartime control of prices. Others will present them for no other reason than their wish, for selfish reasons, to break down the O. P. A.'s efforts to protect all the people against a rise in the cost of living and to lessen, to the greatest possible extent, the cost of fighting the war.

But on this issue there must be no confusion. Regardless of the sincerity of many of the proponents, these amendments if accepted, can have only one end result. Prices in general will go up. The record of stable prices, established with such difficulty during the past year, will be blasted. Inflationary forces headed by the wartime profiteers, will again be on the march.

Mr. Chairman, the final all-important decision as to whether or not the present price line should be held, or whether the cost of living and the cost of the war are to be increased, is a question which Congress alone must decide.

But I know that you favor price control. I know that you would not intentionally cripple its effectiveness.

Knowing that, I would be remiss in my duty as Price Administrator, if I did not do my utmost to convince you that the major amendments proposed, whatever the intentions of their sponsors, would mean substantially higher prices.

I am sure, gentlemen, that you will see to it that this does not happen.

Mother an' Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mother an' Me," written by Mark M. Shaw, and printed in the Greater Nebraskan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTHER AN' ME

(By Mark M. Shaw)

Lord, we've been comin' to You for a long time, that is mother an' me, tellin' You of our joys and our sorrows. We've grown so to depend on You. Lord, in all the years gone by, You've never disappointed us. We know You'll forgive us, we know You'll not be mad at us for comin' to You again.

Lord, You see all, You know of our weaknesses and our shortcomin's even before we tell You about them. Lord, we need You right now.

We've been walkin' around in a sort of a daze. We look at the trees bare and skeleton-like, at the grass brown and dead; even the good old earth seems cold and forlorn. If the sun shines, we don't see it, and if the birds sing our ears are deafened to their music.

Dear Lord, You had a Son, so You'll understand. We want to tell You about our son, our Johnny Boy. To other folks he's a man, to us, that is mother an' me, he's just a bright-eyed, hopeful, eager little boy—he's our baby. His mother has to lay his shirt out for him and tie his necktie, and as for me, I have to slip a dollar into his pocket now and then for spendin' money.

It brought tears and regrets when our older children left for homes of their own, but we knew that was the way of the world. We left home in the long ago, that same way, that is mother an' me did.

Last week, our John squared his shoulders proudly and marched away to war, to defend this Nation, our beloved homeland, from

the attacks of despicable enemies. John's room is empty, the bed is neatly made up, his clothes are made ready and gently folded, ready for him if and when he comes marching home again.

Lord, You know our Johnny Boy, but we do want to tell You this: We, that is mother an' me, have been building air castles around our baby boy for a good many years. Our plans were all for him, but in every one of these plans—and we changed them a good many times—there was always a quiet place for mother an' me. Perhaps it would not have worked out that way, but we liked to think so, and that part of our plans were never changed. Lord, today all our air castles lay in ruin at our feet and we do so miss our John as we wander from room to room and place to place in a sort of an endless maze.

An' now, Lord, we, that is mother an' me, are not complainin'. We know other folks' sons are going along with our Johnny Boy. We know that their hearts are torn with anguish, too. So we are askin', pleadin', and trustin' that You will take care of all these brave boys. Guide them, bless them, take care of them through the long, bitter days ahead. And if in Your divine judgment, goodness, and mercy You can see fit to bring this conflict to an ending soon; if peace can be restored to a suffering world, with victory for justice and the right; we, that is mother an' me and all the other mothers and fathers all over the world, will be so happy.

Somehow or other, Lord, we just can't say "amen," we can't say "good-bye." We're just holdin' onto Your hand for strength, faith, and courage to meet the cares of the day and to help us drive away that dread of what might happen. Lord, You do everything right. We're coming back to talk this over again with You, right soon, and to ask You to give us the strength, the faith, and the courage to meet whatever in Your divine wisdom is best for us. We have that firm faith that You will bring our John home safely again soon to us; that is to mother an' me.

The Farmer and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the column of W. H. McWilliams published in the Times-Leader of Martins Ferry, Ohio, relating to the farmer and the war.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER AND THE WAR

(Extracts from the column of W. H. McWilliams, Times-Leader, Martins Ferry, Ohio)

Are the country people as patriotic, as far as rationing goes, as the city slickers? Is the housewife from the sticks abiding by the law on rationing of supplies as good as her city cousin who merely goes to the phone and tells the grocer to bring her a batch of grub—or as big a batch as her ration book will stand?

You hear a lot these days and some time ago I stood in the conference room of the United States Department of Commerce in Washington and listened to a discussion of that same question. One half-baked guy with the mark of Cornell all over his face, contended that out in the sticks farmers and small-town citizens carried on trade more or less like the mountaineers of Kentucky do their stills—without regard for the "revenuers" from the banks of the Potomac.

He's nutty.

I have just got back from making a wide survey over the industrial-farming section of eastern Ohio including Jefferson, Harrison, Guernsey, Belmont, and Monroe Counties and I can say that if the rest of the United States was as conscientious in observing the rules and regulations of rationing as are the industrial worker and the farmer, there wouldn't be any need for rationing in America.

Four things impressed me. The farmer has the best chance of any class in the country of busting the rationing laws wide open but they are, instead, the most conscientious in obeying them.

Another point is that the workingman's family, especially the mine and mill folks, probably has as much right to squawk as any class and yet I found family after family that undoubtedly went without what they needed of some articles because it wasn't lawful to buy them without points and they didn't have points enough.

And the third point I observed was that rationing-board personnel in the rural counties couldn't be any more rigid or faithful to the letter of the rationing law, and it's my opinion that even Moses, the lawgiver of old, couldn't have found any fault with the spirit in which rural boards from one end of the district to another administered the rules and regulations—the extent of which, by the way, would sometimes baffle old Moses and cause him to cast, as he once did the tablet of stone, down in unutterable disgust.

I don't know yet how city people are living up to the rationing laws, but I know this—if they live up to them any more faithfully than do industrial-farm sections of eastern Ohio, you had better load 'em down with the nearest blacksmith anvil because they have already sprouted wings and will soar upward, very shortly, into the billowy clouds of celestial perfection.

I have found farmers by the score who have let meats and certain foods waste and lose the sale of them because they were conscientious enough to feel that it would be "agin the law and their country in wartime to sell without points."

And lastly, in my tour, I failed to find a single storekeeper who had deliberately put the price of his products higher than that allowed by law. I found scores who were complaining about not being able to make a profit, but none who did else than to post the regulations on the wall and point with stern finger to the notices when customers came to buy: "There's the law, neighbors; wartime, you know."

They ought to strike a medal for the rural sections of America. They are holding, even though they disagree sometimes, the ceiling price on commodities.

Alcohol as a Supplement to Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release entitled "Farm Bloc Plans Determined Fight To Assure Alcohol Important Place as a Supplement to Gasoline." It relates, of course, to assuring adequate motor fuel in the post-war period.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM BLOC PLANS DETERMINED FIGHT TO ASSURE ALCOHOL IMPORTANT PLACE AS A SUPPLEMENT TO GASOLINE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Senate farm bloc plans a determined fight to assure alcohol an important place as a supplement to gasoline for powering post-war automobiles.

The Gillette subcommittee on utilization of farm products of the Senate Agriculture Committee will be the vehicle for the farm b' 's drive. It is the same group which triumphantly pushed alcohol into the synthetic-rubber program which originally was based on petroleum as a raw material.

Motivating force of the latest move is ostensibly to widen the market for farm products. Corn is the most adaptable grain for alcohol production. Other farm products which have been used with varying degrees of success—and cost—include blackstrap molasses from sugarcane—our cheapest domestic material but not available in quantity; grain, sorghum, wheat, potatoes, sweet-potatoes, sugar beets, and apples.

While a place for alcohol in the post-war motor-fuel market is the ultimate goal of the drive farm-bloc representatives want a start made now while the public is conscious of a gasoline shortage—less attention has been given so far to the fact that alcohol is in extremely short supply—even experimental quantities for a motor-fuel program would be difficult to obtain while it is needed for explosive manufacture and other war uses.

The subcommittee's recently opened hearings will be directed primarily toward convincing the War Production Board and the public that materials should be made available for such things as sawdust-alcohol plants and dehydrators for grain-alcohol plants. The prospects of a big post-war market for alcohol in the automobile fuel field will be one of the chief arguments.

Even committee members probably will not contend that the use of alcohol is economic at present or even feasible on a large scale. They will suggest that when a large and efficient alcohol industry is built up it will become practical.

In backing alcohol for the synthetic-rubber program the committee picked a winner. Originally expected to produce about a third of the butadiene used in Buna S, it actually has produced nearly two-thirds. The oil companies were slow to get under way in the butadiene field because the same materials were more urgently needed for high-octane gasoline. In addition the petroleum-alcohol process developed kinks.

Whether another winner is in the offing for the farm group, however, is a wide-open question. Alcohol for motor fuel is not a new thing. The Department of Agriculture has experimented with it since 1907 and has had a special laboratory for the purpose at Peoria, Ill., since 1936. Oil and motor companies have made experiments.

Out of this a few general conclusions can be drawn, but there still is a wide area of controversial thinking.

If alcohol ever comes into general use in this country, it probably will be as a blend for gasoline in the proportion of one part to nine or more of gasoline.

The resultant blend will cost more than gasoline alone under any processes so far tried. Alcohol enthusiasts claim, however, that under certain circumstances the operating results would offset greater cost per

gallon since alcohol raises the octane anti-knock number of lower-grade gasolines.

A widespread use of alcohol for auto fuel will probably have to await the production of post-war models with certain engineering changes designed to take care of it.

Despite these hurdles, which most people familiar with the gasoline-alcohol problem agree are present, the committee is expected to arrive eventually at certain concrete recommendations.

War Production Board officials forecast that the committee will recommend changes in W. P. B. policy so as to grant materials to build plants producing alcohol from sawdust and wood-alcohol enthusiasts think too that by installing many more dehydrators in alcohol-from-grain plants the waste—wet slop—from alcohol output could be reclaimed for stock feed. Thus more grain could be diverted to alcohol.

It has been contended in some official quarters that no good could come from expanding alcohol facilities, because they would be of absolutely no use after the war, to counter this view the Gillette committee aims to explore publicly the post-war automotive prospects for the commodity.

This committee, members feel, is particularly timely because of repeated alarms about the Nation's vanishing petroleum reserves. But even if oil resources are deemed stable, as the Petroleum Industry War Council currently asserts, the committee will push the use of alcohol after the war as a logical cushion for farm surpluses.

It intends to show how alcohol is being used in motor fuel in Cuba, was used before the war in the Philippines, and can be used efficiently after the war in United States automobiles. As one witness follows another, it will become clear that the committee is trying to prove conclusively that alcohol can be produced from wastes and surpluses at low enough cost so it can get in the filling-station pump.

Alcohol can be used effectively with gasoline either in a prepared gasoline-alcohol blend or mixed in the carburetor.

When farm wastes and surpluses find an outlet as fuel, the alcohol advocates say there will never be any reason to pay farmers not to grow wheat.

Letter of Mrs. Jane Marianna, of San Juan, P. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Mrs. Jane Marianna, of San Juan, P. R., representing the Pro-Statehood Association of Puerto Rico:

Much controversy has been going on in the press and in governmental circles about Puerto Rico, particularly in relation to the government of Rex G. Tugwell, the Tydings bill for the independence of Puerto Rico, and the senatorial committee which visited the island some time ago. Among other things, the argument sustained by some members of the Chavez committee relative to the English language as being a major condition for the admission of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union startled many. It is beyond our comprehension how the Spanish language and the Spanish culture could be considered as a barrier to such a goal at this moment when the Government of the United States is taking such pains to develop permanent ties of friendship and understanding with the South American continent. At this time when schools throughout the United States are adding Spanish to their curricula, when even the far-seeing wife of the President of the United States is learning Spanish, the much coveted knowledge of this language is precisely thrown up against us as a capital obstacle to the solution of our colonial status.

Far from being a handicap, our Spanish language and our Spanish culture should be considered as a decisive factor for our admission to the Union, for where could the United States find a more complete stock of potential commercial or government employees and teachers with excellent command of three languages? (Portuguese being easily acquired by us.) Who could make, I ask you, a better ambassador of good will or otherwise to the South American republics, an American who speaks a more or less intelligible Spanish with no knowledge, or a superficial one, of the idiosyncracies of the Latin peoples or a bilingual American of Puerto Rico with both cultures equally at hand?

Many Puerto Ricans have already successfully contributed in establishing cordial and friendly relations between the United States and the Latin-American countries. Among them are:

Col. Serafín Montesinos, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Staff, Panama Canal Zone. Decorated by the following Latin-American countries: Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Panama, Ecuador, and Nicaragua.

Col. Eduardo Andino, United States Army, former United States military attaché in Costa Rica.

Col. Francisco Parra, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Antilles department.

Maj. Guillermo Moscoso, Jr., United States Army, former assistant military attaché in Guatemala, El Salvador, and British Honduras.

Capt. Alfredo Ramírez de Arellano, United States Army, Inter-American Defense Board, Washington, D. C.

I don't know of any time in the history of the United States when the admission of Puerto Rico to the Union would constitute not only a master diplomatic step of great repercussion in the hearts of our sister American republics but also a more timely addition to the United States Government's aiming at the transcendental fusion of the commercial and war interests of North and South America.

To those who think that the language might constitute a problem, let me remind them that there is a small, highly civilized country in Europe, composed of 22 cantons of which 16 speak German, 5 French, and 1 Italian. You have guessed that I am speaking of Switzerland whose heterogeneous population amounts to only 4,000,000 people; just 4,000,000 people with 3 national languages and 91 dialects. For many centures 3 different languages were accepted without prerogatives by the Swiss Government. Laws were promulgated in the 3 national languages. Lately the language of a small canton which persisted in preserving its own particular personality and its own particular language was accepted as the fourth national language. And what has been the result of this system of government? An extremely cultured and civilized small country with the most perfect national feeling of unity which has enabled them, among other remarkable achievements, to maintain peace twice, in the midst of the 2 greatest world conflagrations.

How could anyone think then that a language of the actual importance of Spanish could be an insurmountable obstacle to the recognition of 2,000,000 people to share, on equal terms, the rights and responsibilities of the 48 States of the Union?

Let Puerto Rico acquire full consciousness of its personality as a State of the Union and the so-called independence movement will fade away like a dream. What irks that particular group is the uncertain feeling of our status. What keeps the people of Puerto Rico constantly divided and fighting petty political fights is the uncertainty of our future. Naturally enough, different ideals spring up. Our humiliating colonial status is forever present in the minds of political parties. The problem is so deeply rooted in their subconscious mind that they go as far as antagonizing the intensive teaching of English from fear that our national feeling be dulled and finally absorbed with, as a result, a fatal weakening of our will to be acknowledged as a free people.

This psychological uneasiness is responsible for the partial failure of our educational system. But let us be delivered from that nightmare and the renaissance of Puerto Rico with a stabilized, normal government would be assured.

How could a ship ever reach its destination when half of the crew steers her in this direction and the other half steers her in the opposite direction? I would go as far as saying that it is remarkable that our ship has traveled so far in spite of such rough seas. But let that crew know that they are heading for a safe harbor and watch that ship gallantly and proudly sail next to 48 powerful senior ships.

I cannot lay enough stress on this point: the major problem of Puerto Rico is a psychological one.

Honorable Members of Congress, who represent the well-meaning democratic and liberty-loving people of the United States, you cannot continue to be the insensible onlookers of the moral disintegration of 2,000,000 people whom this Government of its own free will took under its care.

An overwhelming majority of Puerto Ricans favors statehood for the island, because for 45 years we have lived under the American flag, because we have been educated under the American educational system and we have learned to love and respect American institutions, because when we were given our first civil Governor President McKinley entrusted him with the mission of orientating our political future toward statehood; because in a speech made in New York on April 19, 1921, at the unveiling of a statue of Dante, President Harding declared that Puerto Rico was a part of the Nation and called it an American State; because President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected in 1932 on a platform which advocated independence for the Philippine Islands and statehood for Puerto Rico; because on the platform on which President Roosevelt was reelected it was emphasized that "we favor a larger measure of self-government leading to statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico," and on the platform of the Republican Party a similar declaration was made; because Puerto Rico is the natural link between the two Americas and Puerto Ricans are anxious to do their share in the momentous rapprochement of the two powerful continents, because the American Government has spent sums of staggering heights to make of Puerto Rico its outstanding stronghold of the Atlantic and it eliminates the possibilities of integral independence for the island, even if we had wanted it; because when the United States entered the First World War, the American Government deemed that the cooperation of Puerto Ricans was important enough to grant them American citizenship, and when this country declared war on the Axis, Puerto Rican patriots volunteered by the thousands to help America save democracy for the world.

For all those reasons we have focused our hopes on the ideal of becoming the forty-

ninth State of the Union and expect reciprocity of feeling from the Americans of the continent. Thousands of Americans in Puerto Rico and on the continent, who have known us well in our long years of social and commercial relations, can vouch for our feelings of loyalty to the American Government and our friendship for continental Americans.

We realize fully that this is not the best time to bring up the matter of statehood before Congress. We are deeply conscious, as the whole world is, that our great and only aim now is and should be to concentrate all our efforts against totalitarianism until final victory is attained. But it was precisely a Member of this Congress, a United States Senator, who took this step much against our desire not to distract this administration, already overburdened with the superhuman task of defeating a demoniac invader.

The well-known magazine Life did us the harm of publishing a very partial and most unfair illustrated information about us. They criticize this administration for their failure to solve some of our gravest problems, in spite of the fact that the Government has spent $300,000,000. Let me tell this honorable Congress that even if it had lavished $300,000,000,000, still the results would have been more or less transitory. It is not monetary help that will solve any of our problems. What we need is protection from the colossal manufacturing power of these United States. We have struggled to develop many industries; they have been drowned by the fabulous output of American factories. What or who would not be? Even the invincible Hitler and his satellites will succumb to the gigantic power of American industries. God be thanked for that!

But, if, as the smallest child of this great family of grown-up States, we had been protected by this Government, we would have had a fair opportunity to develop our potentialities. But as things are, a small island, in the middle of the ocean, under a colonial regime, no matter how heroic her struggle, cannot but choke to death. I dare hope that Life will do us justice in publishing the other side of the story to prove how much credit we are entitled to because, in spite of such adverse conditions, we have attained remarkable progress and our buying power has placed us second on the list of the Latin customers of the United States.

Our island is poor in mineral wealth, but rich in population. Our men and women have deft fingers. Our beautiful drawn work and embroideries had found their way to the big stores on Fifth Avenue; our handmade blouses and dresses were among the favorites in American summer resorts; our beautiful rugs decorated the floors of your liner *America*, the Federal Building at the World's Fair boasted magnificent rugs from our factory in Puerto Rico. We could develop to a high degree the natural wealth born with our artisans, but to take only one example, our needle industries have been pitifully ruined because our fellow citizens of the continent flooded the market with cheaper handicrafts from Japan at cheaper prices. They helped Japan buy war materials to destroy American lives, while their fellow citizens of Puerto Rico watched helplessly their working classes starve to death. That certainly did not prevent heroic men and women of Puerto Rico from offering their lives to fight the Japanese aggressors. I could submit a long list of names which would mean nothing to you, but to mention a few: Brigadier General del Valle, hero of Bataan; Col. Virglio Cordero, a prisoner of the Japanese; and Commander Juan Pesante, graduate of the United States Naval Academy, killed in action at Guadalcanal. Among those on the occidental hemisphere, I cannot fail to mention Capt. Oscar O'Neill, who as commander of a Flying Fortress was cited by Mr. Winston Churchill for his heroic and valuable services. He is now a prisoner of the Nazis.

The law of minimum salary, on the other hand, has ruined many of our growing industries because local conditions made it impossible for us to meet the conditions established so suddenly by this Federal law. If we had had our representatives in this Congress, we would have prevented the harm done us. In many instances, as we say in Puerto Rico: "The cure was worse than the disease." Wisely amended to suit our particular problems, it would have done justice to a great many, without ruining many others.

What we need, allow me to insist, and what we ask of you, honorable Members of Congress, is protection for our growing industries, a fair chance to provide work for our great population, and the solution of our psychological uneasiness, which cannot be overcome until we know very definitely what our place in your pan-American program is going to be. We want to know that we can look forward to seeing our little star take its place in the American flag where President Wilson wanted it to be when he made us his equal in citizenship.

We know what Arizona, New Mexico (a bilingual State whose laws are published in both English and Spanish), Indian Territory, and Oklahoma went through to obtain statehood. We have our problems which are no greater than those of the Southern States. We can take our troubles and our growing pains and make use of them as the others. You've had your internal troubles, your guerrilla warfare, your bleeding Kansas; you have had great Presidents killed; you have your fanatics as much as we or any other country have had theirs. We are no better nor any worse than other peoples.

If representatives of our local political organizations to the Insular Committee tell one story and someone else tells another, let your imagination go beyond their inconsistencies and realize that back of it all the situation is economic and psychological.

We know that nothing but a definite promise of statehood will put an end to these controversies that inevitably weaken the faith of Puerto Ricans in their own government, as well as their confidence in the directing ability of this Government which holds their destinies in its hands. We have gone through great sacrifices and are ready to prove once more that we can bear hunger better than we can bear the lack of hope. You have much to give in the way of helping us trace our road to full maturity; we have much to offer in just reciprocity of feelings.

We do not expect to obtain the solution to our colonial status at this very moment, but we do expect a formal promise of this Government that in a definite period of years the recognition of Puerto Rico as the forty-ninth State is assured.

We are so conscious of the responsibility we are asking to assume that if you were to give your immediate and unconditional solution now we would say "no." We want a period of years in which to prepare ourselves fully to enter on the same footing as the continental citizens of the United States. We want to have time to get rid of our prejudices and allow Americans of the continent to free themselves of their own misjudgments. They do not know us as yet under normal conditions. Americans have made us feel oftentimes that they are the owners, we, their possession. Let us meet for some time on the same footing, as I have said before. We want to have time to establish a current of better understanding and good fellowship among us. We will open our homes to your students of Spanish and we will send you our students of English. They will constitute our best mouthpiece. They have already come by the hundreds to your colleges and universities, and they have proven to be second to none.

Right now hundreds of American enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy are marrying Puerto Rican girls. Our men are fighting, shoulder to shoulder, with their brothers of the continent; we are defending the same ideals under the same flag. May the mingled blood of our best men and your choicest youth, running on the same battlefields, be the communion of the American citizens of the continent and the American citizens of Puerto Rico to a new feeling of thorough understanding and permanent brotherhood.

JANE NICOLE MARIANNA.

Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if Virginia and Ohio can be called the mothers of Presidents, Wisconsin has long appeared to be the father of political trends. Bob La Follette, the elder, was not only a shrewd politician, but a statesman as well, and from his day to the present moment, the voters of that great State seem to be able to anticipate the course of national thought.

To many, Wisconsin's overwhelming repudiation of Wendell Willkie was not only an emphatic rejection of his international views, but a notice to all the world that Wisconsin at least wanted none of the New Deal, not even an imitation or carbon copy of it, as Willkie by some was considered to be.

The Wisconsin result is hailed by many as an unequivocal endorsement of Thomas Dewey. That conclusion may not be as accurate as it at first appears. The vote may have been more a protest than an endorsement of anyone.

In his 1940 campaign for the Presidential nomination, Dewey, throughout the country, made a series of speeches which have seldom been equaled in the clear, concise presentation of the issues then confronting us. Then he went into Wisconsin, made what was termed an isolationist speech, which lost him the support of the international bankers, cost him the Republican nomination at Philadelphia when they swung to the support of and put over Wendell Willkie.

Will Dewey's New York speech, made on the night of the Wisconsin primary, affect his strong midwestern support? In that speech he said that, after the war is over, there must be established a system of international cooperation in which free nations—

can be secure in the liberties which shall have been won at such great sacrifice. * * * One of the great problems seeking solution will be the protection of minorities. The genius and culture of minority groups must be safeguarded to their nations and to the world as a whole. * * *

We have learned unmistakably out of this war that no nation can remain free when

great slave populations exist under dictatorships elsewhere.

Already there is speculation as to whether Dewey intends, so far as foreign policy is involved, to follow in the footsteps of Willkie, who but followed some of the President's supporters in advocating the establishment of a super united states of the world, with an international police force.

It may be that Dewey was making general statements, not outlining specific action, as, for example, whether we should insist upon the independence of Poland or Finland, if Russia insists upon annexing the people and the land of those countries; free India from British or Jap control.

The result in Wisconsin shows that, while the people of that State are willing to be generous, charitable, to cooperate in aiding other nations and other peoples, they think first of all of the welfare of our own country, and they will not support either a policy or a candidate who desires to establish, at the expense of our own sovereignty, a super world government of any kind.

Willkie, in his 13-day campaign, lambasted the New Deal domestic policy, criticized the President's foreign policy, but clung to the idea that America must in some way, no matter what the cost in treasure or men, guarantee the political independence of minority groups and nations throughout the world.

Willkie is a skilled advocate, a polished orator, and no special pleader ever more adroitly, persuasively, and eloquently represented the internationalists and their theory of making this country not only the arsenal of democracy but the bread basket and the financial sponsor of all who might apply.

The people of Wisconsin would have none of it and not one delegate of the 24 did Willkie get. MacArthur, the hero of the Pacific, captured 3. Stassen the neighbor boy from Minnesota, got 3. Dewey will probably get the other 18. Dewey has glamor. His 1940 preprimary speeches have not been forgotten. He has shown himself to be a relentless racketeer-prosecutor, an efficient State Governor.

Not only was Willkie the spokesman for the advocates of the international world, he was the spearhead of the smirch campaign being carried on by the internationalists, the new dealers, and the Communists. Several Wisconsin Representatives have been attacked by these groups. Willkie's complete repudiation by the people of Wisconsin is notice to the Democratic Party leaders and to the Republican organization that the people of the Midwest feel confident of their ability to choose their own representatives for public service.

The great Midwest has been buying its full share of war bonds, contributing its full share of industrial production; its sons and fathers have been doing their duty on the fighting fronts, and those who remain here at home will accept no criticism of their loyalty or their patriotism. They will reject at every opportunity every attempt to destroy our constitutional government, the effort to remake America along either communistic, Fascist, or Nazi lines. They have no patience with would-be instructors or stooges of foreign or domestic internationalists who would make us the Santa Claus of all the world.

Those who make a profit out of this war, those who assume that they possess not only all the knowledge of what is good for us as a people, but that only they are patriotic and loyal, might just as well today as later accept and act upon the fact that the people of the Midwest will follow a policy which to them seems designed to best protect the interests of America and those in the service.

The people of the great Midwest will cooperate with the internationalists, with the people of other sections of this country, in carrying on the war, in the establishment of a permanent peace, in the preservation of a constitutional government here at home; but they will not accept dictation from any international group, no matter how well financed, how well represented by political orators.

Congress Defends Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., before the Women's Republican Club of Massachusetts, at Boston, and broadcast over the stations of the Mutual Broadcasting Co. on Thursday evening, March 30, 1944:

This dinner of the Massachusetts Women's Republican Club revives tender memories of a greatly beloved woman, one of the early founders and inspired leaders of this organization, Mrs. Charles Sumner Bird. Mrs. Bird was one of the really great women of New England. In this Republican club her fine American patriotism continues to point the way to preservation of our American way of life.

The women of this fine organization—indeed, all the women of America—have a great responsibility and a magnificent duty to fulfill in the government of their country. In a larger measure than ever before, they will be obliged to carry out the mechanics of this national election. Millions of the young men of this Nation will be busy putting the finishing touches on the destruction of Hitlerism and the ideologies of the dictator nations that might makes right. Upon the women of America will rest a major share of the responsibility of maintaining our institutions at home. For while we are fighting an all-out war to destroy ruthless aggression abroad, we must not permit our precious American heritage of freedom to slip away from us at home.

Our founding fathers, in their wisdom, contrived our American constitutional government of checks and balances because they knew that too much power corrupts. They knew that too long a tenure of office does something to even the best of men. Power feeds upon power.

The events we have witnessed and the currents which have been set in motion in government in the last 12 years have confirmed the wisdom of the founding fathers.

We have reached a point in our national history when the Congress is the last remaining guardian of the Constitution and the last remaining bulwark of the people's liberties. In recent years there has been a steady, consistent, and, I am convinced, a deliberate campaign conducted by the high councils of the New Deal to drive a wedge of distrust between the people and their Congress.

It has been part of a pattern to centralize control over the destinies of the American people in the executive branch of our Government. Some years ago the same effort was made to alienate the people's confidence in their Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts. The effort to pack the Supreme Court in order to obtain a bench which would be subservient to the Executive will was met and defeated by a thoroughly aroused public opinion. It was through no fault of the people or the Congress that the objective was later achieved owing to the flight of time and the frailties of human life.

Today with such an overwhelming control of the executive and judicial branches of the Government by one group, it is more imperative than ever that the American people have on guard a free, independent Congress to preserve their liberties under our Constitution.

It is a fortunate fact for our Republic that whenever a great crisis has threatened to change our form of government without the consent of the governed, the people of America have asserted themselves and have arisen to safeguard our free way of life.

Government by bureaucracy has grown apace in the last dozen years. The Chief Executive has set up a vast number of bureaus and commissions. There has been a steady and persistent demand for more and more power by the executive branch. It cannot be denied that the New Deal has sought to centralize and consolidate in a small group surrounding the President all of the essential powers of government. It has sought to substitute bureaucratic directives for statutory law.

To protect our precious liberties and our institutions is not an easy way; it is a hard way. Those who have taken up the fight against encroachment by the bureaucrats upon the liberties of the people often find it to be a thankless and disheartening task. There is no reward of patronage, no fat contracts, no favors and no junkets for those who tackle powerful bureaucracies. Then, too, such power has no difficulty enlisting in its support powerful individuals, powerful radio interests, and newspaper propagandists.

Truly, the sole compensation for those who are determined to stand up for the liberties of the people is usually their own sense of satisfaction of having contributed their bit to maintain our way of life—to keep America American.

There have been some who, to deceive the people, have tried to make it appear as though the Congress is obstructing the executive branch. The facts refute such false contentions. If Congress has erred, it has been in its readiness to give to the Executive the broad powers which he has continually demanded for the army of bureaucrats built up under his administration.

In the emergency of war, it has, of course, been necessary to confer upon the executive branch vast powers for the prosecution of the war. Refusal to have granted such powers would have been as unwise as failure to scrutinize closely the use of these powers, to correct abuses where abuses have appeared, to be ready to recall such powers as are misused and to restore them to the Congress and the people when the emergency has ended.

But before the advent of war, or even the threat of war, vast powers vested in the legislative branch by the founders of the Republic were transferred by rubber-stamp Congresses to the President and by him to the bureaucrats under the pretext of emergency. I am glad to be able to tell you tonight, my fellow Americans, those days are over.

The people became disturbed at the trend of events, and they have been speaking at the polls. The people are determined that state fascism isn't going to happen here.

Opposition to the drift toward permanent regimentation of America is by no means confined to those of us who profess the Republican political faith. If that were so, there would be no hope of success. But happily, the opposition includes legions of Americans who proudly boast of their loyalty to Jeffersonian ideals. Then there is also a multitude of independent voters, who hold the balance of power in elections in this country, and who have joined whole-heartedly in this fight to free America from the clutches of a selfish and power-ridden bureaucracy. This fight against bureaucracy is not merely a Republican fight. It is an American fight.

It is these people who helped to swell the vote of the Republican Presidential nominee in 1940 to 22,000,000 votes, and it is the support of this great mass of free men and women who enabled congressional candidates all over the country to poll a million more votes in 1942 than did those who sought election on the Democratic ticket. It is the support of these groups which has shown in the special elections since 1942 that the trend has been constant and progressive, and it is the support of these groups, which together with the new, militant and progressive Republican Party will elect a President this November and finally wrest control of your Congress from the last vestiges of New Deal domination.

A long series of acts by the executive branch in defiance of the expressed will of the Congress, and recriminations against the legislative branch because it would not submit, culminated in an accusation against the Congress that it was perpetrating a fraud upon the men and women of our armed forces while the Senate was considering an honest ballot for the use of absent soldiers, sailors, and marines.

The real significance of this battle has not been clearly impressed upon the people. Some day this contest will stand out as a critical period of our history, as important to the maintenance of constitutional government as the Supreme Court packing issue.

The founding fathers very wisely provided that the States would be supreme in the control of elections. This was to avert the danger of a powerful Executive from utilizing personal control over elections for the purpose of achieving perpetuity in office.

Fortunately there were enough Members of Congress with the courage to make certain that no Federal bureaucracy would dominate the election this November, as would have been done under the bill which was originally proposed.

There was never any difference of opinion as to the desirability of the service men and women being permitted to vote. Everyone believed they should be allowed to exercise this sacred right of citizenship. The bobtailed ballot bureaucrats would have given the service people a blank ballot, with no names printed thereon, and providing only for a vote for Federal offices.

Now perhaps some of us Federal officials are vain enough to suppose that the men and women in our armed services would care only about voting for us. But the fact remains that while it may not contribute anything to our own self-esteem, there may be many members of the armed forces who are more interested in voting for some friend who is a candidate for the State legislature or for a county sheriff than for his Federal officials. A majority of us believed the service people had that right, if they wished to exercise it. A majority of us believed, and still believe, that the boy or girl who is risking his life in Italy or in the South Pacific, is entitled to just as complete and just as valid a ballot as those of us who remain at home.

Evidently those who sponsored the so-called bobtailed ballot brushed aside as of no consequence the fact that under the laws of nearly all the States, such ballots could not have been legally counted and that under such conditions many service people would have been disfranchised. Such a course would have opened a wide field of litigation which might well have cast the Presidential election into Congress for settlement and have resulted in many contests for seats in Congress.

Such a situation would be a major calamity in a tense war year when there is need for the fullest possible unity and cooperation. Those who advocated the State ballot wanted to give the service people the right to vote a complete ballot and one which could legally be counted.

They did not want to fool the service men and women, and furthermore, they wanted to see that in the confusion of these war days, the Constitution, the anchor of all human freedom, should not be set aside.

The States have risen nobly to their obligation to give the men and women in the armed forces the chance to vote. They will provide a full and valid vote. They will have the ballots ready so they can be transported abroad and returned in ample time. The States will do their part. The Federal Government must not fail in its obligation of transporting the ballots, which rests squarely upon it.

The executive branch, for nearly 12 years, has had almost absolute control of our Government. With each succeeding year, this control has become more rigidly fixed. There was a time when there was some degree of independence among many of the various governmental agencies which, because of their quasi-judicial nature, were required to have membership from both political parties. It was a national conception that this arrangement would permit of one party acting as a check upon the other and that no single group would enjoy complete domination in carrying out the policies laid down by Congress.

This wise precaution no longer exists. If new Republicans are named to these agencies, they are appointed chiefly because of their support of the Executive and his policies. For the most part, the only way they could possibly be identified as Republicans is their own claims or through some old and nearly forgotten registration, honored more in the breach than in the observance.

The result has been the New Deal clique has had absolute control of all agencies, with only a lonely and feeble opposing voice here and there.

Through the device of regulations and directives cloaked with the force of law, the Executive boldly moved into the domain of the legislative branch.

Some idea of the New Deal invasion of legislative functions of Congress may be gained from the fact that in the last 10 years the New Deal bureaucrats have put into effect 3,703 Executive orders while Congress has passed 4,553 laws. The figures reveal how dangerously close we have approached rule by bureaucracy.

In an effort to destroy the people's confidence in their Representatives in Congress and thus strengthen their own hold upon all the functions of government, the New Dealers and their propagandists have made Congress the subject of ridicule and attack. The final culmination of such attacks upon Congress and encroachment by the executive branch on legislative functions forced even the Democratic leader of the Senate, Senator BARKLEY, to resign temporarily.

It is probable that nowhere in the history of our Nation can be found a situation to parallel that in which the legislative body found itself as a result of this hostility by the executive branch.

The situation is made more serious by the fact that our Nation is engaged in a great war. It is not a social experiment, but a battle for life and liberty. While our gallant American men are giving their lives on the battlefields of the world to destroy dictatorship and aggression and to keep their homes secure, we at home must make sure that a victory for law and order abroad is not perverted into a government by men and orders at home. We must make certain that regimentation will not be permanently fastened upon America.

Problems of tremendous magnitude are now pending. Whether we shall still have another world war may well be determined in the next few months. Relief of destitute peoples, the stabilization of world currencies, the distribution and control of the world's petroleum, the control of world shipping after the war, the allocation of the aviation routes of the world, adjustment of national boundaries, the making of a just and lasting peace—all these are problems of the near future.

Discussions concerning them have been in progress, but both Congress and the people have been left completely in the dark as to the decisions which are contemplated. A few bureaucrats alone have been participating in these conferences and making the crucial decisions which will affect the future of America for many years to come. Such practice is as wrong as it is dangerous. The men and women who are actually fighting this war, the people who are paying for the prosecution of the war through staggering taxes, and the Members of Congress who are the chosen representatives of the people, should have a real voice in these far-reaching decisions.

Agreements made as a result of these conferences should not be presented to the Congress with the blunt warning that they must be ratified or else we shall be brought into a rift with our allies.

Congress, as the direct representatives of the people, should be represented at these international conferences. And this representation should include delegates of both major parties.

This is not a one-party or a one-clique war. It is a war of all the American people. The future policy of our country must in the final analysis be a policy satisfactory to a majority of our people. If it is not, any international agreements will be as worthless, as far as being permanently effective is concerned, as a piece of scrap paper.

Foreign policy should be a national policy and not the judgment of one individual or small group of individuals.

Now we are winning this war. Our fighting men and women on land, on sea, and in the air are going to take care of that. After we win the war what must we do to win the peace?

If we maintain the free-enterprise system of America, if we keep our country free, who is there who cannot envision glorious new horizons of achievement for this greatest of all nations?

As Republicans and as Americans we in Congress have set our sights upon a definite chart of objectives, which we are in process of carrying out, which we must and will carry out if we are to fulfill our mission.

First of all, we shall give, as we have given in the past, our full cooperative effort to the winning of this war—to winning of this war as rapidly and with as little loss of life as possible. This is and must continue to be

the paramount objective of every man, woman, and child in America.

2. We will continue to defend the Constitution of the United States, whether it is assailed by subversive organizations which would remake America, or by those who would scrap it to entrench themselves in power.

3. We will continue to fight to eliminate waste and extravagance in all Government spending. Any legitimate cost for winning the war will be cheerfully met by the American people, but they rightfully resent the frittering away of funds irresponsibly and wastefully.

4. We will continue to insist upon a simplification of tax returns in order that they may be understandable to the average citizen. Our entire tax system must be overhauled, made more practical, more efficient, and less complex. We must avoid any form of taxation and any burden of taxation which will strangle small business, suffocate community enterprise, or incapacitate the larger industries. There can be no security in America, social, economic, or political, without jobs for the people. In levying taxes we must have in mind the stimulation of production and the creation of new jobs for the millions who will need them.

5. We will plan for the return of our men and women from the battle fronts and peacetime employment of those on farms, in factories, and the shipyards. They will want and they must have real jobs at American wages and under American standards of living, not doles or Government hand-outs.

6. We will make complete provision for those who have been disabled as a result of wartime service to their country and for the rehabilitation of the maimed. We should provide also educational opportunities for those whose schooling has been interrupted by the call to arms. A comprehensive educational and rehabilitation program will be set up at an early date.

7. We must prepare a forward-looking postwar program which will maintain private enterprise and permit this country to go forward to a great era of genuine prosperity and progress. We must maintain the freedom of labor, freedom of the farmer, and freedom of management. We must see that each group in America is given a fair chance and equal opportunity to share in the fruits of prosperity and progress.

8. We must carefully watch the use of powers granted by Congress to the bureaucrats. We must have the courage to curb abuses and to recall powers that are no longer needed. We must stand ready to see they are returned to the people at the conclusion of the war.

9. We must make adequate provision for those who reach old age and are unable to continue to share in the building of their country as they have done in their earlier years.

10. We must discourage and we must attempt to destroy class prejudices and class preferences. We must eliminate special privilege and we must observe constitutional guaranties that under our form of government there shall be fair and honest treatment of every individual, regardless of race, creed, or color.

A square deal to every American is the real guaranty of real Americanism.

Our post-war economy cannot go back. It cannot stand still. The only way in which our free constitutional government and our free enterprise economy can continue is by going forward. By going forward, I mean that after the war we must gear our producing and distributing plant to a new and greater production, one which must be constantly expanding. The New Deal tried the economy of scarcity, of plowing under, and we know now what a miserable failure that was.

We have in our country demonstrated a genius for mass production. We must turn that genius to the making and distribution of more and better goods, at lower and lower prices. It is when goods are produced at reduced costs through increased efficiency without wage reductions, that all income is enhanced so that our people may have more of the good things of life for their dollars.

We have reached our high state of living and working in America because our citizens were free individually to think, to imagine, to experiment, to invent, and to put their intelligence and their energy into the production of new and better goods and services for the people. The reward of profit has been the mainspring of incentive. Our people still believe that if someone can invent a better mouse trap than his neighbor, the world will beat a path to his door.

The only sound, productive, and happy economy is a free economy operated under fair rules. Congress must see to it that the rules are fair.

We are confronted by these tremendous problems. Can we solve them? I say we can. The American people possess a great intuitive mass wisdom and high mass ideals.

American common sense, American courage, American love of liberty, American genius, American faith in God and good, will bring us through.

We will lead the world back to sanity, peace, and prosperity. We will keep faith with the men and women on the fighting fronts by protecting at home those sacred ideals they are so gallantly protecting on battle fronts all over the world. God give us strength.

What Do Congressmen Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial from the Daily Journal published at International Falls, Minn., under date of April 5, 1944:

CONGRESSMAN'S DAY

What do Congressmen do at the seat of government? Do they really work diligently, all the time, for their constituents or is their job a snap? These and some other questions that concern the duties of a public servant in Washington are answered by the Eighth District's Representative, WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, in his current letter to the folks back home.

Mr. PITTENGER tells about his work as follows:

"The work of a Member of the House of Representatives involves a great many duties aside from the rather important one of attending the sessions of the House, and voting on important measures that come up for consideration.

"One of my typical days last week, very briefly stated, was as follows: Answer correspondence, involving the question of furloughs for men in our armed forces overseas, letters from the wives of servicemen regarding dependency benefits, inquiries from parents of men in our armed forces who have not received their letters, and numerous other departmental matters.

"In addition there was a mass of communications from people in the district expressing their interest in connection with pending legislation involving veterans, O. P. A., and numerous other bills. At 10 a. m. there was a meeting of the Committee on Claims, of which I am second in rank on the minority side. This committee considered some 30 measures introduced for the relief of individuals who cannot bring suit against their government in the courts, and whose only redress is to go to Congress. I secured favorable action at that session on 5 different claims bills.

At 12 o'clock noon, the House went in session and adjourned at 4 p. m. The balance of the day was spent in consulting with people from the district and in answering further correspondence.

"I give this somewhat brief summary to show that work here requires constant attention."

Overalls and Work Shirts Are Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for two seasons, the farmers and workmen in Nebraska have in many instances been unable to buy overalls and work shirts. Merchants have informed me that for weeks at a time their stores would be entirely out of both articles; that they had been forced to sell dress shirts to men for working in the harvest fields and that boys' overalls were difficult to obtain.

Mr: Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including an article which may throw some light upon this situation. It is the resolution adopted at the mass meeting of overall and work-shirt manufacturers from all parts of the United States and representing well over 75 percent of the total production of these garments, held in New York City, Tuesday, April 4, last, submitted to me by the chairman, Mr. I. J. Walls. The resolution is as follows:

At a mass meeting of overall and work-shirt manufacturers from all sections of the country and representing well over 75 percent of the total production on these garments, held in New York City on Tuesday, April 4, 1944, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas in the discussion of costs, it was forcefully brought out that the majority of the industry has had increases in labor costs since March 1942 up to 32 percent which, together with recent cloth increases granted to the mills by O. P. A., will result in the continued manufacture of these products at a definite loss. This, together with other increased costs, has brought a stop to selling and distribution and has caused further serious distortion to production; and

"Whereas it is a matter of record that no industry has cooperated more with O. P. A. than the work-clothing industry. Before and since the March 1942 price freeze, its record is one of shining achievement in answering all calls made upon them by O. P. A. It first responded wholeheartedly to O. P. A.'s request in holding down prices in late 1941 and early 1942. Again, after the March freeze, they voluntarily and unitedly followed O. P. A.'s further request in rolling back their prices as an example to other industries. The outstanding result has been that overall and work-shirt prices at the manufacturing level are today lower than they were in March 1942 and this without any deterioration of

make or quality. So far as is known, this cannot be said of any other industry. Faced with past and current labor and cloth increases, however, this fine cooperation is no longer possible; and

"Whereas as early as September 1943 when the mills were making application for price increases on denim, chambray, and covert cloth, the garment manufacturers were assured by O. P. A. that no increases would be granted on cloth without full compensating relief at the same time to the garment manufacturers. This, unfortunately, has not been done; and

"Whereas following recommendations of the Industry Committee in January 1944 that the manufacturers could not absorb increases, O. P. A. requested and received cost information from overall and work-shirt manufacturers proving that these increases could not be absorbed. O. P. A. then advised that they thoroughly understood and recognized the manufacturers' position; and

"Whereas the man on the farm, in the factory and mine knows that overalls and work shirts are his chief working garments and if selling is to be resumed and present production maintained on these critical and much-needed garments, it is imperative that O. P. A. grant quick and definite price relief. It is their responsibility in which they can depend on the complete cooperation of the industry. Prompt action is necessary today, not tomorrow. The industry cannot and should not be expected to carry the burdens of other industries. Unless relief is granted without delay, these much-needed low-cost garments will disappear and the worker will be driven to purchasing much higher priced garments, resulting in widespread hidden price increases: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That O. P. A. grant immediate price relief to manufacturers on overalls and work shirts; such relief to include all cloth increases and all labor increases granted since March 1942 and now pending."

Dear Mr. O. P. A. Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that my constituents in Louisiana are disappointed, disgusted and angry, and demand some consideration in respect to the administration of the O. P. A. program, and are calling upon their Representatives in the Congress to give them some protection.

Mr. Speaker, my district is the largest rice producing district in the United States and notwithstanding my protests on behalf of my constituents, and the protests of the Senators and Representatives from the other rice producing States of Arkansas, Texas, and California. the O. P. A. has promulgated MPR 518, placing a ceiling price on rough rice, which order also includes certain regulations for the regimentation of the rice industry, and we are informed, the O. P. A. proposes to amend the order to further regiment and injure the rough rice producer. While it is true that the order MPR 518 has been issued, the same does not become effective until April 15, 1944, and notwithstanding 16 Senators and Representatives from the rice producing States under date of March 28, 1944 demanded of Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A. that this order be abrogated before effective date, and notwithstanding that we pointed out that this order was unnecessary, unfair, ruinous to the industry, and would reduce production, we have heard nothing from Mr. Bowles. Apparently, we shall have to take other means to end this "bureaucracy."

Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of my constituents, I wish to include in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from the Crowley Daily Signal, of Crowley, La., from an issue of recent date, which reflects the feeling of my constituents in regard to this proposed ceiling price on rough rice. The editorial follows:

SOME 15,000 RICE PRODUCERS IGNORED

A splendid example of how the bureaucrats in Washington ignore the average citizen, the common people, and in this particular instance the rice farmer is shown in the set-up concerning the O. P. A. rough rice ceiling prices.

Some 37 rice mills in the United States have not only a millers' advisory committee but they have a former rice miller and the son of an active rice miller now as head of this particular division, the rice section, of the O. P. A. program.

Bruce Hancock, of El Campo, Tex., held the hearing here when the protest was filed against the rough rice ceiling prices. He is the son of R. M. Hancock, El Campo Rice Milling Co., El Campo, Tex. And this same Mr. Hancock is a member of the millers' advisory committee.

Other members of this committee are Louis Miravalle, St. Louis Rice Milling Co.; E. V. Schafer, United Rice Milling Products Co., New Orleans; E. Harvey Steinhagen, Comet Mills, Beaumont, Tex.; C. R. Walton Rice Mill, Stuttgart, Ark.; J. T. White, Jonesboro Rice Milling Co., Jonesboro, Ark.; W. D. Smith, Government chairman Grains Products Branch of Federal Department of Agriculture; Mrs. Pitman, reporter; M. E. Maule, Pfeffer Rice Milling Co., Houston, Tex.; Guy Landry, Republic Mill, Gueydan, La.; Frank A. Godchaux, Jr., Louisiana State Rice Milling Co., Abbeville, La.; Mrs. F. M. Douglas, C. K. Grosgean Rice Milling Co., San Francisco, Calif.; and George W. Brewer, Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.

They represent the rice mills, the milling interest. There are only 37 mills in the United States. But the 15,000 rice growers and producers, those who actually produce the raw product, which makes the rice industry possible, are not represented.

Once, many months ago, a farmers' advisory committee was called into New Orleans. They have vigorously protested the setting of ceiling prices on rough rice. They are still protesting insofar as possible.

But the bureaucrats have now left them without a voice. They have ignored those dirt farmers; they have forgotten the man who produces the product which makes the industry to exist.

It becomes more apparent daily that something better be done about the situation; that the farmers better be given a voice; and that the bureaucrats with all their power better remember that this is a democratic form of government in theory even if not in reality.

Up to now one side of the argument has been heard. Surely no one, even the rice millers favoring the rough rice ceiling price, are not willing for the farmers to have a voice. And don't forget there are about as many rice millers opposed to a ceiling price on rough rice as there are favoring it.

But certainly it is high time that the American rice farmers speak out. It is time the 15,000 or more in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas have their say. That is their American right and their American privilege. The unions of the Nation would call a strike. The American rice farmer is too loyal and patriotic to talk about not planting the rice, which is needed as food for the war program. But we will predict that unless something is done; unless the farmer is given some consideration; unless he is taken into consideration there will be a lot less rice planted in 1944 than there was planted in 1943.

Yes, the man who produces the raw product that makes the rice industry possible has been completely ignored by this so-called democratic government of ours.

I might add that since this editorial was published, and upon the insistence of the Senators and Representatives from the rice-producing States, an O. P. A. rice growers advisory committee has been appointed. It is very improbable, however, that this committee will be effective because it was appointed after the rough rice price ceiling regulation had been issued. Thus, the gesture is an empty one and comes too late to be of real assistance to the rice producers.

The Late Jared Young Sanders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, those who knew Jared Young Sanders best loved him best.

Upon previous occasions I have reviewed Governor Sander's outstanding political record in the State of Louisiana.

More recently I inserted in the RECORD editorials from the three daily newspapers of New Orleans.

Since the recess of the House an editorial from the Baton Rouge Times has come to my desk. Baton Rouge, La., besides being the State capital, is also the largest city in the congressional district which Governor Sanders represented in this House. The people of Baton Rouge were long associated with J. Y. Sanders, Sr., and the tribute paid his memory in the editorial which follows, is, I believe, one of the finest tributes paid to any public official, living or dead.

Here is what Governor Sanders' own people thought of him as expressed in this editorial from the Baton Rouge (La.) Times:

JARED YOUNG SANDERS

Doughty veteran of many a political battle, Jared Young Sanders, former Governor of Louisiana, has passed from the earthly scenes of strife and triumph, of joy and sorrow. His going was quiet. About him were the devoted members of his family. Near the end of a long and wearisome illness, his once powerful frame was weak, but his fine mind was unclouded. He was fully conscious until the final shadows gathered, in those last few

moments when life hovers between the present and the eternal.

Governor Sanders was tired.

He was ever a soldier, ever a fighter for a cause. Courageously, he had fought many months against illness and waning strength. He had kept his banners flying when one less determined and less stout-hearted might have given up. Yet, he was tired, and to the good soldier rest is sweet relief.

Jared Sanders was a man of great strength and force and personality.

From his youth he had played an impressive part in Louisiana affairs. He had stood out among his contemporaries in the State and in the South. He had made his mark in Washington during his brief years of service there. Whether in the Congressional Halls or at some community assembly in his home State, Jared Sanders was a man to whom others listened. He had unusual capacity for leadership.

As most men of dominant personality and vigorous courage, Governor Sanders during the years of his active career had enemies as well as friends in the political arena. There were those who fought him bitterly, time and again. There were others who stood by his side and marched with him, in victory or in defeat—and he had experienced both. Though in later years his personal ambitions had been merged in the concern over public issues, and in the career of his only son who bears his name, he never lost interest in affairs, never quite retired from the background of political action.

Older Baton Rougeans have known Governor Sanders for a long, long time—as legislator, as lieutenant governor, as chief executive of Louisiana, residing in the dignified old mansion on the boulevard. He was the last Governor to use horse-drawn vehicle, and the yellow-wheeled family surrey was a familiar sight along Baton Rouge's unpaved streets. In many ways his administration bridged a transitory period in life and progress. He was, we believe, the first Governor of Louisiana to have an automobile, and he was one of the earliest crusaders for good roads in Louisiana.

There linger many vivid pictures of Governor Sanders in action. When Mississippi River floods occurred near the close of his administration, Governor Sanders, like the born leader and worker he was, got into his boots and khaki and was down on the river front with the local militia and citizenry to help strengthen and patrol the levees protecting Baton Rouge's lower areas.

His was the rare gift of eloquence. It was used not alone for political speech and purpose. One of the most beautiful addresses he ever made was on occasion of the visit here of a Massachusetts official party to dedicate a shaft in memory of sons from that State who had fallen in battle here during the War between the States. Himself the son of a Confederate soldier, he spoke his tribute in deep feeling, and it was of the type of that finer oratory for which the southland is noted.

Most of all, however, the public remembers Jared Sanders in action on the political platform. One can see him now, stalking back and forth, his massive head bent over his sturdy chest, his eyes looking straight into the faces of his audience, and his clear, deep voice reaching the outmost rings, as he drove home some point. He never failed to hold the closest attention of his audience. He was one of the most convincing of speakers. His brilliant intellect and legalistic training bore up his eloquence.

In his public life, Jared Sanders had been highly honored in this State, and he had served with distinction in every high post entrusted to him—in our old statehouse, and at Washington, and as a member of two constitutional conventions, that of 1898 and that of 1921. Also, he had experienced disappointments in his political career. One of the most signal of these occurred during his governorship, when, after the legislature had elected him to fill a Louisiana vacancy in the Senate at Washington, he declined to accept, because of a situation arising which he felt made it his duty to remain at Louisiana. Acceptance would have meant fulfillment of a cherished ambition, which, by reason of later political turns, was never realized.

He had other disappointments. Yet, however blew the political winds, Jared Sanders remained cheerful, and continued to carry on his affairs as usual, and to fight on for the causes he espoused. If many opposed him, few men in our public life have had more personal friends, or friends more loyal. Though he outlived many of them, others younger have been solicitous of him, and kept in touch with him, during the long months of his illness. He himself was friendly and cordial. He has never been too busy, or too concerned over his own affairs, to give the warm handclasp and the hearty greeting. Jared Sanders always had time for even the humblest acquaintance.

Also, however vigorously he might wage political fight, intimate friends knew the warm and tender side to his nature, as revealed in his home, and in his affectionate devotion to his aged mother to the end of her days, and in his thoughtful regard for his sisters. He was kind and generous, and naturally drew others to him. He was a delightful acquaintance and companion.

During these recent days, as his strength has ebbed, Governor Sanders continued to see all his callers. Even when he was too weak to speak, save with the loving members of his family at his bedside, his hand was outstretched on the coverlet to all who came, and one knew he sensed the firm pressure of affection and regard.

In passing, Governor Sanders, as Louisianians have continued to call him, has left his mark upon this State, as a leader of forceful personality who loved this State and its people, as a gifted Louisianian who has carried on bravely, and who has never feared to face the fight. He was beloved by many. In Baton Rouge, in his home community, and all over this State, there are many to mourn his passing.

Farley on Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa Daily World:

FARLEY ON FREEDOM

High-minded philosophy and genuine patriotism marked the St. Patrick's Day address of James A. Farley at St. Louis. He was not making a political speech, but many of his pungent remarks had poignant application to the present situation in the United States. For instance, he warned that liberty and good government are not lost suddenly but that "political cave-ins occur only when the ground is soft." He plainly saw the erosion in our national life.

Mr. Farley warned strongly against the spread of the habit of untruthfulness in public affairs, not so much a matter of direct falsehood but of suppression, guileful phrasing, and implication. He made an appeal for moral stamina as a necessary ingredient in national welfare and honor.

Thoughtful citizens cannot help applying Mr. Farley's remarks to present-day affairs and tendencies. Everybody knows he is of high caliber intellectually and morally and it is fairly well understood that he has been more shamefully treated than any other man in public life. He does not complain, but he does speak out on principle. In this case, particularly, he was talking straight from the heart and telling people things they should know. His counsels are sane and they should be accepted in a most serious way.

A Fine Tribute to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who dwell in the deep South are always gratified at any expression of understanding or appreciation from our brothers in the North. The following article recently appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, which I gladly ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, having taken the same from the Ed-Clip Service which came from the Dillon Herald of March 23, 1944:

A FINE TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTH

The following fine tribute to the vision and loyalty of the South by the New York Herald Tribune, one of the Nation's most outstanding papers, is refreshing:

"The South's viewpoint of world affairs is possibly more enlightened than that of many equal areas in the North. Its population is largely native to the soil, its blood strains are few, and its reaction to the coming of World War No. 2 was instant and never in doubt. Resistance to tyrants came naturally to men of southern upbringing, and willingness to fight for liberty and against aggression has been part of their history since the landing in Jamestown. There are few isolationists among southern statesmen, and they, for the most part, are considered alien to their heritage and are held in considerable disesteem.

"The recent record of the South in world affairs is inspiring. Lend-lease would have been beaten in Congress but for southern votes. When the first year of the first draft expired, 4 months before Pearl Harbor, it was southern Members of Congress who insured its extension. When, by 1 vote, Congress decided not to send all the soldiers home, it was the South that turned the scale. Representatives of 12 Southern States cast 102 votes in favor of extending the draft and only 6 votes against it.

"The farsighted view of affairs across the oceans, illustrated by these statesmanlike steps in time of world crisis, is the more remarkable when it is remembered what might have been the South's natural preoccupation with its growing interest in foreign markets and particularly in export of cotton and tobacco. It is reassuring to find that older parts of the United States, undisturbed by economic changes and the terrific ordeal of civil wars, maintain their patriotism and that it responds instantly to challenge."

In every crisis the South has stood like a Gibraltar for what it conceived to be the soundest and wisest policies. This character-

istic may be attributed to the strong strain of Anglo-American blood which has remained undiluted since the days the first pioneers set foot on southern soil.

A comforting thought one gathers from the Herald Tribune's complimentary remarks is that the outside world is beginning to "discover the South." The more outsiders know of it the better they will like it.

Herbert Hoover's Endorsement of Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Drew Pearson recently found in the Washington Merry-Go-Round, disclosing how closely the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, is working with Governor Dewey on plans by which Dewey will be drafted at the next Republican National Convention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

Those who have talked to Herbert Hoover lately, in his skyscraper apartment near the top of the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, say that he is absolutely confident of achieving his No. 2 life ambition.

His No. 1 life ambition obviously was to become President of the United States. With that behind him, his ambition ever since March 4, 1933, when he left office with the banks closing and the Nation in economic turmoil, has been to achieve a come-back. He has put out of his mind any thought that he personally might step back into the White House. But he is determined that his men and his policies shall get back into power, and that he shall be the elder statesman to help manipulate them behind the scenes.

The men whom he long ago chose to help achieve this No. 2 ambition are Gov. Tom Dewey of New York and Gov. Earl Warren of California.

Those who have talked with the former President say that as early as last September he had begun to work out plans by which Dewey would be drafted at the Republican National Convention, and by which Governor Warren of California would be his running mate.

To that end Hoover began sometime ago laying the ground work to keep the California delegation out of Willkie's hands—no easy job in a State where Willkie has a very large following. But Hoover seems to have done it.

Also, he has quietly corralled the leading backstage monetary figures of the Republican Party and lined them up solid for Dewey. One by one he has seen to it that leading Republicans who didn't know Dewey got a chance to know him, or were otherwise sold on him.

It has been a meticulous, painstaking process. But Hoover's friends say it is just about finished and that he is absolutely confident that shortly before the Chicago convention the stage will be absolutely set with Dewey and Warren as good as in.

Thus will come about the fulfillment of Herbert Hoover's 11-year-old ambition, an ambition he has nursed ever since the tumultuous days when he left the White House in March 1933, went to the Waldorf-Astoria and waited there for Roosevelt to call him in for consultation on how to revamp the country.

Hoover was never called. And he has been waiting, watching, planning in the New York hostelry almost ever since.

Our Allies and Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Allies and Us," from the Columbia City Commercial Mail, of Columbia City, Ind., for April 10, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR ALLIES AND US

Secretary of State Hull in his address to the American people on Sunday asserted that all possible unity of the American people was necessary to the best peace after the war, as well as to the winning of the conflict. To this we must all agree. The Secretary also advised the American people that a special group of members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was to be formed, composed of members of both major political parties and a similar group from the House, who would be kept advised as to the policies and plans of the State Department and the Government in its dealings with our allies, and in fact all foreign nations.

If that plan is sincerely carried out, it will certainly have a wholesome effect upon the formulation of a policy that can secure greatest possible unity of this Nation. American people do not like to be told that the policies and plans about our relations with other nations have been arranged for in secret, without knowledge of the representatives of the people in Congress.

We do realize that details of policy and detailed plans cannot always be publicly announced during the process of negotiation and at times not immediately after the plans have been agreed to by our allies. Military reasons may make public announcement ill-advised. However, the American people do believe that responsible Members of the Congress of both major parties should be informed of all that is going on—and we believe that such a policy will tend to formulate a foreign policy that can continue through the future years, no matter what may be the political complexion of the Congress and the executive department.

This newspaper believes that the American people are convinced that our present allies should assume an attitude of working together after the present war is over to the end that nations cannot again run roughshod over other nations whenever they feel that military strength makes such a course possible in their nefarious ambitions.

South America cannot safely and wisely be allowed to again become the field for Nazi or Fascist influence from Europe or Asia, if the Monroe Doctrine is to mean anything and if South America is to remain free from becoming a stepping stone for possible military attack upon this Nation. The United States cannot be considered a geographical or political island in world affairs. It is now apparent that our Government and people must form some open alliance to keep ambitious and unprincipled nations from aggrandizement toward our Nation or other peaceful nations. It is a realistic problem in the immediate future and a problem which cannot be solved by forcing on any people the way of life the Allies may hold best, nor even by attempting to force upon others the standards of living that appeal to us or to our allies as the most desirable. The only realistic way of looking at the problem is to unite enough strong nations to insure themselves against attack and to assure friendly weaker nations this same freedom.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the immediate future, the Congress will be called upon to take action extending the Office of Price Administration and make appropriations for its administrative expenses. This is a matter in which the people of the United States are vitally interested It vitally and directly affects our war effort. Recently, Mr. Chester Bowles, the O. P. A. Administrator, addressed a communication to local rationing boards, asking them to make suggestions about the program. A copy of that letter I attach later. I am sure many of the boards have replied to Mr. Bowles' letter. Some of them have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The War Price and Rationing Board of Roanoke, Va., through its chairman, Mr. Morris Graff, has written to Mr. Bowles and made very pertinent and thought-provoking suggestions.

I wish to take this opportunity of commending Mr. Bowles very highly for his effort to get an expression from the local boards who, as stated by Mr. Graff, are on the front line in the rationing program. I share the opinion held by many Members of Congress that Mr. Chester Bowles is making a serious and a sincere effort to improve the administration of O. P. A. He has undoubtedly made much progress but there is also vast room for improvement. He will further demonstrate his wise leadership if he will pay heed to logical and sensible suggestions made by those in direct contact with the public in the administration of this program. I think the suggestion made by the Roanoke board that local boards be given much wider latitude and authority and some discretion is most timely and opportune. This would put common sense and sound judgment into operation in many cases that now greatly irritate the public because of a lack of ordinary human feeling and judgment.

I include herewith a letter from Mr. Morris Graff which sets out Mr. Bowles' communication and also the reply sent to Mr. Bowles by the Roanoke board:

WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD,
Roanoke, Va., April 10, 1944.

Congressman CLIFTON A. WOODRUM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE WOODRUM: On March 27, I received the following letter from Chester Bowles:

"As you probably know, the bill extending O. P. A. authority is coming up soon; also our appropriation bill.

"In preparing our requests to Congress I feel that we should consult the men most on the firing line in contact with the public, our local chairmen, as to what changes, if any, should be made in our plans and operations. I do not want a reply which just says we are doing a fine service to the people unless you sincerely think so. I want a real appraisal of our faults as well as our virtues.

"Is or is not O. P. A. rendering a worthwhile service to the people of your community?

"How could we do a better job?

"Particularly, are there any changes in our powers which you personally would recommend to Congress?

"A completely frank letter will be appreciated."

I thought, perhaps, you would be interested in my reply to Mr. Bowles, and I am, therefore, enclosing a copy of my letter of April 5.

With kindest personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,

MORRIS W. GRAFF,
General Chairman.

WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD,
Roanoke, Va., April 5, 1944.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Replying to your letter of March 27.

As I indicated in my letter of March 29, this communication will represent the composite views of the 35 board and panel members of the Roanoke War Price and Rationing Board, 48-123-2.

GREATER AUTONOMY FOR LOCAL BOARDS

a. Boards and panels are composed of men and women who are thoroughly capable of analyzing and executing the rules that are issued from Washington without having to go through district and regional offices. In marginal cases, they should be allowed to use their own judgment instead of always adhering strictly to the cut and dried national regulations. Without hindering the war effort, board and panel members will be as fair as humanly possible. As an illustration, I mention our food panel. It is composed of three of the outstanding women of Roanoke, who, in addition to having years of experience in running their homes, have been active for a great many years in local and State civic affairs. This panel also consists of the sales manager of the largest chain store in Roanoke, who has a background of more than 30 years of experience in marketing foods; an independent retail grocer, who operates an outstanding establishment, and has been conducting this business for 25 years; a wholesale grocer who, for 30 years, has contacted retailers and institutions and is thoroughly familiar with all of their problems; a merchandise broker who, for 35 years, has distributed goods from all sections of America as well as to many foreign countries. I think you will agree that this panel is composed of very, very competent people. The same is true of our entire membership.

These panels should have the authority to handle discrepancies without having to go through the slow process of sending them to the Roanoke district office, then to the Atlanta regional office, and thence to Washington. The answer comes back through the same slow, tedious pattern. Rationing boards originally were conceived of as committees of neighbors and were highly respected as such by the general public. As a matter of fact, the general public still thinks that rationing boards have some authority instead of being more or less powerless in rendering decisions of their own. I urge, therefore, that rationing boards immediately be given wide latitude of authority in the interpretation of O. P. A. regulations.

b. Rationing regulations should be sent directly from Washington to all local war price and rationing boards in language that is understandable. I happen to have several college degrees to my credit and some of my colleagues are also college graduates, but we still believe that the wording of regulations could be simplified still more. Some progress has been made, but there's still room for greater improvement along this line.

c. Rationing boards should be consulted prior to the formulation of national O. P. A. policies. The rationing boards are largely responsible for the successful operation of the plan, and if they had been consulted in advance about policies many of the mistakes of the past could have been avoided.

MORE FUNDS FOR BOARD PERSONNEL

Inasmuch as the rationing boards are on the first line of the rationing program, they should have funds adequate enough to attract and to hold competent employees. This applies largely to the higher executives, as the chief clerks and heads of the various divisions. They are doing work equally as important, if not more so, than in other O. P. A. offices and yet are not receiving salaries commensurate with their talent and experience.

PRINTING OF COUPONS

(a) Gasoline: B coupons should be printed in single strips rather than rolls of 5 coupons wide. Since the B book is limited to 13 coupons in the eastern shortage area, 16 in area A, and 19 in area B, these can be much more easily and quickly handled by clerks using single strips.

Next issuance of A books should be printed in booklets with cardboard covers. If still printed on sheets, the paper so used should be of a more substantial type. The present A books may not last a whole year without coupons becoming detached from the identification portions.

(b) Fuel oil: To avoid a tremendous waste of paper and time, it is recommended that class 3 consumer coupons (forms Nos. 1107, 1108, 1109, and 1110) be printed in single strips instead of the present sheets of 100. Most of the applications for class 3 consumer coupons are only for 10 or 15 coupons which have to be detached from the present sheet of 100 coupons and the rest of the paper, being a serially numbered coupon, simply becomes waste.

PUBLICITY

1. Premature releases.

(a) Gasoline: Harmonization of information given to local boards and to the press. This will probably require the cooperation of other Government agencies. A case in point is a request from the gasoline division of the Roanoke District Office dated February 16, 1944:

"The gasoline and fuel-oil supply is at a dangerously low point, and we are threatened with a cut in value of coupons in the near future.

"Local boards have been instructed that they cannot restore this cut, if and when it comes, unless authorized by the district director."

And yet a few days after the issuance of the above letter from the Roanoke district office, the newspapers of the country came out with the story that the supply of gasoline may be increased throughout the Nation. This latter publicity came at the very time the transportation panel had received its instructions from the Roanoke district office. I need not tell you of the confusion that has existed there from the utter conflict of news releases.

b. Point charts. It is suggested that O. P. A. point charts be distributed to retail merchants at least by the time the information on the chart is released to the press. What has happened every month since rationing started is that the press publishes the point changes 3 to 4 days prior to the effective date of the change, and 3 to 4 days prior to the merchant's receiving a copy of the chart. In other words, the public knows more about the ration values than the food merchant who is supposed to be familiar with this problem. It is suggested that point charts be distributed directly from the regional offices to the grocers instead of being sent, as at present, from the printing center in New York.

PRICE CONTROL

(a) Check and control restyling and repackaging which attempts to circumvent price ceilings, also check and control new business enterprises and new manufacturing establishments not having any previous basis for price classifications.

(b) More items should be placed on a community dollar and cent basis. Prices so established are easier both for the merchant and the consumer to understand. If the public is able to know readily the specific ceiling price on the commodities, our consumers will become more price conscious. On the other hand, items priced by a markup have no meaning to customers who do not take into consideration varied costs and retail practices and think, "How can I know the ceilings of prices vary from store to store?" Overcharges are more easily detected when items are on a specific dollar and cent basis. Also, community dollar and cent prices are a great help and timesaver for the merchant who is burdened with added responsibilities and insufficient help. More and more fresh foods should be placed on community prices, as each locality has its particular markets which afford a large source of supply.

c. Retailers, especially grocers, would like possession of wholesale ceilings. Knowing wholesale ceilings, the retailers will not pay prices too high.

d. Concentration should be centered upon the prices of items most likely to be scarce, but which are important to consumers and merchants. So often such items are not available at ceiling prices, and therefore black markets arise, and largely because the public needs the commodities and illegal prices are paid in order to obtain them. Such has been the situation with onions in Roanoke.

ABOLITION OF CERTAIN ITEMS

(a) Small children's shoes. Inasmuch as there is no proof required each time need is established, small children's shoes should be removed from the rationing list, thereby effecting a considerable saving of time to the board, to the parents, and to shoe merchants.

(b) Removal of all food items from rationing list except meats, canned fruits, butter, and cheese.

NO RETURN OF THE BAN ON PLEASURE DRIVING

If necessary, cut the allowance to the bone, but if an A holder is given any gasoline at all, he should be permitted to use it as he sees fit.

ENFORCEMENT OF O. P. A. REGULATIONS

Here I would like to quote directly from the letter submitted by the chairman of our hearing panel: "The enforcement officers should use a little common sense in their

prosecutions and other attempts to enforce the law. Some of the trouble results from the fact that a 2-by-4 clerk is given more authority than he ever had in his life and it goes to his head. I am confident that the enforcement officers fail to distinguish between an unintentional violation of a ceiling price, for example, and a deliberate failure to comply with the law. Apparently those in charge attempt to mete out the same punishment to the innocent violator and the one who willfully intends to violate the law. The enforcement officers have been entirely too quick to ask for an injunction and allege that the violation was willful and the defendant will not comply with the law unless an injunction is used. Newspaper publicity inevitably results to the detriment of the party who may have been guilty of an unintentional violation."

All of us are definitely of the opinion that O. P. A. is rendering worth-while service to the population. We are convinced that some form of rationing and price control is not only desirable but is also necessary in times such as these. We likewise believe that you, Mr. Bowles, are doing a far better job than either Mr. Henderson or Mr. Brown. We realize that yours is the task of putting into good order "a house built on a bad foundation and with a leaking roof."

In acknowledging this letter of mine, please do not merely reply, "Thanks for your nice, helpful letter." My file is cluttered with similar acknowledgements from your predecessors. I know you are extremely busy, and this also is a long letter, but my colleagues and I are also busy people and yet we took the time and patience to think out loud with you. There's no need of acknowledging this letter at your earliest convenience, but whenever you do come around to it, I would appreciate it if you would give me your reactions to the above ad seriatum.

Yours very sincerely,

MORRIS W. GRAFF,
General Chairman.

Mr. Ickes Urges Persian Gulf Oil Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent granted by the House, I place in the RECORD an article appearing in the Oil Weekly of March 11, 1944, entitled "Persian Gulf Oil Furnishes Good Backlog for United States Reserves," by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War, and president of Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

This article is interesting as reflecting the viewpoint of Mr. Ickes and his purposes in connection with the activities of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

This subject is now under consideration by the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

When the Oil Weekly asked me for a brief statement on foreign oil, my ability to say "yes" gave me a sense of relief that can be understood only against the background of the necessary secrecy under which I have had to operate over the last months. During these months, many and varied rumors have budded and been frostbitten. "The Government was taking over the oil business." Or, "the Government was selling out to the oil industry." Or, maybe it was a mixture of the two. Speculation ran wilder than "scuttlebutt" in the Navy. And yet there was nothing that I could do but sit quietly and hold my peace. The negotiations that were in progress could never have been consummated otherwise.

Now that the negotiations have been concluded, I can speak. And, now that this is the case, I want to say at the beginning that I speak with the pride of one who feels that he has had a part in doing a praiseworthy job and not in any sense with the embarrassment of one who feels that he must defend a blunder or a sin. So, I am glad to discuss this foreign oil matter and specifically the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. In so doing, I propose to be factual and realistic, leaving emotionalism to others.

In considering Petroleum Reserves Corporation and its activities, one must first regard our domestic oil position, because if we knew that we had beneath the surface of our own soil, all the oil that we ever could possibly need, there would be no point whatever in concerning ourselves with oil across the seas. But we have no such comforting assurance. In a nutshell, our domestic oil position is this:

The most generally accepted estimate of our known domestic crude-oil reserves is about 20,000,000,000 barrels. At the present rate of consumption, that is something less than 14 years' supply—if we could get it all out of the ground within that time, which we could not. This situation would not be disturbing if we were discovering new oil in volumes sufficient to offset our present production, but we are not doing so. Since 1938, our discoveries of new oil—not including extensions and revisions of previously discovered fields—have been very substantially less than our production. Every oilman knows this. In other words, our crude-oil bank account is diminishing every year, and this is true whether our known reserves are 20,000,000,000 barrels, as most people say, or 30,000,000,000 barrels, as some people think, or 50,000,000,000, as few people hope.

Right today we know that we are able to fuel and lubricate our great and growing military and naval machine only by imposing upon the public a degree of rationing which causes not only inconvenience but actual hardship and economic distress. This is true with reserves of at least 20,000,000,000 barrels. Now, if we continue to produce oil faster than we discover it, it is perfectly obvious that our reserves are going to be a great deal smaller if another war comes, in 15, 20, or 25 years. Yet, isn't it perfectly obvious that the oil demands in this next war—if it comes—are going to dwarf those of World War No. 2, just as present demands have made insignificant those of World War No. 1? Of course, we hope that there will not be another war, but we have learned from sad experience that we just can't afford not to be ready if one should come.

To me, all this means that we had better start right now to give some heed to our crude-oil future. We must assure ourselves of an oil supply, not only be developing our domestic resources, which we hope may prove fruitful, but by assuring ourselves some rights in sources beyond the sea, which we know to be fruitful.

PERSIAN GULF SITUATION

These considerations constitute the background for Petroleum Reserve Corporation's activities. The specific situation which led to its creation was that in the Persian Gulf region, particularly in Saudi Arabia, where the oil fields are held jointly by Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co.; and in Kuwait, where Gulf Oil Corporation and Anglo-Iranian each have 50 percent interest in a British corporation holding the concession.

The Kuwait fields, with proved and indicated reserves of about 9,000,000,000 barrels, are now shut in. The Saudi Arabian fields, with four to five billion barrels of proved and indicated reserves, are now producing about 35,000 barrels a day. By contrast, there is now a net daily withdrawal of about 275,000 barrels daily from the British-owned fields of Iran, and about 90,000 barrels daily from the fields of Iraq, 95 percent of which are owned, 23.75 percent each, by Anglo-Iranian, the Royal Dutch Shell group, a French group, and the Near East Development Corporation, which is owned by Jersey Standard and Socony-Vacuum.

Standard of California, Texas, and Gulf have experienced serious problems, including inadequacy of transportation and refining facilities, and have had to draw upon their resources in order to pay royalties and expenses. Their production has not been sufficient to offset their costs. On the other hand, the British-controlled companies or groups have had active support by the British Government. We in government discussed the situation early last year with the presidents of the California and the Texas companies and determined after a thorough study of the situation, that assistance should be given to the companies in the interest of the United States.

Petroleum Reserve Corporation has undertaken only one project so far, the construction of the 1,200-mile pipe line from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait to the eastern end of the Mediterranean, one consideration for which is that the companies will set aside 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil for the military services of the United States. I say without hesitation that I consider the agreement effected by Petroleum Reserve Corporation with California, Texas, and Gulf to be one which cannot be challenged from the point of view of financial soundness.

Building of the pipe line will cost between $130,000,000 and $165,000,000, all of which will be repaid to the Government by the companies within 25 years—with interest and a net profit—after which the Government will still own the pipe line. This repayment will be guaranteed by the companies. The companies agree to maintain the billion-barrel reserve for the military services of the United States, making the oil available whenever requested at 25 percent below the market price, either at the Persian Gulf or in the United States, whichever is the lower.

EMERGENCY RESERVES

The companies agree not to sell any crude or products to any government or person whom the State Department disapproves. In brief, the Government is assured of substantial oil reserves against a future emergency; the companies are given greater financial and operational security; and both sides will benefit financially.

During the negotiations, when secrecy was of prime importance, one of the favorite rumors was that the Government was sneaking into the oil business. I feel certain that, now that the agreement in principle has been made public, no fair-minded man will continue to make such a charge. I have no wish to put the Government into the oil business. The furnishing of a facility, without which the companies cannot get out their oil, is not putting the Government into the oil business. The building of another facility—the Panama Canal—did not put the United States into the transportation business, and no one has ever been so foolish as to assert that it did.

I do not know of any responsible Government official who does. I have the greatest admiration for the American private oil industry, and for the foresight and daring which has characterized its operations

abroad. I say without mental reservation that, wherever private industry can retain and expand its holdings and business, I have no thought of suggesting that the Government offer its aid. But I know, and leaders of the oil industry know, that there are now and will hereafter be situations in which they will need both encouragement and assistance from their Government—at least until such time as there is some kind of a world agreement which will promote the security of peace-loving nations.

As for the possible competition of Persian Gulf oil with domestic crude, I see no reason to believe that oil from those foreign fields will be brought into the United States within the near future. But when the time comes that our domestic crude is no longer sufficient—whether that be in 15 years, or 25 years—I believe that it will be comforting to know that we have an available supply elsewhere. Then the oil industry itself will be the first to advocate a policy of supplying our own people with the oil that they must have, even if it comes from abroad.

Office of War Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Phelps Adams, from the New York Sun of April 10, 1944:

O. W. I. GOES ROUND AND ROUND, COMES OUT HERE

(By Phelps Adams)

This is a simple little story about an editor who was so innocent and so naive as to suppose that an American taxpayer has a perfect right to read the propaganda he is paying the O. W. I. to produce. This editor, while glancing casually through the pages of a British newspaper, noticed an advertisement which read:

"Produced by the United States Office of War Information.

"A handbook of the United States of America.

"This is a book written to promote a clear understanding of America. The Office of War Information has compiled this handbook in the hope that it will be of value to the British public."

The editor, remember, was very innocent, and it was one of those days when he thought that he really needed a clear understanding of America. So he wired down to his Washington bureau a simple and forthright request for a copy of the document.

That was last Thursday.

MR. PLUMMER IS AWAY

The Washington bureau called the O. W. I. news desk and asked for Mr. Plummer. Mr. Plummer, the news desk regretted, was away for the day, but an obliging young lady on duty there was sure that Mr. Pinkus would be the very man to talk to about it.

Mr. Pinkus' line was busy for the next 10 minutes. When he was free, he informed the W. B. (Washington bureau) that a Mr. Kenworthy would be happy to oblige the I. E. (innocent editor).

Mr. Kenworthy knew all about the book right away. It was, he said, nothing more nor less than a reprint of the United States Government Manual.

Now, the Government Manual, you should know, is an extremely dull and uninteresting reference document which merely lists the personnel of the myriad governmental agencies, describes briefly the functions and authority of each, and traces the alphabetical transmigrations of the soul which each has undergone since it was first created under some other authority to perform some other duty. It could not, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, give "a clear understanding of America" to anyone, and not even the O. W. I. could cherish "the hope that it will be of value to the British public."

BUREAU RIGHT AFTER ALL

So the W. B. insisted that Mr. Kenworthy must be thinking of the wrong book. Mr. Kenworthy, with growing vigor, insisted that he was not. Twenty minutes later, Mr. Kenworthy agreed to dig up a copy of the document in question to prove his point. He was sure he had a copy lying about somewhere, and would call the W. B. back again as soon as he found it.

Two hours later, in the absence of the promised call, the W. B. phoned Mr. Kenworthy. He was apologetic. The W. B. had been right. The book advertised in the British newspapers was not the Government manual after all. It was a volume entitled "A Handbook of the United States of America," which had been prepared by the O. W. I. Overseas Division, purely for the benefit and delectation of its own staff abroad. The British Government had been much impressed by it, and His Majesty's Stationer's Office had decided to reprint it at British expense and offer it for sale to all and sundry. The British version, Mr. Kenworthy declared, was an exact copy of the original American publication.

"Fine," said the W. B. "Now, can we buy a copy?"

No; unfortunately, only one copy of the British version had arrived in the United States and that had been forwarded to the O. W. I. offices in New York; and, even more unfortunately, the American version, presumably identical in text, was "restricted."

"Restricted?" echoed the W. B., a little groggy, but still in there swinging.

RESTRICTED CLIENTELE

Yes, restricted. Mr. Kenworthy explained that Congress had raised as much you-know-what about O. W. I. propaganda that everything put out for foreign consumption is restricted, so that it cannot contaminate prospective American voters. A restricted document cannot be distributed in the United States of America, or to American civilians, or servicemen abroad. Neither in mufti nor in uniform can the American taxpayer see this propaganda. He merely is privileged to pay for it.

When the W. B. patiently pointed out that the identical text was being sold in London to any one flush enough to pay ten and sixpence for it, irrespective of the nationality or present condition of servitude of the prospective purchaser, Mr. Kenworthy relented to the extent of agreeing to permit the I. E. to come to the O. W. I. library in Washington and read the document there.

The handbook, as he described it, is a volume of 177 pages. Each page is approximately 12 x 14 inches, and carries 2 columns of very fine type. This suggestion seemed impractical, even to Mr. Kenworthy, when he thought about it, and after trying to switch the W. B. over to someone else, who also proved to be away for the day, he suggested finally that the I. E. himself might contact the New York office of the O. W. I., where they would certainly arrange to let him see a copy, or might even lend him one. He thought Sam Williamson, in New York, would be the man to see.

REPORT OF PROGRESS

So a complete progress report was telegraphed back to New York by the W. B., and the I. E., realizing that the job ahead was no sinecure, assigned his most energetic and persistent reporter to the task of contacting Mr. Williamson.

Before the E. & P. R. could begin, however, a Mr. Bourne, of the Washington O. W. I., phoned the W. B. to find out for himself what was the matter. The story was told to him in detail. He was sincerely apologetic and obviously wished to be helpful. The I. E. was known to him personally, it appeared, and well and favorably, too. He would call Mr. Williamson on the long distance phone at once and he would have Mr. Williamson call the I. E. himself and arrange to send him a copy of the handbook on loan, but Mr. Williamson did not call. The E. & P. R., however, did, at 3:30 p. m.

Mr. Williamson was in conference but would be through in half an hour. At 4 o'clock he was still in conference. At 4:30 he was in a different conference. A secretary promised that he would call. Apparently he did, about 6 o'clock, after even the E. & P. R. had left the deserted office and gone home.

MAN OF MANY CONFERENCES

Friday morning at 9 o'clock Mr. Williamson had not arrived. At 9:30 he was at a meeting. His secretary said he would call. No call. At 11:30 he was reported in conference but would be through by noon. At noon, still in conference; be through at 12:30. At 12:30 he was not available.

That man, complained the E. & P. R. to the feminine voice at the other end of the wire, "has been in conference steadily now for 24 hours, as nearly as I can judge."

"Wait a minute," said the F. V. "Perhaps I can get him," and she did, miraculously, and immediately.

Mr. Williamson explained that he had turned the matter over to a Miss Helene Feller, in charge of the New York Overseas Branch, and that she doubtless had got in touch with the I. E. Miss Feller, sad to relate, had got in touch with nobody. Mr. Williamson, it appeared, moreover, was thinking of the wrong handbook. He had in mind a confidential document full of secret data on German-occupied countries, and when apprised of his error, he said:

"I wish you had called me before." Honest and true; so help us, and no foolin'—that's exactly what he said!

SECRETARY LIKES LUNCH

But he didn't make with the handbook. He just said to call Miss Feller.

Miss Feller, it developed, would not be in today. Her secretary had gone out to lunch but would be back. That was at 12:40. At 1:45 the E. & P. R. called again. The secretary was still out to lunch. At 2:15 the secretary called the E. & P. R. She knew all about it, except that she, too, was thinking of the wrong handbook. However, it would all be straightened out in half an hour, she said, with a reassuring smile in her voice.

At 2:55 o'clock a Miss Parker of the O. W. I. phoned to say that there was only one copy of the handbook in the United States, but the I. E. was welcome to read it if he cared to come up to the O. W. I. offices for a week or two. She referred, apparently, to the British edition, and had completely overlooked the American version, of which heaven only knows how many copies were printed.

On Friday evening, the W. B. found itself by accident at a small informal dinner, at which the guest of honor was a Mr. Barrett, of the Overseas Branch of the O. W. I. By making light conversation and putting the guest wholly at his ease, the W. B. gave him a play-by-play count of entire incident.

DEEPLY DISTRESSED

Mr. Barrett was shocked. He said he would personally see to it that a copy of the handbook reached the I. E. on Saturday or bust. On Monday morning, however, no handbook had been received, and a galloping poll of

the charwomen at the O. W. I. offices revealed that none of them had seen Mr. Barrett hanging about the walls and ceilings of the marbled corridors.

Investigation revealed that Mr. Barrett had put the matter in the capable hands of Mr. Bourne, who, in turn, had called Mr. Williamson, who had told him that everything had been taken care of. Mr. Bourne then called the W. B. to pass this information along, but he selected an unfortunate hour on Saturday afternoon when W. B. was playing golf, which was certainly no fault of Mr. Bourne.

Faithful to the last, however, he called the W. B. at 10 o'clock this morning to report that Mr. Williamson had arranged everything. The W. B. then told him exactly what Mr. Williamson had arranged and how.

Mr. Bourne was deeply distressed. We mean he really was. He would do something about it. He even offered to lend the W. B. his own copy. At 11:09 he called back to report that Tom Carroll, of the New York office, would see that the innocent editor received a copy of the handbook (American version) immediately.

He said he honestly would.

Post-War Business Plans for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, scarcely a day now passes during which I fail to receive one or more letters from soldiers or sailors overseas, and in this country, wherein these men ask what provisions are being contemplated by the Congress to enable them to enter business on their own individual accounts after the war. I assume that I am not alone in receiving letters of this type.

The thing which strikes me so favorably in the majority of these letters is the desire of the senders to stand on their own feet and be able to become businessmen themselves in a number of the fields for which their wartime or prior training has prepared them.

These are not, in many cases, letters from men who are humbly pleading for jobs. Instead they are from men who say, "We are competent and able to take our places in our home towns as citizens capable of running our own individual businesses."

I recently received a letter from Sicily from a private who said that he had enough money saved up to start his own business, but who feared that credit sources might not be readily available to him for installment purchases and at reasonable rates of interest in case he was able to find the type of business suited to his talents.

It would, indeed, be a tragedy if these men should return in high spirits, full of faith in their own abilities and confident that ther own communities would receive them with open arms, welcoming them as fellow businessmen, only to quickly find out that normal credit channels were not open to them for reasons beyond their ken. The House Small Business Committee is now giving serious consideration to the possibility that such a condition might exist and is preparing certain legislative recommendations designed to forestall such possibility. I am hopeful that I may be able to report to you more fully in this connection shortly.

The following is the letter from the private in Sicily, above referred to:

SOMEWHERE IN SICILY,
March 27, 1944.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman of the
Small Business Committee,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Not long ago an article appeared in the Stars and Stripes written by Maj. Edward C. Madden, in which he stated possibilities of the returning soldier to step out of military life into the small-business enterprise which he had been planning during the years of service. Most of us here would welcome information relative to the post-war plans discussed by the Small Business Committee.

My post-war plans concern a small business which I hope to establish after the war. I am capable of raising enough capital to finance the start of the business, but would like a means of paying on the instalment basis so as to counteract expenses that will be a burden to my budget.

My unit approaches its twenty-third month of overseas duty, and it is only natural that we should start now to plan for the day when we will resume our civilian life. It is then my suggestion that some plan be formed to give the returning businessman a chance to get on his feet again. Rather than have the returning soldier borrow from profiteering finance companies, why not constitute some sort of a Government loan for these men? In this way we will not feel that the power of debt is hovering over us.

Sincerely yours,

Pvt. FRANK DEWITT MCLOUTH,
A. S. N. 13057778, Headquarters and Headquarters Sq., Three Hundred and Twenty-second Service Group, A. P. O. 650, in care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

New England Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of April 1, 1944:

NEW ENGLAND UNITY

That New England Senators and Representatives at Washington should stand together on matters affecting this region is one of the planks in the Boston Traveler's platform as set forth at the head of this column.

Without sacrificing party principles, we believe it is possible for our Members in Congress to work together in the interests of New England.

An example of commendable teamwork was in connection with the recent hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board on the expansion of air-line service to Boston and New England.

All of New England's Senators and Representatives went on record before the Board favoring adequate air-line service for Boston and New England. They also pointed to this area's excellent position in regard to transoceanic routes. They recommended additional certificates for more air-line operations.

That's the kind of action the Traveler's platform advocates—New England unity at Washington.

The weight of a solid New England congressional representation behind regional requirements is bound to produce results.

New England's Members of Congress have demonstrated that they can be above party politics when this region's welfare needs a lift. We urge them to keep alive this spirit of unity, for which they are to be complimented.

Missouri's Soldier-Vote Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that the Missouri Legislature at a special session which ended Saturday appears to have passed laws that will indicate special efforts will be made to see that those in the armed forces from our State have a right to vote. While I have not seen the law, nevertheless, comments in the St. Louis newspapers clearly indicate the one thought in mind of members of our legislature was the same as I expressed upon the floor of the House many times—the elimination of red tape.

According to the papers, the law does not require any particular form to be used in applying for a ballot nor does it require that it be certified by a notary public or an Army or Navy officer. Applications can be made by postal card, letter, cable, radio, or wire, and beyond that, it also provides that relatives may apply in behalf of the absentees and 79 days are allowed to transmit the ballot and its return. This is certainly simplifying the procedure, and I want to publicly congratulate the members of the Missouri State Legislature for this outstanding public service. If the synopsis of the law that has been printed in the paper is correct, I cannot conceive that any State in the Union will be more liberal than has the State of Missouri.

Under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks excerpts from editorials published in St. Louis papers. They follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

A USEFUL SESSION

Legislation enacted by the Missouri Legislature at the special session which ended Saturday goes far toward making it easy for citizens of this State in the armed services, wherever they may be, to vote in this year's elections. The legislature deserves praise for the prompt and thorough job it has done in protecting the voting rights of those who are fighting for their country, as well as in passing a number of other measures of great public importance.

One of the good features of the soldier vote legislation is that red tape is minimized. It no longer is necessary that the absent

voter's application for a ballot be made on a particular form, or that it be certified by a notary public or authorized Army or Navy officer. The application will be recognized however it may come—by postal card, letter, cablegram, radiogram or through a relative. This is as it should be, for the scrutiny of the election officials who do the counting is a sufficient safeguard against fraud, under the circumstances.

The new laws authorize the sending out of ballots long enough in advance of election dates to enable their return from almost any point in the world in time to be counted on the day after election day. For the primary, the ballots may be sent out 79 days before the last day for return, and in the case of the general election, the time will be 69 days.

One benefit of this excellent State legislation is that absent voters in the military services will be able to cast ballots for State and local candidates, as well as for President. This advantage was not possible in any form of Federal soldier voting law.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

PRODUCTIVE SESSION

The special legislative session overcame the temptation to play politics in an election year and enacted with commendable speed the program presented by Governor Donnell. * * *

The soldier vote law sweeps aside red tape in an effort to facilitate a maximum vote by Missouri's servicemen in this country and overseas. They may obtain State ballots by a simple postal card application. Affidavits and requests for official application blanks are not required. Moreover, relatives may apply in behalf of the absentees, and a liberal 79 days are allowed for transmittal and return.

If this machinery should be inadequate, soldiers and sailors can still avail themselves of the simplified ballot under the measure which recently became law without the President's signature. Missouri has set an example for other States in acting promptly and effectively to insure a maximum service vote.

Feed Will Remain Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the April 8 issue of Feedstuffs, national publication of the feed-supply industry, is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress:

FEED WILL REMAIN ESSENTIAL

A feed manufacturer beset (as who isn't) with labor shortages sends us his pungently expressed comments on the recently publicized proposals to draft men who have been classified IV-F and place them in war plants. He makes particular reference to legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, which would authorize such a development, calling it "crackpot legislation" and "one of the damnedest bills ever introduced in Congress thus far." "Take the IV-F's off the farms and out of the food and feed plants, and we will have starvation next winter," he predicts.

INDUSTRY'S POSITION MUST BE PROTECTED IN DEEPENING LABOR CRISIS

We are practical or cynical enough to believe that it is highly improbable that any such legislation will be adopted or even considered seriously in an election year. The threat to the Nation's welfare would have to be more frightening than it has been so far before any action so drastic would be taken. At the same time, it is evident that the country's manpower situation is going to be increasingly difficult from the standpoint of industry at least. The conflicting information concerning future selective-service policies is extremely confusing to employers, and to employees within the draft age, but it simply reflects the confusion that exists even among those who must set the policies. When those who must decide the course apparently cannot see clearly how extensive the strictly military needs are going to be, industry certainly cannot make its plans very far ahead. The only thing that one can be sure of is that help is going to be scarce and maintenance of production difficult even in those industries called essential.

There will be few if any physically fit young men left in the feed industry, the outlook indicates, for the combat-fit youngsters are being taken by the armed services in a steady flow even from munitions factories, steel plants, coal mines, and other indisputably critical fields. In all lines of work, more and more dependence is going to have to be placed on men above the draft age, on 4-F's and on women. And, if 4-F's are taken to fill the manpower requirements of essential industry, then the definition of the word "essential" in this application will become of the highest importance.

So far in this war, the feed industry has been recognized as essential, and in general this classification has been extremely helpful in maintaining production and distribution of feeds. If any sort of national-service legislation ever should be adopted, it is unthinkable that the feed industry would lose its rating. Its labor requirements would have to be considered and filled from the national pool or the supply of food would suffer. Yet we know from experience that it is a mistake to become overconfident on such an assumption, or the other so-called essential industries will have their share of the labor supply and that of the feed industry, too. It is right that feed men should be disturbed and that they should anticipate and forestall any development in labor policies or legislation that would handicap them unduly in relation to other, and no more necessary, lines of business. Even at best, the manpower problem will approach a deepening crisis in the next year. The feed and food industries will have no choice but to make the best of the situation that will face everyone, and that situation is going to be difficult; but the thing that should be guarded against is any real or apparent effort to remove feed manufacture and distribution from the category of an essential industry, or to reduce its rating so far below other types of manufacturing that its output would be substantially affected. Food production must be maintained at the highest possible level, and this cannot be done unless feed supplies are ample and available where and when they are most needed.

The Mother of My Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post carried a little poem written by one of my constituents, Brooks Wilson, of Spartanburg, S. C., expressing a very beautiful sentiment.

Under unanimous consent, I include the poem entitled "The Mother of My Son" in the RECORD:

THE MOTHER OF MY SON

(By Brooks Wilson)

Missing in action over Germany—
A tall and slender pilot, eyes as blue
As Carolina skies in spring, his hair
As golden as ripe wheat, fresh-washed in dew.

How can I bear this hurt, remembering
Last Easter, when his silver bars were new,
His youthful tenor soaring as he sang,
"Forgive them, for they know not what they do"?

Missing in action—my young son—yet I
Must hold my tears. I dare not let them fall
Before his mother, sitting calm, strong-willed,
So lonely in our pew, no tears at all.

This Is the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Frank A. Hecht and an editorial from the April 1944 issue of Sea Power:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 10, 1944.*

Hon. RALPH E. CHURCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: It gives me great pleasure to send you herewith a copy of a splendid editorial by Sheldon Clark, president of the Navy League of the United States.

Knowing your great and patriotic interest in our Navy, I thought you would particularly appreciate Sheldon's sentiments.

Cordially yours,

FRANK.

THIS IS THE AMERICAN WAY—TWICE THE UNITED STATES HAS PAID A FEARFUL PRICE FOR THE NEGLECT OF ITS NAVY. WHEN PEACE COMES AGAIN WILL WE REMEMBER THE BITTER LESSONS WE ARE NOW LEARNING?

Strangely enough, our present brilliant victories in the Pacific place us in awful danger. They open the possibility that we may forget that these great victories are built on 2 years of bitter humiliation.

Today we cheer for Admiral Nimitz's brave men. Two years ago we wept for the brave men of Bataan.

Today our superbattleships are shooting Japanese planes out of the skies like clay pigeons. Two years ago Japanese planes smashed our ships at Pearl Harbor and sank two of Britain's greatest battle craft as if they were sitting ducks.

Today our naval guns bombard Japanese islands. Two years ago Japan was wrestling those Pacific islands from us.

These facts are not recited here to show how well we have raised ourselves from under dog to top dog. They are recited to recall the dismal fact that once we were the under dog and to drive home the simple truth that it was not ever necessary for us to be so.

HARVEST OF DEATH

Those 2 years, their pain, their outpouring of blood and treasure, their humiliation, were the harvest that we reaped for our blind belief in the good faith of our inevitable foes. They were the price we paid for remaining unprepared in a world which still settles its problems, in the last analysis, by the sword.

Every American, every civilized man, now holds the devout hope that after the carnage of this war there will be no wars, that man has reached the level of civilization where nations, like individuals, can solve their problems, settle their differences, under a code of law and justice. But there is no sign in the skies, there is no guaranty upon earth that the close of hostilities will usher in such a millennium.

TWICE-TOLD TALE

For more than 40 years, since 1902, the Navy League of the United States has been a Cassandra, has cried its alarms in a wilderness of optimism, has warned that the United States must prepare for an evil day. Twice that evil day of war has come and twice America has been woefully unprepared, has paid for that unpreparedness with the waste of its resources and the unreplaceable blood of gallant young men.

At this moment we are paying in acute and Nation-wide dislocations. We are working long hours. We are paying staggering bills in money. We are stunting the personal careers of our sons as we call them into uniform and send them off to battle, and we are blasting progressive plans, long and hopefully nurtured.

These forms of payment are not always final, but the young lives with which we bought the time in which to make ready can never be replaced.

Americans pride themselves on being hardheaded and realistic. Are we?

PROFIT FROM THE PAST

If so, now is the t ne for those of us who are able to profit from past experience, for those of us who are truly realistic, to make our plans for the future. These plans are not the task of a few leaders. The Roosevelts, Churchills, Stalins, Chiang Kai-sheks, Edens, Molotoffs, and Hulls of this world are undoubtedly men of great courage, foresight, and ability, but it is not the American way to believe in leaders. The true American way, the way of our forefathers, of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, is the employment of the matured judgments of an enlightened people in making their own decisions—governing their own fate. Any other way can lead only to tyranny and destruction.

THERE IS A WAY

The Navy League of the United States, with no political or economic ax to grind, with no special interest to serve, offers one rallying point for enlightened citizens who wish to preserve this Nation. It is one instrument which those Americans who have learned the bitter lessons of recent history can employ to guarantee the Nation's safety in the future. The Navy League has a program that deserves support. The voice of that program is Sea Power magazine.

If you see in Sea Power merely an interesting and authoritative magazine of information about the United States Navy, you see the surface only; for the constant editorial purpose of this official publication of the Navy League is to proclaim the Navy as an essential protector of the Nation in peace no less than in war.

In time of war a powerful Navy is the shield of defense and the spearhead of our offensive strength. In peacetime it is the symbol of our might and power, the proof that our peace cannot be challenged with impunity. It is the guaranty to ourselves, and the warning to aggressors that we not only can defend ourselves but that we can strike back with massive blows wherever they may choose to attack us. And the Navy League has but one program, one goal, one plan—the maintenance of a strong Navy and its necessary support, an adequate merchant marine.

For this reason, you, as a free American, should support the Navy League by every means in your power—not for its past, not because of the dangers of the present, but because the future will surely come, and its safety can be assured only by plans made now.

With the grace of God and the unwavering courage of our fighting men, we will surely win this war, yet we cannot prevent another except by our own efforts. But individual effort, one man who stands alone, is not enough; men of good intention must band together. You can help to do your part by supporting the Navy League.

SHELDON CLARK,
President, Navy League of the United States.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on April 8, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, there are 18,000 patriotic men and women in our locality who depend upon their skill in making shoes for a living. They depend upon the Endicott Johnson Corporation to keep getting those big orders they've been turning out for half a century.

But the big orders won't be filled and the Endicott Johnson workers can't keep busy unless the administration suddenly wakes up. The whole shoe industry is crying for hides.

In order to see things first hand and get a better understanding of the Triple Cities' largest industry, I took it upon myself last summer to make a detailed inspection tour of the Endicott Johnson factories and tanneries. The complaint I heard most from everybody I talked with was the lack of hides.

"Why doesn't the Government wake up? They won't give us enough hides to turn out the most necessary military and civilian quotas of shoes we must meet."

In my opinion, Endicott Johnson workers ought to be making several times the shoes they are now turning out. The fault is not theirs. They are doing a magnificent job with the limited amount of leather they are receiving.

The blame is squarely on the shoulders of the crackpot bureaucrats who have been employed to regulate everything and everybody. If Endicott Johnson were allowed to go full steam ahead, not one American soldier, not one civilian will lack shoes next winter.

As the matter now stands, the shoe industry is stymied. There will be a shortage of shoes soon unless Washington finds some way to slaughter at least 4,000,000 cattle. If a solution is not found to get the hides, we are going barefoot.

There might be some excuse for not supplying Endicott Johnson with the hides if the country were not teeming with an all-time record cattle population of 83,000,000 on the hoof. That is the ridiculous part of it. If the shoe factories can get the leather, they will make the shoes.

Our fighting men wear out two pairs for every one we as civilians discard. And it takes heavier leather to build Army and Navy shoes. Only sheer stupidity or indifference among those in authority in Washington will allow this situation to continue. But if it continues and they don't get hides for Endicott Johnson, this whole valley will suffer and suffer plenty.

For the life of me, I don't know what would happen to this valley if the shoe factories weren't here. For years, the presence of Endicott Johnson in our midst has kept the rest of us on a sound economic standard. Industries have come to us and gone again. Yet we have never suffered appreciably even from depression because so many thousands of families have maintained a steady income from their honest labors in the shoe factories.

So it is important, so important to keep the big orders coming into Endicott Johnson but it is most important to keep them supplied with leather because without the leather, no shoes, and without the shoes, no work.

Realizing the seriousness of this lack of hides and the stupidity of Government agents in allowing such a situation to exist when there are more live cattle today than ever before in history, I have introduced a resolution demanding an investigation of both the War Production Board and the O. P. A. here in Washington.

For the sake of 18,000 Endicott Johnson workers, for the sake of our largest industry, for the sake of enough shoes for our fighting men, and for our people, I hope that Congress will adopt the following:

Whereas the tanning and shoe industries of the United States are facing a most serious situation due to a shortage of hides and are not currently able to obtain enough hides to make leather and shoes; and

Whereas the year 1944 is witnessing the presence of the greatest cattle population the country has ever known, there being over 83,000,000 cattle on the hoof at this time in the United States; and

Whereas the supply of hides coming into the market this year will be insufficient to meet the absolutely necessary requirements for military and civilian needs to the extent of about 4,000,000 hides; and

Whereas the consuming public will suffer immeasurably if hides are not made available at an early date: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture be authorized to investigate the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of finding out why the necessary hides have not been made available.

Ohio Demands Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Ohio needs no encomium. She stands at the head of the list of States in many respects and near the head of the list in all respects.

Frequently a great State, like a great man, fails to get its proper recognition

because of the failure of those whose responsibility it was to secure such recognition.

As we move about the city of Washington, the most beautiful city in the world and the Capital of the greatest Nation in the world, we are disappointed and almost chagrined because none of the many beautiful avenues or boulevards is named Ohio. There is a great avenue named New York; another bearing the name of Massachusetts; another named New Jersey; and there is the historical Pennsylvania Avenue, at one end of which is located the White House and at the other end of which is the great Capitol Building. Practically every State in the Union has been recognized and honored in this manner. Ohio has been omitted. There was once a short, insignificant little street of but a block or two in length that was designated Ohio Avenue. That was long since vacated to make room for one of the beautiful Government buildings which add to Washington's appearance.

That there is no Ohio Avenue in Washington does not in any way dim the luster of the fair name of Ohio. Rather it is evidence that those responsible for selecting appropriate names for the most important thoroughfares of the Capital City consider neither history nor aesthetics. Or could it be due to the inefficiency of the Senators and Congressmen from Ohio or one of the numerous Presidents that Ohio has furnished for the Nation? If so, I cannot shirk my part of this responsibility. I may be entitled to an alibi, however, for I did make an effort to have one of the new and attractive boulevards that now traverse the length of the beautiful Mall section named for our great State of Ohio. Although I failed, I take solace from the fact that the christening authorities advised me that these new boulevards would be named after our first Presidents, which has been done.

So in order to keep fresh in the minds of those who name the streets in Washington, the fact that we Ohioans feel keenly this unfortunate omission, I have prepared a letter which I am sending to Hon. James Russell Young, chairman of the District Commissioners, which letter I shall fortify with a copy of these remarks that I am now making. I shall hope that all other Ohio Congressmen and Senators may also support my efforts in this respect.

Important as I feel this movement is to have Ohio properly represented in the geography of our Capital City, there is another unfortunate situation existing with reference to our fair State that I cannot view as placidly. We are engaged in the most terrific war of all history. Our armies are carrying on with traditional courage and success on many fronts. Our Navy, the mightiest in all history, in her power and majesty rides the waves of the seven seas. She stalks the marauding remnants of the German Navy with a determination to eradicate the last vestige of that arrogant piracy. The boastful Japanese Navy, capable only of tactics such as were demonstrated at Pearl Harbor, shrinks out of sight and hides under camouflage and cowardice. MacArthur and Nimitz will search them out and I have no doubt that they will administer justice, stern and real.

Mr. Speaker, although Ohio has sailors and marines and WAVES and SPARS on practically every American battleship, every cruiser, every destroyer, every submarine, and every war craft afloat today, still neither they nor we at home can feel the pride that comes to residents of other States who can point with pride to the achievements of a battleship bearing the name of their native State. Can it be possible that not one of the many mighty battleships of the great American armada bears the name Ohio? Yes, that is the low nautical estate to which our great State has come in these historical days of naval prowess.

While Ohio does not border on the Atlantic nor the Pacific yet one of the truly great and decisive naval battles of our history was fought in Ohio waters. I refer to Perry's victory on Lake Erie in the fall of 1813. There at that time that intrepid young officer, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, with his small fleet gave battle to the death to a much larger British fleet. His motto "Don't give up the ship," theretofore having been spoken as the dying words of Capt. James Lawrence was the battle cry of Perry and his men. When the sun set on that memorable day, the War of 1812 was ended on the inland waters for which the United States and Great Britain contended. Then it was that Commodore Perry sent to his superior officer that immortal message "We have met the enemy and they are ours. Two ships, two brigs, one scooner and one sloop." This battle and this message are to Ohio what Bunker Hill is to Massachusetts and Valley Forge is to Pennsylvania.

Yet in spite of all this the name Ohio is an obsolete word in the lexicon of the present day Navy.

I hope this is not the fault of anyone. It probably is an inadvertence. It cannot be held to be the fault of the Navy nor any activities or customs of the Navy for we Ohioans are proud of the fact that at this very day an Ohioan is the highest ranking officer in this the greatest Navy ever assembled on the world's Seven Seas. Admiral Ernest J. King, an Ohio boy, who is as sensibly proud of it as we are of him, now holds the rank of Commander in Chief, United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations. This is the highest rank that any naval officer has ever achieved.

Mr. Speaker, Ohio is a nautical term. It is an Indian name given by the Indians to that river in North America which was in their estimation the most beautiful of all rivers—the Ohio River. Ohio means Beautiful River. We Ohioans must do our part to have the name Ohio painted on the prow of one of the big, new, and modern battleships that our country will be building in the near future. To this end we must move promptly and vigorously yet with due respect to the rights of other States.

I will this day send to the Secretary of the Navy a letter setting forth our wishes. I shall fortify that letter with a copy of these remarks. I shall encourage all Ohio Congressmen and Senators to join with me. Our Governor and State officials will be encouraged to do the same as will all patriotic and civic organizations of the State.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Personnel of the United States Navy has been kind enough to prepare a brief historical review of the different ships named Ohio that have been a part of the American Navy from its very earliest days. I hope that the American people will enjoy reading this review which I ask to be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I know Ohioans will read it with pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, this is the review:

U. S. S. "OHIO" (NO. 1 OF THE NAME)

The first *Ohio* in the United States Navy was a schooner of 62 tons, purchased by the Government early in 1813 for operations on Lake Erie.

She was fitted out by Henry Eckford in the Niagara River, and armed with one long 32-pounder. She was blockaded in the river for a period, but in June 1813, Commodore O. H. Perry succeeded in getting her and four other vessels out and brought them to Erie, Pa.

Sailing Master Daniel Dobbins was ordered to take command of the *Ohio* on July 8, 1812, and on August 12 she sailed with the rest of the squadron from Erie to Sandusky. The *Ohio* was employed during the following months in carrying supplies, and on the day of the famous battle, September 10, 1813, she was at Erie taking on armament and stores.

After the ice broke in Lake Erie in 1814, the *Ohio* cruised between Long Point and Erie, and in April Mr. Dobbins was sent with the *Ohio* to Put in Bay to assist in fitting out the prizes *Queen Charlotte* and *Detroit*.

Early in the summer of 1814, Lt. A. H. M. Conclin was placed in command of the *Ohio*. On August 12, 1814, the *Ohio* and *Somers* were captured by the enemy by boarding within pistol shot of Fort Erie.

U. S. S. "OHIO" (NO. 2 OF THE NAME)

The ship-of-the-line *Ohio* was built at the New York Navy Yard under supervision of United States Naval Constructor Henry Eckford. She was commenced in 1817, launched on May 30, 1820, but not finally commissioned until 1830. Her tonnage was 2,757, and her dimensions were: length, 197 feet; beam, 55 feet; hold, 22 feet 2 inches.

The *Ohio* was originally planned to carry thirty-four long 32-pounders and thirty-four 44-pounder carronades, but on January 1, 1830, she is said to have carried twelve 8-inch guns and seventy-two 32-pounders. In 1863, when armed for the defense of the city of Boston, one 8-inch Parrott rifle, four 100-pounder Parrott rifles, and twelve 32-pounders were put on her.

From 1830 to 1838 the *Ohio* remained in ordinary at the New York Navy Yard. From 1838 to 1841 she was flagship of Commodore Isaac Hull in the Mediterranean. After undergoing repairs at Boston Navy Yard, she was again placed in commission on December 7, 1846, and the following February sailed for the coast of Mexico, where she took up station off Sacrificios Island and participated actively in operations against Mexico. The *Ohio* assisted in the bombardment of the Castle of San Juan de Ulloa, and the surrender of Vera Cruz, aiding in the landing of troops and transportation of guns and carriages, and sent a party of 15 officers and 300 men to the U. S. S. *Mississippi* to take part in an expedition against Tuxpan.

On May 9, 1847, the *Ohio* left the station off Vera Cruz and returned to New York, from which port she again sailed on June 26, 1847, for the Pacific, where she served as part of the Pacific squadron until the spring of 1850, when she returned to the east coast.

The *Ohio* was used as receiving ship at Boston until 1875, when she was placed in ordinary at that place. On September 27, 1883, she was sold to Israel L. Snow, of Rockland, Maine, for $17,100.

U. S. S. "OHIO" (NO. 3 OF THE NAME)

The U. S. S. *Ohio*, battleship No. 12, was authorized by act of Congress, approved May 4, 1898, and built at the Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Calif. The keel was laid on April 22, 1899, and the vessel was launched on May 18, 1901.

The dimensions of the *Ohio* were: Length between perpendiculars, 388 feet; breadth, 72 feet 2½ inches; mean draft, 23 feet 7 inches; normal displacement, 12,500 tons. Her battery consisted of (main) four 12-inch, 40-caliber; (secondary) eight 6-inch, 50-caliber; two 3-inch, 50 caliber; two 6-prdr. guns and two 18-inch torpedo tubes (1920).

The *Ohio* was placed in commission October 4, 1904, and sent to the Asiatic station as flagship, received the Taft party on board at Manila, P. I. During 1906 she cruised in Japanese and Chinese waters; in 1907, attended the Jamestown Exposition; and in 1908–9 made the cruise around the world with the Atlantic Fleet, followed by duty on the Atlantic coast. In 1914, she was sent to Vera Cruz for protection of American interests during the Mexican intervention, after which she was placed in Reserve Fleet at Philadelphia.

The ship was placed in full commission April 24, 1917, and employed in training engineer personnel and in general maneuvers and target practice in the Chesapeake Bay area until June 3, 1918, after which she was employed for 3 months in training midshipmen from Annapolis.

On January 7, 1919, the *Ohio* was placed in reserve at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, and on May 31, 1922, was placed out of commission. In accordance with terms of the Washington Treaty for the limitation of naval armaments, the *Ohio* was rendered incapable of further warlike service and sold as scrap on March 23, 1923.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1944.

Hon. JAMES RUSSELL YOUNG,
Chairman, Board of District Commissioners, District Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: Many of the avenues and boulevards in Washington are named for the various States. I think every State in the Union is represented with the exception of the great State of Ohio. The people of Ohio are not willing to believe that this has been a studied discrimination against their great State.

On behalf of the people of Ohio, I am starting a movement which I hope will result in this matter being corrected. We are not so anxious for that correction that we will accept the designation of some small outlying street to bear the name of Ohio. Naturally we want Ohio's name placed on an avenue that ranks with New York Avenue or Massachusetts Avenue or even Rhode Island Avenue.

I wish, therefore, that you would consider this letter as an application on the part of the people of Ohio to have your Board consider naming one of the principal thoroughfares for this great State. Of course, we are not so prejudiced as to ask you to discriminate in our favor against any other State.

I made a speech in Congress today and I am enclosing a copy of it with this letter. I am going to ask the other Congressmen from Ohio and the Senators to write to you. Likewise, I shall ask some of the patriotic and civic organizations of the State and also the Governor and the State departments to write you.

If you have any suggestions as to how we might present this matter in the most effective way, we will be glad to have them.

While I address this letter to you as the Chairman of the Board, I mean to include the other two Commissioners.

With assurances of respect, I am,

Very truly yours,

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1944.

Hon. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLONEL KNOX: Believe it or not, there is no ship in the great American Navy named for the great State of Ohio. On behalf of the people of Ohio, I am making a request that you give consideration to this matter. I shall attempt to support this application with letters from all the Ohio Congressmen and Senators and also from the civic and patriotic organizations of the State as well as the Governor's office and the offices of the various State departments.

I am making a speech on this subject today in the House of Representatives and I am attaching a copy of that speech. I had some information from one of your departments with reference to some of the facts set forth in this speech and I am giving your Department due credit for the same.

We are taking this step not as an idle gesture because it is difficult for the people of Ohio to understand why the name Ohio is not attached to one of the large ships of the Navy.

If there are any special rules of procedure to which we should conform, I would be glad if someone in your Department would advise me because we want to present this matter fairly and in full compliance with the regulations of the Navy, if there are any.

With assurances of respect and best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

The Air Field at Lincoln, Nebr., Should Be Called the Pershing Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Lincoln, Nebr., feel that Gen. John J. Pershing is one of their own. They look back with a pleasant memory upon the years spent there by the general. They would like to have their air field, which is now leased to the Army Air Force, named the Pershing Field.

I would like to extend my remarks by including a resolution, which has been passed on this subject. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the city of Lincoln is now the owner of an airport located upon sections 6, 7, and 8, township 10, and a part of sections 4, 5, 9, and 17, township 10, and a part of sections 31 and 32 in township 11, all in Range 6 East of the 6th prime meridian, Lancaster County, Nebr., commonly known as the Municipal Airport; and

Whereas said airport is now under lease to the United States of America for an Army airfield and is being so used; and

Whereas it is the desire of the city of Lincoln that such airport, as well as the Army post now located thereon, be officially named and designated as "Pershing Field": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lincoln, Nebr., That the said municipal airport be and the same hereby is officially named and designated as "Pershing Field"; be it further

Resolved, That this council respectfully suggests that the United States of America officially name and designate the Army post located upon said airport, "Pershing Field"; be it further

Resolved, That Resolution No. A–11755, adopted February 24, 1931, be and the same hereby is rescinded and repealed.

Adopted by city council March 20, 1944.

LLOYD J. MARTI,
Mayor.

Attest:

THEO. H. BERG,
City Clerk.

The Grip Tightens on the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of particular significance at this time.

It is to be hoped that the publication of this article indicates a change in the traditional policy of the Saturday Evening Post against fair prices for farm products. The Saturday Evening Post, perhaps to a greater extent than any other publication in America, acclaimed the influences which brought about the collapse of American agriculture in the early twenties, a collapse which was the forerunner of the depression which spread from a deflated agriculture to the entire Nation. It is a far cry from the fallacious sophistries of Garet Garet and the mendacious cartoons of Herbert Johnson to this straightforward factual discussion by Ed Will. Let us hope that the bitter lessons learned from the last depression will have a similar reaction in other influential quarters.

THE GRIP TIGHTENS ON THE FARMER

(By Ed Will)

Last October, the War Food Administration announced a program of subsidizing dairy feed to compensate dairymen for their increased feed costs. At the time of this writing, the program has been in operation less than 6 months, yet already the principle of Government subsidy has gripped the dairy industry so tightly that it seemingly must be regarded as a permanent fixture. It would seem to be timely if, perhaps, we stopped and looked down the road of subsidized farm prices before proceeding with more of the subsidy programs that seem inevitable since the President's veto of the antisubsidy bill.

The announced purpose of the payments was to compensate for the increased cost of feed to dairymen, but the payments were based not on the amount of feed used but the amount of milk produced. Moreover, the form in which the milk was sold decided the amount of the payment. The rate was an average of 50 cents a hundred for milk, and

5 cents a pound for butterfat. But a hundred pounds of milk contains an average of less than 4 pounds of butterfat, so that the producer who separated his milk, selling the cream for churning, received only 20 cents a hundred for the milk he produced, because his 100 pounds of milk was devoted to the production of 4 pounds of butterfat. This means that the butterfat producer gets only 40 percent as much as the whole-milk producer. Yet there is no evidence to show that a butterfat producer either uses less feed to produce a hundred pounds of milk or pays less for his feed.

The subsidy had a misleading name. It was not actually a feed subsidy but a milk subsidy, with a bonus to whole-milk producers, who already received a much greater return for their milk than butterfat producers. Perhaps, as a farmer, I would be speaking out of turn to point out that whole-milk producers are for the most part organized, and therefore in a position to exert political pressure, while butterfat producers are usually small-scale unorganized operators. But I am very curious to know whether or not this bonus to the organized whole-milk producers had as its motive the quieting of the resistance to subsidies by organized farm groups.

Despite these feed subsidies, milk production continued to drop. The War Food Administration came to the conclusion that the amount of the subsidy was insufficient to cover the increased feed costs—a conclusion in which they were wholly correct. So the amount of the payments has been raised to 80 cents a hundred pounds of milk produced, and 8 cents a pound of butterfat. The differential between the butterfat and whole-milk producer is retained. But now the dairyman is brought face to face with the accomplished fact that he is dependent for at least 20 percent of his milk income upon Government subsidy. The price which dairymen receive for milk varies, but the net income per 100 pounds, after deductions from trucking, and so on, will seldom exceed $3.20, plus the 80-cent subsidy, a total of $4 per 100. Not a bad price, considering everything, but the subsidy has grown from a source of pin money to a fifth of the dairyman's income.

And this brings up the big question, What will happen when subsidy payments stop? The avowed purpose of the payments is to prevent inflation, but if they are ever stopped it will probably be at a time when falling income and lowering prices ease the threat of inflation. In a time of falling prices can the dairymen of the Nation stand the sudden withdrawal of a fifth of their income, with no immediate compensating cuts in expenses? Would not such a cut cause financial chaos on farms? And would not chaos on farms spread into other industries, perhaps into a Nation-wide depression?

I must confess that I can see no way out of it. To me, it seems as if the dairy-feed subsidy must go on indefinitely, that in starting it the administration started a snowball rolling that has grown to such proportions that it has got out of control. And I am waiting to see several other expected snowballs start rolling, and gather momentum, until they, too, are out of control.

I am just one of the millions of small farmers in the Nation. I did my best to raise my voice against any general-subsidy program, along with the overwhelming majority of the Nation's farmers, but to no avail. But perhaps my betters in Washington, who claim to know what is best for me, since they insist that subsidies are to the farmer's best interest, will pardon my temerity if I inquire if there is any plan for the termination of the subsidy program? Or did the administration just consider how to start it, and let it go at that?

And I don't want to be told that it is no time to ask such questions while our boys are sacrificing themselves overseas. Some of those boys are farm boys, too, and all of those who come back will come back to live in the economy created by present practices. If that argument is to be used in Washington, as I have heard it used by various local minor administration officials, I want to see a signed statement by at least one of the boys overseas that he is fighting for a subsidy program which will postpone a portion of the Nation's food bill until he can come home and help pay it.

In this connection I also include a letter just received in this morning's mail, which is self-explanatory:

RHINELAND, MO., *April 7, 1944.*

DEAR MR. CANNON: I am an 18-year-old farm girl. I have had to quit high school to work on my father's farm. My only source of income is from the egg money. Eggs are now only 24 cents a dozen, and after I have paid for the feed I have hardly any money at all. We live in the river bottom where all the crops were flooded out after we had replanted three times, and we must buy all our feed. The egg money is divided between my brother and myself, and we must pay the grocery bills from the money. We get about two cases of eggs a week, which now bring about $8, and we can't make it. Everything else is higher. Can't you do something to get enough for our eggs to pay expenses and leave us just a little.

Sincerely yours,

IDELL MEYER.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is typical of many received in the last few days, not only in my own office but in the office of every Congressman in the House. Eggs, hogs, cattle, and all the major income products of the farm are selling at less than they sold last year. Notwithstanding the flamboyant reports of vastly increased farm income featured in the press and over the radio, there is not a farmer anywhere operating under normal conditions who is not making less this year than last year—the only group or profession or industry in the Nation which is receiving less this year than last. And this is merely a foretaste of what is in store. After the war will come the deluge. And unless steps are taken to put the same permanent floor under farm wages and prices already enjoyed by industrial wages and prices another depression will start with the farm and spread to the Nation as it did after the last war.

Foreign Affairs of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and informative address on Foreign Affairs of the United States in Wartime and After, delivered by the Honorable Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, before the American Federation of Labor Forum on Labor and the Post-war World, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on April 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES IN WARTIME AND AFTER

It is with a solemn understanding of the significance of this meeting and of the forward-looking undertaking of this post-war forum that I address this gathering tonight. I bring the best wishes of Secretary Hull and give expression to his hope that your deliberations will be highly productive not alone in the nature of the conclusions to which you may come but in the success they may promise for the realization of a stable peace and for a better world.

It is a matter of solid encouragement that an organization such as the American Federation of Labor, which has done so much to stimulate the conscience and actions of mankind in behalf of human welfare, and which has so consistently recognized that the human element is not a simple matter of local or national concern, is directing its energies toward seeking solutions for post-war problems.

The post-war world presents in prospect many vistas which have a present interest and which hold forth a promise of political stability and economic prosperity—but there will be no realization of those promises unless we win this war—and win it completely.

Victory in this war cannot be reckoned merely in terms of a successful repulse of the enemy. Our victory must mean complete destruction of fascism and nazi-ism and the obliteration of every vestige of the vicious movement which set out to destroy, all over the globe, the very foundations of freedom and democracy. All the power of this Nation is directed to that end. And this includes the Axis partner, Japan, and its brutal attempts at domination. That is the reason the full diplomatic power of the United States has been and must remain committed to support in every possible way the armed forces in attaining their military objectives to the end that the enemy may be completely overcome as quickly as possible. Our diplomatic activity is to be judged primarily by the standard as to whether it will be of maximum effectiveness in winning this war by promoting Allied cooperation to that end. Thereafter it will be judged by the measure of cooperation it has achieved among the peacefully inclined nations of the world and the success it may achieve in collaboration with them in laying the basis for a peace of political security and economic well-being.

Of fundamental importance in such an undertaking as the waging of this world-wide war is full cooperation among our allies; and that has been a primary objective of the wartime foreign policy of the United States. Through our diplomatic activity we have developed a very close and satisfying cooperation with our allies against the common enemy. That does not mean that we have each seen each detail with the same eye, but it does mean that we work and fight in unison, that we are united on all-important policy, and that we are all determined to fight it through to complete victory.

Occasional instances, in the kaleidoscopic changes of events, in which in some detail there may not have been full concert of action between great allies have been fully discussed in public while the continuing coordination and cordial cooperation in the common effort, which is the basic fact, is frequently overlooked even though it be essential to victory. No one supposes that by signing the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of the United Nations, and the Moscow Declaration, that the signatories disposed of all the details of their multiple relationships. The important fact is, however, that they are in harmony as to their general objectives and agreed on as to how to achieve them. It is easy, particularly under the stress and worry

of wartime conditions, to magnify some problems out of all proportion to their real merit in relation to the attainment of military success.

We are approaching the time when the Allied military operations against Nazi Germany will bring about the liberation of those nations which have been so long and so tragically under its brutal domination. We shall carry with us into those ravaged territories our deep and abiding interest in the restoration of individual liberty, of popular institutions of government, of freedom of worship, of speech, and of the press, of right of assembly, and of all the rights and privileges of free peoples. In keeping with the provisions of the Atlantic Charter and in line with our own devotion to democratic principles, we intend to take no action which will in any way interfere with the free and untrammeled choice by these nations of the officials and the governments under whose authority they wish to live. We will not permit the armed forces of this country to be used for the support of any group or any government contrary to the will of the people. We intend to do everything we can toward encouraging and assisting these liberated nations to shape their own destinies and to develop their own way of life. We intend to make our contribution toward aiding them to recover from the political, moral, and economic prostration into which they have been plunged by the ruthless enemy.

For effective prosecution of the war there is need that all peoples now submerged under Axis invasion use all their energies to resist the invaders and thus speed the day of their own liberation. Internal political controversies inevitably weaken the war effort. We have consistently urged that they not be permitted to impair the war effort.

Such a situation, for example, has existed in Yugoslavia. Even beneath the heel of Axis occupation, that country, formed of many races, has fallen into divided councils. These divisions have seemed to us tragic in themselves and calculated only to benefit the common Nazi enemy. Our policy has been to endeavor to bring these elements into sufficient harmony so that they can make a common front against a common enemy. We are, meanwhile, cooperating in furnishing arms and supplies to all Yugoslavs who are fighting the Germans.

A similar tragedy almost occurred in Greece. Happily it was averted by common effort of the Allies. The differences have, for the time being, been composed. Political questions have been set aside for orderly solution when time permits, and energies are pooled for the common struggle.

Sometimes the objective is not achieved. Finland is a case in point. Finland, an ally of Nazi Germany, seems unfortunately to be choosing a course of action very different from what we desire. We have made every effort to induce Finland to terminate her ill-chosen association with Germany. We have emphasized to her the consequences which must flow from a continued participation in the war on the side of the enemy. We have repeatedly made clear to her that responsibility for the consequences of continuing her association with Nazi Germany must rest solely on the Finnish Government, just as, in the case of Germany's other satellites, the responsibility for remaining in the war on the side of our principal enemy must rest solely on them.

The American people need have no fear that the American point of view is not being vigorously and effectively presented on every occasion where our immediate or long-range interests are involved. These problems are solved, in consultation with our allies, in accord with the controlling purpose of unity in the war effort, and in keeping with the fundamental principles of democratic philosophy.

The diplomatic power of the United States is the servant of American foreign policy. There is an inclination to confuse the two, but they should be distinguished. Diplomatic activity is particular action taken in the application of foreign policy to a specific situation, while foreign policy itself is general in character.

American foreign policy is a composite of many factors and influences. The principles of social justice, individual liberty, orderly democratic government, and fair play which compose our political philosophy are the spirit of that policy. These and other principles well known to every American are part of our foreign policy because they are a part of America. Whatever else it contains, it must always reflect the doctrines, philosophies, aspirations, and practices of the American people.

Our success in the working out of these principles will, of course, vary with time, place, and the exigencies of military necessity. However, this Government will give representation abroad to the ideals of America and, within the limits of the principle of self-determination, encourage democratic practices in liberated countries.

I have emphasized the dominant part that the war, and its winning, must play in the application of our current foreign policy. But essential as is the total defeat of the Axis, that is not and cannot be the sole great objective. There are two others with which American foreign policy must be concerned—the prevention of future wars and the promotion of conditions which will permit our people to attain the greatest possible measure of economic well-being.

I should like to speak briefly of our preparations for the future in these two broad fields; of the establishment of an effective system of international peace and security; and of the creation of conditions and agencies for the promotion of economic and social welfare.

For some time the Department of State, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government, in collaboration with individual Members of the Congress, and in consultation with individuals of experience in private life, has been engaged in studying these questions and in formulating the bases for constructive programs of action.

A thorough analysis of the mistakes of the unhappy past, a study of current developments, and an examination of future possibilities have led us to the following conclusions as regards some of the basic problems involved in the future prevention of aggression and war:

1. The major nations together with the other law-abiding states should create an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security.

2. The major nations and in due course all nations—should pledge themselves not to use force against each other or against any other nation, except on the basis of arrangements made in connection with such an international organization.

3. Each of the major nations, and any other nations to be agreed upon, should accept special responsibility for maintaining adequate forces and for using such forces, on the basis of arrangements made in connection with the international organization, to prevent or suppress all disturbances of the peace.

Our basic thought is that a general international organization of sovereign nations, having for its primary objective the maintenance of peace and security, should comprise effective agencies and arrangements for the pacific settlement of international controversies; for joint use of force to suppress disturbances of the peace; and for fostering cooperative effort among nations for the progressive improvement of the general welfare. The organization should at the outset provide the indispensable minimum of machinery of action and should be expected to develop and grow as time goes on and as circumstances may indicate to be wise. It is clear that there must be some general body on which all member states will be equally represented to serve as a world assembly of nations. There must be a court of international justice. And there must be a small body or council, representative of the large and small nations, endowed with adequate powers and means to arrange for maintaining the peace.

The step in the direction of creating an effective general international organization was taken at Moscow. The Four Nation Declaration signed there constitutes a solemn declaration of intention on the part of the four major countries to act in common for the preservation of peace and security, and to take the lead in the establishment of a permanent international organization for this basic purpose. The next step had to be a joint examination of the problems involved in setting up such an organization.

Our studies in preparation for discussion with other governments, which were well advanced before the Moscow Conference, have been intensively carried forward since. They have involved a careful examination of the various alternatives with respect to the structure, powers, and procedures of an international organization. They have involved also an examination of our constitutional processes as regards participation by this country in the creation and functioning of such an organization, including especially the providing of armed forces for international action.

The next step involves additional conferences with representatives of both parties in the Congress and thereafter a full exchange of views with other governments and in accordance with our constitutional provisions, discussions at home—all looking toward an agreed proposal for an effective international security organization.

At the same time our thoughts have been on the other related question, that of economic security.

International cooperation is as important in one field as in the other. This is not the occasion to undertake an extensive discussion of the broad question of economic collaboration, but I do wish to stress the need for collaboration in this field as well.

Events have lifted one fundamental aspect out of the realm of speculation and controversy. The economic interdependence of nations is no longer a theory but a well-substantiated fact. The economic and social policies of one nation exercise influence on the economic and social conditions of other countries. This phenomenon of international relations leads to one basic conclusion: National and international economic policies should be formulated with a recognition of the basic and permanent interests of all peoples. These policies should be designed to promote, as widely as possible, full and productive employment under conditions favorable to the physical and moral well-being of the worker.

Under present-day conditions, all nations are vitally dependent on each other as regards their economic and social well-being. The state of employment, distribution, and living conditions in our country and in every other country are mutually interdependent. Hence the welfare of every country requires the greatest practical measure of collaboration between nations on policies affecting the production, distribution, and use of the world's goods and resources. I need hardly underscore the fact that no group has a larger stake in both the economic and social-security aspects of post-war economic cooperation than has labor. The reduction of the barriers to an expansion of mutually profitable trade after

the war will be needed in order to open opportunities for work for millions now employed in war production and millions now serving in our armed forces.

In the field of international cooperation directly affecting the interests and problems of labor, we are fortunate in already having an international organization with 25 years of experience—the International Labor Organization. In this field we do not have to wait for the establishment of a suitable vehicle.

A few of those present tonight working and planning with others assumed responsibility in the movement which led to its establishment. I refer to Mr. William Green. Mr. Matthew Woll, and to Prof. James T. Shotwell, who was not only collaborator in the movement but its historian as well. And yet another in that group also here tonight is the distinguished Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Harold Butler. Without the unremitting labors of these able and forward looking men—always remembering as one of the leaders of the whole group, the late Samuel Gompers—without them there might not be an I. L. O.

But there is. And it is fitting in this connection to recall that one of the most important steps—if not the most important—which this country took during the interwar period toward assuming its rightful place as an active member of organized international society was taken in 1934 when President Roosevelt, pursuant to a joint resolution of the Congress, accepted membership for us in the I. L. O. It is commonly acknowledged today that the establishment of that organization marked one of the truly significant milestones in the history of a social progress.

It has a value today of particular importance, when some persons are skeptical about the possibilities of world peace through international organization. I suggest that such persons study the history of the I. L. O. At the time of its inception there was hunger, misery, and serious disorder throughout Europe. President Roosevelt, referring to its origin, said of it later, "To many it was a wild dream." The dream carrying hope to those who could hope has justified the confidence of its founders and become an outstanding demonstration of the effectiveness of men of many nations when determined to do so to work together for the good of all. It is an inspiration to those who believe that the mind and heart of man can solve the problems of mankind.

The C. I. O.'s Political Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the old adage that you shall reap the fruits from the seeds you have sown is as true today as it was when first spoken. Many former Members of the Congress have reaped the fruits from the evil seeds sown by reason of their votes and actions while they were Members of this body. I am thinking many will reap it again this following November, and next January their seats will be filled by others.

I have reference to laws that have been passed by the Congress legalizing the racketeering of a certain labor-organization leadership—John L. Lewis, Phil Murray, and others of their ilk and clan. The Congress legalized by statute their high-handed methods of mulcting from the pockets of good and patriotic American citizenship who are compelled by law to join their union and to contribute to them without any accounting whatever of the funds. Those ill-gotten gains are now being used by this racketeering bunch—Sidney Hillman et al.—to further their own ends and defeat Members of the two legislative bodies who do not blindly follow them.

An exposition of their intentions and manner of doing so has been ably outlined by George Morris, staff correspondent of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., in an article written by him on April 6. I think each Member of Congress should be interested in reading this article; hence, I beg leave to extend my remarks and include it therein:

IN WASHINGTON WITH GEORGE MORRIS

THE C. I. O.'S POLITICAL FUND

WASHINGTON, April 6.—When the C. I. O., at its annual convention at Cleveland, established the political action committee, gave it $700,000 as a starter, and announced that $2,000,000 would be available for the purchase of votes to perpetuate the New Deal, the country was amazed that an organization would brazenly proclaim a program in plain violation of the law.

The explanation was simple. Any individual or organization may openly and flagrantly violate the law, provided violations are sanctioned by the law-enforcing officials. It is not suspected that there is a written agreement between the conspirators to the effect that the political and economic spoils of the country shall be divided, but enough evidence already exists to prove that plans for the future involve no more than the program that has been employed in the past, in which cooperation has been complete.

This program, as shown by convincing evidence, is that the New Deal, through the War Labor Board and other agencies, gives the C. I. O. racketeering privileges over labor, and in return the New Deal receives financial and political aid as its cut for the concessions.

Shortly after the C. I. O. announced its intention to spend millions in the fourth-term campaign, Representative SMITH of Virginia wrote a letter to Attorney General Biddle calling his attention to the announced violation of law and asked what he intended to do about it. Mr. Biddle has not shown Representative SMITH the courtesy of a reply, which means that the C. I. O. program has administration sanction and nothing is to be done about it.

The plan for purchasing the November election is not even clever. It simply implies that the law will be violated by one group on the one hand and sanctioned on the other hand by the group which will profit from the violation of law. At the time the announcement was made that the C. I. O. intended to spend millions for the purchase of the election, there was amazement in some quarters that the C. I. O. should have a campaign slush fund of such dimensions at its disposal.

As a matter of fact, the C. I. O. did not have the money in hand at the time. The plan was for governmental agencies to approve C. I. O. raids upon other unions, be recognized as the exclusive bargaining agent, and vastly increase its revenues. That was illegal and vicious, but the C. I. O. did not stop there. It has now levied a political assessment upon all members to raise funds for the campaign, and any member refusing to consent to the assessment will be expelled from the union, and under the closed-shop policy of the administration, will be dismissed from employment.

Workers dominated by the C. I. O. represent various political views. Some are Democrats, some Republicans, others New Dealers, or Socialists, or members of other political organizations, such as Progressives and Farmer-Labor. Regardless of the political opinions of the workers or what candidate they support, every member, without exception, will be compelled to make an involuntary contribution to the C. I. O.'s political action committee, and the C. I. O. will decide how the money is to be spent, where it is to be spent, and in what amounts.

Congress could pass over the conspiracy between the C. I. O. and the New Deal, by which the C. I. O. was permitted to raid other unions, because the War Labor Board has legal authority to make such decisions, and there is no recourse against such procedure so long as the present administration remains in power. However, it was something entirely different when the C. I. O. decided upon a policy of enforced political contributions through assessments, with workers the victims and no choice except to contribute to the fourth-term campaign or lose their jobs and means of livelihood.

The C. I. O. announcement that it will spend $2,000,000 in the fourth-term campaign is regarded as perhaps an understatement. There is no limit to what it can spend and scarcely any limit to the amount it can collect through its hijacking policy with administration endorsement. The only hope that the C. I. O. can be prevented from buying the election is the prospect that the money it spends will be more than offset by the amount of indignation it creates.

The immunity granted by the administration in consideration of profiting from the spoils will exist only so long as the New Deal is in power. Should the plan be repudiated by the voters and another administration be elected, the statute of limitations will not expire with repudiation of the New Deal. An administration in power with a decent regard for law would have an opportunity to proceed with criminal prosecution and New Deal exemption from law violation would be no defense.

As Representative SMITH pointed out in his letter to Attorney General Biddle, labor unions are in the same position as other corporations respecting campaign contributions, and, while the New Deal proceeds against violations of law by those opposing it and exempts from application of law those who violate it in behalf of the New Deal, the law itself makes no such distinction.

The workers themselves, unwilling and defenseless victims of the C. I. O. and New Deal conspiracy, likewise are deserving of protection. There should be some way by which a person who refuses to contribute to the campaign of a candidate he opposes should not be denied the right to earn a living.

The Dies committee charges that the political action committee of the C. I. O. is controlled by Communists, and, regardless of the ideological unity between the New Deal and the heads of the C. I. O., the workers of the country are not Communists, and Congress should find a way to relieve them of communistic domination, despite New Deal opposition.

Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 11, 1944:

RATIONING WORKS HERE—AND WHY

It was gratifying to Milwaukeeans to learn that the Journal reporter who found it comparatively easy to get gasoline and meat without ration coupons in Chicago found it impossible in Milwaukee under exactly comparable conditions.

Of course, this does not necessarily mean that there is no black market at all in Milwaukee. The number of places visited was only a sampling. Besides, some of 30 or more dealers who refused to sell to him, an utter stranger, without points might not have been so exacting to a trusted customer.

But it does mean that ration and price-control violations here are neither as extensive nor as flagrant as in Chicago and some other cities. For that, a good deal of credit is due to the people of Milwaukee—because no black market exists except as its customers support it.

Milwaukee and its suburbs have established a fine reputation as a law-abiding community. They have enviable records in recruiting, bond sales, Red Cross drives, support of the U. S. O., and in many other activities that indicate a general willingness to sacrifice time, money, and convenience in behalf of the war effort. If the record of supporting O. P. A. regulations is good here, it is quite in keeping with both the peacetime and wartime reputation of the Milwaukee area.

Also, a good deal of credit is due to the local administration of the O. P. A., which has been aggressive in enforcement to the limits of its personnel and solicitous of public understanding and support. To the recalcitrant, the word has gone forth that there is no way to wheedle out or buy out of a penalty for deliberate infractions.

Only by such teamwork between a generally patriotic, law-abiding public and utterly fearless, impartial public officials can any system of wartime regulation for the benefit of all achieve substantial success. Without public support, the administrator becomes impotent and discouraged; without aggressive and firm administration, the control system loses public faith and cooperation.

Washington, D. C., and Chicago, please note.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, if the O. P. A. would concentrate on putting floors in feed lots we might partly forget consumer subsidies.

The men and women who have never had anything are coming into their own in this era of irritation and computation.

Army waste and General Hershey's vacillation, along with taxes, are the chief sources of consternation at the crossroads.

CLYDE REED now becomes the target of the Navy deserter in time of war, the White House mouthpiece of the air.

To me there is as much thrill in a big locomotive engine doing her stuff as there is in a bomber plane roaring above.

Forty-six years ago I sat on a boxcar at Ottawa and watched the old man river go by. Last Tuesday the dear Marias des Cygnes did not look a day older or any less subdued.

Many banks hold War bonds equal to 10 times their capital stock. One of the smartest told me that banks would burst if bonds went down 10 percent. Is it true or false?

The less Mackinacs the Republican Party has the better, in agriculture and foreign policy. Let the majority party with responsibility hold or fall on their own record. They want something from us to shoot at to divert attention.

In the last 3 weeks I have been seated in lodge and at dinners with men from the Santa Fe shops at Topeka. My faith has been reconfirmed in the steadfastness, the dignity, and the patriotism of the rank and file of labor. Nobody questions whether or not this group is essential.

The late Dr. O. O. Wolf was a successful farmer and farm leader—they do not always go together. We congratulate the Kansas Farm Bureau on his long-sustained presidency. Wolf and I met in the State senate in 1913 and the fact that we had never quarreled in 30 years was a testimonial to his angelic qualities.

Agricultural Finance—Recommendations by the Southern Great Plains Agricultural Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks I am including a list of recommendations relative to agricultural finance, which were adopted at a meeting of the Southern Great Plains Agricultural Council, composed of State and Federal Agricultural Agency representatives from the States of Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas meeting at Wichita, Kans., January 5, 1944:

1. Agriculture and our returning soldiers: From the point of view of most sincere concern for the welfare of returning soldiers desiring to engage in farming, it is recommended that agricultural credit be made available under special terms to returning soldiers, first, only to those of proven ability and capacity; and second, under conditions as to size of unit, location, purchase price, and terms of contract and in such amounts that insure reasonable expectation of profitable operation.

The experience following World War No. 1 in the rehabilitation of soldiers on the land from the point of view of the effect upon the morale of the returning veteran and the financial results obtained indicate the need for the limitations indicated above. Widespread action upon the slogan "Fifty (or 5) acres and a jeep for every returning soldier," would be most unfortunate for the soldiers and for agriculture. There is not apparent room or need for a large expansion of agriculture in the post-war period. Wholesale subsidized purchase of farms for returning veterans would only aggravate an already inflated farm real estate market.

Fortunately there is a place for many thousands of returning soldiers on the farms of those desiring to retire from active farm operation because of age or other reasons. Credit can assist in this transfer. The transfer should be gradual and on a selective basis rather than indiscriminate and forced by public initiative. Agriculture should not be expected to absorb large numbers of the incapacitated veterans. Contrary to popular sentiment and expressed belief, success in farming is a difficult and demanding task for those mentally and physically well equipped.

Sharp differentiation should be made between those veterans placed on farms or in agricultural pursuits as a means of regaining physical and mental health and those assisted in undertaking farming on a business basis.

2. Agricultural training for returning soldiers: Expenditures for specialized training, in many instances, will be of more permanent value than expenditures of like amounts in credit subsidies for the purchase of farms. It is recommended that due consideration be given to the benefit to the veterans per dollar of Federal expenditure in subsidized education in agriculture as well as other vocations. Here again, however, the subsidized training should be made available to those selected individuals who have a reasonable chance of profiting by this expenditure of time and money.

3. Land price inflation: Taxation of capital gains on the resale of farms during the war and post-war period is recommended as the most feasible means of exercising control on farm-land prices. It is further recommended that education concerning normal values of farm lands and the methods of determining normal values be encouraged.

The period of most dangerous inflation of farm real estate prices is likely in the early post-war years when pent up savings and the desire for a job and the supposed security of farm ownership all operated to force land prices upward.

The need for control of land prices is not as urgent and is not as well recognized in the southern Great Plains as in other parts of the United States where the present period of high farm income has been of longer duration and where prices of land have advanced higher in proportion to prices sustained over long periods of time in the past.

A continuation of price control and price support for agricultural products will afford a measure of farm-land price control.

4. Crop insurance: It is recommended that consideration be given to the reestablishment of Federal crop insurance on a limited risk basis. Such insurance should not be subsidized except as to administrative expense over a long period of time. Federally sponsored crop insurance can be of major importance in giving stability to agriculture and in reducing credit costs. The need for such insurance is greatest in the high risk areas and among tenant farmers generally.

5. Soil and water conservation: Continued liberal Federal support and redoubled effort on the part of credit agencies and all others interested in the future welfare of agriculture to hasten the general adoption of recognized soil and water conservation practices is recommended.

Failure to act upon what is now recognized as economically sound soil and water conservation practices has been a major factor, among the several, contributing to widespread foreclosure of mortgaged farms in the

southern Great Plains during the past decade. Erosion has been as important a factor as drought or depression in robbing farmers of their means of livelihood and their children of their rightful heritage.

With plenty of money, manpower, and equipment available, soil conservation should be a major project in the post-war rehabilitation of agriculture. It should be pushed vigorously as a measure of general welfare, not only with Federal but with private funds.

6. Agricultural prices and income: It is recommended that consideration be given to the maintenance and further refinement during the post-war period of much of the production control, price regulation, and price support legislation that has been found to be beneficial to American agriculture during the past 10 years. Since this is a surplus producing area of agricultural products, we are definitely concerned in efforts to revive and stimulate world-wide international trade.

7. Cooperative associations: It is recommended that support be given farmers' cooperative associations in their position that patronage dividends should continue to be exempt from corporation income tax.

Farmers' marketing and servicing cooperative associations will undoubtedly play an increasingly important part in furthering farmer welfare in the post-war period.

8. Landlord-tenant relationship: It is recommended that the various means, legislative and educational, for improving of landlord-tenant relationships be further supported and pressed forward. Sharecropping too often is extractive and exploitive one-crop farming. Livestock share leasing or partnership operation is on the other hand, in many instances, a necessary adjunct to mutually beneficial results with diversified modern farming where soil and water conservation is practiced. No one type of tenure can be recommended for all farmers at all times. With the increasing investment involved in the ownership and operation of a successful modern farm, increased attention should be given to improving in various ways the joint operation of farms.

Men and Women in the Armed Forces May Now Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, now that the calamity howlers and misinformed people have a chance to ascertain the facts, I think it well to call attention to Public Law No. 277, Seventy-eighth Congress, which was passed by the Senate and House of Representatives and became a law without the President's signature. This act was presented to the White House March 20, 1944, and provides in effect that men and women in the armed forces may apply to county auditors in their respective districts for ballots. This law grants them permission to vote for State and county officials as well as Federal officials. The original bill which was correctly named the bobtail ballot was just a piece of paper on which our armed forces could write in names of Federal candidates only and no one seriously thinks it was at all constitutional.

Already the War Department and other Government agencies are issuing instructions for voting by personnel in the armed forces of this country. I refer to circular No. 128 issued by the War Department on April 3, 1944, for distribution in every unit in our Army and Navy. In my opinion, Congress did a good job in the enactment of this legislation and I say without fear of contradiction that every man and woman in our armed forces can vote just the same as anyone who resides in the district, provided, of course, that conditions on the war front permit voting at all.

I would urge the fathers, mothers, and relatives of these people to contact the county auditor in their particular county who will give full information and arrange immediately to get in communication with the armed forces and with the soldier or sailor in question.

I know that some pressure groups have lied about the soldiers' legislation and have gone out of their way to misrepresent my attitude in connection with this important problem. "Politics is politics" and of course, these people including the one who had a member of the armed forces write a letter accusing me of helping mutilate the rights of our soldiers and sailors, have just been misled by a bunch of high-powered politicians.

The roll calls in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show without any possibility of contradiction that I supported this important legislation, voted for it, and helped enact it into law.

Antifriction Bearings and World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Antifriction Bearings and World War No. 2," written by Walter C. Sanders and published in the April 1944 issue of the magazine Railway Purchases and Stores.

In view of the Allied bombings of the antifriction-bearing plants in Germany and Italy, this article is very timely.

The article follows:

The vital importance of antifriction bearings in the present world-wide conflict is amply illustrated by the tremendous volume of their use in war planes, antiaircraft guns, tanks, ships, locomotives, railroad cars, and machine tools. The Allied air forces' successful raids on the antifriction bearing plants in Germany and Italy dramatically emphasized that importance.

The fact that antifriction bearings are hidden or out of sight in the machines and equipment in which they are used and are not visible to the eye causes little thought on the part of most people, much less their placing any great importance on them when thinking of the major pieces of war equipment. If the antifriction bearing could be seen as you see gun mechanisms, aircraft propellers, motor transport tires, as examples, their great importance would be obvious.

ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS THE BASE FOR STEEL PRODUCTION

Antifriction bearings should in reality take preference over almost every other piece of equipment because of the fact that they are needed even before the manufacture of steel can begin. For example, the mining of ore and other raw materials, such as coal and limestone, is the beginning of steel making. To mine ore and transport it to the mill, antifriction bearings are required in all this equipment—ore cars, power shovels, trains, ship propellers, and mechanical loaders.

After the ore reaches the melting furnaces, antifriction bearings are required in the handling of ingot and charging cars, cranes, chippers, and furnaces. When the steel is ready for rolling into various sizes and shapes and the piercing of tubes, roller bearings are required on the rolling mills, on the cranes, on the saws, the run-out tables, the cooling beds; in fact, practically every piece of modern handling equipment is on antifriction bearings.

Another example of where antifriction bearings are needed much in advance of fabrication of the steel is in the machine tools used for cutting the steel into the millions of parts required to make these major pieces of war equipment. No modern machine tools operate without anti-friction bearings, and some of these tools use as many as 500 antifriction bearings. Now bear in mind, that few machine tools for cutting the steel for these various pieces of equipment can be constructed without antifriction bearings, and the anti-friction bearings must be produced well in advance of the actual production of the machine tool.

PLANES HAVE THOUSANDS OF BEARINGS

With reference to the major pieces of equipment that will win the war, in aircraft, for example, every plane is equipped with many antifriction bearings. Some of the large bombers have as many as two and three thousand bearings. The radial engine is vital to airplanes and antifriction bearings are the heart of the radial engine—they make the radial engine possible. Antifriction bearings are also vital parts of bomb sights and gyro compasses which make possible successful high altitude and blind flying.

In case of the M–4 tank, the popular one, it uses more than 100 antifriction bearings and almost as many are used in a light tank.

In the case of guns for both the Army and Navy, antifriction bearings support the operating mechanisms of these guns. Some of them have as many as 50 antifriction bearings.

On seagoing craft one would not generally think of antifriction bearings in connection with this equipment, but there are thousands of antifriction bearings in the various pieces of equipment necessary to man these ships.

Motor transport and combat vehicles have assembled in them as many as 60 antifriction bearings. These vehicles, of course, are used in all branches of the service.

RAILROAD EQUIPMENT USING ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS

Roller bearings greatly increase the availability and utilization of steam, electric, Diesel-electric locomotives and passenger-train equipment. They help to make high-speed trains possible. The Pullman Co. uses roller bearings on all new cars. Hundreds of existing freight and steam locomotives have been converted to, or built new on roller

bearings, and these locomotives are doing a vastly increased amount of work.

Records kept by the railroads themselves show that locomotives are doing a vastly increased amount of work.

Records kept by the railroads themselves show that locomotives with all axles on roller bearings will make from 33 to 100 percent more miles in the same period of time than similar locomotives on friction bearings * * * and the maintenance costs on roller-bearing locomotives is from 30 to 42 percent less. The general concept of nations at war is that costs do not mean much in winning a war, but when these savings in costs are translated into a saving in manpower and vital materials it means a great saving in time, which is the vital element in winning a war. The use of roller bearings on freight cars is now a very active subject, as roller bearings will eliminate hot boxes and remove all speed restrictions as far as the bearings are concerned, which will make possible an approach to one-speed railroading on many railroads.

EQUIPMENT OF SUPPORTING INDUSTRIES DEPENDS ON BEARINGS

Aside from these major pieces of war equipment in which antifriction bearings are such a definite part, we should think also in terms of the supporting industries and mechanisms which are necessary to round out our war machine. A few examples are the construction of airports which requires all types of equipment such as mixers, tractors, shovels, crushers, graders, scarifiers, paving machinery, conveyors, cranes, compressors, screens, locomotives, and bulldozers.

The mining of such important ores as nickel, copper, molybdenum and many others requires many different types of machinery similar to that used in the steel industry and all of them require antifriction bearings.

This same thing holds true in the grain-milling industry, the ceramic industry, the electrical industry, the rubber industry, the refrigerator industry, the paper industry, the automotive industry, the construction industry, the lumbering industry, farm-equipment industry, coal-mining industry, textile industry, petroleum industry, fuel industry, cement industry, and many others. All these industries have been antifrictionized in the past 25 years, and they, and their specialized machinery are of vital importance in supporting the primary war industries engaged in the actual production of fighting equipment.

For this reason, such pieces of modern equipment that are essential to supporting the war program carry high priority ratings, and that equipment could not and cannot be bilt without antifriction bearings.

Dewey's Naval Victory and the American Pioneers in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Sergio Osmeña, Vice President of the Philippines, entitled "Dewey's Naval Victory and the American Pioneers in the Philippines," which was delivered on April 3, 1944, before the Naval Academy Woman's Club at Annapolis, Md.:

Madam President, distinguished members of the club, and friends: I am deeply thankful to you for the opportunity afforded me to address you today. I have chosen for my subject "Dewey's Naval Victory and the American Pioneers in the Philippines." I have done this for two reasons: First, because it is in Annapolis where your famous Naval Academy is located and I wish to honor one of the academy's most distinguished graduates—Dewey; second, because Admiral Dewey's gallant fight at Manila Bay almost 45 years ago cannot be considered any longer as an isolated exploit of a great commander. It is, in fact, the starting point of a political association between the United States and the Philippines—a partnership of mutuality and helpfulness that has been carried out successfully during all these years and has contributed greatly to the happiness and welfare of our two peoples.

The event that brought the United States to the Philippines in 1898 was the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. Commodore Dewey, who was in command of the American Pacific squadron then in Hong Kong, was ordered to Manila Bay to engage the Spanish Fleet there. "You must capture vessels or destroy," instructed the cable of the Secretary of the Navy. After waiting 2 days for information from the Philippines, Dewey left for Manila, entering its bay on the night of April 30 in disregard of the mines and fortifications therein. He then circled past the water front, ignoring shots fired by Manila batteries, and proceeded to Cavite where the Spanish Fleet under Admiral Montojo was formed in battle line.

The engagement did not take long. In the morning of May 1, at 5:41, with Dewey's command, "You may fire when you are ready, Gridley," the American squadron commenced the attack, keeping it up until 7:45 a. m., when Dewey, confident of victory, retired. At 11:16 a. m. he reengaged the enemy, but by this time most of the Spanish ships were aflame and sinking, while others had fled, seeking protection behind Cavite Point. At 12:30 p. m. a white flag was hoisted on the Government Building at Cavite and the firing ceased. Thus, Admiral Dewey, with his little squadron, composed of the *Olympia*, his flagship, and the *Baltimore, Raleigh, Petrel, Concord,* and *Boston,* in less than a day, destroyed the sea power of Spain in the Philippines. Having accomplished this, Dewey then proceeded to effect a blockade of the city of Manila, isolating it from the outside world.

Important as was the Battle of Manila Bay, it was only incidental to the big military operations conducted by the United States in the Caribbean. In that area she waged war on Spain with a definite purpose—that of liberating Cuba. In the Philippines she had no avowed objective except to destroy Spanish power in the islands. When this was accomplished the United States could have withdrawn from the islands after the signing of the armistice between the American and Spanish forces. But Dewey's great victory in Manila Bay had created an international situation from which the United States could not escape. Moreover, it brought the Filipino people within the domain of American solicitude and responsibility. The American people who had gone to war for the emancipation of Cuba could not, after Dewey's victory at Manila Bay, be reconciled with the idea of leaving another oppressed people any longer under Spain.

Thus, on October 28, 1898, the Secretary of State cabled this message to the American Commissioners who were negotiating the peace treaty with Spain at Paris:

"The sentiment in the United States is almost universal that the people of the Philippines, whatever is done, must be liberated from Spanish domination. * * *

"Consequently, grave as the responsibilities and unforeseen as the difficulties which are before us, the President can see but one plain path of duty—the acceptance of the Philippine archipelago."

With the assumption of this new responsibility, the question arose as to what to do with the Philippine Islands. Should they be colonized in the manner and style of the old colonizing powers, embarking the United States on the road to imperialism? Or should they be admitted as a State or Territory into the American Union? Or should they be granted outright independence?

To help solve the Philippine problem, President McKinley sent the first Philippine Commission—headed by Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, president of Cornell University, a great liberal and an outstanding scholar.

The Schurman commission arrived in Manila in February 1899, some time after the outbreak of hostilities between the American and Filipino forces. The only Philippine territory occupied by the Americans was the naval station at Cavite and the city of Manila. Manila was forced to surrender under a combined Filipino-American pressure. All the other provinces and islands of the Philippines were under the control of an independent government of the Philippines which was set up by the Filipinos a month before at Malolos. This situation naturally increased the responsibilities and difficulties of the commission. It not only had to make a study of the conditions of the islands among a hostile population but also had to help the United States Army in the task of acquainting the people with America's altruistic purposes.

To understand the situation that faced the Schurman commission at this time, it is necessary to consider the existing political temper in the islands. The Filipino people, repeatedly subjected to injustices and abuses, had tired of airing their grievances and of petitioning without avail for redress. Their clamors for urgent and essential reforms in the government remained unheeded. Having exhausted all peaceful means, they turned to the last recourse—revolution.

When the revolt was of a local character it was easy for the Spanish Government to quell it. But in 1896 the revolution acquired national proportions. It spread not only to the provinces surrounding Manila but to other islands in the south as well. Indeed, it became so menacing that the Spanish Government had to compromise with its leaders in the famous Pact of Biak-na-bato—by the terms of which Spain agreed to initiate reforms in the government and to give indemnity to the Filipinos in exchange for the surrender of arms and the exile of the Filipino leaders. Neither of the parties—Spaniard or Filipino—intended to live up to his bargain. The Spaniard had hoped that with the exile of the Filipino leaders the people would calm down, while the Filipinos, with the indemnity money paid them, intended to purchase arms. It was at this time that the Spanish-American War broke out.

It is interesting to note that Dewey was instrumental in bringing Aguinaldo, the exiled leader of the revolution, back to the islands. In him, Dewey and the other military commanders found a ready ally in the war against Spain. On the other hand, Aguinaldo, in lending his support to the American forces, had hoped that the Philippines would be eventually independent. Given the signal to resume the struggle against Spain, the forces of the revolution swept from Province to Province, forcing the capitulation of Spanish garrisons and finally reaching the gates of the city of Manila.

When the Treaty of Paris, of December 10, 1898, was signed, by the terms of which

the Philippines was ceded by Spain to the United States, the Filipinos became bitterly disappointed. They questioned the legitimacy of the transfer, since the ceding power no longer had any possession of the islands. In addition, they entertained doubts as to the real intention of the United States in the Philippines. To enlighten them and to win their confidence became, therefore, the immediate task of the Commission. They exhausted every method of conciliation to win popular support for the cause of peace and the acceptance of American sovereignty.

In a proclamation the Commission declared that the aim and object of the American Government "* * * is the well-being, the prosperity, and the happiness of the Philippine people and their elevation and advancement to a position among the most civilized peoples of the world."

Although no immediate results could be achieved by the Commission in its peace efforts, Dr. Schurman and his colleagues rendered signal service to the United States by helping the military authorities in the islands expound to the people the liberal policy and beneficent aims of the United States in the Philippines. Upon the completion of its studies and investigations, the Commission returned to the United States and submitted its report. This report is one of the most important documents in the history of Philippine-American relations. It served as a basis for Executive pronouncements and congressional actions. Although the Commission did not recommend the granting of immediate independence or the admission of the Philippines into the American Union, it clearly stated in its report that ultimate independence is the aspiration and goal of the Filipinos, including the conservative elements that at that time were opposed to immediate independence. To reconcile the political rights and privileges of the Filipinos with the democratic traditions and sovereign rights of the United States, the Commission recommended from the very outset "to extend to the Filipinos larger liberties of self-government than Jefferson approved of for the inhabitants of Louisiana." In such a scheme of government the people were to be allowed to elect the members of the lower house of the legislature.

Filipino resistance, in the face of America's superior arms and of her liberal pronouncements, could not last long. Foreseeing the termination of hostilities, President McKinley sent to the Philippines a second Commission, headed by an outstanding jurist, William H. Taft, to exercise the powers of a quasi civil government in the islands.

For the guidance of the Commission, the President signed a letter of instructions drawn by a great statesman, Secretary Root. In those instructions, the President enjoined the Commission that the welfare of the islands should be a paramount consideration and, among other things, said:

"In all the fields of government and administrative provisions which they are authorized to prescribe, the Commission should bear in mind that the government which they are establishing is designed not for our satisfaction or for the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands, and the measures adopted should be made to conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices to the fullest extent consistent with the accomplishment of the indispensable requisites of just and effective government."

In compliance with the instructions, the Commission proceeded to prepare a municipal code and a provincial law which invested the people with the power of exercising wide autonomy in their municipal governments and a considerable autonomy in their provincial governments. The Commission also passed a civil-service act which specifically provided that other things being equal Filipinos should be preferred for governmental positions.

Subsequently, three Filipinos were appointed to the Commission and when Congress had under consideration a bill providing a more definite organization for the government of the Philippines, Governor Taft, siding with Mr. Cooper, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, and with other liberals in the House, fought vigorously for the inclusion in the bill of the provision, giving to the Filipino people an elective assembly. In his whole administration, Mr. Taft, as President of the Commission, and as Civil Governor, emphasized that the motto of the government was "the Philippines for the Filipinos."

It is to the credit of the United States that for the purpose of the pioneering work in the islands, men of the highest qualifications were chosen. Mr. Taft and his colleagues of the Commission ably tackled the difficult initial problems of government. Through their patience and tact, limitless energy and enthusiasm, consideration, and sympathetic understanding, they won for the United States the good will of the Filipino people.

In the successful execution of America's high purposes in the Philippines, such competent and firm direction as that lent by Taft and his colleagues was, of course, indispensable. But this alone could not have been sufficient. It was necessary to enlist the full cooperation of all the other elements. I wish to speak of the magnificent contribution rendered by each of them.

In the first place, the American soldiers are to be commended for their exemplary conduct during the military campaign in the islands. Led and inspired by such outstanding military commanders as Generals Otis and Arthur MacArthur, they generally respected the rights and liberties of the civilian population as far as military necessity permitted. They treated their prisoners-of-war in accordance with the rules of international law.

In the administration of civil affairs during the military regime, their work was most constructive. They facilitated the resumption of the normal functioning of courts of justice and issued general orders governing marriage and criminal procedure which are in force up to the present. They supervised with fairness and impartiality the first municipal elections held in the Philippines under the American flag. Many of them accepted commissions in the Philippine Constabulary, a national police organization, which became a very important factor in the maintenance of peace in the islands. Others became teachers. Nothing was more inspiring than to see American soldiers, in the towns and barrios they had occupied, putting aside their rifles, and with book in hand, repairing to the public schools to teach the children of those whom they had only recently faced in the field of battle. But that was what actually took place—and that was the spirit that was to win over the Filipinos in those crucial days.

In its first proclamation in 1899, the Schurman commission declared the establishment of elementary schools and the provision for appropriate facilities for higher education to be of cardinal importance in the American program for the islands. And one of the first acts of the Taft commission provided for the appointment of more than 1,000 American teachers. These teachers and the others who followed them became missionaries of good will and the exponents of American democracy among the masses. They did a marvelous work because of their zeal and solicitude and considering the conditions they had to work under. Often, they had to stay in far and remote places, devoid of conveniences they had been used to. The zeal of these teachers was repaid fully, however, by the enthusiasm shown by the people for education. No people ever accepted the blessings of education more readily than the Filipinos. This is the reason why we never had to pass a law making public education compulsory.

In the report of the Schurman commission, there was recognized as a basic need for a sound organization of the executive branch of the Government, the existence of a body of honest and efficient government officials and employees. When the Taft commission was organized, the fifth act approved by them was that providing for a civil-service system in which merit and fitness alone should govern, and these qualifications were to be determined by competitive examination. Many Americans from the United States Civil Service went to the Philippines to take part in the work started by the Taft commission. They were diligent and honest, courteous, and efficient.

One of the early problems that faced the new government was that of public health and sanitation. The incidents and mortality due to certain diseases were high all over the islands. Every now and then epidemics of smallpox or cholera would break out. Under American leadership, vigorous health measures were taken, such as compulsory vaccination and the building of artesian wells, and steps were taken to prevent the transmission of disease by the rat, fly, and mosquito. Infant mortality, too, was reduced. In the organization of the bureau of health and its branches in the provinces, in the establishment of hospitals and dispensaries and maternity clinics, and in the quarantine service, American technical assistance was invaluable and doctors and nurses made a splendid record.

The lawyers who were appointed to the bench were men of honor, learning, and ability and they helped in establishing in the islands an independent judiciary. Those who entered into the law practice were fair-minded and able men, and they helped in setting up a high standard for the legal profession. Both judges and law practitioners, solicitous of the people's welfare, poor and rich alike, cooperated together in winning from the masses faith and confidence in the administration of justice.

In the building up of a strong national structure, roads and other transportation facilities to develop trade and promote understanding are essential. When the civil government was established, with Governor Taft at the head, the old Spanish road system of less than a thousand miles throughout the islands was almost destroyed. Most of those roads were impassable during the rainy season, and the facilities for travel in the dry season were very limited. The problem facing the Commission was not only to repair and widen the old roads but to build new ones. A constructive policy for the building, repair, and maintenance of roads was adopted by the Commission, and experienced engineers were brought from the United States. These engineers, through their technical ability, industry, and endurance, carried out the program with marked success. These engineers were also helpful in the construction of waterworks, artesian wells, and public buildings.

The American missionaries of all denominations and sects who came to the islands were among those who rendered valuable service to the Filipino people. As soon as the flames of war died down, they established schools and missionary centers, to work among the native inhabitants, often in remote places, helping them to improve their lot and do away with diseases and prejudices. While these missionaries did their religious and missionary work with zeal, they did nothing to prevent other existing religious organizations from carrying on their re-

ligious activities and professions. Religious freedom, in place of religious intolerance, became the rule in the new regime in which the church became separated from the state. This was one of the blessings of democracy which America brought to the Philippines.

When the main body of the Army was withdrawn from Philippine service, many enterprising Americans who came with the Army established themselves in the islands as independent businessmen, farmers, and manufacturers. Many of them, after a few years of toil became prosperous. With the increase of Philippine trade with the United States and other countries, greater impetus was given to the economic development of the islands, and outside capital was especially needed. In a large measure, however, it may be said that the greater portion of American capital invested in the Philippines before the war did not come from the United States but was made right there and multiplied by these enterprising men.

In addition to these groups, there were individual Americans, scientists, researchers and economists, journalists and writers, educators, industrialists, and others, who came to the Philippines to add their contribution to the islands' political, social, educational, and economic development. Each, working in his own way, helped to lay the foundations of a new nation.

All these people were the pioneers of America in the islands. They worked closely together to make the American adventure in the Philippines a success. They were the ones who blazed the trails of good and humane government in the islands, and set the pattern which has been consistently followed in the succeeding years. They were the ones who, for a time, suffered the natural coldness and indifference of a people newly conquered and who waded through their prejudices and indifference to win for America in the end the everlasting and fervent affection, gratitude, and loyalty of the Filipino people.

Nothing, of course, could have been accomplished without the support and cooperation of the Filipino people themselves. The environmental factors were indeed conducive to progress and development, but the principal reason why so much success was made within a relatively short period of time was that America found in the Philippines a people possessing a basic culture, politically conscious, ready for the exercise of the prerogatives and duties of self-government, and responsive to the continuing demands of progress.

It is said that shortly after his victory over the Spanish Fleet, Dewey, professing to ignore the possibility that Spain might be succeeded by the United States in the Philippines, prophesied that in 40 or 50 years a Japanese naval squadron might enter Manila Bay, as he had done, demanding surrender of Manila and the Philippines. As Dewey predicted, so the Japanese came. But one essential fact is to be noted and it is this: When America came, we Filipinos sided with America and fought against the existing sovereign. When 45 years later, Japan came, we Filipinos not only sided with America, the sovereign power, but ourselves voluntarily and spontaneously bore the brunt of the battle in defending the American flag.

The explanation for this is simple. Disregarding old colonial methods, America followed in the islands a policy that was humane, altruistic, and progressive. Her dealings with the people have been characterized not only by sincerity and good faith, but also by a spirit of liberalism, equality, and justice. She has complied with every promise made to them. She has administered the affairs of the islands as a true trustee not for her own benefit but for the benefit and welfare of the Filipino people. "The Philippines for the Filipinos" had been her guiding principle throughout all these years. She, therefore, has won not only the cooperation and support of the Filipino people but also their steadfast loyalty, gratitude, and faith.

In the building up of this faith we owe much not only to the pioneers of America in the Philippines but also to the multitude of men and women of good will and stout hearts who have since gone to our remote islands in the Pacific to join in the task of nation building, keeping in mind the welfare of our people and maintaining always the good name of America. Many of these have returned to the United States and are living here. Others like Dewey, Schurman, and Taft have passed away, but to all of them—living and dead—and, indeed, to those now suffering in enemy prison and concentration camps and to those still maintaining the spirit of resistance in the mountains of the Philippines, I wish to render a tribute of affection, admiration, and gratitude in behalf of my people.

Extending alongside Manila Bay, where 45 years ago Dewey won his laurels, there is the most beautiful boulevard in the Orient, which the Filipino people, in token of their affection and respect, named after Dewey. At one end of this boulevard is the monument to Jose Rizal, our national hero, and from this monument begins the Bonifacio Drive, named after our great revolutionary leader of 1896. Not far from this, running parallel, is Taft Avenue which itself meets the Father Burgos Drive, named after our priest-martyr, and ends with the plaza named after General Lawton. To the left of this plaza is the most important bridge, crossing the Pasig River, and named after William A. Jones, author of the organic act which promised independence to the Philippines. Inside the walled city is the Plaza McKinley, which was the old Spanish Government center, with the supreme court building on one side and the cathedral on the other. In that plaza Mr. Taft took his oath of office as the first civil governor of the Philippines.

In addition, there are three public parks and a parkway named after four Governors General—Luke E. Wright, W. Cameron Forbes, Francis Burton Harrison, and Leonard Wood—while the main Philippine army post and training camp was named after the last Governor General and first United States High Commissioner to the Philippines—Frank Murphy.

As time goes on, other landmarks and monuments will doubtless be erected in honor of individual Americans and Filipinos who distinguished themselves in the service of the Filipino people, both in war and in peace. Among these, I envision a simple one—a great square block of native stone—dedicated to the imperishable memory of those who fell in the Battle of the Philippines, sealing with their sacrifices the enduring friendship and solidarity of our two peoples. I propose to have it lettered thus: "To all those, known and unknown, whose mingled blood was shed for the defense of America and the Philippines and for the glory of God."

Are We Heading for Fascism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis., April 9, 1944:

We are today engaged in our most serious war. Today we are facing probably the most critical time in the history of our Nation. After all, we never really got into World War No. 1, although we rejoice in the fact that it was undoubtedly our entry at a critical period which swayed the balance in favor of our allies and brought the war to a speedy conclusion before we had an opportunity to get into it with both feet.

So, I say to you that the last previous real crisis in our national history was during the days of the Civil War. In Abraham Lincoln's time our problem was to keep America a united nation. Today our problem is equally serious. It is to keep a united nation American.

What are the principles of our republican form of government as guaranteed to us by our Constitution? That Constitution branded us as a Republic of 48 sovereign States banded together to establish a society founded on the rights of the individual. Our Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government. It declares that the rights of the people are inviolable. It declares that those people are to be free from government control. Our forefathers fought for our independence because of their desire to establish these principles of government. They fought against taxation without representation, but we have it today in many of the regulations promulgated by some of our bureaus here in Washington. Our Constitution provided that the individual violations of the rights of others was to be protected by regulation, by laws, and by policing. Throughout all the days of history we have fought for a classless system in this Nation until recent years. Remember, back in the Civil War days, the admonition of President Lincoln that no nation can long exist half slave and half free; yet today some of our bureaucrats in Washington are deliberately fostering a society by classes, crosscut by religious, educational, and economic groups.

Now, why? Why do these economic planners in Washington, operating under a cloak of war secrecy, try to impose a foreign political ideology upon this Nation? Is it to keep themselves secure in a governmental position for all time? Or is it because they seek to prepare the American people and the American Government, and the American economy for participation in some ideological world state? It is a problem with which we must all be very seriously concerned at this precise moment.

Last week I discussed with you the perfectly obvious program, adopted in Washington by certain of those within the high councils of our Government or certainly within the high bureaucracy in our Government, who seek to impose upon us some form of National Socialism. I promised to discuss with you today the other philosophies, and particularly the Fascist philosophy of government adopted by another school of thought among these long-haired post-war planners here in Washington, who work steadfastly, and very effectively, I assure you, while our patriotic loyal constitutionalist Americans have their eyes on our immediate goal of winning this war.

First of all, we have at large in this country a group of American Marxian Communists, very effectively operating to conceal or becloud the ultimate aims of those who actually are in the drivers' seat. Recently, they have concentrated their efforts under the left-wing branch of American labor leaders and now have come out in the forefront openly as the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O., supposedly headed by Sidney

Hillman. According to the Dies committee, as reported in two recent lengthy speeches on the floor of the House, by the chairman, MARTIN DIES (Democrat, of Texas), into this C. I. O. political action group has been corralled practically all of the communistic, or pink, radical labor leaders and their spokesmen in this Nation.

According to Mr. DIES, the announced policy of this organization has been to raise a political campaign fund of around $2,000,000 to besmirch and besmear and to bring about the defeat of any and all Members of Congress, who refuse to be dictated to by this group. According to the laws of our country, it is illegal for an employer of labor to contribute more than $5,000 to a political campaign fund. It is illegal to contribute anything to any campaign fund in exchange for a promise of political support after election. It would be regarded as an unfair labor practice and the employer subject to prosecution under the National Labor Relations Act, were he to solicit campaign contributions among the personnel of his organization. Yet, according to the newspapers, it has recently become the open policy of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee to have its henchmen circulate through various war plants in this Nation in which they have a closed-shop contract, on company time and, therefore, actually because their time is chargeable to a Government contract, they are, in effect, on Government time, demanding from each and every worker a stipulated assessment of $1—or in some cases $2—as a contribution to their political campaign fund. Should this supposedly free American citizen refuse to contribute thereto, he is subject to dismissal from the union and having been thus dismissed, because of the closed-shop contract, he not only loses his job in that plant but loses the right to work in any other plant in which the C. I. O. has a closed contract. Is this Americanism? Is this what free, liberty-loving Americans shall freely permit having imposed upon them in a Presidential election year?

The fact remains that it is being done and the further fact remains that the Attorney General of the United States, upon being challenged on this matter, has decreed that whereas—as I have previously stated is the case—an employer is precluded from contributing over $5,000 to a political campaign, the unions are perfectly within their rights in carrying out their program, which includes their announced intention of collecting over $2,000,000 for their participation in the coming campaign.

What these unions do not realize is this: Actually, we are not heading for communism in this country—Marxian communism which means that "everything is for the state and everything shall be owned by the state and equally distributed by the state." Instead what they do not realize is this: That for many years our starry-eyed dreamers in Washington really have been heading us for a Fascist or a Nazi state. Yet there is no more slurring epithet that the so-called liberals, or pinks, or radicals of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee love to level at all those who do not agree with them than to charge us with being a Fascist or a reactionary, or a Tory. Oh, how proud they are in their egotism, when they can level those epithets at us.

What these union leaders fail to realize in their egotistical enthusiasm is this, that the very Administration which they are so benignly following, and for which they are so enthusiastic, has taken from them—as is the basic program in the establishment of any Nazi or Fascist state—their principal bill of rights, namely, their right of collective bargaining. They have forgotten that while theoretically management and labor can still sit across the table and bargain collectively, nevertheless, they can only do so when Government also is represented at the same table. They have forgotten further that whatever decision has been arrived at by both management and labor, and even with the ever-present governmental agency acquiescing, still those agreements are subject to review by a further governmental agency, namely, a direct agency of the White House, which in the last analysis tells both management and labor what the ultimate decision will be. And if they don't like it, if they disagree with that decision, what recourse is left to them? Management can have its property seized under the War Powers Act by the Office of the Presidency. Thereupon, labor theoretically becomes an employee of the Government; labor's greatest weapon then becomes nullified, because should labor express its dissatisfaction with the Government decree by calling a strike, labor then is in the disreputable position of striking against the Government in war time. And so, I say to you listeners, that when any group presuming to speak for labor—and I know the C. I. O. Political Action Committee does not begin to speak for labor—seeks to unfairly and illegally influence an election at this time, they know not whereof they speak and the rank and file of American labor is not going to be misled by any such group, which has assumed wholeheartedly, and welcomed, according to MARTIN DIES, the support of Earl Browder and the lately disbanded American Communist Party, now exemplified by the American Labor Party in the State of New York.

What is the immediate program of attack of this C. I. O. political action group? It is principally that they intend to put on an intensive "educational campaign" all over the United States, and according to Mr. DIES, over 400 of their educational speakers, as presently advertised, are, or have recently been, members of the Communist Party of the United States. And that reminds me that very recently an outstanding American citizen, who talked off the record to a group of Congressmen here in Washington, and I was a member of that group, stated that he was told in Russia by Mr. Stalin himself that "some time you people in America are going to wake up. We tried Marxian communism over here for many years and we found that it simply would not work. Eventually you people in America will wake up to the fact that it will not work over in America either." And he went on further to say that American Communists would be denied entry into what we like to call Communist Russia. They don't want them over there either.

Now, I have previously said that we are heading for a Fascist state in this country, or, perhaps, a Nazi state; and there is very little difference. I define Fascism in this manner, and I ask you whether or not in your opinion, after your careful consideration, it does not fit exactly to our present economy in this Nation?

"Fascism is the government control of the means of production and distribution and of the flow of capital, effected through government controls operated under a single political party system."

I repeat that because I want you to think that over carefully.

"Fascism is the government control of the means of production and distribution and of the flow of capital, effected through government controls operated under a single political party system."

In other words, under Fascism, as under Nazism, you have the sham or the delusion of private ownership, but every move you make is controlled by the government; in your production, in the distribution of your products, and in the flow of capital needed to keep you operating.

Every manufacturer, patriotically and courageously participating in the war production program is alarmed over his post-war future. Taxation is taking most of his profits and renegotiation is taking away from him not only any excess profits, but also is taking away from him any reserve which he may be setting aside to cover the cost of his reconversion to peacetime production. This is entirely in accord with the program of these Fascist-minded planners. At the conclusion of his war production effort, finding himself without any cash reserve, in order to reconvert and at the same time in order to meet his pay rolls, the manufacturer will be forced to go to the Government to borrow funds and this will effectively give the Government the ultimate control over his operation.

Let me give you one simple example illustrative of this program. I have a letter in my files from a relatively small but very capable manufacturer in my district, who last year did a half million dollars' worth of Government business. He showed a paper profit of roughly $145,000 of which taxes ate up $115,000. He set aside as a reserve for post-war adjustments $11,000, leaving him a net profit of $29,000. Now, this is not unreasonable bookkeeping, but along comes Mr. Renegotiation, and he takes $10,000 in addition to the taxes of $115,000, leaving the manufacturer a net profit for distribution among his stockholders of $20,000, and a reserve for post-war adjustments of but $4,000.

And remember this: No provision remains for the absorption of any losses. Government takes away the profits, but Government is never renegotiated to make good on any losses. That is simply the manufacturer's tough luck.

Now, surely the manufacturer's stockholders are entitled to their pittance, but how is that manufacturer going to be able to reconvert his plant to peacetime effort, meet his pay rolls to keep his employees working steadily without being forced to borrow money from the Government? When he does so, the Government will have a lien on that property and will dictate his means of production and his means of distribution, because the Government has control of his flow of capital—the money needed to operate that plant. I repeat, you have the sham of private ownership, but you also have complete Fascist control of that plant, and that is what is going on all over this country under our present program. It is up to us to put an end to it. Wake up, America, before it is too late.

Polish Agent Tells Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Daniell, from the Milwaukee Journal of April 7, 1944:

POLISH AGENT TELLS MISSION—BRAVED EYE OF GESTAPO

(By Raymond Daniell)

LONDON, ENGLAND.—In a room just off Piccadilly this correspondent talked with a blue-eyed earnest young Pole who had just returned from his own country, to which he had been sent in February 1943, by the late Premier Sikorski to serve as liaison officer between the exiled Polish Government in London and the Polish underground. For 11 months this 27-year-old officer, who prefers to be called George Jur because that is

not the name he used on his dangerous mission, lived and worked under the unknowing eyes of the Gestapo.

He had some amazing adventures, but it was not of these he spoke so much as of the observations he made in the course of his travels around Poland. He had gained several pounds more weight and explained that this was because he and those underground friends who hid him from the Gestapo always felt that each meal might be his last. In Poland, he explained, it is patriotic to upset German economy by supporting the black market.

The Germans have practiced two kinds of terror in Poland, the agent said. In the territory west of the Curzon line, he said, it has taken administrative form. There, he said, it is unlawful to speak Polish on the streets, there are no schools for Polish children, and Poles are forbidden to move from one town to another without special permits. In the eastern territory which Russia claims, he said, extermination has been the apparent German aim, and since last October, when it became clear that a German withdrawal was inevitable, terror has increased.

SAW MASS EXECUTION

Jur said that there had been almost weekly mass executions in all large communities. In Warsaw he saw 100 of his countrymen lined up against a wall and shot by German policemen with tommy guns, while SS men saw to it that the populace kept 100 yards away and did not interfere. The victims, he said, had been forced to submit to blood transfusions for wounded German soldiers before they were executed, and stood like ghosts in their hospital shirts, hands bound behind them, eyes blindfolded and lips gagged so that they could not shout defiance.

Despite the terror, Jur said he found his countrymen more united than in times of peace and more determined than when they chose to fight rather than surrender to Hitler. Germany has not yet found a Quisling among them, he declared.

One of the charges the Soviets have made against the Mikolajczyk government in London is that it has no roots in its own country. Jur said that on the contrary probably not more than 5 percent of his people, or a little more than the total Communist Party membership before the war, opposed the policies of the Mikolajczyk government.

DENIES DISTINCTION IS MADE

"What the people outside Poland do not understand," he said, "is that the people there are not drawing any distinction between those who left and those who stayed home, as long as they are fighting for Poland."

Jur described what happened when the Russians penetrated early in January what before the war was Polish territory. Wherever the Russians appeared, he said, underground officials approached the Russian commanders, identified themselves by showing the colors of Poland, together with a certificate bearing the seal of the Deputy Prime Minister resident in Poland, and offered to help.

When he left Poland, he said, there was considerable uncertainty about how the offer was being received, for in some places it was reported the Russians had welcomed the proffered aid and in others, according to unconfirmed reports, they had either shot or arrested those who offered it.

EXPECTED BALKAN INVASION

Morale in Poland is still good, Jur said, although there was a wave of disappointment when, after the Italian collapse, the expected Anglo-American invasion of the Balkans did not materialize. By this time, he said, it had been hoped in Poland that Anglo-American forces would be "closer to central Europe." Now, said Jur, Polish underground leaders are hoping that Russia will allow them to administer civil affairs at least west of the Curzon line and that Soviet administration to the east at least will be carried on under the eyes of American and British observers.

While the present government now has the support of the bulk of the people, it may lose that support if it agrees to cede eastern territories to Russia in exchange for east Prussia, because that would be regarded as treason, Jur declared. "The people are beginning to ask, "What are we fighting for?" He said, "A country cannot keep moving from west to east and east to west."

Speedy Ending of Global War Desired by All People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, bringing the world war to a successful and speedy conclusion is desired by all American citizens. Today the House begins consideration of the naval appropriations bill for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1944, and ending July 1, 1945. This bill calls for an enormous appropriation of $32,000,000,000, and the Navy Department officials have asked for this amount so as to have increased airplanes, ships, and men for the activities against Japan in the Pacific. This legislation concerns the Navy, the Marine Corps, and United States Coast Guard. The best way to bring a speedy victory, is to carry out the program of the Navy and the Army.

When the United States found itself forced into a global war by the attack on the part of Japan against Pearl Harbor there was no alternative, and during my service in the House of Representatives, I have supported every effort made to build an army and to build a navy, and to create an air force second to none in the world. A remarkable job has been done by the men in charge of this program. Figures submitted by the committee, and according to testimony before the Appropriations Committee, indicate the strength and power of this Republic of ours. They plan by July 1, 1945, to have a personnel of 3,657,437 officers and men, including the women's units, under Navy jurisdiction. Under this pending legislation, the Navy by July 1, 1945, will have over 10,000 self-propelled ships and over 74,000 vessels of other descriptions. They will have over 37,000 aircraft.

The expenditures called for are large, but they are necessary. At the same time emphasis should be placed upon efficiency and economy on our domestic front. Government bureaus, not having to do directly with the war effort, should be reminded by Congress that bungling and waste and extravagance in connection with the money of the taxpayers of this Nation is not to be tolerated.

There has been too much of that type of effort. There is now pending in Congress legislation which will bring the different department heads before Congress, require them to answer questions, and give reasons for the request for increased appropriations on the part of bureaus and bureaucrats. Such legislation ought to be enacted. It will have a wholesome effect upon different department heads, whose chief aim in life is to see how much money they can spend. Such a practice is not calculated to help in the war effort.

Preparations for Peace on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the very timely, sound, and appropriate speech delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, in New York before the Academy of Political Science last evening. While we all agree that the winning of this war is the most important objective before us today, it is well that these post-war problems be considered now. I repeat that it is as essential to prepare for peace in time of war as it is to prepare for war in time of peace.

Justice Byrnes has ably presented some of these post-war problems and wisely suggested some of the answers in the following speech:

We have reason to be proud of the success of our armed forces. But we must not be blind to the task ahead of us. American and British Armies are approximately 500 miles from Berlin. The Russian forces are about the same distance on the other side from Hitler's capital. In the Pacific we are 1,800 miles from Tokyo and the British in Burma are approximately the same distance.

The roads to Berlin and Tokyo are not only long but bloody. Already our casualties, including killed, wounded, missing, and prisoners, number 173,239; United Kingdom, 667,157; and the Soviet Republic, 4,500,000.

The casualties of the enemy are almost double those of ourselves and our allies, and we expect to keep them in that ratio.

Some are impatient at our lack of progress in Italy. No other major European battlefield on which we might choose to fight or on which we might be forced to fight, can give the enemy the natural defense advantages that the Nazis have at Cassino. But on the whole the Italian campaign is a success. Our major victory is the defeat of Italy, the opening of the Mediterranean, the control of the Adriatic, the control of Italian air bases, the transfer of the Italian Fleet, and the tying up of 19 German divisions during the period of crucial Russian operations.

Ahead of us is the greatest military adventure in the history of the world. Of the part our forces will play in that great drama we can say nothing, and those of us at home can do little. We must wait—and we must pray.

While the armed forces are winning the war we must prepare to win the peace. That is a necessary part of our war effort. The knowledge that the Government is planning for the transition of war to peace should relieve industry, agriculture, and labor of the

fear of post-war depression and unemployment. It should help those on the home front and on the fighting front to concentrate on winning the war.

Because we have changed from the defensive to the offensive, it has already been possible for us to cut back some programs. These cut-backs are not primarily for the purpose of producing civilian goods. They are cut-backs in war programs no longer urgent, in order to expedite war programs that are urgent. The cut-backs in the Army programs approved for 1944 and 1945 amount to $16,750,000,000. That does not include the air service.

A review of the spare-parts programs of the Army and Navy just completed indicates that by December 31, 1944, there will be reductions in these programs for the Army aggregating $1,000,000,000 and for the Navy aggregating $402,000,000.

The Goverment must take a firm stand and close plants no longer needed in the war effort. From civic groups and from men in public office, there will come the cry, "Woodman, spare that plant." But we must realize that Santa Claus has gone; that there are no more plants to distribute, but there are many more bills to pay. It will be far better for communities to have plants closed now when the employees can find other jobs, than to continue operating and later close the plants when employees may not be able to find jobs.

The constructive report of B. M. Baruch and John Hancock on the problems of post-war readjustments has gone far to dispel the fog of controversy which had hung over the discussions of the termination of war contracts and the disposition of surplus property.

Legislation is necessary to effectively solve these problems. However, from my long experience in the Congress, I realize that delays in legislation are unavoidable. I believe it essential for the Executive to take no chances but to proceed to the fullest extent possible under existing law.

While waiting for legislation we have established an interdepartmental board to unify and simplify the procedures of our procurement agencies in handling contract terminations. The Government will promptly pay contractors and promptly remove war materials no longer required, in order to make room for the installation by manufacturers of equipment and materials for civilian production.

The more difficult problems center about the freezing of capital which industry has tied up in terminated war contracts. Procurement agencies must have the power to settle and pay promptly items on which they and the contractors agree.

Where claims cannot be settled by agreements, we must make adequate provision for interim financing of war contractors, particularly of small business which has only limited working capital of its own.

We must give adequate authority to the procurement agencies to take over and settle in appropriate cases the claims of subcontractors.

We must authorize the procurement agencies to make advance or partial payments on account and we must give a contractor the right to require a procurement agency to make, within a reasonable stated period of time, its determination of the value of the contractor's claim and to pay, on account, a substantial portion of such determination.

A Surplus War Property Administrator has been appointed. He has called upon the procurement agencies for an inventory. If we wait to get a complete inventory from all war theaters, the inventory will be only of historical value. But we will secure an inventory in sufficient detail to enable us to know what surpluses we have and where they are located. This list of surplus materials will be furnished to each procurement agency and no agency will purchase additional supplies without first consulting that list in order to ascertain if Government supplies are already available.

Our surplus supplies must be disposed of at a fair price, and as rapidly as possible without demoralizing trade and industry. There must be no scrapping or destruction of useful property. Private monopolies must not be created or strengthened. Small independent local businesses must be given preference and industrial loans made available to them on appropriate terms.

The Government's wartime investment in new plants and new machinery amounts to approximately fifteen and and a half billions. But about one-third of this amount is invested in plants specially designed for the manufacture of munitions which could have little or no peacetime use.

The problem of disposition, however, is enormously aggravated because 70 percent of the Government's total plant investment is in projects costing more than $10,000,000 each. The Surplus Property Administrator must be authorized to lease as well as sell these plants if independent and local enterprises are to be given an opportunity to take over any of the larger plants. And where possible, we must subdivide the larger units.

We cannot consider the problems of transition from war to peace without considering the problems of the farmer, the worker, and the returning soldier.

Agriculture, no less than industry, has established unprecedented production records in this war. The farmers must not be penalized for their war effort as they were after the last war, with widespread foreclosures and bankruptcies.

Steps have already been taken to protect the farmers from a repetition of such a disaster. In the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, the Congress, acting on the President's recommendation, authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans on basic crops at the rate of 90 percent of parity for 2 full crop years after the formal termination of hostilities.

The full significance of this provision may not be realized. Within 2 years after the last war the net income of our farmers was cut in half. The Government now guarantees that it will not happen after this war. It is a wise policy not only for the farmers, but for the Nation as a whole. It gives assurance that after this war we will have a policy not of scarcity but of food abundance.

Full crops will mean employment for those engaged in transporting, financing, and selling them. The purchasing power of the farmers will turn the wheels of industry. Full crops will give our people health and strength. The mass of our people under conditions of full employment brought about by the war has been eating more food than ever before. We should see to it that they have the means to continue to do so.

Such surpluses as we can produce will be necessary to help replenish our reserves and to help the war-devastated countries during the period of rehabilitation. Such help is not misguided philanthropy. It is intelligent self-interest and plain common sense.

In the national interest the Government also has a duty to help labor tide over the period of transition from war to peace. The workers want work—productive work. But workers cannot create jobs that do not exist. The war has caused great movements of labor from State to State, from industry to industry, from farm and home to industry, and from farm, home, and industry into the armed forces. Not only have we taken 11,000,000 able-bodied men and women into the services, but the net increase in industrial employment between 1937 and 1944 is estimated to be more than seven and one-half million.

Even if industry is helped to reconvert with unprecedented speed, even if agriculture is helped to continue a policy of abundance, there is bound to be considerable unavoidable unemployment during the adjustment period, and the problem wil' be much more aggravated for some types of work than for others.

We cannot say to our service men and women, or to the men and women who supplied them with food and munitions, "You must shift for yourself until you find a job." That sort of attitude can only bring discredit upon, and sap the strength of, our system of free, private enterprise.

A retraining and reemployment administration has been established and is coordinating the activities of the various agencies having anything to do with veterans' a fairs. There will be established in every urban center an information office where the veteran can learn what assistance he can secure from the Government, and talk with an individual handling the particular kind of assistance in which he is interested.

Congress has already provided mustering-out pay for our service men and women. The broadest possible facilities have been provided for their retraining and opportunities will be accorded to those who wish to continue their education. Not only must we do everything possible to find or create jobs for our service men and women, but we must provide unemployment benefits for them until they do find jobs.

Some persons have urged that a dismissal wage be paid to workers on their discharge and that the cost of dismissal wages be recognized by the Government as part of the cost of contract termination. However, the dismissal wage would bear no exact relation to the needs of the workers, and some who might quickly find new jobs would get more than they needed while others would get much less. If the dismissal wages were limited to employees of war contractors, it would unfairly discriminate against workers in essential civilian industries. And it is difficult to draw a line between war workers and nonwar workers.

The dismissal wage would be exceedingly difficult of fair and equitable application, but we should realize that neither industry nor government will be able to resist the demand for dismissal pay unless a better alternative is offered to them.

The existing State unemployment-insurance laws were framed to meet local conditions of temporary unemployment and are not adequate to deal with the Nation-wide problem of reemployment. Demobilization must be regarded as a national problem and its costs as part of the costs of the war.

I think the most constructive approach to this problem is to supplement existing State unemployment benefits to the extent necessary to give workers, during the transition from war to peace, suitable unemployment benefits to be prescribed in a Federal demobilization law.

The Federal law could fix a maximum and minimum benefit. Within the range prescribed by the law the benefits payable should be a stated portion of the worker's previous earnings with allowances for the worker's dependents. In view of its purposes, the Federal law should cover practically all workers. If there is a waiting period it should be very limited. The number of weeks in any year that the benefits are payable should not be as restricted as they are under existing State laws. Those receiving benefits should report to the employment services and should lose their benefits if they refuse suitable employment. Such a plan might be put into effect after the collapse of the Nazis and be continued for a period after the war.

Of course no one would suggest that unemployment benefits should be considered as an adequate substitute for a real job. But in an interdependent society the worker cannot make his own job and the burden of

unemployment must not be allowed to rest solely on the worker.

The proposal gives to private enterprise the assurance that its efforts to expand after the war will not be frustrated and stalled at the outset by unemployment and falling purchasing power. It gives private enterprise assurance that unavoidable unemployment shall not breed avoidable unemployment. It gives to all of us the assurance that our hopes for the future will not be blasted by growing social discontent during the period of transition from war to peace.

But all of our plans for the reconversion of industry and for the progressive improvement of agriculture and labor, however carefully and cautiously they may be worked out, are likely to come to naught if we have not the courage and self-restraint to withstand the threat of inflation.

The greatest danger to post-war reconstruction at home is the danger of inflation. If prices are to skyrocket and then fall, as they did after the last war, industry, agriculture, and labor are going to be hurt and our efforts to help all or any of them will be a failure.

So far, I think the American people can be proud of the fight that they have made against inflation. We have had to draw much more drastically upon our manpower and resources than during the last war. Yet in this war the cost of living has risen only 25.9 percent as against a rise of 64.6 percent during the comparable period of the last war. During the last year, with the help of the hold-the-line order and the judicious use of subsidies, the cost of living has not risen at all.

While we are now taxing our people more heavily, more money is left in the hands of our people after they have paid their taxes than they had during the last war. A large measure of credit for the success of our stabilization program must go to the mass of our people who have been patriotic and intelligent enough to save their money and buy war bonds.

If the people will preserve their purchasing power until after the war, not only will reconverted industry have a better market for its products, but the people will get better products for their money.

Our present stabilization program may not be perfect, but it has worked. So far as inflation is concerned, we are on a dangerous sea, and any group that rocks the boat now is taking on itself a grave responsibility.

The Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act expire on June 30, and legislation to extend them is now pending before the Congress. It seems clear to me that this is no time to tinker with those control measures. Any concession to any group will only invite demands for other concessions from other groups. As we value the future and the peace for which our boys are fighting and dying, we should stand firm against any relaxation in the fight against inflation.

If we do hold the line against inflation, when the war is over we can proceed with confidence to build for the future. We have the energies, the food and resources, the productive plants, the technical skills, the scientific knowledge, to supply in greater abundance than ever before the needs of our people.

Taxation which is best suited to the needs of a war economy is not at all suited for an expanding peace economy. With the end of the war there should be an end of the wartime system of taxation.

The history of tax legislation shows that the drafting and passage by Congress of a general tax bill frequently requires 6 months. We must avoid this delay. An interdepartmental committee is now working under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury upon proposals which he will submit to the Congress at the proper time. Congress is also studying the problem and I am sure that with the coming of peace, the Government will quickly provide a system of taxation that will enable us confidently to build for the future.

Nothing is more essential to peace and well-being of the world than a prosperous and fully employed America.

Out of this war we will come with great natural resources and greater productive capacity. We will have most of the gold of the earth and most of the ships on the seas and in the air. We will have a powerful Army and the most powerful Navy. Our economic and military strength will be greater than that of any nation on earth. The use we make of that power will be the test of our statesmanship.

More than our material prosperity is at stake. Of what value is our wealth and military strength compared with the lives of the boys, and girls too, who today are dying for us? My prayer is that God will inspire us to rise above selfishness and love of luxury, and demand that the power and wealth He has given us shall, at the peace table, be used to make certain that never again will the mothers of the world suffer the anguish and pain they now endure.

Are We Heading for Nazism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered over Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis., April 2, 1944:

While most of us have our minds almost completely occupied with the most important immediate problem before us, namely, that of winning this war, nevertheless, we must realize there are others among us whose thoughts are concentrated on post-war planning. Some of those minds are very logically concentrated on post-war international problems in the hope that having won the war, we shall not lose the peace.

At the same time, there are among us here in Washington, as well as elsewhere in the Nation, many minds active in studying the post-war problems of internal economy and, unfortunately, for us many of those minds are engaged in working out ways and means by which they may utilize our present preoccupation with the all-important war effort—to remake America—to remake our constitutional and our traditional America into an entirely different America fashioned after the very European ideologies of National Socialism, Nazism, or Fascism, which our sons and daughters are being told they are being shipped overseas to eradicate from the world for all time.

This program is not a new one. These social planners for a new era have been given pretty much of a free reign for a number of years and they have made great headway. Various smoke screens have been thrown up from time to time to becloud the issues and afford an umbrella under which they could work very much unmolested. With this tremendous responsibility of global warfare occupying the minds of most of us, it affords a splendid field of action for them to sew, fertilize, and harvest their seeds of social revolution. If the American people do not realize the seriousness of this situation and wake up very shortly, it may be entirely too late and our returning sons and daughters will find that they are returning to a national socialistic economy—a Nazi form of goverment—that has been securely fastened upon their backs in their absence. The severity of their wrath will unquestionably be unheard of. The responsibility rests squarely upon us who have remained behind to preserve for them their constitutional form of government, a constitutional republic of America, which they left and which they were told they were being sent abroad to defend so they will be able to recognize it as such on their return. If we do not preserve that for them, well may we expect to have visited upon our heads either a bloodless or—God forbid—even a bloody revolution may come about—as recently predicted by none other than the Vice President of this Nation.

These new-era social planners—these long-haired boys and short-haired girls—justify their nocturnal schemings for a better America by consoling themselves with the fact that they feel they received a mandate from the people in the last three Presidential elections. They claim that their majority of votes for their New Deal is the essence of this new democracy, that they have been given a mandate to provide greater "liberalism" in our Government.

On the other hand, how frequently in discussions with shallow thinkers do we hear the statement made that, "The Republicans may have a chance next November if they will be but a little more liberal and a little less reactionary." The Republican Party now, as always, believes in liberalism—liberty for the individual as opposed to liberty of bureaucracy to impose all manner of restrictions on the life and liberty of the individual.

Well, now, if a majority of the votes be a symbol of democracy, can we not justly and by the same logic classify Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy as super-democracies? For in the last two elections held in Germany, Hitler was elected by receiving over 90 percent of the votes, and Mussolini had the backing of over 80 percent of his people. No, in my opinion if 54 to 60 percent of the popular vote received by one party in this country makes this a democracy, then I say we must bow to Europe's two high-powered dictatorships as the arch-democracies of all time.

No, my friends, do not let these ideologists becloud the issue. We are very definitely on the road to the establishment of a national socialistic or Nazi form of government in this country, or we are headed for a fascistic form of government. This week I shall discuss our trends toward a Nazi form of government. Next week I shall discuss our trends toward a Fascist form of government; and I am perfectly frank in telling you that there is little, if any, difference between the two, although the approach is slightly different.

National Socialism, or the German-Nazi form of government, stripped of all fanfare, simply means a system of government that readily enables those who gain control to exploit the entire nation for their particular selfish purposes.

Now what was the program employed in Germany to build up the Hitler regime, and how does it coincide step by step with the program which these long-haired men and short-haired women have skillfully put into effect in our country during the past decade?

First of all, the people must be made to feel that they are utterly incapable of solving their own problems. There must be inculcated a sort of a helpless feeling which can be solved only by some all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure for all of their ills. We must in other words establish some super godfather who knows the answers to all questions. Times of economic distress,

or through the creation of an emergency, furnishes the most fertile field in which such a seed can be sown and fertilized.

Secondly, the people must be told that the principle of local government, government by their local communities and their States is no longer capable of maintaining their economy. Therefore, the rights and duties of the local governments and of the State governments must be subordinated to a Federal Government operating under directives from the man-created god.

Third. Constitutional guaranties, under which we have become the richest and most powerful nation on earth, must be swept aside; which, perhaps, is most easily accomplished by ridiculing these guaranties as outmoded and as obstructions to progress. We must be reminded that the Constitution is a relic of the horse-and-buggy days or again, when a psuedo-patriotic smoke screen can be developed, we are told that the provisions of the Constitution guaranteeing to the States complete control over the powers of election must be suspended, in order that we may conduct a straw-vote type of Presidential and congressional election for our boys in uniform. Oh, how cleverly that scheme was worked out to help foist upon these very brave youngsters of ours the complete establishment of a Nazi government in America.

Fourth, public faith in laws—faith in the sanctity of our courts and our faith in the entire legal profession, those who defend us or seek redress for us before those courts of justice—must be completely destroyed. Remember that one of the basic doctrines in the philosophy of a totalitarian state is that there is no place for the lawyer; there is no place for the champion of the peoples' rights in such a state.

Fifth, the Congress—the duly elected lawmaking body of the people—must be intimidated by smear and slander, and mud throwing, through the activities of pressure groups, and time after time must be rebuked by the Executive in such a manner as to completely prevent the development of public confidence in the law-making body of the Nation, the only body duly elected by the voters of the Nation.

Sixth, economically, the people must be kept well under heel by the medium of high taxes. Thus, through the use of taxation, as a means of the confiscation of wealth, is a program unfolded to bring all classes of people down to a common level of income. Thus is initiative—thus is the spirit of free enterprise which made America great—effectively stifled by these economic planners. Economic independence is kept at a minimum and a citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the Government that controls him. Consequently, the control of capital and credit are thus completely held within the Federal Government itself.

Now, the next—or seventh—step is to build up a great public debt so the citizen can never escape his burdens of taxation and the result of this policy is that the Federal Government in effect becomes a virtual receiver for an entire nation in bankruptcy.

To put across their program, of course, these schemers must create a great distrust in all private enterprise. Private business, private industry, private initiative, private "know how"—without which the good Lord only knows where we would be in this war effort right today, and without the products of which our allies all over the world would be in a demoralizing route—all must be smeared and slandered and criticized by these planners, in order that the people may be intimidated against any attempt to rely on their own resources. Everything must be made subservient to the Federal Government and to the master who sits in the exalted driver's seat.

Instead of private business and initiative, governmental bureaus take over—governmental bureaus by the dozen, by the hundreds, are set up to control practically every phase of each citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number. They are their own lawmaking body; they are their own police force; they are their own prosecutors; they sit in judgment in rendering a decision against violators of their own directives. They constitute a government not of laws, but a government of men. A great number of them have no authority in law or even by the intent of an act of Congress, but instead are set up by, and responsible only to, the all-high Executive of the Federal Government.

And, lastly, in this program to create a Nazi America, must of necessity come a program to control the education of the youth of the Nation; to teach the youth as they grow up to become all subservient to the all-high power seated as the Executive head of this gigantic Federal governmental octopus. This program is now in the making down here in Washington, under a proposal to have the Federal Government appropriate around $300,000,000 a year to assist the States in their educational program. It has been approached in various ways, such as through the medium of a teacher subsidy, and again as through the method of direct subsidies to the schools themselves, working through a central State organization. It has been perfectly easy to build up logical arguments for its adoption. In the first place, due to the Federal Government's having taken over millions of acres of State- and county-owned property and lands, which are thus automatically removed from the tax rolls, the local school systems have become so impoverished as to be unable to meet their running expenses. Then, again, with the competition from high wages in war-production plants and with the effectiveness of the soldier draft, it has been indeed difficult to keep our schools supplied with an adequate teaching staff; hence develops a perfectly logical appeal for a Federal teachers' subsidy. But the inevitable result—when, and if, a Federal-aid program for education is adopted—will be that the Federal Government itself will assume control over the educational system of this country, and will quickly dictate the teaching policies of those educational institutions.

To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing program, so effectively worked out and proven effective in Germany—and which has been step by step imposed upon us in America—is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol and praise all those who bow the knee, intentionally or unintentionally—while at the same time villifying or crucifying all those who dare to raise their voice in protest.

Ladies and gentlemen, National Socialism stands for a leveling process; it stands for a process that makes the lower classes among us think they are getting something for nothing; it keeps the efficient and thrifty people from rising and possibly getting out of hand. And at the same time it enriches the Treasury for the purposes of wasteful spending by the executive leader. I think we want none of this in this country and I think when the American people wake up to themselves and realize, after careful consideration, that this is what we have among us today, they will put an end to it.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I started broadcasting over this station, I was very properly requested by the management, who make these broadcasts possible, to refrain from partisan political discussions. I have steadfastly sought to adhere to that principle which is certainly perfectly logical. This question is not a partisan issue nor a question of partisan politics. It is a patriotic question of where we are heading in America. I feel it my sincere duty to give you my views and to call your attention to my reactions to what has been going on, what is going on, in Washington. To those of you who may feel that I have been indulging in a partisan political discussion here today, may I recommend to you that you read the Reader's Digest issues of last August and September. Much of what I have told you today you will find in an article entitled "America Is Being Made Over, and We Won't Like It" written by the Senior Democratic Senator from Wyoming, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY; and in the September issue, under the title "Don't Blame the Bureaucrat" is an article written by Chairman HATTON W. SUMNERS of the House Judiciary Committee, a Democrat from Texas, who has served 32 years in the House of Representatives.

Wake up America.

Furloughs for Overseas Men and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, when the United States entered the World War, I promptly announced that the responsibility for conducting our war operations, in my opinion, rested upon the trained experts in the Army and the Navy. It has been my policy to support the programs of these Departments of our Government, and I have felt that in doing that I could render the best possible service to the men and women in our armed forces.

It has been my policy to support programs of these departments of our Government, and I have felt that in doing that I could render the best possible service to the men and women in our armed forces. There has been a lot of enthusiasm about a speedy termination of the war, but I think I am correct in saying that progress in that direction has been slow, and sometimes not favorable.

From time to time I get letters from fathers and mothers who have relatives in the armed forces overseas. They ask me why is it not possible to have our armed forces rotated so that those who have served overseas for a certain period of time can be returned to the United States, and replaced by others who have not had overseas service. I feel that these questions are fair and that it would contribute to the morale of our armed forces as well as to that of relatives in this country if some system of furlough could be worked out properly so that men with a certain period of service can be returned to the United States and be replaced by others who have not been overseas.

One of the letters I received last fall stated that the man was inducted in February 1941 and shipped overseas in 1942, and at that time he had been 2 years in foreign service. I have many other letters similar in character, and I believe there is a general feeling among the people throughout the country that the question of furlough should have more active consideration by our Government agencies.

I have no desire to make any unjust criticism, or to hamper in any way the

progress of this global war. I do know however, that when men can be granted a furlough, even in this country, that it contributes to the happiness of their families, and makes them more determined than ever to render effective service in efforts to bring this World War to a prompt conclusion.

The House of Representatives is the only elective body where the voters and constituents of a Member of Congress can have a voice and be heard. I call attention to this furlough problem, for that reason, to the Members of Congress, because I think it is important for many reasons.

I hope that the proper committees in Congress will give consideration to these suggestions, and I know that I speak the sentiments of the people of my district in these brief remarks.

Address of Speaker Sam Rayburn at Jackson Day Banquet, San Francisco, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, Speaker of the National House of Representatives, at the Jackson Day dinner in San Francisco, Calif., March 30, 1944:

When a man goes west across the country, for every 900 miles on the average, he has to set his watch back an hour. But when he gets to the Pacific coast he has to set his mind ahead a generation.

That is how I feel when I come among you, out here where tomorrow is always more important than yesterday; where the traveler, if he has eyes that see and ears that hear and a soul that responds to his fellowman, always catches the contagion of looking ahead, always has a feeling that he has reached the gateway to a new world.

I think I remember hearing once or twice in my life, perhaps, some few brief references to your climate. Of course, that is a topic that you Californians never discuss with strangers.

Well, that may be. But the thing that exhilarates me here is not your climate. It is your people. It is the sense I get from them of being in a young country with a forward-looking viewpoint, where folks pride themselves less on what their ancestors did than on what their children are going to do.

Well, you and I know that California and Texas are doing their full share now, today, to make that future certain. Now, with just a little more of that same cooperation from the District of Columbia, a few more men in Washington from the far West, with that same western streak in the blood, we might speed up the solution of many problems.

Let no man tell you that those problems are going to come to an end with military victory. The days that lie beyond the armistice, beyond the peace treaty, loom before us even now as days of crisis.

To meet that time of crisis, our country will need men who have bred into them the habit of looking forward, with chins up; men who have in their very veins the lifeblood of a new world.

I think our country is going to need men of that kind, and need them more in those days that lie just ahead than she has ever needed them since the time when our forefathers gave the world their courageous design of a new way of life.

So I am in dead earnest when I tell you that it would be a wholesome thing for the Nati n if more men of California and your neighbor States on the west coast were taken into the high councils of government in Washington. And in coming here to speak to you, it is part of my purpose to pass on to you this belief and more than belief, this intention.

There are some other intentions we have, that I think I should tell you about now. One of them is our intention, war or postwar, to keep our country safe, and especially to keep this particular part of it safe.

Nobody has to come and stand here before a meeting of Californians and warn them of the dark designs of those forces that we are now attacking out there on the Pacific. Long ago, you told us about the Japs. I am not going to tell you about them. I am going to talk about us.

The men in Congress refused to fortify the island of Guam. Where is Guam today? For what it was worth, those men had the satisfaction of overruling the aims and purposes of the administration.

Well, Guam is a spot on the Pacific. There are scores of dots in that vast expanse of water just like it. Now, with the passing months, above those dots—more and more of them—the American flag is flying.

In the world of tomorrow, with its new tools of war as well as peace, many of those islands will take on new strategic importance. They will be as vital as Guam once was. And the day will come when it will be up to us, not the Japs, to decide what shall be done with them.

We Americans don't need what Adolf Hitler calls living space. We don't want those islands for the sake of relieving the housing shortage in Richmond.

But we Americans do need to know, now and for all time, that there will never be another Pearl Harbor. We need to know, now and for all time, that there will never be another march of death like the one that took place at Bataan.

We need to know that never in the future can the island outposts of the Pacific Ocean be put to the treacherous uses of the Jap. They can send their emissaries to this country and they can smile and scrape and bow till kingdom come; we will be the ones to say what will be done with those islands in the future.

From now on, let us look at that smile of theirs over the barrel of our heaviest artillery. Let us turn our backs to only one kind of Jap—the dead kind.

There may be some who will say that this is empire. What I say is that when any Jap war lord knocks a foul ball our way, we want to be the umpire.

It must be our intention to safeguard our national security in the Pacific Ocean after this war in any manner and by any means that may be necessary. We know now that treaties and agreements, presuming a sense of honor in both parties, do not accomplish this in the case of the Japanese because the Japanese are not an honorable people.

They have interpreters to translate words of honor into their language but they have no interpreters who can bring the meaning of honor into their understanding and their hearts.

But there is one language that they can understand. Our battleships, our planes of war, our tanks, our fighting men, speak that language. Our 16-inch naval guns speak it fluently. So do our block busters and our torpedoes. And with this kind of language, we want to be ready at any time, now and forever, to talk to the Japanese in case they don't get what we mean.

For this reason, when the war is over, our great fleet is going to remain intact. We are not going to sit down with any representative of Tokyo and figure out ratios on paper and then sink our battleships to fit the details of a scrap-of-paper peace.

This time the only battleships that are going to be scrapped are those that fly the Rising Sun.

For our part, we can scrap any illusions that we may have had about dealing man-to-man with a Jap. We can scrap any dangerous notions of pacificism on the Pacific Ocean. We can scrap a lot of our old thinking and our old methods. If we want to get rid of something when this war is over, let's get rid of our red tape, of the endless controls over persons and business that this war has made necessary, and of old ideas that our trade with the world should be all take and no give.

But again, in order that the Japs will not misunderstand us owing to differences in language or to any other differences, when we say no more treachery, no more Pearl Harbors, we are not getting rid of our submarines, our airplane carriers. Our bombers and fighters and patrol planes are going to be ready for business at any time. When we end this war, it will be with the Jap in surrender at gun point; and after the war, we the people and the armed forces of America, are going to keep him covered.

And may I say now that with the heroism and courage that can spring only from confidence in a hopeful future for her people, our ally, China, continues—steadfast as ever—in its determination to fight until not one inch of her proud land any longer bears the imprint of the Japanese imperial sword.

For nearly 7 years China's fighting men and women and, yes, children, have marched against the Japanese in the soil that is drenched with the blood of China's brave dead.

In the realm of facts, had we not been witnesses in the war that China has waged against Japan, it might be nearly impossible to believe that a country whose only preparation for war was a deep desire for peace could for these many years hold off an aggressor whose long and careful preparation for war made her indeed a dreaded foe.

At no point did China underestimate the strength of her formidable enemy. At no time did she feel that victory would be early or easy, but she preferred death to compromise.

We are very proud of the 160 years of unbroken friendship that has existed between this country and China. The bond of understanding will be even stronger through our having fought side by side, sacrificing for each other in the common cause of free people.

Now, this problem of the post-war military, as much as any other post-war consideration, is going to take some good, hard thinking and planning. And one of my purposes in coming here to speak to you is to assure you people on the coast that the Congress is already at work on it.

As I see it, there ought to be a unit of the Congress exclusively devoted to that one job. In matters as vital as this to our national security, we must allow no possibility of a lag. As soon as hostilities end, alert peacetime policing of the Pacific Ocean begins. And the time to get ready for that is today.

Also, as I see it, in any such group of the Congress, the west coast should be given a direct, substantial representation.

Only recently I appointed a committee of 18 men to study post-war planning. We must get ready to do the great job of peace as our soldiers are doing the terrible work of war. I asked the members of this committee to consult with those in Government, in industry, in labor, and in agriculture in order that the best and soundest ideas may be put into our recommendations to the Congress. I appointed a Californian as a member of this 18-man committee, the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS.

We must have a military policy in the United States after this emergency is over. On Tuesday of this week I appointed a committee of 23 members to study post-war military policy. Almost 20 percent of that number, or 4, are from the 3 west coast States. Two of them, JOHN COSTELLO and HARRY SHEPPARD, are from the State of California. I do not know what all of our post-war military policy will be, but some of it I do know, and may I repeat that we are not going to destroy all of our munitions factories, we are not going to tear down our airplane plants, we are not going to sink our Navy.

Once we have tackled and licked that great post-war "must" job of making and keeping the Pacific Ocean safe, the West, your territory, will have its big chance to come into its own.

We hope, and we are determined, that prosperity will go hand in hand with peace throughout this country. But from what I have already seen here in California, I would venture to say now that your State and your neighbor States on the coast, together with my own State of Texas, will do the leading of the way.

Foreign trade depends on foreign policy. With a wise foreign policy, the commerce of that newly awakened world of tomorrow will be brought to the Golden Gate in volume such as may be hard at this time to imagine.

For, remember, out there beyond those blue horizons to the west of you, when peace comes there will be a new world a-building. A vast world, embracing vast peoples who have been backward through the centuries but will be backward no longer.

Where you find progress, there you find trade. Nowhere else in the world is there such room for progress, nowhere will there be such demand for it, as we shall one day witness beyond those great wastes of water to the westward. And as that world builds, your State and your city will be channels of the trade that measures this growth of a new world.

In the focal points of any newly developed flow of commerce, in order to keep the ships sailing, the planes flying, there is other work—work to be done in offices and factories and shipyards, work on the docks and over the railways.

In your bay area here you have these facilities. They are in high gear now, working for war. They should not be let down when the time comes to work in peace.

Here, as in the field of the military, there should be no lag, and there need be none. But to prevent it, to keep the wheels turning and the people employed, real foresight real statesmanship, positive leadership, will be required.

That is going to be a stiff test of what we Americans and our future leaders are made of. And that is another reason why I think your territory and your people should have fuller representation in the Federal Government.

You have an example, in northern California, of what that kind of leadership can do, of what it has been doing in the past dozen years. That example is Shasta Dam and the whole Central Valley project.

Shasta Dam is helping America today to meet the tremendously increased need of light metal production for war. It will help America tomorrow to meet other needs, needs that will be just as critical in time of peace.

In the whole Central Valley project, the investment of $300,000,000 which the Federal Government has made will be returned to the American people manyfold through the years.

Certainly it widens the horizons of the people of California. The supply of low-cost water for new lands and for supplementing what is now available to your farms will stabilize the agriculture of your rich valleys. Low-cost power will put industry that is now used for war into the new uses of peace. You will be able to find a workable balance between farm and factory. And that is where we want to see your working people—on the farm, in the factory—not on relief.

For the boys who come home from the war, no medals, no parades, will express the gratitude of America for what they have done as much as the chance at a job. For those who deserve bonuses we shall provide bonuses. But no dollar bonus within the gift of this rich Nation can equal, in their eyes, the great moral bonus of security, of steady employment, and the right to work. If that right can be granted them anywhere in America, it can be granted them here.

Problems of Men and Women in the Armed Forces and Their Dependents—Information of Interest to Returned Service Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in these remarks I want to discuss some of the legislation that is of interest to men and women in the armed forces and to their dependents; also I want to call attention to legislation that has been passed which is very important to those who have been discharged on account of service in World War No. 2.

Preliminary to this discussion, however, I want to discuss the provisions of the law which entitles men and women in our armed forces to a vote in the coming elections. Public Law 277, Seventy-eighth Congress, which provides for such a ballot, became a law some time ago without the approval of the President. This legislation was designated in the newspapers as a compromise and I supported it. Prior to its enactment there was legislation known as the bobtailed ballot, which consists of a blank piece of paper and provided that men and women in the armed forces could write in their choice for President, United States Senator, and Member of the House of Representatives. There was no provision in the bill granting men and women in the armed forces the right to vote for State and county officials. Public Law 277 gives men and women in the armed forces that privilege. It is true that some high-pressure groups in the district have criticized me for not voting for the bobtailed ballot. I am satisfied that when people know the facts that they will be glad that I supported legislation which is at least constitutional and which permits our armed forces to vote for State and county officials as well as Federal officials.

The War Department under date of April 3, 1944, issued Circular No. 128 giving in detail the procedure to be followed in voting by members of our armed forces. Of course, the Minnesota Legislature has passed a law which will facilitate the voting of every man and woman in the service of their country if they so desire. I take this occasion to suggest to relatives of every man and woman in the Army, Navy, or Air Forces to contact the county auditor of the county in which such person has legal residence and see to it that the county auditor is requested to have a ballot sent to the person in service. Under the Federal statute, Public Law 277, and under the law enacted by the State legislature there is absolutely no reason why every member of the armed forces cannot vote if they so desire. Any statements to the contrary are false and circulated purely for political and propaganda reasons.

LEGISLATION AFFECTING MEN AND WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Congress has passed many laws which are to the advantage of those in the service of their country. I do not here enumerate all of them and I would suggest that interested parties confer with local veterans' service organizations because they have the necessary information and can advise fully as to rights and procedure. If there are any further questions, my office will be glad to have a letter from you and will render all possible assistance in connection with these cases. If Congress should not be in session, my congressional office in Washington will be open and in charge of competent and efficient secretarial help and any communication addressed to me at room 244, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., will receive prompt and courteous attention.

During the summer I may be back in the district, but it will expedite matters if letters are addressed to me direct to Washington.

A great many people are not familiar with the rights and benefits under the various laws enacted by Congress, and I would again repeat that it is important that they confer with the service officers of the various veterans' organizations throughout the district.

I now discuss legislation in which you are particularly interested.

BENEFITS PROVIDED BY LAW FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2 AND THEIR DEPENDENTS WHILE IN THE ACTIVE MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE

Active service in the Army or Navy during the present war includes active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and the personnel is composed of regular officers and enlisted men, members of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, female reservists, National Guard men called into active service, volunteers and selectees and persons appointed to the armed forces from civilian life. The Women's Army Corps, the

Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard are included among those in the active military and naval service. The Office of War Information, in its release of April 6, 1944, announced that the Army of the United States has reached its planned strength of 7,700,000 officer and enlisted personnel, but will require 75,000 to 100,000 men a month throughout the remainder of 1944 to maintain that strength. The Navy Department has estimated that it would reach a strength of 3,500,000, including the Marine Corps and Coast Guard personnel, by July 1, 1944, and that approximately 300,000 men will be needed to reach that net strength and at the same time provide necessary replacements. An additional 100,000 men will be added to the net strength of the Navy between July 1 and September 1, 1944.

ACTIVE SERVICE PAY

The Pay Readjustment Act, 1942, as amended, increased the pay of privates from $21 to $50 per month with proportionate increases for noncommissioned officers to $138 per month for master sergeant or chief petty officer, first grade. Longevity pay was improved by adding 5 percent to the base pay for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. A 20-percent increase is provided for enlisted men and 10 percent for officers on sea duty or in any place beyond the continental United States or in Alaska. Active flying duty increases base pay by 50 percent and active parachutist's duty increases the base pay by $100 per month for officers and $50 per month for enlisted men. Similar liberal increase is provided for submarine and diving duty. The Pay Readjustment Act, 1942, as amended, also provided entitlement for retired personnel to adjustment of retired pay.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended October 26, 1943, provides family allowances for dependents of any enlisted person, male or female. A rate of $50 per month is provided for a wife where there is no child; $80 per month if there is a wife and one child, with $20 for each additional child; a rate of $42 per month if the enlisted man has no wife but one child, with $20 for each additional child; a rate of $50 is provided if the enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support, but no dependent brother or sister; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him, with an additional $11 for each dependent brother or sister; a rate of $68 per month is provided if the enlisted man has two dependent parents but no dependent brother or sister, with $11 additional for each dependent brother or sister. A rate of $42 per month is provided if the enlisted man has no dependent parent but has a dependent brother or sister, with $11 for each additional dependent brother or sister. The monthly pay of the enlisted man is reduced by or charged with the amount of $22 per month for any month in which an allowance is paid with an additional $5 if the dependents include more than one class of dependents.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, provides for a temporary suspension during the war and for 6 months thereafter of legal proceedings and transactions which may impair the civilian rights of persons in the active service. These rights involve rent, installment contracts, mortgages, insurance, taxes, homestead rights, and so forth. The primary purpose of this act is to relieve members in the military service from worry over their inability to settle their civilian liabilities by reason of reduced income because of military service. It does not relieve a soldier from the obligation but provides a means of relief. The courts are given jurisdiction to stay the enforcement of certain obligations. In title IV of this act, which is administered by the Veterans' Administration, any person in active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of the law, upon application to the Veterans' Administration upon a form supplied by the Army and Navy may secure guaranty of premiums on the amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000 while he is in the service during the present war. The premiums guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien and must be paid by the company out of any settlement. In the event of the discharge of the insured, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed, otherwise the indebtedness constitutes a lien upon the policy with interest. As of March 31, 1944, 72,204 applications, with insurance totaling approximately $178,000,000 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Members of the active military and naval service may at any time while in such service file application for national service life insurance, which is administered by the Veterans' Administration. If the service person applies within 120 days after enlistment or enrollment no medical examination is required, otherwise satisfactory evidence of good health must be furnished. Insurance in the amount of $10,000 with premiums paid by the Government is available for aviation cadets of the Army Air Corps; enlisted men detailed to schools as aviation students, participating frequently in aerial flights; cadets at the Military Academy while undergoing flight training; enlisted naval and Marine Corps Reserves or cadets undergoing training as aviation pilots; and aviation cadets of the Navy or Marine Corps are included within this protection. Upon being commissioned or released from flight duty they must pay premiums on the insurance.

This insurance is against death and includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing more than 6 months and commencing prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy and is payable to specified classes: Widow, widower; child, including stepchild or illegitimate child if designated as beneficiary by the insured; parent, including person in loco parentis; brother and sister of the insured; and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary at any time. If the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted into an ordinary life policy, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration, without examination. As of March 30, 1944, over 14,000,000 applications had been received representing a total of over $105,000,000,000 of insurance. The average policy is approximately $7,382.69; the average coverage per life is $8,926.74. In the event of the death of the insured the policy is payable as an annuity in 240 monthly equal installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary under 30 years of age at the time of death of the insured; otherwise it is payable in continuous monthly installments throughout the life of the beneficiary with a guaranty of a payment of 120 monthly installments. Under the latter method of payment, the amount of the monthly installment is dependent upon age of the beneficiary. For example, if the beneficiary is 40 years old, the monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50 years of age, $5.39 per each $1,000; if 60 years of age, $6.81 per each $1,000; or if 70 years of age, $8.51 per $1,000. Taking those particular ages and a policy for $10,000, the monthly installment would be $45 if the beneficiary is 40 years old; $53.90 if the beneficiary is 50 years; $68.10 if the beneficiary is 60; and $85.10 if the beneficiary is 70. Claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but the necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

GRATUITOUS INSURANCE

Any person in the active service on and after October 8, 1940, who, while in the service, and before April 20, 1942, died in line of duty without having in force at the time of death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, as amended, or the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, in an aggregate amount of at least $5,000 is deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance in the amount of $5,000. This gratuitous insurance is payable to the widow or widower; or if no widow or widower, to the child or children; or if no widow or widower or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living. Provision is also made for gratuitous insurance to those who within such period suffered line of duty total disability for 6 months or more without having in force an aggregate amount of $5,000 insurance under the acts aforementioned. The law also provides for gratuitous insurance to those who, prior to April 20, 1942, were captured, besieged, or otherwise isolated by the forces of any enemy of the United States for a period of at least 30 consecutive days and extending beyond April 19, 1942.

DEATH GRATUITY

A death gratuity equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received by the veteran at the time of his death in line of duty is payable by the War and Navy Departments. Provisions for payment of this gratuity are administered by the Service Department having jurisdiction of the person in the armed forces, and the benefit is payable to persons within a certain class. Application for the 6 months' death gratuity should be submitted to the Chief of Finance, War Department, Washington, D. C., if the person served in the Army; Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., if the person served in the Navy; Commandant, United States Marine Corps, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., if the person served in the Marine Corps, and to the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Washington, D. C., in the cases of members of the Coast Guard.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

With certain exceptions set forth in the act of February 3, 1944, members of the armed forces discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941, may receive mustering-out pay. The rate is $100 if there was service of less than 60 days; if the person served more than 60 days in the continental United States, the rate is $200, payable at the rate of $100 upon discharge and $100 1 month later; if the person served more than 60 days and served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, the amount is $300, payable at the rate of $100 upon leaving service, $100 1 month later, and $100 2 months later. This pay is in addition to whatever regular pay and allowances to which the person may be entitled. Persons entitled to base pay of over $200 per month or who are retired with pay, or who were discharged at their own request to take a job, or who served only as a student in the Army educational program are not included for mustering-out pay. If the person served overseas, however, he would be entitled to mustering-out pay, even though discharged at his own request. Mustering-out pay is exempt from taxation and is not subject to the claims of creditors.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Extensive programs of in-service education, including the retention in service of persons whose disabilities do not disqualify them completely for active service for readjustment into proper activities in the armed forces have qualified and will qualify thousands of persons for lucrative employment after the war and in a great many instances it has been possible for persons to supplement their education while in the active service so that in many instances the handicap from an educational standpoint has been materially reduced.

REEMPLOYMENT

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, preserves employment rights of persons entering the military and naval training forces, who occupied permanent positions at the time of entering service. These provisions are administered through the Employment Division of Selective Service. These provisions apply both to Government employment and private employment to insure restoration of the veteran to the former or similar position upon his discharge or release from the armed forces. It is necessary to apply for reemployment within 40 days after discharge.

The United States Employment Service, Veterans' Placement Service, with local agents, are ready to assist veterans in getting a job.

HOSPITALIZATION

Members of the armed forces are provided with all necessary medical care and hospital treatment and their rights upon discharge as veterans of World War No. 2 will be stated later.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

These benefits are administered through the Federal Security Agency and the operation of State plans. Practically all of the States have enacted legislation protecting the unemployment insurance credits of persons in the armed forces and legislation is pending to make certain that all necessary protection is afforded the insured workers who are in the service and to liberalize in any other manner which may be justified the laws governing these benefits.

RETIREMENT PAY

In addition to the regular retirement of officers and enlisted men of the armed forces, Reserve officers and officers appointed to the Army of the United States from civilian life and enlisted men with 20 years or more of service may be retired for disability incurred in service in line of duty and in such event they are entitled to three-fourths of their base pay which is paid by the Veterans' Administration upon certification of eligibility by the War Department.

BENEFITS ADMINISTERED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AND PERTAINING TO WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration administers pensions to disabled World War No. 2 veterans, their dependents, national service life insurance, hospitalization and domiciliary care, and vocational rehabilitation for the service disabled as well as some other benefits which I will not enter into at this time.

The Veterans' Administration has 94 facilities throughout the country. To give you an idea of what has already taken place in connection with benefits to veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents, I will give you a few figures. From December 1941 to January 31, 1944, there had been paid to World War No. 2 veterans for service-connected disabilities over twelve and one-half million dollars and in addition approximately $700,000 in retired pay administered by the Veterans' Administration. There had also been paid approximately eleven and one-half million dollars in pension to dependents of deceased veterans of World War No. 2, making a total expenditure of approximately $25,000,000. You will understand that this is an accumulated figure and the expenditures are of a continuing nature and are increasing steadily. Between December 1941 and January 31, 1944, the Veterans' Administration had paid national service life insurance cash benefits for death in the amount of approximately $20,000,000. Over the same period the cost of hospitalization and domiciliary care, World War No. 2 veterans, was over $9,000,000. Through February 29, 1944, there had been approximately 52,500 admissions of World War No. 2 veterans for hospitalization or domiciliary care. The number remaining under such care at the end of February 1944 was 11,622.

PENSIONS

Pensions are payable for disability or death incurred in or due to active military service in line of duty and not the result of the person's own misconduct. Disability pension is payable to any person honorably discharged depending upon the degree of disablement, ranging from 10 to 100 percent with payments from $10 to $100 per month. For specific losses, as the loss of a hand or foot, blindness, and so forth, additional amounts are payable, the highest rate being $250 per month. Death pension is payable where the World War No. 2 veteran died as the result of service-incurred disability. The rates of pension are: Widow, with no child, $50; widow, with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38, with $10 for each additiona' child; dependent mother or father, $45, or both, $25 each. As to the widow and children, the total amount cannot exceed more than $100 per month.

REHABILITATION (HOSPITALIZATION, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING)

The first step of rehabilitation is that of physical and mental repair for the service disabled. Medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, and domiciliary care are available to any veteran of the present war honorably discharged for a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably discharged, and also one not dishonorably discharged who is unable to defray his own expenses, is entitled if he has tuberculosis or neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care. Any veteran of the present war, not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor, is entitled to hospitalization or domiciliary care, notwithstanding the disability, disease, or defect is not shown to be due to service. This latter benefit is contingent of availability of facilities. It might be stated at this point that in the 94 facilities of the Veterans' Administration, as of March 23, 1944, there was a total of 92,019 beds. The Veterans' Administration also has 7 diagnostic centers. The present building program will raise the total beds to 100,000. The Veterans' Administration anticipates and expects an eventual need of 300,000 beds to enable veterans of World War No. 2 and of prior wars to re-

ceive hospital and domiciliary care to the extent now provided. However, this is an estimated maximum and should not be needed until long after the war or require eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities, and it is anticipated that it will be possible to obtain another 100,000 beds from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

Vocational rehabilitation of the World War No. 2 disabled is provided by the act of March 24, 1943. It covers the veterans of the present war, honorably discharged, and who have a disability incurred or connected with such service which is pensionable or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay and who are in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of the disability. This benefit is administered by the Veterans' Administration through the Director of Vocational Rehabilitation in central office and the planning and control functions are performed there. The operations, which include the determination of the need of training, vocational advisement, induction to training, supervision, and selection of training facilities, are handled by the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in the facility of the Veterans' Administration in the territory where the veteran resides. There are 53 such facilities. The veteran while in training, unless his pension equals such amounts, is entitled to $80 per month if single; $90 per month if married, with $5 additional for each child and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required. Persons honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

TAXATION

Payments under any of the laws relating to veterans are exempt from taxation, exempt from claims of creditors, and are not liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by legal or equitable process. The exemption does not apply to certain claims of the United States arising out of such benefits or to property purchased in part or wholly out of such payments.

PENDING LEGISLATION

There are numerous bills pending in the present Congress proposing to grant additional benefits to veterans and their dependents and which would, if enacted, be applicable to persons who served in the present war. Exclusive of the bills to liberalize pensions and to change the existing law pertaining to national service life insurance, the major proposals are those which would grant aid to World War No. 2 veterans in securing employment; provide reasonable allowances as a protection against unemployment; afford educational and training opportunities without the requirement of a service-connected disability producing a handicap, and centralize in one agency, namely, the Veterans' Administration, the services to veterans without physical transfer thereto of other established agencies or any part thereof. There are other bills pending which would provide adjusted-service pay, particularly in the form of bonds, which could be used by the veterans to meet their needs. The purpose of this statement is to indicate the consideration now being given by the Congress to additional aid to World War No. 2 veterans without entering into the specific bills and their progress.

Not the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt said that one of the objectives of this war where hundreds of thousands of Americans will be required to die, was to carry the "four freedoms" to the uttermost parts of the world in our time.

The death of a million or more Americans, which Rickenbacker predicted, cannot be justified on any ground other than that the war is necessary for self-preservation.

As the casualty lists grow and as community after community throughout this land of ours is notified that some of those who used to be met day after day on the streets have been wounded, killed, or are missing in action, the frightfulness of the war becomes more apparent.

The administration day after day calls for additional young men, who, it says, are necessary to carry on the fighting. But here at home the President, through his administrative agencies, denies to thousands of our people at least one of the "four freedoms"—freedom from want, unless they submit to the unjustifiable, unconstitutional demands of his political allies.

The press once again carries notice of picket lines, which, in mass formation, attempt to prevent, attempt to deny to, American citizens their God given, their constitutional, right to work to earn the wages which will keep them from want; which will supply them and the members of their families, their dependents, with food, shelter, and clothing.

While our armed forces are fighting abroad to open the way, so that people may be free, so that they may work to avoid want, this administration permits massed picket lines to interfere with American citizens who are on their way to their jobs in the plants of Montgomery Ward & Co.

Congress gave the War Labor Board authority to settle labor disputes by issuing orders, provided those orders were fair and reasonable and did not conflict with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

The National Labor Relations Act permits, but it does not require, employers to enter into a closed-shop contract with any union. Nevertheless, the National War Labor Board, according to the testimony of its Chairman, William Davis—and I heard that testimony—has required employers and unions to enter into contracts containing a so-called security-of-membership clause.

Under that clause, if a man belongs to a union which has a contract with an employer and does not withdraw from the union within a specified time, he must thereafter remain a member of the union, pay all dues and assessments levied by that union. The practical effect, regardless of the legal terminology used, is to establish in many instances a closed shop.

The Chairman of the Board admits that such an order was issued against Ward, but it also admits that it has no legal authority to enforce that order; that the only remedy is to notify the President of the situation and that he then can take over the plant.

And, if the usual course is followed, the President will take over the plant and his representative will then employ only union men, who will be required to pay all union dues and assessments and, in some instances, undoubtedly the dollar which will go into a political fund, a part of which will be used to reelect the President.

According to reliable authority, Congress never gave the President or any administrative agency any authority over any industry or business which was not engaged in war production.

Montgomery Ward & Co. is not engaged either in war production or in war activity. It is carrying on a civilian mercantile business. Nevertheless the W. L. B. has issued an order which would ultimately, if the usual procedure is followed, compel the employees of that organization to join a C. I. O. union, pay dues, and assessments.

Some of the C. I. O. affiliates are levying an assessment of $1 each against their members, the dollar to go into a political fund, a part of which is to be used in support of the administration and New Deal candidates for Congress.

Employees, in order to hold their jobs, will in some instances be forced to contribute to a campaign fund to be used to elect candidates whom they oppose.

To get the dollar, the employee must work. Analyzed, the procedure of the Board forces an American citizen to spend at least a part of his time in involuntary servitude to earn the dollar which the C. I. O. political action committee intends to use, and will use, in opposition to the employee's political views.

Is it not logical to argue that inasmuch as the administration and the War Labor Board force employees to join a C. I. O. affiliate, which in turn forces them to work to earn the dollar which goes into the campaign fund of the C. I. O.'s Committee for Political Action, which in turn supports the President for a fourth term and supports those candidates who agree to go along with the President's program,

the Administration is practicing involuntary servitude?

But get this: Last Monday, the United States Supreme Court, a majority of whom were appointed by President Roosevelt, held that a Florida statute, which made subject to fine and imprisonment a man who obtained money by falsely representing that he would work to earn it, was unconstitutional and void; that the enforcement of such a statute amounted to involuntary servitude.

But is not the man who, in order to earn a livelihood, who in order to hold his job must pay an assessment of $1 levied by a union to promote a political campaign, also subjected to involuntary servitude?

If he would eat, unless he steals, is wealthy, or is an object of charity, he must work. If he would work, he must join the union; and, if he belongs to the union and would remain in good standing and so hold his job, he must pay the dollar to support a candidate against whom he may intend to vote.

The inconsistency of such a situation is apparent to everyone. Boiled down, this phase of the administration's labor policy means that it is trading, through administrative order and directive, special privileges to C. I. O. unions in return for political support for the fourth term.

If the foregoing is not an accurate statement of the situation, if the conclusion is not logical, let some member of the majority side give us the answer from the floor of the House.

War Damage Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following announcement by the Secretary of Commerce:

Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, announced today that in consideration of premiums heretofore collected, War Damage Corporation will extend automatically for a period of 12 months from their respective expiration dates all war-damage policies duly in force March 31, 1944, without any additional premium or other charge. No action is required of the insured or the policyholder to keep the insurance in force for this extended period.

New and additional insurance that may be written effective on and after April 1, 1944, will be at the presently established rates and premiums.

This action is being taken with the approval of the President and also with the unanimous approval of representatives of the insurance companies participating in the program.

War Damage Corporation, created by R. F. C. pursuant to section 5d of the R. F. C. Act, as amended, began business July 1, 1942, and established uniform rates by classes throughout the country. By operating through the insurance industry, War Damage Corporation has been conducted on an economical basis, and great credit is due the insurance industry for its cooperation and assistance. 546 fire and 88 casualty-insurance companies have participated, taking an aggregate of 10 percent of the risks and being entitled to 10 percent of any profits. The fire-insurance companies have a maximum liability of $20,000,000 and the casualty companies $5,000,000, with maximum possible profits of like amounts. Any company that does not wish to continue in the underwriting will be relieved by War Damage Corporation, the company withdrawing to be relieved of any possible losses and not to share in any possible profits. It is hoped that all companies now in the program will continue their participation.

Up to December 31, 1943, premiums collected amounted to approximately $218,000,000 after payment of all expenses, which have been unusually light.

Claims for losses totaling $72,899.74 are in process of adjustment. In addition, approximately 300 claims arising out of the explosion of the destroyer *Turner* in New York Harbor on January 3, 1944, have been presented and are being investigated.

United States Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, it was with misgiving and dismay that I recently learned a board of naval officers had visited the United States Naval Home in Philadelphia and made a detailed inspection of the entire installation with a view to determining the further usefulness of the institution.

The Appropriations Committee has eliminated the sum of $39,900 from the home's appropriation, which it seems would have been used for repairs and rehabilitation. This action indicates that the Navy Department is seriously considering turning the Naval Home to other purposes and transferring those who live there to some other facility.

The Naval Home is a safe harbor today for over 250 retired and disabled officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps. All of these veterans saw honorable service at sea and many of them are survivors of battles in the Spanish-American War and World War No. 1.

The Naval Home has a long and glorious history. In 1811 Congress granted authority for its construction and for 111 years it has harbored naval veterans. The Naval Academy was originally established in the home in 1839 when 11 midshipmen were ordered there for instruction, and it was not until 6 years later that the naval school was transferred to Annapolis.

Today it is a real home for many naval heroes and is the last word in comfort for the sick, the lame, and the halt who in the years that have fled rendered great service to their country.

No investigation is necessary to determine its usefulness. It has been a snug home for more than a century as the Navy Department well knows without any inspection, and I propose to do all in my power to see to it that these veterans of other wars do not lose their home. Any action on the part of the Navy to take over the institution for other purposes would be the heighth of folly. But more than that it would be notice to the heroes of today that they, too, may be forgotten in the years to come.

The United States Naval Home must not be disturbed and I call upon all those who are interested in those heroes of yesterday to join with me in the fight today.

Inexcusable Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some waste, some confusion is connected with the operation of every business. The bigger the business, the greater the opportunity for mistakes which create unjust discrimination.

The administration in peacetime carries on what is probably the greatest single business enterprise in the world. With a million or more employees added to the Federal pay rolls, with Government activities increased to an almost incredible extent, with some 10,000,000 men and women in the armed forces, mistakes which work hardship are unavoidable.

Many a businessman has seen his means of livelihood destroyed by a Government order. Many a farmer has found it almost impossible to till the soil, produce the food which normally came from his land. Some workers in mill, mine, or factory and certainly many white-collar workers have found it almost impossible to meet the increased cost of living, pay increased taxes, buy War bonds, and create a fund for old-age security.

All those things are hardships which grow out of an inefficient administration which refuses to acknowledge the existence of the law of supply and demand, which refuses to admit that it cannot control the weather, the growing seasons, or the frailties of human nature.

But some hardships can be cured by the ousting of the New Deal next November. The substitution of practical men in the places of dreamers and theorists will give some relief. Some of the mistakes, some of the waste, some of the suffering, which our people have been enduring cannot be eliminated; much of it can in the manner just suggested.

But over and beyond those hardships to which reference has just been made, there have been hardships, loss of business, loss of opportunity, and acute men-

tal and physical suffering for which there is no excuse.

THE DRAFT CONFUSION

April 13, speaking in the Senate, Senator TAFT clearly and concisely stated the evil, placed the responsibility, when he said:

The time has come to quit playing fast and loose with the existence of American men and their families. It is utterly ridiculous at this stage of the war to have married men telling their families good-bye, giving up their jobs, and selling their businesses, only to be told the next day it was all a mistake and they will not be needed; that they can go back home and pick up the scattered threads of their lives—but not securely, for they might be called again on a moment's notice.

President Roosevelt has authority to promulgate and enforce draft regulations. He is directly responsible for much of the unnecessary loss and suffering which those subject to draft have been required to undergo because of conflicting draft policies.

Manpower Director McNutt, Draft Director Hershey, Secretary of War Stimson, Interior Secretary Ickes, and General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, administer draft legislation. They are all under the President's control. They issue conflicting orders and on occasion one or the other issues orders which are later overruled by the President himself. Local draft boards know not where to turn and draftees and their families are suffering cruelly, unnecessarily, from the conflicting regulations.

The President refuses in the first instance to himself exercise complete authority over the induction of men. Then when some of those authorized to issue orders do so, he or some subordinate changes or overrules those orders. He has refused to adopt a clear, definite policy covering the conscription of men.

Those subject to draft and their dependents have a right to know what to expect.

The administration's handling of the drafting of men is clear proof, if any were needed, that this administration is not competent to successfully, efficiently, and with the least cost in material and life, carry on this war.

The incompetent should be ousted at the coming election, and men with a record of success, with experience, should be placed in charge of the civilian machinery upon which the success of our armed force depends.

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack at Bataan Day Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the majority leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, at the Bataan Day exercises held on Boston Common April 9, 1944:

We gather here in solemn tribute to the heroes of Bataan. On this day when the alleluiahs for a risen Christ triumphant over sin and death resound throughout America, we pause in memory of those valiant men and women who, in heroic battle, fought the enemy of mankind until their weapons fell from hands too tired to carry on to victory the fight their spirit so devoutly desired consummated. With courage high and heart heavy those men—the bravest of the brave gave way before the foe—not in ultimate defeat but in anguished despair that our beloved Stars and Stripes could not continue in glorious permanence, over the land for which America gave of its fortune and its blood. Men of Bataan, your bravery and sacrifice in the cause of free mankind relighted the path for us who, as true Americans today, give promise that your cross shall not have been borne in vain.

We all know the story of the epic of Bataan. When the siege of Bataan began, General MacArthur had in his command approximately 7,000 American combatant troops, 8,000 Filipino Scouts, and 55,000 Filipino Reserves. This small army was without important air and naval protection. Heroically they battled against a force of yellow zealots far superior in number, seasoned by training, well equipped for battle. The Japanese were supported by bomb divers and naval guns, with lines of communications intact, reinforcements constantly available, supplies and ammunition at instant command. Despite these overwhelming odds our men fought until exhausted from hunger, sick from disease, and until their ammunition had been exhausted.

Beleaguered American soldiers held their ground against repeated and sustained attack, meeting assault upon assault without rest or replacements, tired to exhaustion in a situation greviously aggravated by lack of sustenance, medical aid, and munitions. At their outpost they were surrounded and cut off from our aid by an enemy superior on the sea, in the air, and on the land. They met their enemy with faith in their hearts—courageous beyond description—in conduct becoming our fighting forces. Under fearful bombardment from daylight to nightfall and from dusk till dawn they kept a faithful vigil at their posts. Four long months of siege was withstood by these brave men who succumbed only after they had become so exhausted by hunger, disease, and fatigue that it was humanly physically impossible for them to carry on. Their days were numbered as the world knew, and on April 9, 1942, after 4 months of siege in which a fearful enemy utilized every instrument of destruction, the bitter truth that courage alone will not suffice in war became too evident and a battle of man against machine was over. We in America have not felt, nor can we feel, their suffering, but we can, with reverence, be ever mindful of their dignity in their fate. General MacArthur had no hesitancy in proclaiming publicly: "The sacrifice and halo of Jesus of Nazareth has decended upon them and God will take them unto Himself."

The significance of Bataan rests upon the vital moral effect of our defeat upon the American people. After World War No. 1 America, ostensibly at least, had been lulled into the false security that a war to end war had been fought and its end accomplished. America refused to face reality and even in the approaching storm when the heavens filled with war clouds Americans refused to believe that World War No. 2 was our war. Then came dastardly Pearl Harbor, and Bataan and its horror. Then America, aroused from its peace-loving lethargy, proved that her sons had not grown soft in luxury and could, with men of other nations, equally withstand the frightfulness of modern warfare. Bataan regenerated hidden American morale.

In this hour of recollection America must not forget the courage and devotion with which Filipino troops fought side by side with our soldiers. Their example established them to a place among free nations and vindicated forever the basic soundness of our American policy of holding the Philippines, not for exploit or gain, but for the development, education, and preparation of their long-awaited self-government. When our hour of crisis came, these natives of the Philippines, three out of four of our Army being Filipinos, never hesitated or wavered in their determination to fight valiantly and unflinchingly with America for its future destiny—and our victory. We must never forget that they, with us, were glorious in an army which won the commendation, "No army has ever done so much with so little."

There are, because of understandable circumstances, few available statistics which will accurately portray the fighting forces of Bataan. On April 17, 1942, a War Department communique stated that there were approximately 35,000 American combatant troops and several thousand noncombatant troops and reserves at Bataan. There were included in these figures Filipino Scouts. In January of 1944 the War Department stated that the casualties of the Philippine campaign amounted to 1,092 killed, 1,720 wounded, 15,309 missing, and 13,494 prisoners of war. In this total of 31,615 fighting troops who became casualties, there are included 12,506 Filipino Scouts. Foreign governments have officially notified that 1,614 prisoners of war have died in prison camps and it is safe to assume that the majority of these men died following their capture and internment by the Japanese.

No story will ever be complete without reference to the group of American nurses who were always at the side of our soldiers in their hours of sorrow and suffering. No words of mine can adequately portray their sad and inspirational performance of duty. These heroic women faced hardship and danger without murmur or complaint—with distinguishing courage and example. Only the men who were there can truthfully tell what we can but imagine—the strength and faith and spirit instilled into our soldiers by these angels of mercy as they quietly and efficiently cared for the wounded and the sick, encouraged the impoverished, made brave the faltering. These women learned intimately the meaning of want and privation. They suffered the worst of heartache and disappointment, as only a woman can know and understand the suffering of a man. These heroes of our nursing corps have won, unasked and unasking, our undying praise and gratitude for their devotion to duty. And their sorrow, the bitterness of their fate, is but a mild reflection of the sorrow of womanhood throughout the world—in all lands—where the crimes of the aggressor nations have brought death and ruin.

America has learned a lesson from Bataan—taught by those heroes who knew they never had a chance but who fought a hopeless, delaying series of actions that our country might have as long a time as possible to recover from Pearl Harbor. We have learned realism in international relations. May we ever profit by their teachings—may we never forget that international trust must be wise as well as sincere. Reproachment and recrimination will never avenge our sorrow. Hope and faith will, however, soften its grief.

We have learned another lesson from our Philippine campaign. You and I, as Americans, have come to know that we can make sacrifice in our daily lives without complaining. We, as a nation, have come to realize that by our sacrifices alone we can reward

those men and women who have left their homes and families and today, on distant battlefields, protect our lives, our wives, our parents, our children, from the crushing evil of despotism and tyranny. We have learned as a Nation that we are glad to be able to show individual appreciation of that protective sacrifice of the men and women of the armed forces which brings both sorrow and joy into our hearts. May we ever strive to be more worthy of those men and women who have given and are giving all that we may live in freedom and peace.

President Roosevelt has said, "I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources in men and materials of the United States stand behind that pledge." Inspirational words of our inspirational Commander in Chief, General MacArthur, on the first anniversary of Bataan, stated, "I was the leader of that lost cause, and from the bottom of a seared and stricken heart I pray that a merciful God may not delay too long their redemption, that the day of salvation be not so far removed that they perish; that it be not again too late."

I, too, say Bataan shall be redeemed. The vile barbarism of the hand that wreaked havoc upon our people with all the terrible consequences of cruel and devastating war shall be destroyed. The guilty will be punished. No plea of madness will bar retribution.

No; Bataan was not fought in vain, a futile sacrifice upon the altar of militarism. The greatest single defeat of our history has proven worth the tears and blood. Bataan has taught that America can lose a battle and win the war.

Let us hope and pray that after we win the war, that the heroism and sacrifices of those who fought at Bataan and on other battle fronts, past, present, and future, will be the guiding spirit to our statesmen in winning the peace.

T. V. A. and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 14, 1944:

T. V. A. AND POLITICS

The Tennessee Valley Authority, when it was first established, constituted an experiment with a new type of governmental instrument—the regional development corporation. Today it is almost universally acknowledged that the experiment has been signally successful. No one now dares openly to assail the T. V. A. But Congress at present has under consideration two proposals by Senator MCKELLAR—passed by the Senate as amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill and currently before a Senate-House conference committee—the effect of which would be to undermine the political independence which has been the cornerstone of the agency's effective operation. It is of the very first importance to American Government that these proposals be defeated.

In setting up the T. V. A., Congress gave the most careful consideration, through committee hearings and debates on the floor, to the principles of organization and the managerial policies under which this new instrument of government was to be administered. It laid down two basic rules: (1) that responsibility should be fixed in one place for an entire undertaking of varied yet interrelated parts; (2) that politics should be rigidly excluded from the selection of personnel and the technical decisions to be made by T. V. A. The purpose of these two rules was summed up recently by Senator LISTER HILL, one of the South's ablest and most progressive legislators, who as a Representative in 1933 was one of the conference managers for the original T. V. A. bill and just lately led the defense of the agency in the Senate. The intent of the whole T. V. A. statute, he said recently, was "to create an agency which would be free of some of the Government red tape about which we complain, which would have authority commensurate with its responsibilities. We made certain that it could not 'pass the buck' to another bureau or department in the event of failure, and that it would not be required to waste time and energy in jurisdictional disputes. It was intended that the Board alone be held responsible for the effective administration of the policies laid down by Congress."

One of Senator MCKELLAR'S proposals would require the T. V. A. to deposit its receipts in the Treasury's general fund and come to Congress each year for operating appropriations. As we have pointed out before, this could not fail to be a serious handicap to efficiency and would make it impossible for officials to deal adequately with unforeseen contingencies. It would, moreover, subject the T. V. A. to political pressures respecting such matters as the location of power lines or the granting of special concessions to favored companies from which it ought to be kept altogether free. T. V. A.'s financial operations are now meticulously audited and subject to the closest congressional scrutiny. This attempt to take hold of its purse strings can have only the most sinister political implications.

We have dealt many times in the past with Senator MCKELLAR'S other proposal—senatorial confirmation of all executive appointments to jobs above the $4,500 level. T. V. A. would be only one of many victims of this transparent patronage grab. But its victimization would be peculiarly disastrous because it would end forthwith all hope for the authority's political independence. T. V. A. simply could not do the job assigned to it if its personnel had to be chosen at the behest of Congressmen—Senator MCKELLAR, for example. Its work is of a highly specialized and technical character calling for appointments strictly on a merit basis.

In passing these amendments advanced by Senator MCKELLAR, the Senate has threatened to destroy one of the most hopeful contemporary adaptations to the problems of Government in our complex economy. We hope fervently that the House conferees will not let these narrow, vindictive, and venal measures become law. They strike at the root of sound administration.

A Report on the Second Session of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce on April 11, 1944:

Ladies and gentlemen, Benjamin Franklin once said: "The absent are never without faults, nor the present without excuses." He was speaking, no doubt, of his Congressman. In any case, I am very happy today, after a long absence from Bridgeport, to be asked to report to you on the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and to offer whatever reasonable excuses there may be for the failures and faults of a congressional session in which there were few outstanding accomplishments and virtues.

The history of the Seventy-eighth Congress has been a complicated and a stormy one. But of necessity, I must review that history briefly. And brevity is bound to rob such a report of much significant political and legislative detail.

In trying to report succinctly on so vital a subject, I am reminded of the story of the English cub reporter who was frequently bawled out for relating too many details, by an editor naturally pressed for space. After one such last warning, the cub reporter turned in the following copy: "A shooting occurred last night. Sir Dwight Hopeless, a guest at Lady Panmore's ball, complained of feeling ill, took a highball, his hat, his coat, his departure, no notice of his friends, a taxi, a pistol from his pocket, and finally his life. Nice chap. Regrets and all that sort of thing."

If one were to condense the history of the Seventy-eighth Congress in similar fashion, it might read like this. "The price for the third and fourth terms has been very high for the American people. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, an able politician, campaigning as the man best fitted to keep America out of war, sought and won the third term in the face of tradition, the instincts of the people, and an unmistakably anti-New Deal trend in the country. War came anyway. So Franklin Roosevelt faced a disillusioned people, the Seventy-eighth anti-New Deal Congress, and a hundred national and international problems which cried for the leadership of a man who should stand wholly above personal ambitions or partisan politics. In spite of which, he seemed to wish 16 years in office. Whereupon the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, took fright, took stock, took heart, took themselves to politics, took every legislative means to clout the administration over the head, took Roosevelt down, took few bows for any other accomplishments. Awfully hard on the war effort and the American people."

Yes, history will certainly relate the story of the Seventy-eighth Congress as a long and bitter struggle by the legislative branch of the Government to wrest from the executive branch the proper restoration of those powers which, if there had been no third term, would naturally have returned to it. Had there been no third term, or even today no threat of a fourth term, the Seventy-eighth Congress would have been free to concentrate completely on the conduct of the war and the shaping of our foreign and domestic post-war policies. The force of public opinion alone would have made Congress cooperate fully with truly disinterested leadership from the White House. For if the President were not so widely believed to be a fourth-term candidate, there would then be no reason to suspect that any request of his for this or that legislation was inspired by a desire to keep himself in power. Increasingly, during the past 4 years, the great energies of both the Chief Executive and the Congress have been tragically diverted to a dreadful internecine struggle which has ill served the cause of the American people at war.

Once again it seems that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were right when they established the tradition that two terms

in office sufficed to safeguard the welfare of our Republic.

But to return to a specific, though brief, review of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. In this atmosphere of mutual distrust, suppurated with political suspicion and saturated with political expedience, in which Congressmen on both sides of the aisle missed no opportunity, however small, to pin back the ears of a President of "ambitious views," to use the words of Jefferson, Congress passed only three major pieces of legislation.

One act authorized the expenditure of $1,350,000,000 for U. N. R. R. A. This is the amount of the people's money that the Congress has authorized the administration to spend on Europe's post-war grocery bill. I was heartily in accord with the passage of this legislation. The rehabilitation of post-war Europe is vitally necessary, not only to a peaceful world but to American post-war prosperity. But I would feel much better about voting that sum if I were sure that the American people were totally aware of two facts:

First. That this $1,350,000,000 is really only about half the amount we are going to be asked to lay out for Europe's grocery bill, for another billion and a half, for post-war feeding of Europeans and Asiatics, is concealed in future Army and Navy appropriation bills, for food to be used in the wake of our armies, and in lend-lease military protocols to our allies, notably our lend-lease protocols to the Russians. Once the Russians have crossed their old frontiers, they will be using American groceries in all the countries they occupy. I would like it if in the countries soon to be occupied by the Russians the peoples were as well aware of the source of their groceries as they are of the nationality of their Russian liberators, for food is a very great political weapon, both in war and in post-war strategy. "Who eats my bread sings my song." And I think it would serve both the cause of democracy and American interests best if the peoples of Europe and Asia would sing Yankee Doodle Dandy quite as loudly as they will sing the Internationale or Britannia Rules the Waves. In short, I hope this $3,000,000,000 European grocery bill, which will be presented to the American taxpayer, will be as much a matter of common knowledge in foreign lands as it is bound to be in America.

The second fact I am not certain that Americans are aware of is that many of our present domestic agricultural policies may well result in such serious American food shortages that when the war is over we may not be able to feed the peoples of Europe, anyway.

The second major bill passed in Congress was one which my subcommittee worked on, and reported out of the Military Affairs Committee, the bill to provide mustering-out pay up to $300 for servicemen, at a total cost of about $3,500,000,000 to the people. No one in Congress quarreled with this legislation, which was designed to provide a small monetary cushion to the ex-serviceman, in order to tide him over the time during which he sought to adjust himself to civilian life.

It is to be hoped that no further legislation of such a nature, certainly no bonus legislation, will be passed until the whole problem of what fair and generous financial arrangements are to be made for ex-servicemen and their families can be reviewed by a calm and nonpartisan Congress. There is today, however, a desperate need for the Congress to turn its attention vigorously to the drafting of over-all legislation for the rehabilitation, care, and reemployment of our returned veterans. For my part, I would like to see all legislation affecting ex-servicemen and their families gathered together in one comprehensive omnibus veterans' bill, to be handled after its passage by one department of the Government and placed under one governmental roof, so to speak.

The third major piece of legislation was the soldiers' vote bill, passed only after months of bitter wrangling and savage and sometimes deliberate misunderstanding by both sides. Some of the arguments both for and against the Federal ballot bill were sound. But many of them were merely sound. In the end, the States' rightists won an equivocal victory. Of course, there are always two sides to every question, and they say a politician will generally take both of them. But I am being utterly sincere when I say that, whereas I feel that a straight Federal ballot was desirable both from the point of view of the soldier and home-front patriot, I am glad that its defeat has guaranteed that the constitutionality of the next election will be unchallengeable.

It was above all in this debate that one saw how the third-term and fourth-term ambitions of the President had compromised, poisoned, and vitiated the patriotic instincts of many legislators, both in his own party and in the opposition. In the end, the President, softened up by the stinging rebuke his veto of the tax bill had received, let the bill become law without his signature. If soldiers do not vote in the next election in as great numbers as we all could wish, the blame must be shared by the President with the Congress.

I have spoken of the tax bill. This bill was finally passed in such an unsatisfactory form that the President vetoed it. Not his veto, but the language in which it was couched, provoked the storm that ensued. The message bristled with jibes and barbs, and was interlarded with a contempt for Congress almost unique in the history of Executive messages. The storm was climaxed by the resignation of long-suffering New Deal Senator BARKLEY as the Senate majority leader. BARKLEY was forthwith unanimously reelected majority leader by a Democratic caucus. And then the Senate and the House, its unique purse-string power impugned, its dignity affronted, passed the tax bill by an overwhelming majority. Had the President, in his veto message, taken a temperate tone, and made a simple patriotic plea for higher taxes to foot the war bill with, the answer of Congress might have been different. Here was yet another unhappy example of how the knock-down, drag-out battle between a domineering, power-hungry Chief Executive and a stubborn, alarmed legislature compromised the war effort.

Only one major appropriation bill, the first deficiency, was passed.

A bill extending the Commodity Credit Corporation and its crop-lending powers again reached the floor, festooned with anti-subsidy amendments—just as had occurred in the previous session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. When passed, after acrimonious debate, this bill was also scorchingly vetoed. But this time the President's veto was sustained. And for a simple reason. While the Congress profoundly, and I believe properly, suspects the cynical election uses to which a fourth-term aspirant may put subsidies, the Congress is equally concerned about inflation. The Congress is not at all anxious to have the onus for inflation laid on its doorstep. But all the debates on this legislation were dominated by the fear that the administration would, once granted the wholly legitimate economic instrumentalities of subsidies, abuse them politically. Still one more tragic example of the high price every consumer in the land is today paying for the fourth-term desire. We will no doubt see an unhappy reenactment of that entire bare-knuckled debate when, in the next session, we receive again the Price Control Act—which now expires June 30. This bill is now pending before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The outcome is unpredictable. But on the record of past performance, it would seem that the farm bloc, in alliance with those who cannot but fear, as I say, the political uses to which subsidies may be put, will prevail to vote down subsidy authority—and thus invite another scorching veto.

De Tocqueville, that wise and sympathetic critic of American institutions, once wrote: "A candidate who is not the President, seeking the Presidency, is but an individual, while the President seeking renomination is the state itself, intriguing and corrupting with its immense resources." To keep these immense resources out of the hands of a President seeking renomination for the fourth time was the great battle fought—though not completely won—in the last session of Congress. And partially won in the process was the real battle for the restoration to Congress of its constitutional powers.

So much for the last session. Its whole political temper was keynoted, not by a Republican, but by a Democrat, and an ardent new dealer at that, Senator BARKLEY. "Dear Alben," in the manner of "Dear Brutus," was the good friend who finally, in the name of the peoples' representative government, delivered the unkindest cut of all to the New Deal Caesar. For BARKLEY had begun to see which way the American political winds were blowing. All through the session the Democrats had been growing more and more jittery as they lost district after district in special elections. In 11 elections the Republicans had won 8 seats, including 3 held previously by Democrats. Today their membership in the House is below a clear majority and although the election of W. G. STIGLER in the Second Oklahoma District gave them a shot in the arm, it did not allay their deep doubts about November 1944. For in all these elections the leadership of Roosevelt himself had been made the issue. Publicly, the Democrats are still claiming that the name of F. D. R. remains potent magic at the ballot box. But privately in the cloak rooms, in the House restaurant, they will tell you that this just ain't so. When big ED JOHNSON, the Senator from Colorado, plumped against the fourth term in Chicago recently he voiced the private conviction of many a Democratic Senator and Congressman and started what may yet be a bandwagon rush away from Roosevelt. Senator BAILEY and Senator BYRD may second at any moment this un-nomination of their ancient party leader. Many a Democrat today is beginning to view his own bootstraps as a safer device for political levitation than Mr. Roosevelt's threadbare coattails. Add, that many governmental activities have stirred up that bitterest of all questions, racial questions, and you have the formula for a sizable anti-Roosevelt rebellion in Democratic ranks in Congress.

Thus, as I say, the loss of many special elections, continual Democratic as well as Republican sniping at the President and vice versa, the President's own tragic lack of leadership on vexing and crucial home front problems, the even split in numbers between Democrats and Republicans, and the imminence of a national election, all conspire to the creation of an atmosphere hardly conducive to the passage of vigorous, foresighted, dynamic national legislation in the next session.

And yet—there is a next session to be gotten through before the November elections can happily clear this surcharged air. What is there to be accomplished which can be accomplished when we meet again this week?

I have already touched on some of that legislation: The Price Control Act and veterans' legislation. There are a dozen appropriation bills to be passed by June 30, including the independent offices appropriation bill, with its highly debatable McKellar amendment, requiring Senate confirmation of every Government employee earning $4,500 or more. And there is still to be enacted the

extension of the lend-lease program. H. R. 4254 now has a new amendment, and I believe an excellent one, offered by Representative WADSWORTH, which would make the Congress, rather than the President, the final arbiter of settlements between the United States and beneficiary lend-lease nations after the war.

A bill is also being worked on, in the Ways and Means Committee, to simplify our Rube Goldberg tax laws. As things stand today, a man who doesn't know how to make out his income tax goes into jail. Let us hope when he does know how he won't go into bankruptcy. In any case this bill ought to encounter few difficulties on the floor, and will certainly be welcomed by the American people.

And then there is the question of whether or not to pass manpower legislation. The manpower problem has been before my committee ever since I went to Congress. To date, the War Manpower Commissioner, Mr. Paul McNutt, has not demonstrated that he could effectively solve the problems of shortages, replacements, and turn-overs.

Today, with the Presidential termination of almost all draft deferments of men under 26, and with the decided trend of war workers back to private civilian employment, there rises a new threat to our production program. The best known solution in the Congress is the Wadsworth-Austin national service bill, which has received new attention since the President called recently for national service legislation. I do not hesitate to say I have always been vigorously against this over-all National Service Act as a workable or democratic solution to our manpower problem. I have offered myself legislation of a very limited nature, designed specifically to divert nonessentially employed 4–F's and 38–45 unmarried men into essential industry. Although my last bill has been reported as a labor-draft bill, it is nothing of the kind. Even so, I have never pressed this legislation, and I do not do so now. I prefer, as every American should, to see the production home-front job entirely done by private initiative and the voluntary method, if it is at all possible. Nevertheless, should legislation become necessary—and most departments of the Government charged with the war effort have testified before my committee that it is necessary—I favor limited and specific legislation, such as my own, which will not in any way threaten the gains made by union labor. For no unbiased review of organized labor's part in this war can fail to show it has on the whole magnificently met the challenge of production. It is such specific legislation I have tried to draft, in case—and only in case—legislation is needed.

Another piece of legislation upon which my committee has worked, and which I believe to be of primary importance to this Nation, as well as to Connecticut and our Bridgeport area, is contract-termination legislation. There are bills in the Senate, in the Naval Affairs Committee, and before various other committees of the Congress which duplicate this legislation before our own committee. I don't care a fig which committee's bill finally comes to the floor, if only we will soon pass a bill which will enable war contractors to be paid fully and promptly as their contracts are canceled, clear their factories of Government-owned facilities, and enable them to convert with utmost rapidity to consumer production. Legislation too long postponed or faulty legislation in this field may easily result in longer bread lines and vaster unemployment than this country has ever known. Good legislation may pave the way to greater prosperity than even the most optimistic can foresee.

Now I have perhaps painted too gloomy a picture for you of the atmosphere in which the Congress has worked this past 18 months—and is doomed to work until next January. There are bright portents and hopeful signs both in the mood of the men who make up your Congress and in the legislation upon which they are working. Congress's many economy measures in the last session are rightly to be applauded. Bipartisan committees in both Houses are working most honestly and patriotically to explore programs for our post-war industrial, agricultural, and employment problems; and although it was a resolution doomed to defeat by the administration, the Palestine resolution, sponsored by Connecticut's own RANULF COMPTON, was a sign of the humanitarian and international understanding Republicans are showing for foreign peoples. And while it may not sound so to those who are forced to listen to radios almost completely dominated by New Deal commentators, today in Republican ranks in Congress there is a wholehearted, realistic, and vigarous interest in America's role in post-war international problems. It was, after all, the trenchant letter of 24 freshmen Congressmen, of whom I had the honor to be one, to Secretary Hull which finally drove him to the radio on Sunday night to explain the administration's foreign policy to the Nation and elicited from him the promise to cooperate and consult fully with the Congress in the future.

Indeed, I could say, very tritely, it is often darkest before the dawn, and that Congress has, I believe, hit its legislative bottom. I believe that from here out, as the great issues, both foreign and domestic, are debated in the public forum in this election year—yes, precisely because of this debate—Congress will soon begin to formulate clearer policies, better legislation, a more vigorous program; so that, in the end, in both your Houses, legislative victories will be won for the people that are worthy of the military victories that our soldiers are winning for us in the Pacific and the Atlantic. And I can further reassure you that when you have penetrated the smoke and pall of politics that unavoidably hang over a Congress threatened by an unprecedented fourth term every Congressman, Democrat as well as Republican, stands united with all his colleagues on the question of victory. To win the war, finally and indisputably, and to make a better world and a better America, is the deep desire of every Congressman. We are Americans first and Republicans and Democrats only secondarily. And that is why, cost what it has, in wealth or in blood, every piece of legislation that has been presented to your Congress since the day of Pearl Harbor which has clearly had to do with aid to our allies and victory to our arms has passed swiftly and overwhelmingly. Next year the President may change, or he may not. But this year, regardless of what happens at the polls, your Congress will, to a man, vote for victory over America's enemies.

Records of Three Wars Show How Lucky We Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of April 9, 1944:

RECORDS OF THREE WARS SHOW HOW LUCKY WE ARE

Uncle Sam has won his most important battle on the home front.

President Roosevelt has released a report from his economic advisers which shows that in the year since his hold-the-line order prices were reasonably stabilized.

For 12 months the United States Department of Labor price index has remained around 134—a remarkable testimonial to the efficacy of the entire O. P. A. program.

True, some prices increased in that year, but others dropped. What matters most is that a level generally has been maintained—thanks to a vigilant O. P. A. and to generally wholehearted public cooperation.

As the President's advisers state: "One year of stable living costs is a record unprecedented in this war or in the last war."

To a lot of people, however, statistics don't mean much.

That's why Edwin Kemp's recent interview with Clay Park, grocer, of Three Springs, Huntingdon County—which appeared in the Record the other day—tells us in a homely but effective way how lucky we really are on the home front in this war.

The Park store has been a landmark for many years. It was old when the Civil War broke out. Its ancient, faded records tell the story—

The cost of the market basket in three of this Nation's great wars: The Civil War, World War No. 1, and the present war.

During the Civil War, for example, Park's records show that calico which formerly sold for 10 cents a yard soared to $1 a yard. Likewise, muslin, "the same we now sell for 18 cents."

Let's hear more from Grover Park:

"Coffee? In the Civil War there wasn't any. People had to do with roasted rye. There was very little wheat. Flour you now buy for $2.85 a sack was $7.50 then. Soldiers got $13 a month, when they got it, so they and their families had no purchasing power."

The Park's store records show interesting comparisons with World War No. 1. Here are a few extracts:

"In World War No. 1 a 48-pound bag of flour you can buy for $2.85 today was $4, and in order to get it you had to buy rice flour, barley flour, and other substitutes which brought the price to $8.

"Sugar was 30 to 32 cents a pound. Today it's 7 cents. We sold Boscul coffee in 1918 for 55 cents. Same brand is now 35 to 38 cents. Butter we're selling for 50 cents now was 70 cents then."

In that country store they sell shoes as well as groceries, and the same books show that shoes now selling for $6.50 were $15 in World War No. 1.

Perhaps you read the whole story. But these facts and figures are worth repeating because they tell us how fortunate we have been and how well—in spite of griping and opposition—the price control program has succeeded.

Whether you take the statistics which show the price index stabilized or the records of Clay Park's country store—you can see what a good job has been done for you by the O. P. A. and by W. L. B., which has kept wages down.

Yet at this very moment O. P. A. is fighting for its life.

The Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts expire after June 30 and Congress is now debating their reenactment.

There is strong opposition. Especially from groups which would stand to gain bigger profits if O. P. A. ceilings were killed and the sky again became the limit of the price index.

Look at that price index again. Reflect on the faded records of Clay Park's country store. Then ask yourself whether we are to

keep the system which has kept prices in control—or whether we are to junk it under profiteer pressure?

We know what your answer will be.

But don't tell it to us. Write your Congressman.

A 3-cent stamp now will save dollars in your market basket after June 30.

Advertising Subsidy for Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED ROWE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram of March 31, 1944:

WE DON'T BELIEVE IN SUCH A SUBSIDY

Reports from Washington are to the effect that congressional advocates of a Government advertising subsidy for newspapers are pressing for a hearing before the House Rules Committee to bring before the House their bill for a $15,000,000 yearly subsidy.

The bill purports to aid War bond campaigns and the stabilization program by forcing the Treasury to pay 12½ to 15 million dollars yearly for advertising War bonds in weekly newspapers and some 400 small dailies.

The Treasury is opposed to the subsidy bill on the ground that it would disrupt the system by which record-breaking amounts of advertising are contributed by advertisers to War bond campaigns.

It is stated that the bill is supported by officials of the National Editorial Association, representing half of the 10,000 weekly newspapers who would get an average, in excess of $1,000 annually for bond and other governmental advertising.

We are opposed to this bill and we sincerely hope it will be defeated. We have a number of reasons for our opposition to it. If this amount were spent in newspapers it would not be long until there would be another bill calling for equal or larger amounts to be spent in magazines, radio, out-door advertising, direct-mail advertising, and larger newspapers.

We wrote to Senators BURTON and TAFT, and Congressman BENDER, back in June 1943, that in our opinion the Government needs to spend less, not more money. This bill is just another one to open the floodgates of public spending. We do not believe it is sound business for the spending of advertising dollars should be determined by the market so as to get the greatest value for the dollars spent.

Such a proposition might well develop into a subsidy to the newspapers of the country and this would be a dangerous thing for the people, for the Government, and for the newspapers themselves.

We have long felt that the newspapers of America cannot afford to place themselves in a position where anyone might have an opportunity to accuse them of securing benefits from the Government. Subsidies for advertising is just an opening wedge to a policy that newspapers might eventually find very hard to combat.

The idea of a free press is fundamental. We de not believe that any publisher should jeopardize the freedom of his editorial expression.

We fear that governmental subsidies might eventually be destructive to the very spirit of a free press.

Advertising is a business proposition. It should be purchased on the basis of the service it renders in the production of sales or creating a desire to purchase. We believe the newspapers should be resourceful enough to sell space direct to the citizens of this country in sufficient amount to publicize bond-selling campaigns. We do not believe it should be necessary for the Government to pay for any such advertising space. We can't see why the Government should take on additional overhead in War bond campaigns. We can't see why the Government should be seeking new avenues into which to pour public funds.

We have long believed that the greatest asset that a newspaper has is the confidence of the public. This confidence could deteriorate under a Government subsidy set-up because of the possible political influence. We know that a lot of publishers feel free to criticize governmental policies now. We wonder just how much effect and in what direction advertising subsidies would have. We can see where political influence might be a great deal stronger where it is backed by subsidy funds from the Government which would be paid for advertising.

We believe it would be a very short-sighted policy for publishers to accept such advertising subsidies from the Government. In the long run the influence of such public funds might be disastrous on newspaper policy. We hope we shall never see the day that any governmental official will be in a position to bring any influence on any newspaper, large or small, because of advertising funds he may have at his command.

We believe individuals should sponsor advertising as they desire but we can't see such an expenditure being made by the Government.

Government Anti-Inflation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Federal grand jury report from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne division, April term 1944:

The grand jury sitting at Fort Wayne, Ind., for the northern district of Indiana herewith presents a report of its investigation into alleged black-market activity in said district, this 12th day of April 1944.

We have conducted this investigation for the purpose of determining the degree of compliance with all phases of the anti-inflation program of the Government. We have heard evidence from approximately 335 witnesses called from each of the 32 counties of the district, as well as leading experts and businessmen. The investigation has concerned itself with alleged black-market activity in the fields of gasoline, oil, and tires; food and liquors; industrial materials; farm machinery; and the rent program of the Office of Price Administration.

The grand jury, in addition to hearing scores of general witnesses, has heard evidence in 41 specific cases of black-market activity and herewith returns in open court 24 indictments, charging 26 persons and corporations with violations of the Federal statutes investigated by this grand jury; 14 cases were continued for further investigation.

Gasoline, oil, and tires: The principal black market with respect to gasoline is brought about by the illegal printing and distribution of counterfeit coupons of B, C, R, and T denominations. There is also evidence of illegal activity in the district with respect to the unlawful sale and transfer of gasoline in the market where no coupons are required for the purchase of gasoline.

The Office of Price Administration, and other law enforcement agencies, have been vigilant and active in investigating and apprehending the illegitimate dealers in gasoline but are urged by the grand jury to double their efforts and improve the vehicles of enforcement in order to strike down the coupon counterfeiters. They are the greatest menace to the legitimate market and present a problem in the enforcement of the law.

Unless the black-market activity in gasoline is curbed the legitimate supply for the consuming public will be materially diminished.

The grand jury found no black-market activity with relation to fuel oil.

The investigation revealed no evidence of black-market activity in automobile tires in the district.

Food and liquors: There is some activity on the part of a few wholesale fruit and vegetable merchants in the district to evade ceiling prices. The evasion is brought about by either directly overcharging the retail merchant or by invoicing the ceiling prices to the merchant and in addition receiving side payments in cash for the merchandise involved. The evidence before the grand jury indicated that such practices cause the retail dealer to sell at a loss or in turn sell at retail prices over the ceiling level as prescribed by law.

The grand jury heard evidence from wholesale or retail liquor dealers from every one of the 32 counties in the district. There is evidence of a few persons traveling about the district and offering liquor for sale in case lots far in excess of the ceiling price. The grand jury is continuing its investigation into these practices.

The practice of tying in unwanted spirituous merchandise with the sale of whisky by a wholesaler to a retailer is condemned.

The grand jury finds that no evidence of alleged violations of food-price regulations has been presented against any person or corporation unless prior notice of such alleged violations has been given an opportunity for compliance afforded.

Industrial materials: The grand jury found no evidences of black-market activity in the field of industrial materials.

Farm machinery and equipment: The grand jury found that the heavy demand for farm equipment, coupled with the practically nonexistent supply of new farm equipment, had created terrific pressures against the used farm-equipment ceilings. Evidence was presented to the grand jury which revealed that machinery of this character had brought several times its ceiling price; used equipment in many cases selling for sums far in excess of its price when new. In the absence of vigorous enforcement this condition, we believe, will contribute materially to the inflationary spiral.

Rent: In the northern district of Indiana, the grand jury found virtually universal compliance with the rent program of the Office of Price Administration. Only two instances were found on which to base indictments in this field, indicating the substantial compliance in the district on the part of property owners.

From all of the evidence presented the grand jury desires to report that almost all persons, with few exceptions, were in favor

of the Government's program to curb inflation. The control of war prices, rationing, and rent was considered a good thing as a whole—minor improvements were suggested and made a part of the transcript of the record.

The grand jury desires to inform the court in conclusion that generally the drive against inflation in the district has been successful. The report of the investigation conducted by the grand jury and the indictments returned herewith for alleged violations of the war price, rationing, and rent program are presented as an aid in the enforcement of the law and to assist in the drive against inflation.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS J. CONNELLY, *Foreman.*
FRED N. KUIPERS, *Clerk.*
ALEXANDER M. CAMPBELL,
United States Attorney.
JOHN E. SCOTT,
Special Assistant to the United States Attorney.

Civil Aeronautics Act, 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from the Pacific American Steamship Association to Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA on the subject of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938:

PACIFIC AMERICAN STEAMSHIP ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., March 20, 1944.
Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEA: Referring to your letter of February 14 addressed to our Washington, D. C., office, and with particular reference to the third paragraph, which reads:

"This would break down the general policy of preventing monopoly by undue control of one type of carrier by another which developed out of protection of water transportation 30 years ago. On account of the widespread application of the proposal, it must be considered in relation to the whole problem."

We are not suggesting "undue control of one type of carrier by another." What the shipping industry has suggestd, which it contends is only fair and just treatment, is the removal of a discrimination which has grown out of misinterpretation of the law by the Civil Aeronautics Board which would prevent overseas carriers from using planes integrated with their ships in a complete transportation system between their customary terminals, serving the same business which they have developed and to which they have furnished transportation services for many years.

That it is necessary for a transportation system, or any other type of business, to progressively apply new methods and new and modern types of equipment which serve the same purpose and which are desired by the public and are in the public interest. In this instance the industry envisions the transition of a portion of its passenger business from surface carriers to air carriers. The extent of such transition depends upon the wishes of the traveling public. To the extent that the traveling public desires to use air transport, the regular line carriers which have developed and served this business for a great many years should be allowed to furnish this type of service in conjunction with their customary services, as a complete transportation system. It follows the many progressive steps which have taken place in transportation, from one mode or form to another.

That what the shipping industry is suggesting is the opposite of monopoly. To restrict aviation development to particular groups would trend toward monopoly. The shipping interests have never suggested any diminution in the number of permits which might be issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board as found by them to be in the public interest. All that the industry asks is the same privilege which all other citizens have, to utilize aviation in conjunction with its business where this can be shown to a proper Government regulatory body as being in the public interest. The shipping industry does ask the removal of a discriminatory misinterpretation of the law by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There has never been any general policy of dividing modes of transportation as these apply to traffic outside the boundaries of the United States. The Panama Canal Act and the Motor Carrier Act deal only with internal commerce, which is strictly controlled and regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congress has always recognized by the application of a different rule that overseas commerce should be given different treatment. It cannot therefore be said that in removing this discrimination against the shipping industry there would be a breakdown of general policy.

We feel that perhaps there has been a misunderstanding concerning the shipping industry's objective, and as to the whole proposition, and are confident a reanalysis will justify the giving of the relief sought.

Very truly yours,
J. P. WILLIAMS, *Secretary.*

School Hot-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have had many inquiries in reference to the attitude of Congress toward assisting the States to establish and maintain school lunch programs. This program has been in existence for some time, but unless legislation is enacted for the next fiscal year Federal assistance to the various schools will soon be discontinued.

In my district the school hot-lunch program has been of great advantage to many rural communities and other sections of the district in taking care of numerous school children who desire that this program be continued.

I think a mistake was made when the House failed to adopt legislation for this purpose, and it is a matter of record that the House Appropriations Committee made no appropriation in the appropriation bill submitted by the Committee on Agriculture for the purpose of continuing the school hot-lunch program.

This program has operated successfully in my district. School children are transported by bus many miles from home to school, and, in my opinion, this program has contributed to the health and physical condition of the students.

The appropriation bill is now pending in the Senate and the only way to continue the school hot-lunch program is to have an amendment adopted in the Senate for that purpose. I am hopeful that the Senate will take favorable action so that this matter may again be presented to the House under the parliamentary procedure for further and favorable action in connection therewith. I shall support such a Senate amendment.

Organization of Fair Employment Practices Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been very deeply concerned over the purposes and activities of the organization here in Washington known as the Fair Employment Practices Committee. It is common knowledge that such an organization could have no proper functions in this democracy. It has been my opinion that it was born of the fertile mind of someone in this commonwealth of communistic philosophy and based on its activities I am convinced that my convictions were founded on truth and fact. The Communists some months ago came out with the statement that the South was the black man's country and in substance that they expected to put him in possession of the property of the South and in control of its destiny and people.

I have recently procured factual information on the personnel of this committee, which I think will and should be of vital interest to the membership of this body and for that matter to every taxpayer in the United States. It is, of course, known that Malcolm Ross is chairman of the committee, whose function is reputed to be to see that there is no discrimination in employment account of race or color in this country. It is noteworthy in the organization of his committee this principle is most flagrantly violated. Over all, there are 106 paid employees—61 Negroes and 45 whites. Compare that with the percentage of Negroes against the percentage of whites in this country. I am a great believer in letting the people know the facts and that with such knowledge they will correct any wrong. When the people are called upon to favor increased taxes I hope you will remember this committee which is not only totally useless, but a vicious bureau that breeds disunity and costs the people each 12 months $317,160

or approximately $1,000,000 every 3 years. The 45 white employees draw $143,600 per annum and the 61 Negroes draw $173,560 per annum. The employees of this bureau are the highest paid of any bureau or department of the Federal Government, on a per capita basis.

In the central office where all the policies are made and enforced here in Washington there are 10 white employees and 35 Negro employees, the whites drawing $48,540 per annum and the Negroes $94,220.

The chairman is white, his associate fair-practice examiner is a Negro. The office of the chairman is staffed by 2 other whites and 3 Negroes. His administrative office is staffed by 11 Negroes and no whites. His Operations Section is staffed with 7 Negroes and 6 whites, his Review and Analysis Section has 7 Negroes and 3 whites. His Legal Division 2 Negroes only. Hearing examiners, 1 white and 5 Negroes. The Director of Review and Analysis is a Negro. In fact, the whole set-up is strictly Negro dominated with just enough whites to give a slight diversity of color. This is the gang that goes into the South and sets up offices with Negroes and whites working together; to Detroit and sets up an office with one Edward M. Swann, a Negro man, as fair-practice examiner, at a salary of $3,800 per year, with a white lady for his secretary at $1,620 per year, the 2 constituting the entire office force. This is the same gang that has told the management of southern railroads they must use Negro engineers and conductors, and union officials that they must accept Negroes in their organizations.

In the capital of my State, Atlanta, Ga., this same gang of Washington Negroes, by the authority of this committee, set up an office with Bruce Hunt, a white man, as senior fair-practice examiner, at $5,400 per year; John Hope, Jr., a Negro, as associate fair-practice examiner, at $3,800 per year; James H. Tipton, white, associate fair-practice examiner, at $3,200 per year; Myra Bunting, white, clerk-stenographer, at $1,800 per annum; and Thelma Horton, Negro, whose classification and salary was either intentionally or inadvertently omitted. Please note that Hope, the Negro, and Tipton, the white, have exactly the same classification, the only distinction being color, and the Negro gets $3,800 and the white $3,200 for the same duties and in the same office, and yet this infernal Committee is designated the Fair Employment Practices Committee.

They were liberal enough to let the regional offices in the deep South have a slight advantage in number of white personnel. In New York, however, the regional office has a personnel of nine, six of whom are Negroes and three whites. The big boss, head of the office, with the classification of regional director, is a Negro at $5,600 per year, and the highest paid white in the office is designated "associate field examiner" at $3,200. His white lady assistant clerk-stenographer gets only $1,620, while her Negro boss draws approximately three and one-half times this amount.

There are four regional directors in the entire United States, one Negro at $5,600 per year and one Negro at $4,600 and two whites at $4,600 per year. You will note in every instance the Negro has the controlling voice and the higher salary with the same classification.

I am wondering if our people have reached the great divide in the path of civilization and have started down the slope to the sunset of the same. I wonder if they have become so spineless—and in this I include the membership of the Congress—and so weak and faint of heart that they will see perish before their eyes all that has made our Nation great, and sleep through the operation being performed on our democratic system of government by the Communists of this country, and let them bury beside the heroes who made the air free for Old Glory to fly, the Stars and Stripes that has stood vigil over their tombs through the years of freedom and progress this Nation has enjoyed.

The greatest responsibility placed on mankind is to keep his race pure; the greatest destroyer of civilization and Christianity is the mongrelization of races. If this bunch of moral lepers are not stopped the depth to which they will bring our citizenry is unpredictable. God made His people as He would have them be, and if you doubt that the full plan and chart of these communistic rats call for a full race adulteration watch the years that are to follow soon, and your complacency so abundantly enjoyed now will stand before you an ugly skeleton of condemnation. I have in the past and expect to in the future warn my people of these dangers and fight these Communist enemies of America as long as I am able to speak.

I hope it will be borne in mind that the Congress had no part in establishing this Committee, nor was this body consulted with regard to the advisability of its establishment; nor has the Congress ever appropriated one dime for the operation of this Committee, the money for its operation being taken from the President's emergency fund.

The President created the Committee by Executive Order No. 9346, May 27, 1943, said Executive order providing:

First. All agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Second. All Federal agencies concerned with vocational and training programs for war production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination.

Third. The Committee shall formulate policies to achieve the purposes of this order and shall make recommendations to the various Federal departments and agencies. It shall also recommend to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission appropriate measures for bringing about the full utilization and training of manpower in and for war production without discrimination.

Fourth. The Committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination. It may conduct hearings, make findings of facts, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

Fifth. The Committee shall assume jurisdiction over all complaints and matters pending before the old committee.

Sixth. The Committee shall have the power to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of the order.

I have given the full facts as disclosed by the records with regard to this committee's origin, powers, and functions. I leave it to the verdict of the citizenry who make up these United States of ours—

First. Whether this Committee has any place in the orderly progress of our Nation.

Second. Whether the powers granted this committee are beyond that which should be vested in a board of Negroes to exercise against the people of the United States.

Third. Whether the effects of the activities of this Committee create unity or discord and, whether the war effort is advanced or retarded by its existence.

Fourth. Whether the expenditures of these great sums of money can be justified when the people are staggering under the tax load they are now carrying.

Business Controls of Army Service Forces' Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Howard Bruce, deputy director of matériel, headquarters, Army Service Forces, before the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., Wednesday, April 5, 1944:

The Army Service Forces' procurement constitutes the largest business under one management that the world has ever seen. It represents an expenditure of close to $2,000,000,000 each month. This figure includes substantial procurement for Lend-Lease, Navy, and the Air Forces, but does not include Army aircraft and related items.

Our task is to design, develop, procure, maintain, and distribute, on time, to camps and stations in this country and to theaters of operation that cover the globe, most of the items needed to equip and to maintain an army of over seven and a half million.

The number of items of supply, including spare parts, reaches a total of more than 1,000,000, involving, it is estimated, over a million prime and subcontracts.

In carrying out its program, the Army Service Forces, at one and the same time, are creating and expediting the completion of new facilities for the production of urgently needed items, putting in stand-by condition other facilities, placing and expediting emergency contracts, largely for newly developed items of supply, cutting back contracts for

other items of supply, computing requirements, establishing throughout the organization machinery for accurate price analysis, renegotiating contracts, trying, through the War Manpower Commission and other agencies, to assist in relieving shortages of manpower in certain areas and in taking advantage of surpluses in others.

It is obvious that an enterprise of this magnitude requires close controls. We have been developing controls for years. Our critical problems requiring control are never static, which means that the major effort or the emphasis is constantly shifting. Our experience indicates that whenever and wherever sufficient intensive effort has been brought to bear on a critical problem, it responds to treatment and drops back in degree of urgency. But there is always a new crop of problems to take its place

The shifting of emphasis is illustrated by the phases through which Army Service Forces' procurement has passed. In 1941, while we were constantly planning and preparing, the war had not come close enough to bring about a complete change from the normal way of life. Then Pearl Harbor, overnight, brought on a period of unprecedented expansion—expansion of production in existing facilities and expansion of facilities. The results since that time represent the most remarkable accomplishment by industry, labor, and Government in all history.

Our sights were set high—in some instances, perhaps, too high. We began to run into conflicts between production and the creation of facilities for increased production. More and more we had to bring the various programs into a balance that was within the country's facilities and raw materials capacity.

The priorities system did not balance supply and demand, nor provide adequate controls of distribution of the basic raw materials. Such a system will not work successfully where demand substantially exceeds supply. The production requirements plan, which was an attempted combination of priorities and allocations, though an improvement, was still not adequate. Eventually the controlled-materials plan succeeded in balancing requirements against supply and in controlling distribution of the three basic materials—steel, copper, and aluminum. After some confusion and much education, C. M. P., together with limitation orders, brought the country's production into workable balance so that all essential programs could be met. As a result, it was astounding to observe the almost miraculous shift of emphasis from materials to critical components and finally to manpower.

This brings us to the present. Today the shortage of manpower is our No. 1 worry and is the chief threat to production. We are much concerned about this problem because, so far as we can see, the situation is likely to become worse before it becomes better.

Our second important problem is the necessity for developing even closer and more accurate controls over procurement. This need has become more pressing as the phase of procurement concerned with furnishing initial equipment to troops and filling the "pipe line" approaches completion. From now on, production must closely approximate consumption and with the rapidly changing demands of war, it is difficult to keep the two in balance at all times. This must be done in order to meet the needs of our armed forces and, at the same time, avoid the piling up of surpluses. Surpluses mean wasteful expenditure of money and the absorption of manpower direly needed for items in short supply.

In spite of these manifold problems, both the Army and industry have gained enormously from experience, and many of the production problems that were both difficult and critical have finally settled into grooves. Our procurement is more and more a going concern, and like any going concern, we should operate on a minimum working capital consistent with maintaining our ability to meet promptly all the needs of our armed forces.

For the purpose of closer supply analysis, there has been established an authorized stock level for each item of Army purchase. For each item, the necessary information on inventory, past issue, estimated future issue and scheduled procurement must be brought together. In an effort to achieve balance and flexibility, procurement agencies which a year ago were being urged to place contracts well into the future, in order to get the benefit of proper scheduling, are today being urged to restrict contract commitments to the practical minimum both as to time and quantity. Regardless of the Army's efforts, it is inevitable that when this war does end, there will be surpluses. The mere fact that no one can predict the duration of the war makes it necessary to operate on the assumption of a continuing war. This means the "pipe line" must be kept filled all the way from the manufacturer through the many points of storage and transportation to the theater of operations.

Now that industry has the benefit of 2 years or more of experience, production costs of many items are subject to fewer uncertainties and cost-analysis work is assuming greater prominence. It is the hope that closer buying, with better knowledge of costs, will permit greater use of fixed-price contracts and will supply a substitute for renegotiation.

It is important to realize that such a vast program of procurement cannot be controlled in all minute details from one central point. Therefore, a large degree of decentralization is essential. Each of the seven technical services, which are the procuring and issuing agencies of A. S. F.—Ordnance, Quartermaster Corps, etc.—is responsible for certain classes of items; and these services, in turn, decentralize procurement to their field offices. The degree of decentralization varies with the type and character of the items involved. It is necessary to maintain a closer and more centralized control over items of major significance from a military, monetary, and materials-consuming standpoint than over less important items. Our procedures are designed to take into account such factors—we would become hopelessly enmeshed in red tape and detail if we did not do so.

Cut-backs and their byproducts of contract cancelation and settlement constitute another very large sector of Army Service Forces' business. Definite procedures have been laid down covering the actions to be taken from the moment requirements are reduced until a given plant has been released or placed in stand-by.

Cut-back recommendations of the procuring offices are passed upon in each service by a board of review whose findings are submitted to a similar board in the staff headquarters. There is in process of organization a War Production Board committee that will lay down the policies, criteria, and broad procedures governing the cut-back actions of all the procurement agencies.

In the selection of facilities to be cut back, among the considerations are: Dependability; cost of product to the Government; availability or scarcity of labor; the amount of subcontracting, with particular consideration to the use of smaller war plants; and transportation.

After giving due weight to the above, there often occurs the necessity of a selection between a Government-owned and a privately owned facility. Where there is a probability or even a possibility of a future need for the cut-back item in increased quantity, there is often an advantage in cutting back the Government-owned facility, as it can be placed in stand-by and later, if needed, quickly restored to production. This reasoning will be reversed when cut-backs become wholesale and conditions are such that private industry can return to normal peacetime production without jeopardizing the war effort.

The critical and decisive stage of the war is still ahead of us. Yet this discussion would not be complete without giving assurance that we are doing some sensible planning against the eventual end of the war. General Marshall has been aware of this problem from the beginning, and successive steps have been taken to perfect our plans.

Almost a year ago, a number of committees were set up in the Army Service Forces, among which was one under Maj. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Director of Matériel, A. S. F., to begin planning on the industrial side of demobilization. Since we began this work, there has been much discussion in Congress, and recently a very able report by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock on war and post-war adjustment policies has disclosed the fact that we are cooperating in the preparation of "an 'X-Day reconversion plan' based on the assumed defeat of Germany on 'X-Day.'"

It is vital that this work be seen in its proper perspective. Today it is distinctly of secondary importance and must not be allowed to interfere with the all-out effort required to defeat our enemies.

The first rough A. S. F. demobilization plan was developed last September, and since that time there have been improvements so that we now have a better plan, not yet perfect, but the planning is being carried forward steadily by a small and detached group of officers working in close collaboration with the Baruch committee, the Army General Staff and other governmental agencies concerned.

It is extremely fortunate that present terminations are providing a laboratory in which the War Department and industry may test principles and methods so that when the problem becomes general, smooth-working plans will be in operation.

It has been our view that our greatest problem at the end of the war would be to clear the decks so that industry could provide employment in the production of civilian products. If we fail in this, demobilization will bring about chaos. Therefore, our plans have emphasized such matters as:

Setting up of machinery for prompt termination and settlement of canceled contracts.

Making available to industry, through prompt payment of claims or other means, its urgent needs for working capital.

Clearing plants so they can promptly return to peacetime work.

We now are sending the many thousands of private plants that contain Government-owned equipment a questionnaire to obtain from each an appraisal of its situation and its judgment of the measures necessary to free it for civilian production. This survey will also develop information on contractors' plans for purchasing or leasing Government-owned facilities.

I cannot leave this subject without again emphasizing the fact that it would be fatal if the Army, industry, labor, and the public generally in this country allowed any post-war considerations to reduce by even the smallest degree the concentration on our one important job—winning the war.

General Somervell recently said: "No organization ever reached perfection in its methods but no organization worth its salt ceases to strive for it." The organization of the Army Service Forces is "worth its salt." It is drawn 95 percent from civil life and represents a cross section of this country. Its management has the same habits of thought and familiarity with business procedures as the men who run this country's industries. They have a full appreciation of the problems and an earnest and enthusiastic desire to improve constantly their performance.

Veterans' Benefits—A Series of Articles by Congressman Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts, Appearing in Massachusetts Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from articles written by me and appearing in the Boston Traveler and other newspapers on veterans' benefits:

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—MATERNITY CARE PROVIDED BY ACT—PHILBIN POINTS TO APPROPRIATION FOR FREE MEDICAL AID TO WIVES, BABIES

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

(This is the first of a series of articles to appear in the Boston Traveler on veterans' benefits by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of the Third Massachusetts District.)

With the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, American families are facing many bewildering problems. In addition, there has been of late much agitation for congressional action on the recently enacted mustering-out pay bill for veterans of World War No. 2. Evidently some persons have the impression that Congress has done comparatively little for the man in the service.

Of course, this is not true, as I propose to show in this résumé, which describes the various governmental aids and benefits already extended to servicemen and discharged veterans.

I plan to touch, as briefly and as concisely as possible, on monthly family allowances, emergency aid for servicemen and their families made available through the Army Emergency Relief, Navy Relief, and Red Cross home service, maternity and child-care assistance through the State department of health, national service life insurance, veterans' compensation, and related matters which affect veterans of World War No. 2 and their families.

MATERNITY AID

In this first article, I would like to treat of a subject which has received far too little publicity: the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care Act, legislation provided by Congress.

Financed by Federal grants, free maternity care for wives of men in military service and free medical and nursing care for their babies are now provided through the Massachusetts State Department of Health, Dr. Florence L. McKay, director of the division of child hygiene, is in charge.

A total of $4,400,000 for this purpose was appropriated by Congress last spring and an additional $18,600,000 was voted by Congress on October 1, 1943. Of this amount, $530,388 has been allocated to date to Massachusetts. These allocations are made monthly.

The emergency maternity and infant care program, or E. M. I. C. plan, as it is called, provides for prenatal care for the wife of a serviceman by a qualified doctor of her own selection at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. In addition, the baby is entitled to receive free medical care during the first year of his life.

Next: Further discussion of maternity and infant care.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—MOTHERS TOLD HOW TO GET E. M. I. C. AID—WHEN THEY FIRST VISIT DOCTOR'S OFFICE SPECIAL UNITED STATES FORMS MUST BE FILLED OUT

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

(This is the second of a series of articles to appear in the Boston Traveler on veterans' benefits, by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of the Third Massachusetts District.)

STUDY E. M. I. C. RULES

So that there be no question as to eligibility to participate in the E. M. I. C. program, wives of servicemen should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the rules made by Congress and the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor in Washington, which supervises State operation of this program. These regulations are procurable from the State department of health or from the Children's Bureau and they must be carefully followed in order to obtain this free care and service. When the wife visits her doctor the first time, she should ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, 73 Tremont Street, Boston, asking that an application form be sent to you.

Fill out the application form carefully and be sure to include your husband's serial number. It is necessary for you to fill out part 1 of the form. Ask your doctor to fill out part 2 and then send it to Boston for approval. If your application is passed upon favorably, you will receive a letter from Dr. McKay within a few days to the effect that your physician and the hospital, in the event you decide to go to the hospital, have been notified that funds have been authorized for your case. Keep this letter since it will serve as a means of identification when you go to the hospital.

APPLY EARLY

It is important that wives apply for E. M. I. C. funds in early pregnancy. The State department of health will not approve payment of the doctor, hospital, or any service bill before the application is made. In case of emergency it is advisable that the doctor in the case make application for you within 48 hours after the service is rendered since no bills for hospital or medical service will be paid under the E. M. I. C. program if this is not done.

Wives can consult their regular family doctor for this aid. It is not necessary to go to a Government doctor.

Should you know of any wife of any serviceman who is in need of this care, be sure to impress upon her that it is necessary that she should see a doctor at once and make application. In too many instances wives of servicemen were refused E. M. I. C. funds, because no application was made beforehand, a very unfortunate and tragic occurrence, but this is required by the State.

CARE PROVIDED

The charges for this medical, hospital, and surgical assistance are paid through the division of child hygiene, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, directly to the hospital and the doctor and nurse. No money is given the wife.

A minimum stay of 10 days in the hospital after childbirth is arranged for the mother, if facilities permit. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospital, including Army and Navy hospitals, where maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State department of health. Therefore, it is imperative that the prospective mother ascertain whether or not the local hospital has been approved by the State under the E. M. I. C. program.

Please direct inquiries to me at Washington, D. C.

Next: Employment opportunities for disabled veterans in the Government service.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—PROVIDE TRAINING FOR DISABLED VET

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

(This is the third of a series of articles to appear in the Boston Traveler on veterans' benefits, by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of the Third Massachusetts District.)

Both Congress and the Federal agencies recognize that the reemployment of disabled veterans is not exclusively a post-war problem since disabled veterans are being returned every day from the fighting fronts all over the world.

I think practically all of us feel that preferences should and will be extended to veterans, whether disabled or not, by both public and private employers. As a matter of public conscience, over 11,000,000 of our young men and women cannot be taken from their normal pursuits and asked to make every kind of sacrifice and then be cast aside to shift for themselves, deprived of previous jobs and new opportunities after the war has been won.

FEDERAL PLEDGE

The Selective Training and Service Act specifies that persons who have left positions in the Federal service and have entered the armed forces shall be restored to the positions they left, or to like positions of seniority, status, and pay. This is the obligation of every appointing officer of any Federal agency and there is no question that this obligation will be carried out conscientiously and honestly.

The act specifies that the veteran who formerly worked for the Government has a right to return to his old position or to a position with similar seniority, status, and pay if he is still qualified to perform the duties of such position. This provision could be interpreted by some Federal officials that the Federal Government, as an employer, is under no obligation to a former employee who becomes disabled and who is unable to perform the duties of his former position.

NEW TRAINING

This means that in many instances disabled veterans will have to be trained to do things which they have never done before. Fortunately, this training will be provided by several agencies, for instance, the Veterans' Administration through its vocational rehabilitation program, which is already functioning here in Massachusetts, the Federal Security Agency, the Army, the Navy, and the War Manpower Commission. All these are by law required to see to it that the disabled veteran is given some type of special training to utilize his skills and background in the best possible manner so that the veteran may take up his peacetime way of living without serious disruption. Other enabling laws will doubtless simplify and coordinate these efforts.

For some time past, the Civil Service Commission has been working on the rehabilitation phase of the veteran's problem. Over 2,500 different positions in the Government embracing millions of job opportunities have been examined and surveyed to find out what jobs can be filled by handicapped persons. This survey has disclosed just what abilities and what faculties are needed in particular jobs. Already, civilian persons, who are handicapped, have been placed in many of these positions on the basis of war-service appointments, and there is no question that

these people are making a magnificent contribution to our war effort. Since October 1942, more than 15,000 physically handicapped persons have been placed in the Federal Government as the result of this special rehabilitation activity of the Civil Service Commission.

REAL SERVICE

There is no question but what our disabled veterans will be able to take over these and many other positions in the Federal Government without interfering with the status of faithful and efficient regular employees.

Armed with factual information obtained by various surveys, the Commission will be in a position to render real service to all former Government employees who have been disabled as a result of their war service. The Government will work with the handicapped veteran in finding jobs which can be filled by persons with the abilities and faculties which he possesses, even though he may be regarded at the same time by the Veterans' Administration as a physically handicapped person. There is no question but that the handicapped veteran will be given preferential treatment once it has been demonstrated that as a result of special training he can do the job required.

WHAT OF OTHERS?

What of the disabled veteran who, prior to his entrance into the service, did not work for the Government? As an indication of official policy, I quote United States Civil Service Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming, in a recent talk before the Disabled American Veterans in New York City:

"They should be given preference in the filling of these positions.

"* * * we will present to appointing officers disabled veterans who have the faculties and abilities needed to perform particular jobs, irrespective of any other physical handicaps which they may have. Appointing officers who pass over veterans must now submit in writing their reasons for so doing."

Already the Commission has established in its Washington office an organizational unit charged with the responsibility of devoting all of its time to veterans' problems. In time each of the Commission's regional offices, including Boston, will have a similar staff.

It is evident that in pursuance of long established congressional policies, our administrative practices are being shaped to accord to returning veterans, especially the disabled, decisive preferences and widespread employment opportunities for training and placement.

Please direct your inquiries for further detailed information to the United States Civil Service Commission, the Veterans' Administration, both at the Federal Building, Boston, or to me at House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Next: What next of kin should know.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS — INSURANCE PAID ACCORDING TO AGE — BENEFICIARIES OF 6 MONTHS' WAGE SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AT ONCE

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

There is hardly a town in Massachusetts which has not felt the heavy burden of war through the loss of a native son on some distant battlefield. Sad to relate, more such sacrifices will follow. It is, therefore, appropriate that our people be informed as to just what dependents and next of kin are entitled to as a result of the loss of a son, a daughter, a husband, or a father. I hope and pray our people may be spared but if a casualty visits your family or your immediate neighborhood, you ought to know the rights of certain relatives. Basically, there are four money benefits as follows:

1. A 6-month gratuity payment: This payment is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran; or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving orphan child or children.

This 6-month gratuity is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters. The man or woman in the service must designate beforehand that the parents or brothers or sisters receive the 6-months gratuity payment. As a result, it might be well to advise the unmarried soldier to obtain necessary forms from his commanding officer and designate his parents or brothers and sisters to receive this payment. If this is not done, the parents or brothers and sisters are not eligible for this payment.

DEPENDS ON RANK

The amount of the payment depends on the rank of the soldier. If the casualty is a private, it is $300. If he is a corporal, it is $396. If he is a sergeant, it is $468. The payment is six times the monthly base pay of the man or woman in the service. This payment is made in addition to insurance and is payable even if the soldier has no insurance.

2. Monthly insurance payments: This insurance is not paid in a lump sum. It is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary. The older the beneficiary, the higher the monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy a beneficiary under 30 years of age will receive $55.51 a month for 240 months. A beneficiary over 30 years of age will get a guaranteed 120 equal installments—and if they survive beyond 120 months, it is paid for life. The amount paid to the beneficiary over 30 depends on the actual age. Under the $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will receive $53.90 a month. Under the same policy, a 70-year-old beneficiary will receive $85.10 per month, and so on, according to tables set up based upon the age of the beneficiary.

PERIODIC CHECK

It is always a wise procedure for the parents and next of kin of veterans to check periodically with the men in the service concerning insurance policies to make sure they are in effect and in order. The serviceman can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—PENSIONS, BACK PAY EXPLAINED—BE SURE TO DETERMINE IF WAGES HAVE BEEN COLLECTED UP TO DATE

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

Besides the 6-month gratuity payment and the monthly insurance payments, discussed in an earlier article in this series, benefits to veterans and their dependents include pensions and arrears in service-personnel pay.

A pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible and children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school at the time of death. If the child marries before 18 or 21, he or she is not eligible for this pension.

Parents who have been dependent upon the soldier can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are receiving a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. A widow under 50 gets $45. In addition, she receives $10 per month for the first child up to 10 years of age She also receives $15 per month for each child between 10 and 18 and this continues up to 21 years of age if the child is in school.

It is important to note that a widow, a child, or parent receives the insurance payments, if a policy has been taken out by the enlisted man, in addition to getting a pension. Both may be collected, the pension and the insurance. Accordingly, make sure that insurance is in effect and in order.

BACK PAY

Arrears of pay is a possibility sometimes overlooked.

When a casualty occurs, there is always a chance the veteran has back pay due to him. For instance, if the casualty occurs on the 27th day of the month, the veteran had 27 days' pay coming to him. If the casualty occurs on the 15th day of the month, 15 days' pay is due, and so on.

Also, when soldiers are at the front, there is always the possibility that they may have missed several pay days. All this back pay is paid directly to the next of kin. Inquiries should always be made about possible arrears of pay so it can be collected by those entitled to it.

To summarize, I advise that you make careful note of these four payments due the dependents of deceased service men or women:

1. Six-month gratuity payment.
2. Insurance.
3. A pension.
4. Arrears of pay.

In the event there should be any difficulty in getting these payments from the Government, it might be advisable to write me at Washington.

Next: An explanation of the Increased Veterans' Dependents Allowances Act.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS — DEPENDENCY CLASS KEY TO PAYMENTS

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

AN EXPLANATION OF THE INCREASED VETERANS' DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT

Recently, Congress voted an increase in allowances to be paid to veterans' dependents. Since there is considerable confusion as to how these payments are made and who is eligible, this article may help clarify some of the problems of the dependents of veterans.

Broadly any dependent of a man or woman in the service, who is being paid $138 a month or less, is eligible to receive a dependent's allotment or allowance from the Government. This act applies only to men and women in the service whose base pay is $138 a month or less. Those servicemen who get more than $138 a month come under another system. The new act provides for a monthly allotment as follows:

Class A dependents: a wife, $50; a wife and child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife with one child, $72; a divorced wife with each additional child, $20. In case of alimony, a wife separated or divorced from a serviceman will receive no more than the amount fixed in a court order or decree. If the divorce or separation order does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, she will not receive any allotment.

Class B dependents, or where the dependency on the serviceman is less than 50 percent: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers or sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. It is important to make mention that Class B dependents are classified as such because they are only partially dependent upon the service men or women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon men or women in the service, 50 percent or less, they come under Class B. Only $37 is given in such cases and applicants have to prove that they are dependent upon the enlisted man or woman for support.

B-1 DEPENDENTS

Class B-1 dependents, or where the dependency on the serviceman is 50 percent or more: One parent, $50; one parent and one

brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79; two parents and each additional brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $52; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

Here also it is necessary for the applicant to prove 50 percent or more dependency. If the proof given is not sufficient, the dependent automatically comes under class B and gets much less. Thus, the dividing line, above or below 50 percent dependency, has an important bearing as to the amount of the allotment.

Now that many of the married men in the community are being called for the services, it is important that they make application for allotment upon induction. The allotment payments are not retroactive and only begin the date the application is filed. As a result, if the enlisted man waits 1 month or 2 months, or even more, before filing his application, he automatically loses 1 or more months' allotment money. It is highly desirable that the serviceman file the day he is inducted so that his family can be promptly provided for.

Next: Further discussion of veterans' dependents allowances.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—DEPENDENTS' AID OF SEVERAL KINDS—NOT ONLY WIFE, CHILDREN BUT PARENTS, BROTHERS, SISTERS MAY BE ELIGIBLE

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

The application for veterans' dependents' allowance is important, and there is need for giving the matter prompt attention.

This application is made on special forms, available at the induction center from the enlisted man's commanding officer. In filling out the form the enlisted man should be careful to spell all names correctly and give exact information as to marriage, dates of birth, etc. Many of the difficulties concerning allotments are due to carelessness in filling out the form.

In the event the enlisted man fails for some reason or other to make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. These forms may be obtained from the War or Navy Department or you may obtain an application by merely writing your Congressman or Senator, who will be pleased to forward one to you and assist in every possible way. The Army requires that its regular application form be filled out, while the Navy simply requires a letter giving the name of the applicant's wife and children, date of birth, and service address of the enlisted man.

If the serviceman does not wish to make application for class B or B-1 dependents, no other person can apply. These allotments are granted and continued only at the will of the man or woman in the service. They cannot be forced to make application. However, whenever an enlisted man fails to make such application and the dependents are reasonably sure that he will approve it, they may make the application themselves.

The permission of the enlisted man then will be obtained by the service; and if he gives permission, the allotment will be approved and payments started.

Thus, it can be seen that only class A dependents can obtain allotments without the consent of the serviceman. All other dependents require his approval.

OTHER RELATIVES

Parents and brothers or sisters of servicemen can receive an allotment even if the serviceman's wife and children are getting one. If the enlisted man also partially supported his parents and brothers or sisters prior to his entrance into the service, they are also eligible for an allotment. Application can be made in the usual manner and all that is necessary is proof of dependency, as though the enlisted man were single.

For example, if there is a wife and one child dependent upon the serviceman, they receive $80. If this same man has two parents and a sister, also dependent upon him, they can receive a total of $79 also. To get this extra $79, all that is necessary is an additional $5 deduction from the serviceman's pay. The Government makes up the difference. If the parents and brothers or sisters are only partially dependent—that is, less than 50 percent—if they can get $37.

In addition, if parents are dependent upon more than one son or daughter, who are both in the service, they are eligible for larger allotments. For example, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son in the service, they receive $68 a month. Now if another son or daughter enters into the service, upon whom they depended also for support, these same two parents are eligible to receive another $37 from the second son or daughter.

Often your Congressman can help expedite allotment applications when there is real need for this money, so it is advisable that you write him when payments are slow in coming to you. Also, your Representative in Congress often can help clear up some of your difficulties. Do not hesitate to write to him.

Next: Emergency relief for servicemen and their dependents.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—RELIEF FUNDS FUNCTIONS TOLD—MEN THEMSELVES, AS WELL AS FAMILIES, OFTEN MAY RECEIVE TEMPORARY AID

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

Now that some of the married men of this community are being called into the service, there sometimes arise cases of extreme hardship involving dependents of servicemen. In some cases, even the men and women in the service have found themselves in destitute circumstances at one time or other. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need.

These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army relief fund at the special offices set up in each Army camp in the United States and overseas or through the Red Cross, if he is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance, and he will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is open to all dependents of men and women in the Army. Should anyone know of any destitute dependent at home or any destitute member of the Army, advise him to get in touch at once with the Army emergency relief fund direct or through the local Red Cross office.

Another agency is the Navy Relief Society. Any dependent of a man or woman in our naval forces can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. Any member of our naval forces in destitute circumstances can appeal to this agency and his needs will be taken care of. Should you know of anyone in our naval forces in dire circumstances, advise him to take up his case with the Navy Relief Society. To get immediate action from the Navy Relief Society, it is advisable to take up the case through the local chapter of the American Red Cross. The Red Cross is in a position to expedite matters, but in the event that it is not possible for the dependents of the enlisted man in the United States Navy or the man himself, in destitute circumstances, to get in touch with the Red Cross, an appeal can be made to the Boston branch of the Navy Relief Society Auxiliary, Bank Building, Thompson Square, Charlestown, where prompt and courteous assistance will be given.

ONLY FOR SERVICEMEN

These two agencies were set up to take care of the urgent critical cases of men in service who are in need of immediate financial assistance. This service is available only to men actually in the armed forces and is not available to servicemen who have been discharged. Likewise, the service is available only to dependents of men in our armed forces, and not to dependents of a discharged soldier or sailor.

If urgent need actually exists, it should not take more than an hour or two to get financial help for anyone who is destitute. The Army and Navy Emergency Relief Funds reach out to every community in the country. This emergency help is available at all times, and our service men and women and their dependents should have no hesitation in making application for it when in real need.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—RED CROSS AIDS SERVICE FAMILIES—WILL HELP WHILE DEPENDENTS OF FIGHTERS AWAIT RECEIPT OF THEIR ALLOTMENTS

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

Another agency that gives aid to the dependents of servicemen is the Home Service of the American Red Cross and this is available through the chapter located in your town or the nearest community. The Home Service gives financial assistance to dependents of servicemen during the period from the time of filing of the soldier's or sailor's application for a family allotment and the receipt of such allotment. There is no specific sum granted for all cases. The amount will depend on the extent of the dependents' needs at the moment.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

The Red Cross will not supplement the dependents' allotment once the checks start coming from the Government, taking the position that the increased allowances are ample to take care of the immediate needs of the families of servicemen.

Other assistance available from the home service of the Red Cross is funds for transportation of wives stranded far away from their homes when their husbands leave for overseas assignments, or transportation home when their husbands are transferred to other camps. Medical care to the wives and children of servicemen is also available from the home service in the event there are no community facilities available to provide such care. This medical care is especially given to wives or families of servicemen living in the so-called camp communities whose hospital facilities are closed to them because they are transients.

The home service is also equipped to give financial assistance to dependents of servicemen for special and unusual needs, such as operations, and so forth, when such assistance is not available from community welfare services.

FOR DISCHARGED VET, TOO

There is also this special fact to note about the home service of the Red Cross, as compared to the assistance from the Army Emergency Relief Fund and the Navy Relief Society; this financial assistance is also available to the discharged veteran, especially the disabled, during the interval of the filing of his claim for veterans' compensation and the adjudication of his claim by the Veterans'

Administration, a period extending anywhere from 3 to 8 months.

NEW ARRANGEMENT

In response to inquiries I have made concerning problems of veterans' dependents as a result of the closing of the Army Emergency Relief district offices in Massachusetts, A. E. R. headquarters in Washington advises "This new arrangement with the Red Cross was effected in order to prevent duplication of effort by the Red Cross and the Army Emergency Relief and further in the interest of a conservation of Army manpower now used in relief work. The Red Cross has given every assurance that it will care for the needs of servicemen and their depedents and the Army Emergency Relief stands ready to supplement that aid in any case where the Red Cross is unable, due to the provisions of its home-service policy, to handle a particular case."

Where supplemental aid, not given by the Red Cross, is needed, servicemen or their families should ask the local Red Cross to channel their request to northeastern headquarters, American Red Cross, 300 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., where a liaison officer of the Army Emergency Relief is stationed, or write or wire me at Washington.

Next: The Nation cares for its veterans.

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—DISABLED VETS GET GOVERNMENT CARE—PAYMENTS ARE FROM $10 TO $100 A MONTH; THOSE HANDICAPPED VOCATIONALLY TRAINED

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

Since the founding of the Republic, the United States has paid out more than $21,000,000,000 in direct benefits to veterans and their families, including those of World War No. 2. This is ample proof that a grateful Nation has ever been mindful of the sacrifices made by her sons and daughters in defense of our country. At the present time, the Government is caring for veterans of all wars and their dependents and at last count, the Veterans' Administration was caring in one way or another in substantial manner for more than a million persons.

One theory underlying all laws concerning disability resulting from service in the present war is that the Government is under a duty to do everything humanly possible to enable our disabled men to become once again useful and self-supporting members of the community. Disability must have occurred or have been aggravated in line of duty in order to warrant a pension or vocational training, but hospital treatment and domiciliary care in soldiers' homes may be given for disability not due to war service.

DISABILITY PAYMENTS

These disability payments run from $10 a month for a 10 percent disability to $100 a month for total disability. The current average rate of disability for World War No. 2 is 40 percent, which means payments of $40 a month. Sums as high as $250 a month may be paid for certain specific disabilities of an unusual or particularly burdensome character.

If the disability is characterized by a vocational handicap, the veteran is entitled to receive vocational rehabilitation or training from the Veterans' Administration for a period of 4 years, if he requires and demands it. All expenses of this training are paid, including books, tuition or other equipment. In addition, the veteran's pension is increased to $80 a month, if single, and $90 a month if married, with additional sums for other dependents this man has to support while in training. Application for this training should be made at the Veterans' Administration, Boston.

LIFE INSURANCE

Every serviceman may apply for what is known as national life insurance. This insurance is sold at a lower price than would be possible for a private insurance company because the Government assumes the entire cost of operation, as well as the cost of the extra war hazard. Beneficiaries of this insurance are limited to wife, children, parents, sisters, and/or brothers. The serviceman may apply for amounts running from $4,000 to $10,000 and within these limits may take out more than one policy if he so desires. He may designate beneficiaries of his own choice within the categories mentioned above.

The serviceman may apply for this insurance without examination during the first 120 days following his induction. After the first 120 days, he is given a physical examination when he applies. After 1 year, the serviceman may convert his insurance to standard forms such as 20-pay life, which in addition to protecting his family, will build up a solid asset for him when he returns to civilian life. The serviceman may continue his insurance after he has left the service by forwarding the required monthly payments to the Veterans' Administration at Washington. While in the service, the man has regular deductions made from his monthly pay. More than 13,000,000 policies have been applied for with a face value of about $92,000,000,000, a number larger than the total enlisted in all the armed services.

Next: Further means of emergency assistance.

FAMILIES GUARDED AGAINST EVICTION

(By PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Congressman, Third Massachusetts District)

There are other benefits arranged by the Federal Government for the war veterans, besides insurance and others which have been discussed in this series.

Other servicemen's benefits I might mention include protection against eviction of servicemen's dependents for nonpayment of rent under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. Under this law, evictions for rentals not exceeding $80 a month may be made only on court order and may be stayed for 3 months by the court.

In addition, stays of judgments, attachments, garnishees, in the discretion of the courts, on actions against men during their service or within 90 days thereafter, may be granted. Further information concerning these legal protections is available at the local courthouse or soldiers' relief agent in your town.

The Seventy-eighth Congress during its first session has already enacted several sweeping and vital measures extending liberal benefits and rights to service men and women. Those include Public Law No. 10, providing hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to World War No. 2 veterans on a parity with World War No. 1 veterans; Public Law No. 13, authorizing renewal of the expiring 5-year level premium term insurance policies by the agent or beneficiary of an insured serviceman who is outside the continental United States; Public Law No. 16, providing for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans, mentioned earlier in this article.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Of very direct interest to all discharged veterans in certain categories is the so-called mustering-out pay bill, which provides for payments ranging from $100 to $300, depending on the length and character of service of the veteran. Now that this legislation has become law by virtually the unanimous vote of Congress, veterans eligible for mustering-out pay receive such payments as they are discharged from the service without making the special application required of the 1,300,000 or more veterans discharged prior to the enactment of this bill. Of this number, about 700,000 are believed eligible for mustering-out pay and I desire to make some brief observations for the benefit of these men and women which may help them to expedite their respective applications.

Discharged veterans, desiring to apply for mustering-out pay may obtain mimeographed application forms from the Finance Officer, United States Army, Chamber of Commerce Building, 80 Federal Street, Boston. These same forms may be used by Navy, Coast Guard, and marine veterans. In addition, local veterans' organizations may also have a supply of forms, and newspapers throughout the country have printed the official blank, which is readily procurable.

CERTIFICATE NEEDED

Let me emphasize here that the serviceman must return this application with his original service-discharge certificate. Under regulations, photostatic copies will not serve the purpose inasmuch as the original certificate itself must be marked with appropriate notations that the serviceman has applied for and has been granted mustering-out pay. This ruling was made in order to minimize duplicate or fraudulent claims and at the same time expedite payment to the veteran, inasmuch as centralized discharge records will not be consulted for some time following actual payment of these benefits. The applications of all discharged veterans who were inducted from this area must be returned to the Army Finance Officer at Boston and payment will be made from that office. Veterans should not become concerned if they receive their first check without their discharge certificate returned in the same envelope. The certificate will be sent in a day or two as an added protection against mail-box theft of the check. These safeguards were deemed necessary to prevent fraud and misrepresentation.

WRITE FOR OTHER DATA

It is exceedingly difficult to write at length and explain in full detail all benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars.

I have tried in these articles to sketch briefly and concisely the benefits and rights of veterans under existing legislation. Of necessity, it was impossible to recite in full detail in such limited time and space all the ramifications and technicalities of the relief provided by Congress.

I hope the information contained herein will, in the main, point the way of guidance and effective action by which veterans may move to avail themselves of current legislative measures in their behalf. If anyone has special questions or special problems, I suggest you write to me personally, 420 Old House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

This is the last of a series by Congressman PHILBIN. Possession of these articles may be of inestimable value as guidance if you need them later.

The Rights of Man in the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject The Rights of Man in The Post-War World, delivered by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr.

O'MAHONEY], before the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, at Richmond, Va., on April 13 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would be difficult to find a spot in all the world more appropriate for a discussion of the principles which must guide us in reorganizing the post-war world than here in Virginia, for of all of the States in the Union none made a richer contribution than Virginia to the founding of the Nation. The leaders of this State in the formative period of the Republic had a clear understanding of the principles upon which free government must be built. The people of Virginia may still be proud of the fact that its public officials in both State and Federal office hold the respect and admiration of the country. Both Senator GLASS and Senator BYRD are known and respected everywhere for their loyalty to conviction.

Certainly, too, it would be impossible to find a day more appropriate than this for the discussion of any theme involving freedom of the individual, for this is the birthday of the author of the Declaration of Independence. The fame of Jefferson increases with the passing years. Nothing can dim the luster of his reputation as the philosopher of human rights.

"Nothing is unchangeable," said he, "but the inherent and inalienable rights of man." That was his faith, political and economic, from the day he penned the Declaration of Independence until that day in June 1826, half a century later when he wrote the last message that ever came from his hand.

I need not tell this gathering that the mayor of the city of Washington had invited Jefferson to attend the celebration that was planned for the Nations Capital on the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration and that Jefferson, unable to leave Monticello, sent him this message in response:

"All eyes are opened, or opening, to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few, booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

With these final words there passed from the active scene the great Virginian who, in the Declaration of Independence, had asserted that governments are instituted among men to secure the inalienable rights they derive from their Creator and that the just powers of government come only from the consent of the governed. This principle of the relation of government to men is now enduring its most dangerous attack. The appalling conflict in which we are engaged was initiated by men whose views were at utter variance with those of Jefferson. The war was started for the purpose of making government supreme and of denying to men the right to control it.

We now know that this attempt to destroy the principles of free government has failed. We know that though military victory may be delayed and though we must still pay a terrible price, nothing can now prevent the forces of freedom from achieving it.

MILITARY VICTORY WILL VINDICATE JEFFERSON

When that victory comes it will be a vindication of the philosophy of Jefferson and the principles of political freedom which this Nation has always cherished. It has been the contribution of the people of America, the people in whom Jefferson had such profound faith, that has made this victory possible. Totally unprepared as we were at the outbreak of the war in Europe, our people have transformed this Nation from one which was devoted only to the pursuits of peace into the mightiest military power that ever existed. We have produced the implements without which Britain and Russia could not have withstood the totalitarian might of Germany. We have produced the food necessary to maintain not only our own military forces but to supplement the supplies of all our allies as well.

Agriculture and industry both have been organized by a free people in such a manner as to exceed the most efficient achievements of concentrated arbitrary state power. We entered this war with only part of a one-ocean Navy. Now we have a Navy capable of dominating two oceans, a Navy greater by far than that of which any dictator ever dreamed. We entered the war with only a handful of airplanes. Today we are driving Japanese planes from the sky and, in cooperation with our British allies, are slowly but certainly destroying the Luftwaffe on the ground and in the air.

In a single month our industrial machine is now producing three times as many airplanes as we were capable of manufacturing in an entire year before the war began. Our industrial organization is today outproducing both Germany and Japan in the manufacture of all types of combat material.

This is the achievement of a free people, an achievement which beggars all description, an achievement which will be remembered long after the annoyances we have endured and the sacrifices we have made will have been forgotten. It is an achievement which justifies the faith of Jefferson and all those other Americans from all 13 of the original colonies who built the American Republic upon the indestructible foundation of popular sovereignty.

But if we look back upon the legacy which was bequeathed to us and seek to peer into the future to discern the outlines of the new structure of freemen that is to arise, we must ask ourselves how it came about that 168 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the principles of human freedom came to be in such grave danger. Hitler and Mussolini warned us long before the war began of their intention to make the state the master of men instead of their servant. They told us in words of one syllable that democracy was outmoded and could not endure in the modern world. We heard them, but we did not believe them. We waved aside their declarations as the unimportant rantings of demagogs, but we know now that if it had not been for the heroic defense of Britain by the freedom-loving people of England and if it had not been for the extraordinary productive output of our own people, Hitler and Mussolini would have made their boasts good. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, in our plans for reorganizing the future to search out the causes of this great horror which might have turned out to be complete disaster for the rights of man.

STABLE LOCAL ECONOMY ESSENTIAL

The message I bring you is simple and I think altogether understandable—there can be no successful defense against the encroachments of central arbitrary power until first there is a stable local economy. It has been the loss of economic stability in local communities and subdivisions, in villages, cities, and States that has undermined political freedom and made possible the growth of the totalitarian state.

When Jefferson and his colleagues labored for the establishment of this Government, our economy was almost exclusively individual. Today it is an organized economy and is preponderantly national in scope. This change from the individual basis to the organized basis has taken place all over the world and we have not successfully adjusted ourselves to the alteration. It was the failure to make this adjustment, the failure of a central economy to provide sure and certain employment for all men that created the opportunity for the advocates of totalitarian central power to walk upon the scene.

Our success in reorganizing for the post-war world will be measured by the degree in which we succeed in stabilizing the opportunities of individuals and localities in a world in which the advance of science has made organizational activities necessary. This adjustment can be obtained without injury to any group or class, without the necessity of any class warfare, without the loss of individual freedom if only we open our eyes to certain plain and inescapable facts.

Forty years ago there were in the United States 30,000 more post offices than are in existence today. Good roads and high speed automobiles have destroyed the little post offices and built up the big ones. At the turn of the century we had over 72,000 fourth-class offices and only 194 post offices of the first class. Today we have only 27,000 fourth-class post offices while offices of the first class have increased in number from 194 to 1,444.

With the change of the instruments that we use in the modern world, there has been a complete change likewise in our manner of living. No one, of course, would want to go back to the days of the dominant fourth-class post office. No one would want to sacrifice the improvements and the comforts which have come with the increased number of first-class post offices, but unless we understand precisely what brought about this change in the geographical structure of the country we shall not understand how it happens that little business and local business is in such a precarious position from end to end of the country. Precisely the same influences which have been destroying the small post offices have been sapping the vitality of little business, of local business, of individual enterprise.

Let me give you another example. The United States Steel Corporation during the last week in March published in most of the great newspapers of the country an advertisement to show what it has accomplished in the war effort, how much it has produced, what it has received for its production, and how its receipts have been distributed. This record shows, for example, that of almost $2,000,000,000 which it received in 1943 from its customers (an increase of 22 percent over what it had received in 1941) almost $1,000,000,000 was paid to employees who received 45 percent more than they had received 2 years before.

THE "POPULATION" OF BIG BUSINESSES

The advertisement showed that the United States Steel Corporation in 1943 paid out $707,000,000 for the purchase from others of products and services. This was also an increase of 22 percent over payments for the same purposes in 1941.

Significant as these figures are, the United States Steel Corporation has given us even more significant information in the advertisement by reciting that it has more than 340,000 employees and 222,000 stockholders. Let us add these two figures together and we find that the "population," so to speak, of the United States Steel Corporation, without taking into account at all the families of employees and stockholders, is more than 562,000 persons. How many cities in Virginia, how many counties, have a population that great?

Let us suppose that each one of these employees and each one of these stockholders is a member of a family of three—that means a "population" of 1,686,000 persons. There are 18 States in the Federal Union each of which has fewer people than that.

Let me take another example. This is from an advertisement published by General Motors in all the leading newspapers of the country this week. Like the ad of the United States Steel Corporation, it tells a story of marvelous achievement, of efficient

industrial management, of a great contribution to the war. But here again we have an amazing revelation of the gigantic size which has been attained by industrial organization. General Motors which manufactures not only 5 different models of automobiles, a popular truck, a desirable coach, the Fisher body, and the Frigidaire, but also a score of other highly essential and valuable products, tells us that in 1943 its average number of employees was 448,000. Its stockholders numbered approximately 421,000, a total "population" of individual employees and stockholders of 870,000. Multiplying by 3 we have a total industrial "population" of 2,600,000, again exceeding the number of inhabitants found by the United States Census in 1940 to be domiciled in each of 29 of the 48 States.

General Motors tells us with pardonable pride that in 1943 the physical volume of war materials which it produced was more than double that produced in 1942. It tells us that the value of this production amounted to $3,500,000,000, and that it paid for materials and services purchased from others approximately $1,900,000,000.

General Motors tops the list of all the organizations in the country to which the Government has awarded its war contracts. It and 99 others have received war contracts amounting in value since the beginning of the war effort to more than 70 percent of all the billions of dollars which the Federal Government has expended out of its deepening deficit—70 percent to 100 huge organizations, 30 percent to all the other thousands. Here, again, you have the same condition of little groups drying up and big groups growing bigger that I showed you at the outset in the story of the Nation's post offices.

HOW WHOLE COUNTRY IS AFFECTED

It is undoubtedly true that this country could not have made the marvelous record in the manufacture of war materials, of which we are so proud, without the highly efficient, well-organized activity of these giant industrial institutions. But it is only necessary to consider for a moment the magnitude of the purchases made by these units to realize that the prosperity of every community in the land is dependent upon what the managers of these organizations do and the decisions they make. When United States Steel, which last year bought $707,000,000 of products and services from others, or when General Motors, which last year bought almost $2,000,000,000 of such materials and services, reduces the amount of its orders, mines, and factories, farms and stores all over the country will experience a reduction of business. Communities and States from coast to coast are intimately affected by the decisions reached by the managers of these units and nothing that the people in those communities or in those States can do is likely to affect the result.

But the condition is even worse if instead of United States Steel or General Motors, we consider "General Government," the title which I give for the moment to the huge Central Government organization we have had to establish in Washington to wage totalitarian war against totalitarian dictators.

It has been necessary for the Federal Government to control production and allocate materials in order to organize the war effort, because we had to have the guns, the airplanes and the battleships with which to overmatch the aggressors of Europe and Asia. This was all done necessarily by increasing the national debt to unimagined proportions. The orders which have come from Washington from the Army and the Navy, the Maritime Commission, the Defense Plant Corporation and all the rest amounting in value to about $150,000,000,000, account for more than 50 percent of all the goods and services which are being produced in the United States. In other words, Uncle Sam is buying with deficit dollars more than one-half of all the things that are produced and all the services that are rendered in this country by the people of the country. When the peace comes and that purchasing stops, when Uncle Sam withdraws from the market, then indeed unless we are ready in advance, every community in the land will feel the effects. This is the picture of the effect of economic concentration upon the lives of people. This is the story of the effect of an organized economy upon an individual economy.

Here is the reflection in our country of the very conditions which in Europe and in Asia produced arbitrary central political power. Here is the illustration of the two conflicting principles which lie at the root of this war—individualism versus arbitrary central power. Fascism and communism both stem from central economic power. They came into existence because men did not know how to adjust the necessary huge organizations of the modern world to the needs of individuals and localities. Because men did not know how to make that adjustment, they began to struggle among themselves for control of the government upon which, in turn, they were ready to depend for the complete control of their economic lives. People divided into groups, workers or proprietors or farmers, and each sought to protect its own interest by seizing and holding the government and excluding the members of all other groups from that position of advantage.

MEANING OF THE AMERICAN WAY

If the American experiment in government means anything, if this American way of life of which we all speak so readily means anything, if the principles that Jefferson taught and Washington fought for mean anything, they mean that in America government is the instrument of all of us and not the instrument of any group or class. The American ideal of living is that both economically and politically we are all freemen and no part of us has any right or shall be permitted to regiment all the rest of us.

The problem of the modern world is the problem of the preservation of economic independence. Without economic independence, as the terrible events of the last 4 years have taught us so well, there can be no such thing as political liberty. One depends upon the other. The founding fathers were able to build a democracy in America because men were economically free. The very existence of democracy has been threatened all over the world because the growth of economic organization has been such as to unstabilize the economic basis of our society.

When, therefore, we look to the future, we must give our thought to the reestablishment upon a stable basis of the economy of the people in their local communities. This does not mean the destruction of big business at all. It does not mean the sacrifice of any of the great achievements, of any of the great efficiencies that big business has brought. It means, first of all, the protection of the local economy from arbitrary central power whether it is exercised by public or private authority.

A big country needs big business. Much of the enterprise which modern civilization demands cannot be carried on except by huge organization. The airplanes with which we are battering down Fortress Europa were possible of production only by huge organizations like General Motors. When the war is over we shall have to depend on the same organizations to build the planes which will carry the new commerce of the air across all continents and all oceans.

Just as when in the middle of the last century we spanned the continent with railroads, now that we expect to girdle the globe by air transport, we must expect to utilize huge accumulations of capital and large armies of workers under expert management. But we shall make a mistake if we imagine that we can turn the direction of the future over to the managers of these great units without Government supervision in the public interest. Government is just as essential as industrial organization. What is needed is not the elimination of industrial managerial authority or the elimination of Government supervisory authority, but the establishment of a rule of law under which the responsibility of all groups, public and private, to the whole people shall be recognized and maintained.

If big business is necessary, as we must recognize, to furnish the commodities and the services which the modern world demands, little business is no less necessary, for upon it depends the maintenance of the market which all business requires.

PURCHASING POWER OF PEOPLE ESSENTIAL

It is not necessary to tell any group of businessmen that there can be no prosperity unless the people have the means with which to purchase that which business handles. We have had a higher standard of living in the United States than ever was established anywhere in all the history of civilization, only because a larger proportion of the people here have been able to enjoy the output of all industry. The wise businessman first of all builds his markets, for unless he can sell his goods he has no interest either to produce them or to deal in them. Every chamber of commerce, therefore, which devotes attention to the problems of the post-war world must give heed to the creation of a stable purchasing power by the people throughout the Nation to take the place of Government purchasing when the war is over. That in turn means that one of the primary concerns of every chamber of commerce should be to help create new opportunity for employment in every community. Stable employment at good wages in every town, village, city, and State should be one of the primary objectives of local business everywhere, for only thus can a private economy be maintained.

We know that there is no other course to follow because we have tried the alternative courses, and each of them has failed. The private managers of our concentrated industrial economy were not able to prevent the collapse of 1929. Government managers by public spending did create subsistence jobs for the unemployed in the 10 years that followed, but a self-sustaining private economy was not established because concentrated public management is just as unable as concentrated private management to provide opportunity for all. Moreover, it must be perfectly obvious that deficit financing by the Federal Government in the post-war period offers no hope for the establishment of a stable economy.

Already the Government deficit is climbing toward $200,000,000,000, or almost $1,500 per capita for 135,000,000 people. The annual interest charge upon this deficit is more than $3,000,000,000, and this in turn is greater than the aggregate debt of all 48 States.

A PROGRAM FOR A DYNAMIC DEMOCRACY

The substitute for public spending is private spending. We know from the records of the banks and insurance companies, and from the reports of the United States Treasury Department that the people have been saving. They have the money, and it seems to me to be the plain conclusion of common sense that if we really want a private economy,

if we really want an individual economy, if we really want men to be economically free as well as politically free, we have no recourse but to take those measures that are necessary to stimulate the investment of these savings in local private business, in new competitive industry, and then protect these investments against the destructive action of both private monopoly and arbitrary central-government power.

The tax laws can be revised in such a manner as to promote and encourage the investment of private capital, and thereby stimulate the substitution of private spending for Government deficit spending. New enterprises thus brought into existence by the investment of private capital can be protected from destruction by monopoly through laws which will more clearly define the powers, responsibilities, and duties of all economic organizations.

This new enterprise can also be protected from regimentation or restraint by government by laws which though recognizing the necessity for public supervision, shall deny to all administrative bureaus the power to be both judge and jury, manager and master of private business. It should not be difficult to draw the line between local business and national business. It should not be difficult by law to stake out the respective jurisdictions of the two, so that while escaping from central government domination we shall not be in danger of falling back into the control of private managerial power, which, through national and international cartels and combinations, can close the door of opportunity to little business and to the individual.

Finally, we should seek to revive our confidence in State and local authority. We should undertake to stimulate the local development of local resources, and to develop everywhere throughout the country a new community consciousness, a new pride in our local subdivisions. We have had altogether too great a tendency to look to either concentrated financial power in the hands of big business or concentrated political power in the hands of big government to provide the employment which our local communities have neglected to provide by their own initiative. We have permitted class consciousness and pressure groups to grow at the expense of the integrity of the communities in which we live, and thus the vitality of both the economic and the political systems has been drained away.

Democratic society is the most difficult of all societies to maintain, but it is the society which is natural to man, because man is free.

The theories of fascism and communism are defeatist theories. They have been conceived by men who do not believe that the individual is competent to direct the modern economy. It is because of their lack of faith in man that they erect the state as the source of all power and authority.

The people of America have already demonstrated by their tremendous accomplishments in this war that they are not defeatists. They still believe in the principles of individual freedom, and I have no hesitation to say that they are competent to direct a free economy under a free government.

The Republic which Jefferson and the colonial fathers founded will lead the world to the reestablishment of a free economy, just as it is now leading the world toward the redemption of free government.

One thing only is needful, faith in ourselves, faith in the heritage that is ours, faith in those inalienable rights which Jefferson taught us were given to man by the Creator of the universe.

Address by Senator Bilbo Before Mississippi Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on March 22, at the invitation of the joint session of the Mississippi Legislature, I delivered an address which has caused some slight disturbance in the minds of some, which I think is largely due to the fact that they do not know the contents of the speech, since only short reports of it have appeared in newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Excellencies, Governor Bailey, Governor Wright, Mr. Speaker, members of the Mississippi Legislature, and you ladies and gentlemen present and of the radio audience:

The gracious invitation of the Mississippi Legislature to come here today and to speak to you in joint session made me very happy indeed because returning to these familiar scenes and greeting my friends of many years give me the joy and happiness of the prodigal son returning to loved ones and the old homestead.

For 16 years on these grounds and in this building I dreamed, planned, and labored, giving the best efforts of my life to make Mississippi a greater State and her people happier, more contented and more prosperous. How well I realized those ambitions of earlier days you are in position to know. You will pardon me, I am sure, for a brief mention of some of the fruits of my dreams and efforts.

A few minutes ago, as I rode up Capitol Street, so beautiful and prosperous looking that it would do credit to any city in America, I could not help but visualize the dilapidated old Capitol Building, home of bats and owls when I first became Governor in 1916, which now stands restored, rejuvenated, useful, and beautiful with all the historic and thrilling memories of our State's great and glorious past history, an architectural structure of beauty and joy forever.

I am happy to see the faces of several of my colleagues who helped in this great restoration still members of the Mississippi Legislature. I am also happy to note the presence of one of my dearest friends on earth, Senator H. K. Rouse, of Poplarville, Miss., the only member of this legislature who was a member of the last legislature that convened in the old capitol, and who, by the way, after the roll call defeating the bill to erect this new Capitol Building in which we meet today, changed his vote making it possible for Mississippi to have one of the most beautiful capitol buildings in America. By the way, Senator Rouse is a first cousin of mine; otherwise he would not have changed his vote.

The tubercular sanatorium, one of the Nation's best and largest tubercular institutions, has sent its tens of thousands back home well and happy, with a new lease on life, being saved from the ravages of the great "white plague," and it will save hundreds of thousands more in the days to come.

The feeble-minded colony at Ellisville, where the unfortunate feeble-minded are being trained and taught, and many returned to their homes able to make their own living in life.

The great industrial training school at Columbia has snatched, as "brands from the burning," hundreds of our neglected and wayward boys and girls, converting them into useful members of society. And tens of thousands will yet be saved at this great institution.

Tens of thousands of the poor and indigent have been restored to health and life at the South Mississippi Charity Hospital at Laurel.

The tax commission revolutionizing the revenue system of the State, equitably distributing the burden of taxation without which the State's fiscal system could not have been saved.

The highway department that has dug Mississippians out of the dust and mud and has given us one of the best highway systems of any State in the Union.

The completion of the Mississippi State Hospital that is unexcelled by any State in the Union.

The enlargement and expansion of buildings and facilities for the University of Mississippi and other higher educational institutions, the wisdom of which has been vindicated by the enlarged enrollments and higher standards of educational attainments for our Mississippi boys and girls.

I secured passage of necessary legislation to make Mississippi one of the greatest cattle-raising States in the Union.

In addition to these great institutions and remedial and progressive laws and measures, I sponsored and urged the adoption of many others; but, though delayed in the fulfillment of my dreams, I thank God that I have lived to see most of them come true. Governor Conner saved the financial structure of the State by the passage of the sales tax, for which I plead for 4 years as Governor. Governor White's administration made my dream of a State-wide system of connected hard-surfaced highways come true. And with all my pleading and working for years, it was left to Governor Johnson—and may God bless his memory—and his administration to give free schoolbooks to all the children of Mississippi.

I want to apologize to the legislature for the delay in responding to the great honor and consideration that you have shown me in inviting me to speak to a joint session. While my many duties at the Nation's Capital demanded my presence and attention, yet I want to be frank with you and tell you that while I was anxious to come I did not want to come until you had practically finished the work of this session of the Legislature, because I did not want anyone to say that I came to Mississippi to try to tell the Legislature what to do and what not to do. When I supported Governor Bailey I did so believing that he was amply able to perform the functions of a governor in advising the Legislature as to the status of the commonwealth and in making the proper recommendations of laws and measures for the welfare of the people. And you must remember that I was Governor of this State for 8 years, and well do I remember how many times I made my own recommendations to the Legislature, all in vain. I think I know when I get enough of anything.

Naturally, I have watched with a keen and sympathetic interest the progress of the program recommended by Governor Bailey and the enactment of same by the Legislature, and I want to congratulate Governor Bailey, Governor Wright, Speaker Sillers, and the members of the Legislature on the very splendid program that you have put over. You have more than justified the hope and confidence of your constituency. No doubt some mistakes have been made, both in commission

and omission, but such is common to all administrations, even to the best of them, but on the whole you and the people of Mississippi are to be congratulated sincerely upon the progressive and harmonious session that will now close in a few days.

Fellow Mississippians, as your servant, agent, representative, spokesman, advocate, and ambassador in the United States Senate, the upper branch of the greatest lawmaking body of the world, assembled in the busiest and most important spot on earth, Washington, D. C., the Capital of the wealthiest, most powerful, and influential nation of the world, I come today to make a brief report of the momentous and history-making events and happenings about which every Mississippian is keenly interested because what we, as a nation with such great power in wealth, resources, ingenuity, productive power, and manpower, do in this world crisis will directly affect every human being in Mississippi and our children yet unborn.

It is within our power to shape the destiny of the peoples of the earth for hundreds of years to come. Our opportunity and responsibility in this hour are far beyond mere words to describe.

In the few minutes that I will be permitted to speak to you hundreds of subjects come crowding into my mind that I would be happy to discuss on this occasion. I know how keenly interested you are in many of the laws and policies and problems that the Congress has had and is having under consideration. I would like to discuss with you the all-absorbing question of taxation which becomes more important day by day as the war-tax burden piles up by the hundreds of billions.

Every farmer is interested in the question of subsidies, adequate labor, price fixing, and the adequate supply of fertilizers and implements with which to farm. The small businessman is anxious to know whether he is going to be permitted to do business or whether he is going to be wiped out under the present monopolistic trend. Every businessman is anxious to know whether he is going to succeed or be forced into bankruptcy by the regulations and price fixings of the O. P. A. The traveling man is interested, yea, he has almost been driven mad on the question of gasoline and tires and automobiles. The laboring man wants to know if his wages will keep pace with the rising price of food and clothing.

Hundreds of thousands are still losing sleep over the question of whether they will be called upon to leave their wives and children for the armed service. Everyone is interested in what we propose to do for our brave and gallant soldiers, many of them maimed and crippled for life, as they return from the battlefields all over the world.

All of these and more as equally important questions come crowding into my mind today as I speak to you and the people of Mississippi, for whom I am accountable by virtue of your good will and suffrage—selected as one of your Senators to represent you in all these things in this the darkest period of our country and of the whole world. I will at another time be ready to answer and discuss freely with my masters—the people of Mississippi—all these problems which are my responsibility in part to solve.

Governor Bailey, when you go back to Meridian, please tell my friend "Jake" that he is a false prophet when he says that BILBO will not be a candidate for reelection year after next, 1946; and at that time I will be ready to answer for every vote I have cast and every position I have taken in the deliberations and consummation of the solution of these problems that so vitally affect the people of Mississippi.

Tell him that if any ill-informed dreamer plans to try to take my job away from me because he has heard it whispered that I am not physically well, he will be promptly disillusioned by finding that I am still growing stronger in mind and body as the days go by; in fact, I do not expect to be in my prime until I am 75 years old.

There is one question above all other questions which I am sure is engaging your thoughts, your hopes, and your prayers, and that is the progress and successful conclusion of this global war. While a mere Senator, like a civilian, is not permitted to know the plans of operation and strategy that the Commander in Chief and the Army and Navy are using for the success of the war, yet I do not hesitate to give expression to my views and convictions about the seriousness, the price we must pay, and the time of the victorious termination of this the greatest war of all the ages.

About 28 months ago, we were plunged into this world conflict by the cowardly attack of the Japs at Pearl Harbor, on the 7th of December 1941, a day that will live forever in the memory of man as a day of infamy.

In 1934, when I first ran for the Senate, I announced in the thirteenth plank of my platform that, if elected to the Senate, I would fight for and vote for the biggest and strongest Army, Navy, and Air Force of any nation on earth. If this Nation had done this—President Roosevelt would have done it if he had not been stopped by the Republicans and pacifists—we would have never been attacked and forced into this war. Preparedness is our surest guaranty against war.

It took a war to do it, but I have lived to see that plank of my platform come true, because, with these 28 months of preparation and before the close of this year, we will have a Navy stronger than all the other navies of the world combined. Already we have the strongest Air Force of any nation on earth. Already we have a merchant fleet larger than the combined fleets of our allies, and by July 1 we will have under arms and in training 11,300,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, and men of the Air Force.

We have produced in this short period, through the cooperation of both capital and labor, 150,000 fighting airplanes; 28,000 of these have been turned over to our allies for cash and under the provisions of the lend-lease law. We have over 2,000,000 men in our air service. In addition to our great airplane production, we have turned out unlimited supplies of tanks, antiaircraft guns, cannons, other large instruments of death and destruction, trucks, jeeps, bombs, and small arms by the millions.

With these gigantic preparations we are just now getting ready to fight this war. Up to this date there has been comparatively little fighting done. In fact, there are more than twice as many people in peacetime killed every year in automobiles and other accidents in the United States than we have had soldiers killed for the 2 years and 4 months. We are not really in this war yet. The real battles are yet to come.

Let no one be fooled about what we are now facing. Churchill was right when he said that victory would come only through "blood, sweat, and tears." With my limited knowledge of the task before us, it is my honest opinion that this war will yet last from 3 to 5 years and maybe longer. I pray God that I am wrong, but as I see it nothing but an internal upheaval or revolution at home in the Axis countries, Germany and Japan, will shorten this war.

General Eisenhower, it is said, insisted that we could whip Germany in the year 1944, but since the armies of England and the United States have been stalemated for 6 months in a deadly conflict with a few crack German divisions in Italy as we have attempted to take the city of Rome, many prophets have revised their opinions as to the length and seriousness of the war.

It is true that Russia with unlimited manpower and with several billions of supplies and ammunition and implements of war furnished her by the United States and England has been able to crack the German lines and has practically driven the Germans out of Russia; yet we must not forget that Germany still has between seven and eight million well-trained and equipped soldiers that we must overcome before the German war machine has been destroyed and the Germans unconditionally surrender.

The eyes of the whole world are focused on the impending invasion of western Europe, but do not forget that Hitler, with millions of enslaved laborers from the occupied countries of Europe, has been working day and night for more than 2 years in erecting the most elaborate and near-impregnable lines of defense all the way from the shores of the English Channel to the German fatherland.

In fact, we are yet to meet on the battlefield Hitler's best trained divisions, and he has over 400 of them. Most of the divisions on the Russian front were second-rate soldiers, largely made up from the satellite countries which at the point of a bayonet Hitler had forced into this war as his allies.

He has planted from the English Channel to the German borderland every known contraption of death and destruction. He has from the first held back in reserve his best trained soldiers, his largest guns, his best planes and fortresses and trained crews, getting ready for the real battle of this war.

Let us not be misled. Hitler has adequate supplies in both food and ammunition to contest every inch of ground from the shores of the English Channel to the German homeland. Millions of lives are yet to be sacrificed in this one great European battle, and before we shall have attained victory over the German war machine, every stream from France to Germany will flow on to the sea crimson with the commingled blood of the American, English, French, and German soldiers.

With the defeat of Germany that could take place this year or next year, we will have just commenced the war with the Japanese Empire, with her population of over one hundred million and with an army of twelve to fifteen million soldiers thoroughly equipped and thoroughly trained, fighting with a fanatical zeal, that prefer death or suicide to capture.

The Japanese have had universal military training since 1875, and this means 2 years of hard and thorough training to every able-bodied male inhabitant of this great empire. Tens of thousands of their women are equally well trained.

I have no doubt about the ultimate defeat of the Japanese by the American and English soldiers, because with the few small battles that have been fought on the fringes of the Japanese Empire it has been proven that our soldiers are more than an equal to the vicious, cunning, fanatical Japs. But the delay in consummating this certain defeat of the Japs will be due to the great distances that we must traverse with our ammunition, guns, supplies, and men before we can really get to the Japanese in all parts of their sprawling Empire from the ice-bound stretches of the Japanese Island to the palm-covered atolls of the South Sea Islands.

There is one ray of hope in this dark picture and that is that Admiral Nimitz, that good old Texas boy who is making it so hot for the Japanese in the South Pacific, will open a highway on the broad expanses of the Pacific to the shores of China where we can land our men and supplies and there train, equip, and supply the 50,000,000 potential Chinese soldiers to help us in the final campaign to crush Tojo with all of his cruel, fanatical, atrocious and inhuman, semigorilla, damnable men of war.

But my countrymen, I did not come here today to paint this dark and bloody picture of the future to discourage or break down the morale of my people and destroy their faith in ultimate victory. I wanted you to know the truth as I see it. But with all these forces of 20 or 25 million well-trained enemy soldiers thousands of miles away from our own bases of operation, we will, we shall, we must win in the end because God and right are on our side. The fate of all humanity is hanging in the balance. Under the leadership of the great minds of strategy of both military and psychological warfare possessed by Chiang Kai-shek, Joe Stalin, Winston Churchill and our own matchless, incomparable, world leader, commander in chief and President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, we shall win!

Permit me to digress long enough to tell you that it is a foregone conclusion that the Democratic convention in Chicago in July will nominate Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term as President. And I hope that in these hectic, troublesome days with all the tantalizing regulations incident to prosecuting this world war that no good Democrat in Mississippi will be led astray because of his dissatisfaction of disturbing factors and sacrifices on the home front.

There are many things in the administration that are being said and done that are displeasing to all of us. Let us clean up our own household from within instead of getting on the outside and throwing bricks at the house of our fathers. The United States and the world need Roosevelt to finish the prosecution of this war and to bring victory to our armed forces. He has made a "jam-up" job of it and we are going to need him not only to win the victory but we will need him more in securing a perpetual peace to follow.

Let no good Democrat vote against Franklin Roosevelt because he dislikes some of his associates. The interest of Mississippi and the South will be best conserved by the continuation of a Democratic administration. With Roosevelt, now a world leader, we can win. You may think that conditions are bad now, but if you turned this Government in the midst of this war over to a Republican outfit, you would soon find out that we would be in a "helluva" fix. Paraphrasing Shakespeare, "It is better we suffer the ills of the present than to flee to those we know not of."

Yes, victory will be ours. We are confident of that fact even though the road may be long and bloody, costing hundreds of billions. And today, while our first goal is to win the war at the earliest possible moment, we must not lose sight of the necessity of winning the peace that will follow. We have already made progress in that field. The Moscow Conference last October paved the way for the meeting of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo, and then a meeting of Roosevelt and Churchill with Marshal Stalin at Teheran.

We all know the far-reaching importance of those meetings in which plans were made for the military victory and for the winning of a lasting peace. We have charted our course and we have pledged our Nation to a policy of international cooperation after the war. Never again shall we make the tragic mistakes of 1918. When peace is again ours, we shall do all that is humanly possible, cooperating with Britain, Russia, China, and the freedom-loving peoples of Europe and Asia and Africa and the Americas, to maintain and to preserve that peace. And we are agreed, in the words of our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, "that if force is necessary to keep international peace, international force will be applied—for as long as it may be necessary."

We must do all in our power to win a just and lasting peace for that is the only way we can justify all the sacrifices and blood of this war. These sacrifices are being daily made by our Nation's men and women both in the service and on the home front. In this all-out war, the people of Mississippi are fully playing their part. Our Mississippi boys and girls have gone forth to serve beneath Old Glory, our men and women have answered the call to the war plants and the production centers, our farmers and their families are heroically carrying on to produce the farm products so essential to the war effort. No hardship should be too great for those of us left at home to bear for we are ever mindful of the sacrifices of our boys who are so gallantly meeting the enemy on the battlefields of the world. To them—the finest flowers of American manhood and womanhood—we owe a debt that we can never fully pay.

Today we lift our hearts in prayer to the merciful God above that He will give His divine protection to our fighting men the world over; that He will give them the strength and the power to win the victory; and when the final battle is over, that He will bring them safely home to the loved ones who prayerfully and patiently wait.

In addition to putting forth a total effort to hasten the winning of the war, 1944 presents another challenge to the American people; that is, the preservation of our dual system of constitutional government. We all realize and understand that in time of war, our Federal Government must exercise extraordinary powers and we are in full accord with the belief that our Federal Government should do everything that is necessary to protect the life of this Nation and to win the war in which we are engaged. However, our democracy must not be destroyed in the name of war.

If our ships, our airplanes, our tanks are destroyed, we will replace them; if our factories are torn down, we will rebuild them; if our cities, our highways, our bridges are destroyed, our engineers will restore them; if our inventions are lost, our scientists will discover new ones; if even our armed might should be crushed, we will rear sons who will regain our power. But if our democracy itself should be destroyed, then all is lost; and even though we might have gained the whole world we will have lost our soul. Therefore, I would admonish the American people in these dark and perilous days ever to be on guard, to protect and to preserve with zealous care the American system of constitutional government.

It is not my purpose here today to tell you of all the possible threats to our dual system of constitutional government. You are fully aware of conditions as they exist in this Nation, and you know as well as I do the dangers that would befall us should we be governed by a bureaucratic government on the banks of the Potomac. It is not my purpose to warn you that there is a tendency on the part of the Federal Government to usurp the rights of the sovereign States. Being States' rights Democrats, you are already aware of Washington's growing power, you know that the destruction of the rights of the 48 States and the wiping out of States' lines would open the flood gates and prepare the way for the ultimate destruction of freedom, made safe by our dual system of Government.

And I believe that you, just as I, have implicit faith in the American people and are confident that the people of this Nation will face openly and squarely any threat which may come to our democracy and that our dual system of constitutional government—established by the founding fathers and paid for in American blood—will be preserved. However, there is one bill now pending before the United States Senate directly affecting States' rights which I want to discuss briefly with you. That bill, known as H. R. 7, is the so-called anti-poll-tax bill and I want to bring this bill with all its implications before you, together with a full discussion of the great race problem which we are now forced to openly consider.

The anti-poll-tax bill, which would make unlawful by Federal statute, the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, is clearly unconstitutional. Section 2, article 1 of the Federal Constitution provides as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Amendment 17 to the Federal Constitution makes like provision regarding the electors for United States Senators. Thus, by these constitutional provisions qualified electors for Congressmen and Senators are those electors in each State who are qualified, in accordance with State law, to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Nothing is more clearly shown by the debates in the Constitutional Convention than the intention of the founding fathers that each State should have the power to fix the qualifications of the electors within its borders. The power to fix such qualifications was one which the States zealously guarded. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, most States required that qualified electors be property owners, and it was some years later that poll tax laws became popular as a means of extending, not limiting, the franchise.

Nowhere in the Constitution is Congress given the power to strike down or add to the qualifications for electors as set up by the sovereign States nor is the Congress given the power to define the qualifications or prerequisites for electors. The decisions of the United States Supreme Court are unanimous in holding that the poll tax laws are constitutional and nondiscriminatory. The tax applies equally to whites and Negroes and the proceeds are generally used for educational purposes.

Regardless of what any of us may think of the poll tax as such and regardless of whether or not we are in favor of its abolition by our State—just here let me say that for the holding of our white party primaries I have long contended that the poll tax should be abolished—nevertheless, the Congress has no power under the Federal Constitution to pass this bill outlawing the tax. Such a law would be an unconstitutional, unwarranted interference with the rights of the sovereign States and would destroy our dual system of constitutional government.

Section 241 of the Mississippi Constitution provides that a qualified elector must have lived in the State 2 years and the election district of his county 1 year next preceding the ensuing election; Section 243 provides for the payment of the poll tax; Section 244 provides for the educational test. Now, if the Congress succeeds in abolishing the poll tax, then the precedent will be set for the abolition by the Congress of any or all of our franchise laws and our ballots in Mississippi, and in all the other 47 States, will be at the mercy of the Federal Government. Constitutional government, as we have known it for over 150 years, would then no longer exist and the rights of the sovereign States would be destroyed.

In the face of these facts, you may rightly ask: Who are the advocates of this infamous unconstitutional bill? Why are the forces behind this piece of legislation so strong that we will have to resort to a filibuster to bring about its defeat in the Senate? You will recall that during the last Congress

a similar bill was killed by a filibuster during the closing days of the session, in which I spoke 4 days, but the bill was revived and passed by the House of Representatives last May 25. It is now on the Senate Calendar and may be brought up for consideration at any time.

There are various individuals and organizations sponsoring this bill, but the main pressure groups behind it are Negro organizations. They are able to wield this power because the Negro vote in some nine northern States constitutes something of a balance-of-power between the white Democratic and Republican Parties. And these groups are determined to make an all-out effort to secure passage of this anti-poll-tax bill because the enactment of this piece of legislation is one of the steps—the entering wedge—toward the fulfillment of the "full equality" program which the Negro leaders have launched in this time of war. While I am prepared to speak and filibuster this damnable bill for 8 months to kill it, yet I warn you that if our colleagues in the Senate ever succeed in invoking the cloture rule, which stops debate, the bill will pass.

Thus, the poll tax bill brings the entire race question before the American people. Because of this implication and because of conditions existing in Washington, of which city I am now mayor ex-officio by virtue of the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to discuss with you this grave race problem fully and frankly. In the interest of our Nation, our Southland and our own State of Mississippi, I shall be forced to make startling revelations to you. Such action I have decided is absolutely necessary at this time.

The race question is certainly not a new one and first, I would like for us to look briefly at the historical background of this problem. As Aristotle once said, "Of all these things the judge is time". Thus, let us look back into the centuries and find what has been written on the pages of history concerning the races.

No one disputes the greatness of the civilization that once belonged to the Empire of Egypt. The mighty pyramids are the most conspicuous evidence of Egyptian greatness, for in the ability of the engineers in planning, and he power of the Pharaohs in perfecting their ideals, we see the Caucasian civilizers of Egypt at the height of their power. We are amazed at the progress of the Egyptian Empire, and we are struck with awe at how the Empire flourished as long as its people remained white. But that great Empire fell from within and we have seen 3,000 years of decay of Egyptian civilization. The period of greatness was over when the day arrived that a mulatto negro sat on the throne of Egypt and ruled a negroid people.

Maspero's History of Egypt says:

"The large number of black women found in the harems of the rich, and even in the huts of the common people, quickly impaired the purity of the race, even among the upper classes of the nation, and the type began to resemble that of the Negro tribes of Equatorial Africa. The language fared no better in the face of this invasion and the written characters soon became as corrupt as the language. The taste for art decayed; technical ability began to deteriorate. The moral and intellectual standards declined and the mass of the people showed signs of relapsing into barbarism."

Now, let us look at the history of India for a moment. There we find another great civilization that perished through contact with the colored races. The white Aryan came into India to find a decayed civilization which was in its last stages and to find the Caucasian which had come earlier and produced that civilization submerged in the black mass about him. The Aryan perpetuated civilization in India and attempted to keep his race pure by the caste system and by laws forbidding interracial marriage. The Aryan conquerors of India tried every remedial measure but one to keep their blood white. They tried everything except a geographical and physical separation of the races, but all their attempts failed and the result is written in one word—amalgamation.

And this is the reason I am urging the voluntary resettlement of America's 12,800,000 Negroes in their fatherland, West Africa. Three and one-half million Negroes have petitioned me to push this legislation, for they are ready to go. When this war is over and the over 2,000,000 Negro soldiers, whose minds have been filled and poisoned with political and social equality stuff, return and hell breaks out all over this country, I think I'll get more help in settling the Negroes in Africa.

We find also in the pages of history the stories of civilizations which have existed in China, Mexico, and Peru, and which have perished through contact with colored races. And even today, right before our own eyes, we see the civilization of South Africa and of Latin America greatly imperiled by such contact. We have only to look about us and to read what time has recorded about race relations to realize that there are only two permanent solutions to the race problem—separation or amalgamation. If the first—a physical separation of the races—is not chosen, then the results will inevitably be the latter—amalgamation, a mixing of the blood and the destruction of both races.

Just as the race problem is not new in world history, neither is it new in the United States. Of course, during the days of slavery, the relations between the white race and the Negro race were definitely fixed, but with the freeing of the slaves, immediately the question of the status of the newly freed Negroes became a national issue.

The man who is credited with the freeing of the slaves, Abraham Lincoln, fully realized the seriousness of the race problem and he further realized that physical separation of the two races was the only solution which would assure the future of this great Republic. In the Emancipation Proclamation—that immortal document penned by President Lincoln—he said:

"I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy thereof, do hereby proclaim and declare that * * * it is my purpose upon the meeting of Congress to again recommend * * * the immediate or gradual abolishment of slavery * * * and that the effort to colonize persons of African descent, with their consent, upon the continent or elsewhere, with the previously obtained consent of the government existing there, will be continued."

In one single breath, President Lincoln proclaimed freedom for the slaves and at the same time proclaimed that the effort to colonize them, which had been started in the days of slavery, would be continued. Lincoln was opposed to social or political equality of the two races as is shown by the following statement made by him in a speech at Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1858:

"I will say that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and, inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior; and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

In his second annual message to Congress, submitted in December 1862, President Lincoln again emphasized the fact that colonization would forever settle the Negro problem, and he then proposed an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing for such a program. But having brought the war to a successful close, Lincoln was assassinated and the future of this Nation was destined to fall into far less capable hands.

Lincoln's plans for reconstruction were quickly discarded, and the Congress became dominated with Negro-loving politicians. The efforts of reconstruction politicians migrating from the North into every nook and corner of the South paralyzed the activities of the American Colonization Society, and the carpetbagger of those days impregnated the Negro brain with the idea that he should abandon the effort of establishing a Negro nation in a foreign land and become reconciled to his manifest destiny, which was to take over the lands and properties of his former slave owners, and also to make ready to seize the reins of government.

During the era of reconstruction, the unscrupulous political leaders of the Congress succeeded in securing the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. It mattered not to them that they had to place the South under military rule and force the acceptance of these amendments upon the Southern States. Their madness to deracialize suffrage knew no bounds, and the methods to which they resorted caused the Secretary of State, Mr. William H. Seward, to question the validity of the fourteenth amendment.

While the Congress was attempting to secure passage of these amendments, what was happening in the Southland where the grass was not yet green over the graves of the heroic dead? Ten of the late slave States were seized and placed under military control; their legislators expelled and new legislatures set up which gave State suffrage to Negroes. Under military rule, many Negroes were installed in these new legislatures, forming almost the whole body of them, and the South lay prostrate in defeat and humiliation.

The history of reconstruction days in Mississippi holds for us tragic significance. Our State, which gave to the Confederacy President Jefferson Davis, paid for the Civil War with the blood, tears, and suffering of our people. But any school child can tell you that the blackest pages of Mississippi history were not being written when Vicksburg fell to the Federal soldiers nor in any of the other battles when the soldiers of the gray and the blue met in deadly combat. Those dark pages came after the last cannon had been fired, and the proud people of the Magnolia State lay helpless at the mercy of the carpetbaggers and scalawags who took over the reins of government.

Those were the days when Mississippi was represented in the Chamber of the United States Senate by a Negro, Blanche K. Bruce, an ex-slave whose term was from 1875 to 1881. Those were the days when the Negro Revels, the first Negro ever to sit in Congress, represented Mississippi in the House of Representatives during the Forty-first Congress. The Forty-third and Forty-fourth Congresses also found Mississippi represented by an ex-Negro slave. It was during this period that Mississippi had a Negro lieutenant governor, a Negro State superintendent of education, and when there were numerous Negro sheriffs and county officials, as well as Negro members of the State legislature.

With such conditions existing throughout the Southland, the people began their struggle to restore white supremacy. This was done in Mississippi finally, as you know, by the constitution of 1890. And as white supremacy was restored in the South, the relations between the races began to take on

a definite fixed pattern. With some 4,000,000 ignorant, freed slaves in their midst, the southern people put into operation the policy of segregation of the races.

With separate facilities and separate accommodations for the white people and for the Negroes, the color line was drawn in every walk of life below Mason and Dixon's line. Accepted by the members of both races just as they accepted the air they breathed, the policy of segregation has remained in the Southland, and the attacks which, down through the years, have been made on it from the outside have met with complete failure. However, it has become necessary for us to consider and to openly discuss the forces which are today attempting to destroy the color line.

The so-called leaders of the Negro race have deliberately chosen this time of war to launch their program of full equality of the races in this country. The March-on-Washington movement, a Negro group headed by A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, carried their demands to the White House in June 1941. Thousands of Negroes threatened to march in mass upon Washington in what they termed "protest of discrimination in Government employment and in the war industries." After conferences with the Negro leaders, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 and the march on Washington was called off. This order, issued June 25, 1941, provided that:

"There shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries or Government because of race, creed, color, or national origin."

The order also established the Committee on Fair Employment Practices to carry this policy into effect. There is nothing in Executive Order 8802 about abolishing segregation and ordering the mixing of the races. However, as a result of the order there is today no segregation in the United States Government offices in Washington.

In the Federal offices in Washington, whites and Negroes work in the same rooms, the same offices, eat together at the same cafeterias, use the same rest rooms and recreational facilities. White girls may be assigned as secretaries to Negro men, and Negro girls may be sent to the offices of white officials. I remember one occasion when a Government official, a man from Atlanta, Ga., called me and asked my advice on a certain matter. He said that upon his request for stenographers the Civil Service had sent him colored girls. In many bureaus and departments, the mixing of the races has gone so far that southern girls, going to the capital city to work, have returned to their homes. Others, who for various reasons must remain there to work, find such conditions almost unbearable.

So far Executive Order No. 8802 has not been successfully enforced in the war industries in the South. Perhaps the attempt to do so in the Mobile shipyards, which resulted in a race riot, was sufficient warning.

The March-on-Washington group proposes to abolish segregation completely throughout the United States and to bring about the full political, economic, and social equality of the races. So that you will have no doubts about their demands, I wish to read you excerpts from an article, "Why Should We March," by A. Philip Randolph, head of the movement, appearing in the November 1942 Survey Graphic:

"* * * What are the reasons for this state of mind? The answer is: discrimination, segregation, Jim Crow * * *.

"It is to meet this situation squarely with direct action that the March-on-Washington movement launched its present program of protest mass meetings. * * * Meetings of such magnitude were unprecedented among Negroes * * *.

"The March-on-Washington movement is essentially a movement of the people * * * the plan of a protest march has not been abandoned. Its purpose would be to demonstrate that American Negroes are in deadly earnest, and all out for their full rights. No power on earth can cause them today to abandon their fight to wipe out every vestige of second-class citizenship and the dual standards that plague them * * *.

"By fighting for their rights now, American Negroes are helping to make America a moral and spiritual arsenal of democracy. Their fight against the poll tax, against lynch law, segregation, and Jim Crow, their fight for economic, political, and social equality, thus becomes part of the global war for freedom."

This is the kind of propaganda being fed to the Negro masses. It is the contention of these Negro leaders that segregation is in itself discrimination. This question has been before the United States Supreme Court on a number of occasions and the Court has held that segregation is not discrimination as long as adequate accommodations are provided for both races.

The theory that segregation is discrimination is adhered to by the Negro judge, William H. Hastie. Hastie resigned from his post as civilian aide to the Secretary of War because of his disagreement with the War Department over its policy of segregation in the armed forces. In a speech before some 20,000 Negroes in Detroit in June 1943, Hastie declared that there is a terrific waste of energy and man-hours by the segregation of Negroes into their own Army groups and by denying Negro officers the right to command Army groups composed in part, or entirely, of white men.

At this same mass meeting there was also a speech made by Roy Wilkins, assistant secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This association is another of the Negro organizations leading in this fight for full equality of the races. Wilkins declared:

"We refuse to listen to the weak-kneed of both races who tell us not to raise controversies during the war. We believe, on the contrary, that we are doing a patriotic duty in raising them."

I am sorry to say that certain religious leaders of the Negro race are joining the organizations and groups already named in spreading the preachings of social equality to the Negro masses. The following article was clipped from the New York Herald Tribune and will show you how far some of these Negro preachers are going:

"The Reverend James H. Robinson, pastor of the Negro Presbyterian Church of the Master, 86 Morningside Avenue, in an address yesterday in Milbank Chapel, Teachers College, Columbia University, described the race problem in the United States as 'very bad' and suggested that the time might come when certain groups would protest by forceful means.

"Speaking at a 3-day conference on religion in the modern world, sponsored by Columbia University, Mr. Robinson asserted that Negro soldiers who had been taught to kill those standing in the way of democratic principles 'are not going to discriminate between a German and an American who does the same thing.' He warned the 75 delegates that if Americans did not approach the racial problem with frankness and courage, they might see a march on Washington, or race riots, after the war.

"He said the morale of Negro troops is 'very low' because they are being discriminated against by other soldiers in the Army. Similar discriminations, he asserted, exists in war plants, and is lowering morale among Negroes there.

"SAYS TROOPS TRUST IN RUSSIA

" 'The Negro soldier,' he said 'hears platitudes of democracy, but can see no adequate demonstration of them. It is lamentable, but true, that Negro soldiers believe the outcome of the war will be determined by how strongly the Russians come.'

"Although admitting that he was 'very pessimistic concerning the attitude of the United States toward Negroes after the war,' Mr. Robinson said he felt the fundamental solution to the problem could be found in education. But he criticized the colleges for alleged discrimination against Negroes.

" 'Vassar College,' he asserted, 'has not admitted a Negro student in 25 years, and Barnard College has a quota system permitting entrance to four Negro girl students every 2 years.' Barnard, he said, would not admit the quota system existed, but it was there.

"ASKS COLLEGE FACILITIES

"Reiterating that education can go a long way toward solving the problem, Mr. Robinson said a start must be made in the colleges, both through association of white and Negro students and the inclusion of Negro scholars on college faculties.

"He expressed the hope that more colleges would employ Negro professors, so that the American public could learn to associate the professor with a special field of skill and not see him merely as a member of a race.

" 'Negroes,' he said, 'don't want to spend their time talking about race prejudice. They want the opportunity to teach what they are qualified to teach.'

"Asserting that the problem required the most serious thought on the part of Americans, and that they must be courageous enough to realize the potentialities and begin education for a better understanding of the racial problems, Mr. Robinson said:

" 'Lynching is not the basic problem; it is that spiritual death which is worse than physical death.' "

I am sure you have read in the Jackson Daily News of Wednesday, March 8, the Washington story of Dr. Studebaker and his Negro assistant, Dr. Ambrose Caliver, calling on the colleges and universities of the South to open wide their doors for the matriculation of Negro students. This is exactly in line with what Dr. Thompson in New York was advocating in his speech at Columbia University.

It is a real news item when BILBO and Fred Sullens get together and agree on anything, but Major Sullens' editorial on this report from the Office of Education out of Washington, under the title of "Go Straight to Hell," meets with my full and complete endorsement. Sullens is right when he says that the South won't do it and that not in this generation and never in the future while Anglo-Saxon blood flows in our veins will the people of the South open the doors of their colleges and universities for Negro students. I repeat that Major Sullens is right. We will tell our Negro-loving Yankee friends to go straight to hell.

Another group of Negroes recently sounded the warning that they would use force if necessary to win the full equality that they are seeking. This group visited me in my office in Washington shortly after I became chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. Practically every Negro organization in Washington had a representative in the group, and they wanted me to know the demands which they were making for full political, economic, and social equality. When I expressed my doubts as to their receiving what they were asking, one spokesman said that if that were true, then Negroes had just as well quit buying War bonds and get out of the war effort.

It was further said by one member of the group that Negroes intended to secure full equality and would do so by force, if necessary, when the war was over. There you have their demands in no uncertain terms.

The race situation has for some time been tense in Washington. Negroes already compose 30 to 40 percent of the population of the Capital City, and efforts are being made by their leaders to get as many Negroes as possible on the Government pay rolls. If suffrage should be granted in the District of Columbia, the Negroes would soon have control of the city and the alleys would be completely outvoting the avenues.

On the 7th of February 1944, a Negro attorney, John P. Davis, carried his 5-year-old son to a white school in Washington and attempted to enroll him. Davis had already been told that the child would not be accepted, but he carried out his plans to make the attempt to enroll him in order that he may bring a test case challenging the dual school system in Washington.

In February the C. I. O. opened a canteen in Washington for service men and women. Immediately a storm of southern protest was sounded for it was unbelievable that newspaper accounts of the opening of the canteen could be true. However, these accounts did paint a true picture of the activities. On opening night there were some 200 service men and women present. There were about an equal number of white and Negro soldiers who attended and white girls and Negro girls served as hostesses to those soldiers in equal numbers. Can you picture such social affairs taking place in our Nation's Capital? In speaking of the opening of the canteen, Congressman MCKENZIE, of Louisiana, asked:

"How can anyone be a party to encouraging white girls into the arms of Negro soldiers at a canteen while singing Let Me Call You Sweetheart?"

The sponsors of this mingling of the whites and Negroes in social equality declared that the "plan was proving successful." And Joseph Phillips, president of the C. I. O. Washington Industrial Union Council, said that his organization was proud to sponsor the "first effective non-Jim Crow canteen in Washington." He added that "when people come to our dances they dance with whomever they choose."

Have we reached the place in this country when we are going to permit our white girls to attend social functions with Negro soldiers? If we do permit such, can we profess to be surprised at what the results may be? No possible good, but much harm, can come to both races by activities of this kind. Are our soldiers and sailors fighting to save this Nation, or are they fighting so that we may become a mongrelized people? Practicing social equality of the races is certainly the surest way to destroy the culture of the white race.

We condemn such activities as are being carried on at this canteen and we also condemn those in high authority who sponsor or attend or endorse such activities.

We in the Southland, being fully aware of the attempts to break down segregation and implant social equality of the races throughout the Nation are ready to do some plain talking. The Negro leaders have brought this issue of race relations before us in this time of war; they have stated their demands so we have no alternative but to tell them where we stand.

We in Mississippi are justly proud of the harmonious relations existing here among the races. Our population is almost equally divided and we are glad to have peaceful, law-abiding Negroes within our midst. We ask no Negro to leave our State; at the same time we ask no discontented Negro to remain.

Three-fourths of the Nation's 12,800,000 Negroes are living and earning a livelihood in the South. We have an established policy of segregation known and understood by the members of both races. We recognize the right of a Negro to hire Negroes in preference to white people and the white employer has the same right. The right of Southern white people to operate political associations and hold their primaries, excluding Negroes, is no more to be questioned than the right of Negroes to form political or social clubs, excluding white people. Certainly Negroes may own and conduct their own restaurants, hotels and shops exclusively for themselves just as white people may do likewise. The races shall have equal but separate accommodations on busses and trains; and separate public schools shall be maintained. Equal and exact justice shall be accorded both races under the law, but segregation of the races shall be enforced. Honest and intelligent Southern white and colored people agree with this policy. In commenting on the recent Detroit race riots, a Negro leader in Arkansas, Rev. Thomas J. Brown, editor of the Eastern Arkansas World, made the following statement:

"The only way to live peaceably and unmolested in the South, North, East, and West is for every kind to himself; whether it be race, clan, or tribe. Henry W. Longfellow wrote, 'Birds of a feather flock together.' 'Society, like water, seeks level,' says another writer.

"The average Negro is proud of his race and its achievement and would not care to undermine its solidarity by amalgamation or intermarriage with other races.

"No one needs to be uneasy about the Negro in the South wanting to associate with white folks. He does not even want to live in the same block with them. He does not care to even sit in his front room or eat with him at his table. We don't want to ride with him. We are contented to reside in a Negro section of our towns, go to our own church which is pastored by a black man; send our children to school where they can be under the loving care of Negro teachers.

"It seems that some of our best white friends of the South are becoming afraid of this southern Negro. Don't worry about us. You can continue to trust us with your banks, your stores, your farms, and even your homes."

The Negro race in the South is fortunate to have such a leader as Reverend Brown, and I think he would agree with me that it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand why any group or individual outside the Southland would want to destroy the harmonious race relations which exist here. Yet, we have only to look about us to see these attacks on southern segregation going on before our very eyes. The three reasons for the destruction of all racial barriers throughout the Nation are stated by the Militant Church Movement, 602 West Walnut Street, Louisville, Ky., in the following manner:

"The Militant Church Movement affirms:

"That color does not affect anything but the outer surface of the skin. * * *

"That every act of racial hatred or discrimination is in violation of the will of the founders of this Republic and the principles of Christianity upon which this Nation was built. Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, freed his slaves to prove his sincerity in declaring that all men are born free and equal.

"That no church is Christian that is not built on the foundation laid down by its founder, Jesus Christ, namely, the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the Golden Rule. And if we are not willing to accept those principles, we should change our name and abandon our leader."

Now, I propose to show the falsity of all three of these reasons. First, history and science both defy the statement that "color does not affect anything but the outer surface of the skin." Historical and scientific research has established three propositions beyond all controversy:

First. The white race has founded, developed, and maintained every civilization known to the human race.

Second. The white race, having founded, developed, and maintained a civilization, has never been known, in all history, to lose that civilization as long as the race was kept white.

Third. The white man has never kept unimpaired the civilization he has founded and developed after his blood stream has been adulterated by the blood stream of another race, more especially another race so widely diverse in all its inherent qualities as the black race.

The superior ability of the white race has been proven both craniologically and by 6,000 years of planet-wide experimentation. The dividing line may be small, but it is definitely there; and I am reminded of the words of Browning when he said:

"Oh, the little more, and how much it is.
"And the little less, and what worlds away."

The superior ability of the Caucasian man is evidenced by his endless creation of art, science, law, religion, literature, and every other form of activity known to man down through the ages. Against these achievements, what has the African to offer? What history? What art? What science? What morality? And who will deny the almightiness of heredity? Let the blood stream be corrupted and nothing can ever restore its purity. If you do not accept this as true, then you brand as false both history and biology. If you refuse such truths, then Spencer, Haeckel, Weismann, Mendel, and Pearson have lived and labored in vain.

In the second place, this group has tried to justify full equality of the races in this country in the name of democracy, the name of the founding fathers, and the teaching of Thomas Jefferson. I quote Jefferson's own words:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate, than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them."

Jefferson, along with Clay, Madison, Monroe, and many others believed that Negroes in the United States should be colonized on the coast of Africa. This is the same movement to which Abraham Lincoln later gave his approval. President Grant spent the 8 years of his administration trying to resettle the American Negro in another country.

The founders of this Republic never dreamed of it being anything but a white nation. We owe an immeasurable debt to our forefathers who preserved us white through 300 years of race contact. They did not, as did many Latin Americans, barter their birthright for temporary gain. If our ancestors had possessed less courage, less foresight, less intelligence, and weaker morals, we would be today a mixbreed people.

Col. Earnest S. Cox has this to say in his book, White America:

"While the purity of the white race has been the national ideal throughout American history, it is not the Nation as a whole, but that part of the Nation in immediate contact with the Negro that has been submitted to a rigid test of this ideal. The South emerges from 300 years of immediate contact with the Negro and is white. This is the greatest miracle in the record of the contact of races. Faithful to race and institutions, the South now presents 25,000,000 Anglo-Saxon sons and daughters for the Nation's use in peace or war."

The third argument used by the Militant Church group, that of religion, to break down

all racial barriers has been frequently used. It was used at one time by the British missionaries in South Africa, and we have before us the practical results of their teachings that all races are of one blood. The mixbreeds of the Cape of Good Hope are evidence of the influence of these ignorant, Negro-loving missionaries who brought disaster along with their teachings. The doctrines of the missionaries were soon changed and they ceased to teach social equality, but who could undo the damage which they had done? The present missionary teaches of the same God and the same Christ and tells the same story of redemption, but the social teaching has been changed.

In Africa, in China, in India, in parts of Asia, in Latin America, Christianity has been implanted by the white man and it has not survived after the departure of the white man. History clearly shows that the white race is the custodian of the gospel of Jesus Christ and that the white man is entrusted with the spreading of that gospel.

The gospel, of course, is universal; it is missionary in scope; and it is given to all men of all nations. Yet what can be more foreign to the ideals of the Christian religion than amalgamation and miscegenation? Anyone who would, in the name of Christianity, make us a negroid people betrays his religion and his race.

It should be the desire of both races to maintain racial integrity and have their blood remain pure. If religion teaches the destruction of the races and commits the error of preaching the mixture of all bloods, then what can the missionaries and ministers do to give to the unborn generations the racial heritage which is rightfully theirs? A. H. Shannon, author of Racial Integrity, poses this question: "Which is better, a mongrel race, whose origin is in sin, and which represents the worst of all races; or a race, whatever its limitations, yet true to its own racial peculiarities and striving to attain, intact, the best and highest of which it is capable?" To ask the question is to answer it.

Those who would teach us social equality of the races remind us of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Why place a fallacious interpretation on these two phrases? If we are to spiritualize "Fatherhood of God," then why must we literalize "Brotherhood of man"? Both the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are spiritual, and anyone who would interpret the brotherhood of man in such a manner as to destroy the blood of the white race would destroy the race which has through the centuries proven itself to be the custodian of the gospel of Christ, of his spiritual and ethical teachings.

We in the South are sworn to uphold racial integrity. We condemn, we will not condone, the attempt on the part of any group, or individual, to destroy our ideals and principles in the name of history, or of science, or of democracy, or of religion.

One of the most pregnant sources of corrupting the minds of our people on the race question is the apostasy of ministers and preachers of practically every denomination expounding the theories of the Christian religion under the favorite texts of Brotherhood of Mankind, Fatherhood of God, and All of One Blood. Some of these negrophilistic preachers with their false interpretations of the real teachings of the Christian religion, pouring out a lot of maudlin sentiment and ecclesiastical rot, tend to make their followers, here in the South and in the North, believe that, under God, the white man is no better than the Negro and that, if you want to go to Heaven, you had better take the sons and daughters of Ethiopia into your fond embraces.

The time has come when we must draw the color line so tight that no man, whether he be sinner, saint, steward, elder, deacon, pastor, priest, or bishop, shall be permitted in the name of the church or the Bible to expound theories of God's teachings that would most certainly lead to sin, miscegenation, intermarriage, or social equality in any form between the Negro and the white man. Any preacher or minister who would take advantage of his divine calling to thus destroy the integrity of his race and contaminate and corrupt the blood of his fathers should by his own church be unfrocked and never permitted to smack his traitorous lips on another yellow-legged chicken.

Not only do we answer the attacks of those who would destroy our policy of segregation but we will go further and renew our faith and allegiance to the color line. Reduced to its simplest form and laid bare for all the world to judge, we declare that the South is justified in the absolute denial of social equality to the Negro regardless of what his abilities or accomplishments may be. This the South must do, in behalf of her blood, her essence, and the stock of her Caucasian race.

If we sit with Negroes at our tables, if we entertain them as our social equals, if we discard the color line in all other relations, is it possible to maintain it fixedly in the marriage of the South's Anglo-Saxon sons and daughters? The answer is an emphatic "No."

If the middle wall of social partition is ever broken down, then the tides of life will begin to mingle. It matters not that the process may be gradual; it would be nonetheless irresistible. The lower stratum of the white population would be affected first, but the invasion of the middle and uppermost would be in the foreseeable future. Then, as a race, the southern Caucasian would be irreversibly doomed. If the mingling ever starts, then there is no possible check for the process. When there are two streams which flow side by side and the barrier between is removed, they immediately begin to mingle their molecules. No power on earth could sift them out and restore the streams to their original purity. Should the barriers in the South which separate the blood streams of the two races be removed, then that moment the bloom of her spirit is blighted and the promise of her destiny is annulled forever. Dr. Benjamin Smith, in his book, The Color Line, has ably said:

"No other conceivable disaster that might befall the South could, for an instant, compare with such miscegenation within her borders. Flood and fire, fever and famine, and the sword—even ignorance, indolence, and carpetbaggery—she may endure and conquer while her blood remains pure, but once taint the well-spring of her life, and all is lost—even honor itself. It is this immediate jewel of her soul that the South watches with such a dragon eye, that she guards with more than vestal vigilance, with a circle of perpetual fire. The blood thereof is the life thereof; he who would defile it would stab her in her heart of heart; and she springs to repulse him with the fiercest instinct of self-preservation. It may not be that she is distinctly conscious of her roused antagonism; but the instinct itself is nonetheless just and true and the natural bulwark of her life."

Yet, there are those who would tear away this racial pride, knowing full well that it would plunge the Southland into hopeless depths of hybridization. Implant the doctrines of social equality below the Mason-Dixon line, and the result will be a mongrelized Southland. And if the transmitted germ plasma is destroyed, nothing shall ever restore it; neither wealth, nor culture, nor science, nor art, nor morality, nor religion itself.

To southerners this is not a question of individual morality or of self-respect or of individual accomplishments. Every child that is born is born not only of its immediate parents but of all its ancestry. Every child is a child of its race, and heredity plays its part upon it and upon all its descendants. However weak the white man, behind him stands Europe; however strong the black, behind him lies Africa.

Northerners may lightly dismiss instances of social equality practiced by them as insignificant and of no serious consequence. This the South cannot do. We congratulate our friends of the North that they seem to be able to play with fire without fear of burns, but with us the situation is totally different. Three-fourths of the Nation's Negroes live in our midst, and such incidents tolerated by the North will only cause southerners to bolt the door of social equality more firmly and guard the gates more narrowly.

And I am convinced that this is a question which we must settle for ourselves, and that the solutions to the problems as they arise must be our own. We have long listened for some just and fair consideration from other sections, but we have listened in vain. Instead of understanding and help, there is a systematic warfare being waged in many quarters against southern traditions and customs. We are outvoted in Congress; thus we cannot look for help from the Federal Government. We have in the past successfully handled the race problem and we will continue to do so in the future.

We people of the South must draw the color line tighter and tighter, and any white man or woman who dares to cross that color line should be promptly and forever ostracized. No compromise on this great question should be tolerated, no matter who the guilty parties are, whether in the church, in public office, or in the private walks of life. Ostracize them if they cross the color line and treat them as a Negro or as his equal should be treated.

And just as we will not tolerate attacks on the color line from the outside we will have no such attacks from within our own borders. I regret that I must tell you that a teacher in one of our southern colleges recently made a vicious attack on southern ideals and customs. I charge that Mrs. Louise Perry made, in substance, these statements:

The Negro has the equal ability of the white man, and if he were given the opportunity, he would accomplish just as much; that the Negro has not had the same chance as the white man because the Negro's civilization is not nearly as old as the white man's; that the Negro should be given equal education and equal labor opportunities; that we must educate the Negro politically, that is, how to vote intelligently, then we would not fear his vote; and further that the white man has nothing to be superior over, because it was just by accident that he was born white; also that it would be better to marry a high-class Negro rather than a man of poor white trash; and eventually the Nation would be of mixbreeds.

The teacher I have referred to is from North Carolina, but the school where she is teaching is a tax-supported college in Mississippi, the Delta State Teachers College at Cleveland. I have the proof for the charges which I have made and will supply such to Governor Bailey and the members of the Board of Trustees of the Institutions of Higher Learning. God help us if we do not prohibit such teachings in every white school as well as every Negro school in Mississippi.

I have exposed the above incident and have made this speech here today because I feel it is imperative that we face squarely and frankly the conditions which confront us. We must not sit idly by, but we must ever be on guard to protect the southern ideals, customs, and traditions that we love and believe in so firmly and completely. There are some issues that we may differ upon, but on racial integrity, white supremacy, and love for the Southland we will stand together until we pass on to another world.

Twenty-four years ago last January 6, I stood here and spoke to the Legislature as I

left the Governor's office the first time. The closing words that I used then I now repeat with a feeling that has grown deeper with the years that have passed:

"* * * For I love the South with all my soul; I love her, and have long ago consecrated and dedicated my life and my services to her glory and welfare. When I think of what she is and what she shall be, I feel that no other words can more appropriately express her beauties, her matchless glory, her magnificence than the words of the poet who came from the North, and when his eyes first beheld the beauty, the charm, and the glory of this sunny clime, his heart burst forth in these beautiful lines:

"Oh Southland! loveliest land beneath the bright blue, bending skies!
Oh land most passionate this side of the gates of Paradise!
A sense of gladness unconfined was mine when first I set my foot upon thy flowery sod,
It lingers with me yet.

I love thy immemorial hills by humankind untrod,
The rose lights of their raptured heights, touched by the skies of God,
The crash and warble jubilant of the cataracts that flash and shimmer through the vines that trail from steep to steep.

I love thy waving woods
Where in the glooms of green the miracle magnolia flowers
Like fallen moons are seen.

Where the mock birds pipe and twitter through the long resplendent days,
Until every leaf and flower seem to dance in rhythm with their lays,
Where the wild ripe roses trail their scarlet mist of bloom
And sparkling sunlit lily bells with their amber hearts illume,
Where rivers roll and surge, proud, passionate, and free,
Through sweeps of glad savannah lands, to kiss the open sea.

Oh land of Calhoun, of Jefferson, and Davis,
Oh land of romance, and roses, of sunshine and song."

Ladies and gentlemen of the Mississippi Legislature, I bid you godspeed and pray that His divine mind will influence and direct your every act for the realization of such a government and civilization that will prepare this old world for the return of His Son and His kingdom upon the earth.

I thank you.

Americanism and Individual Opportunity Must Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote address given by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at the Connecticut Republican State Convention held at Hartford, Conn., on Thursday, April 13, 1944:

This fine gathering of patriotic men and women is an inspiring and impressive demonstration of the functioning of free men and free women under a representative Republican form of government. We are assembled in convention in a historic city that you may select the delegates who will represent Connecticut in the great national party conclave to be held the latter part of June in Chicago.

The rights of American citizenship which we are exercising tonight are among those which inspire men and women to fight and die on many far-flung battlefields. It is the spirit of free men and women which assures victory in this war in which we are now engaged. Armies driven by the lash of a dictator never can defeat armies of free men and women, who fight for the holy cause of freedom. That is why we face the crucial months of war with full faith and confidence.

I come to Connecticut with full appreciation of your contribution to the preservation of the two-party system of government both in your efficient State government under the leadership of your outstanding Governor, Raymond Baldwin, and in the fine and capable Representatives you have sent to the National Congress.

Six years ago when the lights of Republicanism burned low, you elected Senator JOHN A. DANAHER. You made no mistake. In one term he has won the deserved reputation of being an outstanding statesman, one who ranks high among the brilliant men New England has sent to the United States Senate. Reelect him next fall, and you will have a strong guardian of your interests as we travel through the uncertain years ahead.

In 1942 Connecticut very wisely reelected JOE TALBOT and gave us five other excellent Republican Congressmen in CLARE LUCE, B. J. MONKIEWICZ, WILLIAM J. MILLER, JOHN D. MCWILLIAMS, and RANULF COMPTON.

These Representatives have been outstanding in the fight we have waged in Congress for the preservation of our constitutional government. They have aided in the battle to bring about a little sanity into the spending of the people's money; they have joined wholeheartedly in the fight to prevent a ruthless, arrogant, and power-lustful bureaucracy from fastening permanently its paralyzing grip upon the people.

In the early days of this country, when liberty was first budding in America, the people of Connecticut showed their devotion to constitutional government when they hid away for safety the charter of their liberties in the historic oak-tree here in Hartford. Ever since that day Connecticut has resolutely fought in defense of the Constitution and the rights of the States. And I am supremely confident as we go forward in the next 2 years to fight in Congress for the preservation of the Constitution and our American way of life, these able and conscientious Representatives I have commended will be sent back to join in this battle of the people.

We have reached a point in our national life when the Congress is the last remaining guardian of the Constitution and the last remaining bulwark of the people's liberties. This may appear to some of you as a bit fantastic; but let us review the past. It is only through the lamplight of experience that we can intelligently appraise the future.

Government by bureaucracy has grown by leaps and bounds since the present administration came into power on the solemn pledge to reduce expenditures and eliminate bureaus and commissions. Not only have new bureaus and commissions multiplied, but they have come under the complete domination of the Executive and his little group of "palace guards."

Expenditures of the public funds have reached a magnitude beyond human comprehension.

New bureaus have been created, consolidated, and shuffled about at the whim of the Executive and often in complete defiance of Congress. When Congress eliminated an agency, it was often kept going through the use of blank-check funds granted to the President. If a bureau was allowed to lapse because of popular sentiment against it, the political favorites therein were transferred to other snug berths. Frequently in the transfer they were given largely increased salaries. There is no Little Steel wage formula for the favorites of the New Deal.

The New Deal has fixed rigid control on the Government agencies. That control has extended even to quasi-judicial agencies. In creating some of the important industrial regulatory commissions, Congress provided for representation therein by members from both major political parties. It was the national conception that this arrangement would permit of one party acting as a check upon the other and no single group would dominate in carrying out congressional policies.

That wise check no longer exists. If new Republicans are named to these agencies, care is taken to make sure they lean to the philosophy and support of the New Deal. Jeffersonian Democrats fare no better than Republicans. Appointments are seldom made from this branch of the party. As a result, the New Deal clique has achieved absolute and complete control of the Government.

With complete control of all the executive agencies, the administration carefully planned complete domination of the judiciary. It was an old-fashioned idea that by selecting able jurists of both major parties the Federal courts could be kept out of politics and would function as tribunals whose decisions would be based on law and not the personal or political predilections of the judges. To free them of political influences the founding fathers provided life tenure for these judicial officers of the Government.

The movement toward control of the courts at first went rather slowly; so slowly the new dealers became impatient. Few died and none resigned. Consequently there was born the movement to pack the Supreme Court. The people were shocked at this arrogant attempt of the Executive to dominate the judiciary, which under our Constitution was intended to be one of the three coordinate and independent branches of the Government. A popular uprising on the part of the people prevented even a "rubber stamp" Congress from agreeing to this proposal. The new dealers were forced to wait. Time marched on, and human life is frail. Through the power of appointment, the courts were packed, until today no one questions the dominating philosophy of the Federal courts.

After achieving complete control of the independent agencies and with the New Deal judiciary, the new dealers turned their attention to Congress.

The people had begun to ask questions. The New Deal promises were still dreams that had not come true. Efficiency in government was conspicuous by its absence. Wanton waste of the people's substance was apparent everywhere. Taxes were skyrocketing. Under the cloak of emergency, the bureaucrats grabbed power, and in too many instances, exercised it arrogantly and unwisely.

The people decided they wanted a better balance in government, and in 1942, they sent a larger representation of Republicans to Congress.

This new complexion in Congress, I am happy to report to you tonight, ended the rubber-stamp era. No longer can the palace guard send bills to Congress and demand that they be passed by midnight without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." No longer can they telephone their orders with the certainty they will be carried out by a subservient Congress.

The blank checks are less plentiful, and today are confined chiefly to the war effort. If they are now used for other purposes it is a flagrant violation of the expressed intent of Congress. Wide powers have necessarily been voted for carrying on the war, but they are now carefully examined, and generally a date is fixed for their termination. And it is the firm resolution of us Republicans in Congress that these powers shall be canceled at the earliest possible moment. The New Deal hope of permanence of its bureaucratic powers and control will be rudely shattered.

Congress refused to give the Federal Government control over the elections under the false plea that this was the only method by which service men and women could vote. Everyone wanted to make it possible for the soldiers and sailors to enjoy this right of citizenship. But it was the position of a majority in Congress that the service people were entitled to the complete ballot like that of any other citizen. It is the proper function of the Federal Government to make certain these ballots are distributed to the soldiers and sailors and returned to the States to be counted in the local precincts where the service people have their homes.

Congress refused to abdicate its control over the taxing power and rebuked an attempt by the Executive to dictate the exercise of these powers. To give away its control over taxation and the spending of the people's money would reduce the legislative branch to a mere shell.

A close watch is being maintained over the New Deal technique of assuming legislative powers through bureaucratic directives rather than acts of Congress. We must guard against this habit of the bureaucrats, and we will not hesitate to intervene for the protection of the rights of the people.

Congress has given the fullest measure of cooperation for the winning of the war. We have and we shall continue to lean over backward in providing the fighting forces with all the money they say is necessary, but we will continually be on guard against extravagance, waste, and corruption in the spending of this money.

We are determined that Congress shall have a full voice in the making of the peace and in post-war planning. The sooner the bureaucrats awaken to that fact, the better it will be for all concerned.

Conferences are now being held and presumably the basis being laid for our cooperation with our allies in the post-war days. These conferences will determine the boundaries of the world; they will shape the plans of peace, and they will determine the kind of world we shall have in the days to come. It is not enough that these decisions shall be the exclusive judgment of the executive branch of the Government. They should be the result of the combined judgment of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The people are fighting this war; the people are paying for this war; and it will be the people who will be asked to stand behind any commitments that are made. And the Congress which represents the people must be given a voice in these commitments if they are to endure. That voice should be in evidence not only in the final peace conference, but in the preliminary gatherings.

Representation from Congress should include Republicans as well as Democrats. Then, and only then, will the people be satisfied their rights will be fully protected. Let us make the deliberations of these conferences open to all our people. Let us put an end to war-breeding secret agreements and understandings between nations, and let the American foreign policy be forged under the bright light of public opinion.

The new spirit of independence in Congress of late naturally stirred the new dealers to a determined effort to discredit and smear Congress. Over the air, in newspapers and pamphlets, and in the movies came the tirades of the faithful propagandists of the New Deal. It was one chant and one theme; all based on the hope that the people would lose faith in the popular branch of Government and permit the new dealers to complete the circle of absolute control of Government.

This fall there will be unleashed the full fury of the New Deal attack against Congress. The people must be prepared, and we can make certain we do not permit a complete monopoly in Government to rest with a little New Deal clique by electing a Republican Congress. Keep the Congress of America a free, independent body.

The delegates you elect tonight will select the next President of the United States. The man chosen faces a herculean task. He must cooperate with the military and naval leaders in the winning of the war; he must guide wisely the making of the peace; he must with courage face distressing post-war problems. Upon him will rest, with the Congress, the responsibility of preserving the American system of government and the American way of life.

Fortunately, the Republican Party is not a one-man party. Despite our years of adversity, we have a number of good men who possess the essential qualifications of leadership, the courage and the patriotism to meet the serious demands of the hour. I have every confidence the good judgment and the good sense of the convention will select a candidate who will be elected and who will lead our country out of the wilderness of confusion into the bower of peace.

Political straws, political trends, and popular sentiment, all indicate the next President will be a Republican. But this is not the only foundation upon which rest our hopes of next November.

The absorbing and dramatic events of war have obscured the fact that today, the Republicans are actually in a majority in this country. A majority of more than a million voted for Republican candidates for Congress in 1942 in preference to those on the Democratic ticket. Twenty-six of the 38 Governors in the States outside the 10 Southern States are Republican, the State legislatures in 27 States have Republican control to 9 controlled by the Democrats and 2 with a divided responsibility. Nearly 80 percent of the county governments in the 38 Northern and Western States have Republican officials. This is a foundation strong enough to give any party real hope of victory.

A well-planned campaign will be undertaken in the next few months to build up the myth of the indispensable man. It will be represented that without Mr. Roosevelt, the war will be lost or dragged out, that without him, there will be no one who can talk intimately and intelligently with the leaders of the other nations of the world.

This type of campaign will not succeed. The American people are not so gullible as to believe the war will be lost or delayed a single day by the presence of another man in the White House. Mr. Roosevelt's successor would do exactly what Mr. Roosevelt should do, if he uses good judgment, and that is to depend upon the professionally trained generals and admirals to plan the strategy and to direct the movements of war. No new Commander in Chief would dare hesitate for a moment to take full advantage of the ability and knowledge of our professional military men. The experienced military leadership and the zeal of our millions of fighting men and women will be fully supported by the new administration, and they will bring about the victory for which we all devoutly pray.

In planning the peace and the post-war reconstruction period, there exists a wealth of experience and ability in this country, which is not now tapped for service. It can be stated definitely that all the brains in America are not to be found in the New Deal.

Many fine, patriotic men and women who are opposed to the New Deal and who belong to either the Republican or the Democratic Parties are anxious to serve and would well serve the people of this country. They can help bring about an early victory. They should be given a chance. All the ability in America will be needed in the critical years ahead.

This great Republic has not reached the state where it must depend entirely upon one man. If this were so, it would be a strong indictment against a people's government. It would mean the end of the Republic. It would signify the end of the people's conception of America as a land of freedom and opportunity.

We will win the war, regardless of what happens to the political fortunes of any one individual, and through the good, sound common-sense characteristic of our people we will steer the world into a future blessed with peace, prosperity, security, and happiness.

In the last 12 years the New Deal has tried to make the people of this country believe that to achieve success was wrong; that thrift, economy, and hard work are old-fashioned and should be discarded; that a hand-out from the Government was preferable to a larger reward from honest endeavor.

It has brought into existence policies that have drastically reduced the revenue from savings-bank deposits, life-insurance reserves, and the general investments of millions of our thrifty and hard-working citizens.

There has been a deliberate and long-range attempt to crush the spirit of free enterprise. By legislation, by executive decrees and orders, and by threat of punishment, the campaign of the New Deal to subject enterprise, large and small, to its domination has been waged relentlessly and continuously.

Step by step, we have gone forward to Government control until we stand at the brink of some form of state socialism.

At this late hour, we see clearly now the path we have been traveling. It looked enchanting for a while, but the fog has cleared, and we are presented with a frightening picture.

We have willingly assumed new taxes, and today we find ourselves in a position where all individuals and business alike are being pretty thoroughly squeezed. We can do fairly well in a wartime economy with these high taxes in a period when the Government is putting up the cash, but it will be another story when we go back to the economy of peace. That is why we are asking for a thorough reexamination of our taxation system and a simplification of tax returns.

Carry the policies of the New Deal into the post-war days, and there is no hope of progress and prosperity for millions of our countrymen. There will be precious little opportunity of real jobs for the millions of veterans returning from the fighting fronts, for the war workers turned out of factories and shipyards, or for the tillers of the soil.

There is one way out of the morass, and that is to re-create opportunity, to restore initiative, to make profitable work and investment, to restore to all Americans the incentive of profit. Reward the inventive genius and the willingness of the American people to work.

To achieve this kind of an America we must bring about a revival of real Americanism. We must lay that foundation in these days of toil and sacrifice, and we must patiently move ahead in the days following the war.

The false lights of the New Deal must be extinguished. We must build the new America on the solid foundation of self-respect, self-confidence, and hard work. No success was ever achieved in any field of endeavor that did not represent years of hard work. Work is the price we have always paid for

success, and no New Deal slogan will ever change that basic law.

To the Republican Party was given the task of rebuilding the country following the last World War. History will repeat itself.

Next November the people of America will once more turn to the Republican Party. We will work to hasten the delivery of the knockout blows against our enemies, and then we will bring our boys back to their own country and their own homes.

We will cooperate intelligently with other nations in bringing about peace and security. We will cooperate to bring about more friendly relations with other nations and to build a better world. But we will not fail either to protect the vital interests of the American people.

There is no room for defeatism in America. There are in this great land the brains and the resources and the will to achieve any objective we may seek. In order that the American people may achieve their objectives and have restored to them their constitutional, representative form of government, a huge task lies ahead of us. We must restore faith in ourselves; we must restore faith in our institutions and ideals; we must restore faith in our individual destiny and the destiny of our Nation; we must restore integrity in government office, and we must restore intelligence in administration.

To accomplish these aims we must first sweep the present administration from office and we must give our country an administration in which the President and Congress will cooperate intelligently and wisely, under the cardinal rules of American free government, to restore to the people the American way of living.

May God give us the wisdom and the strength to fulfill these sacred responsibilities to the people of America.

The Right of Negro Units To Participate As Units in Combat Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, racial discrimination in public service is never excusable, and if there is one place more than another where it should not be tolerated that place is the armed forces of our country in the midst of a desperate war when Negroes are freely and gallantly offering their lives to defend our precious institutions of freedom and to save civilization.

It was my privilege some years ago to offer the amendment which was adopted to prohibit racial discrimination in the administration of our military training programs. That was before we got into the war actively.

As the war has progressed I have heard, and I am still hearing reports to the effect that Negroes in the military service, are being assigned chiefly to menial duties, such as service at docks and supply dumps, and are not being given equal opportunities with other soldiers for the combat service which every true soldier covets. I have heard that Negro units are being broken up and their component members are being scattered to perform service duties instead of being allowed to go forth as units to battle in unit formation, the only exceptions being the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron and a few antiaircraft units.

This appears to be in contrast with the policy of our allies, for whole units of French Senegalese and British divisions from India have been seeing active service in unbroken formations. It is also in contrast with our own policy in the First World War, when four separate colored regiments made gallant records of service.

I have felt it to be my duty to protest this discrimination and I have taken up the matter with Secretary of War Stimson in an effort to get a clear explanation of the War Department's policy in respect to assignment of Negro soldiers.

I present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letter to Secretary Stimson and his reply.

It will be noted that Secretary Stimson promises that additional Negro units will be utilized in combat in the future, though for security reasons he cannot reveal units, times, or places. The correspondence referred to is as follows:

MARCH 20, 1944.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am receiving inquiries from Negro constituents and from epresentative Negroes throughout the country indicating a good deal of anxiety over reports that Negroes are not being given a fair show in fighting the battles of our country. It is felt that this is especially to be deplored in view of the fact that Negroes have acquitted themselves with honor and credit in every war in which our country has engaged. Specifically, there is an undercurrent of dissatisfaction based on reports that Negroes are being preponderantly assigned to service the Army and are being deprived of the opportunity which every true soldier covets to engage in combat.

If there is no basis for these reports, I think it would be reassuring if I could so inform our colored people, and whatever the facts may be I think our colored friends, whose patriotism cannot be challenged, are entitled to have the facts.

It is in the hope, therefore, of allaying dissatisfaction, which certainly bodes no good, that I respectfully ask you to advise me on the following points:

1. How many Negroes and how many whites are there in the total military forces?

2. How many Negroes are assigned to service the Army?

3. How many Negroes are assigned to combat duty?

4. How many Negro units are engaged in combat and what are they?

5. How many Negro units are assigned to service duties and what are they?

6. Is it contemplated that additional Negro units are to be placed in combat, and if so, what are the units that are to be so assigned?

7. Finally, from your comprehensive overall knowledge of the military service, what in your opinion are the facts as to whether or not there is discrimination against Negroes in the service, and is it your intention in your position of high responsibility to see that such discrimination is not permitted to exist in the future?

If you can see your way clear to send me a reply covering the above points it will be helpful, I hope, in resolving doubts which must inevitably be injurious to morale.

With kind regards,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 8, 1944.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your letter of March 20th concerning the utilization of Negroes in the Army, and inquiring specifically whether the military service is following a policy of practiced discrimination against Negro soldiers.

Concerning War Department policies affecting Negro soldiers, I wish to invite your attention to the following paragraph which concluded my letter of February 19th to Congressman HAMILTON FISH.

"Permit me to emphasize, in conclusion, that any implication that the War Department is deliberately attempting to avoid sending overseas, or to keep out of combat, troops of the Negro or any other race, is entirely without foundation. Our personnel is distributed and employed as required, on duties individuals are qualified to perform, regardless of their racial derivations. Large number of Negro troops are overseas or en route and will be given every opportunity to win battle honors and demonstrate their worth in actual combat. The War Department has every intention of continuing its past efforts to make the best possible use of its available manpower in the prosecution of the war without regard to race, religion, color, or other unmilitary considerations."

I feel sure that the above statement, which has been and remains our policy, needs no elaboration.

With regard to your numbered questions requesting statistical data on various phases of Army Negro policy, unfortunately complete answers to most of them are precluded for security reasons, but I am more than glad to reply as comprehensively as military circumstances will permit.

As you perhaps know, the Army is accepting and absorbing Negro personnel corresponding to the registration ratio (10.4 percent) of its authorized male enlisted strength. At present approximately 9 percent of the total Army male enlisted strength is of the Negro race, but it is anticipated that the 10.4 percent ratio will be reached during the course of the current year. Our plans contemplate that of our total enlisted personnel 6,245,720 will be white, 709,280 Negro, and of the Negro personnel approximately 14 percent are scheduled for assignment to combat organizations. I believe this information responds to the first three of the numbered questions in your letter.

Concerning the utilization of Negro units in combat, obviously the details of the employment, locale, and disposition of overseas organizations, whether white or Negro, cannot be disclosed for security reasons. However, it may be stated that of the total Negro strength of the Army, approximately 50 percent are now overseas or en route. Moreover, 32 percent of the Negro contingent overseas are combat and combat support troops. I am sure you realize that, as is the case with many white combat units, a number of Negro combat units will not be employed in combat until concentrations are completed for projected major tactical operations scheduled for the future. Although publication of data on the number and type of units engaged in combat, whether white or Negro, would constitute a violation of security in that it would tend to reveal our deployment, I will state that Negro units, like white ones, are being shipped to combat areas as rapidly as their state of training and transportation facilities permit and that Negro units have participated and are participating in combat. It may also be stated that additional Negro units will be utilized in combat in the future, though, again for security reasons, it is not possible to reveal units, times, or places.

Permit me also to make this general observation with regard to the utilization of

Negro soldiers in the military service. As you doubtless know, the Army has been faced with the fact that in civilian life large numbers of Negro inductees had inadequate educational opportunities. In a recent study of all men processed at reception centers from June through December 1943, 20 percent of the Negroes and 74 percent of the whites were rated in grades I, II, and III by Army general classification tests; 80 percent of the Negroes and 26 percent of the whites fell in grades IV and V. While these lower classifications certainly do not reflect either the intelligence of the men or their native abilities, they do indicate the nature and extent of the problem with which the Army must deal. To meet it, special training units for all men in class V, irrespective of race, have been established at several posts throughout the country. Courses of instruction are offered to give these men a basic education that will fit them for the proper performance of their Army duties. Very encouraging results have been obtained to date, for in the first 6 months of these courses, out of 29,000 Negro trainees approximately 90 percent were retained in the Army and assigned to more advanced training. Many excellent soldiers have been developed out of men who have initially made a low score in the Army general classification test.

In conclusion, permit me to reiterate and emphasize that all our military personnel is distributed and employed solely in conformance with military considerations which, of course, are entirely unrelated to racial derivations. I appreciate the spirit and purpose of your letter and hope this clarifies our position to your satisfaction.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

American Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an interesting, illuminating, and timely article by our scholarly and distinguished Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States. The article is entitled "WALLACE Defines 'American Fascism,'" and was published in the New York Times magazine, of April 9, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE DEFINES "AMERICAN FASCISM"—THE VICE PRESIDENT SAYS IT POLLUTES PUBLIC OPINION, ENCOURAGES INTOLERANCE AND PRESENTS A CHALLENGE TO OUR DEMOCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

(By HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States)

On returning from my trip to the West in February, I received a request from the New York Times to write a piece answering the following questions:

1. What is a Fascist?
2. How many Fascists have we?
3. How dangerous are they?

A Fascist is one whose lust for money or power is combined with such an intensity of intolerance toward those of other races, parties, classes, religions, cultures, regions, or nations as to make him ruthless in his use of deceit or violence to attain his ends. The supreme god of a Fascist to which his ends are directed may be money or power; may be a race or a class; may be a military clique or an economic group; or may be a culture, religion, or a political party.

The perfect type of Fascist throughout recent centuries has been the Prussian Junker, who developed such hatred for other races and such allegiance to a military clique as to make him willing at all times to engage in any degree of deceit and violence necessary to place his culture and race astride the world. In every big nation of the world are at least a few people who have the fascist temperament. Every Jew baiter, every Catholic hater is a Fascist at heart. The hoodlums who have been desecrating churches, cathedrals, and synagogues in some of our larger cities are ripe material for Fascist leadership.

The obvious types of American Fascists are dealt with on the air and in the press. These demagogs and stooges are fronts for others. Dangerous as these people may be, they are not so significant as thousands of other people who have never been mentioned. The really dangerous American Fascists are not those who are hooked up directly or indirectly with the Axis. The F. B. I. has its finger on those.

The dangerous American Fascist is the man who wants to do in the United States in an American way what Hitler did in Germany in a Prussian way. The American Fascist would prefer not to use violence. His method is to poison the channels of public information. With a Fascist the problem is never how best to present the truth to the public but how best to use the news to deceive the public into giving the Fascist and his group more money or more power.

If we define an American Fascist as one who in case of conflict puts money and power ahead of human beings, then there are undoubtedly several million Fascists in the United States. There are probably several hundred thousand if we narrow the definition to include only those who in their search for money and power are ruthless and deceitful.

Most American Fascists are enthusiastically supporting the war effort. They are doing this even in those cases where they hope to have profitable connections with German chemical firms after the war ends. They are patriotic in time of war because it is to their interest to be so, but in time of peace they follow power and the dollar wherever they may lead.

American fascism will not be really dangerous until there is a purposeful coalition between the cartelists, the deliberate poisoners of public information and those who stand for the K. K. K. type of demagog. Every year, however, the deliberate, systematic poisoning of the public channels of information is becoming more evident. At the moment the anti-Jewish, anti-Negro, anti-Catholic outbreaks are not too serious, but who can say what they will be if the poisoning of the public mind continues and we enter a period of serious depression?

The European brand of fascism will probably present its most serious post-war threat to us via Latin America. The effect of the war has been to raise the cost of living in most Latin-American countries much faster than the wages of labor. The Fascists in most Latin-American countries tell the people that the reason their wages won't buy as much in the way of goods is because of Yankee imperialism.

The Fascists in Latin America learn to speak and act like natives. Our chemical and other manufacturing concerns are all too often ready to let the Germans have Latin-American markets provided the American companies can work out an arrangement which will enable them to charge high prices to the consumer inside the United States. Following this war, technology will have reached such a point that it will be possible for Germans, using South America as a base, to cause us much more difficulty in World War No. 3 than they did in World War No. 2. The military and land-owning cliques in many South American countries will find it attractive financially to work with German Fascists concerns as well as expedient from the standpoint of temporary power politics.

Fascism is a world-wide disease. Its greatest threat to the United States will come after the war, either via Latin America or within the United States itself.

Still another danger is represented by those who, paying lip service to democracy and the common welfare, in their insatiable greed for money and the power which money gives, do not hesitate surreptitiously to evade the laws designed to safeguard the public from monopolistic extortion. American Fascists of this stamp were clandestinely alined with their German counterparts before the war and are even now preparing to resume where they left off, after "the present unpleasantness" ceases.

To the end of facilitating the reestablishment of these international cartels, these stuffed-shirt Fascists are presently engaged—not always covertly—in a campaign to subvert the distinctively democratic public policy founded on the principle of economic freedom. They seek nothing more, of course (and, incidentally, nothing less), than a license for an even more rigorous and more remorseless application of the principle of "charging what the traffic will bear," in league with their erstwhile Axis partners, than that which glorified the "new era" of the twenties—and prostrated the world economy in the thirties. They have a vain delusion that in this fashion they can again bring the common man to his knees and make of him this time a groveling suppliant who will "keep to his place." The susceptibility to hallucinations of this kind is one of the surest signs of the Fascist mentality.

The symptoms of Fascist thinking are colored by environment and adapted to immediate circumstances. But always and everywhere they can be identified by their appeal to prejudice and by the desire to play upon the fears and vanities of different groups in order to gain power. It is no coincidence that the growth of modern tyrants has in every case been heralded by the growth of prejudice. It may be shocking to some people in this country to realize that, without meaning to do so, they hold views in common with Hitler when they preach discrimination against other religious, racial, or economic groups. Likewise, many people whose patriotism is their proudest boast play Hitler's game by retailing distrust of our allies and by giving currency to snide suspicions without foundation in fact.

The American Fascists are most easily recognized by their deliberate perversion of truth and fact. Their newspapers and propaganda carefully cultivate every fissure of disunity, every crack in the common front against fascism. They use every opportunity to impugn democracy. They use isolationism as a slogan to conceal their own selfish imperialism.

They cultivate hate and distrust of both Britain and Russia. They claim to be superpatriots, but they would destroy every liberty guaranteed by the Constitution. They demand free enterprise, but are the spokesmen for monopoly and vested interest. Their final objective, toward which all their deceit is directed, is to capture political power so that using the power of the state and the power of the market simultaneously they may keep the common man in eternal subjection.

Several leaders of industry in this country who have gained a new vision of the meaning of opportunity through cooperation with

government have warned the public openly that there are some selfish groups in industry who are willing to jeopardize the structure of American liberty to gain some temporary advantage. We all know the part that the cartels played in bringing Hitler to power and the rule the giant German trusts have played in Nazi conquests. Monopolists who fear competition and who distrust democracy because it stands for equal opportunity would like to secure their position against small and energetic enterprise. In an effort to eliminate the possibility of any rival growing up, some monopolists would sacrifice democracy itself.

The sincerity of monopolists and cartelists who deny that they have any Fascist tendencies is easily tested. Do they uphold, in their policies and practices, the genuine principles of free enterprise, granting to the newcomer, the little businessman, the inventor, a fair start in the game? To ask this question is to answer it. The monopolist wants no rivals. The cartelists want to regiment existing business, to eliminate all competition, and to prevent the emergence of new enterprise. In other words, the cartelist and the monopolist don't believe in economic democracy and if necessary are willing to see political democracy die in order to maintain their grip on economic life.

Very often big business gives unwitting aid to fascism. Many British businessmen would be incensed if they were branded as Fascists, yet by playing the cartel game they supported the policies that led to Munich and finally to the Duesseldorf agreement, signed the day following Hitler's seizure of Czechoslovakia. In this agreement they sanctioned the cartelization of industry in Germany and England, and stated that they intended to exert pressure on their governments to cartelize world trade. In the United States many industrialists whose personal patriotism is unquestioned placed themselves and their corporations in ambiguous positions because they had succumbed to the false security of cartel agreements with totalitarian German concerns.

It can be pointed out to such men that many of the German industrialists who financed Hitler found they had created a Frankenstein monster who did not hesitate to destroy them economically or personally if it suited his purpose. The ghost (and this may be literal) of Thyssen should haunt every American businessman so minded. Similarly, many thousands of businessmen who played ball with the Nazis found that the swastika stood for a double-cross, by which small industries were sold out to the giant combines, or to enrich favored members of the Nazi Party.

It has been claimed at times that our modern age of technology facilitates dictatorship. What we must understand is that the industries, processes, and inventions created by modern science can be used either to subjugate or liberate. The choice is up to us. The myth of Fascist efficiency has deluded many people. It was Mussolini's vaunted claim that he "made the trains run on time." In the end, however, he brought to the Italian people impoverishment and defeat. It was Hitler's claim that he eliminated all unemployment in Germany. Neither is there unemployment in a prison camp.

Democracy to crush fascism internally must demonstrate its capacity to "make the trains run on time." It must develop the ability to keep people fully employed and at the same time balance the Budget. It must put human beings first and dollars second. It must appeal to reason and decency and not to violence and deceit. We must not tolerate oppressive government or industrial oligarchy in the form of monopolies and cartels. As long as scientific research and inventive ingenuity outrun our ability to devise social mechanisms to raise the living standards of the people we may expect the liberal potential of the United States to increase. If this liberal potential is properly channeled we may expect the area of freedom of the United States to increase. The problem is to speed up our rate of social invention in the service of the welfare of all the people.

So long as private economic governments stifle initiative and attempt to control technological development, it is not possible for genuine advances to be made in economic and political democracy. As long as we falter in the solution of the unemployment problem, as long as monopoly chokes off the opportunities for investment and the development of an expanding economy, the specter of fascism will haunt our efforts to promote the general welfare.

The world-wide, age-long struggle between fascism and democracy will not stop when the fighting ends in Germany and Japan. Democracy can win the peace only if it does two things:

1. Speeds up the rate of political and economic inventions so that both production and, especially, distribution, can match in their power and practical effect on the daily life of the common man the immense and growing volume of scientific research, mechanical invention, and management technique.

2. Vivifies with the greatest intensity the spiritual processes which are both the foundation and the very essence of democracy.

The second of these two requirements is even more likely to be overlooked than the first. Our colleges, because of their preoccupation with science, history, economics, and athletics, stimulate too little serious questioning in the minds of the young Wall Streeters (and young La Salle Streeters) concerning that which is the essence of both democracy and religion—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Democracy might well be called the religion of the general welfare in action. Against the international, imperialistic aspects of fascism and cartels it has its own type of internationalism—the good-neighbor policy. But the good-neighbor policy will be replaced by a new fascism if, after this war, we do as we did after the last war—insist on higher tariffs and the punitive payment of debts which foreign nations owe us.

The moral and spiritual aspects of both personal and international relationships have a practical bearing which so-called practical men deny. This dullness of vision regarding the importance of the general welfare to the individual is the measure of the failure of our schools and churches to teach the spiritual significance of genuine democracy. Until democracy in effective enthusiastic action fills the vacuum created by the power of modern inventions we may expect the Fascists to increase in power after the war, both in the United States and in the world.

Fascism in the post-war world inevitably will push steadily for Anglo-Saxon imperialism and eventually for war with Russia. Already American Fascists are talking and writing about this conflict and using it as an excuse for their internal hatreds and intolerances toward certain races, creeds, and classes.

It should also be evident from what has been said above that exhibitions of the native brand of fascism are not confined to any single section, class, or religion. Happily it can be said that as yet fascism has not captured a predominant place in the outlook of any American section, class, or religion. It may be encountered in Wall Street, Main Street, or Tobacco Road. Some even suspect that they can detect incipient traces of it along the Potomac. It is an infectious disease and we must all be on our guard against intolerance, bigotry, and the pretension of invidious distinction. But if we put our trust in the common sense of common men and "with malice toward none and charity for all" go forward on the great adventure of making political, economic, and social democracy a practical reality, we shall not fail.

A League of Sovereign Nations and Not a World State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A League of Sovereign Nations and Not a World State," delivered by me on the Win-the-Peace Forum program at Youngstown, Ohio, April 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Ohioans, we debate tonight the policy which the United States is to pursue after the war in relation to other nations. While many other questions of foreign policy must be decided before we settle the form of an international organization, it is not too soon to debate this most important question which faces American statesmen after the war.

To decide this question intelligently, however, it is necessary to determine clearly in our minds what is the ultimate purpose of American foreign policy. Until that question is thought through, it is impossible to explain our past policy in time of peace, the reasons why we have gone to war, or the reasons for joining an organization of nations after the war.

The Revolutionary War was fought to secure the freedom of the people of the United States. The Constitution declares that the Government was established to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." To me it is clear that the only purpose of American foreign policy is to insure freedom for the people of the United States by preventing invasion and threats of attack which might bring slavery to our people, and prevent their working out here at home the destiny of the American Republic.

The ultimate purpose of our foreign policy is not to bring peace into the world, but to secure our own freedom by preventing the rise of an aggressor who will cause another world war into which we may be drawn. World peace is a means to that end. We are interested in world peace because world war threatens our own security.

The ultimate purpose of our foreign policy is not to benefit other nations by spreading democracy or the "four freedoms" throughout the world. We desire to be good neighbors throughout the world. We are anxious to help other peoples, but only to the extent that this can be done without involving us in unnecessary war or endangering the future welfare of our own people. We did not enter the present war in order to crusade throughout the world for the Atlantic Charter. There is no intention on our part to insist on the freedom of India, or, apparently, even the freedom of the Baltic states,

or eastern Poland. We are not fighting for democracy, except to protect our own. As a matter of fact, if we admit that a military crusade for an ideal, or a way of life, or a form of government, is justifiable against other nations for their supposed benefit, the world would be involved in perpetual turmoil.

We pursued a warlike course against Germany because our people were convinced, whether rightly or wrongly, that a German victory would threaten the peace and security of the United States. Our interest in the British Empire is not in maintaining the Empire, but because we feel that war between us is inconceivable, and the existence of Britain as a great sea power is a strong element in preventing any attack on this country from across the seas. Throughout our history our policy has been based on establishing and maintaining the freedom of every individual as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, the freedom of our States, our cities, and our schools to manage their own local affairs, the freedom of our Nation to pursue those policies best designed to secure the liberty and happiness of our own people.

It is in the light of these purposes that we must examine the proposals for an international state, or a league of sovereign nations.

What is this federal world government which Mr. Nash proposes? It is a government to bear the same relation to existing nations which the Federal Government in Washington bears to the individual States. That is the parallel upon which Mr. Nash relies for every argument. There will be then a world government. At the head of that government will be a president, or a king, or a chairman of the council of people's commissars, or a generalissimo, according to the philosophy prevailing in the constitutional convention. In any event, he will be charged with the execution of the laws, and the command of the only army and navy which exists in the world.

There will be a legislature of one or two houses in which the American people may have perhaps 10 percent of the vote. That would be fairly liberal, since they only have 5 percent of the population of the world. This legislature would have power to make laws dealing with certain subjects. Presumably, they could regulate all international trade and prohibit tariffs, or perhaps sanction them if not forbidden as in our Constitution. This power would be the power of life or death over many American industries. Shipping would be controlled or might be internationalized and operated by the government. The same, of course, would be true of all aviation. Any one country which happened to be in a minority at the moment might be wholly deprived of opportunity to expand its industries or even use its shipping and air equipment.

The legislature would have power to levy taxes, and it is not inconceivable that, since the United States is the richest country in the world, the taxes might be so devised as to come almost entirely from this country. Coinage and money would be an international affair, and, together with the banks, would, of course, be subject to the control of the government. I don't know exactly what definition of interstate commerce might be written into the new constitution, but if we follow the American Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court, the legislature under its power to control foreign trade could make laws which practically controlled labor organizations and farm organizations as well as all processors and manufacturers, if the products extended in any degree into foreign commerce.

It is somewhat difficult to guess just what individual bill of rights would be written into the new constitution, but, whatever it might be, it would be construed by an international court. This court, of course, would be made up of representatives of many nations, most of which have a rudimentary idea of individual rights. Even the rather rough, treatment which the Bill of Rights has been receiving in this country would be mild compared to what might happen if individual rights were construed by a court of which a majority happened to be made up of Frenchmen, Russians, Chinese, and East Indians. In the modern world with the strong tendency to centralization of power and the regimented state, it is hard to see how we can protect either nation or individual against a centralized world state controlling the only police force permitted to exist in the world.

We may question how there can be in this world constitution, anything like the provision of our own Constitution, guaranteeing to every nation a republican form of government. Apparently, this would be impossible, for neither Russia, China, nor even Great Britain, has that form of government today. But was that guaranty an essential feature of the Union of the Thirteen Colonies?

This whole project appears to me to be fantastic, dangerous, and impractical for a number of reasons.

First. It would destroy the very purpose of our foreign policy, the freedom of the people of the United States. Our people could not be free under a government controlled by foreign peoples, many of whom do not understand what freedom means. The liberty for which we fought in 1776 has made this Nation the greatest power in the world. It has set an example of individual progress and improvement of standards of living unequaled by any other nation. That result has been due primarily to the fact that we have been a free and unfettered people. We are asked to scrap a tried plan, which up to this time has successfully maintained our liberty; a plan which has afforded to this country the very protection against invasion and interference which is the alleged purpose of all these international plans.

Our future freedom will depend entirely upon the manner in which the new government chooses to operate through its legislature and the executive. Unquestionably, the legislature will be controlled by a block of nations constituting a majority. We may be a member of that bloc, or we may belong to the minority. In the latter case there is no way in which we can prevent the rest of the world from dominating our industries, our trade, our currency, our agriculture, and levying taxes which fall upon us with the greatest severity. This is not liberty as Americans understand it.

Second. A world state could not be truly democratic. When we consider this question we see clearly that the analogy between a world state and the union of the Thirteen Colonies is completely false. Those colonies were made up of men of similar origin, similar methods of thought, similar ideals, and similar forms of government. They lived approximately the same kind of life, with similar standards of living. They all looked back to the English common law and a free parliament. Here we would be attempting to unite peoples who do not understand even how their new fellow citizens begin to think. We would join democracies with dictatorships, Moslem states with Christian states, the Brahman with the Rotarian, men who talk and think only Japanese with men who talk and think only English. We would attempt to unite the most highly civilized with the aborigines, the workman who earns $20 a day with the coolie who earns 20 cents a day.

Surely we would only join a world state if it were democratic, but such a huge conglomeration certainly would not remain democratic—if a state including dictatorships like Russia, China, Brazil, and Greece could ever have been considered democratic. True democracy depends upon effective access of the people to their central government. Sometimes I question whether the United States has not reached the limit of size, under which the people of the Nation can have a real voice in its government. Certainly a world government at Geneva or Panama would listen more closely to the voice of the world theorists and the world cranks and the world pressure groups, all camped on their doorsteps, than they ever would to the voice of the far-distant American people. Democracy depends on the freedom of local self-government. I have shown why that freedom would not exist in the United States, and even less, would it exist in many other nations throughout the world. It is significant that the British Empire, because of its size, has moved toward decentralization of government in order to insure freedom and democracy. It has today no over-all legislative body, no over-all executive, and no over-all police force. If Canada and Australia and New Zealand and South Africa and Eire are regarded as too diverse to be consolidated into one government, what about China, Japan, Russia, and Ethiopia?

Third. A world state would fall to pieces in 10 years. Even in the case of the Thirteen Colonies a difference in one matter, that of Negro slavery, brought about a war 75 years later which almost destroyed the Union. The differences of religion, philosophy, form of government, and economic resources in a world state would be a hundred times as disrupting as was slavery. The first time a majority attempts to impose its will upon a substantial minority it will be faced with revolution and war, the very dangers which we are seeking to avoid.

It is said that diverse peoples have been held together in single nations, but this is not substantially true. Except for Switzerland, the nations which have successfully amalgamated divergent peoples have had the problem of reconciling the views of only two different peoples, recognizing each other as equals. This is the case of Austro-Hungary, English and French Canada, and South Africa. The history of these states is a constant history of adjustment between the two divergent peoples and a constant threat of disruption. Furthermore the people united have lived close together and been forced to recognize common problems. Switzerland is a small state, historically a refuge from larger states, which cannot possibly be compared to a federation of the world. A world state would dissolve in a few years in World War No. 3 because it would be constantly interfering in the internal affairs of other nations.

Fourth. From the point of view of practical politics we are simply wasting our time to discuss a world state. No one is going to join it. The American people would reject it by an overwhelming majority. I don't believe our allies, England and Russia, would agree for a moment to submit themselves to an international state and have their seaports and airports run by an international bureaucrat. Remember that this would involve the scrapping of all national armament for an international police force, controlled by some international executive, selected by a body the control of which would rest in a combination of member nations impossible to predict. If you can see Winston Churchill liquidating the British Fleet, or Joe Stalin dismissing the Russian Army, or either of them turning over their forces to President Whoozis, of Worlditania, you are more clairvoyant than I.

This condition, of course, is recognized by the action of the various responsible parties and statesmen in this country. Secretary

Hull's speeches all point clearly away from an international state to a league of sovereign nations. The Mackinac declaration of foreign policy adopted by the Republican Party provides for "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world." The Moscow Declaration of the four United Nations, as well as the Connally resolution, recognize "the necessity of their being established, at the earliest practicable date, a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states." Neither party would consider endorsing in its platform any plan for subjecting the sovereignty of this country to a world state.

In short, a world government in my opinion, would do far more harm than good. It would bring about war rather than prevent it, and would destroy in America the very freedom which is the purpose of our foreign policy.

I am further convinced that a military alliance with England, or with England and Russia, would inevitably produce a counter-alliance, which in the end would make war more likely. In effect it would destroy freedom throughout the rest of the world, and we could not destroy that freedom without in the end threatening that of the people of the United States.

I do believe that a league of sovereign nations agreeing upon a rule of law and order throughout the world has today a real chance of success. The fact that similar efforts have failed in the past, is by no means conclusive against another attempt. Its success depends upon proper organization, and upon a substantial majority of the nations of the world keeping their promises. If those promises are clearly understood, and subject to further definition by a court, I believe they will be performed. The utter destruction which would be produced by another war is so obvious to every people, that the determination to keep the peace will be overwhelming if it can be properly organized.

The first step in any league is to write an international law by which the sovereign nations shall agree to be governed. That law should prohibit any nation from making war without international sanction. It should provide a set of rules dealing with the relations between nations, and provide for the submission of all disputes involving such laws to an international court. It should provide for the submission of other disputes to arbitration. The nations should agree to abide by the decisions rendered.

Most of the argument of the theorists has been on the method by which this international law shall be enforced, but the first step is to determine what the law shall be, and with what international relations it shall deal. It must be written clearly, and in accord with principles generally accepted by civilized peoples. Force will never succeed unless it is backed up by the public opinion of the world, and it is only possible to mobilize that opinion behind a law or court decision which is clear and obviously just. In the case of the prohibition amendment we saw that even within a nation laws may be so unpopular or so incapable of enforcement as to bring about violence and lawbreaking.

If we attempt to prescribe laws dealing with the internal affairs of the member nations or others, I believe it is more likely to cause wars than to prevent them. Furthermore, we must not impose on any nation obligations which seem unreasonable to those people, or obligations which we ourselves are unwilling to assume, nor should we force them to take part in disputes where they cannot see any interest whatsoever.

I suggest, therefore, that the permanent law which we write deal only with the action of nations outside of their territorial boundaries, with one exception as to limitation of armament. Temporary internal restraints may have to be imposed upon the Axis nations, but it should be understood that the time will come when they will be removed. I would prefer to build the association on the old League of Nations, although the covenant will require such extensive revisions that it may be simpler as an administrative matter to begin over again. There should be subordinate organizations, such as a council of Europe, a council of America, and a council of the Far East, with courts to consider the questions which involve those areas alone. Special laws may be written, applicable to any given area, but not applicable throughout the world. When the law has been defined, I believe all nations should enter into an obligation to join, and use economic sanctions and force if necessary, to prevent law violation which is defined as aggression and found to be aggression by an international court or council.

This is the respect in which we are asked to depart from our traditional policy. We will no longer have a free hand because we will have agreed to make war under circumstances found to exist by an international body in which we do not have a majority voice. I see no infringement of sovereignty in undertaking that obligation. However, I think the obligation should be carefully defined. The types of law violation constituting aggression should be clear and definite, and the method of finding the action of any nation to be aggression should be equally clear. I do not believe a nation in one area should be called upon to furnish forces to prevent aggression in another area until the nations of that area have made every effort to settle their own problems. We certainly should not go into Europe unless we are invited to do so by a substantial majority of the people of that continent, who have shown their willingness to cooperate with us when we do so. Otherwise we will not only make ourselves exceedingly unpopular, but we shall probably fail in our objective.

Under the regional plan, our forces could be compared to a suburban fire department, called in only on a three-alarm fire. It would be necessary for us to maintain an Army, Navy, and Air Force specially trained for operations in all parts of the world. I believe such a force need not be extraordinarily large or expensive, probably no greater than the American people will insist on maintaining in any event after the war. It will require no conscription. If adequate pay is given the men, it should be an attractive profession.

I would be inclined to oppose an international police force. If such a force were large enough to overcome the forces of every other nation, it would subject the entire world to the rule of some international body, and would have the same dangers as an international state. Someone would have to be chief of police, and the executive or council which directed him, or he himself, would rule the world. If the force were a small one, merely designed to interfere with small nations, it would still be controlled predominantly by one or two powerful nations, and would always be a threat to the freedom of all smaller nations.

It would be necessary to prescribe a definite limitation of armaments for each nation, and the covenants between them must provide that they shall not exceed this limitation, and must permit inspection by the council to determine from time to time whether they are complying with their covenant. A violation of this covenant would be defined as aggression. In this one field of arms limitation it seems to me necessary for the league to interfere with action going on within the boundaries of individual nations, for I see no other way in which to prevent the competitive growth of armaments, which would certainly destroy the hope of peace.

Can such an organization as I have described succeed? Frankly, no one can be certain. Every detail must be worked out to eliminate as much friction as possible. The machinery must operate smoothly without offense to the reasonable desire of all peoples to be free and determine their own future. A league is not likely to succeed if it contains in its basic law, or in the structure of nations on which it is built, any fundamental wrong. It is not likely to succeed if peoples earnestly desiring freedom are subjected to the arbitrary rule of other nations. It is not likely to succeed unless economic arrangements are made so that every nation shall have means available to obtain necessary raw materials and pay for them.

There has been too much emphasis on the question whether we are willing to agree to use force, and too little on the basic nature of the league and the law which it is attempting to impose upon the world. There should be no rushing into a new organization. Plenty of time ought to be taken after hostilities cease, to build up the foundations of peace before we attempt to place upon them a permanent structure. If we finally complete a league of nations 2 years after the end of the war, there will be more chance of success than if we rush into it the day after the armistice under the pressure of some emotional propaganda.

No peace organization will be a success unless the people of this country, including the men who have served abroad, are persuaded in their hearts that the organization is necessary and appropriate to maintain future freedom and peace. Those who try to force the people into an organization now, on the theory that later they may not be so agreeable to the idea, endanger the success of the whole project. I am confident that the people can be permanently persuaded. I am determined that some such effort as I have outlined shall be made.

First Things Should Be Done First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the radio address which was delivered by Mr. Millard W. Rice, who is the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, on Tuesday, April 11, 1944, over station WWDC in Washington.

Mr. Rice has definitely called attention to the real problem concerning veterans' legislation, namely, the need for adequate compensation to those who are disabled during the period of their war service. The able-bodied veteran who returns to this country from his war service does not have the demand upon the Government for aid and assistance which the disabled veteran definitely has. In considering the present legislation before

the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, I trust that the entire question of veterans legislation will be carefully weighed before reporting any particular bill. We cannot afford to be lavish in gifts to the able-bodied and subsequently find that we must curtail our discharge of the obligations to the disabled.

In order to emphasize this problem, I am happy to present to my colleagues the speech of Mr. Rice in this regard.

I am delighted that I have this opportunity to tell the radio audience something about the Disabled American Veterans, its service activities, and its interest in various pending legislative bills, for I am sure that your audience includes many fathers and mothers and wives of those now serving in the armed forces, many war veterans, and many service disabled veterans, and their dependents.

Every American citizen is surely interested in, and will inevitably be affected by, whatever Congress may decide to do in providing post-war adjustments for America's veterans.

Incidentally, may I state that the Disabled American Veterans is a congressionally chartered organization, formed back in 1920 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans. The D. A. V., speaking alphabetically, is the most exclusive of the major veteran organizations, for it will grant membership only to those American citizens who have been wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the armed forces during time of war. Its members, therefore, include wounded and disabled veterans ranging from the Civil War through the Spanish American War and World War No. 1, up to and including an increasing number of disabled dischargees from World War No. 2.

Although the D. A. V. is naturally the smallest in membership of the three major veteran organizations, it has the largest staff of nationally paid national service officers, located in most of the 52 regional offices of the Veterans' Administration. These full-time national service officers, together with the part-time and volunteer service officers of our some 900 local chapters, specialize in assisting deserving disabled veterans as to how to comply with governmental technicalities in establishing legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be equitably entitled from the Veterans' Administration or from some other governmental agency. They also counsel and assist disabled veterans to locate suitable, gainful, useful employment.

Being composed exclusively of American war-disabled veterans, the D. A. V. specializes in their problems. It is especially interested in protecting and promoting their welfare.

Americans generally have complacently assumed that America's disabled veterans and their dependents are being adequately cared for by the Government. Such an assumption is definitely not in accordance with the facts.

Many legislative corrections and liberalizations are still needed to eliminate the many existing inadequacies, inequities, and inequalities as to the Nation's service disabled and their dependents and for the dependents of those who have died while serving in the armed forces or because of having so served—too numerous for me here to explain.

I shall cite only a few examples of what I mean. Most Americans do not realize that their Federal Government has, in effect, been discouraging its disabled veterans from getting married and, after marriage, from having children. Rather ironic, is it not, that those who have sacrificed their youth, their joy of living, and their health, by reason of active service in the armed forces of the country in fighting to preserve our American way of living should thereby have lost the opportunity to pursue happiness and to live according to American standards? That's definitely what does happen as to those who become totally disabled, and therefore unemployable, by reason of wounds, injuries, or ailments incurred by serving in the armed forces.

If a veteran of this war becomes so disabled as to become unemployable, then he may be awarded a total rating, in which event he would be entitled to a pension of $100 per month but with no dependency allowances whatsoever. To cure this, the D. A. V. has sponsored the introduction of companion bills in the Congress, S. 1733, on the Senate side, by Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, and H. R. 4280, on the House side, by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, whereby America's disabled veterans would be entitled to the same dependency allowances as Canada has long provided for its service-connected disabled veterans.

Even though its cost of living is considerably less than in this country, Canada provides higher rates of pension for the widows and orphans of men who have been killed in action or who have died by reason of service-incurred disabilities than does our own rich country. Bills to increase our rates are still resting in congressional committees.

Since 1921 Canada has reimbursed its Provinces for payments made, on the basis of the operation of their workmen's compensation acts, to service-connected disabled veterans, or, in the event of their death, to their next of kin.

The D. A. V. has insisted that the natural fear, on the part of employers, that they might increase their State workmen's compensation costs, by their employment of disabled veterans, should be removed by requiring the Veterans' Administration to reimburse all such costs as to all service-connected disabled veteran employees, or, in the event of their death, to their next of kin. H. R. 2950 to accomplish this is still reposing before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The D. A. V. has been insisting that the present rates of compensation and pension to disabled veterans should be increased, in part, to meet the substantial increase in the cost of living. Precedents were established nearly 2 years ago by authorizing time-and-a-half pay for overtime work for governmental employees, and for unionized labor.

Disabled veterans, however, who, because of their disabilities, are unable to secure employment, and therefore have no other source of income than their pension payments, have been unable to relieve the situation as to themselves and their dependents. Their only recourse has been to reduce their standard of living. Partial increases to meet the increased cost of living would be provided for by the enactment of H. R. 3356 and H. R. 3377, which, after passing the House of Representatives without objection last November, have been left in the files of the Senate Committee on Finance without any action so far.

Many more deficiencies as to America's provisions for its disabled veterans, and their dependents, could also be cited, but these are enough to indicate that those who have served and sacrificed a part of their bodies or health, have good reason, in many instances, to become disappointed, disgusted, and disillusioned.

Bills to provide badly needed benefits for war-disabled veterans and their dependents have, in effect, been shoved to one side to give the right-of-way, in response to the pressure of numbers, to the so-called G. I. bill of rights.

The continued existence of these situations is particularly distressing when one notes the undue haste with which consideration and action has been given to the so-called G. I. bill of rights, designed to provide post-war education, unemployment compensation benefits, and $1,000 loans to buy or improve a farm or a home or a business, under certain conditions, primarily to benefit able-bodied veterans. As a matter of fact, very little would thereby be provided for service-disabled veterans, and their dependents, which is not already available to them under existing laws or Executive orders.

In view of the existing manpower shortage, there are no such emergency needs as to discharged able-bodied veterans as necessitate the speedy enactment of such proposed legislation, without all of its implications and possible after-effects, being first carefully considered in connection with other proposals for post-war adjustments for veterans. Surely, while Congress is considering this very important question, it should consider all proposals to provide for the post-war needs of veterans of this war, and then adopt the best method, rather than the proposals behind which the best advance "pressure of numbers" campaign may have been organized.

We, of the D. A. V., are very apprehensive about the probable after-effects, if the so-called G. I. bill of rights should be enacted into law, "as is." It proposes that such new types of benefits, primarily for able-bodied veterans, should be made the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration, which, heretofore, has been regarded as the Federal agency primarily to take care of the responsibilities of the Nation's disabled, and which, in our opinion, should continue to specialize in their problems.

The Veterans' Administration ought not to be converted into an administrative monstrosity by overloading it with new types of benefits for which its officials have had no adequate background of experience. Its facilities and personnel are already being taxed to take care of the fast expanding problems of disabled veterans and their dependents, and of the widows and orphans of those who will be with us no more.

If the Veterans Administration is also to be required to administer complicated laws for able-bodied veterans, then we of the Disabled American Veterans fear that the even tougher problems of disabled veterans and their dependents will get less attention than they deserve. Moreover we do not think it fair that the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration should be further increased to provide benefits primarily for able-bodied veterans, thus aggravating the false impression of the public that adequate governmental provisions have been made for the Nation's disabled and their dependents.

The D. A. V. is in favor of adequate post-war adjustments for able-bodied veterans, but not by any method which unnecessarily jeopardizes existing and badly needed proposed legislation for war-disabled veterans and their dependents. Post-war adjustments as to able-bodied veterans should be assigned to governmental agencies other than the Veterans' Administration.

The economy of America should not be divided up between veterans and nonveterans.

Post-war education for able-bodied veterans should come under the United States Office of Education or delegated directly to State governments. Unemployment compensation should come under the Social Security Board, or more directly under the several State boards of unemployment compensation. Loans for agricultural purposes should come under the Department of Agriculture, for business purposes under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Department of Commerce, and for homes under the Federal Housing Administration.

It is very doubtful that the unemployment compensation benefits for unemployed veterans—at much higher rates than provided for in most States—as proposed in the so-called G. I. bill of rights, would, in the final

analysis, prove beneficial to veterans. Such higher Federal rates of unemployment compensation would actually encourage employers to employ nonveterans, so that the higher unemployment compensation benefits thus to be available to veterans would then come into the community.

These higher Federal rates of unemployment compensation to unemployed veterans will probably also cause many difficulties as to various segments of our population. The veterans, too, will not understand when, under the technical provisions of this bill, their Federal benefits are discontinued, probably then giving rise to further demands for additional legislation to straighten out the inequalities that would thereby arise.

A much better method of providing postwar adjustments would be to give every dischargee an adjusted-service certificate or bond, the amount of which would be computed on the basis of length and place of service, on an earned-rights basis, to be redeemable in installments, when needed, during unemployment, or while attending school, or, in larger amounts, to improve or buy a home, farm, or business, thus accomplishing the same objectives in a much more equitable way, and, in the final analysis, by a less costly method, without any interference with State standards or State rights.

An adjusted service-pay method would not require any vast Federal bureaucracy, and, best of all, would not interfere with existing and proposed benefits for disabled veterans. Moreover, such adjusted-service pay would also go to wounded and disabled veterans, whereas the G. I. bill of rights would grant its benefits only primarily to those able-bodied veterans who might be smart enough or "chisely" enough, or "needy" enough, to insist upon them.

If this so-called G. I. bill of rights is enacted into law as is, I prophesy that it would, sooner or later, engender many misunderstandings and much bitterness, and would eventually arouse a demand for another economy act, which would then prove harmful to disabled veterans.

Congress should give very careful consideration to all of the various proposals for postwar adjustments, before deciding upon any method. First of all, however, Congress ought to meet the crying need of those who have earned the first concern of the Nation—its war disabled and their dependents, and the widows and orphans of those who have sacrificed their lives.

First things should be done first.

Jefferson Day Dinner Address by Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by the Honorable Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the Jefferson Day dinner held at the Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, April 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this day I like to think of a mighty spirit looking down upon the struggle in which our country is engaged, recognizing the objectives that are at stake, and then going its way peacefully back into eternity, content that the heritage of man's freedom is entrusted into good hands, is being ably defended, and is certain to endure.

That spirit is Thomas Jefferson, who was born on this day 201 years ago.

If Jefferson were to walk among us now, I do not think he would be surprised that we must still fight, that the blood of Americans must still be shed for the principles of liberty and democracy that were given to the world in 1776 by him and his little band of fellow-statemen. Those principles are not cheaply won. Neither are they cheaply saved.

I think it is quite natural to envisage the spirit of Jefferson walking among us today. For in that which he said and did there is ingrained the quality of timelessness. He wears immortality not as a mantle thrown over him out of the memories of other men, but as a garment fashioned by his own hand, spun out of the raw fabric of a great Nation, and woven to withstand the centuries. His is a living greatness that confuses and confounds the lesser in spirit, a quality that does not lend itself well to those who traffic in empty platitudes.

For example, those who today are crying aloud in agonized tones about a "government of men" as opposed to a "government of laws" cannot look for much comfort in the authority of Thomas Jefferson, greatest lawgiver in our history. For, said Jefferson, and I quote:

"Strict observance of the written laws doubtless is one of the high duties of a good citizen, but it is not the highest. The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger, are of a higher obligation."

That counsel has held good in every great crisis, every great war, which our country has fought. It holds good in this time of crisis, in this mighty struggle of World War No. 2.

When the time comes for writing the history of World War No. 2, I would like to be there, looking over the historian's shoulder. And when he makes out his list of the wrong guesses of Adolf Hitler, I would like to check it over and see that all the grade A, class I wrong guesses are down on that list.

First, I think, among these wrong guesses, would be the toughness of democracy as a people's and a nation's way of life—the toughness of our own American democracy.

I would put that down as wrong guess No. one because the paperhanger of Austria never got further out on the bias in all his career than he did with this one.

As wrong guess No. 2 I would have the historian of this war set down the ability of the peace-loving peoples of the world to join hands—and keep hands joined—against the aggressor.

I think we have it well depicted right here at home, in the unity of the people of the United States. Of course, we have our political differences. There is a rumor afloat that one of them is going to be ironed out again next November; and something more than a rumor that it is going to be settled in much the same way, partywise, that it was 4 years ago. Only more so.

But we in America have never differed about the ultimate fate of Corporal Hitler. There is no argument among us about what will happen to the Japs. Even the isolationists who talk of a negotiated peace do not like Hitler or his allies. They would as soon see him dead. On that score the only difference is on the timing and the cause. We Democrats are united in our preference to end the Fuehrer's career with something more appropriate, by some cause which he better deserves, than old age.

Third in magnitude of Hitler's wrong guesses concerns the leadership of this Nation, the foresight that kept us out of any fatal attempt to appease the aggressor and that armed us in time so that rather than being forced to do business with Hitler, on his terms, we retained our prerogative to do battle with Hitler, on our own terms.

Outstanding in that leadership is the record of one man—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

How very wrong the German Fuehrer was about this man. How sadly misinformed. And how heavily that mistake has cost him.

Wrong guess No. 4 of the Berlin Government may be symbolized, it seems to me, by the city of Coventry, in England. You all know what happened there, and you also know what the people of Coventry refused to let happen there.

As the symbol of wrong guess No. 5, I give you the city of Stalingrad, in Russia.

As the symbol of wrong guess No. 6, the city of Chungking, in China.

And as the symbol of wrong guess No. 7—and as something more than a symbol, for already, to many thousands of Germans and Japs it has spelled death and destruction in letters of cold steel, I give you the city of Detroit in the United States of America.

Yes; the paperhanger of Austria was looking at the wrong blueprints when he dreamed of gumming up the works in Detroit.

He knew we had vast manufacturing industries here. He knew we had brilliant technicians, men of science who have pointed the way for the whole world to follow. He knew we had management that could operate those plants with an efficiency that other nations had studied for years. And he knew, too, that we had labor here, hundreds of thousands of skilled workers, with other thousands who could be brought in from many parts of the country.

What Hitler did not know, what his advisers could not get through their heads, was the fact that under a free democratic system all these resources—plant, technique, management, and labor—could be brought together, almost overnight, at the call and under the direction of a democratic administration, and swung over from the making of automobiles and refrigerators into the greatest machine for producing the tools of war this world has ever known.

What he did not know was that shipments out of your city in time of peace could be doubled and redoubled for war, that from turning out $4,000,000,000 worth of the manufactures of peace in 1939, Detroit could reach the staggering figure of $12,000,000,000 worth of the manufactures of war in 1943.

That is where Adolf Hitler miscalculated on Detroit. That is where the ideas in Hermann Goering's head got in the way of the gray matter. That is where Joseph Goebbels found out that you don't wipe freedom off the earth merely by burning up the books about it.

Well, what is the point they missed about Detroit? Principally, I would say, in one great word—labor. American labor, labor that has won the right to organize, the right of collective bargaining, the right to speak its mind, the right to worship its God, the right to vote leadership into office that will keep it free from want and free from fear.

You see, in Nazi Germany, and over in Japan, they don't have that kind of labor. Their workers are not held in the public respect that American labor has long enjoyed. Their common people, their workers and fighters, have none of the rights that American labor has gained in the 12 years since our last Republican President called out the troops to break up a bonus march.

So the Nazis and the Japs figured that labor with such rights as we have here would not deliver. And if a nation's labor did not deliver, that nation was licked. War, as the

rulers of those two countries saw it, was a business of holding a gun at your enemy's people and a whip over your own. Instead of the lash, this Democratic administration gave our workers the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Wage and Hour Act, and many other legal rights of labor that became the law of this land under the leadership of Franklin D Roosevelt.

And American labor did deliver. It delivered on a magnificent scale. And it is delivering today.

We know that from time to time there have been difficulties. There have been some strikes. Those strikes made headlines, and they also served as ammunition for labor-baiters, some of whom have placed a higher value on the opportunity to make political capital for themselves than on the unity that exists among the great majority of our people.

Strikes in time of war are serious. But if we are reviewing the loyalty of American labor, then let us review the whole picture, and let us review these strikes against that true picture, against the record of labor as a whole.

When we do that we find that man-hours lost on account of strikes, taken altogether, are an almost infinitesimal fraction of the total of man-hours worked in war industries. The Truman committee of the United States Senate, for example, reported recently that strikes in mining, manufacturing, and construction in the year 1943 resulted in a loss of manpower of less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the manpower actually used. In that same year—1943—the total manpower contributed by labor exceeded that which was used in 1939 by 76 percent.

Those who have tried to distort this magnificent record remind me of the man who was attending a lecture on astronomy. The speaker made the statement that the sun was gradually losing its heat, and that this would mean the end of the world inside of 300,000,000,000 years.

The gentleman in the audience fainted. When they brought him to and asked him what was the trouble he said he was terribly frightened. This business of the world coming to an end—why, it was terrifying. But, they told him, that was to be in 300,000,000,000 years.

"Oh!" he said, letting out a big sigh of relief. "I thought he said 3,000,000,000 years."

Well, now that American-made bombs from American-made planes are exploding right in der Fuehrer's face, now that American-made shells from American-made guns are ripping the heart out of the German armies on the Russian front, Hitler and Tojo realize—too late—that defeating America was not quite so simple. They did not know America. They did not know Detroit. And they did not know the loyalty of labor.

They must write off that mistake to a lack of experience.

Lack of experience is a dangerous thing in any government. It can lose a war. And it can lose a peace.

But we, too, in America have some people, some would-be leaders, who also lack experience. The difference over here—for which we may all thank God—is that they have not been at the head of our Government.

Now, to lack experience is not a crime. Of itself, it is not even a mistake, nor an accusation that may be fairly held against a man. Experience takes time, and to profit by experience takes a special ability—the kind of ability that makes a statesman.

It is no reflection on a man to admit that he is not a great statesman. It is no very harsh criticism of a man to point out that he does not qualify for the office of President of the United States.

Quite the contrary, if he has little or nothing in his record to show that he has had either the time in which to gain experience or the ability to turn that experience into statesmanship, then I would not blame such a man for keeping silent on those great questions that are distinctly in the realm of statesmanship, those issues of today on which the future of our people and our country depends in this period of world crisis.

Of course, when such a man is offered to us in all seriousness by a political party as the best that party can produce for the Presidency of the United States, that is another matter. Then a question at once arises.

It is the same question that I once heard an old trapper ask when he was offered a rather doubtful-looking dog in return for cash money. The owner of the dog said he was full grown and in his prime, and he hadn't learned much yet, but there was still a chance that he might turn out to be a fine hunting dog. It wouldn't surprise him if that dog could learn to outpoint, outrun, and outhunt any other dog in the whole State of Michigan. He might even turn out to be a champion. In that case he would be worth many times the price. There was a chance that he might. You couldn't tell, and certainly there was nothing about the dog to prove that he couldn't do it. But after a great deal more of this kind of enthusiasm about what the dog might do, and what it wouldn't surprise the owner if he did do, the old trapper turned to him and asked "Well, do he or don't he?"

Now, when the Republican Party works up a similar enthusiasm over the things a candidate might do to win the war and win the peace, the people of America may well borrow the simple query of that Michigan trapper: "Do he or don't he?"

Of course, when our people want to know whether the Republican Party's candidate is going to offer this Nation its chance to help in realizing the hope of all humanity—the hope of finally joining hands with other nations to rule out future aggressions and future wars—it may be a little embarrassing to be confronted with that same question, "Do he or don't he?"

And, of course, at a time like this, when the workers of America are thinking about the jobs they hold in a war economy, and about the future of those jobs in a post-war economy, when they are wondering whether the Republican Party's candidate will be as determined and as able to protect those jobs as the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, then the same old question arises, "Do he or don't he?"

Oh, yes, the Republican candidate will tell you he wants you and your family to be secure after this war. He will assure you that he knows the way to keep you safe. Well, do he or don't he?

The last Republican administration we had in this country did not know of a way to keep our people safe. And the Republican Party has recently expressed itself once more in a very significant manner when, a few days ago, in Wisconsin it struck off the last half-hearted pretense of progressive principle from its political future.

By that act the Republican Party showed its hand. It showed that it wants to go back, back to the closed-bank credo of Herbert Hoover. It wants you, American labor, to announce today, in advance, your unconditional surrender to whatever the wheel of chance or the whim of vested economic interest may bring in the critical times to come. Yes, the Republican Party seems to be homesick for Hooverville.

Oh, you will hear much vague promising about the work you would get, the security your family would have after this war, if a Republican candidate were to be elected. You will hear much about what that candidate hopes to do for you. But you will not hear much in direct answer if you happen to ask now, "Do he or don't he?"

From that party you will also hear many complaints while you yourself go on working in a job and helping your country to win this war.

From that party you will hear whispers that there must be something wrong with this picture of your earnings, which averaged $21.23 a week here in Detroit when the Republicans were in power—and when you had a job at all—and today averages $56.94 a week.

You will hear vague warnings that there must be something wrong with free enterprise when your wages get that high. Republican rumors buzz about your ears today, and the woods are full of them. But let me ask you, ladies and gentlemen, who is sawing the wood?

Are you interested in knowing what the Republican Party's ideas about your employment after this war really are—as expressed by a certain group which may be in a position to dictate the economic policy of that party?

Then let me tell you now of the kind of language some are using when they talk to you of your job and your future. They have a little phrase, this group, only four words long, but to you—to the working people of America—that phrase speaks volumes. They are talking of a "normal backlog of unemployment."

Now, just consider that a moment. Let it percolate. A normal backlog of unemployment. And if that isn't quite clear, let me add another statement of this same group: "Full employment would be incompatible with the free-enterprise system which carries with it the right to a normal float of unemployed."

The right? Whose right? Is that the right of the employing interest to keep you out of your job? What is a "normal float" of unemployed? Is your life normal, is the lot of your children normal, when you have no job, when you happen to be one of those who make up this "normal float of unemployed"?

Well, such is normalcy—the old normalcy for which the Republican Party has developed a bad case of homesickness. That is what the leaders of that party have in mind for you when this war is finished.

That is the untold story behind the scenes. That is the idea of free enterprise which the Republican Party pledges itself to bring back to this country.

And so, when you hear the promises which that party's candidates will make to American labor between now and November, when you hear the Republican nominee for President tell you what he can do to keep your job safe, and what he wants to do, and what he believes in doing, remember that old question, "Do he or don't he?"

The Lawyer and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Lawyer and the Peace, by G. L. DeLacy, president of the Nebraska Bar Association, delivered at the Lincoln Bar Association dinner, held at Lincoln, Nebr., on March 27, 1944. The manuscript slightly exceeds the

limit with respect to matters to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have received from the Public Printer an estimate that the printing of the address will require three and one-fifth pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $144.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On August 21, 1789, President Washington informed the Senate that on the following day he would meet to advise with them regarding the negotiation of a treaty with the Cherokee Indians.

Article II of the Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall have power, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

It will be noted that the Constitution uses the words, "with the advice and consent of the Senate." President Washington attended the Senate and was given the chair of John Adams, the Vice President. He expected the Senate to debate the treaty, while he answered questions and explained his views, and either accept or reject it. Robert Morris, however, moved that the question of the treaty be referred to a committee. Washington rose and angrily said:

"This defeats every purpose of my coming here." An embarrassing pause ensued and then President Washington left.

William H. Crawford, in relating the incident many years later, said that after his cool reception by the Senate, Washington declared that he would be damned if he ever went there again. This ended the attempts of the Executive to advise with the Senators as a body in an attempt to consummate treaties.

From time immemorial treaties have had rough sailing in the Senate. John Hay, America's most brilliant Secretary of State, is purported to have said:

"A treaty entering the Senate is like a bull going into the arena. No one can say just how or when the final blow will fall, but one thing is certain, it will never leave the arena alive."

As can be seen, under the Constitution the House of Representatives has no vote on the question of whether a treaty should be adopted. The ratification of a treaty is reposed in the Senate, the requirement being a concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present. It is extremely rare for a treaty to be approved by a two-thirds majority consisting entirely of the President's party.

Generally, the opposing party occupies more than one-third of the seats in the Senate. Likewise, as politicians, many Senators find that they have more to gain by embarrassing the President than by considering the interests of the people. In speaking on this point, Secretary of State Hay said:

"The fact that a treaty gives to this country a great and lasting advantage seems to weigh nothing whatever in the minds of about half the Senators, personal interests, personal spites, and a contingent chance of a petty political advantage are the only motives that cut any ice at present."

Our history records from the very beginning constant strife between the Executive and the Senate, growing out of the consideration of treaties. In 1824, a treaty negotiated with Great Britain for the suppression of the slave trade, although ratified by the Senate, was so amended that it resulted in the British Government justifiably refusing to accept the amendments and the treaty was abandoned. This treaty was negotiated by John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State. He was likewise a candidate for the Presidency. The opposition of the Senators seemed to be dictated entirely by partisanship and politics.

In 1844, a treaty was negotiated by John C. Calhoun, Secretary of State, which provided for the almost inevitable union of Texas with the United States. As it turned out afterward, the treaty had the support of a large majority of the people. Its discussion arose during a Presidential campaign, and the treaty was rejected by a vote of 16 to 35. Later on, President Tyler deliberately circumvented the Senate by proposing to annex Texas, by a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress. In the House, the resolution was carried by a vote of 132 to 76. In the Senate the resolution carried by a bare majority of 27 to 25, a plurality of 2 votes, rather than two-thirds. If you now believe that it was a good thing to admit Texas to our Union, you are invited to ponder this history.

In 1897 President McKinley submitted to the Senate a treaty with the Republic of Hawaii, providing for annexation. Once again, a two-thirds majority in favor of the treaty could not be mustered in the Senate. Democrats opposed the treaty as a Rpublican measure, and a few isolationist Republicans stood with them. Again the Senate was circumvented by a joint resolution providing for the annexation of Hawaii. If you now feel grateful for our great stronghold of Pearl Harbor, without which the west coast might have been bombed, you are invited to ponder this history.

In 1904 and 1905 Secretary of State Hay had negotiated a series of arbitration treaties with France, Switzerland, Germany, Portugal, Britain, Spain, Austria-Hungary, Mexico, Norway, and Sweden. In these treaties all questions of vital interest, independence, and national honor were exempted from arbitration. The Senate, however, was so hostile that President Theodore Roosevelt finally withdrew the arbitration treaties, saying:

"The individual Senators evidently consider the prerogative of the Senate as far more important than the welfare of the country."

For years public opinion demanded American entry into a world court. Presidents Harding and Coolidge urged this step. In 1925 the House of Representatives supported the proposal by a vote of 302 to 28. In 1926 the Senate accepted the protocol, but with certain amendments. The other 57 signatory powers of the protocol demurred. A compromise was originated and proposed by Elihu Root, conceding almost every demand of the Senate, but the Senate rejected it. The world court died aborning.

It is thus apparent that from the very beginning of the Nation, a minority in the Senate has been able to thwart the wishes of the majority in most instances, and an examination of the historical background surrounding these occasions indicates invariably that party politics and the pleasure of embarrassing the President motivated a sufficient number of Senators, rather than the consideration of the interests of the Nation.

President Woodrow Wilson spoke of what he termed the "treaty-marring powers of the Senate."

Attorney General Wickersham, in the Taft Cabinet, said:

"A body of 96 men of such diverse characteristics and opinions as compose the Senate is almost hopeless as an executive force, and it is ideal for the purposes of obstruction."

John W. Davis, a one-time candidate for the Presidency, said in an address to the American Bar Association:

"It did not contribute to national influence or prestige or safety that the processes of ratifying or rejecting treaties should degenerate to an effort to discover some qualified formula acceptable to a minority."

There are at the present time 96 Members of the Senate, representing 48 States. New York, having a population of 13,479,000 plus, is represented by 43 Representatives and 2 Senators. Nevada, with a population of only 110,000, is represented by 1 Representative and 2 Senators. The negative vote of 1 Senator from Nevada, representing only 110,247 people, carries as much weight, when voting on treaties, as the affirmative vote of the 2 Senators from New York, representing 13,000,000 plus.

If 2 Senators from Pennsylvania, representing 9,900,000 people, approve a treaty, while the second Senator from Nevada opposes it, the 2 Nevada votes cancel out the 4 votes of New York and Pennsylvania. In other words, the will of 110,247 persons, as represented by 2 Senators, successfully overrides the will of 23,279,322. If the votes of the Senators of 17 States are sufficient to wreck a treaty, and if all the votes should come from the smaller States, the Senators representing 10,000,000 people plus would be able to block the will of more than 121,000,000 who live in the larger 31 States. In other words, it has been figured out that one-twelfth of the American people can prevent eleven-twelfths of the American people from following a course of action in foreign relations.

It is thus apparent that in the making of treaties the will of the majority of the people of this country can be thwarted by a minority—and that by a small minority.

I have laid this historical background as a basis for a discussion of the League of Nations fiasco which occurred after World War No. 1, and for a discussion of what we may expect from the Senate when the time comes to write a treaty following the present war.

With your permission, therefore, I shall, at this time proceed to give you one man's views and ideas on certain subjects which I believe pertinent.

We are living during the greatest military crisis since Napoleon. We are living during the greatest economic crisis since Adam Smith. We are living during the greatest social crisis since the fall of the Roman Empire.

It is apparent that there must have been a profound fault in the economic, social, and political structure of the world to have caused this crisis, and that such fault cannot be eradicated unless we remove, in part, old attitudes, old notions and old valuations.

You will remember that World War No. 1 was fought to make the world safe for democracy. The defeat of the world's aspirations in this regard, after that war, resulted in sordid materialism, a skepticism and sense of frustration which always result when human ideals are thwarted, because they are not implemented with appropriate action.

You will remember that your country entered into this First World War with great reluctance; that President Wilson exercised the greatest patience and forbearance toward the Central Powers, but the same arrogance on the part of the same German military machine which ordered the invasion of Belgium and thus forced in Great Britain, also, by ruthless disregard of our country's rights, compelled action on our part.

Your country was not actuated by selfish motives; it coveted no nation's power or territory.

Then we were led by a great idealist and a great humanitarian, who had compassion for the small nations of this world. President Wilson saw the youth of the world sacrificed to the god of war and believed and hoped that some plan might be evolved which would prevent such holocausts in the future. With only the loftiest motives, he took part in evolving a League of Nations.

But even from the beginning it appeared that the time was not ripe for such a league. While the President was in France, 39 Members of the Senate signed a round robin, saying that they would have no League of Nations. When the proposed treaty with the Central Powers, which included the League of Nations, was presented to the Senate for a two-thirds ratification, the objecting Senators were able to prevent its adoption by

7 votes. The League was supported by ex-President Taft, Charles E. Hughes, Elihu Root, President Lowell, and ex-President Eliot, of Harvard, and many other high-ranking members of the opposite political party.

There was a long and bitter debate. The League became a political issue. The President determined to make an appeal to the people. This necessitated a coast-to-coast tour. Because of his extreme physical condition he was advised to refrain from so arduous a task, but brushing aside those objecting, said:

"I know I am at the end of my tether, but the trip is necessary to save the treaty. No decent man can count his own personal fortune."

Day after day the President carried on, making speeches throughout the land, until his ultimate collapse. His adversaries in the Senate likewise journeyed across the country and appeared and spoke in the same cities, following his appearance, making savage attacks upon him and violently opposing the ratification of the proposed treaty.

At Pueblo the President broke into tears while delivering an address, to so slender a store of nervous stamina had he come. That night he became seriously ill; one side of his face had fallen; his left arm and leg refused to function.

His secretary, Mr. Tumulty, proposed canceling the trip. Pleadingly, the President said:

"Don't you see, if you cancel this trip Senator Lodge and his friends will say I am a quitter, and that the western trip was a failure, and the treaty will be lost?"

However, it was necessary to cancel the trip.

The Covenant was eventually beaten by seven votes, and the United States did not become a member of it. Without this country's support the League was ineffective.

Thus, in my judgment, passed a great opportunity. It may be that the time was not propitious. It may be that the world was not ready for it.

But, however that may be, in my judgment, narrow and short-sighted attitudes prevented this Nation for attempting, at least, to get together with other nations and to work together for the prevention of these cruel wars.

Mark Sullivan, in his work entitled "Our Times," very vividly portrays the last months of Mr. Wilson's administration. He was very ill and confined to his bed; he was heartbroken because of the failure of the Senate to ratify his League of Nations. On some of the White House windows there were iron bars, put there years before when Theodore Roosevelt's children, playing ball, broke the window panes; the bars were now pointed to with whispers—there was a madman in the White House. In the Senate there was a discussion whether the technical condition of the President had not arisen that called for action: "In case of the * * * inability of the President to discharge the duties of said office. * * *"

The Senate sent a committee to find out if the President of the United States was capable of carrying on the public business. Ostensibly they put their visit on the ground of a wish to discuss our Mexican policy; actually, they were, as universal comment at that time put it, a "smelling committee."

Mrs. Wilson and Dr. Grayson demurred about admitting them. The leader (a sinister person, later publicly discredited), Senator Albert W. Fall, of New Mexico, persisted, said it was a matter of public importance. Mr. Sullivan states that on the second trip the President pulled himself together, exerted and employed what little strength there was left in his frail body, and through almost superhuman effort, remained courteous and calm toward the Senators, knowing full well the real object of their visit.

It is reported by Mr. Sullivan that this same Senator Fall (who later was convicted of having accepted a bribe while Secretary of the Interior) in leaving, said:

"I want you to know, Mr. President, that I am praying for you."

After Mr. Wilson's retirement his home in Washington was a shrine, visited by liberals from all over the world. On one occasion when a group of adherents paraded before his home, the band played the old hymn, How Firm a Foundation. Mr. Wilson then, as if moved by the spirit of the hymn, said:

"Just one word more: I have seen fools resist Providence before, and I have seen their destruction, and there will come upon these again utter destruction and contempt; that we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns."

I believe his words were truly prophetic.

In my judgment, it is not written in the stars that there must always be wars; that every 25 years or so the youth of the world must be lined up in battle array against each other. It will be remembered that not so long ago disputes between individuals were settled by trial by battle or legal duel. This practice was, as you will remember, changed by an all-powerful and universal church, which established courts or tribunals which adjudicated men's individual rights. I suspect that at that time certain elements of the population branded as radical the idea of doing away with trial by battle or by duel. Men, I suspect, were characterized as crackpots and weaklings who advanced the idea that men's rights could be determined in a court or a tribunal presided over by a disinterested person, or that the guilt or innocence of accused persons could be determined by a hearing before such a distinterested individual rather than by the cruel and savage system then in force.

It is the considered opinion of many scholars and students of international affairs that one of the great tragedies of our age was the failure of this country to become a member of the League of Nations following the last war. Many men wonder whether this present tragedy would have come to pass if we had followed Woodrow Wilson's ideal of "a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." The League, of course, was not perfect; it had its faults, but at least it was a start. Had we lent the influence of this country to it, this present conflict might have been averted.

It is only in times of great upheavals that revolutionary advances can and may be accomplished. The First World War was truly such an upheaval and the world was presented with its first opportunity to evolve and formulate some practical plan for the abolition of wars.

Another great upheaval has occurred—even greater than the first. Again the youth of the world is pitted against each other in mortal combat. Again we are approaching the writing of a peace; again we are approaching the moment when it is possible to attempt to do something constructive. In my judgment, history of tomorrow will never forgive the men of today if we fail to understand or to measure up to that which must be done. The finish of a total war should be a total peace. The price of victory does not cover the price of peace. It has been said that we pay billions for victory. Shall we offer nothing for the one great good that this victory makes possible—an abiding peace?

When this war is over there will be a great desire to return to normalcy. The country and the world will be war-weary. There will be, however, leaders who believe that the establishment of an abiding peace demands that nations should contribute something of their sovereignty in order that there may arise in the world a supranational system, implemented with the necessary police and judicial powers to make it, in the nucleus of the universal community, the supreme court of last appeal in international affairs.

At such time there will appear again short-sighted ones who peer at their own narrow interests and will not raise their eyes to the stars. There will appear intolerant persons who make their own group or their own nation the standard of humanity. There will appear the stupid ones who cannot think beyond the old traditions or the old catch words. These will all oppose the world's attempt to establish an international association or an international court. They will characterize those who advocate it as idealists, as dreamers, and as stargazers.

It is true that they may be idealists and dreamers, but idealists and dreamers are the ones who carry the torch of civilization ahead; they are the ones who set the stakes in advance—farther ahead, ofttimes, than the times will permit us to follow—but they set the stakes forward and onward. They are as necessary in a civilization as those practical souls who counsel against too much progress.

It has been said that the moral law of Hebrew faith, the idealism of Grecian thought, the universality of Roman law, the highest aspirations of the classical age, the spiritual conception of a common God, and one great family, of all men as brothers and sons of God, the persistent, Christian hope of human brotherhood, nurtured in the hearts of men for over 2,000 years, cry out and impel us at this time of great opportunity, to insist that some practical and workable organization of nations be formed which will at least start the development of procedures which will prevent the settlement of international disputes by resort to arms.

It is my hope that whatever plan is proposed it be not known as a Republican, Democratic, or New Deal plan, and be thus characterized. I hope that it is some plan worked out by representatives of all factions and representatives of the United Nations. Only in such an event will it have a chance of adoption.

From the history of Senate actions in the past it is apparent that it will not be an easy task. A majority of the people at the close of the last war were undoubtedly in favor of some international association or tribunal. But, as I have heretofore pointed out, willful men in the Senate were determined that there should be none. In opposing it, this vociferous minority went up and down the country, appealing to prejudice against Mr. Wilson, constantly reminding communities of alien voters that Mr. Wilson, at the peace table, had treated their homelands badly. They constantly drove in the wedges of discord along the lines of racial cleavage. They effectively jeered and ridiculed his lofty ideals and aims.

It will be so again. After this war the people will be again, for the most part, interested in their private affairs; they will lose the crusading sprit born of the war and will recede from the high moral and spiritual reactions arising out of their sufferings. There will be those who will again appeal to national, racial, and sectional prejudices.

You will again hear the cry "America first!" and "Let's take care of Uncle Sam!" There will be pressure groups, led by eloquent leaders, who will oppose such a proposal because of its claimed effect upon their particular groups. The defects or insufficiencies in any plan proposed will be magnified. There will be those who will advocate that we withdraw to ourselves; that we become practically an armed camp and that we let the rest of the civilized world shift for itself. You can recognize the beginning of such resistance in the opposition occuring in the Congress of the United States to the bill having to do with Mr. Hull's reciprocal agreements.

It is easier to frustrate the accomplishment of high purposes and ideals than to successfully carry them through. It is easier to be

passive and do nothing than to move forward, especially when it is necessary to be at the head of the column.

I am of the opinion that the American people have accepted the necessity for American participation in the creation of a peace system in the post-war world.

In May 1943, the Gallup poll posed this question:

"Should the countries fighting the Axis set up an international police force after the war is over, to try to keep peace throughout the world?"

From the replies it appeared that 74 percent of the people favored this policy; 14 percent opposed it, and 12 percent expressed no opinion. In June 1943, the following question was posed:

"Should America play an active part in post-war affairs?"

The result was as follows:

	Take active part	Stay out	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
New England	81	9	10
Pacific Coast	80	12	8
Mountain States	79	11	10
Western States	78	13	9
South	76	11	13
Middle Atlantic	76	15	9
Eastern Central	71	18	11

Two surveys were conducted by Fortune magazine in December 1941. The question was asked: "After the war, do you think the United States should play (1) a larger part, (2) about the same part, or (3) a smaller part in world affairs?"

Of the replies received 58.4 demanded that this country play a larger part in world affairs. The same question was asked in June 1943 and resulted in a demand that the United States play a larger part, by 76.6 percent.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appear addresses of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, and Senator BALL, of Minnesota. These addresses were given January 17, 1944, at a United Nations Forum, wherein world peace was discussed. In speaking of the League of Nations, Senator TAFT said:

"The refusal to enter the League of Nations was based on the theory that our association with the quarrels of Europe would be more likely to produce war than to prevent it. I never agreed that such an argument justified a refusal to join in an attempt to outlaw war.

"The question we have to face today is whether conditions in the world have so changed, or may so change during the next decade, that the policy of the free hand is no longer the best method of preventing aggression against the United States. In my opinion the conditions which we face after the war are substantially different, and do require a departure from our traditional policy. I, myself believe that those conditions had changed 25 years ago. It had become apparent then that any major war between great nations was likely to involve the rest of the world, and grow into a war which might threaten the peace and freedom of the United States. We had, therefore, acquired an interest in preventing the development of a major war. If by agreeing to join with other nations in preventing aggression we could discourage the beginning of war, or if by joining in a minor war we could prevent a world conflagration, I always thought we should have been prepared to make definite commitments in advance."

Senator BARKLEY, in his address, in speaking of post-war collaboration with other nations, said:

"As already suggested, I cannot here dogmatically determine, even for myself, the form which such an international arrangement shall take. But I feel very strongly that it must come about, and that the harrassed and overburdened people of the world will demand it, and that statesmanship will be bankrupt unless it can respond without fear and without self-seeking quibbles and technicalities."

Senator TRUMAN, in his address, used the following language:

"Many Americans today are being led down false paths and enticed by negative un-American brands of thought to fight each other over secondary issues. We need to emblazon across the life of this country the cardinal truths of nationhood—that the real issue is not between group and group within our own country who seem to have conflicting interests. The real issue today is whether we are going to sacrifice personal and group selfishness for the sake of the Nation, or whether we are going to sacrifice our Nation for the sake of our selfishness. The issue also is whether we are going to sacrifice our national selfishness for the sake of the world or insure World War No. 3 by sacrificing the world for the sake of our national selfishness.

"Americans must fight on the real issues. The real issue is whether we as a Nation of strong-minded men and women are going to have the courage to sink our differences which arise out of selfish interests and pour everything we have into the Nation's interest. This is crucial if the great lessons of this war are to be mobilized for the building of a united America and a new world."

Senator BALL, of Minnesota, attending the same meeting, spoke as follows:

"So our first and basic tep in the United Nations should be to agree on the machinery to implement our common objective of a peaceful, stable world in which justice rather than force prevails. That means that as soon as possible the United Nations should agree on a few common rules of conduct among nations, including the requirement that all international disputes that threaten war be settled by peaceful means and that future attempts at military aggression be stopped by the collective force of the world community. Senator TAFT has developed more fully the concept of international law and peaceful settlement of disputes, so I will not dwell on it except to state that I believe all of us recognize that peaceful means for settling disputes, in the justice and fairness of which all nations have confidence, must go hand in hand with the use of military force to stop and punish future attempts at aggression. Otherwise, the use of force would be all too likely to degenerate into the type of oppression against which we are now fighting.

"There is, I believe, general agreement in the United States now that if we hope to have a world in which law and order and peace rather than chaos and war prevail there must be somewhere in the picture military force available to stop and punish violations of the international code of conduct."

These are the expressions of two outstanding Republican and two outstanding Democratic Senators.

The Senators whose speeches I have quoted from take, in my judgment, a fair-minded and constructive view as to the extent to which this country should participate in post-war planning to preserve future peace.

We still have, however, a number of extreme and persistent isolationists in the Senate. These men, I am fearful, will use all their efforts to lead us back to isolationism and to thwart this country's participation in any plan opposing any treaty including any plan. These, and other opponents, will seek to recruit adherents from the agricultural or Midwestern States.

It is the fear that they may be successful that prompts me to thus speak to you tonight. I have the fear that we will not recognize their real purpose; that they will divide us and chill our enthusiasms and that enterprises of great pith and moment in this regard will turn awry and lose the name of action. Some of these men may give lip service to the people's wishes, as did Candidate Harding, and others, after the First World War, but will raise subtle objections to any plan proposed. They will not make a frontal attack upon the broad principle of participation. They will wage a war of attrition, sniping at this or that particular of the final plan. They will urge that the British Empire will have too many votes; that the Soviet Union will have too many votes; that the ideology of the Russians is impossible; that they are demanding a certain boundary line in Poland; that India is still not free; and will urge all such controversial issues. They will appeal to our selfishness, urging against any commitments.

In the past, arguments of this character have been effective, especially in the Middle West.

For more than a century great wars have led to great hopes for a system of permanent peace. So it was when Napoleon's empire was overthrown, in 1815. So again, in the last war, when President Wilson proposed and the rest of the world assented to the plan of the League of Nations. And so it is today; even before the victory is won plain people everywhere search for the hope that peace, when it comes, may be just and lasting.

It has now been realized that permanent peace is not to be had for the wishing.

Ambassador Litvinov remarked that peace is indivisible, and Secretary Hull observed, only recently, that "all of the United Nations have a common interest in national security, in world order under law, in peace"; and he added "the future of these indispensable common interests depends absolutely upon international cooperation."

I believe that in the struggle to see to it that the victory shall also bring hope of permanent peace to the world, there are no parties—there are only Americans, seeking for our people, and for all peoples of the world, this advancement on the road of civilization.

The choice is before us whether we shall allow pressure groups, extreme isolationists, die-hard conservatives, petty politicians seeking to curry favor with various nationalities and sectional and industrial groups, to combine together to thwart the accomplishment of a noble purpose, or whether we, as important citizens of this Republic, shall assert our opinions and demand of our Congress that they put aside politics, jealousies, and hates and that they lend their aid to accomplishing some practical plan of collaboration with other nations to prevent these awful wars, and to prevent the necessity of our grandchildren being sacrificed to the god of war.

To me, the two important questions that our generation should handle are the winning of this war and the evolving of some plan for permanent peace upon this earth. If we fail to do both, then we shall have failed the future. To me, the incessant and unseemingly wranglings constantly going on in Congress, and the jockeying for political advantage, ever present, are extremely discouraging.

I have called attention to the foregoing to awaken a present consideration of what course our country should pursue after the victory shall have been won; to suggest that after the last war the will of the majority of the people was thwarted in the matter of a league of nations, and to suggest that it will be so again, unless the people know what they want, make their wishes known, and demand of their Executive and of their Senators that their wishes be carried out.

At this time, while we are carrying on a terrible conflict, nearly everyone will accept

the broad principle of participation in some plan which offers hope of escape from future wars, but the day I am concerned about is the day when vague generalities must be translated into commitments.

Will Americans then be willing to bind their country to specific obligations and even to some limitation on national sovereignty? Will Americans stand together for participation with other nations in some practical plan, or will they be split apart by clever reactionaries and self-seeking pettifoggers?

We must know that temporarily submerged rifts, doubts, and personal enmities will then come to the surface; that there will arise a certain amount of disillusionment and distrust of our allies, that there will be many, many difficulties. At such times, in my opinion, it will be the duty of the lawyer, throwing all politics aside, to patriotically advise and lead the people.

In my judgment, he should urge upon the people that American participation is more than a dream of idealists; that it is a practical necessity if we are to live in decency and reasonable security.

It has been said, "Here is today's challenge to American lawyers, individually and collectively. History has given us no greater opportunity to improve somewhat man's rough road."

Our own chief justice, Robert G. Simmons, plotted our course when he said:

"We should help to so crystallize America's public opinion that, when the time comes for the peace to be written, the men who speak for us in high places can know without question the will of America's people, and knowing that will speak with the confidence of the power of a great nation.

"In forming that public sentiment lawyers trained in principles of government, the thing with which they deal, can and must furnish a sound public leadership in this country."

In the Old Meetinghouse in Boston hangs a picture of Samuel Adams, and underneath it are some lines by William Roscoe Thayer, that might well be pondered by us of the present generation:

"You hurry by—what errands call?
Service to heart, or head, or purse?
Shed you a freeman's boon on all,
Or shape a subtler tyrant's curse?
We numbered but a little clan
Beside your million-teeming press,
Yet wrought the general good of man—
Woe be your meed, if you do less."

Making International Relations Attractive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Making International Relations Attractive," delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, at Kansas City, Mo., on April 16, at the Pan American Day observances held in the First Christian Church.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary of State Hull made a new, and on the whole, constructive start last Sunday toward laying a sound foundation of a national policy for a workable peace. It is true that the Secretary was not very explicit. He really cannot be expected to lay down a complete blueprint now. However, there must soon be a definite forceful direction in our foreign policies. Unless we have that, we are nothing but water boys bringing up the rear.

So far as he is concerned, Mr. Hull attempted to correct the faults that have disrupted successful agreement on the President's personally conducted foreign policies. It is hoped that he will be permitted to prepare the stage for better collaborations at home by his recognition of the Congress bipartisan membership and by his sane general approach to hitherto ignored fundamentals.

In Mr. Hull's speech Sunday he showed no inclination to give away any of the fundamental strength of America. He aroused no false hopes, as other administrative representatives have done, in foreign land, or fears at home, that Uncle Sam was to be a "sugar daddy." Mr. Hull takes the Congress in on our foreign policy as it must be, when he announced that bipartisan committee of the Congress would participate in planning the American policy.

That does not mean that there will be complete agreement on all the important and vital details as men and women attempt to look beyond the war and deal with a lasting political order. But the anticongressional campaign of the President gave no hope of reaching any accord on even basic general principles of our foreign policy.

The Secretary's frank recognition that the Atlantic Charter does not justify the hitherto extravagant claims made for it by the administration, even if a plea of confession and avoidance is a welcome contrast to the excess of enthusiasm that surrounded the disastrous claims of great accomplishments at Moscow and Tehran.

Secretary Hull, Sunday, did not repeat the mistake of so many sincere and zealous advocates in the unending fight for world freedom and decent behavior, of placing the responsibility on our own United States, for what happens in the post-war world.

Mr. Hull frankly recognized the basic truth that if war is to be driven from the world, it does not depend on us alone, but also on many other great peoples—Slavs, Asiatics, as well as Anglo-Saxons. I would personally add Teutons and Latins, if you please.

It is no longer a matter of the world being uncertain as to our position. We have made it plain that the bulk of Americans are desperately anxious to participate in the organization of the world on a basis that gives the most hope for a durable peace. It seems to me that the best service that can be rendered the cause of peace now, is to make it equally plain to our allies that the extent of that participation depends on their course of action.

In other words, the potentiality for American participation in collective security is at hand—but our actual participation depends on its just and fair application. We Americans are not interested in substituting one tyranny for another. That's a basic principle which no plan for world collaboration can ignore.

Broadly speaking, perhaps Secretary Hull's greatest contribution toward a national policy, was the recognition of the need of bringing bipartisan committees of both Houses of the Congress into international post-war discussions. I urged that long ago as one of the means essential to developing a sound international peace structure, and further, that at least one member of the proper congressional committee be appointed as a member of all executive committees on post-war planning.

An English historian says, "There is no great mystery attached to negotiation between governments. They proceed on the same fundamental principles that affect other business dealings where the object is to reconcile a conflict of interest." Of course, in a republic all the people are entitled to know what the negotiators are saying and thinking and doing.

In the end the people must decide what agreements we will have with other nations, for they must pay the price for the failure of statesmen.

The crux of the business lies in acting with sincerity, energy, faithfulness, and shrewd appreciation of the needs, not only of America, but of the rest of the world, in preventing another holocaust.

The huge productive mechanism of our country cannot find adequate markets at home or on the North American Continent.

There are three solutions for that situation. One, for the United States to get political control over large undeveloped areas, from which we can have a monopoly of trade. Two, a regimented society that might work for awhile. Three, for both American political parties to reverse their tariff policies. The last will give the world a different kind of goal to aim at than it now has. It would be an energizing force. Prospective markets the world over would encourage banks to finance a round trip where previously they were not justified in financing even a one-way passage.

So let's consider reorganizing ourselves, in order to help and aid—not supervise or dictate—the life of the others in order to help ours.

There is no such thing as one world, politically. There can be economically, if private enterprise is free to trade in all countries. Flourishing commerce and prosperity for all peoples, means economic progress and hygienic progress. Only when a healthy competition between all peoples can be brought about, can we have any semblance to world order or unity, or whatever it is that causes people to eat regularly, and laugh occasionally.

A growing mutual understanding and respect for each other's ways among the peoples of the world will do more to restore, build, and maintain peace in the world, than all the police forces of Christiandom. It means making peace so attractive to all nations that they will not want to risk breaking away from it.

Such meetings as this fulfill the function of the peoples as citizens of a republic. We meet to discuss in particular, our relations with the other great countries of this hemisphere. That relation is both economic, political, and cultural.

The policies of our Government and the attitude of our people to these questions is of tremendous importance. That is a normal situation. So it was a great mistake to think of our relations with the great countries to the south of us as a temporary concern, born of the critical times.

We are far behind other nations in our appreciation of the political, economic, and cultural trends in our neighbors of this hemisphere.

No government center, however efficient, can adequately shoulder the job of changing that. It can help, but the proper interest can only be created by our own desires.

We must realize that we will not gain the enduring friendship and respect of the other great peoples of this hemisphere by organized economic, political, and cultural drives on them. The kind of relations we want with the countries to the South of us are not gained that way.

Yet that is precisely what we have been doing. All the people of this Western Hemisphere are naturally friendly peoples. We do not have the age-old hates of the Old World born of burning homes and starving and slaying men, women and children. Natural friendships do not thrive on organized drives, designed to force a hothouse growth.

Thus so far, our relations with our fellow Americans on this hemisphere have alternated between indifference or positive attempts in cultivations, lacking much semblance of the approach on which lasting friendships are based.

Our recent sudden attempts at buying this friendship through the greatest money spending splurge in all history are not successful.

We cannot buy the respect and the liking of the people of the other great nations on this hemisphere. We have got to be as understanding of their ways as they are of ours, and that is the why of such meetings as this.

In December 1889, delegates from 18 American republics met in Washington for the first pan-American conference. The following April 14, they carried a resolution to found a permanent organization which later became the Pan American Union. Consequently April 14 is now observed as pan-American Day.

After 54 years pan-Americanism still needs promoting. We have to work for its ideal objective, and guard carefully lest the gains of a half century should be lost. Why is this so?

First, our interest in pan-Americanism for a long time was overshadowed by the problems of our own security. This led us to exercise controlling influence in some Latin American countries, which in turn aroused antagonism.

Second. Latin America had close economic and cultural ties to European nations, and the latter often encouraged the feeling of antagonism towards us.

Third. Inferior communications hindered the north-south exchange of ideas. Not until recently have the radio and airplane and study of languages helped to overcome this.

Fourth. We were absorbed in the development of our own country. It was in this past 50 years that we completed the conquest of our land frontier and built much of our present industrial plant.

Fifth. We did not need seriously the products and cooperation of Latin America until recently. Although many Latin Americans have long felt the need for closer bonds with us, their entreaties fell on a deaf ear and it took a world crisis to awaken us to the advantages of inter-American cooperation.

Nevertheless, there have been through the years many advocates of inter-American friendship, among them Henry Clay, James G. Blaine, Elihu Root, Woodrow Wilson, and Herbert Hoover. Until the late 1920's their voice represented our minority opinion, but finally under President Hoover we began to respond to the need of the times. The results of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull's relations with the other great peoples of the hemisphere have been very successful until the doubtful handling of lease-lend.

Now this new inter-American movement has grown greatly, and in the present wave of interest I hail one very significant trend: Friendship with Latin America is becoming an absorbing interest and responsibility of the citizens of our country, and the Latin Americans are reciprocating in full measure. In other words, a responsibility which we once erroneously left chiefly to Government agencies is now becoming local and spontaneous. Given a continuation of this trend, those American governments which truly represent their people will naturally respond and work in harmony. You will think of many illustrations of this popularization of hemispheric cooperation, and I shall cite one. Here in the Midwest our leaders in business and education have founded the Midwest Inter-American Center. Under the stimulation of coordinated regional action the response in this area has been gratifying, even beyond expectations. Hundreds of adults are taking up the study of Spanish and Portuguese. Thousands of copies of published materials have been made available for use in the schools, more and more visitors from Latin America are being brought into our midst, and from them we are learning to know our neighbors much better; agencies of information, like the radio and press, are giving more attention to inter-American affairs; our industrialists are beginning to look south, and our airlines are leading the way in making better connections for us.

If you were to ask me to interpret this, to say what is back of this awakening, I would sum it up as the result of two problems and two opportunities.

The first problem is that of establishing a truly sound policy toward Latin America—one based on interchange instead of spending or exploitation, on respect instead of condescension. Moreover, we and the Latin Americans want assurance that a sound policy once established shall continue. The only way to meet these needs, we believe, is to take over in our own region the management of our relations with Latin America and put them on the basis of personal acquaintance, friendship, and mutually beneficial economic relations.

The second problem is that of lack of our knowledge about Latin America. As Americans are brought into contact with each other, we discover that the Latin Americans are educated, refined, and informed, and that our ignorance about them is appalling and embarrassing. Some of us do not know whether Honduras is in South America or Central America, whether they speak Spanish, French, or Portuguese in Brazil. Most of us are not aware that Latin America had recognized universities, a great literature, thriving cities, and leaders in science, long before we could boast of similar achievements, in fact, in some cases, before our ancestors had even put ashore in North America. Most of us do not even know the name of one great scholar of Latin America, and they have many such scholars who have long been recognized in Spain, Portugal, France, and Germany. As long as this state of affairs continues, little wonder our neighbors would rather fraternize with people from Europe instead of with us. If we are to win the respect of our good friends to the south, we must overcome this great handicap. Therefore, we must devote ourselves to intensive study of Latin American geography, history, literature, and languages, and we are now rising to meet this problem.

Two opportunities also give us encouragement. One is the certainty that there will be a great development of inter-American trade after this war. Latin America is accumulating great reserves of dollar credits with which to buy from us. Those countries are developing industries and transportation lines which will help supply our growing markets here, and here we will have the greatest industrial capacity we have ever had, and for its products we shall look to Latin markets. There are along with this opportunity, we realize, some responsibilities. We shall be responsible to maintain full employment after the war, and to do this we are making preparations now. In addition, we must see that our economic relations with Latin America are on a partnership basis, and not aimed at exploitation of either party.

The second opportunity is that of travel. With the opening of airways and the destruction of Europe, we are looking forward to vacations in the lands to the south. Their attractions are abundant, we have learned only recently. But here we again face a responsibility and that is that we must be prepared to carry with us a spirit of respect, leisure, curiosity, and admiration, and not the traditional bullying, spendthrift, patronizing of our pre-war tourists. No one can effect this change for us; we have to do it ourselves, and we are striving to do so.

These things, then, inspire our present interest in Americans, and our observance more seriously than heretofore of Pan-American Day. Now, however, we are determined that this shall not be a mere annual holiday to which we render lip service, for now a great majority of us are moved by the spirit of inter-Americanism the year round. We recognize and accept the challenge of the new trend. Our foreign relations shall no longer be left exclusively to the agencies of diplomacy, to the pressure of powerful economic interests, or to the exigencies of a crisis in Europe. We are going to carry the responsibility ourselves on the basis of trade, travel, friendship, and mutual respect. This, I conclude, can and will shape anew the destiny of the Americas.

But without the moral and spiritual decisions to make this a just and Christian peace, they will be as tinkling cymbals and sounding brass.

We must life our eyes to the living principles of international peace and justice not in terms of a fixed and rigid structure, but as a forward step in man's age-long struggle to free himself from war.

I distrust anyone who believes he has the only blueprint as to just how it must be done and who malevolently attacks all who disagree with it as lacking in intelligence or patriotism.

The foundations of world peace, like the house of freedom, must be rebuilt time and time again and are subject to change in growth.

The important principle is our determination to stick with the problem, despite discouragement, until it is comprehensibly settled.

To quote from the Reconstruction of Europe: "It appears," Ferrero says, "that the moment is at hand when the order of influence may be changed and the United States be called upon to exert a decisive political influence. If the United States will understand the problem and make an effort to help the great powers in Europe rediscover the path of order and peace, she will render a tremendous service to herself and to the world.

"When I visited the United States for the first time in 1909 I was impressed—as I said in the book which I wrote on my return, Between the Old World and the New—by the enormous effort the United States was putting forth to 'translate quantity into quality'—that is, to draw from the immense wealth which she was producing something fine, noble, and beautiful. A magnificent purpose, but the task which might tomorrow be given the United States would be more important than any she has accomplished up till now, and that is to help that part of the western world which has lost itself in revolution and has become incapable of governing itself according to old political principles or according to new ones, to find its bearings and restore peace and order to the world by rediscovering either the one or the other for itself."

The influence of America in these far-reaching events depends on friendship on this hemisphere and abroad.

There must be a give-and-take policy based on a mutual understanding and appreciation of each other's rights, needs, convictions, and contributions.

I do not believe a nation can live for itself alone any more than man can live by bread alone.

Tribute to Senator Truman and the Truman Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator TRUMAN Diligent in Task of Watchdog of War Effort," by Paul W. Kearney, which appeared in the Washington Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR TRUMAN DILIGENT IN TASK OF WATCHDOG OF WAR EFFORT

(By Paul W. Kearney)

Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN was giving a dinner party downstairs in my hotel in Washington as this was being written. The guests included Secretary Knox, General Marshall, Admiral King, a half-dozen Senators and other notables. Also among those present were Beulah Mason and Eddie Martin.

In case you don't place the last two names, Beulah is a file clerk on the Truman committee staff, and Eddie is a 16-year-old messenger. They, and every other committee employee from top to bottom were invited to this staff party. But I couldn't get in—reporters were not invited.

Right there is as sharp a little snapshot of the junior Senator from Missouri as you'll ever see in type. Inherently democratic, congenial and affiable, scrupulously fair—and none of it slapped on like make-up for an interviewer's camera.

There isn't the slightest trace of horns on the graying head of this ace inquisitor, whose activities as chairman of the Senate Committee Investigating the Defense Program have won him the enmity of many of those he has investigated and the gratitude of multitudes of taxpayers. Rather, you are surprised to meet an exceedingly friendly, easy-laughing, unassuming farmer from Jackson County, Mo. No flowing tie, no pomposity, no meaningless eloquence; just a regular guy by any standard. But the finest investment the taxpayers have in Washington today.

In 3 years his renowned committee, composed of Senators from both parties, has been allotted $400,000, of which $100,000 is still unspent. On its first major investigation this group of hustling junior Senators saved the country at least $250,000,000 by its disclosures of waste and blundering in the pell-mell construction of new Army camps. Since then the direct savings in war operations attributed to this committee's work have been variously estimated at from $1,000,000,000 on up to astronomical figures.

Such achievements are dramatic, but they are really secondary results. The big idea which first prompted Senator TRUMAN to propose the committee 3 years ago was to get on with the war with the greatest dispatch. As it functions, it is not so much the "billion-dollar watchdog" as it is often called, but the epitomization of democracy at work. It has no power power, no authority to enforce any decision. Its sole weapon is a simple, three-letter word: Why? But instead of waiting until the war is over—as we did last time—the gentleman from Missouri figured it would be smarter to start as soon as the war did and keep right on asking, "Why are you doing that?"

The results of this foresight have been fabulous in tangible accomplishments and even greater in performances which can't be put on paper: The prevention of abuses. Early in the game, for example, the committee did masterful work in its studies of the critical situations in aluminum, copper, zinc, rubber, at a time when everybody else was blissfully coasting along on an opium-pipe dream. Indeed, if you care to compare the widely hailed Baruch rubber report with the Truman committee's recommendations made 3 months earlier, you will be astonished at the similarity.

Without pausing for breath, the committee has sailed into one situation after another: Gas rationing, war housing, priorities in scarce materials, farm machinery, essential civilian goods, shipbuilding, magnesium, corporate cartels that are linked with Nazi trusts, the Canol oil project, and so on down a lengthy list.

To date, Senator TRUMAN'S group, consisting of 6 Democrats and 4 Republicans, has filed 31 reports, some running 600 pages. All 31 have been unanimous.

Thumb through the most recent annual report, or its two predecessors, and you are struck with one fact. That is that no matter who is involved—Government agencies or big business, labor groups or the Army or Navy, Cabinet members, admirals, generals, or obscure subordinates—all are fair game for Senator TRUMAN'S hustlers.

"We just dig out the facts, all the facts," says Senator TRUMAN. "Naturally, the conclusions take care of themselves. Our sole function is to promote the war effort. A political report has never come from our committee. If one ever should, it would be our last, for the committee would then have committed suicide."

TRUMAN is soft-spoken, unassuming, easy to meet, but not at all effusive. He was born in Independence, Mo., 60 years ago this May 8. After high school he tried for West Point but was rejected because of poor eyesight. Discarding the idea of college, he went to work, moving up from a $3-a-week bottle washer in a drug store to a bank clerk. Later he spent 2 years in Kansas City Law School.

At 21 he enlisted as a private in the National Guard, drilling in time spared from helping his father operate the family's 600-acre farm; and he was no "gentleman farmer." When World War No. 1 broke out, he had organized the Second Missouri Field Artillery, served with the unit through St. Mihiel and the Argonne as a captain. On the way home on the transport the men in his command took a cut out of every poker game on the ship and with the proceeds bought him a loving cup 4 feet high. That gives an idea of what sort of commanding officer he was.

During the next several years he tried his hand at various business enterprises before entering politics. He was elected county judge, then presiding judge for two terms. He went to the Senate in 1934 and was re-elected in 1940.

For 25 years he has been married to Bess Wallace, a childhood sweetheart. Their 18-year-old daughter, Mary Margaret, recently christened the U. S. S. *Missouri*.

A diligent worker, he gets up voluntarily at 6 a. m., hops a bus to the Senate Office Building around 7:30, generally gets back to his Connecticut Avenue apartment with a bundle of home work at 7:30 p. m.

Through all the bouquets and brickbats the gentleman from Missouri and his 10 Republican and Democratic associates blandly pursue their chosen course of getting on with the war with dispatch. Lately his subcommittees have been very busy with rent gouging of servicemen's families in Miami, crack-ups of Liberty ships, foreign air bases, and lend-lease. And, of course, the renegotiation of war contracts.

"Renegotiation is a poor word," says Senator TRUMAN. "We should call it repricing. For all it amounts to is sitting down calmly and refiguring the costs of war contracts on a mass-production basis. Many of the things we needed in vast quantities had never been made that way before; nobody could know what they should cost. All that counted was getting them. No one objects to a fair profit. But now we have the leisure to recheck and it is our duty to do so to protect the patriotic majority of war contractors against the stigma of profiteering generated by the self-seeking minority. We intend to see that no man or corporate group of men shall profit inordinately on the blood of the boys in the fox holes."

It has been said that there is no other country where such a committee could work along its chosen lines without fear or favor. If that be so, we should put up a sign outside the office door of the gentleman from Missouri and of members of his committee. It should read, "Caution—democracy at work."

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent radio address on the school-lunch program, which was delivered by Dorothy Thompson over the blue network on March 26, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I am going to talk about the most important long-range question in America. That is the American child.

Today's children are tomorrow's America. America 20 years from now will be exactly as intelligent, ethical, and self-controlled, as the men and women are, who are today's boys and girls.

All wars are terribly costly. We are accustomed to reckon costs in terms of the national debt; of money taken away for taxes; in casualties of fighting youth; of support and retraining that must be given to the injured; of pensions for veterans.

But the casualties of this war, and in all countries, do not include merely the fighting men of our armies. Among the casualties must be counted thousands and thousands of their little brothers and sisters. I am not here referring to the children who have been killed by bombs from the air. I refer to children, like our own, who are safe from such attacks. But they are not safe from the effects of the home-front effort which disorganizes homes, by moving workers from one part of the country to another, by creating housing shortages, and overcrowding, and above all by drawing mothers into factories, leaving the children to feed themselves.

Neither are they safe from the sensationalisms that war instigates—from the films that continually display blood and slaughter; from the newspapers with their fearsome headlines; from the crimes they publicize; from the feverish atmosphere of recklessness and waste that always attends war booms, or from the nervous tiredness that make their parents irritable. You who have children know that they are like little receiving stations. When the atmosphere of the home is tense, the child knows it—with his nerves, even though his mind does not take it in. The children of unhappy homes are likely to be naughty children, because they are unconsciously subjected to strained emotional atmospheres, and in war, emotional strain is everywhere.

All these things, physical and emotional, are playing upon the American child, especially among the children of workers, many of whom are on night shifts, so that the home never becomes normally organized, and among the children of working mothers, who are all but utterly neglected.

Juvenile delinquency is terrible. It is the most alarming product of the war. Our clinics have as patients little girls, children of 14 and 15, infected with veneral diseases. Girls of 14 and 15 are mothers. Children, getting out of school at 3 o'clock have nowhere to go. Perhaps at home they must be quiet because their father is asleep since his work begins at 7 p. m. Or the mother is not there. Perhaps the apartment is empty, and they gather in it without any supervision. Or they haunt the streets in gangs, picking up acquaintances, or wander through department stores, picking up a little notion here and there, when the understaffed personnel are not watching.

Their physical condition is neglected. The mother coming home from the factory is too tired to cook a decent meal. Something is scrambled together, or set upon the table out of the icebox. Their clothing is neglected, or they are left to buy it themselves, little girls picking out garments unsuited to their years to make them appear older than they are, and more attractive to soldiers. They either take a cold lunch to school, or use the lunch period to haunt the streets, because there is no lunch waiting for them at home.

This is the condition in which the war has put millions of America's greatest assets, our children. And thus we are rearing the social and physical misfits of tomorrow.

Nevertheless, this week the Appropriation Committee of Congress chose to turn down a $50,000,000 appropriation with which to continue Federal grants to public schools to provide school children with cheap, nourishing lunches.

About two-thirds of our schools have lunch programs. Under the Federal grants, which are only given to such schools as decide there is need for it and apply, 6,000,000 children have been given a good lunch in the school every day. That is only one-fifth of America's 30,000,000 school children under the age of 16. Many of them paid for the lunch, but mass buying made it cheap. An excellent lunch could be served for 17 cents. But the House Appropriation Committee has decided it costs too much, and we must save.

Actually, of course, nothing whatever is being saved by the American people. Children must eat. I do not think there is a living American who would deny the right of a growing American child to 3,000 calories of nourishing, bone-building, body-building food per day. He'd get it in all orphan asylums. Nobody can give his child at home a decent meal for 17 cents. So the withdrawal will either mean that the children go without, get worse food, or that it will cost more, not less.

Boys of 18 are drafted. The reports of the Selective Service show nothing of which we should be very proud, considering the wealth of this country. Hundreds of thousands are rejected because they have never seen a dentist. Bad eyes, bad teeth, nervous disorders, and defects caused by malnutrition are startlingly prevalent. Malnutrition does not necessarily mean under-feeding. It means wrong feeding.

When these lads get into the Army in order to prepare them to fight and maybe die, the Army feeds them as they have never been fed in most of their young lives. And it costs the Government to do that just 62 cents a day.

A high caloric, appetizing diet, is possible at that price because of mass buying and collective distribution. You or I could not feed our children the same food at three times the cost. Yet, the Appropriations Committee feels that we cannot take care of our little ones, not even the poorest and weakest of them in their growing years, which from a nutritional standpoint are much the most important.

Fellow Americans, the little state of Norway, when it was free, had a sufficient sense of social obligation to its children to give every single school child, rich or poor, a hot breakfast with which to begin every school day. Norway is a poor country. But we, apparently are even poorer.

People always ask, when a necessary and valuable social measure is projected; Who is going to pay for this? But the American people must pay for feeding their children. Nor do I see the slightest reason why the childless should not also help. Ought not a nation as great and rich as ours guarantee at least one thing that every American child shall be decently nourished? Some families are too poor; some are too shiftless or ignorant; some are too overworked, to properly feed their children. But the responsibility of society cannot be avoided, if society does not want to reap the evil results.

Do you know that at Army costs every single one of our 30,000,000 school children could be given breakfast and lunch, balanced and nourishing, every school day, at a cost for actual food that would be less than half of what this Nation spent last year for alcoholic beverages? The children are now drinking those too.

Every single child could be given two hot meals every school day at the cost for actual food of 10 days of conducting this war.

If we could open the imaginations of our Government representatives, we would take hold of this problem of the American child in a big, worthy, American way. We would make the public school a real extension of the home. We would see to it that Hollywood made and distributed entertaining but appropriate films just for children and teen-age boys and girls, and that special theaters were opened, where parents could always safely send their children. We would have such films shown in schools. We would extend the educational budgets by Federal grants in aid, so that schools could be open until 6, and every school child have supervised home work and indoor and outdoor recreation until the time his parents got home from work.

We would save food, labor, and utilities by collectively and scientifically feeding the already collectively educated children. Does anyone think it is a saving in precious labor and gas and food, to feed 30,000,000 children in almost as many separate kitchens? Feeding all school children would also take immense amounts of food off the black market, it would be the most effective check on inflationary prices. The Army is not paying black markets for food. Neither would the schools. But millions of their parents are. Feeding the children would give priorities to those Americans who have first claim on them among all civilians—the children.

Now that the Appropriations Committee of Congress has taken from the mouths of the smallest and neediest the little they have, can't we pursuade our Congressmen and Senators not to put that back, but to open public hearings on the whole subject of the welfare of the American child, an design a big, intelligent, comprehensive program to deal with the whole problem? England, under bombs, and with great food shortages, is doing better by her children than we. That thought fills my heart with bitter shame. The Bible says, "Suffer the little children to come unto me." It doesn't say to turn them loose to shift for themselves in a time of war and social upset. Clergymen are preaching and deploring; club women are noting with alarm. But won't someone—can't we all—do something about it?

Manpower in the Production of Cheese in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 13, I issued a release which related to manpower in Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an editorial printed in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, under date of April 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the release and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin) stated to Food Administrator Marvin Jones today that the omission of cheese manufacturing from the list of essential activities would result in the paralysis of the cheese industry of Wisconsin. He said every skilled cheesemaker was working over 70 hours, 7 days per week with no extra pay for overtime. Over 60 percent of the Nation's cheese is made by 1,700 Wisconsin factories.

The Senator said further that drafting 1 man under 26 would take 30 to 75 percent skilled help from the individual factory affected, and 100 percent in about 150 factories, and many factories would be forced to close. Others would have to reduce milk receipts within physical possibility for proper handling of the milk.

The Senator stated that the pasture season would soon open and the flush production of milk is just around the corner. The closing of the factories would disrupt the handling of the surplus milk. Therefore, the Senator insisted that because selective service is speeding the induction of these men, relief must be granted at once if cheese production is to continue.

The Senator said that 1 pound of cheese was the equivalent of about 5 quarts of whole milk and that about 1,000 men would be affected. These 1,000 men would produce 600,000,000 pounds of cheese.

The Senator called Marvin Jones' attention to the fact that the State representatives of selective service say they are powerless to grant relief and that relief must come direct from Washington

Senator WILEY wrote to Marvin Jones and wired George L. Mooney, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association, Plymouth, Wis., as follows:

"DEAR JUDGE JONES: I issued the enclosed release to the papers. This is in accordance with talk I had with Mr. McNutt's office and Colonel Bruton of your office some weeks ago.

"After talking with you today, I called Colonel Keesling of the Selective Service and informed him of your promise that you would recommend to the committee that necessary cheesemakers be listed as 'critical.'

"I don't want to accuse anyone of the old army game of 'passing the buck.' I am satisfied that if your recommendation goes to the committee, Hershey's office will see the advisability of at least deferring these men until an investigation can be made.

"The situation is very serious. I don't want to see a paralysis of the Wisconsin cheese industry and something must be done about it at once.

"I am making this record, and if the Government fails, I am going to make sure that the responsibility falls on the shoulders of those who do not adequately handle this situation.

"Yours for victory,

"ALEXANDER WILEY."

"GEORGE L. MOONEY,

"Plymouth, Wis.:

"I contacted Marvin Jones personally and Colonel Keesling of the Selective Service. Jones assured me he will recommend to the committee that skilled cheesemakers be classified as critical. Keesling agreed to take the matter up immediately with Hershey and promises to get Jones and Hershey together. I expect definite action at once.

"ALEXANDER WILEY."

[From the Sheboygan Press of April 14, 1944]

MANPOWER GREATEST NEED

In the recent order issued by the Government relative to essential industries, the manufacture of cheese was omitted, and at a time when the labor shortage in that field is most critical.

Last evening George L. Mooney, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, wired Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, as follows:

"Omitting cheese from list of essential activities indicates that we have either failed to make proper presentation of Wisconsin's critical labor situation in cheese industry we have been misled by reported essentiality of cheese for nutritional needs for military and civilian use and desired by Government. Every skilled cheese-maker is working over 70 hours 7 days per week rendering combined technical skill and manual labor with no extra for overtime. What other industry can match that war-labor record? Over 60 percent Nation's cheese made by 1,700 Wisconsin factories. Drafting one man under 26 takes 30 to 75 percent skilled help from individual factory affected and 100 percent in about 150 factories. Many factories forced to close and others must reduce milk receipts within physical possibility for proper handling. Just entering pasture season and flush production. Closed factories threaten economic handling surplus milk. Selective Service speeding induction compels immediate relief if maintaining cheese production is desired. Nutritional value of dairy products admitted. One pound cheese equivalent to 5 quarts whole milk. About 1,000 men affected in State producing about 600,000,000 pounds of cheese. State Selective Service and W. F. A. State representative powerless. Relief must come direct from Washington."

The Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association has a grievance. We exempt farm labor which produces the milk from which cheese is made, and then deny the same consideration to the cheesemaker who may be the only one operating a corner cheese factory. Milk that is hauled to the factory must go into the vats the same day or it spoils. As Mr. Mooney says: "The labor situation in the cheese industry is critical," and he calls attention to skilled cheesemakers working over 70 hours 7 days per week, combining technical skill and manual labor with no extra pay for overtime, and then points out that 60 percent of the Nation's cheese is made by the 1,700 Wisconsin factories. Just 1 man under 26 years of age out of a factory would in many instances cripple production and make it impossible to handle the patrons' milk. It must also be borne in mind that now is the high production period as we are coming into pasture time, and if we fail to produce cheese in the next 60 or 90 days to the maximum amount of production the food program will be jeopardized both here at home, in the lend-lease program, and in furnishing cheese to the fighting forces in our own armies.

We would ask that Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey give immediate attention to a problem that confronts no other State to the extent that Wisconsin will be penalized if expert help is drafted from the cheese factories. Unless a remedy is applied for Wisconsin, and this remedy must come from Washington, the cheese industry will be seriously affected and milk produced on the farm in even greater quantities will find a bottleneck at the factory where milk is delivered and cheese is produced.

Elimination of Slums and Provision for Low-Rent Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the housing problem is extremely complex, and there are several committees of the Senate and of the House working on it now. I have a release issued by the National Association of Home Builders of the United States and because of the public interest in the release, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDERS READY TO ELIMINATE SLUMS AND PROVIDE LOW-RENT HOUSING

Evidence received from scores of cities throughout the country shows that immediately after the war, private home builders will start their programs providing adequate housing for families of low income at costs from 20 to 35 percent less than the same dwelling units could be provided by public housing agencies, according to a statement made today by Robert P. Gerholz, president of the National Association of Home Builders.

"There is good reason to believe that the tremendous savings of taxpayers' money to be realized by turning full responsibility for rehousing slum families over to private builders is fully recognized by the leaders in Congress who are preparing to legislate in this important field," Gerholz said. "The next step is for the builders to demonstrate clearly to their communities that they are willing to devote a large part of their efforts to this important segment of the residential construction field.

"Experience gained in building low-cost, low-rent housing during the war construction program has shown many private builders for the first time that they can well afford to construct and rent these properties, provided they are built in sufficient quantities to permit the narrow margin of profit and operating expense which such ventures involve.

"In Washington, D. C., conceded by many to have the worst slums in the Nation, a group of more than 50 of the Capital's most prominent home builders appeared before a Senate subcommittee and pledged their willingness and demonstrated their ability to build in the brief period of 6 years enough low-cost, low-rent housing to accommodate every family now living there in substandard and slum dwellings. Similar commitments have been received from other groups of builders in every section of the country.

"Private enterprise can build better and at considerably less cost than Government-housing agencies principally because of their much lower operating and overhead charges and because the profit motive has trained private builders to operate efficiently and take full advantage of all possible economies in construction," Gerholz added. "Governmental red tape, overlapping authority, and inefficiency add enormously to the cost of building and there seems to be no way to prevent the waste," he said.

"In the past, private builders have been unable to help to the extent they desired in ridding the Nation's cities of slums because they have not been able to exercise the power of eminent domain, needed to clear existing slum areas. Congress now recognizes this handicap and undoubtedly will attempt to remove this obstacle so that the job of rehousing families now residing in slums or substandard dwellings can be speeded up.

"Performance records also indicate that the low-cost housing program will get under way far faster when the job is entrusted to private enterprise. Public-housing agencies often require 6 months to a year to reach the stage where construction actually starts; private builders, with their own funds tied up in the projects, start work quickly as they cannot afford to have their working capital tied up during a prolonged period of construction.

"Builders everywhere are completing plans for a huge post-war program of residential construction, with the result that a large volume of home building will get under way as soon as materials and manpower are available. Although low-cost housing undoubtedly will constitute a large share of the total housing constructed, there also will be an unprecedented number of fine homes placed under construction soon after the war ends and restrictions are removed." Gerholz concluded, "In terms of employment the home-building industry will play a dominant and vital role in the Nation's post-war adjustment period."

Consumption of Gasoline by Mrs. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a constituent of mine in Arrow Rock, Mo., inquiring into the consumption of gasoline by Mrs. Roosevelt, and a reply from the head usher at the White House setting forth just how much gasoline Mrs. Roosevelt has actually used.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARROW ROCK, MO., *March 5, 1944.*

Hon. HARRY TRUMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TRUMAN: The man who farms our land, Mr. John Madden, has just been in our drug store and made the statement that he read in the Kansas City Star some time back that Mrs. Roosevelt had four cars and had a gasoline rationing of 2,000 gallons per month. Now, I am not questioning her possessing four cars, but I do question her having a ration of 2,000 gallons per month, and told Mr. Madden so. Will you please put this letter in the hands of the proper person who could find out if this is true and let me know.

I do not seem to know the proper authority in Washington to ask, and I am anxious to correct this falsehood (if such it be, and I think it is).

We are very proud of the record you are making in cutting profits in war contracts. Thank you.

Your well-wisher,

MRS. W. R. HUBBARD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 31, 1944.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: The letter of Mrs. W. R. Hubbard, of Arrow Rock, Mo., dated March 5, 1944, addressed to you has come to me for reply.

Mrs. Hubbard states that a gentleman of her acquaintance has made the statement that he had read in a newspaper that Mrs. Roosevelt "had four cars and had a gasoline rationing of 2,000 gallons per month." I am glad to give you the facts as you requested.

Mrs. Roosevelt personally owns one automobile, which is kept at her home in Hyde Park, N. Y. For this car she has an A gasoline ration book.

For her use in Washington, only one White House car has been assigned to her; and no other White House car is used by her. Accurate records are kept at the White House garage of the mileage of each car. Mrs. Roosevelt has spent most of the month of March 1944 on her Caribbean trip, and therefore I have taken the figures for the month of February 1944. Her car was driven a total of 168 miles during that month. During the same month a year ago her car was driven 184 miles.

Very truly yours,

H. G. CRIM, *Head Usher.*

Naval Oil Leases

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of contribution to the war emergency some peculiar things have happened. I had occasion some months ago to discuss the Canol project of the Army, which has had and will have as little to do with the final victory as the earlier dancing phase of the civilian defense planning.

We had a new manifestation of waste of effort. The Navy, not to be outdone by the Army in adventures in the Arctic region, has been granted in a naval appropriation bill recently passed an appropriation of $1,000,000 to search for oil on the north coast of Alaska, on the naval reserve that was created some years ago.

Concerning the execution of the plan of exploration, Admiral Stuart said to the House subcommittee on Navy Department appropriations on March 22:

> We hope to do it with Seabee personnel. We have a large number of Seabee personnel who are experienced in all phases of the oil industry and we hope, that is, we intend to do it if allowed, with Seabee personnel.

I think the Congress should see to it that it is not allowed. The Seabee personnel entered the service pursuant to the call of their country, to help with their respective skills in fighting the war. They were willing to go anywhere and do anything required for the war effort. But this proposal is one that just doesn't make sense, so far as getting on with the war is concerned.

The Navy makes no claim at all that this is related to the war, or that it is essential at this time. It is merely an exploratory program to see whether there is any oil on this Arctic reserve. Ocean navigation to the region, the only way there is of getting any oil out should any be found, is limited to the months of August and September, according to Admiral Stuart. He said that the transportation of the oil would be a question to be settled later, if oil is found.

So, according to the admiral and according to Secretary Knox, there is no thought of making any use of whatever is found—no plan. Secretary Knox told the same subcommittee that "if we do explore and find there is a considerable body of oil, we will probably keep it there for a long time."

The oil problem in which the American people are interested is the one which exists here at home. The O. P. A., which has kept its head buried in the sand for 2 years on the oil situation, is now screaming loudly about the black market in gasoline and is urging the prosecution of the motorist who is suspected of having an extra gallon. That seems to be the extent of the Government's domestic oil program today.

Men, materials, and money have been denied the domestic producers. All have been exported freely. Now Navy proposes to send more men with oil experience away from here.

If Navy really wants to do something about oil supply, something that will be of direct help in this war, let the Navy release the surplus of Seabees they seem to have and the oil industry will gladly offer them employment at industry rates of pay. Manpower has been drained away from the oil industry by the processes of enlistment and selective service.

The Arctic venture can wait. It should not be undertaken at this time. There is a war to be won and naval reserve No. 4 in Alaska will contribute nothing to the victory.

The American oil industry will take care of petroleum if the Government will keep out of the way and end its several forms of interference. The Navy's job is to run the Navy, not to get into the oil business.

I do not believe the Congress in any of the legislation authorizing increases in Navy strength and in appropriating the billions of dollars to enable the Navy to fight a war ever had any thought that the Navy intended to use personnel recruited from an industry essential to the whole war effort for such purposes as the announced venture in the Arctic. I do not think the men who went into the Navy thought for one moment that they were to be used on such nonessential business. There will be plenty of time after we win this war to explore northern Alaska—and do it with men whose employment on that job will not affect the welfare of the Nation.

The Milk Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a front-page article from the Detroit Free Press carrying the headline "Milk gluts sewers as city goes without—W. F. A. rule keeps supply curtailed." The opening sentence of the article, which follows, is—

> While thousands of Detroit families were continuing on reduced milk rations, dairies here Thursday still were dumping milk down the sewers because of War Food Administration policies.

And so on.

Mr. President, when there is a shortage of milk for children and invalids in this country, together with a lack of butter and other dairy commodities, I think it is a disgraceful condition that any policy of any Federal department is such as to cause the dumping of milk down the sewers of a city.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Detroit Free Press be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILK GLUTS SEWERS AS CITY GOES WITHOUT—W. F. A. RULE KEEPS SUPPLY CURTAILED—CREAMERIES ALSO DENIED RIGHT TO MAKE OTHER FOODS OF SURPLUS

While thousands of Detroit families were continuing on reduced milk rations, dairies here Thursday still were dumping milk down the sewers because of War Food Administration policies.

Excess milk available now is not reaching the public because dealers are limited by the W. F. A. regulations to 90 percent of their sales last June. Detroiters—many with children—not only were prevented from getting their milk supply restored to meet their needs, but dairies were prevented from converting the surplus into such shortage foods as cheese, powdered milk, buttermilk, chocolate milk, or ice cream because of a limit on sales.

The charge that an artificial shortage was being preserved in Detroit in the midst of plenty was directed at Marvin Jones, National

W. F. A. Chairman, Wednesday by Charles C. Lockwood, Consumers' Council leader.

Lockwood told Jones that although Detroiters could use every drop of milk available, the creameries, "with more milk than they know what to do with," were forced to dump it into the drains.

"It is an intolerable situation," Lockwood said Thursday. "Even the schools are short of milk. The milk is available, but the people can't have it."

Dairies here, suffering heavy losses, have threatened to drop part of their dairy farmers, Lockwood said, and several delegations of farmers have visited his office fearing that they will be cut off from the Detroit market.

DUMPING CONFIRMED

Confirming the report that thousands of pounds of milk were going down the sewers, the Golden Valley Creamery, 14007 Wyoming, was checked Thursday. Harry Greenstein, its president, said that 12,000 pounds of skim milk were being dumped every week.

"What can I do?" he said. "I call the W. F. A. and they tell me to make butter out of it. That milk costs me $3.78 a hundred and the best I can get out of it is $1.45 a hundred by making the butter."

One dairy head declared, "The W. F. A. office here collects $20,000 from the Detroit dairies to keep Detroiters from getting the milk they need. It doesn't make sense."

At the State Parkview Creamery, 3878 Hendricks, George W. Genematas, the owner, estimated that he was forced to dump between 100 and 150 cans of milk a day.

"I don't know what the Government talks about when it speaks of a controlled market and you've got people needing milk. We've got plenty on hand and it has to go down the sewer," he said.

Postmasters, Supervisors, Etc., Are Entitled to Overtime Pay for Overtime Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office and Post Roads Committee began hearings on H. R. 2928 on June 24, 1943. This bill was introduced by Congressman FAY, of New York, upon the recommendation of the Post Office Department. When the Post Office Department recommends legislation to our committee, it has always proved to be worthy of real consideration. It is usually to provide legislation to meet a definite administrative need. Constantly changing conditions in our mail service cause previous legislation to become inadequate or outmoded. H. R. 2928 falls definitely into this classification.

It provides legislative authority permitting the Postmaster General, in cases where exigencies occur, to permit certain classes of employees who have not been covered by such legislation, to work overtime on Saturday and to pay them for their work instead of being obliged to give compensatory time later on in the following week. This legislation affects primarily, postmasters of the "first, second, and third classes, supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, laborers, watchmen, and messengers, in first- and second-class post offices, and employees of the motor-vehicle and pneumatic-tube services, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the Village Delivery Service, and employees of the Railway Mail Service, post-office inspectors and the clerks in their offices, employees of the stamped envelope agency and employees of the mail equipment shops, cleaners, janitors, telephone operators, elevator conductors—paid from the appropriation of the First Assistant Postmaster General—employees of the Air Mail Service; cost ascertaining employees; employees upon the field roll of the Division of Equipment and Supplies, and all employees of the custodial service except charwoman and charmen, and those working part time."

Now it is obvious that this legislation is sorely needed. It corrects a situation that has grown worse with each succeeding year. Fifteen or twenty years ago there was little need for overtime. The burden of work and service has grown over the years to a much greater degree per man than was true in the past. Particularly is this the case during these emergency years of the war.

The duties of all types of post office employees have increased. The Post Office Department has contributed a goodly percentage of its members to the armed forces. Others discouraged by the comparatively low wages they received have been forced by the rising cost of living to find better paying jobs in private industry. Thus we see the situation of increased work and duties with decreased personnel.

By the passage of H. R. 1366 we increased the pay by 15 percent to many of the Post Office employees. This partially compensated for the increased cost of living, although, in my opinion, it ignored undeniable statistics which prove that the cost of living has increased 25 percent plus. But H. R. 1366 did not cover the overtime phase which H. R. 2928 seeks to cover.

The principle of overtime pay for extra hours worked is so eminently fair, is such an accepted principle of the American system of wage compensation in private industry, that it would seem unnecessary to even present arguments in its behalf. Apparently, however, our Government lags behind private industry in many of its social relations. We are all proud of our Government Post Office Department. It has a record of service and efficiency superior, in my opinion, to any department of Government. Its personnel is comprised of the highest type of dependable, loyal American citizens. They depend upon the Members of Congress for legislation that will recognize and reward their service to the people in our Nation. It is the solemn duty of every Member of Congress to legislate fairly in their behalf.

H. R. 2928 is an effort to correct this custom of overtime duty without compensation and would give the Post Office employees in unprotected classifications the same treatment given employees in private business. It would seem that no opposition would develop against this equitable approach to this problem. The Post Office Department has approved it. Mr. Purdum, Second Assistant Postmaster General, in his testimony on this bill before the Post Office Committee said, among other things:

> The bill conserves manpower and gives you (the Post Office Department) the benefit of the continued help of experienced employees.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved it with one exception, by asking that overtime pay be denied all those above the $2,900 salary bracket. I think this objection is most discriminatory. Not only would it deny recognition to postmasters, postal supervisors, and post office inspectors, and so forth, for their important part in the success of the postal service, but it would actually reduce their compensation below that of existing overtime provisions.

One point I wish to emphasize at this time is that such overtime as is now credited to these employees is credited at the regular hourly rate of remuneration. It does not provide for the usual time and one-half hourly rate as paid by most private industries for extra time worked, and I might add that many other Government departments pay overtime at the rate of time and one-half. I, therefore, strongly resent this discriminatory objection by the Bureau of the Budget and I am glad that the House Post Office Committee rejected it. I think that the bill, H. R. 2928, as reported by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and passed by the House on July 5, 1943, was a good bill and it certainly met the approval of the Post Office Department and answered a growing need of the employees concerned.

Unfortunately, certain changes were made in this bill by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and passed the Senate, amended on March 30, 1944. The Senate committee followed the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in regard to the $2,900 salary ceiling and eliminated from participation in the overtime provisions all postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, post office inspectors and cost ascertainment employees. I sincerely hope that the conferees will be appointed by the respective chairmen of the House and Senate Post Office and Post Roads Committees who will agree on the reinclusion of these classifications under the benefit of the overtime provision extended to the lower wage classification. If we fail to include the postmasters and inspectors, and so forth, in this legislation, it is my opinion that we have unjustifiably discriminated against the very keymen in our postal service. I believe it would cause them to lose faith in our fairness as legislators. At a time when their duties are multiplied by cooperation with bond drives, war-stamp sales, and personnel problems, we would seriously impair the morale of these fine public servants.

I, therefore, urge that all postmasters, post office inspectors, and cost ascertainment employees be reincluded in the bill by the conferees and final action be taken as soon as possible for the good of the Postal Service.

Europe's Starving Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, which I wrote to the New York Herald Tribune, on relief for the starving children of the German-occupied countries of Europe, and which appeared in that newspaper on April 16:

EUROPE'S STARVING YOUTH

To the New York Herald Tribune:

There is a new Pied Piper in Europe today, not the wry-mouthed, gay, tatterdemalion Pied Piper of the familiar legend, but the grim, gaunt, tight-lipped piper of death—death by famine and disease. But he, too, is leading the children away and leaving, as the original piper left, only crippled and deformed youngsters to tell what happened to their playmates.

It is in our administration's power to choke off this piper's tune, to silence the dismal dirge which is killing democratic Europe's new generations.

And yet we are letting the piper play on, we are letting the children die. We are doing this because men in authority have said that it would be strategically inadvisable to save them. These officials who oppose, and by their opposition block any effort to save the children from starvation, have not yet given one incontrovertible reason why such a program of relief would be prejudicial to our victory over Germany. They have not been able to give an incontrovertible reason because today no reason exists. Today, if not yesterday, when victory seemed less certain, the children of Europe are being led away by the piper of death through the same ageless blundering which doomed the children of Hamelin—official inertia.

The State Department does not, and cannot, answer persons who point out that the relief program in Greece has worked with great success, and a similar program in unoccupied France was equally successful until it was closed down. Not even the officials responsible for the blockade of European children argue their case from a humanitarian angle. No human being with anything but a mechanical heart would want to see any child starve to death in Belgium, in Norway, in Holland, in Poland, in France, or in any nation anywhere in the world. All the horrors of this decade of horrors have not hardened us yet to the suffering of small children.

From the humanitarian side, feeding the children is not and never will be a debatable question. The case is wholly argued in terms of "military and political expediency." And I agree that this is a time when military and political considerations must have priority over humane views for long-range objectives.

So let us look at it from a purely patriotic—that is to say a realistic—attitude.

What does it mean to us as Americans if millions of European children, the children of countries allied with us, the children of countries which have been throughout our history good friends, starve or go down from disease brought about by famine?

It has been said that no man can be a patriot on an empty stomach. Whether or not this is true, can any man be wholly devoted to the cause of the Allies when a blockade instituted by one of his allies and indorsed with silence by another is helping to starve his children to death? Can any man be expected to believe with all his mind and heart in the Four Freedoms when he sees the sponsors of these freedoms, the spokesmen for freedom from fear and freedom from want, depriving his children of bread? Can any man, however passionate his belief in democracy and his faith in a democratic victory, remain steadfast to the democratic cause—so steadfast that he is willing to die for it in a revolt timed with the opening of a second front—when his children are dying needlessly because they will not spare them a few crumbs?

Can any man who is daily bombarded by German propaganda to the effect that the British, with American consent, are countenancing the starvation of his children, and who knows that in this case Dr. Goebbels is speaking the bitter truth, preserve his devotion to the Allied cause and his conviction that it represents a more enlightened, more humane world order?

And what about the children, the children who never know for one day a moment's peace from the pangs of hunger, who haven't the strength to attend a full session of school, who see their playmates fall from malnutrition or cough out their lives with tuberculosis—that dread shadow of famine? What about the crippled children, the ones who have been deformed by starvation which began at birth, the weak, sickly, rickett-twisted youngsters of Belgium, France, Holland, Poland, and Norway and the other countries which have been crushed under the Nazi heel?

What, for instance, about the children of Belgium, 80 percent of whom, according to an authoritative source, are said to be in the pretubercular stage? What about the children of Poland, whose diet is said to be about 85 percent short of the required calories? What about the French, who are getting a maximum of 1,200 calories, 400 less than the amount the Germans themselves consider the frontier of famine?

What sort of citizens will all these youngsters make for the post-war world? How will their warped minds feel toward the so-called Christian democracies whose blockade warped their bodies? How will this generation of starvlings regard England and the United States in the year 1956? At best as liberators who came too late, at not-impossible worst as nations whose un-Christian military expediences equaled in evil effect the pagan, studied brutality of the Nazis. (Is there any doubt in any Christian's mind how Christ would have stood on the question of feeding the Christian children of Europe?)

Who will have won the war, as we now know wars are won, if the adequately fed youngsters of Germany face, 20 years from now, a thin line of crippled, stunted Norwegians, Belgians, Frenchmen, Hollanders, and Poles, with many gaps in the ranks to mark those who perished under the Nazi occupation and British blockade of the forties? Won't the last laugh, the final victory be the next Hitler's? What is in the minds of authorities who talk in one breath of wiping out Germans, and who in the next endorse a blockade which is effectively wiping out the next generation of their allies?

Would sending the proposed 51,000 tons of food a month to save 10,000,000 children and expectant mothers in occupied Europe lengthen the war by 1 day? The officials who mumble "strategically inadvisable" have not said that it would, and they cannot say that it would. Could such a program in any way benefit the Germans? Its worst enemies have admitted that exactly the same plan has enabled at least 3,000,000 Greeks to survive and has in no way aided the war effort of the Nazis.

Would it be an intolerable burden on the people of the United States? No, because many of the governments of countries which would receive aid have funds in this country to pay for all the cost of this relief work and are eager, terribly eager, to do so. They would rather spend their own money now to feed their starving children now than spend, under U. N. R. R. A., the American taxpayers' after those children are dead. Would the program divert valuable shipping from our war effort? No; neutral vessels, now idle, would be employed to ship the food. Would the program dip into the rations of our fighting men or our civilian population? It has been estimated that enough food is wasted in this country each year to feed 20,000,000 people. Scarce foods would not be sent, only those of which we have an abundance, supplemented by supplies from South Africa and South America which we do not have sufficient shipping to move for our own uses.

The plan does not call for the complete feeding of these children, but only for the supplying of additional nourishment necessary to maintain their health. They would continue to consume as much food from their own countries as Nazi rations and the available supplies permit. The effect of the blockade on Germany would in no way be lessened; it would only be less oppressive to our allies.

Senate Resolution 100, introduced by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE for himself and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, has been reported out by the Committee on Foreign Relations and passed unanimously by the Senate. It states that the Senate "does express the conviction that immediate steps should be taken to extend the Greek experiment" by "the setting up of systematic and definite relief for all stricken and hungry countries." House Resolution 221, a resolution with the same purpose, introduced by Representative HAMILTON FISH, has been unanimously reported out of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives.

These resolutions express only the opinion and wish of the Congress. They do not have the effect of legislation. When passed, to be effective, they must have the backing of public opinion, outspoken and positive, and action, forceful action, by the administration. If the people of the United States insist that the children of Europe be fed, that they will not take an unexplained and unsupported statement that it is "strategically inadvisable," the relief ships will soon be sailing.

Sending food to these children cannot possibly jeopardize our certain victory over Germany. To fail the children now is, in the end, to fail ourselves and our fighting men, to write down our war aim of a democratic Europe. Each day we delay sending the food we are betraying more children—children who would have lived to be our friends and allies—to the Pied Piper of Death.

And one last question: Why, if it makes sense to feed as we do our Norwegian, Polish, French, Belgian, Dutch prisoners of war in Germany, is it wrong to feed the wives and children of those same prisoners outside of Germany?

In the name of a merciful God, I urge every one in this great and strong and Christian Nation of ours to plead with the administration for these innocent children of our allies.

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 12, 1944.*

The Hungry Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3570, a bill to authorize the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam

in northwestern Montana should come up within the next 10 days. Because of the importance of this measure to the people of Montana I am inserting in the RECORD material which will make more understandable the reasons for our concern over our water resources. It is our greatest resource and we are asking the Congress to give our plea its most serious and earnest consideration. The Hungry Horse Dam, if authorized, will give us security and allow us to build for a better and a greater Montana.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I offer the following newspaper article which appeared in the Montana Standard on April 7, 1944. It illustrates, on the basis of stream-flow studies, what our water resources are and how much of it is not being put to use but is allowed to go to waste.

MONTANA LOSES ENOUGH WATER EACH HOUR TO IRRIGATE ENTIRE SECTION

HELENA, April 6.— Enough water flows out of Montana every hour to irrigate a section of land throughout a normal irrigating season, Fred Buck, State engineer, said Thursday in a summary of stream-flow studies completed recently by the State water conservation board

"If all the water that escapes from Montana each year could be stored and used for irrigation," Buck said, "we could irrigate an additional 5,000,000 acres per year. That would be more than twice our present 2,000,000 irrigated acres."

Buck said tabulations of stream flow show that 56 percent of the State's total drainage in acre-feet is carried in the Columbia river tributary channels, which drain considerably less than half the State's total area. He said th Kootenai River, which rises in Canada and cuts across only a small northwestern corner of Lincoln County, carries 8,250,000-acre-feet of water annually, while the Clark's fork of the Columbia carries an additional 15,250,000 acre-feet, both emptying into the Columbia.

The combined flow of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers at the junction just across the border in North Dakota is 17,480,000 acre-feet annually, or 47 percent of the State total. Of this total, the Yellowstone carries 8,330,000 acre-feet and the Missouri 9,250,000 acre-feet.

Only a tiny portion, 710,080 feet annually, flows neither into the Columbia nor Missouri channels. This is carried by the St. Mary River, which rises in Glacier National Park and eventually empties into Hudson Bay.

Buck said a total of only 6,000,000 acre-feet out of the grand total of more than 32,000,000 acre-feet which annually leaves the State now is retained for irrigation purposes. He said recent snow surveys show the stored water supply in mountain snow piles is 81.2 percent of normal.

Robert Morss Lovett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, many former neighbors and associates of Prof. Robert Morss Lovett in the Second Congressional District of Illinois heartily subscribe to the sentiments concerning him expressed in an editorial printed in the Washington Post on April 15, 1944, from which the following excerpts were taken. Likewise the appraisal of the character and service of Mr. Lovett as portrayed in the scroll presented to him by the citizens' organizations of the Virgin Islands coincides with their estimate of him as a public-spirited resident of the city of Chicago. I know those friends and admirers of Prof. Robert Morss Lovett heartily approve of the inclusion of this tribute of the citizens of the Virgin Islands in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOR THE RECORD

There appears to have been a difference of opinion respecting the character of Robert Morss Lovett between the Congress of the United States and the people of the Virgin Islands. Since the Virgin Islanders, whom he served and among whom he lived for 4½ years knew him rather better than the Members of Congress, their judgment of him seems worth recording. The united citizens' organizations of the islands presented to him and to Mrs. Lovett a scroll which read as follows:

"It having been our great pleasure and blessing to have you in our midst for nearly 5 years, it is with a deep sense of gratitude that on the eve of your departure from our shores we, the people of the Virgin Islands, tender to you this expression of our esteem.

"Our island home, our community, and, in no small measure, our own lives have been enriched by your faithful and devoted service and by your shining example of citizenship. Your zealous concern for the well-being of even the poorest citizen, your firm and unrelenting demands for justice to the humblest; your vigorous fight for the blessings of the 'four freedoms' for us, the people whom you chose to serve, will ever remain amongst our treasured memories.

"We are proud to have known you, to have worked with you, to have shared your dreams of a better Virgin Islands; proud to have your friendship; proud to have had the rare privilege of association with a lady and a gentleman.

"It is our earnest hope that you will find happiness wherever you may go and we know, sad though the loss of your presence may be, that you will still be with us in the many good and noble causes you championed and in those deeds of kindness which neither man nor time can efface.

"On behalf of a grateful people, reluctant to let you go, we subscribe ourselves."

The Tennessee Valley Authority

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up the cudgels just wielded by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] with reference to Republican candidates for President.

I have just seen one of them, Mr. Wendel L. Willkie, start out with great ballyhoo, with a world-wide "one world" background, and gradually retreat from the wilds of Wisconsin, as Gov. Bob Taylor, of Tennessee, once said: "With a hole in his vanity and his pride in a sling." Under the circumstances, I propose to leave the selection of a Republican candidate for President to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

I want to speak for a moment on the McKellar amendment that was adopted by the Senate with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The people I represent are very much concerned over that amendment. They feel that it would adversely affect the activities of the T. V. A. just at a time when it is doing the greatest job of any governmental agency that has ever been established. Twelve years ago, in 1932, the local power company was paying less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour for electricity, wholesale, at Muscle Shoals and was selling it to the people I represent, that is to the domestic users, at an average of 10 cents a kilowatt hour.

Now we are paying 4.8 mills a k. w. h. wholesale for it, and last year the residential consumers of my home city paid an average of 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

It is the greatest agency of its kind on earth; and I do not want to see it handicapped, injured, or destroyed.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the city of Tupelo and one adopted by the city of Columbus:

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF TUPELO, MISS.

Whereas it has come to the attention of the mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Tupelo, Miss., that there is now pending in Congress a bill which, if enacted, would change the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this Board that this legislation would cripple the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and would vitally affect its usefulness, not only in this territory, but to the entire Nation; and

Whereas the great contribution that the Tennessee Valley Authority is now making to the war effort would be seriously endangered; and

Whereas under the original act, as passed by Congress, the Tennessee Valley Authority was ready when war came, and has met all the demands required of it by reason of the fact that the law gave them the right to make quick decisions and to conduct its program in a businesslike manner; and

Whereas this board has had considerable experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority and has found it to be one of the best conducted governmental agencies it has ever dealt with: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board petition Members of Congress to vote against the McKellar amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill, which directly affect the Tennessee Valley Authority; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN with the expressed hope that he will use his influence to defeat this dangerous legislation.

This the 4th day of April 1944.

J. P. NANNEY,
Mayor of Tupelo, Miss.

Attest:

J. H. MERRITT, *Clerk.*

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF COLUMBUS, MISS.

Whereas the independent offices appropriation bill, as passed by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and amended by the Senate, provides that all of the revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be placed in the general fund of the Treasury Department, and that all funds expended by the Authority shall first be appropriated by Congress; and

Whereas the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been very successful and of very great benefit to the territory served by the Authority, and it appears to the mayor and City Council of the City of Columbus, Miss., that the effect of the proposed change in the method of handling the Authority's funds will inevitably handicap the Authority in its operations and make it unable to act quickly in emergencies, which will result in inferior service to the many municipalities and cooperatives in its territory: Therefore be it

Resolved by the mayor and city council, That they go on record as believing that adoption of the amendment changing the method of handling the Authority's funds will not be for the best interests of the country as a whole, the Authority itself, or the customers served by the Authority, and may result in great hardship to the Authority and its customers; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the conference committees considering the independent offices appropriation bill and to each Senator and Member of Congress from Mississippi.

The above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Columbus, Miss., at a meeting on April 11, 1944.

T. W. HARRIS,
Mayor of Columbus, Miss.

Attest:

T. W. LEWIS, Jr., *Secretary.*

Announcement of War Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention recently that telegrams from the War and Navy Departments announcing the death or serious wounding of boys in the armed forces are, in many places, delivered by taxicab services under contract with the telegraph companies. This practice has become so well known that relatives are stricken with fear and dread when they see uncalled taxicabs stopping in front of their homes.

One can readily imagine the feelings of a mother on seeing a taxicab stop in front of her home and the driver approach with a telegram. I am told by the owner of one of the taxicab services delivering these death messages in the county of my residence, Belmont County, Ohio, that it is not uncommon for mothers to faint or go into hysterics upon the receipt of such a telegram. The shock induced by the unannounced visit of the taxicab and the blunt conveyance of the death message in this manner is too much for the average person to stand.

It would seem entirely feasible for the War and Navy Departments to convey the sad news to shocked parents in some more humane manner, and I should like to suggest that, before a message announcing the death or serious wounding of a boy in the armed services is delivered to his parents they should be prepared gradually to receive the same; and I further suggest that this preparation should be made by the visit of a minister of the gospel, a preacher, a priest, or a rabbi to the home for the purpose of mentally preparing the relatives to receive the sad news. I understand that in some places ministers, priests, and rabbis have volunteered their services for such missions, and I am sure if a call were issued for this sort of service there is not a religious leader of the Christian or Jewish faiths who would not gladly welcome the opportunity to perform this humanitarian and patriotic service. I suggest that the War and Navy Departments use the services of preachers, priests, and rabbis for this purpose.

Mr. Bowles Has Made, and Is Making, Other Changes in the Administration of the Price Control Act by Simplifying and Reducing Paper Work To Aid Businessmen and the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, improvement in the administration of the Emergency Price Control Act is making substantial headway under the management of Administrator Chester Bowles. A law of this type without any previous experience or guide to follow naturally would bring on misconceptions and errors of omission and commission of policy under the best administrations. With college professors having no practical business experiences, the errors of omission and commission would naturally be intensified.

Credit should be given to Administrator Bowles for his earnest endeavors to improve administration of the law and eliminate the complicated regulations, language which has been difficult even for lawyers to interpret. The numerous regulations, reports, and forms required of business have created no end of adverse reaction in face of the shortage of help. What has been available has been in many instances inefficient because of lack of experience.

It has naturally taken time to thoroughly digest the needs and survey all phases to bring relief to the businessman. Mr. Bowles has made some radical changes by bringing into his organization businessmen with practical experience. Moreover, he is proving a genuine sincerity in weeding out superfluous and cumbersome reports and forms which businessmen have been required to fill out. It is understandable, of course, how these have proved irksome with all the other problems of business incident to war conditions.

BANS 296 REPORTS AND FORMS

In 1 week in the recent past, for illustration, Mr. Bowles announced the discarding of 296 forms and reports of various kinds. These eliminations will materially simplify conditions under which businessmen have been operating in the past. This will take a load from their shoulders and reduce the amount of paper work to that extent. It shows tangible progress in the direction of relief to men engaged in business and affected by the operations of the Price Control Act.

It has required time and patient study by the O. P. A. personnel to make these changes as well as an appreciation on the part of Mr. Bowles that something is necessary to relieve businessmen already affected with many trying problems aside from complying with the Price Control Act.

Another illustration of the progress that is being made in curtailing paper work for business concerns is indicated in a letter from Howard D. Williams, treasurer of the Washington Mills Abrasive Co., of North Grafton, Mass. This letter is addressed to Mr. Edwin F. McConnell, of the Norton Co., of Worcester, Mass., chairman of the advisory committee, who helped to revise O. P. A. form on which business concerns all over the country make their financial operation costs each year:

"I thought you might be interested to know that we have just submitted our O. P. A. Form A for our year ending December 31, 1943," writes Mr. Williams to Mr. Norton.

SAVES DAYS OF WORK

Completion of this form from our records took just 1 hour. The data called for by O. P. A. in their previous requirements gave them no more significant information, but were called for in form that obliged us to spend days, not minutes, in their preparation.

As I believe you were a member of the committee which worked out and recommended the changed form, we want to congratulate you on the job done, and incidentally to add personal thanks.

Now will you start in on the income-tax mess.

Probably the severest critics of O. P. A. regulations, red tape, complex orders, amendments, inability to understand their meaning and because of the extra work forced on them trying to keep abreast of what was required of them, have been the retail grocers. Being a business operated by men almost exclusively they have been severely handicapped as their help has either gone to war or into defense work. This necessitated the employment of green help without any experience as a general rule.

TO SIMPLIFY RETAIL OPERATIONS

The Office of Price Administration has just announced what will be a radical change in policy affecting the explanation and enforcement of food price ceilings at retail which is now in the making. Through this policy it is planned to more thoroughly sell the retailers the idea of price control through an educational program showing the need for these regulations.

Any amendment that is issued which affects retail pricing will be accompanied

by what O. P. A. terms a "retailer bulletin" which will explain the action to the retailer. Under this plan to be instituted at once after the lawyer drafts an amendment, the price specialist will explain in writing just what the action means to retailers. Following this an O P. A. staff writer will put that explanation into a retailer bulletin. This will be prepared before the amendment is cleared for announcement. When these bulletins are printed they will be distributed to regional and district O. P. A. offices for further distribution to the trade.

The resulting effect of this is that retailers, and especially those in classes 1 and 2 representing merchants doing the smallest volume of business, will obtain information in language they can readily understand in place of copies of legal orders. The reasons behind this drastic move are threefold:

First. Simple understandable regulations;

Second. Perform a careful and intelligent job of educating the retailer; and

Third. Enforce regulations strictly when necessary.

RECOGNIZES NEED OF BETTER JOB

The O. P. A. recognizes that the better job that is done on the first and second, the trouble encountered with the third will be reduced in proportion, and better results accomplished. The effect is simple regulations, give the retailer a simple and easy method of following price controls, community ceilings will be easier for the retailers, consumers and O. P. A. examiners will know what top prices are, price panels will be better able to correct errors through friendly education rather than an enforcement threat, with an index of price controls the retailer can tell at a glance what mark-up or price may be charged, what regulation applies, and which retailer bulletin explains it.

Another innovation that reduces work for retailers is the issuance of tokens as change for ration stamps. This plan speeds up buying by the housewife and reduces the time involved for retailers in waiting on their customers.

Still another change that has just been instituted for the good and convenience of both store patrons and merchants is the abandonment of expiration dates for ration stamps. Under the former plan, housewives were much concerned about expiration dates of red and blue stamps. They frequently lost track of the dates or the type of stamps whether for processed foods or meats. In addition, there was always a rush to redeem stamps at the last minute which caused confusion in stores and delay in serving patrons. Moreover, this eases up the strain on retailers with limited help.

AID TO FARMERS

A further move is in the direction of helping farmers and those who patronize farmers in the purchase of meats. To enable such buyers to purchase in larger quantities they are now permitted to use two series of ration stamps for each ration book instead of one to obtain meat from the farmers.

Here, Mr. Speaker, we have a number of illustrations to show the improvements that have taken place in the efforts of Administrator Bowles to adopt more practical ways to administer the Emergency Price Control Act to relieve the strain upon business, to recognize their difficulties due to the war, and also to assist consumers in doing their marketing.

Life Line to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

RE POPE EDITORIAL

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include editorial entitled "Life Line to Victory," which appeared in Il Progresso Italo-Americano on January 18, 1944, at the beginning of the Fourth War Loan drive. Il Progresso Italo-Americano is one of the most influential newspapers in the city of New York, and has a very large circulation throughout the city and area.

LIFE LINE TO VICTORY—APPEAL TO ITALO-AMERICANS

As chairman of the Italian section of the New York State War bond drive, I am taking this occasion to address myself to all Americans of Italian origin. To us this War bond campaign is not a matter of merely lending some unspent money, some idle dollars, to our Government. We will be throwing ourselves into this War bond drive even more enthusiastically and energetically than we have done in any of the previous campaigns. We are now on one of the last laps of the race to overtake and overwhelm the mortal enemy of all that is decent and humane, the savage foe of all that we cherish and value as civilization. In the preceding War loan campaign our efforts and results won the admiration and commendation of our Government authorities and national leaders. Nearly $50,000,000 of War bonds were bought by Americans of Italian extraction throughout the State of New York.

Nearly a million Americans of Italian extraction are now fighting side by side with many of their kinsmen living in Italy. In closed ranks, these heroic sons of Italian lineage are today battling against a common enemy—the Teutonic barbarians inside Italy, the hordes of Hirohito in the Pacific. The soil of the Roman peninsula is now being hallowed with the blood of our beloved sons, brothers, and fathers in American uniform and with the blood of the inhabitants of Italy itself. In the infernal heat of battle there are being welded the forces which will bring victory to both peoples and cement their lasting friendship.

In the Fourth War Loan drive, we Americans of Italian descent have a twofold inspiration. Every dollar we lend our Government helps our cherished land of adoption, the United States, to preserve and expand its democratic institutions. It is these institutions which have meant so much to us in opportunity to fulfill our hopes and live a better and fuller life. At the same time, every War bond we now buy hastens the day of full independence for Italy, insures the revival of freedom for the Italian people and their restoration to a place of dignity and honor among the great nations of the world. What nobler ideals, what higher goals, could inspire us than to serve at one and the same time America and liberated Italy? America, land of realized promises, the land of dreams come true, and hopes attained for curselves and our offspring. And Italy, the land of our forefathers, the soil that has nursed and nurtured so many illustrious sons of all mankind.

In this vein I speak to my fellow Italo-Americans. I know I am telling them only what they feel deep down in their hearts. All of us aspire to ever greater happiness. In fighting for the preservation of this right to the pursuit of happiness, every one of us is inspired and guided by Mazzini, that stalwart champion of Italian freedom and human welfare, when he told the world: "The sole origin of every right is in a duty fulfilled." I might well add: And the greater the right, the higher the duty. It is in this spirit that I appeal to all Italo-Americans to show the way and buy more War bonds today. In this plea I am only translating into inadequate words their own warmest feelings and strongest convictions, their own clearest thoughts and finest ideals.

To us who have come to America's shores to escape back-breaking poverty and soul-crushing want, to those of us who have found in the United States a haven from fear and tyranny, the fourth War bond campaign is a stirring confirmation and timely reminder of an undying universal truth. Liberty is not a drug which someone can prescribe for us. It is a living plant of slow and difficult growth which demands constant care and continuous cultivation by all of us. Fully aware of this immortal truth and deeply aroused by the grave Axis menace to our own freedom, as well as to the rights and freedom of the Italian and all other liberty-loving peoples, we Italo-Americans will go all out to help our country go well over the top in this drive.

When our country's needs are greater, our own efforts and deeds must be greater. The time to buy more War bonds is today. Postponed efforts will never win us a lasting and just peace. No two words can be more terribly bitter than "too late." The more we will suppor' the attack, the sooner will our loved ones be back—triumphantly from Italy, from the Pacific, and from all the far-flung battle fronts.

It is with joy and pride that I say to the Italo-American community: Americans of Italian origin have done it well before and will do even better now. To assure victory in 1944, we will buy War bonds more and more. Let us all do our best to speed the day of freedom's triumph over Axis barbarism.

GENEROSO POPE,
State Chairman, War Bond Committee for Americans of Italian Origin.

The IV–F Draft Classification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to call to the attention of the House the situation with which boys who are placed by Selective Service in the classification of IV–F are confronted.

These boys have been placed in the deferred class because of physical disability and yet the average person has no means

of knowing whether a boy is deferred because of a bad heart, for instance, or is evading military service; consequently, many of these boys placed in IV–F are constantly being harassed by well-meaning people who, seeing a boy not in uniform make remarks in his hearing or even bluntly ask him why he is not in uniform and always with the implication that he is a slacker or one who is not doing his duty.

This is, of course, utterly unjust to these IV–F boys and yet it is a perfectly natural, human reaction at the sight of such boys out of uniform. For the purpose of correcting this situation I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Selective Service adopt a button or other insignia to be worn by the boy who is classified in IV–F by which he will be identified as one who is not in uniform because of the rules of Selective Service and who, therefore, is manifestly not a coward or slacker or willfully evading service in the armed forces of our country.

I understand that the Selective Service contemplates the drafting of IV–F boys into some sort of labor battalions and I should like to suggest that, if this is done, these boys should not be required to work in civilian clothes and be subjected to the taunts and sarcasm and humiliating remarks of those with whom they come in contact and should be placed in some sort of uniform to identify them as men serving in labor battalions or in limited service but, nevertheless, in the service of their country.

I sincerely trust that the War and Navy Departments will recognize the wisdom of the suggestions I have just made and put the same into actual practice as speedily as possible where IV–F boys are inducted into the service.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times, April 16, 1944:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The voice of America assumed new authority in world affairs during the past week when Secretary Hull, supplemented by Assistant Secretary Long, spoke up to explain anew the foundations, the aims, the ideals, and the limitations of American foreign policy. They were speaking on the eve of great events, when the American Nation is preparing to lay its greatest sacrifices on the altar of victory and peace. The program to which they gave eloquent support rises above partisan clamor or special pleading, and the general satisfaction with which it has been received both here and abroad is reassuring. Moreover, as Mr. Hull emphasized, this program is advanced by a nation which is speaking not from weakness but from strength. It is to be hoped that it will carry appropriate weight in the London conferences attended by Mr. Stettinius as this country's ranking representative.

The program does not pretend either to lay down the law or to solve all problems of the world. But it does outline the fundamental premises from which we must proceed, the immediate and ultimate goals for which we strive, and the most hopeful methods of attaining them. The fundamental premises are: First, that the full diplomatic power of the United States must be committed to the military necessities of total victory through cooperation with our allies, and that this must determine in the first instance every diplomatic step we take; second, that the American foreign policy must express as nearly as possible the will of the 135,000,000 people of America who give this policy its force, but also determine its possibilities and its limitations. The goals are: First, total victory and the complete overthrow of nazism, fascism, and Japanese jingoism; second, the earliest possible restoration of order and stability through strong, progressive, and popular governments dedicated neither to revolution or reaction, but to democratic achievement and, third, a democratic world organization of sovereign nations based on the power of the United States, the British Commonwealth, Russia, and China, but embracing all nations, large and small, for the maintenance of peace, the settlement of international disputes, and the promotion of a free and expanding economy as the best means of social and political progress. The methods for attaining these goals are not unilateral action or national power politics but united and agreed action based on a reign of law and morality and the harmonizing of the real interests of the four big powers which must assume responsibility for the program.

This, in general, is the program of the Atlantic Charter and the declarations of Moscow and Teheran. These are neither pious platitudes, as some scoffers would have us think, nor are they an immutable code of law. But they do represent the fundamental objectives of this Nation. Mr. Hull specifically warns that any proposal is dangerous for us and misleading to others if it does not find the sanction of popular support in this country. To this Mr. Long adds that we will not permit the armed forces of this country to be used for the support of any group or any government contrary to the will of the people.

As Mr. Hull repeatedly emphasizes, the chances and effectiveness of this program depend on agreement among the Allies and among the American people themselves. To attain the former, numerous inter-Allied commissions and conferences are now at work. To attain the latter, Mr. Hull has invoked the aid and advice of a bipartisan group of Congress in order to avoid the mistakes following the last World War. He is fully aware that this is a slow and difficult process, but he prefers to let the necessary agreements grow slowly and organically, and he can furnish solid evidence that we are making progress by this method.

Problem of the Press—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Times of April 4:

PROBLEM OF THE PRESS—I

Wisconsin today is in the news because of its Presidential primary. That makes this a good day to call attention to a problem in the relationship of newspapers to politics that was brought into focus in connection with this primary.

When Wendell Willkie was campaigning for Wisconsin delegates the Times assigned its Washington reporter, Robert E. Kennedy, to cover the news of Willkie's tour. Other newspapers also had correspondents on the story.

It was all in the day's work. Yet we were criticized and by—of all sources—the editor of another newspaper. The newspaper is the Daily Herald, of Merrill, Wis., and the editor is Mr. Walt Chilsen. Mr. Chilsen declared that by assigning reporters to Mr. Willkie's tour we were "magnifying (Willkie's) utterances out of all proportion." He also talked about "a conspiracy on the part of New Deal newspapers." In the group besides the Times were the Milwaukee Journal, the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and others with which it had been a practice to cover important political events.

It puzzled us that an editor should talk that way.

FACTS CLEAR UP OUR PUZZLEMENT

Our puzzlement began to lift after we discovered some facts. Fact No. 1 was that Editor Chilsen was a candidate for Presidential delegate in the Wisconsin primary. He was running for the office under the designation "Anti-Willkie." Fact No. 2 was that he is recognized as a "veteran Republican leader." Fact No. 3 was that the vice chairman of the Republican organization in this particular Wisconsin county is a Joseph A. Chilsen, whose address is "care of the Merrill Herald."

We asked ourselves: "In what capacity was Mr. Chilsen speaking? As a newspaper editor, or as a political figure?"

If he were speaking as newspaper editor, the implications of his remarks did not make sense—certainly not in accord with our understanding of the purposes of newspapers. But if he spoke as "anti-Willkie candidate" his remarks did make sense—but it would be political sense, not newspaper sense.

We could stop here, if all that was important was just to clarify this one incident, if our point were merely to answer criticism. The incident, in itself, is not any mountain, and we are not so thin-skinned that we fret over criticism.

But this matter does raise an issue, one that hasn't had much attention from this generation at least, one that ought to be faced by all newspapers, and by the public in whose service newspapers are supposed to be dedicated. The issue is: How closely associated with party politics and with the actual administration of government is it proper for a newspaper to be under the freedom the people have given the press?

Phrased another way, the issue is: If the press is to perform its proper function, should there not be an inviolable separation between the press and government?

It may be argued that a newspaper owner or editor has as much right to engage in active politics, or to hold public office, as any other citizen.

It may be argued that newspaper owners have held the highest offices, and the country has not gone to the dogs.

It can be pointed out, too, that it had been traditional in this country for newspapers to "pick" candidates for office, from local officials to the President of the United States.

Some newspaper offices have been busier as political headquarters than as purveyors of news.

TWO-TIMING RAISES SERIOUS PROBLEM

All this is familiar in American politics. It may even be conceded that it is all under

the heading of accepted practice. Certainly there is nothing immoral or illegal in a newspaper proprietor or editor leading the double life of journalist and politician or of journalist and office-holder.

In individual cases, such two-timing may be precisely the right thing at a particular time.

But if the press generally, through multiplication of such individual cases, should become so entwined and mixed up with politics and office-holding that it is not at all separate from Government, but gets into Government through its political satellites, haven't we a serious problem on our hands?

The Times believes there is a problem here. It thanks the Wisconsinite for his criticism, because that brought up the subject. The Times believes this problem gets to the vitals of why freedom of the press is—and must be—a constitutionally guaranteed part of our Government's system. We'll go into that in another editorial.

Radio Address to the People of the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on April 15, 1944:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, at this time, I think it only right to thank my sponsors, the patriotic women of the Hall Furlough Clubs for their undying interest in the principles they have espoused. They are doing a wonderful job winning this war and building up morale, not only on the home front but among the servicemen.

Some of the clubs have circulated petitions during the past few days among various plants and factories in the district. I have already received petitions bearing over a thousand names and am presenting them to Congress each day as they are sent to me by club members.

The petitions read as follows:

"To the Congress of the United States:

"We the undersigned members of the Hall Furlough Clubs of America and friends do hereby petition your honorable body to pass H. R. 1504, otherwise known as the Hall furlough bill, introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress by Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL."

Not long ago, someone wrote me from Johnson City and asked me if I approved the work the Hall Furlough Clubs are doing. She also asked me if I am a member of a club.

Yes; I wrote back to her, I heartily approved of the work these clubs are doing. Any American can do no less than approve of their high and noble objectives. Who would disapprove of the clubs' effort to help the servicemen?

Who would be so unpatriotic as to ridicule the sincere, honest Americans who belong to the Hall Furlough Clubs whose main objective is to obtain free furlough transportation for our soldiers, sailors, and marines? Who would be so dumb as to want to stand in the way of the members who are doing so much to help on the home front, to assist the loved ones and families of our fighting men?

No, I am not a member of this worthy organization, I continued, but I wish I were. Moreover, I would certainly join if I could. However, I understand these good ladies have barred men from membership which is probably a good thing. Anyway, they seem to be doing all right without me. They have won some good fights and tell me they are ready for any more that come their way.

At any rate, I am certainly grateful to them for their able defense of me when I have been wantonly and scurrilously attacked. They must know how much I am indebted to them for their aid and also for this time on the radio.

So, naturally, I approve of their activities and I am pleased they approve of mine. Although I am not permitted to join any of these splendid groups because of their by-laws, that doesn't mean I am anything but solidly behind them and am very much interested in their future course. I know they will continue to grow and expand, thereby becoming an even greater force for good for the reason they are larger.

In these days of frustration and despair, of discouragement and heartache, you and I must look to our Creator for strength and support. In the hour of tribulation, what is more appropriate than the solace and comfort of the Twenty-third Psalm:

"The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures. He leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me: Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever."

Problem of the Press—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Times of April 8:

PROBLEM OF THE PRESS—II

Why do we have freedom of the press? Why did the people, in our founding days, insist on getting for the business of publishing a specific protection in our Constitution that no other enterprise has?

These questions are asked here in connection with a previous editorial that raised the issue about two-timing newspaper owners and editors. By two-timing, we mean functioning as publishers of news and also as participants in political organizations—sometimes being part of government itself.

GOVERNMENTAL REASON FOR FREE PRESS

Some people may believe that a free press is protected in our Constitution simply for a humanistic reason—because it is right to allow people to express themselves. That is one good reason, but it's not the major reason. The major reason is governmental.

The press is really, although not formally, one of our branches of government, in a sense comparable to the sense that the executive, the legislative, and the judicial units are branches. The press has a definite function in government—to check on all other branches.

The importance of freedom of the press consists, besides the advancement of truth, science, morality, and arts in general, in its diffusion of liberal sentiments on the administration of government; its ready communication of thoughts between subjects, and its consequential promotion of union among them, whereby oppressive officers are shamed or intimidated into more honorable and just modes of conducting affairs.

The above is the first written definition of freedom of the press by an American Congress. It was included in a communication addressed to the people of Quebec, Canada, by the First Continental Congress in 1774.

The quotation shows that the early Americans understood clearly the relationship between the press and government. The relationship combines that of a brake and a goad.

To the extent that it is functioning healthily, the press is the people's major instrument of public opinion.

In all governments, and especially in democratic forms, public opinion is the only continuous means of checking, supporting or correcting government. As Thomas Jefferson once wrote to Lafayette:

"* * * the only security of all is in a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted, when permitted to be expressed."

Much of the struggle that went on in old England between the crown and the people, a struggle that carried over into the American colonies, was over publication of opinions of government—even writing them in a private petition to the king himself, for that matter—without danger of prosecution for libel against the crown.

FORTIFIED FREEDOM DEMANDED, OR ELSE

In this country, even with a republican form of government established, the people still felt that they needed protection from oppressive officers, in addition to that offered by the system of elections at set intervals. That is why they insisted that in their Constitution freedom of the press be impregnably fortified, to use a phrase of Washington's. That is why the Constitution had to be amended. In its original form it came close to being rejected by the States because a Bill of Rights, specifically mentioning freedom of the press, had not been included.

The people were not merely interested in seeing that some fellow citizens had the right to publish on just any old subject. They were more interested in a press that would check the Government. As Madison said, "a free press is one of the ways in which the people communicate their will to governments."

Can a press that is dominated by men who are as much politicians as they are journalists, whose publishing offices are really political headquarters, who themselves are in government or are silent partners or bosses of mayors, governors, Congressmen, and Senators—can such a press be said to be wholly fulfilling the responsibility that goes with freedom of the press? We believe not.

If a newspaper "owns" a public official—or a group of office holders—how can it be their sponsor in a partisan sense and at the same time their censor in the sense of being critic on behalf of the people? If a political newspaper's satellites in government become the oppressive officers who must be shamed or intimidated into more honorable conduct, it is apparent the newspaper runs out on the public by its association with them and their misconduct.

Review of Out of Debt, Out of Danger in Free America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a review of my book, Out of Debt, Out of Danger, which recently appeared in the magazine Free America, edited by Herbert Agar and others.

Free America carries on its masthead the following statement:

Free America stands for individual independence and believes that freedom can exist only in societies in which the great majority are the effective owners of tangible and productive property and in which group action is democratic. In order to achieve such a society, ownership, production, population, and government must be decentralized.

Against this background I am specially gratified at the review given my book in this fine magazine and because I believe so earnestly in the message the book carries and the program outlined therein, I am including it here with my remarks.

OUT OF DEBT, OUT OF DANGER

(By JERRY VOORHIS, Devin-Adair Co., New York, N. Y., $1)

We will just forget, for the purpose of this little composition, the tall talk that is going around about making the whole world a better place to live in after the war, and focus our sights for the moment on a little section of it that we know something about—the United States of our own America. For it's a very safe bet if we can't do anything about improving our segment of the globe we won't be able to do much about binding up the wounds and effacing the scars of the rest of the bloody world.

Of plans for post-war prosperity we have plenty running from the slightly more than fantastic to the considerably worse than futile, and they all have one great weakness in common; nobody is quite sure where the money is going to come from to implement the schemes. True, our wartime producers will, many of them, have ample funds for reconversion to peacetime output, and, true, many enterprises, large and small, have in mind new and improved products that will add greatly to the comfort and convenience of life. But when it comes to the problem of finding a continuing and expanding market for these products, the question of a continuous flow of consumer purchasing power is the first to arise.

For the simple truth is that with everything in our favor and with very little debt to drain off our national income in taxes, we weren't able to maintain that flow in purchasing power in 1929, and we were never able to prime it back into an adequate stream with all of the New Deal measures until a new war came along to blast out the barrier of an inadequate money supply.

The fault, as Congressman VOORHIS sees it, lies in the fact that Congress has long since abdicated its constitutional right to "coin money and regulate the value thereof" to the privately owned banking system of the Nation.

And until Congress by its own act restores to itself that function, our economy will be nothing but a series of alternating booms and depressions, with each succeeding panic a little worse, and lasting longer than the one that preceded it.

The book, Out of Debt, Out of Danger is complete not only as a masterly analysis of the causes of all past depressions, but in that it points out the steps that can be taken now to avoid those that darken the horizon of tomorrow. To pay all or a large part of the costs of the war as we fight it, to establish a reservoir of purchasing power available for immediate post-war purchases, to insure an adequate supply of sound money commensurate with our expanding economy, to remove at the root the factors that threaten to cause inflation, seems like an order too big to ever be filled. Yet Mr. Voorhis has already introduced into Congress two bills that can represent a major step toward the fulfillment of these desirable ends.

If you think it makes sense for the Government to pay interest to the banking institutions on money that the Government loans to itself to finance the war—which is all that it amounts to—then you might find Out of Debt, Out of Danger a little disturbing to your complacency. If you think that America should be able to consume what it can produce in peace, as well as in war, any time and all the time that its citizens are willing to work for a living Out of Debt, Out of Danger will show you how it can be done—and fast.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 16, 1944, relative to the Price Control Act. I feel it is worth reproducing. Therefore, under the permission granted me I include it as a part of my remarks:

DANGEROUS TINKERING

The fact that the Price Control Act expires at the end of this year has made it necessary for Congress to pass legislation providing for its extension. As we had feared, an opportunity has thus far been afforded for various organized groups to urge amendments that would seriously impair the effectiveness of O. P. A.'s program. Testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee last week, Price Administrator Bowles mentioned three proposed changes that he rightly considers particularly damaging.

Heading the list is a proposal to strike out the word "generally" from the text of the present law requiring ceiling prices to be "generally fair and equitable." The effect of that omission would be to compel O. P. A. to fix maximum prices for specific products at levels that would guarantee reasonable returns to the highest-cost producer, no matter how inefficient he might be. Such a proposal would boost price ceilings to cover marginal production costs, thereby giving extra high profits to lower-cost producers. Mr. Bowles explained that companies unable to make a profit under existing price regulations can ask O. P. A. for relief. Then, if the output of the high-cost marginal producer is considered essential, he can be given relief in the form of a subsidy. But it would be a costly sort of folly for the Government to fix prices so high as to assure every individual businessman a profit regardless of his efficiency. Such a policy, according to Mr. Bowles, would spell the death knell of private enterprise. Suggestions to split price-control functions among various Government agencies are also frowned upon by the Price Administrator, while the proposal to throw open all courts to complainants against O. P. A. would, in his opinion, lead to price chaos, insurmountable delays, and contradictory rulings in various parts of the country.

No doubt all the amendments now under consideration are the outcome of grievances, sometimes fancied but often quite real. However, the redress of wrongs resulting from mistakes of policy in the administration of price-control legislation cannot be taken care of satisfactorily by sweeping amendments to the law that tie the hands of officials and prevent them from administering the price-control program discriminatingly and intelligently. Abundant room must be left for the exercise of administrative judgment in order to make the price-control system responsive to changing needs and to allow for exceptional cases calling for special treatment. Officials in charge of the program must be trusted with large discretionary powers; otherwise they are sure to fall down miserably on the job. The best guaranty of effective enforcement lies in permitting Mr. Bowles to continue to function under the law as it now stands. If he were to be forced into a legislative strait jacket by passage of the type of amendments here discussed, his usefulness would be destroyed.

Free Ports for Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Grafton, from the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1944:

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT—UNITED STATES CAN INVOKE NEW SYSTEM OF "FREE PORTS" TO CARE FOR REFUGEES

(By Samuel Grafton)

We need a system of free ports for refugees. These would be reservations, fenced and guarded, which any person could enter without formality, no matter how homeless or stateless he might be. Until we set up free ports for refugees we shall be asking the refugee to stand on one foot while we solve his problem, a position in which a man can wait just so long, and a child less.

No rights would be acquired by anyone who entered such a reserved area, except the right to sit down, which is a rare right at the present moment in civilization's majestic march. By an easy legal fiction, entrance into a free port would not constitute legal entrance into the country and stay in the free port would not constitute residence in the country.

We have used this same legal fiction to establish free ports for goods. For reasons much too dull to tell you about here, these are of great advantage to our foreign trade in time of peace.

FREE PORT IN NEW YORK

There is a functioning free port in the New York City area, into which foreign merchandise and alien corn can be brought without payment of customs duties, parked for

a while, then transshipped elsewhere. The stuff can stay here for a year without ever being considered to be in the country, and if we can use a legal fiction to make a dollar, we ought to be able to use a similar legal fiction to save a life.

There are practical difficulties in the way of such a scheme, because storage facilities for living women and children have to be a bit more complex than storage facilities for wine and corsets.

Yet these difficulties are hardly great enough to stun the human imagination. Any Army camp scheduled for early abandonment might do, or a fence could be put around some of the excess housing facilities we have built in eastern industrial areas.

As to what agency would run the free port for refugees, the answer is, of course, the new War Refugee Board. With such a free port in its pocket, the War Refugee Board would be in a position to go to other members of the United Nations and ask them to establish similar facilities, and it could not be turned down. The burden would thus be distributed around the world.

POT AND KETTLE REMARKS

But if we ask other nations to set up facilities while we do not, the answer is going to be a low, leering laugh, accompanied by remarks about the pot and the kettle, etc.

There are legal difficulties too. But we are entertaining 130,000 Nazi prisoners of war at the moment in this country, and not one has entered under the quota. It is true that prisoners of war have certain established rights, including the right to a safe haven, where nobody shall "make funny" with them. But can we really argue, with shabby earnestness, that the innocent victims of these Nazis are not entitled to equal rights with their deadly and malicious enemies?

If we cannot give our friends at least the same rights we give our enemies, then a host of questions are raised, including whither are we drifting and what is wrong with our heads.

COULD BE PICKED OVER

The refugees could be visited by consular and other officials of their own nations in these free ports, they could be investigated, picked over, and perhaps, in time, outfitted with papers and thus gradually raised to the lofty level of legal existence, as distinguished from the inconsequential level of mere physical existence.

Meanwhile, those Americans who do not want refugees here could have the assurance that they were not legally here at all; while Americans of a more humanitarian turn of mind and heart could have the assurance that refugees were being cared for and this is, therefore, a democratic solution, in harmony with the traditional ingenuity and resourcefulness of Anglo-Saxon law making.

As one looks it over, it seems, also, to be a fairly repulsive solution. But that is all the refugees ask for—a repulsive solution. Can we give them less?

Mr. Trimble on His Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following poem, a tribute of affection to South Trimble on his birthday from one of his old friends:

MR. TRIMBLE ON HIS BIRTHDAY

'Mid an avalanche of flowers,
Handiwork of shines and showers,
Mr. Trimble, in his office,
Entertained his friends today,
Who called in, with smiling faces,
To enjoy, with him, his vases,
Filled with floral effervescence,
And their heart respects to pay
To this honored friend of theirs,
Who grows grander with the years.

Mr. Trimble's great admirers,
Many of them, were inquirers,
In their own hearts, of his silent
True philosophy of life;
But no one dared ask the question,
Openly, or by suggestion—
His philosophy of silence
Strengthened him in every strife—
Master of himself, he stands,
Meeting squarely right's demands.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

APRIL 13, 1944.

Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the following open letter written by E. C. McKibben, of Ashtabula, Ohio, is of sufficient importance to include in the RECORD. Under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks herewith:

EXCERPTS FROM AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. RUSSELL WEISMAN, ECONOMIST-COLUMNIST, CLEVELAND, OHIO, BY E. C. M'KIBBEN, R. F. D. NO. 4, ASHTABULA, OHIO

ASHTABULA, OHIO, *February 21, 1944.*

DEAR MR. WEISMAN: You will pardon my intruding on your time, but as a reader of your column I have reached the point where I cannot help but foam over. Not just for any personal relief the foaming might cause, but with the most sincere hope that something I may say might in some way help maintain the solvency of this Nation and, therefore, help perpetuate a free America. At the same time being honest with the boys and girls who are staking their lives for this purpose, as well as those on the home front.

Your position that this or that "is inflationary," without any explanation of whether it is bank-book inflation or money inflation, or whether something inflationary, if properly controlled, might not be beneficial and desirous, is hard to understand.

Putting additional money into actual circulation increases the supply and decreases its value—purchasing power—per dollar. It is in this manner that the dollar value of all raw material, real estate, and some other consumer goods are increased. This is inflationary.

Deflation is the same process in reverse. In early 1920 a bushel of wheat—raw material—would buy $2. After the abrupt withdrawal of billions of dollars of the Nation's medium of exchange it would buy about 60 cents and a ten- or twelve-thousand-dollar property could be purchased for $4,000 to $6,000 or less.

The Nation's currency problem is much like an automobile tire. With the tire there is a poundage point of air pressure that is sufficient to carry the load for which it was designed and at the same time not be injurious to the tire structure. A substantial increase or decrease—inflation or deflation—from this point is injurious to the tire and means disaster for all concerned.

With the Nation's currency in circulation there is a dollar point, although not so definitely defined as in the case of the tire-poundage point. This point represents an amount sufficient to purchase all consumer goods needed, pay for a reasonable amount of luxuries and amusement, amortize personal debts, and pay all taxes, this at a rate of spending—velocity of dollar turn-over—by the people that they establish, according to their faith or fear, at that particular time.

It was the abrupt withdrawal of billions of dollars, below this point, and maintaining this low currency level that caused and maintained the panic of the decade preceding this war. This was augmented by the refusal to grant new, and the calling of outstanding bank loans—$20,000,000,000 worth—at a time when there was not money enough in circulation to meet the demands. Hence the wholesale bankruptcy, jobless millions, soup kitchens, and bread lines in a land of plenty.

It would have been just as intelligent to have sabotaged the lake shipping by dredging the Niagara River, above the Falls, to a point that would have lowered the water level of Lake Erie 10 feet.

Millions, many millions of dollars have been spent for boats, wharves, dock machinery, and channel dredging in the justified belief that this level will be maintained.

This is the part you fail to mention. The Government gives the bank an interest-bearing bond running for 30 or 40 years, the bank makes a deposit entry on their books in the amount of the bond and permits the Government to issue synthetic money (checks) in this amount. The synthetic money (checks) is dead in 30 or 40 days. But the taxpayer must continue to pay taxes to pay interest, on this dead synthetic money for the life of the bond.

This practice is dishonest, unpatriotic, and economically unsound.

If the school board of your city was to hire a group of teachers, promising to pay them their salary for 30 years and only require their services for 30 days, I am sure you would be one of the first to point to this economically unsound practice. So why keep quiet just because it's the Government and the big money interests indulging in the same practice?

They call it credit money. But you know, and I know, that there is no such thing as credit as a commodity that can be bought or sold, loaned or borrowed. Credit is purely a condition attached to an individual, corporation, or government, just as much so as their politics or religion and cannot be transferred to anyone else. Credit is determined by the ability plus the willingness—past reputation—to pay, of the individual, corporation or government in question.

If an individual gives his note for 1 year to a bank for a substantial amount, and as security gives a mortgage on his home, his farm, or business and receives a check book, he is credited on the bank's books as having made a deposit of the amount in question.

If the borrower promptly checks out the full amount, he and the bank in cooperation have coined that much synthetic money (checks) and put it into circulation. If these checks (synthetic money) return to the home bank and are canceled in 10 days, then the entire transaction is dead so far as money in circulation is concerned. Although the bank still carries the amount in question on their books as a deposit. This was never a money deposit. It was a deposit of the home, the farm, or the business of the borrower, or an equity therein, and when the amount was checked out it became a deficit deposit. The same procedure is also true when the Government issues bonds to a bank.

Of course, you will probably lead off with a flow of banker mythology—that, to issue a check puts new money into circulation which

goes on and on to—nobody knows where—but is still in circulation long after the check is dead.

To those who would argue this point we would ask—why, if an individual deposits $1,000 in the bank or the Government $1,000,000 cash, that when the individual has checked out $1,000 or the Government $1,000,000 the deposit will be promptly removed from the books, but when the individual deposits a note for $1,000 running for 1 year or the Government sells the bank a bond for $1,000,000 payable in 30 years which is placed on deposit and they each promptly check out their respective amounts and the checks are canceled, that in the case of the individual the deposit is carried for 1 year or until the note is paid and the Government's deposit is carried for 30 years?

When did a Government check for $1,000,000 become of so much value to the American people that they should be required to pay $2,000,000 in 30 years for the use of a $1,000,000 check for 30 days when they could have had the use of $1,000,000 United States money for 30 years for the cost of printing the money, which would be no more than printing the bonds? And as Thomas Edison said "If the Government can issue a dollar bond it can issue a dollar bill. What makes the bond good makes the bill good."

This banker mythology that claims that new money is put in circulation when a check is issued and stays in circulation long after the check has been canceled is why President Roosevelt could not successfully prime the pump with all the ingenious alphabetical inventions to get people on the Government pay roll—when the checks were canceled he did not even have the primings.

There is a marked distinction between the Government and the individual as to the purpose of having money. As for the individual or corporation, it is theirs to be used for their particular benefit either to lend, spend, or invest, and there is no provision for them to create any money. In fact the Constitution expressly prohibits the coining of money to the States and surely no private corporation could claim special privilege rights greater than those of the States.

As for the Government, the Constitution expressly provides that they shall coin and regulate the value of money as well as foreign coin. The primary purpose for the Government having money is not, as in the case of the individual or corporation, to lend, spend, or invest, but to furnish a medium of exchange among the people for the transaction of business of every kind and nature. The present practice of the Government borrowing money into circulation is wrong. As Mr. V. C. Vickers, former governor of the Bank of England, says in his book, Economic Tribulation, which he had written just before he died. "Any additional supply of money should be issued as a clear asset to the state: so that money will be spent into existence, and not lent into existence."

It would be no more dishonest, no more economically unsound, and no more unconstitutional for the Government to turn the Post Office Department over to Sears, Roebuck & Co., and the War and Navy Department to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., or any other chain-store system to be operated for their own personal gain, than it is for th Government to turn over the coining of the Nation's medium of exchange and the regulation of its value to a huge, privately owned chain banking system, which operates for its own personal gain.

Of course, the cry will be, "Fiat money," "Inflation," from all the flat-tire, debt- and interest-minded element. "Fiat money." Is it no good? Do not forget that every outstanding United States Government bond is a "fiat bond." The average liability of the bond, per dollar, is double the face value, principal plus interest, and the asset if any is dead when the check that was issued for it is dead.

The honest thing to do, the constitutional thing to do, and the thing to do that will maintain the solvency of the Nation, is for the Government to create and spend into existence "as a clear asset," honest-to-God United States constitutional money, its volume, and value per dollar, to be under the direct control of the Congress, which is necessary for it to be constitutional.

The value of money is controlled purely by "supply and demand." Regulate the supply (volume in actual circulation) to any given point in relation to the demand and that particular value point can be maintained within a very few degrees variation.

To control the supply (volume in actual circulation) in a constitutional manner, the Government must own the Federal Reserve bank and operate it under the direct supervision of the Congress.

This ownership is necessary for three specific reasons: First, there is no one entitled to create (coin) money except the Government; therefore, no one is entitled to the profits derived from such creation except the Government, for the benefit of all the people.

Second: The only way to regulate the value of money is by regulating the "volume in actual circulation," to achieve this, someone must reckon with the demand to purchase consumer goods. Must reckon with the ability and inclination of the public to spend or save (velocity of turnover) and must reckon with the volume of deficit bank deposits on the books of the banks. Surely the experience of the last 15 years will satisfy anyone that private institutions will not do this impartially and that the Government must do it.

Third: To keep our currency in circulation or to be in a position to withhold it to maintain a prearranged index point, we must open the dead end of the one-way street, down which practically all Government tax money, post office money, and Federal farm-loan payments go, to rest peacefully in the vaults of the Federal Reserve bank.

After arranging for control of the Government's money (the people's medium of exchange) the Government must issue money, "as a clear asset to the State," instead of interest-bearing bonds.

All the bonds sold in America do not pay $1 of war debt. Bonds are just an instrument of transferring the payment of a debt of the present time over to some future time, and in addition they create the added expense of selling costs, discounts, and interest which, when all is paid, will probably be 125 percent or more of the amount the Government received. Do you call it sound public finance to buy bonds at the present time, when everybody is working, promising to pay $2 for every one now received at some future time, when millions will be out of work, who, instead of being able to pay, will need to be fed? There is just about as much sense to it as there would be for a country village to borrow water in March and April when all the wells are full to overflowing, promising to pay it back with interest, in kind, in August and September, when half the wells are dry, and the rest hard put to meet the then local demand. If we could buy a dollar bond, we could have paid a dollar debt.

Do not misunderstand my motive. I am not advising to not buy War bonds. Everyone who can, must buy; for it is the only way provided to keep going, and the war must be won. But the finger of shame should be pointed at every Congressman, every Senator, and everyone in the executive branch of the Government who has not worked for some honest method of meeting this war expense, at least in a large degree, as we go, instead of instigating this bond policy.

We must confess failure on our part to those boys and girls who have staked their lives for a free America. We must confess our American ingenuity has not been directed toward paying the cost of this war but toward transferring the cost, at enormous expense, to the future.

This is not alone dishonest to the boys and girls who had a right to expect us to do our part while they were gone, but it is dishonest with ourselves. How can anyone pretend that we can pay with interest after the war, on a $75,000,000,000 income, that which we have failed to pay on a $150,000,000,000 income?

No industry, business, or farm can continue to pay a heavy tax, levied to pay principal and interest on mythological or synthetic money, which either never existed, or only for a short time, and pay it with honest money.

War Production Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that anyone will dispute the statement of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY that the control of our economic system has been concentrated both geographically and in terms of industrial units to a degree that has almost destroyed the ability of the States and other public subdivisions to protect the economic interests of their citizens. According to the figures thus far compiled and as of May 31, 1943, the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, Treasury Department and the R. F. C. through its subsidiaries had awarded approximately $161,000,000,000 in supply and facility contracts. Of this amount, more than $101,000,000,000, or 62 percent, had been awarded to the industrial areas for which the W. P. B. had regional offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago and Detroit. So that 62 percent of all the war contracts had been concentrated in the industrial areas of 19 eastern and north central States. To the western States for which the W. P. B. maintained regional offices at San Francisco, war contracts in the amount of a little more than $20,000,000,000 were awarded. To the areas having W. P. B. headquarters in Dallas, Kansas City, and Denver, war contracts to the approximate amount of $15,000,000,000 were awarded; to the area having W. P. B. headquarters in Atlanta, $7,500,000,000, and to the area having W. P. B. headquarters in Minneapolis $1,660,000,000.

This geographic concentration is not a new development, but one that existed prior to the war and perpetuated and protected during the war by the W. P. B. through its control of production and materials in the United States. Geographic concentration of itself may not be a fearful situation; however, when it is coupled with the additional factor of corporate concentration we find ourselves confronted by a totally different and dangerous problem—a problem which affects the very welfare of the Nation itself.

The concentration of these war contracts in the hands of a limited number of corporate units proves to be much

more startling than the case of geographic concentration.

Of all the prime contracts issued by all governmental agencies in the period of June 1940 to December 1940 but 100 corporations had been awarded 86 percent of the value of those contracts. The percentage was reduced to 75.4 percent the following year, and to 71.2 percent the year following that, but it still remains at more than 70 percent despite the vigorous efforts on the part of Congress to protect small business.

Just a moment ago I said that geographic concentration had been protected by the W. P. B. I am sure that an examination of the personnel rolls of that agency will reveal that it is controlled by representatives of the 100 corporations who have made it their business to maintain the status quo of geographic concentration by merely protecting the interests of their former employers. Therefore, this recent clamor on the part of the W. P B. for the right or the power to handle the job of demobilization worries me and should worry the people of some 34 States. In fact, the recent news reports indicating that Mr. Donald Nelson would resign if the W P. B. were not given that assignment, makes me wonder just why that agency is so concerned over demobilization when they have not as yet completed the job of mobilization in the face of this unfinished total world war. They are worried and upset and they will continue to be worried and upset until they are assured of that job. Now you may ask why. I think the answer is fairly obvious. Up to this point they have had complete control of the economy of our Nation. Because we are involved, according to Senator O'MAHONEY, as a nation in a war against totalitarian aggressors who had marshaled all the resources, human and material, of the territories which they had conquered or influenced, we ourselves were compelled to adopt totalitarian methods in totally mobilizing our country. The utilization and control of manpower and material was centered in Washington without regard to the effect upon our normal economy. This power or control was vested in the W. P. B., which thereupon assumed jurisdiction of every phase of our industrial economy. It is this W. P. B., staffed by the representatives of the aforementioned 100 corporations, that has delivered the war, and perhaps even the post-war, industrial economy into the hands of their former private employer corporations.

It is this corporate concentration that the W. P. B. is making an attempt to retain for post-war use. It is the fear of this agency that in the process of demobilization and reconversion, the peacetime economy of the Nation may be decentralized for the benefit of the average American citizen, and it is this decentralization which the W. P. B. is seeking to prevent with whatever means they have available, even under the guise of war decisions. It is the feeling of the W. P. B. that if they are given the job of handling the demobilization of our war industries, they can fully protect this entrenched concentration of industry in the northeast section of the United States to the detriment of the industrial economy of some 34 States in the Union. This design on the part of the W. P. B. was recently supported by a declaration of its Director, Mr. Donald Nelson, to the effect that no contracts for civilian goods would be allotted to any company or business located within a No. 1 manpower shortage area. At first glance this pronouncement of Mr. Nelson would seem reasonable. However, upon closer study of all of the facts involved, one can see that through this decision of Mr. Nelson, the markets of the smaller industries, of which Southern California has many, will be delivered lock, stock, and barrel to the monopoly corporations of the northeast section of the United States.

Let us analyze the facts upon which I base the charge with reference to the W. P. B. It is fairly well conceded that the European war will end before the war with Japan in the Pacific. It is also admitted that at that particular time war production will be concentrated on the Pacific Coast for the purpose of conducting the all-out war against Japan. It is also conceded that partial and even total reconversion will be authorized by the W. P. B. for the various plants and factories in the east and northeast sections of the United States. This will therefore mean that the corporations of the East will be producing civilian products for sale in the West, many products of which were manufactured in West Coast States prior to the war.

For a period of a year or a year and a half, while west-coast industries are engaged in war production, eastern industry will be in civilian production and supplying the needs of western citizens. It so happens that the west coast has developed into a two-industry region—namely, aircraft and ships, with all of its small business subcontracted to them. When the Pacific war ends, it is admitted beyond a doubt by all the war agencies, that the contracts for ships and airplanes will be canceled, thereby throwing into unemployment in the west-coast States many hundreds and thousands of people, for how long no one knows, as western industry will have to start from scratch in the matter of reconversion to civilian production. This they will find quite difficult, as their markets for civilian products will have already been usurped by eastern business interests.

Now, there is a way of meeting not only the war production requirements, but adequately protecting western business interests—a way which the executives of W. P. B. should be very familiar with in light of their past business experience. However, they apparently have not taken time to find this answer that would adequately do both jobs, and I am going to take this opportunity of publicly suggesting this solution to them for their consideration.

I say it is possible for western industry to continue its all-out war production and still safeguard its post-war markets. If western industries are allowed to accept contracts for civilian goods along with eastern business, with the right to subcontract these contracts to eastern firms cut back in war production, for manufacture under the brand name of the western concern, western industry will thereby be able to protect its markets by distribution during wartime of its own commodities under their established pre-war name. They will not have been caused to let up in war production; the cut-back firms in the East will have been fully utilized for peacetime production, and there will have been no sacrifices required on the part of anyone.

I have discussed this plan with Mr. Baruch, and I feel free at this time to indicate that in Mr. Baruch's opinion the foregoing suggestion would be the only solution to the problem at hand.

Without the utilization of this particular suggestion, or a similar one, certain cities on the west coast look forward to serious localized depressions immediately following the cessation of hostilities. This problem is a serious one, and in light of the fact that it has not been thought through thoroughly by the officials of W. P. B., I am led to believe that it is but a further development in the plans of the W. P. B. to solidify the concentration of industry in the eastern and the northeastern parts of the United States to the serious detriment of the West and the South.

Landon's Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I insert an editorial appearing in the Chicago Times entitled "Landon's Progress." Of course, it will be recalled that Mr. Landon, in 1936, was a candidate for President on the Republican ticket.

LANDON'S PROGRESS

Remember Alf M. Landon?

He ran against Roosevelt in 1936. He was "the Coolidge of Kansas." That subtitle was supposed to be enough to elect Mr. Landon as President.

Mr. Landon has just made a speech before the Republican State Convention in Topeka, Kans. A great many speeches are being made by politicians these days. We can't discuss all of them. But a speech by a former standard-bearer of one of the major parties would seem to merit some special attention. That is what we are now going to give to Mr. Landon's.

His was a speech which, in the old-fashioned Kansas way, tears the hide off the "ins," which is proper for an "out" to do.

It tears the hide off the Roosevelt administration once for its domestic policies.

It tears it off again for its foreign policies.

Of the latter, Mr. Landon says that the administration hasn't any. He says that all is confusion.

The implication of Mr. Landon's complaint is that he is not confused. Which would mean that he has a clear and definite program of alternatives.

WE'D LIKE TO HEAR SOME ALTERNATIVES

That's what we would like to hear from the opposition.

That's what the American people would like to hear.

It would be good for the country to have a clear choice of policies for our Government. Name-calling is no substitute for a policy, yet that is about all that we have been hearing from most of the administration critics.

After Mr. Landon had finished with his lambasting of Roosevelt, which took six out of the nine pages of his speech, he said, "Now, in contrast, what is the Republican position?"

We perked up over that statement. We wanted the contrast.

But what did Mr. Landon give to us? An excuse.

"In the first place," he said, "it is almost impossible for the minority party * * * to make much of a record. If a Republican Member of Congress offers constructive legislation that strikes a popular note, his proposal is never passed under his name. Some Democratic committee chairman will change it slightly and introduce it under his own name."

To that, we say to Mr. Landon: "Gosh, aren't these Congressmen awful, Alf?"

After getting his excuse out of his system, Mr. Landon went on to say that nevertheless "we (meaning the Republicans) are boldly preparing to meet our responsibilities." At that, we perked up again, especially on hearing the word boldly. To what did Mr. Landon refer? His answer is:

"Under the able and far-sighted Republican leader, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, committees composed of members of the National House of Representatives have been appointed on the most vital questions of taxation, post-war conditions, food, and powers of the President.

"Republican National Chairman Spangler has * * * seized time by the forelock and named committees composed of Republican Governors and Members of the Congress to prepare for post-war legislation on many vital subjects."

Committees to study problems.

Well, maybe this indicates some progress on Mr. Landon's part at that. Cal Coolidge was proud of a philosophy based on the idea that 9 times out of 10, if you did nothing about problems, the problems would solve themselves. The President who was famous for appointing committees was Herbert Hoover. So maybe Mr. Landon now has progressed to being entitled to be called, not the Coolidge, but "the Hoover of Kansas," albeit Mr. Hoover, to his credit, has been voicing definite ideas on foreign policy.

One portion of Mr. Landon's talk did impress. This was his statement that, "Now with our country at war we must guard against unreasonably inflaming public opinion by flinging about loose abuse."

PATRIOTIC ADVICE FOR ALL POLITICOS

We say amen to that. We hope certain members of Mr. Landon's party in Illinois will hit the trail on that. If they don't, they may find the voters becoming inflamed, but at them. The people have a sure sense of the impropriety—and the danger—of fomenting disunity in time of war.

Division Does Not Beget Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Danville (Va.) Register:

DIVISION DOES NOT BEGET UNITY

Reasonable, constructive criticism rarely is offensive to a region, community, or an individual. Here in the South, for instance, newspapers, educators, statesmen, and the churches have been striving to create higher levels, economic, political, spiritual, and social, for all the people by constructive leadership. The effort, as applied on the racial front, has not been without progress—a greater degree of progress than any other decade can match. Yet today much of that progress is in jeopardy because of what southerners describe as "outside interference."

The South is especially resentful that it should be forced to divide its attention between the fight against foreign enemies and those at home who would destroy southern civilization. The tensions now disturbing the South—and candor forces admission that tension has multiplied rapidly, not only in relations between white and colored groups but between the prevailing southern majority and all minority groups—are not of southern making. They are a result of constant prodding, of provoked incidents and of a propaganda campaign of unprecedented proportions aimed at revolutionizing the South overnight into a sort of utopia where the "four freedoms," the Ten Commandments, and the 59 directives of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices shall replace custom and law of many generations.

Southern Negroes and other minority groups have begun to realize all this outside "aid" is having an effect just the opposite of that desired. The progress to which they can point was achieved not because of but despite inflammatory agitation depicting the average southerner as an ignoramus guided in his relations with his less numerous neighbors only by blind prejudice.

The strategy basically is wrong. Making a whipping boy of the South, its leadership, and its customs is no way to gain from this region the kind of cooperation sorely needed in the United States today. Yet the whipping continues. One finds difficulty in picking up a publication printed north of Mason and Dixon's line without finding therein some article or item abusive in comment on the South. Recently the Senate of the United States saw a scene in which so calm and able a statesman as North Carolina's JOSIAH W. BAILEY warned he and his colleagues have had enough of sarcastic, ridiculous references to "southern Democrats." Even this week Members of the House of Representatives revealed their anger at the continual abuse of a columnist who makes southern Democrats his most frequent target because they do not follow that portion of the party line directed at changing the South to meet Eleanor Roosevelt's specifications for a millennial socialism.

What is going on is enough to make—and does make—Southerners of good will toward Negroes and all minority groups sick at heart. They see falsehood being purveyed as gospel; friction being peddled as patriotism; prejudice being branded as tolerance; lawlessness being counseled as good citizenship—when directed against the South.

Typical of the monstrous calumnies heaped upon the South is a quotation from the opening paragraph of an article running four columns in length and appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of last Sunday. Mrs. Eugene E. Meyer, wife of the owner-publisher of the Washington Post, wrote:

"In the South the uniform worn by a Negro (soldier) affects the ignorant white population as a red rag does a bull; what is worse, a large part of the South is very crude in its attitude toward murder, particularly when the victim is a Negro."

Negro soldiers and sailors are to be seen daily on the streets of Danville and every other Southern city and town. There is a pride in the khaki and blue in the South that is unsurpassed anywhere, regardless of the color or creed of the person wearing that uniform. During more than 2 years of warfare less than 30 Negro servicemen have been booked or even questioned at Danville police headquarters. The explanation is that the vast majority of Negro servicemen coming to the city have been our own boys on leave. They have found a welcome from both white and colored and an evidence of pride in their service from both groups. They did not find, and few expected, the uniform to prove an open sesame to all their aspirations; but they did find still at home a genuine friendliness that crossed racial lines.

Such falsehood as that written by Mrs. Meyer does not help the situation. It is a pity that, posing as a friend of better race relations she, like others, exercises her talent and her position to add fuel to a flame that had been kept under control by the whites and Negroes who are accustomed to cooperate in efforts to build better Southern communities.

Editorials Approve St. Lawrence Seaway Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that every Member of the House will become familiar with the bill S. 1385, introduced by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. This is a companion bill to the one I introduced on March 23, 1943, H. R. 2280. Both bills call for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway power project as a part of our post-war planning effort. Hearings will be held on the Senate bill by the Senate Commerce Committee, and I am hopeful that favorable action may be taken there so that consideration may be given in the House.

I have been furnished with editorials on this subject by Harry C. Brockel, secretary of the Great Lakes Harbor Association of Milwaukee, Wis. These editorials are all ably written and correctly state the facts about this project. They challenge careful consideration. They are as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal (State edition) of April 4, 1944]

NEW YORK FOR SEAWAY

New York's legislature has adopted a resolution favoring the St. Lawrence Seaway.

For a long time the port of New York opposed this improvement, largely because it feared that some of the shipping now terminating in New York harbor might move up the St. Lawrence and into the Great Lakes.

However, it ought to be obvious that, as Wisconsin and other Lake States would benefit by direct shipping, large parts of New York State would benefit by power incidentally, to be created by the proposed St. Lawrence development.

The Midwest will, of course, welcome the additional support offered by the New York legislative resolution. In behalf of its own interests, it now needs the St. Lawrence Waterway more urgently than ever.

The war has cause the development of great industries on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Those industries will, in the post-war period, ship their products to foreign markets as well as to domestic consumption centers. They will ship largely by water—over the seas, to foreign markets; via the Panama Canal and by coastal routes to many of the richest domestic markets.

The Midwest, unless it gets the seaway, will remain largely "land bound." It, too, has great industries. Under present arrangements, they will have to ship largely by rail to many American markets, and by rail to seaboard ports for transshipment to foreign markets.

They will be forced to receive their imports, the vast supplies of raw materials they will need, by the same means.

That will be unduly costly. It is well known that bulk shipments, at least, can most economically be moved to distant places if they can be loaded into vessels and be transported to the ports nearest consumption centers, without transshipment.

It is improbable that New York or any other American State can suffer if, by any good device, the Midwest is helped to prosper. The inner region then will but become a more generous consumer of goods of all kinds, whether water- or rail-borne, produced near the coasts or elsewhere.

There is no national benefit in hampering or stifling the commerce—and thereby the purchasing power—of any region. So the action of the New York Legislature seems foresighted. In the end the ports of New York and San Francisco should gain rather than lose as the Midwest is opened to waterborne traffic.

[From the Detroit News of April 3, 1944]

WORK FOR MANY THOUSANDS

It has been estimated that the St. Lawrence seaway as a post-war project would give direct employment for 4 years to 10,000 men. There was mentioned also a further employment, incapable of precise estimation, in the preparation of materials and equipment, including the huge electric-power installations.

The fact is, however, that these estimates are only a beginning. Anyone familiar with the purpose and practical potentialities of the seaway will see that the ramifying activities it will inspire must result in far more employment than this, scattered over the whole Great Lakes Basin and, indeed, the whole country.

It is not always realized that the seaway in truth is already all but completed over its total length of 1,500 miles. The new Welland Canal, completed in 1932, the Sault locks, and the other Great Lakes connecting channels all are ready to accommodate ocean shipping. It is only the 48 miles of St. Lawrence rapids, which will be flooded out and made navigable by the two power dams commonly referred to as the seaway project, that remain to be dealt with.

Thus the authorization of this final project by Congress will be the signal for vast activity, especially in all the Great Lakes ports, to get ready for the day when ocean navigation will be extended into the farthest reaches of the Lakes.

The channels are ready for the ocean shipping that will plough them. But the lake ports, though most of them already have the requisite depth, are not. In all these cities, from Buffalo to Chicago, and Duluth, docks, warehouses, railroad sidings and other facilities of an ocean port will be projected and built. New businesses also will be brought into being, which, too, cannot be ignored as sources of employment.

The materials used and the new enterprise to be stimulated by this bustle of activity will have an enlivening effect on business and industry throughout the country.

There is no conceivable project the Government could undertake that would have a comparable effect in stimulating private investment and enterprise.

The over-all effect of admitting ocean shipping to the heart of the North American Continent will be one of a tremendous boost in national economic efficiency. The seaway will serve as the opening of a new frontier, which, indeed, is literally what it is.

This great project ought to be authorized in readiness for the war's end as insurance against a post-war slump and unemployment.

[From the Sheboygan Press of April 1, 1944]

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

From the State of Vermont comes a voice favorable to action by Congress for the building of the St. Lawrence waterway and hydroelectric development as a post-war project.

In a bill introduced by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican he asks the approval of an agreement made between the Governments of the United States and Canada to provide for the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway. From the White House comes a message from President Roosevelt favoring the development. In a letter to Senator AIKEN, President Roosevelt says:

"I am convinced that the time has come for a nonpartisan effort to secure congressional authorization for the St. Lawrence development in order that the project may be available for early post-war construction.

"The undertaking will offer such important benefits to many States that I am sure it will provide a desirable stimulus to industrial and business activity which will assist the entire country in its reconversion to a stable peacetime economy on a continued high-production level. Many competent studies have shown that it will not hurt the railroads or ports through which foreign commerce now flows, but will ultimately increase their business.

"I am advising interested Federal agencies that your bill (S. 1385), modified to provide for construction as a post-war project, has my approval.

"I have appreciated your consistent support of this great undertaking."

Out here in Wisconsin—and perhaps that is true of the Great Lakes region—few seem to visualize the importance of this development and what it will mean to the land-locked regions bordering the Great Lakes. The time for calling names is past and we feel that Congress can no longer shirk its responsibility. Every time we delay this project powerful forces including the drainage crowd of Chicago take a new breath, pull in their belts, and go into action. The people sit idly on the sidelines and see the middlewestern section of this country in a bottleneck that can only be removed with the building of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Senator AIKEN'S bill will soon approach the period when hearings will be held, and we cannot hope to defeat the special interests who are blocking the seaway unless we give every support possible to the Aiken bill. For a long period of time the Senators and Congressmen from territory opposing the bill have been able to defer action. In the East there is an effort being made to develop the waterpower independent of the seaway disregarding entirely the navigation features.

Let the power-project crowd gain their point and we will continue to sit high and dry on the shores of the Great Lakes with ports closed and navigation stifled. The Great Lakes Harbor Association has done a marvelous job, but alone it cannot do all of the work and meet the powerful enemies that would try to stop the building of a deep waterway to the ocean front. Back as far as President Coolidge's time in 1924, negotiations were in progress between Canada and the United States. Secretary of Commerce Hoover, afterward President, called attention to the need for the development of inland waterways, including the St. Lawrence Seaway. All of this delay has been occasioned by selfish interests on the seaboard who felt they might be losing something.

As far back as January 21, 1927, J. Adam Bede, of Duluth, Minn., former Congressman, spoke before an annual meeting of the Association of Commerce in this city, making a ringing plea for the St. Lawrence Waterway, and up to this time neither our association nor any other has taken a leading part, but rather has sat on the sidelines along with the people who feel that it is no concern of theirs.

Back in January 1927, Sheboygan was represented at Muskegon at the Regional Tidewater Conference Waterway by the then St. Lawrence Deep Waterway by the then mayor and the writer. Every mayor we have had has been in favor of a deep waterway, and still we have never done more than raise a voice here at home.

Now that the matter is in the foreground it is time for action. The Association of Commerce and every business association bordering on the Great Lakes should hold meetings and pass resolutions and have them presented at the hearing in Washington—not through long distance contacts, but presented personally at Washington, and arguments made so that the Congress may know where we stand.

The matter of drainage has been in the courts, and recently the Supreme Court has sustained the people and served notice on Chicago that it cannot, by greater diversion of water, flood southern areas with contaminated water, the result of their own neglect in failing to build proper purification plants.

In March 1941 the city of Ottawa, the Government of the United States, and the Government of Canada signed a pact which is known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Agreement. Presidents Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt have all approved in no uncertain language during their administrations. Senator VANDENBURG, Representative GEORGE DONDERO, and, in fact, men of all parties, have voiced their approval. Canada is ready and our own United States has been the stumbling block of delay. That delay must be met now as a post-war measure. It will provide an outlet from the Great Lakes and it will make possible to a land-locked people of the Middle West an inland ocean at its doors.

We appeal to every newspaper and every civic body in the States bordering on the Great Lakes to back this post-war plan with action. Let Congress and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, father of the proposed post-war bill, know that we are back of them.

Justice to Our Ally, India—Repeal Exclusion of Her Nationals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at Town Hall, New York, April 13, 1944, under the auspices of the India League of America:

In my many years as legislator, one surprising discovery stands out—and I say this with thankfulness—the cynic is hardly ever right, if at all. The cynic who, as it has been said, "knows the price of everything and the value

of nothing," has never known the exhilaration of the fight for justice. He denies the evidence of his senses, knotting the moral fiber of his humanity. He is forever for the status quo, whatever it may be, for, as he sees it, there can be no betterment, hence, change can only be for the worse.

I am not here to deliver a little homily. I am here to assert a belief in the essential upward struggle of peoples, without and within the frame of governments. In every age, in every country, the struggle has gone forward to gain a bit here, to win a skirmish there, but the important thing to remember is—that the gain was made and is being made in each age, each century, each day. It is what we must remember in the hours that look black, in the years of turmoil and hatred when the forces of evil seem about to engulf and drown us. It is the cynic who is the defeatist.

In the United States we know that we have not reached the millennium. While our achievements in justice and equality stand as monuments to that very belief in the future of man, we have, by no means, reached any epitome of perfection. But we never cease our self-scrutiny to find wherein we fail, wherein we are betraying the purposes of our founders. Slowly, we forge ahead to the realization that no man, no government, no people are islands entire unto themselves, that insomuch as what happens in one corner of the earth reverberates throughout all corners, or, to change the figure, like waves that wash one shore because stones had been cast into the waters from the opposite shore.

Here we are fighting racial arrogance. "The United Nations are fighting," said President Roosevelt, "to make a world in which tyranny and aggression cannot exist; a world based upon freedom, equality, and justice; a world in which all persons, regardless of race, color, or creed may live in peace, honor, and dignity." And in so saying, the President of the United States was delineating our war aims That's a mighty large program. It means the liberation of oppressed peoples as well as the removal of discriminatory measures, not so thoroughly advertised, on the statute books of our own country.

Naturally, I have reference to the fact that for no reason save that of origin, Eastern Hemisphere Indians are precluded from entering the United States under immigration quotas such as are established for other peoples already embraced within the Immigration Act of 1924, and moreover, are precluded from becoming naturalized citizens of these United States. They were thus excluded from the family of nations that is the United States. I fought against the Johnson Act of 1924. It not ony discriminated against people of eastern and southern Europe but in its utter exclusion of nationals of Asiatic countries, anticipated Hitler's theory of Herrenvolk and Sklavenvolk. Is such continued exclusion the evidence that we have not as yet purged ourselves of the ugly taint of unfounded prejudice? Is it evidence that we have not been vigilant in watching our growth to a true maturity? Is not such an exclusion an echo of the totalitarian ideology that we seek to crush today? From what Olympian heights do we point our finger and say "You, Welshman, you may become part of us; and you Italian, and you, Yugoslav, and you, Iraqis; but, no, not you, Indian. Under our violently discriminatory laws, a guttersnipe from Prussia, a disguised Fascist from Spain, can enter, but the late Rabindrinath Tagore or Pandit Nehru enjoy no such right. If we have erred in the past in not recognizing such exclusion for what it actually is—an insufferable act of pompous racial ego—there remains no reason for such error to continue. Several remedial bills, among them my own, await legislative action. No sound reason exists for delaying the passage of such bill, setting up an immigration quota for the Indian peoples and according them the right of naturalization. It must be passed if the sincerity of our war aims is to pass the test, a test placed before us by every oppressed peoples on this earth who look toward these United States for justice and equality.

The Indian peoples have joined us on the battlefield. Two million are fighting in the Army, Navy, and merchant marine of Great Britain. They are among the dead, wounded, and missing. They are producing for war, farming for war, building for the war which is ours and theirs. Can we not underscore that brotherhood away from the war-torn fronts? The people, we the people of the United States, through their Congress will answer thunderously in the affirmative

If we are to follow the logical consequences of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, then, indisputably, the argument forces itself upon our consciousness that the people of India and their descendants are deserving of no less equal and equitable treatment.

But leaving aside the potent arguments that from the Chinese have been removed the unconscionable stigma of "lesser breed," and leaving aside the equally unanswerable argument that the soldiers of India have bravely fought a common foe on the battle fronts of Burma, Italy, North Africa, and against the Japanese in southeastern Asia, a higher morality demands that we prove to ourselves, and to our allies, all our allies, that our preachments of democracy are not empty tenets. We cannot, on one hand, revile the Nazi theories of racial supremacy, and, on the other, ignore the sinister implication of our immigration legislation that bars one people and not another, restrictions based on no moral or ethical ground save that of man's origin.

We are paying a bitter price to learn the lesson of the interdependence of the world and its inhabitants. We fight in brotherhood recognizing our mutual debts. Can we not underscore the brotherhood away from the death-drenched battlefields?

East Indians, once admitted, will become thoroughgoing American—as American as any. Many denizens in America are not American in heart and mind. Many natives here are not. The import factor is not that you are born in America, but that America is born in you.

Practically, the amendment of the provisions of section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, will make permissive the admission of somewhat less than 100 Indians annually.

The hue and cry that will rise in opposition to the proposed establishment of an immigration quota for Indians and their right to citizenship, making much of the competitive labor argument and of the evils of widening immigration legislation have, therefore, no validity, no foundation in fact.

It is not a special privilege we accord the Indians in establishing for them an immigration quota nor is it an act of condesension from our favored heights. It would be, rather, the acknowledgement of our sincerity in our battle cries, a renewal in the faith of our founders.

The inclusion of the Eastern Hemisphere Indian in our family circle is, however, one step forward in the progression of the world toward equality. As we view the upheaval in almost every region of the world, our consciousness gives pause before the thought of 400,000,000 inhabitants of the land of India who find themselves subjected to foreign rule. The pulse of a people stirs. A national consciousness arises, an awareness that whatever destiny awaits India, it must be of her own making.

Yes; there are poverty and disease in India. Agriculture and industry have not reached the highest point of development. There are divisions of class and caste. I point these out because these are the very arguments that are advanced for keeping India a subject nation. This is how India has fared, ruled from above and from outside. An absentee landlord sends its overseers—who must somehow manage to keep their jobs—to attend to the needs, not of the inhabitants, but of the employer. Exact tribute, divide the interest, keep the level of living low, but remember to tell them that it is for their own good.

How much of poverty and disease could be wiped out if India as a nation could be permitted to work for itself, to pay taxes for institutions of its own, could trade freely and be traded with by all the nations of the world? No unbridgeable chasm exists in India to keep the people divided and render them unfit for self-government. There are more minorities, more unrelated languages spoken in the United States, more variance in custom and belief in the United States, than there are in India and yet out of the amalgam we have forged a mighty nation.

India has an embedded culture of its own. It has no need for the kind of civilization the conqueror gave it. In justification of conquest, the 19th century self-pitying cry of "white man's burden" has often impelled me to ask in viewing India, "Who is really carrying the burden?"

Moreover, and while this thought cannot take precedence over our American basic principles of equity and justice for all, the decisive, overt act of placing the Indians within the embrace of our immigration quota and citizenship laws, on the basis comparable to those of the other peoples, will rob the Axis of their most telling barbed weapon in the battle of psychological warfare. But were it a time of peace, we could do no less.

Except for raids by Afghan tribesmen, India for the first time since the Raj took over in 1858 has now actually been invaded. The Japs are at the gates of Imphal in Manipur State and definitely threaten Kohima and may cut the Bengal-Assam railway.

The people of India realize that Nippon is on Indian soil and Jap propaganda is riotously gloating over it. Much is made of the fact that the so-called Indian National Army, headed by the Quisling puppet, Subhas Chandra Bose, is participating in this Indian invasion. He speaks of his "army of liberation." There can be no blinking the fact that Bose's pro-Jap propaganda is adding fuel to the political fires of unrest in India.

Tokyo, Burma, and Malay radios hammer harder than ever at India. They shout, "Come over to our side. You have nothing to fear from the Japanese." They taunt the people of India with the gruesome assertion of Churchill that the Atlantic Charter does not apply to them. Indians are reminded that the Allies promise them freedom from the Japs but not freedom. They speak of the hypocrisy of the offer of freedom of the Cripps' mission and high light the caustic comment of Gandhi that the offer was like a "post-dated check drawn upon a tottering bank."

Our breaking down of immigration and naturalization barriers may do much to dull the edge of this Jap propaganda against us and our allies.

If we do not do the honorable and decent thing, if we do not place East Indians on a parity with the Chinese and our other allies, the Nazis and Japs will continue to rub it in on India and incessantly repeat that Americans are long on words of sympathy but short on deeds of actual help.

Unless we amend out of our statutes the bar sinister against East Indians, Hirohito will call us hypocrites and will screech "Don't be fools, you good people of India. These Christians of America and Britain prate of brotherly love, but they only pretend good will. They give you pious platitudes about dignity of the individual, about equality of all men, about the four freedoms, but it is all poppycock. You can't even emigrate to their land. They blacklist you. Join up with us and help drive the white humbugs out of all the Orient and keep them out."

Such messages pour into India from all sides. They reach the lowliest peasant in his dunghill hut. They seep and spread through human grapevine communications.

We must at once erase from the statute books the malignant inferiority with which we brand East Indians. Our action would be as refreshing to them as a cool breeze in the heat of summer. It would be an effective antidote to poisoned propaganda. It would hearten and encourage the Indians to fight with and for us.

Our troops are in India which is our base against Japan. Unless the people of India cooperate wholeheartedly the war will be prolonged. India, therefore, is America's business, China's business—the earnest concern of all our allies.

How can we exclude as immigrants a friend and ally? Our airmen in Calcutta, when asked, "Why do you proscribe us? We do not exclude you, friend," have no answer, because they realize the wall of injustice and humiliation we erect between comrades in arms.

We must get away from the notion, and as quickly as possible, that India is still the India of barrack-room ballads.

India is precisely what I had in mind when I spoke of the hollowness of the cynic. As the world progresses in accelerated pace, as it does today, toward international collaboration, toward a firmer understanding of the actual physical and spiritual nearness of one people to another, there needs be much rejoicing in the heart of India. For India, today, remains an indictment of greed and lust for power and political bid for prestige. It cannot remain so for long; indeed we, the free peoples of the world dare not let it so remain. India must march with the free nations of the world, lest we slip again into the sham pose of the cynic which breeds defeat even before it has encountered the enemy.

What We Get

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 29, 1944:

WHAT WE GET

Lend-lease was conceived as a common pool of the resources of the United Nations, some of which are of such a nature that application of the dollar sign is next to impossible. Timeliness of aid, for example, is difficult to appraise.

But it is important that from time to time there should be an accounting on all sides of this assistance. We report periodically on what we lend-lease to other nations; Britain has just come forward with an impressive statement of what she is doing for us.

At the peak of construction work on bases in the United Kingdom two-thirds of all the civil and military labor available there was working for the United States, but being paid by Britain. Both the *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* have been devoted to our transport service. Britain now is supplying 20 percent of all the food for American forces there, and about 10,000 British civilians are employed by the United States but paid by Britain, their wages amounting to $12,000,000 a year. Britain also pays the cost of handling V mail in that country.

Britain is currently devoting 10 percent of her total war expenditure to mutual aid, and in proportion to national income is giving the United States as much as we are giving her. The full list of supplies and services furnished us is impressive. The volume and variety are important, chiefly in demonstrating to Americans that lend-lease is not a one-way street. But of far greater moment is the contribution of each nation in accord with its ability.

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following song, sent to me by Mr. Alfred Peterson, of Rogers, Ark., expresses so well the faith and hope of democratic peoples throughout the world that I am asking consent to have it printed in the RECORD with my remarks:

DEMOCRACY—THE WORLD SONG

Let the people rule, let all men be free,
This is the song of democracy.
Let freedom's call thrill the lives of all
To gain this glorious liberty.

Chorus

Then shout aloud for that great day
When all old things have passed away,
When war and strife and greed shall cease,
And none shall rule but the Prince of Peace.

All men are equal and must be free
To attain their highest destiny.
Then unfúrl the flag of humanity
And proclaim a world-wide democracy.

Dictators' rule is tyranny,
Their reign shall end ingloriously,
And then forever o'er land and sea
We'll sing the joys of prosperity.

All nations shout this mighty cry,
No more for tyrants shall we live or die,
And then the world with one accord
Will make their plows from shell and sword.

—*Alfred Peterson Rogers.*

MARCH 12, 1943.

Exploring Agriculture's Post-war Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the House the following address by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, before a meeting of the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies at Chicago, March 22, 1944:

I did not come here to describe post-war agriculture for the very simple reason that I don't know what post-war agriculture will be like. Furthermore, I do not even feel in a position to hazard a guess as to what it will be like.

However, I am glad to have the opportunity to tell you my ideas of some of the problems which will confront American agriculture in the post-war period.

These problems, I think, are going to give us a lot of trouble and cause us to experience some unhappy years unless we do some hard thinking about them now. We will never solve them unless we can unite on an effective post-war program. Furthermore, it will be too late to develop such a program after the shooting stops.

Now, I know some may feel that such thinking and such planning may interfere with our war effort. We must not let that happen. Nothing must stand in the way of winning the war as decisively and as quickly as possible. On the other hand we want a satisfying and lasting peace. That kind of a peace won't just happen. We have to prepare for it. It may take just as much effort to win the peace as it does to win the war. The fact of the matter is that we are now making decisions which will have a great bearing on our peacetime welfare. Some of these decisions I will mention a little later in my talk.

Without laying claim to any unusual ability to see what the peacetime problems are going to be, I will say that the longer this war goes on, the more I am convinced that we are likely to face a good many of the very same problems we faced after the last war. And I am afraid if we aren't very careful, some of those problems will be even more troublesome than they were then.

In the first place, although we had made a lot of progress, we hadn't anywhere near solved all of our agricultural problems when the present World War obscured them. Because this war is so much greater in all respects than the last war the problems growing out of it are potentially larger and harder to solve than the problems which faced us at the close of the last war. Especially is this true of those problems in the economic field.

I am going to confine my remarks today for the most part to the economic problem, for three reasons. First, I don't have time to discuss all the problems; second, I don't think we can go very far toward solving our social and agronomic problems without finding the solution to our economic problems; and third, the economic problem seems likely to worry us most w en we think about post-war. I would like to emphasize, however, that I think some of the other problems, such as conservation of the soil, and good rural homes, are really he most important over the long pull. But of course, farmers can't actually conserve their soil or have the kind of homes they want unless their economic problems are solved.

There are going to be many kinds of economic problems for agriculture but one of the biggest, it seems to me, can be stated rather simply. It is: Finding a good market for all the American farmers want to produce and can produce within the limits of sound farming methods. That problem can be stated simply, but the problem itself is far from simple. Neither is it a new problem. But I am genuinely afraid it is potentially more tremendous than ever before.

To get this problem out where we can examine it, we might first discuss what farmers want to produce. I believe you who know farmers will agree with me when I say that farmers want to produce all they can. They are never happier than when they are producing to capacity. They have surprised the whole country—I should perhaps say the whole world, including Hitler and Tojo—by showing how much they will produce with wartime incentives. They have performed wonders in production despite shortages of labor, machinery, and materials, and if they have just average weather it is my personal

opinion they will break production records again in 1944. Every citizen in our country, and in many other countries, is greatly indebted to the American farmers for their wartime service.

Now, I have been wondering how much the American farmers can produce when this war is over and they are able to obtain enough help, machinery, and materials, and when they are able to take full advantage of some of the recent technological developments. To help me size up the possibilities in this field, I asked some of the people in the Department to make some estimates for me. The estimates astonished me at first; yet upon examination of all the factors involved I am inclined to think they are reasonable. As a matter of fact, I think they are conservative if our technological developments continue at the present rate. But let us take them as they came to me.

They indicate that with good demand and effective educational campaigns we can, within the next 6 years, increase our production to 60 percent above the average of 1935–39. If we have moderate demand and employ only our usual educational methods, we can increase our production up to 40 percent above the pre-war level. Just for purposes of illustration I am going to assume an increase of 50 percent. Increasing production one-half above pre-war by 1950 doesn't seem unreasonable when we stop to think that our production in 1943 was almost a third higher than 1935–39 production, despite wartime production obstacles.

Now it is estimated that our population by 1950 will be not much more than 10 percent larger than the average for 1935–39. Therefore, our agricultural production per capita under these assumptions will be way beyond any comparable figure in the past.

That should be a cause for rejoicing. Think how much health and happiness could come out of this production if the people who want and need more food could obtain it. Therein lies the other part—the big economic problem which I stated in the beginning—finding a market for all the farmer wants to produce and can produce.

Well, we know the big share of the market for this huge production must be found in this country. We have found out in wartime how much more good, nutritious food people will consume in this country when they have high incomes. But what kind of incomes are they going to have in 1950? Are we going to have as high industrial activity then as now? Shall we have the knowledge and the determination to lick the unemployment problem which has plagued us in the past? These questions can't be answered now. But they won't be answered satisfactorily in the peace period if we view them with complacency now—if we just put our heads in the sand and hope for the best. If these problems are not answered satisfactorily the farmers' economic problems won't be solved satisfactorily. But even though we do find the right answers and our per capita domestic consumption of food and other agricultural commodities has increased, say as much as 15 percent above the pre-war level, what are we going to do with the rest of the increase of which we are capable, amounting to perhaps 15 percent of our total production?

There is a possibility that we can increase the industrial uses of our agricultural products if we have high industrial activity. But I would say a word of caution about being to optimistic with regard to solving our economic problem by greatly expanded industrial uses of agricultural products. Our experience has too often been that we have to price our products too cheaply to enable them to move effectively into industrial channels. At best, it doesn't seem that we will be able to increase the industrial uses by 1950 to a point where more than 5 percent of our total production will be absorbed.

That leaves 10 percent of the expanded production, or an amount equivalent to 15 percent of our pre-war production, to be exported. That is more than we exported in the immediate pre-war years, and as much as we exported in the years following the last war. Do you remember that during those years immediately after the last war we were extending credit to other nations so that they could buy our products? Again, we either are going to have to extend credit or give agricultural products to other countries, or we are going to have to accept goods or services in exchange. That is a hard, indisputable fact. It need not be an unpleasant one because we can export our surpluses if we import surpluses of other countries. Are we, as individuals and as groups, ready to accept in exchange products which can be more efficiently produced in other nations? Let us be honest with ourselves about this, because honesty as usual is the best policy. Are we really ready to advocate lower tariffs rather than higher tariffs? Are we ready to agree to fewer trade barriers rather than more? All of us know that international trade is a two-way street. Are we willing to act as if we knew it?

But even though we do find an outlet for all that farmers can produce, we still must have a satisfactory price before we can say our big economic problem is solved. First, what is a satisfactory price? Some would say that parity is a fair price; others would prefer to speak in terms of parity income rather than parity price. Still others will say whatever the law of supply and demand dictates should be the price, even though they know that farmers seem to be the only ones subject to this law in its crude, unvarnished form. Too often farmers have felt the law means that the greater the supply, the less the demand at a fair price. They know of instances in the past where the larger supply has not only meant lower prices but has also meant much lower total income.

That leads us around to the idea of price supports or price fixing of some kind. Quite frankly, I think we are not going to abandon the idea of price support of some kind. And I personally think we should keep price supports for the protection of both consumer and producer. In making that statement I am thinking about stability of supplies and prices as well as the general level of prices resulting from price-support programs. However, I want to point out some problems growing out of price supports which must be licked if we are able to keep them over the long period.

First, let us not forget that, although you can set a price for an article, you can't force the public to buy it at that price. And if the public won't buy as much as farmers have to sell, we are in trouble. If the product is perishable the trouble comes very soon. If the product can be stored, the evil day is only delayed. So we are going to have to adjust our production to meet our consumers' demands. That may mean less hogs and more dairy cattle. It may mean less cotton and more food and feed crops. Something to be remembered, of course, is that support prices produce some international complications we can't ignore. For example, in thinking of fair prices to United States farmers, most of us will be contemplating levels considerably higher than world prices or export prices have been in the past. Who will absorb the difference between them—the farmer or the taxpayers? Let us take wheat for an example. In the years before the war we had hundreds of millions of bushels of extra wheat. So did Canada and Australia and Argentina. Our farmers were getting more for their wheat than it would bring on the world market. As a matter of fact, if the world market had been as high as ours, foreign production would have increased much faster. So we tried export subsidies. I don't think we could have continued to use them very long for several reasons. They are costly. I think they tend to drive down world prices still further because, in a buyer's market, everyone usually has to meet the low price and quite often further price cutting occurs. One of the worst features is that other nations very seriously object to them.

Of course, temporarily the war has obscured this problem of support prices for products which are produced in exportable quantities.

Even though the product in question isn't produced in large enough quantities so that there is an exportable surplus, how shall we prevent other nations from glutting our markets with their products if our price is higher than the world price? That very thing is happening in wool right now simply because our price is higher than the world price. It will be said that, in such a case, we should apply an added tariff or a barrier of some kind. But tariffs and barriers, as well as export dumping, only lead to retaliatory measures by other countries, and if we aren't careful we will have ruined our possibilities for international trade and aggravated our farm economic problem.

Now, as I said in the beginning, there are some decisions in the making at the present time which will have an important bearing on our economic situation in the post-war period.

As an example, let's look briefly at the problem of inflation. I can't think of anything that would cause us more economic difficulties in the post-war period than permitting ourselves to be caught up in an inflationary cyclone during or immediately after the war. I know we would like to receive higher prices. That's human nature. And I appreciate the fact that our pride doesn't permit us to readily endorse subsidies. It is only natural that we should much rather have higher prices. But how long would it take us to get over inflation if we let prices go up and what would we suffer while we were recovering. That is too dreadful to contemplate. I can't forget that some farmers never recovered from the deflation of the last war. For myself I would much rather have $13 or $14 hogs now and comparable prices in peacetime than to have hogs go to $20 or $22 a hundred, as they did during or immediately after the last war, and then have them in just a year or two go down to $6 or $7.

Today there are unmistakable signs that another land boom is in the making. I don't need to take your time to describe the losses and the heartaches that followed in the wake of the land boom of the last war. The Government is still trying to help people and institutions recover from that crash. What are we doing about the present land boom which can be even more devastating? Thus far we have done nothing but talk about it, and not even enough of that. There are some measures, such as a stiff capital gains tax on the profits of farm sales and the limitation of credit, which would help to hold the boom down, but apparently there aren't enough people aroused to bring about such action.

In the coming weeks, Congress is faced with the task of making one of the most important legislative decisions of the war and post-war period. On June 30, the Price Control Act expires. Between now and then, the people, through their legislative representatives, must not only decide the question of renewing the act, but also the kind of bill to be adopted in replacing the present act.

I think it is fair to say that the majority of us are overwhelmingly in favor of continuing these price-control measures. At the same time, I think it is fair to say that the majority of us would like to see some amendments to the present act. In the minds of those persons proposing them, the amendments are only fair and necessary. However, if we start to amend this act so that it will be acceptable to everyone, it will be a price-control act in name only. And there is utterly no use in passing a price control act unless it is going to control prices.

Perhaps the reason we hear complaints about the one we have now is because it is effective. Many of these complaints we hear are based not so much on the harshness of the act itself, but on what appear to be inequities. In the course of a week's time you can, if you wish, become completely convinced that the present act is unfair to labor, or agriculture, or industry—or any two of the three. And since the act is a creation of human beings, it does have its weaknesses. By and large, however, it has done a most effective job. Comparing prices in this war period with those of World War No. 1 proves that. Our price-control measures have not only made it possible for us to provide wartime necessities for our families at reasonable prices but they have also contributed importantly in holding down the cost of the war itself. Mr. Bowles has estimated that if it had not been for the Price Control Act our war costs would be $65,000,000,000 more than they are now.

Enactment of an uneffective price-control measure at this time would do three things: (1) It would increase the cost of living; (2) it would increase the cost of the war; and (3) it would seriously disrupt the distribution of food and other civilian wartime necessities. Inflation feeds on itself. Increases prices cause hoarding and reluctance to sell. That, in turn, creates still higher prices.

Furthermore, any measure which fails really to hold the line on inflation would seriously jeopardize some of our great American institutions. Insurance companies and other institutions of public trust would find their investments depreciating and at the same time find insurance less attractive to a public which sees its money constantly losing value.

This is a matter in which you must take a deep interest. You must keep yourself informed and keep your policyholders informed. It is one of the most critical issues in our history. Because it means so much to everyone now and in the future, let us make price control more effective rather than less effective. Let's hold the line while our boys are whipping the Nazis and the Japs. We should do it for their sake if for no other reason. Inflation now means post-war misery for everyone, and farmers in particular.

I suspect I have left the impression that I am very much concerned about agriculture in the post-war period. I am. Maybe you think I have overemphasized some of the difficulties that lie ahead. I don't think I have. I tried to describe them as I see them, not as I wished they were. As a matter of fact, the potential difficulties I described were based on the assumption that we would find a solution to our old problem of unemployment and underconsumption. If we should fail to do that—and we have to recognize that there's no positive assurance that we will find a solution—well, I don't know how much worse the farm-economic problem would be than what I have described as a possibility.

Again, I want to call attention to the fact that none of the problems I have referred to are new. But I am afraid they are potentially more difficult than they have been in the past. However, I think we can whip them if we really try. We have had a lot of experience with these problems. We know some remedies are practical and some are not. We have learned that we have to weigh the cost of doing something effective against the cost involved in the waste and loss of doing nothing.

For instance, I think we ought to know now that one of the greatest wastes in the world is permitting human hands to be idle when we have the resources to produce things people need. We surely can agree that increasing consumption to support prices is not only cheaper but more humanitarian than restricting production to support prices. That should go for industry and labor as well as for agriculture, of course.

Above all, I hope we have learned that, after all, most of our problems are man-made problems and therefore they can be overcome by our own actions. These actions call for hard thinking, careful planning, unselfish leadership, and a resolute will to do the job.

The Real Isolationists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick, of April 14, 1944:

THE REAL ISOLATIONISTS

The term "isolationist" should not be used in a criminating manner. Many of those who now apply it derisively were isolationists themselves before Pearl Harbor. Even after it was seen that war in Europe was inevitable no one stressed neutrality more than President Roosevelt. There was also general agreement on the cash-and-carry plan of sales of war materials to the European nations likely to become embroiled. This was isolationism.

Our idea of the real isolationist is the man who refused to recognize the imminence of this war and who did not add his voice to the demand that we build up an army and navy sufficiently large to meet the challenge of Nazi Germany or warlike Japan. Rather than take protective measures we allowed ourselves to be bullied by the Communists and labor leaders, the New Dealers, and the rest of the radicals who fought military preparedness as if it were a pestilence.

We sank billions of dollars in power dams, we wrangled over Muscle Shoals, and we spent more billions for unemployment relief, but we let Japan outbuild our Navy, we shipped her oil and scrap, and about the only army we had was the National Guard. If the pursuit of these policies was not isolationism what was it?

Isolationism has been the curse of the past decade. Surely, Ambassador Grew knew what Japan was preparing for. If he conveyed his fears to the State Department, and the State Department in turn conveyed them to the President, why were the facts not laid before Congress and appropriations urged for an army and navy great enough to preserve world peace?

The ostrich-like policies of Britain, France, and Russia might have lulled us into a false sense of security, but where were the eyes of our ambassadors and ministers? Or were they merely rich men enamored of the glitter of the European capitals who had won their posts through fat contributions to Democratic campaign funds?

The world is in the mess it is today because the democratic nations refused to read the danger signals. Our Government was playing power politics. Our managing politicians were more interested in their own security than they were in the Nation's safety.

These men were the true isolationists. At one time we had upward of 300,000 young men in the Civilian Conservation Corps. When the suggestion was made that these boys should get some military training what a howl went up. The radical friends of the administration wanted nothing that would smack of militarism, while Hitler was training every youth in Germany for that purpose and Japan was fortifying every island in the Southwest Pacific.

The French were swayed by Blum and his Popular front, the British by Bevin and his professional agitators, and the Americans by the Lewises, Greens, Murrays, Hillmans, and Dubinskys—by the leaders of the pressure groups who had millions of votes to sell for Government favors.

Certainly the use of "isolationist" as a term of opprobrium does not come with good grace from those who refused to see the war trends in Europe and Asia and who waited until we were attacked before they began to prepare for war.

Farm Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that at least 98 percent of the farmers of the United States are aware of the much greater returns they have received for their 1943 crops which approximated four times as much as they received in 1931, 1932, and 1933. I observed an article appearing in the Chicago Sun, bearing on farmers' income which shows that in 1943 it was in excess of $19,000,000,000—an increase of $5,000,000,000 over their 1942 income. The predictions are that 1944 will be still more prosperous for them. I insert the article under the leave given me and I urge the farmers to read it and to give credit where credit is due:

FARMERS' CASH INCOME IN 1943 SOARED TO ALL-TIME RECORD

Farmers' cash income in 1943 soared to an all-time high of $19,764,560,000—$3,684,752,000 more than in 1942—and revised estimates of cash income from livestock may push the total increase over 1942 to better than $5,000,000,000, Agriculture Department sources said today.

Th cash return to farmers last year was the largest on record and 23 percent higher than a year earlier when $16,079,808,000 was earned, a Bureau of Agricultural Economics report showed. The total figures include Government payments.

Income to farmers in 1943, after deducting labor and other costs, was estimated at $12,475,000,000, compared with $9,480,000,000 in 1942, a 32 percent increase, the department said.

"Marketing of the largest number of hogs in the history of the country and the sale of increased numbers of eggs from larger flocks accounted for most of the advance in income," B. A. E. said.

"The record potato crop in Maine, favorable prices for tobacco in Connecticut, exceptional crops of citrus fruits in Florida, both in 1942 and 1943, and the valuable crop of vegetables in Arizona went a long way in bringing about the increases in receipts from crops in 1943 of well over 60 percent as compared with 1942."

One source pointed out that the $19,764,560,000 figure may be increased by another $2,000,000,000 when revisions are made in the near future on 1943 livestock marketings.

Thomas E. Dewey Belies the Title of "The Sphinx of Albany"—He Makes His Position Clear on Domestic and Foreign Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, we Americans frequently develop misconceptions and form false conclusions simply because we hear or read statements which are not based upon fact but which are accepted as factual only because they are so frequently repeated and so widely circulated. In connection with the prospective nomination of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey as Republican candidate for President, many Americans are in danger of forming erroneous conclusions solely because so many ill-founded and fictitious statements have been bandied around by careless writers and speakers to the effect that the attitudes and policies of Tom Dewey are not known to the electorate of this Republic. The truth is, however, that better than any other potential candidate for President on either ticket the policies and program of Tom Dewey have been made clearly available to the general public both by the spoken and written word and by his definite actions as Governor of the State of New York.

The following article by Gould Lincoln, taken from Sunday's issue of the Washington Star, provides informative, albeit partial, summary of Governor Dewey's attitudes on matters of public policy of importance to this Republic.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Tom Dewey is also author of a book which sets forth his position with crystal clarity. That book is The Case Against the New Deal, and it is published by Harper Brothers, of New York City.

In view of the fact that from his own book, from his various speeches, from his official acts and declarations as Governor of New York, and from many, many interviews with the press the attitudes and policies of Governor Dewey have become widely known, it is a bit surprising to read so much in certain metropolitan newspapers and in the columns of pro-New Deal columnists to the effect that Governor Dewey should now announce himself as a candidate for President and begin an extensive speaking campaign setting forth his stand on public questions. In my opinion, Tom Dewey is wise in not permitting himself to be stampeded from his consistent position in which he has said he will not become a candidate for the Republican nomination and in which it is clear that as a good American he will accept the Republican nomination and head the campaign for his election if the convention selects him as the party nominee.

It might be noted in passing that the newspapermen and radio speakers who are now most articulate in urging Mr. Dewey to take time off from his many wartime duties as Governor of New York to start an active personal campaign for his own nomination are the self-same speakers and writers who were most active in advising Wendell Willkie the best procedures to follow in order to secure the Republican nomination. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the value of the advice and counsel of this self-appointed coterie of president-makers is not beyond suspect in view of the results which it obtained for Mr. Willkie. Having seen their suggestions adopted and followed by Mr. Willkie with such poor success, these persistent advisers are now offering them to other candidates. However, it would appear that Mr. Dewey as well as Governor Bricker, Harold Stassen, Douglas MacArthur, and others prominently mentioned for the Presidency, would do well to seek the counsel of political doctors whose prescriptions for the body politic have not brought the disastrous results procured by those offering the recommendations followed by Mr. Willkie.

We used to have an old-fashioned idea in America that when the office seeks the man, we secure our best Presidents. We also considered it good American procedure for a presidential candidate to run on the platform developed by his associates and himself at a national party convention. For a pre-convention presidential possibility to beg for the nomination too vigorously or to endeavor to impose his personal notions upon the party too violently is neither a dignified nor a successful formula to follow in persuading Republicans whom they should nominate for President. Tom Dewey is versed enough in American history and American traditions to realize the function that party government plays in America and to understand that one man domination of either the Republican Party or the people's Republic is something foreign to the basic features of the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress and the country will be interested in reading the interesting summary of Tom Dewey's attitudes prepared in the following article by Gould Lincoln. It reveals Tom Dewey as a man with definite convictions but he is not a man possessing a dictatorial complex.

THE SPHINX OF ALBANY SPEAKS FREELY—MANY ADDRESSES GIVE CLEAR PICTURE OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC VIEWS

(By Gould Lincoln)

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, leading probability for the Republican Presidential nomination, has been labeled "the Albany sphinx, the enigma of 1944." No one, so the charge goes, knows his opinions regarding the important issues of the day. No one knows what his own political plans are.

These are the moans of the Democrats—and of those Republicans who do not wish to see him nominated. Mr. Dewey is constantly importuned by them to say where he stands on public problems.

What does Dewey think about these issues? More important, what has he said about them?

Governor Dewey has never been a "pussyfooter." His opponents in past political fights have never found him reluctant to state his views or to strike hard. A perusal of his speeches, made during the last 2 years, his messages to the State legislature, and his statements to the press, reveal a careful study of both national and international issues and a searching knowledge of State affairs.

He is shown as a strong supporter of international collaboration for peace in the future. He is shown as a determined supporter of the war effort, wishing to press the war to final and complete victory. He is an ardent advocate of revival of State control of State affairs. He is an opponent of centralized power in Washington. His speeches and his record as Governor show him a progressive in the field of social security and in his attitude toward organized labor and management.

Here is what the New York Governor has said on important issues:

THE WAR EFFORT

From Governor Dewey's inaugural address, January 1, 1943:

"We are engaged in a savage war for survival. It is a war not merely of men and materials, but also a war of human faith. * * * In all things needed for the winning of the war we are united in unswerving loyalty to our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. We are united in our faith in freedom, in the ultimate triumph of justice and in the triumph of freemen under God. Shoulder to shoulder, with every resource at our command, we shall carry on the fight to total and lasting victory."

From Governor Dewey's annual message to the legislature January 5, 1944:

"Since we last met, the armed forces of our country and our allies have made great strides on the road toward victory. * * * I have absolute confidence that this precious unity will continue and grow even stronger as we enter the final, desperate stages of this dreadful conflict and that victory will surely and before too long rest on the arms of the free people of the world."

From Governor Dewey's speech to the Republican women Saturday, May 9, 1942:

"We shall win the war and then we must win the peace. For as the most powerful of nations, we have learned that power begets responsibility. Never again shall we forswear hard-won victory. * * *

"It will not do now, in my judgment, merely to voice again the aspirations that were shattered 20 years ago. The world has greatly changed since then. Even after the total victory, upon which we shall insist, it will be impossible to put back into their bottles the genii which have been released. National and racial aspirations, long subdued, have been awakened. The hopes of hundreds of millions of people all over the world are on the march. The victory at arms will not be the end, but only the beginning. * * *

"We know we can work together with other nations for war. We must work with other nations for peace. We know that when the freedom of one nation is destroyed the freedom of other nations is already in peril."

From an address by Governor Dewey to the Young Republican Clubs May 16, 1942:

"We cannot think about the future of America without considering the future of the world. On this subject there is need for hard-headed thinking. Every time we get into a war we tend to think only in terms of idealism. After the war we tend to think only in terms of domestic materialism.

MUST PLAY WORLD ROLE

"We cannot build the next peace on sentimentalism alone. We of America are tough-minded realists. We strive for a world where peace will endure not only for the welfare of the world, but for the elementary self-interest of every American. Unless our thinking includes that premise, the American people will reject it. And that must not occur again. We must use our industrial might with a full sense of responsibility. The young and vigorous America that will be reborn out of victory must play its part in building a peaceful world to come.

"No man can chart a blueprint of the future of the world. But any man who thinks of the suffering and horror of war must think with a clear and resolute mind and spirit about the future. Twice now the people of the United States have entered a major world war which they hoped to avoid. As a result our people should be determined that we must not continue this process of periodic sacrifice of the flower of youth. * * *

"We must meet from a human and understanding point of view the problem of the homeless Jews and other dispossessed peoples. We must meet constructively the legitimate desires of a free Polish people, a free Czechoslovakian people, a free Dutch, and free Belgian people, among others. We will deal, when the time comes, with a free France and we will recognize the aspirations of those great peoples of the human family—China and India."

From Governor Dewey's Lincoln Day dinner speech in New York, February 12, 1944:

"Anyone who gratuitiously raises so much as a doubt as to the unswerving determination of our party (Republican) to build a great peace trifles with the truth and with his country's future. I was present at Mackinac Island when the Republican Governors and Republican leaders in the Senate and House of Congress deliberated upon the principles which must guide us in bringing about a lasting peace. There was not one person present who was not moved by the tremendous opportunity to state the principles by which it was to be approached and inspired by what lies ahead of us as a Nation.

"It was that group of Republicans who drew the Mackinac charter, which was translated into action by our distinguished Secretary of State at Moscow. It was that result which was embodied in the Connally resolution, adopted by a bipartisan majority of the Senate. Here was the first concrete, constructive achievement in our foreign policy of the future and its framework was advanced by the Republican Party at Mackinac Island."

From an interview with Governor Dewey at Mackinac Island, September 5, 1943:

"It would be to our interest to have a military alliance with Great Britain after the war. The American people have never suffered such a shock as when they feared the British Navy might be seized by the Nazis in the summer of 1940. As a matter of fact, we have had a de facto alliance with Great Britain ever since the War of 1812."

LOOK TOWARD OTHERS

Governor Dewey added at the time he believed that eventually Russia and China should be included in the alliance.

From an excerpt of the 1942 New York Republican platform drafted by Governor Dewey himself:

"The United States must be prepared to undertake new obligations and responsibilities in the community of nations. We must cooperate with other nations to promote the widest international exchange of goods and services, to broaden access to raw materials, to achieve monetary and economic stability and thus discourage the rampant growth of nationalism and its spawn, economic and military aggression."

From an address by Governor Dewey in New York May 28, 1942:

"Assuming that the lease-lend debts will be canceled and that there is to be no repetition of the futile attempt to collect reparations in the form of money, there will still be difficult transfer problems. After the war we shall have to lease, lend and give both to our allies and to our defeated enemies, food, medical aid, machinery and equipment to rehabilitate their destitute peoples and rebuild their bomb-torn lands. But we cannot establish a sound post-war economy beyond the first period of emergency reconstruction on a basis of international charity. We must find means of exchanging with other nations the things they can use and the things we can use."

POST-WAR ECONOMY

From an address by Governor Dewey in New York, May 28, 1942.

"Our great danger may very well be that, having succeeded in suppressing, in part at least, a price inflation during the war, we may give way to a post-war inflation. I have already spoken of the reaction of the public to wartime controls. If the history of the last war is any guide, we may have strong popular insistence for throwing off all such controls and for getting 'back to normalcy.' That, rather than any business collapse, may be our test.

"If we suddenly discard all controls and give way to a post-war inflation we will have still another reaction. That revulsion may carry us, by another swing of the pendulum, far into a peacetime system of regulated economy. Our people will not want that, but there will be those who will point to the episode as conclusive proof that private, unplanned enterprise is incapable of giving us sustained employment except under the stimulus of war and the restraints of full Government control.

"I do not believe either swing is necessary. Neither is it necessary if the genius of American business which is producing to win the war starts now—today—to win the peace. * * *

AMERICANS NEVER GO BACK

"The American people never go backward. I do not believe in reverting to the theory of laissez faire, nor am I willing to go back to the nearer past and accept the creeping collectivism of the past few years.

"Facing the world ahead and recognizing the necessity of a Government active in promoting the best interests of individuals and individual enterprise, we should establish two principles at the base of such regulation.

"The first is that Government intervention must be of a character consistent with the American free-enterprise system. Its objective must be to widen—not restrict—individual economic opportunity. It must do this without any reservations as to its faith in private enterprise. In short it must promote fair trade and not treat trade as a thing to be tolerated.

"Second, in the administration of Government intervention in private business the personnel must be composed of those who believe in and understand both American workers and businessmen. This is impossible where a supreme qualification for holding public office seems to be complete innocence of any experience in the matter which is to be the subject of regulation. * * *

"Businessmen must learn to work with the Government. They must learn to think in terms of national well-being as well as in terms of their duty to their stockholders and to their partners."

LABOR

From Governor Dewey's annual message to the legislature January 6, 1943:

"In planning for the future we must make sure that we are preserving the rights of labor in accordance with the constitution and laws of the State of New York. Organized labor faces a difficult crisis in our country today. In large measure the functions of free collective bargaining have been superseded by regulations governing hours, wages, and conditions of employment, promulgated by the Federal Government. In total war this is probably inevitable. * * * The process we are witnessing with our own eyes here at home demonstrates the fundamental truth that there is no place for genuine collective bargaining in a regulated economy."

From Governor Dewey's address to the State industrial union October 30, 1943:

"In other States there have been large and dangerous strikes in the production of coal or airplanes and of vital parts of war machines. * * * But in New York State since the beginning of the war there has been a steady decline in the number of strikes. * * * There has not been a single major strike in our State this year. There are many reasons for this record. First and foremost is the striking patriotism of labor in our State. * * * Here is a record that says plainly that organized labor in New York State has come of age. * * * In New York the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively through agents of its own choosing is written into the constitution. It is part of our fundamental law. That is as it should be. In our modern society this right is as basic as freedom of speech or freedom of the press.

"RIGHTS BRING RESPONSIBILITIES

"Like every other human right, the right of collective bargaining carries with it responsibilities. The overwhelming majority of labor leaders clearly recognize those responsibilities. Unfortunately it is the few abuses of power which get attention while the honest day-to-day job is often taken for granted. It is true we still have labor organizations that are run along undemocratic lines. We still have instances of the misuse of union funds. * * * But there is no longer room for question of the vitality and essential character in our society of labor organization. We are developing a mature, responsible leadership in labor.

"Out of the sacrifices of this war we intend to create a better future. In the shaping of that future labor must of right have a big voice.

"Only a fool in management would wish to destroy the sense of security and usefulness which comes to workingmen when they are ably represented by honest labor leadership which believes in the American enterprise system. Such management would be digging its own grave.

"By the same token labor unions can never be destroyed from the outside. They can only fail if they fail to lend their united support to full production in a free society. We must—all of us—learn to marshal our full support for every single useful enterprise that is ready to produce goods and employ people."

SECURITY

From Governor Dewey's inaugural address January 1, 1943:

"The new administration of your State is committed to the proposition that our society must provide full employment through full production. We know that these objectives are attainable at a price, for twice within our generation they have been attained at the price of war. They must also be achieved in peace. * * *

"The State will have a duty constantly to adjust its social-welfare agencies and educational facilities to meet the special needs of a post-war community. * * *

"We seek security from the economic hazards of large-scale industrialization. But we cannot rely solely upon Government for that security."

From Governor Dewey's annual message to the legislature January 5, 1944:

"A more effective attack upon our present day and future responsibilities in the field of social security requires that we bring related activities in the field of social service into an effective working team and that we simplify our administrative machinery. * * *

"Medical care for persons who cannot provide it for themselves and their families continues to be one of the chief areas of unmet human need. This calls for cooperative action on the part of public administrators and private physicians to bring about a high order of medical care for the needy sick by the judicious use of tax funds and medical facilities."

From Governor Dewey's message to the legislature March 26, 1943:

"When I first addressed your honorable bodies at the opening of this session I called your attention to a long-standing evil which permitted the payment of as little as $900 per year to full-time employees of the State, and recommended an increase in such pay to a minimum of $1,200. By action of the legislature the $1,200 minimum has since become law."

SOLDIER VOTE

From Governor Dewey's message to the legislature, March 7, 1944:

"There is a perfectly simple solution to the problem. Every soldier can be provided with a ballot which will be valid under our Constitution. Any pretense of overburdening the military or transport services is a sham. Purported literature many times the weight of all the paper ballots under the plan I propose have been shipped regularly abroad at the direction of officials in Washington. Moreover, we have at last been able to find out what the authorities in Washington say they are willing to transport and the size and weight of the ballots I shall propose to you comply with their own specification. * * *

"Citizens who fight for their country have the right to vote. That right must be made effective. They are entitled to have that right free from partisan exploitation or perversion. They have a right to know that their vote will not be limited to some offices and denied as to others."

CENTRALIZATION AND BUREAUCRACY

From an address by Governor Dewey at the New York Herald-Tribune Forum November 17, 1943:

"Most of us are agreed that there must be a halt to the concentration of power in the national Government. That means we must stop leaning wholly upon the national Government. In the period ahead the States will be strong. They alone will have survived the war without overburdening debt. They express the vitality and resurgence of a free people. They are unafraid of the future. They are untrammeled by the weariness and defeatism that comes from the repeated fumbling of overcentralized government, which believed that this country was built to saturation in 1932.

FREE ENTERPRISE

From an address by Governor Dewey in New York October 1, 1943:

"The society which has completely abandoned all private enterprise, whether it be in business, education, or social service, cannot any longer claim to be a free society. The fellow over whose head government must, in all matters, hold a protective umbrella, is a frightened man, not a freeman. It is the frightened man who is the source and raw material for regimentation and totalitarianism."

From an address by Governor Dewey in New York, May 28, 1942:

"It is my firm conviction that we can meet these burdens and fulfill our future responsibilities as a free people and only under a system of free enterprise. But if we do not meet them well and fully under free enterprise the school of collectivist planners will surely be here to take over the job. And that will be the last chance of freemen to solve their own problems."

From an address by Governor Dewey in New York, May 9, 1942.

"Our factories are turning out the arms. Meanwhile the administration is busy putting into reverse, every economic concept it has preached for years. It used to tell us that our industrial plant was overbuilt. Now untold billions must be poured into construction of new plants. It used to tell us to borrow, spend, and consume. Now, it must warn us to save, conserve, and pay our debts. It used to promote inflation by adaptations of every device advocated from William Jennings Bryan to Dr. Townsend. Now it belatedly warns us against the terrible consequences of inflation. It used to tell us that we had too much food, and throttled its production. Now it must ration what it so long tried to destroy. It used to pillory industrial managers as public enemies. Now it calls upon them to save the Nation from disaster. These foolish, false prophets who could not plan for a war they said was inevitable would not plan for a new world."

AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

From Governor Dewey's address at the Governors' Conference, Columbus, June 22, 1943:

"No purpose would be served in analyzing the incredible deficiencies of the National Government in its 10-year campaign to restrict food production in the United States. We are just now reaping the harvest of these policies. But just as a sardonic final touch, we now find that out of the genius of the O. P. A. there was developed a theory that it would be a good idea to repeal the natural law of economics that corn and hog prices are tied together. The result is a ceiling price on corn at $1.05 at Chicago. Meanwhile the farmer can get $1.45 for the same corn right on the farm just by throwing it over the fence to his pigs."

From an address by Governor Dewey in New York, April 9, 1943:

"Under the stress of war we have relearned the obvious truth that no central government can solve at one time the problems of the Indiana corn grower and the New York potato grower or fruit grower. No power in Washington can fit into the same pattern the needs of the Colorado rancher and the Virginia tobacco grower. No set of national controls, however much they may be multiplied, can do anything but hinder total agricultural production."

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of my address given before the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Chicago, Ill., on Tuesday, March 21, 1944.

The matter referred to follows:

First, I want to thank my friends in the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association for honoring me with this manifestation of their gratitude for my services in promoting rural electrification throughout the country.

I regard my work in this respect as my greatest service to mankind. As I have said before, electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. It is the greatest servant humanity has ever known, and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford. It has been the dream of my life to have it placed in every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay; and I want to say here and now that regardless of the carping criticisms on the part of the real enemies of rural electrification, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is rendering a service in helping to defend and promote this program that simply cannot be overestimated. Their services recently in helping us to get the main provisions of the Rankin-Russell rural electrification bill incorporated in the Pace bill that was pending before the Committee on Agriculture, and which has now been reported and passed by the House with those amendments included, was one of the greatest services ever rendered to the farmers of this Nation.

These provisions reduce the rate of interest to the co-ops to 2 percent, extend the amortization period to a maximum of 35 years, take the ceiling off and leave the amount to be provided each year for rural electrification to the discretion of your Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

This will go far toward helping us to realize the goal of our program, the electrification of every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

I began this fight more than 10 years ago by organizing cooperative power associations in every county in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, and have pushed the program locally and nationally with all the energy I possessed. The result is that today I have one of the best electrified districts in America. It is true we have not reached all the farmers in every county, but we have a program in operation through which, when materials are again made available, we can, and we will, reach them all.

From a national standpoint our success has exceeded my fondest hopes of 10 years ago. At that time less than 10 percent of the farm homes of this country enjoyed the use of any electricity at all; while all the countries of western Europe had from 90 to 100 percent of their farms electrified. Even Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified; New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had more than 65 percent of her farms electrified.

Owing to the $40,000,000 limitation on the amount Congress was authorized to provide each year, we were so handicapped that we could not have electrified the farm homes of America in 50 years, without some relief from that restriction. In 1938 I forced through an amendment to a bill in Congress, on which all points of order had been waived, increasing the amount provided for rural electrification for the next fiscal year by $100,000,000, making a total of $140,000,000 available for the fiscal year 1939. Immediately the cause of rural electrification sprang into new life and leaped forward with such vigor that today, instead of 10 percent we have more than 40 percent of our farm homes electrified.

With the assistance of organizations such as yours, with the support of the individual independent farmers throughout the Nation, we expect to carry this drive onward until we reach them all.

When I came to Congress the American people were using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. This year they will use more than 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or five and one-half times as much as we used then.

I predict that within a reasonably short time after the close of this war we will be using anywhere from 500,000,000,000 to a trillion kilowatt-hours a year; and I want to see that the farmers get their pro rata share.

We have 230,000,000,000 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. I want to see that waterpower developed, harnessed, and used for the benefit of all the American people, and especially the American farmers.

Some time ago a Member of Congress is said to have accused us of trying to enslave the farmers of this country, intimating that we were trying to control them politically. I have heard a great deal of nonsense expressed in criticism of the rural electrification program, but I believe that was the limit. In the first place, this rural electrification program with its independent cooperative associations, controlled by the independent individual members themselves, is one of the greatest democratic movements of all times.

It would be absolutely impossible to control the votes of these farmers and their wives, even if anybody were stupid enough to undertake it. As for enslaving the farmers by imposing this program upon them, that suggestion is more stupid than the other.

Do we enslave the farmer by taking away from him the old brass lamp, or inducing him to discard it and light his home, his barn, and his outhouses with electricity?

Do we enslave the farm women of the country when we turn the old washpot bottom upward, or use it to feed the cows in, discard the old scrubboard and deprive her of the luxury of bowing down over it and wearing her life away scrubbing the family clothes, and substitute a modern washing machine that will do the same work for almost nothing, while she goes about her housework or attends to her other duties?

Do we enslave the farmer, or his wife and children, by doing away with the old oaken bucket with its long rope and creaking windlass, and enabling him to install a modern electric pump that supplies his home with water throughout, also his barn and his cattle in the pasture, for a few cents a month?

Do we enslave the farmer when we enable him to use a modern milking machine, with which he can milk four or five times as many cows as he could milk with his naked hands, and provide him with the facilities for operating a grade A dairy, which he could not do before?

Do we enslave the farmer and his wife and children when we make it possible for him to own and operate an electric refrigerator to preserve and keep fresh and wholesome the food his family needs, or provide cold storage facilities that enable him to save his own meat and other produce, instead of having to ship it to a processing plant 300 or 500 miles distant, and back, paying the freight both ways?

In a word, do we enslave the farmers of this country when we make it possible for them, through their own efforts, to take to their homes everything we have in the city except the noise and the city taxes?

If that is enslaving the farmers, please brand me as one of the greatest advocates of such slavery the world has ever known, for if I have my way, those facilities are going to be made available to every farmer in America, at rates so reasonable that it will not only be possible for him to pay them, but it will be economic folly not to do so.

Remember that our farm boys, those young men from the farm homes of every State in the Union and every section of every State, are today fighting the battles of this Nation on every contested front in the world. It is our duty not only to preserve American institutions against those radical elements that would tear them down; it is our duty not only to guarantee to those boys that when they come back home they will find the same flag flying at the same place, over the same institutions their fathers established; but it is also our duty to make it possible for them to go back to the farm and enjoy all the comforts and conveniences our modern civilization can provide—one of the greatest of which is an abundant supply of electricity at rates they can afford to pay.

When we shall have consummated this program, electrified America from coast to coast, even to the most remote precinct and the most isolated home, we will have laid the foundation for the future greatness of a country more powerful than the Athens of Pericles or the Rome of Augustus, more splendid than the France of Louis, or the England of Queen Elizabeth—one that will shower her blessings upon the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, and make this the greatest, the richest, the most desirable country the world has ever known.

Iraq's Contribution to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting statement compiled from Iraq Government official sources by Maj. Chefik Haddad, of the Iraq staff in Washington, setting forth the sacrifices this small and young nation is making for the successful prosecution of the war in which we are engaged.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since Iraq's entry into the war the activities of its national administration have been greatly expanded and coordinated with the war efforts of the United Nations in the Middle East.

Public security organizations, such as police, censorship, etc., have been enlarged in order to furnish the necessary protection for the large Allied forces stationed in Iraq, and for the immense supplies of war material that have been transported through the country en route to Russia. All expenses thus incurred by these organizations have been borne by the Iraq Government.

All telephone and telegraph installations have been placed at the disposal of Iraq's allies. Iraq has reduced civilian use of long distance and local lines to a minimum. Moreover, telephone communications with neighboring countries have been completely suspended for civilian purposes and handed over to the Allied military forces. Trunk lines, switchboards, instruments, wires, poles, and other equipment which the Iraq Government had in stock and on order for the much-needed expansion and maintenance of the country's communication system, have been made available to the military authorities together with the services of Iraq's engineers and workshops.

The ministry of education has made available to the Allies all the educational facilities and workshops of the manual training schools.

The ministry of social affairs has devised a labor program whereby military needs are being served most efficiently and with precedence to civilian requirements.

Iraq's public health department and hospitals have extended their services to the Allied troops and technicians stationed in Iraq.

LAND COMMUNICATIONS

The service of the public works department and its large, well-equipped workshops have been utilized exclusively for the construction and maintenance of war communications. Large stocks of irreplaceable materials owned by the department, such as steel and other metals, and originally intended for national needs, have been utilized to further the war effort of the United Nations.

Very stringent restrictions have been placed on civilian use of building materials so as to divert existing stocks for military purposes.

The entire railway system of Iraq (about 1,200 miles), together with its workshops, stocks of material, technical staff, etc., has been placed under the joint control of the Iraq Government and the British military. Maj. Gen. H. C. Smith, of the British Army, in a signed statement dated July 14, 1943, declared:

"These railways have readily supplied the British military forces with various materials, stores, equipment, etc., whenever these were required and have also extended to them facilities relating to the supply of electricity and water and repairs in the workshops. In addition, lands, sheds, buildings, etc., the property of the railways which the British forces needed for their purposes have been placed at their disposal. The provision of such facilities and the extension of assistance of this nature will be continued by this Administration whenever and as long as they are required.

"It may not be out of place to mention here that the demands of the British military authorities have placed a heavy strain upon the various services of these railways, especially upon traffic operations and this Administration is gratified to place on record the fact that all staff, both Iraq and non-Iraq, have risen to the occasion and by their unstinted exertions have enabled this Administration to cope adequately and expeditiously with the increased military traffic and other requirements.

"H. C. SMITH, *Major General.*"

All of Iraq's existing roads have been used gratuitously by the armies of the United Nations. Many new highways have been constructed and large expenditures made for the strengthening of bridges and other overpasses in order to carry the exceptionally heavy traffic. All motor and animal transport has been requisitioned for military purposes.

WATER COMMUNICATIONS

River steamers and crafts, inland port installations and waterways have been handed over to the military, leaving a minimum of facilities available for civilian use.

The Port of Basra with its grounds and equipment, which includes electrical power and water purification plants, roads, airdromes, hangars, residential quarters, rest houses and clubs, has been made available for the use of British and other allied nations even to the exclusion of commercial traffic.

Civilian employees of the port have been evacuated in order to provide living quarters for the military. The plants have been enlarged so as to supply Allied troops with electricity and safe drinking water. Large tracts of ground owned by the port have been allotted to the Allied military authorities for the construction of building and camps.

Among major works carried out by the port technicians have been—

(a) Construction of two deep-sea berths.

(b) Construction of berths for discharge of lighters.

(c) Surfacing of areas for storage purposes.

(d) Erection of additional quay cranes.

AIR COMMUNICATIONS

All Iraq's air communication facilities such as airports, landing fields, hangars, workshops and equipment, have been handed over to the Allied military forces for their exclusive use.

IRRIGATION

Flood control: The department of irrigation has had to give full protection to the country's strategic communications, to the large areas occupied by the armies of the United Nations and to numerous storage installations housing valuable stocks of war materials. The building and reinforcing of river bunds and other protective earthworks such as diversionary outlets, sluices, and gateways has necessitated a 50 percent increase in the department's engineering staff and an increase of over 400 percent in its labor force. The available stocks of building material, originally intended for the expansion of irrigation, in accordance with Iraq's plan for economic development, have been used almost entirely for military purposes.

Canal construction: To promote production of foodstuffs, the Government has had to hasten the completion of canals which

were under construction and to open new ones with the object of increasing the arable areas by about 30 percent.

Clearance of silt: Before the war, individual farmers were responsible for the clearance of silt from canals passing through their lands, but now all irrigation canals are being dredged by the government at its own expense. This has been done for the double purpose of keeping farm labor at its productive occupations and to insure an even flow of water so as to irrigate all available land. The department of irrigation has had to meet these very costly undertakings from Government funds.

AGRICULTURE

Though essentially an agricultural country, Iraq has had to increase its yearly exports of foodstuffs so as to relieve the food supply crisis faced by the United Nations in the Middle East. The following steps have been taken:

(a) Control of foodstuffs at their source of production and Government requisitioning of all agricultural products at fixed prices.

(b) Distribution of free seeds to farmers.

(c) Expansion of the organization by the department of agriculture of an antipest campaign.

(d) Government provision of credit facilities and financial loans to farmers.

As a result of the above measures taken by the departments of irrigation and agriculture toward the war effort, Iraq has succeeded in increasing its exportable quantities of foodstuffs by 50 percent. This increase was made available to the Allies—

1. Through the Middle East supply center for distribution to both the military and civilian populations of the countries surrounding Iraq, and to the war refugees stationed in Iraq (about 200,000).

2. Through local contractors to the large armed forces and technicians stationed in Iraq itself.

MILITARY EFFORT

For reasons of security, Iraq's military efforts cannot be divulged except for the fact that all ordnance factories belonging to the Iraq Army and its contractors as well as its military installations have been gratuitously placed at the disposal of its allies.

The following are a few of the additional noteworthy sacrifices made by Iraq to further the war effort.

Clothes have been rationed as well as essential imported foodstuffs, such as sugar.

Houses have been requisitioned and occupied, the tenants have been evicted so as to provide housing for the military.

Allied military forces have been allowed to use government-owned land for camping and other purposes free of rent.

A control of foreign exchange was imposed so as to make Iraq a member of the sterling area.

The Government of Iraq has levied no customs duty or impost on the huge quantities of war materials imported into the country or transported over its highways and railways to neighboring countries. Nor has the government collected income tax from either civilian or military members of Allied Nations who are stationed in Iraq and engaged in the war effort.

Surplus production of wool, cotton, and dates (150,000 tons yearly), oil seeds, etc., are entirely used for the war effort and have been exported for that purpose under control at low fixed prices.

CONCLUSION

It is evident from the foregoing that the people and government of Iraq recognized the importance of the geographic and strategic position of that country and in their effort to help their allies in the common cause, the country's national economy has been severely disrupted.

Every material and installation connected directly or indirectly with transportation and communication services has been strained to the utmost in order to handle the hundreds of thousands of tons of military equipment, and in rendering the various services required for the efficiency of the Allied armed forces stationed in Iraq and the surrounding countries.

A very large portion of the Nation's various installations such as: Port machinery, rails, engines, workshop machineries, telephonic and telegraphic equipment, electric and water purification plants, etc., will need replacement at the end of the war. The various stocks of materials which had been intended for national requirements and diverted to the war effort will have to be replaced.

Not only will the cost of these replacements after the war be more than their original value but as no customs or other revenues have been collected on anything connected with the war effort from which a reserve fund could have been built up, the Nation will have to face a tremendous tax burden in the post-war period. And during that period both the economic and social requirements of the country will be handicapped.

Customs revenue formed 54 percent of the budget before the war and now it has dropped to 44 percent, the deficit has to be made up by increased taxation.

It is estimated that about 35 to 40 percent of the labor available in Iraq has been used for unproductive military purposes and this will have its repercussion on the national income in the years to come. The high wages paid to labor for war work has drawn manpower from the shepherd tribes and cattle breeders and has retarded the land settlement movement. Thus, the supply of farm labor has become short.

Except for dates, Iraq did not export vegetables or fruits. These were cultivated in quantities just sufficient to supply the country's requirements. The large Allied forces and refugees stationed in the country were allowed to buy vegetables and fruits without restriction. This condition decreased the supplies available to Iraquis and has caused a very sharp rise in the cost of living.

When one considers that the population of Iraq is only about 5,250,000 people and that the national income is comparatively low, it is obvious that Iraq's citizens are rapidly incurring a per capita tax burden which may bring them dangerously near the border line of economic disaster. And this is being done knowingly and in a sincere cooperative spirit by the Iraqi Nation.

Indeed a creditable effort on the part of a 20-year-old nation!

Prelude to Peace—Address by Senator Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL D. JACKSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Prelude to Peace," delivered by me at the seventy-fourth anniversary banquet celebration of Perry Lodge, F. and A. M., Marysville, Pa., on Thursday, March 16, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

William Lyon Phelps is accredited with a report that there appears on a tombstone, dated 1440, in Essex, England, the following verse, predicting the motion picture, the submarine, the airplane, and the war:

"When pictures look alive with movement free,
When ships like fishes swim beneath the sea,
When men outstripping birds, shall scan the sky,
Then half the world deep drenched in blood shall lie."

As to the power of prophecy or the wisdom of the author of this quatrain, I have no concern. But why could not he have said:

"When pictures look alive with movement free,
When ships like fishes swim beneath the sea,
When men outstripping birds shall scan the sky,
Then all the world in blessed peace shall lie."

Is it of the very essence of this world that 504 years of man's mastery of invention must be accompanied inevitably by war? In spite of our enlightened hope for a just and durable Christian peace, must we submit 504 years from now to more war? I do not believe it.

As to how man may acquire this durable and permanent peace, that is, the structure of his permanent peace plans, is a political problem which I do not desire to discuss here. Whether or not he must have peace is the moral question with which I am concerned this evening. Man needs peace more than he needs a narrow nationalism, just as he needs religion more than prosperity.

Before erecting the structure of peace programs, the world must have the conviction that mankind is worth the price we shall have to pay for peace. First, then, whether man is worth saving is a problem, the answer to which constitutes this prelude to peace.

Our race will live upon its faith in this worth of man, or assuredly it will perish.

Man must have, cherish, and defend this faith or forfeit his hope and right to persist.

Holy Writ brings us the assurance that God created man in his own image—as the Psalmist said, "a little lower than the angels, and crowned him with glory and honor." Shakespeare marveled, "What a piece of work is man," he exclaimed.

Matthew Arnold says the race of man has long fed on boundless hopes and has angrily spurned all simpler fare.

To be rational and consistent, we either must believe dynamically in the value of man or prepare our minds to assume a slow and painless process of race extinction. If we are indeed no more than a burned-out match in the midst of a black and dismal void, why should we not let it go at that, cool into dead ashes, and let the endless night rains wash these into the crevies of oblivion. No, He who created man never intended for him such an ignoble and futile end, such a nameless destination.

Suppose in some cosmic court, having jurisdiction throughout the whole of the created realm, some interplanetary indictment were brought, calling into question the actual deserts of man upon the earth, based on the record of his history. Suppose that you and I were called upon as citizens of this planet to defend not only "all that tread the globe," but also all "the tribes that slumber in its bosom." What writer of unanswerable briefs would we scurry to retain to aid us as solicitor; what silver tongue, what Paul, Demosthenes, or Bryan to serve as advocate.

Most assuredly our client will be accused of brutality, stupidity, greed, littleness, super-

stitution, arrogance, vulgarity, injustice, corruption, degredation, moral disintegration, and cowardice. The naked charge, apart from the specifications which will follow, is so overwhelming at first blush as to almost persuade us to assume the burden of the proof that man on the contrary is kind, intelligent, unselfish, magnanimous, tolerant, humble, pure, honest, significant, vital, and heroic.

Even as we stand there and hear the charges read, there will break through upon our senses—adding a flush of terror to bewilderment—the recollection of the wrongs that plagued the melancholy Dane.

When our ears have been filled to overflowing, when they have heard all they have capacity to listen to, impish memory from within will whisper these words of Hamlet:

"* * * the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely
The pangs of despised love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns,
That patient merit of the unworthy takes
* * *."

In support of the presentment, as specifications, there will be paraded across the pages of the true bill each felon, zealot, traitor, bigot, and drunkard—the thankless child, the thoughtless parent, the slaver, the imbecile, the tyrant, and all the diseased of mind and body. The facts will be alleged, recounting the children's crusades the fall of Rome, the slaughter of the innocents, the smelling flesh of witches burning, Negro slavery, anti-Semitism, Huns and vandals, both ancient and modern, of every kind, screams from dungeon chains, and the atrocities of all those who have stalked through blood to mount a throne.

Experts will be waiting there to give opinion evidence against us. These will be the defamers of mankind, the cynics, the iconoclasts, and the arrogant. We shall hear, probably, the apostrophe to man:

"Detestable race, continue to expunge yourself, die out;
Breed faster, crowd, encroach, sing hymns, build bombing airplanes; * * *
Convert again into explosives the bewildered ammonia and the distracted cellulose;
Convert again into putrescent matter drawing flies,
The hopeful bodies of the young; * * *
Breed, crowd, encroach, expand, expunge yourself, die out,
Homo called sapiens."

Indeed we must admit that if we were to go this day upon such an errant of defense, we should have to be careful to wash our hands, clean our shoes, and put on fresh counsel robes, lest the very tribunes of the sky smell the sticky stench of human blood.

We should have to be in good voice and hold rapt attention, lest there be heard away up there the agonizing cries of children begging for crusts to stem the pangs of hunger.

Alas, why did that loved and loving Scotchman have to write:

"Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn."

They will quote it against us, citing volume, page, and line. But the significant part of that quotation is that man can mourn and man does mourn. We take heart. Out of the salty residue of tears there spring the triple alchemies—remorse, aspiration, and resolution—transmuting indifference into charity, hate into love, ineritia into action.

Let us anticipate the case, counsel upon the measure of our proof, and shape the rough outlines of argument.

The infamous house painter of Austria—more cruel than Genghis Khan, more ambitious than Napoleon—bartered all that was high and good of the German people to launch the minions and mechanics of offensive war. He conquered guiltless Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Denmark, denuded their fields, emptied their granaries, and stole their factories. A part of the peoples of these dozen nations he ordered massacred by his secret agents, the bleeding remnants he chained to his chariot. The myth of his invincibility was feasted and glutted upon the whole of Europe's colossal industrial capacity.

The Jap—master of long-range planning, precise execution, and aggression on a grandiose scale—pursued his national jujitsu to that day of infamy, that day of the great treachery, that changed Pearl Harbor from a place to a date. It overtaxes the finite mind to try to comprehend the ruthless destruction in the cruel onslaught of these two powers.

But here is patient China, trading space for time and numbers for future opportunity. Here is England, with quiet fortitude, holding on until blue birds over the white cliffs of Dover, the shepherd's flock, and Jimmie sleeping in his own little room again, form a sweet sentiment wherever men love liberty and would die for freedom. Here, just yesterday, emerging out of almost hopeless darkness, are the Russian masses, with a power of resistance, a will to defend, an organizational ability, a new generalship—and now the counter assault—which make all free men want to bend the knee in gratitude.

Towering above all this, behold the growing soul of America. Before December 1941, the blood surging in the streets of Stalingrad was seeping down Pennsylvania Avenue from Capitol Hill to the White House. An attentive ear could hear the whir of Zero planes above the gray clouds over Washington. A watchful eye could see the haughty, shiny boots of the Gestapo, clicking in the streets of your city. But the majestic will of our one hundred forty millions stands between us and the shadow of the swastika. Now we are on the march on every continent. We are on every ocean. We are in the air everywhere. We have written an Atlantic Charter. We have stated "four freedoms."

Does not our willingness to assume and endure the countless hells of war in order to extirpate the tyrant's ills, far outweigh these evils we are seeking to destroy? Does not our determination to preserve the freedoms for man expunge the curse of those who would take these freedoms from him? Who ever can find it in his heart to answer "No" is a philosophic Nazi. He should take a comfortable refuge in the company of mankind's moral debits—no asset to the brotherhood of man. He will find no asylum in the company of the valiant sons of men who give their lives to see to it that right shall not be forever on the scaffold and wrong forever on the throne.

But enough of man's invention, war; he also invented music. With the brush upon the canvas, the chisel on the stone, genius finds nobility in the innermost nature of things, and calls it forth, thereby awakening the soul of man. Awhile ago I sat before a symphony orchestra and heard again the beautiful Blue Danube Waltz. I saw the bright children of the morning's sun dancing on the bend of the river. I pushed off and floated on the current of the stream. I felt its broad meandering sweeps and its slower movements. Each changing moment brought me hours of shifting scenes—of valley, field, mountain, wave, and glassy stillness. All this was without an effort, free from ugly and mundane realities I know are there. I believe I was filled with more enrapturing delight in the craft of my imagination than if I had been aboard a real one on the muddy river itself. Why? Because one time, nearly a century ago, a young Austrian named Johann Strauss labored and struggled, with this as his only hope of reward—that he might speak beautifully to men, women, and children he would never know; that he might be able to talk to future generations out of their yesterdays with tone and harmony and melody.

I stood before the Lincoln Memorial. No one can feel just the same sense of quiet dignity unless he stands there in what William Howard Taft called the whole sacred place. I looked at the figure of the great President. Around me were his words. I could feel the power of his justice, truth, patience, mercy, simplicity, humility, self-abnegation. The sculptor had worked with shapeless stone, and had fashioned a figure of such artistic perfection that it made me feel an overwhelming sense of the presence of the Great Emancipator softly saying, "With malice toward none, with charity for all." Because of the great skill and labor of this artist, whose wage I have never paid, and never shall pay, there descended upon me the dual blessing of the sculptor and the man.

The yellowing scrolls of history disclose the tenacity with which the human race survives. Famine, pestilence, earthquake, and fire work their devastation in their several seasons, but over them all rolls the great river of humanity. All the cancerous growths of innate lust feed upon the heart of man to discourage him. He falters, stumbles, and falls, but he is up again in the morning. Throughout the ages he has sometimes sloshed along in the morass. His boots sometimes pound out a firm staccato upon the flinty path. He is sometimes up and sometimes down. But patience always guides his face aloft again, and hope forever swings his eyelids toward the sunny hilltop. The poet, Edna St. Vincent Millay, who calls upon detestable man to expunge himself, would have to admit upon cross-examination that she also wrote how man met the earthquake:

"* * * he heard the sick earth groan * * *
Rolling its pitchy lake of scalding stone
Upon his house * * *
Where did he weep? * * * with his head between his knees?
Where said the race of man, * * * 'let me freeze'?
By nightfall he has built another town * * *

And how he met the flood:

"The broken dike * * *
And nothing left but floating disarray
* * * was this the day
Man dropped * * *
And died * * *
His burden heavier than a quilt of clay?
No, * * *
Above his garden faintly glimmering yet * * *
There bulked the plough * * *."

Surely some ancient graybeard will interject that we have stoned our prophets. Yes, the centuries have stoned their prophets, but the later generations of their offspring worship at their shrines. Our Presidents, whose only cause has been that of liberty and justice, we have maligned and persecuted with cunning, hate, and fury, but the future ages of our children will look upon their faces in Mount Rushmore and call them blessed.

Thomas Paine may speak up to declare that our governments are imperfect. Our country, it is true, has never met his standard of perfect government. We cannot say:

"My poor are happy, neither ignorance nor distress is to be found among them, my jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars, the aged are not in want, the taxes are not oppressive. The rational world is my friend because I am a friend of its happiness."

But experiments in democracy have brought man nearer to that goal than he ever has been in all his history under any other form of government. More than that, as men in their religious concepts think less and less of the other great nations as their enemies, they come to regard them all as potential

allies against a common foe, materialism, and greed.

They will remind us of the Negro. Has not the blood so freely volunteered upon the battlefields of the War between the States, given to redeem the black man from his shackles, gone a long way to heal the stripes of slavery? Did not the lives of thousands—themselves without guilt—lives gladly laid upon the altar, expiate the wrong of those who took the Negro captive? Has not the later poverty and humiliation of those who were called the Negroes' masters paid some bit of interest on the debt? Have we not tried to wash away the last drop of blood drawn with the lash? Do we not now know and plan and teach according to the principle that unless we help the wretched we ourselves become degenerate?

Some astronomer may want to change the subject from ethics and morals to matters of man's relative importance, size, and achievement. He will demonstrate that our sun and moon and all the several companies and constellations of stars and planets as the layman sees them, taken as a composite whole, form but a speck in a universe; that this whole universe is but a pin point in a larger universe bringing to bear distances of millions of light years in their apartness. He will show that in the cosmos, containing universes of universes, our earth is but an infinitesimal rotating shadowy part of an almost dimensionless point. Another scientist asseverates most gravely that we who are the tiny inhabitants of this atom earth, small as we are, are retrogressing, even degenerating.

Our answer to this shall be that the bigness of things lies not in their physical size, and that the bigness of the human intellect, of the soul of men, matches the physical bigness of the creation. Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his essay on history, says man is greater than all the geography of the world. The retrogression and the degeneration we deny.

Let us imagine a minute worm munching on a weed in the midst of the sargasso seas. Suppose that by the employment of only its own potentialities, and by the aid of only the implements it finds at hand upon the stem on which it lives its puny life, it reaches out beyond its watery home. Assume that it comprehends the bursting of the continuous dawns around the globe, the heights of Tibet, the Valley of the Nile, the Aztec ruins, the New York sky line, thundering Niagara, undulating fields of ripened western grain, the slow digesting of the barks and ships of all the ages in the bellies of the seven seas, and the red sun resting on the blue pillow of the Pacific. The achievement of that worm would be no more phenomenal than the wonder of man's conquest of the illimitable creation about him. Man has taken the lightning from the sky and put it under heel. He has made slaves of all the forces of the land, the sea, the ether, and the air. The coordination and skill represented in a home run, a completed forward pass, and the precision of invented things challenge comparison with nature's physical perfections. Slowly but surely medicine and surgery, too, outwit and overcome the natural enemies of health.

Spiritually, physically, intellectually, man has indeed, as Milton said:

"* * * regained the lost Paradise and frustrated the conquest fraudulent."

We shall not be without the aid of testimony on our behalf. Out of eons of time and out of space ubiquitous will come our witnesses. One by one we shall call them to the stand, all those whose foreheads have felt the touch of divine power. There will be Moses with his tablets of stone; St. Francis of Assissi; all the pious popes; Martin Luther blazing a way for the Knoxes and the Calvins; Mrs. Bixby, of Boston; Confucius writing the laws of man's intrinsic nature; Helen Keller; Joan of Arc out of the fire; Woodrow Wilson, who saw the light of heaven shining on his blade; Socrates, draining the world's cup of death, returning it full of his wisdom; Father Damien and his lepers; Booker T. Washington; the Mrs. Minivers; Beethoven; Voltaire, with the "forest of minds" around him; Justice Brandeis; that pair of dreamers, Keats and Shelley; Jean Francois Millet with his gleaners, and under his arm the wooden shoes out of the Angelus; Thomas Jefferson, writing copybook maxims about governments of the people, by the people, and for the people for Thomas Lincoln's awkward boy and all the future statesmen of the world; the Mormons; the blind whose souls can see; Mary, Martha, Magdalene, and all their daughters; Capt. Colin Kelly.

We shall have witnesses, and to spare. Against blasphemies, we shall set off, "Peace on earth, good will to men." Against the felon we shall set off the just judge. Against ignorance we shall set off universities and schools, and the millions of patient teachers of the young. Against intolerance and superstition we shall set off the devout pulpits bearing on their backs like Atlases, the Holy Bible. Against cheapness and vulgarity we shall set off the Red Cross, and the unnumbered organizations not for profit, building character in men. Against corruption we shall set off the myriads of honest men whom the spoils of office cannot buy. Against avarice we shall set on the philosopher, the philanthropist, and that mud-spattered saint, the country doctor. Against selfishness we shall set off that neighborhood angel who assuages bereavement with a cherry pie.

We shall match Pilate with Paul; the Benedict Arnolds with the George Washingtons of the world; persecution with Easter. The darkness of those children's crusades we shall dispel with the altar fires of Asia, and a million lighted Christmas trees.

But the best to speak for us will be a lowly Jew. He has ragged wounds—of nails in His hands and feet; of thorns upon His head: of a spear in His side. The most persuasive and authoritative voice, the sweetest tongue of all time, with paradox, beatitude and parable will tell what He sees in man. As Dr. William Lowe Bryan of Indiana University said:

"* * * underneath the man of lust and murder and treachery, He saw another man who cannot be given up. He knew the passion of the prodigal, the passion which led Him from His father's house into every iniquity; but He also knew that in the prodigal there was a deeper passion which, if awakened, would lead him from among the swine back to the life where he belonged. He knew the disloyal cowardice of Peter, but He knew that below the cowardice and disloyalty there was a Peter who would stand like a rock in a storm. He looked out upon a jeering multitude, symbol of the vaster multitude who forever jeer and crucify the good. He believed in them. He saw what was in them. He saw through the darkness and through the whirlwind of evil passion the real multitude, whose deepest law, whose deepest necessity, is that they shall be loyal to each other and to their Father in Heaven."

So will He testify.

The trial begins today. We are arraigned. The court is ready. Let us fasten to our shoulders the royal purple and let it trail. Let us grasp and hold aloft the scepter. Let pomp prevail. Let trumpets sound. Let the heraldry proceed. We march with certain tread into and beyond the singing stars, each proclaiming as we go, in the words of Emerson:

"I am the owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Caesar's hand and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart and Shakespeare's strain."

The sheer audacity of our resolution will justify our claim and show of worth; and listening, those we leave behind shall hear like rolling thunder, the acclaiming verdict of eternity.

Having conquered the prelude to peace, man will have laid his foundations for peace. Then will he be ready for the architects of his future.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway. The editorial appeared in the St. Albans Messenger for April 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE FOR THE SEAWAY

Here in the north country are a number of small groups of men of long vision who have been working, year in and year out, for adoption of the St. Lawrence seaway project. In addition to the cheap power this development would afford, there has been the added attraction of the Champlain cut-off, the proposed development which would link Lake Champlain with one of the great inland waterways of the Western Hemisphere.

In opposition to these persons have been certain powerful industrial and financial interests. They have seen cheap power as a threat to their own swollen power, they believe that such progress would bring with it a natural breakdown of their control.

But to these small groups which have been able to see the glories of the future as they are linked to this gigantic construction proposal goes our sincere appreciation. We have seen the light of their wisdom. We know that the railroads would be given untold quantities of freight for their carriers; and the cheap power that would abound would entice many a manufacturer to open shop in the Green Mountain State.

It is because of this view of the one sure pathway to a prosperous future in Vermont that we hail the support now being given to the St. Lawrence seaway development by no less a person than Secretary of State Cordell Hull. The bill now before Congress, sponsored by and named for Vermont's Senator AIKEN, would create the seaway and hydroelectric project. No provision is made for the Champlain cut-off, but this development would naturally arise out of the other in a very few years—if once the larger project could be built. Then the public would see what benefits are inherent in large developments of this sort.

The Aiken bill, calling for an expenditure of $421,000,000, would permit a masterful undertaking—one overshadowing in history the Erie Canal and marking for the future a waterways course that would eventually lead from Burlington and St. Albans to the shores of Chicago and its great center for agricultural implements manufacture, to Detroit and the heart of the automobile industry, and to the massive grain elevators of Duluth.

Receipts by Farmers Under 1942 Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter and accompanying tables from the Department of Agriculture, showing the estimated gross payments, by States and commodities, under the 1942 agricultural conservation program.

There being no objection, the letter and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 1, 1944.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: In response to your request for the amount of money received by farmers under the 1942 agricultural conservation program in each State, we are enclosing a processed table entitled "Estimated Gross Payments, by States and Commodities—1942. Agricultural Conservation Program." Payments for each commodity and for conservation practices are shown separately as indicated, and the total for each State is shown in the last column.

If you desire additional information with respect to this or other phases of the program we shall be pleased to hear from you.

Very truly yours,

W. G. FINN,
Acting Chief.

Estimated gross payments,[1] by States and commodities—1942 agricultural conservation program

[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	Cotton	Corn	Wheat	Potatoes	Peanuts	Rice	Tobacco									Soil and range building	Naval stores	Total gross payments
							Flue-cured (11–14)	Fire-cured (21–24)	Burley (31)	Dark air-cured (35, 36)	Virginia (37)	Pennsylvania (41)	Cigar (42–44, 51–55)	Puerto Rico Cigar (46)	Georgia-Florida (62)			
Maine				848												590		1,438
New Hampshire				9									[2]			407		416
Vermont				9									[2]			993		1,002
Massachusetts				34									53			514		601
Rhode Island				13												57		70
Connecticut				50									119			323		492
New York			251	344									7			4,918		5,520
New Jersey			43	160												730		933
Pennsylvania		521	915	235								88				4,068		5,827
Northeast		521	1,209	1,702								88	179			12,600		16,299
Illinois	14	13,718	2,641	3					[2]	[2]			[2]			7,374		23,750
Indiana		5,990	2,073	14					55	2			[2]			4,166		12,300
Iowa		18,623	584	8												6,985		26,200
Michigan		651	1,243	255												5,026		7,175
Minnesota		5,791	1,927	186									4			5,192		13,100
Missouri	2,011	4,141	2,371	15					34							6,753		15,325
Nebraska		6,875	4,062	121												5,342		16,400
Ohio		4,893	2,624	64					67				81			4,596		12,325
South Dakota		1,557	2,387	21												5,860		9,825
Wisconsin		1,539	139	137									216			8,319		10,350
North Central	2,025	63,778	20,051	824					156	2			201			59,613		146,750
Delaware		74	130	2												320		526
Maryland		359	596	27												947		1,929
Virginia	213		417	121	121		375		70	199	14					3,106		4,636
West Virginia			94	4					12							1,842		1,952
North Carolina	4,183		161	74	186		2,809		50							4,913		12,376
Kentucky	91	475	338	9				384	1,434	228						6,176		9,135
Tennessee	3,582		267	10				410	381	38						4,840		9,528
East Central	8,069	908	2,003	247	307		3,184	794	1,947	465	14					22,144		40,082
Alabama	5,994		[2]	20	98		2		1							2,682	93	8,890
Arkansas	8,707		28	5	2	124			[2]							3,289		12,155
Florida	157			59	22		75								12	1,830	353	2,508
Georgia	6,105		23	3	167		354		[2]						1	2,957	745	10,355
Louisiana	4,411			39	2	181										1,616	3	6,252
Mississippi	10,794		[2]	2	[2]											3,203	32	14,031
Oklahoma	3,743		2,936	2	14											4,407		11,102
South Carolina	5,507		25	25	8		509		1							2,376	21	8,472
Texas	20,239		2,758	13	47	109										15,991		39,157
Southern	65,657		5,770	168	360	414	940		2						13	38,351	1,247	112,922
Arizona	1,154		27	2												552		1,735
California	2,605		696	158	1	80										4,856		8,396
Colorado			1,111	191												3,353		4,655
Idaho			1,679	398												1,400		3,477
Kansas	1	1,496	10,713	12					2							7,289		19,513
Montana			2,966	15												3,504		6,485
Nevada			25	3												150		178
New Mexico	656		210	3	1											1,721		2,591
North Dakota			6,836	196												5,155		12,187
Oregon			1,323	93												1,636		3,052
Utah			376	21												698		1,095
Washington			2,224	74												1,536		3,834
Wyoming			223	23												1,366		1,612
Western	4,416	1,496	28,409	1,189	2	80			2							33,216		68,810
Alaska																7		7
Hawaii						1										104		105
Puerto Rico														278		1,082		1,360
Insular						1								278		1,193		1,472
Total	80,167	66,703	57,442	4,130	669	495	4,124	794	2,107	467	14	88	480	278	13	167,117	1,247	386,335

[1] Includes amounts deducted for county association expenses.
[2] Less than $500.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Division of Special Programs, September 1943.

Winged Victory and Moss Hart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is, of course, a very obvious statement to say that there are many people in this country who are doing a good war job even though they are not in the thick of battle on the fighting fronts of the world.

I would add, of course, that people in political or public life are on the firing line all the time and that their lot is never an easy one.

However, it is my purpose today to advert briefly of the war contribution of one Moss Hart, noted playright, and author.

At the suggestion of officers of the Army Air Forces, Mr. Hart made a tour of many camps in the country where young American boys were being processed from raw recruits into perfect flying supermen.

He lived with the men in their barracks, got the real feel of the life of an Air Corps man and then went into comparative seclusion to write a play about the activities he has viewed with much enthusiasm.

He came up with Winged Victory which has been playing on Broadway in New York City for many months. Of course just writing the play was not all. There was the big task of finding the proper personnel in the Army to play the right stage roles and, of course, there were the off-stage functions to consider, too, such as box-office work, scenic design, and so on.

Needless to say Winged Victory has been a smash hit from the theatrical showman's viewpoint but it has also been a success from the angle of its broader purpose.

Hundreds of thousands of mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, and friends of men in our Air Force have gotten a sweet simple peek into the behind-the-scenes comedy, tragedy, human goings on that are part and parcel of the period during which Johnny Jones, bank clerk, or student, or apprentice lawyer, or farmer, is transformed as if by magic into Flier John Jones, out to smash the Axis, to preserve American democracy for the benefit of his country, his family, and all his loved ones.

I can say without fear of contradiction that this project would not have seen such success, may never have seen the light of day if it had not been for the creative work of Moss Hart. At the height of his career, he gave up one of his most productive years to his country so that Winged Victory would become a reality for the home-front folks to see, enjoy and know.

I take this opportunity of saluting Moss Hart as an outstanding figure on the home front for World War No. 2.

Address by Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before State Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the address delivered by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, at the annual conference of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on April 17, 1944.

This address represents, in my opinion, one of the outstanding analyses of the role which American labor is playing in the present conflict, and of the true nature of that conflict as it affects the institutions, the constitutional guaranties, and the freedoms for which America is now fighting.

Governor Martin, who himself enjoyed a distinguished military career in the Spanish-American War and the previous World War, is well qualified to make such a statement. He has made an outstanding record as Pennsylvania's war Governor, a record comparable to that of the late Andrew G. Curtin, the Civil War Governor of the State of Pennsylvania.

I commend this address to all those who are sincerely interested in a clear-cut and comprehensive statement of the true nature of America's society, and the contributions which that society is making during this war to the preservation of freedom and the rights of mankind throughout the world.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, 28 months ago America was at peace.

There was an abundance of food.

Goods were plentiful.

Our cities roared with night life and reckless spending and we were watching, as from a great distance, the war in Europe.

A national election had been held in which both parties pledged no interference in the war.

They said it was not our war.

We were planning new enterprises, considering new ideas in social security and moving toward finer educational standards.

The politically minded, ignoring a great and growing national debt, were making more and bigger governmental commitments.

How they were to be paid for nobody knew and few cared.

We all wanted to be let alone

Then on that fatal December Sunday morning came the infamous blow at Pearl Harbor.

We were stunned.

Those in authority minimized both the danger and the disaster.

The Nation tried to place the blame.

Men gathered, talked, reasoned, and worried.

Nothing resulted.

Then out of the past like a dream rose the real America.

The suffering at Valley Forge; the shame of the burning of Washington; the dead we left in Mexico; the hard marching, the terrible fighting, the hospitals of pain in the war between the States; the fever and hunger of the war with Spain; the long, dark nights, the days in the dugouts, and the years in the hospitals of World War No. 1—all these came back out of the national memory.

Then there appeared a fighting America; a dynamic America; a crusading America; the old America of the frontier.

All of our greatness in the crises of the past rose up before us.

Everything we had done became an inspiration.

A soft, easy going people, wishing only an undisturbed peace, suddenly became strong, terrible, determined, and aggressive.

Labor, agriculture, management, and government moved toward war.

Farmers produced more food.

Industry raised more capital.

Management sought ways and means.

Workmen gave their skill and their energy.

More plows turned more furrows.

More wheels of industry turned faster.

More men were training and hardening in camps and maneuver areas.

The sea and the air were filled with troops, and materials moving to fight in all parts of the world.

We were no longer on the defensive.

In the American way we were attacking.

In 2 years able management, abundance of capital, and skilled workers, backed by American will and enthusiasm, had done as much as Germany did in 9 years, Russia in 20, and Japan in 25.

We have made a great start, but there is much more to do.

We must have a united country.

We must work as hard as our men fight.

In the sixties, in the War between the States, there was sectional strife.

Now there is the menace of another kind of strife—of one group against another.

This is dangerous to our country.

This is no time for men to seek personal gain.

No man today should try to put personal ambition above the security of this Nation.

Real Americans must face this situation as real Americans faced the emergencies of the past.

Three hundred years ago strong men came to the western world in pursuit of happiness and security.

They landed in New England, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

They worked, endured, and prospered.

They moved westward.

They cleared the land, broke the prairies, built roads, bridged the rivers, erected homes, founded schools and churches, constituted government, and helped each other.

But at all times they kept their individual freedom.

They did not seek collective economic security for fear it would interfere with liberty.

To them the liberty to pursue happiness was the most precious thing in the world—for it meant freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and freedom of action.

Franklin said over 160 years ago:

"Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

During the Revolution they endangered their right of property and their very lives so that the right to pursue happiness might be guaranteed by a written constitution.

This has always been uppermost in the minds of real Americans.

It has made us the most progressive people of the world and, as a result, we have enjoyed the highest living standards in the history of the race.

This record made by this Nation is the world's greatest wonder.

We have had differences, but political class distinction has never entered our political, cultural, and religious life.

The War between the States was a sectional and economic quarrel.

It was followed by the flowering of the greatest economic period in the annals of any people.

Our system has grown until it is colossal.

It is interdependent.

We depend on one group for food; another for clothing; another for heat or light or water.

It is so complicated that the people entirely depend upon it.

Only government can see to it that these various agencies do their work.

A group in transportation cannot tie up heat, light, and water, for they are all int rdependent, and the lives of the people are menaced.

Other vital groups are in the same category.

Helpless people may die as a result of group action.

The rights of the people are always superior to the rights of an individual or a group.

This situation must be approached with courage, knowledge, and understanding, for the people are sovereign in the United States.

It is a job for each of us.

It will be unfortunate if the time ever comes in America when all of a certain group, class, or section belong to one political party.

We must not have a farm party or a labor party or a conservative party or a radical party or any political organization which can claim that all the people of one section or one group or one class are members.

If we want our free government to endure, each party should be a cross section of the whole country.

The difference in parties should be upon the question of governmental problems as a whole and not for one class or group.

It is the duty of all of us to see that every American is gainfully employed, but this cannot be done by force.

As we approach this problem, the ability of the individual must be considered.

The Almighty did not create every man to be a fine workman with tools, or a great executive, or a grower of crops.

Our social system should be so perfected that, as nearly as possible, each man may do the work he is best fitted to do and at a fair profit.

This will help in maintaining the high living standards this Nation has enjoyed for generations.

To work, to invest money, or be a candidate for office, no man must be forced to belong to a certain group, church, club, organization, or political party.

When that time comes, individual freedom is lost.

Any man may aspire to belong to an organization but he should not be forced to do so.

In America we believe in labor organizations, in their right to strike, and in their right to collective bargaining.

These rights, however, entail a public obligation.

If the leaders of labor in America fail to recognize this obligation, they may spel the destruction of organized labor in America, which will be detrimental to all of us.

We all want every American to earn a wage which will maintain the American standard of living.

The wage to do this depends upon economic conditions.

It should be high enough that savings can be made for the inevitable rainy day.

We want freedom from fear and freedom from want through our own efforts.

If we insure these freedoms in any other way, then our individual freedom that means everything to an American may be lost.

And now, as spring comes to the world, we know that bitter fighting confronts us and all our sons and that 1944 is the decisive year.

We know that we are making terrific sacrifices, that we are sending enormous quantities of material and millions of men overseas to preserve liberty. What is that liberty?

It is:

That we may meet as we like in our churches, our union halls, our lodge rooms, our clubrooms, and our great places of assembly.

That labor unions, veteran organizations, granges, Sunday schools, Boy Scouts, fraternal societies, and all other groups may parade and assemble in entire freedom.

That any of us may be candidates for office regardless of our position in life or what we may advocate, and that political groups shall be free from oppression.

That no government or organization may tell us what speeches we may hear, what music we may enjoy, or what pictures we may see.

These are the outward signs and visible symbols of what we are fighting and dying for, as we have in the past.

True liberty means that a man should not be kept from a job because he is denied membership in a union.

Union fees that are too high are bad.

Monopolies, either in capital or labor, are bad for America.

Both are un-American.

Monopolies made capital unpopular, and they can make labor unpopular.

We must always remember that in America the people are supreme.

Union officers represent the people just the same as public officials and the heads of corporations represent the people.

When big business threw smaller businessmen out of business, curbing legislation followed.

This can happen to labor.

Too many strikes are unpopular and against public policy.

It is up to labor to regulate such matters.

After Pearl Harbor labor pledged fewer strikes.

What is the record?

In November 1942 we had 144 strikes; and in November 1943 we had 300 strikes.

In November 1942 our strike-idle workers numbered about 52,000; and in November 1943 they numbered ten times as many.

In November 1942 we lost less than 130,000 man-days; but in November 1943 we lost the enormous total of nearly 3,000,000 man-days.

Doubtless there was merit on both sides of these arguments, but the enemy rejoices in them as a sign of weakness and disunity.

Too many accidents are crippling production.

The record shows:

War-front totals of casualties, from Pearl Harbor to January 1, 1944, according to the Office of War Information, were 32,078 killed, 45,595 wounded, 32,478 missing, and 29,707 prisoners.

Home-front accident totals from Pearl Harbor to January 1, 1944, according to the National Safety Council, were 190,000 killed and 18,500,000 injured.

Traffic accounted for 54,000 dead, and accidents in the home killed 63,500.

There is no comfort for ourselves and our allies in these accidental dead and wounded.

A casualty on the home front hinders victory.

An absentee in a plant is as hurtful as the man who fails to report on the fighting front.

Whether the absentee will admit it or not, he is prolonging the war.

This is the war of every one of our more than 130,000,000 Americans.

We can, as General Eisenhower says, win it in 1944 if every American on the home front does his duty.

We are winning, but the advance is so slow that effort must be renewed.

Production must not lag.

Food, transportation, rifles, planes, tanks, all the tools of war and all the drive and power of the spirit of the past are needed.

From the days of Lexington down to the South Pacific, north Africa, and Italy labor has made possible the feats and victories of American arms.

Everything labor has is at stake in this war.

In the lands of the Axis labor is enslaved.

In the lands conquered by the Axis labor is enchained.

Our form of government means more to labor than to any other group of Americans; and we know that we can depend upon aroused labor to do its full duty.

I am urging and pleading with you to do everything in your power that Pennsylvania industry, mines, and farms may set new records in 1944 in the production of critical war material, and by so doing you will let our fighting men on the fighting fronts know that you are behind them in every act and deed.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Hon. I. H. Hull, of Indianapolis, before the National Electric Cooperative Association, of Chicago:

Mr. President and friends, it is true I have been interested in the cooperative movement for several years, but it is also true that even before I became interested in cooperation I was interested in rural electrification.

Sixty miles southeast of here I was living on a farm where three of my four children were born in the farmhouse by the light of a dim kerosene lamp. About that time a power line did come past the house and we were the first ones to make use of it.

My wife had become so completely sold on the idea of rural electricity that when we talked about moving a little while later she said, "Well, I don't care so much about whether or not we are going to get a place where we can make more money, but we must have electricity." So it became a pretty fundamental part of our home life.

A little later I became affiliated with the cooperative movement and had the opportunity of visiting in Denmark and Sweden and saw the wonderful rural electrification systems which had been built up in those countries. I came back and our State of Indiana enacted our rural electrification act, several months before the R. E. A. law was passed.

Since that time I have always been very much interested in both cooperation and rural electrification, and so for the little while that we are going to visit this morning, I hope we can keep both of those things in mind and work out, as far as we can, the interrelationship between the two and the help that each should be to the other.

I think we ought to take just one moment to get before us a little of what we may be confronted with in a general way after the war.

I saw a figure the other day that caught my eye. We will have a national debt of one-quarter of a trillion dollars. They have even quit talking about billions any more. On that particular day I noticed the national debt had gone up to $187,000,000,000, and the estimate, of course, now is anywhere from $250,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. That in round figures, is two-thirds of the value of all the physical property of the Nation as estimated just a few years ago.

Well, we could get pretty badly alarmed, but I am not one of those that is going to get panicky about that thing just yet. I want to do a little thinking first to see just how we are going to face a situation of that kind.

If we enter on the post-war period with conditions such as we had in the early 1930's, and add this tremendous war debt to an unbalanced economy in the Nation, things can get unbelievably bad. I think one thing we want to keep in mind is that because of the tremendous burden we are placing upon the Government (rural electrification is one of the best investments that one can make) that we do have a real reason to try to relieve the Government as fast as possible and pay off the debts we owe in our rural electric lines the same as we pay off on other debts.

I am a firm believer in trying to work out these obligations as rapidly as convenient. But the best we could do on that isn't going to make a lot of relief on this one-quarter of a trillion dollars. Another thing we must keep in mind is this—after all, the real wealth in all America is not in our physical property. The wealth of America is in our manpower and the manpower of this country can create or destroy, according to the way we use it, in a very short period of time the entire value of this obligation. They say we will have some 30,000,000 men and women released from the war and the war effort in a short period of time. If those 30,000,000 persons come back and are not used to produce wealth, if we do not keep them properly engaged, we can go into a bad situation, but, on the other hand, if we take those 30,000,000 persons and let them produce wealth at the rate of $1,000 a year apiece, there will be thirty billions a year and we will pay off this war debt with the newly created wealth in a period of 10 years' time.

The future depends, in other words, on how we organize and train and mobilize the manpower of the Nation. That is where our real wealth is.

Now you are wondering really what that has to do with rural electrification or cooperation either. Well, let's examine the three proposals that are made generally as to how we are going to utilize that manpower in the post-war efforts.

The first one of those three and one we must consider is Government activity. The best Government activity that I know of is the rural electrification project. We do go ahead and make many more jobs by activity of Government enterprise and I am not quite as much against that as are some folks that I have heard of.

I heard a story the other day of a couple of fellows that belonged to a church. One of them was very hard of hearing and he didn't have one of these hearings aids yet and he couldn't understand the other fellow very well. The other fellow came up to him and said to him, "Have you seen our new preacher yet?" And he said "Eh." And he said, "Have you seen our new preacher yet?" And the fellow said, "Have I seen a New Dealer?" "No," he said, "I asked you have you seen our new preacher yet, he is a son of a bishop." "Yes, yes," the hard of hearing fellow said, "They all are." [Applause.]

I said I haven't become quite that much set yet against all New Deal programs. As a matter of fact, this rural electrification program properly carried on is one and I have always been a thousand percent for it. But listen, I have two boys in this war and most of you have them and if I know what those boys are fighting for today, it is to bring about an economy in the United States of America, as free as possible from Government domination and control, so let us relieve the Government as much as we can of the responsibility and burden of keeping these 30,000,000 men and women working.

The second thing that is generally proposed and it is a thing we will have to follow through, is a large expansion of profit business. Now, I have no quarrel whatsoever with profit business. We have had profit business and it is a good thing. We have it now and, of course, we will have to depend on profit institutions to furnish most of these jobs. Jobs will be made, as Eric Johnson said, by the demand of the people not by the institution. But profit business will have to create the machinery that gives the jobs for most of these people. Last spring my wife and I took a little vacation and went down to visit our daughter in Miami, Fla., and we went all over Miami Beach and up and down Biscayne Boulevard where those thousands, yes, I would say thousands, of those magnificent homes are, and I certainly enjoyed looking at them and was glad somebody built them so I could take a look at them. Among other things we walked down past the home of William Deering. Again I want it distinctly understood I have no quarrel with William Deering. He did a marvelous job. I think he did a service to the American farm that we ought to be truly grateful for, but as we walked down past that home, the first remark my wife made, "Oh," she said, "I would hate to have the responsibility of organizing all the servants they have in that home," and I came back and my first remark was something like this, "I wonder how many corn planters and cultivators and tractors it took to build that home." After all, the fellow that builds up those funds is the fellow that has the patronage out here whether it is electric power, farm machinery, or gasoline and we have rather imposed on a certain group of those people by forcing all of these tremendous funds on them, they have to take care of that home and the money we have given them. [Laughter.]

My wife's next remark was, "William Deering, I'll bet, doesn't have any more enjoyment out of that mansion where millions of dollars have been invested than we can have in our seven-room home in Indianapolis." The point that I am bringing out is not that I am criticizing William Deering. Someone had to do that job and let us be grateful that he went ahead and did it. The point of this is that when we enter this post-war economy we must depend upon a wide distribution of wealth and earnings among a large group of people to keep buying power alive, and you have to keep that buying power alive. That is the only way to make these jobs. We cannot solve the post-war problem by depending entirely upon profit business unless we can put some checks on it and unless we can find a way as far as possible of distributing earnings out among the people on the cooperative basis as you are doing in your cooperative rural electric program.

Well, that brings us down to the third proposal. Let us not do away with anything we have that is usable. Use all the Government agencies we can but keep them under proper check, and the same with profit business, but let us go ahead and develop our cooperative program.

While I was in Denmark I was riding along the country road with the manager of the Cooperative Wholesale. And some way we got to discussing the matter of farm tenancy. He pointed out that in Denmark they had overcome tenancy in that country to a large extent. Whereas half the farms had been operated by tenants, at the time we were there only 8 percent were operated by tenants, the rest by landowners. He also pointed out all over the countryside which we went into, little butcher shops where farmers brought their hogs in and processed them. They put them in brine instead of flooding the market at the wrong season of the year. They took those hogs out of the brine and sent them into the market as the market could use them. He pointed out and showed me some little cheese factories they had put up in those neighborhoods and this and that and other little community enterprises which had been built up.

I said do you think it has been the cooperative movement that has relieved your tenancy here and he said that is only one thing. The first thing though that he did mention was rural electrification. He said that the first thing they did in Denmark toward solving their tenancy was to get their electrification. At that time two-thirds of the farms were electrified. They had access to this power for these little community enterprises. Then he said the next thing perhaps was the cooperative movement. It helped make jobs for a lot of the boys and then he said they had a definite planned social program to try to improve living standards out in the rural communities and make it attractive so folks would want to stay in the rural communities. He said he used to look forward as other farmers did to the time when he got old and could move to the city. In the meantime he had taken that job in Copenhagen but he said country life was so beautified since conveniences had been brought in and the social environment so improved since he had moved into Copenhagen that he said "I am now looking forward to my old age when I can move back into the country and enjoy our Danish country life." I wonder if we get the full significance of what that means.

Three or 4 years ago I saw some figures that went like this. Ten parents in the county will bear 14 children, those 14 children, the second generation, will bear 20 children, the third generation, if they all stay there, those 20 children will raise 28. The parents in our large metropolitan cities bear 7 children, the 7 have 5, and the 5 in the third generation have 3. The city population dies. In three generations 10 parents in the country will increase to 28 while 10 parents in the city dwindle to 3. In other words, country communities are raising surplus children, feeding, clothing, and educating those extra children to replenish the population of the dying city. Not only that, one-third of each generation of children carries with them their inheritance from those country communities and takes it to the town. Don't you see what we are doing? That is not the fault of profit business. It is not the fault of anybody but ourselves and gradually we are sapping the natural wealth of our country community, taking each generation of children with their share of inheritance, one-third of the family, moving to the city, there to spend their lives. And that is not all; in our more prosperous territories, like Iowa, for instance, a good share of the fathers, when they have accumulated a sufficient amount of wealth which they have drawn out of that country community, move out and go to town and take their fortune and with it build a home and spend a good deal of what they have built up.

Now, what are we going to do about that? And this is my principal message I want to

bring to you this morning, as we look forward to these hard days that may come while we are trying to pay off the war debt, as we face the facts as to what we have always done in the way of building up the great centralized industries with remarkable efficiency. Profit industry must draw all of the earnings it can get out of every community. I would like to bring up one more illustration. Some time ago one of our country bankers told us that at the end of the year the cooperative association in his county had accumulated in his bank over $24,000 which they distributed back among the people. He told of another petroleum distributor, a local agent for a chain system, when he made his deposit he would sign a draft and send every bit of the money to a certain New York bank. All profits left the community.

Since that time—that has been several years ago—we have integrated that business down there until today these farmers maintain their own local distribution and keep all the savings at home. They now own the transportation system and bring the earnings of that transportation system back to the community. They own their refinery and bring the savings of that refinery back and pass them around among themselves in that community. They own the oil wells where the oil comes from and the savings of the oil wells are brought back and passed around among the folks in that community. On the one hand, the one system was just taking every dollar out of the community and depositing it in a metropolitan bank and on the other hand the reverse operation. All savings from industrial transportation and distribution come back and are passed around among the folks in that community.

I am tremendously interested in the future of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I hope as we go ahead and develop it we will all of us keep in mind the tremendous desire and opportunity to serve the people and bring about a better distribution of the good things of life. It must be done in this post-war era and I am thinking, in order to do that, if you do have some things in your set-up that are not entirely right it is nothing to get scared about. I never knew anything that grew up as fast as this did that didn't have some things wrong with it. The only thing is, let us look at this thing now from the standpoint of the benefit there will be by being controlled out here among the people. Use it and make it genuinely cooperative. If there is any complication because of politics or anything else, keep those in the background just as much as we can but build this thing and serve the folks and bring about that distribution of earnings which must be done as we are to face this post-war era.

I think of this whole cooperative program today pretty much as our fathers looked upon the affairs of government back in 1776. I am thinking of it from the standpoint of getting fair play in business just as they were looking forward to getting fair play in Government.

You will recall that the Colonies had all the trouble in the world trying to get someone else to solve their problems for them. They sent emissaries to the King of England, and the King could not understand their problems; he wasn't living there and didn't know what they were up against, and he didn't know how they suffered to pay taxes, and so finally after they tried everything else in the world, and tried to get somebody else to solve their problems for them, they came back home and decided if they were to have fair play in government they would get it by governing themselves and not depending on someone else to do that job for them.

I say to you today the time is past for us to expect some metropolitan center to solve our farm problems for us. I say to you today we must be willing to do what is necessary, and, if necessary, do a little house cleaning to get our house in order, then all get together, all of our cooperative movements in America. Let the various units help each other and build up such a strong movement in the interests of the farmers and other common people that we can build a program on which we will bring about our economic freedom and fair play, and when we bring that about we will solve our problem and we will build these community enterprises. Maybe we are going to process some of our meat and keep it in cold lockers or brine and feed it onto the market, as they did in Denmark. There are a hundred things we can do as we look around this program. I wish we could get the picture, building up those little rural communities as fast as we can, and bring those centralized industries back out into the neighborhood and keep our surplus boys and girls out there—they are the most valuable thing we have on the farm today—and put them to work, not for somebody else whose main interest is exploiting the farmer but putting them to work for the dads and uncles they have grown up with. When we get that kind of an economy there isn't any reason why we should look forward with fear to our post-war era.

I Am Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, is a State administrator who has a full appreciation of the significant contribution which education makes to the development of an alert citizenry and to the functions of freedom in this Republic.

The other day in an address delivered by Governor Sharpe in connection with the dedication of the new administration building at the University of South Dakota he made a dramatic presentation of the virtues of education which is impressive enough and sufficiently significant to warrant its finding a place in the permanent literature of this country. I take this means of calling it to the attention not only of the Congress but of all citizens interested in the expansion of educational opportunities in America:

I AM EDUCATION

(Excerpts from the dedicatory address of Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, in connection with the dedication of the new administration building at the University of South Dakota, located in Vermillion, S. Dak.)

This is an appropriate time and place to pay homage to the sublime influences and benefits which education has spread over the world in all ages and places. The most vivid way I can do this is to personalize education as a living, pulsing being which we may see and hear. Thus personalized, education would appear before us as a great, majestic figure in our own image, with the high brow of knowledge, the level, steady gaze of inquiry and truth, a face of power and purpose, and with an ever-directing finger pointing toward an attractive, interesting future; and would say something like this:

I am education. I grew with life as its "leader-out" to higher planes and broader fields of thought and action. All life just naturally follows me because I am its guide, its plan, its experience, its ambition, its progress, its ever-present benefactor. Those who follow me reverence me more and more as they see my pliant horizons ever widening into more interesting, serviceable, healthy, and civilizing epochs; as they see my wholesome, accurate, practical ideas guarding them from harm and increasing their happiness. Those who belittle me are never confident. They are always using the ideas and products of my scholars, students, and disciples. They fear my records of laws, principles, and truth.

In the nests of the apemen and the caves of the cavemen I was incessantly telling them: this is the right way; that is the wrong way to make it or do it; there is still a better way; you can have a better home, a better life. In the squatting places of the aborigine I first became identified as a factor of better life because I caused him to classify and to record in his memory and to transmit to posterity by oral tradition, all those methodical customs, habits, principles of humanity which today are instinctive in each of you and are the foundation stones on which your present education and civilization rest. I am one of the beacon lights which led you up from savagery. I still lead you on, and on, and on.

My mission is to make things better; to identify and promote the good and the true; to label and obstruct the bad and the false. The written record, the schoolroom, the laboratory, the test tube, the microscope, the telescope, the electronic rays, and tubes: these are some of my instruments. Ever and ever bringing forth new laws and truths, my scholars, students, and disciples produced for you the engine, the bridge, the vehicles of the air, earth, and sea, the wires and tubes of communication and transportation; and all the numerous engineering, mechanical, and scientific benefits, comforts, conveniences, and pleasures which you have around you in such profusion today. Some of them took up the test tube, the electric ray, the surgeon's instruments, and the pleasure of study and experiment with chemistry and life, and there came into general use and practice much knowledge of health, so that pain and disease are being alleviated and the maimed and disfigured are made whole and efficient; and the human body is made better and stronger and more capable of the eternal struggle for individual and racial improvement. The philosopher, the jurist, the statesman, are slowly but surely etstablishing the truths and principles necessary for myriad races, kindreds, tongues, and people to live together under the benign principles of law, order, equity, and fraternity.

The teacher, professor, instructor, tutor, and trainer are my ambassadors, counsel, and apostles to you; but all of them and all of you are ever my own scholars, students, pupils, and disciples. The more you acquire of me the more do you become persons of considered judgment, practicing moderation, frugality, industry, truth. You learn the futility and the fallacy of excesses, anger, improvidence, dishonesty. My eternal promise to you is: You make the most of me and I will make the best of you.

Why I Would Like To Be a WAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, some months ago the Illinois civilian WAC

recruiting committee in cooperation with the United States Army sponsored a drive for the recruitment of young women for military service. To stimulate interest, the American Legion Auxiliary joined with the recruiting committee in sponsoring an essay contest which provided a prize of a $25 War bond to the young woman of high-school or junior-college age who submitted the best essay on the subject Why I Would Like To Be a WAC. The contest was organized on a basis of congressional districts and a like prize made available for each district.

In the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois, which embraces Peoria, Tazewell, Bureau, Marshall, Stark, and Putnam Counties, the winner of the contest was adjudged to be Miss Gretchen Phillips, Varna Township High School of Varna, Ill. She is a charming, studious, patriotic young lady who has so generously participated in the war activities of her community and has devoted her talents to the victory effort. I find therefore a genuine pride in suggesting the publication of her essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and therefore make a unanimous-consent request that it be included with these observations:

WHY I WOULD LIKE TO BE A WAC

(By Gretchen Phillips, Varna Township High School, Varna, Ill.)

My interests, just like so many other girls of my age, have usually been centered around educational and social functions. During war, I must make these functions coincide with the war effort, putting my heart and soul into winning this—the people's war.

I know that buying bonds or doing some defense work is going to help, but does that in any way compare with what our boys are giving?

I, as a woman of my country, can do much more. One way is by joining a branch of the service, and certainly one of the finest branches is the WAC's. There is no conscription to force me to join a woman's corps, but I am simply asked to do my part. Certainly that is not too much to ask. For in so doing, I will free some man for active service.

As a member of the WAC's, I would be using my talents for the good of my country; moreover, the educational facilities offered me would be beneficial in my later civilian life. We know that all work and no play makes Jane a dull girl. Taking this into consideration, a number of social and recreational activities are also provided.

A WAC must necessarily go where duty calls. This demands that I would have to leave my home, friends and dear ones, but in so doing, I will speed the day when all the members of our armed service can again return to their beloved homes.

Comments on Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles with reference to the subject of veterans' benefits:

[From the Marlboro (Mass.) Enterprise]

PHILBIN INFORMED ON ROTARY POLICY FOR TROOPS ABROAD—FIRST CONTINGENT OF MEN FROM SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA EXPECTED TO BE HOME SOMETIME NEXT MONTH

WASHINGTON, D. C.—In response to his inquiry concerning the troop rotation policy soon to be placed into effect in the Southwest Pacific theater of operations Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of the Third District, which includes Marlboro, has been assured by Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, The Adjutant General of the War Department, that the shortage of shipping space to place this policy into effect was being alleviated and it is expected that the first contingent of troops from that area will begin to arrive in the continental United States during April 1944.

The Massachusetts Representative held several discussions with officials of the War Department relative to troop rotation plans for boys in the Southwest Pacific, shortly after the Army announced plans for furloughing troops from other battle areas, including the African and Alaskan theaters of operations. The discussions were partially prompted by correspondence Congressman PHILBIN received from anxious parents in this section since many families from this area have boys who were among the first to leave the continental United States for action in the Southwest Pacific.

PHILBIN released the following letter from General Ulio, confirming previous talks he had had with War Department officials:

"I refer to your recent letter concerning the return of enlisted personnel, now on foreign service, to a station within the continental limits of the United States.

"The War Deparment does not question the desirability of rotating troops who have been on foreign service for a considerable length of time, and has had the matter under continuous study since the inception of the war. Until recently lack of shipping space has been the main obstacle in the return of personnel from overseas duty. This shortage of shipping has now been partially alleviated and there is a policy for the South Pacific theater now being prepared, and it is hoped that shipping facilities will sufficiently improve by April 1944 to enable the return of a certain number of men from this theater.

"Emphasis is placed on the rotation of units and individuals from combat duty to rest areas and to areas of healthier climates in all overseas theaters in order to alleviate the stress of combat and the effects of severe climatic conditions and it must be appreciated that the actual number of men returned to the United States must depend upon the amount of shipping which can be made available, since the maintenance of full combat effectiveness of our troops overseas must always receive first consideration."

War Department officials told PHILBIN that the selection of enlisted personnel to be returned to the United States under this policy rested entirely with the commanding general of the particular theater of operations in which the man was stationed. The selection would be determined upon the basis of length of service and the type of duty of the enlisted man.

PHILBIN also revealed that the War Department has two methods of repatriation of enlisted personnel serving overseas—"rotation" and "return." The rotation policy applies to men released by the theater commanders after replacements of the same military skills are furnished to him. The return policy covers personnel sent home for hospitalization, discharge, and, in the case of officers, because it is desired to use their skills in special assignments. In the latter case, no specific replacement is sent from the United States.

Personnel chosen under the rotation policy are to be given leave or furlough on arrival in the United States, sufficient for them to spend 3 weeks at the place of choice. They are then to be reassigned to duty in the United States before return to a foreign area unless military requirements make reembarkment necessary.

More than 200,000 troops, exclusive of sick and wounded, have been returned to the United States, War Department officials told PHILBIN, since the beginning of the war. Some of these were "rotated" personnel, others "returned" personnel. To date, the minimum period for rotation has been set as 18 months for service in the north African area and 2 years in the Alaskan and Caribbean commands. Regulations for eligibility in other theaters, including the Southwest Pacific, are now being formulated and it is expected that 18 months of service will be one of the requirements.

PHILBIN stressed the fact that availability of shipping for the transportation of rotational replacements is one of the main factors in controlling the number of eligible men who can be sent to the United States under the rotation policy. Military exigencies and the personnel situation in the theater of operations are other factors.

[From the Hudson (Mass.) News-Enterprise]

PLEDGES UNYIELDING SUPPORT FOR BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN—CASH PAYMENTS FOR VETERANS—CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN ADDRESSED HUDSON AERIE, F. O. E., LAST NIGHT

HUDSON.—Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of the Third District, and a member of the Military Affairs Committee, again pledged his unyielding attention and efforts to the welfare of the men and women in the service of their country when he spoke before the meeting of Hudson Aerie, F. O. E., last night, declaring, "Nothing is too good for them."

Congressman PHILBIN is one of the staunchest supporters of the bill now before Congress, providing for adequate muster-out pay for those in the armed forces, and he is confident that the bill, which calls for substantial cash payments, will become a law. His particular interest is in the disabled veteran, and he advocates cottage care rather than institutional for the mentally ill.

In his brief but stirring address he urged the members of Hudson Aerie to continue their good work for liberty, justice, and equality, and called upon all citizens to work shoulder to shoulder for speedy victory and an early return home of those in service. Ever mindful of the sacrifices and sorrows of homes throughout the land, he has every confidence in the ultimate attainment of that for which we fight, if the American people will be ever vigilant, not only toward destroying the tyrants on foreign soil but will also be mindful of the enemies of freedom on the home front—those who would destroy our freedom and our form of government.

Congressman PHILBIN, who is spending the holidays at his home in Clinton, and who returns shortly to Washington for the reconvening of Congress, cited the outstanding work of Hudson Aerie, one of the largest and most active organizations in the State. Always among the foremost in support of community, county, State, and Nation, the Aerie, with a membership of more than 500, is credited with the purchase to date of $24,000 in War bonds, a record difficult to be equaled. Sixty-seven members are now in the service of their country and their names are suitably inscribed upon an honor roll which hangs in the lounge in the Aerie suite. Stanley J. Kurgan introduced Congressman PHILBIN.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 3, 1943]

SOLDIER'S DISCHARGE PAPERS MUST OMIT AILMENT DETAILS

WASHINGTON, December 3.—Disabled veterans of this war who have protested to New England Congressmen that their discharge certificates revealed the diagnosis of their ailment were advised today that such disclosures violated Army regulations and should be eliminated.

Maj. Gen. J. A. Ulio, adjutant general, told Representative PHILBIN (Democrat, Massachusetts) to advise veterans who complained to the Congressman to return their certificates to the War Department for "any correction that may be warranted."

The veterans, PHILBIN said, considered such information harmful to their future, and General Ulio cited this regulation:

"The diagnosis of a disability will not be shown on the discharge certificate as the cause of discharge."

The adjutant general in a letter, also explained procedure for filing claims for pensions by enlisted men discharged from the Army by reason of physical disability.

"Army regulations provide that when an enlisted man is to be discharged on certificate of disability for discharge, and regardless of line of duty, he will be afforded an opportunity to file a claim for pension on Veterans' Administration Form No. 56," said General Ulio.

"If the soldier does not desire to file such a claim, the regulations prescribe that he sign a statement to that effect.

"The signing of such a statement does not prevent him from filing a claim at any time in the future."

PHILBIN also announced today that in response to requests from residents of Milbury and Milford, he had obtained from the Solid Fuels Administration inventory adjustments which would entitle them to more anthracite coal.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of March 28, 1944]

PHILBIN URGES SPEEDY ACTION ON G. I. BILL

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Speedy congressional action on the G. I. bill of rights to assist war veterans was urged today by Representative PHILBIN (Democrat, Massachusetts) in a House speech.

PHILBIN said he hoped to introduce an amendment to the Senate-passed measure which would provide for establishment of rest homes and smaller isolated units for the solicitous care of mental and nervous cases. He declared such cases will embrace well over half of all our casualties.

PHILBIN said, however, that if it appeared his amendment would delay passage of the bill he would seek other means of effectuating his objectives.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette of June 5, 1943]

WOULD GIVE SERVICEMEN MORE INSURANCE PROTECTION

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Provision for additional insurance protection for members of the armed forces is contained in a bill which Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat) of Clinton, Mass., introduced in the House this week.

The bill, similar to one introduced in the Senate by Senator WALSH of Massachusetts, guarantees to every enlisted person full insurance coverage as soon as he enters military service.

"It also gives the enlisted person broader discretion and power of disposition with respect to designating and changing beneficiaries so as to permit enlisted persons to have full control of their insurance" PHILBIN said.

[From the Boston American of December 8, 1943]

WASHINGTON, December 8.—Speedy passage in the House by Monday of "just and generous" legislation providing cash benefits for honorably discharged veterans was predicted today by one of its chief supporters, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, Republican minority leader.

Equally rapid approval in the Senate also was anticipated by the Bay State Congressman. MARTIN made his prediction as members of the House Committee on Military Affairs met in executive session to draft a bill which will be acceptable to all persons interested in the welfare of former servicemen.

PHILBIN GIVEN CREDIT

Great credit for the swift action by the committee went to Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, who had scoffed at statements that a quorum could not be mustered.

Both MARTIN and PHILBIN seemed certain that the bill would be reported out of committee without delay, perhaps even today. They stressed that members are familiar with what veterans need and that the only argument appears to be over the size of the cash payment.

CITES PRESSING NEED

Congressman PHILBIN, himself a member of the Military Affairs Committee, summed up the feelings of the great majority of Members of the House when he said:

"We can no longer tolerate a situation where our discharged veterans are being cast aside, unprovided for, and permitted to go in want and suffering. We must give practical effect by immediate legislation to our oft-repeated slogan: 'Nothing is too good for them.'

"That there is pressing need for Congress to take this action is becoming increasingly apparent. Day after day reports are brought to my attention of boys being mustered out of the service, oftentimes in poor health, sometimes with unfortunate mental afflictions, and sent to their homes without even so much as an escort.

"This condition must be remedied at once. The American people will no longer tolerate carelessness or neglect of our gallant war heroes. We've had a great deal of talk about heroism and sacrifice. Now is the time for Congress to show that it appreciates the outstanding deeds of these young men and that it is prepared to provide every possible measure of compensation, support, hospitalization, care, and treatment that a grateful people can give.

"I think that the Boston Record-American and Sunday Advertiser, and other Hearst papers throughout the United States are to be highly commended for their efforts in endeavoring to adjust these intolerable conditions."

[Editorial from the Boston Post of June 26, 1943]

SIMPLE JUSTICE

The bill to be introduced in Congress within the next few days by Representative PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, safeguarding the status on civil-service lists of men and women now in the armed services, deserves careful consideration.

It proposes authorizing the Civil Service Commission to revise its regulation so that at the close of the war prompt consideration will be given to those on the lists whose names have been reached while they are serving their country.

This would seem but the simplest of justice. Were these young men and women who have passed their examinations and secured eligibility on civil-service lists still at home, they would automatically secure the positions to which their preparation entitles them. They should not be penalized for serving their country in time of war.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Pvt. A. C. Stikl which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on April 14, 1944:

SCOLDS REPUBLICAN CONGRESSMEN

To the Journal: I wonder how our Representatives in Washington think we in the service overseas feel when we read about their conniving to deprive us of our vote. Don't they represent us? Are we in servitude? Are we fighting for the right to preserve representation? Don't they think we might resent their bickering?

I wonder if Representatives SMITH, STEVENSON, KEEFE, MURRAY, and O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin have sons in the service. If this item receives space, will the above-mentioned Representatives be kind enough to reply to the writer justifying their defeating votes? I am sorry to say that 5 of the 224 defeating votes were from Wisconsin.

I sent my address to the Milwaukee election commission to assure me of receiving a ballot unless the afore-mentioned five Representatives can think up a scheme to persuade our State government to deprive us of our vote.

Congress offered us an empty hand through the Rankin bill. What a mockery! It is an insult to the intelligence of every fighting man. Very few servicemen overseas have heard of the conniving on Capitol Hill to deprive us of voting. If my citizenship is shelved for the duration, please let me retain the right to vote.

I hope the people of Wisconsin remember the five afore-mentioned names on the roster of the House of Representatives. They should be removed as soon as possible, at the next election affecting them.

I almost forgot an important name—Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. He also contributed to the cause of the afore-mentioned "statesmen" by being absent or not voting in the Senate. Was he ashamed to vote for us? He should be certain of replacement at the next election.

The armed forces have the situation well in hand at the front. Let Congress keep order and democracy at home for us!

Pvt. A. C. STIKL.

SOMEWHERE IN NEW GUINEA.

Britain's Broken Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post of April 3, 1944:

BRITAIN'S BROKEN WORD

We are sure that the British Government knows even better than we just what has happened to the Jews of Europe under Hitlerism and how desperate is their need of a haven. Still it has chosen to shut its eyes to this. But even if it can keep out the sights and sounds of 4,000,000 people being murdered or starved to death, it cannot evade its legal obligation which is a heavy one indeed.

The British Government holds Palestine as a mandate from the League of Nations. It holds it under 28 articles which specify exactly what the British can and cannot do.

What are some of the terms?

1. The preamble and article 2 say that England shall be responsible for putting into effect the Balfour Declaration which called for making Palestine into a Jewish homeland.

2. Article 6 calls upon Britain to facilitate Jewish immigration into Palestine. It also calls upon Britain to encourage "close settlement by Jews on the land."

3. Article 15 says that no person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief.

4. Article 27 emphasizes that "the consent of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate."

What has Britain done with these terms to which it agreed? It has violated each and every one. It has set aside the Balfour Declaration, it has barred Jews from settling on the land, it has shut off Jewish immigration.

DEFIANCE OF THE LEAGUE

It has done all these things without the consent of, in fact in defiance of an unequivocal protest made in June 1939 by, the League Mandates Commission. In violation of the mandate, in violation of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1925, which incorporates the mandate, in violation of the Balfour Declaration, Britain has gone ahead with the white paper.

Today, the land that was to become the Jewish homeland is instead the land that discriminates against the Jews. Instead of article 15 of the mandate, "No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief," the white paper sets up a blunt system of discrimination, "No further Jewish immigration will be permitted." Could anything be clearer?

This means that Zoroastrians, Christians, Buddhists, or fire worshipers may go into Palestine, but not Jews.

An American Protestant may immigrate into Palestine, but not an American Jew. This is discriminatory legislation, of a kind that is opposed to the American system.

Is the State Department ready to cooperate with the British in making this discrimination effective? Will it notify the British Embassy which applications for passports to turn down and which to approve on the grounds of race?

Or will it instead remind His Majesty's Government that by the treaty of 1925, which, word for word, incorporates the mandate of the League of Nations, the British Government agrees not to make any changes in the mandate without the specific consent of the United States?

UNILATERAL MONKEY BUSINESS

Will it tell the British Government that we don't like the kind of unilateral monkey business being pulled now any better than we liked Mr. Hitler's?

We think the way to test this unappetizing mess of broken treaties and violations of solemn pledges would be for a Jew, a citizen of the United States, to apply for a passport to immigrate into Palestine.

His application would be taken up by the British Embassy. If rejected, the embassy would have to specify that it is as a Jew and not as an American that he is turned down. For immigration is closed to no one but Jews.

If he is turned down, as he probably will be under the terms of the white paper, this Jewish citizen of the United States then would have the right to expect our State Department to secure for him his rights under the Anglo-American Treaty of 1925, which includes the mandate.

If the State Department should refuse to do this, then we would have a clear case of its refusal to carry out a sworn obligation. The matter would become one for the courts of the United States.

We think such a test is imperative. It is called for by the law; it is called for in the name of decency.

Tomorrow's Roads Must Be Planned Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a program which was delivered over the Mutual Network, Friday, March 17, 1944:

ANNOUNCER. How are the streets and roads in your area? Are they highly congested with heavy wartime traffic? Are they full of chuck holes and other indications that men and materials for maintenance are wartime luxuries? Are you becoming travel-hungry and planning many long trips on America's highways when gasoline and tires again are plentiful? What kind of highways do you expect to find after a lot of wartime battering? What kind of highways for post-war travel would you like to have? Mutual has brought to the microphone in the Nation's Capital outstanding leaders qualified to bring you answers to these questions. Under the chairmanship of the Honorable J. W. ROBINSON, Member of Congress from Utah, the Committee on Roads of the House of Representatives is conducting hearings to determine what should be done about America's highways after the war. Here is Congressman ROBINSON, who will lead the discussion on Tomorrow's Roads Must Be Planned Today.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not going to have any speeches. We are going to just talk over informally the subject of roads, in which all of us have an interest. First, I want to introduce the gentleman here with me.

Mr. Samuel C. Hadden is from Indiana. He is chairman of the State Highway Commission of Indiana, and he is also the president of the American Association of State Highway Officials. Mr. Hadden.

Mr. HADDEN. Thank you, Congressman ROBINSON. We highway officials have recommended that Congress authorize the appropriation of funds, effective immediately upon the conclusion of hostilities, for the improvement and expansion of our highway system.

Our recommendation was made in the belief that because of our specialized knowledge in this field, it is incumbent upon us to advise the Congress as to the needs of the highways of the Nation and to offer our assistance to your committee, Mr. ROBINSON, and to other Members of the House and Senate, in working out the details of whatever program the Congress sees fit to authorize.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Roads Committee appreciates that very much, Mr. Hadden.

Ladies and gentlemen, the other member of our group is Mr. Russell E. Singer, general manager of the American Automobile Association. In that capacity he speaks on behalf of millions of owners and drivers of passenger cars, who are the users of the roads. Mr. Singer.

Mr. SINGER. I am glad of this opportunity to take part with you, Congressman ROBINSON, and with Mr. Madden in a round-table discussion of post-war highway problems. On October 15, last year, the board of directors of the American Automobile Association approved a comprehensive eight-point post-war highway program. I don't want to go into the details of that program now, because I am sure they will be developed as we get further into the discussion. In general, however, I can say that the motorists of the country are aware of the serious deficiencies which exist in our road system, particularly in the cities and suburban areas, and that they are strongly in favor of getting prepared so that when the war ends the improvements that are needed can be undertaken without delay.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you, Mr. Singer.

It is important that our listeners understand exactly what is before the Congress. As Mr. Hadden pointed out, the State highway officials of the country have recommended that Congress authorize Federal highway funds to be used after the war is over. In order to get this proposal into Congress for consideration, a bill was introduced by me in the House of Representatives. That is the bill on which we are now holding public hearings. An identical bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

This bill would authorize $1,000,000,000 in Federal funds for use in each of the 3 years after the war on highway projects which are eligible for Federal aid. Many details have to be worked out as to what projects would be eligible for this Federal assistance. In general, however, they include the construction of new roads, and the reconstruction of old ones, on highways which have been designated as part of the Federal-aid system. In addition, the building of bridges on these highways, and the construction of grade separations at crossings, are eligible. Is that about the substance of it, Mr. Hadden?

Mr. HADDEN. That's it exactly, Mr. ROBINSON. The Federal funds would be apportioned among the States according to a formula established by the Congress in advance. The Federal money also would be matched by State funds, in such proportion as the Congress determines. In this respect, the bill is the same as previous Federal-aid highway legislation. It retains the traditional principle of formula distribution and the policy of Federal-State matching of funds.

Mr. ROBINSON. I'm glad you mentioned those points, Mr. Hadden. The Federal-aid principle has made possible during the last 28 years the development of a system of roads in the United States which is the envy of all the rest of the world.

I think it would be worth while to spend a minute or two explaining how this came about.

The Federal Government first took action in road-construction matters way back in 1806. Funds were appropriated that year for the improvement of the historic National

Pike. Again, in 1893 highways came to the attention of Congress as a national problem, and a small sum was appropriated for surveys of road management. In 1912, Congress appropriated $500,000 for improvement of rural postal delivery routes.

But it was in 1916 that Congress passed the law which was to become a landmark in highway development. That law provided for the appropriation of Federal funds which were divided among the States, according to the population, area, and mileage of post roads in each State. Matched by similar State funds, the money was applied to the construction and improvement of a selected system f highways.

That Road Act of 1916 was a milestone in our transportation history. It stood the test of time, and with certain amendments which have been made to meet changing conditions, is still the basic law of the land.

Mr. SINGER. Incidentally, Mr. ROBINSON, the gold pen which was used by President Wilson in signing the 1916 Federal Aid Act is on display in the headquarters of the American Automobile Association.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is an interesting memento, Mr. Singer. We have in this country about 3,000,000 miles of rural roads. The Federal-aid system totals 235,000 miles, representing about 8 percent of the total mileage. Those are the primary highways. In recent years we have begun the development of a secondary system, which is limited to 10 percent of the total.

Mr. HADDEN. It is worth noting, Mr. Robinson, that the funds appropriated for these Federal road systems are used only for construction purposes. The repair and maintenance costs are borne by the States.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. Our road law also gives us a workable pattern for Federal and State cooperation which is worth attention in these troublesome days. Under our road law, the individual States continue to bear the responsibility for the planning and the construction of roads. They likewise share in their cost. The Federal Government, in turn, sets up certain standards of design and construction, and coordinates the road plans of the States so that we get a Nation-wide system suitable to the requirements of military defense and the national welfare.

Gentlemen, that gives us a little historical background. We have said something about the basic principles which underlie this present bill. But there are many important questions about the program which ought to be answered.

For example, there is the matter of timing. Why should this bill come up now? Here we have a measure dealing with post-war appropriations, for projects which can't be undertaken until after the war is over. Why not wait, then, until after hostilities are concluded, before we take up this legislation? Mr. Hadden, would you care to comment on that point?

Mr. HADDEN. I would, indeed, Mr. Congressman. It was more than a year ago when the association of which I am president first proposed a measure of this kind. We urged then, and we urge now, that Congress take action as promptly as it can. The reason is simple. If we are going to be ready when peace comes to begin the improvement of our road system, then we must plan the work in advance. But sound plans can't be made overnight. We can't even begin many of them until we know the amount of Federal funds that will be available, and for what type of projects. Until we have definite assurances as to what part Federal aid is going to play, no State can make real progress in planning its post-war program.

Our highway engineering staffs are now greatly depleted. We have got to use our limited manpower with the greatest possible economy and efficiency. That means concentrating our work on those projects which come within the scope of this legislation.

Mr. SINGER. Mr. Hadden, how much time do you estimate is involved in making these plans, and what are the principal difficulties involved?

Mr. HADDEN. The time varies, Mr. Singer, depending upon the type of project, the availability of manpower for surveys and planning, and other factors. In testimony before Congressman ROBINSON'S committee a few days ago, Mr. T. H. Cutler, the State highway engineer of Kentucky, pointed out that in 1933 and 1934, it took the highway departments of the country 3 months to put only $96,000,000 in projects under contract. At that time all the States had adequate engineering staffs.

One of the biggest problems, of course, is securing rights-of-way. In some States, the legal procedures involved in land acquisition make that job even longer and more difficult than in other States. But under the best circumstances it takes a great deal of time. Then there are the complex problems of selecting and locating the most needed facilities, of designing them, and of preparing construction drawings and specifications. All of these preliminary steps must be taken, however, if the highway program is to be soundly engineered and constructed.

Mr. SINGER. Let me add a word to what Mr. Hadden has said regarding the urgency of this program. The obstacles which stand in the way are large. The time for preparation is short. In my opinion, the planning and blueprinting of warranted projects is dangerously lagging. I think that we have a right to expect leadership from the Congress during the months ahead in the enactment of wise and proper Federal-aid legislation. But the States and local communities also are confronted with the necessity to complete their plans without delay, to the point where bids can be obained and contracts let immediately after the termination of the emergency. Mr. ROBINSON, what can we, as individual citizens, do about this?

Mr. ROBINSON. Everyone listening to this discussion, Mr. Singer, has a responsibility in this important problem. Because only to the extent that road needs are thoroughly understood, and vigorous public support is given to those who are in charge of highways, can we expect real progress to be achieved. This is true not only of the community programs, but of State and Federal activity as well.

There you have the historical background and the reasons for speedy action. But we haven't said much about the need for the program. Why are these projects essential? What is the size of the program that will be necessary? What amount of Federal-aid funds should be authorized?

Mr. HADDEN. The program recommended by the State highway officials provides for the expenditure during the 3-year period following the war of a total of $4,000,000,000. That figure includes both Federal and State matching funds. It is based on estimates which were made in all the States. A program of that size, Mr. Robinson, is regarded by the highway officials as the minimum program which should be planned. It will not accomplish in that period all that we feel should be done. But it is about as much as the States believe can be undertaken without a sacrifice of efficiency.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Federal appropriations would be considerably larger than those made during the years previous to the war. Can you tell us, Mr. Hadden, what the factors were which prompted this recommended increase?

Mr. HADDEN. Well, there are two conditions with which everyone is familiar that call for a large-scale program of highway construction after the war.

The first is the fact that we haven't had any regular highway construction in this country since 1941. About all that States have been able to do has been on access roads; that is, on the connecting links to military camps, war factories, and similar installations. These represent only a small fraction of our road mileage.

The second is the fact that our roads have gone right on wearing out. When you stop to consider, gentlemen, that before the war the biggest part of our regular construction program each year was devoted to replacement of worn-out and obsolete roadways, and that this work has been completely suspended, you begin to realize the huge backlog of work that is accumulating and the job which must be done when activities are resumed.

There are other circumstances which tend to increase the size of the job to be done. Many of the most heavily traveled roads, for example, are the oldest roads, and the most inadequate. They were due for replacement long ago. Some of our principal highways are handling large concentrations of war traffic. They are taking a severe battering in some instances from military vehicles and from the transportation of war goods. Some of the highways are being kept in operation only by extraordinary maintenance, and will have to be reconstructed entirely.

Mr. SINGER. In regard to that maintenance question, Mr. Hadden; would you say that road repair has been seriously curtailed during the war?

Mr. HADDEN. Yes; there has been some curtailment, due to shortages from time to time of equipment, materials, and manpower. In certain States there has also been a shortage of funds, due to the decrease in highway revenues resulting from gasoline rationing. In general, I would say that the roads are being kept up reasonably well in the face of extreme difficulties.

The highways which are especially hard hit are those in areas where military maneuvers and heavy troop movements have taken place. Then, of course, the weather continues to take its annual toll, particularly in the northern part of the country.

Mr. SINGER. I bring up the question of road maintenance, Mr. ROBINSON, because it has a bearing, as Mr. Hadden explained, on the amount of replacement and new construction which will be necessary after the emergency.

It also has an important bearing on the immediate problem of maintaining essential wartime transportation. We are facing a critical task from here on out in conserving this transportation. Each month, 150,000 automobiles are being scrapped or retired from service. Motor vehicles are steadily growing older, with no replacements in sight. The tire situation is serious. Gasoline supplies are short. Each day, we must get along with less and less, but we must manage somehow to keep 'em rolling.

In these circumstances, adequate repair of streets and highways obviously is of great importance. A ragged hole in the street, or a broken shoulder on the highway, can tear up desperately needed rubber, and put a serious strain on equipment already operating on borrowed time.

Mr. HADDEN. That's certainly true, Mr. Singer. Highway officials recognize maintenance as a problem which is going to get tougher as more and more road mileage wears out. Some of the worst difficulties encountered in past months with respect to materials and equipment are being ironed out, so that the outlook is improving in that regard. But manpower is an increasingly serious problem.

Mr. SINGER. Mr. ROBINSON, we were talking about the factors which must be considered in determining the size and character of the post-war highway program. Mr. Hadden

pointed out that we are accumulating a large wartime deficit in our highway system. The plans also must take into consideration the inadequacies which existed in the highway system before the war.

Because of the reduction in travel today, it is easy to forget how bad conditions of traffic were in those days, especially in and near our cities. But they were serious. Congestion, delay, and accident hazards created bottlenecks which were strangling highway movement and taking a huge toll in time, money, and even in life and limb.

After the war, highway travel will be resumed. Unless proper action is taken to provide adequate facilities, these conditions will become serious again. The problem on roadways where traffic is concentrated in heavy volume can be met—and must be met—by the construction of modern expressways and other types of facilities with large traffic capacity.

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no question, Mr. Singer, of the need to modernize a great many of our heavily traveled highways. In 1940, the Public Roads Administration reported that there were 5,500 miles of road less than 18 feet wide on the strategic military network alone. This system includes approximately 80,000 miles of primary roads which have been designated by the War Department as having critical military importance. In addition to the 5,500 miles of narrow pavements, the report showed 14,000 miles of weak road surfaces on the system, and serious deficiencies in a considerable percentage of the bridges.

Mr. SINGER. Yes, that's a good example of the modernization program needed. During the last 3 years, of course, these deficiencies have increased because of wartime deterioration. Mr. C. H. Purcell, director of public works in California, has stated that our military road network is at the most only 75 percent adequate. He further states that other primary rural highways are even less adequate.

Mr. HADDEN. In July of last year, the American Association of State Highway Officials asked all highway departments to list their minimum needed construction on main highways. The result was a listing of 158,000 miles of immediate highway construction needs, plus 30,000 bridges requiring rebuilding. The total cost estimated for these projects was over $7,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Hadden, did that estimate cover the cost of modernizing all main roads, including State highway systems?

Mr. HADDEN. No, it didn't. Additional construction is necessary to bring all State highway systems up to modern standards. The total estimates were 5.3 billion for the primary Federal aid system, 3.2 billion for the Federal secondary system, that is, the farm-to-market roads eligible for Federal aid—and 2.5 billion for highways extending into and through cities. That adds up to a grand total of $11,000,000,000. From these figures, it can be seen that the post-war authorization which has been proposed is not too large, so far as road requirements are concerned. The program contemplated under the present bill would, in fact, make possible only a part of the improvements that the States have listed as necessary.

Mr. SINGER. What you have said about the requirements, Mr. Hadden, reminds me of a statement made recently by General Fleming, the Federal Works Administrator. Talking in Chicago about the highway-construction plans for the future, General Fleming remarked that what we are facing is not so much a post-war program as it is a postponed program. He was referring, of course, to need for catching up after the war with the schedule of improvements which was getting under way when the war intervened. Anyone who has been jammed up in a long line of cars back of a red light, or crawled at snail's pace, bumper to bumper, on some roadway incapable of handling the traffic load, knows exactly what the General meant.

Mr. ROBINSON. That gives us two yardsticks with which to measure the size of our post-war program, gentlemen. The first is the maintenance and construction which have been deferred by the war. The second are the inadequacies of our roads, which existed before the war emergency arrived, and which resulted from the spectacular increase in highway travel that took place during the past three decades in this country.

Now I want to suggest a third factor. The third factor is the future of highway transportation itself. In peacetime we learn to expect a new model car each year. Improvements are incorporated into our motor vehicles every season. But roads can't be built that way. The roads we are planning today will be constructed after the war, and then will be expected to serve the public in 1960 and 1970. They must accommodate cars that won't even be on the drafting boards 15 years from now.

We must plan boldly, gentlemen. The program must take into account the increases which are anticipated in vehicle registrations and in mileage of travel. Otherwise, the facilities that we build will soon become obsolete. And the penalty of obsolescence is a stiff price we can't afford to pay. Expediency is a wasteful policy from the standpoint of highway costs.

Fortunately, we do not have to rely on guesses as to what our traffic needs will be. As result of the highway planning studies which have been carried on in all the States for several years, we now have a solid foundation of factual information on which to base our program. From these studies has emerged an orderly and progressive master plan for highway development.

Mr. HADDEN. That is absolutely correct, Mr. ROBINSON. Working in cooperation with the Public Roads Administration, the States have accumulated a tremendous amount of information on the character of road use, on the economics of the highways, and other engineering and fiscal data. It was these surveys which made possible the work of the National Committee on Interregional Highways, under the chairmanship of our veteran and able Commissioner of Public Roads, Thomas H. MacDonald. Analyzing our national highway needs, that committee found that more than 20 percent of the total traffic could be carried efficiently and safely on less than 1 percent of our total road mileage, if those roads, both rural and urban, are improved to new high standards in the years ahead. The committee's report recently was transmitted to Congress by the President, and it recommends that this interregional system of modern highways be officially designated, so that future projects on these routes can be designed to meet the necessary specifications.

Mr. SINGER. Those are the roads, Mr. Hadden, that will have the capacity needed to open up the bottlenecks in our highway system. Here and there around the country are samples of these roads of tomorrow, with limited access to prevent roadside encroachment, with separations between opposing streams of traffic, with all intersections eliminated. When an expressway of this type is constructed in a congested area, the heavy volume of traffic seems to disappear as if by magic. The modern highway does not appear to be carrying a load at all. That is simply because it is doing the job for which the roadway was designed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Singer, is it your opinion that in the years ahead motor travel will continue to increase as it did during our recent history?

Mr. SINGER. Yes, Mr. ROBINSON; all signs seem to point in that direction. A few years ago the Public Roads Administration estimated that by 1960 the vehicle mileage in this country would be double that of 1937. The war has interfered with that upward curve, but the trend definitely will be toward more and more use of motor vehicles. At present the passenger car is doing a war job. Social and recreational driving for the most part have been greatly curtailed. But when peace comes again a travel-hungry public will soon expand that mileage to its peacetime level and beyond. We can certainly expect in the post-war years a revival of the great tourist industries and other activities dependent upon highway travel.

Mr. HADDEN. That activity, Mr. Singer, will mean employment. And that reminds me that we have not mentioned at all the economic benefits which are derived from safe and efficient highway transportation.

Mr. ROBINSON. That's true. Nor have we said anything about the useful jobs which the highway-construction program itself will provide during the demobilization period after the war, when peacetime industry and business are coming back. The employment in those projects will be a secondary benefit of the highway program, but it may prove to be an extremely valuable asset in the post-war adjustment period.

Mr. SINGER. Much could be said also, Mr. ROBINSON, about the imperative need of giving more emphasis in the post-war highway program to the requirements of city and suburban areas. The 1916 road law got us out of the mud. I hope that the 1944 road law, ushering in a new era in the history of America's highway transportation, will get us out of the muddle.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; we could go on profitably for hours, gentlemen. Highway traffic is something which affects the day-to-day living of each and every one of us. In conclusion, I desire to thank the Mutual Broadcasting Co. for the time and courtesies extended us. Also, I want to thank you gentlemen for joining with me in this discussion. I want to thank our listeners, too, for myself and on behalf of my colleagues in the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, for the constructive interest which so many of you are showing in the solution of this important national problem.

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to a round-table discussion on the subject of Tomorrow's Roads Must Be Planned Today. Participants were the Honorable J. W. ROBINSON, chairman of the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives; Mr. Russell E. Singer, general manager of the American Automobile Association; and Mr. Samuel C. Hadden, president of the American Association of State Highway Officials. The program came to you from Washington, D. C., as a public-service feature of the Mutual Network.

Why Labor Should Vote Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address I made over the National Broadcasting Co., April 2, 1944:

Fellow Americans, the workers of America are to be congratulated on their splendid efforts to create a miracle in war production. The free men and women of America have rolled up their sleeves and done an outstanding job. Their record speaks for itself.

You, better than anyone else, know that all real wages are paid out of production. You know that without constant expansion of enterprise, full employment and higher real wages and resultant better working conditions cannot be realized.

The Republican Party, throughout its entire history, has been a real friend of labor. You perhaps have forgotten that the very birth of the Republican Party came from its determined effort to end the most oppressive of labor's abuses—slavery. And since that birth the Republican Party has never failed to protect the expansion of enterprise; it has always fought for full employment; and under its administration of the Nation's affairs the trend of the real-wage level was always upward. The greatest peacetime prosperity enjoyed by any laboring men any place in the world has been enjoyed by the workers of America under the administration of Republican Presidents. The American people attained the highest level of individual possessions, the greatest number of comforts and all of this without incurring any peacetime direct, interest-bearing Federal debt.

Leaders of the Republican Party have devoted themselves to enacting helpful labor legislation for many years. They have spoken fearlessly, frankly, on the subject of collective bargaining, decent wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions.

President William McKinley signed the Erdman Act June 1, 1898, which provided for mediation and conciliation in the settlement of disputes between the railroads and their employees. It prohibited the discharge of a railroad employee because he was a member of a trade union.

A Republican Congress passed the Railroad Labor Act of 1926, which further aided the prompt settlement of railroad labor disputes. Again the Republican Party sponsored the Anti-Injunction Act of 1932, which protects labor from a discrminatory use of the injunction to break strikes. It was the first party to foster protective tariffs to maintain American wage scales. It has restricted immigration to protect our standard of living. It has opposed child labor.

As a member of the House Labor Committee, I have had the opportunity to contact many employers and labor leaders. All labor organizations, and most of the employers, are united in preserving the Wages and Hours Act and the National Labor Relations Act which gives the American workers minimum wages and the right of collective bargaining. Most employers have complied willingly and in good faith with these provisions. They believe it would be a step backward to destroy them. No one wants to return to sweatshops and low wages. However, thousands of employers and employees are disgusted by the way these acts are being administered.

Employer and employee alike have seen the National Labor Relations Act administered to provoke strife. They have seen it used for political purpose to play one labor organization against another. It is perfectly plain that the right of the employee to bargain collectively with his employer will be of no avail unless there are employers with which to bargain.

In its manipulation of organized labor, the New Deal has injured the labor movement. It has claimed as allies and it has sought to make political vehicles of certain labor groups and thereby aroused opposition to the labor movement by other groups of our citizenry. This is the underlying cause of the agitation that "something must be done to labor."

In the general confusion of our Government, labor has been the whipping boy of bureaucrats. The Department of Labor, which was established to be the central clearinghouse for labor problems, has been rendered impotent, and now labor's leaders have to go from one to another of 25 governmental agencies dealing with labor.

Under this New Deal administration labor unions have been deprived of their right of collective bargaining. Federal bureaus control wages, hours, working conditions, and promotions. The Wages and Hours Act has been hamstrung from the beginning because of the poor administration of the act.

The Republican Party will replace the New Deal's plan of regimentation and compulsion with good management and persuasion. We will utilize the facilities of industry to the best advantage of labor, management, and capital in the post-war period. We will continue to work for full employment, better working conditions, wise and considerate supervision, old-age and disability insurance and the rights of collective bargaining.

The Republican Party will see to it that laws enacted to help labor are administered properly. We will recognize honest American labor leaders and see that industry in this country is a partnership between labor, management, and capital. We will demand that there be a fair division of income in this three-way partnership. We will help to bring about mutual confidence and understanding. We will get the job done with old-fashioned American teamwork.

Fellow Americans, will we rake leaves for the Government under New Deal leadership, or will we have real jobs in private enterprise under Republican leadership? We will have to make our choice. There is no question as to how real Americans will decide. Free enterprise must lead the way, unfettered by Federal restrictions. The hope of the world lies in free men and women. We must keep faith with the men and women in our armed forces. We must keep the torch of liberty burning at home to light the way.

The Hungry Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, an editorial from the Flathead Monitor of Thursday, June 10, 1943, concerning the proposed Hungry Horse Dam in Montana. The writer of this editorial, Mr. Harry Kelley, has been devoting the last 20 years of his life toward the development of this project because he is convinced of its need in furtherance of Montana's progress. He knows whereof he speaks and our people have every confidence in his ability and all of us of Montana are in wholehearted accord with what he says.

The editorial follows:

Hungry Horse Dam is the one answer to the Grand Coulee water needs. It is ready to go now and can be built in time to meet a great part of the alleged needs by 1945. It was brought out in the hearing that it may be needed in 1945 and would actually be necessary in 1946. That is a far cry from the middle of 1944. We have no objection to Grand Coulee or any other downstream development having the full use of Montana water, but we insist on them having it in an equitable way that would give Montana its full use by holding this water in the upper reaches of the Flathead, where it would damage no one.

The McKellar Amendment to T. V. A.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of my section, especially the farmers, are greatly disturbed, and rightly so, over what is known as the McKellar amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill.

There are two of these amendments, the adoption of either one of which would, in my opinion, wreck the T. V. A.

Let us consider these amendments separately in order to determine just what effect the adoption of either one would have upon the future of T. V. A.

One amendment would require T. V. A. to turn into the United States Treasury all of its receipts and then come to Congress annually for an appropriation covering expansion and operating costs. Now, on its face, this amendment will probably appeal to those who do not think the matter through. A careful analysis of the amendment, however, will clearly show up the dangers that are so cleverly wrapped up in this seemingly righteous piece of legislation.

Congress, under the leadership of Senator Norris and Senator McNary, was functioning in a businesslike, statesmanlike manner when it set up T. V. A. Under the terms of the T. V. A. Act it first laid down the objectives, then the method of operation, and then, following sound business practices, it allowed the Authority to function as a business corporation through a board of directors, managing its designated functions and its own funds, free from Washington bureaucracy, and free from national and local politics. Moreover, Congress, in order to safeguard every right, required the Authority to make an annual report to the Congress, and required that all receipts and expenditures of the Authority be audited by the General Accounting Office. In other words, as a private corporation operates within its charter provisions through a board of directors, the T. V. A. operates within its legislative provisions through a board of directors. And, as the board of directors of a private corporation has to report to its stockholders, so the board of directors of T. V. A. has to report to the Congress,

the representative of the people, who, in the final analysis, are the stockholders of T. V. A.

Now, T. V. A., operating as it has along business lines, free from political influence, has made a great record. No charge has been made that the management has not been efficient and that the Authority has not operated in accordance with good business practices. No charge has been made that funds have been diverted or that the Authority has been guilty of waste, extravagance, or poor business judgment. It has a record for efficiency and sound management that any business corporation would be proud of. And, in my opinion, the reason it has such a fine record is because it has been free of political influence. Now, what would this McKellar amendment do? It would force the Authority to come to Congress each year for expansion and operating funds. And Senator MCKELLAR, due to the illness of Senator GLASS, is the acting chairman of the Senate committee that would pass upon the appropriation. It is well known that Senator MCKELLAR, in spite of Lilienthal's outstanding record, does not like Lilienthal and wants to get rid of him. What does all of this add up to? Let us be plain about the matter. It simply means that T. V. A. will no longer be run along business lines, but will be conducted along political lines. It means that when the Authority comes before the Congress for an appropriation, you would have the McKellars saying, "Get rid of Lilienthal and I will go along." Others would be saying, "Do this, that, or the other, and I will go along." It simply means converting T. V. A. from an efficient business organization into a political organization. Do this and you will destroy T. V. A.

The other amendment is equally as vicious. This amendment would require Senate confirmation of all Government employees receiving $4,500 and more and would apply, of course, to the some 600 T. V. A. employees receiving such compensation, most of whom are in Tennessee. In all, I understand this amendment would apply to some 30,000 Government employees. Stripped of all hypocritically pious arguments, what would this add up to? Well, every sensible person knows that neither the President nor the Senate could even pretend to consider 30,000 appointments on their merits. It simply means a revival of the spoils system upon a scale never before dreamed of, and the allocation of these appointments under the ancient rule of senatorial courtesy.

To the spurious argument that this legislation is aimed at reducing T. V. A. power rates, let me say in no uncertain terms that I do not know of a more effective way of raising T. V. A. rates, and raising them not only to a point where they would no longer serve as a good yardstick by which power rates in general can be measured but to a point where the farmers could no longer afford to use electricity. Why? Because in substituting political management for business management you would crucify the Authority upon the political cross of inefficiency. If the power interests had set about to destroy the Authority, they could not have devised a more ingenious scheme than the McKellar amendments.

Another thing I desire to bring to the attention of the House is the manner in which this legislation originated. It would seem that such far-reaching legislation would originate in the usual way; that is, by a proper bill, which would be referred to a committee for proper hearings and study, and then a report to the Congress, setting forth its findings and recommendations. This is not only the proper legislative procedure but the only safe procedure. This legislation originated, however, by what is known as a rider; that is, an amendment to an appropriation bill. Such an amendment could not have originated in the House because it would have gone out on a point of order as being legislation on an appropriation bill. The rules of the Senate, however, permit such amendments. I am always suspicious of legislation by riders. Legislation that cannot weather hearings and study by the proper committee is seldom, if ever, proper.

Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1944, the Southwest Virginia Agricultural Association held its annual meeting at Abingdon, Va. The meeting was attended by over 300 outstanding farmers from the 9 Virginia counties lying within the watershed of the Tennessee River. Among other resolutions adopted, the association adopted a resolution condemning what is known as the McKellar amendments and calling upon the Virginia Senators and Congressmen to lend their influence to defeat same. Under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks, I include herein a copy of the resolution:

At the ninth annual meeting of the Southwest Virginia Agricultural Association, held at Abingdon, Va., on April 8, 1944, in attendance were over 300 representative farmers from 9 Virginia counties lying within the watershed of the Tennessee River, the below resolution was unanimously adopted by the entire body:

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this association that certain proposed amendments undertaking to obstruct the efficient administrative, financial, and operating powers of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as created by the act of Congress in 1933; and

"Whereas this body deplores such amendments as being inimical to the efficient and effective operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the best interest of this area and State; and

"Whereas the farmers in the counties represented here, together with the farmers from the other Virginia counties, are receiving material assistance in their farming operations through the efforts of the Tennessee Valley Authority in their fertilizer program; and

"Whereas the entire Nation is receiving benefits from the T. V. A.'s national defense program of electric power and munitions production, navigation, flood and soil-erosion control, high-analysis fertilizers, and other activities of inestimable value to our war effort: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this body unanimously endorses the entire program of the Tennessee Valley Authority and requests that its present activities be continued and expanded as rapidly as practicable; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Virginia Congressmen and Senators and members of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees be forwarded copies of this resolution with the request that they use their vote and influence to oppose any action which would in any way impair the efficient and valuable work being done by the Tennessee Valley Authority at present or in the future."

J. L. SANDERS,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1944, the city of Bristol, Va., also passed resolutions condemning the McKellar amendments. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a copy of the resolutions adopted by the city of Bristol, Va.:

CITY OF BRISTOL, VA.,
March 28, 1944.

Mayor Preston presented the following:

"*Resolved*, That this council go on record as opposing the McKellar amendments now pending before Congress concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority, because: First, having already signed a contract, we are interested in obtaining T. V. A. power for our city; second, we believe that T. V. A. should be kept out of politics; and, third, T. V. A. now has a fine record in fact and in the public estimation as rendering splendid service in many ways to the people in the area served by it and we regret that its future and its usefulness is threatened by said amendments.

"We respectfully call upon our senators and members of the house of delegates to oppose said amendments."

Upon motion of Mayor Preston, seconded by Mr. Aaron, and by unanimous vote, the foregoing resolution was adopted

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Bristol, Va., at its meeting of March 28, 1944, as recorded in minute book 13, page 354.

Given under my hand and the official seal of said city, this the 30th day of March 1944.

B. E. BALLARD, *City Clerk.*

Amendment to Use Tax Stamp Act

REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to advise the House that I have introduced an amendment to title 26, section 3540, of the United States Code, which is commonly called the Use Tax Stamp Act. Under the provisions of that act each person owning and operating a motor vehicle or a boat is required to purchase a use-tax stamp and attach the same to the motor vehicle or boat, and to exhibit the same in a conspicuous place. A failure so to do subjects the owner to a fine and punishment.

In many cases, since this act became a public law, the people have complied with the law by purchasing the stamp and affixing it to their motor vehicle or boat, and thereafter the same has been lost, removed, stolen, or mutilated, and the owner has been compelled to purchase another stamp, for that period for which he has already purchased a stamp and for which he has already paid the

fee of $5 therefor. Under the present law there is no receipt issued to the purchaser of the use-tax stamp, and no other written evidence is issued to him, so evidence is available whereby he can show that he has made such purchase in compliance with the law.

The bill which I have introduced provides that the selling official shall issue and deliver to each purchaser a receipt, or written evidence, of such purchase, showing the date of the purchase and the name and address of the purchaser, which shall be duly signed by the selling officer and which such evidence may be thereafter used, by the purchaser, in case of the loss, removal, theft, or mutilation of such sticker, stamp, or tag so purchased by him, to secure another of the same, or a duplicate thereof, without any additional charge therefor.

Mr. Speaker, it was not the intent of this law that our people should be required to purchase, at a cost of $5 each, more than one stamp for any one motor vehicle or boat during any one year. However, in many instances where the stamp or sticker was lost or stolen the people have been compelled to purchase another to take its place in order to avoid the punishment provided by the law. This measure will provide the material evidence necessary for our people to secure a duplicate stamp, without any additional cost, in cases where the stamps or stickers have been lost, stolen, or mutilated.

How to Continue Our Traditional Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me last night:

Both in the public press and on the radio, there has been criticism of the alleged lack of a consistent foreign policy. Many people in public life have complained that our Government did not follow a foreign policy that was consistent; that our foreign policy of today was not the policy of yesterday, or would be the policy of tomorrow. This criticism was wholly unjustified by the facts.

A few days ago our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, told the people of the United States very plainly and in very definite language just what our essential foreign policy is, was, and will be.

One of the principal points which were raised in the Secretary's speech, was the fact that our country has always followed the policy of human freedom, human dignity, and the right of every individual to live happily and without fear.

It is in line with this policy that we now have the opportunity of again demonstrating to the whole world that we value human rights; that we seek to save human lives wherever possible; and that we shall do our share to bring about a condition for many, so that they may be relieved of the haunting fear of a hopeless existence.

As the German Army is retreating on the eastern front, it leaves in its wake hundreds and thousands of victims. These victims are not soldiers who are fighting in the ranks and who wage battle. These victims are men, women, and children left behind all over the war area, whom Hitler has marked for extermination. Knowing that he cannot win this war, he wants to complete his fiendish program of destruction before it is possible to rescue his victims.

This condition has now existed for some time, and since I believe that it is our duty as American citizens, and in the tradition of our country, to help the oppressed, I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives, which declared it to be the sense of Congress that aid should be given to victims of oppression, who are desirous of establishing temporary homes in the United States, so that they may come to us until such time as other homes can be provided for them.

What I propose to do under this resolution, is to save as many human lives as can be saved within the framework of our immigration laws.

While much can be said concerning our future immigration policy, there is no question that restrictions of immigration and limitations of immigration have been clearly written into our legislation and there is no question but that our future immigration policy will continue to be based on selective immigration. It is therefore impossible to do anything by way of increasing the number of permanent immigrants who might be admitted from Europe from the Hitler-ridden countries.

In his progress through Europe, Hitler has already murdered and enslaved masses of people in every country to which his legions have gone. He enslaved the countries of western Europe and whenever his armies are forced to retreat from Russian territory, he slaughters and enslaves thousands along his path.

The only way we can save at least some of his victims is by granting temporary havens of refuge to as many as can find the opportunity to escape, until such time as they shall be able to return to their homelands or until such time as other countries might be found ready to receive them.

The object of my resolution is, therefore, no amendment to our immigration laws and no desire to interfere with a settled policy of our immigration laws, but it is purely a temporary measure designed to help and to save. The program is not limited to Jewish victims of Hitler's persecution, but is to be applied on a broader basis, including all racial groups, which have borne the brunt of Hitler's persecution.

The important thing now is not to provide for a future settlement of these people, but to enable them to save their lives until such time as definite plans could be made for their settlement.

Hitler will not wait for us to rescue them from his clutches. He is carrying on his program with ferocious and unrelenting might, and if we do not do something now, at once and in a hurry, there will be nobody to save when the time will come for us to resettle the ravaged countries which Hitler has despoiled.

In pleading for justice for the many who have been dispossessed by the fury of the German regime, we are not seeking to open the doors for those who may be unworthy. On the contrary, the types of aliens who have come to the United States since 1933 have been persons who have materially contributed to the welfare of the United States, and many have since given their lives in battle. A few days ago, I had the pleasure of listening to a very interesting discourse by my colleague, the former Governor of Massachusetts, and former mayor of Boston, Congressman CURLEY, who recited the fine record of achievement and bravery contributed to this country by a large number of Jews, who have distinguished themselves as soldiers, sailors, and marines. Among the names he mentioned were many who have only recently arrived in the United States as victims of Hitler's persecution. Undoubtedly, there will be many others in the same category who will be found among those whom we may rescue from Hitler's clutches.

To be sure, the ideal solution of the problem of the men, women, and children who are slated for extermination would be their removal to Palestine. Palestine is ideally situated to receive these persons, since it is accessible to them by land, does not require any shipping for transportation, and would be the place in which these victims could find a congenial home.

I have not yet given up hope that some way will be found to open the doors of Palestine to the victims of Hitler's persecution.

The British white paper is not recognized by the people of the United States as being within the terms of the British mandate over Palestine, and there is no question in my mind that this so-called white paper is a clear violation of our treaty with Great Britain, and I will leave no stone unturned to see that this white paper is abrogated.

Palestine could be opened not only as a home for the Jewish victims of Hitler's persecution, but to all races and nationalities, who can be invited to settle there within the limits of the country's absorptive capacity. I know that sooner or later the great powers will see the wisdom of this step and will themselves propose Palestine as a solution of the problem of persecuted minorities.

Only recently a fine economist and a member of our own Department of Agriculture, Dr. Lowdermilk, wrote a very convincing book, in which he pointed out the miracle of achievement of Palestine. He showed how waste lands have been converted into blooming gardens, how empty spaces which had been neglected for hundreds of years have become thriving and fruitful. So I do believe that since this miracle was accomplished, in face of tremendous odds against it, these prospective refugees can make Palestine even more fertile, and even more suitable for a homeland for the dispossessed. But, I am afraid that if we waste too much time in trying to convince people who do not wish to be convinced, how wonderful a solution Palestine would be, we shall lose valuable time in effecting the rescue of those who may otherwise not be rescued in time.

As a result of my correspondence, I am convinced that with the approval of our Federal authorities, many States would welcome refugees to settle on farms wherever possible, and by doing so will help to relieve our present critical shortage of agricultural workers throughout the United States.

Another possibility was Alaska, which offers the additional advantage of being strategically an important outpost of the United States, so that a resettlement of suitable persons within its borders will result in obtaining favorable groups of people in the interests of the United States, in this remote corner of our country.

Only recently Congress appropriated $30,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture, in order to import into this country Mexican and other residents of this hemisphere to help to relieve our labor shortage. It has been an increasingly difficult problem to find enough hands to take care of our farms, and in many places our agriculture suffers tremendously from the shortage of manpower to operate farms.

I know I speak for the many independent farmers in this country who have found it increasingly difficult to keep step with the necessity of wartime production to permit this country to fill its quota of products to feed the United States and the world. As a matter of fact, it was necessary from time to time to grant deferments from military service to persons engaged in farming, because without such deferments we could not possibly keep our farms.

By increasing agricultural production, we will make a decided contribution to our war effort. We have called upon our youth to work on the farms while on vacation from school and at other odd times. But here are men, women, and children who will undoubtedly utilize the opportunity of working on our farms, if we give them the chance of leaving behind their enemies who are seeking to exterminate them. It will not cost us one cent in appropriations. Why not try the experiment of permitting entry to the United States of any fit and law-abiding alien who will undertake the work of our farmers?

The resolution I have introduced may not be a complete solution to the problem, and while I do not contend that it will put an end to Hitler's destruction of the many racial and national groups of Europe, it will go a long way toward the principle which is so thoroughly American—the saving of human lives.

We shall also thereby give an example to the countries of Central and South America, who will, I feel, likewise open their doors to the victims of persecutions and rescue them from their destruction, if we show the way.

Report on the Aleutian Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report made by me to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to orders of the committee, the undersigned proceeded from Seattle on Tuesday, January 24, 1944, on an inspection tour of the Aleutian naval bases west of Dutch Harbor.

I proceeded by Naval Transportation Service from Seattle up the Pacific coast, over Canadian territory, to the base at Annette Island, southeastern tip of Alaska Territory. The Navy maintains a naval air facility on Annette Island. Lieutenant Commander Snyder is in command. This facility maintains patrols generally doing what would be normal Coast Guard work in the area. Much of the work is the handling of military transients. The facility maintains several quonset huts for that purpose.

The Army field at Annette is an excellent one and within easy reach as a gas facility and alternate field for planes going north from Seattle, and is on American territory. The main complaint of the men, both Army and Navy, on the island was the utter lack of any recreational facilities. The only town of any consequence was the Indian village of Metex which has long since been declared out of bounds. The Navy facility had under its command several trained pilots who, by their own confession, had very little to do inasmuch as patrols were limited and the general pressure of enemy activity in this area has long since been removed.

Annette Field is an air facility, however, that should be properly maintained at all times because of its importance as an American way point on the coast air line north, now and post-war.

The Sitka naval base was passed up due to bad weather but conversation was had with several officers who had recently returned from the base and all were of the opinion that the Army-Navy facility there was much too large; that the expenditure of money had been excessive and extravagant and that it should be reverted back to a section-base status. Admiral F. J. Whiting, commandant of the Alaska section, had already surveyed the situation and was making moves toward this end, both in way of reduced personnel, and in the removal of materials needed elsewhere. The Army has expended many hundreds of thousands of dollars in building breakwaters and levees to small islands beyond the Sitka base. The desirability of same is doubtful. A Coast Guard Patrol station, in my opinion, should serve the purpose with a reasonable Navy section-base status on Sitka proper. Admiral Whiting is thoroughly cognizant of the situation and is taking steps to correct the situation. Whiting's recommended personnel cut for the base is well within line of the above impressions.

Left Annette Wednesday, January 25, by N. A. T. S., direct over the Gulf of Alaska, in a land plane for Kodiak Naval Base. Arrived at 0400. Weather conditions again were bad with the thermometer below zero, a blizzard in progress and a 60-knot-an-hour wind. The landing strips at Kodiak, however, are more than adequate since my last visit to the island, and aids to navigation allow landing of large land planes in almost any type of weather if ceiling is available. The naval air field at Kodiak Island is one of the most adequate of any of our naval bases if not one of the finest in the Pacific. Present runways are sufficient to take care of any type of plane built. The base has grown considerably since my inspection of a year ago but finds itself in a somewhat comparable position to other eastern Alaskan bases; namely, that the war has moved westward. It is, therefore, recommended that no further new projects for the development of the base be made without careful scrutiny as to their necessity. The main activity was the handling of aircraft on the north and south Aleutian run and a great number of personnel moving in and out. Two excellent officers are in charge, Captain McDade, the commander, and Commander Rice, the executive officer. For example, regarding the necessity of maintaining facilities to handle transfers in this area, I found two full companies of Seabees at Kodiak awaiting transportation out. McDade and Rice expressed the opinion that their main job now was to make the base as ship-shape and as efficient as possible. This air facility should be maintained to its fullest extent because Kodiak Island, like Annette, will always be an important waypoint over the northern air route.

Storage facilities here are of the finest in Alaska. The supply department is doing an excellent job in maintaining backlogs of supplies for all activities to the westward. One of the most vital services to be put to use by the base is a full utilization of its airplane repair facilities. Kodiak has excellent repair shops, hangars, and power facilities.

Several hundred permanent personnel are maintained on the base. This amount seems reasonable for adequate maintenance.

At Kodiak there appeared much wasted Army personnel. It is hoped the Army quickly moves on this matter, in view of manpower need. These are trained men, many of them stagnating there. Transportation is, of course, a problem.

The Kodiak Air Field has plenty of hangar space and future construction projects do not seem desirable at this time. Such is also the opinion of the competent officers there.

It may be well to note some comments regarding a complete inspection of ship service in this area. It was well stocked and the ship service officer and myself counted at least 50 separate items available to the men there which are not available in the States. This, of course, is as it should be.

Recreation facilities were in fair abundance but the men are pretty restricted during the winter months. This base, as well as other bases on the chain, was equipped with a gymnasium, a sun room, and a steam room—which were used constantly. Lieutenant Nielson, a reserve officer who had been in charge of a Boston athletic club, has done a great deal to stimulate interest in the physical welfare of the men. This is excellent utilization of ability and experience. The officers had also installed, in order to utilize a certain amount of waste time, what they call Kodiak University. Officers stationed on the base from Reserve groups who had been either teachers or had some specialty in civilian life, taught night classes. The classes were open to all and were well attended. The base had a local radio station from which it broadcast music, news as picked up by short wave from Pacific coast stations, and good use was made of local talent on the base. Radio scouts might do well in some of these Aleutian bases. The three small movie houses were crowded every evening. This station had solved its problem of keeping the men active both on and off duty in the best possible way available. No civilian population exists on the island, except the small town of Kodiak. Very little exists there. Activities on the base were such that I was told the men expressed no desire for leave to go to this town.

No venereal-disease problem exists at all. As a matter of fact, the health of the men along the whole naval activity of the Alaskan and Aleutian chain is better than anywhere else in the world. This is, of course, due to the climate and the lack of carrier germs.

An interesting feature of recreational activities was observed in that during the months of snow a ski lodge was built on one of the mountains outside the base and a Red Cross girl who had been a ski instructor was assigned to give men ski instructions. The very few hospital cases at Kodiak as well as other bases were mainly accidents from skiing, slipping on the ice, etc.

Admiral Whiting met me at Kodiak and, as before pointed out, he had been on an inspection tour with almost the same purpose in mind as the remarks of this report. He is an able and practical officer.

The Navy is further utilizing, on the Kodiak base, the services of Reserve officers who are very familiar with Alaskan problems, both air and sea. For example, the able air transportation officer at Kodiak, a key point in Alaskan air transportation, was Commander Herb Munter, one of the oldest and most experienced of all Alaskan flyers. This personnel utilization can be multiplied many times in the area.

Admiral Whiting and I flew direct from Kodiak to Adak in a DC-4, nonstop. For pure transportation work, all experienced air officers agree, and this nonstop flight bore out, that the use of large land planes which can fly long distances over Alaskan and Aleutian weather are most desirable. The "chain" is becoming literally not only the main air highway via the great circle route to Asia but also probably one of the finest air road beds in the world.

Several discussions were had on this point regarding N. A. T. S. service. Admiral Whiting and N. A. T. S. officers were in the process of working out main routes and shuttle serv-

ice, a very fine system of air transportation from Seattle all the way to Attu. Pan American Airways, under contract, is flying part of the route. Northwest Airlines, under Army contract, is flying the inside route and from Anchorage clear on out to Adak along the chain of Naval bases. These private air carriers are doing an excellent job and should be encouraged in every way, not only for the purpose of keeping this in private hands when they can serve the war effort successfully, but for the purpose of giving commercial air lines the so-called know how of this terrain in order that in post-war aviation they may be in a position to take best advantage of world air development. Both Army and Navy transport service should only be used where commercial contract carriers are not available.

At Adak I was met by Admiral Frank J. Fletcher, the commandant of the Northern Sea Frontier. Adak is the main advanced base in the Aleutians. It is an amazing place which has been built up to fighting strength in 1 year. It might be well to note here that this tremendous construction job at all these northern bases west of Dutch Harbor has been accomplished by the Seabees. One can only appreciate what has been done by visual observation. They have gone out on these barren wastes, pitched tents, and, starting from scratch in the sleet, slush, rain, cold, and snow, have built some of the finest air fields, air facilities, piers, etc., that exist anywhere in any advanced base in the world. I spent some time with the Seabee unit at Adak. I found them commanded by able engineers and composed of the most varied assortment of men that ever donned a uniform. They can do anything and build anything and are willing to do so on a moment's notice. Their activities range from driving "cats" and bulldozers, mending furniture in a nurses' home, stevedoring on ships, digging pits, gravelling roads, exploring for wild game and fish, to interior decorating in the officers' office.

For instance, at Adak they have drained a small lake and provided for a fleet anchorage which will take care of anything we will ever use in the Aleutians. They have just about completed a Navy air field. They have built roadways and all the other things necessary for this vast naval facility, all in the period of 10 months starting from scratch.

They happen to be the healthiest and happiest crew of men of any corps, and I may say also the hungriest, which is only natural after this outdoor work. It might be interesting to the committee to know that at one dinner with them we had soup, turkey, asparagus, mashed potatoes, dressing, bread, butter, cookies, salad, ice cream, and coffee, all in generous helpings and many of them took a second, along with music and free cigarettes. Some ingenious Seabee had rigged up a phonograph with loudspeaker, along the lines of Musack system so that every mess hall had as fine music as they wanted. This ingenuity is typical. The cost to the Government is nil. In my opinion, from observation not only in the Aleutians, but over a period of many war months in the Pacific, the courage and accomplishments of the Seabees is one of the bright spots of efficiency in war.

It was found that there had been no court-martials and only three mast cases in 3 months, and not one man on report in 3 weeks.

Adak has the best harbor in the Aleutians. Why the Japanese did not establish themselves there is a military mystery. Possibly the best explanation is that for many years on all of our maps we designated Kiska as a "Naval Reserve—Keep Out," and, therefore, the very subtle way of Japanese thinking must have led them to Kiska instead of to one of the finest potential bases in the Aleutians.

The Army airfield at Adak is a unique one with a very long runway. This was accomplished by a very bright young engineer who discovered a lagoon with a narrow entrance from the sea and merely drained the lagoon by building a dam at the entrance. They drain the water in or out at will leaving a very fine hard-surface airfield. Army activities at Adak are numerous but are necessary here inasmuch as it is an advanced base and still subject to enemy surveillance. The Northwest Sea Frontier is in the able hands of Admiral Frank J. Fletcher, whose reputation as a hard, practical fighting man has long been established in the Navy. He is an inspiration to the drab life of the men on the "chain," and since the beginning of the Paramushiro bombing both by air and by sea he has the morale of the men in excellent shape. In other words, after 2 years of intense hardships and tedious, almost unbearable living conditions, the men now feel that they are a definite part of the offensive war against Japan. Typical of this spirit is the little military radio station on Adak, which begins is radio day by announcing, "This is station on the northern highway to victory."

Ship service in this advanced base is well stocked. There is a shortage of liquor and beer due, I am told, to transportation problems. The officers' clubs are only open as a consequence approximately 2 hours a day. This should be corrected. The logistic problem in supplying this area is tremendous, although surely living conditions and the type of area involved should give these Aleutian bases every priority.

Both Navy and Army are building good sound dockage in Adak Bay.

Hospital facilities at Adak and on the chain are ample. The only women on the entire chain are the nurses assigned to the hospitals. The usual set-up is quonset Pacific huts and the doctors in charge appear well satisfied. The flow of medical supplies was always adequate. Four hundred major operations have been performed on Adak alone in the past year.

The Army and Navy appear to be working in complete unison. The Army being snowed in at the time, bulldozers were making progress to open their roads. The importance of this equipment in Alaska might be illustrated by the remark of one Seabee working on a closed road, "If it weren't for these damn 'cats' there wouldn't be any way in the Aleutians."

Constant conferences go on between Army and Navy commands at all times both on strategy and internal matters. The only friction I found between Army and Navy on the whole trip existed over locations in which to establish facilities. If the Navy had taken one portion of the island and the Army had a position not as valuable, or vice versa, there was always some conflict by virtue of the fact that one of the services would want to move in. This was true for instance on Adak, where the Navy had established a radio range and the Army seemed to think there was no place else available for an ammunition dump. The reverse was true at Attu. These things, however, are very minor matters compared to much of the confusion that existed in the earlier part of the war in the area, and in every case the officers in charge of the matters involved sat around a table and worked them out without trouble. A lot of this results too from the fact that where there is only so much land available a scramble exists. However, any present lack of unison is negligible and never goes beyond the conference stage.

Mail facilities to the men are normal; however, a revamping of N. A. T. S. service providing direct contact from Adak with Anchorage with shuttle service to the southward through Kodiak, Cold Bay, and Dutch Harbor would provide better facilities through to most of the men. I have had conferences since my return upon this proposal and such service is being worked out. Admiral Whiting has some good ideas on this.

The constant complaint along the whole chain and in the Alaskan area was the feeling with many of the men who had been stuck there for many months that surely something should be effected to effect transfers and reliefs. It is agreed that the type of service in the area justifies a better turn-over of replacements. Although the Navy normally attempts to effect relief in most areas after 18 months, as a general practice, the hardships of the Aleutian service would seem to justify a maximum of no more than 12 months. Relief should then be effected, transportation permitting.

Recreation-wise, keen disappointment was expressed in many instances by the men over the type of U. S. O. shows given them. Very few have showed up and those haven't been up to the standard or anticipation of the men. Whether or not advanced reports regarding U. S. O. shows are too optimistic or whether the type of show being sent to the Aleutians is not up to standard should be investigated. Because of transportation difficulties, the best type of U. S. O. for this area would seem to be individual artists and stars that could be transported with minimum space.

I proceeded after 3 days to Attu with an excellent break in the weather giving us opportunity to make complete air pictures of the excellent chain of air fields and bases between Adak and Attu. Reconnaissance was made of Kiska and Amchitka. These fields are on comparatively flat islands with long runways and the only problem existent is the supply difficulties.

Since the removal of the Japanese from Attu, both the Navy and the Army have made tremendous strides in the development of the base. The Navy has an excellent air field, with adequate strips for landing of the type of aircraft now used in the area. It is hoped that further development of the Navy field will be such to allow the Army to participate in joint use. The weather on Attu is the most changeable of all islands on the Aleutians.

Attu will be the post-war spring board for American air routes to the entire Orient. The expenditure of money on any field here will have recurrent value for the commercial and military for many years to come.

Attu has a fair harbor. Docks exist to handle cargo ships and the base has potentialities. The men stationed there live a similar life to those on the chain, although the weather is a bit more rugged. Inasmuch as it is the most advanced and newest base in the area many things are needed. For instance, the few nurses on the island at the naval hospital were completely without adequate furniture. This was being sent to them from Sitka. Gymnasium facilities were not adequate.

These men participate on these long flights, and facilities for their personal care at the end of the flight should be constantly watched. For example, the group itself had no gymnasium equipment at their section base. I made a personal note of this and reported same to the Seattle area and was advised that they would immediately send out proper equipment. The cost of the same is minute as compared to keeping a valuable flier in physical condition.

An acute shortage of lumber existed, so much so that a great deal of unauthorized appropriating was going on between divisions for any type of lumber they could lay their hands on. Much difficulty existed through the entire chain in trying to get finished lumber. This condition was also reported.

At the Attu field they had recently installed Barto lamps. All aviators and officers were high in their praise of their value.

The Japanese base on the northern side of the island has already been abandoned as

being not as feasible as the present location of our base. They again picked a mediocre area.

I spent 4 days on Attu and had opportunity to talk to a great number of men and officers and fliers. The morale of the men was pretty much keyed up at the time.

The return trip was made through to Adak and then by smaller plane from Adak to Dutch Harbor where we encountered the most favorable weather but finally made the Dutch Harbor airport.

At Dutch Harbor I found great development since my last visit, and here again is a base which is making itself shipshape with no enlargement contemplated. There appeared to be many more Army men stationed there than needed, including infantry.

The airfield at Dutch Harbor is not as we would all like, but topographical conditions are such to make it almost impossible for any enlargement of the same.

The submarine base at Dutch Harbor has proven to be very valuable. Storage and supplies at Dutch Harbor were found to be good, and task forces or military movements based to the westward will find facilities ample and efficiently administered. Captain Lanny Conn is commandant. The submarine-repair facilities at Dutch Harbor should be zealously kept up. As the war moves westward, Dutch Harbor, like Kodiak and Sitka, can stand a reduction of personnel.

After weather delay in Dutch Harbor I proceeded again to Kodiak and then across the Gulf of Alaska to Annette Island. The weather did not allow the Navy plane to proceed further south, so through the courtesy of the Army I hitchhiked on an Army transport to Seattle.

Respectfully submitted.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Personnel should immediately check on shortage of cooks for bases west of Dutch Harbor. Common complaint, cooks not available.

2. Supplies and Accounts should make immediate check of continuing shortage of drag lines in area.

3. Much of the equipment, particularly for construction work not fully utilized because of lack of spare parts. Trucks, bulldozers, and like shipped to area in good shape but not sufficient spare parts accompanying.

4. Question of finished lumber supply important. Most lumber coming up is 12 by 12, and no tongue-and-groove lumber for necessary minimum housing. Lumber situation causing many hardships. For example, no lumber available at Attu for sentry houses.

5. All outside recreation such as U. S. O. shows sent to the area should be sent to westward first and work back to the chain, otherwise many of them never get out to advanced bases.

6. Adequate supply of beverages, hard and soft, is too spasmodic. Type of life should give this area priority.

7. Steps should be taken to attempt to get more barges in the area.

Other general recommendations contained in body of report.

House and Senate Investigating Committees

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, recently when I stated unless the Senate and House discontinued the practice of ordering special investigations, the people would cease to look upon the Congress as the legislative branch of the Government, but would term it the department of investigations, I had in mind the many resolutions passed by both Houses.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, I have had compiled a list of committees granted special powers in both Houses of Congress that are active today. The Senate has passed no less than 38 resolutions and the House 30 resolutions. Many other resolutions are pending in both branches of Congress for investigations.

What disturbs me most is the duplication of effort. We have committees of the House duplicating the work of the Senate, and committees of the Senate going over the same ground covered by House committees.

I am going to name some, where there is a House and Senate committee covering the same field. Some of the subjects covered are production, distribution, and consumption of food; obtaining data for appropriations committees; Indian affairs; radio; investigating war contracts, Navy, military, and merchant marine; public lands; conditions in Puerto Rico; small business; civil service; national defense programs; post-war policy and planning, both economic and military; conservation of wildlife; and petroleum, and aside from that there was a time when both the House and Senate had committees investigating airplane disasters. Then, again, there has been some duplication by Senate committees of the work of the Dies committee, such as investigating civil liberties.

How can we justify our criticism of duplication, waste, and extravagance in the executive departments when we practice what we complain of?

I concede there are times when special investigations are necessary and prove to be of great value.

Of course, it is too late now to act on this suggestion during this Congress, but I say in future an effort should be made to have an understanding with the Senate whereby joint committees could be appointed and not have one branch duplicate the work of the other. Time and again I have seen the high-ranking officials of the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and other war agencies before a Senate committee one day and a House committee the next day going over the same subject. These officials are charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the war and should be at their desks just as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have another suggestion which might well be considered. Special committees and authority to investigate by standing committees are created by a resolution reported by the Rules Committee. Seldom does the House, in creating this authority, thoroughly discuss the question of expenses. If it does, never do I recall where a limitation was placed in the resolution. In other words, the sky is the limit if the House so desires. It is my thought when a resolution is brought in by the Rules Committee a limit of cost should be included. That would not mean the entire amount would have to be appropriated but it would serve as a warning to the Committee on Accounts, beyond that limitation you shall not go. It would also serve as a warning to the committee they must stay within that amount or return to the Rules Committee for a further authorization. As it is now the Accounts Committee feels, as an agent of the House, it is required, when the House creates a special committee to investigate, to appropriate funds. In this way, if a committee reached the limitation, the House would have a right to determine whether or not it desired the committee to continue its activities. For one, I would like an opportunity to vote on the continuance of some of our present investigating committees. There is a difference between voting to extend authority to a committee and voting funds for expenses of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the time has arrived when we should proceed with caution and not create any more investigating committees unless absolutely necessary.

Below will be found a list of House and Senate committees active at the present time, together with the amount of money appropriated for each for expenses.

House of Representatives, investigating committees

(78th Cong., Apr. 1, 1944)

STANDING COMMITTEES

	Total amount authorized
Air navigation and commerce (Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee)	$10,000
Appropriation Committee investigating organization and operation of Government departments and agencies	100,000
Appropriation Committee investigation of subversive activities	15,000
Civilian employment, investigating Government departments (Civil Service Commission)	34,500
Columbia River and tributaries (Commitee on Irrigation and Reclamation)	5,000
Farm security investigation (Special Agriculture Committee)	20,000
Farm products investigation (Agriculture Committee)	45,000
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (Foreign Affairs Committee)	500
Defense housing program (Public Buildings and Grounds Committee)	10,000
Indian Affairs Committee, investigation of American Indian	15,000
Judiciary Committee, investigating Judges Johnson and Watson of Pennsylvania	2,500
Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee (national defense program)	127,000
Military Affairs Committee, national defense program:	
Old appropriation	65,000
New appropriation	90,000
Naval Affairs Committee, national defense program:	
Old appropriation	90,000
New appropriation	50,000
Investigation of newsprint, brand names, and so forth (Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee)	12,000
Petroleum investigation (Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee)	30,000
Puerto Rico investigation (Insular Affairs Committee)	25,000
Public lands investigation (Public Lands Committee)	10,000

STANDING COMMITTEES—continued

	Total amount authorized
Investigation of roads, highways, bridges, etc. (Committee on Roads)	(1)
Investigation of guayule as rubber (Agriculture Committee)	$5,000

[1] No funds authorized.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Conservation Wildlife Resources (Congressman ROBERTSON, Virginia, chairman)	$7,500
Investigating Federal Communications Commission (Congressman LEA, California, chairman)	110,000
Investigating Government departments and agencies beyond the scope of their authority (Congressman SMITH, Virginia, chairman)	60,000
Small Business, National Defense (Congressman PATMAN, Texas, chairman)	67,500
Un-American Activities (Congressman DIES, Texas, chairman)	652,500
Post-war Economic Policy and Planning (Congressman COLMER, Mississippi, chairman)	100,000
Post-war Military Policy (Congressman WOODRUM, Virginia, chairman)	25,000
Joint Committee to Attend Parliamentary Association of Canada (Congressman BLOOM, New York, chairman)	1,000
Joint Committee Commemorating the Centennial of the Telegraph (House share) (Senator WHEELER, Montana, chairman)	2,000
Joint Committee Nonessential Federal Expenditures (Senator BYRD, Virginia, chairman) (House share)	20,000

United States Senate

	Resolution agreed to—	Total amount authorized
STANDING COMMITTEES		
Agriculture and Forestry:		
Investigating District of Columbia Commodity Prices	Feb. 25, 1943	$1,000
Investigating Production, Distribution, and Consumption of Food	June 1, 1943	5,000
Investigating Rural Electrification Administration	Feb. 8, 1944	7,500
Investigating Synthetic Alcohol and Rubber	do	11,500
Appropriations: Obtaining Factual Data, etc	Oct. 14, 1943	30,000
Commerce: Investigating Airplane Disasters	Feb. 4, 1943	15,000
District of Columbia: Investigating Administration and Operation of District of Columbia Water System	Jan. 25, 1943	5,000
Education and Labor:		
Investigating Physical Fitness of Civilian Population, etc	June 2, 1943	5,000
Investigating Violation of the Rights of Labor	Feb. 8, 1944	204,000
Foreign Relations: For Expenses of Entertaining Distinguished Visitors, etc	July 1, 1943	1,000
Indian Affairs: Making a Survey of Indian Conditions	Jan. 25, 1943	109,000
Interstate Commerce:		
Investigating Ban on Recordings by American Federation of Musicians	Feb. 4, 1943	5,000
Investigating Supply and Distribution of Hydroelectric Power	June 26, 1943	3,000
Investigating Shortage of Railroad Equipment	Feb. 15, 1944	1,500
Investigating International Communication by Wire, Radio, etc	Mar. 29, 1944	5,000
Judiciary:		
Investigating Operations of the Alcoholic Beverage Industry	Nov. 16, 1943	10,000
Investigating Authority of Executive Orders	Mar. 30, 1944	5,000

United States Senate—Continued

	Resolution agreed to—	Total amount authorized
STANDING COMMITTEES—con.		
Military Affairs:		
Investigating War Contracts	Feb. 8, 1944	$5,000
Considering Mobilization of Technological Resources	Dec. 21, 1943	12,500
Naval Affairs: Inspection of Naval Establishments	July 7, 1943	4,000
Post Offices and Post Roads: Investigating American-Canada Highway, etc	July 1, 1943	3,500
Public Lands and Surveys:		
Investigating Administration of National Monuments, etc	July 8, 1943	3,000
Investigating Mineral Resources	Jan. 28, 1943	8,000
Investigating Administration of Public Lands	do	25,000
Territories and Insular Affairs: Investigating Economic Conditions in Puerto Rico, etc	Dec. 21, 1943	25,000
SPECIAL COMMITTEES		
American Small Business	Feb. 25, 1943	115,000
Centralization of Heavy Industry	Dec. 21, 1943	5,000
Operation of Civil Service Laws	Jan. 28, 1943	2,500
Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages	Feb. 4, 1943	22,500
Operation of Programs for National Defense	Feb. 8, 1944	400,000
Post-war Economic Policy and Planning	Mar. 16, 1943	50,000
Production, Transportation, and Use of Fuels West of the Mississippi River	Feb. 4, 1943	10,000
Effects of Silver Purchase Act of 1934	Jan. 28, 1943	10,000
Conservation of Wild Animal Life	Apr. 2, 1943	103,000
Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool	Feb. 8, 1944	23,000
Campaign Expenditures of President, Vice President, and Senators in 1944	Mar. 30, 1944	30,000
Petroleum Resources Within and Outside the United States	Mar. 13, 1944	25,000

W. P. B. Explains Magnesium Cut-Back in Production at D. P. C. Plant in Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the following exchange of letters between myself and Philip D. Wilson, director of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board, is of sufficient importance to include in the RECORD. It is self-explanatory, citing W. P. B.'s reasons for a recently ordered cut-back in magnesium production at the D. P. C. plant of Basic Magnesium, Inc., at Las Vegas, Nev. Following is my letter to Mr. Wilson, sent a few days after a speech by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, in which the Senator objected to the cut-back order:

APRIL 13, 1944.

Mr. PHILIP D. WILSON,
Director, Aluminum and Magnesium Division,
War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I have noted with considerable interest the remarks of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, made in the Senate Saturday, April 1, in regard to a proposal of the War Production Board to cut back production at the Las Vegas, Nev., plant of Basic Magnesium, Inc., a Defense Plant Corporation project.

Senator MCCARRAN charges that if there is to be a cut-back in magnesium production, it should be instituted at D. P. C. plants in Michigan, operated by Dow Magnesium Corporation, a division of Dow Chemical Co. The Senator also charges, directly and by repeated inference, that W. P. B.'s decision to make the cut-back at the Las Vegas plant was influenced by the fact that perhaps certain officials of W. P. B. were former employees of Dow and thus partial to Dow interests.

I am only interested in the actual facts of the situation, and not at all in personalities as such. Furthermore, it doesn't seem strange to me that W. P. B. may indeed have had the advice of some former Dow people, although I do not know at all that this is true. In fact, I am informed it is not true. Nevertheless, if you want to know about automobiles, you go to the automobile people, and it would be the same with magnesium.

After all, Dow was the only producer of magnesium metal in this country prior to the present war, the firm having spent thousands of dollars in experimentation over a period of 25 years, perfecting its magnesium processes at a time when the rest of the Nation's metal industries apparently didn't feel that there was much of any commercial future for this new material. If Dow knows more about making magnesium, and can make it more economically, it is because this firm learned the hard way, and kept at it the longest time.

Nevertheless the facts should be able to speak for themselves and, in view of Senator MCCARRAN'S comments, what I should like to have from your office is:

First, the complete factual background which led to the cut-back order for Basic Magnesium, Inc.;

Second, any remarks you care to make regarding Senator MCCARRAN'S charges that personalities entered into the decision.

Third, any further information you can give me that is pertinent to the case.

Most sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Following is Mr. Wilson's reply, specifically answering Senator MCCARRAN'S charges and giving the factual background which led up to the cut-back order at the Government plant in Nevada:

APRIL 17, 1944.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ENGEL: You have asked me in your letter of April 13, 1944, to comment on the remarks of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, made in the Senate on April 1 concerning a proposal of the War Production Board to cut back production in the Las Vegas, Nev., plant of Basic Magnesium, Inc., a Defense Plant Corporation project. You have particularly called my attention to the Senator's charges, directly and by repeated inference, that the War Production Board's decision to make the cut-back at the Las Vegas plant was influenced by the fact that perhaps certain officials of W. P. B. were former employees of Dow and thus partial to Dow interests.

With regard to the Senator's charges, I told him prior to his making his address to the Senate that neither I nor any member of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division, or to the best of my knowledge and belief any member of the War Production Board, had ever worked for the Dow Chemical Co. or had been "members of boards of directors of present or prospective competitors of Basic Magnesium." Senator MCCARRAN also remarked that "a man who in years past has

served private industry, and who now seeks to serve private industry in some capacity by reason of his place on the War Production Board, is not serving his country as he should serve it. If he were in some other countries I might mention at this time, not only would his services not be called for in the Government, but in all probability he would be stood up against a wall at sunrise." I am glad to say that in no instance have any of the men responsible for planning the programs of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division been seeking to serve private industry or been influenced by "how the particular enterprise which they served in years past can be successful against its competitors in the post-war era."

You asked for the complete factual background which led to the cut-back order for Basic Magnesium, Inc. Curtailment of the Basic Magnesium plant is part of a general program involving the complete shut-down of two other magnesium plants and the partial curtailment of three more, affecting a total of 6 of the 15 plants now producing magnesium in the United States. The Aluminum and Magnesium Division originally developed its magnesium-production program to provide adequately for the stated requirements of the armed services. The program was expedited in every way possible and we now find ourselves in the comfortable position of being able to provide not only all of the magnesium which is demanded by the war effort and essential civilian requirements but of having a productive capacity substantially in excess of those requirements. This surplus capacity situation has come about wholly through the inability of the armed services to use as much magnesium as they originally stated to us would be necessary. Production was continued without curtailment until a substantial stock pile of magnesium metal had been accumulated and the decision to cut-back production was reached only when it became obvious that the ever-growing surplus was becoming unnecessarily large. The policy of the War Production Board does not permit the continued expenditure of labor and materials in continuing production of any commodity beyond the point where it can be considered essential to the successful prosecution of the war.

The individual plants which were selected for cut-back were those which in our best judgment would contribute most by their curtailment to the war effort, whether the saving might be in labor, transportation, fuel oil, coal, or other essential materials. In the case of Basic Magnesium a careful determination was made as to the labor which could be released in the Southwest where manpower is critically short, of the saving in the consumption of critically needed fuel oil in that same area which could be effected if the electric power consumed by the Basic Magnesium plant were released, of the transportation which would be saved by eliminating the movement of large tonnages of peat moss from Canada, and of the magnesite and calcined magnesia used for feed from the mines at Gabbs, Nev., 350 miles by road to the plant, and furthermore of the amount of chlorine, critically needed in the war effort, which could be released for use elsewhere if it were not consumed in the Las Vegas plant.

These investigations showed that approximately 1,500 less men would be needed at Las Vegas and 100 less men at Gabbs if operations at Basic Magnesium, Inc., were curtailed by 40 percent. It was further determined that between 120,000 and 135,000 barrels of fuel oil could be saved each month if the amount of electric power used by 40 percent of Basic Magnesium's capacity were released for transfer to California, thus making possible the closing down of certain fuel-oil consuming power units in California.

Changes in the Las Vegas plant which are now being made will result in the elimination of Canadian peat moss from the process to the extent of 50 to 60 percent of its total capacity. By curtailing production in the amount of 40 percent the elimination of most if not all of the peat moss used in the operation will result, thus making unnecessary the transportation of some 1,200 tons per month of peat moss from Vancouver Island in British Columbia to Nevada. The proposed curtailment also will make it unnecessary to move about 5,700 tons of magnesite and calcined magnesia per month, 350 miles by motortruck from Gabbs to Las Vegas. The additional chlorine which will be made available under this program for the requirements of the Chemical Warfare Service will amount to approximately 1,400 tons per month.

As regards the labor situation, we have been advised by the W. M. C. that the 1,600 men who might be released in Nevada could be used most effectively in group 1 labor areas of Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other centers of labor shortage. They further state that the proposed curtailment would relieve the heavy drain on the labor market in that area caused by the continued recruitment of replacement labor for the Basic plant.

As regards the saving of fuel oil, a survey by the Office of War Utilities indicated that 135,000 barrels of fuel oil per month could be saved continuously through 1944 and 1945. This was confirmed by the Director of the Division of Power of the United States Department of the Interior in a letter, dated March 24, 1944, which he addressed to Senator McCARRAN, in which he stated that the energy released by a 40-percent reduction in production at Basic Magnesium could be used to replace oil-fired steam generation in California throughout 1944. His letter stated that this would result in an oil saving of some 1,400,000 to 1,600,000 barrels, or an average ranging between 3,800 barrels and 4,400 barrels per day over a 12-month period. He further stated that the average daily demand for fuel oil in the Pacific coast area is approximately 540,000 barrels and that the average daily production is 420,000 barrels, indicating a daily deficit of 120,000 barrels.

A careful comparison was made of the savings which would result from a curtailment of 40 percent in the production of Basic Magnesium, Inc., and from the curtailment of 50 percent of the production of the Marysville, Mich., plant owned by the Defense Plant Corporation and operated for D. P. C. by the Dow Magnesium Corporation. The labor which would be saved by such a cut-back at Marysville and at the Ludington, Mich., feed plant would amount to approximately 400 men in a group II area. Approximately 19,500 tons of coal coming from Kentucky and West Virginia would be saved monthly by such a curtailment. The transportation of 7,800 tons of magnesium chloride feed per month from Ludington, Mich., 250 miles by rail to Marysville, Mich., would be eliminated. The over-all cost of the magnesium produced at the Marysville plant is approximately 2 cents per pound less than the cost of magnesium of equivalent quality produced at Basic Magnesium, Inc. Taking into consideration all of the factors involved, it appeared to us obvious that a greater saving for the war effort could be accomplished by a reduction at Basic Magnesium than at Marysville, Mich. No consideration whatsoever was given to the post-war competitive position of either plant. As a matter of fact both of them are entirely owned by Defense Plant Corporation.

As regards post-war competition, however, the wholly owned plants of the Dow Chemical Co., which before the war was the sole producer of magnesium in the United States, have a combined capacity of 36,000,000 pounds of magnesium per year. The rated capacity of Basic Magnesium is 112,000,000 pounds per year and if operated at 60 percent of this capacity, Basic would produce 67,200,000 pounds per year. This rate is nearly twice the combined productive capacity of the privately owned plants of the Dow Chemical Co. It is true that the Dow organization through Dow Magnesium Corporation is operating for the Government other plants with a combined capacity of 162,000,000 pounds per year. These plants are, however, owned outright by the Government and unless the Government should be willing to sell them to the Dow Chemical Co. after the war that company would be left with a very minor part in the whole magnesium picture. It would seem that Basic Manesium, Inc., operating at a rate of more than 67,000,000 pounds per year and with a potential capacity of 112,000,000 pounds per year, should be able to compete effectively against the Dow Chemical Co. with a capacity of 36,000,000 pounds per year.

Senator McCARRAN has emphasized the fact that what is known as the Vernon plant, an aluminum plant in southern California, should be closed down with the release of some 3,000 men in the critical Los Angeles labor area instead of curtailing Basic Magnesium. Senator McCARRAN is not fully informed regarding the facts of this case, since the aluminum ingot plant to which he obviously refers is located at Torrance, Calif., and employs about 600 men. The plant at Vernon which employs a very much larger number of men is an aluminum fabricating plant that produces aluminum forgings, castings, extruded shapes, tubing, and other fabricated products used almost entirely by the aircraft plants in that immediate section of the country. Even if it were practicable to close down both the Torrance and the Vernon plant, it would be highly uneconomic to ship the fabricated material from far-distant plants to the aircraft plants in southern California which use it. However, the over-all situation in aluminum ingot and fabricated products will not permit of any curtailment of the activities at either Torrance or Vernon.

I trust that this letter will answer your questions satisfactorily. Please do not hesitate to call upon me if you would like any further information in this connection.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP D. WILSON,
Director Aluminum-Magnesium Division.

I believe any fair-minded person reading Mr. Wilson's letter, will agree that it constitutes a sound and comprehensive reply to Senator McCARRAN's charges.

Maintenance of a Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the struggle between the Allies and Germany reaches a climax it is apparent that the United States cannot remain aloof from the new world order that is in the making. Regardless of how the war might turn out, the world as we knew it in 1939 has vanished. The realization is upon us that whatever we attempt to accomplish in the way of a lasting peace will be met with failure if the basis of our effort in that direction is limited to platitudes about international cooperation or

the restoration of the status quo. If the concerted action of the Allies is to be rewarded this time they will have to demonstrate now and from here on that they are resolved to preserve three essentials of democracy: The first, respect for the integrity of the individual; the second, government responsibility to the people; and the third is, the adoption of some international organization of representatives of Russia, Great Britain, China, and the United States, the purpose of which will be to maintain by force, if necessary, the peace of the world.

The League of Nations provides a background of rich experience for future international organization. Such an organization should be given compulsory jurisdiction in the settlement of disputes, It should have at its disposal an international police force, preferably an air force, and it should be provided with effective machinery for economic cooperation. To succeed, it will require in a much larger measure a willingness on our part to greater sacrifices of national sovereignty, and much more international planning and control over armaments than has hitherto been developed.

There is a growing demand for a planned international order, certainly so far as such a system will serve to prolong peace. Americans of whatever political persuasion will endorse such a plan, but to develop a planned international order for this purpose there is no way under the sun to do it except by giving authority to governments. We must codify a system of world law, and in no other way can a world code be fashioned. Our people hesitate to make such a commitment because deeply ingrained within them is the fear of depotism. This is the crux of the whole matter. This fear is the background out of which Democrats and Republicans alike pluck their varied contentions. It is the lute upon which a colossal discord is played. This conflict between the desire for international order and the desire for freedom creates the dilemma of democracy. We cannot have our cake and eat it, too. This dilemma must be solved if we are going to achieve a new democratic order in our international relationships.

There are unmistakable signs that the Republican and Democratic Parties are getting ready for the orchestration. The coming national election sets the stage and guarantees packed houses for the innumerable maestros who, all over the country, will be conducting violently amid great sound and fury. For example, last week the chairman of the Republican National Committee was encouraging his party by predicting a wholesale desertion of the Democratic Party in November by foreign-born voters in protest against some of the administration's wartime policies which were not in harmony with the interests of their former countries. Members of the Democratic Party will no doubt publicly proclaim the momentary advantage, at least, of other racial groups who are thinking solely of the interests of their native countries. Polish-American people are bitterly resentful against Russia for its aggressive plans against Poland; Italians in crowded cities of America are complaining because for the moment in Italy we have recognized a Fascist leader and the King; Jews are not quite happy because of the British white paper, and the military situation which affects the Zionist movement in Palestine, and some Irish citizens are unhappy because the administration is in accord with the British in their demands on Eire. These are only a few of the antagonistic elements in the country.

So, will begin this unmusical rendition. The country heard it played in 1919. There will be the usual variations. It will be rendered in every key and octave depending upon how it harmonizes in different sections of the country. It will rumble in some quarters with dislike for the British. Its high notes will introduce the new social order. It will register the controversy on trade agreements and economic reconstruction. It will depict all differences and shades of opinion. The concert will be interrupted only long enough to count the votes, and then it will continue to play, but this time the performance will in all likelihood be transferred to the floor of the United States Senate.

The score will have been written. It will have been tried out in the countryside, in every buggytown and great city in the country. As a musical hit it will be a dismal failure. Its utter lack of harmony will kill its sales here at home and we could not give it away to our erstwhile allies.

We have known all along that there were bound to be differences of opinion between Russia, Great Britain, and ourselves, when we got around to forming some sort of international order. To surmount that difficulty is enough, but with the knowledge of our failure in President Wilson's time to effect a lasting peace, it is unbelievable that we shall be so stupid this time.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull in June of 1938 made this statement:

> The most important problem now confronting the human race is that of establishing throughout the world, as the foundation of further progress, an unshakable regime of order under law.

The foregoing is a principle to which everyone will subscribe. Munich and all subsequent events in Europe have demonstrated that if civilization is to progress we must have order under law. How can we expect Secretary Hull to hope to successfully advocate this principle without unity of thought and purpose on the part of the people of this country? How can we reasonably expect a just and enduring peace unless every citizen not only subscribes to this principle but is prepared and determined to unselfishly lay aside every consideration which could impede us in our quest for a lasting peace. If representatives of the United States at the peace table are going to demand an unshakable regime of order under law we shall have slight chance of success in achieving so desirable an end unless we Americans have given unassailable proof to the world that we are willing to implement such a move. To do this calls for unprecedented action. We cannot hope to avoid the same fate which befell the League of Nations unless as peacemakers we carry to the peace table the positive and unquestioned backing of both the Democratic and Republican Parties on questions of foreign policy. Peacemakers cannot begin to function unless there is unanimity and accord among those whom they represent.

In January of 1918, with U-boats sinking tons of Allied shipping each month and when the Germans were bringing up their big guns to shell Paris, President Wilson announced his 14 points. Twenty-six years later with the Germans holding their own in Italy, the invasion of the Continent not yet begun, Secretary of State Hull announces his 17 points of American policy. There is universal agreement on the points enunciated by the Secretary of State. There is universal complaint because no plan is set forth by which these laudable points may be obtained. Simply winning the war in Europe will not achieve them. We learned that when we were victorious in World War No. 1. Everywhere Mr. Hull's call for international organization backed by force has met with warm approval.

As never before the people of our country wish to avoid the old days of international anarchy. If American opinion is not to recoil after the war from the realities of international politics and once more attempt to escape in isolationism, we have got to begin now to follow a course of unity of thought and action. If we are to convince the representatives of other Allied countries at the peace table that we are in earnest we have got to present a solid front on foreign policy. If we are going to put the breath of reality into Mr. Hull's 17 points, we must adjourn politics at the point where the waters of the Atlantic lave our beaches. Peacemaking is team work and unless we can coordinate the play of our own team we can scarcely hope to play well in the international matches.

The first step in this direction has already been taken by Mr. Hull. He has requested the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to designate a subcommittee to consult with the Department of State on problems connected with the establishment of an international peace organization. A like committee will be appointed in the House, and these committees will be of great value in carrying the congressional viewpoint into the task of working out a peace policy. This is not enough. The Congress, and particularly the Senate, should be a sounding board from which the will of the people in this matter should be projected. There will be little to project if in the coming campaign prejudice in its myriad forms, ambition, avarice, personal animosity, and party opposition, are played upon.

There are in the country today some militant groups creating an interest in and appreciation for the necessity of a just and lasting peace. If in time they are joined by a sufficient number of equally determined people we cannot lose the peace, and we could witness the Republican and the Democratic Parties whose conventions are soon to be held and whose platforms are yet to be completed, each adopting a similar foreign-policy plank, the effect of which would

do much to silence the increasing din of political debate concerning the establishment of an international peace organization. The leaders know that the majority of Americans everywhere are determined that the conflicting contentions of the romantic, the designing, and the far-seeing and sincere politicos shall not result in throwing them to the wolves of isolation again. There is danger that this majority may well become a minority or its voice may not even be heard if we jam the radio and fill the columns of our newspapers with heated controversy on this subject. We must seek unity of thought, not division, for if we are divided here at home, we certainly will not be able to safeguard the peace.

The leaders of the major political parties need only to hear the voices of their masters, and if the people will speak they could by convention time envision the Democratic and Republican Parties vacating a field of impassioned and irresponsible debate to listen intently and with respect, both ears to the ground. If the voice of the people is strong and insistent, a political millennium is not impossible. Americans know that thus far our foreign-policy commitments, when made, have never had the virtue of permanency. God speed the day when political parties and citizens at long last recognize the fact that if we are to achieve in post-war international planning we shall be compelled to declare a moratorium on partisanship. This is our testing time.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to the House resolutions adopted by the St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors, the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, and the West Parishville Grange 542, Potsdam, N. Y., urging the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project bill, of which I am a strong advocate:

Whereas the American portion of the international section of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project lies wholly within the bounds of the county of St. Lawrence, in the State of New York; and

Whereas our St. Lawrence County people have constantly before them the magnificent spectacle of the mighty St. Lawrence rushing past them to the sea, unharnessed and mostly unused, a tragic spectacle of waste during this period of needed conservation of our natural resources and their best adaptation to the uses and needs of us all; and

Whereas it has been with much satisfaction that we have learned of the unanimous adoption—March 15–16, 1944—by our New York State Legislature of the concurrent resolution favoring prompt development of the St. Lawrence River power resources; and

Whereas all the people of the county of St. Lawrence are first, last, and always for the development of the St. Lawrence River at the first opportune time, which time we believe to be in the coming years of post-war reconstruction; and

Whereas the Aiken bill—United States Senate No. 1385—authorizes such development at such time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of St. Lawrence County urges the passage of the Aiken bill (S. 1385) and respectfully petitions the chairman and members of the Commerce Committee's subcommittee now having it in charge to take prompt and favorable action thereon; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators John H. Overton, George L. Radcliffe, James M. Mead, Arthur H. Vandenberg, and Harold H. Burton, chairman and members of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, also to Senator Robert F. Wagner, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Congressman Clarence E. Kilburn, and to Senator George D. Aiken, sponsor of the bill.

Whereas the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce and its membership are vitally interested in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will remove the last major obstacles to deep-draft navigation throughout the Great Lakes system to the Atlantic Ocean and the ports of the world; and

Whereas the same development will simultaneously make available 1,100,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity under a self-liquidating State power project; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15–16, 1944, by unanimous vote adopted a resolution declaring that this State urgently requires the prompt development of the St. Lawrence to furnish low-cost power to millions of industrial, rural, commercial, and domestic consumers; and

Whereas the Aiken bill, S. 1385, is now pending before the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, under which those benefits may be realized without further delay: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the State of New York, representing a score of separate communities and civic and trade organizations throughout the St. Lawrence Valley, declares its unqualified support of this project as an imperative necessity for post-war reconstruction in this area and for the future balanced growth and development of the entire Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we appeal for the immediate enactment of the Aiken bill, S. 1385, authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as a post-war project and strongly urge the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of New York and the Congress of the United States to give this measure their active support.

Resolved, That West Parishville Grange 542, Potsdam, N. Y., at a meeting April 11, 1944, are in favor of the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman CLARENCE KILBURN and Mr. John C. Tulloch, secretary of chamber of commerce, Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Bypassing Our Isolationists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill, from the Boston Sunday Globe of April 16, 1944:

Sufficient time has now elapsed since Wendell Willkie kicked his own hat out of the ring to view this political event in the right perspective. It is perhaps true that Willkie did not help his chances by throwing his weight around in a rather spectacular manner. It may well be that the electorate, after 12 years of dynamic leadership, is inclined to shy away from an aggressive personality. Certainly, the whole Willkie campaign was in the hands of amateurs. But whatever the explanation may be, it surely cannot be assumed that, because a limited number of voters of one party in the traditionally isolationist State of Wisconsin were reported against Willkie, the American people are prepared to support isolationism after this war, and to repeat the tragic experience of a quarter-century ago.

It is certain that many thousands of Republican and independent voters were disappointed when Willkie conceded defeat. They saw in the Willkie candidacy a chance for continuity in our foreign policy, without committing the country to the fourth-term precedent. It is almost inconceivable that the people will place in the White House any man who will not pledge himself to work for collective security.

SECRETARY HULL'S REASSURANCE

It is highly improbable that any candidate for President is going to have to worry about the America Firsters. The present administration has been vulnerable, not because its foreign policy has been too bold, but because it has been too timid. Fortunately, Secretary of State Hull has now made it clear that our Government has no intention of appeasing neutral nations which play ball with the Axis, that it stands foursquare for a post-war policy of international collaboration, and that the French Committee of National Liberation is to be given a chance to set up a civil government in France after the Nazis are driven out.

During the past week, while our Air Forces have really been turning the heat on nazidom from the air in advance of invasion, our foreign policy has stiffened and clarified. Warning to Sweden on exports to Germany followed protest to Turkey on chrome shipments to the Reich and a word of caution to Spain about her reported plan to seize Allied oil stocks in Morocco. The word from London is that plans for setting De Gaulle's committee up in liberated France, with no Allied military control in any territory where military operations have ceased, are virtually completed. Here is a good omen, signifying the confidence of our side that it is going places.

Best of all, Mr. Hull has invited the United States Senate, which shares the treaty-making power with the executive branch of the Government, to appoint a bipartisan group of its members to consult with the State Department in planning the peace, and has signified the intention of asking the lower branch of Congress to sit in on these discussions.

This is a good start. Nothing could better demonstrate the effectiveness of our democracy than bipartisan agreement in the coming election campaign on foreign policy, giving assurance to our allies that America knows it is fighting for a constructive purpose, that continuity is in the cards. If Mr. Hull's gesture is accepted by the opposition, the prospects of an enduring peace will be advanced.

It is impossible to improve upon Mr. Hull's own statement of the case. "Once before in our lifetime," he said, "we fell into disunity and became ineffective in world affairs by reason of it. Should this happen again it will be a tragedy to you and to your children and to the world for generations."

Trial and error—this is the way democracy learns its lessons and profits by them.

OUR FATAL MISTAKE

Now is the time to reflect on the magnitude of our failure 25 years ago, and to be conscious of how and why we failed. Doing so points up the great opportunity which is ours today. Indeed, it is clear that the circumstances are much more propitious at the present time than they were then.

We must make allowance for the fact that, when he undertook to negotiate peace terms, President Wilson was a sick man. Regardless of that, viewing the matter impersonally, we are now able to detect certain mistakes that were made.

Then, as now, we had given allegiance to a set of lofty but vague principles—Wilson's Fourteen Points, the Atlantic Charter. How alike they seem—"Open covenants openly arrived at"; "Freedom of navigation"; "Removal * * * of all economic barriers"; "An independent Polish state" * * * "No aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise"; "No territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people"; "Fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field"; "Abandonment of the use of force."

According to Mr. Mark Sullivan, one of Wilson's great weaknesses was inherent in his career, in his training. "He dealt with ideas," "handed down principles," and refused "to discuss details until the principle was agreed to." The same weakness could afflict our foreign policy today. As a matter of fact, in some of its clauses, Wilson's Fourteen Points were much less vague than the Atlantic Charter. This is why Mr. Hull's specific statements, especially with reference to France, are important. We must this time, in advance of the peace, set forth definite plans for organizing it.

The really fatal mistake 25 years ago was permitting our foreign policy to become a bipartisan issue. President Wilson asked for a Democratic Congress. This was asserted to be a challenge to the patriotism of many thousands of Republicans. Moreover, when as a result of mistake No. 1 the Republican party became the majority party in the Senate, Wilson committed error No. 2, ignoring this party and appointing a delegation to accompany him to Paris composed entirely of Democrats, with the exception of one man who was not prominently identified with the Republican party.

UNITED WE STAND

Mr. Hull, by inviting the Senate to appoint a bipartisan committee to confer with the Department of State, gives notice that the administration considers the future peace of the world too important to be kicked around as a party issue.

The chances for collaboration between the White House and Senate in seeking collective security are much better today than they were 25 years ago. Instead of witnessing the discouraging spectacle of more than one-third the membership of the Senate signing a round-robin resolution against the League of Nations, we have today a Senate which passes the Connally resolution with only five dissenting votes, and a House which has gone on record for the Fulbright motion by just as impressive a majority.

How amenable our allies will be to the principle that only a coalition of great powers (organized on a democratic basis with recognition of the rights of small nations) can guarantee an era of peace remains to be seen. Stalin is doubtless as hard-boiled as was Clemenceau, and Churchill's loyalty to the ideal of empire may be as obstructive as Lloyd George's political opportunism. Russian policy seems to be aiming for a vast sphere of influence in eastern Europe. The British Foreign Office, witness India, thus far reveals no liberal tendencies. But there is this to remember: Russia, for a decade and a half, has been a stanch advocate of collective security. She may not be sold on the idea of destroying Germany, but she has her own ideas about controlling German heavy industry, which means the power to make war. She is beginning to thumb her nose at Japan. As for Britain, she did not emerge from World War No. 1 the dominant power in the universe, and she will emerge still further weakened from World War No. 2. It would seem as if England and the British Commonwealth of Nations would need collective security as much as we need it.

Our job, however, is to bypass our own isolationists, and by bipartisan consent to agree not to disagree among ourselves on American foreign policy. Divided at home, we cannot hope to advance the cause of unity abroad.

We should let the whole world know in the coming election campaign that, in relation to foreign policy, united we stand.

Do We Have a Positive Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered on the Town Meeting of the Air program on April 13, 1944:

DO WE HAVE A POSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY?

The answer to the question under discussion tonight depends on how we interpret the term "positive foreign policy." If we mean that the Government of the United States has on occasion proclaimed certain lofty and, I think, thoroughly sound aims and principles, then unquestionably the answer is "Yes."

If, however, we mean there is evidence it has reduced the general aims to specific objectives and policies which it is actively pursuing in the same bold, resourceful, all-out way in which Admiral Nimitz, for example, is pursuing our military policy in the Pacific, then the answer of millions of thoughtful Americans is a reluctant "No" or "We hope so, but doubt it."

After Congress passed by large majorities the Fulbright and the Connally resolutions, and Secretary Hull returned with the Moscow joint declarations, hopes for a decent peace ran high. Then, when little or no follow-up was observable, and in fact relations seemed to be rapidly deteriorating, a serious let-down occurred.

It may be the doubts are in part a legacy of the 10 years before Pearl Harbor when we declared a sound policy with regard to Japan, but didn't follow the policy. We called Japan's actions by their correct name—ruthless aggression—and then we armed her so she could continue it. We supported that which we ourselves condemned.

Anxiety arises now not because most Americans don't believe in the principles and policies enunciated by our greatly respected and honored Secretary of State. Most people, I think, do believe in them; but they have been forced by what they see and read to wonder if the whole administration is united and coordinated in actually conducting our foreign relations in accord with the declared policies.

There is a growing fear that instead of gradually extending our principles of cooperative teamwork to Europe, we are taking over Europe's traditional principles and practices for America, the same short-sighted expediencies, the same diplomatic maneuverings and intrigues, the same power politics that we have always condemned so bitterly in others.

There is an uneasy belief that while we are assuming an ever-larger share of military responsibility all around the world, we are not exercising political initiative commensurate with our Nation's real strength and influence, both material and moral.

Thousands of people have talked with Americans returning from north Africa, or Italy, who are bitterly critical of what they openly call our indecision, our procrastination, our lack of direction and positiveness in exerting leadership there.

Americans also wonder why we seem so often to be at least one jump behind Russia and England. Those nations appear to know just what they want and how they intend to get it. Their leaders do not hesitate to state their war aims, in concrete, precise terms, and to promote them with vigor. Why should we hesitate to be equally forthright and energetic about ours?

Recently I heard a member of the State Department say, "Our policy is not action; it is reaction. We wait until the other government acts, and then we just react."

Almost 6 months have passed since the four powers at Moscow declared that they recognized "the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization * * * for the maintenance of international peace and security." That is a positive policy—if it is pushed. Unfortunately, we have seen almost no evidence to that effect.

Instead we read of meetings here and there to discuss post-war aviation, education, oil, monetary arrangements, and so forth. Then we hear unilateral announcements of how the Italian Navy is to be divided up. Inevitably, people wonder "Are these piecemeal dickerings to take the place of creating on a solid foundation the machinery for establishing and maintaining international peace and security?"

Whether or not such doubts are justified is beside the point. They exist, and they are dangerous. Failure by our Government to take the people into its full confidence is inevitably interpreted as meaning either that it does not have a positive foreign policy, or that if it does, it is not working at it very hard or effectively. Either of these interpretations leads to an almost fatal cynicism.

More and more people are saying, "Well, we'll go ahead and win the war all right, but the peace is already lost."

Because of the danger in such a national mood, some of us new Members of Congress recently sought opportunity to express our alarm to the Secretary of State. We have proved by our votes that we want to keep foreign policy out of domestic politics, that we want the two parties to work out together a sound, continuing national foreign policy—neither Democratic nor Republican, but American. We wanted not to oppose, but to support such a policy, if we could be sure that the whole administration is really in earnest about it.

Mr. Hull, with a candor that to me was most reassuring, described to us some of his policies and his efforts to further them. I could only wonder why they have not been talked over with the whole Nation with equal frankness and long ago.

Some of us urged him as strongly as we could to tell the same things to the people fully, freely, and frequently. It is not enough just to take a few Congressmen partially into his confidence. There are 135,000,000 Americans to be consulted. This is their war, their money, their sons, and their peace; and they will not subscribe to settlements which they have had no chance to debate with understanding.

I am glad beyond words that last Sunday, Secretary Hull did that in part, making the most comprehensive, concrete, understandable, and convincing statement to date of America's foreign policy. It was a long step in the right direction. I only wish he had gone further, or that he will in the near future, even with regard to points on which we do not yet see eye to eye with some of our allies. We are not improperly criticizing another nation's position when we declare ours. We do not need even to refer to the other nation's position. The American people are quite able to draw correct conclusions regarding the other nation's policies if they are given an opportunity to understand our own. If ours are sound, the people will approve them, and thereby greatly strengthen the hands of our Executive, whoever he may be. If they do not approve, far better for everybody to find it out now, not later.

The only possible way to meet the widespread criticism that our foreign policy consists largely of vague platitudes and generalities is first, to make sure that it does amount to more than that, and then to give the people more information about it.

It will be objected that to do so might alienate the support of some of our allies. My answer is, "Yes, it might; but not to do so is certain to alienate the support of our own people." Which support is the more essential? What will it profit us or anyone else to work out a perfect agreement in Europe and have it rejected here at home? How can anyone expect other nations to negotiate freely and frankly with our Government until they know whether its proposals have the support of the American people? And how can they discover whether its proposals have the support of the American people unless the proposals have been frankly discussed with and by the American people?

To have a positive foreign policy is not sentimental idealism, or utopianism on our part. It is stern, inescapable necessity if we ourselves would be free, prosperous, and secure. To try to stand alone in this jungle of a world is to be overwhelmed.

A positive policy does not mean we are to threaten, or to give moral lectures, or to insist that all settlements of all disputes be in accord with our views; but rather on a perfectly hard-headed basis to try to show all nations, including our own, that any gains one nation makes at the expense of others' fundamental rights will be short-lived and through building up enmities give it less rather than greater security.

It means striving to get immediate settlements of this boundary dispute or that minority problem, yes—but even more to establish international machinery by which to settle all disputes by peaceful means. Such a mechanism must (1) provide every nation the prospect of being able to get a reasonably equitable adjustment of its legitimate grievances so that it won't need to go to war; and (2) have available enough military force and enough unity of purpose to make any lawless nation know in advance that it can't win if it does go to war.

The first objective of our foreign policy must always be our security. Whatever maintains world order and peace gives us security. Therefore, it is not enough that America just be willing to collaborate with other nations if and when they want to get together to establish order and maintain peace. We must tirelessly take the lead in getting them to get together, partly because no other nation can take the initiative—no other nation has such a heritage of trust and good will throughout the world; and partly because the stakes for our own future are so high we dare not allow things to go by default.

It may be that we will fail; but at least no other course can succeed.

We are in one of the most crucial moments of history—just before the invasion of Europe. Somehow we have not yet mobilized fully the hearts of this people or achieved the unity, the self-discipline, the willingness to sacrifice, that we know down deep in us we are capable of. Perhaps it is because we have not yet found a cause big enough to justify such great sacrifices.

Surely, as never before this Nation and the world need "under God, a new birth of freedom"—fresh, challenging statements of a positive, practical, inspiring, and convincing peace policy to which all men everywhere who understand and love freedom can dedicate themselves with confident hope. Secretary Hull has made a good beginning. Let it be done again and again, expanded, amplified, and striven for by all of us until finally accomplished.

Resolution of West Frankfort Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution, as adopted by the board of directors, West Frankfort Chamber of Commerce, regular monthly meeting, Monday, April 3, 1944:

Resolved, That whereas a bill, known as the Boren bill, H. R. 4184, has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative LYLE H. BOREN, of Oklahoma, for the repeal of the Land Grant Acts insofar as the railroads operating under the Land Grant Acts are required to transport a large volume of Government traffic at less than normal rates paid by other shippers; and

Whereas the rates required by the Government under the Land Grant Acts is discriminatory to other railroads, who do not come under the Land Grant Acts and the public shippers in general. The Land Grant Acts as far as railroad shipping rates are concerned should be repealed.

Whereas among the organizations of shippers, farmers, and commercial interests who have expressed their support of the repeal of the Land Grant Acts; and

Whereas the National Industrial Traffic League, the National Association of Shippers Boards, which compose it, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the American Farm Bureau Federation and others support the repeal of the Land Grant Acts; and

Whereas truck lines, short-line railroads, and labor organizations of railroads, the American Trucking Associations, the Mississippi Valley Association also support the repeal of the Land Grant Acts;

Therefore: The reason for repeal. To sum up, the land-grant rate reductions should be repealed because—

The Government has long since received full consideration for the lands granted many times over in the settlement of the continent.

Building of the Nation.

Increase in wealth and taxable resources.

Enhanced value of its own lands.

Reduction of transportation costs; be it, therefore, further

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the West Frankfort Chamber of Commerce urge the support of the Boren bill, H. R. 4184, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Representative BOREN, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and each of the members urging the favorable action on H. R. 4184; and further, that a copy be sent to the Honorable SCOTT W. LUCAS and Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of the United States Senate, and a copy also be sent to the Honorable C. W. BISHOP, Representative from the Illinois Twenty-fifth District, urging the support of H. R. 4184, and that Representative BISHOP present this resolution to the House of Representatives in session for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully submitted.

LEO MCDONALD,
President.
DELTA C. LOWE,
Executive Secretary.

Religious Book Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to Religious Book Week which is sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It will be celebrated this year from May 7 to 14. It is interesting to note that this week also marks the anniversary of the public burning of the books in Berlin by the Nazis that took place on May 19, 1933, and we have since seen some of the consequences of the spirit which led the "master race" to perpetrate such a crime. It is eminently fitting that in the United States we dedicate this anniversary to books with a spiritual background.

A committee of 24 clergymen, authors, and librarians have selected the titles included in the 1944 Religious Book Week list. Representatives of each of the three religions have made selections for members of their own faith and in addition a good-will list chosen by a Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish committee has also been published.

I should like to quote the introduction to the listings written by Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College in New York City, one of the outstanding Catholic layman of our time. I quote:

Last year's Religious Book Week was a great success. What I recall most about it, perhaps, is that all the volumes listed were eventually presented to Sara Delano Roosevelt House at Hunter College through the generosity of the publishers at the request of the national conference. Looking over the titles again the other day, I was struck by the fact that many have worn very well indeed. These are not books for a week or a month only. They were written out of deep conviction and strong feeling. Each of them preserves some light from one of the three religious faiths which underlie our western civilization. Yet there is nothing in any of them which will wound or insult those who do not agree with the author. In short, these are books pro-

fessing positive values with courtesy and discernment.

Literature is one of the essential aids in the building of democracy. And democracy is, above all, a code of mutual respect and services. It is not a creed in its own right but is rather a commitment of the belief that the social lives of men can be regulated amicably through the law. I believe that each of the great religions can strengthen the intensity of this commitment in its followers for reasons implicit in the religions themselves. But each will, of course, do so only through emphasis upon the validity of those ethical impulses making for a better social order which it shares in common with others. That is why I am happy in the knowledge that at Sara Delano Roosevelt House, which is itself dedicated to the fostering of those impulses, we are privileged to have the custody of so many books serving the same ideal.

Letter From Constituent Suggesting Amendments in the Operation of the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter received from one of my constituents, suggesting amendments in the operation of the Price Control Act.

These suggestions are made by a man who has been in the retail business in Connecticut for many years. They are the conclusions and recommendations of one who runs up against O. P. A. every day of his business life.

I sincerely trust that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee will particularly note the contents of the letter.

The letter follows:

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED IN THE O. P. A. ACT

APRIL 13, 1944.

Hon. JOSEPH E. TALBOT,
Representative from Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.

1. That the act should be extended for 1 year.

2. That the purposes of the act be clarified that the O. P. A. be limited solely to the prevention of speculative, unwarranted, and unreasonable increases in prices and not permit it to try to change or reform the ordinary existing methods of distribution of goods.

3. That retailers should not be held responsible for and be required to absorb increases in prices by freezes or otherwise below their historic customary and usual mark-ups on merchandise coming under price control.

4. That on all orders or changes in orders, O. P. A. be required to consult with representatives of the industries and trades affected, and that such representatives should be selected by the industries and trades themselves rather than by the O. P. A., and that when the O. P. A. arrives at a conclusion not in agreement with the recommendations of the representatives of the industries or trades affected, the O. P. A. should make a report to such committee stating fully the facts and reasons therefor.

5. That different ceiling prices for different classifications of retailers selling the same goods should be eliminated.

6. That the authority given to the O. P. A. in the original act to buy and sell commodities, which power has not been used, should be eliminated and that the O. P. A. should be confined solely to the function on control of prices as needed under the purposes of the act.

7. That whenever changes in business practices, cost practices, etc., are written into any order, the burden of proof of the need for such changes be upon the O. P. A.

8. That highest price line limitations should be definitely prohibited.

9. That price control must be simplified. At present, retailers in the variety trade alone are subject to over 1,000 price orders and amendments. It is impossible for any single store operator to keep up and make sure that he is in complete compliance on all of these orders.

10. That the O. P. A. should be required to grant or reject protests within 30 days and not be allowed to let them drift along indefinitely.

11. That provision should be made for judicial review by local Federal district courts of all price regulations, including the power to determine the validity and legality of such regulations, and to grant relief, and that the court may in its discretion rather than as at present understood by the O. P. A. to be required to issue a permanent or temporary injunction.

12. That the defendant in an O. P. A. case may plead that an order is capricious, unreasonable, or impossible, and have a judge or jury pass upon not merely the legality, but also upon whether the violations were willful.

I very strongly insist that as my elected representative in the Congress you use every possible influence you have to bring about the common sense, American way of business regulation in the O. P. A.

Yours very truly,

THE HEATON-BARNETT CO.,
W. B. BARNETT, *Treasurer.*

St. Lawrence Seaway-Power Project Endorsed by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something today about the Honorable Cordell Hull, our Secretary of State, and a distinguished member of the President's Cabinet. Mr. Hull has taken the forthright and courageous position in writing Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, that his Department favors the Aiken bill, S. 1485, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for the St. Lawrence seaway-power project. This is a companion bill to the one I introduced in the House of Representatives, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and reintroduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and known as H. R. 2280. Extensive hearings were held in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and the bill was reported out of the committee favorably by a 2-to-1 vote. Incidentally, I was and still am a member of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee which conducted the hearings in the Seventy-seventh Congress. In the Seventy-eighth Congress, no further hearings were held, because the committee desired to report out a committee bill with no controversial items, and because the subject matter had been heard previously.

The rivers and harbors bill of the House is now pending in the Senate, and Senator AIKEN is to be commended for asking for hearings on his bill, so as to incorporate it in the bill now before the committee of the Senate. His bill provides both for navigation and power development. His section is interested in power development at Massena, N. Y., and the Midwest is concerned in the navigation features of the bill. It is therefore a bill of national and not of sectional features. It ought to receive favorable action by the Senate committee.

In the report of the Secretary of State, which ought to be read by every Member of Congress, and by every American citizen, he says:

> The enactment of this bill would now provide the authorizations for undertakings which would make an important contribution to the post-war period in providing for the expansion of water-power development, and for greater efficiency in transportation.

I think it well to quote in full his report to the Senate Commerce Committee. He says:

> The bill would approve the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement between the United States and Canada signed at Ottawa on March 19, 1941, providing for the construction of dams and powerhouses in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway. The bill would authorize the President to fulfill the undertakings made in that agreement on behalf of the United States. The construction would be undertaken under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The bill would provide for an agreement between the Federal Government and the power authority of the State of New York for the transfer to the State of the power facilities and the right to use the United States share of the waters at the project for hydroelectric purposes, such arrangement not to become effective until approved by the Congress.
>
> I suggest that S. 1385 be amended to authorize construction as a post-war rather than as a wartime project. This could be done by deleting the word "immediately" in line 12, page 2 of the bill, as well as the phrase "and shall be diligently prosecuted with a view to making essential facilities of said project available for national defense uses at the earliest possible moment" in lines 16 to 19 on the same page. Consideration might well be given to the desirability of describing the terms of the arrangement with the power authority of New York by means of a formula rather than the statement of a particular amount.
>
> Subject to the foregoing suggestions, I recommend the enactment of S. 1385. I believe that it would be desirable to assure the availability of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project for early post-war construction. The enactment of this bill now would provide the authorization for undertakings which would make an important contribution to the post-war period in providing for the expansion of water-power development and for greater efficiency in transportation, as well as in providing employment on useful and essential public works during the period immediately following the war.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been supported by leaders in the United States for many years without regard to political affiliation. It is my earnest hope that Senator Aiken's bill authorizing this great project will be enacted into law.

I concur in the recommendations made by Secretary Hull. This bill ought to be enacted into law, and I shall do everything I can to that end. Secretary Hull properly ignores the opposition which testified for months before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, and urged that this ought to be a treaty, ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, rather than by a majority vote of the House and Senate on the pending legislation. The able and alert Adolf Berle, representing the State Department, before the House Committee, demonstrated clearly in his testimony, that the treaty method was not necessary, and that the adoption of legislation by both the House and Senate was proper and legal. The opponents of this measure, who are powerful and numerous, want the Senate treaty method followed, because it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate, rather than a majority vote on bills of the character now pending. Their only object in the present objection to the present bill is the hope that there will not be a two-thirds majority in the Senate, instead of a majority as provided in Senator AIKEN'S bill. No one should be misled by this false propaganda. Mr. Berle in his testimony in the House committee in the Seventy-seventh Congress demonstrated the correctness of the procedure in the Aiken bill. Don't be misled by the powerful lobby opposed to this bill.

Then, there is the matter of supporting legislation that is of benefit to America, rather than to a particular section of the United States. As a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, I supported that bill, of vital importance to the West and the South, but not of direct benefit to my section of the United States. But the projects were worthy and had the investigation and benefit of the favorable recommendation of the Army engineers of the War Department. That is one of the most efficient bureaus in our Government. So, I have supported the Army engineers' recommendations because they know more than I do about these problems. General Robins of the Army engineers wholeheartedly indorsed the St. Lawrence seaway power project. It ought to receive the endorsement of Congress now.

Back From Hell

REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last, Richard I. Bong, a 23-year-old Wisconsin-born pilot, was promoted from captain to major for outstanding service to his country. All the world hails this young hero as America's No. 1 ace, for on that day he shot down his twenty-seventh enemy plane and became the top combat fighter pilot in America's history. Wisconsin is proud of Dick's outstanding performance.

The same courage and dogged determination displayed by Captain Bong, now Major Bong, in achieving his enviable record brought Corp. Irvin Sheedy, of Green Bay, Wis., back from hell on Buna, New Guinea. On the night of December 8, 1942, a Jap grenade exploded between his legs, hurled him into the air, breaking both of his legs below the knees, chewing up his arms with shrapnel and peppering smaller fragments into his chest and eyes. Later, at a Port Moresby hospital, surgeons shook their heads as they went to work. Sheedy had a compound fracture and shattered ankle in his right leg, and the muscles and nerves in both legs were greatly torn. The grenade had shattered the nerves and muscles in his left forearm. There was a bullet wound back of his ear, and 57 shrapnel wounds on his face and body. He got malaria in the hospital in Australia. From Port Moresby he was brought to Staten Island, N. Y., then to Walter Reed Hospital here, and finally to Forest Glen, Md., the convalescent annex to Walter Reed. Today, this Irish infantryman is as good as new. I consider it a privilege to extol these American heroes from the well of this House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article appearing in the American Herald on March 27, 1944, which describes in detail the grim tale of this night of hell on December 8, 1942:

BACK FROM HELL

(By Burris Jenkins, Jr.)

JAPS COULDN'T STOP AN IRISH INFANTRYMAN

They were all dead.

The whole detail was dead. * * *

Lying there in the thick dark, with both legs broken and shrapnel all through him—even in his eyes—Corporal Sheedy is sure his 15 men must be dead and he is long past the point of being afraid of even caring what happens to himself.

He can hear Japs moving in the dark around him, although he can't see much from where the grenade has blown him into the heavy undergrowth, but he can hear the Japs grunt and squeal like wild pigs as they plunge bayonets into bodies of his men.

Actually, only 11 of those men are already dead. Five, like himself, still breathe.

Of these, one cries out a little as a bayonet goes into his back. The Jap stabs him seven times more. Miraculously, this man still lives. Another, stabbed twice, makes no outcry and the Japs leave him for dead. He, too, is alive today.

Feet tread on him

More than once stealthy footsteps approach Sheedy and feet tread on his arm, half-covered under the broad leaves of jungle foliage, but Sheedy doesn't move and the Japs go away without as yet discovering him.

From the sounds, he knows they are going through the packs and clothes of the dead men. And then they sit down a few feet away to open and eat the captured United States rations. He can hear their slimy mouths smack over the food and the sound and smell of them are sickening.

Prayers die half-uttered on his tongue now as consciousness comes and goes in waves, like a recurring dream.

Time was, in the heat of early combat, when prayers and curses mixed heedlessly in his mouth, but that was long ago, when he still knew what it was to feel fear—42 days ago, to be exact—and when Irvin Sheedy, of Green Bay, Wis., carried 197 pounds of fighting Irish blood into Oro Bay on New Guinea with an infantry regiment of the Thirty-second Division.

That was a time when they foolishly expected the little brown men to be push-overs for a 'handful of Americans. Corporal Sheedy, himself, led part of the attack during the first 3 days until they struck overpowering Jap resistance at Point Inundara.

Hit for first time

From then on it's blood and heat and hog wallows, sweat and dysentery and scarce food and no sleep and limited water, until Sheedy's 197 pounds dwindle to 140 and below. * * *

And then he gets hit the first time. * * *

It doesn't amount to much—just a bullet grazing his back on Christmas Day, the day they took the Buna airport, and Sheedy and a bunch of his men are behind a little knoll near the swamp beyond which what's left of his infantry regiment is closing in on the triangle of Buna Mission.

A machine gun opens up and Sheedy feels something hit him in the back, but he doesn't know that it's a bullet until the man near him sees the bullet tear through the shirt between Sheedy's shoulders and splash the mud between his feet.

"You're hit!" the man tells him.

Dash for shell hole

Sheedy feels no pain, but decides it's a good time to withdraw to safer territory. He and his squad dash for a shell hole and lay up for the night. It is already getting dark. They establish a line and Sheedy decides his wound can't be serious enough to bother with.

Advancing again in the morning, two enemy pillboxes, armed with 4-inch AA guns, hold them up for awhile. Supported by a platoon of Australians attacking from the left, it takes until 4 p. m. to knock out the pillboxes. That was December 26.

On the 27th, Sheedy's second lieutenant commanding officer assigns him a detail to search and bury the dead Japs behind them, and afterward he moves on up with the others without encountering much opposition.

He hears the Japs

On the morning of the 28th the opposition stiffens, and with part of his company and part of another, Sheedy's outfit succeeds in cutting off about 60 Japs, but some of these get away.

That night Corporal Sheedy is placed in charge of an advance outpost of 15 men.

The evening remains hot and quiet until 9 o'clock. Sheedy has just changed guards and is walking back from the field telephone to where his men are spread out in foxholes in the dark ahead of him when off in the jungle to his left he hears the squealing and jabbering of the Japs who had escaped them, preparing an attack.

Sheedy empties one clip of 20 rounds from his tommygun at the invisible enemy, mostly with the intention of arousing his men to the danger. His warning is only partially successful. The first rush of Japs is stopped, but many of his men are hurt. On the second attack more of his men are hurt and more Japs get through.

On the third attempt, Sheedy is standing, legs apart, looking toward the oncoming Japs over his tommygun when a grenade explodes between his legs, hurling him in the air, breaking both legs below the knees, chewing

up his arms with shrapnel and peppering smaller fragments into his chest and eyes.

Hit, he "sees stars"

Assured in his own mind now that his 24-year-old life is finished—as he has been convinced so many times in the past month and a half—Sheedy is not motivated by fear at all, but only by what he calls an ugly feeling—a desire to take as many Japs with him as he can before he dies—that makes him roll over on his stomach, grope for and find his weapon, and with numb fingers blaze away in reckless hatred with his tommygun until another bullet breaks his right leg for the second time, and then something hits him in the head.

For a moment Sheedy "sees stars," just like any blow on the head. He doesn't realize that a bullet has grazed the mastoid bone on the left side of his head to pass through the lobe of that ear in one of the closest shaves any living man got in this war.

When his head stops swimming everything is still about him except the faint noises of Japs moving among the bodies and the snickering sound of their obscene bayonets.

He doesn't dare move

For many hours Sheedy lies motionless through waves of consciousness, listening to the Japs, like jungle beasts, moving among the bodies of fallen enemies. Even when he doesn't hear them any more, he doesn't dare move. The four other living Americans in the outpost don't dare reveal themselves to each other either.

It was 10:30 when the third Jap attack wiped out the detail. At daylight a United States patrol comes out looking for survivors, but not expecting to find any. Among the 1. dead Americans they find 22 dead Japs.

They don't find much left of Corporal Sheedy—with 57 wounds in his body—except an irrepressible Irish heart and sense of humor.

"Wait'll next year," he says, as they carry him a couple of miles to the rear to a portable hospital. "They can't do this to an Irish infantryman."

Placed aboard plane

His wounds dressed, New Guinea natives carry him 4 miles more to another hospital, where what is now only 120 pounds of Corporal Sheedy is loaded on a plane for Port Moresby and a series of bone and nerve operations extending from there to Australia and the States.

An attack of malaria in Australia didn't help his chances any, but he got by in spite of the weeping predictions of a nurse who gave him up for lost one night in Australia.

"Wait'll next year," he says, and now it is next year and Corporal Sheedy, true to his word, is strutting around the convalescent annex to Walter Reed Hospital in Washington on two good legs again and with almost the full use of his shattered arm. He even gets week-end passes, and what he does with his time then is none of your business. Now that his weight is back around 180, he is soon to go back on duty.

An Alien Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

AN ALIEN SPEAKS

(By Abraham Sussman)

Flag of the States—
Banner of the Republic,
Emblem of democracy,
Symbol of the world to be,
I salute you!

I have a confession to make,
A confession and a declaration,
Listen!

I am an alien, that is to say, I am not legally bound to you.
Yet I have been bound to you with the fibers of my soul
Even before I knew you.
Bound to you in love, in admiration.

Believe me!

I have dreamt of you in my little Galician frontier town,
I have dreamt of you under the flag of a dying monarchy,
Under the burden of poverty, under the fear of pogroms.

I saw you in my dreams. You were floating in the stifled air that surrounded me.
At times I thought you were an illusion, a fantasy,
But a distant voice called to me and said:
"She is real, alive, somewhere * * *."

So I left the place where my cradle stood,
Where mother rocked me to sleep with her tearful lullaby,
And I wandered through lands and states
Until I reached your shores.
And I saw you, real, alive—as I saw you in my dreams.

I looked at your stars and I saw a message in every one of them;
A message to me and to the millions like me;
To all Americans, born and unborn.

In your stripes I read declarations, one as mighty as the other.
The Declaration of Independence;
The declaration of emancipation;
The declaration of the rights of labor;
The declaration of equality and tolerance.

I looked at you in meditation,
And I thought you were conceived by men and women of divine vision,
You were born of a holy rebellion against a tyrant,
The realization of freedom's dream.
And so you became a warning to tyrants, a hope to men.

I speak to you as millions before me did,
Men and women forgotten by fate and fortune,
The downcast and outcast of an old world.

Listen, flag of the Nation of nations—
I came to you, a pilgrim in rags,
A wanderer driven by hate and need,
I came with shattered dreams, but undying hope.

I brought to you a rich heritage of ages and generations—
The divine truth of prophets;
The spirit of sacrifice of holy martyrs;
The ballads of ancient bards, the dreams of dreamers.

I came to your shores, not as a soldier of fortune,
But as your knight errant.
To defend you, my protector;
To share your lofty inspirations and your humane ambitions.
I came to be your adopted son.

The other day my fingerprints were taken,
They asked me if I minded; I smiled, why should I?
I have given you my heart—why not my finger-tips?
Today I am an alien.
Tomorrow I shall be a full-fledged, true American.

Flag of States,
Banner of the Republic,
Emblem of democracy,
Symbol of the world of tomorrow,
I salute you!

Patriotic Appeal by William T. Kerr, National President of the American Flag Day Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

OUR ENTIRE NATION, IN EVERY COMMUNITY, SHOULD PLAN NOW AND MAKE AMERICAN FLAG DAY, JUNE 14, THE BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF OLD GLORY, THE GREATEST PATRIOTIC CELEBRATION AND NATIONA UNITY PROGRAM IN OUR COUNTRY'S HISTORY—WE MUST "KEEP THE HOME FIRES BURNING"

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it is not too early to bring to the attention of the country the approaching birthday anniversary, June 14, of the Nation's emblem, our Stars and Stripes, but as this is one of the most important years in our Nation's history, it is desirous to give this early notice so plans may be made everywhere for Flag Day celebrations all over this land in schools, colleges, universities, women's clubs, service and community clubs, fraternal bodies, religious, civic, and other groups. This has been emphasized by the American Flag Day Association through Hon. William T. Kerr, of Yeadon-Lansdowne, Pa., who founded and organized this patriotic group when a schoolboy in Pittsburgh, Pa., his native city, in 1888, and who 10 years later, in 1898, during the Spanish-American War, was made national president and since then has been for 46 consecutive years, and now is, the active leader and promoter of Flag Day and director general of this organization cam aigning to have the birthday of Old Glory celebrated by the Nation. From the public press, pulpit, and by radio, from parades on Flag Day annually, everywhere the seed sown has borne and is bearing fruit everywhere as one of the strongest appeals and arguments for national unity.

Hundreds of organizations of all kinds now join in this patriotic object, particularly the public schools who promote it daily by their pledge to the flag. Many societies do this whenever they meet. Some require Flag Day observance in their rituals.

It may not be generally known but the American Flag Day Association erected in Schenley Park, Pittsburgh, and dedicated it on Flag Day, June 14, 1927, a granite shrine in honor of the flag's one hundred and fiftieth birthday anniversary that day, the only known monument in the world to any national flag, an event in which State, county, and city officials took part with a great patriotic parade and public meeting in the

park. Many newspapers and magazines throughout the Nation have commended and aided their unselfish, patriotic work, for in all their years no one connected with this patriotic association ever received a penny for services. Members of past and present Congresses have been speakers at their patriotic gatherings. Their national president and founder, William T. Kerr, who holds active and honorary membership in numerous fraternal, patriotic, religious, civic, and educational bodies, was formerly a resident in my district and, while I was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, I was the author of the bill making Flag Day, June 14, a legal holiday in the State of Pennsylvania—Pennsylvania being the first State in the Union to honor Old Glory legally. In their story of Flag Day, Everybody's Weekly, of Philadelphia, the Inquirer's magazine, said of Mr. Kerr's patriotic leadership that he was "devoting a lifetime to Old Glory." The Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia, used almost the same words: "A one-man organization in himself, he has spent since 1898, the better part of a lifetime, to have Flag Day made a legal holiday." As one feature of his efforts, he personally talked with and wrote Presidents and Governors, urging proclamations for Flag Day observance with national success. This year he has requested that American Flag Day be observed for itself on June 14, and a special day of their own, if one is desired, be set for another date as United Nations' Day.

When the city of Pittsburgh, where he was born, had him as their special Flag Day guest, and the mayor presented him with Pittsburgh's golden key to that city, he laughingly said he really did not need it. He was an active figure in the Pittsburgh district until 1928 when the Pennsylvania Railroad sent him to Philadelphia. On his return Flag Day visit to Pittsburgh they had a huge parade of patriotic and civic societies, military and service organizations with city officials and 20,000 school children marched. The Sun-Telegraph of Pittsburgh called him the "father of Flag Day" and Pittsburgh's Post-Gazette said he was "the man individually most responsible for Flag Day."

Many times this patriotic promoter for Flag Day could have profited by political appointment and office because of his wide circle of friends and contacts, but he refused this, preferring to pursue his free efforts among all groups and parties in the United States to popularize Flag Day and if possible have it receive congressional approval if not legal holiday enactment, as was done by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is no wonder therefore that the Ledger of Philadelphia in extending birthday greetings to him designated him "Old Glory's most ardent champion keeping up schoolboy enthusiasm." He still carries it in his many speaking engagements and writings, into schools, societies, clubs, and even pulpits. Associated in this unselfish, nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nonsectarian but entirely American effort are men and women throughout the United States who are officers and leaders in various groups, by which means the celebration of Flag Day and the pledging of our American flag is being promoted widely. All of these are anxious that Federal, State, and local officials shall do their utmost by early proclamations and planning to make fitting arrangements. Formal request for this purpose, as has been his custom since the days of President William McKinley, has already been made and we are pleased to include the patriotic appeal of their national president, William T. Kerr, that "our entire Nation, in every community, should plan now to make American Flag Day the birthday anniversary of Old Glory the greatest patriotic celebration and national unity program in our country's history—we must keep the home fires burning."

AMERICAN FLAG DAY ASSOCIATION PROMOTING NATION-WIDE CELEBRATION OF FLAG DAY AND FLAG WEEK

(By William T. Kerr, founder, and, since 1898, national president and director general, American Flag Day Association)

YEADON, PA., *April 10, 1944.*

Fellow Americans, to secure greater national unity, to encourage American patriotism, plan now and arrange to join in national tribute to Old Glory.

STARS AND STRIPES ADOPTED AS OUR BANNER

June 14, Flag Day, birthday of Old Glory, is the anniversary of the adoption by the Continental Congress June 14, 1777, of the Stars and Stripes as the emblem of the United States, symbol of our nationality. A legal holiday in Pennsylvania since 1937 several other States provide by law for proclamations by Governors for observance of Flag Week, June 8–14, especially Flag Day, June 14.

GREATEST UNOFFICIAL NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Yearly it is becoming the greatest unofficial national holiday on our calendar, principally because the American Flag Day Association, organized in Pittsburgh, has promoted Flag Day observance for almost half a century, even before June 14 was called Flag Day.

A WEEK FOR FLAG'S BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

Flag Week, June 8–14, was inaugurated by the American Flag Day Association, first observed in Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1917, during the First World War, so that our flag's birthday anniversary might be celebrated, if desired, at their own regular meeting places by organizations meeting during that period. Flag Day proclamations have been made by many Governors of States and various Presidents of the United States, especially on our request.

WOODROW WILSON ASKS CELEBRATION YEARLY

But Woodrow Wilson, May 30, 1916, practically made it a continuing unofficial celebration for all time, saying "It has seemed to me fitting that I should call your attention to the approach of the day upon which the flag of the United States was adopted by Congress as the emblem of the Union and to suggest to you that it should this year and the years to come (note the last five words) be given special significance," etc., and he emphasized it in a special formal Flag Day address June 14, 1916.

CALVIN COOLIDGE REQUESTS WE RECALL FLAG'S MEANING

President Calvin Coolidge said in 1927, "It is fitting that we recall (on June 14) all that our flag means to our citizens," etc. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1941, before we entered the war said, "It is especially fitting that we reaffirm our faith in the ideals for which our flag stands and our loyalty to the Nation," etc.

PRESIDENT F. D. ROOSEVELT SHOWS CELEBRATION IS OUR CUSTOM

In 1942 he said, "For many years it has been our custom to set aside June 14 in honor of the flag," etc.

1943 AMERICAN FLAG'S BIRTHDAY OVERSHADOWED

In 1943, however, the O. W. I., last year practically made June 14 United Nations Day, destroying the object of our own Flag Day. When President Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, is celebrated, pictures of Churchill or Stalin are not spread around nor even of Jefferson or Jackson as there are special days for them, and June 14 should be our very own.

UNITED NATIONS DAY SUGGESTED FOR OUR ALLIES

March 25, 1944, we requested our President as we have done every President since William McKinley, to issue Flag Day proclamation, but earlier this war year than usual, to make June 14, its actual birthday, the specific celebration of the American flag and set aside a United Nations Day for our allies.

Our United States boys are fighting, many giving their lives, side by side with those of other nations to preserve our freedoms, they have to save, if possible, their national life, we to keep and hold ours. Old Glory is our very own flag and on its natal day deserves special honor and tribute since it specifically represents all our people, native and foreign born, rich and poor, high and low, of every race, color, and creed, and if special honors are to be given our allies, and they deserve it, another day—United Nations Day—should be set aside, either by the President or Congress.

FLAG WEEK SUGGESTED FOR NEXT WAR BOND SALE DRIVE

As Flag Week is June 8 to 14, we suggested (April 7) to Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., that as June 12 is the date for the opening of the War-bond sale drive, he use Flag Week for patriotic psychological effect throughout the Nation in their publicity in securing bond subscriptions, bringing practical, patriotic results.

April 10, we have advice this will be done, Field Director R. W. Coyne, of the War Finance Division, says, "The occurrence of Flag Day at almost the beginning of the drive will materially help."

1944 PROBABLY GREATEST YEAR IN OUR HISTORY

This year will be the most trying in all our history. Probably by June 14 nearly every family in the United States will have someone under the Stars and Stripes in some service on land, sea, or in the air. Let's make this the greatest of all Flag Days and honor them.

RELIGIOUS BODIES SHOULD COMBINE PATRIOTIC WITH SPIRITUAL

Religious leaders should preach patriotic, spiritual sermons Saturday, June 10, or Sunday, June 11, and Children's Day programs combine patriotism with religious programs for we are a God-fearing Republic. Always our flag has unselfishly championed the cause of the oppressed. Wherever Old Glory floats there is a shrine.

FLAG DAY CALLS ALL TO LOYAL SERVICE

Here, because the great mass of our people are God-fearing, we have liberty, freedom, and constitutional democracy, making us the greatest republic of all times. Flag Day calls on us to preserve it as our forefathers willed it and enshrine the love for our flag, our Nation, that bulwark, our Constitution, and American institutions in all our hearts in consecrated, loyal, unselfish service to God and country.

Refugees in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a report by Miss Laura L. Margolis on refugees in the Far East. Miss Margolis was a representative of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in Shanghai, directing assistance to men and women who had fled to that city from Nazi Germany. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Miss Margolis, as an American citizen, was interned by the Japanese. She was recently repatriated.

Our country has every reason to be proud of the fact that its citizens of Jewish faith have been able to develop an organization such as the Joint Distribution Committee. The committee was organized during the last war and for a generation has been the chief American agency giving aid to Jews overseas. Its leadership and personnel have shown not only a sense of personal sacrifice, but a vision and an ability to plan, which will yet save the remnants of the Jewish communities from the holocaust of the present war, and stand out in the annals of great human services.

It is interesting to note that while this committee was established and is supported by men and women of Jewish faith, it has not limited its benefactions exclusively to Jewish victims of war and persecution overseas. It has cooperated closely with such organizations as the American Friends Service Committee (Quakers), the Unitarians, and with Catholic and Protestant organizations everywhere. Frequently Christian as well as Jewish refugees have received the help of this committee.

In Shanghai, a substantial number of the refugees to whom Miss Margolis refers are persons of Catholic and Protestant faith. They are still being assisted by a local committee which represents the Joint Distribution Committee. In the actual rendering of human service, distinctions of creed and nationality have disappeared and men and women of many backgrounds and faiths have served in the common cause of humanity.

REFUGEES IN THE FAR EAST—EVEN AFTER PEARL HARBOR THOUSANDS OF EUROPEAN JEWS IN SHANGHAI CONTINUE TO BE KEPT ALIVE THROUGH MACHINERY SET UP BEFORE THE WAR BY THE JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE

(By Laura L. Margolis)

I don't have to tell you how glad I am to be home. I'm still a bit confused, rushing around to say hello to my family and my friends at the Joint Distribution Committee, trying to sort my thoughts and impressions of my two and a half years in Shanghai into some sort of order and particularly trying to get some clothes to round out the wardrobe of a single dress and one pair of worn-out shoes that I came home with. I left America to help refugees and now I return a refugee myself.

I went to Shanghai for the Joint Distribution Committee in May 1941. Manuel Siegel, who remains in internment there, joined me just 12 days before Pearl Harbor. Before he could unpack his bags Japanese warships were firing on American and British gunboats under our windows and we realized that our country was at war.

It's only when people begin asking you questions about how you lived, what you did in an enemy-occupied city, how you were able to help the refugees—and we were able to—that your whole experience shapes itself into some meaningful pattern.

THOUSANDS KEPT ALIVE

I want to make one point very clear: The Joint Distribution Committee and the organization it set up in Shanghai under wartime conditions in enemy-occupied territory has meant the difference between life and death to thousands of refugees there. Our kitchen, now feeding 5,000 persons 1 meal a day, our 5 camps that are housing them in crude but protective barracks, spell hope and life for these people. Our work has never stopped for a single day. That work is still going on.

Our difficulties were so numerous and serious that more than once I felt sure that our whole structure would collapse. Money was always a problem; getting adequate equipment was a major headache for us. Unraveling the red tape, overcoming the apathy of the Japanese occupation authorities was a long-term undertaking in itself.

Just before Pearl Harbor we were feeding 8,000 a day in the Joint Distribution Committee kitchen, giving them a noon meal and an evening meal. But our funds were running low and the expected Joint Distribution Committee allotment for December had not arrived. In fact, it never arrived, because Pearl Harbor intervened.

The declaration of war automatically put the Joint Distribution Committee's arrangement for occupied countries into effect. Here I must explain that before Pearl Harbor the Joint Distribution Committee in New York, foreseeing the possibility of war, had informed all its overseas committees, including ours, that local borrowings should be made against the Joint Distribution Committee's post-war credit if war should come and communications be severed. This credit was for a period of 6 months, at the monthly rate of expenditure then current.

On the basis of this guaranty we called a meeting of a group of prominent Shanghai Jews, explained the plan to them, and appealed for their support.

At first, the large sums we needed were slow in coming. In the meantime we took stock of our funds and decided that, by cutting out one meal a day, we could continue for some time. Cutting out one meal a day was a difficult decision to make, because it meant putting already undernourished men, women, and children on still shorter rations. But it was either that or close down entirely and turn the refugees over to the Japanese.

More meetings followed, this time with individuals. Again we explained the Joint Distribution Committee's arrangement; again we asked for funds, explaining how increasingly desperate the refugee situation was becoming.

The loans grew—not only in number, but also in amount. As a matter of fact, we exhausted the Joint Distribution Committee's credit limit. But we went ahead with our borrowings, feeling sure that, although we had no authorization to do so, the Joint Distribution Committee wanted to help, but because of wartime conditions couldn't communicate its wishes to us. All in all, we were able to accumulate $500,000, and up to the day of my internment I was able to contract a loan. This made my internment easier to bear.

FIVE THOUSAND MEALS A DAY

The Japanese allowed us to borrow from neutrals only. At first the loans permitted us to give one meal a day. When I say one meal a day, you must understand that I mean a meal of one course—a heavy soup that we made as nourishing as we could, or a stew of some sort. Later we were able to add 8 ounces of bread a day. Later, too, we bought a large amount of soya beans, and, with a press that we acquired, turned out enough of the highly nutritive soya milk to supplement the children's diet. At first they refused to drink it, but after a while they got used to it.

When we first began working in Shanghai we found that we were burning money. Our kitchen was an antiquated Chinese affair which was terribly inefficient. Meals cost us 60 cents each in Chinese money—3 cents in American currency. Of this, 10 cents went for food and 50 cents for fuel. Obviously, this extravagance had to be eliminated. This was easier said than done. You just couldn't go out and buy new equipment in a city where every piece of metal was a Japanese prize. But we did manage to locate four steam boilers that belonged to a commercial firm. By much persuasion and wire pulling, we got possession of the boilers and installed them. This gave us a kitchen with a capacity of 10,000 meals a day at a cost of only 10 cents a meal, in Chinese money, of which only 2 cents went for fuel.

Unfortunately our resources forced us to limit ourselves to 5,000 meals a day. We chose only the most needy—the children, the aged, the ill—and fed them. This is a tragic situation. Unless funds can be sent through to the committee that is now operating the kitchen, it means that they will have to maintain this level of inadequate relief; it means giving people neither enough to let them live, nor enough to let them die. In order to keep feeding the people we had to close our two hospitals in June 1942.

I want to tell you proudly that the refugees themselves worked with us, shouldering their responsibilities, rather than sitting idly by and passively accepting our aid.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

In January 1942 we called a meeting of the 500 paid refugee workers in our kitchen, two hospitals, and barracks, and explained our precarious financial situation to them. We told them that there would be no money for salaries, that every cent we were raising from day to day had to go into the kitchen. We asked them to please find other jobs. The next day every one of them reported for work. We held meetings with all the other refugees because we felt that they had a right to know the situation. We told them that to work together most efficiently they would have to organize themselves democratically, to elect representatives who would consult with us. Only then would we pull through this crisis together.

We organized ourselves along these lines. We met regularly with these delegates, heard their special problems, and, consequently, found things working out much better. It was as if we were shipwrecked on an island and had organized ourselves into a community government so that we could more efficiently stave off disaster until we were rescued.

THE POOR HELP THE POORER

A great change came over these people as a result of this application of simple democracy. Poor as they were, they recognized degrees of poverty among themselves. I remember that one day a representative came to see me with an idea. He was gaunt, pale from insufficient food, and wearing threadbare clothing. He told me that some of the refugees had thought of giving a party to raise funds for their fellow refugees. That

first party led to others. The poor were helping the poorer.

In February 1943 I was interned in the Chapei camp in Shanghai. People want to know why the Japanese waited so long before interning us. The answer is very simple: until then they needed us to help run the varied and complicated affairs of a city as large as Shanghai—under their supervision, of course. By February they had no further need for us, so they interned us. I can't tell you too much about the camp for obvious reasons.

I was given 1 week's notice to get ready and pack. The camp to which I was sent was for women and families. Mr. Siegel was interned in Pootung camp, which was for unattached and single men.

The food was very simple and quite inadequate. We had three monotonous meals each day. If I never taste fish, rice, and cabbage fried in oil again, it won't be too soon. According to Oriental standards, we were well treated.

We had to do all of our own work. The buildings and stoves were furnished to us and we were just dumped in to shift for ourselves. We did our own laundry. We did our own cooking and preparing of food. As for accommodations, I had a cot which was just enough to turn over in, and the space between beds was just enough to get in sideways. The only thing that kept us going was the hope of repatriation.

I feel that I have come out of darkness into the light, that I have come as a messenger from a far world, to tell you that back in distant Shanghai, in the hands of your enemy, there are brave men and women of your blood and kin, who in danger and in difficulty have never lost faith, have never lost hope.

War Prohibition Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article written by Rev. O. R. Miller, D. D., State superintendent of the New York Civic League, which appeared in the Civic Bulletin of April 14, 1944:

WHY PASS THE BRYSON WAR PROHIBITION BILL?

TWELVE REASONS FOR THIS BILL, H. R. 2082

First. Because it will help greatly to protect the sobriety of our soldiers and sailors. Millions of these boys never tasted liquor before they were drafted into the Army. It is hard enough in these modern times for a boy to lead a sober life even with all the home influences of father, mother, brothers, and sisters to help him. Why should the Government make it hard for them to continue as total abstainers in the Army?

In World War No. 1, under the approval of President Woodrow Wilson, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, war prohibition was passed by Congress, "for the duration." It was made a crime to sell or give liquor to any soldier or sailor anywhere in this country, or in any foreign country by anyone connected with our Army or Navy. That produced the finest and most sober Army in the history of the world.

The passage of the Bryson war prohibition bill will protect the hundreds of thousands of soldiers now in this country training to go abroad, as well as protect the many thousands who are continually coming back to this country on furloughs from war fronts.

Second. Because sober soldiers make better fighters than drinking soldiers.

President Ray Lyman Wilbur, in an address at Stanford University, said: "In these days of range finders, cross hairs, precision instruments, speed, and team play, anything that confuses either mind or body, be it fatigue or drugs, is a menace. The present widespread misuse of alcohol does not go well with the intricate instruments of industry and war, or the cyclonic maneuvers of combat. Five-second relays of bombers demand the clearest of heads and the most dependable of bodies and brains."

Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada, though not a prohibitionist, when announcing, in December 1942, severe restrictions on the whole beverage liquor traffic, including the prohibiting of all advertising of spirituous liquor, wine, and beer, for the war, said:

"The lowering of efficiency due to the use of alcoholic beverages is certain to slow down the progress of the recruit in training. In these days when the utmost alertness is needed, whether on land, or sea, or in the air, such lowered efficiency is bound greatly to increase the likelihood of accidents in which others besides the offender may be involved. Just as a defect in a plane or a gun or a ship may cost men's lives, so may some carelessness or neglect in the sailor, the soldier, or the airman endanger the lives of their comrades, and risk grave danger in training, or in combat.

"Then, too, failure to be temperate helps to establish habits which later may lead to a breakdown in morale. It is common observation of seasoned soldiers that intemperate habits lead to reckless exposure when men are under fire, thereby occasioning needless casualties. Only the man who disciplines himself strictly can stand for long the terrific pace of modern war. Those who indulge themselves too frequently and too freely will break down under the strain. That was true in the last war; it is more true in this."

Third. Because the drinking habits of thousands of laboring men not only reduce the output of urgently needed war material, but also reduce the quality of their workmanship.

Men who have been out drinking until late the night before, are not in a fit condition to handle delicate and expensive machinery as they could if they had not been drinking. Many complaints have come in recently of bad workmanship on Government vessels, tanks, and other war material, so much so that it has even caused congressional investigations concerning them. But when they get back to the root of the matter they usually find that the chief cause of the trouble was the drinking habits of those who work on delicate machinery when they were not in condition to work at all.

Fourth. Because liquor drinking has been the greatest of all causes producing absenteeism from work by many engaged on Government jobs.

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox testifying before the House Naval Affairs Committee, when investigating the shipbuilding industry, was asked what explanation he had for the fact that the figures before the Committee from the Bureau of Ships and the Department of Labor showed 40 percent of unexcused absenteeism occurring over the week ends, and he replied:

"Dissipation is one. More money than they can spend is another. The real major cause is that men go out Saturday and Sunday and indulge and don't feel quite so well on Monday."

The Report on Private Shipbuilding Companies on the Pacific Coast, among other things, said: "All studies indicate the peak of absenteeism is reached over the week ends, with absences on Saturday and Monday accounting for almost 40 percent of the total man-hours lost."

At a hearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in March 1943 there was a discussion of the need of manpower and more production in war industry, at which Mr. Grenville Clark, when asked what he thought the trouble was, replied:

"I think it is largely liquor, to be frank. The consumption of liquor in 1942 was the greatest per capita in the history of this country. I mean hard liquor. If the truth was told, if you would bring it out, I think a large proportion of the difficulty is due to an immense consumption of liquor, under the stimulus of enormous wages, twice as much as most of the workers have ever had. They haven't much to spend it on; they cannot buy cars, and you always notice the percentage of absenteeism is twice as large on Monday as on other days."

At a hearing before the House Labor Committee on the problem of absenteeism Assistant Secretary of the Navy R. A. Bard said to the committee:

"During December 1942 approximately 16,700,000 man-hours were lost through absenteeism in the shipyards and navy yards of the country—sufficient man-hours to construct 14 additional destroyers and about 40 times the man-hours lost due to strikes or shut-downs in the shipyards of the United States for the whole year of 1942.

"The chief reasons for unjustifiable absences are probably the desire for recreation and absence due to dissipation over the week-ends, because statistics show approximately 40 percent of all absences occur on Saturdays and Mondays."

At the same hearing S. M. Du Brul, director of the personnel staff of General Motors Corporation, said: "Whatever extent short-term sickness accounts for the increase of absenteeism it is a sort of sickness to which workers are particularly susceptible just after pay day and on week-ends."

Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins at the same hearing testified to the large loss of production of Government materials by absenteeism, and among other things said: "There are undoubtedly men who have been absent from work Monday morning because they were drinking on Sunday." She is also reported to have said that more men have been killed and injured the day after pay day in factories than at the battle front.

M. S. Rukeyser, International News Service commentator, in an article that appeared in many papers last May, thus wrote concerning absenteeism.

"The second cause was hang-overs from drinking. As to this the magazine Management said 'Hang-overs with 12.2 percent is the most horrible example. For every 10 persons out through natural, poor health, 7 are home recovering from bouts from the rum pot. Big bar bills, big losses in pay, and big heads, total up to an awful price for high-jinxing. That is not all. Our men on the fighting line pay for lost production in blood—in life itself.'"

Every man incapacitated by alcohol becomes an extra burden upon a Nation at war.

On Christmas Day, 1943, the New York Times had this United Press dispatch from Detroit:

"Closing of plant laid to Yule drinking parties. Officials charge employees were too drunk to work. Premature celebration of Christmas closed the Continental Motors Corporation plant today as company officials charged that men and women workers on two shifts were too intoxicated even to attempt precision work. So many of approximately 6,000 workers on day and afternoon shifts showed up intoxicated that it was necessary to close the factory. To have worked might have ruined vast quantities of valuable materials, said a spokesman for the company."

Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin, State president of the New York W. C. T. U., in New York Temperance Work.

"While on my recent trip of 4 weeks in upState New York, I visited several cities where large defense projects are located. I talked with a woman physician who had been to the city police court that morning to attend a patient. There she saw drunken men brought in a truck from a defense plant to be sobered up so they would be able to work the following day.

"I talked with a man who is the head of nine big plants and he said that alcohol was the cause of most of the absenteeism in all his plants—week-end drunks can't come back to work on Monday.

"Another man told of an employee in a defense factory who, because of being under the influence of alcohol broke his machine. Two men had to spend a whole day repairing it, only to have the same man break it again because of another lapse.

"A group of men in one plant were dismissed to give blood to the Red Cross blood bank. Only a few could be served at one time, so the others went across the street for a drink while they waited. When they came back the doctors refused to take their blood because of the alcohol in it, and so time was wasted and no blood given to save some boy's life, all because of the drink."

It has often been shown that a large percentage of the cases of venereal diseases in the Army and Navy have been contracted when our boys were out drinking and under the influence of liquor. It is reported that the percentage of venereal diseases in World War No. 2 have been much larger than in World War No. 1, in which the Government kept away from the soldiers and sailors, all liquor, including beer, as far as possible.

In World War No. 2 the Government officially shows alcoholic liquor before the soldiers and encourages them to drink and does little to prevent them going outside of the camp to get stronger liquors than beer, and many become disgracefully drunk. The boys are given beer in the camps by the Government, which in many cases whets their appetites to go outside for stronger liquor and also get into dens of vice.

Fifth. Because war prohibition will help greatly to protect our soldiers and sailors against venereal diseases.

Many conscientious Army officers who see the injurious effects of beer drinking in the camp as well as the drinking of other liquors outside of the camp, have testified that liquor largely increases the venereal disease problem in the Army.

TESTIMONIES OF ARMY OFFICERS AND OTHERS

At the Philadelphia Conference on Social Hygiene during the week of February 7, 1944, Commander Clarence J. Buckley, venereal-disease control officer of the Fourth Naval District, said: "A survey during the past 90 days shows that 58 percent of the social disease contacts among sailors and marines here could be traced to taprooms. A survey of the past year showed that 75 percent could be traced to these places. They are a major problem."

About the same time Dr. Hubley R. Owen, director of public health for Philadelphia, said: "The matter of intoxication of servicemen with respect to venereal-disease control is of double importance. In the first place an intoxicated soldier is less apt to resist the advances of the prostitute or promiscuous girl. In the second place, he is unable to follow out prophylactic procedures when not in full possession of his faculties. Reports received from both the Army and Navy indicate that the majority of exposures leading to venereal infection among servicemen occurred when they had had too much to drink."

Dr. Arthur T. McCormack, secretary of the Kentucky State Board of Health, said: "It has been shown that in World War No. 1 venereal diseases cost the United States Army a loss of almost 7,000,000 days—equal to a full year's absence from duty of 19,000 men. Only battle wounds and influenza cost more in terms of days lost."

The reports from our Army of the increasing number of venereal cases in the present war indicate that that evil is now very serious. Is not that largely because the present administration has steadily opposed war prohibition which was adopted by our Government in World War No. 1?

The experience of many years past shows that alcohol and prostitution are always inseparable partners in iniquity. Proof of this is found in an article by Mr. Bascom Johnson entitled "Prostitution in the United States." Stressing the relation of alcohol to prositution he said:

"Since the repeal of Federal and State prohibition laws, the old alliance between prostitution and the saloon has been renewed with enthusiasm on both sides. The public drinking places definitely favor the traffic in sexual relationships. While it should not be imagined that the conditions described are peculiar to, say, Chicago, a recent report from that city states:

"'Vice in Chicago's saloon taverns flourishes. Some saloons are simply houses of prostitution, having adjacent rooms used for vice. Hostesses solicit at the bars and tables, then retire with patrons to connecting rooms. In other cases street walkers come into the saloons to solicit. Bartenders, doormen, and toilet attendants serve as agents for prostitutes.' All of which presents a picture disturbingly like the bad old days before World War No. 1."

Dr. Milton Rosenau, professor of preventive medicine in Harvard University, in his authoritative book on Public Hygiene, says:

"Alcohol is the bedfellow of syphilis and gonorrhea. The story of many cases of sexual immorality begins with the influence of drink. Alcohol is generally credited with increasing sexual desire. The unquestioned sexual excitement is not due to stimulation of the generative organs, but to the loss of self-control and the anesthetic action of alcohol upon the higher centers of the brain."

E. L. Transeau, of Boston, in writing about the relation of drink to syphilis, said, "Various investigators have found from 75 to 90 percent of venereal infection, including syphilis, to have been contracted under the influence of alcohol. It is particularly noted that the exposure occurs not in the deeper stages of intoxication, but in the early stages in which the weakened higher mental faculties, the loss of self-control, and the sense of responsibility, turn conduct over to passing impulses. This throws still stronger emphasis on the share attributed to alcohol."

Therefore, we need war prohibition to save many thousands of our soldiers and sailors from having to be sent home because of ruined health from drink and venereal diseases. A soldier or sailor whose heart, nerves, and eyesight have been injured by drink or syphilis, cannot stand up under the terrific strain they must endure on foreign battlefields or in naval battles or battles in the air, and must be sent home or kept in service only to meet an early death. The Army, Navy, and Air Force are thus losing many good fighters from the service by venereal diseases.

In March 1937 Secretary of War Stimson wrote to several Governors concerning certain war conditions in their States, in which he said:

"I hardly need to remind you that among these healthy young men of our Army, venereal disease produces more disability than any other single cause, and that among industrial workers it is one of the most serious causes of disability and inefficiency."

Sixth. Because no grain or other food material should be made into alcoholic beverages while millions of people among our allies in Europe and China are starving.

It is brutal; it is inhuman to take the bread out of the mouths of starving children and of adults in the countries now fighting with us and for us against Germany and Japan in order to make intoxicating beverages. Many millions of Chinese have starved to death already and still more millions are starving and will starve to death, if we continue to turn enormous quantities of grain and other food materials into intoxicating beverages which do nobody any good, but which harm all who use it as a beverage, instead of sending it to feed our allies across the sea.

President Roosevelt said: "The entire nation is mobilizing to produce the materials necessary for the defense of democracy. As a part of this production effort, food is just as important as munitions."

Seventh. Because the Government needs all the space on its ships and on the railroads for hauling Government supplies during the war.

The newspapers have told us of many instances where war materials were left in freight houses or on the docks and large space was given on the trains and ships for the shipment of enormous quantities of beer and other liquors. Evidently in the minds of Government officials beer is more important than bullets or other war material. The Chicago Tribune of August 18, 1942, said:

"Delegate ANTHONY J. DIMOND, of Alaska, today termed 'scandalous' the transportation to that Territory of large quantities of liquor while food and other war necessities were left lying on the docks. DIMOND indicated he was hopeful steps would be taken soon to stop it. A recent report, he told a reporter, showed that requests had been made for allotment for space to carry 16 tons of freight on one vessel, and space for only 1½ tons was granted, whereas the same ship carried beer and wine valued at $60,000."

Mr. Murl Vance, in the Signs of the Times, wrote:

"I talked with a man, an evacuee from Singapore, who declared that the alcoholic situation was jeopardizing the stand of the United Nations, and that thousands of lives were being lost which would be saved if the men would keep sober. Alcohol, he declared, was heavily at fault for the loss of Singapore, just as we all know that it accounted for a very large percent of the loss at Pearl Harbor. Even the boat on which we escaped had one large room piled high with alcoholic beverages, in spite of the fact that many refugees had to be left behind at the mercy of the enemy for lack of transportation."

Eighth. Because it will be a great aid to the farmers in keeping their help sober and working, which is desperately needed in these times of shortage of food.

Many farmers have a very serious problem to keep their help from going into town Saturday and getting drunk, so much so that they are often unable to feed the livestock or milk the cows on Sunday or work on Monday.

At a farm labor hearing in California last year President Paul M. Thornton, of the Southern California Vegetable Producers' Association, said 1 farmer reports that from 10 to 20 of his 600 employees are absent every day because of drinking. Mr. Thornton further said:

"If the Government would make it as hard for the farm hand to buy liquor that will make him play into the hands of Hitler or Tojo for 24 hours to a week as it is for me to get gasoline for producing food, we could get somewhere." The applause which greeted that statement was the most hearty noticed during the whole 4 days of the hearing, the Los Angeles Times reported.

Ninth. Because of the loss of enormous sums of money wasted on drink which could and should be devoted to buying War bonds or some such patriotic service.

The latest Government reports show that America's liquor bill for 1943 was over $6,000,000,000. That is terrible to think of, but we should consider to how much better use that money should be put.

The drinking of so much liquor incapacitates physically many thousands of young men for military service. Also war prohibition of the manufacture, distribution, and sale of liquor would release for military service nearly a million liquor employees and thus make it unnecessary to draft young fathers with several children.

Tenth. Because the fathers and mothers who have given their sons to serve their country in war, and are anxious for their moral welfare as well as for their physical safety, deserve to have war prohibition for their moral protection.

Eleventh. Because the wives and children of thousands of soldiers drafted into war services also are entitled to war prohibition for protection of their husbands and fathers.

Twelfth. Because many great military men have opposed drink in the Army.

General Lord Roberts said, "I beg most earnestly that the public generally will prevent our young soldiers from being tempted to drink."

Count von Moltke, Germany's great field marshal, said: "Germany has more to fear from beer than from all the armies of France."

General Lord Kitchener, the great English general, said, "Resist alcohol as you would the enemy."

Generalissimo Joffre, of World War No. 1, said: "Alcohol, by diminishing the moral and material strength of the Army, is a crime against national defense in the face of the enemy."

On Mr. Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in th New York Sun of April 10 and which is a very clear and informative dissertation on the important subject of our foreign policy. I am one of those who believe that our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has been doing, and is continuing to do, a masterful job in difficult days, and it is encouraging to note men of the type of Mr. Lawrence recognize that.

The article is as follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

HULL'S EXPOSITION OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

WASHINGTON, April 10.—An American foreign policy—free from partisan bias and true to the American purpose of serving humanity, by devising the means of preserving peace so that World War No. 3 may be prevented—has just been proclaimed by Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.

It is by far the most comprehensive expression of war aims and peace objectives that has come from any government and constitutes the kind of Americanism which the men in our armed services can honorably support and embodies a cause for which they can fervently make the needed sacrifices.

The document ought to be printed and reprinted widely, for it is a simple explanation of the trials and tribulations of a government that is trying to make worth while the tremendous expenditure of energy and resources being mobilized.

The pronouncement suffers but little that it has not come earlier, though, indeed, impatient critics have been expressing a recurrent insistence during the last several months for something of this kind.

But the declaration of American foreign policy has been made and only those who are concerned with captious or pettifogging detail, those who want to accomplish a reconstructed world by next week or next month, or those who allow the pressures of left or right wing or of this or that national group to impair their objectivity can complain now as to an alleged reticence or a failure to chart the course to peace which our Government has embarked upon.

The underlying counsel of the Secretary's statement is patience and forbearance, and running through it, too, is an implicit caution that we must bear strongly in mind the relationship of military command to civilian affairs in France and Italy, for example, and in other countries where liberation by the armies of the United Nations is to occur. It is clear that General de Gaulle and his followers must not allow their ambitions to mess up a military movement for which the Allies have given vast amounts of equipment and on which our high command is dependent to hold the invasion front.

The Atlantic Charter is "not a code of law from which detailed answers to every question can be distilled by painstaking analysis of its words and phrases," says Mr. Hull, but he adds that "it points the direction, in which solutions are to be sought." The "essential understanding and unity of action" among Great Britain, the United States, China, and Russia, according to the Secretary's statement, is "not in substitution or derogation of unity among the United Nations." He makes it plain that an international organization is desirable, but points out that without "an enduring understanding" between these four nations on fundamental purposes and their obligations to one another, peace organizations are "creations on paper and the path is wide open again for the rise of a new aggressor."

This is common sense and horse sense. Secretary Hull says "it is hardly to be supposed that all the more than 30 boundary questions in Europe can be settled while the fighting is still in progress," but he assures us that "this does not mean that certain questions may not and should not in the meantime be settled by friendly conference and agreement." Most important, however, is this:

"We are at a stage where much of the work of formulating plans for the organization to maintain peace has been accomplished. It is right and necessary that we should have the advice and help of an increasing number of Members of Congress. Accordingly I have requested the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to designate a representative, bipartisan group for this purpose. Following these and similar discussions with Members of the House of Representatives, we shall be in a position to go forward again with other nations and, upon learning their views, be able to submit to the democratic processes of discussion a more concrete proposal."

This is the American way of doing things and every Republican as well as every Democratic leader, including Governor Dewey, Governor Bricker, and others being mentioned for the Presidential nomination, ought to take this opportunity to second the efforts of Secretary Hull and keep foreign policy out of partisan politics. For if another world war comes because this generation fails to do its duty in establishing an international means of keeping peace the blood of American boys who are sons of present-day Republicans as well as Democrats will have to be shed a third time to defend America.

Lawyers in O. P. A.

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss this morning a highly controversial subject, and that is as to how many lawyers there are in the Office of Price Administration.

Recently I received a communication from Chester Bowles, Administrator, who states that on March 10, 1943, there were 440 attorneys in the Washington office drawing salaries totaling $1,867,470 annually. There were 1,367 attorneys in the field drawing salaries totaling $4,927,605 annually, making a total of 1,807 attorneys in both the Washington office and in the field at an annual outlay of $6.795,075 base pay, without overtime.

As of February 29, 1944, there were 298 attorneys in the Washington office drawing salaries of $1 368,000 annually, and 1,145 attorneys in the field drawing salaries totaling $4,505,095 annually, making a total of that date of 1,443 attorneys in both the Washington office and in the field drawing salaries totaling $5,873,095 annually; I presume this is base pay without overtime.

Recently we have been reading about the great savings effected the American taxpayer by the O. P. A. Now if Mr. Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A., could be induced to reduce by at least 30 percent the legal minds in this department of the Government, it would be one instance where we would definitely know the O. P. A. was effecting savings for the American taxpayer and at the same time would afford relief to the industrial, business, and agricultural life of the Nation from the barrage of directives thrown at them daily. When the O. P. A. was instituted there may have been need for many legal minds; however, since this organization is now on a working basis there can be no justification for the number now on the pay roll.

One of the most important matters facing Congress is what to do about the O. P. A., authorization of which expires on June 30. There is no disposition in the Congress to do away with price control. It is a necessary instrumentality created by Congress to do a definite work. Their legal department, however, at times, goes far afield.

There is considerable sentiment for making the authority of O. P. A. more specific instead of leaving it with a wide field of bureaucratic discretion. There

is also considerable sentiment for providing for court appeals against its decisions.

There has been an abundance of evidence that O. P. A. has abused its authority. Under the Henderson regime the lawyers and economists were using the agency to effect their pet reforms of the American business structure.

If Administrator Chester Bowles actually wants to save the American taxpayer some money he will reduce the personnel of his legal staff another several hundred and not alone save the American taxpayer considerable money but a considerable number of headaches.

The effort should be made in the Congress, when this matter is up for consideration, to impress upon the O. P. A. to return to government by law instead of by bureaucratic directives.

Even though the O. P. A. has reduced the number of attorneys since March 1943, they can still reduce the number considerably more. I feel quite certain it would operate in a more businesslike and efficient manner if surplus legal talent was moved out.

Views of Justice Byrnes on Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence that the Members of both Houses of the Congress are, each day, giving more serious thought to the vital question of providing an orderly program covering the disposal of Government-owned surpluses of all kinds. All of the Members with whom I have discussed this personally feel that it is the definite duty of the Congress to pass appropriate legislation on this matter at an early date in order to provide an official policy statement of the Congress to the agency or agencies to whom this gigantic task of merchandising is to be allocated.

In this connection, I am sure that the Members will be interested in the views of the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, as given by Mr. Byrnes in an address to the Academy of Political Science in New York on April 12. The subject of Mr. Byrnes' address was Preparation for Peace on the Home Front. In respect to the surplus property question, Justice Byrnes had the following to say:

The constructive report of B. M. Baruch and John Hancock on the problems of postwar readjustments has gone far to dispel the fog of controversy which had hung over the discussions of the termination of war contracts and the disposition of surplus property.

Legislation is necessary to effectively solve these problems. However, from my long experience in the Congress, I realize that delays in legislation are unavoidable. I believe it essential for the Executive to take no chances but to proceed to the fullest extent possible under existing law.

A Surplus War Property Administrator has been appointed. He has called upon the procurement agencies for an inventory. If we wait to get a complete inventory from all war theaters, the inventory will be only of historical value. But we will secure an inventory in sufficient detail to enable us to know what surpluses we have and where they are located. This list of surplus materials will be furnished to each procurement agency and no agency will purchase additional supplies without first consulting that list in order to ascertain if Government supplies are already available.

Our surplus supplies must be disposed of at a fair price, and as rapidly as possible without demoralizing trade and industry. There must be no scrapping or destruction of useful property. Private monopolies must not be created or strengthened. Small independent local businesses must be given preference and industrial loans made available to them on appropriate terms.

The Government's wartime investment in new plants and new machinery amounts to approximately fifteen and one-half billions. But about one-third of this amount is invested in plants especially designed for the manufacture of munitions which could have little or no peacetime use.

The problem of disposition, however, is enormously aggravated because 70 percent of the Government's total plant investment is in projects costing more than $10,000,000 each. The Surplus Property Administrator must be authorized to lease as well as sell these plants if independent and local enterprises are to be given an opportunity to take over any of the larger plants. And, where possible, we must subdivide the larger units.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ASSOCIATED WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARDS OF SOUTHWESTERN OHIO,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 7, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At a meeting of the Associated War Price and Rationing Boards of Southwestern Ohio, held on the evening of April 6, 1944, it was unanimously agreed to present for your consideration the following observations and recommendations, based on our practical experience in carrying out the O. P. A. programs, in the hope that they will be of assistance to you in making the O. P. A. a better instrument of true democracy, to the end that more efficient price control and more equitable distribution of rationed necessities may be afforded the American people.

1. Without reservation we here signify our complete devotion to the fundamental purposes of the O. P. A.

2. We believe that as the O. P. A. is at present set up and administered, those purposes are not being fully served.

3. We submit as our considered judgment our conclusion that many of the fundamental purposes are being defeated because Congress has not laid down proper definitions and limitations under which the O. P. A. should function; that it is the duty of Congress to do so in accordance with our American principles of government.

4. The policy of placing rationing and price control in the hands of local boards made up of volunteer citizens is a thoroughly sound one that should be perpetuated. It is the American way that, properly guarded by Congress, will produce an utmost of good will and cooperation on the part of our people.

5. To the greatest degree possible these local boards should be made autonomous, to act without petty interference or political or personal considerations for the purpose of promoting price control and the equitable distribution of rationed goods among our people.

6. That this autonomy no longer exists is obvious to anyone who has served as a member of such boards. This condition has come about through the growth of one of the greatest and most vicious bureaucracies that ever fastened itself on the American people that is composed of salaried employees in the district, regional, and national offices of the O. P. A., whose chief purpose seems to be to defeat the autonomy of the local boards through petty nagging, unjustified interference and the constant issuing of involved regulations that have now grown to such a volume that much time and effort are expended in interpreting those regulations and their many amendments to the point where all semblance of simplicity has vanished.

7. We strongly recommend that the entire structure of the O. P. A. be overhauled to the end that the basic principle of simplicity be regained and that definite lines of procedure and administration be established as a part of the law passed by Congress under which the O. P. A. is to function.

8. As an important part of this law we respectfully suggest that the fundamental purposes to be served by price control and rationing be restated in terms of the greatest possible simplicity; that the status of local war price and rationing boards and their responsibilities and duties be clearly defined by law; that these rules and regulations under which they are to function be made clear; that the rules and regulations be codified; that the extent to which the Government official who is to administer them be severely restricted except with the consent of Congress. In other words, it is our recommendation that Congress fully accept its constitutional prerogative and duty by making of the O. P. A. an agency of well-defined law, instead of one of men as it is now constituted to so great a degree.

9. It is our conviction, based on experience, that neither price control nor equitable rationing will be achieved until all factors, from producer to consumer, are placed under the jurisdiction of some one agency of Government.

10. Should Congress see fit to follow these suggestions in placing the actual operation of the O. P. A. program in the hands of the local boards, it is our conviction that great saving of money could then be effected and greater efficiency be secured by reducing the personnel of district and regional offices to the point where they would be largely occupied in the work of enforcement which, as they are at present constituted, is being sadly neglected, with the result that black markets are flourishing at the expense of law-abiding citizens. Of the many cases of black-market operations and other cases of violation of the regulations that have been referred to the local district office by our boards, we know of practically none where enforcement has been accomplished.

Through failure of Congress to establish the O. P. A. on such lines as herein suggested, thousands of American citizens have been subjected to the humiliation of having their rights abridged or completely denied through vicious un-American kangeroo courts procedures and other forms of bureaucratic rule by men, and the O. P. A. has assumed, in the average citizen's mind, the ugly aspect that brought open rebellion against the prohibition law.

It is our conviction that respect for, and cooperation with, this important agency can be reestablished if all taint of bureaucracy be removed, the dignity of citizenship be recognized, and effective means of removing black-market operations be established to the end that equity and justice may be served in the interest of all citizens alike.

ORVILLE W. CRANE,
Chairman.
F. G. GEDGE, *Secretary.*

False Implications of Reverse Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, considerable publicity has been given to lend-lease in reverse with the statement that it is a "two-way street." The public reaction has been that we are receiving from members of the United Nations as much as we are sending to them. The facts as shown by the committee report to accompany H. R. 4254 permit of no such implication.

The lend-lease aid rendered other nations from the date of approval of the act in March of 1941 is valued at slightly less than $20,000,000,000. It is of interest to note that two-thirds of this aid was rendered in 1943. The United Kingdom has received about six and one-half billions of dollars in lend-lease goods and services. Russia has received in excess of $4,000,000,000 of these same items. Africa, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean area have received $2,000,400,000. Lend-lease shipments to China and India totaled about $1,000,000,000; Australia and New Zealand got $803,000,000, and other American republics received one hundred and twenty-seven million. So there was an aggregate outgo of approximately $20,000,000,000 all up until December 31, 1943. Now that's a pretty broad street that leads away from home and represents a substantial gift by our taxpayers in the cause for which we fight.

What about reverse lend-lease? Again as shown by the committee report, up until December 31, 1943, it totaled $2,094,872,000. And this was received from the British Commonwealth. No other member of the United Nations family has contributed anything in reverse lend-lease to this country. So this alleged two-way street is a boulevard going out, but a city alley coming back and this is the fact that should be given publicity. The people have a right to know all the facts in connection with this program. It is $20,000,000,000 against two billions and the difference is a considerable sum in any language.

Again referring to the committee report, I was surprised to find that the hearings were conducted on an ex parte basis—that is, only one side of the subject was presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and that committee based its conclusions solely on the testimony of individuals favorable to the program. Why were others not called, who have knowledge of the operations under lend-lease, and who have serious doubts about its continuance as presently organized? Less than a year ago a bipartisan committee of the Senate toured the world and returned with amazing stories about the program as it was being administered. In a unanimous report Republican and Democrat alike was critical of what he had observed. None of these men were asked to appear and testify and when the chairman of the committee was asked why this was so, in response to a question by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER]—Report, page 3574, April 17, 1944—he said:

> We did not think it necessary. We have received the true facts from official Government sources.

Now there you have the strictly partisan approach that has been made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It did not want to hear the other side of this story. The Senate will soon have this matter for consideration and it is to be hoped that the gentlemen who have knowledge of import will speak out and tell the people of this country just how the lend-lease program may be administered efficiently and with due regard for our national interest. There is still too much secrecy in connection with this program.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk by Ben Schlossberg, immediate past president, New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards, before members of Jersey City Real Estate Board at Jersey City, N. J., Tuesday, April 11, 1944:

As your State president last year, I spoke in every part of the State on many issues which concerned our business, including O. P. A. as a war emergency.

I was always in favor of rent control, but against some of its directives. There were some officials that administered the law arbitrarily, which caused much confusion. However, since Ivan Carson was made Administrator of Rents in Washington, and the dismissal of a few arbitrary subordinates who caused the confusion, there has been a noticeable change for the better.

In recent months, under the able leadership of Chester Bowles, the O. P. A. Administrator, a definite change for the better has taken place.

The O. P. A. has been called everything in the book—but its most violent critics will admit it is necessary and must be maintained. We must not permit the realtors to be the tool of any individual or institution that wishes to increase rents arbitrarily. If there should be a distressed owner, the O. P. A. will give that owner proper consideration.

As realtors, we must fight the battle of inflation. If rent control were done away with, rents would skyrocket overnight, and cause an increase of rent payments to the extent of 100 percent.

Of course, there would be a boom in the selling of properties, but when conditions became normal rents would drop, and property would be valueless.

Recently the Chain Store Age, speaking for food distributors, stated: "Grocers don't like price control or rationing any more than our boys at the front like fighting for their lives. But they know these things are necessary if we are to lick inflation on the home front, as well as our enemies on the fighting front."

Price control to hold down inflation is essential in all fields, and despite its many shortcomings and rules that are difficult to understand at times, the O. P. A. has done a good job. There are billions of dollars in the hands of the American people today, and those hands are itching to spend it. Relax controls and prices would skyrocket, touching off inflation, and creating a condition that would make the 1930 depression seem like a picnic.

The basic purpose of price controls in time of war and in the adjustment period following the war is sound and necessary. When conditions become normal, O. P. A. can be discarded. In the meanwhile, let us continue to fight our enemy at home—inflation, and the causes of inflation.

O. P. A. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WAR PRICE AND RATIONING
BOARD 34-31-9,
Cincinnati, Ohio, March 24, 1944.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, O. P. A.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Upon receipt of your letter of March 16, I called a special meeting of our Board, which was held on the evening of March 20, for the discussion of the invitation contained in your letter to me as chairman, as I felt that since all members of our board have shown such devoted interest in the progress and welfare of the O. P. A., my reply to your letter should represent the consensus of the good judgment of these members.

At that meeting we thoroughly discussed your letter and the matters we feel should be brought to your attention. We delegated to our information officer, Mr. Otto Garr Tague, the work and responsibility of preparing our reply with the understanding that a draft of his effort would be submitted for approval at our meeting of this date,

which approval has now been unanimously given.

Let me say at the beginning that each and every member of our board is in full and complete accord with what we understand to be the fundamental purposes of the O. P. A. program. As you indicate in your letter, we who are on the firing line and in direct contact with the public should have some very constructive suggestions for betterment.

We believe we have these. We believe that we are all of sufficient executive experience to enable us to avoid expressing to you either petty, carping criticisms, or destructive comment that might have its basis in personal resentments. Some of our members antedate, in point of service, the establishment of the O. P. A.

We are in full agreement with you in your conclusion to the effect that the O. P. A. has saved the people of the Nation untold sums of money and has put a very important check on inflation. We believe that sufficient money should be appropriated by Congress to enable O. P. A. to continue to function on the basis of carrying out those fundamental purposes for which it was established.

The suggestions for betterment which we offer for your consideration fall, loosely, under two main headings, viz: (1) Theoretical, or matters with which we have had no personal or direct experience, and (2) Practical, or those with which we have had personal and direct experience—suggestions which we believe would, if put into practice, result in better understanding and cooperation on the part of our fellow citizens and save large sums of the taxpayer's money while getting far greater results.

Under the former heading we shall offer herein suggestions which we most frankly state may be entirely beyond the powers of the O. P. A. to adopt, as follows:

1. Price control: It is our conviction, based on our observation and contacts with retailers and other marketing factors, that control of prices can never be made effective until that control is aimed more directly at those factors higher up in the scale than the retailer—certainly as high as the wholesaler from whom the retailer must get his supplies, to whom he must pay the straight-out gouges or artificially created prices, demanded of him.

We have overwhelming evidence that retailers are the unwilling victims of what amounts to blackmail sales of worthless or unsalable merchandise on which they have to pay extravagant prices in order to get standard merchandise for which there is a demand and that the prices thus seemingly paid under established ceilings have their above-ceiling character hidden in the fancy prices they are forced to pay for unwanted goods which, when it becomes evident that they cannot be sold, frequently force the retailer to break the ceiling on price-controlled merchandise.

This is especially true in the fresh-vegetable field. We have seen receipted bills which in many cases clearly showed such facts as just related, presented for our examination only after our pledge had been given that the persons involved would not have their names used. We have striven many times to break down this refusal to stand behind the facts, but have always been defeated in our efforts by the fear that the retailers in question would be blacklisted by all wholesalers if it became known that they had made known the facts.

We are under the impression that this condition may be the result of divided authority—that some other agency of the Government controls the prices and other factors up the line toward production to which level O. P. A. cannot reach.

If this assumption is correct, we submit that the remedy for this and similar conditions lies in removing this divided authority and the price control that should extend to all factors of price-making be given to the O. P. A., from origin of the item to the consumer.

We also suggest, that if our price panels and local boards are to be required to supervise and enforce price ceilings at the retail level, they should also have the authority to enforce them at least as high as the wholesale level.

2. Gasoline-rationing control: The figures that represent the amount of gasoline that is escaping rationing strike, with a sense of futility, upon the minds of all conscientious members of local boards. It is very difficult to become acquainted with these figures and then be forced to deny, under the regulations, a few gallons of gasoline to a returning soldier or some other law-abiding citizen.

We are, therefore, in full sympathy with all efforts to eliminate black-market operations. Obviously, there is little that we can suggest in the way of preventing these operations where they depend on counterfeit or stolen ration tokens, other than that steps be taken to create tokens of such a character that any small printing shop could not duplicate.

With reference to that part of the black market that functions without the use of gasoline ration tokens, we believe that we have a suggestion that is worthy of consideration and adoption. And again as we suggested with reference to price control, it is our recommendation that gasoline rationing start at the source.

Our inquiries have developed the apparent fact that no rationing control is enforced upon the refineries where gasoline is produced. If this be the fact, then it is very obvious that the source of supply to wholesale and retail distributors of gasoline who require no tokens from a car operator in order for him to obtain gasoline would be dried up if all factors below the refiner were required to present tokens to the latter for all supplies that are released to the civilian market.

We are under the impression that here again enters the factor of divided authority which gives the O. P. A. the responsibility of rationing gasoline upon a basis of equity of distribution, while placing in the hands of some other government agency the supervision of gasoline at its source, the refinery.

If this be the case, we recommend that O. P. A. be given the authority to control the rationing of gasoline from the source to the consumer. And we include in this recommendation the rationing of fuel oil which we understand to be weakened by the same conditions that apply with reference to gasoline, and we suggest that the same principle be applied to all other rationing. For without control of distribution factors including the source, neither rationing control nor price control will ever be made effective.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN FUNCTIONING OF O. P. A.

Here we feel that we are on solid ground of experience, both as to our work as practical and important factors of the program, and in the light of our combined many years of experience as executives in other lines of endeavor.

We make the bold and challenging claim that, as at present constituted to function, the entire O. P A. organization is completely upside down.

As a matter of logic and reasoning we offer, in support of this, the fact that there are, in the Cincinnati district, something less than 40 local boards composed of an average of about 10 businessmen each, or 400 volunteer citizens who have been chosen for their work after careful investigation as to their qualifications, and there are some 220 paid personnel in the district office whose chief purpose, real or assumed, is to supervise the work of these 400 businessmen.

That represents approximately one supervisor for each two board members. The latest figures available to us indicate that this average seems to be closely representative of the conditions that obtain with reference to the national set-up—some 57,000 board members and some 30,000 supervisors.

From these figures the mind of any businessman will immediately draw one of two inevitable conclusions:

1. That the businessmen who comprise the 5,700 boards are exceedingly incompetent, or

2. That the paid personnel of the district, regional, and national offices consists of a far greater number of individuals than is necessary.

We strongly recommend that you give most careful consideration to these two statements in the light of your own business experience and that you take steps that will, to whatever extent is possible, remove from the O. P. A. organization the element of improper and inefficient functioning that immediately becomes apparent when these conclusions register on your consciousness.

Solely in the spirit of cooperation and helpfulness, we offer the following observation from our own experience:

It was the originally announced purpose of the O. P. A. to make the local boards practically autonomous. They were to be constituted of men and women who lived in the area of their activities—the neighbors of those citizens whose precious rights as American citizens they would have the responsibility to curtail.

Cooperation of the friendly American nature was to be the keynote of our activities. Sympathetic understanding of the problems offered was to become the very foundation upon which this voluntary relinquishment of those rights was to be built.

The rationing and price control of the necessities of life were to be accomplished on the basis of equity of distribution that would remove all resentments that would inevitably result, unless that equity were clearly established.

Citizens would be dealing with their neighbors who would see that, on the basis of equitable distribution, each of them would receive his full share—without argument, political influence, personal favoritism, or any other factor but that of equity.

Washington would determine the amount of supplies on hand for distribution among the civilian population and the prices that could equitably be charged for them, hand these determinations down to the boards who would then see that the citizens in their respective areas were given access to their rightful shares.

And regardless of all other considerations, Mr. Bowles, that is the very simple premise upon which the rationing and price controls of the O. P. A. were set up. At least that is the premise upon which it was offered to the American people for their voluntary acceptance from which was to spring their voluntary cooperation.

We will not go into the painful review of what the people got. You and we know very well that they got a monstrous thing that in no way resembled what they had been led to expect, or what Congress approved of.

In many ways you have been responsible for changes that have resulted in bringing the O. P. A. back to some resemblance of its original purpose. For some of these changes we take credit for having offered suggestions that you have incorporated in your reforms. Your files will bear witness to this statement.

It is our conviction, based on the reception our suggestions have been received and acted upon by you, that had you been in your present position throughout the building of the O. P. A., much of the un-American

character of this very important agency of Government would have been avoided.

But we also submit, with all due respect for your good intentions, that there is still much to be done before the O. P. A. will be functioning efficiently and economically, in such a way that the respect and cooperation of our fellow citizens may be reestablished. And it is our hope that you will accept for careful consideration the observations we now make in the spirit of helpfulness and constructive effort in which we offer them.

We earnestly believe that autonomy of the local boards is the very key to the establishment of all that is desirable to obtain equitable rationing and effective price control. That these boards are not autonomous is clearly evident to all members of this board and to those of other boards to whom we have talked.

Instead of this, there has been a recently constant tendency to concentrate rationing in the district office. Truck tires which formerly were rationed for the county by our board to the eminent satisfaction of the truck owners of the county are not being rationed at the district office on the silly pretext that parking space in the neighborhood of our office was so greatly restricted that rationing should be taken to the Union Trust Building downtown, where there is no parking, with the result that we understand that the truck owners of the county recently sent to you their written protest.

Institutional rationing of food has also been withdrawn from the boards and taken to the district office for no more sound reason that members of boards have been able to discover than that possibly the politically appointed bureaucrats—the "little men rattling around in titles too big for them," as the regional office expressed it in a recent bulletin, are more capable of handling this program than the disinterested businessmen of character and repute who comprise the boards.

And now it has been announced that all issues of gasoline rationing that involve war plants will be taken over by the district office.

This constant encroachment on the prerogatives of the boards is producing a serious feeling of resentment on the part of members of the boards which you, Mr. Bowles, may not yet have detected, but which has assumed such proportions that it could easily result in wholesale resignations that would leave the O. P. A. wholly in the hands of the bureaucrats and materially increase the resentment of the public.

Is it your purpose so to bring the entire O. P. A. program into the field of politics and bureaucratic influence?

Are you willing to go before Congress and frankly state that this is your plan?

The resentment of the law-abiding public over the failure of O. P. A. to put a stop to black-market operations while punishing the innocent law-abiding citizens by cutting his A gasoline rations from 3 to 2 gallons of gasoline per week would, we believe, be increased by this move to such an extent that rationing and price control would become a farce.

Excessive and dictatorial supervision, spiteful nagging, unjustified interference on the part of those two-hundred-and-twenty-odd "supervisors" in the district office still prevail. The only possible inference we can draw from this activity of "little men rattling around in titles too big for them" is that they have to justify drawing the pay for the jobs they hold down and that they have not enough real and necessary work to keep them busy or that they have accepted the theory that board members are of such moronic level of intelligence that they have to be watched over like an old hen looks after chicks.

We could produce conclusive evidence in the nature of hundreds of cases of this tendency, were anyone in authority interested in listening to it. And we are sure that other boards could do likewise. It results in tragic waste of our time and that of the chief clerks and other paid personnel of the boards, in provoking delays in providing attention to the needs of our citizens and resentment in their consciousness and the loss of their willing cooperation, all of which could be avoided, along with waste of the people's money, by reverting to the simple basis of board autonomy, upon which O. P. A. was originally offered to our people.

It has been our observation that 95 percent of our citizens are within the compliance group, while not more than 5 percent constitute the noncompliance group.

If you will reorganize the O. P. A. on the basis of board autonomy we have suggested, and turn the district office into the agency of cooperation with the boards that we have been misled, on many occasions, into believing they were to become, you will be able to reduce the appropriation you ask Congress to grant and, at the same time, secure far greater efficiency of operation than has ever been achieved to date.

This premise is based, of course, on the assumption that members of local boards are of such executive capacity and experience as to enable them to do the really simple job that is assigned them. If they are not, then we suggest that as your first move you improve the personnel of the boards.

It has been our observation that each local board is only about as efficient as the chief clerk whose functions are to represent the board in direct contact with the large majority of the public. If the chief clerk is merely a nincompoop who has been given this important job on the basis of political or personal influence, then service of the board in meeting the public need is slow, inefficient, and tragically lacking in all the elements that create good will, understanding, and cooperation.

We suggest, therefore, that you give special attention to the improvement of the character of these chief clerks who, if lacking in executive attainments and experience, should be replaced by persons who have what it takes to deal with the public as the media through which the boards must function in contacts with the public.

Since rationing and price control are, in their essentials, quite simple, it is but logical for us to suggest that the regulations governing them be simplified, and that, when this simplification has been accomplished, the regulations that govern be permitted to stand at least long enough for those of us who are charged with the final responsibility of executing them can become familiar with them.

The thousands of pages of fine type that provide the regulations under which we are to function have assumed such proportions of complexities that they defy the human mind to embrace them. The changes that reach us almost daily—usually for immediate adoption—tend to add confusion to minds already confused. (On Monday of this week, we received 207 pages of changes in the regulations, all couched in technical terms and printed in very small type.)

Much waste of the people's money could be eliminated and far greater efficiency of application secured if a little thought and effort were given to the reconstruction of the regulations on a simple basis and to their standardization for a sufficient period to enable their uniform application. Waste of paper could also be materially reduced through following this suggestion.

That naturally leads us to the subject of printed matter in the form of multicolored posters, pamphlets, copies of radio speeches to which nobody listens, and all the many hundreds of items of advertising matter which we receive, all of which is apparently based on the mistaken assumption that the American people have to be sold on something which they have to accept anyway, or the equally mistaken assumption that 95 percent of them are disloyal crooks, while only 5 percent of them are willing to comply.

You don't have to sell the American people on rationing and price control, Mr. Bowles. All you have to do is to give them a chance to get what is equitably coming to them with as little as possible of bureaucratic interference with their time and effort and in such a way as will be conducive to their willingness to cooperate with the programs that it becomes necessary to adopt in their behalf.

They know that we are saving them money; they realize that we have done much important work to stop the ravages of inflation. They will go along with us, almost to a man or woman, if you will provide the easiest possible way for their cooperation to become manifested and with the least possible artificially imposed restraints to their freedom of action.

To this end we urgently recommend that the local boards be given the authority to carry out the rationing and price-control programs in the spirit of neighborliness originally conceived and announced to the public; that the suspicion that the vast majority of our citizens are constantly seeking methods to break down our programs, be abandoned; that the district office personnel, instead of devoting so much of its time to dictating to the boards and petty nagging and interference with their efforts, be reorganized on a basis of economy and efficiency and that its time and effort be devoted almost exclusively to doing what the boards obviously cannot do, viz: the enforcement on, and punishment of that small minority of citizens who flagrantly violate the letter and spirit of such simplified regulations as may, from time to time, be found to serve as guides to the equitable rationing and price-control efforts of the O. P. A.; that chief clerks be required to function as executive contacts between the board members and the public with full authorized powers to act, without interference on the part of district office personnel, in all cases where normal, current, and obvious rations are involved, to the end that the public may be served quickly and efficiently and that much of the resentment of the public may thus be removed.

Do these things that we have outlined in rather broad detail, Mr. Bowles, and we are supremely confident that better results will be had with the expenditure of a greatly reduced sum of the taxpayers' money.

In view of the interested effort we have herein made to answer your letter as we believe you wanted it answered, we ask that you show us the courtesy to reply with an indication of your reactions after you have fully considered it.

Sincerely,

O. W. Crane, chairman; Sam Agnew; George M. Bailey; Charles F. Christensen; Morten Carlisle; Robert Maddox, Member of Congress; Clifford McCoy; George Stalf; Clifford Wolf; Otto Garr Tague, board members.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a most extraordinary incident occurred

in the year 133 B. C. It does not seem so extraordinary now that the people of the United States are becoming accustomed to the unusual in government. The legislation by which we transfer money, material goods, battleships, and what not in terms of billions to foreign nations has thus far contained no restraint upon those vested with executive authority from disposing of the United States to some other nation by last will and testament, which may in the light of well-established precedents for such a type of disposition be worthy of some consideration. It is recorded by an eminent English historian that when Attalus, King of the rich country of Pergamum in Asia Minor, died, 133 B. C., he devised and bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman people. The motive for this strange bequest was not disclosed, except as some historians have drawn the inference that Pergamum had at one time been an ally of Rome, and that there then existed an organization promoting the idea of Union Now. Even in the far-off evil days of nationalism the unpardonable sin of loving one's own country—Josephus bears witness to the strong desire for annexation among the rich men of Syria, although this desire ran counter to the wishes of both king and people. In these modern days when both the king and a few rich seek Union Now it may not be treason to inquire whether along with silent and secret commitments, there is a last will and testament drawn in true and ancient form devising and bequeathing the United States with all its treasure and its people to some foreign nation. I would not call attention to this strange bequest of King Attalus were it not for the disturbing fact that his action was followed by several other ancient kings. One of these bequests by will was made in 81 B. C. by Alexander II, King of Egypt.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Enquirer:

LEND-LEASE PROGRAM SHOULD BE CONTINUED

There is little doubt that the lend-lease program will be continued for at least another year.

Under existing law, it would expire June 30 and Acting Secretary of State Stettinius last week appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to ask for its continuance.

"Obviously this must and will be done," comments the New York Times. "Lend-lease is the kingpin of our whole war effort. Without it the offensives of the United Nations in every part of the world would go to pieces. Mr. Stettinius did not overstate the case when he told the committee that an extension of this act is indispensable to victory. 'The war,' he said, 'is not over—not even almost over. Lend-lease is a powerful weapon which we must maintain and strengthen. The great battles of western Europe, and of Asia have still to be fought.'

"Lend-lease in another week will be 3 years old. Its adoption was one of the great landmarks in the life of the American people. Still at peace, we wrote this law upon our statute books because we were even then aware—long before the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor—that our fate as a nation was linked indissolubly with the fate of other democracies which had taken up arms in self-defense; that there was no safety for us in isolation; that only through some method of collective security—and lend-lease is collective security—could the peace-loving nations survive in a world in which aggression had run wild.

"It was many months before the stream of goods exported under lend-lease to the nations which were even then our allies, in everything but name, amounted to more than a trickle. But from the day of its enactment lend-lease began to play a part on the great stage of world affairs. It brought fresh courage to the nations fighting for their freedom. It laid the groundwork for what became the grand alliance of the United Nations. It is now the chief inter-Allied instrument of victory.

Of much interest was a statement made public yesterday by Administrator Leo Crowley, of the Foreign Economic Administration, that almost 28,000 American-built planes, valued at $2,300,000,000, have been sent to the air forces of the other allied nations since the passage of the Lend-Lease Act.

Lend-lease is certain to be continued in effect, we believe. This program is vital to the winning of the war.

The Hungry Horse Is Our Only Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the proposed authorization of the Hungry Horse Dam, H. R. 3570, will come before the House soon. It is our only protection in saving Flathead Lake from being tampered with again. This bill, which is so vital to Montana, is one of the most important pieces of legislation which we have ever brought before the Congress for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD another editorial concerning the Hungry Horse. It is from the pen of Harry Kelly, father of the project and publisher of the Flathead Monitor. The editorial is dated June 10, 1943, and was written during the period of grave emergency in the Flathead last summer.

HUNGRY HORSE OUR ONLY PROTECTION

There is little consolation in calling attention to the fact that if the people and business interests of Kalispell had got behind the Hungry Horse Dam project during the past years when the fight was being carried forward by a few, we would not now be faced with the destructive problem of defending Flathead Lake and our farms and homes. It is nevertheless true.

Hungry Horse becomes a more important factor than ever in warding off the disaster of raising the lake levels for storage purposes. At the hearing last week it became evident that at some time in the future it will be necessary to have the great volume of water originating in western Montana regulated so that beneficial use can be made of it downstream, especially at Grand Coulee. In order to secure the beneficial use of this water the excess run-off must be stored in the upper reaches of the Flathead. If this is not done at the earliest date possible, there will be added efforts made to use Flathead Lake as a reservoir. In fact, we will not be safe or protected against such attempts until we find a way to store this water by developing the dam sites above Flathead Lake.

Our first protective measure lies in the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam, although we may later find it necessary to use the fine dam site of the North Fork to hold back sufficient water that can be let down on a related second-feet basis to the water stored in order to give the downstream power plants operating the regulated water they need. The average annual flow from the gathering area above Flathead Lake is 8,000,000 acre-feet. Practically all of that water originates in the upper regions of the Flathead. The South Fork project, known as the Hungry Horse, is already engineered and has successfully made all of the technical and political hurdles from and including the Army engineers to Congress, and is now ready for an appropriation for construction.

The estimated cost of building the Hungry Horse Dam, including a $5,000,000 generating plant, according to the Army engineers' report on the project, is $31,000,000. This, under any circumstances, is not an excessive cost even for the salable power it would generate from the power plant at the dam. But that is practically nothing, at least insignificant, when the benefits to down-stream power plants is considered. This item is impressive and might well have been included in the testimony at last week's hearing. Through regulating the waters held by Hungry Horse Dam alone, Grand Coulee and Bonneville would benefit to the extent of 890,000 kilowatt-hours and all other downstream power developments constructed and planned to be constructed by the Government, together with Grand Coulee and Bonneville, would benefit to the extent of practically 2,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or practically 215,000 kilowatt prime power. This is exclusive of the benefits that would accrue at the Kerr and Thompson Falls Dams. Reducing these benefits to dollars and cents they would be in excess of $2,818,750 on the same charge made at Grand Coulee for power. This increase alone would pay 6 percent interest on an investment of over $45,000,000 per annum, or $14,000,000 more than the total cost of Hungry Horse Dam. At the same time there would be no damages or loss of property, as the water would be held back in the rough, noncultivatable area of the Flathead Forest, where no crops could be raised and there is no individual ownership. The Hungry Horse Dam would hold back 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, which would be sufficient until a dam could be built on the North Fork, and another on the Middle Fork, if needed. Hungry Horse is all ready to start work on. If this could be used as a first alternative, it would forever eliminate the raising of Flathead Lake, as there are other dam sites in the upper Flathead that could and would be built, if the start was made at Hungry Horse to hold the flood waters at or as near the source as possible. The feeling here is, and justly so, that if the Bonneville Administration were permitted to raise Flathead Lake a single inch, their rights would be established and the lake would

eventually be raised 27 feet or more if they ever needed the water to increase Grand Coulee power for industrial purposes in Washington or Oregon. We feel the same way about the building of Hungry Horse Dam. Once a start is made on storing the flood waters in the upper Flathead, that will become the permanent plan for water storage in this part of Montana. We firmly believe it is the only sure way of protecting Flathead Lake.

James A. O'Leary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, nothing which I might say about our late colleague James A. O'Leary could be nearly as eloquent as the poem written by our good friend Horace C. Carlisle.

The manly traits, which I knew our late colleague possessed, are well enumerated in this poem.

He shall be missed on the floor of this House but not in the hearts of his friends.

Pursuant to leave granted to me, I insert Mr. Carlisle's poem:

REPRESENTATIVE O'LEARY

James A. O'Leary of New York has gone—
His fruitful labors among us are done—
Now he is resting in comfort and ease
Under the shade of eternity's trees,
That line the banks of the River of Life,
Where is no sickness, no sorrow, no strife.

James A. O'Leary was loved and revered
By all who knew him, but truly endeared
Was he to Members of Congress, for he
Stood ever ready, at all times, to be
Spent and to spend, whensoever he could
Help in promoting Americanhood.

James A. O'Leary, on down to life's close,
Favored his friends, but respected his foes,
Whose rights were sacred to them as his own
Were to him—truly, he never was known
Wrongly to treat a political foe—
His motto was, "We 'll reap what we sow."

James A. O'Leary, when came the last call,
In meek submission, bade farewell to all
His friends and kinsmen, and went on ahead,
Over the River of Death, unafraid,
Where, far beyond the celestial blue,
He sees the dreams of his heart coming true.

—Horace C. Carlisle.

Uncle Sam's Girls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

UNCLE SAM'S GIRLS

Our young men in uniform, seen everywhere,
Should be, and are, highly esteemed;
For them there's ascending full many a prayer
From hearts of which they've never dreamed;
Yet, never must we, as a nation, forget,
Wherever Old Glory unfurls
The Stripes and the Stars, that we owe a real debt
To Uncle Sam's war-working girls.

The Capital's filled with young women today,
At work in war offices here,
As beautiful as are the flowers of May,
Whose fragrance abounds everywhere—
The breezes of h-aven seem happy to glide
Thru their silken, velvety curls—
And all true Americans take special pride
In Uncle Sam's war-working girls.

The smiles on their faces seem lighted with joy,
But down in their souls' secret parts
There lurk unseen sorrows that sadly destroy
The joys of their war-worried hearts.
God only can know what a great sacrifice
Is made by these sweet human pearls—
O God! hear America's prayers, as they rise,
For Uncle Sam's war-working girls.

—Horace C. Carlisle.

The Future of Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over Station WHN Monday, April 17, 1944:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I want to thank Station WHN for giving me the privilege of speaking to you tonight.

I want to discuss a most important subject, namely, the future of our American merchant marine. Much has been said during the past few months concerning the perpetuation of this great industry, and during the next few minutes, I want to give you some astounding, nevertheless positive, facts concerning this all-important subject.

This is a war of transportation, both on land and sea, and as a result we Americans have become the strongest and greatest maritime nation in the world, and at this particular point I wish to stress the fact that our American railroads have done a splendid job. The railroads' contribution to the war effort cannot be measured on a cold hard basis of dollars and cents.

Since 1938 we have so amplified and intensified both our immediate and long range shipbuilding program that when this war is over, we Americans will emerge from this conflict the undisputed queen of the seas. I, for one, tell you most emphatically it is my desire, my ambition to see that we keep this title and allow no one to relegate us to an inferior position on the high seas as we were relegated after the last war. This will necessitate eternal vigilance on our part, but you may rest assured we intend to do just that.

I am acutely conscious of the undisputed fact that our allies or at least some of our allies are now making elaborate preparations to take over just as soon as this war is terminated.

You know in 1938 we started to build up a merchant marine under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and it might be most interesting for me to inform you that money spent from 1938 and money which will be spent by 1945 will amount to approximately $19,000,000,000. This includes money spent for ships and facilities.

It is my intense belief that having spent that tremendous amount of money it is the absolute desire of the American people that our American merchant marine be perpetuated, and I do not labor under the impression for the slightest fraction of a second that any red-blooded, two-fisted, square-shooting American would want us to be anything but queen of the seas. We have the best officers and crews of any Nation in the world. Our officers and men are well trained and know their business. Not a day passes but what we receive a glowing account of their daring and skill. Surely that alone would be sufficient to strengthen the determination of the American people to keep our heroes and ships flying the American flag on the seven seas. We are capable. This war has added materially to our experience and our efficiency cannot be questioned.

It is not the desire of our country to hog the seas. It is not our purpose to push any country out of the maritime picture. We want to cooperate—yes, cooperate wherever we can for it is my belief that there is room for all.

I, for one, am terrifically impressed by a statement uttered in London by Admiral Vickery, Vice Chairman of the Maritime Commission. I quote: "We will take our place as a maritime power and we want to do it in a cooperative manner, but cooperation or no cooperation, we demand our place." That is a strong statement and it is a remark that meets with my unconditional approval. Now let me quote from a statement by Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission. This statement also has unusual significance and I quote: "The United States has no desire to thwart the legitimate operations of other nations at sea."

My friends, you can readily conclude that the American people are determined and they will follow the rules of the game, if others want to abide by the rules.

Both Admiral Land and Admiral Vickery are outstanding figures in the world of shipbuilding, and let me grasp this opportunity to say publicly that they have done a miraculous job. Under Jerry Land we started from scratch to build our marine industry and the accomplishments have been phenomenal.

I also want to pay my respects to the workers in the shipyards throughout the country for their glorious contributions and I also want to congratulate the management on the job they have done in such an efficient manner.

The merchant marine is not only a very valuable adjunct to our national defense in time of war but we can reverse the statement—a strong and powerful merchant marine can be used as a terrifying instrument in peacetime as well. Any country with a well-equipped merchant marine demands the respect of every nation. When hostilities cease in continental Europe and in the Pacific, I hope that we will not forget, and in fact it behooves us to remember, that it will be our duty to see that the Nazis and Japs are allowed only a minimum maritime tonnage.

The Japs and Nazis at the outbreak of this war had between them approximately 17,000,000 tons of marine shipping. After Pearl Harbor and our declaration of war on these two countries they immediately converted their cargo ships into combat ships. This cannot—it will not happen again. We, as Americans, have not scratched the surface of our foreign-trade potential. We must also be in a posi-

tion to resume normal trade relations with other nations immediately after this war.

Plans are now being formulated and regular discussions are held and ways and means are being devised whereby we can, without too much loss of time, take our place on the high seas immediately after the cessation of hostilities.

Our peacetime ship program will require in the neighborhood of about 20,000,000 deadweight tons. With this tonnage we will be in a position to carry on our commerce and carry it on we will in a most efficient and effective manner.

I am acutely conscious that our American men who are familiar and skilled in the shipping industry are most desirous of carrying on and I give them my word, as I give to you, the American people, my promise that I will labor indefatigably to see that our merchant marine takes its place in world affairs and holds the glorious position as queen of the seas which it so richly deserves.

I am aware of the fact that international conferences on the future of world shipping are being held in this country and I do hope, in fact I insist, that those responsible for these conferences exercise extreme wisdom in formulating our future program which will drastically affect American shipping. May I respectfully suggest that men long experienced in our shipping industry be given conspicuous assignments whereby we can capitalize on their knowledge and pioneering skill. This is the practical thing to do, and because it is practical it may not be done.

One of the most important issues which now confronts the American merchant marine, and which is being debated in Congress, is whether the steamship companies shall be denied an equal opportunity to participate in overseas air service.

It is reasonable to assume that shippers and passengers will prefer an integrated transportation system which can furnish them all types of service. Unless American shipping companies are given the right to engage in air traffic, our merchant marine will be at a great disadvantage in competing with foreign shipping lines which furnish air service as well as shipping facilities. Furthermore, American shipping companies have a great background of experience and trade contracts which can prove most valuable in promoting the interests of American air traffic. Their overseas staffs are familiar with customs and other regulations, and much of their existing organization and knowledge can be utilized to give efficient and economic air service.

The shipping companies have pioneered many overseas routes, and developed trade and commerce, and they should be permitted to continue this trade and commerce by including the use of our latest form of transportation—the airplane.

American shipping is completely engaged at the present time in the war effort. When peace comes, American ships will still be engaged in the transport of American troops for some time. In addition a very considerable time will be required for reconditioning and rehabilitation of American ships, and this is particularly true of our passenger ships.

It is generally recognized that foreign shipping companies will be in a position to resume passenger traffic at a much earlier date than can our American lines. If American shipping lines are permitted to supplement their surface operations with air-borne transport, this disadvantage will be minimized and trade and traffic operations can be at least partially maintained during the interim. Both common sense and equity require that the American merchant marine should not be excluded from participation in air transport. In conclusion, let me leave you this parting thought—the American merchant marine now and always must have its rightful place on the high seas.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to the House a resolution adopted at the seventy-seventh annual session of the National Grange, at Grand Rapids, Mich., November 10-18, 1943, favoring the St. Lawrence seaway and power project bill:

Whereas the National Grange has for years advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, nearly 90 percent of which is already completed, and opening this wonderful artery of commerce to carry the products of the interior of our country to the markets of the world at reduced costs; and

Whereas the completion of this project would permit the development of vast electrical energy now going to waste in the onrushing waters of this mighty river, resulting in cheaper electric power to all our people; and

Whereas there is legislation now pending in Congress to bring this project to completion as soon as material and labor are available: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Grange reaffirms its position favoring completion of this project for navigation and power purposes.

American Revolution—1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a timely discourse delivered by Mr. Miles F. Hollister, of Altoona, Pa., before a number of service clubs and civic organizations throughout the United States.

Mr. Hollister is a keen student of economic affairs and his philosophy of thought has received wide acclaim. Among Mr. Hollister's several future speaking engagements are included the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club of New York City.

The address, replete with timely observations, is as follows:

I presume it has been years since most of you read Dickens' Tale of Two Cities—but because it is pertinent to the subject of this discussion, I am going to take the liberty of paraphrasing the opening paragraph of that great book:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair. We had everything before us, we had nothing before us. We were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct to hell. It was the year of our Lord 1775."

In this unique way, Dickens tells us that in 1775 the people of France were in a very uncertain state of mind. There existed an undertone of doubt which gradually rose to a crescendo and found its climax when the streets of Paris ran red with the blood of revolution. The old order passed to the rhythmic rise and fall of the guillotine at the Bastille of France.

But that was in 1775—what has that to do with us? Well, if we were to carefully analyze Dickens' prelude to the French Revolution we would find that conditions were almost alarmingly like those of the present. If we were to go back only to 1933 every word of the paragraph which I have just quoted could be applied. We could very truthfully have said:

"It is the best of times. It is the worst of times. It is the season of light, it is the season of darkness. It is the spring of hope, it is the winter of despair. We have everything before us." Perhaps. And perhaps we have nothing before us.

And just as in 1775, there was in 1933 an uncertainty in the minds of people everywhere. Like the rumble of distant drums, there was an undertone of doubt and it also rose slowly to a crescendo. In 1933 the overture to revolution was in the air. It reached its climax in 1939 when the whole world burst into flames—and we found ourselves the spectators of the greatest revolution history has ever known.

During all of this, the average American was blissfully indifferent to the developments of nis time. He still is blissfully indifferent, and this indifference, if it is not corrected, may cost us our freedom.

We are in a world revolution. We are in the midst of the greatest political and economic upheaval of our long and tragic history. Yet, the complacency of the average American in the face of this revolution would lead us to think that we were being annoyed by only a gentle political zephyr. The fact is that we are squarely in the path of a political cyclone. This cyclone has already devastated a large part of Asia and Europe and right now it is headed straight for America.

Today, now, we are standing face to face with the largest question mark we have ever known. Can we withstand the impact of revolution or shall we, in turn, yield to state socialism and dictatorship? Can we save democracy? This is the most vital question facing American civilization. It is the most vital question facing each of us. It involves everything that we have built through a lifetime of effort. In short, we are in a hell of a fix and we had better do something about it.

What can we do about it? Well, before we start doing anything about any problem, we should be sure that we thoroughly understand that problem and the forces that brought it into being. With this in mind, I want to digress for just 2 or 3 minutes to take you on a little journey far back into history. But bear in mind that on this journey we are taking with us a problem—a problem of 1944 vintage.

We are speaking, remember, of revolution. The question that we are asking of history is, What causes revolutions? With what forces are we dealing? It is not necessary to go into all the contributing factors. For our purpose, it is sufficient to take into consideration only three important facts regarding every revolutionary movement.

The first fact is that throughout all history approximately 95 percent of the people have depended upon the other 5 percent for leadership. History says that 95 percent of the people must have leadership.

The second fact is that no revolution, in all history, has ever occurred unless and until existing leadership failed.

The third fact is that in all history the people—the 95 percent—have never started a revolution. The people, remember, are the followers. It has always been the 5 percent who started revolutions. The people merely participated.

Ninety-five percent of the people of every nation must have leadership. When existing leadership fails, the people in desperation will accept whatever leadership comes along—and that leadership is usually revolutionary.

This pattern has been repeated over and over again since the beginning of history. There is nothing new about this business—it is only new to us. The Old Testament presents an almost endless procession of revolution—and the prelude to each succeeding revolution was the degeneration of established leadership. The golden age of Athens ceased to be golden only when Athenian leadership became selfish and ingrown. The same story was repeated in Carthage, in Rome, and finally in France. In our own day we have had Russia, Italy, and Germany. Here, the design for revolution was the same.

In Russia the reign of the czars had become decadent and imbecilic. Without leadership the people turned to Lenin and Trotsky. In Italy the arm-waving and bellowing of Mussolini succeeded only because the Italian people had no leadership. In Germany the leaders sold their people down the river through inflation—and so the people accepted Hitler.

But in no one of these cases did the people start the revolution. The Russian revolution was thoroughly rehearsed in the minds of Lenin and Trotsky long before the people accepted it as even a possibility. The German revolution was created in the mind of Hitler while he was in prison. The people did not decide upon revolution. In their desperation they merely accepted Hitler—and Hitler did the rest. But they did not even accept him until the leadership of the German Republic had completely failed.

And so, history does tell us something about our problem. It tells us that the failure of established leadership always opens the door for new leadership—and then the people are apt to accept any crackpot savior who comes along. That is history's record of revolution. Now we can end our little journey and return to America.

Let's see to what extent the lessons of history apply to us. Well, what happened in Russia, Germany, and Italy is exactly what happened here in 1932—without benefit of violence. The people said, "We have had enough of Hoover and the Republicans." Then came Roosevelt. Yet the advent of Roosevelt and his New Deal was brought about not by public acclaim but by the default of the old order. It was definitely an escape mechanism on the part of the people. The failure of leadership again opened the door for revolution—and make no mistake about either fact—it was failure of leadership—and it was revolution!

But I'm afraid we can't pin the blame on Hoover or Coolidge or even Harding. No, the fault lies deeper. Or as Shakespeare would say, "The fault l'es not in the stars, dear Brutus, but in ourselves." Because in America when we speak of leadership, we are not speaking of any one man, or of any one political party. We are speaking of our entire economic system and of all of the men who are leaders in that system. In the old days, leadership meant a king or a few proconsuls. A little later Napoleon started the idea of self-appointed dictatorship, but in America there remains at least some semblance of democracy. We are divided into communities of free men—communities just like Altoona. When we speak of American leadership we are talking about ourselves. Here it is—right here. This room is filled with a typical cross section of American leadership.

And it was the failure of typical American leadership—the failure of men just like us—that ushered in the present bureaucratic regime. It was not just Hoover's failure. Actually, the failure of American leadership took place long before Hoover was elected.

This statement, of course, calls for an explanation. In what respect did American business leaders fail? The answer can be given in one word—indifference—indifference to everything except their own immediate interests.

Leadership implies responsibility—not just for one's self but for all who come under that leadership. Responsibility for the people being led is the very essence of leadership. American business has never accepted their responsibility.

Leadership also implies vision—vision to see the effect of forces at work in the present—vision to anticipate their effect upon the future. In this particular case, leadership required that the American businessman raise his eyes from his ledger sheets long enough to see the dark clouds of State socialism gathering. But he didn't do it. The profit-and-loss statement was too interesting.

Leadership also requires interest in the system that has made possible the leadership of the leader. Leadership requires that the American businessman recognize the inherent value of the system under which he functions—the system of free enterprise. It requires that he cherish and protect this system—as he would any benefactor. But American businessmen have not done that. No. They took the profits and left the guardianship of free enterprise to the politicians. As we have said, they were indifferent to just about everything except the profit-and-loss statement and the monthly balance sheet.

Oh yes, there has been a lot of talk, but the trouble was that we talked only to each other. Beyond griping among ourselves, most of us did nothing. I want to use one classic example to show you what I mean.

Most of you, I am sure, remember the talk made in this room by Dr. Judd, some 4 years ago. I doubt if there was a man in the room who didn't realize that Dr. Judd knew what he was talking about. He not only predicted the beginning of our war with Japan—he missed the date by only 6 months. More important, he told us that a complete embargo, if immediately declared, would not only avoid war with Japan but would force Japan to take her armies out of China within a year. He told all of us that—and what happened?

The applause at the end of his speech was loud and long—and we just about shook the poor fellow's hand off. But did any of us do anything about it? No. It was a swell half-day speech. Its effect lasted until about 4 o'clock that afternoon when it was promptly and completely forgotten.

And now, we are at war with Japan. And who's responsible? Cordell Hull? The President? Congress? Our Board of Military Strategists? Yes; all of them are to blame. They all made mistakes. But they are not alone. We're all responsible. We were told the facts as plainly as the English language could convey them. We believed those facts—but we did nothing. The responsibility for the war with Japan rests squarely with all of us—with every man in America who holds a position of leadership.

We are all guilty as hell. The bloodstains of Tarawa and Guadalcanal are on all our hands.

Yes, our own indifference helped us on the road to war. But our indifference left the door open for State socialism long before the war clouds gathered. Let's go back once more for a half century and take another look at our American business system. If we look closely enough we will see two interesting things. We will see, in the first place, that our technological development has been the amazement of the world. We took to the machine age in a big way and, while we were doing it, we created the highest standard of living the world has even known. And when the war came, we converted to wartime production with an amazing speed and efficiency. Mechanically we have done a magnificent job, but I'm afraid our development has been a bit lopsided. While we were becoming the technological wonder of the world we almost completely forgot one other factor—which in the long view, may be even more important than our mechanical genius. We overlooked human nature. Technologically, we have been supercolossal, but psychologically, we have been profoundly stupid.

We have been so busy with machines, inventions, balance sheets, and inventories that we forgot to stop occasionally and take an inventory of human values. We forgot to find out what the average man was thinking—particularly what he was thinking about us and our leadership. Above all, we forgot to sell the American system of free enterprise to our own employees. In true American style we took it all for granted. And when trouble came the door was wide open for the flood of crackpot, bureaucratic doctrines that are slowly but surely consolidating themselves into a design for socialism and dictatorship.

But again, the responsibility does not rest entirely with our present political leaders. They have sown the seed of socialism but with the dull blade of our own indifference we plowed the ground for them. Our indifference to the fireside problems of the rank and file man was an open invitation for Government intervention.

Now, let's pause for a moment and take a look at those fireside problems of the average man. I'm talking about your employee—and mine. Let's go into his home and have a chat with him. Let's see what kind of a fellow he is. Let's take a look at his urges and desires. What does he expect from the system under which he works?

Well, the average man wants a wife, some kids, and a home—even as you and I. In order to have this he must, of course, have a job, just as we must have. You might say, "That's simple. Haven't we supplied these things to the average American? Didn't you just get through saying that we have the highest standard of living in the world?"

Very true. But there is one thing more our average man wants. He wants a plus, over and above the concrete things of life. And this is purely a psychological thing. It's a very difficult thing to explain, but I hope I can do so, because if we understand this psychological plus which our average man wants, we will understand something of what has happened to us and at least one good reason why it happened.

Perhaps the best name that can be applied is ego satisfaction—ego build-up. Our average man wants to feel important. Every man who is worth his salt wants to feel important, wants to feel that he is a worthwhile contribution to something.

We needn't go outside this room for an excellent illustration of what I mean. Why do you belong to the Knights of Columbus, the Shriners, the Rotary Club, etc.? Well, there

are, of course, a number of reasons—but you can be sure that one of them is ego lift. Even more important, we get a large part of our ego satisfaction from our jobs as heads of our various business and professional activities. We feel that we are doing something worth while. We feel that we have a definite place in the procession of life. We feel important.

Well, that's just what our average man wants to feel and, next to his wife and his children, he wants it more than anything else in the world.

I have here a copy of a symposium taken from the Reader's Digest for August. The Reader's Digest made a survey to determine what the average American worker thinks about the management of the business with which he is associated. They received thousands of letters from employees throughout the United States—and some of them were brutally frank. I want to read you just one of these letters. I have taken the liberty of paraphrasing this just a little to clarify the thought:

"Bill Smith, a conscientious fellow with a wife and two swell kids, becomes No. 1499. He is hired and fired as such. Management would find that the personal touch pays dividends. Management should learn that men think and would like an opportunity to express their thoughts. Labor should be consulted more often. Years on the job have taught us much—much that we would like to pass on to management. There is a gap to be bridged and management needs to lay a few planks."

That's all we have time for. Suffice it to say that this same theme appeared throughout most of the letters received. In effect, these employees were saying, "For heaven's sake, recognize us as human beings. Let us take a real pride in our work. Give us an ego lift. Make us feel that we amount to something."

That's the plus they want—and in the past we have failed to give it to them. As this one man says, the American employee is too often No. 1462, morning shift, pay rate 64 cents. In other words, we put him on the inventory as we would a bolt of cloth. I know merchants who give much more attention to the dead, inert material that crosses their shelves than to the human beings who work for them. You'll find on the balance sheet of almost every business an item called "goodwill," meaning the goodwill of the public. But I have never seen on any balance sheet an item representing the happiness and good will of employees.

But what has this to do with the onrush of state socialism? Well, our average man does the voting—and how he votes depends upon the state of his happiness. The state of his happiness, in turn, depends to no small extent upon us. We have here much of the answer to the present trend toward socialism. We have done a swell job with machinery—a very poor job with human beings. In our indifference to human values we forgot that our employees are by far the most important factor in our system of free enterprise.

When I say this I am still speaking about psychology, not about physical things. I am not an economist and I don't know whether or not American business in the past could have given its employees a higher scale of pay. At any rate, I am sure that higher wages would not have been enough. It still would have been necessary to merchandise the system of free enterprise to our employees—to the voters of America. I don't mean just by talking to them. I mean by taking them into the family circle and proving to them by our interests and our attitudes that we looked upon them as an important part of free enterprise and not as commodities of trade. Instead, we have allowed them to consider us the privileged few and themselves the hirelings.

Here is the ridiculous picture. We have had our own employees right in front of us all the time. Certainly this flesh-and-blood association gave us a definite advantage—an advantage which we recklessly threw away. We let a man talk to them over the radio. We let him do the selling job that we should have done.

Yet, we believe in this system of free enterprise. We want to preserve it. But again we have done nothing except talk among ourselves. I doubt if there is a businessman in this room who has spent as much as one hour convincing his own employees that the system of free enterprise is best for them. I doubt if there is a doctor or a lawyer in the room who has even attempted to sell it to his nurse or his secretary. We just didn't have time to talk to them—but the politicians did. They talked in glowing terms about human happiness and they made a great many promises. Perhaps they were only promises, but even that is more than we offered them.

And to no small extent, this failure to take into consideration simple, every day, human psychology has contributed to the growth of social legislation, the growth of unionism and antibusiness sentiment. We have had our milder revolution here in America for exactly the same reasons that France and Russia had revolutions. Psychologically at least, we failed to supply the necessary leadership—and so, the people looked elsewhere for leadership. And so the unions—and so the bureaucrats.

But that's water over the dam. The important thing is that we have one more chance. This war, if it has brought nothing more of a constructive nature, has offered to American business the greatest political opportunity it has ever had—or ever again will have. What is that opportunity? I'd like to present it to you in a very concrete way. I want to take you across 5,000 miles of water and introduce you to a friend of mine. I want you to meet Corp. Harry Jones of the United States marines.

So far this discussion may have sounded theoretical, but from now on it isn't going to be theoretical at all. We're going to deal with a real human being. Corp. Harry Jones is very real. He went from my organization into the marines about 2 years ago—and he is now stationed somewhere in the South Sea Islands.

Before he left, Corporal Jones was just an average American lad. He was not at all concerned with the great problems we are discussing here. It is probable that he never heard the term state socialism. It is probable that he didn't have any definite ideas regarding Congress or bureaucratic control. In fact, it's doubtful if he even voted. Certainly he wasn't a very important factor in shaping our history but he will be. Corp. Harry Jones is destined to take an important part in the future of America. I mean, of course, he and 10,000,000 other American boys who make up our armed forces.

That being the case, it might be a good thing for us to get fairly well acquainted with Corp. Harry Jones. Unfortunately, we can't do that in the flesh, but we can use our imaginations.

Let's skip a little time. Let's imagine that the war is over. The tumult and the shouting have died away—and Corp. Harry Jones turns eastward toward home. He lands in San Francisco and is whisked over the Union Pacific to Chicago. At Chicago he boards the Pennsylvania with a ticket for Altoona. And now his train is coming in. Suppose we all go down to the station and meet him. Let's see what sort of a chap this Harry Jones is after 2 or 3 years of fox holes, jungles, and Japs. More important, let's find out what he expects of this America he has so valiantly defended—not what he expects of Congress or the New Deal, because Corporal Jones, when he gets off the train, will not be thinking about Congress. He'll be thinking about Altoona—which to him will be America. Let's find out what he expects of Altoona. Let's find out what he wants.

Well, first of all, there'll be an attractive blond in the front row. He'll want an enthusiastic reception from her—and he'll get it. With that greeting over, of course, the next thing he'll want is a bottle of Coca-Cola. (That's my commercial.) Then about the third thing he'll want is a member of the clergy—and after the honeymoon is over—he'll want a job. That's where we come in—and that's where we must be very careful. Because Corporal Jones won't want just a job—not just a job that will pay so much money for so many hours of work. He'll want something more important than that. He'll want the plus we talked about a few minutes ago. He'll want a job that gives him ego satisfaction—a job in which he feels he is doing something worth while. Above all, he'll want to feel that he has come back to friends, and that in his job he belongs. He'll want to feel that he is a worth-while part of the business with which he is associated. In a word, he'll want a job that will yield human happiness.

Is Corporal Jones asking too much? No; I don't think so—and I don't think it will be very difficult to give him what he wants. But it will take more careful planning than we have done in the past. We'll have to do a far better job with Corporal Jones than we did for the soldiers in the last World War. The failure of business leadership to provide for the return of soldiers at the end of the last war was bad. If it is repeated at the end of this war—it will be fatal.

Yes, we'll have to do better with Corporal Jones. We'll not only have to give him a job—we'll have to recognize that we are dealing with a human ego—not a commodity.

We'll have to do just about four things which American business has certainly failed to do in the past. I said a while ago that management had not made a deliberate effort to promote the happiness of its employees. But happiness is a rather general term. In dealing with the case of Corp. Harry Jones let's be more specific. Just what can we do for him? What are these four things?

First, we must be sure that we put Corporal Jones in the right job, that we make him a square peg in a square hole. We haven't done that in the past. We have dumped millions of men indiscriminately into jobs for which nature never intended them—jobs which in many cases they came to hate. We haven't even stopped to ask whether or not there was any way to avoid this almost criminal error. If we had we would have found that science was prepared to help us. Let's not make this mistake with Corporal Jones. Let's put him into a job that fits his natural aptitudes. As leaders that responsibility is ours, not his.

Secondly, we must see that he is properly trained for his job so he can do it well, so he can realize a pride of achievement. Here again we have been weak in the past. We have dumped men into jobs for which they were inadequately trained, and then we have given them hell because they didn't do the job right. I wish time permitted further discussion of this subject. I can only say in passing that American business has been exceedingly stupid in its failure to train its employees. Even in normal times you could find throughout America millions of men and women who had never seen an intelligent analysis of the jobs they had been doing for years. You could have found thousands

upon thousands of employers who were paying these employees $1,500, $2,000, $3,000 a year, but who were not spending 5 cents a year to train them.

If it is worth spending $1,000, $2,000, or $3,000 a year to keep a man on the job it is worth spending a small percent of that to train him for the job. If the average employer would spend even 1 percent or 2 percent of his pay roll in a definite, organized training program it would pay him larger dividends than any investment he has ever made. The training of personnel has always been good business, but in the post-war period it will also be good politics. We will have to train Corp. Harry Jones far better than we have trained our employees in the past.

Thirdly, after we have put Corporal Jones in the right job, after we have trained him, we must sell him on that job. We must give him ego build-up. We must cause him to realize that he is making a worth-while contribution to his business and to his community. Which is to say, we must sell to Corp. Harry Jones the American system of free enterprise as his best opportunity to build the good life.

Fourth, and finally, if he does a good job, we must give him credit for it—not just in the Saturday night pay check, but through our attitudes, our words, and our smiles of appreciation. We must, in other words, get on a human basis with Corp. Harry Jones. If we fail to do these four things, it won't very much matter what we pay him. Money cannot compensate for the lack of human, intelligent leadership in handling men.

But if we do these things, what will be the result? Well, we will have a man who is in a job for which his aptitudes fit him. That means happiness. We will have a man who is properly trained for his job—and to whom the job yields pride of achievement. That means happiness. We will have a man who is sold on his job and who, furthermore, is sold on the business with which he is associated—a man who realizes that through that business he is rendering a worth-while service. And when he sees this he will realize that all businesses throughout the United States are doing a job which could never be done under bureaucratic control. That also means happiness.

We will have on our hands a happy man, made happy because his job satisfies his psychological urges—because his job, with the assistance of his blonde, has taken care of the ego of Corp. Harry Jones—now Citizen Harry Jones.

And what does this mean to us? Again, what has all this to do with the onrush of state socialism—the impact of revolution? A great deal. The issue of state socialism versus the American way of life will be decided by what? By votes. And the vote of Corp. Harry Jones and his 10,000,000 fellow servicemen, together with their wives, mothers, sisters, and brothers, will be sufficient to determine any political issue in the United States for at least the next decade.

And so we see that Corp. Harry Jones is a very important man—that he is going to have much to do with this issue of state socialism versus free enterprise. Nothing is, of course, certain, but I have a feeling that the way he votes will depend largely upon whether or not we do the four simple things I have just outlined—put him in the right job, train him, sell him on the job, and then give him credit for the job. In other words, how he votes will depend upon the condition of his ego—will depend upon whether or not he is happy. If the business with which he is associated yields him human happiness he is not apt to vote against it.

But we must remember what every politician has long known—that votes are very human things. Too often we make the mistake of assuming that people are persuaded to vote by logic. They aren't. Votes are guided by emotions. Even a small-town politician knows that. The vote of Corp. Harry Jones will not be cast for American business if American business does a job on Corporal Jones' ego. If American business fails to do that job, then you can be sure the politicians will do it and the vote will go to them. Can we afford to let that happen? If you think we can, let's take one more look into history.

This time let's look at current history. There we will see a gory panorama of government tyranny. In a swift-moving sequence we have seen the enslavement of the people of Japan, the people of Italy, the people of Spain, and the people of Germany. Wherever we look we see the blood-red afterglow of revolution.

We realize that this world revolution in reality centers around one question. Whether government shall be the servant of the people or whether the people shall be the servants of government. We have seen the people in all these foreign countries enslaved by their governments, but that does not tell all of the story. If we could stop the vast, fast-moving mechanism of our own Government long enough to carefully examine it, we would find that today—right now—the people of America, rich or poor, executive or employee, are little more than servants of Government dictate.

Can we afford to take this situation lightly? Do we fully realize that in most of this world the people are slaves? Do we fully realize that the present mechanism of our own Government is sufficient to make us slaves—and that the slave-master in that case would be the very Government under which our sons are now fighting for democracy? Do we realize that the Government that is sending our sons into battle to fight in the name of freedom is at the same time oiling the machinery that may rob them of their freedom when they come back?

I don't mean that this is deliberate. I don't mean that our President is deliberately building a bureaucratic dictatorship. I do not think so. But the trouble with bureaucracy is that it gets beyond the control of its makers. By its very nature, it grows in size and momentum until it gets beyond the control of any one man or group of men. Like the barnacles on a ship it gathers its kind. One good bureau deserves another—until today, no one knows how many bureaus we have. A late report lists something over 2,000 and it does not pretend to be accurate.

No. The growth of bureaucracy is never deliberate. The most sinister thing about bureaucracy is that it grows up like Topsy, until it becomes a monster—always working in the name of charity. Bureaucratic control of our boys in the post-war period, if we permit it, will be of a very charitable nature.

There will be much talk of the generosity of the Government to the returning soldier. It will all have a very patriotic flavoring. Yes, they'll send him to school. They'll get him a job. In short, they'll do everything that will obligate him to his Government—and prevent him from thinking and acting as a free man. The question is, will we let them do it, or will we do the job ourselves? That question may well carry with it the future of American democracy.

Finally, I want to speak of something even more important. Throughout this discussion I have talked of business, bureaucrats and votes. To phrase it in its most vulgar aspect, I have been talking about saving our own skins. If we closed on that theme, this talk might well be considered just a little cheap. But this subject has a much broader aspect—a much deeper significance.

I want you to visualize with me, if you can, the homeward march of 10,000,000 men. Ten million of the finest men this generation of America has known. Among them is your son and mine.

Ten millions! That's a lot of men—and they represent a lot of potential human happiness. They represent a lot of firesides, a lot of wives and a lot of children, yet unborn. They represent the kind of parents to which those children will be born, the kind of homes they'll live in, the kind of schools and churches they'll attend, and in the end, the kind of America they'll inherit.

They're coming back to us, these men, not only because of blood ties, but they're coming back to us economically, politically, and spiritually. They're coming back to us because we control the businesses and the professions in which they will find their jobs and build their happiness. They are coming back to our leadership.

How we receive them, where we place them, how we train them and what we cause them to believe in, is up to us. What we do or fail to do when they come back, will to no small extent determine the future of America—not just the future of our sons, but the future of our grandsons and great-grandsons.

America faces a choice—democracy or dictatorship. In the years just ahead the decision will be made. The votes will be cast by the men who come back. Whether they vote for or against a free America will depend upon the kind of leadership they find. That means you—and me.

Probably at no time in the history of the world have so many ordinary men like us had the privilege of influencing world events—the privilege of constructively influencing so many human lives. Are we big enough? Can we forget our selfish interests long enough to do this job? Frankly, it's doubtful. Based upon past performances, the answer would have to be "no." But let's hope that on this job, we'll do better than we have done in the past. In all our lives we will never know a more splendid opportunity. We will never face a bigger job.

I opened this discussion with the first paragraph of Dickens' Tale of Two Cities. I think the last paragraph of the same book might be appropriate in closing. Because if we do this job as it should be done, then when we of our generation look backward at the evening of our lives, we can surely say as Sydney Carton said, "It is a far, far better thing than any we have done; it is a far, far better rest we go to than any we have known."

The Internal Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the fifty-third continental congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, April 17, 1944:

Each continental congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution is a reminder of the struggles, sacrifices, and glorious deeds of the men and women who founded this Nation and which are perpetuated in your efforts to further the elements of patriotism and the national welfare. You Daughters of the American Revolution have the power in your hands and the purpose in your hearts to influence the guidance and direction of the destiny of our Nation.

The experiences of the past reveal that every period of great danger was first preceded by inaction, theorizing, and a paralyzing blindness to such fundamentals as the necessity of preparedness. It took a Pearl Harbor to shock us out of our lethargy and galvanize us to concerted action with a unity of effort.

Americans from the founding of their Government never have known the servile meaning of surrender—God grant we never will. True, there have been defeats—never capitulation. But some day history may change its course. Democracy as we have known it could become inert. Liberty and freedom could become heroic memories. This heritage could be lost by us unless it is cherished, fought for, and preserved as it was proclaimed and won by our forefathers. Other civilizations and nations have flourished and passed away and sinister new orders have sprung up. This could happen in America unless we jealously safeguard our foundations.

The first concern of every citizen, therefore, must be the internal defense of our Nation. We will win the war. Of this I am certain. But to win with a minimum of sacrifices and losses there must be no turning or wavering at home which would stem or clog the uninterrupted flow of materials to our fighting men on the far-flung battle fronts and seas. Breaches already are painfully evident in the unity of effort which is so necessary to the success of the ghastly fight we are waging against fanatical fiends who would rather be slain than conquered.

Something has happened in this land for which our forefathers fought and died. Once, it was a true melting pot, fusing the cultures and ideals of oppressed peoples everywhere into the common mold of Americanism. Our goal was the guaranty of equal protection and opportunity for all—it still should be.

But today, that noble purpose has been clouded and challenged by opposing interests. Constitutionally, we are a land where the will of the majority should prevail; actually, the will of the minority too often is overevaluated. There is a reason. As a people we expect and engage in fair play. Many of us are inclined to go about our daily tasks oblivious to the menacing forces around us. We are working in the interest of the majority and in the pursuit of that objective we take for granted that everyone else is doing the same. Too often, militant self-seeking, loudly vocal groups of muddled emotionalists, parlor pinks, fellow travelers, and avowed Communists are mistaken for the masses.

Scan the editorial page of any old-line ethical venture in journalism. The editor sets forth his views in clear and unmistakable language so the reader may make up his own mind. That is the way of the vast, unvocal majority. Now, consider some of the current, irresponsible journalistic attempts of groups which do not represent the best interests of democracy. Their editors not only proclaim their personal views but urge their readers to wire or write their demands urging this or that action. The Fascist-minded tyrant is no different from the native-born communistic-minded corruptionist. Both seek the same objective and speak the same sinister language—totalitarian control. Let us not minimize their evil effect. The time has come when loyal Americans, even though in the majority, must make themselves heard in defense of America, to balance the disruptive nonsense and neutralize the woeful will of a minority who would tear down and make rubble of the democracy our forefathers passed on to us.

Surely we have learned a lesson from observation in these recent tragic years. We have watched nations as they have been overrun and practically annihilated by the Nazis under Hitler after they have been weakened by internal strife engendered and fostered by subversive agents of that pagan order. Political and financial greed have blinded the leaders of those nations to the necessity of absolute unity, both internal and with their sister nations. The experience of the ages teaches clearly this lesson: Sacrifice leads to sunlit heights; selfishness leads to the darksome pit.

Our own internal defense demands oneness of effort and unselfish dedication to the preservation of the heritage of the American way of living. America cannot exist half democratic and half Fascist or Communist. Only the rebirth of the melting pot of old, fusing all peoples into vigorous, unmixed patriotism and a common unity, can truly accomplish this end.

The day of the front organization is not over. Already there are signs of a revival of the very forces that ridiculed preparedness and defense. To further insult the intelligence of the American public there are those who hold that the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor was justified, and still others who would not offend the Japanese by speaking disparagingly of them, while they behead American flyers, starve innocent civilians, and engage in other savage forms of debauchery and torture too horrible to mention.

America must, if it is to defend itself, build up a barrier against the prophets of doom who would trade personal advantage for principle, who would debauch freedom into license, and who malign America by shallow, superficial sugar-coated panaceas that are neither democratic nor defensible.

Knowledge is a bulwark of defense. No finer job ever has been done in the world's history than that being performed today by the alert journalists representing American newspapers and magazines. With fidelity to American principles they have sought to separate the true from the false and fact from rumor.

It is to the legitimate press that we must look for protection from the false prophets and deliberate propagandists. They are the watchmen on the ramparts. They are the narrators of facts, the exponents of truth, and the enemies of wrong. Not only must we expect a continued performance of high character but, as true citizens we must lend them our support whenever it is needed. With the press are their kindred purveyors of news and molders of public opinion—the radio and screen. They merit the same support and backing that should be afforded all protectors of freedom so long as they keep within the realm of fact and truth and aim to perpetuate our democratic institutions and honored traditions. By the same token, when unprincipled persons would foist alien ways of life upon the American people whether it be through the press, the screen, or the radio, they should be resisted with all fearless determination.

While patriotic men and women have given a commendable account of their stewardship of our internal security, a contrary record has been written by a segment of so-called journalistic enterprise. From this source has come a constant stream of vilification which has the effect of weakening our foundations of security. Cloaked with the guaranties of the Constitution, with brazen effrontery they seek to destroy constitutional government. Whether they hide behind the Fascist or anti-Fascist label makes little difference. The results are the same. Always seeking to incite class against class, race against race, and creed against creed, they foist themselves upon a people who seek to live and let live in peace and progress. The poison gas of misrepresentation and falsehood is employed by them in reckless quantities. If a voice is lifted against them, they cry of persecution and abridgment of freedom of speech. They are the enemies of true freedom of the press. They give one side only of the picture. They deal in half-truths or whole lies, thus putting weapons in the hands of those who would destroy a free press. Laws will not curb these malicious forces for they are usually cunning enough to keep within the strict letter of the law; only the therapeutic rays of a white-hot public opinion, informed and militantly democratic, will effect a cure.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has not been spared from such groups. Paid rabble-rousing propagandists misrepresent the F. B. I. as a menace to civil liberties. The truth is that the F. B. I. stands between them and their desire to abrogate liberties by installing their own treacherous and ruinous philosophies of rule by license. No device is too low for the forces that would tear down these ancient and honorable sentinels of our finest traditions and security. Unfortunately, such propaganda is not always labeled. It sometimes emanates from decent quarters that have been hoodwinked by misinformation.

Of prime importance is the need for our people to judge critically the source. Native-born agitators today who would sell America "down the river," regardless of their party line, have clearly established themselves as turncoats and dealers in colossal falsehoods. We should recognize them by their stripe which is neither American nor decent. The same is true of their Fascist counterparts—the variety that weeps and wails but never corrects, only obstructs.

As a people we may as well recognize that certain vital and fundamental problems do exist, through misunderstandings, ignorance, and a false spirit of toleration, which permit otherwise controllable conditions to get out of control. Baseless rumors and hates started by one bigot can, and frequently have, reached flood-tide proportions. The Ku Klux Klan, a few years ago, flourished on hate and false rumors just as did the small group of so-called Christian Fronters who hid behind a respectable group of people whose citizenship is exemplary. Neither was truly Christian, both were in fact rackets. So it is with other groups. I think the time has come to demand proof when biased accusations are leveled at groups of people because they are Catholic, Jew, gentile, white, or Negro. True Americans deplore racism, hate, greed, and injustice.

Our democracy was established because of the common desire of the founding fathers for tolerance. Yet, paradoxically, it was because of intolerance that the Revolutionary War was fought. Even today, our fighting men face the supreme sacrifice because of intolerance, intolerance of the system which has made one-man control the destiny of Germany and of Japan. Yet, it was misguided world tolerance and stupid apathy that permitted this condition to become a world menace. Here again, knowledge of the right kind and at the right time surely would have prevented the present world turmoil. Instead, an apathetic world viewed the antics of an Austrian paperhanger as something humorous—his rantings were regarded as those of a crazy man. Now is the time to make secure the internal defense of America; now is the time to plan for the future. Let us do it in the interest of America; let us put our own national self-interests first and be expedient rather than vacillating and appeasing.

Let us forever pledge that we shall keep here in America a way of life that is wholesomely democratic, where citizens walk consciously and fearlessly as free men.

We must preserve and teach democracy now for the future. All now realize that in many quarters we have failed in the past. Before Pearl Harbor, the lack of patriotic and militant sentiment and loyalty, together with a too evident attitude of selfishness discouraged timely preparation for defense.

This situation, however, is understandable when a condition can exist, for example, where subversive elements through pressure tactics, seek to dictate what publications are to be distributed in schools and which ones are to be banned. It is to God-fearing women such as you that America must look for support when the flanks of democracy are attacked by subversive-minded espousers of alien ways of life. You will let your voices be heard when the defense of the land needs strengthening and through you, the wisdom and sacrifices of the founding fathers shall not have been in vain.

To my plea for unity and knowledge, I would add another. It is the duty of patriotic citizens in high and low places to be sure of their facts when they level charges of nonfeasance or malfeasance, disloyalty, or misdirection at public servants, and if they do not know, they should inquire first before undermining confidence and causing disruption, for it must be remembered that the answers and vindications never catch up with the charges. The mouthings of the psychopathic publicity seeker, in or out of politics, should not be the springboard for public recognition. The defense and security of America are too sacred to be the medium of irresponsible feuding between selfish individuals who would warp and distort any fact into political buckshot.

Many fine American organizations, citizens, and institutions have been the subject of such attacks. Frequently, the charge is justified but leveled in the wrong direction. For example, on occasions, unprincipled persons have not been averse to implying or representing they were associated with the F. B. I. Questions of an offensive nature have been asked. Acts that have been construed as threats have occurred. In each instance when derelictions have occurred, it is the citizens' duty to see that they are corrected, but here and now I want to state in unmistakable language that no one is authorized to speak for the F. B. I. unless he is able to produce proper credentials of that organization. Likewise, I want to make it plain that the F. B. I. is a career service designed to protect all law-abiding Americans and, as such, it has been scrupulously kept out of politics by every administration since 1924. So long as I have the privilege to head it, it will never be used for political purposes. Anyone who charges that it exists for such purposes lies or does not know what he is talking about.

By force of necessity, any discussion of the defense of the Nation must eventually come down to the fundamental and basic unit of our civilization—the American home. I do not believe it is necessary for me to set forth in detail the conditions, not only unsavory but heartbreaking, which exist in our country at this time. You are intelligent individuals; you are aware of the staggering increase in lawlessness, of seeming blindness to the ruin which is being vested upon our society. You are equally aware that the very core of our homeland is being weakened. Something must be done. America's destiny rests at the threshold of the homes of our people. If we are to maintain our advanced position in the world, the home must be revitalized. For too long the duties of parenthood have been delegated. I am frank to say that I fear the future and what it will bring—more because our internal defense has been weakened than because of any external threat of force.

The emotional instability revealed by the experiences of the draft alone is enough to be the cause for alarm, to say nothing of the startling increase in the number of youthful offenders. The cause goes directly to the home. Make a survey in your own home towns and count the number of homes where there is a plan of training, by precept and example, to impel children to recognize their good fortune in being Americans. Are they taught to respect the American flag as a symbol of liberty? Do they respect the honorable forces of law and order? Are they taken to the shrines of great Americans and are they told of their glorious histories? Do they go to Sunday school and church? Are they taught that the best opportunities come from hard work and industry? Are they taught that honesty and integrity are the only way, as well as the best way of life? Are they being prepared to assume their full responsibility as useful citizens?

The figures point to the contrary. Last year a major crime occurred every 23 seconds. More persons were murdered within the United States than there were casualties at Tarawa. A robbery occurred every 12 minutes, a burglary every 2 minutes, a larceny every 39 seconds, and an automobile was stolen every 3 minutes. Remember that 13 percent of all murderers arrested were under 21 years of age, as were 39 percent of all robbers, 55 percent of all burglars, 37 percent of all thieves, 32 percent of all rapists, 30 percent of all arsonists, and 65 percent of all car thieves. In fact, nearly 23 percent of all persons arrested last year were under voting age. More boys 17 years of age and more girls 18 years of age were arrested than in any other age group. In fact, the arrests of girls last year over 1941, the last peacetime year, increased 130 percent. Until we can greatly change this picture, we are hardly in a position to boast of true progress.

But what can we expect when so many parents place their own pleasure and convenience before the training and security of their children? Unfortunately, we are not born with knowledge; we are born with the ability to learn—and it should be the duty of the parents to avail the child of the benefits of their own experience, before expecting them to assume the responsibility of life. Each individual must learn by personal experience, it is true, but youth should not be expected to be bruised and scarred needlessly when a guiding hand could set them on the right path at the beginning. I do not condemn youth. Your young people today have more advantages than ever before and correspondingly more temptations. But they lack the understanding, love, interest, and guidance of experience that can best be given by their mothers and fathers. Neither do I mean to say that parents deliberately lead their children from the straight paths of rectitude. They simply do not seem to care. Too many have other and more engrossing interests. Every newspaper in the land should start a column on a program of education based upon existing community social facilities. Every local chapter of your splendid organization and other splendid groups such as the National Federation of Women's Clubs and parent-teacher associations, should start a series of discussions enlisting the thousands of excellently trained specialists in the field of child guidance to help point the way. Every church and Sunday school in the land should start a year-round campaign to extend their facilities to attract every child in the country to the church of his own denomination.

There is one further step. While winning the war, we should also fight to win an everlasting peace at home. Your law-enforcing agencies have suffered the loss of trained men to the armed services and in facilities to maintain law and order. It is shortsighted and false economy to eliminate recreational and community facilities at home. Instead, they should be extended. What is the situation in your home town? Are your authorities supported as they should be? If not, you are the ones who will suffer. When law and order broke down in the roaring twenties and the delirious thirties, it was primarily because of technicalities, graft, and corruption. This is a trend we should guard against, for the technicalities already are beginning to work against protection of society.

The defense of our land is the joint task of every man, woman, and child—there can be no higher dedication of cooperative effort. If we fail, we are untrue to the men and women who give up their lives fighting for democracy. The only safety for America lies in a passionate determination to defend our own American tradition. May we each dedicate every fiber of our being to the noble endeavor of keeping America safe and secure in the American way.

O. P. A. Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter addressed to me by Mr. Don E. Huddleston, a member of the Malone (N. Y.) Price and War Rationing Board, together with a resolution adopted by the other members of the same board endorsing Mr. Huddleston's letter.

I feel that this is a most intelligent analysis of the method of O. P. A. operation and think it will be of interest to Members of the House and the country:

MALONE, N. Y., *April 6, 1944.*

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KILBURN: It is my understanding that a bill appropriating money for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration another year will come before Congress in the near future. I submit the following information in the thought that you might like to make some inquiry before voting upon such a bill. Perhaps some explanation on the part of O. P. A. officials might not be out of order.

Since June 1943 I have been associated with the Malone War Price and Rationing Board, first as a member of the price panel and since March 1, 1944, as chairman of the tire panel. However, I want to make it entirely clear that I do not speak for the tire panel or the rationing board or any of the members thereof. I speak only for myself as an American citizen who believes that he still has the right of free speech.

As I gain experience it seems to me that the whole rationing program is being operated more and more by regulation dictated from Washington or Albany rather than by judgment and common sense. Every time I attend a panel meeting, I realize that there is little I can do except to initial those applications which meet the requirements of a certain regulation. True enough the regulations imply that there are decisions to be made by the board, but for the most part the regulations have narrowed the range of decision almost to the point of nonexistence. This is a job which can be done by any paid employee. Actually the panel has little function except to act as a sponge for public criticism. Permit me to give just one illustration.

Recently, a tire application came to us from a somewhat disreputable individual who happens to be a part-time salesman of a nonessential commodity. As such he claims occupational mileage and I am informed by members of the gasoline panel that he is

entitled to a B book in accordance with the regulation. Since he has been granted a B book, he is also entitled to a tire according to the regulation. See tire regulations, p. 4119, par. 216, subpar. 1.)

At the same time a second application came from a man who has a job in town but who works part time on a farm. However, he has only an A book and as such is not entitled to a tire. (See tire regulations, p. 4119, par. 216, subpar. 1, ann. (.01)).

The country would be just as well off if the first man never had a tire and it probably would not seriously interfere with his way of making a living, but in my opinion the second man can make a sufficiently significant contribution to food production to justify his request. Yet, under regulations I have found no way in which it can be issued. It is the regulation that governs the case rather than the judgment of the Board and the knowledge of local conditions. I supposed that rationing was designed as a means of securing maximum contribution to the war effort. True enough we probably might refuse the salesman even though in the eyes of the regulations he might be able to build up a fairly good basis of appeal to the district office and even to Washington. Still that does not help the second man who might be able to contribute more to the war effort if the panel had more authority to act.

Secondly, I would like to point out that in my opinion the local administrative set-up of O. P. A. is almost impossible.

The chief clerk is appointed by the Board chairman with the prior approval of the district director. (See General Rationing Orders—Organization—p. 37303, par. 6105, subpar. B). Essentially, this means that he is appointed by the district director.

In another place I find that the Board chairman is responsible on behalf of the board for the supervision of the chief clerk and the clerical staff. (See General Rationing Orders—Organization—p. 37303, par. 61-04, subpar. h). This seems to imply that the local board has something to say about the operation of the local organization and is privileged to speak through the medium of its chairman.

In another place I find something about the responsibility of the chief clerk. It says: "Under supervision of and specifically responsible to the chairman etc." (See General Rationing Orders—Organization—p. 37303, par. 6105, subpar. c). This seems to imply that the chief clerk is responsible only to the chairman and that the Board as a whole has nothing whatever to say about local administration.

Doesn't this seem a perfect set-up for the creation of dissension between the members of the Board and the chief clerk and the district office?

Since essentially the chief clerk is employed by the district director and paid by O. P. A., it is only natural that in an attempt to hold his job, he would make certain that everything he does complies with the wishes of the district office regardless of the wishes of the local board. At the same time in one place the regulations imply that the Board has some control over the activities of the chief clerk. I think you can see what an impossible situation the chief clerk is in when he is faced with the problem of attempting to satisfy both the district director and the local board, especially when they do not see eye to eye on certain policies. Practically, this means that the chief clerk does the rationing in accordance with a specific regulation and the Board either goes along or else, and accepts the public criticism that may result. As a matter of fact I am reliably informed that district officials have on occasion told the chief clerk to disregard entirely the decision of the local board whenever he felt that the decision was not in complete agreement with O. P. A. policy. This type of thing is not only a perfect set-up for dissension, but it is creating dissension, reducing efficiency, and materially affecting the morale of the whole organization.

It is my belief that one of two things should be done. If we are to continue under the present set-up, I would suggest that O. P. A. issue a very specific directive giving the chief clerk complete authority over the rationing program in his area, that it be specifically pointed out that the local board has no authority except under the direction of the chief clerk and that this policy be published in order that the general public may understand where the responsibility lies. If this is not their policy, then I would suggest that a directive in simple language be issued placing the entire authority for the administration of the local rationing program in the hands of the local board, and that the entire clerical staff including the chief clerk be made 100-percent responsible to the local board. Personally, in the interests of the general public I believe the latter course should be followed, and that it would materially improve the efficiency and the morale of the organization. I can see no excuse for divided responsibility.

In the third place, I would like to make a very specific complaint against some of the present policies of the district office.

I have in my possession a memorandum, dated August 19, 1943, from Mr. Lester W. Herzog, district director, and addressed to all war price and rationing board chairmen, board members, and board personnel. In this memorandum he implies that board members are not to publicly criticize the regulations or policies of O. P. A. He goes on further to state: "If any member or local board employee should feel it necessary to submit a controversial subject to the newspapers or make it public in some other way, it will be considered as a violation of the oath of office. This office will expect that any board member or employee who issues such a statement shall at the same time submit his resignation to this office." In my opinion, this is dictatorship of the highest order. There may be some weak justification for asking paid Government employees not to criticize their organization, but there is a distinct difference between paid employees and volunteer public servants. Board members are not, in my opinion, employees of the United States Government. They are public servants of the people who are volunteering their time in an effort to serve the people, and in the eyes of the public have a very definite responsibility. To make such a demand as Mr. Herzog has made is absurd and foolish. True enough, we took an oath, but not to give our silent approval to dictatorship. No doubt when this letter becomes known, I will be exterminated from O. P. A. in true dictatorial manner, in which case I shall keep you informed.

In his memorandum, Mr. Herzog goes on to state: "Any such person may make any statements he chooses without criticism from this office, provided his resignation is filed at the same time."

I think the reasoning behind this statement is clear. Naturally, there would be little effective criticism from people outside of the organization who are not familiar with its operation. By silencing board members throughout the country, a perfect set-up is brought about for tightening controls and bringing them into the hands of a few people.

Perhaps you might be able to find out who in Washington instructed Mr. Herzog to issue this memorandum muzzling the servants of the people. If this regulation exists anywhere in O. P. A. policy, I suggest that you demand its removal before voting for their appropriation.

On or about January 22, I was called by a clerical employee of the local board and was asked several personal questions, including an inquiry as to what church I attended and what political party I belonged to. Upon inquiry I was told that this questionnaire had come from the district director's office. Since when has religion and politics had anything to do with the qualifications of board members or had anything to do in determining the policies of O. P. A.? Upon my next visit to the local office, I inspected a memorandum dated January 20, 1944, from Mr. Paul R. Duffie, district board operations executive, district office, Albany, N. Y., and directed to all chief clerks. In this memorandum he refers to the questionnaire and points out that board members do not need to answer the questions on politics and religion if they do not so desire, but that it will probably not be necessary to contact board members to get the information desired. However, I happen to know that a person claiming to be a representative of the district office came to this town the previous week, made a survey of the political affiliations of the board members and implied his dissatisfaction with the political set-up. As of April 4, 1944, a copy of this memorandum was in the file of the local office.

Perhaps you might be able to find out who in Washington instructed the district office to make a survey of the political and religious affiliations of local board members. If any regulation exists in which political or religious affiliations are a factor in determining eligibility for board membership, I would suggest that you demand their removal before voting for any appropriation.

I somewhat reluctantly became a member of the local war price and rationing board with the thought that perhaps I might be able in some small way to contribute something in the fight for democracy. However, I find that I am more and more becoming a front behind which it seems to me a form of dictatorship is being organized. A demand is being made of me that I either give my silent approval or get out. To this policy I strenuously object. If we are fighting for democracy, then let's fight for democracy.

The regulations say that "the district director shall have authority to select and appoint board members." (See General Rationing Orders—Organization—p. 37301, par. 6104, subpar. a). As a citizen of Malone, are you willing to continue to be rationed by a board appointed by a district director who, by his memorandum, has indicated his intent to muzzle the members and who, by his survey, has implied that he intends to give politics and religion some consideration? Personally, I do not believe this program or any other can be justified unless it is democratically operated. Therefore, I would suggest an amendment to the law governing O. P. A. directing that local board members be elected by the people whom they serve or that they be appointed by a board composed of elected representatives of the people. Don't let anybody tell you that this cannot be done, because it is being done now in another government agency with which I have been connected personally for the past 6 years and in connection with another rationing program. If direct elections seem too burdensome, then as a possibility, I suggest that they be appointed by a committee composed of the supervisors of the townships which are served by the board. I suggest further that the laws governing O. P. A. be revised in order that board members may be subject to removal under only two conditions.

1. At the pleasure of the people served by the board of their elected representatives.

2. When board members violate the provisions of a law as enacted by Congress.

I am convinced that rationing and perhaps some degree of price control is in the interest of public good when fairly, sincerely, and democratically administered.

I do not know how others may feel, but as for myself I would just as soon see O. P. A. abolished and take my chances in the open market, come what may, as to gamble with an organization set up under a dictatorial policy

by regulation and drawn along religious and political lines.

Sincerely yours,

DON E. HUDDLESTON.

Whereas the regulations under which local rationing board operate are so complicated and it is almost impossible to operate efficiently; and

Whereas the administrative set-up is so involved with conflicting statements as to make the operation inefficient; and

Whereas the district director has gone beyond what we consider to be his authority in restricting the activities of board members; and

Whereas Don E. Huddleston, a member of the board, has already written a personal letter to the Honorable CLARENCE E. KILBURN, Member of Congress, in which he has outlined in detail the above-mentioned problems; and

Whereas we are in complete agreement with the statements made by Mr. Huddleston in his letter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board go on record as endorsing Mr. Huddleston's letter to Mr. KILBURN dated April 6, 1944, and that this resolution be sent to Mr. KILBURN with the request that it be attached to Mr. Huddleston's letter of the above-mentioned date.

Respectfully submitted.

Floyd C. Tarbell, B. O. LeDuc, W. J. Ashline, J. E. Price, H. B. Reddy, C. Dumas, L. J. Child, P. B. Brennan, William F. Malchow, Paul U. Smith, and F. W. Schmitzlein.

Class of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malvina Lindsay from today's Washington Post:

CLASS OF 1965

(By Malvina Lindsay)

WAR BABIES SPEAK

We are the war babies of World War No. 2, the nearly 7,000,000 born since Pearl Harbor, the largest oncoming generation of youth this Nation has known.

You see us everywhere, gazing wonderingly on the world from our carriages on sidewalks and in parks, fretting on the crowded train coaches as we are being hauled about the country to see "Daddy," sleeping on benches in dreary waiting rooms of railway stations.

Many of us aren't getting a good start in life. Our fathers are away and we are shunted here and there from Army camps to homes of relatives. We never know the tranquillity and security of a home and of orderly living.

Many of our mothers already work and more will soon do so. Much of the time they are tired in body and anxious in mind. We may have to grow up without the guidance and companionship of fathers, without the reliance of their pay checks.

Yet despite all this, we know we are getting a better chance in the world than the babies of any other country. We also know that our Nation will not let us down, either now or in the future.

As the young men and women of the 1960's, as America's youth 2 decades hence, we ask that we be given as much protection as possible from the strains and sufferings of this war into which we were unwittingly born.

We ask above all that we get the foundation of physical health, that both our mothers and ourselves receive adequate medical care. We don't want to grow up with crooked legs or teeth, or to be scrawny, flabby, weak, or unpleasing looking adults. All of us want the cod-liver oil, orange juice, and doctor's attention that the most cherished babies get; all of us, as we grow older, want our parents to have the chance to buy health protection for us in terms of keeping with their incomes. None of us want to belong to another generation of "soft" youth, such as the one that now has flunked the draft by 50 percent.

We ask that we get the right mental start so that we will not grow up fearful, suspicious, resentful, unhappy, and unable to fit ourselves into society. To that end we ask for a program of education for our mothers so that they may give us psychic understanding, make us mentally self-reliant, and save us from being listed among the misfits of the future. We also ask that our communities, through clinics or classes, do their part in helping us solve our emotional difficulties.

We ask that those of us who are toddlers under 2 years old and whose mothers must for good reason be away from us, be included in the Nation's child-care program. We ask that as we grow older the schools or the communities give us places to spend our idle time before and after school hours so that we will not have to play in the streets, loaf at the drug stores, run around with gangs, and possibly furnish our Nation another generation of juvenile delinquents.

We ask that our mothers be given the chance to be healthy and calm nerved, that if they must support and rear us unaided, their burdens be lightened so that they will not be too tired to bring any joy to the care of us, and that they be able to smile oftener and thus bequeath to us the habit of happiness.

We ask that we be allowed to grow up in homes that are not haunted by fear of hunger and unemployment, and that whoever is supporting us has at least the opportunity to work.

We ask for education—as much as we can take, and of the sort that will fit us for the world of tomorrow, not of yesterday; for the education that will give us the key to knowledge unshackled by censorship or propaganda; education that will fit us to be citizens who will meet rather than shirk their responsibilities and who will pass on a better rather than a worse world to your grandchildren.

We ask for vocational guidance so that we will not grope futilely or wander down blind alleys and become frustrated, nonproduction human beings.

We ask that when our schooling is completed, we be given the chance to work and to contribute to society and that we do not become another generation of idle, transient, bewildered youth such as the first years of the depression saw.

We ask, of course, that you do all in your power to save us from a continuation of this war 20 years hence.

We ask that you start doing something about these things now. We don't want to hear you say, "We'll see about that later. Let's not scatter our forces. Let's get on with the war." For right now the patterns of our lives are being formed, our future destinies determined. We cannot afford to wait. Neither can you.

Anniversary of Battle of Warsaw Ghetto

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this day marks a very important anniversary in the struggle for freedom fought by a small group against ruthless oppressors.

On April 19, 1943, the German Government tried to obliterate the remnant of Jews who remained in Warsaw after most of the others had been destroyed by Hitler and his cohorts. On the 19th day of April 1943, German tanks rolled into the ghetto.

Let me give you the story as it appears in the New York Sun of April 14, 1944:

It was not an unusual incident—quite the contrary. The Nazis began throwing a cordon around one ghetto street, preparatory to picking up another few hundred Jews for deportation, but this time the results were unusual.

The Jews long had been preparing for revolt and this was the night for its beginning. As the Germans reached the ghetto's main street, they were met with a rain of bullets. Their tanks became burning pyres. Every house was a fort and every man and woman was armed.

Night after night and day after day the attacks on the Nazis continued Many died and so did many Jews die. The Germans pleaded for terms of peace and not liking them, called for reinforcements. The battle became hotter.

NO FOOD AND WATER

In time the ghetto was without food and without water. Ammunition was running low and the piles of dead were becoming higher and higher. The streets were masses of ruins. In 42 days it was over—over because the last Jewish defender had been liquidated. Or had he?

The Independent Jewish Press Service has information that even today a ragged, starved defender of the ghetto can be found crawling around the debris which once marked the ghetto homes and shops. If a Nazi tries to capture him, the attempt is fatal. These stragglers still have hand grenades and their attempted capture means that Jew and Nazi alike go to their certain deaths.

A documented account of the battle of Warsaw ghetto was prepared for the Yiddish Scientific Institute by Shlogme Mendelsohn. This report was printed at length in the issue of PM of April 16, 1944, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BATTLE OF WARSAW GHETTO: JEWS CRIED FOR ARMS IN VAIN—DOCUMENTED STORIES TELL HORROR OF FIGHT TO STOP DEATH DEPORTATIONS

In the history of heroic and hopeless causes, the battle of the Warsaw Ghetto must take a high place. April 19 marks the first anniversary of this battle, in which a few thousand Jews armed only with light weapons and grenades stood off for weeks the crushing might of Hitler's forces. How and why these Jews fought is told in the following story prepared for the Yiddish Scientific Institute by Shlogme Mendelsohn from documented sources—reports of Polish Government observers, the democratic Polish under-

ground press, and eyewitness stories. PM considers this account the best and fullest that has come to this office.

PART I. PROLOGUE

On July 22, 1942, the German authorities began their murderous liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto. On that day the Gestapo demanded from the Judenrat (Jewish council) that it supply for deportation to the East from six to ten thousand persons daily. The head of the council, Engineer Czerniakow, in protest against this demand, committed suicide.

The notices regarding deportation announced that families would be allowed to go together, to take some of their belongings with them and that they would all be settled for peaceful work. The deported Jews of France used to inquire for the "Estate of Treblinka"—Treblinka being the spot where Jews were slaughtered in gas chambers. These notices were presented to a population which for months already had been living in the horror of things to come. Simultaneously, the machinery of the Jewish auxiliary police was utilized by the Germans to spread reports about the favorable labor conditions which awaited the deported.

There were many—reports vary from 20,000 to 40,000—who reported voluntarily at the Umschlagplatz (deportation center) on Stawki Street in Warsaw. A picture that can drive one's mind to insanity—thousands of men and women going voluntarily to their death.

Several days after the first deportations, when thousands of Jews already lay asphyxiated in the gas chambers of Treblinka, letters were rumored to have arrived from the deported describing how well things were going for them in their new localities.

Day in, day out, thousands were either dragged from Warsaw or reported voluntarily for deportation. By the sixth day positive information had sifted through on the destination of those railway cars, packed as they were with human beings and sprinkled with quicklime. Despite the desperate desire on the part of the unhappy inhabitants of the ghetto to believe the Germans, to live at any price, the devil's game was unmasked. For a time the mad whirl still continued. Some were still hypnotized by the magic power of these papers which could spell life. But all this did not last long. The abyss of death opened. As the Polish Government report puts it:

Through the streets of Warsaw wandered pale shadows, their eyes frightened, visionless. They ran from street to street, in the delusion that perhaps on the next street the danger might not be as great. Carloads of dead children rumbled over the pavement. Corpses lay unburied on the sidewalks. Deportations continued for weeks.

At the end of 1942 there were a few months of comparative quiet. The hangman rested. Fear reigned in the emptied streets of Warsaw. Terrified eyes peered into the blackness of the night. Ears were strained.

PART II. PREPARATION

While the deportations and murders were still in full swing, the idea of revolt was born.

According to the accounts of the Polish underground newspaper Przez Walke do Zwyciestwa (a radical democratic publication) of December 15, 1942, the greater part of the remaining population consisted of the young and middle-aged, comparatively healthy and able-bodied. The determination to resist gained strength among them. A report of the underground Jewish labor movement dated as early as October 1942 reads in part:

"We shall never forgive the commandant [of the underground Polish military organization] for refusing us arms so that we could die as men."

The period of preparation for armed revolt began. In a letter of December 17, 1942, from London, the unforgetable Szmul Zygelbojm [1] writes:

"I worry now about the problem of the next steps I have to take in the [Polish] National Council and the demands I have to make of the Government. The most important question is this: At home [in Poland] there is a split on whether the time is ripe for armed revolt against the invader. All Polish organizations without exception are opposed to it, because it would only destroy and drain the blood of the people without any results. For this reason the Jewish masses were denied the arms to fight against German annihilation."

Zygelbojm believed, and rightly so, that an uprising must be organized even if it would not lead to a general revolt in the country. The question was discussed by the Polish National Council in secret session. I do not have the right to give you details of that meeting. But by the end of December or the beginning of January, the Jewish underground began to receive arms. This was due partly to that secret session of the national council, but in the main it was a result of negotiations and cooperation between Jewish and non-Jewish resistance groups in Poland itself.

January 1943 witnessed a revival of rumors that a complete liquidation of the ghetto was in the offing. We read in the newspaper Przez Walke do Zwyciestwa of January 30, 1943:

"After a lengthy interval, the further liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto began anew on the 18th and 19th of this month. The Germans have already either killed on the spot or deported between 5,000 and 10,000 people from among the remaining population of 40,000 who had survived from the original 400,000 persons in the ghetto. Thus only 30,000 to 35,000 inhabitants remain. Among others the Germans have deported all employees of the supply department and almost all physicians. The result is hunger and epidemics. We must emphasize and extend our admiration to the fighter unit which during the latest liquidation met the Gestapo with gun in hands."

Now begin the 3 intermediate months between the first and second resistance. We have no information as to what happened in the ghetto during this period. I do not mean the murders perpetrated by the Germans. I am thinking of the internal organization, the political and spiritual preparations among the approximate 40,000 people for the incomparable, historic act. To arm a great part of the population under the conditions prevailing in the ghetto, to organize leadership, to divide the city into defense sections, to dig tunnels for communication with the part of the city outside the ghetto walls—all this demanded extraordinary discipline, an unimaginable will, tremendous self-sacrifice, and sublime revolutionary strength. Human dignity, group pride, and revolutionary tradition must have combined to organize and plan a war which everyone knew would be lost.

PART III. BATTLE

In the middle of April the Nazis announced that 5,000 Jews must report on Stawki Street for deportation. The first transport soon departed. The underground Polish newspaper Polska of April 29, 1943, writes:

"Several Jews in that transport managed to escape. They brought back horrible news. It turned out that the transport from the ghetto stopped not far from Warsaw. There the Jews were ordered to dig their own graves, which were then surrounded by machine guns. A second transport was scheduled to follow on April 20, Hitler's birthday. This news terrified the ghetto. Its streets emptied. People vanished from the streets, the workshops, homes, and factories. The Gestapo began searching, dragging forth the women and children as hostages. They assembled them on the Jewish cemetery, ordered them to dig graves, and wait there for their men. But as a reply from the seemingly empty houses came flying bullets and hand grenades. Roofs and attics began to spit fire and to rain death on the German police. Fear descended on Hitler's henchmen. They fled in confusion."

Use heavy guns

The official government representative thus describes the battle:

"The fight began on the eve of April 19. Armed German detachments surrounded the ghetto, then marched in to complete its liquidation. They came in numerous, heavily armed S. S. detachments on cars mounted with machine guns and on tanks. Ukrainian, Latvian, and Lithuanian detachments supported the S. S. The Jewish fighters began the battle as soon as the Germans marched in.

"The first period of struggle lasted a week. Jewish resistance was brilliantly planned. In the first days of combat the Germans took severe punishment; hundreds of them were killed and more wounded. Several times they had to retreat behind the ghetto walls. During that first week the battle had all the characteristics of regular military operations.

"Due to their defeats during the first 2 days, the Germans changed their tactics on April 21 and attacked one by one the points of resistance by fire (with incendiaries dropped from the air, incendiary grenades, and flame throwers), as well as by heavy artillery. Many fires were started in the ghetto.

"On April 23 the Germans took the central and outer parts of the ghetto. The combat zone then moved farther north. Here the main battle continued, but even in the conquered parts strong guerrilla activity was maintained. The main strength of the Jewish defenders was now concentrated near Okopowa Street and Powazkowska. German planes began attacking this area with incendiary bombs. The Jews replied by setting fire to the German factories situated there and to the ammunition depots, first capturing the ammunition.

"The regular military action lasted about a week. By April 28 the Germans had thrown into the battle 6,000 heavily armed troops. Estimates place the number of German dead at between 1,000 and 1,200. The Jews lost about 3,000 to 5,000 during the same period."

The next period of the struggle began when regular military operations gave way to guerrilla warfare. The report of the Government representative continues:

"At the close of the fifth week of the Jewish-German war, the Jews had not yet ceased their bitter resistance. The Germans are extremely cautious in their attempts to bring the ghetto to submission. Their main methods are setting fire to buildings, blowing them up with dynamite or flooding the cellars where the Jewish fighters hide. The rebels begin their chief activities at nightfall. It is already 3 weeks that building after building, street after street, are being burned."

The armed resistance started on April 19 had become a people's war in the truest sense of the word. All sections of the Jewish population of 40,000 partook in the struggle; some with gun in hand, some by service work, others by bringing medical aid to the wounded. That is the vital characteristic and the historic significance of the revolt. It was conceived by the underground movement, prepared by a coordination committee

[1] Zygelbojm, then a member of the Polish National Council in London, killed himself last May in protest against what he believed was the "indifference with which the Allies observed Hitler's massacre of European Jews."

of several political movements and carried through heroically by the Jewish people at large.

Unspeakable horror

I shall not deal in detail with German bestiality during the struggle. It reached a stage of horror beyond description. A few facts only, as reported by the underground press, shall be stated here. Inside the improvised Jewish hospital the sick were shot in their beds. Jews who managed to escape from the burning buildings were either shot or driven back into the flames.

In the early days of battle, the Jewish Fighter Organization issued the following appeal:

"We realize that the Polish underground movement pays homage to the fighters of the Ghetto. But only the United Nations can give immediate and concrete aid.

"In the name of the millions of murdered Jews; in the name of all those who were burned, tortured, and slaughtered; in the name of those who are still fighting heroically though condemned to certain death in an unequal struggle; we call to the world to listen to us today.

"The Allies must avenge our death and our suffering, so that even the bestial enemy may understand why he is being punished. Our allies must finally realize that a tremendous historic responsibility will fall upon those who remained passive in the face of the unbelievable Nazi crime against a whole people whose tragic epilog we witness today. The desperate heroism of the people of the ghetto must stir the world to an action equal to the greatness of the movement."

Die with dignity

The appeal leaves no doubt that the fighters thought not only of dying with dignity but also of arousing the conscience of the world. They believed that the heroic fight would force the Allies to act against Hitler's headsmen and thus prevent further slaughters. Those who fell perhaps believed in it to their very last breath. Those who remained alive must carry deep in their hearts their bitter disillusionment.

For with the great pain of humiliation, we must admit that the call to the world remained unheard. Unheard were not only the voices of the two small towns of Krynki and Nieswiez, about whose struggles we unfortunately know nothing, but that they took place, but even the great battle of the Warsaw ghetto did not accomplish this purpose. That this happened was not the guilt of the fighters. They were guilty only of credulity.

I also wish to quote from the tributes paid by many individuals in public life to this valiant epic fight.

Governor Dewey said that the uprising in Warsaw had inspired the forces of freedom.

Wendell L. Willkie described it as "a milestone in the old-age history of the Jewish people." Bishop William T. Manning said that the Warsaw revolt was "an act of heroism which has had few equals in history."

The Reverend Robert I. Gannon, of Fordham University, said that on April 19 he will include in the prayers "the thousands of just and upright Jews who perished at the hands of the Nazis in Poland, as I do every day, for the holy souls."

Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College and Catholic lay leader, described the ghetto affair as "a picture of the almost forgotten bravery of olden times." Viscount Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, said that "barbarous as the Nazi policy toward the Jews of Germany has always been, it is easily surpassed in savagery by the treatment accorded the Jews of Poland. The revolt of the Jews of Warsaw," he said, "proves that the human spirit is indestructible."

Farley Bides His Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Journal News, of Rockland County, N. Y.:

FARLEY BIDES HIS TIME

It's interesting to note in words of one syllable that Democratic State Chairman James A. Farley is due to be dumped by New York State Democrats. At the moment of the announcement Jim Farley had nothing to say and he probably will have little to say until later on. This much can be said: Jim Farley will retire as State chairman if he so chooses, and he won't retire if he doesn't so choose.

There is a magic in the Farley name which revives old loyalties by its very mention. * * * Perhaps there aren't as many of those old loyalties as there used to be for Jim Farley has not had the patronage that once he had and old friends in the ranks have been replaced. No matter, there are still enough old friends and enough new friends for him to retain his power in his home State, an area he knows like the palm of his hand, and whence he originally rose to power.

The saying goes that when a politician has once slipped he is a dead duck, and had best not attempt a come-back. That's still true, but Jim Farley has not slipped and has no worry on that score. * * * Jim Farley is a practical politician, a man of his word, and a man of honor, and he stands head and shoulders above those who are now sniping away at him. * * *

Mr. Farley has seen fit to differ with the administration, to hold to the line of the constitutional Democrats. * * * It will be a sorry day for the Democratic organization if ever they succeed, for out with Jim Farley would go all those loyal Democrats who believe as he does. This is not a year when the Democratic Party can afford to lose any votes.

The support of New York State Democrats is a rather important item in a national election for it carries with it a husky block of electoral votes. It would be rather foolish to assert that the loss of Farley and his friends would be offset by American Labor Party support * * *.

One of Jim Farley's uncanniest gifts is his ability to determine whence and whither the winds of political chance are blowing. He can do more with one cross section than most prognosticators can do with a national poll. * * *. He saw some of his fears of Democratic loss realized 2 years ago when Governor Dewey carried the State. The wind was setting in the direction he had foreseen.

Constitutional Democrats as represented by Mr. Farley will long have a place in the national picture. * * * Mr. Farley is still a young man and he can well afford to bide his time. When the time comes for constitutional Democrats to climb back into the saddle he will be there to climb.

Meanwhile, he can afford to let the wind that blows * * * whistle as much as it pleases. It takes more than wind to blow him out of his driver's seat unless he chooses to take a temporary rest. * * *

A Post-War Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, many editorials and columnists have discussed fully Secretary Hull's radio speech of April 9, as it relates to Germany, Japan, Italy, and the neutrals. Few, if any, have approached it from the angle of the post-war program outlined by Mr. Hull, which, in part at least, is undoubtedly the fruit of President Roosevelt's conferences with leaders of Allied Nations at Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, Washington, and elsewhere.

Knowing that many of my constituents did not hear the broadcast and did not have the time to go over the speech with a fine-tooth comb, I have prepared for release to the newspapers of my district—Second, Kansas—the conclusions I have reached from a careful reading of the speech, which covered only a part of the 17 points previously announced by Mr. Hull.

Possibly this release, which follows, will serve to provoke discussion, crystallize sentiment, dispel doubt as to the existence of an administration post-war policy and, perhaps, bring into sharper focus the picture of the part the President and his Secretary of State would have this country play in the post-war world.

IN WASHINGTON WITH CONGRESSMAN ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

Since you all know what our foreign policy is (Secretary Hull stated it was known to all men), I suppose there is no need for further discussion—or is there?

Three times Mr. Hull referred to free and democratic nations, 15 times he used the word "democratic"—including by inference at least, Russia—which does not coincide with my view of democracy or a free democratic nation, even though it is a hard-hitting ally as far as the war against Germany is concerned. (It's neutral in our war with Japan.)

After listening to the 45-minute broadcast and carefully analyzing the text several times, the foreign policy seems to add up to something like this: Prior to the fall of France in the spring of 1940, we had begun preparations for self-defense—after France's fall, we started to strengthen those resisting aggressors. At that time it was England only, Russia being a party to a nonagression pact with Germany. Hence our policy was to aid England.

In August of 1941 came the Atlantic Charter which Mr. Hull passed over lightly, saying it is merely an expression of fundamental objectives, the signers agreeing not to seek

any territorial gains, and which was later agreed to by all of the United Nations.

Mr. Hull told us—without mentioning the existing League of Nations—that a basis has been established and extensive work has already been done on the form and substance of a global international organization to—

(a) Maintain peace and prevent aggression;

(b) Bring about economic cooperation as a partner of other free nations;

(c) Provide adequate forces to preserve peace (world police);

(d) Authorize an international (world) court for the development and application of law;

(e) Create international arbitration machinery;

(f) Improve the material condition of the peoples of the signatory nations;

(g) Stimulate production in industry and agriculture by removing restrictions (tariffs) from international commerce;

(h) Provide investment capital (world R. F. C.); and

(i) Improve labor standards and standards of health and nutrition throughout the world.

Conceding the necessity of some post-war cooperation carrying with it the surrender of some degree of our self-rule, does this go too far? Does it go far enough? These are the questions facing "we, the people." Think it over and we'll talk about it this summer.

The Price We Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the debate yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] said correctly that "We have no yardstick by which we can judge the value of a billion dollars. You can say it as easily as a million, but we have lend-lease now according to the gentleman from West Virginia, something like $67,000,000,000. It is easy to say that, but that is equal to twice the value of all the real estate in the United States today."

Preceding the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] referring to the lend-lease fund grand total as more than $63,000,000,000, said "This represents more than one-fifth of the total wealth of our Nation and nearly one-half the current national income."

I am reminded that the publicity given the statement I made during the course of the hearings on the naval appropriation bill with reference to the $300,000,000,000 cost of the war to date, reduced to a comparative yardstick, suggests the interest of the public in such things.

The Associated Press carried the following story with respect to that incident:

PLUMLEY DESCRIBES COST OF WAR

WASHINGTON, April 12.—Consider a 20-foot wide highway, paved with dollar bills and stretching around the globe more than 13 times and, according to Representative PLUMLEY (Republican, Vermont), you will have a good idea of the cost of the war to the United States.

PLUMLEY made the observation during hearings on the Navy appropriation bill reported to the House today. For round figures he used $300,000,000,000.

Reduced to $1 bills, and laid side by side and end to end, PLUMLEY said that amount would "go 317,187 miles, or thirteen and seven twenty-fifths times around the globe in a highway running 20 feet wide."

The calculation, he explained, was made by "a friend in the Navy" at the request of "a thrifty citizen of Vermont."

The thrifty citizen's reaction, he added, was:

"But somebody has to pick it all up."

Mr. Speaker, I did not then say, but might well have done so, that 300,000,000,000 $1 bills laid end to end would extend 30,000,000 miles, in round numbers, or 29,000,960 miles to be exact. That is nearly a third of the distance to the sun, which astronomers tell us is 92,900,000 miles away. Just think of that.

If you wish to get on to the gold standard, let us take $5 gold pieces to use in our experiment. Five dollar gold pieces are five hundred and eighty-two ten thousandths of an inch thick, and we will pile them on top of one another till we have stacked up $300,000,000,000 worth. You have not the slightest idea, unless you have figured it, how high a column you will have. Believe it or not, the monument you will have made of gold, representing expenditures made, will soar into the blue of the heavens 291,000,000 feet, or 55,113 miles. That is substantially one-fourth of the way to the moon, which is what the cow jumped over and the New Deal started to reach in its wastefulness and extravagant spending—and is 238,857 miles away.

Your dollars in $5 gold pieces make some monument, but measure only the cost of the war to date.

Let us get down onto the old earth and keep our feet on the ground while we spread $300,000,000,000 worth of dollar bills all over the land to see how much territory they will cover. End to end and side by side, these dollar bills will cover 768,709 acres. That is an area in acres larger than the State of Rhode Island, the District of Columbia, Grand Isle County, and a considerable portion of Essex County in Vermont, all combined.

And the end is not yet. So it behooves everybody to economize in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. Somebody will have to pick up these dollars sometime to put them or their equivalent back into the Treasury of the United States to keep us solvent.

Back when we were only $45,000,000,000 in New Deal debt—and that was in 1940 when we were being told the Budget would someday be balanced—I figured it out that, as of February 12, 1940, if 50 men were to start on that day and work continuously for the next 1,940 years to pick up these bills, and each picked up 1 every minute every day every year, they would have put back into the Treasury only $40,677,200,000.

So you take three hundred billion, instead of forty-five billion, as a basis, and, using my 1940 figures, do a little calculating for yourself. Those 50 men would have a hard job to pick up enough to pay the interest as it has accrued and will continue to accrue, to say nothing about picking up enough to make a dent on the principal sum.

What a mess. Is there any reason to doubt that the American people when they come to their senses will relieve themselves of the incubus of incompetency, wastefulness, and bureaucracy found in the present administration of our internal economic affairs? If there be any such reason to think the people will not eventually save themselves, then our form of government is on the road to folding up now as a Government of, for, and by the people.

What can the New Deal find of which to boast in such a sorry spectacle?

The people must save themselves, to save their self-respect, to save the country.

Consecration of Bishop Dun

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the beautiful Episcopal National Cathedral, which I attend, there was consecrated as bishop, the Very Reverend Angus Dun, who was formerly dean of the Cambridge Theological School at Cambridge, Mass. We of Massachusetts are very proud and very happy that the board, in selecting the bishop of the National Cathedral, chose Bishop Dun. He is a man of sterling character, kindly, and broad-minded. He has great ability and great spirituality. I am glad that he can do even more as head of the National Cathedral at Washington during these tremendously trying days than he did as dean of the theological school. The world needs today as never before the consolation and inspiration of religion. The sermon delivered by the Right Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill, D. D., bishop of Massachusetts, is as follows:

TEXT OF CONSECRATION SERMON—BISHOP SHERRILL SEES CHURCH LEADERSHIP VITALLY NEEDED TO HEAL ILLS OF TORN WORLD

We are met to share in the service of the consecration of a bishop. As we proceed there will be heard words proclaiming the great truths of the gospel. There will come before us constant reminders of the long life of the Christian church and the story of successive generations of saints, evangelists, and heroes.

In this cathedral, on this deeply significant occasion, we feel the reality of the presence of the living God. It would be easy to think and to speak solely of the glory of God, of His goodness and mercy, of the comfort and peace which come from fellowship in the blessed company of faithful people.

It is a temptation to shut the doors as of an upper room and so to forget for the moment the stern and tragic realities of the world in which we live. There are times when such

relief and release are essential. But here we are consecrating a leader in the Christian church. A leader must be prepared to face the facts, the discouragements as well as the opportunities of his times.

CHURCH IS BODY OF CHRIST

The church, St. Paul declared, is the body of Christ. It is not my intention to elaborate this familiar statement. I only wish to emphasize what the physical body of Christ faced in obedience to the will of God. That body had nowhere to lay its head. That body was set steadfastly to go to Jerusalem to face danger and arrest. That body was crucified on the cross.

The church, we say, is the body of Christ. Is the servant above His Master or the disciple above His Lord? To be truly the body of Christ, the church of Christ can expect no sheltered or favored position. The church must live so dangerously, so sacrificially that the Master can once again say, "This is My body which is given for you."

It is essential that we understand that fact today. There are epochs in history which seem to be turning points, when decisions are made and roads chosen which determine the course of human events for generations. It is admittedly difficult to view dispassionately and to evaluate one's own time, but everything points to the stern fact that we are in such an era.

I am not thinking alone of the winning or losing of the war. I am thinking even more of the character of the world which is to be. Our situation is too well known to need detailed description. There is no east and west in one sense, for modern invention has made the twain meet. Everything, from physical boundaries to men's hopes and fears, is in a state of flux. With clashes of nations, colors and races, there are cruelties and hatreds.

LONGING OF UNTOLD MILLIONS

Also we may be thankful there are noble deeds of high sacrifice. Above all, there is an unutterable longing on the part of untold millions for the new and finer day which, please God, some day will dawn. It is not a comfortable, but a dangerous world. The church cannot escape the common trial by fire. Too often Christian people are inclined to live in a paradise of wishful thinking which overestimates the influence of the church and minimizes the difficulties we confront. We are prone to lack discipline and determination because when we are with church people and groups we become complacent.

Surely now any sane view both of the church and the world should stir us to the realization of the magnitude of the task before us. Is the church merely an agreeable association without vital impress on the times, or is the church the body of Christ who gave His life? May it not be true that we are living in a period when the fullness of time has come again?

Certainly we are at one in the conviction that Christ has a message and a life for our day. Surely we must proclaim that His gospel is applicable to our social order. But it is not enough to preach and to resolve; it is essential that the Word become flesh, that there be a true body of Christ in an individual and corporate life which will determine the course of history.

Let us apply this to some of the pressing questions before us. I imagine that most of us would agree that the greatest need beyond the immediate winning of the war is the establishment of what, to avoid political terms, we may call a world family of nations. Only on the basis of such international understanding and cooperation can world peace be maintained and a more equable and stable world order be established. There can be no debate as to Christ's teaching as to the brotherhood of man, not as a political slogan, but because all men are the children of a Heavenly Father.

ISOLATION IS SPIRITUAL HERESY

From the point of view of Christianity, isolationism of an individual, a nation or a race is a spiritual heresy. God was not isolationist when He so loved the world. The church has never been isolationist in sending out missionaries to the four corners of the globe. I am not speaking in terms of any one scheme of world organization, but of the general spiritual objective to which the church is committed as the servant of Christ. It is to be hoped that from the fellowship of the church will come inspired and determined men and women who will work out and support the definite means of achieving this objective.

This calls for more than sermons and resolutions; it demands attributes of mind and of heart. Above all, there must be a unique quality of life within the church. The missionary cause is not a work of supererogation, not trying to force our way of life upon someone else. Missions mean the sharing of the best we have, the truth of God in Christ, and then living in a fellowship with God which transcends all barriers of nationality.

We may evolve all kinds of international machinery which is necessary, but which will be bound to fail if formed only for reasons of fear or of selfish advantage. There must be the spiritual motive and life. We may be grateful to God and to thousands of known and unknown missionaries that, in almost every land, yes, including Japan, there are those who count themselves members of the Christian church. There are difficulties and tensions which will continue. But here the church can be the body of the Christ who draws all men to Himself.

Along the same line, there is the whole problem of race relationship, a question not peculiar to the Far East or India, but one which confronts us at home with immediate and pressing necessity. Again the gospel note of brotherhood rings clear and strong. There cannot be the slightest question as to Christ's way of loving kindness which is more than justice. To be realistic it is impossible to ignore the perplexities, the fears, and the prejudices which so often tie our hands and confuse our heads.

PROBLEMS CONCERN CHURCH INTIMATELY

I am not proposing any definite radical solution. I am saying that here is a matter which deeply concerns the Christian church, which is intimately connected with the practice of the religion we profess. Again it is not a question of pronouncements and of programs, though they have their place, so much as it is a matter of life within the church. Are we in truth a fellowship in which God is no respecter of persons? The church is called upon to set an example, to create a spiritual atmosphere in which brotherhood can grow.

Let us take our economic order. There are those who uphold the theory that there certainly is no concern of the church. But others more realistic see that the material and the spiritual are not so easily separated. I learned long ago when I was a chaplain in France that it is hard to pray when you are unbearably cold. The church's interest in the social order is to see that there is the proper environment so that the spiritual life of men may have the chance to live and develop.

In our cities we know that slums, with their bad housing, produce crime. There are slums equally in rural areas where poverty results in ignorance and in evil and where the life of the spirit has indeed small opportunity. The church cares for all men irrespective of their station, but the church should have an especial care for those who through circumstances beyond their control are oppressed by surroundings which destroy opportunity.

But for a much broader reason the church must be concerned with the social order. We live in a period of complexity when great social forces carry the individual along a current which he is unable to control. The war is the supreme, if not the only, example of this. Millions of people who had nothing to do with the policies of nations or of statesmen have been uprooted and sent to far distant places by the exigences of the times.

CHRISTIAN LIFE NOT EASY

What is true of war, in lesser degree is true of business, of labor, or of any of the great social organisms of today. Certain individuals of special gifts or of heroic proportions may for a time seem to breast the tide, but for most people it is an impossibility. The spiritual life practically is conditioned to a tremendous degree by the framework in which it is set.

Christianity does not claim that the Christian life is easy or ever will be, but the church must strive to see, unless religion is to be the possession of the few, or unless Christianity returns to the catacombs or the deserts, that the average man lives in an environment in which he has a fair chance to practice the teaching of the Master.

The world cannot remain one-quarter Christian and three-quarters pagan; for a house divided against itself cannot stand, as the present tells us in suffering. Once again this is not primarily a matter of statements or of resolutions. It is the matter of the common life of us all within the church. Have we such a consciousness of the presence of God, of the impelling summons of the Christ, that from our churches will go industrial leaders, economists, laborers, farmers, men and women of every walk of life who in the name of Christ are champions of a more Christian social order?

Let us come to the church. Here is perhaps the most distressing fact of all. The church which St. Paul stated to be the body of Christ is a divided and broken body. Under these circumstances how can the church preach unity to nations and men? The familiar answer is too true to be lightly turned aside: "Physician, heal thyself."

WORLD WANTS CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

At a time when the forces of evil are so strongly entrenched, when men and women are longing for clear and convinced Christian leadership, there are divisions in the very family of Christ. At a time when the trumpet should give a clear and certain note, there are many trumpets and the notes not in harmony. No words can effectively describe the unhappy effect of this upon average humanity, non-Christian as well as Christian.

I realize full well that this is a somewhat brutal simplification of the situation. There is the long history of the church which has caused this condition. There are prejudices to be overcome and wounds to be healed. On the other hand, we must not forget the real progress which has been made in the greater cooperation of the churches. But what has been accomplished is infinitesimal to what must be done. I know many of the tensions and difficulties, but this cause cannot be ignored, on the lower ground, because of plain common sense; on the higher, because who can doubt what is the will of Christ?

I am not suggesting a colorless, regimented uniformity, or a mere theoretical conceived union, but a deep and overpowering unity of the spirit. Again it is not a matter of words, but of the character of the Christian fellowship and of the vision we have of the glory of God. Let the church be the body of Christ.

It may seem strange to some that I have not touched upon the special responsibilities and opportunities of the episcopate. I assure you that I have not forgotten them. They are implicit in all I have said. A bishop has the privilege of being a pastor to clergy and people. He has upon his mind and heart the spiritual care of all the churches. He has important administrative duties, but they are insignificant compared to the quality of his spiritual vision and leadership. This is involved in every act, whether it be the direction of candidates for the ministry, conferences with clergy, wardens, and vestrymen, visitations for confirmation or contacts with the community. With humility and yet with persistent courage he must strive to keep the church true to the Master, or else the salt will have lost its savor.

BISHOP IS MISSIONARY

The bishop is also a missionary. If one may reverse the figures, he cannot be content to minister alone to the one within the fold, he must reach out to the 90 and 9 who in our world have not realized the implications of Christian discipleship. The bishop must not be insistent upon his authority, and position and rights, as such. The church is not a club with certain officers and with the purpose of mutual help and comfort. The church is a living, militant missionary force, glad to spend and be spent, not careful of her own prerogatives, even her own life. Nothing which is human can be alien to her purpose. The bishop should be the exemplar of this truth.

Perhaps the noblest fact in our day is that millions of men and women everywhere are giving themselves without counting the cost to a cause which they conceive to be greater than they. Whatever their limitations, and they are many, they have learned the meaning of sacrifice. They put to shame many of our complacent self-centered conceptions of the Christian life. They will spurn any institution, no matter how venerable or sacred, which is interested merely in self-service, or self-preservation.

The church is the body of Christ. A body is to be used, as was Christ's body—used to heal the brokenhearted, to free captives, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, not for the sake of social reform alone but that men might be made into the glorious body of their risen and victorious Lord. That is what it means to be a bishop or a priest or a deacon or a layman, in the church. We must never forget these uplifting yet exacting words: "Ye are the body of Christ."

PRAYER FOR NEW BISHOP

My brother: Those of us who know you will realize with what deep regret you leave the special work of training men for the ministry of the church. Because this is so vital in your eyes, I feel certain that in this new office you will find many opportunities to further this same cause. Out of years of study and of teaching, fundamental truths of the word of God have laid hold upon you and you care deeply that these truths be applied to the church and to the world. With simplicity, steadfastness and sympathetic understanding you will labor to this end.

Again, those of us who know you appreciate your genuine pastoral insight and care. Clergy of many points of view, parishes and missions will find in you a wise counselor and friend. You will strive to make the church in this diocese a fellowship, which is the body of Christ. Perhaps I can best express our prayer for you in the familiar words of the prayer for the alumni of the school you have served so well—that God will grant unto you the spirit of wisdom that you may teach His people His eternal truth and the spirit of holiness that you may go before them and lead them into His everlasting kingdom.

Manpower Mobilization Bill Agitated Again

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the pressure in the Congress for the enactment of some sort of a manpower mobilization bill is rising again. The administration is putting on all the pressure it possibly can muster. It has surrounded the whole issue in a cloud of confusion and contradiction. Having done that, it now asserts that since nobody seems to understand either the situation or the needs of the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps, we simply must believe implicitly those officers sent to testify before the committees of the Congress, that the manpower of the Nation—which includes, of course, the womanpower and the childpower, in the final analysis—must be brought under military control.

The master technique of the administration and the New Deal palace guard has been from the first to create so much contradiction, cross purposes, confusion, and misunderstanding as to leave everybody with a sense of futility when trying to understand the issue—whatever the issue has been—and then to demand legislation on the ground that an emergency existed, or that a crisis impended which the people could not be permitted to know about, and then to try to force the legislation through the Congress. That technique has usually been successful. So, as has been the practice, the administration has now produced another emergency—a so-called manpower shortage. It has pulled out every stop, it has used every chord to play the people into a sense of confusion, futility, and bewilderment, in order that the legislation can be forced through the Congress. They proceed upon the theory that the danger is one the people cannot see; that the emergency is a military one which the people cannot be permitted to know about; that the Congress must simply take the word of the witnesses sent up to the committees to testify in favor of the proposal.

Who, what sane person, believes for a moment that the officers who come before the committees of the Congress to testify for this measure, would dare do otherwise than reflect the views of higher authority, if those officers value their rank and their hopes for promotion? This does not mean that these military and naval officers are dishonest. It does mean that strict military discipline in time of war works that way—and has to work that way. So we cannot and we must not take too seriously the testimony of these officers. We must consider their position, the discipline they are under, the compulsions which beat upon them, and remember always that all the wisdom is not bound up in either the administration or the officers under the administration's control.

Punishment, promises, and persuasion have worked with the Congress in days gone by, and the military and naval officers certainly are not to be blamed if they—under very much more acute compulsion—have to come to the Congress and testify for measures which in their hearts they may believe are not strictly necessary to the war effort. They must reflect the views of higher authority or else.

If this administration—if the Chief Executive had always been frank with the people and their Congress, the case would be different. If the New Deal administration had always been willing to acknowledge its mistakes when it made them and saw them, the case would be different. If the New Deal administration had not sought, under the guise of false emergencies and phony crises, to grab and to retain every vestige of power it could get, the case would be different. If the administration were not now talking loudly about how the war controls must be continued long after the war is ended, the case would be different. If the people and the Congress did not know—as they do know—that the administration is filled with men and women whose first aim and main purpose is to overturn our constitutional representative form of government and set up in place thereof a political oligarchy, the case would be different. If the New Deal administration had made a success of solving a single domestic problem, not one of which was solved but all of which simply were obscured temporarily by the greater problem of the war, the case would be different.

This continued and really desperate drive by the administration to put the whole populace into the strait jacket of military control and discipline is part of a plan by the administration to hold its power over Government by any means, fair or otherwise. We must not forget that during the month of February more than 415,000 weeks of unemployment compensation was paid. This number is increasing. We must not forget that today the people in the armed services are muzzled. They dare not tell what they know; they dare not speak what they think; they dare not express their will in anything or on any subject. There are a thousand ways in which men may be punished—from top-ranking generals down to the lowliest private—if they offend their Commander in Chief, or anybody who has the ear of the Commander in Chief.

Once the American people become enmeshed in such military control they, too, will be muzzled. You citizens now listening to my voice would be subject to the disciplines and the pressures and the punishments and restrictions to which other soldiers may be subjected should you express your will or dare to write to your Congressman, or publicly voice your will about your Government.

The New Deal administration faces probable defeat at the polls next November. Naturally it is greatly concerned. It wants to have control of the voters. A New Deal defeat will by no means result in a setback in this war. If the present Chief Executive were to resign and step out of the White House tomorrow, the trained, educated, and highly capable naval and military leaders, planners, and strategists would go right on with this war, and even more efficiently, because they would then be freed of a lot of civilian, political influences which they now have to put up with, together with a lot of interference which at the present time is seriously hampering their war efforts.

Free speech, free press, free radio, and freedom to vote as the citizen desires are the basis and the foundation of a government by consent of the governed. The impressment of the civilian population is exactly in contradiction and utterly dangerous to a government of, by, and for the people. No government by consent of the governed can possibly survive if the public servants become the public masters through the impressment of all the adult people into military service and military discipline. Our government by consent of the governed—your freedom under the Bill of Rights—cannot possibly stand up and remain unimpaired if you are impressed into military service and placed under a military dictatorship.

The Members of your Congress must be on guard for your welfare, because it has been demonstrated over and over and over again in the last dozen years that the New Deal administration is insatiable in its lust for power; that the gigantic bureaucracy which has taken root and flourished under this New Deal administration will hold to its powers, will further entrench itself, will never yield up its fat jobs and its control of the people's money, government, and liberties until it is wrenched loose by the people themselves.

I say to you here and now, my fellow citizens, that this proposal to mobilize the man and woman power of this Nation under military control is not necessary, that it is a most dangerous threat to your liberties, that it is the longest step toward the destruction of free government and the establishment of dictatorship in this Nation that has been contemplated since the Declaration of Independence was penned. In that step, if we take it, we will cast away all the heritage of freedom and self-government our forefathers fought and bled and sacrificed and toiled to give us. We will betray them; we will betray our posterity. If we take this step of impressing the civilian population of this Nation into military control, we will betray the men and women now fighting on the battlefronts of the world to turn back dictatorship and oppression and tyranny from abroad.

Our civil population has not lost its intelligence. The people of this country still in civilian status have not lost their power to cooperate. We have not lost our patriotism, nor our will to win this war. We need to be told what to do—and the administration has not told us. We should be told why things need to be done and the administration has not told us. Whenever we ask the reasons for this establishment of a military dictatorship in this Nation, we are met by the old, threadbare, over-worked excuse that the reasons are military secrets which cannot be told the people.

This concealment of all essential facts from the people is not an accident; it is a part of a design, a plan. The American people do not need to know military secrets which would be of value to the enemy. They do need to know the aims, the designs, the ends sought, and the things to which they will find themselves obligated by those in the administration who can, but will not enlighten them.

The last desperate hope of the New Deal administration to hold its power and its control over the people lies in this proposal to force the civilian population into military service. So keep awake, my friends.

All this hullabaloo and uproar by the administration about the so-called necessity for mobilization of civilian manpower by no means indicates we are losing the war. It just means the New Dealers see that they are losing the next election. They are terrified by the fact that they may be thrown out of office and that the real picture of their machinations, their maladministration, and their manipulations of Government and of the war effort for selfish purposes will be exposed. When that time comes a lot of people now riding high in power will be skulking in the dark corners, trying to escape the public eye and the public anger for their mishandling of the grandest Government, the finest people, and the most wonderful country Divine Providence ever provided a great segment of the human race.

We should all remember the warning words of that great American and statesman, Edward Livingston, who said:

> The gloss of zeal for the public service is always spread over acts of oppression, and the people are sometimes made to consider that zeal as a brilliant exertion of energy in their favor which, when viewed in its true light, would be found a fatal blow to their rights. In no government is this effect so easily produced as in a free republic; party spirit, inseparable from its existence, aids the illusion, and a popular leader is allowed in many instances impunity—and sometimes is rewarded with applause—for acts which would make a tyrant tremble on his throne.

Congressman Gavin, of Pennsylvania, Answered On Criticism of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable LEON H. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, yesterday cited the number of lawyers employed by O. P. A.—298 in Washington, and 1,443 in the field—at a total cost of $5,873,000, and stated that if Administrator Chester Bowles wants to save the American taxpayers money he will reduce the personnel of his legal staff several hundred and not alone save the American taxpayer considerable money, but a considerable number of headaches.

Does Mr. GAVIN realize that O. P. A. is controlling 8,000,000 prices in 3,000,000 business establishments, and is controlling rents in 14,000,000 rented quarters? Does he realize that setting up controls and not enforcing them penalizes the loyal 95 percent of our business concerns but rewards the black-market operators?

Black-market operators in gasoline are robbing loyal car owners of a gallon of gasoline every 10 days. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want to encourage that by reducing the already inadequate staff fighting to thwart these black-market operators?

Does he know that almost 3 percent of the present cost of living is made up of charges over ceiling prices roughly for every 1 percent reduction in prices saves a billion dollars to the people of the Nation as consumers and as taxpayers?

What O. P. A. needs is not fewer enforcement people but a redoubled enforcement effort. Any move to cut O. P. A.'s enforcement staff as an economy move would be penny-wise and hundred-dollar-foolish. The American people as consumers and taxpayers not only want price control to protect their pocketbooks and rationing regulations to give everyone a fair share of scarce commodities. They want those regulations enforced. They want no cut in O. P. A. attorneys which will prevent a vigorous hunting down of black-market operators from one end of the Nation to the other.

I really do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania could have understood the meaning of his proposal or I do not believe he would have made it.

TACTICS OF THOSE WHO OPPOSE PRICE CONTROL

I do not claim that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is opposed to price control, but the tactics he is using are identical with the tactics of those who are opposed to price control and stabilization. Those who have always opposed price control are very much like the isolationists; they have not changed their views; they have only changed their tactics.

Many who are opposed to this act, which has saved us from ruinous or runaway inflation, are doing everything they can to make the enforcement of the law impossible, impracticable, or just as weak as they can make it. The House of Representatives passed a law directing the President to stabilize the cost of living, keep down the cost of the war, and prevent inflation. Then the House of Representatives, by a majority vote—the Republicans voted solidly and a few Democrats joined them—reduced the appropriation of O. P. A. to such an extent that effective enforcement of the law

was practically impossible. By this amendment the enforcement of the act was at least considerably crippled. The House of Representatives also voted to eliminate entirely the $6,000,000 appropriation for O. W. I., known as the Domestic Branch of O. W. I., which, in effect, greatly crippled the only organization in our Government charged with the duty of warning the people against run-away inflation.

Now different Members are coming forward with amendments, no one of which would probably destroy the act; but if all of them, or a substantial number of them were adopted, we would have no price control or stabilization in this country.

Why should the gentleman from Pennsylvania say that the number of attorneys in O. P. A. should be reduced 30 percent? Why should he not say 50 or 90 percent? What does he base his information on? Could he not also just as intelligently say that all departments in our Government should be reduced 30 or 90 percent, or that all Members of Congress should have their appropriations for office assistance reduced by the same amount? Such statements not based upon a knowledge and appraisal of the actual facts are calculated to do much harm. The Price Control Act should be considered from a nonpolitical standpoint. It involves too much for any one party to try to gain a political advantage by opposing it, or attempting to emasculate it in any way.

It Needs Looking Into

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have in hand an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of April 14, 1944, entitled "It Needs Looking Into," and I ask that this editorial be reproduced in full at this point:

IT NEEDS LOOKING INTO

Backed by the high prestige of General Arnold and the Army Air Forces, the Costello bill to commission as Army pilots the women members of the WASPS (Women's Airforce Service Pilots) was favorably reported by the House Military Affairs Committee and is now awaiting a hearing before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee very wisely is delaying its approval. There are a number of things about this WASP program that would stand more examination. The House Civil Service Investigating Committee, for one thing, has not completed its own inquiry, begun some time ago, as to the need and the heavy expense involved in the present organization.

The main question is why the Army Air Forces are doing away with the services of literally thousands of experienced civilian male pilots, which it used in its own pilot training program, and is taking on the WASPS—with the thought of increasing their number—for duties that these men, in the opinion of competent authorities, are well able to perform. Why should a young woman, after a hundred hours or so of training, be a better or more useful pilot for ferrying, target towing, etc., than men with thousands of hours of flying time, who have instructors' rating? Except for those needed for combat service in the ground forces, they are already available for the same type of auxiliary service that the WASPS are furnishing.

There is general praise for the spirit and the competence of the women flyers in the WASPS. But the manifest waste of trained pilots, the rather arbitrary treatment these men have suffered already at the hands of the Army Air Forces, the relatively high expense of training women pilots together with this gesture of setting up a separate female air force (instead of giving pilot training to WACS) suggests the need for a far more careful inquiry into the whole background of this plan than has been furnished up to this time. Certainly, the Rules Committee is well advised to take its time.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Service of the United States Army is headed by a brilliant and devoted disciple of aerial warfare, Assistant Secretary of War for Air Robert A. Lovett. Working alongside of the Assistant Secretary of War for Air is Lt. Gen. Henry H. Arnold who has literally given his life to development of the Air Force of the Army. It has been during the time of General Arnold as commanding general that the Air Force has grown from a few hundred planes to the hundreds of thousands of airplanes of every kind and description which comprises the greatest air armada that any nation has seen. Remarkable work has been done by these two high Army officials and those working with them, and, as a result, the war will be much shorter and many an American soldier will owe his life to the drive and the sustaining power of our Air Force.

In one respect, I feel that the Army Air Force has not measured up to the high standard of its history or its prestige. I refer to the war-training program; and more particularly to the 5,000 men who were taken into the Air Force voluntarily and were given training as pilots in the flying of planes.

Originally, some 14,000 men were recruited by the Civil Aeronautics Authority under a mandate from the War Department and were given civil aeronautics flying throughout the United States. At the outset, these men trained at their own expense, paying for their own food and other expenses. Many of them trained as much as 18 months and have had hundreds of hours flying in various types of planes.

In July of last year, the Civil Aeronautics training program was discontinued, and the Army then culled out thousands of these student flyers, releasing most of them from service. The remaining 4,800 men who were considered qualified were formally inducted into the United States Army and were sent to training camps throughout the country, with the understanding that when they completed pilot training they would be eligible for commissions in the Army. On January 15, 1944, these camps were closed down by the Army within just a few days of the graduation of many of these men. It is now impossible for them to finish the training course, the camps having been closed; and the Army proposes to commission some of these men, place others in the glider program, and the bulk of them it expects to use on work of a mechanical nature, including sheet-metal work.

The men are naturally discouraged. They have trained for many long months. They expected to be pilots and commissioned officers. Many of them are instructors and supervisors. They have hundreds of hours in the air. They are men of ability and standing with an ambition which our institutions encourage and which naturally springs from the heart of every American desiring to make a real record in his work. The action of the Army in closing down these camps when many of these men were within a few days of finishing the course has had the effect of removing the goal toward which they have worked and fought for many months, and it has taken their morale from them. I sincerely hope that the War Department will reconsider its pilot program and will give these men who are already trained and ready for real service to the Nation an opportunity of using the training laboriously given to them by the Government at great expense. They are entitled to this opportunity and to a commission as an officer in the Army when they have successfully completed their training.

Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Westmoreland Observer, of Greensburg, Pa.:

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL—NORTHERN REPUBLICANS PLAYING WITH FIRE IN SUPPORTING THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BILL

When the Congress reconvenes one of the first bills that will be dumped onto the floor is the anti-poll-tax bill, aimed solely at the Southern States. The bill is obviously unconstitutional, it is arousing wide resentment among our fellow citizens in the Southern States, and disunity throughout the country. And in the past when this bill was before another Congress its only result was the wasting of the valuable time of national legislature.

The bill is demagogic and naturally would have the backing of the New Deal administration, it is unquestionably Communist sponsored. So far, so what? In other words, what do we expect from the New Deal-Communist cabal?

Well there is a peculiarity and that is the Republican support it is receiving from a number of northern Republican Members, both Senators and Representatives.

Why do these Republicans, who expect to have as one of the principal planks in their 1944 platform the reaffirmation of the principles contained in, and absolute support of

the Constitution permit themselves to become cosponsors with the New Deal-Communist clique in pushing anti-poll-tax legislation at this time?

Do these Republicans think that they can get some of the Communist-labor element support away from their New Deal opponents this fall? A fat chance they will have of doing that. But they can rest assured that they will disgust and discourage a lot of thoughtful citizens, both in and out of labor, who may not consider it worth while to vote at all.

It seems to us sheer stupidity for Republican Members of Congress to permit themselves to become involved in this acrimonious, and highly explosive interparty Democrat brawl. Why don't the Republicans remain aloof from this matter and cling to the literal precept of the Constitution? Thus they have much to gain and absolutely nothing to lose, either individually or collectively.

It is a trite phrase that southerners would as soon vote for the devil as a Republican. This is not true, and the fact is borne out by not too distant history. The South bolted Al Smith in 1928 when the grievances were as nothing when compared to the studied insults which have been heaped upon the politicos of that section particularly during the fourth term. Are the Republicans so politically dumb as not to see the possibilities of such a policy?

Then there is another phase of this anti-poll-tax issue, and this, as likely as not, may be the real motive behind the New Deal-Communist move in precipitating this fight in Congress at this time, and that is to encourage the Congress to discredit itself in the eyes of the people by a prolonged and bitter debate over what is after all a rather minor matter, thus wasting precious time that ought to be applied to the vital affairs of the war and the coming peace, and the immediate problems which press upon Congress for relief of bureaucratic oppression of our citizenry.

The Republican Party licked itself in 1940; it can do it again in 1944.

Lease-Lend Rumors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of April 18, 1944:

LEASE-LEND RUMORS

It is always difficult to undo completely the mischief done by vicious gossip, mean and irresponsible rumors, and brazen insinuations and innuendoes carefully calculated to injure a man's reputation or besmirch an honest cause. Unfortunately, to some minds, the truth too often seems less appealing and exciting than its meretricious opposite, so that to nail down the latter and get rid of it permanently is by no means an easy task. The thing dies hard; it has more lives than a cat; it needs to be struck down not once but many times before it is finally buried and forgotten.

A notable case in point is the recurring spate of rumors about the operations of lease-lend. From time to time we have been told all sorts of nonsense in connection with this vital wartime pooling and reciprocal interchange of Allied resources, and from time to time the nonsense has been hit resoundingly on the head. But still, resuscitated and nourished in no small measure by Axis propagandists, it gets back in currency every now and then—so much so, in fact, that Leo T. Crowley, director of our Foreign Economics Administration, has just seen fit to make another frontal attack upon it in a special statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

There is, for instance, the old chestnut about how lease-lend money has been used to finance gay dinner parties thrown by Allied purchasing commissions. Nothing of the sort has ever happened. Indeed, according to Mr. Crowley, it could not possibly happen. Then there is the story about sending 50,000 refrigerators to England, presumably to let English housewives have them while American housewives went without. Actually, says Mr. Crowley, only 940 were sent and they were for distribution throughout the entire British Empire, to be used for storing perishable chemicals and foodstuffs in such establishments as hospitals.

Other lease-lend rumors of a potentially more dangerous and derisive kind include one to the effect that the Russians have transferred some American-made planes to the Japanese. This story—one of several of the same type circulated by Tokyo broadcasts—is completely false, as is also the story that Red Army men use our butter to grease their boots. Similiarly vicious are the reports that the British remove our labels from the goods we send them, substitute their own, and then transship the material to other countries, taking the credit that rightfully belongs to us. The British have heard that we do the same thing with what they deliver to us, the guileful Axis radio simultaneously beaming the anti-American version to Britain and the anti-English version to the United States. Nothing is too self-contradictory for the versatile Dr. Goebbels.

Mr. Crowley renders a genuine service to truth and to Allied unity in wielding the ax against these and other trouble-making falsehoods, and his action is especially timely because Congress must soon vote to continue the lease-lend authority for another year.

Simplification of Tax Reports

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reports have appeared in the press recently stating that the Ways and Means Committee has for several weeks been considering legislation to simplify income-tax reports. Of course, these reports should be simplified. There is no question about it. The people of the country demand it. They should not have been permitted to become so complicated and confusing in the first place. Neither should so many reports be required.

I am asking the Ways and Means Committee of the House to hold open hearings on this legislation so Members of Congress and others interested may have a chance to express their views and offer suggestions.

I have confidence in the membership of this great committee, but it must be observed that when the Ways and Means Committee brings legislation to the House it comes under a closed rule. Members are not permitted under such rule to offer amendments. Members of the committee insist it is the only way to handle the situation. As I have said, we are all in favor of simplifying tax returns. I see no reason either why some 40,000,000 people who receive salary and wage incomes should be required to file reports or why those who do file them should furnish 3 or 4 additional reports during the year. Furthermore, if we are going to enact such legislation—and we certainly ought to do it—then it should be made effective right away and not wait until the end of the year.

The committee is to be commended for its industry and perseverance. It must be remembered, too, that we followed this great committee in supporting legislation that resulted in a lot of complications and confusion. Much of the complication, of course, came about because the committee and Members of Congress were anxious to collect taxes from every source available and try, at the same time, to be equitable.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the Ways and Means Committee has had this matter under consideration for 2 or 3 months. It seems to me that during that time, or even now, it would be good policy to hold hearings on this question. It is an important matter and one in which the entire public is deeply interested and concerned.

Soldiers Fed Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, Wednesday, April 19. It is an interview with the gentleman from Michigan, PAUL SHAFER, an able and highly regarded member of the House Committee on Military Affairs:

SOLDIERS FED PROPAGANDA, SAYS REPRESENTATIVE SHAFER

(By Walter Trohan)

Representative SHAFER, Republican, of Michigan, ranking member of the House Military Affairs Committee, yesterday announced he will call on the committee to investigate New Deal political propagandizing in the Army.

The Michigan Congressman said he had received a number of letters from members of the armed services protesting slurs against Americanism and the Republican Party and promotion of foreigners and the fourth term.

SOLDIERS FED NEW DEALISM

"The pattern of propaganda for the New Deal and the fourth terms is at last becoming clearly defined," SHAFER said. "It has, in fact, become a major military activity.

"Soldiers have even been sent off to battle improperly trained and inefficiently com-

manded, but the Army has found time to cram enlisted men and officers alike with internationalism. The men may not know how to shoot properly, but they should be able to spout at length about the New Deal new world order.

"From the day of induction the recruit is fed New Dealism and foreignism at orientation talks and through various courses at Army schools. And the propaganda mills grind out bales of material for his leisure hours."

PROPAGANDA MOVIES TOO

"Soldier reading is heavily larded with administration propaganda in official, semiofficial and private publications. Movies of the documentary type are loaded to the sound track with propaganda.

"Worse than all of this is political persecution, sly and open, of those who oppose the New Deal and its rush toward dictatorship not less vicious than what the soldier is being trained to fight abroad."

SHAFER said he had letters to support his charges. He said he will take precautions to protect the identity of the writers in any investigation by the House committee so that they will not suffer New Deal reprisals.

QUESTIONED ABOUT HIS VOTE

One of the letters from an Iowa soldier told of being questioned about his voting by Army Intelligence.

"I was one of the few soldiers who voted in the elections in Iowa by means of the absentee ballot," he wrote. "Prior to the date of voting I was called to the intelligence officer and the first question he asked me was:

"'Did you make a remark in the barracks that you were going to vote only for those candidates who were isolationists in Iowa?' (I cannot quote his exact words, however.)"

Several soldiers have written to tell how they were hauled up before their commanding officers and asked if they were ever members of America First, pre-Pearl Harbor organization opposed to intervention. Many who answered in the affirmative feel that they were marked for heavy work details.

POKES FUN AT ISOLATIONISTS

All soldiers, said SHAFER, are forced to see an alleged orientation film, "Prelude to War," which makes fun of isolationists. Soldiers write, he said, that they wish that they could spend as much time on the rifle range as they have been forced to spend in seeing this film so that they could be more fit for battle.

Many soldiers complain against ridiculing of Republicans in so-called orientation lectures. They add that they have found that it does not pay to fight back.

SHAFER recalled that in a recent orientation talk to draftees, a naval petty officer smeared Representative HOFFMAN (Republican), of Michigan, after he learned that most of the 600 draftees before him came from the Congressman's district.

CALLS IT TERRIFYING

"This is but a small part of the picture," SHAFER said. "The extent of this calculated war against the mind of the American soldier is terrifying. One gets the impression that it is far more important to the New Dealers than the war against Hitler or Hirohito.

"I believe the committee should seek to find out how much of this is dictated from Washington and how much is due to New Deal officers. I am certain that New Deal officers could not plug for the cause if they were not encouraged by the New Dealers in Washington.

"The committee should also propose effective measures to halt this un-American procedure."

James Buchanan, Fifteenth President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Arthur Cornwall, yeoman, second class, United States Naval Reserve:

James Buchanan, the only President of the United States who died a bachelor, was born 153 years ago at a place called Stony Batter in Franklin County, Pa., at the foot of the eastern ridge of the Alleghenies.

President Buchanan's father, James, was a native of the county of Donegal, in the north of Ireland, who emigrated to the United States in 1783. He was a poor man when he came to America, but through industry and perseverance he acquired considerable property. Five years after his arrival he married Elizabeth Speer, of Adams County, Pa. He and his young wife became pioneers in American civilization, and they built a rude log cabin where James Buchanan, Pennsylvania's only United States President, was born on April 23, 1791.

The pioneer Buchanan was a prominent man in his county and exercised a large share of influence. He had an excellent English education, and so fully understood the advantages to be derived from one of a more liberal character, that he early resolved that his son should receive it. The mother of President Buchanan was a woman of strong mental ability, and although she had not enjoyed the advantages of a superior education, she was distinguished for her intelligence and remarkable literary taste. To his mother's influence, the President was greatly indebted.

In 1798, the Buchanans moved to the village of Mercersburg, where young James received his early education in English, Latin, and Greek. His progress in his studies was exceedingly rapid, and he entered Dickinson College at Carlisle, when he was 14. He immediately took rank among the most outstanding students. He, therefore, rose rapidly in the estimation of his teachers and his fellow pupils. He graduated in 1809, at the age of 18.

At this period of his life, President Buchanan was tall, slender, and graceful. So dextrous was he with his rifle that, like a true backwoodsman, he considered it a disgrace to go home with squirrels or similar game, unless the ball had been sent with unerring precision directly through the head.

There can be no doubt that his vigorous, early training had been the means of giving him that wonderful endurance, which so remarkably distinguished him in after life as a public man.

In December 1809 James Buchanan commenced the study of law in the office of James Hopkins, Esq., of Lancaster, and was admitted to the bar November 17, 1812, when he was a little over 21 years old. He immediately rose rapidly in his profession. From the day he was admitted to the bar until he finally retired from the legal profession, his was a series of successive triumphs. He was poor, and necessity demanded that exertion which soon made him the rival and equal of the best lawyers in Pennsylvania.

He retired in 1831, having accumulated a competence by his steady devotion to business and the superiority in his profession, which his commanding talents had given him. Thus the log-cabin boy, born in a wild rocky gorge of the Allegheny Mountains, at the early age of 40 years, was the architect of his own fortune, and he became the admiration and pride of his native State.

Only once after he left his profession could he be prevailed upon to again appear at the bar. This was in the cause of an aged widow. It was an action of ejectment which involved all her little property. The case was a difficult one and, technically, decidedly against the unfortunate woman. To the surprise and astonishment of everyone, he succeeded in establishing her title to the property in question. The poor woman was overjoyed and overwhelmed her benefactor with expressions of gratefulness, and offers of remuneration. He, however, would accept nothing for his services.

In the War of 1812 he enrolled as a private soldier, and his company was commanded by Judge Henry Shippen. They marched to Baltimore and served under the command of Maj. Charles S. Ridgeley until they were honorably discharged.

He was elected to the Seventeenth Congress in the fall of 1820, and took his seat in 1821. This was immediately succeeding the stormy session of 1820, when the difficulties in regard to the admission of Missouri had been adjusted by the adoption of the first concession ever made to the anti-slavery or abolition sentiment of the country.

Congressman Buchanan quickly took rank among the most industrious and capable Members of the House, which was composed of the ever memorable names of McDuffie, Joel R. Poinsett, John Randolph, Philip P. Barbour, Andrew Stevenson, Louis McLane, and others equally distinguished.

The first set speech which Mr. Buchanan delivered in Congress was upon a bill making appropriations to the military for some deficiencies that had occurred in the Indian Department.

In the Eighteenth Congress, which convened on December 1, 1823, Congressman Buchanan had as colleagues Daniel Webster of Massachusetts and Henry Clay of Kentucky.

He was a close friend, admirer, and ardent supporter of Gen. Andrew Jackson, who was elected President in 1808. Through all the storms of detraction and abuse which were poured upon President Jackson, as no man had ever before been assailed in this country, Mr. Buchanan stood his firm, unwavering friend. However, Jackson and his loyal friends triumphed over every obstacle and inaugurated the most glorious democratic administration since the days of Thomas Jefferson.

At the close of this session, March 3, 1831, James Buchanan voluntarily retired from Congress. He had been a constant Member since 1821.

Ten successive years of active service in the popular branch of the National Legislature necessarily gives a man a thorough acquaintance with the details of legislation, and if he be an individual of even ordinary sagacity he must be qualified for more responsible positions

It is not too much to say that President Buchanan won his position in the affection of the people by the laborious industry of a long life devoted to their interests, and by the possession of those qualities both of head and heart, which qualified him for retaining, in so remarkable a degree, their confidence.

Shortly after Mr. Buchanan retired from Congress he was honored by President Andrew Jackson with the appointment as Minister to Russia. For 3 years he filled this important position with distinction.

After his return from Russia in 1833 he was elected to fill the vacancy in the United States Senate caused by the resignation of Judge Wilkins. He took his seat on December 15, 1834.

He had left Congress just as the storm, which the rigid principles of General Jackson inaugurated, had been raised. He was destined to return to the theater of his duties in time to come to the rescue of his early friend, and bear a part in the memorable struggles that the democracy encountered during his administration.

Senator Buchanan entered the Senate when Clay, Webster, and John C. Calhoun were the mighty intellects which swayed that body, and he immediately took rank among them as a debater, whose blows, if not so brilliant in style, were even more effectual in execution. There is one feature of Mr. Buchanan's speeches which is very remarkable. It is the absence of all display, of all attempts to benefit his cause by any of those adventitious aids which oratory furnishes. He appealed to common sense rather than to fancy or imagination and adhered strictly to plain, yet graceful and elegant language.

He was our ambassador to the Court of St. James for 3 years, and was appointed Secretary of State in 1844 by President James K. Polk, serving for 4 years.

Upon all public questions Mr. Buchanan was awarded a leading part. We find him the Senator chosen to present the resolution for the admission of Arkansas, the champion of democracy in the debate with Henry Clay upon the bank question, and for several years the head of the most important committee of the Senate, that on foreign relations. Upon our relations with Mexico he early took a stand which was at last found necessary to be adopted in order to vindicate our rights. As Secretary of State he was a leader in the acquisition of California, the annexation of Texas, and other valuable and important matters.

March 4, 1857, James Buchanan was inaugurated President of the United States. He was 65 years old and had had 40 years in the legislative, executive, and diplomatic service. When he took office it was perhaps the most perplexing period of our history. Only a great leader might have succeeded in those most difficult times.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt described Mr. Buchanan as "a man who bore with high sense of conscience the trying responsibilities resting upon him in perhaps the most perplexing period of our history."

The Dred Scott decision came 2 days after his inauguration, when the Supreme Court held that all compromises were unlawful, that all political agitation for the restriction of slavery was in vain and that an owner had the same rights to take a drove of slaves, as a drove of horses, into any State of the Union.

The fire of the Civil War had already been kindled in Kansas and it continued to sputter throughout his term as President. At last, it exploded a blast close to Washington, D. C., when John Brown carried the Kansan war to Harpers Ferry, in the wild dream of inciting the slaves themselves, to rise in revolt against their masters.

During this administration the first ocean submarine telegraphic cable was used, when from England Queen Victoria greeted President Buchanan. He assembled the members of his Cabinet for this occasion. However, later the cable broke and no messages were sent under the sea for 8 years.

Secession was the talk in 1860, and President Buchanan expressed himself as bitterly opposed to such action. Although he held that the Government had no authority to keep a State in the Union by coercion, he denied that the States had any right or just cause to secede, and he ordered the commanders of southern forts to defend them. President Lincoln continued that policy, absolutely, without change, when he became President.

Slavery was entrenched behind a wire entanglement of constitutional dogmas, court decisions, and legalistic technicalities.

When the first State seceded from the Union President Buchanan was only within 2½ months of the end of his term. Congress was hostile and the country irresolute. As he saw the Union falling to pieces he hoped that it could be patched up again by another old-fashioned compromise.

Ex-President Hoover said of President Buchanan: "He was the last outstanding figure surviving one of the most remarkable groups of men in our history. He played his part with dignity and courage that only now are assuming the recognition they deserve."

One of the strongest traits in Mr. Buchanan's personal life was the hold he had upon the affections of the people among whom he lived. He was a gentleman of unblemished personal integrity and unusually agreeable manners in his social intercourse with all classes.

He lived at Wheatland, once a large farm noted for its yield of the cereal which conferred its name, now reduced to a few acres in the suburbs of Lancaster. It is a beautifully and carefully preserved estate. The red brick, three-storied house stands about halfway up a gently rising ground, and has a wide lawn stretching down to the street, shaded by oaks, elms, and larches, interspersed with evergreens.

The style of the furnishings and furniture is solid, comfortable, and dignified, without show.

Wheatland was originally built in 1828 by William Jenkins, who sold it to William Morris Meredith in 1845. Buchanan purchased it 3 years later from Mr. Meredith for $6,750.

After the nomination of Mr. Buchanan to the Presidency on June 9, 1856, Wheatland became a busy place. It was literally the Presidential campaign headquarters and the house was always filled with guests of national prominence. From its veranda Mr. Buchanan conducted the first front-porch campaign in American political history.

President Buchanan, the fifteenth President of the United States, spent his declining years in the peace and coolness of Wheatland with his niece, Harriet Lane, who married Henry E. Johnston, of Baltimore. She was said to have been the loveliest mistress the White House has ever known. She was the daughter of the President's sister, Jane, who married Elliott T. Lane, a native of Virginia. Harriet Johnston was a tall blond with violet eyes. Her mother and father died when she was quite young, and she made her home with her uncle, and was with him in his career here as well as in Russia and England.

President Buchanan died in Lancaster, Pa., June 1, 1868, of rheumatic gout. His remains lie in beautiful Woodward Hill cemetery in the city of Lancaster, beneath a simple monument, which records only the date of his birth and of his death and the fact that he was the fifteenth President of the United States.

It is well that the soil of Pennsylvania holds his ashes, for he is the most eminent statesman yet given by the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the service of the country since the Constitution of the United States was established.

United Nations Cast Adrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that mystical and vague organization called the United Nations, which has been used as the clothesrack on which to hang the habiliments of high-sounding platitudes and beautiful ideals has now become more vague than ever before. It is little wonder the American people are confused about the issues of the war; about the aims of the different allies; and about the methods by which those aims are to be realized, if they are to be realized at all.

For your information, it is necessary to trace the origin of this entity called the United Nations and the modus operandi by which it is supposed to have been set up and brought into being.

Thirty-five nations became signatories, or later agreed to what has been known as the United Nations Declaration of January 1, 1942. The list is headed by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. The essence, the soul, the substance of the United Nations Declaration lay in the Atlantic Charter as agreed to, and promulgated to the world by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain on August 14, 1941. The Atlantic Charter was the preamble of the United Nations agreement. Later the organization known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was set up. That organization hangs upon the United Nations as assembled under the original declaration of January 1, 1942, which I have just mentioned.

The United States Congress has already authorized $1,350,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, which is the major share of all the moneys to be put into the original fund of this U. N. R. R. A. You should be aware of the fact that this first authorization actually is only the beginning of what will be a succession of authorizations and appropriations, if the American people do not call a halt on the efforts of U. N. R. R. A. to make them pay for the rehabilitation of all the rest of the war-devastated world, friend and enemy alike.

At this point, it ought to be said that the American people are the most generous-hearted people in the world. Throughout our history, we always have been ready and eager to aid other peoples when disaster has overtaken them. We have done this on occasions of earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, epidemics, and wars. We did it following the First World War. We carried the major part of the load of feeding the starving, friend and foe, in and following the last war under the direction of Herbert Hoover. These activities were paid for by the American people. We are ready to do the

same following this war. That is why it is all the more reprehensible that the people should be fooled and defrauded as seems to be the situation at this time.

Now keeping in mind that the Atlantic Charter, which was foisted upon the world and propagandized as the great aim of all the allies, as the banner under which the civilized nations of the world were assembled to beat down barbarism, bestiality, and aggression, was the essence of the agreement between the nations which caused them to become an aggregation known as the United Nations, ask yourselves what must now be the situation since the Atlantic Charter has been repudiated by one, ignored by another, and neglected by a third of the three leading signatories to the compact.

Time was, not so long ago, when Mr. Roosevelt could scarcely have a press conference, a fireside chat, or a message of any character that did not include some reference to the Atlantic Charter and its noble sentiments. For the last several weeks, Mr. Roosevelt has been strangely silent about the Atlantic Charter. Apparently, like the slogan of the "New Deal," he wants it ignored and buried in forgetfulness.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill, of the British Government, recently told the Parliament bluntly that the Atlantic Charter does not mean what we were led by Mr. Roosevelt to believe it meant. On March 22 he said to the British Parliament:

> It is evident that, as the changing phases of the war succeed one another, some further clarification will be required of the position under the document which has become honorably known as the Atlantic Charter, and that this must be the subject for renewed consultation between te principal allies.

Joseph Stalin, the master of Russia, has never had anything to say about the Atlantic Charter. He has maintained a grim-lipped silence.

The London Times, which is the unofficial organ of the British Foreign Office, on March 20 carried an amazing editorial in which the following statement was unequivocally made:

> Whatever may have been true in past centuries, the division of Europe today in 20 to 30 sovereign independent units, owing no allegiance to any higher authority, is incompatible with the military security and economic well-being of the European peoples. This is a hard, irrefutable fact. To attempt to override it on the grounds of any general theory of self-determination would be an act not of high political principle but of political madness.

Again we are compelled to ask ourselves what, in the face of these facts, has become of the Atlantic Charter? It is obvious that it has been repudiated. It is obvious that it was never accepted by our allies as a definite, genuine, honest statement of their war aims.

Now, when a contract is entered into either by individuals or nations, and that contract is based upon a stated preamble, and it is agreed upon in order to carry out the objectives of the preamble, what happens to the organization when the preamble to its agreement is ruthlessly and callously tossed out the window by one or more of the chief signatories? It is obvious, of course, that the agreement has gone by the board, and that the organization, the United Nations, has been disrupted, blown up, repudiated, and no longer actually exists as an organization bound together by a solemn agreement.

What, then, under this condition of affairs, happens to the other organizations of which all but a few of the signatories were partners in the United Nations agreement under the Atlantic Charter? As a matter of fact, its objectives are gone. The money authorized—the American people's money authorized and the assistance being given without their knowledge under lend-lease are now being given to nations who are in no sense bound by the war aims set forth in the Atlantic Charter. I think you will agree with me that this is a shocking condition of affairs.

There can be no question but that the ideals of the Atlantic Charter are still enshrined in the hearts of the American people. We are going ahead, of course, to fight this war to a finish because of our high ideals; because of our generous impulses; because the civilization itself, which the American people cherish in their hearts, is in peril.

These developments, however, have made it crystal clear that the American people and their Congress must demand more honesty and frankness on the part of the administration. In the face of this shocking and unprecedented abuse of the people's confidence, this monstrous pretense shrouded in the habiliments of noble sentiments and high ideals, and used to befool the right-thinking people of the world, it becomes imperative that the American people demand of their Congress and of their administration, facts and not fairy tales; information and not excuses; truth and not evasions; honesty instead of dissemblance concerning this war, and what the other nations have as their aims in fighting this war.

The aims of the other nations are vital to this Nation, just as our war aims are vital to them. It must be perfectly clear to any thinking person that we cannot possibly plan a sound and successful post-war policy without and until we know the actual war aims of all the other nations. We cannot intelligently participate in any peace settlement without and until we know the war aims of our allies.

It can make no difference now in our attitude toward the war if we find that these war aims of our allies are not at all what we were led to believe they were. But it can make all the difference in the world—the difference between success and failure—in our own difficult readjustment to peace, and in our own readjustment in the post-war world, for us to know actually what the war aims of our allies really are.

It has become perfectly clear that the New Deal administration does not intend to tell the American people the facts about this war, or the facts about the war aims of our allies. It has become equally clear that the New Deal administration still insists on regarding this as its own private war; that it regards our foreign policy as its own private foreign policy; that it has a contempt for the rights of the American people to know about these matters, and that it means to increase its controls over the people, their lives and activities; that it means to continue those controls in its own clutches as long as possible after this war is ended; that it is playing a desperate game of world power politics in which our public officials are novices compared to the British and the Russians, and that it intends to try to purchase power at the expense of the American people.

The people will not stand for this. They ought not to stand for it. I say to you, frankly, that only a change of administration will save our constitutional Government and our Bill of Rights from disaster later on.

We must be vigilant; we must be earnest; we must be courageous, and we must not be fooled.

Post-War Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Albany, April 12, 1944.

Hon. DEAN P. TAYLOR, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAYLOR: I address you concerning the above-entitled bill, now in the House Committee on Roads, and want you to know what its effect will be on the State of New York.

The bill seeks to provide $1,000,000,000 a year for 3 years for the several States for the ostensible purpose of improving highways and assisting in the relief of post-war unemployment. Unlike highway bills generally, it covers a 3-year period and is not part of the continuing Federal-aid program.

It is my measured judgment that this bill, if reported out in its present form and passed, will not be beneficial to the State of New York or its people. The reasons for my position are four:

1. The formula for distribution does not reflect either the highway improvement needs nor the requirements for unemployment relief.

2. The method of matching places an inadequate share on the States and is conducive to insufficient evaluation of the merits.

3. The formula for distribution within the States does not coordinate the urban and rural needs in New York.

4. The size of the appropriation exaggerates all defects.

On March 24, 1944, I appeared before the Committee on Roads in opposition to this bill. I then made a brief statement which

I believe clearly describes the defects of this bill. I enclose a copy of my statement for your consideration.

I believe that when you have examined my statement in connection with the bill you will conclude that the bill is not to the advantage of the State of New York nor any section or subdivision of it, and its passage will not benefit but will harm our State.

I will be very happy to discuss with you, or a representative of your office, the views of this department upon this bill at your convenience. I also want to assure you that I will be glad to analyze and advise with you about any proposed amendments.

I also want to tell you of the care and courtesy with which the Committee on Roads has dealt with both the proponents and opponents of this legislation.

I take this opportunity of bespeaking your cooperation and support.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. H. SELLS,
Superintendent of Public Works.

Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Pioneer:

Americans of Rumanian descent are primarily concerned with the fate and fortune of the United States of America. Most of those who were born abroad have long ago made it their choice to become American citizens.

Their American-born children are valiantly serving in the United States armed forces. Those who are home are working hard and uncomplainingly in the various war factories. They are among the first to invest in War bonds, to donate to the Red Cross, U. S. O., and other patriotic agencies.

The young men and women of Rumanian descent who are serving in the various branches of the armed forces are the best reminders to everyone that the only country that really matters in the heart and mind of Americans of Rumanian descent is the United States of America.

This, however, does not prevent a feeling of sympathy toward the people whom we left in the old country. This feeling comes to the surface especially in times of suffering and misfortune.

To say that the people of Rumania today are suffering and that they are unfortunate is to put it quite mildly. The ill-fated and unpopular decision of the Rumanian Government to place the Rumanian people on the side of the Axis could bring nothing but more misery and unhappiness to the Rumanian people in Rumania.

We hope and pray that Rumania will be soon out of the war and that post-war Rumania will bring freedom and justice to the Rumanian peasant.

We know the intrinsic goodness of the Rumanian peasant's mind and heart, we know how hard he must work to live, for most of us in America come from the peasantry. We have seen what the corruption of the unscrupulous politicians has brought upon the entire Rumanian Nation.

We who are fortunate enough to live in the United States have experienced, more than we ever had hoped for, the blessings of freedom and justice and the fruits of opportunity for all, regardless of nationality, background, and religion. It is natural that we wish that the people of post-war Rumania in arranging their future take their cue from the United States of America.

We know that any discrimination and intolerance toward the Jews or any other racial or religious group is not only wrong and unjust but also unworthy of a people with so many good qualities as the Rumanians have.

Because we know what they mean to us and to our children, because without them we never could have participated in American life, because we feel that without them life would have little meaning, we sincerely hope that whatever form their future government may take, the people of Rumania, as well as of the other countries of Europe, should have complete freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom from fear, freedom from intolerance, and freedom from want.

Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the House the following editorial in the April 14 issue of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, published in New York City:

"GENERALLY" FAIR PRICES

Price Administrator Chester Bowles has advanced a strong case against the proposed amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act to eliminate the word "generally" from the provision which requires the Price Administrator to establish "fair and equitable" maximum prices under the law.

In every industry and trade costs of production and distribution vary greatly among competitors. It is not always feasible to set price ceilings so high as to assure every seller a profit. If every ceiling price must yield a profit to the marginal producer or distributor in each case, sellers who operate more efficiently or more economically than the marginal concern might make larger profits than they require or want.

Normally, the low-cost seller will be content with a fair profit, reducing his price and underselling marginal competitors in order to expand his sales volume. Under the abnormal conditions prevailing in wartime, this competitive pressure for lower prices may not operate. Hence, if ceilings should be generally lifted to take care of marginal sellers, the way could be opened for a number of price increases. There can be no certainty, of course, that low-cost producers would raise their prices even if ceilings were lifted to cover the highest cost producer, but the risk that this would be so should not be run in a period of emergency.

During the First World War, the bulk-line level of costs was used. Maximum prices were set so as to yield a profit to the large majority of producers or distributors in an industry. The application of this formula tended to lift many prices from the previously existing level.

The basic principle of the Emergency Price Control Act is to freeze prices generally at a historic level, rather than to revise the price structure to conform to any one cost or profit formula. However, to avoid inequities and to prevent the drying up of production of many commodities because they could be produced or sold at a loss, the Emergency Price Control Act specifies that prices shall be "generally fair and equitable." This language does not make it necessary that each price cover the costs of every single producer or distributor.

An amendment of the law that would place the burden of the proof upon the Price Administrator to show that each price ceiling is profitable for each vendor could jeopardize the future of price control by opening the way to an endless succession of increases in individual ceilings.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extent my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

With a guilty conscience and occasional nervous glances over the shoulder to make sure that one of J. Edgar Hoover's boys wasn't lurking behind the file cabinet, we have been perusing an absorbing document, bearing that omnious Government warning in red letters: "Restricted."

What's restricted in this case is a history of the United States of America, written and published by the worthy Office of War Information. The volume is formally restricted by O. W. I. imprimatur and cannot be distributed or sold among tax-paying citizens residing in the United States. And we think this is very wise on the part of the O. W. I. Because if their Handbook of the United States of America got general distribution here there would be a howl to Congress which might well boot the O. W. I. out of its present overseas propaganda campaign to put across the New Deal at next November's elections.

But the new edition, 178 pages of history, has been placed in the hands of all of O. W. I.'s overseas staff. And thanks to the enterprise of a British publishing house it will be made available to all United States servicemen in the British Isles, who, before voting next November, would like to brush up on American history as seen through the eyes of Dr. Elmer Davis (late history student at Queens College, Oxford, and present director of O. W. I.) and his colleagues, including Broadway Playwright Bob Sherwood, head of O. W. I.'s overseas propaganda bureau.

Incidentally, the O. W. I. historians who forget to mention that such persons as Paul Revere ever existed or that a gentleman by the name of George Washington led rebellious Americans against the forces of Britain, or that Thomas Jefferson ever lived, didn't pass over the name of old "Massa" Bob Sherwood, who ordered the volume printed at Government expense.

In the section devoted to belles lettres, the savants on the O. W. I. pay roll modestly point out that Robert E. Sherwood "has been a spokesman for democratic ideals in Idiot's Delight and Abe Lincoln in Illinois. And that other pet playwright of O. W. I., Maxwell Anderson, also gets a good international boost at public expense (after all the Sherwood and Anderson plays are bidding for London trade).

Of Anderson, the historians solemnly note "his poetic dramas, like Winterset, Candle in the Wind, have been courageous. His war play, The Eve of St. Mark, has been called Anderson's best. * * * American theater has geared itself to war. Its current plays carry on the war against fascism, interpret the Nation at war, or serve as dramatic statements of war aims and ideals."

We don't like to make any nasty cracks, but lines like those quoted arouse the snide suspicion that O. W. I. Overseas Director Sherwood might be giving an approving nod to the blurbs of Press Agent Bob Sherwood plugging the output of Broadway Playwright Sherwood. We don't know of course, but we do know that it's all done at Government expense in the name of patriotism.

Now, the worthy Members of Congress, who are being implored by Franklin D. Roosevelt, to pony up a neat increase of $25,000,000 over the present allotment for overseas propaganda work, are not particularly irritated about the O. W. I.'s press agent blurbs.

They are not immediately concerned over the fact that from a standpoint of factual history of the United States, the whole O. W. I. jumble is so much fantastic screwball rubbish.

Had the O. W. I.'s Handbook of the United States been written by a child in the seventh grade he would be properly classed as a backward child. Had it been read by Henry Ford, the manufacturer would be justified in uttering the famous phrase "history is bunk."

But what makes the G. O. P. lawmakers, such as Representative TABER, of New York, sore, is the unashamed, bold use of public funds for Roosevelt fourth-term campaign propaganda.

So-o-o expect a merry session on the hill. And if O. W. I. history pundits are placed on the witness stand before a House committee and examined on their scholarship, the belly laughs should relieve the invasion-taut nerves of the Capitol.

The original O. W. I. Handbook of the United States was tossed off in a 400-page edition. Only 5,000 copies were printed at a Government printing charge of only $4,639. These were quietly shipped out of the country.

Last January came the present revised edition with the material slightly revised, contained in the larger format of 178 pages. Cost of this is as yet unknown, but Congress will find out. The British publishers are placing their cloth-covered edition on the market at 10 shilling 6 pence, about $2 in American money. All copies bear the official O. W. I.' seal and the announcement that the volume contains "pertinent information about the United States of America and the war for use overseas" and has been issued by "the overseas branch of the Office of War Information."

In the revised edition only eight columns are required to tell the tale of the Republic from Lief Ericson's discovery in 1000 to the inauguration of F. D. R. and the New Deal.

The O. W. I. historians of the United States skipped rather breathlessly over the B. R. (before Roosevelt) dark ages of our Nation, but when they got down to F. D. R.'s entry into the White House—boy, oh boy. They spit on their hands and really go to town. They cut loose for 22 solid columns of hosannahs in an ecstatic chronological chant of the words and deeds of the New Deal leader.

Somehow or other the boys left out the Constitution of the United States in their history. It didn't make the grade, but they did get in the preamble, however, the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Wilson's Fourteen Points and—here comes the really important utterances—the Declaration of the United Nations, the Atlantic Charter, the Four Freedoms, the Moscow Conference Declaration, and the statement signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin regarding atrocities.

O. W. I. experts probably figured that Washington's Farewell Address or Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" oration didn't place in that company.

Nice Going, Medico!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article by J. Norman Lodge, which appeared recently in the American Legion Magazine. Mr. Lodge is a war correspondent from Methuen, Mass.; he has had wide experience and has covered the various war fronts for several years:

NICE GOING, MEDICO

(By J. Norman Lodge)

Japanese bombs were raining down on Rendova Island. Death and desolation, the war god's premium exacted as penalty for modern warfare, was all about.

Dead and dying—viciously wounded men groaning in the slime of the coral thoroughly wetted down by continuous rain. Orders were being barked by those in command. Discipline was sorely taxed in that terrible moment that lasts a lifetime after such a pattern bombing.

Then from the welter of ruined tents, from the bomb craters, from the hillside foxholes, "messengers of the gods," noncombatants all, began their work. Bandages, splints, morphine syrettes, plasma, and other medical supplies were carried to the wounded and order came from the chaos of a moment before.

One may talk of deeds of derring-do. One may laud the Air Force, one may talk of the marine raider, of the machine gunner and of the submarine sailor. They all deserve all the mention they get, but in my book the fellow with the guts, the fellow who receives little mention for his work in the war, is the one who wears the caduceus of the Medical Corps. Noncombatants, unarmed, in the thick of the bombing or the front-line fighting they crawl out into the vastness of the jungle night to save a buddy, to administer under withering fire the life blood from the plasma bank.

There are others, too, listed as noncombatants—chaplains, for instance—but that is another story. This is strictly about the "messengers of the gods," so named because their caduceus—the twining serpents surmounted by the wings of Mercury, translated means exactly that.

I've seen them when the action was thickest, in the jungles, on bomb-strewn fields, aboard ships, and in the field and base hospitals.

I have seen their sketchy shelters attacked and I have seen them killed. And I have never seen a man, enlisted or officer, wearing the medical insignia who turned coward in the face of enemy attacks.

Away back in the gruesome days of Guadalcanal, when we were storming Mount Austen, when we were on the Matanikau or on the bloody river Teneru, medical men made military history with their magnificent work under fire.

Aboard the destroyers, in the air, under the sea, and in the tangled jungles of New Georgia, Rendova, and Vella Lavella, I have jotted down note after note, not of the Marine private who drove away the fanatical Jap, not of the pilot who waded into too many Zeros, not of the antiaircraft gunner knocking Jap planes out of the sky and not of the raider tracking down an enemy outpost, but of the unarmed, lawful nonbelligerent, noncombatant lad wearing the twining serpents, staff and wings of the Medical Corps.

Lt. Nicholas T. Kliebert of Detroit, the officer in charge of a water hole on New Georgia during the 37 days of horror that the storming of Munda airport was, has this to say about them:

"Sergeants Harry Jeliotti of Bridgeport, Conn., and Joseph Petrosky, of New Haven in the same State, the medical men with us, were the bravest lads I ever saw."

That was just after 300 fanatical Japs had attacked one of our litter columns in the jungles of New Georgia. Storming in on the column in charge of 11 medical corpsmen, they knocked our wounded men from their litters, used bayonets on some, machetes on others, and for several hours sated themselves with gory deeds to the greater shame of anything Japanese.

Kliebert with four others happened on the melee and before their night's work was done 175 Japs paid with their lives for the carnage they had wrought. But, during the donnybrook, Jeliotti and Petrosky, with their nine corpsmen, escorted the ambulatory wounded to foxholes across the small stream; got out at least 35 litter cases. Those men, already wounded and then wounded again by the sadistic Japs, were treated on the spot with whatever the medical men were able to round up.

Not once did any one of the medical corpsmen think of himself. Not once did one slither away in the jungle blackness to safety. And although no one of them was armed, each made repeated trips back into the orgy to bring out wounded to safety.

I recall the night we went up the slot to the Paruso River on Vella Lavella to bring out 157 survivors of the gallant cruiser *Helena*. I was aboard one of the rescue craft—an old four-piper of World War No. 1—now sporting but two stacks and renamed an A. P. D. (Army Personnel Destroyer).

Aboard was Lt. Lewis Kirchhofer, of Philadelphia. As we took aboard our human cargo, shipwrecked for 8 days, Dr. Kirchhofer started to work. It was just past midnight. He had but the tiny wardroom of the small destroyer and the crew quarters in which to work. But from the moment we took aboard the first survivor, Ensign George Bauswine, of Cincinnati, until the last men were picked up further down the island, Kirchhofer dressed the wounded, those suffering brutal coral cuts, and reduced fractures.

Among the *Helena* survivors was one lad with both legs broken. Another had a smashed hip. They were given treatment, as was another poor lad who had one of the worst compound fractures I have ever seen. Kirchhofer, single handed, worked the entire long trip back to Tulagi, then supervised the transfer of the worn-out lads to the base hospital there.

Ensign Bauswine told me that night in talking of the fracture cases: "Thanks to the excellent medical aid by our corpsman, J. G. Layton, of Roxton, Tex., all three still have their limbs." Layton later was recommended for the Navy Cross by Commander John Chew, executive officer of the *Helena*.

Those are not isolated instances. In fact they are some of the lesser deeds performed by medical men. And the same holds true all down the line. The nurses aboard the naval hospital ships, the Army nurses flying the C–47 hospital airplanes, the corpsmen in the various base hospitals at the rear echelons, and the unarmed lad, medical aid kit slung over his shoulder, crawling out into the stinking jungle morass to administer plasma while machine-gun slugs, as thick as a swarm of bees, cut bushes over his head.

Batting the breeze during one of many trips up the slot from Guadalcanal to Rendova aboard an LST (landing ship tanks) which, on the return trip is utilized for bringing out wounded, I talked all night—we were at general quarters, of course—to a medical lieutenant whose name I will not use because of medical ethics.

I asked him how many cases he had treated, how many amputations, how many plasma injections he had given and how many fractures he had reduced and the number of operations he had performed. The figures are startling. Again I will not use the figures he gave me because it might give information to the enemy. But we wound it up, after a battle of figures, by arriving at this estimate.

The doctor, who incidentally also comes from Philadelphia and who knew Kirchhofer, was 40 years of age. He gave up a $15,000 practice to volunteer for naval duty. He had made 15 trips up the slot and on each return trip had brought out an average of 250 cases of all types—war neurosis, malarial, appendicitis, and wounded. He was the only medical officer aboard, but, with the aid of his corpsmen he worked the full 20 hours en route back to Guadalcanal.

We began using figures. We charged each patient with an office visit although I tried to make him see that he had gone to the patient, therefore was entitled to charge a dollar a mile. He listed the amputations at the scale he would charge in his home practice. He listed operations at the same civilian rate, and the medications were charged according to his office price scale. Even he was aghast when we had added it all up.

The New Georgia campaign began June 30. It was over by August 5, when we had Munda airport. My doctor friend had done business that at his home office would have upped his $15,000 practice into six figures. And yet, as he explained it, he couldn't have done it at home even with everything at his command. Men do remarkable things during war, things they couldn't do at home even with better facilities.

And most of this work was done while Japanese bombers harassed us all the way down through Blanche Strait, seldom leaving us until daybreak.

More recently the medical men came in for great praise at the taking of Tarawa, perhaps the bloodiest battle of all time. Marine officers reported from that swift siege that perhaps not more than 200 of the entire marine attacking force escaped without wounds of some description. And yet, as the raiding forces waded ashore from their landing craft, along with them went unarmed men, men with nothing but a red cross to distinguish them from the combatants, men who willingly risked their lives to be present when one of their buddies fell. And the Jap does not recognize hospital men as noncombatants. In fact, they recognize none of the conventions other nations have signed.

Medical men, chaplains and correspondents are unarmed. But to the Jap each category is an enemy. Our medical men who attended wounded Japs on Guadalcanal were often attacked by the very men they were treating.

Some day, medical ethics to the contrary, the saga of the "messengers of the gods" will be told in its entirety. Some day I hope the Medical Corps will have their own P. R. O. (press relations officer) to recount the valiant deeds the unarmed, brave lads accomplish.

You can have your combatant machine gunner, your air hero, your raider or your artillery man. Man for man, pound for pound, worth for worth, I'll take the messengers of the gods, those fearless boys who wear the twined serpent of Mercury as their emblem. More power to their clan.

And, until ethics are shoved aside and their stirring deeds are properly chronicled, this "old sarge" of World War No. 1, and correspondent of World War No. 2, has appointed himself their Boswell. Nice going, men.

What Price O. W. I. Hooey?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

WHAT PRICE O. W. I. HOOEY?

The New York Sun comes to bat with a story from its Washington man, Phelps Adams, about what would seem to be the most eerie single performance to date of Elmer Davis' Office of War Information, or O. W. I.

Mr. Adams tells of a 400-page O. W. I. book entitled "A Handbook of the United States of America," gotten out for circulation in other Allied countries, especially England. The book purports to give a detailed and accurate picture of the United States—its history, its Government, its art, literature, geography, industry, press, etc., etc.

The reader gets some surprising ideas about the United States from this O. W. I. production.

TWISTED HISTORY

For instance, it appears that only two women in our whole history have contributed enough to our national life to be mentioned in this handbook. These astounding ladies were Miss Jane Addams and (you've probably guessed it already) Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

George Washington gets fairly honorable mention—but not as our Commander in Chief in the Revolution. The first mention of him is as presiding officer at the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Thomas Jefferson is not mentioned, probably for the double reason that he wrote the Declaration of Independence and abolished primogeniture in Virginia.

The Revolution as a whole, in fact, is passed over with an extremely light touch, its only actors mentioned by name being John Paul Jones and British General Cornwallis and 7,000 troops. We presume the idea is to avoid ruffling British feelings about the Revolution; to make the British love us enough to continue to accept the lend-lease donations we have been showering on them to the tune of billions of dollars' worth a year.

Andrew Jackson is not mentioned, probably because he beat the British at New Orleans and killed the British Major Gen. Sir Edward Pakenham, Wellington's brother-in-law.

The British, if you ask us, don't need any such buttering up. They will accept all the guns, tanks, planes, and food we will send them, and will not even be pettifogging about the bookkeeping. The British people, too, are well aware that the American Revolution occurred and that England didn't win, as witness plenty of thoroughly objective and accurate books on the subject by British authors.

But to return to the O. W. I. United States handbook. One of its sections is a "Chronology of American History" from 1000 A. D. to January 1, 1943. Our history from Leif Ericsson to Franklin D. Roosevelt's first inaugural takes 8 pages, while our history during the reign of Roosevelt takes 14½ pages.

Mr. Roosevelt does remarkably well, too, under the heading "Historic American Speeches and Documents." Here are printed the Declaration of Independence, the preamble (only) to the Constitution, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Wilson's Fourteen Points, the declaration of the United Nations, the Atlantic Charter, and speeches by Mr. Roosevelt on the "four freedoms," the Philippine Commonwealth, and the Allied invasion of north Africa.

In short, this Handbook of the United States of America is a book which tortures and emasculates United States history for two obvious purposes. One of these is to glorify Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States. The other is to push the idea that he would be the ideal choice for President of the world.

Those two purposes stick out throughout the volume, and are plain to any connoisseur of propaganda.

DAVIS WANTS $64,000,000

The O. W. I., which produced this masterpiece of propaganda, has now come around to ask Congress for $64,000,000 of your money to carry on for another year. That is an increase of $25,000,000 over its current appropriations of $39,000,000.

Congress, we believe on the face of the facts thus far publicized about the O. W. I., should scrutinize this request for $64,000,000 with the greatest care and skepticism. The O. W. I.'s story is that it is fighting the same kind of war of propaganda and nerves for us as Dr. Paul Josef Goebbels is fighting for Germany. The facts as thus far dug up go to indicate that O. W. I. on the contrary is spending our money for a lot of paper, shortwave and news-reel boondoggling whose main effect is to make our allies laugh at us behind our backs.

The American people, who pay the bills, are entitled to know what the truth about O. W. I. is—and to have free and easy access to all the propaganda products it gets out for foreign consumption.

As for the presidency of the world, Mr. Roosevelt can now be assured that there is at least one part of the world where he will never be President. That part is Russia. Pal Joey Stalin has made it more than plain that he isn't stepping aside for anybody.

Allied Victory in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram of April 19, 1944:

ALLIED VICTORY IN RUSSIA

At Sevastopol the Red armies are completing the liberation of southern Russia in the most remarkable military campaign of the war; in the number of troops involved, territory reclaimed, and the steady 800-mile advance despite an entrenched enemy, snow, ice, floods, mud, and bad communications, this offensive is historic.

By destroying so many Hitler divisions and so much equipment; by depriving him of Ukraine food, Donbas minerals and industries, north Caucasus oil, the Kiev-Kharkov networks and Black Sea ports; by threatening the Balkans, and by shattering the myth of Nazi military superiority, the Red armies have opened the way to final Allied victory. There is still much fight left in Germany but, barring miracles, she never can recover from this blow.

Marshal Stalin has said Russia's achievement would not have been possible without our help. While it would be neither fitting nor fair to us to measure our munitions against the blood they have shed, the victory is all the finer for them and for us because it is shared.

Our bombers from Italy have weakened Nazi armies in Russia by blasting their Danubian communications and supply lines, including their precious Ploesti oil source.

The continuous western air offensive has drawn about three-fourths of the Nazi fighter planes away from Russia, where they might have turned the battle. American air forces alone since November have cut Nazi fighter production by about 5,000 planes, and since January have shot down 5,200 planes, all of which Hitler might have thrown against Russia.

In western and southern Europe, Russia's allies have tied down more than 40 percent of Hitler's total divisions, many of them hastily withdrawn from the Russian to the Italian front or to the western invasion coasts.

Nimitz, MacArthur, Stilwell, and Chennault kept Japan so busy that Stalin could concentrate against Hitler instead of using larger Red forces to guard the Siberian back door.

To cite such American contributions is not to lessen Russia's paramount achievement, but to demonstrate anew that there are no separate fronts and no isolated battles in this global war. The only possible complete victory is joint victory.

The G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the April 15 issue of Army Times:

THE G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

There is no reason for any delay on the part of the House of Representatives in passing the G. I. bill of rights. The Senate has already unanimously passed the measure, the entire Nation is behind the bill, the President has indicated that he is wholeheartedly in favor of the legislation, so it is up to the House to quit stalling and take action on the measure.

To the men on the combat fronts the G. I. bill of rights represents a definite move in their behalf. Its concrete provisions give them something to tie onto, a lift for their morale.

Although little opposition has been voiced by any groups or individuals, the credit for getting the bill before Congress goes to the veterans' organizations. Their efforts and actions in behalf of the bill assured its passage.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women in the armed forces are wondering what has become of this bill, and why the House committee has not acted more promptly upon it. The families and friends of service people feel exactly the same way about it, as indicated by the fact that thousands of citizens in my district have signed petitions urging speedy enactment of this measure.

The committee received this bill originally on January 10. It has had a revised form of the bill under consideration since March 27. The Senate passed the bill unanimously on March 24. I urge the committee to complete its deliberations, and to report this measure to the House for action without further delay.

Why They Hear So Much About Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith an article that appeared in the Paris News, Paris, Tex., April 17, 1944, entitled "Aussies Ask Clemo Why They Hear so Much About Texans." It is as follows:

Texans in the present war are upholding the traditions of our State by distinguishing themselves on all battle fronts as well as on the home front. Repeatedly have Australians asked me why they hear so much more about Texas than they do other States in the Union. If such a question was put to me by an American from another State I would, without giving the matter further thought, immediately reply, "Why because it is the best gol derned State in the Union, that's why." But to a citizen of another country one must be less boastful and state specific supporting facts. Due to the number of Australians asking me such questions and due to the necessity to render a plausible reply, I have had to ponder over the facts.

Unquestionably our Texas history plays an important role in giving us such an intense provincial pride in our State. Our forebears fought for and won our independence in such spectacular and dramatic circumstances that would rival or surpass the history of other States, nations, or peoples. We have been a nation unto ourselves, self-governing, and independent. Our State is rich in folklore and legend. Our people are steeped in a pioneer tradition and imbued with intense and justiable pride in our heritage. Our men have always fervidly answered the call to arms in any crisis. In so doing they have proceeded to commit themselves on the field of battle with the same courage manifested by those Texas immortals of the Alamo, Golidad, and San Jacinto. It is little wonder when the call to arms is sounded that Texans are among the first to answer. It is little wonder that on the battlefield Texans acquit themselves in a manner in keeping with the heritage bequeathed to them by Houston, Bowie, Crockett, Travis, and other immortals of Texas history.

The size of Texas tends to give her people an individuality not possessed by others. Not only is our State large geographically, but gigantic in accomplishments. Our oil fields are extensive, our fields of corn and cotton are of great size, our herds of cattle large, and our timber land plentiful. We have large modern cities, thousands of miles of paved highways, and seaports that are growing by leaps and bounds. We have a diversity of climate as well as terrain. We cultivate cotton in the northeast sector of the State, produce choice cattle and sheep in the west, rice in the south, and citrus fruit in the valley. As one proud Texan exclaimed, "You name it and we'll have it."

Texans are their own best publicity agents. When any Texan is asked his home State his chest will bulge with pride and he proudly acclaims, "I'm from Texas." Texans never miss an opportunity to publicize Texas. Only since I have been away from Texas have I fully realized how other people are so universally conscious of the Lone Star State. Australians feel a keen kinship with Texas and Texans. Recently an American war correspondent published an article in an Australian paper on the Australian soldier (the Digger). In his justifiable eulogy of them he chanced to state that they (the Aussies) reminded him very much of Texans. Instead of resenting this comparison, as they would be justified in doing, for, after all, they are of English stock and take great pride in the fact, they loved it. Since that time, upon meeting an Australian and he discovers I am a Texan, I am quizzed as to my opinion on the accuracy of the comparison. An assenting vote that the comparison is true inevitably leads to an invitation to tea as the guest of the pleased Aussie. (Never fear, I am not selling my birthright for a pot of tea. To be compared to an Aussie Digger is a high compliment.)

By our constant boosting of Texas it may appear that fellows from other States would find our conversation a trifle obnoxious. A braggart is never one to endear himself to those around him. Instead of resentment, those from other States thrive on the good-natured raillery that goes on between those from Texas and those not so blessed. A genuine Texan never wears his feelings on his sleeve. He welcomes comment on Texas, whether good or bad. Actually I think that most Texans assume the philosophy of the renowned circus major domo, P. T. Barnum, who made the classic remark, "I don't care what you say about me just as long as you mention my name." So it is with Texans, just mention Texas, whether good or bad. When a non-Texan relates in detail the disadvantages and discomforts he experienced while training in Texas or the heat, rain, or cold experienced when passing through on the way to a port of embarkation, the Texans present will not deny anything said. In fact, they will proceed to tell of even greater catastrophes that he had missed. When an outsider mentions our unpredictable weather, our drought, blizzards in the Panhandle, incessant rain in the spring, or dry heat in the summer, some Texan will inform them that they were lucky to have missed the really bad seasons and then relate instances when we had real droughts, real blizzards, and real rain. I've heard tall tales of atmospheric catastrophes that, if they were true, would have destroyed the State beyond any hopes of reclamation.

When a Texan does boast about his State, or the accomplishments of other Texans, it is always done on such an exaggerated scale that non-Texans take it with a grain of salt and proceed to heckle the boastful individual. I was seated at the mess table eating breakfast one morning when a fellow Texan rushed into the tent and excitedly exclaimed, "Italy has just surrendered to Texas! I just got it over the radio." In the excitement that ensued no one gave thought to what the Texan had said, other than that Italy had surrendered. It finally dawned on those present. "Surrendered to Texas, bosh!" stated a native son of Connecticut. "To hear you Texans talk you'd think you were personally winning the war." From the far end of the mess hall came the drawling voice of a Texan, "I wouldn't exactly say that, brother, the Russians are helping us a lot."

In this war as in the past one Texas A. and M. has provided officers on a larger scale than any other such institution in the United States. Almost daily I meet a Texas A. and M. graduate. Texans in this theater have distinguished themselves in combat. The

exploits of lads from the Lone Star State have become almost legendary. The Air Corps is packed with Texans. The highly successful invasion of New Britain was executed by a Texas cavalry division. From the limited information we receive over here I have gleaned the fact that troops from the Thirty-sixth Division (Texas) were the first allies to set foot on European soil, this at Salerno, Italy. All of this I can now relate to my Australian friends who inquire of me why they hear so much about Texas. Texans make their own news and their own history.

The current rumors floating around here in Australia is that Germany and Japan are suing for a separate peace with Texas. But we Texans aren't concerned because we're in this fight to the finish and will stick with our favorite ally—the United States of America.

Fathers of the Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following poem was written by a friend of mine, Mr. Neal D. Ireland, 1055 North Kingsley Drive, Los Angeles, Calif., shortly after the War Department notified him that his son was killed in action while on a bombing expedition over Berlin:

FATHERS OF THE RACE

(By his father, in the hour of travail, as a memorial to Lt. Robert Neal Ireland)

Fathers of the race, I come seeking entry to your fellowship.
I have the eternal password—"A son given in war."
I do not come demanding, neither do I beg admission.
Out of my own father heart I know your hearts.
We no longer have pride. We no longer believe in demanding.
So out of a great humility I come to you, my brothers in suffering.

I do not ask your color, your politics, or your faith,
Nor does it matter on which side of the tracks—or of the world—you may live.
If you have given—as I gave—all your heart's pride
As your part of Humanity's great sacrifice,
Then neither will you ask any questions.
You are admitted to our great fraternity.

Let us sit together on the banks of some quiet stream,
The Volga, the Rhine, the Yangtze, or the Po,
And tell each other of the dreams we had for him
Whom we loved better than our very lives—
Him for whom we planned since early manhood.

Let us, my brother-fathers, hold together in loss
And in the cleansing flame of pain burn out
The ancient hatreds, all vanity and all pride
That have made man slay his brothers since the time of Cain.
And as we talk together, sharing our common pain
You may be sure I'll never hate again.
Let us pledge faith that we will hence be brothers
Because of this—our Brotherhood of Fathers.

Social Security Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time certain individuals and some editors have been critical in expressing themselves concerning the Social Security surplus. Let it be understood that the law, not rule or regulation, provides those funds must be invested in interest-bearing Government bonds. That provision in the law results in an increase in the surplus. There is an excellent editorial published in this week's issue of Labor on this subject. Under permission granted me, I include that editorial as part of my remarks:

AN OLD SCARE STORY IS REVIVED—SOCIAL-SECURITY FUNDS ARE BEING INVESTED IN GOVERNMENT BONDS, AND THAT'S THE SAFEST I O U IN THE WORLD

From time to time, newspapers in various parts of the country endeavor to scare their readers by repeating the old yarn about the way the Government is using social-security funds to meet ordinary expenses.

The latest to come to our attention is an editorial in the Times of Beatrice, Nebr. The editor says:

"Instead of creating an honest reserve of these paid-in funds for some future showdown, the Government has been spending the money on current expenses and placing in the reserve fund a series of I O U's."

By weird calculations which no ordinary person can hope to follow, the editor reaches the conclusion that there is an over-all 300 percent loss.

It would be most unfortunate if any considerable number of people were to accept that statement at its face value, for it is entirely erroneous.

We don't know what the editor had in mind when he wrote about an honest reserve, but we take it for granted he would agree that any surplus in the social-security fund should be invested, and not piled up in the Treasury vaults in the form of currency and gold and silver.

He would also probably agree that the surplus should be invested in the best securities available.

Well, that is exactly what has happened. The social-security surplus is used to buy a special kind of Government bond. It pays 3 percent. Such a bond would command a premium on the open market, but it is sold to social security at par. That means that Social Security is getting the best security available at a remarkably favorable price.

Of course, these bonds are I O U's, but they're Uncle Sam's I O U's. Every bond he has issued since the Constitution was adopted was just an I O U—that is, it was a promise that it would be redeemed at face value by Uncle Sam on a given date.

Uncle Sam has never run out on such a promise. He has always redeemed his I O U's. With the help of God, he always will. Social security investments are as sound as our Government, and our Government is just about the soundest thing in the world.

We are all interested in social security. Therefore, anything that disturbs our faith in that great institution is worthy of the most serious consideration. Labor has given such consideration to social-security investments, and it does not hesitate to assure its readers that they have no reason to worry.

Mr. Speaker, I feel Hon. Edward Keating, a former Member of this body who is manager of Labor, and his associates deserve our thanks for this clear statement. It confirms what Hon. Arthur J. Altmeyer, the Social Security Administrator, recently told the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Canada and Post-War Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the post-war problems that will confront the Nation will be commercial aviation, and I sometimes wonder if the membership of the House realizes the importance of this subject both from a domestic standpoint and from an international standpoint.

For the information, therefore, of the Members I deem it advisable that they should know something of what our sister nation Canada is doing. The Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply, on Friday, March 17, 1944, in the House of Commons in Ottawa delivered a very fine speech on the subject of post-war aviation both from the domestic standpoint and from an international standpoint and at the same time had printed in the Official Report of Debates a tentative "draft of an international air transport convention." This speech, as well as the draft of the proposed convention, is a little too long to publish in the RECORD at this time. I am, therefore, under the permission granted me, printing a portion of this speech relative to international aviation by the Minister of Munitions and Supply. At some later date I shall quote extracts from the speech on domestic aviation in the Dominion. There is one very significant paragraph in this speech which I shall call to your attention, and shall quote:

Accordingly, after full consideration, the Government has decided that the railways shall not exercise any monopoly of air services. Steps will be taken to require our railways to divest themselves of ownership of air lines, to the end that, within a period of 1 year from the ending of the European war, transport by air will be entirely separate from surface transportation. In the meantime, no new air routes other than Government-operated routes will be allocated to air lines owned by any railway or other operator of surface transportation. The term "surface transportation" includes railways, shipping companies, and highway transport companies.

As to international aviation, Mr. Howe said:

We believe that in the field of international air transport our interest lies in a liberal course of cooperation with other nations. This decision has been reached in view of the great importance of air transport in the fu-

ture. Air transport is more than just the latest and fastest method of transporting passengers and goods. It is a revolutionary development which has already profoundly affected the civilization of the world. No one can predict with any degree of certainty or precision the nature and extent of the contribution which it may make to the future security and prosperity of the peoples of the world. It is our intention to make every effort to ensure that the framework within which the international air transport of the future functions, will be designed to promote international cooperation and not to foster international bitterness.

The demands of war have telescoped into 4 or 5 years the growth that might normally have taken air transport a generation to achieve. Canada's size is shrinking, while our long 3,000-mile frame is filling out, as air transport opens up the Canadian north. All Canadians are becoming neighbors and Canada is being given a new basis for unity. What is true of relations between the various parts of Canada is true also of relations between the nations of the world. These too are being brought closer together. Moreover, new regional connections are being developed and the boundaries of old regions washed away. Because of the geographical location of the land masses of the earth, that section of the globe stretching out from the north pole to a degree of latitude roughly equivalent to the Mediterranean and the southern border of the United States will probably be the most important for the air transport of the future. In this northern region, Canada occupies a strategic position, for it stands athwart most of the air routes linking North America with Europe and Asia. This position carries with it great responsibilities and great opportunities.

As I have already mentioned, on April 2 last year the Prime Minister gave a statement of the Government's position with regard to international air transport, making it clear that our policy would be one of international cooperation and collaboration and that we would support whatever policy seemed best calculated to serve not only the immediate national interests of Canada, but our overriding interest in the establishment of an international order which will prevent the outbreak of another world war. Behind this statement lies a recognition of the duty of the Canadian Government to do what it can to avoid the two chief weaknesses in the pre-war organization of international air transport. In the first place, it was a cause of serious rivalries and disputes between nations. In the second place, and closely connected to the first weakness, lines were run at an uneconomic cost, necessitating large national subsidies. Some countries refused to permit air lines to cross the air space above their territory, necessitating costly detours. Others refused landing rights, as well as transit rights. The necessity for hard and persistent bilateral bargaining resulted, especially in Europe, in the establishment of so many competing national services that air transport became highly uneconomic, and lines were heavily subsidized at the expense of national taxpayers.

Behind much of this friction lay considerations of national prestige, but more especially of national security, Civil air-transport fleets, and civil aircraft industries, represent a war potential, a reserve both of personnel and of industrial capacity which is all important in time of war. The truth of this has been obvious in the present conflict. The emphasis in the pre-war period upon the security aspects of civil air transport was, therefore, natural, and goes far to explain the failure of nations at that time to agree upon a method of effective international control of international air services. Because of the rapid development of aviation since the outbreak of war the international rivalries which would develop in the future after the conclusion of hostilities would be even sharper than those of the past, unless some improvement is effected.

The decision which the United Nations must make in the near future on the post-war organization of air transport thus is vital, and an enlightened settlement will go a long way toward establishing a lasting peace, and a new world order of security. It can constitute a model for the settlement of other difficult international problems, and create an atmosphere in which the settlement of these other problems will become easier. Failure to devise a working system of cooperation and collaboration will not only lead to endless friction in the field of air transport, but will prejudice the establishment of an effective world security organization.

From the point of view of practical politics, the problem is to find some method of international control which will serve the desired objectives, and yet be generally acceptable to all. The task is not an easy one. For many months it has been the subject of exhaustive study by Canadian officials and of active consideration by the Government. I think that a policy which is designed to meet these ends has been worked out, and that the Canadian representatives in future international discussions on air transport will enter those discussions well prepared, and with a clear view of the type of arrangement best designed to meet the needs of Canada for the development of international air services and provide for a fair share of international air transport, and at the same time establish an atmosphere of working cooperation among all other interested nations.

It is obvious that air regulations dealing with such matters as traffic rules, safety, and navigational aids should be as uniform as possible throughout the world, and that an international authority must be set up and given the power to prepare regulations which would be accepted as standards by the members of that authority. This alone, however, is not enough. I have already stated that the difficulties, in the pre-war period, arose because certain nations exercised their sovereignty over the air above their countries in a fashion designed to hinder the development of air transport, and foster ill will.

Accordingly, I think that we must be prepared to subscribe to the granting of general freedom of transit for international air services on a universal basis, so that national air services will automatically possess the right to cross the territory of other nations en route to their destinations, and to land in other countries for refueling and reservicing without having to request the specific permission of each government concerned. However, in order to prevent misuse of this freedom, it would appear necessary to grant to some international authority power to supervise the manner in which it is carried out. Moreover, in thus establishing freedom of transit, countries such as Canada, which are strategically placed, will be making a very great contribution to an effective international system, particularly when, like Canada, their population is not great, and the amount of traffic which they have to offer for international carriage would consequently not be large. On the other hand, this right of transit would be of particular benefit to those nations which have a great deal of potential traffic for international air services, but are less strategically located.

It would seem reasonable, therefore, to suggest that freedom of air transit should be extended to cover as well a certain amount of freedom of carriage of goods and passengers, in order to enable all nations to share in a proportion of the international traffic available without having to go in for all the bilateral bargaining which so confused the pre-war situation. It would seem necessary, accordingly, that each nation should at least possess the right to carry passengers and cargo from its own territory to other countries, and to bring back from those other countries passengers and cargo which are intended for its own territory. This would mean that the nations of the world operating international air services would not only be unhampered in the movement of their aircraft across the territories of other countries, but would also have a certain amount of traffic available to their own air services without the necessity of bilateral bargaining, thus increasing the chances of reasonable economic operation. In order to prevent a helter-skelter of airways developing, each country would, of course, designate the routes across its territory which the air lines of other countries must follow, just as it does for its own domestic services.

While international air transport will be a great and important factor in the future, nevertheless one airplane can do a great deal of work, and in the post-war period all the air traffic available may be carried by a comparatively small number of aircraft. It would not seem desirable that each nation should be allowed to establish as many international services, in as many areas, as it wished, thus bringing about a useless, uneconomic, and competitive situation which could only lead to trouble. Not only should some international air transport authority supervise the administration of the freedoms and rights suggested above, but the authority should also have power to regulate international air services in order to prevent the dangers of unnecessary and uneconomic duplication. Some such method might be used as control of rates and schedules, and licensing. Because an authority, established on a universal basis, might have difficulty in giving due consideration to the special needs of particular regions, it would be desirable that it work through regional groupings or councils.

If any such framework for international cooperation in the field of air transport should be developed, and I think it desirable that it should, it would seem that cross-border services, such as those between Canada and the United States, should be considered in a special category, and dealt with specially by the two countries concerned, since services originating in the one country and terminating in the other are primarily transfrontier extensions of domestic air services.

The Canadian Government is of the opinion that some form of organization along the lines suggested above would go far toward meeting the needs of the world for the establishment of effective international cooperation in the provision of efficient and economical air services, and at the same time provide for the fair and equitable participation of Canada in these air services.

One year ago the Prime Minister said: "The Government sees no good reason for changing its policy that trans-Canada air lines is the sole Canadian agency which may operate international air services." This is a matter of purely domestic concern, and this decision is, in the opinion of the Government, the one best calculated to serve the interests and needs of the Canadian people. It has, however, no bearing upon any decision of this type that may be made by other governments. The choice of instruments for the operation of international air services by the countries concerned is and must remain a matter of purely domestic decision. Each country must decide for itself whether its airline companies operating international air services are to be privately owned or state owned, whether there is to be one single national company or several.

I should like to say a word at this point regarding international discussions on air-transport policy. As Members of this House

are aware, there was a preliminary exchange of views in London last October among the members of the Commonwealth, in which a Canadian delegation under my chairmanship participated. A complete airing of ideas and opinions, with regard to international air transport after the war took place, and provided a useful introduction to the broader discussion which will take place in due course. Canada, of course, expects to participate in these further discussions also, and is at the moment taking part in discussions with the United Kingdom and the United States regarding the holding of further exploratory conversations. No final decisions were taken in London, but I may say that it was evident from the outset that all participants had the same general objectives in view—the objectives which I have described earlier in this statement—and that there was a broad basis of general agreement as to the way these objectives might best be attained. All the participants were desirous of improving the air services between their territories, and agreed that such development must take place within an international framework, and that closed discriminatory systems could only promote disharmony and endanger the chances of reaching that broad agreement which is necessary.

Following the conversations in London, a statement was issued to the press, reading as follows:

"The conference with the dominions and India on civil air transport, which has been meeting in London since Monday last, concluded its sessions this morning. The conversations were informal and exploratory, and the conclusions reached are subject to confirmation by the governments represented at the conference. Unanimous agreement was reached as to the recommendations which should be made regarding the lines on which civil aviation should be developed after the war, and as to the contribution which the governments of the commonwealth and empire could make toward international cooperation in this field."

The chairman of the London meeting was Lord Beaverbrook, who is the member of the United Kingdom Government charged by Mr. Churchill with responsibility for the coordination of post-war civil air transport policy. Speaking in the House of Lords a week after the conclusion of the London meetings, Lord Beaverbrook emphasized the unanimous agreement which the conference had reached on every issue presented to it. He said that those issues were "adequate for testing immediate opinion in relation to civil aviation." He added that it had been agreed that "the international air transport authority should be intimately associated with and responsible to any United Nations security organization which might be established."

In summary, I may say that the Canadian Government is determined that Canada, by its participation in the framing of the general settlement of air transport, will make as great a contribution as possible to the successful solution of this problem. Our representatives in the international discussions, therefore, will be authorized to support or initiate such proposals as, in the Government's opinion, will be likely to result in the establishment of an international air transport authority with effective powers, supported by all the governments concerned, which will further international cooperation and good will, ensure that international air routes and services are divided fairly and equitably among all member nations, meet the needs of the peoples of the world for efficient and economical air transport, and contribute to the establishment and maintenance of a permanent system of general security.

Conduct of the War—Political Versus Military Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include some observations by Constantine Brown, a recognized authority on diplomatic and military affairs, dated March 29, 1944, appearing in Human Events, a weekly analysis for the American citizen.

His observation is an analysis of the political versus military strategy of the war. The article is as follows:

POLITICAL VERSUS MILITARY LEADERSHIP

(By Constantine Brown)

The strategy of the United States in this war has been dictated by political rather than military leadership. The eventual result may justify the adage that civilians have no right to let the military bungle the conduct of the war. But, as matters stand, the military have a case—too seldom stated—for their own strategy, which they claim would have better advanced our military fortunes in this global conflict. The broader outlines of this case deserve consideration at a time when one great strategic operation, the Italian campaign, has encountered heavier weather than civilians anticipated, and another, the cross-Channel invasion, is coming to the fore.

The fundamental principles of the military strategy which has governed our world-wide operations so far were established within a few weeks following the disaster of Pearl Harbor. Premier Winston Churchill made his first visit to the White House at that time and these principles emerged from the joint conferences. They can be summed up as follows: "Hold the Pacific defensively and direct the main effort to the defeat of the Axis in Europe."

It is a little-known fact that American military minds preferred another strategy. General Marshall and later Admiral Stark's successor, Admiral King, believed that the Russians and the British, adequately supplied with arms and munitions, could hold the Germans for a long time. While our allies in Europe were engaged in these operations, the United States should concentrate its efforts in the Pacific where, the Army and Navy leaders believed, the myth of Japan's invincibility could be shattered in less than 2 years. Then, America could turn her troops, seasoned by this time from campaigning in the Pacific, against the European branch of the Axis. Throwing our weight into the scales held by the Russians and British, we could then more easily overcome the German armies.

But the political strategy of Churchill and Roosevelt prevailed over these views. Under the impact of what appeared at that time as a catastrophic defeat in the Pacific, and with knowledge of our lack of military preparation, the point of view of Churchill triumphed. Under these circumstances, the American military leaders bowed to the will of the political Commander in Chief and vigorously put their weight behind the accepted strategy.

But, with the importance of the eventual all-out attack on Japan in mind, the American military leaders had their own idea of how to carry out this strategy of beat Germany first. These military leaders saw that the Germans were strongly engaged in the Russian campaign, against tenaciously resisting Russian armies and handicapped by difficult and long supply lines. Under these conditions, they believed the Germans could not conceivably rush any large reinforcements to western Europe to break an Allied invasion. Therefore, the western Allies should occupy a part of western France. (It was deemed impossible at the time to try to reach the Rhine, because of our lack of divisional strength.) In this bridgehead we should establish airdromes from which we could send bomber forces over the Reich. Because France does not suffer the handicap of the dense fogs which envelop England for about 8 months a year, air operations would prove more constant and successful. In short, with this strategic conception in mind, the military leaders rushed American troops and matériel, in the opening months of 1942, to the invasion base of the British Isles.

Toward the end of July 1942 General Marshall and Admiral King prepared to go to England to discuss the fruition of these plans with their British colleagues. But, at the airport while waiting for their plane to take off, an official car from the White House arrived. The two leaders were handed a large white envelope which they discovered, to their surprise, contained instructions from the President to discuss with the British only the details of a newly conceived operation, supplanting their own—the occupation of north Africa. The military men again bowed to superior orders.

The invasion of north Africa proved a great success, although unforeseen circumstances delayed it from the end of October to the first week in November. But it was principally a success for British strategy because it effectively opened sea communications across the Mediterranean, hitherto clogged by Axis submarines and planes, to the Suez Canal and India.

While American military men rejoiced over the progress in north Africa, their satisfaction was diminished somewhat by the decision at the Casablanca Conference, to invade Sicily. But they were reconciled to this additional investment of men, matériel, and time by another agreement at that conference: Namely, that we would not delay the invasion of western Europe later than the summer of 1943. The Americans wanted to do the job as soon as possible in western Europe so as to get back to the Pacific.

They were, however, to suffer further disappointment. At the Washington Inter-Allied Conference of May 1943 they learned from the British that there were too few striking divisions in England to attempt the cross-channel invasion that summer. They reluctantly submitted to this view, but stubbornly resisted a British proposal to invade Italy itself following the taking of Sicily. The Americans claimed that Italy was already a liability to the Germans, that we should not burden ourselves with feeding at least 15,000,000 Italians and that the supply problems would offer many difficulties. The net result, if we got to the Po River, would be merely acquisition of bombing bases. Finally, they said, military operations with increased supply problems in the narrow hilly peninsula, would jeopardize the success of the essential cross-channel invasion. At Washington, and again at the Quebec Conference in August, the American military chiefs issued these warnings to the political leaders. But the political overruled the military leaders again. The invasion of the Italian peninsula was given priority.

Today, the worst fears of the American military men seem realized. We have, as Churchill said on March 24, "lost heavily"

and are stymied 60 miles south of Rome. It is true that we are holding a number of German divisions in Italy, but these are reserve troops and apparently affect in no way the defensive concentrations of the Germans in western Europe. Also, the long lines of communications which handicapped German operations between 1941 and 1943 have now diminished as a German problem and have become an increased Allied problem. Even from Britain comes skepticism about the Italian campaign, as witness the statement of British Gen. J. F. C. Fuller (retired) in Newsweek, "The lesson of all this is that the strategy is execrable. We should never have embarked on this Italian adventure because it was unstrategic from the start."

Perhaps the success of the cross-channel invasion, which cannot now be far off, will hush the criticism of the military leaders. But, for the present, the advocates of the military as against the political leaders on the direction of grand strategy have their day in court. They can well point to the experience of the last war, which certainly was a military success. In that war, President Wilson from the first claimed no knowledge of military strategy. He entrusted the entire command of the armies in the field to Gen. John J. Pershing, whose decisions he backed wholeheartedly. At no time did President Wilson presume to tell Pershing where or how American forces should fight. With this free hand, Pershing was able to work in conjunction with Haig and Foch for the final destruction of German military power and the victorious end to World War No. 1.

Will similar results come from a contrary policy—the political conduct of the military strategy of World War No. 2?

Pass the G. I. Bill Promptly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following excerpt from an editorial which appeared in the Boston Evening American of March 27, 1944:

PASS THE G. I. BILL PROMPTLY

The United States Senate has passed the G. I. bill of rights without a dissenting vote.

No other action by the Senate could be more pleasing or heartening to the millions of Americans in the armed services.

It is assurance that the sacrifices of those who are bearing the brunt of this war are appreciated by the grateful people back home.

And it is a pledge that the shameful mistreatment of the veterans of the First World War will not be repeated after this conflict.

The G. I. bill of rights now goes to the House of Representatives and there it should be received with the same enthusiasm and absence of opposition.

What is equally important, it should be passed by the House immediately.

Commander Atherton, of the American Legion, convincingly explains the need of quick action when he says:

"The post-war period is here for more than a million men and women who have been discharged from the services.

"Many of them require hospitalization and facilities additional to those they now have. Many of them require education which is not yet provided. Many will require jobs, unemployment compensation, homes, and other opportunities not now available.

"For them the G. I. bill of rights forms the one immediate answer.

"It will go a long way toward giving these men a chance to get another start in life.

"The membership of the House of Representatives can win the eternal gratitude of our fighting men and of all their friends and relatives by passing the G. I. bill now, before the Easter recess."

Close-Ups of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Upton Close on March 12, 1944:

To use an old Bible phrase, we are in the Valley of Decision, as this Nation was never in it before. We are in the Valley of Decision in the military shaping of the war itself, in the shaping of the world after the war, and in the matter of preservation of our American system of liberties and freedom of enterprise. Our wars with Germany and Japan have turned out to be neither a hip-hip-hurrah march nor a glory road to a new world order. In both the military campaigning and the political scheming we have encountered cross-currents and surprises and mix-ups. Our first discovery in the Valley of Decision will be whether or not we can decisively defeat our enemies and get clear-cut victories. In both the European and Pacific wars we have pushed back the enemy where he was over-extended—pushed him back into his area of density. We now face the test as to whether we can break him.

Take our European foe first. We drove the German-Italian forces out of Africa and Sicily. But in the tip of Italy, German forces have held us and our Allies. No use to argue whether or not that campaign is justified despite the present stymie and the losses to date. Or to argue about what it was originally intended to accomplish. The thing to examine is results—as of the present. Situation is that it has tied up more ships and materials on our side than on the enemy's, and possibly as much manpower, while at the rate the draft boards are inducting our older men now it is to be assumed that we have no excess of manpower to be intentionally used for such a purpose. Again, the Italy campaign has tied up the British and Italian shipping which was to have been the basis for a push on Japan in the Indian Ocean. Consequently, nothing has been done about Japan in South Asia this season save a penetration of a few miles into the jungle by foot soldiers. The Chinese and Americans of Stilwell have cleared one jungle valley which the new road to China must cross and in the south the British and Indians of Mountbatten have battered the outermost Japanese garrison.

But the Japs will have another half-year of time in which to dig in and build war industries. In a few weeks now the monsoons will begin again, and fighting weather will not return until early autumn.

A further effect of the unlucky Italian campaign is seen in Turkey's position. Either Britain decided that with everything tied up in Italy, it was useless to plan on a campaign through Turkey, or Moscow told Turkey to forget it. Moscow does not want the Anglo-Saxons to become a factor in the Balkans anyway, nor does Moscow want the Turks to invade Bulgaria. The trend of events is that Russia's influence is being extended through the Balkans to Italy, rather than that British-American influence is being extended from Italy into the Balkans. Randolph Churchill's mission to Tito Broz, and the young King Peter's visit to London are British bids to balance Russian influence, but they are made to look petty beside Russia's successful claim to a third of surrendered ships in the Mediterranean, and rumors that Tito will grant the Soviet a naval base on the Adriatic.

So much for the Mediterranean. It appears that the British and we have had our victory there and outreached ourselves, and that no decision is coming out of operations there. The Mediterranean waits on a larger front for its answer. The base for that larger front is Britain. The attack is being pushed by the largest air force in history. Behind it is assembled probably the largest and certainly the strongest ground attacking force in history. We are in the Valley of Decision regarding the air attack. The destruction it wreaks is tremendous. Its own losses, especially in trained men, are tremendous. Such losses cannot be sustained indefinitely. Yet, say air-training officers, they are proving less than were anticipated for this particular purpose, so that air-force training continues to be ever more severe and exclusive, with less rapid promotion offered.

Plans for the millions of armed men assembled in Britain are made and kept by three or four minds in Britain and America, and no one else knows if it is designed that the ground force should go in regardless of whether or not the air attack is successful in paralyzing the enemy. But we are nearing the valley of decision there, too. Crowded Britain cannot be kept continually overcrowded with several million men who do not go into action. If they do go in on a number of beachheads—certainly their numbers make one beachhead out of the question—we should find out as quickly as we found out in Italy whether or not they have triumph or a stalemate.

In the Pacific, too, we are in the valley of decision. We have now pretty well pushed the Japanese back into their area of density. Between their tough outposts and their main ramparts we have apparently struck a curious area of softness—chiefly because it lacks adequate air cover. Japan's planes as well as her ships are being held in reserve, evidently, for the battle in the inner area, which begins, it seems, with Borneo and Saipan. We have a huge fleet that can divide into several task forces able, it seems, to go anywhere and take care of itself—save for fuel. The millions of tons of oil for ships' Diesels and millions of gallons of high-octane gasoline for carrier planes have to be transported in a steady caravan of tankers whose line gets longer as the fleet goes westward, thousands of miles from its base. The Japanese Fleet and its air force await for opportunity for a surprise attack on that line and on fighting ships 3,000 miles from base, just as Admiral Togo back in 1905 waited in the straits between Japan and Korea to pounce on the Russian Fleet that had to sail all the way around Africa because Britain and France had closed the Suez Canal to it. Our Navy is becoming very ponderous and complex at the same time that it becomes large, and many a smaller ship is having to sail with

one or two trained career officers, while the great bulk of our seamen is now made up of reserves, enlisted and drafted men. They are, however, doing remarkably well, according to old salts. Their one great danger now is surprise, and they know it.

Soon, now, it should be demonstrated whether the fleet can follow through to Guam, and from Guam to the Philippines, and then establish major striking power in the Philippines.

So much for the military phase. We have pushed both enemies back into their areas of density. We are about to find out whether we can break them there, or whether they have us stopped there. We believe the odds are in our favor, but this must be proved, at increasing cost in life and treasure. That is what happens when a nation goes from talking war into fighting it.

Now for the shaping of the world. Here some decisions are already quite completely made, and made over our heads, regardless of what share we contribute to the fighting and the paying. Most Americans do not like these decisions. One is that European children cannot be fed. Another is that nothing can be done for the Jews, either by way of getting them out of Europe or locating them in a national home. But the big decision is that we are not going to have an international federation of nations at all, or even have regional federations, in which the big and little fellows are going to treat one another as equals. Instead we have competition for spheres of influence, political and economic. We have brutal supernationalism and brazen superimperialism. Britain, through its head, Churchill, declined a scheme of international guaranty of future self-government for India. He refused at Cairo the suggestion for internationalization of the port of Hong Kong. That puts the kibosh on internationalism so far as Asia is concerned. Nothing remains for China but to get what advantage she can out of the fact that Britain wants back some colonial areas from Japan, and America wants to punish Japan for treachery and brutality. Nothing remains for Indians but to wait a turn of the wheel that will enable them to catch their rulers in a yet bigger jam, as the American revolutionists caught George III.

Russia through its head, Stalin, declined the suggestion for future international settlement of the boundaries of Poland. That put the kibosh on internationalism so far as Europe is concerned. Everywhere now, in Asia, in the Mediterranean, in Europe, we have a growing rivalry over spheres of influence. This is the exact opposite of internationalism and makes either simpletons or wicked deceivers out of those men who pictured America's participation in war as the final move needed to establish internationalism. Perhaps stronger and better American statesmanship could have averted such a pathetic and tragic collapse of the idealism which was held out as the purpose of the war. But then, stronger and better British and French statesmanship could have prevented the European war, and just a little American statesmanship and preparation and alertness could have prevented the Pacific war. I know that George Creel makes out in a current Collier's magazine article that our statesmanship had to be so pathetically helpless because of popular apathy and that all Secretary of State Hull could do was to play for time. I would like to challenge my old propaganda chief in the last World War on that statement by pointing out that any statesmanship that wanted to use events such as the sinking of the *Panay* to get America ready could easily have done so. Instead of that, the incidents that could have been used to warn and prepare America were officially played down. Before that, Gen. Billy Mitchell, pleading for use of W. P. A. money allocated to Alaska to build installations that could be used in need for our hemisphere's defense, was smacked down—and the record shows that the smack came from the White House.

Competition for spheres of influence rather than international federation has now come into the open, even in our own hemisphere. We are witnessing the breaking of South America into two rival spheres of influence, led by Argentina, which is developing under British business leadership, and Brazil, which is becoming a protégé of the United States.

The historian might well sum up what has happened by a just charge that the empire traditionalism of Mr. Churchill, the reliance upon force of Mr. Stalin, and the weakness of Mr. Roosevelt in the face of these two have done more to injure the ideal and practice of internationalism in our century than all the willful Senators who ever fought the Versailles Treaty, or prevented our adherence to the League of Nations. I believe that present prospects bear out such a charge, and that future history will sustain it. To such tragic tatters have come the Atlantic Charter promises of Roosevelt and Churchill and the One World of Wendell Willkie. If you want to know the charges that responsible circles in England are making, read the last few issues of Commander Stephen King-Hall's London News Letter. I wish I had time to quote them.

Now, behind the spheres of influence and endeavoring to use them, again, are the men who consider themselves the revolutionaries and the counterrevolutionaries of what they call the world revolution. To them these present horrible civilization-destroying and race-hate-rousing wars are merely steps in the world revolution and counterrevolution. The revolutionaries warn us that the counterrevolutionaries are throwing American and British force behind every reactionary element from France to China, and that it will one day be supporting the Mikado and German Junkers. The counterrevolutionaries warn us that the revolutionaries are truly planning a sort of internationalism—an international socialism in theory and world sovietism in power—which would mean a world despotism.

Is it not time for Americans seriously to set up leaders with plans to take us out of this world brawl of ideologies and greeds and power lusts and plots which is about to tear our Government down and tear our Nation into classes and tear our wealth into shreds? Here again we are in the valley of decision. If the people may know, the people will decide.

Continuance of Lend-Lease Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1944.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: Confirming our telephone conversation, will you be so kind as to make a statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that due to Mr. KING'S absence from the House on official business as a member of the board of visitors to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, he was unable to be present in person to vote in favor of the continuance of the Lend-Lease Act; however, he was officially paired in favor of its continuance.

Thanking you, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
JULIE PUMMER,
Secretary to Cecil R. King, Member of Congress.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, a servant girl quit her job because she could not pay her income tax.

The O. W. I. Victory magazine is a sell-out every month in Spain and Rumania.

A Republican President for next January would change a lot of planning for the world.

No minority Member has presided over the House, even in the Committee of the Whole, in 14 long years.

The O. W. I. must feel that psychological warfare has sold itself to Congress because they are asking for a tremendous increase.

Years ago we carried the Chicago Tribune at 5 a. m. in the winter, sometimes in deep snow. Now, after 40 years, it thrills me.

The best evidence that education in northeast Kansas wants no threat of Federal control is that consolidation in 30 years there never took root.

The advocates of lend-lease said it would keep us out of war and therefore we could afford it. Now we are supporting a fighting Army and Navy around the world.

Evidently Mrs. Roosevelt has seen the light, or has felt the impact from the ether waves, for tonight she comes down to earth and brags on the voting railroads.

If Governor Warren can keynote in the HIRAM JOHNSON way of 30 years ago, he will stake down party victory. HIRAM has been the pile driver of the last half century.

JOE MARTIN is just as sure to preside over the next Congress as Speaker as he is to be the permanent chairman of the national convention, and he has been asked to do that.

"Nothing" next week in the House, largely because of the Pennsylvania primary—Indiana primary the next week, and still others the succeeding weeks. Say, Mr. MCCORMACK, where do we go from our Chicago convention, east or west?

The people who were holding back their political exercise for the Republican National Convention may have missed it. Oftentimes the hothouse plants cannot stand the outdoor spring primaries. Possibly the second convention in the Windy City will prove to be more interesting.

Thomas Jefferson, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject Thomas Jefferson, a Great American, delivered by the Honorable Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, before the Virginia State Society, at Washington, D. C., on April 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Colonel Halsey invited me to join you in observing the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, he said he would like to know what would be said to Virginians about Jefferson by a Yankee—with the usual prefix. This was a challenge no Yankee could decline with honor.

I can say that it was New Yorkers, under the leadership of his great rival, Alexander Hamilton, who broke the deadlocked election of 1800 and made Mr. Jefferson President. They could choose between Aaron Burr, a fellow New Yorker, about whose character they had doubts, and the Virginian, to whom they were opposed politically, but whose character they respected. So they threw their support to the forthright Virginian. We still take great pride in that act. Never before, nor since, have a man's adversaries purposely elected him President. Other Presidents have had some help from their enemies, but it was not intentional.

It was the high character of the man that captivated even his rivals and left an imperishable impression on American history. He was pitted against the severest competition. Not only did able men from the North, such as Hamilton, Franklin, and Adams—measure their talents against his, but Virginia itself provided such contemporaries as Washington, Madison, Mason, Henry, Monroe, and many others in whose company it would be hard for any man to distinguish himself. However, we appreciate the true stature of Jefferson the more when we stand him beside the other strong men of his time.

We must not yield to the temptation to deal with Jefferson merely by labels or to oversimplify his contribution to our country. His mind was one of the most comprehensive and complex in our annals. His experience touched American life in every possible aspect.

We all learned in school about Jefferson the statesman; author of the Declaration of Independence, our first Secretary of State, and the third President of the young Republic. Although preeminently a man of peace, as commander in chief he sent the American Navy to the coasts of north Africa to clean out the pirates who were preying upon our commerce. He saw that even in his day the world could be made safe for peaceful pursuits only if someone took the burden of destroying the parasites who would live by violence and oppression of others. Older nations had bought their peace with the pirates. By standing up and refusing to pay tribute to lawlessness, Mr. Jefferson won world-wide respect for our flag and brought a new security into the commerce of the world.

At home he was the author of so many reforms that his election was called "the revolution of 1800," especially by those who did not like it. We know him also as the author of a great variety of state papers ranging from the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom to the Kentucky Resolutions. He was the master of the executive department of the Government for many critical years. He powerfully influenced the legislative department also. As Vice President he presided over the Senate and he wrote the Parliamentary Manual which still guides congressional procedures. And he did not neglect the judicial department. He expressed positive and not entirely complimentary views about the Supreme Court of his day. He advised that every justice write his own separate judgment in every case. To join in a single opinion, he thought, lessened the sense of individual responsibility. At least in this respect his ideas have gained ground in the Court. We could also speak at length of his influence on foreign policy, both in his own and later days; and his services as a diplomat, so helpful to the cause of the Colonies during the Revolution and to the young Republic in gaining recognition.

Jefferson was a brilliant man, to be sure, but he also brought to the Presidency experience—experience in national and in foreign affairs which made him sure-footed when it was necessary to lead the country on dangerous paths. Apprenticeship as Vice President and as Secretary of State taught him the pitfalls which an administration must avoid both at home and abroad.

Moreover, Jefferson's public service rested on a most varied experience in the practical affairs of life and a versatile intellectual interest. It was a very shrewd and business-like Mr. Jefferson who made the largest real estate deal in the history of the country; and like many another businessman, he took some chances with the law to get Louisiana Territory for the United States. He was an architect of merit and an inventor of many useful things, as a trip to Monticello demonstrates.

Despite this practical turn of mind he also was among the first philosophers of his day. He dealt with ancient and modern philosophies and religions and discussed confidently what he called the nonsense of Plato. Then there was Jefferson the educator, founder of the University of Virginia, who laid out its campus, designed its beautiful buildings, prescribed its regulations. He foresaw an American language a century before Mencken.

From his books he turned to farming. He was diligent in searching foreign countries for products that would grow in America, introduced many new plants, and was a pioneer in scientific agriculture. He set forth views on scientific subjects such as natural history and survey, studied methods to measure the velocity of rivers and to find the longitude of the place at land without a timekeeper. He wrote about musical vibrations and corresponded with Robert Fulton about the use of submarines for defense—this in 1807. He was also something of an economist, wrote a prospectus on political economy, a plan for reducing the circulating medium, advised standards for weights and measures, for coinage and currency, and had a plan for cheap wine as a substitute for whisky.

Withal he was a human being who loved the society of fellow humans. Essays of his have been preserved on such subjects as conduct and manners and rules of etiquette in Washington.

I have not begun to call the list of subjects that engaged his attention. There is even attributed to him a poem which includes this verse:

"I stole a kiss the other day,
And trust me, nought but truth I say,
The fragrant breath of blooming May
Was not so sweet as Peggy."

So this was Mr. Jefferson—preeminently a civilized man. He touched life from the grass roots of practical existence to the outer reaches of the most abstract philosophy and speculation. But he tested theories by their effects on the lives of men; he never tried to make life over to square with any set of theories. He saw our America as made up of many tongues and many minds and welcomed any contributions these could make to our total national culture. He saw, too, that from disparity of talent and industry and opportunity men would occupy different stations in life. But he thought the country rich enough so that no useful station in life need be a degraded one and, while standards of living would vary to suit taste and circumstance, none need be below the level of dignity and comfort. He loved the charm and peace of the countryside and the individualism and independence of country living. He never mistook bigness for goodness, either in Government or out of it.

Jefferson was the eternal enemy of the totalitarian and authoritarian systems of government of his time. Then they took the form of monarchy. Divine right of a king to rule other men was the fascism of that day. Jefferson rejected utterly the whole basis of dictatorial government. The majestic words of the Declaration of Independence swept throughout the world. For nearly a century and a half the world-wide trend was to do away with arbitrary rulers and to reshape government to make it rest on the consent of the governed, to put it in the hands of the people.

We in our time have witnessed a weird revival of authoritarian government in Europe. It is not under hereditary monarchs but under aggressive adventurers who became self-made dictators. They scorn and ridicule the teachings of Jefferson and in their countries persecute believers in the democracy he founded. They want to exterminate the Jeffersonian teaching from the earth. They know that no man and no people can admire both a Jefferson and a Hitler.

Mr. Jefferson with our young Navy taught the pirate government of Tripoli that democracy is not weakness, that freedom is not decay. It falls to our lot to bring the same lesson home to those who united to attack us. They dared to do so because they think that a free people will be a divided people; that because we govern ourselves no one can force the inconvenience and sacrifice of war upon us and we will not shoulder them ourselves.

The issue comes to just this: whether Mr. Jefferson or Mr. Hitler has sized us up best. The answer is no longer in doubt. Not only Virginians, but Yankees as well, and all our countrymen and lovers of freedom the world over fight today under the banner of Thomas Jefferson. Under it and by reason of it we will shatter to bits this new and ugly authoritarianism. Let us observe this anniversary by dedicating ourselves to the rebirth of the spirit of Thomas Jefferson.

Invasion and the Final Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very challenging editorial entitled "Invasion and the Final Challenge," prepared by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. and published in the Washington Post of April 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVASION AND THE FINAL CHALLENGE

The idea that our national security some day would depend upon the successful invasion of continental Europe by our armed forces was inconceivable to the average American but a few short years ago. Yet, today our whole strength is assembled for that very action and for assuring a sound and permanent peace.

America became great without aggression, without tryanny. Our greatness has been achieved without destroying others; ours is a history of unprecedented indlustrial progress, of development of our own resources, and reliance on our own efforts.

Aggression is foreign to American philosophy. Yet, today we find ourselves faced with the choice of destroying or being destroyed. Today we are confronted by the hard fact that the kind of peace which we all so fervently desire can be achieved only by crushing autocracy and by removing the causes of aggression.

We are now engaged in the accomplishment of the first objective. Since Pearl Harbor a complacent, peace-loving America—the largest of the "soft" and "decadent" democracies—has grown strong and tough. Out of the inherent virility of a free people we have molded the mightiest force for invasion and attack that the world has ever seen.

We have reached our peak rates of war production. We are producing as much war equipment as all the rest of the world combined.

History will record our industrial mobilization as a phenomenal achievement.

The battle of production has been won.

The full might of our armed forces and those of our allies unleashed against the Axis war machine will bring eventual victory. Two and a half years of intensive preparation, backed by 168 years of growth as a free nation, have given us superiority over 20 years of painstaking preparation by the totalitarian and militaristic countries with their enslaved peoples.

Every American has contributed toward this powerful offensive. Our manufacturers and business leaders have exerted their fullest efforts. Our industries have mobilized their tremendous resources, tapped to the fullest degree their inventive and productive genius. The men and women in the factories, on the farms, and in the mills and mines have played a magnificent part in the tremendous production program. Citizens all are making their contribution to the armed victory that lies ahead.

We have demonstrated that a free people under a free enterprise economy can unite in a common purpose.

When the war is won, we shall be faced by our second objective—removing the causes of aggression. This is a social challenge. A challenge to those who would sacrifice our democratic way of life for personal gains or foreign ideolcgies.

The best insurance for the continuance of our democracy is a successful democracy. That means a dynamic and not a static democracy. All of us who want to preserve the ideals that have made America—and that includes all but a handful of extremists—must determine to find the policies and programs which will permit us to make the most of the abundance Nature has provided for us.

To achieve this end we must recognize the fact that we are but a wheel in the machinery of world economy. A wheel that must drive or be driven. A wheel that must mesh smoothly with the many other wheels or be stripped of its cogs.

We are the only nation on earth free enough and strong enough to shape the mold of its own destiny. We can be hampered by nothing but our own confusion.

The mind and the heart of all America today brood over the shores of Britain and watch over the narrow waters that wash the beaches of the Continent. And the prayers of all America go with each of those who embark upon that epic passage.

Those of us at home who are producing the fighting tools and who are so earnestly concerned with the problems that will face a post-war America, should see now, even if we may never have seen it before, that all our plans will be worth just exactly what the men and women who make that passage are prepared, competent, and inspired by their leadership to make them worth.

For those men and women are America.

They have gone out from rich homes and poor homes alike, from farms and factories, from schools and churches, from mines and ranches, from offices and studios, to take their places in the battle line. They are a cross-section of the America that is to be.

Whoever may draw the plans for that America, it is those men and women who will make the plans good. Invasion is their first step toward that end. May their work be speedily done, and may our plans be worthy of that work.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, Jr.,
President McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

War Bond Purchases by Ninety-ninth Lone Star Battalion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Tom E. Foster, battalion editor of the Ninety-ninth Naval Construction Battalion, and the news article and letter from Vice Admiral W. L. Calhoun referred to in Mr. Foster's letter, all bearing on the highly patriotic record of the Ninety-ninth Naval Construction Battalion in the purchase of War bonds.

There being no objection, the letters and news article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINTY-NINTH NAVAL
CONSTRUCTION BATTALION,
April 15, 1944.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a photostatic copy of a letter written April 2, 1944, by Vice Admiral W. L. Calhoun, Commander Service Force United States Pacific Fleet, and a news article released by the Navy's public relations office, which you may have already seen in print.

I believe that you will agree that the Ninety-Ninth Lone Star Battalion's purchase of War bonds is Americanism at its best, and that it deserves a place in the permanent annals of this war as lasting evidence of the spirit of present servicemen. For that reason, and if it is consistent with your policy, perhaps you might have this material inserted in the RECORD.

Provided it is used, I shall appreciate having several proofs or copies.

Thanking you for your cooperation, and with best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

TOM E. FOSTER,
BM1c, Battalion Editor, Ninty-Ninth Construction Battalion, Headquarters Company, Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.

The Ninety-ninth Lone Star Battalion Seabees are doing their bit toward financing their own private war. Leaving nothing to chance, this group of hard-bitten construction warriors have purchased $745,000 of maturity value War bonds as a personal guaranty that they will get the supplies and equipment to continue action against the Japs, and at the same time provide a nest egg for the day when they will return to civilian life.

The total strength of the battalion slightly exceeds 1,000 men and officers. Thus the average amount of bonds owned per man is near $750, which is believed to be a record among Pacific Fleet units of comparable strength.

Commissioned July 5, 1943, the Ninety-ninth has been in the Pacific theater of war for 6 months. The Battalion has five detachments scattered over the Pacific building vitally needed advance bases for other branches of the service. The command has the singular distinction of being the only Seabee battalion ever sponsored and adopted by a States. Gov. Coke R. Stevenson, of Texas, bestowed the name "Lone Star" on the battalion by proclamation and authorized it to carry the State flag. The Lone Star flag flies daily with the national ensign over the main Ninety-ninth station.

This outfit, whose personnel includes a large section of Texans, was referred to recently by Admiral Chester W. Nimitz when he facetiously remarked, "It is rumored that they contemplate building a tunnel under the Pacific to Tokyo in order to be closer to the shooting." Lone Star men are typical of the legions of construction workers who comprise the rank and file of Seabee battalions; there are powder monkeys who blasted the bowels of the earth away beneath the Hudson River; lumberjacks from the great Northwest; cement finishers from Boulder; welders and steel workers from the Nation's shipyards; bulldozer and patrol operators, roustabouts, riggers, and tool pushers from the oil fields of the Southwest.

Practically every member of the Ninety-ninth volunteered for service; a large majority of them are married; many are fathers and even grandfathers. A liberal sprinkling of veterans of World War No. 1 are in the battalion. There are no millionaires in the unit to balloon the purchase of bonds and the certificates are fairly evenly distributed among the personnel of officers and men.

Comdr. R. R. Cook, officer in charge of the battalion, early instituted a planned educational program urging his command to save by investing in War bonds, and when final results of the battalion's Fourth War Loan drive was made known he said, "I am happy to know that Ninety-ninth men are wisely providing for their future security instead of waiting for any manner of dole."

Vice Admiral W. L. Calhoun, commander, Service Force, United States Pacific Fleet, has commended Commander Cook and the Ninety-ninth Seabees for their War bond purchases stating, "that you and your men now own approximately $745,000 maturity value of War bonds is a spectacular accumulation of post-war purchasing power. These results are a tribute to the realistic and forehanded manner in which the personnel are preparing for future financial security."

COMMANDER, SERVICE FORCE,
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET,
April 2, 1944.

From: Commander, Service Force, United States Pacific Fleet.

To: Commanding Officer, Ninety-ninth Naval Construction Battalion.

Subject: War bond allotment program—report of.

Reference: (a) Final report of results—form BAR-3, dated February 14, 1944.

1. The report of the War bond promotional program of your command has come to my attention.

2. The fact that a large number of the men are saving regularly through War bond allotments is gratifying. That you and your men now own approximately $745,000 maturity value of War bonds is a spectacular accumulation of post-war purchasing power. These results are a tribute to the realistic and forehanded manner in which the personnel are preparing for future financial security.

3. The Commander, Service Force, United States Pacific Fleet, desires to commend you and Lt. C. F. Wittenberg, C. E. C., United States Naval Reserve, for another job well done. May this splendid record be maintained in the months to come.

W. L. CALHOUN.

Lincoln's Peace and Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lincoln's Peace and Ours," published in the Illinois State Register of April 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LINCOLN'S PEACE AND OURS"

Second only to the problem of war is the problem of peace. The time is ripe for a great educational campaign. Rabble-rousing politicians desecrate this great issue which is so close to the church, the home, the school, and the welfare of future generations.

Dr. William E. Baringer, executive secretary of the Abraham Lincoln Association, discussed this problem before the Springfield Lions Club this week, taking as his subject the above caption. He pointed out that the task of establishing a just, permanent peace is more difficult than waging a successful war. He drew a deadly parallel between the peace which President Lincoln sought to establish and the peace which President Woodrow Wilson sought to insure. The same may well apply to the peace which President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and other Allied leaders are planning to establish.

We agree with Dr. Baringer that "the citizens, guiding their government, must be the experts in peacemaking. They can make it, or break it." It was public misunderstanding which sustained Congress in destroying the Wilson plan of peace following the First World War. As was so pertinently pointed out by Dr. Baringer, our own Lincoln planned a comprehensive, lenient, permanent peace with the conquered South. Leaders of Lincoln's party in Congress did not agree with him. They wanted a peace which would create a Republican South, and a battle between the President and Congress loomed. Meanwhile Lincoln was assassinated. His plan, adopted by President Johnson, was defeated in toto by Congress, which proceeded to make its own peace. The Army was put in control in the South, assigned to the task of building Republican State governments which lasted only as long as bayonets held them up.

When the Army was withdrawn (1870–77), as Dr. Baringer pointed out, "southern Democrats systematically prevented the Negroes from voting and resumed control. The solid South became a political reality. The selfish peace of Congress produced exactly the opposite of its intended object."

It is to draw the White House and Congress into close cooperation that Secretary Hull advocates the naming of Senate and House bipartisan committees to cooperate in working out a peace plan to avoid a repetition of what happened when President Wilson's plan collapsed.

In the opinion of the State Register it is vitally important that all citizens weigh and act upon this vital problem free from political prejudice. It is infinitely important. It deals with the flesh and blood of future generations—with our children and our children's children. Dr. Baringer touched the very nerve center of this problem when he said:

"If American citizens are sensitive to the lessons of history, able to learn from the mistakes of the past, they can make their victory in the present struggle something of permanent value." He adds that "hundreds of billions of dollars, tens of thousands of lives, will have been spent for defensive purposes only, if we lose the peace. To make the huge war expenditures something of long-term, permanent, creative value, we can require our Government to construct the kind of peace Lincoln and Wilson wanted—generous, lenient, lasting."

And we might add, the kind of peace which President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, and our leaders in this greatest of all wars advocate on exactly that same basis.

America's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials by Mr. John W. Owens, editorial writer and political editor of the Baltimore Sun, which were published in the issues of the Sun of April 12 and April 14, 1944, respectively. The editorials are interesting, timely, and convincing.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1944]

THE LAG ON RUSSIA

(By John W. Owens)

Much of Mr. Hull's trouble is caused by the failure of a segment of the American people quite voluble, to make mental adjustment to modern Russia.

As to industrial organization and military organization, we are far past the aloof skepticism of '40, '41, and '42. And most of us have made beginnings in realization of the political power in world affairs that flows to Russia from her achievements. But still in our midst are elements which lag in mental adjustment to Russia's political power. They see with everyone else that Russia has been ravaged in hundreds of thousands of square miles. They see that millions of her civilians and soldiers have died at the hands of her enemy. They see that, having endured all of this horror, she is today driving from her soil the last of the greatest war machine of history. They see all of this destruction followed by all of this achievement. And yet they think that at the peace table the Russians should bow to the British and Americans and ask, "Gentlemen, where do you wish us to sit?" Since Russia gives no faintest shadow of any such deferential attitude, these mentally lagging elements live in a fever of apprehension and excitement.

Their condition may be illustrated by reference to Germany and Italy. The apprehensive and excited gentlemen shiver at sight of the westerly march of the Russian armies. The troops which occupy Berlin will enable their statesmen to exert profound influence on the course of post-war settlements. Therefore something must be done by the United States and Britain to slow the Russian march and to hasten Anglo-American arrival in Berlin. Military dominance in Germany is of first importance. But in Italy the Anglo-American armies are in control of occupied areas and will control these areas as they are expanded. And, lo and behold, military dominance in a conquered country now offers little security. Mr. Stalin sees fit to recognize the stopgap government headed by an old, simple soldier, and instantly the uproar in this country is terrific. Among the apprehensive and excited gentlemen a single Russian representative in Italy causes as much noise as the prospect of great Russian armies in Germany.

Again Russia has got out of hand.

Nothing would be easier than to toy with these brethren. They are afraid of everything that Russia does or will do, and yet they dare offer no concrete proposals against her.

But toying with the apprehensive and excited gentlemen is not enough. They are chiefly responsible for introducing turmoil, rather than deliberation, into popular consideration of our foreign relations. They are the people who are chiefly responsible for forcing Mr. Hull into repeated demonstrations that we do, in fact, have a foreign policy. In his last demonstration on Sunday night he seems to have won approval of the policies he has been following. Some of those who gave their approval doubted that the State Department pursues its policies with the vigor that is required. For example, one gentleman in Washington wishes faster reorganization of the political structure in Italy and refused to accept Mr. Hull's decision to heed in this matter the judgment of the military commanders on the spot. But allowing for the mistakes that Mr. Hull may be expected to make in deciding between the opinions of generals on the spot and gentlemen in Washington, the prevailing opinion is that the Secretary did very well. Yet, judging by the record, within a few weeks Mr. Hull will be called upon for another demonstration.

The elements which suffer the mental lag will soon be in full cry again, vaguely, but vociferously, insisting that something must be done and declaring that we have no foreign policy unless something is done. In this uproar the voices of the old isolationists will

be loud. Among the minority of critics of Mr. Hull's statement was Representative FISH, who found that Mr. Hull's policy consisted entirely in "appeasing" Russia. Mr. FISH did not go further, but one gathers that Mr. FISH thinks Mr. Hull should defy Russia n complicated issues at the moment she is defeating Hitler's legions and the Anglo-Americans are preparing to invade the west. Senator NYE also is prepared for action. His statement on the Hull speech showed that he is set to quiver gloriously on a moment's notice over violations of the Atlantic Charter.

The American public ought to measure these uproars. We can, of course, let the people who suffer the mental lag influence and ultimately determine our policies. We can refuse to adjust our minds to the power that Russia has won. We can go on and assume that, if accepted as a giant, she will be our enemy in post-war Germany. We can make the most of argument over the eastern boundaries, refusing to remember that these boundaries have been in dispute for hundreds of years and refusing to listen to Russia's claims that she was a victim in these disputes after the last war. We can refuse to sense the emotions of a people who have been dreadfully tortured and now insist upon protection. We can do all of this, rather than follow Mr. Hull's principles and his work in applying those principles in friendly discussion, rather than in lectures and defiances. But if we do follow the excited men who cry that something must be done, we should make up our minds that the world of the next generation will be divided into two great camps, in one of which a resentful, distrustful Russia will be leader. Such division of the nations may be the world's destiny, but we should not ask for it in our present handling of delicate foreign relations.

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 14, 1944]

ON THE LOOSE AGAIN

(By John W. Owens)

The don't-haul-down-the-flaggers are regaining their nerve.

Most of the time, since 1940, they have been inconspicuous. When France fell in the early summer of that year and the chances seemed to be that Britain would follow—with the British Fleet going into German hands or going under the waves—one could talk in this country about the value of international cooperation and scarcely a word would be said by anybody about hauling down the Stars and Stripes. In 1941, when Russia was reeling under Hitler's blows and Japan decided that the hour had come to join her ally by treacherously attacking the United States in the Pacific, talk about the value of international cooperation caused no more than a whisper that the Stars and Stripes would be endangered. In 1942, when Hitler boasted that he was prepared to give the knock-out blow to Russia and Japan was racing from conquest to conquest in the Pacific, some of the most ardent of the old-time don't-haul-down-the-flaggers were declaring themselves in favor of an international police force—assuming that the Nazis and the Japs gave civilization an opportunity to establish one. Even in 1943, when the tide began to turn, the remaining don't-haul-down-the-flaggers were almost breathless.

But now things are different. We know we shall win the war. The Russians—who have supplanted the British as the foreign ogre in the eyes of many of the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers—first stopped Hitler dead in his tracks and then turned on him with such continuous success that the third anniversary of his invasion of Russian soil may see Marshal Stalin's armies fairly well on their way to German soil. We, for our part, have placed immense armies in Europe and have set up in Britain an air force that is helping to tear German industry to pieces in preparation for Anglo-American invasion from the west. The price still to be paid for victory in Europe is high. But we know we have the resources with which to pay. And in the Pacific, the Japanese race of conquest has been halted and reversed in some of the most brilliant exploits in our history. There, too, we know victory to be assured. So now the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers are sitting up again and talking bravely in Congress and elsewhere. They feel more like themselves.

The primaries in the Middle West have accelerated the rise in their spirits. Politicians all over the country have placed those primaries under microscopes to determine the forces that are at play and a variety of judgments have been offered. But the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers have decided for themselves and proclaim to the world that it's a beautiful morning, a beautiful day, and everything's going their way.

They have some reason for encouragement. Racial influences are at work, especially in the Middle West. Mr. Lawrence C. Eklund, of the Milwaukee Journal, in analyzing the Wisconsin returns, said that to conclude that the State is largely isolationist would be a mistake, but he found that Mr. Willkie, the leading Republican exponent of international cooperation, had done himself no good in German-vote counties by telling of his support of lease-lend to Britain. The Polish voters, running into very large numbers, are being cultivated because no assurance is given them that something will be done to belabor Russia. Among the Irish are elements which resent our present ties with Britain, and especially resent the efforts to persuade the de Valera Government to dismiss German and Japanese agents.

All of this, in its actual or potential effects in the voting, contributes greatly to revival of the ardor of the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers. And they also see rosy prospects in the possibility of converting war weariness—irritations over taxes, wage controls, price controls, rationing systems—into a general revolt against prevailing war aims which will reach such proportions as blindly to include international cooperation.

They may grow in strength. They may threaten the stability of any policy of international cooperation—and no policy will have value unless it is one of long-term stability.

To many intelligent Americans a second triumph of the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers will seem incredible. Twenty-five years ago the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers triumphed in the Republican party, though such figures of that party as Elihu Root, William Howard Taft, Charles E. Hughes, Herbert Hoover, A. Lawrence Lowell and Nicholas Murray Butler favored the League of Nations, some without reservations and some with mild reservations. Having triumphed in the Republican Party, the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers extended their triumphs to the Nation. Results: First, violent economic nationalism which contributed to the worst depression in American history; second, violent political nationalism which facilitated the worst war in American history, involving expenditure of blood and treasure beyond the weirdest imagination of the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers when they were scaring the people in the campaign against the League of Nations. One would suppose that this fatal experience with the don't-haul-down-the-flaggers would be enough.

But the fact is that these protectors of the Stars and Stripes are coming out of seclusion, in fine fettle, and at the moment are definitely on the offensive.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article on the school-lunch program which appeared in the April 1944 issue of McCall's magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As part of our food program, Congress has approved a maximum expenditure of $50,000,000 of Federal funds for school-lunch programs.

No single set plan is suggested. The more nearly self-supporting the effort can be, the better. The Federal funds available are probably not adequate to grant aid to all schools that need a lunch program and may request Federal help. Whenever possible, schools should follow the example of Columbia, Mo., and require payments from those children who can afford it, to cover part of the cost of the lunch.

Any public and nonprofit private school or child-care center will be considered eligible, provided Federal assistance is necessary to operate an adequate program serving nutritious lunches to all children.

Schools will receive a specified amount per child per meal, depending on the type of lunch served. Children unable to pay must be served without charge, and there must be no distinction between paying and nonpaying children.

Foods are purchased by the sponsor locally, through the regular channels of trade. Records are kept and the War Food Administration reimburses the sponsor.

How can a hungry child study? How can he stay well enough to turn up at school every day when his growing body is not getting the good food it needs?

The answer is easy. He can't. It hasn't been quite so easy, however, to work out a plan whereby hungry children the country over can count on at least one nourishing meal each day.

Such a plan has been perfected and Congress has voted $50,000,000 to defray part of the food costs of school lunch programs which measure up to certain definite standards. If your child's school does not serve a midday lunch, I believe it may be your duty as a parent and a citizen to see if a school lunch program can be set up.

Who are the hungry ones? Are they only the children from homes where there is not money to buy enough food? Is it actually possible for a child from a home like yours to be undernourished?

Emotional difficulties are just as likely to hit children in high-income homes as in those of the really poor. And often such upsets are the cause for poor eating at breakfast time. Worrying over homework, fretting for fear of being tardy, these or other causes for nervous tension can keep a child from eating an adequate breakfast. His lunch, which should in most cases be the big meal of the day, is vitally important.

In Columbia, Mo., children of all income levels share the same nourishing hot school lunch. Those who can afford it pay a small

sum; others are fed free of charge. No one except the school principal knows which children belong to the paying, and which to the nonpaying, group.

Who starts a school-lunch program? Does the Government send someone from Washington to do the planning and see that the food is properly prepared?

People like you start school-lunch programs. People who love children and want to see them get a chance to grow up with strong bodies and good minds. People who are willing to pitch in and work to give the youngsters a chance.

In Columbia, a mother who was president of the Parent-Teachers Association in her child's school started the program with the help of the school principal. Later, the city council, men's clubs, and other local organizations lent a hand. The Government served in an advisory capacity through local War Food Administration representatives.

Isolationists, Nationalists, and Internationalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strange Words; Queer Bedfellows" published in the Iron Age of April 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE WORDS: QUEER BEDFELLOWS

One of the advantages (or is it?) of being an engineer is that the words you use in your business have definite and well understood meanings. Thus when you speak of the cosine of an angle, or of an S. A. E. steel of a certain number or of so many kilowatts per hour, the people who talk the same language know exactly what you mean.

The disadvantage, if any, of such exact expression of thought is that you cannot do much finagling with it. You have to know what you mean when you say it, and you cannot twist the meaning later to mean something quite different.

In spite of this disadvantage and the burden it would impose of thinking twice or perhaps three times before speaking, I think it would be of great public benefit if statesmen and politicians were compelled to define clearly the terms that they use. As it is now, we are obliged to define them chiefly by knowing who says them and even then they don't stay put.

Take, for example, the terms "isolationist," "nationalist" and "internationalist." The common acceptance of an isolationist has become that of any guy who doesn't like the New Deal and has guts enough to say so. But as a matter of fact, the chief New Dealer was himself a professed isolationist when he was reelected for a third term on the promise to keep us out of war and that no American soldier would be called upon to fight on foreign soil.

Skipping the term "nationalist" for the moment, because we don't hear much about it now in this country, let's discuss that puzzling noun "internationalist." If you know what it means, you are indeed a better man than I, for I do not. I don't know whether an internationalist is one who puts the interests and welfare of all men and all nations on a par or whether he has mental reservations concerning enemy nations and so-called neutrals. And sometimes I am led to believe that an American internationalist is a person who favors the welfare of some other country more than he does his own. At least that's the impression that some of our leading American internationalists give me.

And now for that forgotten American, the nationalist. A nationalist is not an isolationist. Mr. Churchill is no isolationist but he stamped himself indelibly as a nationalist when he said that he would not preside over the obsequies of the British Empire. Mr. Stalin is a nationalist of the first order in that regardless of what his allies or his enemies do or do not do, he is for the survival and the welfare of the U. S. S. R., first, last, and always, which is as it should be.

Nationalism does not mean that you do not wish to give your neighbors a helping hand when they need it, and if you can afford it. It simply means putting first things first, your own country included.

Internationalism as it is preached in America is an expensive practice which invokes opening the safe to all comers. Only a rich nation can afford it and then not for long. Mr. Willkie's sad experience in Wisconsin is an indication that Americans are getting fed up with it.

J. H. VAN DEVENTER.

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject The Tennessee Valley Authority, which I made in Knoxville, Tenn., on Friday, April 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Knoxville Journal of April 16, 1944]

MCKELLAR SCORES LILIENTHAL'S DOMINATION—SEEKS ONLY TO FREE T. V. A.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Below is the text of a speech broadcast here Friday night by Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR in review of his record in connection with T. V. A., from the time of construction of Wilson Dam down through the current controversy between himself and T. V. A. Chairman David Lilienthal.

The reader's attention is called to an editorial dealing with the subject on today's editorial page. The controversy referred to is a matter of public interest, not because of the personalities but because of the principles of government involved.—Knoxville Journal.)

I want to give to the public a short history of the building of the dams on the Tennessee River. I shall not give hearsay; I shall not give daydreams; I shall give the facts from my own experience and knowledge and backed up by the records in Washington. I have had two experts at work for the last 2 weeks obtaining the exact facts and verifying the history of this great project.

I have been led to do so because of the many false publications recently made in my own State and elsewhere that I am an enemy of the T. V. A. and opposed to the whole project. A more deliberately false statement could not be made, as will be shown by the history I shall give, backed up by the records in Washington.

In 1916 I was a Member of the House of Representatives; I had already been nominated for the Senate by the Democrats of Tennessee but I had not at that time been elected, and was still serving in the House. I was born in Alabama and the great falls at Muscle Shoals always intrigued me. When I went to Congress I was one of the many who felt that those falls could be made useful to navigation, to manufacturing, to business, and to agriculture. My opportunity came in 1916 when President Wilson came before the Congress requesting a national defense act. It was not long after the sinking of the *Lusitania* and probably the majority of the people felt that war must come, and soon. The President recommended large preparations. I was the second man on the Military Affairs Committee of the House. Mr. James Hay, of Virginia, was chairman, Mr. Hubert Dent, of Alabama, was first man and I was second man on the committee. The defense bill came before our committee and we promptly got to work on it. Mr. Dent joined me in recommending that a dam be built at Muscle Shoals in an amendment which we offered in committee providing for the building of a dam to manufacture war materials in time of war and fertilizer in time of peace. Mr. Hay was at first against us but he liked us both and he let it go in. When the bill reached the House Mr. John C. McKenzie, of Chicago, vigorously opposed the provision and it was defeated by a very small majority. The bill then went to the Senate and Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, introduced a similar amendment and it was adopted. Thus the matter was thrown in conference and the conferees adopted a compromise and it became the law.

WORKED ON BILL

The amendment was the work of Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, Mr. Dent, and myself, and I believe I was the most active of the three, but Senator SMITH the most powerful. The War Department at once began building of the dam at Muscle Shoals and when Mr. Wilson went out of office in 1921 the dam was substantially completed, although it required a million or two dollars, as I recall the amount, to finish it. I haven't talked to Senator SMITH about it, but I am sure he would say I had as much to do with that amendment building the Wilson Dam as any other human being. I find where Senator Norris did vote for the Smith amendment, but he had nothing further to do with it. He was in the Senate at that time.

This Muscle Shoals Dam was not completed in 1921 when President Wilson went out of office and I recall distinctly, verified by investigation, that Senator Smoot, a member of the Appropriations Committee, announced openly that he was opposed to furnishing any more money to finish that dam. He was opposed to sending good money after bad money. I earnestly took the other side of the question; the dam was nearly complete and in the meantime the Alabama Power Co. was earnestly seeking to take over the plant from the Government, Senator Underwood tremendously favored the Alabama Power Co. taking over the dam and I was just

as strong on the other side, and doing everything I could to prevent them from taking it over. It was not long after this when Henry Ford made his offer to pay a considerable sum for this dam site, $8,000,000 if I remember correctly, and Mr. Ford's offer galvanized the Muscle Shoals site into life again. From the beginning of the Wilson Dam it was turned over by the administration then in power, to the Alabama Power Co. for what seemed to be a nominal sum as rent and it remained in the hands of the company until after Mr. Roosevelt was elected President.

INTRODUCED FIRST BILL

During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations a number of Senators introduced bills to complete the building of dams along the Tennessee River, the following Senators: McKellar, Norris, Tyson, Heflin, Sackett, and Harrison. I am advised that I introduced the first one in 1927. Senator Norris and the other gentlemen filed later bills. At that time Senator Norris was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to which all these bills were referred and naturally perhaps, Senator Norris' bill was taken up, hearings were held on it, and the bill was reported out.

In this bill there was no provision for the payment of 5 percent of the gross receipts for power and fertilizer into the treasuries of the States of Tennessee and Alabama in lieu of taxes and I insisted that provision ought to go in. Norris opposed it and it did not go in and I held his bill up for quite a while, hoping to get it in and I was told by the majority leader, Charlie Curtis, of Kansas, he would guarantee the President would veto the bill. Mr. Coolidge did veto the Norris bill and there this development remained until 1933. During all of that time it was rented, as I said before, by the several administrations to the Alabama Power Co. for a nominal sum.

Now Mr. Roosevelt in his campaign had announced for the improvement of these dams on the Tennessee River. After he was elected and before he took his seat in 1933 he announced he was going to Muscle Shoals to look at the property and he invited a number of Senators and Congressmen to go along. I recall the most of them because I have a picture of the group. Senators Bankhead and Black, of Alabama, Senator Hull and myself, of Tennessee, Senator Norris, of Nebraska, and Senator Dill, of Washington, who had large power sites in his State. We saw the property and after we started back, as I recall, the President announced that he had a proposed name for the project, that he had several commissions in New York that he had named "authority," like the New York Waterway Authority, and he said he wanted to name this commission the Tennessee Valley Authority. That met the approval of everyone present. He then stated to my very great surprise, and I supposed to most of the others, that he had selected Senator Norris to introduce the bill to authorize the building of the Tennessee River dams.

AIDED STATES TO GET FUNDS

Naturally I supposed that he would select one of the Alabama Senators or one of the Tennessee Senators. Senator Norris had left the Republican Party 2 years before and had joined in the election of President Roosevelt. I realized instantly, however, that we could get nowhere without Mr. Roosevelt's concurrence, and that it was not an important thing as to who introduced the bill authorizing the dams, and we acquiesced in that procedure.

Senator Norris introduced the bill and I finally got my amendment for 5 percent of the gross receipts to go into the treasuries of Tennessee and Alabama, and the bill passed.

Now, gentlemen, it may seem peculiar to the uninitiated and to the dreamers, but it is a fact just the same that authority to build dams is but a small part of the dam-building operation. Perhaps 90 percent of the operation is getting the money. I was at that time on the Appropriations Committee and I got the money with which to build every dam that was built on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and the records of the Senate show it.

The first $75,000,000 was appropriated as follows:

"June 16, 1933. (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.) Fourth Deficiency Act, approved June 16, 1933, carried an appropriation of $3,300,000,000 for N. I. R. A., of which $50,000,000 was allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"June 19, 1934. (Public, No. 412, 73d Cong.) Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1933, carried an appropriation of $899,675,000 for carrying out a number of acts, including the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. Of that sum, $25,000,000 was allocated to the T. V. A."

Out of these two sums the money was used on the Wilson, the Norris and the Wheeler Dams.

At this point I should say or before, Dr. A. E. Morgan and Lilienthal announced that they were not in favor of competing with the private power companies and that they would build no more dams. The private power companies were very strong at that time. The Alabama Power Co. was especially strong a it had been for many years and so was the Commonwealth Southern. Morgan and Lilienthal said that they wanted to establish a yardstick to show the private power companies at what price they could afford to sell power to consumers. Such a policy seemed to me to be nothing but daydreaming. Imagine great power companies like the Alabama Power Co. and the Commonwealth Southern, of which Mr. Willkie was later the leading figure, even considering such a yardstick. And it was at this time the T. V. A. announced it was not going to build any more dams. The T. V. A. did not recommend any more dams to the President and the President did not recommend any more dams to the House and the House did not pass any provisions for any more dams. But in 1935 in the second provision of the bill there was an item as follows:

ASKED MORE DAMS

"August 12, 1935 (Public, No. 260, 74th Congress): Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, carried the first direct appropriation for T. V. A. amounting to $36,000,000."

When that bill got to the Senate I knew it was necessary to force the T. V. A. to build these dams and thereupon I put the following provisions in the law. I am not quoting from the expert who examined the Senate amendment put in each and every one of the bills hereafter mentioned. I quote the provisions of the law as they are now on the statute books.

The bill as it passed the House made no reference to any dams. The Senate subcommittee made the following amendment relative to T. V. A.:

"The continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, and the beginning of construction on a dam at or near Guntersville, Ala., and a dam at or near Chickamauga Creek, both on the Tennessee River, and a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowlers Bend, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the location and desirability of a dam at or near Aurora Landing, a dam at or near Whites Creek." This amendment was approved by the full committee and by the Senate, and finally enacted into law.

June 22, 1936 (Public, 739, 74th Cong.): The First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, carried an appropriation of $39,900,000. When this bill came to the Senate, the subcommittee added "the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar."

AMENDMENT APPROVED

This amendment was approved by the full committee and the Senate, but was lost in conference.

May 28, 1937 (Public, 121, 75th Cong.): The Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, carried an appropriation of $40,166,270. When the bill reached the Senate the subcommittee inserted the following amendment:

"And for the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Watts Bar and at or near Coulter's Site on the Tennessee River, Tenn."

This amendment was approved by the full committee, passed the Senate, and was enacted into law.

May 23, 1938 (Public Law 534, 75th Cong.): The Independent Offices Appropriation for 1939 carried an appropriation of $40,000,000. The bill as it came to the Senate from the House made no reference to the construction of the Gilbertsville, Ky., dam. An amendment was offered in the subcommittee as follows: "and for the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky."

That amendment was approved by the full committee and by the Senate, and was enacted into law.

March 16 (Public Law 8, 76th Cong.): The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1940 carried an appropriation of $39,003,000. The bill as it came to the Senate from the House made no reference to Gilbertsville, Ky., or Watts Bar dams. An amendment was offered in the subcommittee as follows:

"Continued construction of Gilbertsville Dam, and for construction of a dam at or near Watts Bar on the Tennessee River, Tenn., and for preliminary investigations of a site for a dam at or near Coulter Shoals on the Tennessee River, Tenn."

That amendment was approved by the full committee, approved by the Senate, and enacted into law.

April 18, 1940 (Public Law 459, 76th Cong.): The Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1941, carried an appropriation of $40,000,000. As passed the House the bill provided continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky.; Watts Bar Dam; and for construction of a dam near Lenoir City, Tenn. No change was made in the Senate.

July 31, 1940 (Public Resolution 95, 76th Cong.): This resolution provided for an appropriation of $25,000,000 for continuation of construction for the T. V. A. including the funds necessary to begin construction of a dam on the Holston River near Jefferson City, Tenn., to begin installation of two additional electric generating units at Wilson Dam, Ala., and one additional electric generating unit at Pickwick Landing Dam, Tenn., etc. The resolution was not changed as it came from the House.

FORTY MILLION DOLLARS ALLOTTED

July 16, 1941 (Public Law 179, 77th Cong.): This resolution appropriated $40,000,000 for (1) beginning construction of two additional hydroelectrical projects and two additional storage projects on the Hiwassee River and its tributaries, (2) installing additional electric generating units in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority, and (3) building and transmission facilities needed to connect these projects and units to the existing transmission system of the Authority, and to deliver the power produced by these projects and units to the market.

There was no change in this provision by the Senate.

December 17, 1941 (Public, 353, 77th Cong.): The Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act 1942, provided two appropriations for the T. V. A.—one of $25,000,000 and one of $22,000,000. The $25,000,000 provided for (1) beginning construction of a hydroelectric project on the Little Tennessee

River near Fontana, N. C.; (2) for installing additional electric generating units with a total rated capacity of approximately 324,000 kilowatts in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority; (3) installing an additional steam electric generating unit with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000,000 kilowatts in the Watts Bar Steam plant and for developing units of other steam plants to their complete capacity as provided in original plans of installation, etc.

This item was not changed as it came from the House. The appropriation of $22,000,000 was placed in the bill as reported from the committee to the Senate, was adopted by the Senate and finally enacted into law. Originally it called for an appropriation of $24,000,000, but was reduced in conference. As finally enacted it read:

HOLSTON RIVER DAM

"For an additional amount for the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1942, (1) for a site on the South Fork of the Holston River near Bristol, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 75,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (2) for building a dam on the Watauga River east of Elizabethton, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 60,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (3) for the completion of the uncompleted unit of the steam plant at or near Sheffield, Ala., $2,000,000; in all, $22,000,000."

January 30, 1942 (Public Law 422, 77th Cong.): The Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, carried an appropriation of $30,000,000 for (1) the construction of a hydroelectric project on the French Broad River near Dandridge, Tenn.; (2) the purchase or building of transmission facilities needed to connect this project to the existing transmission system of the Authority; and (3) the acquisition of land necessary for, and relocation of, highways in connection with the accomplishment of the above project.

There was no change in this item in the Senate.

It will thus be seen that I was very largely instrumental in getting the Wilson Dam built in 1916. The House was exceedingly close and at that time the Senate took no interest in it. My amendment in the House was defeated at first and was only put in in conference, showing how close the House was. It will also be seen that of the 12 great dams that have been finished or started, I was the author of the provision for building 11 of the dams. And in the Senate I got the money to build all the dams and every time by as close fights as I have ever had in my legislative history. It will be seen from the above statement from the Appropriations Committee proceedings that I lost 1 dam for a whole year, the Gilbertsville, and I got it put in the next year.

SUPPORTED WATAUGA

I also got the Watauga and the South Holston Dams authorized and started, but Lilienthal was opposed to both and his friend, Krug, who was on the W. P. B., got those two dams stopped by that body, no doubt at the instigation of his former employer, Lilienthal.

I said I got all the money for the dams and that is true, and over the greatest opposition that I have ever encountered, and that is true. I admit I was opposed to Douglas Dam because it needlessly took over one of the richest valleys in the State of Tennessee, when the dam could have been built elsewhere. When the Senate overruled me I went ahead and joined in the appropriation of the money even for that dam.

Now, I want to ask all fair-minded people, with these incontrovertible facts before them, how could any honest person say that I am opposed to the T. V. A. and the building of these dams? It is an absolutely false statement, known to have been false when the author of the statement, whose name is Lilienthal, put them out to the newspapers. He has been putting out false statements against me ever since he has been in office and that is the absolute truth. He speaks of me as a politician. He is a politician himself, holding office all his life.

Of course, President Roosevelt had no part in the credit in the building of the original Wilson Dam, but for the continuation and completion of the project he is entitled to every credit. If the President hadn't been for us in 1933, we couldn't have built those dams. The sentiment in the Senate was always strong against these projects, and unless we had had the approval of the President I could have gotten no appropriations for the dams. Not that all his friends on the committee were for the dams, quite the contrary, some of his warmest friends were opposed to them. But he had commended the original project, and, of course, he is entitled to the greatest credit for reviving it and for the building of the Norris and the Wheeler Dams. Whether he was over for Morgan's and Lilienthal's yardstick policy I do not know. If he was, he did not say anything about it. However, he did not recommend the building of more dams, and I supposed this was because the T. V. A. did not recommend the building of more dams. It just happened, however, that I was in a place where I could force the building of these dams if a majority of the Senate committee and of the Senate agreed with me, and they did agree with me, and that was the way the dams were built.

GAVE BEST YEARS

I gave some of the best years of my life to the building of these dams. I was more interested in them than I ever was in any piece of legislation in my life. For 28 years I have in season and out of season supported the building of these dams. As heretofore shown I supported them when the members of the T. V. A. were fighting them actively or fighting them silently. They were for the "yardstick" theory of dealing with these dams. It was on the occasion of one of these great fights that I had in the Senate to build these dams that I found Morgan and Lilienthal were here lobbying with the members of the Appropriation Committee against the building of the Gunterville, Chickamauga and Hiwassee Dams and I gave them notice that if they did not get out of town I would denounce them on the floor of the Senate and I had a man at the railroad station that afternoon to see if they left and they did leave. And yet this man Lilienthal whom his own colleague, A. E. Morgan, denounced as a corrupt and dishonest man in dealing with one phase of the T. V. A., the marble claims phase, is now endeavoring to besmirch my good name and bring reproach to me.

Now, how did all this new turmoil arise? Well, in the present fight in the Congress, Lilienthal came to the House and demanded that this almost billion-dollar investment of the United States Government in these dams obtained in the way I have outlined be turned over to him and managed and controlled by him as he sees fit.

The House of Representatives saw fit to pass the bill recommended by him to reappropriate some relatively small balances and to appropriate all his receipts for the coming year, amounting to some $89,000,000, for the purpose of giving him his claimed necessary appropriation for running his organization and besides that, a revolving fund of $8,659,298 for the coming year. The amount I offered in the Appropriations Commitee and which has aroused all this turmoil and which was adopted in the Senate gives him the $79,134,882 for running the establishment and only takes away from him his revolving fund of $8,656,298 to do with as he pleases. In other words, it requires the T. V. A. to pay its receipts into the general fund of the Treasury and to get its appropriations from the Congress just as the War Department does, just as the Navy Department does, and just as all the other departments, and as the Post Office Department does. None of these departments receives revolving funds, not even the War or the Navy Departments. It has already been announced by the Army that it expects to pay back into the Treasury of the United States $28,000,000,000. Why shouldn't the T. V. A. pay back its unexpended balances in the same way?

FUNDS DANGEROUS

To furnish T. V. A. with a revolving fund of this kind would be setting a precedent that this Government could not afford to set. If it was started in one activity it would soon be demanded in the others.

Let me again refer to the Post Office Department, which deals with sums small as 1 cent. It does a billion-dollar business a year. The Congress appropriates all the money for the Post Office Department every year. It has not injured that Department to come to the Congress for its appropriations. It has not injured that Department to pay its receipts into the general fund of the Treasury. That Department is substantially self-supporting but it does not ask for a revolving fund so that it may be turned loose and spend this money in any way it sees fit.

If, however, we make a special kingdom of the T. V. A., and crown Lilienthal king, and turn him loose with a reserve fund of more than $8,000,000 to spend as he pleases, I see no reason why the Post Office Department, which is splendidly run, should not have the same privilege.

Lilienthal has recently written and published an article in which he says that to turn this activity over to an independent agency like the T. V. A. and let him run it is what he calls grass-roots government. He must have gotten this advice from the Vice President, who seems to be a very close friend. I do not believe this country wants any such policy of government. Now, there is another reason and a very potent one, in my view, why this should not be done.

Article I, section 9, of the Constitution of the United States provides: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

In his report last July, Lilienthal said:

"I paid into the Treasury of the United States $13,148,000." And he claimed that he had done so until confronted with the testimony of the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bell, that the Treasury Department had not received such money. Lilienthal then admitted that he had not paid it into the Treasury but that it was a part of the T. V. A.'s fund in the Treasury which he drew against from time to time. In other words, it was still in the hands of the T. V. A. and the Treasury could not touch it.

LILIENTHAL SCORED

Again Lilienthal has been in a constant state of disagreement with the General Accounting Office ever since he has been with the T. V. A.

Section 12 of the T. V. A. Act required: "The Board shall sell the same (current) to the ultimate consumer without discrimination between consumers of the same class"; and yet the hearings show that Lilienthal has entered into 20-year contracts with two aluminum companies, and the difference in price in favor of one of the aluminum companies over the other for the 20-year period of the contract is a tidy little sum of $7,000,000.

Under these circumstances the committee and the Senate thought that instead of turning the entire discretion over to Lilienthal to run the T. V. A. as he saw fit that the Congress ought to take care of the money it had

invested in these dams just as we have always done heretofore and that we ought to see that Lilienthal obeys the Constitution and the laws under which he is operating. The Constitution requires that all appropriations be made out of the Treasury of the United States. The law requires Lilienthal to pay his receipts into the Treasury and to get his funds to operate the Authority from the Congress.

The Budget estimate of the cost of operating the T. V. A. for 1945 is $79,134,882 and the Senate has appropriated that sum, so that all this noise and clatter about being hamstrung and the like by Lilienthal and his satellites is absolute poppycock. The only thing taken away was a revolving fund of $8,656,298. We give no other activity of the Government any such fund to do with as it pleases. We also required T. V. A. to pay its receipts into the Treasury as required by the law under which it operates. I might add that the Budget undertook to set up a reserve fund itself and the Senate very severely sat down on them.

It seems that Lilienthal has recently written a book on the T. V. A. The book, T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, in one of the advertisements has this endorsement by Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE. "Of all the books I have head in the past 12 months, this is the most exciting." I am wondering if our Vice President was influenced in any way by this book in his violation of the rules of the Senate the other day. When our opponents in the Senate found that they did not have enough votes, Vice President WALLACE undertook to throw my amendment out on a point of order but the Senate severely sat down on him by a vote of 46 to 17.

SEES HARM IN SNIPING

I have also seen another advertisement of this book—I haven't seen the book yet—in which it is said, "Mr. Lilienthal's position becomes almost Olympian, for not only does he disbelieve in government by an elite, managerial class but his love of the democratic processes is so strong as to denounce the growing contempt of politics and of Congress. And he warns that while it is irritating for conscientious and overworked men to be sniped at by professional politicians, progressives, and especially those in administrative or technical posts, they are under a peculiarly heavy responsibility to recognize with scrupulous care, the role of politics in fixing of basic policies.

Mr. Lilienthal was born in Chicago some 45 years ago, and after he was grown he moved to Wisconsin and got into politics by being appointed by Gov. Philip La Follette to a position on some commission, and it is claimed he was transferred from this place through the tutelage of Donald R. Richberg, formerly with the National Recovery Board. Lilienthal was then appointed to the T. V. A. and has been in that place ever since. In other words, he has been in politics practically all of his grown life. He is a nice one to be talking about Congress and denouncing Members of Congress.

But, my friends, the great reason why this revolving fund of $8,856,000 should not be turned over to Lilienthal for such purposes as he chooses to spend it, is because that fund and all other excess profits ought to be used for reducing electric rates to all the people of this whole area. The cities in the State distribute a large portion of this electricity. The contracts ought to be renegotiated with the cities, and the surplus and earnings applied to a reduction of the rates charged in these contracts, and the cities required, as the basic law provides, to reduce the prices charged the people for their electric current. The home owners, the farmers, and all who use electricity, or who use fertilizer, should be given at least a 10-percent reduction instead of building up a reserve in the hands of the T. V. A. These dams were built because of the inordinate charges of the private power companies, and we ought not to slip back into private power company methods, but by all means should reduce the rates of electricity to the people.

NORRIS' ATTACK UNCALLED FOR

Lastly I come to the attacks that former Senator Norris has made upon me concerning the T. V. A. I refer to him only because of his unjustified and uncalled-for attacks on me and the wide publicity that has been given Norris' statements by Lilienthal. I never was more surprised in my life, because at one time during the marble claim controversy Norris criticized Lilienthal quite as vigorously as I have. While he was in the Senate he always appeared very friendly to me. I had no idea that he had toward me personal and malignant hate of which he now gives evidence.

Now, Senator Norris really had nothing to do actually with the building of the dams on the Tennessee River. He had supported President Roosevelt in 1932, and it was because of that fact, no doubt, that President Roosevelt gave him the honor of introducing the bill setting up the T. V. A., which I had always understood the President had prepared. This authorizing bill was passed practically without contest, because everyone knew it was the President's bill. He had in the campaign declared for the building of the dams.

The fights over the building of the Tennessee dams all came before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and before the Senate itself over getting the money to build the dams. In the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate itself there was simply tremendous and vigorous opposition to the building of every one of those dams. Senator Norris never took any part in these controversies and never helped to get a dollar for the building of the dams, so far as I know. Indeed, when Arthur Morgan and Lilienthal were for the so-called yardstick theory, Norris was with them in that contention. I am quite sure that Lilienthal appealed to Norris to say some word about this matter. I do not know, of course; but I can not believe that Norris of his own accord injected himself into this controversy. My understanding has always been that Norris recommended the first three men who went on the Tennessee Valley Authority. I was not consulted about Arthur Morgan or Lilienthal, but I was told that Dr. H. A. Morgan, of my State, was to be placed on the Authority. I had never heard of either Lilienthal or Arthur Morgan, so far as I can now recall.

Inasmuch as Senator Norris has so bitterly attacked me, I cannot refrain from saying that it is remarkable that he never got a dam built by the Government in his own State which, I am informed, has many dam sites. I have heard he has for many years been claiming credit for building the dams in my State.

I am sometimes falsely accused of being a patronage-monger. The accusation is wholly unjust. I doubt if any man in the Senate cares less about patronage than I do.

Lilienthal in his late book has much to say about politics and politicians, and how unwise it is for any people to be represented by politicians. He forgets that he has never been engaged in anything else in his life except politics. I am told that when quite a young man he was appointed to a place on a public-service commission of some kind in Wisconsin by Gov. Philip La Follette, and from that he was appointed to the Tennessee Valley Authority. If that does not constitute him a politician, then I am ignorant of the meaning of the word "politician."

Now Norris says that I ought to be removed from my office as Senator because I got these dams and am still in favor of running them for the benefit of the people of Tennessee and surrounding States. Maybe I ought, I do not know. Confidentially, I think the reason Norris failed of reelection last time was because he never got anything for Nebraska. He was always so busy talking that he never had time to do anything real for his people, and unfortunately the old gentleman is still talking and still venomous. I feel sorry for him, but he had no business attacking me.

Knights of Columbus Service Flag Dedication—Address by Hon. David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me on April 16 on the occasion of the unfurling of a national service flag under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus, at the national headquarters of this organization at New Haven, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have assembled here on this memorable day in the history of our order to give public expression to the esteem, affection, and gratitude which we entertain for our fraternity brothers who are in the military service of our country. The sentiments that overwhelm us on occasions like this are difficult, aye, almost impossible, to express. The reflected light of the eye, or a silent tear is, indeed, more effective than words in giving expression to our present emotion. The resistless urge, the ceaseless longing to give expression in a public way to deep human emotions is the answer to those who ask why this ceremony.

One may fail to properly interpret the significance of this event unless he fully comprehends what it really signifies. The stars on this banner do more than symbolize to us the 75,000 loyal, courageous, and patriotic members of our order who are in the military service of our beloved country. It represents to us the heartaches and tears, the sacrifices and sufferings of the wives, the mothers, daughters, and sisters of those brothers of ours who are giving their all that this great democracy should not perish.

It will also be a constant reminder of the spirit of unity that our order stands for and proclaims—namely, that the men of our faith and of our fraternal order have responded willingly and cheerfully, and will continue to respond, to the call of country—and can and will cooperate wholeheartedly with their fellow Americans of every race, class, and creed in defense of America.

Time does not permit me to describe in detail the magnificent spirit of service and sacrifice that all our members are making in this emergency. One thing we know—no Knight of Columbus has been found wanting. Our brother knights, and I can speak with some intimate knowledge and authority, are demonstrating in every corner of the world where our battle flag has been unfurled, a loyalty, a high degree of courage, and a devotion to their country's cause unsurpassed by any group of the millions of loyal men and

women in our fighting forces. In the air, on the sea, and on land, in every clime, under every condition, enduring severe hardships, our brothers are responding nobly, gallantly, and magnificently.

We are proud of them and our meeting here today is to tell them so. These ceremonies are to let them know that they are not forgotten; that while absent they are in the loving thoughts, not only of their immediate families but of every Knight of Columbus throughout the land.

Many of them are far distant from us as we meet here at this shrine of their order. Many of them have already suffered much in body and mind. Some of them have already made the supreme sacrifice. Many of them are facing with hearts of steel the uncertainty and unknown dangers that lie ahead. Though we cannot see each of them, though we cannot be by the side of any of them, yet there is comfort to them and to us in the thought that we are in constant communication with them through the fraternal spirit and spiritual bonds that permeate our order and unite all Knights in a firmer faith with the Creator.

Today we honor, as these members of our order would want us to honor, their mothers, wives, sisters, and other loved ones who are carrying on the war on the hidden battlefield of their homes. All wars are great tragedies, but we must never forget that first, last, and foremost all wars are mothers' wars.

It is, therefore, with real sincerity and with a full understanding of the sacrifices they are making, that today, in the presence of this service flag, we ask the beloved archbishop to lead us in prayer to the God of Nations to save, guide, and protect each and all of these fighting brothers of ours, and also to protect and comfort their loved ones.

Fellow Knights, we owe these brothers of ours in the armed forces more than words of praise and gratitude. We owe them action and duty. First and foremost, we owe them the obligation to contribute our efforts to bring this war as soon as is humanly possible to a victorious end, to lessen in every conceivable way the loss of human life, and to bring them back to their homes and loved ones speedily.

There is another pledge we owe them. During this war there are forces that have been let loose which are threatening us not only on the battle front but on the home front as well. Many strange political forms are developing in America under the smokescreen of the war. One of these extremes, unbelievable as it must seem to real Americans, is that we must change our form of Government in order for us to cooperate successfully in the post-war organization of the world. While fighting regimentation abroad with all its strength and fury, let us not submit to regimentation at home, for after this war is over American regimentation can be just as intolerable as Fascist regimentation.

We pledge them, therefore, that we will endeavor at the end of this war to make an American, as well as an international, peace—a peace that will provide for the safety and security of America in the future; a peace that will assure the preservation of the free democratic institutions that we inherited from our American forebears. While they are fighting on the war front we insist that there shall be no surrender of the American way of life here at home.

In attempting to solve the gigantic task to bring America back to post-war conditions, let us not repeat the mistakes following the last war. Above all other considerations, we must provide for the safety, happiness, and security of our people here at home, and we must plan to defend ourselves against all aggressors by maintaining unhampered and undismantled the powerful Navy and Air Force we have built up during this war. It is our strongest, and, indeed, may be our only protection against the greed and selfishness, the power politics, and economic ambitions of other nations, and the jealous and vaulting ambitions of dictators.

The members of our order possessed, when they entered the service, two birth certificates. One they took with them; the other they left behind in our keeping. Their baptismal certificate—their faith in the Almighty we know they will preserve, for that faith is embedded in every fiber of the true Knight of Columbus.

The other birth certificate they left in our keeping. It is the birth certificate of all Americans—the Declaration of Independence. This certificate must not be mutilated.

Political principles that will destroy private initiative, and bureaucratic control of our lives, of education, and religion can destroy it. The regimentation, that the war has brought to the forefront, of men, women, and children in all their individual life activities can destroy it. Dissipation by waste and extravagance of our wealth and resources, and the abandonment of foreign-trade policies that have built up our industries and made our working men and women the most prosperous in the world, on the theory that free trade among nations will make for world peace, can destroy it. The book-educated specialists with the policy of exaggerated internationalism can destroy it. Our zeal and desire to help the world, unless restrained by determination to keep out of the present world brawls of ideologies and greed for power and plots to despoil people of their inalienable rights can destroy it. All these and many other subtle means in the political life around us can become as dangerous to our institutions as any foreign war.

The peace that America most of all wants after this war is that our people be left free to live their lives as their ancestors did; free to work, to play, to pray, and to live without the necessity of governmental permission or by direction of governmental edict.

Now, a final promise to our brother Knights whom we honor today: We shall plead and fight for the inspiring peace program proposed by the Knights of Columbus. No sounder or saner peace objectives have been presented by any of the many groups who have been planning after-the-war peace programs.

Our armed forces on the battle fronts are going to win the war, but it is folly to assume, what unfortunately is a prevailing opinion, that it can be done without sacrifices beyond measure and tremendous losses that no one can possibly calculate, during the days ahead. But are we, who have not the responsibility of military service and enjoying the comforts of home life, willing to serve and sacrifice to win the peace?

To succeed in obtaining a just and lasting peace will call for a high degree of courage and much of the spirit to do or die that our armed forces are displaying on every battle front.

If America fails in its efforts for a peace based upon justice it will not be because of defects arising from ill-conceived objectives, but from lack of bold and direct application of sound principles to changing realities as they occur during the war and following the war. Our after-war difficulties will be greatly lessened if our own Nation and our allies all realize that they possess no mandate to determine the forms of government, the policies or viewpoints of the peoples in Europe, whether powerful or weak, of varying customs and races, who during this war have become the victims of aggression and who have shared with us the heavy task of destroying ruthless aggression.

As we fight unflinchingly for a just peace we must keep in mind that such a peace is premised, from first to last, upon the faith on the part of our people and the peoples of the world in the basic value of such things as freedom—political, territorial, and religious. Unless the doctrine, that has gained ground alarmingly in recent years through the world, that the individual possesses no right which the state is bound to respect, and that force can be substituted for justice, is definitely crushed, we are certain to lose the battle for peace. Enduring peace will bless mankind only when the world becomes an association of truly free states recognizing as fundamental to the enjoyment of liberty and peace, as the American founders of this Republic did, the God-given rights of free individuals.

Our forefathers did not begin with the Declaration of Independence. They began with God. Freedom was not their creation. Freedom to them was a gift God had bestowed on mankind. They conceived their function was to create a government which guaranteed the protection of freedom. Only if the spirit—the spirit of In God We Trust is at the peace table when the war is over, will the hopes of lasting peace be realized "by men of good will the world over, who have seen and felt the folly and futility of war."

These ceremonies will be shortly concluded. Tomorrow and the day after, and for many days in the future, our brother knights scattered throughout the world serving our country on land, and in the air, and on the sea will learn about these ceremonies. We pray that it may be a source of strength and inspiration to them to know that we fully sense our responsibilities on the home front and that we will not let them down. I pledge, in your name, we will not let them down.

Address by Hon. Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, at Second Annual Convention of the N. R. E. C. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on March 7 I spoke extemporaneously at the second annual convention of the N. R. E. C. A. in Chicago. Yesterday I received the stenographic transcript covering my remarks on that occasion. President Tate, before presenting me, had asked the Nebraska delegates to come to the platform, to which my opening remarks refer.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Tate, honored guests, fellow Nebraskans, it really was a great surprise to me that Steve pulled in inviting my honorable constituents to be on the stand with me at this time, but I can assure you that it was a very pleasant surprise and in returning the compliment that he may have intended to pay me, I want to say that I think I am just as proud, if not more so, of men like this, and women, too, who support work of this sort in Nebraska than they can possibly be of me or any other representative that may work for you and others in this great program in the land.

It was one of the most pleasant experiences that I have ever had when I attended the

first annual convention held by this association in St. Louis 1 year ago. I didn't know until just a day or two before the convention that it was going to be possible for me to be present and then I went simply to be a guest, to mingle with the people who represented R. E. A. and I thought at that time it was one of the most important and potent movements in America. I think it has set a record that has never been met by any organization of any kind in the attendance that it had in St. Louis and under the restrictions that govern travel at this time I think I can say the same as to the attendance of your second annual meeting here in Chicago.

Last year there were a number of Senators with me at the St. Louis meeting and I regret exceedingly that they were not able to be with us here tonight.

One of the very best friends that I have in the Senate is one of the best friends of rural electrification, GEORGE AIKEN, former Governor and now Senator from Vermont. I sit in the Senate at the left of Senator WILLIS, of Indiana, which State, I believe, is near the top of the States of the Union leading out in the organization and pushing the further extension of rural electrification.

I am a very close friend of JOHN RANKIN and of DICK RUSSELL, and others who have worked so diligently to get this movement under way during the last several years. But I should be amiss if I failed to mention at this time—having just come from a very short visit in my own State of Nebraska—if I didn't mention that one great citizen, not only of Nebraska but nationally famous, for the work that he has done in helping to organize and extend work of this kind. I refer to none other than the great Senator George Norris. [Applause.]

And I am sure that it will please all of you to know that when I called on them a few days ago for about a half an hour in his home in McCook, I found both he and Mrs. Norris in what I considered the pink of condition. And while he did not give me, and I did not request, his permission to extend to you at this time his very best wishes, I am sure that he would have given me that privilege had I asked it, and I am going to assume the responsibility of extending to all of you present and your coworkers his very best wishes. While he is living, you might say, in retirement from public service, he still serves. And, like many other men, the work that he has done through the years may, perhaps, really be more effective as time comes and goes. He was the coauthor and cosponsor of the Norris Act, approved May 20, 1936, referred to by the previous speaker, which took the R. E. A. out of the emergency category and extended its life for 10 years. He will long be remembered for the work he has done in this field.

I have attended a great many national conventions of different kinds—farmer, elevator, grain dealer conventions, etc.—and I can tell you that they have had some speakers of national note who would help to draw a crowd, but I have never attended a convention of an organization of this kind or any other kind where the enthusiasm and the interest and the spirit, as evidenced by those in attendance, equaled that at St. Louis, and I am sure that it will be the same in this convention here.

I really got something from your convention last year, something that is going to keep me active in this movement through the years of service that I may have in the Senate of the United States. I am sure that from talking to those who attended in St. Louis and, perhaps, are in attendance at this convention here this year, that I got a great deal more benefit from it than anything that I could have contributed myself.

One of the very interesting experiences last year was a meeting with a delegation from Nebraska. They had come from Nebraska to St. Louis. I came from Washington to St. Louis expecting to see, perhaps, a half a dozen, maybe 10 or 15 delegates from the State of Nebraska, but there were about 45. We had breakfast together and I can tell you very frankly that it did the cause of rural electrification considerable good so far as I am concerned, because it was a great inspiration to me to see the number of people who came and the interest that they displayed in this program, and, likewise, again at this meeting.

You have a great responsibility here. It gives you the opportunity to get together and talk over your plans for R. E. A., a program that will pay great dividends in the future.

President Tate in introducing the speaker ahead of me, my good friend, Mr. Casey, spoke of him as an active member of the R. E. A. He presented me as a farmer, for which I am very glad and proud. I hope at the next convention, Steve, that you can present me as an active member of the R. E. A. because one of the first things that I went to work on in cooperation with Senator Norris and others in the Senate was the development of the R. E. A. in Nebraska. The Senator and I came originally from the same county in Nebraska. Becoming a member of an active R. E. A. is one of the things that I am looking forward to for the coming year. [Applause.]

I think, perhaps, a word or two in connection with R. E. A. in Nebraska might not be amiss at this time.

When R. E. A. came into existence in 1935 only 9,544 of the 121,000 farms in Nebraska had any form of electric service. The number of Nebraska farms now having such service is in excess of 31,000. The percentage of electrified farms was then 7.1 percent and now it is 25.8 percent.

Not all of the recent increase is due directly to the R. E. A. Private power companies, due partly to R. E. A. activity, have greatly expanded their lines and their services to rural Nebraska.

Since 1935, R. E. A. has loaned $12,520,000 to the 21 borrowers in Nebraska. There were 28 borrowers but because of consolidation and other reasons the number now is 21 and I am glad to say that each of the 21 members are members of this cooperative association. [Applause.]

With the money thus loaned there has been constructed in Nebraska 10,731 miles of rural electric distribution lines.

Speakers who preceded me today and Mr. Casey, who just addressed you, have given you a great insight into the record and into the future possibilities of rural electrification so I am not going to dwell at length on that point at this time, but I would like to mention just one phase of the possibility in the further development of rural electrification and that is in connection with irrigation. Now, that doesn't interest many of you people who come from the Eastern States where you get all of the rainfall that you need, but in 17 other States you would lose crops frequently if you didn't have irrigation. It is one of the greatest and most important subjects that we can consider. I happen to have three irrigation pumps on my own farm in southwest Nebraska, operated by dilapidated, old, gasoline engines, which require considerable tinkering with from time to time. And one of my earliest attempts was to get the power line now in existence through the adjoining territory extended to my farm so that I could have the benefit of the electric current, but when we looked at the cost, and so forth, it was physically impossible. Under the plans that are now being made, the R. E. A. will have lines in that area within another year. And there are many of my neighbors who will be able to produce more because of this service. Our task of feeding not only ourselves, our troops abroad, and those for whom we will be responsible when we take over the new areas conquered will increase the demands upon America exceeding anything that you can imagine. Every additional ton of food that we can produce by installing irrigation is going to be needed and needed badly.

During the past summer I had the good fortune to make an extended trip through Latin America—some of you may have heard or read of it—and one of the sad things that I saw on that trip was the lack of development of irrigation in many countries which would enable them to produce their own food. I visited areas where they produce not to exceed a half to two-thirds of the food that is necessary to keep their people alive. I think it is perfectly proper for me to mention one such country and that is Peru. It is a beautiful country and they are wonderful people that succeeded the Incas. The Indians fed themselves. They had to, because there were no countries from which they could import. They had no facilities for importing food if they wanted to and, therefore, they had to produce the food that kept them alive. And, when you stop to think that the number of people who lived in that area at the time was far greater than the number of people occupying Peru today and that they are not feeding themselves, the waste of power and water from the Andes in abundance, you can appreciate how I understand the importance of developing irrigation not only here at home but helping others in a cooperative effort in their countries, especially our good neighbors to the south.

Perhaps the greatest example of the interest of Congress in rural electrification at the moment is the introduction in the House and Senate of six bills affecting rural electrification. The one that was mentioned by Mr. Casey, the Pace bill introduced March 7 of this year which reduces the interest payments on R. E. A. loans is one, perhaps, of the greatest importance, and I hope that it will soon have passed the Senate and have been signed by the President so that the benefit will be available for those who are extending this work in all parts of the United States. [Applause.]

A farming economy built around a steady source of electrical energy will be one of the chief bases for sound and prosperous agriculture in this country in the years to come. With the aid of electric power at a reasonable price food production may well meet unheard of records in the future. And, let me assure you of my own earnest desire to promote and support this program in every way possible for the best interests of agriculture and the Nation.

As I sat here and looked over this fine group this evening I was impressed with the idea, with the thought of the responsibility that is yours as trustees of this movement throughout America. The trustee of an R. E. A. cooperative has a responsibility that is important to the entire rural community it is impossible to overestimate. In many communities the R. E. A. cooperative enterprise is the largest business owned and controlled by the people themselves. Rural electrification holds no end of possibilities for the improvement of rural lighting. To be entrusted by one's neighbors with the guidance of so important an enterprise is an honor which fills every trustee with a deep sense of obligation and a firm determination to show himself worthy. The success of a national rural electrification program is directly affected by the national success of every local R. E. A. cooperative. For an R. E. A. cooperative to be successful it means that it must be effective both as a business and as a cooperative enterprise. It is, therefore, important that the board shall make use of competent, technical, and business management. It is also important for the board to do everything possible to make the enterprise function as a real cooperative. That means that the employee membership shall cooperate wholeheartedly with the

board in building an enterprise of maximum service to the entire rural community.

There have been many tragic events in our life as a nation since this organization met in its first annual convention in St. Louis 1 year ago. Our country has gone through what is no doubt the most critical period in its history. Sweat, blood, and tears have punctuated the events of the past year. Blood was shed and continues to spill in Africa, Italy, and the islands in the Pacific area, and in many other places throughout the world. Sweat flows from the brow of agriculture and industry throughout the Nation in our unprecedented feat of production. Tears are shed by increasing thousands throughout America. You who are meeting here today well know the record of tragic events as they are being recorded daily in the homes of our rural communities. My own experience is no different from that of all the rest of you. I have no son who can offer himself to the service, but I have, as most men do, a number of nephews. I have in mind at the moment two in the southwest Pacific. One a pilot in the Marine Corps. Another who is a director of radar detector work and who, on Christmas Day last at the Gloucester Straits, took part in his one hundred and thirteenth engagement. I think that will give you some idea of the size of the task that we have accomplished and what still lies ahead of us.

In Congress the load has been no lighter. It grows continually in its intensity and it has taken its toll of life from the Members of both bodies. Among this group was one whose services to agricultural America will stand forever as a grand record of genuine statesmanship and stamped always with a devotion to all he deemed right. I refer to the Honorable Charles L. McNary, late Senator from Oregon and for many years our minority leader but always highly respected by the opposition. I pray that such devoted and able leadership will continue to flow from the homes of America into the Halls of Congress.

Yes; many strenuous days and sleepless nights are spent by those who represent you in the day-to-day consideration of $100,000,000,000 budgets, the draft, food subsidies, rehabilitation of war veterans, shortage of farm labor and farm machinery, the raising of money by taxation, the load of which is reflected in every home, aid to dependents of those in the service, war labor difficulties, and many other similar and even more serious problems. "What is past is prologue." That is a statement that appears on one of the public buildings in Washington which I see nearly every day. And how true it is. The future is the thing that is most important to all of us. What interests us most today is what the future holds for us.

I think all of you realize, to some extent, the size of the task that lies ahead with the debt approximating or exceeding, perhaps, three hundred billion when our total assets or the balance on the other side of the ledger is about two hundred billion. To balance that will task the earning capacity of America. The rapid development of rural electrification will tremendously increase the earning capacity of America. That is one of the real reasons why I am so interested in its further development. I am frequently in conventions where men speak discouragingly of the possibility of America working from under the debt that it has today. But I know of instances and you know of similar instances where some good businessman has met adversity in his business and has gone to his banker for assistance. He inherited a good business from his father, his father inherited it from his father and grandfather. The business through the years had established a wonderful record but at the moment is in dire straits. When the banker after questioning finds that he wants to borrow, perhaps, $100,000 more than his plant is actually worth, he first throws up his hands but after further consideration, taking into consideration the record that the business has made in the past and how it has worked out from under similar circumstances, he changes his mind. That, I think, is a practical illustration of what we Americans face today. We are going to have a tremendous task, going to have to borrow more money than our plant is worth, but by working together cooperatively we will get the job done and continue, perhaps, to be even a stronger Nation at some time in the future than we have been in the past.

I am a firm believer in the constant, continual development of electrical service to rural communities of America. I say constant and continual, because I don't think we want to attempt to do too much in 1 year. Let's take it in small allotments that we can take care of as a group, as a nation. The progress that we make depends largely on the contribution of time and work by you people who are here today. Also on the support you get from the Government. By Government I mean the people of America working cooperatively in solving all our problems. This is truly a cooperative enterprise, one that should interest every citizen of the country whether he is a resident of the city or rural area. As a nation we maintain mail service to the communities regardless of whether each community is in itself self-sustaining in that respect. Likewise we maintain protection for all parts of the country, to all citizens of the Nation regardless of their individual situation or importance. Education, police and fire protection is likewise a community project. Every R. E. A. project that is completed adds to our strength as a nation. You who are here will make your contribution as community builders in helping to organize and extend rural electric service to the farmers of America. National leadership comes from the small communities, and as we cooperatively make electricity available along the highways and byways of America, we thus become the community builders from whence comes the best leadership of our country.

In closing, I want to add my personal pledge to that of our Commander in Chief as it was read by President Tate here this evening as a member of the opposite party. There is no partisanship in an organization of this kind. In work of this kind we all join in to help develop it to the limit of our ability. [Applause.]

Pan-American Day Address by Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, in connection with the celebration of Pan-American Day, before the Pan American Union on April 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pan-American Day is an important anniversary to the nations of the Americas. We meet today to honor those whose vision and energy established and for more than 50 years have carried forward the Pan American Union and all that it signifies. It is well to ask ourselves why it is that we can meet in the midst of the greatest war of history and why it is that we have so great an achievement to commemorate. For in doing so we may more clearly see the guideposts which point the true direction in which we may go forward to new cooperation among ourselves and new cooperation with other nations of the earth.

Inter-American unity was not brought about by force and is not based upon the conception of a master race whose mission is to rule. It was not produced by nations with a homogeneous racial origin. It does not depend upon the bonds of a common language or a culture based on a common literature or common customs and habits.

Were these the only sources of international unity and common action, the future for the world would be dark indeed. But inter-American unity proves that there are other sources more subtle and even stronger—sources which offer hope to a world which can find no hope in the factors which I have mentioned. Our unity comes from a passionate devotion to human liberty and national independence which is so strong that it does not stop with the effort of each people to secure liberty for itself but goes on to respect as no less valid the desire of other peoples to achieve the same liberty in accordance with their own traditions and historic institutions. Although the language of Bolivar and San Martin was different from that of Washington and Jefferson, they were expressing the same purposes and principles and they led their countrymen along the same paths. These are the paths along which inter-American unity has developed, growing ever stronger as the American nations have come to understand one another and to have trust and confidence in one another's purposes and to work together for purposes so identic that they produced not division and jealousy but unity of thought and action.

As the years have gone on, the true principles underlying inter-American unity have been made more specific as one inter-American conference has followed another. In the years between the World Wars the trust and confidence between the American nations grew ever stronger while elsewhere the growth of ambitions of conquest by force brought division and fear. It is the common pride of the American Republics and the good fortune of all mankind that the torch of international cooperation has burned at its brightest in the affairs of this hemisphere precisely at a time when it was being blacked out elsewhere. It is natural that the history of an international association which has endured longer than any other should provide encouraging guidance for the future.

At the Montevideo Conference in 1933 the American Republics affirmed their belief in certain essential principles upon which cooperation between nations and international order must be based. Among them was the principle that every nation, large and small, was equal before the law of nations. Another was the right of every nation to develop its own institutions, free from intervention by others. We already see the beginning of a wider application of these basic principles. They were stated in the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Declaration, and the declarations made at Moscow. Specifically, it was agreed at Moscow that membership in the world security organization must be upon the basis of the sovereign equality of all nations, weak as well as strong, and the right of every nation to a government of its own choice.

The American nations spoke with a united voice at Buenos Aires as early as 1936 and Lima in 1938 of the dangers to world peace which impended and took united action to defend the hemisphere against them. When

the attack came many of the American republics immediately sprang to the defense of the hemisphere. Shortly after the conference at Rio de Janeiro others took the same course. This chapter in our American history will ever be a gallant and glorious one. It teaches that unity of purpose, a common and passionate devotion to the maintenance of freedom, and mutual trust and confidence are the essential elements without which no amount of international organization and machinery can succeed. But it also teaches us and other nations that international organization and machinery are necessary. Successful as our common action has been, it has not been complete. And it took time, which may not always be available. Therefore we learn that an international organization, whether in the field of inter-American cooperation or in the broader field of world peace, must have two main supports. It must gather its greatest strength from the rightness and justness of the principles upon which it is founded and the mutual trust of its members. It must also have such an essential framework and machinery and such an acceptance of their obligations on the part of its members as will enable it to act promptly and effectively in times of crisis.

Another guidepost for the future which our common experience before and during this war has raised is in the economic field. With the outbreak of the war the continent mobilized economically. The extent to which the products of the hemisphere have contributed to the growing success of the war against Germany and Japan cannot be overestimated. Millions of men and women throughout the hemisphere are devoting themselves unsparingly to the production of essential materials and to the forging of the weapons of our common victory. All this has been done under the great handicaps of the dislocations produced by the war.

At the end of the war all of our countries will be faced by problems of immense gravity. Out of the experience of our association in peace and in war, we have learned that the expansion of material well-being can only come with an expansion of production and trade and hence an increase in consumption. We have learned too that no one nation can solve its problems by itself. An increase in production requires financing, a wise selection of the goods to be produced, and wise and fair commercial policies to enable goods to flow to their markets and necessary purchases to be made in return. All of this requires cooperative effort and the creation of international arrangements through which that effort may have concrete expression. But it requires something more than this. It requires the respect by each nation for each other nation of which I have spoken in the field of political relations. International cooperation in the economic field is the opposite of economic imperialism, by which one country seeks to exploit another. It is also the opposite of economic nationalism, by which each nation seeks to live unto itself.

We citizens of this hemisphere have great opportunities before us. The community of action among the American nations, already highly developed, will at the end of the war be indispensable in the advancement of our economic well-being and in the establishment of an international organization to prevent the recurrence of world wars. Together, as I have said, we foresaw, pointed out, and prepared against the dangers of war. Together we must foresee and prepare for the ever greater common task of the peace. I believe that as in future years men of the Americas meet to commemorate this day they will see unfolded before their eyes ever-increasing evidence that the path along which inter-American cooperation has led is the path to human liberty and human welfare.

American Legion Must Not Be Used by Radical Groups for Political Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, a statement was carried in the press recently to the effect that some Legionnaires in Los Angeles, Calif., had accused me of misusing my franking privilege when I permitted C. Leon de Aryan, publisher of the San Diego weekly, the Broom, to mail out a few of my speeches.

I have never met or seen Mr. de Aryan, and know nothing about him except what I have read in the newspapers. I do not know, nor do I care, how he got any of my speeches—which are all 100 percent American, written or spoken, and paid for by me. But, if Mr. de Aryan did receive any of my speeches he had a legal right to readdress them the same as anyone else has under the law. I am informed that he was at one time under indictment, but his name was not included—for lack of evidence—on the list of the 30 defendants in the so-called sedition trial now being held in Washington.

I hold no brief for Mr. de Aryan, but in America every citizen is innocent until proved guilty. In Mr. de Aryan's case it is doubly so, as he was not even reindicted. I am also informed that his newspaper, the Broom, is still being published every week; and, therefore, I assume in accordance with our postal regulations and other laws. It now turns out that Mr. de Aryan, who may have readdressed a few score of my speeches, is just a straw man set up for political propaganda purposes.

I shall, at a later date when I am in the district, make a detailed reply to the report issued by the Los Angeles group. I desire to point out at this time, however, that the report is filled with inaccuracies, distortions, and innuendoes, and that it is nothing but a brazen attempt to revive the scurrilous smear attacks made on me last year. There is not a single statement or inference in the report to the effect that I have violated any law or regulation regarding the use of my franking privilege or any other, and since that was supposed to have been the basis of the original resolution it is now clear that it was created solely for political purposes and timed for release during the coming campaign although the alleged abuse occurred years ago.

The first I heard or saw of this report, emanating from a Los Angeles group of Legionnaires, was in PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker. It is just the setting it deserved, and is best suited for. But even PM had this to say, "The committee makes clear that the [seventeenth] Legion department [of California] does not 'question Mr. FISH'S motives,' or charge that he is 'disloyal' to the United States," and might well have added that there was not even any charge of violating any law or postal regulation in respect to the use of my franking privilege.

I deny any abuse of my franking privilege. All the speeches that have been mailed under my frank, with two exceptions, have been my own, and I defy anyone to find one word or one statement of mine in the long time that I have been in public life that is un-American. I did send out a speech made by former President Herbert Hoover a few years ago, and another that included with my own speech some remarks of another Member of Congress and an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Taken as a whole, the Los Angeles Legion report is cockeyed. It concludes 16 pages of history and propaganda by quoting a statement I made in Congress on September 29, 1941, in answer to the question of whether it was proper for a Congressman to permit others to use his frank. I replied:

> I think if the organization has been under suspicion, then there might be some impropriety in turning over your speeches for addressing.

The fact is I never sent any speeches out to any organizations since September 29, 1941, and, as far as I know, there have been no claims that I did. The propagandists have shot themselves with their own propaganda. The speeches referred to—those addressed by Mr. de Aryan, of San Diego—were sent to an individual, and not to an organization, and, as I have stated, I never heard of him and, naturally, knew of no suspicion attached to him. Furthermore, he was not reindicted, for lack of evidence, which should remove any question of suspicion.

So why all the fuss and feathers, except just to keep alive contemptible smear attacks against pre-war noninterventionists for political purposes, emanating from radical sources which are even able to use units of the Legion against its own members. It is the old Communist stunt of half truths, distortions, lies, and condemnation through fake associations, which Representative MARTIN DIES has so clearly described in his exposure of the efforts being made to undermine the faith of the American people in their elected representatives in Congress and in constitutional government.

The report is a malicious and false propaganda document, going back 6 years to 1938 and, by quoting certain sentences out of my speeches, twists and distorts their meaning, all of which is deliberately designed to smear me and deceive the American people.

To illustrate the bias and fraudulent intent of this report, at no time does it mention in its supposed summary of my efforts to keep America out of war that I introduced a resolution, in January 1939, to prohibit the sale and shipment of scrap iron to Japan, which was opposed by the administration. I made repeated efforts to get action on this resolution in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and on the floor of the House. It was this scrap iron, sold and shipped by the millions of tons and turned into bombs by the Japanese, that sank our warships and killed 3,000 American soldiers and sailors at Pearl Harbor.

Neither does this prejudiced report show that I introduced legislation and repeatedly urged the acquisition of stock piles of rubber and tin and other strategic materials early in 1940, the construction of a tin refinery in the United States for Bolivian tin for use in any emergency, and the allocation of a million dollars to the Secretary of Agriculture for a survey looking toward the development of rubber resources in South America.

I am proud of every act, every vote, and every speech I made in trying to keep America out of war until we were attacked in a dastardly and cowardly manner by the Japanese. I believe I represented the views of 80 percent of the American people, and I know that I voted consistently with 90 percent of the Republican Members of Congress from 1938 to December 8, 1941, when all but one Member of the House voted to declare war. As a result of my efforts to keep this country out of war—along with other noninterventionists in Congress—I am convinced that we saved America from being involved in war at least 6 months earlier, in which case Germany would never have attacked Russia and we would have been left holding the war bag, which would have been the worst disaster in American history.

I have voted for every Army, Navy, and air force appropriation bill since 1938, and for all measures aimed to win the war as quickly as possible and bring our soldiers home.

Efforts by any group to revive the controversy between pre-war interventionists and noninterventionists is a disservice to the Nation, destroys national unity, and interferes with our efforts to win the war.

I do not question the character or integrity of the Legionnaires of the Seventeenth District of California, at Los Angeles, who may have had any part in writing this report, but merely believe they have been deluded and made use of to spread Communist, left-wing, and false propaganda for political and partisan purposes.

Most of the Legionnaires throughout the Nation, however, will resent this obvious smear attack by a small group of Legionnaires from Los Angeles because one of the fundamental principles of the Legion—and I know whereof I speak, since I was chairman of a committee of three that wrote the preamble to the American Legion constitution—is to keep the American Legion out of politics.

Let Us Face the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the American people are becoming increasingly disturbed about the conflicting policies of the leading members of the United Nations. The assurances that the many nations, all very peace loving and liberty loving and democratic, are united in a holy crusade against dictatorship and aggression seem to be weakening in some quarters. We feel we must carry this war through to a victorious finish if we are to have any hope of future peace. It is apparent, however, that we are fighting this war more idealistically, more unselfishly than any of the other great powers, There is in this Nation, thank God, a great measure of ability and determination to distinguish between right and wrong, of moral consciousness, of religious faith, and of plain common decency in human relations. But we must constantly be alert to see that advocates of foreign ideas and ideals do not gain a dangerous influence in our Government far out of proportion to their small number.

It is a strange fact that the political future of the world is discussed much more openly and frankly in England than in this country. Many Americans seem strangely hesitant to voice their doubts and anxieties, or to advocate what they believe this country should do. I do not see why we, who after all are the great advocates of government by the people, should, without justified criticism, acclaim our leaders as do the Germans. If our Government makes mistakes, we, all of us, must suffer the consequences, not only now but in generations to come. The late great liberal, Mr. Justice Holmes, declared:

> We do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war.

We must preserve the morale of this Nation. "Morale," in this connection, I take to mean a common faith in a cause sublimely just. "Morale" does not imply that we must applaud and sanction blindly the actions and policies of politicians, domestic and foreign. Woodrow Wilson, the First World War President, declared:

> We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. It is hoped that criticism will be constructive, but better unfair attack than autocratic repression. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy.

It is particularly important for us to understand the purposes and the political strategy of our two major cobelligerents, the British Empire and the Soviet Union. If we do not understand what they are driving at, and the way in which they traditionally try to reach their objectives, the real meaning of political statements of their leaders, the real significance of the actions of their foreign offices, and the real objectives of their political and military ventures, then the purposes of this war become unintelligible indeed. Let me try to contribute to a better understanding, not by glorifying but by scrutinizing.

It is certain that many Americans do not understand the position of the British Empire in this world conflict. The most striking characteristic of that vast Empire is that it is run by a numerically small nation on one small, exposed isle. The British would be lost, and their Empire doomed, if any power, or constellation of powers, hostile to them, should become militarily stronger than they, combined with those of their friends on whom they can depend to render aid in world emergencies. Britain, therefore, must have friends if she is to survive, powerful friends, strategically located friends, to assure the protection of their island. Moreover, Britain must go to war as she did in 1917 and in 1939 whenever a power or a constellation of powers potentially hostile to her threatens to become too strong. The traditional British policy, therefore, has always been, and undoubtedly will always remain, that of maintaining a balance of power. It is merely wishful thinking, already refuted by the facts, when Mr. Hull expresses the expectation that in the postwar world the balance-of-power policy will be abandoned. We know that the British Nation, despite all of her tribulations in the past few years, has displayed a vitality and a will to survive that has found its classic expression in the persistent and powerful personality of Mr. Churchill.

In the economic field, Great Britain has two major interests, both of them essential to her very life. They are: Foreign markets for the products of her industries, and a principal share in merchant shipping. Only by the income from her sales and services can she maintain the living standards which are established in the British Isles. A threat against these interests is a threat against the very life of Britain. Such a threat, no matter from what source, is sure to be met with determined countermeasures on her part. One may, moreover, fail to understand British actions and reactions unless one realizes that the British have no other aim than to preserve intact the Empire, and no other policy than to attain that end by all available means.

Mr. Speaker, let us now turn to the Soviet Union and scan her basic purposes. The Soviet Union, despite the undeniable rise of Russian nationalism during the war, is fundamentally a dictatorship of the proletariat. All other social classes have been eliminated. As a consequence, the Soviet people have been hesitant in allying themselves with other nations. They have, instead, established intimate relations with the Communist parties of all other countries. The aim has been to weaken these other countries politically and militarily in case such other countries should contemplate action inimical to the Soviet Union.

Moreover, we cannot understand Soviet policies and their bearing on the future without appreciating that the Soviet people are predominantly Asiatics and not Europeans—Stalin himself is not a Russian, but a Georgian from beyond the Caucasus Mountains. In mental reactions and cultural tastes the Soviet people and the western nations do not have much in common.

The Soviet aim has been and continues to be a world communistic society built on the principles of Marx and Lenin. Politically the Soviet leaders are shrewd. It is not easy always to understand their moves if one does not keep in mind the stakes for which they are playing. It is often said that Stalin is a great realist,

and he is. When he makes a move and encounters too strong a resistance, he does not run his head against the wall, but tries another time, in another way, and at another place. He makes clever use of the advantages he may derive from temporary alliances. He was one day the friend of Hitler, and the next day the friend of Churchill and Roosevelt. He opposes the Kings of Yugoslavia and Greece and makes friends with the King of Italy. We would be naive indeed if we did not realize that he is playing his game—not ours. That game involves the permanent absorption into the Soviet Union of at least parts of Finland, all the three Baltic republics, eastern Poland, and parts of Rumania. The second step is the establishment, to the west of the new frontiers, of a number of dependent states whose military foreign policy will be closely coordinated with that of the Soviet Union. The countries of this zone will have independence only in name and that probably only for a limited time. Today this appears to be the future fate of Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Balkan states, and perhaps of Austria.

As to her German policy, the Soviet Government has set up in Moscow a German national committee which, despite Mr. Hull's statement to the contrary, is still very active. Stalin has made no secret of the fact. The Soviet Union certainly does not want to be dependent economically on the capitalistic nations of England and the United States. Therefore, it is repeatedly stressed in Soviet propaganda that Russia does not desire to destroy Germany, not even as a military power, but only demands a change in government. However, the Nazis have so successfully eliminated their domestic Communists that there is not available, in case of a German revolution, the party machinery necessary for setting up a German-Soviet government. The Soviet Union, therefore, must achieve its ultimate purpose in several stages, the first being to assure a sort of democratic government in Germany under which it will be possible to reorganize the German Communist Party. That the Soviet leaders have designs even further west is evidenced by the fact that Soviet agents work in France, where an armed Communist organization, the Riflemen, has already been organized.

It is easy to see that the political expansion of the Soviet sphere of influence westward, even to the narrow channel between France and England, constitutes exactly that menace which again and again has forced Britain into a very real war of survival. This has brought forth several significant expressions, the most important being the speech of the Prime Minister of South Africa, Field Marshal Smuts, immediately after the Teheran Conference, to which I have previously referred. He pointedly suggested the necessity for the British Empire to expand on the European Continent so as to include within the Commonwealth a number of the western European nations which, in the opinion of the marshal, cannot exist as independent states in the post-war power constellation, the implication being, of course, that they would become independencies of the Soviet Union. It is also being stressed in England that at the end of the war it will be urgent to rearm France—not for the sake of France, but for the protection of the British Isles.

The opinion is now being voiced in England that Germany must be maintained as a strong nation. That point of view has even been stressed in a recent editorial in the London Times, the semi-official voice of the British Foreign Office. A story recently featured in the London Daily Mail stated that there is an important group of members of the British Parliament who favor some kind of a compromise peace with Japan in order to maintain that country as one strong arm of a pincers strategy directed toward the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, we are largely financing this war. We are "oiling" it. We are sacrificing our men and our money to achieve victory; and victory we must and will achieve. We must continue to fight for principles even though the world around us may be fighting for power as an alternative to annihilation. To the extent to which we can make our American viewpoints prevail, to the extent to which we may be able to ameliorate the cruelties and the strife and suffering of the post-war world, we shall have achieved a great victory.

We must guard our own strength. We must keep America a strong, sane, solvent nation, because upon us rests the tremendous task of leading the rest of the world out of fear, hatred, and war into the paths of security, confidence, mutual good will, and peace.

Not in the history of man has a greater challenge or a more noble work confronted any nation or people. The American people will not fail civilization. Whether civilization fails America will be determined within the next generation.

Retirement of Charles P. Couch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Couch Retires," published in the Shreveport (La.) Journal of April 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. COUCH RETIRES

The retirement of Charles Peter Couch as chairman of the board of directors of the Kansas City Southern-Louisiana & Arkansas railways, which was announced here and in New York on Tuesday, was heard with genuine regret throughout the entire territory in which he has been for several years a powerful business and industrial factor. He had been closely associated with his brother, Harvey C. Couch, in various big enterprises in this area, succeeding him as head of the merged railway lines—the Louisiana & Arkansas, the old Louisiana Railway & Navigation Co., and the Kansas City Southern.

The operation of these lines under one management proved a great forward step, industrially, agriculturally, and in a business way—one of the greatest that has ever been made in this section. It provided a direct connection between Kansas City, the northern terminal, and the great port of New Orleans, from which the Kansas City Southern had been shut off. The finest and fastest of services, both freight and passenger, were provided, with Shreveport as the hub of operations, and under the Couch management the lines proved successful beyond the highest hopes of those who watched the merger from the beginning.

The system created by the Couch brothers specialized not only in upbuilding of the railroad lines included in the merger, but in the material improvement of every section of the country touched. Through the efforts of the late Harvey C. Couch, and those put forth by his brother C. P. (Pete) Couch, scores of new industries have been established in the territory served by their railway lines and the whole area has enjoyed an era of prosperity that might otherwise have passed it by. They were largely responsible for the great paper mills at Springhill, to cite an instance; their activities along such lines, however, were scattered over a wide section of the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

While full results of the changes made in the Kansas City Southern-Louisiana & Arkansas management are not yet discernible, C. P. Couch expressed the confident hope (in announcing his retirement) that the policy of development pursued under his direction would be continued. In this attitude he will have the support of many thousands of friends in the territory served by the railroads concerned, and especially in the city of Shreveport where he has made his home and where he is exceedingly popular. Mr. Couch is a builder and business-getter with few peers in any part of the country. Knowing the railroad business from the ground up, he has seen to it that the physical properties of the roads under his direction have been kept in the best condition; incidentally, these lines have met every requirement as to freight and passenger service. They have handled vast amounts of Army supplies and personnel for the many military camps and war plants, and with complete satisfaction to all concerned; this greatly enlarged volume of business has taxed all of the Couch-directed lines to full capacity, but they have come through in fine style. We do not hesitate to say that Pete Couch, with his great energy and ability, has been very largely responsible for these splendid achievements.

Additional Pay for the Members of the Armed Forces Engaged in Combat Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, under the leave granted me I present for printing in the RECORD the Gallup poll appearing

in the Washington Post of April 21, 1944, and the radio address delivered by me on April 6, both having to do with the bill introduced by me providing additional pay for members of the armed forces who are engaged in combat service.

The poll and the address delivered by Senator TOBEY are as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 21, 1944]

EXTRA COMBAT PAY FAVORED BY PUBLIC FOR FRONT SOLDIERS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 20.—Newspaper Columnist Ernie Pyle's contention that foot soldiers ought to have their pay raised when they are at the fighting fronts meets with the approval of the vast majority of the American people.

Bills embodying such a proposal are being sponsored in the House of Representatives by Representative SAMUEL WEISS and in the Senate by Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.

A survey of public opinion across the Nation on the issue discloses that 7 out of every 10 voters think servicemen who are in combat should be upped 50 percent in pay.

What makes the vote more significant is that a majority—three out of five—say they are willing to pay increased taxes necessary to meet the costs of the pay boosts.

Overseas soldiers in or out of combat already get 10 percent above base pay, and paratroopers and some specialists also get extra pay.

The question asked of a carefully selected cross section of voters in every State was this:

"It has been suggested that American servicemen who take part in actual fighting should get a 50-percent increase in pay. Should Congress pass such a law?"

The national results:

	Percent
Yes	70
No	23
No opinion	7

Similar high majorities approving the increases for combat servicemen are to be found in every major section of the country. This is shown in the following table giving the vote on the question by sections:

Vote by sections

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
New England and Middle Atlantic	72	21	7
East Central	71	22	7
West Central	68	26	6
South	67	25	8
Mountain and far west	67	25	8

Here are the results when voters are asked if they would be willing to meet higher taxes to finance the pay increases:

"Would you, yourself, be willing to pay higher taxes to make this possible?"

The results:

	Percent
Yes	60
No	8
No opinion	9
Disapprove of plan	23

COMBAT PAY

Tonight I speak to you on behalf of the nurses and fighting ground troops of our armed forces and to explain the features of a bill which I introduced in the United States Senate on March 16 to provide for a 50 percent increase in the monthly pay of our men in the fox holes and mud of the combat areas and our nurses serving in these combat areas.

The suggestion came to me a few weeks ago direct from the Anzio beachhead in an article written by Ernie Pyle, Scripps-Howard writer, who has been on an extended tour of the fighting fronts, and more recently has been with our boys on the Anzio beachhead. He writes as follows. I quote:

"In my usual role of running other people's business, I've been threshing around with an idea. It's to give the combat soldier some little form of recognition more than he is getting now.

"Everybody who serves overseas, no matter where or what he's doing, gets extra pay. Enlisted men get 20 percent additional and officers 10 percent.

"Airmen get an extra 50 percent above this for flight pay. As a result, officer-flyers get 60 percent above their normal base pay and enlisted flyers, such as gunners and radio operators, get 70 percent.

"All that is fine and as it should be, but the idea I was toying with is why not give your genuine combat ground soldier something corresponding to flight pay? Maybe a good phrase for it would be 'fight pay.'

"Of any 1,000,000 men overseas, probably no more than 100,000 are in actual combat with the enemy. But as it is now, there is no official distinction between the dog face lying for days and nights under constant mortar fire on an Italian hill and the headquarters clerk living comfortably in a hotel in Rio de Janeiro.

"Their two worlds are so far apart the human mind can barely grasp the magnitude of the difference. One lives like a beast and dies in great numbers. The other is merely working away from home. Both are doing necessary jobs, but it seems to me the actual warrior deserves something to set him apart. And medals are not enough.

"When I was at the front the last time, several infantry officers brought up this same suggestion. They say combat pay would mean a lot to the fighting man. It would put him into a proud category and make him feel that somebody appreciates what he endures.

"Obviously no soldier would ever go into combat just to get extra fight pay. That isn't the point. There is not enough money in the world to pay any single individual his due for battle suffering.

"But it would put a mark of distinction on him, a recognition that his miserable job was a royal one, and that the rest of us were aware of it."

No one of us here in America can have an adequate conception of what goes through a man's mind and the extension of his hardship and suffering as he faces the full and continued blast of enemy fire, day after day and night after night, under the most trying of conditions. He feels alone and apart from the rest of the world. For him life may be a matter of minutes, hours, or days. All that he has cherished he has left behind him here in America. The least we can do is to give him some small but material recognition—the same recognition, in fact, that we have been giving for years to men and officers engaged in flight duty, submarine duty, and parachute duty where such activity is held to be hazardous.

Before introducing my bill for additional pay to our men in actual combat, I carefully reviewed the committee report and laws passed by both branches of the Congress from as far back as 1913. Few have known how long-standing is this principle of giving additional compensation to men serving in what the lawmakers have termed hazardous occupations. In that year of 1913 the Congress provided an additional pay of 35 percent for officers serving on aviation duty. In 1914 this service was extended from officers to aviation students who were given 25 percent additional pay and to military aviators who were given 75 percent additional pay, when engaged in flight duty.

There is no sound reason why our ground troops who are actually participating in battle should not be placed in the same position as our parachute troops, our men in the submarine service, and our flying men. No man can say that they are not all in equally hazardous duty.

In 1941 the Congress enacted a law providing a minimum additional pay for parachute troops of $50. Let me read from a letter which Secretary of War Stimson wrote on March 7, 1941, to the Chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, recommending this additional pay for parachute troops and, as I read it, see if you do not agree with me that the same reasons advanced by the Secretary of War on behalf of the parachute troops do not apply with equal force to our ground troops lying in the fox holes and mud in actual combat. I quote:

"DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: There is enclosed the draft of a bill to provide for increased pay for certain military personnel while engaged on parachute duty which the War Department presents for consideration of the Congress with a view to its enactment into law. * * * The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize increased pay for the officers and warrant officers who participate in this hazardous type of duty. * * * It is obvious that this personnel incur greater risks than those who fly as passengers or pilots of military aircraft for, in addition to the hazard of injury or death due to a crash of the airplane, there is the constant and continuous risk of the parachute jump which must be made as a routine operation not required by other flying personnel."

As a result of this request of the War Department, the Congress on June 3, 1941, passed a law granting its officers in the parachute division additional pay at the rate of $100 per month and providing $50 per month additional pay to enlisted men in the parachute division. This increase was granted solely with a view to the risks involved in that type of service.

It is not questioned that the risks and hardships being experienced by our ground troops in actual combat are just as great, and I hold that they are entitled to the same consideration.

On April 6, 1942, Secretary of the Navy Knox wrote to Speaker RAYBURN, of the House of Representatives, recommending enactment of proposed legislation to extend the increase in pay provision for officers and men serving on submarine duty. In favorably reporting the bill the House Committee on Naval Affairs wrote in part as follows:

"Since the pay authorized for diving operations is designed as compensation for hazardous duty, the committee is of the opinion that it should accrue to a person whether such duty is performed in depth greater or less than 90 feet, so long as it is in fact of a hazardous nature."

On June 27, 1942, the Congress enacted this bill into law and the bill had been introduced at the request of the Navy Department. Again I saw the same reasons for passage of that bill for men in the submarine service apply with equal, if not greater force, to my bill to provide for similar recognition to our men of the ground forces in the actual combat areas.

The question presented by my bill is, Shall the members of our armed forces who are engaged in the hazards of actual combat service be given the same recognition that we give to our men in submarine and flight service? The men in submarine and flight service receive additional pay on the ground that they are engaged in hazardous duties.

Let us not forget that our ground forces engaged in actual combat are face to face with the enemy in an all-out death struggle.

They know what it is to wait in the night for the second and the third and the fourth and the endless counterattacks that are inevitable. They are the ones who become prisoners of war. They are the ones who lie in the yellow mud and face the hazards of disease and wounds. They are the ones for us to think of tonight and in the months to come.

If you feel that the man serving in the equally hazardous duty of actual combat is entitled to this same recognition that is being given to the man on submarine duty and in flight service, then you have the right and the opportunity to write to your Senator in Washington, asking him to support the Tobey bill, S. 1787. Your Senator will be glad to send you a copy of this bill if you make the request for it.

Now is the time for action. Tonight thousands of the men in our combat troops are in the thick of indescribable hardship and fighting on the Anzio beachhead, in other parts of Italy, and on the isles of the Pacific. Though we are bombing the cities of Europe day and night most Americans feel that in the great invasion to come it will be the ground troops—the men who crawl through the barbed wire and face the machine guns and the enemy mortar fire—who will meet the test of actual invasion and bring final victory to the United Nations. It is to them that we owe a debt which we can never pay. It is of them that we are thinking tonight as we consider this bill to give them the recognition which they more than deserve.

Modern warfare is waged through many activities. Each complements and supports the others.

There is the onslaught of broadsides from our naval ships, preparing the way for invasion and advance of ground troops.

There is the work of demolition and destruction, so terrible in its results, as hundreds of tons of bombs are dropped from our great bombing planes.

There is the effective work of our artillery, as it sets up barrage after barrage of shell fire to destroy enemy positions and supply stations.

But in the last great effort to take enemy positions, and to clean out its forces, it has long been recognized that our final reliance must be on the infantry, the foot soldier, the combat troops.

So they carry on, bravely meeting the savage onrush of the enemy, digging in to hold their advance, facing the most trying experiences of warfare, often coming to grips with the enemy in fierce hand-to-hand fighting.

I hold a brief for these combat troops, and I maintain that justice and gratitude should stimulate us to give them the recognition of their heroism in our behalf.

As we live our lives here at home, enjoying the daily contacts with family and friend, remote from the actual conflict, and the hell our boys are going through that we may be victorious, let us put ourselves in their place, as far as we can visualize it, and by enacting this legislation, give them tangible evidence of the love and gratitude we hold for them.

Price Control Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Price Control Renewal," published in the April 19, 1944, issue of the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE CONTROL RENEWAL

Seemingly the report made by the four chiefs of the Nation's economic stabilization program to the White House the other day knocked some of the support from under the plan to rewrite and soften the price-wage-control law, now up for renewal. When Stabilization Director Vinson, O. P. A. Director Bowles, War Food Administrator Jones, and W. L. B. Chairman Davis put their names to the report, they destroyed much of the argument that was being used by various groups with various axes to grind to obtain relaxation of several features of the law.

One of the strong groups wants food subsidies prohibited so that agricultural products can seek their own price level. In other words, it wants the law changed to allow farm prices to rise. Another group has inveighed against the provisions authorizing wage ceilings and demanded their modification. But it is not easy to press such demands in face of a showing that the price-and-wage line is beginning to hold in all sectors without prejudice either to the wage earners or to farmers as a group.

Pressure blocs are aware that public support for stabilization and the enforcement of ceilings has steadily increased and that the report is likely to intensify it. That considerably lessens their chances of persuading Congress to recede.

The public attitude now is strongly reflected on Capitol Hill, where the fight over control seems to have declined into an effort to have the function of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration consolidated into one agency to eliminate present confusion and contradiction in policies. But that undertaking is likely to fail in view of the evidence that both agencies now are achieving results, and either agency may be expected strongly to oppose any plan to have it take over the activities of the other.

It looks as if what was regarded as the hottest issue in Congress before the summer adjournment may turn out to be a rather mild argument. It may be that stabilization and its administration have passed from the picture as a serious political issue.

Extension of the Lend-Lease Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Encouraging Vote," published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 20, 1944. The editorial deals with the vote in the House of Representatives on the extension of the Lend-Lease Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENCOURAGING VOTE

The country has reason to be thankful that the House has again extended the Lend-Lease Act, for it has been made apparent that the operations carried on under this measure are essential to the prosecution of the war. Indeed, it was quite unthinkable that in this momentous phase of the conflict there could be any alteration of a major and basic wartime policy. The House has shown no disposition to consider any such alteration, and there is no reason to suppose that the Senate will be of a different mind.

It is true that a somewhat larger group of Representatives voted against extension of lend-lease legislation on this occasion than before. Even so, the adverse tally was so small as to be negligible—21 against 334—an indisputable showing of what undoubtedly is the overwhelming sentiment of the Nation. The isolationist views of some sections of middle western opinion obviously do not have any real authority; moreover, it is worth noting that in the House some of the negative votes were cast by men like Representatives KNUTSON, REED of New York, and WOODRUFF of Michigan, who are hold-overs from the Harding period. On the whole, the vote was so heavily in favor of continuance of lend-lease provisions as to give great grounds for encouragement.

The amendment to the act, adopted by a voice vote and stating that no final settlements shall be made by the President except "in accordance with established constitutional procedure," is designed to protect congressional authority in making post-war arrangements. Presumably, it is meant to put at rest fears that the administration would bypass the House and Senate by assuming future international obligations under the act's stipulation that "the benefit of the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems necessary." However, the force of this amendment does not seem great, in view of the administration's disposition to consult Congress in such matters. Secretary Hull's recent proposal that the House and Senate create bipartisan groups to advise with the State Department in handling foreign policy shows that Congress would have been consulted even without this amendment.

Post-War Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, at the request of my colleague, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement called A Yardstick by Which to Measure Plans for Post-War Peace. This statement was worked out by John D. Pearmain and associates, an organization called Toward Freedom, Inc.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A YARDSTICK BY WHICH TO MEASURE PLANS FOR POST-WAR PEACE

APRIL 14, 1944.

Believing that a yardstick or standard of comparison is needed against which to measure plans for post-war peace, we submit the following as such a standard.

Do the terms of any post-war plan in question make provision for:

1. Establishment and maintenance of law and order between nations?
2. Orderly progress toward self-government for colonial and subject peoples?
3. Protection of existing civil liberties against overthow by force?
4. Equality of opportunity between nations and races?
5. Access by all, for purposes of peace, to raw materials and trade?
6. International agreement on conservation of natural resources?

And, to implement these principles, do the terms of any plan in question make provision for:

7. Establishment or reconstruction of an international organization, participated in on a democratic basis by all peoples, having judicial, legislative, and executive powers with effective control of the means necessary to enforce its decisions in support of such principles.

A plan for post-war peace which seeks anything less than these first principles will, we submit, be regarded as a betrayal of the hopes and desires of mankind by all but those blinded by narrow nationalism and prejudice.

We believe that such a yardstick is essential this time if we are to win both the war and the peace.

JOHN D. PEARMAIN,
Chairman, Toward Freedom, Inc.
ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most convincing and logical presentation of the anti-poll-tax question, by Mr. Mark Sullivan, which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday. It is unanswerable, and I invite the attention of Senators to the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL TAX, LIKE WAR VOTE, INVOLVES STATE RIGHTS; SENATE CAN'T LOGICALLY REVERSE DECISION

(By Mark Sullivan)

The expectation is that within a short time the poll tax will again come before the Senate. This will raise an issue broader than the poll tax itself, an issue on which this Congress has already come to a striking decision a few weeks ago.

When soldier voting was before Congress the issue was not whether soldiers should have the opportunity to vote—on that there was practically literal unanimity. The real issue was how the voting should be done, whether by a ballot authorized by the Federal Government or by ballots authorized by State governments.

The debate started from the existing condition. At present voting is exclusively a State function. The question was whether, as respects voting by soldiers on the battle fronts, part of this function should be transferred to the Federal Government. For such a departure there were appealing arguments—voting by a Federal ballot would relieve the Army of much work and difficulty. And there was some justification—in the emergency of war there is always justification for temporarily giving enlarged powers and functions to the Federal Government.

STATES TO RUN VOTING

Nevertheless, after weeks of debate, Congress decided that soldier voting should be carried on exclusively by the States. In the law as written the Federal Government has no part except that of carrying State ballots to the soldiers, collecting them, and returning them to the States. Although the law authorizes use of a Federal ballot under some exceptional conditions, this ballot can be used only when and after a State has specifically authorized it.

The States are kept in complete possession of the whole authority and function. So far as the Federal Government has any part in soldier voting, it is as a messenger and carrier serving the States, in some cases an agent acting by authority of the States.

The reason Congress came to this decision was a widespread feeling that over a period of years the Federal Government has been encroaching upon the States. Congress felt that for such encroachment to extend to the function of voting would be dangerous to the very existence of the States as units of government. Voting is the most fundamental function any unit of government can have. To lose it, even partially, would be a dangerous step in the direction of almost extinction.

IT'S THE SAME ISSUE

Now, within 2 months of having come to this solemn conclusion, the Senate is to be asked, in effect, to reverse the conclusion. The proposal to abolish the poll tax, by action of Congress, raises exactly the same issue.

The poll tax, as a requirement for voting, is practiced in eight States. If it should be abolished by Congress, then Congress—that is, the Federal Government—would be telling these eight States that they must drop one of their voting requirements. And if Congress can tell eight States that they cannot have one requirement for voting, it can by the same authority tell other States that they cannot have other requirements. If Congress can abolish the poll-tax requirement in Texas, it can, in every other State, abolish other requirements which the States have—requirements having to do with citizenship, length of residence in the State or voting district, and the like.

The principle and precedent would be established that requirements for voting are a Federal function, to be exercised whenever the Federal Government chooses.

The merit or demerit of the poll tax is not the question. In late years public opinion has come to disapprove it. Formerly it existed in many States—in Pennsylvania as late as 15 years ago, in Massachusetts as late as 50 years ago. In the South, where it still remains, it is being abolished, State by State. Florida and Louisiana have repealed it during the last few years. Movements to repeal it are under way in three of the eight States that still have it.

If the poll tax is disappearing by action of the States, why should Congress act? The question should be answered by those who propose the pending measure. Without imputing particular motives to individuals and conceding that many who favor the proposed measure are moved solely by disapproval of the poll tax as such, nevertheless a motive for insisting on action by the Federal Government suggests itself. Such a motive would be to establish a precedent—that Congress can control voting requirements in any and all States. And, regardless of motive, there would be a sure effect. The breaking down of the States, the movement toward one great centralized Government at Washington would be furthered.

In the discussion about to take place a point should be remembered, in order to avoid confusion that has befogged the issue. The poll tax should be clearly distinguished from practices in some Southern States which distinguish between Negroes and whites, such as the one recently invalidated by the Supreme Court. The poll tax, where it exists, is universal—applies to whites precisely the same as Negroes. Whites and Negroes alike can pay the poll tax of a dollar or two a year and vote—or not pay it and not vote. To introduce the word Negro into discussion of the poll tax is as unjustifiable as to introduce Swede or Norwegian. Yet Negro, and another unjustified word, discrimination, have appeared over and over in arguments for the measure.

Night Club Mortality

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Members of this House to an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning, April 24, 1944. The title of this article is "Night Club Mortality"; think of it—night-club mortality. It states that some 15,000 cabaret performers will be looking for jobs about May 1 because the 30-percent tax on night-club checks will close their honky-tonks and hot spots. Well sir, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for these people to be looking for jobs. The farmers in my district can use every one of them, so can the sawmills and the pulp mills. Agriculture, lumbering, and paper manufacturing are all essential industries producing for the war effort. All are short on labor, and if these singers and dancers feel that work in the fields, or woods, or mills is something they cannot do—then let me remind them that the armed forces are short on manpower, too. I am sure the ground forces of the Army that took 36,000 highly trained Air Corps cadets to help augment its desperate need can use the men and I know the Women's Army Corps is way short on enlistments and can use all the girls, so can the WAVES and SPARS and the Nurse Corps who are also still recruiting. And remember, every woman enlisting replaces a man for active duty. But read the editorial. I think it sums up the situation nicely.

NIGHT CLUB MORTALITY

The 30-percent tax on cabarets that went into effect on April 1 has already resulted in a high rate of mortality. Many establishments have closed their doors or are preparing to do so. Numerous restaurants have omitted the dancing and entertainment features that caused them to be classified as cabarets. The result, in both cases, has been to throw out of employment large numbers of dancers and entertainers. According to an official of the American Guild of Variety Artists, about 15,000 cabaret performers will be looking for new jobs by May 1.

Consequently Congress is being importuned to slash the 30-percent tax and give cabarets a renewed lease on life. One of the arguments advanced is that the next bond drive will suffer for lack of the services heretofore

donated to the Treasury by performers resentful of the Government's discriminatory tax program. This dire prediction is not likely to cause Treasury officials sleepless nights, although it is true that many professional entertainers have been most generous in assisting the effort to sell bonds and further war activities.

While we sympathize with the plight of dismissed entertainers who may be too old or physically incapable of undertaking essential war work, we conclude that the evidence offered to support the demand for a reduction of the cabaret tax is an excellent argument in favor of its retention. For citation of the havoc wrought by the tax increase focuses public attention most unfavorably upon the enormous numbers of cabarets and cocktail bars that are exacting toll from pleasure seekers in the big cities at a time when the country desperately needs able-bodied men and women to fill gaps in essential industries created by the draft. Although a reasonable amount of amusement is essential as a morale builder and as a means of relaxation for hard-working civilians, it is neither essential nor desirable for a country engaged in all-out war to encourage the people to spend huge sums on luxury entertainment. The manpower utilized in maintaining cabarets is much greater than is generally assumed. For there are not only the entertainers to consider, but also those who provide dance music and equipment as well as the showmanship that makes the whole system function.

Congress raised the cabaret tax, along with other levies on luxury articles, not simply for the sake of revenue but also for the purpose of cutting down inflationary spending. The fact that the cabaret tax has worked toward that end by eliminating a good deal of the flashy entertainment that is an excrescence of war-induced prosperity is an encouraging indication that the American public is not scattering money about without counting the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that if these cabaret entertainers are IV–F or overage and cannot get in the armed services, then they can still do their bit on the farms and in war industries. And for those who still want to sleep in the daytime arrangements can be made, even with the farmers, who in my district are plowing at night and any other time the weather will permit. The farmers need the labor, the war cost needs the tax.

Farmer's Loss on Feeding Lambs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, on July 5, 1943, I called the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. William Schlicht, of Manchester, Mich., had purchased 1,050 lambs in the autumn of 1942 and had sold them on the market in mid-summer of 1943.

In that speech, found on page A3461, was included correspondence with Mr. Schlicht which showed that the lambs cost him $18,202.17, and that he received $10,500 for their sale on the market.

These lambs were sheared before marketing; therefore, after they were sold Mr. Schlicht had in his possession the wool, in which he had an investment of $7,702.17. On July 13, 1943, this wool was sold on the market through Kerr & Kerr, of Coldwater, Mich. Mr. Schlicht has supplied me with a copy of the sales account which is, in part, as follows:

Authorized deductions

Commodity Credit Corporation service, at $1.12½ per hundredweight	$106.12
Primary handler, at $1.50 per hundredweight	141.50
Grading, at 75 cents per hundredweight	70.75
Secondary handler	141.50
Country service	None
In-bound freight	None
Out-bound freight, 9,590 pounds, at 81 cents per hundredweight, plus 3 percent	50.01
Trucking, 9,590 pounds at 8 cents per hundredweight	7.67
Reappraisal (if any).	
Total deductions	547.55
Amount due producer or second handler	3,644.88
Second handler charge	141.50
Gross amount	3,786.38

Total net weight, 9,433 pounds.

Mr. Schlicht calls special attention to the Commodity Credit Corporation service deduction of $106.12. He insists that no service was rendered warranting any such deduction, and at his request I am calling the attention of the proper Senate and House committees to this entire transaction.

To summarize, Mr. Schlicht, as stated in my previous remarks, is a typical lamb feeder in my State. Lambs are purchased from the ranges in the fall, fed throughout the winter, and sold in the spring or summer on the market. It will be observed that no charge has been made by the farmer for his labor. Nevertheless, the entire cost to him of the original shipment was $18,202.17. He received $10,500 for the sale of the lambs. He received $3,644.88 for the sale of the wool. Therefore, his net loss on the transaction was $4,057.29. I cannot stress too strongly the words "net loss."

Mr. Schlicht's experience has been the experience of many lamb feeders. How long can the farmer be asked to take such losses? If we are to have food and fiber, then the producers of this food and fiber must be allowed at least the actual cost plus a reasonable profit.

I am calling this matter to the attention of the Congress, to its committees, to the Department of Agriculture, and all other Government agencies having to do with the control of sales and prices entering into the cost of farm production. I cannot urge too strongly that immediate action be taken to prevent such losses to our farmers in the future.

Report of Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and table:

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
MILWAUKEE COUNTY COURTHOUSE,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 29, 1944.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Recently we received and acknowledged several requests from Congressmen in this region for specific information relative to Farm Security Administration activities in their respective congressional districts and States. They were interested in knowing the number of families Farm Security had helped, amount of loan funds advanced, the repayments made, etc.

It has occurred to me that you too would be interested in similar data relative to your congressional district and to your State as a whole. I am taking the liberty of forwarding such data to you.

No reference is made in our compilations as to the families that have been able to join cooperatives through F. S. A. participation loans, nor to the families helped through feed and seed loans during the drought years.

Very truly yours,

HARRY S. MUIR,
Regional Director.

Report as of Dec. 31, 1943, on Farm Security Administration activities in region II (Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin)

Congressional district	Number families helped through rural rehabilitation loans [1]	Rural rehabilitation loan funds advanced	Principal repaid, rural rehabilitation	Number farm-ownership loans made [2]	Farm-ownership loan funds advanced	Principal repaid, farm-ownership
WISCONSIN						
First	1,366	$1,118,860	$736,194	7	$65,780	$10,451
Second	1,121	1,021,633	675,578	48	426,962	53,852
Third	5,184	4,079,214	2,490,685	144	1,042,691	157,902
Fourth and Fifth	145	55,092	31,771	0	0	0
Sixth	391	352,498	200,531	34	298,105	41,618
Seventh	6,582	2,480,836	1,620,723	163	398,966	24,959
Eighth	2,793	1,341,732	790,162	87	169,120	9,710
Ninth	10,184	4,681,131	3,077,200	307	1,204,078	136,801
Tenth	11,246	3,861,906	2,477,689	483	951,629	77,107
Wisconsin total	39,012	18,992,902	12,100,533	1,273	4,557,331	512,400
Region II total [3]	105,485	59,299,220	34,159,397	3,421	13,343,870	1,606,538

[1] Rehabilitation (chattel operating loans).
[2] Farm-ownership loans (real-estate loans).
[3] Region II comprised of States of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin.

What About France?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include what I consider as a timely article entitled "French Renascence," written by Edgar A. Mowrer, and published in the Washington Post of April 22, 1944.

The article follows:

FRENCH RENASCENCE
(By Edgar A. Mowrer)
EUROPEAN FEDERATION

ALGIERS.—Defeat by the Germans, humiliation by their Allies, and—let us add—the sting of their own consciences have awakened in Charles de Gaulle a consuming passion to restore the grandeur, power, and prosperity of France. It is this passion that makes the stubborn general invulnerable to criticism of men like Roosevelt and Churchill when such criticism goes against what he considers the will of the French people in France. It is this passion that causes Frenchmen on the committee and in the consultative assembly to accept the leadership of this tall, insistent brigadier and his sometimes arbitrary ways. It is this passion that causes the French divisions fighting both in Tunisia and in Italy to earn the unstinted admiration of their British and American comrades by their indifference to danger and privation. It is this passion that has brought Frenchmen from the tail to the head of European resistance groups under the Nazis, so that for each of the hundreds of French patriots shot or exiled, two or three others kiss their lives goodby and join the good fight.

CONSCIOUS OF HIS MISSION

After dining with the general in his Moorish villa on a hilltop behind the shining city, I am convinced that he is intensely conscious of his mission, and, therefore, of the propriety of his remaining magnetic center of the French renascence and head of what he steadily calls, not the "Committee," but the "Provisional Government." People here deny he ever compared himself to Joan of Arc or Clemenceau, but if he did he means just what he said, like Joan, like the Tiger, he intends to pull France out of its historical slump.

Personally, I don't believe De Gaulle is a royalist, and he's certainly not as reactionary as certain American and British generals with whom I have dined in Washington and in London. He wants a reformed French republic with a strengthened executive closer to the American model. In his attitude to contradiction he reminds me of Roosevelt and Churchill. His leadership—in my opinion—is the result of his ability to give expression in words and action to the aspirations of the French people.

It must be understood that the Frenchmen you meet in Algiers, including newly arrived leaders of the French underground, have not accepted and don't intend to accept any diminution of French influence in the post-war world if they can help it. To them the French are still a great people and France a great power, temporarily in eclipse but bound to emerge again.

When they hear Allied talk of post-war rule by the United States, Great Britain, the Soviets, and China without France, they writhe with indignation. What they say is, Shall an empire of 100,000,000 like the French be classified probably after an organism like China? De Gaulle himself certainly doesn't admit the elimination of France from the Pacific. Algiers is full of vivid posters appealing to the people to "rescue Indochina." De Gaulle doesn't admit either that French influence will be eliminated from the Middle East, where, incidentally, he expects the Soviets to play a major role and "new developments are just commencing."

FRENCH ECONOMY

France, nearly everyone here believes, will be a reformed democracy. According to present plans one portion of French economy will be nationalized outright, one portion controlled by the state, and one portion will remain free. Next, the people in Algiers believe, France must again assume leadership of a united "Christian and liberal" western Europe. It is to secure this that the French troops are hoping to conquer Rome for the Allies.

De Gaulle personally expects speedy formation of a western European federation, including Scandinavia, the Low Countries, France, a new Italy, and democratic Spain. Practically everyone thinks that France, while remaining on the friendliest terms with the Soviets, will wish to work closely with Great Britain. Leading Frenchmen count primarily on the Soviets to eliminate the German danger for a long period, yet they admit that Stalin, if disappointed in his allies, might just prefer a not too prostrate Germany linked to Russia. Here in Algiers people still hesitate to believe in American willingness to join a world organization with real power.

Would the French themselves join such an organization with enthusiasm? My belief is yes, but only if Roosevelt and Churchill turn over a new page and decide to treat nascent France as an equal.

Confusion in the Barnyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is confusion in the barnyard today. There has been confusion in the barnyard and market place since the war started. I would like to talk for a few minutes about some of the causes of this situation as it relates to the farmer and to offer some constructive suggestions on what we can do about it.

To reduce the farm problem to its simplest equation, I would say that the source of our trouble is in failure to heed the warning of that great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, who said, "If we wait on the Government in Washington to tell us when to sow and reap we shall soon want for bread." Yes, for several years our farmers, instead of being left free to collect their profits at the stock scale and the elevator, have been encouraged to get their checks from some Federal employee with offices in the county seat.

WHAT IS THE FARM POLICY?

Let me make it clear that I believe the Government has an important educational function to perform for agriculture. That function has been performed efficiently and well through county agents. But, departing from the educational ideals of soil conservation and good farm management, a new idea has grown up in the minds of some of the bright boys who make their living by farming the farmers. This idea was most frankly and eloquently stated by one of the officials of the Department of Agriculture in the present administration. Mr. Franklin Carter, who served as an official in the Resettlement Administration in the Department of Agriculture under the New Deal, voiced his attitude toward the farmer in these shocking words, which I quote:

> The problem of farm relief will become not how shall we relieve the farmer, but who shall relieve us of the farmer? The farmer has abrogated to himself all virtue and all knowledge, he has voted against progress, against civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has made and unmade Presidents in the image of Main Street. He has exhausted our soil as he will exhaust our Treasury if given half a chance. He is the great obstacle to human progress, the great threat to political stability. Sooner or later we shall discover, as England discovered, as Soviet Russia has discovered, that the pagan, the landed proprietor, the kulak, is simply so much mud on the path of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance.

What do you think of one of our public servants, a high official in the present administration, a policy maker for the Department of Agriculture, making such a statement as that? Some might suggest we just dismiss that statement as another of the crazy and irresponsible rantings of one of the "brain trust" bureaucrats appointed by the President. But we cannot do that. We cannot lightly dismiss the statement. The reason we cannot dismiss it is that we have seen under cloak of various so-called emergencies the policy described by Mr. Carter being followed in the United States.

Let me call another witness. This witness is also an employee of the Department of Agriculture in the present administration. This witness is Dr. F. F. Elliott, in the office of the Chief Agricultural Economist of the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Elliott has recently been quoted as saying that part of the Government's plan for agriculture in postwar America is to move 20 percent of the farmers to the city whether they like it or not. Now, why should we reduce our farm population? Dr. Elliott answers that question by pointing to the administration plans to create a hugely industrialized United States with Latin America and other sections of the world supplying the food. The market will be controlled by the Government with fixed prices for the farmer, the market man, and the consumer.

CREATING FOREIGN COMPETITION

Already we see the outlines of this plan going into effect. American agriculture is being destroyed and foreign agriculture is being built up with American tax dollars. Food, including butter, meat, and grain, was being imported in competition with that produced by our own farmers even before the artificially

created grain shortage here which has made us dependent on foreign grain for our livestock and poultry. The so-called Atlantic Charter calls for free trade in the post-war era. I could cite scores of examples. A few more will suffice, however. There is no serious farm machinery shortage in Mexico. We are providing Mexico with almost all of her farm machinery. We are, indeed, building factories at our own expense in South American countries to manufacture farm machinery for use by these foreign peoples. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] established here, to the dismay of Congress, just recently that about half a million items of our farm machinery badly needed by American farmers have been set aside for distribution abroad through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

At the same time, production in this country is curtailed by excessive draft of farm labor, high wages in the war factories which have siphoned off much farm labor, and severe restrictions on distribution of farm machinery in this country. Our farmers have been paid not to grow things. Even with a sugar shortage the Federal Government paid beet-sugar farmers in Colorado not to plant sugar beets. We paid $1,067,665 to a corporation in Florida and $961,064 to our island possession, Puerto Rico, not to raise sugar. The total amount expended by the Federal Government to persuade persons and corporations not to raise sugar exceeds $41,000,000. I do not want to talk about too much water over the dam, but in passing I want to point out that when some of us were insisting that we did not have overproduction but rather underconsumption, that the answer to depression was more production, that those in power in Washington were plowing under and burning and knocking in the head food we now sadly need, food which is now rationed. Some of the good citizens of my congressional district were indicted in Federal court because they grew too much wheat, which ever since we have had to import. But enough of that.

COLLECTIVIST REGIMENTATION

We have seen, also, in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District, the effects of this policy against the farmer in establishment of the $1,078,150 Communist farm project in Bates County, which project I exposed in 1943 as a failure and requested Congress to halt before any more public funds were spent on it. Other projects of this kind cover the Nation. They are part of the new plan for a socialized and regimented agriculture. A plan to take the farmer's freedom and make him a ward of the Government. A plan to make him the scapegoat for Government failures and a whipping post for labor racketeers who have had the gravy while the farmer has been deplored and discriminated against in Washington. Speaking of regimentation, the House of Representatives on March 24, 1944, actually had to pass legislation prohibiting bureaucrats from continuing their policy, in certain areas of the country, in forcing farmers to join the triple A to get gasoline, machinery, fertilizer, and deferment as essential farm labor.

THE BUREAUCRATIC MERRY-GO-ROUND

The farmer is now confronted with conflicting policies which can only result in chaos for the Nation. The farmer is told he must increase his production. He has to make several gasoline, time, and rubber-tire consuming trips to the county seat to struggle with bureaucracy to get sufficient equipment. He finds that the bureaucrats have hamstrung him with rules and regulations and have even added to his woes by monkeying with the clock so that his labor quits in the middle of the afternoon and stores and ration boards are all closed up when the day's chores are done and he can finally go to town for supplies and official permissions. But, over these and other obstacles he gets out a big crop, goes in debt, raises more livestock and poultry, and works his daylights out at the request of his Government and on the assurance of his Government that he will be contributing to the war effort by so doing.

Then he picks up the morning newspaper and sees that the Administration overnight has abolished the unit plan, that all farmers under a certain age will be inducted into the Army regardless of the importance of their contribution to agriculture, that he has done too well and must bear the loss of a reduction in his poultry flocks and livestock, and that corn and other feeds will not be available because of price ceiling differences and other artificial, Washington-generated, New Deal blunders. Thousands of acres of land in my district will produce nothing but weeds, insects, and erosion this year because of that kind of inconsistent farm policy. And, the farm auctioneers will continue to profit.

What some bureaucrats in the executive department of this Government do not seem to understand is that farming is the largest business enterprise in America. Farming is a complicated, technical business. Many risks are involved. There is the weather risk, the price risk, the health risk, the insect risk, and the risk of insufficient manpower. On top of all this the farmer now has the risk of unwarranted Government meddling and controls. This is the greatest risk ever to confront the American farmer. It is the risk of losing his independence and the self-control of his affairs which has heretofore left him free to create the highest level of agricultural productivity and the highest rural standards of living in the world.

The farmer is not unpatriotic. He does not want to avoid military service if he is needed. But he simply wants, and is entitled to, fair play from his Government. He wants his Government to make up its mind about where he can serve the best and then to stick to that policy. The present treatment leaves only the conclusion that the administration farm policy was correctly stated by the Agriculture Department official, Franklin Carter, whom I have already quoted.

EXECUTIVE INCOMPETENCE

During this war, Mr. Speaker, the Government has dealt in piecemeal fashion with the various sides of our food question. Farm production has been within the province of the scores of bureaus and agencies of the Department of Agriculture. Farm equipment and machines for the processing of food is controlled by the War Production Board. Farm labor has been a joint headache of the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service. Transportation is in the hands of the Office of Defense Transportation. Price fixing has been in the hands of the O. P. A. and the rationing of food has also been directed and controlled by the O. P. A., but by conflicting agencies within O. P. A. Congress has insisted that the President appoint a single responsible Food Administrator, but he has not done so. Several able men who tried to bring order out of the food muddle and conflicting agencies resigned in disgust.

As a result, we have seen food wasted; food spoiling in Government storage; spoiled food released for civilian consumption; spoiled food, rationed food, put on the public dump. We have seen Government officials issuing crazy orders, such as the one by Edward R. Gay, Chief of Civilian Supply in the War Production Board, who told farmers to take off their horses' shoes each night to rest their horses' feet and save metal. We have seen unsound, expensive, and inflationary programs, such as consumer subsidies advanced, even though repeatedly rejected by Congress, and by each and every economist, except those on the Federal pay roll. It is a wonder that food production has not collapsed completely. The reason it has not is because of the patriotism of the farmer, the independent American farmer, who has, with his wife and children, worked from before daybreak until after dark, through rain and cold and heat, to feed our armies and our people. If the farmer could be given freedom from red tape, freedom from governmental restrictions, freedom from artificially generated forces which make it impossible for him to forecast from one day to another whether he will produce at a loss or a profit, then the farmer would be happy and prosperous and could multiply his production much easier.

WHAT DOES THE FARMER WANT?

I have had some people say to me lately, "You can never satisfy the farmer. He is always howling and dissatisfied." It is true that the farmer is never satisfied. We should thank our lucky stars for that. It is this spirit of always demanding something sounder and better that has made America the greatest nation in the world. If the American farmer had been satisfied, we would still be living in the days of the oxcart, the squirrel rifle, the ax, and the hoe. I might add that only the rugged, independent spirit of the farmer could have survived all that has been done to him by those who have professed to be doing for him in the past several years. But there is one thing our American farmer is very well satisfied with, indeed. That is our American Constitution and our republican form of government. He knows that under the Constitution and

the Bill of Rights he has a chance to fight back at those who would seek to make him a political puppet, to be moved back and forth to satisfy the whims and ambitions of bureaucratic would-be dictators in seats of the mighty. The American farmer makes reasonable demands of his Government. He is asking simply for a guaranty of the cost of production, some machinery and fertilizer and protein feeds to produce with, some of his sons who understand farm work to help him, some common sense in rationing, freedom from confusing questionnaires and forms, and then he just wants to be left alone to do the day's work. Since he has often to work at night, he appreciates the rural electrification we have provided him, and some of us in Congress hope to extend after the war when materials are available to those who have not yet received its benefits.

I am grateful to the farmers of the Sixth Congressional District for loyally standing by me while I have represented them in Washington. I am grateful for the loyal support of all the farm organizations. I am grateful that my folks are farmers and my wife a farm girl for that brings me even closer to rural problems and helps explain why I can talk the farmers' language.

FARM INCOME

I know that the farmer does not have an easy time. Although he has made some small profit lately he has had many lean years through which it has been hard to hang on. His average monthly income of $62.43 still compares unfavorably to that of his city cousin's monthly average of $209.40. His worst enemy has been his best friend—the weather. Dame Nature, who was lavish in her gifts in 1942, quickly turned her back on men of the soil. She sent rains and floods which destroyed land, crops, poultry, livestock, and barns. But the farmer came back, as he always comes back. He devised short cuts to make his meager labor supply go around. With baling wire he kept his groaning machinery rolling and with a watchful eye cocked on Washington he made his own rules until the official ones came along. He saw the importance of his task, cooperated when cooperation speeded its completion, and fought back when others tried to impede its progress.

He talked and suggested. Yes, he disputed, too. But he worked while he talked. How well he worked is evident in bulging granaries, in the bawling animals that overflow the stockyards, in the milk and cream splashing through separators across the land. The Nation is short of food. We have rationing. Yes. But it is not the farmer's fault. And remember, the farmer has made American boys the best-fed fighting men in the world. He has sent nourishment to the fighting fronts of Russia and the bomb shelters of Britain. He furnished the first full meal in years to the liberated people along the Mediterranean shores. He gives substance to the belief of some that America must feed the world until it gets on its feet. Whether you subscribe to that theory or not, you must take your hat off to the man who, by his energy, skill, and ingenuity, has proved that he is big enough for the job. No other nation in the world could make such a boast based on the productive capacity of its farmers. As a contributor to the war effort, the farmer, despite Government handicaps, did well in 1942 and 1943. He says he will do still better in 1944. He deserves the cooperation of the public and of the Congress. I believe he knows from past experience that he can count on the understanding cooperation of his Representative in Congress from the Sixth Missouri Congressional District.

Tribute to His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, the dean of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States has passed to his reward after a lifetime of service to God, to country, and to humanity. The rise from his humble home of immigrant parents, his father being a mill worker in the city of Lowell, to that of American leader of the Catholic faith is an achievement unsurpassed in the history of our country. William Cardinal O'Connell, whose death is mourned universally, was familiar with the hard road over which the poor were required to travel when he first saw the light of day. To overcome the trials and tribulations of youth and attain the priesthood bringing to that exalted office and the even more exalted one from which the angel of death called him, a realization that the material well-being of the individual was entitled to consideration in the same manner that the church gives consideration to the spiritual well-being. He never forgot, even in the exalted position held by him in later years, the long hours and the meager wages paid by the leading industry of the city where he first saw the light of day. I can well recall an address delivered by His Eminence at a meeting over which it was my pleasure to preside in November of 1930 of the American Federation of Labor, convening at that time in the city of Boston, when His Eminence in the presentation of his views as to the responsibilities of labor and capital made a notable contribution to the cause of organized labor.

It is a very great pleasure to all of us to welcome here in this beautiful church President Green and the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor. This association which began as all great things begin, very humbly and quietly, has grown to be of gigantic proportions. This association contributes not only to the welfare of the individual members of the organization, but to the whole country, and indeed, to the whole world. It is rather a singular thing to look back a very short time, even within our own life, and remember the apathy, the indifference which capital, the employer, had for laborers. The laborer was paid the smallest possible pittance. His condition was despised, his labor sweated and he was cheated out of his wages by a type of inhuman employer who had not heart for his employee and no brains to understand his responsibilities. It is almost incredible that that condition should exist in our lives.

In those early days, so changed from what they are even in our own lifetime, it is hard to realize that such hard-hearted greed and inhuman oppression could exist among the very class that prided themselves on their moral and intellectual superiority.

Finally the day came when the great Leo XIII raised his voice, and that voice was so just and so strong that the power of no one could close his ears to it. It was the voice of Leo calling out to employer and employee, to labor and capital, to cease in God's name this bitter fratricidal war and come to terms of understanding and cooperation. It was that voice which said that the basis for success was not greed and power, but cooperation.

From that day the rights of the laboring man have been more and more respected, until today the laboring man understands perfectly well the dignity of his life, he understands perfectly well that brutal greed and oppression will crush him and ruin him unless there is cooperation on both sides. Why is it that those who possess wealth, the greedy capitalist, the tyrannical boss, continue the quest for gold and more gold? It is insanity, but we see it all around us.

But in these days the laboring man has a voice that must be heard. My dear men of the Federation of Labor, lift up your hearts and thank God and ask Him to preserve you from the greed of the rich, the heartless rich, not the rich who have plenty and who are all the time trying to do something for their neighbor. God bless them. I am not condemning them, I am talking about the greedy, wealthy, heartless rich.

May God's blessing rest upon you, as it does rest upon you here this morning, and may the times which we all hope for be brought about so that this land will be what it really was intended to be, a blessed land of peace and prosperity.

It was my very great privilege to have served 12 years as mayor of Boston and 2 years as Governor of Massachusetts during the period that His Eminence held the exalted office of cardinal and our relations at all times proved most cordial. It was likewise my very great pleasure as mayor of Boston to appoint His Eminence as a trustee of the Boston Public Library Department, to which position he brought a wealth of attainments, possible to few other men in the Nation. He was not only great as a leader of his faith but as an executive he displayed most unusual attainments, since under his administration Catholic charities of every character were expanded and kept free from debt. The contribution to Catholic education during his administration was most notable, parochial schools being found in every section of the archdiocese and on the lintel over the entrance to each school the motto "For God and country." The motto "For God and country" was ever his guidance and inspiration and it is the sincere wish of all privileged to know him that he may rest in peace after a lifetime of service and sacrifice to God and humanity.

The Case of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, according to a dispatch in the Washington Star of yesterday, the Soviet peace terms were rejected by Finland. The Russian terms were as follows:

1. Rupture with Germany and immediate internment of enemy armies and warships, or their expulsion before the end of April.
2. Restoration of the Finnish-Soviet treaty of 1940 and withdrawal of Finnish troops to the 1940 frontier.
3. Immediate repatriation of Russian and Allied prisoners and civilian internees. This repatriation to be reciprocal.
4. Fifty percent demobilization of the Finnish Army.
5. Reparations of $600,000,000, payable in 5 years.
6. Return of Petsamo to Russia.
7. If these conditions are accepted the Soviet Government will renounce its claim to Hango without compensation.

These terms do not embody any mere armistice or conditions upon which a cessation of hostilities only is to be effected. On the contrary they embody final, uncompromising and permanent conditions of peace. Everyone agrees upon the desirability of getting Finland out of the war. But ought it reasonably to be expected that this small country ought to agree to its own national destruction in order to obtain peace?

The Soviet Union has completely ignored the Atlantic Charter in its peace negotiations with Finland. Most of the major conditions laid down by the Soviet Union, such as reparations and boundaries, are questions which involve the settlement of permanent peace. All such questions ought to be settled at a peace conference in which all of the Allies are represented.

If this country is going to silently acquiesce in the piecemeal settlement of international problems before the war is ended, what will there be left to decide when peace finally comes? If we do not adopt a uniform pattern during the progress of this war by which the settlement of permanent questions will be delayed until peace finally comes, we will be circumvented into frustration at the final peace conference. If the Russians enter into peace settlements with the Finns and other small nations during the progress of the war, who will be in a position to challenge such settlements at a later date, even though they may be contrary to every concept of international justice and fairness?

We better watch our step from now on, Mr. Speaker, or we may find that peace settlements, interim agreements, unilateral commitments might pave the way for another Versailles.

I hope that peace will shortly come between the Finns and the Russians in accordance with those principles of common fairness and justice for which our boys are fighting so valiantly.

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the following splendid address by the distinguished mayor of Knoxville, Tenn., the Honorable E. E. Patton, is timely, and I am glad to insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of the Nation:

A great American has well said: "The thoughtful mind, when it sees a nation's flag, sees not a flag only, but the nation itself, and whatever may be its symbol, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag the government, the principles, the truths, the history which belong to the nation.

"When the French tricolor rolls out on the wind we see France. When the united crosses of St. Andrew and St. George, on a fiery ground, set forth the banner of old England, we see not the cloth merely; there rises up before the mind the noble aspect of that monarchy which, more than any on the globe, has advanced its banner for liberty, law, and national prosperity."

When you see the flag of America—the flag of freedom—you envision 13 small and sparsely settled colonies along the Atlantic seaboard, daring to fight that they might have liberty of conscience and freedom of the mind and body under law and right and justice.

We see Washington and his committee visit Betsy Ross, the Quaker seamstress, with their design for a new emblem for a new country, fighting for its very life and existence. We see the stripes unfold, the stars shine forth in all their glory, the most symmetrical and the most beautiful flag in the world.

We see the Continental Congress, on the 14th of June 1777, pass the shortest act in the history of the world: "*Resolved*, That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

This flag of ours had its birth in the trials and tribulations, the storm and stress of war; bathed in blood and tears, it shines forth a beacon light for all the oppressed of earth; it is the world's last, best hope for democratic ideals. May God protect it and preserve it is the prayer of every loyal and patriotic American.

When the flag was born, this Nation had a population of 3,000,000 souls; now it has a population of 135,000,000. By thrift and courage, persistency, and perseverance, our ancestors carried that flag across the great rivers, over the waterless and treeless deserts, over the snow-covered mountains, and in 250 years they planted that flag on the shores of the Pacific.

What does that flag stand for? It stands for freedom of speech, and of the press, trial by jury, and last but not least, the right of religious freedom. And right here let me pay sincere and frank tribute to Roger Williams, a missionary Baptist, for his brave fight that all of us might have this liberty. America owes a debt of gratitude to Williams and the members of the Missionary Baptist Church that we shall never be able to repay except to see that we do not lose this liberty.

Quoting again: "It was no holiday flag gorgeously emblazoned for gayety or vanity. It is a solemn national symbol. It is not a painted rag. It is a whole national history. It is the Constitution. It is the Government. It is the free people that stand in the Government on the Constitution."

"Flag of the free heart's hope and home.
By angel hands to valor given;
Thy stars have lit the welkin dome,
And all thy hues were born in heaven.
Forever float that standard sheet!
Where breathes the foe that falls before us,
With Freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us?

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

—*William Tyler Page.*

Permit me to quote briefly from the Man Without a Country: "He said: 'Look in my Bible, Danforth, when I am gone,' and I went away. I had no thought it was the end. I thought he was tired and would sleep. I knew he was happy, and I wanted him to be alone.

"But in an hour when the doctor went in gently, he found that Nolan had breathed his life away with a smile. He had something pressed close to his lips. It was his father's badge of the Order of the Cincinnati.

"We looked in his Bible, and there was a slip of paper where he had marked the text:

" 'They desire a country, even a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for He hath prepared for them a city.'

"On this slip of paper he had written:

" 'Bury me in the sea; it has been my home and I love it. But will not someone set up a stone for my memory at Fort Adams or Orleans that my disgrace may not be more than I ought to bear? Say on it: "In memory of Philip Nolan, lieutenant in the Army of the United States. He loved his country as no other man, but no man deserved less at her hands." ' "

I now quote from Jacob Riis' incomparable book The Making of an American:

"I have told the story of the making of an American. There remains to be told how I found out that he was made and finished at last. It was when I went back to see my mother once more and, wandering about the country of my childhood's memories, I had come to the city of Elsinore. There I fell ill of a fever and lay many weeks in the home of a friend upon the shore of the beautiful Oresund. One day when the fever had left me they rolled my bed into a room overlooking the sea. The sunlight danced upon the waves; the distant mountains of Sweden were blue against the horizon. Ships passed under full sail up and down the great waterway of the nations.

"But the sunshine and the peaceful day bore no message to me. I lay moodily picking at the coverlet—sick, discouraged, and sore—I hardly knew why myself. Until all at once there sailed past, close inshore, a ship flying at the top the flag of freedom, blown out on the breeze until every star in it shone bright and clear.

"That moment I knew. Gone were illness, discouragement, and gloom; forgotten weakness and suffering, the caution of doctor and nurse. I sat up in bed and shouted, laughed, and cried by turns, waving at the flag out there. They thought I had lost my head, but I told them no, thank God. I had found it and my heart, too, at last. I knew then it was my flag; that my children's home was mine, indeed; that I had also become an American in truth. And I thanked God, and, like the man sick of the palsy, arose from my bed and went home healed."

It is not often that a poet is a preacher or that a preacher is a poet, but Dr. Henry van Dyke was a great in both capacities. In 1907 he spent about a year in Europe; he saw their wonderful industries; their educational and banking institutions; he gazed in rapture at the great art galleries. Just before he started home he wrote a little poem entitled "America for Me," and by your permission, I shall quote briefly from it:

"Oh, London is a man's town; there's power in the air;
And Paris is a woman's town, with flowers in her hair.
'Tis sweet to dream in Venice and it's great to study Rome,
But when it comes to living there's no place like home.

"And so it's home again; and home again; America for me.
I want a ship that's westward bound to plow the rolling sea
To the blessed land of room enough beyond the ocean bars,
Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars."

O. W. I. Revises History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Wednesday, April 19, 1944, entitled "O. W. I. Revises History." This editorial comments upon the history of the United States as written and edited by persons unknown and distributed through the O. W. I. to the Allied Nations abroad. I am confident this sort of propaganda by the O. W. I. does not meet with the approval of the citizens of this country. The editorial elaborates on this conclusion:

O. W. I. REVISES HISTORY

The fantastic document entitled "A Handbook of the United States of America," compiled by O. W. I. for distribution abroad, is further evidence that this Federal agency is dissipating public funds for partisan, political purposes.

The people of America, who pay the costs of publication and distribution of the O. W. I. handbook, are indebted to Congressman TABER, of New York, and the New York Sun for knowledge of its contents. Representative TABER read excerpts into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, whereupon the Sun moved heaven and earth, in Washington and New York, in an effort to obtain a copy and finally succeeded.

The book purports to present a summary of American history and an analysis of the American Government and its mode of operation. It goes back a thousand years to the voyage of Leif Ericson, yet in 10 centuries O. W. I. sycophants find only 2 women worthy of mention, Jane Addams and Eleanor Roosevelt.

So far as one can learn from the handbook, Franklin Roosevelt was the only President ever inaugurated on a blustery 4th of March. In 1,000 years only the following "historic documents and speeches" enriched national philosophy: Preamble to the Constitution (but not the Constitution itself), Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Wilson's Fourteen Points, numerous speeches by President Roosevelt, and one by HENRY WALLACE.

Washington is ignored as the commanding general of the Revolution and as a statesman. The only Revolutionary officers mentioned are John Paul Jones and British General Cornwallis. The 1,000 years from Ericson to Roosevelt consume only 8 pages, the remaining 12 years, 14 pages. The C. I. O. gets more attention than the Congress of the United States. The O. W. I. historians also turn facts upside down by recounting the Federal Government's fight against attempts of States to seize unlawful powers.

In this age, when the telegraph, radio, and airplane make possible rapid transmission of the written and spoken word to all parts of the world, propaganda is a powerful weapon. It is manifest that the United States has an inescapable obligation to distribute among all the nations of the globe an honest exposition of its history and its aspirations.

The influence which this Nation will bring to bear at international conferences designing the new world after the war will depend in large measure on the respect and good will we command in Europe and Asia. This good will can be won by our deeds and by dissemination of democratic ideals and the precepts of world peace. But we do not play fair with our allies nor the peoples under Hitler's heel who look to us for freedom by hitching their hopes to one political party through Roosevelt panegyrics.

The Late Jesse S. Cottrell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of our friend, Jesse S. Cottrell, was a severe blow to this House and, as each day goes by, his presence and his reports of the Washington scene are more keenly missed.

A newspaperman of unusual skill, he had an acquaintanceship at the Capital second to none, and his ability to find facts and to report them with crystal clear exactness won the respect and admiration of all with whom he came in contact.

The people of the Thirty-second District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, loved and respected Jesse Cottrell. He was the confidant of many and accomplished things for them which touched their lives in a most helpful way.

It would not be fair to the people of the Thirty-second District if I did not pay, in their name, this tribute to a great newspaperman and one of the soundest Americans who ever served the free press of this country.

With the permission of the House I would also like to include in my remarks an editorial on the death of Jesse Cottrell which appeared March 25, 1944, in the very able Watertown Times, one of the many outstanding newspapers which Mr. Cottrell represented as Washington correspondent. Said the Times:

Jesse S. Cottrell, long-time Washington correspondent of this newspaper, passes away suddenly in Washington. His name and his work are familiar to innumerable persons throughout this area. He was not only a Washington newspaper writer who kept our people in close touch with important national events, but he was a northern New York ambassador at large without portfolio who looked after the interests of north country people in Washington. Persons who went from this area to Washington on business, private or public, consulted Jesse Cottrell. His thoroughly seasoned knowledge of Washington was always available to them and there was no sacrifice he would not make to assist them. Frequently he accompanied them to the departments, arranged for interviews for them with Senators, Congressmen, and others. This was all outside his regular work as a newspaperman but he did it cheerfully for northern New York people.

Save for the period in the 1920's, when he was American Minister to Bolivia, he had been in newspaper work in Washington almost continuously for a generation. He went there from Tennessee as a young man, first as a secretary to a Senator and gradually he moved into the work of a special correspondent and as such he developed well.

He knew nearly everyone of importance in Washington. He had a rare faculty of remembering backgrounds of individuals. He knew the communities of northern New York almost as thoroughly as though he had lived here and had been engaged in newspaper work here for years. Mention nearly any person here who had appeared in the news, and he had some knowledge of them. The Times had no more thorough reader than he, and this over a long period of years. He knew our communities thoroughly and our problems even though he had not lived here.

His service in Washington began before the last World War opened in 1914. Senators and Congressmen came and went; administrations ran their course, but he went on and on. His knowledge of public men was intimate. He knew their alinements and their reactions. They all called him Jess or Jesse. Employees had confidence in him. Public men would tell him all and rely upon his discriminating good sense to present the facts accurately and well.

He was a kindly man and a friendly man. He had warm friends everywhere, from the Capitol to the White House and all points between. He was richly endowed with intuitive good judgment and common sense. He could penetrate a sham quickly. He could see truth and justice wherever and whenever it appeared. Withal he was a mellow man. He had no deep dislikes or hates.

This newspaper feels deeply his passing. We know our readers and those of our people who knew him in Washington will miss him. He served all of us long and well. His passing ends a career of rich service.

The New Air Liner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., April 20, 1944:

THE NEW AIR LINER

The crossing of the continent by the giant Lockheed *Constellation* in 6 hours and 58 minutes seems almost like a dream. Nothing could better indicate the degree to which commercial aviation has profited by the intensive study of planes and engines that has accompanied the war.

At a single stroke the transcontinental flying time for a transport plane is cut from 10 hours and 22 minutes, achieved from Los Angeles to Washington in 1935, to 6 hours and 58 minutes. The sustained speed of 355 miles an hour was an actual increase of 133.4 miles an hour over the 221.6 sustained speed of 1935.

The *Constellation*, moreover, carried 17 persons on its trial trip and there was room for 40 more to have luxury accommodations. As a troop transport, the ship is designed to carry 100 soldiers with their full equipment. The ship will be turned over for Army transport use for the duration of the war, but she was designed not only for this purpose, but in anticipation of the increased commercial service that is certain to open when the war is over.

War is a grim affair and not one to be desired by anyone. But like all the unpleasant side of life it has its compensations. One of these is the progress that is forced upon us by the pressure of grim necessity

Most human gains have been made under the pressure of necessity. Forced to meet critical situations to survive, man's inventive genius has been stimulated to a point that it otherwise would not have reached. War provides one of these ciritical situations when human genius must be keyed to its highest point to survive.

In the present war, the race to win efficiency in the air has been a vital factor. Under the pressure of this race, planes and engines have been refined and perfected at an amazing speed. As a result when the war is over, aviation will be found to have made a phenomenal advance that otherwise might have taken many years to accomplish.

Far Eastern Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion on the Lend-Lease extension bill I referred to three memoranda prepared by Carl Neprud, a Wisconsin friend of mine who has spent the major part of his life in the Far East. I declared that Neprud's memoranda were well worth embodying in the RECORD for others to read. In touching on Japan's decision to move southward I drew special attention to a pre-Pearl Harbor memorandum which was sent to the President under cover of a letter dated July 9, 1940.

As will be seen Neprud strongly urged that more naval strength be thrown into the Singapore area so as not to leave the door open permitting the Japanese to come south and pick up oil, rubber, tin, and other strategic materials required for conducting large scale warfare. There can be no question about it, instead of stopping the Japanese in the Solomons it would have been better to have stopped them at Singapore. Also, as pointed out in the memorandum, the Japanese would then not have been able to have captured Burma and closed the Burma Road.

The memorandum and its covering letter read as follows:

HAY-ADAMS HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1940.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I beg to append hereto a memorandum stressing the importance to the democracies of maintaining control of the Singapore area. Briefly there are, in my opinion, three vital points at stake, namely:

1. Preventing an important world-trade channel from being developed for the Axis Powers.

2. Preventing the closing of China's communication line through Burma, so essential in keeping Japan bogged down.

3. Preventing such important units of the British Empire as India, Malaya, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand—all of which are dependent in some measure upon Singapore for their defense—being exposed to possible domination by Japan and the Axis Powers.

With our fleet in the Pacific, it is suggested that part of it—possibly a third would be sufficient—be based on Manila with an understanding being arrived at with both the British and Netherlands East Indies Governments that should an emergency arise our fleet could use both the Singapore and Surabaya naval bases, where they could cooperate with the existing British and Dutch sea, land, and air forces. It would be a case of being there first instead of letting the Japanese get in to establish a hornets' nest of their own from which it would be difficult to dislodge them.

The move could be announced as a precautionary measure designed to safeguard the Philippines and our trade channels in that general area, and so would not be directed against any particular power.

Copies of this memorandum are being sent to Col. Frank Knox and Mr. Henry L. Stimson, your recent nominees for Cabinet defense posts, and to Secretaries Hull and Morgenthau.

Respectfully yours,

CARL NEPRUD.

IMPORTANCE OF DEMOCRACIES MAINTAINING CONTROL IN THE SINGAPORE AREA

Having lived in the Far East during the last 27 years and, besides, having traveled extensively in other parts of the world, I have had an opportunity to study conditions—particularly those pertaining to foreign trade and international politics—and to form some views, some of which, with your permission, I should like to bring forward for consideration. The thoughts I have particularly in mind at this time center around the importance of the Singapore area in the world struggle now waging.

It is heartening to know that the fleet is not deserting the Pacific. It would seem that there can be no question that as long as the British Navy is functioning effectively in the Atlantic, then the place for the American Fleet is in the Pacific.

Fully desirous of exploiting the situation which has developed by the collapse of the French armies in Europe and by Britain's preoccupation in home waters, Japan has turned her eyes southward—talking in terms of French Indochina, the Dutch East Indies, and contiguous territories yet to be mentioned specifically. It would seem that at present the only country which is really in a position to keep Japan from entering upon such an adventure is America—who, in my opinion, has it in her power to do it without being involved in war. So far, Japan has been slowed up by the timely statements made by your Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, on each and every occasion that Japan's Foreign Minister, Mr. Arita, has seen fit to speak in regard to the different territories to the south of China. I should like to submit for consideration the thought that what would definitely check Japan in her aggressive designs southward would be moving part of our fleet—possibly a third would be sufficient—from Hawaii to the Philippines—at the same time arriving at an understanding with both the British and Netherlands East Indies Governments whereby in case of need we might use both the Singapore and Surabaya naval bases. We would then be assured of being in the happy position of being there first. The tables would be reversed with respect to Japan. Thus, in the event of an emergency, instead of our fleet being in the awkward position of having to think in terms of going far afield from its bases and entering a hornets' nest, as it were, in Japanese waters, the Japanese Fleet would have to consider whether it would be prepared to leave its main base at Sasebo and venture some thousands of miles away to put itself into a hornets' nest in the Manila, Singapore, Surabaya area, where in addition to our units there would be substantial British and Dutch forces—land, sea, and air.

Surely the democracies must realize that the time has come when they can no longer stand on ceremony—at least vis-à-vis one another. There would seem to be no valid reason why democracies should always be late. Letting Japan move part of her fleet into that area first—thereby creating a second Japanese hornets' nest—would, in my opinion, be most dangerous for the democracies. There would then be the danger of the Japanese and the Italian Navies linking up to permit the important raw materials obtainable from Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, China, and other nearby territories to flow to the Axis Powers.

Not only is control of the Singapore area vital from the point of view of not permitting the aggressors in Europe from obtaining an important avenue for the development of their commerce, but if the Axis Powers succeed in overcoming British resistance on and around the British Isles, then maintenance of the British dominions overseas which, in reality, constitute the British Empire itself, rests in large measure on whether or not Britain has control of Singapore—the base which is so uniquely situated with respect to such important units of the Empire as India, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and Malaya.

I think history would record it as a stupendous error were we to permit Japan to maintain her bluff to the extent that she succeeds in this, her next great adventure.

In my opinion, Japan would not dare to attempt to take over those regions by force were part of our navy in those waters—with two such strong naval bases as Singapore and Surabaya from which to operate should necessity dictate. Japan is overextended now. After 3 years of fighting she has not succeeded in defeating China, her gold supply is about exhausted, and her opportunity of obtaining war materials is gradually being lessened—especially with the power recently conferred by act of Congress to prohibit the export of articles considered essential for our own defense. Japan continues, however, to put up a bold front—speaking with a voice far beyond her power.

Instead of being able to defeat China, Japan's Armies have been spread out over a wide area and are now bogged down with no graceful retreat in sight. The Chinese Armies instead of getting weaker have, in reality, become stronger. They have learned more about conducting warfare and are more effective in the field today than they were when the war first started. In fact, the democracies of the world owe a debt of gratitude to China for the fight she has been wag-

ing against aggressive Japan these last 3 years. The maintenance of a free China is of great importance to the cause of the democracies. Control of the Singapore area will permit continued communication with China via Burma, thus assuring that Chinese resistance will go on. China's almost inexhaustible manpower and the vastness of her territory are important factors in wearing down the Japanese, but they are not enough in themselves. A continual flow of war equipment is necessary, which requires that supply routes remain open.

Such a movement of part of our fleet need not be announced as aimed against Japan. It could be declared that the additional units have been detailed to the Manila area to give added protection to the Philippine Islands and to safeguard the trade channels through which flow the bulk of our requirements in rubber, tin, and some other products. It could be a precautionary measure against any aggressive designs on the part of any power or group of powers and hence not necessarily against Japan. We would need make no statement except to say that the serious political situation in the world necessitates that we take appropriate measures to protect our interests in that general area.

I might add that I quite realize that moving part of our fleet might conceivably go counter to a more or less fixed policy of having our fleet operate as one unit. There is the thought, however, that the whole fleet would continue to be in the one ocean, and that the fleet's two units would be so situated with respect to the Japanese Fleet that they could cooperate effectively should any hostilities arise.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 9, 1940.*

India-China Air Route: Need of Large Transport Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the plea which I made a few days ago for larger transport planes for use on the Assam-China air route, I referred to several memoranda prepared by Carl Neprud relating specifically to this very subject, which in my opinion should go into the RECORD. In his long stay in the Far East, Neprud has had a unique opportunity to become acquainted with transportation conditions in Assam, Burma, and China.

In his memorandum written in March 1943, Neprud strongly urged that greater use should be made of the India-China air route, now China's only line, so that China's resistance can be strengthened, especially as regards air power by which that great tactician, General Chennault, and his American and Chinese airmen are producing such astounding results on but a trickle of supplies. The memorandum reads:

MEMORANDUM

There is no question but that America regards Japan as public enemy No. 1. This I think has been borne out ever since Pearl Harbor, and more particularly in recent weeks by the results shown in Gallup polls and by the views expressed by Members of Congress in both Houses at the time the lend-lease extension bill was up for passage. In fact, I believe that I am not overstating the case when I say that there is unanimous feeling in Congress that every effort should be made to assist China and our own forces operating in the Pacific area against Japan. On the floor of Congress, in the press, and over the radio we constantly hear the earnest desire expressed that more aid should be sent to China.

Mere expressions of opinion, however, will not produce the necessary aid—the fact of the matter is that aid can be sent to China. I fear that many people believe that nothing can be done until the Burma Road is reopened. However useful it is to have this other avenue to reach China, there is no need of waiting for the realization of that event before sending more supplies to our ally in the Far East. Practically all the supplies entering China today are sent in over the India air route from upper Assam to China. The amount of goods shipped can be expanded by the addition of more transport planes and the building of additional airfields in upper Assam. Many people do not realize that supplies can be sent from New York to Chungking by water for the entire journey except for a hop of approximately 550 miles from the head of navigation on the Brahmaputra in upper Assam to Suifu (Ipin) or Kiating (Loshan) on the upper Yangtze. Each new month sees an increased amount of supplies being sent to China by this route. With America producing ever larger numbers of transport planes, it would seem that it is but a matter of assigning more of such planes to that part of the world to strengthen the military position in China, which is the only territory under allied control at present from which air attacks can conveniently be made upon Japanese industry and power units in Japan proper, and on Japan's communication lines to China and to Japan's newly acquired empire to the south.

The importance of this point of attack has been recognized by our high command only recently by placing General Chennault in charge of a separate Army air force command in China. Aside from carrying out air raids over Japanese controlled territories, General Chennault's air forces will, if properly strengthened, be able to give material support to China's Armies who are engaged in fighting Japanese troops over a front of some 2,000 and more miles. In fact, increased air power may be sufficient to enable the Chinese forces to break into a general offensive which as it develops may succeed in driving the Japanese Armies out of many sections of the country.

With the great advance that has been made in aviation and the plans that are now being carried out with respect to development of ever larger and larger transport planes by such men as Kaiser, Higgins, Douglas, Johnson of Boeing's, and others, there is no doubt but what we are entering upon a new phase in transportation history. It will no doubt be found cheaper when new transportation routes are required across rugged, rough, mountainous country to inaugurate aerial routes instead of building motor roads or railroads.

Even railroads and highways have their limitations. The Burma Road, for instance, was limited in what it was capable of delivering to China and was expensive. The rail system in Burma, even before the war when functioning normally, was wholly inadequate for supplying the war needs of China. At no time would more than 30,000 tons ever reach Lashio, the terminal of the Burma Road in Burma, by rail, and the largest amount that ever reached Kunming, at the end of the Road, in any 1 month was 17,000 tons. The average tonnage was, of course, much lower than that, probably 10,000 tons, and a large portion of that amount was gasoline required for moving war equipment to other points like Chungking, which is another 700 miles further. The total haul from Rangoon by rail and throughout to Chungking is approximately 2,000 miles. Aside from the fact that both the railway and the highway are limited in what they can carry even in normal times, it is safe to say that even if they are recaptured, it will be a long time before they will be able to carry anything approaching the amounts carried in the months immediately preceding the war. Much of the railways' rolling stock was no doubt destroyed by the Allied armies before they left Burmese soil, and in the event the Japanese are driven out of Burma and western Yunnan, one can expect that they will leave very little railway equipment and very few trucks for use on the highway. The chances are, too, that bridges will be destroyed, and at least as far as the bridge over the Gohtiek Gorge is concerned, that will be a serious matter, as the work of rebuilding such a bridge is an engineering feat which will take considerable time to complete.

By the addition of more large transport planes to the fleet operating from upper Assam, it should soon be possible to deliver 10,000 tons every month at an airport like Suifu on the Yangtze River, from which the supplies could be floated on down the river to Wanshien and other points by native junks and small steamers. To increase that amount would be largely a matter of increasing the number of transport planes. Less than 25 miles from the airport in upper Assam there is an oil field, and with a refinery which is capable of producing by the addition of ethyl the quality of aviation gasoline sufficiently high in octane content to fuel transport planes. As the hop to airports in China is less than 600 miles, transport planes can carry sufficient gasoline in their tanks for their return journey.

It is only natural that in a life-and-death struggle every person or every nation is thinking about his or her own security, and everyone will regard whatever struggle there is on one's own doorstep as being the most important one requiring solution. One must not blame Mr. Churchill too much for feeling strongly that Hitler must be disposed of first before anything much is done in the Far East, even though it is necessary to allow several years to elapse in the process. The Chinese, of course, cannot be blamed if they feel that the struggle on their doorstep is a most vital concern, and certainly when one reflects on how they have fought their strong, aggressive neighbor these 5½ years, and how they have suffered in their effort to remain a free people, one cannot blame them for expecting to receive something more than 1½ percent of our lend-lease output.

When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, she planted the war of the Pacific directly on our doorstep. The people of this country feel that it is our war. On that there can be no question but what there is absolute unity. The country is undoubtedly prepared to produce the best war effort in meeting the menace from Japan. I greatly fear that for us to mark time in the Pacific for several years while we continue to throw practically all of our support to Europe will not help to promote the best possible war effort on the part of the people of this country. It would seem that maximum results can be attained if we conduct an offensive war against Japan at the same time as we are giving strong support in the European theater. The Japanese must not be given time to consolidate their position. Time is definitely on Japan's side, and she should not be given the opportunity to have it work in her favor.

If no strong, effective opposition is waged against the Japanese, the people now under her control are apt to believe that their only hope is to cooperate with Japan. Even the Chinese in occupied China may ultimately come to feel that the Japanese armies and the Wang Ching-Wei regime in Nanking have come to stay, and that the best thing to do

is to cooperate with them. By supplying General Chennault with more air power, he will be able by periodic raids throughout the occupied area and in Hong Kong, Indochina, and elsewhere, to show to the people of these territories that military opposition does exist and that there is some hope of their eventually being released from their bondage. That in my opinion is the best propaganda this country has to offer.

CARL NEPRUD.

COON VALLEY, WIS., *March 25, 1943.*

China Theater of Operations: Need of More Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent discussion of China's supply problem, I had occasion to refer to several memoranda prepared by Carl Neprud, who has an intimate acquaintance with the far eastern situation. In a memorandum written November 15, 1943, and headed: "Question of supplies: Where a little can do a lot," Neprud stresses the need of increasing the volume carried "over the hump" to China for assisting General Chiang Kai-shek's forces and Chennault's Fourteenth Army Air Corps. While it is appreciated that every commander wherever he is located—in the Pacific or anywhere else in the world—will continue to press for more and more materials to be sent in his direction, still it is difficult to believe that commanders of any other Pacific areas will begrudge General Chennault some additional supplies—in view of the great damage he is inflicting on the Japanese communication lines, airfields, and so forth, within Japan's inner zone. With such striking results being achieved by the trickle of supplies now being sent in by the Assam air route, it would seem that every effort should be made to protect that route and to increase the amount flown in, thereby enabling General Chennault to make greater use of China's air bases with correspondingly greater effect on the enemy's inner defenses and communication lines. Naturally, whatever damage is done to Japan in this area will serve to lighten the task on Japan's distant perimeter.

If China were not in this war one can be quite sure that we would be pleading with her to permit us to use her bases so that we could more easily attack the Japanese homeland and the communication lines southward. The importance of China's geographical position on Japan's flank would then perhaps be a whole lot clearer to us than it is now.

The memorandum reads as follows:

FAR-EASTERN THEATER OF OPERATIONS—QUESTION OF SUPPLIES: WHERE A LITTLE CAN DO A LOT

On page 68 of October 1, 1943, issue of the United States News the following item appears:

"Gen. Douglas MacArthur is protesting what looks to him to be a diversion of available materials from his active war theater to what now is an inactive and long-range theater of operations, in Burma. There are signs that General MacArthur's attitude is not far out of line with some United States naval opinion."

It would seem only natural that General MacArthur, having been driven out of the Philippines, should regard the recapture of those islands as the first important move in the Pacific area. Likewise, one might reasonably expect that from the point of view of Lord Mountbatten and the British in general, no step can be of more urgent a nature in the far-eastern field of operations than the recapture of Singapore, which occupies such a unique position—from a natural defense point of view—with respect to many important units of the British Empire. One must also not blame General Stilwell if he should believe that no move of any consequence should precede the recapture of Burma from which he and his gallant men were driven out.

One need not be an authority on military matters to realize that to carry out even one of these enterprises will require strong sea power, large, well-equipped land forces, and huge air armadas, not to mention mountains of supplies of all kinds. And speaking of supplies, a large part of them require to be transported half-way around the world either from the west or east coast of America. It would seem that any strategic plan which has shown that it has merit and admits of expansion in a comparatively easy manner and without the employment of huge forces—air, land, or sea—requiring to be transported from the other side of the world might reasonably be given greater support than has heretofore been allowed. I have reference to the great work being done by General Chennault and his Fourteenth Army Air Corps, and the Chinese Air Forces which are cooperating with him.

Any man who has had an opportunity to study the military situation in the Far East first hand has come back loud in his praises of General Chennault and his small force. As Senator RICHARD RUSSELL said on the floor of the Senate in rendering a report to his colleagues on what he had found on his world tour of American battle fronts: "In my opinion, General Chennault is one of the most brilliant soldiers that this war has produced. With an incredibly small number of effective airplanes, he is contributing greatly to keeping China a factor in the war. Certainly no man has ever done more with so little. * * * It is requiring a superhuman effort to furnish General Chennault's air forces, but the maintenance of air bases in China is of such great importance that we should attack the problem of supplying him with redoubled vigor."

In his last biennial report, released on September 8, 1943, Gen. G. C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, said with respect to the importance of the present supply route to China:

"* * * The first flight of the air ferry command into China over the Himalayas was completed 6 days later. Moving personnel, equipment, gasoline, and other supplies over the mountains into China following its transportation by sea and air half-way around the globe imposed an unparalleled logistical problem.

"The operations of our air forces in India, Burma, and in China held in that region Japanese airplanes which might have been employed elsewhere; losses were inflicted on the enemy's air force, depots, and communications; and, most important of all, Chinese morale was greatly stimulated by this evidence of America's intention to support China in every way possible.

"There have gradually developed since the summer of 1942 increasingly destructive bomber attacks over Burma and out of China with targets from Hopei to French Indochina, including Hainan Island. The enemy's retaliatory attacks have also been repulsed with astonishingly heavy losses to his flyers. Day by day the power of our air offensive in these regions is growing, and forcing a dispersion of Japanese means along their southern front, extending from Burma 5,500 miles to the Solomon Islands, to meet our attacks, which are involving them in losses so destructive as to threaten the maintenance of their air power and the efficiency of their sea forces."

Hardly a day passes but the papers carry official reports of exploits of General Chennault's American and Chinese flyers in which they have done damage to Japanese communication lines along China's coast or on the Yangtze River, or have rained bombs on power stations, cement plants, colliers, and other useful war adjuncts in occupied China, Hong Kong, or Indochina. In addition, this small air force operating from bases in China is playing an important role in the support of China's armies on the 2,000-mile front, enabling units not only to repel attacks launched by the Japanese but in several instances, notably a recent one in the rice-bowl area below Ichang, to launch an offensive, albeit of a minor nature. The point which should be stressed, however, is that with so much being accomplished with so little, it would seem highly advisable to study the possibility of increasing the aid in that direction and accomplishing a great deal more.

While the grand strategy may have been mapped with the idea of ultimately launching a wide pincer movement with MacArthur's forces moving north and west and Mountbatten's units moving east to points on the Malayan Peninsula with a view to playing havoc with the enemy's communication lines to the rich Netherlands Indies from which Japan gets the bulk of her oil and other important requirements for war, the fact still remains that such an ambitious program from the point of view of men, ships, planes, material, and all manner of supplies, requiring enormous expeditions, would be an expensive venture and in view of the strength of air and other forces which the enemy no doubt has concentrated in that natural hornet's nest may even involve some risk of failure.

The formulation of sound strategy presumably revolves around the idea of doing the greatest damage to the enemy at the smallest losses to one's self. According to Winston Churchill that is the reason why Britain and America have so far not attempted any invasion across the channel but have preferred to concentrate their efforts in that theater to bombing operations against Germany's industrial cities, her transportation lines, and her airports and other military establishments. As Churchill indicated, such a procedure might produce the desired result with a great saving of men, ships, and material. One might reasonably ask, Has not General Chennault established by the damage he has done to the enemy's transportation lines, wharves, docks, industrial plants, air bases, and troop concentrations at such low cost either in initial supply of planes, bombs, oil, and other materials used, or in actual losses sustained that serious consideration might reasonably be given to the idea of using the Assam air route to a much greater extent than it is used at present? No doubt each succeeding quarter shows some increase over the previous quarter in tonnage carried, but why not launch forth in a bigger way by doubling or even trebling the amount now flown into China? The amount would still be relatively very small in comparison with the amounts being stored up for eventual use by MacArthur and Mountbatten but unquestionably the good which would be achieved in damage inflicted on the enemy would be far more than a like amount of

material could produce in any other theater of operations.

The question naturally arises, How can a substantial increase in tonnage carried "over the hump" be attained? To that question I would reply the same as I did to a high American aviation official in China who, believing the obstacles too great, was unable to agree with a recommendation which had been made for the establishment of a direct air route between China and India. The reply was: "Make the planes bigger and put more spinners on out in front." At the instance of my chief, Dr. H. H. Kung, vice president of the Executive Yuan and concurrently Minister of Finance, I had gone to Upper Assam in the spring of 1941 to study conditions there—airport development, transportation facilities by river and rail, gasoline supplies, etc.—as they might bear on a direct air route to China, the thought being that if Japan attacked Britain the whole of Burma might soon be overrun, giving China no practical and convenient route to the outside world except by air to India.

Since that time great progress has no doubt been made in the development of facilities for increasing the air traffic to China. With supply lines by both water and rail from the seaport of Calcutta it should be possible to convey to the steamer and rail terminals in Upper Assam, both of which are not far from the original airport, all the bombs, gasoline, and other aviation supplies which General Chennault might require—even if he is given the 500 planes which, according to newspaper reports, he claims would be sufficient for his purposes in playing havoc with the enemy's communication lines, industrial centers, and ports; and, in cooperation with the Chinese Armies, developing a general offensive which will ultimately drive the Japanese out of China. The importance of keeping China's morale up should also not be overlooked at this critical time. Senator CHANDLER, of the Military Affairs Committee, who was one of five Senators who made the recent inspection trip which took them, among other places, to China, said in part, with respect to the situation there: "* * * The Chinese people are weary of the war, and if by starvation or exhaustion they are forced out of the war, it will be a serious set-back for us in our war against Japan. If the Japanese can make a determined offensive from Indochina and capture our Kunming base (General Chennault's main base), we are through in China, and China is out of the war." Earlier in his report Senator CHANDLER said: "We are in grave danger of losing our bases in China, and if we lose these bases, the war against Japan will be greatly prolonged and the cost to us in American lives will perhaps run into the thousands."

A well-known writer on military matters recently declared that any properly equipped division participating in the invasion of Europe would require the inclusion of an air force of 300 planes. With that being the case the request on the part of General Chennault for but 500 planes for the operations which he carries on over a wide area in China and surrounding territories seems a modest one indeed. In fact, considering the way Chennault and his forces have been producing results with possibly but a fraction of the 500 planes requested, it would seem that the high command might reasonably give serious consideration to General Chennault's plea. After all, as far as the war planes are concerned—whether fighters or bombers—they can be flown in on their own power.

The main task would naturally be to increase the amount of aviation gasoline, bombs, munitions, and other aviation requirements needed by the larger air unit. It would seem that this could be achieved by allocating for the Assam-China route more and larger transport planes. Fortunately, with the great advance in aviation which this generation has the privilege of witnessing, men of wisdom like Higgins, Kaiser, Douglas, and Boeing's Johnson are producing ever larger and larger transport planes to meet the requirements of war in all parts of the world. The Douglas Skymaster—a four-engine job reported to be capable of carrying 30,000 pounds—is now being manufactured in Chicago on an assembly line basis. It is said that such a plane can carry enough gasoline for the round trip to Kunming or to Ipin (Suifu) and still be able to deliver a pay-load of not less than 7½ tons of cargo at destination. Assuming that to begin with only 50 such planes were to be assigned to the Assam-China route and assuming that they were to make but one round-trip per day it would mean a monthly delivery to China of 11,250 tons. And were the fleet to make two round-trips a day, deliveries would total 22,500 tons. Even the Burma Road in its record month did not deliver any larger amount at Kunming. In this connection it should be noted that the air line has a distinct advantage over a motor road in that the road leads to but one place whereas the skyways are wide ways and will permit deliveries in any direction. While I understand that Kunming has been the main delivery base, there should, in my opinion, be no reason why the larger transport planes capable as they are of flying 1,000 or more miles without refueling, should not make deliveries to such points as Ipin (Suifu) Kiating, and Chengtu from which points supplies can be sent on by boats down the Yangtze River to Chungking, Wanhsien, and even to points nearer the enemy lines in the vicinity of Ichang.

Many people seem to labor under the impression that delivery of supplies to General Chennault is a well-nigh hopeless task on account of the distance involved, the assumption being that all of his supplies must start from New York. As regards supplies from America, it should be remembered that to whatever theater they are sent in the Far East, whether to Mountbatten or to MacArthur, they must also leave from New York or other American ports and that the only difference in distance as regards supplies destined to General Chennault is—apart from the steamer or rail haul to Upper Assam—the air hops of approximately 500 miles to the air bases at Kunming, Suifu, or other points in that general area. It is, of course, only natural that it should be a longer haul to reach General Chennault as he is not operating on the perimeter of Japan's newly acquired territories in the tropics but is close to the Japanese homeland—its heart and vitals, as it were—where Japan's main war industries are located and from which hub radiate her communication lines to the far-flung outposts of her new possessions. Surely one of our main objectives is to get into closer striking distance to Japan proper, and naturally the nearer we come to Japan the longer the supply route will be.

In this connection, one must not overlook the fact that when Mountbatten finally decides to use the supplies—which he has been storing up in India—either in Malaya or in Burma, or in both areas, he too, will require to arrange for further transportation which, in view of the obvious risks involved, may prove as expensive, if not more so, than moving supplies to General Chennault by large transportation planes.

It should be noted that one very important item, namely gasoline, which is one of General Chennault's main requirements, is produced in the Indian Ocean basin. A quality of gasoline suitable at least for use in transport planes is refined at the oil fields at Digboi which is but 25 miles away from the original Assam airport, while 100-octane aviation gasoline is produced at Abadan in the Persian Gulf area.

However disturbed General MacArthur may be concerning the amount of supplies going to Lord Mountbatten, or conversely, whatever Lord Mountbatten may think about the volume of stores and equipment being sent to General MacArthur, it is inconceivable that either of these gentlemen would begrudge General Chennault some additional supplies, that great air man having demonstrated time and again, that he and his combination of American and Chinese flyers can produce astonishing results on very little and with remarkably small damage to themselves or their equipment. Given some additional support, General Chennault should be able to inflict on the Japanese correspondingly greater damage which, in the end, can but serve to lighten the tasks which Lord Mountbatten and General MacArthur have before them.

CARL NEPRUD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 15, 1943.*

False Rumors About Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, there have been many false and unfounded rumors about lend-lease and its operations, and Hon. Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, and his general counsel, Oscar S. Cox, assisted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in its recent hearings on lend-lease to explode many of these unfounded and false rumors, and the printed hearings upon the recent extension of lend-lease sets out in full the facts about many of these unfounded and unsupported rumors.

Mr. Frank R. Kent, a newspaper columnist of recognized ability, has written an article relative to this matter, which appeared in the Washington Star on April 21, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

CROWLEY PERFORMED PATRIOTIC SERVICE IN EXPLODING ANTI-BRITISH RUMORS

(By Frank R. Kent)

Mr. Leo T. Crowley, under whom lease-lend is now operated, performed a patriotic service and executed as well an effective piece of personal strategy the other day when, by providing the answers before the questions could be asked, he vaccinated against the anti-British and anti-Russian (but particularly anti-British) rumors that have been current here for weeks and weeks and which, if they persist unchecked, are sure to seep through the country.

The Crowley statement was made before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and should have had much wider publicity than was given. For these reports have had great circulation and are promoted with such detail as to make them easy to believe.

Among those exploded by Mr. Crowley were:

1. That the British had a habit of removing the labels from lease-lend articles and substituting their own, retransferring the goods to other countries and taking the credit.

2. That the lease-lend was selling gasoline to the British in various places for 2 cents a

gallon which the British resold to our Army for 42 cents.

3. That alcohol sent to Britain on lease-lend had been converted into whisky and sold back to us.

4. That we had sent huge quantities of diaper cloth to north Africa which the natives were using for headdresses.

5. That the Russians had traded some of our planes to the Japanese in return for rubber.

6. That the Russians were using lease-lend butter to grease their boots, etc.

DENIAL BADLY NEEDED

These and kindred stories were denounced by Mr. Crowley as without any trace of truth and as having emanated from enemy propaganda sources. Unquestionably a clear-cut, unequivocal denial of these poisonous reports was badly needed. It should have been made long ago, and Mr. Crowley deserves credit for taking the initiative.

The amount of harm such things can do if permitted to go unchecked is hard to exaggerate. In effect, they attribute a degree of depravity to our allies which is almost unthinkable. They play directly into German and Japanese hands at the most critical period of the war. And they create resentment and distrust when good will and complete faith is vital to the common cause.

If there is anything better calculated to weaken the war effort and hamper the essential post-war cooperation than the stirring up of bad blood between ourselves and our allies, it is not easy to give it a name. So clear is this that it would seem worth any exertion upon the part of the administration to render it impossible; that the President himself might take cognizance of these things and use his great influence to disabuse the public mind.

Neither the British nor the Russians can afford to take notice of such reports. Yet both are aware of their harmful potentialities and are deeply resentful over injustices which they are powerless to correct—or even to direct to the attention of the people. It is a situation disturbing to thoughtful men in Washington. To them Mr. Crowley's statement seemed particularly timely and needed.

The question is whether it is going to be let alone or followed up. The hope, of course, is that it will be followed up and that this especially damaging enemy propaganda can be wholly nullified. In this connection, our military authorities could very greatly help.

ANTI-BRITISH FEELING

It is an unfortunate but quite well-known fact that there is a considerable anti-British feeling among some of our higher Army officers; that these have somewhat industriously spread the notion that the British want to get back their possessions in the East without having to fight for them; that their fighting planes are better designed for defending England than aiding in the devastation of Germany; that the British are holding back on the channel invasion because they are unwilling to pay the price, etc., etc.

It is a little shocking to hear this sort of talk from men of high rank in the American Army. But it can be heard from them, both in private conversation and around not-too-private dinner tables. These slurs and insinuations are just as false as those so flatly contradicted by Mr. Cowley and which, he asserted, originally had been, put out by Berlin and Tokyo radio.

It is true that the great bulk of American officers are wholly free from any anti-British feeling; have nothing but praise of the British as fighters and friends. But, there are enough others who, one way or the other, have been irritated by individual Englishmen and who have been expressing themselves, to cause concern at the top.

It is time something were done about all this, and it can be stated that disciplinary measures are under consideration. Certainly, nothing could be more worth while. With the war about to reach its climax and the effectiveness of the peace resting largely upon British-American cooperation and understanding, discord of this character is about as bad a thing as could be.

All these baseless anti-British reports ought to be firmly dealt with and the atmosphere cleared. The O. W. I. might well find a field here. Putting an end to this kind of disorganizing propaganda would be very much more useful than most of the things it has done or is doing.

"* * * for Purple Mountains Majesty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a message written by the 15-year-old son of a well-known citizen of West Virginia, now resident in Washington.

I hope that my colleagues will read this extraordinarily beautiful and powerful message which comes in the midst of wars, alarms, and confusions like a healing breath of peace from the high places:

"* * * FOR PURPLE MOUNTAINS MAJESTY"

(By Charles J. Farrington, Jr.)

Among the great unrecognized wonders of this country are the numerous heights of mountain terrain which expand from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, and from the Canadian border to the gateway of Mexico. These mountains, no matter how wild and desolate they may seem are fine in their symbolic meaning of what this country stands for. The things the American soldier puts in his memory pack as he sets out for battle are his reminders of the democracy he is fighting for. Among these, along with the prairies of waving grain, the blue waters, and the sky that looks over them, are the mountains upon whose slopes he can stand and breathe the clean, pure air of a freeman's land.

The mountains have had such a large part in the history of mankind, the development of government and religion, that I cannot believe that the great outstanding events so allied to the mountains were due to mere chance. They, no doubt, were the result of inspirations stirred by the majesty of the bulk and the height of these great monuments which the Creator has used to beautify the world, and the idea that those who climbed their rugged slopes left behind, somewhat, the taint of the restless world's ignoble strife and gained a higher spiritual atmosphere, closer to their God.

The mountains are inseparably linked with the origin and growth of our religion. Moses, on Mt. Horeb, attracted by a burning bush, gave attention and talked with God. The thunders of Mount Sinai and the tables of testimony written with the finger of God, and the shining face of Moses when he came down from the mountains, are living today, for a thousand parliaments and legislative bodies since then have patterned their legislation after the laws and ordinances of Sinai.

Jesus Christ, himself, was a mountain man, for His home, Nazareth, was among the rugged hills. The mountains were the scene of many of the most important events of His life. His Sermon on the Mount is the sweetest expression of lofty thoughts that has floated into speech in all time. Mount Tabor was the scene of the transfiguration, one of the most wonderful manifestations connected with His mission. Mount Olivet held a prominent place in His ministry. Then, at last, there was Mount Calvary—time's sublimest tragedy. It stands out in the minds of the millions that have come and gone since then, as a symbol of the rescue of all the lost of Eden.

The mountains in our religious history and development make the keys of a great organ on which the fingers of divine love play the grand march of a world redeemed.

The religion of the mountain people in our country, while primitive according to city standards, is heart-deep. Among these people of the hills there is a general reverence for all things religious, but they practice no superficial observance because of custom or style. Mountain people are good and kind and honorable. I have seen them stand before a rude platform in a narrow valley, listening to a mountain preacher tell in simple language, the story of the life and death of Jesus. And this speaker held his congregation under a majestic spell as he plainly, but heart-warmingly, related the splendid life of the Great Teacher and His death to redeem all mankind.

A young mountaineer boy passed away after a brief illness and his friends and family carried his body to a small hillside house and sat with him through the night. They sang old songs—"In the Sweet Bye and Bye," "There'll Be No Sorrow There," and many others. It was several years ago that I witnessed that captivating scene, but sometimes in the cool of a summer's night as I sit on the lawn in front of my home, I seem to hear them again, their voices coming from the far-off hills where the mansions are, in a song of peace and joy that will never end while power divine measures the eternal years.

The preachers are great men in the mountains and the most impressive monument on this continent, I believe, is one standing before a courthouse in a mountain county. It is the portrait figure of a pioneer preacher standing by his pulpit with the open Bible before him. I asked a man as I pointed to the statue, "What did he do to gain a monument like that—was he a soldier?" The reply was, "No, he was not a soldier, nor a rich man, nor a statesman." "Well, what was the monument erected for?" And the man answered, "I do not know, unless it was because he was such a good man." This monument was built by the contributions of the mountain people—they build monuments to good men.

Mountain people have a strength of character, and they are strong in the principles that make a free people. In these mountain folk God has seen a new hope for eternal success. The Creator lavished his blessings upon the mountains. He filled them with mineral wealth and adorned their slopes with flowering vine, shrub, and tree; He crowned their peaks with the glory of vistas beautiful and charming; He caused health-giving fountains to bubble up for the healing of the people; He made swift streams to flow in the narrow valleys, ready to be harnessed to do the world's work; He showered on them the majesty of Himself and put the feeling in men's hearts that those who walked there were closer to Him, for it was on the mountains that He talked with men. He fills the sunshine of the mountain days with the chirp and the hum, the buzz and the song of winged creatures and the call of wild things, and He sweetens the mountain night with the subdued voice of nature falling into restful peace, and paints it with the miracle of soft shadows and lights it with silvery beams that seem to shine through the open doorway of celestial palaces.

In conclusion let me say that when you read some sensational screed, or hear people

say that the mountain regions are benighted and uncivilized, remember that such things are unfair and unfounded. There are many, it is true, who have not had opportunities and advantages in comparison with thickly settled communities, but among the citizenship of the hills are many of God's noblemen. They are meeting the modern-day problems which face them squarely; they are firm in their good citizenship, and hopefully and earnestly looking to the beacon lights that burn on the hills, "from whence," the Good Book says, "cometh our strength."

Republican Aims and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Sunday, April 23, 1944, at 1:45 p. m.:

Ladies and gentlemen, we are living in a period of world-wide upheaval. This is a time of deep and universal changes. National and international affairs are in an unparalleled state of flux. This war and the subsequent peace are integral parts of the same globe-rocking disturbance. In these hours of stress and strain, strife and suffering, conflict and catastrophe, we are confronted with many difficult economic, social, and political problems. If men are to live in prosperity and peace, solutions to the questions raised by a scientific age filled with limitless power must be found.

The people of the United States are turning with confidence to the Republican Party for leadership. Republicans will soon be entrusted with the task of concluding the war and making the peace. By its liberal, constructive and forward looking policies, our party will lead the Nation in paths of great accomplishments. It is the party of youth. It will save the Nation from the mismanagement, the bad administration, and the ruinous policies of the New Deal. The Republican Party will return the Government of the United States to the people. It is the instrument by which this Nation will build a post-war economy on the basis of individual freedom and lead in the reconstruction of the world.

The Nation is supporting the Republican Party because the American people are seeking freedom from the inexcusable blunders, the reactionary policies, and the destructive practices of the New Deal. The opposition to the present administration is a consequence of the cumbersome, flagrant, and irresponsible administrative methods of the party in power. Since 1932 a top-heavy and incompetent bureaucracy, staffed in many instances by people, whose heads have been turned with the authority they possess, has come into existence. Through executive decrees the administration has taken lawmaking into its own hands. The Republican Party dedicates itself to removing the strangle hold which the New Deal has upon the country.

During the 1930's the Congress supinely submitted to the dictates of the White House. It rubber-stamped legislation drafted by the bureaucrats, delegated vast power to the President and surrendered without a murmur to the Chief Executive. As a result of congressional capitulation there developed rapidly the New Deal bureaucracy from which has streamed thousands of needless, nonsensical, and arbitrary regulations. In many cases the intent of the laws written by Congress has been ignored, circumvented, and by-passed. Attempts to control American agriculture, American industry, American business, yes, every activity known to American life are constantly being made. If the principles of the New Deal are not repudiated, they will wreck beyond repair the American system. The fearful thing about this administration in my opinion is that underlying its activities we find a philosophy the goal of which is the complete regimentation of the people of the United States. Such a philosophy is foreign to the heritage of this Nation and will be vigorously opposed by the Republican Party.

Republicans in the Seventy-eighth Congress have fought for congressional independence, for the restoration of legislative leadership and for the curbing of a power-crazed, power-drunk administration. The recent enactment of a law to provide for the service men and women a complete ballot and the overriding of the President's tax veto are the outstanding victories for constitutional government in recent years. The overriding of the tax veto is an excellent illustration of the way in which the system of checks and balances operates. Congress has checked the President in his attempt to arrogate unto himself limitless power. The Republican Party is working for the preservation of representative constitutional government. To thoroughly clean house in Washington, to curtail and control the bureaus, to eliminate waste and inefficiency, to bring about economy in the spending of public money, to end the pernicious philosophy of the present administration and to save from destruction our form of Government, it is necessary to elect in 1944 a Republican President as well as a Republican Congress. Never has there been a greater need for sanity and common sense in the administration of public affairs. Never has it been more imperative to elect a President and a Congress thoroughly devoted to the principles of government as established by those statesmen of the ages who formulated the Constitution of the United States and established the principles of freedom undergirding this Republic.

American industry has done a most praiseworthy job in producing the weapons of war. As peace approaches the questions of taxation, reconversion, employment, and the termination of war contracts will be prominent issues. Machinery to make the transition from a war economy to a peace economy must be set up by the Congress. The industrial life of America will flourish through private effort and not by Government control. The Republican Party is the party of free enterprise, individual initiative, and economic freedom.

Republicans are taking a firm stand for the simplification of the tax structure and the revision of the entire revenue system. Congressman MARTIN recently appointed a Republican committee to make a thorough study of the tax field. This committee will develop a post-war tax program designed to encourage free enterprise and to produce the maximum employment for returning soldiers and displaced war workers. The simplification and the revision of the Federal tax system must be accomplished in such a way as to stimulate business activity and produce a healthy national economy. Thus we will save small business which is the backbone of America, bring about the expansion of industry, and provide employment for all our people.

The farmers have been called upon to produce in abundance. They should be freed from the burden of hampering restrictions emanating from Washington. They ought to have adequate support prices to cover the cost of production and to provide reasonable profits. Sufficient manpower and machinery are essential. An experienced administrator should be put in charge of the production, distribution, and the pricing of food. It is necessary to continue the price-stabilization law but the act should be amended so that the control of food will be in the hands of men who know what they are doing rather than in the hands of inexperienced people. The policies of the Republican Party will keep farmers in business instead of driving them out of business.

The veterans' G. I. bill of rights is now pending in the House. We must develop a full and integrated plan to properly care for the needs of the veterans of this war. No matter what aid we extend or how much we give or what we make available, we can never do too much for those who today are carrying our flag to victory on the battlefields of the world. It is the duty of Congress to enact a complete program of relief and rehabilitation. It is the duty of Congress to pass all the legislation necessary to care for those who have borne the brunt of battle that this Nation and all it stands for may not perish.

The first and most pressing problem in the field of foreign affairs is to win the war. We are making excellent progress in the achievement of this objective. Today the Nazis are being overwhelmed in Russia and harassed by incessant bombing in western Europe. Under American fire the Japanese are retreating from their outposts in the Pacific. In 1944 we will see the dawn of victory. The collapse of Hitler and his military machine may be only a matter of months and the fall of Japan will doubtless be realized next year. We know that our men and our arms will crush the enemy wherever he may be found. Let us make sure that our statesmanship will win the peace.

The foreign policy of the United States should be decided upon with the interests of this country clearly in mind. The Republican Party by the declaration at Mackinac and by the voting in Congress for the Fulbright and Connally resolutions has expressed itself as wholeheartedly approving international cooperation and collaboration. All are agreed that we must strive to prevent future wars and endeavor to replace world anarchy with international good will. Any political party to exist must be in favor of an international organization to end wars. I personally have long been an advocate of international machinery to prevent conflicts and to promote the general welfare of all the people in this world. The best thought and the wisest statesmanship will be required as we construct the international community of tomorrow. This Republic must assume leadership commensurate with the power we possess. No longer is it possible for any people to remain in isolation or to remain apart from the stream of world affairs, either in war or in peace.

Only recently Congressman MARTIN called for congressional representation at the peace table. The Secretary of State is discussing foreign affairs with the Members of Congress. Congress must take an increasingly active part in the formulation of our foreign policy. It would be a most constructive move to have a joint committee of both Houses work with the executive department in the field of foreign relations.

In his recent statement on international affairs the Secretary of State referred to the Atlantic Charter as "an expression of fundamental objectives toward which we and our allies are directing our policies." A year ago last March I introduced a House Concurrent Resolution which, if passed, would place Congress on record as endorsing the principles of the Atlantic Charter. I have long felt that we should have congressional discussion and congressional approval of the principles contained in this famous document.

The Constitution should be amended to permit the House to share in the treaty-making power of the Federal Government.

In speaking to the young Republicans of Ohio last January 22, I employed these words: "One of the most needed reforms is now to amend the Constitution so that a simple majority of both Houses of Congress will be able to ratify a treaty. This should be the next step in developing a foreign policy to meet the complexities of this modern scientific era." On April 13 the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs introduced a joint resolution which has as its objective the amending of the Constitution so that a majority of both Houses may ratify treaties.

A discussion of the Atlantic Charter, the appointment of a committee of both Houses to work with the executive department on foreign affairs, the submission to the people of a constitutional amendment so that treaties may be ratified by a simple majority of Congress, the construction of a world organization to preserve the peace and the development of plans for an adequate defense policy after the war are practical and much needed courses of action.

Never in the history of this Republic has there been such an urgent demand for courageous leadership and intelligent statesmanship. The Republican Party has great tasks to perform. No political organization in any country has had heavier responsibilities or finer opportunities to write an imperishable record of high achievement. In fighting this war it has been necessary to delegate many powers to the Chief Executive, but as soon as the war is over, these powers must be returned to Congress. We must make certain that we will have a healthy economic life in the post-war period. We must clean up the administration of domestic affairs and free the Nation from those who are trying to change this system of government. We must strive to implement the Connally resolution and build that type of an international organization which will become the hope of the future and the hope of those who bleed and suffer and die today that the institutions of democracy may endure. The victories which our armed forces are winning must not be subsequently lost.

As we approach an unknown and uncharted future let us be resolved that the Republican Party shall be the instrumentality of making this Nation truly free economically, socially, and politically. Let us be resolved that this party shall be the instrumentality whereby this Republic will assume its rightful place of leadership in the march of humanity toward the goal of world unity. Let us be determined that from the ashes of this globe-encircling conflagration, that from the pain and the blood and the sacrifices of those who are fighting for freedom, there will arise a structure of international understanding and good will that will afford to all nations the richest possible economic development at home and freedom from cruelty and aggression abroad.

Why I Would Like To Be a WAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, Miss Billie Maye Runyard, Antioch Township High School, Antioch, Ill., is the Tenth Congressional District winner of the WAC essay contest in which high school and junior college girls participated during the civilian WAC recruiting campaign last fall. I have just presented her with the prize—a $25 War bond. She has made an excellent contribution to the victory effort and I take pleasure in including her winning essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY I WOULD LIKE TO BE A WAC

America has been very slow to realize the enormity of this war. Stories like Bataan and Wake Island have gradually shocked us into a consciousness of our importance in this war. With this consciousness of a need for support from every American came that ever-ready cooperation which one finds only in America.

Men had the Army as an outlet for their patriotic spirits, but women, who wanted to be more than mere spectators, who wanted to "get in there" and help win, had no such opportunity until the Women's Army Corps was formed in the fall of '42.

A WAC does not fight, but she does take the place of a soldier by doing noncombatant work in offices, hospitals, communication centers, and post exchanges.

As a WAC, I'll be helping to protect our American liberty, the one and only kind for me; I'll help to avenge those bloody sacrifices on Bataan and Wake; I'll be helping my country win.

BILLIE MAYE RUNYARD,
Antioch Township High School,
Antioch, Ill., Congressional District No. 10.

Resolution of Creston, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been shown in the bill H. R. 4184, which prohibits the transportation of Army and Navy personnel and property at other than the regular rate and fare on land-grant railroads, and the Creston, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce has adopted a resolution which I desire to call to the attention of the House. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include copy of the resolution adopted April 19, 1944:

CRESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Creston, Iowa, April 19, 1944.

"Whereas it has been called to the attention of the Creston Chamber of Commerce that H. R. 4184 has been introduced in the House of Representatives and proposes to correct certain inequalities in rates authorized by the Transportation Act of 1940 and acts prior thereto. Such inequalities of rates are permitted to exist to the detriment of private citizens as well as other businesses and organizations. We therefore resolve that the Congress of the United States be and is hereby requested to pass H. R. 4184 for the following reasons which to us are pertinent:

"1. The present land-grant rate permits discrimination and inequalities in favor of one shipper competing with another.

"2. We believe the Government should pay the same transportation charges as are paid by its own citizens.

"3. We believe that the Government has received full payment many times over for the lands granted because the railroads have added to the settlement of the continent, the building of the Nation, increased the wealth and taxable rescurces of the country, enhanced the value of the lands it has retained and has consistently reduced its transportation costs throughout the many years, and

"4. The present land-grant rate with land-grant reductions conceals the extent to what reductions are made so that it is impossible for shippers to deal with the Government on equal terms known to all."

This resolution unanimously passed and adopted at a special meeting of the Creston Chamber of Commerce held at 2 p. m., April 19, 1944, and ordered forwarded to Congressman K. M. LECOMPTE.

———, ———,
President, Creston Chamber of Commerce.

The Last Stand Against Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, as part of this extension of remarks, I include an address, entitled "The Last Stand Against Bureaucracy," delivered at the meeting of the Committee on Administrative Law at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, March 30, 1944, by Judge James A. Emery, general counsel for the National Association of Manufacturers:

The past 5 years have witnessed the rise of a continuing public interest in, and an unusual endeavor by the Congress to meet, the ever more serious problem of the control of the agencies engaged in the administration of law. The public demand for such action, expressed in often vague but rising criticism of bureaucracy, is now confined to no group. The farmer, the laborer, the merchant, and the manufacturer are equally insistent on correction of the abuses in the administration of our multiplying agencies, which they believe have invaded their respective rights through arbitrary action, marked bias, frequent errors of interpretation, unauthorized formulations of public policy or distortions of discretion, for which the victim has an inadequate remedy or none.

This universal recognition of a dangerous tendency toward Federal administrative absolutism is not a complaint against the natural growth of rational regulation of national trade or commerce, nor is it an unwillingness to perceive the necessity for emergency limitations upon rights of person and property necessitated by the prosecution of the war; nor is it any failure to recognize that there must be necessary and practical delegations of authority and discretion in the discharge of both the executive and legislative functions as the economic and social life of the United States becomes increasingly complex. It is a widespread perception of the dangers to the practical and necessary liberty of the farmer, the worker, the businessman by the unparalleled multiplication of executive agencies, boards, and commissions, formulating binding public policy, writing rules and regulations for the conduct of persons and the uses of property which have the effect and penalties of congressional legislation without uniform procedure, or adequate judicial review, which our traditions and constant experience have

demonstrated are essential to the perpetuation of limited government and effective protection for individual liberty.

The President cannot personally execute the laws. He has 3,000,000 civil assistants to aid in their administration and an army of officials to whom he delegates authority. Our courts have held from the beginning that Congress cannot delegate the power to make a law. But it can make a law to delegate the power to find some condition, fact, or circumstance upon which a previously established congressional rule of conduct becomes effective. The Congress cannot find the facts upon which it levies an export duty or a tax, so it authorizes the President, whom it may make its agent for the finding of some condition, or it creates a board, a commission, or an agency to fill in the details or find the facts or circumstances to which the necessary, preestablished congressional standard or rule is then applied.

But the President or his representative or the board or the bureau or the commission is not dealing with merely arithmetic. It has within its reach, with the vast growth of Federal power by both assertion and interpretation, many social and economic relations of the citizen, which but recently were in their nature local in all the details of their management and legal supervision.

The area and subject matter of Federal Government has within a generation suffered a revolutionary expansion. Let us take a familiar example, the commerce power. A popular as well as a legal distinction between production and commercial intercourse between the States was clearly recognized by far more than a century of undisputed judicial decision. If it were sought to extend the commerce power to include control over manufacture, mining, agriculture, or factory workers, because the product of such activities either contemplated or hoped to move into the markets of other States, or competed in its own locality with their goods; the public shared the view of generations of judges:

"The result would be that Congress would be invested to the exclusion of the States with the power to regulate not only manufacture but also agriculture, horticulture, stock raising, domestic fisheries, mining—in short, every branch of human industry."

Today the persons, natural and corporate, engaged in all these innumerable activities, the nature and amount of their crops, or output, their hours, wages and salaries, the form of their individual and collective relations—to the extent that individual employment relations are still permissible—the price and amount of goods that may be marketed and privacies of individual and community life once presumed to be not merely remote, but immune, from Federal control and supervision, are the actual or proposed subjects of detailed management not as a temporary wartime policy but as permanent subjects for varied direction through individual agents, boards, and commissions, operating under Executive orders, directives, and proclamations or congressional delegation of authority.

Each of these agencies has its origin presumptively, either in the constitutional authority of the President or an act of Congress making him the executor of its policy or authority directly from the Congress which the agency is to administer. The officer or body in question establishes rules of procedure and often major regulations by which it interprets its powers and gives effect to its authority. If it must ascertain facts before making decisions, it must have rules of evidence, the power to summon and examine witnesses and require the production of records and make ultimate orders profoundly affecting persons and property under penalty of fine, imprisonment, or the impairment or deprivation of livelihood. But neither the President, Congress, much less the agencies both create, have, or can have, unlimited or indefinite authority. The two former are constitutionally restricted, the agencies by the nature and terms of their delegated authority. Ours is a deliberately limited Government and to that end its limitations were written. But if the action of any agency in violation of such limitations may not be subjected to judicial scrutiny, any agency of government may exercise uncontrolled discretion or power. All distinction between arbitrary and limited government is soon lost. If the restraint, either of the Constitution or the enactment of Congress is not enforcible, what officials may do and what they may not do is equally permissible. For that reason every grant of power must be clearly defined. But if the agency has a biased interest in the subject committed to it, or is open to partisan influence, if it can act without a fair hearing, or upon anything it calls evidence on an uncontrolled finding of fact, if it may be at once prosecutor and judge; if in any or all such things it may elude judicial control, it substitutes personal rule for government by law. It is confined within neither statutory nor constitutional limitations. It becomes, by public tolerance or neglect, a bureaucratic outlaw.

There is but one control whose deterrent influence was designed and prevents administrative error or misconduct, the rise of arbitrary official power, and thus protects the liberties and rights it is the primary purpose of our form of government to secure. That is adequate opportunity for judicial review of questions of law and the examination of facts found, to determine whether they support orders issued, are relevant to the issues presented, credible, and substantial.

Every sensible person recognizes the value and necessity of empowering administrative officials and tribunals to fill in the detail and ascertain the facts and conditions to which Congress wants its regulation applied or the circumstances ascertained under which a valid Executive order is to be made effective. But we are solemnly and repeatedly warned that administrative law must be surrounded with effective safeguards for private right or we develop an anonymous bureaucracy, not by accident but by design, as dangerous to our native conception of responsible government as any which threatens the people of Europe. It is this continuing danger, confirmed by experience, that causes Congress and many eminent authorities to demand curbs, not on the use but the abuse of administrative law.

Listen to former Chief Justice Hughes as president of the American Bar Association:

"The power of administrative bodies to make findings of fact which may be treated as conclusive, if there is evidence both ways, is a power of enormous consequence. An unscrupulous administrator might be tempted to say, 'Let me find the facts for the people of my country and I care little who lays down the general principles.'"

Now the Supreme Court describes the danger and emphasizes the necessity for judicial safeguards:

"Legislative agencies, with varying qualifications, work in a field peculiarly exposed to political demands. Some may be expert and impartial, others subservient. It is not difficult for them to observe the requirements of law in giving a hearing and receiving evidence. But to say that their findings of fact may be made conclusive where constitutional rights of liberty and property are involved, although the evidence clearly establishes that the findings are wrong and constitutional rights have been invaded, is to place those rights at the mercy of administrative officials and seriously to impair the security inherent in our judicial safeguards. That prospect, with our multiplication of administrative agencies, is not one to be lightly regarded."

The Lord Chief Justice of Great Britain was so convinced of the dangers in this field within his own country that in a series of letters in the public press he illustrated, with numerous examples, exercise of administrative authority which at once invaded the dearest rights of the subject and denied him judicial protection. The distinguished Englishman even outlined with shrewd practicality the method by which an official could and did hold and create arbitrary power:

"This course will prove tolerably simple," he said, "if he can (a) get legislation passed in skeleton form; (b) fill up the gaps with his own rules, orders, and regulations; (c) make it difficult or impossible for Parliament to check the said rules, orders, and regulations; (d) secure for them the force of statute; (e) arrange that the fact of his decision shall be conclusive proof of its legality; (f) take power to modify the provisions of statutes; and (g) prevent and avoid any sort of appeal to a court of law."

How often that fits American administrative legislation.

President Roosevelt as Governor of New York called in 1930 for a halt to the steady extension of commissions and regulatory bodies. As President he appointed a Committee on Administrative Management to study, report, and recommend a method of controlling the numerous Federal agencies. Reporting in 1937 the committee identified 134 administrative agencies and commissions, and remarked, "Perhaps the chief reason for worry about regulatory commissions, is that they are continually being created." It thus described their nature and characterized their operation:

"These independent commissions have been given broad powers to explore, formulate, and administer policies of regulation; they have been given the task of investigating and prosecuting business misconduct; they have been given powers, similar to those exercised by courts of law, to pass in concrete cases upon the rights and liabilities of individuals under the statutes. They are in reality miniature independent governments set up to deal with the railroad problem, the banking problem, or the radio problem. They constitute a headless 'fourth branch' of the Government, a haphazard deposit of irresponsible agencies and uncoordinated powers. They do violence to the basic theory of the American Constitution that there should be three major branches of the Government and only three. The Congress has found no effective way of supervising them, they cannot be controlled by the President, and they are answerable to the courts only in respect to the legality of their activities." (President's Committee on Administrative Management, Report With Special Studies, 1937, p. 39.)

The President transmitted the report to the Congress for their information, with his approval. Three years later the Congress, after elaborate hearings and extensive study, enacted the Walter-Logan bill, "to regulate the regulators." The measure defined the procedure by which the rules and regulations of such agencies should be formulated and proclaimed, together with safeguards to assure impartial hearings and operation, and a uniform system of judicial review. The measure was vigorously opposed by the agencies involved, its consideration obstructed, and its passage opposed by the administration. It was vetoed December 18, 1940.

The subject, however, will not down. On the contrary, it excites increasing public anxiety and renewed congressional determination to enact practical remedial legislation. This movement is reinforced by the

unparalleled increase of executive agencies and further evidence of arbitrary action. Furthermore, a numerous school of administrators and their satellites boldly demand final authority for many boards and commissions to exclusively interpret the statutes which are the source of their authority and determine for themselves the character and extent of their powers. Whatever their individual antecedents they hold, appointment qualifies them as "experts" in their field, and are, therefore, generally irritated by the suggestion of judicial review. They point the farewell admonition of Washington to vigilantly watch, "that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart."

Groups that sought the creation of administrative bodies in their own interest are now repenting in sackcloth and ashes. They find themselves confronted with Frankensteins. No severer criticism of the National Labor Relations Board has been uttered by any employer than by the representative officers of both the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the U. M. W. The farmer has found himself covered with restrictions on production and marketing. He may not kill his own stock on his own farm for his own use without administrative permission. The Securities and Exchange Commission directs a company to issue stock rather than bonds and thus substitutes its judgment of business policy, without appeal, for the customary discretion of executive management. Its counsel declares, "We do make the law. If our regulation is valid it supersedes all laws that are contrary to it." The National Labor Relations Board declared, without statutory authority, that no employer would be heard who petitioned it to determine which of two contesting labor groups he was obligated by law to recognize at his peril. Until stopped by the Supreme Court the Board declared sit-down strikers employees entitled to reinstatement and back pay during the strike. It gave secret instructions to its officers with respect to the issuance of subpenas affecting one party only. The Federal Communications Commission proclaimed a rule requiring broadcast to foreign territory to reflect American culture. But in the midst of public derision withdrew a rule it could neither explain or define. Shortly after the same body asserted the right to determine for the radio industry whether television had reached a point in its development that it could be offered to the public.

Within 6 months the Switchmen's and Firemen's National Unions have discovered, through the Supreme Court, that their right to represent their members is finally determined by an administrative tribunal, and no court may examine the circumstances or the conclusion. Although, declared a powerful dissent: "No intention to refuse judicial aid in administration of the act is apparent." The Union of Red Caps recently found no court could review the finding of the Railroad Mediation Board, that it cannot represent its own members but must be represented by a union to which they may not belong.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a recent opinion, pointed out that nearly every administrative body had not only different powers but varying procedure and limitations upon court review. For some it is denied altogether. For some it is limited severely. Such limitations apply not merely to questions of fact, but of law. Some powerful agencies make their own rules of evidence, and under the specious plea of avoiding "technicalities" have, as in the case of the National Labor Relations Board, not only disregarded plain precepts of law and equity, representing the experience of the race, but permitted, according to a Congressional investigation, the taking of evidence outside the record and the writing of preliminary opinions for the Board, by what were described as "juvenile judges".

Confronted with similar but less grievous conditions, a notable English parliamentary committee, including Prof. Harold Laski, investigating British administrative agencies concluded and recommended:

"We are, therefore, unanimously of opinion that no considerations of administrative convenience, or executive efficiency, should be allowed to weaken the control of the courts, and that no obstacle should be placed by Parliament in the way of the subject's unimpeded access to them."

The invincible demand for uniform judicial review is reinforced by enumeration of the volume of administrative rules and regulations and Executive orders under which we now live. Remember these govern you. For, said the Brookings Institution, speaking of American administrative law:

"It is more than a mere machine for the application of law. To an increasing extent it has become a creator of law; in this sense and within the limits of their respective competences, the administrative departments and agencies resemble a group of special legislative bodies."

The Superintendent of Documents, under the provisions of the Federal Register Act, advertised a few years ago the publication of the Code of Federal Regulations. It was first made available during 1940, embracing "all documents of the various administrative agencies which had general applicability and legal effect June 1, 1938." It then consisted of 50 titles in 17 volumes or from 1,000 to 1,200 pages each. It has now reached more than 26 volumes of some 9,000 additional pages.

At the moment Senator SHIPSTEAD of Minnesota is vainly endeavoring to secure an investigation by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to determine "the source of constitutional or legislative authority for some 3,500 Executive orders issued between 1933 and 1942." Meantime a select committee of the House is investigating executive agencies. It recently reported there are in operation policies of the War Labor Board, in its opinion "highly dangerous and menacing to the system of private enterprise and the constitutional right of judicial review of administrative decisions."

The Judiciary Committee of the House declared 3 years ago:

"It is practically impossible for a Member of the Congress, much less for an individual citizen, to find their way among these many agencies or to locate the particular officer or employee in any of the agencies with whom any particular problem should be discussed with a view to settlement."

But Congress is not alone in its bewilderment. Not only the private citizen but the courts and the executive officials have been equally perplexed in locating Executive orders. In 1935, in the midst of the N. I. R. A., the case of the Panama Refining Co. and the Amazon Petroleum Co. in the Supreme Court of the United States to test, among other things, appeared the validity of section 4 of article III of the Petroleum Code. During the argument Mr. Justice Brandeis vainly endeavored to discover from the representatives of the Government where the original Code was. The case had gone through the District Court and the Court of Appeals, but not until argument in the Supreme Court was it discovered that the provision in question had been eliminated by an Executive order, "with the result," said the Court, "that the persons affected, the prosecuting authorities, and the courts were alike ignorant of the alteration." The attack was upon a provision which did not exist. The Government sought to revive the case by an Executive order, but found it impossible to make it retroactive.

Let us not forget that for 3 years the people of the United States lived under the N. I. R. A., which sought to give to the President and those required to formulate codes of fair practice the power to legislate for themselves with such unfettered discretion that Mr. Justice Cardozo described the grant of power as "delegation run riot."

Such is the condition crying for correction. It is essential, said the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House in 1940, "that the governors shall be governed and the regulators shall be regulated if our present form of government is to endure."

These are grave words addressed to a grave situation. Once again the Congress engages in the same task. Once again aroused public interest can focus congressional attention and secure congressional action on this vital subject.

Far more important than stopping or correcting the maladministration of a particular bureau or commission, or the amendment of a particular Executive order or administrative statute, is the establishment by Congress of a general plan of control over all administrative agencies that assures in definite terms a return to fundamental principles of impersonal government, limited in its nature and protected against the abuse of official power, by the great or the small, through judicial enforcement of the great limitations.

"Among freemen," said Edmund Burke, "restraints on government are to be numbered among their liberties."

The opportunity to secure relief and reform is here. Have we the determination to seek and obtain it? If we have, our people may make this the last stand of arrogant bureaucracy.

Address of Admiral Ernest J. King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Admiral Ernest J. King, United States Navy, commander in chief, United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations, at the graduating exercises, twenty-fourth session, F. B. I. National Police Academy, Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., April 15, 1944:

Mr. Hoover, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, strange as it might seem to the unobserving, there is a curious but very tangible connection between the job the United States Navy is doing today, and what law enforcement officers in hundreds of American communities are doing. Our objectives are the same. You are protecting the American home, the individual rights and privileges on the domestic front. We in the Navy and in the other armed forces are now working, chiefly overseas, for a similar purpose. None realize more than we that the battle against lawlessness, against espionage and sabotage, which you are fighting, is as essential to overall victory as those engagements in which ships, aircraft, or land forces participate.

The Navy, and especially the officers charged with administering intelligence matters, realize full well what effective work the law-enforcement officers throughout our land have done to make this country more secure before and since the outbreak of war. Many of these law-enforcement officers received their training in this school. It can

be said that naval intelligence officers have been working hand in hand with officers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a long time. The absence of foreign-directed sabotage is proof enough of the results of the work of this Bureau and of the spirit of earnest cooperation which exists between the F. B. I., the Army, the Navy, the three principal agencies charged with safeguarding military secrets, industrial production, and the general welfare.

There was widespread apprehension at the outbreak of war that America might be riddled with foreign agents ready to wreck our industries, destroy our communications, scuttle our ships, and otherwise disrupt the normal defense measures we were hastening to perfect. This alarm was not without foundation. We have a heterogeneous population; many of our citizens were born in other countries; some of them might reasonably be expected to feel a blood tie with peoples now our enemies. But the F. B. I., aided by efficient and loyal police departments in hundreds of American communities, had most potentially dangerous characters catalogued before Pearl Harbor. At the first warning of danger they were apprehended. Our relative freedom from sabotage and from interference in military movements and plans at home has been the result of such farsighted planning on the part of the agencies concerned.

The development of this school has been interesting. We in the Navy realize that an inadequately educated naval officer, or a poorly trained bluejacket, cannot be expected to carry out his duties with any degree of success. An unskilled gunner can cause the loss of a ship and the death of many shipmates. In like manner, untrained or halfhearted law-enforcement officers do little to combat crime and secure the safety of local communities. The tangible evidence of awakening community interest in training specialists in your profession, such as you who are graduating here today, is a clear indication that communities which sponsored your period of study here are supporting your efforts to combat crime and thus help to preserve individual rights and liberties.

Through your local police bureaus, you actually are working more directly than you perhaps suspect with the Army and Navy, as well as with the F. B. I. You know, I am sure, of the interdepartmental conference which meets in Washington, when matters affecting national security are discussed between officers of the Army's G–2 Division, of the Navy's O. N. I., and the F. B. I. These conferences are valuable, and have resulted in close liaison between the several investigation and law-enforcement agencies. For instance, the Navy frequently desires an investigation of individuals who are not in the naval service. In such cases a request is made to the F. B. I. to conduct the inquiry. The F. B. I., through its field officer, frequently utilizes the local law-enforcement agencies for such information or assistance as is required. In this way, all energies, in an interlocking manner, are turned toward the common objective of national security with the minimum of duplication or red tape.

You can realize the value of this close cooperation when I tell you that during World War No. 1 no less than 21 agencies were charged with the work the 3 existing organizations are now doing; naturally there was more overlapping authority with consequent delay and duplication.

The fact that at least 100,000 law-enforcement officers have been directly assisted and affected by the F. B. I.'s National Police Academy and its graduates is an indication that former days of lawlessness and disrespect for law and order will not return. Peaceful citizens of this country can be thankful for the men whose vision and whose labor brought this about; similarly we in the Navy are appreciative of the splendid and efficient cooperation we receive from this Bureau and from the local police agencies throughout the country.

One of the greatest essentials in waging war is the ability to surprise our enemies. To catch them off guard is our constant endeavor. We have done this time and again. At Kwajalein, for instance, we caught the Jap planes on the ground on our first day's attack. Not many of them were able to get into the air, and we shot down most of those that did. On the second day, so complete had been our surprise, that of the few planes that came up to offer resistance, not one attacked our surface forces. That, of course, was possible only because complete military secrecy of the plans, as well as the movement of our ships, for this campaign was maintained. Secrecy during the planning and initial phases of naval operations is essential. No better example need be cited than the necessity to deprive the enemy of all information concerning the movement of convoys.

To you, as representatives of police bureaus of these cities and ports, I would like at this time to express the Navy's gratitude for the cooperative spirit you have shown in helping us guard these secrets from the enemy which could be of such vital importance to our cause. Local police cooperation, as well as that of the F. B. I., has been especially valuable and graciously given in all parts of this country.

I know you are interested in what the Navy is doing and what it plans to do, and so—keeping within security myself—I would like to review some of our recent actions and in general discuss some of our plans for the future.

Our objective in the Pacific, it goes without saying, is Tokyo. But we do not underestimate our enemies. We give them credit for determination and tenacity, skill, and ingenuity, as well as a savage disregard for humanity and for lives—even their own.

Our recent successes in the Pacific reflect, in a large measure, a single factor. For the first time since the war with Japan began we are well on the way to having an adequate number of ships, planes, and supplies so that when we find a soft spot in the enemies' defenses we can strike with overwhelming force. Heretofore in the Battle of the Coral Sea, at Midway, and again in the battles in the Solomons, we tore great gaps in Japan's outer defenses. But on each of those occasions we lacked the reserve of ships and aircraft which would have enabled us to follow up and capitalize on our hard-earned opportunities.

I think we could rightly define a major part of our policy with respect to the Pacific as "seizure of opportunity." So far it has been impossible, for lack of Japanese cooperation, to stage a major sea battle. We are willing, but the Japs do not seem to want to gamble with that type of battle. So we are seeking opportunities to strike whenever we can get within range of their warships or bases, and I think you will find, within the next few months to come that we shall create more of these opportunities. For example, I have only to cite the recent successful attacks on Palau, Yap, and Woleai Islands.

Recenty in a weekly magazine someone claimed the discovery of the fact that all things which have been done in the Pacific conform to a pattern. That is correct. What we have accomplished and what we shall accomplish in the near future are integral parts of a pattern, the key design of which is the defeat of Japan.

It is gratifying to report to you today that we have reduced Japan's merchant fleet to not more than two-thirds of what it was when we were attacked. We have sunk well over 2,000,000 tons of her cargo tonnage and have so seriously damaged her fleet of warships that she can never hope to make up losses by building new fighting ships or repairing those that we have damaged. One indication that Japan's shipping problem is becoming acute is the wide use she is making of self-propelled barges, many of wood, for long interisland hauls of both men and materials. If she had enough ships she would never resort to such transportation. To date we have sunk, probably sunk, or damaged by submarine action at least 600 Japanese merchant vessels. She cannot stand such a rate of loss for any length of time and keep her Empire together. The dissolution of that Empire, of course, is one of the primary objectives of this war.

All in all the operations of the past 12 months have been highly encouraging. In the Atlantic we have reduced the submarine situation from the status of a menace to that of a problem. Today we know that Germany is concentrating on the building of submarines to the exclusion of other shipbuilding, and we know how many she is producing. But it is unlikely that Hitler will be able to terrorize Atlantic shipping lanes again as he did 2 years ago.

In the Pacific the strategy of the enemy has been fairly simple. While we were pulling ourselves together after the shock of Pearl Harbor the Japanese quickly overran large areas in the Far East. They reasoned, and rightly, that if they succeed in retaining possession of the inner portion of these areas they will have won the war. The outer ring of islands which they occupy serves chiefly as their fighting front. Through their persistence in holding these islands they hope to make our advance so costly that we will give up the effort to break into their inner defense.

But whatever the cost we know that we cannot regard victory in the Pacific as anything short of the dissolution of the Japanese Empire as a military power. To accomplish this objective we must deliver the heaviest attacks of which we are capable, as frequently as we are able, where they will hurt the most. This will require every ship, every landing craft, every airplane, and every piece of matériel—and the trained personnel to man them—that can be made available.

Our fleet, I can assure you today, is growing at a pace that is little short of miraculous. Its growth could only have been made possible by the energies and the skill of a great and resourceful people. Most of all, the progress we have made in arming ourselves within the past year constitutes in itself a lasting tribute to the American workman. He is doing more than I can tell you to win this war.

I can reveal to you here today that, since July 1, 1940, the Navy has increased the number of warships in our fleet by 130 percent; we have built the greatest fleet of supporting vessels and landing craft that the world has ever seen; we have tripled the fire power of our fleet; we have multiplied our air force by 14; and we have expanded our personnel almost 15 times—the greatest marshaling of men and materials the world has ever witnessed.

Operations we have carried out in recent weeks are evidence in themselves that the accumulated experiences of previous campaigns have been made to count. As time goes on, the Japs will learn that we are not relying on so-called orthodox methods of warfare. We are meeting each situation as it arises or as we can create situations, and our enemies are finding that when we strike, we now have the force behind us to carry the strike through to a finish. Certainly we can look forward with resolute but realistic confidence to future triphibious naval operations, now that we have the men, the guns, the ships, and the planes to carry them out.

I want to reemphasize to you that, while I am talking of the war that the Navy is conducting on land, at sea, and in the air, we are not unmindful of the battle you face here at home. Were these efforts not successful our difficulties would be increased

many fold. You have a tremendous job to do to keep the home front safe. I know that you young gentlemen, as a result of what you have learned here at the National Police Academy, will leave Washington with renewed confidence in your ability to meet situations that will arise in the exercise of your duty as law-enforcement officers. I congratulate you on your graduation today, I assure you that the Navy appreciates the tremendous scope of the work you will be called upon to do, and I promise you that you will have our backing and our wholehearted cooperation in the discharge of your duties. Good luck to you one and all.

Address by J. Edgar Hoover at Graduation Exercises of F. B. I. National Police Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the graduation exercises for the twenty-fourth session of the F. B. I. National Police Academy, on April 15, 1944. The address is entitled "The Importance of Your Job."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF YOUR JOB

Members of the twenty-fourth session of the National Police Academy are returning home at a crucial time. You have completed 14 weeks of diligent and successful effort to prepare yourselves more fully for the task of efficient and impartial law enforcement.

It is well to be ready for the big job which lies ahead. The cunning minds of America's criminals are not idle. While you have learned new ways of fighting the age-old problem of crime, they have been devising their own methods of victimizing the public and escaping punishment. Some are fiendishly clever; many are embittered and treacherous.

Even as you have worked with us to enlarge the scope of your knowledge on law enforcement, there have been significant trends. For example, consider the large number of hijackings and related thefts which have occurred in recent months. In many cases coming to the attention of the F. B. I., small but well-organized gangs have been found responsible. Many of these are composed of persons with criminal records who have been the recipients of that too often misused instrument of leniency—parole. Unmolested and left to take what they like from business concerns and transportation companies, these groups of hoodlums would grow larger, richer, and more powerful. Soon, we would find ourselves caught in the tentacles of a gigantic octopus of gangsterism. Human life would become cheap; mobsters drunk with power would subject honest citizens to all kinds of indignities. And inevitably the political machinery of some of our cities and States would come under the corrupt domination of this criminal octopus.

Law enforcement stands between the public and this menace. Special agents of the F. B. I. and local officers all over the Nation are aware of this threatened upsurge of gangsterism, and good work has been done recently in bringing such persons to justice.

There is no doubt that the ghosts of the old gangs are stirring. By prompt, concerted action they can be forced to remain as mere unpleasant memories of an unhappy era.

The continued high rate of crime and definite threats such as that offered by gangs of bold and heartless hijackers make a bad enough situation. But add to that the present deplorable situation in regard to juvenile delinquency in the United States and it becomes shockingly evident that you truly are returning to your homes and jobs at a crucial time.

All thoughtful persons are much concerned over the steady increase in crime among our boys and girls. This is tragic, indeed, for every child is a potential good citizen. But when serious delinquency develops there is danger that the individual will become a liability instead of an asset to society.

Law enforcement must be constantly aware of this Nation-wide problem. In fact, law enforcement must assume leadership in this field lest it fall into the hands of foggy-minded theorists who would experiment with it at the cost of the well-being of our youth. Law enforcement must be ready to lend a hand to parents, the church, school, and the numerous worth-while organizations alarmed over this dangerous trend and trying to do something about it.

The law, to most youngsters, is personified by the officer on the beat, and if proper respect is to be developed and maintained for legal authority, it must be done through these men. A genuine interest in youngsters and a friendly effort to help them solve their problems are necessary. You, as key men in your organizations, can accomplish great good by promoting this kind of attitude. Our children should be made to feel that the officer of the law is their friend and protector, for that, in truth, is his role. By following such a policy, we shall be able to save an untold number of youngsters from becoming criminals of tomorrow and thus will reduce the tremendous toll of crime in America.

These are problems for strong men, but I am proud to say we have many of them left in law enforcement. We, too, have suffered from the loss of trained and invaluable men who have accepted higher-paying positions or have left for the armed services. But despite this handicap, we ask no allowances. We shall continue to stand shoulder to shoulder in protection of society against the evil forces of lawlessness and we shall not for a moment think of taking even one backward step.

There will be periods of discouragement. Situations are certain to arise which will leave you wondering if the results are worth the effort. But that is the time to work harder and to battle even more determinedly against the criminal foe.

Law enforcement, of course, cannot do the job alone. We must have the active support of the prosecuting authorities, the courts, the public, press, and radio. America must not lose sight of the fact that the goal of our law enforcement and judicial system is the protection of society. Laws and tribunals were designed to administer justice and not provide a maze of technicalities which would allow the guilty to escape punishment.

The great majority of citizens and most of the press and radio give their unstinting support to intelligent law enforcement. But there are a craven few who strive to tear down all respect for law and authority. You, as well as I, have been the recipients of the smear attacks of these distorters of truth.

Fortunately, we can rely on the decency and fairness of Americans to judge accurately between such charlatans and those who exercise their right and duty to criticize honestly and justly where they feel criticism is due.

Our work is made much harder by the maudlin sentimentality exhibited in some places by the promiscuous granting of pardons and paroles.

There are the perennial sob sisters of both sexes who would give every criminal another chance after another chance. We must guard against the influence of these misty-eyed theorists. When a vicious and depraved convict is turned loose and goes back to his old ways we should be certain that the true facts are called to the attention of the public.

This is no time for softness. Americans are dying every hour of the day so that the privileges of our democratic way of life can be preserved and passed along to our children and future generations. We must have the determination and the courage to carry through with our assignment, for we cannot lose the battle at home.

Law enforcement is justified in viewing with pride its wartime record. It has set an example in cooperation and unselfish work for the good of the Nation which is reflected in many ways. There has been no public hysteria, Axis espionage efforts have been kept under control and not one case of enemy-directed sabotage has occurred.

We shall continue to work together as comrades in arms. We shall protect the homes of America against the vicious few who have no regard for property, decency, or human life. And, if it be within our power, when our fighting men come home after the day of inevitable victory, they will find contentment, security, and peace with their loved ones.

Powers of the O. P. A. Threaten the Rights of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., delivered on the evening of April 20, 1944, on the subject Powers of the O. P. A. Threaten the Rights of Americans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By way of explanation as to why I have been here in this city of Wichita, Kans., last night and tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I arrived here yesterday morning in connection with a rather unusual story of good American citizens in the heart of real grassroots America who have found out certain practices of their Government in Washington of which they disapprove very emphatically and who, unlike most of us over the country, have decided, upon finding out, to do something about it. They are not politicians, they are not particularly Republicans or anti-New Dealers; they just are Americans who work for a living and who have built up highly respected names for themselves in this community of a quarter of a million people, and who are mad through and

through because they have discovered what they believe to be a very un-American and extremely dangerous situation in Government, and in the good old American vernacular, they are raising the devil with everybody in sight and demanding that the situation be corrected, and immediately.

It is odd how the thing started. A local businessman here happened to wander into a hearing room of the O. P. A. Enforcement Division in the local city hall some weeks ago, and there he heard a hearing that was going on involving a local filling-station operator, gasoline filling-station operator, who was accused of violating some O. P. A. regulations, and the businessman was so outraged with what he saw that he began doing some investigating to find out what these hearings were all about, and the further he went the more surprised he became. He told some of his business friends about it and they were as surprised as he had been. The upshot was that they set up an organization and got as their attorney the former Governor of Kansas for two terms, Gov. Payne Ratner, who is one of the most able figures in the State of Kansas, and the fur has been flying ever since, as fur does fly when good red-blooded Americans get really mad and begin figuratively swinging their fists.

The facts and the merits of the particular case which was being heard on the occasion in question are not essential one way or the other. The filling-station operator, who has as fine a reputation for honesty as any citizen in this whole area, was charged by the O. P. A with selling gasoline without collecting ration coupons for it. The O. P. A. made no effort to present any witness to show specific cases. They merely based their case on the fact that the operator was short in his gasoline supply as compared with the tickets he should have.

He said that it was chiefly due to shrinkage and evaporation, but he did admit that in order to get from his home to the filling station and back home every day he had to use perhaps 50 gallons of his own gasoline while he was waiting for the O. P. A. to send him his own personal ration book, and that when the book arrived he only put about 25 gallons' worth of ration coupons in his till to cover the 50 gallons he had used. So technically he was guilty. He was found guilty at this hearing and his filling station, which happens to be his only means of livelihood and which he happens to have operated a great many years past, was closed down by the O. P. A. for 2 months.

This organization makes no defense of the filling station operator for his violation; it has no quarrel with the program of price ceilings or rationing or punishment of violations or efforts to stop black markets—don't make any mistake about that; they make it very clear. The point that outraged them and about which they are stirring up this terrific furor is that in the course of investigating the particular incident they found out what the O. P. A. procedure of enforcement is and they contend with blood in their eye that it not only is absolutely unconstitutional and totally immoral from the standpoint of good government, but from the standpoint of civil liberties and the rights of free people it is a duplication of the Gestapo in Nazi Germany.

The story is this, and frankly I didn't know all of its details myself until I had spent 2 days here investigating their claims and contentions and checking statements with local O. P. A. district officials and also checking with proper authorities in Washington. Perhaps you don't know all of it, either. You probably are aware, however, of the fact that the O. P. A. has set up within itself a sort of a court system in which it hears cases of alleged violations of O. P. A. regulations and decides whether the individual is guilty. If he is, this O. P. A. court pronounces a certain penalty. That's what was happening in this case when the businessman happened to walk into the local courtroom.

What you perhaps do not know, however, and I didn't know it, for one, is that those courts of the O. P. A. are not merely informal review courts designed to eliminate a lot of small cases where the individual is willing to accept the decision, thereby relieving a lot of unnecessary routine and pressure on the regular system of courts throughout the country. That is what the general public understanding was when these O. P. A. courts were set up some months ago, but that is not so. Instead, these O. P. A. courts are all-powerful and all-exclusive, entirely exclusive of the established courts of the land. For example, if you are accused of an O. P. A. violation you don't have any choice of coming to these O. P. A. courts, or, on the other hand, taking your case to the regular courts and getting a trial by jury, if you want it—not at all. You have to submit to the O. P. A. courts; you have to accept the verdict of the O. P. A. judge, and there is no appeal in the regular courts of the land from the decisions of that O. P. A. judge.

The local O. P. A. authorities have corroborated that fact to me today. It seems that there have been several test cases which have been taken as far as the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals and those courts have held that the O. P. A. is right, the individual has no right of appeal at law to challenge any of these O. P. A. court decisions.

Governor Ratner said today that that constitutes the most serious attack on the safety and rights of freemen since the day 700 years ago in England when the British barons forced on King John the Bill of Rights guaranteeing every man a trial by jury. He says the net effect of it is that political appointees of a political bureau in Washington, appointees who have never been subject to the approval of the people by Senate ratification or in any other way, merely appointed on the whim of a $7,500 a year officeholder in Washington, are given complete and total autocratic power over the lives and property of free private citizens. He said it means that these appointed political jobholders serve as complainant, witnesses for the prosecution, prosecuting attorney, judge, jury, all at the same time. They can and have closed down endless businesses of private citizens, and if they decide to do so, the private citizen has no appeal to the courts whatsoever. He said that in this case the sentence was only 60 days, to be sure; it might just as well have been 60 years, however. There is no measure or standard and if the power is there to close down a gasoline business for 60 days, the power is there to take all ration books away from a family for the food that the family has to have.

That is all I have been able positively to establish thus far, but that much is fact. From here on we will try to find out whether there have been any abuses of that power by the O. P. A. courts in any part of the country. If you know of any, I hope you will send them to me in Washington at WOL, because this seems to call for further investigation.

Domestic Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Domestic Lend-Lease," by Mr. F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, published in the Missouri Farmer for April 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMESTIC LEND-LEASE

When this war is over the Federal Government will have on its hands a tremendous quantity of surplus war materials and equipment. Just how much of these materials there will be few of us can visualize, and just how they will ultimately be disposed of is of concern to every taxpayer.

We cannot visualize the enormity of this surplus material pile because few of us comprehend how very large our country is * * * we cannot grasp how great the Nation's power is to produce goods or to what extent we have been exercising this productive power since Pearl Harbor.

That the surplus will be enormous can be imagined when we consider that our military leaders have wisely prepared for the very worst, because they know that in war we must be ever ready for the unexpected, and they have ordered war materials accordingly.

We can imagine, too, that the surplus will be great in event the war ends suddenly, sooner than expected, which would mean that much of our war materials will not have been used up.

And what will these surplus materials consist of? Tractors, jeeps, bulldozers, rock crushers, cranes, rubber tires, wheels, lumber, concrete mixers, hospital and medical supplies, and a thousand and one other items.

While the war is by no means won, it is not too early for us to form opinions about how these surplus war materials shall be disposed of, and Senator BENNETT C. CLARK was farsighted when he introduced a bill (S. 1815) a few days ago to take care of the situation. The scandals which accompanied the disposition of surplus war materials following World War No. 1 should certainly be avoided.

What shall we do with these materials? Shall they be junked? Sold abroad for whatever they will bring? Sold back to the manufacturers so that they can reap an unjustifiable profit on them? Or, shall they be disposed of to the people who already have, or will in the future, pay for them through taxation? Do they not already belong to the people anyhow?

Senator CLARK's proposal would seem to dispose of the question in an equitable manner. His bill, if enacted into law, would provide for distribution of surplus war materials through domestic lend-lease to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof.

A Surplus Property Administration would be established, to exist for a period of 2 years unless its life is later extended by Congress. The S. P. A. would receive all surplus war materials from all other Federal agencies, such as the Army and Navy. This agency would then first ascertain if any other governmental agency had need for any of the surplus materials, and if so, those agencies would have first call for them.

If not, the materials would be disposed of through domestic lend-lease by grant or loan to public agencies for: (a) Purposes of soil conservation or other form of land improvement; (b) for flood control; (c) construction, improvement, or maintenance of roads, highways, or streets; (d) public health, or other public purpose useful and beneficial to the people of the United States.

Senator CLARK's proposal is of vital concern to farmers because, if enacted into law, it would aid agriculture in soil conservation, flood control, rural road building and maintenance, and rural hospitalization, to mention a few possibilities.

When this war ends, we must somehow or other control the devastating floods which cost our Nation millions of dollars in money and an incalculable sum in human suffering each year. We must control soil erosion which is costing us, in the long run, four times as much as floods.

We must provide roads so that farmers can move their products to market any time those products are ready for market, and so that farm children won't have to wade mud on their way to school, and so farm families can go to church on Sunday. And we must provide more adequate rural hospitalization and make available medical services to people in agriculture, who are the backbone of our Nation.

All of these things, and more, could be made possible by an equitable distribution of the surplus war materials as contemplated in Senator CLARK'S bill, and the farmers of Missouri and every other State should fight for its passage.

The proposal is so splendid and fair that one would think it should have smooth sailing through Congress, and particularly so when it is remembered that the people are paying for these materials anyhow through taxation. But such will not be the case.

Selfish individuals and corporations will want to pick up these materials for a song, as was done in many instances following the last war, and either use or resell them for a long profit. Some manufacturers will demand that the materials be junked so that their use by the public will not satisfy a demand which they think might exist for their own newly manufactured products.

Other manufacturers will want the materials turned back to them so that they can resell them at a nice profit. Some sections of organized labor, though not all, may not want the surplus materials disposed of to the public for fear it will create unemployment since the factories will not be engaged in making new goods of these kinds. Other working people would welcome this equitable distribution of the materials, however, because men would be employed to use them.

Senator CLARK'S measure may not provide all the answers to the surplus-war-material problem, but it is definitely a move in the right direction, and it is to be hoped that every Missouri Congressman will give it his support in principle.

F. V. HEINKEL,
President, Missouri Farmers Association.

What's Right With America's War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Charles M. Hay, general counsel for the War Manpower Commission, delivered a very interesting address in St. Louis last week. Under the permission granted me I include this address as part of my remarks. It follows:

A few years ago, while preparing an address for a college graduating class on What's Right With America, I went into Washington's largest bookstore in search of some material. When I asked the manager whether he had any book or magazine article on that subject, he smiled with mingled compassion and derision and said: "Oh, no. We have plenty of books on what's wrong with America but nothing on what's right."

But I persisted. I made the speech and was amply rewarded by the response of my hearers who seemed to welcome the title, whatever they may have thought of what I said. That was in 1940. We saw then the possibility of an atack upon our America, and it was good to contemplate what we had that was worth living and dying for. So it is now. It is good now to warm our hearts and fortify our spirits by the contemplation of the fact that we have here a civilization built upon the principle of the equal right of men to life and liberty and the right of the people to govern themselves.

Just as I thought in 1940 that it was good for us to think on the things that are right with our country, so now, as we enter the grimmest, bloodiest days of this terrible conflict, it is good for us to contemplate what's right with us in our war effort. We do not need and must not have overconfidence and deadening optimism; but we do need faith, trust and confidence in ourselves and in each other. We will need to draw closer to each other for mutual comfort and strengthening. We should know whether we are fighting a good fight and whether we are keeping the faith.

Let us see. Have we been and are we right in our war effort? What have we done up to now?

Let us look first at our military forces. When the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, we were ill-prepared for war—even a war of defense. We had at that time in our military forces—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—2,100,000 men.

In December 1941 we had 2,500 naval vessels of all kinds. As for planes, General Arnold says: "December 7, 1941 (December 8, Hawaiian time), found the Army Air Forces equipped with plans but not with planes. When the Japanese struck our combat aircraft strength was little better than a corporal's guard of some 3,000 planes; of these, only 1,157 were actually suited to combat service; of this total, 526 were strategically located to meet possible attacks on the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. Within a few hours that number was reduced to 176."

It is not too much to say that if the Japs had followed up their sneak but devastating attack at Pearl Harbor by taking over the Hawaiian Islands, we could not have made a successful defense against an invasion of our west coast.

It is also fair to say that if we had not had the foresight and wisdom to acquire air and naval bases in Iceland and at other outlying points in the Atlantic, and had permitted them to fall into enemy hands, we would have been helpless against air attacks along our east coast. The exchange of the 50 old destroyers for those bases was one of the best deals ever made in our history. With respect to many things, we were tragically blind through our isolationist trance following the last war, but not with respect to this transaction.

When the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, our industries were geared primarily to the production of civilian or nonwar goods. Few of our industries had converted to war-goods production, and few Government plants had been constructed for that purpose. Our automobile factories, which have accomplished such miracles of war production since Pearl Harbor, produced 4,838,561 automobiles in 1941.

What have we done since in this war which we did not want but which, now that it is thrust upon us, we propose to fight to a victorious end?

First as to the military:

Our military forces have been built up from an estimated 2,100,000 in January 1942 to 10,500,000 in January 1944.

Our naval vessels have been built up from 2,500 in December 1941 to 23,700 by the end of January 1944. In the last quarter of 1941 we were producing ships at about 10,000 displacement tons per month. At present we are delivering them at the rate of about 208,000 tons per month.

Of our present air strength, General Arnold says (in his report of January 1944):

"We now have 15 air forces.

"Total military personnel in Army Air Forces, 1941, 101,227; 1943, 1,597,049.

"Military airplane production (total weight of air frames) 1941, 83,500,000 pounds; 1943, 667,000,000 pounds."

As of December 1941 we had 4,600,000 deadweight tons of merchant freighters; as of the end of 1943, 30,500,000. We were producing in the last quarter of 1941, 90,000 tons per month; at present at the rate of 1,700,000 tons per month.

Our total production of war goods grew from $1,400,000,000 in 1939 to $67,000,000,000 in 1943. Our minds can hardly encompass these figures. Words fail us when we try to describe the magnitude of our achievements. They have astounded us and confounded our enemies.

Great as are our accomplishments in the field of production, more amazing still are our transportation achievements.

We cannot overlook the fact that our boys are fighting a long, long way from home. The nearest battle front is at least 3,000 miles from our shores. Please God, may it never be closer than that. Some of them are approximately 10,000 miles from the nearest home port.

It has been our job not only to produce guns, ammunition, clothes, food, medicines, but to get them to our men over there, even in the remotest parts of the earth.

That job has been done and is being done today. To do it we had to lick the U-boat, and the U-boat has been licked. We had to have ships and yet more ships—and the ships we have, thousands of them. We had to develop an American "Kaiser" to do it. But we've developed him and others like him, with millions of faithful workers to help them.

Our goods have been produced and transported by land, sea, and air to the uttermost parts of the earth in such quantities that we have armed, clothed, fed, and medicated our men wherever they are in a manner and to an extent unequaled by any other nation. Our boys are the best-armed, best-clothed, best-fed, best-cared-for soldiers in the world. And they are the best soldiers in the world.

Not only have we amazed the world by our production of war goods, but we have at the same time maintained production of civilian or nonwar goods almost at the pre-war level. While building the production of war goods from a dollar value of $1,400,000,000 in 1939 to $67,000,000,000 in 1943, we reduced the production of nonwar goods only 8 percent—from $87,200,000,000 in 1939 to $79,900,000,000 in 1943.

While we had to cut down on a lot of things, mainly in the luxury or semiluxury class, we have maintained the production of the necessities, the articles that make for creature comfort, up to the pre-war level, and in many respects far beyond that level. For instance, while cutting out the production of pleasure automobiles, radios, and similar items, we have produced more food than ever before. As witness this—our food production in the boom year of 1929 was $9,969,000,000. In 1943 it was $16,959,000,000.

It is not too much to say that the American people—not in the military service—taken as a whole are living better today, eating more food, wearing better clothes, meeting their living expenses better, have more money in the bank, are enjoying more privileges, than ever before in our history.

The results—these right results have been accomplished in the right manner—by the voluntary, active cooperation of the people—of management, labor, and agriculture, and the people generally, and by the right kind of governmental action.

Let's look first at management. When the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, the industries of the country were in the main geared to civilian and nonwar production. Few had converted to war production. Within 2 months practically every plant in America producing automobiles had ceased their peacetime production and were converted or in the process of conversion to war goods. Almost overnight thousands of men operating filling stations and other automobile services had closed their doors and were entering other activities. That is but illustrative of what occurred in numerous other fields. All these things were done without the compulsion of law and by the voluntary cooperation of these people with their Government.

The farmers of America, the most individualistic and independent of our people, have likewise cooperated with proverbial farmer grumbling and complaining, but with magnificent energy and devotion.

The farm-production figures speak the farmers' most eloquent encomium. Look at them:

The total cash income from farm marketings, exclusive of Government payments, was as follows:

1939	$7,851,953,000
1940	8,331,182,000
1941	11,185,430,000
1942	15,366,000,000
1943	19,009,000,000

Let's now take a look at labor.

This phenomenal production record is the story of the accomplishments of the Nation's manpower. This record—think of it—a total production of war and nonwar goods of $146,900,000,000 in the year 1943 could not have been made except by the labor of workers, with a larger per capita production than ever known before in our history.

The record is all the more amazing when we contemplate the fact that, while building our production to such heights, more than 10,500,000 men, the pick of our manpower, have been drawn into military service, most of them from the normal labor force. In January 1942 there were 56,300,000 workers in the Nation's total labor force, including armed forces; in January 1944 there were 62,000,000 in the Nation's total labor force, including armed forces, while the number in the military service had risen from 2,100,000 in January 1942 to 10,500,000 in January 1944. This represents a net increase of nearly 6,000,000 in the Nation's total labor force, including those who would have entered normally.

The total production, war and nonwar, rose from $93,900,000,000 in 1941 to $146,900,000,000 in 1943.

These figures, without more, set before us the magnitude of the country's manpower mobilization and utilization job.

But the job has been done; the miraculous production record has been made.

In building up the labor force the following worker groups have been added: 4,500,000 unemployed as of January 1942; about 3,000,000 more women than would normally be employed in peacetime; people who by peacetime standards are considered unemployable; and by the use of part-time workers, such as housewives, school children, and individuals doing war work over and above their normal job activities.

We have had far more to do than add to the aggregate labor force and replace workers drawn into the military. We have had to make shifts, adjustments, and readjustments to get the right man in the right place. The imperative demand has been for workers in activities essential to the war effort.

All this has required the transfer of workers from nonessential to essential activities; from less essential to more essential; from essential to critical; and from areas with surplus labor to areas of labor shortage.

It has also required the encouragement of men to stay on essential jobs; to discourage shopping from job to job; to reduce absenteeism and work stoppages.

It has involved also the encouragement of full utilization of manpower. This has required moving against the hoarding of labor on the part of employers; and the encouragement of training of workers into greater skill and usefulness.

Colossal as this job has been, the outstanding and overriding fact is that it has been done. I know that there has been and is a lot of talk about the manpower muddle, but the fact remains that we have muddled our way to the most stupendous production record in the history of this or any other country.

What is the explanation of it all?

How has the job been done?

That which has contributed above all else to these great achievements has been the willingness of the great mass of the American people voluntarily to get in the fight and render the greatest possible service. Oh, I know that there have ben slackers, loafers, self-seekers, racketeers and profiteers—a lot of people have been wrong; but the great overwhelming mass of them have been right—right all the time.

Some employers have hoarded labor; most of them have not. Some workers have loafed on the job; lost time through strikes—most of them have not. The cold figures show that of the total man-hours available for investment in war work less than one-tenth of 1 percent have been lost through strikes.

It would be monstrously unfair to the brave men who constitute our fighting forces to appraise their worth by the conduct of the handful who for one reason or another fall into error. It is equally unfair to the faithful, patriotic workers of the country to blacken them by the errors of a small minority.

The War Manpower Commission has been the Government agency primarily responsible for the mobilization, allocation and coordination of the Nation's manpower. It has had no power to command or to compel work of any kind. It has had only the power to plan, advise, educate, stimulate, and direct those who voluntarily come into the labor field.

It has sought to enlist the full, voluntary, cooperative forces of labor, agriculture, and management through the National Management-Labor Policy Committee and the regional and area management-labor manpower committees. It has sought to provide the maximum latitude for the local solution of manpower problems. These committees, approximately 325 of them, have been the focal points for community action. They have brought to the formulation and administration of plans to mobilize and stabilize labor, the best thinking of management, labor, and agriculture where agriculture is involved, in the labor areas of the country. They have exemplified the democratic process in a fine way.

No fair appraisal of the work done in mobilizing manpower can be made without taking into large account the work of the United States Employment Service. It is through this agency that Government has rendered indispensable service in recruiting, transferring, placing workers, and in helping stabilize employment. The 1,500 United States Employment Service offices spread throughout the country have placed an average of approximately 800,000 workers per month for the past several months. The faithful men and women in these offices, many of them grossly underpaid, deserve unstinted praise for the work they have done.

By what I have said I do not mean to claim that no mistakes have been made or that there has been no falling short in the performance of our duties.

Much less do I wish to imply that our task is finished. Far from it.

In many respects our manpower problem is going to be more acute and more difficult of solution than ever before. There are several factors which will contribute to the difficulty of our task in the months immediately ahead.

In the first place, military service will be taking the kinds of men for whom replacements are most difficult to find. What the Army and Navy need most is physical fitness. This is precisely what is needed in many jobs which are essential to the war-production program.

In addition, we must allow for future military demands. No one can predict with certainty what these demands will be. We know that further drains upon our civilian manpower will be necessary to provide replacements for our armed forces although the net strength of the Army is now reached.

We know also that we must be prepared to shift quickly from one line of production to another, expanding in one area while contracting in other areas.

In the second place, we will have to find replacements for industries which are unattractive to a worker and, therefore, hard to staff, at the same time as we are attempting to raise the employment level in these industries. As our labor reserves have dwindled, it has become increasingly difficult to find workers for the hot, heavy, and dirty jobs, for the low-wage jobs, and for the geographically isolated jobs. Lacking the power to assign labor directly to specific employment, we have naturally met our greatest difficulties in connection with these unattractive jobs. Our most pressing manpower shortages today are found in industries of this type.

Third, I should mention also that the civilian psychology is not going to make the manpower job any easier. Notwithstanding the certainty of grim and bitter days ahead on the military front, the notion that the war's end is just around the corner and that peace and the resumption of civilian production are soon to be here has greatly affected the attitude of many workers toward war jobs. Every production cut-back, certainly every prediction of a military leader that the war's end is only a few months ahead, every discussion of the resumption of civilian production moves many war workers to leave war jobs and seek a place in civilian production, and makes more difficult the task of recruiting workers from nonessential to essential activities.

Our task in the months ahead is clear. We must hold on to the needed workers in essential and vital industries; we must be able to shift workers as quickly as the production demands change; and we must recruit replacements for those who enter the armed forces or who for other reasons leave the labor market.

As our boys fight with greater fury, we shall have to work back home with greater intensity. The fact that this is a total war will sink down upon us with crushing force.

But we cannot fail; we shall not fail.

We are on the right course.

We are fighting a good fight.

We are keeping and shall keep the faith.

We shall finish the course in triumph.

We must come to the end of this war, whether it be soon or late, not only triumphant in arms; but triumphant in our faith in democracy.

We must face the future united in our resolve to perfect our democracy at home and in our determination to cooperate with other nations to set up an international order based on the principle of the equal right of men to life and liberty and empowered to protect all nations and peoples against the bloody scourge of war.

Russians Ask Less of Butter Spread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 18, 1944:

RUSSIANS ASK LESS OF BUTTER SPREAD—SOLDIER'S DISLIKE FOR IT BRINGS CHANGE IN AMOUNT ALLOCATED UNDER LEND-LEASE—HOLDINGS HERE REDUCED—BUTTER HOARD CUT 25,522,000 POUNDS IN MONTH, BUT IT IS STILL 82,038,000 POUNDS

(By Jefferson G. Bell)

While American plants continue to convert millions of pounds of last year's butter into so-called Carter spread and civilian consumption is held to a minimum primarily by the 16-point ration value, Russian fighting men balk at eating this butter spread, which comes to them under lend-lease.

That Russia had asked the United States for less Carter spread was disclosed by the War Food Administration yesterday when it clarified current trade reports indicating that the Russians had rejected a vast amount of Carter spread already shipped or earmarked for them.

In response to inquiries, the War Food Administration in Washington explained that its division of supplies had received a letter from Russia asking that a smaller percentage of Carter spread and a larger proportion of butter oil be shipped under the recent agreement covering 1944 lend-lease fats and oils.

After explaining that the Russians would accept both Carter spread and butter oil, a representative of W. F. A. disclosed that as a result of the Russian request approximately one-third of the original allocation of butter would go to Russia in the form of spread and two-thirds as butter oil.

HOW CARTER SPREAD IS MADE

Carter spread, W. F. A. representatives explained, is made by the addition of about 35 percent of vegetable matter such as cottonseed oil. W. F. A. attachés confirmed reports that spokesmen for the Army Quartermaster centers purchasing supplies had reported that butter spreads were not popular among American soldiers.

Originally, the War Food Administration planned to process for Russia 20,000,000 pounds of butter. This butter began going into storage last May. Butter of this age cannot safely be moved great distances in its original state except under the most ideal conditions of refrigeration.

The quantities of Carter spread and butter oil shipped to Russia from last year's hoard will be charged against Russia's 1944 allotments under lend-lease, it was explained by W. F. A. Plants producing spreads are in New York City, Jersey City, Philadelphia, and Chicago.

Meanwhile, the monthly dairy market report of the Office of Distribution of W. F. A., released here, disclosed that on April 1 the Government's Nation-wide holdings of butter totaled 82,038,000 pounds, as against 16,676,000 pounds on April 1, 1943, and a 5-year average through 1943 of 31,698,000 pounds.

On March 1, 1944, total holdings were 107,560,560 pounds, so that within a month the hoard has been reduced by 25,522,000 pounds. Last January leading trade members had forecast that the carry-over at the beginning of the spring milk flush period would be 82,000,000 pounds.

Of the 82,038,000 pounds on hand, W. F. A. reports that the Dairy Products Marketing Association, buying for the Government, holds 26,436,000 pounds compared with 52,572,000 pounds on March 1, while the War Food Administration holds 25,494,000, compared with 21,917,000 pounds on March 1.

MARKET CONDITIONS REVIEWED

W. F. A.'s weekly dairy market review, distributed over the week end, declared that "the butter markets at wholesale price levels were maintained in firm position," and added:

"But it was becoming increasingly easy to purchase at the higher prevailing jobbing mark-ups. Supplies continued to increase and at most of the major markets were in excess of the curtailed demands. Some butter now is being set aside for sale to the Army Quartermaster Corps, but the aggregate total so far is small. Most retail outlets are filled and many stores have canceled or reduced their orders for short periods.

"Consumer demand, restricted by lack of ration points, continued use of lower priced oleomargarine, and the habit of getting along with less formed during the period of acute shortage. Retail sales are generally reported as even to slightly above last year, when the 30 percent set-aside order cut sharply into consumer supplies, but are sharply below the relatively normal period of 1941–42. Reports vary widely as to the degree that sales are below 1941–42, but they are sufficiently down in some areas to be the basis of concern. At San Francisco retail outlets are definitely filled, with requirements sharply below prewar normal. Per capita consumption in California is reported at an all-time low."

Shortcomings of the Soldier Vote Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and persuasive address, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, dealing with the subject of the soldiers' vote. It will, I think, convince any fair-minded citizen that the so-called soldiers' vote law fails to provide adequate means to allow our service men and women to cast their ballots in the coming election.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One week ago, over this network, Governor Dewey gave what he termed his second annual report on the administration of the State government. As that report was printed in The New York Times, it contained 50 paragraphs. I am going to pass over 47 of those paragraphs, the subject matter of which can await discussion at a later date. I do so because it is imperative that the people of this State be informed, before it is too late to act, that the so-called soldier vote law fails to provide adequate means to allow our service men and women to cast their ballots in the coming election.

Today, almost 20 percent of our voting population are serving in the armed forces. If you include those in the Merchant Marine, the Red Cross, the U. S. O., and other field services, at least one out of every five eligible voters is making a full time sacrifice that our Democracy may live.

All of these are prepared to risk their lives for our country. Many have already died in defense of our American way of life. Their comrades expect to vote this fall. Those who are in hospitals, recovering from wounds, will be bitter in their resentment, if deprived of their vote by unnecessary red tape. Those already on the firing lines will naturally be disappointed, if we at home put obstacles in the way of their making their choice of candidates in the coming election. The fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, wives and husbands of those in the services expect our public officials to protect to the fullest extent the voting privileges of those who, because of their absence, cannot make themselves heard.

Yet this most important of all questions is lightly passed over by Governor Dewey in three short paragraphs buried at almost the very end of his report. His brief reference to the soldier-vote law reflects either his lack of interest in the rights of the service personnel or his embarrassment over having signed a statute so utterly at variance with his own public statements on the subject.

I believe that the vast majority of the people of the State of New York want every man and woman in the armed forces to have full opportunity to cast his or her vote this coming fall in the easiest way possible.

There may be some who can see political advantage in making it difficult for the armed forces to vote. If this is so, those acting from such an unfair and un-American motive should be speedily repudiated. Partisan selfishness must not be permitted to create a road block against the will of those unselfishly giving their all for our safety.

The Constitution of the State of New York, adopted in 1938, in the light of experience gained in World War No. 1 and at the time when the clouds presaging World War No. 2 were gathering on the horizon, took cognizance of the rights of the service voters. In the very first paragraph of article 2, dealing with the qualification of voters, the State constitution carries this provision: "In time of war no elector in the actual military service of the State, or the United States, in the Army or Navy thereof, shall be deprived of his or her vote by reason of his or her absence from such election district."

In those unmistakable words the people of our Commonwealth have placed in our fundamental law a clear mandate to the Governor and legislature to make it as easy as possible for the defenders of liberty to exercise the most precious right of a free people.

Governor Dewey, on March 7 of this year, sent a message to the legislature, in which he said: "Our constitution declares unequivocably that every official, State or local, for which the citizen at home may vote will also be subject to the vote of the citizen in the armed forces.

"There is a perfectly simple solution to the problem. Every soldier can be provided with a ballot which will be valid under our Constitution."

In these three sentences from Governor Dewey's own message, rests the crux of the whole soldier-vote bill. Did Governor Dewey tip his hand when he said, "Every soldier can be provided with a ballot which will be valid under our Constitution"?

Why did he not say, "Every soldier will be provided with a ballot * * *"? The Governor has never before been so meticulously indefinite in the use of promissory verbiage. His sincerity, therefore, must be questioned so long as he persists in holding to his present precarious position.

Quick changes in the rules of the War Ballot Commission, made during the last few days, constitute admission on the part of the State administration that the law is

faulty and unworkable. These changes likewise put in jeopardy the counting of any soldier ballots. The Dewey law expressly provided for the use of post-card applications prepared by the Federal or State commissions or a written or printed application. It further provides that such application must be subscribed by the soldier and that the application must state both his residence address and military address.

The so-called liberal interpretation announced by Chairman Simpson, of the War Ballot Commission, shows that the law is not clear in its meaning and leaves the way open for any person to protest the tallying of all soldier ballots. If there was no reason before for a session of the legislature to be convened to clarify and simplify the law, the liberal interpretation of the Commission certainly makes such a session imperative now in order to insure any of the service votes being counted at any time. If this is not cleared up, the result of the balloting on November 7 next can be thrown into litigation and a condition of chaos can result that will be destructive to war morale.

Governor Dewey has been quite free in his use of the word "chaos" in criticism of far less important Federal matters. He should certainly be equally as zealous in guarding against chaos in a State matter which possibly may be interwoven in the fabric of his own destiny.

But the Republican chairman of the war-ballot commission, even after his so-called liberal interpretation, blandly admits, according to the World-Telegram of April 19, that the service vote will be around 225,000. This naturally is an optimistic estimate by the man in the best position to know the facts. Its import is further proof that the present soldier vote law, even when liberalized, will not work. Surely Governor Dewey, in the face of that admission, that 3 out of 4 service voters will find it too difficult to exercise their right of franchise, cannot further persist in his refusal to call a special session of the legislature to rectify the mistakes that make this really the "soldier cannot vote law."

However, Chairman Simpson unwittingly confesses that his optimistic estimate is much too high by ordering only 200,000 post cards. Those cards have to make a round trip before a ballot can even be mailed to the service voter. Then the ballot has to make a round trip. The delays and losses in these 2 round trips will surely be so great that in the end it is doubtful, with the time limitations, if more than 1 out of 10 service votes ever reach the polls before November 3. Such an eventuality, to all intents, disfranchises 9 out of 10 of your sons and daughters.

Under the present Dewey law the service man or woman must first send in an application asking for an absentee war ballot. Who is to tell the serviceman that he must make such an application? It will certainly take time to get that word to him. It will take more time for his application to travel from far-away places before it reaches the State war-ballot commission. The war-ballot commission must then see to it that a ballot is sent to the applicant. That will take more time. Then, when the ballot reaches the man, he must fill it out, swear to it before an attesting officer and send it on its way back to the war-ballot commission.

Does all that time and red tape make it easier for the war voter to cast his or her vote? The answer became so obvious when the machinery was started that the so-called liberalizing interpretations, despite their questionable legality, were hastily devised in a desperate effort to oil the stalled procedure. These liberalizing interpretations would permit the sending of ballots to any member of the armed forces who, in a signed letter to a member of his or her family, expressed any intention of a desire to vote.

The Republican chairman of the war ballot commission is quoted as saying, "This is a more liberal interpretation of the law than heretofore, and will permit many more thousands of soldiers and sailors to vote than if required to go through the formalities of making a direct personal request." This change of heart was forced by a rising tide of public indignation, aroused by the refusal of Governor Dewey to call a special session of the legislature to make the law fair and workable.

What further interpretations may we now expect the State war ballot commission to make? How will we know from day to day what the war ballot commission may decide to be their interpretation of the law? Why should a law written after 2 years' experience be so imperfect as to need day-to-day interpretation?

When the bill was introduced in the closing days of the legislative session, the Democrats in the legislature offered 31 amendments to make the law simple and definite in its application and administration. But Governor Dewey refused to permit such bipartisan collaboration and insisted on his bill being adopted without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

The liberalizing interpretation that war ballots will be sent upon presentation of a letter addressed and signed by a member of the armed forces and received by a relative in which the writer expresses a desire to vote will beget further interpretations. The commission will be forced to rule on what constitutes a letter addressed and signed by a member of the armed forces. Suppose your boy sends you a letter signed, "Your loving son, Arthur," or "With love, Bill." Will that be interpreted as a complete signature? Will you have to present to the war ballot commission your loved one's entire letter? Any number of such questions will call for new rulings, new interpretations, new liberalizations, because the law is not simple, understandable, or workable.

Likewise the Commission must hand down interpretations as to what constitutes "intent of a desire to vote."

If a soldier asks, "How is the election going?" does that constitute a desire to vote?

If a marine expresses the hope that one or the other candidates will be elected, can that be interpreted as a desire to vote?

If a gob should, in his enthusiasm, say he would like to vote for his admiral for President, how will that be interpreted?

Or, mayhap, a WAC or WAVE may write that she would like to vote for someone who has not been nominated. Would that come under the so-called liberalizing interpretation?

But what can be done to simplify the procedure? The simple and constitutional way is to have the war ballot commission send a ballot to every war voter of the State whose name, home address, and military address is furnished to the commission by any relative of the war voter. That would comply with the intent of New York State's Constitution. That would eliminate the red tape and the unnecessary burden on the transport facilities of our country in time of war. That would guarantee the simplest and the easiest way of allowing service men and women to vote with the least difficulty.

Governor Dewey says that proposed methods, other than his, will make for fraud. That characterization cannot apply to my proposal. How can it be fraud to make it simpler for your boy to cast his vote? The only fraud that is discernible in the present situation will be perpetrated by depriving service men and women of their vote and that fraud is inherent in the cumbersome, red tape requirements of the Dewey law, which are subject to "interpretations" and therefore to possible manipulation.

There can be no fear of any service man or woman casting a fraudulent vote. I am sure that none of our service men or women needs defending on that score. Furthermore, the Dewey law takes ample precautions to make sure that every war ballot, before it is counted, is a valid ballot.

In case you have not read the entire law, let me say that it fills more than 12 pages of closely printed matter. Such items as the size and weight of the ballot and the envelopes to be used are minutely described and specified. The oath to which the war voter must subscribe in sending in his or her ballot is fully set forth and reads as follows:

"BALLOT FOR WAR VOTER, NOVEMBER 7, 1944

"OATH

"I do swear (or affirm) that on November 7, 1944, I will be 21 years old and immediately preceding said date will have been a citizen of the United States for 90 days, an inhabitant of the State of New York for 1 year, a resident of the county, city, or village in which I offer my vote for 4 months, and of the election district in which I offer my vote for 30 days; that I have not received or offered any compensation or reward for the giving or withholding of a vote at this election; that I have not made or become interested in any bet depending upon the result of this election; that I have not cast, mailed, or marked any other ballot for any candidate for any of the offices listed on the ballot enclosed herein; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or my right of suffrage restored.

"I reside at:

"Street or R. F. D. _____.

"City, village, or town _____.

"County _____."

The affidavit must be sworn to in the presence of a commissioned officer, sergeant, or petty officer.

Even under the Dewey law, as most recently interpreted, it is possible that more than one member of a family may receive a letter from a war voter in which the war voter expresses a desire to vote. If more than one such letter is presented to the War Ballot Commission, that will not mean that the service man or woman will attempt to vote more than once.

Lest anyone entertain the thought that a personally signed application must be made as a substitute for registration, let me point out that neither under the Constitution nor in the Dewey law itself does such an application serve any such purpose. This is clearly evident from the Dewey law, which provides as follows:

"The signing of the war voter's name to the oath as above provided shall constitute personal registration wherever such registration is required, and in case of a new voter conclusive proof of his literacy."

You can see, therefore, that the requirement in the Dewey law for any kind of a personal application is entirely unnecessary so far as registration is concerned. When the war voter signs the oath, which I have read to you, and which must accompany his war ballot, then the war voter is registered.

The Dewey law also prescribes in detail how war ballots are to be distributed and how they are to be handled when received back from the war voters; how the inspectors of election shall examine and check each ballot and the action to be taken if objections are raised to the casting of any such ballot.

No, there is no possibility of fraud. The only point that matters is will your loved one in the service receive a ballot in time for him or her to have the opportunity of taking part in this year's election. That is the test by which the Dewey law is unfair to the war voter.

The second and very important count on which the Dewey law is unfair to the war voter is that the war voter's ballot must be back in Albany by November 3, 4 days before election day. You can readily see that it will be necessary for most war voters to make

their choice of candidates several weeks before election day in order that their ballots may reach Albany by November 3. That provision penalizes a service voter for fighting for his country.

Let me remind my listeners that under Republican war-ballot laws in force during the past 2 years, the service men and women overseas were permitted to fill out their ballots right up to election day and their ballots were valid and were counted, if they reached the War Ballot Commission by December 10.

Surely it is only right and proper for us at home to arrange it so that our boys on the fighting fronts may have full opportunity of learning all they can about the candidates and the issues before they mark their ballots, and that they be protected in their constitutional right of voting up to election day.

If it was all right for the law to let them vote up to election day last year and the year before, when a Governor and a Lieutenant Governor were being elected, why make them vote weeks ahead of election day this year? There is no need for such discrimination. The war voter's ballot should be voted and postmarked not later than election day and it should be counted if it is received within a reasonable time after election day.

I propose that such ballots be valid if received by December 1. That leaves plenty of time to certify the results of the election before the electoral college meets. You will note that in 1942, when war ballots were received up to December 10, the election of a Governor was at stake. A Governor takes office on the 1st day of January following the election. This year we vote for a President, and the President does not start his term of office until January 20. Surely we owe that much to the service men and women, who are fighting for us, that we give them reasonable time within which their ballots may be received and counted.

What do you think will be the effect upon the morale of our fighting men when they find that the New York State war voters' law is a gold-brick law? I ask every mother or father of a boy in the service to study carefully what I have said, and I am sure you will agree that what I have proposed in the way of changes to the present Dewey law will simplify the procedure and make it workable. I ask every wife or husband, sister or brother, of any of the men and women in the armed forces of our country to consider this situation seriously. If the election this year should ever be decided without the votes of our service men and women being recorded in substantial numbers, it will be a travesty. There is no partisan advantage in what I have proposed. God forbid that anyone in America will deliberately try to rig these laws so as to promote selfish ambitions or partisan political aims.

You and I remember the rightful resentment of the boys of the First World War who came back to find that the "noble experiment" of prohibition had been put over while they were busily occupied in defending our country against the forces of the enemy. Do not let us repeat that tragic mistake in any degree. No matter what the outcome of the election may be, no matter who is elected President or Senator or councilman, we must make sure that fighting America participates in the democratic processes they are defending.

Now, I well know that there will be a cry of "politics" from the opposition in order to offset the unanswerable charges I have made. Let me answer the opposition on that one before they make it. I have in my hand a letter dated April 19, just 2 days ago. It is signed by Kate E. Grant, secretary of the Election Commissioners' Association of the State of New York. It is addressed to all the boards of elections of New York State and it reads:

"DEAR COMMISSIONERS AND CLERKS: At the urgent request of the New York State war ballot commission, President Werger has arranged for a very important special meeting of representatives of all boards of elections of New York State.

"The war ballot commission has impelled this meeting in order that there may be a unified and correct interpretation of the new war ballot law, concerning which we are so uncertain.

"This meeting will be held in the chambers of the Albany County Board of Supervisors, Albany, N. Y., on Wednesday, April 26, 1944, at 10 o'clock.

"The attendance at this meeting is to be a county charge.

"Make your reservations immediately. The DeWitt Clinton Hotel has advised that the hotel will be able to accommodate all if reservations are made at once.

"You cannot afford to miss this meeting.

"Remember the date—April 26, 1944, Wednesday, 10 a. m., chambers of Albany County Board of Supervisors, Albany, N. Y."

Do you, the voters of New York State, need any further evidence than that letter to convince you that the present soldier-vote law is a monstrosity, a reservoir of ambiguities, and a perpetration of deception against your sons and daughters who, more than anyone else, deserve your protection of their fundamental rights, which they cannot guard because they are in distant lands protecting you from the holocaust of war?

Governor Dewey, on behalf of our hundreds of thousands of citizens in the armed forces, and confident that I am voicing the sentiments of their loved ones at home, I ask you to convene the legislature at the earliest possible date to amend the present so-called soldier-vote law, removing its obvious defects and making it so workable that we all—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—can acclaim it as a real statute that will make it, to use your own words, "a perfectly simple solution to the problem."

H. R. 2082

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have just received from Mrs. Edith M. Irvine, which was accompanied by a petition containing 1,789 signatures petitioning Congress to enact H. R. 2082:

LIGA DE TEMPERANCIA DE PUERTO RICO,
SAN JUAN, P. R., *March 31, 1944.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Puerto Rico, consisting of 40 local unions, has been backing up your bill 2082 by prayer ever since it was presented. We have also collected 1,789 signatures to the petition to Congress in behalf of the bill. Some of our local presidents have written you personal letters thanking you for your good work and offering their undivided support of the movement.

As Puerto Rico has no Senator or Representatives, and only a Resident Commissioner, I am taking the liberty of sending these signatures to you and am hoping that some mention may be made of our efforts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We are praying continually that this bill will be given due consideration and that God will touch the hearts of our lawmakers as to this serious problem.

Puerto Rico is overridden with drinking places. Our servicemen are given beer at such a low price on the posts that many of them seek stronger liquor when they are at liberty. It is pitiful to see our fine young men from the United States, many of whom come from Christian homes, losing their health and their self-respect through liquor.

We expect to send some more signatures and you may be sure that our W. C. T. U. members are backing you up by their prayers and cooperation, and are trusting that God will honor your efforts and convert this bill into a law before this legislative session is adjourned.

May God bless you abundantly and increase our faith as we go forward in His name.

Yours very sincerely,
EDITH M. IRVINE-RIVERA.

Secretaries Want Legal Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article from the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal of March 20, 1944:

SECRETARIES WANT LEGAL STATUS

(By Roland Alston)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional secretaries are laying plans to have themselves designated assistant Congressmen or given some other definite legal status so they can get better results in dealing with Government agencies.

Government departments and agencies usually give due courtesy and attention to any request made in person by a Senator or House Member, but secretaries often have to fight to get anything better than a brush-off.

This is particularly true of the secretaries' dealings with the 160 independent agencies and commissions set up mostly during the Roosevelt administration.

CLERKS HANDLE CALLS

Secretaries complain they can't even get a $6,000 or $7,000 a year division head on the telephone to give information on a Government directive or explain a complex departmental order. Minor clerks handle the secretaries' calls. Only secretaries of Members ranking high on the congressional appropriations committees can get top-flight men, secretaries say.

When President Roosevelt began his fight with Congress on the soldier vote, food subsidy, and tax issues, secretaries complained to their Members that New Deal department staffs seemed to be taking their cue from the President and using similar tone in relations with congressional offices.

Impersonating the Congressman over the telephone doesn't solve the problem. Many secretaries are women or girls. When men secretaries pose as Congressmen, too many fibs have to be told, complications develop, and the secretary usually gets nowhere in the end.

CORRESPONDENCE PILES UP

Result is that correspondence has been piling high on the desks in many Senators' and Representatives' offices, because only the Congressmen seem to be able to get satisfactory replies from the departments, and the lawmakers are busier than ever before, on the floor and in the committee.

Much of this correspondence comes from constituents needing to get straightened out on this or that directive, or wanting help in getting needed priorities for materials.

The secretaries contend the job of meeting all these requests, plus year-around attendance at congressional sessions, is to much for any one man and that need of an assistant Congressman is indicated plainly.

They won't insist upon having the title, but they'd like a precisely defined status in law which would permit them to represent the Members of Congress employing them in all matters except lawmaking.

If Congress would establish that status, Government departments would have to give them more attention and relations between Capitol Hill and downtown would improve, they contend.

CABLE ORIGINATOR

This idea originated with Wendell E. (Jack) Cable, career congressional secretary since 1919 who runs one of the busiest hill offices for Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois. It's a lively topic among members of the secretaries club, which has more or less replaced the little congress of secretaries and other hill jobholders.

Those who have approached their bosses know it won't be easy to achieve their goal. Members of Congress are jealous of all their prerogatives, particularly older Members. Many would go along with the plan except for fear they might be charged with participating in a plot to gain additional patronage for themselves.

The secretaries are counting heavily upon sheer, continued overwork to wear their bosses down to willingness to accede.

A congressional secretary can get as high as $4,500 a year, but the appropriation bills for the legislative branch give lump sums for clerical hire with no specific reference to secretaries. Hence secretaries are now legally only clerks.

For a Peacetime Air Force of 50,000 Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Aviation News of April 17, 1944:

FOR A PEACETIME AIR FORCE OF 50,000 PLANES

The United States aircraft industry built 117 planes during September 1939, when the European war started. Total output that year was 2,400 planes, including scores of trainers. On December 7, 1941, we had 159 4-engine bombers. The Army Air Forces had 1,157 first-line combat planes, with only 526 of these strategically located to meet possible attacks on Hawaii and the Philippines. Within a few hours this number dropped to 176. The Japs' string of conquests continued with little resistance almost to Australia.

Today's production is 9,000 military planes every month, including possibly 1,500 heavy bombers. We have the world's greatest military and naval air force, by quantity and quality. Its peak is still unattained. Over half of the Army's total 1944 production represents aircraft and its equipment.

In the heat of battle, on the threshold of the mightiest invasion ever planned, it is time to start planning our insurance for the future. To assure ourselves that a phlegmatic peacetime let-down does not lay us open to another enemy—or "friend."

The United States must continue to maintain the world's greatest air force, whether it polices others or remains based on American territory. Its very existence will be a powerful deterrent to ill-judged action elsewhere.

Aviation News believes American public opinion will demand that we retain a bristling air force equaled or exceeded by none in the world, even by our present allies. This is believed to be the opinion of some of our highest officials. It is a prevailing belief of a group of the most responsible Members of Congress.

Such an air corps and our determination to keep our leadership, will be as powerful a force at the peace table as in the years ahead.

Therefore, the News believes that congressional plans should encompass the following minimum post-war air program:

1. A peacetime Army and Navy Air Force of at least 50,000 combat planes, plus necessary trainers and military transports.

2. Annual production and replacement of 25,000 of the most advanced combat aircraft.

3. Continuation of what already is the world's best equipped aircraft and equipment research plant, to be maintained by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, plus A. A. F. and naval testing centers, and independent facilities for individual aircraft plants.

4. A continuing national aviation training program utilizing private schools, turning out necessary technicians and a minimum of 100,000 private pilots a year as a constant source of potential combat pilots of the required ages. This program would be independent of a nucleus training system continued by the services.

5. The world's largest and finest equipped commercial air line system with subsidies only on a few uneconomic but militarily and commercially important world routes. The air lines should retain some contract connections with the Army and Navy Transport Services for training and transportation.

6. A peacetime Army Air Transport Command and Naval Air Transport Service competing with no commercial air line, but serving as training and supply agencies.

The American people can find little legitimate complaint in the cost factor of an insurance policy with a premium which is hardly more than several of the current 2,000-plane raids over Berlin.

There are other post-war problems to be solved, of course. What about our post-war Army, surface Navy, peacetime conscription? The question of implementing the post-war air force must be solved. Will the air force be one of the co-equal arms of a single department of defense, for example?

It is now up to our congressional leaders, like Representative WOODRUM and his well-selected military planning committee, to gather the expert recommendations and testimony of our wartime leaders in the services and industry, and prepare a report on which the House can take swift action.

Let them recall these words from General Arnold's classic report to the Secretary of War early this year, listing the Army Air Forces crippling liabilities in the pre-war period:

"These were the lack of funds, the people's aversion to all forms of war which forced us into makeshift methods. The A. A. F. had to teach the Nation that large numbers of planes did not in themselves constitute airpower; we had to show the folly of the numbers racket. We designed different planes to do different jobs, and shouted from the hangar tops that no one superplane could do everything. * * * The people did not realize that the plane had broken down all boundaries of time and distance; that even our inland cities were within bombing range of the enemy."

We believe the people realize these things now and that they expect their Congress to start to work now to insure us against another war.

ROBERT H. WOOD.

O. P. A. Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks a radio address by Hon. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator. The address follows:

There has been a good deal of talk about O. P. A. regulations. Some people say we have too many regulations. Others say they are too complicated.

Well, just how many O. P. A. regulations are there? And how do we at O. P. A. arrive at them? Do we just "dream them up" arbitrarily down here in Washington, or are they practical regulations that will work in fairness to you and to the men in the industries affected by them?

I think you are entitled to the answer to those questions. Because our O. P. A. regulations affect the lives and work of every American every day.

They affect you every time you buy a new suit or drive your car or go marketing for the family groceries. They affect your storekeepers and the men who manufacture the things you buy in your stores. They affect distributors and brokers and landlords and farmers—in fact, everyone who buys and everyone who sells.

In order to keep down your wartime cost of living, the O. P. A. has established rent control in many areas, and ceiling prices on more than several million items. These items range all the way from food to fuel, include just about everything you buy today.

In order to assure every American a fair share of essential wartime shortages, the O. P. A. administers 13 ration programs ranging all the way from sugar to shoes.

And in order to carry out this big wartime job, the O. P. A. has had to have rules and regulations which fall into two general groups—rationing, and the control of prices and rents.

Now, as you know, our O. P. A. power to ration comes from the President's Emergency War Powers Act, through delegation by W. P. B. What shall be rationed is decided by W. P. B. in consultation with the various Government supply agencies. And those supply agencies, such as the Petroleum Administration for War, the War Food Administration, and the Office of Defense Transportation, determine how much shall go for civilian use.

Once these agencies have determined what the civilian supply is for these commodities, our O. P. A. ration orders become pretty much a matter of arithmetic, based on how many

need shoes or meat or gasoline or tires or whatever must be rationed—and how much there is to go around.

Our O. P. A. price regulations, on the other hand, are more complicated. A difference of only a few cents in the ceiling price of one product in one industry may affect the cost of many other products in other industries.

Price control, therefore, is a highly complicated program because of the relationship between the cost of production any place along the line and the final cost to you in your local store. And the purpose of price control is to defeat inflation by holding down your wartime cost of living and the cost of the war to your Government—which means you, the taxpayer.

Obviously, the O. P. A. has had to tread on new ground in doing this price control job. There were no precedents to guide us in the strange new restrictions which total war has forced on America.

Congress realized this when it passed the Emergency Price Control Act 2 years ago. And so it wrote into the act two provisions. One, that before issuing a price regulation, the O. P. A. must consult with a representative group from the industry as to the form of the regulation. And second, that after a price regulation was passed, the O. P. A., upon request of a substantial number of any industry affected, should form an advisory committee from that industry. Thus, from the beginning, all industries have had statutory protection against arbitrary price regulations, and have had the democratic prerogative of their day in court.

However, the initiative for appointing these advisory committees was left to the industries themselves. And as late as January 1943 representatives of only 16 industries had formally requested the appointment of advisory committees.

In June 1943 we in the O. P. A. decided not to wait for industry to ask for appointment of advisory committees. Instead we decided to take the initiative ourselves and form committees for virtually every industry under price control. Some months later we went further and directed that no new price regulations or major amendments should be issued without consultation with a representative advisory committee from the industry.

Today we have 435 industry advisory committees sitting in with us on all stages of price regulations.

Let me make one thing clear right now. These committees do not concern themselves with the level of prices or what should be brought under price control. That is a responsibility that remains ours at O. P. A. But the industry advisory committees are mightily concerned about the form and the structure of price control—and they know more about the details of their own business than anybody else. Who better can tailor a regulation to make it as simple and as practical as possible? Who better can help us to make price ceilings fit in with countless industry practices that have grown up through the years?

Now, who serves on these committees and how do they work? Let's take a specific committee and see. Let's take the committee on coated and combed fabrics—a technical phrase that covers such things as adhesive tape, window shade cloth, oil cloth, and the like.

Well, O. P. A.'s Maximum Price Regulation 478 puts ceilings on coated and combed fabrics. And so, when the regulation was in the first discussion stage, we appointed an advisory committee of 14 members from the industry to help us on the regulation. They come from Massachusetts and Ohio and Illinois and other places where these products are made.

First, this committee met with O. P. A. here in Washington and made suggestions and recommendations on the form of the regulation. Then, when the committee and O. P. A. had agreed on the simplest and most effective type of control, we held regional meetings in New York, Boston, and Cleveland. There, with the members of the committee present, we presented the regulation to larger informal groups of the coated and combed fabrics trade. Here again there was open discussion, out of which came even greater refinements until all the wrinkles which could possibly be foreseen were straightened out. And then the regulation was issued and put into effect.

All of our industry advisory committees elect their own chairman and conduct their our meetings.

Now, obviously, the better job we do writing a regulation to begin with, the less trouble there is later and the fewer meetings need to be called, which takes the time of busy men away from their important war work.

You know, it isn't easy for a businessman to work on these committees. Because the first thing we ask him to do is completely to reverse his normal thinking. A man has spent years in competitive business fighting for his particular firm. He has competed with all comers, and has brought his company out on top simply because he stayed in there and pitched for that company. Then he comes down to Washington to serve on an advisory committee with the O. P. A.

First we ask him to represent—not in terms of the company he's spent years fighting for—but the entire industry of which his company is only a part. That means he becomes a spokesman for his competitors and his own company without distinction. And then, when he's done that—we ask him to go even further, and fit that whole industry into the entire price control picture. It is a great tribute to American businessmen that they have been willing to do that kind of a job for the good of the war effort. And the men on our 435 industry advisory committees are coming through magnificently. I cannot praise too highly the fine help the members of our advisory committees have given us in making price control simple, effective, and as easy as possible to live with.

There are some stormy problems in many industries. We have some stormy committees, to be sure. And in some cases, the members came down here with their "dukes up" so to speak. They don't like regulations to begin with, any more than we at O. P. A. like them. And even through the businessmen are prepared to accept our regulations as a necessary wartime evil, they sometimes start out pretty aggressively determined to fight for their companies as they have been doing for years.

But then these men hear the O. P. A. side of the question. They see why some suggestion simply won't work because it doesn't fit into the big over-all price control program. And you'd be surprised how completely their thinking sometimes changes.

The longer the committee works with O. P. A., the smoother our relations become. Some of our most valuable committees today are the heavy industry committees which were the first appointed.

It would be impossible to frame any price rule which would be absolutely fair to every single individual or firm affected by it. And in many cases, inequities can't be foreseen. It just isn't humanly possible to write a perfect regulation the first time. In an undertaking as new and complicated as price control, you have to try a regulation on, see how it fits, perhaps see how it wears. And then when you find places where it doesn't fit, you make changes. Those things we are doing constantly, with the aid of our industry advisory committees. That's why we issue amendments.

There are only 502 O. P. A. price regulations. But there have been hundreds of unavoidable changes made by amendments to these regulations. And in every case where a major amendment is being considered, we also consult with our Industry Advisory committees.

Just to show you the wide scope covered by these committees, here's a list of the ones that met with us here in Washington last week. Committees on export, import, power laundries, paper products, automotive parts, soft drinks, sulfite paper, canned fruits and vegetables, coil and inner construction for furniture, canners, preserve manufacturers, fresh and frozen fish, iron and steel scrap, cane sugar refining, table and juice grapes, Maryland tobacco, frozen fruits and vegetables. And in addition, in working on one aspect of a flour regulation, we also held meetings last week with that industry in Omaha, Minneapolis, and Chicago.

That's a typical week's sample of how we at O. P. A. are getting the advice and help of every conceivable industry. And here's a sample of the cooperative attitude of these businessmen who are working with us. It's a letter from Walter S. Doxsey, of the American Steel Warehouse Co. Mr. Doxsey is chairman of our steel warehouse and jobbers advisory committee. Recently he wrote:

"May I take this opportunity to convey to you the gratification of our industry over the sincere and constructive cooperation of Mr. D. D. Kennedy and Mr. E. L. Wyman and their staff.

"To my mind, the development of zone-pricing schedules demonstrates most effectively the accomplishments that may be achieved with Government and industry working hand in hand."

I have tried to give you a picture of how we at O. P. A. work with these different industry advisory meetings.

You know, I've always felt that when this war is over and we look back on what O. P. A. did and how it was done, there will be two big stories which will give us all cause for pride.

First, of course, we'll be able to see just how well prices were controlled. We know part of that story now. We know that so far they have been pretty well controlled, and that for the last year the cost of living has been held stable. Some prices are up but others are down, so that on the average, prices are no higher today than they were a year ago now.

And I think we'll consider the second story, just as important as the first. That's the story of how this O. P. A. program to ration and control prices was very largely operated by volunteers.

Of course, you know we have a big building here in Washington filled with people working on O. P. A. problems. But relatively, it's a very small number by comparison with the number of volunteers, working for the same cause all over this country. Actually there are less than 4,000 people here in Washington against 106,000 people regularly working on local boards.

And, of course, very important in the volunteer phase of the program are the businessmen, who time and time again drop their own affairs, come to Washington, to sit and work out regulations which will control prices in their own industries. Generally, these men have very responsible positions in their companies. Still with all the problems of business operations these days, they are glad to interrupt their work to serve on O. P. A. price controls as volunteers. Right now there are 5,300 members of these committees—a good many more, you see, than there are O. P. A. employees here in Washington.

I think you'll agree that the story of O. P. A. is really a story of democracy in action.

Address by Lieutenant General Vandergrift at Graduation Exercises of F. B. I. National Police Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Lt. Gen. Alexander A. Vandergrift, Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, at the graduation exercises of the twenty-fourth session of the F. B. I. National Police Academy, on April 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed an honor to be here with you this morning and to have this opportunity of extending congratulations to the members of today's graduating class.

You are to be congratulated not only upon successfully completeing the academy course, but also upon your good fortune in having acquired this training from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Certainly no law enforcement body in the world is better suited to provide advanced schooling in your highly specialized field.

The fact that you have availed yourself of this schooling and that you plan now to share your progress with your colleagues at home, is testimony of your right to leadership in this profession most vital to the welfare of our Nation.

True it is that we never grow too old, or too wise, to learn. I have heard of one local police officer who thought he had learned everything, and he looked with contempt upon further schooling. But at times he gave himself away. On one occasion it happened that a man who was wanted by the police had been photographed in six different positions and the pictures were circulated among local officers. A few days later, this particular officer wrote to headquarters saying: "I duly received the pictures of the six miscreants whose capture is desired. I have arrested five of them; the sixth is under observation and will be taken soon."

It is most natural that a soldiering man should possess marked admiration for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for this Bureau has many standards of character and conduct which are likewise the ideals of the military service.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has shown constant courage, resourcefulness, loyalty, driving energy, and technical and scientific skill in fighting the enemies of American society within our own borders.

Those of us who devote ourselves to the fight against America's enemies beyond our shore lines look to those same qualities as guides pointing the way to the best performance of the duties with which we are charged.

All the battles of modern war are not fought at sea, in the air, or on well-defined battlefields between masses of opposing troops. Our problems doubtless would be simplified if they were. Other battles of espionage and counter-espionage, agitation and counter-agitation, propaganda and counter-propaganda, go on quietly and intensely under the surface, often in the most unusual and unexpected places.

Mr. Hoover and his staff were on the job protecting this country from insidious enemies without, as well as within, long before the outbreak of war. Their years of work, their background, in the field of counter-espionage came to be of exceptional value to military and naval intelligence when our forces moved out to meet the enemy overseas. That value continues now, and will continue, happily, until the day of final victory.

At the same time, law-enforcement processes throughout the country have met the challenges of these tense, nerve-searing times with a record of outstanding efficiency. You who have built that record have every right to be proud of it, for it is a tribute to your abilities and your progressive spirit.

In your field, as in mine, every man who would discharge his duty well must have that progressive spirit. He must keep pace with new developments, and make the most of his accumulated experience. To fail to do so in the world today is tantamount to failure.

It is not pleasant to conjure what our military plight might now be if we had failed to take advantage of all the material and mechanical improvements and inventions of even the past 2½ years since we embarked on this war.

Likewise our advances against enemy forces, in all theaters of combat, surely would be the less favorable today if our strategic concepts had remained exactly as they were 2½ years ago, unchanged by experience and the unfolding pattern of events.

A county grand jury once passed a series of resolutions which read:

"*Resolved*, That the present jail is insufficient, and that another ought to be built.

"*Resolved*, That the materials of the old jail be used in constructing the new one.

"*Resolved*, That the old jail shall not be taken down until the new one is finished."

It is a wise practice indeed to use old and time-tested materials in the basic construction of newer concepts, but we cannot make the right use of the materials as long as we hesitate to take them boldly from the setting in which we have customarily seen them and build them firmly, and imaginatively, into our improved plans.

When the Pacific timetable called for our landing operations in the Marshall Islands, we achieved almost complete tactical surprise over the enemy by disregarding his outer strong points, to sail in and launch a direct assault on the very heart of the island chain at Kwajalein. We were able to conceive, and prepare, that unexpected move because we were willing to build plans of unexpected audacity on the foundation of our 25 months of fighting experience and our fast-mounting concentration of physical power.

Your completion of the National Police Academy course marks a milestone—an obviously important milestone—in your career. But it is not an end in itself. This ceremony today is a transition—a return to your workaday week. There, the fund of experience you have gained in this class would seem to be best put to use if it serves, not simply as so many lessons to be remembered, but as a constant spur to your progress, and the further expansion of your study, in the law-enforcement field.

Your teaching of what you have learned here to others should likewise be more effective if you urge them to follow through in the same progressive spirit.

A law enforcement officer, to be a good officer, I believe, should have many qualities in common with the good soldiering man.

Some of these—courage, resourcefulness, loyalty, and the progressive spirit—I have already indicated. The law enforcement officer, like the soldier, needs abundant energy, and should as a matter of duty—to say nothing of personal comfort, maintain the best possible health.

Both men should have, and should cultivate, the ability to make the most of every opportunity for training. We cannot stress that point too much. There is a great deal of difference between merely going through the motions and actually drawing that knowledge and that skill from training which makes for greater proficiency in doing the job.

The basic element of Marine Corps training is emphasis on the individual. Whether a man is ultimately to be a rifleman or a fighter pilot, the traditional purpose is to develop his abilities as an individual fighting unit to the utmost.

The meteoric expansion of our ranks has put severe strains on our training facilities, but we have continued, and will continue, to give each man such processing as might indicate that the success of the entire Marine Corps depends upon his personal success—as indeed, in a sense, it does.

The law enforcement officer, like a good soldiering man, should derive from his training—and his common sense—an intuitive faculty which enables him to adjust quickly to any situation in which he finds himself, and when he is on his own, to make his own right decisions.

This faculty seems to be one of the greatest advantages the American fighting man holds over the average Japanese soldier facing him. I do not mean to imply, by any means, that the Japanese is a stupid fighter. But it has been shown that he is often unable to think clearly for himself when cut off from his immediate leadership. He is apt to become sorely confused as things go wrong.

On the other hand, we have had many incidents in every theater of combat in which American noncommissioned officers have carried on with confidence and grim efficiency to gain the objective after their senior officers have been wounded or killed.

Let us hasten to add that a well-trained soldier cannot expect to be utterly independent in performing his duty. He must know how to take orders, and give them. He must have full appreciation for teamwork and the necessity of cooperating closely with others in the achieving of a common goal. Law-enforcement officers, it would seem to me, can best cope with the complexities of modern criminal and espionage activity by exercising that same appreciation.

In battle, the best fighting men have some measure of vision. They look ahead to what they must do, and plan ahead to the end of getting it done. They know where they want to go, and how they intend to get there. To them, "The reward of one duty fulfilled is the power to fulfill another."

I should believe that practical vision is essential, too, for one charged with law enforcement and crime detection.

Sometimes, it must be admitted, a man's vision is not altogether definable. I recall seeing a questionnaire in which a young marine was asked what type of post-war position he would like to prepare himself for, and his answer was: "A defense job."

The Marine Corps is proud of the fact that a part of the training of Federal Bureau of Investigation personnel takes place on the marine base at Quantico, Va.

As you members of the academy know, the F. B. I. has excellent facilities at Quantico for training in pistol and rifle marksmanship, and in many phases of crime detection.

These facilities, since their construction, have been taxed to capacity, with classes in session, and the target ranges blazing, 7 days a week.

We consider it a privilege to have had the members of this class spend a portion of the

training period at Quantico. I hope your stay was a pleasant, even if an arduous one.

The Marine Corps, of course, has not permitted the talents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to go unshared. Long before we entered the war, the hand-to-hand defensive and disarming tactics of the G-men were made available to our men. I can assure you those tactics have been put to good use.

Thus, we have the armed forces, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and local, county, and State law enforcement officers fighting together for victory—overseas and on the home front—and training side by side here for the achievement of that goal.

No one in this auditorium, or in any auditorium in this Nation, knows when the day of unconditional surrender by our enemies will come. But this we do know: Civil police, Federal Bureau of Investigation, legislator, Government worker, industrial worker, farmer, soldier, sailor, marine—every American—we have an equal share in the responsibility of gaining that day in the shortest time possible. We have the common individual duty, and honor, of fighting, every day, with the relentless courage that is ours by unbroken tradition.

I am sure that all here this morning join me, most sincerely, in wishing every member of the graduating class the very best of fortune and a hearty Godspeed.

Cooperative League Opposes McKellar Amendments to T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad of the opportunity to be able to ask consent to include with my remarks herewith a letter received from Mr. John Carson, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the United States, and reporting the action taken by the board of directors of the league expressing strong opposition to amendments generally known as the McKellar amendments to T. V. A. legislation.

In my judgment the action of the Cooperative League board in this matter is indicative of the broad concern which that board has for the general public welfare of the American people.

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1944.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The board of directors of the Cooperative League of the United States of America in its recent meeting at Chicago went on record in opposition to the amendments to the appropriation act for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the amendments commonly known as the McKellar amendments. The board members discussed the importance of the work of T. V. A. not only with respect to the development of power but with respect to the development of fertilizer and with respect to the research done in other fields. The conclusion was that it would be disastrous to the T. V. A. program and to the public welfare if the operations of T. V. A. were hampered now by controls which would destroy the flexibility of the operating authorities in T. V. A.

I was directed by the board to communicate this decision to the Congress. Inasmuch as it is still doubtful whether the issue will be decided in conference committee or in the respective bodies, the House and the Senate, I am imposing upon you to ask if you would be kind enough to direct this information to whomsoever should receive it in order that it might be given proper consideration.

As you know, the Cooperative League of the United States of America is the educational arm of the cooperative movement in this country. The members of the league are great regional cooperative organizations with which some 10,000,000 of our citizens are affiliated.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN CARSON,
Director, Washington Office.

To What Extent Should O. P. A. Be Changed?—Debate on American Forum of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the debate conducted on the American Forum of the Air on March 21, 1944, on the subject To What Extent Should O. P. A. Be Changed?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

There should be no substantial changes, or may I say no changes whatever, in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, for the simple reason that during the past 11 months, to quote from Mr. Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A., "the cost of living, for the first time since it began to rise late in 1940, has been held to a net increase of exactly zero." In other words, almost a year of stabilization should prove that the act is sound and workable.

We have come a long way in stabilizing living expenses by virtue of the law as written, and any substantial changes will endanger our present effective policies. It goes without saying that almost all amendments offered will be submitted so as to readjust upward the price of this or that commodity, or remove from price control specific commodities. I believe in letting well enough alone, since our purpose has been reasonably accomplished, and with excellent prospect of continued success.

I have always shared the view that the original act, as amended, was sufficiently broad and amply flexible to stabilize our economy effectively, if properly administered. Few of us will deny that most of the criticism of O. P. A. can be placed on the doorstep of defective, faulty, and ill-advised administration. And yet, I doubt the propriety of blaming any particular individual or individuals for their mistakes, because stabilization by law was a new venture in the life of free America. Administrators lacked practical experience in this new field. They found themselves floundering on uncharted seas, and it was necessary for them to resort to the age-old method of the "trial and error system" to find their bearings.

On the other hand, this process entailed controls of over 8,000,000 prices with regulations reaching over 3,000,000 establishments. Food rationing requires contact with 30,000,000 housewives, who represent 132,000,000 persons. Gasoline and fuel-oil rationing requires direct contact with over 50,000,000 individuals, and in millions of cases their rationing must be adjusted to individual needs. I mention these figures to demonstrate the immensity of the undertaking, and by reason of the fact that it had to be put in motion almost overnight one should have expected that mistakes were inevitable, all of which caused harsh criticism.

Be that as it may, I am confident that Administrator Bowles is on the right track. He is doing a good job and I know that he profiting by the mistakes of his predecessors in office. He has gained much through experience, and it must be admitted that the American people are beginning to appreciate the importance of a stabilized economy.

Mr. Bowles has simplified many of the regulations and forms; as an example, financial reporting forms have been cut from 21 pages to 8.

Full consultation with industry has become the rule, and such a course is bound to engender better cooperation.

Increased responsibility has been given regional administrators and district directors, thereby decentralizing authority, which means the cutting out of much red tape.

The central authority in Washington has been reorganized with clear and simple lines of responsibility, which enables decisions to be made with a minimum of delay. It will be remembered that much criticism was caused by undue delays. There were too many cooks in the kitchen, so to speak, and much valuable time was spent in checking, rechecking, and then double checking.

These and many other administrative reforms have created a much better feeling for price control by millions of Americans. I know that much more will be accomplished in that direction by the application of practical, common horse sense in the administration of the law, all of which can be done as the law now stands. Before considering any amendments, Congress should give full weight to the views and advice of Mr. Bowles, who is on the ground and who knows best what is necessary to better accomplish the task before him.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you Senator ELLENDER. Next, Representative A. L. MILLER, Republican of Nebraska. Congressman MILLER.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE A. L. MILLER

The long arm of the Government control and regulations today reaches from Washington into every home and every activity of our people. The one causing the most irritation has been the O. P. A. Therefore, it is timely to discuss on this forum the question, To What Extent Should O. P. A. Be Changed?

This Congress and the great majority of the American people are aware that price controls are vital parts of our wartime machinery in order to prevent inflation. I beg to make the following suggestions:

1. The laws governing the O. P. A. should be amended in such a manner as to retain and strengthen inflation controls and at the same time eliminate the abuses and injustices now apparent.

2. There should be a revision and simplification of the rules, regulations, and orders. There are too many illegal, absurd, useless, and conflicting regulations which create great confusion to the extent that the average citizen does not know how to comply with the law.

3. Take every method to insure the greatest possible production of food and other consumer goods. The only sure method of holding prices down is to increase the supply of the goods desired.

4. Amend the law to insure the right of appeal to the proper Federal court, with the power to review the evidence, for every person who has been found guilty of infractions of the law or regulations set up under authority of the act.

No Government agency should have complete domination by regulations over the free thinking and action of the American citizen.

5. O. P. A. should give more power to State and local directors to settle problems within their own State.

6. The scope and control of O. P. A. should be limited to the basic items affecting increased costs of living. It is folly to believe that any executive control can be exercised over the thousands of items which the ambitious program coming from Washington now seeks to include.

7. Announce that the policy of O. P. A. from now on is to put into effect only those orders which are necessary to bring about adequate price control. The functions of O. P. A. should be to control prices, not profits.

8. Put on a campaign to sell the people on the idea that O. P. A. is their agent and can hope to succeed only if it is supported by the determination of the people to refrain from practices that bring on inflation.

9. Subsides should be eliminated and prohibited. Congress has twice passed upon this subject with an overwhelming vote against subsidies.

10. The O. P. A. must rely on business groups to a greater extent, accepting their considered judgment and advice, for the businessman knows how untried regulations are likely to work. The Office has no right to change established business policies.

Theories and ideologies might be fine things in peacetime but what the O. P. A. has needed for some time is more good common horse sense. Men who know the problems of the merchant, the farmer, and the businessman. Then there will be less red tape and the O. P. A. will operate far more satisfactorily to the American people.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman MILLER. Now, Representative JAMES A. WRIGHT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. Congressman WRIGHT.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES A. WRIGHT

Being a typical American, impatient of governmental restraint upon the details of my everyday living, I can get as exasperated at O. P. A., with its multitude of regulations, as anyone. I join with most of America in looking forward to the day when O. P. A. controls can be lifted. Americans are a nation of individualists. It is the same individualism that makes them such excellent, quick-thinking soldiers; that also annoys them when they have to dole out ration points for their food, shoes, and gasoline.

But the most outstanding feature of O. P. A. is that it has worked; in spite of its unpopularity it has been spectacularly successful. It has held down the cost of the war, the cost of living, and has assured a fair division of scarce foods to the American people. Therefore, I want O. P. A. continued with no crippling amendments. Modern war, with its emphasis upon materials, causes an increase in the national income and a decrease in the amount of goods for civilian consumption. The answer is rapidly mounting prices, a decrease in real purchasing power, and inflation. Price control imposes a dam against this inflationary tide. Against this dam continually surge the pressure of high prices for scarce goods and of high wages for scarce labor. These forces must be withheld. You cannot yield here and there when the pressure becomes too great, otherwise you will soon find yourself with no control whatever.

The last war cost us $33,000,000,000, much of that unnecessary because of inflated prices. This war is costing us $95,000,000,000 per year. We estimate that price control has thus far saved us the staggering sum of $65,000,000,000. Living costs, of consuming interest to all householders, rose in price 64.6 percent in the last war—in this war only 25.9 percent. If we had started our price control in the beginning of the war we would probably have had only a 10-percent rise.

The main criticism against O. P. A. was in its bad public relations. Enforcement was efficient in most instances but unsympathetic. We have today an Administrator in the person of Mr. Bowles, who, with his lifelong experience in getting along with people as a businessman, is doing an excellent job in selling the O. P. A. to the American people. Much of the other criticisms of the O. P. A. arises from its hardship upon certain classes of businessmen. I will not argue that many businessmen have not been squeezed, some of them squeezed out of business. Some of these hardships were preventable and should be prevented in the future. Others are the inevitable result of a rigid war economy. It is not practical to have different prices for each of the millions of American businessmen. Any amendment designed to relieve a business group must pass two rigid tests if it is to be in the public interest. First, will it break down the general system of controls? The welfare of the many must be preferred to the welfare of the few. Second, can it be administered without hiring an additional army of enforcement officers? O. P. A. is limited in its personnel and the more individual treatment that is accorded, the more complexity and administrative detail are bound to result.

But the over-all picture is not gloomy. Rent control has been assailed as being too rigid and unjust to certain landlords. But the number of real estate foreclosures has sharply declined. Sales are active and the prices substantially above pre-war levels. The net income for apartment houses and private rental houses is higher than ever before. As to general business prosperity, corporation profits, even after heavy taxes, have increased since 1939 from four to eight and one-half billion, the highest ever reached by American business. Small business is doing better than ever before, profits are at record levels—business failures are at an all-time low and small concerns in the field of retailing are steadily improving their position as compared to the chain stores. Farm operators have increased their income 182 percent since 1939, or almost 90 percent since 1919, which was a peak year. The net savings of individuals in 1943 was about thirty-three and one-half billion, another all-time high. There has been a substantial increase in wages of workers, even when the rise in the cost of living has been discounted. Some workers in nonwar industries and many persons of fixed income appear to be the only sufferers in terms of their ability to meet their necessary living expenses.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman WRIGHT. And now, Representative ROBERT W. KEAN, Republican, of New Jersey. Congressman KEAN.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT W. KEAN

Price control is an essential part of our fight against inflation. It is no partisan matter. The O. P. A. should and will be continued but the act must be streamlined and strengthened in the light of our experience.

The President, in his message to Congress on January 11, emphasized the necessity for early reenactment of the law. In spite of repeated urgings ever since by Republican members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, our New Deal chairman has refused to set a date for its consideration. This attitude by the administration spokesman might lead to a suspicion that the President's request for speedy action may have been merely campaign oratory.

It is true that the chairman at long last introduced a bill, which he has so far pigeonholed, for continuation of price control, but in it he does not propose to change the crossing of a "t" nor the dotting of an "i." He would not alter, clarify, improve, or amend the present law, thus indicating his belief that it is perfect. The people of our country know better.

O. P. A. has used its powers to enforce regulations contrary to the intent of Congress. We set out to control prices—not to control all industry—not to change established business methods.

Ample time should be given for all who have constructive ideas to present suggestions for improvement in the present law. In general, details should await these hearings.

But, among other things, do we want the O. P. A. to continue to control profits? Is this not the job of taxation and renegotiation?

And surely there should be a board of review to whom those aggrieved by price ceilings might appeal, as was provided in the original bill passed by the House.

Then, too, we must strengthen that section of the law which forbids O. P. A. from compelling changes in recognized business practices.

And the definition of what is a strategic and critical material ought to be clarified.

Should we not also protect minorities by modifying the wording through which the O. P. A. has held that regulations, unfair to many, are in order just so long as they are generally fair and equitable?

Representatives of small business have often complained of squeezes between wholesalers and retailers as a result of price ceilings. We should study whether it is possible to prevent these through legislation.

It has been a grave disappointment to me that Mr. Bowles has not seen fit to volunteer suggestions in the light of his experience. Stubborn insistence that the law is perfect is not constructive, neither is blind criticism nor irresponsible attack on O. P. A. Improvements in the law should be obtained by cooperative effort. Only by all pulling together will we achieve that united support from the American people without which price control cannot be fully effective.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman KEAN. The American Forum of the Air continues with its round table discussion of "To What Extent Should O. P. A. Be Changed?" Senator ELLENDER, will you open the panel?

Senator ELLENDER. I should like to ask Congressman MILLER a question. He made 10 suggestions and I presume that he meant that they be dealt with by way of amendments. I am in agreement that in order to do away with subsidies it would be necessary to amend the law, but I am wondering if the Congressman will be good enough to tell us what special changes he would make in the act to retain and strengthen inflation controls as he has suggested.

Representative MILLER. I think the greatest thing to control inflation is production. If you have a large production of foods, for instance, or things that people want, that controls inflation. Many of the acts of the O. P. A. have been those of destroying production. Let's get down to your State. I believe you are interested in strawberries in your State. I notice in the last few days that you gentlemen have had several meetings with the O. P. A. relative to strawberries. The O. P. A. sets up some panels to sort of follow the advice of businessmen. May I ask if they followed your advice in the matter of strawberries when it came to putting price ceilings on them?

Senator ELLENDER. The question is not settled and I presume that O. P. A. will not follow our suggestions.

Representative MILLER. Well, that is what they are doing all along.

Senator ELLENDER. But my observation is that everybody is for price control provided the controls are imposed on the other fellow.

Representative MILLER. Do you think it is possible to control the price of such a perishable fruit as strawberries?

Senator ELLENDER. Yes; I think so. It would be difficult, but I think it could be done.

Representative MILLER. Your people don't think so down in your district.

Senator ELLENDER. The question, though, is would you suggest that the law be amended so as to exclude strawberries, because that is the question before us at the moment?

Representative MILLER. Yes; I think perishable fruits and vegetables cannot possibly be controlled by price ceilings. We did not have price ceilings a year ago; we had O. P. A. Strawberries have been on the market from Florida and Texas for quite some time and now they are proposing to put a ceiling on a perishable product. I notice your own colleague, Mr. MORRISON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, recently attended a meeting of the O. P. A. They did not seem to be able to get anywhere with them. They did not follow their considered judgment and advice.

Senator ELLENDER. I can give you the——

Representative WRIGHT. May I interrupt? I do not wish to disturb anything you have to say, Senator, and possibly you are better able than I to answer that question, but I do know from the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee that one of the worst spots that they had in food control was fresh fruits and vegetables. They did not have any ceiling on them at first. There was plenty of money to buy, the housewives could not buy rationed articles, the prices of other commodities were fixed, and the prices of fresh fruits and vegetables soared. It became necessary in order to reduce the cost of living, and it was reduced materially by attempting to squeeze down the prices of fresh fruits and vegetables.

I do not know its applicability to your strawberry situation, but I know generally that was so.

Representative MILLER. I think that is right, Congressman WRIGHT, but may I say this: that O. P. A. went out to encourage an increase in the price of cabbage. They issued a 2,500-word order within the last few months on cabbage seed, and last week down in Texas there were five and a half million heads of cabbage plowed under because of O. P. A. regulations, 25,000 acres of spring and winter vegetables plowed under. Do you think that helps inflation?

Senator ELLENDER. I thought you said a while ago that production would help to dispel inflation.

Representative MILLER. Correct, it does, but O. P. A. regulations prohibit them from getting onto the market.

Senator ELLENDER. How?

Representative MILLER. By the regulations, it is impossible for the men to make a profit. They issued a 2,500-word regulation on how to plant cabbages. They planted them; now they are being plowed under.

Senator ELLENDER. A ceiling was fixed on cabbage last year and the farmers made plenty of money. This year they planted much more than last with the result that the market became glutted.

Representative MILLER. Whose fault was that?

Senator ELLENDER. Certainly not O. P. A. According to the argument you made a while ago, if you permit unlimited production that will curb inflation. I would like you to answer why it is that your argument doesn't work in the case of cabbage.

Representative MILLER. They will have inflation if they don't put this cabbage on the market, I will say that to you, and if they don't put cabbage and carrots on. There were 15,000 acres of onions plowed under, and if you buy onions in Washington today you buy them on the black market at 15 to 30 cents a pound.

Senator ELLENDER. Congressman MILLER, the black market can be controlled if the people will help. O. P. A. has placed most vegetables of all kinds, and fresh fruit, under control for the reason that if we didn't have controls in fresh fruits and vegetables, and so forth, everybody would want to grow them, and you couldn't force farmers to grow, say, more wheat or more corn or more of this or that than which is essential to our economy and our war effort.

Representative WRIGHT. That comes right back to the point that you made, too, and I agree with the Senator completely on that. You were talking about limiting your controls to basic items. It has been a matter of experience that if you don't control all prices, your labor, production, and everything else tends to gravitate toward those uncontrolled articles and you don't have any control at all.

Representative KEAN. I wanted to change the subject away from farm goods. We have been talking about farm things all the time. I want to talk a little about businessmen. Businessmen tell me that when they seek conferences with the O. P. A. they meet a lot of capable and well-meaning men and the discussions seem to get somewhere, but then after the meetings close the O. P. A. makes decisions completely contrary to what has been discussed in the conference. Now, don't you think that the O. P. A. should give authority to the people who meet with the businessmen to make decisions then and there?

Senator ELLENDER. Of course, you have to have one head. If you were to give authority to these advisory boards to do the thinking and of making the final decisions, business would probably have its way.

Representative KEAN. You don't think that Mr. Bowles makes all these 8,000,000 decisions himself?

Senator ELLENDER. Why, of course not. He does it by and through the advice of people who are probably engaged in these businesses, and I am sure that he takes into consideration the past history of certain businesses before reaching a conclusion. I think that if you look over statistics, Congressman KEAN, you will find that business has fared very, very well under price control.

Representative KEAN. It has fared very well through a wartime economy.

Senator ELLENDER. Of course.

Representative KEAN. Of course.

Senator ELLENDER. And just stop and think. Prior to 1939 your corporate income, as I recall it, was about $4,000,000,000; now it is about eight and one-half billions. I grant you that that is due to the fact that they have had more business, but what has caused them to fare so well is that they had a stabilized economy whereby they could go ahead without fear of cut-throat competition and inflationary prices.

Representative WRIGHT. Another thing, too, Senator; obviously you can't fix one price without any relation at all to other prices. There is an integrated price structure. The decision must be made some place. I think that Chester Bowles has done as much as any man could do to try to bring cooperation with practical business people, and I admit that in the beginning of O. P. A. that wasn't always the case, and, as I said in my statement, I think that one of O. P. A.'s worst faults was public relations. I think that it was the fact that they didn't attempt to get the point of view of the people that they were dealing with and consequently O. P. A. was unpopular and now nobody will have a good name for it. If you will only realize what it has accomplished rather than its faults, I think we would be better off.

Representative MILLER. Representative WRIGHT, do you think that the O. P. A. is now cooperating with businessmen in things that concern their business?

Representative WRIGHT. Much better than they have. I don't say that it is perfect. It is difficult to get every businessman.

Representative MILLER. I think that is true. I want to refer to one thing, for instance, that affects my country out there. Last winter we had a black market in meat and we are going to have a shortage of meat again. This is true in spite of the fact that we have on the ranges of America today about 84,000,000 head of cattle, or will have in 1944. That is about 12,000,000 more than the 10-year average, and yet those cattle are out upon the range and our stockyards, our feeders, have 20 percent less in the feed yards where they actually put the meat upon the animals. The stockmen, the feeders, the cattlemen and all of them came to O. P. A. and said, "We don't want any roll-back on cattle; we don't want any slaughter allocations. We want to go ahead and feed." They didn't let them do it.

Representative WRIGHT. Was that prime quality?

Representative MILLER. Prime quality, beef of any kind. Now they are proposing to put a 30-percent additional subsidy on them so they can get the cattle off the range. Those cattle don't have any meat on them; they are not fit to butcher, yet that is a thing that O. P. A. has done and it is actually causing a shortage of meat. In other words, we are living in a country where there is cattle, cattle everywhere, and not a bite to eat.

Representative WRIGHT. If there are cattle, eventually they will get to the consumer.

Representative MILLER. No, not unless they let the feeders feed them. They put a price ceiling upon the cattle but not upon the feed, the hay, the labor, the salt, and everything that goes into the production of beef. They changed the rules too many times in the middle of the feed yard and the cattlemen are just not feeding cattle.

Senator ELLENDER. Congressman, we discussed that question on this forum some time ago and, as I recall, the increase in cattle production was over 25 percent, in hog production over 50 percent, chicken production was something like 50 percent, and an increase in many other animals that consume feed. Won't you agree that one of the main reasons today why so many cattle are not being fed as in the past is because of a lack of feed?

Representative MILLER. Oh, part of it is lack of feed.

Senator ELLENDER. Won't you say that the major trouble arises from a lack of feed?

Representative MILLER. No; I would not. These people can get feed out there but they can't make any profit on feeding the cattle. They claim it is costing them about 20 cents a pound now to put a pound of beef on these cattle and they just can't afford to do it.

Senator ELLENDER. I would like to ask either Congressman KEAN or Congressman MILLER to answer this question. They have made many suggestions for amendments and, as I indicated a while ago, from the amendments suggested I believe that there is only one that Congressman MILLER has made that would require legislation, that is in respect to subsidies. Now, I would like for either of them to answer what is there under the act as now written that couldn't be done that has been suggested by these 9 or 10 amendments that you have proposed?

Representative KEAN. Senator, I gather from your attitude that you would dispense with Congress entirely. You believe in Congress by directive, by some great power, the President.

Senator ELLENDER. No, sir; no, sir; I don't. The law provides that the purpose of it is to stabilize our economy and, as I indicated in my opening remarks, for the past 11 or 12 months we have had a stabilized economy and that has been done under the law as written, and the question that I am asking you is, Of all the suggestions that you have made, except that pertaining to subsidies, could they not be done under the law as now written?

Representative KEAN. No, Senator; they could not be.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, point them out to me, if you can.

Representative KEAN. Well, the first one that I mentioned was the question of the Board of Review. Then I want to strengthen——

Senator ELLENDER (interposing). Well, what about the Board of Review?

Representative KEAN. The Board of Review? Today it is impossible for any aggrieved party to get any change in price ceilings at all. The only question of review is whether they are according to law or arbitrary or capricious, all of which means the same thing.

Representative WRIGHT. Mr. KEAN, you can't expect Congress to fix the price ceilings. Congress can't administer O. P. A. It isn't equipped to do it, or staffed; it doesn't have the time.

Representative KEAN. There is no intention to have Congress do it. The board of review as it was in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives, in the original act—I don't believe you were here at the time.

Representative WRIGHT. I think that I was. I think it was just shortly after I came.

Representative KEAN. We passed the bill and it provided that, with the advice and consent of the Senate, there be a board of review of five men, that when the Price Administrator set a price ceiling, that ceiling would remain in existence but that aggrieved parties would have the right to appeal to this board of review and that this board of review could set aside these price ceilings—not retroactively—but as of the date when they made their decision.

Representative WRIGHT. Well, it is a question of what party you want to trust with responsibility. Now, my idea is to get a good administrator in there; don't divide the authority, and I will tell you what I would like to do, though; I would like to see with O. P. A. what has been done with several of the committees of the House and several of the agencies, I would like to see them report to Congress and have an informal session where the complaints can be ironed out, explained, criticized, and you have a more effective cooperation of the Congress with their own agency, which is O. P. A.

Representative KEAN. That is what I proposed in a speech that I made a year ago January. I believe you heard it.

Representative WRIGHT. I agree with you thoroughly.

Representative KEAN. But every committee should take the responsibility for every new piece of legislation that is introduced and passed and from time to time review the work and consider in a friendly atmosphere if it couldn't improve its own child, the law.

Representative WRIGHT. Yes, it is Congress's fault as much as it is the O. P. A.

Senator ELLENDER. Congressman KEAN, there is no doubt in my mind that if you gave this Board of Review the power to change any of these price regulations it would probably upset the applecart. It was pointed out by Congressman WRIGHT a while ago that by placing price controls on one commodity it will affect the price of other commodities and therefore that is one of the main reasons for centralizing the authority, and that is why I believe that the Congress has refused in the past to permit this Board of Review that you have suggested to function as you are now proposing.

Representative MILLER. Don't you think, Senator ELLENDER, that there has been too much in the past of the so-called kangaroo court procedures out in the country? They are still doing it out in my State, where they pull some poor fellow in for violation of the O. P. A. regulations and the O. P. A. inspector is the police and the court and the judge and the executor of the sentence. The man who is convicted or aggrieved has no way to appeal at all to the ordinary constituted courts. Don't you think that he ought to have a right to appeal to the courts in an orderly manner, in an American manner?

Senator ELLENDER. You mean on price fixing?

Representative MILLER. Price fixing or rationing or anything.

Senator ELLENDER. That is the suggestion made by Congressman KEAN a while ago and that, to my way of thinking, would result in a kind of divided authority and the Administrator wouldn't know where he was going.

Representative MILLER. I think that is being done. You think you would have to give more authority to the local boards and the State boards?

Senator ELLENDER. Now, you talk about these kangaroo court procedures; I have heard about them, but——

Representative MILLER (interposing). Oh, they have them out in my State; they are common.

Senator ELLENDER. I will tell you what you ought to have in your State, though; a lot of court enforcement to prevent your black market.

Representative MILLER. We don't have so much black market there; you have the black market in the East.

Senator ELLENDER. You said a while ago that the black market was prevalent in your State.

Representative MILLER. You have the black market here in Washington, in Mr. WRIGHT'S district.

Representative WRIGHT. Not where I come from; we are law-abiding people.

Representative MILLER. When they want something to eat they are not going to be able to get it.

Senator ELLENDER. It strikes me that having had O. P. A. for the past 2 years the people are beginning to find out what price controls and ratings mean to our economy. As I suggested from this very platform some time ago, my hope is that the people of this Nation would consider themselves as sentinels to see that the law is enforced.

Representative MILLER. I agree with you; that is fine; it ought to be done.

Senator ELLENDER. All of that can be done under the law without amendment. I have been trying to get out of either your or Congressman KEAN any suggestions as to why the law should be amended in order to carry out the proposals that you made in your opening remarks.

Representative MILLER. I can tell you why, because in the past they have issued over 3,300 directives, they fill 20 fat volumes, the directives and amendments thereto.

Senator ELLENDER. That has been changed by amended regulations.

Representative MILLER. Has it been changed? They are still issuing the orders; they are going to issue one on your strawberries in the next few days that you won't like, but it is coming.

Senator ELLENDER. Your idea would be to exclude strawberries, to exclude cabbage and every other vegetable?

Representative MILLER. I think we ought to take the advice and counsel of men like yourself and your strawberry growers who know something about the business.

Senator ELLENDER. And maybe you would want to do away with the ceiling price on live cattle.

Representative MILLER. They don't have a ceiling price on live cattle. They pay a subsidy to the packer which amounts to a ceiling, but it is not a ceiling. The price on cattle was rolled back $1.50 a hundred as soon as they paid the subsidy to the packers. The grower didn't get the subsidy.

Senator ELLENDER. I think you are mistaken when you say there is no ceiling on live cattle. There is one from $8 to $16 a hundred, as I recall.

Representative MILLER. You are only penalized if you don't stay within that.

Senator ELLENDER. It amounts to a ceiling.

Representative KEAN. Do you approve of the proposition of controlling profits like Mr. Vinson's regulation of November 16, in which he said that certain people would be allowed to make 2 percent and other producers would be allowed to make nothing if they were making good profits? That is certainly contrary to the law.

Senator ELLENDER. I don't know. You have got to go into the profit side before you are able to get price control; you agree to that statement, I am certain.

Representative WRIGHT. You don't want to fix a price to keep a man from getting a profit; I mean you have to take into consideration a profit when you fix the price of an industry. I don't say that the primary purpose of O. P. A. should be to fix profits, and I don't think, although there may have been a couple of fellows working over there at one time who might have thought so, that it is the philosophy of O. P. A. today. I think the philosophy of O. P. A. today is price control.

Representative KEAN. Mr. Vinson's directive to Mr. Bowles was in case a producer who is currently realizing excessively high profits the producer's total unit cost for the individual unit item affected is all he could get.

Senator ELLENDER. Why isn't that sound in price control? Why should you permit a man to make nothing?

Representative KEAN. He wasn't telling him to make nothing.

Representative MILLER. Don't you think it is production and not price control that will take care of inflation? It is production, after all, and not price control.

Senator ELLENDER. My dear sir, under the methods put into effect in the last 2 years I think we have made a marvelous advancement in production.

Representative WRIGHT. Better than we have ever had before.

Representative MILLER. Then it is necessary to ration the articles when you get a large production, or would you rather plow them under like you do the cabbages and carrots down in the valley?

Senator ELLENDER. You mention your cabbage story; that is, of course, in a few instances.

Representative MILLER. Oh, I had some plowed under.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand that. That is because you had a few greedy farmers who made a pile of money the year before in cabbages and they thought they would plant more cabbage this year and make another big scoop.

Representative KEAN. The answer really is production. If you have sufficient production we won't need rationing, we won't need price control, we won't need anything; but you can't get it today. Of course, you have to have price control.

Senator ELLENDER. But in a balanced production program you should produce so much wheat, so much corn, so much of this and so much of that so as to have a sufficiency of all essentials. In order to accomplish such a goal I contend that you should by all means have price control over all commodities. You can readily see that as to those commodities

that are not under price control, as Congressman Wright stated a while ago, you will have the farmers planting peas, strawberries, and cabbage or whatever is not under control, and it would have a tendency of not getting the desired amount of labor to produce those crops that are really necessary. In other words farmers growing crops not under control may obtain more money and could afford to pay better wages.

Representative MILLER. I think that is right, Senator.

Mr. Granik, you know I am interested in how far this thing has stayed above politics here. It has been so interesting—two men on either side of the table. Mr. Bowles is a good Republican; he is doing a good job. One thing I would like to say is this: If I had to make a decision between abolishing O. P. A. or the Republican National Committee, I would abolish the Republican National Committee, because I think the O. P. A. has made a lot of Republicans in this country. Every election shows that, and I think it is going to have more effect as we go on from time to time.

Senator ELLENDER. Don't you crow too early. November is coming and I heard the same boasts in 1940.

Representative MILLER. You are down in Louisiana.

The Christian Movement Toward World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Christian Movement Toward World Order," delivered by Dr. O. Frederick Nolde before the Lutheran Laymen's Fellowship, of Washington, and the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C. Dr. Nolde is professor at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. He is also a member of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, of which John Foster Dulles is chairman. Dr. Nolde speaks with the authority of the Commission.

Mr. President, I have submitted the text of the address to the Public Printer and find that the cost of printing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will amount to $156.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Events of considerable significance are happening throughout the Christian world. They are taking place with such rapidity and with such apparent interrelationship, that many people think a movement is emerging and taking shape. This series of developments is frequently referred to as the Christian movement toward world order. My purpose is to set forth a characterization of it. Any effort to organize a definition of something while it is still in process of formation is attended by obvious dangers. Nevertheless, we must, from time to time, pause and appraise current happenings. Obviously, certain modifications will have to be introduced into the characterization as developments move along.

Before attempting to mark out the predominant aspects of this movement, it seems wise to offset a few misconceptions which are popularly entertained.

1. This movement is not traditional pacifism. The choice does not rest between war and peace. That represents an oversimplification of the issue. The real choice rests between a world of international anarchy and disorder, where maladjustments are allowed to come into being and to develop until a bursting point is reached and, on the other hand, a world of international order, where mechanisms or institutions are in operation to deal with present evils, to prevent the occurrence of future evils, and to allow for creative growth within nations and among nations. Pacifists and nonpacifists are participating. The latter far outnumber the former. The two groups find a meeting point when they focus attention upon what is to be accomplished at the conclusion of the war.

2. This movement is not unpatriotic. People are conscious of the dangers and the hardships to which their friends and relatives are exposed on far-flung battlefronts. Inevitably, they feel somewhat ill at ease when, in the comparative comfort of home surroundings, they deliberate upon peace settlements and world order. Nevertheless, it seems imperative that men and women should thus assign themselves to what may be thought of as a long-range objective. In fact, such activity may represent a type of higher patriotism. Not only church leaders, but governmental officials have concurred in this point of view. Many statements have been set forth by them to encourage people in all walks of life to interest themselves and to become active in the type of world that ought to emerge from this present catastrophe. An illustration of these opinions may be found in a statement made by Secretary of State Cordell Hull in a radio address on July 23, 1942. "Without impediment to the fullest prosecution of the war—indeed, for its most effective prosecution—the United Nations should, from time to time, as they did in adopting the Atlantic Charter, formulate and proclaim their common views regarding fundamental policies which will chart for mankind a wise course based on enduring spiritual values. In support of such policies, an informed public opinion must be developed. This is a task of intensive study, hard thinking, broad vision, and leadership—not for governments alone, but especially for parents, and teachers, and clergymen, and all those within each nation who provide spiritual, moral, and intellectual guidance. Never did so great and so compelling a duty in this respect devolve upon those who are in positions of responsibility, public and private." The attitude here represented has been consistently maintained by leaders in government.

3. This movement is not un-Christian. There are some who have feared that the church is entering the political and economic arenas in unwarranted fashion. This is not the case. It remains the primary task of the Christian church to bring men into right relations with God through repentance and faith in Christ, and to bring them into right relations with their fellow men. In this movement the Christian church is addressing pertinent Christian truths to an area of life which has to do with relations among organized segments of society, the nations and peoples of the world. Fundamentally, it is making a testimony concerning the relevance of Christian teaching to the needs of modern society. Specifically, it is doing two things: (a) it is offering to governmental leaders the benefit of Christian insights and judgments in the area in which governmental leaders must operate; (b) it is seeking to strengthen and to enlighten the consciences of Christians so that they, as citizens, may play a responsible part in the world society of which they are members.

This movement is not traditional pacifism; it is not unpatriotic; it is not un-Christian. What, then, is it? I shall set forth and illustrate the following five characteristics. Perforce, my illustrations of the first will be somewhat more extensive.

I. The Christian Movement Toward World Order views war as a symptom or manifestation of an international disease and seeks to bring permanent Christian truths to bear upon the root causes or tension points from which international maladjustments or wars inevitably emerge.

II. It is transcending the lines of separation fixed by traditional faiths, and, in areas of common agreement, is enlisiting the cooperation of good will everywhere.

III. It is cultivating an international Christian approach to an international problem.

IV. It is proceeding with an attack from the top down; that is, it is attempting to establish and to maintain effective contacts with governmental leaders.

V. It is proceeding with an attack from the bottom up; that is, it is seeking to enlighten and to strengthen the consciences of Christians in all walks of life, so that they will assume a responsible part as Christian citizens.

I. The Christian Movement Toward World Order views war as a symptom or manifestation of an international disease, and seeks to bring permanent Christian truths to bear upon the root causes or tension points from which international maladjustments or wars inevitably emerge.

When a physician is confronted by a patient, he is not content with any superficial treatment of a symptom. He wants to discover the causes from which the symptom has developed. Only when he has identified them and provided some counteraction for them, does he rest content. Similarly, in this movement, Christian leaders are not merely rebelling against the phenomenon of war. They recognize that war is a symptom of an international disease, and that at its root lies a host of causes from which the external maladjustments surely derive. Documents, prepared by Christian commissions in different countries, have been attempting to relate Christian teachings to the tension points in international life. A brief summary of findings is here presented. There is no pretense to inclusiveness. The material is intended merely to illustrate this first mark of the Christian Movement Toward World Order.

1. Violation of moral law. A cause for difficulty among the peoples of the world attaches to the manner in which contracting nations regard treaties and treaty provisions. Treaties are made and maintained by moral compulsion or by the power politics which operate on the basis of military or economic force. Moral law may be violated in one or more of three ways: (1) by refusal to become party to a treaty that is just and fair, and to the best interests of all concerned; (2) by breaking the provisions of a treaty solely on the grounds of self-interest or self-gain; (3) by denying the right to change the provisions of a treaty when the provisions were originally at fault or when changed circumstances make modifications imperative. Too frequently, only the second of these has been considered a violation of moral law. In reality, the first or the third may be the true cause for breaking a treaty and promoting an act of aggression.

Christianity believes that moral law, no less than physical law, undergirds our world. It contends that the moral order, which is fundamental and eternal, is relevant to the corporate life of men in nations and in society as well as to the life of individuals. The sickness and suffering which affect our present society are symptoms and proof of

an indifference to and a direct violation of the moral law. Guilt of this indifference or violation becomes a relative matter, and no nation upon earth is completely free from a measure of responsibility. Christianity therefore proclaims that moral law must become controlling not only in the lives of men as individuals, but also in their corporate life as nations.

2. Inadequacy of International Government. We are, at the present moment, victims of an unbalanced growth. Politically, we are still creatures of nationalism. No new form of government, transcending national lines and designed inclusively to meet world needs has appeared since the rise of national consciousness and the development of national states. Meanwhile, in many areas of our life, we have become international. Tremendous improvements in communication and transportation have knit the peoples of the world closely together in social and economic intercourse. The problems which inevitably arise from these contacts on a world scale find no corresponding directive or control in political structure.

Christian leaders, and to a lesser extent, Christian people in all walks of life, have come to recognize more and more over the last decade a characteristic which inhered in Christianity from its very inception. Christianity or the Christian church is not a national phenomenon. In the truest sense, there is no Christian church of the United States, or of England, or of Germany. Christianity is ecumenical; it represents a universal or catholic mind. The Christian church is coextensive with the inhabited world. As a result from this growing realization, Christian leaders in increasing numbers have taken the position that national states cannot represent the final word in government. Without contending for the abrogation of national sovereignties and without becoming proponents of any particular scheme of world government, they have have nevertheless expressed the conviction that some kind of organic relation among the peoples of the world harmonizes with the ecumenical conception of Christianity, and makes possible the fullest expression of that conception.

3. Economic maladjustments. The primacy of economic issues as a cause for disturbance among nations needs no demonstration. The more obvious problems of tariffs and currencies run out into endless lines of agriculture, manufacture, commerce, transportation, and ultimately touch the life, not only of every nation, but also of every last individual within each nation. In spite of the recognized international repercussions from many of the economic enactments by separate nations, no adequate steps towards international control over economic relationships has been effected. In the realm of economic activity, each nation goes its independent way with the result that the seeds of international controversy are continuously sown.

Christianity is concerned with the effects of economic dispositions upon people and Christianity is concerned that the people who make the economic dispositions shall do so with a regard for the rights and privileges of others. It recognizes that economic injustices work hardship on people as individuals and have an adverse effect upon Christian fellowship. Christian leaders are becoming more determined in their stand that the government of economic relations must be such as to provide opportunity for all men in all countries of the world to meet their basic economic need. In the definition of basic economic need, two criteria operate: (1) the rights and well-being of the individual; (2) the rights and well-being of society or of individuals comprising the social group. The major problem seems to rest in the effort to keep the operation of these two criteria in proper balance; that it, in the effort to establish conditions under which the individual may rightfully seek his own welfare, and at the same time, not interfere with but actually contribute to the welfare of others. Toward this end, Christian standards must direct the requirements to be met by individuals, by industry, by the national state, and by any world organization.

4. Race antagonisms and discriminations. The difficulties arising in this connection may fall within the confines of a single nation. For example, the people of the United States must recognize more intelligently the problems and responsibilities occasioned for them by the large Negro population in this country. Too frequently efforts to ameliorate the situation have been animated by sentimentality or by the desire for political support. The problem remains and dare not be ignored. The difficulties attached to minorities and race relations also take on an international complexion. They become manifest in dealing with national minorities within any country, in establishing national borders, in immigration and emigration restrictions, in the determination of economic and cultural opportunities, and in many other perplexing situations. Persecutions and discriminations frequently result.

Christianity believes in the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. The message of the Christian Gospel relates to all men, regardless of race or color. While it recognizes predominant racial differences among the varied nations and peoples of the earth, the Christian Church does not support a fancied, intrinsic superiority of any one race. Christian leaders therefore believe that it is within their province to contend that the rights and liberties of racial and religious minorities in all lands should be recognized and safeguarded. Freedom of religious worship, of speech, of assembly, of the press, and of scientific inquiry and teaching are fundamental to human development and in keeping with the moral law. The advancement of one group beyond another brings with it no special privilege, only added responsibility.

5. Colonial possessions. A variety of conditions fertile to world disorder exists wherever a somewhat powerful nation regards a territory and its inhabitants as personal property. A colonial people may rebel against some form of exploitation, or they may merely reach a point where group or racial pride leads to a declaration of independence. Granted a sufficient measure of physical and material strength, they will resort to war. Or, a powerful nation near a colony which is held by a distant nation may feel that its operations are restricted and thus find an excuse for precipitating warlike acts. Even in times of peace, when friendly relations are maintained, colonial possessions are a disturbing factor because of the everlasting threat of war. A colony may be entirely harmless to a nearby nation in normal times and yet become a thorn in its side in the event that war should be declared with the holding country.

Christian leaders are saying that no nation is inherently superior to another and that the people governed should have a voice in their government. Obviously, the resources of a people ought to be exploited neither by a national state nor by corporations whose activities are permitted or endorsed by a national state. The view that colonies should be made independent as rapidly as possible is gaining ground. It is further claimed that, as long as some outside control is needed in any colonial possession, there should be international supervision to promote reasonable progress toward autonomy.

6. Armaments. The right of separate nations to develop military machines without restriction leads to a mad race, the end of which no man can conceive. Disarmament treaties have fallen short of their purposes in that they were not sufficiently inclusive and contracting nations too frequently were reluctant to meet their obligations. The growth of armaments contributes to the sway of power politics, and nations with sufficient force at their disposal can, by threat of reprisals, gain almost any desired end.

A Christian view argues strongly for a constructive outlet to human energies and resources. If there is no control imposed upon development of national military machines, the human race will have no means available for the loftier pursuits of life. The least to be sought—and exigencies of international relations may argue for it—is an international control of certain forms of military equipment and the maintenance of some kind of an international police force.

7. Attitudes toward defeated powers. In anticipation of victory by the United Nations, it becomes highly significant to determine the attitude with which peace treaty making shall be approached. There is some truth in the view that it is not wars but peace treaties that make enemies and sow the seeds for future wars. The tremendous severity of the present conflict and the pressures which it has exerted have tended to awaken hatreds and the desire for revenge on the part of many people.

Should the principle of retaliation become determining in the treaty structure, Christian idealism and the best interests of humanity will be ignored. The conditions under which the war may end are obviously uncertain. Nevertheless, Christian leaders have felt called upon to indicate their concern by the formulation of guiding principles. Three of these are most clearly set forth in the British document, The Christian Church and World Order. (1) We repudiate any attempt to solve this problem in the spirit of revenge. (2) We repudiate a vague sentimentalism which ignores past crimes and future dangers. (3) No solution can be regarded as satisfactory which does not on the one hand provide adequate safeguards to all peoples against military and economic aggression by others, and on the other, provide full opportunities to all, victors and vanquished alike, to develop their own national and cultural life within the framework of world order.

8. Relief and rehabilitation. The devastation wrought by total war makes the task of relief and rehabilitation immediate and almost overpowering. Word has come from continental Europe that unless physical help is forthcoming at an early time, all plans for post-war reconstruction will be worthless. Men must first live. Only thereafter can they face the task of ordering their relationships.

So extensive will the need for assistance be that no single agency can be expected to assume full responsibility. Governments have already established commissions to plan and administer relief. The churches have set up world organizations with branches in different countries in order that no time may be lost. Christianity provides a dynamic to work through whatever agency may afford an effective opportunity. Of peculiar importance are the spirit in which this work is done and the purposes it seeks to achieve. By a demonstration of service to all who are in need—victor and vanquished—Christians can further their contribution to heal the wounds of war and to bind the world together in a just and durable peace.

9. The movement is transcending the lines of separation fixed by traditional faiths and in areas of common agreement is enlisting the cooperation of men of good will everywhere.

Obviously many people who are not affiliated with the Christian church, will be involved in the settlements to be made for international order. Christian leaders have been seeking to frame those principles which, while in harmony with Christian teachings, will also win acceptance from men of good will who are not in the Christian fellowship.

The 10 peace points were originally accepted by Roman Catholics and Protestants in England. Subsequently, those portions of them which were not distinctly Christian were endorsed by Jewish leaders.

In December 1942 the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America approved the Statement of Guiding Principles which its Commission on a Just and Durable Peace

had prepared. The preamble first makes a definite Christian affirmation: "We believe that the eternal God revealed in Christ is the ruler of men and of nations and that His purpose in history will be realized. For us He is the source of moral law and the power to make it effective." It then proceeds to state: "From this faith Christians derive the ethical principles upon which world order must be based. These principles, however, seem to us to be among those which men of good will everywhere may be expected to recognize as part of the moral law. In this we rejoice. For peace will require the cooperation of men of all nations, races, and creeds. We have therefore first set out (points 1 to 9) those guiding principles which, it seems to us, Christians and non-Christians alike can accept."

In October 1943 the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant Declaration on World Peace was released over the signatures of 144 religious leaders in the United States. Each group set forth its own preamble to express its distinctive emphasis. There followed seven statements of agreement under the following headings:

1. The moral law must govern the world order.
2. The rights of the individual must be assured.
3. The rights of oppressed, weak or colonial peoples must be protected.
4. The rights of minorities must be secured.
5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized.
6. International economic cooperation must be developed.
7. A just social order within each state must be achieved.

In thus identifying agreements with other groups, Christians are not denying or ignoring teachings which are distinctly Christian. Rather, they are enlisting cooperation to the extent that there is a common objective and to the extent that there are commonly accepted procedures. They must continue to emphasize and to proclaim the essential truths of Christianity.

III. The movement is cultivating an international Christian approach to an international problem.

During the early stages of the war Christian activity in behalf of world order moved most intensively within separate nations. National church bodies instituted commissions, convened study conferences, issued statements of Christian principles, contributed to the enlightenment of public opinion, and established contacts with governmental officials. As the churches throughout the world thus assigned themselves to this international task, it seemed imperative that more definite international consultation—ultimately collaboration—be effected.

Progress in this direction can be seen in the following:

1. The continued activity of world church organizations involving separate denominations.
2. The continued activity of the World Council of Churches, now in the process of formation.
3. Informal personal contacts among Christian leaders of different countries.
4. The exchange of documents on post-war settlements which have been prepared within separate countries (United Nations and Axis Powers).
5. International conferences, such as the international round table of Christian leaders at Princeton in July of this year where representatives from 12 countries were in attendance.
6. The effort to arrive at a formulation which may be commonly endorsed by Christians of all countries. The statement of political propositions (6 pillars of peace) was formulated by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace. It was accepted by the Princeton round table as indicative of what people in all countries should study, understand, and personally accept and seek to have accepted by their governments. Further, it was given substantial endorsement by 14 Christian leaders in England, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, and the Moderator of the Church of Scotland. It has found its way into many different lands. For example, it is currently being used for study purposes in China, Australia, and New Zealand.

IV. The movement is proceeding with an attack from the top down; that is, it is attempting to establish and to maintain effective contacts with governmental leaders.

In a measure, this attack from the top down represents an immediate or short-range procedure. It is highly important that governments should formulate a post-war policy which will permit the right kind of a start. Christian leaders recognize that governmental officials will determine the provisions of a peace treaty and the political and economic structures by which the nations of the world will be related to each other. Consequently, they are seeking to establish effective contacts with governmental representatives. In fashioning their procedures, especially in this country, they are preserving inviolate the principle of the separation of church and state. Fundamentally, they are making their testimony to a group of individuals in whose hands rests the power to order life among the nations of the world. In making this testimony, they are seeking to give to governmental leaders the benefit of Christian insights and judgments. The procedure here followed involves:

1. Submission to the government of ethical principles and of the political propositions derived therefrom.
2. Personal relations between Christian leaders and governmental officials, established through informal contacts and through the activity of permanent collaborators from the churches with the State Department.

V. The movement is proceeding with an attack from the bottom up; that is, it is seeking to enlighten and to strengthen the consciences of Christians in all walks of life, so that they will assume a responsible part as Christian citizens.

This approach involves education of the masses of people. It has both short range and long range implications. Public opinion is immediately needed as an impetus to the right decisions which governments must now make. As public opinion is developed in this and other countries, through a far-reaching and somewhat correlated program of education, it will continuingly serve as a means of support upon which a developing world order can count.

Thousands of parishes and communities in this country have been organizing themselves for study and action. * * * Be it noted that, in these procedures, church leaders are taking the initiative to enlighten and to strengthen the consciences of individuals so that Christians may fulfill their function as citizens—citizens of our own land, but ultimately citizens of the world.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Times entitled "The People Approve Lend-Lease":

THE PEOPLE APPROVE LEND-LEASE

The people of this country overwhelmingly approve the lend-lease program. This is the meaning of the vote of the House for extending the life of lend-lease another year, as requested by the administration. Despite all the loud and constant criticism directed at lend-lease from the beginning, only 21 Members of the House voted against the program. The votes to continue totaled 334. Although all the dissenting 21 are Republicans, the vote to continue was really a nonpartisan expression of approval. And that, in our opinion, is in accord with the sentiment of the country from the outset of the program. On issues like this, our Congressmen usually know the people's attitude.

Lend-lease was a big factor in keeping England from going down when it looked as if that calamity might follow the fall of France, Lend-Lease has shipped needed materials to China, to be used against the Japs. Tremendous quantities of tanks, planes, ammunition, and food have reached Russia through lend-lease. The Russians have acknowledged the great debt they owe to lend-lease in their successes over the German invaders. Those successes are lend-lease victories to a big extent.

History will record that lend-lease was a big factor in upsetting Hitler's idea that he could polish off Russia without being afraid that England or the United States could get into shape to do what we are doing to him now. The people understand this, and Congress has reflected that understanding, the howling of the irreconcilables notwithstanding.

Letter From Minister of Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three articles from the New York Post dealing with the Bank of International Settlements and other related questions. I am in receipt of a letter from the Honorable Charles Bruggmann, the Minister of Switzerland, in which he corrects certain statements made in one of those articles. I am, of course, very glad to insert the Minister's letter into the RECORD in accordance with his request.

LEGATION OF SWITZERLAND,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1944.

The Honorable JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VOORHIS: I refer to our recent conversation when I had the pleasure of drawing your attention to different incorrect statements made by Tabitha Petran about Swiss banking concerns in her article in the New York Post, published on February 4 under the caption "Schacht Is Nazis' Dove of Peace." Among other articles, this one was included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1944, on page A1068.

Above all, I wanted to inform you that the Swiss Banker Rudolf Ernst, Jr., entered the United States in March 1940 and left this

country again in December 1941. He came here as a representative of the Union Bank of Switzerland and has not returned to this country. Neither he nor his father has any connections with the Swiss Bank Corporation (not banking corporation), the two banks being competitors.

I should appreciate the courtesy if you would insert also this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

C. BRUGGMANN,
Minister of Switzerland.

Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on leadership delivered by Col. William H. Neblett, A. C., to officers of the Quartermaster School at Camp Lee, Va., on April 11, 1944. I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate which indicates that the cost of printing the address will be $114.40.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Leadership has been and will continue to be a subject of much discussion during your entire military service. Because leadership when it occurs in an officer, is the most priceless possession of our Army, all of us strive continually to improve our qualities as leaders. My purpose is to bring to each officer here something that may help attain the common objective we seek—perfection in the exercise of the powers of command.

You are still with us so you probably have mastered satisfactorily all technical and tactical training the Army dispenses at its schools and training centers; but that is not enough to make you leaders. You must know how to lead units in battle. When I say units, I include all organizations from company to Army, for the higher commands are open to you in proportion to your demonstrated capacity for combat leadership.

I knew personally most of the officers of the high command in the First World War and I am acquainted with many of them in this one. The conclusions I draw are from observation of them as leaders and from my own personal experience in both world wars.

LEADERSHIP DEFINED

Although many definitions of a leader have been given, they are for the most part vague and uncertain, usually leaving an audience in complete confusion as to what the speaker intended to convey—a confusion no greater than the uncertainty of the speaker as to what the subject comprises. One reason for that state of mind common to both speaker and audience is that he and each of his listeners have their own ideal of what a leader should be; another reason is the tendency of the speaker to build his definition on jargon gleaned from garrison routine and peacetime directives not applicable to war. I believe that the ideal leader in war is the man who gains and holds the confidence of his subordinates and keeps the faith with his superiors.

If I should give you nothing more than a general definition of leadership, then my talk would not be worth while. Victory is our objective in this war, so I shall try to show you that we shall gain victory when we, as leaders dealing with our subordinates and carrying out the orders of our superiors, apply to the task of attaining the objective ordinary, everyday, common-sense business principles tempered with those mutual courtesies and sympathetic considerations we extend to each other in our homes and in our daily work.

A DEMOCRATIC CITIZENS' ARMY

A recent War Department pamphlet declares in effect that we are a democratic Army. That conclusion is probably based on the well-known fact that over 97 percent of our Army—officers and men—have come from civil life. They have been told from infancy that war is a sorry business to be avoided at all costs, and that war is not to be engaged in by our democratic Government unless the provocation requires the defense of our country against an aggressor who, like Japan, forced war upon us by its foul and deceitful attacks on Pearl Harbor and the Philippines. The War Department has wisely established services for the purpose of bringing to this overwhelming group in our Army indoctrination in the ways of a soldier and in the process to show him the reasons for which we fight and the objectives sought in victory.

WHY WE FIGHT

I believe that most of you will go along with me in feeling that all of the purposes for which we are fighting this war and the objectives to be gained, when we have won it, have been summed up by our Commander in Chief in his war-progress report to Congress of September 17, 1943, in which he said: "But there is one thing I want to make perfectly clear: When Hitler and the Nazis go out, the Prussian military clique must go with them. The war-breeding gangs of militarists must be routed out of Germany—and out of Japan—if we are to have a real assurance of future peace."

That is an easily understandable and definite policy for which we fight this war. It is acceptable to the 97 percent citizen component of the Army who feel that they are in the war for the purpose of bringing it to an early conclusion so that they may return to their homes and civilian pursuits.

Most of us have no ambition whatever for a career as a professional soldier. A speedy victory and an early return home are the uppermost thoughts in the minds of us all. We have little present interest in plans for after-war effort, or in the kind of military establishment we will then maintain. We are willing to leave those things to our Government, in which we will have our share when the war is over.

If, after hearing that declaration of policy by the President, there are still some of us who are unconvinced of the intention and purpose of our military leaders, now and hereafter, in gaining the objectives to be secured by victory, then those of us who are still in doubt should remember that the President's statement of principles for which we are fighting the war is in accord with our long-cherished theory of democratic government which we, the people, will be likely to continue to practice.

LEADERSHIP AND DISCIPLINE SYNONYMOUS

That great group of civilians in our army realizes that the hard circumstances of battle require certain disciplinary measures between men and officers, reflected in military courtesies and respect they tender each other. Discipline of your subordinates will be easy and the distinctions between higher and lower ranks will be accepted with enthusiasm, if all of us will remember to apply it in accord with an order of Gen. George Washington issued in July 1776 and a speech made 103 years later by Maj. Gen. John M. Schofield, then superintendent of the Military Academy, to the cadets of that school. They established a principle long adhered to in the Army that discipline is to be administered without strong language or harsh action.

GENERAL ORDER ISSUED BY GEN. GEORGE WASHINGTON IN NEW YORK, JULY 1776

"The general is sorry to be informed that the foolish and wicked practice of profane cursing and swearing, a vice heretofore little known in an American Army, is growing into fashion. He hopes the officers will, by example as well as influence, endeavor to check it, and that both they and the men will reflect, that we can have little hope of the blessing of Heaven on our arms, if we insult it by our impiety and folly. Added to this, it is a vice so mean and low, without any temptation, that every man of sense and character detests and despises it.

G. WASHINGTON."

AN ADDRESS TO WEST POINT CADETS ON AUGUST 11, 1879, BY MAJ. GEN. JOHN M. SCHOFIELD, SUPERINTENDENT OF CADETS

"The discipline which makes the soldiers of a free country reliable in battle is not to be gained by harsh or tyrannical treatment.

"On the contrary, such treatment is far more likely to destroy than to make an army. It is possible to impart instruction and give commands in such manner and in such tone of voice as to inspire in the soldier no feeling of resentment but an intense desire to obey, while the opposite manner and tone of voice cannot fail to excite strong resentment and a desire to disobey.

"The one mode or the other of dealing with subordinates springs from a corresponding feeling in the breast of the commander.

"He who feels the respect which is due to others cannot fail to inspire in them regard for himself, while he who feels, and hence manifests, disrespect toward others, especially his inferiors, cannot fail to inspire hatred against himself."

FAVORITISM OUTMODED

When we exercise the powers and privileges given us as officers in this democratic army of ours, we must remember that our subordinates have come to us schooled in the system applied in civil life of choosing our own leaders. In the Army, they are chosen for us through a system over which we have no control. Our subordinates are bound to feel that many mistakes have been made in officers assigned to command them, probably more even than they would have made, if they had chosen them. If officers without the qualities of leadership happen to be assigned to a unit which you command, a true index of your character as a leader will be evidenced by your ruthless relief of them. In fairness to your subordinates, you must apply that ruthlessness in the relief of officers who do not exhibit the qualities of leadership, no matter what their scholastic attainments are, or political, military, or business ancestry may be. This means that all inefficients among us, from the lowest to the highest, must be eliminated. There must be neither group nor individual favoritism.

An officer should deal with his subordinates as individuals. Elimination accomplished by regulation or directive based upon arbitrarily selected facts applicable to some members of a given group will shake the confidence of remaining members of that group. No American officer can be made to believe that, because he is a member of a group with a different military background from another group, he deteriorates more rapidly than those of the other group. He does see that such action is wholly inconsistent with declared War Department policy, which proposes to condition the thinking of our soldiers to

realize that our democratic Army is fighting the war to defend our institutions against the encroachments of other incompatible forms of government.

BELIEF IN SECURITY OF OUR INSTITUTIONS

An American soldier believes that he is secure in the rights and privileges given him by the Constitution and the laws of our country. He has been taught from childhood that he can rely upon their protection as long as he conforms to the established order. That view has not been changed by bringing him into the Army. Any attempt to upset that view by regulation or directive weakens his confidence in his leaders and makes him question whether or not he and his fellows will ever regain the rights they relinquished in transition from civilian to soldier.

THE IDEAL OFFICER—A BATTLE SOLDIER

These considerations apply to all grades of the Army from top to bottom. They are easily applied to most men of good character and reasonable intelligence who have become technically perfect in their arm. Such men will make good battle leaders. No other leadership is of value in war. The finest instructor, the most entertaining speaker may be the poorest battle leader. In this regard we have probably overdone the schools at the expense of field training or actual assignment to combat zones.

There has been too much repetition of courses which tend only to a general education. It is gratifying to read that Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, The Adjutant General, in an article published in the American magazine of April 1944, says, "Too much theoretical education may rob a man of his qualities of leadership."

LEADERSHIP AFFIRMATIVE—NOT NEGATIVE

Your men will not judge you after you reach the battle line by what you have said or even done in peacetime routine. They will peg you by what you do in combat. Negative effort is worthless. Every act must be affirmative.

There are a few "don'ts" that may be necessary during the training period as a part of garrison routine, but none of them will be used by the successful battle leader.

I shall divide leadership into two parts—the training and battle stages. In the training period the only negative plan I offer you is, "Don't use the accepted 'don'ts.'" I have already said that there are no "don'ts" usable in battle. You cannot, by application to the citizen soldier of the usual standards of peacetime garrison routine, convince him of your ability to lead him in battle.

FEARS OVERCOME

Our Commander in Chief has said that "We have nothing to fear but fear." If that be true, as we all know it is, then it is evident that in battle the fighting qualities of your men will be raised in proportion to the fears you have removed from them during training. Technical and tactical employment in training is simple. The real fighting spirit of your unit will be dependent upon your example in battle. You will have under you, as we have already said, soldiers who are made up almost entirely from civilians. It is they that you must understand, if you would succeed. The group is sensitive; it realizes its importance; it must be made happy in its work by continual encouragement to acquire a combat excellence superior to that of the enemy.

Education in the duties of a combat soldier is the best way to train a fighter. Guardhouse discipline so often resorted to should never be used for mischievous or minor infractions of duty. There are some incorrigibles, of course, but they will be so rare in the unit of a competent commander that their number will be insignificant. The use of guardhouse discipline engenders fear of punishment in the hearts of your men incompatible with the fighting spirit upon which victory depends.

UNIT COMBAT TRAINING

The best way to exercise leadership in the training period is found in unit combat training—unit exercises of the sort that keep every officer and man under you busy doing something which he knows will help bring the end of the war nearer. Good morale is an incident to such employment of your officers and men. The judgment of your troops will be good. No amount of exhortation, provision for their comfort and entertainment, or garrison routine made attractive will, in my belief, be accepted by your soldiers as a substitute for unit combat training upon weapons superior to those of the enemy.

Your subordinates will correctly analyze the relative importance to war effort of what you give them to do in training. You can, however, innocently make it possible for the morale of your subordinates to become high for form and showmanship of everyday garrison life, but so poor for battle that they may resent their relief from camp homes and their assignment to combat duties for which the garrison training you have given them may not have fully prepared them. There are now existing circumstances under which our soldiers may adapt themselves to easy garrison life. If they are held in garrisons too long they may become so fond of camp life that they could lose their desire for battle. Easy living, where the main duties are form and showmanship, is incompatible with the fighting spirit. The prime thought of a battle leader is ever to toughen his men for combat.

KNOW YOUR MEN

Unit training is stressed because one of the most distracting of all fears in the heart of a soldier is that of reorganization on a transfer that takes him out of his unit and separates him from the friends he has made. No man will fight well at the side of a stranger. There is no sentiment so strong in battle as mutual support of a friend and confidence in the help of a buddy by your side. If this is true among the men themselves, how much more important it is for the officers to know the men in their commands. Quoting again from General Ulio's article, "An officer cannot be a stranger to his men."

In an organization commanded by me at the battlefront or being staged to go there, any company officer would be instantly relieved, if there was one man in his unit whom he did not know personally by name. An American soldier will not follow a company officer in battle who knows so little about him that he hasn't taken the trouble to learn his name and can only give him commands by calling him "you" or "soldier."

FIGHTERS WIN BATTLES

The Army has come to the correct conclusion that wars are won by fighting. The high command is rapidly taking out of posts, camps, and stations all officers and men who have been for some time engaged there in training efforts devoted largely to the softening process of garrison routine. It is felt that the move will reach the desired end when pursued far enough to make every man a combat soldier and when all of the personnel of the Army have been trained and incorporated into self-reliant, self-contained units, able to perform their missions without help from other forces. In battle there is no reason to expect help from other units. They will have their battle problems too. The long-sought-after secret of the brilliant Russian successes against the so-called "invincible" Germany Army is found in unit combat training for battle effort, where every man, no matter what his duties, is first a fighter.

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

We, as leaders of the Army, should know what weapons are required to make it possible for us to accomplish our missions. We should insist that we get them. It is better to be relieved for insistence on armament that will protect your men than to be forever disgraced in your own mind for having lost your unit because of the lack of proper protection that would have been gained from training and arming your men with effective weapons. You are advised to insist upon such armament and training, because if you do you are likely to get what you need. Those who do so insist are the leaders who, as commanders of victorious units, will bring the war to a successful conclusion.

You are advised to be always on the alert for new weapons and diligent in the search for ways of improving your battle tactics and technique. They are undergoing rapid and continuous changes. The principal weapons of today will probably be obsolete within a year. Superior ability to destroy the enemy's armies will hasten victory. Your contributions to better and quicker methods of the destruction of the enemy will bring the end of the war nearer. You are assured that the higher command will give effect to your suggestions when good and will even consider your criticisms when constructive.

The campaign in Italy seems to prove that reliance on the conventional weapons of today may result in the stalemate of tomorrow. Victory will be an incident to superiority of weapons and their improved tactical use. If you have an idea that you believe will improve the fighting qualities of your men, but fail to present it because of fear of unfavorable reactions upon you or your Army career, then you have put personal ambitions before duty and you lack the basic qualifications of a leader. Sacrifice of everything personal to the cause as reflected in your acts for the good of your subordinates is the true index of a battle leader.

FEAR OF REVERSES DISPELLED

There have been reverses in this war and there probably will be many more and some disasters before victory is won; but if you have a true conception of your duties as a leader and your men have confidence in you, such things will have no effect upon the fighting qualities of your subordinates. If they believe that you know what you are doing, are certain that their weapons are superior or equal to those of the enemy, yours will be the unit which will succeed when it faces the enemy.

WEAKNESSES REMOVED

Lieutenant General Somervell says in his latest report to the Secretary of War that information from the various battle fronts indicated: "A major weakness of supply troops was their defense against low-flying aircraft." You who are commanders of supply troops will have to correct that weakness in your units or they will be destroyed. There is no such thing as success in battle of a unit so long as it has a major weakness.

STRONG LEADERS

No officer, from the highest to the lowest, can balance the equation of leadership unless he fits the definition of a leader, which means the man out in front—a person to follow. He cannot succeed as a dispatcher. The right and power to lead comes from within the soul of an officer. If an officer feels that he is too old or that he is incapacitated physically or nervously for the position at the head of his troops, then he should be taken at his own estimate of himself, no matter what his rank, and retired from participation both in training and in battle.

Confessed weaknesses in a commander are both contagious and infectious. If a unit becomes contaminated with the influence of

a weak leader, its battle efficiency is gone. Confidence of the men in the physical strength and mental willingness of their commanders to go along with them in battle is the foundation upon which a fighting army is built. That confidence will go to the officer who is out in front where his troops can see him. The example in battle set by a commander is the test of his ability to lead.

AMBITIONS SACRIFICED TO THE CAUSE

There is one "don't" that I wish to emphasize. It is not for application to your subordinates, but for you alone, and it must come from the heart of every leader, if he would hold the confidence of his men and the respect of his superiors. Never allow your hope of personal safety or your ambition for advancement to influence any act of yours, even though you are able to conceal such base sentiment from your subordinates. Once you contract "promotion itch" and become T/O conscious, you have already put personal advancement ahead of duty to your men upon whom you could call to make the supreme sacrifice that you might realize your ambitions. Your men must know that you will be the first to assume the risks you order them to take. The sacrifices you must make in battle cannot be gaged by those of another leader, in a corresponding command on a mission similar to your own, is willing to accept. Carry with you in battle the words of General Lee: "In war there can be no equality of sacrifice."

The Office of Price Administration Cooperating With Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the text of the radio talk by Mr. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, and Mr. Howard H. Williamson, O. P. A. farm adviser, which was delivered recently:

Hello, everybody; for some time I've been anxious to talk to you about the relationship between our farmers and O. P. A. price controls. Right now's a good time to do it, because Howard Williamson, our O. P. A. farm adviser, is just back from a trip all across the country talking to farmers about their problems.

Howard is here on the program with me right now and in a few minutes I will ask him some questions.

But first of all I'd like to remind all of you that the problems which our farmers have faced in the past belong to all of us. The economic distress which so many of our farmers faced after the last war simply must not be repeated. Our country can never be wholly prosperous and economically secure after the war unless all of us are secure—our farmers as well as our businessmen and city workers.

Our farmers have always worked hard to provide us with our food. They deserve a good price for their efforts—not only now under war conditions, but permanently—as an essential part of our peacetime economy.

Today, under our O. P. A. price controls, our American farmers are breaking all records for food production. And today, under O. P. A. price controls, the Department of Agriculture tells me that the average farm income, after all expenses, is also at an all-time high—about 282 percent over the 1935–39 average. Remember, please, I didn't say all farmers. I said the average farmer, lumping together our hog growers, cattle raisers, poultry growers, corn, wheat, cotton, and vegetable farmers. Some farmers are, of course, doing less well than the average.

Our farmers have a very definite stake in effective price control as a protection of the balance between what they get for their crops and what they have to pay out.

They have an equally great stake in O. P. A. price controls as a protection against the same cruel collapse of their farm prices which followed the last war. For the dangers of deflation after the war are just as great as the dangers of inflation during the war.

The collapse in prices after World War No. 1 hit our American farmers harder than any other group. The depression, which for the rest of us, lasted 2 or 3 years, lasted 20 long years for our farmers. It is our job in the O. P. A. to help prevent any repetition of that after this war. And we at O. P. A. sincerely view our present price controls—and our subsidies—as the surest possible safeguard against such a post-war farm collapse.

Now, some farmers have been critical of O. P. A. Some of this criticism has been our own fault.

For some time we have been working closely with every kind of business through over 300 industry advisory committees. But when I came to the O. P. A. in Washington last summer, we had no such give-and-take relationship with farmers on price regulations affecting them.

To correct this—to develop a closer understanding between the O. P. A. and all kinds of farmers in all parts of the country—I called in Howard H. Williamson, from Texas, last November, and appointed him as my farm adviser. Howard had been director of extension services for the Texas A. and M. College. He had done this extension work ever since he was graduated from there 32 years ago—in addition to running his own farm.

We had many long talks together, and Howard agreed with me that something should be done to bring the farmers and the O P. A. closer together. His idea was to bring this about through farm advisory committees working closely with our various O. P. A. district offices. I agreed, and for the past several weeks Howard has been on a trip through the country helping to get these committees organized and our plan under way. He got back to Washington only 2 days ago.

He's here with me now to give a report on how the plan is working out and what the farmers think of it.

First, Howard, I think it's important that people know you're a real farmer and not just somebody with a lot of theories about farming in general. Tell us about that farm of yours down in Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well, if farming makes a farmer, I am one. I started out rather young, traveling south down cotton rows with my hands wrapped around the north end of a hoe handle. At present, I operate on a few hundred acres on Bedias Creek in Grimes County, Tex.—principally livestock farming and some feed growing. My little bunch of livestock consists of whiteface cattle, Angora goats, sheep, and this past year, some hogs. In the past I have engaged in cotton growing and have had some little experience in poultry and dairy business. I am what would be classed in my section as a small farmer but you don't have to be a very big farmer to know what farm problems are, especially during the war period when there are shortages of farm labor, farm machinery, and an abundance of regulations which, of course, can't be avoided in times like the present.

Mr. BOWLES. Tell me, how did you get along with your farm operations last year?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Pretty well, with the exception of my venture into the hog business. That was my 1943 mistake. I got caught like hundreds of others—more hogs than feed. My feed gave out and my acorns washed away. I am now trying to get my hogs finished with high-priced grain so as to get the floor price. I am not sure I will make it, but I will confess it was my own idea in the first place. I understand Judge Marvin Jones, Food Administrator, is recommending some reduction in the 1944 pig crop. I think, for one, I will give him my full cooperation unless I can produce more feed than I did last year.

Mr. BOWLES. You have just made a trip through the country, talking to farmers and farm leaders first-hand. What territory did you cover, Howard?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I attended a State-wide meeting of farmers in Rhode Island and conferences in the Southwest, Middle West, and the Pacific coast. At Dallas, I attended a six-State conference of leading farmers, representatives of farm organizations, and others interested in agriculture. This conference was called and conducted under the leadership of Mr. Maxwell McCullough, regional administrator, region V. It was a very fine conference.

Mr. BOWLES. What are some of the things you found farmers and farm leaders thinking about?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well, as you know, Mr. Bowles, farmers never hesitate to give expression to their thinking. They are courteous but frank. I did not keep a pencilled memorandum of comments, but I can give you a general interpretation of some of their thinking as I understood them. First of all, they want price stabilization and rationing to succeed and they want to help all they can. They don't like regulations any better than anyone else, neither do they like war and the many other things we have to do in war periods. Their attitude in general is that we have a tough war to win and it is going to take sacrifice and hard fighting. They want to get on with the job and do what is necessary but not wear themselves down doing unnecessary things.

Mr. BOWLES. What about suggestions? Do they have any for O. P. A.?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes; the group of farmers and farm leaders from the six States that met in Dallas recommended to the 13 district O. P. A. directors that they arrange for a conference of farmers and farm leaders in their respective districts and give consideration to the creation of a district agricultural advisory committee. This committee would work with the district O. P. A. director on general farm problems affected by O. P. A. Such committees have already been created in several of the O. P. A. districts in various other sections of the country.

Mr. BOWLES. Did they have any suggestions for immediate consideration?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Not in a formal way, but they certainly hinted at several. One was that we should do everything possible to eliminate unnecessary delays in getting out rules and regulations and that they be well in advance of the season's needs. Of course, they understand it takes some time to go through with procedures in getting rules and regulations prepared and released but they want us to make it as speedy as possible. Another thing about which they were very polite was in the suggestion that, in the preparation of regulations, etc., they be put in such language or at least explained in a way that people other than lawyers can understand them. They appreciate the fact that rules and regulations must stand up from a legal point of view but it helps when the laymen can understand them and their application. They are also interested in knowing to what extent producers participate in conferences, when considerations are given

to price ceilings, and regulations dealing with raw or processed farm products.

Mr. BOWLES. They are absolutely correct on all counts. You know—and we want farm people to know—that we are striving to do everything possible to prevent delays and keep programs and regulations simplified. Also, it is O. P. A.'s policy to have producer representatives on all industry councils in which farm products are involved. But now—how do the farmers feel about price control, Howard?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well, I think the experience of one farmer out West pretty well answers that question, Mr. Bowles. He has about 2,000 steers, which means he uses several hundred bushels of corn a day to feed them.

A while back the rumor got started that the ceiling on corn was going up 10 cents—so right away the flow of corn stopped right in its tracks in the hope of the higher price for it. And meantime, this fellow's steers went into a tailspin. That was only a rumor, mind you, so you can imagine what would happen if there was an official report that price ceilings would go off everything tomorrow. As that Missouri farmer put it to me the other day, "We farmers not only want prices fixed; we want prices to stay fixed so we can know where we stand."

That seems to be the general attitude of the farmers I have been talking with on this trip. They want price control and they want to help all they can to keep it.

Mr. BOWLES. Our farm problem as we look ahead is to hold good prices for farmers after the war. And to insure that we mustn't let our price levels go any higher now or we'll get in trouble later. Unless we hold the general level of prices where they are we'll have to face another farm depression.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Most people who were in the farming game 25 years ago remember the seriousness of that post-war depression. And today farmers well understand that in general agriculture is in a relatively better position than it has been in the past century and they are, of course, interested in its staying that way.

Mr. BOWLES. Keeping it that way is one important objective of the price stabilization program today. That is why we at O. P. A. are anxious to work as closely as possible with farmers.

How many farm committees have you got organized so far?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I am not planning to personally organize any. Washington is too far from farm people. However, I am suggesting, with a little urge to it, that the eight regional O. P. A. administrators promote through their district O. P. A. administrative set-up, district conferences as recommended by the farmers' group in Dallas, with the view of creating, where needed, a district advisory committee. The farmers and farm leaders and the district O. P. A. director in each district know the best approach and means of working together. To keep our O. P. A. programs geared to the problems of the farm, there must be good understanding on our part of the wartime problems farmers are encountering. And at the same time, farmers need to know some of the problems that you, Mr. Bowles, and your O. P. A. associates encounter in administering such a gigantic program of price stabilization and rationing for 130,000,000 people.

Mr. BOWLES. Well, as I told you last fall, Howard, we want and need the benefit of the thinking and counsel of farm people on those phases of our O. P. A. program that relate to farming. It is extremely important that we exchange suggestions and counsel in a well-thought-out and organized manner. And I believe your plan for local farm advisory committees throughout the country is the answer. In that way, the O. P. A. and the farmers can work together closely and constantly as a team.

The job of controlling prices is a big one. As I have said before, it cannot be done wholly for any group by us at O. P. A. in Washington. It must be done by all groups in all communities. Only through understanding and cooperation can we succeed in our vital fight against skyrocketing prices now—and the deflation which would inevitably follow after the war.

Thank you, Howard, for your comments and observations. And I would like to take this means of congratulating the many millions of farm men and women and the farm youth of America on the great food-production job you are doing. You have, and are now doing, a big and important war job with many handicaps. O. P. A. wants to be as helpful as possible.

And now, good-bye to you all until next week.

Necessity for National War Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Walter Lippmann published in this morning's Washington Post relating to the necessity for a national war service act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A MILITARY NECESSITY

As for guessing when the invasion will start and when the war will end, we had better ask ourselves whether we are sitting in the grandstands laying our bets and waiting for the whistle to blow. General Eisenhower and his staff will decide when to invade. But the American civilian population have a very big part to play in deciding when the war will end.

In its fundamentals the question is whether Congress and the people take the view that Eisenhower's men must win, lose, or draw with the forces they now have. Undoubtedly they are great forces. But if they are a fixed quantity, then the enemy has everything to gain by taking every risk, fighting to the death at every pill box and every street corner from the coast of Europe to Berlin. For if he knows that Eisenhower's force is just so big and no bigger, and that there is not much else behind it, the enemy has every reason to fight on and to make us pay with the blood of our men for every foot of the soil of Europe.

The Germans are encircled and are cornered, but they still have hope. A fixed force, however formidable, is worth resisting on the great chance that if some part of the plan goes wrong we shall lack the final punch to deliver the knock-out blow. Many a man has gotten out of a hopeless fight by just managing to hang on and not to get knocked out because the other fellow did not have that last punch.

This is the tremendous danger which the invasion forces face: That they will come ashore, that they will move in, as in Italy, and then lack the reserves to push through to victory. If that happens this summer, we might well face a bloody stalemate, and the need to try it all over again next season, and with every plan we have made in Europe and in the Pacific thrown off schedule.

It is imperative, therefore, that once the invasion is launched it should have behind it such reserves that the longer the enemy resists the greater will be the forces that come piling up against him. That will break him. He may withstand the first blow. But if the second is harder, not softer than the first, and the third harder than the second, he will have nothing left to fight for. The fury of the attack must mount, and when it is indisputable to the German Army, who will know all the essential facts, that the attacks are on an ascending scale of violence and power, they will know that resistance is mere suicide. Whole armies and nations do not commit suicide.

This is the reason why our responsible military leaders are asking the American civilian population to back them up with a national war service act. There is no other way to tell our troops and to make it clear to the enemy that when the invasion begins it can never be stopped. We are simply not doing our duty if we leave matters where they now are, saying to our men and to our enemy that we shall fight it out with limited forces.

It is as clear as daylight that the way to shorten the war decisively and conclusively is to mobilize the civilian population, men and women, so that there can be no question in anyone's mind that the attack has behind it waves upon waves of men and equipment. We are a people more used to business than to war. An example from business will illustrate the point: There is a run on a bank, the depositors are drawing down the reserves. How do you stop the run? By feeding into the bank a new hundred dollars for every hundred dollars the depositors draw out? Not at all. You put all the resources of all the banks behind the threatened bank. The moment that is done the depositors quit drawing on the reserves, the run stops, the panic is over. The fact that the reserves are unlimited means that they do not have to be drawn upon.

With the tremendous operations that are now preparing in Europe and also in the Pacific, no American civilian has the right to say to our military leader that he can have the IV–F's but that is all. The civilians who say that—be they officials of the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, or of the Congress of the United States—are, in a matter of life and death for hundreds of thousands of Americans, in a matter of supreme importance to the Nation, putting their personal views ahead of the judgment of the commanders who must conduct the battles. Suppose these civilians who know little of war, are wrong. Just think what we shall carry with us upon our consciences for the rest of our lives if, when we were called upon to support the armies, we refused.

No man will ever regret that in this fateful hour he did too much. He will never be forgiven if he does not do enough.

The President is returning soon. His duty is manifest. He is committed to a National War Service Act. The fact is, however, that he has not fulfilled his commitment. In his message of last January he pledged it with reservations and qualifications which convinced Congress that he was not serious about it. His inaction and silence have confirmed that conviction. Yet he is President and he is Commander in Chief, and if the armed forces need the backing of this act, they need it regardless of the tax bill or any of his other qualifications. We can muddle through on the home front if we win the war decisively and promptly. If we do not win the war, the problem of the home front will be insoluble anyway.

The President cannot wait any longer to take this matter in hand, and to bring it before Congress and the country, not as his personal view, but as a demand, backed by the evidence and convictions of our military leaders. If our people really see that this act is a military necessity, they will not fail.

The act should be placed on the statute books at once to put an end to the shame that only men who are caught in the draft have an obligation to serve. Who said that only young men, and not young women, only men of a certain kind and not all men and women, may be called upon when the Nation needs them?

Why, for example, should a IV-F, or a discharged soldier who may be physically far less fit than a healthy woman without family cares, or a middle-aged man who can do a day's work, be singled out and told he has a special obligation to his country?

More is needed from the President than a resolute and explicit call for enactment of this law. Congress and the country would take a quite different view of the matter if the President acted to convince them that he meant to have the law seriously and competently administered. For they are sick at heart over the manpower muddle.

The fact is that there is no public confidence in those who ought to administer this law. It is a task for the Director of Manpower and the Secretary of Labor. There is not sufficient confidence in Mr. McNutt's lucidity of mind or in his political courage. As for the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins holds the office, but for handling the essential problems of labor in wartime, she is—and the President knows this well because his actions prove it—unemployable.

He must find someone else to administer this act. When he does he will be well on his way to getting the act.

Facts About the Author of Under Cover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Uncovering Under Cover: The Real Facts About the Smear Book's Odd Author" written by John T. Flynn and published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 23, 1944. As everyone knows, John T. Flynn is one of the outstanding publicists of this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCOVERING UNDER COVER—THE REAL FACTS ABOUT THE SMEAR BOOK'S ODD AUTHOR—RIGHT NAME AND FACE ARE EXPOSED

(By John T. Flynn)

Who is the author of that now well-known smear book, Under Cover?

And, having been told on the fly-leaf that it is John Roy Carlson, the next question is—who is John Roy Carlson?

Who is he and where did the smear bund sponsors of this book dig him up?

Well, of course, his name is not John Roy Carlson. That is just a pen name, he explains.

After all, Samuel Clemens had a pen name, he tells us—Mark Twain.

But this chap has had several pen names. He has written in one magazine as Thomas L. Decker, in another as George Paige, in another as John Roy Carlson. Why all the mystery?

Then besides that he has operated as a $25-a-week informer for the Government and as a $40-a-week agent for the smear bund under the name of Pagnanelli. But what is his real name? And who is he?

Why is he the way he is? Someone asked him in a Detroit lecture if his real name was John Roy Carlson. He flared up. "For the love of Pete," he cried out in a burst of impatient candor, "ask something constructive. Of course, my name is not Carlson. My real name is Arthur A. Derounian."

BUT THAT'S NOT HIS REAL NAME EITHER

But that is not his real name either. So what is it? And why does he hide it?

Well, here is his real name: Avedis Boghos Derounian.

He is an Armenian immigrant and, up to the time he got a job as a stool pigeon and informer for the smear bund, he spent most of his time and earned his living working for a small Armenian weekly and taking a very active part in the local quarrels and feuds of the Armenian people.

Now he has blossomed into a flaming American patriot, branding various native Americans of untarnished reputations, loyalty, and eminence as agents of Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Derounian, alias Carlson, alias Paige, alias Decker, alias Pagnanelli, etc., remains, however, a hired hand of the smear bund, a colleague in mud of Walter Winchell.

But though Winchell is his spiritual kinsman, he is not nearly so important in the smear bund's sinister affairs.

Winchell is just their Charlie McCarthy.

This oriental sitting on the other knee is far too significant to be laughed off as Charlie's goofy pal, Mortimer Snerd.

There is no room here to tell all about this queer social and political duck, but at least one episode in his career will help to explain him, as we find him among his own people playing the same role he now plays in the American market. For he is an Armenian, born at Alexandropolis, in Greece. He came to this country in 1921, and his beginnings as a smear artist were among his own people.

BISHOP IS MURDERED ON CHRISTMAS EVE

On Christmas Eve, 1933, Archbishop Tourian, primate of the Armenian Catholic Church in America, was assassinated in his cathedral in New York City. The deed enlivened the first pages of the American newspapers but it shook to its foundations the Armenian colony in America.

Nine men were indicted for the deed, prosecuted by Thomas Dewey, and convicted. Two of them were sentenced to the electric chair. But at the last minute Gov. Herbert Lehman, then Governor of New York, commuted their sentences to life imprisonment because "of unusual circumstances."

What were the unusual circumstances? Perhaps the following facts will clear this up.

Armenia is a small country in southeast Europe that once belonged to the old Turkish Empire but was swallowed during the First World War by Russia.

It is today run by the Communist government under the rule of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Of course, the Bolsheviks proceeded to destroy religion. They seized churches, unfrocked the priests, drove out many bishops and priests. They jailed others. But as time wore on they changed their tactics.

They saw that it is impossible to kill religion in the hearts of the people by persecuting them. In 1929 Gabrillian, the Armenian commissar, said:

"We are enemies of the church and religion in the cities and towns. We must take measures, but not of force or violence, to emancipate the workers from the influence of the church and religion."

Then he explained that the too-zealous Bolshevik partisans must not seize any more churches. The way to do the job is to go to work on the people directly and kill religion in their minds by propaganda, by keeping religious instruction from the young, by indoctrinating them with atheism, by preventing the ordination of young priests until the church finally comes into the hands of only a handful of old, enfeebled, and easily managed ancients.

The big problem for the commissars, however, was the faithful Armenians outside Russia—in Syria, Constantinople, Greece, France, America. They continued to be devoted to their freedom and religion.

An Armenian patriotic society, the Dashnag (dashnag simply means federation), was kept intact and now, in America at least, includes youth and women's auxiliaries, doing charitable and social work among the Armenians.

To break down opposition to the Soviet abroad the Ogpu—the dreaded secret police of the Bolshevist government—was put to work. Wherever there was a large colony of Armenians, there the secret agents and spies of the Ogpu swarmed. But the Dashnags keep up their fight for an independent Armenian republic.

How the Communists dealt with this problem came to light in a sensational manner in 1931. All this seems a long way from Avedis Boghos Derounian, alias Arthur A. Derounian, alias John Roy Carlson, alias George Paige, alias Thomas L. Decker, alias Pagnanelli, etc. But we will get around to him.

HOW RUSSIA'S OGPU BRIBED ARMENIAN PRIESTS

In 1931 George Agabekov, head of the Russian secret police—the Ogpu—in southeast Europe, including Armenia, broke with Stalin and fled to France. There he wrote a book and told how he had managed things for the Bolshevists.

He told how he had bribed Armenian bishops outside Armenia to act as secret agents for the Ogpu. He gave their names—bishops in Greece, Constantinople, Syria, and other places. This, as we may imagine, produced a sensation among Armenians everywhere. It seemed as if the bottom had dropped out of their church.

They did not know which bishop to trust, which prelate, standing on the altar, was also a secret agent of their great enemy, the Ogpu.

Not long after this a prelate named Bishop Leon Tourian was sent to America as the primate on this continent of the Armenian church. When he came Armenians were suspicious of him.

He had been the Armenian bishop in Manchester, England. While there he was a monthly contributor to an Armenian magazine called Massis, which was a stout defender of Soviet rule in Armenia. That added to the suspicion.

Moreover, they remembered how Agabekov had corrupted their bishops.

A prelate had to get permission from the commissars before they would let him in or out of Armenia and always the Ogpu would contact him and attempt to do business with him.

Often, if the priest was sufficiently ambitious to be a bishop, he would agree to go on the Soviet pay roll as a secret agent of the Ogpu as the price of being a bishop.

All these things produced in the minds of many Armenians a feeling of doubt and suspicion.

Then one day the Armenians were holding a great fair at the Chicago exposition in 1933.

Tourian went as the ranking churchman in America. When he arrived he refused to enter the grounds unless the old flag of Armenia was lowered. That signed his death warrant.

On Christmas Eve, 1933, a few months later, as he was moving up the aisle of his cathedral in New York to celebrate mass, surrounded by acolytes, censer bearers, cross bearers and priests, and a bodyguard, nine men stepped quietly out into the aisle from the adjoining pews and swiftly surrounded him, while one plunged a great knife into his body before the congregation realized what was going on.

This tragic deed produced a violent convulsion in the Armenian colony here. The men who did the deed were members of the Dashnag organization, as were most anti-Communist Armenians.

So the Soviet agents here saw in this incident an excellent opportunity to go to work on the old Dashnag patriots—their bitter enemies—and liquidate them in public opinion.

A wave of denunciation was leveled against the Dashnag organization. They were pictured as the "bloody Dashnags." The impression was created that they were a kind of Armenian edition of the Mafia. It was an attack similar in character and intensity to the smear attack now being carried on by the American smear bund against those who refuse to follow the foreign policy of the administration.

DEROUNIAN TAKES UP HIS FIRST SMEAR JOB

Many Armenians became intimidated lest they be branded as criminals. And who should turn out to be the most industrious and persistent instrument of this campaign of abuse against the anti-Communist Armenians? Who but our young hero of Under Cover, Avedis Boghos Derounian, alias Arthur A. Derounian, alias Carlson, alias Paige, alias Decker, alias Pagnanelli, etc.?

He first shows up publicly—making his debut as a smearer—at the trial of the assassins of Bishop Tourian. He was there as the reporter of an obscure Armenian weekly newspaper, the Armenian Spectator.

Another Armenian newspaper, reporting the trial, described how at one point Derounian became so obstreperous during the cross-examination of witnesses that Judge Corrigan halted the trial and summoned him to his desk for reprimand.

The next year Derounian became the editor of the little paper, the Spectator. There he engaged in a continuous course of extolling the great work of the Bolshevists in the subjugation and rule of his fatherland.

Toward the end of 1935 the Spectator, while he was managing editor, sponsored a delegation of 16 Armenians to Moscow and Armenia to celebrate the conquest of Armenia by the Bolshevists.

CHEERS THE SOVIET CONTROL OF ARMENIA

This delegation was headed by the editor of the paper whom Derounian succeeded in office.

And on the fifteenth anniversary of the taking of Armenia by the Soviet, the delegation arrived in Moscow and was received with great eclat by the peoples' commissars. On this day Derounian's leading editorial was a paean of joy over the Red absorption of Armenia.

And in that applause of his country's swallowing by the Russians, we see a complete picture of the cultural and political and national leanings of this young oriental scribbler.

Of course, I do not know whether he is a Communist.

But what would you think of a Pole who would say that the day the Red armies of Russia flowed over the barriers of his fatherland and destroyed its liberty was a glorious day?

What of a Finn who would make a profession of abusing and berating Finns who objected to Communist conquest of Finland, and who would speak of the day the Red armies take Finland as the most glorious in her history?

NEXT HE WRITES FOR PRORED MAGAZINE

In November 1936 this young Armenian, Derounian, alias Carlson, alias Decker, alias Paige, alias Pagnanelli, turns up again in the magazine Soviet Russia Today, with his name signed to an article giving a glowing description of the wonderful progress of Armenia and the happy lot of the Armenians under the Bolshevists.

The piece is well written, which creates the suspicion that he did not write it.

Moreover, it is an eyewitness description of Soviet Armenia he could not write unless he had visited there.

Did he? If not, why is his name on the article? Who, in this Communist magazine, had authority to sign his name?

This is the young man who is the reputed author of the book Under Cover, which, under the most amazing plugging ever known, has sold over 800,000 copies.

This book uses precisely the same technique that this odd oriental used on his own countrymen—smearing all who do not agree with his employers.

The book pretends to expose a number of subversive groups. But they are all so-called Nazi and Fascist agents. Nowhere does the author ever get around to exposing any Communist groups. Instead, always the beneficiaries of his attacks are pro-Communist groups, as in the case of his campaign against his brother Armenians.

Actually this strange young man presents himself in a sort of double life. He signs himself John Roy Carlson, but admits to his publishers that his name is Arthur A. Derounian, under which name he carries on a campaign of vilification against Americans to the loud hurrahs of the Communist Daily Worker and New Masses.

Then under the name of Avedis Boghos Derounian—a name he was still using only a few months ago—he carries on a similar campaign against Armenians to the delight of the same sheets.

He had worked at his Armenian trade until sometime in 1938. Then he was hired by the Anti-Defamation League as an informer and later by the Friends of Democracy, as they call themselves, in the same noble role. They paid him $40 a week.

As such he went around, dressed like a comic stage Italian, visting people suspected of Fascist or anti-Semitic sympathies, encouraging them to make slurring remarks against the Jews, and then reporting the remarks to his employers as samples of anti-Semitism.

He issued an anti-Semitic sheet of his own composition containing some of the vilest attacks on the Jews I have ever seen to fire people already touched with anti-Semitism with further provocative needling, and then he charged those people with anti-Semitism.

However, his purpose was not so much to expose the thirty or forty authentic anti-Semitic and pro-Fascist groups he names and describes in the book—because practically all of these has been endlessly exposed in other books, in magazines and newspaper articles, by the Dies committee and by the Department of Justice.

The object of the book is to name all these miserable and squalid guilty wretches already convicted or located and then twine their names and guilt in an odious smear around the names of a number of Senators and Representatives and other well-known American citizens who do not follow the Communist line or who do not swallow the global nonsense of the present administration.

THE PEOPLE BACK OF DEROUNIAN TODAY

He was hired, I say, by the "Friends of Democracy" (as they call themselves), which is operated by Rex Stout, a former editor of the New Masses and by Leon M. Birkhead, an ex-preacher from Kansas City. They paid him $40 a week as an informer and guided his footsteps.

Rex Stout boasts that he was in touch constantly with Derounian while he was doing this job and Derounian says Stout was the godfather of the book. Birkhead has said that he was in touch with Derounian practically every day that he was working up his smears.

The book must be taken as the joint product of these three worthies—Stout, Birkhead, and Derounian, alias this and that.

Derounian probably wrote the book himself, since it is an amazingly trashy piece of writing. Stout and Birkhead really know how to write.

Konrad Bercovici, gypsy novelist, had a hand in it. His role was to rewrite it and put it into living English, though it is difficult to believe he actually did so. However, he has a share in the royalties on it. How much these royalties are we can guess—perhaps $300,000.

But, alas, they are probably pretty well tied up by libel suits, of which many have been instituted by outraged victims of the wholesale smear.

So this is Mr. Carlson, author of Under Cover—Avedis Boghos Derounian, alias Arthur A. Derounian, alias John Roy Carlson, alias Thomas L. Paige, alias George Decker, alias Pagnanelli, etc. And of whom more will be heard.

His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, for 84 years, William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston and dean of the American Catholic hierarchy, lived a good and full life. Today he lies in state, clad in his full robes of office, in Holy Cross Cathedral. He will be buried on Friday morning, after a Pontifical Mass of Requiem, to be celebrated by the Apostolic Delegate, Most Rev. Amleto Giovanni Cicognani.

Between now and Friday, many thousands of his neighbors and friends will pass through Holy Cross Cathedral to look their last upon the beloved old cardinal. He was a man who not only saw history being made, but who himself helped to make it. He was a militant churchman, unafraid to attack those who offended his strict principles; equally unafraid of the criticism which outspoken honesty always invokes.

Cardinal O'Connell was born among the poor, himself the eleventh child of poor parents, in the mill town of Lowell, Mass. This early contact with poverty—for a New England mill town eighty-odd years ago was a sorry place indeed for the workers—gave the sensitive boy a great compassion for those who struggle

under social discrimination; it also gave him a burning determination to better the lot of his unfortunate fellowmen.

This determination drove him onward until, for these past many years, the cardinal has been a powerful force in his locality, and, indeed, throughout America, for the rights of man and the dignity of humanity. His interest in mankind was all-absorbing and universal; he could denounce a rabble rouser and rise to the defense of a non-Catholic minority group with the same vigor which he so stirringly employed to the glory of his church and his God.

There have been many great cardinals in this country: Gibbons, Hayes, and Mundelein, to mention only three. Today only one, Dennis Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia, remains in his country. The Pope, it is reported, will make no new appointments to the College of Cardinals until the war is over. The responsibility which lies ahead for the men who will become members of the College of Cardinals in the future is a great one indeed. It is not easy to follow in the footsteps of a man and a churchman of the stature of Cardinal O'Connell. He was statesman and patriot as well as prelate; he possessed not only the courage of his convictions, but, what is rarer still, the courage of his impulses.

When I first heard of the passing of Cardinal O'Connell, a poem came to my mind, and I would like to share a few lines from it with you. It was Francis Thompson's To the Dead Cardinal of Westminster, a tribute to the great Cardinal Manning, who was once kind to the poet:

> I saw thee only once,
> Although thy gentle tones
> said soft:
> "Come hither oft."

This was what Cardinal O'Connell said to all who were weary and heavily laden, and many came, and found strength and comfort and courage and peace.

Yesterday on the floor of this House many Members paid tribute to His Eminence, and today the newspapers published the following beautiful messages from our own President Roosevelt, President Quezon, on behalf of the Filipino people, and His Holiness Pope Pius XII:

Following is the text of President Roosevelt's message:

"I am deeply sorrowful to hear of the passing of the venerable figure of Cardinal O'Connell, prelate and prince of the church. With rare gifts of leadership, he served his day and generation with fidelity, steadfastness, and true apostolic zeal. May I, through you, offer to his flock which has lost its shepherd this assurance of my heartfelt sympathy."

MESSAGE FROM QUEZON

President Quezon said: "On behalf of the Filipino people and in my own, may I express, through you to the people of Boston, my sincerest sympathy in the death of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell. In him the church has lost one of her most illustrious cardinals and New England her beloved father and leader. May our Lord grant him the eternal reward he so richly deserves."

CONDOLENCES OF THE POPE

WASHINGTON, April 24.—Pope Pius XII today sent his condolences on the death of Cardinal O'Connell. A cable received at the apostolic delegation here from Luigi Cardinal Maclione, papal secretary of state, said:

"His Holiness has learned with deepest sorrow of the death of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, whose outstanding qualities were ever highly esteemed. He requests me to convey his assurance of prayerful remembrance for the deceased, and also profound sympathy to the bereaved Archdiocese of Boston in the loss of its beloved pastor, imparting to Bishop Cushing, clergy, and faithful the paternal apostolic blessing. The expression of my personal, heartfelt regrets are added to those of His Holiness."

It is difficult to find words adequately to express the sorrow that is in my heart at the passing of this noble person. It was my privilege to have known him since my childhood, and during the years I have always regarded him as a most lovable character and a citizen extraordinary who brought but honored glory to his church and to his city.

It was Dr. Samuel Johnson who said that if one stopped under a doorway with Edmund Burke to escape a shower he would be impressed with the certainty that he had met a kindly man. That was equally true of Cardinal O'Connell. His vigorous and penetrating mind, always at work, gained for him an immense extent and variety of knowledge. He had the learning of a philosopher, and to that learning he added the manners of a gentleman.

Cardinal O'Connell was gifted and blessed above most men of his day and generation, but above all in that simple, childlike faith which was fostered at the knee of his mother, and which survived and grew with all the triumphs of his great career, and carried him onward into the next world with the fervor of a martyr and the certainty of one who knows.

May the Lord deal with him as one who has gained the palm and may his place in the world beyond the grave be even higher and more glorious than that which he won for himself among men.

Political Activities of the C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have before me two very brief articles which I wish to make a matter of record in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first is an article entitled "Hillman Rallies Midwest's C. I. O." appearing in the magazine PM, the companion of the Communist Daily Worker of New York, of September 20, 1943. The second is an Associated Press dispatch from Chicago entitled "C. I. O. Actionists Seek Isolationists' Defeat," dated January 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From PM of September 20, 1943]

HILLMAN RALLIES MIDWEST'S C. I. O.

MINNEAPOLIS, September 20.—Several hundred C. I. O. delegates from five Midwest States met here yesterday with Sidney Hillman, head of the national C. I. O. Committee for Political Action, to map a fight against Congressmen who have voted for antilabor legislation.

The delegates came from Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Iowa, and Nebraska, sometimes regarded as the heart of the isolationist belt. Under Hillman's guidance, they took preliminary steps in organizing a regional political action committee which will have headquarters in Minneapolis.

This move follows recent action by the Minnesota C. I. O. looking toward establishment of a State C. I. O. newspaper by next January.

"The present Congress cannot be entrusted with making the peace," Hillman charged.

Representatives of the C. I. O., A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods and Democratic and Farmer-Labor Parties gave a demonstration of political unity at a banquet that followed. Hillman revealed the political action committee plans to work with the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota, home of isolationist Senator GERALD P. NYE, who is up for reelection next year. Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, has been asked to be identified with the league.

C. I. O. ACTIONISTS SEEK ISOLATIONISTS' DEFEAT

(By the Associated Press)

CHICAGO, January 24, 1944.—Chairman Sidney Hillman said today the Political Action Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations would work to defeat congressional isolationists and to bring out a record vote in the November elections.

Speaking to newsmen at a press conference before a conference with 14 regional directors of the committee from all parts of the Nation, Mr. Hillman said:

"We hope to do our part to retire after-Pearl Harbor isolationists in Congress so that the country will have representatives who represent the will of the people."

Evaluating the Cotton Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial entitled "Evaluating the Cotton Crop," from the State, South Carolina's progressive newspaper, in the issue of April 21.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVALUATING THE COTTON CROP

In evaluating the cotton crop in our national economy the byproducts have not usually carried their due weight.

And specially in this time of war the byproducts of cotton often loom even larger than the lint itself.

Lint cotton is one of the very few things that this war did not catch us short in, thanks to intelligent perseverance against the boll weevil and the other ills that have beset cotton, and even war's great demands are being fully met, and adequate reserves of lint exist.

But cotton is more than a fiber crop—far more.

In 1942 this State's average yield per acre of lint was 294 pounds. Measured against urgent, immediate national need, this lint was rather insignificant when compared with the 89.5 pounds of oil for human consumption that this average acre of cotton produced. That was worth as much to the human race as the lard from three good hogs.

The 252.5 pounds of invaluable high-protein feed in the form of cottonseed meal that came from the average acre of cotton was worth more in producing meat for the human race at this critical hour than a third of that area would have averaged in producing corn, and the cotton also gave, as another byproduct, 125 pounds of hulls for feed or industrial use.

And that is not all. It goes right down there to where the guns of war are booming with 51 pounds of linters for making high explosives.

So there we have it. Against the excellent average yield of 294 pounds of lint cotton per acre in this State in 1942, that same average acre gave 518 pounds of other vital materials that were made from its 546 pounds of seed.

What a crop old King Cotton is! At first only a fiber. But now it is fiber, food, feed, and explosive—a four-way war crop! Where is its equal?

And to get State figures for 1942 we find the following staggering totals came from the 311,000 tons of seed out of that 699,000-bale crop: 51,004 tons of oil; 143,837 tons of meal; 71,219 tons of hulls; 116,936 bales of linters (500 pounds gross each).

Cotton—truly a kingly crop!

S. 1311

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Henry Matt, a member of the Flathead Tribal Council, I am inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, his written objections to S. 1311:

SENATE BILL NO. 1311

OBJECTIONS TO BILL

A proper consideration of Senate bill 1311, introduced May 24, 1943, to remove restrictions on Indian property now held in trust by the United States, and for other purposes, depends on the knowledge of certain basic facts, which should be known and considered.

In 1855 the United States and the Flathead Indians entered into a treaty, which was to last "as long as the sun would shine or water would flow." This treaty recognized the independent national status of the Flathead Indians as a nation. A treaty is a solemn promise between nations that cannot be changed or altered by Congress or law of either nation. It can only be broken or altered by the consent of both. The United States has forgotten this basis of a treaty.

In 1872 a second treaty was put out by the United States changing the first treaty. This treaty seems to have been unsigned by the Indian representative. The purpose of the second treaty, on the part of the United States, was to get back promises of rights and lands and property guaranteed in the original treaty. And the United States by laws and orders has been constantly taking back the promises made in 1855.

The first promise broken was when Chief Arlee was told to move, in 1874. Then Chief Moise was given his order to move in 1881. Chief Charlo received his order to move in 1889. And the tribal members are still receiving orders to curtail their land and privileges.

In 1908, Congressman Dixon, without authority found in any of the treaties with the Flathead, introduced and had passed a bill opening the Flathead Reservation to the white people, which gave the choice of Indian tribal lands to the whites and for which the Indian received nothing. The lands to be retained and held by the Indian were to be in fee and not subject to the white man's tax. This bill goes so far as even to take away the treaty right of tax-free land and will subject the lands of the tribes to taxation.

Another basic fact is, taxation of land is merely another name for rental. If the bill asked the Indians to turn over their land to the Government and the Government would then rent it back to them the thievery in the bill would be apparent. Instead the bill says you can keep your land but you must pay the State a tax for keeping it, and for this great favor we grant you we add another that you will be exempt from taxation for a period of 10 years up to an assessed valuation of $1,000. When one rents land and the tenant does not pay the rent he can be removed from possession. When the State taxes land and the tax or rental is not paid the State takes the land.

The $1,000 exemption would only apply to the extent of $1,000 so if an Indian had a house of $3,000 value it would be taxed to the extra $2,000 and if not paid two-thirds of the house would be sold by the county. This is a clever way to take from the Indian what little has been left to him. The bill is supposed to apply only to the land left in trust, but the next bill would probably tax all Indian lands, trust or no trust. The offer of $1,000 tax exemption is only a bait on the hook, so the Indian—poor fish—will swallow it. The end of the first sentence sounds fine and noble: "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to forthwith execute and issue such certificates, patents, deeds, or other instruments as may be necessary to vest in said Indian allottees or their heirs, or heirs of heirs of said Indian allottees, unrestricted title in fee to such lands or inherited interests therein." (See Cato Sells, Commissioner, letter of April 17, 1917.)

When this title is vested, taxes begin and the Indian would soon loose his land. Much of this would be, vested land has little value, but it would carry the county tax, which would soon take the land.

The part of the bill authorizing the payment of all Indian moneys held in trust, is to be commended, but if to get this trust money which belongs to the Indian he must first put his property on the tax rolls, the price he pays for his own moneys is too high.

If the author of this bill wants the Indians to get the trust money out of Government control, why not give it to the Indians, without any strings? This trust money which belongs to the Indian tribe is being used often for other purposes than to help the Indians and since the Government has started to first take this money in trust, many an Indian who was entitled to it, died without its benefit.

Another feature that is bad in the bill, is the putting of the Indian property under the State laws and State control. The Indian has paid too dearly for his control by the National Government without adding the burden of the State government, which would be more than he could carry.

The offer of tax exemption on $1,000 assessment for 10 years sounds like giving something to the Indian for nothing. The tax is determined in State assessment, by a portion only of the value exempt, so the Indian would be freed from about $5 a year tax for 10 years or a grant of $50 in tax rebates, after which he is subject to tax sale and forfeiture of his land if he cannot pay up.

The allowance in the aggregate, considering the number of Indians over the half-blood, would be very small in total and a disgraceful finish to the prior treatment of the Flathead Tribe.

The reservation was opened with the promise it would benefit the Indian. The white man came and took up much of the land in what is now Lake County. This county has assessed values of $15,000,000, which is owned by the whites. For this the Indians received little or nothing. The land taken up by the whites in Sanders County shows a value by assessment of some $6,000,000, and the assessment to whites of land in Missoula County taken from the Indians, after the treaty, would be double the value of the counties of Lake and Sanders. This promise of benefit to the Indians, when the reservation was illegally opened, has given the white man title to some $30,000,000 of assessed values which the Indians were told would help them.

From being a prosperous nation, before the opening of their reservation, they have become a poor nation.

Another serious objection to the bill, in its concern to the Flathead Tribe, is that the framer of the bill did not even ask the Flatheads if they wanted the bill and if they were favorable to it. This thing is being put over without their consent.

The Government has planned to take away the Indian customs and language and now what little is left of the property covered by treaty.

The plight of the Indian is getting to be on a par with the buffalo. The buffalo are put on a reservation with a fence around it, but are assured of social security, enough to eat, and freedom from fear of molestation. The Indian has been put on a reservation with mountains around it, and ever since the original treaty the mountains are being moved closer, until with the last effort, by passing the bill suggested, he will not even have a reservation. The United States Government is making a greater effort to keep the buffalo from extermination than is being made for the Indian.

After the opening of the reservation the Government took some $4,000,000 of Indian tribal money and expended it on ditches and water canals, and turned them over to the white settler.

The United States in 1855 made a treaty with the Flathead Tribe and the tribe expected that the treaty would be kept. History has shown a path of wrecked Indian hopes and broken white promises.

The United States is now offering freedom from want and fear to all the nations of the earth, and the Indian has more of want and more of fear for his own security than ever.

The bill purports to tell the Indian he is able to stand on his own feet, if he accepts the provisions of the bill, but the Government says he is not competent to handle his own money by keeping it from him.

The bill is objectionable, and has many repulsive features, among them:

1. If this bill becomes a law, then the Indian is forever denied the right to make

demands on the Government for further redress of wrongs.'

2. It will make eventually all the land of individual Indian and tribal lands subject to State control and State taxation, which means gradual confiscation.

3. The time limit for the exemption of $5 per year in taxation on $1,000 of assessed homestead of 10 years, is only long enough to make the Indian 10 years older and then lose his land after that, if he cannot pay the State tax.

4. Amounts in excess of $300 must go through the State courts and subject to State laws, which means that the State will create a commission at the expense of the Indian and his tribe to carry out this feature of the bill and entails large and useless expense which, of course, will come out of the Indian money.

5. On principle the Indian should not accept such a bill, as it is forced on them without their consent, and even the obtaining of their consent is done under misrepresentation as to the good to be derived from it.

6. The bill abrogates, without the tribal consent, the treaty of 1855 which is binding in honor on the United States Government, to keep inviolate and preserve the property and rights of the Indian as long as "the sun shines and waters flow." The white man has already stopped the flow of much of the Indian water and would stop the sun from shining.

7. The Honorable Senator MOORE and other sponsors of this bill should realize and acknowledge that it is partly the fault of men like themselves that the Indian is still the same as he has always been in his relations with the Government. All the responsibility cannot be laid at the door of the Indian bureaus.

HENRY MATT,
Flathead Indian.

Employment of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much said about the employment of disabled veterans, so many attempts have been made to show that they would not be able to carry on work as employees in various enterprises, that I have deemed it advisable to insert in the RECORD a statement compiled by Mr. Harold W. Breining, of the Veterans' Administration, covering the subject of the employment of the handicapped.

Undoubtedly in the old days, before the development of electricity and invention of those electrical appliances that go to lighten the burden of human labor, it would have been more difficult for wounded or disabled veterans to carry on in the average industry.

But under conditions as they exist today, I submit there is no reason on earth why practically every industry in America should not give preference to disabled veterans when it comes to employment.

The following statement by Mr. Breining is sufficient proof that vast numbers of these wounded and otherwise disabled men will be competent to resume their positions, or to take positions in those other activities for which they are fitted.

The matter referred to follows:

APRIL 15, 1944.

ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, THE ADMINISTRATOR, EMPLOYMENT OF THE DISABLED:

In your recent conference with Mr. Ray Murphy of the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives you indicated that you expected in the near future to hold a conference of all concerned organizations relative to the employment of the disabled. I am submitting the information stated below in the belief that you might wish to have such data in condensed form:

"One recent survey made in a large manufacturing plant studied 685 handicapped employees in comparison with the same number of normal individuals. The records indicate:

"Seven and nine-tenths percent more normal workers resigned than handicapped workers.

"Seven percent more absences among normal workers.

"Five and six-tenths percent fewer accidents among the handicapped workers.

"Seven and four-tenths percent more discharges for cause among normal workers.

"Four and six-tenths percent increased earnings for the handicapped as compared with 4 percent for the normal workers." (Letter April 3, 1944, American Mutual Alliance.)

"Caterpillar has approximately 800 handicapped persons in gainful and most useful work. This number is remarkable when one considers that this company builds heavy machinery, calling for heavy and light machine work, similar types of assembling, and gray iron and aluminum foundry work. Those called handicapped by Caterpillar are only those with major defects—loss of one or both extremities; marked deformities, congenital or otherwise; loss of one or both eyes; loss of hearing or speech; and those recovered from tuberculosis, heart disease, etc.

"Yes; the program works in the hardest, most callous test tube of them all—actual experience. The vast majority of these people have a production, safety, and absentee record far above normal. They are paid at the same rate as normal individuals, are shown no special favors, and are in no way considered as accepting charity. They will be given the same consideration as any other employee in being retained on the job in the days following the war.

"The best answer to 'Will It Work?' is from the lips of 'Caterpillar' supervision reflecting positive company policy: 'Give us as many of this type of workman as you can get.'" (Pamphlet, the Caterpillar Tractor Co.)

Such statistics as appear to be available seem to substantiate the belief that physically handicapped persons generally prove to be sound investments when placed in suitable jobs. One study states:

"1. They are virtually draft-proof.

"2. They are often better for particular jobs than a normal person, e. g., workers deaf or hard of hearing are ideal for work requiring concentration in noisy surroundings.

"3. They don't shop around for better jobs. This reduces turn-over and makes for the better morale of a contented work force.

"4. They take better care of their work and pay more attention to it, thus increasing productivity.

"5. They are more appreciative of their opportunities, and hence more loyal.

"6. They are likely to have fewer accidents because they are accustomed to acting more cautiously. The statistical evidence available confirms this belief. Western Electric studied 685 handicapped workers in a 2-year period, finding that 23.5 percent of them were injured at work, as contrasted to 39.1 percent of the control group of nonhandicapped persons. The Pennsylvania State Bureau of Rehabilitation analyzed extensive automobile accident data and found that .6 percent of 29,000 physically handicapped auto drivers were involved in accidents against 4.5 percent of 2,000,000 drivers of normal physical fitness.

"7. Their attendance is as good as that of normal persons." (Letter January 17, 1944, Association of Casualty and Surety Executives.)

"Of the 97 employers who reported on absenteeism—53 found it to be less for the handicapped; 39 found it to be the same in both groups; only 5 found it to be higher among the handicapped.

"Of the 76 employers who reported on labor turn-over—63 found the turn-over rate to be lower among the handicapped; 12 found it to be the same in both groups; only 1 found it to be higher among the handicapped.

"Of the 87 employers who reported on accident rate—49 found it to be lower among the handicapped; 36 found it to be the same in both groups; only 2 found it to be higher among the handicapped.

"Of the 105 employers who reported on productivity—25 found output to be higher among the handicapped; 69 found it to be the same in both groups; only 11 found it to be lower among the handicapped." (Pamphlet study made by the Federal Security Agency.)

HAROLD W. BREINING.

Tables Showing the Treasury Department Estimates of the Number of Civilian Income Recipients Incurring (a) Regular Net Income Tax and (b) Victory Tax, Under the Revenue Act of 1943, at Levels of Income Estimated for the Calendar Year 1944, Distributed by Net Income Classes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD H. McLEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tables:

Estimated number of civilian income recipients incurring regular net income tax under the Revenue Act of 1943, at levels of income estimated for the calendar year 1944

Net income class (dollars in thousands)	Number		Percentage distribution	
	Simple	Cumulative from highest level	Simple	Cumulative from highest level
0–1	6,081,039	40,726,293	14.932	100.000
1–2	17,507,407	34,645,254	42.988	85.068
2–3	9,707,701	17,137,847	23.836	42.080
3–4	3,660,012	7,430,146	8.987	18.244
4–5	2,025,618	3,770,134	4.974	9.257
5–10	1,169,452	1,744,516	2.872	4.283
10–25	446,475	575,064	1.096	1.411
25–50	90,987	128,589	.223	.315
50–100	27,257	37,602	.067	.092

Estimated number of civilian income recipients incurring regular net income tax under the Revenue Act of 1943, at levels of income estimated for the calendar year 1944—Continued

Net income class (dollars in thousands)	Number		Percentage distribution	
	Simple	Cumulative from highest level	Simple	Cumulative from highest level
100–250	8,701	10,345	0.021	0.025
250–500	1,215	1,644	.003	.004
500–1,000	350	429	.001	.001
1,000 and over	79	79	(1)	(1)
Total	40,726,293		100.000	

[1] Less than 0.0005 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Mar. 3, 1944.

Estimated number of civilian income recipients incurring Victory tax under the Revenue Act of 1943 at levels of income estimated for the calendar year 1944

Net income class (dollars in thousands)	Number		Percentage distribution	
	Simple	Cumulative from highest level	Simple	Cumulative from highest level
0–1	9,725,918	50,886,630	19.113	100.000
1–2	22,813,107	41,160,712	44.831	80.887
2–3	10,907,204	18,347,605	21.434	36.056
3–4	3,670,267	7,440,401	7.213	14.622
4–5	2,025,618	3,770,134	3.981	7.409
5–10	1,169,452	1,744,516	2.298	3.428
10–25	446,475	575,064	0.877	1.130
25–50	90,987	128,589	0.179	0.253
50–100	27,257	37,602	0.054	0.074
100–250	8,701	10,345	0.017	0.020
250–500	1,215	1,644	0.002	0.003
500–1,000	350	429	0.001	0.001
1,000 and over	79	79	(1)	(1)
Total	50,886,630		100.000	

[1] Less than 0.0005 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Mar. 3, 1944.

Eulogy to His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following excellent eulogy on the passing of that beloved leader of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, who was called to his Maker on Saturday, April 22, 1944, which appeared in the edition of the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.:

GREAT LEADER DIES

His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, archibishop of Boston, has passed on to his Maker, his earthly task complete.

The passing of the dean of the Catholic Hierarchy in America, despite his advanced age and the knowledge that his illness had been regarded as critical for several days, came as a great shock not only to the people of his own archdiocese, and of the Nation, but also to friends and admirers the world over.

His death marks the exit of a great and outstanding leader at a time when the world can ill afford to lose personages of the brilliance of Cardinal O'Connell. His influence for good spread near and far and his utterances upon matters of world import will be missed. They were always based upon sound reasoning, broad vision, deep study, and with consideration of the welfare of all peoples. His advice and counsel on matters pertaining to local, national, and world affairs were sought as well as his exceptional opinions and utterances upon matters of religion, culture, science, and humanitarianism.

Leaders in all callings, of all races and creeds, hastened to express their regrets and tributes upon learning of the death of Cardinal O'Connell. Messages have been pouring in from all parts of the world. It is generally recognized that one of great vision, unusual broadness, extreme tolerance, of deep understanding, of charity unsung, and of influence among people throughout the Christian world, has passed on from this earth to take his place in heaven.

Cardinal O'Connell, largely because of his tolerance and understanding, commanded the respect of people. His 60 years in the priesthood of God have been fruitful years and productive ones. He never deviated from his standards of righteousness, decency and propriety. His views on many matters relating to certain trends of modern civilization could always be depended upon as fearless, frank, and based upon the tenets of religion. From a boyhood in the home of his parents, humble mill workers in Lowell, he traversed the paths of life and religion to one of the highest honors his church could grant. The archdiocese over which he presided for so many years and so faithfully and well is sorrowing today over the great loss. Cardinal O'Connell's body, garbed in the full ceremonial robes of his high office, will lie in state from today until Friday in the Cathedral of the Holy Cross at Boston. During that time many thousands will pass his bier and pray for his eternal rest.

There are many monuments and memorials to the great churchman all over the great archdiocese. Churches, schools, colleges, institutions devoted to the advancement of the arts and sciences, abodes for the stricken and unfortunate may be counted in the hundreds.

Cardinal O'Connell's fourscore and more of years of life were well spent. His contributions to his God, his church, his country, and to civilization are beyond estimation. Seeing the results of his constancy to the rules of righteousness and decency gave him much satisfaction during his lifetime, but his real reward will come in heaven.

China: A Key to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a broadcast I made over the N. B. C. on Friday, April 21, 1944:

My fellow Americans, this is my third radio talk with you concerning the Far East. My purpose in discussing this field is to keep you informed about what is happening there and to emphasize the importance of that area in this global war.

You are all aware of our successes in the Pacific over the past year and we are justly proud of MacArthur, Halsey, Nimitz, Chennault, and Stilwell and the boys who fight under their commands. But their job has been a long and hard one and the end is, as yet, nowhere in sight. We cannot afford to believe those who say that Japan will be defeated before Germany, because there is absolutely no basis for that statement. Neither should we be complacent about our successes or about the size of our Navy or the fact that we are building 12 warships every day—Sundays included.

While we are scraping the bottom of our manpower barrel to garrison over 50 fronts scattered all over the world, the Japanese have almost 2,000,000 men who have not been called to the colors because they are not needed.

In estimating our enemies we must use common sense and look at them as they really are. Our best military minds recognize the Jap as a first-class fighting man. Yes, he's short in stature, his clothes are ill-fitting, and he's not much on the parade ground. But, in the field he is tough, fanatical, and has a do-or-die spirit. His equipment is good and he can subsist on far less than our boys. His industrial capacity is far better than we give him credit for even if, in quality and quantity, he lags behind. These people, who are supposed to be only imitators, are today building single-seater fighter planes that fly in excess of 350 miles an hour, that have a higher maneuverability than ours, and a rate of climb that compares well with our planes.

Since Pearl Harbor, Japan has become the richest nation in the world and has every natural resource needed to carry on the war. She can, if given time, become perhaps the most powerful military nation the world has ever seen. Japan has no qualms about using the 400,000,000 people it has conquered as a huge pool of subject labor. She is mobilized for a long war, her people eat one-third of what they used to, and every energy is directed toward the killing of Allied soldiers. Japan has made full use of the limited initial resources of a weak nation and has fought a careful and orthodox war with two exceptions—Midway and the fleet action at Guadalcanal. The Japanese intend to make us pay heavily for every success we achieve and their defense, as at Tarawa, New Guinea, and elsewhere, shows careful planning.

In fighting Japan we must keep open the longest supply line in history. To illustrate: it takes 44 ships, 3,200 crewmen, and 165,000 barrels of oil to move 100,000 tons of supplies to Australia each month. To move that amount by air would require over 10,000 planes, approximately 120,000 crewmen, and close to 10,000,000 barrels of gasoline. And these supplies would be enough for an Army to wage a minor engagement only. It is even more difficult to transport supplies to our great Asiatic ally, China. China, with its almost half a billion people born to the oldest culture in the world, struggling, fighting, and dying to preserve her nationhood, has been in this war for almost 7 years. Her material conditions have changed for the worse, her richest industrial areas have been lost, widespread inflation has set in, her troops are still inadequately armed, but today she is as confident of final victory as ever.

China will be the main front in the Pacific war. Even if the Japanese Navy is meeting its match, this cannot yet be said of the enemy Army, entrenched in a vast land domain from Manchuria to Burma. Recently two top American commanders have emphasized in specific terms the nature of the task that lies ahead on the continent of Asia. On February 8, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz told

newspapermen: "My objective is to get ground and air forces into China as soon as possible. I don't believe Japan can be defeated from the sea alone." To this he added the unequivocal declaration: "I believe Japan can be defeated only from bases in China."

Five days later, Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell declared that Admiral Nimitz's naval drive across the Pacific to the China coast "must be supported heavily by an aggressive Allied land and air offensive projected from the interior." Asserting that "vital China-based air operations cannot wait for a penetration of the blockade by land or sea," he stated that facilities are being prepared inside China to service "the largest and newest cargo carriers available."

All sea and overland routes to China—with one exception—are cut off. The one exception is the northwest caravan route from Sinkiang Province into China proper. At the present time negotiations are being carried on between China and Russia concerning the transportation of supplies from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics via this route but no agreement has, as yet, been reached.

The only route now is an aerial one over the "hump" of the Himalayas, and there the Army Air Transport Command and the China National Aviation Corporation are doing a remarkably efficient job. When China first proposed this route to our authorities she was told that the mountains were impassable, the Indian monsoons impenetrable, and when skies were clear Japanese interception would become fatal. All these factors have been overcome and today more material is being flown into China than ever went in over the Burma Road.

Every item of equipment necessary for the maintenance and operation of Chennault's air force in China must be flown in from the outside. This is the fundamental fact of our strategy in China. Transport planes flying the round trip between Assam and Kunming can deliver 4 tons of 100-octane gas, but to do so they must themselves use 3½ tons of the precious commodity.

It is no secret that many planes flying over the "hump" have been lost without trace. In the last 8 months of 1942—when transportation over the Himalayas began—more than a fourth of the planes used were wrecked, shot down, or destroyed. Today the flights go forward on schedule, and until such time as we can either capture a seaport on the China coast or we conquer Burma to permit opening another overland route to China, this route is of the greatest importance and to date is all we have.

We can control the air completely, we can sweep the seas clean, but even then we will be a long way from winning our war in the Pacific. This war will be decided by the bayonet and the rifle, and that means the infantryman will carry the burden. That is where China comes in, because she has the manpower and the will to use it. China's Army has been trained well in the use of small arms—the rifle and the machine gun. She has the experience and the strategic location. This war may end not with the conquest of Japan's Pacific holdings or even with the defeat and conquest of Japan itself. It may very likely end in Manchuria, where this war started in 1931, and it is there that mammoth land armies may well decide this barbaric struggle.

For this reason—and it is not so far fetched as some may think—China must be given every possible assistance and soon. While we have not given her all the supplies she needs, we have been making superhuman efforts and the results are only now beginning to tell. In the last 8 months of 1942 we sent in over the "hump" 5,500 tons of material by air and in 1943 we raised that to 63,000 tons of which 13,300 tons were flown in the month of December alone. This shows remarkable progress and some day when the history of the air ferry from India to China is known, this country will realize that there are no greater heroes in this war than the boys who fly the big transports over the Himalayas. The result now is only a trickle but when the Ledo Road is completed and the Burma Road reopened it will swell and when we conquer our first seaport on the China coast it will become a torrent.

Before this happens the Chinese and Americans will have to continue to fight and fly shoulder to shoulder. The Chinese do not wish to make the war in Asia an American burden but would rather that America give them the tools so that they could do the job.

To implement transportation into China, there is being undertaken at present the building of the Ledo Road from Assam in India through northern Burma toward the Chinese frontier. About 150 miles have already been built and, if we can capture Myitkina, a Japanese-held railroad terminus in northern Burma before the monsoon rains begin in May, the road should be completed by next fall or winter and another highway into China made a reality. Then, in conjunction with the "hump" we should be able to send in material enough to start to drive the Japs out of China.

Gen. Joe Stilwell deserves all the credit in the world for his foresight in building the Ledo Road. The American-Chinese forces are working together and doing a great job. The finishing touches will come when the strength-starved China theater gets the ships, planes, and men to make it possible. Before this can be accomplished the Japanese invasion of India—and it is a serious threat—must be thrown back. If Auchinleck and Mountbatten do not stop the Japanese, the supply routes for the Ledo Road will be cut and all our transport and ground operations in Assam and north Burma will be dangerously menaced.

The Cairo Declaration was one of the first indications that this country and England at last realized the full import of the situation in the Far East. Unlike the Tehran Conference, which was mostly, if not entirely, occupied with European problems, the Cairo Declaration stated that Japan must surrender unconditionally. Furthermore, it stated that Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores shall be restored to China. These statements or promises mean much to China and the Far East, but they do not settle all the questions concerning territory which she considers—and rightly so—hers. No mention is made of the return of Hong Kong and Kowloon by England, of Macao by Portugal, of Kwangchow-wan by France, or of Outer Mongolia and Tannu Tuva by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These are Chinese territories and should be returned to China at the earliest possible moment. We are not fighting this war to bring about the return of the status quo ante in the Far East. To do so would only mean another war in the future. China is not fighting for territorial aggrandizement, but she is determined to reacquire the lands which have been taken away from her by force.

The Cairo Declaration was significant not so much for what it said but for what it left unsaid. It touched on Japanese imperialism; it said nothing of the occidental type.

Most people in this country think that after Germany's fall Japan's punishment will logically and inevitably follow. That assumption is correct, but it is not shared by the military clique which rules Japan even though we have sunk over 500 ships of her merchant fleet through the work of our submarines; even though we produce over 9,000 planes a month to her 1,000; even though our tank and ship production is greater than hers; and even though we exercise complete control of the mid, southwest, and north Pacific sea and sky lanes.

Japan believes that in a few years she can correct her present evident weaknesses if she is not seriously harassed by us. And she is certainly not being seriously hurt, except on the outer fringe of her empire, at the moment. The Japs think that we will become weary of a war that does not directly affect our shores and that our people will eventually insist upon a compromise peace leaving Japan with the greater part of her present gains. This would well suit Tojo because it would allow Japan to consolidate her gains and exploit them to the limit at which time she would resume her advance toward world mastery.

How long can Japan hold out? The Japs think forever. They are wrong. Too many Americans think for only a few months or a year at the most. They are wrong, too. No one can answer the question, but everyone can be assured that it will require every ounce of our energy and ability to do the job, and that applies to the man on the farm, the worker in the factory the legislators in Washington, and the boys at the front. The Japanese say we will not make any sacrifices and they emphasize our softness. They look upon us as weaklings, they play up our disunity, and they question our fighting spirit. They think all these elements will give them time to obtain complete control of all their conquests. They have made no provision for failure, and they feel the American people will give in when the going gets really tough. Will we? The answer is no, because we likewise have made no provision for failure.

Are We Going To Keep Our Promise to C. A. A.-W. T. S. Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have had many inquiries from my people of Louisiana as well as from citizens of other States relative to the manner in which a particular group of men has been handled since their recent activation from enlisted reserve status within the armed forces of the United States. Many of you, ladies and gentlemen, are acquainted with the name of this group by now. They have had little publicity, however, throughout the course of their work and study for the last year and a half, and remain quite unknown to the public generally—especially by comparison with other groups engaged in similar war work. The group of which I am speaking is composed of the C. A. A.-W. T. S. pilots, now privates in the walking army, to speak of the majority.

These men volunteered their services without pay in response to a much-publicized campaign conducted by the C. A. A. during the summer and fall of 1942. At that time they were told that a great need existed for pilots for various flying activities. They were assured that they would be useful pilots within a period of 8 to 10 months, and that the duration of training would not exceed 10 months. For that period of time they would have to make their own financial arrangements, because they would work without pay, being furnished only their subsistence and lodging. The majority

of the men had attained some substantial position in life, and having resources upon which they could draw, were glad to make the necessary sacrifice for this short length of time. Most of the younger men came from families which could assist them. Upon completion of their training the men were to be licensed or commissioned ferry pilots, transport pilots, air-line copilots and pilots, liaison pilots, tow-target pilots, and flight instructors. Most of these flying jobs called for commissioned or flight-officer status, and men were accepted for training only after passing comprehensive mental examinations and rigid C. A. A. commercial pilot physical examinations.

Prospective trainees had to enlist in the Army enlisted reserve corps or the Navy before enrollment for their first courses as early as July 1942. Trainees already in the Civilian Pilot Training Program at the time had their choice of joining the Navy or the Army. By the end of 1942 some 25,000 men had enlisted.

Army and Navy C. P. T. men received instruction side by side in many schools. They attended all classes together—ground school, military subjects, drill, physical training, and flight. In the middle of December 1942 the Navy trainees received the happy announcement that from then on they would be paid while training. Their classmates, the Army men, received no such announcement. In fact, they doubted that the Army knew they existed. This was pretty bad for morale, but the hurt was not too serious for the men did not slacken their efforts. They had their goal to reach—flying in our war effort. It was later apparent to everyone concerned that the time necessary for completing the entire curriculum would greatly exceed the 8- to 10-month period set out in the original plan. The men would have to finance themselves for a longer period of time. Congress came to their assistance in the spring of 1943 by providing pay at the rate of $50 per month retroactive to December 15, 1942.

This program, later called the E. R. C.—Enlisted Reserve Corps—section of the C. A. A. war-training service program, had been in progress for a year when, after investigation of the need for pilots, the Army, through the C. A. A., announced that the program was to be reduced from approximately 14,000 enlistees and trainees to 7,000. As a consequence, the men were required in July 1943 to indicate their choice of one of the following: First, continue training on active-duty status to become Army flight instructors—other kinds of flying jobs were said to be no longer available; second, transfer to active duty in the Army Air Forces for assignment to technical schools—walking army; third, discharge from the Enlisted Reserve Corps to civilian status.

All men remaining in the program were assured that a real need existed for their services as pilots.

By the end of September 1943, almost all the trainees scheduled to be placed on active duty from enlisted reserve status had received Army orders directing them to induction centers for this purpose. As Army personnel on active duty they were sent to basic training centers including Sheppard Field, Tex.; Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; Greensboro, N. C.; and Buckley Field, Colo., where, in addition to receiving basic military training they were screened, tested, interviewed, and given the Army "64" flight physical examination. As a result of this process 4,978 men were found qualified to continue their training to become Army flight instructors. They were reassigned from the basic training centers to W. T. S. schools, or to the Army Central Instructor School at Randolph Field, Tex., in accordance with previous courses completed, and their status now became that of aviation student.

The program was going smoothly, the courses of instruction being substantially the same as they had been prior to activation of the men, when on January 15, 1944, the Army suddenly directed the termination of the entire program. In his letter dated January 15, 1944, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Brig. Gen. Robert W. Harper, assistant chief of the Air Staff, made the following statement:

> Discontinuance of the flight instructors' program is in no sense attributable to dissatisfaction with the training performed by the C. A. A. War Training Service. It is desired to express appreciation of the excellent work accomplished by the fight contractors, ground schools, and C. A. A. personnel who have been engaged in the training of pilots for the Air Forces.

Is there not something strange in the Army's decision of January 15, and its refusal to put to use this valuable flight training? Was the decision of January 15 an overnight affair? Was not the supporting data for this decision accumulated for months prior to January 15? How, then, did this data, which no doubt had been assembled for several months before, compare with the data which motivated the Army's decision in September 1943 to continue the training of 5,000 fight instructors?

Some 4,000 men were left stranded in various stages of progress by this action. Of these, about half are commercially licensed pilots. Many of these men hold flight instructor as well as instrument ratings. All have an intense interest in aviation. They had gone through a course of training which compares favorably with that of the Air Forces combat pilot cadet program, and which is far superior to any other training program. The W. T. S. men have the distinction of having survived one of the most stringent elimination programs in the history of aviation—Flying, April 1944, article by F. Hamlin, page 170.

These pilots were sent back to the various basic training centers, enumerated before, where they were given basic military training for the second time, given more aptitude tests, and physically examined again while awaiting the Army's decision as to their disposition. The Army states in a news release dated March 16 that 2,618 of these men are qualified for technical training. That they are qualified is easy to see, since qualification is based largely on the general classification test—the Army's test of "rate of learning." As a group these men are said to have had higher G. C. T. scores than any group the Army has handled. A great number of pilots in this technical category had already completed courses at the Army Central Instructor School at Brooks or Randolph Field, Tex., or both.

These pilots have been trained in very excellent aviation schools all over the United States—schools which have formerly graduated many fine pilots in prewar years. These schools contracted their facilities to the Government for the purpose of this type of training. Standards were very high and the students found it necessary to study very diligently and practice maneuvers patiently for long hours in order to make the grade. Apprehension over the possibility of being washed out and thus prevented from further flying was always in evidence. These men really wanted to fly. At the end of each course it was required that the student pass a comprehensive written examination as well as a careful flight test. Other tests, both flight and written, were given during the progress of each course.

Should all this expenditure in effort, time, and money be wasted?

At the time of their enlistment, definite commitments were made to these men by Army–C. A. A. sources that on completion of training they would be commissioned and would be used as pilots. To quote the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 3, 1944:

> General Arnold in his report to the Secretary of War in January, pointed out that the Air Force expansion which Congress decreed in 1939 was completely beyond the scope of the existing military establishment. The armed forces were forced to call on the civilian-pilot-training facilities. * * * The graduates of this program are the backbone of the service air forces.

Very few, however, of the trainees who started in the accelerated, full-time C. P. T.–W. T. E. program in the summer and fall of 1942 with promises of utilization in the war effort were ever given an opportunity to be used.

H. R. 4269 provides directly for taking care of W. T. S. trainees, although a possible answer to the question of how to use many of these men might be found in H. R. 4181 now pending in Congress which provides for continuation of the Civilian Pilot Training Program—refer to speech delivered in the House by the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 3, 1944.

Why release male pilots who have been trained at great cost and with great expenditure in time and effort from pilot duties just so women can be trained, while receiving salaries of $150 per month, to replace them? As was stated in American Aviation, February 1, 1944, page 1:

> One cannot blame the women for wanting to participate somewhere in the flying end of the war, but the fact remains that they are not as suitable for ferry work as men, and now that men are available there is every reason to use them effectively.
>
> We are probably stirring up a hornet's nest to suggest that the women withdraw from

ferrying fighter and bomber planes, for the WASPS are well entrenched and have sufficient power to have survived more than one effort to keep them out of the flying end of the Army. But the women themselves might look at their own record (which isn't so hot) and feel motivated by patriotic principles and permit trained men, many of them with families, to take over.

Is it fair * * * to throw them into the walking army while women less fitted for ferry work continue to remain in the service? The women will insist they are just as good as the men, but the record does not show this, and the Army knows it too well.

The 27-week training course of the WASPS cannot stand any comparison with that included in just the first four WTS courses which average approximately 40 weeks. Further attention is directed to General Arnold's report, in which he pointed out that the A. A. F. cannot train or utilize women pilots at the expense of training or utilizing the services of available men pilots. Why, then, is increase of the WASP program currently proposed in H. R. 4219, which provides for appointment of additional WASP cadets and for their commissions as second lieutenants in the Army of the United States on completion of their training?

Great numbers of men who have not had pilot training are presently requesting technical training of the sort being offered W. T. S. pilots in lieu of pilot activities. Men requesting technical training, although otherwise qualified, are being denied admission to the technical schools, it is said, because sufficient numbers of men have already been trained or are in training. The W. T. S. men were told their opportunity to go to these technical schools was made possible for them only after special consideration of their case. Why train pilots over as sheet-metal workers, radiomen, and so forth? If men in these categories are really needed, why fill the need with pilots when so many other men are qualified by experience or ability for such training, want it, and have not had previous specialized army training? The pilots should be flying planes.

Why train these male pilots over as suggested in the Army's March 16 news release for services for which women are not suited? They are pilots. They were trained to do necessary flying jobs. And just what are services for which women are not suited? Women are doing all kinds of nonpilot jobs in the aircraft factories along with young men who are being deferred from the draft. Women are being trained for radio work in Canada. And look how women are performing in Russia.

These men were promised at the beginning of the C. P. T. program, when they went in without remuneration for their time and effort, that they would be used as ferry pilots, transport pilots, airline copilots, and pilots, liaison pilots, glider pilots, tow-target pilots, and flight instructors.

They were reassured as late as September 1943 that there was still a need for them as Army flight instructors and that they would hold an appropriate rank.

The January decision of the Army has broken all previous promises made to these men with one deft stroke.

Surely we can do something about this situation. What are we going to do about it?

H. R. 4269 provides a measure of rectification.

Congress Must Keep Pace With Executive Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of April 24, 1944:

THEY CAN'T BE WRONG

Popular demands for modernization of Congress must be haywire, according to Representative CLARENCE CANNON, because they have never been approved by the men and women who serve in Congress. From the first Congress down to the present session, he says, 9,734 legislators have considered proposals for streamlining Congress and rejected them. Of course 9,734 Congressmen, he concluded, can't be wrong. Newspaper men and Members of Congress assembled to discuss reform of that body's procedure the other night laughed at this statement. It had the ring of an ironic joke. But the speaker left no doubt that he was in dead earnest. His fantastic statement must be attributed to recklessness rather than jest.

In flat contradiction of this pretense that Congress is unanimously opposed to modernization of its machinery, four of the eight legislators on the discussion panel came out positively in favor of reform proposals. A fifth was for limited changes. Only three assumed that Congress can meet its obligations in the post-war era with the present duplication of committee work, the lack of expert assistance, and paucity of leadership. Mr. CANNON neglected also to inform his listeners when Members of the House have ever had a real opportunity to pass judgment upon that body's obsolete rules. It is true, of course, that many proposals to bring the rules into line with modern legislative practice have been introduced. But they have been bottled up in the Rules Committee and the rank and file have had no opportunity to vote for or against them. It should be obvious to the reactionary chairman of the House Appropriations Committee that denial of the right to vote on proposed reforms is scarcely equivalent to their unanimous rejection.

The most cogent argument against modernizing Congress came from Senator O'MAHONEY. He fears that the movement to reduce the number of committees and to strengthen congressional leadership "is part and parcel of the modern passion for centralized management." The best way to fight this centralization mania, he says, is to preserve decentralization in Congress. It seems to us that the reverse is true. One reason why power is now transferred so freely to the executive branch is because Congress functions so clumsily. National policy-making powers tend to slip through its fingers because policy can be formulated so much more readily by executive action. In our opinion, Congress must put aside the trivialities in which it now becomes entangled and enhance its ability to legislate promptly and effectively if our representative system is to survive as anything more than an empty symbol of democracy. Not even Congress can control centralized strength in the executive branch by decentralized weakness in its own.

On the whole, we surmise that the majority of the editors and legislators left this unique discussion with renewed determination to work for a more efficient Congress. The significant fact is that the movement now has powerful support in the ranks of Congress itself. In the end the persuasive arguments of men like Senators MALONEY and LA FOLLETTE, Congressmen MONRONEY, DIRKSEN, KEFAUVER, and others may be expected to make a deep impression on their colleagues who are alert to the problems of twentieth-century democracy.

President Roosevelt Called Upon To Aid Strawberry Farmers Against Unfair Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that, under the provisions of section 3 of the O. P. A. Act of 1942, as amended, the President of the United States has been called upon to exercise his authority under the provisions of section 3 of said act.

In his absence from Washington, the following letter was written and delivered to Secretary Stephen Early, also attached thereto the following petition to the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1944.

The Honorable STEPHEN EARLY,
Secretary to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Realizing that the President is out of the city at the moment, I am hereby transmitting to you an appeal on behalf of 50,000 people of Louisiana, according to the provisions as set forth in section 3 of the O. P. A. Act of 1942 as amended, which gives the President the right to correct gross inequities.

I hereby respectfully request that you immediately notify the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A., that an appeal has been made to the President of the United States from his directive as issued placing a ceiling price on strawberries, and that he be thereby requested to withhold enforcing any ceiling price on strawberries until the President of the United States has had an opportunity to return and pass upon the appeal, according to the provisions of the O. P. A. Act of 1942 as amended.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

To the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America:

Appeal on behalf of 50,000 Louisiana strawberry growers from a ruling and directive issued by the Honorable Chester Bowles,

O. P. A. Administrator. This appeal to you as President of the United States is made in accordance with the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, which provides as follows, to wit:

"Section 3. *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause 2, adjust any maximum price to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities."

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On Thursday, April 13, 1944, a directive was issued by the Honorable Chester Bowles, placing a ceiling price on strawberries. The Louisiana growers, constituting the largest strawberry-producing State in the United States, appealed to their Congressman, JAMES H. MORRISON, of the Sixth District of Louisiana, to protest against these ceiling prices, which are confiscatory, unreasonable, and will severely damage the Louisiana strawberry growers if put into effect. The O. P. A., War Food Administration, and Office of Economic Stabilization have refused to reconsider this matter and therefore comes the necessity of this appeal.

Fifty thousand Louisiana strawberry people have been shipping and marketing their strawberries on a large commercial scale in the same fashion and manner since 1918. The season usually begins in March or April and ends some time during the month of May, depending entirely upon weather conditions. The season this year started on approximately March 14, and from all indications will end about May 15 (depending on weather conditions). Therefore, the present time constitutes the height of the shipping season. The reasons why this O. P. A. ruling should be held up and thereby revoked are as set forth, to wit:

1. That same is capricious and will greatly damage Louisiana strawberry growers at this time because of the serious severe crop failure caused by excessive frost, freezes, and freakish weather.

2. That is present ceilings are put in effect and not revoked, 50,000 persons depending on strawberries as the main basis of their livelihood will incur a terrific financial loss. On the other hand, the over-all economic stability of the United States will not be affected in any manner, shape, or form if the growers are allowed to finish their season without a ceiling price, which will be for a period of a little more than 3 weeks.

Florida, which has been shipping strawberries since December 15, has completed her season without any ceiling price. The increase in price of that particular State in strawberries over last year's season was less than 5 cents per pint box, which was due not to an increase in price, but a decrease in acreage.

From the period in Louisiana of 1930 to 1940, including railway express and truck movements, an average of 3,000 cars per season have been shipped from Louisiana, or an average seasonal return to growers of $5,000,000. (These facts are based on Department of Agriculture figures and statistics.)

Taking the Honorable Chester Bowles' estimates of this season's total number of cars, namely 900 (which Louisiana growers say will be much less), at the highest average price that could possibly be received for the entire season the return to the growers would not exceed $3,780,000 to 50,000 individuals for the entire crop. As an example here in the height of a strawberry season in Louisiana 60 to 70 to 80 cars normally would be shipped per day, while, according to the Department of Agriculture reports, from the period of April 5 through April 12 less than an average of 15 cars per day have been shipped, and from April 12 to date the average shipments per day have been even less. For the entire season up to Sunday, April 16, only 409 cars have been shipped.

Therefore, from the consensus of opinion among growers, shippers, agricultural experts, and all connected directly or indirectly in Louisiana with the strawberry industry, all agree practically unanimously that there is a severe crop failure and estimates run on this crop failure not lower than 40 percent nor higher than 66⅔ percent. Therefore it is safe to assume from a most conservative standpoint that there is a greater than 50 percent crop failure.

The ceilings which have been invoked by the O. P. A. were withheld from being placed on new potatoes which have been placed on the market for the last 30 days, due to the fact that there was a crop failure and a shortage in yield, not however, as drastic and severe as the crop failure and shortage of yield on Louisiana strawberries.

The strawberry farmer started last July cultivating his plants and transplanting same and has constantly worked up until the present moment to produce this year's strawberries. He did not know, nor was he informed that a ceiling would be placed upon Louisiana strawberries until March 1, 1944. If all of the strawberries shipped from Louisiana this season were sent to New York City alone, there would not be sufficient quantity to give each inhabitant in that one city 2 pint boxes.

Louisiana is the only State that produces and ships trawberries in 24-pint crates. Most other States, including Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Virginia, and other States, either ship in 24-quart crates or 36-quart crates. It costs more money to produce a 24-pint crate of strawberries in Louisiana than it does to produce a 24-quart crate of strawberries in other States for the following reasons:

As an example, Arkansas plants strawberries every 3 years, whereas Louisiana plants her strawberries every year. Louisiana, through a painful, tedious process, picks, grades, and face packs her strawberries into an exceedingly attractive crate, whereas other States gather their strawberries in the opposite fashion, thereby marketing them as field run without grade and jumble pack or no pack as compared to the face pack of Louisiana. As an example, where other States' quarts have competed with Louisiana pints in markets such as St. Louis and Cincinnati, on some days Louisiana pints sold higher than Alabama quarts in Cincinnati on the same market, and never lower than 60 percent of the price that the quarts brought. The same is true of Mississippi quarts competing with Louisiana pints on the St. Louis market. Yet, in spite of all the pleas of Louisiana growers, the O. P. A., disregarding the enormous cost of production of Louisiana growers, made the ceiling on Louisiana strawberries not equal to or 80 percent of those ceilings placed on quarts, but placed on Louisiana pints a ceiling price approximately one-half of that on quarts, which is a gross discrimination against Louisiana growers as compared to growers of other States.

When it is considered that strawberries are purely a luxury, that you or I could live normally in the American way of life for the rest of our span of life without eating a single strawberry, yet, on the other hand, the O. P. A. has failed to put ceilings on many, many commodities that are much more vital a necessity in the lives of all Americans than are strawberries—such as jewelry and many other of the like.

Boiled down, the O. P. A. could not suffer nor could the American public suffer if this ceiling price were withheld until the 15th of May. If it is fair and equitable to withhold a ceiling price on new potatoes because of a crop failure, why not strawberries, which are a much less essential element of diet in American life than potatoes? On the other hand, think of how much withholding of this ceiling price would mean to the economic stability of 50,000 people directly affected, who have suffered a 50-percent or greater crop failure, without affecting in the least the over-all economic picture of the United States.

Therefore, on behalf of these strawberry growers located within my congressional district, I make this appeal to you as a great humanitarian to withhold the effectiveness of this O. P. A. ceiling directive on strawberries until May 15, or increase the present confiscatory price to $7.50 per crate, as you are authorized to do under the provisions of section 3 of the O. P. A. Act of 1942, as amended.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Congressman, Sixth District, Louisiana.

How To Prevent Future Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an address of Judge William H. Wadhams before the New York State Agricultural Society.

Judge Wadhams drew upon his experience as an international lawyer, having had offices in Berlin, Paris, and New Delhi, India. As a member of the executive committee of the League to Enforce Peace he worked on the draft for a league of nations, which was subsequently taken as the basis for the Covenant of the League presented by President Wilson to the Peace Conference, where Judge Wadhams was in attendance. He is the permanent adviser to the Chamber of Princes on the Federation of India and was, until the collapse of France, legal adviser to a joint British and French parliamentary committee on post-war organization.

Judge Wadhams said, in part:

The subject of how to prevent future wars brings a sour smile to the backward-turned face of the cynic and yet, to men of good will, it is possible. We often hear it said that all the people of all the nations fervently desire peace. This is not wholly true. There are nations whose people desire war, plan for war, and make war.

To prevent future wars these people must be not only defeated, but so destroyed that they will not have the potential power to make war in the future. No half-way victory will do; and then these people must be taught by the education of their youth that peace and goodwill are a better philosophy. Meanwhile the peace-loving nations will have to be constantly vigilant; that no step toward war is permitted. To prevent future wars we must undertake not only occupation but strict supervision by the victors.

That some form of international cooperation is necessary, and that our own Nation must take part if we are to have the security essential to peace, is self-evident.

There are those who would at once form a federation of the world.

There are others who would reestablish in authority the League of Nations or some modified form of the League.

There are advocates of cooperation in immediate tasks as they arise, leaving the ulti-

mate international organization to some future time.

Having in mind the disasters of the past and our purpose for the future, I have from my experience reached the conclusion that whatever form the governmental cooperation may take, there is one essential to an enduring peace and that is control by law of the individual, and this essential may be included in any plan of international cooperation but without it any plan of cooperation is bound to fail. This essential which I propose does not necessitate a surrender of our national sovereignty.

Any proposal with respect to so vast a subject must necessarily be a mere framework of principles and an outline of methods. I shall at any rate be specific.

First, let us consider what are the causes of war and then inquire how these causes may be prevented. Here it is in outline:

A PLAN FOR MAINTAINING PEACE

I. The causes of war

1. The peace of nations exists only when the freedoms and just rights of their peoples are assured and protected.

2. It follows the conduct which destroys these freedoms and rights leads to war.

3. Every human undertaking is primarily performed by some individual; every act of aggression against the freedom of others is committed by some individual; every encroachment upon the just rights to life and liberty; all deeds which lead to war, are due in the first instance to the misconduct of some individual. And this is true whether the denial of freedom or of justice is committed through group action, as in power politics or in business combination, for such group action is of necessity instigated, set in motion, and, therefore, due to the conduct of some individual or individuals.

Individuals who assail the freedoms and rights of men are the makers of war. And this is beyond question when we look at the realities; wherefore we must conclude that:

4. Control of the individual is necessary to world peace.

Individuals, therefore, must be prohibited from committing the acts which lead to war. As by law we forbid murder and theft, so we propose to forbid by law the commission of acts which lead to or cause war.

Let us examine why leagues have failed.

II. Reasons for failure of leagues of governments

1. A league of governments acts by the adoption of resolutions from time to time and, therefore, depends each time upon the persuasion of each of its member governments to agree, giving constant opportunities for disagreement.

2. Governments acting through their foreign offices are subject to controls by selfish interests and ambitious men, through lobbies and manipulation.

3. The general will of a league, as expressed by the Council of the League, can be defeated by the government of one member nation at any time by mere failure to act.

4. When a League proposal is contrary to the immediate interest of any one nation, or of a special interest controlling the action of such nation, popular support for a refusal or failure of that nation to comply can easily be aroused and supported by a jingo press appealing to a narrow chauvinism.

5. Such a league of governments acts in the interest of the most powerful government or of a group which controls the League, for it is not a league of peoples and soon develops into a league to obtain power and advantage for some at the expense of others, instead of a league to maintain peace.

6. A league of governments of nations without controls of the individuals who compose them depends upon treaties. These have proven ineffective to maintain peace. The memory of the Kellogg Pacts, signed by practically all of the nations of the world, which hoped to abolish war, is bitter.

History proves that wars cannot be stopped by agreement nor by treaties or pacts, but wars can be prevented by removing the cause of war—that is, by stopping the individuals who commit acts that create war by protecting the freedoms that make for peace by definite laws, not by uncertain diplomacy.

There are great advantages in the control of individuals as distinguished from governmental agreements.

III. The advantages of control of individuals as distinguished from governmental agreements

1. Control of the individual establishes the law of nations for all persons alike regardless of their nationality.

It is truly said that nations are diverse and in varying stages of development, but the individual acts which create war are the same in all nations however much they may differ or whatever their stages of development, whatever their race, religion or language.

2. The law of nations once adopted by the people requires no reference to governments for its sanction. Like our Federal laws prohibiting smuggling or counterfeiting, they bypass the state and are directed against violation by any individual regardless of the state in which you reside.

3. Boundaries are no longer of the same importance as sources of war as the law of nations protecting the rights of all persons would apply to each individual whether he resides on this or the other side of the boundary.

4. Regional groupings, such as a Danubian union, a Balkan bloc, the Pan American Union, or even a United States of Europe, may not be objectionable as endangering peace provided all the individuals in each of the nations forming such groupings are subject to the law of nations which is the supreme law of all nations.

5. The plan of individual control removes the safeguarding of peace from the field of diplomacy which has failed to protect the people from war to the field of justice, to the end that in the international as well as the national sphere we may have a rule of law and not of man.

6. It makes no difference whether the nation is large or small. The supreme law of nations applies to all alike. For example, the Federal law of the United States applies alike to Delaware and to Texas.

7. The local laws may vary; for example, the law of Massachusetts is founded upon the common law of England, but the law of Louisiana is founded upon the Napoleonic Code.

8. Individual control, as expressed in the law of nations, applies whatever the form of government of the nation which adheres to the law of nations. It applies equally in a soviet, a monarchy, or a republic.

9. Individual control obviates the long-attempted "balance of power" among nations, which eventually always leads to war. The difficulty is that power does not remain balanced.

I will now outline a possible method, although I am not arrogant enough to maintain that it is the only method by which this control of the individual may be put into effect.

IV. The method of control over individuals to maintain peace

1. Individual control is effected by laws prohibiting acts which cause war—that is, acts which infringe the freedom and liberty of the individual and violate his just rights and are determined to be dangerous as promoting war.

2. These prohibitions may be formulated by a convention composed of delegates chosen by the people of United Nations, men chosen because of their determination to prevent future wars.

3. The convention would prepare codes of law to protect each of the "four freedoms" and such other freedoms as may be adopted in a bill of rights to assure peace. For example, an armament code, a trade and transportation code, an education code, a free-press and free-speech code, a finance code, etc.

These codes together would constitute the law of nations to maintain peace. They shall be adhered to by all peace-minded nations as the supreme law applicable to all their nationals. They must be obligatory in the vanquished countries as part of the terms of peace.

4. Commissions to implement each code; to hear and determine complaints, would be appointed in such manner as may be determined, for example, by an executive committee of the United Nations, which committee shall also fill vacancies from time to time.

And this is important; commissions shall not be appointed to represent any nation but shall be composed of experts in their several fields and charged with the duty of restraining and preventing acts which lead to or may cause war in violation of the codes of law. These commissions would not only restrain acts leading to war by their good offices but would be special grand juries and issue indictments on their own initiative or on the complaint of anyone who has prima facie made out a just case of violation of a code of the law of nations.

V. The supreme world court and its regional courts

Upon an indictment having issued from a commission, an order of arrest would issue out of the nearest regional court and its sheriff would bring the offender before the court for trial.

The judges of these courts, appointed for life by the executive committee of these United Nations, are chosen not to represent any nation or class or interest but for their eminence, independence, and character.

The supreme world court judges would be appointed in the same way and would construe the law of nations and hear appeals from the regional courts.

VI. International sheriffs

The court will have a force of sheriffs, or, as some call it, an international police to arrest offenders indicted and to enforce the court's decrees.

As the Axis enemies will have been disarmed, and as all future armament is controlled by the armament code, and, as the offenders are individuals, the force need not be large to bring violators of the codes protecting the freedoms to trial.

VII. This plan may be applied and is essential to any form of international cooperation to maintain peace

This plan has the advantage that it may be applied whatever the form of governmental cooperation adopted by the United Nations, whether it be a superworld state or federation, or merely an agreement among nations to cooperate. But whatever the form adopted by the victorious governments to establish peace, it is essential that a supreme law of nations be established prohibiting individuals wherever they reside and whatever their form of government from committing acts which lead to war as defined by the codes.

This is the fundamental principle which everyone who desires peace will approve: Every individual of the nations adhering to the law of nations, no matter where he lives, must obey the law of nations and not commit those acts which it defines as leading to war.

VIII. National sovereignty is not surrendered

Under this plan the individual nation continues to exercise its full sovereignty. It recognizes a supreme law forbidding the commission of acts which it has agreed upon,

in the proposed codes, as acts which cause war. The agreement upon and adoption of such codes is in itself an act of sovereignty exercised in the same spirit as the present adherence to the universal postal union and to nonpolitical functions of the League of Nations.

There is no surrender of our national sovereignty as we ourselves adopt the law of nations. It is our own law established for our security.

Stop wars at their source. Stop individuals who promote the causes of war and you will prevent future wars, you will establish peace of earth.

Let Us Here Highly Resolve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the very able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the American Legion Post, No. 1, in New Bedford, Mass. The address is entitled "Let Us Here Highly Resolve."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am delighted to be here this evening and for a most particular reason.

This is the twenty-fifth anniversary of New Bedford Post, No. 1, the first post of the American Legion organized in Massachusetts. Such an anniversary is, in my mind, a most significant one, because it not only affords another opportunity for men who have served together in time of war to join in happy and congenial reunion, but it also gives all of us an opportunity to pause and think on some of the methods whereby veterans whose active service is over may still work for the good of their country. Some phases of this general question I propose to discuss with you this evening.

In Lincoln's great masterpiece, the Gettysburg Address, you, of course, recall these words, "Let us here highly resolve"; resolve what, as Lincoln went on to say, "Let us here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

Since these words were uttered in 1863, how many times have our young men gone forth to fight for our country, its institutions and principles, and how many times have all of us, figuratively at least, highly resolved that "these dead shall not have died in vain."

Twenty-seven years ago you and I set forth on a crusade to save the world for democracy in a war which was to end wars. We did a pretty good job, too, and when it was done, home we came, pretty well satisfied with ourselves, and quite sure that the job was done and that as far as war was concerned we had settled that issue once and for all.

And now where are we? Back into a maelstrom, once more engaged in a life-and-death struggle, which for scope and magnitude and vicious cruelty makes the one in which we fought pale into comparative insignificance. The fine youngsters you and I raised, and into whose upbringing we poured all of our love and affection, are out there in the trenches, in the desert, in the jungle, and on the dark, cold seas, doing the job all over again—and why? Because the American people, while giving lip service to the resolve that our dead should not have died in vain in reality made a sham of these words and proceeded in such a manner as almost to guarantee that it would happen again.

Make no mistake about my attitude as far as this conflict is concerned. I was sure it was our war, long before Pearl Harbor. I was sure we couldn't remain an enchanted isle, peaceful and content in a world menaced from all points by bandits and highwaymen. And when many of our countrymen, blind to the realities of the modern world, were preaching their doctrine of narrow and hopeless isolationism, I urged, with all my strength, that we pick our side and try once more to help settle—once and for all—the age old issue of liberty and human rights.

Now, as we meet here in New Bedford tonight, again highly resolving about the future, let us discuss briefly what we shall do, so that it really will not happen again.

Well, the first thing we must do is to say to the American people—this time we insist that you listen and give heed to the warning and advice of those who have done the fighting, whose sons are fighting now, and whose grandsons will have to do it the next time—if there must be a next time. And further, that in so doing, you discard the advice of those blind pacifists and do-gooders who continually, generation after generation, ignore the fundamental realities of life.

If we want to continue to exist as freemen we have got to win this war and afterward if we want to remain freemen we have got to remember that one of the fundamental laws of nature is for the strong to attack the weak. Our do-gooders know this is so in the animal world, but they think civilization has brought human beings to a point where this law has become academic. I don't know if you can call the Jap or the Nazi a human being, but I do verily believe that unless the great majority of human beings who want to live and let live are strong, and prepared to defend their way of life, their way of life will yield to another.

When I say this country must listen to those who have to do the fighting, let me remind you of what happened after the last war. Pretty soon after we arrived home the professional pacifists and peace lovers started their propaganda from pulpit, lecture platform, and college yard, pouring forth the doctrine that we must disarm, and then maintain peace at any price. Clubs and societies were formed, college students organized, and many an American fell prey to the most fallacious doctrine ever preached—that as a Nation we could be weak and still hope to live in peace.

And then up rose the American Legion. For 20 long years it steadily and consistently preached the doctrine of an adequate national defense.

Listen to some of the statements made to the American people over the past 20 years by those who did the fighting in '17 and '18. Continually, year after year, advocating a strong national defense—in 1926 at Philadelphia it recommended "the training of all field, line, and staff officers of the Reserve Corps, together with the enlisted personnel of the Organized Reserve. A Reserve Officers' Training Corps adequate to provide 5,000 reserve officers annually. A Citizens' Military Training Corps adequate to a strength of 50,000 annually. Procurement, development, and maintenance of such material and camps as will properly equip all the above components (in addition to the Regular Establishment and National Guard) and the further maintenance of an adequate war reserve for three field armies."

In 1933 at Chicago when the Nazi ideology was first burgeoning as a world power and menace, the Legion said: "We believe America will never seek a war and that a war will never seek a prepared America. We believe in an America strong enough to insure and enforce peace. We know that the pitiably small army in existence at the start of every war has never kept us out of war. We are opposed to the disarmament of the United States for the purposes of economy or as an acclaimed means to bring about world peace or as an example which some persons hope other nations will follow."

In 1937 we recommended "Activation of six skeletonized regiments of antiaircraft artillery, complete modern equipment for all active regiments of the Regular Army and the National Guard, and an adequate reserve of equipment for the additional regiments which will be needed immediately in an emergency."

And do you, despite this last appeal and others like it, recall the pictures of the troops, including our own Twenty-sixth Division, in training at Pine Camp, N. Y., in 1940, with trucks dressed up to represent tanks, replicas of machine guns in woods, and so on? And do you recall the pitifully small number of antiaircraft guns we had when Pearl Harbor caught us unprepared?

And as for the Navy—the limitation-of-arms treaty having fixed the United States, Great Britain, Japan ratio on a 5–5–3 basis—the Legion said in 1924: "The American Legion records its demand for maintenance of its position as stated in the limitation-of-arms conference. The ratio is now 5–4–3, with the United States occupying the position of 4"; and continued thereafter to demand a Navy (quoting from the 1939 Chicago convention) "so organized that it can defend our interests in both the Atlantic and Pacific against any possible grouping of aggressors."

In aviation the same sound advice poured forth year after year in the resolutions of our national conventions. In 1919 we urged that "military training in high schools and colleges is to be encouraged." In 1926 "we condemned as unwise and un-American propaganda spread against military training in schools and colleges."

And so goes the record down through the years, while few listened, few paid attention, few were aroused to the danger, few heeded the warning. Had the United States been a force to reckon with and had we been firm and courageous in calling the aggressors to account as, for instance, when Japan invaded Manchukuo in 1931 and China in 1937, as when Hitler first set forth on his career of destruction, had we followed the advice of the American Legion and of the men who knew how unpleasant war is, I firmly believe the world might be at peace today.

But why, say you, rehearse all these unpleasant facts. I do so because when our boys have whipped the enemy, as they will, what then? Shall we again "highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain" and again do nothing? When that time comes, we shall have perhaps 15,000,000 men and women in this country—1 in every 9 persons—who have worn the uniform of their country. And perhaps they will constitute a group sufficiently strong so that we no longer need fear the misguided individual who still thinks the pen is mightier than the sword.

But listen to the voices already raised. In Congress today there is a bill providing for post-war peacetime universal military training—perhaps not a perfect bill—but containing the genesis of sound policy. Listen to excerpts from my mail on this question. One writes "Nothing can be more disastrous for American peace and democracy than the complete militarization of our youth through peacetime compulsory military training." Another, "A year's military training for young men would cause them to be

military minded and would contribute much toward making the United States a militaristic nation." Another, "I hope you will do everything in your power to defeat this grossly undemocratic measure." Another, "Multitudes are longing and hoping for a just and lasting peace, and any such action would ensure the likelihood of another war. We should prepare for peace, not war." Another, "Clearly Washington is filled with persons who lie awake nights hatching plots to destroy American liberty. How this (universal peacetime military training) can be construed as anything but flagrantly disloyal to American ideals I know not." Another, "Do you want war to continue or do you honestly want a world at peace?" As if anyone who had seen war, as I have, could conceivably want anything but a world at peace. And still one more, "This bill appears to be the most diabolically un-American possible. American principles will be violated if our sons are taught to kill." I wonder where our sons would be now, in the jungles of the Pacific and elsewhere, if they had not been taught to take care of those who have been taught to kill.

I think it unnecessary to quote further from the voluminous mail I have received on this very grave question. To all of these people I have responded to this effect—that while I never intend to be intolerant of people whose viewpoints do not coincide with mine, I must confess that I do not for the life of me see how anyone in this day and age can even imagine that any nation is going to preserve its liberties without adequate naval and air establishments, and that when the young men of our country are fighting and dying so that we at home may have a country to live in, I cannot understand how anyone can be so unmindful of these sacrifices as to want to send yet more American boys into action without adequate training. And so, to all my correspondents opposing universal peacetime military training, I have concluded by saying that I most certainly cannot conform to their viewpoint, and praying as I do for the welfare of my country, I most certainly shall pray that the viewpoint they represent does not prevail.

I am not one of those who believes in a blueprinted world order, in world parliaments, in world police forces, in subordinating Americanism to internationalism. On the other hand, I am as far apart as the poles from those elements in this country who are merely biding their time until the fighting is over before breaking forth once again with the fallacious doctrine that we must tend to our own knitting and ignore the rest of the world. If we are strong, and if we are firm and fair in our dealings with other nations, I believe we can so organize our relations with like-minded peoples all over the world that we may reasonably look forward to peace and good will in the foreseeable future.

But let us never again let down in our defenses. War aggression is always in inverse ratio to the preparedness of any nation and the cost of preparedness shrinks into insignificance compared to the cost of war. If this has been true in the past, the complicated development of modern weapons and scientific research which advances month by month in seven-league boots, makes it doubly and vitally true in the future.

We were saved by an eyelash this time. We weren't jumped upon without warning as was, for example, Norway—a country which stood foursquare for peace and strict neutrality and believed these objectives could be attained by allowing its defenses to fall to a point where it was practically helpless in the face of invasion. We have had stout-hearted Allies fighting for us while we have been spending 2¼ years in hitting our stride. Unless we are continually prepared, we well may be the Norway of the next war. Another time, under similar conditions, we could hardly expect to be given the time and opportunity afforded us since December 1941.

And so, let us here highly resolve that when this victory has been won we shall listen not to the nationalist, the pacifist, or the do-gooder, but to the voice of experience, the voice of those who fought and who thus know first hand what manner of people we must deal with when we let down our guard. All to the end that this time "these dead shall not have died in vain."

St. Louis Doctors Honored for Work in Rehabilitating War's Badly Wounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a great deal of interest in connection with the program to rehabilitate or recondition disabled veterans. I have made many inquiries as to what the Government was doing along this line.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that two outstanding doctors from my own city, St. Louis, both members of the Army Medical Corps, have just been recognized for their outstanding work in rehabilitating veterans. Last week Lt. Col. Howard A. Rusk and Lt. Col. James B. Brown received what is termed "American Design Awards," which are sponsored by Lord & Taylor, of New York City.

A very interesting article on the subject written by Alvin H. Goldstein, a staff correspondent, appears in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of last Friday. Under the permission granted me, I include this article as part of my remarks:

ST. LOUIS DOCTORS HONORED FOR WORK IN REHABILITATING WAR'S BADLY WOUNDED—LT. COL. HOWARD A. RUSK AND LT. COL. JAMES B. BROWN RECEIVE AMERICAN DESIGN AWARDS

(By Alvin H. Goldstein)

NEW YORK, April 21.—Lt. Cols. Howard A. Rusk and James Barrett Brown, both of St. Louis and now serving in the Army Medical Corps, yesterday received two of the four awards of $1,000 each, presented for conspicuous service in behalf of disabled war veterans at the annual presentation of American Design Awards sponsored by Lord & Taylor, New York department store. Others receiving awards were Capt. Henry H. Kessler, of Newark, N. J., and, jointly, Lt. Col. Roy R. Grinker and Maj. John P. Spiegel, also for work in rehabilitation of war injured.

Colonel Rusk, now chief of the convalescent branch in the office of the Air Surgeon, was singled out for recognition by the American Design Awards jury in collaboration with Army and Navy authorities for instituting a program now officially adopted by all armed services for reconditioning men for return to productive civilian pursuits, who have been handicapped by injuries, either physical or mental.

Colonel Brown, distinguished plastic surgeon and former professor of oral and clinical surgery at Washington University Medical School, is now chief of plastic surgery at Valley Forge General Hospital for Veterans, and has served in the European theater of operations. He was selected for the award because of the major contribution he has made to the science of restoring maimed or disfigured features of war veterans.

Captain Kessler, of the Navy, was honored for his work in orthopedic rehabilitation, and Colonel Grinker and Major Spiegel jointly for successful efforts in neuropsychiatry in behalf of veterans suffering from the effects of shell shock or battle fatigue.

COLONEL RUSK'S INSPIRATION

Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, spoke briefly after the awards were presented by Walter Hoving, president of Lord & Taylor. Of the work of Colonel Rusk, Hoving said: "Just a little over a year ago, Colonel Rusk was making the rounds in a 2,000-bed Army hospital in the Midwest. He stopped to talk to a bedridden patient motionless in a plaster cast. He asked the boy how long he had been on his back and the boy said, '6 weeks, sir, 6 long dreary weeks with nothing to look at but this ceiling. I can tell you, where every crack is. Even how many nailheads there are. Last week there was a spider in that corner over there, but it was swept away yesterday.'

"In that moment was born the convalescent training program. Started by an Army doctor merely to alleviate boredom, the plan has grown into such proportions that today its far-reaching possibilities are limitless.

"This Army doctor wanted hospital time utilized for the benefit of the individual, not just wasted. A lengthy convalescence, he felt, should become extra time for learning. So he threw out the conventional occupational therapy of stringing beads and weaving baskets because he felt that such pointless work could never hold the interest of a soldier. Instead he worked out an educational program of study and training, military as well as vocational training.

MENTAL AND PHYSICAL EXERCISE

"A bright-eyed boy flat on his back studies models of airplanes, while another flat on his stomach and unable to move cuts out model planes like paper dolls. A man sitting up in bed can make a camouflage net. He scarcely realizes that the motions involved give him physical as well as mental exercise. Of course, care of the body is strongly emphasized. Bedridden soldiers with arms, legs, or both in a cast do setting-up exercise on hospital cots.

"This whole convalescent program is planned to stimulate the mind while coordinating the body. A soldier with a bad head wound learns telegraphy and taps out code signals. Men able to walk about a few hours a day take machine-shop work, learn to run a lathe, or use a printing press.

"Languages are taught with phonograph records from a simple textbook that is light enough for an invalid to handle and at the end of hospitalization a soldier who has completed an accredited amount of study is presented with a certificate just as though he were graduating from a college.

"This Army doctor's far-sighted plan sees men injured in industry learning a new trade or improving an old one while convalescing.

"Hospital time will never again be lost time, because of this constructive concept which has emerged in these days of destruction, this magnificent job of rehabilitation unheard of in the history of any other war."

HOUSE OF MIRACLES

Describing the work of Colonel Brown, Hoving said:

"In the last war Dr. Brown became familiar with men whose disfiguring wounds prevented them from leading normal lives. He is today chief surgeon of a large Army hospital, and his brilliant work in restoring men has earned that hospital the title 'House of Miracles.'

"During a visit to an Army hospital I shook hands with a smiling soldier. His hand seemed no different than mine. When he

first came into the hospital his hands were healed but full of bad scars, with the thumb and index finger so fixed that even the simplest hand movement was impossible. An X-ray showed multiple shell fragments in the hand. Each fragment had swirled around, tearing up nerves, arteries, and tendons.

"It was necessary to remove each piece of shell fragment. At this point our surgeon performed one of his most adroit operations, a split skin graft. This is how it was done. A flap of skin was lifted but not removed from the abdomen of the patient. The soldier's hand was fastened to his side and the skin flap was transplanted to his palm but not severed. It continued thus to receive nourishment until securely healed. Then and then only was his hand released from his side.

"Today our soldier has new hands. This is only one of the miracles in an Army hospital. Every day hundreds of men are given new hands, new bodies, and new hope.

TREATMENT OF BURNS

"In this war a very common disfiguring injury is burn. Pearl Harbor produced nearly a thousand burn victims within a few hours. In addition to the ghastly scars they leave, burns remove the skin, and without skin the vital life forces of the body escape. The patient wastes away before surgery can reach him. One soldier had received severe burns on both legs. He weighed 84 pounds when he arrived at the hospital. Skillful plastic surgery performed its miracles with series of grafts from unburned parts of his body, covering his legs with skin. Operation after operation was performed, because only a tiny square of skin can be grafted at a time to avoid shock.

"Plastic surgery is a long-range job. It takes numerous operations and slow healing. Today this soldier is back in the service. This case is a tribute to the cooperation and teamwork of every branch of the medical corps.

"For his dramatic contributions to plastic surgery, which gives the disfigured a resurgence of hope, the promise of a normal place in society, adding immeasurably to the morale of our fighting forces, I take great pride in making this award to Lt. Col. James Barrett Brown."

The luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel at which the presentations were made was attended by more than 1,500 guests of honor, including Vice Admiral Herbert F. Leary, Rear Admiral Edward U. Reed, Lt. Gen. George Brunert, Col. Oveta Culp Hobby, director of the WAC's; Col. Florence A. Blanchfield, superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps, and Capt. Sue S. Dauser, superintendent of the Navy Nurse Corps.

It was the eighth annual presentation of the American Design Awards, which until this year had been distributed in the fields of fashions and industry. Because men outstanding in efforts toward rehabilitation of war injured were selected this year, the program was entitled "The American Design for Living."

Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials—one from the New York Times of April 24, 1944, and one from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., April 24, 1944—eulogizing the late Cardinal O'Connell:

[From the New York Times of April 24, 1944]

WILLIAM CARDINAL O'CONNELL

The influence of William Cardinal O'Connell extended far beyond the church which so signally honored him. Mourned by Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike, he was recognized not only as a great prince of the church but as a leading figure in the contemporary life of New England and the Nation. He combined the prelate and the patriot.

Born in the mill slums of Lowell, he grew up in the era of the New England knownothings, keenly sensitive to the then widespread prejudice against Irish immigrants and their religion. His long life was proof that the lowliest among them could rise to power and usefulness as great as the old Puritan stock had considered exclusively theirs. Within the church his firm mind and extraordinary attainments soon recommended him for advancement and led him steadily along the road to Rome, where he was ordained a priest in 1884. His subsequent career made it almost inevitable that he should don the red hat of the Sacred College of Cardinals, which he wore for 33 years. Once more in Rome at 79 he was credited with a decisive role in the election of Pope Pius XII.

Cardinal O'Connell was an all around man, interested in whatever pertained to the life of the spirit. He was a finished musician, a powerful writer, a clear, sharp speaker, and an avid reader. His gift for languages was remarkable. He conversed fluently in Latin, French, Italian, German, and Spanish, and also spoke Russian, Syrian, and Japanese. As a citizen of the Republic he never held himself aloof from politics and bluntly criticized whatever displeased him. In Boston, where his popularity was immense and his influence finally predominant, he was always on the side of good government. Archbishop Spellman's tribute might well be his epitaph: "In him, love of country followed love of God, and nobly he served them both."

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of April 24, 1944]

CARDINAL O'CONNELL

Deeply mourned is the death of William Cardinal O'Connell. The first loss is that of his beloved church, which he served so zealously for so many years, but that bereavement is shared throughout the Christian world, for it has come to all to know of his eminence. Long ago, in the days of his youth, his piety, humility, and ability were recognized by his ecclesiastical superiors; long ago he was given heavy responsibility; and fully a generation ago, in recognition of his service to God, he was made cardinal, a prince of the church.

Cardinal O'Connell knew in detail of the life problems of his fellow men; he understood because he himself had known poverty and had surmounted it. Indeed, his career is a shining example of the truth that boyhood lack of advantages does not bar the attainment of greatness in this democracy.

So filled with the achievements was his career that it is difficult to select any single one for discussion, but surely the assignment requiring the greatest diplomacy came in 1905 when he was selected by the Vatican to stabilize the church in Japan and to convince the Japanese that Catholicism is universal.

How well he succeeded is evidenced in the fact that within a week of his return to Rome from Tokyo, he was appointed coadjutor to Archbishop Williams of Boston, with the right of succession. In 1911, some 4 years after the archbishop's death, he was made cardinal. As was then written: "Joy among the people of all faiths prevailed."

Cardinal O'Connell was in his eighty-fifth year at time of death. Illness and the infirmities of age had prevented him from taking the active role that he so much desired, but the instruments of good that he had designed and utilized throughout his long and honorable life remained as the rule and guide of others. And will remain. He himself has gone to his reward, but the good that he did is a compelling force. It is among his finest monuments.

Forty Years of Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Silver Spring Standard, Silver Spring, Md., Friday, April 21, 1944:

FORTY YEARS OF PRESIDENTS

The feature of the fiftieth birthday party of the Columbia Historical Society held last week in the Mayflower Hotel was the illustrated talk by George Harris of the firm of Harris & Ewing. Mr. Harris' career in Washington is almost as long as the history of the society itself and his informal and unrehearsed speech held the 300 guests enthralled for 2 hours.

Mr. Harris, born in Wales, first worked as a news photographer in San Francisco and was sent to Washington in 1904 to do special press work. He soon met President Roosevelt who insisted he open a studio in the Nation's Capital as none capable of fine work was then functioning. His first pictures of Teddy's cabinet launched an intimate discussion of great men from 1904 to 1944 but the greatest of these, he said, was Teddy himself.

From then on through the years Mr. Harris has photographed each President down to Franklin Delano Roosevelt and in several cases, the Presidents even came to his studio for sittings, rather than have him come to the White House; this was true of Calvin Coolidge, whom Mr. Harris admired for his puckish humor and sly wit.

Covering the peace conference in 1919 furnished Mr. Harris with many fine subjects for the photographer's camera and many more anecdotes for the historian's notebook. He photographed all the 64 delegates to the peace conference, many of them in informal poses, which are worth far more than their intrinsical value today. One particularly amusing story referred to his breaking into Buckingham Palace, along with a number of other newspapermen.

All in all, Mr. Harris' speech was one to be remembered, and he should be persuaded to make a recording of it so that posterity may hear it, perhaps even repeat it on the one hundredth aniversary of the Columbia Historical Society in 1944.

Only one charter member of the organization is alive today, Mr. Theodore Noyes, and he was unable to attend the banquet. However, he sent a message, which was read and broadcast over the radio by the president, Dr. F. Regis Noel, of Kensington, who is president of the society. The toastmaster of the evening was the Solicitor General of the United States, Charles Fahy.

A World Monetary Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial entitled "A World Monetary Plan" which appeared in the New York Times of April 24.

It was my privilege to hear Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, present his proposal on the establishment of an international monetary fund to a meeting of representatives of several committees of the House last Friday. After hearing the statement submitted by the Secretary, together with an explanation of the proposal, I arrived at the conclusion that this measure should not be hastily approved. A sound, stable, and financial policy is the basis of a prosperous domestic economy. This, in my opinion, is no time to scatter our gold to the four winds with the hope that it will bring peace and prosperity to all. Would it not be better for our own Nation to adopt a sound fiscal policy which would balance the budget and create within our own borders a financial Rock of Gibraltar to which other nations could tie in time of storm? An international monetary fund could eventually control the domestic economy of every country by controlling exchange rates, tariffs, and prices.

A WORLD MONETARY PLAN

Nowhere will international cooperation be more imperative after the war than with regard to national monetary systems and stable exchanges. Unfortunately, the proposal now announced for an $8,000,000,000 international stabilization fund misconceives the real nature of the problem to be solved.

The text of the joint statement begins with the assertion: "It is the consensus of opinion of the experts of the United and Associated Nations who have participated in these discussions that the most practical method of assuring international monetary cooperation is through the establishment of an international monetary fund." On the contrary, the most practical method of assuring international monetary cooperation is through sound economic, budgetary, credit and currency policies within each nation. If these exist, a huge international stabilization fund will be unnecessary. If these do not exist, an international monetary fund, no matter how large, will be worse than ineffective. It could not, in the end, support an unsound currency; but in attempting to do so it would drain part of the resources of the countries with sound currencies. To that extent it would make it more difficult for them to maintain their own soundness.

A huge world stabilization fund of the type now proposed is no more than a method by which the nations with strong currencies make loans to the nations with weak currencies. Each nation will be at any moment a net creditor or a net debtor to the fund. To the extent that the loans go bad, the net creditors will be the net losers. When nations wish to borrow abroad through private international channels, the private lenders, risking their own funds, can judge the probability of repayment with a purely business eye. They sometimes agree to make loans only if the borrowing country will change its economic or financial policies in this respect or that. Now, it is one thing for the private citizens to indicate distrust of a nation's currency; it is quite another thing for foreign governments to do so. It is also embarrassing for foreign governments, even though acting through a general fund, to demand minimum internal financial reforms within a nation before they will lend that nation money. An international stabilization fund could increase the sources of international friction rather than reduce them.

The principal need for world currency stabilization is sound internal policies in each country, not more international machinery. Each nation must want a stable currency enough to accept its necessary consequences. The greatest single contribution that the United States could make to world currency stability after the war would be to declare its determination to stabilize its own currency. It could do this by balancing the budget and by announcing that the dollar was no longer on a 24-hour basis, and subject to every rumor, but firmly anchored to a fixed quantity of gold. This would in turn give an anchor to other nations.

Other nations also would have to give up their faith in internal inflation as a cure for their ills. Our London correspondent reports the existence of an influential body of opinion in Great Britain that currency stability would be gained at too high a cost * * * if the supply of currency be tied to a rigid international standard when the internal situation demands a policy of expansion. But a nation cannot have currency stability and currency inflation at the same time. Nor can it expect other nations to underwrite its own expansionist policies by giving it a heavy drawing account on a fund to which they have contributed. Each nation should give up the fallacious idea that it is to its own advantage to devalue its currency and that it is hurting itself and conferring a favor on other nations when it does not. Each nation should give up the fallacious idea that it gains when it erects huge barriers to imports and loses when it lowers them; that it gains when it blocks its currency or forbids its citizens to export gold, capital, or credit. Each nation should give up the fallacious idea, in short, that it gains when it makes economic war upon its neighbors.

Not until this ideological reform is achieved will currencies be stable. If it is not achieved, any international stabilization fund must eventually break down. If it is achieved, complicated international machinery or huge funds will not be needed.

A Soldier Speaks on Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said relative to the attitude of members of our armed forces regarding the soldiers' vote law. Some have made the statements that the soldiers were not interested while other statements have been made that were just to the contrary.

I received a copy of a letter that was written by Corp. Kenneth Russell, of St. Louis, Mo., who is now stationed somewhere in Italy. His letter was addressed to the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Local No. 1104, to which he belongs in St. Louis. This indicates the attitude of a soldier on the war front. Under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

DEAR SIR: I received your letter today, telling me that you were trying to protect the boys in the service's right to vote.

I'm glad to hear that someone back home is trying to help the boys that are overseas, also those that are in the States (God's country).

If a man is old enough to fight for his country and hasn't the right to vote what kind of a country has he? What is he fighting for? Some of the boys back home think this is a big joke. It is plenty big but is no joke.

The workers at Wagner are doing a great job; tell them to keep up the good work.

KENNETH RUSSELL.

I have written to Corporal Russell, not so much about the law that the Congress passed but as to the law that the State of Missouri passed, especially telling him that the State of Missouri has just enacted a real soldiers' vote law, one that removes all the red tape. He can get a ballot by writing a postal card, a letter, sending a telegram or a radiogram, or one of his relatives can apply for the ballot for him. It does not require any affidavit of any kind nor does it require the signature of an officer or noncommissioned officer in the armed forces. It also provides, if necessary, for the short or Federal ballot.

Everything is going to be done by the State of Missouri to see that those in the armed forces do have the opportunity to vote in the primary and at the November election.

Transfer of Health Activities of Labor Department to United States Public Health Service

REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill this day which will transfer to the Federal Security Administrator and the Public Health Service, respectively, the functions of the Secretary of Labor and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor with respect to health and for other purposes. This bill would transfer all health phases including industrial hygiene, which is now invested in parts 1 and 2 of title V of the Social Security Act as amended, to the Federal Security Administrator. It would transfer all appropriations and unexpended balances as well as personnel.

As a former State health director in Nebraska I have had the opportunity to observe the activities of the Labor Department as it relates to health. Since

the Children's Bureau was established by an act of Congress on April 9, 1912, it has assumed increasing importance in all fields of health. The original act was set up to investigate the welfare of children and child life; to investigate orphanages, juvenile courts, desertions, dangerous occupations, accidents to children, employment of children, and State legislation affecting child labor. The first bill was introduced into the Congress in 1906 and became law April 9, 1912. At this time the Congress provided $25,640 for its work. The staff for the first year comprised only 15 people. The early work was experimental. The Bureau had no medical staff. They confined their work to social, industrial, and civic factors.

It is my thought that the United States Public Health Service should assume all the health activities now being performed in the Labor Department. They are doing much of this work now and by combining their activities we would eliminate duplications, confusion, and the waste of the taxpayers' money.

The Labor Department now conducts an expanding health department. They have the Division of Maternal and Child Health, a Division of Crippled Children, including rheumatic heart disease. There is a Division of Industrial Health which recently has been expanding its activities. This work is being duplicated in the United States Public Health Service. The Labor Department has an extensive vaccination program. They treat venereal disease. They undertake all health activities in connection with their maternal and child-health programs. Much is being duplicated by the Public Health Service. They have a legal definition of a child as anyone under 21 years of age. The United States Public Health Service and the Labor Department each have a large group of investigators and personnel who constantly travel throughout the country visiting the State health departments helping them to set up a program of health activities. The Labor Department and the Children's Bureau have, in addition, a large force of social workers whose main purpose is to socialize health activities. Both bureaus audit the books of the State health departments, check their moneys, propose and pass on health activities, many of which duplicate each other.

In the matter of industrial hygiene we find the Labor Department rapidly expanding their activities. There are now 38 State health departments with a number of county and city departments engaged in industrial hygiene activities. These political subdivisions have about 550 people and are spending more than $3,000,000 in all health phases of industrial hygiene. The public health authorities are doing a splendid job in controlling industrial activities affecting health. It should not be duplicated by the Labor Department.

Each department has certain funds available for matching purposes with the State. The Children's Bureau under the Department of Labor gets its funds under the Social Security Act. The United States Public Health Service derives its money from the Federal Security Agency under titles V and VI. It is all the taxpayers' money. It is my experience as State health director to find that these two agencies and the personnel in the health departments are jealous of each other. Each wants to expand his health activities. The confusion of plans and conflict of ideas made it difficult for State health directors to coordinate their programs to the best interests of the public. I am convinced that if all the health activities were under one head with moneys and plans spent with one objective in view, that we could eliminate much duplication and confusion in the promotion of better public health.

I believe that all accident prevention, wages, hours, and unemployment should come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, but I do not believe that the Department of Labor and the Children's Bureau should engage in health activities now being carried on by the United States Public Health Service.

Before introducing the bill I wrote a letter to all the State health departments and the State medical societies in the United States. All replies to date are favorable to the purposes of the bill. I feel it will have nearly 100 percent approval by health authorities. It should have the approval of the Appropriation Committee and the Members of Congress because it makes for efficiency in health activities, it eliminates confusion and duplication and will save the taxpayers' money.

Statement of Ex-Gov. James M. Cox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made by ex-Gov. James M. Cox on his seventy-fourth birthday. This statement is worthy of the consideration of all thoughtful people:

My thinking of the peace now is as it was in 1920. The star that Woodrow Wilson followed is still my light and guide. He warned us in words that are now prophecy fulfilled.

I cannot believe, following these years of torment and suffering, that a civilized world will permit to be destroyed the noblest project conceived by mankind. Nor can there be, in the face of our tragic mistake, another triumph in this country for a political cabal such as blasted our hopes a quarter of a century ago.

We have feasted so long at the table of the gods that we cease to regard our fortune as a gift, but take it rather as a right. When emergency compels any trespass upon our bounty, we do not respond with our better selves. We complain and criticize. As our comforts and conveniences are disturbed, demagogues try to take our minds from the Nation's great achievements of war to things so little and so relatively unimportant that we should reproach ourselves for even thinking of them.

This leads us to nag and hamper our leaders with energies that might better be employed against the enemy. Thousands of us presume to know more about the direction of armies than General Marshall and of naval strategy than Admiral King.

We should long ago have learned the dangers of such back-seat driving. Our assumption of superior knowledge runs also in other directions. We are reading in the press and hearing over the radio a continuing inquiry into the necessary secrets of the war movement. What went on at the conferences at Cairo and Teheran? What did President Roosevelt say to Premier Stalin? What did Stalin say to Mr. Churchill? And so on and on. A man from Mars might easily assume that we think these leaders are stupid or unfair when the facts are obviously otherwise.

There will doubtless be future differences to adjust, but I have never known a personal quarrel to be bettered by neighborhood meddling. Too many editors, columnists, and commentators demand the details of the most confidential situation. What could they do about it if they know? There would be wide differences of opinion not only as among them, but their readers and hearers as well. There would be no agreement, no solution, only worse confusion. We must trust our leaders. A million commanders cannot win a war.

Every member of our military forces back from overseas, with whom I have talked tells me that in the hour of peril he was in communion with his God. I am wondering whether the rest of us would not better be closer to God and seek removal of the pettiness of our natures. Let us ask Him to destroy the idols of our partisan politics. Well might we ask Him to make us deserve the coming fruits of a tranquil world.

In the First World War we fought for the preservation of democracy. That is what we are striving for now. That is what the boys at the front are fighting for. It is for us, by putting patriotism above politics to demonstrate that democracy can be made to work in war; and then, after peace has come, to work in the adjustments of a lasting peace.

Dangerous Tinkering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Congress limited the Price Control Act so that it has now to be reenacted witnesses the wisdom of forcing a review of what has always been dangerous tinkering, namely, price fixing by Government fiat as against competitive prices and profits. Was Congress so foolish as to limit the duration of the act on the theory that the duration of the war would be similarly limited and so the need for the legislation would be over after June 1944? Of course not. The conditions under which war-induced scarcities can be rationed and fixed in price, with efficient and economical production and consumption as the end in view, have been ill-defined and require careful review by the representatives of the people, who are compelled to see the

difficulties involved from all angles and not alone from the viewpoint of the Administrator of the act, and certainly not just from the viewpoint of individual constituents who have been on the other end of the headaches which are involved in bureaucracy.

That which is most to be feared is not that the act will be amended, but that it will not be amended at all, or not so as to reduce the blind alleys and dilemmas which have become so obvious. Proposed amendments have been commented on succinctly in a recent editorial in the Washington Post under the above heading, Dangerous Tinkering. In disagreement with this comment let me quote that part which relates to discrimination and subsidies favoring high-cost producers:

Heading the list (of amendments) is a proposal to strike out the word "generally" from the text of the present law requiring ceiling prices to be "generally fair and equitable." The effect of that omission would be to compel O. P. A. to fix maximum prices for specific products at levels that would guarantee reasonable returns to the highest-cost producer, no matter how inefficient he might be. Such a proposal would boost price ceilings to cover marginal production costs, thereby giving extra high profits to lower-cost producers. Mr. Bowles explained (to the House committee) that companies unable to make a profit under existing price regulations can ask O. P. A. for relief. Then, if the output of the high-cost marginal producer is considered essential, he can be given relief in the form of a subsidy. But it would be a costly sort of folly for the Government to fix prices so high as to assure every individual businessman a profit regardless of his efficiency. Such a policy, according to Mr. Bowles, would spell the death knell of private enterprise.

Just what is the most costly sort of folly in this connection is open to serious dispute, particularly as related to the problem of financing the war by taxation. If giving extra high profits to lower-cost producers is the way to the cheapest and most efficient production, it is also obvious that that is the way to collect the most taxes for financing the war in general. It is well to remember that under an income tax the more the national income is concentrated in the hands of the few, the less inflationary it becomes because tax revenues are then a greater proportion of income. Inflation can be countered most effectively when money is not being saved but is entering into those income payments which can be and are absorbed in largest proportion by the income tax. Just such issues as these are involved in the question of amendment of the act to ease as much as possible the extreme complexities in which it has become involved.

As evidence that there are two sides to the question raised as to whether "generally fair and equitable" is a wise wording as it stands, I offer the analysis of Prof. Lewis Haney, of New York University, from an article published by the Commercial and Financial Chronicle on March 9, as follows:

It should be clear that, since one basis for rationing is scarcity, everything possible should be done to increase the available supply quantity for all needy cases. This can be done most effectively in only two general ways: (1) By encouraging production, and (2) by discouraging unnecessary consumption. Thus the wholesale price of the rationed goods will ordinarily be high. It should be high enough to stimulate the maximum output, especially from those superior producers who have great resources and low costs. It should be high enough to prevent purchases for wasteful (unnecessary) consumption. * * *

In no case, however, should the "subsidy" policy as hitherto practiced be extended. That policy has failed to recognize that marginal or high-cost production exists or should exist, among all producers—that "marginal" production is not limited to a few "marginal producers." Even the company having the lowest average cost per unit of product can and should have a marginal cost as high as that of the least efficient company. If the low-cost mine does not use its resources so intensively that it produces all that it can without producing any unit at a loss, it fails to do all that it can for society. Incidentally, it fails to make the highest possible net return for itself.

Nothing in the nature of a subsidy should be given, or "extended", which is not an addition to the flat price. Such an addition is not a subsidy, in the current sense of the term, but is a general raise in the price of a commodity. Never should a subsidy be paid merely to "marginal producers" as distinguished from others. If we pay a high price to a "high-cost producer" to induce him to increase his output, we should also pay a high price to the "low-cost producer" to encourage him to increase his output. Usually, the largest potential addition to supply is in the hands of the more efficient concerns which are already operating profitably. Assuming competition, just raise the price and they will expand their outputs at their ("intensive") margins.

This takes care of much of the current foggy discussion about "newcomers" and the "preservation of pre-war competition conditions" in various industries. The simple, clear-cut way is to invite new production into each industry in which increased scarcity exists. This new production may come from old-comers or new-comers, but it should come competitively from any and all who choose to produce efficiently and economically.

A Plea for Abundance Made by the Farmers National Union to the Republican Conference at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, at the Republican conference held at Chicago April 3 and 4, 1944, the Farmers National Union submitted the following program to the Republican committee on agriculture. This was done at the request of the committee itself.

This program presents a most forward-looking plan of action on the part of those engaged in food production, and at the same time shows a deep determination to win this war and guard against a post-war period of depression. The matter is of such outstanding importance that I submit the whole program herewith:

FARMERS UNION MAKES PLEA FOR ABUNDANCE AT CHICAGO MEETING

We believe that the following specific objectives for our Nation, and for agriculture in particular, will contribute to the peace and security of all people everywhere.

We are urgent in stating our proposals because we are determined that this Nation shall not repeat its tragic errors following World War No. 1 and attempt to return to an economy of scarcity and fear when an economy of abundance and freedom from want is at hand. The spigots of production are today pouring forth abundance for war. They will continue to pour forth abundance for peace unless deliberately turned off. That must not happen.

FAMILY-TYPE FARM

Our Nation's Constitution establishes a Government of, by, and for the people. Agricultural programs which undermine and destroy people within agriculture weaken our Nation and subvert the constitutional purpose of our Government. We believe that American agricultural policy should be built on the solid foundation of the family-type farm, operated by its owner. Existing large-scale, factory-type, farming units must be required to cease exploitation of human beings and the sacrifice of human welfare and security by which they make a fictitious claim to "efficiency"; they must be required to meet wage and working conditions that will permit the workers they employ to live at decent, American levels.

We do not propose a Ghandi-like return to primitive methods, but the use of the most modern machinery, methods, and devices, including cooperation, to promote the security and welfare of the farm family. Family-type, owner-operated farms must not become the barren homes of a rural peasantry. They must afford adequate incomes for a decent level of family living after farm operating expenses and fixed charges have been met. They should be served by the most modern form of energy (electrical or other), equipped with modern machinery and tools, and have upon them healthful and attractive buildings. The families operating these farms must have the best social and community services, such as roads, schools, health programs, and recreational facilities that our demonstrated ability to produce abundantly can offer.

ABUNDANCE

Maintenance of democracy requires that our economic organization function at capacity levels of production, and that it distribute this production widely. Future American citizens, be they rural or urban, will not tolerate the nonsensical paradox of idle workers, idle factories, and idle acres. Poverty in the midst of "surpluses" must be banished from our society. There must be real freedom from want, for we have demonstrated our capacity to produce. That is the most practical advice that can be given those who would return to an economy of scarcity. Time will prove them tragically, if not fatally, impractical, should they fail to heed it. The democratic processes cannot be maintained in a society so beset with monopolies, trade barriers and favoritism to selfish interests that restricted production, want, starvation and disease result. Only force can maintain such an order.

We reject proposals to let our national income fall to $100,000,000,000 per year, because, at this level, agriculture's net income would fall from the 1943 level of 12 billion to 7 billion, leaving 1,000,000 members of farm families unemployed and destitute, 500,000 farm laborers unemployed, and a million farm war veterans without opportunity to find security on the land. They would drift from farm to city and back, competing with each other for more and more of less and less.

The war has demonstrated to the American people that abundance is upon us. They will not tolerate a return to scarcity. We are going to learn to live with abundance and like it.

The National Farmers' Union insists upon the full use of all our human and material resources for production. Nothing less is enough to save the peace.

FAMILY OF NATIONS

We believe the day has long since passed when each and every nation of the world can exercise the full and absolute powers of national sovereignty without regard to their effects on other nations. Within one generation the world has been engulfed in two devastating wars, each more murderous, more costly, more devastating than anything ever before witnessed in the history of man. If we are not to make a pure mockery of civilization, then our country—the most influential in all the world—must accept cheerfully and eagerly its share of the responsibility for peace and freedom. The United States must abandon the policy of isolation, and henceforward assume a sound, constructive, realistic, and cooperative role in shaping the future of the entire world.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

Our society, in prosperity and in depression, in peace and in war, has long been handicapped by concentration of wealth, opportunity, economic power, and by the narrow distribution of educational, recreational, and social opportunities; too much political power gathered into the hands of a few; and too little opportunity for all citizens to participate effectively in our democratic processes.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE BILLION DOLLAR INCOME

The continuing spectacle of a three-ring circus, in which agriculture fights labor, industry and labor fight each other, and all three are incited to mistrust their own Government, can lead only to national suicide. We must have a $175,000,000,000 national income or all will fail. They must meet, through their Government, and by democratic process achieve a $175,000,000,000 national income; otherwise this Nation and each of these groups will slip into fascism, which has only contempt for political parties, legislatures, and the people's will expressed at democratic assemblages such as this. We are producing at a rate in excess of $150,000,000,000 this year, with 10,000,000 of our most productive men and women engaged in war. A $175,000,000,000 peacetime goal is easily attainable.

Because of the very nature of farming, the national interest requires that agriculture receive due consideration in the way of public policies. Farmers as a group do not want special privileges in the sense that they want to benefit at the expense of other groups in society. It will be wise for Government to recognize the nature of agricultural production and adapt Government policies and programs to fit the needs of agriculture.

STEPS URGED

1. Real stabilization of wartime economy to prevent inflation.
2. One hundred percent tax on profits in sale of land.
3. Annual goals for agricultural production.
4. Maintenance of farm credit agencies.
5. Protection from disasters, like floods and storms.
6. Retirement of submarginal land by United States Government.
7. All farmers to be required to carry out conservation policies.
8. Improvement of marketing efficiency by loans, regulation, and grading.
9. Overhauling of present freight rates.
10. Expansion of farm cooperative marketing organizations.
11. Improved family living, especially betterment of housing.
12. Health, medical, and hospital services within ability to pay.
13. Benefits of social security to be extended to farm groups.
14. Distribution of war surpluses to serve the people.
15. Continuation of heavy public expenditures when needed.
16. Active participation of the United States in world Affairs.

CONCLUSION

Today, in a million farm homes thoughts run from the plans for the 1944 ploughing, planting, and harvesting to the son or daughter, sister or husband who, half way round the world, is fighting to keep that home, that farm, free and secure. Farm people, more than ever before, are concerned about the future, about the organization of a lasting peace. They are, we believe, determined that after this war we shall go forward to new freedom, new opportunity, new security; that we shall end the 40 years of wandering in a man-made wilderness of scarcity and finally enter into the promised land of plenty. They are ready and, we believe, determined to learn to live with abundance and like it.

What Is Wrong With the So-Called G. I. Bill of Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, delivered over Station WINX, Washington, D. C., April 5, 1944.

This important bill will be considered by the House in the near future. I entertain a very high regard for both Mr. Rice and the veterans' organization which he so ably represents, but I do not necessarily agree with some of his expressed views herein. Nevertheless, his address illustrates the importance and the need for serious and searching study of the manifold veterans' problems and the further necessity of serious study of the proposed legislation by every Member of this House.

Mr. Rice's speech follows:

During the time so kindly extended to me by this radio station, I propose to tell briefly what is wrong with the so-called G. I. bill of rights now being considered in the House of Representatives of our United States Congress. My remarks in opposition to several of its proposals should prove of interest, particularly to fellow fathers of sons in service, to fellow veterans, to fellow service-disabled veterans, and their dependents, and to fellow taxpayers.

Everyone, I believe, agrees that those who have served actively in the armed forces of the United States, in its most hazardous employment during time of war, deserve some extra consideration by reason of so serving. Every American citizen is desirous of accomplishing the greatest good for the greatest number of servicemen and servicewomen, as nearly as feasible, proportionate to their sacrifices, with the least possible bad aftereffects as to others.

Careful consideration, therefore, should be given to determine the very best method by which to provide justifiable post-war adjustments for America's veterans of World War No. 2. Much better methods, with considerably less ultimate cost to America's taxpayers, can be devised then as provided for in this G. I. bill, which, after being recently passed by the United States Senate, is now before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Its principal provisions are still badly in need of additional drastic changes, if existing benefits and pending legislation on behalf of America's disabled war veterans, and their dependents, are not to be unduly jeopardized.

America's first obligation is to those of its citizens who have sacrificed a part of their bodies, or a part of their health by reason of their service in the armed forces; that is, to our disabled war veterans, and their dependents. First things should be done first. I submit to you that America's disabled veterans have not yet been adequately provided for, nor have their dependents. Proposed legislation, for example, to provide the same dependency allowances to the service connected disabled of America, as Canada has long provided for its service disabled veterans, is still pending. Our Federal Government has actually been guilty of discouraging its service connected disabled veterans from getting married, and has in effect, encouraged those who have gotten married to exercise birth control. It has really been responsible for causing many married disabled veterans, who have become totally disabled and unemployable, to go into Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary facilities, in order that their wives and children might be able to obtain more of the necessities of life out of their small compensation and pension payments.

Why should our rich American Nation continue to be so niggardly as to its war-disabled veterans? At the present low rate of $100 per month for those who are totally disabled, unemployable, they cannot possibly provide a decent existence standard of living for themselves and their families—to maintain the vaunted American way of life for which they lost their employability.

The so-called G. I. bill of rights provides for education for those veterans who had 6 months or more of service, for a period of 1 year, plus an additional month of training for each additional month of service, so long as satisfactory marks were obtained, in an approved school, for a total period not exceeding 4 years, during which the veteran would receive the sum of $50 per month from the Veterans' Administration, and, if married, the sum of $75 per month. If from 7 to 10 percent took advantage of this provision, it would cost about $1,000,000,000, so if 50 percent of them did, the cost would go up to six or seven billion dollars. The Veterans' Administration has heretofore been the one Federal agency delegated primarily to deal with the problems of service-disabled veterans, including vocational rehabilitation where needed, and, if it is also given the same responsibility potentially as to millions of able-bodied veterans, it will naturally be apt to give less attention to the more complicated problems of disabled veterans. Post-war education for the able-bodied veterans should more appropriately be assumed by the various States, or, if Federal assistance is needed, by the Office of Education.

Another important title of this bill would provide unemployment compensation benefits to discharged veterans during periods of unemployment during the first 24 months after the termination of their mustering-out payments, not exceeding 52 weeks, and for

not more than 8 weeks for each 4 weeks of active service, at the rate of $15 per week, plus dependency allowances which could bring the total up to $25 per week—a higher rate than paid in practically every State.

If from 7 to 10 percent of the veterans of World War No. 2 benefited by this provision, it would, according to Senator GEORGE, cost about $1,000,000,000, but if 75 percent should need such benefits, then the cost could go up to $10,000,000,000. This attempt to underwrite the economic maladjustments of veterans following this war, definitely being the wrong approach to the problem, would almost surely fail of its purpose, and thus give rise to no end of demands for further extensions thereto, whereupon the cost could go into the scores of billions of dollars.

Able-bodied veterans who desire gainful suitable employment would probably find lessened opportunities therefor by reason of the fact that higher unemployment compensation rates were available for them. Employers would then have an inducement to extend actual preference of employment to nonveterans, because during unemployment they would be eligible for lower rates of State unemployment compensation benefits, paid for, in effect, by the employer, whereas, during unemployment those veterans would be entitled to higher rates of Federal unemployment compensation.

Much dissatisfaction would, moreover, arise among the veterans themselves when they found that they had exhausted their rights to such Federal unemployment compensation benefits, after which they would receive the lower State rates of unemployment compensation, if entitled thereto. Such State unemployment compensation benefits as might have been frozen to their credit might, in the meantime, have expired, unless all such State laws are further amended. What will be the result when various groups of citizens make comparisons as to their respective Federal and State unemployment compensation benefits? A much better system would be to give an accrual of credits for unemployment compensation purposes on the basis of the length of each person's military or naval service, to be available to the board of unemployment compensation in the State in which any such person may subsequently reside, and thus to be paid to him according to State standards.

The worst part of this so-called omnibus bill which, by some has been referred to as the "ominous" bill, is that it would be administered by the Veterans' Administration, which has had no background of experience concerning the many complications involved.

The Veterans' Administration ought not to be the Federal agency to provide those post-war adjustments for able-bodied veterans. Proponents of the so-called G. I. bill have insisted that the discharged veterans ought to go only to one place to get all of the pertinent information and assistance that they might need relative to any benefits to which they might be entitled. Surely the Veterans' Administration contact officers, if not also the representatives of the various veteran organizations, should be thoroughly prepared to inform each veteran as to all of the various Federal and State benefits that he might be eligible for, but, even if the Veterans' Administration were to be delegated to administer all of such post-war adjustments, any such veteran would inevitably have to go to more than one office to receive the benefits to which he might be lawfully and equitably entitled. Therefore, if there is one place where he can get all of the necessary information as to what he is entitled to, under certain circumstances, then the fact that he may have to go to several different Federal agencies or several different divisions or bureaus of one agency is not of any particular importance. It is, however, important that the Veterans' Administration, which is already overloaded with fast expanding responsibilities for the fast increasing number of disabled dischargees, should not become further overloaded by being required also to administer other new types of potentially costly Federal benefits, for which its officials and employees have had no background of experience.

This so-called G. I. bill of rights, primarily for able-bodied veterans, has already in effect been given the right of way and has shoved to one side other very important, badly needed, and highly justifiable legislative bills on behalf of service-disabled veterans and their dependents.

If the various new types of proposed benefits for able-bodied veterans, as to which there have been no precedents following any previous war, are to be provided for federally, then they should be administered by those Federal agencies which have had an appropriate background of experience, rather than by the Veterans' Administration, so as not to interfere with existing and pending benefits for service-disabled veterans and their dependents.

I am of the opinion, however, that inasmuch as only a small portion of the able-bodied veterans of World War No. 2 are designed to be benefited by this so-called G. I. bill, primarily on a "needs" basis, it would be much preferable that every man and woman who has served should be compensated for the loss of civilian opportunities while so serving by being given adjusted-service pay in the form of an adjusted-service bond, the amount of which could be computed on an earned-rights basis according to the length and place of service of each such person. The amount of such bond could then be made redeemable in monthly installments in the event of need therefor during periods of unemployment or while going to school, or larger amounts could be redeemable in order to buy or improve a farm or home or business, thus giving a free choice to each veteran as to how to use such adjusted-service pay. If it be granted that an adjusted-service pay ought eventually to be extended to discharged veterans of World War No. 2, then it ought to be the first legislation to be enacted for all such veterans, following the precedent established after the First World War. Such adjusted-service method would prove to be much more equitable as to all veterans on an "earned rights" basis and would require much less bureaucratic control and expense. Better still, it would not become the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration and thus could not interfere with or jeopardize existing or proposed benefits for disabled ex-servicemen or their dependents. Moreover, such adjusted-service-pay method would probably eliminate the need for any other type of post-war adjustment for able-bodied veterans, such as those provided for in the G. I. bill of rights.

Legislation for America's discharged veterans should first be provided for on a merits basis rather than a needs basis.

It would be very unfortunate to have the so-called G. I. bill of rights enacted in its present form for it would tend to divide up the country between veterans and nonveterans, thereby developing many more difficulties. The economic maladjustments of our country cannot be solved for its veterans alone, and any attempt to do so will give rise to no end of misunderstandings, bitterness, recriminations, and demands for additional legislation to straighten out the resulting inadequacies and inequalities, ultimately necessitating an expenditure of many more billions of dollars than would be the case by a reasonable "earned rights" adjustment as to every discharged veteran, supplemented by advanced detailed planning to take care of the economic maladjustments of the Nation in such a way as to give to every citizen, thus including its discharged veterans, the opportunity for gainful, suitable, useful employment.

The adjusted-service pay method of providing compensated discharged service persons for their loss of civilian opportunities while actively engaged in the armed forces, measured accordingly on an earned-rights basis, according to length and place of service, for every person who so served, including those who come back handicapped by service disabilities, would be the most equitable and practical method, and the least complicated and bureaucratic. Best of all it would not need to be administered by the Veterans' Administration, and therefore would not jeopardize existing benefits and badly needed pending legislation for war-disabled veterans and their dependents, and for the widows and orphans of those who have died in, or by reason of, active war service.

Those post-war adjustments that can be justified on a "merit," or an "earned rights" basis, whether for disabled veterans, for their dependents, for the widows and orphans of those who have died, or for able-bodied veterans, should be the first legislative proposals to be enacted into law. America's just obligations to those who have served, to those who having served have thereby sacrificed a part of their bodies or their health, and to the dependents of those who have given their very lives, should first be taken care of before going into a new "doles" system. First things should be taken care of first.

Radio Broadcast of Proceedings of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *April 17, 1944.*
Congressman WILL ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At the last regular meeting of the Santa Monica Bay District Central Labor Council the following resolution was concurred in unanimously:

"Whereas the affairs of Congress and of Government in general are vital to every citizen; and

"Whereas no present method exists to provide full information to the average citizen about the real happenings in our Congress; and

"Whereas radio is the simplest and most effective medium for communicating with every American in every part of the country; and

"Whereas New Zealand adopted a program of short-wave broadcasts of the proceedings of its parliament, and has successfully demonstrated that full knowledge by citizens of the affairs of government stimulates and strengthens the democratic system; and

"Whereas our Congress could lease radio time from one or more networks, several important and powerful stations, or broadcast by short wave all important debates, excepting such matters as might jeopardize national security during this war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we propose and urge upon Congress enactment of the necessary measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of its proceedings; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we communicate with each political party asking that this proposal be considered and included in the program adopted at its next convention; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Vice President WALLACE, to the Members of Congress, to the press, and to the sponsors."

Respectfully,

C. G. O'BRIEN,
Secretary.

Women's Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced to the House of Representatives a bill to amend the law establishing the Women's Army Corps. My amendment, in simple terms, will provide that the commanding officer of the Women's Army Corps shall be a major general.

At the present time, by statute, the commanding officer of the Women's Army Corps is given the rank of colonel. My amendment would raise her rank to that of major general. You may ask, "Why the necessity of giving the commanding officer of the Women's Army Corps the rank of major general?" I answer that such would be simple justice and proper recognition of a great organization which is taking an increasingly active part in the great conflict in which we are engaged.

Under the tables of organization of the Army, a colonel is normally placed in command of a regiment, and a major general is normally placed in command of an Army division. In addition to this fact, two brigadier generals are assigned to each combat division, one to serve as assistant commander of the division and the other to serve as artillery officer of the division. Under the old tables of organization of the Army, an Army division was composed of 25,000 troops; but under the new set-up of our armed forces, 15,000 men now constitute an Army division. The Women's Army Corps is composed of approximately 70,000 young women at the present time; and efforts are being made to greatly expand this organization until it will be composed of many additional thousands of WAC's. Considering present enlistments only as a field organization, the enlisted strength of the WAC's would be divided into almost 5 divisions; and if given the number of general officers which the tables of organization of the Army require for combat troops, it would have assigned to it 5 major generals and 10 brigadier generals. Instead of this assignment, we find only one colonel in the WAC's, and she is the commanding officer.

To me, comparisons with the British method or the methods of any other government, are often odious, and certainly not very persuasive with our people. It is interesting to note, however, that the British women's organization is known as the Women's Auxiliary Territorial Force and that its commanding officer has the corresponding rank of brigadier general in our Army.

The WAC's are doing a great job for the Nation during this time of critical shortage of manpower. The Army is having difficulty recruiting the number of young women needed in the war effort, and I think that recognition of this kind, recognizing the proper rank of the commanding officer, and distributing promotions down the line to lesser officers in proportion to the responsibilities of their services, will have a very fine effect upon recruiting of the WAC's and upon the morale of those already in service. We cannot treat this organization as a cast-off shoe and expect it to do its best work. This action is simply a just recognition of a large component part of our Army, and should be put into effect as soon as possible.

The Late William Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 24, 1944:

CARDINAL O'CONNELL

If Emerson is right when he argues that "the genius of our life is jealous of individuals and will not have any individual great, except through the general," the career of such a man as William Cardinal O'Connell is easy to understand. The great leader of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States came to his high office straight from the folk. He was a child of the masses, eleventh born in a poor family of the mill town of Lowell. His infancy and his early youth were spent under conditions of poverty and frustration. He was hurt by the then prevailing prejudice against immigrants from Ireland and their religion. To the end of his life he could not forget certain sorrowful experiences with militant intolerance.

But Cardinal O'Connell was possessed of strength equal to his need. Step by step he developed the powers that were in his mind and soul. By nature a scholar and through rigid discipline a toiler, he made himself master of a vast realm of knowledge from which it was possible for him to draw practical achievements of incalculable value to hundreds of thousands of Americans who even now may not be conscious of their debt to him. Ordained a priest at Rome in 1884, he was granted a ministry lasting nearly six full decades. The award of the red hat was an honor which he earned by his devotion and his labor. He might have won similar success in any other field of endeavor and dedication that he might have chosen, but it was his deliberate and consecrated choice to apply his talents to the church. As a fluent linguist, a convincing orator, a persuasive writer, a competent musician, a theologian and philosopher of supreme distinction, he contributed to the progress of the whole Christian movement in his time.

Cardinal O'Connell also will be remembered as a patriot of wide vision and hope. He was not narrow. In any cause of mutual concern he gladly worked with persons and groups who were not of his own immediate flock. His beliefs were conservative and he always was ready to do battle for them, yet he was not bigoted nor unreasonable. For nearly 33 years he symbolized modern New England in the Sacred College. He was 80 when he went on his last journey to the Holy See to share in the election of Pope Pius XII. Now his striving is done. He leaves many magnificent buildings with which his name always will be associated, but the monument which longest should endure is that which he raised in the recollection of the public which he served.

Golden Wedding Anniversary of Dr. and Mrs. Theodore J. C. Stellhorn, of Sandusky, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today is the golden wedding anniversary of Dr. and Mrs. Theodore J. C. Stellhorn, of Sandusky, Ohio. The doctor is a distinguished churchman and both are leaders in the Lutheran Church. I want to pay tribute to them and extend my sincere congratulations, and include the following from the Sandusky Register-Star-News:

DR. AND MRS. STELLHORN CELEBRATE GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY TUESDAY

Dr. and Mrs. Theodore J. C. Stellhorn will celebrate their golden wedding anniversary Tuesday, April 25.

A celebration in honor of the occasion has been planned to include not only the families of Dr. and Mrs. Stellhorn but also the Zion Lutheran congregational family, among whom they have spent almost the entire 50 years of their married life.

The celebrating couple was married in 1894 in the old Zion Lutheran Church on the Courthouse Square. Dr. August Dornbirer, oldest brother of Mrs. Stellhorn, officiated at the ceremony. He was the pastor of Zion Church at that time, having followed his father, Rev. Jacob Dornbirer, as pastor of the church.

Mr. George Windisch, of Sandusky, and Miss Ada Loy, of Columbus, Ohio, were the attendants. They are both still living and have been invited to join in the festivities of the golden anniversary.

The first 3 years of their married life the honored couple spent in Fort Wayne, Ind., where Dr. Stellhorn was pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, which he had organized in 1892. Since November 1897 they have made their home in Sandusky, where Dr. Stellhorn first served as assistant pastor of Zion Church, and since 1907 as pastor in charge.

HAVE FAMILY DINNER

Tuesday noon the brothers and sisters of Dr. and Mrs. Stellhorn, together with their immediate families, will gather for a large family dinner in the church meeting rooms. The wives of the vestrymen and several women who served the dinner for the fortieth anniversary will cook and serve the dinner. Mrs. Fred Harple is in charge of the com-

mittee. Rev. and Mrs. J. A. Griffith, of St. Paul Lutheran Church, Sandusky, Rev. and Mrs. A. J. Braun, and Mrs. John E. Braun, of Trinity Lutheran Church, of Venice, and Rev. and Mrs. Edwin E. Prange, of Monroeville, have been invited as guests for the dinner.

At 8 o'clock Tuesday evening the membership of Zion Church has been invited to join in the celebration. A brief service of thanksgiving has been arranged for that time in which the congregational family will join.

SON CONDUCTS SERVICE

The service will be conducted by Rev. Theo. Stellhorn, Jr., the junior pastor of Zion Church and the son of Dr. and Mrs. Stellhorn. The only brother of Dr. Stellhorn in the active ministry, Rev. Ernst C. Stellhorn of Ann Arbor, Mich., will deliver the congratulatory address. Rev. Ernst Stellhorn married the former Miss Ann Dornbirer, a sister of the bride of 50 years ago. The senior choir of Zion Church will participate in the service and sing the Latvian spiritual, My God and I, under the direction of Mr. Harold Parker. Miss Helen Louise Reeme, the organist of Zion Church, will preside at the organ for the occasion.

Following the service of thanksgiving, Dr. and Mrs. Stellhorn will receive their friends at the main entrance of the church if Mrs. Stellhorn's health will permit. The many friends of the couple in the community at large are invited to attend this service Tuesday evening at 8 o'clock.

Dr. and Mrs. Stellhorn have four children who will all join them in celebrating their golden wedding anniversary. The oldest, Luther W. Stellhorn, resides in Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Howard Hughes lives in Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Theo. Stellhorn, Jr., has served as assistant to his father for the past 16 years, and the youngest of the 4 children, Katherine, is at home with her parents.

Petition of the Farmers of Upper Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the petition of the farmers of Upper Montgomery:

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the farmers of Upper Montgomery, in convention assembled, respectfully petition that early aid be given to more farm labor, the implement and tractor makers, and nitrate plants for the production of more and cheaper fertilizer, so that the impending shortage of food stuffs and feeds may not be so severe. And this must be done at once, because if the farmers are not in a position to plant 60 percent more wheat by September the war may be lost, due to lack of food for the Army and the civilian population. No more men should be taken from the farms and enlisted farm boys in this country returned to their own farms for spring harvest and corn cutting and wheat drilling in fall. Mr. McNutt will also have to allocate enough men to run the farm implement plants.

We further petition that a nonpartisan five man wheat commission be appointed to have full control of wheat. This commission shall be composed of an economist, a dirt farmer, an expert in marketing, storage, and transportation; also a representative of the milling, cereal, and other manufactured products, the fifth member should represent the consumers.

The above in order that a surplus of 3,000,000 bushels may be obtained and held for the future, that production may be wisely controlled, also that exports and imports may be used to the best benefit of our Country. Further that the wheat industry may be welded into homogeneous, rounded whole. With prices maintained at a fixed level, and the amount to be grown scientifically determined in advance. Food is the first war munition, yet it is being overlooked. An Army is a liability without food.

We further petition the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, that he request all county agents, and their local committees to hold meetings as soon as possible to encourage 60 percent greater wheat planting this fall, and to acquaint the United States Congress with their imperative needs, in order that this great shortage may not occur, and our Army may feed and fight.

JOHN S. LARCOMBE, Jr.,
President, Gaithersburg, Md.
H. W. BECRAFT,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Washington Grove, Md.

Labor Backs the Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a radio address by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, published in the American Federationist for April 1944:

LABOR BACKS THE BOYS

(By William Green)

Every American is proud of the way the armed forces of our country are carrying on the fight against the enemy on the battlefields. Our men in uniform are meeting every test with high courage and driving the enemy back on every front. Who are these stalwart soldiers, sailors, and marines? They are American boys from all walks of life—from the factories, the farms, and the schools of our country, boys from every home and community in America.

More than 1,350,000 of them are members of American Federation of Labor unions. Perhaps another million are members of other labor organizations.

One of the miracles of our times is the fact that these young men, born and bred in a peace-loving atmosphere, have been able to face the horrors of modern war unflinchingly and to defeat the seasoned troops of our enemies. Their record to date inspires us with confidence that when the crucial invasions of enemy territory are launched they will carry out their assignments swiftly and victoriously.

Knowing that great military movements impend and that millions of our young men will be called upon to risk life and limb, we are impressed with the great responsibility of each and every American serving on the home front to back up our boys in uniform to the limit.

Labor recognizes this responsibility and is endeavoring in every way possible to fulfill it. As I see it, labor's responsibility is twofold. First and foremost, we must produce in ever-increasing quantities the finest and best munitions of war, the planes, tanks, ships, and guns which will help the armed forces win victory in the shortest possible time, thus saving life and bloodshed. Secondly, we owe a deep responsibility to those in the armed forces to preserve and protect the free American way of life and the high standards which characterize that way of life, so that when our soldiers and sailors return home after the final victory they will have every opportunity to start life anew under favorable circumstances.

I want to tell you now how labor is discharging these twin responsibilities. It is a story which has not yet been told in its true light and perspective. To a certain degree, the members of the Nation's armed forces have been misinformed as to the facts. To them and to their parents and relatives who are naturally concerned about their welfare, this story should prove enlightening and encouraging.

In the first place, American workers are producing the weapons of war in an awe-inspiring way. I don't ask you to take my word for that. Abundant confirmation—official confirmation—is contained in the third annual report of the Truman committee of the United States Senate, recently made public. This report declares that "the major battles of production have been won," largely through the "astounding performance" of American labor.

"The job that has been done," the Truman committee report says, "not only assures that victory will be won, but it assures that it will be won more quickly and with fewer casualties. Our armed forces have more and better equipment than our foes."

Well, how about strikes? That is the question labor's critics usually interpose at this point. In answer, I should like to quote from the Truman committee report again. It says:

"Strikes receive a very great amount of attention because of their dramatic character and news value, and because the public properly resents these violations of labor's pledge not to obstruct the war effort by striking. However, strikes in mining, manufacturing, and construction in 1943 resulted in a loss of manpower of less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the manpower actually used, whereas the manpower contributed by labor in that period exceeded that used in 1939 by 76 percent.

"This astounding performance exceeds anything of its kind ever achieved in the history of the world. The results obtained are the best answer to the critics of the home front. They do not indicate perfection, but they do evidence accomplishment of a high order."

Mind you, these are not my words, nor the utterances of any other labor representative who might be inclined to advance the best possible interpretation of labor's war record. These are the official utterances of a Senate committee charged with the responsibility of investigating the war effort, a committee which would not hesitate for one moment to denounce labor if the facts warranted. But what does this committee say after carefully examining the facts? It says that "on the whole the performance by labor has been very good."

I'd like to add a few observations of my own to what the Truman Committee reports on the subject of strikes. First of all, let me emphasize that the official policy of the American Federation of Labor is that strikes must be avoided at any cost. In these times of crisis, we insist that no matter how acute the grievance may be, no matter how intolerable the provocation may appear, strikes cannot be justified on any ground. That is our official policy. And the members of the American Federation of Labor have lived up to it almost 100 percent. The comparative few who have broken their pledge are the

exception to the rule. We do not attempt to condone or justify their actions. On the contrary, we condemn them. But we do not consider it fair for all of labor to be vilified for the acts of the few. We resent the attempts of antilabor propagandists, who wish to destroy the standards of the American way of life, to blacken the name of the entire labor movement because a small minority of workers occasionally break discipline. We resent it just as much as the men in the armed forces would object to the entire Army or Navy being smeared just because a few recalcitrants may go A. W. O. L.

The truth is that American workers as a whole are on the job and serving faithfully under trying conditions. I challenge anyone to deny that they are doing a remarkably good job—a better job than the workers of any other nation.

Just as surely as America's fighting forces are outfighting the enemy, America's workers are outproducing the enemy. Together, American fighting soldiers and production soldiers constitute an unbeatable team. He who seeks to divide them or set them against each other is an enemy of his own country and a traitor to the cause of democracy.

I have attempted thus far to show how organized labor is supporting the men in the armed forces in our joint and most important task, which is to win the war in the shortest possible time. That support consists chiefly of production, but it is supplemented by universal purchases of War bonds, by contributions to war relief activities, by donations to the Red Cross, and by active promotion of every administrative and legislative policy which strengthens the war effort.

Now I want to tell you about some of labor's activities in behalf of the post-war economic and social security of the millions of men in uniform who will return to private life when victory comes.

On the economic front, labor's chief battle has been and still is to keep the cost of living within bounds. The returning soldier would be hit just as hard by inflation as the civilian. In order to maintain American living standards, labor insists that wage rates keep pace with inevitable wartime increases in prices of the necessities of life. Let no one tell you that labor seeks to profit from the war by obtaining wage increases. Such adjustments in wages as labor demands are for the purpose of maintaining and preserving American standards of life. Obviously, our standard of living is bound to be destroyed if the cost of living keeps going up while wage rates remain frozen. In fighting for economic stabilization labor is fighting for the returning servicemen just as much as for its own members. Anyone who has to depend on wage earnings for a living must join with organized labor in the patriotic effort to protect American standards of living from deterioration.

The first concern of most servicemen returning home after the war will be—where can I get a good job? The law is supposed to provide that those who have left private employment to join the armed forces are entitled to get their old jobs back after the war. But this law has many loopholes. Organized labor has succeeded in plugging up some of these loopholes by means of union contracts and union policies which protect the seniority rights of servicemen. In other words, members of American Federation of Labor unions in the armed services are guaranteed by the policy of their union and the contracts obtained from employers by the union that they will get their jobs back.

Those who did not enjoy the benefits of union membership before the war will be welcomed into organized labor's ranks if they apply and if they are properly qualified to serve in the various trades. The International Association of Machinists has led the way by announcing that ex-servicemen will be admitted into membership without being required to pay initiation fees. Many other unions are following suit. Of course, during the war the unions have volunteered to keep members who joined the armed forces in good standing without payment of dues.

But even these protections will be of little avail if a post-war depression hits private industry. Therefore, the American Federation of Labor has taken the lead in calling for a vast expansion of peacetime production when the war ends. "Jobs for all" is our post-war slogan. We realize it can only be fulfilled if maximum production is maintained. Labor is joining with industry and the Government in the formulation of post-war programs and policies which will promote all-out peacetime production and provide jobs for all.

It would be optimistic, however, to rely entirely on hopes and promises. Therefore, the American Federation of Labor has drafted and secured the introduction in Congress of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which broadens the entire social security program and particularly provides that ex-servicemen will be entitled to at least 6 months' unemployment compensation if they are not able to find jobs immediately on their return. This legislation stands No. 1 on our list and labor will exert every effort to secure its prompt enactment.

But this is only one of the many protections which labor insists the Government should extend to returning servicemen. We urge that every member of the armed forces should be paid upon demobilization a lump sum adequate enough to permit him to get resettled in civilian status. We favor grants by the Government to enable those who wish to do so to resume and complete their education. Every possible measure should be taken to provide free hospitalization for disabled veterans, to provide disability compensation for them and to make available to them full opportunity for vocational training so that they can become self-sustaining in the future.

These are but a few of the ways in which organized labor is now fighting for the protection of the men in the armed services. I want them to know that labor is actively protecting their interests.

America's debt to those who have given their lives in the war can never be repaid. But we can and must do everything humanly possible to make up, to those who will return, the time they have lost, the opportunities they have sacrificed, the hardships they have suffered and the ghastly experiences they have endured.

Those experiences will leave a deep mark on the youth of America. They will come home determined that victory must bring with it lasting peace, economic security, and political freedom for all. Toward the attainment of these goals, the workers of America will be proud to march hand-in-hand with the veterans of this war.

William Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston and dean of the Catholic hierarchy in America and spiritual sovereign over more than a million Massachusetts Catholics and New England's first and only prince of the church, passed to the great beyond at his residence in Brighton, a suburb of Boston, Mass., on Saturday, April 22, 1944, following a lifetime of service to his church and God.

Death came peacefully to this aged and respected priest of the church in his eighty-fourth year as the beloved prelate responded to the prayers for the dying being offered up by his priests and the members of his family.

During these days of sorrow, flags flutter at half mast on public buildings throughout New England and messages of condolence and tribute continue to arrive at the diocesan house at the episcopal residence, Lake Street, Brighton.

In the passing of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, the church has lost a noble prince, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a prominent citizen, and the country a most respected patriot.

In the words of Archbishop Francis J. Spellman of New York:

> No American loved his country more than Cardinal O'Connell and none with greater intelligence served America any better. In him love of country followed love of God, and nobly he served them both. Love of God made him a true patriot, alert and determined to preserve our liberties.

He was the youngest of 11 sons of John and Bridget (Farley) O'Connell, poor Irish immigrants. He was born in Lowell, Mass., on the feastday of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, 1859. After attending public schools, he entered St. Charles College in Maryland and later he completed his education at Boston College with a degree of B. A. summa cum laude. Shortly thereafter he received a scholarship to the American College at Rome and in 1884 he was ordained a priest in Rome. In 1895, Cardinal O'Connell was made rector of the American College at Rome, building up an excellent reputation for the college. He was made chamberlain—with the title of monsignor—by Pope Piux XII, which gave him access to the papal chambers. In 1897 he was named domestic prelate and in 1901 was appointed Bishop of Portland, Maine. After 4 years in this position, Pope Piux X named him as assistant to the pontificial throne and selected him as papal envoy to Japan. Bishop O'Connell was an excellent linguist, having the ability to speak Japanese, German, Italian, French, Latin, Spanish, Russian, and Syrian.

In the following year Bishop O'Connell was named titular archbishop of Constance and coadjutor archbishop of Boston, as assistant to the aged Archbishop Williams. The following year Archbishop Williams passed away, and he succeeded him to the See of Boston, second only in the American hierarchy to the See of New York. Since that time Carinal O'Connell's reputation and leadership has been well known in Massachusetts. His sermons and his orations have been masterpieces, and although he never participated in politics, he often spoke out freely on the issues of the day which he considered in the spiritual realm of his church.

He has not only been honored by the Holy Vatican but by governments of many lands. He possesses the Lebanese

Grand Medal of Merit, the Grand Crosses of the Order of Malta, of the Crown of Italy, of the Constantinian Order of St. George, of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Legion d'Honneur.

At the time of his golden jubilee in 1934 when he celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, he was presented with a golden chalice by American bishops and letters of praise were received from Pope Pius XI and President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Three thousand people thronged the Cathedral of the Holy Cross of Boston when he celebrated his mass and thousands more were unable to enter. He later addressed an audience of 30,000 Bostonians, urging patriotism, law enforcement, American unity, and tolerance. Harvard University awarded to him the honor and degree of doctor of letters in 1937, and President Dr. James B. Conant stated at the time:

For three decades archbishop of Boston, he is a person of this Commonwealth honored as a faithful shepherd of a multitude of devoted citizens.

And no finer words could be said than the statement made by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Boston, spoken a few minutes after his death, when he stated:

In the death of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, we, the priests and people of the Boston Archdiocese, have suffered the loss of a beloved spiritual father and a gifted spiritual leader. The Nation has lost a distinguished American; the State of Massachusetts has lost a foremost citizen; the church a preemminent prelate; and the entire world a great man. During almost 60 years of his life he was to be found in the arena fighting for both the eternal and temporal rights of his fellow men. His death now comes in the midst of tragic days when we mourn the loss of so many of our youth, the fine flower of our manhood, in the holocaust of war. They are sacrificing their lives in the noble cause of freedom and for the rights of humanity. To that same cause he, too, dedicated his long life and his extraordinary powers.

For a Clean Sweep of Anti-Ally Nonsense—Even From the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Frank R. Kent that appeared in the Chicago Sun, entitled "For a Clean Sweep of Anti-Ally Nonsense—Even From the Army":

FOR A CLEAN SWEEP OF ANTI-ALLY NONSENSE—EVEN FROM THE ARMY

(By Frank R. Kent)

Mr. Leo T. Crowley, under whom lend-lease is now operated, performed a patriotic service and executed as well an effective piece of personal strategy the other day when, by providing the answers before the questions could be asked, he vaccinated against the anti-British and anti-Russian (but particularly anti-British) rumors that have been current here for weeks and which, if they persist unchecked, are sure to seep through the country.

The Crowley statement was made before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and should have had much wider publicity than was given. For these reports have had great circulation and are promoted with such detail as to make them easy to believe. Among those exploded by Mr. Crowley were (1) that the British had a habit of removing the labels from lend-lease articles, and substituting their own, retransferring the goods to other countries and taking the credit; (2) that Lend-Lease was selling gasoline to the British in various places for 2 cents a gallon which the British resold to our Army for 42 cents; (3) that alcohol sent to Britain on lend-lease had been converted into whisky and sold back to us; (4) that we had sent huge quantities of diaper cloth to north Africa which the natives were using for head dresses; (5) that the Russians had traded some of our planes to the Japanese in return for rubber; (6) that the Russians were using lend-lease butter to grease their boots, etc.

POISONOUS REPORTS

These and kindred stories were denounced by Mr. Crowley as without any trace of truth and as having emanated from enemy propaganda sources. Unquestionably a clear-cut unequivocal denial of these poisonous reports was badly needed.

It should have been made long ago, and Mr. Crowley deserves credit for taking the initiative. The amount of harm such things can do if permitted to go unchecked is hard to exaggerate. In effect, they attribute a degree of depravity to our allies which is almost unthinkable.

They play directly into German and Japanese hands at the most critical period of the war. And they create resentment and distrust when good will and complete faith are vital to the common cause.

SHREWDLY CALCULATED

If there is anything better calculated to weaken the war effort and hamper the essential post-war cooperation than the stirring up of bad blood between ourselves and our allies, it is not easy to give it a name. So clear is this that it would seem worth any exertion upon the part of the administration to render it impossible; that the President, himself, might take cognizance of these things and use his great influence to disabuse the public mind.

Neither the British nor the Russians can afford to take notice of such reports. Yet both are aware of their harmful potentialities, and are deeply resentful over injustices which they are powerless to correct—or even to direct to the attention of the people.

It is a situation disturbing to thoughtful men in Washington. To them, Mr. Crowley's statement seemed particularly timely and needed.

The question is whether it is going to be let alone or followed up. The hope, of course, is that it will be followed up and that this especially damaging enemy propaganda can be wholly nullified. In this connection, our military authorities could very greatly help.

It is an unfortunate but quite well-known fact that there is a considerable anti-British feeling among some of our higher Army officers; that these have somewhat industriously spread the notion that the British want to get back their possessions in the East without having to fight for them; that their fighting planes are better designed for "defending England" than aiding in the devastation of Germany; that the British are holding back on the channel invasion because they are unwilling to pay the price, etc., etc.

INDIVIDUAL GRUDGES

It is a little shocking to hear this sort of talk from men of high rank in the American Army. But it can be heard from them, both in private conversation and around not-too-private dinner tables. These slurs and insinuations are just as false as those so flatly contradicted by Mr. Crowley, and which, he asserted, originally had been put out by Berlin and Tokyo radio.

It is true that the great bulk of American officers are wholly free from any anti-British feeling; have nothing but praise of the British as fighters and friends. But there are enough others who, one way or the other, have been irritated by individual Englishmen and who have been expressing themselves, to cause concern at the top.

JOB FOR O. W. I.

It is time something were done about all this and it can be stated that disciplinary measures are under consideration. Certainly nothing could be more worth while.

With the war about to reach its climax and the effectiveness of the peace resting largely upon British-American cooperation and understanding, discord of this character is about as bad a thing as could be. All these baseless anti-British reports ought to be firmly dealt with and the atmosphere cleared.

The O. W. I. might well find a field here. Putting an end to this kind of disorganizing propaganda would be very much more useful than most of the things it has done or is doing.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on April 22, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, for some time now, I have received letters from wives, mothers, and friends of our soldiers telling me how much they wanted to see their boys and how long it had been since these boys were home.

One letter on this subject came to me a few days ago which impressed me very much. A mother was writing about her son:

"It has been over 2 years," she stated, "since my boy, John, went into service. He has been overseas practically all this time, and I think it is only fair he get a chance for a furlough."

"I agree with you wholeheartedly," I answered her, "there are countless mothers such as you who stand at their windows in the dreariness each night and listen for the familiar step of their sons far away, thinking that by some miracle of fate he might be coming home."

By the end of 1944, millions of men will have been sent out of the country. The folks left behind will face an even greater test of courage and morale than now. Everybody is united in our determination to win the war. Everybody is prepared to make more sacrifices.

Yet in the heart of every parent, every wife, every child, there burns the unquenchable desire to see son or husband or brother or father. Their very lives are wrapped up on the never ending hope of having him come home if only for a short while to see his loved ones.

I propose then to call for legislation which will make it possible for every soldier, sailor, and marine to come home at the end of 18

months' service overseas if it is at all practicable for him to do so. I have always maintained that every man and woman in the service should have a turn for a furlough.

Therefore, I am introducing in Congress the following measure which I hope will soon be adopted so that your boys who are far across the oceans, fighting on every continent, all over the globe, will have the chance to come home when it is his turn.

This measure reads: "A bill to provide regular furlough periods for members of the armed forces on duty overseas.

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1078), as amended by section 2 of the act of May 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 816, 10 U. S. C. 17), be further amended by adding to the section the following: *'Provided further,* That no one in our armed forces, except upon his own request shall be required to serve in a single tour of duty in time of war for more than 18 months outside the territory of the United States and its possessions without the granting of a furlough period of not less than 45 days with opportunity to rest and visit his family before reassignment to duty. This provision, however, shall not be applicable in situations where the Secretary of War determines that such limitation would seriously endanger the security of the United States or any of her armed forces, or hamper or impede the tactical or strategical plans of the Department.' "

In line with my thought for the necessity of this measure, let me read some verses written by a war mother:

"TO MY SON IN THE SERVICE

"I have in my window a star of bright blue,
It's there for the best pal that I ever knew.
My house is now empty; my heart often sad;
But he is serving our country for which I am glad.
My prayer is that God in His mercy and love,
Will send a bright angel from heaven above
And watch o'er my son where e'er he may roam,
And bring him back safely to mother and home."

—*A War Mother.*

Continuance of O. P. A. Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Independent Grocer of Friday, March 17, 1944, entitled "Continuance of O. P. A. Is Essential to Wartime Business":

CONTINUANCE OF O. P. A. IS ESSENTIAL TO WARTIME BUSINESS, SAY GROCERS

(By Martin V. Merritt)

The independent retail grocers of this country are pretty well united on one point. They want the O. P. A. continued. It's a safe bet that every one of them will be glad enough to see O. P. A. go when the time comes, after the war, but right now they feel that it is needed and needed badly.

One does not have to inquire far in metropolitan grocers' circles to learn which way the wind blows on that subject here in New York City. There is a very evident unanimity of opinion and those who express this opinion appear to have sound reasons for their judgment. They are not content to say that they want O. P. A. continued, they insist on reasoning it out with their questioner, and it would seem that no one knows better than the independent grocer why the Government price agency should be carried on.

Unless and until the Economic Stabilization Act is extended by Congress, the official existence of O. P. A. comes to an end on June 30. There appears to be little doubt that it will be given another year of life for even with the opposition to O. P. A. that can be found in Congress without scratching the surface, there are few Members of that august body who would want it on their politic souls that they had voted against O. P. A. and thus caused what would be likely to be the greatest economic holocaust we have ever seen.

As one food manufacturer put it, speaking of O. P. A. this week, the crash of 1929 would be schoolboy stuff compared to the crash and profiteering spree that would follow immediately on the heels of O. P. A.'s sudden and unheralded demise.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill has already been introduced in Congress to extend the life of the price-control agency until June 30, 1945. Whether this bill will pass in that form or will be roundly amended is something no one can say. There is a marked difference of opinion, however, between many grocers who have expressed themselves on this subject and the Congressman who introduced that bill. The grocers believe that O. P. A. should not be extended for a year and then possibly for another year, but rather should be continued by enactment at this time for the balance of the war and for as long thereafter, with a reasonable limit, as is necessary for an orderly retirement of its regulations.

It is quite obvious that O. P. A. cannot simply close its doors at any time, whether it be this June or 5 years from now, without causing a tragic upheaval in business. The price structure that this agency has set up during the past 3 years must be retired systematically and in good form. It must be done in each specific case at a particularly appropriate time, when conditions in that market are sufficiently adjusted to stand the shock. It is probable that this ideal time will arrive in some fields much more rapidly than in others, and this must be taken into consideration by O. P. A. when it is preparing to close its doors.

Just as O. P. A. established ceilings in various commodities only when and because they were needed, so must O. P. A. retire those ceilings only when and because they are not needed. Of course, some limit must be placed on its liquidation because it seems that everyone agrees that continual Government control of price is not desirable.

RATIONING PROVIDES ANOTHER PROBLEM

The rationing feature of O. P. A. operation provides another problem, for here is a governmental function that must continue as long as there is a demand for food beyond the capacity of our national supply. As long as we contribute to the feeding of post-war Europe and possible post-war Pacific, there will not be enough food to satisfy any demand in this country, and as a result of this condition we must have rationing.

On the price front, the grocers of the city are farsighted enough to know that they would have lost much of their volume had it not been for ceilings on many food items. Had these prices been allowed to climb to unreasonable heights, the average family would have found it well-nigh impossible to buy a well-rounded menu and would have sought specialized fields in foods.

GROCER FARES WELL

It is generally admitted that the retail grocer has fared well under price control. While there have been, and still are, several items in which the grocer may feel a pinch, nearly all of the price-controlled items in today's grocery store provide a fair mark-up—a margin equal to or better than that provided by independent operation in the prewar period.

From the consumer's side, too, there is reason to want O. P. A. continued, say the grocers, for it is evident that the cost of living would have soared high above present levels were it not for the controlling influence of the Federal agency.

SOME ERRORS SEEN

There have been a few mistakes made by O. P. A., grocers point out, but they have been recognized sooner or later and adjusted. The original idea of housewife policing on price ceilings proved to the "bund," as one grocer put it, and O. P. A. was reasonably quick to change the plan.

The multitude of regulations that once flooded and confused the grocers has been reduced and at present is being cut down even more by consolidation of price orders in groups.

O. P. A. has also restyled its orders on a specific price basis wherever possible, thus doing away with much of the confusion of formula plan in retail pricing.

All of these changes show that O. P. A. is flexible enough to correct its own errors—a point that is very much in its favor.

There is little doubt that the agency will be given a new lease on life, but the grocers of New York nevertheless have expressed themselves forcefully in favor of its continuance.

John Roy Carlson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Easter recess gave me the opportunity to go about among my constituents, to discuss issues of political importance with them and to draw them out on the subjects close to their hearts and minds. What I learned is, I believe, of general importance. I have asked for the floor to report on these observations. I cannot say whether what I learned in my district is subject to the same reaction as can be obtained from other congressional districts. I believe, however, that what I learned is fairly typical. And I have no hesitancy in stating that the viewpoints and attitudes which I found deserve to be fully known and widely appreciated.

By and large, I found great satisfaction with the military conduct of the war. My constituents have reacted normally and appropriately to the turn in the tide. I would say, in fact, that they have all come to recognize the merits of the over-all strategy of joining with our allies in the defeat first of Germany and then of Japan. They knew all along that the choice was a hard one, but they had a justifiable confidence in our Commander in Chief and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They now accept unreservedly the over-all strategy in this global war. They, as all of us, have been heartened by successes in the European theater of war and in the Pacific and Far East. They see in our military leaders—our

President as Commander in Chief, Chief of Staff Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admirals King and Nimitz, Generals Stilwell and MacArthur—and in their fellow military and naval officers, and above all in the large body of Americans now in uniform, worthy links in our American heritage of courage, imagination and competence. They hope for an early victory, but they are prepared for the difficult and hazardous period that lies ahead no matter what its length. And they know, moreover, that the ultimate victory will not come without its cost to us in blood and anguish, in tears and sorrow.

But just as I found a universal sense of gratification and confidence in our conduct of military affairs, so I found a great and depressing sense of bewilderment, worry, confusion, and pained disappointment at the occurrences on the home front and, let me report frankly, at the Washington scene.

Many factors explain this sense of bewilderment and chagrin. For to my constituents, as to all our people, Washington represents something that in its very nature is symbolic of the American people and the American Nation. As such a symbol they look to Washington, to its legislative, executive, and judicial branches to hold high the democratic banner of our way of life, and to bring to our national problems so enormously enlarged because of the war, the serenity of wisdom, the attributes of statesmanship, the selfless devotion that the times call upon us to exhibit. In their stead they find unnecessary conflict and clash; thinly disguised partisanship; the tugs of war of excessive political considerations; unworthy passions. Most of all they are gravely disturbed because in their eyes the Congress to which they normally look for the safeguard of our liberties and institutions does not seem to them to have shown enough awareness and concern for what they regard as one of our great problems; the task of national unity, the avoidance of inner conflicts and the maintenance of harmony among all Americans of all racial and religious groups. They see in such attacks, and in my opinion correctly, a corrosion of the very foundations of our national structure. They see in such attacks however veiled, however artfully presented, the unleashing of forces which would reduce our great country to a disunited and divided people. They know, moreover, that this is a Presidential election year, and that unless checked, these impulses will have an effect upon our national development that will extend far beyond the politics and circumstances of any one year.

This is not dealing with a figurative fear; this is reality itself. My district is composed of Americans of numerous origins, of different races and religious beliefs. My constituents have demonstrated, by their daily lives, the essence of living together peacefully and harmoniously. Broad and offensive generalization about groups in the population; careless slurs and innuendoes which can be interpreted as directed against one or another group; such things become tinder for social conflagration. They have learned to steer clear of them. They expect this distinguished body to do so with even more scrupulous care.

They fail to understand, for instance, the reasons for and the character of the attack on John Roy Carlson, whose book Under Cover has opened the eyes of so many to the existence of subversive propaganda and propagandists in our own midst. They are puzzled that the broad and profound values of the book should be overlooked and indeed thrust aside because of trivialities. They are pained that the essence of the revelations of that book should in any way be obscured by irrelevant considerations about the author as a naturalized American. They wonder what that has to do with the case. They are troubled that divisive lines should be drawn between native born and naturalized Americans as if that distinction were valid for patriotic service to our country. They wonder how the 10,000,000 Americans in uniform feel about that and whether they, out on the fighting lines, are prepared to make the same arbitrary, invidious, and ungracious distinctions between those fighting our Nation's war whose families had the good fortune to come here several generations ago, and those who are recent immigrants or descendants of recent immigrants.

And, my constituents tell me, they feel deep down in their hearts that those who raise irrelevant and un-American questions of presumed degrees of citizenship are doing a disservice to this country and an injustice not only to a man who sought to serve it well as author of a book, but to all of us.

They are pained that, because John Roy Carlson is only a pen name for the author's real name, Arthur Derounian, that this fact should be made the basis for an assault upon the inherent and intrinsic values of his revelations. And they cannot be led to believe that, because the author adopted the procedure natural to such exposure, that is to say, because he passed himself off as a member of these subversive groups in order to gain their confidence, that that justifies contempt and vituperations upon him. How, they ask, can full information of this kind be secured except by such methods that must have been deeply painful to young Derounian? Shall those methods be abandoned by our F. B. I., by our military and naval intelligence, by our local police forces? Is there not something confusing and troublesome in thus concentrating attacks on the author's justified procedure? And what is the purpose of such abuse?

For the issues that are treated in the book, the revelations that are made, and their high average of accuracy are far too important for light dismissal. They are more important than the man who happens to be the author, who labored for years with great risk to himself to gather the vast compilation of information. They are more important because they touch the lives of millions of Americans and our future harmony and stability. Who Mr. Carlson is is of no great moment, but what we propose to do about the situation revealed in his book and in scores of other ways is of first importance.

We cannot be indifferent to the threat to our institutions that lies in the skillful use of propaganda, exploiting the very freedom of expression inherent in democracy. The propaganda tactics of Joseph Goebbels are too well known to justify placidity. The corrupting influence of innuendo, of generalization about religious and racial groups of our Nation, the mockery of our democratic institutions, the sinister whisperings are too grave to be treated cavalierly. Let them not be underestimated. They have destroyed democracy before in other lands. They may yet prove diabolically efficient instruments to injure our own.

I feel that we have a formidable task ahead to strengthen the ramparts we watch, the inner ramparts of our democracy, of our social stability. Let us not decry those who seek to uncover the menace by inconsequential belittlings of their purpose and of their achievement.

Yes, my constituents are concerned as they have every right to be. Not least they are concerned that our legislative body weakens by its dissensions the moral prestige and influence it deserves to have. They feel that such prestige is slipping when unworthy intimations are here made against groups of American citizens and when our National Legislature takes time off for the trivialities of personal challenge and conflict.

My constituents were puzzled by the clash between the worthy gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and the columnist and radio speaker, Walter Winchell. They are all the more puzzled as to what all the shootin' is about when they know from the records of both the desire of both to expose subversive forces in this country and indeed their past collaboration in just that patriotic objective. This should not be a question of one or another individual. Mr. Winchell earns his living by the honest calling of a newspaper column writer and the equally honest calling of radio broadcaster. We should not be concerned with whether or not Mr. Winchell deals with trivia that happen to be of interest to millions of our fellow Americans, or whether he spells his name with one "l" or two, or what his religion may be. We are concerned that Mr. Winchell, who has so demonstrably been of invaluable service in exposing those who despise and would injure our American heritage, must be diverted into self-defense. We are concerned when these great services are made subordinate to matters of judgment and taste. The solid achievements of Mr. Winchell are incontestable. It is regrettable that occasional heat and tension yield an unfortunate phrase or epithet. But I am sure that neither the gentleman from Texas nor any of the other Members who have excoriated and berated Mr. Winchell on the floor of this House will, on reflection, insist that he himself has been blameless in this regard. Shall such lapses be permitted to divert us from our proper concern with the pernicious forces? If we do so persist we will be an example of the success of the

very practice of divide and conquer, against which we all ought to be alert.

This vigilance on our part is all the more important to us now during a year that will see intense political campaigning. I feel, with my constituents, that in such a year we must pledge ourselves to see to it that the political campaign be on the highest level possible. We must demonstrate our awareness of the emergency in which we are living and make sure that what we do will strengthen, not weaken, the democratic process. It may be that in the past we could afford the thoughtless luxury of partisanship and petty politics; we cannot afford them now, in 1944, and in the years that are ahead. We owe it to ourselves and to the American people to avoid doing and saying anything that can even remotely contribute to internal dissension. We cannot have a political campaign giving free reign to the excesses of partisanship which in the long run undermine our democratic system. We must be on our guard in both parties against the raising of false issues, against indulging in smears and name calling, against any appeals to racial and religious prejudices. The responsibility of our political leadership is to see to it—this year above all—that nothing is said or done to raise embittered issues between one group of Americans and another that might unhappily endure far beyond the election date.

We have become a great country—a world power of the first rank—because we have found a method of uniting the common interests of 135,000,000 people and subordinating differences of creed or origin and locality. Continue that process and we will continue to be one great union. Reverse it and we will become another pattern of fragmentized and Balkanized Europe.

By and large, we had no reason to fear a reversal of that process—until recently. But these recent years have made it clear that propaganda to divide us is an all-too-useful instrument in the hands of foreign imperialist nations. Nazi Germany has shown how to use the tools of disunity for ends destructive to our national well-being.

Whatever our personal proclivities, it must be clear to us that racial and religious bigotries among our citizens transcend the area of personal concern only. They become a national menace because they affect our national union and stability.

In the years to come we will have to grapple with the greatest tasks in our national history: The winning of the war, the orderly transition to peace, the prevention of new wars, and the advancement of our prosperity and well-being.

Whether we meet those problems will depend in large measure upon our unity of purpose, upon the collaboration of all Americans of all faiths and of all origins. We, here in the Halls of Congress, have the obligation to set the example to the rest of the country of the reality of such unity. This is the deeply felt judgment and message of the constituency I am proud to represent.

Veteran Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 26, 1944:

VETERAN REHABILITATION

That something must be done to restore wounded and sick veterans of this war all agree. But what? We have the convalescent training program of the Army Air Force, the studies which have been undertaken by the National Research Council's committee on convalescence and rehabilitation, and various proposals of Government and private agencies. But we have no system, no plan. Moreover, experience at the front is not directly applicable, inasmuch as the Army is primarily concerned with returning a disabled man to his regiment. All this being so, the New York Academy of Medicine has conducted a symposium, in the course of which about 40 authorities gave their views. What we have is a useful survey which enables us to focus attention on the medical and social problem presented by the disabled veteran.

Convalescence seems to present more formidable difficulties than training the handicapped for an occupation. It is not that physicians are inexperienced but that they are called upon to deal with unfamiliar complications. At present, time, which does more than any anodyne, must be the chief reliance, and time is the same as rest. The men who will need care are all young—much younger than the average patient. They have been touched by unfamiliar, tropical diseases, and they have sustained injuries rarely encountered in civil life. Hence the difficulties. The addresses delivered before the academy did much to clarify these, but the authorities were agreed that, though certain principles are as applicable to convalescent soldiers as to civilians, we need research to give us a new approach.

Training the soldier for a job in civilian life is easier. We have experts enough in this field. Judging from the declarations of corporation presidents, industry is willing to do its share. For some years it will probably need all the workers it can recruit to fill an enormous demand for goods that have not been made since Pearl Harbor. Lastly, there is the general conviction that the disabled and discharged veteran should be given preference when peace returns. Good as the prospects are, there is clearly work to do both for the physicians and for the trainers, and the academy deserves praise for indicating the nature of that work.

A Factory Is Like a Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the best worded and clearest definitions of free enterprise, and all it connotes to Americans, has recently come to my attention, and I would like to call it to the attention of the House.

This reexpression of a few fundamentals of our American way of life is in the form of an advertisement inserted in a number of newspapers in my district by the Harbor Plywood Corporation, of Hoquiam, Wash. It reads as follows:

A factory is like a tree. America was built on a basic idea: That idea that a man—any man, every man—shall be master of his own destiny; the idea that a man can work a little harder than his neighbor and enjoy the fruits of that labor; the idea that ambition and courage will be rewarded.

The idea that a man can go into business for himself; the idea that he will be privileged to risk his time and his money in an enterprise of his own choosing; the idea that he can start a store or a service station or a restaurant or a factory.

A factory—that is a basic thing, like a tree. Through the chemistry of its complex workings, it produces fruit in the forms of pay rolls, and pay rolls are manna for the grocer, the baker, the doctor, the preacher, the teacher, and the whole intricate life of a community.

The sum of the factories, large and small, constitutes the forest we call industry—American industry—most potent force in the land.

A factory—it starts with a man or a group of men. Because this is America, men are not afraid. Men are willing to struggle and take risks, and from this—from this basic American idea—comes the greatest of all great rewards of industry—the creation of jobs; the creation of opportunity for the returning veteran.

Jobs; work; industrial pay rolls. They support the farmer, providing a market for his harvest; they support the merchant, creating his customers; they support the utilities, the lawyer, the banker, the newsman, the policeman, and the whole body of public servants; they support other industries and, in turn, support themselves.

They are America, and while they survive—while Americans have the freedom of opportunity and enterprise—this land will be strong.

Like a tree, the factory has roots—the deep, life-giving roots that convert labor, materials, and risk into the miracle of the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, in modern jargon, "that says it." There are people in America—and, fortunately, I believe they are very few—who would quarrel with the fundamental ideas expressed in this advertisement. But I am certain that, as they ponder upon it, the vast majority of our people will find the unassailable truths plainly stated in this concise collection of words. I know that many will linger a little longer over one sentence:

And from this, from this basic American idea, comes the greatest of all great rewards of industry—the creation of jobs—the creation of opportunity for the returning veterans.

Most everybody likes to make money; many people would much rather make money than just create jobs. In other words, with many people the main objective still is the simple collection of money, with creation of jobs and opportunities for other people as a subsidiary issue to which they give little thought. But I think that the mere chase after

money for the sake of the dollars themselves is becoming a less popular sport in this country. I see signs that we Americans are growing wiser, and that we are more and more awakening to the plain fact that the best economy is that in which, like the old-fashioned Sunday school picnic, there is plenty for everybody.

We must not lose sight of the fundamental reasons why this plenitude can be maintained in America. These reasons are covered in great part by the Harbor Plywood Corporation's advertisement. I want to add a word about the man I presume directed the placing of this message before the newspaper readers of my district. He is Mr. E. W. Daniels, head of the Harbor Plywood Corporation. He is a man of courage, of vision; he is sagacious, but not greedy. I imagine that Mr. Daniels knows every word of this advertisement by heart. More than that, he practices what it preaches. Mr. Daniels—and thousands upon thousands of other Americans like him—have a fiercely burning faith in free enterprise of the good-will type which they follow. Theirs is a flame that will continue to grow until it consumes the unbelievers—the Fascists, the Communists, and all their crackpot companions.

Shall Congress Surrender Control Over American Economy and Money to an International Monetary Body?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a monetary expert or a financial wizard, and will therefore not attempt to engage in an argument with such technical experts from our Treasury Department in making my observations as to the merits or demerits of the proposed international monetary fund. The proposal for the establishment of such an international monetary fund was made by Treasury Secretary Morgenthau and his staff to a group of Congressmen in a secret meeting held last Friday.

True to his promise to keep Congress informed, Secretary Morgenthau gave those present at the secret meeting, a general statement as to the agreement reached by the "technical experts of the United Nations upon a set of basic principles for the creation of an international monetary fund." I commend the Secretary for bringing the proposal to the attention of certain Members of Congress before the administration commits United States participation in an international organization which, if created, will undoubtedly dominate and control the economy of the world. I regret, however, that the Secretary and his experts did not deem it desirable to provide a detailed explanation as to the workings, management, and operation of this international monetary body, and the part the United States was to play in the scheme.

Although the administration might now possess questionable legal authority to participate in an international monetary group, which authority I do not concede exists, Secretary Morgenthau definitely promised that the Treasury would ask Congress for legislative authority before committing United States participation in the fund. Since legislation will be necessary to chart our country's course in the field of international finance, I insist that Congress should pass on all details of the proposal and clearly define the authority of the Executive, in advance of the international monetary conference, which Secretary Morgenthau states will be called by the President in the near future. As I see it, congressional action is vital in advance of the world monetary conference to decide if the United States is to be a party in the international monetary organization.

Speaking for myself, I am a realist; and I want all information, secret and otherwise, on every proposal relating to the welfare of the United States and its citizens, before I give my approval for any new policy for our country's future course. The financial experts of the Treasury and the United Nations spent months in reaching an agreement upon a set of basic principles for the creation of an international monetary fund with a capital of $8,000,000,000 in gold and money, one-third of which is to be supplied by the United States, the ostensible purpose being to stabilize world currencies and promote international trade. These are laudable objectives, but, surely Members of Congress are entitled to have more than a 2-hour explanation from the experts before passing judgment on such a far-reaching proposal. Secretary Morgenthau stretched his imagination considerably when he said after the secret congressional meeting, that the reception of his international monetary scheme was "on the whole good." I would say it was quite to the contrary.

There are several dangers if a world monetary conference is held prior to congressional action. In the first place, the President of the United States invites all of the United Nations to take part in the monetary conference and to consider an international monetary plan perfected and sponsored by the United States Treasury. What will happen if Congress fails to approve United States participation in the international monetary fund should an agreement be reached by the conference? Will the international fund function without the United States, or does the President intend to put the United States into it by executive agreement and without congressional approval? Will we be forced to join the fund in order to protect our foreign commerce and the $13,300,000,000 in foreign investment which American citizens and corporations now own?

Secondly, it must not be overlooked that most of the United Nation members are debtors to the United States. Will these nations have the controlling vote over the operations and policies of the international monetary fund? If so, will the fund have the power to fix the value of money in any member country or place sanctions on any nonmember country, and thereby stop imports and exports from such country? Under our Constitution, neither the President nor Congress has the power to delegate to an international body, or any other group, the authority to fix the value of American money. And no agreement can be made requiring Congress to secure the consent of an international body to fix the value of our money. Such a provision is contained in the agreement of the technical experts. Congress alone has the sole power to regulate the value of our money, and therefore it logically follows that Congress should retain complete control over the monetary affairs of this country until such time as the people have directed otherwise by constitutional amendment. I am not willing to turn over the control of American money and our future economy to an international banking group.

The international monetary fund proposal is a forerunner of bigger things to come. I am informed that when the world monetary conference is held an agreement will be attempted to create a $10,000,000,000 international reconstruction bank, with the good old U. S. A. as the majority stockholder with minority voting power. About 17 months ago the United States owned approximately 76 percent of the world's gold, worth $22,743,000,000. As of April 20 our gold supply has decreased by $1,294,000,000 to $21,449,000,000. Who got this gold? You know, of course, it is a crime for any American citizen to possess gold. Both international proposals contemplate the use and transfer of American gold.

I do not want to leave any impression with you that I question the sincerity of Secretary Morgenthau in submitting these international monetary proposals to the world. His motives and objectives are no doubt very laudable, but since the Congress is the guardian of the people's money and other resources, I feel it my solemn duty to demand all of the details before the President and the Secretary of the Treasury commit our country and its resources to an international venture which is certain to leave the American peop'e "holding the bag."

Since legislation relating to gold and the present stabilization fund is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, I have requested our distinguished chairman, the Honorable ANDREW SOMERS, to call a hearing at an early date so that the Congress may secure all of the details on the international monetary fund proposal and consider legislation before the President invites the United Nations to take part in the world monetary conference.

An editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 24, 1944, follows:

NEARER TO EARTH

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau has made public a proposal for an international stabilization fund, which on its face is a

considerable retreat from the Keynes and White plans offered some months ago.

Both of those plans, one of British sponsorship and the other offered by American Treasury experts, went far beyond the announced purpose of currency stabilization. They were in fact blueprints of world economic dictatorship.

It is to be hoped that the sponsors of these plans have indeed seen the impossible folly of their original ideas. However, it is not yet clear that there is justification for placing too much dependence on that hope.

The latest proposal contemplates a stabilization fund of $8,000,000,000. It is the judgment of a great many students that the task of clearing international transactions in a way to prevent disastrous currency fluctuations can be accomplished by an agency with a capital which would be a fraction of that amount.

A woman going about the business of the weekly marketing does not usually take with her a large share of the family resources in addition to money which she might be able to borrow from the neighbors. If she did so, it is entirely possible that she would be unable to resist a new fur coat displayed in a window along her route.

And even in these days $8,000,000,000 is still a lot of money, the possessor of which could do some really extraordinary things.

America's Place in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by Gov. John W. Bricker before the Ohio Society of New York, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, in New York City, April 25, 1944:

For the second time within the brief span of our generation, America is involved in a grim and bitter world war. We were caught shamefully unprepared. But today, after months of anxiety and preparation, the tide of battle is running strongly in our favor. Our country again is demonstrating the prowess of her fighting men and the potency of her industrial system. Tough fighting and hard work are ahead. But we shall carry on, with increased determination, until Germany and Japan are decisively defeated.

I

We well may pause to speculate concerning the reason for our involvement in these two world wars. We had no territorial ambitions. We had no major quarrels with other nations.

America was settled by people who sought to be free from the interminable wars between the coalitions and alliances of the Old World. But to their disillusionment and sorrow, even in Colonial days, they discovered that the New World was an ever-present pawn in the imperial ambitions and rivalries of the European powers.

Whatever may explain our early involvements, I have no doubt as to the principal forces that involved us in World Wars No. 1 and No. 2. We were drawn in because we had become of such great importance in world affairs, economically and politically, that we could not escape involvement. Neither Germany in the last war, nor Germany and Japan in this war, could hope to achieve world domination so long as the United States stood strong and free in this hemisphere.

The simple truth is that we have always had a tremendous stake in world order and stability. Yet our national consciousness of our commanding place in world affairs has not kept pace with our own national progress. We have not kept ourselves alert to developments threatening world order. And we have not kept ourselves prepared to deal with them before they attained world-shaking proportions.

Instead of accepting, with intelligent self-interest, a degree of responsibility for world events commensurate with our rank, we have allowed events to control us. Almost a half century ago we assumed obligations in the Pacific. We accepted a direct responsibility for protecting the Philippines. The present administration failed to fulfill this obligation in the face of Japan's growing power.

During the past decade we have unwisely pursued a course of day-to-day diplomacy. Hitler seized the reins in Germany about the time the New Deal came into power. Though the threat to world peace was widely recognized, our Government did not exercise ordinary prudence for our national security. We squandered our substance in boondoggling and took no heed of the gathering war clouds. The present administration sought to appease Japan by selling to her scrap iron and oil, in spite of Ambassador Grew's warnings as to the intentions of her war lords. This policy was continued until late in 1940. Our sons are receiving back those materials today, in bullets and death.

II

Any approach to the future foreign policy of this country, I believe, should be based upon three inescapable premises.

First, our civilization cannot survive if it continues to engage in legalized mass murder every generation or two. It must not pervert its scientific discoveries into instruments of destruction. No Napoleon, no Hitler, no Japanese war lord, nourishing overweening ambition, should ever again be permitted to force catastrophe on the world.

Second, we in America must recognize, in view of our vast expanse of territory, our population, our natural resources, and our scientific skills, that we must share responsibility for world order as a matter of self-interest. I have said before and I repeat now: "If we do not, after the present most destructive of wars, make a serious effort to build a better understanding among nations, then we must stand convicted before posterity as ignorant, heartless, and unworthy reactionaries."

Third, we must assume our responsibilities realistically. The pages of history record many plans for preserving peace. From the Pax Romana to the League of Nations, the common men and women of the world have always yearned to throw off the shackles of barbarism and to establish concord. It is not the people who have failed. It is the leaders of people, through all the ages, who have fallen short of their high obligations. When the governments of the world become responsive to the will of the people, peace will abide.

Again many peace plans are afloat. Too few of them have been evolved with a view to the stark realities which the world will face when this war is over. The machinery of peace will be effective only if it relieves the tensions that cause wars. Only as men diagnose the forces that make for conflict can they provide a cure for this moral malady in our civilization.

III

Let us then consider some of the realities that will confront us as we set about the task of establishing world peace.

First and foremost, we must anticipate temporary economic and political instability in many parts of the world.

At the end of the war there will be all too few stable governments in the world. These must be established before any permanent international organization will be possible.

Likewise, there will be multitudes of starving, diseased, and homeless men, women, and children in Europe and the Orient. Their gaunt faces will haunt the peace table.

Millions of the ablest young men will have been killed or disabled.

Wealth and productive facilities will have been destroyed. Land will be depleted. Property ownership will be confused. No one will know who the rightful owners are because of the Nazi and Japanese scrambling of property rights and the destruction of title records.

There will be no financial stability. Money values today in the area of combat are highly artificial. If controls are removed, it is probable that many European currencies will collapse.

Many nations will be without resources with which to buy raw materials or foodstuffs, except such resources as may be made available by the credit of the United Nations.

Finally, we may expect a terrific conflict of opposing political forces struggling for dominance. There will be a release of deep-seated and engendered hate, especially in the occupied countries.

Unless these problems are frankly faced and solved, anarchy will be lurking around the corner. With anarchy, the hope of a just and enduring peace will collapse.

The United Nations therefore face the necessity of providing food, shipping, supplies, credits—and helping industry and agriculture get started abroad. The United States must do its full share, generously and compassionately.

But we must not be led into assuming a burden intolerable to us and demoralizing to others. We alone cannot repair the destruction of this war. We cannot buy international good will. Our major effort should be to help others help themselves. Any promise to do more than we can perform will breed ill will and hate. There must be open and frank consideration of our responsibilities. There must be no secret international agreements affecting the post-war world. International good will can be developed by open and honest dealings with other nations and by keeping our commitments.

The long-range economic problems confronting the world are even more complex. I refer to the problems of currency, credit, markets, and international trade. After the last war, all nations indulged in excessive economic nationalism. This expressed itself in discriminatory trade agreements, quotas, excessive tariffs, monopolies and cartels, exchange wars, barter systems, and many other barriers to international trade and commerce.

Let us not forget that the President of the United States had an opportunity to take leadership in controlling the world-wide economic maladjustment which deepened after 1933. We all know that monetary instability in the world is a serious barrier to international trade—and that trade barriers contribute mightily to wars. They were forces which helped Hitler rise to power. To meet this problem of instability which existed in 1933, the World Monetary and Economic Conference of London was held. The United States was represented. Suddenly and without warning, the President blasted the conference. It was wrecked just as completely as if a bomb had been dropped out of the skies and taken the lives of all assembled. The present administration, then and there, indulged in an act of extreme economic isolationism, and the hope of establishing monetary and economic stability in the world was crushed.

The failure of nations to deal forthrightly with the problems of currency, credit, markets, and international trade contributed, more than anything else, toward sowing the

seeds of present international conflict. The practice of international improvisation should end. The hour for forthright constructive action is here.

IV

These convictions impel me to offer some specific recommendations:

First of all, as I have pointed out, there will be economic and political instability in Europe and Asia at the end of the war. Pending the time when we may establish a permanent international organization, we must have some kind of effective machinery to preserve international order and to help set the nations of Europe and Asia on the road to self-rehabilitation.

The United States, the British Commonwealth, and Russia will emerge from this war as the nations having the largest responsibility for world order and the power to maintain it. China is a nation of great potential power. These four nations, in my judgment, while acting as independent sovereign states, must assume joint responsibility for world order until economic and political stability has been regained by the individual nations.

This means that these four great powers should agree now to maintain adequate military, naval, and air power in the immediate post-war period. This does not mean an international police force, or a military alliance. The people of this country are opposed to both. It does contemplate that these four nations shall reach a mutual understanding as to their respective military establishments, and that they shall express that understanding in a temporary and transitional compact to be entered into as soon as possible. Other nations, willing to assume their share of responsibility, should be permitted to join this compact. The compact should also contain the principles and aims which these powers will support in the post-war world. It is important that nations know as quickly as possible what adjustments they must make. Through such a procedure the four great powers, and those who join with them, shall become effective guardians of the peace until a permanent international organization can be established.

Already much valuable time and opportunity to hasten the end of the war have been lost by our failure to make clear, both to ourselves and to our enemies, the prime objectives for which we are fighting.

Second, the United Nations should immediately explore the bases for a permanent international structure for peace. Such a structure cannot be completed until stable governments have been restored. The details must be worked out in the light of developing conditions and after open discussion. Lasting peace cannot spring full born by any grandiose plan, but step by step in solution of the problems which will confront us. Fundamental principles, however, can and should be agreed upon at the earliest possible moment.

I believe that the United States must take her place in a cooperative organization of sovereign nations. We want no supergovernment. We want no dictatorial world state. Moreover, declarations and acts of our allies indicate that they likewise want no supergovernment or dictatorial world state. A cooperative organization of sovereign states, bent upon peace and supported by a will for peace among their peoples, can solve the international problems that lead to war.

The major purpose of such an institution must be to establish a reign of law among nations. We need to develop judicial processes for the settlement of justiciable questions. The Hague Tribunal and the Permanent Court of International Justice have demonstrated that much can be accomplished by this means to avoid recourse to arms. They can be made more effective. Personally, I have always felt that the United States should join the World Court. It is vital that there be a continuing study and revision of the principles and procedures of international law and tribunals. We also need more adequate machinery for the settlement of nonjusticiable questions by mediation, conciliation and arbitration. Every problem solved, every commitment kept, will strengthen the program for peace.

The Republican Party at Mackinac took the initiative in bringing our post-war international program down to the hard ground of common sense. Its proposals may well be our guide.

Third, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China should now inaugurate a continuing study of such problems as currencies, credits, tariffs, air rights, markets, and international trade.

Of special importance in such a study is the problem of the money standard. This problem should be approached from the standpoint of stabilizing the currency of individual nations. International economic stability must be built upon the foundations of a sound money and sound economic policy in each of the individual nations. Our first step is the establishment of a sound internal economy in the United States.

In formulating a program for monetary stabilization, all visionary plans, such as the Keynes and White plans, must be avoided. There is no need for resorting to radical theories. The best hope for the future lies in the return of the world in due course to the international gold standard. In spite of its defects, the gold standard is the most satisfactory basis of stability the world has yet known. People generally have confidence in it because they can understand it better than any other monetary standard. It requires less management, and hence it is less subject to manipulation by international politics. In short, I believe that we should begin with what we have found best in our experience and endeavor to improve it by international cooperation.

Fourth, the United States is distinctly in need of consistency and competency in its diplomatic relations.

The State Department again must be permitted to exercise the initiative and responsibility that marked the administrations of such able Republican Secretaries as Seward, Blaine, Hay, Root, and Hughes. We need a President who will permit his department heads the latitude to exercise the responsibility that is vested in them. The United States has just as able, adequately trained, and thoroughly experienced career men in the diplomatic service as any other nation. They are thoroughly familiar with the individual problems and viewpoints of the various nations. This Nation has the know-how in international relations. A Republican administration will use it. No one man knows all the answers, but someone knows each answer.

Finally, in our dealings with other nations, we must act fairly, but with resolution. Too often in foreign affairs the present administration has exhibited before the world indecision, vacillation, and weakness. A strong nation should have a strong policy.

The time has come when an American President should be courageous enough to speak out for America—for our rights and for our convictions. For example, I believe that the President, supported by the Congress, should insist upon the retention of certain strategic military and naval bases and air fields which have been built with American money. We should be just as diligent in protecting our own national interests as our allies are diligent in protecting theirs. We can exert a wholesome influence in the world only if we ourselves remain powerful. After the last war the United States held certain ideals before the world. Many of those ideals were promptly repudiated by the statesmen of Europe. We ourselves let them go by default. We yielded, and we lost the respect of other nations. Indeed, we earned their contempt and, worst of all, the armistice proved to be only an armistice. That tragedy must not be repeated.

America's cooperation with other nations must not be at the expense of her principles, her honor, her ideals, or her form of government. But I believe we can have international cooperation with justice and with honor, and that America must play her full part and do her full share. To do otherwise would be to break our covenant with those who struggle and die for us at this hour.

That is what our fighting sons and daughters are thinking. That is what fathers and mothers everywhere are praying for. Our great objectives must be the speedy winning of the war, the establishment of a just and enduring peace, and the maintenance of a strong America—an America firm in her convictions, cooperative in the building of a better world, and free to enjoy the blessings which can only be assured in a world delivered from the scourge of war.

Address at United Jewish Appeal Real Estate Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the United Jewish Appeal Real Estate dinner, Hotel Lombardy, New York City, April 20, 1944:

Friends, not a day passes without our seeing a newspaper headline that proclaims some new persecution, some new and more terrible tragedy that has overtaken still another section of the Jews of Hitler-dominated Europe.

Last month it was fresh word of the massacre of more Jews in Poland, many of whom revolted and fought to the last man, taking with them before they were killed a few scores, or perhaps hundreds, of our common enemy. Then, a few weeks ago, came the shocking realization that the Hitlerite assassins, in overrunning Hungary, were embarking on a program of complete extermination of the 900,000 Jews of that country who, though previously living under ghetto conditions, at least were living, and doing so in the hope of eventual liberation. Now, unless the agencies for which we are meeting tonight can save them by some superhuman effort, all these 900,000 will be doomed to extinction.

Only recently, long after it seemed certain that all the Jews of Germany had been either deported, or killed, or both—came the amazing news item from that country that the Nazis, now more in need of a scapegoat than ever, were suddenly launching a program to exterminate half-Jews and so-called Aryans married to Jews.

So there seems to be no end to the nightmare of the Hitler horror, and the picture would be black indeed if that were all there is to it. Fortunately, however, the picture has another side—that of the humanitarian efforts made by all the United Nations, but particularly under the lead taken by us in America, to rescue these people, to rush relief as rapidly as we can to as many of them as we can, to aid in the escape and eventual rehabilitation of as many hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, as it is humanly possible.

In making this great effort, we recognize, as the President does, that the humanitarian front is no less important than the military front, though at this moment the latter has inevitably a prior interest. What we do to save lives, to preserve human decency, liberty, and dignity, not only affects the lives we actually save and restore, it also provides a new hope and courage around which those still in captivity in enemy-held territories may rally and find heart to resist all efforts to exterminate them, and in many cases to fight back.

Essentially, that is the message of the united Jewish appeal. It is the living affirmation of the principles for which we fight. As we materialize its vast program of rescue and relief, we give proof to the world that our convictions are not empty words, but actualities.

I would like, at this point, to refresh your minds as to the high points in the extensive work supported by the united Jewish appeal. As you know, it supplies the funds for three separate and distinct major agencies.

One of them, the joint distribution committee, carries on lifesaving activities in more than 50 different nations and areas. Last year it maintained wholly or in part upwards of 50,000 refugees in the neutral nations of Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, and Turkey, emigrating many of them to Palestine and the Western Hemisphere, where they began new lives on a secure basis in places of permanent safety. Last year, for instance, the help extended by the united Jewish appeal through the joint distribution committee supported 21,000 refugees in Switzerland alone—to which country, by the way, many more are still escaping every month, every week, every day. Recently, the joint distribution committee has boosted to 5,000 the number of packages it is sending each month to Soviet Russia, for distribution among the 450,000 Polish Jews scattered throughout that war-torn country from Siberia to the border of Iran. These packages contain sorely needed, in fact, lifesaving, supplies of food, clothing, and medicine. In 1943 the joint distribution committee helped to integrate 125,000 refugees into the communities of the republics of South and Central America—a reconstruction effort it is still expanding. And this is just a fraction of that committee's activities, which exert a vital, healing influence upon the lives of more than 1,000,000 people annually.

Another of the agencies represented by the United Jewish Appeal is the United Palestine Appeal, devoted exclusively to the building and strengthening of Palestine as a great, permanent homeland for our people. I am aware of the dangers threatening Palestine, through the infamous white paper laid down in 1939 by the Chamberlain government of Great Britain. But I assure you, this obstacle will be brushed aside, as others have been brushed aside since the inception of the homeland. The terms of the white paper will be modified, or scrapped altogether, provided we have the same determination we have had in the past to compel, by the thriving reality of Palestine itself, rectification of the injustices that have been done to it. And I want to assure you that right now, in the present, between six and seven thousand Jewish immigrants have been received into Palestine for permanent settlement in the last 6 months, with another 30,000 still holding visas to go there, a figure that will raise the Jewish population of Palestine, even under the terms of the white paper, to the number of 650,000 and more.

Among recent immigrants to Palestine and those now on their way to this sanctuary are refugees from such far-flung places as Yemen, the Balkans, Turkey, Iran, and elsewhere. Most of you know that 2 or 3 months ago Palestine received over 800 immigrants from every corner of Europe who came to their new homeland via Spain and Portugal, after innumerable hardships and hairbreadth escapes in Holland, Belgium, and France.

Some of the help sent to Palestine by the United Jewish Appeal takes the form of supplementary assistance to the families of soldiers serving with the British armed forces, of whom there are 28,000, all volunteers. Continued development of that country's agricultural and industrial resources, useful in both the war and post-war effort, are of course of the greatest concern to the United Palestine Appeal, as it also fosters a traditionally strong religious, cultural, and educational program.

Then there is a third agency whose work the United Jewish Appeal makes possible, that of the National Refugee Service, which operates exclusively within the United States to accomplish the quickest, most effective integration of past and present refugees into the fabric of American life. Two hundred and twelve thousand Jews have come to our shores since the rise of Hitlerism, and because of the cash relief provided to tide them over their immediate destitution, the vocational training they have been offered, and finally the job and professional placement service this agency renders, none of these refugees have constituted any kind of a problem. Today, despite the wartime restrictions on transportation, about 100 new refugees still reach the United States every week. All, except those unemployable by reason of age or illness, have been or are now being restored to normal, productive, self-respecting independence. To slacken in this work would be to jeopardize the immigration of future waves of newcomers escaping from the hatreds and horrors of Europe.

Such is the work made possible by the United Jewish Appeal. But even that is not the whole picture, as it takes account only of the present period and not the immediate future—the rest of 1944 and the early months of 1945.

To take care of its present needs, the United Jewish Appeal is asking the Jewish community and the public at large to help in raising the largest war chest—I might almost call it hope chest—in all of its history. It is asking for $32,000,000 as the smallest figure that will enable it to finish the tasks of 1944, provided no further emergencies arise. That is an amount almost twice the sum raised last year, and there is only one way that fund can be raised—by the doubled generosity of you people who support and make it possible.

But as I said at the beginning of my speech, every day's headlines bring us news of fresh horrors befalling our Jewish brothers and sisters in Europe. There can be no doubt that there will indeed be many, many more emergencies than the budget of the United Jewish Appeal at present allows for. The picture would, as I said, be totally black, were it not for the actuality, the living, fighting, life-saving fact of the agencies of the United Jewish Appeal.

We know, further, that as new areas abroad are liberated from the grip of Hitlerism we will find the surviving three or four million Jews living amid conditions of utter destitution. They will be starved, freezing, shelterless, and ridden with the epidemics, ranging from tuberculosis to typhus, that inevitably accompany such conditions.

Do we want these people to die—as their 3,000,000 brothers have already died—even on the day of their liberation? Would it not be to our eternal discredit if they survived the ravages of war, only to perish through our indifference in the now plainly foreseen era of peace?

We cannot wait until the storm of fresh disasters, fresh emergencies, new famines, and plagues are upon us. To meet them, when they come, we must plan now, build now, work now, and above all—give now.

The future of many hundreds of thousands of Jewish people in war-torn Europe hangs in the balance, depending solely upon what we in America determine to do. And from the bottom of my heart I believe, too, that our own futures depend upon their receiving the help it is our great responsibility to send.

Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very timely statement on the passing of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., on April 24, 1944:

CARDINAL O'CONNELL

A stanch rock, steadfast amidst the swirling tides of modern skepticism, unbelief, and transient philosophies, Cardinal O'Connell symbolized the calm assurance, the gentle yet militant spirit and the unwavering devotion to rectitude which characterize those whose lives are patterned on that of Christ. First and foremost, from his early days as a humble altar boy at St. Peter's in Lowell, through the successive achievements and honors of a rich and busy life, he was a Christian—a follower of Christ. All else was secondary.

His sublime faith was accompanied by a diversity of personal gifts which would have won him eminence in any field. He had a keen, sternly disciplined mind. His instincts were those of the artist and found expression in his lifelong love of music, his skill and strength as a writer, his beautiful eloquence in the pulpit and in his other public addresses, his keen appreciation of the subtleties and cadences of foreign tongues and his love of nature, in which he saw the continuing and undying manifestation of God's goodness to men.

Yet His Eminence was no cloistered priest. He was keenly alert to worldly developments and he could sense a trend, particularly if it were a morally dangerous one, long before other men realized its import. Courageous and outspoken, he never hesitated to condemn sinful or harmful tendencies, no matter where they appeared, and his opinions were feared by the wrongdoer and eagerly hailed by those, of no matter what faith, who were fighting for righteousness.

An able administrator, he made the Archdiocese of Boston a model for the entire Catholic world. He was the good shepherd, ever mindful of the needs of his flock, and the countless schools, hospitals, churches, mission enterprises, and welfare institutions which were established and administered under his prudent and judicious direction will long stand as temporal monuments to his forethought and wisdom.

He was a patriotic American who loved his country, but he was no isolationist. All peoples were children of God in his sight. Archbishop Spellman's beautiful tribute might well be his epitaph: "In him love of country followed love of God and nobly he served them both."

Greater Lynn was frequently honored by his gracious presence, either at ecclesiastical functions or during the summers he spent at his seaside homes in Nahant and Marblehead. A great and kindly man has gone, leaving a void that will not soon be filled.

Air-Line Service for Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as further indication of the urgent need for through transcontinental air-line service from the Boston Airport, I call to the attention of the Congress, the following resolutions recently adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

Resolutions in favor of improved and additional air-line service for Massachusetts

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts now lacks through transcontinental airline service to many important cities throughout the country; and

Whereas many other areas of less size and economic importance enjoy multiple trunk line air service in many directions; of the five largest metropolitan areas in America—New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Boston—Boston alone is so discriminated against as to be served by only one transcontinental airline; and

Whereas Washington, which was also served by but one transcontinental air line, has had its situation rectified by recent action of the Civil Aeronautics Board so as to enjoy today the facilities of all the transcontinental air lines; and

Whereas emphatic consideration should be given to Boston as an ideal point of arrival and departure for trans-oceanic traffic. It is nearest to Europe of our large eastern cities and its airport facilities at Boston and Bedford will be adequate to handle the largest airplanes of the future; and

Whereas the lack of competitive trunk transcontinental air-line services is working to the detriment of the commercial and industrial welfare of Massachusetts and its development: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently demands that the Civil Aeronautics Board grant additional certificates of convenience and necessity to competing transcontinental air lines that will give to Massachusetts through trunk-line routes direct to important cities throughout the country without the necessity of changing at New York, in order to bring to Massachusetts the benefits to be derived by the future traffic of the air; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the state secretary to each member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to each of the Members of Congress from Massachusetts, and to such other persons and bodies as may, in his opinion, have the interest and authority to assure Massachusetts of its rightful place in the air world.

Danger of Disunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, delivered a very interesting address before the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Under the permission granted me I include that address as part of my remarks. It follows:

I welcome this opportunity to meet this gathering of editors from all parts of our country.

By nature I tend to devote myself to a single-minded and perhaps too narrow concentration on the job at hand. For the past 3 years my job has been primarily with the Army and only secondarily and more remotely with public opinion.

Your job is public information and public thought, and what concerns us tonight is public thought—the trend of public thought toward our armed forces.

Possibly I have exaggerated it but it seems to me that today the press reflects a growing disposition on the part of our people to set apart the Army and the Navy from those in civilian life; in other words, to separate a part of our population as a disconnected task force which has been selected to do a difficult, unpleasant, and dangerous job. And while they engage in this desperate assignment, a large part of the remainder of the country feels free to climb up into the grandstand, prepared to watch the show. You should know whether this impression of mine is correct. You are intimately concerned with what the people think and contribute largely to the formation of their thought.

The disturbing thing is that there is much plausible reason for the setting up of such a mental condition of separation. Except for the personal tie of love and affection for individuals who are in danger, the war has moved far away from our vicinity. The efficient setting up and training of powerful armies on land and sea and in the air and their transport to theaters of offensive action thousands of miles away has given an almost irresistible impression of ultimate and even prompt victory. What better opportunity could there be than this for reverting to undiluted, self-interested human nature—for discarding from our minds the necessary sacrifices which should be in the thoughts of a nation at war for its very existence.

And yet, I believe that there is no one among you who does not realize, in the bottom of his heart, that such an attitude of mind, such an illusion is all wrong, and that in it lies the only possibility of our ultimate defeat. That is the condition upon which our enemies, still powerful and still unconquered, are staking their chance for victory. From the very beginning they have continuously and consistently preached to their armed forces and to their people that the United States was too soft, too self-interested, too divided to wage war on the gigantic scale which they would force upon us. They believe it now. They have staked their future on it. Division of our war effort, either by division among our armed forces themselves, or between the armed forces and the civilian population (which was the major cause of the collapse of Germany in 1918), or division between ourselves and our allies—there lies the possibility of defeat.

As to the first, I have no alarm. I should be willing to guarantee that no matter what the tide of battle may bring, your armed forces will fight in complete unity until the race is run. In that direction our enemy has made a major miscalculation. Our supposedly soft and pacifistic youth have emerged from the fire as more than a match for their battle-hardened and supposedly invincible opponents. They have already justified their place in history.

As to the other possibilities of disunity, if in this crisis of the war they should occur, I do not presume to place the responsibility. History will have to do that.

But I do not shrink from pointing out the dire effect which would be caused by such disunity or the vital necessity of complete union in mind and effort of our whole people which will be required to pass the present crisis and to win the war. I see among you men who like myself were in uniform in Europe during the vital year of 1918 when in the last World War the power of the United States was called upon to solve a situation which was dangerously approaching a stalemate. You will remember as I do that it was not so much the actual appearance on the battlefields of that fraction of our strength which reached those fields, gallantly as they fought, which produced the final collapse of Germany. On the contrary it was the prospect of the unlimited strength which lay behind those forces, acting in a superb unity, and approaching in readiness to bring giant strength to the cause of the Allies.

I assure you that the same situation is even more critically upon us today. Britain is in the fifth year of a long, harassing, and critical war. Russia has been fighting with all her giant strength for nearly 3 years. We are only now approaching that climax of our effort which will occur on the battlefields of Europe when for the first time our Armies meet the masses of German Army strength.

When that major issue is joined, our enemies must be made aware of an overwhelming surge of military power which they cannot resist. They must also be made aware that behind that military power comes the even greater power of this united Nation ready to make every bitter sacrifice which will be needed to break the spirit of entrenched evil in Germany as well as the entrenched might of her armies.

At such an hour every symptom of vacillation, division, or disunity on our part will be eagerly watched for and welcomed by our enemies as an encouragement to prolonged effort; while on the other hand the revelation of a united country standing behind our Armies, spreading its spirit like an aura over their efforts, will be the weapon that will break the Nazi heart.

That is the picture as it lies before my eyes. I believe it to be conservative and not in any way exaggerated. I therefore suggest to you gentlemen that in solving the particular problems which may confront you, in your comment upon events as they unfold, and in your guidance of public thought, you always keep in your minds this objective of delivering against our enemy the overwhelming power of a united nation.

If you approach the news of the coming operations with this objective, examining closely the opportunities for praise and blame—weighing carefully the problems of emphasis—and considering possibly even the duty of silence during moments of trial and tribulation, I have no doubt that the verdict of history will credit you with a major part in the victory which must and will be ours.

American People Can Win Present War Only If Everyone Takes Part in Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Lowell Mellett, entitled "American People Can Win Present War Only if Everyone Takes Part in Struggle," from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., April 25, 1944:

AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN WIN PRESENT WAR ONLY IF EVERYONE TAKES PART IN STRUGGLE

(By Lowell Mellett)

Someone once said in better language that in times of great crisis a man always emerges to meet that crisis. Much history is cited as proof that this is true, but I believe it is open to debate.

True, the American struggle for independence produced George Washington and the Civil War produced Abraham Lincoln. True, the present world condition has produced Churchill, Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, and Roosevelt. But, it seems to me, a lot of crises in the history of the human race never were met, whether because the necessary man did not emerge or for some other reason.

The crisis was not met for untold millions submerged in the misery of the Dark Ages. The crisis was not met for the little people of our own time in the late great depression. True, the country as a whole was pulled out of it, but for the babies that starved or suffered such malnutrition that their whole lives have been affected, the crisis was not met.

VICTIMS OF TWO CRISES

The country seems sure to pull through the present crisis as a nation, but can it be said that the men who give their lives or their limbs to the effort have pulled through? I don't think it can be. They are the absolute victims of two crises, the one which followed the last war and which was not met, even in the terms of the Nation's interest, and the one which has engulfed them now as a result of the first failure. By that I mean failure of our statesmen to do their part toward forestalling this present World War.

The great man of all history will be the man who succeeds in doing what Woodrow Wilson tried to do. But I don't believe that any one single man will be able to do that. Just as we cannot leave it to one man to win this war for us, just as we cannot leave it to any one or all of the four men named, we cannot leave it to one man or four men to win the next great crisis in the world's history—before it occurs.

Eisenhower cannot win this war. MacArthur and Nimitz cannot win it. Nor can Marshall and King. Roosevelt cannot win it. Only the American people can. And the American people can win it only if they are all in it. I think this is coming to be understood. I think there is a great deal of soul-searching going on in this country at this time; that people are beginning again to ask themselves as they did in the days immediately following Pearl Harbor, "Am I doing all that I can?"

ACCEPT SITUATION PHILOSOPHICALLY

I don't believe there is as much resistance by the people to the Government's efforts to fit them into the war program as a lot of political and other leaders appear to think. I believe the people recognize that it is not easy to devise a system of selection that will automatically produce complete justice for all men and women. I believe they are willing to accept such unavoidable injustices as occur.

Many have reason to feel they have been miscast, that their best abilities are being disregarded, but almost without exception they seem to accept the situation philosophically. They aren't quitting. This is not a Nation of sunshine soldiers and summer patriots.

We are going to win this war. The American people are going to win it. The thing to pray for is that when we have achieved this victory we will put the same concerted effort into meeting the next crisis—before it occurs.

If we do that, we will be the greatest people in history.

The Honorable James M. Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to pay tribute to the Honorable James M. Graham, former Member of Congress from the Twenty-first Illinois District, who observed his ninety-second birthday on Friday, April 14, at his home in Springfield, Ill.

Mr. Graham served three terms as a Democrat in this House during the Sixty-first, Sixty-second, and Sixty-third Congresses, beginning on March 4, 1909, and ending on March 3, 1915. He is the oldest living former Member of Congress in the United States.

I commend to the Members of this House a story appearing in the April 13, 1944, issue of the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., with reference to Mr. Graham's life. It follows:

HE WON'T GET OLD—CONTENT AND PHILOSOPHICAL, JAMES M. GRAHAM FACES 92

(By Shirley Rogers)

Tomorrow James M. Graham will celebrate his ninety-second birthday, and four generations of Grahams, scattered throughout the country, will be thinking of the illustrious head of their family. Besides the immediate family circle, consisting of 3 sons, 3 daughters, 11 grandchildren, and 14 great-grandchildren; more than 100 cousins here and in Champaign County can also claim him.

Visiting with Mr. Graham is a most stimulating affair, for his interest and knowledge of current affairs makes him a gifted conversationalist. The atmosphere of his home is pleasant and cultured, and his books, numbering almost 3,000, reveal that he has never ceased being a student.

Summing up the events of his life for almost a century, he modestly claims that he has never done anything outstanding.

CAME FROM IRELAND WHEN 16

At 16 he came to America from Ireland, helped his father farm for a short time, taught school over a period of 7 years, studying law at night until he passed the bar. He was most active in court circles, and in 1885 was appointed to serve on the national uniform laws committee, a position which he maintained for 20 years.

Elected Congressman in 1909, when the late William Howard Taft was President, he remained in Washington until 1915. His fellow legislators, Graham says, were men of high grade and fine ability, possessing both intellect and honesty. He believes this holds true of Congress today and agrees thoroughly with his colleague the late Champ Clark of Missouri, former Speaker of the House, that a man who breaks into Congress must have a quality which gives him distinction—even though it only be a sense of humor. Many famous men served with him during this time, including New York City's little flower, Mayor LaGuardia, who he says is one grand fellow.

James Graham returned once to the country where he was born. For 2 short months he visited England and Scotland as well. As a boy he was enchanted by Roman and Greek history and had always desired to visit Italy. But at that time it was impossible for him to visit the Continent, and now he fears that he will never be able to do so.

CATHOLIC HONOR SURPRISES HIM

In 1935 he was informed through Bishop James Griffin, and a personal letter from the Pope he had been appointed a knight of St. Gregory. This honor, bestowed on only a few laymen in this country, came as a total surprise to him and he has never been able to understand why he had been singled out from amongst so many others.

Graham is erect, agile, and still active in civic affairs. He attends meetings of the Lincoln library board, the Sangamon County Building and Loan Association regularly. He is president of the Civic Lincoln Memorial Gardens Association and manages to visit the law offices of Graham & Graham in the Reisch Building at least once a day. Though he is known to be the oldest former Congressman living there is little in his looks or actions to prove it. Facing another birthday Friday, James M. Graham says that one of the things which have kept him young are his many good friends who refuse to allow him to go into retirement.

Post-War Readjustment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is most heartening to know that leaders in many communities are looking into the future—thinking and planning ahead for the post-war readjustment period.

The Glenwood (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce is to be congratulated for adopting the following resolution, which proves that it is alert to the problems facing the people of America and their great desire to preserve free enterprise, under which system our Nation has risen to greatness.

May Divine Providence give us the necessary strength, wisdom, and tolerance to preserve it, and may we on the home front do our part to deserve it, so we can look our returning veterans squarely in the face and say, "We kept the faith; here is your America—unaltered and unspoiled—the America for which you served and fought so gallantly and victoriously."

Resolved, That the Glenwood Chamber of Commerce give its unqualified endorsement to the following statement of principles and procedures.

One of the vital requirements of a free, democratic society is that the farms, the factories, and the business establishments of a country shall be owned and successfully operated by the people themselves, and not by the Government. Accordingly, under all circumstances, during prosperity or depression, our Government should direct its energies toward

preserving and strengthening private enterprise.

The serious national problems of the last depression arose so suddenly that unplanned, hasty Government action was unavoidable. The procedures followed, especially in unemployment relief, were inevitably inefficient and wasteful, and gave little consideration to the need for maintaining our private enterprises, such as contracting firms, in a sound condition. Direct employment of labor by Government results in destroying the normal sources of private employment which are a vital part of our democratic structure.

We now have an opportunity to profit by those past experiences in the advance plans being made by private enterprise, as well as by our National, State, and local governments, to meet the readjustment problems of the post-war period. Private enterprise must plan to use every means at its command to provide adequate post-war employment, but our National, State, and local governments must be prepared to supplement normal, private employment if such action should be required to avoid unemployment hardships.

Such goverment planning should include local financing of public works projects, insofar as that may be feasible; and should, in each community, give preference to available projects of the greatest social or economic value, which are not competitive with established private enterprise; and, as already emphasized, should avoid direct government employment of labor by using established private contracting firms.

Such a procedure will be beneficial to all, as it will give employment to the idle, will help preserve established private enterprises, and will produce better results at lower cost. In other words, under such a plan, our entire economic and democratic structures will be preserved, and the money spent will produce the greatest results in terms of wealth created for the benefit of all.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, to the New Zionist Organization of America, delivered at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, April 23, 1944:

In London on November 2, 1917, Mr. Balfour, His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, issued what has since come to be known as the Balfour Declaration. This pledged the British Government to the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people. For this reason above all Palestine was mandated to the British at the end of World War No. 1.

In 1922 the Congress of the United States passed a joint resolution favoring the establishment of this national home.

Two years later, in 1924, after an American-British convention on the subject of Palestine, President Calvin Coolidge issued a proclamation with respect to the rights of our nationals in British mandated Palestine. The ratification of that proclamation was advised by the United States Senate and then signed by the President and Mr. Austen Chamberlin the following year. Article 2 of the proclamation stated that "the mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home." Article 5 squarely placed the responsibility on the British mandatory for "seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to or in any way placed under the control of any foreign power." Article 6 pledged the mandatory to facilitate immigration and settlements. Article 27 said: "The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate." Whereupon to this proclamation was added in treaty form article 7: "Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States."

It is important for Americans to realize, since many apparently do not, that under Republican administrations in time past our Congress has gone overwhelmingly on the record in favor of the purpose for which the mandate was primarily created, a national homeland for the Jews; that our Government signed a treaty with the British that no modification of the terms of this mandatory could ever be effected without the consent of the League or the United States, and that this consent has never been given.

But all this was 20 years ago. Time marched on. The Jews came to Palestine in many numbers. Their capital, industry, diligence, sweat and brains, raised the living standards of themselves and the Arabs unbelievably. Their great dream, the dream of Israel was coming true. They made the very desert bloom. And then, as Hitler came into power, Palestine became not only a home, but a blessed sanctuary for the driven and persecuted German Jews. And then came Munich, the climax of the terrible and bitter, and, in the end futile, drama of British appeasement of the Nazis. Gradually the logic of strong Nazi policy conspired with the logic of weak British policy to betray not only the Jews of Germany but the Jews of Palestine. This betrayal was embodied in the British "white paper" promulgated in May 1939, which stopped at the end of 5 years any further Jewish immigration into Palestine. In Great Britain's agonizing search for allies anywhere, and everywhere, Chamberlain's government, but another Chamberlain—Neville—sought to appease the rising nationalistic spirit of the Palestinian Arabs. The Balfour Declaration became another famous "scrap of paper." And Britain's unilateral action, illegal because it was taken without the consent of the League of Nations, or recognition by the United States of America, the 1924 treaty with our own Government became a scrap of paper, too. Though few Americans realized at the time that the white paper was not only an illegal but an immoral document, one great Britisher realized it fully.

Let me read you some quotes from Mr. Winston Churchill, then a simple Member of Parliament. On the floor of Commons, 5 years ago this May, he said this about the white paper:

"I cannot understand why this course has been taken. I search around for the answer. * * * Is our condition so parlous and our state so poor that we must, in our weakness, make this sacrifice of our declared purpose? * * * I must say that I have not taken such a low view of the strength of the British Empire, or of the very many powerful countries who desire to walk in association with us; but if the Government, with their superior knowledge of the deficiencies in our armaments * * * really feels that we are too weak to carry out our obligations and wish to file a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy, that is an argument which, however ignominicus, should certainly weigh with the House in these dangerous times. But is it true? I do not believe it is true. I cannot believe that the task to which we set our hand 20 years ago in Palestine is beyond our strength, or that faithful perseverance will not, in the end, bring that task through to a glorious success. I am sure of this, that to cast the Balfour plan aside and show yourselves infirm of will and unable to pursue a long, clear, and considered purpose, bending and twisting under the crush and pressure of events—I am sure that that is going to do us a most serious and grave injury at a time like this. * * * What will be the opinion of the United States of America? Shall we not lose more—and this is a question to be considered maturely—in the growing support and sympathy of the United States than we shall gain in local administrative convenience, if gain at all indeed we do? What will our potential enemies think? What will those wha have been stirring up these Arab agitators think? Will they not be encouraged by our confession of recoil? Will they not be tempted to say: 'They're on the run again. This is another Munich.'"

It was another Munich, of course, as everyone now knows. But before American public opinion had a chance to protest this violation of our treaty and this betrayal of the Balfour plan, war came. And while England stood heroically alone against the Nazis, Americans could not, dared not, deny Great Britain whatever help or comfort she may have thought she derived from the Arab world through her action on the white paper. Moreover, then we were implicated too deeply ourselves in the appeasement of Nazi Germany.

But now 5 years have passed. As one of the mighty United Nations, we stand fighting side by side with our British Allies. Today, the ultimate defeat of the Axis is in sight. Today, the Middle East is no longer in vital danger. Today, there is no physical need, as there never were moral grounds, for appeasing the Arabs, if indeed they demand appeasement, which many wise men deny. And yet the infamous, cynical, illegal white paper, born of long forgotten British weakness and terror, went into effect on April 1 of this year. April Fool's Day. What an appropriate date that must have seemed to the persecuted European Jews. How the Nazis must have rocked with glee at this bloody April Fool's joke which democracy and Christianity itself had played on the Jews.

Today, unless our Government acts to expunge this illegal act from the record, to redeem the honor of our treaty, we Americans will be endorsing the very spirit of Munich anew.

I say unless our Government acts. Now, I shall be quite frank with you. It is the only way I know how to help. Mr. Churchill was, and I believe still is, a loyal supporter of the Balfour Declaration and of the treaty which Calvin Coolidge signed putting the American Government behind the purposes of that declaration. All who know Mr. Churchill are certain of this. But the same forces, the very same sinister forces of appeasement in the British Foreign Office which promulgated the white paper, tie his hands now. How do they tie them? They simply argue that action is up to the United States of America. If the American Government, which under its 1924 treaty has every right to protest the white paper, does not protest it, they say, with some reason, why should they take the entire onus of an action unpopular with the Arab world? But if our American Government insists on Britain upholding her treaty with us, and a return to

our joint pre-Munich agreements on Palestine, in honor and under law, they will have to give way.

Now, this Seventy-eighth Congress tried to advise our administration that this was precisely what it wanted our Government to do. Congress introduced the Wagner-Taft resolution in the Senate and the Wright-Compton resolution in the House early this year to demonstrate to Britain and before the world that its will was that the white paper should be stricken from history's record. But those resolutions were killed. How? By the urgent, off-the-record advice of General Marshall and the State Department at secret hearings. Anyone who knows the inside story of what happened on the Hill—and I followed it quite closely, as many did—knows that in this question our President, while Commander in Chief, took the advice of his chief of staff; our President, while sole designer and arbiter of our day-to-day foreign policy, took the advice of his State Department against any action now. In short, our administration gave the Palestine resolutions no support in the House. Had it done so, those resolutions would have been overwhelmingly passed, and the British white paper would be dead now. If ever there was a time for constructive and positive statecraft in the active solution of a problem, this was it. To be sure, although there was no action, our administration did give the Jews of the world some very inspiring and, I hope, comforting words—the promise of justice for the cause of Zionism—at some future time. The promise to bring to the block or the gibbet their Axis persecutors—at some future time. Now Zionists can live on promises. They have had thousands of years of doing so. But will promises, however happy, keep trapped and persecuted Jews in the Balkans and elsewhere in Europe alive? Will the knowledge that the Nazis are to be punished for their crimes keep life in the Jews who are dying in countless numbers under their heel today? You know they will not. It is all very well to look into the future through rose-colored glasses. But not, as Sam Grafton says, when that rosy hue is really imparted by the blood of other men. The Jews of Europe were promised one small home. They are inheriting a million yawning, nameless graves.

For my part, I know that the whole question of Zionism, as an intellectual one, has long been debatable. Jews themselves continue to debate it, even while Jewish blood stains the blue Mediterranean red. But there is no debate and can be no debate about saving people's lives now and today. When all the fine rhetoric is over, there are only four things that can be done about the refugee Jews of Europe.

1. Admit them into Palestine as we and the British had agreed to do before the white paper made mock of our "long, clear, and considered purpose." I think that this is the proper, the sensible, the legal, and the entirely possible thing to do.

2. Find another homeland in someone else's territory for them. Such a special search, fraught with a variety of economic, nationalistic, and emotional considerations, awaits the end of the war and international conferences on the subject. It is no solution to either the Palestine question or the refugee question now.

3. Let down the bars of immigration for them here and in Great Britain. This would require a revision of our own immigration laws, which I do not need to tell you is a political impossibility at this time.

4. Let the Jews die.

When all the talk is done—or perhaps because all the talk is never done—we are letting them die. To this extent we are as bad as Hitler. I do not see how I can put it any more plainly than that.

I am told very often by my friends on the Hill that the only conclusive argument for the white paper—but the one they all accept, with streaming eyes—is that the Arabs "may make trouble" if we do not assent to it. In short, that now and in the post-war era, there will be unrest in the Arab world, if we return to our pledged word and signed deeds on the Balfour Declaration. As one who has been in that part of the world, I don't believe it. I have seen far too many evidences of friendly Arab cooperation with the growing Jewish homeland in Palestine. And I believe that vigorous, sincere statesmanship could shortly bring the Arabs into amicable accord on the question of Palestine. But suppose it is true? Is this a sufficient reason for Americans to allow their own treaties to be dishonored? And I ask you, what does our Government intend to have an international police force for, a four-power treaty for, a world organization, court, or league for, if not precisely to enforce the sanctity of our treaties and keep justice and peace in troubled parts of the world? If the United Nations cannot keep peace in little Palestine with the vast force we already have there, and the "instrumentalities for keeping the peace" we intend to create in the post-war world, then where in God's name—and I say in God's name—shall we keep the peace in this world?

I think not only of our Palestine treaty with Great Britain, now dead in letter, but I think of the Atlantic Charter and the Moscow agreements, and yes, if you will, of the "four freedoms"—though one freedom, liberty, will do, I suspect, for the Palestine Jews. And I repeat for Americans and to America, Winston Churchill's ringing 5-year-old words: "Is our condition so parlous and our state so poor that we must in our weakness make this sacrifice of our declared purposes? Are we too weak to carry out our obligations? Do we wish to file a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy?" What, so soon?

Zionist friends, friends of a free Palestine, above all friends who simply wish to save innocent human lives, whether they be Jewish or any other nationality, persuade our Government to act. I have sometimes been criticized for saying frankly that I believe our country should be the greatest, the strongest, in the world. That it is the strongest today there is no doubt. But we shall never be the greatest if we default, not only in our obligation to stand by the treaties our Government has signed but in moral and Christian leadership. This we are doing on the question of the white paper now.

Can't we have done, we Americans, with pleas to a foreign government, to a British Prime Minister, who is either bound by his own Foreign Office, in which case he cannot act; or now persuaded against you himself, in which case he will not act? Let us make our respectful plea to the two men to whom both he and his Foreign Office must listen respectfully—to our President and our Secretary of State. Causes can never be won abroad which are not first won at home.

Let us make our plea simple; no more rhetorical promises but honest action—action to reinstate the treaty which our Government signed with the British just 20 years ago; action which will give sanctuary and liberty to a people who have suffered too much, too unjustly, and too long.

Then we will have accomplished two things: The restoration of our country's honored pledges and the salvation of many innocent Jewish lives. Then what Max Lerner considers the greatest argument for all men of good will, "the simple and shining truth of humanity," will not be denied. We must not let it be. As Jews and as Christians, as Americans all, let us see to this for the sake of all for which we claim to fight this war. But especially for the sake of our immortal souls.

President Roosevelt and the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, quarreling between members of President Roosevelt's United States Supreme Court has broken into the open several times recently in form of sharp statements contained in divided opinions of the Court in which justices of one opinion were highly critical of the course taken by the others. The Court has even charged itself with being inconsistent. These recent outbursts are causing many to question the wisdom of course followed in making present appointments. Practically all the "nine old men" who were the target of New Deal theorists in the early days of the Roosevelt administration are now gone.

President Roosevelt's hand-picked majority on the Nation's highest tribunal now totals seven of the nine justices. Six of his seven have been members of the inner sanctum. Justice Black carried the torch for the President in the Senate; Justice Reed was Franklin D. Roosevelt's Solicitor General and represented the administration in such noted Supreme Court cases as N. R. A. and others; Justice Frankfurter has been close adviser to the President; Justice Douglas had a colorful career as a member and later chairman of S. E. C.; Justice Murphy, New Deal Governor of Michigan and Governor General of the Philippines, went to the Supreme Court from Franklin D. Roosevelt's appointment as Attorney General; Justice Jackson served successively as general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Solicitor General, and Attorney General. Justice Rutledge is the only Roosevelt appointee to the Court who did not grow up in the New Deal family.

No other one President in this Nation's history ever appointed so many Justices of the Supreme Court. The roster of the Court against which the President launched his attack was composed of the then Chief Justice Hughes and Justice Van Devanter, appointees of President Taft; Justices McReynolds and Brandeis, appointed by President Wilson; Justices Sutherland and Butler, appointed by President Harding; present Chief Justice Stone was appointed by President Coolidge; and Justices Roberts and Cardozo appointed by President Hoover. Of this nine only Chief Justice Stone and Justice Roberts remain.

In the United States circuit and district courts 216 of the 238 presently sitting judges have been appointed by President Roosevelt. No other President ever came near making such a vast number of judicial appointments. Political appointments run down through the lot, even to the extent that the Governor of one State called the appointee a pawn in

the hands of a political boss. Outstanding in political appointments to Federal courts have been Members of Congress who have been repudiated by their constituents, only to land a judgeship. Writing in a recent issue of the Kentucky Law Journal, Prof. Charles Smith, Jr., of the University of Kentucky, stated:

Although political appointees to the Supreme Court sometimes have been very good ones, no evidence is available to indicate that appointments to lesser courts made to please Senators who want to pay off political debts or to please party bosses who need patronage, have ever turned out so well. President Roosevelt's record in these matters betrays an attitude toward the judiciary which could hardly be called one of reverence, and it is not calculated to inspire reverence in the minds of others.

The Supreme Court was the object of a smear campaign in 1937. Today the Congress is target of a similar effort. The Federal judiciary must handle the problem of interpreting the Constitution and enforcing the laws as between the citizen and his government. It is an unfortunate state of affairs when the confidence of the people in their courts and in their Congress is destroyed. Federal judges are appointed for life and judgeships should not be made a haven for disabled politicians. The voters can take care of their individual Members of the House every 2 years.

Executive orders constitute another phase of the broad control of Government exercised by the President in an unprecedented manner. President Roosevelt has issued 45 percent of all Executive orders since and including the administration of President Lincoln. He has issued twice as many as any other President in the history of our Republic, and twice as many as the combined number of Executive orders issued during both the Civil War and World War No. 1. In some years his Executive orders, which often have the effect of law, have even exceeded the number of laws passed by Congress in the same period. Since he took office in 1933, President Roosevelt has issued 3,707 Executive orders as compared to 4,553 laws enacted by Congress during the same period. These Executive orders are in addition to the multitude of administrative orders issued by his bureau chiefs in the jig-saw puzzle of New Deal agencies.

Maverick, Man of Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of March 12, 1944:

MAVERICK, S. W. P. C. HEAD, MAN OF ENERGY

(By Edward A. Harris)

When burly, bass-voiced Maury Maverick, of Texas, was selected early this year to head the Smaller War Plants Corporation, a murmur of approbation could be heard all the way from Capitol Hill to the big White House at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. From past experience the murmurers knew what to expect as Maury charged in with his usual rollicking gusto—and they expected the best.

For one thing, they knew that Maury was better equipped than the two preceding board chairmen, Lou E. Holland, of Kansas City, and Robert W. Johnson, of the eastern surgical supplies family, both of whom dropped the steering wheel after short trial runs.

For Maverick knows all the front portals and back alleys of the Nation's Capital. Having spent half his life in public service, he has learned how to circumvent red tape, how to sidestep slow or contrary officials. He is well versed in the gentle art of cocktail small talk, the tidbit social chatter that smooths the way for receptive ears in Congress and Government agencies the next day.

PHONE RINGS INCESSANTLY

The redoubtable Maury, who is 48 years old and tips the scales at 220 pounds, arrives at his office each day at 7:30 in the morning and usually stays until 6:30, working at his large, neat desk in his shirt sleeves. He has a dictaphone at his home and often knocks off letters and memoranda in the comparative leisure of his living room until midnight.

His office telephone rings incessantly, and in the hurly-burly of activity he sometimes is so pressed for time that he shouts dictation to his secretary in an adjoining office to save the few seconds it would take her to walk to his desk.

But if his office scene is unorthodox, Maury has method in his madness. His associates, secretaries, and assorted functionaries—and even his colleagues on the War Production Board, of which he is also Vice Chairman—are impressed by his industry and effectiveness no less than they are amused by his antics and unorthodoxies. For Maury, the nonconformer, has "savvy." He goes at things in a big way. And ahead of him lies one of the biggest jobs he's ever tackled.

Of equal importance with his know-how and boundless energy is the fact that Maverick came to his new post with a deep and sincere interest in the small businessman. He had, as the saying goes, been one himself—a lumberman. He had always fought for the underdog, and this job was cut to his lathe.

"LITTLE PEOPLE'S CORPORATION"

He is fond of bringing this fact home. Not long after he assumed his new duties early this year, he described his agency as the "little people's corporation," and joyously defined "little business" as "any business which cannot hire a lobbyist in Washington."

It is too early, of course, to assess Maverick's concrete accomplishments with the Smaller War Plants Corporation, but in view of his record of independence and assertiveness, his sympathy with the "little guy" and his progressive but realistic political philosophy, the outlook is promising.

He is quick to point out that the corporation is the only war agency set up by act of Congress, the others being Executive creations, and he adds happily that the Smaller War Plants Act was enacted as a nonpartisan measure, having been passed by both branches of Congress without a dissenting vote on June 11, 1942. As head of an independent agency, Maury has plenty of elbow room for freedom of act, and in this respect he fully exercises his prerogatives.

Purpose of the S. W. P. C., he has pointed out, is to enable the largest number of small business concerns to make military and essential civilian goods to the greatest extent possible. This is accomplished by going to bat for them with the various procurement offices, by actual financial assistance and by general advisory service.

His basic views dovetail so nicely with his duties that in talking he is apt to lump the two together. "We are for free enterprise and the American system," he declared, "and we are against cartels, dividing markets, against trusts and the cutting down of production in order to keep up prices. Restricting production through monopolies would restrict small enterprise—or kill it."

He favors decentralization of industry throughout the country: "You have more stable economic conditions if you have a diversification of industry, not only in big cities like Washington, St. Louis, New York, and Philadelphia, but in towns of 50,000 to 250,000. Take me away from big industrial cities." Here he was referring to post-war economics. "When our boys come back," he said, "we should try as much as possible not to have a reconcentration in the big city with the consequent development of housing, congestion, crime, and similar problems.

"The big cities of America should try to raise the standard of living and become better cities instead of bigger cities."

Our national industrial economy, he believes, rests not on a few large centers of mass production, but on countless small towns, each with one or more small factories. On demobilization the returning servicemen must have the opportunity to start out on their own, to establish small businesses and accomplish the aims and ambitions they have dreamed of—the cause for which they are now fighting.

In present war production, he says, "we've overestimated the importance of gigantic concerns and overlooked the techniques of small businesses." If the country fails to look ahead, if it permits cartels and monopolies to return after the war, it will be inviting a dangerous situation. Therefore we must blueprint post-war plans now.

"The effects of this war will be felt for at least a generation," he feels. "That's why it's downright silly to think that when the war is over every one will go back to dancing around the maypole and drinking Falstaff or Griesedieck beer in St. Louis without a thought about the future."

HASTE CAUSED MISTAKES

Maverick is often asked about Government bureaucracy, and he has a ready answer: "Some of the worst bureaucrats are those who've devoted their lives to denouncing bureaucracy. Much of our so-called bureaucracy stems from the vastness of the job the Government is doing. The Axis nations were organized for military action and we were not. We were compelled suddenly to create a huge wartime organization, and naturally we made mistakes.

"I think the combination of divergent forces that came up here to try to work together has resulted in the most remarkable job of organization and action in the history of the world. And in doing it we've retained the form and substance of a democracy."

While adhering firmly to the principle of free enterprise, Maverick makes it plain that he still favors public works. "After the war we will have a backlog of essential public improvements costing from thirty to fifty billion dollars—public health, reforestation, irrigation, conservation, the building of highways, slum clearance and all the rest. We need these things, not only to furnish employment for the needy, but for the welfare of the Nation.

"It's not socialism, not communism, not radicalism. It's just a part of the improvement program of any nation on the earth. I say it's essential to civilized society to have

these things. And while we're on it, in St. Louis there is need for much city replanning, rehousing, and a reallocation of sunlight and open spaces—like many other cities of proportionate size."

It is interesting, in any appraisal of the new rampaging S. W. P. C. chairman, to note the genesis of the dictionary's definition of a "maverick" as an "unbranded animal." When Maury's grandfather, old Sam Maverick, was paid 450 head of cattle in settlement of a debt about the time he was signing the Texas Declaration of Independence, his Negro slaves neglected to brand the calves to such a consistent extent that whenever neighboring ranchmen spied an unmarked calf they at once drawled: "Guess that's Maverick's."

So it was that maverick came to mean an unbranded animal, a nonconformer, and in the past two decades the capital and generous portions of Texas have learned to concur in the definition in its literal application to old Sam's grandson.

Fighting Wins Wars, and Privates Are Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night it was my privilege to attend the annual dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors as the guest of Mr. Fred Christopherson, editor of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader. All who were there will agree that it was outstanding in these days of outstanding events. Mr. Roy Roberts, president of the society, stated that editors present represented newspapers with a combined circulation of more than 24,000,000 copies. The speakers of the evening were headed by the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and the Honorable James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy. The Chiefs of Staff for the Army and Navy were present, many members of their staffs, and many Members of the Congress. Reviews were given of the progress of the war on various fronts, and of the outstanding miracles in production and invention that have marked our efforts.

It is significant, I think, however, that the greatest applause of the evening went to some remarks that paid tribute to that almost forgotten soldier—the foot soldier, the infantryman. The remarks were given by Brig. Gen. William L. Wilbur, assistant division commander of the Thirty-sixth Infantry, and under permission granted by the House, I insert them at this point:

THE MEN WHO PROTECT OUR FREEDOM

(Address by Brig. Gen. William H. Wilbur, U. S. Army, Assistant Division Commander, Thirty-sixth Infantry Division, before the annual meeting, American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D. C., April 22, 1944)

As the war progresses I am greatly impressed by the marvelous job that American industry has done. Certainly its achievements have never been equaled in history. But, let us make no mistake, essential as it is, production cannot win a war. It is true that lack of production can lose a war, but, production cannot win one. I wish that it could.

The products of industry are used by fighting soldiers. The period when they are used on the battlefield is the critical, decisive, phase of war. Sometimes our soldiers smash that equipment. More times the enemy does.

I remember working my way to a vantage point on the front line—within sight of the famous monastery above Cassino. I saw what appeared to be an empty fox hole; for as I got close to it I noticed a Garand rifle, thoroughly chewed by shell fragments. The wooden stock was in slivers—the mechanism worthless. To my surprise a soldier stuck his head from the hole. I asked him if that was his rifle. "Yes, it is," he said, and reached over and placed his hand on the wreckage. "It is pretty well smashed," he said, "I should have taken better care of it. It was that shell that just lit here a minute ago. I was just able to duck, myself." Then he brightened up a bit. "But," he said, "I've still got six hand grenades."

Equipment of all kinds is used up, smashed and worn out, from Garand rifles to the most complicated machines of war. Industry must continue to feed in its products, in great quantity, and of the highest quality.

I wish that every American would see just what our men have gone through, and are going through, in Italy. For the fighting soldier at Anzio and Cassino it means day after day of struggle; struggle against rain, sleet, and ice; struggle against fatigue: heavy, sodden, overempowering fatigue; yet his job requires him to go up another thousand feet; struggle against the stupefying blow that strikes when one of his comrades is killed.

I wish every American could have been with me when I have asked one of these men, "How are you getting along?" Covered with mud, bleary-eyed from lack of rest, the infantry soldiers have looked up, squared their jaws and, without exception, have replied: "Fine, sir." They were not fine. They knew that I knew they were anything but fine. But they would not admit anything else.

All Americans can be deeply proud of them.

You will be interested to know of the joy and appreciation of the Italian people when liberated from the German yoke.

Typical of every town is the situation which we found when we went into the ruins of the village of San Pietro. Out of their caves and cellars came the pitiful villagers, dirty, fearful, dressed in worn and tattered clothing—a sorry sight.

An old man rushed up to me, threw his arms around me, and before I could get my guard up, kissed me. Others crowded around expressing their joy and appreciation to the Americanos.

I gave a gaunt old man a 5-cent package of Life Savers. "Molto grazia, molto grazia," he said, and then dove back into his shelter and shortly came up with a bag of dried figs. With real graciousness he tried to get me to accept some of them, although I am sure that he badly needed every one of them.

These pitiful villagers told us that the Germans had systematically looted the town before leaving, that they had taken not only the grain and other food but had collected all woolen clothing, women's as well as men's, for dispatch to Germany. Being slaves of Germany is hard.

Just as we were about to leave the village we encountered an Italian who spoke some English. I asked him how it happened that he spoke English. "Me, me live in Boston for 14 year. Oh, Boston. If me only there now."

Remembering the safety and comfort of our homes in America, we went on with a better understanding of just what we are fighting for in this war.

Contact with home is most important. The soldiers crave letters—they thirst for information of the little things that are going on at home. Anything that typifies your world means a lot to them. Red Cross girls handing out doughnuts are a breath of America. It is interesting to watch the reaction of the soldiers as they receive their doughnuts—each one handed out with a smile. Some, of course, make wisecracks. Others stand with open mouths—happy just to get a look at a fine American girl.

Blood plasma and its miraculous action is another strong tie to the people at home.

The combat soldier has great difficulty in understanding statements indicating that the war will be over very soon. He cannot understand any let-down of effort. Every day he sees his comrades wounded and killed. He sees no weakening on the part of the enemy in front of him. I have talked to a considerable number of German prisoners recently. They were mostly German infantry soldiers. They are solid in their belief that Germany will win the war. It is striking, and very disconcerting, too, to hear them say, with calm conviction, "Germany will win because we all will never quit." Their faith in the final outcome appears to be absolutely unshaken.

The attitude of those German prisoners explains, in part, why bombs and artillery fire cannot do the decisive part of the job of winning this war.

We had hoped that airplanes, tanks, artillery, and machines could carry the major part of the load of battle. We had hoped that in this war infantry could be charged with a minor role. It does not appear to be so. The infantry soldier still carries almost the entire load. On those fronts such as in Italy, where all elements of our fighting forces are in daily action against the enemy, this is most apparent. There for each individual private soldier of the artillery, Air Corps, engineers, or other arms that is killed there are 30, 50, even 100 privates of infantry who make the supreme sacrifice for their country.

Tanks, airplanes, rocket guns, and mines in the hands of the enemy have all combined to make the task of the infantryman a heavier one than in any war of the past. Our infantry realizes this. We, too, must realize that this war can be won when, and only when, the German infantry is defeated. The struggle of infantry against infantry, the physical domination of every German by a superior, free soldier, must be accomplished. In this struggle the human element is the vital one.

This is a war of survival.

In such a war every citizen should feel that he exists to help those men who are fighting the battle. Every worker, every factory, the War Department from top to bottom, every military agency between here and the battle front, exists to help the combat soldier do his tough job.

Wars are won by fighting men, individuals who have the courage to overcome danger, the stamina to withstand hardships of the toughest kind, the individual will to keep going forward regardless of murderous hostile fire, regardless of overpowering sodden fatigue, regardless of the fact that their comrades have been killed and wounded.

Those are the men who protect our freedoms.

When General Wilbur concluded his remarks, Mr. Speaker, that assembly of newspaper editors, supposedly hard-boiled when it comes to speeches, broke into prolonged applause and then stood and cheered for minutes. I do not think they were cheering the speaker, well as

he had delivered his remarks. They were cheering the boys he had been talking about. And they hoped, I believe, that the fervor of their applause might somehow reach the boys and might somehow reach the soul of America.

In that thought I have placed the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a worthy part of the story of the common doughboy, the foot soldier, the infantryman, the private with the gun and the hand grenade—in this war. And in the same vein, Mr. Speaker, under permission also given by the House, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from a small daily paper in South Dakota—the Daily Belle Fourche Post—entitled:

PRIVATES ARE IMPORTANT

Miracles of plastic surgery performed on our wounded servicemen are familiar to all of us. But they have been, until recently, a wonder done for a soldier somewhere—somebody's son, of course—but not one of our own.

Last week, a young soldier, on sick leave from one of these surgical miracles, spent a day in Belle Fourche with friends on his way to the Northwest country to visit relatives.

One side of his jaw and face had been shot away. Plastic surgeons had taken a piece from one of his thighs and grafted it into the wound. So skillful was the operation that the only difference between the two sides of his face was that one would grow a beard, the other wouldn't.

The scar line still showed plainly but that would fade—practically disappear—the surgeon had told him. Cheery as his spirits were, however, the youth showed that he was a wounded veteran, home on sick leave.

Before such sacrifice, I felt unworthy—as we all do—and mumbled something about how much he had suffered for us.

"Everybody says that," answered the soldier. "Everybody has been so kind—on the train, in the station, on the bus—as if they couldn't do enough for me.

"It's the attitude I've felt from the moment I entered combat duty—probably before—but I didn't realize it. It's as if every American serviceman were important—something precious being risked to save the Nation from the enemy. The precautions taken for our health, our safety and our contentment—even in those hellholes where we have to fight.

"When I was wounded, I couldn't have received more consideration had I been a general. From the first, I was assured that I'd have a new face—made, as my lieutenant told me, by the best damn surgeon in the world. Not once did anybody let me feel that all this was too much bother for a buck private.

"The doctors in the hospital—big boys who can ask their price in private practice, and get it—did their darndest on me, one of the millions of Joes in the Army. I've had the best of nursing, Red Cross care—every mile of the way from that fighting front to the Denver hospital—U. S. O. services to help me forget my pain, my mail rushed to me—as if the whole Nation knew I was wounded and wanted to make me just as comfortable as possible.

"I've offered my life, I know. I've had a lot of pain. And I'll probably have some more. But a country like this—where a private is important—is worth suffering for. And just as soon as they'll let me, I'm going back to help finish the job."

I broke away as fast as I could. I knew that boy would call me a darned pantywaist if I blubbered before him. I wanted to get by myself where I could pray, as I had never felt a need to pray before: "God, help us that we may never let that boy down."

A Further Reply to the Seventeenth District Americanism Commission of Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on April 21 I inserted in the RECORD a statement in reply to some Legionnaires in Los Angeles, Calif., who had accused me of misusing my franking privilege.

In accordance with the unanimous-consent request granted me, I herewith submit a letter sent to me by some lady who had inquired at the national headquarters of the American Legion concerning the action of the Seventeenth District Americanism Commission of Los Angeles. The following letter is self-explanatory and requires no comment:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 21, 1944.

Miss OPAL ESSANT,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MISS ESSANT: I have for acknowledgment your letter of April 17 about Congressman HAMILTON FISH.

You probably are now referring to the radio broadcast of Walter Winchell on last Sunday night in which mention was made of the Seventeenth District Americanism Commission of Los Angeles, Calif.

That particular Americanism commission represents a very, very small segment of the American Legion and its actions has not had either county, State, or National approval.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. CHAILLAUX,
Director, National Americanism Commission.

Reduction in War Profits by Renegotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Commission is to be congratulated on the agreement reached with the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation by which the profit on Liberty ships was reduced to approximately $25,000 per ship.

As part of my remarks, I include a statement issued by the Commission. It follows:

An agreement with the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation has been set up as a basic formula for renegotiating the ship construction contracts awarded to the group of Liberty shipbuilders who received their first contracts in 1941, the United States Maritime Commission announced today.

The case of the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation covered the first 5 contracts awarded to that corporation aggregating 181 Liberty cargo ships completed prior to May 4, 1943. The renegotiation agreement as signed finds that this corporation has received or accumulated $6,322,954.08 in net excess profits, after deducting $163,960.60 for items adjusted in renegotiation. This amount, less credit for taxes paid on unreceived income, if any, is to be credited against fees which the contractor has earned since May 4, 1943, and not yet received.

Oregon earned $23,958,564.68 in fees under the terms of its contracts. The renegotiation procedure reduced this to $17,471,650, or $96,528.45 on each of the 181 vessels. From this was deducted $1,267,000, representing disallowances of items claimed by the contractor, leaving $16,204,650 income after renegotiation but before taxes. The net income of Oregon for its services in building 181 ships, after renegotiation and after estimated taxes are deducted, amounts to $4,537,302, or approximately $25,000 per ship, or 1½ percent of the cost of each ship.

The Liberty ship construction contracts all contained an incentive principle based upon the payment to a contractor of a normal fee for his services in building the ship, with additions or subtractions dependent upon variation from the man-hour standard set in the contract.

The original normal fee of $110,000 per vessel could reach a maximum of $140,000 or a minimum of $60,000. Subsequent contracts have successively reduced the maximum to $60,000 and the minimum to $20,000, respectively, without in any way doing violence to the integrity of the contract or destroying the incentive principle which has contributed such a great stimulus to production, the Maritime Commission said.

The Commission has periodically adjusted the maximum fee payable to this group of contractors, first, to $120,000 per ship during the first 15-month period, $100,000 per ship for the next 6 months, and $80,000 for the following 6 months, and $50,000 for all ships delivered thereafter. The savings that have resulted from the reduction in the maximum fees substantially exceed the total of all fees paid to all Maritime Commission shipbuilders.

The formula as established in the Oregon case sets up four factors, based upon the actual performance record, which modify the maximum amount payable upon a ship. It continues the incentive features embodied in the shipbuilding contracts, is consistent with the Commission's action of negotiating reduced fees in the award of subsequent contracts to these yards, and yet accomplishes the purpose of the Renegotiation Act by eliminating excessive profits.

For each one of the four respective periods, the yards are rated according to their actual performance record. These ratings are established on the basis of: (1) The lowest number of man-hours actually used in the construction of each vessel, (2) The lowest dollar cost of each vessel, (3) The largest number of ships delivered during the period from each shipway in the yard, and (4) the lowest dollar investment of Government facility in the yard charged to each vessel. By taking these four ratings and combining them for each yard and applying the result against the perfect rating of 100 percent, the actual rating of each yard is obtained. This percentage is then applied to the difference between the maximum and the minimum fee for each given period and this establishes the actual fee to be paid to the yard for each vessel delivered in that period.

Where special circumstances made it necessary, such as where a part of the Liberty ship program has been temporarily set aside

in order to construct special types of ships, these ratings are correspondingly qualified.

Speed was the essence at all times in connection with the construction of the Liberty ships, and in the renegotiation proceedings. The time factor has been considered the most important element involved.

The incentive system established under the Liberty ship contracts created keen rivalry among shipbuilders to reduce man-hours and cost. This competition reduced the man-hours from the first estimates of 635,900 per ship to an average of 520,000 and in one case to below 350,000. In terms of money saved this has reduced the cost of Liberty ships to approximately $157 per deadweight ton, as compared to about $210 for the Hog Island vessels of the last war, despite the very substantial increase in wage rates that now prevail over that earlier period.

The Coast Guard—Fighting Handyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article which appeared in an issue of Sea Power, entitled "The Coast Guard—Fighting Handyman," written by Kensil Bell.

This article is a splendid contribution to the history and service of the Coast Guard and a brief résumé of the Coast Guard's magnificent service with which everyone should be familiar:

THE COAST GUARD—FIGHTING HANDYMAN

(By Kensil Bell)

Inspired by the deeds of the United States Coast Guard in the Solomon Islands landings, the African invasion, and the Sicilian campaign, enthusiastic war correspondents have been cabling home something like this: "Our Coast Guard men are no longer merely shallow-water sailors."

The correspondents intend a compliment, of course. Yet they show themselves—like most Americans—uninformed on the history and duties of this oldest United States naval service. For the Coast Guard has been a blue-water force since the first days of the Republic. What is more, it has burned its share of powder in every major American conflict.

Confronted with a job of smuggler-busting and customs-collecting, Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, founded the Coast Guard back in 1790. Congress had passed a law, on July 31, 1789, authorizing "the collection of duties * * * on the tonnage of ships or vessels, and on goods, wares, and merchandises imported into the United States." Boats could be used for enforcing this law, Congress said, but it neglected to provide funds for building them.

Almost a year later Secretary Hamilton wrote to Congress and pointed out that "there are persons concerned in trade, in every country, who will, if they can, evade public duties for their private benefit." To thwart such people in the United States the Secretary asked for $10,000 to build a fleet of 10 boats measuring 36 to 40 feet in length, each armed with swivel guns, and manned by a captain, a lieutenant, and 6 seamen.

The appropriation which Hamilton needed came through on August 4, 1790. Congress spoke of the boats as revenue cutters and designated their officers as officers of the customs with power to board every ship arriving in the United States or within 4 leagues of the coast and bound for its shores. The officers were to make a thorough search of the incoming vessels, certify their manifests, fasten their hatches and all other communications with their holds, and remain with them until they docked.

The little fleet of cutters showed the country a worth-while profit from the beginning. During their first calendar year at sea, they helped collect more than $3,000,000 in revenue—three times the average annual revenue for each of the three preceding years. But this peacetime occupation was shortly supplemented by combat duty.

When trouble with France showed on the horizon in 1797 Congress authorized an increase in the complement of any cutter to 30 marines and seamen for defending the seacoast and repelling hostilities to herself and commerce. Thus, for a period of 9 months—until the creation of the Navy Department on April 30, 1798—the revenue cutters sailed as the first and only combat force under the United States flag.

The actual rupture with France soon found the cutters *Pickering, Governor Jay, Eagle, General Greene, Diligence, Virginia, Scammel,* and *South Carolina* under Navy orders. Their complements then stood at 50, 70, and 90 men. Ranging from 98 to 187 tons, they mounted 10 to 14 four-pounders and six-pounders and comprised one-third of the United States Fleet at sea in 1798. Of the 84 sail captured during the war, they accounted for 18, which they took single-handed or in concert with the heavier naval vessels.

During the early months of the French difficulty the cutters served with the Navy solely upon the authority of President Adams. For no law defined the relationship between the Treasury Fleet and the Navy. Early in 1799, however, Congress confirmed the Chief Executive's action and decreed that the cutters should cooperate with the Navy whenever the President directed. This law has never been rescinded, although the cutters have always returned to the Treasury at the end of every national emergency.

When the War of 1812 commenced nine cutters immediately dropped their Treasury duties for naval cooperation. The first capture of the war came within a week, the British brig *Patriot* taken by the cutter *Jefferson.* The cutter *Madison* reached Savannah a few days later with "the fine British brig *Shamrock* of 300 tons, 6 guns, and 16 men" and immediately followed this by bringing in the schooner *Wade,* carrying $20,000 in specie. So it went throughout the war. Yet the cutters suffered losses, too. The *Eagle,* overwhelmed by three men-of-war after a day and night of fighting on Long Island Sound, and the *Surveyor* successfully boarded during a heavy fog near Gloucester Point, Va.

At the outbreak of the Seminole War, President Jackson ordered eight cutters to the Florida coast. Their duties with the Navy and Army included dispatch-carrying, troop-transport, convoying prison ships, carrying refugees to safety, and hauling provisions and ammunition—in addition to combat. Part of the *Jefferson's* record gives some idea of the strenuous work. During one period of 100 days, she spent 73 at sea.

Hostilities with Mexico in 1846 found seven cutters at a rendezvous in the Gulf to aid the Navy. Before the war ended, Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, United States Navy, was commending the cuttermen's gallantry and skill under fire.

Forty-six cutters saw service at various times during the Civil War. The *Harriet Lane,* for example, accompanied the Sumter relief expedition in April 1861, and later participated in the attack on Fort Clark and Fort Hatteras which brought the first Union victory of the war. The *Naugatuck* aided the *Monitor* against the *Merrimac* and afterward led an unsuccessful expedition up the James River in an attempt to take Richmond. The *Miami* served as President Lincoln's personal transport on several occasions, and covered the landing of troops at Willoughby's Point. Among those standing blockage duty were the *Hercules, Hope, Phillip Allen* and *Agassiz.*

Twenty cutters reported for combat when the Nation armed to the battle cry of "Remember the *Maine!*" The *McCulloch* has become the best known of these through her service with Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay. The *Windom,* on one occasion at least, earned a "well done" for her conduct in action; and the *Hudson* received Presidential commendation for "special gallantry in the face of a most galling fire."

During the First World War, Coast Guard officers held command duty with the Navy, aboard combat craft and transports, and at air stations. Six cutters served as convoy escorts between Great Britain and Gibraltar. One of these—the *Tampa,* with 115 officers and men—became the greatest single naval loss sustained by the United States in World War I when a German torpedo sent her down virtually without trace.

The peacetime record of the Coast Guard is no less impressive than its war record. Almost from its inception, the service has been a Government handyman, although the saving of life and property at sea has now become one of its chief duties in addition to its antismuggling work.

In 1799, Congress ordered the officers of the customs to enforce the quarantine laws of the various States while they were also acting for the Treasury aboard incoming vessels. Combating piracy, suppressing the slave trade, and protecting the Nation's live-oak supply also became regular, full-time assignments in the early years of the nineteenth century. Winter cruising along the Atlantic coast, for the relief of vessels and crews distressed by severe weather, had its start in 1831 and continues to this day.

The cutter *Lincoln* was the first Government vessel to visit Alaska after the purchase in 1867. Other cutters going northward in the years immediately following made invaluable contributions to the exploration of the Territory. The Bering Sea patrol is an outgrowth of these early voyages. Cruising approximately 75,000 miles during the ice-free season, the cutters detailed to the patrol carry out a varied mission—protection of fisheries, birds, and fur-bearing animals including sea otters and the Pribilof Islands fur seals; medical and dental aid for natives; judiciary service; hydrographic development; boarding vessels for routine safety inspections; transporting Government agents and supplies.

The international ice patrol is another Coast Guard duty. Inaugurated after the sinking of the *Titanic* in 1912, it has halted the loss of life through berg collisions on the North Atlantic.

Further peacetime Coast Guard duties include assistance to anyone in distress—or likely to be distressed—ashore, afloat, or aloft; enforcement of the Whaling Treaty Act and the Oil Pollution Act; patrolling marine parades and regattas; the maintenance of more than 30,000 lights, buoys, radio beacons, and other aids to marine navigation; supervising the anchorage and movements of vessels in United States harbors; destroying or removing derelicts and other hazards to navigation; maintaining weather-observation stations at sea; relieving the flood-stricken on the western waters.

The annual report of service activities for 1939—the last normal, peacetime year—shows more than 9,000 instances of lives saved and vessels assisted. The value of these vessels, including their cargoes, totaled more than $63,000,000. Other instances of assist-

ance to persons in peril, including many lives actually saved, numbered 10,615.

The present-day Coast Guard is a consolidation of three services: Alexander Hamilton's cutter fleet, the Lifesaving Service, and the Lighthouse Service. The Lifesaving Service originated in the Treasury in 1848. It was largely administered by officers relieved from cutter duty—until it became a separate service in 1871. In 1915 the Cutter Service and Lifesaving Service were combined as the United States Coast Guard. The Lighthouse Service, dating from 1789, also originated in the Treasury. It later transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor—and then to the Department of Commerce. In 1939 the lighthouses returned to the Treasury to become part of the Coast Guard.

Today, as in all of our previous wars, the Coast Guard is operating under the Navy Department by direction of the President—and has been since November 1, 1941. This does not mean that the Service has lost its identity. In fact, Secretary Knox has ordered that the bureaus of the Navy Department are to have no responsibility in connection with Coast Guard administration. The Service simply has become a temporary division of the Office of Chief of Naval Operations under the Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet.

A statement by Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Coast Guard Commandant, helps clarify the relationship of the Coast Guard to the Navy in wartime. In the Commandant's words, the transfer of the Service is not "just a case of throwing into the Navy that many more men, ships, and stations." Instead, it is largely a means of strengthening the fleet with specialized personnel and equipment which the Navy has neither the time nor the necessity to develop during peace. For example, on June 3, 1941, the Navy received 2,100 Coast Guard officers and men to train its personnel in small-boat handling, fully man 4 transports, and serve as boat crews aboard 22 others.

Another instance of Coast Guard usefulness to the Navy occurred during the days of neutrality patrol. Several cutters shared the duty in Greenland waters with the Navy. For Coast Guard officers, men, and ships were especially fitted for service in those northern regions due to the experience obtained through years on ice patrol.

Coast Guard personnel totaled approximately 23,000 officers and men on December 7, 1941. This has since grown to 151,200, including the women's reserve designated as SPARS—a name derived by combining the first letters of the words in the Latin and English versions of the Coast Guard motto: Semper paratus, always ready. Cutters in service numbered in the neighborhood of 300. The largest class, measuring 327 feet, carried 200 officers and men. Other classes measured 240 feet down to 75 feet. These were supplemented by picketboats, fireboats, tugs, tenders, lightships, and almost 3,000 small boats. The air arm was flying approximately 55 planes—mostly land-based, although each of the 327-foot cutters carried a small observation plane.

By the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, virtually all Coast Guard craft suited for combat were on a wartime footing, euipped with such armament as 5-inch guns, 3-inch antiaircraft guns, machine guns, depth-charge racks, and Y and K guns for projecting depth charges.

Also, by the time the Japanese struck in the Pacific, coast guardsmen were long accustomed to a constant alert. For, from the outbreak of European hostilities in September 1939, they had played a major role in enforcing the Neutrality Act, patrolling the Nation's 40,000 miles of seacoast and inland waterways on watch for fifth columnists; supervising and docking, loading, and sailing of belligerents' vessels; cruising offshore in search of submarines.

Today, the service is contributing more to the country than at any time in its 153-year history. Coast guardsmen on foot, on horseback, and in jeeps maintain a constant lookout along the seacoast. These men are chiefly based at the lifesaving stations which have done valiant work in rescuing torpedoed merchant sailors. Watchmen at aircraft plants and shipyards are enlisted in the Temporary Coast Guard Reserve. Waterfront security is entirely in Coast Guard hands. It prevents fire and sabotage; supervises the loading of explosives; supervises warehousing; fingerprints and identifies water-front civilian workers; polices the going and coming of commercial deep-sea fishermen; embarks troops; inspects cargo carriers. Regular and Reserve members are being invaluably aided in many of these duties by the Coast Guard Volunteer Port Security Force and Coast Guard Auxiliary which are composed of civilians serving on a part-time basis.

Much Coast Guard activity, therefore, is centered ashore at home, yet there is probably an equal amount offshore and overseas. A Coast Guard Patrol Bomber Squadron flies above enemy territory. Cutters and planes along the Atlantic coast share in the anti-submarine patrol and rescue of torpedo victims. Convoys plodding to Russia, England, and Africa find a clear track through the watchfulness and marksmanship of Coast Guard cutters. When invasions come landing barges and transports are manned by Coast Guardsmen.

It was Coast Guardsman John C. Cullen who discovered the Nazi saboteurs put ashore on Long Island by a German U-boat. It was Coast Guardsman Douglas A. Munro who gave his life to rescue almost 500 marines from a precarious position during the Solomons invasion. It was a Coast Guard cutter—the *Icarus*—which captured 33 Nazi submariners after her gunfire sent their U-boat on its last dive off the Carolina coast. Another cutter—the *Spencer*—bagged 40 more Germans after a running gunfight with their sub, which tried to give her the slip by dodging through the convoy it planned to attack. The *George W. Campbell* fought six U-boats within 12 hours and finally made a definite kill by ramming the last one she met. Dispatches from Africa, Sicily, and the Aleutians mention, among others, Lt. Comdr. R. R. Smith, Lt. Ivet L. Logan, Chief Boatswain's Mates Hunter Wood and William G. Lawrence, Gunner's Mate Donald E. Burns—some of the many Coast Guardsmen who have distinguished themselves in the drives against enemy-held beaches—and these are only a few of the officers, men, and ships who have shown once more that shallow water and deep water are the same to the United States Coast Guard.

Why Discriminate Against American-Flag Air Carriers in Providing Equipment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, in a statement recently issued by the Minister of Munitions and Supply of the Canadian Government, we find the following passage:

The building of the Alaska Highway was the cause of great activity in air transport in a territory that was being served by Canadian Pacific Airlines, and that company was assisted by the United States Army in obtaining new and modern airplanes, from United States sources, with the result that the equipment of the company was augmented considerably at a time when all other air lines on this continent found it impossible to buy new equipment.

In other words, it is revealed that at a time when our own air lines found it impossible to secure new equipment the Canadian Pacific Airlines was furnished new and modern airplanes in numbers which augmented considerably that air line's fleet. And this occurred despite the fact that one of our own air lines was operating between this country and Alaska, able to serve the territory through which the Alaska Highway was constructed.

Furthermore our own Civil Aeronautics Board some months ago authorized a number of foreign-flag air lines to operate into Miami, serving the Caribbean region, on the ground that those air lines had airplanes with which they could render necessary service and that our own air lines did not have available sufficient equipment to render the service which our national interest required in the Caribbean region.

It is strange indeed that foreign-flag air lines should thus receive benefits from this Government at a time when our own air-transport system has been literally starved for new airplanes. Our air lines are unable to carry essential passengers and cargo because of lack of space. Every day the situation becomes more acute and more harmful to the progress of our war effort.

Announcement has just been made that our domestic air lines will be permitted to acquire nine new airplanes, a modest number indeed in the face of the dire need for air transportation. But at the same time it is indicated that special Presidential approval will have to be secured before any more airplanes can be allocated to our domestic air lines. Apparently some kind of ceiling has been imposed upon the number of airplanes which our domestic air lines can secure. It appears that this ceiling was imposed shortly after Pearl Harbor. Why any such ceiling should continue to be in effect is difficult to understand. Conditions today are far different from the conditions prevailing immediately after Pearl Harbor.

But it is even more difficult to understand why our own air lines should be denied airplanes at a time when our Government is extending privileges such as those indicated to foreign-flag air lines. Something is amiss somewhere which should be corrected and corrected promptly.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to me

under date of April 18, 1944, from Mr. John L. Bogert, associate editor of the Marine Journal, concerning the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal project:

MARINE JOURNAL,
New York, April 18, 1944.

The Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Patents,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The action of the House of Representatives in leaving out of current rivers and harbors bill item relating to Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal was disaster, in my judgment.

For the last 10 years I have devoted much time to a study of transportation economies, especially in relation to living costs of the people. Those studies convince me that only after we have developed our waterways to the limit will all our people achieve a higher standard of living.

As long as products of farms and mines must depend upon railroad transportation to reach our coasts, a higher standard of living for farmers, miners, and countless others will be impossible. The reason? A rail rate structure which cannot average much below a cent a ton-mile.

Utilizing waterways wherever possible mean rates for ores, grains, and other bulk materials as low as 1 mill a ton-mile, only one-tenth of what railroads must exact or go bankrupt. Even at rates which have existed, $4,000,000,000 worth of railroad bonds have defaulted out of a total of some $19,000,000,000 invested in railroad securities.

Argentina lives on export of farm products to Europe. Distance to channel ports is about 7,200 miles. Freight rate for grain is, in peacetime, $5 a ton, or seven-tenths of a mill a ton-mile. With rail rates from wheat-growing regions of the West superimposed on ocean rate from Atlantic seaboard to channel ports, we cannot possibly compete with Argentina. Through use of improved Missouri, Ohio, Mississippi, and other rivers, the bulk of grain movement from the West to channel ports could be almost wholly over waterways. Then our farmers could compete with wheat growers in any other part of the world. Connected, the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers, flowing through industrial heart of South, would yield incalculable benefits.

Yours very truly,

JOHN L. BOGERT,
Associate Editor.

Development and Regulation of Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station KADA, Ada, Okla., and Station KYFF, Shawnee, Okla., April 19, 1944:

One of the sorest cancers in our body politic has been the discrimination against the Southland in our railroad rate structure. Whatever the historic excuses for this discrimination, it should now be apparent to all that the economic power of one section of our people cannot be kept in a state of subjection by any such unnatural and unfair device.

We are now on the threshold of a new development in transportation, the development of an air-transport system which will contribute to the efforts of every section of our Nation to attain increased prosperity and a richer enjoyment of the great resources with which God has blessed our country.

After a year of work, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has presented to the House a carefully framed bill to modernize and perfect our legislation for the future development and regulation of civil aviation.

Symptomatic at once of the care and fairness with which the committee has drafted this bill, and of a determination that the ills of our surface-transport system shall not be permitted to infect our new system of air transportation, is a provision which the committee has included in this bill designed to forestall the possibility of sectional discriminations in the future rate structure for air commerce. This bill provides for an amendment to the declaration of policy in the Civil Aeronautics Act stating that the act shall be so administered as to provide for "the regulation of air commerce * * * so that its advantages will be available, so far as practicable, to all points on fair and uniform terms and without discrimination." Here, for the first time in transportation legislation, there would be definite provision by Congress forestalling the possibility of sectional discriminations which keep one region under an unfair and unjust economic burden.

The civil aviation bill carries out the theory that if air transportation is to be developed according to its inherent advantages and so as to confer greatest benefits upon our country, reasonable uniformity of regulation, prevention of artificial barriers, and assurance against regional discrimination, should be the essential objectives of Federal legislation. If there are selfish interests who would oppose the growth of air transportation, their ends can most effectively be gained by combatting this theory. For my part, however, I believe that the public interest will best be served, and that our future security and welfare will most effectively be promoted, by taking action now, during the infancy of air transportation, that will save it from the artificial restraints which have plagued other forms of transportation.

Fortunately in the case of air transportation, the system has so far developed on a basis providing uniform service and uniform rates under uniform conditions throughout the nation in commerce within States and between States, and within sections and between sections. This essential characteristic of the air-transport system, as we now know it, must be preserved for the future. The civil aviation bill is written with that end in view. And if that theory guides us now and in the future in providing for the regulation of air transportation, we will go far toward assuring for every American, wherever he may live, the advantages and the benefits of the swiftest of all forms of transportation on fair and equal terms.

To no State is this objective more essential than to the State of Oklahoma. Blessed with a central location in our great commonwealth of States, blessed also with weather and terrain ideal for aviation development, only man-made restrictions can prevent us here from enjoying the fullest development of air transportation. Especially to our farmers, that development will bring a new outlet for commerce. Markets in distant States will be brought close to us. Indeed, the trade of the whole world can be brought to the doorstep of every farmer and merchant in Oklahoma if we but keep our air routes free of artificial barriers and discriminations.

Change WAC Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

Col. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Director, Women's Army Corps,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL HOBBY: We applaud your efforts to bring the Women's Army Corps to its authorized strength of 200,000 and we wish you full measure of success in this regard.

Wherever possible, we have been stressing the urgency of expanding this corps. There has been noticeable, however, a considerable lag in enlistment. I venture the assertion that the Army could use a minimum of 600,000. Indeed, General Marshall states that the ranks of the WAC's must be increased tenfold. The Air Forces have said they must have 100,000 additional WAC's to serve on domestic airfields. Thousands more are wanted for overseas duty.

May I offer a suggestion which might aid in the recruiting of more young women? Is it naive to assume that the drabness of the WAC uniform, perhaps, dulls the edge of an enthusiastic prospective recruit? In conversations with numerous WAC's, I am told that their uniforms are far from inspiring, that they lack distinction, and are, frankly, drab and uninviting.

Olive drab material might be essential for combat purposes in men's uniforms. It offers proper resistance to inclement weather and can stand the stresses and strains and is adaptable for camouflage purposes. But WAC's will not enter the active combat or battle zones, although they may enter the theaters of operation. Most will remain in the United States. Many will be on duty in the United States, Australia, or China, but, in most instances, will be far removed from actual combat. Therefore, the same reason for the drab uniform does not obtain as in the case of the male soldier.

Must we not recognize the femininity of the problem? "Equality of uniform" seems unwise. May not the drop in enlistment be, in part, due to the lack of military pertness in the articles of clothing including caps, stockings, and shoes?

It is natural for the WAC to desire to look attractive. She cannot satisfy that craving with the unsuitable, undistinguished apparel granted her. Even girls in bright slacks and colored scarf and blouse in the war plants seem coruscant in comparison. Girls operating elevators regaled in brightly colored uniforms seem more alive. Give any girl an outward attractive appearance and you immediately create an inner self of higher morale.

This is, by no means, any disparagement of the WAC now in service. Despite the handicap of dull clothing, they are doing a spendid job. All power to them, but may we not even boost their present accomplishments with more self-expression in apparel. Let them feel that they look better than a brigade of ciphers.

CONVERT CINDERELLA INTO THE PRINCESS

It is not my purpose to make the WAC's appear as drum majors in a circus or to convert the corps into a Mardi Gras festival. They might well look piquant yet dignified, stern yet charming, but the present lack of

sparkle in uniform places them under a handicap. Even the cap is stiff and fails to flatter. It has not even a little piping, cord of trimming, or a seam of color. I am told it likewise is uncomfortable.

Pretty soon we will see the summer uniform. On a hot day, after a short time, it becomes completely rumpled and shapeless.

In comparison with the WAC uniform behold the apparel of the Red Cross nurse. Her navy blue cloak with red facing, white dress, and blue hat suit her admirably and she wears it with proud distinction. The uniform of the United States Marine Corps Women's Reserve emphasizes the shortcomings of the WAC uniform. Those of the WAVES and SPARS, while not perfect, are far more attractive, in my humble masculine opinion, as are those of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps.

Of course, there will be considerable expense in effecting a change of uniform. However, the expense will be inconsequential if you can recruit your full quota.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Tenth Congressional District, New York.

Air Transportation and Its Role in Our Future National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested at this time in trying to visualize the potentialities of air transportation in the years to come. In this connection I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the following remarks on this subject made by Edgar S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America, over the Mutual Broadcasting system on April 2 during the program entitled "Wide Horizons":

What does air transportation mean in the years ahead of us for American farmers and merchants and workmen and housewives and children?

It means a closer unity for our country. It means news opportunities for pleasure at faraway points brought nearby. It means new channels of trade for communities hitherto limited by the slow pace of surface transport. It means new careers, new jobs, a new source of stimulation for our whole economy. It means bringing the markets of the whole world next door to every American farm and village and city.

But it means something more than all that. It means a fresh guaranty of national security in a world which requires such guaranties as long as the lust of conquest lurks in the hearts of men.

After this war the Army and Navy will go back to a peacetime basis. Perhaps that basis will not be as inadequate as in the past, but in the nature of things they will not be equipped to stamp out distant threats to our security unless they have always available an air transport complement ready for instantaneous action. Such a complement provides the transport wings which can bring our Army's and Navy's force to bear upon danger points.

Our civil air lines have provided that emergency complement in the past. In the future it will be more than ever their duty to do so. Always geared to go into action anytime and anywhere on the earth's surface, bearing critical troops and matériel, our air line system will add their bit to real security for America.

Take Heed for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the war is not won. But it is so nearly won that it is high time we gave some thought to what must follow.

Today both production and consumption are at the peak. Tomorrow, with the close of the war, consumption will decline and production must decline with it. When war consumption is over, war production is over. Industry has already discounted the drop. In every industrial center groups of men have been planning for months for the inevitable end of the war boom. But on the farm front every energy is being devoted to maximum production, with no thought of tomorrow.

As a result farm products are being piled up in record-breaking quantities never approached before. Every warehouse, elevator, refrigerator, and cold-storage plant is filled to capacity. Even the arteries of transportation are congested until another car cannot be loaded until a corresponding car is emptied.

Our national food problem is not scarcity but surpluses. We are shipping more hogs than the packers can process. We are marketing more eggs than the plants can store. We have produced more cattle than we can feed.

We began the current year with half a billion pounds of frozen fruits. That is a year's supply and another crop is now coming on. Canned and dried and salted products are stored in like quantities. Never were there such mountains of food as are on hand today all the way from the farm to the front. The War Food Administration has a $500,000,000 operating stock pile of food. Every Army and Navy quartermaster's depot is piled to capacity with reserve stocks of food of every character. At the close of the war the Government will own $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus food that will have to be thrown on the market in competition with the huge supplies held by the Nation-wide chain-store system, and the 1945 crops at that time coming into harvest. The stored surpluses are too large to be fed into the market without demoralizing prices. There will be no market abroad because every European and Asiatic nation will be destitute. They will have nothing with which to buy. We have most of the gold and silver in the world piled up at Fort Knox and West Point, and they will have nothing with which to buy. The result will be indescribable. The debacle which followed the last war will be as a summer zephyr to a hurricane.

There is only one recourse. The Government must maintain the same legislative floor under farm wages and prices it is maintaining under industrial wages and prices. There is no alternative. Any other course means a return to the $2 hogs, 30-cent wheat, 5-cent cotton, 12-cent corn, and 6-cent eggs of the last post-war period.

That is what short-sighted interests which exploit agriculture are headed for. But 1920 should have taught even the exploiters a lesson. When the farmer can no longer buy, the merchant can no longer sell; when the merchant cannot sell, the factory cannot operate; and when the factory closes down, neither labor nor management has a job. Inevitably the conflagration started on the farm spreads to the cities and eventually the entire Nation is engulfed as in the last depression. Only through the maintenance of fair prices and the preservation of an American standard of living, on the farm as well as in the cities, can the Nation prosper. There must be parity prices in the field and the feed lot to preserve parity wages and dividends in the factory and the shop.

But to maintain prices you must control production. To attempt to insure prices without limiting production is to be drowned in wheat, smothered in cotton, overwhelmed with livestock, and flooded with vast surpluses of every supported farm commodity. No amount of legislation or legerdemain can maintain prices on glutted markets. For example, it is the abundance of food and not price ceilings that has kept the cost of living down. If you entertain any doubt about it look at the recent slump in the price of eggs. The ceiling on eggs is 75 cents per dozen but in the face of an oversupply there has been the greatest difficulty in maintaining the price at even 30 cents per dozen, and on days of heavy shipments it has dipped as low as 19 cents.

Those who loudly demand unlimited production and decry scarcity production and who affect to see in the application to agriculture of the same measured economy they themselves practice, a regimentation of agriculture, are advocating serfdom and peonage on the farm in order to load the tables of the cities with a superabundance at less than the cost of production. We cannot continue wartime production when wartime demand is past. We must necessarily discontinue wartime production when war markets close. To think of unlimited crop production in the post-war period is insanity.

American agriculture must return to crop-production control as soon as the last gun is fired, if not before. Agriculture, like every other industry, must produce only the amount needed to supply the demand. The smallest percentage above that amount will surfeit the market and leave the farmer at the mercy of the buyer—a mercy which in the last

few years has been a cross between the rapacity of a shark and a termite.

We must begin to plan immediately a post-war crop-control program. How can such a program be best effectuated? The Agricultural Adjustment Agency is the ideal agency. It operated successfully and satisfactorily before the war. It has the organization and the program; it has the experience and the personnel. It is a going concern. Although the duties connected with acreage admeasurement and checking compliance have been temporarily discontinued, it is contributing to agricultural rehabilitation and is in a position to resume crop-control operations on short notice, as indicated in the following letter just received in this morning's mail:

DEAR MR. CANNON: We believe that the Congress of the United States should be interested in the activities of the various county agricultural conservation associations functioning under the A. A. A., and we use this means of reporting such activities for St. Charles County, Mo., through the year 1943.

The elected members of the county committee, together with 18 elected community committeemen and 4 employed office clerks, have shared the responsibility and work in the following:

Made personal contact on the farm with 2,173 owners or operators to assist in preparing the 1943 war-production plan, advising increased production, suggesting production of special war crops, and advising prevention of erosion and maintenance of soil fertility. As a result of this planning, as evidenced by complete reports by farmers at arranged meetings with committeemen, again in personal contact, 1,975 farms representing 86 percent of the total farms in the county, all war-crop goals were met and production increased over the previous year, except where production was lost due to river flood.

On 550 farms, 5,095 hundredweight of 20 percent phosphate and 3,475 hundredweight of mixed fertilizers were used to supply added plant food to obtain increased production. Of this amount, 3,198 hundredweight was distributed by direct aid through the conservation materials program of the association.

On 675 farms, 20,729 tons of ground limestone were applied to correct acidity and supply calcium for growing legumes to build and maintain soil fertility and increase production. Of this amount, 5,373 tons were distributed by direct aid through the conservation materials program of the association.

On 758 farms, 9,802 acres of clover were plowed down as green manure crops.

On 240 farms 2,736 acres of permanent pastures were mowed sufficient number of times to destroy weed growth.

On 484 farms 4,678 acres of hay seed was harvested to supplement diminished supply of available seed.

On 133 farms 1,672 acres of lespedeza was incorporated into the soil to stimulate increased production and prevent erosion.

On 95 farms 2,165 acres of small-grain crops were contoured for the same purpose.

On 39 farms 4,855 pounds of pasture grasses and legumes were seeded to improve permanent pasture stands.

On 17 farms 16,576 cubic yards of earth were moved to construct permanent dams for livestock water.

On 26 farms 79,600 linear feet of standard terraces were constructed to conserve moisture and control erosion.

On 27 farms 27,670 cubic yards of earth were moved in constructing farm ditches to remove surplus surface water to increase production.

On 7 farms 81 acres of alfalfa was renovated to secure better growth and longer life for the stand.

On 16 farms 137 acres of small grain, used as winter cover crops, were plowed down as green manure.

Other practices are also listed, too numerous to mention in this report. Sharing in these practices on these farms were 2,519 owners and operators; and of this number, 2,516 cooperated fully, only 3 having refused.

Under the Federal crop-insurance program, we serviced 506 wheat contracts. Claims for indemnity by 479 applicants received a total of 145,002 bushels of wheat to compensate for losses by flood and, in a few cases, excessive rain and winter kill.

In administering the dairy-feed program 1,027 subsidy-payment applications were approved and sight drafts issued for production of 26,188 hundredweight of whole milk and 75,288 pounds of butterfat for October, November, and December.

Assistance was given to 401 truckers in preparing applications for "certificates of war necessity" for transporting farm products, and recommending approval, by the transportation committee, with triple-A committeemen as chairmen.

Under farm-machinery rationing, purchase certificates were issued for 58 tractors, 53 tractor plows, 64 tractor cultivators, 23 combines, 16 corn pickers, 18 corn planters, 14 manure spreaders, 38 mowers, 18 hammer mills, 31 peg and spring tooth harrows, 40 disk harrows, 10 grain drills, 10 soil pulverizers, 13 side delivery rakes, 9 hay balers, and 174 certificates on other equipment such as corn shellers, corn binders, milking machines, and other items.

Recommending approval on applications for farm building, rationing of lumber, electrical equipment, and copper wire when used for farm production.

Meat-slaughter permits were approved for 47 farm slaughterers to permit sale of dressed meat in compliance with their 1941 practice.

Checked farm production and made recommendations on applications for tires and for nonhighway gasoline. Conservative estimate is more than 3,000 applications checked in 1943.

Supplied information of farm production on applications for agricultural deferments to the selective service board.

The community committeemen who are actual farmers in various parts of the county are leaders in conservation practices on their farms, particularly the better mechanical practices, and these practices are rapidly spreading throughout the county with their help, as they have had special training in use of transit to lay out terrace and contour lines.

Because of the wealth of information which reaches the association office due to the numerous contacts with farmers of the county the office is called upon by most farmers for every type of information pertaining to better farming.

Tabulation of calls, etc., is considered impractical; however, a tabulation was made for March of 1943. It was determined that 616 farmers made personal calls at the office for information, 94 persons not farmers called for information and assistance on the various rationing programs, 204 individual letters received from farmers were answered, and 294 phone calls requesting information relative to agricultural problems were handled through this 1 month. A conservative estimate would be an average of 25 personal visits, 10 individual mail contacts, and 20 phone contacts per day, which does not include contacts by farmers with committeemen at their homes. While we know such contacts are numerous we hesitate to estimate the number, while we are conscious of their value.

Three circular letters were mailed throughout the year each to more than 3,000 farm owners or operators. Five form letters pertaining to special phases of the program each mailed to more than 1,500 cooperating farm owners and operators.

Requests for seed, fertilizer, and feeds are among the numerous services handled through the office from listings of such commodities, and in some cases samples are left at the office.

Requests pertaining to various erosion and soil-improvement practices are answered from experiences of other farmers who willingly cooperate by giving such information. Sufficient data are available in the association office as evidence to the fact that St. Charles County farmers (whether they participate in the triple A program or not, and no coercion was ever used in this county to secure association membership) are using their Agricultural Conservation Association for the benefit of agriculture and the Nation, and that the elected committeemen and their office personnel are rendering a valuable service.

Very truly yours,

ANTON J. BOSCHERT,
Chairman, St. Charles County Agricultural Conservation Association, St. Charles, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, we are already talking of domiciling returning soldiers on farms and financing them in crop and livestock production through loans made on favorable terms and convenient amortizations. I hope it can be done. It will assist in the solution of post-war employment and will contribute both to individual and national prosperity.

But there must be some assurance of permanency and success. To sell our soldiers farms and encourage them to invest their future in agriculture and then knock the bottom out of the price of everything they produce, as we did for the soldiers who came back to the farm from the last war, will be the sorriest deception ever practiced in the history of legislative chicanery.

If we place them on farms we must, in all fairness—and in appreciation of the service they have rendered their country in its hour of need—assure them an honest wage for their labor, a fair return on their investment, and a parity price for their products. To do that we must put a floor under prices and restrict production to the normal demands of our foreign and domestic markets—the markets for which our farms must produce after our war plants close and our armies demobilize and our boys come back to start life anew.

Farmers National Union and Our Post-War Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the National Farmers Union presents a philos-

ophy on our foreign policy that clearly indicates that we should make a Herculean effort to stabilize world peace, and avoid in the future a disastrous war such as we experienced in 1917 and are now experiencing. This philosophy is clear cut and drives to the point without "ifs" and without "reservations." If we start in on reservations we shall soon reserve the entire policy out of existence. I submit herewith the full text of the statement coming from the Farmers National Union:

POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY

All the world is looking forward to a peace which goes beyond the mere cessation of hostilities and becomes a thing lived, enjoyed, and depended upon by the great mass of people everywhere. To attain such a peace we must follow these guides:

1. The future welfare of the world demands active participation of the United States in world affairs. This participation must be economic, social, and cultural, as well as diplomatic. We must give world leadership to a movement aimed at eliminating trade barriers, thus expanding the flow of goods and services among nations. As means for accomplishing this end, we should participate in world organizations to stabilize currencies, properly direct the flow of international investments and materials, and regulate international shipping.

2. Although we have placed first emphasis upon economic, social, and cultural collaboration with other countries, it will also be necessary to have some form of international organization of nations whose primary aim is to prevent military aggression.

3. One of the main contributions we can make to the stability and security of the world is to run our own economy at capacity levels of production and be willing to trade with other countries. Our economic conditions at home will have tremendous repercussions throughout the world. The maintenance of peace in a prosperous world is much easier than in a world beset with depression and unemployment. Moreover, the maintenance of prosperity in this country is a large and important factor in maintaining world prosperity.

WORK OUT THE PEACE NOW

Basic considerations that will have to be faced in the making of the peace need examination now, so that policy may be formulated and proclaimed now. Areas of agreement in the organization of peace must be worked out now. By so doing we will speed victory and make genuine peace easier to achieve.

First, as an indispensable prime necessity, we, as a people and a government, must develop an understanding of, and better working relations with, our allies and with the peoples and the legitimate governments of the countries now under Axis control. We cannot afford to maintain an arms-length attitude of fear, suspicion, and fatal hesitation toward our allies and the people we are pledged to liberate.

We have come of age in world affairs. We must accept and discharge adult responsibilities with good will and decision. We must deal with other peoples as equals, neither as inferiors to be exploited nor as superiors who might outwit us. We must deal as equals with England and the British Dominions, China, Russia, the French, and, no less, with the smaller peoples whose contributions to our civilization, notably in the fields of cooperation, practical democracy and culture, have been and one day will again be as important as any furnished by larger nations who, through accident of geography, climate, and resources, have greater material power. Russia is, and will be, a great world power. An understanding with this people is essential to peace. Such an understanding need imply no judgment by either nation on the government of the other.

Second. Essential to the building of an enduring peace is recognition that all men belong to a single human race. Were the peace to be a bill of denial to certain peoples because of color instead of a bill of rights, as set forth in the Atlantic Charter, then we should have laid the ground work for a third world war. Every agreement, indeed every act, of discrimination because of race by the dominant powers at home or abroad is a step toward a future war. Every agreement, every act of world neighborliness toward other races is a step toward a just and therefore lasting peace.

The Italian Campaign Should Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, because Mr. Theodore Terenchin, of Reading, Pa., has asked me to bring his recent letter to me to the attention of the House and Senate membership, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONORABLE SIR: While reading the morning paper, I saw an article by Representative SUMNER (Republican, Illinois) stating the Italian campaign as homicidal lunacy. It is hard to believe that one holding such an important post in the Government should make such a stupid, blundering statement. To give up the Italian campaign at this time, after all our efforts, would not only be the biggest American defeat in history, but it would be something the United States Government and the American public would never live down until eternity. If we have made some blunders, it is not due to the inefficiency of our military experts, but to the gigantic and far-flung scale of operations.

Representative SUMNER'S statement of restrictions of lend-lease to Russia is another example of her stupidity as a would-be diplomat and statesman. Perhaps she does not understand the definition of lend-lease. I do, and furthermore I make this statement: Every dollar our Government invests in lend-lease to Russia is the greatest investment our Government ever made to safeguard American lives and property. Lend-lease is not a contribution; it is an exchange of goods for a price. Therefore Russia is not obligated to us for anything. We in turn should thank our lucky stars to have such a powerful and fearless nation as an ally. If Russia would suddenly cease hostilities with Germany, and 250 divisions would be freed and turned against us (God forbid) I would be very much in doubt as to the outcome of this war, and our chances of winning would be very slim indeed.

My humble suggestion would be to start the western invasion as soon as possible and have our bombers and fighter planes just a little ahead of our invading armies. We know by experience that no war can be won by merely bombing from the air. We have only aerial photographic proof of the damage caused by our bombing raids. We are losing millions of dollars in bombs and planes, and hundreds of pilots which takes month or years to train, and so far no territory has been taken for our great effort. Who knows, perhaps most of our bombs are falling on decoys. Gentlemen, I do not profess to be a military expert, but to lose 60 bombers and 500 airmen on one bombing mission seems such a big price to pay. For what? However, I am glad that we have men in Washington that do not wear an iron cross, and in the future the American public would be served better by men using four-letter words who have eight-letter minds, instead of the opposite.

I sincerely wish that this humble letter be read during a session in Congress. Who knows, perhaps I am expressing my thoughts for millions of American citizens.

Respectfully yours,

THEODORE TERENCHIN.

Montgomery Ward

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] stated he is introducing a resolution to investigate why the Government has taken over Montgomery Ward & Co. I greatly deplore that it became necessary for the Government to take their plant over, the same as was done in the case of some of the coal mines, railroads, and industrial plants which have set themselves up above the Government.

Mr. Speaker, we all should be grateful that we have a Government that is able and does function. I know that the President and those connected with the administration, as well as the Congress, feels that the laws passed by Congress and the power given under the Constitution should be exercised whenever it becomes necessary.

I feel that this Government cannot afford to permit any individual, it matters not how clever, shrewd, or hardheaded he may be and regardless of the institution or corporation he represents, to set himself up above the Government and above the law of the land. Personally, I have seen this company grow from its infancy, the same as many other mail-order houses and chain stores, who believe themselves so great and powerful as to continue to demand of Congress legislation and protection and, at the same time, refuse to be bound by the action of the Congress and the authority vested in the Chief Executive.

With respect to the resolution introduced by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] it will in due time receive the consideration that it deserves, but I am hopeful and firmly believe that within a few days Mr. Avery will come off his high horse and will agree to carry on under the old agreement with the unions until such time as a union election will be had.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that only a few years ago Montgomery Ward & Co.

were in an extremely precarious financial position and had been losing a great deal of money, but due to the aid, protection, and assistance this Government has given them it is reported, notwithstanding the present rate of wages which was asked to be extended for a few months, that the net profit of the company last year was over $20,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, it is claimed that the Government has no jurisdiction in this matter and that the plant cannot be considered a war plant. However, is it not true that the company handles hundreds and hundreds of items which enter into war needs? But I shall not dwell on this further except to state that the action of Mr. Avery, president of Montgomery Ward & Co., will serve to focus the eyes of the American people upon these great mail-order houses and the three or four chain stores which have grown so tremendously at the expense of thousands upon thousands of small storekeepers and small businessmen that the demand for legislation to curb them, which the war stopped, will be renewed.

Checking the wages of employees in mail-order houses and chain stores, it is found that the wages are far below those paid in other businesses and industries in the United States. The group of employees working for the mail-order houses and chain stores surely falls into the category of underpaid white-collar workers whose wages average $22 to $24 a week.

An editorial appearing in the April 26 issue of the Washington Star fairly presents the issues, and under the leave given me I will insert it as part of my remarks. It senses the resentment of the American people to the unfair, bureaucratic position taken by Mr. Avery, president of Montgomery Ward, who also is a director of other large institutions, which, however, may have no direct connection with Montgomery Ward.

I appreciate that I will again be criticized by certain antiadministration newspapers, most of which represent the viewpoint of these big corporations and vested interests, but that will not deter me from expressing my views. The editorial is as follows:

UNREASONABLE STAND

The latest clash between the War Labor Board and Montgomery Ward turns on a small point, but it is one of those small affairs that is capable of causing a great deal of trouble.

During most of 1943 Montgomery Ward had a contract with the C. I. O. United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees' Union covering the employees in its Chicago mail-order establishment. In November of last year the company raised the question whether the union still represented a majority of its employees and refused to renew the contract when it expired in December pending proof of the validity of the union's claim to representation rights.

The case was referred to the W. L. B. and that agency directed Ward's to extend the life of the old contract pending an employee election, which the union was ordered to apply for within 30 days. The union asked for the election, which must be conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, but the company refused to extend the contract, and that resulted in a strike by union workers on the 12th of this month. The W. L. B. then referred the case to the President and the latter issued orders that the strikers return to work and that the company abide by the W. L. B. directions. This Presidential order has been complied with by the union, but the company has notified Mr. Roosevelt that it will not extend the contract, and this refusal presumably will result in the seizure of the business by the Government.

There are many aspects to this controversy. For one thing, the company has waged a long fight in the courts against the W. L. B. maintenance-of-union-membership orders, but the Board through a variety of legal maneuvers has been able to stall off a court test of the legality of these orders. This, to say the least, has not been productive of mutual good feeling. Then there may also be a serious question whether a concern like Montgomery Ward, which has no Government war contracts and which is not engaged in war production, comes within the scope of the President's war powers. But so far as the present controversy is concerned these are secondary considerations.

The order to extend the contract pending the election—the main issue now—is not an unreasonable one, for the extension would automatically expire if the election were to show that the union did not represent a majority of the employees. Had Ward's seen fit to comply with the order it does not appear that its position would have been prejudiced in any way. But if the company, by reason of its refusal to obey, now loses control of its business it will be prejudiced by the loss of any support in public opinion which it might otherwise have enjoyed.

McNary in Statuary Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial about the life and service of the late Senator McNary, which appeared in the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., on April 12, 1944:

M'NARY IN STATUARY HALL

In an article written for La Follette's Progressive of Madison, Wis., printed on this page today, Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, of Portland, suggests that the late Senator Charles L. McNary deserves a statue in National Statuary Hall. It is the closing sentence of a warmly appreciative article, and it deserves serious consideration.

National Statuary Hall occupies what was at one time the Chamber of the House of Representatives in the National Capitol, and it has many historical associations. Within its walls, Madison, Monroe, and Fillmore were inaugurated or took the oath as President of the United States. Webster and Lincoln both sat there as Members of Congress. There, in 1825, when no candidate for President had obtained a majority of the electoral college, the Members of the House chose John Quincy Adams as President over Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, and William H. Crawford. It was the scene of debates over the War of 1812, and the Mexican War and of the earlier controversies over slavery.

After the Capitol was enlarged, and a new Chamber for the House provided, the room was by act of Congress set aside in 1864 for reception and display of marble or bronze statues, not more than two in number to be contributed by each State, of deceased persons who had been citizens thereof, and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service.

About 50 statues have been contributed to the Hall but Oregon has never been represented therein. There is a statue in the Capitol of Col. Edward D. Baker who, after serving briefly as Senator from Oregon met heroic death in the Battle of Balls Bluff, but it was placed there by order of Congress and not as a State contribution to Statuary Hall.

Sporadically in the past names of Oregon men thought deserving of representation in the Statuary Hall have been suggested—James W. Nesmith, Joseph Lane, Matthew P. Deady, George H. Williams, and others. Their contributions to Oregon's welfare and progress are unquestioned, but we think of none whose renown was so nationalistic as that of Senator McNary or who drew such friendly regard and confidence without as well as within this State. And he was a native son.

O. P. A. Threatens to Destroy Swiss Cheese Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year the Swiss-cheese industry in the State of Wisconsin has been threatened by a proposed order of O. P. A. to eliminate grading of that product which has been in effect for more than 20 years under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture in the State of Wisconsin. If the proposed order is issued, it will in effect play into the hands of the cheese monopolies and destroy an industry that has been built by the farmers, most of whom reside in my congressional district in Green County, Wis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an editorial which appeared in the Monroe Evening Times of April 21, 1944:

CURRENT CHEESE COMMENT

More speculation goes on now about the future of the foreign type cheese industry than ever in its history, if the impressions of observers can be depended on.

There appears to be no doubt in any one's mind now that it is only a question of days until the State's system of grading Swiss cheeses will be knocked out by the ruling of O. P. A. that a single ceiling price shall be established, placing Swiss of all qualities on the same basis.

That in itself is the basis for the greater speculation, pointing largely toward a universal belief that the final shakeup will be that after the war, and maybe before, there will be fewer factories, and that larger plants will be established to take care of milk production, while the business goes under the ownership of a few larger concerns. What that will do to the industry is problematical now.

Whatever the outcome may be it is not questioned that the end of the days when the former good, wholesome, and rich Swiss was made may be in sight.

It is probable, according to the argument going on, that much of the Swiss production may be killed off in favor of some other variety, and that the total production may be shoved into processing channels instead of

going out into the counters of the country as good natural cheese.

During the whole history of the foreign type industry production has been an individual matter. It has been an individual business, with the quality of cheese produced depending greatly upon the skill of the maker, and his desire to make a good quality cheese, or upon his indifference to quality. Grading has tended to create improved quality, and it is feared that if it is done away with that quality will hit bottom very shortly.

There appears to be little doubt that doing away with the grade system will play into the hands of processors. Any quality can go into that sort of product, and it would not be surprising to see the prevailing price drop to a level comparable to that paid for the low quality now.

A. A. A. Committees in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the unselfish and outstanding work being done on the home front by the A. A. A. committees in Pennsylvania. I do so at this time particularly because of the partisan and unjustified attacks which have recently been made upon this organization. Constructive criticism is always welcome, but if these critics, both inside and outside the Congress, are sincere in their desire to correct faults in this agency, they should in all propriety await the results of a fair and impartial investigation of the alleged irregularities rather than undermine the confidence of the people in the management of the food front.

Undoubtedly, there are instances here and there where criticism is justified, but on the whole, the administration of A. A. A. in Pennsylvania is deserving of high praise. Of course, it is possible that an agency which must gage the farmer's use of gasoline in accordance with justified usage will arouse resentment among those few who hope to go joy riding on tractor gasoline. It is quite natural, also, that a farmer or two who want to indulge in luxury farming will resent the authority of machinery-rationing committees when they are refused a second tractor because some other farmer has a greater need for it. Or perhaps some farmer with a small war-production program will resent the fact that his son's appeal for a deferment is rejected by the same agency which reports favorably on a similar appeal by the son of a large war-food producer. Yes, criticism is bound to result in such cases. The A. A. A. committees of Pennsylvania have had a tough job, but they have performed their work admirably in spite of the gripers and the prophets of gloom.

It has been no small job for A. A. A. committees to review 16,000 cases of draft deferment in Pennsylvania and to render just and fair decisions as a result of their considered study and investigation. It has been no small job for these committees to pass judgment upon 100,000 applications for farm equipment and to spot these pieces of machinery on the farms which will give us maximum food production. It has been no small task for Pennsylvania A. A. A. committees to study the production records of 83,000 farms and to allocate gasoline so as to conserve the Nation's supply without curtailing our national food-production program. These have been major accomplishments and they have been performed in the simple manner and the conscientious style of the unassuming farmers who constitute these A. A. A. committees.

I would no more desecrate the memory of Israel Putnam and the farmers of Concord Bridge because of the apparent flaws in their colonial uniforms than I would condemn the A. A. A. elected county and community committeemen of Pennsylvania because of the minor criticisms which emanate from disgruntled partisans who base conclusions on isolated complaints. No one condemns the Army because of the peculiar antics of some soldier home on leave. No one condemns the Navy because of the impropriety of some sailor on shore leave. And no patriotic citizen will condemn any A. A. A. committee in Pennsylvania if he first reviews the remarkable record of achievement among Pennsylvania's farmers in 1942 and 1943.

To the farmers of my native State, I pay my respects, and to the A. A. A. committees who mobilized agriculture I give my salute. Petty details are insignificant, but the record of farm production and the reserves of fertility and grains provided by our conservation practices will never be forgotten.

The county and community committeemen so organized production that our allies received the food which their armies so desperately needed while at the same time we at home supported the best fed fighters and Nation on earth.

Because of the democratic and nonpartisan framework of the A. A. A. organization, I presume that I may be extolling and commending in large part members of the Republican Party. A study of the registration figures of rural Pennsylvania counties would so indicate. Therefore, this statement, Mr. Speaker, can have no political significance. But these committees are agencies of the Government and in the eyes of some people they immediately are objects for attack. To these persons, any Governmental agency, regardless of its record, its accomplishments or its achievements, should always be abused and condemned. They recognize only the war against the President and they wage it every day regardless of the effect it may have on the war which the President is waging against our Axis foes.

Partisan attempts to embarrass and destroy our Commander in Chief by smearing agencies of Government such as the A. A. A. committees which are contributing so much toward the winning of the war give comfort and aid to our enemies. And all of us are more likely to be hurt by these barrages than the President.

Simplified Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Washington Post of April 26 and the Washington Daily News of April 25:

[From the Washington Post of April 26, 1944]

SIMPLIFIED TAXES

The Ways and Means Committee has done an excellent job in the plan to relieve the great majority of income-tax payers of most of the vexatious paper work that has been required of them under the withholding-tax system. In place of the existing Victory tax of 3 percent on gross income over $624 per year, a new normal tax of 3 percent is levied on net incomes over $500. The present normal tax of 6 percent and the surtax beginning at 13 percent are to be combined into a single surtax, with rates beginning at 20 percent. The bill also substitutes uniform personal exemptions of $500 per person for surtax purposes in place of the existing system of exemptions. For example, a husband will be allowed an exemption of $500 for himself, $500 for his wife, and $500 for each dependent. The definition of dependents is also simplified. Instead of the present requirement that a dependent must be under 18 or mentally or physically incapable of self-support, the bill defines a dependent as any close relation for whom the taxpayer furnishes over half the support and who is not himself required to file a return. This definition has the advantage of being precise, and seems much more equitable and practicable.

These changes, made for the purpose of simplification, will necessarily cause some shift in tax burdens, but the general effect will be to decrease the payments of individuals with large families and somewhat increase the payments of taxpayers with small families—a move in the right direction. According to committee estimates, the proposed changes would reduce the returns from the individual income tax for 1944 about $60,000,000, or about one-third of 1 percent of total estimated revenue yield. Also in the interest of simplification, taxpayers would be permitted to make standard deductions of 10 percent of gross income, in lieu of allowable specific deductions for charitable contributions, taxes, etc. For incomes above $5,000 a flat deduction of $500 would be permitted.

By such means it would become possible to determine the amount of taxes due with comparative ease, especially in the income brackets below $5,000. After the first year, the Ways and Means Committee asserts that approximately 30,000,000 taxpayers would be relieved of the necessity of computing their taxes. For the remaining 20,000,000, new and simpler declaration forms would be feasible.

As we have frequently pointed out, simplification inevitably sweeps away some of the refinements in the law that in theory make an income tax system more equitable. But the end in this case justifies the means, especially as many of the proposed changes seem to make for more reasonable treatment of the taxpayer with a large number of dependents. There is, however, some criticism of the flat deduction of 10 percent for charitable contributions, taxes, and interest Some critics object that flat deductions of

that amount would make overliberal allowance for charitable contributions. Others would like to take more specific account of actual contributions to charity, in the hope of encouraging larger contributions. Of course, these standard allowances would in any case be optional. Taxpayers may, if they choose, determine their own taxes, rather than take advantage of the simplified procedure.

The tax bill would also increase the tax on capital gains by 3 percent, as the result of subjecting them to the proposed 3 percent normal tax, in addition to the new increased surtax rates. Capital gains are not subject to the Victory tax, which would be replaced by the proposed 3 percent normal tax. Another change that is open to challenge is the additional taxes that would be imposed on income from partially tax-exempt bonds by combining the former normal and surtax rates, and introducing a new and lower so-called normal tax. As we have stated previously, this would be a kind of nibbling away at tax-exemption privileges that would create justified resentment against the Government, and certainly could not be defended as an essential feature of the simplification program. Apart from these controversial features of the bill, however, the program as a whole is a reform measure of which the Ways and Means Committee and all the experts who assisted its labors may well be proud.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 25, 1944]

BOON FROM MR. DOUGHTON

This newspaper has pounded the drums for income-tax simplification so often and so long that its readers may have come to regard us single-tracked. But we will risk immodesty to remark today that this continued drum-beating, in which many others have joined, is at last producing results.

The bill just introduced by Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee, after weeks of study by himself and his colleagues in collaboration with their own experts and the Treasury's, looks like a magnificent contribution to the peace of mind of the American taxpayer, who still cannot look back on March 15 without shuddering.

If this bill is passed—and certainly Congress is now fully aware of the public sentiment for simplification—30,000,000 of the 50,000,000 taxpayers won't have to file any return at all next March 15, aside from a withholding-tax receipt and the answers to four simple questions. Where the withholding tax has taken too much or too little, the Government will figure this out itself and mail either a bill or a rebate. So, for those 30,000,000 people, the bookkeeping nightmare of last March will be exorcised.

Some 10,000,000 others, namely, those receiving more than $5,000 from an employer or more than $100 from sources where withholding does not apply, will fill out a return—but a much simpler one than they have been accustomed (though not reconciled) to.

The final 10,000,000, principally people in the middle and upper brackets, will file on a "long form," but here again a simpler one than in the past.

Other changes are involved, notably the disappearance of the pesky victory tax and the adoption of a flat surtax exemption of $500 a person, whether the person be the head of the house, his spouse, or his dependent. (And the myth that dependency ends as a son or daughter turns 18—when in many cases the expense is just hitting a peak—is abandoned; hereafter the word dependent is to mean what it says.)

All in all, the Doughton bill represents a victory for sense and sanity.

Proper Utilization of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, now that the Military Affairs Committee has rejected the idea of forcing men in the IV–F draft classification into essential war jobs and Secretary Stimson has tried to reduce some of the regrettable confusion about the Army's needs and administration of selective service, it might be well to ask again whether the Army has made the maximum possible use of men with minor physical defects and been as energetic as it could in helping solve this Nation's manpower problems.

Secretary Stimson's statement emphasized previous explanations that the greatest present Army need is for younger men capable of enduring the rigors of combat. Yet, the War Department still vigorously objects to steps which would release men in their twenties, in top physical condition, for front-line service and other duty in advanced areas where stamina, vigor, aggressiveness, and capacity to take it are indispensable.

Instead, the Army has insisted on mobilizing women for numerous assignments that many IV–F's, men obviously not fitted for industrial jobs, could handle satisfactorily.

It still is difficult to understand why the Army resists so stubbornly every suggestion that IV–F's with only slight disqualifications should be used in greater numbers on the home front.

Every Member of the House has observed young soldiers apparently in the finest physical condition, performing jobs which IV–F's, who are basically sound physically and mentally, can perform adequately. They are guarding our Government buildings, bridges, public utilities, and other strategic objectives. They are manning antiaircraft batteries, seacoast defenses, observation posts, detector stations, and military installations in this country where combat requirements do not apply. They are performing military police duty on the streets of Washington, other metropolitan centers, and cities and towns adjacent to Army camps.

Thousands of young men now in IV–F were sorely disappointed when they were rejected by the Army as unfit for military service. Large numbers not only would like to wear the uniform of their country but feel they could do much more in helping the war effort than by transferring to civilian jobs for which they are not trained and may not be physically or psychologically fit. These men should have an opportunity to become members of the Army and after the war be eligible for the consideration given holders of an honorable discharge.

I should like to direct attention to the vigorous drives of the Army and the O. W. I. to recruit more women for the WAC's. In printed advertisements and over the radio we are told that every woman who joins up releases a man for combat duty or some other strenuous service. Since the Army has been unable to obtain as many WAC's as it desires, why cannot many IV–F's be used in clerical work, as automobile drivers, couriers, and messengers, as instructors, and in a host of other jobs which do not require perfect physical condition. The training of IV–F's would not be any greater strain on the Army than training of women.

I should like to suggest that the Military Affairs Committee properly could urge the War Department to reconsider its attitude toward men for limited service and I hope the committee will use its influence to see that IV–F's are reviewed with the thought of finding in this huge group replacement for thousands of men trained and physically fit for combat duty who now are being used on the home front.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commissioner Declares Opposition of National Association of Railroads and Utilities Commissioners to Lea Aviation Bill Not Representative of Membership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD a letter written by the Honorable Thomas C. Buchanan, public utilities commissioner for the State of Pennsylvania, regarding the Lea aviation bill which I believe the Members will find interesting and illuminating:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC
UTILITY COMMISSION,
November 23, 1943.

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEA: My attention has been called to a very definite propaganda campaign in effect among State public service and utility commissioners and State governments in opposition to the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, and its predecessor, H. R. 1012.

To make certain that it is not accepted as a unanimous opposition to the bills, I want to advise you that at the recent convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners in Chicago, the action of that association opposing the bills was not unanimous.

State commissioners have practically no control over rates and service of railroads in intrastate traffic nor of trucks and busses in combined intra and interstate traffic. Actual jurisdiction is vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission, although lip service is paid to State commissions and so-called

States' rights. I cannot understand opposition to similar jurisdiction over airplanes. If the attack was to be made upon the Interstate Commerce Commission and its responsibility for the railroad mess, that would be a different thing, but the I. C. C. seems to get approval in spite of its acknowledged fumbling inefficiency.

I think if you men in Congress would decide the thing from a national viewpoint rather than trying to guess the influences back of political State administrations, Federal actions would be more respected and better in the public interest.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS C. BUCHANAN,
Commissioner.

A Maverick Is Fed Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, April 1, 1944:

A MAVERICK IS FED UP

Mr. Maury Maverick (a maverick, by definition, wears no man's brand) was once a Member of Congress, once Mayor of San Antonio, and for some time has had his headquarters in Washington, where he is Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He is a man of distinction, great forthrightness, enormous zip—in short, a man to reckon with. He has just performed a service which entitles him to the thanks and the grateful remembrance of his countrymen. In an eloquent memorandum denouncing what he calls "gobbledygook talk," he has something to say about the distressing language which adorns the red tape of bureaucracy. He would put an end to "finalizing" contracts; he frowns upon "patterns," "effectuating," and "dynamics," and he threatens to shoot anyone using the words "activation" and "implementation." May good luck attend him. He can make his ideas stick unless some superior, if he has a superior, comes along and (we believe this is the phrase) "dis-O. K.'s" them.

Railroad Misrepresentations Concerning Future Air Transport Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been considerable agitation by some of our surface carrier interests in favor of changes in the law which will permit them to invade and dominate the air transportation field. Much of this agitation is synthetic and is presented under the imposing facade of a so-called neutral agency, the Transportation Association of America. Behind that facade there will be found the ambitions of certain individual surface interests to repeat in the air age the drive for great regional monopolies of transportation which they undertook some years ago and which very nearly succeeded.

Fortunately, this agitation does not meet with the unanimous approval either of the different forms of surface transportation or of all the important companies in any single form. For example, among our railroads there are many thoughtful men who realize the danger which this agitation would lead to. And our motortrucking industry has definitely and vigorously taken an official stand opposed to any changes in the Civil Aeronautics Act which would permit surface carriers to invade the air-transportation field.

One of the principal advocates of opening up to the railroads this new avenue toward transportation monopoly is Mr. Howard S. Palmer, president of the New Haven Railroad. In my extension of remarks on page A5068 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and again on page A5512 in the Appendix of the RECORD, I attempted to point out to this gentleman and to the Members of the House the many fallacies and misstatements contained in his arguments. However, in radio speeches and in expensive full-page advertisements in national newspapers, Mr. Palmer is still beguiling the public with a fanciful picture of his railroad engaged in rail, air, and highway service in the future, thus clutching within the New Haven's fist two new forms of transportation which, if permitted to develop independently, would continue to furnish the New Haven with vigorous and salutary competition.

There recently appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot of March 1, 1944, an editorial which contained some very sound advice to Mr. Palmer, and which merits the thoughtful attention of the Congress. That editorial reads as follows:

RAIL MONOPOLY HEADS FOR TROUBLE

Railroad executives, able as they are in many fields, seem unable to rid themselves of the delusion that if they could only monopolize all types of transportation, the solution would be perfect.

Thus comes the word from New York that the head of the New Haven is all set to put planes in the air if the barriers against the railroads doing that sort of thing are lifted. Then, says the notice, railroad men could thump their chests and proclaim they have a perfectly coordinated rail-air-highway system.

Of all railroads to indulge in such folly, the New Haven should be the last and most ashamed. This is the road that one day controlled the transportation system of much of New England. Not only did they run trains, but they controlled interurban streetcar systems and then they bought up the boats and then sometime later they went broke and have been crippled ever since. The monopoly and the crash could scarcely be called coincidental.

But like other railroads they apparently are shooting at the same targets. What they ought to be doing is making rail service so attractive and economic for the public that the volume of business would rise to profitable levels. As has been said time and again it costs no more fuel, light, or overhead to haul a full coach than a half coach of passengers.

Not everybody wants to ride the planes, the busses, the trains, the ships. Persons have their choices subject to funds, time, and other factors. What the rail and other transportation systems should do is to keep out of each other's way, cultivate competition and resourcefulness, install economies, improve service, reduce rates to increase patronage. These points are advocated for the railroads' benefit and because they must be healthy to do the transportation job.

Such a system is infinitely better than the trend toward monopoly which after all is a step toward socialization. It is going to be much easier for a government so inclined to take over a monopoly of transportation or anything else than widely scattered independent, individually owned enterprises. When railroads or others head for transportation monopoly, they actually are heading for trouble.

G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., April 25, 1944.

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: I am enclosing you herewith a motion that was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Department of Maryland and annual membership round-up held at the War Memorial Building, Sunday, April 23, 1944, and we will thank you to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

J. NELSON TRIBBY,
Department Adjutant.

The department commander, the grande chef de gare, 5 department vice commanders and the commanders, adjutants, and membership chairmen of 101 posts of the Department of Maryland, assembled at the War Memorial Building, Baltimore, Md., on Sunday, April 23, 1944, for the annual membership round-up, respectfully request Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the Veterans' Legislation Committee, to immediately report the G. I. bill of rights—Senate 1767—to the House floor and any controversial sections be submitted to the Members of the House so that this bill may be enacted into law before May 30, 1944, as a tribute to the memory of all the men and women who have given their lives for the preservation of our country and further that a copy be sent to the senior Senator from Maryland the Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS and the senior Representative of the Maryland delegation, the Honorable THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Flood-Free Johnstown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release from the National Geographic Society, Washington, D. C., relative to flood-free Johnstown, Pa.

JOHNSTOWN, PREY TO FLOODS, HAILS NEW CONTROL WORKS

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Johnstown, Pa., is telling the world that it is no longer at the mercy of its rivers.

Reason for the celebration is the completion of an $8,000,000 flood-control project, says the National Geographic Society. As they near the half-way mark in the annual flood season—January to May—the citizens look confidently on the Stony Creek, the Little Conemaugh, and the Conemaugh Rivers now channeled between high retaining walls.

Project includes 9 miles of work on stretches of the three streams—deepening and widening of channels, realinement of courses, and the facing of banks with concrete up to 12 inches thick. Retaining walls range from 37 feet to 67 feet in height.

CITIZENS DECLARE FREEDOM

Pens and typewriters are spreading the news as the city's 67,000 residents and its 41,000 suburbanites declare their new independence to friends in other cities. Watermarks on old buildings will be blotted out. Only reminders of flood stages will be official brass markers recording changes in water levels.

Johnstowners have long been conscious of their water peril. First flood recorded in the city's history occurred in 1808. From that year to the present, about 23 have been big enough for mention in the city's annals.

Flood history took a new turn in 1836 with the building of the South Fork Reservoir, 16 miles northeast of the city, to supply water for the Johnstown-Pittsburgh Canal. The reservoir, fed by the Little Conemaugh and known later as Lake Conemaugh, was 3 miles long, ¼ to 1 mile wide, and 72 feet deep at the dam.

When the canal gave way to a railroad, the reservoir was used as a fish preserve, was neglected as a storage basin. Leaks developed, the dam broke several times, was rebuilt. State of the dam from time to time made local talk, caused little anxiety.

FIRE TAKES HEAVY TOLL

At the beginning of May 1889 the future looked bright to Johnstown's 30,000 people. Toward the last of the month, skies darkened, rain fell heavily for days, the rivers overflowed their banks.

On the 31st mills and stores closed. People in the lower areas began to move furniture to the upper floors. As the rain continued, the swollen rivers made canals of the city's streets, carried away bridges.

The lake was full to the brim, sloshed over the narrow spillways, began to wash over the whole crest of the dam, burst the earthwork in midafternoon. More than 4,000,000,000 gallons of water rushed down the mountain gorge, a deadly and destructive force moving at 24 miles an hour.

Alarm was balked by disruption of telephone and telegraph service. Flight from the doomed city was prevented by the water in the streets. Filled with wreckage from the upper valley, the raging waters hit Johnstown like a battering ram. Fire broke out and 300 persons were burned to death.

When the flood subsided the toll stood at more than 2,000 lives, and property damage estimated up to $10,000,000. Johnstown buried more than 700 victims as unidentified dead.

One of the first major disasters to occur after the establishment of telegraphic wire service to newspapers, the tragedy quickly made front-page news throughout the country. Clara Barton and the Red Cross plunged into the job of relief.

A TRIUMPH OF FAITH

The flood yielded a strange crop of mementoes. Books were written, tales of heroism became legends, exhibits of flood scenes appeared at fairs, even motion pictures were contrived to show what happened.

St. Patrick's Day, 1936, brought Johnstown another ordeal by flood. High waters again ravaged the business district, wiped out Easter stocks, ruined stores, quadrupled the damage of the flood of 1889, took few lives.

Johnstowners are made of durable stuff. Citizens pitched into the litter in the streets, merchants put their stores in order, stretched their credit for new merchandise, reopened for business.

The people resolved to put Nature in a strait jacket, stirred Federal officials to inquiry, got Army engineers to investigate, heard with dismay that building of additional reservoirs would not solve the problem.

It took a flood in May 1937 and an act of Congress to get action on channel improvement, real key to control. Work was begun in August 1938, completed in November 1943.

Johnstown, founded in 1800, is an iron and steel center, and figures importantly in the mining and movement of soft coal. Peacetime factory products included mining equipment, motortrucks, electrical supplies, radiators, furniture, glass, cement, and soap. Clay pits in the vicinity are a valuable resource.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is "Monkey Ward" now. Think what a fourth term would produce.

Who in the world ever told "Old Blood and Guts" that we with the British wanted to rule the world?

When corn is frozen, hogs and cattle will take to market, and soon food for war will require a revamping and the set-up a change of name.

Pray tell us, Colonel Pick, of the Army engineers, where you could build enough dams to hold back this water—guess it is nature's way of replenishing the oceans.

The devastation wrought the small towns here, by the "Nudeal" policies and the war, differs only from some in the Old World in that our buildings have their roofs yet.

The O. W. I. is dropping seeds in neutral and subdued nations with the hope of creating gratitude. Congressmen used to do that in their districts years ago for the same purpose.

Dr. Robert Lovett, one of the four purged by the Appropriations and Dies Committees last year, has been put in the university in Puerto Rico by Tugwell. Congress cannot head off a bureaucrat even in the islands of the sea.

The Interior Department last year spent $160,000 for long-distance telephone calls, and they asked to have 2,200 of their number deferred from military service, in spite of the fact that their Secretary has the reputation of being a fighting cock.

Josephus Daniels pled to the editors that "one-third of the Senate plus one" could defeat a treaty ratification and that the rule should be overhauled. That one-third plus one you complain about, Mr. Daniels, sustained consumer subsidies and threatens to keep the emergency on indefinitely, if the fourth term succeeds.

Uncle Sam Cracks Down on Avery's Chicago Mutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of April 27, 1944:

UNCLE SAM CRACKS DOWN ON AVERY'S CHICAGO MUTINY

Sewell Avery's defiance of the United States Government has gone so far that President Roosevelt has been obliged to call upon the Army to take over the Montgomery Ward Chicago plants.

The explanation for Avery's attitude is quite simple:

He always has been used to having his way and he wants it now. He is a die-hard who refuses to permit the fact that his country is at war to interfere with his belief that he has a right to do as he blamed well pleases where his employees are concerned.

Avery is a die-hard in litttle things as well as big ones. Just 20 years ago this month he was arrested in Chicago for ignoring a "Stop sign." Most millionaires would have waived trial, paid a small fine and saved time. Not Avery. He went to court, insisted he was innocent, fought it out, and finally paid up—having no other choice.

Today he behaves in the same manner. Called upon by the President to obey the ruling of the War Labor Board and continue his union contract pending negotiation, including maintenance of membership—he has forced his Government to the extreme of calling out the Army.

Does it matter that his President is leading a war for this Nation's survival? Does it matter to Avery that the United States Army is fighting that war, and that his obstinacy simply piles upon it added burden and annoyance?

His frame of mind is best expressed in his own words in a recent interview:

"I am against the New Deal and I'm proud of nothing more than that."

He should tell that to the boys fighting at Anzio, at Cassino, at Hollandia, over "Fortress

Europe"—the boys who are making America safe, even for Averys.

We are glad President Roosevelt has acted swiftly to bring this petulant misrepresentative of American business to book.

We say misrepresentative because Sewell Avery does not represent the wartime attitude of business, which has been overwhelmingly cooperative and patriotic. It is to be borne in mind that the industry members of the War Labor Board concurred in the order to Montgomery Ward to extend its contract. And as we pointed out the other day, Business Week magazine chided Ward's for its churlish obstruction in wartime.

The contract in question ran out last December 8. Avery then refused to renew it, claiming the union no longer represented a majority of the employees. The first W. L. B. order was issued January 13—

So that Uncle Sam has been patient with this man for 3 long months.

The issue now is simply whether Avery can defy the United States Government and get away with it.

The answer—given yesterday—is that he can't.

Let that answer now be clear to all others—including John L. Lewis—who permit their prejudices and pet hates to stand in the way of their wartime duty to this nation.

Ninety-nine percent of business and 99 percent of labor have teamed up in the most magnificent war production job of history.

To a man like Avery, of course, that merely means the Army and home front are all out of step but him.

Parachutes for Government Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include at the request of Stanley Switlik, president of the Switlik Parachute Co., of Trenton, N. J., a letter to me from him dated April 18, 1944, and copy of a wire he sent to Drew Pearson:

SWITLIK PARACHUTE CO.,
Trenton, N. J., April 18, 1944.

Hon. D. LANE POWERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: No doubt you have read in the press or heard over the radio frequent statements made by the columnist Drew Pearson during the past month, casting aspersions on parachutes which have been in use by our Government. It is hardly necessary here to repeat those news releases, each one being practically a repetition of each other, and an apparent continuous effort by their author to bask in the limelight; and without securing the supporting facts which are warranted by such allegations, to honestly prove or disprove the contentions which have been made.

I am, however, enclosing copy of a telegram which I sent to Mr. Pearson on the day following his first article which appeared on March 8, 1944, as I strongly object to such procedures on his part. They do not tend to help win the war, but rather break down morale of the boys at the front and instill unnecessary fears into the hearts of their loved ones at home.

You will note that we extended to Mr. Pearson an invitation to visit our factory for the purpose of explaining to him every angle of development, manufacture, and testing of all types of parachutes. We also offered to him the opportunity of reviewing hundreds of testimonial letters, written by men in the armed forces whose lives were saved by parachutes. Many of those letters testify that the men landed in water, and yet found it easily possible to detach their parachutes and return to land in perfect safety, in several instances remaining in the water for several hours before being rescued.

It is also of interest to note that the A. A. F. Matériel Command at Wright Field, Ohio, also invited Mr. Pearson to visit their experimental laboratories, to thoroughly acquaint him with all phases of the parachute situation. He, however, refused to accept that invitation, although news editors and their staffs were only too glad to avail themselves of a similar opportunity to check the items which had been initiated in their columns by Mr. Pearson.

At that time it was pointed out that while the deaths of eight paratroopers were regrettable, they jumped by mistake into water at night. The Air Safety Division reported that, loaded with combat equipment, as they were, and plunged unexpectedly into water, the men would have drowned no matter what parachute they wore.

It is true, no life should be needlessly jeopardized at any time; but since an accident did occur, conclusions should not have been formed by any commentator without a conscientious and thorough study of all factors contributing toward the cause. Neither should he project unjust accusation against the type of parachute as the sole contributing agency for the resulting deaths unless responsibility for its failure had been definitely established.

Since it is apparent that Mr. Pearson is being furnished with reports which are so definitely one-sided, with utter disregard of all phases of the subject at issue, it is recommended that investigation be made to ascertain the source of such misleading information. Further, that the investigation determine the purpose in broadcasting such unfounded releases without their being thoroughly confirmed and sanctioned through proper channels.

All articles published by Mr. Pearson have been full of misstatements. He has been offered opportunities to confirm or correct his impressions. He has, however, made no effort to thoroughly secure first-hand information as to the relative merits of either the parachutes which he has sought to condemn or those which he is apparently attempting to exploit.

We have no selfish motives in bringing this matter to your attention, as we, like other manufacturers, have been called upon to bid on parachutes equipped with the quick-release feature. Regardless of the type that is to be produced, those individuals engaged in both the procurement and manufacture of parachutes can always be depended upon to furnish the best possible type of equipment. Our company, one of the pioneers in the industry, has always demonstrated its willingness to assist the Government at all times in such developments—with one purpose in mind, the saving of human lives. We, therefore, take exception to any misstatements intended to cast a doubt on the efficiency of equipment which has been furnished to our armed forces and the incidental effect on public morale.

Inasmuch as Mr. Pearson has brought before the public such disquieting and unnecessary fears concerning the parachute, we feel that the time has now arrived when they should be acquainted with the true conditions. In line therewith we most earnestly request that full investigation be made by the national defense program and that all facts be made known to the public, in order that our boys and their relatives may rest at ease and realize that those boys are not being sent out into indiscriminate murder, as claimed by Mr. Pearson.

This company, and the writer personally, are at your service; and we are offering our cooperation at anytime we may be called upon, in order that the true facts may be brought to light.

Respectfully,

STANLEY SWITLIK.

MARCH 9, 1944.

DREW PEARSON,
Washington Merry-Go-Round,
Washington, D. C.:

Your article on parachutes very regretful. You were grossly misinformed. Every argument in the article is in reverse. You have done great injustice to the American parachute and the military forces. The military parachute is unrestricted by patents as to manufacture. By trying to perform a good deed you were made an unwitting party and medium to sponsor an article of doubtful value. The Army, Navy, and parachute industry have for years and are at present experimenting and developing improved way of releasing harnesses. Your article puts a fear and worry into the hearts of mothers, wives, sweethearts, and friends of hundreds of thousands of men in air service who use parachutes. You owe it to yourself and your public to get true facts and complete history and story of parachutes. You are cordially invited to visit us in Trenton. Everything will be open to you. You will see how the parachutes are manufactured, developed, and tested. You will also be able to see for yourself hundreds of letters written to the Caterpillar Club for membership from men whose lives were saved by parachute. After this visit with us we believe that Drew Pearson is big enough to recognize the facts as they are and correct his statements. Please advise when we may have the pleasure of expecting you in Trenton.

SWITLIK PARACHUTE CO.,
STANLEY SWITLIK.

The Tax Simplification Bill Does Many Things Besides Simplify

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the recent bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, whose alleged purpose is to simplify the income tax law. This bill is the product of the so-called experts in the Treasury Department. I have reason to believe that it is not satisfactory to many members on the Ways and Means Committee, particularly those on the minority side. The majority leadership on the Ways and Means Committee has stood with the Treasury Department in reporting out this bill.

One of the biggest disappointments of this bill is that it makes no provision for a credit for deductions, such as contributions to religious, educational, and

charitable institutions. I realize it would be argued that there is a blanket deduction granted to all taxpayers.

Let us consider for a moment the proposition as contained in this bill of granting to every taxpayer whose income was less than $5,000 a 10 percent credit for deductions and a $500 credit for all those taxpayers over $5,000. This really is not any credit for deductions at all. The taxpayers of the United States are just one large family or club, which must raise all the money necessary for the Government to carry on. Suppose in a given club, there are 100 members and it is agreed that they will assess their members whatever dues are necessary to pay their bills and they start out by giving each club member a credit for $1. Of what value is that credit?

There is another angle to look upon in reference to a blanket credit for deductions. It gives to some taxpayers credits for which they are not entitled. Thus, the Treasury of the United States is cheated. The credit is given whether they make the contribution or not. Therefore, there is no inducement to make the contribution and the institutions interested will suffer.

Let us consider a few possibilities that might easily arise under this tax bill. We will take the case of two ladies, who each earn $1,000 a year, which is subject to the withholding tax. One of the ladies is buying a home and she pays $50 a year interest. She also pays State taxes in the sum of $50. She contributes to her local church, to missionaries, to orphanages, to the Red Cross, the U. S. O., and other like concerns $150. Her total deductions should be $250. The other lady who receives $1,000 pays no taxes and interests and contributes nothing. Under the bill that we are asked to pass they are both taxed exactly alike. This virtually abolishes the basic principle that 15 percent of an individual's income is exempt from taxation, if contributed to religion and charity. I realize it will be said that the lady who made the actual contributions and paid the other deductions can file a claim for a refund. The Treasury Department itself admits that it will take months and months and months to get this refund and, as taxpayers, we know the handling of those refunds will be exceedingly costly and cumbersome for the Treasury Department.

Let us take another case of two workers in a defense plant, who each earn $4,500 a year, which is subject to the withholding tax. One of these men pays no interest, no State taxes, and contributes nothing to religion and charity. The other individual, we will suppose, pays $300 interest, local taxes of $150, and he gives away or contributes $450. Under our basic law there is $900 which should be exempt from taxation. Yet both of these men are taxed the same. Both have the same amount of taxes taken from their envelopes. Again, it is argued that the one man who is a community builder can ask a bureaucratic and top-heavy Treasury Department for a refund. That is not practical.

A leading tax expert in the city of Washington stated to me this week that he thought these refunds would take 2 or 2½ years. Is that justice?

Let us take another hypothetical case. We will consider the war contract broker, whose sole assets are his suitcase. He pays no State taxes. He pays no interest; yet his income is $25,000 a year. He contributes nothing to religion and charity, but under the bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee he is entitled to a blanket deduction of $500. In other words, at the rates applied to an individual of his income, his taxes are reduced $310 by not giving $500 to religion and charity.

Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that what has happened here is that taxes have not been simplified. Individuals have been ignored and trampled upon, and slyly and subtly without public hearings, the Treasury Department and the majority of the Ways and Means Committee are offering to the Congress a new form of taxation, to wit, a gross income tax. They have for all practical purposes abolished deductions for that great mass of people earning less than $5,000. This same tax bill raises the tax in several instances, all of which was done without any public hearings or a chance for the taxpayers to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, there was a reason why a provision was made when the income tax was first adopted more than 30 years ago that that portion up to 15 percent of a man's income, if given away to help others, was exempt from taxation. The reason is that such a procedure is for the public good. It is for the lasting good of America that men give of their substance to provide orphanages, the great Red Cross organization, community chests, hospitals for crippled children, colleges and universities, and the churches themselves.

I wish to reiterate what I stated before in this Congress concerning the matter of giving to our worth-while institutions:

It is not a preacher's problem or a problem that belongs to those charged with raising money. Because men give a few dollars to support the Boy Scout movement a community may be saved the expense of a costly trial and a prison term. Because men give of their substance to support a church that inspires people to high living and restrains their bent for evil, homes are saved, and children are not sent to public institutions supported by taxation. Because men give of their substance to provide charity and philanthropy the taxpayers of America are saved millions of dollars. Because devout individuals prayerfully give to missionary programs the causes of war were removed in the far corners of the earth. There is no other antidote for the causes of war. Again I say the question of taxing exempt income given to religion and charity is a public question and means much to our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department is making a deliberate attempt to impose upon the country a gross income tax. They are virtually abolishing the established principle that contributions are exempt from taxation. This is not accidental. It is intentional. This problem has been called to the attention of the Treasury on many different occasions. Delegations of churchmen, educators, and others have called upon the Treasury Department officials and their technicians. On one occasion a conference was held with the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and his then chief counsel, Randolph Paul. This conference was attended by Bishop Edwin H. Hughes, of the Methodist Church, Dr. Charles Vickrey, president of the Golden Rule Foundation, Dr. Gould Wickey, head of the Church Related Colleges of America, and Dr. Guy E. Snavely, chairman of the Council on Taxes and Philanthropy, and also executive secretary of the Association of American Colleges, and myself.

Thoughtful letters and telegrams have been sent to the Treasury in regard to this problem. All of these requests have been for naught. The Treasury has decided against these institutions and the majority of the Ways and Means Committee has followed them.

It is now up to the Congress to decide whether or not we shall continue to exempt from taxation that portion of an individual's income up to 15 percent which he contributes to religion and charity, or whether we shall abandon that principle. It is also up to the Congress to decide whether or not we shall, under the guise of simplification, impose a gross income tax.

For the Congress to insist that all taxpayers be taxed the same, regardless of their contributions, is un-American, and it destroys the rights of the individual for the alleged purpose of simplification. A tax structure which destroys and nullifies the desire to support worthwhile institutions for character building, education, service, and mercy, is a step toward totalitarianism. If these splendid institutions which have heretofore depended upon contributions are materially hurt by this tax program, and I believe they will be, the next step is a Government subsidy for every hospital, orphanage, college, and church. Such a thing is unthinkable. It violates every principle of separation of church and state, and intellectual and religious liberty. It cannot be denied that there are those in the Treasury Department who adhere to this totalitarian faith and accept the principle that the Government should do everything and subsidize all institutions. The Congress should reject this theory.

Government by Checks and Balances in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the wise men who penned the Declaration of Independence and who conceived the Constitution, knew that the only possible way in which a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as it was characterized by Abraham Lincoln, could stand, was

by a separation of powers. They visualized such a government as government by consent of the governed. They knew human nature. They knew history. They knew that power corrupts and, as someone recently said, "absolute power corrupts absolutely."

The founding fathers knew that power feeds on itself. They knew that the whole tendency of government is to expand, to encroach upon, and finally to engulf the liberties of the people in tyranny.

Because they so well knew these age-old facts, they provided a scheme of government which has been pronounced by the keenest students of human society as the finest and most stable form of free government that was ever devised by the mind of man. That was our constitutional government of checks and balances. The statesmen of other nations at the time our Government was devised derided it and said that it would never work successfully. They insisted that the people—meaning the masses—were not capable of self-government. They declared that there would be such complete disagreement between the three independent, coequal, and coordinate branches of the Government as to thwart all action and result literally in a deadlock. They insisted that, if this did not occur, two of the branches would combine at some time to destroy the third, and that then the stronger of the two would override the weaker, and tyranny would result. They were mistaken.

The founders of our American system of government were wiser than were the Old World statesmen of that other day.

Under this government of checks and balances, we have developed the greatest people, the highest living levels, the highest wages, the best working conditions, the widest distribution of wealth, the finest educational system, the most wonderful religious institutions, the greatest degree of individual liberty, and the richest economy ever developed by any people in this world. We did all that in less than 160 years.

The last and the greatest test we have met has been the preparation for this war in which we are now engaged. The whole German Nation under Hitler for 12 years has been driven in the most intensive preparation for war ever witnessed in the history of man. Italy, under Mussolini, was so driven for 20 years. Japan, under the war lords, has been so driven for 40 years. Russia, under Stalin, has been so driven for 20 years. Yet, under our American system of government and economy, we have in 3 years overtaken and surpassed the results of all those intensified war efforts under the dictators. Free industry, free enterprise, and free labor cooperated to produce a modern-day miracle—the machines and matériel of war with which we have not only equipped our own armed forces, but to a very great extent those of all our allies, including Russia.

So successful have we been that liberties which the American people of this and previous generations accepted as a matter of course are regarded by peoples of other countries as privileges so wonderful as to be beyond their reach.

American citizens have always been free to earn; they have always been free to buy; they have always been free to hire; they have always been free to be hired: that is the America our fighting forces are struggling on the battle fronts to protect and maintain.

Under our great governmental system of checks and balances, democracy became more than merely a word; it became a way of life and a system of production. Someone has well stated the very essence of our whole governmental and social system in America is direct, voluntary employment of the individual, by the individual and for the individual.

Under this great governmental system, having always before it the Bill of Rights guaranteeing freedom of the individual citizen, the son of the humblest laborer in the land can turn his gaze to the White House and know that a residence therein is open to him. Our men and women could choose their own course of life, their own religion, their own political doctrine, their education, their own business; all this without interference from any source. The founding fathers knew as most of our people have always known, that liberty is orderly freedom under the law. That a man's right to do whatever he wanted to do was limited only by the rights of his neighbors. We have all lived by the creed in America that every man's liberty stops where the other man's rights begin.

It was not until the last decade that the men and women of America began to realize that it was possible for their liberties under the Bill of Rights to be taken from them, and that all the freedom and the privileges which they enjoyed each day were not actually born with them. We had forgotten that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." For the first time and within the last 12 years, the American people began to taste the bitterness of bureaucratic arrogance and official despotism. They began to realize their liberties were slipping away from them.

The American people have heard much in the last 10 years about a New Deal. What they actually have received is the oldest and most dangerous deal known to history—a cunning and continued attempt by a designing clique to concentrate in the executive department at Washington the Government of the Nation, and to transform the rights of the people under the Bill of Rights into favors to be handed out at the whim of bureaucrats and to be bartered for partisan advantage.

No clear-minded citizen can question the fact that for 10 years there has been a constant, never-ending, and exceedingly aggressive attempt to center all power and control in the hands of the executive department, and to weaken both the legislative and the judicial branches of the Government in the estimation of the people. The Chief Executive himself has been the leader in these attempts to besmirch, besmear, and belittle both the legislative and the judicial branches of the Government. He has plainly and openly resented and defied the powers vested in them by the Constitution. He attempted to coerce the Congress to empower him to pack the Supreme Court. In the process of that effort, he heaped more slurs and insults upon our Federal judiciary than all other Presidents combined had ever thought of doing. When he failed in these attempts, he bided his time and managed by appointment through three terms in office to achieve what he failed to coerce the Congress to do—permit him to name six additional judges who would construe the Constitution as he, the Chief Executive, wanted it construed. He has appointed a majority of not only the members of the Supreme Bench, but of the lower Federal courts as well.

The Chief Executive, himself, has been the leader in a long-continued campaign of vilification, recrimination, ridicule, abuse, and insult against the legislative branch of the Government. No person can look back over the record of the attempts of the Chief Executive to usurp the legislative powers of the Congress and to operate the Nation by administrative directives instead of by statutory law, without plainly discerning that the whole pattern was to destroy the checks and balances set up by the founding fathers, to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress—their special instrument of control over their Government and their public administrators.

I again warn you that the government of, by, and for the people in the United States of America is very rapidly being transformed into a government of, by, and for the bureaucrats.

I warn you that unless your Congress, supported and sustained by you, can recover the vast powers which have been delegated to the Chief Executive and which have been used by him to enable him and his subordinate bureaucrats to assume powers never given them by the Congress, your constitutional representative system of government, the liberties you have enjoyed, will become but a hollow form.

This New Deal administration has with incredible cunning built up a vested interest in political patronage which will directly affect millions of voters in the next election. Thomas Jefferson knew exactly what he was talking about when he said:

> Dependence begets subservience and venality, suffocates the germ of virtue, and prepares fit tools for the designs of ambition.

Daniel Webster stated clearly the case of the benevolent autocrat nearly a century ago when he declared:

> It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions, real or pretended. * * * There are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully—but who mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well—but they mean to govern; they promise to be kind masters, but they mean to be masters. They think they need but little restraint upon themselves. Their notion of the public interest is apt to be quite closely connected with their own exercise of authority. They may not, indeed, always understand their own motives. The love of

power may sink too deep in their own hearts even for their own security and may pass with themselves for more patriotism and benevolence.

It behooves us to protect and maintain our Government of checks and balances. Public opinion is still the most powerful force in America. It behooves all the people of this country, if they wish to save their free, constitutional, representative Republic, and, of course, they do, to make known to their present representatives in the Congress in the most positive and emphatic terms their determination that their Government of checks and balances shall be protected and maintained.

It would be a tragedy to civilization if the American experiment in free government should fail. It must not fail. It cannot fail and it will not fail if the people will that it shall not fail and express their will to their representatives in the Congress. It makes no difference in final results whether our free government of checks and balances is lost and destroyed by sincere men who are mistaken or by cunning men who are designing—the final ultimate would be tyranny. It would be governmental tyranny. It would be unspeakable. It would be intolerable. It would be such that the American people simply could not stand it.

May God give us all the wisdom and the strength to preserve untarnished and unimpaired the great rich heritage of our wonderful Nation, our wonderful Government, our wonderful liberties, to hand down to our posterity as our forefathers handed this heritage down to us.

G. I. Joe Understands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article appearing in the News, Washington, D. C., on April 26, 1944, written by the columnist, William Philip Simms, who is in Europe mingling daily with our service people in that theater. The article is most interesting, coming as it does from the front, and is as follows:

G. I. JOE UNDERSTANDS

(By William Philip Simms)

LONDON, April 26.—Surrounded by soldiers who will soon risk their lives in the most portentous battle in history, I am convinced that certain sections of American opinion have a mistaken notion of what makes our soldiers tick.

Some writers, commentators, and politicians are saying that G. I. Joe is puzzled by our foreign policy; that he would put more heart into his soldiering if he understood our policy better; that he would fight harder if we did not bungle things so badly politically—for example in north Africa, Italy, and France.

Personal investigation has led to no such conclusion. I have talked with a good many of our boys in Britain and with some of the world's best war correspondents who have just arrived here from the Mediterranean theater. The consensus is that the one great big thought in the minds of our soldiers is to win the war and go home as quickly as possible.

Of course the American Joe is for democracy. He thinks his own country is mighty grand. In fact he thinks so now more than ever. And broadly speaking, he would like to see poor old Europe enjoy some of the same sort of blessings. But that is not why he crossed the Atlantic. He came to fight for Uncle Sam. Hitler and Hirohito attacked his country and he intends to lick them both to a frazzle and then go home.

Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, is quoted in a London newspaper as saying that the effectiveness of our military forces would be enhanced if our men better understood our political as well as our military strategy and saw more plainly how they were not only helping to defeat the Axis tyranny but also helping to construct the kind of world of which the President has spoken. But observation here leads to the conclusion that however right he may be theoretically, he is not being realistic. Our Joe is not greatly perturbed by such factors. He doesn't vibrate to the words of American politicians the way those gentlemen think he should, let alone to the isms of Europe.

In Italy, according to those who have occupied fox holes with them, our boys don't care a rap whether Badoglio, Signor Croce, Count Sforza, Tagliatti, or A. M. G. O. T. runs things, just so somebody maintains order long enough for the Allies to win this war and get to hell out.

The same, I am convinced, will apply to France and the rest of Europe so far as the American forces are concerned. If the 40,000,000 Frenchmen want General De Gaulle it is all right with our Joes. If not that is all right, too. In any event it is France's business. As our soldiers see it, they didn't come over here to shed their blood in a French, Italian, or Yugoslav civil war. The less they become involved in Europe's family quarrels the better they will like it, and the quicker they start home. That latter thought holds No. 1 priority with practically all of them.

Historical Documents in Seligman Memorial Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have been interested in learning that a very rare collection of historical documents gathered over a half century by the late Edwin Robert Anderson, who held the McVickar professorship of political economy at Columbia University, New York City, is to be permanently available as the Seligman Memorial Library. Sponsoring the library is a committee composed of some of the country's foremost business leaders. As the Seligman collection has tremendous national significance for those engaged in research linking past events with those of today and tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement regarding this important library be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Evidence that history repeats is found in a storehouse of rare historical documents known as the Seligman collection, at Columbia University, established in memory of the late Robert Anderson Seligman, who held the McVickar professorship of political economy.

For example, a century before the American Revolution, the King of England set up a system of price ceilings as a basis for protecting the royal household against profiteering. Today wartime price ceilings are imposed for protection of the people.

For a half century Dr. Seligman searched the earth for the best, the most momentous, and the rarest writings that men had produced. As a result the Seligman collection at Columbia embraces the whole field of economics as it was analyzed and described by the best minds from the thirteenth century on.

To make the Seligman collection a valuable addition to the research material available and to assure its full use as a guide to historical documents that have a bearing on the future, a committee of sponsors has been set up for the Seligman Memorial Library. Sponsors include Thomas I. Parkinson, president, Equitable Life Assurance Society, chairman; Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board, Chase National Bank; Henry Bruere, president, Bowery Savings Bank; Frederick H. Ecker, chairman of the board, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Leon Fraser, president, First National Bank of New York City; Henry Ittleson, vice president, Commercial Investment Trust; Thomas W. Lamont, chairman of the executive committee, J. P. Morgan & Co.; and Thomas J. Watson, president, International Business Machines Corporation.

The value of this priceless collection of rare documents for research purposes is enormous. To find a precedent for governmental price control of such tangibles as foodstuffs and such intangibles as rent, the Seligman collection goes back to the proclamation of the James of England who concerned his royal self with the highest price that might be charged for a quarter of wheat and with the maximum that might be collected by the "weeke" for a "roume," either in an inn or in the stable.

Foreshadowing the condition that, in this day and age, has impelled established merchants to ask the law to protect them against fly-by-night competition, the Seligman papers go back to a yellowed manuscript that bears the date 1786 and read the words of retail merchants, petitioning Parliament to pass an act restricting "hawkers and pedlars."

One learns that: "The Freeman Retail Traders in the principal towns in Scotland have for years labored under considerable hardships arising from a number of hawkers or itinerant dealers opening temporary sale rooms in town and carrying a very considerable share of trade, while they contribute nothing to the public taxes."

To trace back the changes that have been wrought over the centuries in the policies and methods with which the law deals with labor, the Seligman collection goes back to the original imprinting of an order in council that, under date of November 7, 1761, took cognizance of the fact that a great number of journeymen cabinet makers had struck for shorter hours and higher piecework rates. Furthermore, the order set forth that the striking journeymen were meeting here and there to raise subscriptions for strike benefits and had even gone so far as to deter and

hinder others from working as usual and to threaten them with death or maiming if they did not come into and assist them in their demands.

Reviewing the language with which a businessman, in a freer and less formal day of international relationships, wrote to a foreign government, the Seligman Collection has the manuscript of a petition that, in 1796, our own Robert Fulton, steamboat builder, addressed to the revolutionary Government of France, calling for free trade and an end to the holding of colonies.

Checking against the past, our current thinking on such current or recurring matters of public concern as public debt and the relief of the poor, the Seligman Collection goes back to the printed originals of the reports of our own Alexander Hamilton.

To learn from original sources what the minds of the past's most eminent thinkers have thought about usury, tithes, fishing and fisheries, agriculture, colonization, navigation, science, and communism, follow the story of the Company of Scotland, which, trading to Africa and the East Indies, undertook in 1698 and 1699 to settle what now is Darien, Conn. Would you examine the economic conclusions of Adam Smith and Gerrard Winstanley and Sir James Stewart and Josiah Tucker and Malachy Postlewayt and Arthur Young, and the novelist-economists Defoe and Swift?

In the Seligman Collection there is preserved the original form—in manuscript, broadside, pamphlet, or bound first edition—in which their thoughts were set down.

Thus the Seligman collection, as it is seen by the scholar, by the seeker after truth. To others it presents other aspects.

In brief, the collection is an unusual and significant guide from the past as related to events of today and tomorrow; and for those who will shoulder the responsibility of planning our post-war economy, it well may serve as a treasure house of precedent and experience.

Commonwealth Club of California Ballot on International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently members of the Truman committee were in the State of California. While there we were entertained one day at a luncheon given by the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco. On that occasion I met the president of the club, who is also head of the section of the club dealing with international relations. I received a letter from him this morning in which he enclosed the result of a ballot taken by that club on some 16 questions dealing with international relations, all of which are vital in connection with discussions of present conditions and the future welfare of the country. I have found this ballot to be most interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the ballot was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESULTS OF COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA BALLOT ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. (a) Should the United States join the United Nations in giving immediate post-war food, shelter, and medical care to the people of enemy-conquered lands and to our other allies? (Yes 954, no 103.)

(b) Should the United States join the United Nations in giving immediate post-war food, shelter, and medical care to the people of Japan and Germany? (Yes 561, no 458.)

2. (a) Should the United States join the United Nations in industrial and agricultural rehabilitation of the enemy-conquered lands and those of our other allies. (Yes 883, no 168.)

(b) Should the United States join the United Nations in such rehabilitation for the people of Japan and Germany? (Yes 437, no 563.)

3. Should the United States favor making nations holding mandates responsible to the United Nations agency which shall have complete authority to regulate those mandates? (Yes 912, no 80.)

4. Should all nations have equal access to: (a) markets of all colonial possessions? (Yes 757, no 238.)

(b) Raw materials of all colonial possessions? (Yes 743, no 249.)

5. Should the United States—

(a) Increase tariff cooperation with Latin America? (Yes 950, no 93.)

(b) Increase cultural exchanges with Latin America? (Yes 1,020, no 39.)

6. Should the United States both propose and promote an international permanent economic council with a secretariat and permanent office similar to the International Labor Office? (Yes 841, no 162.)

7. Should the United States promote and participate in international conferences aiming to eliminate race prejudice? (Yes 866, no 170).

8. Should the United States in some degree limit her own sovereignty in order to contribute to world organization? (Yes 623, no 406.)

9. Should the United States participate in world machinery to prevent aggression and enforce peace:

(a) With power to indict a nation or nations as aggressors and enforce peace by use of arms if necessary? (Yes 964, no 85.)

(b) With above power plus power of recommendation in all other matters ? (Yes 775, no 204.)

10. Should the United States participate in world machinery to prevent aggression and enforce peace with full powers—

(a) To control world police? (Yes 881, no 149.)

(b) To protect rights of minorities? (Yes 818, no 185.)

(c) To declare a given act constitutes an act of aggression and determine what world police force shall be directed against it? (Yes 908, no 121.)

(d) To establish a world bank? (Yes 606, no 341.)

(e) To invalidate tariffs and trade barriers? (Yes 481, no 451)

(f) To regulate aerial transportation? (Yes 896, no 120.)

(g) To control imigration? (Yes 680, no 330.)

11. Should the United States join the Permanent Court of International Justice, otherwise known as the World Court? (Yes 973, no 70.)

12. Should the United States limit its sovereignty by participating in an international police force? (Yes 547, no 222.)

(a) Provided we ourselves do not reduce our armament until assured of the efficacy of the world police? (Yes 474, no 21.)

(b) Provided we reduce our armament along with an immediate general world disarmament? (Yes 217, no 186.)

13. Should the United States continue its membership in the International Labor Office? (Yes 826, no 137.)

14. Should the United States advocate formation of a permanent council of the United Nations? (Yes 925, no 102.)

15. Should the United States at this time seek a more definite declaration or amplification by the United Nations of the principles of the Atlantic Charter? (Yes 680, no 309.)

16. Should the United States extend liberal economic and financial aid—

(a) To China in the post-war period? (Yes 923, no 115.)

(b) To Russia in the post-war period? (Yes 562, no 442.)

(c) To Great Britain in the post-war period? (Yes 555, no 444.)

Inter-American Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the Inter-American Highway Co., written by Pico Cortes and published in the Naples (Ontario County, N. Y.) Record of April 19, 1944. It is in the nature of a review of an article submitted for the RECORD on April 1, 1944, by my colleague [Mr. BUTLER] and appearing on page A1706 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL GLEANINGS—NAPLES BOY SEES DREAM GO AWRY

(By Pico Cortes)

I desire to discuss, this Wednesday, a subject which should be of something more than passing interest to the good people of Naples, N. Y., remote though the matter of that subject may be. The subject is a project. It was conceived in the mind of a Naples boy, sponsored by President Harding as far back as 1921, thoroughly promoted through Latin America by the same Naples boy under the Coolidge administration, construction thereof was initiated in the administration of President Hoover, brought to a halt under the New Deal shortly before the outbreak of the Second World War, and resumed a year or so ago by the present administration which sent Army engineers into Central America for that purpose. It is the Inter-American highway, which really began in Naples, and is ending nowhere except in disgrace for the American engineer and contempt for the good-neighbor policy. I depend on Senor Don Alfaro Facio for the facts in the case. I know Senor Alfaro personally, and his family in Costa Rica as well, and they represent the highest type citizens to be found in any of the twenty Latin-American republics.

"Up to June 1942," declares Senor Alfaro, "most of the people of Costa Rica had a warm regard for the democratic principles of the good neighbor to the north, and a high respect for the legendary efficiency of the North Americanos. Since that date, when the United States Army engineers took up the task of rushing completion of the Inter-American Highway, from the Panama Canal

to southern Mexico, my countrymen's faith in the good-neighbor policy has gone steadily downhill. General respect and admiration for the North Americanos, based on hearsay, has been changed by first-hand contact to bewilderment, to contempt, and in some cases to hatred."

Senor Facio ascribes this state of affairs to two reasons, both simple: first, the kind of men who were brought from the United States to work on the project; and, second, to the colossal waste which was part of every operation, every cost sheet that he saw and every report that he heard during his employment by the United States Army, for Facio is a civil engineer schooled in the United States. He says the waste of money, time, and materials is none of his business, since the Army engineers were spending North American money; he does claim, however, that the waste was so fearful that it adversely influenced Central American opinion of Americans. In this connection let me add that the Latin Americans as a whole have greatly admired the gringo in the past for his honesty in handling public moneys. For that reason they have been desirous at all times to let contracts to North Americans rather than to let them be performed by other foreigners because they trusted the gringo. Facio says he was taught that an ethical engineer does the best possible job with the least possible waste, and he protests against any operation reflecting discredit on his profession. That's a hot one to hand a New Deal Army engineer.

"Each contractor," says Facio, "was given a cost-plus contract, which would enable him to spend any amount of money on his section of the road and still make a profit." He was also given a high priority to buy any equipment he wanted to build a road through country he had never seen. Every piece of equipment was to draw a high rental from the Army (that's the American Army, my friends, which you pay to support). Naturally, the contractors bought every conceivable type of machinery, since they didn't know what they might need. The Army engineers let them go ahead without advice. Some of the contractors sent down from the States equipment that was worn out and unusable, and it laid idle drawing rentals from the American taxpayers. For example, tractors which cost $4,500 were stored for months without using, the storage charges running up to $9,700 rental each, and cost $2,000 for an overhaul, probably on account of the rainy season disintegration. In one highway division, north Panama and Costa Rica, equipment rental came to about $22,000 a week.

Twenty-odd truck and tractor drivers, electricians, mechanics—a full maintenance and operating force—arrived at San Isidor, Costa Rica, during the latter half of 1942. No equipment was sent them until the middle of May 1943. And these men hung around all that time drawing $1.55 to $1.80 an hour. Señor Facio tells the story of southern Costa Rico, one of the most difficult terrains in Central America—ravines, gulches, peaks. Inland from Golfito the contractor was trying to use a great 18-cubic-yard 6-wheel dump truck. Rental was $1,200 a month on the 40-foot monster, which could no more maneuver in that region that a horse could turn around in a filing cabinet.

There were 175 men kept in the San Jose (capital of Costa Rica) office, most of them idle or getting drunk and raising trouble around town. (And this was going on while little Nelson Rockefeller was hosing off taxpayers' money for the purpose of taking "culchaw" to the Latin-Americans in Costa Rica and elsewhere.) Facio declares the Army surveyors "followed the Public Roads (bureau of roads) line only when it pleased them. They tried to take the road over mountains when it would have been cheaper, easier, and quicker to take it around. They got little stretches of road partly finished, only to have the rains wash them away. Approximately 100 men working out of Golfita built in 1 year 5 miles of all-weather road. This road was to connect with the main highway from the United Fruit railhead, but it ends abruptly in the jungle and within a year the jungle will have repossessed it.

The Army engineers spent about $40,000,000 on the project and ran a perfectly outlandish cost per mile. Much of it will be washed away. I have before me the estimate of the Public Roads engineers, made in 1934, and contained in the Peck report transmitted by President Roosevelt to Congress March 6 of that year. It was printed as Senate document 224. The estimate for type 2 road, which they had in mind and which would do the job, constructed of local materials with an oil treatment, was $37,645,822 from Panama to the Guatemala-Mexico border. A concrete highway called for $101,361,208.

The cost is bad enough, and the waste of time. But by far the worst factor has been the changed relationship that has been created and the downright hatred of Costa Rica for the "Colossus of the North." Up to the war, Costa was our closest friend, and she was the first, the very first, to declare war against the Hun when we threw down the gauntlet. But I shall let Senor Facio tell this part of the story. Any man who has devoted his life to creating better relationships between the Latins and the Nordics sees red when he hears it:

When military necessity demands speed, it is not possible to find a diplomat to drive every tractor. Yet it would not have taken much time to impress on each man that he was being hired for work in someone else's country, and that he would do well to observe at least the fundamental customs of the land. That simple step would have speeded up the job tremendously by insuring good morale among the Costa Rican laborers, who are not unique in working better under reasonable and humane conditions than under rough treatment. Instead, most of the United States contractors for various stretches of the road hired anybody who would walk into their offices in the United States and say he was a truck or tractor driver, mechanic, welder, etc. One man hired had been a soda water jerker and never had been on a tractor in his life. He got $1.80 an hour with time and a half overtime of 30 hours a week. (Figure that one out, Mr. Naples taxpayer—$167 a week!) and food and lodging.

This type of incompetence caused bewilderment and first doubts of "yanqui" efficiency among my countrymen. But the contempt and hatred grew from the attitude of the North Americanos toward the Costa Ricans. The laborers were generally treated as a low species of animal. If an order in English was not understood, it was shouted, presumably, on the theory that any man can understand English if the speaker yells loud enough. When the yells failed, the laborer was sometimes shoved roughly toward the task. ('Spose they had tried that on a Yankee union man?) Though there were many experienced Costa Rican truck and tractor drivers out of work, the contractors on the highway would not hire them except as common labor. The reason? The good neighbors from the north refused to work with the inferior native. Though all of us had college educations and thought ourselves fully the social equal of the average United States truck driver, we were forced to eat at separate mess tables, to use different bunkhouses and washrooms. It was not uncommon for one of the truck-driving aristocracy to yell at us in the mess hall to "Stop talking that damn spic and talk English."

Well, let's drop it right there. Had the New Deal, which paid lip service to the Inter-American Highway but did little with it except to use it as a job pool for its "truck-driver aristocrisy," completed the Inter-American Highway, we would never have had that coffee famine when the submarines were making it interesting for us, and we would have been getting a lot of other critical materials up by highway. But the worst thing about it all is that news of that treatment of Costa Ricans is 'way down to Uruguay by this time, and all the Rockefellerian culture in the known world—which isn't much anyway but costs our taxpayers a horrible sum of money—will never make up for the harm done to American rapprochement. Nope, folks, we've fumbled it again. We did it after Clay's time, after Blaine's time, after Cleveland's time, and now, after Hoover's time. But I'll wager that Peck feller from Naples, N. Y., is pretty sore about all this, wherever he may be. And was Senator BUTLER right? Boy.

Travel Guide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including an editorial from today's Washington Post, entitled "Travel Guide":

TRAVEL GUIDE

The new Director of Defense Transportation, Col. J. M. Johnson, seems to have adopted as his motto one segment of a celebrated Lincoln observation: "You can fool some of the people all of the time." He's quite right, of course. The trouble is he seems to think it a good idea to try. He was reported in a news story of Wednesday morning as having announced that civilians seeking to purchase train, plane, or bus tickets would be required to sign a slip with some such declaration as this: "This trip for which I am now purchasing tickets is a necessary one."

Colonel Johnson explained the purposes behind this interesting little scheme with a cynicism which makes Barnum seem naive. "Of course," he was quoted as saying, "a ticket buyer could sign anybody's name to these slips. We have no way of insuring against that, but we believe that many people will refrain from making unnecessary trips when they have this reminder that all unnecessary travel must be avoided. The plan, if adopted, should save us 10 percent on passenger travel and give us a margin to work with." Ten percent strikes us as a conservative estimate. The percentage of suckers is probably higher than this. What troubles us, however, is the O. D. T. Chief's apparent willingness to sacrifice the suckers for the benefit of the 90 percent who, he expects, will chisel their way onto trains and planes and busses regardless.

What this boils down to, as nearly as we can figure it out, is a plan to invite 9 out of 10 Americans to commit some degree of perjury, or, at any rate, to falsify their declarations through the ingenious device so thoughtfully suggested by Colonel Johnson. It would be hard to contrive a system less calculated to enhance respect for governmental authority. Under what circumstances is a trip necessary anyhow, we wonder? The criteria are elastic. No civilian, we fancy, could travel anywhere with

an entirely clear conscience. Colonel Johnson had better give this brainstorm a sober second thought. He would do well to consider the precepts of his distinguished predecessor, the late Joseph B. Eastman, who knew that regulation, like government, must be by as well as for the people.

Iowa Rural Electric Cooperatives Oppose Amendment to War Utilities Order U-1-C

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of War Utilities on April 6, 1944, promulgated an amendment to its order U-1-C which so materially restricted construction of rural electrification lines by reason of the limitations therein contained that such construction will practically be stopped. The Iowa Rural Electric Cooperatives Association at a special meeting held at Des Moines, Iowa, on April 19, 1944, adopted resolutions with reference to this matter, and I am setting forth said resolutions for the information of the Members of the House, as follows:

Whereas Office of War Utilities has heretofore promulgated orders denominated U-1-C, under which the cooperatives of Iowa have completed applications for construction of electric lines and services to farms and farmsteads in this State; and

Whereas the Office of War Utilities promulgated an amendment to said order U-1-C on April 6, 1944, supplemented by administrative letter, which so materially restrict construction by reason of the limitations therein contained, that such construction will practically be stopped; and

Whereas such restrictions materially hamper and reduce the production of food, and the efficient operation of farms ready to be served; and

Whereas the Office of War Utilities based its amendment to order U-1-C, and the administrative letter, upon a shortage of transformers caused by the alleged conversion of manufacturing plants manufacturing electric transformers of capacity of 5 kilovoltamperes or less to the manufacture of radio or radar equipment for the armed forces; and

Whereas investigation reveals that such conversion has not taken place, and that such shortage does not exist; and

Whereas said transformer manufacturers have available stocks of transformers on hand and available capacity and material to manufacture same; and

Whereas many of the cooperatives in Iowa have transformers on hand and available for construction of electric lines and services, permitted by and developed under the provisions of the original U-1-C order; and

Whereas many farmers, relying upon said original order of the Office of War Utilities, have wired their premises in anticipation of receiving electric service; and

Whereas numerous applications for permission to construct extensions in excess of 5,000 feet under said original orders were forwarded to said Office of War Utilities by said cooperatives long before April 6, 1944, and should have been approved; and

Whereas the recertification by the local agricultural conservation committee required by said amendment to the U-1-C order and by the administrative letter would require excessive waste of man-hours and miles of automotive travel and waste of gasoline and tires; and

Whereas Iowa is the center of food production in the United States of America; and

Whereas the farmers of Iowa are 3 weeks behind with farm work due to weather conditions and the shortage of farm labor and farm machinery; and

Whereas electric motors and other electric equipment are reasonably available and will materially increase the efficiency of farm labor and farm production; and

Whereas the allocation of transformers by the Office of War Utilities to the Corn Belt area has been inequitable and disproportionate to the number allocated to other areas, and therefore detrimental to the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Iowa Rural Electric Cooperatives' Association, in special meeting assembled—

(a) That the War Production Board revoke the order of the Office of War Utilities of April 6, 1944, amending its order U-1-C, and withdraw the administrative letter of the same date and permit the construction of electric and service lines under the orders of the Office of War Utilities as they existed immediately prior to April 6, 1944;

(b) That the Congress of the United States, through appropriate committee or committees, investigate the matters and facts with regard to the supply of small transformers, the conversion of transformer manufacturing plants to radio or radar work for the armed forces of the United States of America, and the allocation of transformers to the various inventory control offices of the United States; and

(c) That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, and the Vice President, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to Members of Congress, to the War Food Administrator, to the Chairman of the War Production Board, and to such others as may be interested in the advancement of the war effort through the increase of food production.

Respectfully submitted.

I. E. TROTTNOW,
Chairman.
O. J. GRAU,
EDGAR D. BEACH,
GEO. A. RICE,
EARL F. WISDOM,
Committee.

Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cambria Dispatch, Portage, Pa.:

MORALE

Much is heard from Washington about the morale on the home front in this war. But that which comes from Washington is not of a morale-building nature, but is more like scolding, berating, and criticism, based upon a premise that the people are not doing all they must do to fight the war. That criticism in many instances is well-founded, as there are many who experience not the heartaches, the terrible fears, the deep sorrows of war, nor even material reverses, but only the selfish satisfaction of more profit and high wages.

But on the over-all basis what do we find? It cannot conceivably be denied that morale is at a low ebb today and that is a serious situation. For this there must be a reason and that reason centers in Washington. Morale cannot be on a high plane when the people lose faith, when they become bewildered and confused. Morale of necessity goes down as objectives become blurred and seemingly blotted out. Morale suffers badly when all that is seen is lack of purpose. And those are the things that come out of Washington.

Confusion and bungling in Washington pertaining to the operation of domestic affairs has been and continues to be shameful and the people are not able to conceive that domestic and military operations can be so widely separated as to not have confusion and bungling rampant in military affairs as well, particularly since they are so closely interwoven and directed from the same sources.

An instance is the football tactics which have and which continue to be employed in handling of the most vital problem of manpower and the military draft. Who dare suggest that either of these matters have been or are being handled fairly and efficiently? Lack of coordination, refusal to adopt a workable policy, permitting first consideration to be given the political angle, governs the course, with the result that the public is confused beyond the point of tolerance. A decision today is reversed tomorrow, accompanied by a constant yapping about the possibilities of doing the things which are already being done.

Politics is the only reason for this and how can morale be high when there is a realization that politics holds first place in the conduct of a war?

Can morale be high when the people are brought to a belief that information to which they are entitled is withheld? Can they be expected to be enthusiastic about anything when they entertain a feeling that all things are done with a lack of frankness on the part of those who direct the destinies of war? Can they have confidence when they see that there is a division in understanding and widely held views of the manner of obtaining objectives among those who conduct the war?

It cannot possibly contribute to morale for the public to learn that major military decisions are overruled by politicians. And that seems to be the case in the course which was first established when this country was put to war. It is charged that the military insisted upon putting all the strength of this country against Japan at once while England and Russia would hold Germany, and having then settled the score in the Pacific, for this country then to help in bringing the conflict to a close in Europe. It was probably on this course which the military should have had good reason to expect would be followed that Admiral Nimitz based his original prediction that the war with Japan would end within a year of its beginning. But the military was overruled by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, not militarists but politicians. Mr. Churchill evidently wanted the pressure taken from his homeland and Mr. Roosevelt agreed. In the meantime what has happened? Japan has been given the cherished opportunity of building up her defenses and by reason of the long delays in Europe Germany has had the same opportunity.

It cannot be inspiring to be told in glowing terms about the great strength which the United Nations, or should it be said the United Nation has attained and that we are now on the offensive and then to witness such situations as in Italy and in India, in

both cases being confronted with the same deplorable conditions which England so sadly bemoaned in the beginning when she fled from Europe and when she lost her possessions to Japan, too little and too late.

It does not contribute to hope and faith when the people are led to expect action of a telling nature and weeks and months roll by and nothing happens. It is not the way to build confidence and morale to have the Government contribute to a belief that big things were in the making in Burma upon the selection of Lord Mountbatten as the military leader in that area and that they would be enacted before the opening of the monsoon season, which will start now in a few weeks, only to find that the Japanese are the ones who make things happen by pushing into India. And morale necessarily takes another nose dive when it is seen that the situation becomes critical only a few days after the military headquarters in that area more or less minimize the operation and tell the people that the Japanese will not be able to take what they have now taken.

These things have a depressing effect upon the people. They see the possibility of the ending of the war fading away. They see little having been accomplished in the defeat of the enemies in spite of the tremendous building of arms and armies. They see the enemies being given longer and still longer time to build and to keep building their defenses. We were told that quick action and surprises will be the influencing factors and yet after the landing on the Anzio beachhead the Allies apparently took time out to permit the Germans to corral their forces and in sufficient strength to hold the line for months.

Instead of events bringing confidence, they actually bring fear to the public when Hanson Baldwin of the New York Times, considered the foremost civilian military expert in this country, asks whether or not an invasion should be undertaken without a major Army reorganization.

If these things have a depressing effect on the people of this country, they have a disastrous effect upon the peoples in Europe who believed that once the Allies would strike the force would be so great that they at last would be in a position to turn their own wrath upon Germany. This situation must cause them to fear to make a move and to wonder if their hopes have not been misplaced.

How about the morale of those boys on the fighting fronts? The one heart-burning desire among those men and boys is to get home and that's where they should be. High fervor in doing a job is not present where that is an ever-present wish—and morale is not aided when these men and boys are prompted to ask, "What are we fighting for?"

Washington would do well to take an accounting of itself and to give an honest and fair accounting to the people.

Governmental Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, there is so much duplication of effort, so many overlapping bureaus, so many conflicting reports, and so many contradictory orders issued by innumerable New Deal agencies that the American public is bewildered. The farmer, the businessman, the factory worker, the miner, in fact, nearly every citizen, whether old or young, whether employer or employee, is lost today in a fog of confusion caused by governmental red tape. Nothing is more illustrative of this assertion than the sorrowful plight in which the American farmer finds himself at this critical time.

Under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks and to corroborate what I have just said, I include a copy of a letter addressed to the President of the United States by Mr. R. W. Brown, president of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, along with a statement on food supply by the executive committee of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation. These communications contain undeniable truths and it would be well if the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Food Administration would get their heads together and decide on some clear-cut, definite policy which would remove the uncertainty that now hangs like a pall over the heads of our citizens and that would bring some semblance of order out of the present tragic chaos:

APRIL 24, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The enclosed statement adopted last week by the executive committee of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation is respectfully submitted for your consideration.

The statement was prompted by news stories appearing in the country press which seem to have the official sanction of Selective Service. From one of these releases the following is quoted:

"All men who are between the ages of 18 and 26 must be inducted into the armed forces to meet the critical need for younger men. This includes those men who are now in deferred classifications, either farming or industry. * * * At this time and for the immediate future the country is amply supplied with both food and munitions and the men of the above-mentioned age will be of more good to their country in the service than in the factory or on the farm. The local board states that men within the ages of 18 to 26 will be immediately reclassified and will in all probability be inducted into the armed services within the next 60 days."

The appearance of such releases at this time is causing much confusion, as the young men now holding agricultural deferments have already started with their farming operations for this year. Reports coming to this office indicate that many of them are now planning to sell their livestock and equipment. That is the only adjustment they can make under the circumstances.

The enclosed statement is not to be construed as a remonstrance against the induction of young men into the Army. If farmers had been told last fall or winter that food supplies were ample and that the Army would need all young men in the age group involved, the present confusion would have been avoided.

Yours very respectfully,
MISSOURI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
R. W. BROWN, *President.*

STATEMENT ON FOOD SUPPLY BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MISSOURI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

We protest the confusing and conflicting statements on the food situation which emanate from various governmental agencies in Washington. In order that farm people may be in position to make their most effective contribution to the war effort we ask for a clear-cut, authoritative statement of policy on food production and manpower.

The current optimism on the food situation, fostered by statements emanating from Washington and Selective Service, are unwarranted by the facts in the case. The facts are that reserves of feed determine next year's food supplies.

Calculations based on livestock and slaughter figures released by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate that for the first 8 months of 1944 we may expect larger meat supplies than for the corresponding period of 1943. That, however, is due to the fact that the feed situation is forcing liquidation of flocks and herds. After this liquidation is accomplished there will be drastic curtailment of meat, dairy, and poultry products.

Already serious feed shortages have developed locally, forcing liquidation which will become Nation-wide. On the basis of livestock and feed now available and in prospect, there will be enough feed for 11½ months, with no feed reserves whatever.

The above statements assume that we have a normal crop year and sufficient manpower and machinery to operate farms according to the farm plan sign-up of the triple A—which is a goal, with no guaranty that it can be reached. Drought, flood, unfavorable planting or harvesting weather, disease or insect damage, lack of sufficient manpower and machinery, can readily cut food supplies to the point of disaster.

As one instance, we may point to the fact that unseasonable weather has already cut oat acreage in Missouri 40 percent. Any one of half a dozen factors can have the same effect on other crops and on livestock production.

Statements from Washington to the effect that we are "well equipped with food and munitions" and that food supplies are ample, are misleading and confusing. They have revealed in misinterpretations by local draft boards that are having serious effects on the production program.

Farmers do not want deferment at the expense of the war effort, but it is, to say the least, inconsistent and confusing to have the War Food Administration calling for even greater exertion in food production than last year when farmers did their utmost to meet the quotas asked for, while on the other hand another agency of Government says "food supplies are ample."

Like all other good citizens, farmers want to do their full share toward the winning of the war. To do so they need to know the plain facts in the case, and they should be given in clear and straightforward manner from an authoritative source.

Mr. Dewey on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 28, 1944:

MR. DEWEY ON FOREIGN POLICY

Governor Dewey's address last night before the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association will give new and strong encouragement to all those who hope that on the great issues of the war and the peace there will be an essential unity of American opinion. We stand now at the very climax of the most fateful struggle in our history, with our armies poised for their invasion of the fortress of an evil and still powerful enemy. In this moment Nazi Germany looks searchingly at us to discover whether there is any evidence of division in our ranks, any half-heartedness in our purpose, any disposition on the part of the party of opposition to dissociate itself from the objectives of a complete and crushing victory and a peace with enough force behind it to put an end to international aggression. There will be no comfort for our enemies, and there will be reassurance for our allies, in the speech made last night by the most likely leader of that opposition in this year's national election. It affirms both the complete and crushing victory and the organization of peace backed by adequate force as purposes on which there is overwhelming agreement on the part of all groups and all sections of the American people.

Mr. Dewey spoke last night as a man who is eager to hurry his party into a position of leadership on international issues—so eager, in fact, that in some respects he claimed too much. Describing the development in this country of sentiment for prompt measures to establish a system of general international cooperation, he said: "First came the Republican Mackinac charter, then the Moscow Declaration and the Fulbright and Connally resolutions." But this account omits much history, the remembrance of which is critically important if we are not to make the same mistakes a second time.

First, and long before the Republican Mackinac meeting, came repeal of the arms embargo, without which there would be no hope today of any kind of international cooperation whatever, for our present allies would long since have been overwhelmed and conquered. Second, after the crucial but negative act of repeal of the arms embargo, came lend-lease, the great affirmative act by which the resources of this Nation, still technically at peace, were put at the disposal of those countries which were fighting for their freedom—and our own. Third came the Atlantic Charter, in which the broad purposes of the anti-Axis Powers were for the first time stated officially by the heads of government of the two great English-speaking nations. Fourth came the act of January 2, 1942, by which 26 countries bound themselves together formally in their war aims and their peace aims with the declaration of United Nations. And fifth came the many conferences, all the way from Washington to Ottawa and Casablanca, by means of which the members of this grand alliance experimented, with increasing success, in the most fundamental of all types of international cooperation, namely, the way to win a common war and to survive as independent nations. Mackinac came later in the day than Governor Dewey puts it.

But that it came, that it ranged the Republican Party on the side of international cooperation as against isolation, and that Mr. Dewey showed himself prepared last night to lead his party farther and faster along the path which it has chosen are all present facts which are reassuring and important.

A newspaper which continued throughout the whole cynical period of the twenties and the thirties to believe in the imperative necessity of international cooperation must find itself wholeheartedly in agreement with all of the major conclusions and purposes which Mr. Dewey described last night; that "the experience of two world wars has taught us that we cannot remain unaffected by what happens elsewhere in the world"; that "unprovoked aggression against a freedom-loving people anywhere is an attack upon the peace of the whole world"; that in the light of what has happened, we now know that "Germany and Japan must not only be utterly defeated and completely disarmed—they must not be left in a post-war environment which might enable them to maneuver as a balance of power"; that this time the "lethargy, jealousy, and power politics" which dashed the hopes of a lasting peace in the years after 1918 must not be permitted again to waste a costly victory when it is won; that the immense problems of the first days following the end of the present fighting will require, above all else, "solid relations among the United States and Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China"; that on the basis of this indispensable cooperation must be built a more enduring "structure of peace backed by adequate force to prevent future wars" and a continuing effort "to establish and maintain in our relations with other nations conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability not only for the sake of the world but also to the end that our own people may enjoy a high level of employment in an increasingly prosperous world."

This is a good speech, made at a good moment.

Mr. Clark and the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Food Field Reporter of April 3, 1944:

MR. CLARK AND THE O. P. A.

It is not difficult to think up some profound reasons why the emergency price control act should be extended "substantially without change" as Administrator Chester Bowles has recommended. In fact, we had intended to spread some of them on this page until we came across this letter written to the Tarboro (N. C.) Daily Southerner by Sam Clark, of W. S. Clark & Sons, retail grocers, which tells the story as well as anything we have seen. Mr. Clark has gotten the idea much better than some of his food trade confreres who are trying to think up slick schemes to sabotage O. P. A. while outwardly professing their love for price control. From here on the language is Sam Clark's:

"We are writing to express our approval of the O. P. A. in their effort to hold down prices. For some of us who were doing business in the last war, we can easily recall when sugar sold for 40 cents a pound and flour for approximately $20 a barrel. Soon after the war nearly every merchant not only lost the profit he made but many of them were put out of business.

POLICE WAS NEEDED

"The consumer, though he feels that rationing of merchandise is hard, will recall standing in line and often doing without merchandise. When we received a shipment of sugar, during the last war, we had to ask police protection in distributing it.

"Of course, it is not easy on the merchant to handle ration points, as it has put a good deal more work on each merchant. However, this in no way equals the sacrifice that our men and women are making in service. We are sure that every patriotic merchant is doing his utmost to comply with the O. P. A. rulings, and appreciate the cooperation and consideration that the O. P. A. board has given his problems."

Get the City Back on the Air Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. PRATT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer, Philadelphia, Pa., April 21, 1944:

For nearly 4 months Philadelphia, third largest city in the United States, vast arsenal of America at war, has been deprived of commercial air service.

It is grounded; off the Nation's air map; not even a whistle stop on the transport lines. A great war production area, perhaps without an equal in the world, is without a working airport.

Here is an absurd and an outrageous situation. It is one that no city in the country would take lying down.

There is no reason for Philadelphia to take it lying down.

What is back of the persistent delay in restoring to this city its indispensable access to commercial air routes?

Is political discrimination against our Republican city administration to blame? Or is it "brass hat" fear in the War Department of losing face by the rescindment of orders that should not have been issued in the first place? Or is it just monumental stupidity, inefficiency, and neglect?

Whatever it is, it can be tolerated no longer.

No reasonable person, surely, could find any justice in the treatment accorded Philadelphia in this matter. The closing order at the municipal airport shortly before Christmas came without advance notice, giving the city no chance to get a substitute field in shape.

It was believed at first that the unfinished northeast airport might be put to use. But the Government, after long-drawn-out dickering, refused to put up any money to complete it.

Philadelphia then found itself faced by these alternatives. Either it must finish the work at the northeast field, with funds put up by itself or by the Government through special congressional appropriation, or it must prevail upon the Government to restore the municipal airport to limited use. Because it would take many weeks to make the substitute field usable, and because the airport in southwest Philadelphia could be placed in service at once, the second course was naturally preferred.

The various Washington agencies concerned have, from time to time, held out some hope that the closing order might be

eased. But the weeks speed by, fresh obstacles and objections are encountered, new surveys and conferences are considered necessary—and Philadelphia is still off the air map.

It is difficult to picture New York or Chicago receiving this raw deal or enduring it for long. We can picture Mayor LaGuardia or Mayor Kelly lifting their telephones, bellowing indignant orders into compliant ears at Washington and getting immediate results.

Philadelphia's Mayor Samuel has unceasingly sought favorable action from Government agencies, but whether or not Republican pleas always encounter deaf ears, his efforts have not met with success.

Victim of discrimination or bonehead bungling, Philadelphia suffers today from a grave injustice.

The ban on the municipal airport should be lifted at once, or definite announcement made that such a step is not now possible, permitting the city to concentrate on substitute facilities.

The present disgraceful state of affairs cannot be endured any longer.

Report on the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of April 24, 1944:

REPORT ON THE NAVY

In a report that reveals many heretofore suppressed details of our naval warfare to date, Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations, stresses one point that will be the key to our eventual victory:

"Our Army and Navy forces have learned how to fight as one team."

In a war that is being fought in almost all parts of the world except within our own borders, no Army campaign would be possible without naval cooperation. In early stages of the war teamwork was untried, and many mistakes were made. But Admiral King can now say:

"Through experience, we have mastered and improved the technique of amphibious operations, in which the Japanese were so proficient in the early days of the war." Furthermore, he is now able to say, "We have learned how to make the most of what we have, but it is no longer necessary to ask our commanders to get along as best they can on inadequate means."

While pointing out that "the encirclement of Germany is in sight," he warns that "Japan will not be directly under attack as Germany is now until the citadel area of that empire island and continental, is under our threat or control."

The Japanese have been driven back from their posts of maximum advance in the Pacific, yet "important as our advances toward Japan are, they do not fully represent the improvement in our position. Japanese capacity to maintain the war at sea and in her advanced areas has suffered increasingly, due to the loss of vital shipping."

At the same time, "the German submarine fleet has been reduced from a menace to a problem."

It is encouraging that we can beat the Axis at its own game in so many directions—that we can defeat the Japanese with submarines in the Pacific while defeating German submarines in the Atlantic; that we can learn amphibious operations from the Japs and so improve on their methods as to wrest from them their gains; that we have not only caught up with the many years of Axis preparation for war, but actually are exceeding them in almost every weapon of war.

And when we get too complacent about these things, we can reflect on how long we have been before Cassino and how far we still are from Tokyo.

Just 150 years ago today, Admiral King points out, Congress passed our first Navy bill, providing for those famous frigates—*Constitution, United States, President, Chesapeake, Constellation,* and *Congress.* Those ships made naval history, but we have come a long way since then. We have had "more warships and auxiliaries on the ways than had ever been under construction anywhere in the world at any one time." We have increased naval personnel from 325,095 when we entered the war to 2,252,606.

Victory may be a long while away. But we have the tools and the teamwork.

Address of Hon. Olin D. Johnston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Gov. Olin D. Johnston at B'rith Shalom Synagogue, Charleston, S. C., March 31, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and friends, we have met here tonight on a solemn occasion. It is an occasion that calls for thought and action. While the Jewish people of the United States are dwelling in security in this our beloved land of plenty, because of our democratic institutions and just laws, yet in other parts of the world, the Jewish people are victims of bigotry and persecution.

During this great conflict which is now raging throughout the civilized world, no people have undergone more suffering and made more sacrifices than have the people of Jewish descent.

Some years ago the civilized nations sought a solution of the Jewish problem by a resettlement of the Hebrews in ancient Palestine. It was the hope of these persecuted people to re-create its ancient homeland into a haven of refuge where they could live together, maintain their civilization, and solve their problems. But today this hope is fastly fading. Palestine, which seemed a harbor of safety for these persecuted people, is tonight threatened with a closed door.

The rights which were guaranteed to the Jewish people in regards to Palestine have been whittled down on the ground of political or military expediency. The white paper of May 1939 nullifies the last hope of millions of homeless Jews.

The Jewish people have marched in the ranks of all the armies of the Allied Nations. They have fought side by side with the forces of decency and righteousness. Through the Balfour Declaration in 1917 and the League of Nations and the unanimous approval of Congress of the United States in 1922, they were solemnly promised this land of Palestine where they could settle and maintain a Jewish commonwealth. But Mr. Chamberlain, in 1939, following his policy of appeasement, issued a white paper which denied the Jewish people complete admission of settlement in Palestine. At that time, Mr. Winston Churchill, in the House of Commons, called this paper a breach and a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration.

We have met here tonight for the purpose of demanding that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration and that the Jewish agency of Palestine be recognized as the authorized representative of the Jewish people. If given this opportunity, the Jewish people would develop to a maximum the agricultural and industrial possibilities and the natural resources of Palestine.

I understand that the Jewish people have pledged themselves to the highest regard for the preservation of the religious and cultural rights of the Arab population of Palestine, and to the civil and religious equality of all of its inhabitants before the law. They have affirmed their readiness and desire for full cooperation with their Arab neighbors in Palestine.

After the war hundreds of thousands of destitute European Jews, who have been victims of the Nazi war on civilization, will desperately need a place in which to begin a new life. Their native lands of Germany, Poland, Rumania, and Hungary will seethe with hatred for them and will render the prospect of a happy future almost impossible.

Palestine, the ancient and never forgotten land of the Jewish people, offers a haven for the misery stricken, persecuted refugee. Over half a million Jews have settled and prospered in Palestine during the past 25 years. The country can shelter and give life to millions more. American experts claim that Palestine can absorb from two to four million additional settlers and this can be done without depriving a single Arab of his job or his land.

Great Britain, the United States, and the League of Nations have recognized Palestine as the national homeland of the Jewish people. During the present war for world freedom, even the Jews of Palestine are volunteers for the armed forces. They are working in war industries behind the lines; they have declared themselves on the side of the Allies.

This white paper which I have been speaking of and issued by Mr. Chamberlain in 1939, forbids any Jew to settle in Palestine once the present quota of 31,000 immigrants is filled.

It limits Jewish land purchase to a tiny area—a discrimination unparalleled in any democratic country. If allowed to stand, this white paper will freeze Palestinian Jewry into a permanent minority. It will mean the death warrant to the one major hope for a renewed and normal life—a hope which now sustains thousands of homeless and hounded Jews. It will inflict upon the post-war world a bitter, cancerous, and insoluble Jewish problem. It will flout the claims of justice, the demands of reason, and every appeal of the human heart.

I can understand many things that have occurred in the course of this war, but there is no explanation of why the Jews should not be allowed to return to their homeland to rehabilitate themselves and to preserve their religious and historic traditions. I want to say right at this time that the world is conscious of contributions that the Jews have made to world civilization. They have preserved the religious ideal of the one true God. They have made contributions in the fields of art, science, and literature. It is nothing but just that they should be afforded a homeland and a flag under which they might

march forward to great heights of achievement.

I understand that in Palestine you have turned over your entire hospital of the Hadassah and all of its facilities to the use of the United Nations in this great war. When I heard of this I remembered that it was the Jewish race that long generations ago codified the first health laws and started a movement which has led today to our modern health program and hospitalization.

Throughout the world the Jews have undergone persecution, but they have borne it with fortitude and faith in a just God. Surely the day will come soon when the persecutors and aggressors shall be destroyed and the Jewish race shall again be free in every land to carry further their many contributions that have been worth while to human society.

Today my heart goes out to all your persecuted brothers and sisters in all the lands of Europe and Asia. To say that I despise this man Hitler is also to say that I despise the persecution that he has made against the Jewish people, and I long for the day when all of his kind shall receive their just deserts at the hands of the victorious Allied Nations and the just retributions of a just God.

Palestine has always been looked upon as the land of the Hebrews. It was there that Jacob found water to feed his flocks; it was there that Moses received the commandments of God; it was there that David wrote his Psalms; it was there that Solomon built God's Temple; and I am looking forward to the day when the Jewish homeland shall again be Palestine and when the Jews will have an opportunity of having their own nation and their own flag.

Today I am looking forward to the era of peace and when that day comes I feel that the Jewish people will make their contribution in solving the problems of tomorrow and of making this a lasting peace.

I look forward to the great day which your prophet Isaiah spoke about, saying: "And He shall judge among the nations and rebuke many people and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

I know that your aim in this hour of war is to win victory; I know that you will do your part, and that in every phase of war effort you will find the Jewish people from firing line to factory on guard against the evils of the human race.

I hope that soon victory will come and that you will have the opportunity of finding homes for these refugees, that Palestine shall be returned to the Jews, and that the world will once more be freed of the monsters of oppression.

There should not and there must not be any deadline against Jewish immigration to Palestine.

Importance of the Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by Brig. Gen. William H. Wilbur at the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, held at the Statler Hotel on Saturday evening, April 22, 1944. The address was the finest tribute to our infantry soldiers to which I have ever had the pleasure of listening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the war progresses I am greatly impressed by the marvelous job that American industry has done. Certainly its achievements have never been equaled in history. But, let us make no mistake, essential as it is, production cannot win a war. It is true that lack of production can lose a war, but production cannot win one. I wish that it could.

The products of industry are used by fighting soldiers. The period when they are used on the battlefield is the critical, decisive, phase of war. Sometimes our soldiers smash that equipment. More times the enemy does.

I remember working my way to a vantage point on the front line—within sight of the famous monastery above Cassino. I saw what appeared to be an empty foxhole; for as I got close to it I noticed a Garand rifle, thoroughly chewed by shell fragments. The wooden stock was in slivers—the mechanism worthless. To my surprise a soldier stuck his head from the hole. I asked him if that was his rifle. "Yes, it is," he said, and reached over and placed his hand on the wreckage. "It is pretty well smashed," he said, "I should have taken better care of it. It was that shell that just lit here a minute ago. I was just able to duck myself." Then he brightened up a bit. "But," he said, "I've still got six hand grenades."

Equipment of all kinds is used up, smashed, and worn out—from Garand rifles to the most complicated machines of war. Industry must continue to feed in its products, in great quantity, and of the highest quality.

I wish that every American would see just what our men have gone through, and are going through in Italy. For the fighting soldier at Anzio and Cassino it means day after day of struggle; struggle against rain, sleet, and ice—struggle against fatigue, heavy sodden overempowering fatigue—yet his job requires him to go up another 1,000 feet, struggle against the stupefying blow that strikes when one of his comrades is killed.

I wish every American could have been with me when I have asked one of these men, "How are you getting along?" Covered with mud, bleary-eyed from lack of rest, the infantry soldiers have looked up, squared their jaws, and without exception have replied, "Fine, sir." They were not fine. They knew that I knew they were anything but fine. But they would not admit anything else.

All Americans can be deeply proud of them.

You will be interested to know of the joy and appreciation of the Italian people when liberated from the German yoke.

Typical of every town is the situation which we found when we went into the ruins of the village of San Pietro. Out of their caves and cellars came the pitiful villagers, dirty, fearful, dressed in worn or tattered clothing—a sorry sight.

An old man rushed up to me, threw his arms around me, and before I could get my guard up, kissed me. Others crowded around expressing their joy and appreciation to the Americans.

TOWN LOOTED BY NAZIS

I gave a gaunt old man a 5-cent package of Lifesavers. "Molto grazia, molto grazia," he said, and then dove back into his shelter and shortly came up with a bag of dried figs. With real graciousness he tried to get me to accept some of them, although I am sure that he badly needed every one of them.

These pitiful villagers told us that the Germans had systematically looted the town before leaving, that they had taken not only the grain and other food but had collected all woolen clothing, women's as well as men's, for dispatch to Germany. Being slaves of Germany is hard.

Just as we were about to leave the village we encountered an Italian who spoke some English. I asked him how it happened that he spoke English. "Me, me live in Boston for 14 year. Oh! If me only there now."

Remembering the safety and comfort of our homes in America, we went on with a better understanding of just what we are fighting for in this war.

Contact with home is most important. The soldiers crave letters—they thirst for information of the little things that are going on at home. Anything that typifies your world means a lot to them. Red Cross girls handing out doughnuts are a breath of America. It is interesting to watch the reaction of the soldiers as they receive their doughnuts—each one handed out with a smile. Some, of course, make wisecracks. Others stand with open mouths—happy just to get a look at a fine American girl.

Blood plasma and its miraculous action is another strong tie to the people at home.

The combat soldier has great difficulty in understanding statements indicating that the war will be over very soon. He cannot understand any letdown of effort. Every day he sees his comrades wounded and killed. He sees no weakening on the part of the enemy in front of him. I have talked to a considerable number of German prisoners recently. They were mostly German infantry soldiers. They are solid in their belief that Germany will win the war. It is striking, and very disconcerting, too, to hear them say, with calm conviction, "Germany will win because we will never quit." Their faith in the final outcome appears to be absolutely unshaken.

The attitude of those German prisoners explains, in part, why bombs and artillery fire cannot do the decisive part of the job of winning this war.

We had hoped that airplanes, tanks, artillery, and machines could carry the major part of the load of battle. We had hoped that in this war infantry could be charged with a minor role. It does not appear to be so. The infantry soldier still carries almost the entire load. On those fronts such as in Italy, where all elements of our fighting forces are in daily action against the enemy, this is most apparent. There, for each individual private soldier of the artillery, air corps, engineers, or other arms that is killed, there are 30, 50, even 100 privates of Infantry who make the supreme sacrifice for their country.

Tanks, airplanes, rocket guns, and mines, in the hands of the enemy, have all combined to make the task of the infantryman a heavier one than in any war of the past. Our infantry realizes this. We, too, must realize that this war can be won when, and only when, the German infantry is defeated. The struggle of infantry against infantry, the physical domination of every German by a superior, free soldier, must be accomplished. In this struggle the human element is the vital one.

This is a war of survival.

In such a war every citizen should feel that he exists to help those men who are fighting the battle. Every worker, every factory, the War Department from top to bottom, every military agency between here and the battle front exists to help the combat soldier do his tough job.

Wars are won by fighting men, individuals who have the courage to overcome danger, the stamina to withstand hardships of the toughest kind, the individual will to keep going forward, regardless of murderous hostile fire, regardless of overpowering, sodden fatigue, regardless of the fact that their comrades have been killed and wounded.

Those are the men who protect our freedoms.

Dewey's Address to Publishers on United States Role After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, at the dinner of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y.:

I am very happy to speak before this wartime gathering of American newspaper publishers. Yours is an essential industry, because in America the press is a vital part of our war effort; it is a vital part of our whole free system; it is an indispensable element of everything for which we fight.

The tragic history of recent years has shown us vividly that freedom of the press cannot exist where there is no political freedom; but the corollary to this basic truth is perhaps even more important—political freedom cannot exist without a free press.

An electorate fully informed on issues is as fundamental to representative government as the election itself. And full information through the press is the bulwark of the people's power to check up on their representatives between elections.

We saw it demonstrated in Germany that tyranny can rise to power by the elective process. But in order to stay in power the Nazis immediately set about destroying the freedom of the German press. In all countries men have been elected to office who proved unworthy of the trust. The strength of a free system is that such mistakes need never be fatal. They can be corrected at the polls. But these corrections can be made only if the people are informed.

GUARANTY PROTECTS PEOPLE

The precious guaranty in our Constitution of freedom of the press is not a mere guaranty to the press. It is a guaranty to the people that their press shall be free. It imposes an obligation on Government to permit free dissemination of news and a duty on the press to print honest news. The right resides in the people because it is basic to their liberties.

Freedom of the press today means more than freedom to print what information can be obtained. It means access to the news. It involves the right of information and a corresponding duty to print it.

All of us recognize the need for military censorship. But there is a dividing line between military news and political news, or, if you will, diplomatic news. It is a dividing line which can never be left without scrutiny, which throughout the war calls for vigilance. Once the fighting has ceased we must insist that all censorship of every description cease with it. We shall need then the uncorrupted word of truth.

I am confident of our future because we have, in fact, a great, free press. I believe our publishers generally are today more conscious of their tremendous responsibility than ever before. They will have much to do with the steadfastness with which we fight through this war. They will have much to do with the intelligence and determination with which we face the even more complicated problems of the peace.

The power of the written word lies in shaping the mind and spirit of man toward high achievement. There is, of course, a wide gulf between a statement of fact or of principles, on the one hand, and epithets or empty promises on the other. In recent years we have had good reason to learn that difference in our domestic affairs. It is not enough to talk about a more abundant life if the actions that follow the words leaves millions unemployed and dependent upon Government for a bare existence. It is not enough to talk about economic security and then pursue policies which promote insecurity. It is not enough to talk about the enterprise system and then pursue a course of action that stifles enterprise.

CONCERN OVER FOREIGN POLICY

These experiences with domestic policies cannot be forgotten when we think of foreign policies. All of us are aware that there is great concern and uncertainty among our people of our Nation's foreign policy. Yet I think it is no more than fair to say that we have had some excellent expressions on that subject lately from the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull. In his address of April 9 Mr. Hull certainly offered a statement of basic principles which deserves respect. His pledge to seek the advice and help of Members of Congress from both parties is especially welcome. Nevertheless, these statements have done little to relieve the concern and uncertainty our people feel. That is not primarily because of dissatisfaction with the words Mr. Hull has used. It is because we see reported daily in your papers developments from abroad and other statements from high Government officials at home which do not seem to fit in altogether with the words Mr. Hull has used. It is because we cannot be sure to what extent our foreign policy is actually being handled by the Secretary of State and to what extent it is being handled privately by the President.

What troubles us is not the main objectives of our foreign policy, but whether that policy will be effectively carried out in accordance with constitutional methods. One way it will succeed. The other way it will surely fail. Foreign policy is not a mere matter of negotiations, of diplomatic maneuvering, or even of treaties and alliances. Foreign policy is the expression of the ideals, traditions, and aspirations of a people in their relations with the people of other countries.

In a free republic there can be no such thing as an administration having an effective foreign policy unless that policy reflects the will of the people. Here we are fighting, hoping, praying for a world in which we can have a lasting peace, but in almost every discussion one simple fact is forgotten. No foreign policy that fails to represent the will of the people will ever last as long as 2 years. It will not last beyond the next congressional election.

AGREEMENT ON OBJECTIVES

Among our people there are differences of opinion with respect to details and methods; but, I insist, there is overwhelming agreement upon the main objectives. Those major objectives are:

To carry on the war to total crushing victory, and in so doing drive home to the aggressor nations a lesson that will never be forgotten;

To organize in cooperation with other nations a structure of peace backed by adequate force to prevent future wars;

To establish and maintain in our relations with other nations conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability not only for the sake of the world, but also to the end that our own people may enjoy a high level of employment in an increasingly prosperous world.

There is, I am confident, no real dissent from those major objectives on the part of any substantial portion of our people. They have been proclaimed by men of all parties and subscribed to by men of all walks of life in all parts of our country. They constitute the fundamental principles of our foreign policy because they represent the will of our people. But once again let it be said that these objectives cannot be attained by mere words.

As to the winning of the war the point needs no argument. We shall win the war only by the work and sacrifice of all our people. We shall win it by the courage, strength, and suffering of our fighting men and by the unremitting effort of our war-production forces at home. To win the peace will require equally great determination, and over a longer period of time. It will not be sufficient when the fighting ceases merely to draw up a treaty and then forget about it. We must not repeat the tragic error of 25 years ago.

The central error of our course in 1919 was the false assumption that words could create peace. Then, as now, there was much wishful thinking. Men everywhere wanted to feel that a treaty which proclaimed peace would suffice to assure it and that from there on they could relax. The war leaders of the world wanted to feel that by signing their names to a treaty they had brought their task to an end. The very idea that fine words made a peace bore within it the seeds of its own failure.

Within a few years the reality of Germany bore no relation whatever to the word picture of Versailles. This was because those who drafted the treaty were tired war leaders. They could not find within themselves the physical and mental strength to make the peace a living reality.

We have learned much since 1919. The experience of two world wars has taught us that we cannot remain unaffected by what happens elsewhere in the world. It has shown us that unprovoked aggression against a freedom-loving people anywhere is an attack upon the peace of the whole world. We may again be tempted to feel that, with the defeat of our enemies and a proclamation of peace, we can afford to rest on our oars. But the truth is, those years that follow will be decisive. The maintenance of peace will require continuing labor and forbearance. When we have ceased to wage war we shall have to wage peace.

POST-WAR UNITY NEEDED

Germany and Japan must not only be utterly defeated and completely disarmed—they must not be left in a post-war environment which might enable them to maneuver as a balance of power. After 1919 lethargy, jealousy, and power politics resumed sway among the Allies. In that environment Germany quickly eluded the controls of the Treaty of Versailles. If after this war we reproduce that same political climate, we will get the same results. No initial measures against Germany and Japan, however drastic, will have permanent value unless they fall within the setting of a durable cohesion between Great Britain and ourselves together, I hope, with Russia and China. To deal effectively with our enemies and also to solve many other post-war problems will, as I have said, require solid relations among the United States and Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China.

We have a long background of friendly working relations with Great Britain and China, which will make easy their continuation. As regards Russia, it would be stupid to ignore the fact that during the 24 years between the Soviet revolution and the German attack on Russia our relations were not of the best. There were faults on both sides. If after this war we relapse into the old suspicions, the future is indeed dark. But there has been genuine improvement growing out of our partnership in this war. The American people have sympathy and admiration for the peoples of the Soviet Union.

UNITED STATES CAN WORK WITH RUSSIA

There are and will be fundamental internal differences between our countries. Our economic and social systems will not be the same. But our political dissimilarities from Russia need not be the source of friction if we seek and find the many practical ways in which we can work to a common end.

Russian affairs are in the hands of hard-headed, realistic leaders. That is nothing we should be afraid of, provided we are equally realistic and devoted to our country. If we are, the United States and Russia can deal with each other with candor, while building firm mutual respect and friendship.

Inevitably a major responsibility to work together will fall upon the United States, Britain, Russia, and China in the first few years following the war. They will be the strongest nations. They will be the nations with the greatest power to preserve peace or to undermine it.

In some countries we may for a time face confusion. We must wisely, and without intrusion into their domestic affairs, seek to make that period as brief as possible. We shall need the participation of these nations. The peace of the world will require the support of all peoples. We are all agreed that there must be prompt measures to establish a system of general international cooperation. First came the Republican Mackinac charter, then the Moscow Declaration, and the Fulbright and Connally resolutions. All agree in proposing an arrangement which will regularly bring together the representatives of the nations to discuss, to plan, and to seek agreement about matters of common concern. This will not be accomplished to perfection overnight, or in a few months. It must be a matter of growth and experience and everlasting hard work.

It will not be possible to solve immediately the economic problems of the world. It will take time and patience to restore currency stability and trade relationships and to promote the general economic well-being.

AMERICAN ROLE DECISIVE

Here it cannot be too greatly emphasized that the role of the United States will be decisive. We will be truly effective in helping with the economic rehabilitation of the world only if we first restore at home a healthy, a vigorous, and a growing economy.

There are false prophets who for years have been telling us that America has ceased to grow; that its period of vigor is over. They would have us believe that our economy has become mature. They say it is static, that it can continue to function only by constantly taking ever more expensive patent medicines. Yet these same people now talk glibly of a W. P. A. for all the rest of the world.

To hear them talk, Uncle Sam must play the role of a benevolent but slightly senile gentleman, who seeks to purchase the good will of his poor relations by distributing among them the dwindling remains of his youthful earnings.

I utterly reject that proposition, America is still young, still vigorous, still capable of growth. Certainly we shall play the part of a good citizen in the community of nations. We shall deal fairly and generously with our neighbor nations throughout the world. This we shall do because it represents the practical idealism for which America has always stood and because it is good, hard common sense. Good will cannot be bought with gold. Good will flows irresistibly to the man who successfully manages his own affairs, who is self-reliant and independent, yet who is considerate always of the rights and needs of others.

Traditionally, America has occupied this role for 150 years. This country won the admiration of the world because we had here something to which the people of all nations aspired. We had a society of free men who believed in themselves and in the future of their country. We were in sober truth the land of opportunity. Here beyond everywhere else in the world there was a field of economic enterprise and human progress.

For the sake of the men and women who are working and fighting and dying to win this war, for the sake of their children, and for the sake of the world we must work to make America once more the land of opportunity.

It is particularly incumbent on us solemnly to view our obligations tonight. As we meet here, hundreds of thousands of the youth of America stand poised on the shores of Great Britain for the mightiest invasion of a defended coast line in history. Everyone of those young men knows that the future of his country and of freedom itself may hang on the success of this terrible venture. Every man knows the price he may have to pay.

Nothing any of us has said here tonight will be of import unless the invasion is crowned by ultimate success. The infinite patience, preparation, and training behind this gigantic effort may well serve us as a standard for our own acceptance of our future responsibilities. Surely it is a minimum standard for the infinite patience, preparation, and toil we should be willing to give for peace. No sacrifice for peace will ever equal the ultimate sacrifice we expect of our young men in war.

The very least we can do, therefore, as we look ahead tonight to hopes of a peaceful world, is to pledge to ourselves and to those who die for our country that we shall accept the challenge they lay before us. We can resolve to accept the responsibility which our own greatness and importance as a Nation place upon us—a responsibility which two World Wars have shown is utterly inescapable.

Let us recognize that this peace we pray for and our young men die for will have to be worked for over many years. Let us be flexible, earnest and devoted enough to make it a reality.

If the newspapers of America will accept the challenge of peace as they have of war, we shall have made a great beginning. The years of labor ahead will be successful only if an informed people support the effort—only if they know the size of the task. We shall need in these years, as never before, a courageous and a free press in the United States of America.

Termination of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Henry E. Bodman, counsel for Automotive Council for War Production, delivered before Academy of Political Science, semiannual meeting, New York City, April 12, 1944:

It has been well said that there are two principal things which menace human happiness. One of these is war and the other is unemployment. We live in the hope that we are approaching the termination of the war. Whenever this comes we will be immediately confronted with a war against unemployment. Unemployment may be a cause of war. But for the period of prolonged unemployment in Germany we might never have heard of Hitler.

If the war should come to a sudden end, what we would actually do would be to tell half of our entire industry to shut down. This is a dangerous thing to do and plans for doing it should be made now. How well and how quickly reconversion is accomplished will affect the welfare and perhaps the safety of us all. This task is a challenge to America—to government and to industry alike. Unless reconversion is accomplished speedily we will have the longest bread line in our history.

NATURE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

I should like to discuss briefly the nature of the termination problem and suggest a few of the things which, in my opinion, should be done by Congress and the executive branches for its solution.

There will be literally millions of contracts, subcontracts, and purchase orders to be terminated and settled. In many cases one prime contractor will have entered into several thousand subcontracts (including purchase orders) and these subcontractors, in turn, will have entered into other purchase orders. On a general termination all of these millions of war contractors will have to be settled with and it is important to understand what settlement involves. It is not merely a bookkeeping or auditing job. It involves the negotiation of a new or modified agreement as to what should fairly be paid for a partial performance, instead of a complete performance, of a contract.

It must provide for payment for work in process, materials on hand, and commitments and obligations in connection with the uncompleted part of the contract. The settlement must deal with the disposition of materials on hand; whether they should be sold, and if so at what price; whether some of these materials are to be retained by the contractor and credited on his claim, and if so at what price; whether they are to be scrapped and the salvage value credited to the Government; or whether the Government is to take these materials over for such disposition as it may see fit to make; and also what amounts are to be paid to subcontractors and suppliers.

Settlement is not merely a bookkeeping or auditing job. It is much more than that.

CLEARANCE OF PLANTS

I want now to refer to the physical side of the problem.

The first step to be taken is to clear the plants of Government machinery and war materials. This problem is more serious in some plants than in others. But in the automotive industry it is a serious problem. When one considers the vast part of our population dependent upon motor-car and truck production; that only about one-half of this production takes place in motor-car and truck plants themselves, and that the remaining one-half takes place in thousands of other plants that supply steel, glass, leather, wheels, tires, bodies, upholstery, etc., one can realize the importance of speedy clearance of these plants.

The automotive industry is one of the greatest employment potentials in America today. The public will be waiting for motor cars and trucks. If the motor industry, on the termination of the war, can speedily resume peacetime production, it will provide employment for millions of war workers and millions of returning servicemen.

What are the obstacles to be overcome? Automotive plants in general require extensive reconversion. Machinery and equipment not adaptable to war business have been ripped out—machinery foundations torn up, conveyor lines pulled out. Plants are filled with Government-owned machinery and equipment. In one plant in Detroit, and

by no means the largest, 100 acres of floor space, 96 percent of the entire plant, covering an area greater than the bomber plant at Willow Run, is filled with Government-owned machinery, war materials, and work in process.

Why not move them right out? Let me tell you why not. Because this material and work in process will be the basis of the settlement claim. Before this claim can be paid, these items must be listed and accounted for. The Government will not pay for all this until it has satisfied itself that the material and work in process is actually there. No one knows where it can or where it will be stored when it is removed. If when the claim for payment is examined and the Government asks the contractor (as it certainly will): "Where is all this material and work in process for which you have asked payment?" The contractor will be called upon to answer that question and his only safety lies in having this material in his own hands where it can be counted and identified.

Their inventories are extremely complicated. They include thousands upon thousands of different parts. When they leave the contractor's plant they may be stored at great distances or mixed with inventories of other contractors. Some of them may be lost or stolen or damaged by the elements.

So that I think I am safe in saying that ordinary prudence will require that before this material is removed it must be checked by the Government not only as to quantity and number of articles, but as to their state of completion, so that once it has left the contractor's possession his inventory cannot thereafter be questioned.

FINALITY OF SETTLEMENTS—DISPOSITION OF MATERIALS

Having prepared an inventory of the property on hand, these various contractors will want to know what the Government wishes to have done with this property. Some of it the contractor may be willing to retain and make no charge for; some of it he may be willing to retain at some mutually agreeable price; some of it he may be able to sell to others at prices which the Government finds satisfactory, and some of it should be immediately scrapped. The fact is that a very large percentage of this material is special to the war and will have no value at all except for scrap. All of these questions will come up for settlement. This requires agreement between Government and the various contractors and instructions from the Government as to what disposition is to be made. These decisions must be made promptly and when made the parties concerned must be able to act upon them with finality.

If these matters are governed by a settlement agreement which is tentative only and which cannot be acted upon until reviewed by another agency, the process of settlement will be slowed down until this review is completed. It has been suggested, and a provision to this effect is incorporated in a bill now before the House of Representatives, that no settlement with any war contractor shall be anything but tentative; that no such settlement shall be effective until it has been reviewed and approved by a Contract Settlement Board to be chosen by the Comptroller General of the United States. This Board will be allowed 6 months within which to act.

In arriving at the amount to be paid in settlement, one of the most important matters to determine is whether the materials and work in process for which payment is asked have actually been procured and their stage of completion. The review board may not be satisfied with the tentative settlement made by the contracting agency but may wish to examine and check this inventory a second time. How can the contractor afford, in view of this possibility, to remove the inventory and allow it to be dispersed? To be safe, he must retain it under his control until he knows that the review board is not going to check it a second time.

Furthermore, under the form of Government prime contract, no prime contractor can settle with a subcontractor or supplier without the consent of the contracting officer. If this consent is only tentative and subject to review and approval by some other Government agency, the prime contractor cannot settle with and pay off his subcontractors or suppliers except at his own risk. He will simply have to wait until the review is completed. Neither can he take over or sell to others or scrap materials on hand until the tentative settlement is reviewed and approved.

The proposal that no agreement of settlement shall be final until approved by the General Accounting Office is at variance with the purposes for which that Office was created. The General Accounting Office has never had the power or authority to create obligations against the United States. Its function has always been essentially an audit or checking function. Its power to "settle and adjust" contractual claims against the Government has been to determine whether the amounts paid or proposed to be paid are called for by a contract which some other agency has entered into. The Comptroller General can decide whether he will recognize a contract calling for payment as legal and whether there are available funds appropriated to carry it out. But he has never had the power to approve or disapprove a contract or bind the Government by making one himself. He has recently said that he has nothing to do with the wisdom or fairness or equity of contract provisions and has no power to negotiate.

Contracts have been entered into by the procurement agencies committing the Government to the extent of approximately $200,000,000,000 to prosecute this war. To terminate and settle the uncompleted war contracts will involve a small percentage of that sum. If the procurement agencies who were authorized to incur the obligations involved in the complete performance of these contracts are not competent to terminate these contracts by negotiating agreements to reduce these obligations, how can it be assumed that an organization which has never had the power to negotiate a contract or incur an obligation and has had no experience or training for that purpose and which was never selected for that purpose could do the job any better or as well?

In negotiating settlements business judgment of a high order will be required. For example: The terms upon which materials should be disposed of or scrapped must be decided. What allowance shall be made to the contractor for the cost of special machinery, special tooling, etc., procured for the purpose of completing a war contract in view of the fact that he has been cut off in the midst of his work—whether these items will be usable in the contractor's regular business and to what extent—whether leases of property entered into for the purpose of the contract should be canceled, and on what terms, or allowed to run out—whether materials ordered were in excess of the reasonable needs of the contract (and in this connection the difficulty of obtaining delivery on time must be given weight)—what should be done about the division of overhead.

This is a field in which the staff of the General Accounting Office has had no training and for which it never was selected.

Many of these contracts are very complicated. I know of one which has been amended and supplemented more than 80 times and another more than 200 times. To expect an organization of auditors to intelligently negotiate a settlement of the millions of terminated contracts, and especially to do this within a period of 6 months, is to expect an impossibility. My fear would be that as the time limit approaches, settlements would be disapproved merely because of lack of time to properly examine and approve them.

To transfer the power to negotiate contracts of settlement from the armed services to the General Accounting Office during the war period will of necessity interfere with the conduct of the war. Contracts are being terminated almost daily and replaced by other war contracts. If these terminated contracts cannot be settled by the armed services, particularly with respect to the disposition of materials which may be required for other war contracts or which should be scrapped and removed to make way for other war work and with respect to the amounts payable to subcontractors and suppliers until the General Accounting Office has had 6 months to review these matters, the war effort will be seriously impeded.

What is really proposed is to take away one of the functions of the procuring agencies of the military departments and transfer that function to an agency that never was intended or organized to perform it. The armed services would be left with the power to enter into contracts for war materials, but they could not enter into contracts to reduce the materials ordered. They could make contracts, but they could not unmake them.

It is my firm conviction that nothing that Congress could do would be more effective to slow down the process of termination settlements than to hold up settlements until they are reviewed by another agency, and that if any such provision is enacted into law, it will seriously retard post-war employment. Settlements must be final when once made and not subject to be reopened except for collusion or fraud. One agency, whatever it may be, should be set up with full power to deal with the subject under proper safeguards for the protection of the Government and the contractor as well. Full and careful examination of termination claims must be made. All the time necessary should be taken before settlements are made. But we should not have a series of settlements. Some mistakes will be made; mistakes will be made no matter what agency has the responsibility for settlement. But the performance of the settlement function must be looked at as a whole, and it would be unfortunate if an occasional mistake should lead to a procedure so intricate and time-consuming that we fail of our real objective, which is to get back to peacetime production and economy in the shortest practicable time.

INTERIM FINANCING

Pending the final settlements of terminated contracts, the war contractor must receive payments in anticipation of the amount to which he will be found ultimately entitled. This subject of interim financing is one of great importance, but the impression is too widespread that it affords a full solution of the problem. Advance payments are in effect mere loans and must be shown on financial statements as liabilities. They are a mere stop-gap. There can be no substitute for a prompt final settlement.

There are some industries, including the strongest ones, which could survive and proceed based on interim financing; but there are many weaker ones whose credit would be seriously impaired; and it is these smaller, weaker concerns which are entitled to the utmost consideration. To have concerns in this category sitting on the anxious seat while settlement agreements are being reviewed and sent back for renegotiation my well prove to be their undoing.

INSOLVENT VENDEES

In the heat of war production, many subcontractors and suppliers have been called upon to perform work and furnish articles to other war contractors with little or no credit standing. In many cases, war contractors have been directed to enter into subcontracts and accept purchase orders

from concerns with very small capital and which may very easily become insolvent.

When a war contractor has furnished goods or services to companies (many of which have been improvised simply for war work), and is unable to obtain payment of his claim, he should be assured of payment by the Government. This is only common and ordinary fairness and equity. Procedures should be set up so as to assure such payment, and where necessary the Government should pay these claims directly instead of allowing them to follow down the chain of subcontractors to the war contractor involved. Any break in this chain may make it impossible for the contractor entitled to be paid to receive his money.

Suggestions have been made to Congress to accomplish this result, and it is to be hoped that some procedure will be worked out to properly care for situations of this character.

Legislative and administrative settlement procedures should be established without delay. These should include: (1) Provision for the prompt clearance of industrial plants; (2) for the prompt settlement of war contracts which will be final and conclusive except for collusion or fraud; (3) sufficient advance payments to free the working capital of war contractors so that civilian production can be resumed; (4) partial final settlements without waiting for approval of the entire claim; and (5) the protection of war contractors against insolvency of other war contractors to or for whom goods or services have been furnished in furtherance of the war effort.

In conclusion let me say that serious and commendable efforts have been and are being made by the executive and legislative branches to assure prompt reconversion to a peacetime economy. Many bills have been introduced and hearings have been in progress from time to time since June last. I agree entirely with the suggestion made in the Baruch-Hancock report that a joint committee of the Senate and House, in cooperation with the executive departments, should decide on some one termination bill and urge its passage.

There should be no partisan controversy, no conflict between different branches of the Government. There must be a combined, unified, cooperative effort to bring about this reconversion at the earliest possible time and in the soundest and most practicable way.

St. Lawrence Seaway Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith an address delivered by a fellow townsman and one of America's leading citizens, Julius H. Barnes. This address was made by Mr. Barnes, at Ogdensburg, N. Y., on April 25, 1944, before a large gathering of public spirited citizens, who met to discuss one of the greatest post-war planning projects now before Congress.

The river and harbor bill recently passed by the House of Representatives is now pending before the Senate committee. Every project in that bill is a worth-while post-war planning project. Efforts will be made to have the Senate give consideration to the St. Lawrence seaway project which was considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives in the Seventy-seventh Congress. I am a member of that committee and the pending legislation is identical with the legislation favorably reported by that committee after months of hearings by a 2 to 1 vote.

As Mr. Barnes indicates, a great mistake was made in 1934 when this project was defeated in the Senate of the United States. I commend his address to every one of you. It is as follows:

This city is the gateway to the St. Lawrence, a region rich in historical tradition and in commercial achievement. Fortunate in its neighbors, its early phase as a potential battlefield between rival nations has been succeeded by the greater significance of a jointly-used highway for the vast commerce of a new continent. It has great possibilities to be further developed to the public benefit. You, here in northern New York, have a part to play.

The great war has quickened national appreciation. The vision of a single world, attaining new standards and new advances, served as never before by expanded production and a swelling commerce—relying as it must on the water highways of the oceans, gives new impetus to the improvement of this seaway.

Fifteen hundred miles west of here, my home town of Duluth—farthest inland port of this continent, still confidently presses for national appreciation of the seaway's significance. The chamber of commerce, through an ably led committee, continues the long fight for recognition. Chicago and Milwaukee stir afresh. The State of Minnesota officially supports these efforts.

There is a philosophy of world peace to follow this World War, and a vista of world commerce to come, that I wish to present to you tonight—rather than any statistical formulas.

We Americans desire no gains from victorious wars. We wish earnestly the gains of peaceful industry and commerce on a world-wide scale to follow.

A great land, this America, and a great new race, these Americans, forged from the ambitious of all peoples. This world-wide war is proving the worth of this land and this people. Incredible as it is, this land of peace and this free people, devoid of military history and tradition, set today the high marks in achievement of victory. Almost beyond belief, today's free labor and the amazing management genius of America, in 2 years conversion from peace to war, forges the weapons that arm our citizen army and equip as well the older armies of our allies. America's output of ships and tanks and guns and munitions exceeds all the rest of the world together. And the quality of our boys from our farms and homes, inspiring the imitative aspiration of all other lands, is proved to be of the highest manly courage and fighting qualities. The free inventive genius of America equips our fighting lads with amazing superiority over the military castes whose profession was supposed to give them ruthless leadership. We have a thrill of pride in the courage, the endurance, the war adaptation of a whole youth, misjudged by Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo as softened by luxury and outgrown from the hardy virtues of early America. Far from it!

This miracle attainment flowers from the peacetime achievement and for the same reasons. In less than two centuries of national life this new race attained world leadership, held it, and deserved it. In this land free of the hampering restrictions of age-old caste, stimulated by the freedom of opportunity to carve each his own niche in life, under a national ideal of common-school education making effort more effective, and under a Government that held the scales, even in protection of each man's attainment, we have written a page of history, inspiring indeed. It is no accident that here in America 6 percent of the world's population learned to convert into living use half the annual world's gifts of nature—coal, iron, steel, cotton, timber, copper, oil. Against our short 3 centuries, today older lands and older peoples realize now, that they also have possessed these same bounties of natural wealth for 5 centuries, or 10, or 20, and had not yet learned that human life, and health, and happiness were directly advanced by their conversion to use through the processes of peaceful industry. This striking difference of achievement rests on the stimulating American ideals of educating the mind, training the hand, and inspiring the spirit.

Nature was kind to America. This land is favored of all the world. But we have valued these advantages, and with them have inspired individual and national effort and achievement. This land in its early days with so much to do and so few to do it, set the early measure of value largely on the dollar sign of attainment. Today we are developing a truer estimate of individual worth. Character and service, the demonstrated spirit of justice, fair play, and the industries, and even of communities and fair chance, rates the true worth of men, of States. That spirit today spans the seas in an awakening sense of obligation toward less-favored peoples.

It is in this spirit that I wish to discuss tonight the inevitable, though long-delayed development of one of the original resources of this vast new continent. Nature gave America the precious advantages of three great coasts, the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific. Nature also gave the heart of America the greater boon of the deep-water inland highway of the Great Lakes. Nature clothed its shores with great forests from which a myriad of homes were built. Nature deposited along the western lakes, limitless treasures of copper and iron for steel from which the industries of America were created. Nature made that waterway reach to the very gateway of the fertile prairies with their vast production. Then Nature seemed to challenge the new men of this new land to measure the value of these great advantages, and seem to challenge the foresight, skill, and energy to convert them into human service. Across that great water highway it threw three challenging barriers; the falls at Sault Ste. Marie, the shallows of Lake St. Clair, and the stupendous falls of Niagara.

America accepted those challenges. The early portage around Ste. Marie into Lake Superior, first in a single horse and cart, was displaced by early shallow canals which grew larger and deeper with the swelling volume of Lake Superior's commerce, until today five great locks pass the Lake's yearly commerce of 100,000,000 tons. The flats of St. Clair were steadily deepened as increasing commerce pressed. They can easily be deepened further as needs develop. The great drop of Niagara has been bypassed by the successive water stairways which the enterprise of our northern neighbors, one tenth our size in numbers and wealth, built unaided, one after another until today's great Welland waits with its 30 feet of readiness for ocean ships.

It is fair to say that, except for that thousand mile deep-water economy in the heart of this continent, the building of America, its homes, its industries, the magic growth of the eastern seaboard would have been impossible. That growth would have been checked by the high costs of development and delivery; and that growth would have been defeated by the impossibility of moving those enormous tonnages on any kind

of land transportation. No system of railroads could have moved, in our time, the vast tonnage of ore, coal, lumber, and grain supporting our great cities and industries. As a lifelong grain exporter, I assert that only because of the economy of that great waterway could the grain fields of the Central West have sold their high-labor harvest, 1,500 miles from the seaboard, in competition with the cheap-labor coastal areas of Argentina, Russia, and India. But our West did meet that world-market competition and by cheap water transportation and the resourcefulness of American traders sold its product at such net to our farms that the Middle West today lines its roads and streets with farmer-owned automobiles.

On our three seaboard coasts, a wise Government provided deeper and deeper channels and harbors for the privately owned waterside docks and industries, and the country grew with increasing power and resources. On the Great Lakes highway, the same enlightened public policy successively deepened the channels and harbors with the growth of trade, and successively deepened the locks around the three barriers between the Lakes.

Only on the St. Lawrence, has the national policy, the ideal of improving facilities to meet increasing commerce, been partially paralyzed. The early 4-foot channel of the fur traders around the St. Lawrence rapids, built first for canoes and bateaux, was soon deepened to 8 feet. Then an enlightened Canada of 50 years ago deepened that waterway again to 14 feet, and installed locks, then stupendous, of 260 feet in length. But in this 50 years, while ships on the improved Lakes inland have grown to 600 feet and 20,000 tons of cargo, the waterway access to the sea remains the outmoded facilities of half a century ago, 260 feet for small ships only. Their 2,000 tons of cargo does not build great ports nor serve today's vast commerce.

I have some sentiment about Ogdensburg, the fruit of my experience in developing 40 years ago from Duluth perhaps the largest export grain business in America. In those early years today's great carriers of the upper Lakes were still a dream only. We still had many ships fitted to the now out-dated facilities of the St. Lawrence and of the early limited 14 foot Welland. At Ogdensburg, and at its sister Canadian port of Kingston, our grain was transferred to river barges for towing, then to Montreal. At Montreal ocean ships that had sailed 800 miles from the coast up the deep lower St. Lawrence furnished the cheapest route to the teeming Old World.

The economies of developing markets and customers through cheap water transportation were deeply imprinted in my early business training. Every year of the 40 since, every experience in the various business activities which I have shared, every contact with businessmen of many lands in which I have been fortunate, every study of commercial history confirms in me the deep conviction that history will condemn unsparingly the men or the influences that have for 30 years defeated the modernization which would put a fourth seacoast in the very heart of America. There its service as ports of entry and of shipment would be doubled above the ordinary. Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth have grown into vast industrial production. I hesitate to disparage the honest judgment of men who oppose this modernization of this existing outmoded access to the sea, but theirs is a great responsibility in denying the 40,000,000 people of our American Middle West the benefits nature can so easily extend. And some of the opposition in these years has been, I think, obviously influenced by a presumedly selfish aim.

It has been stated that Congress refused the Canadian treaty negotiated by President Hoover in 1932, favored by President Roosevelt in 1933, and voted for in 1934 by a majority of the Senate—but not the necessary two-thirds. Today we hear serious discussion of changing our Constitution so that even world peace treaties may be made effective by a simple majority of Congress instead of continuing a veto power in a minority of the Senate. That 1934 minority defeating vote bears a great responsibility. If the treaty had been confirmed, the seaway would have been completed before the invasion of Poland, and before the treachery of Pearl Harbor. America's mighty resources, moving through a new outlet of limitless capacity, might have shortened this war. To shorten this war a year, a month could be measured in precious human lives. Those men should review in sober earnestness their responsibility as a minority in opposition. The great events of this world struggle are passing judgment.

It was argued then that the 2,000,000 new horsepower provided by the seaway was not needed. The 90,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of 1934 have grown today to 190,000,000,000. And more yet is needed. It condemns either the judgment that so greatly erred, or shows a strange lack of faith in the continuing progress of America. Who can really doubt the vast and growing power-driven genius of American industry?

It was argued that the seaway could be used for shipping only 8 months of the year. Rarely with that statement do we hear the associated fact that the great St. Lawrence flow would generate its might of power 12 months each year continuously. And the 8-months argument, while, of course, a limitation, has not prevented my home town of Duluth handling water-borne tonnage every 8-month season exceeded only by the great port of New York with its full 12 months. Credit goes to the restless energy and resourcefulness of hardy men.

It was argued that the increased ship facilities are not needed for the commerce of Midwest America and of the cities that would line the new route to the sea. An old, old story faced by every project of large potentiality. Always great engineering improvements have had to meet the arguments of doubters, both honest and sinister. A transportation genius, James J. Hill, who built the Great Northern Railway west from Duluth to the Pacific coast, said that the Panama Canal would be useful only as a lily pond. Instead, the Panama, which passed 5,000,000 tons in its first year of 1915, passed in 1940 30,000,000 tons. The war years' figures since 1940 are suppressed, but it requires no active imagination to appraise what it means to us today that our vast newly created Navy may pass freely and swiftly between the two hemisphere wars in which we are engaged. The old, long route around the Horn would indeed imperil our striking power. What would Jim Hill say today?

The Suez doubled its tonnage service in the last quarter century. The Welland quadrupled its tonnage in the last quarter century even though it is, by this St. Lawrence obstruction largely a deadend highway. Every chapter of the growth of world commerce shows that trade increases, cities grow, individual welfare is strengthened, when new economies in transportation and distribution costs come into play—and a deep-water highway is the king of economies.

It was argued against the seaway that increased tonnage for that channel must represent diversion from the established railroads. I do not believe it. I think it can be shown that improved access and reduced costs create new tonnage by their very economy, and that the stimulant of production thus attained confers increased tonnage benefits on the whole country. Here we should remember that 40 percent of American railway mileage rests on the Great Lakes terminals.

The American Railway Association opposes this development and has for years. They oppose it today even when they are at their wit's end to handle their vital traffic. We can challenge their judgment on this great seaway even as we pay tribute justly to the operating skill and energy of wartime railway service.

Railway judgment was not always expressed in opposition as it is today through this national association. It is kinder to think that the anxieties as to railroad earnings apparent 10 years ago has unduly influenced a sound judgment on this national waterway service. The railway giants of the development era of the 1920's most affected by its possibilities generally endorsed the plan. Listen to the list in favor: President Pennington, of the Soo Lines, and his successor, President Jaffray, approved it. President Ralph Budd, of the Great Northern Railway, expressed approval in 1920. Budd is still a great railway figure, and I have not heard that he changed his mind. Howard Elliot, chairman of the Northern Pacific Railway, before his death expressed approval, and his successor, Charles Donnelly, president of the Northern Pacific, endorsed his judgment. President Byram, of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, and his successor, President Scandrett, anticipated benefits to their road and their territory. President Felton, of the Chicago Great Western, wished it developed, and to a full 30 feet. President Fred W. Sargent, of the Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co., a close friend of mine and whom I greatly miss, said the waterway would be of "inestimable value to the entire country." President Hale Holden, of the Burlington Railroad, another friend gone on, endorsed the seaway "as a matter of the highest interest and importance to the development of the Middle West." President Downs, of the Illinois Central, looked on the waterway as an extension rather than a competitor of his system. These men were constructive railroad leaders. There is even more reason for their faith in the enlarged opportunities of today.

The Transportation Association of America opposes this development. In 1941 it emphasized that with a national debt of $123,000,000,000 this expenditure should not be made. That association likewise opposed the expenditure when our national debt was only 30 billions. It opposes this improvement today when our national debt will soon be 250 billions. Its opposition on the narrow basis of expenditures may be fairly disregarded. It would have opposed the Panama. Both costs are much the same.

It was argued that American money should not aid in this development because "70 percent would be in a foreign country." Give that only the weight it deserves, if any, in the light of the long association with Canada in so many forms of joint use and mutual interest. Measure it also in the new spirit of the Atlantic Charter.

The Atlantic Charter with its thirty-four subscribing nations typifies a profound change in world relations. America of all peoples must understand and adapt itself to that change.

Since the last war the Russian people—then 70 percent illiterate—have been trained to read and write. They have learned that this capitalistic country can arm its own American forces and besides help equip the heroic armies of its Russian allies. And that dependence of Russian courage on the superior production of industrial America, carries vast significance in our relations across two oceans. In China, since the last war, 400,000,000 brave and hardy people—naturally industrious—are fighting for their national life and the right to develop on their own. Millions are imbued with a new spirit plainly to be seen.

In this new day most of the world—2,000,000,000 people—learn now through the radio, the movies, the airplane, and the printed page what peoples may aspire to own and use and enjoy. They need so much—shoes

and clothes, home and furnishings—so much, indeed. Earning power will grow with ambition, and its effectiveness increase with knowledge and training. Invention suggests today as never before a thousand things of use and value. Science extends life, reduces illness, makes living more precious and more effective. Enterprising industry and the urge for more employment and for better pay will seek out these potential markets and customers, stimulate their desires, show them ways to earn and to buy. The elimination of trade barriers between peoples, excessive tariffs, quotas, currency controls, and embargoes, all promise a great swelling tide of commerce in the interchange of goods serving new hundreds of millions of buyers and users.

Obviously, that great flow of goods must move on the water highways of the great oceans. Railroads cannot be built across five-sixths of the earth's surface which is water. Airways will always be limited in the tonnage of commerce. Waterways assume an importance as never before. Every extension of water highways that reach new markets, create new ports, expand employment, and strengthen industry must be developed with an urgency never before so pressing. The St. Lawrence seaway is the greatest engineering project for national decision today. It stands as never before of first rank importance in required service to our national welfare. It must be built. After 30 years support of this proposal, and 30 years of hope deferred, I still have faith in the good judgment of the American public and in the submergence of any selfish interest in opposition. We have a right to believe the day is near. The New York Legislature this winter again unanimously approved it. The power authority has long diligently furthered it. A Great Lakes ship operator of importance last week told me that, hitherto in opposition, he was now converted. Six successive Presidents, of both parties, have favored this work. A majority of the United States Senate favored this national improvement in the only vote recorded thereon. All the portents carry promise. The story needs only to be told completely and fairly to sweep away the opposition which has so long delayed it, whether that opposition is sinister, selfish, trivial, or only misinformed and misinterpreted.

Those of us who have believed that the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway, creating the fourth American seacoast in the heart of this continent will rank with the early significant crusades of America, owe it to the pioneers of the St. Lawrence seaway to press it with renewed courage and energy. It took in our early days crusaders with vision to cross the Alleghenies, as Washington did at Fort Duquesne, as the early settlers who ventured into the "Western reserve," as the gold rush pioneers in covered wagons across the plains and in ships around the horn, as the men who traced the Oregon trail to the Pacific. These men, and others believed in America and in its future. The brilliant attainment of America today justifies their vision and faith beyond their fellows. So also some day in an expanded America, in an era of more secure and wider employment, in the vast commerce from America to far flung peoples, based on the economy of reaching them across the seas, there will be a new national roll of patriotic Americans who saw clearly with accurate vision, the importance of this great new facility. I wish I could call the roll here of partisans as I have known them. They are a long list of able men: Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce; Franklin Roosevelt, then Governor of New York; the Governors of 23 States some years ago; Charles R. Craig of my home town, Duluth, active for years between Canada and Washington; Governor Goodrich of Indiana; Governor Allen of Kansas; James Davidson of Michigan, devoutly supporting the Seaway against his brother lakes shipbuilders and ship operators; a score and more of earnest men devoid of any personal selfish interest, active in their lives for this project, and convinced in death that the nation neeeded this great contribution to its security and earning power. All honor to them and to the later generation of devoted men who have today picked up their uncompleted mission. New strength, new power, new confidence, new faith. The day is near.

Compulsory Sickness Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sauce for the Goose—", dealing with the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill calling for compulsory sickness insurance, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE—

Propaganda made by the Social Security Board for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill calling for compulsory sickness insurance has led to substantial questioning. There is a Federal law which bars Federal agencies from using their funds to promote legislation. The Social Security Board is so well aware of this that recently it disallowed an expenditure of $95.40 by the Unemployment Compensation Commission of Montana because it had spent that sum for 10,000 pamphlets opposing the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

While the Social Security Board may have been entirely justified in this ruling, its prohibition of adverse propaganda contrasts with its own energetic policy of promoting the disputed legislation. The Board has, in fact, become probably the most influential sponsor of socialized medicine. Its efforts to influence opinion have become so great as to create critics within the system.

In particular, the Board has addressed itself to organized labor. It has sent speakers to labor conventions who have advocated the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and has broadcast to the labor press literature favoring its legislative proposals. Throughout it has urged "action now." The Social Security Board should unmistakably confine itself to the nonpropaganda policy it imposes upon its own branches.

America Can Do Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "America Can Do Better," which I delivered before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women, at Columbus, Ohio, on April 21, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question is: Can America do better under a Republican administration than under the present administration to win the war and the peace?

The answers are: Yes; America can do much better and do much more under a Republican administration than she is doing under the present administration to help her fighting men win the war as quickly and completely as possible in both hemispheres. We owe it to them to do so.

And: Yes; America can do much better and do much more under a Republican administration than she is doing under the present administration to build a straight road to post-war recovery and to a just and lasting peace worthy of the price paid for it. We owe it to ourselves, our children, and our children's children to do so.

We are in the critical year of the war and of our generation. We are in a critical year in the history of America and of civilization. We can make it a year of great progress and success if, and only if, we meet now the issues of our time behind the battle lines as well as on them and do it boldly, intelligently, and courageously. We have gathered here so that we may agree on how best to do this.

I have unstinted praise for the armed forces. Their example lights our way like a pillar of fire. It is for us to do our share on the home front in a manner worthy of their inspiring service on the battle front. I have inexpressibly deep sympathy for all to whom this war has brought suffering at home or abroad.

In response to his welcome to Australia, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said: "I have come as a soldier in a great crusade for personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die. To that end I pledge the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen." That is the high pledge which is being redeemed on the firing line. The test at home should be as high. We should say today without reservation, "We are fighting a great crusade, at home as well as abroad, for personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die and to that end we loyally pledge to our country all the mighty power of our party and all the efforts of our campaign. Let us win the war for freedom. Let us lead the way to a recovery worthy of the freedom so dearly won."

BETTER UNITY ON THE HOME FRONT

America can do better and more under a Republican administration than under the present administration because under such a new administration dedicated to constitutional government and progress she can more readily unite all classes and groups of Americans on the home front under a banner placing the interests of all the people of America above every special or lesser interest.

We then can gain greater unity among the rank and file of labor, industry, agriculture, government and all the rest of America without distinction of race, creed, or degree of prosperity.

In the early days of the war the Axis Powers were winning because the world was not united against them. Nation after nation fell before them and slavery was the penalty of defeat. At almost the last possible moment, the peace-loving nations of the world became the United Nations. The tide of battle turned, and today the United Nations are advancing on every front.

But the war is not yet won. The enemy has one last hope. He seeks to divide the United Nations from one another and to divide each of us within ourselves. He seeks to set race against race, and group against group. He encourages suspicion of each ally within the others. Thus America's home front becomes a critical battle front. The enemy's objective is disunity. Ours is unity.

What shall be the position of the Republican Party on our home front? The course is clear. Our rallying point is our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. On that we stand, "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." If we unite in the full faith in God and in man upon which our Nation is founded at home, the enemy will fail in his attack from within.

LINCOLN ON THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Let us then face the full meaning of our own Declaration of Independence and do battle for it in our home precincts. Abraham Lincoln interpreted this declaration, in 1858, in terms looking toward this very time. He found in it the faith we need today to establish our position not only within our Nation but in our relations with our fellow men everywhere. Speaking of his forefathers and ours, he said: "These by their representatives in old Independence Hall said to the whole race of men: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights: that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty and wise and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures—yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows: They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built."

America in these terms, is not so much a place as it is a people. Our people have come from everywhere. We are an expression of man's faith in God and man. The torch of liberty is in our hands—it is for us to hold it high.

This liberty which is the light of the world is founded upon equality of the individual before the law. In the days of Lincoln, the Republican Party was founded upon the principle of fairness of man to man. No class and no group, be it racial, religious, economic, industrial, or financial, should raise its special interests above the general interest. It is only on this basis that our Government can continue to be a Government for all the people all of the time. It is time to return to the doctrine of constitutional government for the protection of all.

FREEDOM UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Unity in America calls also for faith in and observance of the Constitutional separation of powers between the Federal and State Governments and between the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial branches of the Federal Government itself. Again, it is only on such observance that freedom under the Constitution can survive. The absorption of State control by Federal domination and the absorption of Federal legislative and judicial functions by executive domination destroys the safeguards of the people. The Republican Party seeks to renew the doctrine that we can have faith in the ability and loyalty of the people of America to conduct their own affairs, direct their local and State governments, and enact and interpret their laws without the domination of the Chief Executive and of millions of his civilian employees. To strengthen America's position as the champion of freedom of opportunity, the time has come to make it clear to our soldiers and to the world that such freedom is secure in America.

A young soldier wrote home to his mother, "Please don't change the furniture in the living room, please don't change the pictures on the wall, please don't change a thing on the mantelpiece. When I get home I want to see home the way I think of it and dream of it." If that same soldier were writing to all America, he probably would not insist that there be no change of detail in all America, but he certainly would ask that the substance of his America be unchanged. He certainly would ask for an America of freedom and opportunity for himself, his children and his children's children, a united America of peace and stability with freedom and justice for all, an America worthy of the price that he and his comrades are paying for it—so that when he returns he shall find here the America of which he thinks, of which he dreams, and for which he fights.

When the light of such an America shines through the windows of the White House and the Capitol, this Nation will be united as never before. The war will then be the people's own war and victory will be the people's own victory. I believe, therefore, that a new administration can do much better than the present administration has done on the home front, with the draft, with manpower, with the equal protection of individual rights, with the development of opportunity for individual post-war advancement, with the preservation of the rights of the States and with the preservation of the strength of the Congress and the courts from Executive direction. To do better in these fields means helping to win the war everywhere and to build confidence in the future of governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

BETTER PROSPECTS FOR POST-WAR RECOVERY

Secondly, America can do much better and much more under a Republican administration than she is doing under the present administration to build a straight road to post-war recovery and to a just and lasting peace worthy of the price paid for it.

America will face her post-war internal recovery under the greatest handicap of her history. Her taxes will far exceed those before the war. Her debt will be at least 10 times what it was before the war. The bonds evidencing our national debt will be held by every bank, insurance company, church, trustee and practically every family in America. Default on them would mean a depth of unemployment and suffering greatly exceeding that of the last depression. The resulting scarcity would open the door to such totalitarian regimentation that it would make us wonder whether we had won or lost the war. To carry these taxes and this debt we must have a production of real wealth in America that will substantially exceed that before the war. We have the record of wartime performance, the plants, materials, tools, new inventions, skilled workmen, skilled supervision and an ample initial demand both at home and abroad for all the products that we can make, sell and distribute. We have, therefore, the opportunity for the enlargement of our existing fields of production, and we have limitless new fields upon which to enter. These include aviation, radio, Diesel power, automotive power, chemistry, plastics, glass, wood, electronics, electric welding, home building, air cooling, refrigeration, sulfa drugs and countless other new fields of activity.

Such a recovery calls for a flow of private capital into countless enterprises, large and small. It calls for constructive planning such as the Republican Party has been and is now urging. It calls for joint efforts on the part of industry, labor, agriculture and Government all recognizing their common interests and the need for fair treatment of one another.

The need for governmental action is primarily in providing an orderly means for the withdrawal of Government from its wartime business. This calls for governmental cooperation in the orderly termination of its contracts, the early making and publishing of inventories of surplus plants, tools, materials and supplies, the early disposal of such surpluses, the removal of Government machinery from private plants, the provision of temporary financing pending payment of Government obligations, and the general reestablishment of that dynamic initiative which springs from private enterprise. At the same time, there must be governmental support of fair practices and protection against economic dictatorships which can be as detrimental as political dictatorships. Above all there must be stability and reasonable assurance of stability for a substantial number of years ahead so that private funds may be invested intelligently in new enterprises.

A program is being launched in some places under the leadership of civic organizations whereby the public systematically will do their own budgeting and planning of purchases for the post-war period. Local civic bodies will collect these individual budgets listing in standard form the articles which the makers of the budget plan to buy with their wartime savings. This recorded demand will encourage production to meet those demands and will give confidence both to the returning soldiers and to the members of the public themselves that the market will exist and that employment be forthcoming to match the demand.

Dedicated as the Republican Party is to a recovery of private enterprise and to increased national production with fairness to industry, labor, and agriculture, it becomes the natural agency to develop the Nation's post-war program. It will welcome the opportunity to stop the wastage of public funds which has marked the life of the present spendthrift administration. Living on borrowed money, as the Federal Government has done in recent years, is easy while spending the borrowed capital. It threatens, however, the stability of generations to come and spells hardship for the future. Stopping governmental waste and finding a means of balancing the Federal Budget will be important so that taxation can be reduced to a minimum.

Coupled with the need for increased earnings to meet our existing debt must go a program to attract private capital into new enterprises. The best contribution the Government can make to a program of increasing private enterprise and employment will be the gradual reduction of governmental control of enterprise, of governmental allocation of materials, and of governmental taxes upon productive enterprise. This program might well look forward to the early reduction and later termination of the excess-profits tax and capital-stock tax. It will take some such policy to enable private industry to plow back into productive enterprise the funds upon which our recovery and stability will depend.

INTERNATIONAL STABILITY IS A DOMESTIC NECESSITY

The success of all of this, however, is clearly dependent upon the existence in the coming generation of international peace, international stability, and assurance of that international stability for many years to come. If such peace and assurance of stability do not exist it will be necessary to maintain armaments which will increase our taxes when we need to reduce them, and will create new deficits when we need a balanced budget. Furthermore, there will not be that reasonable certainty of the future that attracts private capital into the new enterprises upon which the structure of recovery must depend. Our international stability thus becomes a domestic necessity.

Into this situation the Republican program of dependable international relations advances 5 percent of the way at a time through the exercise of our sovereign power for the benefit of America in the same manner as the sovereign powers are exercised for the benefit of other nations for themselves. In support of such a program the Republican Party—in contrast to no action by the party now in office—approved at Mackinac Island on September 7, 1943, the following general policy: "Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to retain permanent peace with organized justice in the free world."

A little later most of the Republicans in the Senate on November 5, 1943, joined in the 85 to 5 vote in favor of the following official statement of policy, incorporating word for word a paragraph from the Moscow Agreement between Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States as announced on October 30, 1943: "The Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

WHEN THIS WAR IS WON IT MUST STAY WON

The first essential of these declarations and the first essential of the Republican post-war policy is that when victory is won it shall stay won. If there be one outstanding benefit which has come to the world and to America from fighting two world wars in the same generation, it is that this generation will and should be anxious to see to it that when the Second World War is won that the military gain thus made will be consolidated and that law and order thereafter shall be maintained. There is little doubt that the men serving in this war are determined to see to it that the war is won completely in both hemispheres and also that when that is done we shall have so planned the peace and so determined the policy of the United Nations that the war shall remain completely won in both hemispheres.

The United Nations today have the military power and resources which make it possible to win the war. On the day of the armistice there will be peace throughout the area of the armistice based upon that combined military power.

ESSENTIAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Under these circumstances it is not necessary that something strange or new be organized. It will not be necessary to insist upon some particular form of organized post-war police force or unit, but it will be necessary, and this is a plain obligation to our soldiers who will have won a military championship of the world, that we shall retain that championship team, that unity of purpose, and that readiness to serve on some basis that will make sure that law and order shall be maintained in the world and that the United Nations, in the words of the Mackinac Conference and the declaration of the United States, shall participate in a post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to retain permanent peace and shall enter into a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states for the maintenance of international peace and security.

To permit any dissolution of the existing unity and strength of the United Nations so that any gangster nation might lay the foundation of another war would represent a tragic failure on our part to consolidate the gain of this war in the sector of international relations entrusted to us. As the Pilgrim Fathers met their emergency with the *Mayflower* Compact, and our revolutionary forefathers met their emergencies with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, so we of our generation must consolidate the gain of the war won by the soldiers, sailors, and flyers of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, and meet our emergency with an effective international organization that effectively will stop World War No. 3.

The present war can be won on the battlefields by our soldiers, sailors, and flyers, yet lost on the home front by ourselves if following the war we shall permit our governmental policies either to destroy that freedom of opportunity which has been the foundation of our progress or to lose that invincible military solidarity of the United Nations which is the world's best guaranty of retaining the peace we shall have helped to win.

Under a Republican administration, dedicated to frank constitutional cooperation with Congress, America can do much more than under the present administration to insure domestic recovery and to insure the establishment and maintenance of such a general international organization that our domestic recovery shall be secure and the danger of renewal of war shall be reduced to a minimum. Only thus will our victory be worthy of the price paid for it.

A CHALLENGE TO US

I close with a quotation from a letter that a young American flyer sent to his father and his father made available to me. His faith and his service is a challenge to us to be as true to our trust as he is to his.

"FEBRUARY 7, 1944.

"MY DEAR DAD: * * * The life that I'm leading now is not nearly so bad as one might imagine. Although our lives are risked on each mission the odds are pretty much in our favor. More and more I feel that it is all in the hands of the Lord. At every opportunity I attend mass, go to confession, and receive Holy Communion. On each mission I pray that my crew and I will make it, if it is His will.

"Since my first mission I have been more at peace with myself than ever before. * * * Now I know that they (my crew) will stick by me and I shall certainly do all in my power, with the help of God, to see them through all that lies ahead.

"Going over a target and seeing and feeling all of the flak that is thrown up is an experience which is indescribable. It really makes one feel awfully humble, because you realize that there is only a certain amount that you can do about it. The rest is entirely in the hands of the Lord. Some people call it luck, but I'm firmly convinced that to an element of luck and a certain amount of skill is added an awful lot which is answerable only to God. I know that every time I go over the target I'm scared to death—yet there is something about it that I wouldn't miss for all the world. At least we do know that we are contributing our share, little as it may be, towards winning this war which shall and must be won."

In the light of that sentiment let us not fail to contribute our shares, little as they may be, "toward winning this war which shall and must be won."

Statement by Vincente Lombardo Toledano on Aims of Latin Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 25, 1944, containing a statement made by Vincente Lombardo Toledano to the International Labor Organization, at Philadelphia. The statement deals with the aims of Latin nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIMS OF LATIN NATIONS TOLD

PHILADELPHIA, April 25.—Vincente Lombardo Toledano, Mexico's worker delegate, told the twenty-sixth conference of the International Labor Organization today that Latin America asks "nothing more than to emerge from the historically backward period in which we live * * * to become a part of modern society."

Lombardo Toledano said Latin America feels that the structure of the economic evolution of Latin America has been deformed because the big international monopolies exploit the countries of Latin America through the following mechanisms:

1. Paying very low wages to native workers. 2. Paying very low taxes and tariffs to the national government. 3. Paying very low freight rates to transportation systems. 4. Buying raw materials at very low prices. 5. Selling their manufactured products at very high prices.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to Polish Constitution Day, May 3, which is Poland's national holiday and the anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

May 3 is Poland's national holiday, commemorating the signing of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791.

The Polish Constitution emphatically affirmed the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people. The power of the executive, in the instance of Poland of 1791, the power of the

King, was limited. The Polish Parliament, the Sejm, attained the rightful stature which it deserved: It became the sole lawmaking body of the Nation. It is no wonder, in the light of these significant advances, that the constitution of 1791 is for Poland what the Declaration of the Rights of Man was for France and the Declaration of Independence was for America.

The underlying passion of the Polish people for representative government has not changed in a century and a half of peril and persecution, of ruthless slaughter, of fire and sword. The sacred ideal of Polish liberty stands undimmed today, revered by all who love freedom, its place in history proud and unchallenged.

Do you want living proof of the eternal strength of the Polish spirit of liberty?

I read from the charter of Poland, a creation of the existing Polish Government on February 24, 1942: an advance showing of the type of government to which the people of Poland may well look forward after a complete United Nations victory.

The charter of Poland says, in part: "The Polish Republic * * * will be responsible to a true national assembly, fully representative of the common will of the people. * * * Poland will guarantee the rights and liberties of all citizens loyal to the Republic, regardless of national, religious, or racial differences. * * * Full freedom of conscience and expression, of association, and assembly will be guaranteed to all."

Here speaks the incisive wisdom of a Pulaski, the burning desire for freedom of a Kosciuszko.

America remembers these apostles of liberation. Kosciuszko gave his services to 13 loosely connected colonies on the eastern seaboard, struggling against unbearable tyranny. The America of those days could offer no opportunity for gain to a recognized military strategist. In fact, there was a strong probability that defeat would be the lot of the Continentals. But Kosciuszko the liberator had no thought for material gain. His only wish was to see men free. He gathered his ragged frontiersmen about him and carefully and diligently taught them the use of the unfamiliar cannon. When the beaten enemy marched through the silent ranks of Americans at Yorktown, when Cornwallis surrendered, the enemy knew well the deadly accuracy of American cannon fire.

It was for this achievement that Tadeusz Kosciusko is still known as the father of American artillery.

What did America give to this hero? He was recognized in his lifetime by a vote of gratitude from our Congress and by being granted the rank of brigadier general. But America gave him—and his beloved Poland through him—more than gratitude, more than military honors. America transmitted through Kosciuszko to Poland the letter and spirit of our own Declaration of Independence to be embodied in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

America remembers Casimir Pulaski on Polish Constitution Day. Pulaski, like Kosciuszko, fought for American independence. George Washington, in recommending Pulaski to the Continental Congress for a commission, wrote: "This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country, and has sacrificed his fortune to his zeal for those objects."

Pulaski sacrificed more than his fortune for the liberty of the 13 colonies on the eastern seaboard. He gave his life in the Battle of Savannah. Pulaski could not take the cheering message of American freedom back to his native Poland; but he will carry the undying love of all free Americans with him through all eternity.

Only last month, another Pole—and another Kasimir; this time, Gen. Kasimir Z. Sosnkowski, commander of the Second Polish Corps with the British Eighth Army in Italy declared that his men, fighting on the European Continent for the first time in 5 long years, are "eager to fight their way back home."

Yes. The organized Poles in the organized Polish Army units want to fight their way back home and they are doing a gallant job of it. But back "home" in Poland there are those who never left their country, who have never stopped fighting. I refer to the determined, courageous Polish underground.

Recently, Reichsminister Dr. Hans Frank made this remarkable statement: "There is no Polish National Movement of Resistance, despite the declarations from Britain."

The Nazi Governor General said there was no resistance. Who wrecked the eight trains in the Krakow area in January alone?

The Nazi Governor General said there was no resistance. If that were true, why did the Nazi High Command order all trains to proceed at the breath-taking speed of 72 miles per hour, while all forests have been cut down within hundreds of yards of rail-lines? Could it have been that those forests might have concealed Polish saboteurs?

The Nazi Governor General said that there was no resistance. "Several thousand" more Nazi police have been added to the already large force in Warsaw since the beginning of 1944. Could it have been that the Nazis were not short of manpower after all? Or did they need those policemen to try to hold resistance in check?

The Nazi Governor General said there was no resistance. Yet, in Warsaw during March, 1944, 20 Gestapo officers were condemned and executed by the Polish underground.

I think that the Nazi Governor General has now changed his mind about there being no organized Polish National Movement of Resistance for, quite recently, the train on which he was riding was blown up by Polish patriots. Dr. Frank escaped without injury. But, Dr. Frank's escape is only temporary. Eventually the Nazi Governor General will be tried for his crimes and receive the same just punishment meted out to all enemies of Polish freedom.

What has been accomplished against the enemy within Poland has been matched by the efforts of Free Poland on the offensive. In every phase of Allied military and naval activity Poles are fighting for liberation. The exploits of the Polish Army under General Anders have won the deserved praise of United Nations military leaders. Polish aerial squadrons, operating with the R. A. F. and the U. S. A. A. F., have dropped over 10,000 tons of bombs on vital enemy industrial and transportation targets. The Polish Navy, active in the invasions of Sicily and Italy, has ranged from the Mediterranean to the North Atlantic, seeking out and destroying enemy shipping.

The part played by Poland in the United Nations' war effort is strongly summarized in President Raczkiewicz's broadcast on New Year's Day 1944. This Polish statesman said: "On the 1st of September 1939, our nation took first place in the ranks of those who defend the freedom of nations and of men. Though overwhelmed by the armed might of the enemy, the Polish nation continues to fight on at the cost of casualties that at times are greater not only proportionately but in actual number than those of our allies on the field of battle. This fight is carried on at the cost of physical and moral suffering without a parallel in history. It is not fought in vain, but constitutes our great contribution to the present war."

It is obvious to all the world that the Poland of 1944 is determined to perpetuate the ideals embodied in the constitution of 1791, the anniversary of whose signing is commemorated by all freemen on May 3.

As Poland was a leader in constitutional government, so Poland has stepped to the front in the establishment of relationships that will help to make this a better world after the United Nations' victory.

The joint declaration of the Polish and Czechoslovak Governments, issued on November 11, 1940, says, in part: "Poland and Czechoslovakia, closing once and for all the period of past recriminations and disputes, and taking into consideration the community of their fundamental interests, are determined on the conclusion of this war to enter as independent and sovereign states into a closer political and economic association. Moreover, both governments express the hope that in this cooperation, based on respect for the freedom of nations, the principles of democracy, and the dignity of man, they will also be joined by other countries in that part of the European Continent."

In 1791 Poland was in the vanguard of the free and enlightened nations of the world. Today, a century and a half later, Poland occupies the same exalted position in a world that needs Polish courage and Polish independence of thought more than these qualities have ever been needed before in all history.

America at War on the Farm Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Selden Menefee, which was published recently in the Washington Post. The article which is entitled "America at War," deals with the situation on the farm front.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AT WAR

(By Selden Menefee)

ON THE FARM FRONT

We city folks rarely stop to think what the farmer is up against in wartime. We are apt simply to accept the abundance of fresh vegetables, chickens, and eggs on the market this time of year as our due.

This remark is inspired not by the fine collection of blisters I acquired planting my Victory garden on Sunday but by a conversation I had a few days ago with a man who runs a 300-acre dairy farm out in Loudoun County, Va.

My friend, who is a real dirt farmer, gave me the latest war news from the rural front. "The late spring," he said, "is hitting us in the midriff. All the planting is coming on at once."

Planting, he pointed out, is the first and lesser of the farmer's two annual crises, the major one being the harvest season. Summer and fall will be when things will really get tough this year.

About a year ago the Gallup poll asked farmers what their biggest problem was. Three-fourths of them answered the labor shortage, one-fifth, lack of equipment.

Farmer's problems

The farmer's problems are the same today but more acute, with the draft taking more and more young men and farm machinery wearing out. Selective service regulations have been lenient enough on farm labor, but it should be noted that the great majority of farm lads under 26 have refused to accept deferment, so that the farm labor shortage grows constantly more troublesome.

My farm friend tells me that because he lacks men and machines he is cutting his corn production from 60 to 30 acres this year, despite the Government's request for more corn for making industrial alcohol. The reason? Just this:

Last year the drought got a third of his 60-acre corn crop. That couldn't be helped. What really hurt was that he lost half of the remainder for lack of labor or machinery to harvest it.

"If I could get the equipment, I'd plant 65 or 70 acres of corn this year," he said. "But I can't afford to have it rot in the field. All I need is a corn planter with a fertilizer attachment and a corn harvester, though I can do well enough with hand labor if I can get it. I've had my application in for a corn planter for 2 years, but no results."

In the forage crops things are almost as bad. Last year hay dried up or molded in the Virginia fields for lack of labor and equipment to cut it and bring it in. Yet before the winter was over most Loudoun County dairymen were buying baled hay from Wisconsin at fancy prices to feed their cows.

Haymaking machinery much nearer by stood idle at the time. Such inefficiency is criminal in wartime.

There are two ways to help the farmer get his crops in. First and most obvious is the pooling of farm equipment. Great Britain, Russia, and other warring countries have long been doing this. But many American farmers who own much-needed machinery have been reluctant to lend or rent it when it was not in use, largely out of fear that if breakage occurred, replacements would be hard to get.

The answer might be to have county agents everywhere register farm machinery, encourage the haves to rent it out at a fair price to the have-nots on an orderly, planned basis, and guarantee replacements if and when they are needed.

Rank communism

The Farm Bureau Federation, which would have us think that the farmers' main worry is getting farm price ceilings raised or scrapped altogether, would no doubt call this rank communism. But if the program were on a voluntary basis, with patriotism and the desire for public esteem the only motives for participation, few farmers would listen to such sniping—although some politicians might.

The second thing that should be done is for us sedentary workers to get out and help with our hands this summer. In Lawrenceville, Ga., or Carthage, Tex., the whole town turns out to help when there is a shortage of cotton pickers. But despite a determined drive by the United States Employment Service last summer, relatively few city people turned out to help.

From May to October there will be a continuous demand for seasonal farm workers, experienced or otherwise. And more than 700,000 men and women will be needed over the country for canning and processing foods, according to the War Manpower Commission.

Those who went to the farms for their vacations last year found the experience a satisfying one—and not without profit, for farm wages are good these days. In Maryland, young people on vacation harvested 80 percent of the bean crop.

The United States Employment Service sent 1,036 District of Columbia workers to Camp Timberville, Va., las. year. These vacationists alone picked 343,740 bushels of apples, 40,440 bushels of tomatoes, and 20,220 bushels of peaches.

This year, unless Selective Service intervenes, the peak of the haying season will find me wielding a pitchfork or driving a team of Percherons out in Loudoun County. So help me.

Presentation of Gold Medal Award to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek by the New York Southern Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the record of the fifty-eighth annual dinner of the New York Southern Society, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on December 3, 1943, and the annual meeting of the Society at the University Club, New York City, on April 16, 1943, in connection with the presentation of the Annual Gold Medal Award of Distinction and Honor to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GEORGE A. SLOAN (president of the society). Mr. Governor, Mr. Minister, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, each year since 1932 it has been the custom of the New York Southern Society to award a medal of distinction to some outstanding man or woman who has rendered the most unusual service in the perpetuation of the traditions and history of the South. While I say that it is the custom to make this award each year, the fact of the matter is that the award committee has been so insistent in its own deliberations as to the nature of the service rendered which would entitle the recipient to the award that there have been several years in which no award was made.

It will interest Governor Arnall and our other good friends from Georgia to know that the last award was made to Miss Margaret Mitchell for her great contribution which will rank for all time as one of the classics of American literature. I refer, of course, to Gone With the Wind.

Since the inception of the New York Southern Society in 1886 it has had for one of its principal objectives the perpetuation of the traditions of the South. And I know of no more appropriate manner in which the society has lived up to this objective than in the granting of this annual award.

This year the award will be presented by a distinguished son of old Kentucky, who has made for himself a great name in the business affairs of our community and Nation. As my predecessor during the past 2 years he rendered conspicuous service as president of the New York Southern Society. No president has done more for the society in perpetuating its ideals and in strengthening its membership. It is fitting, therefore, that your executive committee has honored him once more by asking him to present this year's award, which has great international significance in addition to its deep meaning to members of this society and to our beloved Southland—Mr. Floyd W. Jefferson.

Mr. FLOYD W. JEFFERSON. Mr. Sloan, ladies and gentlemen, members of the New York Southern Society, our friends and guests, in absentia is a term which in these troublous times awakens poignant memories of those dear to us who are far away.

In absentia is the term which Mme. Chiang Kai-shek used in graciously accepting the New York Southern Society's award of its medal of distinction, with regrets that she could not receive it from our hands in person.

Fortunate indeed are we that she designated as her personal representative to receive this award for transmission to her our honored guest Mr. Liu Chieh, Minister Plenipotentiary to Washington of the Chinese Republic, that great Government which is our stanch ally and steadfast friend.

Most of us recall that the distinguished Chinese gentleman, Charlie Soong, the father of Mai Ling Soong, our beloved Mme. Ch'ang Kai-shek, was for many years of his youth a welcome guest in the home of Gen. Julian Carr, of Durham, N. C.

There was instilled in him so great a love for our Southland that he chose to send his three lovely daughters to America and to the South for their education, and Mai Ling went to Fairmount School in North Carolina, spent 5 years at Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga., and attended Piedmont College in Demorest, Ga., before going to Wellesley.

No one from a foreign shore has, in our memory, so captivated our people and won the admiration of America as has Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

It would be useless repetition to review her accomplishments and her contribution to the cause of the Allies. It is for these accomplishments that we honor her, but it is for her enduring charm that we love her.

The American people treasure the memory of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's visit; we have not forgotten Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's remarkable document, "I bear my witness," nor his wife's beautiful, "I confess my faith."

It was Hugh Gordon Miller, himself a recipient of this medal, who at the annual meeting of the New York Southern Society, offered in beautiful language befitting the occasion a resolution from which I shall quote only a single phrase: "Whereas Mme. Chiang Kai-shek has, by her shining example, added new distinction to the history and traditions of our Southland, be it resolved that the New York Southern Society hereby award to her its gold medal of distinction and honor."

It was Judge William Harman Black, a past president of this society, who, in words equally appropriate, became the seconder of the motion, which was acclaimed with unanimous approval.

And now, our honored friend, Mr. Liu Chieh, will you accept on behalf of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek this small token of our love, admiration, and esteem.

Hon. LIU CHIEH (Minister Plenipotentiary of China). In her address before the United States Congress Her Excellency, Mme. Chiang, said that coming to the United States made her feel she was coming home.

Particularly had she this warmth and affection for the South because, as Mr. Jefferson has just said, madame received her early schooling in Georgia and North Carolina.

There she spent what is usually considered as the most impressionable years of a person's life. It is natural that she acquired not only a great love for the South, but a real knowledge and understanding of its people which she cherishes to this day. Through madame the Chinese people also learn much about the southland so that we have come to know you best for your friendship, your hospitality, and your generous spirit, even as you have come to look upon her as the embodiment of the wisdom and culture of China, and of the indomitable courage which has sustained the Chinese people in their long and bitter struggle for democracy and freedom.

It may be recalled that last summer she took special interest in returning to the South, visiting both Atlanta and Macon, before embarking on her homeward journey to China, and I believe the distinguished Governor of Georgia can bear me out when I

say she enjoyed immensely renewing the acquaintance of old scenes and old friends in the South.

I know it will afford Her Excellency genuine pleasure to receive, from the Southern Society of New York, this award of distinction, which, in a larger sense, constitutes another manifestation of the great friendship which exists between the Chinese and American peoples. I, therefore, feel it a great honor to accept this gold medal on Her Excellency's behalf.

Hon. ELLIS ARNALL (Governor of Georgia). I am delighted tonight to be present when the New York Southern Society does honor to that eminent woman of the world, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. We in Georgia claim her as our own. It was in the Empire State of the South that she began her educational experiences. It was here that she developed that pleasing English pronunciation and speech which have won the esteem and affection of the entire people of the whole civilized world.

We are pleased tonight that Mme. Chiang is the second Georgia woman who has been honored by the Society. The other, Margaret Mitchell, who glorified the old South, was the first.

We are proud of our southern women. I am glad to see so many lovely ladies here tonight. We southerners have ever idealized our womanhood.

Our women at times sparkle encouragement, inspiration and challenge to us. They sparkle as do the bubbles of champagne, at times so brilliantly. At times they comfort us like the deep red burgundy or the velvety cordial—mellow and soothing. Our women ever remain for us our inspiration, our ideals.

Woman's proper niche in Southern history is secure. She enshrines her sweetness in loving hearts. And so it is that a belief still currently popular in the South is the definite conclusion that God in His infinite wisdom made women but a little lower than the angels in the heavens above.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek has exemplified the influence exerted in this modern world by women.

It is most fitting that in selecting the individual to whom your society makes this year's award, you should have chosen the very great woman whose courage and determination have become the symbol of the courage and the determination of her people. I take special pride in the choice, because she has been a part-time Georgian. So I know however the great heart of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek is exalted as China's sons march toward sure victory to the strains of their national anthem, the feet of Mei Ling dance and her eyes mist over when the band plays "Dixie".

A few months ago, just before her visit to America ended, Mme. Chiang came back to Georgia, to Wesleyan College, the venerable institution, oldest chartered college for women in America, which she attended as a girl. As she chatted with Mrs. Arnall and me across the breakfast table, I saw that all the world has shrunk to those dimensions: that all the world was one entity; that nowhere in all the world can some men be free until all men are free.

RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY HUGH GORDON MILLER AND SECONDED BY JUDGE WILLIAM HARMON BLACK, FORMER JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MILLER. I desire to present a resolution. It has been hastily drawn but it has been approved by the president, Mr. Jefferson, and its purpose by the incoming president, Mr. Sloan. I shall be glad to hear any suggestions as to alterations or corrections.

"Whereas Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, one of the greatest—and be it remembered, we of this society measure greatness through a contemplation of the ideals, purposes and achievements of characters like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Lee—whereas said Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, judged by that American measure of true greatness one of the world's greatest personages, and perhaps the very greatest woman of modern times, was reared during a large part of the formative period of her life, and actually received most of her elementary education and religious training (planting firmly in her youth the foundation of her remarkable and inspiring life of human service) in the State of Georgia, in the heart of southern culture and our best southern traditions.

"The perfect English she employs in speaking is real composite American, a happy combination of the smoothness of the mid-South and the snap of New England, where she finished her college education. She thus has a heritage which she recently described in words that recall scenes in so many typical southern homes, as follows: 'I believe that my childhood training influenced me greatly, even though I was more or less rebellious at the time. It must often have grieved my beloved mother that I found family prayers tiresome and frequently found myself conveniently thirsty at the moment, so that I had to slip out of the room.' (This scene at prayer, she thus describes, is certainly in accord with our best southern traditions. Most of us went through that ourselves.)

"It is apparent, not only from this quotation, but from the whole of her recently published 'profession of religious faith' that Mme. Chiang Kai-shek was grounded in the Christian religion and convinced of the unfailing power of prayer and communion with the Supreme Architect of this Universe, in her childhood home in Georgia in those southern religious institutions, Fairmount School, in North Carolina; Piedmont College; and Wesleyan College of Macon, Ga.—Mme. Chiang Kai-shek lived for 5 years at Wesleyan College. A special writer in yesterday's Evening Sun truly observed that 'In a confession of faith by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, of China, we Americans get a more glowing testimonial to real Christian principles than we have heard from any American spiritual leader in years.' Madame Chiang's father long resided in a real southern home and attended Trinity College, later Duke University, in the South, and attended Vanderbilt University. It is apparent that the family had a religious and cultural background. Let us believe and expect that the fervent prayers of this great and good woman for her people and for all suffering humanity at this hour will be answered, and answered soon. As she so fervently prays for the redemption of her people and this distracted world during the Valley Forge of China, she reminds us of Washington, praying amid the cold, hunger, and desolation of our own Valley Forge. We know that her prayers, like those of Washington, will surely be answered; and,

"Whereas her noble life and her illustrious achievements in her own right, as well as incident to her exalted station as the wife and helpmate of her great husband, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, leader of our ally, the Chinese Republic, and its invincible armies—which have been fighting for more than 5 long years amid almost insurmountable difficulties for China's freedom from foreign aggression, conquest and slavery, has inspired us all. We realize daily more and more that China has been holding back from similar trespass upon us the organized armed hordes of a lustful and barbarous invading enemy, an enemy having neither restraint nor humanity; thereby giving the rest of the world's democracies a chance to prepare to defend themselves from similar destruction and enslavement; and,

"Whereas the said Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, though physically ill and weary from those long years of effort in that great cause of the peace-loving people of one of the oldest and most historic civilizations, as well as all the other democracies, is visiting our country, inspiring our people, and appealing for a continuance and increase of aid to her people in the common struggle; and

"Whereas we wish this great lady to realize that she is still claimed and acclaimed as another great light of our Southland, a light, as it were, of the Orient, holding out the lamp of American liberty and culture in one hand, and in the other hand holding up the history and culture of the Orient. We wish her to know that her memory and record will never fade or grow dim in that Southland of her youth and that her example will never grow less inspiring for the hearts of all our American people everywhere, regardless of State or section. Mme. Chiang Kai-shek with her transcendent faith in our common God, and in liberty, progress, peace, and justice for all nations, and her words and prayers and her noble acts in support of her sublime faith in Almighty God, and the enduring principles which embody the hopes of all humanity everywhere for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, will always be a continuing inspiration to the people of America and to democratic peoples everywhere; and

"Whereas Mme. Chiang Kai-shek by her shining example along those lines has added new distinction to the history and traditions of our Southland, which this society was organized especially to perpetuate and record: It is hereby

"*Resolved*, That the New York Southern Society hereby awards its gold medal of distinction and honor to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek."

Mr. MILLER. We will but honor ourselves in thus honoring the member of a family which contained not only Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, but Madam Kung and Mme. Sun Yat Sen, all of whom once lived in our southland.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek attended Piedmont College at Demarest, Ga., and Mme. Sun Yat Sen, the younger sister, attended Wesleyan College at Macon, Ga. The father, Mr. Charles Soong, as a boy lived as a member of the family of that distinguished Confederate veteran, Gen. Julian S. Carr, at Durham, N. C., whose son, Mr. Claiborne Carr is a prominent member of this society. Madam Chiang and a sister attended summer school at Fairmount, N. C. We mention these details to show how the whole family were identified with the South.

In a beautiful letter to the president of Piedmont College in 1938, she described those early days and those people in the following words:

"They had come from far in the hills, many having taught primary school for years to get the funds necessary to attend Piedmont. All these people were greatly interested in me, and, for my part, I began to get an insight into the lives of those who had to struggle for a living and for even the means to acquire an elementary education. I suppose my contact with these people as a girl influenced my interest in the lot of those who were not born with a silver spoon in their mouths, a contact which I may never have experienced otherwise. It made me see their sterling worth, because, after all, they and their kind constitute the backbone of any nation."

Little did the young people among those hills of Georgia dream that they were playing and plodding to school with a girl whose name one day would rank with Joan of Arc and Florence Nightingale. Perhaps it was no misfortune on the other hand that that little girl landed among the good Christian people who were descendants of the English colonists who followed Oglethorpe to Georgia, seeking and finding civil and religious liberty.

The inscription on the medal might read in abbreviated substance, as follows:

"Presented to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek in appreciation of her great achievements, which have added new distinction to the history and traditions of the Southern States of the United States of America."

For the first time the South has literally taken a foreign-born person to its heart as well as its homes. It has for the first time unofficially, but nonetheless actually, adopted such a foreign-born citizen of another country, though most of the original 13 States approved the award of citizenship to Lafayette. It is therefore appropriate that the first person (certainly the first woman) to be even unofficially adopted by the people of the Southern States of the United States of America, should be that great lady, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, of our great and heroic sister republic of China.

Address by Jos. J. Pietrafesa, Before the Roman Social and Athletic Club, Auburn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Joseph J. Pietrafesa, before the Roman Social and Athletic Club, Auburn, N. Y.:

Mr. Toastmaster, honored guests, members of the Roman Social and Athletic Club, ladies and gentlemen, this is truly a memorable occasion. Mortgage burning occurs so seldom, and is such an event, that it is most fitting that a party should commemorate the deed, and you are to be congratulated on your achievement. Although the Government wants us to save waste paper, I don't think they will mind your destroying such a small piece, but a piece which has been hanging over your heads so long that you are taking particular delight in destroying it. Personally, I am enjoying every minute of it, and for no small reason. After all, we are neighbors, and we have something very much in common—we eat the same brand macaroni products.

A representative gathering such as this is always the target for a high-sounding patriotic address, and particularly for the past 3 years I am certain you have heard many of them, and I am rather hesitant to embark upon a discourse with that theme. But I am afraid I would be rather remiss if I didn't say a few words befitting the times, and knowing the background of most of the assemblage, I know that you will bear with me while I bring a few things to your attention which are most fitting.

The very name of your club indicates the background of its membership, and this background is something that we all are very proud of. It is a priceless heritage, and one that has had no small part in the building of the present great American Republic, which is our home and our country.

It gives me great pride as an American citizen of Italian origin to be able to say, and to have what I am about to say confirmed by the utterances of the President of the United States and other high public officials, that the American of Italian extraction is second to none in his loyalty, patriotism, and devotion to country.

Americans of Italian origin come by their loyalty most naturally, for by long tradition they are as peace loving, idealistic, and democratic at heart as any other people in the world.

The patriotism of Americans of Italian extraction and their devotion to democratic ideals can best be seen in the war statistics of the day. There are now roughly 10,000,000 Americans in the armed forces of our country, and about 1,000,000 of them, which is 10 percent, are young men of Italian extraction. Ten percent, mind you, although the census records reveal that of the total population in the United States, only 4 percent are Italians or of Italian extraction.

Fifteen hundred American boys of Italian extraction from one Catholic parish in Syracuse are in the armed forces. This is more than twice the number of boys that have left from either of the two largest parishes in Syracuse. Needless to say, the parish which has contributed the 1,500 boys is not one of the large parishes, but its membership is almost 100 percent of Italian extraction.

Americans of Italian extraction are proving with their blood and with their very lives their devotion to the American ideals. There is not one casualty list published by the Army, Navy, or any branch of the service in which Italian names do not prominently appear. Many men of Italian origin have been cited for bravery and courage under fire.

Among the first three Americans who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for bravery at Pearl Harbor, one of them was an Italian boy from Brooklyn. Another, First Lieutenant Bianchi, of Minnesota, was also awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his courageous action beyond the line of duty on Bataan. First Lt. John Boselli, of New York City, won the Distinguished Flying Cross and Oak Leaf Cluster for his extraordinary flying exploits in the Pacific.

Ensign William Tepuni, of San Francisco, was also awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for outstanding courage and skill which led to the destruction of a German U-boat.

And so the story goes, and so it has gone on for many years past. In your own community, as in ours, there are many American boys of Italian origin of whom both you and our country are most proud, as witness the following members of our armed forces from your community who have by courageous deeds brought themselves to the attention of our country: Marine DePasquale, veteran of Guadalcanal; Technical Sgt. J. J. Alongi, who has been awarded the Silver Star for bravery on the African front; Pvt. Emanuel Ferlandi, who has been awarded the Purple Heart for courageous service on the African front; Pvt. John Mazzeo, prisoner of war in Germany, and his cousin, Sgt. Michael Mazzeo, who has been awarded the Flying Cross for transporting planes from England to Africa; Cadet Daniel Melie, who was killed while operating a training plane; Pvt. Bernard Capinello, and many others too numerous to mention.

Italians in America gave a stirring account of themselves in the last war, and Italians in America have given substantial contributions to the greatness and progress of our country from the very beginning of our country's history, even before the Revolutionary War. Italians were among the first Europeans to set foot on the American continent, and they have continued to come in a steady stream since the days of Christopher Columbus and Caboto. Caboto you will recognize in your history books as John Cabot. One of the earliest explorers of northwestern Minnesota, and the discoverer of the sources of the Mississippi River, was an Italian, Giacomo Beltrami. I am sure you have all heard of La Salle and his famous expedition to the Gulf of Mexico, but how many of you know that his chief of staff was the Italian Enrico Tonti? Enrico's younger brother, Alfonso Tonti, was one of the founders of the city of Detroit, and its governor for 12 years. His daughter was the first white child born in the West, and his wife and Madam Cadillac were the first white women to settle in Detroit.

Among the signers of the Declaration of Independence you will find the name of William Paca, of Italian ancestry. Proof of his ancestry is established by a letter which he wrote upon his return from a visit to Italy in 1760, in which he declared that he had visited the land of his ancestors.

Perhaps the most outstanding Italian figure in the history of Italy's contribution to this country is that of Felippo Mazzei. He came to America at the suggestion of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. He worked incessantly to change the attitude of the American people, and he actually preceded Thomas Payne, the American liberal, and Thomas Jefferson in their criticism of the then tyrannical British Government. He was a great friend of Jefferson, and some of the very words found in the Declaration of Independence have their origin in an article which Mazzei wrote in 1774, and which Jefferson had published in a Virginia newspaper.

Another outstanding Italian of colonial days was Colonel Francesco Vigo. It was he who made possible the victory of Gen. George Rogers Clarke in 1779, and without this victory, historians say it is very possible that the present States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, which comprised the old Northwest Territory, would today form a part of Canada.

The roster of the United States Navy from its very inception shows many an Italian name. The Italians were of invaluable assistance to the American Navy during the war with Tripoli. Records in Washington show that there were more than 200 Italian officers in the Civil War, including four generals: Spinola, DeCesnola, Ferraro, Fardella, and a host of other high officers, and that they fought with valor is attested to by the awards of several Congressional Medals of Honor to them.

Is it any wonder then that I started out by saying that we had no small part in the building of our great country?

More than that, we have contributed to every phase of our country's history. With the advent of the nineteenth century, the coming of Italians to the United States increased. Religious and political exiles, especially Garibaldi, pioneers in search of new life in a new world, all found their way to this country. The fine reputation carved out for themselves by Italian artists and educators in America is common knowledge, and our contribution is found also in the actual physical building and growth of our country, in the history of our communications and all industrial enterprises in America, and whenever danger threatened this country and the cry went out for volunteers, Americans of Italian origin have always sprung to the van.

I bring these facts to your attention, not because there is any reason for us to protest our loyalty and devotion to this country, as there is no need to talk of that. Actions speak louder than words, and on the basis of the record of action, American citizens of Italian ancestry can turn their faces to the sun and be fiercely proud of their heritage and of the contributions that Italians have made to the greatness of our country.

Were Columbus, Caboto, Vespucci, Tonti, and the other great explorers of the American continent here today, they could well feel a surging pride over the fact that their countrymen and their descendants have immeasurably helped to carry the torch of civilization and progress in this new world.

Today as united Americans we are standing in defense of our homes, our institutions, and our democratic way of life. True that we are doing our duty, but let it not be forgotten that while the American citizens of Italian origin are responding generously, freely, and with their lives, it has been a stern and bitter test, for up to a short time ago, the country of their fathers was on the other side of the fence, and to their everlasting credit, let it be noted and said, that during all that time when Italy was an enemy, not one Italian in this country was charged with espionage, treason, or sabotage.

They have been tried in the crucible of war, and they have been found equal to the full measure of loyalty and patriotism.

Let it be also said and noted that on the battlefield, in the air, or on the sea, the Americans of Italian origin are proudly doing their duty, and on the home front, in the fields, in the factory, in every branch of civilian defense, yea, even in the purchase of War bonds, all are performing their duty and contributing their all for the survival of our way of life, our civilization, for the betterment of all mankind.

In the name of the countless Italian families in this country whose blood has been spilled in the defense of America and in the defense of all mankind, for the defense of America also means the defense of all mankind, I ask you to join me in saluting America, our country, united and indivisible, and affirm once more that we American citizens of Italian origin know our duty and will not falter, even unto death.

The Commandant Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as a former marine, I am happy to have the privilege to insert into the RECORD a copy of the talk given by Lt. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the United States Marine Corps at the Associated Press meeting in New York City on April 24, 1944.

Just as marines waste no time in gaining their objectives so does General Vandegrift waste no words in making a speech. What he has to say is to the point and one cannot help but feel a renewed source of pride in the corps after reading his speech. It is indeed worth the attention of every Member of this House:

It is always a pleasure to speak before the press, and I believe that I have before me today as high powered a gathering of newspapermen as I have ever seen. The prospect of speaking to such a gathering of editors and publishers caused at first a slight feeling of uneasiness, for if the press of this country is any example, the publishers and editors behind that press are keen men of sagacity and knowledge, quick to perceive and pounce upon any hazy or ill-considered statements by a visiting speaker.

But I called to mind the fine newspapermen I have known overseas and since assuming my duties in Washington. I remember all of them as congenial fellows, energetic and dependable, who liked to talk shop about the war in the Pacific, and who could do so with unusual insight and intelligence. If that were true of the field representatives of the men before whom I speak today, it should be especially true of the men here in this room. And so I will talk shop about the war in the Pacific.

The war against Japan has been the primary concern of United States marines, and it will continue to be. It is especially interesting for a marine to look back 2 years and compare the present scene with the picture of the Pacific in those hectic months of 1942. The comparison is pleasant and as the war in the mandated islands and in the South Pacific groups goes forward toward the Japanese homeland, the comparison becomes increasingly pleasant.

To you, this comparison has been brought home by the corps of foreign correspondents who have landed, shoulder to shoulder with marines, on many a bitterly contested beach. Through those public relations officers whose privilege it is to guide and inform the civilian press I have received high praise of the newsmen who have accompanied us. They seem to be honored when we call them "good marines." And there are many who are just that. We have a close tie with them through our enlisted correspondents. Our news services of this country have done a fine job on the reporting of the war, and it is gratifying to look through the files of news stories of early 1942 and early 1944 and to draw comparisons.

So gratifying, in fact that we are in danger of forgetting that black winter of 1941–42. We should never make that mistake. We were not ready. But that is a reason, not an excuse for the shattering news that seemed to come in with such depressing regularity in the early days. Why we were not ready is not a problem to discuss here. But it is a problem for every member of the American information services, if I may so characterize the press of this Nation, to think of as we approach victory; for in our democracy the Nation gets what the people want, and your publications are the greatest educational outlet to the people that we have. We must never let ourselves be so unprepared again.

It was the Marine Corps' privilege to lead the first campaign against the land masses which must be retaken. We were fortunate in the Marine Corps in those days, for I dare say there was not a single unit of any size that did not have in it men who had been in action before. I do not intend to discuss the various small wars and minor skirmishes which marines have observed here and there around the world. I will say, however, that a leavening of old timers who have been in fights before, who have seen shots fired in anger, is the most beneficial human ingredient that a green outfit, going into action for the first time can have. On August 7 at Guadalcanal we had a measure of that leavening—marines who had learned the craft of jungle fighting in widely scattered places. Now there is no outfit going into a fight that does not have men in it who have fought the Japanese, and four marine divisions have attacked as units. The young American men have an aptitude for jungle fighting and it developed quickly.

We were fortunate also in the outcome of a certain gamble. For many years we had been constantly experimenting and developing the technique of that most difficult of all military-naval maneuvers, the amphibious operation. We had known since the twenties that if ever we fought the Japanese we would have to fight an amphibious war in the Pacific islands. We had practiced at Midway and in the Caribbean. Guadalcanal was to tell us whether our amphibious principles were sound or whether we were not yet ready for the test. I do not like to contemplate what the consequences might have been if we had not been ready. But, as events proved, we were. Our techniques were by no means perfect; we learned many valuable lessons, both in landing operations and, as I have said, in jungle fighting. But the basic training principles were sound.

Current in the pages of your newspapers are the stories of the atoll battles, the shattering bombardments, followed by the amphibious assaults. Kwajalein and Eniwetok were the results—in light casualties—of the hard lessons we learned elsewhere. But the remaining islands on the Tokyo road are not all atolls. Some are volcanic islands, choked with jungle growth and honeycombed with caves. There will be many places where naval gunfire will not be possible and where bombs will not penetrate. As we go closer to Japan I have no doubt that the enemy will redouble his fury in defense and counterattack. His fleet, now giving the lie to his propaganda broadcasts in some hidden base, might come out. And we may take heavy casualties. (The enemy will take more, I assure you.)

But in 2 years we have learned much of this close, individual war and our technical equipment has improved by bounds. This learning and development does not stop with technique of battle on a grand scale or new landing craft. It goes into the very heart of our organizations. Since December 7, 1941, in a thousand jungle skirmishes, we have built up a tremendous volume of experience.

A minor but representatively far reaching example of the fruits of this experience is our new rifle squad, which I mention here because it affects every marine in every rifle regiment. Where formerly our squads were 10 or 12 men under a leader and his assistant, now each squad is an integrated unit of three separate "fire teams" each with its own automatic weapon, antitank grenadier, and riflemen; and each man is a fighting unit. It is a good organization for American marines.

I do not pretend to say that we have learned everything there is to learn about jungle and atoll fighting. But we have learned a lot. The campaigns on New Britain and Bougainville go forward faster not because the enemy is tired or low in morale, for as long as he is alive he is dangerous. Rather the advances are more rapid because 2 years of war experience, coupled with 2 years of enthusiastic war production and research, with the whole entrusted to young energetic Americans, who know the resources at their disposal, is a well-nigh unbeatable combination.

We must not assume, however, that all of our successes spring from our own capabilities. The Japanese gave us a respite in May 1942, when they decided to stop their march south long enough to take a good long breath and to build their new possessions into layers of protective steel around the Japanese homeland. Their assumption—and in May 1942, there was apparently little to indicate that it was not a wise assumption—was that we were so shaken that they would have plenty of time to refit for further conquests.

The enemy leaders believed it would be physically impossible for the United States to make in 1 or 2, or even 3 years, the shift to a war basis which had taken them more than a decade. They were confident that by the time the United States, which they considered effete and decadent, had built up its forces, the fortified belts around the new empire of Japan would be well nigh impregnable. They were almost right about the fortifications. Let no one tell you that our first atoll in the Gilberts was easy. The thing that tipped the scales and caused that atoll to become an allied base was an intangible virility in our people. That was where the Japanese had made their biggest mistake. They knew our productive capacity from firsthand observation. They knew our reserves of raw material from the same source, but they considered us, as a people, too effete and decadent to take the kind of war they would force on us.

Perhaps, if we had waited and let them consolidate in the extensive manner they wished, their fortifications might have stopped us. In the light of recent events on Cape Gloucester, Bougainville, and the central Pacific, I doubt it. We would have

taken more casualties, but we would have taken our objective too. At any rate, we did not allow them to rest unmolested while they built up their gains. Although not prepared for an offensive of great size in the summer of 1942, we knew that we had to strike back, divert them from their purpose and at the same time prepare for something that would be more than a diversion. We hit Guadalcanal and today our forces roll the enemy up the north coast of New Britain and our pilots fly unchallenged over Rabaul. It is a source of satisfaction to me to remember that the division which I took into Guadalcanal is now fighting its way toward the bastion of Rabaul from the west.

We have the power in the Pacific. We have the trained men and battle-wise units. Everywhere we strike, we strike hard. The reports from the field must draw grunts from the impassive war lords in Tokyo. The enemy will fight until he is beaten. There might even be leaders of his who still think they can win the war, that we will grow tired, and, being soft and effete, quit the fight short of our goal. But those are men who have never faced our troops in battle. There have been few Japanese in this war who have faced our troops in battle since August 7, 1942, and gotten home to tell of it.

Today, then, we strike the enemy on all his fronts and we strike him successfully. But we must not forget those hectic days of early 1942 and the unpreparedness that brought them about.

Feeding Children in Occupied Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the Blue Network on Friday evening, April 28, 1944:

The object of this talk over the Blue Network is to arouse the humanitarian impulses, to point out the moral responsibilities, and to enlist the support of the American people to help feed the starving children of the occupied nations of Europe before millions of these helpless and innocent victims of the ravages and horrors of war die of starvation and disease.

To those who might think that feeding starving children in Europe would help the Nazis, let me quote from a statement made by Dr. Howard E. Kershner, director of the American Friends Service Committee:

"Hitler wages biological war. He seeks to destroy whole peoples and we play into his hands by doing nothing to save them. Those who survive will be subnormal in mind and body, unable to compete with the Germans in the reconstruction of Europe. The people who established the principles of free speech, free press, free religion, trial by jury, and all the institutions of freemen are dying while the Nazis are still getting enough to eat. What will the future be if the people who believe in human freedom are not here when the war is over?

"It is not a choice between sending food to the children or sending more bombs, for the food would go in neutral ships that cannot be hired for the war effort and would not cost the American people a dollar. No food needed for ourselves or our allies would be sent from this country. It could be brought from South America and South Africa. Half of what we waste here would save the lives of at least 10,000,000 children.

"Impressive testimony was given by spokesmen for the occupied countries showing that the children are dying. In some areas over half of them have tuberculosis and others are threatened. They faint in the schoolrooms. They have stopped growing, are tragically underweight, have no breakfast, a small piece of bread for lunch, with an onion or a turnip, and vegetable soup for supper—perhaps one small portion of meat a week. Millions of children are getting no more than 700 to 900 calories of food daily, about one-third of what we give our children, and not enough to sustain life over a long period of time. I have seen these children with starvation-bloated stomachs. I have seen their blue lips and bloodless faces, their rickety legs and hollow chests. Their sad little eyes accuse us of murder. I have heard the tubercular cough mingled with the cry for bread and I can never forget it."

The Congress has done its part by a unanimous vote. In the Senate the Gillette-Taft bill was adopted, calling upon the State Department to use its influence to persuade the British Government to relax the blockade against food ships. The House of Representatives, also by a unanimous vote, passed House Resolution No. 221, introduced by me, which was practically the same as the Senate resolution except that it specifically included France as one of the occupied countries to which relief was to be sent along with Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, and other occupied nations.

The time for action has come. Every week that passes endangers the lives of untold thousands. I am giving the Macedonian cry for help to American men and women, and am asking them to write to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, at Washington, and request him to use his influence with the British Government to carry out the purposes of my resolution to provide immediate relief to the starving women and children in the occupied nations of Europe.

I am asking you to communicate with Secretary Hull because American public opinion is the greatest and most powerful moral force and influence in the world today. I am convinced that if American citizens make known their views and sentiments in favor of feeding the children in the stricken and hungry nations that have been invaded by the Nazi armies, that the British Government will lift the blockade and cooperate to save millions of helpless children from mass starvation within the next 10 months.

I am proud to be the author of the resolution, and doubly honored in having it reported and passed in my name, which is an unusual honor for a Member of the minority party in Congress. It goes to show that there is not the slightest degree of partisanship in it.

Now let me give you the facts and show you the motives that have impelled Congress and thousands of churchmen and leaders in all walks of life to demand that these helpless and innocent children who are facing death from disease and starvation be afforded immediate relief.

Time is of the essence. It will do no good and serve no useful purpose if after Congress has adopted my resolution the State Department fails to persuade 10 Downing Street to cooperate, at least to the extent of permitting food ships to enter European ports. The resolution, without firm action by the State Department would become a mere scrap of paper and a useless gesture.

I take it that it is the unanimous desire and purpose of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate to insist that the State Department make every possible effort to persuade the British Government, our friendly ally, to relax the blockade to permit food to reach millions of destitute children who are now on the verge of starvation. Many of them have already died of starvation and dread disease, such as rickets. Sixty-five percent of them have some form of incipient tuberculosis. Most of them will not survive another winter.

We in America are, indeed, fortunate. We have plenty to eat. We have been, so far, saved from air raids and bombings by the enemy, but these mothers and children in the nations that have been overrun by the Germans are the victims of war and famine. They did not cause the war. Their fathers fought against the Germans until they were defeated and their countries overrun. Today, as a matter of record, we are feeding our own prisoners in Germany. Great Britain, who so far has refused to relax the blockade, is also feeding hers in Germany, and let me say in all fairness I believe the English people feel exactly the way we do, and so does the Parliament. I predict that within a short time the food blockade will be lifted and these occupied nations with their own money, because they have gold and other securities in the United States and England, will be able to buy food and milk and vitamins to send in Swedish ships, neutral ships, to France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Poland, and other occupied countries.

I believe the British have already about made up their minds, or are going to make up their minds shortly, and this resolution will be very helpful, showing the will of the Congress and of the American people, in favor of relaxing the blockade.

We can understand perfectly well that in the first part of the war, when England was under attack, she could not afford to modify the blockade. Conditions are different today and England is not in any immediate danger of attack. During the last war Herbert Hoover was the administrator of relief in Belgium for 4 long years. He fed 7,000,000 Belgians and kept them alive. It is claimed that not 1 pound of this food went to the German Army or to the German population. Today we are sending to Greece great quantities of food. Turkey and Canada are doing likewise. We are sending it in Swedish ships and keeping young children and mothers in Greece alive, where a short time ago they were on the verge of starvation and death.

It has worked well wherever it has been tried. I know of no military reason for not permitting those occupied countries to buy food, or even for us to put up the money to buy food and let them buy it elsewhere, in Argentina or South Africa, or wherever food may be had.

We have a great moral responsibility in America. We cannot simply sit quietly by and wash our hands like Pontius Pilate, and let millions of innocent children die in the agony of starvation, with bloated stomachs, or die from some dread disease while we evade the issue and the moral responsibility as one of the partners in a war, with food abundant to save these unfortunate and helpless children from death or from living with twisted and distorted bodies and minds.

But one thing I want to make abundantly clear is that if 1 pound of this food goes to the German Army or goes to the German population, then we should stop it immediately. If they did take all of it, it would not be enough to last them 24 hours. At least we would have made an honest effort. At least we would have carried out the desire of the American people to help these starving children and to try to save them from death by starvation and disease.

I predict that unless something is done immediately there will be mass starvation, and millions of these helpless children—Jews and gentiles—will die that terrible death of hunger within the next 10 months. It would

be the greatest tragedy of the war, and we would be morally responsible unless we make a sincere and honest effort to persuade the British Government to permit us to ship the much-needed food to the stricken occupied nations.

So I am hoping that not only the Congress will be listened to by No. 10 Downing Street, but I hope that the women of America who are primarily interested in this kind of humanitarian relief legislation will write to the Secretary of State and to the President and ask them to use their influence in accordance with the unanimous request of the Congress of the United States, to start feeding these children before it is too late. Even now millions of European children will be crippled for life; and if food is not forthcoming soon, the future destiny of these occupied nations will be ghastly beyond words to describe.

Hitler's proud boast that the Germans are a superior race will come true to the extent that we allow him to destroy the freedom-loving people of Europe by starvation and to render those that are left subnormal in mind and body. People who have eaten well are indeed superior to those who are undersized and riddled with disease.

It is not only good charity, but the best of strategy to save the starving children of the Nazi-dominated countries of Europe. These people are our friends and allies. They have fought for liberty for centuries before our country was born. They are still fighting for it. They crave our moral support and help. To save their children now would win their friendship and affection forever. We need their help now, and we shall desperately need it in the reconstruction days ahead. How will we ever reestablish democracy as the ruling philosophy of government if we allow Hitler to destroy the democratic peoples of Europe?

At no expense to ourselves, and without using any ships or food which we or our allies need, it is possible to save many of these starving little ones. It is not only a human obligation, but it may well help to shorten the war by building up the morale and resistance of the people of Europe who are opposed to nazi-ism.

We talk glibly of a better world after the war. How can that be attained with diseased, stunted, and physically and mentally warped children who will be the new generation in Europe?

In conclusion, let me remind you that action speaks louder than words in getting food to the stricken nations, and is the only thing that counts. Starving and dying children cannot live on congressional resolutions, eat promises, pledges, and expressions of good will, or survive on pious platitudes and glittering generalities.

Let us act now, in the name of humanity, religion, and America, asking nothing for ourselves but the satisfaction of feeding the hungry, healing the sick, and promoting peace and good will in the devastated and war-torn occupied nations of Europe.

I have just received the following letter from Secretary Cordell Hull, which is self-explanatory:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 28, 1944.

The Honorable HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FISH: I have received your letter of April 19, 1944, enclosing a copy of House Resolution 221 and expressing the hope that arrangements will be made immediately to send shipments of relief supplies to the distressed peoples of the occupied countries of Europe.

The Department, in consultation with the authorities responsible for the successful prosecution of the allied war effort, is presently engaged in reexamining this entire question in the light of existing conditions with a view to determining whether the most successful prosecution of the war effort will permit the extension of relief to the peoples of the occupied countries prior to their liberation from Nazi oppression. The views of the legislative branch of our Government, as expressed in House Resolution 221 and Senate Resolution 100, are, of course, being accorded the weight to which they are entitled in connection with the examination of this question.

I can assure you that our approach in this matter is a most sympathetic one and that we have a very real desire immediately to relieve the suffering in the occupied countries if such action is determined to be consistent with the attainment of our primary objective, that of bringing the war to a successful termination at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Second Lt. Ernest Childers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 26, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was both my pleasure and my privilege last Monday to meet two prominent heroes of World War No. 2, and holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, namely, Second Lt. Ernest Childers, an Indian from my own State of Oklahoma, and Sgt. Charles Kelly, an Irishman, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

We had lunch in the Speaker's dining room at the Capitol, together with Mr. Thomas J. Kehoe, assistant national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, Senator GUFFEY, Congressman SCANLON, of Pennsylvania, and the members of the Oklahoma delegation. During luncheon Commando Kelly and Lieutenant Childers, after much insistence, modestly related some of their experiences while serving and fighting at the front.

All Indians and all Irishmen, as well as all other Americans, are mighty proud of these 2 young men, who represent 2 of the 15 living servicemen who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor during this war. The Congressional Medal of Honor has been awarded to 40; however, only 15 are living.

Because he is a very interesting young man, I thought you might be interested in Lieutenant Childers' background and service record, as related in a War Department release, as follows:

SECOND LT. ERNEST CHILDERS

Second Lt. Ernest Childers, 26-year old infantryman, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor, has returned to the United States from Italy under the Army's rotation policy.

The medal was presented to Lieutenant Childers on April 12 in the north African theater of operations.

The citation follows:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life, above and beyond the call of duty in action on September 22, 1943, at Oliveto, Italy.

"Although Lieutenant Childers had just previously suffered a fractured instep he, with eight enlisted men, advanced up a hill toward enemy machine-gun nests. The group advanced to a rock wall overlooking a cornfield and Lieutenant Childers ordered a base of fire laid across the field so that he could advance. When he was fired upon by two enemy snipers from a nearby house he killed both of them.

"He moved behind the machine-gun nests and killed all occupants of the nearer one. He continued toward the second one and threw rocks into it. When the two occupants of the nest rose up, he shot one. The other was killed by one of the eight enlisted men. Lieutenant Childers continued his advance toward a house farther up the hill and single-handed, captured an enemy mortar observer.

"The exceptional leadership, initiative, calmness under fire, and conspicuous gallantry displayed by Lieutenant Childers were an inspiration to his men."

Lieutenant Childers, a Creek Indian, was born at Broken Arrow, Okla., February 1, 1918. He owns a 40-acre tract of land in Wagoner County, Okla., where his parents settled in 1906, a year before Oklahoma was admitted to the Union.

His parents are both dead. His father died in 1930, and his mother 6 years later.

Lieutenant Childers is one of five boys in the Childers family, all but one of whom are now in the armed services. Clarence Childers, 31, is married and has a family and is employed in the oil industry in Tulsa.

The other brothers are Anderson, 29, a master sergeant in the Air Corps, now stationed at Seattle, Wash.; Ellis, 24, a corporal in the military police, now stationed at Florence, Ariz.; and Owen, 21, who was inducted into the marines last month.

Lieutenant Childers' parents were both native Oklahomans, and he himself has lived in the State his whole life. As a boy according to his sister-in-law, Mrs. Clarence Childers, of 2537 North Garrison Place, Tulsa, he was noted for his daring and his natural leadership.

He attended school at Wagoner until 1934, and then enrolled in the Chilocco Indian School at Newkirk, Okla., from which he was graduated in 1940.

Lieutenant Childers first became interested in the Army while attending the Chilocco school, where a National Guard unit had been organized. In 1936 he joined the guard and was assigned to Company C, One Hundred and Eightieth Infantry Regiment, Forty-fifth Division.

He has been connected with the Forty-fifth ever since. He went on active service in 1940, when the division was activated and began its training at Fort Sill, Okla. During most of 1941, it was stationed at Camp Barkeley, Abilene, Tex.

Childers was a private when the Forty-fifth began its training. He worked his way up through all the noncommissioned ranks, and was a master sergeant when his outfit reached Italy.

He was given a direct commission in recognition of his battle services.

Mr. Speaker, incidentally both of these young men expressed their interest in becoming active members of the Disabled American Veterans' organization, which consists entirely of American war wounded and disabled veterans. They also signified their intention of becoming members of the American Legion.

When Mr. Kehoe invited them to attend the next national convention of the Disabled American Veterans to be held at Denver, Colo., in September they both agreed that they would like very much to have the opportunity to tell discharged disabled veterans their experiences at the front lines, and I am hopeful that the War Department will allow them to at-

tend the convention of their disabled comrades, and thereby possibly to help to formulate plans for the post-war period.

Although these men declared that they were merely symbolic of the thousands of men who have already been wounded, Childers reminded the gathering of newsmen that he had been fortunate in receiving only minor injuries and that there were many of his buddies who would return to this country less fortunate.

Daylight-Saving Time

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to extend my remarks and include therein certain communications urging the repeal of daylight saving.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in the proposal to repeal daylight saving. It is bringing about wastage of manpower on the farm and absenteeism in the factory. It is contributing to the wastage of farm products and inefficiency of production in defense plants. It increases the consumption of power and light in every home and place of business without corresponding profit. It has contributed directly to juvenile delinquency and assaults upon women on their way to employment in the premature darkness of the morning. It has increased the number of traffic accidents on darkened highways and increased the wear on motor vehicles. It is sending millions of small children into the darkness and cold on remote highways to await school busses in every community in the Nation. It has deprived millions of a needed hour of sleep on sultry nights and has increased death and illness rates through exposure and exhaustion. It has added confusion and distress to the already tense war situation without compensating advantage. Schools and churches and farm and labor organizations and a majority of the citizens of every community and the membership of this House disapprove of it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from some of the letters received on the subject:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

May I add my thanks and hope for success in the good work in trying to abolish the silly winter daylight saving? It is the greatest minor inconvenience of the war. (I have a son in the Navy—I'm not talking about major troubles.)

EDITH LAVELL.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

I wonder if you can realize just how great a thing you are doing for humanity in introducing a bill to set the clocks at their regular time? After all, 24 hours a day divided into three shifts are 8 hours each, and while setting the time ahead really couldn't benefit most of us, it just gives the reckless, adolescent age an earlier start by 1 hour on their never-ending quest for thrills and excitement and parents past their 60 years who have to arise and prepare their household for war industries—some of whom must travel 36 to 40 miles—arise at 4:30 a. m. (while in reality it is only 3:30) more fuel, more light, more effort—and for what?

It is really hardest in the cold winter months. We would gladly accept this war time if it really pertained to the war effort. I have 5 sons out fighting for right and freedom—one has made the supreme sacrifice last November; no sacrifice is too great for our country—but while we all wish to do the necessary sacrifices required of us, it is unnecessary to set the clocks ahead that 1 hour.

MAUD B. ALLEN.

BLUFFS, ILL.

We farmers will certainly welcome the return of sane standard time and appreciate your efforts and wish you every success.

ROYAL OAKES.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

California on three occasions has voted against the adoption of daylight-saving time, or, in other words, burning the candle on the wrong end.

W. B. VAN HORN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

War time is the biggest farce ever put over, and there are thousands of people who see and admit that this measure is becoming more and more unpopular and that it has rendered no service whatever, but, in fact, has been and is now a decided detriment in every respect in the Nation's effort to win this war. Please return us to standard time.

S. G. HELMER.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

Do away with daylight saving. I hope and trust you will be successful in your venture to do away with what we think is the most unjust piece of legislation ever shoved upon the Nation. There is no reason whatsoever to force the public to unnecessary expense by burning electric lights from 4 a. m. until 8 a. m. The children are only half awake when called for school. Our farmers must all wait until 10 a. m. before they can enter a field to work. In fact, there is absolutely nothing gained by daylight saving. It is a detriment to the whole Nation. If it took the Nation 2,000 years to see the advantage by turning the clocks ahead 1 hour then I feel they are very slow in learning a lesson on the downgrade.

JOHN L. ENGLERT.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

As a Government worker who must be at the office at 8:15 a. m., which means I must dress in a cold apartment, struggle in the dark for transportation, and work in the dark for at least an hour during winter months, I certainly hope your bill restoring eastern standard time will pass.

FLORENCE WHITTEMORE.

WOLLASTON, MASS.

I would like to voice my sincere approval for the abolition of daylight saving for all future time.

It would be one move to normal times.

W. F. PIKE.

OLEAN, N. Y.

I have been reading about the resolution to put the country back on standard time, and heartily agree, and know of a great many others who are of the same opinion but are so busy they find it difficult to express themselves on the subject.

There definitely is nothing saved by daylight saving; and, in fact, the time is wasted. Children refuse to go to their much-needed sleep and continue to walk the streets aimlessly as daylight lasts so long—and who wants to go to bed while it is still daylight? This seems to be one of the greatest contributory factors toward juvenile delinquency.

I can't see where electricity or anything else is saved. Some people must arise before daylight to be at a war plant early and must burn lights.

I certainly do wish something could be done about the time, as this daylight business is a pain in the neck to the working class of people.

MARY C. LIPMAN.

OLEAN, N. Y.

I was very happy to learn that you are working to abolish daylight-saving time. We've given it enough time to work, but it is a miserable failure. Let's go back to "God's own time."

Our neighborhood is full of children who will not go to bed because of the added 1 hour of daylight. But they must arise to be to school at 8:25 a. m. They lose 1 hour of much-needed rest.

Mrs. C. E. ISAMAN.

LEESBURG, VA.

I do hope you will not only bring up but succeed in efforts to restore the sun's time. If any business requires the starting of an hour earlier, let them do so; but that the whole Nation is routed out of bed in the cold and dark to stand on street corners, without even the privilege of seeing the sun come up is barbarous.

Not only is electricity wasted, but coal and all heating affairs. At night the house is heated. School children going along country roads, some with flashlights, some candles, and some matches, and then waiting in the cold dark for busses. Nine o'clock is only the sun's 8, and the sun is not up during all winter months until 7:30 sun's time. Think of the mothers who have to get up to get the children, their husbands, and possibly themselves off to work. Quite possibly most of the tubercular cases can be attributed to the meaningless hours.

PAULINE D. CASTLEMAN.

STEVENS POINT, WIS.

You can do no greater benefit for the farmers than restore standard time. We farmers never miss any daylight, anyhow. You cannot begin work till the dew dries; especially in haying and threshing is this true. Then to quit at 5, or about the middle of the afternoon, sun high in the sky—it just don't work.

We are sick of this freak time. Do everything you can to set the clocks right.

MRS. DAMON.

BONNOTS MILL, MO.

The school faculty and pupils, too, are more than pleased with the repeal bill. At present we are handicapped rising early and returning home late from school.

Returning to natural time will help thousands of farmers. They will be able to work longer in the fields and thus raise more needed raw materials. Food is essential to win this war and we are all anxious to do our best.

CAROLINE ALTHEUSER.

MOUND CITY, ILL.

Re: Befuddled clocks in United States.

Have just noted a resolution in Congress to abolish now and forever, I hope, that infamous, diabolical concoction known as daylight-saving time, the most insane proposition ever foisted on the American people.

Just who got the notion that he had been divinely commissioned a modern Joshua is not stated. But evidently, unable to maneuver the sun, he beguiled himself by spinning the hands of the clock into the belief that he had actually done that very thing.

Accept my commendation, and here's wishing your resolution forthwith adoption and approval.

J. KELLY SMITH, *Attorney.*

PADUCAH, KY.

I want to send you the piece out of our Sunday paper. At least we have it in the press. They tried the daylight time here a few years ago (before it was Nation-wide) and the people were up in arms about it, so it didn't last. Now it's a law like some of the other crazy things they pass and we can't do a thing.

Mrs. NEVA LEIBEL.

PADUCAHANS REPORTED IRKED ABOUT DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Some people in Kentucky appear to be irked about the hour-fast war time. Several have written to have war time abolished and clocks turned back an hour to standard time.

From messages entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Paducah seems most sore about the time situation.

"In the winter we get up in the middle of the night," complained Mrs. Neva Leibel, 713 Kentucky Avenue, Paducah, "and in summer we go to bed with the sun shining. We have to burn lights half of the morning.

"The farmers don't like it either," she declared. "Cattle go by the sun. I am just one in this town who is dissatisfied."

The Kiwanis Club at Pikeville has had the matter up before its board of directors, Lon B. Rogers, an attorney there, wrote. "If there is anything we can do," he added, "I feel sure that our club would be only too glad to help in any way possible."

A telegram saying "We farmers have been heavily handicapped" came from J. A. Cole, Paducah, Frederick Beyer, Howard Rottgering, and Harry Ross, all farmers of near Paducah.

And Mrs. J. B. Smith, of Paducah, route No. 2, said "half the people" in her town "have never pushed their clocks forward," including the Catholic school which operates on old standard time though the kids start classes at 9:30 a. m. by the new time. She regards war time as a nuisance.

A Sun-Democrat reporter who interviewed most of those quoted above as opposing daylight-saving time found them standing firmly by their statements.

Harry Ross, who lives near Lone Oak, said that he and the three other farmers sent their telegram after discussing the matter at a chance meeting. He thinks daylight-saving time is strictly against the laws of nature. Here's the way he puts it:

"We have to get up an hour earlier—in the dark winter months it is a long time turning light—and quit an hour earlier to conform with members of our families who work in the city.

"Cows and chickens don't get up before sun-up and it causes a lot of confusion when it comes to feeding time for them. Roosters still crow at the same time.

"Besides that," he continued, "it just isn't natural to get up in the middle of the night and promenade around with a lantern on one arm so we can see our way to do chores."

One of the strongest contenders for the hour set-back is Mrs. Leibel, who complained that people here have to go to bed with the sun shining in the summertime. The Paducah housewife doesn't like it because she says the new time was arranged to save electricity and she has to keep her lights burning until well into the day under the present situation. And then again, as she said, she just doesn't like it.

The directors of both the Catholic schools in Paducah and McCracken County—St. Mary's Academy and St. John's—said that the schools operate on war time, opening at 8:30 a. m. daily. If the pupils go to mass they are sometimes late but never later than 9 o'clock, they said.

PATERSON, N. J.

Change the time back to standard time please. Folks work 24 hours and it has an effect. It is especially harmful to patients in the hospitals. It disturbs conditions, for we know the time is camouflaged.

Let us have something natural in this world. Please give us the old time back.

Mrs JAN ELLENOFF, R. N.

WINTER PARK, FLA.

Abandon war time. You are worthy of greatest commendation for courage in attempting to have this nuisance abolished.

We were on central standard time. The clocks were set ahead for daylight saving and never set back. When the directive—was it—was issued for war time, they were set ahead another hour. Need I add that we now have an oversupply of daylight saving.

GEORGE SCHWAB.

STAR CITY, ARK.

Change war time back as it was before the set-up.

More things should be changed for the convenience of people who are doing their best at home for the war effort.

W. R. ALSOBROOK,
President, Bank of Star City.

DANSVILLE, N. Y.

I wish to express appreciation of efforts to further action that will get the Nation back to standard time.

Farmers have always been opposed to it and it does seem that, in these times the wish of the people who raise food to eat, should be considered.

It is a hardship in many ways for working people. Small school children do not get proper amount of sleep as it is impossible to get children to bed when the sun is still shining.

Keep up the good work.

WARREN S. HOLLIDAY.

CRESTVIEW, FLA.

Am hoping you will succeed in your efforts to abandon war time.

PAUL CONSTANT.

EVANS, MO.

No one likes the new time. Can't see where we save anything as we use it in morning bumping around in dark. This old world moved a long time on the old time.

Mrs. H. BONNICHSON.

BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Enclosed is a copy of resolution in support of the bill introduced by you to end daylight saving.

Sincerely yours,

B. W. TILLMAN,
Farm Adviser, St. Clair
County Farm Bureau.

Whereas the present daylight-saving law is needlessly extravagant in the use of electricity, without any offsetting, compensating, economic saving; and

Whereas the system works a distinct hardship on farmers in the employment of farm labor; and furthermore, the farmer often finds it necessary to attend meetings, which under the present daylight-saving system interferes very seriously with his work in food production: Therefore be it

Resolved by members of the Twenty-second Congressional District in business session, That we oppose the present daylight-saving plan and urge a return to the former standard time.

G. G. PAPE,
Edwardsville, Ill.
F. C. GABE,
Nashville, Ill.
LOUIS J. HERTEL,
Millstadt, Ill.

LIBERAL, KANS.

Get standard time restored. It probably will not affect you so much as western Kansas where I live, as by our old time we were 45 minutes behind sun time and with a move-up of another war time hour we really have lunch by the sun time at 10:15 a. m. Really makes long hot afternoons. This winter it was not daylight until 9 a. m. war time.

We find there are only 24 hours in a day after all.

FERN P. DONLEY.

HITTA YUMA, MISS.

I am glad someone seems to be thinking on the same lines as I am about the so-called daylight saving time.

Be so kind as to tell me what started that. I know that the President consented to it as a war measure but I understand that it originated outside of this country.

On hearing from you I will tell you something of what I know about it.

DAME ELLEN PHELPS CRUMP.

SHERMAN, TEX.

Best of luck in getting standard time back. It has always been silly.

H. E. HARDGROVE.

NOVINGER, MO.

Please do everything to get our standard time back. We are farmers and I have to stop my work at 4 p. m. to have supper ready for hands. Wednesday evening I was trying to get my garden in and I quit at 4 to get supper and never got near all planted. The next morning it was raining and has rained ever since. Look at the time we waste when it is so valuable. We are just one of the many that want our standard time back.

Mrs. BEN BURESS.

AMES, IOWA.

I sincerely hope we can get the time set back to standard and left there. It loses an hour per day working time.

L. M. WESTON.

NORFOLK, VA.

Abandon daylight-saving time. I have always thought that changing the time was a crazy idea and I have not been able to find anybody who could see any sense in changing the time. It puts many hardships on the people, it forces them to get up before daylight to switch on the electric lights and waste a lot of electric power and coal. It deceives the people by pretending that the time is late when in fact it is early. This hurry and rush will soon ruin the nerves of the American people.

We should go on standard time now and forever. If anybody wants to go to work 1 or 2 hours earlier, or later, let that be their choice. Every individual, firm, or organization in the country should be able to select such hours as are best suited to their interest to begin work and everything should be based on standard time.

I hope that Congress will soon pass this bill and may the country soon be back on standard time.

E. B. STACK.

WILLIAMSPORT, IND.

Abolish this crazy war time and return the country to standard time. We wish to congratulate this effort to rid the country of one of the big nuisances of this war. We sincerely hope the bill goes through. We are going to write our Representative and our Senator, asking their favorable consideration.

JESSE F. HETRICK.

ORCHARD, NEBR.

Repeal this foolish so-called new time. To most folks it is a waste of time and a waste of money in every respect.

When I saw the notice in the press of this bill, I immediately wrote to our Congressmen and asked them to get behind this move and do what they can to get the matter before the Congress.

Early last fall I wrote and asked them to do something about this fool change of time, but did not receive any consideration. All I got was their old stock answer—it was by an act of Congress, and they doubted if the matter would receive any consideration. But now since you have seen fit to place a bill before the Congress, I trust that you will receive full assistance from those who are hit the hardest—and by those I mean we who live in the central portion of this country. I assure you that everyone with whom I have talked has expressed the wish and desire to get back to standard time at the earliest possible moment.

D. L. FLETCHER, M. D.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

I am interested in the bill to have the time changed back to its right place. I have been in evangelistic work, and much of it has been in the country, and I know what a hardship that it is working on the farmers. Many of the places that I have been to dinner in the country have two clocks—one to run the radio by and another to work by.

My work has also taken me to the small towns and cities, and I have yet to find one person that was in favor of having the clock moved up as it is now. The general feeling is that it does absolutely no good and that it does hinder many things. It was contended that it would save electricity—well, my light bill has been more since it was changed, and that is the fact with everyone that I have talked to.

Primarily I am interested in the work of the churches. I can definitely say that it is a hindrance to the work of the churches, since it forces them to have their evening services so early in the day that the folks do not come. People going to church are like chickens going to roost—they just don't do it until dark; and if you set the time at dark, then it runs the service too late for those who have to get up so early in the morning. Personally, I feel, after talking to hundreds of people about it, that it would be a distinct benefit to our national program at this time. People seem to feel that it was entirely unnecessary to meddle with the time. Please forgive if I have seemed to be very frank, but I have tried to pass on to you what I have heard from the people.

R. G. VAN ROYEN,
Minister, Baptist General Convention of Texas.

KENEDY, TEX.

In turning the time ahead 1 hour of standard time works a real hardship on farmers in small towns and cities and in many of our larger cities. We hear from every side, "I wish they would turn the time back to where it belongs." Church work in our country is so very vital to every interest of our national life that we need to give it every possible advantage we possibly can. It will be necessary real soon to set the time for the evening service to 8:30 o'clock; and, of course, the people complain about the lateness of the hour. We cannot improve on the Lord's time and we certainly trust standard time may be restored.

If there are certain manufacturing sections who want to get out earlier in the afternoon why can't they begin their work at 7 in the morning, lunch at 11, and out at 4, and this will not place such a handicap on the millions of people who would much prefer the standard time.

JOHN K. BEERY,
Minister, The Methodist Church.

CEDAR FALLS, IOWA.

I am a farmer, and daylight saving time to a farmer has never been anything but a curse. That afternoon hour is valuable beyond comparison to the so-called saved hour in the morning.

The few instances where daylight saving time has been twisted around to appear beneficial does not justify cramming it down everyone's neck. Most industries are working around the clock; for them the plan has no benefit whatever. If some group want to start their activity an hour earlier, all right, but leave the rest of the people alone.

HORACE D. DEWEY.

TROY, ILL.

We are watching with much interest the fight to get the daylight-saving law repealed, and we wish it much success, for it is very unpopular around here.

Please do all you can to help us.

VOORHEES CONLEY.

OKLAHOMA CITY.

The attached article was in one of our publications and desired to lose no time in commending you in your effort and assure you it is the desire of Oklahomans to have this, as a vote was taken by one of our daily papers and there were some 4,000 votes for repeal.

Please spare no time and effort in this matter.

The present time is a hardship on old and young alike and has been the past winter very detrimental to the health of the people standing out in the early cold mornings waiting on transportation, as well as an extreme hazard, street lights being put out before daybreak, many streets being poorly lighted and on the streets with the traffic, the flare and glare of the passing cars, but no steady light to show us the roads and streets afterward, made it very unsafe for pedestrians. In the home a greater amount of electricity was used.

One hour later would take care of this difficulty, insure better health, and lastly, would put people in a better frame of mind to enter upon their duties in places of employment.

FRANCES A. STANWOOD.

CRYSTAL CITY, MO.

The daylight-saving time is a thorn in the flesh. If you can get this law repealed, I will support you for any office and on any ticket.

WM. D. WHEATLEY.

TULIA, TEX.

Swisher County Post, No. 214, of the American Legion went on record last night in regular meeting as favoring your proposal to do away with this foolish system of so-called war time. We have never been able to see just why such a scheme was ever inaugurated. Do what you can to put this bunk in the ash-can. We are sick and tired of this regimented bureaucracy.

AMERICAN LEGION,
Tulia, Tex.
H. G. BRIGGS, *Adjutant.*

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX.

I think you were off a little when you stated only golf players want war time, I think the companies selling power for lights and the like want it, as it makes working people get up earlier, but does not make them go to bed any earlier. In my opinion, if the records of the electric companies could be looked into you would find that nearly every home would show a large increase in their light bills, as here in New Mexico at 8 o'clock in the morning during the winter months it is just coming daylight, and nearly all workers only work 8 hours. Why should they be forced to go to work before daylight? The best of luck in getting us back on standard time.

C. E. ROGERS.

SEATTLE, WASH.

For 2 whole years now every time I've looked at our clock or my watch it has told a lie. It says it is an hour later than honest time. We go to work in the dark and our children go to school in the dark, and then at night it is time to put the little ones to bed and the sun hasn't set yet.

I could put up with all this if it accomplished anything. But it hasn't even helped win the war like we were promised. Let's face realities. Let's be honest with ourselves and our neighbors. Let's stop kidding ourselves. Get this wrong righted.

W. H. TYER,
State Manager, Modern Woodmen of America.

FERNDALE, CALIF.

I understand you have a bill to put the United States back on standard time. More power to you on this move.

I never could understand how we can save something we have not got. There is just so much daylight, and no decree or document can possibly increase it. Just another noble experiment. I agree with you wholeheartedly it has only brought about confusion, is very impractical, and has hindered more than it has ever helped.

HARRY A. PERRY,
Third Senatorial District, California Legislature.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

How grateful many of us are for your effort. In an upset world why upset the time—one thing that could remain stable? And please try, and keep on trying, to turn the clocks back before the hot weather comes. It is truly awful in summer with no cool evenings.

This is the first time I ever wrote a letter about legislation.

N. V. MYERS.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

I may be permitted to extend sincere congratulations on effort to repeal the alleged daylight-saving time and restore this Nation to its usual standard time.

In my humble opinion this change of time has only added confusion, demoralization, derangement, disarray, jumble, commotion, agitation, tumult, turmoil, bewilderment, and embarassment, together with any other synonyms that may be known.

More power to you is the hope of millions and millions of citizens of these good United States.

CHAS. T. ROWLAND.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

Allow me to applaud the resolution offered to return to standard time, throughout the year, as distinguished from what is erroneously known as daylight-saving time. I hear much favorable comment upon the resolution and much hope expressed that it will be passed.

C. L. WATTS.

ARCATA, CALIF.

Thank God someone has waked up. I lived in Detroit the first community to fall for the

insane idea, when it was put over by a doctor who wanted more time to play golf. Electric bills, both domestic and industrial, increased 10 percent.

New York and Eureka are in the same latitude but due to the Rocky, Cascade, and Coast mountains sun rises here at 8:30 a. m. standard time and in New York at 7 a. m. in midwinter—meaning 9:30 a. m. war time.

A. L. PUTNAM.

KENTON, OHIO.

I am writing you to express my appreciation of efforts to have the clocks turned back to standard time. I farmed 280 acres of land. Most of the time it is nearly noon before grain is ready to combine or hay to go into barn. If I have to go somewhere in evening I must lose an hour. There are more meetings now than before war I must attend, if I want to do my full part in war effort.

You are right about golf players and fishermen wanting wartime, because part of farm I rent contains a golf course, and in evening taxis make as high as a dozen trips out and back, and a good many cars find gas and tires to come out and spend their extra hour.

I know of no instance when a man living and working in town has spent his extra hour helping a farmer.

I hope you are successful in righting this wasteful blunder.

JOHN A. WELLING.

[Telegram]

[The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is standard time at point of origin. Time of receipt is standard time at point of destination]

BOSTON, MASS.

Highly favor abolishment of daylight-saving time.

THOMAS A. KERR.

UNION, MO.

Put the time back to the old standard time again. This new time is a nuisance. It takes more light and you get nowhere with it.

LELA HUMMEL.

ALBANY, OREG.

We farmers are all for your fight to ban wartime and return to standard. It has been a terrific and expensive handicap to us.

C. O. KEESTER.

CUMBERLAND, MD.

I have been reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday 7, concerning the so-called daylight-saving bill. Let me say I have always opposed it. My electric light bills have been higher instead of lower. I can't see where we save on electricity when we have to have lights in the morning instead of at night. I hope the bill passes.

WM. H. GATEHOUSE.

XENIA, OHIO.

Just read the evening paper of efforts for congressional action to abandon wartime and put the Nation on standard time.

We most heartily approve—let us know if we can assist. We will be under great obligations to anyone who helps to rid the Nation of this great nuisance and inconvenience. It is an imposition upon working people.

LENA GILBERT.

DOVER, OHIO.

To get rid of this war time would be one of the great things to win this war. It is ruining the morale and health of our people and driving farmers off their land. They tell me it is sheer nonsense. I made a survey of this and find the schools, gardeners, farmers, greenhouses, and work people, and the old greatly opposed to it. Power is wasted now more than when we had the slow time. The defense plants are all working 24 hours 8 hours a turn so what difference is it? Plants that work 8 hours a day do not want this time for they do not want their men to work before daylight.

ELSWORTH ALLMAN.

ADEL, GA.,

I have just read speech in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, Repeal of Daylight Saving. I wish to express my appreciation and approval and urge you to fight on till this impractical, confusing inconvenience is removed by law.

It does no real good. Any practical man knows what time is saved on one end of the day is lost on the other.

One of the worst effects of it all was to shake the confidence of many people in their leaders. It just don't indicate ordinary, practical common sense in times of stress like these to fiddle away time and cause so much confusion. Moving up the dead hands of the clocks can't save anything. I repeat, it makes us doubt whether we are following leaders of practical sense. Lord knows we have confusion enough in these wartimes that is necessarily so without adding any that is not absolutely necessary.

People very cheerfully do necessary things there is real reason for.

W. D. WELLS.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

I sincerely hope the bill re returning to standard time is passed upon favorably.

CORA LORENZ.

LEXINGTON, VA.

It is with genuine pleasure that I note you taking the initiative in the congressional action toward the repealing of the daylight saving time.

This indeed is a step in the interest of the masses, particularly the workman in plants as well as those conducting their own business. In the next place it is very uneconomical, as from personal experience we consumed more electric current under the present time than we did under regular standard.

I sincerely hope you succeed in getting the measure through and in so doing you will have bestowed a wonderful favor on all working people, and not on the golf players.

D. C. REMSBURG.

LANSING, MICH.

I am very much interested in House Resolution 4428 to put the clocks back during the months of January, February, November, and December.

I am very much in favor of this resolution and hope that it will prevail. We here in Michigan are getting a double dose; since 1931 our legal time has been eastern standard time rather than central, in which time belt we are located, so with war savings time we are 2 hours ahead of schedule all of the time.

BERNEICE E. THOMAS.

ST. CHARLES, MO.

Glad to see you are trying to have that silly daylight-saving law repealed.

More power to you!

The folks who want that extra hour in the evening can just go to work an hour earlier by Nature's time, go to lunch an hour earlier, and quit an hour earlier, and not make the rest of the country suffer such inconvenience for their selfish pleasure.

Push the bill for repeal good and strong.

E. F. BLANN.

PARIS, MO.

Won't you do all you can to change "time" back to God's time?

ERNEST HARDWICK.

GOUVERNEUR, N. Y.

The bill H. R. 4489 expresses the wishes of all dairymen in New York State, and I imagine the United States, in regard to the wasted man-hours on farms during the critical harvest season. First, by losing 1 hour in the morning due to the fact making it most impossible to get to work before 9 o'clock on account of the dew. Second, shortage of labor in the dairy section. Having to quit at 5 o'clock war time, 4 o'clock standard time, for chores, 1 hour is lost in the best part of the day for haying. Thus 2 hours daily are lost. Costs farmers millions. Third, it makes no difference in industry as they are working on 24-hour schedule and industry would not be hampered in any way.

Pass this bill.

JAS. B. THOMPSON.

LINCOLN, NEBR.

I want to commend your stand on the daylight-saving law. If there ever was an asinine law put on the statute books this is it and if you can do something about having it changed, I am sure you will receive the everlasting gratitude of the rank and file of Nebraska farmers.

CHAS. Y. THOMPSON,
President, Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation.

DOVER, OHIO.

If you can do anything about this time problem I hope you will. Haven't we enough to contend with in this terrible war, and so many heartaches? And our electric bills are just the same. How in the name of common sense does it help?

It is a lot of baloney. Things go too far sometimes. We in Ohio don't like it one bit. Will be watching our paper for results. We are Americans and if our voice is to be heard we ask a fair deal. Please give us back our eastern standard time.

God bless you.

MRS. D. MORRISON.

RANDOLPH, MASS.

Enclosed find article from Boston paper in regard to returning to standard time, something necessary for the health and comfort of the working class and their children.

Of all the stupid laws, daylight savings was the most stupid. Nothing was saved, much electric light used night and morning, according to the season, and mothers' nerves torn and frayed from children refusing to go to bed in the afternoon.

Have never seen any real advantage to it, unless one calls working 18 hours a day an advantage.

GERTRUDE E. SULLIVAN.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

I want to congratulate you on your good sense in asking for the repeal of the law setting time up 1 hour. I think 90 percent of the people are for it. In my mind you will make a lot of friends if you push the bill on through.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. WILLIAMS,
Commander, Post No. 222,
The American Legion.

CLARKS SUMMIT, PA.

Very glad to see that others are interested in giving us a break in daylight saving.

Never could see how it applied outside of industry and they were working the clock around anyhow.

Thank you; thank you.

H. A.

JONESBURG, MO.

I see in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat where they are going to try and have the so-called daylight-saving time changed. Hope they can because I think it is one of the damnedest fool ideas that was ever put over.

HERMAN LUDY.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

An article in the Schenectady Union Star said that you are against war time, and going to try and have standard time back the way God created it. That's my belief. It should be standard time.

Here in my city they believe in standard time. If one wants to do anything to accomplish it, let him get up 1 hour ahead. I hate this stinking 1-hour-ahead business. You don't accomplish a damn thing with that 1 hour ahead.

S. C. SKOTARCZAK.

DAYTON, OHIO.

With reference to bill No. 4489, introduced recently in the House of Representatives, calling for the establishment of standard time throughout the Nation, I am very much in favor of this bill and hope that you will vote in favor of its passage.

In my opinion the time should never have been changed. It has worked an unnecessary hardship on all people throughout the country whose work requires their getting up at an early hour, and has caused endless confusion in many other ways. The abolishment of this foolish measure will aid in a small measure to get this country back on a sensible basis.

H. A. GOSCH.

MOODY, TEX.

I want to commend the bill which would put the Nation back on standard time, and I herewith add my name to the list of protesters against fast time, which was imposed upon us at the beginning of the present war. I trust Congress will act to restore standard time.

Our national slogan is "Save and conserve." Fast time forces us to get up 1 hour earlier in the coldest part of the day, thus using an hour more of artificial light and an hour more of fuel. Fast time is a burden on the masses and puts money in the pockets of the few who sell light and fuel. It is inconsistent with the idea of saving and conserving.

To our knowledge, all war plants are running on a 24-hour basis, so how could fast time help there?

It also enhances the hazard of night driving of automobiles, as more people have to drive at night, causing more wrecks and deaths, going to and from work. It uses up more car batteries and light bulbs, which is not being conservative.

CECIL O. GUYTON.

LYONS, IND.

I see they are making a fight to get the time changed—I should have said clocks, I guess—because they can't change the time. It was a very foolish thing to do in the first place.

I don't see where there was any saving in daylight by so doing. Success in getting the change.

H. F. FERGUSON.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Have Congress pass House bill 4489, and abolish war time. Fast time works hardships on the working people. School children have to go to school while yet dark.

No electricity or fuel is saved by war-time schedule. I surely hope we as a Nation can get back to normal time.

JOHN L. SUTTON.

SHELDON, MO.

The morning press reports redoubled efforts for congressional action to abandon war time and put the Nation back on standard time.

There has never been any occasion for this funny time. I have lived in Chicago, Kansas City, and Tulsa, etc., and have worked in offices with many different starting times, but there has never been anything practical about the current daylight saving time.

Old Greenwich has been our standard for hundreds of years.

With the necessity for very accurate navigation and avigation I sometimes wonder if our Army, Navy, and Air Force doesn't just ignore the current legal time and go by standard. Otherwise there must be beautiful confusion with the intermingling of the forces of the various nations.

Of course putting Father Time back on his established base will not win the war or save democracy, etc., but it will be a fine start toward unscrambling some of the many useless and irritating fumblings.

I have talked with over a thousand individuals and all consider early time as just plain foolish.

W. L. CORRELL.

NEVADA, OHIO.

The enclosed clipping from the Toledo Blade prompts me to say it will do the country a good turn to get us back on proper time. There is actually a waste of power under war time. Everyone's light bills are higher.

Our legislature put Ohio on eastern time several years ago, after we had been on central time ever since it was established over 60 years ago. Now, almost the whole State is on eastern war time though the legislature outlawed it last year. In summertime it is daylight until 10 p. m. and one must wait until the air and houses cool sufficiently for sleep, and it is midnight before that comes. Then, in the morning when it is cool and one can rest we have to get up 2 hours ahead of the proper time.

War plants operate 24 hours a day so there is no saving there. A man with any ambition can maintain a large garden on 1 hour a day. When this crazy time was proposed I wrote, on behalf of my shopmates, in protest against it.

GEO. R. WILLIAMS.

PARIS, MO.

We are for changing back to standard time.

Daylight-savings time has always seemed out of place and we never could understand why people could not go to work an hour earlier if they wanted to without changing the time.

ANDREW D. THURSTON.

SMITHSHIRE, ILL.

I heard over the radio a few days ago a statement in regard to changing back the time. If they would only change it up there at Washington how much better it would be. Country people go by the new time only because there is a war on. Maybe it benefits some but it isn't the farm people.

MRS. GEO. WEAVER.

BERKS COUNTY, PA.

Am interested in the fight for elimination of daylight saving. I wish to state that we farmers do not wish it as we have just so much work to do and are restricted in help. Also gasoline rations. How does this daylight help us? This is nonsense. It is time for Congress to pull together and get rid of it.

J. N. EISENHART.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

I want to voice my hearty approval of the bill to move the clocks back to natural, sensible time. This freak time has given me the jitters and headaches more than any one thing that I have ever had to deal with. In winter, 9:30 a. m., daylight; in summer, 9:30 p. m. before darkness. In winter huge amounts of electric current is wasted. It is worthless, useless, confusing, so this is one wartime headache of which we can rid ourselves without hampering our war effort in the least.

JOHN P. STEWART.

MARTINSVILLE, VA.

Please let me wish success in doing away with daylight saving time.

How any plan which makes you get up an hour earlier by the sun and burn an hour's more electricity and fuel for 6 months of the year; that makes school children in rural areas walk long distances to catch school buses in the dark, how could time like that benefit anybody?

I hope we will be able to get the Nation back on standard time, and before the hot summer months.

MRS. ROY G. BURGESS.

NIAGARA FALLS.

I am enclosing copy of editorial in my home newspaper which refers to efforts toward abolishing fast time and restoring standard time.

I wish to commend in the highest terms efforts to abolish a long-standing public nuisance and menace to the country. Common sense teaches that inasmuch as war production is continuous day and night, fast or daylight saving time is a useless factor, and should be abolished.

Fast time is not only a public nuisance but a menace to health in loss of sleep. I am working at Niagara Falls at Bell Aircraft. All through the winter months I have had to get up in the morning to go to work in pitch darkness.

I earnestly hope a majority of sensible Congressmen will vote in favor of restoring standard time.

S. C. LEFEVRE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

I urge you to put all power behind the bill to put the Nation back on standard time. The working people in the cities and on the farms want the standard time. The silly law should be erased from the book. It does more harm than good. If it was left to the people to vote it would be voted down. We, here in California, hate it.

E. A. MCNORMAN.

JACKSON, MICH.

Am writing in regard to this "war time." Am glad there is someone to fight for the people of the country and against this terrible time.

In our town or county we were already on fast time, getting up 1 hour before the sun and now it is 2 hours. I wonder how long people are going to keep on kidding themselves.

Persuade the Congressmen to vote this "war time" out.

ANNIE O. PATIENCE.

ELIZABETH, N. J.

Read this newspaper clipping in our evening paper and sure hope the bill wins on the daylight saving question. Our light bill jumped. It takes longer and more light in the mornings. I never did believe in the daylight saving time. It is only for golfers.

Leave God's work as it was.

MRS. P. S. WEIMAR.

DES MOINES COUNTY DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 7,
Oakville, Iowa.

Place the Nation on standard time again and remove one of the greatest handicaps to wartime food production.

Last spring we were delayed by rain during the month of May and could not plant corn until around June 1. Our help refused to work beyond 6 o'clock by the watch and I am

quite sure that considerable land was not farmed because the war time was out of joint with regular standard time, and thus threw our farm operations out of gear.

NOAH SCHROCK,
Chairman, Board of Trustees.

SPRING VALLEY, OHIO.

Put the Nation back on standard time. We farmers and grangers all hope that bill goes through. After all man can't change the sun nor the habits of animals, and we farmers have to work by the sun and with animals. It is a terrible hardship for the farmers and I haven't talked to anyone in the city—teachers, professionals, mothers, housewives, etc.—that are in favor of fast time. Please put the Nation back on standard time again and we will be rid of one bad mess at least. I talked to a Dr. Mon and she said it was the most senseless thing she knew of to set the clocks ahead. You may be sure you have a lot of backing on this whether they write or not.

H. L. GERHART.

OSWEGO, OHIO.

Keep up the good work to abolish daylight-saving time.

J. H. TAYLOR.

MAUMEE, OHIO.

Daylight saving means nothing to the farmer except inconvenience from all angles. The railroad man working by one time and his family living by another may be a means of fewer accidents if we were back to sun time.

As a commercial man this past year have had to contend with three different times in Michigan, and two places in Ohio. Both attorneys general of Michigan and Ohio said changes were unconstitutional. This legislation has been one of confusion.

H. T. HATTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

I appreciate efforts in behalf of setting the clock back 1 hour as my wife was nearly killed by a colored thug taking advantage of the extra darkness to attack women on the streets of Washington.

J. H. N.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The short article in today's Washington Star about daylight savings noted.

For about 25 years this has been a humbug put over on the population of the United States of America. The quicker it is discontinued the better.

H. B. STACKHOUSE.

BOSTON, MASS.

In the Boston Post of today appeared a front page story of efforts to restore standard time. Bring before the people of our Nation a realization of what a humbug is this cock-eyed dislocation—called daylight saving. It is one of those hysterical devices that has helped juvenile delinquency and nervous breakdowns. The great bulk of our people will be with efforts to restore standard time. If anyone wants to set their clocks an hour fast—O. K.—but not by law.

F. E. BENTLEY.

LABOR, *Washington, D. C.*

Thank you very much for copy of extension of remarks on daylight saving. I am with you 100 percent. It's not so bad in the summer, but it works a lot of hardship during the rest of the year.

EDWARD KEATING,
Manager.

FLORENCE, S. C.

I note with a great deal of interest a bill in Congress restoring war time to what it was before we entered the conflict. Such a bill meets with my hearty endorsement, and why our Senators and Representatives in Washington have not urged the passing of such a bill long before now is beyond my comprehension, as the present daylight-saving time, particularly for the southeast section of the United States, has, in my opinion, handicapped rather than helped the war effort.

Please accept deep appreciation of efforts in connection with this matter.

C. W. STIKELEATHER,
Vice President and Treasurer, Peoples Federal Savings and Loan Association.

MARYSVILLE, OHIO.

More power to the effort to repeal the War Time Act. Fast time is doing as much to sabotage agriculture and industry in our war effort as any device that could have been put over on us by the enemy. Let us know if we can help.

CHAS. F. TOSSEY.

BONNOTS MILL, MO.

Our entire school is pleased with the bill to repeal daylight-saving time. If it is passed, it will make a great improvement in our daily routine. The teachers of our school also heartily approve bringing back the old standard time. Many children of our school are obliged to leave home in the dark and return in the dark. Of course, the previous statement is due to the transportation schedules, which cannot be changed without the consumption of more fuel and rubber—a thing we would not do.

I do not know to how many people this will be of an advantage, but I do know it will please the majority.

Since the clocks have been functioning an hour earlier, everything has been unnatural. If the clocks were again to resume their regular time, it would contribute to health, comfort, and production.

IONA KOENIGSFELD.

PERRY, MO.

I note in today's St. Louis Globe-Democrat a bill to abolish daylight-saving time. This is the right track. We Ralls County people hope that it will be successful. If this so-called save daylight has done anyone any good in this section I fail to know about it.

GILL RICHARDS.

MONROE CITY, MO.

I am very much interested in the resolution to abolish daylight-saving time.

Quitting in the middle of the evening when we should be working, putting my sheep and stock up at 5 o'clock when they want to stay out and graze 2 or 3 hours longer, is ridiculous.

CHAS. L. ELZEA.

TROY, MO.

I have been listening with interest to the discussion about changing the time which Charlie Stooke is putting on over the radio. I am heartily in favor of changing it back. If anyone wants to go to work an hour earlier and get off an hour earlier let them settle that, but let the Nation be run by standard time.

E. B. HARDY.

FULTON, MO.

The old time is more acceptable to the farmers and all others. Give us the old time. Give us the 1 hour back.

JOHN DAY.

FARBER, MO.

I was at a club meeting one evening last week and heard the daylight-saving time discussed. Almost everyone present expressed the hope that we'd go back to the old time.

LILLIAN CROW.

SHELBYVILLE, MO.

I've talked to many people, and I felt sure you would like to know how very much they endorse your bill to do away with daylight-saving time. I'm shocked at the many hardships it causes in rural communities.

I'm actually saddened by reports of this regulation, which has served no purpose whatsoever, except to add to the break-down of health and morale of the Nation.

I should like to see the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorse this bill in convention.

MRS. ERNEST W. HOWARD.

COATS, KANS.

May I resent your term "daylight saving"? In my opinion, there is nothing that has done more toward wasting daylight than the present set-up. Best luck and thanks a thousand.

BEN SCHREPEL.

NEW LONDON, MO.

Keep up the fight to get rid of war time, daylight saving, which is a darn nuisance. Those who want to go to work early may do so.

W. W. CROCKETT.

NEW HAVEN, MO.

This and other communities would certainly appreciate if daylight-saving time could be abandoned. It handicaps production. This especially holds true on the dairy farm. We must get up earlier and milk because the truck comes earlier, then to keep from throwing the milking schedule way beyond reason we must milk too early in the evening to get the benefit of a full day's work in the field.

If there is any benefit in having factories start earlier there is no reason why the clock should be tampered with and handicap the farmer, who certainly has plenty of difficulties without adding to them unnecessarily.

WILBERT J. ROHLFING.

PORTLAND, MO.

Good luck these troublesome times. Get the time changed back to the old way. The present time helps no one.

H. V. BAKER.

PERRY, MO.

I don't like the daylight-saving time, it makes things out of balance for the farmer.

DAN T. TICE.

MCCREDIE, MO.

Get daylight-saving time changed back to sun time. This 1 hour per day per man, when multiplied by all the thousands of laboring men on farms in the United States, will amount to thousands of bushels of grain and food for our fighting forces.

RALPH WILKINSON.

MARTINSBURG, MO.

This daylight-saving time is a big nuisance. It is no longer necessary to get people out in the dark and cold to make them war conscious. In the rural districts we have been having daylight saving all through the years. In June, July, and August we have had our church services an hour earlier to escape the heat. If we had school during those months, the classes would have started an hour earlier, too. The only ones who benefited by the war time are the few metropolitan plutocrats who used to get to their office at 10—now get there at 9—standard time; and had an extra hour in the afternoon to play golf—which they couldn't do 12 months in the year, either. If some of the city factories and places of business would start an hour and a half hour earlier, that would relieve congestion on streetcars and busses. But that is the mayors' business. Relieve a war-confused people of this altogether unnecessary, irri-

tating, and costly burden that has been saddled on them.

H. FREESE.

NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO.

Return our Nation to standard time. This daylight saving has created confusion worse confounded. One must use electricity more by beginning a day on eastern war time. Executive decree could govern working hours, but the sun still rises on God's time, which is even one-half hour later than standard. Most sincerely we hope the time bill will prevail.

EDNA M. SOUERS.

SANDY POINT, TEX.

It was an imposition on farmers to have ever had sun time changed. The average farmer can't produce as much with the new time. I have quit farming and don't expect to have another animal harnessed until the common-sense hours are restored. There was never any sense in changing the time. It seems that every nonessential rule those bureaucrats can devise is put into a law or rule. If there was any advantage in the change, it would be O. K., but there was never any need of it. I've discontinued 150 acres, and will never resume until the proper hours are reestablished.

H. L. TRAMMELL.

OUAQUAGA, N. Y.

Do away with this everlasting torment of war time. If golfers want to play, let them get up, and for heaven's sake leave the clocks alone. I am for America first, then pro-English from head to foot, but that don't mean we have to do like the English and set clocks 2 hours ahead. Let us have the time that has always been ours until some "brain truster" down at Washington came along to tell the common herd what's good for them. Success in getting our clocks set to standard time.

F. MERN.

IRWIN, OHIO.

Allow me to express my approval of efforts to restore the Nation to standard time. This idea of daylight saving, etc., is one of the most nonsensical things ever heard of. The return to central standard time in this section would greatly increase the efficiency of farm labor at a time when it is most necessary.

G. G. MCILROY,
President, Farm Management, Inc.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The attention of the board of directors of this organization was called to a news dispatch which stated in effect that a bill had been introduced to return the United States to normal time.

California farmers have found that the so-called war-saving or war time has been a war losing time in their operations. Thousands of hours are lost from day to day because farm work cannot start in the morning until the dew has dried from the fields and trees.

It is apparent that American agriculture will see a greater shortage of labor in 1944 than at any other time during the recent years. It will be difficult at best to plant and harvest our crops.

In view of these circumstances the board of directors of this organization has formally endorsed the proposed legislation.

ASSOCIATED FARMERS OF
CALIFORNIA, INC.,
By S. H. STRATHAM,
Executive Secretary.

WALLOWA, OREG.

I am in accord with the repeal of daylight saving, cutting out all red tape, etc. I have been trying for some time to get one of the Oregon Congressmen to present a bill for repeal.

Here's hoping it carries in a big way.

H. M. THOMPSON.

PINE BLUFF, ARK.

Rid the country of the war daylight-saving time, which benefits no one. This law saves nothing in the way of electricity or gas, and we will be very glad to see the law repealed and let God take care of the daylight.

If there is anything I can do to help along the repeal of this fool law command us.

Mrs. MAUDE S. FLYNN.
Mrs. TRACY MILLS.

MOBERLY, MO.

I hope the bill to establish standard time all over the United States will be enacted. The so-called daylight-saving time table now in effect is, in my opinion, just one more cockeyed regulation and is of no practical benefit whatsoever. In fact, its use entails the use of more electricity in this part of the country.

THOS. J. TYDINGS.

DAYTON, OHIO.

Please do all in your power to put bill 4489 in effect. I am sure the majority of the people of Dayton wish standard time.

LAWRENCE E. MILLER.

ARLINGTON, VA.

The sensible proposal to abolish the nonsense of trying to fool ourselves by monkeying with the hands of our clocks deserves the support of all intelligent citizens. The people deserve to be given the truth, even on the faces of their clocks.

TED SUMMERS.

BOSTON, MASS.

Earnestly endorse the bill to abolish daylight saving and return to normal time. Unfair to the laboring man and wastes electricity and gas and complicates every business and household activity. Let us get back to sun time with which everybody everywhere is acquainted and satisfied.

J. H. CRAMER.

SUGAR GROVE, ILL.

There isn't anything that will help the farmers more than to go back to standard time. They actually have to go by God's time to a certain extent and they are always out of tune with the towns and cities.

City folks complain they can't get the children to bed in the summer so they can get their rest. And all winter they have to get up in the dark.

It upsets the farmers work in every way. There really isn't one good point in favor of it. It very definitely hampers war production on the farm.

So I am speaking for all farmers in this section of the country when I say we hope fast time goes out fast. We are all hoping and praying for our regular time.

Mrs. OAKLEY MIGHEEL.

BOSTON, MASS.

The country is all upset from daylight saving. The time should be left the way the Lord intended, not what a few want.

(Many signatures.)

DAYTON, OHIO.

I wish to express my desire to return to and keep standard time.

CARL BACHER.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

People down here in the sunny South certainly hope the bill against the fast time will go over in a big way. We are tired of it.

MARGARET GIBBON.

ENDICOTT, N. Y.

Get rid of the so-called daylight saving. It is the most foolish and one of the dumbest this country has ever had to endure. Let's have standard time.

Mrs. JOHN N. BOWER.

CLARKSVILLE, TEX.

Millions of folks in these United States join in trying to get the new war saving time repealed and getting back to standard time. This new time has cost the people millions of dollars more for fuel and light bills. This new time has hindered the war effort instead of helping. Do away with this unnecessary wartime.

D. J. STANPHILL.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

These are the days of willing and unquestioning sacrifices. These are also the days of agonized pleas for 100-percent efficiency. It is essential that our workers as well as our soldiers and sailors and air force be at their best at all times. It was no trick at all to sell the idea that by tempering with the clock, more money could be made. The world was stunned by the most calamitous war in all history. It was in a condition to grasp at any straw that would help increase production. The idea looked good. It was adopted, first in Europe, then here. Clocks were earnestly turned back and a certain amount of daylight, previously "wasted," was put to work.

The avowed purpose is to save daylight, yet all our munition works and factories, railroads, coal mines, etc., are working continuously 24 hours a day. Every bit of daylight is used and every bit of darkness too. Who wants it? The farmer doesn't, the mother of growing children doesn't, the laborer, the soldier, sailor, and airman don't, the businessman doesn't, in fact, the vast majority of our population doesn't want it. Only a dwindling handful of golfers get some little light for their pellet chasing while the rest of us are condemned to eat our dinner in mid-afternoon, wasting daylight until after sunset. We get up in pitch-black darkness, turn on artificial light, hurry through our dismal breakfast, stumple out into dimly lit streets, wander into brilliantly lighted offices or work shops where, half asleep and at a dangerously low energy level, we must apply ourselves to precision work at an outrageously accelerated pace for many hours on end, oblivious to whether the sun may be shining or not. That sun is our great health giver, vitalizer, and energy producer.

Absenteeism is on the increase and the toll taken by accidents in war work is mounting at an alarming rate. Efficiency has been lowered and general health menaced in a host of new neuroses and mental complaints due to hyptertension. Set the hands of the clock back where they belong. It would increase efficiency and improve general health, although most of those who suffer most from this off-key life are unaware of the underlying cause of their present discontent and chronic weariness.

RALPH DEGOLIER,
Head of Modern Language Department,
Trinity School.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

We heartily concur with you in the effort to get us back to God's time once more. In fact, the people don't particularly care what kind of time it is, just so we adopt one time and stay there.

The writer is a traveling man and covers several of the Midwestern States. Everybody is badly confused with the various varieties of time. Nobody I have talked with can see where it helps the war effort. The old argument about conserving electricity is the bunk. The golf player is the only one that likes it.

We go to bed by daylight and get up in the dark.

Anything you can do to get us out of this time mess will certainly be appreciated by a very confused public. The thoughts I have attempted to express here are not all my own but of the many that I come in contact with every day.

C. C. THOMAS.

STOCKBRIDGE, MICH.

Get congressional action to abandon war time and set all clocks of the United States on the true time—standard time based on sun time. We have not gotten very far on war time, so I earnestly urge Congress to open their eyes and fall back to God's time. The so-called war time is detrimental to human rights, and our Michigan Legislature voted it down, but the Detroit "Hirohitos" overruled them. In talking with many people I have yet to hear of war time doing anybody any good.

FRED MCCONEGHY.

MANSFIELD, OHIO.

This artificial time is most unpopular and certainly wasteful. You would have to live on a farm fully to appreciate the latter. If you want to have a part in any worth-while project in the city, it is necessary to quit your work in the middle of the afternoon in order to have all stock cared for and just routine work done in time to attend the meeting. You can see what that does toward our efforts to raise all the food we can in this time of war, and we are all doing everything we possibly can in this time.

The bill will have the solid support of rural folks.

Mrs. H. J. SEEVERS.

BRYAN, OHIO.

The bill to return the country to a standard time basis will be greatly appreciated by millions of people, especially the day working class, who must arise around 4 o'clock in the morning, based on the old time, to get started for work. I must be to work at 7:30 eastern war time, as I work on the New York Central Railroad, and must be at the station for a train due at 8:13 a. m. eastern war time. I have talked with several of the railroad men and they do not like eastern war time. Most all of us day men are around 50 to 70 years of age, and we must be to work from 7 to 8:30 a. m. As compared to the old central standard time, we report for work from 5 to 6:30 a. m.

Get the country back on a standard time basis. That is what the people want.

E. A. KASTNER.

STERLING, OHIO.

From my observations, it is my opinion that daylight-saving time or war time is O. K. during the summer months, that is, from around May 1 to October 1, and would be much better for the State of Ohio than the present situation, where we have two kinds of time, but most communities will change to war time again about May 1.

I hope that a compromise will be made between your bill and year around war time, so that we can have daylight-saving time in summer and the regular zone time in winter.

It sure seems foolish to go to work at 7 a. m. in winter and find it does not get daylight for a couple of hours yet.

G. A. MCBRIDE,
General Secretary-Treasurer,
The Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

OXFORD, OHIO.

I have received many communications from Grange members throughout the State expressing satisfaction over the fact that you have introduced a bill to place the Nation back on standard time. It is the feeling of the farmers that the fast time has not been of any benefit to industry and that it has been a great handicap to farmers in their food-production efforts.

JOSEPH W. FICHTER,
Master, Ohio State Grange.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Dallas, Tex.

I am enclosing an editorial from one of our leading newspapers regarding the bill to abolish daylight-saving time. It expresses my views and that of everyone else with whom I have talked, except that I would express my objections to the present system more strongly.

I believe that I can conservatively say that 90 percent of our people would like to go back to standard time. We do not object to any inconvenience that is necessary to the war effort; but we do not like to have a lot of what we think are foolish regulations just to make us war conscious. And no one has ever yet explained satisfactorily wherein the present system in any way contributes to the war effort. During the past winter I have seen many women standing in the cold and rain long before daylight waiting for streetcars or busses to go to work. If that helps the war I cannot see it.

JEFF D. STINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Municipal and Private Corporations.

[Enclosure]

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald of March 29, 1944]

TURNING THE CLOCK BACK

A Representative has introduced a bill in Congress to abolish daylight-saving time. He would turn the clocks back the hour they were set ahead when the present time system was adopted as a war measure.

It is to be hoped that the Congressman's effort will meet with success.

It may be that the ingenious method of setting the clock ahead an hour to get more work done has produced the desired effect in some portions of the country. It is doubtful, however, that it has produced any such results in places like Texas.

It may be that it has saved some electric power, which was, as we recall it, another of the announced objectives.

Lacking specific figures on both these points, no attempt is made here to pass on them definitely.

But it can be said without fear of contradiction that daylight saving, so-called, has disarranged the lives and schedules of a great many people, who do not like it. They would like to get back to standard time again. It is only necessary to point out that several State legislatures have already taken action for their States, and to look around and listen to the reactions of the average citizen, to prove this.

In the face of such popular demand, it should take a good deal of convincing argument to keep this bill from becoming law.

ELIZABETH, N. J.

I am against daylight saving time. We middle-class people, who live in the city, get no enjoyment out of it. The sun stays up too late for the rooms to cool off and a workingman has to go to bed in daylight. I say get rid of it for all time.

Mrs. L. GABRIELSEN.

DAYTON, OHIO.

It will be a godsend to war workers and others to eliminate daylight saving time so it will be effective this month. You are familiar with all the confusion and argument this measure has caused the entire Nation and this letter is merely to add support from this part of the country. Wishing you unlimited success in getting the measure adopted quickly.

D. A. COZAD.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Abolish daylight saving time and return us all to standard time once more. I fail to see how it can aid in the war effort when most of us go to work in the dark of the morning for so many months in the year. It is bad enough for the few months in the summer but all year round is harmful.

A great many fatalities, due to heart attack, are due to an accumulation of fatigue produced in the circulatory system, brought about by the loss of sleep occasioned by daylight saving.

Especially is this true in men who are between 40 and 50.

In behalf of the early riser.

N. E. KOENIG.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

It isn't fair for 999 people to be forced to get out an hour early so one of each thousand can play golf. These golf players could get up before 8 a. m. and play golf before they go to business at 9 or 10.

Believe me, the first ward of Binghamton, the largest and most populated ward in the city, is against daylight saving. Our councilman can attest to that fact.

JOHN J. SIMECK.

MARYVILLE, MO.

We have read of the bill to go off daylight-saving time November until February, inclusive. We, as an American Problems Class, wish to express our opinion of the bill. Many of our pupils must walk considerable distances before boarding our school busses, which leave the far end of their routes at 7 a. m. in order to be at school at 8:30, our usual starting time. Parents have to arise so early to get their children off to school that there is so much time lost because of their being unable to perform any work before daylight. The pupils have to travel in all kinds of weather and, due to road conditions, it is inconvenient to walk in the dark.

It is the opinion of the class that the majority of the people of the rural sections are in favor of your plan to change back to standard time, especially during the winter months.

AMERICAN PROBLEMS CLASS, HORACE MANN HIGH SCHOOL,
THE NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE.
(Many signatures.)

PALMYRA, PA.

So glad someone is interested in abolishing daylight-saving time. I am sure we do not save any, getting up at 4 in the morning, and I would like to see the man from Pittsburgh who is supposed to be father of daylight-saving time get up that time. I think he is one of those who don't know what hard work is. I would like to see him get up at 4 in the morning, work in the hayfields and, when threshing time, help there. I'm sure he would not need to go on the golf course to sweat. I sure think it was one of the meanest things done. If anyone cares to get up an hour earlier let him do so and not compel others. Why not let the time as it was. Man cannot change the moon, stars, or sun.

Hope we will win; here's luck.

Mrs. R. C. BOWMAN.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.

Please give the daylight-saving bill an extra kick for all time when it comes up for repeal. We are a patient, long-suffering people, but when it is 5 o'clock it is not 6; why allow ourselves to be fooled. Don't forget to knock it out for good.

A. H.

JACKSON, TENN.

We, in our city, are very pleased over effort to get back to God's time. Please work a little harder and know all the housekeepers

are with you, for it's been a terrible trial on us.

Thank you.

LOIS SAUNDERS.

BARRY, ILL.

Abandon war time and put the Nation on standard time.

It would be one of the finest things that could be done for the betterment of our country.

I have never been able to see where this war time does anyone any good at all. I could think of hundreds of reasons why it should not have been done.

I hope we get the time changed.

G. N. REDMAN.

EVERETT, MASS.

I have read with interest the April 7 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and want to take this opportunity to commend your stand in this "crackpot" idea of tampering with the Nation's time.

Every citizen of this country is good and sick of this tampering with the clocks and it is high time we got back to sanity.

EUGENE BERTRAM WILLARD.

TACOMA, WASH.

I was very glad to read that Congress will soon start hearings on the bill to put the country back on standard time.

I have never been able to figure out how daylight saving, or war time, has been of sufficient benefit to even offset the confusion and inconvenience it has caused. I sincerely hope Congress will see fit to repeal it.

ALMA MADSEN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

I want to express my appreciation of the bill to eliminate daylight saving from November 1 to March 1.

It's just a pain in the neck to get up and go to work in the dark in the wintertime. And, judging from Pepco's reports, I can't see where it saves any electricity, because what you don't burn in the evening you burn in the morning, and vice versa.

CLIFFORD E. SHULTZ.

LISCOMB, IOWA.

Enclosed find a petition in favor of restoring time back to standard, or sun, time.

This was signed by two Christian churches here.

Nobody refuses to sign, and I could get a thousand signers if I would get out and canvass.

The sun time suits us so much better, and hope you can get it restored to where it should be.

G. S. NUGENT.
(Seventy-eight signatures.)

FORT WORTH, TEX.

Please change the clocks back pronto. Get rid of this confusing mistake. It was well-intentioned but has turned out to be a sad mistake. I hope Congress will never again tamper with the time.

M. F.

BROOKLINE, MASS.

I wish to commend abolition of daylight-saving time.

This is the wish of thousands in this section. Best of luck in the matter.

N. E. BARNES.

ARLINGTON, CALIF.

We in the rural districts of the State of California are, indeed, interested in efforts to repeal the daylight-saving law and put the Nation back on standard time.

The Governor, as well as the California State Grange, have gone on record as being in favor of the restoration of standard time. The act has not accomplished its purpose and is causing vast inconvenience.

T. L. COWDEN.

ARLINGTON, CALIF.

Efforts in regard to the abolishment of the wartime daylight saving have not gone unnoticed by the farmers of California. As you know, the farmer lives and works by the sun, so any legislation to change that is entirely without purpose.

Our Governor Warren has come out strongly in favor of rescinding this bill and we are all firmly behind any action which will restore standard time.

RACHEL G. ORCIERE.

CASEYVILLE, ILL.

I want to add all possible help to efforts to get this country back on standard time. I work shift work, but fast time is as much a detriment to me as to the farmers and other people.

When on the day shift it means getting up an hour earlier, which in the wintertime takes more fuel and electricity and in the summertime robs me of an hour's sleep in the cool of the morning when I could sleep. It means dangerous hardships for most school children starting to school in the dark. If I need to work in the garden, I would much prefer doing it before going to work instead of in the midafternoon in the heat of the day. Very few people will even play golf then, let alone working at anything else. On the midnight to 8 shift I get very little sleep in the daytime and could get another hour before going to work if we were on standard time. Most war plants are on 24-hour schedules, so changing the clock cannot possibly benefit them. I know of no advantage in fast time to anyone, but certainly am aware of its disadvantages.

CARL W. CLAY.

EDMONDS, WASH.

I would like to see our clocks set back where they should of been left. It was never anything but a silly idea at best.

JENNIE L. ANDREWS.

DAYTON, OHIO.

I am in favor of bill H. R. 4489, to restore standard time.

The present arrangement gives us a very unpleasant rearrangement of time that is harmful rather than helpful in the war effort.

M. J. GIBBONS SUPPLY CO.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Abolish war time. I am not only speaking for myself but for hundreds of my fellow men at the L. & N. R. R. shops here, as being in favor of standard time, all the time.

WILLIAM H. PERKINS.

PASS CHRISTIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Pass Christian, Miss.

I am directed to send you a copy of the enclosed resolution introduced by Mr. Robinson on September 2, 1943, at a regular meeting of this body.

MYRTLE S. MCDERMOTT,
Secretary.

Whereas the existing daylight-saving law is causing unnecessary and wasteful use of electricity and imposing hardships and expense on many people during the long nights of the winter season; and

Whereas no such conditions existed during the First World War, when daylight saving was observed during the season when the days were long and the nights were short; and

Whereas there is no reason why the daylight-saving hours observed during the First World War should not be put into effect now, thus causing less expense and bringing more satisfactory results: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Pass Christian Chamber of Commerce, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and urged to amend or change the existing law so as to provide that the period of daylight saving shall begin on the third Sunday in April and end on the third Sunday in September each year at hours to be fixed by law, and continue in operation until the end of the war.

GRAY SUMMIT, MO.

I want to tell you how pleased everyone was with the bill to change back to standard time. Please can you get that bill through in a hurry?

MILFORD T. OMOHUNDEO.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Leesburg, Va.

Several weeks ago there was an article in the Washington papers stating that you had introduced a bill in Congress for the repeal of the daylight-saving time.

The employees of the highway department in Loudoun County are very much in favor of your bill and we would like to know what progress has been made toward getting this bill passed.

G. P. BOZEL, *Resident Engineer.*

MASSACHUSETTS.

To the EDITOR OF THE POST.

SIR: The article on page 1 of a recent edition of the Post setting forth that at last Representatives are coming out for a repeal of the so-called daylight saving is sure good news to all of us workers.

Must we go through another winter with this crazy set-up? Why has there not been something done before this to put us back on our regular time? Farmers, workers, and especially mothers, have been clamoring for the turn-back to normal time and no one has done a thing about it. When this thing was put over it was just for one reason, but like many other things that have been put over on a gullible public, it has remained until we are all fed up on it.

Please, will some of the politicians do something now?

F. D.

CLARENCE, MO.

I noticed in paper a bill to change from war time to old time.

We are farmers, operating about 800 acres of land, and are interested in having time changed. Have talked to a number of good farmers and all have expressed themselves that they would like to have the change.

When we are putting up hay, harvesting oats, wheat, and soybeans, or plowing corn early the dew ordinarily makes it very bad getting started on war time. Then when 6 o'clock comes the greater part of labor wants to quit and at that time it is best part of time to work in farming season.

Then in winter when days are short and you get out at war time you have to get stock up, and we don't think that good in feeding stock.

We are interested in food production and doing our part in winning the war in the best way to our best judgment, and the number we have talked to feel it would be best to have time changed back.

MCCARTY BROTHERS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Abandon war time and go back to standard time.

I don't believe one watt of electricity was saved by this war-time policy, and I believe it is much nicer to go out in the evening when it's dark. The days are long enough in

the summer without trying to make the evenings longer.

Here in Los Angeles before the war this change of time had been voted down by the people several times.

So here's hoping we can return to normal standard time soon.

RAYMOND MCLAUGHLIN.

WINTER PARK, FLA.

I have thought that no one in the United States disliked this stupid war time as much as myself. In winter it is dark here until after 8 a. m.; breakfast has to be prepared and eaten by artificial light—though we are urged to save electricity. It is too wet to work in one's garden. Country children have to take the bus, if they live any distance from it, in the dark. In summer it is not so bad in the morning but one has to water the garden while the sun is quite hot. I should think golfers would not be able to play until 5:30 p. m. at least.

If it were intended for workers in munitions factories, I fail to see the need of it because there is a night shift anyway. I hope Congress will succeed in going back to standard time.

MARIAN S. FRANKLIN.

HUMBOLDT, TENN.

I am glad to find someone whose views coincide with my own on the subject of wartime or daylight-saving time, as it is erroneously called.

Daylight saving time is the greatest misnomer, in fact so great as to be rank folly. I have yet to see one person but that says to have the clock an hour ahead of the sun causes them to use much more current for household and business alike. It causes the man of small or average income to pay extra light bill, for he must have light 2 hours on the average every morning while if the clock were with the sun he would have to use artificial lights only 1 hour.

Defense workers who are on the daylight (8 a. m. to 4 p. m.) shift must get out of bed and make all preparations for the day in pitch darkness and go to the bus lines and stand there in blackness of early morning waiting to catch their bus. This from November to April at least. Frankly, I see not even an atom of common sense in such an arrangement.

MRS. R. C. BETTS.

LITTLE FALLS, N. Y.

Abandon the war time and put the Nation on standard time.

Having the clocks ahead of standard time this past winter was nonsense and no saving as far as electricity was concerned, and many here think it lowered physical resistance.

E. F. J.

CANANEA, SONORA, MEXICO.

I noticed in a Douglas, Ariz., newspaper congressional action to abandon war time and put the Nation back on standard time.

I have noted the effects of time in various parts of the Nation from coast to coast and have made a thorough study of our time system. The sun after all governs daylight and railway junctions do not.

During the short days of winter nearly half the population go to work an hour before daylight and the other half quit work an hour after dark. Such a situation does not help the war effort or save electrical energy.

Your proposal is something that is vital to every American.

JERE CHAMBERLAIN.

[Telegram]

ELKO, NEV.

Fight the silly daylight-saving law. I heartily endorse your stand. More power to you. I think—and so do thousands of others—that this law is about the most foolish and unnecessary one ever written and enforced. There is no saving of anything; in fact, it requires more electricity most places, as 8 a. m. is actually 7 a. m. and barely daylight inside of houses and stores. There is only 24 hours in a day and a man or woman can only do so much in 8 hours whether the day starts at 8 a. m. or fictitiously at 7 a. m.

The people that want to get up early and start Victory gardens, etc., will do it anyway at whatever time they please regardless of the time of day, and if everyone was doing their bit for the war effort they wouldn't need time in the afternoon for golf—they could be better employed helping in some local service that was short-handed on account of the war. There is entirely too much regimentation by Washington trying to tell all the people what they must do, and passing a law telling us when we must start the day, etc., is just much too much. Kill this daylight-saving foolishness.

CARROL H. PARSONS.

ESTHERVILLE, IOWA.

For God's sake do all you can to put the clock back to the right time. It is driving us all nuts and we are all losing money by this war time. The war is bad enough with out putting up with the wrong time. Put it back to the standard time and help win the war.

ALLEN SMITH,
For all the people of Estherville.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Do something to get off this daylight-saving time. I don't see where there is any saving in the new time. I'm speaking from experience, and really I feel worse since the war time has been into effect, as I don't get enough rest. Hoping the new time will be changed and you succeed in getting the clock on standard time soon.

MRS. E. L. BURFORD.

WEBSTER, N. Y.

After reading a news item regarding efforts to abolish war time. I wish to emphatically state that I am heartily in favor of the bill. In my opinion this turning back the clock has done nothing. It has saved neither electricity nor the people's patience and is just another example of foolhardy legislation.

LOUIS F. KOLB.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

I am glad to know someone in Congress doesn't favor daylight-saving time.

For working people who have to get up at 4:30 or 5 a. m. and some even earlier, it is cruel.

The idea that it saves electricity is worse than foolish. People all over the Nation getting up earlier burn a lot more electricity and use their automobile lights. In the summer it is too unbearably hot to go to bed at the accustomed hour so people lose that extra sleep.

I'm positive the people who thought up this abominable idea do not get up early every morning, winter and summer. They would be the first to complain.

MRS. W. G. BROWN.

CAMPBELLSPORT, WIS.

It is with great interest that I and millions of other people of this Nation have been reading and hearing over radios of the fight in Congress for sensible standard time. It's been a big disadvantage to everyone except playboys, night-spot patrons, and golfers, and we the people who are so necessary to the war effort and working for the good of the Nation in every way would like Congress to show us where that caliber of people are so important to the Nation, that Washington should cater to them.

Millions of us in every State are so thankful for the bill to abolish war time. Our earnest wishes are that it will be brought about. The sooner the better for this Nation.

Keep up the fight for us.

E. F. MESSNER.

VACAVILLE, CALIF.

Just a brief note on the bill to eliminate the silly "crackpot" ruling or act called daylight saving which saves nothing and does no good. All its bad features you already know so I will not take up your time in a tirade against the childish act. It is in a class with tin pennies and other well-meant moves produced by war hysteria. We have too many serious things before us these days without so many trivial things. We, the people, are not complacent. We are worried, some of us grief-stricken, all with some fear. We could hardly be complacent and there is no sense in daylight saving. If you could interview 129,000,000 of us, you would find that many against the act.

M. SHARPE.

MOBILE, ALA.

Repeal daylight-saving time.

That will be one of the best things that can be done. I do not see where we save any time, men come to work and have to wait for daylight to go to work.

Keep up the good work and repeal it.

STUART C. STEINER.

UNIVERSITY CITY, MO.

Do all you can to abolish daylight saving. We save nothing. The disadvantages are a hundredfold greater than the advantages. It has caused hardship to 90 percent of the people in our country. I never could understand why any person should want to tinker with Father Time.

F. ROY DEAN,
Member of General T. J. Wint Camp No. 14, Department of Missouri, United Spanish War Veterans.

Mr. Speaker, these letters are voluntary and spontaneous. Without prompting or suggestion from any source, the writers out of their deep personal interest, have taken the time to write a letter in the earnest hope that the Congress will take action for relief from this national handicap.

An interest so general and so insistent warrants at least affording the House an opportunity to consider and vote on the question.

Polish Constitution Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 Poles everywhere will celebrate the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the establishment of the constitution of that great nation. It is especially fitting that here on the floor of the Congress of the United States, a country which is linked to Poland in the firm common bond of the love of freedom, we should pay tribute to our valiant ally.

It was on May 3, 1791—2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution—

that the Diet of Poland adopted a constitution for that nation, which, though the monarchy was retained, guaranteed to the people many liberties which had been denied them. In observing the anniversary of that great event, the Polish people honor the day as we of America do our Fourth of July, for both holidays mark a birth of freedom.

It is hardly necessary to remind any American of the contribution which those outstanding Polish patriots, Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski, made to our own struggle for liberty, nor is it necessary to extol again the heroic deeds of those Poles who have fought in the armed forces of this Nation in all its wars. We are eternally grateful to them. In now fighting on battlefields the world over so that Poland's freedom may again be wrested from the grip of an oppressor, Americans are repaying in some measure, the debt which we owe.

We are indebted to Poland not alone for her examples of bravery, fortitude, and devotion to freedom, but to the contributions which her people have made to the culture, the history, and the industry of this country. Her sons and daughters are talented in the arts and sciences; they are patriotic, God-fearing, and industrious. They have earned high places for themselves in the fields of government, law, medicine, and in other branches of human endeavor in this country, and in so doing they have enriched the Nation.

In the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and other branches of the armed services of this Nation, the rolls of honor of this war are studded with the names of heroes of Polish extraction. Thousands of young men whose parents or grandparents, instilled with the love of liberty in their native land, came to this country from Poland, are serving with great distinction. In my own district, boys of Polish descent have already won high honors for courage and for valor and many of them have given their lives in the service of this Nation.

These valiant boys and all Americans, whether or not we are actually serving in the armed forces, take inspiration from Poland, not alone for her early devotion to the cause of liberty, but for the fact that she has remained steadfast in her loyalty to her ideals. Let us not forget that it was Poland which was the first nation to resist Hitler in this war. Let us not forget that though the odds, as usual, were overwhelmingly against her, Poland chose to fight to protect her soil and her honor. The heroic defense of Warsaw shall ever be one of the most stirring and inspiring chapters in all history.

Again this year, as Polish Constitution Day is celebrated, the nation itself and millions of her people are in chains. Yet, for the first time since Hitler's hordes engulfed and enslaved her, Poland today can feel that the day when the shackles will be struck loose is not far distant. The success of the United Nations in all theaters of war during the past 12 months has given renewed hope to Poles everywhere—to the millions still remaining in Poland with little but courage to sustain them and to the countless others in exile who fight with and in the armies of her allies.

As the mighty armies of the United Nations stand poised for the invasion of the continent of Europe from the west, let those who have suffered at the hands of the brutal German invader take heart. The day of liberation is near. Poland, as she has in the past, will once again rise triumphantly to a place among nations befitting the traditions of her liberty-loving people, and the heroic sacrifices they have made to preserve her national spirit, her honor and her dignity.

Post-War Economy

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, my remarks pertain to that period ahead of us which is occasioning so much apprehensive discussion just now—the adjustment period after victory is finally won. Even those of us who fear that victory is not "just around the corner" must if we are to be conscientious do what we can now to prepare for that post-war period.

I think it is generally conceded that no time in our past history has presented an outlook more fraught with foreboding, more filled with deep concern. And the worst thing about this apprehension is that unless allayed it could make us impotent to do anything definite to avert the danger. Is our Nation so bankrupt of statesmanship that we cannot insure ourselves against disaster? Has the competence we have displayed in waging war successfully exhausted our power to analyze these forces threatening the post-war period? I cannot and do not believe so.

Let us determine exactly what it is that we fear. If we know definitely what it is that we are afraid of we can build safeguards against it.

It is my belief that this fear is a hold-over from the long period of depression that the war lifted us out of so promptly. We fear that we may slump back into that same nightmare of unemployment and destitution. We know that there will be millions of soldiers and sailors and WAC's and WAVES and war workers who will be seeking work when the war ends and who will be unable to wait for weeks or months for it. What so deeply disturbs us then is the fear that after a brief post-war boom we will permit ourselves to slip back into depression—worse perhaps than the last one. This state of mind must and can be overcome.

It seems strange to me that we have not long ago sensed the analogy between depression and war. They are both manifestations of the same fundamental cause—the poverty and misery of great masses of the people somewhere. Allow people to be unable to buy the things they need and the things they can so readily produce and you bring on a depression that leaves them hopeless and apathetic. Allow this depression to last long enough and they become resentful and angry to a point where the demagog finds them in a mood to follow him into the excesses of war. Poverty and its attendant misery produce the social weed crop out of which, if allowed to grow too long, war will inevitably spring.

Our own depression like that in other nations of the world came upon us for one fundamental reason: In the midst of abundant production—or power to produce—we failed to make certain that the people had a buying power equal to their power to produce.

Here we find the key to all our difficulties; here we put our finger upon the weakness in our system. We create a system of exchange for our convenience, using a thing we call money to facilitate the exchange of goods and services that we possess for other kinds that we do not have. And while fully conscious of the fact that none of us can effect the necessary exchanges for our health and convenience without money, we foolishly permit an insignificant number of our population to maintain a monopoly of the creation and supply of money, withholding or releasing it for the use of the public as they will.

If society is ever going to rid itself of depressions and wars, it must destroy the monopolistic control over the flow of money. Money is the lifeblood of commerce and industry. Commerce and industry are the sole sources of created wealth. Without a constantly increasing volume of wealth equitably distributed we cannot maintain a growing and developing civilization.

So it becomes clearly apparent that for the general good it is imperative that the flow of money shall not inhere in the hands of a comparative few, but that its control, its issue, and distribution must be governed by the people themselves through their elected representatives, who will establish constitutional regulation of the output of money, establish its values, and set up an equable system for its distribution.

Among other measures for building such an economy of abundance is House bill No. 1649, which is nothing more nor less than an adaptation of the principle of insurance on a national scale. It would set up a mutual Federal annuity insurance for all citizens, making the immediate beneficiaries all those citizens who were adjudged by competent boards of examiners to be incapacitated for physical reasons from making a living. It would classify the adult population into two groups, the workers and those who by reason of old age, sickness, blindness, or some other cause, are seriously handicapped in the race for jobs. To those latter groups it would provide a fair share of the Nation's income each and every month for expenditure during that month. Thus the money received by the insured would flow directly back into the channels of trade and become a blacklog of assured consumer demand for the goods produced.

This would go a long way toward giving us demand in sufficient volume to enable the consuming public to buy and use goods of all kinds as fast as they could be produced. It is just as necessary for society to build and maintain a market as it is to build factories and turn out goods. Without either of these factors of business the other will prove to be useless.

Mr. Speaker, I urge careful consideration of H. R. 1649. Its basic principles contain in large measure the answer to unemployment, an insurance of the steady development of business and production, and the antidote for fear.

Such a program of national security insurance for those groups who cannot or should not be employed is a basic necessity in meeting our problem of the post-war world.

The Polish Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, Prof. Oscar Lange and Rev. Stanislaus Orlemanski have been received by Premier Stalin at Moscow as American representatives to discuss the Polish situation.

Oscar Lange was a professor in the Chicago University and became a citizen of the United States only about a year ago. He is a self-appointed, one-man representative of the Americans of Polish extraction, and is attempting to sell Communist Russia to Poland so that Poland would then become a republic—but within the boundaries of Russia. It seems that he is in favor of giving away a greater portion of present Poland as a gift. I say that only a rat or a Quisling would sell his own mother country to the hated Communist.

Reverend Orlemanski, a Catholic priest, American-born, of Polish parentage, has made this trip with Professor Lange without his bishop's consent. Remembering Judas Iscariot who betrayed his Lord for 30 pieces of silver, I cannot help wondering what price this priest is asking to betray the land of his forefathers, his church, and the loyal Americans of Polish descent.

I am also wondering if the papal delegate and the bishop of his diocese will take the proper steps to unfrock this traitor to their church—a priest who has forgotten that it was through the valiant efforts of Poland, under the leadership of King John Sobieski, that Christianity was saved for Europe at Vienna in 1683.

I am wondering too why the State Department has issued visas which permitted the transportation of these two "representatives"—the traitors to Christianity, the land of their forefathers, and the principles of Americanism—to Russia at a time when Russia has renounced the principles as outlined in the Atlantic Charter.

It is definitely a matter to be given serious consideration.

Yesterday, Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, issued the following statement, which appeared in the morning Washington Post:

CALLED "BURLESQUE"—PRELATE HITS SOVIET VISIT OF UNITED STATES PRIEST

The visit of an American priest of Polish descent to Russia is "a political burlesque, staged and directed by capable Soviet agents," for propaganda purposes, the Right Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, declared here yesterday.

"It is the 'phoniest' propaganda that the usually clever-idea men in Russia have palmed off on the United States," he said.

The priest is the Reverend Stanislaus Orlemanski, of Springfield, Mass., who has been reported as having conferences in Moscow with Premier Stalin and other Soviet officials, concerning the fate of Poland after the war. He left his parish, according to diocesan authorities, without obtaining the proper ecclesiastical permission.

MENTIONS STATE DEPARTMENT

Monsignor Ready, noting that the priest involved is known as a partisan of Soviet policy, recalled that other had heretofore tried unsuccessfully at the State Department to "get worthy priests to Russia."

He referred to "stabbing in the back the Poland whose government this Nation recognizes."

"Since Russia now considers the Polish forced exiles in her territory citizens of the U. S. S. R., will our Government at the respectful request of millions of citizens, now issue a friendly indorsement for Russian passports for the priests and bishops imprisoned in Russia to come to the United States to enjoy the four freedoms?" he asked.

Monsignor Ready spoke at a communion breakfast of the regional supervisors of the National Catholic Community Service at the National Catholic School of Social Service here. Senator John A. Danaher of Connecticut, also spoke.

MONSIGNOR'S STATEMENT

Monsignor Ready's statement follows:

"The news of the arrival of a Catholic priest in Russia made the front pages of our press this week. The news in Russia was likewise phenomenal.

"Moscow announced that the purpose of this visit was to study the Polish situation and that of the Polish Army in the U. S. S. R. As a priest, Father Orlemanski would be much more interested, it seems to me, if he were permitted to seek out and to confer with the Polish priests and people enduring since 1939 a cruel exile in Siberia and other parts of the Soviet Union.

"But like other missions to Moscow this has no religious significance. It is a political burlesque, staged and directed by capable Soviet agents. It is the phoniest propaganda that the usually clever-idea men in Russia have palmed off on the United States.

"The incident naturally has aroused a great deal of speculation, and a lot of us who have tried heretofore at the State Department to get worthy priests to Russia would like to know the exact part our own Government had in the performance. It is heartening certainly to have the State Department spokesman say the White House had nothing to do with facilitating the passport arrangement, as first widely conjectured in the press.

"The implications of arranging a passport for the only priest in the United States—and likely the world—known as a partisan of Soviet policy are serious enough without having the White House accused of stabbing in the back the Poland whose Government this Nation recognizes.

POSES QUESTION

"The State Department spokesman said a passport was issued because of the request of a friendly government, Russia. That certainly is most interesting. Since Russia now considers the Polish exiles in her territory citizens of the U. S. S. R., will our Government, at the respectful request of millions of citizens, now issue a friendly endorsement for Russian passports for the priests and bishops imprisoned in Russia to come to the United States to enjoy the 'four freedoms'?

"It is discouraging to all who seek friendship with Russia to note the Soviet Government's methods of deceit and confusion. All the great peoples joined in the United Nations are fighting for a world of justice and truth and decency. Only one—Russia—stoops to policies and tactics which divide the orderly march of our forces to victory and a better world. If we cannot attain an honest collaboration among allies in the midst of war, we shall approach with misgiving the task of forming a really noble society of nations after the war.

"Russian valor and genius can contribute much to that hoped-for society, but only if based on truth and justice and charity. We pray for the peoples of the world to unite and bring about that sort of society. Only the Soviet Government is keeping the Russian people from that world fraternity."

The Invasion of Europe

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, zero hour and D-day are approaching for the landing of American troops on the west coast of Europe. This invasion will be the most stupendous, intricate and difficult attack ever made by any army. We hope that the steady, relentless pounding by our Air Forces has softened the German Army and the civilian will to resist. But Salerno and Cassino make us wonder and while we have high hopes, we know the advance is going to be tough.

Many men are sitting in this House who participated in the opening drive in the Argonne on September 26, 1918. That background enables them to visualize and sense the terrible job that our great Army has on its hands; it makes us know how tough a well-trained German Army can be, especially in rear-guard maneuvers.

These veterans of the World War will fully understand what it means to have high morale and the winning spirit in the troops who are going to accomplish such a great mission. Nothing is so important to the soldier as to know that the "folks back home" are thinking of him and supporting him. And I mean thinking of his future so that when he comes home a battle-scarred veteran he will be able to again find his niche in our society. And the mother, wife, and children of

that group that will not come back should be taken care of, and particularly, the troops should know now, as zero hour approaches, that we have made provision for them.

Last night Commander Atherton of the American Legion voiced the hope that the House of Representatives would bring out the G I bill which passed the Senate by an almost unanimous vote. In this I heartily concur. The committee that has the bill should bring it out for action. We are not telling them what kind of a bill to bring out—that is their responsibility. But bring the bill out so we can vote and tell our veterans in a substantial way that we are going to help them when they get home; train each veteran for a job, give him a chance to go to college; loan him money—in short, help him every way we can to resume his place in his Nation, that he and his comrades have protected with their lives. If the committee wishes to amend the bill that is satisfactory, but bring it out now and the House will make short work of it and write into it what amendments it thinks essential. Every member that I have spoken to about this has his mind made up about what should be in the bill. And I predict that the bill we do pass—when we get a chance to vote on it—will be about the bill that the Senate sent over to us many weeks ago. Our troops are entitled to this small recognition from us now just on the eve of their greatest drive for victory.

Anti-Semitism in the Polish Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WEVD on Saturday, April 29, 1944:

Americans were very rudely jolted last week end when news arrived from London that about 21 Jewish soldiers had received sentences ranging from 1 to 3 years for alleged "desertion" from the Polish Army. Soldiers deserting an army? Why? The "desertion" consisted of an attempt by these Jews to join the Britism armed forces. Again, why? And why the British Army? As the facts developed, the picture became clearer, it began to take on form and substance. It was the same old subject in a new frame.

A Polish court martial had been convened in Scotland, and the sentences had resulted. The convicted men had left the Polish forces because they could no longer endure the treatment meted out to them by Polish officers and noncoms. They had been snubbed and cuffed, beaten and insulted. They had been the victims of uncontrollable and deplorable impulses. Those they considered their comrades in arms had fallen upon them with the wickedness of animals in a jungle. One can well imagine their bitterness and amazement. This was happening in free England; 600 innocent men are involved, but to date only 21 have been sentenced.

Reports indicate that many of the so-called deserters were veterans, some were wounded in the battles of Poland and of France. They had amply demonstrated their desire to fight Hitler. As experienced and battle scarred soldiers, they have memories of many an endless march along hot and dusty roads and during the cold and storm of winter. They have known the distress of bad sleeping quarters, of poor food, and danger every minute. They know what it means to lose an arm or a leg or have a bullet go crashing through one's skull. They have also learned that it is necessary to pick one's way carefully at times or a booby trap will blow you to bits.

Yet they had been the objects of scorn and reprisal and hostility. Why? They were Jewish.

There was an intimation of serious trouble when on April 21 the news despatches from London disclosed that the War Minister, Sir James Grigg, would be asked in Commons the following Tuesday if he would consider the formation of a Jewish unit in the British Army, composed of soldiers who could not serve in the Polish armed forces because of anti-Semitic outbursts of a virulent character.

In this connection, a public meeting is scheduled to be held in London on May 14 and the slogan "End race persecution on British soil" has been adopted. The well-known British weekly, the New Statesman and Nation, has criticized Foreign Minister Anthony Eden for the statement that he cannot intervene again for the transfer of Jewish soldiers in the Polish Army to the British forces. The article further indicated that the British Government had the obligation as well as the right to demand that the powers given by Britain to its Polish allies are not to be abused. A refusal, it was said, might lead to grave and damaging incidents among the Allied armies when the offensive against the Continent begins.

Members of the British Parliament, representing all parties have expressed indignation and have protested the convictions. It has been reported in the London Daily Express that the British Government was likely to take action.

This sudden rupture came hard on the heels of the first anniversary of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto, where at least 40,000 were slaughtered. The actual figure is unknown but estimates run as high as 400,000, inasmuch as it has been determined that this number had been imprisoned in a carefully guarded section of the city. These Warsaw martyrs were subsisting on the barest of food rations in tremendously overcrowded tenements under the most unsightly conditions. They were diseased, dying, and helpless. They had been told they would be deported but suddenly it dawned upon them that deportation in the Nazi code was synonymous with death. As their wretched numbers diminished, a wild determination to fight, to resist, stiffened their waning courage. Arms were smuggled in and when the Nazis arrived to make fresh inroads into this poor mass of humanity, the quiet preparation of weeks broke out into a furious battle. Many Germans died and the fortress was bombarded but the survivors held every inch of soil until fatally overcome. Persons of all faiths and all creeds, throughout the world, paid tribute to the Jews of Warsaw, lauding their phenomenal courage and sacrifice in the face of relentless death and destruction. In this historic siege, they struck their blow for the freedom of their fellowman, knowing full well their own resistance was hopeless. The New York Times, commenting in an editorial commemorating the occasion, justly estimated the truly heroic nature of this incident. "The whole human race owes them a debt of gratitude for the inspiration their self-sacrifice gives to the cause of freedom."

Have they died in vain, these Jewish heroes? Shall their spirit go unheeded? Will their Jewish brethren have to struggle on in darkness, to be the eternal whipping posts of Europe? Will they be the continuous victims of unrestrained whims and caprices? Are they doomed to the constant repetition of the discriminatory experiences occasioned by race and religion?

In the light of events such questions are extremely pertinent.

The board of deputies of British Jews, representing the bulk of English Jewry, has expressed deep concern over the terrorism existing in the Polish Army. The British Government was petitioned to intervene with the Polish authorities so that the findings of the court martial might be reviewed and annulled in keeping with the principles of the present struggle.

A delegation of 3,000 Jewish clothing workers called on Prime Minister Churchill and, although unable to see him, left a letter protesting the treatment of Jews in the Polish forces and urging action. It is understandable that British Jews cannot remain content until the rights of Polish Jewish soldiers are fully guarded and preserved.

A high-ranking Polish official is reported to have commented by way of excuse that the details concerning antisemitism were "exaggerated."

However, we have the startling account of one such situation, and it does not sound embellished. A Jewish soldier reports that his superior, in a fury, yelled at him: "When we invade the continent, I know what I shall do with the first two bullets. I shall kill a Jew with one and a German with the other!"

I have seen copies of letters from Polish Jewish soldiers which speak of their desperate plight. The words "dirty Jews" are constantly on the lips of the Polish officers. I quote from one of the letters: "One day, when the wireless gave the news of 40,000 Jews massacred by the Nazis in a gas chamber, a Polish officer said, 'A good job. Poland will have less Jews.'"

At another time a Pole said, "Wait until we get back to Poland. Then we will not leave a single Jew alive." It is the fear of Jewish soldiers on Polish ships that they will be pushed overboard by their so-called comrades in arms.

The worst of the anti-Semitic Poles are soldiers who actually fought in the German Army under Rommel and who were taken prisoners in north Africa. Polish authorities obtained their release because they were Polish subjects and commandeered them into the Polish Army. Their hostility to Jewish soldiers is undisguised and most outspoken. Staff sergeants have repeatedly stated: "We will kill all the Jews when we come to Poland. It is better to kill one Jew on the battlefield than two Germans."

I have the statement of a Jewish young man serving in the Polish Navy on a destroyer. He has the proud distinction of wearing the Polish Military Cross and the English Distinguished Service Cross. He states that he was informed by a friend, a Christian soldier, that Polish sailors had decided to throw him overboard because he was a Jew. He stated that other Jewish sailors and soldiers had been pushed into the sea in that way, and when complaints were offered to commanding officers, no disciplinary measures or punishments were enforced. He stated that Jewish sailors were savagely beaten only because they were Jews.

There was a symposium of Polish officers held at Burn Island, in Scotland, in which captains, majors, and colonels participated. The following opinions and promises were registered: "The Jews will be wiped out not only in Poland but also in England. * * * We should not wait until we come back to Poland to kill Jews, but should kill the Jews here."

Demand has been made—and it is one in which I join—that all officers and noncommissioned officers guilty of generating or permitting such intolerable conditions should be stripped of their rank and immediately and severely punished.

Even Russia has joined in the attack on the Polish authorities and has charged that Ukraine and White Russian soldiers in the Polish forces have been likewise mistreated and tortured by Polish gendarmes.

While American public opinion has not been slow in reacting to this sample of the intemperance and hostility of undisciplined minds, it has not been really vociferous. The Jewish Labor Committee, emphasizing that it speaks for 500,000 organized American workers, cabled a strongly worded protest to labor members of the Polish Cabinet in London, expressing its deep-rooted resentment at the extremity of the sentences imposed by the Polish court martial. It stated, "We are well acquainted with the self-sacrifice and bravery of the Jews in the Polish armed services. * * * We, therefore, resent and categorically reject the slur upon the Jewish people, by saying that the Jewish soldiers in the Polish Army have been guilty of desertion."

I say, they did what any red-blooded American with guts would do—go over to the British to fight. They are no less heroic than their brethren exterminated in the Warsaw ghetto.

The British press has strongly condemned the conduct of the Polish authorities, the News Chronicle commenting that "a thoroughly disagreeable impression has been created among all parties and classes as a result of the heavy sentences." It further states that the people of America, Russia, and of all the United Nations will "watch closely to see how we handle the affair, which contains all the elements of the vile spirit of oppression which millions are giving their lives to destroy." An editorial in the Daily Express said that the British people will be glad to learn that the reassurances of the Polish Government are not merely formal instructions, but indicate a determination to stamp out anti-Semitism in the armed forces.

It has been revealed that the trial of the Jewish soldiers was ordered by the Polish War Minister, Gen. Majan Kukiel, after 207 Jews were transferred by the British authorities from the Polish Army. It is well to note here and now that one-third have already been placed in British combat units, clearly indicating that they did not seek any evasion of action service.

The Polish authorities set up a commission to examine the charges. It sought to whitewash the Polish military, but, frankly, this whitewash will not wash. Indeed, the cart has been again placed before the horse, for it has been learned that a circular has been issued to all Polish troops, warning that desertion would be punished by loss of citizenship to the soldier and his entire family.

Outraged by the entire proceedings, on April 24, I wrote a letter of protest to His Excellency Jan Ciechanowski, the Polish Ambassador to the United States, in which I stated that American public opinion was not indifferent to the unjust treatment accorded these Jewish soldiers in the Polish Army and that it was incumbent upon him to so advise his government. I stated that the action of the military authorities is a negation of the freedom of religion and the freedom from fear, two of the four freedoms and incorporated as basic principles in the Atlantic Charter, recognized and respected by the civilized world as an indispensable adjunct to the continuation of the comity of nations.

I am in violent disagreement with the argument that this behavior on the part of the Polish military authorities is entirely an internal problem. Anti-Semitism is a virus that spreads more quickly than the dread forest fires. It is a menace to all soldiers, not merely to Jewish soldiers in the Polish Army.

I further stated that the good offices of the United States had been sought in the physical boundary dispute between Russia and Poland. I asked the good offices of the Polish Ambassador to wipe out a "religious boundary cruelty."

His Excellency, the Polish Ambassador, replied to my communication. Frankly, his letter is most unsatisfactory. If I were to use uncomplimentary language, I would refer to it as so much "eyewash." It is filled with glittering generalities. He seeks to brush aside all criticism by the flat statement that there is no anti-Semitism in the Polish Army.

I emphasize again it is no internal affair, and its enlarged significance is duly noted. Witness the debate that was resumed in the House of Commons on Thursday where it was announced that Prime Minister Churchill had discussed the question of anti-Semitism with the Polish Prime Minister. Mr. Anthony Eden stated that the usual representations to the Polish Government had been made. He impressed upon the authorities the importance which His Majesty's government attaches to the Polish Government continuing to intensify its efforts to eradicate manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Polish forces in this country and that all steps are taken to insure that this policy be translated into appropriate action. Mr. Eden then added that the Polish Government would keep the British Government informed of the inquiries now being made into anti-Jewish activities in the Army.

Labor representatives in Commons properly indicated their dissatisfaction with the action taken and the statement was made that the Polish military authorities had violated the very principle of democracy and humanity by permitting anti-Semitism in the Polish Army.

The commonplaces of sympathy will not resolve this issue.

All sentences of court-martial must be annulled and these Jewish soldiers, if they so desire, must be permitted entrance into the British Army. The Polish authorities are weakening somewhat and it is now announced that the carrying out of the court-martial sentences may be postponed until after the war. This is no answer. We have no assurance that there will be no repetition of such outrages—against even the bravest of men—men who had received the highest Polish military decorations, to wit, the Vittuti Militare, the Cross of Valor, and the Cross of Merit.

The Government of the United States should and must add its protest to the proper authorities with regard to this unwarranted outburst of anti-Semitism. It is hoped that our State Department will take forthright and vigorous action and make crystal clear that we in America will not tolerate anti-Semitism amongst our comrade-in-arms. It is also hoped that unlike Anthony Eden, Cordell Hull will not deal with the Polish authorities with kid gloves, that he will pull no punches. The niceties of diplomacy will be unavailing. The mailed first will be the best method of driving home our attitude.

This unnatural wilderness of superstition and intolerance must be obliterated. These Jewish soldiers are entitled to be officered by men at least their equals in courage, tolerance, and justice.

Any officer incapable of self-command should be deprived of his privilege to command others. Broad chests and loud voices are insufficient equipment to enhance the dignity of office. Such reactionary militarism must be relegated to the ash-heap of useless accommodations. Such official personnel must not be permitted the insinuation that they, and they alone, rule. Pressure must be brought to bear upon them so that they may be enabled to look beyond their own exceedingly narrow limits. Their shallow responses to and their hollow enthusiasm for an inspired and inspiring cause—the essential reality of the equality of all men everywhere—must be eliminated from their repertoire of irresponsible reactions.

These malignant forces must not be victorious. We can't expect heavenly harmony overnight—but the need to enlarge the vision is definite. Barbarism in the Polish Army must not be the order of the day.

Boon From Mr. Doughton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 25, 1944:

BOON FROM MR. DOUGHTON

This newspaper has pounded the drums for income-tax simplification so often and so long that its readers may have come to regard us as single-tracked. But we will risk immodesty to remark today that this continued drum beating, in which many others have joined, is at last producing results.

The bill just introduced by Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee, after weeks of study by himself and his colleagues in collaboration with their own experts and the Treasury's, looks like a magnificent contribution to the peace of mind of the American taxpayer, who still cannot look back on March 15 without shuddering.

If this bill is passed—and certainly Congress is now fully aware of the public sentiment for simplification—30,000,000 of the 50,000,000 taxpayers won't have to file any return at all next March 15, aside from a withholding-tax receipt and the answers to four simple questions. Where the withholding tax has taken too much or too little, the Government will figure this out itself and mail either a bill or a rebate. So, for those 30,000,000 people the bookkeeping nightmare of last March will be exorcised.

Some 10,000,000 others—namely, those receiving more than $5,000 from an employer or more than $100 from sources where withholding does not apply—will fill out a return, but a much simpler one than they have been accustomed—though not reconciled—to.

The final 10,000,000, principally people in the middle and upper brackets, will file on a "long form," but here again a simpler one than in the past.

Other changes are involved, notably the disappearance of the pesky Victory tax and the adoption of a flat surtax exemption of $500 a person, whether the person be the head of the house, his spouse, or his dependent. And the myth that dependency ends as a son or daughter turns 18—when in many cases the expense is just hitting a peak—is abandoned; hereafter the word "dependent" is to mean what it says.

All in all, the Doughton bill represents a victory for sense and sanity.

The Utah Battery Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Maj. Gen. Lucias D. Clay, Director of Matériel, General Staff Corps, Army Service Forces, in reply to my condemnation of the sales of dry-cell batteries in the Ninth Service Command on a very questionable and unbusinesslike basis.

The House will recall that earlier the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] made a talk on this subject. The Army now says that the investigation is completed. While I am far from satisfied with the results of the investigation, I am encouraged by the statement that corrective action has been taken to prevent the recurrence of like transactions, that properly qualified officers will be assigned to salvage duties, and that salvage property will, in general, be sold on widely circulated written invitations for bids.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to unduly criticize the Army in general, as I feel it has a tremendous job to perform and that it is doing its best. I do, however, intend to watch for future violations of the late battery deal kind and if any such happenings occur again I will consider it my duty to bring it to the attention of the House for consideration and action.

I feel also, Mr. Speaker, that in selling any salvage material, due attention should and must be given to the small businesses interested in the particular items for sale. The little businessman has a difficult time as it is; therefore, in matters of this sort they should be given not only prior but every consideration possible. Let us bend every effort to keep small business alive and see to it that it is given the first opportunities in bidding on salvaged material.

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This is in further reply to your memorandum of March 10, 1944, addressed to Lt. Gen. B. B. Somervell, with which was enclosed an article from the Automotive News of February 7, 1944. The investigation by the Inspector General of sales of certain dry-cell batteries by the salvage officer at Utah Army Service Forces Depot has been completed. The circumstances of the case have been thoroughly explored by the investigating officer.

It appears from the report that during the period April 1 to October 1, 1943, there were turned over to the salvage officer of the depot for disposition approximately 100,000 dry-cell batteries of various sizes, pursuant to the terms of several inventory and inspection reports and reports of survey. These batteries when new had cost the Government approximately $200,000.

These batteries were listed on the reports as having passed their shelf life and therefore as being unserviceable. The report of investigation lends support to the conclusion that there may have been included with these over-age batteries, certain newer batteries which had not passed shelf life. However, it was impossible to trace these batteries to ultimate purchasers to secure definite confirmation. The civilian employees of the depot who prepared the lists of batteries past shelf life were no longer employed at the depot and were unavailable for questioning. The foreman, who supervised these employees, testified that he checked the lists on a selective basis. The officers who approved the reports of survey and inventory and inspection reports testified that they relied on the accuracy of the civilian employees.

These batteries were sold by the salvage officer in three principal transactions. The first lot of batteries were sold by the salvage officer to Mr. J. W. Harbetson of Ogden, Utah, on May 1, 1943, for the sum of $15. This transaction was a private sale made without the solicitation of bids and without any investigation by the salvage officer concerning the possible utility of these over-age batteries. The investigating officer finds that staff officers at Headquarters, Ninth Service Command, either authorized this sale or had prior notice of it. The second and third lots of batteries were sold by the salvage officer on September 20, 1943, to Mr. J. W. Harbetson and to Mr. W. N. Grothe of Bountiful, Utah, for a total price of $110. These two sales were also concluded after private negotiations under the same circumstances as the first sale. In addition, the salvage officer, from time to time, made three retail sales of small quantities of such batteries to Mr. John F. Baker, of Ogden, Utah.

Fraud or collusion by officers or employees of the War Department in any of the sales are not indicated by this investigation or by the prior investigation by the Ninth Service Command. Indeed, the report of investigation shows that the original purchasers were at first unaware of the real resale value of the batteries.

Some of the batteries acquired by Mr. J. W. Harbetson were resold through salesmen employed by Mr. A. W. Schryber, of Salt Lake City, Utah, for between $1,200 and $1,500. Another quantity of batteries were sold by Mr. Harbetson to George A. Lowe Co., of Odgen, Utah, for $984.55. However, the bulk of the batteries purchased by Mr. Harbetson were resold by his brother, Mr. James M. Harbetson, to Jake Hayutin & Sons, of Denver, Colo., in November 1943 for $20,000. The batteries purchased by Mr. Grothe were resold by him to the Magee Radio Co., of Denver, Colo., for $7,000. These latter concerns in turn resold the batteries to the general public.

Two of the initial purchasers of these batteries, Mr. John W. Harbetson and Mr. John F. Baker, were Government employees at the depot. Army Regulation 30-2145 prohibits the acceptance of bids for salvaged property from Government employees. The sales to these two individuals were violations of this regulation. The salvage officer was unfamiliar with the regulation and claimed that he did not know that Mr. Harbetson was employed at the depot.

Dry-cell batteries are a peculiar item of supply. They must be stored in quantities sufficient to meet all foreseeable tactical requirements, notwithstanding the fact that they are of a perishable nature and begin to deteriorate from the date of their manufacture. To meet this condition, the Signal Corps had from time to time issued instructions to all depots setting forth the shelf life of dry-cell batteries held in reserve in storage. The term "shelf life" is defined as the amount of time that a battery may be carried in depot stock and available for issue, before its capacity has declined to a point where it is unsafe to issue it for tactical military uses. Every effort is made to issue dry-cell batteries for tactical military uses before they become outdated, and the War Department's sytem of stock control is designed to this end. However, it is difficult to prevent certain quantities of batteries in depot stock from becoming outdated before issue, even with the most careful regulation of stock levels, because of the large volume of batteries which must be kept in reserve to meet all contingencies. Obviously, for military reasons, the Army cannot issue outdated batteries for troop use, as their life is uncertain. It is recognized, however, that there remains in such batteries a varying percentage of original capacity.

Without attempting to deny that errors were made in this case, it may be pointed out that the resale value of these batteries was greatly enhanced by an abnormal situation arising from the prevailing shortage of batteries. The amount of life left in outdated batteries depends upon the type of battery, the conditions of manufacture, and the conditions of storage. Outdated batteries of excellent manufacture, stored under conditions of ideal temperature, may have considerable remaining life, while others of different quality, stored under different conditions, may be completely dead. The cost of testing each individual outdated battery would normally be excessive. Due to the abnormal supply situation, civilian purchasers were, in this case, willing to purchase such batteries and take a chance on their durability, because new batteries were not available.

The circumstances of the case, as now established, show the following to have been major factors bearing on the losses to the Government. The salvage officer of the depot was a young, inexperienced officer, lacking in business judgment, unfamiliar with basic Army regulations, and burdened with numerous other duties. A more experienced officer should have been selected for the position. Bids were not solicited for the batteries nor was any investigation made by the salvage officer concerning their potential sales value. Also contributing to the loss were the inadequate instructions issued by these offices concerning over-age batteries which tended to give the impression that such batteries had little value or utility. The circumstancs of this case show that such was not entirely the fact.

The War Department does not defend the sale of these batteries at the prices which were received. The sales were the result of errors of judgment and administration. Action has been taken to bring the consequences of this case forcefully to the attention of the chief signal officer, the Commanding General, Ninth Service Command, and the Commanding General, Utah Army Service Forces Depot. Necessary disciplinary action is being taken against responsible officers at all levels of command, including where appropriate, reprimands, relief from duty, and reclassification.

Corrective action has been taken to prevent the recurrence of such improper transactions. The necessity of assigning qualified officers as salvage officers has been called to the attention of all service commands. The service commands have been instructed that salvage property will, except in extraordinary cases, be sold only on widely circulated written invitations for bids. Instructions have been issued that dry-cell batteries, other than those actually exhausted by use, will not be sold as salvage but will be transferred to the Procurement Division, Treasury Department. All depots have been provided with battery test sets, and detailed instructions have been issued for the testing of over-age batteries on a selective basis.

It is believed that in the great majority of transactions, the disposition of salvage property is being handled expeditiously and with proper judgment by the officers and employees of the War Department and the Army. The regulations and instructions concerning the sale of salvaged property are well designed and explicit. It should be recognized, however, that no regulation can provide good business judgment and that constant surveillance is necessary to prevent isolated instances of improper disposition of salvage. The unfortunate experiences of this case have been widely disseminated and are expected to stimulate renewed diligence against the occurrence of further transactions of this character.

Sincerely yours,

LUCIUS D. CLAY,
Major General, General Staff Corps,
Director of Matériel.

Army Sale of Dry-Cell Batteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I made an address in the House where I called to the attention of the country the sale of approximately 100,000 dry-cell batteries of various sizes, which had cost the Government when new about $200,000. I pointed out that the War Department had received a very small amount for these batteries, that they had not been sold as a result of competitive bidding, that an employee of the Army had purchased some of the batteries, one lot for $15, and another lot he purchased jointly with another individual for $110. I further pointed out that this individual had received for one lot of batteries $20,000.

At that time the War Department had made a preliminary investigation and had given me a partial report which I made public. I have now received a second report from the Under Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, which shows that investigation had been completed. While it is regretted that this incident occurred, nevertheless it is pleasing to know that steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence.

This is an indication of the necessity for proper governmental authorities to use extreme care in the disposal of surplus property which will amount to billions of dollars after the war. I feel that the public is entitled to the information contained in this report. It follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: In further reply to your letter of 17 February 1944, inquiring about the sales of certain dry-cell batteries by the salvage officer at Utah Army Service Forces Depot, Ogden, Utah, I wish to advise that the investigation of this case by the Office of the Inspector General has been completed. The circumstances of the case have been thoroughly explored by the investigating officer.

It appears from the report that during the period 1 April 1943 to 1 October 1943 there were turned over to the salvage officer of the depot for disposition approximately 100,000 dry-cell batteries of various sizes, pursuant to the terms of several inventory and inspection reports and reports of survey. These batteries when new had cost the Government approximately $200,000.

These batteries were listed on the reports as having passed their shelf life and therefore as being unserviceable. The report of investigation lends support to the conclusion that there may have been included with these overage batteries certain newer batteries which had not passed shelf life. However, it was impossible to trace these batteries to ultimate purchasers to secure definite confirmation. The civilian employees of the depot who prepared the lists of batteries past shelf life were no longer employed at the depot and were unavailable for questioning. The foreman, who supervised these employees, testified that he checked the lists on a selective basis. The officers who approved the reports of survey and inventory and inspection reports testified that they relied on the accuracy of the civilian employees.

These batteries were sold by the salvage officer in three principal transactions. The first lot of batteries were sold by the salvage officer to Mr. J. W. Harbetson, of Ogden, Utah, on May 1, 1943, for the sum of $15. This transaction was a private sale made without the solicitation of bids and without any investigation by the salvage officer concerning the possible utility of these overage batteries. The investigating officer finds that staff officers at headquarters, Ninth Service Command, either authorized this sale or had prior notice of it. The second and third lots of batteries were sold by the salvage officer on September 20, 1943, to Mr. J. W. Harbetson and to Mr. W. N. Grothe, of Bountiful, Utah, for a total price of $110. These two sales were also concluded after private negotiations under the same circumstances as the first sale. In addition, the salvage officer, from time to time, made three retail sales of small quantities of such batteries to Mr. John F. Baker, of Ogden, Utah.

Fraud or collusion by officers or employees of the War Department in any of the sales is not indicated by this investigation or by the prior investigation by the Ninth Service Command. Indeed, the report of investigation shows that the original purchasers were at first unaware of the real resale value of the batteries.

Some of the batteries acquired by Mr. J. W. Harbetson were resold through salesmen employed by Mr. A. W. Schryber, of Salt Lake City, Utah, for between $1,200 and $1,500. Another quantity of batteries were sold by Mr. Harbetson to George A. Lowe Co., of Ogden, Utah, for $984.55. However, the bulk of the batteries purchased by Mr. Harbetson were resold by his brother, Mr. James M. Harbetson, to Jake Hayutin & Sons, of Denver, Colo., on November 1943, for $20,000. The batteries purchased by Mr. Grothe were resold by him to the Magee Radio Co., of Denver, Colo., for $7,000. These latter concerns, in turn, resold the batteries to the general public.

Two of the initial purchasers of these batteries, Mr. John W. Harbetson and Mr. John F. Baker, were Government employees at the depot. Army Regulation 30–2145 prohibits the acceptance of bids for salvaged property from Government employees. The sales to these two individuals were violations of this regulation. The salvage officer was unfamiliar with the regulations and claimed that he did not know that Mr. Harbetson was employed at the depot.

Dry-cell batteries are a peculiar item of supply. They must be stored in quantities sufficient to meet all foreseeable tactical requirements, notwithstanding the fact that they are of a perishable nature and begin to deteriorate from the day of their manufacture. To meet this condition, the Signal Corps had from time to time issued instructions to all depots setting forth the shelf life of dry-cell batteries held in reserve in storage. The term "shelf life" is defined as the amount of time that a battery may be carried in depot stock and available for issue before its capacity has declined to a point where it is unsafe to issue it for tactical military uses. Every effort is made to issue dry-cell batteries for tactical military uses before they become outdated, and the War Department's system of stock control is designed to this end. However, it is difficult to prevent certain quantities of batteries in depot stock from becoming outdated before issue, even with the most careful regulation of stock levels, because of the large volume of batteries which must be kept in reserve to meet all contingencies. Obviously, for military reasons, the Army cannot issue outdated batteries for troop use, as their life is uncertain. It is recognized, however, that there remains in such batteries a varying percentage of original capacity.

Without attempting to deny that errors were made in this case, it may be pointed out that the resale value of these batteries was greatly enhanced by an abnormal situation arising from the prevailing shortage of batteries. The amount of life left in outdated batteries depends upon the type of battery, the conditions of manufacture, and the conditions of storage. Outdated batteries of excellent manufacture, stored under conditions of ideal temperature, may have considerable remaining life, while others of different quality, stored under different conditions, may be completely dead. The cost of testing each individual outdated battery would normally be excessive. Due to the abnormal supply situation, civilian purchasers were, in this case, willing to purchase such batteries and take a chance on their durability, because new batteries were not available.

The circumstances of the case, as now established, show the following to have been major factors bearing on the losses to the Government. The salvage officer of the depot was a young, inexperienced officer, lacking in business judgment, unfamiliar with basic Army regulations, and burdened with numerous other duties. A more experienced officer should have been selected for the position. Bids were not solicited for the batteries nor was any investigation made by the salvage officer concerning their potential sales value. Also contributing to the loss were the inadequate instructions issued by the War Department concerning over-age batteries, which tended to give the impression that such batteries had little value or utility. The circumstances of this case show that such was not entirely the fact.

The War Department does not defend the sales of these batteries at the prices which were received. The sales were the result of errors of judgment and administration. Action has been taken to bring the consequences of this case forcefully to the attention of the chief signal officer, the commanding general, Ninth Service Command, and the commanding general, Utah Army Service Forces Depot. Necessary disciplinary action is being taken against responsible officers at all levels of command, including, where appropriate, reprimands, relief from duty, and reclassification.

Corrective action has been taken to prevent the recurrence of such improper transactions. The necessity of assigning qualified officers as salvage officers has been called to the attention of all service commands. The service commands have been instructed that salvage property will, except in extraordinary cases, be sold only on widely circulated writ-

ten invitations for bids. Instructions have been issued that dry-cell batteries, other than those actually exhausted by use, will not be sold as salvage but will be transferred to the Procurement Division, Treasury Department. All depots have been provided with battery test sets, and detailed instructions have been issued for the testing of over-age batteries on a selective basis.

It is believed that in the great majority of transactions the disposition of salvaged property is being handled expeditiously and with proper judgment by the officers and employees of the War Department and the Army. The regulations and instructions concerning the sale of salvaged property are well designed and explicit. It should be recognized, however, that no regulation can provide good business judgment and that constant surveillance is necessary to prevent isolated instances of improper disposition of salvage. The unfortunate experiences of this case have been widely disseminated and are expected to stimulate renewed diligence against the occurrence of further transactions of this character.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Overcoming Shortages of War Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Senator Charles B. Henderson—former United States Senator from the State of Nevada—Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, over Station WOL, and coast-to-coast Mutual network, Washington, D. C., April 29, 1944, entitled "Overcoming Shortages of War Metals":

This is a report to the Nation—that nation which is the richest in productive capacity of minerals but which is poor in many of the necessary ores.

Before this war the United States imported substantially all of its tin, chrome, manganese, nickel, platinum, asbestos, and cobalt, as well as much of its tungsten, mercury, antimony, graphite, mica, and vanadium. It is needless for me to dwell on the importance of each of these minerals in war production. Yet each had to be brought into this country for processing into the weapons and machines of war.

It gives me pleasure to report that adequate supplies of these minerals have been obtained. Stock piles have been established. American industry has had the materials needed for its greatest effort in history.

Your Government has spent vast sums to achieve this. But for every $4 spent for these strategic and critical materials $3 worth has been resold to war industry, while the remaining $1 represents the stock piles which are our guaranty against shortages.

Today the words "stock pile" are commonplace. It was largely a matter of debate, however, until 1939, when Congress appropriated $100,000,000 for the acquisition of strategic materials. That was the start, but only the start, as the impact of war in Europe taught us to go much further.

In June 1940, therefore, Reconstruction Finance Corporation was empowered by Congress to form subsidiaries to acquire strategic and critical materials, and to provide the necessary plant facilities for expanding our production of the implements of war. Of the four present subsidiaries, one—Metals Reserve Company—was charged specifically with the task of acquiring strategic and critical metals and minerals.

It is of the work of Metals Reserve Company that I wish to speak. The National Defense Advisory Council recommended that Metals Reserve take immediate steps to expand our supplies of tin and manganese.

World production of tin immediately prior to the war ranged from 150,000 to 200,000 long tons a year. Nearly half was consumed in the United States, even though our tin production was entirely negligible. Two steps were immediately taken to increase our tin supply. One was an agreement with the International Tin Committee, representing the seven major producing countries, to increase the production of tin from the then current rate of 80 percent to 130 percent of the standard quotas. Metals Reserve agreed to take any excess not sold to consumers up to an agreed tonnage.

The second step was a contract with the Bolivian producers and the Government, under which approximately half of the tin produced in that country would be shipped to the United States for smelting. Certain of this ore previously had been shipped from Bolivia to smelters in continental Europe, which were no longer available.

Even though substantial tin-smelting capacity was then open to us in the Far East, it was felt that this country would be safer with a tin smelter within our continental limits.

As a result, a tin smelter costing over $6,000,000 was built at Texas City, Tex. The plant has been operating since Easter Sunday, April 1942, producing tin of the highest quality. Its output to date has exceeded 41,000 tons and the present production rate is approximately 2,500 tons monthly.

Our dependence on imported manganese is only slightly less than our dependence on imported tin. Domestic manganese ore production from 1919 through 1939 had averaged about 40,000 long tons a year, compared with normal consumption of between 600,000 and 1,000,000 long tons. This country does possess substantial deposits of manganese ore; unfortunately, however, most of the deposits are of low grade.

Because of the huge tonnage required for the defense program, it was imperative that Metals Reserve expand production of manganese in the United States. Therefore, a contract was promptly made for production from the deposits at Butte, Mont., the then largest known commercial source of that mineral in this country. Treatment facilities were built by private capital. Production from this one source since late 1941 has been at a rate more than double the previous annual production of the United States. In addition, contracts were given to other companies owning domestic deposits. Buying stations have been established to which a small miner can bring his ore for immediate cash sale. As a consequence, domestic production of manganese ore is now six to seven times the pre-war rate. Domestic mines now supply almost 20 percent of estimated requirements, whereas prior to the war they supplied about 4 percent.

Steps were also taken to increase the manganese production of Cuba, Brazil, Mexico, and Chile, the other Western Hemisphere sources of this indispensable ingredient of steel alloys. Production in these neighboring countries both in 1942 and in 1943 has been more than double their production of 1939. Large quantities have also been obtained from Eastern Hemisphere sources—notably India, South Africa, and the Gold Coast.

In spite of the war requirements of over 1,300,000 tons of manganese ore anually, this country at all times during the emergency has had more than a year's supply on hand.

I have gone into some detail about tin and manganese because these were the original commodities on which we received recommendations. The program of Metals Reserve has, however, been broadened greatly. To date purchases have been made of 46 different metals and minerals. In addition to those materials with which you are all familiar—such as aluminum, copper, lead, and zinc—the list of materials purchased includes such little-known products as:

Zirconium, used as a steel hardener, a refractory for furnace linings, and an ingredient in enamel and glassmaking.

Cryolite, brought from Greenland to be used as a flux in the production of aluminum; and

Rutile, which has made possible the enormous expansion in welding that, in turn, has permitted us to build ships at a rate never before contemplated.

An essential part of the program of Metals Reserve was the negotiation during 1941, before Pearl Harbor, of a series of agreements with Latin-American countries under which we accomplished a twofold purpose;

1. These countries agreed to export strategic materials to the United States only, or to other countries in the Western Hemisphere. Thus the Axis was cut off from all critical and strategic materials from the Western Hemisphere. Japan in particular had been a large importer from Latin America prior to these agreements.

2. Our agreement to buy permitted those countries to expand production. This has been of great value to us. Agreements covering substantially all their mineral output were negotiated with the Governments of Brazil, Chile, Peru, and Mexico. Similar agreements covering specific commodities were negotiated with Bolivia, Argentina, and Colombia.

Fully 50 countries have supplied minerals and metals for our war program. Virtually every one of the United Nations, most of the neutrals, and the liberated territories, including north Africa and Sardinia, have proven valuable sources. These important metals and minerals from abroad are continuing to flow in under the procurement program of the Foreign Economic Administration.

It is interesting to observe how raw materials supplied to us by our allies, are returning to them as weapons of war. For instance, chrome ore from Russia, exported from the Arctic port of Murmansk, returns to the Soviet Union through the Persian Gulf, in the alloy steel contained in tanks, trucks, guns, and planes; nickel from New Caledonia returns to the southwest Pacific in the equipment aboard our fighting ships; tungsten from China returns as filaments in radio tubes on General Chennault's gallant planes, or as an alloy in the tools used at repair shops at air bases. Many of these materials now are being provided to us by our allies under reciprocal lend-lease.

In the expansion of domestic production, Metals Reserve has always cooperated with the Office of Price Administration to help prevent inflation. Let me cite, as an example, the so-called premium price plan—for expanding the output of copper, lead, and zinc. The ceiling prices yield a fair profit to those mines which normally produced most of these metals. However, it was soon recognized by O. P. A., W. P. B., and Metals Reserve that substantial quantities of new production could be obtained at a somewhat higher cost.

To tap this source, a plan was announced early in 1942 whereby each domestic mine producing copper, lead, or zinc in excess of a stipulated quota, would receive a premium payment from Metals Reserve. In these 2 years, the premium payments have amounted to $91,033,000, of which $32,941,000 has been paid to copper mines, $14,340,000 to the lead mines, and $43,752,000 to the zinc mines.

The metals and minerals aspect represents one of the many bright spots of the war production program. Of 46 different materials which Metals Reserve is purchasing or has purchased, in only a few cases—for example, tin and sheet mica—will 1944 receipts be less than requirements. As to tin, we are fortunate in having a substantial stock pile on which we can draw. Sheet mica is the only material in which the situation can be considered tight.

This favorable situation can be maintained only if we continue to acquire additional supplies of these metals and minerals from all sources. In most minerals it is expected that stock piles in Government hands will be materially increased during 1944.

For this reason W. P. B. has decided to curtail production of strategic metals and minerals once ample stock piles have been established. To name a few examples:

Our program for subsidizing high cost tungsten producers recently has been abandoned; the purchase of mercury from small domestic mines at ceiling prices has been discontinued, and the price of that commodity has been permitted to seek its natural level; output of aluminum from high-cost plants using coal-generated power has been stopped; vanadium, graphite, cobalt, and molybdenum are other materials in which both foreign and domestic cut-backs already have occurred.

We have endeavored to make these cutbacks in a manner which will be fair to the producers, to the workmen they employ, and to the taxpayers who are bearing the cost of the war.

Frank Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would feel I had not discharged my obligation to a friend were I not to say with respect to the untimely death of Frank Knox that he was an able and a good citizen; a valiant soldier; a brave man; an exemplary and most efficient public official; always a patriot.

His country and all of us needed and will miss him. He is entitled to the highest and finest accolade which ever can be awarded to any man: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

With Thomas Jefferson may I say:

The term is not very distant, at which we are to deposit in the same cerement, our sorrows and suffering bodies, and to ascend in essence, to an ecstatic meeting with the friends we have loved and lost, and whom we shall still love and never lose again.

Air Bases in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert these two editorials from the New Orleans Item in connection with a recent report of a Naval Affairs subcommittee which has caused international attention.

These editorials express, I believe, the attitude not only of the subcommittee which made the report but also express the attitude of the vast majority of the American people if the numbers of letters which I have received and the editorials from various sections of the country which have come to my attention are to serve as yardsticks in this instance.

The editorials from the New Orleans Item follow:

GIVE US THE BASES

A Naval Affairs Subcommittee headed by Congressman HÉBERT recommends something that is quite urgent as well as vitally important. After a tour of the Caribbean and the South American east coast, it tells the House that the United States should lose no time in procuring from Great Britain permanent right to all of the bases we have set up at great cost on the English islands immediately off our Atlantic shore, from Newfoundland to Trinidad.

We have often said precisely the same thing and can imagine no good reason for the failure of the Roosevelt administration to take this step so obviously required for the future security of this country from foreign attack. Nor can we imagine any good reason why Britain should be reluctant to accord us these bases while continuing to keep for itself all the other territory on the islands involved, and all the British bases and other establishments that stand upon them.

The ground for our island bases was leased to us for 99 years in return for 50 destroyers, of which the English were in critical need. The ships were worth a great deal more than the land, of course. But if this were not so, the staggering values that Uncle Sam has delivered to John Bull under the lend-lease program would put any consideration of our entitlement beyond the remotest question. Ninety-nine years is longer than most men's lives, says the committee, but in the life of a great nation it is negligible.

We don't want an acre of British earth beyond the small areas of it that our bases occupy. We are entitled to these for sheer self-preservation. If those bases had not been deemed by our Army and Navy—and Britain's, too—to be essential for our protection—and Britain's, too—they would not have been turned over to us. They will remain essential to our safety against attack from the east so long as men retain the animal characteristics that beget wishfulness and war.

They could give us no considerable advantage for an attack on England, which we have no reason for making. The protection they give us against attack in the Atlantic cannot give England pause in the teeth of its repeated expression of its desire to live at peace with us, indeed even in alliance with us. Intelligent Englishmen wishing good Anglo-American relations will let no outworn jingo prejudice against giving up a foot of soil withhold these coastal bases from the United States.

Some Americans won't feel this way. Some of these are already opposing sundry objections to taking up the matter at this time. We don't regard these as sound. We think the committee is right when it says that now is the time to take it up. And we believe that those of our people who regard the future security of this country as a paramount consideration will feel the same way when the subject is clarified by discussion.

We present some extracts from the committee's report that will indicate its position more fully: It first objects to proposals for alienating part of the great base on Trinidad for commercial purposes, and then goes on to say:

"This base is probably the most vital to our national welfare of all those acquired under the destroyer-exchange, and no portion of it should be allowed to remain outside our control. The time to correct this situation is now. * * *

"The subcommittee cannot too emphatically stress the importance of retaining and maintaining at this time all facilities at Trinidad now in possession of the United States. * * * It is our considered opinion that our naval activities at this base should never be allowed to lapse or become dormant. Under no circumstances should the advantages now enjoyed by the United States through acquisition of these facilities be relinquished. * * *

"In visiting many of the naval bases on British territory, your subcommittee was impressed with the great amount of money spent on them. When measured in terms of 99 years the investment will be tremendous. Already, the Navy alone has spent over $30,000,000. Although of questionable legality at the time the (destroyer) agreement was made, we thoroughly approve it as an initial step toward the defense of the Western Hemisphere, even though this benefit to us was incidental to a greater benefit which accrued to Great Britain through acquisition of those ships.

"Having acquired the right to build these bases on foreign territory, and having invested and being prepared to invest still further, we feel it would be a mistake for the United States ever to abandon them, even at the end of 99 years. * * * In the life of a nation 99 years is negligible.

"Rather than await this expiration date, and encounter the hazards of ill will and difficulties which may arise, we feel that steps should immediately be taken by our Government to have the bases changed to 'in perpetuity.'"

DISTANT BASES IN FUTURE

Australia's Prime Minister Curtin says, "No one has asked that Australian and New Zealand bases in the Pacific be under other than our jurisdiction after the war." That suits us.

Mr. Curtin then adds, "Nor are we asking that anyone else's bases be changed. We don't think, because we fought elsewhere in this war, that afterward the bases we used should come under our jurisdiction." That also seems quite all right—so far as Australia is concerned. But the United States is in a different position.

Uncle Sam has built and paid for many of the bases in distant countries which he or the Allies have used. This is not the case to any such extent with Australia. It strikes us that those Pacific-island bases that are most essential to our future defense should belong to the United States. We also think that this country should have future use, at least,

of the bases built and maintained by it in other countries, unless these other countries pay us the cost of them. That is mere equitable polity that should put no strain on real friendship.

Mr. Curtin says that discussion of all such details should be reserved until the peace conference. It seems to us, however, that the present is a better time to frame clear understandings on them—which is the position that the Hébert subcommittee has recommended to the House Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to the bases we have built on the British islands of our Atlantic coast.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, on March 21, 1944, at Chicago, Ill., for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

I appreciate your invitation to appear on the program tonight. It gives an opportunity to discuss the progress that has been made by the Rural Electrification Administration, some of its immediate problems, as well as the possibility for achieving your goal and ours—that of bringing central station electric power to every farm home in America. As a farmer, as an organizer, and as a former director of an R. E. A. cooperative, I cannot but have the conviction that those who serve as managers and directors of electric cooperatives have the background for the most constructive criticism, the most sincere interest in its future success, and the greatest loyalty to this outstanding program of cooperative endeavor between an agency of the Government and its citizens.

The directors and managers of the rural electric cooperatives represent the spirit upon which this Nation is founded, the spirit of the progressive pioneer. Without your unselfish leadership we could not have achieved the unprecedented record of R. E. A.-financed systems and R. E. A. in bringing the blessings of rural electrification to so many of this Nation's farmers.

Today I should like to discuss how far we have advanced toward our goal of making electricity available to all of the farms and rural homes of America at low-cost, nondiscriminatory rates. I should like to review for you the progress of R. E. A. and R. E. A.-financed systems during the year which has passed since the convention of the N. R. E. C. A. at St. Louis, Mo. Although this review is on the national program as a whole I am mindful that it reflects the result of the combined efforts of the many local public-spirited leaders throughout the Nation, and I know that each of you has helped in an outstanding way to make that record.

The Rural Electrification Administration has allotted funds to 873 borrowers, of which 853 are cooperatives, or public bodies, such as power districts. Approximately 99 percent of the funds which have been appropriated by the Congress under the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 have been allotted to this group of borrowers. The remaining funds represent loans to 20 borrowers classified as private utilities. Our most recent information shows that up to January 31, 1944, a total of $477,429,269 had been allotted R. E. A. borrowers to provide for upward of 425,000 miles of line and other electric facilities. These rural systems are to serve approximately 1,400,000 farms and rural homes.

These statistics reveal that thus far $379,592,354 have been advanced to R. E. A. borrowers who have used the funds to construct 391,551 miles of line and other electric facilities. These lines are now actually serving 1,096,167 farm families and other rural consumers. As of December 31, 1943, these systems had made their scheduled payments and in addition to this, had to their credit in prepayments to R. E. A. $15,229,507, as compared with delinquencies of only $215,576 which were more than 30 days overdue.

Most of the rural-line construction accounting for this progress resulted from activities prior to Pearl Harbor, before it became necessary to establish controls to direct the use of critical materials to the most essential war needs.

Thus, under the stimulus of the national program of rural electrification established by President Roosevelt in Executive Order No. 7037 on May 11, 1935, and given permanent status by the Congress through enactment of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the percent of farms receiving central station service has increased from 10.9 percent to 41.9 percent.

It is noteworthy that during the 53-year period from 1882 to 1935 the number of farms receiving electric service had reached only 10 percent of all the farms of the Nation. However, after the inauguration of the R. E. A. program in 1935, there took place an unprecedented increase in the number of farms electrified. In fact, within the short period of 8 years there was a total increase of 230 percent in the number of farms connected to rural high lines. Without a doubt, this increase is due in a large measure to your local programs of serving the greatest possible number of farms and rural homes.

To evaluate the progress we have made since last year, let us look at our fiscal data, that is, the factual information obtained from fiscal year operations. Comparing last fiscal year with the present fiscal year up to date, we find that nearly twice as much money has been allotted during the first two-thirds of fiscal 1944 as during the entire fiscal year of 1943. In the last fiscal year a total of $8,225,380 was allotted, while the current year's allotments already amount to $15,922,828. New and increased activities in connection with the food production program undertaken in cooperation with W. P. B., the Department of Agriculture, and the War Food Administration account for a total of $12,736,782 advanced to R. E. A. borrowers through this fiscal year so far, as compared with $14,536,572 advanced for the entire fiscal year 1943.

Estimate work orders submitted by you up to December 1943 resulted in W. P. B. approvals for construction of 19,343 miles of line to serve 73,765 farms. It may be of interest to you to learn that work orders are being submitted today at the average rate of more than 2,000 per week. Minor modifications in regulations will likely result in a further increase in the number of new farm connections.

Our present rate of activity indicates that when this fiscal year is completed, records will show an increase of approximately 400 percent over the activities of fiscal 1943.

As officers and managers faced constantly with problems of operating R. E. A.-financed systems, you know from experience that a construction program of the nature we are now carrying forward under wartime controls, requires much detail work. Not only is this true for R. E. A. cooperatives but it is also true in R. E. A. as well. When a local R. E. A. cooperative submits a wartime application for service, it must be studied from the standpoint of necessity and feasibility and whether provision for the necessary funds has been made in the cooperative's allotment construction budget. All applications also have to be checked in other respects to make sure that they are in shape to be submitted to the W. P. B. for final approval.

Wartime demands, coupled with the grave manpower problem, are adding tremendously to the burden of work and responsibility which has to be carried by R. E. A. cooperatives, as well as by R. E. A. We in R. E. A. know something of your problems in this respect and just so far as possible we are trying to assist you in meeting them. But we too have a manpower problem. It may surprise you to hear that for the present fiscal year we are operating with 20 percent fewer people as compared with a year ago. Today we have only 639 employees to meet the many demands of our 873 R. E. A. borrowers. Obviously it has become necessary to curtail or limit less pressing activities in the nature of service to the cooperatives and to reassign some of the people relieved of this work to temporarily more important duties. Likewise, additional economies and savings of time have been accomplished by simplification of R. E. A. procedures. These steps alone have enabled us to attain a man-hour saving equivalent to approximately 90 employees. Further assistance has been derived from a closer correlation of some phases of the R. E. A. work with that of the other bureaus and administrations of the Department of Agriculture.

You can see that we are attempting to operate R. E. A. with the greatest possible degree of efficiency. If I may be permitted to look at this problem of administration from the point of view of one formerly a member of your ranks, I should say that notwithstanding the efficiencies and improvements R. E. A. may be able to effect, there must be close and constant cooperation and understanding between R. E. A. and its borrowers if the farmers are to get electric services so urgently needed in their wartime food production effort.

Briefly, the program accomplished during the past year under which some 73,000 farms have been connected to R. E. A.-financed electric distribution lines, can be measured by an estimated total livestock production of approximately $257,000,000 and production of livestock products in the amount of $61,000,000 making a total of $318,000,000 based on U. S. D. A. figures of average production and prices. The value of the livestock on hand on these 73,000 farms amounted to over $143,000,000. It is further estimated that the extension of these lines authorized by W. P. B., represents an expenditure of $21,430,400 for labor and material. Compare this figure, if you will, with the resulting benefits to the food production of the Nation of more than $108,000,000—a ratio of better than 5 to 1 for livestock production alone.

This program of extending modern electric power to the farmer on the food front has accomplished unprecedented results. Without question, it has been a vital factor in making possible the food production record of the farmers for the past year, under the leadership of the Department and the War Food Administration.

Thus far I have not given consideration in these remarks to the future of rural electrification. Notwithstanding our splendid record, what all of us should keep in mind is that despite the shortage of personnel both

in R. E. A. and the cooperatives, we cannot afford to limit our attention to the lines now in operation. We have an immediate responsibility to extend service to every qualified farmer. So far as possible, we must see to it that electricity, when available, is put to the maximum use on the food-production front. And, in addition to these things, we have the further responsibility now of so conducting the R. E. A. program that at the earliest moment after the war, central station electric service at reasonable nondiscriminatory rates may be made available to the greatest possible number of the 7,000,000 farms and rural homes yet unserved.

As we look to the future, there are two distinct problems: One, the immediate—by this I mean that which will face us within the next few months; and, the other, which is concerned with what is commonly referred to as the post-war period. Both, however, are to some extent related. For the immediate future, it seems to me that three things are of paramount importance: (1) Construction of lines to every qualified farm; (2) completion of the unelectrified farm survey—as a basis for charting a post-war program; and (3) prudent management of the affairs of the cooperative.

Both you and we are constantly alert to the vast requirements of farm people which must be met in the period following the war. Perhaps this might be briefly summarized by quoting from a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, to one of the outstanding cooperative leaders in another part of the country. I quote: "Rural electrification has two very important aspects with respect to the future welfare of rural America. The electrified farm offers wide opportunities for a more efficient and more diversified agriculture. As your report indicates, you have not scratched the surface in your State, so far as utilization of electricity in agricultural production is concerned. That statement also holds true for the Nation. Of equal, if not greater, importance is the other aspect which involves better living on the farms. I personally know how electricity makes farm life more enjoyable; how it eliminates drudgery by making possible modern conveniences. I know this because I have experienced it as a farmer member of an R. E. A. cooperative in my home State. I know also that electricity offers great opportunities for better health through electric refrigeration and sanitation equipment. It is my sincere hope that rural electrification developments after the war may bring electricity to every farm and rural home in your State and America. Your committee is making the necessary plans now to attain that objective. As you know, the Rural Electrification Administration is quite anxious to do everything possible to assist your committee and the R. E. A.-financed cooperatives of your State in the development of plans for a post-war rural electrification program."

The objectives of a well-rounded program of post-war construction of additional rural distribution lines would achieve a two-fold purpose. First, through the early availability of central-station electric service to other millions of rural homes, it would provide the basis for a more profitable agriculture and richer rural living, so abundantly deserved and won by the sons and daughters of these same families now serving the Nation in this world-wide conflict.

Second, in a program of immediate large-scale construction there would be provided by direct construction activities and through the manufacture of materials and the new market for consumer goods, an opportunity for profitable private employment for thousands upon thousands of our returned soldiers.

The basis for such a program is now being laid through the studies and reports of State committees actively engaged in the planning of post-war programs for agriculture. These State committees generally include representatives of farm groups, including R. E. A. cooperatives, land-grant colleges, and experiment stations—the State extension service, and other State agencies and local and State civic bodies. Through the Department of Agriculture's interbureau committee on post-war programs we have been receiving copies of preliminary reports prepared by many of the State committees. Most of these reports contain a chapter outlining or indicating a post-war program of rural electrification for the respective States. A preliminary examination of the reports we have received so far has convinced me that our own ideas of what a post-war rural electrification program can and should be are right in line with the thinking of these State planning groups.

In this Nation where cooperatives have brought service to more than 1,000,000 rural families, there are yet unserved—according to recent census figures—7,151,188 farms and rural homes. In addition to the two and one-half million farms in America now receiving central station service, available data indicate that there are more than 5,000,000 farms and rural nonfarm residences and other establishments nearly all located within the potential reach of R. E. A.-financed systems.

The major problem that this Nation must solve in the post-war period is that of maintaining employment at a high level. Employment at a level sufficiently high to assure a national income that will provide a decent standard of living for all. If we are to be successful in meeting this problem, private enterprise not inconsistent with the public interest must be facilitated. The Government has a major responsibility in such an effort. We must avoid so far as possible any failure to meet this challenge if we are to escape the more costly remedy of direct Government employment of excessive proportions which a distressed people may demand. As the Baruch report points out on war and post-war adjustment policies:

"Transition from a war economy to that of peace is not easy; nothing worth while is," and "As one indication of the size of the job, about $50,000,000,000 of the current annual production represents strictly war goods—that is, things which, when peace comes, we will stop making. This gap must be filled in large part by civilian production and services, if we are to keep the needed volume of employment."

It is obviously of paramount importance that planned programs be developed which can make a practical contribution to the solution of this problem.

In weighing the desirability of different approaches to the problem, the R. E. A. program should unquestionably receive first consideration. Such a program promotes both the social and economic well-being of people throughout a vast area of this country. This program requires a modest amount of Government assistance on a completely self-liquidating basis, promotes private initiative and enterprise among the people whom it serves, and at the same time opens a vast and continuing market for the products of private industry.

It is estimated that directly and indirectly such a program to reach 5,000,000 members would result in providing a market for goods and services of about $3,500,000,000. Of this total amount $1,600,000,000 would be represented by the estimated physical value of the lines and services constructed to reach and serve these potential consumers of electricity. The value of the wiring and plumbing and of the electrical farm-production equipment and other appliances which these consumers would purchase, on the basis of our past experience in the R. E. A. program, amounts to approximately $1,924,000,000.

Such a program is estimated to create directly 727,000,000 man-hours of work which will be required in the process of constructing the lines, wiring farm buildings, and installing plumbing and other equipment. In addition to this direct labor, it is estimated that at least one and one-half billions of man-hours of work will go into the production of materials and supplies and the manufacture of electrical farm-production equipment and other appliances which these consumers would purchase. In other words, such a program would in itself provide a minimum of two and one-fourth billion man-hours of work, thus opening job opportunities in private industry for thousands of returned soldiers and for industrial workers now in war jobs.

These estimates take into consideration the highly efficient and economical methods of constructing rural distribution lines which R. E. A. and R. E. A.-financed systems have developed together during a period of years. Also, the further economies inherent in the principle of area coverage with its accompanying resultant lower construction costs, which makes it possible to bring electric service to substantially every farm within an area. This principle has been recognized by leaders in rural electrification as fundamental if the greatest possible number of farmers are to have electric service.

The members of the electric cooperatives of this country have conclusively demonstrated that through an intelligent program of cooperation on the part of the Government they can provide for themselves, without expense to others, modern power facilities. The old method—the method which was in existence prior to the time of R. E. A., the method which in 50 years was incapable of providing service for much over 10 percent of America's best-located farms—is utterly inadequate to meet this challenge of tomorrow, inadequate unless it is to be heavily subsidized either by presently served consumers or by the Government itself.

There is another matter of which I wish to speak today, and that is the relationship between the Rural Electrification Administration and its borrowers and other public agencies. R. E. A. is primarily interested in making its contribution to farmers and rural people by carrying out the mandate of Congress to bring electric service to the farms of America through self-liquidating loans.

As a public lending agency, we desire to render those necessary services that will insure the successful economical operation of those lines on which we have loaned money. We believe that since we are working together toward a common objective, we should be responsive to the will and judgment of the local people. I want to make this very clear: It is not the desire of the R. E. A. to run the business of its borrowers. I like to think of R. E. A. as a clearinghouse of ideas and practices, through which the collective experience and the best thinking of all of us—the cooperatives as well as R. E. A. itself—are made available to each individual cooperative or power district. That, of course, requres an exchange of information both ways if it is to be of the greatest practical value to you. Of course, we all recognize that in order to safeguard the Government funds R. E. A. must comply with standard Government regulations and procedures.

R. E. A. looks to the local boards of directors and the local managers for meeting day-to-day management problems effectively. You know what the problems are; you are constantly gaining experience; and so long as membership interest is sustained within the cooperative, so long as public-spirited men and women give their services on boards of directors, I am sure that if we in R. E. A. do our part this program of rural electrification will measure up to our fondest hopes. The record which I have already cited proves that you are doing a good job.

Working together, I am sure that we can achieve the primary objectives of the Rural Electrification Act, which are that ultimately the farm homes of America may be brought from darkness to light, and that the burden of toil upon the shoulders of the American farmer may be lightened by mechanical equipment driven by the smooth, dependable flow of electric power.

Extension of Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Secretary of War before the House Banking and Currency Committee, May 2, 1944:

Your chairman has invited me to come before your committee in order to discuss from the standpoint of our military effort, the question of the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act. I am glad to do so though I have already expressed my views at some length before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. So far as I am aware, nothing has developed in the month which has intervened since my appearance before that committee to cause me to change my opinion as to the importance of continuing present price control legislation without any material amendments.

From the standpoint of the military effort, it seems to me to be essential that we should avoid doing anything at this time which will either create false hopes about the early termination of the war or which will in any way tend to disturb the morale of the soldier in the field or of his family at home. This is particularly vital just now when we are approaching the crisis of the war effort.

From the same standpoint, it is also important that no action should be taken which would tend to check essential war production, whether through a disturbance of morale of the civilian worker or through a dislocation of the national price structure.

It is obvious to all of us that, unlike the last war period, we have thus far succeeded in avoiding a dangerous rise in prices. Undoubtedly this has been due to a variety of reasons: The patriotic restraint of the American people, taxes, some wage control, price ceilings, and rationing. Whatever you may think about the relative importance of these different factors—and I personally would have favored a much greater reliance on a broader tax basis and a firmer wage control—we have in fact adopted and for 2 years have lived under a system of supplementary controls such as price ceilings and rationing. Having chosen greater emphasis on regulatory governmental control without resorting to substantially heavier taxes, I suggest that it would be highly unwise, at this state at least, to remove or materially to modify those controls and thus to run the risk of a price rise that might well be the beginning of the spiral of inflation. Certainly this would be unwise unless higher taxes were first imposed to sop up much more of the present spending power of the people.

It seems to me apparent that with the huge backlog of cash and other savings which are now in the hands of our people and which are estimated to be running at the rate of $38,000,000,000 a year after taxes, a substantial removal of restraints just now might be misinterpreted by many of our people as a deliberate and intentional opening of the floodgates. It might well be regarded as an invitation by Congress to start a spending spree. I am inclined to think that to most of us such action would be taken as a green-light signal which no subsequent tax legislation would be able to reverse in time to avoid disaster.

If that is true, and I think it is, and if our great buying capacity should rapaciously attack our limited supply of civilian goods, then all that we have gained during the past 2 years through the voluntary restraint of the people and from their general compliance with Government regulations may be lost in a price rise which will cause distress and consternation to all our people, especially to those who are obliged to live on fixed incomes.

True, there has been some criticism of the management of the very intricate and difficult problem of price fixing and rationing. I do not pretend to pass on the merits of these criticisms; nor am I in a position to suggest what modifications in the law, if any, might be necessary to insure a more effective or less bothersome administration. So also black markets and other inequities and abuses have developed. To some extent at least these may be unavoidable incidents to such a vast machinery of control. In fact we know they have developed in other countries which have adopted systems of rationing and price control. No one can condone such abuses. If they can be eliminated or minimized, or if troublesome and unnecessary nuisances can be avoided without weakening the control, everyone but the racketeer and the profiteer will applaud. But that will all take time and patience and money to accomplish, and it is my very earnest belief that we should not at this time either scrap or substantially modify the whole machinery of control merely because in some respects it may not yet be perfect in its application or in its administration. In this connection it is encouraging to read Mr. Bowles' testimony before this committee about the determined efforts that are being made, without any amendment to the law, to simplify the regulations and to improve the administrative machinery of the Office of Price Administration.

We now have some seven and one-half million men and women in our Army and most of them have families or dependents at home. The welfare and morale of those at home are vital forces in the morale of the men in the field and have a direct bearing on their military efficiency. I think it would be impossible to measure the effect on the soldier of a sudden or drastic relaxation of the restraints which have been imposed to protect the national economy for his family as well as for himself on his return from military service. Demoralizing confusion might well result from any general price rise or more particularly from a maladjustment of prices which might follow if our controls are substantially loosened at this time.

We all take pride in the fact that ours are the best-paid soldiers in the world and that their dependents receive the most liberal benefits. The amount of the dollar payments to service men and women and their families is not, however, the fair test of the provision which is being made for them. What counts is the purchasing power of those dollars to provide living expenses for those dependent on them. The cost of living will determine whether the actual support received, measures up to the provision intended.

The Office of Dependency Benefits of the War Department sends out over 5,000,000 checks each month aggregating almost $300,000,000 to the families of those serving in the Army. As these payments represent fixed income, the plight of the families in a period of rapidly rising prices is too easily visualized to require any elaboration.

There is also the closely related question of the savings of the men in the Army and what would happen to them during a period of rapidly rising prices. Probably most important in this respect is National Service Life Insurance. By the end of 1943, Army insurance alone had reached a total of almost $74,000,000,000, represented by some 10,000,000 policies. As you know, in the event of a fatality, the insurance is paid to dependents in monthly installments. Certainly the widows and other beneficiaries of those who give their lives to their country are entitled to consideration and, since they are provided with fixed incomes, reasonable stability of prices will determine largely whether they receive the contribution toward their living expenses that was intended.

We also take considerable pride in the War bond purchases of the men and women in the Army and in the War Department. These are running about $60,000,000 a month through payroll deductions alone.

In addition, large savings for assistance to themselves in the post-war period are being accumulated by the soldiers. Those who are overseas send home each month some $20,000,000 in addition to the regular allotments deducted from their pay. I think that everything possible should be done to safeguard the value of these savings.

In addition to the effect on its personnel, the War Department as a buyer of military supplies has the greatest interest in the continuance of price controls. The American people are determined that our fighting men shall have the most modern and effective equipment that can be devised. There is equal determination to devote all necessary proportions of the Nation's resources to the successful prosecution of the war. The result has been the most gigantic production program ever undertaken by any nation. While military requirements will largely determine the magnitude of our expenditures, some control over the cost of the war can be exercised by keeping within bounds the prices paid for supplies and equipment, without sacrificing the quality or the quantity of our armaments.

Thus the War Department itself has a vital stake in the maintenance of stable prices. If prices are rising rapidly, it becomes exceedingly difficult to translate the Army supply program into dollar requirements some months ahead. The normal difficulties of planning a war program far in advance would be greatly multiplied by fluctuating prices and would result in estimates becoming little more than informed guesses.

Let us assume, for instance, that War Department expenditures for the fiscal year 1945 will continue at approximately the same rate as in the current fiscal year, indicated at about $41,000,000,000 exclusive of Army pay and allowances. A moderate increase of 10 percent in cost would involve an additional $4,000,000,000, and an increase of 25 percent would raise anticipated expenditures more than $10,000,000,000. Any such increase in cost would necessitate going to the Congress for additional funds with a consequent disruption of your revenue and borrowing programs and would substantially increase the ultimate tax burden.

Consider also the effect of rising prices on the munitions industry. The War Department has reduced unit prices to a low level by the application of close-pricing policies and by the renegotiation of contracts. These reductions have been possible only because industry could schedule production contracts over a relatively long term. This confidence and ability to plan ahead would be dispelled by rising prices, and long-term commitments would become difficult. Higher costs would result from the short-term contracts under which industry would be forced to operate.

Furthermore, consider the administrative difficulties of the War Department if the innumerable long-term contracts now outstanding should have to be redetermined and adjusted upward continually because of rising prices. Such a burden could not readily be met in the face of rising manpower difficulties today, and close control over expenditures would be lost.

The experience of the last 3 years should be reviewed as a contrast to chaotic conditions which would be produced by rapidly rising prices. A fairly constant price level has enabled the War Department to negotiate expeditiously purchases involving the expenditure of over $14,000,000,000 for munitions in the fiscal year of 1942, $40,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1943, and for the current fiscal year probably over $41,000,000,000, including lend-lease and working funds. Because of relatively stable prices these dollars are actually purchasing more airplanes, tanks, guns, and ammunition than were originally anticipated.

By contrast you may recall our experience during the World War, when prices were rising steadily and rapidly and the expenditures of the War Department necessarily increased in proportion. The Office of Price Administration estimates that the total cost of the war through 1943 would have been increased over $65,000,000,000, or almost 50 percent, if prices in general had followed the pattern of the World War. Mr. Bowles has given some striking illustrations of skyrocketing prices between 1914 and 1919. It is most fortunate for all of us that there is a different story to be told thus far about this war.

How much of the present story is due to price controls and how much to other factors may be a debatable question. But one thing seems clear: Those controls—whether we like them or not, whether or not we favored them at the time they were authorized as a means of obtaining stability—have now become a very substantial brake on the forces of inflation. To release that brake just now after a year of virtual stability, both in commodity prices and in the cost of living, would seem to me to risk all that we had feared and sought to avoid.

So, in the interest of the soldier and his dependents, to do what we reasonably can now in an effort to protect their standard of living, to protect the value of their insurance and of their savings, to maintain essential war production with the least confusion to the workers and the maximum of savings to the Government, I very sincerely hope that you will see fit to continue price-control legislation without material modification. And I hope that you will continue it not only for the period of the war but also for such time after the war as may be necessary to facilitate the conversion of industry from war work to a full-fledged peacetime economy of production and employment. I can well remember that 25 years ago it was the period after the war was over during which the country suffered most from the inflation of prices. And it will be that post-war period with which the returning soldier will be most concerned.

Message From the Indiana State Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of a message I have just received from the Indiana State Federation of Labor. The text of the message follows:

INDIANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR
(AFFILIATED WITH A. F. OF L.),
701 Peoples Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.:

The following is an excerpt from page 1 of our list for the Eleventh Congressional District:

"LOUIS LUDLOW, 843 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis. Present Congressman. No better friend of labor ever represented Indiana in the Congress of the United States."

(Signed) INDIANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Dilemma in Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the Republican Food Study Committee gave notice to the county that the demands for corn and corn products were such that there was almost sure to be a serious food shortage of corn. No firm and constructive policy has been adopted by the Government, with the result that today there is a serious corn shortage in the country. Confiscation of elevators has not been sufficient. Will the Government confiscate the private corn supplies of the farmers of the Nation? This is a question that the farmers are wondering about.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for printing an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1944:

DILEMMA IN CORN

Eastern agricultural authorities warned more than a year ago that the policy of encouraging ever-increasing livestock production was a luxury which this country could not afford at a time when it was feeding its civilian population and armed forces and also carrying out huge lend-lease commitments abroad.

How well that warning was justified is to be seen in the Government's efforts of the last fortnight to break the "squeeze" in corn—a squeeze which has already seriously affected the east and west coast dairy interests and which now threatens a suspension of operations by the corn-refining industry. The Government's first step toward relieving this situation came 2 weeks ago when it ordered 35 percent of the corn in country and terminal elevators earmarked for sale to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The figure was stepped up to 60 percent a few days later and to 100 percent on April 24.

It is not surprising to find that none of these moves has had any appreciable result, since none of them goes to the heart of the problem. The corn is not in the elevators, but on the farms, and it is on the farms because the corn farmer, who is usually also a hog farmer, can use it more profitably as feed. The present dilemma in corn arises from the fact that the corn-hog ratio, which under a free-price system serves to keep corn and hog prices in equilibrium, has been short-circuited.

How can the equilibrium best be restored? From a purely economic standpoint the answer to this is simple. While both corn and hog prices are out of line compared with normal standards, hog prices are the further out of line; hence, it would seem that they should be lowered to the point where the incentive would be increased to reduce the hog population and stimulate the release of corn stocks. Unfortunately, it is not as easy as that. Hogs are selling where they are today not because of high price ceilings but because of support floors placed under them when, back in 1940, it was felt necessary to provide such guaranties to insure increased production. Economically desirable though it might be, these guaranties cannot be withdrawn short of a clear-cut breach of faith with the farmers.

Various suggestions have been put forward for meeting the problem without reference to the price ratio, but all are unsatisfactory in varying degrees. To requisition the corn on the farms, as some have urged, would not only be to open another "bridgehead" like that of Montgomery Ward, in Chicago, but it would leave unsolved the question of distributing the corn so released. Continuing to dump wheat into the feed market would be repugnant, to say the least, at a time when there already is talk of rationing bread. Every suggestion that has been offered has its weaknesses, and this applies to the idea of raising the ceiling price on corn as it does to the others. Nevertheless, undesirable as this may be, standing alone, it is probably less undesirable, when everything is considered, than the alternative proposals. It could not be very inflationary, since most of the end products into which corn goes are already ceilinged; while it is the one way in which the corn-hog ratio can be set to work to perform its normal function.

Modern Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 1, 1944:

MODERN YOUTH

(By Roger W. Babson)

BETTER JUDGMENT THAN PARENTS

During the past few weeks which I spent in Florida, I've seen many soldiers. Babson Park is near the great Avon Park Army Air Field, which contains the largest practice bombing field in the world. This has given me an opportunity to meet not only men in training but men who have returned from all parts of the world. They certainly are a marvelous group. It is almost beyond human understanding what these boys, 20 to 25 years of age, are accomplishing. They truly possess a character, intelligence, and training far in excess of what boys of that age had when I was in college 40 years ago.

However, I wish to write on the business judgment—rather than on the fighting ability—of these young men. The tendency of us oldsters is to judge industry and investments through our own eyes and based upon our own experience. If young people don't agree with us, we naturally assume that we are right and the young people are wrong. I have felt this way for many years; but I am gradually changing my ideas. Without doubt we are entering a new era. Such new eras come only once in about 200 years. It is difficult for us older people to adjust our-

selves to these new conditions and to judge things correctly by the new standards.

I often attend conferences where these questions are discussed: "The future of railroads versus aviation"; "Will utilities become municipally owned?"; "Will the Government go more into business in order to provide employment?" At these meetings we older people think we are to determine what is to happen to our investments. We make a great mistake in figuring on any such false assumption. The answers will be determined by the young people in our families and employment. Even the future of the New Deal lies with these boys and girls.

Do not be shocked by this, but the opinion of most persons in the twenties as to the future of any industry or political policy is more valuable than the opinion of most persons over 50 years of age. The reason is that the future of the industry or policy depends upon what these young persons are going to buy, or do, or vote—not according to what we older ones buy, do, or vote. I had rather have the opinion of an intelligent 25-year-old returning serviceman on the future of most American industries than that of a conservative investment counselor who is judging the future by the past.

Recently I was with a group of officers including graduates from Harvard Business School, Wharton School of Finance, Northwestern University, and Babson Institute. We discussed what would happen, after the war, to our Government bonds in case the debt reaches $300,000,000,000. These are the boys who will decide the question of whether or not the debt is to be refunded and, if so, how. It will not be decided by present Treasury officials, nor by present officers of banks or insurance companies. I will repeat the suggestions of three of these boys:

Suggestion No 1:

"I believe that the government debt of all nations should be reorganized as would be the debt of a railroad which has become too unwieldy. The holder of a $1,000 Government bond could be given $250 in a new 2½-percent 30-year coupon bond; $500 in a registered income bond, the interest on which could be payable at various rates according to the receipts from a new sales tax levied for this purpose; and $250 in non-interest-bearing scrip which could be used for the payment of certain taxes. This would immediately cut the fixed interest payment down 75 percent and yet every bondholder should eventually get his principal back with interest depending upon the prosperity of the country."

Suggestion No. 2:

"Let other countries readjust their debts in the above manner, but I shall never vote to have the United States do anything which could be called repudiation in the slightest degree. I believe a debt of $300,000,000,000 can be supported and should be supported so that every one will get his full interest and some day his principal. All we need do is to revalue the dollar by printing more currency and thus cause an increase in national incomes proportionate to the increase in our national debt. Instead of cutting down the war debt, let us inflate prices, wages, land values, etc. Then it will be just as easy to pay interest on $300,000,000,000 as it was to pay interest on 25 percent of this amount a few years ago."

Suggestion No. 3:

"I have a better idea than either of you other men," said the third soldier, "I oppose either a reorganization of the debt or inflation. Both ideas are wrong. I recommend refunding the entire debt of $300,000,000,000, for 100 years—with a one-half of 1 percent coupon. Then I should allow these bonds to be used at par for the payment of taxes and I should support them with a Federal sales tax, the income from which could be used to call bonds by lot at a premium of 10 percent. A small sales tax will easily give the Government $3,300,000,000 a year which would repay the entire debt within 100 years. It is true that these bonds might at times sell at less than par, but the fact that $3,000,000,000 would be called each year by lot at 100 should hold prices pretty close to par. This means that taxes could be greatly reduced, inflation avoided, and everyone could receive par for his bonds plus as much interest as the big banks of New York are now paying depositors."

Do not quote me as making any of these recommendations, I merely give these illustrations to show how modern youth is thinking and to urge readers to give more attention to the "crazy" ideas of our young people. They are the ones that will determine what will happen to the national debt and to every stock and bond. I do not say that youths have better judgment than their parents, nor that they are less likely to change their minds. All I say is that our returning servicemen should be better able to forecast the future.

Many people worry as to what extent the Russian shadow is to fall upon this country, especially during the next depression. They see Russia becoming such a world power that they fear she will Russianize Europe and England and the effects of this will ultimately be felt in America. This certainly seems reasonable, but a 22-year-old flier, returned from delivering airplanes to Russia, said to me, "Don't worry about Russia. She will have her own post-war troubles. Sixteen Russian generals are already planning to get Stalin's berth."

The Political Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, to the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, in Columbus, on April 21, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always an honor for national officeholders to visit your great State, which has already given America seven Republican Presidents and so many fine Republican Governors. Today, under the efficient administration and fearless leadership of one of the best Governors you have ever had, wartime Ohio is setting an example for wartime production which is the envy of many another State, the more so since Ohio is sure to pace, if not lead, the victorious Republican States in November.

Having shown what he can do in his own State, your Governor is now engaged in a patriotic campaign to lay before the whole American people the issues upon which the next election will be decided. Much of the credit for a Republican victory in 1944 must be given to Governor Bricker, not only for demonstrating to the people, by his own high record in office, what Republican government has always stood for but for his vigorous analysis of fundamental American principles now.

Ohio is also fortunate in its outstanding representation in Washington. Senior Senator TAFT and the junior Senator BURTON are as famed on the Hill as they are at home as 2 of our most brilliant and respected Members in Congress. In the House you have 20 able and hard-working Republican Members out of a total State delegation of 23. Ohio seems to have found the correct congressional ratio of Republicans to Democrats.

I know none of the men Representatives will mind my speaking specifically of Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON. They know, as well as I, that she long ago convinced skeptics that a member of her sex in high office can serve with wisdom, wit, and vision equal to that of any man. But I am especially grateful to her for the record she has made in Congress, for that record made it much easier for my own State of Connecticut to send me there.

But above all I am proud to be here as a woman, talking to so many able and active women Republicans. The women of America will largely decide whether the next President is to be a Democrat or a Republican. It is estimated that 6 out of every 10 votes cast in November will be cast by women. Millions of America's sons and husbands and sweethearts will be away fighting. Many, perforce, must leave the election decision up to their women. And these women see quite clearly at last—clearly even through their tears—that their decisions will affect their homes and lives, and their children's lives for a generation. For this reason alone thousands upon thousands of women who have never voted before, or who have heretofore voted Democratic, motivated by the deepest concern for their loved ones overseas and loyalty to their country's best interests, will cast their precious ballots this year for our party's candidate.

But even apart from their direct effect at the ballot box, the indirect influence of women has always been great in politics, simply because the influence of women has always been great on men. This is, I am sure, no secret to any married gentlemen here.

I sometimes like to think that the reason Solomon was the wisest man in the world was because he had so many wives to advise him. If, in November, many a man shows the wisdom of Solomon by voting Republican—cherchez la femme. For it's the soldiers' mom and sis, his wife or his girl back home who will be most ardently urging the men folks here to vote Republican.

Now expert speechifiers say that the recipe for a successful speech is to present one thought, and three facts to substantiate it. Instead, I am going to present to you one fact—and that one fact is about a woman. And from that fact I am going to suggest three thoughts, which I believe to be worthy of most careful consideration by every person in this Nation—but above all by American wives and mothers—particularly young wives and mothers with growing children.

This fact concerns the woman who has both indirectly and directly wielded more political power and influence, behind the scenes and on the forefront of the political stage, than any other woman in our day.

She is, as you have guessed, Eleanor Roosevelt. Of course her power derives primarily from her position as First Lady and her access to the President's mind. But it would be mean-spirited and wholly false to deny that her power has always been courageously and richly implemented by her own extraordinary physical and emotional energies. Whether one agrees with Mrs. Roosevelt's processes of intellection—and often I do not—the fact remains that she is a woman of

great good will and a lively affection for the masses of the people. However, do not misunderstand me. Much as I admire her as a woman, as a Republican, I do not consider her "the indispensable lady."

But here is the fact which I wish to lay before you this evening: On February 22, in a press conference in Washington, D. C., Mrs. Roosevelt plunked frankly and unequivocally for peacetime universal compulsory military service.

I quote from that interview: "On possible military training for 17-year-olds, which soon may be the subject of hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee, Mrs. Roosevelt thinks there should be a post-war 1-year service program for both boys and girls, after finishing high school, or at the age when they would be high school graduates; for duration training, if 17-year olds are added to the compulsory list as material for replacements, after the end of hostilities, she thinks they should be given the works, like their older brothers. A possible post-war year's military training on the contrary, would be educational and would include some kind of community service to give boys and girls a background of community responsibility." Several times since that interview Mrs. Roosevelt has taken the occasion in other interviews and in print in her own words, to repeat her call for compulsory military post-war training, plus Government directed and supervised education in citizenship for every boy and girl in the land.

Now that is my fact. You ask right away, "But hasn't legislation for universal compulsory military training already been introduced into the Congress." The answer is, "Yes." The Democratic May bill and the Republican Wadsworth bill for compulsory national military training had been introduced long before Mrs. Roosevelt endorsed the idea. And both these bills have been referred to my committee for action. Then what is so significant about my fact?

Perhaps what is significant about this fact is (a) that the President's wife endorsed it; and (b) that she endorsed it 9 weeks after her husband returned from the famous Tehran and Cairo conferences.

At those conferences, we are told the shape of the peace to come was discussed by Mr. Churchill, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Marshal Stalin, and Mr. Roosevelt.

Churchill once spoke of Stalin as "an enigma wrapped in a mystery." Since Tehran, many Americans have come to feel that insofar as the President has revealed his "specific" beliefs concerning the future that America will face after victory, he has become an enigma, wrapped in a mystery, and sealed with a riddle.

But here, in Mrs. Roosevelt's post-Tehran call to arms after the war is won, perhaps we have been unwittingly given a key to the puzzle, a tremendous and significant clue to what the New Dealers think is in store for post-war America.

I believe it is a tremendous clue, not only because Mrs. Roosevelt often reflects, as any wife must, her husband's own attitude on vital questions, but because on the record, for the past 12 years, Mrs. Roosevelt has so often in her interviews and in her column, telegraphed her husband's legislative punches.

There are three possible explanations for why the President's wife, who is certainly America's No. 2 New Dealer, might wish to create public opinion in favor of compulsory military training year in and year out in the post-war era for every American boy and girl.

The first explanation is that Mr. Roosevelt, after the Teheran conferences, concluded that we are not headed for 50 years or even 20 years of peace, but another war in the foreseeable future. After his discussions at Tehran he may have reviewed America's international post-war future and found it not so bright as some New Dealers would, for the purposes of the next election, like us to believe. At Teheran the President may have come to the conclusion that even when the Nazis and Japs are beaten to the ground, even when an international police force is formed, even when some organization for international peace is gotten together, our country is still going to need an army of mammoth proportions that can be whipped together in the twinkling of an eye, and a public, conditioned by training in citizenship, to whip in after it. And if this is what Mr. Roosevelt, after Teheran, thinks, and if he is right, our international future is black indeed and national post-war military service will be a necessity. It was because, in times past, the Swiss, the French, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Danes, and Belgians, although democracies, knew themselves to be surrounded by enemies, that they also had compulsory military training. Aggressive neighbors are, or always should be, good and sufficient reasons for arming. And wise statesmen, when their countries are faced with the threat of future invasion, never hesitate to call for peacetime compulsory military training.

To be sure, statesmen are not always wise, and do not always foresee the dangers which threaten them or take the necessary precautions to mitigate those dangers.

At this point I would like to read a few quotes from Mr. Roosevelt's pre-Pearl Harbor speeches on the subject of our armies and navies, just to show you what he has thought in the last post-war period about American defense preparations.

In his annual message to Congress on January 4, 1935, the President said, "There is no ground for apprehension that our relations with any nation will be otherwise than peace."

And on December 9, 1935, he wrote a letter to Norman Davis, which was read at the naval conference in which he said, "We three Nations—Great Britain, Japan, the United States—have nothing to fear from one another."

In a letter to the D. A. R. on April 20, 1936, he wrote, "We are maintaining a system that will meet our defensive needs. We have no plan for any other kind of system."

In Dallas, Tex., June 12, 1936, he said, "Things are not going so well on the European Continent and on the Asiatic Continent as they are going in the American Hemisphere. That has been the reason why I have tried to keep the feet of this country on the ground, hoping that by our example * * * we might have some effect on the rest of the world that is thinking too much of armaments and war."

And on October 11, 1936, he said, "One reason that we have such a very fine, though a very small Army is that our Army is training for peace."

Today, it is plain as the mustache on Hitler's face, or the hideous grin on Tojo's, that our President grievously misjudged the whole World War No. 1 post-war international situation, and failed entirely to see what America's military relation ought to be to the rising military menaces of fascism in Europe and Japanese imperialism in the Orient.

Actually no President in all our history, after being in power so long, has ever misjudged a world situation more seriously. In view of that fact simple minds like mine are bewildered when his adherents have the intellectual effrontery to present him to our people as the great international statesman who foresaw every disaster we have since faced and took every means to prevent it. But it is not my purpose to examine Mr. Roosevelt's vulnerable record of appeasement, isolationism, and unpreparedness, which lasted until some time after Munich. I am willing to concede for the moment that he has now learned his international lessons. Or rather that millions of our lads on the battle fronts are learning them. Soldiers often die in wars so that politicians may acquire the art of statesmanship. I am suggesting, indeed, that Mr. Roosevelt, confronted with this bloody lesson in New Deal unpreparedness and inept New Deal diplomacy called our World War No. 2, is at long last better capable of judging our future international situation. I have merely recited his pre-1939 attitude to show that at no time before then, when Germany and Japan were waxing in might, did Mr. Roosevelt feel that large armaments, not to say universal compulsory military training, were necessary in order to defend our country. But in view of Mrs. Roosevelt's current endorsement of it, I must assume that he feels differently about our future. This is very strange, indeed, since the might of Germany and Japan is now not waxing, but waning.

But let us assume that Mr. Roosevelt does feel we will still be surrounded by potential enemies and aggressors even after the Axis is beaten. And if this is the explanation of why Mrs. Roosevelt, No. 2 New Dealer and advance legislative agent for Mr. Roosevelt, has come out for compulsory military training in the post-war era is correct, I believe the American people have every right to demand to be told who our potential enemies are when the Germans and Japs are licked. What are their names? How will they get together against us? And why will the international police force, the international organizations, and perhaps leagues, the four power agreement, which we are all hoping will guarantee world security, fail to do so? The American people deserve to be told what there is so dark and menacing in the international post-war picture which makes the President's wife, who knows so well what the President thinks, demand that henceforth young Americans must all go in for a yearly stint of soldiering?

I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not against compulsory military training if it is needed to defend America. It would be utter folly for a Republican, a woman, or a patriot to agitate against compulsory post-war training, if it is necessary to the defense of our Western Hemisphere against our future enemies. We can never prevent wars simply by curtailing our own defense system. Blind and unprepared pacifism in a world of potential enemies is the utter betrayal of one's country. Simply legislating at home against armaments and military training never prevented a foreign aggressor from arming. Mr. Roosevelt thought so in his own isolationist days, when he praised his fine small army. He has since found out this is not true—to many a bereaved American mother's sorrow. At all times, we women must urge the adequate defense and armament of our own country, even while we urge world-wide disarmament and all economic and international measures which will foster contentment and prosperity—the true breeders of the non-military spirit in other nations.

The point is that today, in the utter absence of any information from the White House about the true state of international affairs and future international prospects, no American is able to judge for himself whether the chances are really for a viable peace, or whether we shall have to stay drilled to the marrow of our bones and armed to the teeth for years, even after our present enemies are beaten.

For my part, I am frank to say that if we should have Mr. Roosevelt in the White House for 4 more years, I am inclined to be for compulsory military training, simply because I believe, on the record, that the administration has shown itself unable to keep us out of war or to prevent the rise and rebirth of aggressor nations. It would be folly, if we are to be doomed to 4 more years of New Deal foreign policy not to prepare our growing boys for the next European or

Asiatic holocaust. So who knows? Perhaps the best insurance the Nation could take out on 16 years of New Deal statesmanship would be compulsory national service for everybody of fighting age.

But I said there were three possible explanations why Mrs. Roosevelt came out for compulsory military training after the war is won. I have given you the first and most plausible one: that she feels we will need young men and women trained for war to fight our future enemies, after we have licked our present ones. There are, however, two other explanations.

The second explanation is that the New Dealers may simply feel that discipline, plain, old-fashioned brute discipline of an undisguised military and governmental nature, is good for Americans. The New Dealers may feel that we are a lazy, happy-go-lucky, undisciplined bunch of individualists, who need to be taught henceforth how to snap to at drill time and form squads right at the flicker of a top sergeant's eyelash. They may believe in discipline for discipline's sake. This Prussian approach has certainly become natural to those New Deal junkers, the bureaucrats. But I am loath to believe it would be wholly agreeable to either the President or Mrs. Roosevelt, who, I honestly believe, are too American to believe in regimentation simply for regimentation's sake.

There is a third and better explanation: The New Deal could be for compulsory post-war military training for boys and girls for purely domestic, economic reasons. We all know that if sound financial and legislative steps are not taken in the near future we will be faced with another terrible depression and a disastrous unbalance of our domestic post-war economy. This depression would be deeply aggravated by thousands upon thousands of returning war veterans for whom jobs could not immediately be found and for whom, I fear, jobs will certainly never be found if the New Dealers remain in the saddle.

Now the New Dealers may today be figuring that a nice new way which they have never tried—or dared to try before—to make plenty of jobs, or at least plenty more jobs for returning veterans, would be to start drafting high-school graduates right out of civilian life, to put them into uniforms, so that they would not compete in civilian enterprises with returned veterans. Moreover, large, permanent military establishments might prevent the folding up of Government-owned armament factories, aircraft, and munitions plants, so foresighted New Dealers may view national peacetime service as an excellent flesh and blood P. W. A., easy to sell on patriotic motives to the public. Certainly make-work, leaf-raking, or W. P. A.-ism will not be countenanced again by the American public as a solution for unemployment. But a large army, and compulsory military training possible of passage in the post-war glow of war hysteria—training in which the young boys, in peace, would be "given the works" like their older brothers, as Mrs. Roosevelt's interview had it—might well be, in the New Deal view, a more popular solution.

The unhappy thing about such a solution for a suffering post-war economy is that it has so often been tried before in European countries and found wanting. Indeed, after World War No. 1, the Nazis, and the Italians under Mussolini, began to solve their own domestic depressions in this very way. German and Italian fascism got going and received their popular support by exactly this method of compulsory military training for the young. It may be added that Mrs. Roosevelt's "own idea," as she called it in her interview, of "training at the same time in citizenship" under governmental supervision, was exactly the fillip given to such Fascist programs by Hitler and Mussolini. They called them youth movements and the "strength through joy" programs.

Moreover, militaristic solutions for domestice economic difficulties contain one terrible and bloody joker. It has often been said that the one thing you can't do with bayonets is to sit on them. Certainly history is replete with tragic examples of governments which built armies and navies larger than they needed in peace because of domestic political expediency, only to find in the end that they had to go places and do things with them of a strongly aggressive nature. No, I do not think that compulsory military training as a solution for unemployment is a happy one. And it might have, as Mr. Roosevelt said, way back in '36, a very poor "effect on the rest of the world that is thinking too much of armaments and war." We would be in a sorry position, indeed, in the post-war period to plead with other nations to cut their armaments and military programs if we proceeded meanwhile to build up at home the core of the world's greatest potential army. If compulsory military training is ever advocated by this administration as a means of solving our domestic economic problems, let us remember this: We have embarked on the road to fascism at home, which inevitably leads to imperialism abroad.

To repeat, are we to have compulsory military training (a) for discipline for discipline's sake? (b) To solve the unemployment problem? (c) Because the post-war world that 12 years of New Dealism has led us into will be so full of enemies that it is parlous for us to do otherwise? These are pregnant questions. They should be asked often in this coming election, for it is women above all who will suffer if they go unanswered. It is their sons now growing up who are faced with being cast for time out of mind into military mold, heretofore alien to this country.

And now I must at this point inject a few words which were totally unprepared this morning. I spoke of the way Mrs. Roosevelt telegraphs the administration's legislative punches. Well, an hour ago I was handed a copy of Collier's magazine, on the newsstands today. In it there is an article by Secretary of the Navy Knox, calling for compulsory military training for 17-year-olds now, and for all boys after the war. And among others, the three reasons he gives are:

(1) Discipline will be good for young Americans. It will make them aware of their obligation to the state.

(2) It will help solve the unemployment problem, not only because high-school graduates will not be competing with returned veterans for civilian jobs, but because it is only fair that these young boys should bear the brunt of policing occupied countries for as many years as is necessary after the war, so that their older brothers can come home and get the good jobs.

(3) It will provide us with the core of a great army to defend ourselves against future aggression or invasion. Our future enemies are, of course, unnamed.

Well, that's that. We can tonight here, definitely conclude that the administration has espoused Mrs. Roosevelt's proposition of 2 months ago, and will make from here out a concentrated effort to pass it in law. And thus, are we not also to conclude—no matter what the State Department says, that this administration fears fresh wars and oppression—in short, despairs of bringing about a real peace of any reasonable duration—and also that the New Dealers no longer quite believe in the old, prosperous, democratic, civilian-minded America? Yes; we must, from this latest proof, deduce that the New Deal no longer believes in the possibility of a straw-hat, slouch-hat, baseball-bat America. It believes in a helmeted and bayonet-carrying America.

Is this really to be the fate of American youth, of your boys and girls now growing up, in the post-war era? Yes, alas, if we are to have 4 more years of the New Deal at home and abroad. But, no; if a wise and cautious and sincere man moves into the White House next year; a man who can work out with foreign countries, in predominantly economic terms instead of predominantly military ones, a viable and durable peace, a peace based on better economic and cultural relations instead of backed by the conception of the bayonet, and if at home he finds ways of employing our people without putting them on to a dole or into a uniform. After 12 years it has been writ in the Nation's blood that Mr. Roosevelt cannot do this. With all my heart, I believe that a Republican administration can do it. It may take a long time to clean up the whole New Deal mess after our boys come home from their certain victories. But God willing, for their sakes, the patient American people once put in possession of the facts, will clean it up. I believe they will make a happy beginning with a Republican President in November. To see that this man has this noble and challenging opportunity, the chance to bring our sons home from a completely victorious war over the most evil forces that have ever menaced us, bring them home to an America which is not henceforth to be totally militaristic, and to keep them home for at least the next half century in a truly peaceful and prosperous world is the job for which Republican women will be largely responsible in November. I do not have a shadow of doubt that they will do it magnificently.

"When greater perils men environ,
Then women show a front of iron,
And gentle in their manner, they
Do bold things in a quiet way."

The Use of External Sovereignty for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Use of External Sovereignty for Security," delivered by me at the annual spring meeting of the section on International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, April 28, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States Government can legally become one of the founders, and an active member, of a cooperative organization of sovereign nations, for security.

The power of a nation to establish its security is a birthright. Moreover, a state is not qualified for recognition unless the family of nations can perceive that the new-born state possesses this power. Its source is the practice and law of nations. It may or may not be enumerated in constitutions. It was

enumerated in the Constitution of the United States.

The occasion for my discussing this subject is the recent expression of skepticism by some leaders of thought regarding the legal capacity of the United States to join other sovereign nations in setting up the necessary implements of political, military, and judicial control over the causes of war and threat of war, and to create international conditions in which a peace can be attained which will prevail. If the legality fog caused by the conflicting conceptions of the word "sovereignty" could be dissolved by the sunlight of reason, a seeming obstacle to the joining of nations as friends would disappear. We would open the way to consideration of methods of security which would benefit each of the nations.

As a result of this second needless war, humanity should be ready for the specific institutions for abolition of fascism and the establishment of republicanism.

Such service as we render today, in various forums, is inspired by our desire to establish faith in the new way which leads to the bright horizon of order through justice.

I would strengthen the faith of the American people in the feasibility of the exercise of external sovereignty for security without impairment of the power or the dignity of the United States Government. I would point out that we can safely take the new position, conditioning our nationalism to the extent which may be necessary for protection of our country and the other members of such an organization from military aggression.

In fact, the frequency of wars in the past, through failure to use sovereignty in a partnership for peace, has made applicable Virgil's metaphor that "the unused weapon dies with rust." The most imperative function of sovereignty is such exercise of it as will establish security, in which the virtues and the energies of the people can be freely developed and expressed.

The enfranchised American people, in whom sovereignty, as popularly interpreted, resides, have vested the Federal Government with exclusive exercise of external sovereign powers. They have deprived each of the several States of the functions of external sovereignty.

I do not presume to instruct this distinguished group of international lawyers as to the difference between external and internal sovereignty. I do not undertake any discussion of the devisibility of internal sovereignty, or of the distribution of its powers between Federal and State governments.

In the interest of certainty regarding the use which I make of the term "external sovereignty," I do not discuss, I assume, that there is no such thing as absolute sovereignty beneath the Word of God; that omnipotence or almightiness in states constituting the family of nations does not exist, and that total independence of one another among states that are equally sovereign is impossible.

For practical use, that meaning most available to the people through dictionaries is here used:

"The sovereign states are those which are fully autonomous and independent—i. e., relatively free from higher or outside control—a freedom not fully enjoyed by part sovereign states." This definition recognizes that, on the external side, sovereignty may be limited in various ways by the rules, principles, and customs of international law, and by treaties of alliance, guaranty, and protection, by which a state obligates itself to give aid to another under certain conditions, or to assist in maintaining a state of affairs agreed upon." (Dr. Amos S. Hershey, The Essentials of International Public Law and Organization.) Dr. Hershey says: "External sovereignty or independence must not be understood in any absolute or unrestricted sense. Whatever may be the case in theory, in practice it is very limited and wholly relative."

When given this meaning, the exercise of external sovereignty for security does not cost the surrender of sovereignty. Such use of sovereignty tends to preserve and strengthen it.

Oppenheim points out (I, p. 174) that a State does not lose any part of its sovereignty by concluding a treaty of arbitration, and that, if we had a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, the contracting States would remain sovereign because all would be equally and reciprocally bound.

Merignac (II, p. 43) urges that "treaties of guaranty do not destroy sovereignty. Such treaties do not necessarily imply a limitation of sovereignty—not unless the State whose rights are guaranteed binds itself permanently not to exercise important or essential sovereign powers such as other States enjoy."

Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, in a colloquy with me while I was discussing this subject in debate on the Connally resolution, stated (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 3, 1943, p. 9062):

"Mr. CONNALLY. The question which I wish to propound relates to the subject of the surrender of sovereignty. There are those who contend that by entering into a treaty a nation surrenders some of its sovereignty. Is not the implication just the opposite? Sovereignty implies an independent and free nation with the choice and with the power to do those things it wants to do, and the making of a treaty, instead of being a limitation upon its sovereignty, is really a demonstration of its sovereignty. So far as the terms of a treaty are concerned, a nation's liberty of action is restricted until the treaty has expired. But if we were bound by the exaggerated view of sovereignty that a nation cannot make a treaty without giving up some of its sovereignty, we could never make a treaty respecting anything."

Another colloquy in that debate clarifies the interpretation which I make of the term "external sovereignty" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 9, 1943, p. 9062):

"Mr. WHEELER. When the recent agreement was entered into in Moscow between Russia, England, China, and the United States to do certain things and to say that they themselves would invite other countries to come in, did not that involve the giving up of some of the sovereignty of the United States? * * *

"Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator will permit me, I should prefer to say that it placed a condition on sovereignty. It did not destroy or take away any of the sovereignty of any one of the nations, but it placed a condition upon them for a time and for a purpose; but it was specific and not general."

These colloquies are pointed up by paragraph 4 of the Moscow Declaration, which was substantially embodied in the Connally resolution, reading:

"4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

And by article 6, reading:

"6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation."

This acceptance of conditions on nationalism is already part of our foreign policy.

I am indebted to Mr. Green Haywood Hackworth, legal adviser of the Department of State, for the following citations found in his Digest of International Law, volume 1, pages 51–66, giving historical support for the meaning of sovereignty employed in this address, and for the main thesis that the use of external sovereignty by the United States for security is legally possible, and does not entail loss of sovereignty.

In the case of *Duff Development Company, Ltd.*, v. *Government of Kelantan*, in which the House of Lords affirmed an order staying proceedings against the Government of Kelantan, on the ground that the Sultan was an independent sovereign over which the Court had no jurisdiction, Viscount Finlay made the following remarks:

"It is obvious that for sovereignty there must be a certain amount of independence, but it is not in the least necessary that for sovereignty there should be complete independence. It is quite consistent with sovereignty that the sovereign may in certain respects be dependent upon another power; the control, for instance, of foreign affairs may be completely in the hands of a protecting power, and there may be agreements or treaties which limit the powers of the sovereign even in internal affairs without entailing a loss of the position of a sovereign power."

The Permanent Court of International Justice, in its judgment rendered on August 17, 1923, in the case of S. S. *Wimbledon*, involving the refusal by German authorities to permit this British ship to pass through the Kiel Canal, said:

"The Court declines to see in the conclusion of any treaty by which a state undertakes to perform or refrain from performing a particular act an abandonment of its sovereignty. No doubt any convention creating an obligation of this kind places a restriction upon the exercise of the sovereign rights of the state, in the sense that it requires them to be exercised in a certain way. But the right of entering into international engagements is an attribute of state sovereignty."

The Supreme Court, through Mr. Justice Sutherland, in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp. et al.*, upholding the constitutionality of the joint resolution of Congress, approved on May 28, 1934, to prohibit the sale of arms or munitions in the United States under certain conditions, said:

"Rulers come and go; governments end and forms of government change; but sovereignty survives. A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect of the Colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union. See *Penhallow* v. *Doane*, 3 Dall. 54, 80–81.

* * * * *

"It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality. * * * The power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation (*Jones* v. *United States*, 137 U. S., 202, 212), the power to expel undesirable aliens (*Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States*, 149 U. S. 698, 705 et seq.), the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense (*Altman & Co.* v. *United States*, 224 U. S. 583, 600, 601; Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, 2d ed., p. 102 and note 1), none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exists as inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality. This the Court recognized, and in each of the cases cited found the warrant for its conclusions not in the provisions of the Constitution, but in the law of nations."

Briefly, in the Law of Nations (2d ed. 1936, 86, 38–39), after reviewing the original theory of sovereignty and indicating the efforts of civilization to adapt the old theory to new conditions, said:

"Still another device for retaining the doctrine of sovereignty while adapting it to modern conditions has been to attribute sovereignty to the personified state itself; and this is the usage still current in the literature of international law. But this has only added to the confusion. We may properly speak of states as 'independent' in the sense to be explained later; but it is meaningless to say that they are 'sovereign,' that is to say, superior, when we are speaking of their relations to one another * * *. The theory of sovereignty * * * is not only inconsistent with the subjection of states to any kind of law, but it is in fact an impossible theory for a world which contains more states than one."

The competency of the United States Government to do all that it takes to defend its people from military aggression would have existed without the Constitution. The Constitution necessarily recognized the obligation arising out of the power, because the Constitution was setting up a Federal Republic, in which there might have arisen a conflict of responsibilities and powers as between the federation and the several States united in it. The several States did not lose their individuality, although they accepted the condition that they could not make a treaty, and could not make a compact without the consent of Congress. Nothing was added by the Constitution to the power of the United States Government to establish security against war and the fear of war. The operation of the law of necessity among nations throughout all history had established the power to protect and preserve the government and its people.

This power does not mean conversely the power to destroy the government or to tyrannize the people.

Philemon Bliss, former Member of Congress, professor of law in the State University of Missouri, author of various legal works, in his book on Sovereignty, particularly as related to secession, states (at p. 146): "The State (Federal) is necessarily immortal. It may be crushed by power, may commit suicide by surrender; but its existence can contemplate no limitation as to time; it cannot be legally dependent upon the will of another society; if so, it is not a state, but a dependent province."

This thought appears in Lincoln's first inaugural address:

"I hold that, in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all government. * * * Continue to execute all the expressed provisions of our National Constitution and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself."

The argument that the United States would impair its sovereignty by joining a cooperative organization is a naked assertion. It is refuted by actual legal relations of nations from time to time throughout history. Moreover, it is contradicted by existing treaties to which the United States is a party, and by unions, and agreements, not having the status of treaties.

An example of the conditioning of sovereignty, and the surrender of a degree of nationalism in uniting to secure peace, was the organization, in the nineteenth century, of the Great Powers, consisting of Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia. This organization exercised superintendence, over a limited area, of European affairs. Ultimately Italy was permitted to join. Among the current treaties in which the United States of America now participates, and by virtue of which our nationalism is conditioned, there are those setting up the following so-called permanent international commissions, and other organizations:

Permanent Court of Arbitration.
International Institute of Agriculture.
International Office of Public Health.
International Labor Organization.
International Boundary Commissions.
International Fisheries Commissions.
Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses.
Permanent Commissions of Investigation and Conciliation.
Permanent Commissions of Inquiry provided for by treaties for the advancement of peace, and treaties of conciliation.

There exist numerous agreements not having the dignity of treaties, but which condition the nationality of each of the parties thereto, such as,

International Office of Public Health.
The Pan American Union.
International Sugar Council.
Wheat Advisory Committee.
Committee of Experts on the Codification of International Law.
Permanent Committee of Jurists on Civil and Commercial Laws.
Inter-American Committee of Experts on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation.
Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee.
Pan-American Resources Commission.
Inter-American Commission on Tropical Agriculture.
Inter-American Coffee Board.
Congress of the Postal Union.

Progress toward a judicial system has been made through the Permanent Court of International Justice, through procedure under the 1929 Treaty of Inter-American Arbitration, through special claims tribunals, including the Mixed Arbitral, and the Mixed Claims Commissions, established after the First World War under the .reaties of 1919, 1920, and 1921.

The most recent exercise of external sovereignty by the United States consists in the joint resolution authorizing the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, approved March 28, 1944. This is an example of cooperative organization established, not by treaty, but by a method of exercising powers which are inherent in our National Government as an entity of international law. Such benevolent organizations are worthy evidence that sovereignty is not lost in its exercise in external relations.

The so-called nationalists who doubt the legality of cooperative organization and fear the creation of the implements of security, lack realism. Both Houses of the United States Congress unanimously recognized the validity, and the probable utility, of conditioning sovereignty for security by passing a joint resolution which was signed by President Taft June 25, 1910, providing for the appointment of a committee of five members "to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armament of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force, for the preservation of universal peace," etc.

The adoption, in this Seventy-eighth Congress, of the Fulbright resolution by the House, the Connally resolution by the Senate, as well as the Foreign Policy Declaration by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council at Mackinac, evidence the faith of our people in the feasibility of a cooperative organization in which each nation can legally condition its sovereignty without in any material degree impairing its political power or dignity, and without injuriously affecting its internal sovereignty.

When the isolationists assert "but such cooperation has not and should not involve surrender of the sovereign right of the American people to dictate the policies of this Nation, or impair its freedom and independence, by joining any international police organization controlled by foreign nations" (Senator WHEELER as quoted in the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, April 3, 1944), they are dealing with policy. They are not interposing a sound obstacle to the making of agreements and treaties which would implement the security of the several nations parties thereto.

The answer to the assertion is that the organization, and the other implementation of security will be of such character that it will not impair the freedom and independence of any of these countries. but will guarantee such freedom and independence by the application of justice, the administration of law, and the maintenance of peace, which could not exist for long without security.

Once we recognize that, in any international organization for the promotion of peace, the limitations on each state's independent policing of international peace will be designed to affect all states alike, it will be seen that no one of them will find itself at any peculiar disadvantage in respect of freedom and independence.

Dr. Edward S. Corwin, in his new book, the Constitution and World Organization, gives a striking answer to the isolationists in the following statement:

"When total war is the price of total sovereignty, the price is too high."

The savagery of Hitler and Tojo having been suppressed by united sacrifice and superior force, something commanding reverence must arise. Reverence for law must grow under the moral forces that redeem nations. But this requires known laws to live by. A primary need for security is the establishment of an international code of fundamental rules of conduct among nations. Reason, justice, the divine law within, must dictate such a code. Something more than agreement on such laws is required.

The report of the Committee on Post-war International Judicial Organization of this Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, made the 15th day of last month, pointed out that:

"If injustice and violence are to be supplanted by a reign of law in international society, the members of the family of nations must provide orderly processes whereby any suitor or claimant, right or wrong, may have his day in court before an impartial judicial body."

A tribunal or tribunals must be created for the just application of the laws, and there must be ability to enforce such laws. So far as they apply to aggression, adequate military power is indispensable for security through their operation. In the present stage of civilization self-discipline alone is inadequate. Military power will be especially required if the laws have not been codified nor the peaceful habits of nations yet formed.

I am firmly persuaded that peace cannot be established by negotiation alone. The attainment of peace must be fostered by peoples who are free and equally independent. That is to say, the beginning and development of peace depend upon the establishment and the prevalence of security. Therefore our aim ought to be the extension of the unity that now exists among the so-called United Nations to include the political and judicial fields. It seems to me that a minimum requirement is a council, or a similar body, a judicial system, and a military organization which need not be more integrated than through a joint chiefs of staff.

Thus we could give practical application in international relations of a code that shall be based upon the Golden Rule—the sovereignty of God, without which peace can never endure, and with which it could ultimately be made invulnerable.

Address by Hon. Samuel D. Jackson, of Indiana, at Indiana Democratic Editorial Association Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] in Indianapolis, on April 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, Judge Minton, and ladies and gentlemen, as had already been said, a few months ago, a dark cloud passed over Indiana—death intervened—and a few days later I found myself thrust into the midst of things, the Representative of the people of this great Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States.

High honor comes to the tryst wreathed in smiles but with her always she brings responsibility, who wears a grave and sobering countenance. Mine to exercise was a one ninety-sixth part of the power of the highest legislative body in this country, the most powerful nation on this earth, and in the midst of the most devastating war known to man.

But that is not all. The first quarter of this year has been crowded with legislation as varied in its interests, as profound in its importance, and as far reaching in its significance as can be found in any single chapter of the history of the Republic, and I dare say the remainder of this brief tenure will see developments as critical to the United States of America and to the civilization of the world as may be expected in any similar period in the future.

That others were deserving of selection for this vacancy, on a basis of availability and merit, will not be seriously disputed in any well-informed quarter of Hoosierdom. The grace with which such persons accepted the Governor's solution of this difficult problem was a comfort to him, I know, and from my point of view, I have learned that true nobility is as much a part of our modern life as it was of the olden days of chivalry.

The kindness and generosity with which all of you responded to my appointment will abide with me—an anchor to windward. And if I should fail you in any respect, it will not be for any lack of your original faith in me nor any stint in your expressed good wishes.

In the long years gone by, as I have sat as a regular, and I may confess a persistent, guest at these recurring functions, sitting where you sit now, listening to the leaders of the party speaking as they have done so often and so well, I have always known with an unfailing certainty just what great words of statecraft would have issued from my mouth if mine had been the opportunity at the time instead of theirs.

But now that I am here to talk to you, it all seems quite different. I am too full of gratitude, too much the captive of my own emotions, to do more than make a fragmentary report of what I have experienced, and venture a few rudimentary suggestions to this host of patriotic Americans bound together by the ancient ties of the party of Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

When I sat down to sketch the few brief notes for my remarks on this occasion, I was tempted to deal with interesting highlights, intriguing backstage glimpses and the downright amusing personal experiences of a couple who have lived the story of "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," and to let it go at that.

But this I cannot do. I am surrounded by too great a cloud of witnesses. There are too many scalding tears. There are too many hopeful bodies of the young blasted into atoms or rolling with their ships in the bellies of the seven seas. There are too many mothers who would walk a flinty path half way round the earth just to smooth the pillow of her boy if only she could find him. The cruel torrents of this storm tear us so far asunder—and beyond our wills. There is so much work to be done. There is so much to be learned. There is so much that ought to be said, and it is so late.

One interesting matter, however, I must allude to. It is the custom to seat the newest Senators according to seniority, or rather lack of it, in the last row, farthest from the center aisle which separates the two parties in the Chamber. It has long been the custom for the new members to write their names in the bottom of the desk drawers to which they are assigned. When I went to write mine there I saw the signatures of others, some new, some old and faded, some neat, some almost illegible. There arose before my eyes like a dream, the figures of Indiana's great Senators of yesterday: Daniel W. Voorhees, Albert J. Beveridge, John W. Kern, Samuel M. Ralston, and Thomas Taggart.

High on this scroll is the name of United States Senator Frederick Van Nuys. It is not a joy to be the beneficiary of the misfortune of so fine and good a public servant as Fred Van Nuys. I found him respected and esteemed by leaders on both sides of the aisle, and beloved by all his colleagues. My mail brings daily testimony of the faith of our people in his unswerving fidelity, his indomitable courage, his independence, and his patriotism. I need not tell you, gentlemen, that he was a true friend of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association. He was a close companion of many of its older members who, too, have slipped beyond the veil, where we feel this glorious night they mingle in happy communion (as I have heard Dale Crittenberger say so often at these meetings) "in that Valhalla where all good Democrats go when they die."

One of my first impressions was the genuine affection with which the Senate regarded another of its Members from Indiana. Distinguished Senators, friends of Indiana, who have campaigned for us here in Indiana so often, like BARKLEY, of Kentucky, TYDINGS, of Maryland, WAGNER, of New York, O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and LUCAS, of Illinois, will never understand why Indiana failed to return "Shay" Minton to Washington in 1940. That was a dark day for the Senate and for the electorate of Indiana. His learned colleagues saw in him a strange mixture of the line-plunger and the statesman. They tell me they wept bitter tears and were unashamed that day when they watched him close his desk for the last time and disappear through the familiar swinging doors of that beloved Chamber.

The fact is, Indiana far outruns its reasonable quota of leaders furnished to the official life of Washington. Wherever I have been in the District and in whatever company, I have been proud to come from a State which has produced Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Paul V. McNutt, War Manpower Commissioner, M. Clifford Townsend, former Assistant Director of Agriculture, Walter Myers, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and all the others there whose names are so well known to you all as exponents of the Hoosier democracy.

My mind, though, as you might suspect, turns again and again to another son of Indiana—modest and retiring, but the peer of Indiana's best—one might say facetiously, the man for whom after all that Senate seat is being warmed—Governor Henry F. Schricker. I fear my praises of him down there added little to his fame. Far outrunning me was his reputation for honesty, courage, common sense, and brilliant poise in the presence of adversity. Governor Schricker, the United States Senate awaits your coming with eager and open arms.

On my arrival in Washington I found administration leaders engaged in a valiant fight to procure for the men and women in our armed forces a simple, direct, and constitutionally sound method of voting for President, Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen. In that struggle the opposition of the reactionary minority was not founded upon a conviction of the unsoundness of the bill, but upon the fear that the soldier, by means of the unified Federal ballot, might find too free an opportunity to vote for the man he wanted as commander in chief.

Mr. HOLMAN, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, spokesman for the opposition, declared in the debate, on the floor, and it is in the RECORD, that if only Roosevelt would withdraw himself from the race, they would pass the Federal ballot law in thirty minutes. At every turn of its tortuous journey, I cast your vote for the Green-Lucas bill.

It is all over now, but the Old Guard leadership can never escape the fact that it was willing to and did adopt as its own, poll tax, registration, white supremacy principles, long since outmoded and repudiated by the Congress and the people, in order to deny to our absent hero voters the chance of a simple, easy, and direct Federal ballot. This should be remembered by all lovers of justice when our present senior Senator comes back in 1946 for a renewal of his commission.

No Senator with fewer than two votes on each question could satisfy everyone all the time. Just prior to my appointment, I had been indulging the hope with reference to the older of my two soldier sons, now a combat casualty replacement infantryman out in the Pacific, that somehow I might help to lighten his tasks. I suppose every parent, without challenge to his patriotism, has a right to hope, and to help to save his boy or girl from the heavier burden, the greatest sacrifice. It is so natural to do so. Yet after I took my oath of office, I realized my own parental ambitions were in violent collision with a higher duty—to my State—to that flag. So I could turn not a hand, but only commit his safety to the Almighty. I love my party, too, and when my loyalty to it comes into irreconcilable conflict with the paramount obligation, I pray I may always have strength enough to reach the same conclusion and render the same kind of verdict.

We are in an election year, sad and disturbing as that fact may be. But such things are necessary and of the very essence of the democracy for which we wage war.

I look around me here tonight and see President Smith and the president-elect, Fred Bays, State chairman, Mrs. Bingham, State chairwoman, Frank McHale, national committeeman, and Mrs. Ralston, national committeewoman, and all these other party leaders. A party needs harmony more than money, enthusiasm more than resources. I know our party under the leadership of Bob Hannegan is in safe hands here at home. And I have faith in the press as represented by the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association. With what compelling power the copybook maxims come back across the years. A free press is a requisite to a free people. On the anvil of public discussion, the spark of truth is struck. By the truth do we live and

prevail. Gentlemen, for your forthrightness, fearlessness, insight, and persistence, we who are your guests are profoundly appreciative.

Five weeks ago tonight, in this very room, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, ROBERT A. TAFT, opened the political campaign in Indiana by delivering a speech to the Indiana Republican Editorial Association banquet. It was one of those "How long" speeches. Stripped of its false assumptions of fact, the Senator's speech included this question, in substance, "How long should we keep the Democratic Party in Washington?" There is an answer to that question.

How long? Until the escutcheons of this Government shall have been cleansed of the debauchery of the administration of Warren G. Harding.

How long? Until the economic and financial structures of this Republic shall have been healed of the rampant and unchecked pirating during the do-nothing administration of Calvin Coolidge.

How long? Until the last farmer, businessman, and worker shall have been made whole of the devastation wrought by the unfortunate and unsung administration of Herbert Hoover, the great engineer.

How long? Until that permanent peace promised to the heroes of World War No. 1 shall have been kept in spirit and in truth.

How long? Until all these high ends can be reached or until the people have lost their faith in the possibility of their accomplishment, for there is not a mustard seed of hope for their achievement in the capacities of Mr. Dewey.

One of the most spectacular events ever to occur on the floor of the Senate was Senator Barkley's now-famous address. He played a single dramatic role with the United States Congress as his theater, the whole civilized world as his audience. This was a part of nothing more than a political incident, concluded in a few hours. Yet within that time this event, because its implications were adverse to the President of the United States, skyrocketed Axis morale.

If this passing occurrence could accomplish that result, it is frightening to speculate the damage to the Allied effort if the party in power should be removed completely and with finality now in the midst of the conflict. No political speculation, not even Senator TAFT'S, can escape this overwhelming factor.

They say a change of administration would not impair the war effort, but already we have a forecast of the tragic cost involved in changing the war-time administration.

We were impressed with Mr. Willkie's spectacular withdrawal from the Presidential contest. The results of the Wisconsin primary have been construed, at least by a part of the press, as a repudiation of Mr. Willkie's firm international policies, and a victory for the tenets of isolationism. That was only 10 days ago. Already, encouraged by this turn of political events, scheming men urge a general slackening of the European war effort, and most flagrant of all, a Congressman from our own state openly advocates the abandonment of the war against the Axis. Think of it. What do you think that does to the mercury in the Nazi morale thermometer?

Yes, a change would play into the hands of the Nazi propagandists—with deathly result. That the Axis powers despair of survival is assured. They are fighting through 1944 in the hope that there will be a political upset in the United States next November, sufficient to remove the present administration from power. The Nazis hope they may get something less than unconditional surrender from some other administration.

A change would mean, at least, interruption. It would mean, inevitably, some change of plan—perhaps in the grand strategy itself. It would mean a change of surgeons in the midst of the operation. The sharp scalpel, the delicate hemostat, the deadly anesthesia, would pass from trained hands and cool heads to what hands and what heads, no one knows. Who would select the successors of General "Ike" Eisenhower, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and Admiral Nimitz, and on what basis?

This war is not being fought by the members of any one political party. When a Jap sniper draws a bead on a Marine in an island jungle, he can't see a campaign button. War and partisan politics cannot mix.

Recognizing this fact President Roosevelt gave many of the most important war posts to prominent Republicans. Mr. Henry Stimson, Secretary of State under President Hoover, and Secretary of War under President Taft, was made Secretary of War. Col. Frank Knox, who had been the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1936, was made Secretary of the Navy. Judge Robert Patterson, a Republican, was made Under Secretary of War, and placed in charge of the entire procurement program for the Army, and a long list of Republican industrialists and businessmen have been placed in key war positions, clothed with ample powers.

From a pacific nation in 1940 we have become the strongest military power on earth in 1944. The United States of America has accomplished more in 3½ years than the combined military and naval achievements of the Japs in half a century, and the Nazis in a decade.

This is the result of Democrats and Republicans having peeled off their partisan coats, and going to work in their American shirt sleeves. But it has been achieved under Democratic leadership. If the American electorate is to act upon the principal that a political party is to be rewarded for its leadership, then no justification appears to support a change in 1944.

What about the writing of the peace? At the peace table Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek will be grasping each for his own post-war advantage. The people want our representative to have an equal chance—to be big enough to hold his own. If anyone in this country can mention the name of one man who gives promise of doing this job for the American people more effectively than Franklin D. Roosevelt, the whole country will be indebted to him. In him is to be found a combination of knowledge and fervor rising to the heights of the growing soul of America, and matching the sublimity of our prayers for a just and durable peace. He knows the men with whom we shall have to deal. He knows the forces which will be brought into play. He has an enthusiasm for the field. The welfare of the United States—and in fact the welfare of the world—are at stake in the planning of the peace, and the best is none too good for the United States of America.

Is our party to be removed at the cost of losing the services of this great world statesman, just to place in power another political party? Some there are like Job who lament the fact that this man and this need meet on the threshold of a fourth term instead of that of a first or second, but of such unexpected combinations of fact is the grim business of history.

One thing is sure—the people of the United States do not want Gerald L. K. Smith, or anybody like him, representing us at the peace table when this war is over.

Some say that a change of administration will not affect the peace prospects either, but let us recall clear historical proof to the contrary.

The election of 1918 went against President Wilson following his request for a Democratic Congress. This was the first and irretrievable step in the defeat of the treaty, the ratification of which, through the League of Nations, had potentialities sufficient to have prevented World War II. The change of world outlook and policy effected by the psychological ultimates of that simple political fact ruined the peace prospects in 1920. If we change administrations, we change policy, and we may expect to see our dreams come tumbling down upon us, the wreckage of what might have been the cathedral of a just and durable peace.

Is it of the very essence of this world and man's nature that he is doomed to an everlasting status of recurring wars? I do not believe it. We have mustered strength enough to win a war; we must muster wisdom enough to capture peace.

Here, let me say, Governor Schricker rose to lofty heights of statesmanship in his message to the special session of the general assembly. The seed fell upon barren ground. Those who have tried unsuccessfully heretofore to guillotine the office of governor betrayed the voters in two respects. They refused to recognize the Federal ballot for the soldier and they refused to keep the polls open on next election day from 6 to 8. In time of war, when every war-production hour is precious to victory, either war industries will be compelled to curtail production or workers will be disfranchised. As I have said with regard to the loss of peace, so I say to labor. If you change the administration at Washington, you will lose for half a century your legitimate gains for the last 12 years.

Sitting in the Senate Chamber, I sometimes realize I can look down upon the very spot where the best prospect for peace this old world ever had, was killed. There are the bloodstains from the sacrifice. It was a sacrifice to the gods of partisan greed; and that by unhallowed hands. One can feel the chill of the four horsemen of the apocalypse, riding out of nowhere, and dashing again back through the dark recesses of that same Chamber screaming like frustrated vampires, in search of that, which, found, would give them liberation and rest.

Unprinted in the Senate record, but none the less real, are the voices from Flanders fields, moaning that the torch they threw their statesmen was doused in the filthy vats of party hate. The Lodges and the Watsons were not above striking down peace hopes for a partisan gain. Their modern prototypes are not above the same murderous blow for the same unholy cause. I pray the United States Senate may be redeemed of this assassination, and that right early—that from that sepulcher where she now lies slain, peace may rise, resurrected in the sunrise of man's new day—that they who lingered longest in her defense be the first to greet her on the morn.

Our administration must hold the winning of the war first before its eyes like the saint the cross in the presence of temptation. The war must come first, the peace second, and the reconversion third. These concepts must never lose that order, neither among themselves, nor in their relationship to less essential concerns.

America will win this war no matter who is elected. It is a question as to who can win it quickest and with least loss of life.

Our party spokesman must simplify the message. The voters are weary of their labors and their excitements. Their minds are upon their sons and daughters far from home. They have no stomach for fine-spun political theories nor sophisticated approaches. They are too tired and too busy. The message must be made crystal clear, simple, and brief. It must be made to be easy to listen to. We must resolutely, fearlessly, consistently, and universally advance three propositions—that our leadership is best for the continuation of the direction of the war effort; that we are best equipped to represent the American

people at the peace table with Messrs. Churchill, Stalin, and Chang Kai-shek; that this administration is best to bring to full fruition that restoration which must follow the return of 10,000,000 veterans.

Over and above all this, we must remember that the people have a distaste for facing the disagreeable aspects of a political campaign in the midst of war. They are in no humor to be pushed around nor oversold like yokels gaping before a circus barker. Our men at arms will brook no needless partisan politics while there is a war to be won. This is a danger signal for any political party that bickers.

We shall win in 1944 because the peculiar circumstances of the case compel it. But let me hasten to warn that no Democrat must seek in these circumstances any narrow partisan gratification. This year we fight for America, not for party. Every worker should be touched with the livid fire of high conviction that Franklin D. Roosevelt is the most valuable individual public servant in the world today, and that to retain his party in power until the job is done is a noble cause.

This campaign must be pitched to the tone of the American faith that the Atlantic Charter is a monument to liberty and the "four freedoms," a vehicle of human hope. Let us walk humbly before the people, remembering that America's greatest crisis is at hand during this year, this campaign, and at this election.

Without any malice toward those who disagree with us, let us welcome men and women of all parties to share in this American cause. In the simplest everyday life of the worker, the farmer, and the housewife, there is no dearth of inspiration to this noble and patriotic effort. Stimuli are all about us. Sometimes I ride a crowded streetcar from my hotel to Capitol Hill. In an advertisement I see two manikin-like faces, man and woman, solemn, resigned, patient, with beseeching eyes turned toward Heaven. The legend reads, "With all of us doing our part to the best of our ability, may the spirit and strength of the American people carry on in 1944."

Address by Representative Coffee of Washington, to Federation of Citizens' Associations, District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Washington and chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, to the thirty-fourth anniversary dinner of the Federation of Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, at the American Legion Hall, Washington, D. C., Saturday evening, April 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Even in peacetime there is a considerable amount of business transacted, as you know, on Capitol Hill, but I am confident that it would be difficult for you to comprehend the manifold duties and responsibilities placed upon Members of Congress during wartime. Notwithstanding that heavy burden, however, I am persuaded that all Members of Congress are very vitally interested in District of Columbia affairs. They realize that this is the Nation's Capital, and that this city is a city set apart for all of our people.

I have been profoundly interested in the history of this District and in the determination of the Continental Congress and the Congress of the United States to locate a city where the Congress would not be harassed by the failure of a State government or a local government to afford facilities and adequate protection for its Members. The District of Columbia has a very interesting political background.

The present form of commission government was established in 1874, and under it three Commissioners, two of whom are appointed by the President for 3 years subject to confirmation by the United States Senate, and one detailed by the War Department of the United States Corps of Engineers, are the principal municipal officers.

Under the government existing prior to 1874, the town of Alexandria, the county of Alexandria, the town of Georgetown, the county of Washington, and the city of Washington had their fair share of both political and financial scandals, but since 1874 the District government has been practically free of all such scandals.

It is important for us to consider this item when we are thinking in terms of forms of government. This city has had a constant growth, and today more than 800,000 live within the area we are now considering. A large number of this group are Federal employees who maintain their voting privileges, but that other and larger group obey laws they have no part in making, pay taxes they have no part in voting for, and are governed by individuals whom other people have voted for and sent to this city. The records will disclose that many thousands of your young men are now on the far-flung battle fronts ready to fight, to bleed, and perhaps to die for the preservation of this democracy—men free-born, fine citizens in every respect who have never had the privilege of casting a vote for any local or public official.

It would certainly appear to me that even though the Congress may jealously want to hold its exclusive jurisdiction over the affairs of the District of Columbia, it could not in justice further withhold from your citizens some limited voting representation in Congress and among the electors for President and Vice President.

We of the Appropriations Committee feel a deep sense of appreciation of the very keen interest your associations are manifesting in District affairs. We have found your recommendations to be of very great value, for we know that you desire a high standard of service for this community, and a high degree of efficiency on the part of those who are employed to render the service. The budget which we will consider determines the city's "community standard of living," and even though you are presently without a vote, it is certainly altogether proper for you to help to determine the standard.

During World War I, the annual District Budget approximated $18,000,000. Today that amount would not go far. The budget that we are called upon to consider today approximates 67 millions. I am advised that the total value of all taxable real estate in the District is in excess of $1,300,000,000. At a tax rate of $1.75, this produces a revenue of 22 millions, more than the annual budget of 1917.

There are about 160,000 separate parcels and lots in this District, which apparently are steadily increasing in value. The tangible personal property tax, the income tax, the corporation tax, the gasoline tax, the automobile tax, and the more than 32,000 licenses issued annually give us the revenue for appropriating purposes. The appropriations by Congress from this revenue, plus the Federal payment, are apportioned among the various departments and agencies of the District government for the benefit of this city. Our problem is to allocate these funds wisely, so that one department will not suffer at the expense of another.

It is frequently said that we should bear the responsibilities for certain failures because we failed to appropriate sufficient funds for a certain department or agency. However, you must bear in mind that we can only appropriate to the extent of revenue availability. If you desire expanded programs, then you must be prepared to meet a larger tax burden. Personally, I think it ony fair that those who live in the city, and who pay taxes, should be the ones whose expressions should receive the most consideration.

The Federal Government owns approximately 41 percent of the total land of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets and alleys. It also has title to all the original streets and alleys lying within the boundaries of the original city of Washington, which generally speaking, is that area lying between Florida Avenue and the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. In addition to tax exemption, the Federal Government is furnished water without charge, and is not assessed for special improvements, such as curb and gutter, sidewalk, alley paving, sewer and water mains.

For all of this the Federal Government pays to the municipal government $6,000,000 annually. You think that this amount should be increased, and for your information I might advise you that there are a number on Capitol Hill who feel the same way about it.

You have a vast and complicated business organization in this municipal government with its 70 departments, divisions, and agencies, and when you consider that the residents of this city paid $73,576,233 in Federal income taxes in 1942, an amount which exceeded the payment of each of 28 States, you can appreciate the fact that any material changes made should be based on well-studied long-range planning, because we are constantly growing numerically and financially.

Members of my committee and I have visited District institutions, and we have knowledge of some of the pressing needs, and I want to assure the citizens of this community that we will do all in our power to make this the most efficient and the best municipal government in the world. Your help and your advice is earnestly solicited.

At the beginning of hostilities, we were somewhat disturbed about how the war would affect local financial problems. It was thought that government reductions in the sale of gasoline and appliances of all sorts would materially affect income and although there has been a set-back in some items, the local financial outlook is quite satisfactory.

This year, for the first time in 13 years, it is quite possible that you will be free of debt. It may be that we will find some funds to invest in Federal securities for Capital improvements at a later date. We want to be in a sound condition to go ahead when the war needs are met and manpower is available.

The Budget problem is an all-year one, and just as soon as testimony is finished for 1945, estimating will begin for 1946. We are glad to give our time and attention to District affairs, for after all Washington is our home.

Montgomery Ward Seizure—Excerpts From Address by Leon Henderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from a radio address delivered by Mr. Leon Henderson on Saturday, April 29.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I said last week that Montgomery Ward would be taken over by the Government unless Sewell Avery obeyed the War Labor Board order. I was not quite prepared, however, for the picture of the week this would produce: That of Sewell Avery being carted bodily from his plant by soldiers. I don't know why I should have been surprised because Mr. Avery has a long record of opposition to the Government, and it was just a matter of time until a violent clash occurred. I was on the Government side myself in several instances.

I recall very vividly during N. R. A. when Montgomery Ward served notice on me that they were preparing to violate the law. I had some trouble later with illegal catalog prices that were higher than O. P. A. ceiling prices. In both cases Montgomery Ward was the only company in the industry to openly defy the authority of law.

* * * * *

There are questions of the rights of private companies and they are present to a degree warranting observation by Congress and the courts. But I wish these issues, if they had to arise, could have come up clean of Sewell Avery's belligerence. The very fact that most all other companies in the United States have found it possible to get along with their Government in these difficult times and have subordinated strong feelings is some proof that Montgomery Ward is an especially difficult customer.

The Government could not dodge the Montgomery Ward case without abject abdication. Montgomery Ward refused to extend the life of its old labor contract, claiming that the union did not have a majority. As a matter of fact, under National Labor Relations Board rulings the employer is not entitled to raise the question of whether a union has a majority for bargaining purposes unless there are two unions claiming jurisdiction. After the National Labor Relations Board certifies a union as a bargaining agency, that union is the bargaining agency until there is a new election requested by workers.

Because the Montgomery Ward case had been so disagreeable, a new election was ordered even though there was no other union, and the workers had not asked for it. As the Washington Star points out, all that Montgomery Ward had to do was continue the old contract as directed by the War Labor Board and wait to see what the new election showed. From one standpoint Sewell Avery's contention that the union does not represent a majority is a most curious shift. Last year, when the maintenance of membership was the issue, he fought the W. L. B.'s ruling because he claimed it would result in a closed shop. After a year he has turned completely around and now claims that the union is all washed up.

The matter is of more importance than whether one company can defy the Government. If Montgomery Ward got away with refusal to renew a contract on the claim that a certified union no longer had a majority, then war production and civilian production would be interrupted. Many unions, for example, the mine workers, will not continue work if there is no contract. In the interest of stable relations, with other companies watching the result, the Government had to meet Montgomery Ward head-on.

Unless new disputes arise with Montgomery Ward, the Government should be able to relinquish control of the plant as soon as the new elections are held and let the courts decide points of law.

Competitive Bidding in Issuance and Sale of Railroad Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by me to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission dealing with the private sale of railroad securities with commissions to bankers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 28, 1944.*

Hon. WILLIAM J. PATTERSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Two cases now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission emphatically demonstrate the imperative need for the immediate adoption of competitive bidding in the issuance and sale of all new railroad securities.

One case is the proposal of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad to sell, privately, to insurance companies, $30,000,000 of collateral trust bonds and to pay the New York investment banking firm of Morgan Stanley & Co. the outrageous fee of $75,000 for alleged advice and assistance to the railroad on the sale.

The other case is the proposal of the Pennsylvania Railroad to make a private sale of $35,000,000 of its Pennsylvania Co. subsidiary's notes to a group of insurance companies and banks, and to pay the New York investment banking company, Kuhn Loeb & Co., the outrageous sum of $87,500 for alleged assistance on the sale.

These roads have their own financial experts in their employ. They have telephones. By using the telephone for a few hours they could have sold these gilt-edged securities to the people who are now buying them, without making a gift of the stockholders' money to these banking houses. The railroads' legal and financial experts could have carried this transaction through without any aid from these people.

In the currently proposed Pennsylvania financing, the Equitable Life has agreed to purchase $10,000,000 of notes and this same insurance company is to be the purchaser of $14,000,000 of the proposed Burlington bonds. The only difference this time is that Morgan Stanley and Kuhn Loeb have prevailed on the railroad officials to cut them in on the business.

Had there been a competitive bidding requirement in effect when the Pennsylvania and Burlington officials first contemplated this financing, the question of these scandalous fees would never have arisen, and Kuhn Loeb and Morgan Stanley would have been in the business as prospective bidders on a fair and equal footing with all others, or not at all.

As it is, the Interstate Commerce Commission has only one honest course open to it—that is to disallow the proposed payments to Morgan Stanley and Kuhn Loeb, and to adopt a competitive bidding requirement so that no railroad or banking house may ever again have the effrontery to suggest this reckless dissipation of railroad stockholders' money in needless and exorbitant banker fees.

The financing transactions of American railroads by these banking houses and their control has undoubtedly had a great deal to do and been responsible for the sordid history of railroad financing.

Yours sincerely,

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

Payment in Kind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who is unavoidably absent today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Payment in Kind," from the Capital Journal of Salem, Oreg., of April 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYMENT IN KIND

For political services rendered in the past, President Roosevelt has again rewarded the C. I. O. with a political favor, although he has been compelled to prostitute the exercise of his war powers to do so. For in directing the Army to seize and turn over to the Secretary of Commerce for operation the Chicago mail-order plant and retail store of Montgomery Ward & Co., the Chief Executive has clearly exceeded the authority conferred upon him by the Constitution or the Emergency War Powers Act.

The authority under which the President professes to be acting in this instance empowers him to take over and operate in the name of the Government any business or industry essential to the efficient prosecution of the war which is being either grossly mismanaged, or which is failing to render normal and satisfactory service.

Neither of these shortcomings can be aptly or truthfully attributed to Ward's, nor can the seized properties by any stretch of the imagination be construed as essential to the war effort. At least its employees, as such, are not favored for deferment under selective-service rules and regulations. So far as its essentiality to the winning of the war is concerned, Ward's is just another private retail business enterprise, struggling along as best

it can under the handicaps of labor and merchandise shortages incident to the times, but plagued with more than its share of interference by bumptious bureaucrats. If it can be seized because, as President Roosevelt has charged, labor disputes and strikes interfere with the distribution of essential goods, then any business in the country which has labor trouble can be similarly taken over by the Government.

Granting for the sake of argument that Ward's is a war-essential business, why should the President assess all of the blame for interference with distribution upon the company and none upon the striking employees?

The answer is obvious. Ward's had the courage—in the interests of its independent employees—to defy the administration's sacred cow of organized labor as represented by the War Labor Board in refusing to recognize the C. I. O. as the bargaining agency of its employees until an election had been held to determine whether the union was choice of a majority of the employees as their bargaining agency. The company also refused to be a party to a contract making a maintenance-of-union-membership clause retroactive, which would have subjected employees who had voluntarily quit the union since December 8, 1943, to discharge.

Five months have elapsed since the company proposed an election or card check to determine whether the C. I. O. was the bargaining choice of a majority of the employees without any action on the proposal by the union or the W. L. B. Meanwhile the union members remained on strike until a few days ago, when they were ordered back to work to pave the way for the President's arbitrary action. The only interruption in the company's service to its customers, however, was occasioned by action of the Post Office Department in support of the strike in withdrawing 70 postal clerks from the mail-order house, where they had been maintained for 30 years, and in refusing to deliver incoming prepaid parcels to Ward's.

Such flagrant bias toward labor and such arbitrary abuse of administrative and executive authority as have marked the entire history of the Montgomery Ward case are without precedent even in the annals of the New Deal. Political motives alone can explain them.

Marine Pvt. Carlyle W. Vorachek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Hardy North Dakotan Survives Bomber Crash, 11 Days on Raft," dealing with Marine Pvt. Carlyle W. (Mike) Vorachek, of Garrison, N. D., published in the Minneapolis Tribune, of February 19, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARDY NORTH DAKOTAN SURVIVES BOMBER CRASH, 11 DAYS ON RAFT

SOUTH PACIFIC HEADQUARTERS.—Marine Pvt. Carlyle W. (Mike) Vorachek, 19, Garrison, N. Dak., turret gunner on a torpedo bomber which was downed January 29, 3 miles off Rabaul, New Britain Island, spent 11 days in a liferaft in South Pacific waters and returned to his squadron following his discharge from the hospital.

A dispatch from Sgt. Dan Bailey, Atlanta, Ga., a marine correspondent on Bougainville, said Vorachek lost 26 pounds and was severely sunburned but otherwise was well.

Vorachek's plane crashed into the water, possibly killing the radioman and the pilot.

Vorachek himself did not know how he survived.

He extracted the liferaft from the wreckage and found only 6 cans of water and 6 cans of pemmican.

He rowed the whole afternoon in an effort to get away from New Britain. That night a storm overturned the raft but Vorachek had his food and water lashed down.

The pemmican proved a total loss for every time Vorachek ate it he became violently thirsty. Having no tackle, he had to content himself with watching sharks and other fish which swam alongside his raft.

On his ninth day afloat he ate a raw turtle which he caught barehanded.

Vorachek said that on seven occasions patrols flew over without seeing him. Eventually the current carried him within a few miles of Buka and at noon on February 10, a marine fighter sighted him. A few hours later a Navy flying boat picked him up.

He was taken to the hospital where he spent 3 days eating all they had to offer. Vorachek has now rejoined his squadron.

Isolation and Appeasement or a New League of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, problem No. 1 in the mind of every honest American is to win the war as quickly as possible with the smallest possible loss of American lives. When this is done, problem No. 1 unquestionably will become the winning of the peace.

Wars may be inevitable, but certainly we would be stupid and depraved if we did not use every honorable means to avoid and minimize the evils of international conflict. Only chains and slavery can be worse than war. At the end of this conflict, as at the end of the last one, people will instinctively cry from anguished hearts, "It must never happen again."

The highways and byways leading directly and indirectly to peace and war have never been clearly marked. It is evident, however, that our usual roads of travel have led always into war.

In efforts to avoid war men have tried many things. First they built great walls against hostile foes. Almost from the beginning we have had offensive and defensive alliances between races. Secret treaties and balances of power in myriad forms have been tried for centuries. The greatest leagues to enforce peace were the Holy Alliance of 1815 and the League of Nations of 1919. Both expressed high principles and noble purposes, yet both failed from lack of worthy leadership. It is said the League was born of American ideals and destroyed by American politics. In his last public address on Armistice Day 1923, Woodrow Wilson, speaking of America's repudiation of the League and of her withdrawal into sullen and selfish isolation, made the ominous prediction:

> This must always be a source of deep mortification to us, and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligations of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the role of courage, self-respect, and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

Not relying upon the League for security, between World War No. 1 and No. 2, the nations of the earth entered into hundreds of treaties and alliances. In lieu of adherence to the League, America sponsored and concluded two major world agreements. The first was the Washington Naval Limitations Agreement of 1922, as a result of which we sank a number of completed and near-completed ships while other adherents sank blueprints only. The second was the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact of 1928 in which the nations renounced war as an instrument of national policy and agreed to submit their differences to arbitration. In addition to these agreements we sought to protect ourselves with extensive neutrality acts. Armament limitations agreements, arbitration agreements, and neutrality legislation gave us a false sense of security. We aggravated these mistakes by adopting tragic and fallacious policies of isolation and appeasement. The democracies practiced appeasement when Japan entered Manchuria in 1931. Appeasement was tried on Mussolini when he entered Ethiopia in 1935. As a final inglorious act of appeasement Czechoslovakia was thrown to the Nazi dogs in 1938. To the appeasers and to the isolationists we cite all of human history, both sacred and profane. Friendship and respect cannot be bought by appeasement—they are not subject to sale. Isolation, too, is a myth and a delusion.

What are the alternatives to these discredited policies? What are the antidotes for these past mistakes?

First, henceforth, and forever, America must remain the strongest Nation in the world. Twice within 25 years barbaric aggressors have thought first that they could bluff us, or second that they could whip us. We must make sure that potential enemies do not again fall into this error.

Aside from military strength, thousands of post-war plans and proposals are now being offered. Today every religious and patriotic society in America has passed resolutions on the subject. Most of our leading citizens have given public expression to their hopes and aspirations. Among specific proposals have been those for hemispheric alliances; the creation of zones of influence, dominated by great powers, such as Great Britain in Europe, Russia in Asia, and America in the Western Hemisphere; an alliance of the English-speaking peoples; a union between Great Britain and America; a four-power pact or alliance between

Britain, America, Russia, and China; a perpetuation of the United Nations as a world security organization; and others.

Notwithstanding disagreement on specific proposals, our societies, our organizations, and our Government now urge some form of post-war collaboration. Both branches of the Congress, the Secretary of State, and the President of the United States have gone on record in this matter. The House adopted the Fulbright resolution by a vote of 360 to 29. The Senate passed the Connally resolution by a vote of 85 to 5. Both resolutions were positive declarations favoring American participation in some form of world organization for the prevention of war and the preservation of peace. Upon his return from the Moscow Conference Secretary of State Cordell Hull said:

> As the provisions of the Four Nation Declaration are carried into effect, there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balances of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which in the unhappy past the nations strove to safeguard their security or promote their interests.

Thus the long shadow of Woodrow Wilson falls across our continent. The spirit of the idealist, who they said lived 100 years ahead of his time, seems to walk again in the land. In all of the welter of confusion and debate a long finger seems to point back to the ashes of the League.

Notwithstanding this overwhelming sentiment in public and private life for Amercian participation in some world association for the preservation of peace, there is grave danger that history may again repeat itself. When once the war is over many good Americans, sick of foreign folk and foreign ways and foreign places, will simply want to relax and forget it. America may again succumb to the sincere and insincere cries of those who say we can live within our borders and unto ourselves. The appeasers and the isolationists will have fertile soil in which to plant their seeds of false security. Bitterness and resentment over both domestic and foreign politics and policies will tend to confuse and divide us. The tempting line of least resistance will be to do nothing.

To all of these people, and to those who will again attempt to write the peace, that solemn poem written by Alfred Noyes at the end of World War No. 1 is more than ever in point:

They have no pact to sign—our peaceful dead;
Pacts are for trembling hands and heads grown gray;
Ten million graves record what youth has said,
And cannot now unsay.

They have no pact to sign—our quiet dead,
Whose eyes in that eternal sleep are drowned;
Age doubts, and wakes, and asks if night be fled,
But youth sleeps sound.

They have no pact to sign—our faithful dead;
Theirs is a deeper pledge, unseen, unheard,
Sealed in the dark, unwritten, sealed in red,
And they will keep their word.

They have no pact to sign—our noble dead;
But if, O God, if we, should sign in vain,
With dreadful eyes out of each narrow bed
Our dead will rise again.

The Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. J. Franklin Carter before the Cleveland City Club at Cleveland, Ohio, April 29.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eighty years—three full generations of American life—have passed since this country has held a Presidential election in time of war. Such an election is the acid test of national character and the key to national destiny. What the American people decide next November not only will determine their future, but may decide the future of the whole world.

The world is suffering from a tremendous economic, and social, and racial upheaval. The upheaval is so vast that in the realm of politics it can only be called a political earthquake. Now there are no rules on how to behave in an earthquake, and every man reacts to the shock according to his own nature. Some throw the china out the window and gently carry the bed pillows downstairs. Others get panic-stricken or turn into gibbering idiots. Still others turn out and help fight the fires and rescue the injured. It is on them that the safety of the community depends. Yet no one can say in advance which group will keep calm and be helpful and which will go temporarily crazy. So with the political earthquake which this country is going to experience this summer.

Therefore it is only fair to assume that none of the rules of the grand old game of politics as played in peacetime America will necessarily hold true in 1944. The election of 1864 is our only historical parallel, and as in geometry, so in politics the important thing about parallels is that they never meet. All that we know is that Lincoln, who was triumphantly and overwhelmingly reelected in November, believed in August that he might be defeated by his opponent—and Lincoln was, among other things, a very shrewd politician. In any case, it is safe for us to assume that the election of 1944 will not follow any convenient pattern and that the advance publicity of this—the greatest show on earth—will give little idea of what will happen under the Big Tent.

To begin with, I think that most Americans assume that the two candidates will be President Roosevelt—nominated for an unprecedented fourth term—and Governor Dewey, of New York, who seems to be far ahead in the race for the Republican nomination. It is still too early to pick the Vice Presidential nominees with any assurance. Dewey's running mate might be Governor Bricker, of Ohio, Governor Warren, of California, or any one of a whole stable of political dark horses. Mr. Roosevelt might repeat with HENRY WALLACE or—as some have dared to suggest—might team up with Wendell L. Willkie, or he might go still further afield or stay still closer to home.

The reasons for Governor Dewey's availability are obvious. He is young, able, and has made a good record as prosecutor of gangsters in New York City. He has carried the traditionally Democratic State of New York—President Roosevelt's home State—for the first time since 1920. And he is an able and resourceful politician with strong backing and the ability to get votes.

In the case of President Roosevelt, it seems pretty clear that, whatever his personal wishes might be, he is now the prisoner of the events which he has helped to direct and of the social and political forces which he has mobilized. He is no more free to lay aside his leadership of those forces or his association with those events than the engineer of a locomotive going downgrade at high speed is free to take his hand off the throttle and announce that he is going to take a snooze in the caboose. Not only is President Roosevelt the prisoner of his party but that party in turn is the prisoner of the same forces which called it into being and which gave it a special mandate in 1940 to defend America against our foreign enemies.

Let us move, then, from candidates to parties and consider the picture of American politics in 1944. Both parties are split rather seriously along lines of conviction and interest. The conservative southern Democrats are opposed to the New Deal Democrats. The isolationist Republicans are opposed to the Willkie Republicans. I will not elaborate on this point, except to say that here is a possibility of rather wide and sweeping changes in the final line-up of the electorate. For a time, it seemed possible that the Harry Byrd and Harry Woodring Democrats would go Republican. It is still uncertain whether the Willkie Republicans will vote Democratic.

Both parties and both candidates labor under serious liabilities. Both, in turn, can count on rather impressive assets. Let's take a look at the balance sheet and see what a preaudit will suggest.

Governor Dewey has in his favor the widespread impatience if not war-weariness of the American people. Rationing, manpower, selective service, taxes, and the numerous regulations by which the Congress has tried to adjust the country to the needs of total war—all these have created resentment, especially as the usual number of inevitable mistakes have been made as a result of trying to deal with novel problems by inexperienced officials.

Also in favor of the Republicans is the fact that the older group of voters—especially the farmers and businessmen—tend to support the G. O. P. The chief elements of Roosevelt's traditional strength—the younger people and labor—are largely deprived of an effective vote this year. That is to say, the Army and Navy, under the so-called Soldier's Voting Act, will not vote in proportion to the number of young men and women in the armed forces. The migration of labor into war industries has robbed many workers of their regular voting residence and has planted them in new communities with whose political issues and personalities the war workers are unfamiliar. This set of facts gives to the Republican Party a real windfall which they lacked in earlier elections.

On the other side of the Republican ledger we can set down some of the liabilities.

First, it can be taken for granted that every pro-Nazi in America will vote Republican this year and that every isolationist will vote Republican this year, and that all the forces of sedition and defeatism—in their hatred of Roosevelt—will vote Republican this year.

Second, it is open to doubt that the parents and wives of fighting Americans will—despite their age and property—vote Republican en masse. Most informal checks on the political sentiments of our armed forces suggest that the servicemen are overwhelmingly pro-Roosevelt. To the extent to which the wives and parents of fighting Americans consider themselves trustees for their men in the armed forces, they will tend to vote for Roosevelt.

Third, Governor Dewey will have the support of the same financial and industrial groups which have opposed rather indiscriminately the entire course of events in America for the last 12 years. Many Americans automatically vote for anyone whom these men oppose.

There are other items on both sides of the Republican ledger but these are enough to chew on.

You will notice that I have not said anything about human rights as against property rights. That issue is out, because property rights are the human rights—salted down—of the older generation, while human rights are the younger generation's bid for property rights. Generally speaking, the Republican Party has become property-minded to the extent that it represents the older generation while the Democratic Party has renewed itself in the name of human rights by seeking to promote the property rights of the younger group of Americans. Most of these distinctions, however, are being wiped out by the war itself, which tends to sacrifice the human rights of the young and the property rights of the old. Putting it bluntly, we do not count the cost in money when our sons go out to defend us with their lives and would shrink from no sacrifice to insure their safe return.

Now let's take a look at President Roosevelt's assets and liabilities.

On the debit side of the Roosevelt ledger is the fact that he has served three terms. Both he and his administration, though refreshed with some new blood, are getting old and the country is thoroughly used to them and is beginning to wonder whether a change would be helpful.

Another thing is the fact that the Roosevelt administration has been compelled to ask the people to accept sacrifices and to forgive mistakes. In a political system which has hitherto functioned by granting favors and passing the gravy, this is very disturbing.

Finally, there is the question of a fourth term—16 consecutive years in the White House. Make no mistake about it. We have paid a high price for the third term and will pay still more for a fourth term. There are men and groups of men—ambitious, powerful, and aggressive men in both parties—who are kept within bounds only if they believe that the way to the White House is open to their ambitions. To close our political system at the top for 16 years is to invite bitterness and worse in our public life. Here it can be said that while we may not get what we pay for, we shall surely pay for what we get. The price of the fourth term will certainly be high in terms of bitterness, partisanship, and organized obstruction of our political processes. Some go so far as to suggest that Roosevelt may play the role not only of Abraham Lincoln but of Andrew Johnson in the 4 years that lie ahead, if he is reelected next November.

Another force which is working against Roosevelt is the tendency of foreign groups—allies as well as enemies—to play politics with our electorate in order to put the heat on the Roosevelt administration for their own national purposes. Since this is a very delicate matter for public discussion in time of war, I shall only suggest that we be on guard against any attempt by any foreign government to play politics with our national decision this year. It will be difficult enough for Americans to act wisely in this unprecedented crisis, without the added distraction of special appeals to hyphenates or to ideological prejudice.

Turning to the assets of President Roosevelt's position, they are easy to enumerate: His personal popularity, his record, and, quite naturally, the inadvisability of changing horses in the middle of the stream.

Popularity is, perhaps, not quite the word to describe the broad trust and general affection in which the President is held, not only in this country but throughout the world (excepting, of course, the Axis world). In foreign policy, this is a very important factor which we ought to weigh well in the coming period of diplomatic negotiation and world readjustment. It is not a quality which he can pass on to his successor. The same, of course, is still more true of internal affairs. The people of this country, by and large, like President Roosevelt and, even when they do not agree with his policies, they trust his purposes and his motives. No doubt there are many exceptions, but we are not discussing the extreme partisans, but the average men and women who do the working, the fighting, and the voting.

I have heard serious and responsible men say, in private conversation, that if the Republicans are elected this year, there will be a revolution here within 4 years. I do not agree with them, for reasons which I will outline, but it is worth noting that such extreme prophecies are evidence of the fact that, with the possible exception of HENRY WALLACE, President Roosevelt is the only Presidential possibility of 1944 who will not have to start from scratch in convincing the mass of the people of his concern for the common man and woman.

I do not believe that there is serious possibility of revolution because 1944 finds the forces of corporate property really divided on the matter of national policy. The big business interests of oil, rubber, motors, and chemicals tend to support Dewey and a policy of economic nationalism. The big business interests of steel, rails, utilities, and finance tend to support Roosevelt's policy of international cooperation. Unless all of these great economic corporate forces are vehemently lined up on one side, there is little chance that the politics of this country will go to extremes.

President Roosevelt's record is, of course, largely responsible for his personal popularity, his grip on the imagination and loyalties of the American people. It is a good record. Period. Admitting all possible mistakes, blunders, errors of judgment, and failures, it is still a good record. Period.

The banks were failing. President Roosevelt restored them and introduced needed reforms into the stock exchanges and business systems.

Labor was given the right of collective bargaining, social security, and protection against sweat-shop methods. Whatever the subsequent excesses, the status of labor is more satisfactory to labor and a better guaranty against social catastrophe than the old system of bread lines, riots, selling apples, and Chicago massacres.

The farmers have been given stability and security. The wave of evictions and foreclosures was halted and agriculture is again a profitable as well as a respectable way of life.

Needed public works were instituted. T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams are vital to our war effort. President Roosevelt was blocked on some of his plans, but perhaps it would have been better to have the St. Lawrence power and waterway project as a pistol aimed at the heart of Hitler's Europe. Certainly, American lives would have been saved and American tankers protected, if we had built the Florida ship canal.

As a war leader, President Roosevelt has found and held important allies, with whose help he has kept the war far away from America. None of our great cities has even suffered a single bombing attack. The war is being fought 3,000, 5,000, 8,000, 12,000 miles away from our borders. The fact that we are free to hold an election this year, is due to the sound political and military strategy adopted by the President. The fact is that President Roosevelt is, in the opinion of the mass of Americans, doing a pretty good job as Commander in Chief of our armed forces. His record is, I repeat, the most important asset in the President's possession.

This brings up the issue of not changing horses while crossing the stream.

Here, it seems to me, President Roosevelt is the beneficiary of the fear that the Republican Party may attempt to change streams as well as horses. The Republican candidate—if elected—would owe his victory to, among others, the support of isolationists and pro-Axis elements, hate-Roosevelt men, and the like. His victory could be interpreted as a mandate to change policies. Otherwise, why change Presidents? Why change parties? The pressure inside the party would be intense to alter many of the details and emphases of national policy and, above all, to have a thorough house cleaning, to get rid of Democrats and put in Republicans in all the jobs. Whatever else that meant, it would tend to paralyze the American Government for 6 months or a year, while a bunch of greenhorns were finding out about their new jobs. Wartime is not a good time to introduce a year's delay in our national functioning. That, at any rate, is the essence of the don't-change-horses argument.

Now let's lift up our eyes to the hills a little. What are the things which this election should change, if America is to survive? I can set two of them right now.

First. We ought to do something about bureaucracy. I know the official definition of a bureaucrat is a Democrat who is working for the Government. The bureaucrats who need reform are not those usually attacked. The military and naval bureaucrats are far more dangerous. They are officers and gentlemen and they are honest, patriotic Americans. But they have got set in their ways and have repeatedly blocked necessary developments. I will mention only one point which has recently achieved publicity—the parachute situation. Our Air Forces, until recently, insisted on a parachute which had three points of release for the harness and repeatedly refused to adopt the single-point release used by every other air force in the world. Lives were lost, and our Air Force in England practically went on strike before the Army would change this device. There are many similar situations throughout the procurement end of our armed forces due to stubborn or short-sighted bureaucrats in the uniform of the Army and the Navy.

Another thing which we must conquer is the tendency to engage in a parody of post-war planning. Here again I'll illustrate what I mean by reference to recent newspaper stories. According to these stories, the Army and War Production Board were anxious to release materials for the manufacture of civilian automobiles and suggested that certain motor companies which had finished their war contracts should start making civilian automobiles which were needed as replacements on the home front. According to the newspapers, this proposal met with strong opposition from the motor companies which were still busy on war contracts. They felt that it would be fairer to deprive the public of any new automobiles at all until all the motor companies were in a position to compete for the post-war market for automobiles.

This type of post-war planning is too much along the line of planned scarcity to make much sense. The sooner we get away from it the better off we shall be in the post-war period.

My personal belief is that the sooner we base our planning of all kinds—for war and peace—on acceptance of technological rather than purely financial or political controls the better off we shall be. In this, the most highly technological war in history, it is remarkable that not one single policy-making position in the war administration is held by a man who has technical training or experience. The same, I hasten to add, is generally true of banking establishments and big industry. When the box office tries to write the plays we don't get good theater, and when

the lawyers or the bankers try to run industry or Government we don't get full technical performance. Since the dynamics of both the Hitler system and the Soviet Union are founded on giving free play to technologists—provided, of course, they are party members in good standing—I think that we could achieve staggering results if we, with our free institutions, gave free play to our technologists, regardless of race, color, creed, or political affiliation.

I think that the record of American industry in this war proves the point. In two short years we not only caught up with but outstripped nations which had been organizing their industries for war for whole generations. Our industrial contribution to the victory of the United Nations is one of the marvels of economic history. It shows what we can do when we free industry from financial inhibitions and use the profit motive to unleash full production. For we have done this by scrapping all considerations of financial prudence and using industry on the basis of its capacity to produce rather than its record of past earnings.

Here, it seems to me, is the most hopeful thing which can come out of the war for America. My concept of liberalism is inseparable from human inventiveness. To release the human mind and human energies for discovery and production is what liberalism must accomplish if liberalism is to be anything more than a polite topic for parlor conversation. To restrict human energy, to suppress inventions and to bottle up new processes and production is my id a of reaction. The war has showed what we can do, once we are given the green light. The election of 1944 should decide that, whatever else may happen, America will never return to the kind of normalcy in which production was sacrificed to prices, profits, or property.

As I said at the opening of these remarks, we are going through a political earthquake in this country. I have tried to discuss these political issues calmly and reasonably, because now is almost the deadline which divides reason from passion in an election year. Before the votes are counted, heaven only knows what extremes we may have been driven to by our traditional forms of partisanship. For my own part, I shall try to remember not to throw the grandfather clock out the window and shall also try not to get too excited when I hear others announce that the end of the world has come. I hope, however, that we can do better than that and that during the months which lie ahead all of us—those who believe that I am on the level and those who disagree with any word I utter—can work together and hold this country together. For these are stormy days and unless we keep our heads and tempers here at home, we may find ourselves facing a far worse disaster than that of the victory of the other fellow in this year's presidential campaign.

Soviet Activity in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, to include an article from the April 1944 issue of The Sign, a national Catholic magazine published by Passionist Missions, Inc., entitled "Soviet Activity in Poland." I wish to say the author of this article, under the pen name of Ann Su Cardwell, is in reality Margaret Super, former Warsaw correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, and the wife of Paul Super, who for 19 years was head of the Y. M. C. A. in Poland.

SOVIET ACTIVITY IN POLAND

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

At present we are supposed to have only one occupant—the Germans; but a second is preparing to occupy—preparing with the help of its Communist crews." Thus wrote one of the editors of a Polish underground paper in the summer of 1943. The use of the word "supposed" was intentional, for in reality eastern Poland was even then feeling the weight of the second occupant's hand, and the fingers of that hand were rapidly pushing themselves into the life of every part of Poland. All of this was and is under cover, of course, for the time has not yet arrived when the Soviet Government is willing to let its work be known.

The activities carried on by agents from the U. S. S. R. in Poland at the direction of Moscow are of two kinds, political and military. The work of each group is clearly outlined and in charge of men trained for that particular purpose. Their number reaches into the tens of thousands. In no country except the Soviet Union itself has there ever been such propaganda strength massed to work for communism.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon one of the chief characteristics o all these Bolshevist efforts; that is the camouflaged hand. Soviet political agents were instructed to creep into genuine national patriotic Polish organizations and gradually transform them into tools for the propagation of Soviet doctrine. Since no Polish patriotic institutions or organizations are permitted by the Germans, those existing are of necessity underground, and Poles have so guarded the entry to them that wolves in sheep's clothing seldom have been able to slip in.

But failure here did not deter; it only necessitated other methods. The agents proceeded to set up groups of their own with names similar to those of the genuine Polish groups—names so similar that it is the easiest thing in the world to confuse one with the other. For example, long before the Comintern was dissolved by order of the executive committee of that organization, the Polish Communist Party got orders to disband. One of the leading and most highly respected political parties in Poland, both of pre-war and present times, is that of the Socialists. In Polish it goes by the name of P. P. S. What the political agents from Moscow did—acting as always on instructions—was to dissolve the Communist Party in Poland and announce the formation of a Polish Workers' Party, the P. P. R. The intention here is perfectly clear. It was expected that through confusion of P. P. S. and P. P. R. working people and peasants, who are utterly opposed to communism and the "protection" of the U. S. S. R., would be inveigled into the Bolshevik-sponsored party. For the P. P. R. is nothing but the Communist Party under another name.

With the P. P. R. as their organization, these political workers from the U. S. S. R., dropped by parachute on Polish territory, have established "cells" all over Poland. Their task is to undermine the morale of the Poles, to draw them into the P. P. R., to create anarchy, thus permitting communism to take over at the time of the German collapse. To accomplish this objective the agents have unlimited funds at their disposal. Printed matter in the form of newspapers, leaflets, periodicals, and placards is distributed in enormous quantities, and Polish citizens drawn into corporation receive handsome sums. Few succumb to the munificent offers, but it is understandable that when loved ones are starving and food can be had if there is money for the black market, the temptation is great for those who do not understand the real nature of these publications masquerading as Polish.

For many months, at least a half dozen regular papers of this sort have been appearing in Warsaw itself, right under the noses of the Germans. There is the Tribune of Liberty, the Guardsman, the Peasant's Tribune, the Polish Railroader, the Tramway Worker, the Fighting Youth, the Voice of Warsaw, and a daily radio bulletin—all of them Communist propaganda. The names of these papers indicate the groups to which they are directed, but special attention should be called to the effort through Fighting Youth—which is distributed among the school children as well as youth forced into labor by the Germans—to get hold of Polish young people.

These papers are circulated not only in Warsaw but throughout the country. As for their contents, they are filled with articles denouncing the legal Polish Government in London, with editorials aimed at stirring up discord among Poles, with calls for sabotage that will aid the Red armies, and for strikes of various workers' groups such as telephone operators, with never-ceasing demands for rising of the Poles against the Germans. The Poles do not read these papers. They refer to them contemptuously as dirty red rags.

Another method employed by the Soviet agents is the use of proclamations and manifestoes. One such addressed not long ago to members of all political parties in Poland called for the introduction of the Communist order in that country, the cession of the eastern provinces to the U. S. S. R., and asserted that the future of Poland depended upon its close association with the Soviet Union. Strange as it may seem, though addressed to all Polish political parties, the proclamation vehemently denounces the work and methods of all of them.

Help in the political field is given from the U. S. S. R. itself, where a Communist radio station masking under the name of the Polish patriot Kosciusko broadcasts several times daily to Poland news that is exactly contrary to that broadcast in Polish from London and in addition supplies propaganda and comment from the Communist angle. In Moscow, too, is the so-called "Union of Polish Patriots," a handful of former Polish citizens who are not all Polish in nationality. They are now Soviet citizens. Wanda Wasilewska, their leader, has, I am informed, passport number one of the "Western Ukraine," and has the title and wears the uniform of a colonel in the Red Army. The Polish patriots are nothing but the tool of the Soviet Government, which expects to set them up as a puppet government in Poland that would "ask for admission" into the Soviet Union as the seventeenth Soviet republic.

Among the White Ruthenians there is a struggle between the Soviet agents and the Germans to win the support of the priests of the Orthodox faith. Leaflets are circulated among them carrying instructions from the head of the Orthodox Church in the U. S. S. R. as to what the local priests are to do. From all that can be learned, neither the Bolsheviks nor the Germans are meeting with any success. To the Ukrainians the Soviets are saying that after Stalian defeats the Hitelerites he will clear out the Poles and make all of southeastern Poland part of an independent Ukraine. In other papers they pose as mediators between the Poles and Ukrainians—a hypocrisy that deceives nobody.

Recent trends in the activities of the political agents indicate that they have received orders to prepare all their organizations for participation in actual fighting.

Hitherto there has been nothing of this. All reference to use of arms was confined to insistence upon an armed rising of the Poles against the Germans. Just previous to this change, a number of Red Army officers was sent to Warsaw to increase agitation for Polish uprisings, and prices on the clandestine arms market—which has existed since the beginning of the German occupation of Poland—soared because of the extensive purchases made by the P. P. R.

Poles are not moved by these demands for a premature uprising, as they well understand that any attempt of the Poles to free themselves from German control before the British and Americans are in a position to get aid to them would only end in the butchery of all Poles taking part and mass executions of the rest as punishment. Instead of following the advice of these agents and their tools who term themselves "Polish patriots," the Poles ask where those same "patriots" were when millions of Polish citizens in eastern Poland were suffering deportation, imprisonment, execution, to say nothing of loss of property and all things belonging to western culture and civilization, during the 22 months they were under the control of Stalin, "the protector of the world of labor."

One of the more recent political moves of the Soviets in Poland was the naming of a "National Council," again hiding behind a recognized, respected Polish body, the Council of National Unity. This false council whose formation was announced by P. P. R., will in time appoint a "temporary government" and establish relations with the Soviet Union and others of the United Nations, according to statements issued. It has already "appointed" a puppet commander in chief of all the Polish armed forces to "replace" the actual commander in chief. General Sosnkowski, idol of all Polish soldiers but bitterly attacked by Soviet writers and speakers. It has also ordered the reorganization of the Bolshevik guerrillas, the Partisans, in Poland, whose name henceforth is to be not the People's Guard but the People's Army. Everything is being changed over to a national basis.

All of this activity is being carried on by one of the United Nations—the U. S. S. R.—on the territory of another member of the United Nations—Poland, the first to stand against the common enemy, Germany. There is a legal Polish Government, and it has authorized representatives in Poland with a fully organized Government underground, ready to come into the open and take over whenever the order to do so is given by the Polish Government in London. There is an underground army in Poland, officially the Home Army, with a commander responsible only to the Polish Commander in Chief, General Sosnkowski. Of this army we shall speak further on. The point to note now is that the Soviet political agents are endeavoring to clothe the false regime they are setting up with the truly Polish authority of the legal Polish Government and Commander in Chief. The next step will be the recognition of these false bodies and leaders as the real ones by the Soviet Government, which will occur when Stalin deems that the hour has struck.

Before we leave the political agents, one more word. They are everywhere spreading anti-British and anti-American propaganda. The Poles are told that they must beware of what the Americans and British tell them, that salvation will never come to Poland from the "capitalist" countries, that there is no hope for Poland except from the U. S. S. R. This is nothing new. Authentic reports of such propaganda carried on both in eastern Europe and the U. S. S. R. have been coming out ever since the war began. Such propaganda was entirely unaffected by the German attack on Russia which made the latter one of the "democratic" countries lined up with the "capitalists."

Now about the partisans, of which so much appears in the daily press. They are integral parts of the Red Army. Small detachments of Red Army soldiers were left in the forests of eastern Poland to serve as guerrillas and later as centers around which partisan groups could be organized. These have been augmented by numbers dropped by parachute by the Russians, and continue to be so augmented. In this manner, too, arrive arms and equipment, and by this means groups most readily are established in central Poland.

The headquarters of these troops are in the forests and marshes of northern and eastern Poland, in the forests and mountains of the central and southern sections. The bands are most numerous in the eastern and northern parts of the country, where a single group may consist of several thousand men. In southeastern Poland the groups are smaller, but they have established themselves in every county. The commanders and higher officers are Red Army officers. The soldiers are of various nationalities—Soviet soldiers who have escaped from German prisoner-of-war camps, among them men of Mongolian race; deserters from the Axis armies on the Eastern front; members of the lawless local element, especially Ukrainian youth who have been the object of intensive propaganda under both German and Soviet occupation; Gypsies; and finally, Polish citizens forcibly recruited by the partisans for membership in the various groups.

In eastern Poland, where the Germans have controlled the towns but never the countryside, partisan bands have boldly gone in and carried on recruiting, even having qualified doctors who give the necessary physical examinations. In one area they did this with a German garrison in a town less than 4 miles distant. In cases where the inhabitants resist compulsory induction into these bands, they are shot, sometimes 20 or 30 at a time. Another form of recruiting is to spread a report that the Polish Government has ordered an uprising but that the reactionary representatives refuse to publish the order. Then they send secret orders to young men to report at a given spot in a forest at a fixed time when they will be taken into the home army. On arrival, the rercuit hears a fine patriotic address, takes the oath of allegiance, and then finds himself listening to Communist political teaching. Too late he realizes what has happened, and although many escape, getting away is difficult, and then the youth must reestablish himself in the eyes of loyal Poles.

Many of the partisan units wear the Polish colors and the Polish emblem, the White Eagle. Such say that they are detachments of General Berling's army, General Berling being the commander of the Polish divisions organized under compulsion in the U. S. S. R. by the Polish patriots. The divisions are made up of men from among the deported Polish citizens who, through the break-down of Polish-Soviet relations, were never permitted by Stalin to leave the Soviet Union. They had no choice. They had only orders.

The Partisans are splendidly armed and equipped with everything of the very newest type. They have automatic pistols, machine guns, antiaircraft and antitank guns, and in some cases tanks. One detachment, numbering several thousand men, that passed through southeastern Poland apparently en route to Moldavia, consisted of cavalry, artillery, and infantry.

These bands do not seek to engage the Germans. Quite the contrary. They raid and pillage the homes of Polish country folk, whether manor house or cottage, the homes of the intellectual classes and of the clergy. They rob homes of everything useful, even compelling people to give up wearing apparel. They burn stores of grain and stacks of hay, although they know—or because they know—that increases danger of starvation for the Poles. They learn delivery dates for grain and livestock quotas, and then appear and take these for themselves. Thus in one town where there was a German force of about 100, some 300 Partisans entered and, informing the Germans that they would not be troubled if they stayed out of the way, visited all the stores and went off with all the textile and leather stocks in the town. The next day they returned and drove off all the hogs that the farmers had delivered in accordance with the quota order. On neither occasion did the Germans offer resistance, nor did they do anything later.

The common German reaction to such raids takes the form of reprisals on the innocent Polish people of the neighborhood where the raid occurs. There is no attempt by the Germans to discover and punish the Bolshevik raiders. Instead, a punitive expedition is sent out which deports or executes the unfortunate villagers and burns their homes to the ground. Provocation of these reprisals is part of the Partisan assignment. Thus the Poles suffer twice, one day at the hands of the bandits, the next at the hands of the legal government, while the silent man in the Kremlin wears his enigmatic smile.

Although the Partisans do not engage in anti-German activities, except in sabotaging communication to the eastern front, for which there is a specially trained band of experts from the U. S. S. R., they take credit to themselves before the world for such action carried on by the regular home army, mentioned earlier. In fact, what the Partisans do is all to the disadvantage of the Polish people. It cannot help Poles to have stores of food destroyed. It does not help when the Partisans burn landmarks of Polish culture, like the manor house that was the Soplicowo in Pan Tadeusz, that epic beloved of all Poles and which played so vital a part in the life of the Polish people during the long years after the Eighteenth Century partitions of their country when there was no Poland on the map but only in Polish hearts. It does not help to have the lawless element of the Ukrainian people supplied with weapons and encouraged to hideous mass murder of Polish women and children and of Ukrainians who will have nothing to do with such outrages.

Along with their raiding and recruiting for their People's Army, the Bolsheviks are bold enough to hold meetings which they compel people of the neighborhood to attend. On these occasions the Polish Government is violently atacked, "capitalist" states come in for their share, and the Soviet Government is extolled. At one such meeting the speakers promised that huge Red Armies would soon occupy all the countries now under German control and even Germany itself; and the session closed with the declaration, forced from the assembled audience, that the eastern provinces of Poland belong to the Soviet Union.

The people of Poland are not deceived by this termite work under the guise of Polish patriotism. They know that a real friend does not enter one's house and take over, depriving the owner of all his rights of decision. They know that the Polish Home Army is trained and disciplined, waiting eagerly for the day when it will be ordered by its beloved commander in chief to go into action. They know who in Poland is fighting the Germans in every possible way, and they know that it is not the Partisans.

They know much more than that. When the Soviet agents talk about the necessity of Poland's having the protection of the U. S. S. R., they understand fully what that signifies, for from September 17, 1939, to the latter part of June 1941, all eastern Poland was under that protection. What did it

mean? Destruction of everything in the social, educational, cultural, and economic realms that the Poles had been able to achieve in 20 years of independence; the extermination of all things Polish; vast property destruction; the cruel torture and execution of thousands of Polish citizens, and deportation of more than 1,500,000 others to the depths of Asiatic Russia, where they suffered horrors passing all description and hundreds of thousands of them have perished; pauperization of those who escaped this fate and remained under the oppressors' domination in eastern Poland, where every sphere of life underwent complete sovietization.

Such protection holds no charm for men and women who value freedom more than life itself, who declared at the outset of this war that it was not a war of Hitler and his crew against Poland, but a war of anti-Christian against Christian forces. The fact that Hitler may be on the way out and that the standard of the anti-Christian element may pass from his hand to Stalin's in no wise changes the character of the struggle.

But what will be the fate of the Polish citizens unfortunate enough to be on territory now gradually being taken over from the retreating Germans by the Red Armies? It can only be surmised from the procedures of the Soviet authorities during the period when they were in control of eastern Poland after the treacherous Soviet stabbing of Poland in 1939, at which time I was in that area.

We Must Be on Guard Against Germany's Key Figure for Post-War Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am asking consent to include with my remarks herewith an article from Barron's Weekly which appears in the current issue of Reader's Digest. The article is by Dr. Max Immanuel, former official of the German Reichsbank, who resignad that position when Hitler came to power, was retained as economic consultant by a number of American corporations, came to this country in 1938, has been head consultant of the Board of Economic Warfare, and is now an American citizen.

Dr. Immanuel's article entitled "Beware Schacht" is therefore written from the point of view of a man who knows from his own intimate experience what we have to fear from the crafty operations of this German financier.

In connection with Dr. Immanuel's article I refer the House to previous speeches of my own on the subject of the Bank for International Settlements:

BEWARE SCHACHT!

(By Dr. Max Immanuel)

(Condensed from Barron's)

The German to beware of when the war ends in a tall, roosterish financier and jack-of-all-political-trades named Dr. Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht. Hitler and the High Command will be given short shrift by the Allies, Schacht might be accepted—although he is the most untrustworthy German of them all.

Germany even now is feverishly preparing an economic and political offensive to begin the moment war is over. It will be a powerful effort to retain the booty taken from conquered Europe, to evade penalties, to get money for reconstruction—in a word, to obtain the conditions essential to preparation for a third world war. Dr. Schacht is intimately associated with all this activity.

The German radio recently has been reporting Schacht to be in disfavor with the Nazis. This is the beginning of a build-up for Schacht as a post-war negotiator. It will enable him to pop up with the air of a man who has opposed the Nazis all the time, and therefore is worthy of assuming the task of reconstructing Germany along democratic lines.

I know how Schacht operates and what he thinks deep in his heart. For 10 years I was associated with him when he was president of the Reichsbank. We saw each other daily. He had a favorite sermon which he often preached to me: "Forget your idealism. Get rich, then seek political power—and don't let anything stand in your way."

Schacht is a booby trap which, if accepted at face value, will ultimately explode and blow America's post-war dreams into oblivion. One big reason why he is dangerous is that he knows the United States and has a good reputation here. His father brought him here when he was a small child, and he lived in Brooklyn during his boyhood. The elder Schacht, a great admirer of the United States, added Horace Greeley to the youngster's name.

The family returned to Germany when Schacht was 12, but he has been a frequent visitor to the United States and speaks fluent English, sparking it with colloquialisms. In 1931-32 he made a tour of the country on behalf of Hitler, who was then about to seize power. From lecture platforms in all the principal cities he told his listeners that Der Fuehrer was a stanch believer in capitalism, a liberal, and all in all a pretty nice fellow. To friends in New York he said, "A man is rising in Germany who is greater than Napoleon, as great as Jesus Christ." To a lecture audience in Town Hall he promised the most peace-loving government in Germany's history.

A man of infinite charm and shrewd to the point of genius, Schacht made many friends here, particularly in financial and big-business circles. Many of them, I regret to say, still believe in him.

Lately he has been traveling frequently to and from Switzerland. (The fact that he is permitted to move freely is proof of his favorable relations with the Nazi Party.) In Basel not long ago he talked with an important figure in American banking. Other discussions by Schacht's agents have been taking place in Lisbon, Madrid, and Buenos Aires.

Recently Schacht proposed that German industry be taken over after the war by a commission of British, American, and German industrialists. In return, Germany would be permitted to choose its own government and keep its industrial plant.

This proposal aroused no enthusiasm, so Schacht followed it with another. This I have in private cables from a source in London which is not to be doubted. It offers to soften German resistance in the west to permit British and American armies to get to Berlin before the Russians. There is more than one good reason for believing this report. The Russians have no illusions about Dr. Schacht and might promptly liquidate him.

The real peace offensive, however, will begin when the war ends. The Nazi leaders will be either in hiding or in prison, the generals without power. Then my old friend Schacht, brushing the swastikas from his lapel and beaming with cordiality, will begin the task of beating the Allies out of their victory.

After the German inflation that followed the last war, bankers everywhere, with supreme faith in the industry of the German people, hurried to lend the country money. Millions in loans from small American, British, and Latin-American investors went to the Reich. It was this money—little of it ever repaid—that built the German roads and gave the country the finest industrial plant in Europe.

Later Schacht refused point-blank to pay interest on the bonds the foreigners had purchased. This forced down the price of the bonds, and Schacht then bought them in at a fraction of their cost.

Schacht also tricked and maneuvered until he had wrecked the Dawes and Young plans for Germany's payment of war reparations. This led to the Hoover moratorium suspending all reparations payments. They were never resumed. Then Schacht fought and wheedled until the moratorium was extended to private loans—this at a time when the Reich was well able to pay. After these achievements, the way was clear for the coming of Hitler and another war.

Most of these operations Schacht accomplished as president of the Reichsbank under the Weimar Republic. He resigned that post as soon as he decided that Hitler was coming into power. Then he lashed out in a series of brutal attacks on his old associates. When the Nazis marched in, the men of the republic fled or were seized, imprisoned, or killed. These men were Schacht's former comrades; they had given him a leg up when he needed it. Now he gave them no thought; he merely stepped across the line and joined the new government.

Because Hitler badly needed a front man—one who would look good to international finance and big business—he made Schacht the economic dictator of the Third Reich. Schacht lent the brown-shirted hoodlums of the Munich Bierstube an aura of respectability which helped greatly in establishing the new government.

Schacht today, at 67, is a homely, somewhat ludicrous individual. About 6 feet 3 inches tall, with Clark Gable ears and a G. I. haircut, he wears spotted, baggy clothes and, invariably, a gleaming white celluloid collar about 4 inches high. The collar is his trademark. Gustav Stresemann, former foreign minister, used to say it was the only clean thing about him.

In his personal relations, Schacht's manner varies with the people with whom he is dealing. To subordinates he is harsh and implacable, and to his opponents he is often intolerably rude. But to those he needs he can be a man of great charm. In the movie, Mission to Moscow, Schacht is depicted as an earnest and upright fellow who would do anything he could to accommodate you.

In the summer of 1939 he visited France and Britain and there he warned the chancelleries of the imminence of war and whispered "in strictest confidence" the details of the Nazi military machine. It was Schacht's contribution to the war of nerves which Hitler hoped would be sufficient to keep those two countries out of war.

The paradox of Schacht's career is that, although his gift of betrayal was known to many people, he yet continued to occupy high office. Marshal Goering summed it up neatly when he described Schacht as "unloved, unwanted, indispensable." He was hated and distrusted within the Nazi party, particularly by Goebbels and Himmler, and was never elected a member—although Hitler finally gave him an honorary membership. Schacht in private used to refer to his party pin as his lifesaving badge.

Schacht's first job was record clerk in a large Berlin bank. He advanced with such

speed that early in the First World War he was appointed an aide to the civil governor of occupied Belgium. He made a good thing out of his job until his chiefs discovered that he had been throwing business, which should have been divided equaly among all German banks, exclusively to his former employers.

Later, Schacht used his high office as head of the Reichsbank to make a fortune gambling secretly on the stock exchange in Switzerland. He also became the secret backer of several manufacturing enterprises, and then used his influence to have their products bought by government agencies.

The story of Schacht's economic manipulations that made possible the rebirth of the German war machine is too complex to describe in detail. However, it might be noted that it was Schacht who centralized all exporting and developed the system of barter by which Germany was able to obtain war-essential minerals and oil in return for cheap toys and cameras.

He also invented the blocked mark and a whole series of tricky currencies. A country receiving payment in these money found that they could be spent only in Germany or for German goods, that they had no value elsewhere.

Schacht once made a "plunder survey" of the Balkans, listing everything seizable in production or financial wealth. The report appalled even the hardened Nazis, who pointed out that he had not left so much as a ton of provisions for the needs of local populations. "Oh, God, do they have to eat?" exclaimed Schacht.

By 1937 the German Army was an ominous fact, and Schacht's groundwork was done. He ostensibly retired to raise pigs in the seclusion of his estate.

Every trustworthy source is agreed that, when the war is over, whoever rules Germany will find Schacht at his elbow—or hanging from his neck.

Just as he softened the consequences of defeat after the last war and then made possible the rise of Hitler, so he will come forward to do the same trick again. Inordinately ambitious and supremely self-confident, he sees in the end of this war a new opportunity to gratify his desire to become the one all-powerful man of the Reich.

C. A. A. Instructors Say Army Is Trying To Put Them on the Shelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Sunday Star concerning a situation which I believe every Member of the House should be interested in correcting:

Civilian instructors in the Army's soon-to-be abandoned air-training program are complaining to the Ramspeck Civil Service Investigating Committee in the House that they are being brushed off by boards named to inquire into their further usefulness in the war effort, it was learned authoritatively yesterday.

Meanwhile, the committee's investigators are completing a report which will be highly critical of the Army Air Forces' plan to train 2,500 women ferry pilots at a time when thousands of male airmen with, in many cases, thousands of hours of flight time, are begging for assignment. It will be submitted to Chairman RAMSPECK, probably within the next few days, and he and his committee then will determine whether to transmit it to the House.

An inquiry by the committee has confirmed press reports that 48 members of the Women's Air Service Pilots, with only civilian status, are undergoing training for commissions at the air base at Orlando, Fla. The course given them will last nearly 7 months, which approximates the 9-months course given male candidates for commissions in the Army Air Forces, the committee found.

BILL STILL BEFORE COMMITTEE

Although the Costello bill now pending in Congress would authorize the commissioning of the WASPS into the Air Forces, it is still before the House Rules Committee, and some leaders on Capitol Hill doubt that it will ever pass. In training these women for commissions before passage of the measure, a congressional source said today, the Air Forces appear to have jumped the gun.

As a result of widespread complaints by pilots in the Civil Aeronautics Authority's war training service program, who hold that they are being shelved, the War Department set up boards of inquiry to look into their usefulness as candidates for regular combat pilots, ferry pilots, and other duties.

ONE INQUIRY CITED

A report received in Washington from a squadron commander at one of the training schools gives the following account of the inquiry that was allegedly conducted there:

"On Saturday, April 15, 1944," the report said, "the instructors of this school engaged in the flight training of aviation cadets for the Army Air Forces were favored with a visit by a so-called Flying Instructor Board.

"The opening words of the speaker for this Board were in part: 'Since curtailment of the primary training program so many telegrams and letters have been received by your Senators and Congressmen as to your disposition that they are on the Army's neck, and we have to do something to get them off.'

"The things that followed were most humiliating and embarrassing. After a brief explanation we were handed a contract, called instructor interview form, to sign. It asked what we wanted to do if we were qualified. We were not given time to think it over, and were required to make our choice in pencil and make our signature in ink. They told us it was only a survey and not a contract."

THREE CHOICES PROVIDED

The report then quoted the form submitted to the men. It provided that they might apply for (a) discharge from the Enlisted Reserve Corps; (b) continuance in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for training and duty with the Air Transport Command; (c) call to active duty with the Army Air Forces.

The form, as quoted in the report, concluded:

"I further understand that if I choose major option B and am assigned thereto, and am at any point found not qualified for such training or duty I therefore and with due consideration of the above-named major options, elect the following dispositions or forms of duty on training as my preference in the order named * * *.

"And I accept and desire whichever one of the above three preferences is approved for me under existing regulations, and will perform to the best of my ability. Signature * * *."

The pilot making the report said that he considered the form "a binding contract."

QUALIFICATIONS ARE RIGID

The report pointed out that to qualify for training as an Army Transport Service pilot the applicant must have at least 6 months' service in an Army contract or war-training service school, be between 18 and 35, and have flown 1,000 hours as a pilot, 200 of which must have been in aircraft of over 200 horsepower. By contrast, WASP applicants are required to have 35 hours.

"If these qualifications are met," it continued, "we then get transition training, but we are told the Air Transport Command is full and running over, so they go on to say in the instructor interview form: 'If the individual fails to complete satisfactorily the above-mentioned training or is discharged from his employment with the Air Transport Command for other reasons, his name will be submitted by the Air Transport Command to higher headquarters for call to active duty in the Army Air Forces in an enlisted capacity.'

"Here they again have ample opportunity to give us the boot."

Inquiry made by the Ramspeck committee at another school, it was understood, was met with the reply that a major—constituting the board—had called to interview pilots. He said before leaving, it was reported, that only one of the group of 14 instructor-pilots had a chance to qualify for the Army Transport Service. At still another school where inquiry was made, the officer conducting the survey was quoted as saying that only one man might qualify, and he was a candidate for glider service.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on April 29, 1944:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, at least 2,000,000 American fighting men will want to own their own farms at the close of this war. But they are going to face plenty of obstacles before they realize this ambition unless they get more cooperation than is now in sight.

One of the greatest accomplishments of the Lincoln administration during the War between the States was the formulation of a far-sighted post-war plan for the returning soldiers. Later Congress adopted this plan and called it the homestead law.

Under its provisions the new lands of the West were opened up for settlement and agriculture. Every soldier had priority for a plot and thousands of them flocked westward to take advantage of it.

The Homestead Act saved many a patriotic American from the misery and poverty of the city and gave him the chance he had prayed for—that of owning and working his own farm. Instead of a burden to society, he became a self-respecting, independent, freedom-loving farmer, who could reap what he sowed and live in the knowledge and security of his own industry and on the stability of his own farm.

I hope the Congress will turn back the pages of history and examine the homestead laws. Many people do not realize that today our Government is still the greatest landlord. There are more than 2,000,000 acres that ought to be given back to private hands. These great tracts should be made available to returning heroes of World War No. 2.

Every soldier who yearns to get back to the farm, who desires to possess his own land should have the chance to do so. As for me, I believe America has grown great because the soldiers of all our past wars were encouraged to make their own way and to till the soil. I believe we can well afford to encourage them after this war to do the same thing.

Would it not be a source of pride to the American people to be able to say to their young men who return from the war, we have kept the faith, we have a program ready for you, the way of peace is open for all men and nations. You must travel that road, and we are causing your journey to be easier by the preparations we have made. Go forth and may success be yours, my son.

No, dear friends, we must not fail our soldier boys. Let us not give rise to the sad spectacle which eighteenth century England faced at the time of her great social revolution when the little farms of her people were transformed overnight into great estates and sheep ranches as result of the vast migration from farm to factory, spelling doom to England's small landowners and independent farmers.

Let us heed the warning of a poet of the period:

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey
Where wealth accumulates and men decay
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them, as a breath has made
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

"A time there was, ere England's grief began
When every rood of ground maintained its man
For him light labor spread her wholesome store
Just gave what life required, but gave no more
His best companions, innocence and health
And his best riches, ignorance of wealth.

"But times are altered, trade's oppressive train
Has entered in and dispossessed the swain."

Abuse of O. P. A. Power by Chester Bowles Destroys Strawberry Growers' Rights and Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, if you are a grower of strawberries or other perishable crops on which an O. P. A. ceiling price has been fixed, you cannot appeal to any court, nor can you help yourself according to former American laws and customs in any manner, no matter how discriminatory, how illegal, or how confiscatory Chester Bowles' regulation is. As far as your property rights are concerned you are an absolute prisoner of one Chester Bowles.

Here is how it operates—you cannot use the courts but O. P. A. can.

Chester Bowles put a discriminatory price ceiling on Louisiana strawberries and considering the crop failure of more than 50 percent this season it was absolutely confiscatory.

First the growers appealed to Chester Bowles, who refused to listen. Next the appeal went to Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and then to Fred Vinson, Economic Stabilizer. No aid was forthcoming.

Next 15 Senators and over 30 Congressmen received a sugar-coated answer of no when they appealed to Bowles.

Next the Louisiana growers appealed to President Roosevelt under section 3 of the Price Control Act, asking that Mr. Roosevelt's secretary, Hon. Stephen Early, instruct Chester Bowles to withhold action until the President could return to Washington and pass on this appeal. Bowles refused to withhold action.

Next a suit was submitted to a State court judge in Louisiana. He insisted he could take no jurisdiction even though he thought the farmers should have a restraining order.

Next a suit asking for a restraining order was presented to the judge of the United States District Court of Louisiana. This judge also stated that even his court had no jurisdiction, showing the case of Lockerty against Phillips to the attorneys.

Next a suit was filed in the United States Supreme Court on behalf of the Governor of Louisiana, the State of Louisiana, and the growers. This highest Court denied jurisdiction.

The only court left was the Emergency Court of Appeals, which is most misleading by its name, since the law provides it can issue no restraining orders or injunctions, and by the time this court could have acted several months would have elapsed since this season's last Louisiana strawberries were picked and eaten.

Therefore, the strawberry grower is out in the cold with no court to appeal to to hear his appeal for justice and nothing to stop his property from being taken without due process of law.

But look what the O. P. A. can do: If the O. P. A. says any farmer, individual, or corporation is not treating the O. P. A. fairly, the O. P. A. can go into any State court, any Federal court, and can end up in the United States Supreme Court.

If an individual mistreats or violates an O. P. A. order, he goes to jail or is sued for triple damages.

If Chester Bowles or an O. P. A. subordinate mistreats the farmer, a group of people, or an individual, or violates the Constitution or other laws with a confiscatory regulation, Mr. Bowles just says, "I'm awfully sorry; the O. P. A. just made a mistake or just handled that situation crudely." No court action, no triple damages, no jail term for him, and no money out of his pockets.

What is the remedy? It is easy. Congress should take out of the O. P. A. Act the provisions that prevent an American from going to court in the good old American way. I am submitting to the committees in both the House and the Senate this proposal. If the committees fail to act on this, then when the O. P. A. Act comes before Congress within the next 2 weeks it should be thus amended from the floor. When that is done Mr. Chester Bowles will lose his dictator powers which he has so wrongfully abused and all Americans will then have an opportunity to have their day in court and their opportunity to seek justice according to the Constitution.

The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, among its other provisions, expressly forbids the Administrator of Price Control to do anything that will destroy the price or marketing system. This prohibition is in the following language:

(h) The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

On the 13th day of April, Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, promulgated a regulation fixing a ceiling price on Louisiana strawberries. This ceiling price took effect at 12:01 a. m. April 27, at the height of the Louisiana strawberry season, which opens about the 1st of March and closes about the 1st of June. The effect of this regulation was to destroy at a single stroke the entire price and marketing system that Louisiana growers have worked out over a period of 25 years. This system is delicately balanced and is conditioned on speed and efficiency, the result being that the growers get a sound price for their berries and the final consumer receives the berries while they are still fresh without any great spread between the consumer price and the price the producer receives.

Despite the fact that the order which Mr. Bowles has put into effect is in direct violation of the statute, which creates the position that he now holds, there is no remedy against him. I have just had a disappointing and highly relevant experience in this connection, which forces me to the conclusion that the fault lies in the Congress not having enacted a statute that permits an irresponsible bureaucrat to take private property without due process of law in violation of the Constitution of the United States and at the same time deprives the citizens whose property has been taken of any effectual remedy before the courts. The bureaucrat himself is primarily to blame, but we have had enough experience with some bureaucrats to expect of them the abuse and misuse of any power that is given to them. We ought to know by this time that the only protection the people have against them is in the Congress and the courts and that unless the Congress and the courts provide such protection such men as Bowles will destroy the remnants of freedom we still have.

It is boiled down to this. The Price Control Act provides an Emergency Court of Appeals and provides expressly that no other court shall have jurisdiction of matters arising under the act. In other words, unless the strawberry growers can get relief from the Emergency Court of Appeals they cannot get it anywhere. The trouble with the Emergency Court of Appeals is that the statute provides that it may not issue a

temporary injunction, or any kind of an injunction. It takes a minimum of 3 months to do anything before that court. The Louisiana strawberry season ends the 1st of June. Hence if the strawberry growers went before the Emergency Court of Appeals the season would be gone and the marketing system destroyed and Louisiana strawberry growers would be robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars that rightfully belong to them before they could get the proceeding well under way, and it is questionable whether or not the marketing system can again be built up once it is destroyed. The damage is permanent and irreparable.

Realizing this situation, I first took the case before the United States district court in Louisiana in an effort to get the court to enjoin the unlawful thing that Bowles has done under the general equity powers of the Federal courts. The judge pointed out to me that he was expressly forbidden by the Price Control Act to do anything about the matter. I had to admit to him that was the language of the act.

Thereupon, acting upon authority of the Governor of Louisiana and in the name of the Governor of Louisiana, I filed an original action before the Supreme Court of the United States under the theory that the State of Louisiana, in accordance with the provisions of the third article of the Constitution of the United States, had a right to appeal directly to the Supreme Court in protection of its citizens. The Supreme Court gave the matter careful consideration. It ruled that it did not have jurisdiction of the case. This ruling appears to be based on the provisions of the Price Control Act and is to the effect that the people of Louisiana, even though the State acts on their behalf, have no remedy for the wrong that has been done them except through the Emergency Court of Appeals provided by the statute.

I had hoped that the Supreme Court might hold otherwise, though I had realized from the beginning that the chances were against us. After all, the Supreme Court itself is bound by the statute, if the statute is constitutional, and this statute has been held constitutional. The thing we complained about was not that the statute itself was unconstitutional, but that the thing which Bowles did was directly forbidden by the statute. In other words, we said that Bowles' conduct was illegal and unconstitutional. The Supreme Court says that our remedy for such unlawful conduct is before the Emergency Court of Appeals and that no other court in the land, not even the Supreme Court, can give us any relief.

Now I come back to the proposition that if the people are going to be protected against the high-handed, arbitrary, and unlawful acts of such bureaucrats as Chester Bowles, the Congress itself must see to it that they are given a remedy before the courts that will be a practical remedy instead of a remedy that cannot possibly be put into effect until after they have been robbed of their property and their rights. What good does it do to get a favorable decision from the Emergency Court of Appeals if our crops have spoiled or have been sold at half their value and the whole system upon which our industry is founded has been destroyed. It is too late to do anything for the Louisiana strawberry growers this year, or for the strawberry growers in Arkansas, Tennessee, North Carolina, Maryland, or any other State, but it is not too late to safeguard them against such outrages another year, or to protect other farmers who are raising highly perishable crops that have to be sent to market under a delicately balanced and highly efficient system. The time has come for the Congress to amend the Price Control Act so as to take from Bowles or any other bureaucrat power to destroy the value of farm crops and to do irreparable damage to farm-marketing systems as he has done in this case.

The following is the complaint which I prepared and filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, which sets out in detail the injustice on the part of Mr. Bowles and the O. P. A.:

[In the Supreme Court of the United States. *Sam H. Jones, Governor of the State of Louisiana ex rel. the State of Louisiana; Louisiana Farmers' Protective Union, Inc.; Louisiana Strawberry & Selling Agency, Inc.; Ascension Farmers' Cooperative Association, Inc.; Wiltz Hoover;* v. *Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.* Original action No. —]

COMPLAINT FOR RESTRAINING ORDER, TEMPORARY INJUNCTION AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION

The complaint of Sam H. Jones, Governor of the State of Louisiana, acting on behalf of the State of Louisiana and of the other plaintiffs named in the caption hereto, respectfully shows to this honorable Court as follows:

1. That Sam H. Jones is an officer of the State of Louisiana duly qualified and acting as Governor of the State of Louisiana, and files this action on behalf of the State of Louisiana as an original action in the Supreme Court of the United States under article III, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States.

2. The Louisiana Farmers' Protective Union, Inc., a corporation organized and existing pursuant to the laws of the State of Louisiana, created and acting as a farmers' cooperative protective association with a membership of substantially every strawberry grower in Louisiana, is authorized under the law of Louisiana and plaintiff's charter to represent the aforesaid strawberry growers in court. The Louisiana Farmers' Protective Union, Inc., acts in this connection on its own behalf and on behalf of all others in similar situations with it too numerous to mention.

3. Louisiana Strawberry and Selling Agency, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing pursuant to the laws of the State of Louisiana, created and acting as a selling agency, having in its membership 10 strawberry growers and 7 member strawberry associations consisting of approximately 4,000 strawberry growers and handling and selling at public auction 40 percent of the entire Louisiana strawberry crop.

4. Ascension Farmers' Cooperative Association, Inc., a corporation organized and existing pursuant to the laws of the State of Louisiana, created and acting on behalf of approximately 450 growers for the purpose of supplying on a cooperative basis fertilizer, crates, and advances as crop loans to its members and loading and handling its members' strawberries for sale through the Louisiana Strawberry and Selling Agency, Inc., at public auction. Ascension Farmers' Cooperative Association, Inc., acts in this connection on its own behalf and on behalf of all others in similar situation with it.

5. Wiltz Hoover, a citizen and a resident of the Parish of Tangipahoa, State of Louisiana, who is a farmer and grower of Louisiana strawberries, having shipped from March 15, 1944, to date approximately 350 crates of strawberries and having still on hand for shipment and sale between date of filing this suit and June 1, 1944, approximately 275 crates of strawberries not yet picked. Wiltz Hoover acts in this connection on his own behalf and on behalf of all others in similar situation with him too numerous to mention.

6. Defendant Chester Bowles is the duly qualified and acting Administrator of the Office of Price Administration of the United States Government appointed under the Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

7. Jurisdiction of this honorable court is based on article 3, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and section 264 of the Judicial Code of the United States, being title 28, United States Code, paragraph 378.

8. That the State of Louisiana by its Governor acts herein in protection of the welfare and property of its citizens, no less than 50,000 of whom are directly affected by the subject matter of this suit, and on behalf of the general welfare of the entire State; it being the contention of the State of Louisiana in this action that the arbitrary, discriminatory, capricious, unlawful, and unconstitutional action of defendant Bowles herein complained of endangers the health, prosperity, welfare, and property of its inhabitants.

9. That pretending to act under authority of the Price Control Act of 1942 as amended, but in fact acting contrary to the provisions of same, the defendant Chester Bowles on or about the 13th day of April 1944, promulgated an order fixing the ceiling price on strawberries produced in the State of Louisiana, which State has within its borders the largest and most important strawberry-producing area in the world, at $4.70 per crate for 24 pints on sales by any strawberry grower up to and including the first day of May 1944, and thereafter fixing the ceiling price at $3.95 per crate for 24 pints. That said order is contrary to and in disregard of the Price Control Act of 1942 as amended and is further in violation of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States in that it directly deprives 50,000 citizens of the State of Louisiana of their property without due process of law, thereby directly affecting the welfare of the entire State of Louisiana. Unless said Chester Bowles is restrained and enjoined from enforcing said illegal and unconstitutional order plaintiffs and all classes of people by them represented will suffer immediate and irreparable damage as is more fully hereinafter set forth in this complaint and in the affidavits hereto attached, herein referred to, and hereby made a part hereof.

10. Since 1918 strawberry growers have built up a unique business practice in the method of marketing Louisiana strawberry crops which has enabled the farmer and the middlemen to receive a fair and equitable distribution of the receipts from these crops and the illegal, arbitrary and highly discriminatory order or regulation issued by the said Chester Bowles will totally destroy the strawberry industry in Louisiana or cripple it to such an extent that it will never completely recover.

11. This order directly adversely affects plaintiffs and the lives and economic well-being of 50,000 citizens of Louisiana.

12. The marketing methods which have taken the strawberry farmers 25 years to perfect operates as follows:

a. The strawberry growing area of Louisiana, which is the largest strawberry producing district in the world, covers approximately five parishes surrounding the city of Hammond, La.

b. When the season opens the farmers throughout this area begin to bring in their

strawberries daily. They take them to any one of approximately 12 shipping points in this area and turn them over to an association whether private or cooperative. Plaintiff, Ascension Farmers' Cooperative Association, Inc., is one of such associations.

c. There are approximately 25 such associations operating throughout this strawberry district.

d. These strawberries are loaded into refrigerated cars immediately. The farmer is given a receipt for whatever number of crates or fractions of crates of berries he brings to market and his berries are loaded on the same car with scores of other farmers' berries.

e. This mingling of various farmers' berries is possible because Louisiana strawberries are shipped in one grade or classification and the carload is sold as a unit as will be explained hereinafter.

f. As these associations complete the loading of a car it is picked up by an express train and started northward with its destination unknown until that night when the berries are sold at public auction while they are traveling northward in the express train.

g. Each night during the season three public auctions are held in Hammond, La., for the sale of the strawberries beginning at 8 o'clock. Plaintiff, Louisiana Strawberry and Selling Agency, Inc., operates one of these auctions.

h. The above-mentioned association which collects and loads strawberries for the farmers brings the bills of lading for their cars that are then in transit to any one of the auctions they select. The auctioneers then put these cars up for sale to the highest bidder. This can be done because all Louisiana berries are shipped under one grade or class.

i. After the cars have been sold the buyer obtains authority from the association that loaded that car to divert the said car to whatever destination he desires.

j. By this method carloads of strawberries flying northward on express trains can be sold at public auction and still be delivered to any destination that the buyer may desire.

k. After the association is paid for the cars sold he calls in the farmers and pays them according to receipts given at the time they delivered their berries. Thus the farmer who may have only 1 crate and 2 pints of berries to sell can get the benefit of a sale by public auction which is attended every season by some 40 or 50 buyers representing fruit dealers throughout the United States.

l. If a maximum or ceiling price of $4.70 and $3.95 to the growers as above described is placed in effect as the Office of Price Administration announced it will be on April 27, 1944, then this entire marketing system, built up over a period of 25 years, will be destroyed.

m. That the entire strawberry industry of the State of Louisana is dependent upon this system of distribution. The ceiling price fixed by the defendant Bowles complained of in this suit will effectively destroy said system in that it will prevent the smooth and steady movement of berries from the fields to the markets and further prevent a small farmer to have buyers from the biggest produce houses in the United States bid against each other for his crate or two of strawberries at the said public auction. With the short crop and unreasonably low and discriminatory ceiling price as fixed by the Office of Price Administration, all of the strawberries will be sold at the ceiling price and therefore there will be no bidding at the auctions.

n. The buyers who are now in Hammond, La., will no longer bid against each other for said strawberries, but will proceed to comb the countryside in an effort to get the largest portion of the crop they can at the ceiling price. The auctions will thereby be forced to close down.

o. With the ceiling prices so fixed, the incentive to buyers for paying black market prices to individual farmers is self-evident.

p. The operation of the marketing system above described, which is unique, and the only marketing system of its kind in the United States, constitutes business practices, cost practices, and methods and means, and aids distribution established in the strawberry industry, which are essential to the industry in that said system permits a highly perishable product to be set in motion on the evening of the same day that it is harvested to markets scattered throughout the United States in such fashion that the product may be diverted in transit from at least five distinct points several hundred miles distant to some 40 or more advantageous markets scattered throughout the United States, thereby assuring the best price to the producer and the most economical delivery to the consumer.

13. Fifty thousand Louisiana strawberry people are shipping and marketing their strawberries on a large commercial scale in the above described manner. The strawberry season usually begins in March or April and ends sometime in the month of May depending on weather conditions. The current season started on approximately March 14, 1944, and from present indications will end about June 1, 1944 (depending on weather conditions). Therefore the present time constitutes the height of the shipping season. Among the many reasons why the defendant should be restrained from attempting to enforce the aforesaid price ceiling order or regulation on strawberries are set forth, to wit:

(a) The said order or regulation is capricious, arbitrary, and discriminatory in view of the fact that the regulation or order totally disregards the fact that Louisiana strawberry growers suffered a crop failure amounting to at least 50 percent caused by excessive frosts and rain.

(b) The Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, gives to the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration power to fix ceiling prices only in such cases as will affect the over-all economic stability of United States currency and in the instant case Louisiana strawberry farmers, if no ceiling is placed on the prices, will not receive more than $3,780,000 for the entire crop as compared with a yearly average from 1930 through 1940 of some $5,000,000 and therefore, when the Louisiana strawberry farmer will receive 20 percent less than he received during a 10-year average, his receipts could not possibly affect stability of United States currency.

(c) The Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, prohibits and forbids defendant from fixing a maximum ceiling price on any commodity until after the Secretary of Agriculture has determined and published: (1) a parity price for such commodity taking into consideration grade, location, and so forth, and (2) the highest price received by the grower during the period from January 1, 1942, to September 15, 1942. The act further forbids the fixing of a maximum price that is below either one of the above two published prices and plaintiffs aver that the Secretary of Agriculture never has determined and published the aforesaid prices as required by the act.

(d) The said Price Control Act forbids the use of any provisions of the act for the purpose of compelling any changes in an industry, business practices or method of distribution except to prevent evasions of the law. Defendant has been shown that the ceiling he has placed on strawberries will not only change the business practices and methods of distribution but will destroy the present method of distribution built up over a period of years and which is beneficial to the growers, distributors and the strawberry industry at large.

(e) Defendant by the aforesaid order or regulation has grossly discriminated against plaintiffs herein in that he totally disregarded the fact that it costs more than twice as much to produce the same amount of Louisiana strawberries as it does to produce the berries grown in most other States of the United States. For a period of 25 years Louisiana growers have been developing a high grade of strawberries, unlike other States, and have gone to great expense and labor each season to cull and carefully grade and hand pack their berries which are sold in packages bearing well established brands or labels. Because of the development and packing of a fine strawberry, a pint of Louisiana strawberries generally sells on an equivalent market for the same price as a quart of berries from any other State of the Union, yet the defendant in his price ceiling order or regulation allows the growers in States other than Louisiana 100 percent more than the Louisiana grower can receive which is a gross, arbitrary and capricious discrimination against plaintiffs.

14. That the order of the defendant Bowles herein complained of is further capricious and discriminatory in that the Florida strawberry season opened on or about the 15th day of December 1943, and was completed about the 1st of April 1944, without a ceiling price. Further the price of Florida strawberries in the present season averaged less than 5 cents per pint box more than it averaged over last year's season and this increase was not due to any inflationary action, but was the natural result of decreased acreage. The Louisiana season during the present year opened on or about March 14 and will close on or about June 1, 1944, depending upon weather conditions. Thus the ceiling price herein complained of goes into effect in the middle of the Louisiana season. Therefore the placing of a ceiling price on Louisiana's strawberries now is an act of gross discrimination against the farmers in Louisiana.

15. In Louisiana for the period from 1930 to 1940, including railway express and truck movements, an average of 3,000 cars per season have been shipped from this State with an average seasonal return to growers of approximately $5,000,000 (these facts are based on Department of Agriculture statistics and figures). The Department of Agriculture's estimate for this season is 900 cars, and plaintiffs aver on information and belief, that the crop will be smaller than this estimate. At the highest possible average price that could be received from the entire season the return to Louisiana growers would not exceed $3,780,000, which would be distributed to 50,000 individuals and therefore could not possibly have any effect on the stability of United States currency. On the other hand, the ceiling price fixed by defendant will seriously reduce the income to the growers and others directly affected and more particularly the plaintiffs herein, and will cause widespread suffering, loss, and irreparable injury to plaintiffs and thousands of others in Louisiana.

16. The shortage of the Louisiana crop is shown by the fact that in normal years at the height of the strawberry season 100 to 150 cars are shipped per day from Louisiana. The current season has been at its height since about the 15th of April. The United States Department of Agriculture reports show that from April 16 to the date of filing this suit the shipments from Louisiana have averaged less than 10 cars per day.

Further opinions among growers, shippers, agriculture experts, and those on the scene in Louisiana, are practically unanimous that the strawberry crop failure this season will run from 50 percent to 66⅔ percent, therefore plaintiffs aver that there will be a crop failure in excess of 50 percent in Louisiana strawberries this season.

This factor has been arbitrarily disregarded by defendant in establishing aforesaid ceiling price which discriminates against plaintiffs

and Louisiana strawberry growers, all contrary to the law and intention of the lawmakers who enacted the Price Control Act of 1942 as amended.

17. As another example of discrimination against plaintiffs and those they represent is shown by the fact that the Office of Price Administration acting through defendant has withheld or withdrawn the ceiling prices to growers fixed on new potatoes due to the fact that there was a partial crop failure and shortage of yield in Florida, not, however, as drastic and severe as the crop failure and shortage of yield in the Louisiana strawberry industry.

18. Louisiana strawberries have been selling during the current season for prices ranging from $8.35 to $6.03 average daily prices per crate of 24 pints. The price per crate so far this season has averaged approximately $7.15 as shown by the War Food Administration reports and the order or regulation complained of fixes the price at $4.70 until May 1, when it is then fixed at $3.95 for the balance of the season. This drastic, arbitrary and capricious action will take plaintiff's property without due process of law if it is enforced and plaintiffs will suffer irreparable injury unless this honorable court immediately issues a restraining order and after a proper hearing issues a temporary and permanent injunction against the enforcement of the aforesaid order or regulation.

19. That the damage with which the plaintiffs are threatened in this case is immediate, great and irreparable in that their whole system of marketing their strawberry crop, built up over a 25-year period and delicately balanced and implemented as hereinabove set out, faces immediate destruction at the height of their production season for 1944, that the plaintiffs have no remedy except in the Supreme Court of the United States.

20. That the remedy generally provided in said Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, does not afford adequate relief to plaintiffs in this situation, since said act provides for only two remedies, first a protest direct to the Administrator which has been made and arbitrarily refused by said defendant Bowles and, second, an appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals which does not provide any remedy to plaintiffs as hereinafter set forth. If plaintiffs should follow only such procedure it would be impossible for them to raise and preserve their objections to the violation of the statute itself and of the violation of their constitutional rights by the defendant Bowles therein complained of in such manner as to protect themselves against the gross and irreparable damage that will come upon them by reason of the arbitrary, capricious, and unlawful act of said defendant Bowles, except for the immediate intervention of this honorable court by granting a restraining order pending hearing for preliminary injunction.

21. That in this connection plaintiffs have exhausted their administrative remedy by protest to the defendant Bowles, which protest was arbitrarily denied by said defendant Bowles.

22. That plaintiffs have no remedy before the Emergency Court of Appeals as set up by said Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in that said statute expressly prohibits said Emergency Court of Appeals from issuing restraining orders or temporary injunctions or interlocutory decrees and provides for such periods of time and procedure before said court that the Louisiana strawberry season of 1944 would be completely ended and irreparable damages herein complained of would have occurred, including the destruction of the plaintiffs' marketing system and the unlawful taking of their property without due process of law.

23. Therefore plaintiffs have no remedy in any administrative procedure or before any court save before the Supreme Court of the United States in the exercise of its general powers in an original action brought by the State of Louisiana joined herein by the other plaintiffs as representative of the several classes whose welfare and property are threatened with destruction, save for the immediate intervention of this Honorable Court.

24. The order herein complained of went into effect at 12:01 a. m., central war time, April 27, 1944, and except for the intervention of this Court by the issuance of a temporary restraining order, the plaintiffs' marketing system as herein set forth which abruptly stopped with the closing of the auction April 27, 1944, at 8 p. m., central war time, has broken down, and thereby plaintiffs and all whom they represent are being deprived of their property rights without due process of law and the general welfare of the State of Louisiana is being irreparably damaged.

Wherefore, these premises considered, plaintiffs pray:

1. That a temporary restraining order issue herein forthwith for a period not to exceed 10 days, and that after due proceedings be had, a temporary injunction issue herein.

2. That upon final hearing a permanent injunction issue herein restraining Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and anyone acting for him from enforcing or attempting to enforce an order or regulation fixing the ceiling price on strawberries in Louisiana at $4.70 per crate of 24 pints for the period running from April 27 to May 1, 1944, and $3.95 per crate of 24 pints thereafter, or from enforcing or attempting to enforce any order or regulation that is discriminatory, illegal, arbitrary, or capricious in such manner as to destroy business practices, cost practices, and methods and means or aids of distribution established in the Louisiana strawberry industry or to deprive the people of the State of Louisiana of their property, welfare, and prosperity without due process of law.

3. And for such other and further relief as to the Court may seem right and proper.

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Hammond, La.
VERNON B. LOWREY,
Washington, D. C.
DAMERON C. MCCANN,
New Orleans, La.
Attorneys for plaintiffs.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Parish of Tangipahoa:

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally came and appeared William Fletcher, who being by me personally known and duly sworn, did depose and say:

He is the president of the Louisiana Strawberry & Selling Agency, Inc. He avers that he has read the petition filed on behalf of the Louisiana Strawberry & Selling Agency, Inc., against Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and all the allegations of fact contained therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Further, that if a price ceiling of $4.70 per 24-pint crate is enforced through May 1 and thereafter $3.95 per crate, the strawberry-auction companies will be forced to close and go out of business and the farmers and growers of strawberries in Louisiana will sustain huge and irreparable losses and damages more particularly because of the shortage of the crop which will prevent them from recovering the sums that they have invested in the production of this season's strawberry crop.

WILLIAM FLETCHER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of April 1944.

EARL SPENCER,
Notary Public.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Parish of Tangipahoa:

Before me, the undersigned authority personally came and appeared R. M. Singletary, who being by me personally known and duly sworn, did depose and say:

He is the president of the Louisiana Farmers' Protective Union, Inc. He avers that he has read the petition filed on behalf of the Louisiana Farmers' Protective Union, Inc., against Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and all the allegations of fact contained therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Further that if a price ceiling of $4.70 per 24-pint crate is enforced through May 1 and thereafter $3.95 per crate, the strawberry auction companies will be forced to close and go out of business and the farmers and growers of strawberries in Louisiana will sustain huge and irreparable losses and damages, more particularly because of the shortage of the crop which will prevent them from recovering the sums that they have invested in the production of this season's strawberry crop.

R. M. SINGLETARY.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of April 1944.

EARL SPENCER,
Notary Public.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Parish of Tangipahoa:

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally came and appeared Wiltz Hoover, who being by me personally known and duly sworn, did depose and say:

He is a citizen and a resident of the Parish of Tangipahoa, State of Louisiana, and a farmer and grower of Louisiana strawberries. That he has shipped from March 15, 1944, to date, approximately 350 crates of strawberries and that he has still on hand for shipment and sale between this date and June 1, 1944, approximately 275 crates of strawberries not yet picked. He avers that he has read the petition filed by him against Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and all the allegations of fact contained therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Further, that if a price ceiling of $4.70 per 24 pint crate is enforced through May 1 and thereafter $3.95 per crate, the strawberry auction companies will be forced to close and go out of business and the farmers and growers of strawberries in Louisiana, including affiant, will sustain huge and irreparable losses and damages more particular because of the shortage of the crop which will prevent them from recovering the sums they have invested in the production of this season's strawberry crop.

WILTZ HOOVER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of April 1944.

EARL SPENCER,
Notary Public.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Parish of Tangipahoa:

Before me, the undersigned authority personally came and appeared Oreal Gautreau, who being by me personally known and duly sworn, did depose and say:

He is the president of the Ascension Farmers' Cooperative Association, Inc. He avers that he has read the petition filed on behalf of the Ascension Farmers' Cooperative Association, Inc., against Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and all the allegations of fact contained therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

Further, that if a price ceiling of $4.70 per 24-pint crate is enforced through May 1 and thereafter $3.95 per crate the strawberry auction companies will be forced to close and go out of business and the farmers and growers of strawberries in Louisiana will sustain huge and irreparable losses and damages more particular because of the shortage of the crop which will prevent them from recovering

the sums that they have invested in the production of this season's strawberry crop.

OREAL GAUTREAU.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of April 1944.

EARL SPENCER,
Notary Public.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally came and appeared JAMES H. MORRISON, who, being by me personally known and duly sworn, did depose and say:

That he has investigated and studied all the facts alleged in the complaint and they are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Further, surveys of the Louisiana strawberry crop made by numerous experts, including Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture for the State of Louisiana, show that there has been at least a 50-percent crop failure this season. A telegram from Harry D. Wilson so stating is attached hereto. Your affiant personally called the attention of Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, to this fact and he totally disregarded it and refused to make any alteration in the maximum ceiling price on strawberries after he learned that there had been a 50-percent crop failure due to excessive rains and freezes.

Further, affiant obtained from the United States Department of Agriculture, now operating under the Office of War Food Administration, figures showing that for the period from 1930 to 1940 an average of approximately 3,000 cars of strawberries were shipped from Louisiana each season, which brought a gross return of some $5,000,000, and under an estimate of 900 cars for this season which the said Chester Bowles said was a proper estimate. The highest possible return without any ceiling price would not exceed $3,780,000 for the entire 1944 crop.

Further, your affiant personally called on the Administrator of the Office of War Food Administration and on Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, to produce and show the publication of the parity price on Louisiana strawberries established for grade and location as required by the Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and for the publication of the highest price received during the period of January 1, 1942, to September 15, 1942, as required by said act before any maximum price or ceiling can be placed on Louisiana strawberries and neither the Office of War Food Administration nor said Chester Bowles could produce any such public prices as required by law.

Thereupon, as provided by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, subsequent to his promulgation of ceiling prices on Louisiana strawberries under date of April 13, 1944, affiant first asked for a hearing in which to submit data, information, and written briefs in protest of said ceiling prices. On or about the 20th day of April at the approximate hour of 5 p. m., in the office of defendant, Chester Bowles, affiant personally on behalf of the plaintiffs and all they represent, presented said data, information, and briefs protesting said ceiling prices. At the conclusion, after approximately 2 hours, the said defendant, Chester Bowles, arbitrarily refused to change the said ceiling prices and thereby turned down the protest as made on behalf of plaintiff and all they represent by your affiant. Affiant was acting in accordance with the Price Control Act of 1942 as amended.

Further, the cost of producing the same quantity of Louisiana berries is approximately twice the cost of producing strawberries in most of the other States. For a period of over 25 years Louisiana growers have been developing a high grade of strawberries, unlike other States, and have gone to great expense and labor each season to cull and carefully grade and hand-pick their strawberries that are sold in packages bearing well-established brands or labels and have thus built up a large demand for Louisiana strawberries throughout the United States. Because of the development in packing of a fine strawberry, a pint of Louisiana strawberries generally sells under similar conditions on equivalent markets for approximately the same price as a quart of strawberries from other States of the Union, as is shown by a copy of a W. F. A. report dated April 24, 1944, showing the St. Louis market in particular, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof. This fact was called to the attention of said Chester Bowles, who informed your affiant that he would investigate these facts, and, if established, the ceiling price would be altered to take this into consideration. Thereafter and before any reasonable check could be made by him, he announced that he would not alter the price ceiling fixed on Louisiana strawberries and totally disregarded this important factor which constitutes a gross, arbitrary, and capricious discrimination against the plaintiffs in the instant suit and against all Louisiana strawberry growers.

Further, that the directive, regulation, and orders, etc., for said ceiling price on strawberries as issued by said Chester Bowles is not attached hereto because said Bowles refused to provide your affiant with a copy of same. Your affiant made every possible effort and a personal request of Chester Bowles to secure said documents, but defendant Bowles steadfastly refused to give same to your affiant, who requested same in the capacity of a Congressman. Affiant further explained that no bureau or department had ever refused similar documents where the welfare and property rights of his constituents were affected substantially. Notwithstanding all of these pleas and requests, affiant was further denied a copy of said documents and was able only by a hurried glimpse to read part of said documents, part of which were on a carbon sheet which was illegible, while being watched by defendant Bowles' subordinate. Affiant was further told by defendant Bowles that he could not copy said documents.

Further, that if a price ceiling of $4.70 per 24-pint crate is enforced through May 1 and thereafter $3.95 per crate, the strawberry auction companies will be forced to close and go out of business and the whole system of marketing and distributing Louisiana strawberries built up over a 25-year period and delicately balanced will be destroyed and, therefore, the farmers and growers of strawberries in Louisiana will sustain huge and irreparable losses and damages more particularly because of the shortage of the crop, which will prevent them from recovering the sums that they have invested in the production of this season's strawberry crop.

JAMES H. MORRISON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of April 1944.

TRUMAN WARD,
Notary Public.

General Accounting Office Criticisms of Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the annual report of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, there is on pages 78 to 81, both inclusive, a list of alleged irregularities and criticisms of the accounts and proceedings of the United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration. It is salutary that supposed irregularities and criticisms shall be subjected to the pitiless light of publicity even though at the time they are given public attention corrections have been made and remedies put into effect. Those against whom charges are preferred are entitled to have their views as to the charges also given publicity, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to me from Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administrator setting forth the facts and circumstances about these so-called irregular practices in so far as they can be presented within reasonable compass.

The charges in the annual report and the answers submitted herewith have been referred by me to the general counsel of the committee in charge of the investigations being conducted by the committee with instructions to cover the charges and answers very fully and bring his conclusions to the attention of the chairman of the committee and the committee for further study where necessary.

The letter of Admiral Land, Chairman of the Commission, and War Shipping Administrator, referred to above, follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, April 13, 1944.

The Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: In the Comptroller General's annual report to Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, reference is made to examinations by his office of accounts and records of approximately 60 ship construction and repair yards performing work for the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration.

He referred to certain "irregular practices" which have been disclosed as a result of these examinations and, while most of these charges are rather general in their character and in some cases broad generalizations from limited or separate instances, it is our desire to set forth within reasonable compass the facts and circumstances about them, insofar as we can, in view of their general nature.

Under date of January 8, 1943, in transmitting to me a copy of a report from one of his field representatives dated September 2, 1942, the Comptroller General stated:

"In order that the United States Maritime Commission may be currently advised of certain field investigations by representatives of this office and at the same time to permit the expeditious handling of the reports with respect thereto, it is deemed advisable to furnish you copies of such reports for your information and appropriate action.

"It is, of course, understood that the comments contained in the reports may not represent the views of the office; however, they may serve as a possible basis for immediate action by the Commission when necessary and at the same time expedite final disposition of the matters involved."

It has been our endeavor at all times to promptly follow through our investigations of all such reports that the Comptroller

General has referred to us on the basis of his statement referred to above.

In a number of cases, the reports of the Comptroller General's field representatives have not been forwarded to the Commission for some considerable time after they were prepared, giving but little opportunity, if necessary, to take immediate corrective action. It has been observed that, in many instances, the reports of the Comptroller General's field representatives referred to disallowances already noted by our own field auditors, and on which appropriate action had been taken.

The various reports that the Comptroller General has referred to this office from time to time, in retrospect bring up the question of the discretionary powers vested in the Maritime Commission by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and in the War Shipping Administrator by virtue of Executive Order No. 9054, of February 7, 1942, as amended by Executive Order No. 9244, of September 16, 1942; and in Executive Order No. 9350, of June 10, 1943.

Congress anticipated that the operations of the Maritime Commission would call for different methods of procedure and accounting from those usually applicable to Government operations. Section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, provided that the activities of the Commission should be carried on in the same manner as a private corporation and the Comptroller General is required to audit the Commission's financial transactions according to approved commercial practices as provided in the Act of March 20, 1922; provided, that it shall be recognized that, because of the business activities authorized by the act, the accounting officers shall allow credit for all expenditures shown to be necessary because of the nature of such authorized activities, notwithstanding any existing statutory provision to the contrary.

The Commission has endeavored at all times to maintain the highest degree of efficiency and honesty in its dealing with the many contractors to whom it has awarded contracts from time to time.

The Committee on Banking and Currency in House Report No. 846, November 8, 1943, drew the attention of the House of Representatives of the fundamental difference between the usual governmental types of audit and the commercial types.

In the Comptroller General's report to Congress covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, he does not take into account the fact that adjustments, corrections, or retractions had been made subsequent to the close of the fiscal year and prior to his report, and unfortunately this is apparently the basis for what we consider an entirely unjustified statement therein, i. e.

"Examination of such accounts and records discloses the existence of many irregular practices some of which were due in no small part to the failure of the Commission to insure proper instructions and to exercise the degree of administrative control ordinarily required in the handling of Government business and the expenditure of public funds."

In the absence of particulars, this appears to be an unwarranted generalization. The Maritime Commission has maintained full control of the activities carried on under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes and Executive orders, has handled the expenditure of public funds appropriated for its use with the utmost care, and has issued proper instructions to all contractors working under its control. There have been and are bound to be occasions where instructions given to cover certain operations, have subsequently proven inadequate, due to the change in operations arising from a rapidly fluctuating war-production program. As fast as the new developments have arisen, however, new instructions have been issued in order to maintain proper administrative control.

In the Comptroller General's Annual Report to Congress, he listed certain generalized charges which are set forth below with our comments thereon.

Charge 1. "Failure to account properly for receipts from revenue-producing activities such as housing, cafeterias, transportation facilities, etc."

This charge we believe grows out of a complete misinterpretation by the Comptroller General's field staff of the character of the Commission's contracts and the relations between the Commission's prime contractor and his subcontractor, and overlooks certain provisions of the Merchant Marine Act with respect to the Commission's revolving construction fund.

The charge originally made was that the Commission was deliberately utilizing for its ship construction program, funds which should have been covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and therefore defeating the will of Congress as expressed through its appropriations.

This matter was the subject of correspondence between the Comptroller General and our office during 1942 and 1943. In his communication of October 26, 1943, the Comptroller General departed from his original position, and then agreed with our view, that the Commission had the option of having these funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the revolving construction fund, and there to be available for expenditure by the Commission or that where the Commission deemed it advisable and more practicable from an administrative standpoint, it was in order for the Commission to approve of the application, by the contractor, of the receipts from the subcontractor operating the facilities in reduction of the reimbursable costs of the construction work involved.

This understanding was reached subsequent to the expiration of fiscal year 1943, and possibly the time lapse before the Comptroller General made his report to Congress was not sufficient to allow the correction on this point.

Charge 2: "Abnormal increases in salaries of officials and employees of contractors operating under Government contracts."

To a very large extent all pay rates are governed by stabilization rules. Salaries which are not covered by stabilization rules, however, are subjected to extremely careful scrutiny on the part of the Commission's staff, and administrative salaries, in particular, are passed upon for the Commission after a thorough analysis of comparative rates in different shipyards, with due regard to the degree of responsibility involved in the different positions, the magnitude of the management operation, and the complexity of the task. Not only are individual salaries thus controlled, but the relation between the size of the administrative salary roll and the operation as a whole is also subject to control.

There have been numerous instances where a contractor has found it advisable to pay a higher rate to an individual than the approved rate. In such instances the difference is borne solely by the contractor and is disallowed by the Commission's auditor in cost. This applies both in the case of the reimbursement forms of contract and fixed-price contracts subject to recapture of excessive profits.

On the other hand, there are instances where rapid progress has been made by individuals who have assumed successive degrees of responsibility in various shipyards. It would have been utterly impossible to have manned the administrative staffs of these shipyards without advances in responsibilities and corresponding advances in salaries.

We believe that our plan of control is both reasonable and proper, and is based on sound policy and objectives. In no case can the salaries and bonuses combined exceed $25,000 for any one person, insofar as being reimbursable under the contract, and this maximum is graded downward, dependent upon the office, its duties, and the size of the yard.

Charge 3: "Reimbursement of improper expenditures, such as for lectures on human engineering, excessive rentals, bonuses to officials and employees, and the cost of yard publications."

On April 26, 1943, the Comptroller General was advised in a communication from this office that the reimbursements heretofore made by the Commission to three shipyards on the Gulf coast for the expenditures made by them covering the cost of human-engineering lectures had been subsequently disallowed, and that the amounts that had been reimbursed to the contractors had been deducted on subsequent vouchers presented for payment. He was further advised prior to the end of the fiscal year 1943 that two other yards which had expended their funds for this purpose had not and would not obtain reimbursement for this expenditure from the Commission.

It is an accepted practice in industrial plants to spend considerable effort and time on matters affecting working conditions, health, and sanitation for employees to insure the best results for all concerned and while the theory back of the "human engineering" lectures appears to have been of considerable merit, the Commission auditors immediately raised the question of the excessive cost and its value when going over the accounts of a contractor, and noted it for disallowance. This particular item was pointed out to the General Accounting Office auditor by the Commission auditor in the field as evidence of the disallowances he was noting.

In connection with the charge of reimbursement of payment of improper bonuses to officials and employees we surmise, in the absence of direct reference, that this refers to payments that were made to officials and employees of a yard now devoted to naval work. The reimbursements in this particular case were subsequently adjusted on the basis of the control plan referred to in connection with the second charge and in no case did the final adjustment represent any exception from that plan.

Most of the shipbuilding contractors building ships for the Commission as well as hundreds of other business concerns, large and small, put out publications at regular intervals devoted to upbuilding the morale of their employees. Experience has shown that properly edited publications of this nature are of very considerable benefit.

Meetings have been held on numerous occasions with the editors of the yard publications of most of the shipbuilding contractors handling Commission construction in order to produce efficient and economical handling of these publications. The necessity of keeping the reimbursable costs of these publications down to a reasonable figure has been repeatedly stressed by the Commission and its representatives.

Our regional directors of construction and our regional auditors check these costs, and the publications are constantly under review here in Washington.

Charge 4: "Assignment of contractors' employees for duty in Commission offices thereby circumventing administrative salary limitations as well as placing such employees in the position of checking their employer."

There were several instances in the past, on the Pacific coast and in some of the Gulf yards, where in setting up the original Commission's staff in different shipyards and where personnel was not available, the Commission auditor made use of employees of the contractors to prevent serious interrup-

tion in essential work. It was not possible at the time to promptly hire the necessary employees. Many of these employees have since been taken into direct Commission employment, and the entire situation in this respect was cleared up by July 1, 1943.

Charge 5: "Payments for land in excess of the appraised value thereof."

The Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration attempt to secure the most reliable appraisals possible of land which they contemplate acquiring for war purposes. Only after most careful consideration of the public interest have any payments been made by the Commission or War Shipping Administration in excess of appraisals secured by them, and we feel sure you will find that the prices paid are below the value claimed by the landowners. It is quite certain that an overwhelming majority of such cases are in the nature of settlements in condemnation proceedings and are made with the advice and consent of the Attorney General acting through the Lands Division of the Department of Justice.

Charge 6: "Excessive purchase of steel."

The Maritime Commission has not at any time made excessive purchase of steel. What it has done is to make the most effective use of the steel allotted to merchant shipbuilding. On lump-sum contracts the contractor purchases the steel and other materials direct, while on the other contracts where the contractor is paid a fixed fee for his services, the Commission purchases the steel and other materials.

The use of steel in Maritime Commission shipyards is controlled through allotment by the War Production Board and it is a very well-known fact that the shipbuilding program of the Maritime Commission has been limited by the amount of steel made available for that purpose. Steel supply and flow have been fully and currently investigated by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and by the Senate National Defense Committee.

In one case a yard constructing vessels on a lump-sum basis did purchase considerable steel, but all of it was used for the vessels under construction at that yard on the lump-sum basis. There have been cases where some of the faster producing yards have needed a faster flow of steel than some of the other yards, but all steel which was sent to the different yards has been used, and where in a case a yard reported a shortage of steel and we were able to temporarily borrow it from another, this was done. Steel allocations and control has had and is receiving most careful management supervision.

Charge 7: "Excessive rentals on equipment under rental-purchase agreements and the release thereof when only small amounts remained to be paid in order to acquire title."

In carrying out their responsibility of establishing the necessary shipbuilding facilities and getting the largest number of vessels completed and in service in the shortest possible time the contractors have found it necessary at times to rent different types of equipment for specific work. This equipment, in many cases, while useful on certain specific jobs, was not readily useful elsewhere, and in many cases the same type of equipment was being used at the same time in different localities.

In all of its contracts the Maritime Commission either provides that where the work involves the use of rented equipment the contractor shall provide for the title passing to the Government under the rental purchase agreement plan or put such rental on a formula basis.

In many cases, however, it could be clearly shown that it would have been inadvisable from a business standpoint to acquire the equipment after the particular job for which it was rented had been accomplished. There would have been no advantage to the Government in acquiring title to worn-out equipment and its purchase would have resulted in forcing many small-business men out of business by depriving them of their equipment.

The Maritime Commission employed an experienced man to work out and establish a procedure in this respect and our entire operations have been carried out in a manner which we believe was both equitable to the owners of the property and to the Government.

Charge 8. "Purchases of automobiles without regard to statutory limitations as to amounts paid."

This charge apparently refers primarily to the acquisition of automobiles of different types by the shipbuilding contractor for use in the construction of the facilities at the shipyard, or in the operation of the yard. If originally charged to a Commission facilities contract the charges were subsequently disallowed by the Commission auditor because of the statutory limitations. The automobiles, therefore, are the property of, and were actually bought at the expense of, the contractors themselves.

There have been a few instances where a large car has been purchased by a contractor, and subsequent events have shown that without this large car being available, two smaller cars would have been necessary to do the work performed by the one large one, with a corresponding increase in use of gasoline, oil, and wear on at least four more tires.

Our regional directors of construction in every case have the responsibility of refusing to approve reimbursement for automobiles purchased at a price in excess of the statutory limitations. It is our belief that this authority has been properly exercised.

Charge 9: "Excessive cost of telephone service and the personal use thereof."

In handling the very large volume of business in connection with the construction and operation commercially of a vast fleet of vessels, there is no question but what there has been a very heavy use of the telephone.

With some 80 different yards either constructing ships for the Commission or repairing vessels for the War Shipping Administration, and with over 2,000 individual contractors furnishing supplies for a program which called for the most efficient use of time, the most important element in our war effort, outside of the human life, it has been necessary to use the telephone far more than would have been the case if the construction and operation programs were being handled on a normal basis. The widespread scope of the construction and operational programs, and the necessity of keeping up the steady flow of materials for building and repairing ships requires constant contact not only with the contractors, but a vast number of subcontractors.

Constant attention has been given to the use of the phone for personal use, and it is not our belief that there has been any particular abuse of our regulations, which allow for the personal use of the phone only in unusual cases.

Charge 10: "Inadequate safeguard of Government property."

Through the medium of Executive orders, the President designated the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War as the authorities to safeguard the shipyards and other plants handling Government contracts, against sabotage or any other danger. The Commission cooperates very thoroughly with both the Navy and the Army in their work. The protection given by the armed services is very thorough and we receive from them from time to time complete reports on surveys that they are making which are very carefully checked here, with our men in the yards and with the contractors as well.

Charge 11: "Failure to transmit all contracts to the General Accounting Office as required by law."

We have no knowledge of any case where there has been a deliberate failure to transmit copies of contracts to the General Accounting Office. There may have been instances where through some oversight there has been a delay, but we cannot account otherwise for this particular charge. The only exception that appears possible concerns those instances where communications have been received from the Comptroller General's Office asking for copies of contracts which were actually in that office but in the hands of someone other than the one asking for it.

Charge 12: "Failure to maintain adequate inventories of steel, equipment, and other supplies received at the various shipyards or to maintain proper record of transfer of such material between shipyards."

There have been instances called to the attention of the Maritime Commission by the Comptroller General where at the start of the operations at some shipyards there seems to have been a lack of proper records and inventories.

This subject, particularly where it involved transferring materials between shipyards, constitutes one of the most difficult paper problems the Commission's staff has had to face. It would have been entirely possible to have kept meticulously accurate records for the movement of every item, but only at the expense of production, and a considerable increase in personnel. The answer to this charge, as is the case with most of the others, is the output of ships. Many of the transfers were of an emergency character and had to be carried out under conditions that did not permit of the same attention being given to recording such movements as would have been possible in peacetime. Adequate physical control was maintained, but of necessity, the paper work lagged behind. This has been a matter of constant attention, and the situation is being brought as nearly up to date as has been found possible.

Charge 13: "The use of a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost form of contract in violation of law."

Charge 14: "Excessive over-all or composite hourly billing rates for ship repairs due, in part to the inclusion of direct charges also in overhead, thereby duplicating amounts upon which the composite billing rate was based to the extent of such inclusion."

These two charges presumably relate to an interpretation placed by the Comptroller General upon the type of contract used by both the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission in connection with ship repairs. The general counsel of the Commission, at the time the form of ship repair contract referred to was adopted, was of the opinion that they did not constitute a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contract and is still of that opinion. Both the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission, even before we became directly involved in the war, and when it became apparent that there would be a large volume of emergency ship repairs, entered into negotiations with the ship repair industry with a view to effecting contractual arrangements which would preclude the high rate of profit, which had previously obtained generally in the ship repair industry, and which under peace conditions was perhaps necessary for the survival of a repair company because of the sporadic character of their work.

While the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission found it impractical to bring about a drastic change in the methods of billing for time and material, which had been in general vogue for many years in the ship repair industry, they were able, prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor to bring about an understanding to the effect that the profit would be limited to 10 percent, and that the rates charged would from time to time be subject to such revision as would bring about that result.

Later, in 1943, with the country at war, it was possible to make a further revision in the form of contract, which revision is understood to meet the views of the Comptroller General.

This subject was discussed between the legal staff of the War Shipping Administration and the General Accounting Office both in conference and by correspondence. The Comptroller General's office was advised some months before making his report to Congress that the new forms of repair contracts would be put into effect on May 1, June 1, and July 1, 1943.

It is our belief that if we had endeavored to follow the views of the Comptroller General on repair contracts, at the time when the submarine warfare was at its height, it would have so interfered with the prompt repair of the damaged ships that reached our ports it might have resulted in the serious prolongation, or even the possible loss of the battle of the Atlantic, for the time being.

When the story can be fully told of the accomplishments of our repair yards, their tremendous expansion, and the courage and imagination with which they accomplished, in record time, tasks of the most difficult character in putting damaged ships back into service, it will be a dramatic one.

The three special reports referred to in the Comptroller General's Annual Report cover items that have been satisfactorily disposed of as follows:

The Waterman Steamship case was satisfactorily disposed of by the Comptroller General's recent letter to that effect.

The Baltimore Mail case has been covered by congressional committee report and in substance, the basis of the charges in the President Roosevelt report are, we believe, disposed of by the findings in the Baltimore Mail case.

These cases, as well as the references of the Comptroller General to charter rates, and insurance values all have a certain relationship to the question of just compensation. It is our belief that by following the rules laid down by the Special Board on Just Compensation, the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration in handling these cases will be acting in accordance with the law and the best interest of the Government.

In respect to the reasonableness of the Red Sea charter rates, our records show that it was through a communication addressed to the Comptroller General on September 30, 1942, that his attention was first called to this subject, and his suggestions invited as how to best handle the situation. It is our understanding that the subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which investigated this situation, following our calling the matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee, is about ready to make its report.

Hindsight is often much better than foresight, but the Maritime Commission in handling these Red Sea charters for the British War Ministry, was pressed for prompt action. It approved what it believed, at that particular time, to be the most equitable rates for all concerned, inview of the then-known conditions.

Subsequently, when actual experience indicated the rates were too high, we brought about one reduction. When later figures clearly indicated that the returns to the operators were excessive, an endeavor was made to get these operators to make a voluntary refund on the charter payments. We regret that only two of the operators saw fit to follow this suggestion. The matter is before our Price Adjustment Board at present for disposition in accordance with the law.

In connection with the operations of our field auditors, there have been numerous instances where they have disallowed reimbursement of items which the contractor has presented for consideration. There have been other instances where they have discovered irregularities, have recorded them in their regular reports, or have called attention to them in special reports to this office. In all such cases, the subject matter has been given prompt consideration and appropriate action taken. These auditors have been very conscientious in their work, and have by their actions, saved the Government a large sum on the accounts they have checked.

We believe a careful check of the reports, which the Comptroller General has filed with us from time to time, will show that where actual irregularities have been called to our attention, we have taken prompt steps to correct them. There have been instances where his reports have been received by us, subsequent to final action having been taken by us, based upon the information developed by our own auditors. There have been other cases where the questions raised in the Comptroller General's reports have required careful study and have led to many questions as to their accuracy.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administrator.

The Price of Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, subsides are of no benefit to the cattle feeder or livestock producer. Every day there are hundreds of our cattle feeders being forced out of business. Millions of dollars are being paid to the packers which are of no benefit to the cattlemen. The price of beef should be increased 5 cents a pound to the consumer, which would have little effect on the cost of living, or the cost of live cattle could be increased at least $2 per hundredweight.

It is a deplorable situation when the Federal Government pays millions in beef subsidies and the consumer is unable to secure beef and the cattle feeders go broke by the thousands.

No doubt the consumer who purchases beef feels that the present price of beef which seems high would warrant a profit to the producers. If cattle feeding were profitable thousands of our cattle feeders would not be closing up their operations. I can cite a large number of instances where the cattle feeder has disposed of his cattle and closed his operations at a very heavy loss. It is not my intention to mention names, but I am going to give specific instances of what has happened to two outstanding feeders in the livestock area. The names of these men and others are on file in my office.

One feeder writes me he has been feeding five to six hundred head of cattle for years and recently he closed out his feeding operations. When he marketed the last of his steers 2 weeks ago they brought him within 50 cents of the top market, and yet lost him $30 per head. The packer that bought his cattle got approximately $10 a head subsidy from the Government to help him take care of his loss, and no doubt he suffered a loss even after that. This cattle operator received nothing to help him out, so therefore he was forced to quit.

Another operator was forced to sell 330 head of cattle as he could not go on with them any longer. He writes me that he summered the cattle last summer, wintered them this winter, paid taxes on them twice, worked like a dog in the snow and mud, put in 16 hours every day, fed his own feed, and bought additional feed to carry through the winter. Finally, when he sold them he lost $10,000 plus his feed and labor.

In these days of New Deal financing, $10,000 may sound like a small amount of money, but it is disastrous to our cattle feeders. These feeders are in reality small factories in operation all over the Nation. The effect of their closing down will be seriously felt by the consumers as time goes on. Would it not be more practical to increase the price of beef a few cents per pound and let the consumer have beef for his table?

Maintenance of a Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, zero hour approaches in what will probably be the mightiest battle in the history of the world. All the power and striking force that can be amassed by the inventive genius and the brawn of men will hurl itself at the Nazi war machine in an effort to smash the enemies of freedom and the disturbers of the peace of the world.

We wait with anxious, prayerful hearts the outcome of this struggle. We know what dark days lie ahead. We know this venture means the loss of precious lives. We know that there will follow in its wake grief, despair, and heartaches. We pray for strength to do our part of this as well as the gallant lads over there will do theirs.

I hope even in this dark hour we may lift our eyes and look beyond the clouds of war and see the faint glimmer of the dawn of peace and tranquility when the shooting stops. Godspeed the hour. We must be ready for the duties of that hour. The fight will not be won when the armies quit in the field. It will not be won until we have banished war and murder from the hearts of men. That cannot be done by treaties and conventions. Only can it be done by a regenerated spirit. There are at least two great forces in the world that can take up this fight when the armies quit, namely, the Christian Church and the great fraternities which reach out and touch the lives of men in

every walk and strata of life. They all preach brotherhood and peace. That is what the world needs today.

A few evenings ago I addressed one of these groups of fine Americans. I attach a newspaper account of my remarks:

[From the Danville (Va.) Register of April 29, 1944]

WOODRUM CALLS ON ALL TO MAKE PEACE LAST; DEPLORES PRE-WAR TRENDS AT MASON'S MEETING

"War is a horrible thing. I wish you might have a seat next to mine in the Nation's Capitol and read some of the letters, and hear the pathetic calls of mothers and fathers, sisters and wives of some of those who are directly affected by this thing. It cannot be said that everybody in America is ignorant of the fact that there is a war. Some of us are terribly conscious of it," said CLIFTON A. WOODRUM of Roanoke, Representative of Congress from the Sixth District of Virginia, in an address last night in Masonic Temple to Masons of Danville and the neighboring communities.

"The fields of the earth and the rivers of the world," said Mr. Woodrum, "are runing red with the blood of men and women. How long will it be until men will learn the futility of war? Must it all happen again? When will we learn that war is the only game at which everybody loses and nobody gains?

"God grant the day may dawn quickly when this old war-weary world will lay aside its implements of war, when men will turn again and begin to learn once more the arts of peace and good will. There must never be another war.

"You and I as American citizens have been guilty of letting this war come. God forgive us if we sit idly by and let it happen again.

"During my 25 years in Congress I have seen how quickly we forget. I, for one, watched with a heavy heart when, with the best intentions we towed into the Atlantic and sunk a great Navy, on which we had already spent $350,000,000, in what we thought was a great gesture of peace. What a laugh that gave Tojo and Hitler. Hardly was the ink dry on the treaty when they started building again.

"We will come out of this war with the biggest and best Navy, the best trained Air Corps, and the best land Army the world has ever known, and I hope we will see to it that no other nation is again permitted to build up a great, aggressive military force to menace the world. If we do not, your grandchildren and mine will be fighting another war before very long.

"It is a grand thing to look forward to an era of peace, when nations shall march shoulder to shoulder in a great brotherhood of man. That day will come when we can put selfishness and greed out of the hearts of men and nations, but as long as there are those with a spirit of greed and aggression, we must be ready to defend our rights.

"The biggest battle of this war," said Mr. Woodrum, "the battle that will mean more than any battle now being fought, will be the battle around the peace table.

"At that battle I want the representatives of the other nations of the world to look at Uncle Sam, with his hands outstretched to help the world, but I want them also to look over his shoulder and see America, a strong Nation, with ideals and principles of justice and peace, and with the strength to make the other nations respect those principles.

"But if they see a picture of a nation that has lost those ideals, they will have no respect for us.

"I happen to be chairman of a committee appointed to deal with post-war problems. That body met today before I left Washington. We are trying now to consider as far as we can the problems that will have to be faced when the war is over. The final answer, of course, cannot be written until the last gun of the war has been fired, but we can begin to study these problems now.

"The more I have studied the history of America, the more I have become convinced that the guiding hand of God has led this Nation of ours. So has it been in this war. Nothing but the guiding hand of God protected us.

"Some of our leaders saw this thing coming, but almost in the very shadow of Pearl Harbor some of our so-called leaders were shouting from the housetops, over the radio, and in every way they could command attention, that no nation would ever dare attack America. It makes interesting reading now to scan the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of those days, when some of us were called warmongers.

"We couldn't do much about it until Pearl Harbor, but after that some of those gentlemen who were the loudest in denouncing us were out in front waving flags. I shudder to think of what would have happened if Japan had pushed on in her conquest. They could have landed almost anywhere they wanted to, but for some reason they held back and gave us time to prepare.

"When historians of the future write the future of America's war development following Pearl Harbor, it will be one of the greatest pieces of history ever written.

"If there is ever to be a lasting peace," continued Mr. WOODRUM, "it must be based on the principles of the Christian church and the Masonic fraternity, and other great fraternal organizations who preach and seek to emulate the Christian principles of brotherhood and tolerance."

Mr. WOODRUM spoke under auspices of the Scottish Rite bodies of Danville; however, the meeting was open to all Master Masons, with invitations extended to members of all neighboring lodges.

Speaking on Masonry, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow, he sketched briefly the influence of the fraternity on the early history of America.

"Masonry," said he, "is the most universal of all organizations. Its footsteps may be traced to the most remote regions of the world. Its teachings have been found in the most out-of-the-way places of the earth.

"I have in my hand the membership card of Brother Carter in the First Masonic Club of Bougainville. Evidently Brother Carter has traveled extensively, for we also have his membership card in the Square and Compass Club of Guadalcanal. Out there in the southwest Pacific, the members of our fraternity are meeting with each other where they are fighting the Japs." (The cards had been handed to him since he reached Danville yesterday afternoon.)

"That," said Mr. WOODRUM, "is typical of the history of Masonry. Wherever men may gather throughout the world they find a common meeting place under the square and compass. The history of this fraternity has been built indelibly into the very foundation and framework of our Nation and our Government. Down through the centuries its paths have been bordered by roses of love and kept green by the tears of widows and orphans who have been blessed by its ministrations. Down through the years the Masonic fraternity has spread sunshine and joy and consolation, and the world has been a better place because Masonry has passed that way."

Mr. WOODRUM was introduced by Lt. Gov. William M. Tuck, of Halifax. Mr. Tuck was introduced by State Senator Maitland H. Bustard. Senator Robert C. Vaden, of Gretna, and a number of other well-known out-of-town Masons were guests of the occasion.

Dewey Avoids Giving Pledges to Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article by Mr. Bert Andrews appearing in the New York Tribune of April 30.

Governor Dewey stands way out in front as the Republican candidate for President. Still there are those who feel he has been silent on present and post-war international problems. Mr. Andrews, in an editorial printed in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, April 23, brought to the attention of the public many excerpts taken from several of the Governor's speeches proving conclusively that this is not true. One of the outstanding remarks of the Governor's is that he feels a durable peace will only be attained by the willing sacrifice of the people the world over, because they understand the conditions of peace and want them. He also believes in Congress because it is close to the people, and that is something today when so many attacks are made on this body of Representatives. I feel that the following editorial by Mr. Bert Andrews is timely in that it refutes the attacks one hears on Governor Dewey's personal qualifications and also gives one a clean-cut argument favoring his silence. I'm sure we would all favor a President without the usual so-called strings tied to his election.

DEWEY AVOIDS GIVING PLEDGES TO POLITICIANS—ONE REASON FOR NOT DECLARING CANDIDACY IS FEAR OF "STRINGS"—MANY FORMER CRITICS FIND HIM "CHANGED"—SAY HIS NEW POPULARITY RESULTED DIRECTLY FROM "CHANGE OF OCCUPATION"

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's views on foreign policy, as reflected in his numerous public addresses, messages, and statements, were described in detail in this space last week. Today three other matters relating to the silent man of Albany will be discussed under the following headings:

Does the New York Governor have more than one reason for sticking to his statement that he is not a candidate for the Republican nomination for President?

What about the double-barreled question that has often been heard in political circles: Would Governor Dewey be able to get along with Congress and does he have a definite theory of running the executive branch of government?

What is the answer to two more personal questions: Is there a "new" Tom Dewey? If so, what wrought the change?

WOULD HONOR A DRAFT

As to the first puzzler, one reply already has been heard. This is that Mr. Dewey believes that he cannot in honesty recede from his gubernatorial campaign statement that he would serve out his 4-year term, but that this pledge would be nullified if the

national convention drafted him, in that it would be tantamount to treason to both party and country to refuse a bona fide draft to the Nation's highest office.

But in the opinion of men who know the Governor well, there are more reasons than that for his taciturnity. The chief one is this: If he became an avowed candidate, he immediately would be subjected to all the pulling and hauling that besets any admitted candidate.

This would not mean that a candidate would have to go so far as to promise cabinet posts or other appointive jobs in exchange for support. It would mean that he would have to take political support where he could find it and that some of the supporters, mistakenly but sincerely, would think that their helpfulness entitled them to a few strings on the candidate in the event of his election. And, according to men who know Governor Dewey, it is only natural that he, like any other potential Presidential candidate, would like to go into the campaign and into office as stringless as possible.

SEEKS HIGH TYPE AS AIDS

This ties in with the second question, as to Mr. Dewey's ability to get along with Congress and his theory of administrative duties.

For an answer, Mr. Dewey's intimates point to what he has done in Albany and what he did as district attorney. They say he would seek the cooperation and suggestions of Congress, just as he has sought the cooperation and suggestions of legislative leaders in New York's capital, but at the same time would hold to his view that as the elected head of the executive branch it would be up to him to outline the broad governmental policies. As for appointments, the precedents he has set in Albany and New York seem to make it clear, the intimates say, that he would search the country for the highest type of men for appointive offices, and would do all that any President could do to keep political hacks out of positions of eminence.

DISLIKED IN 1940, LIKED NOW

What of the more personal questions—those about the "new" Tom Dewey?

To begin with, it is merely factual reporting to state that up to and through the 1940 national convention there were many newspapermen and politicians who disliked the New Yorker because they believed he was often bumptious and sometimes downright supercilious in his dealings with people.

Lest this seem an exaggeration, it can be pointed out that Raymond P. Brandt, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, had this to say recently in writing of the 1944 Dewey as contrasted with the 1940 Dewey who showed up at the Philadelphia convention.

"At Philadelphia, Dewey irritated and at times infuriated many prominent and obscure delegates by his arrogant cockiness and self-satisfaction. The old observation about him that 'you have to know Dewey well to dislike him' was disproved; many disliked him after 5 minutes' conversation. At 38 years old he was 'the young man in a hurry,' the 'boy scout,' the 'political upstart.'"

It is also merely factual reporting to state that since 1940, and particularly in the last 2 years, there has been a pronounced tendency among many of the former critics, newspapermen, or politicians to regard the Governor as a changed man. This reporter has heard many Washington and Albany correspondents say that the Governor is more affable, courteous, and friendly; that, in fact, he gets along with press and politicians as well as any Governor did.

So much talk of that nature has been heard, indeed, that this reporter developed a personal curiosity to learn what led to the improvement.

Did it result from some conscious soul searching on the part of the Governor; from a self-examination which convinced him that so many critics couldn't be wrong, and that, therefore, it was up to him to change his tactics?

Or did it result from outside pressure, from close advisers who bluntly told him, "Look, Tom, if you're going to get anywhere in politics, you'd better get in and learn the facts of life about not going around winning enemies and alienating people"?

Men who know the Governor best don't bat an eye when the foregoing questions are put to them. They acknowledge that Dewey's tact left something to be desired in 1940. But they insist that neither of the suggested explanations is the correct one. They offer a third one, and it has some logic behind it.

These men declare that the change resulted directly from "a change in occupations."

As district attorney of New York County, they explain, Mr. Dewey broke with precedent. Earlier prosecutors had often called newspapermen in, on the night before a trial session, to give them a hint of what he'd do the next day. Mr. Dewey took the view that he would be betraying his trust if he tipped his hand and refused to do as other prosecutors had done. In the process he irritated and infuriated many newspapermen, as well as some politicians who had been used to getting inside dope from the D. A.'s office. They spread the word to other newspapermen and politicians, until the "we-don't-like-Dewey" theme was taken up by many men who'd never even laid eyes on him.

Then came the change in occupations, with Mr. Dewey stepping into another phase of political life. With the stepping, say the men who know him best, he was able to drop his prosecutor's guard; was able to deal with questioners without sparring, and was able to smooth over injured feelings.

That, in a nutshell, seems to be the favored explanation. Whatever the reason, the fact is that many who disliked him now feel more kindly to him and are convinced that he has matured and mellowed.

Former Delegate King Now Port Director at Base in Marshalls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 13, 1944:

FORMER DELEGATE KING NOW PORT DIRECTOR AT BASE IN MARSHALLS

(By Mac R. Johnson)

AN ADVANCED AMERICAN BASE, SOMEWHERE IN THE MARSHALLS, April 10.—Commander Sam King, former Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, is port director at an advanced American base in the Marshalls.

Every ship that enters the harbor and every boat that plies between them and shore is Commander King's responsibility. Sam, other officers said, is doing a splendid job.

Commander King is a graduate of the Navy School, as older officers call the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. He resigned his commission to enter private business, and later served four terms as the Territory of Hawaii's voteless Delegate to Congress.

I talked to Commander King for an hour after accidentally meeting him while trying to find transportation to a ship. He talked of his work in Washington, the newspapermen he knew, of his friends in the Hawaiian islands. But he's in the Navy now and couldn't talk politics.

However, in summing up his years in the House of Representatives, Commander King said, "One attains a nonpartisan perspective when one is without a vote."

He didn't seek reelection a year ago, deciding instead to return to the Navy and apply his academy training in such ways as the Pacific Fleet found he could be most helpful.

Sam has a wood-and-screen office that keeps out much of the ever present dust at this base. But traffic through his door is brisk and the flies get in. The commander has fashioned a fly swatter from a piece of screen and wood to eliminate those which successfully infiltrate.

"While the dead Japs were being buried, the flies were terrible," King said. "They're not so bad now," he added, taking a crack at the only fly I saw in the office.

It was hot and Commander King repeatedly mopped his face and neck with a handkerchief. Yeomen, coxswains and messengers constantly entered to see the commander. His pleasant way of talking to the enlisted men, solving their problems and giving orders, was refreshing. Not all naval officers have this virtue.

The men weren't taking advantage. Everyone addressed him as "Mr. King," or "Sir."

Later, I asked several dungaree-clad men how they like working for Commander King. "He's all right," said one. Another said, "He's okay." Both answers were complimentary. Sweating sailors seldom use ecstatic superlatives.

Speaking of the Marshalls invasion, Commander King said, "It was the first amphibious operation I have ever seen." He said he was given permission to go on a combat vessel (minesweeper) which went within 150 yards of an enemy-held beach prior to the landing of American troops.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the building-supply dealers, concrete-block manufacturers, sand and gravel producers, and ready-mix concrete operators, at a regular meeting of these associations:

Whereas it has come to our attention that the Price Administrator, Chester Bowles, has asked Congress to continue price control substantially without change under the O. P. A., which expires on June 30, 1944; and

Whereas the undersigned manufacturers, dealers, and processors are in favor of the continuance of price control, subject to modifications to permit correction of injustices and inequalities; and

Whereas the complexity of regulations and the indifferent and arbitrary policy adopted in many cases in connection with the adjustment of inequalities by representatives of the O. P. A. in cases where such inequalities and adjustments do not affect the war effort has created a hardship on certain industries without any prospect for relief from them under the present law; and

Whereas this policy is not in accordance with equitable principles and is contrary to the American way of fair play and has created a situation which will, unless curtailed, unnecessarily destroy firms long established in business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we apprise our representatives in Congress of this situation and appeal to them to take action when the renewal or continuance of price control comes up for consideration to insist that some provision be included in the bill to either establish a tribunal or provide for court review to give petitioners an opportunity to be heard and present evidence before representatives of O. P. A. deny an application to correct maladjustments; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman representing the State of Minnesota.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, recently the Navy Department announced the death in this war of Ensign Anthony Mannix Moriarty, son of Judge and Mrs. Joseph J. Moriarty, of Shakopee, Minn.

Ensign Moriarty was one of the boys whom I had observed grow from boyhood into young manhood, and who left college to respond to his country's call and to win pilot's wings.

My attention has been called to the following remarks of Judge Moriarty in his court which contain a most touching expression and reference to his son and an inspired expression of the principles of American citizenship. I consider it an honor and a privilege to extend the following remarks of Judge Moriarty in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOSEPH J. MORIARTY, JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT, AT THE NATURALIZATION PROCEEDINGS HELD AT THE COURTHOUSE IN THE VILLAGE OF LE CENTER, LE SEUR COUNTY, MINN., ON THE 24TH DAY OF APRIL 1944

It is the duty of the judge in a proceedings of this kind under our rules to make some statement to the new citizen, but my heart is too heavy this morning to say much.

The flag was never so precious as now. There is a soul this morning somewhere in the Heavens who died for that flag, and he was dear to me, and if he were here he would not want me to mention his name because he was a modest fellow. His spirit is still alive and that spirit was not a spirit of the shy or the retreating or the cowardly, that was a spirit dedicated to fight for what was right. He saw his way clearly, he never flinched, and now he is with God.

If he was here this morning he would tell you just one thing, and that is how necessary it is for us to understand some of the basic principles of the Government and the country for which he died. He would tell you, because he was a student already of the law, that man moves in a democracy under three great influences, in three great spheres of action. In the one there is government by the positive written law of the country; the other, there is government by the principles of justice; and in the other, there is government by the law of Almighty God. Now, some of you may think that that is just the fond hope of some theologian and that statement really belongs to religion and not to the judiciary, but that is where we are mistaken. The very basic law of this country rests squarely on the will of Almighty God. We have certain provisions in our Constitution, we have certain statutes, but that is not the law in its entirety. It is only a small portion of the law which regulates the affairs of men in a democracy.

Side by side with that is another great sphere of jurisprudence, it is called equity, and that branch of government is based entirely upon the justice of God, the law of nature, the principles of right and justice. That is what the judges say of it, Story and Kent and the great American judges.

Then there is another sphere, mind you, and in order to define that sphere for you I am going to define it in the very language of one of our greatest of American judges. He says, "All of the precepts of morality are not jural in their nature; that is, they do not relate to mankind considered as organized into society or as into a state, but separately to individuals, prescribing their duties toward each other and toward God. These moral precepts or precepts of morality create obligations which rest separately upon persons which the human law and the state does not and cannot recognize or enforce. They are left for enforcement to the divine sanction as it acts in and upon the conscience of each individual." Now, then, that judge had this in mind, he had one word that is used in the Declaration of Independence in mind when he made that statement, and when he made that statement he voiced the basic law of America and the underlying principles of a democracy. What word was it? That little word "unalienable" rights. Rights which the individual cannot surrender; rights which the state cannot take away; rights which the state cannot regulate. Oh, that is a great sphere of human action where that influence controls. Has it a court? Yes, it is the court of conscience. Has it a judge? Yes, God is the judge of that court. Right there, my friends, is the great outstanding characteristic of a democracy, the existence of this free field of human action and the protection of it by all the rest of the law of the nation.

My friends, I told you a moment ago that if it were not for all of the religions a democracy could not prevail; and why, because it is in this sphere of human action where conscience is the court and God is the judge, where the State stands apart, that religion has its influence. Here is where all the individual initiative arises from. It is in this sphere where a man's noblest ambitions and greatest ideals take rise. It is that sphere that controls this country. It is in that sphere we find our true freedom. There is no freedom under the positive written law of a State, and that is why the original founders of the United States of America said, we will create a free field here and in that the rights are inalienable, never shall the State interfere there.

Do you know my good new citizen, the distinction between a democracy and a totalitarian form of government where a dictator and one man rule prevails? Well, I will tell you, it is very simple and tell it to your children. In a totalitarian form of government, a one-man ruled government, everything is wrong except what he says is right. Do you see where that free field of human action that I am talking about is wiped out, equity is wiped out, nothing but the positive letter of the law, the human law. Now, in a democracy, our United States of America, oh, the difference. Everything is right except what the Government by positive law says is wrong. Here is the great distinction.

You know I pray to God that before my death I could see the young Americans decide to say whether or not they were or were not true Christians, but everywhere throughout the land they are answering as did the Christians of old. Just one answer for those fellows—we are ever ready to die for the right. We shall never submit to wrong. That is the spirit of the boys of today. That is the spirit of the old Christians of the ages, and that is our spirit here at home.

So, my good American, you have many people, I know, that are related to you and friends of yours in Germany and they wish they could be with you this morning, but not yet. The day will come when we will enter into that very nation, not with hate, oh, no, but with Christian love, and the light of Christ will shine there and peace will prevail and God will have His way and justice will have its day in the whole world.

I congratulate you, and I want you to take that flag home and keep it forever.

An International Court and Four Sheriffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An International Court and Four Sheriffs," by Richard S. Childs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INTERNATIONAL COURT AND FOUR SHERIFFS

A SET-UP AMERICANS CAN ACCEPT

(By Richard S. Childs)

The people of the United States want an end to all wars, and plans for that will be listened to eagerly—and warily. They will not, however, in our time, consent to taking a minority position in an international legislature of a supergovernment and be bound in advance by the votes of its alien majority. Neither will the United Kingdom. Nor the Soviet Union. The various blueprints for world government all are made unrealizable by that inescapable fact.

An international police, involving as it does an international political set-up to finance and control it, is under the same disability.

We drop back then to the classic program of our scholars in such affairs—namely, to revive the League of Nations, supplemented by regional set-ups such as the suggested Council of Europe. The United States will, I hope, consent this time to take its permanent seat in the League Council.

Still remains the fact, however, that the League did not prevent aggression. Reference of nonjusticiable disputes involving aggression to the Council of the League did not confront an undoubted aggressor with any uncertainty of instant overwhelming concerted armed intervention to protect the victim. Japan in Manchuria, Italy in Ethiopia, Germany in Austria flouted the Council and left its members to "advise" as to what, if anything, its members should do, resulting only in the Lytton inquiry in Manchuria, feeble sanctions against Italy, and so forth. A cynical world, including the United States, jeered at the League and seems likely to despair again when statesmen propose reassembling it.

Unless something further can be done about aggression.

For this high purpose, victory brings a new opportunity. At the end of the war we shall see four nations (including China) mightily armed; three Axis nations and their Balkan satellites thoroughly disarmed for a long, long time, and a scatteration of little nations like Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Argentina, whose arms are relatively trivial.

Even after demobilizations of their victorious armies, the ready-made alliance of the four nations can easily retain an aggregation of 95 percent of the land, sea, and air power of the world. An extraordinary situation unmatched since Rome.

So the Moscow statement went beyond the League, sounding a new note to which American public opinion, happily, is making little objection thus far—the new note of determination that the outlawing of war shall be implemented by the vast concerted postwar forces of the four nations and of all other nations that accept their invitation to join up in an elaborated understanding toward that end. This project has not yet been drafted but it needs provision of mechanism and procedure if only for the purpose of putting all nations on notice as to its scope and method.

The present vague position seems to be: "We four nations will go after an aggressor any time we get together and agree that we have spotted one." Our people may well fear that under that loose arrangement we may find ourselves invited from time to time to help to rake chestnuts out of the fire to satisfy some obscure national ambition of Russia or the British Empire. We and the other nations will delay to check the circumstances warily each time. In some cases we may be unsure that the others will proceed along with us with equal resolution.

Who is to say just when aggression has developed? If it is to be the Council of the League as heretofore, I doubt if the United States, for one, will bind itself to respond unquestioningly and every time with arms to support a decision made by the Council identifying the offending nations. The four nations will certainly not agree to let a majority of the Council determine for them whether and when their forces shall move to war against an alleged agressor; they will require as they did before, that such a vote in the Council shall be unanimous or shall include the separate assent of each of the four nations (which presumably will hold permanent seats). For the Council is a political body, our people are skeptical of its motives, its members are not impartial judges of objective facts but official national mouthpieces of their respective ministries, foreign policies, national ambitions, and alliances. So if no better provisions are to be made for making certain that the concerted power of the four dominant nations will really move toward the control of a Council-identified aggressor, we are back to the ghastly hazard again that after aggression appears, each of the four nations, regardless of the Moscow Pact, will pause to consider each time whether this really is a case of aggression of which they should take notice, whether if so, they shall move this time, and in general whether they and their people are sufficiently inflamed about it to go to war alongside equally hesitant and dubious peace-loving allies. The stern determination voiced at Moscow may soften in decades of peace. If the Kaiser and Hitler had felt sure of the odds that finally piled up against them, they would never have started; aggressors 20 years hence may dare again in the absence of utter certainty of encountering an overwhelming combination of enemies.

How can aggressors be identified in such impartial fashion that democracies and the American people in particular will agree to accept the finding and to proceed to war without indulging in a fatal delay to mull and split over the merits of each case? How can the would-be aggressor be blocked by a certainty that his aggression will bring this democracy and others into swift and early military action as indicated at Moscow?

I propose this:

Let the four nations, and all others that can be led to join up, agree that they will:

1. Adopt a broad definition of aggression which will so amplify the meaning of that highly uncertain word as to make it possible to take questions of aggression out of the nonjusticiable into the justiciable class of international disputes.

2. Refer to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague all complaints against themselves wherein aggression is alleged, and abide by the verdicts and penalties in respect to the aggression factor of the dispute—other factors may be nonjusticiable and referable elsewhere or left unsolved.

3. Require all other governments, whether signatories to this agreement or not, to renounce the use of force likewise, and take their cases to court (or elsewhere) and abide by the verdicts.

4. Maintain armed forces of the four nations at sufficient strength according to their respective judgments, to be jointly overwhelmingly paramount in the post-war world.

5. Dedicate their armed power solely to the support of the Court and renounce the use of their arms for any other purpose.

To reach the Court in such cases, aggression under the agreed-upon definition must be alleged in the complaint and found existent by the Court. Failure by any defendant nation to answer the complaint, or failure to abide by the decision and penalties (including any interim injunctions to refrain from or reverse aggressive acts), will be ascertained and published by the Court. Forthwith the four nations and all other signatories are under agreement to move armed forces against the aggressor to compel obedience to the Court—acting as sheriffs and posse comitatus.

Here we do have just a bit of supergovernment, any nations not signatory get the same treatment as those that have agreed that such measures may be used against them in such circumstances. Justification for that, aside from its necessity, lies in the fact that the signatories will represent over 80 percent of the world's population.

Here, too, we have the blank check which the American people must be asked to sign—an agreement to go with arms to the support of the Court in such circumstances along with the other sheriffs. But the issue will not be the allegations in a far-away dispute but the clearer and nobler one—"We must support the Court, we agreed to, the orderly way of settling international disputes must be upheld—a nation must not be allowed to take the law into its own hands!" And if the other three great nations keep faith and move likewise as promised, in concert with us, in overwhelming power, there will be no fighting. The prompt appearance in the offender's foreign office of all the ambassadors asking for their safe conducts, would be enough!

The American people, I contend, would subscribe to that much and live up to it.

But suppose we are sued. Suppose we pursue another Villa into Mexico, rushing troops across the Rio Grande? The Mexican officials, responsive to local resentment, cable to the Court alleging aggression. We would have to respond and expound the theory of our act—"not really aggression at all"—and abide by the finding, recalling our troops if the court so decreed. And we would. I see no trouble in inducing the American people to promise that we would, if other nations are taking the same risks of an adverse decision in such matters.

The American people have already applauded the Moscow Pact with its promise that we, with the others, will employ force hereafter against those that break the peace. They will still more readily accept that obligation if it be based on a familiar type of procedure designed to provide cool, orderly, and impartial justice. This plan will pledge them to take weapons from the wall and go forth with the other sheriffs (not alone) against any nation that flouts the Court—they will stand for that. They will do it for the Court more willingly and unquestioningly than for the League Council; the Court is a court; the Council is a composite of intense political cross-currents. The Court is in good standing here, the Council is in mixed repute.

Of course the situation becomes precarious if a Court decision leaves three of the four nations to enforce a decision on the fourth. China, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom, however, are geographically so separated that disputes between them seem unlikely to reach a stage where any one of them would flout the court and take to arms. The Soviet Union's self-interest seems ready to turn toward the vast opportunities of her internal development and industrial modernization, hampered now by weight of great armaments. German aggression which she once had reason to fear, will be no longer a risk at the end of this war. Accordingly the Soviet Union could well afford sincerely to try this plan. (Otherwise, I admit, this plan, or any other, is a four-legged table with one leg off.)

The provision thus of "An international court and four sheriffs" does not obviate the need for having a League of Nations again to facilitate legislation as before, mediation and procedures for peaceful change. This does not transfer from the League Council to the Court any powers except the power to determine when there has been aggression under an agreed-upon definition. Other phases of disputes re boundaries, economic grievances, treatment of minorities, colonies, mandates, if not justiciable, stay in the League Council and if not solved there, the aggrieved nation, big or little, is left without redress as now subject only to a further effective denial of the opportunity to resort to war as an instrument of national policy.

If the League is not reconstituted, or if the United States does not join, this plan can still be effectuated.

SUMMARY

It seems to me important that the four nations do not attempt after the war to use their triumphant power in the discretion of their shifting ministries to regulate the world; the rest of the world would hotly resent such power-based assumptions of either wisdom or authority.

To dissipate the power of this great alliance, to permit resumption of the old scramble, mitigated only by the incomplete powers of the League, seems equally perilous.

To hold dominant power, but pledge it exclusively to the service of organized justice, to keep the weapons and promise to use them only against any nation which the Court reports to be guilty of aggression, that would constitute in the sight of the world a noble and reassuring renunciation of the selfish opportunities of victorious power, and channel the power to the point where it would be least used and most useful.

Frank Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following poem entitled "Frank

Knox" written by Horace C. Carlisle, Washington poet:

FRANK KNOX

Since God who created us is no respector
of persons when comes the last call,
He pays heed to no "conscientious objector,"
But gives the death sentence to all—
The weak and the strong and the sick and the
healthy
Enjoy no alternative choice—
The wise and the foolish, the poor and the
wealthy,
All stop at the sound of His voice.

Our noteworthy Navy's renowned Secretary,
Bemoaned by the peace-loving world,
In this darkened day was a bright luminary
Wherever waved, proudly unfurled,
The Stars and the Stripes in their grandeur
and glory,
Significant of the great Cause
Of Freedom, enshrined both in song and in
story,
Safeguarding democracy's laws.

Frank Knox has passed on, but his mem'ry
we'll cherish
As long as the ages shall last——
His wholesome influence on life cannot perish,
But will ever live in the past,
Directing, from out of the silence, our actions,
On down through the challenging years,
Imploring us, in all transocean transactions,
To follow our wise pioneers.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Construction of the Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, my warm friend, Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, recently appeared in my home city of Tacoma, Wash., where he made a notable address replete with fascinating material concerning the very romantic engineering undertaking, the Alaska Highway.

Captain Neuberger, the author of this address, is a notable magazine writer, author of best-selling books, and a journalist of note. He has been a member of the Oregon State Legislature and was a staff writer for many years on that great newspaper, the Portland Oregonian.

The speech is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, and friends, I can see that I will have to be very careful what I say today. My service in the far North lasted only 19 months. That is a long time, particularly when 3 of those months were during the coldest subarctic winter since 1913, yet I see in this audience a number of old-timers of Alaska and the Yukon. Mr. Ward Estey hiked over the Chilkoot Pass and so did your sheriff, Mr. Lee Croft, and I understand that Mr. Barrett, at the table in front, actually cooked for Jack London when Jack was snowed in at Stewart in 1898. So if I make any mistakes or wander from the truth, you can be sure that I will be called to account by some very well-informed individuals.

I first met Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor—who is known throughout the Corps of Engineers as "Patsy" O'Connor—at Log Cabin in September of 1942. Ward Estey and Lee Croft will know where Log Cabin is. Log Cabin is a little way station near the bleak summit of White Pass. There the red-coated constables of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police checked in the gold seekers as they trudged wearily across the mountains in search of riches half a century ago.

"Who are you?" asked the general.

"I'm your public relations officer, sir," I replied.

"Are you the fellow General Sturdevant wrote me about?"

"Yes, sir."

(At this point, let me add parenthetically that Brig. Gen. Clarence L. Sturdevant, who is assistant chief of Army engineers, is well known in the Puget Sound region, for he was district engineer at Seattle for a number of eventful years.)

Almost since that time, I have served as General O'Connor's aide-de-camp. It has been a historic experience. His job has been that of developing transportation and communication to Alaska. Under his direction have been many projects of great significance—the 1,600-mile Alaska Military Highway, the Haines Military Road, the telephone line from Edmonton to Whitehorse, the pipe line from Norman Wells, the military operation of the White Pass & Yukon Railroad, the construction of key airfields leading to Alaska and the north Pacific theater of war.

All these undertakings are of immeasurable importance to you here in Tacoma, for the Puget Sound area is the sea entrance to Alaska and the Yukon. And let me say here that Tacoma shall always hold a warm and affectionate place in my heart, because Tacoma is my mother's birthplace. I also am proud to know such eminent public officials from Tacoma as Hon. HOMER T. BONE, this State's senior United States Senator, and Hon. JOHN MAIN COFFEE, who represents this city in the House of Representatives of the American Congress, and Hon. Harry P. Cain, your mayor who is now a major in the American Army Military Government Section.

Much of the pioneering in Alaska has been the work of the United States Army. Frederick Schwatka, the man who surveyed almost all of southeastern Alaska, was a first lieutenant. The late Col. Charles Erskine Scott Wood, who at the time of his death a few weeks ago was the oldest living graduate of West Point, was the first white man ever to boat down the Yukon River to the Bering Sea. The late Gen. Billy Mitchell, pioneer advocate of air power, had charge of stringing the first telephone lines in the Sitka region. And everyone knows that it was Mitchell who said, "He who holds Alaska holds the world."

The undertaking assigned to General O'Connor followed in this pioneer tradition. He had been detailed to conquer the last great wilderness on the North American continent, a wilderness of vast distances and high mountains and far-flung forests.

Let me tell you something about a few of the experiences which attended that task.

When the route for the 1,592-mile Alaska International Highway was first selected, veteran Army men had looked at the map with some misgivings. The job would mean stationing American soldiers in the coldest patches of North America. Year after year Alaska's lowest temperatures are always recorded at Tanana Crossing, and the highway goes straight through it. Canada's Yukon Territory has frozen and maimed more men than any other Arctic region, and the highway twists across the Yukon for 551 wilderness miles.

In such a land it was inevitable that trucks would freeze, bulldozers would be immobilized by ice, and manifolds and differentials and carburetors would fail to function. But what about the soldiers? This was the Army's dominant concern. Could recruits from Florida and Mississippi and southern California come unscathed through a Yukon winter?

During the last great influx into the Yukon, that of the Klondike gold rush in 1898, men had died along the trail every day during December, January, and February. Frost-bitten lungs and frozen limbs had sent scores of others back to Seattle and Edmonton crippled wrecks. The trek to Whitehorse and Dawson was studded with pain.

The present Yukon migration rivals the one of '98. Approximately 20,000 soldiers have worked on the Alaska Highway and such associated projects as telephone lines, barracks, and landing strips. Construction on the road commenced in April of 1942. Today soldiers are driving trucks its full length, from Dawson Creek on the British Columbia plains to Fairbanks in the heart of Alaska.

In that time, with 20,000 men—many of whom had never felt even freezing temperatures before—worked out in the open in the coldest part of North America, there has been only one death from exposure.

In addition, Col. Walter F. von Zelinski, surgeon of the Army's Northwest Service Command, has said, "We have treated 140 men who were incapacitated by the cold. Of those 140 cases, all except 4 recovered completely, with no ill effects. The 4 required amputations of 2 or less toes. No amputations of hands or feet were necessary.

"In my opinion," Colonel von Zelinski has added, "this constitutes an all-time record for protection of the human body in the coldest imaginable temperatures. The record becomes all the more remarkable when one considers that three regiments of Negro soldiers composed almost wholly of men who never had been out of the deep South, played an important role in the construction of the Alaska Highway."

Colonel von Zelinski attributes this showing to three major factors: "First, the cold-weather discipline instilled in the troops, in the form of repeated instructions for behavior and living in extreme cold. Second, the studies made by the Army for safeguarding our personnel in temperatures touching 70 degrees below zero. And third the excellent Arctic clothing and unsurpassed sleeping equipment which have resulted from those studies."

The Quartermaster Corps of the Army was ready for the great road-building adventure in the far North long before that adventure began. On the 20,300-foot summit of Mount McKinley, loftiest spot on the continent, Bradford Washburn conducted special clothing experiments for the quartermaster general. Washburn is one of the best known mountain climbers in North America. He also is director of the New England Museum of Natural History.

"I believe that Mount McKinley is the coldest point in the world which men can reach," Washburn told Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States Army.

It was on McKinley's frigid crest that Washburn discovered that blankets and quilts, no matter how numerous, are a frail reed against the extreme cold, and that a sleeping bag is essential. There he found that eider down is warmer than any other material as a filling for the bag. He also found that a smaller sack fitting within the outer bag provided considerably more protection than a single bag of double thickness. And he insisted that the bag be made light enough for a man to carry with ease. "We don't want soldiers getting separated from their equipment," he warned.

Along the full length of the Alaska Highway's 1,592 miles—at truck relay station, airport, and signal unit—the G. I. sleeping bag is the most popular as well as the most vital article of equipment. I have eaten in a tent so cold that canned corn froze in my mess kit and I dared not take off my gloves,

yet that night I slept as snug as in a steam-heated hotel room. The G. I. sleeping bag bridged the temperature gap. When he came to the opening of the Alaska Highway, Maj. Gen. George R. Pearkes, wearer of the Victoria Cross and commander of Canada's Pacific Army Command told General O'Connor that the American Army's sleeping bag was the best piece of Arctic equipment that he ever had seen.

This was the voice of authority, for as a young man in 1913 Pearkes had been a Royal Mounted constable at Dalton Post on the Alaskan border. And when the Canadian general left Whitehorse he had in the pocket of his battle dress all the specifications of our G. I. sleeping bags for his own army to study.

The tendency of our soldiers at the start of their Arctic service was to wear too many clothes. This sounds paradoxical, but one of the facts definitely established by Bradford Washburn and his associates in the cold-weather tests was that perspiration and overheating are the gravest perils to a man on the northern trail. It is practically second nature for a soldier, especially if he has come straight from an orange-blossom climate, to wrap everything around himself except the kitchen linoleum when he feels the temperature falling to 60 below.

This is where Colonel von Zelinski's "cold-weather discipline" enters the situation. Our soldiers along the Alaska Highway have been schooled against dressing too heavily. All of them have been warned that men freeze to death when their inner clothing, becoming saturated with moisture from perspiration, conducts the heat from the body and then freezes hard. Another maxim hammered home is that several layers of light clothing are infinitely warmer than a single layer of equal weight. And no soldier is allowed to wear tight shoes or breeches that pinch at the knee. "Tight shoes mean frozen feet" is virtually an aphorism all the way from Dawson Creek to Fairbanks.

For what reason was all this pioneering and exploration undertaken?

The answer is simple—for the sake of anchoring, implementing and securing the air route to the North Pacific. From Edmonton to Fairbanks runs the route of the Alaskan Wing of the United States Army Air Forces. The Alaska Highway and communications system serve the air fields along this wilderness thoroughfare. On the highway have been transported the girders, cement, and other equipment which have transformed rough clearings in the evergreens into expansive airports with solid runways and permanent buildings.

You people of the Northwest will be proud and interested to know that a man whose home is in Portland, Oreg., commands the Alaskan Wing. He is Brig. Gen. Dale V. Gaffney, one of the pioneers of cold-weather flying. General Gaffney shares with a few American and Russian flyers the distinction of being one of the world's leading authorities on subzero aviation. He developed and planned the famous cold weather testing station at Ladd Field near Fairbanks. Under his command the Alaskan Wing functioned in frightfully bitter temperatures, often touching 70 degrees below zero. Even in these grim conditions, the men of the wing carried on rescue work, serviced planes on naked, blizzard-gripped runways and kept flying across the woods and mountains. General Gaffney, a pilot himself, served in the air corps in the First World War and was born near Methune, Mass.

The American people may be proud of the way in which their sons—whether in the Air Corps, Engineer Corps, quartermaster regiments or any other unit—have endured the bleak and harsh weather of the Arctic. Too much credit cannot be given the Medical Corps for this outstanding record.

Our station hospital at Whitehorse first was set up in tents. Then it was moved into an old tin-sided gymnasium. Major Mendel Silverman and his staff performed many successful operations in the most primitive conditions. Maj. William Joyce and Capt. Eugene Moscovitz risked their lives to fly through a fierce blizzard to a sergeant many miles north of Whitehorse who was stricken with acute appendicitis. Major Silverman organized a complete health program with the most limited sort of facilities.

This splendid care and treatment has extended all the way from the dispensaries along the road and at small air fields to the big general hospitals in the United States, where men are shipped for more extensive convalescence and observation. For a time in the winter of 1942–43 I was a patient at Barnes General Hospital not far from here, in Vancouver, Wash. The care, medicines, attention, and general treatment which I received there would compare, in my layman's opinion, with any hospital in the Nation. I found the doctors and staff executives conscientious and sincere, and vitally interested in the progress of each patient, whether he was officer or enlisted man.

Coming back to the United States, after more than a year and a half of service in the Far North, I see many luxuries and frivolities. Some people are disposed to patronize black markets, fake applications for "B" and "C" gasoline cards, and otherwise use this grim and tragic war as a means of furthering their own selfish desires. This was not so in the sub-Arctic. Men there put up with trying conditions and limited facilities, and although there was the usual Army "griping," the work went forward despite any and all difficulties. I have seen Negro soldiers standing in icy water to their armpits to build a timber bridge. I have watched white troops starting bulldozers and trucks with numbed hands at 60 degrees below zero.

For the first 3 months of its existence the Northwest Service Command operated from a single old temporary C. C. C. building. We had offices in the front of the structure, and we lived in a long hall at the back. Col. Kenneth B. Bush, our chief of staff, and a veteran of six major engagements in the last World War, handled a myriad of details from an office about the size of a steamer trunk. At midnight he still would be hunched over his desk, organizing and planning, and early in the morning he would be back on the job, ready for another 16 hours of work. Soldier railroaders on the White Pass & Yukon Railroad were lucky to sleep 5 hours out of 24 when snowslides plugged the line. I wish the civilians who lag on the war effort could have seen Colonel Bush in that little plywood office or those soldiers shoveling snow in the Yukon fastnesses.

General O'Connor displayed a spirit of leadership which was magnificent. He got from his men a loyalty and fidelity that were in a class by themselves.

Capt. William Hammond, of the Twenty-ninth Engineer Battalion, mushed 560 miles across the Mackenzie Mountains from Whitehorse to Fort Norman, but first he asked the Royal Mounties how they would keep alive on such a trek. Throughout his equipment and around the sleds, on their advice, he scattered big blocks of sulfur. If his hands froze too stiff to grip a match, he could always use wrists and palms to ignite the blocks. He also carried a pail of oil-soaked rags. Perhaps survival might depend upon getting a fire started quickly. If you break through a hidden spring on the trail, it requires only a few minutes for wet legs to freeze. And around his neck on a blue lanyard he hung his G. I. mitten of wolfskin. Once laid down, the mittens might never be picked up again by fingers rapidly stiffening at 70 degrees below. The lanyard was assurance that the mittens would always be available. It was 70 degrees below, and winds scoured the Mackenzie passes, but Hammond completed his mission and returned by dog sled, too, a total journey of more than 1,100 miles across unexplored terrain.

Hammond's mission was a volunteer one. General O'Connor wanted the job done and Hammond did it. When he arrived at Fort Norman, worn out and exhausted, he knocked on the door of the commanding officer's cabin and said, "General O'Connor sent me." He seemed like an apparition. Had he crossed those forbidding mountains in the dead of the Arctic winter? How had he done it? And the phrase "General O'Connor sent me" has now acquired Message to Garcia implications in the land where the aurora borealis flickers.

Of the 1,600 miles of the Alaska Highway, approximately 1,240 are on the soil of our sister nation and ally, the Dominion of Canada. From the people and officials of Canada we received the most outstanding courtesy. General O'Connor, Colonel Bush, and I visited Ottawa in February of 1943 and had the pleasure of being the guests of the Prime Minister and members of his Cabinet. We found all the citizens of Canada—regardless of political belief—eager to cooperate in the work of the American Army. At Edmonton we received the most outstanding cooperation from Maj. Gen. W. W. Foster, a distinguished Canadian officer, who has served as special liaison officer between the Canadian Government and the American construction projects.

We also had the pleasure of many favorable contacts with that illustrious Canadian soldier, Maj. Gen. George R. Pearkes, commanding Canada's Pacific Army Command. General Pearkes is one of the most decorated of the Dominion's fighting men. And we recall with satisfaction our association with such other noteworthy Canadians as Maj. Gen. John Peter Mackenzie, Maj. Gen. H. H. Ganong, Hon. John Hart, premier of British Columbia; Hon. Ernest C. Manning, premier of Alberta, and Dr. Charles Camsell, commissioner of the Northwest Territories and one of the noted authorities on the Far North.

I think General O'Connor summed up this friendly situation between our two lands when he asked last year, "Where else would one nation be allowed to construct a highway for 1,200 miles on its neighbor's soil and be given such outstanding cooperation?"

To a very great degree, the Alaska Highway and other undertakings in the sub-Arctic have demonstrated the capacity and resourcefulness of the average American soldier. When some of our sob-sisters and weepers decry the passing of American spirit, I think of the boys who hacked a road through a wilderness as trackless as that crossed by the covered-wagon trains which went to Oregon in 1850. I think of Negro soldiers, from the deep South, who drove trucks at 45 degrees below zero. I think of the white troops who pioneered the transportation system down the Mackenzie River to Fort Norman. I think of Captain Hammond driving his dog team across the Pelly Mountains. I think of Major Joyce and Captain Moscovitz flying through a blizzard in the darkness to aid a stricken sergeant. I think of Major Silverman operating with numbed fingers in a tent. I think of Colonel Bush handling a thousand administrative details from his tiny plywood office. I think of Capt. Roland Small, a Jewish engineer from New York City, who lost his life helping to blaze the highway through the foothills of the lofty St. Elias Range. I think of General O'Connor sleeping in a tent in the Yukon wilderness, sharing potluck and cold quarters with his men.

If the pioneering spirit is dead in America it is dead only among those who, from their ivory towers and night-club bivouacs, send others to do their job. The average American soldier is as much a pioneer as those soldiers of a century ago who followed Fremont and Kearney and Bonneville on the explora-

tions undertaken by the War Department of the American West.

There is a stanza by Houseman that I like:

"These in the days that Heaven was falling,
The hour that Earth's defenders fled,
Stood to their ancient calling,
Took their wages and are dead."

Most of the American soldiers who conquered the Yukon and Alaska fastnesses are still very much alive, but in an hour of crisis they stood to an ancient calling and helped save this continent. They blazed a land and aerial route to Alaska when the enemy threatened our North Pacific bastions. And their place in the history of the North Country is immortal.

"By Executive Order"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor Daily News of Saturday-Sunday, April 29–30, 1944:

"BY EXECUTIVE ORDER"

Specifically, the Montgomery Ward case boils down to this:

The collective-bargaining law directs that the employing company must arrange its labor policies by negotiation and contract with whatever union has a membership which includes the majority of its employees; and that the majority shall be ascertained by means of balloting among the employees—that is, by an election held under the auspices of the presumably neutral National Labor Relations Board.

In the Montgomery Ward organization, the management had such a contract with a C. I. O. union. This contract expired. How about its renewal?

The union parties to the contract maintained that they still represented the majority of the employees. The management said it was not convinced. Everybody agreed that there should be an election—at first. But everybody knew that the National Labor Relations Board requires considerable time to prepare for an election. The union asked a temporary contract, to cover the interim. The management replied that, under the law, it would not make a temporary contract, because it doubts whether the union represents the majority of employees.

Then the C. I. O. union members strike. And then the President of the United States sends soldiers to the scene—and ousts the management by sheer force.

For the seizure itself, there are comparatively recent precedents aplenty, yet no perfect precedent. Existing precedents generally antedate passage of the Smith-Connally law.

The President argues that he is acting on behalf of the War Labor Board and in conjunction with it. David Lawrence has given, in these columns, an adequate answer. The Smith-Connally law provides that the War Labor Board, an emergency makeshift, must adhere to the terms of the permanent National Labor Relations law. Under the terms of that law, Montgomery Ward seem clearly correct in their decision to make all contract-renewal await an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

So much for the specific case. The inferential results of the President's course, the possibilities inherent in it, may be even worse:

It is said that Mr. Roosevelt is merely exercising his Presidential wartime powers. No President of the United States has any such powers except those given him by the Constitution or the Congress—and you will search the Constitution and the statute books in vain to discover justification for the deeds of Federal force in Chicago.

It is said that Montgomery Ward are liable to such treatment because they "distribute products indirectly to the war effort." What, in total war is not indirectly essential to the war efforts? The word "indirectly" is practically all inclusive. It covers 99 out of every 100 industries, businesses, trades. It is dictatorial dynamite.

In short, defenders of the administration's action in regard to Montgomery Ward are inferentially extending to infinity their theory that government by Executive orders may legally supersede government by constitutional legislation.

The application of such a theory would, quite simply, put an end to government by the people.

The Manpower Situation in the Cheese Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, one of Wisconsin's greatest industries is the making of cheese. Our cheese makers have struggled under many adverse conditions to aid our country and her allies in this war emergency. Again and again, in spite of lack of materials and manpower, our cheese industry has increased production at the request of our Government. Now, however, the situation has become acute.

I take the liberty of calling the attention of the House and those in authority to the letter of Professor Clark, whose knowledge of this subject is outstanding. Professor Clark is honest, sincere, hard-working and absolutely reliable and his letter should be heeded.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, April 26, 1944.

Congressman HARRY SAUTHOFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAUTHOFF: Yours in regard to the cheese makers' situation came yesterday. It seems to me that the present policy of Selective Service in drafting all men under 26 (except in certain specified categories) is contrary to the intention of Congress in enacting the original Selective Service act. You know better than I about this, of course.

When passed, I think it was felt that National Selective Service headquarters would be fully apprised of the needs of men for military service and would distribute the quotas among States for draftees. The local boards would then provide the knowledge and judgment on which to select the men who could best be spared from their current occupations. No other source of such knowledge and judgment on individuals was, or is, available. Various means were provided in the appeal boards and the State Selective Service headquarters for review and checking actions of local boards. Recently in Public Law 229, State extension services were authorized to furnish information regarding farm registrants to local boards.

Recent directives from General Hershey have eliminated entirely the place of local boards and even State headquarters in determining the relative essentiality of men under 26. No agency exists which can consider deferment of men between 18 and 26 except possibly the War Manpower Commission. The latter is incapable of discharging this function. It has neither the information nor the personnel to do it.

General Hershey's recent orders have in one stroke taken away from the local boards all the opportunity to exercise judgment and authority which Congress intended them to have. The Congress is the only hope of the people for the restoration of these powers.

No question of the personal interests of the men under 26 is involved, as I see it. The problem involved is that of retaining in their present occupation young men who are irreplaceable and essential. There is no substitute for the judgment of the local boards on these cases. The cheese makers are an example of such cases.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. CLARK,
Associate Director.

Governor Green of Illinois Addresses Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a speech by the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, on the occasion of the second annual convention of the member co-ops of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Chicago, Ill., on March 20, 1944.

Governor Green's speech follows:

On behalf of the people of the State of Illinois, I am happy to extend to the members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association the warm and hospitable welcome which our State traditionally gives to her visitors. Your meeting this year is of the utmost importance because, like all Americans in every line of endeavor, you are faced with the task of preparing to meet the problems of the post-war era.

All of us are agreed that every branch of our economic system must be fully prepared to convert to a normal, peacetime basis as rapidly as possible if we are to avert the disaster of unemployment and the confusion and disillusionment which have followed in the wake of every war in history.

Jobs for veterans will naturally be our first concern, our most solemn obligation. But before we can provide productive, self-supporting jobs for our returning fighters, we must first take steps to set our entire economic system in order, because only strong, prosperous agriculture, industry, and labor can offer the permanent employment and security that is our ultimate goal.

As we turn our attention to the problem of post-war reconstruction, as we seek methods and means to guide our agriculture, industry, and labor over the shoals of reconversion to peacetime production, we must be certain that we dwell with equal emphasis

on each, because it has been demonstrated over and over again that if one should fail, if one of the great branches of our economic system is allowed to fall into ruin, then all will fail.

In the field of post-war planning it seems to me that too little attention has been placed upon the needs and problems of agriculture. As Governor of Illinois, one of the richest, most productive agricultural regions in the world, I have had unlimited opportunity to observe our farmers at work on the home front in this war, and I know that when the conflict ends they are going to be faced with serious and menacing problems which must be solved if our plans for post-war prosperity are to be crowned with success.

You are all vitally concerned wtih these problems of agriculture. Indeed, many of you are experienced farmers engaged even now in tilling your soil to produce another record-breaking crop of foodstuffs to further the Nation's war effort. And your national association and its member cooperatives are closely connected with the progress of agriculture all over the Nation. When the war ends and we begin to return to normal conditions you will have an even greater share in the development of our agricultural production.

Here in Illinois, prior to 1936, our farmers had not had the advantage of electric service to any great extent largely because it had not been made available.

It is true that some progressive farmers had installed their own individual power plants, while others had been able to obtain service from commercial power lines. But since the organization of electric cooperatives began to spread and the commercial power companies speeded up their activities to meet this cooperative competition, the use of electricity on farms and in rural communities has increased four or five fold.

Latest reports show that more than 135,000 farm families, or approximately 65 percent of the total in Illinois, are benefiting by electric service.

Of this number approximately 49,000 farms are being served by cooperatives, while more than 86,000 receive service from public-utility companies.

The expansion of these services naturally has been at a standstill since Pearl Harbor because war industry has had vital need for the materials and supplies you use. But when peace comes the demand for your services will be greater than ever. There will be new and improved machinery for the farms, and there will be wonderful labor-saving and comfort-producing equipment for the rural homes which will call for more and more electric power.

Your problems in meeting this demand will be many. You will be forced to compete with other peacetime industries in securing the needed materials.

You will be faced with technical difficulties growing out of the extension of your lines and the greatly increased power loads they will be called on to carry.

In Illinois we believe that, without doubt, rural electrification will be one of the greatest of post-war projects. Our State Board of Rural Electrification is cooperating closely with the Illinois post-war planning commission which already is formulating definite and practicable plans for resumption of peacetime activities in agriculture, industry, and labor.

The State board of rural electrification has prepared maps and reports showing all details of rural electrification transmission and distribution lines in Illinois.

Cooperatives, public utilities, and municipal plants have been supplied with this data which would serve as a valuable guide for post-war expansion plans.

While we are in the midst of all this post-war planning we must not overlook the immediate problems of the war veterans returning from the armed services. Already thousands have come back to civil life, many of them burdened with disabilities, to overcome which it is our sacred duty to give every possible assistance. They must be fitted to fill jobs in the war industries now, as well as the jobs which our post-war planning will develop in peacetime.

In Illinois the Governor's Committee on Veteran Rehabilitation and Employment has been in operation for almost 2 years now and its program has been endorsed by the American Legion and other experts in veterans' care and has been recommended as a pattern for other States.

As war Governor of Illinois and as a veteran of the First World War, I have devoted a great deal of time and personal attention to the veterans' problems. It is my firmest conviction that our first and most solemn obligation is to the men and women who have risked death on the battlefronts of the world in defense of our country's freedom. I know that anyone who recalls the deplorable conditions at the end of the last war—when veterans returned to find no jobs, no plan or program to solve their problems—will be firmly resolved that it shall not happen again. We will not forget their suffering and sacrifices and we will express our undying gratitude with every reward which it is within our power to give—and what reward could be greater than an opportunity to enjoy the independence and security of a self-supporting job?

Our heroic sons and daughters are marching on toward victory on all the battlefronts of the world. God grant that victory may come soon, speeding the time when they will return to their homes in the cities and on the farms of America—and those who return to the farms will find working conditions improved and standards of living higher because of the benefits you contribute to the American way of living.

Opium Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Washington Post of April 28, 1944:

OPIUM THREAT

Were an epidemic of smallpox or yellow fever to threaten our troops overseas, or at home, there would be an immediate attempt to stamp it out. We ask why Congress has not taken on the passage of a measure that would check the spread of an infection infinitely more insidious—we mean the danger of opium contamination that is facing our troops in Asia.

Some time ago a resolution was introduced by Representative JUDD of Minnesota requesting the President to urge the opium-producing countries of Asia to restrict their cultivation of the poppy to the world's legitimate medicinal need. It was not too soon. We have known for many months of the havoc wrought by the Japanese in China by the use of opium, which they have termed an instrument of war, with which they have demoralized and destroyed the resistance of the Chinese. In a recent short-wave radio from China it was stated that in Manchuria and Jehol, Japan has forced the planting of 46,260 acres of poppies producing an annual crop of 2,800 pounds of opium. Under their encouragement 13,000,000 Chinese in the northern provinces are addicted to opium smoking. They have also established large drug factories in Mukden, Harbin, and other cities for the manufacture of morphine and heroin. In Harbin during the last half year, 1,568 corpses of drug addicts were found in the streets. In other cities they have forced the manufacture of hundreds of thousands of narcotic pills to be sold under military pressure in provinces occupied by Japan, and attemps are being made to smuggle the pills across the Yellow River in order to spread the poison into Free China.

In Iran, where thousands of our American troops are guarding the lend-lease goods being sent to Russia, the production of opium would more than meet the needs of the world's medicinal market. In that country there is little if any control over the production or distribution of this dangerous drug. Our soldiers and seamen are constantly being approached by opium peddlers, and the port of Basra on the Persian Gulf has become a seat of infection where the drug can be obtained at a minimum price and with little difficulty smuggled into the United States and sold at an immense profit.

Congress should take immediate action on the resolution which has been under consideration.

ACTION NOW.

WASHINGTON, *April 26.*

Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of Saturday, April 29, shows that the President is not fooling anyone by the special privileges which he has been and is extending to some labor politicians.

That editorial is as follows:

BUT WHERE ARE THE TROOPS?

In Chicago an employer whose operations the Government considers essential to the war effort refuses to sign a contract with a union of his employees and the union, in retaliation, takes steps that interfere with those operations. Quite promptly the President of the United States orders the Army to seize the business, and soldiers drag its elderly chairman kicking and squirming out of his office as the Government takes over.

In Indianapolis an employer whose operations the Government considers essential to the war effort refuses to sign a contract with a union of his employees and the union, in retaliation, takes steps that interfere with those operations. Do the troops march in here, too?

Well—not exactly. You see this Indianapolis employer is Daniel J. Tobin, general president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, a great and good friend of the New Deal and high in its councils. The Chicago employer is Sewell Avery, head of Montgomery Ward & Co.

Except for the outcome, there isn't much difference between the two labor disputes. In each a labor union sought to negotiate a contract with an employer. Both employers re-

fused to negotiate. Both unions appealed to the War Labor Board for support of their legal rights, and both took similar actions that halted distribution of their employers' products.

The War Labor Board ignored the appeal of Mr. Tobin's employees. It ordered Mr. Avery to sign a contract—"or else." Mr. Avery defied that order, and the Presidential order that followed. Soldiers with bayonets seized his business by force and the Federal Government operates it today.

Mr. Tobin first ordered all the union employees fired—an action specifically prohibited by the Wagner law—then backed down and rescinded their discharge under heavy criticism. Up to today he still had refused to negotiate a contract.

And up to today there had been no stern orders from Washington, no sound of marching feet in East Michigan Street—and not a bayonet in sight around the offices of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffers, Warehousemen, and Helpers.

An Air Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the April 27 issue of the Las Vegas Daily Optic, published in Las Vegas, N. Mex.:

AN AIR ACADEMY

Representative FERNANDEZ yesterday introduced a bill in the House for the location in New Mexico of a memorial to American defenders of Bataan. His bill provides that such memorial shall be an Army aviation academy similar in rating and importance to the Army, Navy, and Marine academies of historic fame.

Here is something for the people of New Mexico to support without intercommunity or sectional division and from which political considerations should be eliminated. By harmonious action which would leave the selection of location to the military authorities, when and if the bill passes, New Mexicans can help contribute something tangible to honoring the memory of those hundreds of its young citizens who died in battle or in the tortures of Japanese prison camps in the Philippines.

In each section of the State, not excluding our part of the mountainous northern area, there is an aviation training base in operation under Army or Navy supervision. Some of these are even larger than would be required in serving a "West Point of the Air" training program. Conversion of any of those bases for continued use after the war would be not only economical but wise.

It is known that complete and detailed surveys have been made by the Army Air Forces command for the establishment of just such a course of training. The projected plan has been fitted to a number of airbases in Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona. It has been found not only feasible but highly potential in preparing commanding officers for our future air forces.

Representative FERNANDEZ' proposal can be enacted to the lasting benefit of New Mexico if it does not arouse envious bidding from other States. It will be the Congressman's task to present evidence that New Mexico is best suited to the actual operation of such an academy as well as most entitled to consideration as the site for such a memorial to the heroic soldiers of Bataan.

Launching of the U. S. S. "Chehalis"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the city, river, and valley of Chehalis, Lewis County, Wash., have all been honored recently by the Navy Department by the selection of the name *Chehalis* for a large Navy tanker launched at Savage, Minn., on April 15.

By special orders the Navy Department arranged for Seaman Frank E. Junkin, son of Mr. and Mrs. T. K. Junkin, of Chehalis, to represent his home city and Lewis County at the launching. Seaman Junkin made the speech in behalf of his home folks just before the great vessel moved down the ways.

The people of Chehalis and Lewis County have responded fully in all the past loan drives. They are fully deserving of the recognition the Navy Department has accorded them.

Following is news story from the Chehalis Advocate on the launching:

U. S. S. "CHEHALIS" IS LAUNCHED IN MINNESOTA—FRANK JUNKIN REPRESENTS CHEHALIS AT CEREMONY

The U. S. S. *Chehalis* is in the water of the Minnesota River, having slid down the ways during a colorful launching ceremony Saturday at Savage, Minn.

A crowd of 5,000 defied the windy and snowy weather to see the naval auxiliary tanker launched, and to hear a short but impressive speech by Seaman (2d cl.) Frank Junkin, who represented Chehalis.

In a letter received by Arthur S. Cory, chairman of arrangement for the special Chehalis-Kiwanis committee. Cargill MacMillan, vice president of Cargill, Inc., builders of the ship, stated that the launching "went off very successfully, and Frank Junkin handled himself very well and was a distinct credit to your city. He spoke a few words and did it very well, indeed. Unfortunately, the weather was abominal. There was quite a wind and it was snowing."

Mr. MacMillan added that Frank has the remains of the bottle used for sponsoring and containing a sample of Chehalis River water. Frank intends to send it back to Chehalis.

Considerable publicity came to Chehalis in Minnesota through the launching. The Minneapolis newspapers carried pictures and stories of the launching, with emphasis on the bottle of Chehalis River water. In addition, Congressman FRED NORMAN plans to have remarks on the event published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The *Chehalis* was christened by Mrs. J. H. MacMillan, wife of the chairman of the board of the Cargill Co.

Frank Junkin has two brothers, also in the service. Jim is a lieutenant in the Marine Corps and is serving in the Pacific. Bill has already served for some time in the South Pacific, and is now taking training at the University of Washington which will lead to a commission in the Navy.

The event marked the beginning of an intensive drive in Chehalis to raise a million dollars in war bonds to equip the ship. The drive will continue through the Fifth War Loan.

A Record of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to direct attention to the unusual record of a constituent of mine as a member of the South Carolina Legislature. Only a few days ago Representative W. R. Bradford, of Fort Mill, S. C., completed his twentieth session in the house of representatives. No other man, I am informed, in the long history of York County, a history which runs concurrent with the life of the Nation, has been similarly honored.

During his legislative service Representative Bradford has continuously been a member of the ways and means committee and has served as chairman of that group. He also has been on numerous other important committees and commissions—one, a joint good roads committee, of which he was chairman, laid the foundations for the fine highway system of South Carolina.

At present, one of Mr. Bradford's assignments is the joint committee on Indian affairs, which has been interested in arranging the details of a plan under which Federal assistance has been accorded the Catawba Indians, who live in York County.

These Indians compose the only Indian group in South Carolina still retaining their tribal identity. They reside on a State reservation. When I came to Congress, I introduced bills which would make the Catawbas wards of the Federal Government. At first, I ran up against a stone wall of opposition. The Office of Indian Affairs and the Indian Affairs Committee of the House refused to report the bill favorably on the ground that the members of this tribe, like a few other small tribes in the United States, had never been wards of the Federal Government and that there was no basis for Federal responsibility. I then decided to pursue another course. I had numerous conferences with Mr. Collier and his assistant, Mr. Zimmerman, of the Office of Indian Affairs, with a view to getting Federal aid for the tribe. I also went over the history of the Catawbas with Secretary of Interior Ickes. He showed great sympathy and interest and instructed Mr. Collier to go the limit under exitsing law in an effort to remedy the conditions of the Catawbas. A plan was then worked out whereby it was proposed

that the State of South Carolina and the Federal Government enter into an agreement to rehabilitate these Indians. The State responded; and, as a result, the Federal and State Governments have agreed to a plan and signed the contract wherein and whereby it is hoped that the Catawbas will receive the consideration and help to which they are entitled.

The Catawbas now number about 300 and have a score or more of volunteers—all the able-bodied young men—in the armed services. South Carolina is doing its part to establish the Catawbas in better homes on more than 3,000 acres of fertile land which has been added to their old reservation.

In addition to his long service in the House of Representatives, Mr. Bradford has for many years been an active and influential newspaper editor. I wish for him many more years of activity and achievement in the public service and the newspaper field.

The Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the editorial comment of the Cincinnati Enquirer on the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. by the military forces of the United States is both interesting and timely:

IT ISN'T AMERICAN

The highly irregular affair at Chicago yesterday, in which the chairman of Montgomery Ward & Co. was forcibly ejected from the premises of his own company, is not only to be decried as an incident. It is to be feared as a precedent.

It may be that the company head, Sewell L. Avery, had been intransigent in his attitude on the long-standing labor dispute; for the moment the details of the union controversy are unimportant. What is important, we believe, is the fact that the power and authority of the Federal Government has been used to seize a private business and to forcibly interfere with its management by the officials chosen by the owners of the business.

We have had instances where such forceful means were used to insure the continuation of essential public services, and felt them not out of place under the circumstances. If a strike or other similar form of work stoppage develops in a public utility, or a plant producing implements needed immediately in the war effort, the right and propriety of Government intervention is not very questionable.

Montgomery Ward, however, is purely and simply a business, albeit a big one which plays an important role in civilian supply. When the Government goes to the length of taking it over and sending soldiers in to carry out bodily the head of the concern, no one associated with any form of private business in the United States can feel unaffected by the precedent.

Whatever the merits of the union controversy at Montgomery Ward, the seizure of the company properties and the manhandling of Mr. Avery are inexcusable. It borders upon the fantastic that there is no other, much more orderly process of law or government by which the controversy might have been resolved.

The news and pictures describing the incident at Chicago yesterday did not look to us like an event in America. They had the strong taint of the sort of stuff that Europe became infamous for during the last decade. We should have other ways to handle things in America.

H. O. L. C. Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert an article published in the Columbia (S. C.) Record giving a brief history of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The article is by the Honorable James A. Hoyt, who held a responsible position with the H. O. L. C. and who is one of the best-informed men in America today:

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION DEFENDED

Several weeks ago there appeared in the editorial columns of the Columbia Record an article which was extremely critical of the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The article concluded with this expression, "Never again."

May I dissent from the editorial conclusion? I do so, because the article was evidently based on biased information, and because the implications of the article reflect more or less seriously on several South Carolinians, some of whom are not now living, and cannot speak for themselves.

Permit me, briefly, to give a little history of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which was organized under one of the first acts passed by the Democratic Congress in 1933, under the first Roosevelt administration. The purpose was twofold: First, to stop foreclosures on urban real estate, and second, to give relief to the banks and building and loan associations which were frozen with real-estate loans.

Both of these objectives were accomplished, and accomplished speedily and effectively and intelligently.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was placed under the management of the board of directors of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, who became the directors of the new corporation. When the H. O. L. C. Act went into effect, upon its signature by the President, June 15, 1933, the directors were: William F. Stevenson of Cheraw, S. C., chairman; and T. D. Webb, of Nashville, Tenn., Democrats, and Carroll B. Merriam, of Topeka, Kans., Republican.

The secretary of the bank board, A. E. Hutchison, of Rock Hill, S. C., for many years reading clerk of the South Carolina House of Representatives and secretary to Mr. Stevenson when in Congress, was made general manager of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. He selected as his two assistants his close personal friends of many years' standing, William P. Goodman, then city manager of Rock Hill, and James A. Hoyt, then temporarily residing in Columbia.

The general counsel of the bank board was Horace Russell, of Atlanta, who became general counsel for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. He had drawn the act, largely. His advice and counsel to the board proved to be admirable. He was, and is, one of the ablest lawyers in the country and one of the best posted on real estate law and conditions.

An office was hurriedly set up in each State, and a State manager appointed. For South Carolina, Mr. Stevenson personally selected his former law partner, Mr. D. S. Matheson, of Cheraw, as manager for South Carolina. His assistant was Bruce W. Ravenel, of Columbia.

South Carolina has never produced a finer citizen than D. S. Matheson. Like his friend, Mr. Stevenson, he has passed on, and it is largely respect for the memory of these two which has caused this article to be written, by one who knew and admired them both.

In South Carolina, under Mr. Matheson and his assistants, in the 3 years of active operation, ending in June 1936, there were made 5,683 loans, aggregating $14,478,610.

It is not likely that any of the recipients of these loans in South Carolina would agree with the editorial exclamation—"Never again."

Of these 5,683 South Carolina loans, 1,894 have been paid in full and approximately 440 of the borrowers still on the books are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contracts.

As of September 30, 1943, the latest figures available from the books of the Corporation, the total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in South Carolina, together with the value of the properties acquired, has been reduced, through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $5,274,889, about equivalent to 63.4 percent.

Of the 5,683 loans, about 11 percent, to be exact, 644, were forcelosed. Of these properties taken over, the Corporation states that all but 5 have been sold.

It must be remembered that under the stringent provisions of the act, only "distressed" mortgages could be taken over—that is, loans that were being foreclosed or about to be foreclosed.

When the Home Owners Loan Corporation was set up, in June 1933 with a capital of $200,000,000 and authority to issue $2,000,000,000 in bonds, subsequently increased, it was the largest real estate loan operation in the history of the world, and it still is. To project such an undertaking, to foresee its extent and its accounting and mechanical necessities, was a very big job, and the job had to be done under extremely high pressure. It should be judged not under the coinditions of war prosperity in 1944 but in the light of the conditions then existing, marking the depth of the deepest depression this country has ever known. God grant it may never know another.

The Board appointed the general counsel, Mr. Russell, and the assistant general manager in charge of the Finance and Accounting Division, as a committee to draw up a plan of operation. That plan, prepared after days of hard work and nights of study, was substantially adopted. It was forcasted that the Corporation would make about 1,000,000 loans, averaging about $3,000.

The figures of the Corporation will show that the total number of loans made by the Corporation in its Nation-wide operations, and including the loans made in Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, amounted to $3,485,348,743 in value and to 1,017,821 in number.

The forecast was not far wrong.

It is officially stated to me, March 30, 1944, that as of September 30, 1943, the "dollar value of the active accounts outstanding, together with the value of the Corporation's acquired properties, amounted to $1,535,772,767, or a liquidation of $1,949,575,981, equivalent to 55.9 percent."

In this connection it should be said that the loans were originally made for 15 years, and that later the Board was given authority by Congress to extend the loans to 25 years in certain justifiable cases.

Shortly after the organization of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation the Board was changed. Mr. Merriam, an experienced mortgage banker and a director of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and of the Santa Fe Railroad, was transferred in 1933 to the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (where in 1935 I joined him as his assistant). Mr. Hawkins, from the west coast, was made a director. He was then in ill health and died not very long after his appointment. The other two directors were Walter H. Newton, Republican, who had been secretary to President Hoover, and who proved one of the best men on the Board, and John Fahey, of Massachusetts, who in the fall of 1933 became Chairman in place of Mr. Stevenson, who remained a member of the Board until ill health compelled his retirement.

LIQUIDATION NOW

The present discussion in the Congress and in the press of the affairs of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation springs largely from the agitation by Senator Byrd and others for the immediate liquidation of the corporation, which is opposed by the management now in charge.

This is a proposal which should be passed on without prejudice on the one hand and without personal interest on the other.

Jimmy Byrnes has more than once said that the nearest thing we know to immortality on this earth is a Government agency. All of them, perhaps naturally, fight for their lives.

In the case of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, whatever may be the motives of those agitating for liquidation (and the writer does not assign or judge motives) it seems that good business judgment would indicate that in the time of prosperity, when concerns such as large insurance companies and banking institutions and building and loan associations have surplus funds and are looking for good, sound real-estate loans—it would seem that this is the time for the Government to get out of the real-estate-loan business.

These institutions, which, after all, are the largest buyers of Government bonds, are certainly not undeserving of consideration. The Government, through the H. O. L. C., in 1933, relieved these institutions of their bad loans, but that is no argument against permitting them to buy the loans now in the hands of the Government, which the Government took as an emergency measure and not as a permanent investment. It was never intended that the Government would remain forever in that business.

It is no argument against liquidation to assert that these borrowers should not be turned over to the mercy of private lenders. The terms of the mortgages are plainly stated therein, and a purchaser would be bound thereby, just as would the purchaser of any other obligation.

That the poor loans might not be sold is evident, but it is better to maintain a small organization to collect these than a great organization to collect these, along with the good loans.

That losses in liquidation now would be very much, if any, larger than losses if the Government should hold the loans until all have matured is not demonstrable, nor is it a persuasive argument in any sense, for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was not set up to make a profit, and it was expected from the first that it would have substantial losses. It was strictly a remedial emergency measure.

Now is the time for the Government to liquidate what was a splendid demonstration of a government's ability and willingness to assist its worth-while home owners in a desperate situation, the purpose having been fully and effectively accomplished.

JAMES A. HOYT.

WASHINGTON, *April 6, 1944.*

Ship Repairs Aid in Atlantic Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in connection with certain charges contained in the Annual Report of the Comptroller General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, wherein Comptroller General Warren charged the War Shipping Administration with use of a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost form of contract, which has been discussed by Admiral Land in his letter of April 13, 1944, elsewhere extended in this day's Appendix of the RECORD to which reference is here made, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD today an article from the New York Times of April 16, 1944, further discussing the same subject under the caption "Ship repairs aid in Atlantic fight."

SHIP REPAIRS AID IN ATLANTIC FIGHT—LAND BACKS IGNORING VIEWS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON CONTRACTS

WASHINGTON, April 15.—Rear Admiral E. S. Land, War Shipping Administrator and Maritime Commission Chairman, said today the battle of the Atlantic might have been seriously prolonged, or even lost for the time being if we had endeavored to follow the views of the Comptroller General on ship-repair contracts.

In a letter to Representative BLAND, chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, he defended his agencies' policies against criticisms expressed by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren in his annual report.

Among other complaints, Mr. Warren charged the W. S. A. with use of a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost form of contract in violation of the law, and with allowing excessive overall or composite hourly billing rates for ship repairs, due in part to the inclusion of direct charges also in overhead.

"These two charges," Admiral Land wrote, "presumably relate to an interpretation placed by the Comptroller General upon the type of contract used by both the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission in connection with ship repairs. The general counsel of the Commission at the time the form of ship-repair contract referred to was adopted was of the opinion that they did not constitute a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contract and is still of the opinion.

"Both the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission, even before we became directly involved in the war, and when it became apparent that there would be a large volume of emergency ship repairs, entered into negotiations with the ship-repair industry with a view to effecting contractual arrangements which would preclude the high rate of profit which had previously obtained generally in the ship-repair industry and which under peace conditions was perhaps necessary for the survival of the repair companies because of the sporadic character of their work.

"While the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission found it impractical to bring about a drastic change in the method of billing for time and material which had been in general vogue for many years in the ship-repair industry, they were able, prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, to bring about an understanding to the effect that the profit would be limited to 10 percent and that the rates charged would from time to time be subject to such revision as would bring about that result."

Mr. Speaker, in the same connection I ask unanimous consent to extend certain excerpts from House Report No. 846, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3477, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States. The excerpts referred to relate particularly to commercial and governmental audits and are as follows:

Section 2 extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the Government to June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as may be fixed by the President by Executive order. Section 2 further provides for an audit of the capital fund operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation by the General Accounting Office. It is provided that this audit shall be made in accordance with principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions. Since the establishment of the Corporation in 1933, its capital-fund operations have been subjected to a commercial type of audit by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as an incident to the financial relationship between the two corporations. In addition, many of the capital-fund operations which are carried out through the facilities of the Federal Reserve banks have also, because of the interest of the banks in these operations, been subjected to a commercial type of audit by these banks. Moreover, pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107, as amended), the Treasury Department makes an annual appraisal of the assets and liabilities and a determination of the net worth of the Corporation and reports the same annually to Congress. The administrative expenses of the Corporation are audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the regular governmental type of audit as required by the appropriation act making funds of the Corporation available for these expenses. This audit of administrative expenses by the General Accounting Office is not disturbed by the bill, but the audit of the capital-fund transactions provided by this bill could replace the commercial type audit made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As an incorporated agency of the United States the Commodity Credit Corporation follows business methods and procedures in the performance of its functions rather than the customary pattern of Government department or bureau operations. Flexibility in operation, an essential attribute of the corporate form of organization, is indispensable to the accomplishment of the functions and objectives for which Congress has directed that the Commodity Credit Corporation be employed. The War Food Administration and the Comptroller General of the United States agree that the regular governmental type of audit is not adaptable to the capital fund operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In general, the purpose of the governmental type of audit is to determine the validity of expenditures under appropriations made by the Congress, in the light of restrictions and limitations placed by the Congress generally upon the expenditure of appropriated moneys. It is a part of a system designed to enforce the personal accountability of governmental officers authorizing or expending those funds upon the basis of documents and records usually submitted to the General Accounting Office and retained in its custody. In contrast, the commercial type of audit is separate and apart from the accounting system and internal financial control of the Corporation and is designed to determine the true financial condition of the Corporation as of a given date

and the results of its financial operations during the period covered by the audit, as well as establishing whether the funds of the Corporation have been regularly expended in accordance with proper authorization. These determinations are made by detailed examination of the operating and financial records of the Corporation at the places where they are being used in the conduct of corporate business.

The Commodity Credit Corporation's fiscal responsibility is vested in the Corporation and not in the individual fiscal agents. In other words, the fiscal agents are responsible to the Corporation, which in turn is liable to the Federal Government for the Government's investment in the Corporation. The examination of the individual accounts of particular fiscal agents with a view to external control and settlement would not facilitate a determination of the financial standing or progress of the Corporation as a whole. Such an examination would, as a matter of fact, seriously interfere with the Corporation's internal financial management and impair the flexibility which is the very basis of the Corporation's existence.

The fundamental difference between the two types of audit, and the inadequacy of the governmental type of audit as applied to capital-fund operations of the Corporation, may be more clearly seen from a comparison of the procedures involved.

The governmental type of audit generally involves the following seven steps:

1. The fixing of the amount for which the disbursing officer is accountable under his bonded responsibility by reason of the advance of funds under particular appropriations upon accountable warrants and by reason of collections received by him;

2. The submission by the designated disbursing officer to the General Accounting Office for audit and settlement of an account supported by certified vouchers and by other original papers evidencing specific payments which he has made from the particular funds charged to him;

3. The examination by the General Accounting Office of these vouchers and other original supporting papers to determine whether the payments covered thereby were properly authorized and whether the expenditures represent valid obligations of the Government under the specific appropriation sought to be charged;

4. The settlement by the General Accounting Office of the disbursing officer's account and the determination of his liability to the United States;

5. The determination of the liability to the United States of the officer certifying for payment the items included in the disbursing officer's account;

6. The preparation and issuance of certificates of settlement incorporating all unexplained or unadjusted differences developed in the examinations of the accounts; and

7. The institution of collection proceedings if the accountable officer fails to pay over any balances found due from him in the settlement.

The commercial type of audit ordinarily made of large business corporations usually involves the following seven steps:

1. The establishment of the authorities of the various officers and employees by reference to the original articles of incorporation, bylaws, minutes of the board of directors, and other official authorizations taken in the name of the Corporation;

2. The verification, through appropriate checks, of the original general and subsidiary ledgers by comparison of original collection and disbursement documents with such ledgers and, in connection with this, the determination that all actions reviewed are properly authorized;

3. The verification from the original accounting records and supporting documents of the accuracy of all items appearing on the balance sheet, including verification of all cash on hand and in banks, and when needed, positive establishment of the existence of assets by physical inventory methods or through inquiries addressed to debtors and the determination of actual liabilities through inquiries addressed to creditors;

4. The review and establishment of the accuracy of any operating statements to determine that they clearly indicate the financial progress of the Corporation during the period covered by the audit, including proper reflection of any profits made or losses suffered;

5. Determination, in light of the action by the board of directors and any changes in the policies of the Corporation, that proper records are established and necessary safeguards developed correctly to reflect the financial operations of the Corporation and to protect the Corporation from financial loss which can be prevented by proper and adequate records and procedures;

6. The preparation of a report covering the audit, including certified financial statements and comments deemed appropriate by the auditor, such as recommendations for changes in the accounting procedure and records, errors still uncorrected at the completion of the audit, analysis of facts brought out in the financial statements, and the submission of such a report to the officials ordering the audit; and

7. The institution of corrective action by the corporate management.

Railroad Misstatements Regarding Future of Air Transport in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the New Haven Railroad has been printing large full-page advertisements appealing to the people of New England to support it in its air-line operations. One of these advertisements appeared in the Washington Post for Tuesday, March 28.

The advertisement makes a statement concerning the present Civil Aeronautics Act, and its application to the matter of surface carriers acquiring an interest in air lines, which is absolutely incorrect. The advertisement states:

This is the coordinated transportation system southern New England needs. It can best be realized through a union of interests between our railroad and an established air line * * * by permitting our railroad to participate in such a combination through a minority financial interest in the air line. But not until the present ban against surface carriers engaging in aviation is lifted, can this program be put into effect.

Neither under section 408 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act nor under any decisions made by the Civil Aeronautics Board is there any ban, bar, or limitation whatsoever preventing a surface carrier from acquiring a true minority financial interest in an air line. Such action can be taken without securing the approval of any Government agency whatsoever.

The Civil Aeronautics Act applies only when a railroad seeks to acquire an interest in an air line which would give the railroad control of the air line. A true minority financial interest, not amounting to control, is in no way affected by the act.

If the New Haven Railroad is genuine and honest in its desires, it should cease misinforming the people of New England and of the country.

Oil for 1,000 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 29, 1944:

OIL FOR 1,000 YEARS

The Derrick is indebted to Franklyn Waltman, director of public relations, Sun Oil Co., for one very satisfying piece of information. He says that at the rate of depletion in 1943 we have known oil reserves sufficient to last us for 1,000 years.

This statement was made before the Foreign Policy Association in New York City April 15. Mr. Waltman started by saying he was without authority to speak for the petroleum industry. However, we can assume he spoke with the authority of the members of the Pew family who own the Sun Oil Co., and have made it one of the most successful in the world.

This family is the quintessence of conservatism. We have the assurance that Mr. Waltman knew what he was talking about. We know of nothing which will kill the Arabian pipe-line project quicker than this.

This pipe line is planned by Secretary Ickes, head of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government agency. He estimates its cost between $130,000,000 and $165,000,000. Mr. Waltman says the American petroleum industry unqualifiedly opposed the plan. "The premise upon which it is projected is that our domestic oil resources are nearing exhaustion—that after the war we shall be a mendicant for oil at foreign council tables—that we cannot 'oil' another war," said Mr. Waltman, who then continues:

"This premise is without foundation. The petroleum industry repudiates it and all of its implications. It is a piece of subterfuge offered in an attempt to justify a project which cannot withstand scrutiny upon its own merits. Exactly the same things were said in the latter stages and immediately after World War No. 1. Time proved them to be false. Ever since America became a nation on wheels somebody or other in authority has been predicting that within a few years our oil resources would be exhausted.

"The truth is that during this war the American petroleum industry has taken more crude oil out of the ground than in any similar period and it has a greater volume of known reserves underground than have ever been previously recorded.

"In 1943, when the production of crude oil in the United States reached an unprecedented high of 1,503,000,000 barrels—more than four times the amount that was produced in the last year of World War No. 1—our discoveries of oil equalled 99 percent of our production. These discoveries came within 18,000,000 barrels of meeting the un-

precedented war demand, and to make up that difference we had to draw upon our previous accumulated reserve of over 20,000,000,000 barrels. How much do you think we reduced that reserve? We reduced it less than one-tenth of 1 percent. At that rate of depletion of reserve we have known reserves sufficient to last us for 1,000 years.

"Yet you are being told by persons high in authority that we only have enough oil in this country at the current rate of production for 14 years more. This conclusion is reached by dividing the current rate of production of one and one-half billion barrels into the existing reserve of over twenty billion barrels. In other words, they would have you believe that never again would we discover a single barrel of oil.

"To state the proposition thusly is to demonstrate its absurdity. As a matter of fact, millions of barrels of oil discoveries are being made every week. Instead of being our total resource, this 20,000,000,000-barrel reserve is but a fraction of our total reserve—it is our underground stock pile. What other industry has a 14-year stock pile available? Once the war is won and we get back to the free play of prices in a competitive enterprise system, there will be no more ground to worry about future oil supplies than there was after World War No. 1—and events have shown that those worries were absolutely baseless."

We are quoting this part of Mr. Waltman's address fully because we think it is the most remarkable statement about our oil reserves we have ever read. But if this were not enough, he says the pipe line would not make accessible any oil not already accessible. Oil in the Persian Gulf is already on the sea coast and can be shipped by tank steamer anywhere in the world; it will not result in the acquisition of any new oil or oil reserves for the United States or its citizens. It will in no way contribute to the prosecution of our war in Europe or in the Pacific.

Construction of the pipe line at this time would divert critical material and manpower, said Mr. Waltman, and its projection without consulting Britain or Russia has been disruptive of United Nations unity. As a preparatory step for a third world war this pipe line could create dangers and risks out of all proportion to the possible benefit.

The optional reserve of 1,000,000,000 barrels in a field controlled by American nationals is meaningless because in time of war all the oil produced by American companies or citizens anywhere in the world is available to our Government "if it can control the necessary routes to the desired destinations."

The proposed agreement, Mr. Waltman stated, will put our Government in the transportation business as owner of a pipe line traversing three foreign countries with the obligation of promoting and protecting the interests of those countries without reference to their future policies or existing spheres of influence. This means the maintenance of a permanent army in Arabia.

We would be promoting the development and marketing of oil from the Persian Gulf in competition with our own supplies and those of Latin America. Further it could easily pave the way to war. Finally, he says, private enterprise can best supply the capital required, the necessary managerial and technical skills and the operating knowledge for the development of foreign resources without involving the United States in international political dangers.

In conclusion, says Mr. Waltman, the American petroleum industry is now raising its voice in opposition to this proposal because it does not wish to have upon its head the blood of that war when it comes. "All the oil in Arabia is not worth the life of a single American boy needlessly sacrificed on a foreign battlefield."

There is the answer to Mr. Ickes' project.

Thirty-four Michigan Men Graduate From Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the third front has been opened on American home soil.

I refer to the broad program to curb juvenile delinquency being launched by Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in connection with the training course of the National Police Academy which he also heads.

Every Member of Congress is aware, I believe, of the splendid work that has been done by the National Police Academy. This great school has not only placed the same general training afforded G-men at the disposal of police officers, sheriffs, and other law-enforcing people, but it has melted away a barrier which once unfortunately separated the Federal police agents from State and local agents.

Much credit is due Mr. Hoover for bringing about harmony and unity of purpose in the agencies of the Nation which must deal with the vicious un-American element which haunts the shadows, preying upon our citizens.

And now another very forward step has been taken by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in placing special stress on the problem of juvenile delinquency which is indeed becoming a grave one.

Statements made by many of the noted lecturers who addressed the closing sessions of the academy a few days ago are worthy of review inasmuch as juvenile delinquency has become one of the major home front problems of the war.

That the solution of the problem does not rest in the theories of stratosphere thinkers has been made very clear by Director Hoover. He said:

> If the present surge of adolescent crime is to be stemmed it must be done through the wise and kindly administration of the home, and society in general which understands the needs of the child, his idealism, ambitions, and hopes.

Continuing he said:

> With our soldiers and sailors fighting on the world's battle fronts we of the F. B. I. have a bigger responsibility than ever before, because by keeping the home front secure and intact we are keeping faith with our men at war.
>
> We have become convinced that crime prevention is more important than crime apprehension. The 17- and 18-year-old child is no longer a juvenile. He is shrewder and has more knowledge than his father had at his age.
>
> It rests with the nation's fathers to direct the energies of 14- and 15-year-olds to wholesome pursuits.
>
> Police chiefs and those taking courses in the academy are urged to go forth, armed with the knowledge that the present emergency makes it imperative that they work with the established agencies in directing exuberant youth along the channels which make for good citizenship.

That not all juvenile delinquency can be placed in the laps of fathers and mothers was emphatically pointed out by Dr. Arthur L. Beeley, professor of sociology at the University of Utah, who addressed the academy.

While not entirely absolving parents, Dr. Beeley told the academy that:

> A mother's contribution is a drop in the bucket compared with the average movie. It would take a super-superparent to counteract the influence of the movies.

The church, the school, and other influences outside the home were emphasized as needing to participate in the correctional role in delinquency, and he urged upon the police officers their responsibility in awakening communities to their responsibilities in this great delinquency problem.

I cite these things as evidence of the very forward steps being taken down at the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its National Police Academy to cope with current and future problems.

To date 855 men have graduated from the National Police Academy. It was organized in 1935 to make advanced training in crime detection available to the entire law-enforcement field, has been instrumental in raising the standards of law enforcement generally. The graduates, who are carefully selected representatives of municipal, county, and State law-enforcement organizations, have returned to their own communities and established training schools, thereby making the instruction received available to approximately 100,000 local law-enforcement officers.

During the past year particular emphasis was placed upon national-security matters in the courses of instruction afforded the officers attending the National Police Academy. The graduates of the academy, many of them chiefs of police or occupying other high-ranking positions in the law-enforcement field, continued to be of great assistance to the F. B. I. in shouldering its responsibilities.

We in Michigan are proud of the fact that 34 of our State, county, and city law-enforcement officers have been privileged to attend and be graduated from the National Police Academy. Their training has greatly strengthened police work in our State, where we have a State highway police force, under the direction of Commissioner Oscar G. Olander, that is second to none.

Michigan graduates from the F. B. I. National Police Academy are:

Battle Creek: Franklin E. Crooks, sergeant, police department.

Bay City: Frank W. Anderson, chief of police, police department.

Benton Harbor: Walter E. Knuth, sergeant, police department.

Big Rapids: Harold V. Mehl, superintendent of police, police department.

Birmingham: Grant K. Springstead, patrolman, police department.

Dearborn: Emrys R. Evans, inspector, police department.

Detroit: James C. Berg, patrolman, police department; Claude Broom, lieutenant, police department; Marvin G. Lane,[1] detective-lieutenant, police department.

East Lansing: R. W. Robers, chief of police, police department.

Ecorse: Charles W. Miller, assistant chief of police, police department.

Flat Rock: Arthur A. Busick,[2] chief of police, police department.

Flint: Garland A. Driskell, instructor of police, police department; Gerald William Spencer, detective, police department.

Garden City: Arthur Nagle, chief of police, police department.

Highland Park: John D. Allen,[3] sergeant, police department.

Houghton: Ernest R. Klingbeil,[2] deputy sheriff, Houghton County sheriff's office.

Jackson: Fred E. Foster, superintendent of records, police department.

Kalamazoo: Carlton A. Jackson, sergeant, police department.

Lansing: Okla H. Knox, sergeant, State police; Joseph R. Nelson,[3] identification officer, State police.

Menominee: Anton G. Jensen, chief of police, police department; John W. Reindl, chief deputy sheriff, Menominee County sheriff's office.

Midland: Ben Penner,[2] assistant chief of police, police department.

Mount Pleasant: Royal Stauffer, patrolman, police department.

Muskegon: L. B. Plough, detective sergeant, police department.

Plymouth: Vaughan R. Smith,[2] chief of police, police department.

Port Huron: Ferris E. Lucas, sheriff, St. Clair County sheriff's office.

Saginaw: Dale Austin, superintendent, identification bureau, Saginaw County sheriff's office; William O. Barlow, lieutenant, police department.

St. Joseph: Ottis V. Kelley, identification officer, Berrien County sheriff's office; Erwin H. Kubath, chief deputy sheriff, Berrien County sheriff's office.

Sault Ste. Marie: Roy C. Maimborg,[2] patrolman, police department; J. Willard Welsh, chief of police, police department.

[1] Marvin G. Lane in present N. P. A. session.

[2] Indicates that graduate is no longer connected with any local, county, or State law-enforcement agency.

[3] Indicates that graduate is now in the armed forces.

Purchase of Paper by Government Should Be Centralized in Government Printing Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a report of the A. N. P. A. committee on Federal laws at annual convention in New York City:

In the opinion of your committee a very important bill is now pending before the Congress calling for centralization of the purchase of paper for printing and binding and blank-book work in the Government Printing Office. Introduction of this bill, H. R. 3559, by Representative BOREN (Oklahoma) followed testimony presented before the Boren subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Public Printer Giegengack to the effect that although he had been trying to find out for years how much paper is used by the Government of the United States and all of its agencies he has never been able to do so. Mr. Giegengack testified that all Government printing was not channeled through the Government Printing Office.

The bill is before the House Committee on Printing and in March Representative JARMAN (Alabama) advised that the committee had taken no action. The bill has been sent to the Government departments concerned for their recommendations. Under the present set-up there is a lack of complete check on the amount of purchases by Government agencies as well as the amounts of paper on hand. In this time of paper shortages it seems to your committee most important that this bill should be acted on without delay and that steps should be put into effect immediately to get some sort of check on how much paper is used annually by all Government departments.

Emergency Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the past few days press accounts as well as letters and telegrams from constituents living in the Midwest have called to our attention the unprecedented floods which have been raging in the lower Missouri and Mississippi Valley and their tributaries.

Ordinarily we make $1,000,000 per year available for emergency flood-control work. Last year, because of the unusual severity of the floods, we appropriated an additional $10,000,000, which was approved July 12. This sum, we are advised by the Army engineers, just about went around, and only about $40,000—a negligible sum in this great emergency—remains.

The immediate thing for us to bear in mind just now is that farmers must, because of the nature of their work, plan ahead, and with so many levees broken during the past few days and in view of an anticipated June rise, thousands of farmers will permit thousands of square miles of fertile river bottom land to lie idle unless funds are provided forthwith to rebuild the levees broken in the present floods. To wait until July will be too late to be of help for this year's crop. I am therefore introducing today a bill providing for $2,000,000 to be made immediately available as an emergency fund to be expended for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of the levees, and I trust the Congress will see fit to act without delay, not alone to help the farmers but in the interest of food production and the decisive part it has in our all-out war effort.

A bill to provide an immediate fund for emergency flood-control work made necessary by the 1944 floods

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $2,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be made immediately available upon the passage of this act, as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the 1944 floods.

Workers and Women in Inter-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, May 1 is Labor Day in the other American republics, and hence is a good day on which to take stock of inter-American relations in the field of labor and social welfare.

This year May 1 finds a momentous conference sitting in Philadelphia—the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Office. Both workers and women are taking a leading part, and some 70 out of 350 delegates and advisers are from Latin America. The lessons and results of the I. L. O. conference will have value for the winning of the peace through the attainment of full employment and high standards of living for all mankind if the workers' delegates and women present have their way. There should be many more women at such international gatherings, and the number of labor delegates should be at least doubled. Workers and women in my city of Tacoma, in the Evergreen State of Washington, and throughout the Nation and hemisphere have a vital stake in this great conference.

THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

It is fitting that one of our most distinguished women, Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, should head the large and able United States delegation to the I. L. O. conference, and that Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the capable Congresswoman from Maine, should also be representing our country. Among the many other United States advisers helping to guide the conference are Robert J. Watt—like Philip Murray, of the C. I. O., a Scottish-born United States labor statesman—and his fellow A. F. of L. leaders, William Green, George Meany, Matthew Woll, and Marion Hedges. In addition, a notable adviser is the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, well known in this Capital as a militant friend of Negro workers before his appointment to be Catholic bishop

of Grand Rapids. An outstanding United States business adviser is Charles W. Taussig, authority on the sugar economy of the Caribbean area.

Among the issues first taken up by Latin American delegates to the I. L. O. conference were cartels and international monopolies which block progress and back reactionary forces in Latin America, creation of joint labor-employer-Government control over foreign firms, equality for small nations, wage discriminations on racial and national grounds such as the United States practices against Panamanians in the Canal Zone, and the seating of the Argentine labor delegate. Lombardo Toledano, the outstanding Latin American figure present, Mexican leader of the powerful Confederation of Latin American Workers, led the fight against Argentina's labor delegate on the grounds that Argentina is a Fascist dictatorship and a Nazi beachhead in the Americas which menaces our safety. Most Argentine workers are strongly pro-Allied and democratic, but their unions have been either destroyed or taken over by military tyrants who admire Franco and Hitler. Lombardo Toledano pointed out that Argentine labor leaders who escaped jail and harsh concentration camps came to the labor conference he called recently in Montevideo and approved the step he took to bar Argentine participation at least in the workers' group at the I. L. O. conference.

Lombardo Toledano, speaking for the over 4,000,000 Latin-American workers of his federation, claimed a victory over Argentine fascism in the 14-to-3 vote of the workers' delegates against the Argentine delegate. Lombardo Toledano will lead the Latin-American labor delegation which will soon leave for the world labor conference in London, called by the British Trades Union Congress, where additional heavy blows will be struck against fascism and for democratic labor progress. Philip Murray and the leadership of the C. I. O. are taking a keen interest in the London conference, the I. L. O. conference being of chief interest to the A. F. of L.

Vice President HENRY WALLACE, next to President Roosevelt our best-known and best-liked public man among Latin Americans, has paid the I. L. O. conference the compliment of publicizing its efforts to tackle the world's foremost post-war problem—jobs; first, for the returning soldiers; second, for the displaced war workers.

HEMISPHERE ROLE OF WOMEN

Over a dozen women are active participants in the current I. L. O. conference, and many women have been sent as observers or reporters by publications, the O. W. I., the United States Department of Labor, and by the newly created Labor Relations Divisions of the Department of State and Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. I am glad to see this and to recall what our remarkable First Lady wrote in April regarding women at international gatherings:

Women value the conservation of human life more highly than reaching out for more power through force or trade. Women try to find ways to cooperate.

Mrs. Roosevelt added that there is much more social legislation where women have votes and a voice.

My plea is not for women at a peace conference only. It is for women in every meeting which deals with post-war problems.

I agree that women deserve a bigger role in pan-Americanism.

Mrs. Roosevelt has charted a new course for constructive feminine social and pro-labor action. She has rendered immense service selflessly, despite narrow and often politically motivated criticism, and has contributed to United States and international well being. Government and union officials can profit from Mrs. Roosevelt's example and rely more on women in discussions which shape inter-American relations. With characteristic energy, thoughtfulness, and social insight, Eleanor Roosevelt in March of 1944 promoted hemisphere understanding and relieved the tedium of life at isolated bases for scores of thousands of lonely American servicemen by visiting the bases scattered through the Caribbean and across northern South America. She traveled from northeastern Brazil, that great crossroads of vital air and naval traffic, to the far islands off Ecuador to greet and encourage the war role of North and South American workers and men in uniform. Mrs. Roosevelt told Latin-American journalists of her interest in what their armed forces and workers are contributing to the victory, and made a tremendous hit with our good neighbors. Newspapers in every Brazilian city, for example, front-paged stories and photographs of Mrs. Roosevelt's activities among cheering soldiers, sailors, and laborers. The strongly unionized river boat and dock workers of Barranquilla, Colombia, recognized Mrs. Roosevelt when she was driving through their city and gathered to applaud her as the world's leading woman envoy of good will.

Just before the I. L. O. met, the active and important Inter-American Commission of Women met at the Pan American Union under Senorita Minerva Bernardino and Miss Mary Cannon, a widely traveled official of the Women's Bureau of our Labor Department. This Commission was established by women of several American nations attending the Pan American Conference at Havana in 1928, and is steadily growing in usefulness by looking after the interests of women in the Americas. Mrs. Roosevelt gave this year's delegates a tea at the White House.

Women at the I. L. O. sessions have a particular contribution to make to the study of the extension of social security to humanity, the raising everywhere of living standards to promote prosperity, comprehensive medical and maternity care, child welfare, and the improvement of diet, housing, and facilities for culture, education, and recreation. Women will have an equal chance to contribute to the World Labor Conference in London. Women in Latin America as here are doing excellent work in war industries and the armed forces, in agriculture, the Red Cross, and their clubs and organizations for promoting hemisphere understanding and cooperation for winning both the war and peace.

NELSON ROCKEFELLER, COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Nelson Rockefeller, whose work as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs is now so well known throughout the Americas, spoke last month on the future of Pan-American relations before the National Council of Women and the Inter-American Commission of Women in New York, praising continental cooperation as highly promising for the future. It is here to stay, and is in the hands of the people.

In March, Nelson Rockefeller toured the valuable Central American projects of the C. I. A. A. and was enthusiastically greeted everywhere, especially in Nicaragua. There the Nicaraguan labor movement made him an honorary member, declaring that Rockefeller had won them by his genial, democratic sympathy for their problems, and that he was the first United States notable ever to make the effort personally to meet Nicaraguan workers. On May 1 Nicaragua will hold its first national labor congress, to which it has invited delegates from the A. F. L. and the other American republics.

Glowing praise has been given to Rockefeller's Inter-American Training Administration for bringing several hundred young Latin Americans to the United States to enter our factories and work with their hands, learning industrial methods and respect for labor and precision. Another sign of progress and managerial statesmanship was given on March 29 when the Creole Petroleum Co., which, I believe, Mr. Rockefeller was associated with during his stay in Venezuela before the war, agreed with the Venezuelan Ministry of Labor to soften the terrible effects of inflation and sharply increased wartime living costs by voluntarily raising the pay of its workers to make up to them the difference between past and present prices of staples. In addition, Standard Oil engineers have plans for new refineries and operations in the great oil republic and announced a moral obligation to give preference to Venezuela and its workers in future.

I have been acquainted with Nelson Rockefeller for over 3 years and am convinced of the sincerity of his concern with problems of inflation, living standards, health and sanitation, better diet and working conditions for Latin-American labor as a sound investment in United States and hemisphere prosperity.

A WHO'S WHO IN LABOR AND SOCIAL WELFARE IN LATIN AMERICA

Nevertheless, the serious crisis which threatens inter-American relations as a result of fascistic revolutions in Argentina, Bolivia, and Paraguay, and perhaps in other South American nations at any time as economic and labor conditions cause political unrest, caused me recently to suggest to Mr. Rockefeller the urgent need to increase United States Government activities in the field of labor and social welfare in Latin America.

It is true that since my demand before Congress on March 25, 1941, that labor be included in pan-Americanism, much has been done—but not enough to cope with the current crisis.

To check and offset the forces of fascism and unrest spreading in South America in particular, I called to Mr. Rockefeller's attention the desirability of cultivating contacts with labor, women's groups, and democratic and reform forces in Latin America. Despite the creation of small units to handle inter-American labor relations in the Pan American Union, the Office of Inter-American Affairs and the State Department, leading progressives and publications of the hemisphere have been criticizing the paucity of labor and social welfare ties in this period of social and economic dislocation and tension and would welcome the preparation and publication of a who's who in labor and social welfare in Latin America.

I pointed out to Mr. Rockefeller that the C. I. A. A. might care to undertake such a project as an invaluable reference for officials of our Government, of Latin America, of the A. F. L., C. I. O., and I. L. O.

MEXICAN LABOR LEADERS RESENT UNITED STATES POLICIES

Marshall Field's hard-hitting newspaper PM on March 12, 1944, sharply criticized our Government for failure to heed the views and problems of Latin-American labor and liberalism. Victor Bernstein of PM spent 2 weeks interviewing resentful Mexican laborities and progressives who complained at United States diplomacy and policies which virtually ignore prodemocratic elements while cooperating with tories, profiteers, and reactionaries. We ignore labor—the one group which is strongly for allied victory. United States officials do not know what Latin-American labor leaders are thinking. Allen Haden says the answer is a militantly democratic and prolabor foreign policy.

UNITED STATES LABOR LEADERS WANT STRONGER HEMISPHERE TIES

A number of United States labor leaders who have visited Latin-American unions, cooperativese, industrial centers, and social-welfare institutions have told me in reply to my recent inquires as to their views that they strongly approve of the compilation and publication of a Who's Who of Latin-America labor and social welfare. One leader, who toured six American republics last year in addition to praising the idea of a Who's Who which would stimulate the interchange of ideas and information in the hemisphere regarding labor and social welfare, suggested that labor attachés at our embassies in Latin America be more democratically chosen. He complained that the State Department apparently wants only United States college graduates for the few such positions which they seem willing to create. Instead, labor attachés should be chosen chiefly from among staff members of unions, from among men or women who have worked up from labor's ranks and know intimately labor problems. Latin-American labor looks to us for encouragement and guidance, declares David McDonald, official of the United Steelworkers of America, C. I. O.

The views of Mr. McDonald and his colleagues of the C. I. O. Committee on Latin-American Affairs, which is headed by the able and active Mr. Jacob S. Potofsky of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in New York City, are forcefully set forth in the excellent C. I. O. pamphlet entitled "North and South of the Border." United States labor delegates to conferences and on tours in Latin America all return struck by the terrible poverty, disastrous inflation, costly prime necessities beyond workers' reach, pitifully inadequate school and recreation facilities, and the need not for United States charity but for our intelligent and fraternal aid and cooperation to raise living standards.

Catholic workers will be glad to know that one of the C. I. O. leaders just mentioned is Martin Kyne, of the United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Workers, an outstanding liberal Catholic labor figure whose description of the appalling poverty, misery, illiteracy, and exploitation of Bolivian tin miners and other workers on the bleak, frigid Andean plateaus appeared in that fine Catholic magazine The Commonweal shortly after Mr. Kyne's return from touring Bolivian industrial centers with the joint United States-Bolivian mission under Judge Magruder. Martin Kyne early this year attended the significant meeting called in Montevideo by Lombardo Toledano and the Confederation of Latin-American Workers to plan widespread opposition to the intrigues of Argentine clerical-fascism and Spain's vicious Falangist gospel of antiallied disunity, which I have repeatedly attacked before this body, demanding that we break relations with Franco.

At this point I would like to remind my hearers of what I said in the House of Representatives on March 25, 1941: "The A. F. of L. and C. I. O. should jointly strengthen Latin-American labor by insisting on labor attachés in our embassies. Labor relations and labor solidarity are the very basis and bulwark of democracy. In the long run, it will be more important to help Latin America solve social problems than to arm her. There should be an interchange of social workers as well as of labor leaders. There is need for an inter-American institute for social and labor research with adequate funds to study significant social and economic aspects of labor's place in hemisphere affairs." Then I warned against certain reactionary officials in our Government by declaring that "our cooperation with democratic forces in Latin America may be prevented by inside sabotage."

Hence, it is a pleasure for me to see that progress, even though too little, has been made in 3 years toward achieving some of the objectives which I called for early in 1941. The Pan American Union, handicapped by slim funds which should be doubled or trebled by the American republics, has established a splendid little division of labor and social information under Dr. Ernesto Galarza. The International Labor Conference is now studying the creation of powerful means for preventing post-war unemployment and reactionary cartels. A good start is being made, but it is only a start toward economic democracy.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

I congratulate the American Federation of Labor for launching a Spanish-language news letter called Noticiario Obrero Norteamericano. The A. F. of L. is helping to cement inter-American labor cordiality and understanding during a period of tension and crisis. Labor is the first bulwark of democracy, and the first object of attack of dictators everywhere.

I am sure that a published who's who in Latin-American labor would prove of immense use to the A. F. of L. in distributing its news letter in the other American republics, and that Robert J. Watt, Boris Shiskin, George Meany, and other A. F. of L. executives would agree that such a project would produce great good will among South American workers. Such a volume might prove a big stimulant to the interchange of ideas and information for strengthening our relations and the good-neighbor policy, now seriously strained because of Argentina's crushing of labor and democracy not only in Argentina but in Paraguay, in part in Bolivia, and tomorrow perhaps elsewhere in South America.

The American Federation of Labor is taking an outstanding part in the deliberations of the International Labor Conference in Philadelphia, where A. F. of L. international representative, Robert Watt, is serving as United States workers' delegate. This is the seventh I. L. O. meeting in which Mr. Watt has ably presented the viewpoint of the A. F. of L. He is, like Martin Kyne of the C. I. O., deeply touched by the plight of Bolivian and other Latin-American workers who so fervently want freedom to organize and better their wretched standard of living, and to give their children education, adequate food, clothing, and housing.

The A. F. of L. joined the C. I. O. recently in making a generous gift to the widows and children of the Bolivian miners killed brutally by order of the overthrown dictatorship of General Penaranda and the selfish tin cartel, whose bloated head lives in luxury in New York as the richest man in all Latin America. I trust that it will be possible to force him to pay his share of taxes to Bolivia, Britain, and the United States for world reconstruction, returning some of his ill-gotten millions to the workers who produced this wealth.

The Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks

in the RECORD, I include the following statement released to the newspapers yesterday, Monday, May 1, by my colleague, the Honorable HAMILTON FISH, of New York, regarding the Montgomery Ward case:

There have been rumors in the press that efforts would be made by Chairman SABATH of the Rules Committee and other Democratic leaders to prevent consideration of the Dewey resolution to investigate the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. I do not give any credence to such idle gossip. The House will pass the Dewey resolution by a vote of 4 to 1. The Rules Committee is the servant, not the master, of the House. The vote on the Dewey resolution should, in all fairness, follow the simplification tax bill next Friday.

The House and the American people are entitled to know under what statute and by what legal authority or constitutional power the seizure of a nonwar industry was made. It smacks of totalitarianism, dictatorship, and Gestapo and un-American methods. In its essence it is lynch laws and terrorism that resembles the high handed, autocratic political tactics of Hitler and Mussolini on their advent to power. If the Congress has unknowingly given any such power to the President it should be revoked immediately.

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, the United States has sustained a great loss. Under his able leadership this country has constructed the most powerful Navy in the world.

During his term of service, Secretary Knox made an invaluable contribution to the war effort by putting our Navy on the offensive in every theater of warfare. He was a fearless, courageous leader. Always serving his country to the utmost of his strength, he departed in the heat of battle.

Secretary Knox had the satisfaction of knowing that the cause for which we fight and for which he gave his own life will be won. His place in the history of the Second World War is assured. He is now a member of that great host of illustrious dead who have made possible our freedom. The entire Nation grieves at his passing.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., April 29, 1944, eulogizing the late Frank Knox:

FRANK KNOX, AMERICAN

"I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

New Hampshire first knew Frank Knox as a young man. He was less than 40 then, but New Hampshire was quickly impressed with his ability, his fearlessness, his honesty, and the maturity of his judgment. Although he had come to the State from another part of the country, his birthplace was Boston, and it always has seemed, in evaluating his career, that his viewpoint and his conduct were an intermingling of that which is strong and fine in two peoples—those who left home scenes to pioneer and those who, because of home responsibilities, stayed in New England not only to carry on but to provide for sectional industrial and social progress.

Frank Knox's parents went West, but they always maintained a place in their hearts for New England; not only that, but it came to pass that their son was to return here to play a definite role in returning New England to greater usefulness. A concrete example of this interest was in his high regard for the New England Council, of which he was a founder.

To know Frank Knox even casually was to be impressed with his vigor, keenness, and patriotism. In the earliest days of his career as publisher, it was necessary for him to devote long hours to the task of hewing out a new line of approach to local, State, and national affairs, problems, and situations. He had gained attention and respect in Michigan, in partnership with his beloved friend, John Muehling.

Quickly—almost instantaneously, in fact—the New Hampshire public also came to know Frank Knox. It did not always agree with him, but New Hampshire never had cause to question his integrity. And more than that, whenever there were points of issue, New Hampshire and New Hampshire people had deep-seated respect and admiration for his "no" when it was more politic to say "yes."

It was only natural that he should soon become a national figure in journalism, that he should later be called to assume guidance over a great chain of newspapers, and that he himself was to become publisher of a metropolitan journal, whose own history of usefulness is a tradition in American journalism.

It follows, as well, that he was to gain countrywide admiration, that he should be sought for the highest of national elective offices, and that he should accept, with all his native vigor and fearlessness, the challenges he felt must be met.

That they were well met, and scrupulously, is proved without the slightest trace of doubt. For Frank Knox, Republican, was to become Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is not difficult to understand why he was chosen, or why he accepted, in those difficult and dangerous days before Pearl Harbor. He knew and this Government knew, if the public did not, of the grave dangers ahead.

This Government needed, for the upbuilding of national strength and honor, a man who was unafraid, who was resourceful, who possessed initiative and the other qualities of leadership, who was himself a pillar of honor and strength, and who loved his country. With Frank Knox, politics always had ended at water's edge.

Stupendous was his task. Equally stupendous was the extent of his success. It must be that this devotion of his is directly responsible for his untimely death. He gave the Nation his all.

So many-faceted is Frank Knox's life and works that the emphasizing of some must not be allowed to obscure the others. One case in point is his active service in the Spanish-American War and World War No. 1, in the first as one of Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders, in the second in the A. E. F. as a major of artillery.

Frank Knox entered that conflict as a private. Ever impatient with delay and red tape, he wanted to get in and did. As early as August 1917, he had been commissioned a captain. By December he had been made a major.

Upon his return to civilian life, he maintained his Army connection in the Reserve, in which he was soon to become colonel. More than that, as was characteristic, he practiced what he preached. Strength of body, he knew, is as important to the national welfare as strength of mind. For himself as for others, he believed that "a system of national military training of all young American men would pay swift dividends in a healthier, more unified, more democratic Nation, better endowed in mind and body to utilize the rich heritage of American citizenship; and a Nation more quickly and more efficiently able to defend itself, should we ever again be attacked.

Those are his words. His own life is proof that he meant them.

But neither must the multiple facets of his life be allowed to obscure attention here, in words which must be inadequate, to what Frank Knox meant to us who were privileged to know him somewhat intimately. Just as one was impressed with his vigor, so was one impressed with his "humanness," and kindliness. Success, national prestige, never changed him. He delighted to return to his home and to his office. In the first, he relaxed as much as is possible for a member of the Cabinet to relax. In the office and downtown he chatted with friends and the men and women of the Union-Leader "family." Frank Knox did not forget names and faces; and he had the happy faculty of taking up threads of friendship and association where they had been broken off perhaps long ago. It was a delight and an education to be with him—and we mean just that. He was thoughtful of others, and when they were in distress he went to great pains to see that they were helped and comforted. Someone said not long ago, "Frank Knox's head has never grown too big for his hat, and never will," a homely observation that nevertheless succeeds in helping to measure his worth as man, citizen, good and kindest of friends, and high government official. He himself once wrote:

"Let us aim to be genuine, to seek simplicity and be unassuming, unostentatious; to keep our hearts tender and pure and our minds on the higher levels. To be genuine means to be true and simple. Pretentions never served their intent. An old proverb says, 'No man who loves applause more than the truth will add much to the world's progress.'"

Frank Knox was a great Secretary and a great patriot. Love of country he translated into living, vibrant terms—terms that called for self-sacrifice and that, finally, cost him his life. Through him the greatest Navy of all time has been built up; through him the greatest Navy of all time is crushing Axis might and ruthlessness.

No man has been more devoted to his country, none has played a more essential part in demonstrating that devotion. Frank Knox fought the good fight. He kept the faith.

Eulogy on the Occasion of the Funeral of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following eulogy by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., on the occasion of the funeral of His Eminence, William Cardinal O'Connell:

BISHOP CUSHING'S EULOGY

"Behold a great priest, who in his days pleased God, and was found just; and in the time of wrath was made a reconciliation."

These inspired words are taken from the Book of Ecclesiasticus of the Old Testament, chapter xlv: 16, 17.

Behold a great priest. He, whose mortal remains lie here before the altar of this cathedral, whose soul has gone forth attended by our prayers and the prayers of millions all over the world, could ask for his extraordinary endowments and surpassing achievements no more satisfying recognition. That was his ambition, that was his triumph, to be a great priest.

Sixty years ago, when the sublime dignity of the priesthood was conferred upon him, he harnessed the leaping energies of a keen mind and powerful personality for the race to his goal—to full accomplishment of his vocation. Never a moment did he loosen the rein or slacken the pace till the day came when he could say with St. Paul: "I have finished the course."

The 11 years of his parish service saw him crowding his scant hours of leisure with earnest study. As rector of the North American College in Rome, he pursued perfection in new fields, administration, diplomacy, a wider experience of men and affairs. The famous embassy to Japan he executed with the same unbending concentration, learning at every step and in the end achieving a brilliant success.

After years of distinguished work in Rome, amid the deep currents of international relations, in contact with the high and the humble of many lands while ever close to the heart of Christendom, he returned to America, to preside first over the diocese of Portland and then over his native archdiocese of Boston. Here he found a complete contrast—a society economic in its structure and its standards, a people scarcely at all concerned with world politics, provincial in outlook, a religious frontier where the concept of Christendom was unknown and diverse groups held their particular beliefs, each hidden behind its own stockade of exclusiveness.

He had known this frontier of old. He could measure the gains of his own garrison. Aware of the approaching crises that would tax its strength, he felt that the time had come to organize it on a larger and permanent basis, and to reveal the fact of world-wide Christianity, the dignity of the spouse of Christ. The undertaking was vast and beset with difficulties; the manner of its doing had to be chosen; the man who saw the vision had to win others to it in his own way. Not always understood, even by his own, but always steady of purpose and strong of execution, he has been justified by the severe tests of eventful years.

His enlightened foresight and vigorous leadership made this archdiocese one of the foremost sees in Christendom. To him, to the clergy, to the religious, and people he had organized, Pope Pius X accorded the highest of honors by raising him to the exalted position of Prince of the Church. As an administrator, the new cardinal had few equals. When he delegated authority, he placed absolute confidence in the men of his choice. Under his direction as a spiritual leader, under his guidance and inspiration as a molder and ruler of men, priests rose to every opportunity and shared with him in the extraordinary growth of his archdiocese.

To single out special phases of that growth would be an impossible task. Fortunately he, himself, when he reached the biblical age of three score and ten, listed what he considered his three greatest accomplishments: the founding of more than a hundred new parishes, the reorganization of the diocesan seminary, and the establishment of the diocese on a strong financial basis—surely, three worthy and lasting memorials. The 100 and more new parishes have dotted this great center of Catholicity with as many churches where dwells the King of Kings, awaiting with bountiful gifts the homage of those who love Him. The development of the diocesan seminary assures a continuance of the highest ideals of the priesthood and the solid financial structure of the archdiocese survived without the slighest shock the greatest depression in the Nation's history. We may truthfully say: "If you seek his monuments, look around."

FRUITS OF HIS LABORS TESTIFY FOR HIM

Look around. The fruits of his labors multiply to our gaze. In the churches he planned, how many will find the abiding solace of religion? At the altars he raised, how many will gain grace and eternal salvation? In the schools he sanctioned, how many will imbibe the true philosophy of life? In the hospitals, homes, and charitable institutions he fostered, how many will attain health and refuge and blessed peace? And from the devoted priests of God whom he trained or ordained, as well as from the hundreds he helped to ordination in distant mission lands, how many souls will receive the heavenly mysteries and life everlasting?

"Behold a great priest, who in his days pleased God."

The cause of God was his consuming passion, and he defended that cause with life-long devotion and singleness of purpose, with a rare freedom from human respect, and we dare add, with the fighting spirit of a crusader. He attacked evils and wrongs, not persons; he hated the sin, but always helped the sinner. And his charity to those who erred knew no bounds. To one to whom nature had given a rock-like resoluteness and a certain stubborn inflexibility of character, and who was by temperament strong, vehement, commanding, that is no small tribute. This great zeal for the cause of God and for the preaching of His gospel was not merely diocesan nor even national. It reached out into every land, so that today in every corner of the vast mission fields of the world his name is blessed. Missionaries are keeping his memory sacred before the crude altars of jungle chapels and in the stately sanctuaries of oriental cathedrals. "Remember," he frequently admonished me, "this is God's work, and keep it in God's hands."

God's work is the salvation and sanctification of souls everywhere, the work of universal charity. Universal charity is, therefore, the key to the life of William Cardinal O'Connell. It was the concept he had formed of the priest as universal in charity and absolutely detached in judgment, that kept him deliberately and consistently outside of all secular concerns, outside of every partisan movement, every controversy, even ecclesiastical, save only when the spiritual welfare of the community seemed to call for a pronouncement. He did much—more than the world could know—to remove the sources of injustice, to replace with a spirit of mutual understanding and friendlines the old and unwholesome divisions among the people of New England. What our first bishop, John de Cheverus, had endured with the courage and wise forbearance of a pioneer, this great successor of his, taking up the crozier nearly a century later, attacked with no less courage but with the power and skill of a diplomat. The sturdy character, the ideals and accomplishments of the Puritan and Pilgrim fathers, he admired. Their resentment and hostility toward other races and religions, he understood. Giving honor to the leaders on both sides who, before his day had succeeded in narrowing the gulf, he resolved to leave nothing undone in order that in his lifetime the gulf might be completely closed.

SURMOUNTED OBSTACLES BY FAITH AND PATIENCE

By faith and patience and good will, by dint of example and counsel, he strove to destroy the ignorance which breeds prejudice, the misconceptions which perpetuate dissension. The odds against him were enormous, obscure, increased by the active operation of forces which a generation earlier had been only speculations and theories. Perhaps the task he set was too long for even his long lifetime and giant strength. But what one man could do he has done, so that now we live our lives and fulfill our destinies on an equal footing with our fellow citizens of all faiths in an atmosphere of mutual respect and tolerance.

"Behold a great priest, who in his days pleased God and was found just; and in the time of wrath was made a reconciliation."

It is not surprising that civil as well as ecclestiastical authorities recognized the power and influence of this eminent prelate. Widely traveled, deeply versed in the history, the customs, and the governments of many nations, he was ever filled with a profound love of his native land and her institutions.

The highest officials of state and nation recognized in him not only a true patriot but also a leader in the defense of the principles upon which our Nation has risen to greatness. He was an eloquent teacher of civic virtue, of justice and honesty, and respect for authority. He taught his people to know their civic duties and practice them and to know their civic rights and demand them.

In every crisis of our country he hastened to place his services at the command of the Government. In the truest sense, he inspired patriotism, for the hope of the country no less than the hope of the church lies in the democracy that he envisioned and urged; men of principle, men of honor, men of faith and men of God.

To his words of advice, of admonition and of warning, all men turned attentive ears, because no one ever doubted his understanding, his sympathy or his judgment.

For the glory of God, and by the grace of God, William Henry O'Connell became a prince of the church and a pillar of his country. But those who lived close to him knew him otherwise. They knew him as a student, a lover of art, a musician, a poet, a friend. To a degree unsuspected by many, he was a man of heart, of deep and strong emotions. His books are on library shelves for all to read, his hymns are in the schools and homes of the diocese he loved, but the organ tones of his beautiful voice must speak and sing in memory. The kindliness of his counsel and the charm of his companionship must be cherished by the few that have known him well.

Any man exalted above his fellowmen, most of all in ecclesiastical life, can have few intimates. In an extraordinary degree, Carinal O'Connell succeeded in combining a genuine love of his priests and people with a detachment which kept him from the softening consolation of their friendships; but he paid the price for this magnificent service to God and country with a lonely life and a no less lonely death.

COMPLETE DEDICATION OF HIS LIFE TO PRIESTHOOD

All the friendship, the flaming love of his soul was given to God, and his private life was an unceasing integration of his every endowment and every attainment into the perfection of his priesthood. Oh how exacting, how all-absorbing, how supreme is that spiritual life to which the priest, any priest, commits himself. Sanctus—Sanctus—Sanctus. Holy—Holy—Holy—that is the priesthood of Christ. His Eminence expressed it at the close of his autobiography in words

that echo the utterance of St. Augustine, and across the centuries identify our present-day priesthood with his:

"The life of the spirit, unquenchable, can never be completely content until the soul has found repose in the possession of God."

There speaks even now the wisdom of our late cardinal archbishop. He knew with the certainty gained from a lifetime of experience with the souls of men that the true priest can never in this life find rest. This lesson he leaves us as a legacy. We have no right to bury it and forget it. All the rest of the wealth he has left us—charitable institutions, Christian education, financial security, churches, religious communities, lay societies, mutual trust, peace, and a love for the Holy See and the sovereign pontiff, these depend for their welfare and progress upon that one priceless legacy, the secret of his method—his spirit never rested.

Well did he change his family motto—"Victor in arduis," triumphant over difficulties, to the humble and even more energetic, "Vigor in arduis," strength amid difficulties. For victory won means fresh combats ahead, but strength is the source and the sword of every new accomplishment.

CARDINAL POSSESSED EXTRAORDINARY STRENGTH

He possessed extraordinary strength. Even physically he towered among men. That was nature's gift to him. Intelligence shone on his wide brow. Large, deep-set, scrutinizing eyes bore witness to his penetrating mind. Intellectually he also excelled. His powerful pen constantly flashed out in defense of Christian faith and morality. That was the result of his own efforts in enriching his mind and training his intellectual powers. Spiritually he was irresistible. That was the grace of God for which he prayed and which he employed to the best advantage. From the very record of his years he was unique. Eighty-five years a Christian, 60 years a priest, 42 years a bishop, 33 years a cardinal. Here, indeed, was an illustrious man, a great priest who in his days pleased God.

Not every priest can be physically powerful, not every priest can be an intellectual giant, not every priest is called to a long life of high ecclesiastical honors, but the grace of God is for all of us and the vocation to the priesthood means the unresting activity of the soul. We are forever grateful to our venerable and beloved cardinal archbishop for this priestly bequest—"The life of the spirit, unquenchable, can never be completely content until the soul has found repose in the possession of God."

Today the life of his spirit, unquenchable, is at last content. His soul has found repose in the possession of God. He has attained his ultimate goal. He has won the only crown he ever really prized and sought, the crown of God's glory. His death, never to be forgotten by his loved ones, was an inspiring testimony of faith. He passed from this life blessing his priests and people and kissing a crucifix that he had cherished from his student days in Rome. The prayers of his flock were generously answered: God gave to our good shepherd a beautiful Christian death.

Here before the altar of the God he loved and to whom he consecrated his long life and great talents, in the cathedral church of the archdiocese he raised to such preeminence, lie his mortal remains. But to his diocese, his country, his church, he is not dead, he still lives.

In the words of the poet:

"Were a star quenched on high
For years would its light
Still streaming downward from the sky
Fall on our mortal sight.

"So when a great man dies
For years beyond our ken
The light he leaves behind him lies
Upon the paths of men."

So the lifework of our beloved Shepherd is not yet done. In a broader sense it is only beginning. He was, above all else, the apostle, who taught the word and law of God to his fellowmen, that the noble and the eternal in our nature might be nourished, that the ties that bind us to God might be strengthened.

Such a teacher never dies. In lesson and example, in service and remembrance, he is as truly with us today as he was before he passed beyond the ivory gates of sleep. The light of his long life is only a brief candle in comparison with the enduring light of the inspiration he has bequeathed to us. Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow we shall be enriched and ennobled by the abiding influence of his myriad of lasting works.

Vital in his loyal love of God was his devotion to the Blessed Mother of God. His birthday was December the eighth, the Feast Day of Her Immaculate Conception, and deep devotion to her marked his entire life. Deep devotion also to his own beloved mother, who, like so many a saintly mother, by her love and sacrifices, enabled her son to become a priest of God. At her feet, as long as she lived, he laid his scholastic trophies and priestly honors as an act of love and gratitude for her inspiration and help.

There was another beloved mother who claimed his lifelong unbroken devotion, Our Holy Mother Church. To her, in deepest love and reverence during his priesthood of 60 years, he gave his all in arduous labors that her holy influence and her divine message might be brought to all mankind.

William Cardinal O'Connell is no more. "Behold a great high priest, who in his days pleased God, and was found just, and in the time of wrath he was made a reconciliation." In a spirit of Christian resignation, to the will of Almighty God, bear away his body, lay it reverently in its final resting place on the grounds of our diocesan seminary where every future priest of the archdiocese of Boston, and where, at every annual retreat we, the priests whom he has left behind, may breathe a golden Ave Maria in honor of our Immaculate Mother, the Queen of the Clergy, that our departed shepherd may be joined in eternal fellowship with the Apostles of Holy Mother Church forever and ever.

Then and only then can his great soul rest, for "the life of the spirit, unquenchable, can never be completely content until the soul has found repose in the possession of God." This is the legacy bequeathed to us by a great priest, His Eminence, William Cardinal O'Connell, "who in his days pleased God, and was found just; and in the time of wrath was made a reconciliation."

May he rest in eternal peace. Amen.

The Necessity for Closer Latin-American Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an essay written by one of my constituents, Miss Joan Morin, of Newark, Ohio, who was one of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

This contest was entered into by approximately 300,000 of our State. I congratulate Miss Morin on her achievement and respectfully urge the membership of the House to read her splendid essay.

THE NECESSITY FOR CLOSER LATIN-AMERICAN RELATIONSHIP

(By Joan Morin)

An infinite binding tie between the Americas. Yes; that is the goal toward which we are striving. But in order to form and maintain that relationship, we must understand the necessity for it. The foundation for this inter-American policy is the fact that the countries of the American hemisphere possess certain common interests and problems not generally shared by the people of the Old World. These problems should be the basis of a common understanding and of common political and commercial transactions among these United Americas. We must seize the opportunity to build upon this foundation.

North and South America are a balance and a support to each other, a great reservoir of strength and natural wealth. Therefore we must work together and cooperate with each other more than we have ever done in the past, for "United we stand, divided we fall."

We should begin now to cement the friendship which will make our comrades to the south of us our allies in times of peace and war. First let us look at the problem as it stands now, an important factor in the present conflict.

Many vital materials necessary to our war production have been cut off from us by the enemy. Our Latin-American neighbors have a large supply of these natural resources, including copper, diamonds, tin, manganese, nitrates, rubber, oil, and iron, which they may share with us. Also, they can lease us territory where we may place strategic land, air, and naval bases, which will help protect the American from foreign invaders. We, in turn, will send them technical experts who will improve their sanitation methods and help develop their hidden resources to the extent that they will be independent and self-sustaining from a commercial standpoint. This will result in increased production for the United States and more wealth and a higher standard of living for the Latin-Americas.

Now we should look to the future and some additional reasons why we should become better acquainted with our southern neighbors. We are far from the trade centers of Europe and we would profit by trading in our own hemisphere. The United States provides a good market for the products of Latin-America, and they will reciprocate, because the agricultural products are harvested in alternating seasons. Also, we have excess manufactured goods and they have raw materials on which our factories of tomorrow will feed and prosper. An increasing flow of trade between the Americas in the future will provide a source of employment for many discharged American soldiers.

We shall set an example for the world, showing that if 21 republics can live together peacefully, then countries all over the world can do likewise.

We, the people of the United States, should give more consideration to the good neighbor policy. Exchange of students, mutual comprehension of one another's language, and completion of the inter-American highway will help bind us together in a lasting friendship. Forevermore let us drop the word "policy" from our good-neighbor policy and just be good neighbors.

We are the new world, the united world. The influence of the old is fast fading, and our light should shine out as a beacon of inter-American friendship and love.

Court Martial of Polish Soldiers of Jewish Faith

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, April 26, appears a statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], regarding the court martial of certain Polish soldiers of Jewish faith who were A. W. O. L., saying "I arise today to call upon the Polish Government in exile to remove certain officers of the Polish Army who are responsible for the court martial of 30 Jewish soldiers."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has misrepresented the entire affair, and I am asking unanimous consent to insert at this point a statement made by a special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor of London, and also an article by the Associated Press, a statement of the Polish Ambassador in London. I am also asking unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, at this point, a copy of a letter written by the Ambassador of Poland in Washington to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my own remarks:

BRITISH QUIET AS POLISH ARMY TRIES JEWS

(By E. Berg Holt)

LONDON, April 28.—A statement by Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden to the House of Commons to the effect that he is convinced the Polish Government is doing "everything possible" to eradicate anti-Semitism in the Polish armed forces, is regarded here as definite intimation that the British Government categorically refuses to intervene further in connection with the trials for desertion of a number of Jewish soldiers from the Polish Army.

By implication, it is apparent that the British Government will take a similar position regarding 25 Ukrainian White Russians, accused of the same offense.

Regarding the Jews, the British standpoint is understood to be that they had ample opportunity to transfer to the British Army and that, in fact, two groups of Jewish soldiers, numbering 207 in all, had actually been allowed to do so. To have allowed the possibility of transfers to stay open indefinitely would, in the opinion of military experts, be prejudicial to discipline, since it would enable Jewish soldiers to demand transfers whenever they had real or fancied grievances against either their comrades or officers.

While it is undenied that anti-Semitism exists in the Polish armed forces, many influential members of the Polish-Jewish community consider, in the words of Dr. Emanuel Scherer, Socialist member of the Polish National Council, that "Polish Jews should stay in the Polish Army."

Dr. Scherer added that the Polish Army is the "army of our country" and "we have to fight anti-Semitism wherever it appears by staying to fight it and not—as anti-Semites themselves would wish—by leaving any one of the institutions of our country."

While no figures are available as to the actual number of Jews in the Polish Army, Polish authorities declare those who have asked for a transfer are a comparatively small proportion of the whole. They add that some of those who have just been sentenced, deserted as long ago as 1940, and do not appear to have made any effort to join the British Army in the interim.

JEWS COMMISSIONED

An official Polish statement published here avers that "in the last 6 months 37 Jews were commissioned—a comparatively large proportion, considering the number of Jews serving in the Polish Army. Nine Jews were promoted to the rank of lieutenant, 3 to captain.

During the war 2 Jews have received the Virtute Militari, the highest Polish war decoration, 26 the Cross of Valor, and 3 the Cross of Merit. During his recent inspection of the Polish corps on the Italian front, Kazimierz Sosnkowski, Commander in Chief of the Polish Army under the exiled government, personally decorated 2 Jewish commandos of a Polish commando unit.

The official statement admits, on the other hand, that "six cases of alleged offenses against Jewish soldiers are now being investigated." It added that "during the court martial other cases of offenses were reported by defendants. * * * These cases will be investigated and offenders duly tried."

PROTEST MEETINGS

Despite these explanations, great excitement has been caused by the incidents. Mass protest meetings have been held. A deputation of Jewish clothing workers went to Downing Street on April 22 and left a letter urging the British Prime Minister to intervene.

By comparison, the case of the Ukrainian and White Russian deserters has attracted much less attention here. Moscow's Pravda, however, published a two-column article on the subject from its London correspondent on April 23. The statement in Pravda was to the effect that one of the deserters had had his arm broken by a Polish noncommissioned officer was denied by the soldier concerned when interviewed by a representative of the London Daily Herald.

Whereas a majority of the Jews in the recent trials are from Poland, the Ukrainians, and White Russians came from the Argentine to join the Polish forces. The fact that all those who have been tried have expressed a desire to fight Hitler gives rise to hope that the regrettable incidents will result in a closing of ranks and greater willingness to cooperate on both sides.

POLISH AMBASSADOR HITS ANTI-SEMITISM

LONDON, April 28.—Speaking at Bristol, England, Count Edward Raczynski, Polish Ambassador to Britain, said charges that anti-Semitism was condoned in the Polish forces "are entirely untrue and deeply resented."

Anti-Semitism would not be tolerated anywhere in the Polish movement, he said, "and any cases of Jew baiting brought to the notice of authorities will be severely punished."

APRIL 27, 1944.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Your letter of April 24 reached me on the 25th, sometime after I had read its text in the New York Times, where you had previously sent it for publication.

May I draw your attention to a special correspondence from London in the issue of the New York Times of April 26, page 10, in which excerpts from an official statement by the Polish Government were published, which, in my opinion, supply answers to some of the points raised by you in your letter concerning alleged anti-Semitism in the Polish forces. That official Polish statement brings out the following points:

1. The sentences imposed upon the defendants were strictly in conformity with the penal military code of Poland applicable to all soldiers in the Polish Army, irrespective of their race or creed. It was therefore mandatory to apply the laws of this code in this special case, no discrimination being possible. However, you will note that the actual carrying out of some of the sentences may be indefinitely suspended, depending on the good will and future good behavior of these soldiers.

I should like to add that in judging this special case the court martial showed leniency, inasmuch as it did not apply the maximum penalties applicable to soldiers deserting in time of war.

2. The statement of the Polish Government clearly indicates that an investigation of cases of offenses against Jewish soldiers over a period of the past several months is being conducted and that eventual offenders will be brought to trial. This part of the statement should convince you that, contrary to your accusation, there is no attempt on the part of the Polish authorities "to whitewash the culprits."

3. Furthermore, it has been ascertained that the great majority of our Polish-Jewish soldiers desire to continue to serve in the Polish armed forces without complaints.

4. In the past 6 months the number of Jewish soldiers in the Polish Army who have been commissioned and distinguished with high military decorations for valor, proves that there is no anti-Semitic discrimination in the Polish Army.

I take exception to your totally unfounded accusation that the Jewish soldiers in our Army were victimized because of their religion. Throughout our history the Polish Nation has invariably shown the highest degree of religious tolerance. Poland's record is entirely free from religious persecution. The great majority of Jewish citizens who for centuries came to settle in Poland, did so mostly to escape persecutions in other European countries. This amply proves the irrefutable fact of Poland's traditional religious and racial tolerance.

If you had taken the trouble to verify the facts, you would know that there is an adequate number of Army chaplains of Jewish faith in our Army, and that every facility has always been given to our Polish soldiers of Jewish faith to follow the rites of their cult and to celebrate their religious feast days.

If you had taken the trouble to pass in review the statements issued by the Polish Government relating to our Jewish citizens in the course of this war, and the numerous initiatives it has taken, calling for United Nations action in defense of the Jewish people—you would undoubtedly arrive at the conclusion that the Polish Government and the Polish Nation have been and are actively working to save the Jewish people and that they are decidedly not anti-Semitic. It is therefore an injustice to accuse them of racialism, or of any other form of intolerance.

The Polish people and the Jews of Poland are closely knit in their common fight against the racialism, inhumanity, intolerance, and barbarism of German nazi-ism. An ever closer understanding is developing between them as a result of common suffering.

The Polish and the Jewish peoples are going through the most tragic period in their history. It is an unjustifiable wrong at this time to take advantage of regrettable isolated incidents or personal quarrels among individual soldiers of an army in order to accuse an entire army, a nation, or its government of mass tendencies of which they are not guilty.

Very truly yours,

J. CIECHANOWSKI,
Ambassador of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the struggle for independence which the Polish Nation carried on since Poland was partitioned between Russia, Prussia, and Austria, the Jews, alongside the Poles, took an active part in those struggles. In the Polish legions which fought in the ranks of the Napoleonic armies the name of Col. Berek Joselewicz, a great Jewish fighter, gloriously highlights the pages of Poland's history. In the heroic struggles against czardom in 1830, 1831, 1863, 1905, and through the bloody struggle of World War No. 1, Jewish names were inseparable from the Polish names on the lists of heroes of those struggles and of their victims.

In this war during the short but costly military campaign in Poland in September 1939, the Jews fought arm in arm with their Polish cocitizens wherever blood was shed. Many instances of Jewish heroism were rewarded by decorations and other forms of recognition by the Polish high command. During the now historical siege of Warsaw the Jews defended the Polish capital and certain sectors of Warsaw were manned by Jewish workers exclusively.

As in battle the Jews of Poland shared the fate of other Poles in the persecutions in which the conquerors indulged. When over a million and a half Poles were deported deep into the Russian Provinces of Siberia and Kazakstan, there was a fair percentage of Jews among the most unhappy deportees. In the latter part of 1941, when on the basis of an agreement between the late Polish leader, General Sikorski, and Marshal Stalin, a Polish army was to be formed on the soil of Russia, the Russian authorities were quick in trying to separate the Poles from their Jewish cocitizens. As early as January 14, 1942, the Russian authorities have forbidden the Polish Jews to enter the Polish Army, but so overwhelming was the will of the Jewish youth to fight the common German enemy in the Polish ranks, that despite most incredible difficulties which were put in their way by the Russians, several thousand Jews entered Polish military ranks.

When the Polish Army under General Anders was forced by Marshal Stalin's personal order to leave Russia and to leave every Jewish citizen within the borders of Russia, the Polish military authorities, upon heartbreaking insistence of the Jewish soldiers, literally smuggled out of Russia 4,000 Polish soldiers of Jewish faith, mostly under assumed names. But as soon as those 4,000 soldiers reached safety from the dreaded Ogpu and took stations in Iran—Persia—and Irak, within 5 months their number decreased to exactly one-half, because over 2,000 Jewish soldiers left the Polish ranks and tried by every means to reach the homeland of their ancestors—Palestine. The Polish authorities were rather complacent. They understood the internal urge driving young Jews who escaped both the cruel fate prepared for them by the Gestapo and by the Ogpu to reach the promised land. The good will of the Polish authorities went even so far that they negotiated with the Moslem-Arabic and violently anti-Jewish authorities of Irak the right for the Jews to cross Irakian territory unmolested and enter Palestine.

When a few months later the Polish divisions were moved closer to the African front into Syria and Palestine, 1,600 more Polish soldiers of Jewish faith found their way into the Jewish settlements of Palestine, leaving the Polish Army behind.

It is known that despite the law which gave the Polish authorities the right to seek those who fled, there is only one instance of such a search undertaken by the Polish and British military police, and this on repeated insistence of the British authorities.

When the Polish Army left Palestine and moved into Italy where it is now in the front battle line, 400 out of the original 4,000 Jews went along and are now fighting there. In the very first days of the battle 4 Jewish soldiers of the Polish Army won particular distinction for bravery—2 of them, Corp. Benjamin Kagan and Pvt. Henry Jedwab, in the ranks of Polish commandos, and 2 others, Corp. Fischel Krieger and Abraham Szapiro, were distinguished by the Polish commander in chief, General Sosnkowski, with the Polish decoration of Cross of Bravery.

When the Polish Army was formed in France by General Sikorski it accepted into its ranks several hundred Polish citizens of Jewish faith who lived in France, Belgium, and Holland, in many instances since 10 and 15 years, but still having maintained some ties with their mother country. After a determined fight as the rear guard of the retreating French armies, over 35,000 of the Polish soldiers were brought safely by General Sikorski to England, taking with them almost 700 Jewish soldiers who thus escaped the terrible plight which was the fate of their coreligionists in German occupied France. This group of Jewish soldiers served in the Polish ranks until this winter preparing for the day of invasion and of liberation of Europe.

A short time ago a strange agitation of foreign origin which should not be named, started its work among those soldiers. The awful strain of terrible news from their homes which is daily reaching both the Poles and the Jews, had probably also its influence. Quietly and without publicity the Polish military authorities negotiated with the British military authorities for the transfer into the British Army of 300 Jewish soldiers who volunteered for the British service.

And, finally, a very small group, 27 or 30 Jewish soldiers, went A. W. O. L. recently, some of them from outfits slated to spearhead the Allied invasion of Europe. It is obvious that no British, no American, and no other military authority could permit to overlook such acts without justice intervening. It is obvious, too, as many times stated by Polish authorities, that every occurrence of personal enmity in the military rank and file will be appropriately punished.

Address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial commenting on the address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey before the American Newspaper Publishers' Association on April 27 which appeared in the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News under date of April 28:

A NOTABLE STATEMENT

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey made clear his views in relation to foreign policy in his address last night before the American Newspaper Publishers' Association. Fundamentally his position is that expressed in the Republican Mackinac declaration, which he helped to draw and in the Fulbright and Connally resolutions passed overwhelmingly by Congress. Simply stated, he stands for total crushing victory of the enemy and for international collaboration—backed by adequate force—to maintain the peace and to establish a co-operative order for world economic progress.

Governor Dewey went much further in particularizing as to war aims and post-war peace structure than have any statements from administration sources, which largely have dealt in generalities. "No initial measures against Germany and Japan, however drastic, will have permanent value," he declared, "unless they fall within the setting of a durable cohesion between Great Britain and ourselves, together, I hope, with Russia and China." He was at the same time positive on the necessity for Soviet-American understanding, which he asserted must never be allowed to relapse into the old suspicions that clouded relations between them for a quarter of a century. "Russian affairs are in the hands of hard-headed, realistic leaders," he said. "That is nothing we should be afraid of, provided we are equally realistic and devoted to our country. If we are, the United States and Russia can deal with each other with candor while building firm mutual respect and friendship."

Warning against a repetition of the mistakes of the last war, Governor Dewey named three objectives of a foreign policy:

First. To carry on the war to total crushing victory, and in so doing to drive home to the aggressor nations a lesson that will never be forgotten.

Second. To establish in our relations with other nations conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability not only for the sake of the world, but also to the end that our own people may enjoy a high level of employment in an increasingly prosperous world.

Third. To build a structure of peace through international collaboration, backed by adequate force to prevent future wars.

Governor Dewey's address was pitched on the high plane of principle. He commended Secretary of State Hull's recent utterances on foreign policy but he noted the doubts that have arisen in the minds of many Americans as to whether expediency in the practices of our relations with other countries has not in many instances overtaken the principles set forth by Mr. Hull. There is also concern, he said, as to whether much of our foreign policy is not being handled

privately by the President, rather than through the established diplomatic machinery.

Taken along with similar utterances by other Republican leaders as well as the statements of administration spokesmen, Governor Dewey's program forms the basis for removing fundamental issues of American foreign policy from partisan controversy. The real issues of the coming campaign have to do with the character of leadership; and the Republicans offer a progressive program and a fresh viewpoint, one unclouded by official responsibility for the mistakes of appeasement, international divisionism, and unpreparedness that led to the present war.

Finally, Governor Dewey, the leading possibility for the Republican Presidential nomination, has performed service for his country in taking an unequivocal stand for total victory and post-war collective security. He has struck a death blow to Axis hopes that a political division could be created in the United States on these issues—a division that might justify desperate measures to prolong the war. He has brought reassurance to the people of the Allied nations that the American people, whatever the outcome of the election, will assume their full responsibility in a world order for peace and progress. In so doing, Governor Dewey has made a real contribution, not only toward clarification of foreign policy issues, but toward winning the war.

Poland in the World of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. PRATT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, it is an auspicious occasion when both sides of this House can join in paying heartfelt tribute to our gallant ally, Poland, on her national day, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791. When the century before last was drawing to its close, the despotism of Frederick the Great of Prussia, the Czar of Russia, and the Empress of Austria dominated eastern Europe, and no country could unfurl with impunity the flag of liberty and of the rights of man. Poland paid for her temerity with 123 years of national extinction. After the last war—and for this we, her American friends, may take some credit to ourselves—Poland was reborn or rather she rose again from the dead and for 20 years, until the day of Hitler's unprovoked aggression in 1939, astonished the civilized world by her progress. To her people, held in ignorance by the partitioning powers, she brought education and enlightenment. In their train commerce and industry, fostered by individual enterprise, grew by leaps and bounds. Reasonable taxation permitted a gradual increase in salaries and wages, in earning power, and the standard of living rose. Poland was a well-governed, modern state. And when Germany is beaten, Poland will rise again, great and strong and independent. We owe it to our 5,000,000 Americans of Polish descent to see to it that the land from which they come, the land that was the first to rise in arms to oppose German might, shall suffer no injustice at the hands of the 3 great powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Russia—banded together to win this war and establish on God's green earth, a just and lasting peace.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today as we celebrate the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution, it is a privilege dearly cherished to join with my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to the indomitable courage of the Polish people. Despite persecution of the most ruthless kind, despite the scourge of war and suffering, the Polish people have always maintained their love of freedom and their desire for representative government.

In the beautiful State of New York there are many loyal Americans of Polish ancestry among the thirteen and one-half million people it is my honor to represent. In my home city of Buffalo, for example, there are more than 200,000 Americans of Polish descent. Through my friends, neighbors, and classmates of Polish descent, I have come to appreciate and admire the fine qualities which are typical of the people of that great nation. Throughout the long and terrible months of the present world conflict, those qualities have been displayed in a truly heroic manner. Liberty-loving men and women everywhere have marveled at the brave resistance of the Polish people to the Nazi reign of terror.

Our hearts are heavy with sorrow when we consider the fact that this year Polish Constitution Day cannot be a celebration in the usual meaning of that word. It cannot be a celebration because on this May 3, 1944, men, women, and children in occupied Poland are suffering untold agony. Not only have freedom and liberty been wrested from them, but today they live, if it can be called living, under the yoke of the most cruel tyranny in modern history. We need not rehearse the ghastly details of that brutal reign, the systematic starving and torture of children, the unspeakable treatment of women whose only crime is that of loyalty to their beloved country, the death of stalwart Polish patriots, the enforced slavery of an entire people. But when we reflect upon such facts, which constitute so sickening a blot upon the page of human history, we realize that this day must be regarded not as a celebration, but rather as a rededication to the sacred principles of freedom and representative government which are embodied in the Polish Constitution.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes the ideal so well expressed by Chief Justice Marshall when he wrote, "That the people have an original right to establish for their future government such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness, is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected." Similarly the Polish Constitution expresses the great principle that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." The Polish people, believing as they do so fervently in self-government, will never cease to fight until Poland is restored as a free, sovereign, and independent nation.

As we join in this tribute to Poland on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, those of us who know and appreciate the intelligence, the fortitude, and the idealism of the Polish people have complete faith that Poland will again be free.

May God speed the coming of that day.

Secretary Hull's Fine Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas News of April 28, 1944, commending the record of Secretary Hull:

WISE OLD EAGLE

New details that illuminate, and are intended to justify, the policies of the State Department in these trying years of world-changing war are revealed by Kingsbury Smith, a Washington writer, in the May issue of the Reader's Digest. The wisdom of the course followed by Secretary Hull at every stage of the conflict, often adhered to in the face of stormy criticism, has been attested by results, in the opinion of this close-up observer who ends his spotlighting with this appraisal: "The wise old eagle who hovers over the conduct of affairs at the State Department may not live to see all his principles applied in this world, but he has steered a course in American foreign policy to which posterity is likely to pay tribute."

The true stature of a public servant of any period must be determined by the future's appraisement. What posterity will appraise in the light of results, and what many of the wise old eagle's contemporaries have found it hard to explain, are the long-sustained relations with the Vichy government, the long-delayed recognition of General de Gaulle, as yet only partially extended, and

the tolerant dealings with Spain up to the time of the recent note which was couched in stronger terms.

By playing ball with Vichy for several extra innings, Kingsbury Smith notes, the French Fleet was saved for the Allies along with air bases in Africa, and, but for this, Hitler could have controlled the South Atlantic and there would have been no landing of American forces in north Africa, an accomplishment that marked a change in the war. By dealing with Franco Spain, the bulk of Spanish trade is now with this country and Great Britain, and Germany has been deprived of many vital war materials from that source. By withholding recognition from de Gaulle, the State Department has adhered consistently to its determination to permit the French people, after liberation, to choose their own form of government and pick their own leaders. It has been made plain that if de Gaulle should be the popular choice to head the French Government, recognition would be readily extended. Employment of Gestapo methods by the Free French Committee in acts known only to the State Department is cited by this commentator as the sound reason for lack of endorsement and denial of recognition.

All facts that should be known eventually will be revealed as a part of history. The wise old eagle will have as full justification as any man in his post of responsibility in such a troubled time could hope for as the conscientious, but wholly human, servant of an individualistic and opinionated democracy.

FDO 79

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture was considering the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945, some controversy developed over the administration of FDO 79, a food-distribution order relating to the handling of milk and milk products and the imposition of a handling charge on certain handlers. The subcommittee thereupon inserted a proviso in the bill relating to this matter.

Subsequently it came to my attention that in other sections of the country milk dealers felt that FDO 79 was proving very useful and effective, and in support of that position I am herewith inserting a memorandum, dated April 18, 1944, from the International Association of Milk Dealers, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., relative to FDO 79:

At the meeting of our war conservation committee and executive committee last Wednesday, President Skinner submitted the report received by him of unanimous recommendations made by members of the National Fluid Milk Conservation and Control Industry Advisory Committee of W. F. A. when they met in Washington recently. The national committee's position was endorsed by the two I. A. M. D. committees in every detail and President Skinner was authorized to urge all fluid-milk distributors to cooperate with the War Food Administration to insure the success of FDO 79 and, thereby, forestall possible coupon rationing.

President Skinner explains that the need for Nation-wide industry support now arises from the possibility of assessments which enable the order to function being knocked out by legal action or legislation. If this results in the dropping, or even the temporary suspension of FDO 79, more serious difficulties face the distributing industry in the future.

Members of the W. F. A.'s Industry Advisory Committee reported to War Food Administration officials at a meeting held April 11 in Washington that the milk-conservation order—FDO 79—is diverting substantial quantities of milk to manufacturing plants to meet the larger war requirements for evaporated milk, butter, cheese, and milk powder. As more troops move overseas even more of these products will be needed in the near future.

The sales limitations on milk dealers in FDO 79 represents the best method of channeling more milk into manufactured products. Under the order milk dealers may sell as much fluid milk as they sold last June, but not more. Cream and fluid milk byproducts are limited to 75 percent of the quantity sold in June 1943. These quotas are established for a month that enjoyed the highest sales of any month of record in the history of the industry.

Members of the W. F. A. committee unanimously adopted an 8-point resolution stating that "the objectives of the order are the joint responsibility of government and industry" and recommending "that the present method of financing the program be continued."

As the next 3 months of flush milk production will provoke a critical situation with respect to the sales quotas, continued cooperation between Government, industry, and consumers is most important.

A majority of the members suggested that some adjustment in the sales quotas be made during the imminent period of peak milk output to insure that all milk produced would be used.

The flush this year probably will be larger than ever before, whereas total production for the year might be slightly less than in 1943. Under these conditions and with war requirements for manufactured dairy products constantly increasing as soldiers go overseas, it is necessary to get as great a quantity of the surplus milk into manufactured dairy products as is possible. Otherwise it may be necessary later to reduce present quotas in order to supply these necessary products.

Milk distributor members of the industry advisory committee of W. F. A., prior to the last meeting with War Food Administration officials, unanimously adopted the following:

1. That Food Distribution Order 79 (the milk conservation order) is a necessary war measure.

2. That the objectives of this order are the joint responsibility of Government and industry.

3. That the milk industry is local in character and therefore that the administration of any regulation of this industry must be flexible and adaptable to local conditions to be equitable and efficient.

4. That the present system of operating FDO 79 makes possible local administration while achieving the over-all objective of the program—stabilization of fluid-milk consumption so as to make more milk available for manufactured dairy products for war use.

5. That the War Food Administration has done an excellent job of administering FDO 79.

6. That the record of compliance with this order by the industry has been outstanding because the need for the order is fully recognized and the method of administration has the cooperation of practically the entire industry.

7. That the present rate of administrative assessment is very low and is not an economic burden; and that producers as such are not assessed but only as they also become distributors of milk.

8. That the fluid-milk industry is predominantly in favor of administering the program through a handler assessment and this committee therefore recommends that the present method of financing the program be continued.

President Skinner further points out that if assessments supporting FDO 79 are eliminated and the order continued under usual governmental administrative procedures, we may only look about us and compare other Government programs to be convinced it will be more difficult for the fluid-milk industry to operate due to lack of flexibility.

The setting up of the usual Government administrative program could lead to the following:

1. A tendency to make emergency control permanent.

2. If no appropriations were made to carry on FDO 79 or a similar plan, coupon rationing would be the result.

3. Loss of right under FDO 79 which enables dealers to assist in working out allocations.

4. Loss of present broad-gaged, experienced market agents.

The most satisfactory solution from the milk distributors' point of view, suggests President Skinner, is for the industry to continue paying assessments and comply with FDO 79 regardless of a recent court decision or proposed legislation knocking out the assessment, thus keeping the present machinery in operation.

Many milk dealers have advised the House Appropriations Committee that they believe the assessment plan of financing FDO 79 should be continued during the war emergency, as it is the most satisfactory method yet devised of avoiding coupon rationing and preventing wartime disruption of milk marketing and distribution.

"FDO 79," said President Skinner, "is a remarkable demonstration of effective self-regulation and cooperation of industry with Government war objectives." It is a program immeasurably better than any other existing program of rationing, restriction, or allocation in the food field and it is his considered judgment that the program should be continued in its present form.

Our Job in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, before the Wethersfield Businessmen's and Civic Association annual banquet on April 27, 1944:

If we Americans who have been privileged to live for some years in the Far East have any particular contribution to make to our country's thinking in this time of confusion, it is, I believe, primarily because of the simple fact

that we have had the opportunity to come to know something about the peoples who live there and their psychology, and with whom we must, whether we like it or not, be dealing in this war and after it.

I think we will have to admit that we went into this war without the slightest understanding either of ourselves or of our enemies in the Pacific area. We need to examine the situation there just as a doctor examines the body of a patient at the autopsy table.

Where did we go wrong in our thinking that a nation with the size and strength and strategic advantages of America would allow herself to get into a position where a nation with nothing but a bunch of volcanoes like Japan could shake us like a dog shakes a rat for a year? We must learn so that we won't make at least these same mistakes again.

The Japanese used to say back in 1938, after they had conquered the area in which I was working, "We fear eventually Japan and America will have to go to war. We don't want that war. But the only language the white men understand is force. They have called the tune; we have to dance to it. If such a war comes, we Japanese will win. You Americans have a great deal more money and men and resources and territory; yes. But we Japanese have spirit. We will win. Well, maybe we won't win the first time, but if we don't win the first time, then we will win next time; if we don't win next time, then we will win the next time; some day we will win." And then usually they would add, "Or if we don't win, at least you will lose." Of course, that's about as good, in the long run.

Now the Japanese militarists are aware of the fact they aren't going to win this war. That was merely a long shot, a chance worth taking. They know they aren't going to win, but they are still wholly convinced that we are going to lose. And no one yet can be wholly sure they are not right. We can win. There is no question about that. But will we? Are we willing to go on 3 years, 5 years, 10 years? I believe so, but I don't know. And neither do you, and neither can anybody else know until the chips are down.

Did those who thought up that Doolittle raid imagine that we were going to jar the Japanese out of their wits? Well, if so, they hadn't spent much time with the Japanese people. Look at what one tiny island, Tarawa, cost. Then look at the Japanese mainland, where there are 70,000,000 people like the Japanese at Tarawa, and think how many Americans will die trying to take that, if we try to win the war that way.

Perhaps two stories will illustrate the psychology of the Japanese and Chinese peoples and give us some clues as to how to deal with them.

A Japanese division had its headquarters in our city. I spent many hours negotiating with its officers on all sorts of matters, trying to protect the 1,700 women and children refugees in our compound from the things that were happening everywhere else in the city, trying to get permission to keep our hospitals and schools operating, etc.

One day in the midst of a conversation I inadvertently mentioned to the Japanese chief of staff that I had served as an officer in the United States Field Artillery in the last war. He looked at me rather hesitantly for a moment and then his face broke into a smile. Up to that time I was a troublesome neutral and a potential enemy, but when he learned I once had had military training, too, he apparently accepted me as a buddy, as if all people whoever had military training anywhere would automatically think the same as he did.

He said, "You had a hard time defeating the Germans but nothing like we have defeating these Chinese." I asked, "What do you mean? The Germans are considered to have one of the best, if not the best, military machine in the world."

He replied, "It is easier to defeat the Germans than it is to defeat the Chinese, because the Germans know how to fight. But the Chinese don't know how to fight. Therefore, it is harder to defeat them.

I began to get a glimmer of light, but I asked for further explanation. He said, "Military science is the same all over the world; the trouble is the Chinese don't understand it; that's why it's hard to defeat them. You could look at the map and study the terrain and you could tell where the Germans would put their artillery, where their infantry would come; but the Chinese never put them in the right place. You have no idea how hard it is to conquer them." He said, "We have defeated them and defeated them, and they still won't sue for peace."

I suppose that is what the Japanese mean when they say the Chinese are insincere.

Surely that gives us some insight into the Japanese mentality.

The key conclusion can be stated in one sentence. In fighting the Japanese, don't fight according to the book. If we just resist their offensives, planned and initiated at their time and place, they will be carried out with the utmost precision and with a meticulous attention to the most minute detail, such as we or any western nation are not capable of. They will be just as accurate and efficient as at Pearl Harbor, which was probably the single most brilliantly executed military feat in all history.

But, on the other hand, if we will meet Japanese offensives, not with defense but by taking the offensive ourselves and by unorthodox tactics, her military machine can be thrown out of stride, even disorganized, as easily as any great army in history.

The Chinese have proved that, over and over again. With nothing but their wits and courage, they made monkeys out of the Japanese repeatedly. And yet, in spite of all those years of Chinese experience, we insisted during the first year—and some still are insisting—on fighting Japan according to the book.

We were fools for too long not to learn more from China. The Chinese didn't have guns so they used their wits. Now they have got to have some guns in addition to their wits, but we have got to get more wits in addition to our guns.

The other story reveals the Chinese technique. A Chinese captain was brought in 60 days after he had been wounded up at the front. He had been carried from one village to the next by Chinese volunteers, civilians. His leg was so badly infected I had to take it off. As he was gradually recovering he said to me one day, "When I was a student in high school we studied English as our foreign language, and once we read a poem called, The Charge of the Light Brigade. Did you ever read that poem?"

When I replied that I had, he asked "You don't think that ever really happened, do you?"

"Oh, yes," I said, "that's true."

"How could it happen? It says in the beginning of the poem that they couldn't succeed, that there were cannon in front of them, cannon to the right of them, cannon to the left of them. Still they went on? Why?"

"Because that was the plan; that was the order."

"But," he said, "It says right in the poem that they knew the order was a mistake, someone had blundered. Still they went ahead?"

"Yes."

"Why?"

"That's the way we fight, discipline, carry out orders."

He shook his head, "We Chinese don't fight that way. You westerners say, 'They shall not pass,' but even though you say that, sometimes they do pass; then what do you do? You fight like walls," he went on, "and not matter how thick a wall is you can break it if you concentrate enough power against it. We Chinese don't fight like walls; we fight like glue. You can't shatter glue. All you can do with glue is shove your fist into it, and the net result is that it's hard to get your fist out. And if you do get it out, pretty soon you can't see where it was."

There are two philosophies of waging war.

If we insist on fighting Japan according to the old orthodox plans, we will have incredible casualties. Fortunately, it appears we are learning, the hard way. That was the meaning of the interview with Admiral King, head of the American Navy, when he made an official statement a few months ago that the key to our war with Japan is China and he emphasized it by asking us to imagine what our situation would be if China were to drop out of the war. He knows how almost impossible it would be to beat Japan without China's wholehearted cooperation, and therefore he knows that we can't alone hold Japan until we can dispose of Hitler and get our full strength into the Pacific; we can do it only if our allies hold. Thank God we have a man at the head of the American Navy who is big enough to stand up and say so. It must have been an awful pill to swallow. Since the Spanish-American War our Navy has had one great commission and that was to take care of Japan; it carried out its Pacific maneuvers in great detail almost every year against Japan as the hypothetical enemy. And now its leaders frankly state "We can't do it alone."

The same thing was said by General Arnold in his report the first of January, and later by Admiral Nimitz. At last our strategists are forced to see what Chiang Kai-shek and General Chennault have been pleading with them to see since 1937—that the real way to defeat Japan was by land and air attack from China; that the best place from which to defend the Aleutians is not the Aleutians, it is China; and the best place from which to defend California and Hawaii is not California and Hawaii, it is China. The place from which to defend Australia is not Australia, it is China. The place to defeat Japan—the admirals admit it now, you don't have to take my word for it—has got to be China.

So, in addition to knowing our enemy and knowing ourselves, we must know our allies. Only by their holding can we be enabled to finish first in Europe and then bring our full strength into the Pacific to attack from the continent. What is the condition of our allies in Asia?

Begin at the north with Russia. Many Americans assume that Russia is not helping at all in our far eastern war. That is not true. Russia has been tying up five or six hundred thousand of Japan's best troops in Manchuria and Korea. Japan has never sent against us on the ground, to date, anything but her second team, except the Imperial Marines at Tarawa. Her first team has been and still is in Mongolia, Manchuria, and Korea. She dare not remove them. So actually Russia, without being in the war against Japan at all, is neutralizing more Japanese ground forces than we and the British and French and Dutch combined are neutralizing.

Second, it comes with rather poor grace, being perfectly blunt, for us who haven't gotten even one good front going yet to start out by demanding that Russia open a second front, when actually she has at least one front, and going pretty well, too.

The third thing is the assumption we could hold the much-discussed Siberian bases if Russia gave them to us. There are two important considerations about any naval or air base. One is its usefulness as a place from which to attack; the other is the ability to defend it against attack.

On the map you see how the Siberian border comes way down to the sea at Vladi-

vostok, flanked for several hundred miles by Manchuria and Korea. Why, there are a score of places where the Japanese could overnight cut the Trans-Siberian railroad, the lines of supply to those bases, after an outbreak of war between Japan and Russia. Let's wait until we are in a position to defend those bases. I think we will get them when we can use them. We haven't had enough force at any time yet to use fully the bases we do have. Witness the appeals from MacArthur. If we haven't enough air power for the bases we do have, should we be demanding more bases that we can't yet defend, to say nothing of using fully?

Moreover, if Russia gave us those bases now, we would instantly lose what has been our best route of supplies to Russia, although probably overtaken recently by the Iran route. As many as three-fourths of the vessels in some convoys on the northern route to Murmansk in the summer of 1942 were sunk. Whereas every week out of Vancouver or Seattle or Portland fully lighted Liberty ships flying the Russian flag and loaded with war materials are sailing across the Pacific Ocean, right through the Japanese Islands into Vladivostok and other Siberian ports taking critical material to our Russian allies.

Russia is holding the northern flank. The center is being held by the Chinese. For almost 7 years Japan has thrown everything she could against the Chinese and has not been able to crack them. It has been an amazing phenomenon. Not a single white person in China or Asia, including myself, thought the Chinese could take what they have withstood.

The Chinese are a long-suffering people. They don't like trouble. They will yield to avoid it. Five times in 6 years they gave up to Japan, not pieces of somebody else's territory, as England and France did at Munich, but pieces of their own territory, to try to keep out of war. But when they found out that Japan could not be appeased, that they faced a choice, not between war and peace, but between war and slavery, they discovered that though they despised war, ghastly and terrible and cruel as it is, still it wasn't the worst thing in the world. Slavery was worse.

And when the Japanese committed the incredible blunder of not understanding the Chinese any better than we understood the Japanese, and when they attacked the Chinese homes, they bared a core of steel in the Chinese character, that even we who lived there did not realize existed.

China has demonstrated through almost 7 years that she can take the worst that Japan can send against her. She has endured bombings, invasion, migrations of more than 50,000,000 of her people, lack of medicines and even of anesthetics, starvation and the worst famine in two of three provinces since 1922, inflation so that the rice that used to cost $4 for 130 pounds costs up to $6,000 today, in some parts of China. All these China has gone through and never wavered. Only one thing could cause her to waver, a loss of expectation that out of her struggle she will eventually get full freedom and equal treatment among the nations of the world, a loss of confidence in the ultimate motives of her allies. That is the one thing that could break China's will to resist actively and offensively. And there are some reasons—I wish there were not, but there are—why thoughtful Chinese are being reluctantly driven to the conclusion that there is no intention on the part of some of their allies to help or even to allow China to become free and strong in her own right.

I don't like to mention these things, but we might as well be frank. They are there, and we will fool ourselves as badly as we fooled ourselves about Japan and Hitler if we don't recognize their existence and their danger.

What would you think if you were a Chinese and you observed such things as these: First, that the white man never made one real move against Japan's aggressions until Japan went into Indochina, that is, began to meddle with the white man's colonial system. Protests, oh yes, and condemnations, but never a real move until she began to interfere with the white man's empires.

Second, China was startled beyond comprehension that we, the great white powers, should prove so weak. For years we had watched Japan move ever southward, step by step by step, and yet we were caught absolutely flat-footed in our own possessions, all of us. How could we be so dumb?

And then third, our failure, our American failure, to make good on the promises that the President made on March 15, 1941, the week after the passage of the Lend-Lease Act. You remember what he said. He promised to China, as well as to the others, "unqualified, immediate, all-out aid." Now, of course, he should not have made any such promise as that. The Chinese were astonished at it; they never expected any such promise, because they knew what it involved. And for us now to try to excuse ourselves by saying, "Look at the difficulties in transportation." Sure, but those difficulties of mountain and jungle had been there all along. The Chinese knew full well the difficulties, they didn't see how we could do it; but we are the people who are always boasting that we can do the impossible, so when the responsible head of the great Nation to whom the Chinese had always looked as to no other made a flat, blanket commitment, they supposed we must have some way to deliver the goods. It may make other people feel better temporarily for us to make such promises. It raises their morale 10 points, but then if we don't make good, it falls 30 points. I don't like to say that because I may be accused of being partisan; but it is not partisan in the least. To report something unfavorable that isn't true is partisan; but to refuse to tell what is true just because it is unfavorable is equally partisan. We are first of all Americans.

Then the orientals observed, fourth, the calculated, carefully repeated speeches of Mr. Churchill. I am reluctant to bring this up because the last thing on earth I want to do is to create disunity among the Allies. Nobody can ever accuse me of being anti-British, because I was going up and down this country, as some of you know, 2 years before most Americans would believe that any of these aggressions abroad were a threat to us at all, begging that we help Britain in Europe and China in Asia, as the best way to serve our own interests in the long run. But we have no right to endanger the lives of thousands of American boys by keeping quiet on something that directly involves their lives and when even the stones are crying out.

You remember within a week of the time we landed in north Africa a year ago, and the tide began to turn, and for the first time it looked as if the Allies were certain to win, Mr. Churchill declared his views and his war aims. He said, "I have not become His Majesty's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

I haven't the slightest criticism of his trying to establish his policy. I admire him for his frankness. My criticism is that we haven't established our policy in equally unmistakable terms. He gets there first, you see, and drives down his stake. He declares his policy, and then if we come along with a different policy we are accused of creating disunity. In a sense he was the one creating disunity, because what he said was in opposition to the Atlantic Charter. If there is disunity, it was he who created it, not we.

A month later he made a world-wide radio address in which he said that it would be a good thing, probably, if the war didn't end all over the world at the same time. If the war were to end everywhere at the same time, the chances are the allies would start quarreling among themselves; but if Hitler should be knocked out, we still would have to defeat Japan, and the fact that we had to hang together for that purpose might give us, he thought, enough cohesion so that we would be able to settle Europe's problems. Which to the Chinese, and to you and me if we were Chinese, could mean only one thing—that prolongation of their sufferings was considered of no consequence. They had been in it 6 years, but that didn't make any difference; they were just so many millions of flies. The only thing that was important was that the allies get agreement in Europe, that European civilization be saved—as if European civilization on the basis of its behavior the last 50 years deserves to be saved! I don't like to say that; I never liked to tell a patient he had tuberculosis, but if a condition exists we had better face it.

And then Mr. Churchill last May sent a message to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in which he said, in essence. "Hold on until we finish in Europe, and then we will come over and rescue you." Now, may I suggest respectfully that the Chinese don't care to be rescued by the British or by the Americans or anybody else, any more than George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and the rest of the colonists wanted to be rescued by the French; no, indeed. They wanted the French to come in and help them get their American independence, not to have France come in and deal the deciding blow and then establish herself in control of the colonists in place of the British. Just so, what the Chinese want is not to change masters, but to gain their freedom from any master; and they have a right to expect some help from us in getting that freedom because they held the line for us so long before we woke up.

Now, the Chinese were not surprised unduly at these statements by Mr. Churchill. They are a wise, understanding, patient people. They know it would be a miracle if a man, brought up in Kipling's day in India, could suddenly begin to think differently about Asia and empires. They didn't expect that. The Chinese know that he is one of the last of a great but a dying dynasty, the Tories that built the British Empire. They know that he is a giant on the battlefield and they and we will never cease to be grateful for what he has done for us. They know also that another England is coming along in which they have confidence, as have I, and as have you.

That is, they did not expect a man with Mr. Churchill's background to come over to our side, our views on empires, but, on the other hand, they did not expect people with our background to go over to his side, his views. The thing that disturbs them most is not what he said; it is what we have not said and have not done. It is our appearing by our silence to acquiesce in the restoration of white men's empires in Asia, allowing ourselves to be in the position of seeming to have no war aims for ourselves other than the ones Mr. Churchill has for the English.

That is the dagger in China's heart, the doubt that the Allies have any intention to let her become truly free, lest it put similar ideas into the minds of other Asiatic peoples. That is awfully blunt, but we must recognize it. It may cost your boy's life out in the Pacific if you don't recognize and deal with it.

The Cairo Conference helped allay some of China's fears. The Chinese have been afraid, as well as some of us who have lived there, that the Allies had no real intention of completely destroying Japan's military power. They have been afraid, with good reasons which I can't recount in detail, that England

would try to fasten on Asia the old European balance-of-power system which led in Europe to one war after another and could only do the same in Asia. They have feared that when it came to a show-down the white man would decide it might not be a good thing to reduce Japan utterly, for maybe the Chinese would get expansive notions, maybe they would produce a man with his glands out of order who thought he ought to conquer the world. (Almost every other country has had at least one or two, but China never has had a one in 4,000 years.) Maybe Russia would start expanding too much in Asia. Perhaps it would be better just to clip Japan's wings a little and keep her there as a balance, a buffer against Russia and China. That is what China has been worried about. Cairo apparently dispelled that because we can't go back on the flat commitments at Cairo without being utterly dishonest. England and the United States there agreed not to stop until Japan is totally defeated and disarmed and Korea, Formosa, Manchuria, and the mandated islands taken from her. Without Korea and Manchuria she never could have started a world war. Without them she never can start another world war. And therefore the Chinese, even though they still have doubts as to the western nations' attitudes toward them, are nevertheless reassured greatly by our blanket commitments with regard to Japan. They have feared we might give in to Japan's peace moves, which will begin the minute Hitler folds up—powerful ones aimed at those in America and Britain who are tired of war.

Another thing that has encouraged the Chinese in the midst of all the discouragements I mentioned is the four-power declaration at Moscow. I think we must credit this largely to the common sense and statesmanship of Joseph Stalin. When Hull and Eden went to Moscow, Stalin, of course, was in the driver's seat. He didn't have to make a single concession to us. He could do as he pleased. Yet, he moved over and invited some of us up on the seat too—not only England and America but also China—for the four-power declaration. If he had been like some of the men of small caliber and short vision who sold him out at Munich, he could have said, "I will show them. I'll humiliate them" He could have done that. But he apparently is smart enough to know it would almost certainly have solidified the world against Russia and within 25 years or so his country would be at war with the world. Stalin doesn't want that war, so he makes moves to reassure the other nations.

So, in the four-power declaration is clause 6, in which each nation pledges it will not use its troops after the war in the territory of another signatory nation for any purpose except the putting down of aggression, and then only after consultation with the nation in question. To the Chinese that means Manchuria. The Chinese know that after they get Manchuria back, Russia could take it over if it chose. But no, Stalin promises that he will not move Russian troops into Manchuria.

Those two declarations don't say all we wish, but I think we should rejoice in what they do say. There are two ways you can look at a situation. You can look at this glass of water and complain because it is half empty, or you can say, "It's at least half full." I think that our only sensible course is to take these recent declarations at their face value until proven otherwise, and hope they will lead to complete fulfillment eventually.

To continue the discussion of our allies: Russia holds the northern flank. China holds the center. On the southern flank there are other allies. First, the Philippines. I wish I had enough time to discuss the situation there. I think I will have to pass it by except to say that it is not too good. It is utterly unrealistic to imagine the Japanese have not made a lot of progress with their Asia-for-the-Asiatics slogan. Many of those Filipino officials who are in Japan's puppet government did not join because they like it or are pro-Japanese. They are merely hard-headed and practical. They could see no evidence that America would ever retake the islands. Therefore, why not make the best of the situation? There has been more disaffection in the Philippines than you realize. I hope and believe recent events will reverse the trend.

Now we come to the Dutch East Indies. The Dutch Government has come along with some concessions, some promises that, after several hundred years of control, they will take some real steps toward a sort of dominion status for the Indies. Better late than never.

The blackest spot on our side in Asia is the British colonies. I don't like to say this. I have British blood in my veins, as have most of you. I love Great Britain, the fine things in England's glorious past, yes, and that are there now. It hurts me that some blind Tories should destroy her through failure to understand the times in which we live. That's what they are doing, unwittingly. Time marches on and they cannot hold it back. The peoples of the Orient are on the move. No one can hold them down, no one can drive them. Japan tried that and has found out she couldn't. What makes us or Britain think we can?

In order to hold China, we have got to hold India, have got to hold Burma. They are the only bases from which we can get planes and roads to China, yet it is not because we need India and Burma for themselve, or for their resources, great as India's are. It is because we must have them as bases for the war against Japan that I plead for England to change her policy in order to gain and hold India's loyalty to the Allied cause.

Her unwillingness to make a bold movement toward reconciliation with the Indian leaders is most discouraging. It has got to come from England. But pride and tradition prevent. Let me illustrate the point by looking at Hong Kong, for instance. The Chinese aren't greatly worried about Hong Kong. England does not have a choice between giving it back to China, or not giving it back. Her only choice is between having sense enough to give it back now with a generous gesture and thereby make Hong Kong into a gigantic center of mutually profitable British and Chinese trade, or stubbornly hanging on to Hong Kong and having it become just a useless island, a drain upon the British Treasury. The Chinese can and will break Hong Kong by boycott. They did it once before, and they will do it again, if necessary. England will not gain, but will lose the good will of 450,000,000 Chinese, the greatest potential market in the world, just for the pride of saying, "We are going to hold it."

Some westerners don't see the trend in Asia. In modern times communication into China has been almost entirely by sea. On her south were the Himalayan Mountains, on the west the Tibetan Plateau, on the northwest the Gobi Desert, and on the north the frozen Siberian plains and forests. China was at the mercy of Britain, America, and Japan because they controlled the only open frontier, the sea.

But on the northwest China has a 2,000-mile-long land border with Russia. Russia knows how to make the roads and railroads to open those backward areas where China's great resources wait to be developed. If we don't watch ourselves, China is going to be oriented toward the heart of Asia instead of toward the sea. Russia can have the lion's share in developing China, if we continue to be blind and short-sighted.

In the last war, looking back upon it, we see the most important thing that happened was not any of the things that seemed important then—it was the Russian Revolution. I am willing to predict that 50 years from now, and probably in less time, we will see that one of the most important things in this war, along with the emergency of a free, independent China, was the Indian Revolution. You are not allowed to hear about that revolution. But it is going on just the same. Will the Indians and Chinese be for or against the west?

This brings us to one of the two most crucial questions of the whole war. Is this a war for freedom for all people as they fit themselves for it? Or is it only for the freedom of the self-selected peoples of the west? We are in an intolerable position, fighting for our freedom while we fight other people who are fighting for their freedom. When some French saboteurs wreck a German train, they are wonderful patriots. When some Chinese guerrillas wreck a Japanese railroad, the Chinese are wonderful patriots. When Indian patriots trying to get their freedom wreck a British railroad, they are dogs and traitors.

There are a billion people in Asia. They are awakening and no one can put them back to sleep. We will either anticipate what is inevitable, accept it, and get in at the start, and thereby gain enormous good will, or we will just cut off our own noses.

The Chinese, and oriental people generally, still trust the Americans, as I think no nation in history has ever been trusted, yes, they even look upon us with affectionate regard. Why? Because of certain things in our past. They never forget the fact that we took over the Philippines and, instead of making them the first colony in a new empire, made them a republic, set a date, and promised to give them their independence—a new chapter in the history of colonies.

They trust us because they know that although for a hundred and twenty-five years we had the power to take over the whole Western Hemisphere, we didn't do so. Every republic in the hemisphere today is independent. Hitler thinks and the Japanese think, and I suspect Churchill thinks, that the world will respect them because of the way they wield their power over others. China and Asia respect America because of they way she has not wielded her power over smaller nations. That is why they trust us; that is why we can lead—if only we will lead steadfastly in the same direction in which our forefathers started this Nation when they founded it.

Again, the Chinese never forget our 135 years of missionary work there—schools, hospitals, agricultural stations, churches, helping people—not giving them things, but helping them, strengthening them. You may have thought missionary work was rather insignificant, a sort of harmless philanthropy. But I tell you one good mission station does more for permanent friendship and peace than any battleship ever built. I don't know whether I will ever be able to do much good for my country as a Congressman, but I know the 10 years I spent as a missionary in China did a tremendous amount of good for America, although that, of course, was not the primary purpose I had in mind.

The Chinese don't forget that way back at the end of the last century, when the other nations were dividing China up, it was America's announcement of the open-door policy and resolute adherence to it which prevented the other powers from dismembering her then. They don't forget that when the other nations grabbed their indemnities after the Boxer Rebellion we took ours and returned it to China to build a great university there and to help over 4,600 selected Chinese students in the next 40 years to come to American universities and learn our ideas and skills and go back imbued with American

ideals to be the leaders of China. There was never an investment in all of history that has paid larger dividends.

The Chinese veritably love General Chennault and the Flying Tigers. They still have an unbelievable, almost pathetic confidence in America, in spite of some less worthy chapters, like our arming of the Japanese and our refusal to relinquish extraterritoriality until we no longer had it to give back. They are a mature, experienced people. They know everybody gets off on the wrong track occasionally. But the main line of America's history has been toward freedom and equality for all.

One action of our Congress last fall has done more than any other single thing to reassure Asia as to our real war aims. It was the repeal of the old Chinese Exclusion Acts, and putting Chinese immigration on a basis of equality with our other allies. It was a deed, not just a word. The same quota formula which admits over 65,000 English a year will admit only 105 selected Chinese. For such a tiny price we remove a long-standing stigma, start treating them as equal human beings, instead of as biological inferiors. That is recognized instantly by all orientals as a revelation of our basic attitudes and war aims. That act will prove to be worth 20 American divisions.

One other thing has helped China's morale, the long hoped-for and spectacular successes of MacArthur and Halsey in the Southwest Pacific and of Nimitz in the central Pacific. For the first time there is visible to all real evidence that we have both the will and the ability to come back. You and I have known all along. They had faith but would not really be sure till they could see.

To sum up, then: Our first job in the Pacific is to understand our enemies, our allies, and ourselves. Second, we have got to win the military offensive. We can't win on the defensive. We must get more guns, planes, tanks, men to Asia. There never again can be a decent, orderly, secure world for America, unless there is a defeat of the thing that Hitlerism and Japanese militarism represent. But we can get that defeat, as we did once before, and still not get a decent world.

Therefore, third, we must also win the political offensive. That is where we have thus far failed worst. The less we are able to get military supplies to the peoples of Asia, the more imperative it is that we get to them spiritual help, during these desperately dark months, more encouragement and restored confidence in our ultimate aims. The harder it is to take the military offensive now, the more imperative it is that we win the political offensive quickly. That means that we in America must think through what we ourselves really believe, and how we can make the war of maximum abiding benefit.

I believe we in America today are in the valley of decision. We are at a crossroads. There are four main paths before us, each being advocated by some as the way to get security. My judgment is that the basic decisions we make now as to the directions we shall take, the attitudes and policies we adopt in these next critical months are likely to determine our fate and that of much of the world for a good many decades.

The first way, of course, is to try to go back to isolationism. It was once possible because we had two wide oceans that gave us physical separation from the rest of the world. But that separation is gone. We ourselves destroyed it with our own inventions. We, not the Germans, invented the steamboat. We, not the Japanese, invented the airplane. We, not the Italians, invented the submarine. We ate up that cake of our isolation with our own inventions and still thought we had it. Our own inventions, the ability of the airplane to ignore all land and sea boundaries, and the fact that other nations will not ignore us no matter how much we want to ignore them, make it impossible for us ever again to escape the world.

The second possible path is American imperialism. Some say that since we can't escape the world then we must run it. We must get control of the key air bases, the strategic islands, the main arteries of trade. We must build up an army and an air force and a navy that will cover the seven seas and make ourselves so strong that nobody can ever threaten us.

That sounds big, but let us look at it coolly for a moment. Have we got what it would take? In the first place, it would mean that one to three million American boys would never be able to return to civilian life. Your boy won't get back into civilian clothes, ever. Is that what you want out of this war? Permanent militarization of America?

In the second place, it would cost fifteen to twenty-five billion of dollars for armaments in our National Budget every year. We appropriated $106,000,000,000 for armaments last year. Of course, there isn't that much real money in the world, but we appropriated it nevertheless. The total to date for the war is $544,000,000,000. How many years do we think we can stand that rate of expenditure? Some day, even under these new-fangled ideas of economics, we are going to have to balance the Budget, and there are only two ways of doing it; one is by reducing expenditures, and the other is by increasing income, that is, taxes. Now we can't reduce expenditures if we are going to embark on a policy of dominating the world and provide the armaments necessary for such a program. There is left, then, only one way—higher and higher taxes. That means we will have less money for clothes, less money for food, less money for homes, less money for comforts, education, travel. That means labor cannot get what it deserves; it means capital cannot get what it deserves; it means the farmer cannot get what he deserves. Each group begins to quarrel with the others, to blame everybody else for its steadily falling standard of living; we divide into factions and America goes the way of France—blocs and national disintegration. Or some man comes along with a hypnotic personality and says, "I will show you the way. Follow me." And millions of frustrated Americans will follow him—and lose our freedom in the process: Do we want that?

In the third place, we don't have adequate natural resources. We are going to be a "have not" Nation in many, many respects when we get through with this war. We are using up our resources like mad. Those we don't have we are getting from our allies. But if we embark upon a program of ruling the world, the other nations of the world will gang up against us just as surely as we now unite against those nations who seek to dominate us. The next time, Bolivia won't be our ally to sell us tin; the next time, Chile won't be on our side to sell us copper; the next time China won't be on our side to export tungsten to us; Turkey won't be on our side to sell us chrome. We don't have them, and we simply can't fight wars without them.

And, in the fourth place, we don't have the manpower. We are going to have at the end of the war less than 140,000,000 people, a little tired and asking only to be let alone. But there are almost 200,000,000 Russians, and they don't seem to be very tired. There are 450,000,000 Chinese, and they are aflame with the desire to be free, just as our forefathers were in 1776. There are 375,000,000 awakening in India. There are almost 150,000,000 in Latin America, restless and uneasy. And America, with 140,000,000, is going to rule the world? Such an attempt would be suicidal.

The third path is that advocated by those who say, "Well, if we can't escape the world and can't rule the world maybe we can buy the world." Some people have that idea. We are to feed the people of the world, clothe them, and provide them shelter, and then they will all love us, and we will have no more trouble. Of course, that notion is based on a lack of understanding of human nature. You don't win people's love by giving them things except in temporary emergencies. Most people don't really want to be given things; they want the chance to get them for themselves. If you train them only to receive from you, then when sooner or later you have to say "No," they hate you worse for the one time you refuse them than they love you for the 10 times you gave in. It has always proved an unsound philosophy to try to help people by giving them things, instead of helping them to get on their own feet so they can establish their own freedom from want. What kind of freedom is it that you are dependent on someone else for? By very definition that is not freedom. It is self-defeating in the long run because it destroys independence and will end initiative and self-respect.

Well, if we can't escape the world, and can't rule the world, and can't buy the world, what can we do? We can join the world. We can cooperate with it. Its peoples are on the move. Let's not fool ourselves. We can't hold them back, we can't fool them, we can't bribe them. But we can join them, move along with them; yes, we can lead them, if it be on a basis not of superior and inferior, but of working together for the good of all as the true way to promote the good of each.

This is not starry-eyed idealism, or sentimentality, or utopianism. This is stern, inescapable necessity if we would make our own country safe and secure. I recognize fully the risks in such cooperation, but look at the risks of trying to go it alone. To try to stand alone in this shrunken world is to be overwhelmed. Our best hope for security is by working with other peoples of like mind to achieve in full, frank cooperation agreement as to the rules and procedures by which life and intercourse on this plane are to be conducted. They must be agreements that will be to the benefit of all parties concerned, and therefore will serve the vital interests of each. Otherwise, we cannot expect the agreements to be adhered to faithfully.

I am not greatly disturbed at the moment with the actual details of such organization. It is not possible to settle the exact form of it now, because the exact circumstances with which we will be dealing are not yet apparent. I am perfectly confident, however, that if we and the other peoples of the world see, first of all, that we must find some other way than war of solving our disputes—because neither we nor the world can stand these periodic returns to the jungle—then we can overcome the spirit of defeatism which tends t say that because it never was done, therefore it can't be done. We have plenty of able, resourceful, experienced leaders who can work out the actual machinery when we see that we must.

If we in America are sufficiently intelligent and resourceful and wise in our own American interests to be able to work out with our allies ways by which we can jointly win the war, then surely we are sufficiently intelligent and resourceful and wise in our own American interests to be able to work out with those same allies ways by which we can jointly win the peace, jointly establish order based on law and mutual agreement, and jointly prevent these periodic returns to the jungle.

The sufferings through which our country and the world is going can be either death pangs or birth pangs. They can be the end of all that freemen have struggled for through centuries and mark the beginning of a return to the Dark Ages, because mankind and civilization cannot stand more of these wars.

Or, they can be the sufferings that attend the birth of a new era in history, with greater material, cultural, and social richness than we have ever glimpsed or dreamed.

Which they are to be depends, more than anything else in the world, I believe, on the way we in America in the next few months decide to go in cooperation, with other freemen.

Thank God our country is one of the few remaining places in the world where the common people, just like ourselves here this afternoon, still can determine their own destiny—if they will.

Letter of Rabbi Baruch Korff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1944.*

Congressman JAMES M. CURLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was deeply moved by the beacon of freedom you so ably held aloft on two occasions in the House of Representatives, once when you declared that the Jews of America, who constitute only 4 percent of our population, number 7 percent of our armed forces. This you linked to a great tradition which we have inherited from the Revolutionary patriot and financier, Haym Salomon, whose contribution to the birth of America will remain in the archives of our independence. Another occasion when you excelled in paying tribute to Jewry was when you addressed the House on the subject Mass Murder of Jews Must Stop. In conjunction with the above I should like to have a word in the midst of prevailing chaos, for I, too, was among the afflicted.

While at one time I thought that we Jews stand alone, marked for annihilation by the most ruthless enemy of mankind, I was gratified, indeed, to find that millions of Americans are too horrified and angered over the inhuman persecution by Hitler's gang of the helpless minorities of Europe. I find that all of us have a common cause, the saving of these people. If we are going to save them we must act now, today, before it is too late.

This Government has made a beginning. It has created a War Refugee Board. It has charged that Board with taking "all measures within its power to rescue victims of enemy oppression who are in imminent danger of death and otherwise to afford those victims all possible relief and assistance consistent with the successful prosecution of the war." That is a fine and noble objective in keeping with the wishes of the American people. The question is: Have we taken all measures within our power to rescue those tortured victims of Hitler's hate? If we have not, then our hands, too, are stained with blood.

I believe that the War Refugee Board is working sincerely. It has opened the way for a trickle of refugees to come out of the Balkans via Turkey to Palestine. But a trickle is not enough. They should be coming in a great, swollen stream.

The eyes of the suffering people in the Balkans are turned westward to America. Those who have managed to survive the rigors of torture, disease, and privation are hungry, whipped, footsore, and weary. They look to us for help. Through Istanbul they may escape. But more ships are needed. It is the obligation of this Government to provide those ships insofar as military operations will permit.

We are a humanitarian people. We place a value on human life. We deplore needless waste. It is, therefore, our sacred obligation to exploit every conceivable means to save lives without delay. Here at home we can do no less than see to it that our immigration laws are so administered as to place no unnecessary obstacles to the entrance of refugees into this country under our quotas. Anything less would be out of keeping with the American tradition, out of keeping with the humanitarian instincts of civilized people.

Mr. John Pehle, Executive Director of the War Refugee Board, has manifested the American way of life before a world at war. He is, in my estimation, the redeemer of millions of human beings appointed to die. He, John Pehle, has lit for the helpless a candle of hope. We must follow it with a flare of action.

You, my dear Congressman, are well under way with that flare of action. Godspeed to you.

Yours very truly,

RABBI BARUCH KORFF.

Bill Bailey and the Four Pillars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Bill Bailey and the Four Pillars," written by F. P. McEvoy and published in the Reader's Digest for April 1944. The article is one of which I am very proud. It gives good advice to bankers in every county of my State, as well as in every county of the entire United States. I recommend its reading to every Senator and Representative. I know Mr. Bailey personally. He is entitled to the greatest credit for his fine work.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL BAILEY AND THE FOUR PILLARS

(By F. P. McEvoy)

In Tennessee you hear a lot about the resourcefulness of C. W. (Bill) Bailey, president of the First National Bank of Clarksville, and you can understand why, because he is a good example of what country bankers can do for their communities when they are willing to use their resources and resourcefulness.

Banker Bailey will tell you that an old farmer rocking on his porch changed his whole viewpoint about country banking—and revolutionized the agricultural economy of that part of Tennessee.

For more than a hundred years the rolling red fields of Montgomery County were planted to "dark-fired tobacco," so-called because it is cured for weeks in dark barns over smoldering fires, and for decades this heavy-feeding plant has been devastating the soil and impoverishing the farmers.

Bailey, who had worked up from a junior clerk to the presidency of the bank, had been sending out circular letters filled with advice for his farmer clients. But conditions steadily deterioriated—and so did the bank.

The one day Bailey called at a farmhouse. The old farmer, rocking on his porch, invited him to sit a spell. "I want to talk to you," he said. "I've been readin' your letters all these years and now I want you to listen to me.

"The farmers around here have forgotten how to farm. For a long time we've been growin' dark-fired tobacco because this was one of the few places where it would grow, and we made a lot of money. But those days are gone. Yet the farmers go right on plantin' nothin' but tobacco, and you go on lendin' 'em money to do it—when you should be tellin' 'em about the four pillars.

"The what?" asked Bailey.

"The four pillars," said the farmer. "Four crops for the four seasons. Tobacco to sell in the later winter, lambs to market in the spring, wheat to harvest in July, and cattle in the fall. That's the way our fathers farmed before we started makin' so much money out of tobacco that we got greedy and forgot how to farm so we'd have somethin' to sell all year round."

Banker Bailey went home that night and pondered. A few days later those on his mailing list received a letter explaining the Four Pillars of Income theory.

The proverbially conservative farmers scoffed at the idea. They told Bailey that sheep couldn't be raised in that region. But Bailey had learned that, in a nearby Kentucky county with similar soil and climate, the farmers grazed 58,000 sheep and received $1,000,000 a year for lambs and wool. And that county was much smaller than Montgomery.

Organizing an auto cavalcade of 63 farmers, Bailey led them over the border to Kentucky and let them see what they could do by showing them what was being done. They came home converted.

But where would they get the money to raise sheep? Bailey promised financial backing. What was equally important, he would also provide the know-how. Expert guidance in their new endeavors was needed to make the farmers good bank risks. So Bailey staffed his bank with men experienced in every department of this diversified farming program.

A folksy letter to the farmers, entitled "Twenty-five Ewes and a Ram," told about these experts and helped sell the idea. And when Bailey brought in a shipment of 2,000 cross-bred yearling ewes which he had purchased in Montana, the farmers came from miles around to buy. Those who couldn't pay cash were financed by Bailey, who loaned nearly $20,000 in the first few days. Within 5 years 30,000 sheep were grazing in Montgomery County, providing a cash crop of meat and wool for the late spring.

Meanwhile Bailey had set up several demonstration stock farms. The bank bought 50 purebred Hereford bulls from Oklahoma and loaned them to farmers free of charge, on condition that the service of these bulls be given free to neighbors. At the end of 2 years the farmers had the option of buying the bulls or returning them to the bank. Most bought, but not before a puzzled bank examiner in going over the bank's books found 50 bulls under "current assets." The

examiner questioned the asset, but Bailey convinced him. It is even rumored that his sense of humor led him to change the item to "bulls receivable."

Today practically every Montgomery County farmer owns a small herd furnishing milk and butter for the table, and calves for the fall market. Similar success attended Bailey's wheat-growing program. The wheat yield was down to 10 bushels an acre when Bailey started his "four pillars" campaign. It has climbed to 40 bushels.

Next, the marketing was made easy. At first farmers had to ship or truck their stock 26 miles to Hopkinsville, Ky. Then Bailey backed the local chamber of commerce in promoting a community-owned stockyard where, in the first 6 months of 1943, $750,000 worth of cattle were sold.

Now every Wednesday is auction day in Clarksville. The farmers flock to town, many of them with a calf or a few pigs bouncing in the back of the family jalopy. They can get as much at home as they would in Nashville; and as soon as Pa collects money at the auction, Ma takes it to the local stores to pay old accounts or make new purchases. As one merchant put it, "Now we have two Saturdays a week."

Bailey made two movies to spread his gospel. The first, Sheep in the Clarksville Trading Area, drew crowds whenever it was shown in churches and schools, all over the county. Later Bailey dramatized The Four Pillars in a color movie that ran for an hour and a half. The bank officials themselves made this picture with hand cameras, starring well-known farmer neighbors.

The film, which cost less than $1,500, unrolls a dramatic symphony of the four seasons, demonstrating step by step how to grow better tobacco, finer cattle, more abundant wheat, and how to conserve the soil. More than 15,000 farmers and their families have seen the picture.

Bailey has built up his community by lending money liberally but judiciously. His credit-information system is considered a miracle by other bankers. It is a complete record on each of the 7,500 farmers in the trading area, and is so accurate that a farmer can get a definite "Yes" or "No" on his application for a loan within 5 minutes.

Bailey tells bankers' meetings that the country banker must know three things: the people of his community, what the land can produce, and what the market is for the products. He points out that any country banker can do what he does: list all the landowners in his community from the tax records, break this list down into districts, consult at least two men in each district as to the standing of their neighbors, and cross-check these reports. He names the merchant, the doctor, the schoolteacher and the substantial farmer in each community as reliable sources of credit information.

Bailey meets his junior officers at 7:30 every morning in the bank to go over loans, new accounts and other routine business. Then the officers scatter out through the countryside to visit with the bank's farmer customers, ready with information and advice about individual problems. If a farmer needs a loan, they talk it over right there on the ground.

Bill Bailey, now in his sixties, is tall, burly, white-headed—a dynamic homespun prophet with honor in his own country. When the Graduate School of Banking holds it annual summer session at Rutgers University, in New Jersey, this rural oracle from a Tennessee town of 12,000 population draws a large and respectful hearing. Bankers by the scores have come from Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and the Carolinas to see for themselves what Bailey and the "four pillars" have done for Montgomery County.

As one of them put it, "the South has all the elements that have made great and prosperous civilizations: Mineral wealth, fertile soil, a long growing season, favorable climate—and yet the South is the poorest section of our country. Obviously what we need is more economic statesmen with the practical vision and enlightened self-interest of Country Banker Bill Bailey."

Put Humanity Above Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Il Progresso Italo-Americano of May 3, 1944:

PUT HUMANITY ABOVE BUREAUCRACY!

Before the Italian people overthrew Mussolini last July, outstanding representatives of our Italo-American community gathered to launch a movement for united and harmonious action. This committee set to work to help take Italy out of the war and aid in feeding and clothing and providing medicines for the hungry and ailing Italian people.

Many of the leading figures in this body had, for months, been appealing by short wave to the Italian masses to rise and revolt and cast out the Fascist regime which drove them into degradation and disastrous war. History has since shown what a magnificent response the people of Italy have given to these American appeals. When the Fascist dictatorship collapsed, the American Committee for Italian Democracy inscribed on its banners: Freedom and Bread for Liberated Italy.

Here were free citizens who were eager and ready to throw all of themselves into a splendid humanitarian and patriotic cause. They were not looking for material rewards, credit, glory, or power. They were concerned primarily with those to be helped. To them hunger and disease knew no political differences. Therefore, their relief organization was to be—like all bona fide American charity institutions—on the broadest all-inclusive basis, embodying all constructive forces, drawing in everybody who could be helpful.

But under our Government regulations, all such solicitations and collections of funds and contributions with which to secure food, clothes, and medicines are under the direction of the President's War Relief Control Board consisting of three members. Here the American Committee for Italian Democracy struck a snag in its efforts to help the starving women and children, the sick and the famished in freed Italy. One member of this Board died; another has been ill. Virtually, only one was left to constitute the functioning Board and to concentrate in his hands colossal power over the lives of millions of needy.

We are grieved to say that the destitute and the ailing among the freed Italian folks have been victimized by the lone member of this War Relief Board. Sundry subterfuges were resorted to to thwart the noble endeavors of the American committee to speed succor to starved Italy. Wearisome delay stalled every effort of these noted citizens to overcome poverty and pestilence in redeemed Italy. This was especially exasperating in view of the fact that this same War Relief Board has permitted extensive drives for aiding other national groups—like the Chinese, Yugoslavian, Greek, Russian, and others. These campaigns have been generously assisted by our Italo-American community.

This unwarranted conduct, rank prejudice, and injustice against the suffering Italian people, simply outrage all the dictates of humanity. By what authority can anyone arrogate to himself the right to deny free American citizens an opportunity to engage in humanitarian endeavors, in activities which can only serve our country in its crucial hours, and save thousands of lives of men, women, and children in unoccupied Italy? Why, the very name of this Board is misleading. Operating under the label of the President's War Relief Control Board, it gives the false impression that the President himself is aware of and responsible for its policies and malpractices. We know the President is beset and weighed down by countless grave problems and is, therefore, compelled to delegate authority to others.

Thus, without any justification, President Roosevelt, who has been a stanch friend of the Italian people, becomes a target of widespread resentment. Many tend to place on his shoulders the blame for the misdeeds of an individual official. We are firmly convinced that this Board must be immediately reorganized so that it can function on a fair and democratic basis—without malice or rancor against any needy nation fighting alongside of us against Axis savagery.

We call upon every fair-minded American citizen to write his or her Congressman and Senator in vigorous protest against the course taken to date by the War Relief Control Board—a course extremely harmful to everything that is near and dear to the American and Italian people. Let every organization and institution—civic, educational, fraternal, labor, and press—in our democratic ranks make its voice heard in unmistakable words to our legislators in Washington—to the President himself—in behalf of the unfortunate Italian victims of Nazi-Fascist aggression and brutality.

The fair name of our great American people and the very cause for which liberty-loving people everywhere are now paying with their limbs and lives cry aloud: Humanitarianism above bureaucracy. Away with all obstacles to adequate and prompt relief for the distressed and ill in freed Italy. Save the famished Italian people, our comrades in arms, from starvation, disease, and death.

The South's Share in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very informative article by Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn., entitled "The South's Share in the Nation."

THE SOUTH'S SHARE IN THE NATION

(By Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.)

The people of the 16 Southern States, from Texas to Maryland, comprise one-third of the

population of our country. It is quite fitting, therefore, that these same States comprise one-third of the Nation's land.

To rank on a par with the national average, the people of the South should also own one-third of the Nation's wealth and should receive one-third of the Nation's annual income. On a total basis, this is far from being the case. While it is impossible to give actual figures, it is unquestionably true that the per capita wealth and per capita income of the southern people are considerably below the national average. Some estimates place the southern per capita average as low as half the national average.

In only two important divisions of the main sources of income does the South exceed its proportionate one-third share: namely, the forests and the mines. The South produces 42 percent of the board lumber cut annually and 45 percent of the value of mineral products produced annually.

In a third important division of the main sources of income, the South receives almost exactly its one-third share. That is in the cash income from all products of the farm.

As fundamental as are these materials from the farms and the forests and the mines, however, they do not produce a very large percentage of the money values in present-day commerce. It is in the changing of these raw materials into finished products that the greater value accrues. In this respect, the South has been sadly lacking.

In 1940 the Southern States produced only 20 percent of the value of manufactured products. This means an average production per person of $248 compared with a national average of $433. The per capita income of the South from forests and mines and farms amounts to approximately $145 compared with the national average of $133, but this advantage of $12 per capita looks small indeed when compared with the $185 advantage the national average has over the South in value of manufactured products. The net result is to give the Nation a per capita advantage in income from these three main sources of raw materials and from manufactured products of $173 over the South.

The other main sources of income are from services rendered and from capital invested.

So far as wages and salaries for services rendered are concerned, here again the Southern States compare very unfavorably with the average for the Nation. The median income for the United States in March 1940 was $833. Of the 21 States with a better than national average, only 1—West Virginia—is among the 16 Southern States. Of the 16 lowest States in the Nation, 13 are among the Southern States. The 6 lowest States are Southern States.

The median wage or salary income for cities of 250,000 and over in population shows an even more striking difference between the South and the national average. There are 37 cities in the United States with a population of 250,000 or over. The 30 cities with the highest median wage or salary income are all outside the South; the 7 cities with the lowest median wage or salary income are all in the South.

There are a number of reasons for this lower median income for the South than the national average. The percentage of nonskilled labor in the South is much higher than in the North; 30 percent of the people in the South are Negroes compared with 10 percent for the Nation at large; a large percentage of the southern people are small farmers, where cash income does not play a large part in their welfare. Dry census figures overlook this latter point. It may well be possible that a small farmer, say in Mississippi, who has a cash income of $300 per year is just as well off as a clerk in New Jersey who has a cash income of four or five times as great. Perhaps the Mississippi farmer may be even better off insofar as the welfare of his family is concerned. There is a great difference between welfare and health in dollars, and the fact that the average per capita income in the South is considerably lower than the average for the rest of the Nation does not necessarily mean at all that the welfare of the people of the South is lower than that for the rest of the Nation.

Then, when we come to the per capita income from invested capital, the Southern States undoubtedly suffer in comparison with the national average. There are no total figures available to prove the point but we have indicative figures that unquestionably substantiate it. For instance, the Southern States have only 15 percent of the Nation's banking resources, a per capita average for the South of $281 compared with the Nation's $666; and only 10 percent of the savings deposits of the Nation, a per capita average for the South of $55 compared with the Nation's $190.

The estimated property value of the Southern States is only 25 percent of the Nation's total. (The assessed property value in these States is only 20 percent of the total for the Nation, but this is not a good comparison, inasmuch as property is usually assessed on a lower percentage of full value in the South than elsewhere.) This is closer to the South's proportionate one-third than the banking resources and savings deposits but still leaves the South with a per capita property value average of $1,300 compared with the Nation's $1,832.

It would be no explanation to say that the South's disproportionately small share of the Nation's wealth is due to the fact that the people of the South do not have as much money as the people of the balance of the country. That would be similar to the famous statement ascribed to President Coolidge that "when a great many people are unable to find work then we have unemployment."

It would be an explanation, however, to show why the Southern States do not have as much money as other sections of the country. That is a different story and goes back a long way, at least to the Civil War. In 1860 the South had 39 percent of the total wealth of the Nation; the per capita wealth of the South was greater than for the Nation as a whole. Following 4 years of the bloodiest war in history and then more years of carpetbagger rule, the South's proportionate share of the Nation's wealth was reduced to 14 percent by 1870. It's not so hard to replace living expenses; it's terribly hard to replace capital! The Civil War set the South back 100 years or more.

During the war practically everything in the South was destroyed except the spirit of the southern people. A large part of the capital of the South had been invested in 4,000,000 slaves, valued conservatively at $2,000,000,000. If the South had been reimbursed for this amount which was destroyed by Presidential edict during the war and this $2,000,000,000 had been put to work in southern industry and had increased at an average rate of 4 percent per year for the last 80 years, the South would now have $46,000,000,000 capital which it does not have. This is not an unreasonable assumption and when it is realized that the total assessed value of all taxable property in the South for 1940 amounted to only $29,000,000,000, it can readily be seen what an enormous change this would have made in the picture.

And it must be remembered that the value of the slaves was only a part of the capital lost by the South. Most of the accumulated capital of 200 years or more was destroyed. Almost two generations of the South's finest men were destroyed. Those who were left came home barefooted to a ravaged land. Then was a time when it might well have been said of the Southerners that they wore no shoes.

But the South did not complain. It set about to work out its own destiny. And it is that spirit which will not be downed that is the hope of the South. It is that spirit which is now, after all these years, beginning to bear fruit.

For the outlook for the South is not dark. The outlook for the South is bright. The South has the greatest future of any section of our land. It has the climate and the natural resources and the people and the spirit that make this inevitable. Comparing the South with the national average may give an unfavorable complexion to Southern economy but we must not be blinded to the fact that that complexion is clearing up and is now beginning to do so rapidly. The status quo (which the old Negro said was Latin for "de mess we's in") may not look good, but comparing it with the past and comparing the present rate of growth of the South with that of the Nation gives a different aspect.

The South is advancing faster industrially than the Nation as a whole. It is usually considered an agricultural section, yet in 1939 the value of manufactured products made in the South was $11,190,000,000, while the cash income from all farm products was only $2,800,000,000. The South's share of value of manufactured products remained stationary for 30 years—from 1900 to 1930—at 15 percent of the Nation's total. During the next 10 years—by 1940—it advanced to 20 percent of the Nation's total. The Southern States now contain 38,980 manufacturing establishments, 82 of which are the largest industrial plants of their kind in the world or in the United States. The value of manufactured products in the South increased from $9,805,000,000 in 1919 to $11,190,000,000 in 1939, a gain of 14 percent, while for the United States as a whole it was decreasing from $62,418,000,000 to $56,828,000,000, a loss of 8 percent. The number of wage earners in the South increased from 1,597,684 to 1,765,064 during the same period, an increase of 10 percent, while for the Nation as a whole the number of wage earners decreased from 9,096,000 to 7,887,000, a decrease of 13 percent.

Some illustrations are in order. In 1900 the South manufactured 40 percent of the Nation's cotton; in 1940 it manufactured 85 percent of the Nation's cotton. For the years 1936-37 the South gained 57 new plants in cotton manufacturing while the rest of the country was losing 42 plants. For the year 1937 the rayon industry in the South increased 238 percent over 1935, while the rest of the country was gaining only 97 percent. The South manufacturers 90 percent of the Nation's tobacco. In 1900 the South manufactured 12 percent of the Nation's furniture; in 1940, 26 percent. The South has been consistently producing approximately 40 percent of the Nation's lumber for the last 40 years. The value of wood pulp produced in the South, a new industry for this section, increased 70 percent in 1940 over 1939, compared with an increase of 15 percent for the rest of the country.

In 1900 the South only produced 15 percent of the value of the Nation's mineral products; it now produces 45 percent. Some of these mineral resources produced by the South are practically 100 percent of the Nation's sulfur, phosphate, carbon black, bauxite; 90 percent of the ball clay, barite, fuller's earth, and kaolin; 71 percent of the natural gas; over 70 percent of the natural gasoline; 60 percent of the petroleum; 50 percent of the marble; 49 percent of the bituminous coal; over 40 percent of the fluorspar and lead; over 35 percent of the feldspar, stone, zinc, limestone and lime; and hundreds of other products too numerous to mention.

The 1941 Blue Book of Southern Progress stated, " * * * the (industrial) growth which is taking place in the Southern States can be justly termed phenomenal."

As has been noted, the South produces one-third the value of the Nation's farm products. The South produces 98 percent of the Nation's cotton; 98 percent of its tobacco; 27 percent of its corn; 15 percent each of its wheat and oats. Great strides are being made in the use and development—both for agricultural and manufacturing uses—of such special southern crops as tung oil, peanuts, and sweetpotatoes. The South contains 33 percent of the Nation's cattle; 27 percent of its sheep; 30 percent of its hogs; and 46 percent of its horses and mules.

Unquestionably, the South has a marvelous future before it. Its mineral resources, with an annual output almost half the Nation's total, are almost beyond compare. Its forests produce more than 40 percent of the Nation's lumber and the manufactured products therefrom are rapidly growing. The South's income from farm products is on a par with the Nation.

Of course, the South still has its needs. It is most backward in education. The South needs better teachers, more progressive educational leaders, and more up-to-date educational facilities for its youth. The farming of the South might be more diversified. The South needs to produce much of the feedstuffs which it now imports. The South definitely needs greater industrialization, with its attendant greater income and higher standard of living. The South greatly needs more capital with which to develop its own resources.

On the other hand, the South does not need sympathy. The South would not take kindly to subsidization. Both have been exuded and advised in considerable amounts by certain alphabetical agencies in their social studies of recent years. The South has been forced for 80 years to work out its own destiny. The South as a whole desires to be let alone so that it may continue to do so.

Most of all, the South simply needs time. Under the system of free enterprise and individual initiative which has made our Nation great, the South is destined for a wonderful prosperity and in the normal course of events nothing can prevent it. Time—and the spirit of the South—will bring this about.

All Votes Are Soldier Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial entitled "All Votes Are Soldier Votes," written by Edward Lindsay, and published in the Herald Review of Decatur, Ill., on February 6, 1944. The editorial makes particular mention of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. It is also of interest to know that the Decatur Herald-Review is one of the most independent newspapers in Illinois.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL VOTES ARE SOLDIER VOTES

(By Edward Lindsay)

Republican Members of Congress have maneuvered themselves into an uncomfortable position on the soldiers' vote bills. This is particularly impressive if you sit in the Senate gallery for a few hours listening to each of them building up an extensive explanation for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the folks back home. * * *

It is easy to see what happened.

After administration leaders presented the simplified Federal ballot bill that did not recognize the constitutional fiction requiring a vote for electors rather than candidates for President and Vice President, Republican Members rebelled.

This was partly reflex—if the administration wants it, there must be something wrong with it—and partly an extension of the grass roots political philosophy upon which the Republican comeback has been built.

States control the election machinery, with a few minor exceptions, so it seemed to be good politics for the Republicans to defend them against this newest encroachment by the Federal Government. It looked like a good bet.

If the fight could have been kept on this basis—an argument over the relative importance of permitting the soldiers to vote and the constitutional rights of sovereign States—the Republican position would not have been damaging to the party's chances in the next election. It might have helped.

Two other reasons for opposition to the Federal ballot bills have been widely discussed. The opposition of most of the Southern Democrats underscored the panic into which many Southerners are thrown at the thought of the consequences of making ballots available to all Negroes over 21. Moreover, the idea has gotten around that an overwhelming majority of servicemen, especially those overseas, favor the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt.

The Republicans, then, found themselves in the position of opposing the Federal soldiers' ballot to sterilize 10,000,000 voters who favored President Roosevelt, and incidentally to protect States rights. The Negro vote issue added confusion.

Obviously, this was not so good. There has been a great clamor by Republicans in both Houses to repair the damage by getting State ballots into the hands of at least some soldiers. The Army and Navy have not been very helpful. They have refused to call off the war while the ballots of every county in the United States are routed to each of the servicemen from those counties wherever they may be. Their position is that a simplified Federal ballot is the only kind they could consider handling.

This leaves the Republicans the choice of facing the charge that they deprived the soldiers of a vote or of accepting the uniform Federal ballot with as many face-saving amendments as can be tacked on. Whatever happens to the legislation, the Republicans have hurt themselves.

There is, I believe, some merit to the widely held idea that a majority of the soldiers overseas favor the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt. A few months ago I saw a confidential poll made in one group of soldiers overseas that bore out this belief. (The poll was not made by the Army or the Government.) While this report is not available for publication, it was widely distributed so there was the opportunity for political leaders of both parties to know about it.

On the other hand, reports from reliable correspondents and personal letters from soldiers at the front suggest that voting, one way or the other, is not the first thing in the minds of our fighting men. My guess is that while every soldier would tell you he ought to have the right to vote, not one in 10 would walk across the street to do it.

A soldier in a training camp in the United States is preoccupied with his weapons, his comforts, the fighting techniques he is learning and the most interesting use of his leisure time. At the fronts this absorption with the military business at hand must crowd out civilian considerations even more completely. A good bed, a bath, a package of cigarets might seem more important, most of the time, than the privilege of drawing an X in a square.

The effect on the election of the ballots soldiers mark or don't mark will be negligible. The vote of the folks at home, however, will be affected tremendously by what they think their soldier sons, brothers, sweethearts and husbands would have them do. Nearly every vote cast in the next election will be a soldier vote.

The point I am trying to make is that the soldiers' vote bills, as such, are not nearly so important as the atmosphere around the contest they engendered. It seemed to me that the opponents of the Federal ballot have lost ground and that its supporters have created so favorable an impression that Democratic candidates in the North may do better in the fall election than seemed possible 2 months ago.

If this is a fact, it has particular significance in our own State. All of the pollsters and political prognosticators put us in the "doubtful" column with a nip-and-tuck contest between Democratic Chicago and Republican down-State.

Moreover, Illinois will not overlook the part played in the soldiers' vote bill contest by her senior Senator, SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat. Mr. LUCAS was cosponsor in the Senate of the administration's Federal ballot bill, but he was more than that. He led the fight for its adoption on the Senate floor so effectively that he has won national recognition. He is being mentioned as a possible candidate for Vice President.

And I can see why. I have thought well of Mr. LUCAS for a long time. He is, I have known, a good representative for the State, well informed in the ways of the Federal Government, and willing to use his influence to the benefit of worth-while local projects requiring Federal cooperation. I was not prepared for the discovery that he is one of the biggest men in the Senate, and respected on both sides of the aisle.

Seizure of Montgomery Ward Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial entitled "By Due Process of Force," appearing in the Daily Republican-Times, published in Ottawa, Ill. This editorial expresses the view of the vast majority of the people who reside in this section of Illinois.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY DUE PROCESS OF FORCE

In an outrageous abuse of his authority, President Roosevelt has seized control of the mail order properties and Chicago retail store of Montgomery Ward & Co. Uniformed, armed soldiers have evicted physically the

legal operators of the business and the valuable properties now are under Government control.

The situation arises from a controversy between the management of Ward's and a union to which a number of Ward employees belong. Ward's refused to recognize the right of that union to bargain for all employees until, by vote or otherwise, such right was established.

A strike ensued and the War Labor Board, unable to effect a settlement, laid the matter on the President's doorstep. Why the War Labor Board failed to require a ballot to determine whether the union represented a majority of employees no one seems to know * * * we hope it was not to protect and foster a union which might prove to represent but a small employee group and therefore could not win in such an election.

Regarding the legal merits of the altercation between Ward's and the union the Republican-Times has little knowledge and no opinion. We believe, however, that every person in these United States must take an interest in the steps the President has chosen to take.

The management of Wards points out that the mail-order business and retail store are in no manner equipped for manufacture, production, or mining of any product or material required for the war effort, and consequently cannot be considered in the category of plants or mines in which strikes would interrupt vital war production. In view of this, it is difficult to understand why the President has a greater right to seize Wards than he would have to take over your business or ours, or to take over operation of a labor union, with an Army to force subservience.

If the position taken by Wards is upheld, President Roosevelt has openly and advisedly violated the Constitution he has sworn to uphold—the Constitution which guarantees to all of us fundamental rights without which there can be no liberty. He didn't go to the courts; he didn't ask Congress to act or to so empower him; he simply commanded the Army to take over.

Unless empowered by Congress to do so, no man—President or otherwise—may legally seize any other man's property, either in time of war or peace, and even Democratic Representative SMITH of Virginia, coauthor of the Smith-Connally Act, which gives the President power to handle labor disputes in wartime, joined with both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress yesterday in demanding an investigation of the President's action.

If Roosevelt has ordered gun-point seizure of the Ward properties without legal right, then no property is safe. Then he becomes openly a dictator * * * doing the sort of things our sons and husbands and fathers are giving their lives to prevent. If that's the way it is—and certainly that's the way it seems—the President's action is unpardonable and impeachable.

If no war production is involved in the seized Ward properties, a close examination of the Roosevelt motives becomes even more important. For more than 2 years, the Government has been jousting with Sewell Avery, chairman of Ward's board of directors, over labor matters and has forced upon the mail order house a union contract, which Avery signed over bitter protest. Could it possibly be, as some quarters point out, that the President is using the United States Army to punish Avery and to pay personal obligations to C. I. O. unions by forcing the employer to his knees? Could a greed for continued power become so insatiable that the head of our Nation has been led to a point where, for votes, he will disregard his oath of office and cater to the whims of any class or group at the expense of others? That seems utterly fantastic. Is it?

The Republican-Times believes that operation of war industries must continue without interruption and that the Government is both legally and morally justified in taking any step necessary to guarantee continuous production, whether the threat of interruption has come from management or labor. But one's imagination must be stretched thin to picture Montgomery Ward's retail store as a war industry.

We admire Mr. Avery's courage in fighting for the rights we thought were won for all of us in the Revolutionary War. We regret he was forced to bow to Hitler-like tyranny. We hope the courts will render a quick decision and that Congress will take whatever steps are necessary to prove to the people of this Nation that we still live in a democracy and that the Constitution yet means those things our school teachers said it did, 'way back before 1932.

Additional Details Concerning the Atlantic Charter Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the permanent RECORD, volume 88, part I, at page 780, appears a reference to an address by Prime Minister Churchill dated January 28, 1942. It deals with certain discussions and events which transpired at the Atlantic Conference in August 1941. In the permanent RECORD for the events of July 7, 1942, in volume 88, part V, at page 6013, appears an account by Mr. Ernest Lindley dealing with the same matter. Those events are not unrelated to later disclosures.

I refer particularly to an article which appeared in the New York Sun on April 21, 1944, under the title "Churchill Asserts Roosevelt Reassured Him About Empire."

On the morning of Sunday, April 23, 1944, the Hartford Courant published an editorial entitled "An Empire Firster"; and collateral thereto, an editorial entitled "With No Apologies" appeared in the New Haven Register of the same date.

In view of the reference just made, it is interesting to find that in the Washington Post for Tuesday, April 25, 1944, appears an editorial entitled "Bulldog Breed."

I ask unanimous consent that these various articles may appear in continuity in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of April 21, 1944]

CHURCHILL ASSERTS ROOSEVELT REASSURED HIM ABOUT EMPIRE—TELLS COMMONS ATLANTIC CHARTER DOES NOT CONTEMPLATE ABOLITION OF BRITISH PREFERENTIAL PROGRAM

LONDON, April 21.—Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons today that the Anglo-American mutual-assistance agreement was reached in 1942 with assurances from President Roosevelt that "we were no more committed to abolition of imperial preference than the American Government was committed to abolition of their protective tariff." Winding up a debate, Mr. Churchill said:

"At my first meeting with the President of the United States, in Newfoundland, at the time of the so-called Atlantic Charter, and before the United States had entered the war—a meeting on very anxious and critical matters—I asked for insertion of the following words in the Atlantic Charter which can be read in that document:

"'With due respect for their existing obligations.' There are the limiting words and they were inserted for the express purpose of retaining to this house and to the Dominions the fuliest possible rights and liberties over the question of imperial preference."

[Imperial preference means that States belonging to the British Empire charge lower import duties on goods coming from other States of the Empire than they do on goods arriving from countries outside the empire. Sometimes it means a waiving of duties altogether on empire goods.]

"Again, in February, 1942," he went on, "when the United States was our closest ally, I did not agree to Article 7 of the mutual-aid agreement without having previously obtained from the President a definite assurance that we were no more committed to the abolition of imperial preference than the American Government was committed to the abolition of their protective tariffs." This part of the prime minister's statement was greeted with loud, approving shouts of "Hear! Hear!"

BRITAIN FREE TO ACT

"The agreement for discussing as to how a greater volume of trade and a more harmonious flow of trade can be created in the immediate post-war years leaves us in every respect, so far as action is concerned, perfectly free," Mr. Churchill said. "How could it otherwise be when Parliament itself would not only have to debate the matters, but would have to legislate upon them when they were brought before it?

"I am convinced that there should be a careful searching and far-reaching discussion of the economies of the post-war world and a sincere attempt should be made to reconcile conflicting interests wherever possible. There must be a wholehearted endeavor begun in good time to promote the greatest interchange of goods and services between various communities of the world, and to strive for that process of betterment of the standings of living in every country without which expanding markets are impossible and without which world prosperity is a dream which might easily turn into a nightmare."

SNEERING AT EMPIRE

Declaring he never had thought that the Empire "needed tying together with strings," Mr. Churchill said he agreed that natural forces "will carry everything before them, especially when those forces are fanned forward as they will be, by the wings of victory in a righteous cause."

Reviewing Britain's ups and downs, Mr. Churchill acknowledged that there had been mistakes, but at this stage of the conflict we find the British Commonwealth and Empire more strongly united than ever before.

"It is extraordinary," he went on, "what a business it has become to sneer at the British Empire. Those who have tried it in the United States have been discredited. Those who have tried it in the Dominions have found no public backing."

CLOSE TIES ALREADY

With the meeting of Empire premiers approaching, Mr. Churchill said that the question was how the British Empire family could

gain greater benefits from its already close ties.

"I do not think we should embark upon that task with the sort of feeling that if we do not do something, everything is going to crash. The world is in a crisis, but the British Empire, and the commonwealth within it, never were more united," he said. He concluded his remarks by saying:

"I have never conceived that the fraternal association with the United States would mitigate in any way against the unity of the British Commonwealth or Empire, or breed ill-feeling with our great Russian ally, with whom we are bound by a 20-year treaty. I do not think we need to choose this or that. With wisdom, vigor, and courage, we can get the best of both.

"We have often said of our British Empire, 'In my father's house there are many mansions.' So, in this far greater world structure which we shall surely raise out of the ruins of desolating war, there is room for all generous and free associations of a special character, so long as they are not disloyal to the world cause, nor seek to bar the forward progress of mankind."

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of April 23, 1944]

AN "EMPIRE FIRSTER"

It is not at all to the discredit of Prime Minister Churchill that he is an Empire and British Commonwealth of Nations "Firster." In closing a 2-days' debate on the Empire he told the House of Commons that he insisted at his meeting with President Roosevelt, resulting in framing the so-called Atlantic Charter, that the words "with due respect to the existing obligations" be inserted. "These are the limiting words," he said, "and they were inserted for the express purpose of retaining to the House of Commons and the Dominions the fullest possible rights and liberties over the question of imperial preference."

And on another occasion, the signing of the lend-lease agreement in 1942, Mr. Churchill objected to one article until he "obtained from the President definite assurance that we were no more committed to the abolition of imperial preference than the American Government was committed to the abolition of its protective tariff."

Imperial preference is the system under which members of the British Empire levy lower import duties on goods exchanged among themselves than on goods from outside the Empire. It is one of the evidences of Empire, one of the ties that bind the Empire together. Mr. Churchill is a stout and staunch champion of that Empire, as he gave further convincing and eloquent demonstration in his speech last Friday.

No, this statesman who did not became the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire hasn't bartered away a bit of that Empire nor surrendered a single one of the privileges that its members enjoy. Nor will he. His foreign policy, even toward the United States, to which he admits Great Britain owes a great debt, is based on self-interest, self-preservation. In that respect he is an unashamed "Empire firster." He knows that in no other way can the British Empire be held together. Nor through any weaker policy can any other nation long survive.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register of April 23, 1944]

WITH NO APOLOGIES

At least twice in the process of drawing up mutual agreements between Great Britain and the United States, Prime Minister Churchill assured the House of Commons on Friday, he took express precautions to make it clear that he was in no fashion or degree signing away the Empire's own preferential trade practices as between divisions thereof.

He did it first in connection with what he referred to as "the so-called Atlantic Charter," which reference brings that down somewhat out of the clouds, and implies that it may be gazed upon and weighed by mortals without deep genuflection. He did it the second time in connection with the negotiation of the mutual assistance agreement in 1942. That time, he told the Commons, he did not agree to a certain article "without having previously obtained from the President a definite assurance" that the imperial preference was in no way being jeopardized.

Mr. Churchill did not appear to be in the least reluctant or apologetic about giving Parliament the assurances. Nor, judging from his manner of relating the incidents, was he backward about insisting on full British prerogatives at the time of the transactions.

No reason can be seen, in fact, why he should have been either apologetic or backward. The incident is conspicuous, and commanding of notice, only because of its contrast with the attitude of foreign sublimation and self-derogation which some persons who try to expound proper United States policy seem to think should be America's mood in dealing with her allies. They seem to think that no American should say a single "Boo!" lest someone now on our side might take offense.

Where these get their apparent phobia toward standing four square and unashamed for the natural and earned interests of the United States and its citizens, is difficult to see. Certainly they can find no model in the attitude evidenced by those who make or expound policy for our foreign associates.

[From the Washington Post of April 25, 1944]

BULLDOG BREED

Mr. Churchill's speech on the future of the British Empire must have caused some eyebrow raising in Washington. It is all very well to retort to captious or ignorant critics in the United States that he wasn't called to his high office in order to liquidate the British Empire, as Mr. Churchill prefers to call the Commonwealth. It is another matter when he talks about a program to strengthen the Empire in a bond of exclusive federation. An economic tie-up is his stated aim. That doesn't mean that non-Commonwealth goods would be kept out of the nations of the Commonwealth in order that the Commonwealth might be self-sufficient. But it does mean that priority would be given to goods from other Commonwealth nations. This practice of playing favorites is called by various names, though, except in extraordinary circumstances, they are all equally noxious to Secretary Hull, who believes in a free field and no favor in commercial dealings. Economic discrimination is the commonest and the plainest phrase to describe the Churchillian prescription. In this case discrimination goes under the label of imperial preference, which came to flower in the Ottawa agreements of 1932. For returning to that system or lack of system, says Mr. Churchill, there have been reserved "the fullest possible rights and liberties."

Mr. Churchill was referring to those provisions of the Atlantic Charter and the master agreement governing lend-lease which seemed to sound the death knell of economic discrimination. Article 4 of the charter pledged equal access to trade and raw materials for all the signatories. But a qualification marred the purity of the pledge. It protected "existing obligations" in violation of the pledge. Thus the charter kept the path open to the victors for a return to all those discriminations in trade which thrust the nations into economic war in the decade prior to the outbreak of hostilities. It was Mr. Churchill who, as he now says, insisted upon keeping that path open. It was Mr. Hull who, in the negotiations over a master agreement governing lend-lease, sought to close it. Article VII appeared to renew the charter pledge sans qualification. But, though at the time it was widely hailed as having accomplished that purpose, in fact the text is as noncommittal as any of Mr. Hull's speeches prior to April 9. The clause is too long and involved to permit of recital. But, though there was no repetition of the qualification in the Atlantic Charter, the provision was so drawn as to be all things to all men. What it meant to Mr. Churchill is plain from the Prime Minister's speech. To him it didn't prohibit a return to an even tighter system of imperial preferences.

This clarification of a clarification is to be welcomed when so many weasel words are being uttered in the name of post-war reconstruction. We now know where we stand. That is we know where we stand so far as the British are concerned. But it would be surprising if the other members of the Commonwealth would want to go back to the Ottawa policy. That policy led to misunderstanding and trouble abroad and mutual recriminations among the nations of the Commonwealth culminating in a boycott of Australian goods by Lancashire towns. It will be interesting to see whether the Dominion Prime Ministers soon to assemble in London will subscribe to the Churchill policy. We are in some doubt. The Dominions like to think of themselves as free and independent nations whose nexus with the mother country is sentimental and institutional. So they are. But the surest way to injure their international status as separate sovereignties, and to intensify the feeling that they are one and not many, is to embark again on economic exclusionism under the Churchillian formula of federation.

Perhaps Mr. Churchill is merely trying to win the Commonwealth over to a bargaining position in future trade negotiations with America. There is indeed a suggestion of bargaining in his reference to American tariffs. But the two subjects are not comparable. The tariff system is by no means singular to the United States. What is at issue is whether the end of this war is going to witness a return to the pre-war days of discrimination and reprisal and war or to a serious effort to promote equality of treatment. Mr. Churchill's statement must have left Mr. Stettinius in London more than a little discomfited. Clearly Mr. Stettinius must have pleaded for a serious effort to promote equality of commercial treatment under Mr. Hull's instructions. That would be one way, the trade way, of showing that we all belong to "one world."

Lend-Lease Scarecrows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lend-Lease Scarecrows," published in the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of April 19, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEND-LEASE SCARECROWS

Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economics Director, said in a statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that there is no truth in many of the wild stories that have been told about lend-lease, including the one that Russians were using American butter to grease their boots.

Mr. Crowley flatly, convincingly, and categorically denied a long list of accusations that have been going the rounds as half wisecracks, half whispering campaigns. He branded these charges as fiction "in some cases directly inspired by Axis radio propaganda."

We do not know to what extent Axis radios or secret agents have started these tales of the misuse of lend-lease, but it is apparent that if they were actually the products of spy rings they could not be more damaging to morale in this country. The whole basis for Axis aggression is that the weakness of the democratic nations and their incompetence and carelessness has justified the "superrace" in its depredations.

Mr. Crowley also denied flatly that the British charge up Washington whisky parties against lend-lease funds or that a variety of frivolous imports including powder puffs and nylon stockings had gone to the women of Australia or that Scotch whisky had been furnished to the British delegations.

The State Department has repeatedly investigated rumors spread by radio Tokyo and has found these statements to be utterly without foundation, Mr. Crowley said. He did say that butter shipped to Russia had found a new use in that military surgeons were giving injections of it in a new technique for the treatment of abdominal wounds whereby food was pumped directly into the intestines of a wounded man.

The biggest story of all has been that Russia was trading American airplanes for Japanese rubber and therefore was giving to Japan airplanes with which to fight the United States.

Mr. Crowley brands this as without foundation. He is right in condemning these canards and in denying, one by one, the charges that are being made because, of course, there cannot be wholehearted support of the prosecution of the war if it is believed that the resources of this country are being recklessly wasted.

Post-War World Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by David Dubinsky, president of a very large labor organization, at the American Federation of Labor Post-War Planning Forum, at the Hotel Commodore, New York, April 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We in the American labor movement traditionally have maintained a strong sympathy for minorities and small nations. In the open declarations of policy and in our public acts we have invariably followed out the theory of equal rights and privileges for groups of all races, creeds, and nationalities. This may be due to the fact that our labor movement, as the economic organization of all wage earners, organically draws no line between creeds and nationalities, and it may have been influenced by the fact that as part of America itself we are historically bound up with the philosophy of equality of all men.

This outlook and this philosophy of the labor movement is not exclusively American. From their very inceptions the labor movements of all countries, with very few exceptions, have adhered in thought and practice to the principle that small nations have an inherent right to independence and cultural freedom within the frame of international teamwork. Our international federations of trade unions in various crafts and industries were set up as models of such world-wide organizations within which major economic and social problems were to be deliberated upon and legislated.

It is due to this social philosophy that our trade-union leaders welcomed with such faith and enthusiasm the Wilsonian doctrine of self-determination of nations, large and small, and why Samuel Gompers and his associates of that day laid such great store by it. If this doctrine and the international institutions which emerged at the end of the First World War failed, with the result that we have a Second World War, it surely was not the fault of the labor movement.

When President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, therefore, met on a battleship in the mid-Atlantic in August 1941 and gave the world the Atlantic Charter, labor throughout the world felt that the war had become overnight something far greater than one of defense against the menace of Nazi aggression. Labor felt that this war is a crusade for a better kind of a world, the world we have always believed in. Labor, therefore, hailed the Atlantic Charter with enthusiasm.

During the following 2 years, that enthusiasm suffered a decline as we watched with disappointment that the promises of the Atlantic Charter were not being implemented into reality.

Then came the Moscow meeting of the foreign secretaries of Russia, Britain, and the United States, when labor's hopes were again renewed. As you will recall, the Moscow Conference pledged the three powers to form a general international organization for the preservation of peace after the war. The Conference also stated that pending its formation, they would immediately set up machinery for consultation on all subjects of mutual concern. They also specified that they would call in the smaller nations whenever issues which concerned them would have to be decided.

Later came the meeting at Teheran of Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin and everybody expected that out of that meeting would come the announcement of a step in the direction of creating such an international organization promised at Moscow. Unfortunately, the announcement issued after the Teheran Conference said almost nothing about the organization of peace after the war.

Since that time, we have come to realize that, instead of moving to create a general international organization to maintain the peace after the war, we are face to face with policies designed to establish spheres of influence in which the great and powerful nations can dominate militarily and politically.

And Secretary Hull's interpretation of the Atlantic Charter given only a few days ago, while it was received with general favor and has aroused hopes, it does not contain enough assurance that our own disinterested policy as a member of the United Nations can prevail against facts accomplished today while the common struggle against the Axis enemies is still on. Said our Secretary of State: "The Atlantic Charter is only an expression of fundamental objectives. It points the direction in which solutions are to be sought; it does not give solutions."

Does that mean that we are ready to drop the Atlantic Charter, the promises of the Moscow Conference, and the hopes that we entertained from the Teheran meeting? Does that mean that the policy of power, the policy of spheres of influence, the policy which permits a few gigantic empires to absorb the smaller nations on the ground of "strategic security" is to prevail at the end of this World War? Does it mean that the vision of a better organized world that labor saw when the Atlantic Charter was proclaimed is to be abandoned? Does it mean that we are still adrift with regard to peace planning and peace organization? Or does that mean that after having won the war we are still likely to lose the peace?

There is one very important thing to bear in mind in attempting to answer these questions. The swallowing up of the smaller nations will not come by the consent of these small nations themselves. It could only be accomplished by force, against the will of the peoples concerned. The Nazis tried to accomplish this by the most brutal force, with what results? They could not organize Europe on the basis of swallowing up the smaller nations. And it means further that within the great empires that will absorb the smaller nations by force there will arise rebellions and insurrections against the dictatorships that will be imposed upon them. There will be no room left for democracy, no room for liberty, no room for national freedom.

What will inevitably follow is rivalry, jealousy, and conflict between the big empires, each of them desiring still greater spheres of influence, wider domination over the smaller national units on the various continents. This would, indeed, be a sad prospect, a sad conclusion to all the bloody sacrifices of this war. For such an outcome would present almost unavoidable dangers of a third world war.

American labor, the millions organized in the greatest sector of our national community, does not welcome such a tragic prospect. American labor is fearful of the prospect of great empires controlling spheres of influence after the war because it is convinced that this will never lead to permanent peace and stability. An unstable world and an unstable Europe mean that the working masses the world over will never be able to form stable organizations to defend their standards of living. An unstable world means the continuous break-down of labor organization, it means misery and degradation for the wage earners everywhere, including our own country.

Poland is a case in point. Poland is a testing ground. Poland was the first of the United Nations to resist Nazi aggression. She fought bravely against the Nazis more than 4½ years ago and she is still fighting bravely today, both on the battlefields and underground.

The Atlantic Charter promised Poland that she would not be the victim of any territorial mistreatment by any of her neighbors after the war. It assured her that she alone—her people alone—would decide what kind of a government they wanted to live under. Today Poland is faced with the probability that, whether her people like it or not, a sizable part of her territory will be taken away from her by the Soviets. What is even worse, the promise is now made to her that she will be "compensated" by a large slice of eastern Germany. That means that Poland, or what remains of her, will become a center of constant and bitter struggle after the war, a football which other nations so inclined will

be able to toss around to achieve certain political objectives.

We hold no brief for the former governments of Poland. Many of their former rulers were blind reactionaries who persecuted minorities and who denied the millions of Jews, Lithuanians, and White Russians in Poland equal rights and opportunities with other sections of the Polish population. But it would be stark blindness to deny that the Government in exile of Poland, representing as it does a cross section of Poland itself, is composed of a majority of sincere democrats, many of them well-known leaders of the labor movement. But regardless of what one may think of the Polish Government today or even the anti-Semitic colonels there is one principle to which we must adhere—that the Poles and only the Poles must decide the personnel of their cabinets or ruling administration. We cannot deny to Poland as she is bravely struggling on our side in this great war for human rights, the same rights we accord ourselves and Great Britain though very few will defend British policy in India or British treatment of the Palestinian problem.

Next week, if I may be permitted to bring it to your attention, marks an anniversary of a stark tragedy which has befallen the Jewish masses in eastern Europe. Out of the continued massacre of millions of innocent Jewish men, women, and children by the Nazi demons in every part of Europe under Hitler domination, the battle of the Warsaw ghetto, which occurred on April 19, last, stands forth as a timeless monument to the desperate courage of thousands who in the face of hopeless odds chose to die as men rather than to be slaughtered as cattle by their merciless executioners. The voice of the martyrs who died as heroes in the barricaded houses of the Warsaw ghetto calls for a reckoning from the fiends who deliberately ordered the extermination of an entire people. The civilized world must not, will not, forget this titanic butchery.

And while at this point, I believe that I express the undivided opinion of the labor movement in our country without regard to affiliation when I say that the obstinate refusal on the part of Britain to lift the immigration bars in Palestine in this greatest period of tragedy in Jewish history is an act that stuns the imagination and freezes the heart. It means death for countless thousands of Jewish people seeking escape from Hitler's charnel houses and gas chambers in his bloody domain.

It is my conviction that the American labor movement, with the exception of a tiny minority who follow blindly the totalitarian angle, will stand up, together with the other free labor movements in Allied Nations in defense of the Atlantic Charter. And by that I mean not the interpretation of the Atlantic Charter to accommodate and to appease certain elements in Britain as well as the "realists" in Soviet Russia.

No one will honestly charge the American trade-unionists with enmity or jealousy toward Soviet Russia; no American trade-unionist can honestly underrate the magnificent role of the Russian people and its armies in the common war we are waging on nazi-ism and its barbarities. But if it is realism that we must practice, let us keep our eyes open as realists of the situation. There is today an unfortunate and dangerous tendency to confuse ruthlessness with realism. We shall not be fooled by those who pay lip service to unity, but in reality hunger for power and domination of other peoples; by those who profess to believe in national rights and freedom for all small nations, but in reality follow the policies of narrow national interests and world power.

We of the labor movement who hailed the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" do not wish to see them emasculated and watered down to a point that neither friend nor enemy will be able to recognize their force and meaning. As a great democracy, our strength in war and peace does not lie in appeasement—this we have learned from bitter experience in the past half-dozen years. Rather, is our strength in the force of principles which underlie decisions; rather, is our strength in the confidence and faith which the world may have in America as a land that believes in what it promises and acts accordingly.

We of the labor movement are for real democracy and real freedom. That's why we stand by the Atlantic Charter for all and every people on the face of the globe. That's why we demand that it shall not be treated as a scrap of paper. It is such scraps of paper which today incite national hostilities and tend to even more ghastly conflagrations tomorrow.

Governor Dewey's Report to the People of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Members of the House will be tremendously interested in having made available to them the text of the address by Governor Dewey to the people of the State of New York, made on April 14, 1944.

In appraising the message, many things stand out. Especially significant, to my view, is the matchless teamwork, unity of effort, and cooperation that has been achieved in the government of the Empire State. Governor Dewey's administration is close to the people, and it is particularly refreshing to see this contrast in government with what is happening in the national field.

Here is the full text of Governor Dewey's inspiring address to the people:

Tonight I want to give you my second annual report on the administration of your State government. When I reported to you last April, we had just made a fair beginning on the task of cleaning out, from the departments and agencies of the State, the accumulated cobwebs of 20 years. In the last 12 months, without interrupting or disturbing for a moment the day-to-day business of the State, that job has made tremendous progress. We have now in Albany a complete administration, infused with new blood and new energy, filled with a spirit of teamwork between the legislative and executive branches, working in cooperation with each other, with the people of the State, and with the local units of government which are closest to the people.

We are striving, in other words, to establish and maintain a genuinely competent and progressive government—in sharp contrast with that type of personal government which talks fine phrases of liberalism while seeking to impose its will and its whims upon the people through centralized bureaucracies issuing directives from a distance.

Three immediate and fundamental purposes have guided our work to strengthen the State government: First, to win the war; second, to prepare for a rapid and smooth readjustment to peaceful pursuits, once complete victory is won; third, to preserve and develop that freedom at home for which our young men are fighting abroad. In the light of that intent I want now to throw into perspective for you the pattern and interrelated purposes of what we have been doing since last April.

When the year began it was clear we were going to have a large accumulated surplus in the treasury; actually, at the first of this month, starting the new fiscal year, that surplus amounted to $163,000,000. This money had piled up as a result of abnormal wartime conditions and of good State housekeeping. There were many suggestions of pleasant and useful ways in which we might spend it. But it seemed to me, and to the Republican leaders of the legislature, that this money was not really ours to spend. Rather, it was a fund to be held in trust for the million young men and women of our State who are in the armed forces, for the millions of war workers who, when hostilities end, will be changing over to peacetime jobs. When that time comes, a great responsibility will fall upon the State, which it must be ready to meet without delay—to help industry convert itself to peace production and to contribute its own part through immediate launching of needed and deferred public works.

Accordingly, in my opening message to the legislature—to forestall raids which were later vigorously attempted by pressure groups on this wartime surplus—I proposed to create a post-war reconstruction fund and to lock up in it, the entire surplus. This was done, as chapter 1 of the laws of 1944.

Our State Post-War Planning Commission has been working hard to prepare for the day of reconversion for peace. Blueprints are now being drawn for new housing projects. Plans are being made for urgently needed additions to our overcrowded State hospitals. Under a law passed this year we are now already at work, preparing to purchase rights of way for a great arterial highway system.

When the day of reconversion comes, New York State will approach it, not merely with blueprints and bond issues to create new debts; we will have, ready for instant use, a minimum of $163,000,000 cold cash. Moreover, the State department of commerce is working intensively with business, big and small, all over the State, for the new industries and quick change-overs, which will provide the great bulk of opportunity and employment for our people.

Some of you have now paid the first quarterly installment of the State income tax. You know, therefore, that we were able to salt away our surplus while continuing the 25-percent reduction in the tax on personal incomes. Many of you did not have to pay any State tax at all, because we had been able to continue the high exemptions—$1,000 for single persons, $2,500 for married folk, and also to continue the deductions for medical expenses, life-insurance premiums, and children in school. But the most gratifying thing about the income tax this year was that we were able to let the taxpayer make his return on a new and simpler one-page form.

When the president of the State tax commission first proposed that simplified form I realized once again how fortunate we now are to have a cabinet officer who is out to make taxation more simple, rather than to drape it in mysterious complexities.

When I spoke to you last April we were just hearing the first of that sordid history of corruption under the workmen's compensation law which was revealed by a Moreland Act Commission. For many years groups of corrupt lawyers, doctors, and laymen, licensed by the Department of Labor to represent claimants, had been siphoning off millions of dollars from benefits due to injured workers. There were also shocking delays by the industrial board in determining the case of injured workmen; the board was 4 months behind in its work.

Eighteen bills designed to correct these long-standing evils were proposed by me to

the legislature this year and are now law. Under this program the industrial board was enlarged from 5 to 10 members, so that determination of claims of injured workmen can be cleared within a month. Another bill increases benefit claims from $25 to $28 a week. Still others provide for increased benefits for disability and death resulting from dust—the disease we know as silicosis. Other bills will, I hope, under good administration, drive the thieves permanently from the field of workmen's compensation.

The working men and women of our State can now know that they will receive full and prompt compensation for their injuries. They do not have to pay 1 cent for tribute to anyone.

Trade-unionism is an increasingly important factor in the life of our State, but events of the last year have shown us that workers and employers alike have much to learn about the vast field of industrial relations. One of the most important things we did this winter was to create, through action of the legislature, a State school of labor and industry at Cornell University. This school, blazing a great trail, will offer advanced studies in this rapidly expanding field, will prepare young men and women for useful careers of leadership in the solution of labor's perplexing problems. Such a school as this can become not only a training place but also a meeting ground for industrial statesmanship.

One of our most grievous problems in industry has been that of discrimination against some groups because of race or religion, and particularly because of color. I am deeply gratified at the progress we have made through a committee of the war council, and New York State today leads the Nation in employment regardless of race, creed, or color. But with the end of the war the fight against discrimination in employment will need new legal basis. Accordingly the committee proposed legislation to me and to the legislature to this end. Unfortunately the bill came in just 2 weeks before the close of the session, and I was advised that, despite my interest in it, no action could be taken at this session. To make progress in the meantime, after consultation with the chairman of the committee, I recommended to the legislature, and it passed, a bill creating a temporary State commission for the purpose of drafting good, sound legislation. Shortly the members of the commission will be appointed, and I have every hope and expectation that they will be able to report to the next session of the legislature a system and philosophy of law for the permanent elimination of discrimination in industry in peacetime.

Now, as in normal times, much of your State's daily work has to do with the health and social well-being of its people. Let us take a swift glance now at some of the things which have been happening in some of these basic State departments.

I have just signed two important laws to improve our public health service. One of them discontinues the so-called means test for care in county tuberculosis hospitals. In other words, a person no longer has to be a pauper to have quick treatment for tuberculosis in a county hospital. The means test has long stood as a barrier to the early hospitalization of many tubercular patients, who have stayed at home risking the infection of others in their families, gradually exhausting their resources and becoming impoverished and neglected. Now we have a better chance to put them under treatment right away; they have a better chance for recovery and restoration to a useful place in society.

I have also approved a bill empowering the commissioner of health to reorganize his department, rearrange divisions and bureaus—in short, to bring it up to date. Since the health department was last reorganized some 30 years ago, its annual budget has increased from $576,000 to $5,346,000, its personnel from 230 to 2,300. In those years our needs and concepts of public-health service have changed utterly, but the department just grew—like Topsy—and its divisions remained rigidly in the old mold. Now they can be reshaped for present needs with better service to all.

The same principle of responsible administration was involved in a recent bill to give New York City a real superintendent of schools. Down through the years, since the consolidation of the greater city, its schools have been run by a circle of nine associate superintendents, each with a neighbor on his left and another on his right, with whom to share responsibility. Every city I know, except New York City, has long had a superintendent of schools who, under the board of education, was the responsible operating head of the school system. I am profoundly convinced that the school children of New York are entitled, equally, to a system with responsible leadership. We had to fight hard, for 2 years, to get it but get it we did, this year.

The social-welfare department has been busy at the job of reexamining and simplifying its procedures. I have just signed a whole series of bills wiping out technicalities which long had stood as obstacles to assistance for worthy cases among the blind, the aged, and dependent children. During this past year our social-welfare program extended aid, for the first time, to some 7,000 dependent school youths between the ages of 16 and 18. With the aid of the State, free school lunches for New York City's needy children were continued when the termination of W. P. A. threatened to force abandonment of the program.

I am happy to report real progress in our program of providing care for the small children of women engaged in war industry. Through the committee on child care, the State is contributing to 47 child-care centers in New York City and to 105 centers upstate. Arrangements are now being made to speed the opening of new centers in war manpower shortage areas.

A year ago we had just discovered the deplorable epidemic of amoebic dysentery which had raged unchecked for 2 years at Creedmoor State Hospital. Since then the Department of Mental Hygiene has had a thorough investigation; its headquarters staff has had a house cleaning, and a new cabinet officer is at its head—the finest, I believe, in the United States. Where we had defeated hospital administrators who had thrown up their hands and surrendered to discouragement, we now have able, energetic men who are giving real leadership. We still have, of course, serious problems in our mental hospitals because we simply cannot hire enough help to give proper care to our overcrowded mental patients. But with the superb loyalty of the employees we are carrying on the work and making great strides in its improvement.

During the last year the administration, by heroic efforts, has virtually completed a long-overdue classification of some 20,000 positions, aimed to make these hospital jobs more attractive. The classification and salary boards and the division of the budget are still working long hours to smooth out the kinks in this tremendous undertaking. All told, improved pay scales and administrative practices are helping the employees. In addition we are getting better cooking, as a result of increases in pay for cooks, and for the first time, provision has been made for dietitians in all the hospitals.

Most important of all, we are in the process of trying, at long last, to change the basic concept of our mental hospitals. We must not regard them as mere institutions of custody. We must and will make them into institutions not merely of care but of cure, not of despair but of hope—hope for restoration of mental health. Our State can have no more important long-range objective—through research and sound administration—than the cure and conquest of mental illness.

Last year we were worried about food; this year we had better not stop worrying. Right now we have gluts in certain foods, which give us an illusion of plenty, and which might lead to a dangerous complacency.

There is, for example, a temporary surplus of potatoes and eggs which, for the farmer who went all-out for maximum production, is a matter of serious and unjust distress. But there is a great, overshadowing specter of food production in general which is a matter of real concern.

The people of New York may well be proud of the way the farmers of this State met the crisis last year, with inadequate help, little new machinery, excessive regulation, and, at times, not even gasoline for plowing or cultivating. Under the distinguished leadership of the Emergency Food Administration many obstacles were overcome. The crops of our State were harvested and processed without loss last fall with the extra aid of a volunteer army of 111,000 workers.

This year, as we enter what may well be the decisive moments in our war against the enemies of mankind, it is doubly important that the crops of our State be produced, harvested, and processed. The Emergency Food Commission is on the job to foresee and meet critical problems. This year the State and Federal farm-manpower agencies estimate that we will need a volunteer army of 140,000 seasonal farm workers. I am sure the people of the State will respond to the call for help to the farmers in even greater numbers than last year.

I have told you about our post-war fund and how it has been segregated and saved, to be used for the benefit of our returning veterans. Now, in conclusion, I want to explain in some detail our further plans for these young people who must be first in our hearts and plans.

One thing immediately at hand for the benefit of these veterans while they seek employment is unemployment insurance. Nearly half of the members of the armed forces from our State come from our farms and from small businesses, which are not covered by the unemployment insurance law. So today, as a result of action this year, and until the Federal Government takes action, there is unemployment insurance for every returning New York veteran.

We have set up a temporary commission to study the various proposals for assistance to veterans and to help them and their families learn of the many provisions, both State and local, which exist for their assistance. The sum of $100,000 was appropriated for this commission.

Your State administration also took the lead in proposing a simple, workable formula for soldier voting. Under the new State law, adopted at this last session, every member of the armed services desiring to vote has simply to send in his name and his home and service address. He will then receive in the mail a ballot and self-addressed envelope.

This soldier ballot will not be the blank piece of paper which was sponsored in Washington. Nor will it, as the National Government tried to do, deprive the soldier of his constitutional right to vote for every office to be filled. It will give every man and woman in the armed services, by the simple act of signing his name once, a valid vote for every candidate from President down to the local officers in his home town. Under this New York law voting is simpler for a soldier on foreign service than it is for a citizen here at home and the honest ballots cast by real soldiers will not be canceled by the frauds which other proposals would have permitted.

The problem of the interrupted or incomplete education of our youth in the armed

services is vital to them and to our country. We must not miss part of a generation of skilled men and women or of doctors, clergymen, lawyers, architects, and engineers. To this end, the legislature this year created 1,200 scholarships for veterans to continue their studies. Those scholarships are available now for the veterans who are already returning from war this year and 1,200 per year will be available after the war.

We have taken the first step in the direction of technical training through action looking toward a system of vocational courses throughout the State. In the present State institutes and others to be established our returning veterans who have served in technical ratings will be able to receive further training in their military-taught trades for peacetime use.

These, then, are part of the fruits of the labors of the past year. They are, of course, only the portion of which mention is possible in a summary report. But they show the purpose with which our war tasks are being met and the spirit and purpose of your State government.

Running like a thread through our every thought and act has been the sacred task of bringing this tragic war to a speedy and overwhelmingly successful end. No other consideration can be allowed to enter our minds until nazi-ism and fascism are totally wiped off the face of the earth.

But, as we labor with singleness of purpose to this end, we can think and plan for the future. We must look to the day when freemen everywhere, regardless of race, color, or creed, can live in freedom, can work at occupations of their own choosing, can raise their children in the traditions of their parents, can worship God in the manner of their own choosing. We can, and we must, keep our own society clean of those within who would lead us into paths of narrow or bigoted selfishness.

Our State will be strong to meet the great problems after the war. It will be clean of the poison of hatred or prejudice. It will be set on its course toward full peacetime production and employment for all the day the war ends. It will do its part in the Nation to the end that out of this war may come a happier day for all mankind and the beginning of a just and a lasting peace.

Statement of Senator Taft in Voting for the Connally Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me regarding my vote for the Connally resolution, together with a copy of the Connally resolution.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Connally resolution expresses the opinion of the Senate in favor of international cooperation to assure peace in the future world. While it has no legislative effect, the overwhelming vote by which it has been adopted demonstrates clearly to our allies the desire of all the people of this country to make every effort to develop a practicable plan. The resolution makes clear that any specific plan negotiated by the President must be later approved by a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and the resolution is therefore not a commitment to support any specific plan.

The first three paragraphs comprise the original Connally resolution. The fourth paragraph is identical with paragraph 4 of the Moscow Four-Power Declaration. The fifth paragraph is an amendment offered by Senator Willis of Indiana. I think it was wise to add the Moscow Declaration, so that there might be no question of any conflict between the Senate and the executive representatives of the Four Powers.

As I read the Connally rsolution, it expresses the willingness of the Senate to abandon the traditional policy of the United States which usually refused to commit our Government to any action in advance, and left it free to deal with each crisis as it arose. On the other hand, the insistence upon the "sovereignty" of nations in both paragraphs excludes the idea of any federal union, or international super-state, or predominant international police force strong enough to overcome the national forces of every nation in the world. The language taken from the Moscow Declaration excludes the policy of any exclusive military alliance as advocated by Mr. Lippmann.

My only criticism of the resolution is that it omits any reference to the establishment of a rule of law and order, and to a world court to interpret that law. This principle is set forth far more effectively in the resolution adopted by the Republican Post-War Council at Mackinac. However, it may be argued that a rule of law is implicit in the setting up of any general international organization.

The resolution as passed, therefore, is like the Mackinac resolution of the Republican Party, the Hull speech of September 12, and the Moscow Declaration. It looks in the direction of a league of nations not unlike that established after the World War, but with more definite obligations to use national military forces to suppress aggression in its early stages. This is the policy which I have heretofore favored, and I believe there is now substantial unanimity on the broad outlines of such a policy, between the President and Congress, between the Senate and the House, and between the Republican and Democratic Parties.

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION—ADOPTED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES NOVEMBER 5, 1943

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

H. R. 1649

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, when a legislative bill is presented for the consideration of this body that will simplify taxation and at the same time apportion the tax burden in accordance with the ability to pay; a bill that will raise abundant revenue for Government without oppressing the taxpayers and at the same time insure permanent prosperity while adding to the sum total of human happiness—and all without incurring one cent of debt—such a bill, Mr. Speaker, should immediately engage the interest of this Congress.

Unless my ability to analyze the written word has gone entirely hay wire such a bill is now in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee and should be brought on the floor of this House for discussion and debate. I refer to H. R. 1649. This bill is quite revolutionary in many respects, but we are living in a revolutionary age and are being presented daily with new ideas that a generation ago would have been labeled fantastic, yet are proving their worth with every passing day.

The first unique feature of this bill that I shall mention calls for every individual in the land who is making a living or selling goods or services for profit to pay a tax on each and every such transaction and do it every 30 days. This feature of the bill makes the payment of taxes almost painless, at least not more painful than paying the grocery or rent bills. It makes practically the entire adult population taxpayers. This is an immeasurable improvement on our present system. We are facing the necessity of carrying a debt and interest burden greater by far than any other nation has ever faced in all history—a burden that cannot be carried unless every soul in the land assumes his or her proportionate share and hands it over promptly. Not only does the bill require the individual to do his share, but it requires every business of whatever nature that is run for profit to do the same. This feature, as stated flatly in the bill, is a gross income tax. It would permit of no deductions other than to eliminate the tax from the first hundred dollars of intake.

This exemption is for the relief of the lowest income wage earners. Few there are who have ever given heed to the tremendous possibilities in the gross income form of taxation. Economists of note are of the belief that at least 10 times the revenue can be obtained through it that is collected from a net property tax. To the doubters I would refer the report of the tax commissioner of the Hawaiian Islands where the gross income tax system has been in operation since 1935 and is producing from a 1½ percent rate $25 per capita from each of their 400,000 people, young and old. This low rate gives

these island people $10,000,000 this year for their cash box which is always full. They have not borrowed a cent since they cleaned up a burdensome debt of $2,000,000 after adopting the gross income tax system.

The next unique feature of bill H. R. 1649 lies in the disposition that is to be made of the money that is collected. It only asks for a 3-percent tax to begin with until the fruitfulness of the system is demonstrated. The entire production of the 3 percent tax is to be distributed equally each month to some 16,000,000 people who are distributed about equally—10 percent of the population everywhere—throughout the country, who are so afflicted with physical disabilities as to hinder them entirely from making a living. Each of these will be paid his prorata share of all the tax produces every 30 days on the one condition that the money must be spent within the ensuing 30 days as a qualifying requirement for receiving the next month's payment.

The intent of this disposition of the tax money is evident. It will convert some 16,000,000 people, who are now to a great extent objects of charity, into self-reliant contributors to the public market, thus building business in every locality instead of being a burden to that locality. Here is indeed a unique feature. It is believed by economists that the 3-percent tax will raise on the present level of business $1,600,000,000 each month, or enough to pay each of these afflicted people about $100. Now, when we contemplate what would happen in any community where a tenth of the people who are nonbuyers suddenly become important buyers, we begin to see the true design in this bill. What every community wants is a factory pay roll or a sustaining business revenue that is dependable. This distribution of tax money coming, as it will, into every community each 30 days and being expended there will be the equivalent of a factory pay roll the wages of which would rise with the growth of business, for obviously, as the gross business of the country grew the volume of tax money would grow, and more money could be distributed accordingly.

Now let us see what would in all probability take place if our National Government were to establish this constant and liberal flow of money into every community. In the first place it would make every community prosperous, not just those which have factory pay rolls now. The war has taught us how enviable are those communities where Government contracts have been placed. Unfortunately not every community has received these contracts and thus we see a spotty and uneven condition in the financial health of the Nation. The even distribution of buying power throughout the entire country proposed in this bill will eliminate the upkeep of poor houses and farms, wipe out the costs of charity in all its ugly forms, probably reduce our jail and penitentiary population by 75 percent within a few years, and raise the standard of living and education immeasurably. What a boon it would be for the general health of the Nation in eliminating the cares and worries of all the afflicted ones as well as those of the ones who are burdened with the necessity of caring for the afflicted.

This war in which we are engaged has taught us one all-important lesson, namely, prosperity depends entirely upon the rapid and continuous movement of money. The income of the country has risen during the past 2 years a hundred billions of dollars above prewar times and for no other reason than that the demands of war made a rapid distribution of money necessary. While turning all our energies into the production of destructive goods, we have become immeasurably enriched and now are enjoying a prosperity that we never believed possible. We have developed our productiveness as a nation beyond any former conception of our ability. We must not allow this productiveness to lapse. We have foolishly burdened ourselves with an enormous public debt. This debt we must pay. If we repudiate it, we will destroy the profit system of business upon which our Nation has developed and grown great. To pay off the debt and its concomitant burden of interest we shall have to maintain our wartime prosperity. This cannot be done unless we systematize the flow of money throughout our entire population on an even more equable basis than the war has made necessary. Every community must prosper. Not just those where industries have developed. We must make it possible for industry to develop in every community. Wealth must not be allowed to accumulate in certain spots to the impoverishment of other spots. To have a nation safely and enduringly prosperous all its citizens must become prosperous.

I believe, my colleagues, that in House bill H. R. 1649 we have a proposal that, if we adopt in time, before the war ends and unemployment piles up on us, will insure the continuance of our present prosperity and steadily improve upon it. I adjure you to give serious and prompt consideration of this bill and to see that it is brought before this body of lawmakers for immediate discussion.

Candidacy of Senator Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "SCOTT LUCAS Announces for Reelection," from the Alton Evening Telegraph. I am advised that the Alton Evening Telegraph is one of the most influential Republican newspapers in downstate Illinois.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTT LUCAS ANNOUNCES FOR REELECTION

Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, in announcing that he would seek renomination and reelection on his record, is relying on a fine background when he seeks office. Senator LUCAS has done well since he became the Democratic Party candidate for Senator. It is a fitting compliment to him that he is to have no opposition in his own party and he deserves that recognition. He has been a useful man in the Senate. Though he has not always sauntered happily along the New Deal path hand in glove with the policies of the New Deal, he nevertheless has merited and received the confidence of his colleagues in the Senate and he is one of the most influential men in that body. He has always shown a readiness to be of any possible service to his constituents and he has had the natural ability as a legislator and an influence that has made him a useful man.

For usefulness he is on the high level of two predecessors, William B. McKinley and James Hamilton Lewis, which ought to be a high compliment.

Continuance of O. P. A. Is Essential to Wartime Business, Say Grocers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the near future this Congress will consider the manner of extending the Office of Price Administration.

It is my opinion that the testimony before both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees justify that extension without modifying amendments.

The administration of the Price Control Act presented tremendous difficulties and many mistakes have been made, but at the conclusion of its second year we find the O. P. A. functioning smoothly and holding the line against inflation.

The independent retail grocers are cooperating with the O. P. A. in a fine manner, and I wish to append to my brief remarks an article which appeared recently in their trade paper, the Independent Grocer:

CONTINUANCE OF O. P. A. IS ESSENTIAL TO WARTIME BUSINESS, SAY GROCERS

(By Martin V. Merritt)

The independent retail grocers of this country are pretty well united on one point. They want the O. P. A. continued. It's a safe bet that every one of them will be glad enough to see O. P. A. go when the time comes, after the war, but right now they feel that it is needed and needed badly.

One does not have to inquire far in metropolitan grocers' circles to learn which way the wind blows on that subject here in New York City. There is a very evident unanimity of opinion and those who express this opinion appear to have sound reasons for their judgment. They are not content to say that they want O. P. A. continued, they insist on reasoning it out with their questioner, and it would seem that no one knows better than the independent grocer why the Government price agency should be carried on.

Unless and until the Economic Stabilization Act is extended by Congress, the official

existence of O. P. A. comes to an end on June 30. There appears to be little doubt that it will be given another year of life, for even with the opposition to O. P. A. that can be found in Congress without scratching the surface, there are few Members of that august body who would want it on their politic souls that they had voted against O. P. A. and thus caused what would be likely to be the greatest economic holocaust we have ever seen.

As one food manufacturer put it, speaking of O. P. A. this week, the crash of 1929 would be schoolboy stuff compared to the crash and profiteering spree that would follow immediately on the heels of O. P. A.'s sudden and unheralded demise.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill has already been introduced in Congress to extend the life of the Price Control Agency until June 30, 1945. Whether this bill will pass in that form or will be roundly amended is something no one can say. There is a marked difference of opinion, however, between many grocers who have expressed themselves on this subject and the Congressman who introduced that bill. The grocers believe that O. P. A. should not be extended for a year and then possibly for another year but rather should be continued by enactment at this time for the balance of the war and for as long thereafter, with a reasonable limit, as is necessary for an orderly retirement of its regulations.

It is quite obvious that O. P. A. cannot simply close its doors at any time, whether it be this June or 5 years from now, without causing a tragic upheaval in business. The price structure that this agency has set up during the past 3 years must be retired systematically and in good form. It must be done in each specific case at a particularly appropriate time, when conditions in that market are sufficiently adjusted to stand the shock. It is probable that this ideal time will arrive in some fields much more rapidly than in others and this must be taken into consideration by O. P. A. when it is preparing to close its doors.

Just as O. P. A. established ceilings in various commodities only when and because they were needed, so must O. P. A. retire those ceilings only when and because they are not needed. Of course, some limit must be placed on its liquidation because it seems that everyone agrees that continual Government control of price is not desirable.

RATIONING PROVIDES ANOTHER PROBLEM

The rationing feature of O. P. A. operation provides another problem, for here is a governmental function that must continue as long as there is a demand for food beyond the capacity of our national supply. As long as we contribute to the feeding of post-war Europe and possibly post-war Pacifica, there will not be enough food to satisfy any demand in this country and as a result of this condition we must have rationing.

On the price front, the grocers of the city are farsighted enough to know that they would have lost much of their volume had it not been for ceilings on many food items. Had these prices been allowed to climb to unreasonable heights, the average family would have found it well-nigh impossible to buy a well-rounded menu and would have sought specialized fields in foods.

GROCER FARES WELL

It is generally admitted that the retail grocer has fared well under price control. While there have been, and still are, several items in which the grocer may feel a pinch, nearly all of the price-controlled items in today's grocery store provide a fair mark-up—a margin equal to or better than that provided by independent operation in the pre-war period.

From the consumer's side, too, there is reason to want O. P. A. continued, say the grocers, for it is evident that the cost of living would have soared high above present levels were it not for the controlling influence of the Federal agency.

SOME ERRORS SEEN

There have been a few mistakes made by O. P. A., grocers point out, but they have been recognized sooner or later and adjusted. The original idea of housewife policing on price ceilings proved to be "the bunk," as one grocer put it, and O. P. A. was reasonably quick to change the plan.

The multitude of regulations that once flooded and confused the grocers has been reduced and at present are being cut down even more by consolidation of price orders in groups.

O. P. A. has also restyled its orders on a specific price basis wherever possible, thus doing away with much of the confusion of formula plan in retail pricing.

All of these changes show that O. P. A. is flexible enough to correct its own errors—a point that is very much in its favor.

There is little doubt that the agency will be given a new lease on life, but the grocers of New York nevertheless have expressed themselves forcefully in favor of its continuance.

The Guayule Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have addressed this House on the importance of continuing our guayule program. Especially have I emphasized the necessity of carrying through the experimental work at the station at Salinas, Calif. We have already invested over $30,000,000 in this guayule program, and it is only good business that we protect our investment, not only by carrying through the experimental program to its logical conclusion, but by harvesting the rubber which is now under cultivation. Yet the entire appropriation for continuing the guayule program was stricken from the last agricultural appropriation bill.

A few weeks ago, during the Easter recess, a special subcommittee of the House Agricultural Committee visited California and carefully inspected the Salinas station, as well as other phases of the program. While the recommendations of this committee have not yet been published, it is my understanding that all members are heartily in favor of continuing the present program. The importance of reinserting in the agricultural appropriation bill the $7,000,000 to carry through the work has been urged. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will restore this amount to the bill and that when the conference report comes back to this House we too will concur in its restoration.

This is a matter which goes far deeper than one district or one State; it is of vital importance to our entire Nation. The Office of the Rubber Director has urged the importance of carrying through the guayule experiment. Common sense dictates that after spending millions of dollars we get every scrap of information possible out of our experimental work. The possibility of having a source of domestic rubber reserve in case of future emergencies has frequently been cited. The importance of experimenting with private growing of the shrub has been pointed out many times.

I urge every Member of this House to thoughtfully consider the issues involved in this case; I am sure that after such consideration a majority will decide that it is both wise and far-sighted to replace the money in the bill which will enable the American Government to carry its guayule program through to its logical conclusion.

The Late Honorable Frank Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, in Frank Knox the country has lost a great American. A vivid personality, he was a fighter for every cause which won his allegiance, who served in the field in two wars, and died at his post of duty in the present conflict. While intolerant of evil and pettiness, wherever found, he was a warm-hearted and devoted friend, and a fair and honorable employer who won the respect and affection of those who worked with him.

He had always been known as a man of fine character and great energy, successful as a newspaperman and in many fields of public relations; but it was the present crisis which gave him his great opportunity and showed forth to the world the full stature of the man as he will live in history.

For those of us who were honored with his friendship his passing has left a void which will not be quickly filled. What his loss means and will mean to the Nation has been splendidly expressed by Maj. George Fielding Eliot in an article in the New York Herald Tribune for April 30, which I am including in my remarks under leave granted me:

KNOX'S DEATH CALLED LOSS TO UNITED STATES IN WINNING PEACE AS WELL AS WAR—NAVY SECRETARY, RELENTLESS FIGHTER, REALIZED VAST ROLE THE MIGHTY FLEET HE HELPED TO BUILD CAN PLAY IN ASSURING A SECURE WORLD

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

The Nation has suffered a loss which will not be easily replaced in the death of the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox. To all who were privileged to know him during these days of trial, his forthright courage, his unswerving singleness of purpose, and his astonishing energy were an inspiration.

He won the respect and the affection of all ranks of the naval service as few secretaries have ever done. He went to the fighting fronts; he never was so happy as when he could actually come within reach of enemy fire, in order to be for a little time with the lads who were doing the fighting; he was tireless in his devotion to duty and to the Navy,

of which he always regarded himself as the servant rather than the master. He never spared himself. He died at his post; he gave his life for his country as truly as any bluejacket who has fallen in battle.

But if the Navy and the Nation will miss his wartime leadership we shall miss him still more in the time to come when the fruits of victory must be safely garnered and the world made secure against the recurrence of the holocaust of total war. Frank Knox grasped—as few men in civil life have grasped—the essential fact that this Nation is, in the military sense, an insular power. He understood the fundamental importance of sea power to the security of the United States. He understood the relationship of command of the sea to our national military policy. In the Cabinet or out of it, his voice would have been raised to speak with authority on this point, which is so often lost sight of amid the complexities of modern warfare.

LED GREATEST NAVY EVER

Under his direction the United States has built the greatest navy the world has ever seen. Under his direction that Navy has grown until America stands, for the first time in her history, as the premier naval power of the world. This sea power has given America the ability to launch her armed might across two oceans, against two enemies simultaneously: The Germans to the east, the Japanese to the west. It has been the foundation of the greatest military effort in all our history. It will become the foundation of our greatest victories; which, alas, Frank Knox has not been permitted to live to see.

But above and beyond the golden horizon of those victories stands the goal of a greater achievement of which that American sea power may likewise become a cornerstone; the establishment of a just, charitable, and enduring peace, a peace of free men and women, of free nations, a peace preserved by the safeguarded use of force in the hands of a law-abiding majority of peoples. It was in these terms that Frank Knox thought. It was of this final achievement that he spoke with earnest and fiery devotion whenever his mind had a moment of leisure to turn from the besetting cares of his daily duties. He would have been one of the major architects of that peace; and his sure hand and clear mind will be sadly missed when the time comes to begin its fabrication.

LEGACY OF STRENGTH AND HOPE

Yet he leaves behind him the Navy he has done so much to create and to inspire. He leaves behind him the work he has done and the legacy of his great thoughts and his unselfish purposes. His country, our country, will emerge from this war not only victorious, but powerful; able to speak in the councils of the nations with the sure voice of proved strength; the mistress of the seas which wash her shores, the seas by which her power can go forth to the uttermost limits of the world. In that fact there is hope. In the realization of that fact there is the beginning of hope fulfilled.

It is not enough to be strong. We must know how to use our strength in our own interest and in the interest of the world community of which we are a part. We Americans have created the sort of fighting power particularly adapted to our needs, and based on that sea power which must always be the foundation of our military system. We have done these things under the stress of a war, which we did not seek; we can use them, and the lessons of their creation, not only to win that war, but to build a better future in which there shall be no wars.

That would be the work to which Frank Knox would have turned his hand from the moment victory was assured. He has not lived to assume that new and greater burden, but he has left behind him the inspiration of his courage, his selfless sacrifice, and his vision for the future.

The Plight of America's White-Collar Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able article appearing in the May issue of the American magazine. The article was written by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It deals with the tragic plight of the great army of white-collar workers of the country trapped between rising prices and lowered incomes, and affected by other economic consequences of the war. The story is a startling one, demanding the attention of the American people. In the face of the fabulous profits made by some, and the wild extravagance displayed in many places in the country, it is well that we consider this story told by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY MILLION FORGOTTEN AMERICANS

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor)

(The startling truth about the plight of America's white-collar workers, trapped between rising prices and lowered incomes, is revealed here by the head of the Senate's investigating committee. These neglected millions, he says, are taking more than their share of punishment. Many are losing their homes, insurance, and life savings in the struggle to keep going. Their very existence is threatened. Can they be rescued?)

We must put an end to the general impression, fostered by some statesmen, that almost everybody outside of the armed forces is getting along fine in this war. True, there is much evidence to sustain that idea. Theaters, restaurants, hotels, expensive resorts, and Pullman cars are full to overflowing; department stores, jewelers, and furriers are doing a rushing business; the black-market crooks find an endless supply of contemptible customers eager to pay preposterous prices for beefsteaks, whisky, nylon hose, and gasoline.

There are, indeed, millions whose standard of living has risen or, at least, has not dropped. But beneath this upper layer of war rich is a great mass of war poor—larger than any of us even suspected until the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor recently completed its investigation of the white-collar class. Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, is chairman of this subcommittee, and the other members are Senators JAMES M. TUNNELL, of Delaware; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin; KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska; and myself.

Skeptics may say, "Of course, there are a few who aren't getting along so well, but total income payments to individuals in 1943 were nearly $142,000,000,000. There is no such thing as unemployment; every newspaper carries columns of 'Help Wanted' ads offering good jobs to one and all. There just can't be many whose standard of living has gone down."

Not many? Well, I have before me incontrovertible testimony which shows that 20,000,000 Americans and their dependents are living as best they can on incomes that have not risen appreciably since Pearl Harbor. While their incomes were frozen, their taxes have increased, they have bought War bonds they have contributed to war charities and their cost of food, clothing, and shelter has gone up. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics says the rise in the cost of living is 23.4 percent. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., says it's 50 percent. Our committee isn't sure as to the exact figure, but we do know that millions upon millions of good American citizens have had their incomes cut, in effect, from 25 to 50 percent.

Few thoughtful and patriotic Americans expect to go through the war without sacrifice. Those at home realize that no matter how much their standard of living is cut, no matter how shabby and hungry they may be, their sacrifice is nothing compared to that of their sons, husbands, brothers, and sweethearts on the fighting fronts. But as the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps share the hardships of war as equitably as possible, so should we at home divide the hardships of the home front.

We're not doing that. Our white-collar workers are taking more than their share of punishment. Those in this class who are in the better-income brackets have tightened their belts, set their teeth, and probably will manage to get the necessities of life throughout the war. But in most areas now a white-collar family cannot exist upon much less than $50 a week, an independent business girl needs $30 a week, and millions of these low-salaried workers and their dependents will suffer dire poverty if the cost of living continues to rise.

Millions of white-collar workers are trapped like a man in quicksand. The more they struggle, the deeper they sink. Desperately they cut their expenditures for food, clothing, and housing; they give up movies, books, magazines, vacation trips—everything but the bare necessities—but still, with their actual income going down, they can't make ends meet. Piling up are fixed expenses incurred before the war—installment purchases, insurance payments, payments on a home, to dependents, on a car needed in business. No longer can they save. They must sell their War bonds, spend the funds accumulating for education of the children, give up their life insurance and their home.

When we increase by millions the number of persons who are debt-ridden we are endangering the economy of the Nation. But that isn't the only danger. Upon this class depends the further growth of American education and culture.

When you drive these workers into a bare-existence living you retard the development of music, of literature, of the arts; you stop the progress of education; you block the development of better homes and of the decent living of which the United States has been so proud.

In the category of white-collar workers we arbitrarily place many who are not exactly that, such as the aged and infirm who have pensions and annuities that gave them a decent living until prices went up. One man wrote me, "After running an engine 45 years I was put on a pension of $100 a month and I could get along. Now it takes $125 for my wife and me to get by on. Last week I bought a bushel of oats for my chickens for $1.10. For those same oats last year the farmer got 40 to 45 cents. That is not fair to me or to the farmer."

We also include those men in the armed services whose dependents are affected by the rise in living costs. Most of the families of servicemen reduce their standard of living

the moment the wage earner goes into the service.

The wife of a serviceman wrote me: "My best girl friend and I both married about the same time, and each had a baby. My husband was getting $52.50 a week when he was drafted. I get $80 a month allowance, and everything costs so much more every day that I am selling our War bonds, and even cannot take the baby to the doctor as often as I should. My girl friend and her husband work in a war plant, and I would do that, but I have nobody to take care of the baby, and she has. I have no relatives who can help me. The two of them make more than $150 a week. My husband writes to me to be a good soldier and everything will be all right after the war, and I try to be and not worry about what will happen to us if he is killed, but it seems to me something is awful wrong about everything."

About 15,000,000 of the white-collar class are salaried workers, and you can't fight a war without them. You can't have schools, churches, hospitals, or Federal, State, or municipal government; you can't operate stores, offices, hotels, or restaurants; or publish magazines, newspapers, or books; you can't get your mail delivered or your checks cashed at the bank, or make a long-distance call on the telephone.

Harass them, undernourish them, force them, through underpayment, out of their jobs, and you cripple the Nation. They are vitally necessary to the thousands upon thousands of vitally necessary men and women. How many lives could doctors save if they had no nurses? How could a judge hold court without clerks and stenographers? What good is a college with a scholarly president if there are no teachers? How much could be accomplished by executives of great banks, insurance companies, and industries if even one-fourth of their white-collar assistants decided to don overalls and go to work in war plants?

Many white-collar workers have done just that. In addition, hundreds of thousands, of course, have left to join the fighting forces. Fortunately for our economy, enough have stayed on their jobs to keep the wheels going, even though their raises in pay usually have been inadequate, or nonexistent. We worry about the lack of manpower that may reduce production in war plants. It's time we started to worry about manpower that is just as essential—white-collar manpower. Weaken the present staffs and you'll create behind-the-lines bottlenecks that will affect war operations far overseas.

The typical white-collar worker, man or woman—7,500,000 of them are women—is a mighty good American. He usually is well educated, versed in current affairs, and must dress well and make regular trips to the barber or hairdresser. He budgets his expenses and wastes no money. I have no figures to prove it, but I believe he has made more real sacrifices to buy War bonds and to contribute to war charities than have workers whose earnings have risen because of the war. Usually, white-collar workers do most of the volunteer work in War bond, Red Cross, March of Dimes, and Community Chest drives. They're on the job in civilian defense and they're, mostly, the ones who worked long hours at the schoolhouse getting out the ration books.

Who is interested in these people? Nobody. They're the forgotten men and women.

Ordinarily they belong to no union. No experienced negotiators plead their cases. Their collective bargaining usually is a brief session in which the employee stands before his employer's desk and, shaking in his shoes, asks for a raise which he doesn't get. He enjoys his work, likes his associates, has been on the job for years, is in a groove, and he stays on the job.

Back at his desk, he's resentful, perhaps, or maybe he agrees with his employer that this is war and everybody must make sacrifices to help the boys on the firing line. He doesn't quite understand why he must suffer more than do his friends in war work, but loyally he plunges back into the old routine, working harder at longer hours to make up for the vacancies in the staff left by those who have gone to war, proud that he's doing his job well, hoping that some day, some way, things will get better.

But unless Congress takes action right away things are going to get worse.

One group of these workers is made up of the 900,000 school teachers. They exist upon an average salary of less than $1,550 a year. More than 250,000 teachers have gone into the armed services or have taken more profitable jobs, and, according to Dr. Donald DuShane, of the National Education Association, "At least 30 percent of our children are being cared for by improperly and inadequately trained teachers who are working only temporarily." That means that 7,000,000 children—perhaps yours are among them—are not getting the kind of education they need.

More than 4,500,000 white-collar workers, in addition to teachers, are on public pay rolls, from the tiniest towns up to the Nation's Capital. In some cases these employees have been given relief—an over-all average increase of 14 percent between January 1941 and July 1943. But that increase brought the average earnings up to only $118 per month.

A clerk in a Los Angeles court writes, "I would be willing to make sacrifices if others would do the same. My cost of living has increased 40 percent and my income tax 400 percent. My income has not increased one red cent. Yet a neighbor's daughter, 19, on her first job, receives $225 a month—much more than I get."

A civil engineer writes: "I am 42 years old, and have worked for this city for 12 years. Checking back over my records, I find that 2 years after I left college I was making just as much, in buying power, as I am now. Then I wasn't married. Now I have to support a wife and three children."

Too many college-trained men and women are reaching the point where they must cash in their life's savings and borrow to get the bare necessities of life. These include librarians, lawyers, social workers, architects, college professors, and scientists of many kinds. The income of some classes of scientists has risen, but the American Association of Scientific Workers reports that "large numbers of scientists earn between $35 and $50 a week."

There are 136,000 clergymen, most of whom never had much more than a bare living, whose parishioners have given them little, if any, increase in salary. Nearly a million employees of hospitals, including nurses, are working loyally and tirelessly, attempting the impossible task of caring for more patients with smaller staffs. Hospital workers are notoriously underpaid, but ask a $25-a-week nurse why she doesn't give up the drudgery and take a more profitable job in a war plant, and she probably will tell you firmly, "I love my work. I'm happy to be helping the unfortunate." That's the kind of American who is being pushed around.

The largest group that is paying more than its share of the cost of the war is made up of workers in offices and wholesale and retail stores, and itinerant salesmen. The National Industrial Conference Board in 1943 made a survey of 35,600 employees in 351 companies in 21 cities, and found that the average file clerk got $22 a week; the average stenographer, $30; switchboard operator, $25; key punch operator, $25; and junior typist, $23. These generally were in the larger companies that pay fairly well. Conditions vary in different areas, and hundreds of thousands in those classes, particularly in small businesses, are paid much less.

Although it is agreed that the average woman cannot live in most cities on less than $30 a week, the average wage for clerks in department stores in New York is $23 a week. A recent survey by the Y. W. C. A. showed that the average salary of women office workers in the Midwest is $27.89 a week.

Remember that an average figure is reached by combining the salaries of workers who are being paid a living wage with the salaries of multitudes who are not. Statesmen may attempt to quiet protests by arguing that the average isn't too bad, but such oratory won't buy food and clothing for the office worker who gets $16.60 a week.

One office worker wrote me: "We who work in offices and stores and banks are in a pocket. Even in the boom of 1928 we didn't get raises in proportion to those given the bosses. For most of us there is little opportunity of advancement, for we can't all rise to the heads of departments and there always must be $25-a-week clerks. I've given up hope ever of increasing my standard of living, but surely, in order for my company to do its part in the war, it isn't necessary that my standard be cut in half."

Too many persons don't consider the difference between salary and take-home pay. One office worker observes, "When I get my pay, 20 percent has been taken out for withholding tax, 10 percent for War bonds, 1 percent for social security, and 5 percent for the company retirement fund, totaling 36 percent. Then when my wife and I pay for food and clothing we find they've gone up 30 percent. And now they want us to double our purchases of War bonds. I haven't had a raise, yet workers out in the plant have had two or three raises and, with all the deductions, make more than ever in their lives before."

How can Congress help the white-collar worker? First, we must keep the cost of living from rising any more. If possible, we must reduce it.

But we must do more than that. We must increase the "take-home pay" of those white-collar workers who are suffering real privation. They should be given some relief from taxes, which can be done by increasing the exemption figure. It has been suggested that, also, there should be an additional exemption for those workers whose income has not increased perceptibly since Pearl Harbor. Certainly a good tax program should be based primarily upon ability to pay.

Probably most important of all, Congress should ease the War Labor Board restrictions on frozen salaries in the lower brackets. The wage-stabilization program is necessary and its over-all effect has been good, but whoever thought we wanted to freeze the wages of clerks getting $25 a week?

While the stabilization program, justly, has been blamed for much of the suffering of white-collar workers, some of the criticism has been unfair. There are two classes of employers: one that is willing to give raises, but is often blocked by War Labor Board rulings; and the other, that wants to buy labor as cheaply as possible, and falsely tells employees, "The War Labor Board has frozen all salaries. We'd like to give you raises, but the Government won't let us." So employees of the latter go around cussing the W. L. B. and the Government.

The War Labor Board has been partly to blame for this. W. L. B. rules and forms are so complicated that the average person can't understand them, and when an employer says, "That's the W. L. B. ruling," employees don't know what the rules really are and are unable properly to plead their cause.

When William H. Davis, Chairman of the Board, appeared before our committee he admitted that the forms are complicated and promised to try to simplify them. We suggested that the W. L. B. prepare and circulate

to all white-collar workers a statement in simple English that would tell them exactly how they can get a raise.

One thing that should be made clear is that most employers of eight or fewer employees are exempt from W. L. B. rulings, and also that the Board has no control over State, county, and municipal employees, nor over those of nonprofit hospitals and charitable organizations. When teachers and nurses don't get raises it's the fault of local officials. It should be made clear also that, in most cases, the W. L. B. does not oppose raises that bring wages up to 50 cents an hour. And that the Treasury Department, not the W. L. B., controls salaries of more than $5,000 a year.

Unfortunately, in most cases, increases in salary are limited by law to 15 percent above the base salary of January 1941. But individual increases, under certain limitations, may be given for length of service, merit, reclassification, promotion, etc. Some employers don't understand how to give raises properly; some don't want to know.

"My company had a job classification that had been approved by the W. L. B.," one clerk writes me, "and they said they couldn't give me a raise. When I told them I would quit, and convinced them I meant it, they quickly wangled a way to give it to me."

Another: "I am an office manager for a Tennessee concern. I am 37 years old and earn $180 a month. I have received one $5 raise since 1936. But for W. L. B. rules, I would be getting at least $225 a month, which is what new men doing less important work here are getting."

The cure for this is to raise the 15-percent ceiling in the lower-salary brackets and to loosen slightly the restrictions, so that fairer adjustments may legally be made.

"That will bring more inflation!" some statesmen cry in horror-stricken tones. "You'll raise prices so a loaf of bread will cost $100!"

That is nonsense. Inflation doesn't come from the bottom. The $25-a-week clerk doesn't overspend. It is the uncontrolled waster who brings inflation. In Washington, in New York, in every city, you see men and women spending $100 in one evening in a night club, you see them buying mink coats, jewels, and liquor. They toss away millions of dollars to get what they want at any price in the black markets.

Thousands of businessmen, evidently with unlimited expense accounts, are coming to Washington in drawing rooms, living in expensive suits, spending enormous sums for food and drink. The money they spend and the money the Government pays them for contracts, much of which is spent lavishly all over the United States, may cause some inflation.

But you won't get inflation by giving a shabbily-dressed typist $2.50 more a week, or by increasing the wages of a bank clerk so he and his family can keep up the payments on their little home, or by giving a college-trained school teacher enough money to buy a new dress. That money is spent for bare necessities, not squandered on luxuries.

If we give a fairly decent living to the white-collar class we won't weaken our economic structure—we'll strengthen it, and in spots that are becoming dangerously unsound today. They're fine, upstanding patriots and are being kicked around, forced to make more than their share of sacrifices for the war effort, mostly because they are unorganized.

No longer must they be the forgotten millions. Not only for their good, but for the good of all of us, we must give them aid, for these people are as necessary as the men and women who are building airplanes. Crush the white-collar workers and you cripple America.

The Seizure of Montgomery Ward Mail-Order House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the War Labor Board issued an order requiring Montgomery Ward & Co. to enter into a contract with the C. I. O. union which acted as bargaining agent for its members working at Ward's Chicago plant. The contract carried a maintenance-of-membership provision under which the union members had a stated time to resign from the union. If they did not resign within that time they were obligated to remain members in good standing by obeying all the rules, and to pay all dues and assessments. For failure to do so, Ward's was compelled to discharge them. Such a provision in the contract, in reality, amounts to a closed shop. Not all of Ward's employees, and as the company contended, a majority never did willingly belong to the union. This contract expired in December 1943.

The Ward Co. has been appealing to the National Labor Relations Board since last November to hold an election for the purpose of determining whether the employees wished to be represented by the C. I. O. The Board has refused to hold the election.

The C. I. O. demanded that the contract be renewed, but Ward's refused and stated that it would gladly continue in effect the hours and wages and other conditions of employment which were carried in the expired agreement, but would not enter into a new agreement with the C. I. O. without the National Labor Relations Act was complied with by the holding of an election to determine whether the employees wanted the C. I. O. or some other bargaining agent. The company emphasized that if the employees voted for the C. I. O. to represent them it would bargain with the C. I. O. But C. I. O., probably fearful of the result of the election and relying upon the W. L. B. to force the contract upon the company, went on strike and threw up picket lines around the Chicago offices of the mail-order house. The Chicago police prohibited violence on the part of the picketers who were trying to prevent workers from entering the plant to continue at their jobs. The strike failed. Ward's continued to operate their business.

C. I. O. appealed to W. L. B., who ordered Ward's to sign a new contract without an election as provided by law. Ward's refused and the W. L. B. appealed to the President, who issued the order that the Government take possession. In walks the Army and bodily throws Sewell Avery, chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward & Co., out of his office and into the street. These are the facts in connection with the case. I have been asked what I thought of such tactics of the Government sending in the Army to take over private business that is engaged in civilian pursuits. Here is my reply:

Could anyone think of anything more ridiculous as to have to write:

"Dear General Marshall, would you please deviate from your accustomed war duties to fill my order? I wish you would please send me 4 yards of flowered gingham and a No. 50 spool of white thread. Rush please."

I never dreamed that I would live to see the day that an Executive order would be issued in America for the Government to take possession of a private firm, a civilian mail-order business, because the company had not signed a C. I. O. contract carrying a maintenance-of-union membership clause. It is an arbitrary and flagrant exercise of powers unauthorized and far removed from the prosecution of the war.

Regardless of the outcome of the court action, which is expected soon, the whole incident is extremely unfortunate coming on the eve of the all-out invasion of Europe. Such dictatorial action of the Government for the purpose of appeasing a labor union in forcing membership in the C. I. O. is in total contravention to the principles for which our brave warriors fight and die on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate action by this House to the end that the rights to work when, where, and for whom a person pleases shall not be challenged by this or any other administration in America.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, today the Polish people are celebrating the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of their liberal constitution. May 3 is a glorious day in Polish history, and the people of this great country are justified in commemorating this notable event—an event hailed by every freedom-loving nation in the world.

For 6 long years the people of Poland have gallantly suffered martyrdom under the domination of the Nazis. The sacrifices made by the Polish people—their sufferings and ignominies—will go down in history and prove in a most conclusive manner that they are a determined, rugged, freedom-loving nation.

The Constitution of the Polish Government is a symbol of the ideals of democracy and liberty. It clearly defines the direction and development which the Polish people have worked to attain. The creators of the constitution had for their objectives many noble aspirations. They continually worked to further prove to the people of the world that they were deserving of such men as John Sobieski, Kosciusko, and the other Polish leaders who made such great contributions to Poland and the entire world.

People of Poland, today we honor you and we know that through your patriotic determination and with the assistance of

divine providence you will again enjoy the freedom and privileges that belong to a great nation.

We in this country hold the inhabitants of the great country of Poland in high esteem. The Polish people of the United States consist of some of our outstanding citizens and their firm belief in our free institutions, precepts and policies of a republican form of government have helped make America the great country that it is. On this day our heartfelt sympathy goes out to you and it is our ardent wish that on one day in the very near future you will again enjoy the privileges which you so richly deserve.

I salute you Polish patriots and you American citizens of Polish extraction.

Poland Still Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message to the Polish people.

Throughout the world today the Polish people are commemorating the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, the first bill of rights in Europe and one of the world's great documents of freedom. The freedom of spirit that was born within all Poles on that day has marked the tragic history of Poland down through the centuries.

As a nation, Poland today has very little cause for celebration. Her land has been overrun. Her people are being ruthlessly persecuted. Her future is dark and uncertain. But Poland still lives.

Just 1 year ago, on this similar occasion in 1943, I urged before the House that no one permit the observance of Polish Constitution Day to take on too much the aspects of a funeral because Poland would rise again. I said than and I have repeated it today—Poland still lives. She lives in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles all over the world; Poles living and fighting underground in Poland; Poles living and fighting over the skies of Europe; and Poles ready and willing and anxious to fight through the defenses of western Europe and into the land of the oppressor.

Yes; Poland still lives and she will rise again to take her rightful place among free and democratic nations. But she will need the help of the United States and the American people.

The spirit, the tragedy, and the heroism of the Polish people will be recited here in Congress today by many of the friends of Poland. The story behind the story of the 3d of May 1791, can better be told by those who pridefully recall their Polish heritage. For my part, I think this occasion can be used to best advantage by reminding the Members of this body that if the United Nations owe a first duty anywhere in the world they owe that first duty to Poland. When we win this war—as we surely will—we will have lost more than we will have gained if we do not make certain that Poland arises again as the same great nation she was on September 1, 1939. It is fairly certain that we can protect Poland from further harm at the hands of her enemies and our enemies, but it is less certain that we can and will protect her from our friends.

Many problems will face this Government and the leaders of the United Nations between this moment and the moment when an armistice ends hostilities in Europe. No problem is deserving of more sympathetic and just consideration than the problem of Poland as a nation. Many promises have been made to the Poles. Already there have been indications that settlement of disputes affecting Poland may be held secondary to the settlement of other matters. Perhaps we Members of Congress will take little part in the final settlement of any of the problems, but I think one of our primary duties, from this moment on, is to let it be known that we consider the solution of the Polish problem a paramount issue on which the Government of the United States should take a position on the side of Poland.

Since December 8, 1941, when this country accepted the challenge of the Axis nations, our Government has assumed many obligations. We have set up clearly before the world a pattern of ideals to which we should adhere if we are to preserve the respect of all other nations. Within that pattern is the Atlantic Charter and the Joint Four-Nation Declaration of the Moscow Conference both of which give assurance of friendly cooperation toward the settlement of international dispute. The United States is a friend of Poland and we have pledged ourselves to oppose any territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. In any dispute which may occur between Poland and other nations as a result of territorial changes resulting from the Nazi invasion, let the United States be certain that it alines its strength and good will on the side of justice. If such is our course, Poland, indeed, will rise again.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May is Poland's national holiday. It commemorates the signature on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's greatest documents of freedom, like the Magna Carta and the American Declaration of Independence.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Republic of Poland was the freest state in Europe, the state in which the greatest degree of constitutional civic and intellectual liberty prevailed. In fact, it was so free that Poland's neighbors, absolute monarchies, were unwilling to have such a free state on their frontiers.

The tragic partitions of Poland commenced in 1772 at the hands of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. On May 3, 1791, the Polish Parliament passed a constitution, which was the first written democratic constitution in Europe, establishing the rights of the middle classes and of the peasants. It was a challenge to the divine right to rule and the cruel partitions of 1793 and 1795 resulted. Kosciuszko on his return from America in 1794 led the first Polish insurrection which preceded the third partition. Thereafter, for 123 years Poland disappeared from the map of Europe and it was not until 1918 when she again resumed the place that was hers among the nations of the earth. The absolute rulers of Poland's despoilers, the Czarina of Russia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Austria, although they envied Poland's culture and progress, feared that Poland's love of liberty and democracy might infect their own subjects. Poland was free, independent, and democratic. Poland was doomed.

It must be noted that the Polish Constitution of 1791 recognized the cardinal principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people and religious toleration was thus proclaimed:

> For as the same sacred faith enjoins us to love our neighbors, therefore we should guarantee to all people peace in the faith and government protection, and therefore freedom to all rights and religions in the Polish lands, according to the country's laws.

This constitution proclaims three separate and equal authorities—legislative, executive, and judicial. It was therein stated that:

> The judicial power cannot be wielded either by the legislative authority, or by the King, but only through the courts of law established and chosen for this purpose.

It is highly significant that the Poles thus defined the role of the Army:

> The Army is nothing but the defensive and ordered strength drawn from the general strength of the nation.

Today we must pay respect to this courageous declaration by the Polish people. We must also resolve that there must be a future Poland dedicated to equal freedom if we are to remain true to our own professions of faith. The sad predicament of Poland today would be discouraging if we could not take renewed hope from the fact that the fire of liberty still burns in the hearts of the Poles of 1944. We dare not countenance any ravishment of Poland which will destroy the national existence of the Christian Poland. Millions of Americans are deeply discouraged by reports reaching them to the effect that Poland will be a victim of aggression. It is well for us to recall that on September 14, 1939, German panzer units had been stopped, thanks to the resistance of the Polish Army and an organized opposition was formed, and then on September 17, 1939, without any declaration of war, Soviet Russia, despite her nonagression treaty

with Poland, attacked the rear of the Polish armies fighting Germany. On September 28, 1939, Germany and Russia signed an agreement dividing Poland between themselves "for all time," along the Ribbentrop-Molotov line. Once more, Poland had been despoiled by her autocratic neighbors.

I am informed by my many friends of Polish extraction in the United States that the people of Poland believe that the post-war organization of the world should be based on Christian morality, international democracy, and political and economic collaboration. They insist that Poland, the first real democracy in Europe, is deeply attached to her parliamentary system based on broad democratic representation of the people and that Poland will be a land of the middle class, of workers and farmers. The Polish love for constitutional liberty is deep and abiding and on this day which commemorates the great Polish Constitution of 1791 we should dedicate ourselves to the high resolves that such a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. JEFFREY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, today when the young men and women of America are displaying incomparable courage and unquestioned patriotism on fighting fronts all over the world it seems most fitting that the attention of the Congress of the United States should be directed toward the courage and patriotism of one of our allies. Were anyone to write a history of human courage a most amazing chapter would be devoted to the people of Poland and their struggles toward liberty. Today marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791, the first constitution in continental Europe to recognize the political rights of the townsmen and the common people.

In reading the glorious story of this struggle toward freedom I am impressed by the parallels it reveals with our own American history. Although the Polish Constitution—adopted May 3, 1791—came several years later than ours, which was framed in 1787, the conditions surrounding them revealed marked similarities. Poland had encountered some most instructive demonstrations of the dangers of a weak and disunited government, just as the 13 American States had been disappointed with the Articles of Confederation. Forceful action was required to bring about the necessary changes. But when this was taken the same spirit which motivated the framers of our Constitution at Philadelphia motivated the framers of the Constitution of Poland. This is shown by the manner in which these two documents were headed. The Polish Constitution, significantly enough, began with the words: "All power in the state emanates from the people's will," while that in America began with the familiar phrase, "We, the people of the United States." Even the difficulties of translation and the differences of phraseology cannot obscure the similarity of thought and purpose in both documents.

What happened to this noble political instrument in 1791 must be rated among the political tragedies of the world. Unlike the liberty-loving Americans who were protected from alien aggressors by a broad ocean or trackless forests, the people of Poland found themselves menaced by aggressors on all sides. The result of this liberal document—a document which seemed revolutionary to the selfish and privilege-loving powers nearby—was another partition of Poland which aggravated the plight of an already long-suffering people.

Instead of entering upon a period of growth and development, like the liberty-loving colonials in America, Poland was again subjected to the terror, the cruelty, and the indignity of foreign domination. This is something that we as Americans find it difficult to understand; it is so foreign to our own happy experience that it is hard to appreciate what it really means. But to me this indignity is represented by the pathetic and dramatic account of the secret classes in history conducted in Warsaw in 1872 and so magnificently described in the immortal biography of Marie Curie. The picture of the class of little girls swiftly abandoning their textbooks on Polish history—the teaching of which was forbidden by a foreign government—and becoming a sewing class, studying in the regimented and prescribed fashion decreed by their overlords, is one not easily forgotten. It helps an American understand the uncompromising devotion and the reckless courage of men and women whose patriotism was acquired under such conditions.

Even lacking this priceless ingredient of liberty—save for a brief period following World War No. 1—Poland has given the world much. Mankind has Poland to thank for the music of Chopin and Paderewski; for the majestic narratives of Joseph Conrad, one of the few masters of literature whose greatest work was done in a foreign language; the brilliant bravery of Marshal Pilsudski and his celebrated Kadrowka, which eventually became the Polish Legion; and for the priceless contribution to science and humanity made by Madam Curie. When we think of what the Polish people have accomplished under conditions of indignity and torture what marvels may we expect of them when they are free.

Mr. Speaker, I make no attempt to draw the national boundary lines of the Europe of tomorrow; I would not be so rash as to say what land should be allotted to what people. Yet the feeling is inescapable in me that a nation of such brilliance, such courage, is facing the dawn—not the dusk—of its development. Earnestly we hope, fervently we pray, that Poland which is now the home of the brave may tomorrow become the land of the free.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LAURENS, IOWA, *April 30, 1944.*

Hon. FRED C. GILCHRIST,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our Ware School superintendent received word from Des Moines last week we should write our Congressmen at once regarding our hot-lunch program for schools.

I have been chairman of the Ware Parent-Teachers Association for the past 4 years, and we have sponsored a very successful hot-lunch program for the past 3 years. We have the entire community's approval and backing, and the Ware school board has always cooperated 100 percent. When we started we had an empty room and $13 in our treasury, but the school board bought us an eight-foot General Electric refrigerator and a fine gas range and helped us pay our gas bills. By securing 3 cooks through the W. P. A. we fed the 120 students, which is Ware's enrollment. This last year we have paid our 3 cooks with money received from the lunches. Now, our kitchen is one of the best in this part of the State, and our record of students eating in our lunchroom is 100 percent.

As you know, Ware is a farm community, and the students are farm children ranging in age from 5 to 17. They climb into cold buses early in the morning, with many times only a hasty breakfast. I send five children. The older ones have had to do chores before they hurry to their bus, and the little ones are hardly awake. Don't that child deserve a hot meal 4 or more hours later? If he doesn't get a hot lunch he munches cold sandwiches and has 4 or more hours before he gets home. Not only this, but since the shortage of hired help a lot of these students do practically a day's work after they get home from school. The hot-lunch program is not the place to start cutting down expenses in our State or Nation, Mr. GILCHRIST. These farm boys need good food as much as soldiers, for they are future soldiers, and all growing youngsters eat and need hot food—not a cold sandwich of minced ham and bread or, as some records show—of left-over pancakes from breakfast, or peanut butter and bread. School teachers can tell you what some misguided mothers send as school lunches. The penny-milk program and the hot-lunch program are a godsend to the entire Nation, and it's regrettable if they take it away. By watching our money carefully in the treasury and by donations of money and commodities we balanced fairly well. But it's impossible to continue without Federal or State aid, because in our case 15 percent are considered by the county welfare office to be undernourished and unable to pay and are fed on a free list. This is a lower percent than in most communities because it is solely agricultural. Will you let me know immediately if a signed petition from the entire Ware community would help you. If necessary, we can send you one at once. Believe me, we are all anxious about this hot-lunch program. It seems that out of all the millions being appropriated for our bureaus to regulate our lives that they could find a few dollars to see that some of these children get enough to eat.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. ROBERT R. CEJKA,
President of Ware
Parent-Teachers Association.

The Montgomery Ward Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the action of Attorney General Biddle in using the Army to seize the Montgomery Ward mail-order plant in Chicago has generated a storm of protest over the entire country. I enclose the following editorial from the Denver Post of Sunday morning, April 23, 1944, which expresses the general feeling throughout the Nation:

United States soldiers, carrying out orders of President Roosevelt, forcibly seized the Montgomery Ward mail-order plant in Chicago, Wednesday. According to press dispatches, men in the squad dispatched to the office of President Sewell Avery of the company carried their rifles at the ready and soldier guards posted outside the building stood facing the crowds with fixed bayonets.

Army seizure of private property is commonplace in Nazi Germany. No American is surprised at such a high-handed procedure in Communist Russia, or in Fascist Italy. But who would have thought that such a thing could happen in the United States which is supposed to be a free country and in which the Government is supposed to be a government of laws—not a totalitarian dictatorship?

Whom does President Roosevelt think this country is fighting—the Japs and the Germans, or American business? The American people have been under the impression that the Army to which they have been giving their young men was mobilized to fight the Jap and German enemies of the United States. Certainly it never occurred to them that American soldiers were to be used to Hitlerize American business.

Under article V of the American Bill of Rights, which is a part of the Constitution of the United States, "no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." If the Army seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co., doesn't violate these constitutional guarantees, then how can they be violated?

President Roosevelt's order of seizure was not issued to enforce any court order. The Montgomery Ward Co. had not refused to perform any war service. It had only refused to obey what it considered an illegal and unconstitutional order of the War Labor Board, directing it to extend a contract with a C. I O. union. We have courts to decide, in an orderly and lawful manner, whether such an order is binding and must be obeyed. But the Government did not resort to its own courts. It said, in effect, to Montgomery Ward:

"Constitutional or not, you obey this order," and sent in armed forces to take over the company.

Wards insists it is a nonwar business. The administration disputes this on the grounds that the company supplies a lot of farmers and war workers with essential equipment, clothing, and other supplies, and therefore must be kept in operation. But Wards has not threatened to close down. The only threat to its uninterrupted operation has come from its union employees. They went out on a strike. But President Roosevelt made no attempt to take over the union nor to send in troops to protect employees who wanted to remain at work. No labor union is compelled to obey any War Labor Board order, but let any employer balk at submitting to the Board's dictation and soldier bayonets are ready to force him to submit or to take his business away from him.

If President Roosevelt gets away with this seizure of Montgomery Ward there is nothing to prevent him from taking over and having the Government run every other private business, large or small, in the Nation. If Wards can be classed as a war business because it sells to war workers, then every other business in the land can be placed in the same category, subject to Government seizure.

On November 5, 1942, the Labor Board ordered Wards to incorporate in a contract with the C. I. O. a clause establishing a form of closed shop called maintenance of union membership. The company finally did that, under protest, at the express order of President Roosevent as Commander in Chief in time of war.

"When Wards brought suit to have the Board's orders declared illegal," President Avery, of the company, said in his telegram to President Roosevelt a few days ago, "the Board asked the courts to dismiss the case. The Board's plea to the court was that its orders were not legally binding, but were only advice which Wards need not accept. The purpose of this plea was to deny Wards a trial before the courts."

If the order issued by the War Labor Board for inclusion of a maintenance of union membership clause in Wards' contract with the union was illegal, as Avery says the Board admitted, then the President, in forcing Wards to obey that order, forced it into an illegal contract. And the recent order of the Board for extension of that contract was an attempt to continue an illegal contract.

There is no excuse at all for the present trouble at Ward's Chicago mail-order house. Last November, the question of whether the C. I. O. union represents a majority of its employees was raised by the company. That question could easily have been determined by calling an election. But the Labor Board didn't do that. It stalled along and tried to favor the C. I. O. by attempting to force the company to extend the union contract until an election was held.

Avery charged in his telegram to President Roosevelt that on April 13, the Post Office Department, presumably acting on order from Washington, removed its 70 employees from the mail-order house in Chicago and that on April 17, the United States Post Office refused to deliver to Ward's incoming parcels from customers on which postage had been paid. And now the administration insists that Ward's is an essential war business.

If the charge is true that the Post Office Department refused to deliver mail on which postage had been fully paid, then the Postmaster General or whatever official was responsible for that should be impeached and kicked out of office. This matter is one which demands immediate congressional investigation and action. In fact, the whole controversy between Ward's and the Labor Board should be thoroughly probed by Congress.

The Signal From Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Farm Journal for the month of May:

THE SIGNAL FROM WISCONSIN

Wisconsin voters in both parties had something important to say to America in their primary election April 4. No press or radio analysis that we have seen has emphasized the message.

About 70 percent of the combined vote was against Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt. The three-term President, after long submerging his party under personal power, received about 60 percent of the Democratic primary vote. He was opposed only by a headless anti-Roosevelt party slate. Mr. Willkie, an apostle of personal leadership rather than party responsibility, received only 15 percent of the votes in the Republican primary. Since Wisconsin voters are permitted to cross party lines in primaries, it is fair to assume that Mr. Willkie, after a 13-day campaign appealing for Democratic as well as Republican support, may have saved some of the delegates for Roosevelt by attracting a margin of the Roosevelt opposition.

The significant fact is that 70 percent of all the Wisconsin people voting opposed both men.

This is notice, sharp and clear, that one-man government and party irresponsibility are not desired in America. It is a signal that fully responsible, two-party government, our safeguard of freedom, is again on the way forward.

The instinct of the people prefers moral and spiritual values to cynicism, character rather than charm, and demands the eternal verities of honesty and righteousness in public places. This instinct is stronger than party masters, partisan tacticians, or political organizations. It comes from the soul of the Nation when the national future is at stake.

Mr. Roosevelt has long been credited with a high degree of political astuteness. Perhaps the Democrats of America now have a real chance to regain their party.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, is supposedly free America in the same unhappy condition as Poland on her Independence Day, May 3, 1944?

In that unhappy country many a Polish shopkeeper sits with anxious heart behind closed doors listening to the tramp of the Gestapo, who on the order of some German official, may seize his property and eject him from it. The same astounding action has occurred in Chicago when soldiers seized the private property of Montgomery Ward & Co. and ejected its management on the order of a Government official.

There is a similarity of action between what happens in Poland and what happened in Chicago, but there is this difference in our blessed land—we still have a people's Congress who can act swiftly in protection of the people's rights.

As author of House Resolution 521 to appoint a special committee of investigation of this un-American procedure

by the Attorney General of the United States, I shall spare no effort to search to the bottom of this whole matter and bring the facts to the people's Congress.

I believe that the people's Congress will act promptly.

Statement of General Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including below a letter received from a lady in my district. If the incredibly ill-considered remarks of General Patton about it being "our destiny" along with certain selected members of the United Nations "to rule the world" have such an effect on a normal American, can any one estimate the disastrous effects on the billion actual or potential allies in Asia and on the oppressed peoples and guerillas of the small countries in Europe, or upon our Latin-American neighbors?

If the Commander in Chief is not going to reprimand the general publicly, as a minimum, then he owes it to this country and to the rest of the world to at least repudiate publicly the general's remarks.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 29, 1944.*
Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. JUDD: Is the attached clipping (the authentic version released by American military authorities) an exact transcript of what General Patton actually said, and if so why has he not been relieved of his command?

I think most of us are willing to concede that there was some excuse for the former "Patton incidents" on the grounds of human frailty and his value as a military strategist, but what possible excuse can be offered for this outburst? Was he under the influence of liquor—or just drunk with power? In my opinion this affair could be more disastrous than Pearl Harbor in prolonging the war and a greater detriment to friendly relations with our allies and the neutrals than all the Nazis' propaganda. If he is not removed from his position, won't his utterances be interpreted by the rest of the world as a reflection of the sentiments of the United States Government and its people?

The thought that my husband will possibly be serving under this blundering, bloodthirsty egotist makes my blood boil. How must this disgraceful speech delivered in their midst make our men in England feel on the eve of the invasion? Does it give them confidence in their leadership—and faith in the cause for which they are fighting?

Is it not natural that those of us who are totally in the dark as to what is going on behind the scenes would wonder if this speech, coming from one who perhaps is in a position to know more about what is going on than some of us will ever learn, does not represent the true picture? Has General Patton unwittingly exposed the war lords? Is this war just a farce after all? If this is the true picture, then we wives, mothers, and sweethearts entreat your aid in bringing home those of our boys who are not fighting for the glory of it—and we don't want General Patton, or his kind, on the welcoming committee when they do come home.

Sincerely yours,

GENINE KRENZ.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Anglo-American Treaty on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses delivered at the dinner commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the Anglo-American Treaty on Palestine, sponsored by the New Zionist Organization of America, Hotel Commodore, New York City, Sunday, April 23, 1944:

ADDRESS BY GOV. J. HOWARD M'GRATH

Friends of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, my distinguished colleagues on this program, I am happy to be here and enjoy the opportunity of contributing to the cause of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, a cause which you are so heartily interested in.

In times such as these, and at the price of enormous sacrifices, we are laying the foundations for a new and more decent world. In its accomplishment the statesmen of the great powers bear a heavy responsibility. Suffering humanity of all countries have but them to look to with prayerful hope. Their promises alone represent humanity's guaranty of a better future, and the form in which these promises are kept will be the justification or futility of the present conflict. Just as reliance on these official statements can raise hopes of subjected people to sublime heights, so would disillusionment lead to utter despair, blackest cynicism and contemptuous rejection of political leadership for generations to come.

Since we in America are known as an idealistic people, easily swayed to noble causes, and quickly disgusted when convinced of the insincerity of crusaders, the spoken words and promises of our leaders are even more important than those of countries that are looked upon as less ideologic.

Others have spoken tonight of the great tragedy of the Jewish people. Full as Jewish history is with tragic incidents, none was ever so great as the systematic campaign of slaughter which the Jewish people are undergoing in our day. One quarter of the Jews of the world are being exterminated.

No act of infamy in all the pages of history, from the beginning of time, to now, can compare with the savage campaign of wholesale martyrdom and murder now being conducted against the Jewish people. To withdraw, or to evade under such conditions from our commitments and responsibility to provide a promised homeland to these people, is to me, unthinkable. To avoid this measure of assistance in human misery by the great Allied Powers, would mean the establishment of a new low in international morality.

Perhaps I can best contribute to this cause by leaving to others the proof of the moral untenability and political short-sightedness that such a course would portray, and myself stress the fatal part which such an unpardonable attitude is bound to play in testing the worth of any of the promises which are being lavishly poured forth, and out of which mankind takes courage to go on with this struggle. Woe unto the world if its people become convinced that they can judge their leaders only by their words and not by their deeds.

There are those who will say that the question of Palestine—the closing of its doors to the Jews—is an issue between Great Britain and the Jewish people, in which the United States of America has no right to interfere. To any who think thus, I would remind them of the historic declarations of our Government with respect to this question, going back to the early twenties. Speaking of the mandated areas in which Palestine is included, our Secretary of State wrote a note to Great Britain on November 20, 1920, as follows:

"Such powers as the Allied and Associated Nations may enjoy or wield in the determination of the governmental status of the mandated areas, accrued to them as a direct result of the war against the Central Powers. The United States, as a participant in that conflict and as a contributor to its successful issue, cannot consider any of the Associated Powers, the smallest not less than itself, debarred from the discussion of any of its consequences, or from participation in the rights and privileges secured under the mandates provided for in the treaties of peace * * *. The United States is undoubtedly one of the powers directly interested in the terms of the mandates, and I therefore request that the draft mandate forms be communicated to this Government for its consideration before their submission to the Council of the League."

Subsequently, and as a result of the foregoing, the United States in a further note to Great Britain insisted that: "The consent of the United States should be obtained before any alteration is made in the text of the mandate.

The British Government agreed to give a separate undertaking to this effect and the United States, on April 5, 1922, consented that such an undertaking be embodied in a special convention. According to the official communique issued at Washington on May 14, 1922, the treaty was to incorporate the text of the Palestine mandate and to provide that no change should be made in that text without the concurrence of the United States. One June 20, the British Foreign Office forwarded to the American Ambassador at London the draft of the treaty.

These excerpts from our diplomatic correspondence explain the purport of Article 7 of the Anglo-American Convention of December 3, 1924, as follows:

"Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States."

This article, which clearly and unequivocally establishes the right of the United States to give or to refuse its assent to any modification in the mandatory status of Palestine, was the guiding principle of American policy with regard to Palestine for nearly 13 years after the conclusion of the convention of December 1924. In 1937, when the second partition of Palestine was proposed, this American right was the subject of an important and illuminating discussion between the American and British Governments. And what was the stand taken by our Government? Our Government insisted (and I am quoting from the official correspondence of our Ambassador to London, Robert W. Bigham) that it adhere to the "principle established in 1921 that the approval of the United States is

essential to the validity of any determination which may be reached regarding mandated territories."

This, my friends, is the record which clearly establishes our right to intervene at this hour when the mandate to which we have given our concurrence is being nullified in practice, without our consent, and without even following the procedure laid down in the mandate, itself.

This is the basis of our right. But I believe that unless our good faith is to be made the victim of contempt it is also our duty to be heard. It has been said in the recent past, and it is being said with regard to the future, that any war anywhere, any breach of international law anywhere, is a concern of ours; that we may not dissociate ourselves from it at the risk of having the whole structure of world peace shattered.

As to this I can only say that I believe that when we put our signature to a document it is up to us to see that commitments to us are not nullified. Otherwise what is the sense of putting our signatures to international documents? Our consent is not being asked to a most far-reaching and a most unfair change in the status of Palestine despite the fact that a convention to which we are a party stipulates that our consent is essential. The consent of the League of Nations, which, according to the mandate incorporated in our convention, is also essential, is equally dispensed with. Are we to stand mute and silent and acquiescent? Or are we asked why such things are possible?

Our own citizens, under the white paper, have been made victims of discrimination in that land of Palestine if they have the misfortune to belong to the Jewish faith. They are excluded from entering Palestine as a matter of policy. They are forbidden to purchase land in most of Palestine as a matter of policy. We did not stand for it when Czarist Russia tried to do it decades ago. We did not stand for it when Hitlerite Germany tried to do it a short decade ago. Why should we silently acquiesce in such a course now?

Ultimately the protest of all decent Americans is directed against the cruel gesture of closing the gates of Palestine to the Jewish people; the gates of a country which has been entrusted to British guardianship for the explicit purposes of facilitating Jewish settlement therein; and in doing so at the most tragic time in Jewish history—when Jews stand in need of a homeland as never before; and in doing so in violation of solemn pledges both to the League of Nations and to us.

Our immediate protest is directed against that inept, unwise, and unworthy policy which makes our own Government stand idly by watching this moral error; a legal misdeed being perpetrated without us exercising our right to cry out against it; without us discharging our duty to cry "Halt!"

I am particularly glad to attend this New Zionist meeting because my belief in the aims and aspirations of Zionism are in accord with my American patriotism and my Catholic faith. I believe that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine will be of benefit not only to Jews but to non-Jews as well. To Jews it will provide some place in this world which they will be able to call their own. A race, like an individual, feels lonesome and destitute without a roof over its head.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. BULLITT

Ladies and gentlemen, this evening's gathering is called a twentieth anniversary dinner, but to me it represents the twenty-fifth anniversary of a tragic event. Twenty-five years ago, in the spring of the peace conference, a British plane flying from London to Paris plunged into the Channel. On it was the leader of the Zionists of Palestine—Aaron Aaronsohn. He was a great agronomist, the discoverer of the wild wheat, parent of all the wheats of the world. He was also a very great man, and he was my own close friend.

In the volume which was published in his memory, I wrote, in 1920:

"Aaron, to me, was not merely the flaming embodiment of the determination of the Jewish race to have a home and to be again a nation, but rather, a captain in the foremost company of that small army of humanity which marches ever against ignorance, superstition, and hatred. If he had lived, I believe that he would have been a world leader through the years of travail which are now upon mankind.

"Nothing in the nature of man was strange to him or beyond the range of his quick sympathy. The Jewish race has many brilliant leaders, but when Aaron died I believe that it lost the man who, before all others, could kindle the minds and hearts of men of other nations to active sympathy; and not Zion alone will suffer for his loss, the world is poorer."

Since Aaron Aaronsohn's death I have often felt that I was in a minority of one on the question of Palestine. His opinions were my opinions, and for a long time there seemed to be few, if any, who shared them. Aaron had lived most of his life at Zikron Jacob, a little Jewish colony in the hills, and he had got along well with the Arabs. He felt neither hatred nor contempt for them. He was fond of them. But he believed profoundly that not only the fate of the Jews in Palestine but also the fate of all the Jews in all the world demanded that Palestine should become a Jewish state, free and independent, with its own flag and its own citizenship. He foresaw endless difficulties and hatreds, and even massacres, if Jewish immigrants should merely be poured into Palestine as a mandated area, against the will of the Arab majority. Indeed, he went so far as to say that it would be better for the Jews of Palestine to remain under the rule of the Turks, rather than to become a hated minority surrounded by the masses of Mohammedans who inhabit the Near East. He sought an agreed solution.

Many times during the Peace Conference in Paris, I sat with him and Dr. Weizmann while they thought out together policies and plans. Aaron's proposal was that, while Palestine should become a Jewish state, the vast valley of Iraq, watered by the Tigris and the Euphrates, should be turned once more by irrigation into the garden of the world—which it once had been—and that the Arabs of Palestine should be offered there lands far richer than the lands they owned in Palestine, and that as many as possible of them should be persuaded to emigrate to Iraq. He foresaw no insuperable difficulties if some should choose to remain in the Jewish state. And he recognized fully that Jerusalem was a holy place not only for the Jews but also for the Mohammedans and the Christians. He proposed that Jerusalem and Bethlehem should be set apart as a sort of Vatican City to be administered jointly by representatives of the three great religions under international guarantees.

These, briefly and roughly, were Aaronsohn's ideas. They seemed to me to offer a possible solution of the problem of Palestine. It was obvious that the utmost diplomatic skill and energy, and large sums of money, would be required to put them into effect. Nevertheless, in 1919, they seemed to be within the realm of practical politics. At that time there was little hatred between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine. And the combined power of the British, French, and American Governments to carry out policies they might agree upon was almost unlimited.

After Aaronsohn's death his ideas were forgotten, and Palestine under British mandate entered upon the splendid course of material development with which we are all familiar—but at the same time upon the course of growing race hatred which Aaronsohn had foreseen.

Today, the question of Palestine remains as unsolved as it was in 1919. It is, indeed, more difficult to solve than it was in 1919—so difficult that in spite of the terrible need of the Jews of Europe for a land of refuge, the only visible policy toward Palestine is the policy of preserving the status quo until the end of the war.

Under these circumstances, I wonder if it may not be wise to consider now, seriously, the proposals which Aaron Aaronsohn made in 1919. Conditions, to be sure, have changed. There are many new factors in the situation. Some favorable, many unfavorable. One of them is so important that it is worthy of special attention.

The petroleum reserves beneath the soil of the United States have been drained and are being drained at such a rate that our Government estimates that in less than 20 years they will be exhausted. For reasons of national defense, our Government is vitally concerned that they should not be exhausted and that reserves of overseas oil should be assured for the United States. Our Government, therefore, is now taking a direct interest in the petroleum reserves of Saudi Arabia. A long step in American foreign policy is involved in this decision. The Near East is remote from our shores. It lies in a British sphere of influence, and may become an area of conflict between Great Britain and Russia. Our future need for oil, however, has seemed so important that our Government has decided to involve the United States directly in the affairs of the Near East.

If the United States has a major national interest in the Near East, the Government of the United States cannot be indifferent to the settlement of questions which affect the tranquillity of the area. And the unsettled question of Palestine does affect the tranquillity of the area.

This new policy of the American Government may influence our official attitude toward Palestine in either of two ways. It may cause our Government to become increasingly apprehensive about making any proposal which might irritate the Arabs—just as British policy with regard to Palestine has been influenced by British interests in Mohammedan areas. On the other hand, it may be made the starting point for a truly constructive policy with regard to the whole Near East, including Palestine.

Since 1940, when America was unprepared for war and Great Britain stood heroically, alone against the Nazis, there have been few Americans who have not realized that there can be no peace and little decency in the world unless there is the closest cooperation between the United States and Great Britain. That cooperation exists today and should become ever closer. In view of the present coordination of American and British efforts in so many vital fields of world affairs, it is not impossible to imagine that the American and British Governments might work out now with each other and with the rulers of the various Mohammedan states in the Near East a policy for the development of the whole area not only in respect of oil but also with regard to the irrigation of the great valley of Iraq and the settlement of the question of Palestine.

Thus, once more the proposals which Aaron Aaronsohn made in 1919 may come into the realm of practical politics. I do not say that they will but that they may. It is easy for politicians to evade the issue, and settle the question of Palestine so far as their own careers are concerned by expressing great sympathy for the Jews. There is no Arab vote in the United States.

Kind words are pleasant but acts are needed and, in this case, wisdom, energy, and human understanding of no common order.

The case is genuinely difficult. The facts are hard. And nothing but disappointment and disillusionment is to be gained by pretending that the question is easy of solution or by belittling the Arabs.

There has been greatness in their past. There may be greatness in their future. New life is stirring in all the Arab world from Syria to Morocco. In Arabia, Ibn-Saud has created greater unity than any man since Mohammed. The religion of the Arabs is a noble one which, in its pure form, produces men of profound courage, courtesy, and loyalty. And any act which can be construed as an attack on their religion creates among the Arabs a unified will to fight. And they still outnumber the Jews in Palestine by approximately two to one.

The striking economic progress in Palestine since 1919 is, of course, attributable to the Jews; but the Arabs have participated in the advance, and even today 50 percent of the vast orange groves that beautify the plain along the sea are owned by Arabs.

Such magnificent creations as the great new hospital in Jerusalem and the Hebrew university splendid tokens of the ability of the Jews to bring western civilization to the Near East. But the case of the Arabs is far from weak, and the overriding argument for a Jewish State in Palestine is not to be found in local conditions but in a world-wide need. Anti-Semitism has not disappeared, and will not disappear even with the death of Hitler and the destruction of his criminal accomplices. The Jews, like all other peoples, need a land; and it is right and fitting that their land should be the promised land of their fathers. To reach that promised land I know no better way than the path proposed by Aaron Aaronsohn. And I think the American and British Governments should follow it.

It is not on easy path. Determination, energy, wisdom, diplomatic skill and the closest cooperation between the American and British Governments will be needed in full measure if it is to be followed successfully to the end. Unless it is followed as a major policy in foreign affairs it will be too hard for the politicians. But there is no easy, short cut to a lasting settlement of the question of Palestine and those who propose short cuts by force, whether they be Arabs or Jews, prepare only disaster. If the Arabs of Palestine and the neighboring states should attempt to drive the Jews out of Palestine by force, they would be crushed by the overwhelming strength of the British added to that of the Jewish population. If the Jews of Palestine should attempt to impose their rule on the Arab majority by force, they would face the forces of the neighboring Arab states as well and would achieve only their own destruction.

The question cannot be settled except by an agreed solution. Why should we despair of such a solution? Constructive statesmanship is still possible in this world. Only 20 years ago, great statesmen—Venizelos, of Greece, and Ataturk, of Turkey—settled the ancient blood feud between the Greeks and the Turks by an exchange of populations which finally included 1,500,000 souls—an exchange of huge dimensions compared to the resources of their states. It was an enormous effort, but a constructive one; and it settled the question. For the first time in history Greece and Turkey became close friends.

Are the great powers incapable of constructive statesmanship? Are their leaders incompetent, or is the will to act wanting?

After Aaron Aaronsohn's death, as I said to you, I felt often that I was in a minority of one. I may still be. But I continue to have faith in his proposals. I believe that it is possible for the British and American Governments to work out with the rulers of the Arab states, and with the Jews and Arabs of Palestine, an agreed solution which will bring vast benefits to the Mohammedans of the Near East as well as to the Jews.

The blood of the tortured Jews of Europe cries out to all humanity for a Jewish state in Palestine. The American Government is embarking on a new policy toward the Near East. It is the part of men of good will of all faiths to see to it that policies are pursued which will produce an agreed solution between the Jews and the Arabs and permit at last the creation of a free Palestine in a free world.

The 3d of May—Anniversary of the Charter of Polish Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, today the Poles throughout the world are celebrating their national holiday—the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the constitution which marked their nation's spiritual rebirth. This is the fifth year in succession when Poles within their home territory have been compelled to observe their national holiday under the tyrant's heel, intimidated and brutally treated by the satraps of foreign dictator carpetbaggers.

The 1791 Constitution of Poland was the first democratic charter of liberties of any European country and was inspired by Anglo-Saxon liberal thought. That constitution decreed a great reform, revolutionary in effect. It improved the existing regime and inspired the people of all of Europe. It gave expression to the grim determination of Poland to throw off foreign invaders and domination. It eloquently underwrote Poland's hostility to tyranny and unwillingness to submit to international immorality.

The Poles were the first to fight the Germans. There is no Quisling in Poland. Her people have made incredible sacrifices and have been subjected to uncivilized, barbarous, and savage treatment, virtually unparalleled in history. Unfortunately, the reforms provided in the constitution were prevented from going into effect and were held in abeyance by the combined action of foreign nations, but the national spirit of Poland has ever remained alive, while the people have bided their time.

Today I pay tribute to the heroic peoples of Poland, unintimidated and uncowed in their zeal for independence. Their friends in the United States may take pride justifiably in the contribution made to world civilization by Polish culture.

In the field of music alone, Polish composers have set a standard for the world to emulate. In literature, painting, and sculpture, Poland's sons and daughters have been outstanding.

I join with my colleagues today in congratulating Poland on the anniversary of her constitution. God speed the day when Poland will be liberated and will rise again.

International Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

THE COMMISSION ON A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE,
New York, N. Y., April 21, 1944.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: I am enclosing herewith a statement signed by more than 1,000 churchmen, lay and clerical, urging that steps be taken to initiate now the nucleus of a general world organization such as that envisaged by the Moscow Declaration and the Connally resolution.

I do not believe I am overstating the case when I say that the preponderant majority of the church people of America, of all denominations and faiths, support the proposals embodied in this statement. They look to you to do everything within your power to achieve the ends therein set forth.

May I respectfully suggest that you give this statement your careful study.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. VAN KIRK,
Secretary.

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT, THE CONGRESS, AND THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

We, the undersigned, believe that the time is at hand when a concrete beginning should be made to realize the Moscow declaration and Connally resolution which recognized "the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization * * *." We need now at least the nucleus of such a general international organization in order to promote unity of political and diplomatic decision by the principal United Nations and consistency with such aspects of the moral law as have been proclaimed by the Atlantic Charter and other declarations of the United Nations.

If, however, international organization is to serve its purpose of achieving just and durable peace, it must from the beginning be planned to become universal in membership and curative and creative in purpose.

We subscribe wholeheartedly to the affirmation ("Six Pillars of Peace") of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, instituted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, that not only must there be "the political framework for a continuing collaboration of the United Nations," but that "such collaboration should, as quickly as possible, be universal." We also believe, with that Commission, that the international organization which is established should have not merely the task of seeking physical security but responsibility to deal regularly with conditions which contain the seeds of future war. It should be designed to seek the change of treaty conditions which may develop to be unjust and provocative of war; to bring within the scope of international agreement those economic and financial acts of nations which have widespread international repercussions; to promote the attainment of autonomy as a genuine goal for dependent peoples; and to assure for people everywhere a regime of religions and intellectual liberty.

We appeal to the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States to work vigorously for practical steps which will initiate such an organization.

The Liquor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, some people in Washington appear hell bent on driving the people of the United States headlong into the evils of prohibition whether the people want it or not.

The latest attempt in this direction comes from the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board, which after 6 weeks and more of dilly-dallying, double-talk, and coy excuses has failed to promulgate a policy giving relief to American liquor dealers who have traded with Cuba and other Latin-American countries.

I know 6 weeks is only a second in the existence of bureaucratic rule and ruin but when the little-business man has funds tied up for 6 weeks it means a lot to him. I wouldn't expect it to mean anything to cushion-seated procastinating bureaucrats here in the "District of Confusion."

For 6 weeks I have been trying to get a ruling from the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board and for 6 weeks all I have gotten has been conversation and promises which could be accepted for any conclusion I choose to arrive.

We have but to look around us to realize, if we look the facts in the face, that because of the liquor shortage, all the old prohibition evils are coming back—bootlegging, hijacking, black-market price gouges, bad liquor and so on.

The people of this country do not want a return to prohibition and the evils which followed in the wake of the so-called noble experiment but if these bureaus are allowed to run hog-wild under the guise of the war effort we are going to have prohibition and all its attendant evils in fact if not in theory.

There is a liquor shortage in this country because distilleries have not been allowed to manufacture alcohol over a long period because the alcohol was necessary in explosives. Nobody complained about that. Winning the war is our first object, and if it is necessary to stop manufacturing liquor to get sufficient alcohol, then stop manufacturing whisky in this country.

With the shortage of liquor, however, came the black market, which has become a public scandal and which is now the subject of investigation by a congressional committee.

Many well-meaning persons have advocated a 3-week vacation for the distillers from war alcohol to blend 100,000,000 gallons or a 2-year Nation-wide supply of 86-proof whisky. Or a lot of alcohol sugar could be procured from Cuba to substitute for grain alcohol used in explosives. Alcohol is obtainable, too, from sulfite by products of paper manufacture.

Driven through necessity by lack of marketable drinking spirits in this country, liquor dealers turned toward the Latin-America countries for relief and imported a huge quantity of rum from Cuba and other Latin-American countries. A quota import was slapped against Cuba, and then to appease Cuba for the ban, the W. P. B. also ordered a ban on other Latin-American countries, including Mexico, which was and is one of our large suppliers.

Again I say, if this was necessary in the war effort, then let us do it by all means, but let us be fair about the thing.

Without warning and without advance notice the War Production Board issued an order banning the importation of all liquor with a sugarcane base.

Some dealers learned of the order only through accident. I may say that the order was issued almost in secrecy and to only a favored few who even now seem to have a knowledge of what is going to happen before either the public or Members of Congress know anything about it.

At any rate on March 9 the order was issued by the War Production Board, becoming effective on March 15.

What was the effect of the order, particularly on the little liquor dealers? Unaware that such an order was contemplated these dealers had already issued letters of credit, or otherwise contracted for the shipment of merchandise which was either in transit or being prepared for shipment.

Although that order became effective on March 15 and letters of credit have been outstanding since that time, impairing the credit of the little dealer, the War Production Board to this date has not publicly issued any policy granting relief to these little dealers who have been caught "holding the bag."

Mind you, the only request which has been made has been to allow the importation of that merchandise which was contracted prior to March 15. Is that asking too much? Is it asking too much to have a ruling made in 6 weeks?

It took the War Production Board 6 days to make the ban effective but in 6 weeks the War Production Board has failed to grant relief from the ban to those injured by the order.

Not only has no relief been granted but severing the Gordian knot becomes an easy matter compared to getting some intelligent information from the War Production Board as to when relief can be expected.

Nero is said to have fiddled while Rome burned. These bureaucrats fumble while American small business becomes slowly strangulated in a mesh of indecisiveness and procrastination.

But the door of information is not closed to everybody in the liquor industry and others as far as the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board is concerned as evidenced by this series of events.

Shortly after the order was issued I learned through a certain source in the liquor industry that the W. P. B. would remove the ban on all 3-year-old rum. This was a logical exemption since such rum was already produced and would obviously have no effect on future production of alcohol. That seemed to be a matter for early and immediate determination. It seemed to an ordinary layman with an ordinary mind to be an easy solution but I failed to conjure with that which makes the minds of these bureaucrats. function

It was on March 21 that I received this information and relayed it to Mr. John Boyer, head of the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board, who should know what was going on since he is the head of the division.

In substance Mr. Boyer told me there was nothing to the report and that no "Technique of policy" had been determined and that "anything could happen."

On April 12, 3 weeks later, it was announced over the radio and in the press that the ban on 3-year-old rum would be removed.

When I contacted Mr. Boyer to have the report confirmed or denied I was informed by him that such a statement was "unauthorized" and reasonably came away with the impression that the radio and press reports were in error.

On April 27, 2 weeks later, such an order was "officially" released, according to Mr. Boyer.

Pressed by the reason of his reply to me on April 12, Mr. Boyer adroitly pointed out that he had not denied such an order was in the making but specifically said it was "unauthorized."

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, what conclusion would any of you had come to if given such information? That's an example of the double-talk the public and Members of Congress get. It is the old run-around at its zenith. The facts as stated by me indicate somebody knew as far back as March 27 that such an order was contemplated. The press and radio found it out on April 12 but the little fellows down at the bottom of the ladder did not know anything about it until April 27 and inquiring Members of Congress heard about it at an even later date.

I cannot but wonder who did profit by the advance information on the subsequent policy. Surely it was of advantage to somebody to be on the "in" on such information.

I wonder who now has knowledge of what the "technique of policy" will be relative to those unfortunate dealers who have been caught in the predicament which I have described.

It is possible that the "technique of policy" has been decided upon but its announcement has not been "authorized" as was the case relative to lifting the ban on 3-year rum. The "authorized" announcement will probably be forthcoming after the "technique of policy" has been passed along to favored parties without benefit of "authorized announcement" but just as effective for all intent and purposes.

Very frankly, I am not optimistic that any relief will be granted to the little liquor dealers. The big fellows can handle themselves and are doing it pretty well. I am not interested in them. I am interested in those folks who need a friend at court, where there is so much confusion, indecision and chaos.

Somebody has observed that the most outstanding shortage in Washington is a shortage of old-fashioned common horse sense.

The application of a little such common horse sense where the public is concerned would be rather refreshing. It is too much to hope for, however, in the light of previous occurrences and rulings by some governmental bureaus. Or perhaps the apparent lack of use of common horse sense is only a subterfuge for more double talk and run-around.

Somebody has got somebody bluffed in connection with this liquor situation. Just yelling out "war effort" does not answer the problem. Enough crimes are being committed under the cry of aiding the war effort. It is about time somebody got to the bottom of the whole thing and a good place to start would be in the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board to determine why they cannot make up their minds after a lapse of more than 6 weeks and why information is accessible to some persons and not to a Member of Congress.

I am persuaded there is something rotten and it is not in Denmark this time.

Poland Redivivus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of a memorable occasion, a day in the world's history never to be forgotten.

One hundred and fifty-three years ago today the Polish Parliament adopted the first written democratic constitution to establish the rights of people and peasants, to secure liberty, freedom, and equality for all under law. The constitution of the 3d of May was of import beyond purely Polish bounds. It was an event of general human significance, as Edmund Burke truly remarked. It possessed a value of no mean importance to the progress of mankind. The immediate consequences of its adoption were tragic, its lasting significance great.

We Vermonters, imbued with the same spirit, whose fathers established and maintained an independent republic for 14 years before joining the United States on March 4, 1791, pay our tribute to the same kind of indomitable courage and imperishable spirit which has dominated Poland over the years. As our allies they have fought as have we for freedom from oppression whenever and wherever the flag which marches ahead of blood brothers for liberty has been flung to the breeze and led the way. The record of Polish patriots is a bright spot in the dark shadows that have enveloped the world through the years. We salute them.

This people have come from the four corners of the earth to fight for freedom and to exemplify what love of liberty means, no matter how great the sacrifice involved to make their dreams come true. They have paid a terrible price to maintain their rights.

I say to the Polish people that we deeply sympathize with your struggle to keep your liberties alive. We believe with you in the absolute right of small nations and freemen to enjoy such freedom and liberty as that for which you and we are fighting. To live without them is to die. We congratulate you on this your aniversary of your declaration of independence.

Dictatorial Practices of the New Deal Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the exercise of dictatorial powers by the President and the Attorney General in the seizure of a nonwar plant in Chicago last week, I wish to call the attention of the House to another White House directive of sabotaging the Constitution.

The undisputed facts to which I invite your attention disclose the President of the United States using his powers in an attempt to conceal the activities and records of 30 Federal employees who have been accused of disloyalty to the Government. Here, again, we find Mr. Biddle, the Attorney General, justifying the President's action with one of his celebrated opinions.

As a member of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, I am disturbed and alarmed over this situation, and I feel that the House should be equally concerned.

In December of last year the Special Committee on Un-American Activities authorized an investigation into the investigative procedures in loyalty cases of the Civil Service Commission. This action was prompted by a directive issued in November 1943 by the Commission instructing its field agents not to ask applicants or Government employees questions concerning their affiliations with certain Communist-front organizations.

On February 18, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities served a subpena on the President of the Civil Service Commission calling upon him to produce the files and records of 10 persons employed in the Federal Government, and again on February 25 the committee issued a subpena for the files in 20 other cases. On February 18, and again on February 26, Harry S. Mitchell, President of the Commission, replied to the subpena in the form of a letter in which he stated:

> The Commission has therefore concluded that it would not be in the public interest to disclose these documents to the committee.

He concludes the letter in the following language:

> You can be assured that it is the desire of the Commission to cooperate with your committee in every way and that the Commission now declines, with the approval and at the direction of the President of the United States, to comply with certain of your requests only because it is believed that it must do so if it is to properly perform its statutory duties.

The well-worn phrase "not in the public interest" has again been employed by the administration to conceal evidence which, by no possible stretch of the imagination, can affect the prosecution of the war. A Senate subcommittee when similarly defied by an aide to the President, took steps to hale him before the bar of the Senate for contempt and only then was given the information which it desired. The House should not be reluctant to protect its authority in the same manner.

Why should the President take such extraordinary precautions to keep the Congress and the public in ignorance of the records of 30 persons in key positions of the Government whose loyalty to our American system has been questioned? What information or evidence could there be in the files of a Federal employee which would be against the public interest? I can easily understand that certain information in these files would probably be against the public interest of the New Deal but certainly not against the public interest of the Nation.

The President of the Commission also informed the committee that they are relying upon an opinion given by the Attorney General dated April 30, 1941, which held that the investigative reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are confidential documents of the Executive Department and that congressional or public access thereto would not be in the public interest. I am sure that every Member will agree with me that there is a vast difference between the confidential records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the records of a Government employee.

The Civil Service Commission has delivered to our committee, since the service of the subpenas on them, skeleton files with considerable deletions, and I am of the opinion that our investigation cannot be properly carried out without the full records and facts. I feel that the Congress should insist on having the full and complete files on the background and employment record of these Government employees whose loyalty is in question.

While on the subject, I should also like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Department of Justice has utterly failed to properly carry out its statutory duties in protecting and defending the dignity and power of the Congress of the United States. On April 8, 1940, the House adopted House Resolution 457, which referred to the United States attorney of the District of Columbia the case of Philip Frankfeld, Communist official in Boston, Mass., who had been held in contempt by the Special Committee on un-American Activities. Similar action was taken by the House on the same date under House Resolution 458 in the case of Dr. Albert Blumberg, head of the Communist Party for the State of Maryland. Similar action was also taken under House Resolution 459

in the case of Communist official Thomas F. P. O'Dea, of Boston, Mass. Similar action was also taken under House Resolution 452 in the case of George Powers, Communist official of Pittsburgh, Pa., and under House Resolution 446, James H. Dolsen, Pennsylvania Communist official, was also cited for contempt.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been approximately 4 years since these five Communist officials were cited for contempt by the House of Representatives and to date not a one of these defendants has been brought to trial. From such action it appears that the Communists are not the only ones who have contempt for the Congress.

I urge the Judiciary Committee of this body to investigate this matter and determine why the Communists in this country enjoy such a privileged status with the Department of Justice.

Anniversary of Adoption of Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish today to commemorate the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791. This anniversary is important not only to those among us of Polish descent, but to every true American who is fighting today for liberty and justice.

The Polish Nation, as is well known, has been the pawn many times in its long and tragic history on the European chessboard, being submerged time and again by the various militaristic governments in Europe. But the spirit of the Polish people did not die. On November 11, 1918, when the armistice was declared between the Allied and the Central Powers, out of the ashes of World War No. 1, modern Poland was born as a nation and less than 3 years later, on March 17, 1921, 130 years after the adoption of the first Polish Constitution, a new constitution was adopted by the Polish Parliament.

America knows well the Polish apostles of liberation, typified by that glorious patriot, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who gave his services to 13 loosely connected colonies on our eastern seaboard in their struggle against tyranny and oppression. The United States of those days offered no opportunity for gain to a recognized military strategist, but Kosciuszko, the liberator, had no thought of material gain. His only wish was to see men free and for his deeds of valor he was recognized in his own lifetime by a vote of gratitude by the Congress and by receiving the rank of brigadier general in our Army. But America gave him—and through him gave to his beloved Poland—more than gratitude and more than military honors. Through Kosciuszko, America gave to Poland the spirit and letter of our own Declaration of Independence, to be embodied in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

During the years immediately after the rebirth of Poland in Europe in 1918, there was enthusiastic support from the Allied Nations but as was to be expected, extreme coolness from Germany and other Central Powers. As the years passed, the enemies of Poland became stronger and rumors swept through the world that this reborn democracy would not last long as a nation. These harbingers of gloom emphasized the differences between the long-submerged Polish peoples; they spoke of their economic and political troubles; they played up the supposed rightful claims of neighboring nations. It is not too much to say that it was in the 1920's that many of the seeds of this present war were sown by men who hoped secretly to see Poland again submerged beneath its predatory neighbors, with whom it had tried to live at peace. And so, on September 1, 1939, rather than compromise with Hitler and his evil powers, Poland again became the battleground of Europe.

This brief recital of part of the history of Poland is important today as we commemorate the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. Many attempts are being made to becloud the Polish issue and it behooves us today—as always—to review the facts and to keep them clearly in mind. The Polish Nation, through its Army, Navy, and air force, side by side with our own gallant men and women, is fighting openly against Germany and through the "underground," many millions of Poles are playing a courageous and vital part in the war. Throughout the years the Polish people have been our brothers in liberty and the United States must not forget them at the peace table.

In 1791 Poland, with America, was in the vanguard of the free and enlightened nations of the world. Today, a century and a half later, the world again needs Polish courage and Polish independence of thought if the wounds caused by this frightful conflict are to be healed. The United States to be true to its many loyal citizens of Polish descent, aye to be true to its very self, must encourage and aid Poland in keeping bright the fires of liberty and democracy which burn so fiercely in every Polish heart, brave lovers of truth and freedom.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791, I would like to pay a brief tribute to the first of the United Nations to accept the German challenge and to fight for her own freedom and that of the whole world. Poland, our gallant ally, once the largest and most democratic country in Europe, was crushed and partitioned by her neighbors. And this brings me to a point that is too often overlooked. It is the fact that Poland, a purely Slav nation, has for a thousand years been most closely allied with western culture, that she is saturated with western ideals, that in Europe's hour of religious intolerance Poland was a haven to the oppressed of all races and of all creeds. And even after Poland had suffered national extinction, when there was no longer a Polish state, Poland, true to her Christian ideals, fought all over the world and right here in the United States "for our freedom and for yours." Yes; Pulaski gave his life; Kosciusko fought for our independence. Shall we not in our turn see that Poland's independence is restored? Let us join here today in a solemn pledge that when victory has been achieved by the United Nations over Germany and her partners in crime, Poland will be retsored to the place that is hers, a strong, free, and independent nation, as ever a loyal friend and ally of our glorious country. May the American eagle and the white eagle of Poland fly wing to wing over a world of peace.

Anniversary of Adoption of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. D. McWILLIAMS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, although the Polish Nation is overrun with foreign invaders and her cities have suffered the extreme and most cruel ravages of modern warfare the spirit of her people remains undaunted.

Today the Polish people are observing another anniversary of their great Constitution adopted May 3, 1791. This Constitution, extending greater freedom to the people of this grand and gallant country was inspired by the ideals of our Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Men.

It was the first written democratic constitution in Europe establishing the rights of the middle classes and of the peasants. And down through the trying years of Poland's subsequent history this famous document has given the people of Poland added strength in their continued fight for freedom and against aggression.

Today our own Nation is again engaged in a great fight for freedom and Poland is our ally. It is therefore fitting that on this memorable Polish anniversary we rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom for Poland and all the nations of the earth.

To that end, the people of Poland will make any sacrifice and have already

emulated over and over again the fortitude of our own founding fathers in their quest for freedom.

May the day soon come when Poland may once again take her rightful place among the nations of the world and enjoy again the freedom for which she so valiantly fights as our ally today.

Poland's Restoration Humanity's Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, July 4, 1776, there was proclaimed for the world to know, with a profound and eloquent declaration, the freedom of a subordinated people. They had protested the wrongs to which they had been subjected and petitioned for relief. No consideration had been given to their petition, and with determination these courageous pioneers, upon a virgin continent, declared the birth of a new Republic. With it, a written constitution; unique, sound, humane and visionary, was conceived and adopted. No sooner had it been adopted than a need was observed for the establishment in such magnificent document of a guaranty of certain inalienable rights to the people who were to be governed by it. Thus came the first ten amendments, commonly referred to as the Bill of Rights. It has since been eulogized throughout the world by the leading statesmen and scholars as the greatest document for the government of human society ever to come from the brain and pen of man. Eternal vigilance is essential for its preservation and permanency. Let no man or woman for one moment abandon vigilance in protecting and preserving this document to which we owe all our progress, liberty, and privileges.

May 3, 1791, our great sister republic, Poland, also a pioneer in establishing the fundamental rights of the common man, announced to the world the establishment of a democratic written constitution. A glorious and outstanding period in European history was thus established.

After hundreds of years of persecution, suffering, trials and tribulations filled with sweat, toil and bloodshed, the people of this progressive and advanced nation, courageous and forward-looking, likewise, in their great document for the government of people of that part of the world, proclaimed new and unannounced principles recognizing the fundamental and inalienable rights of the common men.

May 3, 1944, marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution. That 153 years has also been filled with many chapters of interesting history in which these great people have valiantly fought and bled to preserve their native land and all that it symbolizes. Frequently attacked and torn asunder by the great military powers of Europe, having been subject to partition, conquest, and disintegration, with all of the genius with which such people are blessed, never for one moment have they abandoned the torch of liberty and human freedom and the cause to which they dedicated their nation by the establishment of their constitution.

September 1, 1939, the forces of aggression, iniquity and bloody persecution again invaded this land. Within 3 weeks all of this great sister republic was occupied and much of it devastated. Its brave and patriotic people were humiliated, persecuted, and wantonly murdered, and the glorious civilization achieved by a thousand years of terrific struggles was supplanted by this force of wicked aggression and wanton destruction.

The debt to Poland for its achievements in defending the continent of Europe against the aggressors in the past is such that we cannot adequately repay until there has again been established in this land of traditional liberty, progress, and advanced civilization, a free government of the people with security and peace. Can we forget that it was the valor, courage, and sacrifice of Poland that saved western Europe from the Tartar invasion in the Battle of Lignica in 1241? That it was Poland who stopped the first Teutonic thrust for power in the Battle of Grunwald in 1410; that it was Poland, in 1683, that stemmed the invasion of the Turks at Vienna; that it was Poland that saved Europe from the Bolshevik invasion at the Battle of Warsaw in 1920, and that she most courageously, to the utmost of her ability, and at great sacrifice, loss of life, and even country, defended her borders and her national honor and resisted to the utmost of her capacity, the Nazi invasion of 1939.

These are but a few of the heroic contributions that Poland has made to the advancement of civilization in Europe and in America and for the world. Our debt to Poland can only be repaid by keeping in the forefront, and for primary consideration at the peace table, the fundamental rights that Poland possesses to be again established in her homeland as a sovereign democratic nation. I have faith that our Government will insist that the problems that have eternally subjected Poland to persecution, that have caused her to be torn apart from time to time, will be settled once and for all time and that she will be restored to her rightful place in the family of nations, in that the genius of her commonwealth can contribute to the attainment of a higher and better civilization for all mankind. Nothing less will suffice for these noble, heroic, and persecuted people.

On this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the establishment of this great democratic constitution let us rededicate ourselves to the fulfillment of this sacred obligation.

How Could This Happen in America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from Mr. Win. C. Davidson, president, Bowles Livestock Commission Co., of Omaha, Nebr.:

BOWLES LIVESTOCK COMMISSION CO.,
Omaha, Nebr., April 28, 1944.

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Representative of Iowa,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On April 26 Leroy K. Smith, regional director of A. A. A., called a meeting at the stockyards to explain the new order—"freezing corn on the farm." After his explanation, the meeting was open for discussion. There were about 500 farmers and cattle feeders at the meeting. The questions asked brought out these facts:

1. That all corn had to be sold to the C. C. C. and they are to pay ceiling price, plus 5 cents per bushel for shelling and trucking. This corn could not be sold to anyone, except industrial plants.

2. Where a farmer or cattle feeder needed corn he had to go to A. A. A. and get a certificate for 30 days' supply. He could only pay the farmer ceiling price. Naturally, the farmer could not sell his to the feeder, when he could get ceiling price, plus 5 cents per bushel for shelling and trucking, from the C. C. C.

3. There was to be an official of the A. A. A. visit each farm to determine whether that farmer had more corn than he needed to feed his cattle and hogs.

And, when a farmer or feeder asked for a 30-day supply, there would be an official of A. A. A. go to his farm or feedlot, look at his cattle, and if he decided the cattle were fat enough to ship he could refuse the feeder the corn and tell him to ship. In fact, if the feeder could not get the corn he would be forced to ship whether his cattle were actually ready or not.

4. Where a feeder had contracted for corn for future delivery and a down payment made, or paid in full (before the freeze order was issued), this contract is voided.

In my opinion this is the most drastic order yet issued and one which will wreck the meat industry.

Tuesday of this week, after the order went into effect, we had 12,000 cattle on the Omaha market, where 6,000 had been estimated. Wednesday there were over 10,000 cattle and 26,000 hogs—double the amount we would have had if this order had not been issued.

There was a line of trucks 2 or 3 miles long until noon each day, indicating liquidation of livestock. If this continues the country will be drained of fat livestock.

Mr. Smith informed us that this order for a month's supply of corn was for cattle in feed lots at present time and there would be not certificates issued for new cattle going into lots. You can readily see what effect this will have on the feeding industry for the future. There should be something done and speedily to stop this liquidation of livestock and, also, arrangements made whereby feeders can get corn for replacement cattle.

I understand that this order was framed months ago—and it looks to me like another case of regimentation and more power for the bureaucrats.

The big percent of the farmers are not in favor of continuing A. A. A. It looks to me like it is time for Congress to assert itself and abolish this bureau, also the O. P. A. and their Gestapo methods with their own courts. How could this happen in America?

In abolishing these bureaus it would release thousands of men who the W. M. B. claim are badly needed to win this war.

Very sincerely yours,

WIN C. DAVIDSON.

Anniversary of Adoption of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, in honoring Poland on this, her national day, the anniversary of her famous constitution of the 3d of May 1791, let us pay tribute to the sublime fortitude with which its Christian people are withstanding German terror.

It is because their patriotism has been strengthened by faith in God that the Poles have been able to withstand the bloody and relentless persecution that for 56 long months—2 months more than the last war—the German invaders have vented upon her. As has been stated heretofore—2,500,000 Poles murdered—the figure, Mr. Speaker, has now risen to 3½ million—500,000 starved to death by the Germans; 2,000,000 Poles deported to Germany for forced labor; 1,600,000 driven from their homes in the western provinces of Poland and sent to the east; hundreds of thousands confined in concentration camps; the population reduced to human slavery; dissenters who disputed the Nazi philosophy of state absolutism and a master race eliminated without mercy; more than a thousand towns and villages evacuated; 348 villages burned; everything of value confiscated, including farms, factories, workshops, stores, and even household furniture and personal effects; 7 dioceses under total persecution; churches, colleges, and high schools closed, and in some instances churches desecrated; members of religious orders banished; archbishops and bishops deported, imprisoned, and in some instances put to death; thousands of priests and religious students executed; other thousands thrown into concentration camps where large numbers of them died of maltreatment; and the civilian population, especially of the Jews, in many localities subjected to terrible "blood baths."

I have full confidence in the final victory and fulfillment of the obligation of recognition of the full sovereignty and territorial integrity of Poland. Surely after what Poland has been through, the first victim of Hitler's unprovoked aggression, of his mad bid for world dominion; after what Poland has done, how she defended her homeland and then fought in France, in Norway, in Libya, in Italy, on land and sea and in the skies, where the Polish air force helped to win the battle of Britain, our country, our Allies, the United Nations and civilization as a whole cannot stand by and see anything less than full justice done and full restoration of her rights assured to Poland, our gallant ally in this war and be it not forgotten whose sons fought and fell in our own war of independence like Pulaski, or played a notable part in organizing the military forces of our Republic, like Kosciuszko. What Poland did for America, we must do for Poland.

Freedom of Religion, Freedom of Worship—There Is a Difference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely jealous of the freedoms enunciated in the first amendment to the Constitution of this Republic.

That article, the first article of the Bill of Rights, says in clear terms:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievance.

Congress can neither establish a religion nor prohibit the free exercise thereof. It will be recalled that Jefferson, Madison, Adams, Franklin, Patrick Henry, and most of the others who provided the bulwark of the freedoms we enjoy in this country today were quite outspoken on the matter of religious freedom.

In his January 6, 1941 message to Congress, President Roosevelt began the "four freedoms" campaign and said, in enumerating them, "the second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world."

It should be especially noted that he said freedom "to worship God in his own way." It is truly religious freedom. Shortly after that the Office of War Information issued a booklet entitled "The United Nations Fight for the Four Freedoms." A chapter in it was labeled "Freedom of religion."

Three years after his original "four freedoms" speech, President Roosevelt sent another message to Congress in which the wording was changed as far as religious freedom is concerned. The contrast is striking.

On this recent occasion, January 11, 1944, Mr. Roosevelt referred to the subject as Free Worship. Pictures of the Four Freedoms now being distributed label one "Freedom of worship."

But, alas, the difference is as great as the space between the earth and the heavens. The state might direct a man's religion and give him "freedom" to worship in accordance with the state plan. We might have freedom of worship as long as we worshiped in a manner prescribed by or in the church set up and approved by the state. But that does not measure up to the first article of the Bill of Rights providing that Congress cannot obstruct the free exercise of religion. Freedom of worship and freedom of religion are two separate things.

In this connection the March 16, 1944, issue of the Baptist Western Recorder views with some alarm, and justifiably so, the present trend. It states:

> Baptists and all other free churchmen should be on their toes these days to guard their liberties. In his January 11 message to the people of the United States, backing up his appeal to the Congress for enactment of some new war measures, President Roosevelt turned from his appeal for freedom of religion and spoke only of freedom of worship. That is exactly what the state church groups of the world want him to do. Freedom of religion means everything; freedom of worship means only that one will be unmolested in his house of worship, but the minute he goes out of that place of worship to teach, preach, circulate printed literature and converts, especially proselytes, to his faith he will go to jail.
>
> Perhaps the President heard from some of the other countries with respect to his original statement of "Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world." Perhaps they thought he was taking in too much territory.
>
> Be that as it may we have a Republic here in America and under a Republic the rights of minorities are respected. This cannot be said of a democracy. No matter what other countries may do, let us maintain fredom of religion here—freedom of every man to worship God when, where, and how he chooses. Also let us talk more about freedom of religion and quit talking about freedom of worship.

Patriotic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an editorial from the Greenville Piedmont of South Carolina, of May 1:

PATRIOTIC CONGRESS

Congress, at its worst has some faults, and at its worst is terrible. But it should be given its due.

The way it has supported this war, and the people conducting it, to the almost complete exclusion of politics, is one of the brightest features of these unpleasant times.

The latest example is the passage of the biggest naval appropriations bill in all history, by both houses of Congress, without a dissenting vote.

This is by no means an isolated case. There have been several other notable examples of unanimity in Congress, and the whole handling of the war, on the legislative side, has been surprisingly free from opposition or delay.

Regardless of political complications in an election year, and the inevitable antagonisms of policy and prejudice, first things have been put first, and there has been better cooperation so far than most observers would have thought possible.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. For 6 long years Poland has been under the heels of Nazi oppression. For 6 long years the people of Poland have been fighting the tyrannical power of the Axis, both within their country and in aiding the Allies in carrying on the war.

One hundred and fifty-three years ago Poland set up a constitution quite similar to our Constitution, and based upon the dignity of the individual, with liberty and freedom for each of its citizens.

The present conflict began on Polish soil, and history will record the terrific struggle that was put up by Polish patriots. Many of Poland's young men were successful in getting out of the country and in joining the air forces and combat forces in England and in giving their all to defeat the Axis. Many of these brave Polish youths have died for the cause.

It is my hope—and I believe the hope of all of us—that Poland will arise again as a great nation. I am hopeful that following the present conflict we may see a new Poland, with her pre-war boundaries preserved. Poland has never been hesitant in its fight for right and liberty and in its fight against tyranny and oppression.

On this great day in Poland's history, let us pay tribute to the great Polish heroes of yesterday and to the men and women of Poland who are fighting for freedom today.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks, I insert the following letter:

GMINA NO. 152 ZWIAZKU NAR. POLSKIEGO,
Waterbury, Conn.
Congressman JOSEPH E. TALBOT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the 3d of May 1791 the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men. What other nations and people did with bloodshed, Poland with her long tradition of tolerance, accomplished by peaceful means.

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto "for your freedom and for ours."

Could you, sir, on the 3d of May, call this fact to the attention of the American Senate? It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who though faced with insurmountable obstacles would rather die than surrender. The constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Respectfully submitted.

A. BRZEZINSKI, *President.*
S. CHMIELINSKI, *Secretary.*

Poland's National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a pleasure to join with my colleagues in saluting Poland on the celebration this day of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of her constitution. Every Polish patriot, no matter where he may be, can well be proud of the Polish Constitution, which is one of the world's greatest documents of freedom. No nation has fought harder or suffered more to maintain and uphold the principles of freedom and justice for its people.

Today Poland finds herself in perhaps the most desperate circumstances of any period of her whole history. She is beset by the cruel armies of the aggressors on either side of her borders and she knows not which way to turn. The people of Poland want peace, as do the people of most of the other nations of the earth and when peace finally comes to them, let us hope that it is upon the basis of international justice and equality and in accordance with the principles for which the boys of our own country are fighting so valiantly.

Poland entered this conflict with overwhelming odds against her upon the assurance of the nations then fighting on our side that all possible aid and cooperation would be given her.

In her peace negotiations with the Soviet Union it is sincerely to be hoped that the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter will be followed. In her dealings thus far with Poland and the other smaller nations, the Soviet Union has completely ignored and disregarded the Atlantic Charter.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this country should insist that peace negotiations made during the progress of this war should be conducted in accordance with the same rules and regulations and in the same spirit that we hope will obtain when final victory comes. For this war will have been fought in vain unless the freedom and sovereignty of peoples and nations, small and large, are fully respected and protected.

The G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WOL of the Mutual network, Washington, D. C., May 2, 1944:

It is not my purpose to confine myself to a discussion of what is commonly called the G. I. bill of rights as set forth in the proposed bill, S. 1767, passed by the Senate and awaiting consideration by the House. The scope of my discussion goes far beyond that. Senate 1767 is an indication that Congress is aware that we cannot be haphazard about the future of the boys who have marched fearlessly off to battle. It is more than a debt of gratitude we owe them. No man has yet bought groceries, paid his rent, gone to school or married on a "thank you." We are faced with the solemn obligation to assure them those very things they are fighting for, among them, freedom from want, freedom from fear. It is not a question of sentimental slobbering over their sacrifices; too many pompous phrases have already covered that. It is a question of facing realistically, honestly, without compromise and without flinching what every fighting man and woman in our armed forces is asking now: "Where do we go from here, boys?"

What are some of the specific questions they are asking?

Will I get my job back? What if the firm has been reorganized and my job destroyed? What if it has been combined with another job? Where do I fit in? What if it has gone out of business? What if it is doing another kind of work? These are not remote possibilities.

If I had no job to go back to, what do I do? What provision is made for tiding me over? Whom do I see? Who answers my questions? Selective service in reverse? The United States Employment Service?

Will I be flung headlong into an economy changing from wartime to peacetime pursuits along with 10,000,000 other returning men and women? Will there be a plan of gradual demobilization, feeding manpower into industrial and agricultural life piecemeal? If so, how will selection be made? From point of view of length of service or demands of the labor market?

What of the time I have lost in climbing upward in social and financial progress? Many of those who stayed behind to fill my job have been promoted. Theirs is the added experience and, consequently, higher pay. What compensation, if any, can be given me for time out? A new generation will have grown up and gone into the labor market. These will be my competitors. What equitable adjustment is being planned now?

These and many more questions, I know, buzz around and around in the fighting man's head like so many flies that won't be shooed away.

The story of Capt. Don Gentile is appropriate. It is the pay-off on what the boys who are fighting our fight are thinking about—what they expect from us in the postwar world. He said he had lived on $1.50 a month and had been banking the rest of his allotment to "carry me over the lean, job-hunting days I expect after the war."

A brave lad like Gentile should not be harried in mind by the thought that he

might be forestalled from realizing a gainful living. After the war, it would be tragically cruel to present him and any of the boys with only the lack of opportunities to work and serve in peace as they did in war. His story and that of others should have a happy ending. That happy ending means economic security and safety after the last shot has been fired. They are entitled to jobs, homes, freedom from fear, security in a world rid of fascism. The war will have been fought in vain if all we can give them after they return are victory medals and apple-stands. And so I say while the boys are in all the corners of the world intent just now, on carrying you and me forward to victory, strangers to the comforts we enjoy now, strangers to the fireside, to the luxuries, to the freedoms we take so much for granted, we, here, must attempt to find some of the answers. We cannot wait until they are returned to begin then, lest we be confounded by confusion and those we are so proud of now be the sufferers.

The G. I. bill of rights proposes to "provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans." I shall outline the bill briefly and generally.

It calls for the expediting and completion of additional hospital facilities for war veterans. It outlines the establishment of boards of review to pass upon the nature or type of discharge of any officer or enlisted man, except a discharge or dismissal by reason of a sentence of a court martial.

It provides for a director of servicemen's education and training under the direction of the Veterans' Administration, together with an advisory council, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administration, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the United States Commissioner of Education, and eight representatives of the public who shall be recognized leaders in the fields of education, labor, agriculture, and industry. Those eligible for education and training shall be entitled to such benefits for a period of 1 year and a further period of education and training is provided for those who have satisfactorily completed the first year. A veteran during the training period will be entitled to $50 per month subsistence, plus $25 per month if there are dependents.

It is no empty provision. A survey conducted by Research Branch of the Morale Service Division indicates that 7 percent of the men think they will actually go back to full-time school or college after the war. It is conceded, however, that married men and those over 25 are least likely to do so.

The condition of the labor market is expected to exert a strong influence on these prospects. Eighty percent of the men say that if they can get no job and Government aid is available they will return to school.

Colleges are preparing to absorb 1,000,000 service men and women at the close of the war as a result of the educational aid to be available to returning veterans.

Colleges are introducing new courses, providing individual-guidance counselors, establishing testing centers, etc.

The University of Michigan is considered to have promulgated the most far-reaching programs. The University of Buffalo has an 11-point plan which covers every field of study and endeavor, including special brush-up and short courses. Other universities have appointed committees to study the problem.

When veterans return to the classroom they will find the curriculum adjusted to their special needs. Study courses will be accelerated in every way consistent with good educational policy.

All types of schools have signified their willingness to go along with the project—elementary, secondary, business, and vocational schools, normal schools, mechanical schools, and professional schools.

While the present Senate bill does not specifically, step by step, provide for definite processes of rehabilitation, there are carryover statutes from the last war which do. These statutes must be strengthened so that there will be absolute assurance that every effort wil be made to restore to good health the wounded and the sick veterans. There will have to be absolute assurance of a convalescent-treatment program. The harrowing experience of men in the air forces, pilots, bombardiers, gunners, parachutists, etc., will need a kind of rehabilitation and convalescent program somewhat different from infantrymen or men of the Navy. All the wisdom and ingenuity of this country will have to be tapped. The experience of foreign governments will have to be considered.

Social adjustments bristle with difficulties. The handicapped will have to be trained for occupations to the end that there not develop again the panhandling, the peanut vending, the leaf raking, and the boondoggling which became such tragically familiar scenes. There will be the difficult adjustment of men who have returned from places so distant that even the land names are unfamiliar and those lads who have experienced ills and diseases we heretofore did not even know existed. In trying to plan for the future none of these must be forgotten.

Subject to certain limitations provision is made in the bill for loans to veterans up to $1,000, which will bear no interest the first year and 3 percent thereafter. Such money can be applied to the purchase or repair of residential property, land, machinery, businesses, and the like.

The bill calls for an effective job-counseling and employment placement service for veterans within the United States Employment Service.

It further calls for a readjustment allowance for each week of unemployment up to 52 weeks. Generally the allowance provided for is $15 per week, plus an additional $5 if there is 1 dependent, $8 if there are 2, and $10 if there are 3 or more dependents.

This, then, generally, is the G. I. bill of rights, which passed the Senate. True, it provides a partial answer to some of the questions that are being debated up and down G. I. fronts—in the Pacific, in England, in Italy, in the United States, in India; in short, wherever our American serviceman sits down to talk or think.

But what does he think about it? It is his future.

Is the bill really adequate? Education, training, hospitalization, loans, job counseling, unemployment insurance, these are well enough in their way, that is, they are excellent provisions if the jobs are to be had, if the economy is ready to absorb new business adventures, new agricultural enterprises. The bill provides for guides, but what if there is nothing to guide to? Of what avail is job counseling, if there is no job, or vocational training if the labor market is glutted, or the readiness to lend money to the veteran for a business venture, if the risk, at best, is a shaky one?

Again, talk will arise of bonuses. The word "bonus" in itself is a bad word. It implies a gratuity or something given for nothing. That is farthest from the truth. You could camouflage it with calling it "adjustment compensation" as we did in the last war. Whatever you call it, payment will have to be made. But ahead of the bonus must come jobs. The so-called bonus is a nice gesture, but definitely limited in character and hardly conducive to maintaining the morale of those whose most earnest desire will be to establish for themselves a suitable place in the new scheme of things.

There are already one and one quarter million discharged soldiers. The problem they present is not so great as that which will be presented when we have 10,000,000 so discharged. The rate of discharge is approximately 35,000 per month. In some communities there has already been felt the impact of this sudden return. But they do constitute a problem here and now, a problem in education, rehabilitation, hospitalization, economic and social adjustment.

We have all seen variations of the ad featuring a serviceman urging "Leave my country the way I left it, please." This caution has as many meanings as there are individuals for the service. To many soldiers, sailors, and marines, home sweet home was not a vine-covered cottage by the side of the road. It might have been a slum on a side street in some metropolis. Many never enjoyed the right of reasonable opportunity—never knew the dignity of a regular job. Many never knew the luxury of even a small-savings account to cushion the blow of a lay-off. Frequently, illness was their lot and economic hardship, their daily problem.

To these, then, it is our responsibility to insure a decent way of life—a home in improved surroundings, a job, world security. It must be a better world, after the blood, toil, and tears. General welfare must prove more than a blanket to toss over the unsightly sores of the body politic.

It's a threefold responsibility, that of management, labor, and government. The demand exists for consumers' goods, but demand without purchasing power does not create a market. In the reconversion from war to peace economy, the soldier has an important stake. Shall present controls be narrowed gradually or suddenly broken off altogether? These are questions we must soon solve for the soldier and ourselves.

However, the picture is not one of despair. Far from it. New industries are waiting to be born. Miracles of invention and discovery, accelerated by war, give promise of wider distribution among the people of the goods of this earth. There are tremendous savings in the hands of the people now in the form of War bonds and at the same time a dearth of civilian goods. This will be a pertinent factor in carrying over the precarious transition from wartime to peacetime pursuits. There are healthy signs everywhere of post-war planning councils, in management, in labor, in government. They are all intent upon preventing what happened after the last war as symbolized by the corner apple stand.

The United States Chamber of Commerce consumer survey states that 35,000,000 families had named one or more major purchases that they will make within 6 months after the war. About 1,540,000 families intend to build or buy new homes; 17,400,000 will acquire automobiles; 24 States and 150 cities with populations of 500,000 are planning some kind of public-works program.

Much of the problem will be solved with the return of prosperity and economic well-being to this land of ours. The demand for civilian goods will be tremendous. There will be a huge backlog of accumulated demand for our goods all over the world, especially where the good will has been developed by lend-lease aid. A vast merchant marine will take the productivity of our farms and factories to the ports of the seven seas. Individuals in this country now have $30,000,000,000 in savings. They are going to buy homes, refrigerators, radios, automobiles, television sets, new furniture, etc. The present economic vacuum that exists here and abroad relative to civilian goods must be filled and will be filled.

After every war history tells us, the tremendous demand for civilian goods causes a prosperity to descend upon the land. This, in turn, creates most of the jobs for G. I. Joe and G. I. Jim after demobilization day.

But that prosperity will not completely solve all difficulties. There will be many

maladjustments, frustrations, conflicts, and disappointments. We must prepare the blue print now.

Thus, it is clearly your job and mine to leave no thought unexplored, to dismiss no idea merely because it is new and untried, to leap beyond our prejudices, to keep the mind receptive so that we shall not fail the serviceman as he has not failed us.

Poland Is Not Yet Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a happy privilege on the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution to join with over 5,000,000 American citizens of Polish descent in paying tribute to courageous Poland for her notable contribution to the cause of the Allies in the present titanic struggle against the barbaric forces who seek to extinguish the light of liberty troughout the civilized world.

The history of Poland is replete with sacrifices and a firm determination to exist as a peaceful and liberty-loving nation. From the tenth to the sixteenth century Poland experienced the transition from a vassal state to the full dignity of a kingdom. Destined to become an influential nation, the avarice and greed of the nobility who were the ruling class proved a serious detriment to the progress of the nation. Aided by a Constitution that was vicious and impractical, the nobility abused their power and although they represented about 5 percent of the total population of Poland the remaining 95 percent were powerless to express their will and, as a result, the nation was torn asunder and chaos and confusion prevailed.

During this dark period in the Nation's history, Count Joseph Pulaski, with his three sons and three other patriotic Poles, met on February 29, 1768, at the town of Bar where they signed a secret compact which is known as the famous Confederation of Bar. Bent on saving Poland from complete disintegration, Count Joseph Pulaski began the task of securing recruits and 8,000 Poles responded to the call. Count Casimir Pulaski, who was later to gain undying fame as a member of Washington's army in the fight for American independence, was then only 20 years of age and was placed in charge of a detachment of troops, in which position he distinguished himself by his valor and courage.

Due to the overwhelming superiority in number and armaments of the enemy, the Pulaski forces were finally forced to bow to defeat with the elder Pulaski dying in prison camp, his son, Francis, killed in battle, and Count Casimir Pulaski with 10 survivors seeking refuge in Hungary from where he later migrated to the United States to join Gen. George Washington and to become known as the father of the United States Cavalry through his ability to train troops based upon his military experience in fighting Poland's battle for freedom and liberty. Imbued with the burning zeal of a true patriot, Pulaski fought with the Continental Army and distinguished himself by his rare courage and marked ability of leadership. His colorful military career was ended at the Battle of Savannah when he gave his life in defense of our country.

America owes an undying debt of gratitude not alone to Gen. Casimir Pulaski but also to another great Polish patriot, Kosciuszko, whose statue adorns Lafayette Square near the White House and is a constant reminder of his sterling contribution to the American cause of freedom. General Washington was quick to appreciate the ability of Kosciuszko in training the Continental Army, and when the hard-earned victory was achieved this liberty-loving son of Poland returned to his native land with the assurance of this Nation's gratitude for the heroic services he rendered during that perilous period in our history.

The same spirit of sacrifice and intense love for freedom and liberty has burned in the hearts of patriotic Poles for many centuries. When Hitler began his march through Poland in September 1939, the honor of the nation was at stake, and motivated by the spirit of Pulaski and Kosciuszko the gallant Poles elected to defend their nation against the German aggressor. Hopelessly outnumbered they fought valiantly against the common enemy of mankind and their valiant resistance in the face of overwhelming odds proved a powerful influence and a lasting lesson of patriotic fervor to all nations.

Despite the subjugation of their homeland, the courageous Poles are fighting on with relentless fury. Their nation despoiled and millions of their fellow citizens murdered or placed in concentration camps, the flame of liberty and freedom still burns deeply in their hearts. Various forms of continued resistance to the Nazi hordes have given Hitler grave concern. Despite the enslavement of the Polish people, they continue to fight the oppressor by sabotage at every opportunity. Their dogged determination to oppose Hitler gave France and Great Britain precious weeks in which to mobilize their forces. The underground forces in Poland today are a source of constant worry and annoyance to the Nazi invaders and require a large number of German troops for patrol duty that could be used to advantage elsewhere, while remnants of the Polish Army, Navy, Air Force, and merchant marine are serving valiantly on all battle fronts and aiding the allies in their determination to free the civilized world from the throes of dictatorship.

It is a tragic truth that today Poland is in ruins, with her soil barren, her food confiscated, her people enslaved, her churches and convents desecrated, and institutions of learning abolished. But the invader in his lust for world domination has forgotten an age-old truth that the blood of a nation's martyrs is the seed from which springs the deliverance of free men everywhere.

For 5 years Constitution Day—the greatest national holiday in Poland—has been observed in the dark shadows of war. It is a day comparable to our own celebration of the Fourth of July and the Polish Constitution is but 4 years younger than our own priceless treasure—the Constitution of the United States.

The blood of over 2,000,000 Polish victims of German aggression has irrigated the soil of the small and peace-loving nation of Poland, while thousands of her valiant sons are fighting with the United Nations and many of them laying down their lives on the far-flung battle fronts.

The Polish anthem—"Poland is not yet lost" is echoed by every liberty-loving American on the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. It is my fervent hope that the full and complete restoration of Poland as a nation will ever remain the aim and objective of not only the American people but of all of the United Nations.

In saluting the indomitable courage of the Polish people on their great national holiday, let us remember Poland's brave past, her tragic and heroic present and the brighter future in store for this courageous nation. In addition, let us add our prayers to the devout exhortations of a brave and unconquered nation, mindful that Poland whose stellar role in the present war has proved an inspiring spectacle and has earned the undying gratitude of freemen throughout the entire world.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, today is Poland's national holiday. It commemorates the signing on May 3, 1791 of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's great documents of freedom.

In Poland today lips will be sealed and church bells will be silent. The Nazis have temporarily destroyed the freedom which the people of Poland gained on this day 153 years ago. This set-back to Polish liberty is only temporary however. Soon the Nazis will be conquered, with the help of thousands of Polish Nationals, and the glorious traditions of Poland will once again be restored. Those of us who have been spared the atrocities of the Nazis salute the valiant and brave sons and daughters of Poland within and without their native land. We assure them that their fight has not been in vain. We pledge them that all in our power will be done to restore their territory and their sacred right to live again as free men and women.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we who enjoy the liberties, the freedoms, the opportunities that this great land of ours offers, should pay tribute and honor to the valiant people of Poland. We should properly recognize the great contribution to the cause of freedom and the democratic way of life that was embodied in the historic document adopted by the Diet of Poland on May 3, 1791. The principle of that doctrine, namely, "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people," was 2 years previously adopted by our Constitution. The Constitution of Poland, like our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, recognized that all men are created equal and that each is endowed by his Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Polish people not only believed in freedom for their fellow Poles, but also for their fellow men. No complete history of the United States fails to record the exploits of brilliant Polish men who came to this country to fight against tyranny, and to help our land gain the freedom in which they so steadfastly believed.

Unfortunately, the freedoms and liberties in which they believed and for which they fought, not only for themselves, but for others, were difficult to maintain for themselves. Though they became embroiled in many wars, the Polish people pressed forward in their quest for freedom. Only a few years ago, the clouds of war gathered over them. They were firmly convinced of the righteousness of the principles of their Constitution, and determined to uphold them. Rather than to compromise these principles, they stood heroically and fought bravely against the forces of aggression. Their material resources were, in many instances, reduced to shambles. Their material losses were insignificant compared to the loss of life, and to the untold mental and physical sufferings that were inflicted upon them. Anguish and agony were endured because the doctrines of their Constitution were not empty words, but rather were principles that were inculcated into their minds and hearts to such a degree that those principles meant more to them than life itself.

While the forces of the United Nations strive for victory—a victory in which Poland is taking its noble part, the principles of the Atlantic Charter, of the "four freedoms," of the Teheran Declaration, should ever remain a vital force in the world, and brave Poland should again take its well deserved and proper place among the nations of the world.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of Adoption of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, today the Polish people are commemorating an event of great historic significance. It is the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, a liberal document recognizing the rights of the common people and dedicated to the same principles of freedom which inspired our American forefathers.

We in America have been a happy and prosperous nation under our charter of liberties. Poland has suffered dismemberment and persecution. Free people everywhere admire the steadfastness of the Polish people in keeping the ideals of democratic principles alive and vibrant during 123 years of national extinction and they rejoiced when Poland again took her honorable place in the family of nations after the last World War, largely, we like to think, because of the power and influence of the American people at the peace conference.

In 1939, Hitler, with ruthless and barbaric savagery and with overwhelming military strength, occupied Poland. He conquered territory, but not the indomitable spirit of the Polish people. Despite murder, starvation, enslavement, and indescribable suffering, there has been no appeasement, no surrender. The Polish people fight on for their rightful place in the sun, and it is with deep satisfaction that we realize American boys of all ancestries fight with them.

Governor Dewey, of New York, issued a proclamation a few days ago. I include it as a part of my remarks. It expresses my thoughts and sentiments on this historic occasion.

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Executive Chamber, Albany.

For almost 6 years the people of Poland have suffered an appalling matyrdom under the heel of the Nazis. When their country was invaded they resisted against overwhelming odds, with a valor which has compelled the admiration and respect of the entire civilized world.

As part of the United Nations, the fighting men of Poland have fought with their traditional bravery and military skill in the same cause as the armed forces of the United States. On the home front men and women of Polish origin are working hard and making great sacrifices to support the war effort of our country.

On May 3 the Polish people will commemorate a notable event in their history, the adoption of a liberal constitution in 1791. In consideration of all these facts it is fitting that we should join our fellow Americans of Polish blood in doing honor to the great traditions of the people of Poland.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, hereby proclaim May 3 as Poland Day, and I urge all the citizens of New York State to display the flag of Poland side by side with our own national emblem to show our sympathy and comradeship.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 14th day of April A. D. 1944.

By the Governor:

PAUL E. LOCKWOOD,
Secretary to the Governor.

What 3d of May Means to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know of no written or spoken word which more clearly commemorates the significance of this day in Poland's history and the militant spirit of a truly great people than the following statement:

WHAT "THIRD OF MAY" MEANS TO POLAND

(By Joseph P. Junosza, Director, Polish Government Information Center)

Poles the world over are celebrating their national holiday, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the 3d of May Constitution that marked their nation's spiritual rebirth. Since 1939, for close on 5 years, Poland has observed her national holiday under the yoke of foreign aggression that has utterly failed to crush her free spirit.

When, in 1791, the Polish Diet adopted the 3d of May Constitution, it was the most democratic in Europe. Anglo-Saxon liberal thought and British political custom inspired its framers, proof of the spiritual ties Poland had with the most advanced nations of the west. This democratic relationship, rooted in the traditional tolerance of the Polish people, endured through the tragic years of Poland's bondage and became an inspiration for future generations of Poles. These ties are still alive and can never be broken.

The 3d of May Constitution brought about a great reform, peaceful in method, revolutionary in effect, and carried out according to law. Its purpose was to preserve the existing regime by improving it, to concentrate the moral forces of the nation, and draw the people into the task of building up Poland's national strength. What better national day could we celebrate?

The constitution, saturated with the spirit of well-ordered freedom and tolerance, with respect for the rights of man, overthrew foreign domination striking at the very core of Poland's existence and independence.

Poland will always fight tyranny and immoral international agreements. Poland will always support every lawful expression of international morality, such as the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" and demand that they be strictly adhered to and implemented.

Closely linked with the defense of law, freedom, and morality in international affairs, is the question of Poland's independence.

In defense of Poland's freedom and independence, all Poles are united and of a single

mind. Nothing can loosen the close unity of the government and the people. It is impossible to detach the underground movement from the Polish Government in London, the only lawful and constitutional government. All attempts to impose upon Poland a government or a regime from outside, to meddle in her internal affairs—political or social—to violate her territorial integrity, or to control her foreign policy, will always and everywhere meet with unanimous resistance from the government and people of Poland, at home and abroad.

Poland's gallant and unswerving fight against German aggression, Poland's immaculate moral and ideological record, give her the undenible right to full justice, and to compensation for the incredible sacrifices made by the Polish people in their fight for world freedom.

The Poles were the first to fight the Germans. Poland has produced no Quisling. The sacrifices of the Polish Nation are greater than those of any of her allies. More than one-tenth of the entire Polish Nation have laid down their lives in the fight for freedom.

Our immediate aim is victory over the Germans, a victory that will free Europe and the whole world from any new aggression. Poland will demand material guaranties against any new German attack. Poland will demand strict adherence to articles 6 and 8 of the Atlantic Charter, which provide for a system of collective security and for permanent disarmament, as well as for rendering harmless states that are a potential threat to peace.

In reborn Poland, the complete unanimity existing between the Government and the people will find immediate expression in far-reaching political and social reforms, which, however, like the great reform of the 3d of May will not be imposed by force, but enacted by a free parliament elected by democratic universal suffrage. These reforms will seek first of all to raise the standard of living and productive strength of Poland to the level of the western democracies, and to improve the lot of the working classes which—as the 3d of May constitution said—are the best part of any nation. The declaration of policy of the Polish Government in London—a government of national unity—issued on February 24, 1942, rejecting all dictatorship, emphasizing devotion to democratic principles, guaranteeing equal rights to all minorities, promising full employment at fair wages, also provided for the completion of agrarian reform to increase in Poland the number of medium-size homesteads. Poland believes in the victory of right over might, justice over violence, and the reign of freedom in this world. Poland in a spirit of democracy looks to the world for the realization of her hopes, for Poland is really a test case. Without justice to Poland, there can be no better world.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, as we mark the anniversary of the adoption of a constitution in Poland in 1791, I should like to express the hope of every one of us, I am sure, that Poland and Polish people may once more enjoy the liberty and freedom for which they have dared so much and endured so much. As we enter upon the days of our own greatest trials and final victory, it should not be forgotten that we are also charged with a great mission to restore the imprisoned and oppressed peoples of Europe who have already paid so dearly for their share in the triumph and in the better world to follow.

Freedom Through Free Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith, including as a part of the RECORD, an interesting and informative address delivered in this city late in April by Clarence K. Streit, author of Union Now and proponent of a proposed pattern of international cooperation called Federal Union.

Whether you agree with Mr. Streit's proposals as many do or whether, like me, you remain open-minded as to the optimum method to be used by the United States in making its influence felt for good in the post-war world, I believe you will find considerable food for thought in the accompanying address by Mr. Streit. His reasoning is the more challenging because it has the virtue of leading to specific suggestions and I am sure that it is the fervent hope of many Americans today that more and more we can replace the glittering phrases descriptive of general goals by definite proposals as to possible policies to be pursued in approaching the objectives which are so universally desired.

It is only as we get down to procedures and policies that we can really discover the size and scope of the area of agreement existing in the world today as to what can be done and what should be done to provide for a permanent peace and an orderly and prospering world in which a fair chance for a free people may become the right of the many instead of the privilege of a select few.

I do not know how to express my appreciation of the honor you have heaped upon me; it touches me too deeply. I feel the need of support, and when I really need support I always turn to my wife here. We have been a team now, and loved it, longer than either of us have lived alone.

My wife is French, you know, and I can express best in French how much I owe to her. The French have a word for it that we lack, or rather don't use any longer. I mean the second person singular. The French say vous to all the world as we say you, but in the family they use the more intimate tu and toi, our thou and thee, without the religious significance that has almost monopolized that form of address in English.

The first book I ever got published I dedicated to my wife. The dedication was in French, and one critic said it was the best thing in the book. It was simply this: Pas sans toi Jeanne Defrance. (Not without thee, Jeanne Defrance.) And that's the way I feel about her tonight.

I would try, next, to thank those of you who, like my friend Governor Landon, do not agree with me in favoring union now—what am I saying?—who do not yet agree with me in favoring union. I honor highly the friendship of these men who carry the principle of free discussion to such a height, who not only agree with—was it Pitt?—that if the opposition did not exist it would have to be created, but join in honoring the opposition with a dinner.

I think they embody one of the highest American traditions, I confess I hope that they will end by following the example of one of the greatest of our neglected heroes. I mean Melancton Smith, the chief orator of the majority opposing Federal Union when the Constitution was up for ratification in New York State in 1788. When he finally became convinced—partly by the urbane logic of Hamilton and partly by the harsh logic of events—that he was on the wrong side, this remarkable Mr. Smith went over to the other side and brought with him enough others to give the Constitution a majority of three votes, enough to ratify it * * * for luckily the Constitution did not have to pass the Senate to go into force.

If my opposition friends who have done me so much honor tonight do not follow Melancton Smith's road, they are still in the great line that Peter Porcupine embellished. Peter Porcupine—his real name was William Cobbett—was, as his pseudonym implies, the sharpest-quilled of the British pamphleteers opposed to Tom Paine. But when Paine died in America, neglected by the people whose independence he had been the first to champion, Peter Porcupine so resented this indifference that he had the remains of Tom Paine dug up and brought back to an honorable tomb in England, to rest among the Englishmen whose Empire he had cut in two, but whose rights as men he had so immeasurably advanced. It seems to me this should encourage us all to look on our opposition with a more mellow eye. After all, without opposition none of us could discuss anything at all, and freedom of speech would be an empty right.

But though I am a great believer in thinking things out and discussing them freely, I must say that my primary aim has never been simply to stimulate thought and discussion. I am for them as the best means to sound action, but I would never divorce them from action, timely action. And so I hope you will pardon me if I express even warmer appreciation, if possible, to all those friends of mine who have agreed with me enough to work for Union Now. I wish I could thank each in person, or at least those whose devotion has touched me most, but there are too many of you. It is your unrecognized work that has brought me here and given the union idea what strength and life it has.

No matter what power a book may seem to have, no matter how much thought it may stimulate, its power is dissipated and lost unless some of its readers band themselves together to achieve its ends, and thus provide the only democratic means of achieving them, as these friends of mine have done in Federal Union organization (some of them, such as Howard Ford and Brice Toole there, continuously now for 4 or 5 years), and in the Student Federalists.

I know that many of these friends of mine agree with me only on balance. And I honor them the more for working for a program that is perhaps only 60 percent, or even only 51 percent, to their liking, and working as devotedly as though they approved it 100 percent. They are playing anew the part of

Alexander Hamilton, who, though many of his ideas were rejected by the Convention, championed the Constitution as ardently as if it were his own creation.

It is true that 51-percent swings the balance against 49 as decisively as does 100 percent against 0, but it takes a high type of citizenship to champion the reality of 51 percent right as firmly as the fanatical followers of dictators and demagogues champion the illusion of 100-percent perfection.

I confess I feel deeply on this problem of translating thought into action. It is the great problem of democracy in general and of our Republic in particular. For the wise checks and balances which our Constitution contains give a greater guarantee of free discussion than do other systems, but this greater freedom to find fault, and this greater difficulty to act, combine to expose us to the grave danger of too much thought and too little action.

"And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action."

By its very nature our Republic is always in much more immediate danger from its Hamlets than its Caesars; the dictator can rise only after prolonged indecision has delivered us to anarchy.

We Americans, it seems to me, have gone much farther than we realize on the road to anarchy. We say we are fighting in this war for freedom, period. Well, to advocate freedom without government is to advocate ungoverned freedom, or anarchy. We always stood before for freedom through free government, or for free government as the way to freedom, for the combination of these two that Webster phrased so well when he said: "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

In our first great war we Americans fought behind the great declaration that proclaimed that all men equally have certain inalienable rights and that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men," and that "when any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government." How far we have wandered from that inspiring realism.

We were even more clear-headed in the Constitution when we announced that "We the people * * * in order to form a more perfect Union * * * and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution."

The issue in our next great war was to advance freedom by preserving the Union or, as Lincoln phrased it at Gettysburg, in the great language that is the hallmark of the true American tradition, "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Then Woodrow Wilson led us into our third great war * * * "for the things"—as he put it—"which we have always carried nearest our hearts, for democracy * * * for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." Confusion had already put the accent on the rights of nations instead of the rights of men, on "dominions" and "concerts of free peoples" instead of on government, and union. Even so, President Wilson never treated freedom as a thing that could be divorced from human organization, never made the mistake of letting the people perish from lack of vision of the inseparable relation of freedom and government.

That mistake was never made in all our great wars until the present one. This time we have gone to war for freedom, indeed, for "four freedoms," but the leader who put the greatest accent on freedom has passed mutely over the primary American principle, that freedom can be had only by instituting free government. There is no hint of this principle in the Atlantic Charter or in the Declaration of the United Nations or in the Teheran communique.

The wishful tongue may find some taste of it in the statements of Secretary Hull, or in the Connally and Fulbright resolutions, but how their formulas suffer from the confusion of national sovereignty with human sovereignty which frustrated Woodrow Wilson. How much weaker are these formulas than his league, which failed because it was too feeble, because it did not form a government but what Alexander Hamilton called a political monster—a collectivity of governments.

The best that our leaders have yet given us—how blurred or blind it is compared to the vision in the Gettysburg address, the Constitution's preamble, the declaration of 1776—the clear vision of "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

For lack of this vision the people perish, and, first of all, our sons. We stand on the brink of the most difficult and dangerous of military enterprises—the invasion of Europe. We stand with millions of men armed with billions of dollars of material weapons, but not armed with the most powerful force on earth—a great idea capable of arousing fresh hope and faith and enthusiasm among the people. There has not been and there cannot be enthusiasm anywhere for reviving the big-power system of the quadruple alliance, the holy alliance. There has not been and there cannot be any enthusiasm for restoring national sovereignty or for a redictated Versailles treaty or a reconditioned League of Nations. The idea that freedom can be had without government has not aroused and cannot arouse faith or hope; the people know, as do their leaders, that ungoverned freedom is only anarchy in sheep's clothing.

The old American idea, the idea of freedom through free government, of liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable, that idea has never failed to rouse hope and faith and enthusiasm. Look at the support the great principles of the declaration drew us from Europe when the Colonies had no material power, nothing but an idea. Look at the way this idea undermined George III even at home. Consider, too, how the confused Wilsonian dilution of this idea of freedom through union fired our men and weakened the enemy, and brought victory sooner, and saved so many lives in 1918.

Now, for the first time in our history we are sending our sons to battle unarmed with a powerful idea, unarmed with the great idea that made America powerful, unarmed with the moral force that could save so many lives.

Who is responsible for this tragedy?

The President has a heavy responsibility for it. He has shouldered the responsibility for arming us on the material side and discharged that responsibility better, I believe, than any President ever did. But whereas the President can delegate his authority on the material side, he cannot delegate it on the moral side. This moral responsibility came first with Wilson and with Lincoln, and I wish the President had followed their great example. I pray he still may do so.

The candidates for his high office have their responsibility, too, for the country's lack of moral preparation, lack of bold, honest, straightforward leadership in the highest American tradition, for the neglect in this crisis of our primary principle of freedom through free government.

The Members of Congress, too, have their responsibility for this neglect. For 20 years the standing excuse for not trying to extend this basic principle beyond our shores has been that "you can't get it through Congress." Had the Executive defaulted on the material instead of on the moral side, had the boys been sent to invade Europe, armed only with a great idea, would Congress have merely washed its hands? A Congress that could override the President on the tax bill could have assumed the moral leadership that he neglected, instead of passing milk-and-water resolutions on world organization.

After all, the first great enunciation of the American principle of freedom through free government did not come from any President or from any single leader; it came from Congress itself in the Declaration of 1776. Before there was a White House, there was Congress; it has never lost the right to lead; and from the Senate itself first came the great formula, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

But before there was the Congress, there was the people. It was the people, acting in informal committees outside the regular machinery of government, who established the governments of the 13 States and the Congress. And it was again the people, acting through special conventions outside the regular governmental machinery, who established the Constitution, not only proclaimed therein the principle of freedom through free government, but set up the first Federal Union, the only form of interstate government that ever solved the problem we face today.

That first generation carefully secured the right of every succeeding American generation to be as great as they were. They expected us not to do less than they, but more. Since we have never lost the rights they had, it is no use our trying now to put on the President and Congress all the blame for our failure to arm our sons with the most powerful of principles. We the people, who made the Congress, and the Presidency, and the Constitution, have the ultimate responsibility for the tragic fact that our sons must now dash their lives against the walls of Europe without a single attempt to save them or to help them by first trumpeting forth a call that could shatter those walls as the walls of Pericho were shattered, the old American call of "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

It is no use our saying, "I'm only one individual in 130,000,000; what's the use—I'll never get the others to do what they should do." To make that excuse is worse than useless, for it is to deny the basic principle of this Republic—that "all men are created equal," equal in their right to freedom, equal in their responsibility for the Union of the free through which freedom comes.

The deep distinctive thing about our Republic is that it did not hitch its hopes—as so many regimes did before and do today—on great material power, but on great moral principles, not on the men in power, not on hereditary kings and lords, not on passing Presidents and plutocrats, not on fuehrers and dictators and members of a self-perpetuating ruling party, but on the least of men, on the humblest citizen—and on the only unmaterial, intangible thing in him, on his conscience.

The hopes of our Republic have never been hitched before our time on combining the greatest armed powers, on bringing heads of states together in a clubby threesome or a foursome, and leaving everything to them, but bread and circuses. The hopes of our Republic have always been centered on uniting the common garden variety of citizen, the man with the hoe—on uniting the humble, man to man, equally and freely, first by the millions and then by the tens of millions and later * * * now * * * by hundreds of millions, and eventually by billions.

The hopes of our Republic have always been centered before our time on uniting more and more of these microscopic, invisible drops of conscience which the Almighty gave equally to every individual of our species, uniting them in a Niagara of ever greater majesty, and beauty, and power for good. So it has been for generations, and so it must be now or we shall have a river of drops of blood, flooding devastation through the Valley of the Shadow.

You have been kind enough to make this a personal dinner, and I have told you now what I personally believe from the bottom of my heart, for what less could I say in thanking you? Perhaps you will not mind if I conclude with a little personal experience which brought light to me on the whole problem we face today and taught me unforgettably that no community can live without conscience, and that the more directly we hitch the community to the conscience of the humblest, the safer and happier and freer we shall be.

The unforgettable experience I would tell you about came when I was in the Army, going over on a transport, the *Saxonia*, in 1917.

The transport was jammed deep in the hold with my regiment, the Eighteenth Engineers Railway. The hold was divided in sections as protection against torpedoes, mines, and fire. Bulkhead doors connected these sections. To improve the ventilation they were left open, under guard.

One night, I was stationed on guard duty at one of them, at the foot of a gangway. On either side I could see nothing but sleeping soldiers, in narrow bunks two tiers high. My orders were to close that bulkhead door instantly in case of explosion or fire on either side, and shoot to kill if necessary to maintain order on the other side, so that all the men on that side, at least, might get up the gangway.

I was only 21 and had never faced such a responsibility. One can think very far in a couple of hours, standing guard alone among hundreds of sleeping men, below the waterline, with only the hull over there between them and lurking death, standing with a loaded rifle and nothing to do but wait for God knows what, and ponder.

These men around me were not enemies. They were my own outfit. There was Dick Jones, Bud Martin, McWilliams, all asleep. And if anything happened on their side, I had to slam the door against them, condemn them all, perhaps, to death, and maybe shoot some of these fellows on the other side. And if I faltered, failed, I would be condemning even more men to death. They were all sleeping in an implicit faith not only in their own lucky star but in the guard—in me. They didn't know who was standing at the bulkhead door, but every man on board was counting on the guard doing his duty at the showdown, counting on me.

I still wonder whether I would have been man enough to meet that test. I thank God I never had to meet it, but that I was forced to think it through.

For it taught me many things. It taught me there are situations when men must dispose of the lives of others, even kill the innocent. Where they inflict the most suffering and death by doing nothing, by indecision and inaction. Where they can hope to save life only by prompt and drastic action, life-taking action.

If I stayed at my post and did my duty, who would know, I wondered. Who but I? And I would probably go down with the ship and be forgotten. We might all go down no matter what I did.

Why not drop the rifle if we were hit, leave the bulkhead door, slip up the gankway in the jam, get in a lifeboat? Who would remember me at such a time, in such confusion? The officer of the guard might not even live. The records would go down with the ship. How could anyone trace any responsibility to me? If I quit my post and ran, who would know? Who but I?

I was not the colonel, not the captain. I was just one buck private, one insignificant individual in the thousands on this ship, in the millions in the war. Who was I to think the universe depended on my doing this or that? What difference would it make in the end what I did? Either way no one would know but I—no one but I and a spirit in me whose good opinion I respected most.

And so it came home to me that a man is never really alone, that he has within him an all-knowing, ever-present companion who stands guard over him, for him and for other men. A guard who never leaves that bulkhead door deep in every man. A force that holds him fast when all men sleep and nature tempts. A friend who loves him most, yet can destroy him to save men he does not even know. A conscience that will not let him live ignobly, and die in peace. A soul for whom he, and all mankind, can thank God the most.

There I began to learn that Shakespeare was right when he told how the pale cast of thought can sickly o'er the native hue of resolution until it destroys action, but that Shakespeare was wrong when he said that "Conscience doth make cowards of us all." Conscience never made any man afraid to do anything, except the thing that does not become a man.

There in the hold of the transport *Saxonia* I was taught that our species does really depend on the soul of individual man, at every danger point, that conscience is the creator and the maintainer of organized human society, and the greatest power we have.

There I began to appreciate, too, how deeply our daily personal security and liberty depend on individuals who are prepared to do more than risk their lives. And I began to see that whereas men need risk only their own lives to confer on men the benefits of scientific discovery and engineering invention, they must pay more dearly for the peace and freedom that political science seeks to provide. For to have peace and freedom men must have government, law and order and justice, and to have these they must have judges and policemen, and agents of all kinds from President to sentinel who are prepared not only to risk their lives, but also to take the lives of others, for the general good, if that horrible need should face them.

If we must pay in this coin to maintain government, we must also pay in it to establish government where it does not yet exist. Whether we are establishing government between tribes, states, or nations, the process is the same, the basic unit is still individual man; the government, to be effective, must operate on him individually, by him and for him, and the more directly it depends upon him, and upon his conscience, the more realistic and effective it will be.

If we cannot now escape the mass slaughter of war, we can still seek to lessen that slaughter and make it result in the establishment of a government that will save men from having to go through this again. And if we are to succeed in that great undertaking, we must be practical and begin where we are, it seems to me, and preserve the governments that now respect human life and liberty and the conscience of the humble, strengthen them by uniting all their citizens man to man and conscience to conscience behind this common principle, and seek steadily to extend the number of human beings governed by it.

Idealistic? When a man confronts his God he is facing the ideal. He has nothing left but the ideal. Only the ideal is realistic then.

In conclusion I have only this to say: Peace is a personal thing, and it must be founded on individual persons, not on nations. Freedom is a personal thing. It is a right of individual persons, not of their governments. Union is a personal thing. It is a government of, by, and for individual persons, not a collection of collectivities. And the greatest hope we have today to advance these ancient aspirations is that this war is not what we pretend it is, an impersonal drama played by collective nouns—nations, armies, task forces, assembly lines—but a thing that keeps facing each of us, and all of us together, with the most personal mysteries of life and death.

This war has forced millions of our young to grapple with the problems we let them think they could safely leave to preachers. It has multiplied Job by the million, put him in uniform instead of sackcloth, and left him facing the mightiest of mysteries.

War is no less personal to the woman in love; nor to the one whose name is called first from the cradle and most often after the battle. Job can be a woman, too.

No, this war is not less personal when one is far from action, waiting, waiting, in the lonely dread that broken even the mighty warrior who slew Goliath. And if we choose to assault the walls of Europe now without the trumpet blast of freedom through free government, how many hearts will echo the vain lament of David: "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son!"

They are not dying for us, my friends, they are dying for our mistakes; for our lack of faith, hope, charity, courage, vision, for our failure to think things through and act in time.

The least that we can do is to live henceforth for them, live determined to bring now from all this suffering the great good that conscience bids us each to bring.

A Tribute to Polish People Everywhere on Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, thoughts of liberty-loving people everywhere turn once again to the brave people of Poland with their indomitable spirit. It is with a sense of humble pride that I join today in honoring the Poles throughout the world in tribute to a nation that will never die, be it crushed and ground beneath the heel of the vilest oppressor.

Five million Americans of Polish origin know the depth of pride which comes from noble descent. Theirs is a history of the truest faithfulness to ideals. The freedom that burned in the hearts of Polish heroes helped to establish the United States of America. Poles everywhere have fought for universal liberty—not for themselves alone, but for all.

Who is there who does not recall the heartening aid of Pulaski and Kosciuszko to the struggling American Colonies at a time when the only hope of reward lay in the principles they defended so mag-

nificently? Count Pulaski, at the age of 25 the acknowledged leader and hero of his own countrymen, commended to General Washington by Benjamin Franklin as "an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia," came to America at the age of 29 to aid in the American cause. Not even waiting for the Congress to act upon his commission, the distinguished Polish officer joined the ranks of Washington's army as it marched through the streets of Philadelphia, a humble private in the ranks. Within 2 months after his arrival, the Congress on September 15, 1777, had elected him "commander of the horse with the rank of brigadier." Already he had performed in brilliant fashion in the defense of the city of Philadelphia. During the following March, Count Pulaski obtained permission to organize his own independent corps, later to be famous throughout the Colonies as the Polish Legion. Pulaski himself was acknowledged as the most expert horseman in the American cavalry. His leadership was such that it is entirely possible to envisage defeat for the American cause without his invaluable contribution. He died a patriot's death at the age of 31, wounded on the field of battle.

Kosciuszko, another great Polish leader who came to America to fight for 6 years with the Continental Army and become one of the greatest heroes of the Revolutionary War, bears a name familiar to every proud American of Polish descent. Washington recognized his abilty immediately and appointed him aide on his own staff. Soon he was commissioned Chief Engineer in the Colonial Army with the rank of colonel, carrying a modest pay of $60 a month. He was a young man of 30 at the time. His subsequent record as builder of splendid fortifications against Burgoyne established him as one of the truly great leaders of the war. The present site of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., owes it choice in large part to the recommendation of Kosciuszko.

In the city of Washington statues have been raised to commemorate the contributions of these two great Polish heroes who helped to establish American freedom. They were not the only Poles who came to this country to fight for her liberty; dozens of others stood our among the leaders of the Revolution. But their spirit was the spirit of those who followed the lead of the American Colonies and fashioned for Poland the first written constitution on the continent of Europe.

If not in all, then at least in many ways, the Polish Constitution resembled the American Constitution. It acknowledged the principle that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." It accepted the doctrine of religious toleration. It adopted the system of separation of powers into the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. It was not so revolutionary as the American Constitution, but it was a far step forward in European history. It established a hereditary monarchy where the king was the servant of the people. It was the forerunner of later European constitutions which had to be fought for, but the Polish Constitution was different, in that it was established without recourse to bloody upheaval.

The history of the Poles is brilliant with sacrifice to the cause of liberty. Through every fight for freedom, the sons of Poland have come forth in proportion and spirit that far outrank the size of the nation. A free land from 1918 to 1939 when her people were the first to resist the war-mad Axis dogs, Poland will rise again to resume her birthright of liberty.

Not alone in the respect of the democratic world is she held for her deep traditional will to fight for freedom, but even greater perhaps are her people admired for their peaceful industry, their steady application to the doctrine of neighborly living.

Five million loyal Americans of Polish extraction—quiet, hard-working citizens devoted to highest principles of living in war and peace alike—will live to see their homeland freed again from the yoke of Axis barbarism. The spirit of the Poles who helped to free America a century and a half ago is the spirit of those who will free the world today from Axis aggression. This Nation is proud of her citizens who bear the name of Poland.

Also, I wish to pay tribute to the many thousands of Polish people and those of Polish descent who reside in my congressional district. They have successfully entered into all industrial, business, and professional life and have contributed greatly to the upbuilding of the communities in which they reside.

I considered it an honor last year to nominate one of their sons, from the city of Erie, Peter C. Kochis, 518 East Avenue, as a candidate for the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. He successfully passed the requirements of the entrance board and is proving himself a worthy midshipman. I fell safe to predict that in the years to come he will distinguish himself as an officer in the United States Navy.

The Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, which was adopted on May 3, 1791.

This constitution, which was adopted unanimously, provided liberty and equal rights for all men, and through its adoption, Poland was able to accomplish by peaceful means what other nations were required to purchase by death and bloodshed.

In the words of the membership of the Springfield (Ill.) community of the Polish National Alliance:

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

I give my whole-hearted support to this timely suggestion, because the heroic Poles, always ready to support the cause of democracies, in World War II were the first to stand against the enemies of freedom. Again they followed their motto: "for your freedom and ours."

As Americans, it is our duty to remember an ally who would rather die than surrender, despite insurmountable obstacles.

Poland: The Symbol of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Poland is a symbol of freedom and liberty to all liberty-loving people throughout the world. Poland chose to maintain her honor by resistance rather than live in subjugation by a policy of appeasement. Poland refused to compromise with treachery and barbarism. In the ruthless onslaught of the powerful Nazi juggernaut, industries and railroads were destroyed, dams bombed, homes, churches, and institutions shattered, and thousands of men, women, and children maimed and killed—but the spirit of Poland lives on. As President Franklin D. Roosevelt recently said:

> The heroic and determined manner in which the Polish people have struggled and sacrificed in the face of tremendous hardships and deprivations has been an inspiration not only to the people of the United States but to liberty-loving people everywhere.

Today Poles the world over are celebrating their one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the 3d of May constitution that marked Poland's spiritual rebirth. Since 1939—nearly 5 years—Poland has observed her national holiday under the yoke of foreign aggression that has utterly failed to crush her free spirit.

When in 1791 the Polish Diet adopted the 3d of May constitution it was the most democratic in Europe. Anglo-Saxon liberal thought and British political custom inspired its framers—proof of the spiritual ties Poland had with the most advanced nations of the west. This democratic relationship, rooted in the traditional tolerance of the Polish people, endured through the tragic years of Poland's bondage and became an inspiration for future generations of Poles. Those ties are still alive and can never be broken.

No better commentary on the principles of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May can be given than in the eloquent

words of Burke, the great English statesman and orator:

We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties * * * not one man incurred loss or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order, but in that place and order everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder, this unheard of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spaces; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled; all of the people, by the people, and for the people.

That was the document praised throughout the world.

A. Pogadin, outstanding professor and historian at Kharkov University, 1911, had this to say of the May 3 constitution:

Poland's best sons fought to save their country. The constitution of the 3d of May, 1791, created an order of things guaranteeing the rebirth of Poland. Had these reforms been put into effect, Poland would have become a sufficiently strong state. But her neighbors did not permit the Polish commonwealth to strengthen itself in this way. Russia and Prussia, but recently enemies, clasped hands across Poland. The constitution supporters guarded by their ardent desire to save their country, knew they were subscribing to it "in an hour fraught with danger to the commonwealth."

From that day to this the spirit of Poland is the same. Polish sons have fought and died for liberty and freedom.

Kosciuszko and Pulaski, great Polish military leaders, led Polish troops in the Revolution side by side with Washington to help establish this great country of ours.

Thousands of Polish sons fought in World War No. 1 to crush German imperialism.

Today we find millions of Poles here and abroad fighting and dying for the same principles, democracy and freedom.

The Poles will never forget the 3d of May constitution. German treachery will not permit them to forget, and while Poland itself is under German yoke and somewhat broken, I heartily agree with the famous utterance of that great Polish leader, the late Ignatz Paderewski, loved by all America, when he said "Polska powstanie"—Poland will live.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of Adoption of Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, today the Polish Nation throughout the world is celebrating the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the enactment of Poland's Constitution—the establishment of the first constitutional form of government on the continent of Europe.

Poland—our ally—the first European country to take up arms against our common enemy, will be silent today. May the words of this House ring a glowing tribute to that heroic nation.

Aftermath of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Happens After the War," by Mr. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator. The address has been published by the International Latex Corporation, Dover, Del., as a public service. In my opinion the address is well worthy of publication.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THE WAR?

(By Chester Bowles, Price Administrator)

Today our industrial production stands 125 percent above the levels of 1939. Today our farm production stands at the highest levels of history. Today jobs go begging and anyone can sell anything that he can produce.

But let's not forget that this unprecedented level of business activity is built directly upon war demand, for directly or indirectly Government is now providing half the jobs and half the pay rolls of the country.

When the war is over and when our huge war expenditures disappear, what happens then? Will there be a market for all the goods we can produce? Will there be a job then for everybody who seeks one? Will we sustain the present high level of production, employment, and national income in building an economy of abundance? Or will we again return to the unemployment, the artificial scarcities, and the low standard of living which plagued so many millions of our citizens before the war broke out?

No one man or any group of men can begin to have all the answers. But we know it will take expert management and a firm hand to bring us through the reconversion period with a whole skin. War contract termination settlements will have to be made, and they will have to be made on a basis of fairness and speed. Millions of war workers will have to be placed in new jobs. Millions more will be returning from the armed services.

These adjustments will all be difficult. But no one should doubt our ability to make them successfully provided that the national buying power can be sustained and markets found for all the goods we can produce. Can we find these markets? I think the answer is "yes."

The demands of a vigorous, expanding America can fill the void that will be left when Government war expenditures are tapered off. They can keep our economy running indefinitely at peak capacity. But we must remember that these are only potential demands. Whether they will materialize in actual orders on the books will depend, first of all, upon how effectively we plan the job of unwinding our wartime economy. The job will not be an easy one and a slip may well spell disaster.

THE HEART OF POST-WAR COLLAPSE

If when the war is over we fail to take full and immediate advantage of our export opportunities, if we are not prepared to throw in public works when they are needed, business activity will slow down. If that happens, employment, pay rolls, and prices will begin to fall and the vast potential demand of 132,000,000 consumers and of 3,000,000 businesses will dry up and disappear.

Men who have lost their jobs don't buy that new refrigerator and they don't buy that new car, nor do they make a first payment on a new home. Permit employment levels to shrink and fear will hold most of the hundred billion dollars of wartime savings off the market.

Businessmen don't invest in a falling market. When prices are dropping, there won't be much replacing of equipment and building of new plants. To a large extent the $25,000,000 of reserves that business has accumulated will remain right where they are—in reserve.

What I am saying is that if we permit the economy to sag immediately after the war, we face a tail spin. We face the menace of deflation feeding upon itself, with no one knowing how fast the economy will fall or how far. It seems to me imperative that we see to it now that this will not be permitted to happen.

PROGRAM FOR THE RECONVERSION PERIOD

Full advantage must be taken of our export markets. The world will need vast quantities of our goods. If we are to have this business—and have it we must—we shall have to provide broad export credits. We must make the decision now that these credits will be extended.

Further, we must determine now that needed public works—Federal, State, and local—will be thrown into the breach at precisely the time and in whatever quantity is necessary to keep the wheels of industry running and to keep men at their jobs. Public works must be planned today and the programs at all levels of Government must be coordinated so that they may be instantly available if the need arises.

And, finally, we must determine now that any broad deflation of our present price and wage structure will not be permitted. We have placed ceilings over prices and wages to prevent wartime inflation. In the reconversion period we must protect prices and wages to prevent equally disastrous deflation.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER RECONVERSION?

I think all reasonable men will agree that only wise management on the part of Government and business can bring us through the reconversion period with our economy still sound.

What deeply troubles many of us is the question, When does the Government step out? Do we have to reconcile ourselves to a regulated economy indefinitely? For my part I am convinced that if extensive Government regulation is long continued the springs of our vitality will dry up and our present free society will gradually decay.

It may be that for other peoples other systems may work effectively. But free enterprise is the system with which we in this country have converted a wilderness into the greatest industrial civilization ever built. In the past free enterprise has served us magnificently. It can continue to do so, but very frankly I have no patience with those

who can see only its virtues and are blind to its past defects or unwilling to take steps to correct them.

As our free-enterprise system has worked in the past, it has periodically yielded us many years of depression. During the years of the upsurge of the business cycle, we took giant steps forward only to lose, in the years of depression, a valuable portion of the ground we had gained.

It has meant that we have periodically condemned the Nation, every part of it, to idleness and poverty, to foreclosures and bankruptcies, to insecurity and despair. And this was the more galling because men went idle and mouths went improperly fed in a country that was recognized to be the richest and most plentifully endowed on this earth.

There was a time when these periodic break-downs of our economy could be tolerated. It was not so long ago when no American was more tha none generation from the farm. Forty years ago, when depressions hit, when plants closed down, the industrial worker could often return to his family farm and find there a living for himself and his family.

That time was passed. Today, the industrial workers of Detroit cannot retreat to the farms. It is here—on the assembly line of your own Detroit—that they must make their living and find their security.

There was a time when we believed that the business cycle was a disease of our system for which there was no cure. It was bitter medicine. But knowing no alternative, we accepted it.

Today we know better. With good planning, with close cooperation between Government and business, we know that the level of business activity can be sustained. We know that resulting jobs can be provided.

DEPRESSIONS CAN BE PREVENTED

In my opinion, the Nation will never again accept poverty in the midst of plenty. No longer will our people accept insecurity in peacetime, when the power of our economy to create abundance has been so vividly proven in time of war.

It has been claimed that economic security is incompatible with the free-enterprise system. That in my judgment is nonsense. It is nonsense because it fails to distinguish between the risks of competition, which are and must be part of our system, and the risks of depression, which no man, however efficient, however enterprising, can overcome.

During the periods of depression it is not the inefficient business alone that goes under, but the efficient as well. In depression it is not the inefficient or the lazy worker alone who cannot find a job, but the efficient and the industrious one as well.

Americans are overwhelmingly in favor of a system in which the efficient will thrive and the productive and the resourceful can find rewards commensurate with the contribution they can make to our society. To attain this goal, it is imperative that markets be maintained for all who can produce and that resulting job opportunities be provided for all who are able and willing to work. The free-enterprise system can never fulfill its promise unless this is done.

Let me state most emphatically that this does not mean Government competition with industry or Government control of industry. It means a government that encourages, that stimulates, that supports free enterprise and the initiative of the individual. The essential role of Government in our economic future, backed by the will of all of our people, must be to underwrite a high level of business activity and thereby to release the full energies of all our people under our democratic free-enterprise system.

And let us never forget that we are the Government. The Government responds to our will and our direction. That point will bear constant repetition because fear of Government may be the most dangerous single stumbling block in the path of a vigorous, dynamic, expanding free-enterprise economy in the years following the war.

Operations and Methods of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the president of the Minnesota Municipal Judges' Association dealing with the difficulty the people have in complying with the directives and regulations of the O. P. A., and protesting against the arbitrary acts of the administrators of that bureau of the Government.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNICIPAL COURT, CITY OF AUSTIN,
Austin, Minn., April 5, 1944.

Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Now that the O. P. A. is asking for a new lease, perhaps it is a good time to have an understanding about a few things that have been causing trouble.

There are some of us who have felt that the O. P. A. has had an important function to perform, but that many of its methods have been so arrogant and arbitrary as to drive the people into a spirit of revolt against its entire program.

When we have offered criticism, we are met by a general blanket indictment against our patriotism—and a scorching generality about our being unwilling to sacrifice for the war effort.

Such accusations against the people of the Midwest are unfair. Our people do little complaining and always carry their full share of the burden. Recently the O. P. A. cut the gasoline allotment here, which cut was evidently made to quench the thirst of the black markets in the East. If you will check the black market spot maps, you will note that we are relatively free from it, while the New York counterfeiters are growing fat on wholesale operations in illicit gasoline trade.

There is little mention of that, because we know it is a difficult problem, and may be one of those things that must happen in war, like shooting down one of our own planes, or dropping a grenade into the wrong fox hole. But we do feel somewhat sensitive about this, because it is these Eastern States who have bedeviled us for not knowing of the war.

We know it was a Minnesota lad who was the first United States soldier to set foot on European soil in this war. We know the length of Minnesota casualty lists when a new beach head is established. We know that the leading aces of the air force come from our neighbors in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Poplar, Wis. We know what befell the five brothers from Iowa. We know what happened to the company from Brainerd. We know of the war. It is not here that the O. P. A. is frustrated by noncooperation, and maybe our turn has come to ask whether these people from the swanky Fifth Avenues in the East know there is a war on?

We have a right to ask the O. P. A. to stay within the law, and we should be permitted to make this request without having the patrons of the black market in Hoboken point at us with the finger of isolationism.

We are expected to cooperate with the rules of the O. P. A., and Minnesota has one of the best records in the United States in doing so. But how can we maintain a respect for this bureau if it in turn has no respect for the people, and no regard for the law?

The O. P. A. is the most consistent law breaker in the State of Minnesota. I find daily examples of its flagrant violations of American principles, and these violations are openly flouted and boasted of by the employees of the bureau.

I am referring specifically to an inquisition court which is being operated by a number of these self-important fellows, who are feeling their oats because of having a little authority to which they are evidently not accustomed.

That these courts are illegal is the frank opinion of every eminent legal authority I can find who has expressed himself on the subject.

Our Constitution cannot be repealed by the theoretical logic of a bureaucrat, no matter how good his intentions.

The most vicious aspect of this situation is the fact that these courts are deriving their jurisdiction from a duress on the accused, and operate in the style and arrogance of a blackmailer.

That such black-market courts are permitted to exist is creating a general feeling of distrust to all judicial process.

As president of the Minnesota Municipal Judges Association, I feel it has become necessary to protest, in vigorous and certain terms, to this unnecessary undermining of the judicial branch of our Government.

We have a court structure in every community, presided over by judges selected by the people. The qualifications of these judges are passed on by the voters, and they are well able to exact such penalties and corrective measures as may be necessary in each case. I feel it is unnecessary to have an O. P. A. court to supplement the penalties of the peoples' courts. For example, where revocation of driving privileges is necessary, the existing courts are competent and willing to perform that function, as may be verified by records in the driver's license division of our State highway department.

As a judge, I have been finding it increasingly difficult to discern that which is law, from that which is the whim of an experimenting bureaucrat. It is becoming cruel to punish the workingman for violation of rules and directives so complex that the lawyers and bar associations are groaning under a nebulous ambiguity which defies interpretation.

Since rationing and price control is important to our national interests, the O. P. A., as now constituted, is the greatest evil and danger to our economic structure. The people have no respect or confidence in this ogre of bureaucracy, and the necessary cooperation is collapsing.

We need a rationing structure which understands the American people, and knows how to work with them. The O. P. A. is a disgrace to our American history, ranking along with the witchcraft in the days of Cotton Mather. It should be expelled with a resounding slap, so that no more will Americans try to hex one another with bureaucratic directives. In its place should be created a board authorized to act in

legally prescribed bounds, consisting of a personnel maintaining some degree of respect for the laws and people of this Nation.

The people are entitled to know that only such restrictions are enacted as may be necessary and definitely not created for the purpose of teaching Americans to come to the Government for all and every detail that may suit the fancy of bureaucracy to dole out.

The people are entitled to know the law by reading that which is enacted by their authorized representatives. The people are entitled to their day in court.

And where teeth are necessary in the law, the judges of Minnesota are ready to perform their duty, of that I am certain.

Let's have abolished this abominable black-market justice in which the O. P. A. is revelling, and return some sanity to America. The best way to lose our fight is to first lose our heads.

Respectfully,

CLIFFORD E. ENGER,
President, Minnesota Municipal Judges Association.

Avery's Private War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in this morning's Washington Post by Mr. Marquis Childs, entitled "Avery's Private War."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVERY'S PRIVATE WAR

(By Marquis Childs)

The men who fought on the Government side in the battle of Montgomery Ward & Co. have a healthy respect for Sewell Avery, their adversary. They recognize that he is 100-percent sincere.

The beliefs of this $100,000-a-year corporation executive are more than sincere. They are fanatical. Sewell Avery believes passionately that the Roosevelt administration has brought the Nation to socialist dictatorship.

In spite of all the evidence to the contrary—the substantial war profits, the real influence business exerts, the right of businessmen to damn the Government up and down—he believes just that. Consequently he regards himself as a martyr and a hero.

It makes it all the harder, of course, to work out anything like a reasonable truce so this little private war can be suspended at least long enough to get the bigger war across the Atlantic ended. Three years ago Chairman William H. Davis, of the War Labor Board, wanted to sit down with Avery and talk the whole thing out.

That was at the beginning of Avery's private war. The trouble then was not in Montgomery Ward but in the United States Gypsum Co., of which he is also the head.

Avery refused to meet Davis either in Washington or in Chicago. Thereupon Davis persuaded his personal friend, Owen D. Young, to go as a kind of unofficial mediator and to try with all the weight of his national and international prestige to iron out the difficulties.

Young had lunch with Avery in Chicago. They talked all afternoon. They talked until 9 o'clock in the evening. Young really thought he was getting somewhere. Finally Avery said:

"You know you've made the best presentation of an indefensible case I've heard yet."

I must say the basic contention of the War Labor Board seems to me sound. You can't unscramble war from nonwar when it's on the scale of Montgomery Ward. To compare a concern with 78,000 employees, including complicated manufacturing industries, with a corner grocery isn't logical or fair.

Davis and the members of his Board know that the balance they've been able to hold between peace and chaos on the labor front is as delicate as a watch spring. To allow a big strike to go on in Chicago would have been to risk a prairie fire of strikes spreading across the country.

Just this week, James C. Petrillo, czar of the musicians' union, came before the Labor Board to argue that radio broadcasting wasn't a war industry, and that, therefore, his musicians weren't bound by the no-strike pledge. That's the practical situation confronting the Board. By unanimous decision, Petrillo was turned down.

People ask why John L. Lewis, when he directed the coal strike of a year ago, didn't get the same treatment as Avery. Why wasn't he carried out by the soldiers?

The answer seems fairly obvious. John L. wasn't sitting down in a coal mine. He was sitting down in his union office, and for the Government to have taken over that office wouldn't have helped the war effort one single bit.

Congress is going into this dispute, but I wonder if they'll really get to the root of it. There is an attitude of contempt toward the Government in both the Lewis and the Avery cases.

It goes back to our pioneering past. We're anarchists of a sort—free-wheeling independents. It's been our strength and our weakness. Sewell Avery is a tremendously effective business head—hard working, imaginative, conscientious. His success has been outstanding. Similarly, John L.'s success in building his union to wealth and power has been outstanding.

But in wartime you can't make your own rules. In a complicated industrial society the umpire has to have authority.

I suppose many people think of Avery as a martyr. As for me, I felt sorry for the two soldiers who had to carry him out. Think of getting set to fight Hitler and Hirohito and then finding yourself in a battle with the boss of Montgomery Ward & Co.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, big league foul lines being guarded by IV–F's, while one-eyed men are drafted for the front lines, helps my golf.

It must be mightier than the Mississippi of today or the Amazon to take 16 years for that horse to get across.

The new tax bill before us today is principally to simplify. Emerson said, "We learn geology the morning after the earthquake."

Henry the Morgue's mathematics is as versatile as the opinions of the Attorney General when the Chief wants to swing a deal.

We wonder if the debts they owe us from World War No. 1 are being liquidated by lend-lease money for World War No. 2.

If points are not necessary now, then they never have been. The wasted O. P. A. manpower and the unnecessary sweat of merchants should be a part of our new "lest we forget."

B. Baruch loves to sit in Lafayette Park in front of the White House. While feeding the squirrels and pigeons, he transacts official business hours at a time.

A common racket in the Federal bureaus is to reclassify one's job, under rules laid down by the Civil Service, to get an increase in salary. By this method they outwit Congress.

At the turn of the century, Montgomery Ward fought for years to preserve their riparian rights to keep the lakefront clear from buildings east of Michigan Avenue and they won. The tenacity of this set-up goes away back.

When Jimmie Byrnes appeared before the deficiency subcommittee, we were reminded that never before had there been a witness who had served in House, Senate, on the Supreme Court, and in the executive branch—all three departments of Government.

It was my first visit to the Pentagon yesterday. I was most impressed with the huge innercourt strewn with big red, white, and blue umbrellas around the liquid center tent—it was Coney Island on the green—it had atmosphere and sunbaths.

Praise for Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 4, 1944.

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH,
Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MACLEISH: I wish to express my admiration for the splendid work done by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

I have found it at all times courteous, efficient, prompt, and thorough. Its immediate and intelligent response to my inquiries have been most gratifying. Oftimes, at a moment's notice, it has furnished me with urgently needed information.

It deserves the highest commendation for the services it performs, and I for one wish to note my sincere appreciation of the quality and manner of performance.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Haters of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "They Hate the President Worse Than Hitler—No. 1," from the Philadelphia Record of April 25, 1944; also an editorial entitled "They Hate the President Worse Than Hitler—No. 2," from the same newspaper of May 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of April 25, 1944]

THEY HATE THE PRESIDENT WORSE THAN HITLER: NO. 1

The above is not written in perfect English, but we think you get the idea.

Our first portrait in America's gallery of Roosevelt-haters is that of Sewell L. Avery, president of Montgomery Ward & Co., big Chicago mail-order house.

Avery is in the news just now through his second wartime defiance of Uncle Sam. In refusing to obey a War Labor Board order to extend his union contract, pending negotiations, Avery has compelled the President to interrupt his sorely needed vacation and take a personal hand in the dispute. It repeats Avery's performance when he defied the W. L. B. last June.

Now it's a good thing to have some healthy hate in wartime—if it's hate for the enemy.

Avery hates Roosevelt. We've carefully culled our files. We can find no instance where Avery publicly expressed so much as dislike of Hitler, or Tojo, or even Mussolini.

Why does Avery seem to hate Roosevelt more than Hitler?

Sewell Avery doesn't like to take orders from anybody. That includes his own stockholders, whom he cursed out when they questioned his $100,000 a year salary.

Avery is one of our successful businessmen who got to thinking he also was a self-made god. He started life with a silver spoon in his mouth and has had it there ever since. He became a lawyer but switched over to business when he got a job, in 1901, as eastern sales manager of the United States Gypsum Co. Four years later at 31, he was elected president.

Sewell Avery likes to boast that never since has he held any job anywhere beneath the rank of president.

When Sewell Avery took over as president of Montgomery Ward, at the pit of the depression, he remained as president of U. S. Gypsum, doing most of his work for Gypsum, he told stockholders, on golf courses.

Avery started hating the New Deal as soon as the recovery it engendered began pulling Montgomery Ward back on its feet. In 1938 Avery told Montgomery Ward stockholders the New Deal was destroying the "confidence of business to proceed." He carried on his tirade—

After which he revealed that his firm had upped the earnings per common share from 33 cents a share the first quarter in 1937 to 70 cents a share same period in 1938. In the first 4 years of the New Deal, he revealed, sales of Montgomery Ward increased 76 percent.

In 1935 the firm earned $1.72 per share; in 1941—$4.14.

Why does Avery let his hate for the President and the New Deal drive him into making an utter ass of himself?

For one reason: The New Deal, for his own good, had to discipline his power over his employees. It not only helped Avery and his firm, it also helped the men who worked for them.

Thanks to wide distribution of stock, Avery has a firm grip on his Ward job. He does not have the same influence on his employees, or on his Government (as he used to when Hoover consulted him). He doesn't like unions. They challenge his power. He doesn't like the New Deal, for the same reason. He doesn't like Roosevelt, ditto.

Even Business Week magazine bawled out Avery for his asinine attitude in defying the President last summer. Since then, he has behaved more and more like one of industry's spoiled children.

Someone once called him the "John L. Lewis of business." Of course, he could say he hasn't bushy eyebrows. But his motto is: "To hell with you."

[From the Philadelphia Record of May 2, 1944]

THEY HATE THE PRESIDENT WORSE THAN HITLER: NO. 2

The above is not written in perfect English, but we think you get the idea.

Second portrait in our gallery of Roosevelt haters is that of Frank Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y., head of the third largest newspaper chain in the country.

Mrs. Gannett once told an amusing story. She was about to give a dinner party and couldn't find flowers in the colors she wanted. So she took what flowers she had in her garden and dusted them with colored chalk powder until the blooms were in the exact hue desired.

This is how Gannett handles news and information. He takes a fact or an idea, dusts it with the powder of prejudice against the President, and lo, the result is colored precisely as he wants it.

By this device he managed to portray proposed expansion of social security as a New Deal plot to get "itching hands" on the $30,000,000,000 assets of United States life insurance companies. With the same device he argued that the President was "dragging" the country into war, and he now uses it to claim the President laggard in the war effort.

No matter what Roosevelt does, Frank Gannett gets out his editorial flit gun, sprays prejudice powder, and proves F. D. R. wrong.

Gannett knows all about war. He is waging one. Against the President, of course.

Right now he is in the news for two engagements on this Gannett "second front": (a) His sponsorship of the millionaires amendment to the income-tax law, which would limit rich men's income taxes to 25 percent, and boost the taxes of small wage earners to make up for lost revenue;

(b) His attempt to suppress John Roy Carlson's famous book, Under Cover, a campaign in which the publishers, E. P. Dutton & Co., charged intimidation, and which has had the effect of keeping Carlson's volume No. 2 in the nonfiction popularity list.

But the Gannett hatred of Roosevelt goes way back. It was a hate set deep, like a toad in its hole. In 1939 Gannett charged the President with creating unemployment, and causing hundreds of thousands to lose their homes and businesses. A few months later, with a perfectly straight face, Gannett announced that the year had been so profitable for his papers that all employees of more than a year's service would be paid a bonus.

It was during the Supreme Court fight that Gannett set up his committee for constitutional government, which ever since has whanged the tom-toms of reaction and hate.

It is this outfit which is now waging Gannett's fight to help the war effort by cutting income taxes. A new publication, Needed Now, tells of its various fights to wrap reactionary greed in the Constitution, of its war against the third term, of its campaign for a $400,000 fund, and its boasts that since 1937 the Gannett propaganda organization has sent out:

Eighty-two million pieces of literature; 760,000 books; more than 10,000 radio transcriptions, 350,000 telegrams, full page ads in 536 newspapers, and "thousands of weekly releases to newspapers."

Gannett, in addition, has sent "countless" letters to private individuals, urging them to bigger and better hatred of the President.

We have looked through them for hatred of Hitler. But mention of the Nazi seldom appears—except for one purpose:

To argue that Roosevelt is imitating Hitler.

What ails Gannett?

Some of his friends say it is astigmatism.

As a Presidential candidate in 1940, he could not see the link between democracy—the will of the people—and the reelection of Roosevelt. As a businessman, he could not see the connection between New Deal recovery and the fact that his own business made $600,000 more in 1938 than it had made in the last G. O. P. year of 1932.

As a citizen, he now cannot see why it is atrocious taste and worse patriotism to be doing his fighting against the President and for a cut in income taxes of the rich—at a time when Americans are dying on the battlefield that the right of the Gannetts to gripe shall be preserved.

Somebody once pointed out that Gannett was a Democrat until he paid off the first quarter of a million dollars he owed. Then he became a Republican.

Simplification of Income Tax

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the learned and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and his associates for bringing in this measure at this time. Since the enactment of the last tax bill, it has been apparent to everyone that scarcely a taxpayer in this Nation has escaped the heavy burden of technicality, confusion, and bewilderment that the requirements of that measure imposed.

It is enough that our citizens and taxpayers should be called upon to pay such a large share of their current incomes in taxes to the Federal Government. That there is hardly a prospect that these levies will be diminished, but, on the contrary, may well be increased in the future, is beyond contradiction. Therefore, sincere efforts to alleviate these onerous conditions such as are manifest in this legislation are praiseworthy and

commendable and will undoubtedly have the wholehearted support of the membership of this House.

Its asserted objectives are desirable and sound. If it can in any substantial way relieve the great majority of taxpayers from the necessity of computing their income tax, reduce the number of tax computations, simplify the return form, decrease the number of persons required to file declarations of estimated tax, and eliminate some of the difficulties and uncertainties in the making of estimates required for declarations, as is suggested by the committee, then it will be indeed a most welcome relief to practically the whole American people.

These onerous conditions I describe, and which are so well known to the Members of this body, are not confined to large business alone. They affect, impair, and frequently penalize the conduct of all our small businesses, and have become a source not only of heavy drainage of income but also of the very greatest annoyance to almost every person in the United States who is gainfully employed or has any source of revenue.

By all means, let us promptly enact this measure and send it along to the Treasury Department with the intention and in the hope that that agency will move speedily to lay the groundwork through a process of education and publicity and the issuance of new regulations for the clarification and simplification of all present tax forms and methods.

And while we perform this much needed task, let us also give our attention at as early a date as possible to the matter of repealing the so-called iniquitous "cabaret tax" of 30 percent. Whether intentionally or not, this tax is imposed under a misnomer because it affects not only cabarets, but practically every place in the country where our servicemen, our faithful war workers and their friends and families seek well-earned entertainment and recreation.

The tax levied under this provision has already caused unemployment, loss of business, diminished revenue to the Government, and also has struck a particular blow at the morale of our people. It is, in every sense of the word, a repressive tax entailing serious and steadily increasing diminishing returns. We can correct the situation it has created by reducing the percentum of the tax from 30 percent to 5 percent. This would permit certain, substantial revenues, the continuance of employment and the operation of many small businesses and a restored morale to the American servicemen and people. I hope that this House will not further delay action looking to the correction of this unwholesome situation which in this time of stress and anxiety is closing down very many places throughout the Nation to which our people turn for relaxation, rest, and relief from the stresses and strains of over-all war. Apart from any question of assisting private business, the repeal of this unfair and onerous tax which has worked to the great disadvantage of our servicemen and women, will be a contribution to them and their families during this critical period that will not go without appreciation.

Polish Constitution Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority floor leaders, and all of the Members of the House of Representatives who participated in the celebration of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution yesterday, May 3, 1944. May the Stars and Stripes and the White Eagle of Poland be united in victory.

I was particularly impressed last night while listening to the radio program, Report to the Nation, by the remarks of Quentin Reynolds when he stated that although Poland had lost over 5,000,000 people in this desperate struggle, she had not produced a Quisling, and that the Polish people had remained steadfast and faithful to the cause of the United Nations and would rather die than to betray their faith in that cause.

Another commentator in his report of the national news brought out the matter of Reverend Orlemanski's trip to Moscow—he said that friends of the father in New York stated that both the high officials in Washington and the high officials of the church knew about that trip. Now, just who could his friends in New York be? Well this morning I received a postal card from New York which warned me "to leave Reverend Orlemanski alone as he is trying to pull Poland out of the seventeenth century." It was signed, "A Brooklyn Catholic." There is some doubt in my mind as to whether the writer of this card has ever been inside a Catholic church. He is nothing but a Communist, and, therefore, communistic tactics are the only ones he knows. Having 52 nationalistic groups in my congressional district, I know the underhanded methods of the Communist. They even go to the extent of joining the churches, the civic organizations, and the patriotic societies—they then start their boring from within. They even attend church services although they do not believe in it—but only so that they may perform their dirty task of undermining. A lie does not mean anything to a Communist or the misrepresentation of a true fact just so long as he is able to gain his point and attain his ultimate goal. It matters not to a Communist how long it will take him or by what means he will have to travel to reach his goal or the expense he may incur—the result is what counts with him.

I repeat what I have said before—it is time for those in authority in the United States to quit quibbling about diplomacy and worrying whether or not we might embarrass one of our allies, and stand four-square behind their oath of office to uphold the Constitution and the American form of government, and get to the bottom of these communistic agitations and the other efforts of the Communists to indoctrinate Americans with their ideologies.

You hear so many stories in regard to Reverend Orlemanski's trip to Europe—well, here is one that is based on fact: When New York newspapermen went to Springfield, Mass., to ascertain from the chief of police there the basis of the clearance for the visa that was issued to Reverend Orlemanski, they were informed by the chief of police that he did not know very much about how Reverend Orlemanski got his visa—he was simply instructed by the State Department to fingerprint him, and during the process of that fingerprinting, Reverend Orlemanski remarked that a copy of his fingerprints had better be kept because he might not ever return from Russia. It would be interesting to know by what means Reverend Orlemanski really reached the Kremlin or how long he has been planning this trip and just what information he has been collecting here in America. Reverend Orlemanski is even being protected by our State Department—our own State Department has failed to explain to the American people the reasons behind his visit to Russia. They have on the statute books a provision that requires foreign agents to register—many people are wondering whether Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange, well-known Russian sympathizers, are really foreign agents of Russia, and if they are the agents of Stalin, and there appears that there is some connection for he journeyed to the Kremlin to report to his master—why have the names of Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange not appeared on the published list of registered foreign agents residing in America?

Well, if it is so easy for a Catholic priest indoctrinated with communistic idealogies to get to Russia, I believe we should make it as easy for the rest of the communistic sympathizers and agitators residing in the United States to go there. Let us just load them all on a boat and send them back; in fact, I am so eager to see them leave that I am in favor of furnishing them transportation by air. Stalin, no doubt, can use them to good advantage. Certainly, the people of America, with true American ideals, have no use for them.

Treat Them Alike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here are two editorials written in connection with the seizure of Montgomery Ward, which express widely held views. One is from the Detroit Times of April 28; the other is from the San Francisco Examiner of April 27:

[From the Detroit Times of April 28, 1944]

WILL THE PRESIDENT NOW SEIZE DEFIANT UNIONS?

The Montgomery Ward seizure, affecting an organization supplying solely civilian goods and services, is at worst a gestapo proceeding and at best a high-handed misuse of wartime powers. But for the moment let that issue be waived.

If the President can justify his action in the Montgomery Ward case, what about the machinists' unions in the San Francisco Bay area?

If the mere refusal of a civilian business to sign a contract with a C. I. O. union is sufficient cause for sending the Army to take forcible possession of the premises and manhandle the head of that business, what is the President going to do about union bosses who, almost from the first day of war, have defied every process of the New Deal's own laws, have called 13 strikes, have held up vital ships and goods—ranging through warships to transports to munitions—and who are at this moment in defiance of a War Labor Board order.

These union bosses have caused incalculable loss to the war effort.

Will the President send troops to seize the union's books and determine what happens to the huge sums received by the union in dues and initiation fees?

Will the President order all members of the union under 45 to be drafted for the Army?

When John L. Lewis defied the Government no troops were sent to eject him forcibly from his office and take over the union.

What is the President going to do now about the men who are willing to jeopardize our Army and our Navy in the Pacific?

[From the San Francisco Examiner of April 27, 1944]

HERE IS RECORD OF MACHINIST UNIONS—13 STRIKES CALLED SINCE PEARL HARBOR

A. F. of L. and C. I. O. machinist unions of the San Francisco Bay region, currently holding up vital war work, have pulled 18 strikes since 1940.

They have called 13 strikes since Pearl Harbor, despite their no strike pledges.

They have been condemned by President Roosevelt, the War Labor Board, military leaders, and other unions; but they continue to call strikes on the slightest or no provocation.

Here is the record:

October 1940: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 struck at the Jack-Heintz, Ltd., airplane parts plant at Palo Alto, demanding a closed shop. The plant moved to Cleveland, Ohio, where it grew into a huge enterprise. It had war contracts at the time of the strike.

January 1941: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 struck for 1 day at the Bethlehem shipyard, building Navy ships, in a dispute over the presence of five nonunion men in the plant.

April 1941: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 struck for 3 weeks against 57 downtown San Francisco machine shops with $27,500,000 in defense contracts. Won compromise contract demands.

April 1941: A. F. of L. Oakland machinists struck for 10 days against Caterpillar Tractor Corporation, San Leandro, building parts for Diesel engines under defense contract. Won contract demands.

May 1941: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 and C. I. O. Local 1304 struck for 5 weeks against 11 shipyards and repair shops, forcing 20,000 men out of work on $650,000,000 worth of war and merchant ship construction.

They had agreed to the Pacific coast shipbuilding stabilization agreement, but nevertheless demanded 3 cents an hour more and double time for overtime.

This became the most serious strike in the Nation. It was condemned by the President, by the Navy, the United States Senate, Admiral Land of the Maritime Commission, and other unions. The strikers defied orders to return to work from national presidents of their unions.

The strike collapsed after other unions walked through the picket lines and the Navy began employing machinists under civil service.

December 1942: C. I. O. Local 1304 called its men off ship construction in Oakland over the Christmas holiday weekend, holding up a convoy vital to the Pacific war. The union demanded overtime pay for Saturday and Sunday regardless of whether the days were the sixth and seventh worked. A. F. of L. Lodge 68 worked closely with the C. I. O. union. The President condemned both unions in curt telegrams ordering them to live up to agreements. They did not win demands.

January 1943: The War Labor Board accused A. F. of L. Lodge 68 Business Agents Harry Hook and E. F. Dillon of engaging in a "completely, unresponsible act" when the union leaders threatened to strike at the Joshua Hendy Iron Works, Sunnyvale, to force a quick decision from W. L. B.

March 1943: C. I. O. Local 1304 struck at General Engineering & Drydock, Oakland, to force out one man who had worked over the Christmas holidays in defiance of the union business agent. The strikers returned the next day when the man quit.

May 1943: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 struck at the Redwood City plant of the National Motor Bearing Co., building airplane parts. The union demanded a closed shop. Hook and Dillon refused to obey a W. L. B. back-to-work order, saying no strike was in progress. W. L. B. then ordered strikers individually to return to jobs.

The strike lasted 9 weeks. When 24 machinists defied union leaders and returned to jobs, union trials were ordered for them. The machinists transferred to Lodge 504, San Jose, and signed a contract with the plant, restoring peace.

June 1943: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 struck at the Joshua Hendy plant, building engines for ships, when the company attempted to change hours and place men on 10-hour shifts. W. L. B. settled the strike after 2 weeks.

December 4, 1943: A. F. of L. Lodge 824 called out 3,700 machinists at Richmond shipyards in jurisdictional dispute with A. F. of L. operating engineers. It was called a "continuing union meeting." Returned to work next day.

December 9, 1943:C. I. O. Local 1304 struck at Moore Drydock in Oakland, refusing to work on a new Navy tender because the company would not pay the premium repair rate. Sailors finished the work.

February 1, 1944: 400 A. F. of L. Lodge 68 machinists called a 45-minute "quickie" strike at Joshua Hendy in protest against a lay-off of men occasioned by a change in shifts.

March 5, 1944: C. I. O. Local 1304 struck at Moore Drydock because machinists were refused the premium repair rate for the job of finishing two new Navy vessels built at Richmond and placed in a Moore drydock. Idle for 2 days were 1,700 men.

March 11, 1944: Work on the same vessels was halted again briefly by a jurisdictional dispute between C. I. O. Local 1304 and A. F. of L. Lodge 824 over which was entitled to the work.

March 28, 1944: A quickie strike of 60 A. F. of L. Lodge 68 machinists was called at the San Francisco plant of General Engineering & Drydock Co. and ended when Admiral C. H. Wright warned them that war work was being impeded.

April 14, 1944: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 refused to work more than 48 hours in 104 downtown San Francisco shops as pressure move to force new contract. W. L. B. ordered union back to overtime hours.

April 16, 1944: A. F. of L. Lodge 68 struck at plants of J. D. Christian Engineers and Industrial Gear Co., both with war contracts. Cause given was jurisdictional dispute with another A. F. of L. union. Strike lasted 3 days.

April 18, 1944: The series of C. I. O. shipyard stoppages caused by the repair-rate dispute was condemned at a public hearing in San Francisco by high officers of the Navy, Army, and Maritime Commission.

April 25, 1944: C. I. O. Local 1304 again struck, refusing to work on a new Navy vessel at United Engineering & Drydock Co., Alameda, unless given the premium repair rate.

Fight Pay for Fighting Men

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the American people overwhelmingly favor fight pay for fighting men. The idea originated with Ernie Pyle, one of the world's outstanding journalists and war correspondents and recent Pulitzer Prize winner—a real champion for the cause of the G. I. The combat troops love Ernie. He has lived with them ever since the invasion of November 7, 1942, and his column and opinions reflect the temper and sentiments of your boys overseas.

Provision was made for the boys in the Air Corps to receive 50 percent extra flight pay, which is fine; but, as Ernie Pyle says:

> Fifty percent flight pay for airmen is fine, and as it should be, but the idea I would suggest is why not give your genuine combat ground soldier something corresponding to flight pay? Maybe a good phrase for it would be "fight pay."

Of approximately 2,000,000 men overseas probably no more than 100,000 are in actual combat with the enemy. But as it is now, there is no official distinction between the "dog face" lying for days and nights under constant mortar fire on an Italian hill and the headquarters clerk living comfortably in a hotel in Rio de Janeiro. Their two worlds are so far apart the human mind can barely grasp the magnitude of the difference. One lives like a beast and dies in great numbers. The other is merely working away from home. Both are doing necessary jobs but it seems to me the actual warrior deserves something to set him apart. Medals are not enough.

To quote Ernie Pyle further:

> When I was at the front the last time several infantry officers brought up this same suggestion. They say "combat pay" would mean a lot to the fighting man. It would put him into a proud category and make him feel that somebody appreciates what he endures.

Obviously no soldier would ever get into combat just to get the extra fight pay. And that is not the point. There is not sufficient money in this world to pay any single individual his due for battle suffering. But it would put a

mark of distinction on him, a recognition that his miserable job was a royal one and that the rest of us were aware of it.

Congress was fully aware of this deserving recognition to our gallant youngsters in the Army Air Corps when on June 16, 1942, it enacted into law a 50 percent increase of their pay when these boys participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights.

On March 8, 1944, I introduced an amendment to this act which extends this same recognition to the grand soldier—the ordinary regular G. I. infantryman, to the fighting sailors and marines, and to the nurses and others in the service who engage in actual combat fighting. The introduction of this measure was hailed by the millions of fighting men on all the battle fronts of the world. The introduction of this measure was headlined in Stars and Stripes, Yank, the Guinea Gold, and the Dragon in China. I have received hundreds of letters from boys everywhere urging its passage. Here are a few brief excerpts from letters from boys overseas:

Read your article of fight pay in British paper and we in our company are happy they are thinking of us at home. It's not the money, it's the principle of treating the Army, Navy, and Air Corps alike. (From a private (first class) in Italy.)

Congratulations on Ernie Pyle's fight-pay bill you sponsored. More talk about it than the fighting last few days. All the boys are for it. Not the money but the recognition, and I hope the war ends quickly so we never collect a cent. (From a technical sergeant in Italy.)

When Ernie Pyle came out with his column he summarized in a simple, clear proposal what had been in our minds for some time. When we later read about your bill there was more discussion on it than on that night's bombing. I'm not in a position to speak of how all combat troops feel about the proposal, but the boys in this outfit, an infantry regiment on the front lines, congratulate you and say God bless you. (Lieutenant, One Hundred and Eightieth Infantry in Italy.)

Congratulations, Sammy. Glad you introduced Ernie Pyle bill. It's been the best morale stimulant I've witnessed here for over a year. (Major, Field Artillery Battalion.)

All boys in this outfit tickled to death over your 50 percent pay increase for troops in combat. You're doing a wonderful thing, and will certainly spur our boys on. It's not the money, but the thoughtfulness of the folks back home. (Sergeant, Twenty-second Field Artillery Battalion.)

Glad a Pennsylvania Congressman has introduced Ernie Pyle's suggestion about combat pay for combat soldiers. It's not the question of money but is just the distinction as Pyle says that means so much to us boys on the front lines. For the war's sake I hope it passes. (Lieutenant, Six Hundred and Thirty-sixth T. D. Battalion, Italy.)

Sammy, you made a ten-strike in introducing that bill—extra pay for the ground soldier here. We live for days in mud holes—with rats and insects and no money could ever pay me for doing this in peacetime, but your bill was like a tonic and made us think that, "Well, after all, it's worth fighting for the folks back home." All my pals in New Guinea are for it 100 percent. (Staff Sergeant, Headquarters Three Hundred and Eighth Bomb Wing.)

The very same sentiment is reflected by the people of this country as is evidenced by the report of the Gallup Poll of April 20, 1944, when 70 percent of the people in a national poll favored "extra combat pay for front-line soldiers." A typical example of this public sentiment is carried out in a letter sent me by Prof. Charles F. Young, superintendent of schools, of East Pittsburgh, Pa., a splendid educator and a distinguished veteran of World War No. 1, when on March 31, 1944, he wrote:

This communication is written as a measure of appreciation and also to congratulate you upon the presentation of your bill for equalization of pay for men doing the actual fighting. To my way of thinking this is a long-needed measure. I never could see any justification for the wide range of pay given to men in the different branches of service. Your bill will boost soldier morale and should be promptly passed.

A majority of the membership on the Committee on Military Affairs favor the Ernie Pyle proposal and I hope that Chairman ANDREW MAY will find time to consider this simple amendment consisting of only five lines and which provides for "fight pay" for fighting men.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, history, with its so-called lessons, has proved to be a poor teacher, particularly in the matter of inflation control by price-fixing, because it has told us only what we cannot do, when what we need to know is what we can do. We cannot stop eating because the proof of the pudding has been indigestion. Yet there are so many ingredients in a political pudding that random trial-and-error cannot be viewed as a wise way of changing the recipe. When devising new methods, the scientist invariably resorts to theory. His selection of new methods is a matter of principle, not of expedient; for by the use of intelligent analysis results can, without actual trial, be foreseen with more or less certainty.

It would seem accordingly, that the first step in a scientific approach must be to arrive at a correct definition of the problem. A beginning toward such a definition of inflation is made when we find out what it is not. Let me quote Prof. Lewis Haney on this, from a recent article in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle:

The chief point in defining inflation is to understand that it most emphatically is not a rise in prices—or at least commodity prices. Prices can rise without any inflation. Inflation can exist without prices rising. By "prices" one ordinarily means commodity prices as measured by price indexes. Anyone who really "lives" today knows that the cost-of-living index does not really measure commodity prices. Moreover, it is not true that all prices are represented by commodity prices, and inflation may find expression in prices other than the prices of commodities. My main point in emphasizing the lack of necessary relationship between prices and inflation is that it follows that inflation cannot be stopped by holding prices down—not even if all prices could be held down, which is never the case.

In another contribution to this excellent series of articles gathered by the Chronicle, Dr. Melchior Palyi points out that "price control and rationing tend to accomplish the opposite of their aim" insofar as they are alleged to be a control for inflation. There may be in war a momentary occasion for preventing speculation against sudden inadequacy of supplies in specific commodity markets upset by war measures. But when extended to the point of attempting to prevent spending of excessive cash balances, price control becomes an attempt at "freezing" the civilian economy which is worse than futile because it does not allow for the shift from pre-war to war-time distortions of a normal economy, particularly from underemployment to overemployment. It thus interferes with price and wage adjustments that are essential to production, particularly in agriculture.

This policy of relying on saving to prevent monetary depreciation actually interferes with fiscal dependence on taxation of income to finance the war. It merely puts off the evil day of reckoning with an "inflationary gap" in current money incomes, thus creating an untaxable pool of buying power. As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] has observed in the Senate committee, it is better to keep all money in active circulation, with higher prices, profits, and wages, and to rely on taxation to reconstruct a balance between a higher level of money incomes and what should be a lower level in wartime living standards. Present procedure is producing higher, not lower, civilian levels of expenditure and consumption.

True, "there is no mechanical relationship between the increase in the amount of money and the level to which prices may rise, no law that would tie them together in terms of definable or predictable ratios, or in timing," as Dr. Palyi points out. Bank-credit expansion and its concomitant of printing-press money is linked to the breadbasket by "psychology." Dr. Palyi continues:

Prices rise if and when the excessive volume of money is disbursed, and it is disbursed if and when the public, or part of it, is convinced that its liquid holdings are excessive—that prices will rise. This is obvious, but the elusiveness common in arguments on the "psychological" level invites more or less subtle reasonings to prove that inflation need not occur in the presence or absence of this or that element, which is supposedly relevant to mass attitude. Such arguments, typical of every inflationary scene, merely confuse the psychological and the mechanical; they serve to assure the gullible after the reasonings of a purely quantitative nature have been exhausted. Pseudopsychology is as good a method of "kidding" one's self as is the pseudomathematical approach to monetary problems. The two "methods" are of about the same age, too.

WHY WE "CAN'T HAVE" INFLATION

Quite a few such "psychological" reasons are current to convince us that we cannot have inflation, because our situation is "different" from others. The Germans lost a war, and had to transfer reparations, which, incidentally, they did not "transfer." The French parliamentary system was corrupt, and much of their country had been devastated; in Italy, the Syndicalists and Fascists played havoc with the political set-up, etc. Much comfort seems to be derived from the fact, too, that foreign trade is of lesser importance to this country than to most others. There are, of course, special circumstances present in each and every case. But each time, the reason price inflation takes place is the preceding and continuing monetary inflation. Whether purchasing power is being poured out on account of reparation payments or on behalf of lend-lease; for the benefit of reconstruction problems abroad or of public works at home; to finance war or to finance revolution, or what have you, is as irrelevant to its effect as the cause of a death is to the estate tax on the fortune of the deceased. What matters is the amount of money that has been and will be created, without an equivalent rise in the flow of goods at the consumers' disposal.

More effective, or more insidious, are arguments of this kind—that price inflations are not threatening so long as the country has a large gold reserve, or so long as it maintains its exchanges at gold par (and its money "stays at home"), or so long as it maintains "effective" price controls. The underlying assumption in each case is that it is not the vast volume of money per se that upsets the equilibrium of the markets. The unbalanced situation arises only if and when some external circumstance brings about a buyers' panic. All we have to do then is to control those external circumstances. The burden of the inflation problem is thus shifted from the consideration of supply-demand forces to that of administrative powers—to the maintenance of a large gold reserve, to the stabilization of exchange rates, and to price controls.

GOLD RESERVE AND PRICE INFLATION

The least valid of all such "psychological" arguments is the one which uses the size of the gold reserve as a means to convey the impression that no danger of price inflation exists or needs to exist. In reality, the significance of the gold reserve, psychological or otherwise, is twofold: To limit the amount of available purchasing power at home; and to protect the value of the currency abroad. In a paper inflation, the first function is gone with the wind. As to the second, it is valid only so far as it creates the presumption that a country with a large gold reserve is likely to be able to maintain the gold content of its currency unit. What matters, however, in this respect, is not the absolute volume of gold on hand, but the relative one; in relation to the potential demand for international payments.

At the time the United States went off the gold standard in 1933, its gold reserve of some $4,500,000,000 was the largest of the world, but the loss of a bare quarter billion, due to the withdrawal of foreign funds and to the fight of American money into foreign currencies, drove the Administration into panicky measures. At that time, the total "current liabilities" of the Nation—that is, the foreign and American owned money that could be withdrawn on short notice—consisting of bank deposits and of cash in circulation, was covered by gold in the ratio of about 9 percent. Presently, the huge gold reserve of almost $22,000,000,000 represents only about 12 percent of the total "quick liabilities" of the country (including the short-term Government bonds outside the banks and those redeemable on short notice). If we proceed with a deficit of about $60,000,000,000 per annum, most of which takes the form of legal tender and bank deposits, or short-term paper, the gold coverage of the national purchasing power volume will soon be as low as it was in 1933. The same problem of maintaining the exchange rates at par may arise as it did then, even if the gold reserve remains untouched.

But will it remain untouched? We have lost since Pearl Harbor over $1,000,000,000 of gold. After the war our position will be very strong on the international market, indeed, but comparatively few outlets for exports—other than Latin America, India, etc.—will be open unless financed by short and long credits or by lend-lease. The balance between paid-for imports and largely unpaid-for exports is not likely to net gold and with the revival of tourist traffic substantial gold losses may be in the offing. What is more, very little of our outstanding credits can be mobilized while our total indebtedness to foreign countries is estimated lately as high as $13,000,000,0000—not counting the earmarked gold—of which at least $5,000,000,000 are "hot money" that might be promptly withdrawn. On top of it the vast expansion of currency at home, coupled with severe taxation and the prospect of rising prices, is likely to invite American capitalists to seek foreign investments and "hedging" outlets. All of which adds up to the prospect that after the war our gold reserve may decline substantially while the monetary volume is bound to be much larger than now and may continue to rise further.

EXCHANGE STABILITY VERSUS INFLATION

What, then, of the prospects of exchange stability? Presently, the United States dollar sells in the open markets of the world at a 45 to 55 percent discount, indicating a depreciation against gold approximately equal to that under which the mark labored at the time of the Armistice. At that time the Germans knew as much about it as Americans know now about the actual "gold content" of their money. Of course, this decline may be corrected by an early return to the free export of gold—that is, de facto suspended by the method of freezing foreign claims. But how long can the convertibility into gold—for export—be maintained under such post-war conditions as outlined above?

Nor is it even correct that the depreciation or devaluation of the dollar has to precede the rise of prices. Historically, decline of the currency's purchasing power at home often precedes the decay of its value on the foreign exchange markets. Theoretically, the two symptoms—rising prices and rising foreign exchange rates—are correlate; the one may be the cause as well as the consequence of the other. From the psychological angle, rising prices create the expectation of currency depreciation, just as the latter brings about the anticipation of the former.

Of course, a nominal gold parity can be maintained by foreign-exchange regulations, by "freezing" the dollar in relation to other currencies. This is the German system of the 1930's that has been widely adopted during this war. Regulated foreign exchanges amount to concealing the actual depreciation, driving it into black markets, and presaging a future devaluation. They eliminate, for a while, panicky fluctuations which could be eliminated anyway (by open-market operations in gold, etc.). But the price to be paid for regulating foreign exchanges consists of the necessity of putting everything that may affect them into strait jackets, exports and imports, capital movements, and even tourist traffic. Freezing foreign exchange transactions is temporarily "helpful" to a debtor country that uses the technique instead of an open default on foreign obligations; or to a creditor country to stop lending abroad. But in either case, it spells the ruin of international trade and credit, and presupposes a managed economy at home.

REGIMENTATION VERSUS INFLATION

The final word of every approach that pretends to combat inflation by psychology is regimentation. Indeed, the only way to stabilize a price level in the midst of, or after, a saturnalia of governmental spending, and to keep the public from converting the paper proceeds into real goods, is by not permitting the consumer to freely consume and business to invest. Consumption and business investment have to be strictly regulated so as to keep the demand within the potentialities of supply. All psychological cures of inflation amount to curing by strait jackets.

Let's be clear about the underlying fundamentals. The average American will command three or four, or maybe five and six times more purchasing power—currency, and paper readily convertible, at face value, into currency—than he used to possess. Unless a price inflation is permitted to run amuck, due to the disbursement of excess purchasing power (over and above the disbursement of currently earned incomes), one of three policies, or their combination, has to be adopted:

(a) Deflation of the excessive volume of purchasing power by default on the promise to redeem at par;

(b) Absorption of the same excessive volume by taxation;

(c) Reduction of its velocity of circulation by persuading or forcing the owner to restrain from spending—the psychological approach.

THE MEANING OF PRICE CONTROL

Few people believe that persuasion would work under post-war conditions: That the appeal to patriotism, or even the offer of much higher interest rates, could keep the consumer from spending, and business from investing, when a vast accumulation of purchasing power will coincide with a similar accumulation of unsatisfied demand for durable goods. The medicine of European doctors is to force self-restraint down the throats of individuals and corporations. They may keep their money, provided they don't buy more than what the authorities permit. The way to accomplish this is rationing, which in turn permits control of prices. This is the way most belligerent governments actually plan to dispose of their post-war inflation worries, by letting the consumer keep his money but keeping him from spending it. The same solution is being propagandized by American economists who get their cue from German, Russian, or English intellectual headquarters. They claim that since price control works—allegedly—in wartime, there is no reason why it shouldn't be enforced in peacetime; and they assume that people will regard their money as good even if it cannot buy, provided the loss of its purchasing power is due to administrative constraint and not to rising prices.

The answer is, briefly, that—

1. Rationing and price control are so far only successful under wartime conditions when the consumer is willing to cooperate for patriotic reasons—when his economic motivation is dulled, so to speak.

2. Even in war their success is temporary and limited. Luxury goods skyrocket even in Russia and in Germany, and black markets develop everywhere.

3. Post-war enforcement would necessitate an over-all control of economic activities, and a vast bureaucratic set-up, scarcely compatible with American standards of individual freedom.

4. The physical impossibility to enforce an all around price control necessitates the use of subsidies, direct and indirect, which in turn add to the volume of purchasing power and enhance the upward pressure on the

price level, making control more and more difficult.

5. Especially so, in view of the fact that an inflated monetary volume combined with price control means that the broad masses will feel secure in the possession of their vastly increased purchasing power. The psychological consequence is more spending.

6. Lastly, under those conditions, full employment is likely to prevail, with the consequent shortage of labor; if so, wages are bound to rise, in turn raising costs and prices.

PSYCHOLOGY OF INFLATION

The psychology of inflation has little to do with foreign exchanges and still less with gold reserves. Rising exchange rates and declining gold reserves may stimulate the buying spree; their absence does not hold it up. Price control and rationing tend to accomplish the opposite of their aim. What makes the consumer disgorge his liquid holdings and induces him to accept higher prices—the change in attitude from the hoarding propensity to the preference for spending—is a matter of economic reason, not of administrative tricks.

The average American—man, woman and child—will have this year an income of $1,100 or more, as against less than half as much 5 years ago. By the end of the year, he or she will have in liquid assets (cash, deposits, and other paper at its cash surrender value) at least $1,500, or about three times more than what used to be in prosperous times the per capita liquid holdings in this country. An over-all prohibition to stop the use of comparatively high incomes and of disproportionately high savings, will create misgivings and fears rather than confidence; the attempt to enforce it by a policeman in front of every retail shop and another one behind every consumer is bound to bring about chaotic market conditions.

What determines, under such circumstances, the consumers' and investors' attitude is their expectation; that their incomes will or will not stay high, and rise further. If they expect the maintenance of the same or similar incomes, the incentive to reduce current saving and raise current spending is bound to prevail. Unless the American people have changed their psychology to such an extent as to become primarily interested in counting dollars rather than in enjoying things which dollars buy, it is most unlikely that either the saving of 35 to 40 percent of the national income, as last year, or the hoarding of the already accumulated liquidity should continue much longer.

Nor is it necessary that all people should act simultaneously and in the same fashion. A substantial fraction of the population dishoarding its liquid reserves can start the ball rolling. Once it rolls, once prices start to rise, without the excuse of wartime shortages and without the inhibitions of wartime restraint, the dishoarding is bound to progress in a cumulative fashion.

For all practical purposes, it makes little or no difference in what form the cash holdings are being accumulated; in which way we classify them (as Professor Schlichter does) as hot, warm, and cold savings; nor even does their distribution among savers matter. Few people ignore the real status of their "liquidity" because a greater or smaller part of it is in one cash form or another. What part of one's savings is hot or warm or cold, to use this new academic jargon, depends on temporary preferences, and is irrelevant to the problem. They may all turn "hot" as soon as the disbursement of a minor part has started raising prices, which in turn causes more income inflation and more dishoarding of savings. It is this vicious circle from excess spending to rising prices to more spending, etc., that constitutes the psychological essence of a run-away inflation. It can be prevented only by stopping its material and psychological source—the expectation of a continued monetary inflation.

Writer Sees Seizure of Ward Plant as Administration Double Dealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the most lucid and clarifying articles on the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co., of Chicago, appeared in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, written by Frank R. Kent. Mr. Kent tells the story briefly but completely. I offer it for the RECORD:

WRITER SEES SEIZURE OF WARD PLANT AS ADMINISTRATION DOUBLE DEALING

(By Frank R. Kent)

The big thing about the President's seizure of the Montgomery Ward Chicago plant is the clarity with which it is revealed that this administration has one policy for dealing with one group of citizens, the employers, and quite a different policy for dealing with another group, the labor leaders and their unions.

Toward the first it is ruthless and hostile; toward the second servile and partial. This is not news to those who have followed the Roosevelt record in labor matters. But it has now been made so plain that the conviction which informed men have had over a period of years seems likely to become much more widely held—so widely, in fact, that the political reaction may be important.

For this time there has been no pretense of "equality of treatment"; no show of "even-handed justice." This time, with the President approving from his vacation retreat, and with no national crisis threatened, the full weight of the Government was thrown on the side of the unions. The Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, flying from Washington, personally directed the soldiers who took over the property and physically ejected the protesting head of the firm from his building.

NOT INTENT OF CONGRESS

It is contended by the authors of the law under which this action was taken that the seizure is in violation of the intent of Congress. And, it is asserted by others that it is without moral or legal justification; that if this kind of thing can be done to one business it can be done to any business; that this is an instance of Federal strong-arming sharply at variance with any conception of freedom.

But aside from the merits of these contentions, and centering upon the conflicting administration attitudes in dealing with controversies between businessmen and labor leaders, the facts as presented by Senator BYRD in a notable speech and by Mr. Mark Sullivan in recent articles leave little room for defense.

They point out that the Ward case parallels almost exactly that of Mr. John L. Lewis and the coal miners last year. The same contract issue was involved with the same Government board which appealed to the President when Mr. Lewis refused to sign.

The Lewis refusal differed only from the Ward refusal in that it was flagrantly defiant and denunciatory, whereas the Ward refusal, while firm, was neither arrogant nor bellicose. Another difference, of course, was that the Ward refusal did not threaten to tie up a basic industry upon which the conduct of the war and the life of the Nation depend.

Mr. Roosevelt's method of meeting the appeal of the War Labor Board over the Lewis refusal was to do nothing. Nothing happened to Mr. Lewis. He was not compelled to sign. He was not even denounced from the White House. He was not proceeded against under the Smith-Connally War Labor Disputes Act, though Senator BYRD appealed to the Attorney General for action under that act. Nothing was done to Mr. Lewis and in the end he got more for his union than he had asked.

The contrast to the Ward case is complete. In that case, acting with great speed the Government took over the plant, ejected its head, and gave the union a victory.

POLITICAL ALLIANCE

In considering these things, it is impossible not to recall (1) that this is election year and the President (unless all signs fail) will seek a fourth term; (2) that the C. I. O., which is the organization concerned in the Ward case, is the chief, earliest, and most ardent group urging a fourth term; that Mr. Sidney Hillman, head of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, has an admitted campaign fund of $700,000 and is vociferously demanding the Roosevelt reelection; that Attorney General Biddle is the official who, in March 1942, urged a gathering of radicals to "hold the political trench," declaring that "the New Deal is a political party tied up with the labor movement under an able political leader."

It may be, as his friends contend, that the President has no thought of politics and is concentrating wholly upon the war. But these are the facts. Nor does the known hostility of Mr. Lewis to the President affect them. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Murray, of the C. I. O., are not friends either, but that did not prevent Mr. Murray from standing with Mr. Lewis when the test came 2 years ago.

It may be that before this case is over the great mass of unattached voters will understand the degree to which Mr. Roosevelt and his administration are "tied up" to the labor bosses. And that might make it worth while.

Poland's National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting and enlightening editorial that appeared in the publication of the Lynn Daily Item, Lynn, Mass., on May 2, 1944:

POLAND'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Tomorrow, May 3, is Poland's national holiday. It commemorates the signature on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's greatest documents of freedom, like the Magna Carta, the declaration of the rights of man, and the American Declaration of Independence.

Poland was less fortunate than the United States in maintaining her independence. The new constitution, recognizing the equality of all men and extending religious lib-

erty to all, was more than Catherine the Great of Russia could stand. In 1793 Poland was again dismembered, and on October 24, 1795, Poland ceased to exist as an independent state until the day dawned in 1918, when she again resumed the place that was hers among the nations of the earth. Her brief period of freedom was interrupted on September 1, 1939, by Hitler's unprovoked aggression which began the present war.

Poland has never ceased to resist the Nazis. The Polish Army, Navy, and Air Force have fought in France, Norway, and Libya. Polish flyers took part in the Battle of Britain and are in action every day over Germany. Polish divisions are now fighting side by side with their American and British allies on the Italian front. The Polish Navy is doing its full share in the Battle of the Seven Seas. Poland has never had a Quisling. Her underground carries on a relentless struggle against the German invaders.

The large population of Polish descent in Lynn will celebrate tomorrow with mingled emotions—sorrow at Poland's present plight and joy in the knowledge that Poland still fights on and that her new day of liberation is not far off.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy on this significant occasion to join in tribute to the people of Poland and the indomitable spirit which they have shown throughout the centuries.

Non one can turn the pages of history without realizing the brilliant contribution which the Polish people have made to mankind in the field of literature, in the field of music, in the field of science, in the military and other fields.

No one can travel throughout Poland, meeting some of its outstanding leaders as it was my privilege to do in days gone by, without sensing the genius of the people.

We in America know many whose forebears lived in Poland. We are fortunate in having in America over 3,000,000 people of Polish descent. They have contributed greatly to the life of the Nation in time of peace and today on the home front and on the fighting fronts overseas, are playing their part in the worldwide struggle by the United States for freedom and independence.

America and Poland have had much in common in their love of liberty, justice, and peace.

America and Poland have evidenced their friendship in experience shared and in mutual assistance rendered in time of need.

During the Revolutionary War it was General Kosciuszko and General Pulaski who came to the assistance of America.

During and after the First World War it was our own national leaders who contributed so greatly to the rebirth and rebuilding of Poland.

Today the two nations again stand shoulder to shoulder in the struggle throughout the world for liberty.

The soldiers of Poland have been fighting for almost 5 years. They have fought brilliantly in many theaters of the war. They have fought on land. They have fought in the air. Their aviators have won especial renown. The have fought on despite unbelievable suffering inflicted upon those at home.

The spirit of Poland which proved indomitable, despite 150 years of occupation and partition by the forces of three empires, is again proving itself indomitable today. May that spirit find its reward, with the overwhelming victory of the United Nations, in the reconstruction of a free and independent Poland, worthy of the ideals and courage of its people, playing a useful role in the family of nations.

Resolution of Supreme Council, Order Sons of Italy in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 14, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert a resolution unanimously adopted by the Supreme Council of the Order Sons of Italy in America at its meeting on April 1, 1944. At this meeting the Supreme Council appointed a committee consisting of the following persons:

Hon. Edward Corsi, of New York City—a member of the cabinet of Governor Dewey—chairman; Judge Felix Forte, Supreme Venerable; Judge Eugene Alessondrone, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Judge Francis X. Mancuso, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hon. Joseph Gorrasi, of Massachusetts; Dr. Louis Luigi Scala, of Providence, R. I.; Hon. Frank Pallaria, of New Jersey; Hon. Charles Cultrone, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Attorney S. M. LoPresti—assistant to the Supreme Venerable—of Cleveland, Ohio; Attorney George Spatuzza, of Chicago, Ill.; Hon. Frank J. Carbone, of Tacoma, Wash.; Attorney John Musacchio, of Baltimore, Md.; Antonio Guidice of Charleston, W. Va.; Dr. Frank Gigliotti, of LaMesa, Calif.; Leonard H. Pasqualicchio, of Washington, D. C.; Attorney Anthony Tapogana, of Connecticut; Salvatore Parisi, Supreme Secretary.

This committee represents practically all of the exponents of the 6,000,000 Americans of Italian extraction who contributed in a large measure for the persuasion of the Italian regime to accept the American invasion.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas conditions in liberated Italy call for urgent and immediate measures of relief, all reports from that unfortunate country indicating that poverty is widespread, the means of bare subsistence facing the entire population, and confidence in the United Nations waning because of our failure to act; and

Whereas millions of friends of the Italian people in this country are ready and able to assist the Italian people with funds, food, clothing, and other necessities of life by generous voluntary contributions; and

Whereas until now, because of the refusal of the Federal Government to authorize the formation of an Italian relief committee, similar to the committees of other oppressed peoples of Europe already operating in the field, the friends of Italy in America have been estopped from aiding that unfortunate country; and

Whereas we feel that this failure of the Federal authorities to authorize the formation of an appropriate committee is extremely unfair to the friendly people of Italy;

We, the Supreme Council of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, representing the largest organization of Americans of Italian origin throughout the country, call upon the President of the United States and the War Relief Board to extend approval to an Italian relief committee to be formed by the Order of the Sons of Italy in America with power to conduct a Nation-wide relief campaign among friends of Italy in the United States, and that this committee be included as a member agency in the forthcoming drive of the national war fund.

The Late Reverend Stanislaw A. Iciek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the following:

On Sunday, April 30, 1944, in St. Joseph's Church at Norwich, Conn., it was my privilege to be present and participate at a posthumous presentation of the officer's cross of the Order of Polonia Restituta to the late Reverend Stanislaw A. Iciek, former pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Norwich. The presentation was made by the Honorable Sylvin Strakacz, consul general of Poland, in the presence of the entire parish and many guests from all parts of the State of Connecticut and the United States. Later, the congregation and the visitors attended exercises in Reverend Iciek's honor at the Pulaski Hall in Norwich. These exercises were attended by the officials of the city and town of Norwich, including the mayor and the first selectman and also State officials which included a representative of Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin and the Honorable JOHN MCWILLIAMS, United States Representative from the Second District of Connecticut. This was an honor that Father Iciek indeed deserved. Those who are not acquainted with his work may ask, "Who was Father Iciek?". In order to answer this query, I feel honored to relate the following facts about him:

THE LIFE OF THE LATE REV. STANISLAW A. ICIEK

Rev. Stanislaw A. Iciek, late pastor of St. Joseph's Church, in Norwich, Conn.,

was born on October 30, 1882, in Hilliards, Mich. He attended a local parochial school, the Polish Seminary, in Detroit, Mich., and the Theological Seminary at St. Paul, Minn. He was ordained to the holy priesthood in 1905. Later he served as pastor of several parishes in the Duluth diocese.

During World War No. 1 he was very active in many patriotic movements, particularly in the Liberty Loan campaigns and Red Cross activities. He offered his services to the armed forces of the United States, but was rejected. He thereupon volunteered as chaplain in the Polish Army then being recruited in America, and served with them overseas. Later he volunteered his services and worked with the Hoover food mission in Europe and was the first Polish-American to enter reborn Poland, where he spent several months in humanitarian activities.

Upon his return to the United States, always an ardent patriot, he devoted his life to acquaint his fellow countrymen, particularly the Polish immigrant, with the greatness and glory of the United States.

He was a writer of outstanding ability, and for nearly 40 years constantly contributed countless articles to the Polish and American press on various topics, particularly on the history of the United States, of which he was a great student.

A traveler of great experience, he covered the entire country from one end to the other numerous times, later publishing a three-volume book, America, the Beautiful, in which he depicted every phase of American progress, history, natural resources, geographical advantages, and so forth, with the ultimate motive of acquainting the Americans of Polish descent and the Poles in Europe with the beauty and development of the United States.

He was also the author of several other Polish books dealing mostly with our American way of life. He was chief editor of the Polish homiletic monthly, The Pulpit, which, since the outbreak of the war, was the only Polish publication of its kind in the world. His column in the Pittsburczanin, a Polish daily newspaper, was read widely.

The last 2 years of his life were devoted to his last literary work. Their Grandson, of which the renowned writer, historian, soldier, and philosopher, Rupert Hughes says:

He who would know the soul of Poland and its people, past, present, and future, could hardly do better than read Their Grandson, by S. A. Iciek. It is fascinating, human, and rich in information. From the most ancient times to the present the Polish ideal has been the same, through periods of triumph, as of prolonged and tragic oppression; proud, indomitable, unchangeable. Even in the times of its monarchy, the kings were elected. The ideal of the individual right and of democratic purposes brought forth documents and laws centuries before the United States put them in practice and gave them power. The Polish rule that the kings could make no laws without the consent of the gentry long preceded Magna Carta. "Give me liberty or give me death" was the Polish cry long before Patrick Henry voiced it. There were Poles in Virginia with Capt. John Smith before the Puritans reached New England. In our Revolutionary War, the Poles Kosciusko and Pulaski were of immense help. Polish immigrants have flocked to the United States in great numbers, bringing with them no ideologies foreign to our own and contributing nobly to our best citizenry.

Though predominantly a Catholic country, it was a Catholic Pole, John Zamoyski, who said: "I would like all Poles to become Papists, but I will lay down my life to protect from persecution those who do not."

The author of this book became a priest and served as chaplain with the Polish troops sent from America in World War No. 1. His heart is imbued with the American spirit of religious freedom and equality. He was born of Polish immigrants and grew up with them as they built themselves homes in the wilderness. He knows America and is a true American without being the less a lover of the Polish traditions and ideals.

He was one of the first Americans to visit Poland and other countries of Europe immediately after World War No. 1. He returned to Poland and saw the miracle the young republic had wrought just before Hitler overwhelmed the Nation.

He gives most vivid pictures not only of Poland as she was, but as she might have been. He knew many of the great leaders—Paderewski, Haller, and others. He published a book describing America for the Poles as a result of travels throughout our land. In this book he gives an astounding account of both the great and the humble Poles who have become as good Americans as our best. He tells in detail of Poland's recent relations with Russia, of the effort of Russia to overwhelm Poland, and of the devastating defeat administered to the Bolsheviki. He recounts the treaties Russia made with Poland at a time when Russia was overwhelmed with disaster and needed Polish help—those treaties which Russia is speaking of with contempt now that she is on the crest of the returning tide.

The book is filled with captivating pictures of Polish life in all its phases, from the peasantry at home to the pioneers in America. It is filled with information and inspiration. It is a noble work splendidly accomplished.

Unfortunately, Reverend Iciek did not see his book published, having suddenly dropped dead in New York on March 17 while on his way to the publishers.

Reverend Iciek's willingness to sacrifice was of course, shown very early in his life when he adopted the rigorous obligations that the Catholic priesthood imposes. His special mental capacities made him all the more valuable as a priest, because he was able to delve into the mysteries of eternity and marshal naked truths together for the relief of suffering, discouraged, and wrecked souls. To this we might add that his wholesome personal character was an attribute that very few possess.

As one of the Catholic Church, I shall always be happy and proud to preserve in my memory this minister of God. As an American of Polish descent, I am grieved, and I know that I am only one of thousands upon thousands who will experience the vast emptiness in our lives occasioned by his departure.

Perhaps it was his anxiety to give to us the results of the fullness of his life that made him gear all his energies in order to benefit the people that he served and those to whom he wanted to be useful. His abilities of course, were quite evident in the fluent expression of thought in two languages—English and Polish—which he commanded masterfully. Whether it was at the dinner table, in the pulpit or on the public platform, or through the medium of the pen, his genius was apparent. He was rugged and pioneering and commanded confidence and respect. He was strong but merciful and generous and these qualities made him lovable. He was comfortable in any company and his manner never changed whether he was in the presence of the lowliest or the most dignified.

The parish of St. Joseph in Norwich has really lost a dear, devoted, and a most adored guiding pastor. The community of Norwich has been bereaved of its most distinguished citizen. The State of Connecticut will miss his strong contributions to its life.

We in America who have been wont to follow his activities and his life, to seek his counsel and hear his speeches and read his books will not be able to replace him for a long, long time. His friends mourn for him. Those who disagreed with him also bow with reverent respect to his memory.

The present important world problems, of course, received his most devoted attention. He was a good, loyal American patriot, but he also loved the land of his forefathers. His interest in both made him a student of history. His analyses of and his contribution to these problems will be missed. He did leave for us, however, the fruits of his productive mind. From these we might derive much sustenance for strength for the future. They will also preserve him in our memories, and in the memories of those who will come after us, as a guiding light for the tired and worn and as an inspiration to strive for those accomplishments which make our lives useful to God and man.

The world has lost a devoted servant of God, a philosopher, and a statesman.

Do We Want Facts About Liquor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include a certain article, I want to say if the Congress seriously wants facts about the illicit, vicious, flagrant, law-violating practices in the traffic of whisky almost within the shadows of the Capitol dome, here is a newspaper correspondent who offers figures, facts, names, and addresses. His article here printed is indeed an enlightening commentary on the Department of Justice, the F. B. I., and our Capital's reputed fine Police Department.

The article follows:

A CURB-SERVICE BOOTLEGGER NOT FAR FROM WHITE HOUSE

(By Earl Wilson)

WASHINGTON, April 17.—I just left a cab driver who said: "My, my, some people surely do get drunk." I observed that I also had noticed this.

"Yes," he said, "I just had a couple that was so drunk, the man gave me $5 to carry the woman in the house. I just folded her up and put her on my back and carried her in." Inasmuch as he told me all this practically in the shadow of the White House, I blushed furiously for several seconds, then decided to tell you something I found at 3:30 o'clock Sunday morning, about a dozen blocks from the White House.

A curb-service bootlegger. Just what we've been waiting for. A bootlegger who makes drinking easy. Takes the hardship out of it.

He was lean and sinister-looking, with a pulled-down hat, and he came right out into the dark street to take my order for a bottle of scotch. "Service" is his motto; he gives southern hospitality with a smile. He should go far and don't ask me to what jail. He has an office. In fact, he was waiting in it. It was a Buick roadster parked in the driveway of a tire service station at Fourteenth and P Streets NW.

He uncoiled from it, hustled the booze from a small brick house, then slid back into the car to wait for other patrons who are his fans.

At least I was one till he told me the price of his dynamite; later when I got a look at the bottle in the light, my confidence flagged further. I now suspect him of ignoble ethics.

I came here to watch some of the swell comedians now appearing in Congress. But I went to the night clubs for a story because of the post-Easter lull. From my room across from the National Press Building I can see, with the naked eye, the Washington correspondents yawning. No wonder; the Senate in two sessions last week met for 39 minutes. This drove me to the curb-service bootlegger—and please get this straight; just anybody can't buy from him. You've got to know somebody influential like, say, a cab driver.

We met our gabby cabby while exploring some of the chartered "private clubs," which take care of the tipplers who want to go on guzzling after the curfew, which is midnight Saturday and 2 a. m. weekdays.

These private clubs are as private as the Yankee Stadium. The members bring guests. Hang on till we look at the Spotlight Guild, at Seventeenth and M.

At 2:45 a. m. it's dark and lonely as we come up to the big building with the sign that says, "Harry's Parking." It seems empty of life. But we knock on a wooden door. A doorman peeks out and lets us in. Here's a big room with low lights, some drinkers at tables, a soldier passed out in a chair. The big excitement's downstairs. A couple of girls are arguing on the stairs.

"Course I'm drunk," one says. "Everybody's drunk."

It's a lie. I'm not. Many aren't. A naval captain makes a few passes at gals. A small orchestra blares against the uproar of 200 to 300 voices. It's noisy, dark, and close.

You have to bring your own bottle here unless you want only a cola drink or ginger-ale. A show's coming up at 3:30 a. m. We leave, go to the Club Lamplighters, also a private club where you bring your own bottle. A doorman studies you through a glass panel.

We are leaving here when the gabby cabby loads us in and begins bragging he's taken 15 or 20 into that private club tonight.

I asked him how.

"Just knocked on the door," he said. "It's for anybody's got a buck." He looked at me and noticed my unmistakably sober countenance and said, "Whats wrong; ain't you happy?"

"Oh, we just haven't any bottle."

"You want a bottle?" He almost shouted. He could see now that we were real people worthy of his friendship. I'm not saying he was a steerer; I'm not even mentioning it.

To be truthful with you, I didn't want a bottle * * * but this, in the National Capital, which doesn't permit sale of liquor at all on Sunday, sounded interesting. "Where do you go—to a kitchen or cellar or something?"

"Nah—just to a parked car. They make it easy for you in Washington."

It was just a block away. Two men sat in the Buick. As we pulled up the lean one came to the cab; his pal, a lookout, sat there. The curb service bootlegger made me begin the conversation.

What did he have?

"Johnny Walker Red Label." "O. K.," I said. He headed up P Street, crossed to a brick house, came out in a minute, looked up and down the street, then walked to us, holding the bottle, which was in a brown paper sack, in his coat pocket. I magnanimously handed him a $10 bill.

"Twelve," he said.

"Twelve," I spluttered. That made it about $6 or $7 above retail. I left, with all the license numbers, house numbers, and everything, in case anybody wants to investigate, and when I got my little bundle of joy home I looked at it lovingly and—the Government stamp had been broken. It had been opened and cut, obviously; I wonder if with Potomac River water? To think I'd done it when I wasn't stinkin'.

A Brave and Heroic People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed by the tributes that were paid to Poland on the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. We in America, after passing through our colonial stage, realized fully the value of a written constitution, which was to be the law of the land and the beacon light for future generations.

Poland adopted its constitution just 2 years after our Constitution had been adopted and Washington had become the first President of the United States. We have long felt an admiration for the brave and heroic people of Poland, who through their years of suffering and tribulation, have a continuing determination that their Poland shall once again assume its full and proper place in the history of the world.

They are a brave people, an intellectual people, a religious people; and by their strong determination manifested through their many years of turmoil and trouble will definitely restore Poland to its proper place. The Polish people of today and their descendants everywhere are joining with the other liberty-loving nations of the world in order to establish governments of the people and by the people throughout the world.

During the years of Poland's continued struggle for liberty, her people have never lost sight of their goal of freedom. Wherever the sons of Poland have wandered from their mother country, they have always been among the leaders of those advocating freedom and self-government of the people.

It is perfectly fitting and proper that the great Polish Nation should be commended for her zeal and efforts for a full restoration of their Poland. The Polish people of my home town of Flint and my district have a right to be proud of their native land and have a further right to be proud of the splendid contributions which the people of Poland have made toward world civilization and progress.

The O. W. I. Handbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention a tribute from Great Britain to the O. W. I.'s Handbook of the United States of America, which has been the subject of a good deal of uninformed discussion in this country. Members will recall that this fact book, prepared by our Office of War Information for its overseas staff, was republished by a private British publisher because it contributed to a better understanding of us among the British people. The handbook has now been reviewed in flattering terms in the April 14 issue of the Spectator, one of the oldest and most distinguished of British weeklies. The author of the review is Prof. Denis W. Brogan, of Cambridge University, an editor of the British Dictionary of National Biography and one of the foremost authorities on the United States in Great Britain today. The following is the text of his article:

FACTS ABOUT AMERICA

(By D. W. Brogan)

"In this catalog of books which are no books—biblia abiblia—I reckon court calendars, directories * * * the works of Hume, Gibbon, Robertson, Beattie, Soame Jenyns and, generally, all those volumes which 'no gentleman's library should be without.'" It is pretty certain that Charles Lamb would have classed a Handbook of the United States of America, Pertinent Information About the United States and the War Effort (Hutchinson, 10s. 6d.), as a specimen of the biblia abiblia that he detested. But there are tougher souls for whom this mass of information will be nourishment and who will have reason to be grateful to the Office of War Information and its Overseas Branch for making it available here. It is true that little has been done to conceal that this is roughage. Grim pages of small and unattractive print may put off the mere idler, the lounger in the flowery fields of statistics and crude, unprocessed information, but the reader who is in good training will be very amply rewarded. In short, this is a book which every editorial library should possess, and which by its very factual sobriety does a better job than many more lively impressionistic works have done.

First of all, it makes clear how great have been the changes imposed by the war on the American governmental structure. The old

simple division into executive, legislative, and judicial branches, the division of the executive into the great Cabinet departments and the independent agencies, the division between the Union and the States, these classical landmarks are hidden beneath a deep, lush growth of new bodies, under unclassifiable heads, exercising new powers in all kinds of relationship with the old units of government, from harmonious symbiosis to civil war. Much of the permanent growl of discontent from Washington comes from innocent and lost wayfarers who hope to find their way through the war Capital with the comparative ease of 1939. There was in Washington, 2 years ago, an information bureau designed to help people like these, and it did help them, but this book, even more effectually than what was unkindly called Melletts madhouse, will do the job both for the bold explorer who dares the risks and discomforts of a journey to Washington and the fireside traveler who simply wants to know what is going on and is content with vicarious experience.

By the very elaboration of the picture painted in detail by the first section of this book, it is made easier for British stay-at-homes to understand some of the American irritation at what, by the national tradition, is superfluous bureaucracy. For many Americans still dream dreams of the days when all men were masters of all political trades and when business was supposed to have secrets hidden from the politicians and bureaucrats. They are wrong—how wrong this book, unconsciously, perhaps, makes clear. But it nevertheless is a source of irritation to a patriotic and indignant citizenry to discover that somehow the bureaucrats stay and grow. It may in time (after this year's elections, perhaps) be learned that you can have good and bad bureaucrats, but that you must have bureaucrats—which is a lesson for us, too. Whitehall may be less of a hothouse than Washington, but Whitehall does not publish guides to its own Kew Gardens of new departments and old ones redone.

But there is a larger and more interesting section in this book: the collection of basic facts. We learn a great many things that ought to interest us, even if we do not always come easily to believe that figures prove or even suggest as much as a chamber of commerce hand-out suggests. There are, taken at random, such figures as 22,500,000 books published, 216,000 degrees conferred by universities and colleges, nearly 4,000,000 college graduates, and a yearly average expenditure on elementary and high-school pupils of $105 per head. Fifty million visitors entered museums, and 1,250,000 pints of blood had been collected for plasma by the end of 1942. There are 56,000,000 radios (nearly 2 for each family group) and 6,000 television sets. There were 21 major short-wave stations and 15 more under construction. "Under centralized control, they direct transmissions to all parts of the world, in nearly 40 languages and dialects." There were 24,250,000 telephones, "about half the world's total."

Basic facts of a more important kind are here, too. We learn of that decisive dividing line between the adequately watered and semiarid zones. It runs roughly up 103°, usually simplified into the short-grass and long-grass divide of 100°. East are the farmlands, west are (or should be) the ranches. "For sustenance, each head of cattle needs from 12 to 320 acres of grazing land, depending on the quality of the range. Approximately 263,000,000 acres of grazing land sustain the West's livestock production, an area about five times as large as Great Britain." But more surprising is the limited amount of good farm land available. "There are about 460,000,000 acres of good arable land, of which about 350,000,000 acres were in crops in 1942." And only about 130,000,000 acres of land were entirely free from erosion—whose chief cause is not the tearing wind, but the pounding, sudden, heavy rain. We are assured that this time everything possible is being done to prevent that reckless plowing-up of what was really nonarable land that did so much harm in 1917–18. Can it be that there is a lesson for us here?

And, as we contemplate the tide of American production flooding in, we should always remember the great peacetime industry that beat its electric razors into tank parts, its refrigerators into planes. "January 1942 saw the last gaming machine produced; February the last passenger automobile; March, the last piece of metal office furniture for civilian use. In April, production of civilian trucks, radio receivers, gramophones, refrigerators, amusement machines, slot machines, and vacuum cleaners halted. In May, production of household washing machines, automatic ironers, residential coal stokers and oil burners, commercial laundry equipment (except for military use), metal household furniture, safes, vaults, electric roasters, toasters, waffle irons, grills, razors, and a dozen smaller items stopped. June saw the last metal casket and burial vault, the last lawn mower and commercial dry-cleaning machine for other than military use. In July, production of bed springs, bicycles, and household sewing machines ended." This is the reverse of lend-lease; it was the turning over of this productive capacity to military uses that was decisive. (It illustrates the American inflationary problem, too.) This turn-around could not have been achieved but for Pearl Harbor. Hitler may well curse his Japanese ally. He and the Third Reich will be buried in that last metal "casket" which is the coffin of his illusions and hopes.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of the Enactment of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the one-hundred-and-fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution. The enactment of this constitution in 1791 was, for that time, a highly democratic constitutional reform. This day has always been celebrated in Poland as the greatest national holiday. As it cannot be thus celebrated in Poland now it would be just and proper for us lovers of freedom and democracy to take over and remind the world that Poland was not only the first nation in Europe to write a constitution granting individual rights to all her citizens, but has through the years struggle mightily against oppression.

On September 1, 1939, Hitler ordered his armies to attack Poland and began a war which has spread throughout the world. Hitler was strong; the Poles were not. In 4 weeks the campaign was over, but the defense of Gdynia and the heroic resistance at Warsaw will be long remembered. The Poles have not surrendered; the Polish Government in London leads thousands of Poles who have escaped the Nazi hordes and continue in active service against them. They continue to hold high the burning light of freedom which was instituted in 1791 with their constitution's writing.

Poland is a nation with a past—in science with Copernicus and Mme. Curie; in music with Chopin and Paderewski; in statesmanship with Casimir the Great, John Sobieski, and Kosciuszko. We must not forget also Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, prominent Polish statesman, poet, playwright, and political leader, who played such a large part in the enactment of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, commemorated today. Poland is a nation with a future. For that future the Poles are fighting, in common purpose with the other United Nations. The spirit of its indomitable people will never be crushed; resistance will continue until the Nazi conqueror, who thought to break the Polish spirit, will find he is beaten.

In connection with this one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution it would be fitting to mention Poles in America. It is believed that Jan of Kolno, a Polish sailor, reached Labrador and explored the Atlantic coast as far south as Delaware Bay in 1475. There were Poles in John Smith's settlement at Jamestown in 1607 and in New Amsterdam from 1659. Infiltration of Poles into these United States produced a hardy, industrious people who have contributed greatly to the richness of our country. Wherever busy industry may be found—in sugar refineries, plants producing agricultural implements and rolling stock, cotton mills, furniture factories, coal mines, in the meat-packing and leather trades—you will find the industrial Pole. Also we must not forget the Pole's love of the land and his hard work which has produced so many successful farms throughout these United States.

Therefore, it is with pleasure that I salute undefeatable and immortal Poland. Together with the other United Nations, we are dedicated to help Poland survive and to reestablish a strong and healthy independence, not only for the sake of the Poles but also for the benefit of the world in the future—an independence that is the cherished possession and trust of all freedom-loving Americans.

School Lunches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint of broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over the Mutual network Tuesday, April 18, 1944:

I learned today that the Senate Committee on Agriculture has been flooded with mail from all parts of the country about an issue that is coming before that Committee on

Agriculture in the very near future and which I think will be interesting to you particularly if you happen to have any children. It involves the low-cost hot lunches for school children all over the Nation, and at the moment there is a threat to discontinue that program, in fact the appropriation of some $50,000,000 to finance the Federal Government's share of the program was stricken out of the agricultural appropriations bill in the House of Representatives about a month ago and these letters are demanding that it be restored to the bill in the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Perhaps I had better give you a little background on this school-lunch program because it is the past and the future that are chiefly important in deciding whether the program should be continued or not at this time. It was started back in 1935 at a time when the Surplus Commodity Corporation in Washington was buying up large quantities of surplus farm produce of various kinds, the buying being done to help support the price of those farm products by absorbing the surplus production which would have knocked the bottom out of the market. The Government, having these farm products on hand, began distributing them to local welfare agencies all over the country and considerable quantities were given to school organizations to help provide lunches for the schools.

One of the most important commodities was milk, of which there was a tremendous surplus all through those years, and it is pretty hard to question the wisdom of any plan by which surplus food of that kind, particularly surplus milk above all things, is turned into the building of better and stronger bodies for the school children of the Nation, instead of being dumped into sewers or allowed to spoil. What's more, this was chiefly a local program in which the help of the Federal Government was only a small factor and that still is true, by the way. For example, a local parent-teachers' association or a Kiwanis Club or the Rotary or the Lions or some such organization sponsor the school-lunch program in one or more schools where there are needy children; they make a cash contribution and in some cases the city government also helps out, but over the broad average the lunches have cost all told about 2 cents per child. The contribution by the Federal Government has been the equivalent of about 9 cents per lunch, 9 of the 27 cents, and the local interests have made up the other 18 cents.

The average cost to the individual child has been between 10 and 15 cents per lunch. That is what little Willie pays across the counter. But this year, for example, some 800,000 children have been given their lunches absolutely free, children who couldn't even pay the 15 cents. With the stress of wartimes and the dislocations, the surplus products from the farms have just about disappeared, so the foundation upon which the entire Federal Government participation was based has been largely swept away. There are some periodic surpluses here and there, but they are not large and the materials which the Government buys probably could be disposed of in other channels, so beginning last year in order to keep the program going the Congress appropriated $50,000,000 in cash, the money to be distributed to the local school lunch agencies in the place of actual food commodities. The requirement is, however, that that money be used to buy certain specified things, a list of which is provided from time to time, that list being, of course, the commodities of which there is the greatest abundance or of which there actually at the moment is a surplus.

In the House of Representatives, however, the appropriation was stricken out this time, and unless it is restored in the Senate Agriculture Committee it would appear that the Federal Government is going out of the school-lunch program.

The argument was used that the surpluses are gone, therefore the justification no longer exists.

The counter-argument, however, is that the moment the war is over the surpluses will reappear as serious as ever or worse, and it may happen before the war is over. When it does happen, this machinery will be just as much needed as it ever was, and unless it is kept alive in the meantime the whole thing will have to be rebuilt after the war. It took years to build up the machinery of this school-lunch program; it will take years to build it again, and it seems penny-wise and pound-foolish to wreck the whole structure now merely on the strength of extraordinary conditions of the moment.

Executive Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from the Washington Post of May 3, 1944:

EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY
(By Mark Sullivan)
EXTREME EXTENSION

If the Montgomery Ward case stood alone, it might be regarded as a casual step out of bounds, unpremeditated and taken in the hurry and pressure of war, without realizing its nature and consequences. Even if the policy and course of action underlying the step, the policy of enlarged powers for the Executive had been adopted only for the emergency of war, if there had been no such course of action before the war, and if no such course were anticipated after the war—in that event the course might be looked on with some tolerance (though by no means could there be tolerance for the extraordinary assertion of Attorney General Biddle that, in time of war, the President does not need authorization by statute, that by his inherent powers as Commander in Chief he can take any step which his judgment deems necessary.

If a step outside the Constitution, outside the established pattern of governmental practice, were taken by a public official to whom such a step is repugnant; if it were taken with regret and only because of the emergency of war; and if we could feel sure that the public official taking such a step and following such a course would be quick to abandon it when the emergency was ended—in such a condition the step might be regarded without great concern.

But the country is obliged to remember that the seizure of Montgomery Ward, as an extreme extension of the power of the Executive, is kin to a course and attitude that existed before the war. It is unhappily not possible for the country to look upon the Roosevelt administration as one which, in normal peacetime, had meticulous regard for the Constitution; which was careful to restrain itself within the limitations of its Executive powers, careful to have regard for the powers of Congress and the courts, and for the rights of citizens. The country is obliged to look at the present extreme assertion of Executive power during wartime in the light of a course of action that went on during several years preceding the war.

That the administration, during peacetime, followed a course leading toward extension of the Executive power is a familiar fact. It is not merely a charge made by the administration's opponents and critics. It is the verdict, in many cases, of impartial persons, even of persons prevailingly sympathetic to the administration. It has been the observation of persons trained to observe, the judgment of persons equipped with the background for judgment.

While this tendency of the administration has prevailed at all times, it became conspicuous in the summer of 1937. That was when Mr. Roosevelt had sent to Congress his measure for changing the Supreme Court, and followed that up with a group of far-reaching measures, one of which would have reorganized and enlarged the Executive branch of Government, and transferred a degree of power from the legislative to the Executive. At that time, among other critics, Dorothy Thompson made a careful analysis of the measures and concluded that they were "profoundly revolutionary." She added:

"These bills are not isolated measures, but add up to a consistent picture, and the picture is of a tremendously centralized government, with a power and authority vested in the President, not far from equal to the power and authority vested in Mussolini or in Stalin."

It was about the same time that Mr. Walter Lippmann wrote: "I feel, let us hope mistakenly, that he (President Roosevelt) really does have a plan and that he is determined to execute it. * * * It is a plan, as I see it, to gather together an irresistible power over the economic life of this country and to consolidate that power in the hands of his own following * * * irresistible power personally directed. * * * These fears, I regret to say, are shared by men who have occupied high places in this very administration and in the confidence of Mr. Roosevelt himself."

The fears Mr. Lippmann spoke of have been and are in the minds of many, in Congress and outside. They account for a further apprehension, now expressing itself in connection with the seizure of Mongomery Ward. The apprehension is that extensions of Executive authority, practiced in time of war, and for which justification is claimed on the ground of war, may have an effect after the war.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH MRUK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by an assembly of Americans of Polish extraction gathered in Buffalo, N. Y., April 30, 1944, in celebration of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791:

Whereas each May celebration brings to us a rebirth of courage and a renewal of our pledge to the ideals of freedom, we solemnly

observe today, through the gloom of the moment the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption by the Polish Diet in 1791 of the world-famous Constitution of May 3, so justly appraised by the English statesman, Edmund Burke, as "the noblest benefit received by any nation at any time"; and

Whereas we draw our moral strength from that historic document which inspired our ancestors imbued with a feeling of intense national unity in the face of impending danger, to proclaim courageously to the world that "more than life and personal happiness we value external independence and internal freedom"; and

Whereas we are approaching the decisive moment when the Allied operations will bring the liberation of Poland, the first member of the Allied Powers to resist brutal aggression over 4½ years ago, in result of which every tenth Pole has died for the cause of freedom, a record which no other nation has equaled in this cataclysm called World War No. 2; and

Whereas we are fully cognizant of the historic fact that the geographic location of Poland in the vast plain of central Europe between two powerful neighbors, opposite in their culture, both ambitious for territorial expansion, makes the need of a strong and an independent Poland an essential requisite for enduring peace not only in Europe but in the entire world of today; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has declared repeatedly that it stands for the establishment of a strong, independent, and a friendly Poland, and since it is easy to understand that the loss of 51 percent of Polish territory and 37 percent of her people, 85 percent of her oil and natural gas, more than half of her lumber, about half of her chemical industry, her potassium mines, phosphates, and most of her grain—cannot possibly lead to a strong, independent, and friendly Poland; and

Whereas it is a matter of historic record that Poland, in the period of her greatest expansion, when her territory comprised more than double the 150,000 square miles restored to her after the First World War, Poland before the first partition stood out prominently in Europe as an illustrious commonwealth of federated republics enjoying unprecedented religious tolerance, liberty, and freedom based on Christian principles of social justice; and

Whereas sincere cooperation and mutual trust among the Allied Nations are indispensable for bringing on a final victory, we strenuously condemn all agitation and every suggestion of acts tending to divide and weaken the common front of the United Nations, especially at this critical hour in the prosecution of this war for freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That as loyal citizens of the United States we solemnly pledge our unstinted support to the great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and to our Government in their untiring effort to bring this war to a complete and an early victory conforming to the terms of the various declarations made by the United Nations for a just and enduring peace for all nations, large and small; to this end, we promise first, to increase our purchases of Government bonds, especially at this time of the coming Fifth Loan campaign; secondly, we pledge our increased contributions in money and work for the American Red Cross and other recognized war relief agencies performing missions of mercy to our men and women in the various services, as the zero hour of the allied invasion approaches; thirdly, we further promise conscientious performance of all our duties at home, in war plants, or in other positions working for increased production of supplies, equipment, and weapons with which to arm our sons and daughters in the fight for freedom and justice for all nations; and be it further

Resolved, That after the war is won and the proper moment shall arrive, we shall stand united in our most earnest appeal to the leaders of our Government in Washington and particularly to the President, and to the Secretary of State, to use their good offices as mediators on behalf of the righteous cause of Poland by supporting her determination to maintain the integrity of her territory so that the world may be assured of a lasting peace; and finally, be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Ambassador of Poland-in-exile to the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The Jewish Agricultural Society, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to the forty-fourth annual report of the Jewish Agricultural Society, which since the beginning of the century has been dedicated to the advancement of farming by Jewish citizens of the country. The encouragement which it has given during those years is today bearing fruit in increased food production for war needs:

THE JEWISH AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY—ITS AIMS AND ACTIVITIES

The Jewish Agricultural Society was founded and is maintained by funds derived from Baron de Hirsch foundations and by virtue of a revolving fund which these endowments created. Its purpose is to encourage and advance farming by Jews in the United States.

Through a department of farm settlement, the society advises those who intend to take up farming as a livelihood and helps the qualified person to get the right farm at the right price and on the right terms. The society acts on the premise that a prime requisite for successful farming is a genuine desire on the part of the individual to farm and that an artificially stimulated desire is apt to wane as soon as the sober realities of farm life are confronted. In the last 10 years over 10,000 people sought the society's advice and the society was responsible for the establishment on farms of 964 families directly, many more indirectly. Of the 739 families settled by the society since 1939—and the 5-year period is taken because the first 5 years are the crucial years for the new farmer—692 are still on their farms.

The society's farm-loan department makes loans not usually obtainable elsewhere, based not strictly on tangible security but also on human factors—faith in the ability of the borrower to make good; a service which any self-respecting man can accept without the sacrifice of prestige or dignity. Since its inception in 1900 the Society has approved 14,371 loans aggregating $8,907,268 in 40 States.

For the Jew, farming is an acquisition, not an inheritance. The task of making a farmer out of a Jew is one of orientation as well as of craftsmanship. Because of his loss of contact with the soil, the Jew needs a special type of service suited to his background and which no public or governmental agency can be expected to provide. Recognizing this, the society maintains a department of agricultural education and extension, designed to bring to the new Jewish farmer agricultural information on all phases of farming. In the more populous Jewish farming districts, Jewish agricultural experts carry their teachings from farm to farm. During 1943 these traveling teachers made 3,134 farm visits, held 144 farm gatherings of various types, with an aggregate attendance of over 7,500. This was in addition to 2,527 individual letters of advice and 4,464 circulars and 2,429 office consultations. The society conducts agricultural night classes for farm aspirants in New York City and Chicago; publishes the Jewish Farmer, an agricultural magazine; maintains a purchasing service for individual farmers and farm cooperatives. It works with farm youth groups.

The society's farm employment department has made 19,669 job placements in 32 States since its inception in 1908. Some of these workers have developed into successful farm operators.

The society's department of rural sanitation carries on work to promote higher standards of sanitation in and about the farm premises. Through farm gatherings, public meetings, demonstrations, and lectures, this department has reached many thousands of rural folk.

The society makes loans for the erection of synagogues and center buildings in Jewish farm communities. For many years it made loans to agricultural students and awarded agricultural scholarships.

Since the advent of refugees, the society has devoted effort to the rehabilitation of those who saw salvation in farming. It has helped to settle refugee families on farms in 12 States.

The society holds that the family farm is the backbone of American agriculture. It is opposed to a system of farming which, while euphemistically termed cooperative, is in essence collectivistic and lacks the voluntary motif of free persons working together toward a common end. From the experience of early Jewish colonization efforts and from resettlement attempts the society has learned that the average American wants to be the possessor of his own farmstead, be it ever so modest or burdened with debt. But the society has from the very beginning been a staunch advocate of those forms of cooperation among farmers which promote the common weal and yet leave individual ownership unfettered. It has helped to organize and it works with cooperatives in the fields of buying, marketing, processing, fire insurance, and credit—all on a nonsectarian basis. It extends credit to cooperative enterprises.

Since the outbreak of the war all these activities have been mobilized toward a single end—to help Jewish farmers achieve maximum food production.

It's Time To Change Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the written text of an address given by myself before the Douglas County Republican Convention, Omaha, Nebr., April 27, 1944:

Fellow Republicans, there is a lot of confidence and enthusiasm this year among

Republicans, who have watched the great upsurge of our strength in the Middle West and throughout the Nation. They see this country going toward a Republican victory like a great tide. I am pleased by their determined energy and enthusiasm, but I want to put in a word of warning.

This country is in the grip of the most powerful political machine the world has ever known. This machine is not going to give up the power it has seized for itself over the lives of the people without a desperate fight. The men who are running the Government in Washington know every angle, every trick, every "sleezy" method to keep your lives under their control. These men are not men who were elected by the people, so that you can only remove them by changing administrations.

There is only one agency which can do that job. That agency is the Republican Party. Accordingly, our party has a solemn and fearful responsibility in 1944. That responsibility divides itself into two parts:

First. To save representative government in America, which is the last major country in the world where the people are at least partially governed by representatives elected at regular intervals.

Second. We have the job, and this is the most complex and difficult part of our task, of saving Government by the consent of the governed in a manner and by methods which will hasten the winning of the war and get your boys back home. These two great objectives, to save representative government in America, and to hasten the winning of the war and get our boys back home as quickly as possible, are not easy to achieve. The New Deal is going to exploit every aspect of this war and its related problems to win the election this fall.

They will say, for example, "Stop politics, and win the war." But, behind this pious phrase, they will play politics 24 hours a day. If they possibly can, they will prevent the American people from throwing out of office those who have betrayed their responsibilities. We must learn from history. The New Deal perpetuated itself in power in 1940 by claiming that it wanted a third term for Mr. Roosevelt "to keep us out of war." It was a clever trick and it worked, but it did not keep America out of war.

Now, they are telling the American people "not to change horses in the middle of the stream." Fellow Republicans, let me warn you of the danger which lies ahead. If this New Deal stays in power another 4 years, the liberty that you and I inherited, and which we should pass on to our children, may be gone forever.

If that prophecy sounds too fearsome, let me remind you of a parallel prophecy by John T. Flynn, in 1940. He stated, "If * * * you reelect the President and the war drums should beat and your son should be marched off to the transports and find himself a grave in some distant land—in Europe or Indochina—fighting to save the colonial possessions of some European empire—do not blame Franklin Roosevelt for it. The blame will be upon your own heads."

The blame for despotism will be on the heads of the people of America, if they allow the New Deal to stay in office another 4 years after their colossal failures of the past 12 years.

"Don't change horses in the middle of the stream." That is an old saw, and may have merit on some occasions. But, it is an assertion that has always been used by bungling failures to keep the reins of office. The New Dealers believe that this is their strongest argument. But, if you examine that argument carefully, it soon falls apart. But first, let us look at the example of England.

In 1940, England had Chamberlain running the government. Chamberlain, the man of Munich. What did the English do after Dunkerque in their hour of supreme trial and crisis? They threw Chamberlain out and put in Churchill. They changed horses right squarely in the middle of the stream, and that change was the action that saved England. I say to you, fellow Republicans, that here in America, 4 years later, a change of horses is the only action that will save America.

They are going to tell you that a change in administration will interfere with the winning of the war. They will say they have the machinery all set up, the job under way, and that control should be left in their hands.

Let us examine that counterfeit logic and expose the humbug in it. Our military effort fits into one of two categories: Either it is being run by the military heads of our Army and Navy, or the politicians are interfering with the direction of war strategy. One or the other. It can't be both.

Either General Marshall and Admiral King are running the war for America, and are making the final decisions—which is as it should be—or Roosevelt and Churchill and other politicians are mixing into the military decisions. Now, if the military men are running the war and a Republican President is elected, which he will be next November, the conduct of the war will stay just where it is and where it ought to be—in the hands of the trained military experts.

If, on the other hand, and this is a big "if," Roosevelt, Churchill, Harry Hopkins, and Henry Wallace are mixing into the military decisions that should be made by the Army and Navy, I can tell you that that kind of damnable monkey business will stop when the Republicans are elected.

Now, let us get this situation straight. The question is whether they are mixing into the military decisions, or whether they are not mixing in these decisions. If they are not mixing in the war effort, a change in leadership can have no affect on the successful conduct of the war except to help dramatically by strengthening the home front. But, on the other hand, if the Palace Guards are mixing into the military strategy and invasion plans, a Republican administration will stop that kind of political finagling.

Now, let us examine the domestic false front which the new dealers plan to use in selling their candidate to the American people. It is their claim that the New Deal has prevented inflation. And, when it comes to gigantic and colossal absurdities, that claim is the worst of all. Here is a similar situation. It would be like you going to your doctor with a badly infected tooth, only to have him pack it with morphine and tell you that he had fixed the tooth and prevented the infection simply because it had stopped hurting.

We have had in this country, price control and price-fixing—and incidentally, as an adjunct to the management of the economic front, price control is necessary—but price control is a dangerous device and is not a preventative of inflation. Price control is like an anesthetic, it is like packing your tooth with morphine. It does not remove either the infection or the cause of the infection. And the infection, as Roosevelt said in 1932—and has violated every year since that time—is an unbalanced Budget.

Spending more than you take in is what sends an individual to the bankruptcy court. Spending by a nation of more than it takes in is what sends a nation into inflation. Reckless spending went on for 9 years before we got into the war and has been going on since we got into the war.

No, the New Deal has not prevented inflation any more than the application of morphine has fixed the aching tooth. All the New Deal has done has been to prevent us from feeling the pain. But, we are beginning to feel it now. Many articles of commerce cannot be bought except in the black markets, and there is chiseling, bootlegging, and economic distress on every hand. The great middle classes of America, the backbone of the country, are being squeezed and beaten down by the impact of higher prices and higher taxes.

Let me, just for the record, here cite you an example of how these clever schemers in Washington are misleading you on the economic front. A few days ago, you were told that the cost of living was remaining stable. They didn't tell you that they don't include taxes in that cost of living index. But, taxes have increased tremendously since the war began, and they are a much bigger part of your cost of living than ever before, and much of our taxes are taken out of our paychecks even before we get them.

Now let me tell you something about the difficulties—we who oppose the New Deal in Washington are up against. This administration possesses more power than any Government has had at any time in the history of the world. No Caesar ever had the armies, the industrial capacity, or the propaganda agencies available to our modern rulers, at his command.

This tremendous power breeds ideas and dreams of imperialism and empire in the minds of the bureaucrats. For example, a few days ago one of the fantastic schemes in the minds of our leaders was brought to light, when Ickes announced that the United States Government was going into partnership with Standard Oil thousands of miles away in desert Arabia.

The fact that power feeds upon itself is proven again and again in the history books. Today, we see it in a so-called New Deal, which has constantly used its power to perpetuate itself in office. We must be prepared to see this effort made cleverly and shrewdly behind the screen of beautiful oratory, noble promises, and glowing reports from the battle fronts.

The New Deal is counting on the emergency which has involved us in war in all corners of the world as a successful alibi for their continuance in office. As a word of caution let me suggest to you that this clever scheme is affecting the minds of some anxious parents, who are desperately worried about their sons and daughters in the armed forces. You will hear some people say that the New Deal is wrong and should be done away with, but that we should wait until the war is over.

Fellow Americans, as long as this gang is in power, there is no hope for a return to normal conditions under which they can be removed from office. In the first place, the New Deal has proven for 12 long years its absolute incapacity to create a normal and healthy condition; secondly, the record indicates that you cannot have a normal situation with the New Deal in power any more than you could teach love, tolerance, and fair play on a battlefield.

In exploiting the crisis alibi, the new dealers are making use of their control of the propaganda agencies of this country to a degree which borders on the sinister. Your actions and mine are governed by the information which is available to us. What you may do in a given situation depends on the facts in your possession.

This administration controls the radio through the F. C. C.; war news is released or not released as the new dealers desire, and the same is true of domestic news. They pull the strings and exercise the controls that determine the sly and hidden propaganda that permeates the movies and the newsreels in every theater in the land. Beyond that they have developed the most unwholesome and vicious smear technique that has ever been known in American history.

In the Voice of Destruction, by Hermann Rauschnigg, which tells of Hitler's rise to power, Hitler is quoted as saying, "I will destroy my opponents by making them look ridiculous and contemptible." Today you see the same tactics being used on outstanding and patriotic Americans.

For example, we are seeing this smear technique used on our senior Senator, HUGH BUTLER. During his first 2 years in office, he had consistently opposed the New Deal, but not until he delivered a body blow at their boondoggling in South America did the high-powered hatchet men go to work. They attacked Senator BUTLER'S figures. They attacked him personally. They attacked his sincerity of purpose, and finally, they used many tricks calculated to blacken his reputation.

The truth is that BUTLER gave the people a realistic picture of the tremendous expenditures of American dollars in Central and South America—with side-line allies who have received from us hundreds of millions in goods, services, and actual gold itself.

The same technique has been used on Senator KENNETH WHERRY. When WHERRY went to Washington, the New Deal used its regular methods on all newcomers. They flattered him and made the usual allurements of parties, teas, and trips to soften him up and bring him into camp. That is a regular part of the New Deal chicanery. They make it very pleasant for a Senator or Congressman who can be influenced in this fashion. Of course, these methods failed on WHERRY. Now they have started to get out the old tar bucket and start their mud-slinging procedures.

You may have seen the actual incident on Senator WHERRY. A sly story was written that WHERRY, a Senator from the Bible belt, was helping get the Police Gazette more paper, but would not help high-grade concerns with their paper problems. This story represented a downright distortion of the facts.

This smear was shrewdly and carefully calculated to make WHERRY look bad with the people in the Middle West. In this particular instance WHERRY called their bluff and exposed the trickery. Donald Nelson got busy immediately and pledged himself to stop that kind of monkey business. Nevertheless, it will go on and on by the New Deal hatchet men against every candidate or Republican officeholder.

The fire of their hate propaganda will be centered most of all on the Republican candidate for President. They will belittle him and cleverly suggest that the Republican candidate is a man of small caliber who is unable to handle the great problems confronting us. Likewise he will be smeared and sniped at from every conceivable aspect. The backroom artists of the New Deal play on every aspect of race, religion, economic life, minorities, and class prejudice in the book. Underlying all these other sources of social disturbance is the hatred of business which has been conducted from the White House since Roosevelt took office in 1932.

The New Deal has striven to undermine the foundation of America, which was builded on the absence of classes. All their devious schemes of creating unrest, disturbance, and distrust lead in just one direction and toward one result—an atheistic, communistic, and totalitarian society where all the great values for which America has stood will be dumped on the scrap heap.

America was built on the great virtues of righteousness, justice, freedom, and opportunity. Under the New Deal, the American home, which glorified these virtues, has been literally torn up by the roots. Your boys and girls have been sent to the four corners of the earth and shifted back and forth across the country until the trains cannot carry them. The manpower bureaucrats have created such a muddle that heads of families don't know from one day to the next whether they are in or out of the Army, and our people get new rules and regulations from the bureaucrats in Washington almost every day.

When the people are poor and desperate, when they lose confidence in each other, and when the middle classes have been destroyed, the country is in a desperate plight. That process of destroying the constitutional Republic has gone a long way in this country.

It is not a question of whether the country can stand a fourth term or not. The basic question which confronts us is whether or not we can recover from three terms of New Deal waste, extravagance, and bungling. For 12 long years the people of America have not exercised their constitutional right to change those in power.

The only practical way the existence of the all-important right can be demonstrated is by its exercise. You can say you know how to drive a car, but the only way you can prove it is by driving one. The same logic applies to freedom in this country, and the only way the American people can prove they are still free and can still choose their own rulers is by throwing this gang out of power.

Fellow Nebraskans, I could go on telling you about things that are going on down in Washington. It makes my heart sick to see how the loyalty, patriotism, enthusiasm, and industry of the common people is being misused by those in whose hands the fate of this Nation currently rests.

But I want to talk to you about the most important aspect of this situation. American boys, right now, are fighting, bleeding and dying all over the world. They have gone willingly, bravely, and courageously to these outposts and far-away places scattered from Suez to Singapore, from Timbuctoo to Iceland. These boys face not only danger on the battle front, but also the ugly dangers behind the lines in every war. And it is all these dangers together which constitute an overpowering reason why we must get them back as soon as possible.

While these boys are gone, we must remember one obligation above all. In Heaven's name let us keep the kind of America they left and the kind of America they are praying they will come back to. We must preserve America as a trusteeship while they are gone.

The brave American patriots who have gone where they were ordered and have died in their tracks on 50 different battle fronts—we must respect their memory by preserving here in America the freedom and opportunity for which they have cheerfully and bravely given their lives. Here is the supreme challenge in 1944. It is not whether the Republicans or the new dealers win this election.

There are a lot of tremendous values in a Republican victory. First, a Republican victory will enable the genuine Jeffersonian Democrats to regain control of their party from this group of new dealers who have taken their party over. Thus America will get back to the actual two-party system so essential to our country.

Second: A Republican victory will stop the deadly march toward totalitarianism via the inflation route. Third: It will establish the fact that the American people have retained their right to change their rulers. These are all great objectives.

Anyone of these benefits make a Republican victory in 1944 worthwhile, but all these benefits are as nothing to the sacred responsibility that we have to preserve America as it was when these boys left. Only a Republican victory will assure them of their heritage.

The founding of America brought new hope to the common people of the world. It was the first land in all recorded history where the ordinary person, born of humble parentage, could rise in the respect and esteem of his fellow man, and his opportunity for advancement was only limited by his own ability and energy. Under that system the common people of America have enjoyed more spiritual happiness and material advantages than the common people of all history.

That America was an America of righteousness, justice, and opportunity. The New Deal is now destroying that kind of America. It has uprooted the home, torn apart the family, and is undermining the churches and the educational systems which prepare our children for the responsibilities of citizenship.

The New Deal is destroying the God-given right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness guaranteed by the Constitution. The New Deal has brought economic disaster to this land and has set class against class.

Unless there is a Republican victory this fall, this will not be the century of the common man which Henry Wallace has been talking about. Instead, it will be the century of the betrayal of the common man. For 150 years, America was truly "the light of the world." It must become "the light of the world" again.

As I have said before, the decisive battle for freedom in this generation will be won or lost in America. Victory will come in that battle November 7, when the Republican Party will drive the threat of slavery from America and reopen the doors of freedom and opportunity.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that the Polish people made the greatest fight for liberty and freedom of all the human beings in the world. For over a thousand years the Polish people strongly adhered to their determination to some day secure absolute freedom for their nation, and it is indeed a glorious coincidence that their constitution was adopted on May 3, 1791, about 2 years after our Constitution was ratified.

We in America have always held that the two great outstanding men of foreign birth who came to our assistance in our Revolution against the mother country were Kosciuszko and Pulaski, and we have always recognized them as of the same caliber as George Washington and Alexander Hamilton.

Today, as in the past, the Polish people and we of the United States of America are fighting shoulder to shoulder for the preservation of our glorious principles which inspired us in 1775 to erect in this country a nation of freemen, and which for over a thousand years inspired the Polish people to adopt their constitution of similar character to our own on May 3, 1791. It is, therefore, highly fitting that the Congress of the United States on this occasion pay high tribute to the magnificent part that Poland is playing in the present war, and I join with great happiness with all my colleagues in as-

surances of our support for, and interest in, a free and independent Poland as a part of Europe when we have succeeded in the defeat of our enemies.

Operation of Airplanes by Steamship Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A1786, a letter from the Pacific American Steamship Association to the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This letter was inserted in the RECORD by the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The steamship association states that it desires to integrate airplane service with its steamship service, and attacks the Civil Aeronautics Board on the ground that through misinterpretation of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 the steamship companies will be prevented from doing so. The letter is based entirely upon misinformation as to the rulings of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I also received a copy of the letter which Mr. BLAND inserted in the RECORD, and I have written a reply in an effort to provide the steamship association with accurate information on this important subject. In order that the House will not also be misinformed, there follows a copy of my letter:

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for the copy of your letter to Mr. Lea dated March 20, in which you state that the Civil Aeronautics Board has so interpreted the law as to prevent steamship companies "from using planes integrated with their ships in a complete transportation system between their customary terminals."

I am quite surprised that you should make any such statement. The two cases involving steamship companies which have been decided by the Board both dealt with American Export Steamship Co. In one case the Board denied American Export the right to acquire control of T. A. C. A. Airlines. T. A. C. A. Airlines operated in Central America. American Export Steamship Co. operated to the Red Sea. In the other case the Civil Aeronautics Board denied the steamship company, operating to the Red Sea, the right to operate an air line between New York and Ireland.

How, by any stretch of the imagination, do these rulings bear on the question whether a steamship company can be permitted to use planes "integrated with their ships in a complete transportation system between their customary terminals"?

I strongly suspect that someone has given you misleading information. There is nothing in any decision of the C. A. B. that even suggests that the Civil Aeronautics Act constitutes a bar to the operation of airplanes by steamship companies in conjunction with their customary services, provided that such operation is found to be in the public interest. Your association and other representatives of the steamship companies have been flooding us and the public with the most striking misstatements concerning the rulings of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and I do feel that you must have been given some very faulty information.

I also observe the statement in your letter to the effect that "there has never been any general policy of dividing modes of transportation as these apply to traffic outside the boundaries of the United States." Is not this statement somewhat naive? Until the development of air transportation the only mode of transocean transportation was steamship. Now there are two modes, air and steamship. Consequently the question arose in 1938 whether Congress should not apply to that situation legal provisions similar to those which it has applied in other cases where competing modes of transportation have existed. The action taken in 1938 was very definitely in accordance with a general policy followed in transportation legislation. In fact, in the Panama Canal Act, dealing with railroad interests in certain water carriers, even more drastic restriction was applied to the railroads than has been applied to the steamship companies and other surface carriers in the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Feeding of Children in Nazi-Dominated Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Howard E. Kershner dealing with the subject of sending food to the children of Nazi-controlled Europe. Mr. Kershner is chairman of the Temporary Council on Food for Europe's Children. I also ask in the same connection to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by Mr. Kershner to the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are most grateful to every Member of the Senate and House for the unanimous passage of Senate Resolution 100 and House Resolution 221, both of which urge child-feeding in Nazi-dominated Europe. Experience has shown how it can be done without aiding the enemy and with great benefit to our friends and allies who endure every form of torture to help us in the struggle against the common foe. Strategy and humanity unite in urging immediate action.

The vision and wisdom of the Senators and Congressmen in this instance shows high statesmanship and encourages one to believe that free, intelligent, democratic government will not perish from the earth.

In view of the unanimous action of both Houses of Congress and the overwhelming expression of public opinion it is difficult to believe that action to save these children will be postponed. Evidence of public approval is also very strong in England and the governments of the exiled countries continue their urgent pleas for their children.

The approach of invasion emphasizes the importance of sending food before communication becomes increasingly difficult. When we call upon our tortured allies for a last effort against the foe, we will want them to have the solid encouragement of a little food for their children—the most effective form of propaganda.

If the mercy ship with food from South America, Africa, and if need be a little of what we waste, are not started promptly we trust that you and your fellow Senators and Congressmen will find some way to implement the action already taken in the passage of the resolutions.

With congratulations and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD E. KERSHNER.

APRIL 22, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The British Broadcasting Corporation has just warned French listeners (New York Times, April 18) "they had better store up supplies as best they could because the Allies would be able to distribute only limited supplies while the fighting was going on and for some time afterward."

May I suggest, Mr. President, that this emphasizes the importance of sending food to the children of the occupied countries before invasion. Now may be our last opportunity to strengthen the morale of the conquered peoples by this gesture of friendship, before all means of communication are cut off by the disorganization accompanying the reoccupation of Europe.

For 4 years the patriots in the occupied countries have endured every form of torture and martyrdom in order to continue their resistance to the common enemy. They have scorned the inducements of the enemy to submit to the hated regime. At the moment when a last call is about to be made on them to support the action of the invasion troops some tangible evidence in the form of food for their children, showing them that we care and appreciate their help, would stimulate their capacity to render aid to our forces and be more effective than the most eloquent propaganda.

Child feeding in Greece and France has shown that the operation can be so closely controlled that no food gets into German hands and that the enemy is unable to profit even indirectly.

Surplus foods are available; the occupied countries have their own funds to make payment; neutral ships not available for the war effort are ready—only official permission from Britain and America is needed to start relief.

The occupied countries are as anxious to win the war as we are. Their military leaders and their governments believe that child feeding would help and have pleaded for it earnestly. They are a part of the United Nations group, certainly their opinions should be taken into consideration.

If Hitler is permitted to destroy the democratic peoples of Europe by starvation our boys will fight the next war alone. The armies that would have helped will not be born or will be so enfeebled as to be ineffective. The people of these countries have fought for liberty for centuries before our country was born—certainly we shall need their help in reconstruction days ahead. It cannot be right to allow them to perish. Humanity and strategy unite in urging action.

By unanimous vote both Houses of Congress have urged you to act, Mr. President. The Gallup poll shows that the people of this country want the children saved. All religious faiths have urged it; the press has

urged it; and innumerable resolutions, petitions, and letters from individuals have been sent to Washington.

We appeal to you, Mr. President, to start the mercy ships before it is too late.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD E. KERSHNER.

A Monument to the Mothers of America

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this Congress will be glad to accept joint authorship of a resolution that I have just introduced. It is a joint resolution to erect here in the Capital of the Nation a permanent memorial to the mothers of America. Monuments have been erected to commemorate the noble deeds of soldiers, statesmen, scientists, poets, jurists, and others, but nothing to that sweet and gentle spirit of motherhood.

Mr. Speaker, the two words most hallowed in every language spoken by man are God and mother. God, in every language, means good. Mother, whatever the vocal sound which denotes it in any language, always means to the heart of man one great, deep-rooted sense—love.

Civilization is based upon mothers and mothers' love.

Religion is based upon mothers and mothers' love.

In the sacred manger in Bethlehem, holding, as a tiny mite, the Light of the World, was—mother.

At the foot of the Cross on Calvary, faithful—utterly faithful—in the great trial knelt mother.

Infancy's first consciousness is mother. The last thought of old age must be of mother.

In that one word, mother, is embraced all that is lovely; all that is loving; all that is faithful; all that is long suffering, enduring, forgiving, comforting, understanding, courageous, gentle, self-sacrificing; and all that is noble, all that is beautiful in this strange enigma we call human existence.

It has been written that "The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world." It can be written, the hand that rocks the cradle comforts the world, nourishes the world, saves the world from its own follies; and redeems man from his own mistakes.

It is written that God made man in His own image. That image of infinite love must be mother love. That image of infinite compassion must be a mother's compassion. That image of infinite care must be a mother's care.

If ever the world shall know peace, sanity, and happiness, it will be mother love which will accomplish it. That mother love which longs for the touch of baby hands; that mother love which will make any sacrifice, suffer any torture, pray without ceasing, to preserve her offspring from the ravages and horrors of war, and gain for them the blessings of peace.

Mother—the cry of baby voices in the fears of night's shadows and the pains of adjustment to the world of men.

Mother—the cry of the dying soldier, in his agony amid the awful confusion of the battlefield.

Mother—the glad cry of greeting on the tremulous lips of the aged beginning in the last struggle of human existence—the journey to that far shore from which no traveler ere returns.

Mother—that name so hallowed within itself that to attempt to shed upon it added lustre by means of mere words is futile—that name which we can but pronounce and leave it in its deathless splendor forever shining on.

American People Can Win Present War Only if Everyone Takes Part in Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lowell Mellett, published recently in the Washington Evening Star.

AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN WIN PRESENT WAR ONLY IF EVERYONE TAKES PART IN STRUGGLE

(By Lowell Mellett)

Some one once said, in better language, that in times of great crisis a man always emerges to meet that crisis. Much history is cited as proof that this is true, but I believe it is open to debate.

True, the American struggle for independence produced George Washington and the Civil War produced Abraham Lincoln. True, the present world condition has produced Churchill, Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, and Roosevelt. But, it seems to me, a lot of crises in the history of the human race never were met, whether because the necessary man did not emerge or for some other reason.

The crisis was not met for untold millions submerged in the misery of the Dark Ages. The crisis was not met for the little people of our own time in the late great depression. True, the country as a whole was pulled out of it, but for the babies that starved or suffered such malnutrition that their whole lives have been affected, the crisis was not met.

VICTIMS OF TWO CRISES

The country seems sure to pull through the present crisis as a nation, but can it be said that the men who gave their lives or their limbs to the effort have pulled through? I don't think it can be. They are the absolute victims of two crises, the one which followed the last war and which was not met, even in the terms of the Nation's interest, and the one which has engulfed them now as the result of the first failure. By that I mean failure of our statesmen to do their part toward forestalling this present World War.

The great man of all history will be the man who succeeds in doing what Woodrow Wilson tried to do. But I don't believe that any one single man will be able to do that. Just as we cannot leave it to one man to win this war for us, just as we cannot leave it to any one or all of the four men named, we cannot leave it to one man or four men to win the next great crisis in the world's history—before it occurs.

Eisenhower cannot win this war. MacArthur and Nimitz cannot win it. Nor can Marshall and King. Roosevelt cannot win it. Only the American people can. And the American people can win it only if they are all in it. I think this is coming to be understood. I think there is a great deal of soul-searching going on in this country at this time; that people are beginning again to ask themselves as they did in the days immediately following Pearl Harbor, "Am I doing all that I can?

ACCEPT SITUATION PHILOSOPHICALLY

I don't believe there is as much resistance by the people to the Government's efforts to fit them into the war program as a lot of political and other leaders appear to think. I believe the people recognize that it is not easy to devise a system of selection that will automatically produce complete justice for all men and women. I believe they are willing to accept such unavoidable injustices as occur.

Many have reason to feel they have been miscast, that their best abilities are being disregarded, but almost without exception they seem to accept the situation philosophically. They aren't quitting. This is not a Nation of sunshine soldiers and summer patriots.

We are going to win this war. The American people are going to win it. The thing to pray for is that when we have achieved this victory we will put the same concerted effort into meeting the next crisis—before it occurs.

If we do that we will be the greatest people in history.

A Great and Patriotic American Exonerated—Legion Executive Committee Clears Representative Hamilton Fish of Alleged Abuse of Franking Privilege

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this body has been more brutally and unjustly treated than has the able, distinguished, and patriotic gentleman from New York, Hon. HAMILTON FISH, but many of us felt that a new high in that direction was attained at the national convention of the American Legion at Omaha last fall.

We have no way of determining whether the action referred to was made in good faith or inspired by desire to injure Mr. FISH politically. Whatever the reason the effect was the same. We all recall that the Legion's action aroused universal resentment among servicemen and others who knew of Mr. FISH's splendid service in the First World War, and his equally fine and long service in this body. We all rejoice that the national executive committee of the American Legion, in a report, has completely exonerated Mr. FISH of the baseless charges that were made at their national convention.

Under permission granted me I desire at this point to insert a news item from the Washington Evening Star of May 3, which follows:

LEGION COMMITTEE CLEARS FISH OF MISUSING FRANKING PRIVILEGE

The national executive committee of the American Legion virtually has cleared Representative FISH, Republican, of New York, of previous Legion charges of misuse of his congressional franking privileges for subversive and un-American activities.

In a report couched in language which was critical of the Legion itself in some respects, the committee suggested the next annual Legion convention at Chicago in September approve the loyalty and patriotism of the New Yorker, whatever the Legionnaires may think of the soundness, wisdom and property of some of his speeches and proposals.

NO SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The committee found that charges contained in a resolution scoring Mr. FISH at the annual Legion convention at Omaha last year were not based on sufficient supporting evidence.

The committee took its action by approving unanimously at the Statler Hotel, a report of a special subcommittee of three which had spent months on the case. It warned Legionnaires to be more careful in the future to see that their resolutions were based on fact, and could be substantiated.

The special subcommittee report was presented by its chairman, Harry W. Colmery, of Topeka, Kans. Other committee members signing the report are National Vice Commander Edward A. Mulroonew, of Wilmington, Del., and W. H. Hargrave, alternate national executive committeeman from the District.

CONCLUSIONS REACHED

Among the conclusions of the 14-page report were:

"There was no basis for the charge that Congressman FISH allowed certain groups and individuals, including George Sylvester Vierick and the America First Committee to use his congressional frank."

"Not only was there no violation or misuse of the franking privilege but the act of use complained of and on which the (Omaha) resolution was based was specifically authorized by * * * postal laws and regulations. * * *

"The charge that Congressman FISH allowed * * * Vierick and America First Committee to use his frank for disseminating propaganda inimical to the United States has no foundation in fact."

The committee also found no evidence to support a condemnation by the Legion of the use of franking privilege by Senators and Representatives for the distribution of matter "subversive and un-American in their character."

At Goshen, N. Y., Mr. FISH said his exoneration was "a simple, outspoken act of justice," the Associated Press reported. He is campaigning for renomination in the twenty-ninth district.

Mr. FISH had appeared before the executive committee in Indianapolis some time ago, where he made a lengthy defense.

Referring to Legion charges against a speech of Mr. FISH and his proposed amendments to the sedition laws the Colmery committee found that the whole labor of the speech and the amendments is the protection of individual freedom. The charge against Mr. FISH in this respect, the committee declared, "is contrary to the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy to which the American Legion is dedicated," adding and although we may question the soundness and the wisdom and the propriety of such expressions it is not in accord with the American ideal to level the accusation of subversive and un-American to such remarks as are contained in that speech, just because we do not agree.

OTHER RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

The executive committee, which is the governing body of the Legion in the periods between national conventions, adopted several resolutions before it adjourned late yesterday.

The committee denounced all proposals for an immediate and negotiated peace, favored retention of a strong, thoroughly manned and well equipped Navy; favored retention in the armed forces of men with minor disabilities, to prepare them better for return to civil life; asked the Army and Navy to issue battle clasps for former prisoners of war, and ribbons or medals for service in this country; and endorsed a House bill to permit promotions of prisoners of war.

The committee tabled a proposal calling for more complete and true news of military and naval action, contending that the Army and Navy should be sole judges of what is appropriate.

Warren Atherton, national commander, presided.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD the complete text of the report to the national executive committee of its subcommittee on the Hamilton Fish resolution, as certified to the national executive committee of the American Legion by its chairman, Harry W. Colmery, past national commander of the Legion, and which was adopted by the national executive committee amid prolonged applause without a dissenting voice being raised.

Mr. Speaker, this may exceed the usual allowance and I ask unanimous consent that such limitation be disregarded in this instance and that the article and the report may be printed notwithstanding the additional cost.

REPORT TO THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ITS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE HAMILTON FISH RESOLUTION

(Resolution No. 296, adopted by the twenty-fifth annual national convention of the American Legion, Omaha, Nebr.)

Subject matter: "Guard against the misuse of franking privileges for subversive and un-American activities."

Mr. Commander and gentlemen of the committee, your committee, appointed by the national commander, pursuant to your action taken at the November 1943 meeting[1] submits the following report:

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

At its 1943 convention, the California Department of the American Legion adopted a resolution on the above subject matter, which, under the terms of one of its resolving clauses, was communicated to the twenty-fifth annual national convention of the American Legion, held at Omaha, Nebr., on September 21-23, 1943. There, the convention committee on Americanism reported the same resolution, in substance, as Resolution No. 296, entitled "Guard Against the Misuse of the Franking Privileges for Subversive and un-American Activities." That convention adopted the resolution.

Thereafter, request having been made by him to the national commander, the national executive committee, by a mail vote of 60 to 5, extended to HAMILTON FISH, a Member of the Congress of the United States, the privilege of addressing this committee on the subject of the above Resolution No. 296.

Following the appearance of Congressman FISH, the national committeeman from the department of California moved that "the commander be empowered to secure and proceed to get further evidence regarding the resolution, possibly through the medium of a proper subcommittee and report back to the May meeting of the executive committee."

That motion was duly seconded, and was adopted by this executive committee. Obedient to that instruction, the national commander appointed this subcommittee which now reports.

Pursuant to said instruction, your committee, acting both as individuals under specific assignment and as a committee, have examined the pertinent records of the proceedings of the American Legion; the correspondence and documentary evidence available and material to the inquiry; have studied and analyzed the resolution, and the Postal Laws and Regulations relating to the franking privilege; have interviewed various officials of the Government and Members of Congress as to the custom and practice in sending mailable matter under the free frank; and have interviewed 10 of the members of the convention Americanism committee, which considered and reported Resolution 296 to the Omaha national convention, and also the director of the Americanism commission, who functioned with that committee; and have also done some legal research on questions involved.

2. THE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The constitution of the American Legion vests the legislative power in the national convention (sec. 1, art. V). It is the source of power and authority. Between national conventions the administrative power is vested in the national executive committee (sec. 1, art. VII). In the exercise of that power, the national executive committee transacts its business in accordance with the rules adopted by it on November 21-22, 1940, as amended on May 1-2, 1941, referred to as "rules of the national executive committee of the American Legion." Rule 4 thereof, having to do with its duties and powers, provides that—

"The national executive committee is specifically empowered to exercise the following powers and rights, and may delegate to any subcommittee composed of members of the national executive committee authority to investigate and report back to the committee on any of the following powers and rights:

"(a) To make decisions on all matters executive or administrative: *Provided, however*, That the said action so taken shall not be contrary to nor in derogation of actions of the national convention, except as provided by the resolution adopted at the Cleveland national convention in 1936, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That any policy adopted by the national organization of the American Legion by convention action shall be a mandate during the year of its adoption, and thereafter shall continue as the national policy of the national organization unless changed by subsequent convention action or by action of the national executive committee."

Under this rule 4, it is clear that—

(1) Any policy adopted by a national convention is a mandate during the year of its adoption.

(2) The national executive committee cannot change that policy during the year of its adoption.

(3) After the year, the policy may be changed by either convention or executive committee action.

(4) On all matters other than policy, the executive committee cannot take any action contrary to or in derogation of the convention action.

It is also clear that, since this resolution 296 condemns the use of the franking privilege for the distribution of articles and

[1] Digest of Minutes, national executive committee meeting, November 1943, p. 4.

speeches which are subversive or un-American in character; calls upon the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to take proper action to guard against such use for such purposes; and instructs and directs the national commander to take the necessary steps to enforce the postal laws and regulations against their infringement through either the misuse of the franking privilege or its misuse for subversive and un-American activities, that it expresses the policy of the American Legion in those particulars. For they constitute a settled or definite course or method which the American Legion has adopted as to the subject matter involved.

Therefore we conclude that—

1. The national executive committee cannot change that expressed policy at this time or prior to the 1944 national convention of the American Legion.

But this does not mean that the national executive committee cannot take any action at all. It is inevitable, and our experience in this organization has demonstrated the fact that, from time to time, this executive committee has found it necessary to interpret various actions of national conventions. On these occasions it has done so, and properly so. And it is recognized in the law of private organizations that, although an inferior body may not change the policy of its parent body, nevertheless, in the administration of the organization's policy, it may properly and legally ascertain facts, record experiences, report mistakes and failures, to the end that the parent organization shall have the benefit of its experience and, through that medium, judge the soundness of its own policy and the effectiveness of its own procedure. In fact that is a cardinal principle in the delegation of responsibility, and in management and organization.

We make it clear, therefore, that in the rendition of this report, we are aware of rule 4: That we have no intention to, and do not recommend any action which will constitute a change in convention action. But we do reflect our analysis of the situation created by the passage of resolution 296, and the problems it creates, leaving it for this committee, in its own wisdom to determine its own course of action.

We now invite your attention to an—

3. ANALYSIS OF RESOLUTION NO. 296

An analysis of the resolution will be helpful in understanding its purpose and scope and the exact statements of fact contained therein on the basis of which action was taken.

A. The recitals

(1) The postal laws and regulations make it unlawful for any person entitled to the use of the frank (a) to lend such frank, or permit its use, by any committee, organization, or association; (b) permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any committee, organization, or association.

(2) HAMILTON FISH (with certain other isolationist Members of Congress) allowed his Congressional frank to be used by certain groups and individuals (including George Sylvester Viereck, and the America First Committee), disseminating propaganda inimical to the United States.

(3) That on April 14, 1943, there was mailed in San Diego, Calif., under the free frank of HAMILTON FISH, a reprint of his remarks made in Congress on April 6, 1943, on proposed amendments to the Alien and Sedition Act of the United States, which envelope was mailed on a mailing list of the pro-Nazi editor of The Broom, one C. Leon de Aryan, who is stated to be under Federal indictment for sedition and is "out on bail and still pursuing his activities."

(4) That the amendment to the Alien and Sedition Act proposed by Congressman FISH, (a) would make it impossible for the United States Government to convict certain persons now indicted for sedition, and (b) would cripple the Department of Justice in its efforts to convict enemies of the United States.

B. The resolving clauses

(1) The American Legion affirms Resolution No. 127 passed at the twenty-fourth annual national convention at Kansas City, Mo. That resolution states:

"We condemn the use of the franking privilege by Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives for the distribution of articles and speeches, subversive and un-American in their character, and we urge that * * * Senate and House * * * take such proper action to guard against the misuse of the franking privilege for such subversive and un-American activities."

(2) Instructs and directs the commander to take such necessary steps by and in the name of the American Legion, including court action, if necessary, which will enforce the postal laws and regulations of the United States, against the infringement of the spirit thereof, by Members of Congress, whomsoever they are, who are misusing their mailing frank, or who are allowing the same to be misused for subversive and un-American activities.

4. THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE—LAW AND REGULATIONS

The applicable provisions of the law and regulations are as follows:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person entitled under the law to the use of a frank to lend said frank or permit its use by any committee, organization or association, or permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any committee, organization or association. (Chap. 8, title 39 U. S. C. A. sec. 335; sec. 613 Postal Laws and Regulations 1940.)

"(b) The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or any part thereof, or speeches or reports therein contained, shall under the frank of a Member of Congress * * * written by himself except as provided in section 185 of title 44, be carried in the mail free of postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe." (Chap. 8, title 39 U. S. C. A. sec. 325; sec. 609 Postal Laws and Regulations 1940.)

"(c) All franked matter shall be forwarded like any other, but when once delivered to the addressee, may not be remailed unless properly franked again. A bulk package of franked articles may be sent by a person entitled to the franking privilege to one addressee, who on receiving and opening the package, may, on behalf of such person, place addresses on the franked articles and remail them for carriage and delivery to the respective addresses. This section relates to matter entitled to free carriage under sections 608 and 609." (Sec. 612 (3) Postal Laws and Regulations 1940.)

5. The evidence or facts upon which the charge is based that there was a violation of the Postal Laws and Regulations, with reference to the franking privilege or misuse thereof.

The resolution adopted by the California department had attached thereto as exhibit A, a photostatic copy of a page from an issue of The Reporter (vol. 6, No. 1, report for April 1943), an organ of first mail advertising published monthly by Henry Hoke at 17 East Forty-second Street, New York City. That page contained an article entitled FISH Is on the Hook Again, and reproduces a copy of an envelope, bearing the frank of HAMILTON FISH, with post-office stamp of San Diego, Calif., April 14, 1943, and the printed label showing that it contained an extension of remarks of Hon. HAMILTON FISH, made in the House on April 6, 1943, on the "proposed amendments to Alien and Sedition Act to Conform to Bill of Rights."

This documentary evidence was not attached to and made a part of the Omaha resolution as presented to the convention. However, according to approximately 10 members of the convention committee on Americanism and the director of Americanism, who have been interviewed, the attention of the convention committee was directed to that evidence, and its consideration of the resolution was based thereon.

In writing to Homer L. Chaillaux, director, National Americanism Commission, on November 1, 1943, Lewis Hayd Leve, Americanism chairman, thirteenth district, Department of California, who wrote the resolution and "put it in the hopper," stated:

"I wish to recall to your attention, which is important, that our resolution was based on the data furnished from the article and photographed in The Reporter and the resolution so states. When the resolution was submitted in post, district, and Department of California, a photostat of the page you have was attached to the resolution showing that we went no further than the data submitted."

And on November 6, 1943, Leve also wrote to Chaillaux:

"It is important to remember that the resolution had attached thereto as an exhibit a photostatic copy of article from The Reporter showing the franked envelope mailed from San Diego, Calif., as being the basis and proof of the resolution. I personally know from a member of the Department Resolutions Committee that the said data was attached to the resolution when it passed the Department at the San Francisco Convention. As far as I know, the exhibit accompanied the resolution when it went to national."

Your committee finds that, insofar as allegations of misuse of the franking privilege by Congressman FISH are concerned, that they are based upon:

1. A franked envelope, bearing the frank of HAMILTON FISH, and postmarked at San Diego, Calif., April 14, 1943. (Exhibit 4).

2. The remarks of FISH on the proposed amendments to the Alien and Sedition Act, contained in said envelope. (Exhibit 5.)

3. Page from The Reporter, containing the article, FISH Is on the Hook Again. (Exhibit 3.)

(From this article it appears that it is claimed that the publisher of The Reporter knows from the name of the addressee, which is not revealed, that this envelope was mailed by an individual whose name is C. Leon de Aryan.)

6. The subcommittee's interpretation of its assignment.

Inviting your attention to the fact that the expressed subject matter of Resolution 296 is "guard against the misuse of franking privileges for subversive and un-American activities," and that the evidence on which it was based was confined to exhibits 3, 4, and 5, referred to above, we restate the fact that the basis of the resolution is the misuse of the franking privilege, by permitting an individual to use the frank, and the misuse of the franking privilege for the dissemination of propaganda inimical to the United States or subversive or un-American in character.

Since the committee was directed only to consider Resolution 296, it has confined its work to the above subject matter. It does not consider that, by any construction its assignment goes beyond that stated. Therefore we have not felt called upon to consider and have not considered, and make no report on such subject matter as whether the views of the pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists were, or were not right; whether the principles and the activities of the America First Committee, and those who supported it were or were not right; whether George Syl-

vester Viereck should or should not have been convicted; or the Americanism and the patriotism of Congressman FISH.

Having stated the applicable provisions of the law and regulations, and the facts upon which the resolution was based, we now consider whether the charges contained in the resolution are supported by the evidence.

a. As to the violation of the Postal Laws and Regulations relating to franking privilege by Congressman Hamilton Fish

1. As to Exhibits 3, 4, and 5

The law: The use prohibited under section 613 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, set out in the resolution is (1) lending the frank or permitting its use by any committee, organization, or association; or (2) permitting its use by any person for the benefit or use of any committee, organization, or association.

The evidence: An individual person used the frank by mailing the envelope exhibit 4.

Finding and conclusion: The prohibition is against use by a committee, organization, or association either directly, or by a person for the benefit of such committee, organization, or association. There was no evidence of such use. On the contrary the use was by an individual. Therefore, there was no violation of section 613 of the Postal Laws and Regulations.

We also invite your attention to the fact that resolution 296 only sets out section 613. Why its authors did not set our section 609 and section 612 (3) of the Postal Laws and Regulations (cited hereinabove) we do not know. Those sections specifically authorize the sending of franked mail in bulk, to one addressee, who may, on behalf of the sender, break the bulk package and address the franked articles and remail them. And that privilege covers specifically speeches contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, such as exhibit No. 5.

Under the law of agency, the interpretation of section 613, is that, when the person entitled by law to the franking privilege, sends a bulk shipment of sealed franked mailable matter to an addressee, he thereby makes the latter his agent, to address the franked articles and place them in the mail on his behalf.

Our investigation discloses that the mailing of franked material in the nature of a speech of the sender under section 613, in the manner and form as shown by the facts herein, is a well established and widely used and authorized custom and practice.

Therefore, not only was there no violation or misuse of the franking privilege, but the act of use complained of and on which resolution 296 was based was specifically authorized by section 613, Postal Laws and Regulations 1940.

And now, having arrived at this conclusion, independently, we direct your attention to the fact that the Reporter—a page from which was the basis for the original resolution, likewise, has come to the same conclusion. I read from its May 1940 issue:

"Last month the Reporter reproduced an envelope bearing the frank of Congressman HAMILTON FISH * * * mailed from San Diego, Calif., on April 14, 1943, to a dummy name placed on the list of C. Leon de Aryan, who is under indictment for sedition but who is now out on bail. We revealed how HAM FISH is again allowing his frank to be used by seditious characters * * * and how HAM FISH is trying to defend the 33 people who are now under indictment."

Then, after setting out a copy of a letter written to the Postmaster General, it states:

"Third Assistant Postmaster General Ramsey S. Black replied without humor. He had to be officially dignified in turning down the request for free postage. But here is his paragraph concerning the use of the frank:

" 'With respect to the matter referred to which was mailed under the franking privilege of a Congressman, you are advised that under the provisions of paragraph 3, section 612, Postal Laws and Regulations, a Member of Congress may send a bulk shipment of franked articles properly mailable under his frank to one addressee, who on receiving and opening the package, may, on behalf of the Member of Congress, place addresses on the franked articles and remail them for carriage and delivery to the respective addressees. This contemplates that the person who addresses and mails the matter is doing so as the representative or agent of the one whose frank appears on the matter.'

"Study that paragraph carefully. That is exactly what the Reporter has been beefing about all these years. What moral right has HAMILTON FISH, or any other Congressman, to appoint an addressing agent far removed from his own congressional district? Why shouldn't the Government or the Post Office Department have some rights to inquire into the status of the agent appointed by the Congressman? Under the present laws and regulations HAMILTON FISH is entirely within his legal rights. He can furnish his franked envelopes to an unlimited number of Nazi-loving seditionists * * * and no one can make him stop. Isn't that one hell of a mess?"

b. By certain groups and individuals, including George Sylvester Vierick and the America First Committee

The Evidence

There was no evidence before the convention Americanism committee at Omaha, Nebr., nor at the Department convention of California, that the frank of HAMILTON FISH was used by George Sylvester Viereck, the America First Committee, or any other group or groups.

Finding and Conclusion

Absent such evidence to support the charge, we find that, as to Resolution 296 there was no basis for the charge that Congressman HAMILTON FISH allowed "certain groups and individuals, including George Sylvester Viereck, and the America First Committee" to use his congressional frank.

c. Disseminating propaganda inimical to the United States

It will be noted that the resolution recites that Congressman FISH allowed his frank to be used by Viereck, America First Committee, disseminating propaganda inimical to the United States. Such a charge has no relation to or bearing upon the misuse of the franking privilege. The franking privilege law does not make the character of the mail matter an element in determining the misuse of the franking privilege. Furthermore there was no evidence before the convention committee on Americanism that any speeches or material of Viereck or the America First Committee, or any group had been sent out by FISH or under his frank, directly or indirectly.

Finding and Conclusion

We find that, as to Resolution 296, the charge that Congressman FISH allowed George Sylvester Viereck and America First Committee to use his frank for disseminating propaganda inimical to the United States had no foundation in fact.

2. Misuse of Franking Privilege by Members of Congress.

Attention is invited to the fact that Resolution 296 reaffirmed the Resolution 127 passed at the Kansas City convention. Note what that resolution says:

"We condemn the use of the franking privilege by Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives for the distribution of articles and speeches, subversive and un-American in their character, and we urge that the Senate and House of Representatives take such proper action to guard against the misuse of the franking privilege for such subversive and un-American activities."

Resolution 296 also instructs and directs the Commander of the American Legion to take steps necessary, including court action, if necessary, which will enforce the postal laws and regulations against the infringement of the spirit thereof by Members of Congress.

(a) Who are misusing their mailing frank, or (b) who are allowing the same to be misused for subversive and un-American activities.

Your committee does not know what evidence the Kansas City convention had before it to support and justify the condemnation of the Congress for and charging them with distributing subversive and un-American material under their free frank. Our investigation as to the Omaha convention justifies the statement that at that convention there was no evidence before the convention Americanism committee to support such a charge against the Members of Congress.

In fact, to carry out the instruction, the national commander would have to put some snoopers on guard to check the use of the franking privilege and the nature and character of all such mailed matter.

Gentlemen of the committee, the American Legion has done a great job. It is quite natural that weaknesses will show up in our operations, and that we will make mistakes. That is typical both of the ways of democracy and any mass operation. Even so, it is beneath the character, and the tradition of the American Legion, and of the spirit that gave it birth, and of the record of its worthy accomplishment to impugn the motives, or to attack the Americanism of the Members of Congress, either directly or by inference or innuendo, unless such charges are supported and justified by provable facts. Legionnaires, Legion posts, districts, department and national committees should set the example in the field of doing justice. Let's be American.

B. Violation or misuse of franking privileges by dissemination of propaganda inimical to the United States or of a subversive or un-American character

Speech by HAMILTON FISH on amendments to the alien and sedition law

The resolution charges that the above amendments proposed by Congressman FISH (1) would make it impossible for the United States Government to obtain conviction against certain persons now indicted for sedition, and (2) would cripple the Department of Justice in its efforts to convict enemies of the United States.

What is the subject matter of Resolution 296? It is to "Guard against the misuse of the franking privileges for subversive and un-American activities." As pointed out hereinabove in this report, the character of the matter mailed is not an element in connection with the lawful use of the franking privilege. A "good speech" in the hands of a reader does not become harmful to the public welfare, because sent out by a scoundrel. And a "bad speech" is none the less detrimental if sent by a superpatriot. So we hold that it is of no consequence that de Aryan, alleged to be under indictment and a pro-Nazi, mailed the speech, if he did. In fact in a letter by Leve to Chaillaux dated November 6, 1943, he states:

"The entire point and purport of our resolution is to stop Members of Congress in allowing other persons not Members of Congress, to obtain their franked envelopes for mailing purposes, even though they contain speeches or other data furnished by Congress. It is this feature which causes abuse. It is immaterial, therefore, whether FISH'S envelope mailed at San Diego was mailed by de Aryan, or some other person."

It is interesting to note that, as a matter of record, in a subsequent indictment, which

supersedes the prior indictment the name of de Aryan was not included. So he no longer stands indicted. We are referring to the so-called sedition case pending in the District of Columbia. If there be any other case, we are not aware of it. Incidentally, his paper Broom continues to be published during the month of April 1944 so that the Department of Justice and the United States postal authorities must not consider it to be seditious.

These charges that FISH's purpose in advocating the proposed amendments to the sedition law was to make it impossible to convict persons now indicted for sedition, and would cripple the Department of Justice in its effort to convict enemies of the United States, are not germane to the subject matter and have no bearing on misuse of the franking privilege, and as such constitute no violation or misuse thereof.

It will serve no good purpose to analyze the sedition law and the proposed amendments. It is sufficient to state that the general main purpose of the amendments was to tighten up the prosecution and require the Government to prove that the act complained of had a direct relation to and were brought to bear upon the result, that is, the interfering, impairing, or influencing the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States.

But regardless of what our view or opinion might be on the purpose of Congressman FISH, your committee is of the opinion that the charge in this respect is contrary to the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy, to which the American Legion is dedicated. The whole labor of the speech and the amendments is the protection of individual freedom.

In the first place, this speech is protected under section 6 of article I of the Constitution, which states as to Members of Congress that "and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

This privilege is not the privilege of Congressman FISH. It is the privilege of the people he represents. It is not given for the purpose of protecting him for his own benefit, as to the wisdom of legislation. It is given in support of the rights of the people by enabling their representatives to execute the functions of their office without fear of prosecution, civil or criminal, or coercion, or intimidation. It is given in order that the channels of free and open expression of opinion may be kept open, to the end that in the legislative halls, whatever should be said and needs to be said, will be said, courageously and fearlessly, so that there may be accomplished a complete fulfillment of the hopes, aims, and desires of the people as they go about the business of establishing the rules through which to govern themselves.

And although we may question the soundness and the wisdom and the propriety of such expressions it is not in accord with the American ideal to level the accusation of subversive and un-American to such remarks as are contained in that speech, just because we do not agree.

We understand that freedom of speech and of the press secured by the Constitution, does not confer an absolute right to speak, without responsibility, and that, though freedom of speech is an inestimable privilege in a free government, without limitation, it might become the scourge of the Republic. For the security and stability of the state is essential to freedom of speech. And this freedom does not deprive the state of the primary and essential right of self-preservation, "which, so long as human governments endure, they cannot be denied."

For that purpose the state may punish utterances which endanger the foundation of organized government, or threaten to overthrow it by unlawful means, or which attempt to destroy or imperil the government or impede it in its governmental function; or advocate that citizens should not assist the government in carrying on war on the like. But there is nothing wrong in discussing or advocating the rules or standards upon which such acts should be judged. That the people must do. That is the nature of the speech and the proposed amendments. And as such we do not consider them properly subject to the criticism of being subversive or un-American.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

As we view this experience, may we respectfully invite your attention to these observations and suggestions for the good of the American Legion:

Greater care should be taken to limit the scope of our deliberative actions, to the end that they will be kept within a field which is germane to our primary objectives. The American Legion should not attempt to solve all the social, economic, and civil problems of the Nation. To "fiddle around" with the problem of what mailable matter should be sent free, and by whom, and what violations have taken place is beneath the dignity and high purpose of our great American institution.

2. Since the real purpose of this resolution in its origin was to stop Members of Congress from abusing the franking privilege by allowing other persons, not Members of Congress, to use it, the effort should have been or should have been directed to changing the law governing franking privileges. And if a person is un-American and commits subversive acts, let's say so, and meet that issue "head-on." It is worthy of that approach or none.

3. Possibly we have adopted the practice or habit of assuming things to be facts, solely because resolutions presented at a national convention so state, and making no further inquiry to substantiate them as such. In some matters that policy is justifiable. But where the alleged facts are being used as the basis from which interferences are drawn, or sought to be drawn, or conclusions are made or sought to be made, which involve in any way or reflect upon or question, or create a suspicion or an unfavorable impression as to the character, loyalty, fidelity, patriotism, or Americanism of any individual or group of individuals, the American Legion owes it to them, to itself, and to our country to make certain that the facts upon the basis of which we presume to judge are the facts, that we have the evidence to support them, and that we adopt appropriate procedures to make certain that accomplishment, to the end that our actions shall always be just and worthy of our name and our purpose.

Whether the purpose of the resolution 296 was to curb the abuse of the franking privilege or to condemn Congressman FISH for the alleged misuse thereof, your committee does not see where any good purpose was served, or any sound reason, for including the reference to and implied criticism of "other isolationist Members of Congress" and of "the America First Committee," and attributing to them un-American and subversive tendencies.

However mistaken some may think the persons who classify under these designations were in their views on the Nation's foreign and military policy, our examination of the declared principles of the America First Committee, our rather intimate knowledge of the public life and service and public and private character of many fine citizens who are active in or adhered to the cause of that committee; our knowledge of the ebb and flow of public opinion on the matter of our foreign policy before Pearl Harbor; our acquaintance with many pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists; compels the conclusion that, although fair criticism may be justifiable, we have no right, in good conscience directly or by inference or innuendo, to impugn the good faith or ascribe any subversive or un-American tendencies to either such persons, their point of view, or their program. It is unfortunate that we should not have kept our escutcheon untarnished.

With the hope that your committee shall have accomplished the assignment to your satisfaction, we shall submit a resolution for your consideration, and ask to be discharged. If not, we await your further command.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD A. MULROONEY,
W. H. HARGRAVE,
HARRY W. COLMERY, *Chairman.*

International Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 22, 1944, dealing with one of the most important problems with which this country is faced, that is, the proper organization of our international air transport.

This editorial comments on the proposal recently made by Senator MCCARRAN that this Government have only one company in the international field; that this Government adopt the "chosen instrument" policy. This is a subject in which I am deeply interested and to which I have given a great deal of thought and study.

My conclusion is that Senator MCCARRAN'S chosen instrument policy, a policy which failed badly in Great Britain, should be adopted only if other proposals which do not involve the creation of such a huge monopoly are clearly doomed to failure.

The editorial is as follows:

MONOPOLY IN THE AIR

This newspaper is not enamored of the idea embodied in Senator MCCARRAN'S proposal for a single American corporation with a capital of $1,000,000,000 to conduct civil aviation beyond the borders of the United States. While the existing United States air lines would be exclusively admitted to ownership of the corporation's stock, the corporation would be an obvious monopoly. As such it would be subject to rigid Government regulation, tantamount in all probability to control. This could only tend to foster a similar development in other nations which would in time inevitably bring the respective governments into a competition that could easily develop dangerous friction, unless the various national air fleets were included in a great international "cartel" of sorts. This would in the present state of American opinion be an extremely unpopular idea and politically impossible of adoption.

The fact is that international transportation by sea as well as by air is a tough problem to solve, if by solution a reasonably orderly state of competition is understood. The war has made us enormously powerful in both fields so far as equipment is concerned, particularly in the air. It has also generated relative similar growth in some other nations, notably in the British Com-

monwealth. Facilities for the conduct of international transportation at the close of the fighting will be very large and each nation which finds itself with such facilities will be keen to put them to the largest possible use.

The less that this use is tied to direct governmental control the better. It is obvious that a considerable degree of control or regulation will everywhere be necessary, but it is important that it be kept at a point short of promoting direct governmental rivalry. As between a system of definitely "national"—and therefore monopolistic—fleets of ships and planes competing with each other for the available business, and a number of privately owned companies doing the same, the risks to international peace are greater in the former than in the latter, even if the latter involves greater economic casualties to the participants.

No one can now clearly foresee the conditions that will surround international commerce and travel in the years immediately ahead. In these circumstances it is only prudent not to commit ourselves too closely to any single course of action, until we know a good deal more both of these conditions and how the other nations propose to meet them.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 3d of May was Poland's national holiday. It commemorated the signature on May 3, 1791 of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's greatest documents of freedom.

For almost 6 years the people of Poland have suffered an appalling martyrdom under the heel of the Nazis. Their valor in resisting against overwhelming odds, has brought the admiration and respect of the entire civilized world to their country.

In defense of their freedom and independence, the people of Poland have united together and are of a single mind. Poland has contributed greatly in the field of education, music, and culture. The Poles have always known that to retain their national identity they must preserve their language and culture.

Poland was the first to fight the Germans. They will continue to fight to the very end, until victory is theirs. I can only say that the heroic manner in which the Poles have sacrificed for the love of their country has been and will continue to be an inspiration to the people of the United States, as well as to all liberty-loving people everywhere.

Each year the sons and daughters of Poland parade up Fifth Avenue in New York City. It is one of the most colorful parades New York witnesses.

I have had the honor to witness it for the past few years as a guest of a great American of Polish extraction, John Pateracki, of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of New York City. He is a great American and exemplifies the highest traditions of the Polish race.

I have in my district many people of Polish ancestry and they, together with other loyal Americans, are looking to the day when peace and victory will come to the Allies.

Treatment of Jewish Prisoners of War by Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folowing letter written by me to the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, and his reply thereto:

APRIL 3, 1944.

HON. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The official reports of Japanese treatment of American prisoners of war, which have shocked all of us, have been particularly painful to residents in the district I have the honor of representing in Congress. While these reports are of American prisoners of war taken in the Pacific area, many of my constituents are concerned to know more about the treatment which our war prisoners may be receiving at the hands of the Nazis.

Their concern arises from the fact that many of them stem from lands now occupied by the enemy. They know the bestial treatment which their kinsmen in those conquered lands have received from the Nazis. They know that the Nazis look upon other people as inferior beings and have not hesitated to starve them, despoil them, and butcher them. They know that the "master race" theory has both served to brutalize the Nazis and caused them to hate, and smother and destroy all the civilizing forces in our society—the forces of religion, of democracy, and of decency

These American citizens, therefore, live in constant fear that their sons in the service who may fall into the hands of the Nazis will receive the same brutal treatment which has been the lot of the peoples in the conquered lands.

In particular, American citizens of the Jewish faith, in the district I represent, knowing how their coreligionists have been murdered by the thousands, are especially fearful that the "Aryan" laws will be applied to American soldiers, too, should they be so unfortunate as to become Nazi prisoners.

With the invasion of the continent daily growing nearer, you can readily understand that their anxiety becomes more pointed.

I would deeply appreciate information that your Department can furnish relative to this subject.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 18, 1944.

The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: I have received your letter of April 3, 1944, requesting information concerning the treatment of American prisoners of war held by the German authorities.

The Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929 which the United States and the German Governments are applying provides a humanitarian standard of treatment for prisoners of war. Specifically, it provides that prisoners of war shall be treated humanely and held in honorable captivity—not imprisoned as criminals. It establishes as the standard for shelter and diet of prisoners of war the corresponding treatment of garrison troops of the detaining power and establishes fundamental rights regarding correspondence, medical care, clothing, pay for labor, satisfaction of intellectual, recreational and religious needs, and the continued enjoyment of full civil status.

The Department of State is constantly alert to ensure the observance of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention. Whenever it is learned through the Swiss Government which represents American interests in Germany and German occupied territories, through the International Red Cross Committee, or otherwise that the terms of the convention are not being observed, the United States Government draws the attention of the German Government to that government's obligations under the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention. It may be stated that as a result of such representation improvements have been reported in the conditions under which prisoners of war are held by the German Government. I enclose a copy of a memorandum summarizing the information received by the Department concerning the treatment of American prisoners of war held by Germany.

The Department is exericising special vigililance to prevent discrimination by the German authorities against American prisoners of war upon a racial or religious basis and it has not so far obtained evidence establishing that such discrimination exists.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Address by Senator Langer Before India League of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at a meeting held last night at the National Press Club, in Washington, under the auspices of the India League of America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, distinguished guests, and friends, it has been a distinct pleasure to hear foreign correspondent Leland Stowe and Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE speak so eloquently about democracy. In my State of North Dakota, in which I was born and reared, true, and not pseudo, democracy prevails. There, on Lincoln's brithday, the common people meet in the voting precincts, select delegates who meet at the county seats on Washington's birthday, and there select delegates who meet at a State convention, where the candidates are endorsed by ballot.

The names of the candidates are placed on the blackboard. The delegates then vote. The person receiving the least number of votes is eliminated, until only one name remains on the board, and he or she is the endorsed candidate.

Then, the convention of the common people decides whether the endorsed ticket shall

run in the Republican, Democratic, or Independent column. I might add that they have placed candidates in all three.

The people there are concerned primarily with helping the political and economic conditions of the farmer, the laborer, and the small businessman. In that State there is no distinction of any kind because of race, color, or creed. So it was that as their representative I, over a year ago, made a tour of the Southern States, studying the conditions of the sharecroppers, black and white. And so it was again, that 2 months ago, I traversed Arizona, California, and other States, visiting and studying the economic and political conditions of the immigrants from India, although only one Indian family resides in North Dakota.

Upon my return and in discussing what I had seen, I was amazed at the lack of information about India. Here, Mr. Chairman, is a country which has a population of 389,000,000 of people—almost three times the population of the United States of America, three-fourths of the total population of the British Empire, four-fifths of the overseas population of the British Empire, and nearly nine-tenths of the subject colonial population of the British Empire. And this country contains more than one-half of the total colonial population of the world; this country that is a little more than one-half as large in area as the United States; this country that is 20 times as large as Great Britain.

We hear much these days about Estonia, Rumania, Finland, and other European countries, but few people realize that India is as large as all the countries of Europe combined, minus Russia.

Without at all criticizing England or risking any disunity of the United Nations, I say that those opposed to the independence of India have said much about the various dialects, but the truth of the matter is that there are only 13 distinct languages, as compared to the 150 spoken in Russia. But so neglected has this country been that less than 1 percent of the population can read or write English, in spite of 200 years of English rule.

The most interesting fact about India from an agricultural standpoint is that her soil is rich and her people are poor. Even under primitive agricultural conditions, she produces a large quantity of rice, wheat, sugarcane, tea, cotton, jute, linseed, rape and mustard, sesamum, coffee, rubber, barley, tobacco, and indigo.

Her vast reserves of coal are estimated at 36,000,000,000 tons; her iron-ore deposits amount to 3,000,000,000 tons, as against 2,554,000,000 for Great Britain and 1,754,000,000 for Germany, and she is exceeded only by the United States and France. And yet before the war, India's production of iron was only a little over 11 percent of capacity.

India is rich in manganese, bauxite, chromite, mica, and copper ores, and she has vast water-power resources.

Water power resources

[In million horsepower]

Country	Potential	Developed	Percent developed
United States	35.0	11.7	33
Canada	18.2	4.5	25
France	5.4	2.1	37
Japan	4.5	1.7	37
Italy	3.8	1.8	47
Switzerland	2.5	1.8	72
Germany	2.0	1.1	55
India	27.0	0.8	3

(World Almanac, 1932, quoted in Statesman's Yearbook, 1942.)

India stands second only to the United States in water-power resources, yet uses only 8 percent, compared to 72 percent in Switzerland, 55 percent in Germany, 47 percent in Italy, 37 percent in France and Japan, and 33 percent in the United States.

CONDITIONS

More than 80 percent of the people of India depend directly upon agriculture, on an average holding of one and one-half acres. The vast majority of peasants live in debt. The average annual income of an agriculturist is round $15. From the borrowed money with interest rate from 22 percent to 160 percent, he pays taxes to the landlord, the state government, tax on waterwells, cattle, grazing land, forest, etc.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

There were in 1930 about 56.5 million wage laborers out of 154,000,000 million persons in all occupations in the whole of India. Industrial workers in the modern sense represent less than one-half percent of 40,000,000 landless semiskilled workers, unemployed for 10 months in a year.

CHILD LABOR

"Workers as young a 5 years of age may be found in some of these places working without adequate meal intervals or weekly rest days, and often for 10 or 12 hours daily. For sums as low as 2 annas (4½ cents) in the case of those of tenderest years."—(Royal Commission on Labor in India, 1929, p. 96.)

INCOME

"The annual income per head in India in 56 rupees, or about $18."—(Budget speech in the Central Legislative Assembly, April 1938.)

HEALTH

Combined central and provincial expenditure on public health is only 2.6 percent of the total central and provincial expenditures. (Figures for 1935–36—Official.)

"The average length of life in India decreased between 1921 and 1931, being 23.2 and 22.8 years of males and females respectively."—("Industrial Labor in India," International Labor Office, 1938, p. 8.)

There is only a small hospital for every 165 square miles. Infant mortality rate in India is 171 per 1,000. In overcrowded cities like Bombay it is 374 per 1,000, the highest in the world. Two hundred thousand mothers die annually during child birth. Thirty-nine percent of the population is well nourished, 41 percent poorly nourished, and 20 percent semistarved.

EDUCATION

In 1941, only 12 percent of the people were classified as literate, 8 percent male and 4 percent female. India does not have a general system of compulsory or free education. There is one elementary school for every 10 villages. About 18 cents per capita is spent annually on education. The United Kingdom spends $6.50 and the United States, $20.

The literacy in the Philippines under the American Government increased from 2 percent to 55 percent in 40 years.

PRINCES

There are 563 Indian princes who rule about one-third of India's area, and whose subjects number about 90,000,000. The present status of the princes is upheld by the British. Most of the princes are autocratic and medieval in their outlook. There is a growing agitation among their subjects for democratic rights.

"It was said long ago by Sir John Malcolm * * * that if we could keep up a number of native states without political power, but as royal instruments, we should exist in India as long as our naval supremacy was maintained. Of the substantial truth of this opinion I have no doubt." (Lord Canning, April 30, 1860.)

Sovereignty over India rests with the British Cabinet, responsible to the British Parliament. The Viceroy on their behalf exercises supreme executive power in India.

VICEROY'S SPECIAL POWERS

The viceroy may, at his discretion:

1. Appoint or dismiss ministers.
2. Veto legislation passed by the legislature.
3. Pass legislation rejected by the legislature.
4. Prohibit the discussion of legislation.
5. Issue ordinances.
6. Instruct provincial governors to issue ordinances.
7. Veto provincial legislation.
8. Issue rules for the police.
9. Control the use of the armed forces.
10. Dissolve the legislature.
11. Suspend the constitution.

Besides the special powers, of which the above are but a sample, there are special responsibilities of the governor general—commonly called safeguards, in connection with which he may take any action that he individually deems necessary for their discharge.

Among the special responsibilities are included the protection of the rights of the Princes, and the prevention of discrimination against British imports into India and against British individuals or companies operating in India whether the companies are incorporated in India or in the United Kingdom.

The Viceroy never hesitates to exercise his powers whenever he thinks that Britain's economic interests are in jeopardy. The Ottawa Pact (Imperial Preferences), rejected by the Indian legislature, was enforced by the Viceroy. Since the war, he has exercised unlimited dictatorial powers. Under his ordinance powers, the Viceroy imprisoned Gandhi, Nehru, Azad and thousands of other political leaders without any trial. These arrests were declared invalid by the chief justice of the federal court of India—an Englishman—but the Viceroy over-rode the decision by holding the prisoners and issuing another ordinance which made the arrests legal retroactively.

THE VICEROY'S COUNCIL

The Viceroy appoints an advisory council, enlarged in 1942 to 14 members, 11 of whom are Indians. The key positions of war, finance, war transport, and the home department, are in the hands of Englishmen. The members of this council hold office at the Viceroy's pleasure; they cannot be removed by any hostile vote of the legislature; they have no collective responsibility. The British Cabinet is responsible to the Parliament and falls if it forfeits its confidence. The members of the American Cabinet are chosen by the President, who has been elected by the people. The Indian Cabinet is responsible neither to the elected legislature, nor to an executive enjoying the confidence of the people.

The present members of the council do not speak for any of the major political parties of India.

THE GOVERNORS OF THE PROVINCES

The governors of the Provinces (who are Englishmen—appointed, not elected) have under their individual control the police, secret or political, whose records are not accessible even to the ministers. The governors have over-riding veto powers.

After the resignation of the Congress (Nationalist) Provincial ministers in 1939, the working of the constitution was suspended in seven provinces, the Provincial governors assuming the direct autocratic rule. The Prime Minister of Sindh, the late Allah Baksh, elected by the people, was dismissed by the governor although he still enjoyed the confidence of the elected legislature.

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN INDIA

Press restriction and rule by ordinance have made a mockery of civil liberties in India. The English Civil Liberties Union has protested against the infringement of civil liberties in India. By December 1942, 60,229 ar-

rests were made and 39,498 were in jail as political prisoners. The crimes of these persons vary from Gandhi's announcement of his intention to start civil disobedience, to marching in processions, shouting nationalist slogans, and carrying the Indian national flag. Official figures give 940 persons killed by police or military up to the same date, and 1,630 injured—sometimes by machine guns from planes. The home member, Sir Reginald Maxwell, said that he had no figures on the number prosecuted, sentenced to death, or executed.

Hundreds of India's daily newspapers have suspended publication as a protest against humiliating press restrictions. There have been cases of public whippings to intimidate the people and of exorbitant collective fines upon impoverished communities for the suspected guilt of one individual.

INDIA AND THE WAR

For years before the outbreak of this war, the people of India expressed their opposition to fascism. They proclaimed their solidarity with the peoples of Ethiopia, Spain, and China. And in 1938, they launched a boycott of Japanese goods in protest against her aggression in China.

"The Congress is fully conscious of the necessity of facing this world menace in cooperation with the progressive nations and the peoples of the world." (Indian National Congress, December 1936.)

Since 1927 Congress has been warning Britain that unless the people of India were first consulted they would not lend their support in any future war.

Disregarding these warnings Britain declared Indian belligerent without consulting anyone in the country.

At the outbreak of the war Congress reaffirmed its opposition to fascism and its faith in democracy, but demanded a clear-cut enunciation of British war aims.

"A free democratic India will gladly associate itself with other free nations for mutual defense against aggression. * * * The Working Committee, therefore, invite the British Government to declare in unequivocal terms what their war aims are in regard to democracy and imperialism and the new order that is envisaged, in particular how these aims are going to apply to India and to be given effect to in the present." (Congress Resolution, September 15, 1939.)

The Viceroy refused an explicit declaration of war aims, but offered a "consultative group" to be associated with the Government.

The disappointment over Britain's response led, in October 1939, to the resignation of the nationalists from the Central and the Provincial Legislatures.

OFFERED COOPERATION

Following the collapse of France, Congress made in the summer of 1940 a new offer of cooperation in war, contingent upon the recognition of—

"A provisional national government at the center, which, though formed as a transitory measure, should be such as to command the confidence of all elected members in the central legislatures."

The Viceroy's statement of August 9, 1940, offered no transfer of real power to Indian hands, but the enlargement of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and the inclusion of a few Indians in a "War Advisory Council."

INDIA'S WAR EFFORT

During World War No. 1, India's contribution in manpower was greater than that of all the self-governing Dominions put together, and her financial contributions were very large.

In this war India's soldiers now number almost 2,000,000—of whom 170,000 were already in her standing army. 500,000 Indian soldiers are serving overseas.

India is producing 80 percent of her own war equipment—as well as supplies for other members of the United Nations. This includes armor-plating for tanks, etc., small arms, shells, and many other articles. She is making uniforms at the rate of 10,000,000 garments a month.

ARMY NOT NATIONAL

The Indian army has long been treated as a part of the armed forces of the Empire.

"Most of our Asiatic wars with countries beyond the limits of our Empire have been carried on by means of military and monetary resources of the government of India, though the objects of those wars were, in some instances, purely British, and in others but remotely connected with the interests of India." (Major Wingate, "Our Financial Relations with India," p. 17.)

Between 1913 and 1928, the military expenditure in India increased from 22 to 44 millions sterling—an increase of 100 percent, as against an increase of less than 50 percent in Great Britain and 33 percent in the Dominions.

In 1936–37, the military expenditure in India represented 54 percent of the central budget and 29 percent of the combined central and provincial budgets.

In spite of the appaling burden on India, the Indian soldiers receive about one-third the salaries that the British soldiers in India get. Up till very recently Indians were barred from training in aviation, artillery, and mechanized warfare, and no Indian ever rose higher than the rank of captain. Even now there is only an insigificant number of Indians commissioned, and these only to the lower ranks.

WHY CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE?

The failure of the Cripps mission generated bitterness and frustration.

On August 8, 1942, the Congress resolution called for the establishment of a provisional government whose "primary function must be to defend India and resist aggression with all the armed, as well as the nonviolent, forces at its command, together with the Allied Powers."

The committee sanctioned "for the vindication of India's inalienable right to freedom and independence, the starting of a mass struggle on nonviolent lines."

Nehru observed in the final debate: "The resolution is not a threat; it is an invitation and an explanation; it is an offer of cooperation."

Ghandhi's letter to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in July 1942 said:

"I am straining every nerve to avoid a conflict with British authority."

Gandhi started by writing a letter to the Viceroy asking for an interview. The Congress resolution was passed on August 8, and on the morning of August 9, 1942, all the principal leaders, including Gandhi, Nehru, and Azad, were arrested and the Congress was declared an illegal organization.

BLOCKING SETTLEMENT

Since the arrests of the Indian leaders, practically all the Indian parties have been urging the Government to reopen negotiations. The Chinese have expressed profound concern over the Indian deadlock. Sixty of America's leading public men and women signed on September 28, 1942, a full-page ad in the New York Times urging mediation in India.

The Viceroy has refused to allow Indian leaders to see Gandhi. He refused permission to William Phillips, President Roosevelt's personal envoy to India, to see Gandhi. The Viceroy even refused to deliver in full Gandhi's letter to Jinnah.

The British Government has taken the position that nothing can be done now.

"Perhaps I can give you my father's position. I feel that I know what it is.

"My father would want an unequivocal declaration of India's independence now. He would be accommodating on matters of detail and war direction if he could be convinced of the genuineness of the British desire to set India free.

"He would not consider immediate Pakistan, nor does Mr. Jinnah demand it." Devadas Gandhi, son of Mahatma Gandhi, in interview with Dewitt MacKenzie, quoted in latter's India's Problem Can Be Solved, 1943, (pp. 185, 187).

PROMISES AND ACTIONS

Ever since the First World War Britain has kept dangling before India the prospect of Dominion status. Almost 25 years have gone by and that promised land still remains a mirage. Here are a few sample promises:

"The policy of His Majesty's Government with which the Government of India is in complete accord is that of increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of a responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire." (Mr. Montague, Secretary of State for India, August 20, 1917.)

"I hope that within a period of months rather than of years there will be a new Dominion added to the Commonwealth of our Nations, a Dominion of another race, which will find self respect as an equal within the Commonwealth. I refer to India." (J. Ramsay MacDonald, July 2, 1928.)

"I am authorized on behalf of His Majesty's Government to say that in their judgment it is implicit in the declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress as there contemplated is the attainment of Dominion status." (Lord Irwin (now Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to Washington), Viceroy of India, October 31, 1929.)

"The object is the creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a Dominion associated with the United Kingdom and other Dominions by a common allegianec to the Crown but equal to them in every respect, in no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic and external affairs." (Sir Stafford Cripps, March 29, 1942.)

There is no basis for Britain's contention that she has always been preparing India for eventual self-government. It is repudiated by earlier pronouncements of prominent Englishmen, and a recent series of statements confirms India's belief that, in spite of Cripps' offer, Britain has no intention whatsoever of relinquishing her hold upon India.

"I do not hesitate to say that both the Governments of England and of India appear to me up to the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they have uttered to the ear." (Lord Lytton, Viceroy, 1876–80, in a confidential letter to Lord Cranbrook, Secretary of State.)

"That Britain under no circumstances will relinquish her responsibility in India is a cardinal principle not merely of the present government, but of any government which will command the confidence of the people of this country." (Lloyd George, in the House of Commons, August 2, 1922.)

"No one had the right to tell the people of India that they were likely in any near period to attain Dominion status." (Lord Birkenhead, in the House of Lords, November 5, 1929.)

"None can say when responsible government will be established; none can say what shape it will take." (Stanley Baldwin, when Prime Minister, December 4, 1934.)

"Our Viceroys and our Governors in India, and under them the services that will be recruited by the Secretary of State and safeguarded by Parliament, will have the duty and the means to ensure, if need be, that that political power is exercised by Indian ministers and legislatures for the purposes

that we intend." (Stanley Baldwin, broadcast on Government of India bill (new constitution) February 5, 1935.)

WINSTON CHURCHILL AND INDIA

"The loss of India would mark and consummate the downfall of the British Empire. That great organism would pass at a stroke out of life into history. From such a catastrophe there could be no recovery." (Winston Churchill, December 12, 1930.)

"Of course, we have always contemplated it (dominion status) as an ultimate goal, but no one has supposed that, except in a purely ceremonious sense in the way in which representatives of India attended conferences during the war, that that principle and policy for India would be carried into effect in any time which it is reasonable or useful for us to foresee." (January 28, 1931.)

"We are encouraging hopes in India which cannot be realized, we are assigning exaggerated importance to individuals in India with whom we shall never be able to agree and are injuring the prestige and strength of British Government in India for dealing with all these problems." (March 12, 1931.)

"I am against this surrender to Gandhi. I am against these conversations and agreements between Lord Irwin and Mr. Gandhi. Gandhi stands for the expulsion of the British from India. Gandhi stands for the substitution of Brahmin domination for British rule in India. You will never be able to come to terms with Gandhi." (March 1931.)

"It is alarming and also nauseating to see Mr. Gandhi, a seditious middle temple lawyer—striding half naked up the steps of the vice regal palace—to parley on equal terms with the representative of the King-Emperor." (March 1931, referring to the Gandhi-Irwin pact.)

"Most of the leading public men—of whom I was one in those days—made speeches, I certainly did, about the dominion status, but I did not contemplate India having the same constitutional rights and system as Canada in any period which we could foresee." (December 3, 1931.)

"And I do not believe the people will consent to be edged, pushed, talked, and cozened out of India." (April 29, 1932.)

"This India home rule plan strikes at the destiny of the British Empire. We have in this island a population of 45,000,000 living at a higher level than the people of any other European country. One-third of these would go down, out, or under if we ceased to be a great empire with world-wide connections and trade. * * * And then they tell us that the relations of Great Britain and India are not a matter for the working classes or for the ordinary elector. Let them mind their own business. India has nothing to do with them, nothing. It is only their daily bread. That's all!" (Broadcast, January 29, 1935.)

"* * * At the Atlantic meeting we had in mind primarily restoration of the sovereignty, self-government, and national life of States and nations of Europe now under the Nazi yoke and the principles which would govern any alterations in the territorial boundaries of the countries which might have to be made." (September 9, 1941, in the House of Commons, commenting on the Atlantic Charter and its application to India.)

"Let me make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." (November 10, 1942.)

INDIA FOR WORLD FEDERATION

India wants freedom from Britain's political domination. This is her birthright as a nation. She is anxiously looking forward to the day when, as a free nation, she will play an active role in a federation of all the free peoples of the world.

"The committee is of the opinion that the future peace, security, and ordered progress of the world demand a world federation of free nations, and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved. Such a federation would insure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation by one nation over another, the protection of national minorities, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples, and the pooling of the world's resources for the common good of all. * * * An independent India would gladly join such a world federation and cooperate on an equal basis with other countries in the solution of international problems." (Resolution passed by the All-India Congress Committee at Bombay, August 8, 1942.)

Mr. Chairman, on my trip through Arizona, California and other States, I was accompanied by Mubareck Ali Kahn, president of the India Welfare League, Inc., who has worked unceasingly with others for many years for the naturalization of those Indians who came here before 1924.

These men had come here at the request of missionaries in China and India, and as a result of conversations with Army officers in those countries.

Most of them had taken up agriculture by improving what was considered worthless alkali swamps, and by making them into profitable rice fields. By the passage of the Asiatic exclusion bill they suddenly found themselves deprived of their property. Some States, notably Washington, Oregon, California, and Arizona, would not permit them to own land. Their property was taken away from them in one breath. In some States they could not even get married, the claim being that they had no civil rights. And so we today find these men who are experts in agriculture, and in the sciences and the arts, facing problems to the removal of which, some of us have dedicated ourselves.

I thank Mr. Mubarek Ali Khan, president of the India Welfare League, 113 Broome Street, New York City, for his great assistance in the endeavor to pass my bill, and tonight I express my warm appreciation at the efforts of the chairman, Mr. J. J. Singh, of the India League of America, for getting assembled under one roof this vast multitude so greatly interested in democracy all over the world.

Milk for School Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress magazine, and general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, of Washington, D. C., made an able statement at a hearing on May 4, 1944, before a subcommittee appointed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, urging that milk be provided as a part of the diet of the noonday lunch for school children. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Abraham Lincoln said at the conclusion of his first inaugural address, "I am loath to close." In view of the wealth of testimony which has been presented in favor of the passage of one or the other of the bills considered for three days by this committee, I am loath to begin.

I wrote the chairman from Boston on Tuesday to suggest my desire to be heard if the issue before the committee today was on the passage of the pending school lunch bill, and not on the method of its administration as proposed by S. 1820 or S. 1824, as I am not an expert on matters of administration in a bill of this character, dividing the responsibility of its enforcement between the Federal Government and the States.

We most heartily favor the passage of the school lunch bill. We could not do otherwise as a Christian organization. Our Lord said, "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water, verily I say unto you he shall in no wise lose his reward." Certainly if this be true of a drink of water it must be doubly true of providing food for a multitude of school children of a Nation, who would otherwise go hungry. Some 4,445,000 children are now receiving lunch aid through the Food Distribution Administration.

That is certainly "a multitude" and we read that "Jesus had compassion on the multitude because they had nothing to eat, and He commanded His disciples, saying, "Give ye them to eat." Not only once, but twice he fed the hungry multitude of four and five thousand men, besides women and children, the record says, for no other reason than because they were hungry. I believe he would say the same to the hungry school children of this richest and most blessed of all nations, no matter how large or small may be their numbers, whether 1,000,000 or 10,000,000.

We could multiply the reasons, had they not already been presented, and there was any doubt about the passage of the bill with such amendments as may be offered in the Senate, after a favorable report by this committee of either S. 1820 or S. 1824.

However, I do discover one very important difference between these two proposals. S. 1820, known as the Russell proposal, reads in its title, "An act to provide for Federal assistance in the maintenance, expansion, and operation of school-lunch and school-milk programs, etc." This language is repeated throughout the bill. On page 1, line 6, "school lunch and milk programs" are specifically named again. In lines 23 and 24 on page 2, we read, "distribution of food and milk for such children." On page 3, line 13, we read, "what kinds and forms of food and milk shall be provided." On page 4, line 1, we read, "this title may be used for the purchase of food and milk and the distribution thereof, or to make payments or repayments for the purchase of food and milk." The language is uniform and explicit throughout that the appropriations made for school lunches are to be for "food and milk."

In marked contrast to this provision in S. 1820 is the ambiguous language of S. 1824, known as the Smith-Ellender bill, which reads, "to provide lunches and nutrition instruction thereto for children while attending school." The language employed here is not only ambiguous, but it is capable of various interpretations as to what the Federal Government may supply for the children to drink, from this appropriation of $50,000,000 "as a measure of national security" * * * "of high-school grade and under" * * * "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children," as stated in S. 1820, which specifically provides for milk.

It would be possible under the Smith-Ellender bill, S. 1824, to give the school children coffee, with its caffeine, to drink, and tea, with its tannin, to drink, and in some localities, Coca-Cola, and in others a light alco-

holic content of malt liquor, let us say up to 3.2 percent which, for taxable purposes, is not now considered an intoxicating beverage. This may not be probable, but it would be possible, and certain powerful interests may and likely would attempt to so construe and interpret the statute so loosely drawn, as it is now construed for boys of high school age in the Army training camps of the Nation and teen-age girls in military service.

We express the hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that with regard to what shall constitute food and drink, the language of S. 1820, known as the Russell bill, shall be employed, and that such an amendment shall be made in your committee report, and sustained by Congress "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children," as stated in the act.

Irrigation Versus Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Irrigation Versus Navigation," originally published in the Minneapolis Star-Journal, and reprinted in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of May 2, 1944, together with a news article published in the Bismarck Tribune of the same date entitled "Missouri River Is Low for May."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRRIGATION VERSUS NAVIGATION

War prices and unusually plentiful rains have restored Dakota and Montana agriculture to prosperity, but the residents of those States have their fingers crossed. They point to the record since 1880—only one profitable crop year in five. Lack of moisture is the constant threat west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Yet there are small areas which have raised a crop each year in spite of the vagaries of weather. They are the 4,410,000 acres under irrigation along the upper Missouri River and its tributaries.

Westerners are fired with the idea that an increase in irrigation could stabilize their farming. It is estimated an additional 4,560,000 acres could be watered. North Dakota, with 24,000 acres now irrigated, looks forward to 1,500,000 acres made drought-free. The Bureau of Reclamation has ready a report to Congress outlining a plan to spread far distant the water of the Missouri.

The reclamation report will conflict in many particulars with the Army engineers' report, which already is before Congress. The Army proposes a series of dams to control floods and insure navigation on the lower Missouri. Army engineers say that water for irrigation still would be available, but irrigation enthusiasts answer that their needs should be met first and any additional flow be used for navigation. Other forms of transportation are at hand, they argue, to handle the freight which river barges would carry. They have appealed to the Twin Cities, as the business capital of their territory, to assist in presenting their claims.

The rivers and harbors bill recently passed by the House and upon which a Senate subcommittee soon may open hearings contains authorization for a 9-foot channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri.

Western Congressmen are seeking the inclusion of an amendment which would read: "In connection with dams or works authorized by this act, any use of the waters of any stream or tributary thereof having its source west of the ninety-seventh meridian shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any use west of the ninety-seventh meridian of such waters for domestic, irrigation, mining purposes whenever established under State law."

That is the language of an amendment defeated in the House. Senators will be asked to include it in the rivers and harbors bill. Certainly it seems reasonable to insure water for irrigation, a productive enterprise, ahead of navigation on the lower Missouri, where maintenance for traffic is a costly and constant problem.

Yet inland waterways leaders point out that the water of the Missouri is necessary for year-around navigation on the lower Mississippi. With any appreciable diminution of flow from the Missouri in dry weather, the Chain of Rocks near St. Louis would be a big hazard. When the level falls in the lower Mississippi now, water is released from Fort Peck Dam in Montana. It is clear that continued navigation on the lower Mississippi is closely linked to continued traffic on the upper Mississippi to the Twin Cities.

Thus the differing interests of navigation and irrigation appear. Some years enough water is available for the maximum requests of both, but all agree this is not usually the case.

Despite these differences, spokesmen for each side are reasonable men and their usual attitude is only that their arguments not be overlooked before Congress commits itself. Probably the first step in a compromise is to bring together the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. They have been at odds for years in their whole approach to the Missouri Basin problem. When the two reports are before Congres surely an intelligent integration of them can be worked out.

That might well be the plan for a huge, sound post-war project of everlasting benefit to the northern States of the Great Plains.

MISSOURI RIVER IS LOW FOR MAY

Although the Mississippi River at St. Louis is at a near-record flood stage, the Missouri River here is at the lowest point ever recorded at this season, Federal Meteorologist F. J. Bavendick said Tuesday.

The river stage here Tuesday morning was 3 feet, 1 foot below the previous low mark of 4 feet recorded on May 24, 1938.

The all-time low mark for the Missouri here, Bavendick said, was 0.9 of a foot on December 12, 1913.

Operation of the Fort Peck Dam, which shuts off the flow of water from the main stem of the Missouri, is credited with causing the low flow here.

Inflationary Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Inflationary Taxation," published in the Northwestern Miller of May 3, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATIONARY TAXATION

In the current issue of his company house organ, mailed to customers, a miller—who we assume would prefer not to be quoted by name—discusses what he terms the increasingly extravagant habits of business enterprises. We are quoting below the essential part of his comment, not only because it is sound reasoning succinctly stated but more because of a single sharply pointed phrase—"Certainly high income tax rates must be more inflationary than all other influences combined."

"Present all-time high in the use of long-distance telephone facilities is one manifestation of the frame of mind of business people. That and the tremendous increase in passenger traffic are, of course, partially due to wartime activities; but to our notion indicate the rapidly growing I-don't-care attitude toward expenses—occasioned by confiscatory tax rates. Extravagance is rampant. Certainly high income tax rates must be more 'inflationary' than all other influences combined.

"The danger to the individual businessman is the formation of bad habits, his own as well as those of his organization. 'What's the use' is a phrase that should never be allowed, for some day the good old ways of thrift must be resumed."

By coincidence, we were about to air our own views on this particular subject when along came this circular supplying the exact text we needed phrased in better words than we ourselves could have chosen. Can any single reader of this think of a single item in the whole vast complexity of causes of present and threatened further inflation than the current income-tax rates, especially those which confiscate virtually all corporation earnings over 5 percent? Marching with it, indeed part and parcel of it, is the incredibly wasteful spending of public money for purposes not associated with the actual war effort and thus adding astronomical sums to the mounting public debt.

Every man associated in any responsible capacity with business and industry well knows how widespread is the practice of considering every kind of expense, not with the customary prudence and exercise of sound business judgment but largely in connection with its relation to taxes, with the frequent answer to expense problems expressed in the phrase, "Oh, well, why not? It costs only 5 cents on the dollar." This applies not only to such minor items as telephone services and travel costs but, especially among some of the country's largest corporations, to such things as advertising and sales promotion extravagances, vast contributions to this and that permissible and presumably worthy cause and a thousand items of cost which would not be given a moment's consideration in normal times.

We have willingly done our share in sandbagging folks for these last-mentioned donations, but have as yet failed to carry on with our cheer leaders' emphasis on the argument that most of such contributions is paid by the Government. The argument is, of course, perfectly all right, fair enough and even endorsed by Government. Furthermore, our conscience is as elastic as most, and we certainly take account of every permissible allowance in our own settlements with the tax sleuths. Yet we someway cannot escape the conclusion voiced by Huckleberry Finn's "Pap" when he declared it "is a hell of a Government any way a feller looks at it." We mean, of course, in this particular matter.

Also we know almost no man responsible for the management of even a modest corporation who would not greatly prefer in

these difficult times to pursue a prudent program of expenses, and then pay the Government a fair and just, even overgenerous share of his income provided he were permitted to lay aside the money he now wastes as provision against post-war rehabilitation, reconversion, and a score of other needs not accurately to be even estimated in advance of the event. We can, indeed, testify to the accuracy of this because of consideration we have had to give to it with little or no worth-while result in our own relatively small establishment. Literally none escapes.

Perhaps the danger of "formation of bad business habits" mentioned in the opinion we quoted at the beginning may not be lasting. Men who succeed in business necessarily must have capacity to adjust themselves to changing situations. So quite possibly the tax-reckless spendthrift of today may in the hard days which quite possibly may succeed the peace easily return to his old habits of prudence and economy. Yet, so far as now can be foreseen, he will have then, as he has now, the overshadowing wastes of government, quite possibly increased by some new slant to the economic philosophy of overcoming hard times by increased taxation and multiplied expenditures of public funds. It is not beyond imagination to picture an administration of government setting out to defeat depression by keeping up civilian expenditures to the present basis of war costs. Sounds silly, but might happen.

Manpower Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Manpower?", published in the New York Times of Thursday, May 4, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH MANPOWER?

Speaking for the Army Service Forces which he commands, Lieutenant General Somervell tells the American Legion that the Army's greatest demand on the country's manpower is still to come. There will be a terrific problem, he believes, when we try to take 1,400,000 more men from the factories and farms and still try to maintain production at a high enough level to beat Germany and Japan. But, speaking on the same day at a meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green calmly assures us that there is no manpower shortage whatever, only sporadic local shortages; more likely to be labor surpluses from this point forward. The A. F. of L. council itself takes the Army severely to task for ever having proposed a National War Service Act, declares that the arguments in favor of such a measure have been demolished, and demands that all Government officials who have ever favored this proposal back down from their support of it entirely.

It seems to us that the executive council of the American Federation of Labor is taking a quite large burden of responsibility on itself when it attempts to match its judgment against the combined judgment of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the head of the Maritime Commission in the matter of estimating what our manpower needs will be after our armed forces have met, not the mere advance guards but the main military and naval power of our enemies. Mr. Green, and Mr. Murray and Mr. Lewis as well, guessed badly when they originally opposed the prompt enactment of a Selective Service Act. It will be small comfort to the organized labor movement if its leaders again guess badly now.

In our own judgment, not one of the important arguments in favor of the enactment of a National War Service Act has been seriously answered, let alone demolished, by the critics of this plan. Those arguments are that such a measure (1) would provide a more effective method of recruiting manpower to fill really critical shortages than is furnished by the present hit-or-miss methods; (2) could and would bring about a reduction of labor turn-over, which is now running at the perfectly fantastic rate of 72 percent a year, in wartime; (3) would provide a safeguard for use in sudden desperate emergencies, which may occur if we are forced suddenly to shift tens or even hundreds of thousands of workers into the production of some entirely new weapon to meet a surprise tactic or a surprise invention of the enemy; and (4) would give welcome and needed assurance to our soldiers in the field that they are not being discriminated against unfairly; that we who are safe at home recognize and willingly accept the same legal obligation for service which now rests solely on their shoulders.

These are all strong arguments in a year when many American boys will die in action in France and the Pacific.

Civil Rights No Longer Secure

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt's ordering the Army to move in on Montgomery Ward & Co. after he had been assured by Attorney General Biddle that he had a legal right to issue such an order, on the ground that labor difficulties at the plant were impeding or threatening to impede the war effort, is, in my opinion, one of the most disgraceful spectacles in the history of this Nation.

What were those labor difficulties? No issue of wages or working conditions was involved. What was involved was this; the company had not signed the C. I. O.'s contract which carried a maintenance of union membership clause and which required the company to withhold union dues from the employees' wages for the benefit of the union. The old contract had expired in December 1943. The War Labor Board ordered Montgomery Ward & Co. to sign a contract with the C. I. O. without an election by the company employees as provided for by an act of this Congress. The company refused. The C. I. O. officials ordered a strike and placed pickets around the plant in an effort to keep employees out of the premises. However, with protection from the law enforcement officials of Chicago, against violence, many of the workers remained at their jobs and the company continued to operate its business. But because there was no signed contract with the C. I. O. Attorney General Biddle ruled that Montgomery Ward & Co. was impeding or threatening to impede the war effort.

If the war effort can be impeded in this manner in a mail-order establishment such as this, it can be empeded in any business institution in the Nation and soldiers can be sent to take over whenever the President gives the order.

The average American citizen is not concerned over the affairs of Montgomery Ward & Co. as such. What he is concerned with is the implication that the trend toward fascism has become so pronounced in the United States that it is now possible for the Government to take steps such as the Fascists took in Italy and the Nazis took in Germany—steps that mean the civil rights of American citizens no longer are secure; that they are subject to the whims and prejudices of Government officials and agents.

Supporters of the administration are crying out in holy horror that the company's chairman, Mr. Avery, defied the President and by the same token defied the Government of the United States. Sounds like a good argument, does it not? But less than a year ago one John L. Lewis was defying the same President and the same Government of the United States, but the President, through his Attorney General, sent no soldiers of the United States Army to seize the United Mine Workers organization and bodily eject Mr. Lewis from his office. Evidently it makes a difference who does the defying.

Perhaps part of the answer as to why there is a difference in who does the defying may be found in a speech Attorney General Biddle made on March 5, 1942, at a banquet held at the Cosmos Club here in the city of Washington and sponsored by the leftist New Republic magazine, celebrating the tenth anniversary of the New Deal's ascent to power. It is also interesting to note that Sidney Hillman, now head of the C. I. O.'s political action committee, was a guest at this banquet. In this speech Mr. Biddle stated, "The success of the New Deal is due to the fact that it is not just a group of theorists and liberals, but because it is a political party tied up with the labor movement under an able political leader." Mr. Biddle also stated in this speech, "Regardless of the war, we must keep up the fight for the liberalism of the New Deal."

Defiance of the Government in error reaps no condemnation through the years. Many men have defied the Government when it was in error. George Washington did and so did Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Avery, as chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward & Co., in this case defied the Government because he dared to believe the fact we are at war is not enough to empower even the President of the United States to ignore the fourth amendment to the Constitution which provides that the rights of the people to be secure in their persons, homes, businesses, and effects against

unreasonable search and seizure shall not be violated.

A great majority of the American people, I believe, agree with Mr. Avery that a great mercantile establishment is not a war plant and that the Presidential right of seizure does not apply without due process of law.

For those of us who believe in peaceful adjudication of controversies between capital and labor—adjudication—not mere arbitrary decisions by the administrative branch of the Government, there is something ominously inimical in the helplessness of any individual or firm opposed by the Government as illustrated in this case.

The manner in which President Roosevelt and Attorney General Biddle handled this situation just is not the American way of doing things. It smacks too much of Hitlerism, the very thing thousands of American boys are fighting and dying to suppress.

As the duly elected representatives of the parents of these boys, and the boys themselves, it is our solemn duty to see to it that the liberty they are dying for on the battlefields abroad is not assassinated on the home front and to this end I am sure the Congress will meet its responsibility unflinchingly.

The Montgomery Ward Case

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Montgomery Ward matter I shall first briefly summarize my position and then set it forth more fully. First, then I am going to vote in favor of the investigation. I think it is altogether fitting and proper, and I hope every phase of the matter will be gone into.

In the second place I believe that orders of the Executive and the executive departments should in all cases be subject to appeal to the courts to determine and define the extent and scope of those powers. But in the third place I should like to point out that if the War Labor Boards to be effective if it is to settle labor disputes in the only way they can be settled in wartime the War Labor Board must be supported in its decisions by responsible public officials. To support the Board only part of the time, only when a Member of Congress likes the decision is not to support them at all. Unless the War Labor Board's decisions are going to be upheld, unless people are going to loyally abide by them, then it cannot be what it was set up to be, namely a wartime substitute for the last steps of collective bargaining, for the strike or the lockout or action by either employers or workers which impedes production. Upon those people who are undermining the Board and its work will rest responsibility, if they succeed in their efforts of desiring some other means of assuring us a continuation of the most prodigious production that has ever taken place in all the world. America is outproducing the whole world today. Something or other must be right about that situation, Members of Congress, corporation officials, and everybody else ought to think a long time before they destroy existing machinery that has made this production possible. But to encourage defiance of decisions, especially unanimous decisions of the Board, is to invite exactly that result.

The temporary taking over of certain property of Montgomery Ward & Co. by the Government and the events which led up to it have precipitated a critical situation in our country on the very eve of the invasion of Europe, when all our thoughts should be upon that great effort.

It is very important that some straight thinking be done by all of us, and with the hope that all the facts can be made available to the people thereby I shall vote for the pending resolution for a thorough congressional investigation of this whole Montgomery Ward matter.

I cannot agree fully with the sweeping nature of the Attorney General's description of the President's powers. There are, and must be, limits to those powers, although in time of war those limits have got to be greatly extended if we are to fight the war successfully. The question, however, as to whether either the President or the War Labor Board has exceeded the proper scope of their powers should be decided by the courts, as is now being done. In the minority report of the Smith committee to investigate executive agencies, which was just issued, I myself wrote:

> It is our opinion that provision for appeal to the courts of the land from the decisions of the executive agencies exercising such broad and sweeping powers as those given to the Office of Price Administration and War Labor Board is no more than fitting and proper. At the very least, citizens and organizations should have the opportunity of appealing to the courts to see whether the rule, regulation, order, or decision is a valid one and whether the agency in question has exceeded its duly granted power and authority in issuing such a regulation. Indeed, it is our opinion that provision for appeal to the courts would strengthen rather than weaken the stabilization structure, and we are certain that the possibility of such court review would add greatly to the confidence of the people of the Nation in their dealings with these agencies.

According to the tripartite form of the American Government Congress must grant powers, the Executive must exercise them and the courts must decide whether or not they have been properly exercised.

Fundamental to all other considerations, however, is the effect of this whole situation on America's war effort. This is not the first time that similar action has been taken by the Government during this war. When North American Aircraft plant was taken over I spoke publicly in support of the President's action, pointing out that the Nation could not tolerate a strike and that the interest of the Nation was paramount to the particular interest of any group.

In connection with the coal mine dispute, I spoke publicly against refusal of John L. Lewis to submit his case to the War Labor Board, against the fact that the War Labor Board was circumvented in the handling of the matter, and against what appeared to me the breaking of the no-strike pledge by Lewis.

In the railroad situation I was thoroughly convinced that better handling of it by the Government could have settled the matter without the drastic action taken. But I wrote in my newspaper column at the time my approval under all the circumstances of the President's action and pointing out that by means of the Government taking over the railroads temporarily all possibility of strike was removed. In this particular case I do not believe a strike would have taken place anyway.

But my purpose in reviewing this history is to show one thing. From the beginning I have consistently upheld the principle that the War Labor Board must be the wartime substitute for peacetime methods of collective bargaining; that strikes and stoppages of work, whoever is at fault, must be prevented; and that the only way this can be done is by both sides accepting decisions of this Board and loyally abiding by them. The only alternative is to let management and labor fight out their differences and to leave both of them free to do so. In wartime that simply will not work.

I cannot take a different position with regard to the Montgomery Ward case than I took in connection with North American Aircraft, the mines, or the railroads. I found no great outcry that the Constitution was being overthrown in any of these three instances. In those three cases the Government took action to curb the demands of labor. In the Montgomery Ward case it is taking action because the employer has refused to agree to a War Labor Board decision, although it was a unanimous decision of employer, public, and labor members of the Board. I have supported the Government when it temporarily put the flag over properties in order to resist demands of labor, which the workers believed were just demands. I take the same position in support of my Government when it takes similar action to meet Montgomery Ward's defiance of a unanimous War Labor Board decision. I do not believe that in wartime labor has a right to strike against a War Labor Board decision. Neither do I believe Montgomery Ward & Co. has that right.

When last winter the President took over the railroads temporarily the unions stated, as they should have done, that it was impossible to contemplate a strike against the United States Government, regardless of how justified the men might feel in the position they had taken. Montgomery Ward said just the opposite.

Now, what exactly did the President ask of Montgomery Ward? He simply asked that they agree to continue in effect the terms of the agreement with the union under which they have operated for the past year until such time, not longer than 30 days, as was required for the National Labor Relations Board to conduct an election. Montgomery Ward refused to agree to a 30-day continuance

of the same agreement that they had agreed to a year ago and thus precipitated the present situation. What changed their minds?

Mr. Avery's statement that the issue is whether or not anyone is going to be compelled to belong to a union in order to work for Montgomery Ward & Co. is simply false. The maintenance of membership provision does not compel the employer to hire members of the union. He can hire whomever he sees fit. Neither does it compel any employee not a member of the union to join it. All it provides is that anyone who continues as a member of the union 15 days after the contract goes into effect shall remain a member of the union as long as that contract lasts—usually for 1 year. As a matter of fact, Mr. Avery himself has made the statement in connection with the current dispute that he did not want to deal with this particular union for the reason that it only had 20 percent of the workers in the plant as members. In other words, 80 percent of Mr. Avery's employees have, under the terms of the very same War Labor Board decision which he refuses to continue to abide by, not been members of the union according to his own statement.

It is utterly impossible for the War Labor Board to decide disputes in a manner 100 percent agreeable to both labor and management. Usually it will not please either. In the future it will make decisions denying pay increases to workers; it will make decisions which employers will not like.

If the management of Montgomery Ward is going to be exalted into a position of national heroism because it chooses to defy the Government of the United States, then we must expect, if we are to be fair, to accord that same right to other employers and other groups of workers in future labor disputes. It goes without saying that those employers and those workers will be quite as convinced of the righteousness of their cause as Mr. Avery. Either the War Labor Board decisions have to be accepted and upheld or else everybody—not just Mr. Avery—will have to be excused from paying any attention to them and allowed to do as they see fit. In that event the War Labor Board will become useless and we will be without any machinery for settling labor disputes in this war period. The dangers in such a situation I need not elaborate.

As I have said, I believe Montgomery Ward or any other company or any union should be able to go to the courts for a decision as to whether or not the War Labor Board acted in excess of its authority and whether the action taken is legal or not. Such an appeal to the courts is now being taken and these questions will be determined there as they should be. Should the courts decide that the Government acted in excess of its authority then that puts an entirely different complexion on the whole matter so far as I am concerned. It also will mean that we must very quickly devise some other method than those now in use of assuring continuous production for the war.

No one regrets more than I that this whole thing has happened. Its political value to the opponents of the present administration is too obvious to require comment. Whether that factor in the situation influenced Montgomery Ward to take the position it did I do not know, nor do I presume to say. But the refusal of this company to continue in effect for a brief 30 days its working agreement with this union pending a decision through a duly held election by the National Labor Relations Board as to whether the union is entitled to be the certified collective bargaining agent in its plants is in my judgment a very considerable contribution toward weakening the hand of the only Government we have at preesnt to carry on this war—namely, the Government of the United States.

Farm Machinery

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, our farmers have been called on to meet tremendous food-production goals in 1944. The production records made by our patriotic, hard-working farmers during the past few years have been miraculous when we consider the handicaps under which they have worked. They have had many difficulties in obtaining necessary machinery—and too often have not been able to get it at all. They have lost much of their young, experienced farm labor, and in spite of the numbers who have already gone into military service, I read in this morning's paper that Selective Service has ordered reconsideration of present farm deferments with the view of drafting more of our younger, skilled farmers.

Whitley County in my district in Indiana, like other farm areas, is experiencing a difficult farm help situation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolutions unanimously adopted by the Whitley County War Board in session at Columbia City, Ind., on April 28:

Whereas the different local divisions of the United States Department of Agriculture have been instructed to urge farmers to produce food to the maximum of their ability as a patriotic endeavor; and

Whereas industrial plants have been given war contracts which enable manufacturers to far outbid farmers for labor with farm products marketed under O. P. A. ceiling prices; and

Whereas the age of the average Whitley County farm operator is estimated to be well above 50 years; and

Whereas the selective-service policy now operative, is rapidly raising the average operator's age to still higher levels, thereby alarmingly reducing production efficiency; and

Whereas the labor-saving machinery policy now in effect is inadequate for the production needs of the county; and

Whereas imported foreign labor has been altogether unsatisfactory for all general farm work excepting hand labor: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That we the undersigned members of the Whitley County War Board of the United States Department of Agriculture, do petition the Whitley County Selective Service Board to maintain the present supply of dependable and skilled agricultural labor on our farms throughout the productive season now under way; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Whitley County Selective Service Board, the Indiana Selective Service Board, the Indiana U. S. D. A. War Board and the press.

WILSON BENNETT,
Chairman, Agricultural Adjustment Association.
WELDON MAY,
Assistant Secretary-Treasurer Albion Production Credit Association.
H. K. WAUGH,
Manager, Whitley County, R. E. M. C.
B. V. WIDNEY,
County Agent, Purdue Agricultural Extension Service.

D. A. V. Policies and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, as a wounded veteran of World War No. 1, I am a life member of the Disabled American Veterans, which, incidentally, is the only congressionally chartered organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving actively in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

As a D. A. V. member, I receive its official publication, the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper in a recent issue of which I noted an outline of the policies and objectives of the D. A. V.

This outline emphasizes two points: First, preserve America and its freedoms; and second, promote welfare of America's disabled defenders and their dependents. These two points, with which all of us can certainly agree, are interrelated, and are of vital importance to the future welfare of America.

Such outline is here inserted, as follows:

I. Preserve America and its freedoms.

A. Protect America.

1. Maintain adequate specialized armed forces. (Numerous laws, appropriations, and pending bills.)

2. Produce needed war material quickly (policy).

3. Mobilize America's manpower efficiently (policy).

B. Provide adequately for America's defenders and their dependents.

1. Maintain adequate pay during service, supplemented by adequate post-war adjustments on an "earned merits" basis. H. R. 4256, by Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana. Now before Committee on World War Vet-

erans' Legislation. Also, sec. 55 of Disabled American Veterans omnibus bill, H. R. 912.)

2. Liberalize national service life insurance provisions. (H. R. 4770, by Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.)

3. Establish Army, Navy, and Marine Corps boards of appeals and reviews, with authority to revise discharge certificates. (H. R. 1105, as to Army, by Hon. OVERTON BROOKS. Now before Committee on Military Affairs, H. R. 1110, as to Navy and Marine Corps, by Hon. ED. V. IZAC, of California; now before Committee on Naval Affairs. Also secs. 55–56 of H. R. 912.)

4. Emphasize complete assembly of medical records before discharge (policy).

C. Eliminate excess profits from all-out war for freedom.

1. Control purchasing power of United States money (policy).

2. Impose taxes according to ability to pay (policy).

3. Regulate men, money, material, machines toward war victory (policy).

D. Perpetuate Americanism.

1. Protect Americanism by its promotion. (Educational publicity.)

2. Promote workable representative democracy. (Educational publicity. Numerous bills.)

3. Protect democratic institutions against subversive forces.

(a) Have all persons fingerprinted, registered, and identified. (H. R. 1032, by Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana. Now before Committee of the Judiciary.)

(b) Issue certificates to all citizens. (H. R. 812, by Hon. CHARLES R. CLASON, of Massachusetts. Reported favorably by Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on March 2, 1943, Rept. No. 201. Now on Union Calendar of House.)

II. Promote welfare of America's disabled defenders and their dependents. (H. R. 912. Disabled American veterans' omnibus bill, by Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Referred to his committee.)

A. Keep Veterans' Administration primarily for disabled veterans and their dependents (policy).

B. Extend Disabled American Veterans' services to all of America's disabled veterans (policy).

1. Through expanded national and local service officers' set-up (policy).

2. By extensive educational publicity (policy).

C. Liberalize policies as to service connections.

1. Decentralize authority to review and readjudicate all previously denied claims. (H. R. 706, by Hon. JERRY VOORHIS, of California. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 31 of H. R. 912.)

2. Insist upon recorded résumé of all pertinent facts and evidence in claims filed prior to certificate of appeal. (H. R. 706, by Mr. VOORHIS, above.)

3. Reinstate direct-service connections granted in 1933–34 by the President's Review Boards. (H. R. 935, by Hon. JOE B. BATES of Kentucky. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 8 of H. R. 912.)

4. Liberalize eligibility as to disability-retirement benefits. (H. R. 1036, by Mr. BROOKS. Now before Military Affairs Committee. Also secs. 44–45 of H. R. 912.)

D. Extend increased monetary benefits of disabled defenders.

1. Provide adequate allowances for dependents of all compensated and pensioned disabled veterans. (H. R. 4280, by Mr. RANKIN, and referred to his committee. Also S. 1733, by Hon. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK of Missouri, chairman of the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation; referred to Committee on Finance.)

2. Increase compensation and pension payments by 10 percent for each 10 percent increase in the cost of living over 1940 figures. (H. R. 1111, by Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida. Compromise measure, H. R. 3356, raising rates by a straight 15 percent for veterans of World War Nos. 1 and 2 entitled to wartime rates for service disabilities, etc., favorably reported by Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on October 11, 1943; Rept. No. 749. Passed House Oct. 11, 1943. Reported by Senate Committee on Finance, Rept. No. 854, on May 5, 1944. Also secs. 1–2 of H. R. 912.)

3. Provide minimum 10 percent rating for wounded or gassed veterans. (H. R. 738, by Mr. VOORHIS. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also, sec. 4 of H. R. 912.)

4. Increase basic ratings by 20 percent for each 5 years after age of 40. (H. R. 754 by Mr. VOORHIS. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 3 of H. R. 912).

5. Restore full compensation to the so-called presumptives. (H. R. 1000, by Hon. GEORGE M. GRANT of Alabama. Now before House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 5 of H. R. 912).

6. Provide full compensation for single veterans while hospitalized. (H. R. 979 by Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN of Louisiana. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 7 of H. R. 912).

7. No reduction of compensation during first 3 months of hospitalization. H. R. 1035 by Hon. B. W KEARNEY, of New York. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation).

8. Increase pensions to war veterans with permanent total nonservice connected disabilities to $60 per month. (H. R. 1370 by Mr. VOORHIS. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 11 of H. R. 912. Compromise bill H. R. 3377, increasing from $40 to $50 per month and to $60 where 65 years of age or so rated for 10 years, after being passed by House on Oct. 11, 1943, Rept. No. 747, was favorably reported by Senate Committee on Finance on May 5, 1944, S. Rept. 855.)

9. Authorize payment of compensation for partial service-connected disability plus the percentage of pension for permanent total disability (nonservice) equal to the difference between 100 percent and his degree of service-connected disability. (H. R. 918, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before his committee. Also sec. 13 of H. R 912).

10. Increase pension to service disabled regulars to 90 percent of wartime rates. (H. R. 919, by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI of Michigan. Now before Committee on Invalid Pensions).

E. Liberalize Veterans' Administration determination.

1. Expedite adjudication of claims of disabled veterans.

2. Determine permanent and total disability on individual inability to follow any substantially gainful occupation. (H. R. 1118, as to service-connected disabilities, by Mr. Peterson; H. R. 683, by the Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM, as to nonservice-connected disabilities. Now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also secs. 9–10 of H. R. 912).

3. Eliminate statutory limitations as to applications for benefits (H. R. 707, as to "bonus," by Hon. FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, now before Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1036, by Mr. BROOKS, as to emergency officers' retirement benefits, now before Military Affairs Committee. H. R. 318, as to World War decorations, by Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, of New York, now before Military Affairs Committee. Also secs. 16, 37, 40, 45, 46, 48, 51, 52 of H. R. 912).

4. Limit misconduct bar to willful or felonious misconduct (H. R. 986, by Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Pocket vetoed July 13, 1943. Compromise bill H. R. 3355, by Mr. RANKIN, now before his committee. S. 1250, by Senator REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, favorably reported by Senate Military Affairs Committee July 1, 1943. Passed Senate July 3, 1943. Favorably reported by House Military Affairs Committee March 16, 1944, Rept. No. 1263. Also sec. 15 of H. R. 912).

5. Adjudicate claims retroactively according to facts (H. R. 796, by Mr. RANKIN, now before his committee. Also sec. 17 of H. R. 912).

6. Forfeit benefits only where evidence is clearly not sufficient, but subject those guilty of fraud to fine or imprisonment (H. R. 664, by Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also secs. 49 and 50 of H. R. 912).

7. Extend time within which to make appeal from decisions of rating agencies (H. R. 855, by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 16 of H. R. 912).

8. Provide minimum rating of 1 percent for veterans noted as having some disability at time of discharge. (H. R. 641, by Mr. ALLEN, of Louisiana. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 16 of H. R. 912.)

9. Permit suit on any claim after final denial. (H. R. 706, by Mr. VOORHIS of California, and H. R. 980, by Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Both now before House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 33 of H. R. 912.)

F. Liberalize insurance benefits.

1. Reduce interest on Government insurance policy loans to 3½ percent. (H. R. 682, by Mr. WICKERSHAM. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 36 of H. R. 912.)

2. Permit suit on any Government life-insurance policy at any time. (H. R. 1120, by Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 40 of H. R. 912.)

3. Insurance judgments to be binding upon Veterans' Administration until modified by court order. (H. R. 803, by Hon. JOHN S. GIBSON, of Georgia. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 41 of H. R. 912.)

4. Make Government life-insurance policies incontestible after 1 year and return premiums on canceled policies. (H. R. 749, by Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 39 of H. R. 912.)

5. Continue permanent total disability insurance protection to veterans who have received 240 or more monthly installments of insurance benefits. (H. R. 794, by Mr. RANKIN, now before his committee. Also sec. 37 of H. R. 912.)

6. Veterans receiving insurance benefits on permanent total disability not to be reexamined more than once each 5 years. (H. R. 981 by Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 799 after 10 years, by Mr. RANKIN. Favorably reported on February 10, 1943. Report No. 113. Now on Union Calendar of House. Also sec. 38 of H. R. 912.)

G. Facilitate suitable employment of service disabled.

1. Extend effective preferences for veterans, their wives, and widows, for all Government employment for which qualified. (H. R. 4115 by the Honorable JOE STARNES, of Alabama. Favorably reported, with amendments, by Civil Service Committee. Report No. 1289. Now on House calendar. Also sec. 58 of H. R. 912.)

2. Exempt disabled veterans deemed to be risk to civil-service retirement fund from provisions of act, and then cover them into the social security retirement provisions. (H. R. 1016 by Mr. MCMILLAN. Now before

Civil Service Committee. Also sec. 59 of H. R. 912.)

3. Extend full vocational training and suitable employment to all handicapped service veterans. (H. R. 2950 by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also secs. 51–53 of H. R. 912.)

4. Require Veterans' Administration to underwrite all State workmen's compensation costs as to service-connected disabled veterans (H. R. 2950).

H. Provide miscellaneous benefits.

1. Extend adjusted compensation for provisional officers. (H. R. 1547 by Mr. CARLSON. Now before Ways and Means Committee. Also sec. 48 of H. R. 912.)

2. National cemetery in every State. (H. R. 1109 by Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas. Now before Military Affairs Committee. Appropriation bill (?). Also sec. 61 of H. R. 912.)

3. National war memorial auditorium in the Nation's Capital (H. R. 1245, by Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California. Now before Public Buildings and Grounds Committee. Also sec. 60 of H. R. 912).

4. Liberalize State laws and appropriations affecting veterans, their dependents, and their organizations. (Policy, Educational Publicity).

I. Eliminate existing inequalities and inequities as among various similar groups of disabled veterans and their dependents and uniformize administrative provisions. (H. R. 1774, by Hon. HARRY P. JEFFREY, deleting limitation as to number of dependent children. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 1445, by Mr. CARLSON of Kansas, to replace destroyed or withheld bonus certificates. Now before Ways and Means Committee. Also secs. 6, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 47, of H. R. 912).

J. Needed hospitalization and domiciliary care to be available for (1) service-connected disabilities; (2) non-service-connected disabilities (policy. Also secs. 34–35 of H. R. 912.)

K. Additional Veterans' Administration facilities, according to veteran population needs. (H. R. 981 by Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 54 of H. R. 912.)

L. Adjunct treatments to be liberalized. (H. R. 658 by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation (policy).

M. Provide pension of $60 per month to widows of war veterans who have died by reason of service-connected disability, or who have suffered permanent total combat disability. (H. R. 841, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, to increase widows' pensions to $60. H. R. 888, by Mr. Van Zandt, to include widows of total combat-disabled veterans with widows of veterans who died by reason of combat disabilities. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also secs. 19–20 of H. R. 912).

N. Provide pension of $50 per month to widows of deceased war veterans who were suffering from service-connected disability. (H. R. 915, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before his committee, partly provided for in H. R. 3356 in II D 2 above. Also sec. 23 of H. R. 912.)

1. Eliminate "needs" test. (H. R. 979, by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 26 of H. R. 912.)

O. Extend pensions to dependents of veterans who have suffered disabilities traceable to examination, or hospital treatment, or vocational training. (H. R. 942, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 28 of H. R. 912.)

P. Widows otherwise eligible for pensions to be eligible if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death, or, if being married, she gave birth to a child by the veteran. (H. R. 846, by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, chairman of Committee on Invalid Pensions and now before his committee. Also sec. 30 of H. R. 912.)

Q. Provide pensions to dependent parents of deceased service-connected disabled war veterans. (H. R. 915, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before his committee. Also sec. 22, 24, 25, 27, of H. R. 912.)

Mr. Speaker, many various objectives under the last principal point above are, it will be noted, embodied in the D. A. V. omnibus bill H. R. 912, introduced by my friend from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Each separate objective is also covered by a separate legislative bill as indicated.

This comprehensive program of the D. A. V. is well integrated, looking to the welfare of our country, our communities, and our comrades. By providing for the welfare of America's disabled defenders and their dependents we thereby help to promote, protect, and preserve America and its democratic institutions.

America will, of course, be able to continue to provide adequately for its disabled defenders and their dependents only if our democratic America is preserved. Victory in World War No. II is therefore regarded by the D. A. V. and all Americans as our primary objective. Adequate provisions for America's disabled defenders and their dependents are inevitably linked up with the protection, preservation, and promotion of America.

To see to it that worthy disabled veterans of all of America's wars, and their dependents, are enabled technically to establish their equitable claims for various types of benefits provided for by existing legislation, the D. A. V. has long maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization of full-time national-service officers—one or more in nearly every regional office of the Veterans' Administration.

Every American war veteran who has been wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of his active service in the armed forces is eligible for membership in this exclusive service-giving outfit. Every eligible ought to support its legislative and service activities by becoming a paid-up life member of the D. A. V. If he was born prior to January 1, 1902, he can do this by payment of $50 or, if born thereafter, by payment of $100 in cash, or by a down payment of $5, plus installments until fully paid.

Application and payment for D. A. V. life membership should be sent to my long-time friend, Vivian D. Corbly, national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, 2840 Melrose Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Patriots' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following resolution adopted May 1, 1944, by the Boston (Mass.) City Council, urging that April 19 of each year be proclaimed as Patriots' Day, to emphasize the significance of the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops of the War of the Revolution:

Whereas the 19th day of April, 1775, witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops and the opening events of the War of the Revolution and the struggles through which the Nation passed in the early days; and

Whereas the City of Boston played so important a part on that first patriots' day, and is concerned in strengthening general interest and knowledge of the historic events of that day which lighted the torch of American independence; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this great Nation arose, and a better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Boston City Council in session assembled hereby requests that favorable action be taken by the Judiciary Committee at Washington on House Joint Resolution 117 of 1943, introduced into the Congress of the United States by Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, asking that national recognition be given to this date by authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year as patriots' day, emphasizing the significance of the events that occurred on April 19, 1775, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the patriots who laid down their lives for the cause of independence; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Judiciary Committee of the Congress and to the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

Mrs. Alfred E. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of today:

MRS. ALFRED E. SMITH

It will be 44 years tomorrow since her marriage. The stroke is cruel. The long "bright day is done." The survivor's sole consolation is the deep religious faith and hope that are his as they were his wife's. Because he is the best-beloved citizen of New York, because his wife won the affection of many friends, this is a public sorrow and we may speak of it. The life of these two seems like an idyl of some happier world.

She, too, was a fourth warder, but her parents had moved up to the Bronx. Young Mr. Smith bicycled up there time and again. He was a long time winning her. The wedding journey was to Bath Beach, where they lived for a while. Then they came back from Brooklyn to Madison Street, to Peck Slip. The convent-bred girl washed, ironed, cooked, scrubbed, swept. Mr. Smith began his political career. Thereafter, whenever she could,

wherever he was speaking, she was in the audience. After his eye had found her he knew, as he said, that "he was all right."

Whatever honors came upon him, to whatever post he was called, she was equal to any duty or fortune. When he was a candidate for President the crowds in the cities which she visited with him gave her a friendly welcome. Whether she was doing her own housework or mistress of that somber palace, the Governor's Mansion, she was serene, living for her family, for others, for charity, for her church. In the turbulent stream of events the life of these two together is a gracious remembrance. The presses swarm with novels and romances. In none can be found anything half as pleasant and as touching as the game of cards that Mr. and Mrs. Smith played every night before bedtime.

The Smith-Connally Act and the Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as a friend of both labor and management I rise today to urge Congress to repeal the Smith-Connally Act and to do it immediately before the pernicious effects of that act become more widespread.

The act stands indicted and convicted of two major crimes against public welfare, as follows:

First. It has cast unwarranted reflection on the masses of American labor who have accomplished the greatest war-production record of all time.

Second. It is doing incalculable damage to the relations between Government and industry.

I have deep feelings on this score because as a citizen and as a representative of citizens I feel very keenly my obligation to do everything I possibly can to protect civil liberties and free enterprise and no matter what may come I am going to be true to that obligation.

To my mind there is one lesson the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant points clearly, and that is the advisability of repealing the Smith-Connally Act.

The President and Commander in Chief must, of course, have ample authority to deal with incidents that threaten the war effort but he has that ample authority under his other war powers and he does not need the extraplenary, ambiguous, and apparently all-embracing authority in the Smith-Connally Act which the Attorney General construed as the basis of his procedure in taking over the Montgomery Ward plant.

I voted against the Smith-Connally bill and on that occasion I gave out a statement in which I said:

> I think we ought to be recapturing the powers Congress has surrendered instead of augmenting those powers. When this war is over I want this country to be the same country of free enterprise it always has been and which, please God, may it always be.
>
> Yet no totalitarian ruler of Europe or Asia has more power over industry than this bill confers on the President of the United States. He can take over plants at will and hold them; his executive instrumentality, the War Labor Board, will write labor contracts all over the United States. I do not want Franklin D. Roosevelt or any other President of the United States to have any such power. I will not, as long as I am a Member of the House vote totalitarianism into the laws of the United States. It is altogether too dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to the President to say that he never asked for the authority which the antilabor groups in Congress, in an effort to strike at labor, thrust upon him. He opposed the passage of the Smith-Connally bill, and when the Congress passed it he vetoed it and it was passed over his head.

I think it is now pretty clear that the zeal of labor-baiters overreached itself when it forced the passage of the Smith-Connally Act. I imagine that in the light of the recent developments in the Montgomery Ward case many who formerly supported the Smith-Connally Act would now be reconciled to its repeal.

The uncertainty which the passage of the Smith-Connally Act has injected into the relations between Government and industry was by the Washington Evening Star in its leading editorial of April 28, 1944, from which I quote as follows:

> In taking over the plant, the President acted on the basis of an opinion by Attorney General Biddle that he had lawful authority to do so. A careful reading of the opinion, however, leaves many doubts on this score.
>
> The Attorney General relied in the first instance on the Smith-Connally Act, which empowers the President under certain conditions to seize "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith." It requires a considerable exercise of the imagination to fit the Montgomery Ward mail-order house into this category, and there is excellent reason to believe that Congress in passing the law had no thought that it would be applied to such an establishment.
>
> It also may be inferred that Mr. Biddle has doubts on this score, for his opinion goes on to express the view that, aside from any authority derived through the Smith-Connally Act, the President could lawfully seize the Montgomery Ward plant under "an aggregate of powers" that are "derived from the Constitution and from various (unspecified) statutes enacted by Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war."
>
> Unless it is proposed to abandon constitutional government in time of war, this assertion of vaguely defined power is an exceedingly dangerous doctrine. Where does the President's authority end? If he can seize a man's business and forcibly evict the operating head under his "aggregate of powers" and without regard to specific legislation enacted by Congress to deal with such situations, what protection has any citizen against wanton abuse of power?

Without in any way prejudging the case, I shall vote for an investigation of the Government's seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant. In a matter of such transcendent importance it is in the interest of labor, of management, of the Government, and of the people of America, that the facts should be immediately developed and the issues immediately clarified. Let the truth be brought out. If no wrong has been done the investigation can do no harm. If wrong has been done the facts should be known. No harm can ever come to the public by having the truth revealed through an impartial investigation. The investigation should be conducted openly, with unrestricted opportunity to the press to report all of the proceedings. It should be as thorough as possible, and it should be by the Congress of the United States to whom the people are looking for protection of their constitutional rights.

There has been much criticism of Congress for alleged failure to resist trends which many people believe threaten to change the form and mold of our Government. Here is a fine opportunity for Congress, the popular branch of government, to assert itself and to render real public service. Ours is a government by laws and must always remain so. This resolution does not condemn anybody or exonerate anybody. It merely provides for an impartial examination to establish the facts so that the people of America may know.

I want to know more about the Government's seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant. I want to know not only what the Government did but what the company did leading up to the dramatic culmination of its controversy with the Government. As an investigatorial duty it is a matter that very properly comes under the jurisdiction of Congress. I hope that Congress will see its duty and rise to its responsibility.

I am against a labor draft; but I go further and say that neither business nor labor must be regimented. I do not believe that there is any substitute for the American system of free enterprise. I am opposed to the Government entering any field of business that can be carried on by private business under the principle of free enterprise. Those are all questions that are involved directly or indirectly in the present controversy.

The investigation of the Montgomery Ward case should be as complete as human wisdom and efforts can make it, but we do not need to wait for its findings before we strike from the books an act of demonstrated potentiality for harm, both to the great body of organized labor which has made a magnificent record of war production, and to industry which must be protected and preserved if free enterprise is to survive. The immediate duty of Congress is to repeal the Smith-Connally Act, and I hope it will do so without any waste of time.

Election Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 4, 1944:

ELECTION TESTS

The people of Florida and of Alabama, even more than the two successful candidates for

senatorial renomination in those States, deserve congratulations on the outcome of Tuesday's primary contests. We are unreservedly glad that Senators PEPPER and HILL were renominated—not because they happen to be new dealers, but because the opposition to them was ugly, obscurantist, and essentially undemocratic. What was tested on Tuesday was neither the popularity of the administration nor of this particular pair of its supporters, but the intelligence of voters in the two States concerned. Happily the intelligence of the voters was equal to the test.

Rarely have election practices in the United States descended to so low a level of meanness and chicanery as during the campaigns just ended in Florida and Alabama. The wholly irrelevant issue of race was raised by those who strove to beat the incumbents. Whispered innuendoes and phony photographs were circulated to inflame racial prejudice. But when all this fog and poison cleared away, it was found that the people of Florida and Alabama hadn't succumbed. There is a good deal of vitality left in the democratic process, after all—not to say common sense in the American people.

The Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial taken from the Daily Pantagraph, Bloomington, Ill., under date of May 3, 1944.

This editorial is well worth reading by every Member of the House. It puts the finger directly to the point as to whether or not in this proposed congressional inquiry we will "press on into the fundamental constitutional powers of the President and propose definite bounds for it."

In the Montgomery Ward case we see where once again legal interpretations have been strained to favor one group while punishing another, and that the Attorney General and his aides are reading into the law things which were never the thought, intent, or purpose of Congress when the legislation was passed. In addition, it does seem that under the cloak of war, many unwarranted and uncalled-for steps are being taken as acts of favoritism and rather than these acts proving of any benefit to the war effort they are most definitely helping to break down national unity.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this matter needs a complete investigation and I wholeheartedly support the passage of this resolution.

The editorial follows:

A GREAT ISSUE FROM A LITTLE ONE

The only possible excuse for the seizure of Montgomery Ward was that the company's attitude regarding a labor union was interfering with the war. (The business itself was in full operation.)

Yet Attorney General Biddle argued before the court Monday that "no business of any kind is immune" from the President's power of seizure. Apparently, he would agree with the Montgomery Ward attorney who said that if the President could seize the Chicago store he could also seize a general store in Marshfield, Wis.

The President of the United States in time of war is one of the most powerful governmental leaders in the world. As Biddle argued, he does have a vast constitutional reserve of power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

But that is exactly the point. As Commander in Chief, he prosecutes the war and this embraces tremendous power over civilians. Does it, then, include the power of seizing a retail mail order house because it would not accede to a labor ruling?

Biddle seemed to sense the weakness of the Government's position for he went on to try and make a case for regarding Montgomery Ward as a war facility. The Smith-Connally act, which defines the President's power to seize plants, authorizes him to take over any "plant, mine, or facility equipped for manufacturing or mining of any materials used for the war effort or essential thereto." Biddle stressed the word "facility."

And yet, he retreated from this position too. "The essence of this case is based not upon the type of goods Montgomery Ward & Co. may or may not produce, not on a narrow construction of the law, but upon the whole history of Executive orders issued by the President. It is based upon the war emergency. . . ."

This seems to bring one back to the sweeping declaration that the President can seize any business in the country.

Despite the tangents, such as the precise meaning of the Smith-Connally law, this is the essence of the Montgomery Ward case. It is a war industry only by the furthest stretch of the imagination. A similar stretch would take in any kind of enterprise.

The Montgomery Ward case has deeply disturbed the people. The administration argues that the quarrel with a union was disturbing. But the administration's action is much more so. It has raised questions and created suspicions at a time when national unity should come before anything. This dangerous, ill-considered act has created an issue far greater than any involved in the original controversy about union maintenance.

If the court decides the president does have the power to seize any business in the country, regardless of its connection with the war, then the congressional inquiry now getting underway should not rest with a few hearings. It should press on into the fundamental constitutional powers of the President and propose definite bounds for it. The "vast constitutional reserve of power," if it is to be used recklessly, constitutes a danger to the people's liberties.

Acceleration of Peacetime Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1944:

ACCELERATION OF PEACETIME PROCEDURES

The intemperate protests of union spokesmen at Montgomery Ward should not serve to becloud the fact that the National Labor Relations Board, in ordering a representation election within 7 days, has acted with commendable speed to resolve one of the central issues in this extraordinary wartime controversy.

It is the function of the N. L. R. B. to determine the appropriate bargaining units and to conduct an election to ascertain whether the union has a majority in these units. From the practical standpoint, and without regard to legal questions concerning the validity of the seizure of the Chicago plant at the order of the President, the labor board election should settle the dispute. If the union wins in either or both of the designated units the objection which Montgomery Ward has interposed to negotiation of a new contract will disappear. And if the union loses that will automatically terminate its asserted right to represent the employees.

In these circumstances, and particularly in view of the resentment stirred up by the use of troops to take over the business, it was obviously desirable to dispose of the representation issue as quickly as possible. Hence, the N. L. R. B., invoking procedures which have been perfected for speeding up the handling of labor disputes presumed to bear on the prosecution of the war, arranged for a preliminary hearing in Chicago last Saturday. This hearing was completed on Monday and the transcript was flown to Washington and laid before the members of the national board on Tuesday morning. They completed their consideration of it that day and ordered that the election be held as early as possible or, in any event, within 7 instead of the usual 30 days.

This acceleration of peacetime procedures has brought excited protests from spokesmen for the union involved, one of them going to the extent of describing the order as "the dirtiest deal ever dished out to labor by the N. L. R. B." This is a complaint which can be discounted, however, for the N. L. R. B. does not "dish out dirty deals" to labor. There is every reason to believe that the arrangement provided for in the order is as fair to one party as to the other, and certainly it is in the interest of expediting the settlement of a dispute which has been hanging fire too long and which has caused an internal disruption in this country out of all proportion to its inherent importance.

The Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me I am including in my remarks two editorials, one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "The Ugly Case of Ward's" and the other from the St. Louis Star-Times entitled "The Montgomery Ward Seizure."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

THE UGLY CASE OF WARD'S

In the Montgomery Ward case, exception may be taken to the course of action of all of the three parties involved—the company itself, the labor union, and the Government.

The company and its president, Sewell Avery, have a bad record of intransigeance in wartime. In December 1942, after a prolonged controversy in which Avery became known as the John L. Lewis of industry, President Roosevelt ordered the company to comply with a War Labor Board ruling that it

sign a C. I. O. contract embodying a clause for maintenance of union membership.

At that time, there was no question that the union was the legal bargaining agent for the employees and, however strongly Avery felt about maintenance of union and however justified his position may have been in ordinary times, his last-ditch resistance to the W. L. B. brought down upon him the condemnation even of industry members of W. L. B.

Referring to the questionable advertisements published by Montgomery Ward at that time, Roger B. Lapham, steamship line head, said:

"Ward's has freedom of speech and the industry members of this Board also have freedom of speech, and they intend to use it to tell the truth and not a damn bunch of half truths."

Another industry member, Harry L. Derby of American Cyanamid, said:

"Montgomery Ward has done the greatest disservice to industry and the private enterprise system of any concern in the United States, and I feel that just as strongly as I can."

The latest position of Montgomery Ward will necessarily be read in the context of its past attitude toward W. L. B., although the present dispute has some different aspects.

The company now is able to question whether the union does in fact represent the majority of the employees and is, therefore, the employees' legal bargaining agent.

Under the circumstances, the position of the union is subject to criticism. First, why has it resisted an election or other test which would determine exactly its rights under the National Labor Relations Act? If it had been able to make a clear showing that it continues to be the legal bargaining agent of the employees, the company's position today would hardly be defensible.

Second. The union can be criticized for going on strike in time of war in violation of unionism's no-strike pledge. However great the provocation, and it must be recalled here that the union is dealing with a very hostile management, the union is not nearly in as good case now as it would have been if it had disciplined itself in the difficult situation by which it was confronted.

In seizing the plant of a commercial company not a war industry in the strict sense of the term, the Government has brought into question certain legal and constitutional questions that are not at all clear, despite Attorney General Biddle's opinion.

The Attorney General himself was at pains to write that opinion. He had to fall back on that uncharted no-man's land of Presidential war powers. He had to say:

"In time of war, when the existence of the Nation is at stake, this aggregate of powers (conferred by Constitution and statute) includes authority to take reasonable steps to prevent Nation-wide labor disturbances that threaten to interfere seriously with the conduct of the war."

Many lawyers will question the shotgun nature of Mr. Biddle's opinion. He and the Government would be in much better case if he could point to the language of the War Labor Disputes Act or any other statute and show, without doubt, that the President's powers in this case are specifically outlined. The nearest approach to the specific was citation of a section of the law saying the President may take action in any dispute that might interrupt work that contributes to the effective prosecution of the war. The application of this clause to the present case is doubtful.

So with the legal basis of the Government's action cast in doubt, with the union's position impaired by its walk-out, and with the company branded with intransigeance in time of war, the picture is not pretty.

It is only fair to the union and to the Government to say that the ugly situation in Chicago could have been avoided if Sewell Avery had not, on two occasions, set himself stubbornly against the Government in wartime.

We repeat he has a perfect right to insist that maintenance of union is the opening door to the closed shop, to which he is opposed on principle. He has a perfect right to cite his construction of the law. He has a perfect right to make the strongest kind of case before the W. L. B.

But there are values involved here that rise above all these things. These values concern the proper behavior of parties to a controversy in wartime. Many employers have, in the interest of national unity and patriotism, swallowed W. L. B. rulings that are distasteful to them. They have temporarily surrendered principles and abandoned strong legal positions because they believed they owed it to the country not to cause harmful distractions from the war effort.

In the light of the sacrifices other private businesses have made and of the discipline they have imposed upon themselves, Sewell Avery and Montgomery Ward have done the country a disservice.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

THE MONTGOMERY WARD SEIZURE

In the seizure by the Government of the great mail-order house of Montgomery Ward & Co. the country witnesses an unhappy failure of national and private interests to attain the harmonious cooperation essential in wartime. From the soldier at the front to the board of directors' rooms, the war has demanded sacrifices and has altered the pattern of peacetime behavior.

The 2-year-long quarrel between Ward and the War Labor Board was dramatically climaxed yesterday when a truckload of military police physically took over the huge retail store. A total of only 13 property seizures by the Government, during more than 2 years of war, indicates that in the main we have solved our differences without carrying executives kicking and squirming from their offices.

No one interested in the inviolability and health of our democratic institutions as they bear upon both the rights of men and those of property can brush aside the assertion of Ward's that it is a nonwar enterprise and that its seizure represents a dangerous expansion of arbitrary power over property by government.

But there should be no leaping to conclusions either from the springboard of union sympathies or of antagonism to the Roosevelt administration. The facts on both sides should be soberly appraised.

Mr. Roosevelt ordered seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. under the War Disputes Act. Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, one of the co-authors of the act, has stated that he never contemplated its application to such an establishment as that of Ward. Nevertheless the President acted under a specific provision, section 3, of this measure. This section states that the act applies to "any dispute" that "might interrupt work that contributes to the effective prosecution of the war."

If there is no basis for the Government's position that the big mail-order house contributes to the "effective prosecution of the war," then the Government has clearly exceeded the powers granted it by Congress and has entered dangerous ground. Here the evidence is by no means one-sided. Fundamentally Montgomery Ward is a retailer of peacetime commodity goods. But apparently Sewell L. Avery, militant, intransigent executive for the company, solicited priorities on many occasions on the contention that its business contributed to the war.

Attorney General Biddle, in his ruling that the President possessed the power to make the seizure under the Smith-Connally Act, stated that priority rating had been granted Ward for materials used by them in the manufacture of farm pumps, separators, paint, wire, and chains. The W. P. B. held that these commodities were essential to the war effort.

Also bearing on this central issue is the fact that the War Labor Board was unanimous in accepting jurisdiction in the Ward dispute. It was apparently the conclusion of the industry and public members of the Board, as well as the union members, that Ward was a business connected with the war.

Biddle, some critics will say, will furnish the President with any interpretation he wants. Possibly there is some tendency on the part of Biddle to weight his interpretations on the side of New Deal ideology. But in this case we have, in addition to Biddle's ruling, the decision of the W. L. B. and the requests of Mr. Avery himself for priorities.

This newspaper opposed the Smith-Connally Act as unfair and dangerous, both to labor and to property. During the debate on this measure we predicted that property would find itself frequently being seized. A measure designed to invade some of labor's legitimate rights is now boomeranging against the rights of property. Representative SMITH is entirely right when he states today he never intended that the War Disputes Act would authorize such seizures as that in Chicago yesterday.

The very nub of the present dispute, of course, is the failure of labor and management to compose their differences. This failure was the basis of the Smith-Connally Act itself. It is the basis of the long dispute between Ward and the C. I. O., which finally resulted in Ward being trapped by a bill drafted by a Congressman who himself was uncompromising toward labor and thought he was forging a weapon to be used against unions.

A powerful case can be made out, both for and against the maintenance-of-union order, the occasion for most of Ward's resistance to the W. L. B. That was not, however, the immediate issue that brought about the seizure of Ward. The final straw was the company's refusal to continue in force a C. I. O. contract at least until a new one could be negotiated. Here was a point where Ward might have compromised, and, in the interest of industrial peace, conformed to the decrees of our wartime agencies, seeking redress in the courts. Even the conservative New York Herald Tribune denounced the company's position on this score. In explanation of its refusal to compromise this point Montgomery Ward claims that the union has refused to show that it is the majority choice of the employees by either a card check or an election. The company offers to continue the wages, hours, and others terms of the expired contract.

Also, one can hardly overlook, without seeking full information, the charge that the administration used the Post Office Department to help win the strike for the union. It is alleged that the Post Office removed its 70 employees to cripple its service, and even refused to deliver incoming mail. These charges, if true, should become the subject of a congressional investigation and the full findings made public. If agencies of the Federal Government are being used to help either side in a strike, the public should be in full possession of the facts prior to the next time the voters express themselves at the polls.

It is plain that the right and wrong of this situation is not all on either side, and it is strongly indicated that neither Government nor Ward comes into court with lily-white hands. Meanwhile the war must get on. After all, there is an invasion in the offing.

Fair Employment Practices Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to read last night an Associated Press report that the Committee on Labor would be called into session next week to consider hearings on bills to create a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. That my stand may be made very clear, I want to announce my opposition to the creation of any such commission, either permanent or temporary. I believe it to be a waste of the committee's valuable time to even consider hearings on such a ridiculous subject.

Today I have directed a letter to the honorable chairman of the Committee on Labor which expresses my views. Under unanimous consent, I include the contents of this letter at this point as a part of my remarks:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1944.

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman, Committee on Labor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: Through the Associated Press I learned last night that you plan to call the Committee on Labor in closed session to determine whether to hold hearings on bills introduced by Representative DAWSON et al., that would create a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee.

As a member of your committee, this is to here and now place myself on record as being opposed to hearings on any such asinine measure.

The F. E. P. C. was conceived in sin and born in inequity. It is the rottenest, vilest, most communistic infested agency of this regulated Government. It is doing nothing but fanning the flame of race hatred and dividing our people when the very soul of our Government is at stake in a colossal war. It has for its purpose the further regulation of a free people. I don't know about yours but I do know that my constituents are tired of being regulated. It has about reached the revolting point. Every mail brings to them further Government regulations. The old mantel clock no longer beats a quiet "tick tock, tick tock," but a rapid "regulate, regulate, regulate, regulate," until the nerves and stamina of the Nation are at the breaking point. The Government now regulates labor, agriculture, commerce, business, mail-order houses, prices, food, clothing, hours, wages, exempting only bridge prizes and ping pong. It even forcibly acts as a stake holder for a large portion of the salaried incomes. We are regulated to death.

Now these so-called uplifters seek, through a permanent F. E. P. C., to regulate the personnel of business by forcing the hire of so many Negroes, Chinamen, gentiles, Jews, etc. When and if this regulation goes into permanent effect, we will thereafter be confronted with further break-downs of so many blacks, so many chocolates, so many tans, so many yellows, or so many full-bloods or half-blooded Chinamen, or, even quarter-bloods. And then why not so many Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Catholics, etc.?

I repeat, my people are tired of being regulated. For the sake of our Nation, its fighting forces, let's not use your committee to further regulate our people or be a party to further fanning the flame of race hatred.

Incidentally, we have some war industry antistrike bills pending before your committee. It might not be a bad idea, while we are regulating, to have some hearings on these. I think the soldier boys would appreciate it and so invite your attention.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
Member of Congress.

Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote today for the resolution directing a congressional investigation of the seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant in Chicago. In my judgment this seizure was illegal and unjustified.

Congress did not intend, when it passed the Smith-Connally Act, to confer upon the President power to seize other than war industries to prevent strikes and mercantile establishments such as Montgomery Ward were not included or intended to be included in the powers conferred upon the President.

A discussion of the issues and incidents involved in this seizure are contained in an editorial appearing in the Dallas News of May 2, 1944, which, under leave granted, is herewith submitted:

MONTGOMERY WARD CASE

It is easy to go off half-cocked on an issue so involved as that in the Montgomery Ward case. Biased statements obscure facts even for those who want to look from the objective viewpoint. Yet some of the facts and conclusions are obvious.

Chairman Sewell L. Avery contends that not more than one-fifth of the workers involved would vote for the union. Labor officials contend that they have practically 100 percent support. If the latter are right, why did they not consent to the election which should have been held under War Labor Board regulations? The corporation has offered to abide by an election and its opposition to the Government is based upon failure of the Government to see that the election is held.

Two issues have been raised which transcend the present local controversy. One is brought about by the Attorney General's specious argument that Montgomery Ward is a war industry because "the maintenance of a healthy, orderly, and stable civilian economy is essential to military effort." Under this theory, the whole Nation's economy is swept under presidential dictatorship over war industry. The Supreme Court has said in substance that the meaning of an act is what Congress had in mind in writing and passing it. In conferring the wartime powers, Congress did not mean what Attorney General Biddle now reads into the act. To put this interpretation upon the act makes the President virtual dictator of the Nation's economy. And this he actually is if he has the authority to direct the military forces to throw the head of a civilian corporation bodily out of his office on no other authority than Executive ukase.

The second general issue raised by the incident is the increasing obviousness of the President's lopsided policy as between labor and management. The outstanding example of defiance of government order by as individual is by no means this of Sewell L. Avery who refused to leave his desk—who simply took the defensive position against what he considered unfair Government action—but John L. Lewis who aggressively defied the Government. Yet at no time during the controversy did a military force or any other agency of law enforcement go near Mr. Lewis.

It is argued on behalf of the President that, when the case was placed before him, he had no other alternative than to uphold the authority of the Government. There is a measure of truth in this; and there is also an answer to it. It was Attorney General Biddle who said some months ago that the Roosevelt administration is a "labor government." Remembering this, it is easy to see why the course of events has run to its present end. The Secretary of Labor in certifying the case to the W. L. B., the W. L. B. in placing it before the President and the President in resorting to forceful eviction of Mr. Avery have each seen the need of upholding not only the prestige of the United States Government but also the "labor government." They did not want to lose face, and therefore votes, with the bloc that we may assume to be the core of the administration's support. The present general reaction ought to be a warning to the administration even in the matter of maintaining its political prestige.

It is also argued that Mr. Avery, even granting that he was right, should have bent to the need of harmony in the hour of national crisis and complied under protest as he did before. There is more substance in this contention. To have done so, of course, Mr. Avery would have necessarily overlooked the instance of Mr. Lewis' very aggressive noncompliance by which he won his point.

It seems that the issue might still be solved by simple compliance with the regulations of the W. L. B. that the company insists upon. If not, the case should be tried in the courts and if the courts find, on the basis of law, that the President has unwarrantedly wide power over civilian economy, then Congress should give the law its attention.

Address of Gov. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, to the Independent Petroleum Association of America, Bradford, Pa., April 27, 1944:

Mr. President and fellow Americans, it is a pleasure and an honor to welcome to Pennsylvania the representatives of one of America's greatest industries. The oil business is not only vital in war and peace, but it is typically American.

Its development represents all the greatness of the pioneer spirit in this Nation.

You men represent what we call the American way. It is the way of initiative, hard work, and willingness to make sacrifices. In that way business has been built up by men willing to risk and work. They went out into the rough, hard places and lived the hard way to find new fields. They developed the oil industry under the American doctrine of the incentive plan.

Our forefathers knew they were taking the hard way when they came to America. Rich or poor, artisan or gentleman, they knew it was a hard way.

William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania, born 300 years ago, knew the way would be hard. He belonged to the ruling class of his time, but in his heart he wanted to set up a government of justice, good will, nonviolence, and recognition of the rights of the individual. He knew the wilderness must be conquered to make a home for that government. Had his ideas been universally accepted we would not now be defending our way of life on the sea and land and in the air, in every part of the world.

Penn came to Pennsylvania. Other men had come to Virginia and New England. They were God-fearing people. They all wanted to escape from fear and want through their own efforts. They wanted the opportunity to live their own lives and make their own way.

They were self-reliant. They found their own food, built their own homes, their own schools, their own churches, and their own welfare institutions. They worked out the first form of government, wherein certain great freedoms—particularly freedom to pursue happiness—were safeguarded.

In shaping this great country that is our birthright, they conquered a savage race, a wide wilderness, great rivers, mountains, and endless prairies. They had courage, patience, and a willingness to work and sacrifice.

The oil industry pioneers and develops rugged individualists. It conquers new frontiers just as our fathers conquered a continental wilderness. America made strong men then, and it can make strong men now.

You know the magnificent story of the development of the oil business. It is an American epic.

Drake's discovery well near Titusville in 1859 did more to revolutionize the world than any other single discovery. Nowhere was the impact so great as on the strategy and tactics of war. Not since the discovery of gunpowder had anything so greatly changed the very face of warfare.

Speed revolutionizes the strategy of war. Getting men and materials to a strategic position ahead of the enemy wins battles and decides campaigns. It does so with less loss in blood and material.

Swift transportation of units is the key to winning this war. Planes, tanks, trucks, and guns depend upon oil and the highest quality of oil.

It is history that the winner of a war is usually the nation that controls its own sources of supply.

The most critical items in modern war are food, oil, and ships. We have the greatest Navy in the world. We have the greatest production of food. We have the world's greatest oil fields; the best refineries; the most skilled workers, and best transportation for both raw and finished products.

In 1938 the United States produced 61 percent of the world's oil. Of the oil produced outside the United States, one-fourth was produced by American capital.

We dream that this may be the last war in human history, but it will not be. As long as we have aggressor nations we will have war.

We can, however, make war less likely by certain common-sense precautions, by training men and by planning for supply. We have the food, the transportation, and the greatest output of oil. We should develop these advantages not for making war but for preserving peace.

War demands are terrific now and will be in the future. It takes 80 times as much gasoline in this war as it did in World War No. 1. Including gasoline, 50,000,000 gallons of oil products go to the fighting forces every day.

We have so far produced 28,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition, planes at the rate of 100,000 a year, and 30,000 boats of various sizes since the war started. Included are more than 600 combat ships for the Navy; 1,250,000 trucks, more than 50,000 tanks, and high-octane gas at a rate never dreamed of by our enemies.

Oil products are required to produce and to operate all this equipment. The oil industry will do this job if given the opportunity.

What are some of the things that will give us an adequate supply of oil?

Incentive is one of them. Men take chances and work harder to secure a profit. This may be in the form of better wages or a return on invested capital.

The profit is an incentive for men to develop new fields of production and to increase the output of old fields.

Since Americans work by the incentive plan, there is only one way by which oil production can be stimulated. That is by an increase in price.

Just what would this mean? The cost of this war is running into tens of billions. Production for war, regardless of patriotism, has depended upon wages and prices. An increase of 50 cents per barrel would add no more than $700,000,000 yearly to American production costs, and it would speed up production, keep the industry healthy, and insure the necessary profits and good wages to employees.

New fields must be found year after year. Old ones must be continuously developed. In the Pennsylvania fields, for example, methods must be found to recover a greater percentage of oil from the sands.

The record of wholesale prices in this country indicates what an advance in the price of oil would mean as a stimulant to production.

In November 1941, using 1926 prices as equaling a basis of 100, farm products sold a little above 90 and in November 1943 at a little above 110. Metal products on the same dates were about equal to 103. Food in November 1941 was a little above 89 and in November 1943 a little above 105.

Petroleum and its products in November 1941 were a little above 60 and remained at that price in November 1943.

Retail commodity prices for the same dates, using 1923 prices as 100, show about the same picture. Food in November 1941 was a little above 92 and in November 1943 a little higher than 106. Clothing in November 1941 was a little more than 79 and in November 1943 was 88½.

Gasoline in November 1941, was a little above 66 and in November 1943, a little above 68. In brief, the present price of petroleum is clearly out of line with other commodities used by Americans in the war effort.

An increase in price is necessary to keep up production.

The proposed Arabian pipe line may easily lead us into a third world war. It will cost American taxpayers not less than $160,000,000. Nobody knows what it will actually cost. This money for the prosecution of the war can be much better used in the development of our own home fields. Arabia is on the other side of the world. Always remember that armies and nations should retain control of their source of supplies.

We need improved techniques in the development of new oil reserves and in the production of fields now in operation. The methods that were in use during 1917 and 1918, in World War No. 1, recovered less than one-third of the oil we produce by present methods. There is no reason why future methods cannot considerably increase production.

This is true also in refining. The present 100 percent octane gasoline was so expensive 10 years ago that its use was impossible. Now private enterprise has developed the process so that it can be more economically produced than was the poorest quality of gasoline 10 years ago.

The oil potentialities of the United States are much greater than is generally understood. Defeatist Americans, who would destroy American initiative, insist that the supply is so limited that it will be gone in a few years. That is not true.

We must depend upon private enterprise for our production. Subsidies for oil or any other commodity is not sound governmental policy. It may be necessary in a grave emergency but only in such an emergency.

The oil game is pioneering. Our American pioneers in the industry have shown all over the world that our methods are the best. We know how to get results. We can take care of the situation if we are given the "go sign."

The New Deal and its economic Fascists want to control the oil business. That must be prevented.

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the United States occupied only 7.3 percent of the territory and had but 6.9 percent of the population of the world. It did have 30 percent of the railways, 54 percent of the power, 63 percent of the oil, 70 percent of the radios, 80 percent of the motorcars, and two-thirds of the wealth of the world

It had these things because of its able management and skilled workers, and these skilled workers and that able management had been developed by the free enterprise system of the United States.

And what was the result of that free enterprise plan in war production?

An aroused America has produced oil, tanks, ships, planes, guns, trucks, munitions, and food in 2 years' time equaling the best efforts of Germany in 9 years, Russia in 20 years, and Japan in 25 years. In addition we have lent and leased to our allies much of the equipment they have so gloriously used against our enemies.

This policy of free enterprise can still continue and it should continue to make this Nation secure.

We will win this war but there is something more that should command the attention of American businessmen.

Back in the twenties we all wanted to be on "easy street." In the thirties we were scared. Everybody, business groups, chambers of commerce, labor unions, States, and cities rushed headlong to Washington for Federal help.

Now we all go to Washington after a war plant. When the war ends we are likely to hurry to Washington, demanding that these plants shall remain open, and that, if necessary, Washington shall pour more money into them to keep them alive.

That is not the way we made America great. America became great because our people had the courage to seek liberty rather than security.

Individual initiative made this the finest and strongest country under the sun.

I sincerely believe the salvation of America depends upon maintaining free enterprise at home. This proven system stood up in the crisis. In cooperation with the Government acting as a great umpire and arbiter, it can shape the plans that will absorb all the labor in this country.

Free men and free women made us the most powerful people on this earth. We have done more for the people of the world than has any other nation in history. We have extended goodwill, progress, and religion to the remote ends of the earth.

Our purpose in this war should be to retain our greatness as a people so that we may further extend progress, religion, goodwill, and the blessings of peace when the war ends.

This should be our contribution in preserving the peace of the world.

Inflation and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by me at the annual meeting of Academy of World Economics, Washington, D. C., May 5, 1944, at Brookings Institution:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have here some facts and some figures about inflation. I think this is the time and the place to draw these figures to public attention. I think it must be done to prevent any premature relaxation of effort on our part.

I am afraid there is a feeling out through the country that the war is drawing to a close and that surely we can start now to relax our efforts. I am no authority on the war. I have no knowledge of when it may end. I can hope that it will end shortly, but I certainly have no reason to believe that it will. All I can find out from the War Department is that by far the worst of the war lies ahead and that in the invasion to come we will have all the experiences that we have had during our 2 years of war, but they will come condensed into days and weeks instead of months and years. If all goes well in this invasion, we will be a very fortunate nation. If the invasion does not go well—we must never forget that it may not go at all well, for our record of fighting back the Nazis is not such that the doubt is erased—if, as I say, the invasion does not go well, we may get our first real taste of war in the days to come, and such corollary projects as the control of inflation may become far more important, instead of far less important, in the last half of 1944.

Up to this time we have done an extraordinary job in controlling inflation. I think the job we have done is in itself inclined to make us overconfident. We think because we have whipped a substantial problem that perhaps a problem did not ever exist.

I can assure you, gentlemen, that the problem did exist and does exist. In every nation of the world where war exists, or which war has touched, there has been inflation.

The cost of living has risen since the outbreak of the war in Europe by 29 percent in England. It has risen from 130 to 600 percent in the Near East, and from about 50 to 100 percent in Latin-American countries. Our own record has been the best of the lot. As in the case of Great Britain, we have had effective controls, and our total rise in the cost of living has been 23 percent.

The nature of the fundamental pressures which make for inflation is common to all wars, but these pressures have been more intensified in the case of this war than in the case of any other of which we have record.

In the eighteenth century wars were playthings of monarchs, conducted on the boundaries and in the far reaches of their realms. They were scarcely felt in the metropolitan centers and were not felt at all in the countryside in the heart of their kingdoms. Even the Napoleonic wars did not fundamentally disrupt this pattern, although the French levy in mass marked the first step toward the modern concept of total war.

The nineteenth century was, for the most part, a century of peace. During the whole of it, however, there was growing up the highly developed technology and the intensified spirit of nationalism which, between them, were destined to make present-day war so deadly and so total.

This country entered the First World War late and never felt its full impact, yet the economic intensity of war had been so increased by the developments of the preceding century that during the First World War about 25 percent of this country's gross national product went into the war effort.

The present war has involved a far greater aggregate economic effort than the last war and the proportion of the total effort put forth by the United States has been much greater. The money expense of the United States thus far in the war has been about $185,000,000,000, or more than five times the total current money cost to this country of the last war.

Every dollar spent now means more, too, than it did in the last World War. It is, of course, impossible to compare the value of a dollar spent in fabricating a tank or a plane in this war with that spent in fabricating a tank or a plane in the last war. Any tank or plane made during the last war would be junk in this war. But compare the cost of one or two basic war materials: Copper which costs 12 cents a pound now sold as high as 26 cents a pound in 1918; steel billets which cost $34 a ton now sold as high as $47.50 a ton in 1918; and today's billets are better.

Our gross national product is about 3 times as great as it was at the time of the last war, but the war effort is absorbing twice as large a proportion of it. Today about 50 cents out of every dollar of our gross national product goes into the war effort.

Consider for a moment what this means. About half of the labor force of the country, measured by the value of its product, is engaged in producing goods and services for use in the war effort. The other half is engaged in producing goods and services for civilians. Both halves are paid. They receive money incomes and at the best rates of pay in the history of the country. All producers receive these money incomes, yet only half of them are producing goods and services on which the incomes can be spent. This is the problem of wartime inflation.

The certainty of the development of this problem of inflation could be foreseen, and was foreseen, by the President as soon as France fell and the war clouds commenced to gather around the United States.

To foresee it, required only common sense. To act upon it, required political courage. The President had both and did both.

At the very beginning of the defense program he took two steps: He appointed a member of the Advisory Committee of the Council for National Defense to watch the prices of the commodities likely to be affected by the defense program, and he asked Congress to enact an excess-profits tax. Both of these steps were generally applauded by the country. Congress gave the excess-profits tax expeditious consideration, and it was enacted and signed into law on October 8, 1940.

Many voices raised at that time urged that stronger measures should be taken to check the speculative boom. But the President had the wisdom to see that the problem of inflation could not become serious or general in its incidence until the unemployed labor and resources of the country were set fully to work. He, therefore, asked for no measures additional to those just mentioned, and concentrated on the goals of raising the national income and achieving full employment.

For a year after the inauguration of the defense program national income and employment rose rapidly. Production of both war goods and peace goods was increasing apace. The bottle neck to a more rapid increase in the production of war goods was not competition with the producers of peace goods for the general run of labor and materials, however, but was still mainly technological—principally the time required to produce machine tools and plant capacity for making new products. Consequently, no measures generally restrictive of peacetime production were necessary and none were applied.

During this period the country received a foretaste of the spirit which was to set the economic development of this war off from that of its predecessor. Mr. Leon Henderson, who had been appointed to the function of watching prices, was keeping up a continuous survey of developments in this field, but had no statutory or other authority to fix prices or control the production of commodities. He was nevertheless able, because of the fine cooperation which he received from the producers of basic materials, to keep the prices of these commodities down by voluntary agreements. The country was treated to the spectacle, never seen before, of the prices of those very commodities which formed the basis of the defense preparations and which, therefore, might have been expected to be the spearheads of inflation—commodities such as copper, steel, and aluminum—become instead the bastions of price stabilization.

The voluntary agreements which held down the prices of these basic commodities were made possible by a general conviction, shared by all segments of the public, that the national necessity should not be made the occasion for any avoidable increases in prices, or for any excessive profits. It is this conviction—so different from that which has prevailed in earlier wars—which has made the policy of price stabilization possible, and has given it such deep roots in the sentiments of the people.

By the middle of 1941, the defense program had progressed to a point where it appeared that competition between peace goods and war goods for the available supply of labor and materials would soon be holding back the rate of increase in the production of war goods. At the same time there commenced to become apparent a general upward pressure on prices, because of increased incomes, and because of the growing inroads of defense production on the supply of goods and services available for civilian consumption.

Several steps were taken by the administration to combat these tendencies. In May 1941 the Treasury commenced a popular sales campaign for Defense Savings bonds, in order to drain off some of the growing purchasing power of the economy into United States securities. In August, the Federal Reserve Board, pursuant to an Executive order of the President, promulgated regulation W to tighten the terms of installment selling of durable goods, and so bring demand and supply more into line.

Most important, the President, on July 30, asked Congress to enact a Price Control Act, to give statutory authority to the voluntary agreements by which prices had hitherto been kept down, and so make possible an extension of the scope of the controls to industries with large numbers of individual producers, in which voluntary agreements were not feasible.

During the 2 years from August 1939 until the President asked for the passage of the Price Control Act, the cost of living rose a total of 7 percent, or an average of about thirty-one one hundredths of 1 percent a

month. This was the period during which our unemployed productive resources were being put back to work. It was a period of relatively light inflationary pressure and few controls, outside of voluntary price agreements in the basic industries.

About the middle of 1941, the growing inflationary pressures began to forge ahead of the forces making for stability, and prices rose one and five one-hundredths of 1 percent a month during the 6 months while the Price Control Act was under consideration by Congress.

Commencing with Pearl Harbor, the war expenditures of the United States shot sharply upward. Spendable incomes increased and the available supply of goods and services contracted. Based on past precedent, prices should have surged upward at a redoubled pace. What actually happened was quite different, however, and provides one explanation of the remarkable fact, which I mentioned earlier in this paper, that so far in this war the price increases in the principal belligerent nations have actually been lower than those in many nonbelligerent countries.

War tremendously increases inflationary pressures. But like Pandora's box—which, when opened, brought so many troubles into the world—it has also brought us the spirit necessary to hold these pressures under control. This spirit is apt to be insufficient or lacking in nonbelligerent countries, and this is one reason why these countries have often borne up less well under their usually lower pressures than the warring nations have under their heavier ones. From this fact, the warring countries themselves may well take warning when their spirit flags and threatens to wilt in the heat of internal partisan dissension.

Even before Congress passed the Price Control Act in January 1942, the cooperation of industry permitted setting up the machinery of price control, and this machinery became more effective following the final passage of the act. At the same time, the increased spirit of cooperation for the common good, brought about by actual participation in the war, permitted the Treasury to organize its pay-roll-savings plan for drawing off excess purchasing power for investment in United States securities, and has made possible an ever more successful series of war loan campaigns, whereby a larger and larger proportion of the purchasing power pressing on the available supplies of goods and services has been invested in United States Government securities.

You will note that so far I have said nothing about credit control. Credit control used to mean a general tightening of money-market conditions, thereby forcing up interest rates. This was supposed to discourage borrowers, and so check inflation. Great store was set on this method by the economists and statesmen of the last generation.

It ought to be clear, however, that this method of controlling credit expansion cannot be effective when the Government itself is the principal borrower and is borrowing for the purpose of financing a war. Such borrowing can be reduced only by increased taxation. It cannot be reduced by the process of the Government raising interest rates against itself, and it is hard to believe that as late as the last World War this was supposed to be good counsel. The finance ministers of every belligerent have now learned better and so have the great body of economists, although I regret to say that there are a few of the latter who have not learned their lesson and lag behind the body of their profession.

Our thinking has advanced further in this war. We have seen that credit control to be effective must be selective, and must operate only to discourage borrowing for purposes not connected with the war effort. Regulation W of the Federal Reserve Board, which I have already mentioned, is a regulation of this type. So also are Regulations T and U dealing with security loans. Each of these has been effective in its field. Although the experience of this war has shown that the most effective means of credit control is that operating through priorities and allocations applied at the physical level.

The relative effectiveness of today's selective method of credit control, as compared with the shotgun method of the last war, is shown by the fact that the total loans and discounts of all commercial banks which rose by over $4,000,000,000 between June 20, 1917, and June 30, 1919, have declined by over $2,000,000,000 so far during our participation in this war.

Nevertheless, considered in the broader prospective, credit control has been relatively unimportant so far during this war compared with direct price and rationing controls. It is possible that this situation may be reversed during the reconversion period after the war, however, and if this should prove to be the case, I hope that the selective-credit controls which may then be necessary will be administered and received by the people in as good a spirit as the direct price and rationing controls are today.

As a result of the various measures which have been taken, despite the vastly increased inflationary pressures, prices rose only 72/100 of 1 percent a month from the passage of the Price Control Act until the President's hold-the-line order of April 1943. Since then, they have not advanced at all.

This record has been made possible only by the wholehearted cooperation of the people in the objective of price stabilization. It is easy, in the petty annoyances of today, to forget what this spirit has meant, and still means, to the cost of the war and to the position of the people of the United States now and for generations to come.

According to the recent testimony of Mr. Chester Bowles before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, if prices of war materials had risen as far and as fast this time as they did in World War No. 1, this war would have cost $65,000,000,000 more than it had up to the end of 1943. The dislocations incident to this price rise would have caused endless bickering between labor and management, and among producers of different commodities. At the best, these bickerings would have slowed down production; at the worst, they would have produced labor disturbances throttling major industries. In return for these wartime troubles, our only reward would have been a devastating post-war deflation leaving unemployment and ruin in its wake.

But so far we have held the line, and are in a position to turn over to the post-war generation a debt many billion dollars smaller than it would have been without efficient controls, and a price and wage structure under which they can operate without ruinous deflation.

I hope that I do not speak too soon, however, for our price-control structure faces a great test during the next 6 months. Price control is unfortunately becoming a partisan issue. In district after district and in State after State, Republican candidates for office are running on platforms of more gas, more tires, more sugar, higher prices for their constituents' products, lower taxes, and down with all bureaucrats.

These platforms are not put together in a conscious effort to wreck the country's war effort, but they do add up to just that. They are not put together with any object at all, save to elect the candidates, and the easiest way to do this seems to be to tell the people that their sacrifices are needless and are imposed only for the pleasure of sadistic bureaucrats; to tell them that they can relax and still win. No, the platforms are not consciously designed to wreck the war effort; they are simply Irresponsibility, written with a capital "I."

The Democratic Party has no monopoly on patriotism, but it seems in danger of having such a monopoly forced upon it. We do not want it. If the price-control program is wrecked by the efforts of petty politicians—and I say this irrespective of the offices which they seek—to secure their own elections by persuading the people that the real sacrifices of war are undergone only to please the whimsies of bureaucrats, this country will pay the bill for decades to come.

Let me close with this thought: Wars have always brought in their train pestilence and inflation. More men have died of disease than from enemy action, and more economic havoc has been wrought by inflation than by the laying waste of cities.

The advance of medicine has now nearly wiped out the dread horseman of pestilence. This preventive medicine, however, has its inconveniences. Arms must be jabbed with hypodermic needles, and it hurts. Water must be boiled, and it is a nuisance. Attractive native fruits and vegetables must be avoided, and it is a sacrifice. Do the boys believe that the nurses prick them with needles for the pleasure of it? Do they call the medical officers "bureaucrats" and blame them because disease germs are virulent?

Modern techniques of price control have also made great strikes against the fifth horseman of inflation. Against greater pressures than ever before inflation here in the United States has been held to smaller proportions than in any other major war.

But price stabilization has its annoyances, too. Shoes and gasoline and sugar must be rationed. We must observe price ceilings. Our accounts are sometimes blocked at department stores. Taxes are higher, and we are asked to buy War bonds. These sacrifices are required for the war effort and the economic welfare of the country. They are no more for the personal gratification of Mr. Bowles, Mr. Vinson, and Mr. Morgenthau than the jabs in the arms of the boys are for the gratification of the Army Medical Corps. If they continue to be made partisan issues, God help the country.

Drifting Away From the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun of April 15, 1944:

DRIFTING AWAY FROM THE CONSTITUTION?—SUPREME COURT'S DEPARTURES FROM PRECEDENT DECISIONS ATTRIBUTED TO DANGEROUS ZEAL FOR FLEXIBILITY

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: The decision handed down by the United States Supreme Court relative to the Texas primaries, like so many other of its recent opinions, shows an increasing restiveness under the restraints of written constitutions. I hold no brief for the Texas plan to bar Negroes from the Democratic primary, but I am very much disturbed by the method chosen to assure their civil rights.

During the past 10 years if an abuse existed, whether real or imaginary, the New Deal majority in the Congress felt impelled to apply its own particular remedy, without showing too much concern for the provisions of the Federal Constitution. When the "nine old

men" of the Supreme Court intervened to preserve the integrity of that venerable document, the administration made a determined effort to drive them from office or to nullify their decisions by packing the court. Though this effort was frustrated, death and resignation have enabled Mr. Roosevelt to fill the bench with men after his own heart—men of aroused and eager minds, who apparently feel obligated to use their position to correct any and every abuse without regard to precedent.

If the letter, or even the spirit, of the Constitution seems to bar the way to the desired remedy, the ingenuity of the legal mind has come to the court's rescue. The provisions of the Constitution are given interpretations diametrically opposite to those which have governed the court for a century and a half.

"CASTS US ADRIFT"

Of course, this speeds up action. It produces results. It may even be popular for the moment. But it should give thoughtful citizens pause. I say this because to change the meaning of our constitutions by legislative or judicial action amounts to an abandonment of the principles on which the American system is based.

It casts us adrift to be tossed hither and yon by the caprice of legislative majorities, or by the fitful winds of judicial reasoning. If hereafter public affairs are to be administered in this fashion, we might just as well tear up our constitutions or put them under glass in the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, as interesting relics of the past.

Unfortunately, too many people are wholly uninterested in constitutional questions. Discussions of them seem dry, pedantic and unprofitable. They do not seem to realize how completely their liberty, their property, and their mode of life depend upon the meaning given to our State and Federal Constitutions.

Other citizens are enamored of the flexibility of the British system, and so welcome any step which seems to make ours more nearly like it. But England's government is founded on a philosophical concept wholly different from our own. In Great Britain the people are supposed to have parted with all of their sovereignty to the King and Parliament—reserving nothing to themselves. There is no written constitution. The will of a parliamentary majority, tempered by custom, habit, and precedent, is the supreme power in the nation. It controls in all respects the rights and conduct of the subject, as well as the executive and judicial functions of public officials.

This highly flexible system has worked extremely well in the tight little island of Great Britain. But it failed utterly when applied to larger areas where sectional interests were divergent. That is why Ireland could not be retained as an integral part of the Empire. And why it was found necessary to decentralize by creating self-governing dominions bound together, in the British Commonwealth of Nations, by nothing more substantial than allegiance to the king.

Our concept is entirely different. We have believed that the individual, as God's creature, has certain natural and inalienable rights, with which no public authority ought ever to interfere. We have believed that the right of local self-government ought to be safe-guarded in a Nation covering so great a territory as the United States. And we have believed that Government itself must have only limited powers if it is to remain the servant of the people.

Written constitutions were adopted to give effect to this unique concept. In them, the rights of individuals are defined and guaranteed by bills of rights. The duties and powers of local governments are prescribed in State constitutions. The scope of the National Government is set out in the Constitution of the United States. These organic laws represent the supreme legislative acts of the people.

RESERVED POWERS

They are not immutable like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Both State and National Constitutions have amending clauses by which the people may change them from time to time. But they are supposed to be binding upon the citizen and upon his public servants until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the people themselves.

If through ignorance or indifference we permit these constitutional rules to be changed by legislative enactment, or by judicial decision, we will have ceased to be our own masters and have delivered ourselves over to our public servants. This is the road which leads to despotism.

It leads to despotism because the sovereign people cannot remain sovereign if they abdicate their exclusive right to frame their constitutions. Yet this is precisely what they do, when they permit interpretations of their constitutions to veer from one point of the compass to another, like a weathercock, under the impact of partisan opinion. Nations which have lost their freedom have nearly always forged their own chains. Germany did it in 1933, when the Reichstag authorized Hitler to "deviate" from the Weimar Constitution.

I am afraid that during the past 10 years we, too, have been very busy at the anvil. There is but one remedy. That is, for the people to insist that the words of our written constitutions be interpreted in the sense intended by those who wrote them. If, as a consequence, injustice is permitted, let it be corrected by constitutional amendment. In this way alone can the people remain the sovereign makers of their own constitutions and preserve them as dikes against the rising tide of totalitarianism now sweeping the world.

ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON.

NEW CANAAN, *April 11.*

The Stripper Operator and Secondary Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. D. Sandefer, Jr., of Breckenridge, Tex., president of the National Stripper Well Association, at the mid-year meeting of the board of directors of the Independent Petroleum Association at Bradford, Pa., April 27, 1944:

In my discussion of the subject assigned to me by Chairman Merle Becker and his program committee I shall steer away from the technical approach of the subject, because we are having this midyear meeting here in Bradford, where secondary recovery by water flooding has perhaps been advanced to a greater degree than in any other section of the country.

Bradford is in the center of approximately 140,000 stripper wells, about half of the stripper wells in the United States. At the end of 1943, there were 410,184 producing oil wells, and of this number some 296,450 wells, or 72 percent of the total number are in the stripper class at the present time, and the remaining balance will all become strippers at some future date.

The added drain of production occasioned by wartime needs will cause many fields to become stripper areas in advance of their normal expectancy. This acceleration toward stripperdom becomes more alarming when it is fully realized that in 1941 there were 20,067 oil wells completed, and in 1943 only 9,812 oil wells were completed.

Oil operators have been referred to as God's frozen people. Taking that reference as a fact, the stripper operator is in the position of being as cold as the proverbial Eskimo well digger in Alaska. He is the one who has really been handicapped for some time.

When I refer to the stripper operator in this discussion, I mean just what the name implies—the operator who owns only stripper wells, the one who is not blessed with large wells which furnish him an income that enables him to sit back and hold his stripper production for a later day, and a higher price. The statement has been made by executives of larger companies, by some of those in authority in Government, and even by larger independent operators, that "there is no place for the stripper operator in the present day." Again I heartily disagree with this statement. The stripper-well problem is not only a problem for today. It is a problem that will always be with us as long as the industry exists. I have said many times that we are sure of three things:

1. We all must die.
2. Taxes will always be with us.
3. Every gusher will some day be a stripper.

My files are full of letters from small operators from nearly all of the oil producing States stating "we must have relief. I have held on as long as I can." In my mind the small oil producer has just as much place in the picture as does the larger operator. In our American way of life the small businessman has always had his place in the picture. Today, in my opinion, the stripper operator has a more important place than ever before. Twenty billion barrels of reserves is the generally accepted estimate of leaders in the industry and of those charged with the responsibility of insuring this country with oil for the future. It is estimated that only 12,000,000,000 barrels can be produced at the present price. If 4,000,000,000 barrels of this estimate is under stripper wells, then is it not the duty of this country, as well as the duty of the owners of these reserves, to see that this oil be produced?

Oil is vital to the war. Oil is vital to the peace. No one has ever argued this fact. If the stripper operator produces and owns 15 percent of the present daily production of the United States, and 20 percent of the oil for the future, do you not agree with me that he definitely does have a place in the picture? He not only has the problem of producing this 15 percent of the total daily output, but he has the responsibility to his Government in time of war of doing his part toward the war effort. If he had an integrated company, with pipe lines, gasoline plants, synthetic rubber plants, refineries, 100-octane gasoline manufacturing facilities—or a large cash reserve—he could hold on until the "lights come on again" and contemplate producing his secondary reserves tomorrow. But, the stripper operator is not that fortunate. He has only what remains after his expenses of operating are deducted from his income from his strippers.

In the Southwest, where I am privileged to operate, the price of oil is $1.25 per barrel for 40 gravity, average $1.19. You operators of this district have been perhaps more active than any other district in the fight that we have waged for a higher price for crude oil. It has been a privilege to work side by side with you. Yet, you have been in a more fortunate position when it comes to the price of oil. In case you do not operate in the

Southwest, or in other sections of the United States, turn over in your mind the situation you would be in if you had received only $1.19 for your crude. Also consider the 1943 average price for stripper production: In Wyoming, $1.10 per barrel; Louisiana, $1.06 per barrel; Colorado and Kansas, $1.05 per barrel; Arkansas, 91½ cents per barrel; and California, 83 cents per barrel. Your wells in the Pennsylvania region average approximately one-half barrel of oil each per day.

In north Texas, where I live, we have 20,000 wells averaging approximately 2 barrels each per day. We are forced to abandon our wells long before they reach the half-barrel stage. We producers from other sections are glad you receive your price. I am mentioning this fact in order that you may for a few minutes picture what the stripper operators from other sections have had, and are continuing to receive, for their crude. I feel sure that many of you who have been listening to me to this point are saying to yourselves, "Why does he attempt to sell us on the matter of price. We are already convinced that crude is too cheap." I am simply attempting to impress on your and the public's mind the fact that the stripper operator is up against a real problem in producing oil under present conditions—oil that is vital to victory.

May I give you this illustration? One firm in northeastern Oklahoma recently called my attention to the fact that they had produced in excess of 905,000 barrels of gross oil from two different water-flood developments covering slightly over 400 acres of leases and that these two develoments were still $220,000 in the red. It is the opinion of those who have made a study of water flooding that the producers of this oil needed at least 30 cents more per barrel in order to break even on the development, to say nothing of what they are entitled to as a reasonable profit for their effort.

The smart boys who have fixed the present price for crude might say that this loss was due not so much to the price of crude as it might have been due to the fact that the territory under development did not justify the installation of the water-flooding method. However, I hasten to deny any such allegation because the results outlined above are typical of a great number of operations which have been undertaken in the midcontinent area within recent years. The best evidence of the fact that we are not getting a price that would justify the expansion of a water-flooding campaign in the midcontinent area is to be found in the following figures, which are taken from the records of one of the larger purchasers of water-flood oil in northeastern Oklahoma.

Since 1936, when water flooding was first brought into use in Nowata and Rogers Counties, this company has purchased a total of 27,105,000 barrels in that area. Of this amount, 17,000,000 represent water-flood production and 10,105,000 represent production from property not using the water-flooding method of production. At one time during this period this company was purchasing 12,716 barrels daily. The price of crude in this district was cut 20 cents per barrel which caused the producers to indefinitely delay additional water-flooding expenditures; and since that time the production in this area has dropped to 7,583 barrels per day, resulting in a net loss of 5,130 barrels per day of badly needed oil. I feel that this picture illustrates the direct relationship between an adequate price for crude oil and the amount of water-flood oil which can be made available for the market.

Many stripper operators are faced with the abandonment of their wells. We have made this statement many times before the authorities that have to do with price. Some have said to me that wells are not really abandoned. According to the incomplete figures covering the national stripper-well survey being prepared at this time by the Interstate Oil Compact and the National Stripper Well Association, more wells were abandoned in 1943 than ever before. Under these wells lie many barrels of oil that this country needs.

When these wells are abandoned, these reserves are lost forever, in most cases. Why? Because the price of crude oil will have to be, in most instances, three times what it is now if these reserves are to be redrilled. I have a list in my files of 3,000 wells in one State that have been shut down for more than a year. No; they are not completely exhausted. Many wells naturally reach the stage where they can no longer be produced without loss. All wells canont receive a price that will always keep them alive, but when wells are abandoned in the United States that could produce secondary recovery oil when we need it so badly, I feel that it compares with a war plant that is not allowed to produce its maximum of planes, shells, or ships.

The application of secondary recovery to stripper wells is largely an economic problem. I am of the opinion that we have advanced further in the technical side of this problem than we have in the economic side. The cost of secondary recovery oil is small compared to the intrinsic value of the extra oil produced, and it is a sad state of affairs that the price of crude oil is so low that it will not support the application of the best technology in the production of that oil. Under the present crude-oil prices, the use of secondary recovery is denied to most of us in the Southwest and in other sections of the United States.

Reliable engineers estimate that 1,400,000,000 barrels of oil can be produced from the small wells producing today under primary methods. Two billion six hundred million barrels can be produced by secondary recovery methods. Thus, when we talk about strippers and secondary recovery, we are shooting at nearly 3,000,000,000 barrels of oil, or reducing this figure to a simpler total, enough oil to run the war and our Nation for nearly 2 years.

If the extra oil will more than pay for the extra cost, then secondary recovery is feasible. If not, then all such primary wells will be abandoned long before the reservoirs are exhausted. If this abandonment of reserves were only a personal problem of the oil producer, then our Nation should probably not be interested.

However, when the Nation is running short of oil to power the war and its domestic machinery, then it should become of great concern to our people. In the survey now being made by the Interstate Compact Commission and the National Stripper Well Association, the questionnaires reveal no incentive exists to justify secondary recovery operations. We are met with this situation at every turn, and as a result valuable petroleum reserves are being lost. We find that stripper-well operators are flooding and repressuring their properties where the work was commenced prior to Pearl Harbor, but since then there has been a marked decline in the number of new installations.

On the other hand, there are instances where extensions have been made on projects previously in operation and represent only a small expenditure.

I am informed that as a general rule normal producing methods recover from 20 to 30 percent of oil in place, where repressuring is applied the total recovery with gas repressuring is 30 to 45 percent of oil in place, and the total production with normal and water flooding or normal repressuring and water flooding is 65 or 80 percent of oil in place.

We are shocked when a fire devastates one of our forests, but little concern is manifested by the loss through inefficiency of our petroleum reserves, a commodity that is irreplaceable and that during war and peace means so much to the life and welfare of our Nation. Does not the following describe our predicament:

"If you can pump your wells when all about you
Are plugging theirs and blaming O. P. A.
If you can keep your credit at supply stores,
And have your banker say you're still Okay.
If you can take the price the majors give you,
And meet the rent and pay your pumper, too,
And break yourself from jumping in a slutch pit
Each time a hunk of income tax comes due.
If you can take a worn-out Fort Worth spudder,
And drill a well to 15,000 feet,
And build a string of sucker rods from nothing,
And make one pump without a ball and seat.
If you know your Federal rules up to the minute,
And think that filling out these forms is fun,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it;
And—what is more—you're an oil man, my son."

Secondary recovery becomes automatic when the price is sufficient. The stripper operator will continue to do his best. He is a rugged individualist or he would already have given up. He must not be overlooked by his fellow operator, by the major company, or by his Government.

Declaration of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the declaration of Chicago, unanimously adopted February 4, 1944, by the American Democratic National Committee. This declaration is particularly interesting at this time considering some of the statements that have been made in today's debate on the resolution to investigate the Government's seizure of Montgomery Ward. There are those who have said, "It can't happen here!" Well, it did at Montgomery Ward's.

Whereas our fathers established this Nation upon the principles of liberty set forth in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed to posterity by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas Thomas Jefferson later founded the Democratic Party, dedicated to certain fundamental tasks, among which were the following:

1. To maintain a wise and frugal Government.

2. To prevent concentration of the power of Government in Washington and the blight that flows from "the palsied hand of bureaucracy," thus to keep government close to and the responsible servant of the people.

3. To preserve the rights of minorities and to protect persons of all races and creeds against the tyranny of majorities.

4. To prevent any branch of Government from usurping the functions of any other branch.

5. To prevent regimentation of the people.

6. To maintain a government of laws and to prevent "a government of men."

7. To exalt individual initiative and incentive enterprise as the surest sources of personal happiness, national progress, and prosperity.

8. To preserve the American States "as the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican principles."

Whereas the present administration has persistently and flagrantly violated every such precept and has, moreover, surrounded itself with alien-minded advisers, who are destroying the American form of government, substituting a system of bureaucratic control over the lives and affairs of our citizens and injecting the doctrine of the "indispensable man"; and

Whereas millions of American youths are now risking their lives that human freedom may live: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the followers of Thomas Jefferson will no longer stand idle while men, falsely calling themselves Democrats, destroy on the home front the very liberties for which our sons are fighting overseas; and be it further

Resolved, That we Jeffersonian Democrats, today gathered in the city of Chicago, invoke the ancient common law writ of right for the recovery of our inheritance. We hereby denounce the palace guard as trespassers, wrongfully in possession of the Democratic Party. We hereby summon the true followers of Thomas Jefferson to join in recapturing our birthright. To this end we issue the following plan of action:

1. We call upon the followers of Thomas Jefferson in every State of the Union, to select two members for each such State to serve on this temporary national committee. The committee is to meet, at time and place appointed by the chairman, to plan for a national convention for the purpose of adopting a Democratic platform and nominating Democratic candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

2. In the said national convention each of the several States shall be entitled to the representation enjoyed prior to 1933 unless such has been altered by law. We recommend that the traditional "two-thirds rule" for the nomination of candidates be readopted as a safeguard against future attempts to subvert and destroy the Democratic Party.

3. In this great emergency we pledge ourselves by the grace of Almighty God to support the war effort to the utmost of national capacity until victory is achieved. We further pledge ouselves to reestablish in peace every liberty and privilege set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Senator James J. Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the district of Pennsylvania which I represent many thousands of citizens devote their skill and energy to the great steel industry. They are capable, patriotic, and sincere American citizens who, by their talents and by their labor, transform iron ore into the thousand-odd weapons of war which are so vitally needed by our Nation and our allies at this time.

One of Pennsylvania's outstanding citizens, who has himself mastered the difficult trade of the iron puddler, now represents the great State of Pennsylvania in the Senate of the United States.

JAMES J. DAVIS began working in the steel and iron mills at Sharon at a very early age. He became his father's first helper and under his tutelage learned the trade of the iron puddler. He was one of the early members of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of America, in which organization he held a number of elective offices. And while his work in later years has carried him into other paths, he still remains a strong advocate of the fundamental trade-union principle.

Senator DAVIS' knowledge and insight into the problems of labor, employment, and related matters have long been recognized by outstanding authorities in the United States, and his years of service as Secretary of Labor and Senator from the State of Pennsylvania have shown him to be one of labor's outstanding champions—one who, indeed, has remained loyal to the men and workers with whom he toiled many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a most interesting article which appeared in the Philadelphia Dispatch under date of April 30, which gives an account of the skill which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania yet possesses in the time-honored field of iron puddling. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the Appendix of the RECORD, in order that the people and workers of Pennsylvania might be apprised that the senior Senator is still a master of his first trade, the present-day masters of which, together with the coal miners of the Nation, comprise the backbone of the great and powerful steel industry, which is now contributing so effectively to the war effort of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that I am proud to be the representative of this group which has made possible the creation of the tremendous war machine which shall bring us and our people the inevitable victory in this struggle for the preservation of justice, right, and human decency.

SENATOR JIM DEMONSTRATES HIS PUDDLING TECHNIQUE

(By Ross Hill, Republican City Chairman, New Kensington, Westmoreland County)

When United States Senator JAMES J. DAVIS boasted before New Kensington Republicans recently that he could still do a good job of puddling molten steel, Dr. H. A. McMurray, county coroner, and I took him up on it. Well, I saw the sight of my life. We had been twitting the Senator as to whether he could still handle his old job. We challenged him to go down to the Penn Iron & Steel Co. and demonstrate. Dr. McMurray said, "Come and show us." A group of us, including some of the members of the New Kensington Council of Republican Women, Dr. McMurray, and myself and a group of newspaper reporters escorted the "Honorable JIM" to the mill.

The heat was on at what is termed a "high boil." A committee of oldtimers at the mill were selected to pass judgment on Senator JIM'S skill. When the Senator got to the furnace it was like an old fire horse smelling smoke—off went his coat, he slipped in the raising hook and began working.

The committee of workers were unanimous in saying that he handled the tools like a veteran. After bringing the heat to a high boil and running off the cinders and carrying the waste from the furnace, he moved on to another furnace close by which was drawing a full heat.

Three big round balls of steel, weighing about 200 pounds each, were being prepared for the roller. The Senator was challenged again as to whether he could handle the iron and prepare it for the roller.

Senator JIM reached for the tongs which were fastened to the roller on an overhead trolley. He reached into the furnace, tested the iron, brought it up to the fore plate on the furnace, got a better hold on it and off he flung that ball of 200 pounds of solid iron down to the squeezer. As the impurities were sloughed off it sounded like a cannon going off.

Sparks were flying and red-hot cinders scattered. You would have thought you were on the battle front. The rest of us standing around the furnace jumped back in alarm, but the old Senator went on down to the squeezer taking the ball of iron to be crushed into form for rolling.

An old-timer standing by grinned and rubbed the sweat from his head, saying, "You can tell a man who was brought up in the trade in his early days. He handles the tongs different from a man who has learned the trade after he was out of his twenties. Senator JIM can certainly do the job like an old-timer."

By that time we were all convinced that the Senator could still handle the tools with the skill of a veteran puddler. "How can you do it after all these years?" we asked him. The Senator grinned and replied, "It's just like learning to play baseball when you are a boy. After you grow older you may not be able to play as well, but you still have the knack and the spirit for the things you learned in your youth."

The meeting of the new Kensington Council of Republican Women was a great success. Senator DAVIS spoke for 40 minutes on "Free Enterprise in America." He used the town New Kensington as an example of how a great industry can change a little place along the river bank into a thriving city housing industries that employ hundreds of thousands of people. It was a great day for the Republicans in this district. As Mrs. Grayce Evans Daugherty said, "Our meeting was a big success; our Senator made an excellent speech, and it was the most enthusiastic crowd we have had for 12 years."

Financial Aid for Paving of City Streets Under Federal-Aid Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, smaller cities and towns through which Federal and State highways pass are under constant expense, building and keeping up paved roads that are used more by the general traveling public than by the citizens whose property is adjacent to the highway, and who are assessed for the construction of the pavement.

The Grinnell (Iowa) City Council has recently adopted resolutions on this subject which I desire to call to the attention of the House, and I ask permission to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD and include therein this set of resolutions asking for financial aid for construction of paving on city streets under the proposed legislation for a Federal-aid highway system:

Whereas as it has come to the attention of the city of Grinnell that the proposed highway bill S. 971 and H. R. 2426 now before Congress makes no provision for assistance of cities and towns under 10,000 for the construction of paving on city streets; and

Whereas the cities under 10,000 contribute considerable to the gas tax paid by car owners who use city streets the greater percentage of their travel; and

Whereas the cities and towns of this class can finance the construction of new paving only by assessing it against the adjacent property owners; and

Whereas this method of financing is not only unfair but is vigorously resisted by the property owners: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the city of Grinnell respectfully petition their Representatives in Congress to make every effort to amend this bill so that cities and towns under 10,000 will receive their fair share of financial aid from any highway bill passed by Congress.

Abuses of Executive Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, IOWA, *April 28, 1944.*

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Just as a private American citizen, interested only in preserving personal liberty and independence for myself and other individual Americans in our private, business, and social lives as guaranteed by our Constitution, I write you this letter as one of our responsible representatives in this crisis when our constitutional rights are jeopardized as never before in our history. Save only for such action as Congress may take, the American people must remain silent and incapable of making an orderly protest until election time. Much harm can be done before that time by an executive who seems to have given himself over entirely to a program of bringing all of our activities, business and otherwise, under detailed Government control through agencies dominated entirely by himself and committed to the complete destruction of private industry and competitive enterprise.

Recent happenings have demonstrated beyond further serious question that Congress in the past has given our President grants of power never previously enjoyed by any one person in our history. This was done for an extended period before the war started to meet certain crises, both real and imaginary. It is also true that Congress has enlarged this grant of power to vast proportions during the past 3 years with a view of helping the war effort by so doing.

It appears now that the confidence of Congress has been misplaced, and that our President, influenced by persons and forces unfriendly to our American way of life, has not scrupled to abuse the power given him or to evade the limitations on these powers contained in that grant from Congress or as set forth in our Constitution.

A specific incident of this official misconduct is the taking over of a privately owned commercial establishment, not related to the war effort to further the interests of certain elements of organized labor engaged in a controversy with the management of that concern.

The arbitrary and autocratic action of the President in so enlarging and prostituting his war powers, must serve to unmask the executive department of this administration and reveal in its true light for the first time the vicious, and heretofore cunning, activities of this department of government designed to accomplish the transition of our democratic constitutional form of government to some type of totalitarian government conceived by the President and his advisory cliques.

In view of the fact that our Supreme Court has ceased to be the safeguard it formerly has been to protect the American people from impositions by ambitious and misguided executives, the public can expect little protection from that quarter to curb the present autocratic and unconstitutional activities of the President and his horde of bureau puppets, in their present activities of destroying private enterprise.

Now having had a taste of autocratic authority, we can expect to see the President and his cohorts repeat the performance with ever growing vigor, unless Congress takes forthright measures to curb the future actions of the President and his department for the remainder of his term of office.

The writer, because of our present concern with winning the war, hesitates to suggest impeachment as the proper remedy, although the power-mad excesses of the President are ample to subject him to that penalty. However, this inclination to spare the President this humiliating ordeal because of the immense load of responsibility he has chosen to carry alone, which may have turned his head but not his heart, in no manner should deter Congress, and you, Mr. Congressman, individually, from initiating action to recall these powers that are being abused by the President.

The writer suggests charitable consideration of the President because of his infirmities and his burdens, but this charity will cease to be a virtue when exercised by you if you fail to safeguard the private, personal, business, and social life of individual Americans from the mischievous conduct of the President and his underlings in destroying our American way of life.

You owe every man and woman in America, and particularly those who are fighting our battles on foreign fields, the duty of giving careful consideration to the matter herein suggested in this letter, and taking the course that is justified by the present circumstances.

Respectfully,

LOUIS J. KEHOE.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by an assembly of over 2,000 Americans of Polish extraction gathered at Dom Polski in Buffalo, N. Y., on April 30, 1944, in celebration of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791:

Whereas each May celebration brings to us a rebirth of courage and a renewal of our pledge to the ideals of freedom, we solemnly observe today, through the gloom of the moment, the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption by the Polish Diet in 1791 of the world-famous Constitution of May Third, so justly appraised by the English statesman, Edmund Burke, as "the noblest benefit received by any nation at any time"; and

Whereas we draw our moral strength from that historic document which inspired our ancestors imbued with a feeling of intense national unity in the face of impending danger, to proclaim courageously to the world that "more than life and personal happiness, we value external independence and internal freedom"; and

Whereas we are approaching the decisive moment when the Allied operations will bring the liberation of Poland, the first member of the Allied Powers to resist brutal aggression over four and a half years ago, in result of which every tenth Pole has died for the cause of freedom, a record which no other nation has equaled in this cataclysm called World War No. 2; and

Whereas we are fully cognizant of the historic fact that the geographic location of Poland in the vast plain of central Europe between two powerful neighbors, opposite in their culture, both ambitious for territorial expansion, makes the need of a strong and an independent Poland an essential requisite for enduring peace not only in Europe but in the entire world of today; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has declared repeatedly that it stands for the establishment of a strong, independent, and a friendly Poland, and since it is easy to understand that the loss of 51 percent of Polish territory and 37 percent of her people, 85 percent of her oil and natural gas, more than half of her lumber, about half of her chemical industry, her potassium mines, phosphates, and most of her grain cannot possibly lead to a strong, independent, and a friendly Poland; and

Whereas it is a matter of historic record that Poland in the period of her greatest expansion, when her territory comprised more than double the 150,000 square miles restored to her after the First World War, Poland before the first partition stood out prominently in Europe as an illustrious commonwealth of federated republics enjoying unprecedented religious tolerance, liberty, and freedom based on Christian principles of social justice; and

Whereas sincere cooperation and mutual trust among the Allied Nations are indispensable for bringing on a final victory, we strenuously condemn all agitation and every suggestion of acts tending to divide and weaken the common front of the United Nations, especially at this critical hour in the prosecution of this war for freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That as loyal citizens of the United States we solemnly pledge our unstinted support to the great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and to our Government in their untiring effort to bring this war to a complete and an early victory conforming to the terms of the various declarations made by the United Nations for a just and enduring peace for all nations, large and small; to this end, we promise first, to increase our purchases of Government bonds, especially at this time of the coming Fifth Loan campaign; secondly, we pledge our increased contributions in money and work for the American Red Cross and other recognized war relief agencies performing missions of mercy to our men and women in the various services, as the zero hour of the Allied invasion approaches; thirdly, we further promise conscientious performance of all our duties at

home, in war plants, or in other positions working for increased production of supplies, equipment and weapons with which to arm our sons and daughters in the fight for freedom and justice for all nations; and be it further

Resolved, That after the war is won and the proper moment shall arrive, we shall stand united in our most earnest appeal to the leaders of our Government in Washington and particularly to the President, and to the Secretary of State, to use their good offices as mediators on behalf of the righteous cause of Poland by supporting her determination to maintain the integrity of her territory so that the world may be assured of a lasting peace; and finally, be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Ambassador of Poland in exile to the United States, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Who Said Freedom of Speech?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Eugene L. Garey before the Economic Council in New York, April 18, 1944:

These are grave days and many vital problems confront us. What I am about to say should not be construed as reflecting partisan views, as it is not offered for that purpose. I want to talk with you about matters concerning which I have abiding convictions and which, I am sure, affect us all irrespective of party. I want to discuss with you dangerous changes which are taking place in our form of government—changes which have not been honestly or frankly advocated as desirable changes to which we should assent, but revolutionary changes which are being made without the knowledge or consent of our people.

And today seems to be particularly appropriate for such a discussion, because the 18th of April is a significant date in American history. That date, as you will recall, is the anniversary of Paul Revere's immortal ride on the eve of the Battle of Lexington and Concord—that historic ride which Longfellow described so beautifully in his poem recording that event.

It was at Lexington and Concord that the long struggle for American liberty began, and where, Emerson tells us, "the embattled farmers stood, and fired the shot heard 'round the world."

The time has come for us once more to figuratively fire a shot for liberty that will be heard around the world, because the struggle which began at Lexington and Concord is not ended. It will never be ended because there will always be some among us who, in the lust for power, will ever seek to destroy our liberties. Each generation must struggle to acquire liberty or fight to retain it.

We of this generation are now at our rendezvous with destiny. We are face to face with making a determination of whether this Nation shall be brightly clothed in liberty or darkly shrouded in dictatorship. On April 18, 1775, the rights of men were denied by government, the dignity of freemen and their inalienable rights were being trampled under the heel of a despotic government and Americans were called to defend their liberties. The Americans of that day well knew that life is a dangerous game, and they also knew full well that life without liberty is like a rope of sand that crumbles in the twisting. And consequently from the courage and from the "blood" and from the "sweat" and from the "tears" of the men of Lexington and Concord finally emerged a free nation of freemen.

God intended man to be free. The dignity and nature of freemen were the underlying concepts of this new government. This political philosophy fulfilled the divine command to "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's, and unto God the things which be God's." Hence, the American concept of government is that man was made to serve God—that government was made to serve man and to enable him to fulfill his divine destiny—and that in attaining these ends man was not made for the state.

The counter, self-labeled "liberal," philosophy—that the state is supreme and man exists only to serve the state—is not the American creed. It is the liberty-destroying philosophy of the totalitarian. It is a philosophy completely alien to our American way of thinking. It is a philosophy that begets the dictator. It is a philosophy that denies the sovereign power of the people and the inalienability of their rights and asserts that all power resides in the superstate. It is an alien ideology and concept of government imported from foreign lands and imposed there in an embittered and frustrated people who have never known liberty and its blessings. It comes from foreign lands where freemen have never trod and where economic and political slavery still prevail.

Yet that very alien philosophy is now gradually but surely being imposed on the American people chiefly by the employment of the communistic technique known as cessation of gradualism. That technique, as I understand it, means the unlawful seizure of power by the Government to accomplish its so-called reforms by bloodless revolution without resorting to constitutional methods because of the fear that resort to constitutional procedures would result in a denial of the powers desired. Whatever the technique be called, that method of unwarranted assumption of power is the technique employed in Washington today. These enemies of America are so obsessed with the beneficence of their own alien ways that they willingly kick the Constitution around and nullify its provisions in order to indoctrinate America with their own alien ideologies. Today we have not a single right that any Washington bureaucrat will respect if he desires and wants to ignore it.

We have been unassailable as a nation so long as we have held steadfast to the great principles of our American creed. Free enterprise and individual initiative have made us a great and powerful nation—a nation which has brought more comfort, more happiness, and more freedom to more people than any other form of government conceived by the human mind in the history of the world.

We have recently come a long way from the principles laid down for our freedom. The power-grasping bureaucrats and world planners will, if they can, destroy our American institutions of government. They will, if they can (and they have already made unbelievably great strides), convert the American Government into a totalitarian government. They are continuing and will continue, unless they are stopped and stopped now, to destroy free enterprise and individual initiative in this country. They are hell-bent on destroying the very foundations of free enterprise upon which our American successes have rested and, ironically enough, to which they have been compelled to turn for protection against the chaos engulfing the world today.

It is a sad but nevertheless a patent fact that in the present day both judicial doctrines and executive attitudes are manifestly not in accord with our institutions. Whether they are evolutional, as some contend, or revolutional, as I contend, they portend evil days for our Nation. We can see on every hand in high places in our Government constitutional limitations transcended, baneful official breaches of trust, and unwarranted assumption of power.

We can see on every hand executive and judicial departures from established principles of statutory construction to so great an extent as to cause these departments of government to exceed their constitutional functions in administering or enforcing the law. We find the bureaucrats deliberately seeking means of thwarting and circumventing the congressional intent and purpose in order to accomplish their so-called reforms and bring about a complete collectivist statism here.

Instead of following the law and the policy of Congress in accordance with the plain intent, these bureaucrats by farfetched and unfounded interpretations and administrative applications substitute their own laws, their own policies, their own will, and their own concepts of public good. Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, who trained many if not most of those now holding key and important posts in our bureaucracy, used these words in a recent decision: "The notion that, because the words of a statute are plain, its meaning also is plain is merely pernicious oversimplification." And consider, if you will, what an opportunity this Frankfurter dictum accords these archdisciples of this alien philosophy when it is recalled that in our present governmental set-up there are some two hundred forty-odd special courts, bureaus, and commissions which promulgate, interpret, and administer their own rules and regulatons and the various Federal laws directly affecting the lives, liberty, and businesses of our people.

The bureaucrats call their technique "administrative interpretation." I call it usurpation of power. I assert that their philosophy has created here the totalitarian state. The American system of representative government has been destroyed. We have lost the liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

George Washington said that the concentration of political power in any one unit of government is tyranny. And bear in mind, if you will, that it is not in mere isolated instances that this concentration of power occurs—it is a part of the maliciously conceived plot subtly and secretly to change our form of government without the knowledge or consent of the American people. Any careful observer of Washington trends will agree that that statement is not merely a bit of campaign oratory.

The spirit of Paul Revere must ride again. America needs to be again awakened and warned of what men, who have solemnly sworn to defend and maintain the very institutions which they are now so insidiously and covertly destroying, are doing to our cherished institutions.

The Federal Communications Commission is one of the most powerful bureaucratic agencies of our Government. It exemplifies in the most dangerous aspects the indoctrination and activatfon of the revolutionary changes to which I have been referring. Probably few if any of you have ever had any contact or business with this agency, and yet it plays an important part and exercises great influence on our national life—in our personal lives and homes—and in our businesses. We all listen to the radio, use the telephone, or send a telegram. Are you aware that the operations of all these communications systems are regulated and controlled by this Commission?

Thus F. C. C. is a powerful agency which is capable of destroying our liberties because in a democracy such as ours, the keystone of

fee institutions is the unrestricted right of every citizen to express and exchange his thoughts, beliefs, and opinions with his fellow citizens by the spoken or the written word, so that a common way of life—a uniformity or community of thinking may be thus evolved. Democracy is premised on a meeting of minds on a common ground, and on the acceptance of a common ideology or philosophy. Any curtailment of the free exchange of ideas renders democracy impossible of accomplishment.

In the control by F. C. C. of the media of this free exchange of thoughts is the seed of dictatorship and the historic warning of the approach of tyranny. It must not be forgotten that tyranny first appears in the guise of benevolence. Freedom of speech as guaranteed in our Bill of Rights embodies "freedom from fear of government reprisal for what is said and for what is not said." F. C. C., however, completely ignores these basic constitutional principles, and also the statutory provisions which deny to it any power of censorship.

It is primarily through abuse of its licensing power that F. C. C. accomplishes indirectly and unlawfully that which it desires but cannot do directly or lawfully. Through the sometimes direct and other times covert threat to revoke licenses, F. C. C. censors by denying to some persons and programs the right to use the air, and by requiring that others be permitted on the air.

Freedom of speech requires that radio should be as free from government licensing regulation and control as the press. But in the case of radio we are confronted with a practical physical fact—the presently known useful radio spectrum is inadequate to accommodate everybody because there is a fixed natural limitation upon the number of stations that can operate without interference by one with another. Two radio stations broadcasting simultaneously on the same frequency cannot be intelligibly heard over receiving sets within the range of both stations. The chaos thereby resulting in the ether is characterized in radio as interference. With the expansion of broadcasting, this problem of interference threatened ultimately to destroy the usefulness of radio.

The problem of interference, which rarely arose prior to the First World War as there were more than sufficient frequencies for all the stations then operating, however finally became so acute that it became apparent that if radio was to survive Congress alone could remedy the existing chaos in the radio field.

And so we have the Government entering upon the regulation of radio to meet the national need and to prevent the loss of the potentialities and usefulness of radio to the Nation. From the necessity which required the Government to license and regulate the physical aspects of radio we have come a long way. A new and unlimited occasion to control and regulate a new business, and thereby influence and control the thinking and lives of the American people, was presented to the bureaucratic enemies of America, and they have been quick to seize upon and take full advantage of the opportunity thereby offered to control and utilize mass communications to further their "bloodless revolution."

Much bitter controversy has raged—and still rages—over the extent and meaning of the statutory words "public interest, convenience, or necessity" employed in the legislation creating the Commission. Everyone is agreed that certain powers were unquestionably vested in the Commission by the act. However, the Commission contends, and the Supreme Court about a year ago concurred, that its authority under the act is much broader and more extensive than those unquestioned powers.

So that you may envisage how far we have gone from the original need of legislation to regulate the physical aspects of radio, let me sketch briefly some of F. C. C.'s present powers. You will thus be able to comprehend the broad field available to F. C. C. to usurp power and function beyond its legitimate scope.

The regulatory functions of the Commission break down into two fields, communications by wire and communications by radio. Wire communications comprise telephone, telegraph, and the cables. Companies engaged in these communications are subject to regulation by the Commission as common carriers, which includes regulation of rates.

The field of radio communications is divided into three distinct types of service:

1. Common carrier radio communications: This includes domestic radio telegraph service, domestic radio telephone service, international radio telegraph service, and international radio telephone service. These services are subject to F. C. C. licensing authority as well as regulation as common carriers similar to that applicable to the wire communication services with which they compete.

2. The radio broadcast services: In the radio broadcast field, F. C. C. has licensing authority over the 900 stations which furnish standard broadcast domestic service. In addition, the Commission licenses the international short-wave broadcast stations and the frequency modulation stations. Then there are the television stations, and finally, the facsimile broadcast service, by which a receiver in your own home may, perhaps in a few years, bring you your morning newspaper.

3. Safety and special radio service: The safety and special radio services include ship radio services, aviation radio services, police radio services, forest fire wardens, etc., amateur radio services, and other special services, including, for example, the geological services which are used in prospecting for oil and minerals.

The Commission not only licenses the stations in all of these services, but it also licenses the operators of these stations.

The administration of these functions by the Commission has been widely and bitterly criticized and condemned—to an extent perhaps to which no other Federal agency ever has been subjected. This began with the inception of the Commission, and has justifiably grown in bitterness under the chairmanship of Corcoran's protegé James Lawrence Fly.

A traffic policeman for the air lanes is a vital necessity but, as in the case of other police agencies, F. C. C.'s legal function is and should be to preserve peace among the stations, to protect property rights, and not to terrorize, dominate, and control the business of free speech it was designed to protect. From the seed of need, F. C. C. has grown into a strange and weird fungus on our body politic. From an agency of protection it has become a menace and a destroyer.

In my investigation of the Commission, I found that, under the domination of Fly, whom a Washington writer has termed "a dangerous guy":

1. From the legitimate allocation and policing of wave-lengths, F. C. C. has become the sponsor of novel and illegal theories of governmental control and regulation and has illegally assumed enforcement of the Sherman anti-trust law in respect of alleged monopolistic practices in the communications industry subject to its jurisdiction, as witness the Commission's chain broadcasting policies and its handling of R. C. A. and the Postal Telegraph matters.

These F. C. C. policies, and others of like nature relating to other criminal statutes with the enforcement of which Mr. Fly had nothing to do, were not lawfully enforced through the courts—no charges were formulated or tried, but they were enforced without hearing by devious illegal means such as unlawful threats of refusal to issue licenses, and by compelling station operators to submit their proposed contracts for broadcasts to the Commission for prior approval.

2. The Commission was arbitrary and dictatorial in the enforcement of its illegal policy of prohibiting newspaper ownership of radio stations, a policy which it has now, after 2 years of enforcement, apparently abandoned. This policy was pursued notwithstanding that the Supreme Court had held that "Congress did not authorize the Commission to choose among applicants upon the basis of their political, economic or social views, or upon any other capricious basis."

At first these newspaper applications were denied by the simple device of pigeon-holing them without acting on them. Let me cite an instance of just how far Fly went to deprive one newspaper applicant of his lawful right to appeal to the courts for redress against his illegal action. The application was that of the South Bend Tribune, and because this was an application by a newspaper, Fly wanted to deny it and at the same time prevent an appeal to the courts. This was the scheme he employed. I quote from the confidential minutes of the Commission, dated February 26, 1941:

"Chairman FLY. I do not like the word 'decision' and I do not like the word 'is' five lines from the end. It looks like an order and I don't think it should be signed by the Secretary. I don't want to give them something to appeal from. I would call this an opinion and say 'was on —— date granted.'"

Note, if you will, this from a Government official—"I don't want to give them something to appeal from." Fly wanted to deny that newspaper its lawful rights and see that it couldn't get into the courts for redress.

For the purpose of granting political favor to friends who believed in his political ideologies, Fly did make certain notorious exceptions to his general newspaper ownership policy. I have in mind now particularly the Gordon Gray station and the Marshall Field station at Hammond, Ind., which surrendered its license after I started investigating it.

As another instance of the manner by which the Commission punishes those whom it regards as political enemies and rewards the politically faithful, let me mention Station WNNY at Watertown, N. Y.

In 1936 two groups of local businessmen applied to F. C. C. for a license for a radio station at Watertown, N. Y. Hearings were held, and the decision of the Commission was that "public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served by granting the application for Black River Valley Broadcasts, Inc., and will not be served by granting the application of Watertown Broadcasting Corporation." As a result, the Black River Co. was granted a permit, and spent about $16,000 erecting a tower and preparing a building.

Some weeks after construction began, on December 2, the White House forwarded to F. C. C. a letter from a Watertown citizen addressed to the President. This letter pointed out that several of the Black River stockholders were Republicans, and asked:

"What will that mean to the future of the Democratic Party in northern New York? Your seaway and utility program has been fought from the very start by these same birds to whom you are now giving this radio station. It is inconceivable. I don't think you know these facts or you would not permit such a mistake to go through."

Another letter to the President, also forwarded to the F. C. C., urged that the WNNY license be revoked to "assist those who are working for the seaway and other parts of your program."

The day after these letters were received by the Commission, on December 3, F. C. C. sent a telegram to the Black River Valley Broadcasts saying that their permit had been revoked—and this without a hearing and without any reason being stated. No explanation for such action has ever been given. A license has since been granted to the rival applicant—Watertown Broadcasting Co.—of whom the F. C. C. examiners had first reported "the record does not justify a finding that the

applicant is legally qualified." This company is operating in Watertown today.

3. Himmler could well envy the Gestapo which Fly created under the respectable name of the War Problems Division, which the House Appropriations Committee asked him to discontinue because it served no proper useful purpose. No lawful authority whatsoever existed for the creation or activities of this unit—not even that modern day misfit called the Presidential Directive. Fired by nothing but zeal, this outfit proceeded for over a year to make a shambles of constitutional rights and privileges, and without warrant in law and without a hearing, threw people off the air against whom not even the faintest justification for such action can even now be advanced.

Let me cite one or two such instances. Take the case of Stefano Luotto, who was put off the air in November 1942 by the unlawful and coercive action of the F. C. C. Gestapo. It was only after fencing for more than an hour and after threats of citation for contempt were made that the House Select Committee, on March 30, 1944, elicited from the F. C. C. general counsel this statement:

"From the Commission's standpoint there is no reason why he (meaning Luotto) should not be permitted to broadcast."

And yet, believe it or not, for no valid reason whatsoever Luotto has been deprived of the means of earning a livelihood and to this day is still off the air. And keep in mind, if you will, that this man never had any charges preferred against him, never received and could not get a hearing after repeated attempts to do so were made, that F. C. C. denied responsibility for what it had caused to happen, never made the slightest effort to rectify the injustice it had caused, continued to a late day to find some reason to support what it had done, and had no more lawful authority to cause this man to be put off the air than has anyone present at this meeting.

Again take the case of Lido Belli. He was put off the air through the illegal and secret activities of the F. C. C. Gestapo. I say to you such action was entirely without justification in fact or in law. No justification has ever been advanced to this day to support such unwarranted action. After losing some $90,000, he was permitted a limited resumption of his business activities until he finally agreed to appoint an alien to control his business and to discharge old employees who were American citizens and hire other aliens in their places. He then and not until then became a proper person to go back on the air.

Again, without warrant or authority in law, Fly and his Gestapo became much alarmed and sought to compel broadcasts with a Russian slant to American citizens of Polish descent; they pondered and were deeply concerned over the effect the broadcast of Italian music would have upon citizens of Italian descent because such music would create "nostalgia for Italia"—I take that phrase from their own report—and the effect the broadcasting of Kathleen Mavourneen or the Wearing of the Green would have upon the heart of an Irishman. All of which I say to you as a matter of law neither is nor should be any of the Commission's business. And yet thousands of dollars of your money have been literally squandered on such illegal nonsense.

Among the many other unlawful activities of the Commission I found:

(a) That, again without legal authority and against the express wishes of the Army and Navy, F. C. C. was operating monitoring stations manned by men sorely needed in the military services and using equipment vitally needed by the armed services. Its action was confusing and impeding the war effort.

In a joint letter to the President, dated February 8, 1943, Secretaries Stimson and Knox stated that 5 months earlier the Secretary of the Navy had requested the Joint Chiefs of Staff to study the radio intelligence situation. As the result of this "thorough and comprehensive study," the letter recommended that "participation by the Federal Communications Commission in radio intelligence should be discontinued."

The Joint Chiefs of Staff reported in writing:

"Radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission tend to be less and less useful as the art progresses. This is due to integration into proper radio-intelligence system of large quantities of secret military information * * * which for obvious reasons cannot be disseminated to an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission * * * the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence. In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy. The foregoing conclusions are supoprted by the views of the Army and Navy commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence."

The normal run of patriotic Americans might consider this sufficient reason to surrender their judgment to that of the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Mr. Fly, however, launched a stubborn counter-attack during the next 7 months—and won. On September 7, 1943, the President wrote a letter permitting F. C. C. to retain its radio intelligence activities and suggested that disputes between the Army and Navy and F. C. C. in the future shall be submitted for adjustment to the Board of War Communications of which Mr. Fly is self-constituted chairman.

In other words, the President said: Whenever you can't get along with Fly as chairman of the F. C. C. talk to him as chairman of the Board of War Communications.

The Congress, however, decided otherwise, and, within the last month, on the record of the House select committee, cut approximately $2,200,000 out of the F. C. C. appropriation. The taxpayers and the war effort thus have both profited as a result.

(b) The F. C. C. had required all radio operators and communications company employees to file their fingerprints with the Commission. In September of 1941, J. Edgar Hoover, F. B. I. chief, requested that these prints be turned over to the custody of his Bureau for checking and processing, as this agency had been designated by the President, on September 6, 1939, as the clearing house for all "investigative information pertaining to the national defense." For months repeated requests from Mr. Hoover and Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, failed to induce Mr. Fly to surrender the fingerprints. Parenthetically, I might add that every radio operator at sea is a licensed radio operator in a very important post where he can do great and irreparable damage to the interests of the United States by communicating to the enemy the location of convoys and ships. The Navy wanted to know who were on these merchant marine ships. They asked F. B. I. to find out and that is what brought this subject up.

On January 2, 1942, Mr. Biddle wrote to Mr. Fly: "You explained that you had obtained the prints under a promise they would be kept confidential" and that the labor leaders, to whom this promise was made, would be asked to "release you." "The evidence is strong," said Mr. Biddle, "that messages have been surreptitiously transferred to our enemies by radio and that military attacks upon the territory of this country may have been furthered thereby." Did Fly then turn over these prints? He did not.

On May 6—5 months after Pearl Harbor—Mr. Fly wrote to Mr. Biddle: "I am today drawing the matter again to the attention of the labor leaders." Some 7 months after Pearl Harbor during which period the Nation's very life was in danger, Fly, even then under protest, began to transfer these records to the F. B. I. and it took nearly a year thereafter before they were all finally delivered. Three or four thousand of the persons whose prints were delivered had criminal records. Some 50,000 of the 250,000 prints, incidentally, were returned to F. C. C. as having been taken so improperly that they were useless.

(c) That there was an unlawful conspiracy between F. C. C. and the Office of War Information, O. W. I., to compel radio stations to use O. W. I. canned material or else. * * * F. C. C. unlawfully placed stations questioning this policy on 30-day licenses until they "saw the light," although the Communications Act contains no provision whatsoever for such a period of license in such circumstances.

The result of this Commission's nefarious activities is that radio has a weak heart, for all its powerful voice in America. It has no independence, no freedom, and lives in constant fear for its life. It dies a thousand deaths every Presidential campaign in expectation of the revenge of some politician or some political group.

Because of radio's fear for its life, the politicians kick it around in a fashion beyond belief. F. C. C. not only keeps radio terrified but punishes it for not being sufficiently terrified of other bureaucrats.

Fly will tolerate no public investigation of his stewardship. He resents the very idea of any accountability to Congress, whose creature he is; he will permit no criticism of his conduct and administration; no inquiry to ascertain whether the law under which he is acting should be amended in the public interest. He asserts immunity from all the legitimate processes of Government.

The F. C. C. is, after all, nothing more than a creature of Congress. It can be unmade as quickly as it was made. F. C. C.'s performance sums up to harassing radio management, doing administrative hatchet work on the political front and now moving toward reduction of radio to the last stages of regulation before outright censorship and Government ownership.

Congress had better act now to reverse this trend or one day soon the Nation will wake up with a muzzle on. I found a muzzle on many an official of the Government whose testimony I sought in my investigation.

I could detail without end instances to support my statement of the unlawful activities and the grasping of power by this Commission. Time prohibits more. I have already spoken too long.

Shall we close our eyes to what is happening in our Government? Shall we stand mute as step by step the lifeblood of our liberties is sapped? Must we be confronted with the totalitarian state as a fait accompli when we are so weakened that we can then do nothing about it?

Rather let us look up at the flag and again pledge renewed devotion to it and to the institutions which it represents and at the same time recall an old astronomer's words to his pupil Galileo, "Why should we who have so loved the stars, be frightened of the dark?"

Let us live recklessly as if today were our last, and fight as if we expected to live forever and would live in liberty or not at all. Let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of America. In the words of John Adams: "Live or die, sink or swim, survive or perish, I give my heart and my hand to this cause."

Lurking Dangers Which Coolidge Foresaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles (Calif.) Examiner, of April 28, 1944:

LURKING DANGERS WHICH COOLIDGE FORESAW

The political genius of the American people has been recorded in the wise observations of its statesmen.

While there is general recognition of the enormous contribution made to the American constitutional tradition by such Founding Fathers as Jefferson and Madison, it is not always appreciated that each new President has his opportunity to add to or detract from the heritage.

As the years roll by the extraordinary devotion of the late Calvin Coolidge to constitutional restraints take on new significance.

The late President showed great forebearance in avoiding any semblance of abuse of power.

After his retirement, in referring to his return to office in the 1924 campaign, Mr. Coolidge wrote in the Cosmopolitan Magazine:

"Many people at once began to speak about nominating me to lead my party in the next campaign. I did not take any position in relation to their efforts. Unless the nomination came to me in a natural way, rather than as the result of an artificial campaign, I did not feel it would be of any value.

"The people ought to make their choice on a great question of that kind without the influence that could be exerted by a President in office."

At the same time, with prophetic wisdom, Mr. Coolidge examined the "indispensable man" thesis.

"Had I been chosen," Mr. Coolidge wrote in the same article, "for the first place (the office of President in 1920) I could have accepted it only with a great deal of trepidation, but when the events of August 1923 bestowed upon me the Presidential office, I felt at once that power had been given to me to administer it.

"This was not any feeling of exclusiveness. While I felt qualified to serve, I was also well aware that there were many others who were better qualified. It would be my province to get the benefit of their opinions and advice.

"It is a great advantage to a President, and a major source of safety to the country, for him to know that he is not a great man. When a man begins to feel that he is the only one who can lead in this Republic, he is guilty of treason to the spirit of our institutions."

And since this is a presidential year, which may bring a new face to the White House, it seems timely further to explore Mr. Coolidge's simple guidebook.

Warning against exploiting evils and weaknesses as a means to achieve personal power, Mr. Coolidge concluded:

"Perhaps one of the reasons I have been a target for so little abuse is because I have tried to refrain from abusing other people.

"The words of the President have an enormous weight and ought not to be used indiscriminately.

"It would be exceedingly easy to set the country all by the ears and foment hatreds and jealousies, which, by destroying faith and confidence, would help nobody and harm everybody. The end would be the destruction of all progress.

"The only way I know to drive out evil from the country is by the constructive method of filling it with good."

Thus the years magnify our recognition of the profundity of Mr. Coolidge's quiet insight.

As time passes Coolidge's stature grows, and the people can benefit by rereading his admonitions as well as his infrequent exhortations.

Lt. Richard P. Doran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I came upon a clipping today which gives an Associated Press story from Ceylon in the Far East, which is of interest to me and will be of particular interest to the people of Vandalia, in Fayette County, Ill., which I am proud to say is a part of the district I represent here in this Congress.

I call attention to it because it shows what the American boy, whether he be located in the great cities or the villages of this Republic, has been called upon to do and is doing so well in this war.

In this peaceful democracy of ours, a few years ago, there was little thought when this boy was growing up, that he would be the subject of a news article from the Far East and there was little thought that a time would come when he would play such an important part in world military affairs.

This short dispatch goes on to say that Lt. Richard P. Doran of Vandalia, Ill., is commander of the first all-American tank unit to fight on the Asiatic continent, a unit that was sent into action in northern Burma under Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, and may I say that this unit has defeated the Japs, driving them ahead until it has recaptured a great expanse of that territory.

I am glad in my humble way to attempt to honor him by placing his name and calling attention to his unique distinction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the House of Representatives:

[From the Centralia (Ill.) Evening Sentinel of May 3, 1944]

FORMER CENTRALIAN LEADS TANK UNITS

Lt. Richard P. Doran, son of Paul Doran, of Vandalia, a former oil operator here, is commanding the first all-American tank unit to fight on the Asiatic continent, it was learned today.

Lieutenant Doran's name was erroneously listed as Bocan in several news releases, but relatives state that he has written them of his experiences and has sent home pictures taken with Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell. The group is in Burma and during its first action Saturday of last week more than 100 rounds of shells were used in an hour's fighting, destroying two Japanese antitank guns, exploding an ammunition dump, and killing 30 of the enemy. Some of Doran's tanks were hit many times, but there were no casualties reported.

Lieutenant Doran's brother, Tommy Doran, is the husband of the former Nina Louise Kaelin of this city.

They Are Not Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the so-called common people are seldom deceived for long by political maneuvers.

Columnists for the larger papers frequently but reflect the views of the average man in the so-called sticks. They just express, perhaps in more elegant language, what the folks back home talk among themselves.

As indicative of what the home folks are thinking, read the following editorial by David Lawrence:

MONTGOMERY WARD—SEIZURE OF PLANT DRAMATIZES ADMINISTRATION-LABOR TIE-UP

(By David Lawrence)

The seizure by the Government of Montgomery Ward & Co. on the ground that it distributes products essential indirectly to the war effort would prove to be more than a labor dispute. It could intensify the attitude of hostility toward the present administration in the farm States and dramatize, as no other single event could possibly do, the tie-up between the Roosevelt administration and the labor unions.

The issue in the Montgomery Ward case is whether the Roosevelt administration, acting through the War Labor Board, can force a maintenance-of-membership contract on an employer even though the latter has reason to believe that the union has lost the membership of a majority of its employees.

Congress has never authorized any governmental agency to compel the signing of contracts either with or without maintenance-of-membership clauses. Such a piece of legislation would be bitterly fought by the labor unions themselves, who do not want compulsory arbitration or coercion of any kind but desire it to be left entirely to collective bargaining with, of course, the right to strike.

"NO-STRIKE" PLEDGE REWARD

Because the labor unions have, through their national organizations, proclaimed that they would not strike, the administration has felt that as a reward for this the membership of the labor unions must be maintained with the aid of the Government. In previous instances, where employers have declined to sign contracts containing maintenance-of-membership clauses, the War Labor Board has insisted, and the President has ordered properties to be seized and operated by the Government. The threat of seizure has, in most instances, been enough to force the employers to sign the contracts.

But a change came over the situation when the Smith-Connally law was passed last year. It contained a provision that the orders of the War Labor Board must conform to the National Labor Relations Act. This is generally interpreted to mean that the collective-bargaining process shall be preserved and that the determination of whether an organization represents the majority of the employees is to be carried on by the National

Labor Relations Board in wartime as it has been in peacetime.

There has been no way, however, heretofore, to enjoin in the courts the orders of the War Labor Board with their multifarious commands supposedly derived from Presidential war powers. As a matter of fact, the President had no war powers except those actually delegated to him by Congress, but many an Executive order has been written on the assumption that in wartime the President can be a dictator and that laws can often be brushed aside without authorization from Congress.

The pendulum is swinging now. There is a trend toward court review, and there is a definite feeling that test cases should be brought to check the unrestrained use of governmental power. The Montgomery Ward controversy may result in just such a test case. The principle which has been espoused by the Montgomery Ward management—namely, that the National Labor Relations Board should determine whether the union in question has a majority—is accepted by the War Labor Board, but it insists that pending the outcome of that election the Montgomery Ward management should sign a contract renewing its old relationship. This, of course, is tantamount to saying that even through the status quo may be wrong, it should be maintained.

Normally, there is a great deal to be said in favor of maintaining existing relations, but in the Montgomery Ward case the maintenance-of-membership issue is the vital thing that may determine the outcome of the National Labor Relations Board case itself. In other words, by ordering a temporary or intermediate contract the union is given an opportunity by the War Labor Board to build up its membership so that when the National Labor Relations Board holds an election the union will have had a full opportunity to recruit new members.

POSITION TAKEN BY COMPANY

The Montgomery Ward management takes the position that Congress has not delegated any power compelling a maintenance-of-membership clause in union contracts, and the big mail order house, along with other large employers of labor, consider the maintenance-of-membership merely a steppingstone to a closed shop. President Roosevelt has declared that he would never order, nor did he believe that Congress would ever legislate, compulsory closed shops in America. This, he has insisted, must be the result only of voluntary agreements between employers and unions.

But in the case of maintenance of membership, which is considered by many employers as a modified form of the closed shop, the Government has been willing to bring its full powers of coercion into play. Inasmuch as Congress has not legislated on this subject and the administration has never sought legislation empowering it to grant maintenance of membership clauses to the unions, the raising of the issue through the courts has become inevitable.

It is most unfortunate that the administration still flounders without a constructive labor relations policy, and that the administration, which is so anxious to have the unity of the country in future programs of foreign policy, should be assisting in the breeding of isolationist votes in the Middle West.

For unhappily, when grievances on domestic matters become acute, they dwarf in importance international questions, and many a voter thinks of his ballot as one that should register his protest against the granting of special privileges by the administration to the groups with which it is politically allied. Back in the old days of the Republicans, people generally resented the same thing when the big corporations got their high tariff favors from the administration as a consequence of substantial financial contributions to presidential campaign funds.

When the Government seriously considers seizing a mail-order house to enforce a labor union contract on the ground that it is indirectly related to the war the result is that the issue will be discussed everywhere more on its political potentialities than on its merits.

Who Makes Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM I. TROUTMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of my colleague from Pennsylvania Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., over radio station WHN, New York, May 1, 1944:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish, at the very beginning, to draw a clear line right down the middle and to put military strategy on one side of it and foreign policy on the other. My talk to you tonight is concerned only with foreign policy.

I am going to say to you that our foreign policy should be specific. I do not mean that we can anticipate every detail or that we can expect all of our views to prevail around the conference table with our allies, but before we sit down at any such table we ought to know what the American people want. We won't know unless we have had public discussion of specific problems. Broad generalities are not enough on which to base a lasting peace. Let me illustrate by quoting from an advertisement published by Time magazine this past week. What was said there as to Europe, and Germany in particular, poses the type of question for discussion. The same particularity should be directed to Japan and the problems of the Pacific.

I quote:

"The swift march of day-to-day events shows that general principles are not enough. We—meaning you—have got to make some specific decisions pretty soon.

"Right decisions will help to win the war. Wrong decisions will certainly lose the peace. The important questions have no easy answers. For example:

"When Old Glory flies over the Rhine—what then?

"One decision we must face is what to do with a beaten Germany.

"Do you want Germany divided into dozens of little states, as she was before Bismarck's time?

"Do you want to see pieces of Germany given to her neighbors as was done to ancient Poland?

"If so, do you want the Germans 'evacuated' from East Prussia to make room for Russian and Polish colonists?

"If Germans are allowed to stay where they are, do you want them treated like a conquered people or like equal citizens?

"Do you want Germans to rebuild the cities German Armies have destroyed?

"If none of these make sense to you, then what should be done with Germany?

"And, finally, how great a part are you willing that American leaders, American boys, and American dollars should pay in building a new democratic Europe that can live in peace?"

Who makes our foreign policy? In order to give you an idea of what some of your Representatives in Congress are thinking about this I have cast this subject in the form of a summary of my own efforts to find out what our foreign policy is. I believe it to be extremely important that we get an answer to our questions.

I came to Congress in January 1941. It is a part of my business to know what our Government is doing at home and abroad. I have done my best ever since to find out whether we have a foreign policy and what it is. As far back as May 27, 1941, I was saying in the House of Representatives:

"The great test of leadership—of American leadership—is near at hand. One hopes that the great moral forces which do certainly exist here and in England and in other democratic bastions of the world may somehow achieve a more endurable and a more worthy future for mankind.

"Our confusion ought to be resolved, through free discussion, into a workable pattern upon which Americans united can stand."

The New York Times, on Armistice Day, 1941, nearly a month before Pearl Harbor, reported my speech of the day before, as follows:

"HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., the only Republican Representative from Philadelphia asked President Roosevelt today to give the Nation seven pledges, including one denouncing all aspirations for a fourth term, to win complete unity for the foreign policy now being pursued.

"Mr. SCOTT asked the President to promise he would:

" 'Save labor from those who would betray it and preserve the right of every man to produce for his country's defense.

" 'Put defense production under a single, responsible, capable head.

" 'Cut nondefense expenditures.

" 'Clean the Communists and radicals out of the Government.

" 'Disclaim here and now all ambitions for a fourth term. Let us be sure we are fighting for democracy and not for a dictatorship here at home.

" 'Keep out of local politics. A President dedicated to winning a war ought not to take time to meddle with the election of coroners and magistrates.

" 'Clarify the foreign policy. Let us know what we are fighting for and how far the administration believes and intends we should go. Is there going to be an American expeditionary force?'

"Then Mr. Scott added:

" 'Give us these assurances, Mr. President, and I am sure that the American people will give you a united effort, dedicated to victory, down whatever road you want to take us.' "

By April 21, 1942, after we had been at war more than 4 months, my concern continued as to the administration's intention to take the people into its confidence as to our essential aims after victory, and I said:

"This is no time for politics. Republicans and Democrats alike have a victory to win and an obligation to see that the fruits of victory are not lost."

In November 1942, just 1 year after this further plea for national unity, I said that I believed the recent elections indicated: (1) The demand of the public that we get on with the war; (2) a feeling of resentment at the concealment of truth when such concealment was not essential for military reasons. I repeated: "The public has not been taken into the confidence of the Government."

In September 1943 I remarked in a Philadelphia speech:

"The President and Prime Minister Churchill are relying on their skill at improvising solutions for situations as they occur, but Americans have not yet been given a glimpse of our foreign policy simply for the reason that we do not have a foreign policy to exhibit.

"Just as we have no domestic policy based upon equality of treatment for all, so we have no foreign policy founded on union of purpose and clarity of understanding. Our lend-lease dollars have not bought for us an overlordship of the peace conference. They can do much to win the war, but they cannot purchase the peace.

"Military decisions must obviously remain secret until they are put into practice, but our political intentions are the property of the American people.

"It is about time we had a foreign policy."

You will notice that I was continually making the basic point that any foreign policy determined upon by this country cannot and must not come down to the people from above in the form of Executive agreements which have not been examined by the people and their representatives. Rather, it must arise from considered public opinion to be truly a people's foreign policy.

If any advantage lies in secrecy, or in secret conferences secretly connived at, such an advantage must be sacrificed to the more impelling necessity for an informed thinking citizenry, for a public which knows where it is going, and what course the captain is steering through the turbulent waters of foreign relations. Leaders who withhold vital future plans from the public deny democracy.

I supported and actively worked for the adoption of the Fulbright resolution, adding these words of warning:

"I am glad this resolution has been presented to us. I hope in the future our Government will be more candid in giving us sufficient information as to its intentions toward the rest of the world. * * * Unless the Government informs the people it cannot complain if, having kept the facts secret too long, the public and its representatives balk at adopting such foreign policies as the administration may seek to force through the legislature.

"The people of America are reasonable. They will do the right thing and they can be trusted. They would like to trust their Government. It would be a lot easier for them if they felt the Government trusted them."

In October I was hammering away at the same thought:

"It is only natural for men in positions of authority to resent any criticism of their omniscience as they drive toward important goals, but unless we have a full and fair appraisal of the actions of our public leaders, even including the self-anointed ones, we will not have an informed public opinion."

On Armistice Day of 1943, as I had done in 1941 and in 1942, I spoke again on the same theme:

"We confuse these reports of highly satisfactory conduct of our military and naval forces with foreign policy. At the same time examination will clearly reveal that a consistent foreign policy does not exist and has not existed in this country during the past decade. * * * The Government cannot be the judge and the critic of its own policies. The people will judge and the people cannot deliberate without access to the facts. * * * Our foreign policy today appears to consist of the Atlantic Charter, the 'four freedoms,' and the partially revealed program of the Moscow Conference. I submit we are entitled to more than that, and I make the point on this day of armistice, the beginning of the long armistice, because the armistice is not over, and our debt to our honored dead (of both wars) is still undischarged. * * * An informed, intelligent, free people must arrive at a just, workable, and enduring compact among the nations."

Only the day before I had introduced the original resolution inviting Secretary Hull to address the Congress upon the results of the Moscow Conference. As you know the Secretary did so amid warm tributes to him as a distinguished American, but his report was, to say the least, disappointing to those of us who had hoped for something specific. Many Congressmen had been quite specific in outlining some of the questions in the minds of the American people which we thought should be answered.

On March 21 last I asked in the House of Representatives:

"What are some of the questions on which information is available but withheld. Just to state some of them will exhibit the need for more information, unless we are prepared to surrender, by default, our right to any share in the making of the conditions precedent to an enduring peace.

"Was it decided at Teheran that Germany is to be kept strong and substantially intact, a buffer between Great Britain and Russia?

"What of the German Army? Were decisions made on its continuation in strength, after surrender?

"Were not the terms of an eventual German armistice agreed on in principle?"

Up to this day no specific word has ever come from the President of the United States, but a 17-point program was recently announced by the Secretary of State. In my opinion, this was the Secretary's best speech. It was, however, significant generally for what it did not say. In this careful speech, it appears that our Government still does not fully trust the right people in France and is willing to trust a while longer the wrong people in Italy.

In the cautious words of our eminently respected elder statesman could be found nothing to inflame the peoples of occupied Europe to revolt at the time of invasion. There was notable lack of such specific promises as in the Wilsonian 14 points relating to restoration of nations and their frontiers. Are we not entitled to some information from our Government on specific matters, such as the following:

1. Have we become a party to a partition of Poland?
2. Will all of China be returned to the Chinese?
3. What are we going to do with the Pacific Islands?
4. Is there to be a League of Nations or not?

Every public pronouncement of the President and Secretary of State has skirted these politically troublesome questions by the use of idealistic generalities. When we promise an association of nations, using force if necessary, are we referring to the use of national armed forces or an international armed force? Why not frank discussion on this, led by our leaders?

President Wilson's 14 points end with this statement "We have spoken now, truly, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question." This was true. Peoples of Europe accepted the 14 points and German Army lost the support of the home front because the German people had specific promises upon which they believed they could rely. Wilson had spoken in concrete terms. Has Secretary Hull so spoken? Has the President so spoken?

On foreign policy pronouncements, we are tired of being beaten to the gun again, and again and again by other nations. We are entitled to expect that our President, in paraphrase of the words of President Washington, will raise a standard of foreign policy to which Americans may repair.

Our foreign policy does not even compare favorably with our pitifully unfortunate domestic policy. There is just one thing to be said for an inadequate and unfortunate domestic policy: Mistakes made on the home front can be corrected and the damage undone by a succeeding administration headed by competent men. Damage done in foreign affairs wrought through ignorance, vanity, secretiveness, or plain incompetence may lead us, without the consent of our people, into such deep involvement with other nations as to be irreparable.

A wise and clear-sighted foreign policy is the need of the hour. The American people should be told the facts of life as regards foreign policy and how we expect to avoid the catastrophe of another war through an acceptable form of international organization, established within the powers of the constituent governments and dedicated to the maintenance of the peace.

It is up to the President of the United States to take the people of the United States into his confidence.

It is later than we think.

Betrayal of Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker—

When the soldiers went away to war in 1917 they had no idea that the war emergency would be used to foist prohibition on the country and when they came back they had a feeling that, expressed in their own way, "something had been put over on them."

Today, with the vast majority of the younger men of the country away from home, the administration is engaged in a betrayal of trust which far overshadows the experience in the World War.

In the guise of war emergency and after having given explicit pledges that the war situation would never be used to alter the status quo by permitting either labor or management to exploit the emergency for their own advantage, the administration has deliberately set in to put over the closed shop in America.

The administration denies vehemently that the maintenance-of-membership idea is a closed shop, but the element of compulsion remains. The fact is that, having elicited a no-strike pledge from labor, the administration has felt it necessary to pay labor for adherence to the job by giving it a maintenance-of-membership advantage.

There can be no doubt that if there were no war on the country would be besieged by an epidemic of strikes and that the maintenance-of-membership clauses would be won in very few cases. Economic warfare would result just as it has in respect to the closed shop.

Congress has never set forth as a national policy either the closed shop or maintenance-of-membership coercion. But notwithstanding this fact the administration has made maintenance of membership a cardinal policy and is willing even in the critical months of this war to stir up a bitter controversy and call in troops to enforce that basic labor advantage.

Perhaps the simplest way to put an end to capricious handling of governmental power is to put a criminal clause in the statutes so that any violation of the Constitution by an official will be subject to a severe penalty.

The above was not written by me. I just copied it, word for word, from an article by David Lawrence, publisher and editor of the United States News and who, on the whole, has said some very nice things about the President and the New Deal. David Lawrence, as well as many others, has had more than enough of dictatorship.

Having been so vigorously and severely criticized because of my criticism of the New Deal, it is encouraging to find, after 8 long years, a man like Lawrence and many other sound, influential writers, giving utterance to the same thought earlier expressed by me. It leads me, not to use the somewhat conceited expression, "I told you so," but to the conclusion that perhaps, after all, the danger to our free institutions was sensed, warned against, and all along has been realized by many who were not so outspoken or who did not have the opportunity to be heard.

Believing that action rather than words or investigations is needed, an amendment was on May 1 introduced by me which would make impossible a repetition of the Montgomery Ward & Co. case.

Citizens who are victims of arbitrary, unjust, unconstitutional administrative orders should have an adequate, easy, and cheaply available remedy through local courts, and administrative officers who willfully make and enforce such orders should be punished or ousted from their jobs.

Congress should no longer let some agencies run hog-wild.

As One American Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following statement by a leading citizen in my congressional district:

DEMOCRACY OR NATIONAL SOCIALISM?

This is our only political issue. The war is not an issue. Our military staff is giving the war capable management. International affairs are not an issue. Most Americans realize there must be some form of international cooperation. It cannot be exactly defined until all of the cards are on the table. There is no contest between the major political parties. Patriotic Americans in all parties adhere to democracy.

What do we mean by democracy? We mean a government entirely subservient to the individual citizen, not a paternalism which regulates the affairs of the people. Democracy is not the dead level of "mediocracy"; neither does it make mendicancy respectable. Our forefathers took their woman, and an axe and a gun and headed back into the wilderness where they had to contend with savages, wild beasts, and an uncompromising nature.

"Times have changed?" "Old-fashioned democracy cannot meet modern conditions?" "The democracy of that day does not fit our needs?" "We are now an industrial Nation rather than agricultural?" That is adolescent drool which I heard from long haired undergraduates back in the gay nineties. We thought them amusing then, but they were still nuts in the 1930's and were able to do a quack doctor stunt for a people suffering from an economic stomach ache. The real Americans of today do not wish to be diapered from the cradle to the grave. That is not democracy. A bonnet and shawl do not make Hitler's wolf or Joe Stalin's bear Little Red Riding Hood's grandma—democracy.

From the beginning of "the great experiment," democracy, those suffering from delusions of grandeur have believed themselves ordained of God to manage the affairs of their fellow men. The present effort to undermine democracy is not new.

If we have any part of the patriotism of the boys in uniform we will defend democracy with all we have. The candidate, in the coming election, who has the guts to come out for an individualistic democracy can either win a glorious victory or he can go down to defeat as a great patriot along with those boys who, in their battle against national socialism, do not come home.

ERNEST W. TOWNE.

WOLLASTON, MASS.

The Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the president of the Hotel Association of New York City:

HOTEL ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK CITY, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 4, 1944.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: The Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., representing 196 hotels with an assessed valuation of over $400,000,000, respectfully urges you to approve legislation that will eliminate the 30-percent cabaret tax, or at least bring it down to a maximum of 10 percent.

The present tax is adversely affecting our member hotels that provide dancing and entertainment for their guests. The 30-percent tax is compelling changes in entertainment policies, with a resulting loss of employment to entertainers and musicians. Some hotels have already eliminated entertainment and dancing during the dinner hour, and we know of one hotel that will not open its roof garden. Another is considering a like step unless relief is promptly provided.

The hotels of New York City, like those throughout the entire country, are cooperating in every way possible in the war effort. We are complying with every wartime request; are helping all organizations working in behalf of the members of our armed forces, such as the Red Cross, U. S. O., Travelers Aid Society, etc. We are willing to continue to do our part, but we sincerely believe, judging by our experience during the last month that, in the 30-percent cabaret tax, we are carrying an unfair and inequitable business burden.

Congress, in adopting the tax legislation, considered the 30-percent cabaret tax as a luxury tax. But our experience shows that the members of the armed forces are among the greatest victims of the tax. It is a well-known fact that many men and women in the service of our country come to New York for rest and relaxation. Many of them are here just prior to their leaving for foreign duty. This tax is depriving these people of the very thing they are seeking in their visits to New York. This is a situation, we are certain, Congress never intended to create.

We urge you, therefore, to use your influence to eliminate the cabaret tax entirely or reduce it to a maximum of 10 percent. This, in our opinion, will be placing the operation of the tax on a practical and sensible basis.

Sincerely,

MARTIN SWEENY,
President.

Let's Not Tax Our Boys in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code in such a way as to relieve the men of the armed forces of the United Nations of a tax which, on the pay of an enlisted man or of a junior officer, can be a mighty big item, though in relation to the total revenues of the country it is nothing.

I refer to the transportation tax.

Under the law as it reads today the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission are authorized to set up special low-cost traffic for enlisted men, with a rate of 1¼ cents a mile for round trips only, when the men are on official leave, furlough, or pass, and traveling at their own expense.

In 1941, the Internal Revenue Act we passed that year added to section 3469, United States Internal Revenue Code, the following language:

Tax on transportation of persons: (f) Exemptions—(2) Exemption of members of military and naval service: The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to the payment for the transportation or facilities furnished under special tariffs providing for fares of not more than 1¼ cents per mile applicable to round trips sold to personnel of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard traveling in uniform of the United States; or to members of the military or naval forces of any of the other United Nations traveling in uniform of such nation, at their own expense, when on official leave, furlough, or pass, including authorized cadets and midshipmen, issued on presentation of properly executed certificate.

The tax we have assessed against transportation of persons is 15 percent of the value of the ticket.

To you and to me this tax is certainly something we feel; to the men in uniform it is almost prohibitive.

Naturally, most of the men who travel at their own expense take advantage of the special low fares on day-coach round trips.

That is why assessing full tax on first-class tickets is unfair—about the only time an enlisted man or a junior officer will want to go by Pullman at his own expense is when he is on emergency leave and has far to go.

The other day we read of an officer who received emergency leave to go to the

bedside of his dying wife and arrived too late by an hour. This officer was flown to San Francisco, then had to cross the continent to New York by train. He paid 15 percent of the price of his ticket on an extra-fare train plus 15 percent of the cost of his Pullman seat in his frenzied dash half-way around the world.

It is in cases like this where my proposal will help out. I am indebted to my long-time friend, Harold M. Miles of the Southern Pacific Railroad, for this suggestion. He assures me he knows of no railroad which will object to relieving the soldiers and sailors of the tax when they are paying full first-class fare. All my bill does is to delete the language restricting tax exemption for servicemen to the special low tariffs and relieve them of all transportation tax, at all times, when they are in uniform, on leave, and paying their own way.

I have no slightest doubt but that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Members of the House will give this proposal their earliest possible approval so that the law may be at once amended and collection of this tax from servicemen stopped immediately.

The Montgomery Ward Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present my views on the seizure of the Montgomery Ward Co. in Chicago. The newspapers have already given this incident the very dramatic title "The Battle of Chicago." I regard this battle as a defeat for the people of America. Whatever the ultimate outcome may be, the action of our Government in this dispute deserves the severest criticism. It was shameful because it was unnecessary and unwarranted. The laws of our country are designed to protect the weak against the persecution of the strong. Our Federal Government had every means at its disposal for the solution of this problem. It could have ordered an election instead of waiting until after a crisis developed; it could have used the services of civilian authorities instead of calling in the Army; it could have permitted the head of this company to remain in his office without resorting to absurd physical violence.

I regard Montgomery Ward & Co. as occupying a position similar to that of thousands of other wholesale and retail business enterprises in our country. They are not in themselves manufacturers of war materials, and the reaction of the majority of Congressmen to this situation makes it apparent that the legislation under which our Government acted was not intended to cover a company of this kind.

If a war-goods manufacturer, producer, or mining company had defied the Government, a different question would be presented. This arbitrary action now becomes a new testing ground for the entire issue of big government versus private business.

H. R. 4479

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech which I made on May 4 at a meeting in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the India League of America. The speech was in connection with H. R. 4479, a bill which I introduced to provide for the naturalization and admission into the United States of Eastern Hemisphere Indians and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians under a quota.

I am including a resolution passed by the audience at the conclusion of the address:

Ladies and gentlemen, I have dropped into the congressional hopper the companion bill to Mr. CELLER'S. As you have been told here repeatedly tonight, this bill would naturalize some 3,000 Indians from India who are today living in America, and would allow not more than 75 Indian-born Indians to enter our country a year, where they could become American citizens.

Why did I introduce this bill? So far as I know, not one of the 3,000 Indians who might be benefited by it lives in Fairfield County. Nor, for that matter, will the good opinion which numbers of literate and patriotic Indians in far-off India may conceive of my colleagues and me do much to help any of us next November. Then surely you think we did not introduce this measure to get votes? Perhaps we should claim that this is precisely the case. The average politician generally does like to be in a spot where he can effectively deny that his actions or words are motivated by any selfish desire to be reelected. He thinks if he can but show that there is no connection between his legislative propositions and the local ballot boxes, he may be hailed as an idealist or even a statesman. But why does the average politician yearn above all things to be considered an idealist and a statesman? Perhaps because upon analysis it so often turns out that idealists and statesmen are even more popular—that is, better vote getters—than politicians. For Americans, by and large, are still a nation of idealists, and a people who prefer their legislators to be statesmen rather than demagogs.

But I would never deny the accusation that fundamentally in all I do and say in Congress I seek popular votes, which is to say—the free approval of the people who elected me. It seems to me that the very safety of our Republic lies in the fact that our politicians have never yet discovered a way of doing or saying unpopular things for very long and still being returned to office. Storm troopers and blackshirts, dictators and tyrants can, with the aid of billies and bayonets, get away with unpopular words and laws, words and laws against the best interests of all the people. But democratic legislators can't. This is the essence and strength of our representative form of government. That is why no politician should ever deny the accusation that he is seeking votes. For as long as he is seeking votes he is bound to seek public approval. And, in the long run, public approval is accorded only to those whose words and laws tend to benefit the community and the Nation.

I, therefore, say frankly that I introduced this bill because I think in the long run the majority of the people of my own Fairfield County, who are a pretty good patriotic cross-section of the United States of America, will approve of me for doing so, because they will know that it is to their best interests, as Americans, that it should be passed.

In short, the best way for a politician to get votes today and tomorrow is to behave like a patriot. And a patriot is a man who cares about the safety of American troops overseas, while we are fighting, and the good will of other peoples and nations, when we are done. We may build the post-war edifice of peace by force, but good will is the only cement that will hold the international blocks together. And I say that the reason that the people of my own State will be for this legislation is that they will understand that it was introduced primarily as a small but important safeguard for the lives of their sons in the China-Burma-India theater, and a small but important step forward in securing the friendly cooperation and respect of hundreds of millions of Asiatics in the post-war era.

Why especially then is it to the benefit of Americans that they should give an immigration quota to Indians from India which will allow approximately 75 Indians a year to come to our shores?

First, because it will strengthen Indian morale now, by showing the Indian people, Moslems and Hindus alike, that this Nation does not discriminate among its allies on a purely racial basis. There are 2,000,000 Indians under Allied arms today. Indian regiments are fighting in Italy. Indian regiments will cross the channel with Allied invasion troops. Indian divisions are today the backbone of the British armies fighting the invading Japanese around beleauguered Imphal. Upon their success largely depends the fate of Gen. Joe Stilwell and his American and Chinese troops, fighting in the heart of Burma. Upon the success of Indian arms greatly depends our ability to continue to supply China by air over the Hump. Indian troops guard all the sea and air and land portals of India. In their loyalty and prowess lies the ultimate security of all India and, therefore, to a great extent, of all China.

Today there are a half million American troops in the China-Burma-India theater. Perhaps a million more will be needed before the Japanese armies can be driven from the Asiatic mainland. American prestige and popularity and, therefore, the safety of American troops cannot fail to be enhanced by the passage of this legislation. For the admission of a mere 75 Indians a year will become a great and persuasive symbol that we have wiped from our statute books the stigma of Indian inferiority, and are willing to cooperate as democratic partners today and tomorrow with India's three hundred and ninety millions.

Do not think for a moment that Indians will not hear of this small but shining deed. There are radios and newspapers, of course, in India. But the whispers that travel through the bazaars of a hundred thousand Indian villages travel faster than either. If this legislation is passed, it will be whispered there—no it will be shouted in all of India—that Americans think no less well of Indian fighting men than they do of Chinese fighting men. For we have already erased from our

laws the insult written there to our magnificent Chinese allies. We can do no less for our Indian ones.

Secondly, I believe, as do millions of Americans, that it is today and always will be to our best interests to practice the democracy and Christianity we preach, both abroad and at home. I know how deep is the prejudice among many of our people against all of God's sunburned sons of sorrow. The black, brown and yellow peoples of the world have long been looked down upon as inferiors by the white man.

But the luxury of prejudice, whether religious or racial, was one mankind could never really afford. Many of the worst and bloodiest catastrophies of history were rooted in these blind prejudices. Still, until now, the white man has somehow survived the evil results and dangerous implications of his own racial prejudices. Space and distance and a superiority of industrial and military might allowed him to do so. But this is a rapidly shrinking world. It has been shrunk to the size of an apple—an apple, alas, of discord, by the airplane and the railroad and the battleship and the truck and wireless and radio. Moreover, these mechanical inventions and mobile power units are no longer exclusively the sole property of the white races. Today it behooves the one-third of the world which is white skinned to think long and hard about its prejudices against the two-thirds whose skins are of a different color. It is high time, it is none too soon that we begin to make a little democratic and Christian sense in this matter of racial prejudice, if not for the sakes of our Christian souls, for the sakes of white skins.

It seems to me that this pending legislation is a step forward toward a recognition of this problem, an effort, however small, to do something in the direction of both skin and soul saving. We shall not be the losers either on earth or in heaven for admitting by this gesture the democratic brotherhood of man on earth which is eternally posited on the spiritual fatherhood of God in heaven.

Seventy-five Indian immigrants a year in a growing population of 135,000,000 Americans can certainly present no threat to our culture or our living standards. It is far too low a figure to matter either as a threat to domestic labor or to our national racial and cultural composition. Let me make it quite plain at this point that I am in favor of keeping it low. I have no wish to see my country flooded by peoples whose cultures and political backgrounds differ greatly from our own, whether they be Asiatics, Europeans, or Africans. For vast or even sizable numbers of peoples of alien turns of mind would be impossible for us to assimilate. But I consider this bill of mine and of Mr. CELLER, not so much an immigration bill, as a diplomatic and political measure against our present and future enemies. It bears precisely the same relation to our war effort and the peace effort that must follow, as the recent bill passed by Congress admitting a hundred-odd Chinese to our country.

I hesitate to say that one more reason I favor this quota for Indians is that we Americans might learn something from them, even though they are only a number of 75. Unhappily few people in America are fully aware that the great 6,000-year-old Hindu-Muslim civilizations of India have produced many of the world's greatest poets, philosophers, saints, scientists, authors, and artists, and notably few of its bloodthirsty warriors. But all Americans know that India has been for time out of mind a land of vast wealth. They know this because they know that Christopher Columbus' voyage was undertaken to discover a new route to the rich and fabulous Indies. They know that America might not have been discovered for several more centuries if India had not already been so famous in all of Europe. Surely there is something to be gained by our still young culture by opening our minds by this small gesture of invitation to 75 Indians to a healthy and useful recognition of India's ancient and powerful one. But it is also high time that we production-minded Americans faced the fact that this Nation of 390,000,000 of people is actually the eighth great industrial state in the world and potentially the third greatest—the first and second being, of course, the United States and Russia.

This fact has a vast import for the future of civilization. A country actually so strong and potentially even stronger cannot be ignored in our future calculations in foreign policy whether we think in geopolitical or power-political terms, which are today so much the fashion, or whether we think in terms of Christianity, democracy, and the humanities.

In terms of industrial facts and human figures, India is today a colonial possession of Great Britain. But tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow, she will become a free nation. This has been promised to her by the British themselves. The redemption of this promise will be one of the noblest and most constructive acts of statesmanship ever practiced by any nation. It will be similar in spirit to our procedure in the Philippines, but much greater in scope and in significance for the whole world. The temporary material sacrifice to Great Britain would be great—a fact we must never in the flush of our own strength and richness and comparative security forget for a minute. But in the end it would enrich Great Britain more than it would impoverish her. For it would, I believe, promote the cause of a long and prosperous peace in the Pacific as no other action taken by any other nation possibly could. As a member of the British Commonwealth, or as a totally independent nation, India would become not only a powerhouse of democratic thought in Asia but a vast and rich industrial market for the world. A free India would be a Pacific ally we Americans could cherish with enormous profit to ourselves and them. But whether Britain redeems her promise or not, the Indians intend one day to be free. Certainly one mighty neighbor of India's encourages, if not abets, this aspiration. That is Soviet Russia. I am not one of those who fear today that Russia and Russian communism will inevitably spread upon India. But I do fear that if India loses her faith in the political promises of Great Britain and the idealistic foreign aims of America, India and Indian communism will spread upon Russia. In short, an India too long thwarted of freedom by the western democracies might turn as her only alternative, to Russian communism and Russia itself for salvation and succor.

Japanese propagandists daily din into the ears of Indians that, although the Americans and British feel that Indians are good enough to die for them by the millions, they do not feel they are good enough for freedom; they are not even good enough for America to allow a mere paltry 75 of them to enter our country. Now, this is precisely what Communists in all countries, including our own, are saying, too, of the way be behave to our Indian allies. So Communists, Japs, and Germans all agree on this: We do not practice in foreign relations the democracies we preach. In the final analysis we can make liars of them all only by what we do and not by what we say when faced with such accusations.

Japanese propaganda in India today will suffer a mortal blow if we pass this legislation. And Indian Communist propaganda there tomorrow will find it harder to get off the ground, or rather out of the ground.

I hope, therefore, my purpose in introducing this legislation is clear. It is calculated primarily to help keep India in the columns of our democratic allies and friends, both today and tomorrow.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE AUDIENCE

Whereas this war is professedly being fought to achieve democratic equality among all nations; and

Whereas the nationals of India are objects of discrimination under our present immigration and naturalization laws; and

Whereas the United States has recognized the injustice to the Chinese people by lifting immigration and naturalization barriers against them; and

Whereas India is allied with the United Nations in the conduct of the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this audience assembled in the National Press Club Auditorium urges Congress to enact immediately pending legislation which would permit immigration under quota of nationals of India and make them eligible to United States citizenship.

Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which, if adopted by the Congress, will place Congress on record as favoring immediate resumption of full diplomatic relations between the United States and Italy and favoring the recognition of the present Government of Italy as a full and equal ally of all the United Nations. I attach the utmost military and political importance to this resolution, and I hope it will aid in bringing about a resumption of friendly relations between the United States and Italy.

The situation in Italy today is such that the Axis enemy, now occupying the major cities and rich industrial areas of northern Italy, may be struck a major military and political blow by the wise action of the leaders of the United Nations in giving diplomatic recognition to the Government of Italy and according it United Nations' status.

For the first time in 22 years the freedom-loving people of Italy have the opportunity to reconstitute themselves into a free and independent nation. All anti-Fascist and pro-democratic parties in Italy, clearly reflecting the expressed will of the Italian people in free and occupied Italy, are united behind the present government and form a major portion of its ministries. For the United States to resume diplomatic relations with Italy now will be to give the Italian people back their dignity and self-respect, to furnish the unequivocal guarantee that post-war Italy will not be a vassal Mediterranean state subject to the imperialistic whims of any nation. This action will make the whole Italian people realize that this war is a war of liberation for them and for all people.

Resumption of full diplomatic relations with Italy will aid materially the

cause of the full mobilization of the Italian people to drive out the Axis enemy, to strike him and strike him hard in the front lines at Cassino with Italian soldiers, behind these lines with increased production of food and war munitions, and in the occupied areas by ceaseless and fearless guerrilla warfare and sabotage. It is through this action that the lives of many American and other United Nations soldiers may be spared on the beachhead at Anzio and on the Cassino front.

I have every confidence that my resolution coincides with the policies and convictions of President Roosevelt and other leaders of the United Nations.

Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy

Whereas the President of the United States, acting with the full consent of the leaders of the United Nations, has pledged the Italian people the right to a free and democratic government of Italy of their own choosing; and

Whereas the present government of Italy is preponderantly composed of the representatives of the six political parties, comprising every current of anti-Fascist and prodemocratic sentiment in Italy; and

Whereas these politicial parties therefore reflect the will of the Italian people, not only of the liberated areas but of all of Italy; and

Whereas the presence of these Italian anti-Fascist and prodemocratic parties in the government of Italy offers clear assurance to the Italian people and to the world against unwanted forms of government in Italy, whether monarchial, dictatorial or imperialistic; and

Whereas the resumption of full diplomatic relations between the United States and Italy and the recognition of the present Italian government as a full and equal ally, entitled to lend-lease aid and to a proper role in the counsels of the United Nations, will release untold energies of the Italian people in both the liberated and occupied areas of Italy to give their fullest support to crushing the Axis, thus striking a hard political and military blow against Hitler and his agent, Mussolini, and shortening the war with consequent saving of the lives of thousands of gallant American soldiers now fighting on Italian soil: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and is hereby requested, to direct the Secretary of State to resume friendly diplomatic relations between the United States and Italy, to extend lend-lease aid to Italy; and to use his good offices to the end that the other United Nations resume diplomatic relations with Italy and that the United Nations recognize Italy as a full and equal ally.

Commando Kelly's Come Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by me, entitled "Commando Kelly's Come Home":

COMMANDO KELLY'S COME HOME

(Dedicated to Sgt. Charles Kelly)

There's a gnashing of teeth in Berlin,
There's a gnawing of nails in Rome;
The whole world with a heart tears Pittsburgh apart—
Commando Kelly's come home.

They've got honors galore for *the* Kelly
As he wings his way over the foam,
But above any other is the kiss of his mother—
Commando Kelly's come home.

There's a swell hotel suite that's not wanted,
For far sweeter than pure honeycomb
Is the house friends and kin crowd with neighborly din—
Commando Kelly's come home.

So here's to the One-Man Battalion,
As modest and brave as they come,
Who added new glory to our glorious story—
Commando Kelly's come home.

MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
Member of Congress.

Address of Secretary of Labor Perkins at I. L. O. Conference, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Philadelphia, where I have been serving as a technical adviser to the Government delegates—Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins and Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS—at the Twenty-sixth Conference of the International Labor Organization. The House approved request for leave of absence upon my designation to the post by Secretary of State Hull. All meetings are held at Temple University.

This is a tripartite conference with workers, employers, and Government represented. It is too early to report on the Conference. Much time was used in discussing jurisdiction and procedure, but now progress is being made in dealing with the many far-reaching and important points on the long agenda. One of the most serious problems still requiring considerable study and discussion is the framing of recommendations to be made to the United Nations for present and post-war social policy.

The procedure being followed at all meetings is most democratic both in form and in fact. The major committee deals with the basic questions concerning the future role of the I. L. O. in the world organization which will come with the allied victory.

This group is headed by Miss Perkins, has 72 members, including representatives of 36 governments, 18 employer delegations and 18 worker representatives.

Because of the procedure in voting, there is little chance for "steam roller" tactics. In the deliberations so far, Miss Perkins has avoided settling matters in dispute by vote, encouraging full discussions and changes in language until all members can agree. So far this method has worked and seems to be a wise one since the differences have been largely on details. It takes more time but leaves all delegates happier than if their proposals were voted down.

The committee which I have been serving on—Employment During Transition From War to Peace—has dealt with the major points that were controversial, so I have returned to the Capital until the Conference is ready to act upon this report. There was considerable debate on demobilization of soldiers and of those in war industries and other practical questions.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the address of Secretary Perkins setting forth the American Government's position on the matters of the agenda, President Roosevelt's letter to the Conference on its opening April 20, and the telegram of Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, read to the Conference on its second day:

Every nation in the world today accepts as axiomatic the idea that a man should be able to live as the result of the work that he does and the contribution he makes to society. We know that long-term mass unemployment can be prevented in any society. It must be accepted as a fundamental labor standard, that steady and regular jobs will be available for all who are able to accept work discipline and to achieve some minimum of skill and efficiency. Whatever devices may be necessary we must see to it that our economic organization is such as to provide the necessary millions of jobs throughout the world and increasing opportunity for the investment of the savings of the people in the further expansion of its economy. These jobs must be distributed among manufacturing, construction, trade, transportation, agriculture, and private and public services in reasonable and practical proportions. Above all there should be jobs for the production of needed and useful goods and services which can be consumed locally or traded profitably in the world markets.

While the availability of jobs depends primarily upon the maintenance of a dynamic equilibrium between production on the one hand and consumer purchasing power and investment demands on the other, we have all learned during the war the importance of flexible and efficient organization of the labor market as a means of reducing lost opportunities for employment. A free public employment system, serving the whole population, will be even more indispensable in the transition from war to peace than it was during the war. There should be no weakening of these services after this war. We welcome the opportunity at this conference to discuss means for improving national employment service through international collaboration, and to discuss ways and means of placing disabled persons in self-sustaining employment.

In the transition from war to peace we shall have to guard against the erection of barriers to employment. We cannot protect employment and labor standards by a hierarchy of preferences. The needs of individuals who are seeking work must be recognized. All nations should undertake that, in plans for the demobilization of war industries, special attention will be given to the needs of women for reemployment. The failure to do so will result not only in the exclusion from employment of women who need jobs but in a letdown of labor living standards.

In the transition from war to peace we must be clear-headed with regard to the means of preventing unemployment. Whenever unemployment has appeared as a phenomenon in the past, there has been a tendency to excuse or write down part of it on the assumption that there is no need for the product of as many people as are willing to work. Overproduction is a popular but untrue word. Actually periods of depression have been periods of real poverty, real lack of things when there was desperate need for the goods that might have been produced. Today, having partially appraised the needs of our own and other countries, we know that there will not be too many workers to serve those needs. We should never again allow trained workers and developed facilities available for the production of needed goods and services to remain idle, while the needs of large parts of the world's population remain unsatisfied.

But employment is not an end in itself. Free and informed societies recognize that the purpose of the employment relationship is to produce goods and services for consumption and to provide incomes for both employer and workers that will make an adequate purchasing market for the things that have been produced, or their equivalent, in trade. Improper employment or harmful employment should and can be avoided. Except in great emergencies, the current work of an individual should promote his future capacity to render service.

The improvement of the conditions of employment is therefore of essential concern. The International Labor Organization has a special and peculiar responsibility for developing those minimum standards that all of us accept as necessary.

Reducing hazards of work places;

The regulation of the employment of children;

Special safeguards for the employment of women;

Provisions for minimum wages and maximum hours;

The provision of rest periods and opportunities for leisure;

The establishment of comprehensive systems of social insurance and public assistance;

Provision for opportunity for development of collective bargaining.

The experience and techniques which the I. L. O. has built up, the faith that is put in it by the people of so many lands, and above all, its character as an organization in which representatives of workers and employers have an established right to participate, give it a strength which no newly created instrument could equal. I take it therefore that all nations gathered here, including the U. S. A. intend in the future, as in the past, to place primary reliance on the procedures of the International Labor Organization to develop and implement international labor standards.

We shall not satisfy the legitimate expectations of the people of the world, however, if we do not strengthen the organization and adapt it to meet additional responsibilities in the post-war period. No constitutional change is needed.

To equip the office more fully as an organ to offer advice and assistance to competent national authorities in the development of labor standards and administration:

To provide within the office competent technical investigators to make impartial investigations on the spot, under specified conditions, of compliance with accepted obligations; and

To develop regional conventions in some instances to supplement international conventions.

In particular, for example, we believe there should be further explorations of the possibility of setting specific minimum wages by international negotiation for particular industries or regions. We believe that the I. L. O. in the past has not given adequate attention to the problem of securing minimum earnings for those groups of workers who do not work for wages but sell the product of their labor. We believe that the role of the I. L. O. in connection with labor standards in dependent areas can be greatly extended.

We would also favor formal action by the United Nations, and such others as may care to associate themselves with their action, to extend the influence of the conventions and recommendations adopted at the International Labor Conferences. As in the past, member states should be free to ratify these conventions, or not, as they see fit. Only thus can we preserve the influence of the economic groups and avoid an insistence upon the rule of unanimity that has been so generally the practice in diplomatic conferences. But when a two-thirds majority of the accredited delegates from the member states have adopted an international labor standard, that standard should be held constantly before the eyes of the world and of all governments. Member states should adopt a requirement to report to the I. L. Office on the status of legislation, administration, and practice under collective agreements with respect to all matters covered by conventions whether they have been ratified or not. Such reports, incidentally, can be expected of Federal states, even on matters that may lie within the province of the component states and are therefore not submitted to the Federal authority for ratification.

The present moment seems to us a propitious one in which to implement the last 25 years of work by the I. L. O. Between 1919 and 1939 the conference adopted 63 labor conventions. At the time that each was adopted, it would have been impossible for all the nations of the world immediately to have ratified any one. Standards must be built up gradually. But I think we should ask ourselves whether the time has not come when some of these standards could be made more nearly universal.

We believe that within the framework of the peace settlements it should be possible to secure world-wide adoption of certain minimum child-labor standards. Those nations, for example, that have already established a 14-year minimum age for industrial employment should be able to ratify the 15-year minimum provided in convention 59; others should be able to accept the 14-year minimum in convention 5. We believe that all nations should be prepared to prohibit the underground work of women in mines in accordance with the convention adopted in 1935. We believe that in every country there should be minimum wage-fixing machinery and current knowledge as to what wages are paid and what hours worked.

Whenever international economic arrangements are being consummated—whether it be a matter of international loans, of the redistribution of merchant shipping, or an agreement with reference to air transport—the negotiators should bear constantly in mind the possibility of utilizing those negotiations and instruments as a means of improving labor standards.

But even though there lies behind us a record of great accomplishment in formulating international labor standards, though we have a chance at this time to associate the I. L. O. with those who will shape the peace in the United Nations, though we intend to use the I. L. O. to establish even better standards in the future, all this is not enough.

The United Nations are pledged to seek to achieve freedom from want for the mass of the population. In formulating these labor and social standards which are described on our agenda, we have an opportunity and an obligation to advance standards of living throughout the world through the instrumentality of the peace settlements.

How is this to be done? What role does the I. L. O. have in this great struggle to establish a socially just peace?

The political framework to maintain peace and an energetic joint program to raise production and consumption to the highest possible levels will reinforce each other. The resources of the world are inadequate to sustain it as an armed camp and at the same time to maintain its population in health and comfort. We have learned that improved working and living conditions contribute to social stability and thus to world peace.

Freedom from want requires productive capacity sufficient to satisfy the needs of all people. It requires an organization of the economy such that this capacity will be used and that the resulting product is so distributed as to insure at least minimum standards to all workers. Systems of social insurance and public assistance have the effect of putting purchasing power in the hands of those who do not for a variety of reasons achieve an adequate income through their own current efforts. Such systems make consumers out of otherwise indigents. To these things we are pledged.

At this stage in the world's history, man has a conscious choice. Good standards do not necessarily flow from productivity, but without high productivity, standards are bound to be low and even deteriorating. The opportunity before the civilized world at the present time is to choose to establish high social standards and high standards of living out of increased productivity and to develop that productivity with a view to enhancing human living. Our work in this conference should be directed to crystallizing that choice in the certainty that high levels of productivity will be enhanced by the efficiency arising out of good standards and that the building up of purchasing power on a broad scale through better incomes and better standards throughout the world will create markets to support the expanding production.

International collaboration toward this end will be facilitated, if the specific objectives embraced within the concept of freedom from want are defined and if the force of world opinion can be brought to bear continuously upon the problem of raising living standards throughout the world. Nations should agree that they will develop national policies and will cooperate in international policies which would seek:

To insure a high level of steady employment.

To encourage development of natural resources, technical progress, improved management, and training of workers, in order that labor may be employed under conditions of maximum efficiency; and to discourage the restriction of useful production.

To insure that all young persons have access from birth until they are fully grown to adequate food and medical care so that they may be healthy, strong, and vigorous; to housing conducive to family welfare; to educational and guidance facilities adequate to the maximum development and utilization of their personal capacities; to protection from employment at too early an age or under conditions detrimental to their health or welfare; and to social and recreational opportunities adequate to develop self-reliant, socially responsible individuals.

To establish minimum standards of employment to prevent the exploitation of those workers (whether employed or self-employed, in industry or in agriculture) whose opportunities for high wage employment are limited; and to make progressive improvement in these standards as their resources permit.

To provide for a regular flow of income to all those whose employment is interrupted

by sickness or injury, by old age or by lack of employment opportunity.

To maintain the health of the population through adequate public-health measures and the safeguarding of work places and by providing that all individuals have the opportunity to receive adequate preventive and curative treatment.

Agreement with respect to such objectives should underlie and motivate all of the special international economic agencies that have been or may be created as part of the peace settlements. We welcome the recognition of these goals by the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture and by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The collaboration of the International Labor Organization in the pursuit of these objectives is vital. They are also objectives of this organization. They are the objectives of the groups here represented. Few of us here are technically competent to stabilize currencies, to arrange international loans, to develop more efficient production of foodstuffs. But we do know whether standards of living are rising or falling. We can distinguish whether a technical economic device is contributing to employment and a rising standard of living or is designed to limit production of needed commodities perhaps only to create great profits, greater than the necessity of fair returns or investment required. The International Labor Organization should appropriately discuss the various ways in which progress is being made toward the objective of freedom from want and should be able to communicate its suggestions for the more effective pursuit of this objective to each of the technical agencies whose activities will be indispensable to its attainment.

More than this, the I. L. O. is a suitable forum in which nations should review from time to time the total picture of their progress in social justice. As we set up a series of specialized technical economic bodies, there is danger that we may lose sight of our basic objective. It is not our object to progress in identical ways in all parts of the world. In some countries sanitation may be prerequisite to progress; in others food may be the greatest need; in others, housing, in others, a wider distribution of income; in others, the stabilization of employment. All that we are trying to do is to set in motion forces throughout the world which will insure that everywhere, year by year, in one respect or another, progress is made toward these goals. Where more appropriately than in the I. L. O. can that progress be discussed?

The I. L. O. has always been a forum for the discussion of social conditions and economic problems affecting the well-being of workers. The United States Government will propose that this function be extended and formalized:

"The United Nations, and such others as are willing to join us should agree to give information annually to the I. L. O. Conference in regard to the degree of achievement of the social goals they agree to set for themselves."

Such reports will be more fruitful if there is general agreement with respect to objective standards that should constitute the goals of economic and social policy and if there is some uniformity in the compilation of information with respect to the extent to which these standards have been approximated. We shall therefore wish to recommend a formal undertaking among the United Nations, to be adhered to in connection with the peace settlements, to develop, through appropriate international agencies, statistical measures and to maintain statistical and other information bearing on the enumerated goals of social policy, as well as on employment, national income, and the distribution of income. There should be close collaboration and full exchange of information between the I. L. O. and other international bodies established to promote economic advancement and social well-being.

There should be no conflict between technical progress and steady employment. Technical progress has made possible mankind's rise from misery. Under the best of conditions, it will still require decades of capital accumulation to produce the tools that are needed to free more than half the people of the world from the necessity of using back-breaking and pathetically inefficient methods of production.

Without a broad and developing base of efficient productive capacity, the ideal of achieving freedom from want involves perpetual makeshift. When one must choose between enough food and good medical care, drugs, or sanitation, no choice will be satisfactory, because nutrition is perhaps the most important principle of preventive medicine while poor health makes men inefficient producers.

It follows that the fundamental lines of economic policy must concern themselves with raising the productive capacity of populations and with insuring a full and effective use of productive resources. The population of the world can be better nourished while young children are freed from labor, for example, if agricultural machinery, fertilizer, breeding stock, and technical help are imported by poor regions so that more food can be produced with fewer hours of labor.

Their need for tools promises a market for the products of industrialized countries. This market will be profitable, however, only if the rest of the world is willing to buy part of the increased supply of goods that may be produced in hitherto underdeveloped areas so that payment can be made for the equipment needed. Thus an orderly and continuous expansion of world trade is an indispensable part of an international program aiming at the elimination of want.

Even were the objective of achieving freedom from want conceived by any government exclusively in the interest of the workers of that country, the program for economic development should be world-wide in scope. Geographical specialization of production, insofar as it is consistent with military security, has the same advantages in the international as in the national sphere. We shall limit the possible increase in the standard of living in the United States, for example, if we insist upon using part of our labor in the exploitation of inferior resources. Equally we shall increase the difficulty of furnishing regular employment to all workers in industrially advanced countries, if we fail fully to avail ourselves of the tremendous market for machines and technical assistance created by the needs of areas with undeveloped resources.

Nor is the development of a high level of national income a matter exclusively of national concern. Imports to the United States are high when our industrial activity is running at high levels; low, when we are in depression. Every country depending upon exports to the United States for its well-being—and there are many that are dependent primarily upon this market—has a vital stake in policies that we may or may not adopt. We equally are concerned that other countries do not permit depression to develop or follow national policies that would spread depression from other countries to our own. The cost of insulating ourselves against economic disturbances in the rest of the world is too high. Unless all of us are prepared to face permanent international conflict for raw materials and to curtail seriously the opportunity for free individual initiative—indeed, unless we are also willing to risk a sinking standard of living—we have no alternative other than to join together in a mutually advantageous effort to increase the production of all nations and to free markets sufficiently to consume the resulting product. Therefore the United States delegation will recommend that—

"The United Nations should agree in principle that the maintenance within each nation of high levels of employment and national income is a matter of international concern."

The International Labor Organization has been and will continue to be a powerful instrument for social progress. I am proud to have shared in the work in recent years. It is an instrument through which labor and employers have a direct and continuing voice in shaping world social economic development, and as such it will grow in influence in the years of peace that lie ahead.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 19, 1944.

To the Members of the International Labor Conference:

I send you greetings and a warm welcome. We are glad to have you in the United States. It is a privilege to welcome on our soil for the third time a general conference of your great organization.

The conference that opens today is most significant in the annals of international gatherings.

The mere fact that in the tradition of the founders of the International Labor Organization the conference still maintains its distinctive, democratic, tripartite character is in itself of significance.

As part of the regular constitutional machinery of the I. L. O., it also testifies to the vitality of one of the few international organizations which have continued to function throughout the war. The determination on the part of its member states that the I. L. O. should continue its activities during the war years is evidence of the indestructible tenacity of the democratic way of life. As representatives of the practical affairs of these nations—not only of their governments, but also of their workers and employers—you have come together to make plans and recommendations for the continuing improvement of labor standards and for raising the standard of living of the world's people. The task you are undertaking, even at the moment when the tide of war is mounting, bears testimony to the fact that the welfare of the world's population and their liberty are a first and an ultimate concern of those dedicated to root out from this earth every trace of Nazi ideas and Nazi methods.

We know that the conditions of a lasting peace can be secured only through soundly organized economic institutions, fortified by humane labor standards, regular employment, and adequate income for all the people.

Within the field of your activity the United Nations have no need to extemporize a new organization. The ways and means for obtaining this underwriting of a permanent peace are among the items on the agenda of your conference. In your recommendations will lie the foundation of those agreements in the field of labor and social standards which must be part of any permanent international arrangement for a decent world.

The Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has already publicly announced that the Government of the United States is now working on plans for an international organization to maintain peace. He has also referred to the economic and other cooperative arrangements which must be made in order that the peoples of the world may have the opportunity through their own efforts to improve their material condition.

As part of these plans and international arrangements, I see in the I. L. O. a permanent instrument of representative character for the formulation of international policy on matters directly affecting the welfare of

labor and for international collaboration in this field. I see it as a body with the requisite authority to formulate and secure the adoption of those basic minimum standards that shall apply throughout the world to the conditions of employment. As part of these arrangements, also I see in the I. L. O. an organization which shall serve the world for investigation and research, for discussion and debate. But more than that it must be the agency for decision and for action on those economic and social matters related to the welfare of working people which are practical for industry, and designed to enhance the opportunities for a good life for peoples the world over.

It is to the I. L. O. that we shall look as the official international organization where ideas, experience, and movements in the field of labor and social development may find practical and effective expression.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The following telegram from Secretary of State Hull was read today by Otis E. Mulliken, Acting Chief, Division of Labor Relations, Department of State:

"I am happy to extend my cordial greetings to the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Conference.

"You are not strangers in this country; your first session held in Washington in 1919 laid historic foundations for your work and your most recent session in New York in 1941 expressed the determination of free peoples the world over to carry this war on to victory and to restore and strengthen the liberty, the dignity, and the inalienable rights of man.

"You are meeting in a city in which many years ago our forefathers met in conference to pioneer these fields. From their debates emerged the Declaration of Independence which proclaimed the self-evident truths that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"A few years later, in another conference in Philadelphia, the Constitution of the United States was framed 'to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty' for themselves and their posterity. Twenty-five years ago the same 'sentiments of justice and humanity' led to the creation of the International Labor Organization. Designed to deal with those labor conditions which involve 'such injustices, hardship, and privation that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled.' The International Labor Organization also was designed as a great pillar in the arch of peace and security. It, too, proclaimed the need of tranquillity and the promotion of the common welfare.

"Just 25 years ago this month a little band of courageous and determined men were busy organizing the first session of this conference which was held in Washington in October 1919.

"No groups have larger stakes in both the economic and social aspects of international cooperation than those represented at the International Labor Conference. We are fortunate indeed to have the machinery of a well-established and experienced organization to facilitate international collaboration in matters directly affecting the interests and problems of employers and workers; the agenda of your present session shows both how far you have progressed and how far we have still to go.

"The interdependence of nations to which this conference draws dramatic attention has been driven home upon us with increasing force. We have learned that deep seated economic and social evils cannot be cured by the action of any one country alone. Accordingly, it is essential this conference should lay down a program which will increase still further the effectiveness of the International Labor Organization in the difficult days to come and to assist us in directing national and international policies to the advancement of the basic and permanent interests of all peoples."

Air Cargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1944, the Detroit Board of Commerce and Wayne University, under the Edward S. Evans grant for air cargo research, sponsored in the dynamic city of Detroit an inter-American air cargo luncheon.

For the first time, fresh fruits and vegetables, vine- and tree-ripened, were flown from East, West, the South, Mexico, Central and South America to a central point. Despite the difficulties of wartime transportation, this demonstration indicated the post-war possibilities in the transport of fresh produce.

Distinguished guests spoke on the subject of aviation and air cargo transportation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speeches delivered at the luncheon. My own address on that occasion appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1944:

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND AIR TRANSPORTATION

(Address by Secretary Claude R. Wickard)

I deem it a great privilege to be accorded this place of honor on your program. I want to congratulate Wayne University, the Detroit Board of Commerce, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the air-transport companies, and others who have helped to make this unique luncheon and meeting possible. Also, I want to congratulate Col. Edward S. Evans, of Detroit, for his foresight and public-spirited interest in making possible the air cargo research fund here at Wayne University.

I believe that my allusion to this luncheon as being unique is entirely fitting. The fact that the very excellent fresh fruits and vegetables, including tropical varieties, served here today were flown to Detroit by cargo airplanes is sufficiently novel and prophetic of things to come to stir the imagination and arouse the interest of all of us. In addition to the delicious flavor and sun-rich color of these tree- and vine-ripened fruits and vegetables, their high-vitamin content is another important factor to consider from the standpoint of our health and general well-being.

Perhaps the radio audience is interested in knowing that we have some tropical foods here that are so rare the aid of the Department of Agriculture was solicited in preparing a special set of recipes for cooking and serving them.

The in-season products of soil, sunshine, and labor on our menu here today were flown in from our own Southern States, from the Southwest, and from the West, while the tropical foods came from the Caribbean area. To most of us this is symbolic of a new milestone in a phenomenal era of transportation progress. To our pioneer forefathers the mere mention of such an achievement would have seemed fantastic, if not miraculous. It staggers the imagination to try to reconstruct in our minds the degree of amazement that would have gripped those plodding surface travelers could they have been given a preview of such an event as this.

The telescoping of time and space presents to us a challenge and an opportunity. It is indeed gratifying to see Wayne University and the Detroit Board of Commerce sponsor this meeting which focuses attention upon a field that offers so many possibilities. I think we will all agree that, through air transport, there is a very real prospect of developing: One, a new and improved method of marketing some of our perishable farm products, benefiting both producers and consumers; and two, a new use for the vastly expanding air industry of this country.

There is an equally important advantage which would accrue to a highly industrialized community, like Detroit, through the development of such a program. The same cargo planes that bring in the perishable fruits and vegetables would, of course, transport industrial goods to the agricultural areas, thus providing a round-trip pay load for the planes and facilitating the exchange of products between rural and urban communities.

The importance to both industry and agriculture of speeding up the exchange of industrial and agricultural products is readily apparent. To agriculture it offers a quicker and surer market for some commodities. Likewise, such an exchange would assist in making available markets for industrial goods and jobs for factory workers, which means purchasing power in the hands of city people. Those of us in agriculture have long been aware of the fact that farm people can't prosper unless city people have the money with which to buy the things farmers produce.

With regard to air shipment of farm products, we realize that perhaps the greatest possibilities for new and more revolutionary developments lie in the post-war period. However, there is one extremely significant fact to bear in mind now. That is: The almost immediate possibility of inaugurating a program for the shipment, by air, of perishable farm products. This prospect is predicated upon the assumption that transport planes as they are now designed and built could be used as they are released from war duty, rather than to wait for newer designs that might be turned out sometime after the war. I am told that some surplus transport planes are already being made available to air lines, and it is reasonable to expect that after the war many more will be available.

An additional advantage, but by no means a secondary one, to consider in connection with the expansion of air transport is the possibility of providing employment for our highly trained pilots, aircraft mechanics, and technical and other personnel for aircraft as they come back from the war. Any development which offers greater use of transport or cargo planes I am sure is welcome news to those valiant airmen who are doing so much in this war.

Since these cargo planes are already being released from war duty it seems plausible to consider seriously the possible results if air-cargo service for the transportation of certain agricultural products were begun at an early date rather than to wait until some indefinite time in the future. We know that the farm commodities best suited, for the present, to air transport are those that demand high speed transit or special care in handling. Certain fruits and vegetables are of this type. If the airplane can get the produce to the consumer in a more palatable and nutritious form the consumer will gain by getting a better product and the producer stands to gain by obtaining a larger income because of the greater demand for his product.

One of the chief factors upon which the success of such a venture on a commercial

scale depends is, of course, the comparative costs of air-cargo transportation and surface methods of shipment. In this connection, I should like to call attention to a study, recently published by Wayne University, on the subject Air Cargo Potential in Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. Copies of this report have been distributed to the guests here, and I am sure it offers interesting material for study. I should like to mention also a report on another study, conducted jointly by the Department of Agriculture and Wayne University. This report is called Post-War Possibilities of Air Transportation of Fresh Strawberries and Tomatoes. We realize that, for air transport, strawberries and tomatoes offer perhaps the most promising prospects of any of the perishable foods, but the possibilities are by no means limited to these two commodities. Information or experience gained in connection with strawberries and tomatoes will no doubt be useful in considering the air-shipment possibilities of other fruits and vegetables. Now I should like to report to you briefly some of the highlights of the findings, particularly of the study in which the Department of Agriculture cooperated.

Under conditions assumed in the study the cargo plane would have a pay load of four and a quarter tons of strawberries from Lakeland, Fla., to Detroit, for example, or the same weight of tomatoes from Miami to Detroit. When air-transport costs are compared with the fastest surface methods of transit now being used for these commodities air charges are 6 cents per quart higher for strawberries and the same figure per pound higher for tomatoes.

As now handled, most fresh tomatoes sold at retail during the winter months are picked when green in the field. After being picked green, they are wrapped and shipped to ripening plants in the large northeastern consuming centers. In the ripening plants they are unwrapped, and after ripening, are re-sorted and packed for sale. It is easy to see that by packing the tomatoes directly into consumer packages in the producing area labor costs are reduced and less handling occurs, thereby cutting down on spoilage and waste resulting from bruising in handling. These savings would tend to decrease further the net difference in transportation costs between sky hauling and surface hauling.

Still there is another significant factor to take into account when weighing sky hauling against surface hauling. That is a saving in both time and weight in packaging by using paper containers instead of wooden crates as now required. This may have two significant effects: One, by decreasing the weight of the container, the per-unit cost of transportation is reduced; and the other is that by packaging the food in the area where it is produced into consumer-size packages a saving is effected in labor costs, and waste from spoilage is reduced.

After considering the savings to be gained by air transportation there is reason to believe that tomatoes can be placed on retail counters in the winter season at practically the same price as those transported by surface carriers. They could not successfully compete, of course, with the locally grown, vine-ripened, in-season product.

In considering cargo shipment by air, we should not lose sight of the fact that the principal advantage to be gained, through faster transportation, is in the improvement of the quality of the product as it reaches the consumer. To bring strawberries, for example, from Florida to Detroit by rail express requires a minimum of 3 days, and by rail freight and truck, a minimum of 4 days. Tomatoes take slightly longer. By air, the time required is between 7 and 8 hours.

Think of what this means. Produce may be harvested during the forenoon of one day, precooled in the afternoon, loaded on the plane in the evening, transported overnight to the northern consuming centers and placed in the retail store less than a day after being harvested. This makes it possible to harvest produce in a much more advanced stage of vine or tree ripening with, in most cases, considerable increase in its palatability, vitamin content, and yield per acre.

There is ample reason to believe that movement of produce by air would make a significant contribution to the public welfare, not only from the standpoint of increased satisfaction to be derived from the pleasure of eating a better product but also from the standpoint of improved public health.

The fact that the public has spent tremendously increased amounts of money on vitamin pills in recent years might be an indication that the people would readily appreciate the value of getting more of their vitamins from fresh produce.

We know that vitamin C, for example, is a very important part of our diet. This vitamin, which is needed to build body tissue and bones and to fight infection, is found in abundance in fresh fruits and vegetables. And the fresher these foods are, the higher the vitamin content. Tests show that stored or slow-transit fruits and vegetables lose appreciable amounts of their vitamin C content, particularly at warm temperatures or when the produce is in a bruised condition.

For those who find pleasure in new and different foods, the possibilities of bringing in tropical varieties from the Caribbean area by air offer interesting prospects. In addition to supplementing our supply of perishable foods, this commercial tie-up with our neighbors to the south would, no doubt, do much to strengthen our good-neighbor relationships.

Before closing, I want to make it clear that we realize that the feasibility of this air-cargo-transport idea for perishable foods depends upon the answers to some problems yet to be explored. There are quite a few unknown factors in the practical application of this project. We are aware of the face that it is only through further study and the actual stocking of the produce in stores that a determination can be made as to whether or not the quality of the produce will be sufficiently improved through fast transportation by air to offset any premium in price to the consumer that may exist under actual commercial conditions. Should the optimistic view prove to be true, and the difference between air-and-surface transit charges be eliminated or otherwise entirely compensated for, I believe it is not trite to say that the sky is the limit for the future of farm-produce shipment by air.

As for the farmers of this country, I am sure they will be enthusiastically watching the developments in the air-cargo field. A favorable turn of events along this line could be a great boon to their business—particularly in the post-war period.

Forecast on Air Freight

(Address by E. S. Evans, founder of the Wayne University Research on Air Cargo)

This luncheon marks another milestone in the progress of aviation. The war has made us leapfrog many milestones. But from the standpoint of post-war aviation—and the consumer of air-borne goods—this is probably the most significant milestone since air-cargo transport has been discussed.

Picked Yesterday—Eaten Today

Ripe fruits and fresh vegetables are served here today which only yesterday vibrated on the vine thousands of miles from each other. "Picked yesterday—eaten today" will be the slogan of tomorrow. This marvelous concept in merchandising and transportation is not new. The Incas, at the time of the Spanish conquest of Peru, had fruits and vegetables from the lowlands served on their tables 24 hours after they had been picked in the gardens and orchards a hundred miles away. But the Incas had to depend for these delicacies on fast human runners. Today we look to the heavens for our swift runners, and not only just the favored few, but everyone will be able to enjoy the benefits of air transport.

Air Transport Versus Conventional Methods

The series of studies being made by the Wayne University is giving to the public for the first time a practical basis for more accurate comparison between air-cargo transportation and conventional methods. These studies permit a shipper at a glance to see whether it will pay him to ship by air or otherwise. Air lines can ascertain from these studies what business they can develop at various ton-mile charges. Thus, the whole picture of air-freight transportation takes on a tangible form that it has never had before. The railroads can adjust intelligently by using these charts of probabilities. A businessman can more accurately calculate the potentialities of air cargo. For the first time we can estimate aviation's proper place in cargo transportation.

Dreams and Realities

I have been accused of being an incorrigible optimist where aviation is concerned. In 1929 I had the pleasure of making a speech before the United States Chamber of Commerce in which I said:

"I believe that we are going to see great airliners—perhaps with a speed of 90 miles an hour—carrying 50 to 100 tons which will be used for transporting our freight. Those planes will burn low-priced fuel, and they will transport their freight cheaply enough for the businessmen of the country to use them."

Time has proved how conservative I was.

Conversion of Military Planes Wishful Thinking

I have now been asked to give a forecast on air freight for the radio. To do so, I shall have to debunk some popular conceptions about air cargo. Daily we hear that after the war the Government is going to sell its Liberators and Flying Fortresses for a song, and that buyers expect to convert them to air transport and reap a fortune. This is bunk. It would be like converting a battleship to a tramp steamer and economically just as impracticable. With such a conversion it would be impossible for the operator to meet competition from well-designed new air transports built specifically for cargo carrying.

And more important still, it would be disastrous to the engineering and commercial development of air transport and to the future of the air-cargo business to have the Government's military bombers tossed into the open market. It would be equally dangerous to have the present 15,000 military transports bargained off without the most careful study. Such a procedure would retard aircraft development for a decade. Military transports in limited quantities—some of which were originally taken over from the airlines and converted to military use—should, of course, be utilized to bridge the air transport gap until modern cargo carriers can be built and delivered.

Three Percent Only of Railroad Freight Is Air Candidate

It has also been said that air transports will put the railroads out of business. Bunk! The freight which may be expected ultimately to take to the air totals about 3 percent of that now carried by the railroad. If in the next 5 years or so aviation can "woo" 1 percent of this total freight, it will mark great progress in air transport.

AIR-CARGO TRANSPORTATION STILL IN INFANCY

To make a fair comparison of air transportation with the railroads, we have to go back to about 1850, when the railroads were still struggling with their engineering and operational difficulties. Today, in 1944, airplanes as a means of freight transportation are at about the same level of progress that the railroads were in 1850, or trucking was in 1915.

AIRPLANE DEVELOPMENT INEVITABLE—FUEL, GLIDER TRAINS, ETC.

To meet rail competition the airplane must improve in many categories. For instance, the use of Diesel motors, which would reduce the fuel cost of planes by about 80 percent. The Germans have used Diesel airplane engines for a long time. The Packard Motor Car Co. in the late twenties, under Captain Woolson, produced a small Diesel engine weighing about 1 pound to the horsepower, which flew successfully. His death stopped the development. The jet propulsion engine doesn't burn 100-octane gasoline. I am told it can operate on a comparatively cheap fuel mixture. Further progress in cheaper fuel should be expected.

In the field of gliders we have yet to build a locomotive of the air designed properly for the glider-train operation. Gliders, as freight cars of the future, are still in their infancy, and they lend themselves to many economies that have not yet been tried.

SHIPS VERSUS PLANES

I have been quoted as saying that ocean liners such as the *Normandie* or *Queen Mary* probably will never be built again. I believe this is true, but that flying boats will sweep the seas of cargo-carrying ships—that is bunk.

Ships are able to carry cargo for one-tenth of 1 cent a ton-mile, but seaplanes or large airplanes may never get their costs below 2 cents a ton-mile. Such a differential precludes the elimination of surface vessels. Flying boats, of which the *Mars* of today is only a small sample, will, according to Glenn Martin, carry 40 percent more net cargo than land planes of the same size, and, of course, will be able to alight on either ocean or inland waters. This is a field yet unexplored.

SEPARATE CARGO AND PASSENGER AIRPORTS NEEDED

We should have in the United States in all post-war commercial centers well-equipped cargo airports separate from passenger airports, and at all major crossroads there should be landing strips which can be used by small planes or in an emergency by large ones.

AIRPLANES OF TOMORROW

Let's be realistic about the present but optimistic about the future. Today we are only at the beginning of the development of air transport. I look forward to a tomorrow which will see jet propulsion airplanes flying at 550 miles an hour or more in the substratosphere, and at hardly less speed, with great cargo-carrying capacity, the flying wing. The glider freight train will fill a gap in air transportation because a glider can take smaller loads and by adding or subtracting gliders to the train adjustment can be made with greater economy to cargo demands. The cargo-carrying capacity of the helicopter will be consigned to the family shopping tour or suburban deliveries.

I remember my father telling me when I was a little boy that my grandfather was approached by Mr. Howe who wanted to sell him stock in a company for the making of sewing machines, and my grandfather decided that it was a foolish idea and that no woman would ever give up her needle for some gadget of a machine. My father regretfully told me that if his father had put a few hundred dollars in Mr. Howe's company he would have gotten returns of over a million dollars.

Let's not discount the air possibilities of the future.

FLYING CARGO

(Address by L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board)

In undertaking a series of studies in air transport, Wayne University and the Detroit Board of Commerce are to be most heartily congratulated in presenting the first of the series on air cargo potential in fresh fruits and vegetables. Here we have another of those commendable unions of business enterprise and educational institutions for the purpose of working out common-sense answers to new questions. Professor Larsen and his staff, working under the Edward S. Evans grant for air-cargo research, have pioneered in a new, a vital, and a very promising field. It is, and will be, common sense to ship by air if to do so makes money; and I have a very deep-seated feeling that, as further progress is made, there will be more and more flying cargo.

This study on air cargo potential in fresh fruits and vegetables has, as I understand it, a most commendable objective. Many studies are merely an analysis of what can be done under existing transportation rates and practices. Air transportation is obviously so young that it is unwise to cling to the rates and practices of a given moment. The approach in this study is to show what movements by air might be expected to occur in the field of selected commodities at varying rates. Thus it becomes possible to show the manufacturer, the operator, the shipper, and the consumer what can be done under varying operating conditions. If an operator then can show a manufacturer that if he can make an airplane which will carry a certain volume of a certain product at a stated cost, the manufacturer will have a new meaning given to his purpose and the operator can make his business plans accordingly. This is an approach calculated to permit the intelligent planning for future business expansion.

Merchandising by air is a subject about which you will hear a great deal from time to time in the future. The rates charged for the actual transportation are by no means the only things which the shipper must appraise in determining whether to ship by air. Incidentally, those rates are coming down very drastically and as they fall the volume of flying cargo will rise. I will mention only a few things which, in addition to the rates, relate to the pocketbook.

New markets will be available to perishables; new opportunities will be created for the marketing of goods whose salability depends upon timeliness. These are all important fields for flying cargo, but I am speaking primarily of types of savings. Packing can be less expensive, because it need not be so heavy as when shipping by rail or truck. If it is not so heavy, the transportation rates apply to a smaller-weight base. Much handling can be eliminated in many cases because an airplane can go directly from anywhere to anywhere. Breakage and spoilage will be reduced and, in many cases, eliminated. Insurance will be saved because the risk may be less and the time of coverage is drastically reduced. Inventories can be reduced when a consumer market is within hours rather than days and weeks of the wholesaler or middleman. In some cases, capital goods can be eliminated because one plant can serve a wider territory. Refrigeration, where required, may possibly be provided by nature, absolutely free, at 10,000, 15,000, 20,000 or more feet altitude, depending upon how cold you want the cargo to be. There are probably many other items that have to be analyzed before we can get the pocketbook answer as to whether the article can profitably be shipped by air.

I am not one of those who thinks that the airplane is going to eliminate the railroad and the steamship from the cargo field. It would not be hard to persuade me, on the other hand, that the principal impetus of air cargo will be in the development of new markets, and I can easily see how the shrinkage of the world by air transportation might result in such an acceleration of new market activity as actually to increase the cargo business of the steamship lines and the railroads. I say these things are possibilities; no one can be sure. I am reminded in this connection that it was thought as late as 1850 that railroads could not compete with waterways and canals except where speedy carriage was essential. I repeat, therefore, that however pleasant it may be to indulge in prophecy, the making of careful analytical studies showing what commodities will move at stated costs, is the practical and sensible way to get on with the development of flying cargo. I congratulate you and wish for you a succession of achievements in your studies.

THE AIRPORT AND YOUR COMMUNITY

(Address by Charles I. Stanton, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics)

In aviation, the impossible has a habit of becoming a reality overnight. Only 3 years ago, men who prophesied 1,000-bomber raids on Berlin were looked on as good candidates for the job of authoring comic strips. Today this "impossibility" has moved to the front page. At about the same time, the President's call for 100,000 planes a year was termed fantastic. Today the assembly lines are rolling them out at this "impossible" rate, and an increasing proportion of our output is made up of heavy bombers rather than light training or fighter planes.

You can see why it's risky to attempt forecasts in the aviation business. Such amazing things do happen that you're tempted to offer wild guesses. On the other hand, conservative estimates are dangerous, because any development programs based on them may be made obsolete by rapid aviation progress.

Now that aviation is our leading industry, with production valued at $20,000,000 a year, everybody realizes its importance to the future national economy, and you'll find self-appointed experts on the subject everywhere you turn. I hesitate to join this company. I admit I don't know all the answers. But as spokesman for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, I do feel it my duty to put forward a few suggestions based on the 17 years' experience of C. A. A. and its predecessor agencies in this field.

During that time we have made our share of mistakes and, I hope, learned something from them. We have also watched others make mistakes, and have learned a few lessons in this way. One phase of aviation in which mistakes have been plentiful enough to teach us quite a bit for future use is that of airports.

We have seen the creation of what were thought to be de luxe airports, only to find that advancements in aircraft construction made necessary longer approach paths and runways, while the growth of the surrounding metropolitan area made such extension impossible.

In other cases, we have seen airports so placed that the trip through surface traffic from airport to town wastes much of the time saved in traveling by air.

Where the city has been lucky enough to get its airport properly located—and too often this has been a matter of luck rather than planning—there may have been a lack of foresight in the provision of terminal buildings, hangars, and other facilities which supplement the landing areas themselves. The results, if not the cause, are readily apparent to the traveler, in such forms as time lost in way-billing him and getting his baggage off and on planes.

Today, our cities do not seem to be heading for a repetition of these mistakes, which were

largely the result of underestimating the aviation potential. If anything, they are leaning toward building airports of size and cost, which take very strong imagination to justify.

I am not so much worried about possible overbuilding, however, as I am about the fact that many of us are too ready to go ahead and build without adequate attention to over-all planning. We may not repeat the specific mistakes of the twenties and thirties, but if we follow the basic mistake of allowing our airports to "jes' grow", like Topsy, we are bound to have trouble.

Airplanes move so fast, and there are so many of them even now, that we cannot, with safety, plan even the smallest airport, unless we take the broadest view of the sky traffic involved in a wide surrounding area.

Thus you can see that the air space affected by an airport is far greater than the ground area. In the case of certain locations in Detroit, for example, air space of both Canada and the United States is involved. An airport in the New York City area may affect the air space over two States.

Problems of this kind begin to arise when you talk of only one airport. Imagine the complications when you undertake to spot half a dozen or more fields in and around a big city, as you will have to do to accommodate private and commercial post-war traffic.

It is evident that if new airports are not to create traffic tangles they must be built in accordance with a comprehensive national plan. That is not to say airport building must be the exclusive domain of the Federal Government. The C. A. A. is not making a bid for bureaucratic aggrandizement.

We are merely offering to cities, counties, States, and other potential airport sponsors the benefit of our experience and advice. In the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 Congress directed the Administrator to make a Nation-wide survey of airport needs. Such a study was made and submitted, and in 1940 Congress made its first direct appropriation to the C. A. A. for airport construction, allotting $40,000,000. Since then we have been authorized to spend a total of $400,000,000 on airfields. All of this, however, was available for expenditure on airports which were certified as necessary for national defense by a board consisting of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce.

In this period of a little more than 3 years the C. A. A. program has been responsible for the construction or substantial improvement of 519 airports. We have increased the number of airports suitable for airline operation from 94 at the end of 1940 to 1,085 at the end of 1943. In the course of this work we have achieved many technical advances in matters of soil stability, paving materials and methods, drainage, and other problems of airport construction which, even though basic, had not been fully explored.

The program we are now completing is guided, as you probably know, by needs of the Army and Navy, with possible post-war use a deciding factor when there is a choice among sites which meet military requirements. Thanks to this program we now have about 3,000 airports, contrasted with some 2,300 at the end of 1940.

As we near the point where the needs of the armed services are satisfied, it is in order to look around us and determine whether the post-war needs of air commerce will also be adequately met by this net work of airports. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has been bringing up-to-date its survey of our national airport requirements, and we find that it will probably be necessary to double the present number of fields to accommodate the expected air traffic of the early post-war years. That is, we will need about 6,000 ports by 1950.

This immediately raises questions of concern to all. How is such an airport system to be build and financed? Should the job be undertaken by the Federal Government? Or by the State governments? Or by local authorities? Or by a combination of all three?

A major question of policy is involved here—one that you and the electorate of the country will soon be called upon to make, speaking through your duly elected representatives in the Congress.

I suggest that the Federal Government and the State governments become partners in building the Nation's post-war civil airports system in general accord with principles worked out in building our national highway system—admittedly the best in the world. If the President and the Congress authorize a Federal-aid airport program, funds could be apportioned to the States by the C. A. A. upon the basis of some accepted formula. Such a formula, we believe, should take account of four factors—(1) the area, (2) population, (3) number of registered aircraft, and (4) the existing number of accredited airports in each State. As in the Federal highway system, each State would have to match a specified percentage of its quota of Federal funds.

Airport improvements or construction projects would be selected and carried out by the State's own aviation agency. Only projects fitting the national airport plan would be eligible for Federal aid, and C. A. A. standards for location, lay-out, and construction for the class of airport proposed would have to be met.

Whatever agency finances and builds airports, a mass of advance planning will be necessary. In order that such material will be available without delay when the need arises, the C. A. A., in cooperation with State and local planning groups where they exist, has already begun studies leading toward preparation of a systematic plan for airports. We have had excellent results working locally with the Michigan Board of Aeronautics, in the persons of Thomas Walsh and George Roff.

As I have indicated, planning of buildings and other facilities is almost as important as planning of the landing areas themselves, and the C. A. A. has also started work compiling information in this field for the benefit of interested users. We entered this field because we found that while architects and engineers designing buildings for special purposes ordinarily have access to data compiled over a period of years of periodicals, book publishers, and others, such information was not available on airport terminals, highly specialized as they are.

Our airport building design unit is not ready, at this time, to offer suggestions, but is gathering information on existing airports and ideas from those experienced in airport operation. In this manner we hope to compile and analyze a fund of specific information that will enable us to advise communities what facilities their airport buildings should contain, what space these facilities require, and what relation they must have to each other to function efficiently.

Throughout this study, the importance of flexibility will be emphasized. Remembering that many cities once planned what seemed adequate airport buildings only to find them outmoded even before they were completely occupied, we will attempt to anticipate the possible needs of any airport over a period of years, and suggest building in such a manner as to provide for future expansion.

We hope to provide assistance on two other phases of airport planning to communities desiring it. Already under way is a study of airport management experience, from which we hope to assemble methods proven successful in keeping airports out of the red, a color which has marked their account books more often than not.

In the near future we also intend to begin a survey of the place of airports in community planning. It is obvious that airports have a close relationship to every phase of city growth. Proper integration with the local road system, for example, would provide a fast route from the airport to town, instead of forcing the air traveler to waste perhaps an hour's time crawling through heavy automobile traffic.

There are many more phases of city planning which are important to airport development. As aviation grows, we can expect to see the creation of multiple airports to serve varied community needs. Speaking hypothetically, for I have made no study of the situation here, Detroit in 1950 might need two or more terminals for air-line passengers, mail and air cargo, and perhaps twice as many for local private and commercial flying. Study might show the need for still a third type of port, a downtown landing place for commuters or others using helicopters. These really are city planning problems which need to be tackled.

I believe I have said enough to indicate how vital a role planning plays in sound airport development. We in Civil Aeronautics Administration stand ready to offer to all who want it every assistance within our power (and funds) in making and carrying through such plans.

GLOBAL EATING

(Address of Miss Eloise Davison, director, New York Herald Tribune Home Institute)

This is a history-making occasion. Four countries and eight air lines, extending from Canada to South America, have cooperated with Wayne University and the Detroit Board of Commerce to make possible this air-borne luncheon and demonstration.

Vine- and tree-ripened fruits and vegetables, some of which were picked only yesterday thousands of air miles away—still sweet, fresh, and almost warm from tropical sunshine—have been transported in commercial-sized shipments for the first time.

Five of our great growing States—lush California, sunny Texas, tropical Florida, Arizona, and good old reliable Pennsylvania—home of the Liberty Bell and the mushroom—have sent their most epicurean harvest for this event.

From Mexico, Central and South America, have been flown exotic fruits and vegetables once too perishable to ship.

Gathered here today are those whose decisions and enthusiasms are bound to have a far-reaching effect on every home. Here are air-line executives and aircraft manufacturers who are shaping the sky roads of tomorrow. Here are produce leaders who have entered enthusiastically into the post-war picture to bring new variety to tomorrow's dinner table.

If you could see the tropical picture this crystal room makes with its tables laden with exhibitions of unusual fruits and vegetables from the Caribbean and from far places in our own country, you would see the native fruits and vegetables in the form of model cargo planes.

The Imperial Valley of California has sent a glider, suggesting the glider freight train of the future out of compliment to Col. Edward S. Evans, father of gliding and founder of the Wayne University research on air cargo.

From Florida comes a flying boat made of strange and delicious fruits and vegetables.

The speakers are wearing leis of white, pink, and purple flowers with pendants of white orchids.

Before me is an orange filled with a mousse in which figs, dates, California walnuts and Brazil nuts make a happy alliance. This delicious concoction is called mousse tropicana.

When Colonel Evans, pioneer in air transportation established the Edward S. Evans grant for air cargo research, little did he think he would be pioneering in global vegetable plates and fruit cocktails.

This air cargo he brings today shows what the air age can really do to change our standards of eating.

Sigh if you will for the "good old days." Not me. We are on the threshold of a new era in eating. This luncheon today in aviation parlance is the "take-off." As the world shrinks in distance because of air transport, our habits and our dinner tables expand to become more cosmopolitan.

Our post-war vegetable plate may include hearts of palms from the South Pacific with chayotes from Guatemala—an exotic squash served here today. Dasheens from Florida—rich in starch—will alternate with the local potato. And, carrots for good eyesight in the air age when we shall all be driving helicopters and skycars (we hope).

The good-neighbor cocktail of tomorrow served here for the first time today contains mangosteen, said to be the most choice food in the world. Today's first cup will be manna dropped from the skies unto many post-war dinner tables. It has a juicy rose-tinted or creamy pulp divided orangewise and tasted to me today like a heavenly combination of pineapple, grape, peach, and strawberry.

Chayote, loquat, cassava, platin—it sounds like poetry—or a Berlitz course—they mean squash, plum, and baking banana. These are only a few of the exotic air candidates for our tables from Latin America in reciprocity for our good North American produce in the age of air to come.

But now alas! Time compels me to come to the end of this drool story.

THE FUTURE OF AIR TRANSPORT FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

(Address by William Garfitt, executive vice president, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association)

If there is any truth in the old saying that important events cast their shadows before them—and who can doubt its truth—this meeting is being held in the shadow of the greatest development in civilian transportation philosophy the world has ever known. For, were we not on the threshold of a mighty revolution in thinking and planning for the future transport of men and goods, this assemblage would never have been called together.

I have listened with rapt absorption to what our Secretary of Agriculture has said, not only because he has tempered his prophesies with the wisdom of sound experience, but because the future he looks forward to is the same future to which our millions of growers, and our thousands of distributors, also aspire. What we seek is merely a quicker, safer, more economical method of moving perishable commodities from their fields and groves to the kitchens of our hungry people.

The nature of Secretary Wickard's organization needs no explanation. Perhaps, however, ours will be better understood at a time like this for a few words about its functions and responsibilities. The United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association is a nonprofit organization of growers, growers' sales agent, shippers, and wholesale distributors of perishable-soil products. It has members in each of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, the provinces of Canada, and the Republic of Mexico.

Though it neither produces, buys, nor sells the products of nature with which it is concerned, it is interested in every phase of production and distribution, from the time the seed goes into the ground or the sapling is planted, until the product is ready for consumption in some market place a thousand or more miles from the spot wherein it was grown. Therefore, as with the United States Department of Agriculture, transportation is one of its constant and most absorbing problems.

How sincerely interested our people are in such a project as this can be judged in a measure by the brilliant display of winter-grown semitropical and exotic fruits and vegetables which have turned this meeting place into a veritable garden, and which have made today's repast a pleasant preview of what our senses may enjoy at all seasons of the year, as soon as air transport really comes of age.

We are indebted to Pan American, Eastern, Pennsylvania Central, American, Braniff, Chicago & Southern, and Transcontinental & Western airlines for flying these dozens of gorgeous exhibits thousands of miles in order that we may feast the eye, as well as the inner man, on this memorable occasion. These token shipments have been handled under most difficult wartime conditions as a foreshadow of what the future may hold for our industry.

We are also indebted to the thousands of growers and shippers who compose the Florida Citrus Commission, the Florida Vegetable Committee, the Texas Citrus and Vegetable Growers & Shippers Association, the Western Growers Association of Arizona and California—and other individuals and groups—for their cooperation in assembling and shipping these commodities that we may gain a clearer vision of the shape of things to come.

And while I am on the subject of acknowledgments, I wish to pay special tribute to Drs. Spencer A. Larsen and Jerome Thomas; to their associates in the splendid work being reported today; and to their chief sponsor, Mr. Edward S. Evans, for choosing fruits and vegetables as the subject of their painstaking research. We feel they have chosen wisely, as there is probably no class of freight commodities more likely to provide a substantial, year-round air tonnage than these products of nature.

Though I may sound unduly critical of what I shall refer to as the slide-rule method of projecting our industry into its air-borne future, I hope Dr. Larsen and his industrious aides will accept what I shall say merely as evidence of our eagerness to see our future course plotted by actual experience rather than by drawing-board projections. For any seeming criticism in my remarks, I apologize in advance to our hosts in general, and to Dr. Larsen in particular.

Secretary Wickard has mercifully spared his audience a great deal of the statistical side of his Department's responsibilities. I shall try to be as sparing. But, to those of you who occupy the consumer's seat in this parade of facts and prophecy, I think it justifiable to lift the curtain and give you a brief glimpse behind the scenes of one of the greatest branches of American industry—a branch which is so universally taken for granted that few laymen ever stop to give it more than a passing thought.

If I told you that the commercial production of fruits and vegetables for marketing in their fresh and natural state amounts yearly to something like 1,300,000 carloads, you might still have a rather nebulous vision of our business. But when I tell you that this vast quantity, if coupled into a single train of 44-foot refrigerators cars, would be 27,500 miles long, or one and one-tenth times round the earth—our business begins to look really big.

It should not be surprising, therefore, that the commercial grower and the terminal market distributor of fresh fruits and vegetables is keenly interested in any new or improved method of transportation. Our products must of necessity be grown where Nature is most generous. They must be marketed also of necessity where people live in the largest numbers. And there is an average distance of 1,400 miles between our chief areas of production and our chief centers of consumption.

As in the past, the bulk of our commodities will probably continue to move by surface transportation in the more than 125,000 refrigerator cars now plying back and forth over our quarter-million miles of railroad and in the thousands of motortrucks which will again infest our public highways, once the war is won, and tires, gasoline, and drivers again become plentiful. For the most part, I believe, fresh fruits and vegetables will continue to be surface-borne as long as railroads and highways continue to exist.

Perhaps some air enthusiasts will disagree with this prediction. Perhaps some have visions of the airways putting our railways virtually out of the long-distance-hauling business. And perhaps they are right, but I have yet to meet a thoughtful or experienced transportation authority who believes that more than a small percentage of all perishable freight will ever take to the air, though even a small percentage of it will give our air lines all they can handle for some years to come.

To illustrate, more than 600,000 carloads, or carload equivalents, of fresh fruits and vegetables are unloaded yearly in 63 of our consuming markets. These arrivals amount to nearly 10,000,000 tons. I am using Department of Agriculture figures. Now, with the maximum capacity of transport planes likely to be available at the war's close limited to 4.2 tons of net freight, it would take more than 14,000 airships each flying 3 weekly round trips to supply these 63 cities with all their fruits and vegetables.

But let us narrow the illustration down to a few cities for the sake of simplicity. Take New York as a classical example. This largest of all markets consumes yearly about 146,000 carloads—or more than 2,000,000 tons—of fresh fruits and vegetables. Based on 4.2 tons of pay load per cargo plane, this would mean more than 520,000 plane loads a year—or 1 landing at LaGuardia Field each 52 seconds, day and night, 6 days a week, 52 weeks a year.

To come a little nearer home, let us look at our second largest market—Chicago—which unloads more than 62,000 carloads of produce yearly. This is close to 1,000,000 tons—nearly 222,000 plane loads. Consequently, Chicago's municipal airport would have to accommodate only 710 plane arrivals each 24 hours—1 in every 2⅓ minutes. At that, I wonder where the passengers and mail would find space to land.

Now, let us take your own city of Detroit as our last illustration. This city gets along in normal years with a few more than 20,000 cars of green groceries. What its wartime population consumes is anybody's guess. However, Detroit's relatively small produce volume adds up to the sum of more than 300,000 tons a year, and this would mean more than 72,000 plane loads—1 every 6¾ minutes, 24 hours a day, 6 days a week, 52 weeks a year.

These figures are not pulled out of a hat. They are realistic calculations based on known data. I give them, not to discourage those who may be gazing at the sky as the arena of our next adventure in transportation—though the sky certainly has its limits—but as a caution that we will never get our commodities, or any considerable tonnage of them, up into the air until we learn to keep our feet on the ground. As I have said, we are facing a revolution in transportation philosophy; but not, in my opinion, the complete reversal of methods some air enthusiasts vision.

And, as Secretary Wickard has said, many commodities are now candidates for air transport. You would not doubt this if you had heard as I have in many conferences

among fruit and vegetable men such questions as: "When will our transportation system be improved? When will we be relieved of this snail's-pace, 17-miles-an-hour movement of our refrigerator car trains? When can we be sure a 7-day schedule will not take 14 days? When will we escape the cost of precooling and icing? Will air transport solve all these problems for us?"

Gentlemen, I sincerely believe that air transport will solve some of them; that it will go a long way toward helping to solve others; but I believe it will never come into its own—will never earn an enviable place as a carrier of freight—until it ceases looking upon itself as a novel, romantic, and totally different mode of transportation, and begins psychoanalyzing itself from the standpoint of what it can contribute as a part—not as the whole—of a national transportation system.

If there are any among our air-minded friends who look upon the post-war era as an opportunity to rush in and nail down private air-transport monopolies, I am afraid they are relying too much upon the time-honored philosophy which has been applied to all pioneering enterprises in the past. That is, the man who gets there first and stakes out the first claim is entitled to perpetual rights in the area he has preempted for himself. I shall try to demonstrate that this thing is too big for any such preemption.

On the other hand, if some aircraft manufacturer is secretly developing designs for a cargo ship which will blitz the industry after the war by putting into the air a type of carrier—protected by exclusive patents, to be sure—which will make all other transport planes obsolete overnight, I doubt very much that he will come out with a cargo carrier which will turn his plant into another Pullman Standard Car Co. of the air with exclusive rights to manufacture or operate essential air-carrying equipment.

Gentlemen, I ask you in all sincerity, do you think anything like that will be possible? And, if it is possible, will it be permitted under the necessities of national security? For, unless we realize that the greatest impetus like to be put behind post-war commercial air transport will be that of national security, we are bound to leave this meeting, and many like it, only to awaken with a sudden jolt to the fact that, while we have been planning one thing the world has been planning something entirely different.

It is said—and with perfect justification—that this Nation will come out of World War No. 2, not only with the greatest aircraft-production plant on earth—equal, no doubt, to all other nations combined—but with the greatest trained flying, operating, and manufacturing personnel. And it is reasonable to suppose that thousands of competent young fliers and technicians will want to remain in a field in which they have received their training. There will be no lack of skilled personnel after the war—but how can it be used to the best advantage?

Commercial air transport will profit tremendously from concentrated war experience. No other industry has ever inherited such enormous impetus from the sacrifice of human lives—from the lavishing of billions upon the altar of trial and error, of waste, and destruction. Brilliant planning and leadership have made this the greatest military air power on earth. Our civilian planning and leadership must be equally brilliant and objective if our air future is to realize its destiny.

The smartest aircraft designers and operators will be those whose plans are most adaptable—not merely those whose plans are most opportune. The aeronautical industry has brilliant prospects if it establishes a reputation for stability, conservatism, and restraint. If it attracts as its leaders men of the caliber of Arnold, Spaatz, King, Doolittle, Rickenbacker, and Chenault, it will not have to fall back upon private monopolies to win the respect of its Government and its public.

There will also be no lack of support on our Government's part in keeping its thousands of heroic young pilots, navigators, ground crews, and grease monkeys gainfully employed at the jobs they know best. Any nation which lets its trained air personnel go to seed after the war unless forced to do so by the peace treaty—will be as guilty of courting self-destruction as were our politicians of another day who disbanded our Army, grounded our Air Force, and scuttled our Navy in the fond delusion that we had just ended the war to end all wars.

Gentlemen, I believe we can look to whatever administration this Nation has after the present war to be more realistic in the matter of national security than was our previous post-war Government. With this belief firmly in mind, I look forward to the coming post-war period as one in which air transportation will be developed under Government supervision—and possibly with Government financial aid—not as something to be tossed up for grabs, but as a means of national security first, and private gain second.

Radical though such a prediction may sound to a group of American businessmen, it is not as radical as it seems, for our country will have no choice in the matter, if it hopes to keep pace with the rest of the world in the domination of that one medium of transportation which has proved more valuable in warfare than any other—the air. So, whether we like it or not, we shall have to look to our Government to encourage, supervise, and control, as never before, our future use of the skies.

Our railroads and our highways serve incidental military uses, but the airplane is supreme as a future instrument of defense and attack. This, therefore, is bound to be our national and international policy of the air: We will send passengers and cargoes into the stratosphere bound for every home and foreign port. But, if another gangster nation—or any combination of gangster nations—is looking for soft picking, we will put the bombardier and the machine gunner back into our flying boxcars.

Our post-war commercial air policies must be closely integrated with military necessities. Our commercial air transport must be convertible instantly to the maintenance of international peace, just as commercial shipping must be convertible into a merchant marine. As this is bound to be the decision of our own and our allies' statesmen, our job will be to have the best and most effective flying forces in the world, devoted—if you please—to commercial uses, but convertible to defense.

I believe our people are to practical to be much interested in the romantic side of aviation. Though they are among the most enthusiastic patrons of air travel, they use it only because they find it more saving of their time. They cannot, therefore, be expected to take a great deal of interest in the air transport of their commodities, unless such air transport is made a part of a national transportation system, and not merely a new and romantic mode of moving cargoes from place to place.

Though we have been greatly confused by the mass of contradictory opinions and ambitions which have been poured in upon us, I believe our industry has in mind one fairly definite development it would like to see put into effect: That is, something closely resembling our present refrigerator car services—a refrigerator line of the air, if you please—a service whereby cargo carriers can be made available at any time and in any place where commodities need quick shipment.

I do not mean, necessarily, the construction of special refrigerated planes capable of carrying no other freight, for we do not know at this time whether refrigeration, pre-cooling, or many of the other factors of surface transportation will be needed when our commodities are taken into the air. I mean, merely, that any system—and I emphasize the word "system"—of air transport in which our industry can be expected to take much interest must have as its foundation the one prime requisite—flexibility.

There is still a tremendous amount of spade work to be done before we can begin offering the airplane as a substitute for—or even an auxiliary to—the railroad freight car. Your engineers and aerodynamic researchers have still a long way to go before the aeronautical industry will have much to sell. Will we require refrigeration? Can pre-cooling be eliminated? Is a different type of shipping container needed? Are terminal airports conveniently located?

All these and many more technical nuts will have to be cracked before you can say to us, "Here it is. Use it." And, until some of the problems have been solved by actual, practical flying tests, I believe it may be largely a waste of time to project by slide-rule and comptometer the percentage of this commodity or that commodity which is likely to move by air at this ton-mile rate or that ton-mile rate. In this great guessing game the $64 question is, "Will it work?"

Which reminds me to close with a little business parable—one that may appeal to you as having a slight parallel, at least, with the present tendency to project our air-cargo potential in the mathematics classroom, instead of in the element it proposes to invade. The story I am about to tell is not intended to be facetious. It is intended, rather, to emphasize a necessity concerning which I am sure you are already thinking. For what it may be worth in such a discussion, here it is:

The sporting goods buyer of a large department store received a sample shipment of rubber balls, whereupon he went to the merchandise manager to decide what to do about laying in a stock. Together they went to the big boss, who promptly called a conference of the advertising manager, the advertising agency, the sales manager, the traffic manager, the head window dresser, the display manager, and several others in the hope that together they could decide upon a promotional campaign for the new item.

After the conference had gone on for several hours without getting anywhere an office boy, who happened to pass through the room, asked, "Is the darn thing any good?" Thereupon the big boss turned to the merchandising manager and said, "George, we've overlooked that little detail. Hire the best research organization you can find and have this ball given the acid test. Spare no expense. Make it thorough. This great institution can't afford to promote an article about which it is in the slightest doubt."

So several research experts were called and the best of them was given the job of analyzing the rubber ball. Several weeks later he was ready to report, and the same group of executives was again called into conference. "We have put this ball through every conceivable test," said the laboratory chief. "We have tested it for weight, specific gravity, tensil strength, moisture absorption, heat resistance, spherosity, color, compression, purity, and 57 other indices. And here is our bill for $2,731.62 for making these exhaustive tests."

Impressed by this mass of scientific data, the store executives sat in silent awe. At that moment, however, the self-same office boy happened to pass through the room again. Glancing contemptuously, first at the ball and then at the assembled department heads, he asked, "If you want to find out whether that danged thing is any good, why the heck don't you try bouncing it?" With that he took a long drink of the water cooler and passed on about his business.

And that, gentlemen, is my parting query. If you want to find out whether air transport is any good in the movement of any part of 19,500,000 million tons of fresh fruits and vegetables, why the heck don't you try bouncing a few sample plane loads around the country? I think such tests will prove the practicability of air transport. But I am equally convinced that its practicability cannot be determined in the laboratory of the mathematics classroom.

Quite an Expenditure for Doubtful Need But May Be Justified as Precaution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on roll call vote today on the Dewey resolution to provide a House committee of investigation to examine into the matter of the seizure by our armed forces of the Montgomery Ward properties in Chicago, I felt constrained to vote "yes," but with no enthusiasm. It is difficult for me to see the need for the House to appoint such a committee and to go to that amount of expense, as the Senate has already taken some such action, even going further than the House committee is authorized to go.

It is true that such is our duty as a Congress, not only to write the laws but to see that they are properly administered without permitting authority to be usurped or laws maladministered. However, in this case I think that a committee of one House might have been sufficient. Again, while this is in line with our congressional duty and obligations, I feel that in this particular case it is of doubtful propriety because the matter has already been referred to the courts. It is also the duty of Congress to avoid exercising the judicial function, or interferring with the judicial function. If the military has gone beyond its legal authority the courts of the land are authorized to speak and no doubt will do so.

Yes; we in Congress are obligated to protect the rights of property and also the rights of private citizens, but if a bull headed business executive of such a large establishment as Montgomery Ward is motivated by his private peeves into such actions as will jeopardize the national safety in time of war, it may become a close question as to which obligations are greatest and which rights most demand protection. Montgomery Ward's property rights are distinctly secondary to the rights and welfare of the American Nation in time of war—a situation which a congressional investigation may reveal. It is, then only as a precaution against the abuse of executive power—which I seriously doubt this is—that I can consent to vote what otherwise seems a useless expenditure.

Land Erosion in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the State of Oklahoma has 44,341,120 acres within its boundaries. Of this vast amount of land a little in excess of 8,000,000 acres are classified as timberland; 1,667,763 acres are in meadow; 10,210,000 acres are in pasture; and there are 13,854,290 acres which are in cultivation.

Erosion has already played a disastrous role in Oklahoma and has caused 1,854,069 acres to be abandoned from cultivation. There are not figures available to show how many acres in pasture have eroded beyond their usefulness.

One million five hundred and forty thousand acres of tillable lands are affected by blow sand. There are approximately 795,000 acres which need protection by levees—430,880 acres could profitably be irrigated.

To accomplish this great task of alleviating and repairing damage would require the following: Terracing on 9,000,000 acres, regrassing and reseeding on 4,900,000 acres, construction of 170,000 farm ponds, construction of 8,500 small lakes, construction of 3,400 miles of drainage ditches, construction of 6,000 miles of levees, construction of 62,000 trench silos and adequate irrigation laterals and canals to serve 430,006 acres.

To do this job it is estimated that an expenditure of $175,000,000 would be required over a period of 15 years.

A total of 4,500,000 acres are planned for conservation treatment and 2,500,000 acres have already been established in soil-conservation practices. To treat the unprotected land so that it can be used permanently and profitably, these quantities of labor, equipment, and materials are among the resources expected to be required: 5,000,000 man-days of skilled labor; 26,000,000 man-days of unskilled labor; 4,000,000 man-days of assistance by experienced technicians; 3,500,000 days of work with light tractors; 600,000 days of work with heavy tractors; 23,000,000 days of work with horse-drawn equipment; 155,000,000 seedling trees for windbreaks, shelter belts, and post plantings; 104,000 miles of fences.

In terms of units of construction equipment, it will require the following for the State of Oklahoma to do the soil-conservation job ahead of it:

Tractors	1,033
Graders (large)	665
Graders (small)	1,000
Fresnos	1,700
Power shovels and drag lines	600
Trucks	1,400
Pick-up trucks	1,500
Centrifugal pumps	400
Road-patrol machines	500
Scarifiers	340
Sheep-foot rollers	300
Concrete mixers	500
Brush mowers	1,134
Grass seeders	2,000
Bulldozers	835
Carry-alls	370
Limespreaders	350
Terracers	114
Land levelers	50
Fertilizer attachments	245
Air compressors and drills	400

Also a great amount of small tools and implements.

This report has been prepared in cooperation with the organized soil-conservation districts in the State, the extension service of Oklahoma A. and M. College, and the United States Soil Conservation Service.

As an example of a typical post-war plan of an organized soil-conservation district, there is appended hereto a copy of the post-war plan for the Greer County Soil Conservation District.

There are at this time great quantities of construction equipment, such as that listed above, which is being used throughout the State of Oklahoma and neighboring States, on Army and Navy bases and other war facility installations. There is also a large quantity of construction equipment impounded at various places within the State of Oklahoma, and elsewhere, which is not now in use.

It is not the intention of this report to recommend the taking of this equipment from vital war uses, but it is felt that arrangements should be made now for securing this badly needed equipment for distribution to organized soil-conservation districts throughout the State of Oklahoma immediately at the cessation of the war.

We would further suggest that if there proves to be inadequate quantities of equipment available within the State of Oklahoma, or the United States, that arrangements be made for the return of construction equipment that has been sent to foreign countries during the period of war.

It is believed that now is the time to make arrangements for the acquisition of this equipment and, if it must be purchased, some type of Federal assistance in the way of long-term loans, or a combination of loans and grants, should be worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to a typical post-war plan of a typical soil-conservation district, as follows:

POST-WAR PLAN FOR GREER COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

I. INTRODUCTION

The general welfare of all people living within the boundaries of the Greer County Soil Conservation District is dependent upon the soil resources, as there is no manufacturing, oil industry, or other sources of income. Realizing "A nation, state, county, or individual is only as rich as its soil" we have prepared this plan setting forth the needs of the district for technical personnel, equipment, and labor to establish a well-rounded conservation program on every farm.

The district was organized in the summer of 1941 and began operations in September of 1942. Conservation plans have been worked out on 94 of the 1,800 farms within the district. There has been no farm plans completely established due to the fact that the district has been in operation for only a short period of time.

Personnel and equipment have been very limited and we feel that the rate of planning and establishment of conservation practices should be stepped up if the productivity of our soils is to be maintained.

We realize that the present job is to win the war and the conservation practices which have been established on the land have done much for the war effort, by increasing food production. But after the war is won and the Nation returns to peacetime activities, a war should be declared on the evils of erosion. Therefore, if any Government machinery should become a surplus, this machinery that is suitable for use in the construction of conservation measures should be made available for that purpose. Also should a public-works program be necessary, which we hope is not needed, the use of this labor should be given first priority to be used for the construction of conservation measures on the farms which will conserve our soils. Not only the people of this district but the people of the Nation as a whole must put forth every effort to retain our soil resources.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT

The Greer County Soil Conservation District, comprising all of Greer County, lies in the southwestern part of Oklahoma, and is bordered on the west by Harmon and Beckham Counties, on the south by Harmon and Jackson Counties, on the east by Jackson and Kiowa Counties, and on the north by Beckham County. The district covers 644 square miles, or approximately 407,680 acres. There are approximately 1,800 farms in the district, with an average of 117 acres in cultivation, the rest is in pastures, woodlands, waste land, town sites, and roads. The district headquarters is located at Mangum, Okla.

III. EROSION CONDITION, FLOOD DAMAGES, AND CONSEQUENCES

The land of Greer County Soil Conservation District has been damaged from water and wind erosion to a very great extent, ranging from slight on the nearly level to severe on the rolling to steeply rolling cultivated land. The steep rough pasture land has been damaged to a very great extent by overgrazing. More land is being left idle each year due to water and wind erosion and this condition will increase until conservation practices are applied to the land of the district as a whole. About 3 percent of the cropland has been abandoned and about 10 percent more should be retired to pasture in applying a well-balanced conservation program. The remaining 87 percent of the cultivated land can remain in cultivation for a long period of time with moderate to high yields if proper conservation measures are applied in time. The nearly level land of the district, which is about 30 percent of the land in cultivation, can be protected by simple conservation practices. The remaining 70 percent will need moderate to intensive treatment.

The heavier soils are affected very little by wind erosion, while the sandy soils are affected by both wind and water erosion. Due to erosion and cropping of soils of the district they have lost about 30 percent of the organic matter or nitrogen.

The pastures and range land of the district make up about 49 percent of the district, about 50 percent of which is severely overgrazed and is causing erosion to take place at a very fast rate. The overgrazing causes gullying which will take mechanical treatment and a large amount of labor to control. Much of the pasture land is rough broken land and contains outcrops of gypsum rock and shale which have very little cover. Such pasture land should be stocked at a very low rate to maintain an effective cover as these areas cause damage from silting of ponds and to land subject to overflow.

The increased erosion has caused an increase of the water run-off, which has increased flood hazards. Floods have deposited silt and sand on rich bottom lands, silted up ponds and stream channels, and spread noxious weed seed, such as Johnson grass, Russian thistles, cockleburs, and others.

The population of Greer County was 20,282 in 1930 and decreased to 14,500 by 1940. The greater part of this decrease is from farm areas and has been due to erosion, which caused lower production. When one drives through the district, one sees many abandoned homes in the more severely eroded areas. These eroded farms require a large unit for the farmer to make a good living.

IV. BENEFITS OF A SOIL- AND MOISTURE-CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The primary purpose of a soil- and moisture-conservation program on every farm is to decrease erosion and increase and maintain yields. Already a number of farmers have stated that this has been done on their farms even though only a part of the plan has been applied to the land.

Reports from various neighboring districts indicate that production has been increased from 14 to 30 percent on row crops, such as cotton and grain sorghums, and 10 to 25 percent on small grains. Similar increases have been obtained by applying conservation practices on pasture lands.

Additional benefits which may be expected are as follows:

1. Maintain or increase present standard of living among farm families.
2. Permit more people to make a living on the farm.
3. Provide better social conditions by maintaining a more stable rural population.
4. Reduce silting and flood damage.
5. Return abandoned lands to production of grass and cultivated crops.
6. Keep farm land in crop production that would otherwise be abandoned.
7. Reduce crop loss on flat land caused by excessive run-off from areas above.
8. Help decrease roadside erosion.
9. Help maintain well water.
10. Stabilize the urban income and population.
11. Offset crop damage from droughts by storing moisture in the soil during the rainy season.

V. LIST OF SOIL-AND-MOISTURE-CONSERVATION PRACTICES APPLICABLE TO THE DISTRICT

These practices are recommended since farmers' experience in the district has proven them to be very effective in controlling erosion and conserving moisture:

1. Cover crops.
2. Crop rotations.
3. Contour planting.
4. Crop-residue management.
5. Cropland with effective cover.
6. Green-manure crops.
7. Emergency tillage.
8. Terracing.
9. Strip cropping for wind erosion.
10. Tillage for impounding water.
11. Terrace outlets.
12. Application of barnyard manure.
13. Establishment of small irrigation systems.
14. Drainage ditches.
15. Planting old permanent pasture.
16. Planting permanent pasture or range.
17. Establishing small irrigation systems.
18. Fencing to protect erosion-control measures, for gully control, and to secure proper land use.
19. Roadside-erosion control.
20. Proper stocking of pasture and range.
21. Proper season of use of range.
22. Rotation grazing of pasture and range
23. Deferred grazing.
24. Pond management for erosion control and fish production.
25. Farm and ranch ponds.
26. Supplemental pasture.
27. Development of springs and wells.
28. Contour furrowing.
29. Clearing and grubbing.
30. Mowing grazing land.
31. Rodent control.
32. Fire prevention and suppression.
33. Maintaining feed reserves.
34. Stream bank erosion control.
35. Woodland and shelterbelt plantings.
36. Protection of post lots and shelterbelts.
37. Leveling fence row drifts and hummocks.

VI. LAND USE ADJUSTMENTS

Data from the conservation surveys of the district and farmers' experiences indicate that about 13 percent or 27,000 acres of cultivated land should be retired to permanent grass cover. The larger part of this acreage is in the area around Wildcat School. The remaining acres are sandy sections of the district, some of the steep rolling cultivated land along the breaks, and other small areas throughout the district. There are another 15,000 acres which are in the critical state of erosion. If erosion measures are not applied on these 15,000 acres within the next 10 years they, too, should probably be retired to permanent grass cover.

In the sandy areas of the district approximately 2,500 acres of shelter belts should be planted to protect this land from wind erosion. These shelter belts not only protect the land from wind, but serve as post lots, firewood, and wildlife areas.

Due to shallow soils, steep slopes, and size and shape of areas, there is very little pasture land in the district which could be put into cultivation.

It does not appear at the present time that a Government land-purchase program is needed, as the surrounding farmers of the eroded areas are generally able to purchase the submarginal farms and are able to establish the needed conservation measures.

There is very little land available in the district for settlement by families from outside of the district. However, the district should be able to take care of all the returning farmers from the armed forces.

VII. RESOURCES NEEDED

Technical personnel

To get sound conservation programs on the land, it has been demonstrated that plans need to be developed for individual farms that consider all of the conservation needs of those particular farms. A sound conservation plan which will maintain the fertility of the land includes a multiple of practices which have to be applied over a period of years. In other words, conservation of the land is a continued process.

The welfare of the people is dependent upon the need of getting soil- and moisture-conservation practices established at such a rate to where the productive capacity of the soil is not lowered to such an extent that the present standard of living cannot be maintained. To reach this goal, the district will need the following Soil Conservation Service personnel: three farm planners, two engineers, one conservation surveyor, seven aides.

This amount of personnel will be needed to get the maximum benefits of the equipment and labor which are listed elsewhere. The present soil-conservation personnel consists of one farm planner and two aides.

Equipment

Farmers' experiences have indicated that the equipment they have on hand will not permit them to establish soil- and moisture-conservation practices at a rate which is rapid enough to maintain the soil fertility. It has been definitely proven that additional equipment can profitably be used by the farmers on the following practices: Terrace construction, terrace outlet waterways, farm and ranch ponds, pasture seeding, pasture sodding, roadside erosion control (public and private), diversion ditches, contour furrowing, trench silos, harvesting seed, mowing sage and brush.

In order to establish the above-mentioned conservation practices, the farmers with the assistance of an adequate technical staff as

listed elsewhere will need the following equipment: 13 tractors, 60 horsepower or greater; 10 graders, 10-foot blades; 6 bulldozers; 4 carryalls, 6-cubic-yard capacity; 1 tractor, 30 to 35 horsepower, crawler type; 9 power mowers; 15 farm tractors; 3 Bermuda grass harvesters; 5 Bermuda grass planters; 8 grass drills; 2 combines (all harvesters).

In addition to the above equipment the following is needed to transport labor, move equipment, supervise labor and equipment, and service equipment: One 10-ton trailer; eight 1½-ton trucks; one 2-ton truck; two 1-ton trucks; eight ½-ton trucks (pick-up); sufficient hand tools such as shovels, picks, post-hole diggers, etc., will be needed for the laborers.

Labor

The following practices will require labor in excess of available farm labor: Terrace outlet waterways, farm and ranch ponds, planting native grass, roadside erosion control (public and private), fencing areas for exclusion for erosion control, sodding diversion ditches, gully control, woodland planting, harvesting seed, sodding pasture land.

Skilled operators for the equipment and skilled and unskilled labor needed for the establishment of the above practices are as follows:

Skilled operators	39
Foremen	2
Truck drivers	12
Foremen (labor)	5
Mechanics	2
Blacksmith	1
Unskilled laborers	72

Group conservation projects

The individual farmer can apply practically all of the needed conservation measures on the land. However, a group project for roadside erosion control may be needed occasionally to get effective erosion control. Such a group project would not require additional technical personnel, labor, or equipment.

VIII. DISTRICT ORGANIZATION CAN CONDUCT THIS PROGRAM

The district organization is a result of the Oklahoma soil conservation district law. It is a democratic organization being organized by popular vote of the landowners and operators. It is governed by a board of five farmers, of which two are appointed by the State soil conservation committee and 3 are elected by popular vote. The only purpose of the district is the conservation of soil and water and soil resources.

The State law provides that the district supervisors may call upon various Government agencies and may accept money, equipment, or material as a grant to be used in establishing conservation measures on the farms.

Since the district has been in operation it has become very popular with the farmers and businessmen. It is now considered the organization that the people of the district go to when they want assistance in solving conservation problems. It is the belief of the district supervisors that the district can logically conduct this program.

W. T. S. Flyers Do Set Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Richard I. Bong, a product of the C. A. A. war trainees school, has distinguished himself as few air pilots have in the remarkable record of 27 Japanese planes shot down in combat. This is one more than the World War No. 1 record of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, who, individually, shot down 26 planes in combat.

Major Bong, a most quiet and reserved officer, and seemingly nerveless fighter pilot, has little regard for the new Japanese pilots now appearing in his theater. He calls them dumb, or something, and says they are easy to shoot down once you can catch up with them.

Thousands of instructors and war trainees find themselves today without hope of ever serving in the Air Corps in any manner, and many of these thousands had the same ambitions to try to accomplish or surpass the record of Major Bong. With the recent decision of grounding and placing all of these men in the Army as privates, regardless of their hours of flying time and experience, these thousands of so-called forgotten airmen will never see a chance to fulfill their desire and ambition unless they are taken into the Regular Army Air Corps with commissions and placed in whatever department of the Air Corps they could serve best.

Survive or Perish, They Write Unity in the Skies Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, during my short stay in Arizona at Easter time I was privileged to speak at the graduation exercises of a splendid class of pilots at Williams Field in Arizona on April 15. Touching on their careful air training for possible usefulness in peace following the war I pointed out the part our heroes and especially the survivors of this terrible conflict may play in uniting the parts of a broken world and spreading unity around the globe. My remarks to the graduates follow:

Colonel Grills, members of the staff, friends and loved ones of the members of the class, and all men of Williams Field, this is a significant day not only in the education and training of you members of the class but in your lives as well. Not only is it significant to you but very significant to your country. I have no doubt that your training for air service has been of a high order. We have not only justifiable local pride but a national pride in Williams Field and in the men of Williams Field. At Washington we have watched the splendid work of this great field with solicitous care and appreciation. I have had great concern for Williams Field for I have watched it grow from the desert.

Men of the graduating class, your total training for the wings of an eagle has at least a twofold prospect—and both prospects are of momentous concern to your country's future. In this day of war perhaps I should not speak of but one of these prospects, as the war is necessarily uppermost in our minds. And yet, notwithstanding the frightful hazard of your great commission, it is our prayer and hope that you will survive the ordeal of battle and that your air service training will bless our land during a long period of peace so long as you shall live and serve.

To those who are earth-bound the impetus of air navigation is a never-ending marvel. Some weeks ago Congressman JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, chairman of a committee of which I am a member, flew into Washington Airport in a unique manner and several Members of Congress were there to meet him. Why did we go to all that trouble? Because it was an epoch marking flight, though not apparently so to the hurrying throngs. He flew the first plane into the Nation's Capital fueled by gasoline made from coal. Some recent legislation, of which this merely hints, will open up new vistas in peacetime as well as wartime aviation.

WHO WROTE E PLURIBUS UNUM?

How much influence does the inventor or the scientific explorer have upon human destiny? How does the Edison compare with the Jefferson in shaping the trends of history? We are so near Thomas Jefferson's birthday, and because we give much credit to statesmen and the political side, we are apt to think that great political leaders shape the course of history. Let us not take a too limited view. Now, what is one of the most significant things in American history and who did most to bring it about?

I need not tell you that one of the most significant accomplishments in America's great destiny was the welding of diverse racial elements and social ideals into one political union. Early Americans united so that out of many we became one. The founders of our Republic wrote "E pluribus unum" on the coin, in the law, and across the face of our history. Who were the architects of this united country?

EARLY STATESMEN HAD AID

Of course the eminent men who met in old Independence Hall at Philadelphia in the summer of 1787 drafted the fundamental law which provided a more perfect union. I greatly honor them and would not detract one bit from their glory; however, others had a part in the final result. One afternoon during that summer at Philadelphia the Constitutional Convention took a short recess and most of the members went down to the river's edge to watch a curious experiment. A poor ragged inventor was trying to show the world that a boat could be propelled by steam. Those statesmen saw the first successful application of steam to water transportation in our history without realizing its great import.

Who had most to do in binding this vast country into one Nation—the ones who wrote our laws, or the ones who applied steam to rapid transportation by land and water? Who wrote "E pluribus unum" across America? I will take time for only this one illustration for I can but mention that 100 years ago Morse gave us the electric telegraph and four decades ago the Wright Brothers gave us the wings which you have so well burnished. Thus statesmen and scientists have enlarged and united America into a glorious country through the years of peace.

VICTORY IS YOUR IMMEDIATE OBJECT

Men of William Field, and all men and women of America's armed forces, your immediate objective is to preserve your country from the greatest danger which ever beset it. We know you will do it, and having preserved America for a glorious future, what a wonderful training you have had to enable you to have a meaningful part in that future. God grant that you may survive to play your rightful part in the uniting the parts of a broken world. After this war it is yours to write E pluribus unum, not only

across a continent, but in the skies around the globe.

But why discuss works of peace now in the midst of this terrible war? You are trained to fight and you are well trained. Perhaps I am not enough of a Christian to advise you as a Christian, but even so, I would have you each afire with Christian wrath. You will meet a ruthless foe, who knows no mercy. I do not advise you to act in a spirit of vengeance but rather in a fighting spirit of right. The Lord Himself has fought the forces of evil, and you may have a part with Him. And what a glorious part yours is to be—in the skies.

IN THIS SPIRIT FLY AND FIGHT

It is no evidence of weakness if you have the spirit of Lt. John Gillespie Magee, who wrote High Flight. Less than a month ago I had a long talk with Lieutenant Magee's godly father, who glories in the Christian spirit of his noble son. Lt. John Magee wrote in letters of fire across the skies of battle these great words:

"I've topped the wind-swept heights with easy grace
Where never lark, or even eagle, flew;
And, while with silent, lifting mind Ive trod
The high untrespassed sanctity of space,
Put out my hand and touched the face of God."

It is not a sign of weakness, rather it is a sign of righteous strength if your prayer is the same as that of Sgt. Hugh Brodie when he said:

"Almighty and all present Power,
Short is the prayer I make to Thee,
I do not ask in battle hour
For any shield to cover me.

The vast unalterable way,
From which the stars do not depart
May not be turned aside to stay
The bullet flying to my heart,

I ask no help to strike my foe,
I seek no petty victory here,
The enemy I hate, I know,
To Thee is also dear.

But this I pray, be at my side
When death is drawing through the sky,
Almighty God who also died
Teach me the way that I should die."

Men of Williams Field, I am but one of your countrymen sending you forth to fight, and some perhaps to die, for the preservation of your country and our heritage of civilization. If you die, I shall feel personally that you died in my stead as literally as I do feel that in case of my own son, Lt. David Murdock cut down while leading infantry in Sicily. I am, and shall always be, sacredly obligated and consecrated just as one ransomed from horror. No doubt your parents and loved ones feel exactly the same deathless obligation.

Promises are often in vain; sometimes deeds are in vain. Surely your loved ones are unalterably bound by this sacred obligation to see to it that any sacrifices you make are not in vain. God be with you and keep you.

The Late Catherine Smith

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness I received word this morning that Catherine Smith, the wife of Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York four times, and once a candidate for the Presidency, died this morning. I have known her personally for many, many years. She was a woman of outstanding loyalty, ability, and charity. The city of New York, the State, and the Nation has lost a great citizen.

Catherine Smith was one of those great women whose modesty was proverbial. She made a true companion to Alfred E. Smith and was a devoted wife and mother. Her interests were centered in her home and she offered her husband that fine companionship which was a haven in the storms of public life which Al Smith encountered in his public career. He could always return home secure in the knowledge that his loving wife was there to greet him and that his children had been properly taken care of. She relieved him of all the drudgery which is the lot of many men and proved her worth in the success which her husband found as legislator, governor, and businessman.

To Governor Smith and his family we wish to offer our sincerest condolences and words of sympathy.

Absentee Voting by Citizens of the State of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Senate bill 284, passed by the General Assembly of Ohio, the purpose of which is to allow everyone in the State of Ohio the privilege of voting a complete ballot.

I am making this request in behalf of Hon. George Thompson, member of the general assembly from Lucas County in the Ohio House of Representatives:

[Ninety-fifth General Assembly, special session, 1943–44]

Senate Bill 284

A bill to facilitate voting at the elections to be held on the seventh day of November 1944 by persons absent from their voting residences and serving in or with the armed forces of the United States or serving in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the armed forces of an ally of the United States, and to suspend sections 4785–86, 4785–92, 4785–93, 4785–94, 4785–95, 4785–96, 4785–98, 4785–105, 4785–110, 6064–32 and 6212–62 of the General Code during the period of time in which this act is in force and effect, and to repeal section 4785–141 of the General Code, and to declare an emergency

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. Any provision of the General Code of Ohio to the contrary notwithstanding, any person serving in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations, and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States, or serving in the armed forces of an ally of the United States, who will be 21 years or more of age on the 7th day of November 1944 and who is a citizen of the United States, may vote absent war voter ballots in the elections held on that day in the precinct in which he shall then have a voting residence in Ohio, as provided in this section. If he resided in the State of Ohio at the time of the commencement of his service in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine of the United States, or in the armed forces of an ally of the United States, he shall have a voting residence at that place in the precinct in which he so resided provided the time during which he continuously resided in Ohio immediately preceding the commencement of such service plus the time subsequent to such commencement and prior to the 7th day of November 1944 shall be equal to or shall exceed 1 year.

Such absent war voter ballots may be obtained by applying therefor to the clerk of the board of elections of the county in which such person's voting residence is located in one of the following ways:

(a) Such person may make written application therefor. He may personally deliver such application to the clerk or may mail or otherwise send same to the clerk. Such application need not be in any particular form. It need only contain words which, liberally construed, indicate that he requests such ballots, that he is engaged in one of the services as hereinabove specified, that he has a residence in Ohio, and sufficient information to enable the clerk to determine the precinct in which it is located. If he desires that such ballots be mailed to him, such application shall state the address to which they should be mailed.

(b) Application to have such ballots mailed to such person may be made by the spouse, father, mother, grandparent, father-in-law, or mother-in-law, brother, or sister of the whole blood or half blood, son, daughter, adopting parent, adopted child, step-parent, step-child, uncle, aunt, nephew, or niece of such person. Such application shall be upon a form prescribed by the secretary of state and provided by the clerk upon request therefor, and shall be subscribed and sworn to under oath by such applicant. Such application shall contain:

1. Full name of person for whom ballots are requested;

2. Statement that such person is serving in the armed forces of the United States; or in the merchant marine of the United States; or in the American Red Cross, The Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations, and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States; or in the armed forces of an ally of the United States;

3. Statement that such person has a residence in the county and information as to the precinct in which it is located;

4. Statement that applicant bears a relationship to such person as hereinabove specified;

5. Address to which such ballots should be mailed;

6. Name and address of person making the application.

Applications to have absent war voter ballots mailed to an elector, as provided for in this section, shall not be valid if dated, postmarked, or received by the clerk of the board of elections earlier than the 1st day of January 1944 or if delivered to such clerk later than 12 noon of Saturday, the 4th day of November 1944.

The board of elections of each county shall provide, and on the 9th day of August 1944

it shall have ready for use as absent war voter ballots, official national party column ballots, party column ballots, nonpartisan ballots, and issues ballots as referred to in section 4785-99 of the General Code. Such ballots shall be of the same kind of paper, and shall be the same size and in the same form, style, and text as the board will provide in accordance with law for the use of all voters who will vote in person at the polling place in each precinct on the 7th day of November 1944: *Provided, however,* That such issues ballot shall contain only such issues as shall, prior the 25th day of July 1944 have been lawfully certified to the board for submission to the voters of the county or of any political subdivisions or taxing units thereof at the election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944 and which such board shall on the 9th day of August 1944 be lawfully required so to submit.

On the 9th day of August 1944 the clerk of the board of elections shall mail, in the manner hereinafter provided, such absent war voter ballots then ready for use as in the preceding paragraph hereof provided for, and for which he shall have received valid applications prior to that time. Thereafter, and until 12 noon of Saturday, the 4th day of November 1944 the clerk shall, promptly upon receipt of additional valid applications therefor, mail to the proper persons all absent war voter ballots then ready for mailing.

If, after the 9th day of August 1944 and before the 7th day of November 1944, any other issue is lawfully certified to the board of elections for submission to voters at the election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944 the board shall promptly provide a separate official issue ballot for each such issue, and the clerk shall promptly mail each such separate official issue ballot to each person serving in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations, and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States, or serving in the armed forces of an ally of the United States, to whom he shall have previously mailed other absent war voter ballots as in the two preceding paragraphs hereof provided for.

In mailing absent war voter ballots to persons, as in this section provided for, the clerk shall use the fastest mail service available therefor, but he shall not mail same by registered mail. He shall place such ballots in an unsealed identification envelope, gummed ready for sealing, which shall have printed on the face thereof a form as follows:

"IDENTIFICATION ENVELOPE

"(Absent war voter ballots—election, Tuesday, November 7, 1944)

Information concerning voter:

"1. What is your full name?_____

"2. What is the date of your birth?_____

"3. Are you a citizen of the United States?

_____

"4. Where were you born? _____

"5. If a naturalized citizen, when and in what court were you naturalized? _____

"6. Are you serving in the armed forces of the United States? _____

"7. Are you serving in the merchant marine of the United States? _____

"8. Are you serving in the American Red Cross? _____, the Society of Friends? _____, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots? _____, or the United Service Organizations? _____, and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States? _____

"9. Are you serving in the armed forces of an ally of the United States? _____

"10. What was the date of the commencement of such service? _____

"11. Did you reside in the State of Ohio at the time of the commencement of such service? _____

"12. How long had you continuously resided in Ohio immediately preceding the commencement of such service? _____

"13. What is the location of the place in which you resided at the time of the commencement of such service? This is:

"What street and street number? _____

"What city or village? _____

"What township? _____

"What county? _____

"I hereby swear (or affirm) that the answers to the questions above set out are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

"_____

"(Voter must write his usual signature here and his oath must be administered and attested.)

"Personally appeared before me the above-named voter, to me known and known to me to be the person who, after being duly sworn, subscribed to the foregoing oath; and I hereby certify that he exhibited to me the enclosed ballots unmarked; that he then in my presence and in the presence of no other person, marked same in such manner that I could not see how he marked same, and enclosed same within this envelope; that he was not solicited or advised by me to vote for or against any candidate or measure.

"In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this _____ day of _____, 1944.

"_____

"(Signature and rank or title of commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath.)"

The clerk shall also mail with such ballots and such unsealed identification envelope, an unsealed return envelope, gummed ready for sealing, for use by the voter in returning his marked ballots to the clerk. Such return envelope shall have two parallel line, each one-quarter of an inch in width, printed across the face thereof parelleling the top thereof with an intervening space of one-quarter of an inch between such lines. The top line shall be 1¼ inches from the top of the envelope. Between the parallel lines shall be printed the following words: "Official election war ballots—via air mail." Three blank lines shall be printed in the upper left corner on the face of such envelope for the return address of the voter. The following inscription: "Free of postage including air mail (war ballot)" shall be printed in the upper right corner on the face of such envelope. The official title and the post-office address of the clerk of the board of elections to whom such envelope shall be returned shall be printed on the face of such envelope in the lower right portion thereof below the bottom parallel line. All printing on such envelope shall be in red ink.

The identification envelope in this section provided for shall be a No. 8, 24-pound white commercial envelope. The return envelope in this section provided for shall be a No. 9, 24-pound white commercial envelope. The envelope in which said two envelopes and the absent war voter ballots are mailed to the elector shall be a No. 10, 24-pound white commercial envelope which shall have two parallel lines, each one-quarter of an inch in width, printed across the face thereof paralleling the top thereof, with an intervening space of one-quarter of an inch between such lines. The top line shall be one and one-quarter inches from the top of the envelope. Between the parallel lines shall be printed the following words :"Official election war ballots—via air mail." The appropriate return address of the clerk of the board of elections shall be printed in the upper left corner on the face of such envelope. The following inscription: "Free of postage including air mail (war ballot)" shall be printed in the upper right corner on the face of such envelope. Several blank lines shall be printed on the face of such envelope in the lower right portion thereof below the bottom parallel line for writing in the name and address of the elector to whom such envelope is mailed. All printing on such envelope shall be in red ink.

The clerk shall keep a record of the name and address of each person to whom he mails or delivers absent war voter ballots as in this section provided, the kinds of ballots so mailed or delivered, and the name and address of the person who shall have made the application therefor. After he shall have mailed or delivered such ballots he shall not mail or deliver additional ballots of the same kind or kinds to such person pursuant to a second or subsequent request therefor unless such second or subsequent request shall contain the statement that an earlier request had been sent to such clerk prior to the first day of September, 1944, and that the absent war voter ballots so requested had not been received by such person prior to the first day of October 1944, and provided the clerk shall not have received an identification envelope purporting to contain marked absent war voter ballots from such person.

Upon receiving his absent war voter ballots the elector shall fill in answers to the questions on the face of the identification envelope and write his usual signature in the proper place thereon; then he shall exhibit his ballots, unmarked, to some commissioned office, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest oaths, to whom he is known. He shall then, in the presence of such officer or other person authorized to administer and attest oaths, and in the presence of no other person, mark such ballots in such manner that such officer cannot see how they are marked, fold each ballot separately so as to conceal his markings thereon, deposit them in said identification envelope, and securely seal the same. Thereupon he shall swear to or affirm the oath upon said identification envelope and have same properly attested by such officer. He shall then place said identification envelope within said return envelope, seal same and mail it to the clerk of the board of elections to whom it is addressed.

Any commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, in the armed forces of the United States or its allies, or any member of the merchant marine of the United States designated by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration for the purpose of administering and attesting oaths to facilitate voting by members of the merchant marine of the United States, shall be authorized to administer and attest oaths required by this section.

If, after the 8th day of August 1944, and before noon of the 7th day of November 1944, a valid application for absent war-voter ballots as in this section provided for, is delivered to the clerk by a person making such application in his own behalf, the clerk shall forthwith deliver to such person all absent war-voter ballots then ready, together with an identification envelope as in this section provided for. Such person shall then immediately retire to a voting booth in the office of the board, and shall there mark such ballots. He shall then fold each ballot separately so as to conceal his markings thereon, deposit them in said identification envelope, and securely seal the same. Thereupon he shall fill in answers to the questions on the face of the identification envelope, write his usual signature in the proper place thereon, swear to or affirm the oath upon said identification envelope and have same properly attested by a proper official of the board. He shall then

deliver said identification envelope to the clerk. If thereafter and before the 7th day of November 1944 any additional separate official issue ballots are provided by the board the clerk shall promptly mail each such separate official issue ballot to such person at the address specified by him for that purpose.

Upon receipt of envelopes bearing the designation "Official election war ballot" prior to noon of the 7th day of November 1944, the clerk of the board of elections shall open same but shall not open the identification envelope therein contained. All sealed identification envelopes bearing the designation "Absent war-voter ballot" in the hands of the clerk at the time the election supplies are delivered to the presiding judges of the precincts, as provided by law, shall then be delivered to the presiding judges of those precincts, respectively, in which the absent voter's voting residence is located, as indicated on such envelopes. Any additional identification envelopes bearing the designation "Absent war-voter ballot" received by the clerk prior to 12 noon of the 7th day of November 1944, shall be delivered by messenger to the presiding judge of the appropriate precincts between the hours of 12 noon and 6:30 p. m. of the 7th day of November 1944.

Envelopes bearing the designation "Official election war ballots" received by the clerk after 12 noon of the 7th day of November 1944, shall not be opened or counted, but shall be preserved in such envelopes unopened for a period of 30 days after the 7th day of November 1944. Thereafter they may be destroyed on order of the board of elections unless the secretary of state shall order them preserved for a longer period of time.

As soon as the polls are opened on election day the judges of election shall examine the information contained on the face of each identification envelope bearing the designation "absent war-voter ballot" to determine if it shall appear therefrom that the voter whose marked ballots are contained therein has the qualifications prescribed in the first paragraph of this section. At such time any duly appointed challenger, or any of the judges or clerks of election may challenge the vote of such absent voter on the ground that he does not have such qualifications. If a majority of the judges find that the voter has the qualifications required, and that the information on such identification envelope has been properly subscribed and sworn to by the voter, and that his oath has been properly attested as provided for in this section, the presiding judge shall open the identification envelope without defacing the written or printed matter thereon, remove the enclosed ballots without unfolding them, and deposit them in the proper ballot boxes. The name of each such voter, followed by the words "absent war-voter ballot" shall be written in the poll book or poll list together with such notation as will indicate the kinds of ballots the envelope contained. All identification envelopes bearing the designation "absent war-voter ballots" received by any presiding judge between 12 noon and 6:30 p. m. on the 7th day of November 1944 shall be examined and the ballots therein shall be voted or not counted in the same manner as hereinabove provided for other absent war-voter ballots.

If any challenge as hereinbefore provided for is made and sustained the identification envelope of such voter shall not be opened and shall be endorsed "not counted" with the reasons therefor, and such envelope shall be returned to the board of elections along with any other contested ballots. All identification envelopes from which ballots shall have been removed and voted shall also be returned to the board of elections at the close of the polls.

SEC. 2. At 10 a. m. of the 11th day of May, 1944, the board of elections of each county shall meet and canvass the vote cast at the primary election held on the 9th day of May, 1944, and shall declare and certify the results thereof in the manner provided by law. The executive committee of each political party participating in said primary may have one representative present during the canvass of the vote.

Each board shall promptly certify in duplicate to the secretary of state, upon forms prescribed by him, the results of the votes cast for each candidate whose nomination or election is determined by the votes of electors of the State-at-large. The secretary of state shall thereupon promptly canvass the votes cast for such candidates in all of the counties of the State, shall declare the results thereof, and shall issue certificates of nomination or election to those of such candidates entitled thereto.

Each board shall also promptly certify the results of the votes cast for each candidate whose nomination or election is determined by the votes of electors of a district comprised of more than one county but less than all of the counties of the State, to the board of the most populous county in such district. The boards to which such certifications are made shall thereupon promptly canvass the votes cast for such candidates in all of the counties in their districts, shall declare the results thereof, and shall issue certificates of nomination or election to those of such candidates entitled thereto.

Each board shall also, after canvassing the vote for each candidate whose nomination or election is determined by the votes of electors of its county, promptly declare the results thereof and issue certificates of nomination or election to those of such candidates entitled thereto.

SEC. 3. All separate petition papers comprising the nominating petition of a candidate for election at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November, 1944, shall be filed as one instrument not later than 6:30 p. m. of the 30th day of June, 1944, and shall be accompanied by the written acceptance of nomination by the nominee named in such petition. In the absence of such acceptance the nominee's name shall not be printed on the ballot.

If the petition nominates a candidate whose election is to be determined by the voters of the State-at-large, it shall be filed with the secretary of state. If the petition nominate a candidate whose election is to be determined by the voters of a district comprised of more than one county but less than all of the counties of the State, it shall be filed with the board of elections of the most populous county in such district. If the petition nominates a candidate whose election is to be determined by the voters of a county, it shall be filed with the board of elections of such county.

If such petition is filed with the secretary of state, he shall promptly transmit to each county board of elections such portions of the petition as purport to contain signatures of electors of the county of such board. If such petition is filed with the board of elections of the most populous county of a district, such board shall promptly transmit to each county board of elections within such district such portions of the petition as purport to contain signatures of electors of the county of each such board.

All petition papers so transmitted to a board of elections and all nominating petitions filed with a board of elections shall, under proper regulations, be open to public inspection until 6:30 p. m. of the 10th day of July 1944, during which time the board shall examine same and determine the validity or invalidity of the signatures thereon. Each board shall, not later than the 10th day of July 1944 return to the secretary of state all petition papers transmitted to it by the secretary of state, as hereinabove provided for, together with its certificate certifying its determination as to the validity or invalidity of signatures thereon, and shall return to the board of elections of the most populous county of a district all petition papers transmitted to it by such board together with its certificate certifying its determination as to the validity or invalidity of signatures thereon.

Objections to nominating petitions may be filed by any qualified elector eligible to vote for the candidate whose nominating petition he objects to, not later than 6:30 p. m. of the 14th day of July 1944. Such objections shall be filed with the election officials with whom the nominating petition was filed. Upon the filing of such objection the election officials with whom it is filed shall promptly fix the time for hearing same and shall forthwith mail notice of the filing of such objection and the time fixed for the hearing of same to the person whose nomination is objected to. They shall also forthwith mail notice of the time fixed for the hearing to the person who filed the objection. At the time so fixed such election officials shall hear the objection and determine the validity or invalidity of the petition. Such determination shall be final.

SEC. 4. Any person nominated in the primary election held on the 9th day of May 1944 or by nominating petition as a candidate for election at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944 may withdraw as such candidate at any time prior to the 20th day of July 1944. Such withdrawal may be effected by the filing of a written statement by such candidate announcing his withdrawal and requesting that his name be not printed on the ballots. If such candidate's declaration of candidacy or nominating petition was filed with the secretary of state, his statement of withdrawal shall be addressed to and filed with the secretary of state. If such candidate's declaration of candidacy or nominating petition was filed with a board of elections, his statement of withdrawal shall be addressed to and filed with such board of elections.

SEC. 5. If a person nominated in the primary election held on the 9th day of May 1944 as a candidate for election at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944, whose election is to be determined by the voters of the State-at-large, shall withdraw as such candidate prior to the 20th day of July 1944, the vacancy in the party nomination so created may be filled by the State central committee of the political party which made such nomination at said primary, at a meeting called for such purpose. Such meeting shall be called by the chairman of such committee, who shall give each member of the committee at least 2 days' notice of the time, place, and purpose of such meeting. If a majority of the members of such committee are present at such meeting, a majority of those present may select a person to fill the vacancy. The chairman and secretary of such meeting shall certify in writing and under oath to the secretary of state not later than the 24th day of July 1944 the name of the person so selected to fill such vacancy. Such certification must be accompanied by the written acceptance of such nomination by the person whose name is so certified.

If a person nominated in the primary election held on the ninth day of May 1944 as a candidate for election at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944, whose election is to be determined by the voters of an election district comprised of more than one county but less than all of the counties of the State, shall withdraw as such candidate prior to the 20th day of July 1944, the vacancy in the party nomination so created may be filled by the district committee of the political party which make

such nomination at said primary, at a meeting called for such purpose. The chairman and secretary of the county central committee of such political party in each county in such district shall comprise such district committee. Such meeting shall be called by the chairman of the county central committee of such political party of the most populous county in such district, who shall give each member of such district committee at least 2 days' notice of the time, place, and purpose of such meeting. If a majority of the members of such committee are present at such meeting, a majority of those present may select a person to fill the vacancy. The chairman and secretary of such meeting shall certify in writing and under oath to the board of elections of the most populous county in such district, not later than the 24th day of July 1944 the name of the person so selected to fill such vacancy. Such certification must be accompanied by the written acceptance of such nomination by the person whose name is so certified.

If a person nominated in the primary election held on the 9th day of May 1944 as a candidate for election at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944, whose election is to be determined by the voters of a county or an election district smaller than a county, shall withdraw as such candidate prior to the 20th day of July 1944, the vacancy in the party nomination so created may be filled by the county central committee of the political party which made such nomination at said primary, at a meeting called for such purpose. Such meeting shall be called by the chairman of such committee, who shall give each member of such committee at least 2 days' notice of the time, place, and purpose of such meeting. If a majority of the members of such committee are present at such meeting, a majority of those present may select a person to fill the vacancy. The chairman and secretary of such meeting shall certify in writing and under oath to the board of elections of such county, not later than the 24th day of July 1944, the name of the person so selected to fill such vacancy. Such certification must be accompanied by the written acceptance of such nomination by the person whose name is so certified.

If a person nominated by petition as a candidate for election at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944 shall withdraw as such candidate prior to the 20th day of July 1944, such vacancy so created may be filled by the committee of five designated in such nominating petition to represent the candidate named therein. To fill such vacancy the members of such committee, or a majority of them, shall, not later than the 24th day of July 1944, file with the election officials with whom the nominating petition nominating the person who has withdrawn was filed, a certificate signed and sworn to under oath by each of them, designating the person they select to fill such vacancy. Such certification must be accompanied by the written acceptance of such nomination by the person whose name is so certified.

If a person nominated in the primary election held on the 9th day of May 1944, or nominated by petition, as a candidate for election at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944 shall die the vacancy so created may be filled by the same committee in the same manner as provided in the four next preceding paragraphs for the filling of similar vacancies created by withdrawals, excepting that the certification, when filling a vacancy created by death, may not be filed with the secretary of state or with the board of elections of the most populous county of an election district later than 6:30 p. m. of the 28th day of October 1944, or with any other county board of elections later than the 2d day of November 1944.

If a person holding an elective office shall have died subsequent to the 10th day of March 1944, and prior to the 20th day of July 1944, and if, under the laws of Ohio, a person may be elected at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944, to fill the unexpired term of the person who shall have died, the appropriate committee of each political party, acting as in the case of a vacancy in a party nomination as in the first three paragraphs of this section provided for, may select a person as the candidate of its party for election for such unexpired term at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944, and certify his name, and thereupon such name shall be printed as such candidate under proper titles and in the proper place on the party column ballots used at such general election.

SEC. 6. The secretary of state shall, on the 25th day of July 1944, certify to the board of elections of each county in the State the forms of the official ballots to be used at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944, together with the names of the candidates to be printed thereon whose election is to be determined by the votes of the electors of the State-at-large.

The board of elections of the most populous county in each election district comprised of more than one county, in which there are candidates whose election is to be determined by the votes of the electors of such district, shall, on the 25th day of July 1944, certify to the board of elections of each county in such district, the names of such candidates to be printed on such ballots.

If, after the 25th day of July 1944, and before the 29th day of October 1944, a certificate should be filed with the secretary of state to fill a vacancy caused by the death of a candidate, as in section 5 of this act provided for, the secretary of state shall forthwith make a supplemental certification to the board of elections of each county in the State amending and correcting his original certification provided for in the first paragraph of this section. If within such time such a certificate should be filed with the board of elections of the most populous county in an election district comprised of more than one county, such board shall forthwith make a supplemental certification to the board of elections of each county in such district amending and correcting its original certification provided for in the second paragraph of this section. If, at the time such supplemental certification is received by a county board of elections, ballots carrying the name of the deceased candidate shall have been printed, such board shall cause strips of paper bearing the name of the candidate certified to fill such vacancy to be printed and pasted on such ballots so as to cover the name of the deceased candidate, before such ballots are delivered to electors.

SEC. 7. Official printed ballots shall be provided by the board of elections for each polling place for the elections to be held on the 7th day of November 1944, and for any special elections to be held at any prior time in the period of time during which this act is in effect. In addition to the names of the candidates, all ballots shall contain spaces, as required by law, for writing in other names. The number of ballots to be provided for each precinct, for use at any election, shall be determined by the board of elections having jurisdiction. Sample ballots shall not be supplied by the board of elections but when printed shall be printed on colored paper and the words "Unofficial sample ballot" shall be plainly printed in bold-face type across the face of such ballot.

SEC. 8. All ballots which county boards of election shall be required by law to provide between the 10th day of May 1944, and the 8th day of November 1944, shall be printed in black ink on No. 4 sulphite bond white paper of 13 pounds weight per ream. Each ballot of each kind of ballot shall have attached thereto at the top thereof two stubs, each of the width of the ballot and 1¾ inches in length. The stubs shall be separated from the ballot and from each other by perforated lines. The top stub shall be known as stub B and shall have printed on its face "Stub B." The other stub shall be known as stub A and shall have printed on its face "Stub A." Each stub shall also have printed on its face "Consecutive Number ———." Each ballot of each kind of ballot provided for use in each precinct shall be numbered consecutively beginning with number 1 by printing such number upon both of the stubs attached thereto.

On ballots bearing the names of candidates such names shall be printed in eight point bold-face upper-case type, and an enclosed blank rectangular space shall be provided at the left of each candidate's name. The titles of offices on such ballots shall be printed in eight-point bold-face upper- and lower-case type. Headings shall be printed in display roman type. Where the names of several candidates are grouped together as candidates for the same office, there shall be printed on such ballots immediately above the names of such group of candidates, the words: "Vote for not more than ——— (filling the blank space with that number which will indicate the number of persons who may be lawfully elected to such office) ———."

National party column ballots and party column ballots shall have a blank circular space three-fourth of an inch in diameter below the device and above the name of the party at the head of the ticket or list of candidates. The heading of each party ticket, including the name of the party, the device above, and the circle between the device and such name, shall be separated from the rest of the ticket by a heavy line, and the blank circular space shall be defined by heavier lines than the lines defining the blank spaces at the left of the names of candidates. The circle shall be surrounded by the following words: "For a straight ticket mark within this circle."

Each party ticket shall be separated from other party tickets and shall be bordered on each side by a heavy border or a solid line at least one-eighth of an inch wide, and the edges of the ballot on each side shall be trimmed off along such border or solid line.

SEC. 9. Upon presentation not later than 6:30 p. m. of the 30th day of June 1944 of a petition to the board of elections of the county wherein the district or any part thereof, as defined in section 6064-31 of the General Code, is located, signed by qualified electors of the district concerned, equal to 15 per centum of the total number of votes cast for Governor at the last regular State election in such district, the board of elections shall proceed as follows:

1. Within 5 days after such presentation, determine the sufficiency of such petition and, in case of overlapping residence district petitions presented within said period, determine which of such petitions shall govern the further proceedings of such board. But if the district be located in more than one county, the petition shall first be transmitted to the board of elections of each of the other counties in which any part of such district may be located, for investigation and report with respect to said matters and things, in such rotation as may be determined by the board of elections to which the petition is presented; and each of such other boards of elections shall make such report within 5 days from the date of transmission of such petition to it; in which event the time within which the final decision of the board of elections to which the petition shall have been presented must be made shall be extended accordingly.

2. If the petition shall be found sufficient and, in case of overlapping residence district petitions, after the governing petition shall have been determined, the board of elections to which the petition has been presented shall order the holding of a special election in the district for the submission of the questions in section 6064–33 of the General Code specified, on the 7th day of November 1944, and shall certify such order to the board or boards of election of any other county or counties in which any part of such district is situated.

3. Give notice of such election in each county in which any part of such district is situated, in the manner and within the time provided by law.

When, within 5 days after the filing of a residence district petition pursuant to this section, another residence district petition is filed with the same or another competent board of elections, which includes territory covered by the petition first so filed, that petition shall govern which applies to the territory containing the lesser number of election precincts, if otherwise sufficient; and if such second petition covers the same territory as that covered by the first, such second petition shall be disregarded and the first petition shall govern, unless the first petition is insufficient.

SEC. 10. The question of the sale of beer as defined in section 6212–63 of the general code, by holders of C or D permits, may be presented to the qualified electors of an incorporated municipality, a residential district of a municipality as hereinafter defined, a township in which no incorporated municipality exists, or to the qualified electors of that part of a township outside of an incorporated municipality, for their adoption or rejection.

The question to be submitted shall be, Shall the sale of beer as defined in section 6212–63 of the general code be permitted within the district, municipality, township, or part of a township outside of the municipality?

The exact wording of the question and form of ballot as printed, shall be determined by the board of elections in the county wherein the election is held, subject to approval of the secretary of state of Ohio.

Upon presentation, not later than 6:30 p. m. of the 30th day of June 1944, of a petition to the board of elections of the county wherein such election is sought to be held, requesting the holding of such election, signed by qualified electors of the district concerned equal to 35 percent of the total vote cast for governor at the last regular State election in such incorporated municipality, residential district of a municipality, township in which no incorporated municipality exists, or of that part of a township outside of an incorporated municipality, the board of elections shall submit such question to the electors of the district concerned, at the general election to be held on the 7th day of November 1944.

If a majority of the electors voting on said question vote "Yes" thereon, the sale of beer as defined in this section shall be permitted in the district concerned, subject only to the provisions of law. If a majority of the electors voting on said question vote "No" thereon, it shall be unlawful for any C or D permit holder to sell beer within the district concerned until at a subsequent election similarly called and held, a majority of the electors voting on said question shall vote "Yes" thereon.

No such election shall be held oftener than once in each 3 years.

A residential district shall be held to mean any two or more contiguous precincts in the residential portion of a municipality.

SEC. 11. The provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this act shall cease to be in effect on and after November 8, 1944, and the provisions of sections 4785–86, 4785–92, 4785–93, 4785–94, 4785–95, 4785–96, 4785–98, 4785–105, 4785–110, 6064–32, and 6212–62 of the general code are hereby suspended until the 8th day of November 1944.

SEC. 12. Section 4785–141 of the general code is hereby repealed.

SEC. 13. This act is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety. The reason for such necessity lies in the fact that a large number of the citizens of Ohio are absent from their homes serving in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations, and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States, or serving in the armed forces of an Ally of the United States, in various parts of the world. Because of such absence they might, under present absent-voter laws, be unable to vote at the November elections in 1944. This act will make it easier for them to vote at such election.

Army Air Force Convalescent Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and many speeches have been made relative to the reconditioning of disabled members of the armed forces. Medical men realize the mental condition of the patients who day after day lie in bed and count the cracks in the ceilings and the nails in the walls with nothing else to do. It was at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., just outside of my own city, St. Louis, where a real rehabilitation and convalescent training program was started. It has spread now until it is a major program in the Army Air Force. It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that realizing the value of this program, other branches of the service will adopt it.

I have just read a very interesting article in the Army-Navy Journal of May 6 on this subject entitled "The A. A. F. Convalescent Program." Under the permission granted me, I include this article as part of my remarks. It follows:

Pioneering in this field, in December 1942, the Army Air Forces established a convalescent program for the ordinary sick soldier in the station hospital designed to return him to duty, not only in first-class physical condition but with a period of training behind him instead of enforced idleness.

The convalescent training program, which has been in operation at Army Air Forces hospitals for over 16 months, has a remarkable record of reconditioning, utilizing convalescent time to the utmost, and returning men to duty or starting them on the road to civilian life with a definite objective and a well laid groundwork of training. Now in operation at all Army Air Forces station hospitals and at convalescent centers in strategic locations throughout the United States, the program is of the utmost flexibility and meets the requirements of the individual, not only with carefully planned physical training in keeping with his condition but with training along lines which he has followed or will follow in the future.

Under the program the average patient at an Army Air Forces station hospital engages in light exercise of some type within 48 hours after an operation. As he improves, the strenuousness of his exercise increases until he is taking part in competitive sports. It is not unusual to see men with an arm or leg still in a cast playing volleyball or softball, thus avoiding the atrophy of unused muscles which would accompany the usual idle period of convalescence.

As to the training and study which he gains under the program, cadet training and basic training centers now give full credit and recognition to the military training gained in this way. Thus, the patient has had no period of mental idleness. If in a training phase when hospitalized, he continues his studies under special instructors, themselves often patients, he quit possibly may return to duty on the same training level as the other men of his squadron.

The hospitalized soldier differs from the hospitalized civilian in that there is no period of taking it easy after leaving the hospital. He must remain there until able to assume his regular duties. Not only is this lengthy period utilized to the fullest extent but the combined physical training and study has been found to result in shortened periods of convalescence, a reduction in hospital readmissions by sending men back to duty in better physical condition, and often in elimination of the necessity of sick leave. The result of the teaching is an increase in the soldier's military knowledge and in his general knowledge.

Lt. Col. Howard A. Rusk, Chief of the Convalescent Training Branch, Medical Services Division, who had been an instructor of medicine at St. Louis University before becoming a medical officer, was Chief of the Medical Service at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., station hospital, when he first put the program into operation. In December 1942, Maj. Gen. David N. W. Grant, the air surgeon, ordered the program installed in all A. A. F. hospitals. Colonel Rusk was assigned to duty in charge of the over-all program.

Convalescent centers are located at Fort George Wright, Spokane, Wash.; Fort Logan, Colo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Nashville, Tenn.; Coral Gables, Fla.; St. Petersburg, Fla., and at Mitchel Field and Pawling, N. Y. At these centers returned casualties undergo a physical, emotional, and psychological assay and are properly assigned in the program by medical officers trained in this work. Then under the combined program the reconditioning begins, special treatment and instruction if the man returns physically handicapped, psychiatric treatment and guidance if necessary. His vocational training may include such subjects as radio, photography, metal work, woodwork, aircraft identification, and synthetic training devices. His educational review may include languages, mathematics, armed forces institute courses, agriculture, bookkeeping, typing, and teaching methods.

While primarily intended to return the men to duty, and the greater percentage are so returned, either to their former duties or to duties suitable to their present physical condition, those whom it is found necessary to send back to civilian life have had the opportunity to plan their future and are turned over to the appropriate agency with a substantial background of training.

Being based on the individual needs and abilities of the patients the educational phase of the program is one of the greatest

variety. Keeping up with the latest techniques and research on military subjects they study camouflage, land mines, booby traps, first aid, defense against chemical attacks and military sanitation. Some patients while still confined to their beds are disassembling and assembling motors, generators, aircraft instruments, and weapons. According to a recent survey over 600 different subjects are now taught in the program, subjects ranging in scope from basic military subjects to highly technical investigative research.

Hardly a subject in which a man has had training, desires training or evinces interest in is overlooked. Many of these subjects are those for which the man would not have had time in his routine training. Almost no morale or disciplinary problems arise where patients are kept busy both mentally and physically.

A summary of the convalescent training centers shows that the service is conducted with the following possibilities of the disposition of patients in mind: Return to original A. A. F. assignment; return to A. A. F. in a different assignment; return to assignment within the Army; return to civilian life as a socially and economically self-sufficient individual.

"It is fitting," says General Grant, "that the A. A. F. should have adopted as the basic philosophy behind its convalescent training program this phrase, 'The debt of disability shall be paid in the currency of opportunity.' To accomplish this we have preached that the soldier must be to us a name, an individual, and not a mere serial number to be filed away or shelved when his usefulness appears to be at an end."

Gen. Henry H. Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, has stated:

"Our responsibility for the Air Forces soldier does not end when the bombs are dropped over the target."

Address by Hon. Marion E. Martin Before the Maine State Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Marion E. Martin, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the Maine State Republican Convention in Bangor, Maine, on Friday, April 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been a great deal of discussion about the advisability of changing horses in the middle of the stream. My advice is, "Let's change horses and cross the stream." It certainly is the only way we are ever going to get across. We have heard that argument now for 8 years, and unless we make the change this year, we may hear it for another 20. The only reasons given by the opposition to back up this argument are that we are in an emergency—and how familiar that phrase is—and that we need the New Deal President to remain in office in order to carry on the war and to work out the peace after the war. Peace negotiations are, however, time-consuming, and it may take 10 or 20 years to write the peace.

The first statement can be disposed of very quickly. Political leaders do not make the decisions of military strategy. Those decisions are made by trained military leaders. Military science is an exact science and the President has no training in that field. If our military campaigns are to be conducted along political lines, we are doomed to failure. Military operations are conducted by military leaders, and they would not be changed if there were a change in political leaders. They achieve positions of prominence not by party affiliation but because of ability. They serve as Americans, not as Republicans, Democrats, or new dealers. In a Republican administration, political preferment would not be given to any military man—ability would be the criterion for advancement.

The second point demands more careful analysis. If the fact that Mr. Roosevelt is the only one who can carry on peace negotiations is a compelling reason for electing him for the fourth term, then we must face the fact that we must continue him for 5 terms, 6 terms, or even 10 terms in office because the peace will not be written overnight. It will be a long process of negotiations, adjustment, and readjustment. We will be fortunate if this does not extend over a period longer than 15 years. Do we want to stay on the same old horse for that length of time? No, let's change horses and cross the stream.

In our system of government, the conduct of foreign relations is primarily an executive function, the State Department being an adjunct of the President. Continuity of policy, however, is provided by the State Department and the United State Senate. If the policy we are pursuing is an American and not a personal policy, we will not have to worry about its being changed. Our foreign relations would be much better if they were conducted on a less personal and a more objective basis—if they were conducted with greater regard for the opinions of the experts in the State Department and less regard for the opinions of the little coterie of the President's personal friends who have had no training or experience in that field. The State Department has a continuity and perpetuity which give a security and nonpolitical, nonpartisan slant to our foreign relations. Our foreign policy should be long range and not dependent upon the personal reaction of our President toward Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek or anybody else. It should be long range and American in viewpoint rather rather than short range and personal.

If Mr. Roosevelt's policies are so personal that only he can carry them out, then certainly they are not wise for this country. If the policies are sound and best for the country, our trained career men in the State Department should be in on the secrets, and be able to advise with Mr. Roosevelt's successor so that there will be a consistency in policy and so that America's prestige and welfare will always be maintained. If they are not sound, the quicker we have the change the better.

There's one thing certain, and that is that in view of the record we are taking an awful lot on faith when we, even for a moment, admit that Mr. Roosevelt has provided—or assume that he can provide—better leadership in the international field than he has in the State or National field. Leopards don't change their spots. The minute the President boards a clipper or a warship, no metamorphosis of character takes place. He is the same Mr. Roosevelt who did, even as late as May 14, 1940, show astonishing lack of understanding of national defense needs, even though he had all the information concerning world developments. At a press conference on that day, when questioned about a two-ocean Navy, he replied that the two-ocean Navy "is an entirely outmoded conception of naval defense, and it has been since about 1847 when we first acquired California. I just never discuss two-ocean Navy in one way or the other, because it is not sensible to talk of naval defense in those terms."

Further, he said:

"It really, honestly is an outworn conception that nobody who knows anything about defense would ever use. Nobody has ever used that term that knew anything about defense. Such a conception is just plain dumb."

The tragic consequences of President Roosevelt's failure to recognize the necessity of a two-ocean Navy was clearly demonstrated in the public statement on October 19, 1942, of Admiral Ernest J. King, our commander in chief of the fleet and Chief of Naval Operations. He said the United States "is fighting a two-ocean war with just about a one-ocean Navy." "We have got to hold on," he said, "until we gain some strength." Much to the credit of the Navy and American industry, the picture today is very different. We can boast now of a seven-ocean Navy—a Navy unequaled by any other nation in the world.

Aside from the demonstrated weakness of not recognizing the implications of world conditions, the President also made the mistake of talking big and doing little. It is fundamental that the foreign policy of a country should be backed up by the strength and will to carry it out. But, beginning with his famous quarantine speech of 1937, the President began to throw the moral support of the United States against the Axis aggressors. Yet complementary steps were not taken to strengthen our national defense forces by which he would be able to enforce those policies which he announced. Moreover, he did just the reverse. By shipping oil and scrap iron to Japan he made it possible for our enemy to rearm. He also made it difficult for our political ally, China, to carry on her battle with Japan. It is a just criticism of Mr. Roosevelt's lack of vision in the pre-Pearl Harbor era that he talked big but did very little to equip the country to carry out the threats he was making.

These are but two elements of the whole national defense picture. They are evidence of President Roosevelt's proven lack of foresight in the past. Lacking such foresight when he had all the information at his fingertips that would have enabled him to judge the seriousness of the world situation, why should we give him the benefit of the doubt and believe that he would show any more foresight in preparing for peace than he did in preparing for obvious war?

If we are to believe that the President was prepared for the proximity of war, that he had a well-defined war policy in relation to the military, the navy and the critical supply situation, what interpretation can be placed on his pronounced disarmament leanings, his disregard of diplomatic warnings regarding Japanese threats, and his press conference characterizations of impending war queries as irrelevant?

The facts are indisputable to show that the President scuttled the 1933 London Economic Conference. As an aside, he now has set up various conferences similar in composition to the London Economic Conference, to deal with segments of the economic problems. If 10 years ago the system was bad and unable to cope with comparatively simple problems, why would there be much hope that the more complex problems of today can now be solved that way? No—the system was all right then and it is most unfortunate for the world that President Roosevelt scuttled the London Economic Conference,

thereby accentuating the economic stresses and strains that produced this present war.

It is also true that the President favored downright disarmament during the whole time war clouds were gathering, that he delayed preparations for adequate defense, that he ridiculed the urgency for a two-ocean Navy, that he was dilatory in recognizing the potentialities of air power, that he pursued a tardy course in the acquisition of war materials, that he actually assured the American public not to become "discomboomerated" by foreign developments and, moreover, that he was not on guard regarding Japanese threats.

These deficiencies constitute incontrovertible evidence that the President was not competent to evaluate and to counter the warlike trends of the pre-Pearl Harbor period. He erred, too, in failing to portray frankly to the people the status of world conditions.

In view of this record, it is a natural consequence that the people should question the "official" acts since the Pearl Harbor tragedy—but the post-Pearl Harbor record is shrouded in darkness. The American people have not been kept informed of the official foreign transactions and intents of the Roosevelt administration. Neither have those acts which have been given the spotlight of publicity been convincing, nor have they encouraged the public to think there is a clear national policy.

What assurances are there, therefore, that an administration that had a vacillating, day-to-day foreign policy in the pre-war days has thereby demonstrated an unquestioned right to be entrusted with the future planning of America, with the winning of the peace?

There is also ample evidence that just as the President is not frank with the people of this country, neither is he frank with the leaders among our allies, nor are they frank with him. Certainly, there was no meeting of the minds as far as the Jewish homeland in Palestine was concerned. Neither has there been a meeting of the minds as to the release of publicity in connection with the disposition of the Italian Navy. We could hardly say there was complete cooperation between Russia on the one hand and Great Britain and America on the other, when Russia recognized the Badoglio government. Certainly, there was not frankness when Russia split itself up into 16 independent Soviet Republics. Neither is there evidence today of what our relations are or are to be with the Balkan countries.

This is all a far cry from "open covenants, openly arrived at." These are but a few of the available examples of the weakness typical of the present administration, the lack of foresight and forthrightness which must be demonstrated if we are ever going to cross the stream.

I do want to say that one of the most intelligent steps taken by the Republicans in Congress was initiated by our own Congressman ROBERT HALE. He led a group of 24 freshman Congressmen, who called upon the Secretary of State in an attempt to find out what our foreign policy was. Apparently they were unsuccessful, but if 24 Members of the House of Representatives, who are close to the scene and who are making a conscientious effort to get information; 24 outstanding legislators who have cooperated in all measures necessary for international collaboration, are unable to get a definition of our foreign policy, then why should we, the rank and file, fall victim to a lot of hocus-pocus that we approve a foreign policy about which we know little, or that we can't change horses because it would break the continuity in the foreign policy?

What we need is more forthrightness in dealing with each other. We should point with pride to the pronouncement made by our Republican leaders at Mackinac, in which our Governor Sewall had a large part. This pronouncement reads as follows:

"Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

The Mackinac statement was the logical sequel to the White-Vandenberg resolution previously espoused by our able Senator WHITE. It was the first definite and specific commitment on foreign policy by either party. It was the lead which was followed later when the Congress adopted the Fulbright and Connally resolutions. The Republicans supplied the vision. In so doing, they proved their capacity for leadership in foreign affairs.

I have covered this field at some length because of challenge made at the Democratic State convention and because there has been so much confused thinking on this subject.

There is, however, one additional item that needs be taken up briefly, namely, the statements by the friends of the President that the name of Roosevelt carries so much weight and prestige in foreign countries that for the good of the world, we need maintain him in office. Certainly, if that is the case, it is an indictment of the New Deal because they have been selling Roosevelt rather than America abroad. There is, too, the very important consideration of whether their statement holds water. If my information is correct, the French people do not look upon Mr. Roosevelt as their great savior. Certainly, also, there can be two opinions regarding Mr. Roosevelt among the Yugoslavs and the Greeks. Also, if it is the name rather than the country that is important, we would have to establish a dynasty in order to maintain our position and prestige in foreign affairs.

We realize the great responsibility that is going to be America's because of the position which we have earned in the leadership of the world's social and economic development. Sad to say, however, there are many in our national life at the present time who overlook the very fundamental fact that in order to continue that leadership and to be strong internationally, we must be strong nationally. We cannot dissipate our wealth and resources in following a policy of profligacy and still maintain our strength and the respect of our fellow nations. We cannot create full employment in the world unless we have full employment here. We cannot provide healthy environment for others unless we have a healthy environment for ourselves. The only thing that we can share—and profit in our sharing—is our ideals of service and cooperation. We cannot buy friendship. We can only set an example. Dollar diplomacy creates jealousies and animosities. Only through true and intelligent consideration of other countries, their problems and aspirations, can we build a sound good neighbor policy throughout the world.

It is a national characteristic to favor the underdog. We have, therefore, butted into the problems of little nations with an emotional fervor, sometimes with little regard for the equities involved. It is well to champion the cause of the weak, but weakness in itself is not always a virtue, just as bigness per se is not a vice. Moreover, when we espouse their cause and hold out hope and promise to them, we must be prepared to deliver. We must not make the mistake we made in Greece when we encouraged her to believe that we would give her supplies, but which we couldn't deliver. So while we believe in world collaboration, let us ever be mindful of the fact that such collaboration should be based on considered judgment rather than on emotions. In order to carry out any policies so conceived, we must be strong internally as well as externally. We must speak with authority. We must perform on our promises. We must be respected.

We cannot be strong internally if we are torn by two conflicting political philosophies. For some time, we have traveled a road, part socialist and part capitalistic. Just as we could not be half free and half slave, we cannot embrace at one and the same time two diverse economic and political philosophies. We are fast approaching the time when we must decide whether we are to continue under our American economic and political system, or whether we are to go into a Fascist, Socialist, or some other totalitarian form of government.

In making this decision, we should always remember that it is the combination of our political and economic systems that has provided the greatest Nation ever known to man. We, as a people, have the greatest freedom, the greatest happiness and the greatest opportunities of any people at any time. I believe it is those things which our soldiers are fighting to preserve. It is our responsibility to recognize that fact and to do everything that we, as individuals, can to protect that system internally, while they are protecting it externally.

I am proud that women the country over are recognizing this fact. I am proud of the interest that they are taking in government. I am particularly proud of the contribution that our own Congresswoman Margaret Smith is making to the country, to the party and to our sex. Her success brings greater recognition and opportunity to all women. She is a pioneer. Because of the work she is doing as a pioneer, other women will find doors open so that they, too, can make contributions to the welfare of the country.

We place great emphasis on the part that women are playing in this election. It is not, I am sure, to be interpreted that we mean men to suffer by contrast. It is only that women have been a "sleeping giant" and that they have been awakened by war. Their wrath is mighty. They are taking an interest in politics hitherto unknown. They are determined to wipe out the New Deal. At the same time, however, they want to continue some of the programs so necessary to a changing world. They are of the opinion that just because a thing is old, is no reason why it is acceptable. Just because a thing is new, is no reason that it is undesirable. They are eclectic in their thinking—they want to preserve the good and discard the bad, regardless of the sponsorship.

Women want to build on the solid philosophy of Americanism represented by the doctrines of the Republican Party. They do, however, want to have it adjusted to 1944 thinking. We realize that our social structure has changed in many respects and that just as some of us cannot get into our graduation dresses, we can no longer go back to the period in which those dresses were made. We demand 1944 implements to meet 1944 problems. We are confident that the Republican leadership will provide them for us. We are happy to be united for Republican victory which will spell future happiness and security for America. We are getting across the stream!

Preservation of Jewish People of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on Saturday, April 29, 1944, at a rally sponsored by the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are living in an era which history will remember as the period of greatest cruelty, of deepest anguish, of death and desolation for the peoples of the earth. Human beings created in the image of the Father have enlisted the devil as their lieutenant and plunged the world into turmoil. They let loose the four horsemen who have now been riding the skies for almost 5 years, obliterating the flower of humanity, sacrificing millions of souls upon their satanic altar of greed and lust. So many men, women, and children who wanted, more than anything else in life, to live in peace with their families and loved ones, are now buried in unmarked graves throughout the four corners of the globe. Rivers, nay, oceans of blood are flowing freely—forever to stigmatize this century with the mark of Cain. Parents are crying for their dead children. Children find themselves orphaned in a world being consumed by fire and sword.

Who is there to measure tragedy? Is the death of one different from the death of others? Is pain of one different from the pain of others? Is torture of one different from the torture of others? Yet in this world of ours, among the tortured and the beaten, among all these people who yearn for freedom and peace, now fettered with the chains of slavery, there is one whose death, whose torture, whose pain, whose anguish is worse than those of their unfortunate neighbors.

I speak of the Jew, of Europe's Jew, for his death is a hopeless one, his death is a useless one. Others there are Poles, Greeks, Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Slavs, Russians, Englishmen, Americans, Chinese, and more who are dying. They die with the knowledge that soon, soon a new day will dawn—the black clouds of despair will disappear, the light will shine once again. For them the sun has set but they know full well that a new sun will soon arise. Day follows night. But the Jew—Europe's Jew—what has he to hope for? What new sun will rise for him? What ray of light can he see through the thick walls of misery under which he is buried? Will he ever be reunited with loved ones? His loved ones weren't merely torn from him—his loved ones were torn from life itself. Even Europe's Jew who still lives and fights in all the underground movements of that unhappy continent, in the guerilla units, in the Polish forests, in the partisan units of the Yugoslavian mountain strongholds, even he is not permitted to fight as others do, for himself—but only as himself for others. The Jew, in the field of battle, in discrimination and torture, is recognized as a Jew only by the enemy. Democratic governments do not recognize him as such and thus far have not permitted him to fight in his own army; thus denying him the privilege which is due to every human being and to every member of all nations. He is recognized as a Jew only when he manages to escape and demands to enter his homeland, Palestine. By official decree of the British Government, the Jew is the only human being on earth who is not permitted to enter Palestine. Ladies and gentlemen, in the name of decency and justice, such things must be stopped.

The souls of close to 3,000,000 Jews who have already died in Hitler's hell, cry out to us: "Remember us," "save those who may still be saved—rescue those who may still be rescued. Open the doors of Palestine where they may go and give their all toward building a better world."

Palestine has been promised to the Jews as their national home. Only the greatest military necessity should be allowed to slow up the realization of this promise. The United States is a partner to that promise. If, for military, or even political reasons, it is not expedient to establish that national home or commonwealth at this time, then they should certainly be permitted to enter temporarily until such time when peace comes once again to tortured humanity and the fate of the Jew will be decided as well as the fate of many other peoples. But for the present, now—not tomorrow, but now, the gates of Palestine must be flung wide open so that each and every Jew who manages somehow to escape will be welcomed and nursed back to health and normal society.

I stress Palestine because rescue is merely a problem of geography. Of course, all Christian countries, all civilized countries should permit those who manage to escape into their territories a temporary haven until the time comes for permanent adjustments. Even if our own country were open to all escaping Jews, it would be of little immediate help, because of the barriers of many other countries they would have to pass and the ocean they would have to cross. The rescue, therefore, has to proceed along shorter and safer routes. These lead to Cyprus, to north Africa, to Turkey, and to Spain. One route, however, is shortest and surest. It leads to Palestine.

Palestine is the closest and most practical haven for the escaping Jews. Bulgaria is nearer to Palestine than New York is to Miami. It is only a few days away from the Axis countries by short, quick water routes, by train, or even by bus. The Jewish population of Palestine is the only population in the world that is ready and eager to receive Europe's Jews. The Jews of Palestine enjoy more food than any other group of people of like numbers anywhere in the world outside of North America. They have better homes, more hospitals, more schools, more doctors, and more nurses than any other people of like number anywhere in the world. This food, these hospitals, doctors, nurses, homes, and schools, they are anxious to share with their relatives who are trapped in Hitler's hell. And there is immediate room in Palestine for hundreds of thousands. Palestine today is suffering from a serious labor shortage and must have a great number of additional workers so that she may increase her already proud and conspicuous contributions to the Middle East war effort. Thus it seems there is no justification for keeping the doors of that country closed to Europe's Jews. There certainly is no justification for the anti-Jewish descrimination laws which exclude the Jews alone from entering Palestine. These people, to whom Palestine means life or death, are the only ones in all the wide world prohibited by law from entering Palestine. Decent humanity can never erase from its mind the thought of thousands of Jews, who had already entered that country, sent back to their death or to far-off disease-infested islands. Need I remind you of the Struma, the Parita, and that far-off island in the Indian Ocean, Mauritius?

The War Refugee Board which the President created, is doing a magnificent job. I am given to understand that as a result of that Board, many lives have already been saved. But I do not believe that that Board can accomplish what it was intended to accomplish—the rescue of hundreds of thousands—unless Palestine be opened as a haven. When a house is on fire with people trapped on the roof and there exists in our possession safety nets into which these threatened people may jump and save themselves from the consuming flames of the conflagration, it would be sinful for us to withhold these nets because we are not certain to whom they belong. We must permit these people to jump into the nets and then, after they are saved from certain death, decide who are the real owners of the nets. Palestine is that net of safety into which so many of them may jump. It would be contrary to the laws of God and man to withhold them from Europe's trapped Jews. As to whom Palestine shall ultimately belong, that question must be decided at the peace conference after the fires are extinguished and the people, more or less, safe.

I, for one, don't believe that these Jews will be able to return to Europe after the war. It would be asking too much of people to return once again to the territories where their loved ones were so brutally murdered; to walk the streets where crimes beyond human imagination were enacted; to rebuild homes wherein wives, daughters, and sisters were dishonored, children murdered, parents decimated before their every eyes. No, that is too much to ask of any human being! These people must be transplanted into a new life, a new environment, a land which gives promise to a new and better future, where they can rehabilitate themselves spiritually as well as physically, for one cannot be done without the other. I, therefore, wish to make myself clear.

When I say that Palestine should be opened as a haven of refuge, I, for one, do not feel that it should remain a mere temporary haven. I only say that now, while the Jew is being tortured and killed, we should put aside all political considerations and permit him to enter that land until such time when the United Nations will be in a position to solve the Palestine problem. That ultimately a Jewish state will be established, I am certain. It is a precept of my very faith—the Mormon faith teaches me that, as well as the belief that this Jewish state will be there—in Palestine—on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean; there where their warriors fought and their prophets dreamed—where their psalmists sang and their mourners lamented—there where eternal truth was created and sent to the four corners of the earth—there this "tribe of the wandering foot and weary breast" must find a haven of peace and rest. And some day, in the near future, a free Hebrew nation, nursing its wounds of freedom's battle, will stand together with all the freedom-loving nations of the earth over the ashes and ruins of the common enemy's forts and strongholds, beneath the unfurled banners of liberty, including the blue-white banner of Israel—that ancient symbol of Jewish eternity. And then, and only then, shall the swords be beaten into plowshares—and spears into pruning hooks and nation shall no longer lift up sword against nation, and man shall no longer be afraid of man. We shall then recognize that we are all brethren—all of us—all races and all creeds—that we are the children of the One Heavenly Father.

Address by Senator La Follette on the Tenth Anniversary of the Progressive Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LAFOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on May 6 and 7 the Progressive Party of Wisconsin held a convention at Milwaukee, Wis., on the occasion of the tenth

anniversary of its formation. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered to the convention on May 6.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Seventy-one years ago a young man drove up to Madison from a farm in Primrose, Wis. He drove that 20 miles with a horse and wagon to find out what preparation he needed in addition to his country schooling to enter the university. While in Madison he heard Chief Justice Edward G. Ryan deliver an address to the graduating class of the University of Wisconsin. Speaking in the assembly chamber of the capitol, the voice of this great chief justice shook with emotion as he warned the students that a new and dark power in the form of corporate wealth was looming up in the United States: "The question will arise, and arise in your day, though perhaps not fully in mine, 'Which shall rule—wealth or man; which shall lead—money or intellect; who shall fill public stations—educated and patriotic freemen, or feudal serfs of corporate capital?'"

The prophetic words of the chief justice had an enduring influence on that young man from the Primrose farm. The question arose in his day, and he dedicated his life to the answer that freemen should rule in this country. He, and the men and women who built up the progressive movement, fought steadily against this dark power of the greed of corporate wealth which began to loom up in their generation.

When this fight began the reactionaries controlled both great parties. The Progressive movement gradually won the Progressive elements in both parties. Working through the Republican Party within the State, Progressives made Wisconsin the leading laboratory of the Nation in the battle for the rights of men and women as against the vested interests of special privilege. They fought together that free patriotic men should rule—and not organized wealth.

By 1911 the progressive victories in this battle for the public good and the rights of the people had been so remarkable that after a visit to Wisconsin an ex-President named Theodore Roosevelt, was inspired to write an editorial entitled, "Wisconsin: An Object Lesson." In concluding this editorial he said, "After my visit I felt like congratulating Wisconsin upon what it had done and was doing, and I felt much more like congratulating the country as a whole because it has in the State of Wisconsin a pioneer blazing the way along which we Americans must make our civic and industrial advance during the next few decades."

This was true prophecy. The history of the decades after 1911 now shows that most of the advances which have been made in dealing with civic and industrial problems were along the trails blazed by the pioneering movement of Wisconsin.

At one National Republican Convention after another the Progressive State of Wisconsin presented minority platforms which represented the cooperative thought and work of the ablest Progressive leaders in Wisconsin and other States. These platforms were all based upon sound research. Many of the planks urged national legislation based upon principles which had been actually tried out and found effective in Wisconsin.

Again and again these Progressive platforms were jeered at, voted down or laid upon the table by the reactionaries who dominated the National Republican Conventions. But the Progressives were not discouraged. They had faith in the people. They carried their battle back to the voters of the different States.

Through La Follette's Magazine and from the platform in speeches the roll call was read on the record votes of reactionary Congressmen and Senators. Many of them were defeated. Progressive Republicans or Progressive Democrats took their places at Washington. Slowly but steadily the Progressive planks which had been hooted down at National Republican Conventions became the law of the land. By 1920, 11 of the 13 planks submitted by the Wisconsin delegates in 1908 had become Federal laws, and 15 of the 18 propositions submitted in 1912 had been written into the Federal statutes.

When we look back upon the extraordinary achievements which history now records as largely the work of Progressives in this State and in the Nation we often forget how many battles were lost before these outstanding victories were won. But some are still living who recall the beginnings of the Progressive movement and participated in its battles year after year. They know that each achievement was the result of a long educational campaign carried on at first by a courageous minority which finally grew to be an awakened majority. None of the victories was easily won. None was the work of one man alone. They have all been the product of the continuous cooperation of many men and women working together for a common ideal.

This kind of patriotic public service cannot be performed by fair-weather liberals—those who like to shop around for personal political bargains. No; this kind of service calls for high courage and personal sacrifices. The men and women who made these sacrifices in the past, and those who have made them in more recent years have all done so because of a determined purpose that freemen should rule this country.

They know that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The courage to carry on this long fight against what often seem great odds springs from an enduring faith. It is a faith in the ability of the men and women of this country to solve the problems of a complex industrial civilization and at the same time to maintain a government of the people, for the people, by the people.

To serve as an instrument for action in this same enduring faith the Progressive Party was organized in this State 10 years ago, on May 19, 1934. It was organized in the midst of the economic crisis of the depression which both the Republican and the national Democratic parties had failed to prevent or remedy during the years they had been in power.

In our modern industrial civilization depressions are neither acts of God nor inevitable disasters. These disasters are largely made by the shortsighted greed and the blind selfishness of the great monopoly corporations. Seeking excessive immediate profits regardless of the common good, these vast monopoly corporations and cartels limit production through the power of monopoly and interlocking financial manipulation. This policy creates huge fortunes for the few, but it brings unemployment, insecurity, and the disaster of black depression to the many.

Since in our time a depression is a man-made disaster of the greedy few it could and should be prevented by the united intelligent action of many men. The terrible depression that followed after World War No. 1 could have been avoided had the political parties in power heeded the warning and followed the program advocated by the Progressives.

The Progressive Party came into being because the progressive-minded people of Wisconsin knew they needed a more effective instrument to express their will in meeting the tragic problems of this terrible depression. During those dark years this party accomplished a great deal within the State. Had the Legislature been solidly Progressive even more could have been done within the State. It was the cooperation of reactionary Republicans and Democrats in the Wisconsin State Senate that defeated some important measures like the Progressive Governor's works program.

But many of the problems created by the economic crisis could not be solved solely within the boundaries of any one State. In the national field the Republican Party was in power until March 1933 when the Democratic Party took over and became responsible for our national policy.

In the national effort to deal with the problems created by the depression the Progressives furnished courageous and outstanding leadership. They advocated and fought for policies and legislation designed to assure and maintain individual political freedom, economic opportunity, and economic security for every American citizen. When the Democratic administration sponsored legislation directed toward these ends the Progressives cooperated. But when the Democratic administration broke its pledges to the American people and turned its back upon many of our unsolved economic problems the Progressives dared to criticize the party in power and to tell the people of this country what was happening.

The high hopes which the Democratic Party held in 1933 for many sincere Democrats and Liberals have been dimmed.

The bright New Deal with its tarnished record of failure to carry through many of its promises of a constructive program is a casualty of war as the forces of monopoly and reaction strengthen their power within the administration. The Progressives can be thankful that they have maintained their independence and have not allowed some political pied piper to lead them into the Democratic Party in Wisconsin.

At present the indications are that the Republican Party is still dominated by eastern big business and eastern financial interests just as it was in Hoover's administration. If the Republican Party comes into power at the next election and fails to meet the problems produced by this war as it did those of the last war, Progressives will again have cause to be thankful they have maintained their independence and refused to be lured into that political party as well.

We are, I believe, living through a great crisis in the history of the United States. The decisions made in dealing with the economic problems created by this war will affect our destiny for generations to come. Already many decisions have been made on the domestic industrial front which are alarming in their implications. The Democratic administration has collaborated with the reactionary elements of the Republican Party in adopting agricultural and industrial war production policies which, under cover of the war situation, speed up the growth of monopoly. In converting from a peacetime basis to a war basis the Democratic administration has capitulated to the vast corporations. A mere 100 giant corporations have secured 70 percent of the prime war contracts. They are operating a proportionate share of the $20,000,000,000 worth of new plant facilities, financed directly by the Government through R. F. C. and indirectly by the Government through tax concessions to the owners.

After the war these great corporations will be more firmly entrenched than ever before. They and the great international cartels with which many of them are allied will seek to control and limit production through patents and monopoly. It was these monopolistic forces which contributed to fascism in Europe and to bringing on the depression which followed World War No. 1.

Throughout the period of conversion from peacetime production to war production in

World War No. 2 the Progressives fought to the last ditch for Government aid to small business and the equitable distribution of war contracts so that small business units could survive and carry on after the war. And we hope to reaffirm before this convention adjourns our steadfast support for Progressive alternatives to the Tory policies now so popular in our National Capital.

The Progressives have repeatedly warned the Democratic administration that the harvest of its policy of turning over production to these powerful monopolies would be another depression at the end of World War No. 2. But the warning has been ignored by the Democrats just as it was by the Republicans after World War No. 1.

Progressives are keenly aware that military victories abroad will be empty victories for the plain people of the United States if we lose the fight on the economic front either at home or abroad.

Progressives are fighting now in Congress and in their own States on the political and economic fronts so that our soldiers shall not return from military victories abroad to meet the personal defeats of a depression and unemployment at home.

I believe that the rank and file of the people of the United States know what has been happening through watching small business units fold up in their own communities. They fear what this means for the future economic independence of individual American citizens. They want equality of opportunity for all. They want continuous employment for every able-bodied man and woman who wishes work. They want this country ruled by patriotic freemen. They do not want the invisible government of vast wealth concentrated in the hands of a privileged few. They know that means excessive profits for the few and depressions for the many.

In the small towns, on the farms, and in the factories I believe men and women sense that the Democratic administration has forgotten the forgotten man and handed production over to monopoly interests. Their protest against this betrayal by the party in power will be registered in the elections through the defeat of many Democratic Representatives in Congress and on State tickets.

Progressives tried to keep us out of the war just as they tried to prevent our entry into the First World War, but on both occasions to no avail.

It was a Progressive who had the realistic vision to see where the policy of the Democratic Party was leading the United States. As far back as 1937, Congressman HARRY SAUTHOFF introduced two resolutions designed to stop the shipment of war materials to Japan.

Seven months before Pearl Harbor, HARRY SAUTHOFF predicted that while our Navy was convoying supplies to Great Britain in the Atlantic, Japan would seize the opportunity to attack us. He urged the strengthening of our own defenses in the Pacific so that Japan could not catch us off guard. Had the warning of this Progressive Congressman been heeded by the Democratic administration the disaster of Pearl Harbor could not have happened.

From the hour that the United States was attacked at Pearl Harbor the Progressives have supported our war effort. They are doing their part on every military front in World War No. 2 as they did in World War No. 1. But Progressives are also continuing to fight for their principles on the home front because they have not forgotten what happened during and after World War No. 1. They still remember the munitions investigation and the revelations of corrupt financial agreements that cut across national boundaries to put profits into the pockets of international cartels.

Progressives read and remember the secret treaties which had been entered into by our allies before we went into World War No. 1 and were published in this country after their discovery in the archives of czarist Russia. Progressives remember what happened at the Versailles peace table to the Fourteen Points announced by President Wilson as our war aims. Progressives know that the forces which worked secretly to defeat those Fourteen Points at the peace table are now at work in every country. These ruthless forces of monopolistic wealth and international cartels thrive in wartime and occupy invisible thrones at the peace tables. Fascism in Europe after the last war was one of the bastard children bred by these greedy ruthless parents.

Progressives know that they are using the war situation for undercover work of this same kind in our own country. That is the meaning of the constant campaign that has been carried on to smear the magnificent war production record of labor and agriculture and to force through legislation to conscript all able-bodied men and women. That is the meaning of the effort to impose permanent conscription upon the youth of this Nation for generations to come. Under cover of a wartime situation the conscription of labor and the universal conscription of youth for peacetime have been the cornerstones of European fascism and imperialism.

The Progressives are fighting fascism at home. They will not compromise with the forces of fascism at home or abroad, in wartime or in peacetime.

Progressives believe in cooperation at home and abroad with the forces which share their ideals for political freedom and economic opportunity, and will help to make them realities in the daily lives of the American people and the peoples of other countries. But the Progressives are realists. They know that the United States cannot buy the friendship of other nations. They do not intend to sign blank checks now to be filled in abroad later by the very reactionary and monopolistic forces they have been fighting at home for two generations. They remember the forces which, behind closed doors, wrote the peace at Versailles and betrayed the common people of this country and of other countries.

In the light of this tragic experience, Progressives will continue to oppose the unilateral determination of the boundaries of small nations by any great power as in the case of valiant Poland or other nations in similar circumstances.

Instead we shall persistently advocate the right of self-determination for small nations by plebiscites held under international supervision which will guarantee an expression of the popular will free from coercion in any form.

The great hope for the solution of Europe's complex economic, ethnic, and political problems will be realized when the governments of Europe are willing to renounce their conflicting imperialistic aims. Then the peoples of Europe can find the solutions of these problems through a confederation of States upon the basis of the experience of Switzerland and the United States.

Progressives are opposed to all efforts to commit the United States to a specific future course in world relationships so long as the people of the United States are still in the dark as to the peace demands and post-war objectives of the other United Nations including Great Britain, China, and Russia.

No sensible man or woman buys a house blindfolded. Before he buys a house to live in for many years he takes time to examine it. He examines the foundations and he looks into every room in that house before he puts down his money and signs the contract.

Progressives believe the United States should not take over a lease or rent a room in any international house until we know who is building that house, just how it is built—what the foundations are, and most of all, whether the structure is to be a haven of hope for the common man of all countries, or merely a superstockade to protect a ruthless imperialistic status quo.

No intelligent farmer buys a pig in a poke. Progressives are realists who will not cooperate in any efforts to force the United States to buy an international pig in a beautiful poke if it has been bred by the forces Progressives have been fighting at home for two generations.

Progressives will cooperate in supporting sincere efforts made by the United States' representatives at the peace table to secure a just and lasting peace. When those peace terms are settled and known to the people of the United States will be the time to consider the degree of further cooperation we can wisely enter into with other countries.

We believe that the same principles which guide our program and our action on domestic policies should govern our decisions on foreign policy. We believe that patriotic devotion to the United States of America makes it impossible to separate our foreign and domestic policies. What we do in one inevitably affects the other.

Any assistance we give to the peoples of other countries must be based upon the health and well-being of our own people. It must be based upon their power to produce abundant resources. This depends upon the policies we pursue now and immediately after the war. Our gross national debt is over one hundred and eighty-five billions of dollars. It may reach several times that huge sum. Already it means a per capita load of $1,300 for every man, woman, and child. Unless this debt is met by the Progressive policy of taxing in accordance with ability to pay it will destroy our capacity to aid the rest of the world and impose a pauperizing burden on the rank and file of our people here at home.

If American farmers are forced to kill off their dairy cows during the war because they cannot get enough men to milk them, then we cannot send milk to starving children in other countries after the war. If our industrial economy is allowed to break down again because of the limitations placed upon production by monopolistic control, we shall have depression and unemployment. If our own people are jobless and hungry they will not be able to help themselves or to help other peoples. Conversely, if we have full production and full employment, we shall be in an immeasurably stronger position to lend a helping hand to the oppressed and the needy in other lands.

A depression and unemployment can be avoided by carrying through a wise constructive program in the interest of the masses of the American people. The Progressives have such a program and will fight to put it through.

Progressives are in accord with the eminent historian, Charles A. Beard, who, after a lifetime devoted to the study of American history, has come to the conclusion that "The supreme object of American policy should be to protect and promote the interests, spiritual and material, of the American people, and subject to that mandate to conduct foreign affairs in such a manner as to contribute to the peace and civilization of of mankind."

We approach the critical hour of decision for democracy at home and abroad. Progressives have a great responsibility and a magnificent opportunity. Let us renew our faith in the dignity of man and his rights as an individual. That is the American way. That is the way marked out for us by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

We can make a real contribution to our country at this time. But to make it we must keep our established Progressive traditions. We must have the courage to resist every temptation to take the easy road

where it turns away from the true principles of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

These men never yielded to the false doctrine that the end justifies the use of evil means. They knew that evil means corrupt the men who use them. They knew that the end inevitably becomes power and more ruthless power. They knew that only through democratic means can we build and preserve the democratic way of life. These men knew that the democratic way often seems the slow way. But they knew it is the only way that does not, in the end, betray the people.

I appeal to the progressives of all parties in Wisconsin to close ranks and unite in the Progressive Party for action. Let us reaffirm our determination to carry on the fight for equality of economic opportunity and individual political freedom. Let us here today rededicate ourselves to the basic principle of a progressive democracy.

"The will of the people shall be the law of the land."

Reclamation Is the Best Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I note with satisfaction an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which emphasizes the desirability of coordinated river development. "Floods and Irrigation" is the title of the editorial which I think is of particular significance at this time when the use of the waters of the Missouri River is a subject for consideration by the Committee on Commerce and ultimately by the Senate. Irrigation is the most effective type of flood control. Those residents of the Missouri River Basin who in the last few weeks have been suffering physical discomfort and financial loss because of floods would be benefited by the sort of upper-basin work contemplated in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation which the Senate last week ordered printed as a Senate document—Senate Document 191.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with another editorial from the same journal entitled "This Unsafe Valley."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOODS AND IRRIGATION

The floods which have descended again upon the Missouri and Mississippi valleys are an object lesson in the fundamental fact that we of the lower Missouri shall never have the flood control works we so desperately need until we have enlisted the cooperation of the States toward the headwaters of the river.

The cooperation of the plains States can never be attained until we of the lower valley become as sympathetic to their needs for irrigation as we expect them to be to our needs for flood control.

To our neighbors of the upper valley the flood is an object lesson too. The turbulent waters that are today our bane are waters that might to them have been a blessing—but they will never irrigate a foot of land, their usefulness is lost forever.

In order for the upper and lower sections of the Missouri Valley to work together as they must, there must be a plan unselfish and farseeing enough for all the valley States to realize an advantage in entering into it.

During the months when the Army engineers were speaking for their Missouri River development plan, calling it comprehensive, we said the irrigation States could best serve their own interests by dropping selfish sectional claims and helping to fill in the broad outlines of the plan. We argued that irrigation could thus be realized as well as flood control, navigation, power production and all the other benefits of a river-control system of engineering works.

In the 2 months during which the Army engineers' plan has been speaking for itself, it has shown itself to be not comprehensive, and in the context of other recommendations of the Army engineers, to be actually prejudicial to the irrigation interests of Montana, Wyoming, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas.

Obviously the irrigation States cannot be expected to support a plan which merely says in a general way that irrigation is a good thing, which leaves a vacant spot to be filled by an irrigation plan, and which operates—in conjunction with other proposals—to establish water priorities for navigation and against irrigation. Yet that is what the Army engineers' plan does.

The irrigation States' response to grab tactics with grab tactics—as in their unsuccessful effort to reserve the flow of the upper river for irrigation purposes—is understandable. They were fighting water with water. But all that is to be gained by selfish grasping tactics on either side is obstructionism of the whole valley's proper development.

The root of the trouble is that planning for the Missouri River is done by several Government agencies which are required by acts of Congress to press their special interests and to desist from working upon others. The Army engineers, who have flood control and navigation as their special province, are prohibited by statute from planning for irrigation, while the opposite is true of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The only really workable solution is the entrustment of the work of planning—and later of construction and operation—to an agency of Government which will be equally responsible for irrigation, flood control, and navigation, and which all the States of the Missouri Valley can rely upon to look after all their interests.

Such an agency does not now exist. It should be created. A Federal development corporation is wanted, and until it is brought into existence no planning for the Valley's future will be much more than the carrying on of an obstructionist dispute or the making of a makeshift compromise.

THE UNSAFE VALLEY

The Tennessee River throughout its length is controlled. This valley has been made safe.—David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, in T. V. A.—Democracy on the March.

The Missouri River is uncontrolled. This valley has not been made safe. Between the Great Lakes and Oklahoma, between the Great Divide and Canada, the people live in fear: To the north, of the drouth that stays always on the land; to the south, of flood.

Today, 1,000,000 of the Missouri Valley's acres lie under the wildly uncontrolled flood waters of the river in the States of Missouri and Illinois. Six thousand persons have been driven from their homes. More than a half-million acres of crops have been destroyed.

Wheat has been lost, that was to become the grain alcohol to make the synthetic rubber for our armies. Food has been swept away, that was to have fed us and our fighting comrades. Cattle and hogs safe after the flood's passing are still partly lost, for they will be sold unfattened, now that the growers lack barns and feed.

In St. Louis and St. Charles Counties alone, the crop loss is estimated at $2,000,000. In the entire Missouri Valley, the damages of the flood of the spring of 1944 are expected to be as great as the damages of the floods of the spring of 1943, if not greater; and they were estimated at $26,000,000.

How long will the anger of the people burn slowly at the deadly folly which permits the Missouri River to bring disaster to the farms and towns and cities along its banks almost every spring—sometimes doing its worst, as it has done this season; and sometimes doing less; but almost without fail bringing calamity year in, year out?

The way of controlling the wasted waters of a river and, having brought them under control, putting them to work, is described by Mr. Lilienthal in his spirited and imagination-stirring book. After T. V. A. there is no longer reason for anyone not to know how the thing is done. As its chairman says, "The T. V. A. Act was the deliberate and well-considered creation of a new national policy. For the first time in the history of the Nation the resources of a region were not only to be 'envisioned in their entirety'; they were to be developed in that unity with which nature herself regards her resources."

Yet this national policy, priceless and irreplaceable as it is to the Missouri Valley, is not only not being followed here—it is actually being foresworn. The Federal Government is going along in the old inefficient, discredited way, and without protest from the Governors of the Missouri Valley States or any of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The consequences of this supreme effort to avoid learning by experience are now being demonstrated in Washington. The Army engineers' Pick plan has been embodied in the 1944 flood-control bill, but it is so deficient in respect to irrigation that the President and the Bureau of the Budget have requested that action on it be held up until the Reclamation Bureau can complete its 5-year study and irrigation can be made a part of the plan.

However, navigation interests—principally the Mississippi Valley Association—are not disposed to wait, and they are pressing for congressional approval of the Pick plan, though the Reclamation Bureau report has not yet been issued.

Moreover, the navigation interests are seeking to have enacted in the rivers and harbors bill a provision which would legally reserve to navigation virtually the entire flow of the Missouri. In retaliation, the Great Plains States, to which irrigation is life itself, are attempting to obtain enactment of a proviso which would reserve to irrigation all the flow of the Missouri which originates within their boundaries.

This fratricidal struggle will be joined Thursday and Friday of next week when hearings are held on the rivers and harbors bill. A rule-or-ruin attitude is indicated for the navigation interests by the assertion of Lachlan Macleay, president of the M. V. A., that irrigation interests are sabotaging flood control and that the Pick plan should be approved by Congress whether the reclamation report is ready or not.

Mr. Macleay seems to be speaking of flood control, but actually he is speaking of navigation. There is no contest between the Great Plains and the lower river on the subject of flood control. Our neighbors to the north realize we need it and they want us to have it, but they are not willing to let it be done as part of a project to grab Missouri River waters for navigation and shut off irrigation interests from the river. In short,

Mr. Macleay, and others who are primarily interested in navigation, worthy as navigation is, are actually standing in the way of flood control.

How long will the people of the valley States stand this fruitless bickering while their homes, their crops, and their lands are washed away in the stream that has become the Missouri Valley's sorrow? Of all the Representatives in the two Houses of Congress, is there not one who will have for the Missouri Valley the vision which George Norris had for the valley of the Tennessee? Patience has not only a beginning; it has an end; and the patience of the people with devastating floods is running out.

Address by Judge D. Burns Douglas to Convocation Banquet, Fort Wayne Valley, A. A. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL D. JACKSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address by Hon. D. Burns Douglas, judge of Allen Superior Court No. 2, Allen County, Ind., before the 1944 Spring Convocation banquet, Fort Wayne Valley A. A. S. R., Friday, April 28, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Illustrious deputy, most worshipful grand master, brothers, this has been a very happy occasion. We sit in the midst of plenty, peace, and joy. We are among friends. We are at home and we are not, like so many people of the earth, refugees on the face of the earth.

I want to talk to you about one of the most distinguished refugees the world has ever known. Years ago he and his captive people were working under the supervision of the earliest form of the Gestapo. This man and a fellow countryman were laboring in the fields. A Gestapo was watching them. The work of the one did not appeal to the overseer and he was beaten to death. The other rose up in his righteous wrath and slew the overseer. In 24 hours he was a fugitive from justice. He went out of that country into a rather sparsely settled territory. Being a fugitive from justice, he got himself a job that would keep him as far removed from the eyes of man as possible. He was a herder of sheep.

One day he happened to visit a remote section of his ranch and there saw a strange sight. A bush was ablaze with fire and yet it was not consumed. He walked over to examine this strange phenomenon and as he stood there wondering a voice said to him, "Moses, go down to Egypt and tell Pharaoh to let my people go." The sheep herder replied, "Who am I to go to Pharaoh, and if I go to Pharaoh, who shall I say sent me?" And the voice replied, "Tell him that 'I am' sent you."

Then followed a series of some of the most remarkable incidents in the history of mankind. In those days the Grand Architect of the universe was a very present, personal, individual being. He opened the waters of the sea that the children of Israel might pass over dry-shod. He guided them with a cloud by day; by a column of fire by night. He pitched his tent beside their tents. His glance was the lightning; His voice was the thunder. He rode on the wings of the storm; and oftentimes in the solemn solitude of the mountains He spoke quietly and intimately with men.

The prophets enunciated His will; the psalmist sang His praises; and then in the fullness of time He sent His only begotten Son to teach men how to live in harmony and friendship one with another.

The voice of the prophet is silent; the harp of the psalmist is broken; and even the great temple of Jerusalem, made forever sacred by the presence of the Man of Galilee, has long since crumbled into dust; and men have said that God has withdrawn from the world.

Brethren! What God was, He still is. What would it profit us if the rains that brought forth the spring flowers in the hills around Jerusalem no longer brought forth flowers in the hills of Indiana? What would it matter if the sun that ripened the grains in Palestine no longer ripened the grains in this great America of ours? "What God once performed, He still performs." Newell Dwight Hills wrote that the hope of these latter days is in the promise that God has reserved the richest wine for the last. For years God performed miracles by Himself. He ultimately found that the doing of such miracles profited neither Him nor the people for whom He did them. He changed the method, and working through the intellect of man, and with man's cooperation in the eternal everlasting laws which He created, His miracles are now performed. The crude tents of the Israelites have been transformed into the modern dwelling house which is at the command of almost everyone. The pool of Siloam has become a great medical clinic. The ravens of Elijah have been transformed into the giant planes bringing food, supplies, and medicines to the deserted, the forsaken, and marooned peoples of the earth. The cranky canoe of the ancients has become a giant passenger liner. The battle-ax floating on the brook of Kedron has become a battle wagon bringing vengeance or peace in a warring country—miracles wrought by the infinite intelligence of the Grand Architect of the Universe working through the finite intelligence of men, and this, all this, goes on today although civilization has exploded in our faces.

Members of this spring class, why do I bring this topic to you? I have but one purpose and one purpose only: To remind you that in every degree which you have heretofore received and in every degree which you will hereafter receive there is just one underlying thought and that thought is God—God—God. Whether it be in the lodge room or whether it be in a battle cruiser or PT boat in the Atlantic, or in the rain and mud of the islands of the Pacific, it is still God; and as our brothers go forth and have gone forth into war, their hope and our hope is in God.

Cooperative Way to Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to include with my remarks in the RECORD an address recently given by George Radin.

It is my earnest hope that every Member will carefully read this speech. It has been cut to the very bone in order to shorten it for this purpose, but I think the main outlines and emphasis are clear. In my judgment, there are two all-important messages in this address—the first is the emphasis upon the almost limitless possibilities for building economic rehabilitation and true peace in Europe on the foundation of the cooperatives of the people which they have built up through the centuries; and the second is the message which Mr. Radin's speech brings to us on behalf of the smaller nations.

Unless the real interest of those smaller nations is considered and unless everything possible is done to enable them to live together at peace and to work out their particular problems in some sort of federation, there is extreme danger that post-war governments in the small nations of Europe will drive their people back to the old system of boundary disputes, petty philosophy, narrow nationalism, and racial quarrels, and the whole pattern that has brought so much misery to the people of Europe in the past.

I am happy indeed to attend the annual meeting of the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association. In Yugoslavia I took part in many annual meetings of our cooperatives, both those of our national federation and of local cooperatives. Since I came to America 30 months ago, this is the first annual meeting of cooperatives in which I have been privileged to take a small part.

Please forgive me if I become a bit sentimental. To me, this is like a family gathering at which I, a fellow cooperator, can say things I should hesitate to express in other gatherings for fear that I might be misunderstood. After this emotional introduction I want to tell you at the outset that my coming here to be with you at this meeting is strictly business and not simply a matter of sentiment.

I am about to take your thoughts to the Balkans, across the Adriatic Sea from Italy where sons and daughters of Indiana are now facing death and will continue increasingly to come to grips with the very enemy with whom many of us here tonight have wrestled in a deadly struggle only a few years ago. Then, when armistice came, we said "never again" and proceeded to isolate ourselves, thinking we would live peacefully, each in his own way. Now we see that our interdependence is an accomplished fact. War or peace in any part of the world affects sooner or later your lives in Indiana and our lives in the Balkans; and it may be well to remember that a bullet which put an end to one form of an oppression in the Balkans started the First World War. Our problems there are really as well your problems here. That is basically the message I am bringing you this evening; and that is my excuse for taking you now to the Balkans.

In order that there be no misunderstanding on the part of anyone anywhere, let me at this point stress with full emphasis that I am here solely in my capacity as a member of the executive board of the Federation of Health Cooperatives of Yugoslovia.

Allow me also to stress here that practically everything that I am to tell you tonight has been said by me and was approved in hundreds of meetings of our cooperatives in Yugoslavia. The extent to which our people felt that I am interpreting accurately their wishes was demonstrated rather markedly when in the spring of 1940 in the town of

Lazarevac near Belgrade a resolution was unanimously adopted at the annual meeting of the health cooperatives there, asking me to lead the revolt from there, the heart of Serbia, on to Belgrade to overthrow the regime which had abandoned the tradition of the people of which I am about to speak.

Our farmers said in that resolution:

"Our forefathers, with their farm implements, led by the Holy Cross, drove out of Serbia the Mohammedan conquerors a little over a hundred years ago. We must now drive out of the capital our own infidels, who have abandoned the great tradition of our fathers and have established for themselves a way of living wholly foreign to us, and who refuse to work with us."

The cooperative way of life is the inborn tradition of my people. Cooperation lies deep in their very character. When 1,500 years ago the Mongols under Attila, the Hun, dislodged my people from their homes back of the Carpathian Mountains, they gradually settled in the Balkans where they have lived ever since. The earliest records show that they had already developed a unique family cooperative way of living in their social, economic, and political structure. This way of living of my people is in all probability as old as Plato's Republic, or even much older. For that reason we hold that one of the cradles of real democracy was right within my people, although we were never able to bring this to the attention of the world because much more powerful nations have stood in our way. We have always had a special term for this democracy of ours. We call it a zadruga, which being translated means "for (your) fellow man."

Note the set-up of the original zadruga. The members are related by blood or marriage. All property of its members is joined and worked together. No one can alienate his share of commonly held property unless he or she decides to quit the zadruga, in which case remaining members of the zadruga have the first of purchase at the market price. Labor and earnings of all, either within zadruga or outside, go for the benefit of all. The business of a zadruga is managed by a stareshina, elder, elected annually by the majority votes of all members. A woman is often stareshina—especially in later years in the villages where our traveling homemaking school had worked. Farm implements and other tools of production are owned in common by all; marketing goes for the benefit of all. Each contributes in labor in accordance with his ability; the benefits each receives from the common efforts are in accordance with his or her needs. (In case of illness or when a child of a zadruga is sent to schools for a higher education, of course the needs of such member far exceeds those of other members.) Each member owns his or her share of the property, which can be cut out and identified, if he or she at any time decides to quit the zadruga. Frequently, the whole community, one or more villages, belong to the same zadruga. A person is known not so much by his own name as by the zadruga to which he belongs. In cooperation they produce and consume; they play, they sing and dance their kolo, holding hands together.

In 1895 a member of the Avramovitch zadruga from near the iron gates on the Danube, an economist, returned to Serbia from his studies in England. While there, he studied the Rochdale system of consumer cooperatives and discovered great similarity between that system and the Serbian zadrugas. He found that they both had a social as well as an economic goal and that they are not simply another way of doing business for profit. Both organizations were open to membership by all classes of urban and rural population, but the original zadruga was limited to family relationships. So, when this Serbian economist returned to his native land, he acquainted his own zadruga and others with the Rochdale practices. These practices were then introduced to form much bigger zadrugas, extending their scope and increasing the membership to include many families. Wisely, the traditional name "zadruga," so close to the hearts of the people, was retained for the new, modern cooperative as well.

When the First World War broke out in 1914, 92 percent of the people of Serbia belonged to various kinds of cooperatives. After Yugoslavia was formed in 1918, the system was introduced in other sections of the country where cooperatives had not been organized. In 1941 when Yugoslavia was attacked, approximately 7,000,000 out of the total population of 16,000,000 of all shades of life were included in one type or another of our cooperatives, although by far the majority of the members were farmers. All cooperatives were joined in 1919 into one big federation, known as Glavni Zadruzni Savez. The cooperative law of Yugoslavia of 1937 sanctioned the existing organization, so that Glavni Zadruzni Savez, Main Cooperative Federation, represents all the cooperatives of Yugoslavia, both etxernally and internally, in all broader issues that concern all.

A foreign system of exploitation, of which I speak latef, snatched the protective food from the very mouths of our children in Yugoslavia, which practice resulted not only in political disturbances that labeled the Balkans as the "powder box" of Europe, but moreover, it resulted in bad and insufficient nutrition which brought about one of the highest infant mortality and death rates from tuberculosis reported for Europe in recent pre-war years, the effect of which gave to the people of that otherwise healthy country a low average span of life. Seventy-six percent of the people live in small villages or on the land; the bulk of which is held by them in small parcels. For all of these people medical facilities were practically nonexistent. These facilities were either too far off in the cities and the patient died (often in the oxcart) before reaching a medical center, or he died because he could not afford the price of the doctor and/or the druggist. This grave situation brought about the idea of grafting a health arm onto the agricultural body through the traditional zadruga way of living of the people concerned. Whatever good has resulted or may follow from this system to humanity, I am glad to state that it came to the world from simple Serbian peasants. Being one of them and having been fortunate to be among the original founders, I naturally, take a personal pride in it. The system enables the rural population of Yugoslavia to receive some benefits from medical science, a blessing they had never had before in their history.

An analysis of the set-up of our zadrugas, such as I have tried to set forth briefly in this discussion, shows rather forcefully that it excludes dictatorship of any kind. That is why no dictator could get hold of our people in all those 1,400 years, although many attempts were made. This cooperative way of life is the reason why Serbia, which is now a part of Yugoslavia, was the last nation in the Balkans to be organized in a state. Rather than submit to dictatorial rule at a time when dictatorship was the established practice among states, my forefathers were linked in small zadruga units, and traded in a cooperative manner among themselves and with other peoples.

Christianity was brought to us in the ninth century, and it fit perfectly into our zadruga, family way of life. To this day, the village priest or minister is usually an active member of the local cooperative.

It goes without saying that our cooperative way of life precludes aggression upon or against other people or nations. Except in revolt against oppression, our people have never made war upon other people or among themselves. Their cooperative way of living made it incompatible for them ever to join hands with dictators for any exploits.

Our traditional cooperative way of life saved the people of Yugoslavia from ever living on the exploitation of other people. They were never parasites, since they never exploited others. Being true cooperators they had never lived on dole nor had they ever been a nation of beggars, a condition which they expressed in their Magna Carta in 1349.

This cooperative way of life has demonstrated over the centuries that in cooperation men can be governed without might. In a society in which the greedy profit motive is eliminated, where individuals elect annually bodies which govern by and for the people concerned, who are constantly and effectively in control of all that vitally affects them—in such a set-up democracy lives by works, not words, and people in it are governed by self-discipline and right and not by might.

Some of you may wonder how it is that you were not already well acquainted with this old cooperative way of life of the people of Yugoslavia.

The fact is that Yugoslavia is rich in natural resources. Its agricultural land and climate are excellent. There are big and well known mineral deposits and rich forests. The country is inhabited by a sturdy, industrious population.

All this attracted greedy foreigners. Hungary and Austria subjugated the people and the land of Croatia and Slovenia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and kept them under their heel until the end of the First World War, 1918. The people of Serbia succeeded better in resistance, preserved their liberty, and developed their zadruga way of life and their own fairly high civilization until the middle of the fifteenth century, when they, too, succumbed to the Turks.

Croats and Slovenes slaved for their foreign masters for almost a thousand years. For a period of some 400 years big Turkish landlords took for themselves everything that the Serbian people produced that was worth having. In vain during those four centuries did the Serbian people appeal to the Christian nations of Europe to help liberate them from the Mohammedans, pointing out that Serbia had fallen in the struggle for the common cause. No one would come near them until they, without outside help, drove out the foreign exploiters. But the moment Serbia was again free, foreign nations commenced to meddle into the country's internal affairs with schemes to exploit the people and the land in much the same manner as the Turks had done, only more efficiently. We read of the complaints made by the consul of a great power in Serbia in the nineteenth century to the effect that his Austrian and Russian colleagues were "interfering" in Serbia internal affairs, whereas all that he did at the time was to offer "friendly advice" to the Serbian authorities.

Well, such "friendly" advice has never ceased. It is being offered now more generously than ever, although, as always, unsolicited. Foreign concession hunters and traders, aided by their official representatives in Belgrade, were instrumental in introducing a different way of life among a handful of our city folk. A life that results from domination, exploitation, and competition.

In order that they might succeed better in exploiting the people and the resources of the country, foreigners induced some of our own people to become their agents and help them carry on the exploitation. They selected young boys and girls, sometimes orphans, and sent them to be educated in foreign countries. These students in turn adopted the way of living of their benefactors and, when they returned, they joined the foreigners in their exploitation, to help maintain such foreign way of living. You

will be sorry when I tell you that our people met some of such foreigners in the capacity as relief workers in the last war.

Besides, Yugoslavs were obliged to send their children to foreign countries for education. The centuries-old struggle for liberty had left the Nation without sufficient of the necessary higher training schools, and young men went to foreign countries to study. Some such students learned, while studying in foreign countries, foreign ways of living, which they adopted and tried to imitate when they returned among their own people, although their undeveloped country could not afford to support it.

Some of these, Yugoslavia's own native sons but foreign students, are now busy, far away from their own people, trying to help their foreign supporters to create a condition which might enable them to return to Yugoslavia when the war is over and resume their old exploits.

I complained above about the multiple unsolicited advice that goes to the people of Yugoslavia constantly, both with regard to the war effort and in respect to post-war.

In all frankness, I wish to submit to you and through you to all cooperators in the world—and thank God we number close to a third of the people of the earth—that we do not need advice from our great allies as to the kind of political, economic, and social life that is best fitted for us. We feel strongly that our cooperative way of life is superior to the way of life of many of those who are now giving us unsolicited advice, and who have been trying to force upon us different ways of life. Then let us introduce together the experiences you have gained in agricultural practices in a peaceful development of a century and a half.

Unfortunately, our cooperatives have ventured but very little until now in industries. Such industries as we have had were operated mostly by foreigners for their own benefit, and not in the best interest of our people. Foreign concessionaires and traders took out of the country our minerals in raw state, allowing our people to participate only as laborers for low wages. I was particularly happy to learn that your cooperatives have invaded the industrial branches of your economic life, as well as agriculture. Perhaps we could combine our councils to insure the success of cooperative ventures in some industries in Yugoslavia.

However, all our lofty plans and cooperative operations may come to naught if the cooperators of the world should continue their timid attitude toward the broader aspects of world affairs. For us to say that our final goal is an international cooperative commonwealth and to do almost nothing more than talk about it is, to my way of thinking, not doing our duty.

Necessity and expediency compelled the Rochdale weavers to proclaim their neutrality in politics. This principle has been wisely followed in other countries by national cooperatives in their home politics as well as by the International Cooperative Alliance in London, until this war. However, the cooperative movement in the world is today the greatest world organization of the people. It has grown far in area and in scope from the days of the Rochdale pioneers and I wonder whether the wisdom which compelled them to proclaim their principle of neutrality does not demand of us today an initiative on the road to world peace and prosperity. Unless we have peace, all our cooperative plans may be frustrated again at any time.

As to that, it may be well for me to tell you what the cooperatives of the Balkans have done in pre-war years which has had a tremendous influence for peace in that part of the world. In fact, as late as the middle of 1940, the London Times observed that the Balkans were the quietest spot on earth. Yet not often do you read or hear that the cooperators of the Balkan countries, notably those of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, with their cooperative trading and friendly demonstrations on a huge scale created a public opinion which compelled their respective governments to enter into a treaty for everlasting peace and friendship. But for Hitler and other foreign meddlers, those people would be dealing today and living together as good neighbors.

What the cooperators in the Balkan countries accomplished in that part of Europe between the two World Wars, the cooperators of the world could attain in the world at large—and much more. Cooperatives with their enormous membership reach today practically every corner of the globe. That is a power which should be exerted in the interest of the peace of the world, a goal preached by prophets of peace ever since political consciousness of man has been recorded.

Until now, there were two outstanding influences struggling to maintain peace and their own security. Both failed because they both labored in the interest of one class or of one race in a nation. Both tried to enforce peace by force and both ended in disaster for mankind.

One was through seizure of power by a single state; the other, through a more complicated system of a work of art, known as balance of power. The first example was that of the Roman Caesars, aped now by Hitler and his gang. As to the other, it is by international cooperation and not by balancing might against might that lasting peace is assured among all good neighbors.

Both devices caused untold suffering to the masses of humanity, not only of other nations, but also in the State from which the practice emanated. Both systems failed because both were based upon the domination of other peoples and their resources by a single power and its associates for selfish, non-Christian purposes of the dominating powers. These two systems are now again bleeding the world in a deadly struggle for success or survival. If our cooperative tradition has taught us anything over centuries of suffering (and I assure you that you gain a good deal of wisdom in suffering), then both contendents must fail.

People will not stand for domination and exploitation of man by man. We want to cooperate in the world as equals because we feel that each of us has contributed his share for the welfare of man. Serbia gave by far more lives per capita in the First World War than any of her allies. And in the present war Yugoslavia has paid until now with more lives per capita than even Russia, and tremendously more than any other of our allies. Should the people of Yugoslavia therefore claim for themselves a more privileged place at the future peace conference? Our cooperators say "no." But they do assert that the recognition given to small nations as equal partners on the battle front during war should be extended them to an equal degree in time of peace. We should end all domination and exploitation of man by man in favor of cooperation as equals in the interest of man. That is, I believe, the only way of peace and prosperity in the world.

This, however, will not come about and our sons and daughters will continue to be dispatched to the jaws of death and the mouths of hell unless we, the cooperators of the world, do something about it. The time has come for us to abandon the complacent political neutrality and to take an initiative in the peace and prosperity to come. If we are determined in our mission, the long-craved brotherhood of man, irrespective of race, color, or religion, will come on earth and the prayer of our Lord will become a reality. But that means, immediate action, showing and demonstrating to our own members and to others what an enlightened self-interest of the people for the people really means. The International Cooperative Alliance in London has made a modest beginning when it expressed its desire to be associated with those who will be sitting at the next peace settlement. However, a mere expression of such a desire will not bring about the desired result if history is a guide. Cooperative public opinion must secure for us the place we deserve there. Cooperatives must have the machinery for guiding public opinion. Unless we arrive at this peace cooperatively, this war will again have been in vain.

It can be done; it will be done if we are determined. You cooperators of this great Nation are free and sufficiently powerful to act. The enslaved cooperators of the world look to you now for action. They have faith in you. This is a historic opportunity. Please do not miss it. With the help of God and your determination, our cooperative banner, which stands for peace, prosperity, and brotherly love, may soon wave in a happier world than any we have yet known.

Principles Involved in Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, along with most other Members of Congress, I am receiving a very large number of letters and messages from my congressional district protesting against the seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. by the Government. This was a most regrettable occurrence and this arbitrary action is doing much to destroy the unity of thought, purpose, and action which is so essential to the war effort at the moment. As the zero hour approaches for the great European invasion our people, especially those who have dear ones in the European theater, are most disturbed, anxious, and, in many instances, even distressed.

My attention has been called to an editorial written by Mr. Arthur State, editor of the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, one of the leading out-State dailies in Michigan. This editorial is temperate and is well worth reading, and pursuant to the authority given to me, I include it in these remarks. The editorial is as follows:

PRINCIPLES INVOLVED IN MONTGOMERY WARD CASE

Two important decisions in the Government seizure of the Montgomery Ward & Co. Chicago properties are watchfully awaited by Americans interested in the legal status of the situation and in the labor dispute between the company and the C. I. O.

These decisions are to be rendered respectively by Federal Judge Holly and by Montgomery Ward employees.

Judge Holly's decision will be technically on the question of whether the injunction obtained by the Government to restrain officials of the company from interfering with Government management shall be continued or dissolved. But it also will determine the principle of the national administration's right to seize a retail store, so far as the Fed-

eral court is concerned. It is questioned whether Congress, enacting legislation empowering the President to make seizures of war production plants during wartime, if necessary in order to avoid interference with the manufacture of munitions and mechanisms necessary to prosecution of the conflict, intended to give him similar authority in regard to retail stores.

Congress ought to know what it intended, and it may be necessary for the national legislative bodies to take action clarifying their attitude on the subject. But, of course, there is also the question of constitutionality, which ultimately must rest on a Supreme Court interpretation. Congress does not have the power to enact legislation violating any provision of the Constitution.

TWO QUESTIONS OF LEGALITY

So there appear to be two questions of legality to be settled—whether Congress intended to authorize seizure of stores as well as manufacturing plants, and whether the Constitution permits it, regardless of what Congress may have intended.

It is high time that these matters were cleared up. In addition, the power of the War Labor Board to enforce its orders should be settled in one way or another. The Board ordered Montgomery Ward & Co. to renew a C. I. O. contract, and the organization declined to obey, asserting that a majority of its employees did not belong to the union and that therefore the union no longer was entitled to bargaining rights. The W. L. B. seized the property as a means of enforcing its order.

If the Board has the right to seize private property to enforce its orders directed to the company, what shall be its attitude in regard to failure of union strikers to obey W. L. B. edicts?

With respect to this phase of the question, it will be remembered that during the mine strike this same Board ordered President John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers to return to work. The order was not obeyed, and the mine properties, and not the properties of the disobeying labor organization, were seized.

REMOVED BY FORCE

Sewell L. Avery, chairman of the Montgomery Ward firm, was removed forcibly by soldiers from his offices when he rejected the Board order, and his offices were taken over by the Government. But when the mine union failed to obey the back-to-work order, John L. Lewis was not ejected from his offices and no properties of the labor organization were seized. Whether such procedure should work only one way is a question that might reasonably be asked now, though it is to be doubted that Judge Holly can cover this phase of the situation in the opinion he is expected to render next Monday.

The merits of the labor dispute resulting in the Montgomery Ward seizure must be considered as something aside from the principles involved from the public point of view. One of the fundamental principles, in which all citizens should be interested, is that of civil rights during wartime in localities where martial law has not been proclaimed and where the relationship of the involved properties to the war effort is not precisely clear.

The forthcoming election by employees ought to settle the argument in regard to bargaining power, but the principles of the case must be handled by unbiased and wise authorities on the legal aspects.

It must be generally recognized that any reasonable, authoritative constitutional action that is necessary to the prosecution of the war, in any instance in which there is hindrance or threats of hindrance, is justifiable. What remains to be determined by the proper authorities in the Montgomery Ward case is whether the Government acted reasonably, according to the empowering act of Congress and to constitutional provisions, and whether the seizure was necessary.

Perhaps it was fortunate that the incident occurred, in the long view, for it is highly desirable to have a test case that can bring about definite decisions that can be utilized for guidance in the future.

One Hundred and Fifty-third Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER H. WENE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. WENE. Mr. Speaker, let us pause a moment in the present world turmoil to pay homage to a great and courageous nation—Poland—on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of her constitution. Though the victim of wanton Nazi aggression on that memorable day, September 1, 1939, a tragedy unparalleled in the history of the world, Poland will emerge from it all a stronger and more determined freedom-loving nation, as a close ally of our own American Republic.

And while Poland suffers let us not forget that the restoration and rehabilitation of that persevering nation is one of the objectives to which we, as a principal power, have dedicated our great responsibility and our great authority. After the last war, when the prospects for Polish sovereignty were less tangible than today, the United States was largely instrumental in securing for her the opportunities of political and economic independence. Her achievements were rewarding both to our faith and our generosity. Today, Poles are fighting side by side with us on all fronts in the gigantic struggle for righteous independence, including many thousands of Americans of Polish extraction.

It was a little more than 4½ years ago when the world was startled and Poland momentarily stunned by the realization that an enemy who even before the onslaught, posing as a friend, pounced upon a peaceful people with weapons and a military might which he had been preparing for a quarter of a century. It was to be "der tag," the day of ultimate triumph for one Herr Hitler, a crystal gazer, who saw a terror-stricken world before him, at his feet in abject slavery; a pipe dream—a figment of a weird imagination.

The invasion of Poland cost that nation 2,500,000 dead. The same proportionate loss to our country would be about 9,700,000—a figure approximately corresponding to the size of our armed forces at present. This is not a juggling of figures. It helps one comprehend the size of the sacrifice which one nation must make when an Adolf Hitler is permitted to guide the destiny of another nation. It is only when we see the picture in such sharp outlines as this that we can truly observe "what a small world it is after all."

But the total of the Polish war dead is a relatively small part of the Nation's sacrifice. In total war the dead are the least of the casualties. Another 500,000 have been deliberately starved to death by the German occupation authorities since 1939. More than 2,000,000 Poles have been sent to Germany for forced labor. Another 1,600,000 have been uprooted from their homes and agricultural pursuits to the no-man's land of the so-called government general. Some 1,500,000 were deported to Soviet territory. So the real casualties number 8,000,000 victims.

In this the fifth year of the war, Americans and Poles side by side, let us say, as two of the peoples who have subscribed to a military and rehabilitation program underwritten by thirty-odd like-minded nations, there must be some basis on which we can jointly see these figures in the true perspective. If we may judge by the experience of the last war, it is going to bring such nations as ours, in spite of the 5,000 miles between us, closer together. It may be that as part of a steadily broadening concept of the brotherhood of man, two such nations will come to know each other better, and better serve each other's interests.

Between the two World Wars Poland learned a good deal about America, seeking to emulate our national pattern in many ways, learning our methods and seeking out commercial and cultural contacts with us. This tendency was reciprocated on a relatively small scale, because of our preoccupation with the economic vicissitudes of depression and recovery. On the other hand, during the present war, a good many thoughtful Americans have undertaken some further study of Polish problems, largely in the political field. If the results have been inconclusive, the outlook is nevertheless a bit more promising. Both nations have learned much-retarded lessons from the experience gained in the past 4 years. Americans have learned to look beyond the immediate horizon; the Poles have learned to look ahead.

At least in one direction, mutual understanding in the past seems to have been hampered by the American impression that the Poles "lived in the past," a vernacular expression implying that they had a somewhat exaggerated historical sense. Students of European history can find an answer to that easily enough. Polish history reaches well back into the past. In the fifteenth century it was the largest state in Europe. Its record as a national entity dates back to the tenth century. For a thousand years this Christian fortress on the eastern frontier of continental Europe has nearly single-handed acted as the bulwark against the periodically rising tide of Asiatic ambition and depredation threatening to engulf Europe.

It would seem somewhat remarkable, but for one fact, that most Americans have the vaguest ideas of Polish history; indeed even among the educated classes a preponderant majority seem to harbor the notion that Poland's history as a

sovereign state began in 1918 or thereabouts. The most plausible explanation is that during the century of America's principal growth and development, if not essentially of her greatness, the nineteenth, Poland did not appear on the maps as a nation at all. Between the three partitions of the late eighteenth century and her resurgence as a republic after Versailles, the 12,000,000 Poles increased to 35,000,000 during their 122-year struggle for liberation from the bondage of three mighty empires.

It does not require fervent nationalism to appreciate why the white eagle of Polish independence should strongly symbolize political freedom, cultural autonomy, and the sovereignty of statehood to a people whose past has been almost continuously devoted to self-defense and self-preservation in the face of the persistent rival imperialism of the three black eagles of Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

That is Poland's part, and no wishful thinking can controvert its implications. Poland, like Russia, must be regarded today not in the light of the past but as a protagonist of the present. Poland, now the sixth largest country in Europe, is a member of the United Nations' family, a near neighbor politically and socially of all the other Allied Nations, whose cultural and productive resources must be reclaimed from the tyranny of Hitlerism and reestablished as an integral part of the orderly community which European society hopes to achieve after victory has been won.

After almost complete destruction of her physical resources following the last war—and very little financial assistance from abroad; about 15 cents per capita per annum as against $1.10 Germany received—she increased her agricultural acreage by 11,362,000 acres; she increased the number of her locomotives from 1,750 to 5,500; her freight cars from 30,000 to 164,000; and the length of her highways by 30 percent. The 1918 Poland possessed not a single ship; in 1939 she had more than 500 merchant vessels. She opened 23,000 primary schools and 2,400 technical training schools. Nearly 2,000,000 acres of large land holdings were broken into smaller peasant-owned farms. Her electric power installations increased threefold; she reached fourth place among the world's coal exporters; she manufactured textiles and other goods for shipment to 42 countries. Her per capita production rose 29 points; the purchasing power of wages rose 6 percent; she established a comprehensive social-security program and her death rate decreased from 16.7 per 1,000 inhabitants to 14. The tonnage of traffic at her Baltic ports increased from 10,157 to 17,900 tons annually.

Poland's capacity to look ahead, to build her future upon the firm foundations of democracy and progressive economy, appears demonstrable from every indication of her record between the two wars and her sacrifices in this one. Once again Poland looks to the friendly American initiative which may enable her to take up the rights and duties of statehood where she left off.

We do not need to be reminded that she had to leave off in the middle of her greatest work, because she recognized the implications of Hitlerism and faced the reckoning squarely. Polish integrity, the nation's priceless ingredient, was never compromised, either during the 10 years in which Hitler tried to seduce Poland into joining him in his campaign against Russia, nor today when the Poles are ready to fight again on every one of their homeland's battlefields.

Poland's flags will always bear the ancient and honorable legend "For your freedom and ours."

And so, as we give appropriate recognition to a stalwart nation on the occasion of its national holiday, let it inspire a new courage in the men and women who are everywhere fighting for the most precious of liberties, and let it give new hope to those whose spirit is bolder for their faith in a better world to come. And I call upon you my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and Americans everywhere, to let the Poles know that they are not fighting in vain. Poland has just as much right as we have to life as a peaceful nation in a peaceful world. Let us all maintain our courage for the day of deliverance is not far off.

Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 5, 1944:

RATIONING

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—What is the reason for the remarkable double flip-flop executed by the administration in respect to meat rationing? While action was welcome news to every citizen, questions naturally arise as to why the delay in relaxing restrictions. What new facts as to the situation with respect to food supplies, now being regulated by eight departments and bureaus, suddenly came to light which were not known before?

That the change with respect to meat was a hasty decision is proven by the May 6 issue of Collier's Weekly in which Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, had a signed article declaring that no relief from meat rationing could be expected until 1945, and perhaps later. Under the heading "When will rationing end?" he makes prophesies as to various staple products. As to meat he said:

"Some relief in 1945 (with luck) and possible end when the war in Europe is over." Explaining this statement he continued: "Recently the Canadian Government removed meat from rationing. This caused a lot of people in this country to think that O. P. A. would take the same action. The situation in this country and Canada, however, is totally different.

"Meat rationing will be with us until several months after the end of the war in Europe. Our armed forces will continue to require huge quantities of meat even after the war shifts into the Asiatic area. With luck in the latter part of the war, however, meat rationing may be eased and perhaps eliminated entirely."

The implication is strong that the order to ease meat rationing came from the White House, being transmitted to Administrator Bowles by James F. Byrnes, sometimes referred to as the "Assistant President." Whether the order was motivated partly by politics is problematical.

When Mr. Bowles wrote the article for Collier's, he must have known of the vast stores of meat. At a press conference he explained that statistics from the Food Administration indicate that 68,500 hogs were glutting western terminals Wednesday, embargoed from admission to stockyards. The reason—packing plants, shipping facilities, and warehouses, like a continuous assembly line from the farms to the fighting fronts, are jammed with pork products.

Speaking before a Senate committee Thursday, R. W. Olmstead, Deputy Director of the Food Administration, said that the surplus not only of pork but of 14 or 15 other commodities is so great that it will be impossible to maintain ceiling prices for them except through a complete removal of rationing restrictions.

The Army, Navy, and lend-lease have on hand all the food they can dispose of during the next few months, it was revealed. One embarrassing complication arising from the Bowles order is that the War Department is preparing to demand that 400,000 farm boys under 22 years of age, deferred from the draft on the grounds of food shortage be called forthwith into the military service. The demand will have strong backing as a means of relieving the draft drain on married men with families.

At his press conference, Mr. Bowles' attention was called to estimates of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that if meat rationing is removed, American civilian consumption would jump to from 160 to 170 pounds per capita annually. Bowles remarked that the Argentinians consume 200 pounds per capita, leaving the inference that Americans were invited to emulate them. Certainly the country will now launch on the greatest meat-eating spree in history.

It is enviable that relenting in meat rationing should be tied in with the Roosevelt fourth-term drive. The criticism has often been made that rationing was in effect when there is in the country the greatest population of meat animals in history. Dissatisfaction with the situation was emphasized when there was a reduction in the ceiling price of hogs with the purpose of making it more profitable to sell corn for industrial purposes than to feed it to livestock.

Curtailment of meat rationing will tend to take the minds of the people off the Montgomery Ward affair. Robert Hannegan, new Democratic chairman, after a tour of the West told friends that the seizure of this plant was injuring Democratic election prospects.

His Guidance and Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL D. JACKSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a short article prepared by a beloved philosopher of Indiana, French Quinn, published in the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, and reprinted on the front page of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIRROR OF WORLD OPINION—HIS GUIDANCE AND PROTECTION

May from the bottom of every heart every day go forth a fervent prayer to Almighty God that these soldier champions of ours shall have His help, comfort, guidance, and high protection, that they may do those things which they have set out to do.

We shall be resolved that they shall not come home cynical, disillusioned, and brittled by war but shall come home clean and strong, and with a consciousness of duty well done and that quality of American citizenship that they may bind up the Nation's wounds and hold intact our country's great ideals. (French Quinn, of Decatur, Ind., as quoted in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette.)

Address on Conservation by Hon. Claude R. Wickard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, April 12), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, before an annual North American Wildlife Conference in Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1944. He presented a matter which I consider of vital interest to the future of the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This Nation should, as soon as possible, develop in detail a more comprehensive plan for the conservation and restoration of our soil and forest resources than is now in effect. At the very latest, this plan should be ready to be put into effect whenever unemployment occurs. Utilization in the post-war period of possible surplus manpower in a well-organized conservation program will give tremendous impetus to present efforts to restore and conserve our soil and forest resources.

In a comparatively short time, this Nation has become the most influential power in the world. In addition, our standards of living has become the highest in the world. We have achieved these results because we have been an energetic and ingenious people in a land of vast natural resources. In the processes of our national development, we have drawn upon our resources aat a rapid rate; during the war, the rate has increased sharply. Today, because of a scarcity of certain raw materials, we are becoming alarmed. In one sense, it is well that we are alarmed because it means we are aware of danger. In another sense, there is no need for alarm because it is still within our power to prevent the exhaustion of our resources. We can, through aggressive conservation measures and at comparatively little cost, restore, conserve, and rebuild our renewable resources in such a way as to assure our continued preeminence as a world power. Likewise we can provide sufficient natural resources to maintain a high standard of living.

Now I want to make one thing plain. I am one who believes we must have high industrial activity in this country. I believe we must have high farm and forest production. High production not only means providing enough of the things of life for all to maintain a good standard of living; it also means providing employment and income for consumers so that they can afford a high standard of living. It is my sincere hope that through the initiative, and resourcefulness of private enterprise, we can maintain high employment. But I am being only realistic when I say that there may be times when there may not be opportunity for gainful employment in private industry for all who wish to work.

For reasons too obvious to require repeating, the Government should stand ready to provide additional employment opportunities at such times. My plea is to do it by furnishing jobs in endeavors which will not only permit the country to grow, but which will provide the resources to maintain happy and prosperous people for generations to come. To do this effectively and efficiently, we must make plans now.

At the out set I referred to the conservation of our soil and forest resources. I should like to talk about soil resources first. It is imperative that we stop soil depletion in its tracks. We can't maintain, over any reasonable period, a nourishing and appetizing diet for our people if we continue to drain away the productive capacity of the soil. I say that in spite of my conviction that for temporary periods, and especially during the first decade or two after the war, we may have food surpluses insofar as the needs of our own country are concerned.

Erosion is the saboteur of our soil resources. Since this continent was first settled, about one-third of its topsoil has been lost through the devastating processes of erosion. All too often erosion has gnawed away the topsoil, leaving only raw clay or sand or gravel. In many places, gullies have shredded the land, leaving deep scars on the face of the earth. This waste of soil costs the United States billions of dollars annually. And the further tragic part of the story is that where erosion takes place, the standard of living always goes down. Through the ages, poverty has followed in the wake of erosion.

Loss of soil and its fertility has also caused widespread damage on the western range. Present safe carrying capacity is judged to be only about half of what it was when the toll grass of the range swept the stirrups of our pioneer forefathers. Deterioration of the cover of vegetation has exposed the soil so that over 500,000,000 acres of the western range is affected by erosion. Deterioration is a symptom of overuse, especially during critical periods, such as droughts.

The conservation movement in this country, to check the loss of soil, did not really get underway until about 10 years ago. The erosion problem was forcefully brought home to the Nation when the dust storms began to darken the noonday skies over State after State. Those clouds of soil did much to draw public attention to the erosion problem. As a result of that attention, Congress passed legislation which brought into being the first concerted effort to combat soil erosion on a Nation-wide scale. Since that time, much progress has been made through the programs of Federal, State, and local agencies. Through technical and other assistance to farmers, nearly 10 percent of the farm land of the country has already been protected against erosion. By all reasonable reckoning, this is a permanent and complete protection. On much of the other farm land of the country, less intensive conservation measures have been employed.

In the last 10 years we have perhaps made more progress in the soil conservation field than in all our previous history. But even so, about 90 percent of our complete conservation job still remains to be done. We were so late in starting, and so much damage has been done.

To show something of the size of this soil conservation job that needs to be done, here are some figures compiled by the Soil Conservation Service. According to preliminary estimates, it would take a force equivalent to around 500,000 men working a year to do the necessary work on the big soil conservation jobs—those requiring rather large crews of men and using big equipment. In this class are such tasks as drainage, flood control, clearing, quarrying of limestone, improvement of irrigation systems, and control of erosion along highways and stream banks. Mind you this estimate does not include the large amount of labor that could be used in carrying out conservation work on individual farms and ranches.

Now I should like to talk about the depletion of our forest resources. Conservation of forest resources became a live issue at the opening of the twentieth century—many years before soil conservation came in for serious study. During that time we have learned much about the problem of forest conservation, and have made some progress toward solving them. As a Nation, however, we haven't come to grips with those problems on a scale which would effectively cope with the processes of depletion.

Of all agricultural resources, it is upon forestry that the pressure of war has fallen hardest. The heavy wartime demand for lumber and other products of the forest has notably accentuated the drain upon our timbered lands. Destructive cutting and premature liquidation of young timber are widespread.

Lumber and pulp for making paper are critical materials today. Although shortages of manpower and equipment loom large in the immediate picture, the stringency is due in part to failure, in the past, to provide for a continuous growth of all sizes of the most valuable of trees in various parts of the country. We were too blinded with the apparently inexhaustible supply of virgin timber to recognize, in time, the ultimate effects of clean-sweep logging. Those operations moved like a giant scythe across the Nation. The after-effects of such cutting are still with us in the cut-over areas of the Great Lakes States and in many other areas. Such unwise practices were little less destructive than the present-day, scorched-earth methods of a ruthless wartime enemy.

The present drain upon our sawtimber is almost twice the current growth. Even in normal peacetime we used up our forest resources at a rate far faster than nature was replacing them. Fire, which has in the past taken such a terrific toll of our timber, is still an enemy to be recokoned with. Almost 140,000,000 acres of private and State-owned forest land have no protection whatever from fire, and additional large acreages suffer from inadequate protection.

Of the commercially productive forest land on farms and in other private ownership, 58,000,000 acres have poor stocking of small growth or none at all. A large part of this acreage must be replanted before it can become productive. Considerable acreage in public ownership should also be replanted, and stand-improvement cuttings are needed to improve the growing conditions on other large areas in State and national forests.

Now let's take a look at the estimates of labor requirements to do the part of the forest-conservation job that requires large

numbers of workers. The Forest Service has estimated that it would take around 500,000 men working 1 year to accomplish just the larger jobs, such as installing fire-control facilities, constructing timber and other forest utilization roads, planting forest trees, and improving timber stands. Like the soil-conservation estimates, this does not include labor requirements of the smaller forest-conservation jobs that are just as important, in many respects, as the big projects.

Thus the opportunity and need for employment in forest work is also huge. Even a glance at this farm and forestry situation, in its broad aspects, reveals a tremendous post-war job ahead—constructive work that is needed to provide and maintain a firm base upon which our Nation can continue to meet the needs of an increasing population and an expanding economy. These measures are in the public interest, even though much of the work to be done is on lands in private ownership.

We have the know-how and the experience to immediately undertake conservation and restoration operations in various fields on a large scale. But unless we wage an all-out war on erosion and depletion, the conservation job will drag out, on a hit-or-miss basis, over a long period of time. We need to capitalize on every opportunity to speed the job. That is why we must be prepared to take advantage of whatever extra manpower becomes available for this constructive purpose in the post-war period.

We know that the productive capacity of our lands and forests can be improved because of the constantly increasing number of successful examples. On farms, where conservation farming is practiced, row-crop yields have increased 10 to 50 percent per acre. Yields per acre of small grains have increased 25 percent and livestock capacity per farm has increased up to 100 percent. Appreciable acreages of industrial timber holdings are being managed according to good forestry practices. Very attractive annual growths per acre are being obtained on these lands in contrast to relatively lower increment on adjacent holdings, where the growing stock is badly depleted.

An all-out conservation program also would offer greater enjoyment of life through increased recreational facilities. Most of us like and enjoy the out-of-doors. We like to see things grow. We like to hunt and fish. A program which would conserve our soil, water, and forests would also have a highly beneficial effect on wildlife. We have come to realize that wildlife conservation cannot be achieved by measures of protection to limit the kill but requires constructive management just as is the case with soil and forest resources.

The implications for maintaining and increasing all forms of wildlife are impressive on the 40,000,000 acres now in cultivation which are actually unsuitable for crop use. This land should be turned over to grass and trees at the earliest practicable opportunity.

In thinking of the problems of maintaining and restoring the productive capacity of our resources, we need to think largely in terms of controling water. In addition to helping to solve the conservation problem, control of water stabilizes stream flow and thus adds to our water-power facilities, reduces flood damage, and aids navigation.

The nature of the water problem varies in different parts of the country. In the East, as is well known, the question may center around what to do with too much water. How are we to protect sloping lands against the washing of frequent and, often, heavy rains? Forest lands should not be exposed by extensive clear cutting. For croplands, the solution frequently takes the form of cultural methods which involve contouring, strip cropping, and maintenance of cover crops. In much of the West, of course, the problem is different. There it is the question of how to conserve occasional heavy rains for use in dry periods.

We all know that water which is permitted to wash, in torrents, off the land not only is lost to plant use, but it also carries with it valuable soil. The silt which chokes the creeks and rivers of the Nation and fills up the reservoirs behind dams is but a grim reminder of waste which, by and large, can be prevented. The mudded waters of streams are unmistakable signs that erosion is still winning out over conservation. Soil that is protected by conservation farming practices like terracing—and by trees and vegetative growth—will absorb water where it falls. It is only soil that is unprotected—exposed to the ravages of rain—that we see conveyed downstream in silt-laden waters.

The benefits to be derived through the conservation and restoration of our soil, and particularly our forest resources, offer hope and encouragement for the future well-being of our people through new industrial utilization of these resources. The products of the soil and forest offer new sources of liquid fuels, food, feed, cellulose, textile fibers, starch, plastics, a large number of chemical products, building materials, and the energy for increased mechanization and better living. These are a few of the products which hold tremendous potentialities for the future.

The crops that grow on the land, perpetually capable of being harvested and used, are sources of energy without conceivable limit. When they are harvested and used properly, the yield does not decrease, nor, with proper management, is the soil lost. Energy products, cellulose and starch, can be transformed to alcohol, and thus become, if need be, a substitute for petroleum products to keep our motors running. Cellulose and starch—these are the main products of forest and field, and a permanent source of future power.

It is in these newer fields which we as a Nation are just beginning to explore, that wood and wood products offer such far-reaching and dramatic prospects. We now know, for example, that alcohol from waste wood is a technically feasible process, and as such is definitely competitive with alcohol from molasses and much cheaper than alcohol from grain at current prices. There is reason to believe that when the full possibilities of lignin—a constituent of wood wastes—are developed, alcohol will be a cheap and abundant byproduct of other chemical manufacturing processes. It is my belief that we have far too long overlooked this possible source of alcohol and chemical goods. As a matter of fact, it very unfortunate that we permit the burning of our sawdust piles and our other wood wastes when they offer potential supplies of alcohol which must now come from war critical materials.

The field of wood plastics alone is intriguing almost beyond any of the materials now being used. Research has already made wood and paper plastics important in parts of our war effort previously reserved for the metals. Each day now sees developments in this field which enlarge the post-war potentialities for plastics, and it is impossible to imagine the important place these fledgling products of the soil and forest will occupy in our lives in the future. There is an increasing number of reports, each revealing some new and unanticipated use for wood and wood products.

Much of the work in the wood products field is being carried on by the Department of Agriculture Forests Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. That work is supplemented by research in related fields in the Department's other research laboratories. I am convinced that the post-war period will see an emphasis on forest-products research approaching the intensive studies which our petroleum and coal-tar industries underwent during the last quarter of a century.

Germany and other foreign countries are drawing heavily on their forest resources. The Nazis are using their forests to run their war machine. It is a challenge to us to use for peacetime pursuits the resources which the Nazis have exploited so completely for destructive purposes.

Before closing I want once more to emphasize the fact that if we are successfully to carry forward the conservation job that lies ahead, we need now to plan carefully for this program. This means that we need an effective and well-coordinated program for the Nation, instead of many scattered, unrelated, and possibly conflicting projects. Such planning takes time. Surveys must be made first, and technicians require time to prepare plans for congressional consideration.

I have tried to point out to you some of the reasons why we need to do something positive about our erosion and depletion problems. I have told you my ideas about why we need to plan now so that we can seize every opportunity to make rapid strides forward. I have mentioned some of the long-range and more immediate benefits to be gained from wise use of our soil and forest resources. I want to state further that, in my opinion, we are at the crossroads in our history insofar as our natural resources are concerned. Either we take the uphill road to conservation and restoration, or the downhill road to further exploitation and eventual ruin. The decision as to which course we shall pursue is clearly up to us.

Let me sum up some of the benefits that would accrue to the people of this country through an aggressive conservation program. Such a program would stop erosion and depletion, conserve our soil, restore our forests, reduce floods and dust storms, provide greater recreational opportunities, and guarantee that we shall be able to have and enjoy better living that will result from better use of our manpower and new uses of our agricultural resources. To me, those benefits would be a bargain at any price. I know of no other way we could use our manpower to a greater permanent advantage of our country than in the conservation and restoration of our farm and forest resources.

Planning now means economy not only because it will enable us to get the most for our money; it means that we shall have a happier and more secure future. That is a sound investment in America.

Public Opinion and the Reader's Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital for Chronic Disease dinner on Sunday evening, May 7, 1944, at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria.

The circulation of the Reader's Digest in England is 262,000. It is the largest monthly publication in England. It has several foreign editions, to wit, Spanish, with a circulation of 753,000, which circulates in South America and other Spanish-speaking countries. Its Portuguese edition is placed at 313,000, the Arabic edition at 125,000, and the Swedish edition at 248,000. The domestic

circulation, including the armed forces, is over 7,000,000. Thus, all told, this unusual magazine sells over 8,701,000 copies per annum and is probably read by three times that number in family groups.

When a publication reaches such gargantuan—almost oppressive—size it compels notice. If, in addition, it fails properly to carry out the responsibilities inherent in such size, it then awakens misgivings and suspicions. Here we have the fourth estate—that is, one segment thereof—growing into an empire under the control of one man. Its potency is national and international. Nothing like the Reader's Digest has ever existed since the world began.

It is time for the American people to take stock and inventory—the good and the bad—of this oversprawling creature of the press.

It started out, as its name implies, to digest and publish in condensed form striking and interesting articles that appeared in various publications. As its circulation increased and the financial surplus of its ownership developed, it belied its name and printed original articles. There is no objection to printing original articles, but the subterfuge was used by first inspiring and commissioning the writer of the article and then farming out the piece to some willing daily, weekly, or monthly newspaper, magazine, or trade journal. These lesser publications, in some instances, are practically on the pay roll of the Reader's Digest. They are retainees or sycophants of the Digest. Those articles inspired by the Reader's Digest assume a general pattern. They reflect the economic ideology of the ownership of Reader's Digest; they are just so much propaganda. It is readily discernible that the Reader's Digest is violently anti-Roosevelt, unabashedly and vigorously antilabor, and, to say the least, it is not particularly careful in its scrutiny and editing of articles which disparage the Jewish effort in Palestine and other matters Jewish.

I cite but a few instances of such policy. There is the instance of the digest of Kiplinger's Washington Is Like That. Of all the numerous chapters of interest in the book, Reader's Digest needs must select that which deals with the percentages of Jews in Government and present such in a most unfavorable light. Reader's Digest took occasion to print Robert Moses' appraisal against increased immigration. On still another occasion, it fed its readers with the anti-Zionist expressions of King Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabi.

Now again, in an article by Frederick C. Painton, entitled "Report on Palestine," appearing in its current issue, Reader's Digest offers to its vast public what it calls an honest and objective appraisal of the conflicting claims of Jew and Arab in Palestine. Let's take a few moments to analyze its honesty and its objectivity.

Mr. Painton ignores completely the historical background of the Palestine Mandate. No mention is made of the Balfour Declaration, of the ratification of the Palestine Mandate by 52 nations, the admitted purpose of such mandate being the establishment of a national homeland for the Jews. He maintains an unbecoming silence on the agreement entered into by Emir Feisal and Chaim Weizmann, wherein as spokesman for the Arabs, Emir Feisal stated unequivocally his acceptance of the homeland in Palestine and emphasized that the Arab and Jew could live side by side in amity and peace. Without interference by the British Colonial Office and the self-serving interests of the large Arab landowners, harmonious relations could have been maintained. Indeed, witness the preference of the Palestine Arab for living near the Jewish colonies, his glad acceptance of the high standard of living, and the increase of population not only by higher birth rate but by the influx of Arabs seeking benefits.

Mr. Painton makes no mention of the fact that the White Paper was furiously attacked by such high authority as Winston Churchill, Lord Wedgwood, General Smuts, Leopold Amery, to mention but a few. The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations termed it illegal and stated it thwarted the very purpose of the mandate. Had the article seriously been intended as a guide to an intelligent appraisal, as the Reader's Digest boasts, the entire background of the Palestine question would not have been so scrupulously omitted.

If it is so informative as the Digest terms it in its foreword, then as to give the impression that "Jewish wealth" and "world press" (the author's own phrases when deploring the inability of the Arab to advertise his claim) is all powerful, why is the long struggle of the Jews to found a home in Palestine not yet ended? If Jewish wealth and press are that powerful, why is not the national homeland a fait accompli? Colonization did not take place over night. The Jewish colonists, in reliance upon a mighty promise, gave their life and their labor to performing the miracle that has reclaimed Palestine from a dead land to the most thriving and progressive area in the Middle and Near East.

Does not Reader's Digest as well as the author know that the vast wealth of the Jews (as Mr. Painton calls it) that bought the land in Palestine, built the hospitals and schools, developed the industries and cultivated the neglected barren soil is the pennies and dimes collected all over the world from the poor and needy who voluntarily contributed because they saw the redemption of Jewry in Palestine? Mr. Painton makes it sound like a bit of Goebbel propaganda—rich, international Jewry.

The Arab fears the Jew, fears bodily harm from him, says the author. Mr. Painton omits the massacres of the Jews by the Arabs in 1921, 1929, 1936 through 1939 where the Jew found himself entirely at the mercy of the armed Arab, without a weapon of any kind to defend his home, his life and his family. Surely, such an omission scarcely makes for the objectivity boasted of. The impression created is that of a Jewish plot, so dear to Hitler's heart.

The Jews of Palestine are busy, it is claimed, smuggling in at an alarming rate rifles, machine guns, mortars and making hand grenades. The fact is that over 38,000 Palestinian Jews are now serving voluntarily with the British Army. All the Palestine Jewry is producing for war. In the Allied struggle with Rommel, the Jewish contribution of men and materials was so great as to be accredited by some observers with having turned the tide. Arabia, with its Iraqi revolt, its Grand Mufti of Jerusalem now doing Hitler's bidding, the neutral Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, was not concerned with Allied victory at all. Indeed, the Jews of Palestine must have been very busy, if while working night and day for the Allied cause they could also smuggle in rifles, machine guns, mortars and making grenades at an overwhelming rate. It is a curious fact how every trial for Arab gunrunning has been obscured in the press. They are a frequent occurrence, but I find no mention of that fact either in the article under discussion or any other objective report.

Permit me to quote a paragraph: "The British believe they have lived up to the letter of the Balfour Declaration, which said only that His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment of a home for the Jews in Palestine. There is a home, they say, and Britain is absolved." How easily and swiftly is the tremendous document dismissed. How easily Britain is absolved. "There is a home"—is there—while thousands upon thousands of Jews perish in the Balkans, in all occupied Europe, because there is no place for them to go, because they could find no welcome anywhere, save in Palestine were it not for the White Paper? But Britain says "there is a home," and who are we to controvert the evidence of the British Colonial Office's saintly benevolence?

The old, outworn cry of "absorptive capacity"—that is, the lack of room in Palestine—is again given prominent space. I noted, however, that the scientific exposition of Dr. Lowermilk, who asserts there is room for millions more, is relegated to a footnote.

Mr. Painton states that after two decades the national homeland is still an enormous philanthropic venture. Is Mr. Painton more of an authority than the Royal Peel Commission, which after a thorough investigation stated that it is no longer an experiment but a "going concern"?

Because Mr. Painton went hungry in Palestine, it is concluded that Palestine is a failure. There are many countries now faced with hunger because of the war, but would an "objective" observer call these countries failures as such?

The author makes the point that the refugees now inhabiting Palestine will return to their native lands. It's as simple as all that; is it? Returning refugees, of course, will have no difficulty in getting a foothold in a torn economy after the war. His property will be returned without a murmur; his economic competition will be accepted gracefully after a decade of cultivated anti-Semitism. Immigration bars, of course, will be let down all over the world after the war. Does Mr. Painton "honestly" believe that. After years of persecution and pilfer, not to speak of murder, Mr. Painton actually believes that those countries that spewed forth the Jew will call him brother. That is a bit of facile thinking without recognition of existing related facts. I think the author's closing sentence is the pay-off. He says: "Then, if my observations are correct, the Palestine problem will die out of sheer lack of Jews who would give up their own homeland to plant themselves anew in the sterile hills of Judea." He forgot to mention that there will be no "sheer lack of Jews" who have no land to return to.

Spokesmen for England have said the Jews in Palestine are there "by right and not on sufferance" and the mandate demands that the establishment of the homeland be viewed with favor and facilitated. It does not call for a "neutral" standpoint. The Reader's Digest should have considered that the facts and the questions posed by Mr. Painton were considered by the League, that there is no new development to warrant a reversal of the international edict, except, perhaps the success in Palestine which has developed far beyond the wildest dreams of the ratifiers.

I have gone into the details of this Report on Palestine because it so very clearly illustrates what I mean when I talk of the power of the Reader's Digest unaccompanied by a sense of responsibility to its readers. The danger has been recently recognized by such highly thought of magazines like the New Yorker, Commonweal, and the New Republic.

It is just so much waste of words merely to point up these failings of the Reader's Digest. What should be done about it?

First of all, the world of readers must be made aware of the policy of the Reader's Digest so that whatever is read therein must be viewed as not a cross-section of opinion as voiced in various magazines, but rather as selections designed to promote the ownership's viewpoint exclusively. Secondly, it is well for readers to request that the other point of view be printed when an article of general interest appears as is the case with Report on Palestine. Thirdly, it is well for the magazines in the pay of Reader's Digest to realize the pitfalls and to assert a real independence consonant with the tradition of the freedom of the press. I call upon publications such as the Saturday Evening Post, the American Legion Magazine, the American Mercury, Colliers, Fortune, Liberty, Barrons,

Popular Science Monthly, the Red Book, Hygeia, to mention but a few, to ask themselves why they lend themselves to a scheme that is fraught with such danger. They are building for themselves and the Nation a Frankenstein monster.

I am not in opposition to bigness in and of itself. Bigness never frightens me provided it plays cricket and is not guilty of concealing its real purpose behind an innocuous mask. If Reader's Digest announced proudly, "This is our policy," the reader would be properly prepared to reach a sound solution of the article appearing therein.

But Reader's Digest, if left unrestrained, promises to become an institution greater than the Government, but without an announced platform whereby it can be judged.

For instance, the Reader's Digest never prints the views of the underdog, or that of minority groups. It has become illiberal and sows disunity during time of war by holding the Government up to ridicule. It must be kept in mind that Reader's Digest has a scope that reaches far beyond national importance. It is read by allies and neutral foreign countries as well. Recently in an article by Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, an original written for the Digest, the good neighbor policy was placed entirely out of focus by the deliberate exaggeration of the amount of money spent by us for lend-lease purposes in our southern neighbors. When presented with the actual facts, the Reader's Digest refused to retract. The Reader's Digest owes that responsibility to retract to its country because its vast circulation gives it a prestige and respectfully attentive audience.

Because of this attitude, it fails to cooperate with agencies such as the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, the Foreign Economic Administration and War Refugee Board who have such work to do in allied and neutral foreign countries.

Within our own country, the influence of the Reader's Digest is such that it must necessarily undermine the morale of lesser publications who in their anxiety to be represented in the mighty Reader's Digest—and remember the Reader's Digest pays well—might well adopt a policy of accepting only such articles for publication that will appeal to the Reader's Digest editorial palate. This is no remote danger. Moreover in the farming-out process, the smaller publications again must accept such articles that have pleased the Digest's fancy. Thus we have one voice so beautifully manipulated as to appear to our country and others as a representative choral group. It is not good. A controlled public opinion is being fashioned by one medium. It has been said that public opinion is stronger than the legislature and nearly as strong as the Ten Commandments.

One final word. There may, of course, be no connection, but I cannot, for one resist the temptation of thinking of the Arabic edition and its bid for circulation when viewing the persistent anti-Zionist tone of the Reader's Digest. At least I am honest in admitting my temptation.

Will the President Now Seize Defiant Unions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of April 28, 1944:

WILL THE PRESIDENT NOW SEIZE DEFIANT UNIONS?

The Montgomery Ward seizure, affecting an organization supplying solely civilian goods and services, is at worst a Gestapo proceeding and at best a high-handed misuse of wartime powers. But for the moment let that issue be waived.

If the President can justify his action in the Montgomery Ward case, what about the machinists' unions in the San Francisco Bay area?

If the mere refusal of a civilian business to sign a contract with a C. I. O. union is sufficient cause for sending the Army to take forcible possession of the premises and manhandle the head of that business, what is the President going to do about union bosses who, almost from the first day of war, have defied every process of the New Deal's own laws, have called 13 strikes, have held up vital ships and goods—ranging through warships to transports to munitions—and who are at this moment in defiance of a War Labor Board order?

These union bosses have caused incalculable loss to the war effort.

Will the President send troops to seize the union's books and determine what happens to the huge sums received by the union in dues and initiation fees?

Will the President order all members of the union under 45 to be drafted for the Army?

When John L. Lewis defied the Government no troops were sent to eject him forcibly from his office and take over the union.

What is the President going to do now about the men who are willing to jeopardize our Army and our Navy in the Pacific?

Reconversion of War Plants to Peacetime Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, W. P. B. Chairman Donald Nelson has recently pointed out the importance of laying immediate plans for the reconversion of our war plants to peacetime production on the speediest possible basis. In a talk at Boston, Mr. Nelson urged the Nation's manufacturers to prepare for such a shift.

Just how this change may be effected has remained something of a military-civilian secret, and apparently no one in the Washington W. P. B. set-up has come forth with anything like a constructive solution. Yet such a solution lies so readily at hand that it should be apparent to the people close to the situation at once.

Our Nation's machine-tool manufacturers have been publicly declaring their concern over the fate of their own industry. Machine tools and dies used to expedite manufacturing in every industry have a relatively long life. As the products of these companies have been turning out of the plants in huge quantities, the demand for machine tools has been rapidly decreasing. What would be more effective, then, as a means of assuring rapid conversion to peacetime industrial operation than the utilization of these plants for the manufacture of the machine tools and dies needed in peacetime production so that they might be on hand, waiting and ready for the end of the war? These peacetime machines could be manufactured by those companies whose war orders are now being curtailed or canceled to the benefit of the entire Nation, now and in the difficult period of reconversion.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Public Law 138, Seventy-eighth Congress and an editorial from the Toledo Blade:

[Public Law 138—78th Cong.]

[Chap. 224—1st Sess.]

S. 1134

An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of $10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided,* That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further,* That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities on any lands affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out on said lands by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting on such lands of any crops which are essential to the war effort, without the imposition of any penalty or the withholding of any benefit, soil conservation, or other agricultural payments.

SEC. 4. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations.

Approved July 12, 1943.

[From the Toledo Blade]

NO FLOOD AT RENO?

We don't know what the New Deal would call the deluge in the days of Noah, but in the considered opinion of official Washington there has been no flood in the Reno Beach and Howard Farms area—only progressive erosion.

Our best dictionaries give several definitions of the word "flood," among them this: "A body of water rising, swelling, and overflowing land not usually so covered."

Under the impact of wind from the northeast, Lake Erie rose and swelled and broke through the dikes and overflowed several thousand acres in eastern Lucas County "not usually thus covered."

We believed that newspaper reference to this condition as a flood which ruined crops and drove 350 families from their homes was justified by Noah—Webster.

Now is our face red? By inference, if not directly, Washington rebukes our editorial ignorance. "The inundation of the shore land was not a flood, but only a part of the process of shore erosion."

Even the O. P. A. couldn't have manufactured a more confusing explanation of a condition and not a theory which confronts us.

Go down to Reno, rent a row boat, draw on your rationed rubber boots and form your own opinion.

But this much seems certain. Not a dime from that fund of $10,000,000 appropriation is going to be available for the hundreds of disaster sufferers who have for a great many years paid property taxes to the State and the county—and income taxes to the Federal Government.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on May 6, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, the ravages of hunger and starvation are to me the most tragic of all the horrors of war. They are no respecters of persons or sides and they strike with all the damage and suffering in the world.

Armies are usually well fed and well supplied. Even the hard-pressed nations are able to feed the men who fight. They are the last to feel the pinch of lack of enough food.

The real sufferers are the little children, the very ones who should be exempt, not only from the pangs of hunger but also from the war itself. These are the little sufferers, whose innocent souls have no traffic with the sins of the world and should be spared from the terrible agonies of starvation.

Yet, in the conquered countries of Nazi Europe, millions of children are paying for the crimes of which cruel fate has made them victims. These children are innocent but they are starving.

Their very innocence makes the wickedness of the fact all the more pronounced. They must be saved.

I have long been an advocate of America's feeding these starving children. I believe it is a duty passed on and assigned to us by a merciful God. In feeding these children, we are shortening, not prolonging the war.

As a child, I vividly remember the excruciating stores of the starving children in Asia Minor and the Balkans during World War No. 1. Today children are being made hungry in all the occupied countries by cold practical calculations to destroy future generations of Germany's enemies. We must not, we cannot allow that to happen.

As a Member of Congress, I voted on April 17 for a resolution directing the present administration to send food to Europe's starving children. In so doing, I am certain I followed the dictates of the consciences of every patriotic American in my district.

In so voting, I reflected the desire of organized labor, the councils of which have continually demanded these children be fed.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has long advocated feeding these children.

The Catholic archbishops and bishops have asked for this action and the Rabbinical Assembly of America has approved the idea.

Every letter I have received on this subject has insisted that I urge the President to act immediately on this vital matter because nothing has been done thus far.

According to the recent statement made by the Committee on Food for the Smaller Democracies, the President is responsible from here on out. Everybody seems to want action taken. Nobody wants the children to starve any longer. The President, as our Commander in Chief, has the power to put this feeding policy into effect. I hope he does this as soon as possible. It will be the most humane undertaking of this day.

And now let me read to you the fitting lines of a former clergyman of my district:

"VICTORY

"Last night 'twixt sleep and waking,
I heard the tramping feet
Of millions crying victory,
Where clashing armies meet.

"I saw fair cities burst in flame,
And then to ashes turn,
Dismantled now by steel and fire
As if of no concern.

"I saw the works of genius,
Of all that man had made,
In book and stone, in church and thought,
Laid low by brutal raid.

"The unknown graves of children,
Who wandered in the night,
Afar from home and shelter,
Were present to my sight.

"I stood with those who listen
For news which is not sent,
Or coming, brings a sorrow,
Through which the heart is rent.

"And then 'twixt sleep and waking,
I heard the tramping feet,
Of millions crying victory,
Where clashing armies meet.

"But as the trumpet blazed the note,
It gave uncertain sound;
Its lips were brass, not golden,
Its note fell to the ground.

"The summer fruit, all fair outside,
May hide a worm within;
And victory unsought of God,
Will lead our lives to sin.

"And what shall be the fruitage
Of all our weary strife,
When chiefs are met in council,
To deal with things of life?

"When 'peace' is cried from housetops,
And bells ring out again;
When diplomats assemble,
Will there be vict'ry then?

"With books piled high on tables,
And legal learning there,
Still, shall one chair be empty,
And no one seem to care?

"To care for Him who walks the sea,
And gives the stars their place;
And who for love of me and you,
May save us by His grace.

"May save us from the fear of death;
'The sting of death is sin.'
But Christ has won the victory,
And we may enter in."

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials, one in the Pike County Republican and the other from the Calhoun News:

[From the Pike County (Ill.) Republican]

SNY FARMERS HAVE A CASE

Three-quarters of a century ago this newspaper led a fight for the reclamation of a vast area of wild swamp and flood and miasma-scourged land extending the entire length of the broad Mississippi Valley in western Pike County and containing some of the richest farm land in the West.

That was back in the days when the first Joseph Merrick Bush was State Senator, and Charles Kenney and Albert Landrum were representing this old fortieth (now thirty-sixth) district in the lower house of the Twenty-seventh General Assembly, the first assembly after adoption of our present State constitution.

We were successful then. The fertile valley of 110,000 acres now known as the Sny Island Levee and Drainage District (largest of its kind in the world and lying in Pike, Adams, and Calhoun Counties) was reclaimed and made the setting for happy homes and firesides and for the production of great food crops that amazed the early skeptics who said this valley belonged to the Father of Waters and would always be his.

Today this newspaper again takes up the cudgels for this far-flung district whose future is threatened by the United Government's erection of huge dams in the Mississippi River for the purposes of a deeper navigation. These dams are holding back and preventing a run-off by way of the river of flood waters that tumble down into the great valley following storms on the uplands.

These dams are of course, in no way responsible for surface floods that occasionally inundate these fertile lands. They are responsible—and directly so—for the long-continued inundation of these lands. The water, once precipitated into the valley by upland floods, cannot get away by its hitherto

natural outlet because of the high stage of the river maintained by these dams.

Herein is based the case of the Sny landowners. Their claim against the Government for damages and for drainage facilities comparable to those of the past, arises from the patent fact that the Government's operations in the Mississippi are holding back the waters, keeping inundated lands under water for weeks and ruining the chances of one of the globe's most fruitful valleys that for years has blossomed as a rose.

Sny farmers propose to fight for their rights. They have just cause for complaint. We toured these flooded areas along the Sny when last year's great floods lay on the lands for a period of several weeks, unable to get away. Again, the past week, we toured the valley and found near a third of it under water, which in some localities will be weeks getting off because of the dams in the river, particularly the one at Cap au Gris where the dam maintains a water stage on a level with that at the mouth of the Sny.

Sny farmers applaud the Republican's intention, announced last week, of giving their cause editorial recognition. "I don't know how your paper could be of greater service," said Louis Rodhouse, Saturday. "People outside these bottoms don't realize how serious this is; we need publicity," said Mrs. John Koetters of Rockport. "You will do a fine thing by putting this situation squarely up to the Government and keeping it before the people," agreed men working to hold the levee at Mackey schoolhouse Wednesday night.

This editorial is by way of introduction to a series that will follow in succeeding issues, wherein we will seek to emphasize the obligations of government to the people of this district; pointing out the agreements and understandings that have been had with the War Department to the end that the district shall have drainage facilities equal to those obtaining before the dams were built; calling attention to the disaster and damage incident to the repressed floodwaters; describing plans under consideration for relieving and controlling flood conditions in these bottoms; urging the rights and claims of the valley inhabitants for rehabilitation; and revealing how the Sny levees that were built and paid for by the landowners without cost to Government have been taken over and used by Government for a purpose wholly contrary to the one intended by those who built and paid for them.

We shall insist that Government keep faith with these valley farmers who otherwise face ruin.

Meanwhile we suggest reading the story of the Sny Valley and its reclamation appearing elsewhere in this issue and which constitutes one of the most thrilling chapters in western Illinois history.

[From the Calhoun (Ill.) News]

RIVER DAMS CAUSE FLOODS

After two disastrous floods in as many years, we are wondering if that is sufficient proof that dams do not control floods, but cause them. Anyone with common sense can see that the dams keep the rivers 5 to 7 feet above normal stages and that when heavy rains come floods occur. Also the dams cause a slowing of the current and sediment fills the river bottoms from 3 to 5 inches each year, or a foot to a foot and a half within 5 years.

We realize that deep water is necessary for river traffic, and that is all right. But we think it would be cheaper in the long run and certainly would save a property damage to dredge the river channels each year like they used to. We very seldom had floods befort the series of dams were built up and down the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. Now we have them every year and will continue to have them unless something is done about flood control.

If we must continue to have river dams and keep the river at such a high stage the year round, the War Department should make plans to take care of excessive water during the rainy seasons of the year. This could be done, especially in the Western States on the upper Mississippi River, by building large places to use in storing water during flood times instead of allowing it all to rush down the rivers to cause inestimable damages farther down the river stretches. The water could be guided into these large reservoirs and stored for use by farmers the following summer when crops are burning up for the lack of rain.

We think it is high time the War Department realized that dams cause floods and that something should be done to remove the cause.

Treason on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following statement which I gave to the press on May 6, as well as my telegram to Mr. William H. Davis, Chairman of the National War Labor Board:

The three petty "Caesars" of the San Francisco Bay area have renewed their treasonable activities and are once more holding up vitally necessary construction work on Navy and Maritime ships. In utter defiance of requests from the Navy and the Maritime Commission, as well as directives from the National War Labor Board, Messrs. Hook and Dillon, Local 68 of the International Association of Machinists, and "Turkey-neck" Smith, Local 1304 of the C. I. O., have successfully brought about another work stoppage.

This is just one more in a long series of work stoppages and delays that have been instigated by these individuals in spite of organized labor's pledge of no strikes for the duration. Their word is not worth the paper it is written on and their pledges and contracts are apparently made only to be broken at will. Even their own organizations have no control over their activities.

I have conferred with officials in the Navy Department and the Maritime Commisison, both of which organizations are deeply concerned over the situation. They have advised me that substantial concessions were offered to Hook and Dillon and to Smith in order to insure the continued production of ships that are needed by our boys at the front. Appeals to patriotism, which these business agents do not understand, have had no effect.

I am, therefore, requesting that the National War Labor Board subpena Hook, Dillon, and Smith and ask them to show cause as to why they should not obey the directive of the National War Labor Board to continue work on war-construction jobs. If the Montgomery Ward Co., an organization not even remotely connected with war production, can be seized by the United States Government under some weird interpretation of law, how can these well-known public enemies continue to defy that same Government with impunity?

The activities of Hook, Dillon, and Smith have gone past the coddling stage. They should be treated as traitors to their country. The public and the loyal workers in the ranks of labor will applaud and support the most drastic action to rid the San Francisco area of their blighted influence.

MAY 8, 1944.

Mr. WILLIAM H. DAVIS,
National War Labor Board,
Department of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have just learned that Hook and Dillon Local 68 of the I. A. M., and Smith Local 1304, C I. O., are again holding up work on essential naval and maritime construction. Am also informed that your compliance director has left for the coast by plane with instructions to subpena Hook, Dillon, and Smith and to ask them to show cause why they should not comply with labor's no-strike pledge and N. W. L. B. directives. It is my opinion that these individuals are guilty of treasonable activities and hope that your board will use every means at your disposal to remove them from positions of influence in the San Francisco Bay area. Please keep me advised of all developments. Regards.

J. Z. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

Harry Bridges Charges Congress Fails to Cooperate with President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I desire to place in the RECORD an article from the Houston (Tex.) Press, dated Tuesday, March 14, 1944. The article follows:

CONGRESS FAILING TO COOPERATE WITH F. D. R., SAYS BRIDGES

DALLAS, March 14.—Congress does not represent the people and Members aren't cooperating fully with President Roosevelt to shorten the war, President Harry Bridges, of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (C. I. O.), charged yesterday.

"The way Congress is operating today its worst enemy is President Roosevelt and not Hitler and the Japs," Bridges said.

Bridges said he was here to confer with local labor leaders to determine if union members are cooperating in the national labor political program.

"The A. F. of L. and C. I. O. might find opposition over organization, but that doesn't keep them from being together on politics," Bridges said.

He said people to whom he had talked are not satisfied with the new tax bill Congress passed over the President's veto and with the compromise soldier vote bill.

In commenting upon this article, E. M. Biggers, of Houston, well-known Texas patriot, makes the following pertinent observations:

Isn't this the same Mr. Bridges who was charged with being an enemy of the American form of government, and ordered deported?

wasn't the order sustained by the courts, and isn't he now out on appeal bond?

Is it not possible that the political activities of the C. I. O. may have a bearing on the President's zeal in protecting its membership, as in the Montgomery Ward case, rather than the Nation's interest or the rights of our citizens?

A Cause Celebre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan in the Washington Post of Monday, May 8, 1944:

A CAUSE CELEBRE—MONTGOMERY WARD

(By Mark Sullivan)

Because the Montgomery Ward case is certain to be discussed for a long time to come, it may be useful to summarize the successive steps that compose it, so far as this is possible in a limited space. The steps cover a period of some 18 months:

First, a C. I. O. union made demands upon Montgomery Ward.

The dispute went before the War Labor Board.

The Labor Board ordered—the Board's word is "directed"—Ward to sign a contract with the union. This must not be understood as merely directing the company and the union to arrive at a contract by mutual negotiation. What the Labor Board did, and habitually does, is to write out a form of contract, containing stipulations set down by the Board. One stipulation was for "maintenance of union membership"—meaning that after a fixed date Ward must discharge any worker who fails to keep up his union membership.

Ward declined to sign the contract, mainly because of the "maintenance of membership" stipulation.

Thereupon a member of the Labor Board, Mr. Wayne L. Morse, said the Board would use "whatever forces of Government are necessary to compel compliance."

The Labor Board turned the case over to President Roosevelt. The President issued an order, "I direct Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply without further delay." The President gave as his authority that he was acting as "Commander in Chief in time of war."

Ward wrote the President: "Your order of November 18 (1942) has been received and will be promptly obeyed."

When Ward came to signing, it said the contract must include a statement saying, "The following provisions are not voluntarily agreed to by the company * * * and are incorporated herein * * * under duress; and only because the President of the United States as Commander in Chief in time of war has expressly ordered that they be included."

The C. I. O. union objected to inclusion of this statement in the contract. The union went back to the War Labor Board. The board proposed a softened modification, dropping the words "under duress" and substituting "after protest."

Ward said this was unsatisfactory, insisted upon its own wording. But the Labor Board directed Ward to sign forthwith.

Ward declined to sign but said it would sign if ordered to do so by President Roosevelt. The President wrote Ward saying: "As Commander in Chief in time of war I hereby direct Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply * * * without further delay."

Ward signed the contract.

All that was in the fall of 1942. The contract went into effect for the stipulated term, one year. As the end of the year approached, Ward, last November, announced it would not renew the contract, giving as one reason, that the union no longer had a majority of Ward's workers.

Following Ward's refusal to renew, there ensued the steps recently familiar—ending in seizure of Ward's plant by the President, involving seizure of the person of Ward's head, Mr. Sewell Avery, by soldiers, and ejectment of him to the street.

That is the Ward case up to date. Among several deeply vital aspects of it is a contrast between the course of the Administration toward an employer, Ward—and its course, in a different case, toward a head of a labor union, Mr. John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers.

In the Lewis case, last July, Mr. Lewis and his union were on strike against the mine owners. The case went to the War Labor Board. The Labor Board, following its usual procedure, stipulated a contract and directed Mr. Lewis and the mine owners to sign it.

The mine owners signed, not because they wanted to but because they were afraid not to. They feared what the Administration might do to them.

But Mr. Lewis refused to sign. Thereupon the Labor Board, again following its usual procedure, sent the case up to President Roosevelt, asking him to compel Mr. Lewis to sign.

Up to this point, the cases of Mr. Lewis and of Ward are identical. The only difference, which is no difference at all, is that the Ward company refused to renew a contract stipulated by the Labor Board—while Mr. Lewis refused to sign such a contract in the beginning.

But from this point on, the course of the Administration in the two cases differs utterly. In the Ward case an employer was ordered by the President to sign, and when it did not sign was penalized by seizure of its plant and of its head. But in the case of a labor leader, Mr. Lewis, nothing whatever was done. The President did not order Mr. Lewis to sign, nor in any way penalize him.

This contrast—between the course of the President toward an employer and toward a labor leader—is one of several aspects of the Ward case having implications of the deepest possible consequence.

American Zionist Emergency Council Resolution Regarding the Late Secretary Frank Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, the late Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, had many friends. It has just been called to my attention that another great group of American citizens held him in high regard and mourn his loss to them and to the country.

I therefore want to call to the attention of the Members of the House and also to the country a resolution of national scope adopted by the American Zionist Emergency Council:

Zionists everywhere mourn the passing of Col. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, devoted servant of his country, trusted friend of the Jewish people.

The qualities of sincerity, loyalty, and fair play which were the cornerstones of Secretary Knox's life served also the movement for the establishment of a free Jewish homeland in Palestine, to which he gave a large measure of devotion. Both in his public and his private career, Frank Knox demonstrated an unfailing and helpful interest in the upbuilding of the Jewish national home.

In mourning the death of Secretary Knox, the American Zionist Emergency Council pays reverent tribute to a great American and to a stanch friend of a Jewish Palestine.

Governor Tugwell: A Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present a statement I made at a press conference, answering remarks made by Governor Tugwell in Puerto Rico.

TUGWELL COMES OUT

I am glad Governor Tugwell himself comes out in controversy. That gives me a larger territory for my spring offensive. I wish that I were now more near to him, because then the controversy would be more lively. Tugwell is an easy target for anybody that is fighting for decent government, for democracy, and for the American system of ways of life.

TUGWELL HAS NO MORAL AUTHORITY

He has no moral authority to challenge my statements. He is simply a "carpet-bagger" defending his job. I am the elected democratic spokesman of my people. I don't care much about what he says. Tugwell has been convicted by Puerto Rican courts for uttering slanderous statements. Everybody knows in Puerto Rico who he is and who I am. I wish he could run against me on a ticket in Puerto Rico, in an impartial and honest election. The people would make the proper choice.

TUGWELL'S BUREAUCRATIC VORACITY

When Tugwell arrived in Puerto Rico, he, in an attempt of unprecedented bureaucratic voracity, tried to hold office and draw salaries both as Governor and as president of the Puerto Rican University. He did hold both jobs at the same time for 6 months, through maneuvers of the Governor's appointees in the university board of trustees. At last he had to step out from one of the two jobs, forced by pressure of the Puerto Rican people. As Governor he has always been rancorous and vindictive against the people that deprived him of the university job and salary.

TUGWELL A FAILURE IN THE UNITED STATES

Tugwell is well known in the United States. People here know of his speeches and articles impeaching free enterprise and attacking the best traditions and standards of American democracy and ways of life that have made

this Nation respected, great and progressive. It is known here how Tugwell squandered millions of the people's money, and how he has failed in all positions he has held. He feels himself entrenched in Puerto Rico, because he knows that the American Government and the American people are afraid that he might come back to the United States.

TUGWELL'S CONTEMPT FOR CONGRESS

Causing harm to Puerto Rico, Governor Tugwell has contempt for Congress, and he rejoices when he mortifies the Representatives of the American people in Congress. Recently, Governor Tugwell appointed for the Insular Government a Robert Morss Lovett, when this Tugwell's fellow-traveler was stricken out from the Federal pay roll by Congress.

TUGWELL, PAIRED TO GEORGE III

Governor Tugwell, afraid of the Puerto Rican people that hate him, only goes out from the executive mansion when protected by armed guards and policemen with machine guns, surrounded with all the paraphernalia of dictators. Dictator Tugwell has made a scrap of paper of the insular constitution. The insular government department, created by Congress, have been substituted by an unconstitutional supergovernment of numerous and costly new bureaus, boards, authorities, etc., created by executive fiat or by unconstitutional measures forced by Governor Tugwell in violation of expressed prohibition of the Puerto Rican organic act. The insular auditor, office created by Congress, has been deprived of the powers to keep accountenancy, to supervise and control public expenditures. Governor Tugwell has the same respect to Puerto Rican laws as George III had for the laws of the American Colonies. Tugwell's arbitrary conduct has several times been ruled as unlawful by the insular supreme court.

PUERTO RICO GONE ON THE ROCKS

It is an audacious effrontery of Tugwell when he speaks of the Puerto Rican boys who are fighting for democracy and decent living. When these boys come back home, they will find that, under Tugwell, democracy is a shallow word and a mockery in Puerto Rico. They also will find that Tugwell has squandered in Puerto Rico millions of good money from Puerto Rican taxpayers and also from continental American taxpayers covered into the Puerto Rican Treasury. They will also find that 300,000 of Puerto Rican poor boys, in increasing numbers, lack educational opportunities. They also will find that disease, unemployment, and misery have increased in Puerto Rico. They also will find, that through Tugwell's experiments and crackpot schemes, industry, agriculture, and business, and all sources of work and income for the people have been damaged, and that the island has practically gone on the rocks.

PUERTO RICAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REQUESTS REMOVAL OF TUGWELL

Recently he was responsible for sabotaging and killing splendid measures approved by the Puerto Rican House of Representatives aiming to give work, relief, and aid to thousands of Puerto Ricans unemployed and suffering hunger and misery. He did that in revenge, because the Puerto Rican House of Representatives had adopted a resolution requesting his removal.

GOVERNOR TUGWELL—A SHAME

It is a shame that such Governor was sent to Puerto Rico. While England appoints for the British dominions and colonies statesmen of high rank and of economic independence, the United States appointed for Puerto Rico a bureaucratic wreck, a simple jobhunter and "carpet bagger," whose personal destiny and economic security are tied with the local politrickery of a crowd of anti-American fellow travelers.

Federal Irrigation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am presenting a statement made by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, before the Senate Commerce Committee considering the Rivers and Harbors bill, H. R. 3961.

I call attention to Mr. Bashore's statement because it marshals many pertinent facts which should be considered in connection with the construction of any projects having to do with water conservation, control, or use in the West. The emphasis he places on the value of water in the West is well merited.

The importance of western irrigation to the ramainder of the country is well illustrated by Mr. Bashore's factual statements on the purchasing power created for non-western manufactured goods and agricultural commodities not produced on irrigated land:

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before you today as Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation to emphasize the critical importance of water to the western half of the United States. The Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior has the responsibility for planning, constructing, and operating projects which have for their major purpose the conservation of the limited water resources of the West.

At this time I propose to discuss only one amendment. The amendment to which I direct your attention reads as follows:

"In connection with dams or works authorized by this act which the Secretary of the Interior determines, with the concurrence of the Secretary of War, may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and works authorized by this act may be utilized for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of said Federal reclamations laws and this paragraph."

The principle involved in this amendment is far-reaching. This principle goes to the root of the vitally important position that irrigation has in the agricultural, industrial, and other economic pursuits of the 17 arid and semi-arid States of the West. To facilitate a full understanding of the role which irrigation has in the life of the Nation, I have had prepared several charts and photographs which will illustrate some of the major points I will emphasize.

The low rainfall in the region west of the ninety-seventh meridian makes the maximum conservation and use there of water for irrigation vital to the maintenance of its agriculture, and, in fact, essential to the support of the population itself.

About 21,000,000 acres in the arid and semi-arid West are now irrigated. The water is delivered from storage reservoirs or it is diverted directly from streams for distribution to land that is thus made productive.

Studies indicate that sufficient water could be economically conserved to provide an adequate supply for the 21,000,000 acres now irrigated and in addition provide for the irrigation of about 22,000,000 acres now practically all unproductive. Water, which could be economically stored and diverted to irrigate productive land, is the limiting factor in the expansion of irrigation.

In the 11 far Western States, 73 percent of the agricultural production comes from irrigated land. The great livestock industry of the West, commonly thought of as one aspect of dry-land agriculture, is itself largely dependent on irrigated land for winter forage and for feeding and fattening cattle and sheep for market.

The greater part of the West's 20,000,000 people on 275,000 farms and in more than 1,000 cities and towns, is dependent directly and indirectly on irrigation.

The Federal Government assumed sponsorship for irrigation on the passage of the Reclamation Law of 1902. It did so as a means of stabilizing the agriculture of the West, of developing the arid regions, and of providing homes for pioneer settlers. A first consideration in the enunciation of the Federal policy was that the construction costs of irrigation should be repaid by beneficiaries.

Ninety-five percent of the cost of the projects in the reclamation program now authorized is reimbursable from irrigation water users, municipalities, and power consumers, and is being repaid. Power, developed as an incident of irrigation, is an essential factor in assuring the repayment of construction costs of multiple-purpose projects.

The Treasury of the United States today, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has an investment in irrigation and related projects of more than $900,000,000.

Fifty-two projects have been completed by the Bureau of Reclamation and 20 others still are under construction. Each is based on the conservation and consumptive use of the waters in the western streams.

Four million acres of land now are served by Federal reclamation systems. The total will be increased to 12,000,000 acres upon the completion of projects now under construction, upon which construction will be resumed at the close of the war, or which have been authorized for construction.

The hydroelectric power installations at reclamation projects exceed 2,000,000 kilowatts. These power plants have been of great aid in the prosecution of the war and will make an equally tangible contribution to the normal peacetime development of the West. The revenue from power assists in repayment of irrigation costs and the employment in the industrial activities resulting from power developments expands the market for irrigated agricultural products. The power byproduct of western irrigation, therefore, is a most useful tool of water conservation. Valuable as is irrigation, many of our modern projects require the aid of power to render them economically feasible.

The future of whole States and hundreds of communities built up by irrigation demands that additional water be made available for existing irrigated farms. The provision of supplemental supplies for irrigation systems which were built by private capital and which are now faced with water shortages is a major work of the Bureau of Reclamation. More than half of the areas now irrigated need additional water to insure maximum crop production and to maintain existing communities. The reasons for this extensive need of supplemental water sup-

plies are many and complex, but most of them are found in the growth of the West, expansion of the irrigated acreage, and the inadequacy of irrigation systems constructed before the science of irrigation engineering had developed to its present efficiency.

The population of the far western States has more than tripled in 40 years, while irrigated land acreage has barely doubled. Since 1940, the Bureau of Census reports the West is the only one of the Nation's four major regions to show a gain in population. All others show a loss.

The full development of the irrigation potentialities in the West would provide for 400,000 to 500,000 additional irrigated farm homes and support an additional population of 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 persons on the farms and in cities and towns which would be established or expanded in its wake.

The full development of irrigation would also create additional property values estimated at $16,000,000,000.

The purchasing power for non-western manufactured and agricultural products created by the present irrigation and related developments is estimated at $2,500,000,000 annually. The full development of irrigation possibilities would increase the home or domestic market for farm and factory products to more than $5,000,000,000 annually.

From an agricultural standpoint in the arid and semiarid regions, irrigated land has a special significance. The per acre crop output of irrigated land, which is the basis of the purchasing power of the West, is nearly five times more than that from the dry-land farms in the region. The per-acre output of irrigated land is nearly three times the average for the entire United States.

These seem to be hopeful facts for the West, holding great promise of extraordinary growth and prosperity. But the perspective must be maintained. Of the 750,000,000 acres of arid and semiarid land which is possibly tillable, there is water which can be economically conserved to irrigate at the maximum only 43,000,000 acres. This 43,000,000 acres is about twice the 21,000,000 acres now irrigated, to which I have previously referred.

Western irrigated agriculture complements and does not compete with the farm products of other sections of the country. No tobacco is grown on irrigated land in the West and the output of other so-called surplus crops, like wheat and corn, is inadequate even for the regional needs. Distance and freight costs raise a bar to the economical marketing of fruit, vegetables, and other specialty crops which are peculiarly adaptable to irrigated land in competition with the product of farms near the great metropolitan centers of the Midwest, South, and East.

The wartime contributions of irrigated land to the Nation's food supplies have been fully demonstrated. The War Food Administration has recognized the potentialities of Bureau of Reclamation irrigation development for war-food purposes and 24 projects which it has recommended have been approved by the War Production Board for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Federal reclamation projects alone in 1943 produced potatoes sufficient for the annual rations of 25,000,000 people; beans for 57,000,000; and alfalfa with feed grains for dairy and beef herds, which supplied 11,000,000 with dairy and meat products.

Since more than 80 percent of the power supply of the far Western States comes from hydroelectric plants, the Reclamation output of this essential energy as a byproduct of irrigation is exceedingly significant. In 1943 nearly 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours were generated at Reclamation plants—a greater volume than was produced in all of the New England States in 1940.

From the summary presented, I am sure you must agree with me that irrigation is essential to the very existence of our Western States.

In this region there are more than 1,100,000,000 acres of land—more than half of the area of continental United States.

Anticipating your question, "Why is irrigation necessary?" I point to the map, which shows how the United States is divided into two parts by the 20-inch rainfall line, which roughly follows the 100th meridian. To the east of this line, running as far as the 97th meridian, lies what is commonly referred to as "the subhumid belt." In this belt rainfall is erratic. It is generally regarded as adequate for crop production. In the years when it is not sufficient, lack of rainfall spells serious losses for those farmers who are not within an irrigation project. To the west of the 100th meridian the rainfall generally is insufficient for crops.

Except for the high mountains and the strip along the northern Pacific coast, less than 20 inches can be expected in a normal year. The great areas shown on the map as receiving 15 inches or less of rainfall are true deserts. These arid lands and the semiarid lands, which receive between 15 and 20 inches, taken together include all of Nevada and all but mountainous areas in Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho. These lands also include (except for small patches or strips, principally mountainous) the three Pacific Coast States, Washington, Oregon, and California, and the western parts of those States of the Great Plains, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Development of intensive farming is limited by the availability of natural moisture or water supplies for irrigation.

Agricultural experts tell us that if 20 inches of rainfall or even if 15 inches could be counted upon during the growing season for crops in these Western States, irrigation might not be required. For that reason, it is important to consider the seasonal distribution of rainfall in the West to determine the prospects in the average year during the period from April 1 to September 30, which is the growing season. This distribution is given in reports of the United States Weather Bureau which show the percentage of the average annual rainfall which is received during the growing season for crops. The greater part of California is shown to receive less than one-fifth of its average annual rainfall during the growing season.

Most of the States of Washington and Oregon and parts of Idaho, Nevada, California, and Arizona receive only about one-third of the total precipitation in the growing season. In the whole central part of the West—the Inter-Mountain States—from 40 to 60 percent of the rainfall is received during the growing season. I want to call your attention in contrast to weather records of the great middle part of the United States, where, you will see, more than 60 percent of the rainfall to the eastward of the ninety-seventh meridian comes when it is most needed for the growth of crops.

The Weather Bureau reports show further that from the Continental Divide westward virtually nowhere but in the high mountains, which cannot be farmed anyway, can more than 8 to 10 inches of rain be expected during the period from April 1 to September 30, the period when moisture is most needed for crop growth. Between the Continental Divide and the one hundredth meridian in only a few tillable areas can as much as 15 inches be anticipated during the growing season. From the one-hundredth meridian eastward the precipitation is somewhat higher on the average, but this subhumid area suffers from periodical drought and the economic stability of the area is frequently seriously disturbed.

In other words, the area west of the one-hundredth meridian for the most part receives less than 20 inches of rainfall during the normal year. Furthermore, the small amount of moisture which does fall there is unfavorably distributed through the seasons, so far as agriculture is concerned.

Please remember that between 15 and 25 inches of rain, depending on summer temperatures, are necessary during the growing season for farming without any irrigation. From the facts that I have presented, it readily can be seen that irrigation is essential to farming in virtually all of the West.

I have emphasized the climatic conditions in the States of the mountain and Pacific group because of the critical effect the sparse rainfall has on agriculture. Although this region was also affected by the critical drought of the thirties, irrigation prepared it better to meet the impact of the exceptionally low rainfall, and the result was less severe than in the Great Plains and subhumid area. In North Dakota and South Dakota in 1934, where there is virtually no water conservation for irrigation, the harvested acreage in 1934—at the height of the drought—was reduced from thirty-eight to fourteen million acres—65 percent. Land in other areas, without irrigation, virtually reverted to the desert.

The transformation by water conservation and irrigation of the western deserts and sagebrush into thriving farms has been a gradual process.

Irrigation in the West began with the settlement of the Mormons in Utah in 1847. As the receding frontier drew the American people westward, they came upon these arid and semiarid regions, trapped the waters for fur, explored the mountains for metals, and cut into the forest, but they passed rapidly over the deserts. They crossed miles upon miles of arid land hoping to find fresh fields. They pressed onward until they realized that it was upon the foundation of this desert that the permanent civilization in the West must be built. Then they began the easy stream diversions and irrigated the low-lying valleys and the benches near the big rivers. Gradually the irrigation systems became more complicated. Finally, the unregulated flow of the streams became insufficient for the needs of developments relying upon them and storage works were required.

At the turn of the century, about 10,006 acres of land had been irrigated. It was at about this point that the Federal Government became concerned about the need for water conservation in the West and the reclamation law of 1902 was enacted under the sponsorship of the late President Theodore Roosevelt. Summarized, this policy was designed to conserve and use the waters of the West for the development of the vast areas of public land to which the Government had taken and held title. The increasing population of the West made it necessary to provide for the support of a larger number of people than could be sustained by the meager agricultural resources then existing. These resources rested on the limited irrigation expansion and on the small volume of crops which could be wrested from the arid and semiarid lands without the artificial application of moisture.

That irrigation brought a permanent civilization to the western deserts was recognized. Just as this particular science of agriculture has been maintained uninterruptedly in the valleys of the Nile, in Syria, Persia, Judea, Java, and some parts of Italy, it demonstrated its value in the Western States and was adopted as a national policy.

The recognition of the great value of water conservation by the Federal Government stimulated private capital to invest in irrigation systems. In the 42 years that have elapsed since the passage of the reclamation law, the acreage under irrigation has increased to more than 21,000,000 acres. Since 1930, however, the irrigation expansion has been primarily under the auspices of the Federal Government. This has been due to

the fact that the complexities of modern systems were beyond the ability of private capital to finance. These complexities included the necessity for great storage works, as well as the recognition of the need for and usefulness of mutiple-purpose projects which would assure maximum use of the water resources for irrigation, power production, municipal water supplies, and other purposes.

As every dam on a western river aids stream regulation, so also does each contribute to flood control. The fact that the Federal Government owns more than half of the land area of the 11 far-Western States and the interstate characteristics of the water supply of many potential projects are other factors which make water conservation and irrigation in the West a primary concern of the Congress as the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

The entire Nation has a deep concern for the continued development of the West, which rests on the highest beneficial use of its scanty water supplies. The conservation of this water for irirgation and related purposes means homes on irrigated land for returning service men when peace comes. From the long-range view, the expansion of a stabilized agriculture in the West is necessary to support the expanding population and insure an increasing home market for American factory and farm products not produced in the West.

From a population standpoint, the West has outstripped its agricultural production, as I have pointed out. In the first 30 years of the present century, the West grew more rapidly than the remainder of the country. The rate was three times as fast. From 1930 to 1940, the population growth was twice the national rate. From 1940 to November 1943, the West was the only one of the four major regions of the country to show an increase in population. Its gain was 8.5 percent while every other major region lost from 3.4 to 5.7 percent.

The return of the servicemen from the battlefields and high seas will see the wartime impact of the population on the West intensified. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that nearly 1,800,000 men of the armed forces and 1,200,000 emergency industrial workers will be demobilized in the 17 Western States. Conservative estimates are that about 250,000 of the returning servicemen will be farm boys, most of them from irrigated land, while a proportionate number of the emergency industrial workers to be demobilized have a farm background.

Irrigated land in the West will be required for the permanent location of a substantial number of the 400,000 men of these two groups who will be seeking a return to the soil and an opportunity to reestablish themselves and contribute to the permanent prosperity of the country. Like their forefathers, who transformed desert and sagebrush land into irrigated farms, they are entitled to the conservation of western waters that will afford them a similar opportunity.

Preliminary studies by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that in the major subregions of the West water could be economically conserved to assure ultimate irrigation results, including protection for existing irrigated areas through supplemental water, as follows:

Subhumid and Great Plains: Irrigation of 4,500,000 acres of new land and supplemental water for 700,000 acres to provide 58,000 farm homes and protect 7,000 existing farms. These figures compare with 2,100,000 acres now irrigated which are included in 20,000 farms.

Inter-Mountain: Irrigation of 6,400,000 acres of new land and supplemental water for 8,000,000 acres to provide 140,000 new farm homes and protect 66,000 existing farms. These figures compare with 13,400,000 acres now irrigated which are included in 135,000 farms.

Pacific coast: Irrigation of 11,100,000 acres of new lands and supplemental water for 3,000,000 acres to provide 230,000 new farm homes and protect 50,000 existing farms. These figures compare with 5,800,000 acres now irrigated which are included in 120,000 farms.

From a population standpoint, the use of water required for these developments would provide for 1,639,000 additional persons on irrigated farms and more than 4,000,000 persons in cities, towns, and villages, who would receive their principal support from the new irrigation developments.

The added property values of $16,000,000,000, which I have previously estimated as possible from the full irrigation development of the West, is not comparable with the tremendous human considerations that will flow from the full use of the precious waters of the West for irrigation.

The use of structures in the West in water control such as is proposed in the pending rivers and harbors bill usually affects irrigation possibilities. Since irrigation is so important and so highly specialized a use, a Federal agency has been established to sponsor and foster it, and a body of laws and policies has been built around the function. My position, as head of that Bureau, is simply that all irrigation work should be under the jurisdiction of this agency, governed by the special law sthat have been adopted, and prosecuted in conformity with the national policy. For that reason, I advocate the amendment that I earlier read to you.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the members of this subcommittee for listening to me so patiently. I know that, to some of you who live in the humid areas of the United States, irrigation has not appeared to be an essential factor in the economic life of our great country. I have tried to give you a picture of it. I hope that this committee and the Congress will adopt the amendment in question. I add that, so far as I am aware, the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers have expressed no opposition to this amendment.

I thank you.

Why Are We Fighting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be interesting for the Members of the House and those who get the RECORD to read the opinion of a 14-year-old girl in regard to why we are fighting. This appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 10 and, under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

WHY ARE WE FIGHTING?

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

That is a very broad question and it would take a long time to answer it thoroughly. But I, a 14-year-old girl, am going to give you my opinion on it.

We are all fighting for a new world. We are fighting to put together what Germany and Japan are trying to tear apart. The only thing I can see that Germany and Japan are succeeding in trying to do is to build the world over again—a world where they would be dictators and we would be slaves. But God didn't make or intend for it to be that way.

They are fighting to kill off all human civilization and we are fighting to preserve this. They are killing off people, destroying beautiful cities, and ruling weak countries who cannot defend themselves, who were not prepared for war, who did not desire war.

Our force is so big and powerful that we will soon overtake Germany and Japan and stop them. And then the world will be in the right hands—hands in which everyone will be safe and free.

And this will be the way everyone will want to live.

If an airplane flies over, a person won't have to run for shelter or think, "This will be the last time I will ever see my family, my home, my friends, and my country."

People won't have to be doing underground work; won't have to fear their life will be taken any minute; can go into stores, cafes, and not be watched with an eagle eye. People won't have to sneak along the streets and won't have to fear they are being trailed. They can live happy and free.

All this I think is why we are fighting.

PEGGY.

Whose Attorney Is Mr. Biddle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, of May 3, 1944:

WHOSE ATTORNEY IS MR. BIDDLE?

Francis Biddle must be the strangest Attorney General we ever had. What does he think are the functions of his office? To devise ways of destroying the Constitution, abrogating the Bill of Rights, and installing an executive dictatorship? Why, that isn't the function of the Attorney General at all. He is there for the sole purpose of enforcing and supporting the law as it exists. He is not there to advise the President on how he can evade the law, but where his authority is restricted by it. He has absolutely no legislative function. His job is strictly limited to interpretation of the law as it stands in the Constitution and the acts of Congress.

But what does Mr. Biddle think of all that old-fashioned stuff? Let his own words inform us. After discovering that his thin ingenuity in finding legalistic excuses for the Montgomery Ward seizure by talking about "war production" was universally greeted with sniffs of perplexity, he decided upon more outspoken tactics.

His ruling, he said, was not based on Montgomery Ward's relation to war production; nor to the difficulty over the maintenance-of-union clause, but because "no business or property"—the words are "no business or property"—is "immune to a Presidential order." A pretty kettle of dictatorial fish, indeed.

But by no means the worst. Mr. Biddle has something to say about the United States courts. It is safe to say that nothing like it has been heard in America before; not only from our own Attorney General, but from anybody. Here it is:

"Particularly in time of war the Court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive."

Every word is a pearl. "Particularly in the time of war." "Should not substitute its judgment." So, according to Mr. Biddle the Court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive even in times of peace and, according to Mr. Biddle, any opinion of the Court not in agreement with that of the Executive is merely a substitution for the really basic authority of the President. Wherever Mr. Biddle studied law he must have taken a refresher course in the Reich's Chancellory. The American people certainly never elected a President on those terms.

As far as American democracy is concerned, Mr. Biddle apparently doesn't know what it's all about. Such an application of the theory of government, now used against a capitalistic enterprise, would if accepted as a precedent, be just as great a threat against labor and the institutions of labor, against every civic institution—it is already aimed against the courts—against every public forum, including the American press, and against all private property.

If these are Mr. Biddle's opinions he has no right to be Attorney General of the United States. His only limitation as a menace is in the absurdity of his views.

Freedom From Government Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is aroused like it never has been before by the action taken in connection with the Ward mail-order seizure. If Ward's store were open or closed this in itself would nowise affect the war effort. It could never be successfully argued that the operation of a retail store was essential to the drive into Italy, Burma, or necessary in the invasion of Europe or the Philippine Islands. Everyone knows that the War Labor Board was created for the purpose of alleviating labor troubles in war plants filling orders for the fighting forces of our men and their allies. It was never intended to interfere with the free choice of a bargaining agent by members or to force membership in a labor union against the will of the worker himself.

Congress not only has not authorized by law the seizure of nonwar private business but has expressly provided that an election must first be held before the management of a plant could bargain with a union. That was what Montgomery Ward & Co. was doing, simply complying with the law as written into the National Labor Relations Act and reaffirmed in the Smith-Connally Act.

Regardless of the fact that no legal authority exists to force the C. I. O. upon these employees and to confiscate Ward's store, Congress has moved fast to save what remains of freedom and liberty. The Senate and House both have approved resolutions to probe this un-American act on the part of power-drunk federalites. The Congress of the United States is the only hope left in America to combat the steady and consistent drift toward total dictatorship.

The people in this country have no intention whatever of accepting the "four freedoms," which have been publicized so broadly as the exclusive freedoms for which we fight. Freedom from want, fear, religion, and speech could be enjoyed although a goodly number of the citizens were confined to concentration camps. The most sacred of all freedoms which caused our forefathers to settle here was the freedom of opportunity and the resultant right to work—when, where, and for whom one pleases.

I feel that it is necessary to pass additional laws to strip any official of the power to trample to the ground the sacred rights of patriotic citizens. I have introduced today the following bill, which should be speedily enacted into law:

A bill to impose certain restrictions upon the taking possession of business enterprises

SECTION 1. The President, or any other officer or agency, shall have no authority under the provisions of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or under any other provision of law, which authorizes the taking of possession by the Government of a strike-bound plant; to take possession of and/or operate such plant or business enterprise if it is carrying on essentially the same character of business that it was engaged in prior to December 7, 1941, unless such business enterprise is primarily and directly engaged in the manufacture, mining, or transportation of articles or materials necessary in the war effort.

SEC. 2. As used in this act the term "business enterprise" means any plant, mine, facility, or other industrial or business establishment.

A Worker Passes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, some of America's heroes of this war are seldom given the honor that is their due. All over the Nation men and women—many of them carrying a burden of age or physical handicap—are doing their work from day to day and taxing their strength to the very limit. In tribute to one such man, and through him, as a symbol of millions of others, I ask consent to include in the RECORD a brief paragraph from a letter recently received from one of my constituents, Miss Margaret Brown:

Tragedy struck Worth Bros. last Good Friday. Dick Pimely, of Pasadena, died. He worked the day before he died. He was my boss and I did not know it. I felt more as if he had been my dad. He was one of the kindly, worker type of men who keep the wheels of industry rolling—literally, and thus the wheels of America speeding on to victory. Dick has a boy overseas and a wife and sister at home. His sister lives here in Alhambra. Dick would oil my machine while it was running, Dick would put his arm around my shoulder and explain a detail about the threading of each spindle as Mr. Worth had explained or asked him to do when the men ran my frame after 3:30. Dick would arrive at 6:19 in the morning, turn on the heat and get the power going, and would work overtime until 4:30 every afternoon, except for the last week when the burning in his chest would cause Mr. Walter Worth or Roy to send him home. Just look how our older men are standing by America in her crisis and giving their lives.

The Truth About Liberty Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, when the history of this war is finally written, the contribution made by the men and women building ships in the shipyards of the Nation will rank high among the reasons for our success. They rightfully deserve high honors for their patriotic efforts to make ships and more ships available to carry the supplies to our men and allies throughout the world.

There has been much unjust criticism leveled at accidents in construction of a few of the Liberty ships which created defects causing failure. On the other hand, it is the overwhelming success in the construction of these Liberty ships that has contributed so largely to the successes we and our allies have had on far-flung battle fronts. The following editorial which recently appeared in the Los Angeles Times, entitled "The Truth About Liberty Ships" tells the story of their value and success:

THE TRUTH ABOUT LIBERTY SHIPS

The loss at sea of the Liberty ship *John Straub*, with an estimated loss of 55 lives, gives the critics of our war-emergency shipbuilding program a fresh supply of ammunition. The campaign of condemnation has been led by Senator MON C. WALLGREN and Representative WARREN G. MAGNUSON, both Democrats and both of the State of Washington. So far as can be determined from the record of hearings held on the subject by the Senate Truman committee to date, they are very largely in the minority in their denunciation of what Senator WALLGREN, himself a member of the committee, calls the major scandal of the Liberty ships.

Before hastily concluding, on the strength of the *Straub* disaster, that these Congressmen are right and the others, who include the head, members, and technical experts of the United States Maritime Commission and the country's ablest shipbuilders, are wrong, it may be well to assemble the established facts and look them over open-mindedly.

In so doing, it is also well to keep in mind that the Liberty ship was not only our best answer but our only practicable answer to the war's sudden and imperative demand for the largest possible cargo fleet in the shortest possible time. Undoubtedly we could have built ships with a broader margin of safety against emergency conditions requiring hasty loading, overloading, and schedules that had to be met regardless of wind, weather, distance, enemy sea raiders, and other risks of war. If we had, however, it can be said with a minimum of doubt that by now we should have lost the war—or at least have lost our Russian, British, and Chinese allies in it. In that case we would not need the cargo

ships, anyway, except the few we could employ in our own lone war against the combined and victory-enlarged strength of the Axis.

In other words, instead of the 2,500 new bottoms of roughly 30,000,000 aggregate tonnage which we have built since 1941 under the Liberty ship program, we should have been able to construct perhaps 400 of the older and—in one sense—doubtless safer types, or maybe 5,000,000 tons altogether. Since this number of vessels is fewer by about 300 than the toll of Axis submarines in the West Atlantic alone in the same interval, it seems probable that we should have lost all or nearly all of them by enemy action before they had much more than got started on their way with American war supplies for our allies.

What would have been the result? British authorities say that, in at least two separate periods of greatest danger, England was saved from collapse by the record rate of American shipbuilding alone. Stalin has said that our ship-borne lease-lend aid has been a large factor in enabling Russia to save herself and finally to turn back the invader. How much China, India, and Australia owe to the Liberty ship is not known, but it is at least a great deal, to say nothing of the war cargoes which have kept our own forces going in the Orient.

Now let's see how bad the Liberty ship "major scandal" actually has been.

The first Liberty built under the speedy new mass-production device of welding plates instead of riveting them was the *Patrick Henry*, launched at Baltimore September 27, 1941. She took about 240 days from keel-laying to delivery. This construction time was quickly lowered to a 64-day average, then to 50, 37, 25, and finally to the demonstration (nonschedule) record Kaiser performance of a completed ship in 7½ days. In December, last, we built 208 ships, an average of about 7 a day. Our record for all of 1941, practically all under the pre-Liberty system of construction, was 100 ships, or about 4 percent of the December rate of output.

To about mid March 1944 we had turned out about 2,200 Liberty ships. Of all these, the *Straub* is the sixth to break up at sea and the second on which lives have been lost. The first fatal accident to a Liberty was to the *John P. Gaines*, which split open in heavy Alaskan seas early last month. The crew took to lifeboats, and one of these, carrying 11 men, was lost in the fog. Total loss of life to date as a result of Liberty failures, 66. How many American and other Allied lives have they saved by expeditious overseas delivery of the tools of war?

This is, of course, only part of the story. According to testimony taken by the Truman committee here and elsewhere, about 170 Liberties altogether have developed structural defects, many of them minor. According to the National Maritime Commission, the national average of serious faults has been 3.23 percent, or about 70 ships altogether out of 2,200, which the National Maritime Commission says is "extremely low." Other witnesses put the number of "seriously faulty" ships at 65, those with "major faults" at 45. Congressman MAGNUSON'S count is 14 bad ones out of 1,700. Out of 333 deliveries from the Calship yards on Terminal Island, 8 developed serious defects after 1 to 22 months' service. Calship's rate of defectives has been 2.5 percent. The Kaiser yards at Portland, Oreg., have had 59 defectives (including minor faults) out of 300, but only 1 with even a minor defect in the last 97 turned out. All the Kaiser yards together have built 900 Liberties, or nearly half the total, and their over-all average of "serious faults" is included in the 3.23 percent national average.

Theoretically, of course, there should be no faults at all, but perfection in the hurry-scurry of wartime is too high a goal for practical realization. Better construction and inspection methods are lowering the defect rate and we are now getting started on construction of the Victory type of ships, faster and stronger vessels.

But for the emergency it so well met, the Liberty ship would have been hard to improve upon.

Refuting a Slander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 4, 1944:

REFUTING A SLANDER

The executive committee of the American Legion has adopted a report retracting the unjustifiable criticism heaped on Representative HAMILTON FISH, the America First Committee, and other Members of Congress who opposed intervention in the European war before Pearl Harbor. A resolution of censure was adopted at the Omaha convention of the Legion last year. The report of the executive committee now says that the Legion had "no right, in good conscience, directly or by inference or innuendo, to impugn the good faith or ascribe any subversive or un-American tendencies to either such persons, their point of view, or their program. It is unfortunate that we should not have kept our escutcheon untarnished."

The resolution attacking Representative FISH was the result of a conspiracy among a few unprincipled men who were attending the Omaha convention and most of the Legion members knew nothing about the resolution until it had been passed. The vicious people who were responsible for it were allies of the New Deal smear gang, and there is nothing in American history as vile as the workings of that cabal.

The action of the Legion's executive committee exonerating Representative FISH and expressing regret for the resolution does as much justice to the Legion as it does to HAMILTON FISH. The responsible leaders of the American Legion recognized that their organization was duped, and by denouncing and repudiating the Fish resolution they will be able to clear the Legion's good name and preserve the respect which the Legion has always commanded.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following letter from Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, which is self-explanatory:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, May 5, 1944.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAM: The report by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion was certainly a fine tribute to you, and you are worthy of everything they said. I am glad that Harry Colmery had a part in making this report. I am proud to say he is one of my best friends, and, furthermore, he is always right.

I would not be surprised if you are re-elected by the largest majority you have ever had. I certainly hope it will come that way.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

"American" Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the United States News, of May 12, 1944:

"AMERICAN" FASCISM

(By David Lawrence)

It can't happen here—no, not in America.

Here, of course, we believe in democracy—not totalitarianism.

Here we believe in courts of law—not government edicts enforced at the point of a bayonet.

Here we believe in labor unions, the right of self-organization, the right to strike, the right to lock out, the right to bargain collectively—not government control of labor unions enforced at the point of a bayonet.

The foregoing represented our thinking in America—indeed, our complacency—prior to April 26, 1944.

We now have entered a new epoch in American history—"the epoch of American fascism." It is not the kind that selects the same minorities for persecution that were selected abroad. It is not the kind that interferes with religious liberty, but it's the same brand of fascism that Hitler invoked when he ordered his own judges in the courts to decide cases in accordance with "local sentiment." It is the same kind that Mussolini introduced when he put labor unions under government control.

Many people have forgotten that Hitler's rise to dictatorship was thoroughly "constitutional." Every step along the way was buttressed by constitutional precedent—till he got possession of the government.

When Attorney General Biddle argued last week before Judge Holley in Federal court—not before he took military possession of Montgomery Ward but afterward—that the courts "ought" not to interfere with the Executive, he also said that the President has a "great constitutional reserve of power" and that "no business or property is immune to a Presidential order."

PLANT SEIZED ON BASIS OF DECREE, NOT COURT ORDER

Certainly in time of war there is ample authority for the President as Commander in Chief to do anything or everything to defend the Nation against military attack. Certainly, even in time of peace, the President as Commander in Chief can do almost anything to prevent armed insurrection. These are contingencies well understood and not at all pertinent to the present case.

What is pertinent is that the Roosevelt administration—using the powers and authority of the United States Government—seized a mail-order house at the point of a bayonet, never stopping to get a court order but merely presenting a piece of paper on which the President had written his own decree.

What is pertinent here also is that the national safety was not imperiled by waiting a few days to get a court order and to proceed in a lawful, constitutional manner to test the ambiguously worded statute.

PRESIDENT SHOULD HAVE ASKED FOR AID OF CONGRESS

When the War Labor Board last year ordered John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers of America to sign a contract after the Gov-

ernment had seized the properties and the coal miners were still on strike, the President was asked by newspapermen in a press conference what he was going to do about it. He asked what action he could take—send a little polite note on pink paper and say, "Dear Mr. Lewis, I hope you will sign the contract"?

Mr. Roosevelt was right then. He is wrong now. He should have asked Congress for authority then. He should have asked Congress for authority on April 26, 1944. The Congress has not proclaimed the "maintenance of membership" scheme as a national policy of labor relations in time of war. Such an important step, to be enforced, should have had legislative sanction. The War Labor Board has not had and does not now have any legal right to compel an employer to fire a man because he hasn't kept up his union dues or retained his membership in a union. There is no statute that permits coercion of the employee by the employer.

But the administration has usurped this power just the same. The labor unions will rue the day they acquiesced in government by bayonet in enforcing Government control of labor unions. In the February 19, 1943 issue of this magazine, William M. Leiserson, at present chairman of the National Railway Mediation Board and formerly a member of the National Labor Relations Board, and an outstanding exponent of trade unionism throughout many years, wrote:

"In the face of a critical Congress, now inclined to restrict the rights and privileges labor organizations have won, organized labor has concentrated its forces on the executive branch, and, in spite of the urgency of the war program, has made demands with little restraint. If organized labor were in the mood to take stock, it would discover that it is growing increasingly dependent on the executive branch of the Government, not only for those things that it ordinarily strives to get by collective bargaining with employers, but also for the maintenance of its own membership and the stability of its structure as a combination of labor organizations. Indeed, organized labor now moves in a vicious circle: As it resorts more and more to political action to achieve its objectives, it tends to divide its members and to disrupt its organization; then it must appeal to Government to use its coercive powers to force workers into unions or to prevent members from resigning.

"Never before has the labor movement considered it wise to compel membership by Government edict. For half a century, Samuel Gompers preached the gospel of voluntarism and won its acceptance by most collective-bargaining organizations. Under that policy, union men refused to work with nonmembers, using their bargaining strength to compel employment of members only; but the issue of the closed shop was normally considered nonarbitrable—unions being unwilling to delegate to any arbitrator the authority to force workers into a union or the correlative authority to keep them out. Now, however, the labor organizations seem to be of one mind, that they must get union security from the Government.

"To some extent the labor movement has committed itself to this policy because it fears an antiunion drive after the war which might destroy its gains. But it may be questioned whether unions are building security by having the Government compel thousands, perhaps millions, of working people to join or to remain members against their will."

MAINTENANCE OF MEMBERSHIP AS A LABOR POLICY

The War Labor Board says that it has made the "maintenance of membership" clause a national policy and that it must be included in contracts hereafter. Under its terms, employers agree to discharge anybody failing to keep up membership. In 291 cases between January 12, 1941, and February 29, 1944, involving "maintenance of membership," the National War Labor Board decided 271 in favor of compelling "maintenance of membership." This provided a guarantee of union dues from 1,409,050 workers.

During the same period, the regional war labor boards, basing their action on National War Labor Board precedents, granted "maintenance of membership" in 783 out of 817 cases involving 351,000 workers. These figures were issued by the War Labor Board.

The Board takes the position that the "maintenance of membership" scheme is a reward to labor for its "no-strike" pledge. But what about the employers who have maintained a "no-lockout" policy and have scrupulously adhered to it? What is their reward?

CAN BAYONETS BE USED TO ENFORCE ALL DIRECTIVES?

And what about the pledges given by the officials of the Roosevelt administration from the President down, and reiterated glibly by the War Labor Board itself, that the war emergency would not be used to exploit advantages by either labor or management? Is the use of the bayonet to force the unwilling hand of the employer to sign a "maintenance of membership" clause a fulfillment of that original pledge? This betrayal violates every concept of fair play, promotes distrust and intensifies disunity.

Senator BYRD in a public statement last week said:

"Have we reached a State in this country that the directives of a Federal bureau can be enforced at the point of the bayonet? If the directives of the War Labor Board can be so enforced on a nonwar business operation, then so can the directives issued by the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, and the dozens of other Government agencies, with the result that the constitutional rights of the citizens of America will be denied to them of adjudication of their rights in the proper court of law.

"In this instance, Mr. Biddle assumed the position of both the judge and the prosecutor. Are we coming to a gestapo in this country? Does Francis Biddle cherish the ambition to be an American Himmler?

"Our boys enlisted and were drafted to fight the Japs and the Germans. They did not enlist to enter the offices of businessmen throughout the country and drag the men from their businesses by physical force and thus violate the very principles of freedom at home which our sons are fighting and dying abroad to preserve.

"The American people are shocked by this unwarranted use of military power."

What is Congress going to do about it? What are the people saying to their Senators and Representatives about it? Or is Congress just another Reichstag—putty in the hands of the coercionists? The will of the people can still be expressed at the polls.

Resolution of the American-Italian Democratic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the American-Italian Democratic Club:

Whereas Dr. Gaetano Salvemini has been represented in the public press not only as opposing the continuation of the monarchy in Italy, but also as gratuitously charging President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill with being abysmally ignorant of European conditions; and

Whereas the American-Italian Democratic Club, while confirming its unequivocal opposition to the monarchy in Italy, is nevertheless convinced that both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are in a position to know all conditions in Italy, and to determine the best policy to follow, temporarily or otherwise, in order to achieve not only the liberation of Italy but also the supreme purpose of defeating the enemies of democracy in Europe; and

Whereas both President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill have, in enumerable occasions, shown their ability to direct the course of their respective governments with competence, firmness, and exhaustive knowledge of the tremendous international problems now confronting their nations and the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American-Italian Democratic Club expresses the most severe condemnation of the intemperate and unseemly remarks uttered by Professor Salvemini against the illustrious leaders of the two greatest democracies; and be it further

Resolved, That the American-Italian Democratic Club reaffirms its complete and unshaken confidence in the President of the United States and in his willingness and ability to use his great personality to further, and the great powers of the United States to defend, the cause of the world's democracy until its final and ultimate triumph.

Admiral King Absolves Congress of Leaving Guam Unfortified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 8, 1944:

ADMIRAL KING ABSOLVES CONGRESS OF LEAVING GUAM UNFORTIFIED

Demands that Admiral King, commander in chief of the United States Fleet and chief of naval operations explain the "false" and "unjustified" charges in his official report on the Navy at war that Congress was responsible for our failure to fortify Guam, yesterday brought an almost complete retraction of these allegations.

In a letter to Acting Secretary of Navy Forrestal, Admiral King completely absolved the Senate and gave almost a complete exoneration to the House to the accusations that have been employed in primary campaigns against Senators TYDINGS (D.), of Maryland; HOLMAN (R.), of Oregon; and NYE (R.) of North Dakota.

The letter in effect placed the blame for Guam going unfortified on President Roosevelt. It said the "essential desirability" for fortifying Guam was communicated to Congress in the report of the Hepburn Board of 1939, and orally by the chief of naval operations in the course of committee hearings on a House resolution to increase naval aviation

facilities on Guam. It said these recommendations never were incorporated in the bill.

While Admiral Arthur J. Hepburn, commander in chief of the Fleet, recommended fortifications costing $180,000,000 be built, neither the President nor the Navy made a direct request to Congress for such an appropriation. Admiral King skirted these facts, however, in his letter absolving Congress.

In his letter to Forrestal, Admiral King wrote:

"The essential desirability of fortifying Guam was communicated to Congress in the report of the Hepburn Board in 1939 and orally by the chief of naval operations in the course of the committee hearings on H. R. 2880 (76th Cong., 1st sess.), but these proposals were never embodied in formal draft legislation.

"Though the question of 'fortification' entered into the debate on said bill, it was not included in the bill as voted upon. The proposals relating to Guam that received adverse votes in Congress were:

"(A) A provision in H. R. 2880 (changed to H. R. 4278) introduced February 21, 1939, to establish, develop, or increase naval aviation facilities at Guam. (B) A provision in the 1940 naval appropriations bill for improvement of harbor channels at Guam."

Duplicate Inquiries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial published in the Washington Post, of Sunday, May 7, 1944. This editorial entitled "Duplicate Inquiries" is a discussion of the congressional attitude toward the seizure of Montgomery Ward's Chicago store, and I believe the points raised are worth the thoughtful consideration of the Members of this body:

DUPLICATE INQUIRIES

Further evidence of the deep concern of Congress over the seizure of Montgomery Ward's Chicago store may be seen in the House vote of 300 to 60 for a resolution authorizing another investigation of the incident. No doubt some who are chiefly interested in having Sewell Avery's arbitrary conduct further explored voted for the resolution. But for the most part the vote was a protest against the Government's arbitrary conduct in resorting to armed force to take over a plant not directly connected with the war effort. We share this anxiety over the reckless use of Executive power, but we also believe that the House investigation is likely to result in a waste of time and money.

Basically, the question raised by this seizure is a legal one. It must be determined by the courts. There is every indication that it will be carried to the Supreme Court, which means that the final decision may not be known before next year. Meanwhile we see no reason why two congressional committees should waste their time rehashing the facts of the company's defiance and the Government's use of armed force, which are already well known.

There is much sentiment in Congress for modification of the Connally-Smith Act, so as to make it absolutely plain that no authority has been granted to the President to seize civilian industries and commercial enterprises not supplying the Army and Navy. But in any event Congress would scarcely know how to draft such legislation until the courts have spoken. And if the courts should uphold the seizure under the Connally-Smith Act without passing upon the scope of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President would presumably go on taking over nonwar plants and stores that refuse to obey the W. L. B. regardless of anything that Congress might do.

This is indeed an anomalous situation for any democratic country to face, but it is part of a general problem of greatly expanded executive powers in wartime. The Senate Judiciary Committe was already making a general study of Executive orders and directives when the present case arose. Senator MCCARRAN sent an investigator to Chicago to look into the Montgomery Ward incident even before the Senate backed up that inquiry by passing the Byrd resolution. Hearings will also be held by this committee. To institute a separate House inquiry in the face of this elaborate effort to obtain all the facts for the information of Congress is an inexcusable waste of effort. The House could reasonably have asked the Senate for a joint inquiry. Or it could have asked its appropriate standing committee to look into the facts and determine, when feasible, whether new or additional legislation is desirable. The procedure it has chosen serves chiefly to emphasize the inefficiency of Congress as a legislative body and thus to distract attention from the power-grabbing proclivity of the administration.

Declaration of Policy on World-Wide Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication received by me from the Mechanicville (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce:

MECHANICVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Mechanicville, N. Y., April 21, 1944.

Hon. DEAN TAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAYLOR: You have no doubt noted the declaration of policy on world-wide aviation, as filed on July 15, 1943, with the Civil Aeronautics Board by the 16 signatory air lines. The Chamber of Commerce of Mechanicville has given careful consideration to and approval of the five following policies in international air transportation as defined in this declaration:

I. Free and open competition—world-wide—subject to reasonable regulation by the appropriate governmental agencies.

II. Private ownership and management.

III. Fostering and encouragement by the Government of the United States of a sound world-wide air-transportation system.

IV. Freedom of transit in peaceful flight—world-wide.

V. Acquisition of civil and commercial outlets required in the public interest.

The above objectives have been approved by this organization and we now therefore respectively urge that Congress incorporate and adopt the above five basic policies. With such commitment by Congress, the appropriate governmental agencies will then be enabled to direct their efforts so as to accomplish these desired objectives in their planning of foreign air-transportation routes to be operated by United States flag air carriers.

Respectfully yours,

O. W. KREUTZER,
Secretary.

We Are Fooling Ourselves About Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our recent struggle to simplify tax returns I desire to extend my remarks to include an interesting article, "We Are Fooling Ourselves About Taxes," which appeared in a recent issue of the Michigan State Labor Journal, Michigan's only independent union labor paper:

WE ARE FOOLING OURSELVES ABOUT TAXES

How much of the price of a 10-cent loaf of bread is taxes? I don't know exactly, but a large group of statisticians and tax experts investigated a number of such items for a couple of years and came up with the figure of "between 2 and 2½ cents." Two cents is not a considerable amount, but it is between 20 and 25 percent of the price of the loaf of bread, and that puts a different light on it.

How about your automobile? There must be 10,000 items of tax in an automobile. I believe there probably are 100,000 different tax items in a thousand-dollar car. They amount to close to $250. So, again, 25 percent of the cost of an automobile is taxes. But I do not know exactly how much and, like most of us, when I get my new car I am so excited about my new purchase, about its color and body lines, that I don't stop to worry about how much of it is taxes. Probably I wouldn't enjoy the car as much if I did know.

Does the figure of between 10,000 and 100,000 different items of taxes in an automobile sound farfetched? Well, take the smallest screw in an automobile, for example. Some of the taxes represented in that little screw are:

1. The income tax of the screw manufacturer. Also, that manufacturer's property tax, capital-stock tax, old-age and unemployment-insurance tax.

2. The machinery on which the screw was made contained all the above taxes for the machine manufacturer. The cutting and lubricating oil had many taxes on them, too.

3. When the machinery was transported and later when the screws were shipped by train or truck, they accumulated some more tax costs of the transportation agency.

4. The raw material from which the screw is made also has all the above types of taxes in it.

We could go farther and farther into the subject, but we are only talking about one screw. There are hundreds of screws, bolts,

rivets, etc., in a car. Take the carburetor alone and think of all the parts entering into it and each part with all these dozens of taxes in it. So you see, perhaps 100,000 is still too low. And you can see why neither you nor I know exactly how much the tax is.

The Treasury Department and the White House, according to some recent headlines, are still opposed to the sales tax. The C. I. O. has also expressed its opposition to the direct sales tax. They all say they don't like it because it bears too heavily on lower income groups. But the real reason ought to be pretty obvious.

Taxes that are all covered up like those I have been describing are called hidden taxes. The sales tax, income tax, withholding tax or property tax are called direct taxes, because you pay them directly as such and you know how much you are paying because you make out a check for the amount or fork it over in greenbacks.

But, when you pay between 20 and 25 percent of the price of a loaf of bread or a new car in taxes which are hidden from you, you seldom realize at the time that you are paying it and it doesn't occur to you to check up and find out exactly how much of it is taxes. For example, do you realize that the Federal taxes on cigarettes and on liquor are from twice to four times as much as the total factory cost of making the cigarettes or the liquor? This is a fact.

Well, and so what?

Just this. When you spent $1,000 for a new car, what is it really for? What are you getting for your money? The taxes are a part of the price of the car, but they are not a part of the car, like one of its accessories. Seven hundred and fifty dollars is for the car. Two hundred and fifty dollars more or less, is the cost of Government hidden in the price of the car. When you pay for the car, and for your bread, meat, clothes, and cigarettes, you are really paying a large and unknown amount of wages to various Government employees.

Now, suppose all taxes were direct. When you went to the grocery for a loaf of bread, the grocer would tell you, "It's 8 cents for the bread and 2 cents for taxes." The car dealer would say, "The car is $750 and there is a tax of $250." The liquor dealer would say, "It's 75 cents for the quart of whisky and $3 more for tax." You would probably yelp in amazement and disbelief. You wouldn't like it a bit and neither would any of your friends and they would want to see something done about it pretty fast.

You would all sit down at the end of a month and figure out this tax business and you'd begin to realize what it was costing you, in pleasures you could have had, to be supporting millions of Government employees all over the country. And you would begin to inquire very minutely into just what these employees were doing to be earning your dough. You might even say, "Why not let about half of them quit living off my wages and start working in factories and on the farms producing for a change."

That's the tax story in a nutshell. If it's a direct tax, you know "how much and when." A sales tax is a direct tax and you do know. A sales tax doesn't have to be uniform in rate. It could be 10 percent on food, 15 percent on clothes, 25 percent on cars and gasoline, 50 percent on jewelry, diamonds, and so forth, 100 percent on cigarettes and liquor and 200 percent on motorboats, yachts, and club memberships to "soak the rich" if you wanted it that way.

Of course, with such sales taxes in operation, all corporation taxes should be canceled. You realize that you pay the "corporation" taxes anway, as we have just demonstrated in talking about the taxes included in even one small screw on your car. The corporation simply collects all the taxes involved from you and passes them on to the Government.

And now you see why the politicians shy away from the sales tax as if it were rank poison. The answer as to whether or not a sales tax is a good tax is answered by another question—"good for whom?" It is good for the taxpayer and the consumer, but it might be bad—very bad—for a lot of people with their fingers in the political pork barrel.

The Cartel Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the address of Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York bar, before Institute on Postwar Reconstruction, New York University, April 19, 1944:

"Cartel" is the newest epithet in the antitrust vocabulary.

This word has now been so overworked that it is fast losing all its sting.

This point was reached last January 1944, when a motor-carrier consolidation, which had been expressly authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission after full hearings, report, and argument, and later had been unanimously approved by a statutory three-judge court after full hearings and argument, and later after appeal and argument before the Supreme Court had been approved in an exhaustive Supreme Court opinion, was nevertheless called a cartel by the two dissenting Supreme Court Justices.

"Cartel" means today, therefore, merely something that somebody happens to dislike.

Most of the international trade agreements attacked as cartels by the Department of Justice rest on patent license limitations and conditions based on Supreme Court decisions whose authority was unquestioned before 1938.

Since 1938 the Supreme Court has been narowing its interpretation of the patent laws, and stretching its interpretation of what the antitrust laws forbid, so that today there is legal doubt about limitations and conditions in patent agreements which before 1938 rested securely on Supreme Court decisions in which had concurred such precursors and stalwarts of the New Deal as Justice Holmes, Justice Brandeis, and Justice (now Chief Justice) Stone.

In this new area into which the Supreme Court has been beckoning and leading since 1938, it is hardly strange that the Department of Justice is now instituting many new prosecutions.

Deficient in petroleum, rubber, quinine and numerous other materials essential in case of war, and deficient also in seapower by which to import them in case of embargo or war, Germany concentrated for many years on chemical research and production synthetically on a commercial scale products or substitutes of these materials.

With respect to these strategic materials, German universities have graduated more chemists, and German governments have aided more chemical research and production on a commercial scale, than any other nation in the world.

America and Great Britain did not concentrate on these things, because for a small fraction of the cost of producing these synthetics America and Great Britain could produce or import the natural materials themselves, and because America and Great Britain, unlike Germany, were always confident that their sea power could enable them to import any materials they did not themselves produce.

Because of all this, German chemical companies led the world in chemical research and production synthetically on a commercial scale of products and substitutes of petroleum, rubber, quinine, and other strategic materials, and the governments of every nation in the world, especially the United States and Great Britain, in consideration of the public disclosure of these German inventions, were issuing in the 1920's and 1930's to German chemical companies and their nominees thousands of patents covering thousands of German inventions.

If "Patents for Hitler" had been "Germany's Master Plan," those German chemical companies should have kept for themselves the patents they thus obtained from the Governments of the United States and Great Britain and every other nation in the world.

Just the opposite happened, however.

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's American industrialists, now defamed by the authors of various books, articles, statements, and speeches as traitors or saps, or both, succeeded in obtaining from the "supermen" and "herrenvolk" directing these German chemical companies, now acclaimed by Dr. Goebbels and these authors as the intellectual and business masters of these American industrialists, the right and "know how" to develop and improve upon and manufacture on a gigantic scale German inventions covered by these German-owned patents.

This has enabled America in its hour of greatest need to produce 100-octane aviation gasoline now used by all bombers and fighters of the United Nations, and buna synthetic rubber which is the chief part of the Government's present synthetic rubber program, and substitutes for quinine like atabrine whose production has been raised from 5,000,000 tablets annually before this war to over 1,000,000,000 tablets in 1943, without which American troops could not take the field against the Japs in the Solomon Islands or New Guinea or China or in any other malaria-infected region of the world.

To obtain for American industry the right and "know-how" to use the German inventions covered by these German-owned patents, American industrialists had to come to terms with the German companies owning these patents.

If all that a German company would grant was a right and "know-how" under a United States patent, the American industrialist had no right to manufacture or sell in South America, for a United States patent is, of course, limited to the United States.

This explains why some German inventions manufactured and sold within the United States have not been sold in South America.

Sometimes a German company would grant only a limited right and "know how" under a United States patent, restricting the American industrialist in respect to the quantity of the product he might manufacture under the German invention, the price at which he might sell it, and the purpose for which, the manner in which, and the geographical area within which he might manufacture and sell it.

Sometimes a German company would grant the right and "know how" only on the condition that the American industrialist would grant to the German company a reciprocal right and "know how" in improvements discovered or invented by the American industrialist in the field opened up by the German invention.

Foreign trade that in no way involves patent agreements seems also to be engaging the Department of Justice's attention.

A typical foreign trade pattern is this:

An American national gets a foothold in a foreign country, and its success attracts competition in that country from other American nationals, and from nationals of that country, and from nationals of other foreign countries.

American nationals continue competing in that foreign country with one another, and with nationals of that country, and with nationals of other foreign countries, until the nationals of that country, or the government of that country, or both, become restive and critical of the extent to which American nationals are winning the market in that country.

Thereupon the nationals of that country, or their government, or both, intimate to these American nationals that unless they consent to an arrangement restricting their proportion of the market in that country, or limiting their competition in that country with one another and with nationals of that country and with nationals of other foreign countries, the government may enact a tariff, or impose import quotas, or establish a government monopoly, or take other measures to oust American nationals from continuing the business they have built up in that country.

On other continents outside North America such arrangements are customary, lawful, and encouraged by governments, and by public opinion, and by generations of judicial decisions and trade custom.

Arrangements analogous to these have repeatedly been upheld by judicial decisions of the House of Lords and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which are the highest courts of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Not as a complaint against our Supreme Court and our antitrust laws, but as a plain statement of fact, it is axiomatic that American nationals doing business abroad must frequently condition themselves to customs and pressures of foreign governments, foreign public opinion, and foreign competitors, compelling arrangements which, if made and operative within the United States, might be contrary to recent decisions of our Supreme Court and other Federal courts.

If American nationals, under these circumstances, are liable to prosecution by the Department of Justice, they will be as completely barred by the United States from doing business abroad as were the nationals of China and Japan during the centuries when these were the "hermit nations."

The United States with its allies is now engaged in a devastating war.

With the peace will come international problems of the utmost difficulty.

The United States has a democratic political system and a competitive economic system.

The United States does not intend to coerce Great Britain, Soviet Russia, China, and the rest of the post-war world to adopt the democratic political system of the United States.

But in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice of the United States some officials now appear eager to coerce Great Britain, Soviet Russia, China, and all the rest of the world to adopt the competitive system of the United States, with all the refinements added by successive decisions of the Supreme Court under the antitrust laws.

This program these Department of Justice officials are now carrying out in the midst of the greatest war in history, instituting every kind of criminal and civil prosecution in their power for the purpose of injecting into foreign and international trade relationship every new requirement of competition that can be spelled out of the Supreme Court's ever-expanding interpretations of the antitrust laws.

President Wilson, in the First World War, foresaw the folly of all this, and also the folly of subjecting Americans doing business abroad to all the requirements of all the American antitrust laws, as well as all the requirements of all the laws of the foreign countries where they are doing business, while the foreigners against whom they are competing abroad need comply only with the laws of the foreign countries where they are doing business.

To correct this obvious injustice and absurdity, Congress during the First World War enacted at President Wilson's insistence the Webb Export Trade Act of 1918, which now, however, is quite out of date.

Without delay, therefore, the State Department, the Department of Justice, the Foreign Economic Administration, and every other Government department and agency pertaining to this subject should promptly collaborate in framing and recommending to Congress legislation to meet this situation, so that now in this present Second World War and for all the post-war period there can be achieved all the objectives that President Wilson sought to attain when he procured the enactment of the Webb Export Trade Act in 1918.

Resolution of the Ohio Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Ninety-fifth General Assembly of Ohio:

Senate Resolution 51

Resolution to provide that the State of Ohio be recognized in the naming of a street in the Nation's Capital and in the naming of a battleship in her honor.

Whereas the State of Ohio stands at the head of the list of States in many respects and near the head of the list in all respects; and

Whereas the sons and daughters of the Buckeye State have heaped laurels on her fair name in the fields of science, literature, art, commerce, and industry; and

Whereas in the arts of war and in the arts of peace Ohio stands forth renowned and distinguished, ever ready to fight the battles for liberty and freedom, and at the same time a bulwark of strength to the weak and the oppressed; and

Whereas in this most terrific war of all history Ohio's sailors and marines and WAVES and SPARS man every American battleship, every cruiser, every destroyer, every submarine, and every war craft afloat today that ride the waves of the seven seas: Therefore be it

Resolved, In conformity to the rank and position of the State of Ohio in the great sisterhood of States, it is deemed most fitting and proper that the name of the fair State of Ohio assume due recognition in the Nation's Capital on equal footing with her sisters of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, in that an avenue or boulevard bear the name of Ohio, in the city of Washington, the most beautiful city in the world, and the Capital of the greatest Nation in the world, out of respect to one of the indestructible links from which that Nation has been forged, and in keeping with the honor, dignity, and prestige of the Buckeye State; and be it further

Resolved, While Ohio does not grace the shore line of the Atlantic or the Pacific, her contribution to the naval history of our Nation from the time of Perry's victory on Lake Erie in 1813, when Capt. James Lawrence's dying words: "Don't give up the ship" became the battle cry of Perry and his men, down to this very day and hour, when our sailors and marines shed their blood and die in the far-flung waters of the seven seas in order that liberty and freedom may not perish from the face of the earth, would merit the feeling of pride on the part of residents of Ohio, who should be able to point to the achievements of a battleship bearing the name of their native State, and that the name Ohio no longer remain an obsolete word in the lexicon of the present American Navy, and that the name Ohio grace the prow of one of the new battleships that our country will be building in the near future; and be it further

Resolved, That a properly authenticated copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the senate to the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, to John Russell Young, president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and to the United States Senators and to each of the Members of Congress from Ohio.

I, Thomas E. Bateman, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution 51 adopted by the Ohio Senate on April 27, 1944.

THOMAS E. BATEMAN,
Clerk of the Senate.

Great Britain and Post-War Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of a most interesting speech, indeed, made in the Canadian House of Commons by the Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply, on the subject of post-war aviation. It will be recalled that Mr. Howe on that occasion advised the Canadian House of Commons that due to Canada's experience in air transportation Canada would require that all modes of surface transport divorce themselves from control of air transport within 1 year after the current war. Canada had tried control of an air carrier by surface transport. It did not work. Hence the decision of the Canadian Government.

Along this line the House will be interested to know that a similar situation took place in the British House of Commons. In the debate of March 14, 1944, on page 147, Sir Archibald Sinclair, Secretary of State for Air in Great Britain, said:

Just as I have always fought the idea that the air force should be split up and developed as ancillary to the Army and Navy, so I believe it would be short-sighted to allow the growth of civil aviation to be subordinated to the interests of older forms of transport.

A little further on in the same speech on page 150, we find Sir Archibald Sinclair, in replying to a statement by Lord Beaverbrook to the effect that in England a chosen instrument had no monopoly of anything in international aviation except a monopoly of subsidies, stating as follows:

It is true that at present there is no statutory bar to the operation of unsubsidized services by other interests, but I am afraid that only the most lucrative routes would be attractive to those other interests, and I cannot help doubting whether Parliament would approve of a policy which left the most profitable routes to private enterprise, and left the state to shoulder the burden of the unprofitable. Moreover * * * governments are hardly like to seek from foreign countries * * * facilities for private undertakings to compete against a public corporation, to deprive it of profitable traffic, to leave it * * * with the Cairo to Karachi route and to take from it the New York to London route, thereby increasing the burden on the taxpayer of maintaining the public corporation, which would be indispensable for national, imperial, colonial, commercial, and defense purposes.

West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the act creating the grade of cadet in the Army. I include an editorial entitled "West Point," from the New York Times of Sunday, May 7, 1944. Few congressional actions have brought so many rich returns to the people of this country as those which founded the United States Military Academy at West Point, and which have aided in the development of this institution to its present state of excellence.

WEST POINT

The United States Military Academy at West Point observes today the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the passage of a congressional act creating the grade of cadet in the Army. That act was the real beginning of the West Point of the present, though the act creating the academy itself had to wait 8 years. Both measures were the fruit of the foresight and the persistence of George Washington.

As early as the dark year 1776 Washington had seen the need for a school in which men should be trained in military science in readiness for emergencies that might come. He had had enough, he said, of officers ignorant of their profession; he yearned for "men that may give luster to our arms." He kept the vision before him, and always, in his opinion, the place for the school was the already historic West Point, then "the key to America." He visited the post in 1783 and in imagination saw the great establishment that now stands there.

The young country was slow to catch his idea. It was tired of war and had no military ambitions. It wanted to turn to the business of peacetime and enjoy the freedom the now disbanded Army had won. Americans of that generation were very like those of later ones. But Washington, in his annual message as President in 1793, still urged that the system of national defense should "afford an opportunity for the study of those branches of the art which can scarcely be attained by practice alone." It was in response to that appeal that Congress at last passed the act which West Point recalls today.

After a century and a half, no citizen needs to be told what West Point has meant to the well-being of the United States. Woven in the fabric of our history is a shining line of men who once were cadets on the sightly parade ground in the Hudson highlands: Grant and Lee, Jackson and Sherman, Pershing, March, and Bullard. And now again, in the grimmest ordeal of our years as a Nation, we put our hope and our faith in West Pointers whose watchword is that of their school: "Duty, honor, country."

What About That Canal Proposal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal of May 6, 1944:

WHAT ABOUT THAT CANAL PROPOSAL?

More information than is readily available seems necessary in reaching a conclusion as to advisability of the Government—which means the taxpayers—expending close to $40,000,000 to construct a canal from the Ohio River to Struthers, which is in the Ohio steel mill district.

It appears that such a proposal is before Congress, presented by Senator BURTON and endorsed by Senator TAFT, but, oddly enough, it is reported from Washington that J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Congressman from this district, spoke against it, which arouses interest as Mr. MCGREGOR'S position is usually quite soundly taken.

As nearly as can be judged, with information incomplete, the canal project is one that has bobbed up from time to time for a number of years, promoted by what is termed "Youngstown interests," and said to be opposed by the entire steel industry with the exception of a few mills in Youngstown.

Explanation offered by the Upper Ohio Valley Association, formed some years ago to oppose the project, is that "these mills want a cheaper method of bringing coal from their captive mines in Pennsylvania to the Youngstown mills, and a less expensive way of delivering the finished product.

"This desire may be natural," the opposing association says, "but to ask other mills and taxpayers everywhere to stand the expense of building and maintaining an outmoded, subsidized form of transportation for the use of two or three steel plants doesn't sound economical or fair."

Which gives what is called the Beaver-Mahoning Canal proposal all the elements of controversy, and if the facts are as stated by the Upper Ohio Valley Association spokesmen it may appear that our Congressman is justified in opposing the measure, even though he may be running counter to views of our Senators.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address recently delivered by me on America's Town Hall Meeting of the Air program in Philadelphia:

Do we have a positive foreign policy now? Emphatically we have. Whatever the shortcomings of the past may have been, today our foreign policy is one which we and the rest of the world can understand and one of which every American citizens may well be proud. There is nothing secret or evasive about it. It is not a statement of vague principles. It blazes a trail that those who will can find and follow. It has developed into a clear-cut bill of rights for men and nations everywhere, and the enunciation of our foreign policy has been followed up by dynamic action on the part of our Government.

As Secretary of State Hull has said, in determining our foreign policy we must first see clearly where our true national interests are. So, necessarily, the first aim of our foreign policy is to win the war. To win the war there must be unity among the United Nations. To attain unity some nation must lead by word and example. That nation has been the United States.

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill in the Atlantic Charter proclaimed the principles of liberty, economic opportunity, peace, and security through international cooperation.

To chart a course of united action on the basis of the Atlantic Charter our Government proposed to the nations of the earth still outside of the Axis orbit a joint declaration as to a course of united war action.

Not only representatives of the United States, Great Britain, China, and Russia signed the document known as the Declaration by United Nations, but also 22 other nations. Since that time, 9 others have come into the fold. Thus 35 nations have pledged all of their resources to the winning of the war and bound themselves to make no separate peace with the enemy.

The next objective of our foreign policy was to promote the future security of our country by taking definite steps to weld the United Nations together for a course of postwar action calculated to insure international cooperation for the preservation of the peace.

There were many who scoffed at Mr. Hull when he took his brief case in his hand and went to Moscow for conferences with Stalin and representatives of China and Great Britain with that object in view. But those who scoffed remained to pray. Mr. Hull came back from Moscow with his—and I say "his" advisedly—historic document signed, sealed, and delivered.

To put it briefly that declaration of four great powers states that their united action in prosecuting the war will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security; that they will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of their common enemies; that they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization of all peace-loving states to maintain peace and security.

In the years to come this document will be recognized as the forerunner of a new era in history. This agreement was brought into

being through the leadership of the positive and strongly asserted foreign policy of the United States.

Thus our foreign policy became a two-edged sword—one the one side cooperative effort to win the war; on the other, international cooperation to preserve the peace. The initial move in each case was made by those in charge of the foreign policy of the United States.

To implement the Atlantic Charter and the declaration of the United Nations, the President himself, in the interest of harmony and unity of purpose, went abroad, and at Teheran he, Churchill, and Stalin broadened and made more definite the policy of cooperation and agreement, both as to the winning of the war and the preservation of peace thereafter.

At Cairo, the President, Mr. Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek further agreed on war policies in the Pacific, and there agreed that Japan after our victory would be forced to disgorge her ill-gotten territorial gains.

As a further step along the road to cooperation and understanding, the European Advisory Commission suggested by the Moscow conferences has been appointed to study and examine the various European questions arising as the war develops.

There have been held already two great United Nation conferences, both in the United States, on the questions of relief and rehabilitation and food. Our representatives are also meeting with representatives of the other United Nations to study post-war educational policies. Another group is trying to solve the problem of international post-war civil aviation. These are only a few of the vital questions which may be solved by cooperative spirit.

I reassert that the foreign policy of the United States can easily be understood not only by the people of our own country but also by other peoples everywhere. On more than one occasion its main points have been published to the world. They are:

1. Destruction of fascism and nazi-ism.
2. Creation of an international organization backed by force to keep the peace.
3. Reduction of international trade barriers.
4. Simplification of international finance.
5. Sovereign equality of nations.
6. Freedom of people to choose their form of government.
7. Nonintervention.
8. Arbitration of differences.
9. Establishment of an international court of justice.
10. Discouragement of spheres of influence and alliances.
11. No secret agreements or commitments, political or financial.

It is not an easy thing for those in charge of the foreign affairs of a democracy to put into effect a definite sustained course of foreign policy because in a democracy any such policy is subservient to the will of the people. It is doubly hard in the United States to formulate a definite and permanent foreign policy on account of our two-party system of government and our constitutional provision requiring ratification of all treaties by two-thirds vote of the Senate. The President and Mr. Hull, however, have shown sympathetic understanding of our constitutional processes and on all occasions have consulted and gone hand in hand with Congress on matters of foreign policy. The passage by an overwhelming vote of the Fulbright and Connally resolutions calling for an international organization to maintain a just and lasting peace bespeaks cooperation and agreement between the legislative and Executive in this field.

It should be kept in mind that during wartime our military and diplomatic effort must be carefully coordinated, and this is the case on all fronts of the world today.

Then too, don't forget that this is election year under our two-party system. This is a time when the record of the party in power is being critically scanned for flaws in both the fields of foreign and domestic policy.

It is being said that our foreign policy is not definite, and does not go enough into detail. The best answer to that charge is the declaration of the Republican Party at the Mackinac conference last fall, which said:

"1. We declare our approval of responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

"2. At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives will be impossible and specific commitments of this council of the Republican Party or by the Nation would be unwise."

What better defense of our present foreign policy could be wanted?

Steadfastly, the President and Secretary of State have pursued main objectives. They have properly refused to be diverted by selfish bickering here and abroad. It must be heartening to them that the great opposition party has voiced approval of the keynotes of their foreign policy. Never was there more urgent need for unity in that field. In the words of Benjamin Franklin: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

Aviation Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the Tennessee Bureau of Aeronautics, the first program for mass aviation indoctrination of high-school teachers to be held anywhere in the United States will begin shortly at Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tenn.

During the course of that special program at least 1,000 Tennessee high-school teachers will be given an intensive course of instruction in basic aviation training which will aid them in teaching subjects related to flying in the public schools.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include here a press release which explains briefly the nature of that program.

It follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN., April 13.—America's first program for mass aviation indoctrination of high-school teachers will get under way May 22, 1944, in Tennessee, Col. Herbert Fox, executive director of the Tennessee Bureau of Aeronautics, announced today.

Under an agreement entered into yesterday between the bureau of aeronautics and Austin Peay State College, 100 Tennessee high-school teachers qualifying for scholarships will be given basic aviation training which will aid them in teaching subjects related to aviation in the public schools of the State.

Twelve weeks of ground school instruction, coupled with 10 hours of dual-control flight instruction will be given under the direction of the college at Clarksville, and expenses of teachers holding scholarships will be defrayed by the bureau of aeronautics.

W. Percy McDonald, chairman of the bureau, in a statement accompanying the announcement of the agreement, said: "Flight indoctrination training of high-school teachers in the State is but the latest step in the program of the Tennessee Bureau of Aeronautics and Gov. Prentice Cooper to further aviation education in the schools and colleges of the State. The youth of Tennessee is air-minded, as shown by the fact that the Army and Navy have recruited more aviation cadets in Tennessee than in any other State in the Southeast.

"The application of such standard high-school subjects as mathematics, physics, and history of aviation is now being stressed in our schools. Governor Cooper and the bureau are convinced that teachers who have received ground school instruction and some actual flight training will be better able to teach such subjects to air-minded students.

"It is not our intention to make pilots of teachers who receive the instruction; but to qualify thm to speak with authority on aviation subjects. If the fight-indoctrination program meets with the success we anticipate, we hope to be able to extend our work to the colleges of the State in connection with our already extensive college-airport program."

Under the agreement just made public, the Bureau of Aeronautics will provide scholarships for the hundred teachers, with at least one teacher-student being selected from each county.

Applications for scholarships may be made by high-school teachers of good ability and good health who expect to continue to teach in the high schools of Tennessee. All applicants must be recommended in writing by the county superintendents of their counties; and the qualifications of applicants will be passed upon by the college, with the assistance of the State board of education, county superintendents, and high-school principals.

If any county fails to accept its scholarship allotment by May 10, 1943, the scholarship will be allotted to another county—preferably one with a large population.

Teachers receiving scholarships will be provided with room and board at the college, and will be furnished transportation to and from Outlaw Field at Clarksville during actual flight instruction.

The college, which has operated a war-training-service program for the Federal Government through 8 classes of naval cadets, will give the ground-school course covering 210 hours of classroom instruction. The subjects covered will be: Civil air regulations, navigation, aerology, recognition, code, engines and aircraft, values and problems of aviation, and seminar discussion of high-school problems.

Members of the college faculty who have had experience in instructing civilian pilots and Army and Navy cadets will be in charge of ground-school work.

Actual flight indoctrination training will be furnished by Knapp Flying Service, Clarksville, under direct contract with the college.

Flight indoctrination training will cover 10 hours in the air, and the 10 hours have been divided into three divisions.

Division one, which covers 5 hours, will include some 12 elementary flight maneuvers, ranging from familiarization with airplane and cockpit procedures through take-offs and landings.

Division two will include 2 hours' demonstration and practice of spins and stalls, recovery from poor landings, and primary emergency-landing procedures.

Division three will cover a 3-hour cross-country flight from Clarksville to Nashville to Smith's Grove, Kentucky to Clarksville. This flight, which will climax the flight training, will furnish an actual demonstration of navigation, flight plans, traffic control, weather report utilization, use of check points, etc. Scholarship students will actually participate in all phases of such a flight.

The Tennessee Bureau of Aeronautics has appropriated approximately $25,000 to defray the costs of the program.

Dangerous Curves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House know Mr. David L. Behncke, president of Air Line Pilots Association. Recently I received a copy of the magazine, Air Line Pilot, and I read Mr. Behncke's editorial which I think every Member of the House should read:

DANGEROUS CURVES

In post-war planning there are dangerous curves ahead. It makes little difference what kind of post-war planning it is, whether it be in air-line transportation, domestic or international, or in any other industry.

To begin with, the Jap-rats and the never-had-a-free-thought-of-their-own squareheads are not yet licked. We have all heard the time-worn adage about not counting one's chicks before they are hatched, and about the famous turtle and the hare race. It is up to those on the firing line to not play the part of the hare, and it is up to those at home to back them up by not letting up on their hatching. That's today's most vital concern.

In civil aviation post-war planning we hear much of one instrument air lines, free air international policy, and so forth, and there have been so many formal applications for the extension of existing routes and new routes filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board, which, if placed end to end, would quite likely cover a greater number of air-route miles than this country will ever be able to support.

Why are there dangerous curves ahead in post-war planning? Simply because no one can say just where we're headed. When on a strange road caution must be exercised or one may run up to a dangerous curve so abruptly that disaster can be the only result. Nowadays we hear much about the dangers of inflation, referring, of course, to monetary values. There are other kinds of inflation. The most dangerous of which is inflationary post-war thinking and planning. Overselling and overpromoting post-war air-line transportation is unwise and a dangerous inflationary trend. So much of this is going on that a certain amount of debunking is obviously necessary or we are bound to overrun the curves ahead.

Here are a few shining examples—statements sorely in need of debunking: "Our country will ride to a new unprecedented high wave of prosperity after the war because of the growth of air transportation." "Air-line transportation must be prepared to furnish employment to everyone who has had aviation training." "Air lines will be extended to every city, town, and hamlet in the country."

Now for a bit of debunking. Air-line growth will have some, but, unfortunately, a very limited effect on post-war economic and prosperity factors. Post-war air-line transportation will be able to furnish employment to many, but again, unfortunately, far from all of aviation's wartime trained personnel. When the men formerly in active air-line employment, now on active duty with the armed forces, return to their jobs from which they have been furloughed, the air-carrier industry employment possibilities will be greatly lessened. There will be air lines to all cities and communities that can reasonably support such service, and no more.

Summarizing, big talk is necessary to promote anything, but debunking is also vital to keep things on a sound and realistic footing. Bubbles are nice to look at, but they burst very easily.

To remember that there are dangerous curves ahead in all post-war planning is only being fair to labor, industry, and to our country. Most of it is bamboozling, and unless we want to be bamboozled we'd better keep the trusty old salt shaker handy and remember always that well-known grain of salt, and let's remember, too—first, last, and always—we still have a very rough and tough war on our hands, which is today a very long way from being won. Yes; and don't forget to buy that battle bond each month. It's still the best investment ever—an investment in the good old United States of America—and that isn't bamboozling.

DAVID L. BEHNCKE.

The Union Pacific Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Will P. Kennedy, from the Washington Star:

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

The celebration next Wednesday of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the completion of the Union Pacific Railroad, uniting by rail the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, emphasizes how Congress has exercised its powers enumerated in the Constitution "to provide for the common defense and general welfare," "to establish post offices and post roads," "to promote the progress of science and useful arts." Congress passed statutes of July 1, 1862, and amended July 2, 1864, "to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes." Thus Congress, according to a report from the select committee of the House, incorporated the Union Pacific Railroad Co., thereby uniting the railroad systems of the Eastern States with the railroad system of California, strengthening the bonds of union between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and leading to development of the immense resources of the great central portion of the North American continent—creating a new route of commerce from the Atlantic and Europe to the Pacific and Asia. As a transportation and communication system during these emergency days of the present global war, this railroad and telegraph line authorized by Congress 82 years ago has done honor to the foresight of Congress. It has been a bond of steel uniting the Nation.

The famous golden spike joining the rails at Promontory Point, Utah, on May 10, 1869, was driven by Governor Stanford of California and Thomas C. Durant, vice president of the Union Pacific.

Three months after Congress had authorized that "railroad and telegraph line," another great pioneer service—the Pony Express—which had contributed an heroic and exciting chapter to American history ceased operation after its dauntless riders, the youngest of whom was a 14-year-old boy later known as Buffalo Bill Cody, had covered through Indian-infested territory 650,000 miles carrying 30,000 pieces of mail, with loss of only one pouch. The Pony Express quit when telegraph lines advancing from east and west were joined. The Union Pacific Co. took over the pony route from St. Joseph, Mo., through Forts Kearney, Laramie, and Bridger, Salt Lake City, Carson City to San Francisco (Sutter's Fort).

Simplification of Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the simplification of tax returns through the proposed legislation will mark a tremendous step forward in tax collection. By eliminating the need of some 30,000,000 wage earners to file returns, the annual headache inflicted upon the Nation by its financial doctors will give way to a very mild indisposition. When we take the next forward step by making all tax returns a simple statement without complicated mathematical computations, we shall have solved the problem of simplification. All that remains then will be the creation of some device whereby comparable ease in paying the bill may be attained.

Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Des Moines Association of Accident and Health Underwriters at a meeting on April 3, 1944:

Be it resolved by the Des Moines Association of Accident and Health Underwriters, assembled at Des Moines, Iowa, That we are unalterably opposed to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill now pending before the United States Congress for the reasons that:

1. Said bill, or any other bill, providing universal unemployment compensation, old-age retirement pensions, accident and sickness disability benefits, together with hospital or medical care, would increase present individual Federal income and social security taxes more than 29 percent.

2. Said bill would regiment patients, hospitals and physicians, thereby destroying individual incentive and free competition with a resulting reduction in medical standards.

3. Said bill would create a gigantic Government monopoly readily available for patronage purposes, and susceptible to the political whims of the party in power.

4. Said bill would eventually destroy private accident and health insurance companies who, through free competition and

free enterprise, have provided adequate and economical insurance protection since 1847. These same companies today provide sound and economical accident and health protection for nearly one-third of all citizens of the United States. It is inconceivable that an inexperienced Federal bureaucracy could provide accident and health protection upon any adequate or economical basis.

5. Said bill, if enacted, would surely prove that "the power to tax is the power to destroy."

Address by Senator Barkley at Thomas Jefferson Dinner, Hotel Commodore, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very learned and interesting address delivered by our majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], at the Democratic Jefferson Day dinner held last evening at the Hotel Commodore, in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, it is fortunate that in these tragic days of struggle and sacrifice we can meet in the name and under the continuing inspiration of Thomas Jefferson.

The struggle of which I speak is one that is being waged not only for the preservation of the human rights which Jefferson did so much to establish, but also the right to assemble as we are assembled here, to discuss and debate them.

No such right exists now anywhere in that part of the world controlled by our enemies; and no such right will exist here if our enemies should triumph in this war. We meet, therefore, with a background of a century and a half of political, economic, and social development for which Jefferson's philosophy prepared the way.

Faced as we are with the most stupendous and world-embracing battle to preserve a world in which the mind and soul of man may flourish and be free, poised for the impending stroke which may determine its length and final issue, we confront three problems, none of which can be separated from the others.

First, we must win this war so crushingly and overwhelmingly that no class or clique in any of the Axis nations may again delude their people with the claim that they had not been defeated.

Second, we must work for and help to secure a peace which will be just; a peace that may be durable because it is just.

Third, we must organize the world for peace, so that the peace which we shall earn and set up may be preserved by the united and cooperative activities of those who have brought the enemies of peace to their knees and ushered in some form of world order in which the arts of peace and the will for peace may flourish.

Regarding the first of these three tasks, there is no important or substantial disagreement among the American people.

And there is no substantial disagreement that in the 2½ years since Pearl Harbor the United States, as a Government and as a people, have gone farther and faster in getting ready to fight than any nation ever went in the whole history of nations.

That we were not wholly prepared for this war when the Japanese treachery of December 7, 1941, broke upon us there is no point in denying.

That we were as well prepared as we were is due to the foresight, the warnings, and the insistence of the Democratic Party and the Democratic administration presided over by President Franklin Roosevelt.

I do not like to become partisan in the midst of war, even at a Democratic gathering like this. But a few days ago I read a speech by a prominent candidate for a Presidential nomination on the other side of the political fence in which he claimed that our military and naval weakness were due to the negligence of the present administration.

It is necessary to refute this only by recalling that from 1921 to 1933—12 years—during which the Democratic Party was not in power, not a single battleship was laid down for construction in the American Navy.

It might be well for some of these ambitious Governors to do a little cramming on American history between now and next November.

But while we were not prepared for all-out war when war was forced upon us, the same can be said of every war in which we ever engaged, beginning with the Revolutionary War itself.

The same can be said of every democracy in the world, including those which lay all around Germany and could look over the back fence and see what was going on under Hitler.

Democracies are never prepared for war at the drop of a hat. If they were, they would not be democracies but would be the kind of autocracy against which we are fighting to protect ourselves and the world.

Under these circumstances we, as well as our friends among the United Nations, have been compelled to fight the enemy back and hold him off with one hand, while preparing with feverish intensity with the other to forge the instruments with which to drive him back and crush him utterly and fatally

In this process we have transformed our Nation from a peace to a war economy. We had done some things before we were drawn into the war. But in the war effort itself we have exceeded in many respects what we hoped to accomplish in the training and equipment of the largest Army and Navy that ever fought under a single banner, and the quality of this Army and Navy is in every way commensurate with their numbers.

Now, in the performance of this task, and in the incredible progress we have made toward victory, there has been no distinction of politics, religion, race, or color. Industry, labor, agriculture, and finance have put on the uniform and shouldered a gun, and turned out the instruments with which men must fight.

This program required organization and concentration of energy. It required the delegation of power to somebody who could use it. For democracies cannot fight against aggression with a sprawling, disjointed, heterogeneous outfit without form and void.

I presume that even our opponents, those who are most critical and most partisan, will concede that this organization, this concentration, this transformation, and the magnificent results which have flowed from them took place under the guidance of a Democratic administration, headed by a Democratic President, chosen for the task by the people in a free election.

Again let me say that I prefer not to speak in a partisan vein even at a partisan assembly. But I do not propose that those whose chief business at present is the fomentation of partisan hatred shall fill our backyard with political hand grenades, even though none of them explodes. I shall at least contend for the right to call attention to their presence and their intent.

Some of these things have made it necessary to put into effect restrictions and regulations which have been irksome and irritating. Politicians bent on office and disunity will undertake to magnify and capitalize these disarrangements. But the American people know what is involved in this war. They are not children. But even if they were, as some loquacious and mendacious persons seem to think, they would still know that the inconveniences and hardships being experienced by those of us who still live in comparative comfort are not to be mentioned in the same breath with those being endured by the fighting men and women who are honoring the name of America all over the world.

Through all these energies and these efforts, we shall win this war. We shall win it so completely, along with our friends of Great Britain, Russia, China, and other peoples who are fighting by our side, that the world will not be bothered by another debate as to who won the war.

We cannot afford to allow the controversies and disunity growing out of a Nation-wide election to retard by a single item or moment the momentum which we are gathering and shall soon display.

There are some among us who deplore the fact that in the midst of war we must undergo a campaign and an election.

I am not one of them. The people have a right to pass judgment on their Government in war as in peace. We welcome the people's judgment upon our record in peace and war alike. We entertain no fears upon that score.

The only thing we ask is that the American people search and assess that record for themselves without prejudice, without malice, without heat, but will all the light they need to enable them to see, keeping in their memories the conditions we inherited, what we have done to alleviate those conditions, and keeping in mind our present task and its final and glorious consummation.

When the war shall end, our task will not be over. In some respects it will have just begun.

We shall reconvert our war economy back to a peace economy. We shall retransform our factories, our farms, our financial institutions, our manpower, back to the pursuits of peace.

We shall undertake to do this with speed and care.

We are already beginning this process so far as possible without impeding the war effort.

We shall bring back to their homes and families eleven or twelve million men and women. We shall be confronted with the duty of seeing that these men and women obtain work at fair wages. We shall see to it that they are reintegrated into the social and economic life from which they departed to serve their country. We must make sure that they do not return to an economic situation which requires them to sell apples and lead pencils on the streets in order to eat and sleep and support their families in a land that they have saved.

This great cause cannot be served by a resort to political heroics. It cannot be solved by appeals to ignorance or prejudice.

The kind of life to which our Nation and the world will return will be determined by the degree of cooperation, tolerance, patience, and understanding that may be brought about between Government and business, agriculture, finance, labor, and all other elements of our wonderful people.

None of these can do the job alone. All of them, working together with the same unity and determination which has characterized the war effort, can and will accomplish it.

Along with these national and economic readjustments, the peace itself poses a question of major consideration. Indeed, the kind of peace which will follow this war may determine not only the real outcome and effectiveness of this war, but whether another is to follow soon upon its heels.

Already the groundwork is being laid in a most nonpartisan atmosphere, for our return to economic stability and for our return to peace.

In both Houses of the Congress men of all political parties are serving upon committees to look in advance at the post-war probabilities, and be prepared to meet them. We have made much progress in preparing for peace.

In the international field, conferences have been and are being constantly held, that much of the underbrush in the thickets and jungles and forests of international relationships may be cleared away.

In this undertaking the heads of our Government are utilizing the ability, experience, and patriotism of men of all political persuasions.

Under our Constitition our President is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations. This is true no matter who is President or to what party he belongs

President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull have worked together in not only conducting our relations with other nations but in the formation of the consistent policy of our Government.

Sometimes they have conferred separately with the representatives of other governments, as at Moscow, Quebec, Casablanca, Teheran, and in the Atlantic, as well as in London and Washington.

To say that they have worked at cross purposes, or that their right hands are ignorant of what their left hands are doing, is a preposterous and fantastic misrepresentation

It was disappointing, and somewhat disillusioning, to hear such a claim come from one who became dry behind the ears on any kind of foreign policy after he had perceptibly slowed down his own synthetic flight from a Presidential nomination.

Out of this war must come a peace that is just and honorable, a peace to which all fair-minded men and men of good will can subscribe.

In order that such a peace may be ordained, the economic problems of impoverished and overrun nations cannot be ignored. Chaos and disorder cannot be the breeding ground of a durable peace. Hunger, starvation, and disease cannot constitute the fertilizer for a healthy growth of peaceful restoration.

It will not be necessary to set up an international W. P. A. as some prominent political candidates now pretend to fear. Nor is it necessary for our own salvation, nor will it shorten the war or hasten the peace, nor make a better peace, for such candidates to seek to destroy the confidence of our people in our allies for some local and temporary purpose.

When peace comes it must come as the result of confidence among the peoples who must win this war.

No blueprint of a peace treaty can now be exhibited. But we are looking and preparing for the day when the peoples of the earth may throw from their backs the burdens of war, stand erect again, and demand that all peoples and all nations that now assert their desire and intention to pursue the arts of peace shall do so in good faith.

When that peace shall come, it must be preserved.

Whether any discussed or projected organization to preserve world peace shall be launched before any treaty of peace is concluded, or shall become a part of it, or shall come afterwards and separately, is a question of details and mechanics. Many nations will have to be consulted and will have to agree.

But the substance is what will count ultimately in determining the value of any organized effort to preserve world peace.

We have learned now that when storm clouds gather over the world, threatening our own and the security of all peace-loving nations, we cannot rush into a storm cellar thinking that when the storm subsides and passes we may emerge to find our homes and institutions and our traditions untouched.

There is no such thing as individual freedom from flames when the world is on fire. We know that now, and only folly could dictate that we seek to shirk our share of responsibility for the peace of mankind.

I do not wish to disinter the bones of the Versailles Treaty or the League of Nations.

But a coy, demure, unannounced, but palpitating candidate for President a few days ago startled the world by revealing that the defects of the Treaty of Versailles grew out of the fact it was written by a group of tired old men who had enough life left in them to win a war but were too feeble to write a treaty of peace.

The petty implications in this observation are too obvious to need photographic exhibition or blueprint delineation.

That the Treaty of Versailles had defects no one will deny. So have all treaties contained defects, and many of them contained the seeds of future wars.

The Treaty of Versailles failed not because it was written by tired old men who had won a war, but it failed because a group of men, some of them malicious, some of them old, and some of them young, destroyed it before it had a fair chance to work or to have its defects cured.

In our own country it became the football of partisan politics and as a result we got nothing but a separate peace with Germany.

It does not serve our present generation, nor compensate for the enormous sacrifice which we are suffering in this war to reflect either upon those who wrote that treaty or those who opposed it. Our task now is to avoid such mistakes as were then made, if we can detect them.

It is our duty to protect future generations from the necessity of going through another slaughterhouse in order to preserve a decent civilization, elevate the ideals of the world in general, develop the resources with which God has endowed the earth, give remunerative labor to all who are able and desire to work, provide an opportunity for profitable investment by those who are able and willing to invest, lay the groundwork for a higher and more universal education, and cultivate the moral and spiritual values which exalt a nation in its own eyes and in the eyes of the world.

In behalf of such a concept of life the Democratic Party has fought for 150 years. In behalf of such a concept it calls now for the earnest and devoted aid and cooperation of men and women of all ages, religions, colors, conditions, and political persuasions.

A few local or temporary political victories or defeats may inflate or depress minds which look upon them as the supreme object of all life.

But—

"Truth crushed to earth
Shall rise again.
The eternal years of
God are hers.
But error, wounded,
Writhes in pain
And dies amid its worshippers."

The Arabian Pipe Line—A Proposed Venture Into Imperialism

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss briefly and plainly a subject which has commanded a considerable amount of publicity in recent weeks. That is the proposed pipe line across Saudi Arabia to some point on the Mediterranean Sea.

The project was announced early in February by Secretary Ickes, president of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, which Corporation was chartered nearly a year ago by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is, therefore, a Government-owned corporation and the money it proposes to spend on a pipe line would be taxpayers' money. The announced estimate of what the line would cost was one hundred and thirty-five to one hundred and sixty million dollars—a considerable leeway in cost and perhaps indicating that those who planned the line were not very definite on what they were setting out to do.

The Petroleum Reserves Corporation was chartered under authority in an act of Congress which was designed to enable Government to procure critical materials and metals for the war program. It is the opinion of many, including myself, that the authority in that act was stretched beyond recognition in forming this petroleum corporation. The act meant, for instance, to form a company to buy rubber—but not rubber plantations; tin, but not tin mines. The charter of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation authorizes it to do anything its directors choose to do in producing, refining, transporting and marketing petroleum and products in foreign companies. It was given unlimited borrowing power and, of course, freedom from taxation.

The officers chose to engage first in transportation of foreign oil. Crude oil is of no use to anyone without being refined, the pipe line would be followed by a refinery. One of the directors of the corporation said that would be the case. The cost of such plant would be many millions more; it would have to be a very large refinery, for the proposed pipe line would have a daily carrying capacity of some 300,000 barrels a day. With all the facilities that would be needed for this venture, it is easy to foresee the American taxpayers being tapped for a half billion dollars at least.

What is the purpose of this strange excursion into a country which one authority and historian has said is the cross road of all wars? Let me first tell you some of the things that it will not do, regardless of what its sponsors say.

It will not provide any oil for the conduct of this war. At first no such contention was made, but lately that reason was used. Mr. Ickes said in one of his

public utterances that it would enable us to make good on the obligations which we would have to assume in the post-war world. This, it seems to me, was a case of creating a chicken before there was an egg to hatch it from. We would build a pipe line and then wait for some obligations to appear.

It would not help in this war, for it is estimated that 2 years would be needed to get the pipe line laid and in operation, even if started now. It cannot be gotten under way at once, first, because nobody has more than a hazy idea of how to do the job—it would go across a country that has no roads, no railroads, no bases for operation; all these facilities would have to be built. All the surveying and mapping is yet to be done. Next, there is no steel available now. It is needed for other purposes. It is needed, among other things, to drill wells in this country and try to keep that gasoline ration of yours from shrinking further. Further, we have a manpower shortage and there are no men available to send to Arabia and if anyone suggests that as much as one soldier be put on this job, I promise you I will raise as much disturbance as the alligator did when the creek went dry. Soldiers were used on that useless Canadian oil venture, the Canol project, before any of us knew it was going on, but it will not be allowed to happen again. The boys did not go into the Army to work on any Arabian W. P. A. job.

It has been suggested that the line would safeguard an oil supply for the next war. I don't know that we are supposed to be using our energies now to prepare for another war; let us finish this one first. In the event of another war, we would have to defend this 1,200-mile pipe line and the refinery to make it of any use to us and we would be tied to that part of the world with a huge Army and Navy.

The proposed line would open up no oil not already available. The oil fields in Arabia which it would serve are owned by two American companies. Another American company has a half-interest in the Kuwait concessions. All the oil from these two countries can be moved to the Persian Gulf through short pipe lines and transported by tankers to any point in the world. As much of it can now be moved by tankers as there is demand for—right away, not 2 years later. After the war ends the large tanker fleet that has been built to carry oil to the fighting zones will be available. The pipe line would render idle many of these tankers and it would duplicate an expense already incurred.

There has been a sly attempt to make it appear that somehow this line would get back some of the oil supplied to the British. There has been criticism that we have depleted our resources more than they have theirs. There is no truth in any statement that we would be helping save our reserves at British expense. All of the Arabian concession is held by two American companies and the British have no part in it. A British company owns half of the Kuwait concession, but that is the minor part of reserve which would be served by the pipe line. So it is already American-owned oil. Further, let us remember this, not one joint of pipe could be laid without the consent of the British. The Middle East is their sphere of influence, not ours. Do not think for a minute that, if the project goes through, it will hurt any British feelings.

I used the word "imperialism" in the title of this speech. That is what I think it is. Imperialism is a policy of extending the domain or control of a nation. It is the kind of policy this Nation has always avoided. Uncle Sam has never attempted to gain sovereignty over other nations. I don't think you want to see him dress up in a turban now.

Let me indicate quickly how determined some of our planners have been to horn into the Middle East, with all of its feuds and its hatreds. Is our Government being directly and strategically drawn under the pretext of oil and a pipe line into a maelstrom of continental politics? At the outset, they attempted to buy in the name of the Government and with taxpayers' money, the properties of the companies in Arabia. Mind you, this was not submitted to Congress—it never has been to this day. Congress, I believe, is supposed to appropriate money and to have some say in what is spent—at least, the Constitution says that is the case. The Senate's consent to treaties is required and treaties with the King of Arabia and the Sheik of Kuwait, which, in the latter instance, really means Great Britain, would be necessary to get the rights-of-way for a pipe line. No, Congress was not asked whether it might agree to this "Arabian Nights" adventure or not.

But the companies who own the oil refused to sell all or a part of their interest, so the planners next proposed a pipe line.

It is a venture that would commit us to the maintenance of a large Army and the establishment of naval bases in the Mediterranean. That could not be avoided. Do we want that? Do you want your boy stationed in the Middle East to preserve the peace there and protect a pipe line which is not needed, now or in the future? Remember—if trouble breaks out anywhere on Great Britain's lifeline between Gibraltar and Singapore or between any of the nations of the Mediterranean Basin or Indian Ocean, if we have military establishments there, which we must have, to protect Government-owned property, we shall become sooner or later involved. What is at stake in present Saudi Arabia controversy is: Shall our Government back our private oil operators there so long as they are fair and honest in their overseas dealings or shall Government itself take over, backing its acquired properties with American bayonets, battleships, in event countries in that area get caught between two great powers at war?

The oil of Arabia can be developed by private capital. It has been to date. All we need is a diplomatic policy with a backbone in it, conducted on a basis of realism and not beautiful rhetoric. The concessions which American companies hold in that country were obtained while Bainbridge Colby was Secretary of State. There was some common sense trading with the British—mutual recognition of rights there and in other parts of the world—and it cost not 1 cent of the taxpayer's money and not a soldier was sent to intimidate anyone.

One of the spokesmen for this pipeline project recently made a speech about it and he called his oration Oil for Alladin's lamp. I remember that story. When Alladin rubbed his lamp, a couple of oversized gremlins popped up to carry out his wishes.

But they had great capacity for evil, as well as good. I see more evil than good in this. Yes, it will provide oil for another war, or perhaps a series of them—wars which will be caused by our pushing into a place where we are on ground that is new to us and where we will be dealing with people we do not understand.

Our people have not been asked whether they want this scheme. It is the product of a few minds. They are willing to be reckless with your money, with the established policy of nonimperialism and with the futures of you and your sons.

The effort of Congress now under way to stop this headlong rush into turmoil and more debt and higher taxes should have the support of every American citizen.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal which I have long advanced for the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the belief that the accounts now carried by the Corporation are readily marketable, let me call attention to a release dated May 8, 1944, by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, in which it announces that all of the 266 outstanding mortgages in the Territory of Hawaii have been sold to private finance and thrift institutions for cash plus a premium. This action implements the contention I have long made that the H. O. L. C. can sell its accounts and retire from the financing field at a reasonably early date.

To set out the whole case, I am enclosing herein a copy of the release and also a copy of a letter addressed to me by Commissioner John H. Fahey, of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, dated May 6, 1944:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1944.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIRKSEN: At the supplemental hearing before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on February 4 last you will recall that you asked me for certain information concerning proposals to take over H. O. L. C. loans in the District of Columbia and the

Hawaiian Islands (see pp. 23 and 24 of the hearing). I supplied the facts requested (pp. 24–29, inclusive, of the hearing).

As I explained, all the efforts in the Hawaiian Islands were those of individuals and single institutions wishing to acquire the loans which would have given them attractive profits but which would have had a decided disadvantage and risk of loss to the Government. One plan, you will remember, involved an advance by the Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles of one-half of the money which would be necessary to purchase the loans and an equal amount was to be represented by shares in the institution bought by H. O. L. C. with a final maturity of 10 years or more. As you doubtless know, 71 percent of the stock of the Los Angeles Federal Home Loan Bank is owned by the Government. In the case of the exchange of good loans for shares there was, of course, no assurance that the H. O. L. C. would get its money back even in a decade and if the institution was not successful in handling the loans and became impaired, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation would have to make good that impairment. Another proposal also was based upon an advance of a large part of the money necessary from the Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles at not more than 2½ percent interest. In these cases the institutions interested wished to make exclusive trades eliminating opportunities for other institutions to join in making a proposal. As I explained, these proposals were not given serious consideration by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

From 1938 on various schemes of similar character were suggested consistent with the demands that were being made by some mortgage-lending interests that H. O. L. C. should turn its loans over to them as fast as they were made good, irrespective of the losses which might thereby be imposed upon the Government.

In view of the inquiry you made and the statements I supplied for the record, you will, I know, be interested to learn that we have just sold all of our remaining loans in the Hawaiian Islands for cash with a premium payment of 1 percent. We did not go to the expense of preparing lists of loans, information concerning the credit records of borrowers, appraisals or title information, and no bidding plan was followed. The institutions had been advised that when as a group they were prepared to take and pay cash for all of the loans at our regional office in San Francisco without any further responsibility on our part or any guaranties by us, we would consider the proposal. We also provided that borrowers would have to have the same terms they have thus far enjoyed. The Hawaiian associations finally accepted, signed an offer of purchase prepared by us, and accompanied by a forfeit of 10 percent of the purchase price. We have now finished the transfer of the mortgages and the associations assumed the responsibility of distributing them equitably among themselves.

I enclose a statement relative to the transfer which we have released for publication Monday.

I should explain that we have had in the Hawaiian Islands a situation entirely different from that which prevails on the mainland. The islands are so far distant from San Francisco, our regional office on the coast, that we could not service the island loans by mail or bill borrowers direct and maintain the accounts in San Francisco. It has been necessary for us to continuously maintain an office in Honolulu and handle all accounting, collections, and other work there without the savings and efficiency of machine operation such as that used in San Francisco in dealing with over 65,000 accounts. In Honolulu we also have to pay the salary allowance of 25 percent more than regular civil-service rates fixed for employees outside the United States.

You will note from the press release enclosed that the island loans transferred had been paid down to one-quarter of the amount we originally owned. They are now in such shape, the borrowers have developed such equities that they represent no risk to either the mortgagors or the institutions. We could transfer them with no disadvantage or loss of any kind to the Government. The interest income which we have collected on these loans up to the time of transfer has paid all the costs of operation in the islands including overhead and also the cost of interest on bonds outstanding equal to the full amount of the money advanced on the Hawaiian mortgages. The Government has, therefore, gotten back every cent it put into the loans in the islands.

As I have stated, we have not only been relieved of all future responsibility but in effecting this transaction we did not provide advance loan records, comprehensive information on each loan, which it is contended we should compile and make available to mortgage lenders throughout the country.

What it has been possible to work out in this transaction in the Hawaiian Islands would not be practicable in a separate State, city, or county, or part of a State, since our operations here at home are conducted on an area basis. They are centered in a few regional offices where a 100 percent machine operation is possible in servicing, billing, and collecting which is not restricted by State, city, or county lines and which makes handling costs very low.

Because of your special inquiry about the Hawaiian situation, I am sure you will be interested to learn of this development.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

WASHINGTON, May 7.—All the mortgages of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the Hawaiian Islands have been sold to savings and loan associations there, it was announced by John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.

"In view of the difficulty of servicing a small number of loans and maintaining a small accounting office more than 2,400 miles distant from our nearest regional office in San Francisco, the Corporation has sold to 7 savings and loan associations, operating in the islands, all of the 266 mortgages which we had outstanding in Hawaii," said Mr. Fahey. "The purchasers are paying in cash the full unpaid balance of principal and interest on these mortgages, plus a premium, without the necessity of reappraisals or the assumption of any other responsibility or expense by the Corporation.

"The sale of the Hawaiian loans has no relation to the demands of some mortgage interests that they be permitted to buy all the H. O. L. C. loans in the country, by counties and States—at par for some mortgages and at large discounts for others. That scheme would result in heavy losses to the Government and no compensating advantages.

"Within the United States proper, H. O. L. C. loan accounts are managed by regions at low cost and are within easy access and under direct supervision. Such conditions are entirely different from those met in dealing with loans at great distances in the Pacific islands, even though the loans in Hawaii have been reduced by collections to less than a fourth of the money originally loaned and now represent no risk to the mortgage holder.

"The institutions purchasing the loans in Hawaii have agreed that all rights reserved to the borrowers under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation mortgage agreements shall be preserved and continue in full force and effect. It is also agreed that no borrower shall be required to pay an interest rate in excess of 4½ percent, the rate which now obtains on these mortgages.

"During its lending period which expired in 1936, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation received 1,649 applications for loans in the Hawaiian Islands, representing a total of $5,828,159 in mortgages. It made 481 loans which, with necessary later advances, amounted to $1,296,349. These loans have now been reduced in number to 266, with a total indebtedness of less than $300,000. No foreclosures by the Corporation have ever been necessary in the islands and the Corporation owns no properties there. All of the loans now transferred have been reduced to such a point that the borrowers are in no danger of losing their homes, and the institutions were justified in paying a premium for their acquisition."

The purchasers of the Hawaiian mortgages are the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Hawaii; Honolulu Building & Loan Co., Ltd.; International Building & Loan Association, Ltd.; Pioneer Savings & Loan Association; Territorial Building & Loan Association, Ltd.; American Savings & Loan Association; and the State Savings & Loan Association.

What's the Matter With the New Deal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask permission to proceed for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator will proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in the near future we shall hear very much about the so-called New Deal, and very much about bureaus, bureaucrats, and bureaucracy. I ask permission to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement on the question, What's the matter with the New Deal?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The New Deal will be an important issue in the pending campaign.

With respect to this issue the people are entitled to know the facts.

What is the New Deal?

To answer the question, we must first define the term.

To have a new deal, we must have had an old deal; hence, an added question arises—

What was the old deal?

The old deal is alleged to have brought on the depression.

All remember the depression.

All remember the unemployment, causing millions of men to tramp the streets and highways, begging for work.

All remember the vast surpluses of goods and commodities and consequently the low prices, yet the people could not buy because of a lack of money and buying power.

All remember the bankruptcies and business failures leading to still further widespread unemployment.

All remember the soup lines and the demand for governmental aid.

All remember the looting of stores and the rebellion against foreclosures.

The people have not forgotten the bank holiday leading to the closing of all the banks.

With all banks closed; with millions of men and women unemployed, ragged, and hungry; with soup lines in cities and towns; with stores and stocks being looted and with widespread rebellion against foreclosures something had to be done.

The old deal had cost and was costing the people more money than had been lost in all the wars in which we had been engaged.

It was obvious that the people could not protect themselves.

Cities, counties, and the States could neither check nor relieve the misery, suffering, and damage being caused by the depression which broke upon the people in October of 1929.

Conditions finally became so bad that it was not a question that something should be done, but rather that something must be done and done at once.

THE NEW DEAL

A remedy in the form of a program was developed and placed in operation.

What was the remedy proposed?

The New Deal did not bring about the depression for in 1932 the depression was already here.

The New Deal was the remedy proposed to cure the ills of the old deal.

Inasmuch as practically all the people were in distress, practically all had to be helped.

Two classes of relief were provided: First, temporary relief to tide the people through and, second, policies intended to be permanent were provided to prevent a recurrence of the terrible times the people were experiencing.

The temporary relief was provided by such agencies as the Works Progress Administrations (W. P. A.); the National Youth Administration (N. Y. A.); the Civilian Conservation Corps (C. C. C.); the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (H. O. L. C.); and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (A. A. A.).

Early in the depression the Congress declared that a national emergency existed; an emergency productive of widespread unemployment; disorganizing industry; burdening interstate and foreign commerce; affecting the public welfare, and undermining the standard of living of the American people.

Pursuant to such declaration the National Recovery Act was passed.

Under this law fair competition was established; codes were agreed to; the oil industry was stabilized; relief for the agricultural industry was made available; and a program for public highway, public building and publicly owned instrumentalities and facilities; soil conservation; river and harbor improvement and flood control was undertaken.

The evidence of the success of this program may be seen at any point throughout the United States.

As the ills of the "old deal" were cured the depression abated and by 1939 prices of farm commodities were better, unemployment was relieved and the country was enjoying a degree of prosperity again.

Just as fast as these temporary agencies and policies had served their missions they were liquidated so that now they are matters of record only.

What were some of the permanent policies provided by the Congress to prevent a recurrence of a damaging depression?

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (R. F. C.)

The first New Deal law passed by the Congress was the act creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This law was passed to make Federal credit available for financial institutions, agriculture, commerce, and industry.

Later, the law was broadened to relieve destitution and to create employment by providing for a public-works program.

Still later, the law was amended to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting.

Funds were appropriated, loans were made, and the distress was relieved.

Question: What might have happened to our banks, trust companies, railroads, insurance companies, factories, farmers, the unemployed, and all who serve these groups, had not this law been passed?

So successful has been the operation of this law that we still have the R. F. C. serving not only our domestic economy but, in addition, it is promoting our war effort by financing a substantial part of our defense plants and factories.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION (F. D. I. C.)

Another New Deal policy was the guaranty of bank deposits.

During the era of the old deal, bank and trust company failures were common occurrences.

At the end of the last war we had over 30,000 banks and when a failure occurred the depositors, as well as the stockholders, stood to lose their life's savings.

The old deal witnessed the permanent closing of over one-half our banks, causing hundreds of millions of dollars of loss to stockholders and depositors.

One of the most important New Deal policies was established by the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Under this policy banks are not failing now but instead they are the safest, soundest, and the most prosperous in history.

The guaranty of bank deposits is a New Deal policy and, unless repealed, is here to stay.

SECURITIES EXCHANGE COMMISSION (S. E. C.)

For generations corporations and exchanges had been issuing and selling stocks and bonds in such amounts as the public would buy, all without legal rules or regulations and without any Federal supervision whatever.

Many people are convinced that the great 1929 depression was brought about by the speculation in worthless or near worthless stocks, bonds, and securities.

The Securities Exchange Commission is another New Deal policy created to regulate and supervise the issuance of stocks and bonds and therefore to regulate the several securities exchanges and the over-the-counter markets operating in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails.

The purpose of the act was to insure the maintenance of fair and honest markets in stock, bond, and security transactions.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION (R. E. A.)

This law provides Federal aid to farmers in securing electricity; such aid being in the form of studies, investigations, reports, and loans to cooperatives for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of lines to furnish electric energy to farms and persons in rural areas.

Under this New Deal policy transmission lines have been constructed in all parts of the country and, unless repealed, this program will become a permanent institution in all the States of the Nation.

Hence, the R. E. A. is another New Deal activity and those who are against the New Deal must favor the abolition of this program.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT (S. S. A.)

In order to provide for the general welfare of our senior citizens, for maternal and child-health services, for crippled children, and for blind persons, the Congress enacted the Social Security Act and has provided funds to be used in cooperation with the States in maintaining and developing the program.

The old deal program permitted crippled children and the blind to get along as best they could.

For our senior citizens who pioneered and developed the United States, the old deal provided only the poor house.

Today such institutions are practically nonexistent and will never been seen again unless the New Deal program is repealed.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE (S. C. S.)

This program was provided to prevent soil erosion and to protect and improve the food- and feed-producing lands of our country.

All know that we are dependent upon the soil for the production of our food. All know that for many years soil erosion has been destroying many millions of acres of our farm land.

In 1935 the New Deal set up a Nation-wide soil conservation service for the purpose of saving the fertility of our soil.

Already, with the guidance of this service, soil-conservation districts have been organized all over the Nation by the farmers and landowners.

If this New Deal soil-conservation program is not abolished, it will stop erosion and depletion, conserve the soil, restore our forests, reduce dust storms and control, if not prevent, floods.

If the so-called New Deal becomes the paramount issue in the November election, and if the anti-New Deal party wins, then the Congress will have a direct and positive mandate to repeal all the laws passed and the policies inaugurated during the past 12 years for the benefit and protection of the masses of the people.

It must be admitted that a vote against the so-called New Deal is a vote against such policies as the old-age pension system, aid to crippled children, and aid to the blind.

Such a vote will be construed as being against the Federal supervision of the issuance of stocks, bonds, and securities, and, in addition, such a vote will be construed as being against the continuance of the rural electrification program, against the guarantee of bank deposits, against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, against the Federal Communications Commission, against the Civil Aeronautics Board, and against the entire Farm Security Administration including the Soil Conservation Service.

The Government has relinquished all control over the planting of crops, but such benefits as soil conservation, loans on farm commodities, and the broad program of farm loans generally will be retained unless the whole so-called New Deal is scrapped.

SECOND WORLD WAR

In 1939, at the identical time when the people were working out of the depression, the Second World War broke upon the world, and then on December 7, 1941, our country was attacked at Pearl Harbor.

Since that fateful day we have been compelled to live under a strict war economy rather than under the program provided for a peace-loving people residing in a peaceful Nation.

In order to meet the concentrated power of our enemies we have had to concentrate our economic and military power in the hands of our Commander in Chief, the heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps and the departments charged with the responsibility for clothing, feeding, and equipping our armed forces as well as our people here at home.

In order to mobilize and concentrate our power we have had to do things that we would not even consider in times of peace.

Since the war started, conditions have been and are abnormal, and our people should realize that the things being done are war necessities and such rules, regulations, and policies will cease as soon as the war is over.

At that time our major task will be to promptly liquidate the war agencies, thereby permitting the people to return to normal conditions as quickly as possible.

BUREAUS, BUREAUCRATS, AND BUREAUCRACY

During the coming campaign we shall hear much about bureaus, bureaucrats, and bureaucracy; hence, an explanation is in order.

A bureau is a department of the Government such as the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which prints all our paper money and all the various forms of stamps and bonds.

Then we have, among others, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which collects the taxes; the Bureau of Standards; the Bureau of the Budget; the Bureau of Census; the Bureau of Pensions; the Weather Bureau; the Bureau of Education; the Bureau of Mines; the Bureau of the Mint; the Bureau of Prisons; the Bureau of Reclamation; the Bureau of Animal Industry; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This Bureau was created to investigate and suppress crime.

Likewise, the special agencies created to help the people work out of the depression and to help win the war are additional bureaus of the Government.

The War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Censorship, the Selective Service System, the War Food Administration, the War Shipping Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the Veterans' Administration are all bureaus of the Government.

The officials managing these departments, boards, and commissions are sometimes called bureaucrats, and the services provided are by some called a bureaucratic form of government.

If we are to have these services, we must have the bureaus, and to have the bureaus we must have men and women to supervise and perform the work.

Who is there among us who would abolish the tax collector?

Who would abolish the takers of the census; the forecasters of the weather, or the inspectors of our mines?

Who would abolish the coiners and printers of our money; the writers of our pension checks; the teachers of our schools, or the investigators and detectors of crime?

Those who oppose the New Deal deny that they want to go back to the old deal.

Instead, they say that they favor a better deal.

Those who support and defend the New Deal as herein defined say to those who oppose that at any time they suggest and bring forth a better deal the Democratic Party will support their proposal.

Digest of Legislation Enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress, First Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a digest of the legislation enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress in its first session beginning January 6, 1943, and ending December 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF LEGISLATION, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, JANUARY 6, 1943–DECEMBER 21, 1943

AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

(Approved July 16, 1943, Public Law 151, 78th Cong.)

The Commodity Credit Corporation is primarily a lending institution established for the purpose of financing the carrying and orderly marketing of agriculture products. The corporation was created by order of the President, October 16, 1933, and has continued to function by authority of various acts of Congress.

This legislation authorized the corporation to continue its function and duties until December 31, 1943.

(Approved Dec. 23, 1943, Public Law 219, 78th Cong.)

Continued the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until February 17, 1944. The Commodity Credit Corporation was subsequently extended to June 30, 1945 by Public Law 240, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved February 28, 1944.

Farm labor

(Approved Apr. 29, 1943, Public Law 45, 78th Cong.)

Appropriation of $26,100,000 was made by Congress to remain available until December 31, 1943, for the recruiting, placement, transportation, subsistence, and health of adequate farm labor for the production and harvesting of agriculture commodities essential to the prosecution of the war. Thus the farm manpower shortage in specific areas was largely alleviated by introducing workers from areas having a reserve.

Feed for livestock and poultry

(Approved Dec. 22, 1943, Public Law 211, 78th Cong.)

This act permitted the importation from foreign countries, free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed. Domestic supplies were temporarily inadequate to meet the demands of increased production for war. This act suspended for 2 months the increase in the Social Security employment tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, continuing the old rate of 1 percent until Congress should have sufficient time to examine the proposal to revise the 2-percent increase called for in the law.

CIVIL SERVICE

Overtime pay

(Approved May 7, 1943, Public Law 49, 78th Cong.)

Overtime compensation was provided in this act for Government employees. In line with the increase of hours and heavier duties necessitated by the war, increases in pay were provided throughout the Government service on a part with similar increases in private industry.

HIGHWAYS AND ROADS

Federal aid for highway construction

(Approved July 13, 1943, Public Law 146, 78th Cong.)

This act provided for the continuation of the availability of Federal funds appropriated for use of the States in building highways and roads; time for its use was extended for 1 year after the termination of the war. Shortage of manpower and materials prevents the States in many instances from using these funds during the war so that a backlog of construction and repair work has been created which will provide work for war veterans and unemployed former war workers after the war is terminated. This act also authorizes a survey and report on the need for express highways.

On January 12, 1944, the President submitted the report of the National Interregional Highway Committee to Congress (H. Doc. 379, 78th Cong.). This report outlines a broad program of national-highway construction for the post-war era.

HOUSING

National defense housing

(Approved Mar. 23, 1943, Public Law 15, 78th Cong.)

By increasing authorization for defense housing from $800,000,000 to $1,200,000,000 provision was made for decent housing to take care of war workers in congested areas and in new industrial areas where adequate housing did not exist before.

(Approved July 7, 1943, Public Law 119, 78th Cong.)

Authorized an additional $300,000,000 for defense housing as necessitated by expanding war production accompanied by increased employment and greater concentration of manpower in industrial areas.

(Approved July 15, 1943, Public Law 150, 78th Cong.)

Congress increased the appropriation for community facilities in defense-housing areas by $200,000,000. This appropriation, providing for better recreational facilities in defense housing areas, aided in bringing about more stable morale conditions in these areas and thus more efficient and effective war production.

IMMIGRATION

Chinese

(Approved Dec. 17, 1943, Public Law 199, 78th Cong.)

Congress passed the act repealing the Chinese Exclusion Acts and granting a preference up to 75 percent of the Chinese quota, with certain limitations, to Chinese born and resident in China. The right of naturalization was extended to Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent. This act was passed in full recognition of the friendship and mutuality of aspirations of the two nations on a basis of racial respect and understanding.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

President and Vice President of the Philippines

(Approved Nov. 12, 1943, Public Law 186, 78th Cong.)

This act continues in office the President and Vice President of the Philippines until the normal functions of government can be restored in the Philippine Islands.

The Japanese-sponsored puppet regime is thus served notice that its acts are under scrutiny and that collaboration with Japan will bring no permanent political advantage in the light of inevitable victory by the United Nations. Thus, the loyal population of the Philippines has been strengthened and fortified against the immediate future until the day of final deliverance from the enemy.

PUBLIC LANDS

Columbia Basin Project

(Approved Mar. 10, 1943, Public Law 8, 78th Cong.)

This act provided authority to prevent speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project. It permits an agreement between the State of Washington and the Bureau of Reclamation to organize and further develop the Grand Coulee Dam project. This legislation alse provides safeguards for the investment of the Federal Government and the investments of the settlers in the Columbia Basin from the speculative real-estate practices of private operators.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Foreign trade agreements

(Approved June 7, 1943, Public Law 66, 78th Cong.)

The President in this act is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements, for a further period of 2 years, until June 12, 1945, and to suspend such agreements when discriminatory treatment of American commerce results from the operations of international cartels. This policy of mitigating

excessive international trade restrictions by methods of direct international collaboration in setting up bilateral agreements had been extended to 31 nations since 1934. Approval of this program has been of specific value to United States shippers and producers and has greatly implemented our diplomatic policy of the good neighbor.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Fathers' draft

(Approved Dec. 5, 1943, Public Law 197, 78th Cong.)

This law provides for the delaying of inductions of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers as long as possible without affecting the usual regular and orderly flow of required manpower into the armed forces according to quota schedules. Occupational deferments were tightened by becoming subject to review by the appeal board for the area in which the registrant is employed. Provision was also made for setting up a board to review and recommend changes in physical, mental, and moral qualifications for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Government employees deferment

(Approved Apr. 8, 1943, Public Law 23, 78th Cong.)

Deferment of Government employees from military service was stabilized and regulated by this act. Provision was made for the setting up of committees in the agencies and departments for the purpose of review and recommendation of deferments pursuant to Executive Order 9309, March 6, 1943. Power to request deferment was removed from the hands of bureau chiefs and personnel and responsibility placed with special committees appointed for that purpose.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Employment tax

(Approved Dec. 22, 1943, Pub. Law 211, 78th Cong.)

The increase in the Social Security Employment Tax paid by employees and employers was suspended for the first 2 months of 1944 and the former rate of 1 percent was continued for that period. This act enabled Congress to review the involved pay-roll tax situation to effect a final agreement and settlement of the percentage to be withheld for 1944. By temporarily freezing the current tax at the past level of 1 percent, Congress prevented a state of utter confusion developing among employers and employees in case Congress were to revise the 2-percent tax as provided in the existing law. More than 40,000,000 persons would be variously affected by such changes and industry would have found it necessary to revise complicated bookkeeping procedures.

Maternity and child welfare

(Approved July 12, 1943, Public Law 135, 78th Cong.)

The following sums were appropriated for the fiscal year 1944 to be used for maternal and child care:

1. $5,820,000 appropriated for grants to States for the purpose of enabling each State to extend and improve services for promoting the health of mothers and children, as authorized in title V, part 1, of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935 (42 U. S. C. 701).

2. $3,870,000 appropriated to extend and improve services for crippled children, as authorized in title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935 (42 U. S. C. 711).

3. $1,510,000 appropriated for care of homeless or neglected children, or children in danger of becoming delinquent, as authorized in title V, part 3, of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935 (42 U. S. C. 721).

4. Four million four hundred thousand dollars appropriated for emergency maternity and infant care to provide in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States.

(Approved Oct. 1, 1943, Public Law 156, 78th Cong.)

Eighteen million six hundred thousand dollars additional appropriation was made for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care, in addition to similar services otherwise available for wives and infants of enlisted men of the lower paid grades in the armed forces of the United States. This large appropriation provides for a greater extension of this type of aid to those who are least able to pay for it.

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES BENEFITS

Dependents transportation

(Approved Nov. 28, 1943, Public Law 193, 78th Cong.)

Transportation of the dependents and household effects of personnel on active duty of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was provided under this act in cases wherein a transfer to sea duty is involved; or transfer is ordered to a place in which no Government quarters are available or for reasons of military necessity the dependents are not permitted to follow; or in cases in which evacuation is necessary for military reasons or to relieve congestion.

Disabled soldiers and sailors

(Approved Dec. 17, 1943, Public Law 202, 78th Cong.)

The amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States was increased from $240 to $300 per annum for each person.

Merchant marine benefits

(Approved June 23, 1943, Public Law 87, 78th Cong.)

This act extended reemployment rights to persons leaving their positions for services in the merchant marine.

Personal property

(Approved Oct. 27, 1943, Public Law 176, 78th Cong.)

This act provided for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees, when operating as part of the Navy of the United States, for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service. Replacement of such property destroyed or lost in naval action or ship sinkings had heretofore placed a heavy financial burden on the personnel included under the benefits of this act.

Servicemen's dependents benefits

(Approved May 10, 1943, Public Law 51, 78th Cong.)

Appropriated $2,000,000 for expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel.

(Approved Oct. 26, 1943, Public Law 174, 78th Cong.)

Under this act allowances for children were increased from $12 to $30 for the first child, and from $10 to $20 for each additional child. Substantial increases were also provided for dependent parents, sisters, or brothers.

Veterans' Administration

(Approved July 13, 1943, Public Law 144, 78th Cong.)

Congress passed legislation providing for liberalizing and making more uniform the administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement benefits payable by the Veterans' Administration.

Veterans' insurance benefits

(Approved Mar. 23, 1943, Public Law 13, 78th Cong.)

This act provided for an automatic renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain other personnel outside the continental limits of the United States.

Veterans' rehabilitation benefits

(Approved Mar. 24, 1943, Public Law 16, 78th Cong.)

Vocational rehabilitation to overcome handicaps was provided in this act for any honorably discharged person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941.

WAR FINANCE

Lend-lease extension

(Approved Mar. 11, 1943, Public Law 9, 78th Cong.)

The powers of the President under the original Lend-Lease Act of 1941 (Public Law 11, 78th Cong.) were extended by 1 year. Congress voted this extension in affirming the substantial success of the lend-lease program in shortening and winning the war by means of reciprocal aid between all the United Nations.

Lend-lease appropriations

(Approved June 14, 1943, Public Law 70, 78th Cong.)

Pursuant to the increasing demands of offensive warfare, Congress appropriated $6,273,629,000 additional for the purposes of lend-lease.

Monetary stabilization

(Approved Apr. 29, 1943, Public Law 42, 78th Cong.)

This act extended until June 30, 1945, authority contained in the Gold Reserve Act of 1943, as amended (Public Law 87, 73d Cong.). Continuation of the stabilization fund was provided. This fund was established for the purpose of maintaining the value of the United States dollar abroad thus aiding in preserving an equitable balance and an even flow of international trade. Increased activities under lend-lease made continuation of stabilization an imperative part of the war program.

Pay-as-you-go taxes

(Approved June 9, 1943, Public Law 68, 78th Cong.)

This act provides for the current payment of individual income taxes, at the source, whereas in the past a person at the close of the year filled out an income-tax form and paid taxes in a lump sum, or in installments, during the following year. Thus current income was bearing the burden of old taxes and in many cases the Federal Government was unable to collect these taxes. In collecting at the source of income the taxpayer has been relieved of the necessity of withholding income for tax purposes and the Federal Government is more certain of tax collections. In addition, servicemen are allowed an additional exemption of $1,500 over the regular amount of exemption.

WAR PROSECUTION

Antistrike legislation

(Passed over veto, June 25, 1943, Public Law 89, 78th Cong.)

The War Labor Disputes Act was passed by Congress for the purpose of halting strikes and other labor disturbances in plants, mines, or facilities producing articles or materials useful or necessary to the war effort. Provision was contained for Government seizure of plants so affected or about to be affected by labor difficulties. Penalties were included for persons who instigate, coerce, conspire, induce, or encourage any person aiding in any strikes, lock-outs, slow-downs, or other interruptions or interference with production and operation. One section of this act prohibited campaign contributions by labor organizations. This act was vetoed by the President, who did not disagree with the purpose and principles of the act (S. Doc. 75, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) but believed that

the methods to enforce compliance would not prove to be satisfactory. Congress passed the War Labor Disputes Act over the Presidential veto in affirming its belief that this legislation would provide the guaranties necessary to protect the Nation's war production.

Civilian employees of contractors with the United States

(Approved Dec. 23, 1943, Public Law 216, 78th Cong.)

This act amended that of December 2, 1942 (Public Law 784, 77th Cong.) in providing for continuation of 100 percent of average weekly wage of those civilian workers who were taken prisoner by the enemy, and for payment to dependents of 70 percent of such weekly wage.

Diving duty pay increase

(Approved Apr. 10, 1943, Public Law 33, 78th Cong.)

This act recognized the dangers and hazards of diving duty, as well as the technical skill and specialized training required in such work. Diving duty pay was increased by $5 to $30 per month, over the old rate, and by $5 per hour for work under extremely hazardous conditions.

Female physicians and surgeons

(Approved Apr. 16, 1943, Public Law 38, 78th Cong.)

The medical and surgical skill and ability of women surgeons and physicians was emphasized by the Government in this act, which provided for their commission in the Army and Navy Reserve, receiving the same pay and allowances, rights, privileges, and benefits as members of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army and the Naval Reserve of the Navy.

Induction limitations of the Navy and Marine Corps

(Approved Mar. 31, 1943, Public Law 20, 78th Cong.)

By this time the shipbuilding and training-station construction programs of the Navy were sufficiently advanced so that there were adequate facilities for training men and new fighting craft for them to use against the enemy. All previous restrictions on the number of inductions into the Navy and Marine Corps were lifted by this act of Congress.

Landing and auxiliary craft construction

(Approved May 26, 1943, Public Law 61, 78th Cong.)

With the halting of further Axis expansion in Russia, Africa, and the Orient by the fall of 1942 and the beginning of the drive upon the fortress of Europe and Pacific islands, the construction and planning of landing craft of all types was more clearly defined as the future course of the campaigns took shape. Such construction was thus able to make use of the knowledge gained in battle and recent technological advances in boat and shipbuilding research. Preparing for the assault on the Continent, Congress authorized the conversion and construction of 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and auxiliary craft suitable for amphibious operations and for intra shore-based forces and fleet services.

(Approved June 17, 1943, Public Law 76, 78th Cong.)

In addition to the authorization for 1,000,000 tons of landing craft (Public Law 61, 78th Cong.), Congress authorized construction and conversion of 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary craft for offensive use of the Navy.

(Approved Dec. 17, 1943, Public Law 204, 78th Cong.)

An additional 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft was authorized by Congress.

Manpower shortage

(Approved Dec. 23, 1943, Public Law 217, 78th Cong.)

The Farm Labor Act (Public Law 45, 78th Cong.) was extended until January 31, 1944, and provision was included for the War Manpower Commission to continue use of funds to facilitate the movement of Mexican and Canadian nationals to the United States for industrial and railroad employment, essential to the war effort. Severe labor shortages in the field of transportation, repair, and maintenance was effectively lessened by this program of employing workers from our neighbor nations.

Military appropriation

(Approved July 1, 1943, Public Law 108, 78th Cong.)

The Military Establishment appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 was $59,034,839,673. Of this sum the Air Corps received $23,655,481,000.

Naval station and public works construction

(Approved Mar. 26, 1943, Public Law 19, 78th Cong.)

Naval war activities required the construction of vast shore stations and facilities, including public works such as roads, buildings, accessories, and services. For the necessary immediate construction work $1,256,607,000 was appropriated by Congress.

Navy appropriation

(Approved June 26, 1943, Public Law 92, 78th Cong.)

Congress passed the $27,434,000,000 Navy appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944; $6,324,120,000 of this sum was included for new construction and replacement of naval craft of all types and classes and for machinery and equipment for these vessels,

Nurses for war and home fronts

(Approved June 15, 1943, Public Law 74, 78th Cong.)

In Europe and Asia and on the islands of the South Pacific as the tempo of offensive war increased, casualty figures rose. At home, the longer hours of work in business and industry, general war fatigue and tension paved the way for numerous minor and some major civilian ailments, all damaging to the requirements for increased war production. A greater supply of nurses was imperative on the war fronts and at home. Congress promptly enacted legislation providing for the training of nurses for the armed forces, civilian and Government hospitals, health agencies and war industries by providing grants to institutions training nurses. Tuition fees and other expenses are paid by the Government.

Pharmacy Corps

(Approved July 12, 1943, Public Law 130, 78th Cong.)

This act established in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps. Recognition was thus given to the outstanding services of the pharmacists of the Nation in aiding the prosecution of the war.

Protection of vessels and ports

(Approved July 9, 1943, Public Law 127, 78th Cong.)

This act provided severe penalties for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities.

Silver for war and civilian needs

(Approved July 9, 1943, Public Law 137, 78th Cong.)

For war and civilian uses Congress authorized the release of silver, held or owned by the United States, for a period not longer than 6 months after the present war. The disappearance of many metals from the world market necessitated use of substitutes. Silver was held in great quantities by the Government and many urgent war and civilian needs could thus be adequately met by the substitution of silver.

Technical-industrial education for soldiers

(Approved Mar. 6, 1943, Public Law —, 78th Cong.)

Amending Public Law 435, Seventy-seventh Congress, this act deleted the 2 percent limitation heretofore imposed on the number of Army personnel who might be detailed as students at technical, professional, and other educational institutions, or as student observers and investigators at industrial plants, hospitals, and other places. This provided a greater opportunity for in-service training of a larger number of military personnel and afforded the Army a closer contact with the sources of war production in this country as well as providing a pool of highly trained men to aid in the reconversion of occupied territory abroad.

Vocational Rehabilitation

(Approved July 6, 1943, Public Law 113, 78th Cong.)

Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1943 provided for vocational rehabilitation of war and other disabled individuals through State plans approved by the Federal Security Administrator; and allowed a minimum of 60 days after meeting of State legislatures for compliance with such act.

Removed the limitations on the amount to be paid States for vocational rehabilitation upon approval by Federal Security Administrator, and extended provisions of the act to include Alaska and the District of Columbia.

Provided for payment to the States of administrative expenses and (1) necessary expenditures for vocational rehabilitation services for war-disabled civilians; (2) one-half of expenditures for rehabilitation and medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility, and necessary expenditures of disabled individuals (including corrective surgery, therapeutic treatment, and hospitalization where such will reduce handicaps to employment; transportation, occupational licenses, equipment, etc.; prosthetic devices essential to employment; and maintenance during training); (3) full costs of States unable to provide funds prior to July 1, 1945, on the basis of comparative State per capita incomes.

Authorized the Federal Security Administrator to make studies with respect to abilities of handicapped individuals and to train necessary personnel.

War contract fees

(Approved July 14, 1943, Public Law 149, 78th Cong.)

The payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts was prohibited by this act. In negotiation of war contracts there had been numerous instances wherein large fees had been paid to so-called contact men or middlemen who presumed to offer their services to industry at excessive rates in making contacts with war agencies. This act defined as subcontracts all those contracts where fees or commissions are contingent upon actual procurement or amount of the contract, or under which any part of the services consist of the solicitation or procurement of the Government contract. Such contracts were then made subject to renegotiation and the prohibition against payment of contingent fees and commissions for procurement of Government contracts would become effective since commissions and fees could not be included by the contractor as a part of his cost statement in the renegotiation proceedings.

Women's Army Corps

(Approved July 1, 1943, Public Law 110, 78th Cong.)

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was formally constituted a part of the Army of the United States for the duration of the present war and 6 months thereafter.

Address by Robert E. Hannegan at Thomas Jefferson Dinner, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and instructive address delivered by the Honorable Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the Thomas Jefferson dinner at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, last night. I had the very great pleasure of listening to Mr. Hannegan's able address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since accepting the assignment as chairman of the Democratic National Committee last January, I have visited 20 States and talked with hundreds of American citizens in every walk of life.

Tonight I want to report to the Democrats of New York that it is my firm conviction that the Democratic Party will win the national elections in November and that our standard bearer will be New York's greatest son—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Everywhere I have been, I find that there is in the hearts and minds of the American people the resolute determination that our great President must lead us to the conclusion of the relentless war against the enemies of liberty and then utilize his leadership and vision to establish a just and lasting peace.

There is also among people a firm conviction that the Republican Party, irrespective of its promises and the utterances of its leaders, cannot be given another opportunity to destroy or confuse the hope of mankind that we will have both victory and peace in the great war that is now reaching its climax. Yes, I am certain that the American people have learned the lesson of history. They are determined that the vision and idealism of Woodrow Wilson shall not again be submerged by the cynicism and the opportunism of another Harding.

The people of the United States are determined that Franklin D. Roosevelt shall complete the assignment which destiny has given him. And I can say to his fellow Democrats of New York that, whatever might be the purely personal desires of the President, the Democrats of the United States and millions of other Americans will demand that a great historical process be completed without interruption. And despite the malicious whispers to the contrary, I can assure you that the President is fit and ready for the fight.

I wish to make it clear that I have not discussed with the President the question of his own desires or intentions with respect to these demands of the people that he again become a candidate. I am only reporting to you my personal opinion and the conclusions which I have reached after discussions with hundreds of persons throughout the Nation.

It is my personal opinion that the people of America, always the masters of their Nation's destiny, want to finish the job now on hand with the same leadership that has taken them so far toward ultimate victory.

It is my personal opinion that our people have adjudged the life-and-death risks of total war too great to entrust the responsibility of waging it from here on, to a novice or a lesser soldier of freedom.

It is my personal opinion that the mothers and fathers, the wives and sweethearts of the men serving in the armed forces, the workers in our factories and shipyards, the owners of farms, and the enlightened leaders of our great industries, alike are coming to a single great realization: That the future, not only of their own private interests, but of their country, is at stake, and that the stakes are too large, the penalty of inexperience too heavy, to shift the tasks that lie ahead to an unpracticed hand.

And it is my personal opinion, ladies and gentlemen, that we must and shall, over the next 4 years, retain our great leader who is able to tackle those jobs with the practiced hand—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I wish I could tell you more. I wish I could have come to you tonight with something more to report than the will of the people, for it is true that any man, no matter how vital his services may be to his country, must himself give the final answer to the call of his party and his country.

I can say to you, and certainly I shall say to him, that both his party and his country are making the demand that there shall be continuity of leadership in this crisis. And for myself, I am convinced that whatever his judgment in the matter may be, the good of his country will come first, the safety of our people will dictate the decision that he makes.

I can go further with you tonight. I can give you an idea of the case that we, the Democratic Party organization, are preparing to lay before the President. I shall be pleased to know whether it convinces you.

We shall state at the outset our candid opinion that through service rendered, President Roosevelt, more than any other man in America today, has earned the confidence of the American people.

I have the best reason in the world for believing that the people are ready to express that confidence overwhelmingly at the polls next November. I have talked to a considerable and representative sample of them and they have told me so.

It follows, therefore, that our President, better than any other man in America today, stands as the bulwark against opposition views which, if put into practice, would endanger our country both in war and in peace.

What are those views?

First, on the matter of winning the war. Looking back today, every American knows how dangerous were the views, when war threatened us, of certain Republican leaders in the Congress, who opposed preparing the island of Guam for use by our Navy, who were against changing the Neutrality Act, who opposed appropriations for fighting planes, who were against lend-lease, and in most cases opposed selective service.

No one can predict what the world situation would be today if the views of these obstructionists prevailed. The American people not only have the right, but the duty to inquire into their records before political decisions are made. The electorate knows that instead of marching to ultimate victory, we should be facing the possible humiliation of a shameless deal with the Fascist oppressors if the Nation had not had leadership with the courage to prepare swiftly to meet the forces of aggression.

Looking ahead today, nobody knows better than does President Roosevelt how dangerous to the peace are the views of those Republican leaders who run with the hares and bark with the hounds, who cry out, between elections, against the other great powers that are fighting this war side by side with us, and who smoothly declare, as election time draws near, their newly-inflamed passion for the principle of international cooperation.

Nobody knows better than does President Roosevelt how dangerous to the world of tomorrow it would be to entrust the peace of that world to men who learn their lessons late. And such lessons as these Republican leaders have learned at all, they have learned very late indeed.

The Governor of this State, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, who copies down the answers on his little slate after the examination is all over, gravely told the people of America on January 20, 1940:

"Insofar as the present administration has adhered to the policies of his predecessors, it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia."

You folks in the audience cannot see the underlining of that last sentence in the notes I have here, but the italics are mine.

It was "most unfortunate," said the Governer of New York, that our President recognized Soviet Russia. Of course, he said that 4 years ago, and at that time, unless a person was gifted with a rare insight into the play of great forces in the world, unless he had in him the quality of statesmanship which would enable him to judge accurately of the pull and direction of those forces, he could not have known—could not have realized—the great peril in which our country stood in 1940; he could not have recognized the heroic roles which the people of Great Britain, the people of China, and the people of Russia were to play; he could not have foreseen how, in fulfilling their own destinies, they were to halt the menace that threatened us.

Our President, by his actions before and since that time, move by move, play by play, in this grim game of checkmating a world-wide aggression, has shown that insight—that quality of statesmanship—and those characteristics go far toward explaining today the steady march of the United Nations toward final victory.

By the same contract between the abilities of men, the minds of men, we may explain many a similar masterpiece of miscalculation which can be accredited to the present Governor of New York. They bejewel his utterances in those reckless days when he forgot to wait for the teacher to give out the answers before copying them down on his own little slate.

"At last," he said, again in 1940, and again I am quoting, "At last I think our administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia. We need no such partnerships."

A few days ago, speaking his piece this time after the answers had been given out and the examination was all over, Governor Dewey said:

"No initial measures against Germany and Japan, however drastic, will have permanent value unless they fall within the setting of a durable cohesion between Great Britain and ourselves, together, I hope, with Russia and China."

Now, perhaps I do not have a proper understanding of what a "durable cohesion" is. Perhaps a "durable cohesion" is not a "deal" or a partnership.

But I do know the historical fact that the government of Russia with which Governor Dewey wanted to have no truck in 1940 is the same government with which he hopes we shall have a durable cohesion in 1944. The only major change pertinent to this question that has taken place inside Russia since that time is the elimination of somewhere around 8,000,000 Germans.

To borrow from the Governor's bright lexicon, I for one would be better able to understand these gems of statesmanship that he is scattering among us plain Americans if they fell within the setting of a durable cohesion between one phase of this crisis and the next.

But perhaps this uncohesive record is a part of the Governor's studied technique. Perhaps he considers it good politics. You

know, in modern warfare the strategists strive to maintain a "fluid front."

Well, the Governor was plenty fluid when he analyzed the question of national defense 4 years ago. Perhaps some of you will remember his brilliant exposition proving that we could not possibly produce 50,000 airplanes. He had all the figures to show how and why it could not be done, and how even the plant to build that many airplanes would take us at least 4 years to construct.

Then he cinched the argument and boxed it in an ironbound coffin of defeatism by warning us that—I quote—"To use airplanes you have to have an air force. To maintain and fly 50,000 planes, an air force of about 750,000 men is necessary."

These, the Governor continued, "are sobering facts."

Today the present Governor of New York must be very sober indeed. Today, 4 years after he showed us how 50,000 planes could not be built, how an air force to man them could not be trained, America has produced for the armed forces 184,000 planes, and we have an air force of 2,385,000 fighting men.

Again, the difference between men's abilities, men's minds. And I suspect, too, a little of the difference between men who have vision and set their sights high and men who lack this quality and keep them low.

Let us remember that difference. To the people of this country, it is something more than a casual observation on the human species. To our children and our children's children, that difference will mean something more than a paragraph or a chapter in their history books. If we, the electorate of 1944, are not sufficiently aware of this difference, the history that will interest our children could be tragically different.

What new dangers are there going to be, what pitfalls shall we be threading our way through, after the last shot is fired on the battlefield of World War No. 2? And in dealing with the delicate problems that will arise among nations, the dangers that may threaten our own and all other free peoples, in anticipating the world of 1948, will the Governor of New York show the same great lack of comprehension that he has exhibited for the 4-year stretch since 1940?

In calling on President Roosevelt once again to lead his party and his country we shall continue to review this record of defeatism of the opposition.

We shall point out to him the distaste of the people for campaign tactics which, even at this early stage, the Republican opposition has already adopted. We shall point out to him the recklessness, the desperation of a political party so utterly bereft of an issue that it must comb through the newspapers from day to day and catch as catch can their issues out of the emergencies of this war.

We shall call attention to the character of a so-called loyal opposition which lashes out blindly at its Commander in Chief in time of war and prejudges any measure he may take to save the homefront from weakness or from chaos.

In only one respect have I been able to observe any improvement in the intemperate character of recent utterances of the various elements opposed to the President and his policies.

We have recently been provided with certain very vital statistics, politically speaking, from the States of Oklahoma, Massachusetts, Florida, and Alabama. And since that time I have not heard repeated the prediction that the Republican Party could win with anybody.

The victories of our two valiant warriors, Senators CLAUDE PEPPER and LISTER HILL, appear to have silenced the Republican talk of a trend. They had been talking for a long time about a trend.

I think the publishers of Webster might well point out, under the definitions of that word, that a trend is something the Republicans see only when the Democrats don't get out and vote.

If there is any trend running through the months and years that lie ahead of us, it will be the trend to victory, and may that trend reach upward, sharp and high.

It will be the trend to a peace that will prevail over a world of free peoples.

It will be a trend to a better life for our people, a trend to those freedoms for which one man, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has worked so long and fought so wisely and so well.

Address by Senator Truman Before Missouri Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] before the Democratic State Convention at Jefferson City, Mo., on May 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored and distinguished guests, and fellow delegates, it is always a pleasure to meet with Missouri Democrats. Of the many blessings a generous Providence has bestowed upon me, the one I value most is the privilege of coming home to Missouri. That same thought is uppermost in the minds and hearts of the thousands of Missouri's sons and daughters who, in the service of our country, are stationed today all over the world. Their duty is plain. They will not cease, they will not flinch, they will march forward united, until this war is won. Our duty is also clear. It is our plain duty to stand united—to bind ourselves together in unity and harmony, to bring about the earliest possible termination of this dreadful conflict.

Our dual purpose—the two keynotes to which we pledge ourselves today are:

1. Win the war, and
2. Protect the peace.

As citizens of the greatest democracy in the history of mankind—yes, as Missouri Democrats, we must prevent any action, avoid any word which would promote discord and weaken the force of our war effort and thus prolong the fighting by so much as even 1 day. Nor will the end of the war remove all of the dangers facing the cause of democracy. It must be guarded and protected in the days beyond, when—after victory—we still must plan, produce, and preserve a permanent peace.

This is an election year both in the State and in the Nation. Judged by any standard of comparison, the coming elections must be considered the most important in our history because they will not only decide who will carry on our Government during the most critical stage of the war, but they will also determine upon whom will fall the equally portentous responsibility of planning the foundation and building the structure of the peace.

Thus, while meeting the challenge of enemies abroad, democracy is called upon to face a test at home. We would not have it otherwise, even in the throes of a world-wide war, it is not only appropriate but necessary that these processes go on. The right to vote is one of the great privileges of our American democracy. It is likewise one of the fundamental processes of free government and of the democratic way we are fighting to preserve. Even so, the demands of this war are so compelling, that this country cannot afford to become embroiled in political controversy. We cannot neglect, for one moment, the vigorous prosecution of the war.

The present conflict is rightly called a total war. All of us are in it. In cooperative effort gigantic military and naval forces have been drawn together—on the land and in the air—on the water and under the sea—labor, manufacturing and industry, agriculture, railroads, and all other forms of transportation; and to the extent that each person has labored in war production, or bought War bonds, or given his blood to be converted into live-saving plasma—to that extent each one has contributed to the largest single combined enterprise ever conceived by the human mind.

This has not been achieved by accident. Your Government, a Democratic administration, has not only been a vital, integral part, but at the same time has been the guiding and directing force of the whole collective effort.

Destiny placed at the head of this Nation in 1933 a great President, who before all others, recognized the danger to this country of the impending conflagration. The brutal Nazis were across the Atlantic, and across the Pacific were the cruel and cunning Japanese.

These diabolical gangsters constructed a war machine of such power that it was scientifically calculated to overwhelm every free people and subject the entire world to slavery. The scheme was perfected, the weapons were forged, the hour was chosen—and the blitzkrieg struck. Hitler said the democracies were soft. He is reported to have said America would be an inside job, meaning, of course, that our people would not hold together over the long, hard road to victory.

We are meeting this powerful enemy in mortal combat. That we are as well prepared as we are to make an effective contribution now to this war is due to the foresight, courage, and wisdom of a Democratic President, supported by a Democratic Congress.

Destiny has charged a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress with leadership in this emergency. There are those, a minority, I believe, who would change this leadership. In their ambition to promote political ends they concentrate their criticism upon our brave and gallant President.

But these critics, in the same old "business as usual" Republican politics, have not succeeded in hiding the deeper objective which is to transplant into the control of new hands (selected, of course, by the Republican Party) the manifold activities necessary to the conduct of war.

In their frantic search for candidates to offer the voters they have even gone so far as to nominate an entire Cabinet for their as yet unnamed Presidential candidate. To be sure, each member of this prematurely nominated cabinet is a dyed-in-the-wool, gold-plated, old-guard Republican.

We are confident the people will decide that the present leadership must be supported and continued. It requires no demonstration to perceive that a Democratic defeat at the polls this year would confuse the conduct of the war, perhaps imperil the peace, and thus give aid and comfort to the enemy.

The war rulers of Germany have repeatedly expressed the hope that America would become divided that our Democratic administration would be defeated. They now see that

as long as America remains united behind this administration there is no hope for the eventual victory of the dictatorships.

The present war is a continuation of the World War we fought in 1917 and 1918. Out of the ashes of that war a group of German militarists kept alive the spark of hate that the Nazis later fanned to flame.

We are again warned that the over-all strategy of the German war lords includes a preparation for the eventuality of defeat. This is their plan. If the Allies can be separated; if an internal division in the United States can be created; if a negotiated peace can be obtained on easy terms then Germany is free to plot and to lay the foundation for a third world war. If we know anything of German history, this is exactly what they will do. As one who has seen the rough and seamy side of both World Wars No. 1 and No. 2, I urge my fellow countrymen and all lovers of peace wheresoever they may be to take the bold steps necessary to rename the Second World War. Let it be the last world war, and let us be sufficiently strong, sufficiently awake, and sufficiently united to make it mean just that.

A Republican Senate with a few disgruntled Democrats jettisoned the League of Nations in 1919 when our great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, had made plans for a lasting peace. As we go on to certain victory, let us not be unmindful of the reactionary tactics of the Republican Party in 1919. Let us remember that in the few years, perhaps months, ahead of us, a peace will be made that will affect not only our generation but the generation to come—your children and your grandchildren. Let us keep the administration of this Government in strong, firm, tried, and proven hands.

America and her allies are defeating our enemies on land, in the air, and on the seas. Under the brilliant guidance of our Commander in Chief and the generalship of our military and naval staffs, combined with our success in organizing industry and transportation, the fighting forces of the United Nations are now receiving a veritable flood of the finest war materials. From the laboratories of our distinguished scientists have come the devices that protect our soldiers and sailors. We have advanced the development of aeronautical science by a full generation. We have won the Battle of the Atlantic by defeating the U-boat. We have mastered the technique of three-dimensional war on land, sea, and in the air.

The production of guns and planes and ships and all the armaments of war is flowing with ever-increasing momentum from the factories of America. We have built ships of all types, the estimated 80,000 landing craft to be used in the invasion, the over 20,000 other kinds of vessels in use by the allies. From the famous Higgins landing boats to the world's largest and greatest battleship, the mighty *Missouri*, this Nation has become the arsenal of the world, and through the assembled might of the free people who form the United Nations the ravagers of the peace of the world are being subdued and total war is being brought to the enemy's home territory.

Modern war is the most highly specialized endeavor. It is divided into the three branches—strategy, tactics, and logistics. Strategy includes the over-all planning. Tactics puts the plans into action in the field. Logistics means having all the matériel of war delivered on time to the proper place and in sufficient quantity for effective use. We have now solved our problems of supply, and by universal consent the American fighting man is the best clothed, best fed, best equipped fighter that ever stepped forth to do battle. American agriculture, management, and labor under the inspired leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt have combined forces. Under his leadership the war will be won.

In applauding the success of this great Democratic administration in uniting America to meet the challenge of war, let us not forget the tremendous achievements in human advancement which were made by the same administration during the peace.

Let us think back to March 4, 1933. On that day a man of destiny became the President of the United States. That man, who has so faithfuly fulfilled the duties of his office, is Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As I listened to him on that Inauguration Day I knew that he realized the plight of the common man. How proud I was that he was a Democrat when he promised that he would drive the money changers from the temples—the money changers who, under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover had exploited America, for the special privilege of the few and the neglect, yes, even the oppression, of the many. You men of agriculture remember those terrible days. Corn was 15 cents a bushel. Wheat, cattle, and cotton prices were at rock bottom. You could not feed your families on the pittance thrown to you. Millions of unemployed walked the highways and byways of this country looking for work. We all well remember that fear clutched at the very heart and soul of this Nation. These were the conditions which faced Franklin D. Roosevelt when he swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and became the President of this country.

The gravest economic crisis in the history of this Nation existed on that March 4 when Herbert Hoover relinquished the responsibility of President and Franklin D. Roosevelt took up the challenge. He imparted to America some of the confidence which was his own. Boldly and almost overnight he restored the financial structure of this Nation and brought the real meaning of free enterprise into being once again. The history of his entire administration has been to relieve want, suffering, and to restore and maintain our ideals of democracy.

Through the loosely administered banking laws, the manipulations of the financial vultures of Wall Street, this Nation's financial structure was crumbling in every city, village, and town. The life savings of the citizens of this Nation were being wiped out overnight. Lines of people stood with despair on their troubled faces as the doors of failing banks slammed shut before them. Try to picture the courage and the deep conviction that must have been the President's when he declared the bank holiday.

Out of the dark shadows of the conditions that led into the banking holiday, President Roosevelt guided this Nation to safety. Legislation was passed for the first time to protect and guarantee the hard-earned savings of the people.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was created to guard the widows and orphans and thousands of small stockholders formerly helpless in the face of bold and ruthless Wall Street manipulators.

The Wagner Act has been justly called the modern bill of rights for those who by their labor have made this country the industrial giant of the world.

These are only a few of the many steps which have been taken to restore the dignity and self-respect of the comman man—to translate into a living and breathing force the true principles of democracy.

And so from the dark days of the Hoover administration—from a state of chaos and fear—Franklin Delano Roosevelt has led us into our rightful heritage as American citizens. Today the fighting men of our country offer their lives that this heritage may be maintained. Our fighting men are carrying the war to our enemies. Americans are fighting, as they have always fought in the past, with honor and with glory.

Out of the dark retrospect of these past 2 years a total war, one fact, one shining reality, now stands recorded in language that all the world can understand.

That reality, that established and many times reestablished fact, is the tremendous hardihood of our democracy. It is the durability, under extreme stress, of our form of government and of our rights as a people under that government. It is the everlasting strength of those foundations laid nearly two centuries ago by the architects of our Nation.

The language that now advertises this strength of ours to the world is the language of action. In action our meaning is carried, strong and clear, to both our friends and our enemies, in a stern rhetoric which our friends will understand and which our enemies cannot misunderstand.

We who are so close sometimes miss the mighty demonstration which these past 2 years have unfolded. We take for granted and look with familiar gaze upon that which should make our hearts exult.

It is well for us, therefore, to take new account of our Nation at war, to open our minds to the full import of these 2 years of action, this proof of the toughness that is America, of the temper that is democracy.

What we accomplish, then, is simply the reaffirmation of our faith. What we find is our own way of life—a way long despised by its enemies, long underesteemed by the world at large, and long under attack even from within—yet still firm, still unshaken at its simple, massive base, man's will to be free. And what we see around us is a people still dedicated to that way of life and still marching on the road to victory.

Of him who is not moved by this realization I would ask only that he think of the tests of total war, tests which our democracy has had to meet, but which its enemies, lacking concern for human life, lacking scruple for human rights, could brush aside.

Of him who is not stirred to wonder at the survival of his own liberties, I would ask only that he consider the pressures that have been put upon the authority of government which protects those liberties. They are pressures which our enemies could ignore because they have granted no liberty to their own people.

Of him who is not filled with pride, and with humble gratitude, but the fighting power mobilized in time to meet the challenge of our enemies, I ask only that he recall the handicap of years which had to be overcome within a matter of months under this same free system.

Our Government is meeting all these tests. It is withstanding all these pressures. It is overcoming all these handicaps.

But its triumph was not automatic—a thing to be taken for granted. That triumph is a triumph of sound administration. It is the triumph of a loyal people. And the work that must yet be done on the home front still exacts of each one of us all the participation of which we are capable. The same free system which safeguards our rights calls upon us in ever greater measure to fulfill our responsibilities.

It has been my assignment and my privilege to serve in this war as an answerable observer for the Congress. That duty evolved upon me when the senatorial leaders of the Democratic Party advocated the creation by the Senate of a Special Committee to Investigate the War Program and honored me with the position of chairman.

The purpose for which that committee was created was to search out the obstacles that were hampering the war program and to see that they were removed without fear or favor. What is more, the investigation was to be a continuing one. The committee was determined to do the job assigned to it without resorting to either a whitewash or a smear.

It is in that capacity of first-hand observer that I can give this heartening account of our progress on the home front. I cannot, how-

ever, make out any record of this home-front effort that is entirely without blemish.

We have among us, as we have always had in every great crisis, a certain minority of the unenlightened, the unwilling, or the unscrupulous.

Some of these persons and interests place individual privilege or private advantage above the national welfare, war or no war. They are the unenlightened; or, to use a shorter and I think a better term, they are simply plain chiselers.

Some entertain a wholesome dread of our enemies but a less wholesome hope that somehow, from the sacrifices necessary to defeat those enemies, they themselves will be exempted. They are the unwilling.

And some deliberately attack their own Government in public utterance and in the public prints for the political capital which they hope to make for themselves or their party out of these attacks, whether or not the result is constructive, whether or not the cause of this Nation will suffer from the poison of disunity which they spread. They are the unscrupulous.

All these, we have among us. By their actions they add to the strains of war upon our democracy, they increase the pressures that endanger our rights as free citizens; and wittingly or not, they offer by indirection, that aid and comfort which our enemies must inevitably derive from our own dissension.

I want particularly to call your attention to the dangers to our war program which are created by those whom we may describe as the politically unscrupulous. With a national election in the offing, in the months ahead they are likely to become ever more vociferous, ever more extreme and irresponsible in the attacks they make upon their Government. Judging from the character of their past utterances, I think we must assume that neither the absence of truth nor the consequences in terms of the harm they work upon the cause of their country will deter them.

From the records of the Senate committee which I have named you will find much that has been criticized openly and vigorously. Our one thought has been to win the war as quickly as possible. The administration has not taken the position of hiding mistakes. Rather, its policy has been to bring them out in the open so that they can be corrected.

This has led some of the guiding figures of the Republican Party to seek a special advantage for themselves by harping on the mistakes that we ourselves have brought to light.

The propaganda emanating from Republican sources on this subject, in content, in the character, and in its very tone, must be held suspect on this ground. Unmistakably, that propaganda carries the brand of partisan politics attempting to make capital out of this war.

Whatever the intentions of that party's leaders may be toward the early defeat of our enemies, the character of their public utterance subordinates victory in war to the hope of victory at the polls.

In their belief that they can actually turn the crisis of war to their own political purposes; in their belief that they can successfull embitter the American people against necessary war measures; in their belief that in so doing they can unseat the administration that has shown the foresight and generalship to put those measures into effect, these Republican leaders are, I believe, riding to their fall. Meanwhile they ride roughshod over the public interest and over the cause of their own country at war.

Take, for example, the incessant outcry against rationing. So avidly have these spokesmen for the Republican Party seized upon any slightest imperfection in the system, so bitter has been their resentment, so exaggerated their complaints, that they do not condemn the agencies and local boards and volunteers who have given time and effort to the problem. They condemn only themselves.

They cannot claim the license of constructive criticism. Their hatred of the administration responsible for rationing shows through too clearly. Their motives of tearing down, of working on the emotions of a war-beset people cannot be concealed under the pious claim of constructive criticism.

No, this is not an attack on inefficiency in rationing. This is an attack on rationing itself. Those responsible for it cannot now escape the weight of their guilt by styling themselves "critics." They are self-condemned as obstructionists, and they must meet the impact of that condemnation at the polls next November.

The same charge must be made against the Republican leadership in the matter of price control. Here, too, they go beyond the bounds of criticism, they stand self-condemned in their efforts at obstruction and defeat.

We hear the defense made for this clique of the self-styled "loyal opposition," that it supports the general principle of price control. Nevertheless it has attacked relentlessly the Government agency established to make price control effective. Its leaders are now trying to cripple the law itself with amendments that would strip the Federal authority and pave the way for chaotic markets.

Is that course indicative of support for the principle of price control? Are the Republican leaders in Congress who have adopted those tactics merely seeking, as they would tell you, to perfect the law and the agency set up to administer it?

No; those counsels of perfection are not born of the wish to cure. Like the hunter's decoy, they are set out for the kill. And already our entire system of price control, basically essential to the war economy, is menaced.

But here, too, the mask is too thin, the defense too far-fetched. The American people will not be deceived. Those who are responsible for this studied effort to undermine the Office of Price Administration and to perforate its legal authority with countless loopholes for the benefit of special interests will be answered. And that answer also will be given them at the polls in November.

So, too, with those who have deliberately tried to implant in our people the false fear of encroachment on free enterprise. Before them, as they stand at the wailing wall and mourn the death of free enterprise, that same free enterprise rises today to new heights of achievement under the administration of the same great President who directed its recovery from a Republican prostration 12 years ago.

Of course I believe in free enterprise, but in my system of free enterprise, the democratic principle that, there never was, never has been, never will be, room for the ruthless exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few.

There must be, and is, ample room in this country for free enterprise, room for every citizen to have the right to achieve and progress according to his capability and his industry and integrity.

There must be, and is, ample room in this country to be an individualist, to be free, and to be independent.

That is the concept of free enterprise that has been advocated and that has been kept alive and vigorous by the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt since March 4, 1933. It is not the concept of free enterprise of the days of Republican domination of affairs in America. It is not the concept of free enterprise that permits the devious operations of powerful groups to circumvent the will of the American people.

Yes, we of the Democratic Party believe in free enterprise and private initiative. And we pray God that it will be a Democratic administration that will unravel the chaos of this war so that every individual in America may truly enjoy the benefit of free enterprise.

For 12 long years the American people have witnessed this farcical Republican ritual of mourning over the death of a free enterprise that has not died. For 12 long years we have heard the Wall Street funeral march, we have seen the phantom victim laid in its grave, and the mourners have gone about the streets. It is time for the little man, for the worker in the factory and the farmer in the field, to ask, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

But their answer is on the way. Perhaps it will take years, perhaps a generation, to clear the American political scene of that social bankruptcy into which Republican leadership has lapsed. But cleared it must be, for the viewpoint of that leadership, its economics, its philosophy, its approach to the problems of Government at home and abroad, are no longer of this world.

That leadership wants to turn back the clock to the day of Hoover, of Coolidge, of Harding. And those days—thank God—are gone forever. There has been no change in the form of our Government. There has been no jettisoning of our Constitution. There has been no sacrifice of our right to be governed by public servants of our own choosing.

All these the Republicans have charged. They even complained that elections in this country were finished. When they were confronted by the fact that there was an election, then they predicted that it would be the last.

But if none of these dire predictions has materialized, what has happened in America? What is it that now outdates the traditional Republican philosophy which builds up tariff walls, exploits the backward or underprivileged peoples of the world, resists a more equitable distribution of the vast wealth of this Nation, gives a free hand to the predatory in business, pampers the monopolistic in industry, and isolates its own Nation from the part which that Nation must play in the world of tomorrow?

It is outdated because the free peoples of the world have moved ahead since the days of Harding, of Coolidge, and of Hoover. And the great American majority, under the Democratic administration of Franklin D Roosevelt, not only have moved with the world, they have been leading the way.

Constructive legislation passed by the Congress over the 10-year period from 1933–43 under Democratic leadership has saved the financial structure and the banks of the Nation, saved the farmer from ruin, gave labor its Magna Carta, put industry and small business on its feet. Now I wonder just what sections of this legislation the Republicans would repeal. I'll tell you they dare not repeal any of it. Their only claim is that they could administer it better. We have only their 12-year record by which to judge what they do and it won't stand up. After 12 years of Republican power, from 1921 to 1933, banks were busted, farmers out of business and 14,000,000 people were walking the streets in want.

It makes me sick at the stomach to hear these ingrates throw bricks at the administration. They remind me of BARKLEY'S story.

Neither do I admire that brand of Democrat who has profited financially and politically from the Democratic Party and who suddenly becomes a statesman and forgets the party that gave him prominence and prosperity. We suffer somewhat from this brand of Democrat right here in Missouri.

It is party responsibility that has made this country the greatest republic the sun has ever shown upon and when a man rides to

pomp and prominence in his party's band wagon and then forgets what made him, he's the worst form of human animal, an ingrate.

No, we are not going back to the days when enterprise was not free, when this Nation was not safe, when its people were not employed. The thing that has happened to America during these 12 years past was the awakening of a great people to a great destiny, a destiny in logical harmony with its growth through these many generations, a destiny that is founded squarely on the base that was laid in 1776 by those master architects, the founding fathers of our country.

Toward that destiny our Nation will continue to march through the years that lie ahead of us, and though the horizon of permanent peace and prosperity is not yet crossed, with a Democratic administration leading us, we are on our way.

The Citizen and His Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Citizen and His Government," delivered by the Honorable George E. Stringfellow, of West Orange, N. J., before the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, on April 26, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May I say at the outset that a service club, civic organization, or an individual, that avoids controversial subjects because they are controversial or political, is not rendering the community or the Nation a maximum service. If we are to preserve and improve our form of government, we must practice the philosophy of Voltaire, who declared, "I wholly disapprove of what you say but will defend to the death your right to say it."

It is recognized fact that our democratic form of government thrives best in an atmosphere of frank and open public discussion of its strength and weaknesses. To emphasize its strength alone is to unbalance the scales of human wisdom.

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

The distinguished committee which awarded the Pultizer Prize to the late William Allen White for an editorial in which he said, "Only when free utterance is suppressed is it needed, and when it is needed, it is most vital to justice," subscribed to White's philosophy.

WOODROW WILSON

During the last World War, Woodrow Wilson recognized this philosophy when he said he would rather have unfair and unjust criticism than to lose the value that comes from constructive criticism.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln said: "It isn't only the right of the citizen, but it is his duty to criticize the administrators of Government in war and in peace when, in his opinion, the administrators * * * are doing things * * * destructive of our Government."

We have in our country partisans who place the welfare of their political party above that of the Nation, and who, therefore, charge that to criticize our Government in time of war impedes the war effort, aids the enemy, and is therefore, unpatriotic and downright disloyal. That blanket indictment is supposed to muffle all criticism but, that smoke screen does not deceive any thinking citizen.

When attention is called to the inefficiencies of the New Deal party, we are told to be silent for the sake of unity. But, unity, I submit, is an ideal only when there is freedom within a united people to criticize and change its leadership at will. How else can a government be kept efficient, honest, and the servant of the people? Were we not told by the President that freedom of speech is one of the "four freedoms" for which we fight?

Men have told me that they would like to contribute to the financial support of political parties and to agencies fighting to restore and protect our liberties, but that they dare not have their names on such lists lest they suffer discrimination from one of their principal customers—the Government of the United States.

To that I can only reply—if an American citizen has to make his conscience dependent upon the will of a customer—the business is not worth the price.

Our daring forefathers who threw England's tea into Boston Harbor never thought of their safety or profit.

Our ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed troops at Valley Forge thought not of their comforts or safety.

Those great men who appended their names—that all might read—to the Declaration of Independence, which established us as a Nation, cared little for their safety.

Our sons, who are so gallantly fighting today on the battle fronts of the world, think not of their safety. They willingly lay down their lives that principles of government—principles for which our forefathers also fought—may live.

One of those principles—private enterprise—is today threatened; threatened by policies promoted by persons who hold public office subject to the will of the President and who are, therefore, high in the council of the New Deal party.

They believe, or say they believe, that the "rebuilding of America"—to use their own phrase—must be done by bureaucratic dictation to private enterprise and controlled largely by Government spending and subsidy. While paying lip service to free enterprise, these advocates would subtly substitute a Government-planned and dominated economy for our system, which has given us the greatest liberty and the highest living standard experienced by any country in the history of the world.

These 11-year pests swarm through the lobbies of Congress and the cocktail bars of Washington spreading their poisonous New Deal philosophy. They burrow through the fabric of our Government like unseeing moles.

Their foreign philosophy, put forth under the guise of restoring democracy to the people, is incompatible with every form of freedom, for it concentrates all political and economic power in the same hands which always has and always will result in tyranny.

Recognizing that there is no human being to whom we can safely entrust concentration or political or economic power, our founding fathers wisely adopted a Constitution to prevent concentration of political power and enacted laws to prevent concentration of economic power.

To prevent concentration of political power in Government, they divided it between the Federal and State Governments, and further divided it among the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of each government.

To prevent concentration of ecoonmic power in government, our founders prohibited the taking of private property without "due process of law and just compensation." However, today, in the name of national emergency, Washington bureaucrats issue directives, signed by the President, taking over private property without "due process of law and just compensation."

This may be necessary in time of war, yet, in light of our experience, prior to and since Pearl Harbor, what assurance, I ask, do we have that these powers will be restored to the people after we have won the war, if the philosophy of the New Deal party continues to rule our lives?

To prevent concentration of economic power in private hands, wise statesmen enacted laws for Government regulation of monopolies, and antitrust laws to enforce competition in competitive industries. Imperialistic Japan, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy have demonstrated how right our statesmen of past generations were, in believing that concentration of political and economic power in government would destroy every form of freedom.

Such concentration of power has formidable backing—backing of billions of the taxpayers' dollars which can be used as the President and his bureaucrats may elect.

The responsibility of saving our free-enterprise system and other cherished freedoms is yours and mine. If we are good citizens, we will not shirk that responsibility. If we are loyal citizens, we shall never permit anyone to camouflage revolution in the robes of patriotism.

To save our form of government, we need to awaken in our people the kind of crusading spirit that made our Nation the strongest, most prosperous, and freest on the face of the earth.

In Seattle, Wash., recently Vice President HENRY WALLACE, who is not to my knowledge a symbol of success in any business undertaking, charged that American Fascists are trying to ruin our country. The New York Times observed, "It is such vague, reckless charges and abusive language as Mr. WALLACE employs that endangers our national unity."

What is a Fascist, you ask—an American Fascist?

Communists use that word rather frequently. It is always applied to somebody the Communists don't like.

Fascist originally was Mussolini's blackshirt political organization which kept Italy from going communistic. Then it took on an additional connotation of Italian and German participation against Russia's participation in Spain's civil war.

In this country it is a $4 smear word and is used by Reds, "pinks," and their fellow travelers, to plaster anybody they don't like—capitalists, Jews, Roman Catholics, and other religious organizations. Charlie Chaplin said, "Joan Barry is Fascist-minded"—because she wanted more than $25 a week for past services. Of course, anyone who opposes Mr. WALLACE is a Fascist because the Communists are for him, and, insofar as I am concerned, they may have him.

In the same address Vice President WALLACE alarmed those who believe in our form of government and still take what the Vice President says seriously by saying, "We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here in the United States."

Who is this person, HENRY WALLACE, to presume to tell us that we shall substitute any part of our American way of life for Joe Stalin's.

A month or so ago we witnessed the complete, the almost comic degradation of an assemblage—of the members of the national committee of a so-called independent political party—"solicit" the chieftain of their party to run for the Presidency a fourth time so that the Government's foreign nations with which our country is allied in fighting the war might rejoice.

We have heard this same chieftain, seeking his second term of office, define those who differed with him as "forces of selfishness and lust and power." He informed us that he wanted it said "of my first administration * * * these forces * * * met their match," and "of my second administration * * * they met their master."

Can you imagine George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, or Theodore Roosevelt desiring to be the master of those who differed with them?

Who are these "forces of selfishness and lust and power," you ask?

You, if you urged the Chief Executive of the Nation to live up to the platform promises on which he was elected.

You, if you are opposed to waste and extravagance.

You, if you are opposed to demagoguery and pressure groups.

You, if you are opposed to inciting class and race hatred.

You, if you are opposed to the packing of the Supreme Court.

Following his reelection, which was influenced by Government spending of the taxpayers' moneys and rosy promises which were not kept, we witnessed the Chief Executive, in his lust for power, call upon the citizens of the sovereign States of Georgia, Iowa, Maryland to purge such outstanding public servants as Senators GEORGE, GILLETTE, and TYDINGS, who dared to oppose his attempt to pack the Supreme Court.

Blocked in his effort to concentrate the power of the judiciary in the Executive, the President's long tenure of office, death and resignation of members of the Supreme Court enabled him to appoint to that Court a majority who subscribe to his philosophy and thus accomplished his purpose. This is another reason why the third-term tradition should not have been violated. Now there is talk of a fourth and even a fifth term.

We have witnessed a Governor in the State of Michigan refuse to enforce the law of the land—repudiated by the electorate—and then appointed Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

We have witnessed the high standard of that Court diluted by the appointment of a professor who taught his bright boys—who later infested the Executive Department of our Government—how to make the law say what its makers never intended.

We have witnessed that Court, as it is today constituted, rule in favor of pressure groups and violence.

Associate Justice Roberts recently remarked, "The tendency to disregard precedents (speaking of the Court's decisions) has been so strong—as to leave courts below without any confidence that what was said today will hold good tomorrow."

We have witnessed the substitution of administrative bureaus for our courts of law and justice.

Our Government will never be any better or more secure than you and millions of others like you determine to make it. It will be as bad and corrupt as you and others like you permit it to be.

We, who are privileged to remain at home while millions of our citizens risk their lives in the armed forces, must recognize—that we are trustees for them, that we owe them the obligation to preserve American institutions and freedoms so that when they return, they do not find their substance wasted and their country materially and spiritually impoverished.

The businessmen and women who stay out of politics, who refuse to discharge their civic responsibility as citizens and who are reluctant to sacrifice their comforts, or who will not risk being smeared, are undeserving of the free institutions of which they are the beneficiaries.

We should make up our minds that it has to be either the citizen and his Government or dictatorship and its slaves. There can be no compromise. In their relentless drive for power, demagogues never compromise. With them, it's all or nothing.

The good citizens of this Nation cannot afford to be apathetic or cynical about our grave predicament. They must come out of their cellars of silent submission—into the open space of free political discussion.

This is where they belong and where they can best serve and save the greatest system of government ever conceived by man.

More Evidence of Huge Profiteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Evidence of Huge Profiteering," published in the Williams County (N. Dak.) Farmer's Press of March 30, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE EVIDENCE OF HUGE PROFITEERING

Few issues are of more vital importance than taxes. The fairness with which they are levied and the effectiveness with which they are collected may make or break a nation.

As everyone familiar with the situation knows, our tax laws are full of loopholes through which wealthy individuals and corporations are escaping their fair share of the cost of government.

As between Congress and the executive department, we do not attempt to assess responsibility for this situation. Both must share the blame. That is abundantly demonstrated by shocking disclosures in two official reports made public recently.

According to Randolph E. Paul, general counsel of the Treasury, the tax laws provide a post-war windfall for business that may reach the staggering figure of forty-five and one-half billion dollars, even if the war ends this week. The total will be larger if the conflict extends beyond that period.

Before entering Government service, Paul accumulated a good-sized fortune as tax adviser to business concerns. He can't be accused of radicalism or prejudice against business.

Tax legislation enacted in 1940, Paul pointed out in a speech before a gathering of businessmen at New York, permits business to obtain a refund of taxes paid during the war to meet the cost of conversion to peace—"a subsidy in the guise of tax relief," is the way he describes it.

For 2 years after the shooting stops, if their factories do not turn a wheel, industrialists are assured of profits at least equal to their pre-war earnings. Paul fears they may get more by inflating their costs and losses.

For all its generosity, this provision does not satisfy certain business groups. They insist that wartime taxes be returned to them now and retained in their own treasuries. They plead they can lay nothing aside for post-war readjustment. Paul exploded that statement.

He pointed out that, after paying taxes and all other charges, corporation profits during 1943 and 1944 alone will be three times average profits, after taxes, during the period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive. Furthermore, he emphasized, these corporations—after paying taxes and dividends and greatly increasing the salaries of their officials—have already accumulated from their war profits more than twelve billions of undistributed profits.

If we add the tax refunds to the undistributed profits, we will find these big concerns will have a post-war nest egg of fifty-seven and one-half billion dollars—or 30 percent more than the entire national income during the last year of the Hoover administration.

Additional light on the fantastic profits of war contractors was furnished a few days ago by the Truman committee, which for 2 years has been investigating various phases of the war program.

The bulk of war business has been given to 100 corporations.

"Of these 100 corporations," the committee asserted, "only 9 have been found wholly free of excessive profit in 1942."

For the remainder, profits range all the way from 25 to 600 times normal peacetime profits. Concerns which before the war emergency were never out of the red, were able to pile up millions of profits in 1942 and even greater sums in 1943, the committee said.

The committee cites chapter and verse on the profits of various contractors. It tells of a New York aircraft corporation which had average peacetime profits of $32,493, but multiplied that figure 168 times in 1942, after paying taxes and dividends.

A small Pennsylvania airplane company which reported an average deficit of more than $70,000 between 1936 and 1939, had a profit of $11,400,000 in 1942; a cable-making concern in New York in 1942 increased its profits 25 times; an Ohio locomotive plant increased its profits 42 times; a Pennsylvania corporation increased its profits 10 times.

"The story could be extended endlessly," the committee said. "The illustrations given are not exceptional. They happen to have been taken at random from among the 100 corporations holding the largest volume of war contracts. For smaller companies the profit picture is equally as excessive."

Only occasionally, the committee declared, did a manufacturer bob up who placed his country's welfare above his pocketbook. One such is the United Aircraft Corporation of Connecticut, whose officials came to Washington and turned back $286,000,000 to the Government. They said they were ashamed to take the money.

"But, after making these refunds," the committee observes, "the company still had left after taxes in the year 1942 $17,000,000 of net profits, which was a little more than three times its average profit of $5,000,000 a year during the pre-war base period."

What becomes of President Roosevelt's promise that "a new crop of millionaires" would not come out of this war?

What becomes of the plea of certain leaders in House and Senate that we can't increase the taxes of the rich and that if we are to get additional revenue we must place new tax burdens on small incomes?

Fire Prevention Vital to War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in

the RECORD the following excellent address on Fire Prevention Vital to War Effort, as delivered at the Wartime Fire Protection Forum in Philadelphia, Pa., May 8, 1944, by Dr. David J. Price, president of the National Fire Prevention Association. It represents the thoughts of a nationally known expert in the field of fire and explosion prevention, and I believe is very timely to the war effort:

WARTIME FIRE PREVENTION

It is quite appropriate that the forty-eighth annual meeting of the National Fire Protection Association should be held in Philadelphia—the "cradle of liberty." At such a critical period in the history of our Nation, a wartime fire-prevention conference, therefore, is very essential and of utmost importance to our national welfare.

In this conference we are gathered together to consider and analyze the serious problem of fire-waste control in wartime. We believe that this meeting, like our war conferences in Chicago last year and in Atlantic City in 1942, will be recognized as a vital contribution to the war effort in providing to the members present and to a still larger group through our printed proceedings a clearer over-all picture of the problems and responsibilities that we are called upon to meet. There is no doubt at all in my mind that the knowledge gained here will enable all of us better to perform our important and varied war tasks.

The National Fire Protection Association has been established in the historic city of Boston since 1896 to promote the science and improve the methods of fire protection and fire prevention, to obtain and circulate information on these subjects, and to secure the cooperation of its members in establishing proper safeguards against loss of life and property by fire.

The importance of fire prevention in wartime is very apparent and should be definitely recognized by all agencies and individuals engaged in any capacity in this vital war effort. It is, therefore, a source of extreme gratification to the members of the National Fire Protection Association to direct national attention to the contribution made by our association to the development and application of measures for the effective prevention and control of fire and explosions that have such a vital effect on the war effort.

EXTENT OF FIRE LOSSES

All of us appreciate that we are in a period of sharply increasing fire losses. The fire loss in the United States for 1943 has been estimated at approximately $380,235,000—a loss of approximately $65,000,000 greater than the loss for the previous year. This means an approximate increase of about 21 percent in 1943 as compared with 1942. The fire losses in 1943 were at the rate of better than $1,000,000 a day. The dollar value, however, of fire losses in wartime is relatively meaningless. I wish somehow that we could devise a procedure that would carefully analyze and clearly show the indirect losses that accrue from a destructive fire in a plant producing war supplies. If we could but realize the effect of such a loss in terms of delay in delivery of goods to the war fronts, in terms of the possible danger to our soldiers and sailors, in terms of the precious man-hours of production lost, in terms of the difficulties in replacement of machinery and buildings—then we would more fully appreciate the dire effects of fire destruction on our war-production program.

LARGE-LOSS FIRES OF 1943

Some idea of the seriousness of our situation can be gained by a study of large loss fires in 1943 which will show very clearly that we have very much still to do. We have been concentrating valuable war supplies in buildings of inferior construction and excessive areas and we have failed to provide adequate fire protection in many places where such protection is of vital importance.

During 1943 there occurred in the United States and Canada a total of 105 large-loss fires, each of which resulted in a loss of $250,000 or more. There were hundreds of other fires resulting in smaller losses. This information is based upon reports received by the National Fire Protection Association, department of fire record and is not necessarily complete. Nine of these large-loss fires of $250,000 or more occurred in Canada.

This 1943 record—our second year of war—of 105 large-loss fires represents an increase of 25 fires, or 31 percent over the number reported in 1942. In this connection it should be very definitely noted that the 80 large-loss fires reported in 1942, the first year of war, was a 67-percent increase over 1941. An increase in 4 times the number of large-loss fires during the past 5 years as indicated as a matter worthy of utmost concern to a Nation at war.

$250,000 loss or more:	*Fires*
1939	28
1940	33
1941	48
1942	80
1943	105

Some of the factors responsible for these large-loss fires in 1943 include (1) structural factors, such as inferior construction, excessive areas, lack of sufficient exposure protection, and unprotected vertical openings; (2) occupancy factors, such as highly flammable contents, excessive amounts of burnable stocks, flammable liquids and gases, unsafe heating equipment, and of special importance in wartime—contents of unusually high value; (3) fire protective factors, such as lack of adequate private protection, lack of fire doors or cut-offs, and lack of adequate public fire protection; (4) fire fighting factors, such as difficulty of access to fire, poor fire-fighting methods, inadequately trained firemen and inexperience in fighting and handling fires; (5) delays in giving alarm, such as headway of fire when discovered, efforts made to extinguish fires without giving alarms, and confused watchmen; (6) water supplies, such as inadequate water supply, shortage of hydrants, and pump failures.

INCREASE IN INDUSTRIAL FIRE LOSSES

There has been a marked increase in industrial fires during the war period as compared with mercantile and residential fires. For instance, in 1941 the fire loss in industrial plants was estimated at approximately $88,000,000 while in 1942 it was more than $100,000,000 and went up to approximately $145,000,000 in 1943, an increase of 65 percent in 2 years. Many of these fires were in industrial plants producing vital war materials.

An analysis of industrial fires during the second year of this war made by the National Fire Protection Association shows that fires in the metal-working industry, lumber and mill-working plants, and foodstuff warehousing and manufacturing plants, predominated in 1943 in hindering our war effort. In the United States, 101 fires out of a total of 512 important wartime fires occurred in the processing and storage of agricultural products—approximately 20 percent of the total number of fires—with a loss of about $25,000,000.

In wartime when food is being rationed, we can ill afford to destroy valuable food and grain supplies by fires and explosions. Every fire that destroys war-production facilities, raw materials, finished products, foodstuffs, housing, and other essential property hampers the war effort.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR FIRES

The responsibility for these industrial plant fires usually cannot be assigned to any one place. They are usually due to a combination of different factors such as: lack of proper planning on the part of the management, acts of carelessness on the part of employees, lack of adequate fire-fighting facilities and personnel, and a variety of other factors, no one of which can be blamed exclusively in any individual fire. But underlying all the faults of omission and commission, however, is the fundamental lack of appreciation of the importance of fire safety. Of all the measures of fire protection, the most important and the one most commonly neglected is that of subdividing combustible materials so as to minimize the total possible destruction in any individual fire.

An increase in the number of fires is to be expected in wartime during a period of increased production. Most fires however can be prevented but some may occur despite all precautions and what is most important is to avoid conditions which will permit a small fire, whatever its cause, from assuming disastrous proportions.

The measures for fire prevention and fire protection that should be employed to prevent these disastrous fire losses are clearly outlined in standards of the National Fire Protection Association, and information on the important features of construction, protection, and organization of fire safety can be obtained for the asking from fire-protection authorities throughout the country.

WARTIME SERVICE OF NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION

Since December 7, 1941, and in fact for a very considerable period prior to our actual entry into the war, the National Fire Protection Association has turned its efforts almost wholly toward activities that are of direct value in the successful prosecution of the war. Many special publications designed to meet conditions arising from the war have been developed and widely circulated.

Shortly after the outbreak of the war, the board of directors instructed the executive office staff to devote as much time and effort as seemed desirable to matters connected with the war effort and that order has been consistently followed to the fullest extent. The officers of this association feel that the principal function in wartime is to provide our members and others with every bit of useful information possible to further the war effort, and since the outbreak of war, the association has been pouring out material in greater volume than in any period in its history.

It has seemed to me that one of the major contributions that our association has made since the outbreak of the war has been in effectively publicizing the seriousness of the fire losses that have occurred through the series of picture bulletins on wartime fires, through two impressive and factual reports entitled "Fires in 1 Year of War" and "Fires in the Second Year of War," and through the records of fires published in the Quarterly and in the News Letters. This material has not alone been distributed to our membership but has been put in the hands of all of the important officials and important industrial leaders and this has all been accomplished in the face of increasing difficulty in securing factual reports because of the tendency in wartime to keep information about fires and explosions confidential and restricted.

We are glad that the Office of Censorship has not hampered in any way the publication of data that we could obtain but has seen the wisdom of permitting the National Fire Protection Association to publicize information about fire losses and fire causes for the benefit of all concerned. Our fire record department has labored under great difficulties to

perform a service that has been truly valuable and I hope that all will recognize that there is only a constructive desire to be of service in the attempts of the association to secure and publish information about all important fires.

It has seemed to me that the association has been building all through the years to reach the place of usefulness it has attained in this war period. All of us can feel proud of the service rendered by the association and its members. All of us I feel recognize the great increase in the amount of useful material that the association has provided for its members and others and no member has, I feel, begrudged the policy of the association and its board of directors in turning the activities of the staff and the membership generally into an all-out effort to be of service in the successful prosecution of the war. We have not insofar as I am aware declined to provide information and assistance requested of us by any Federal, State, provincial, or local government agency or by any war industry in spite of the fact that such requests have multiplied enormously in the last 2 or 3 years. Our association is stronger in prestige and usefulness right now than ever before in its history.

I wish that there might be time to recount to you in some measuure the many and varied contributions to the war effort made by the members of our association. It would indeed be a most satisfactory record of constructive accomplishment. Most of our members have been informed through the News Letters and otherwise of the many and varied activities of our headquarters staff. Perhaps because I am in Washington, I appreciate more fully than many of our members the amount of time and effort put in by the staff in assisting various Federal agencies in Washington since the beginning of the war. Our staff has really made a contribution of which we can all be proud.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING POST-WAR ACTIVITIES

In my presidential address last year in Chicago I indicated the prominent part our association could take in post-war planning in fire-prevention matters and the recommendation was made at that time that the National Fire Protection Association take leadership in this matter by setting up a committee to deal with this subject. A little later in our session you will hear the first report of our special committee on long-range planning for fire protection. The tremendous gains in fire prevention which have been brought about because of wartime necessity must be conserved; there must be no relaxation in our constant fight to save lives and to minimize destruction of property.

FARM AND RURAL FIRE PREVENTION

Let us consider a field for our activities in which I have long been personally intensely interested—that of fire prevention and control in farm and rural areas. We have only scratched the surface in what might be done to make our farms and our large rural areas, that do not have the benefit of competent and fully paid fire departments, safe against fire destruction. Great opportunities lie before our association to see that proper protection is provided to all places throughout the country. The enormous amount of fire protection equipment built for war purposes must be utilized to the fullest extent and in the most efficient manner after the war is over. When we consider the large amount of rural area now unprotected from the hazards of fire, a very important post-war service could be rendered by the development of a plan for allocating to these unprotected rural areas any war emergency fire-fighting equipment and appliances which may be available after the war. It seems to me that one of the greatest opportunities for constructive effort that we have before us lies in the expansion of our work into rural areas where at the present time the annual fire losses total more than 60 percent of the entire fire loss of the United States.

MEMBERSHIP GROWTH

The increased membership growth is indeed a source of extreme gratification and other reports that you will hear later in this evening's session and in other sessions of our meeting will emphasize the remarkable growth in the association's membership and in its services. It is perhaps enough for me to say here that when I became president of the association 2 years ago we had approximately 6,000 members, whereas today we have close to 9,000. Two years ago our volunteer firemen's section was made up of less than 15,000 members from 750 fire departments; today we have approximately 17,500 members of the section from 1,050 departments. Such growth cannot be undeserved. It is a reflection of the ability of our association to provide useful and constructive service.

The remarkable growth in membership is in my opinion very largely due to the well organized activities of our extremely faithful and hard-working chairman of the membership committee, H. E. C. Rainey, of Washington, D. C. The association owes him a very great debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts and faithful service.

I can foresee great opportunities for us to expand our influence and service throughout the work in the post-war period and I believe that we will see a great growth in our membership in all parts of the world. There is no other association in any other country so well equipped to perform a world-wide service in the interest of fire-waste control.

PROGRAM FOR WARTIME CONFERENCE

The program for this wartime fire conference will cover the latest information on current developments in the fire field, and will offer opportunity for discussion and interchange of information on wartime fire-protection problems. Certain of the sessions will be restricted to identified members and representatives of the armed forces in order to permit the discussion of confidential information.

A special session has been planned to enable speakers representing military and other Government agencies to present latest information on Government policy in fire-protection matters. Another feature of this conference will be a special session for industrial plant fire chiefs.

A general forum session has been provided during which the Committee on Long Range Planning for Fire Protection will present its report and there will be a general discussion of post-war planning.

Another War Industry Fire Protection Clinic following the pattern established at the conference last year will be conducted and a special session has been provided for the volunteer firemen's section. All committee reports included in the program for this conference will be largely limited to those having definite application to the war effort.

This conference will prove to be a very important historical meeting vitally affecting the present and future welfare of our country. The National Fire Protection Association has accepted its full responsibility for service during this critical war-emergency period. The association will continue this service and definitely plan for our future welfare to make this world a proper place for future generations to live. We therefore pledge our faithful support and cooperation to our national government and go forward to still greater achievements for the benefit of our national welfare.

Hugh D. Hart's Plan for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Hugh D. Hart, of Monmouth, Ill., prepared an outline for "a simple plan for the maintenance of world peace" which contains some interesting and constructive suggestions.

Mr. Hart is a well-known life insurance executive. He is a native of Arkansas, where he served under the administration of two Governors as chairman of the State commission of charities and corrections. He was a delegate to five international Rotary conventions. He holds an honorary degree from the University of Vermont, and is the author of several books, including The Mature Person, Life Insurance as a Life Work, and Lincoln—the Man of the Ages. Under leave to extend my remarks I include his statement and the plan:

FOREWORD

Secretary Hull said in a radio broadcast to the Nation not long ago, that the State Department had been aided in its post-war planning by suggestions that had come to it from people who were thinking constructively of the problems that will follow in the wake of the war. That is the true way of democracy. American citizens generally should ponder the vital problems which will require solution in time of peace and, in frankness and sincerity, make suggestions to their leaders.

It is in this spirit and with due humility that I submit A Simple Plan for the Maintenance of World Peace.

HUGH D. HART.

THE PROPOSED PLAN

ARTICLE I

The United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China are to become founding members of the International Peace Association.

ARTICLE II

The founding members are to select from among the other nations two other types of members, namely, adhering members and consulting members.

ARTICLE III

Each nation joining the International Peace Association shall have five permanent delegates. This applies to founding members, adhering members, and consulting members.

ARTICLE IV

Only the founding members and the adhering members shall have the right to vote. The consulting members shall have the right to advise but not to vote.

ARTICLE V

It is the intention of the International Peace Association to establish and maintain peace throughout the entire world. Inasmuch as the greatest responsibilty for attaining this objective has rested and must continue to rest with the four nations comprising the founding members, they shall constitute the executive committee of the International Peace Association, with full power to vote on any issue involving, directly or indirectly, the peace in any part of the world.

The adhering members shall, likewise, be entitled to vote on such issues. The majority vote of the adhering members shall have coequal force and effect with the vote of each of the founding members. Thus, five major votes are to count upon each issue before the International Peace Association, as follows:

(a) The four votes of the founding members, plus—

(b) The one vote determined by a majority of the adhering members—all five votes to be coequal in effect.

Thus, three out of the five votes will determine the recommended policy of the International Peace Association.

ARTICLE VI

When the recommended policy has thus been determined, each nation shall be consulted by its accredited International Peace Association delegates for decision as to whether it desires to participate in the recommended policy. Any nation deciding not to approve, adopt, or participate in the recommended policy of the International Peace Association shall be free to disapprove, reject, or decline to participate in such recommended policy.

ARTICLE VII

The Axis Powers shall be admitted as consulting members, without the right of voting but with full right to be heard on any issue before the International Peace Association.

ARTICLE VIII

The International Peace Association shall sit continuously in the pursuance of its duties.

ARTICLE IX

The Executive Committee shall establish the rules governing procedure of the International Peace Association. In cases of emergency it shall be empowered to fix time limits within which votes shall be taken. It may also establish the rules granting withdrawals and acceptances of memberships, or changes of status of memberships.

ARTICLE X

Each nation's voting delegation of five shall be bound by a majority vote within the delegation.

—

ADVANTAGES OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE ASSOCIATION PLAN

1. It provides a continuing international peace organization.

2. No military alliance has ever preserved the peace for any extended period of time. The International Peace Association plan furnishes an organization to analyze issues and to recommend measures, policies, and remedies relating to the preservation of peace. Such recommendations would involve no coercion, legal commitment, or obligation by or upon any of the member powers, but would have the force found in concerted international recommendation by a body of specialists whose only function is to study the problems of peace in collaboration with all other national representatives comprising the International Peace Association and to make recommendations. It is believed that the prestige of the International Peace Association would grow as it dug deeper and deeper into the factors of war remedy and war prevention, and gave sound recommendations to the policy makers of the respective member powers.

3. The International Peace Association would be not only a fact-finding body, but also a policy recommending organization. It would not be charged with implementing its recommendations. This function would be retained by the respective sovereignties that might voluntarily decide to approve or adopt such recommendations.

4. Treaties have not served to maintain peace. Treaties are usually static. While entered into under certain conditions, yet the execution of their commitments often must take place under far different conditions. Hardly a nation in the entire galaxy of powers, great or small, has failed to violate one or more peace treaties or treaties of mutual defense into which they had solemnly entered. On more than one occasion, even the United States has done so. Peace can be maintained only by voluntary cooperative action of the powers at the time of threat to peace and in the light of all the facts and conditions prevailing at that time. This continuously sitting body would be prepared to make its recommendations on an up-to-the-minute basis, and in the light of all the facts and conditions prevailing at the time.

5. This plan preserves the complete sovereignty of all its members. No nation would need fear to become a member, as no part of its sovereign right to decide questions of vital national or international interest would be finally reposed in the body. For example, in case the International Peace Association should consider armed attack necessary to prevent or stop aggression in some part of the world, it would promptly make that recommendation; then each nation would consider the weight of the recommendation and act according to its judgment and through its constitutional methods, or by such processes of authority as comprise its normal governmental way of arriving at decisions as to policy.

It might be objected that since the final decision in each instance rests with the sovereign government anyway, there is no reason to have the International Peace Association as additional machinery. Why not let the departments of state or foreign offices of the various powers handle these questions affecting peace, as they have heretofore? There are several sound answer to these arguments:

1. The overwhelming answer that this method has prevailed for a thousand years and has not prevented war.

2. Foreign offices are concerned with a multiplicity of duties and responsibilities having no relationship to peace, hence the maintenance of peace is a mere sideline with them, whereas the International Peace Association would have only one concern, namely, the maintenance of peace. Hence, the International Peace Association would attain greater competence in mastering the problems and solutions of peace than foreign offices, hedged in as they are by innumerable political, administrative, and diplomatic duties, having little, if any, relationship to the issues of peace and war.

3. No single foreign office of any power, great or small, could have the prestige of a coordinated body, internationally composed, which devotes its entire efforts to the questions of peace preservation. The prestige of its recommendations would be world-wide in scope, and almost overwhelming in weight.

4. Foreign offices operate through the cumbersome, intricate, and devious processes of diplomacy. Those processes are too slow and too weighted down with tradition to meet the peace needs of a modern world in which an armada of war planes may swoop down anywhere in a few hours in a devastating attack. Decisions must be reached promptly. The International Peace Association would help the foreign offices to make their decisions quickly and soundly by making recommendations based on information, which, because of the association's constant study of trends, conditions, and developments bearing on the issues of peace or war, would be up to the minute.

The foreign offices would have the spotlight of world scrutiny thrown upon them by the recommendations of the International Peace Association, which means that world public opinion would be focused on the various nations following a recommendation by the International Peace Association, and this would tend to inspire more prompt, more efficient, and more upright action than would be possible under the old methods of secret diplomacy.

5. Foreign offices cannot always confer in times of crisis, as witness the futile efforts of Sir Edward Grey, in the crisis of 1914, to engage in effective negotiations with the German policy makers, and also the refusal of the Nazi authorities to confer with Poland in the hectic days preceding the invasion of the latter country, in World War No. 2. The International Peace Association would always be in session, thus obviating this problem.

6. This plan provides a method for marshaling the world's attention and opinion upon the issues affecting peace and war. Public opinion, in the last analysis, is the most potent force among the nations, but heretofore it has lacked a proper instrumentality for its crystallization and dissemination.

7. The International Peace Association would provide the powers with the machinery for reaching voluntary agreements concerning sanctions, strategy, military movements, international police measures, and other drastic war preventatives at the time required and on a temporary basis, without the necessity of entering into dangerous alliances, long-term peace or mutual-defense treaties, or other commitments which might prove embarrassing in the light of possible unforeseen historic developments. It also would enable the major powers to marshal, by persuasion and discussion, the good will and cooperation of many or all of the adhering members and perhaps to restrain, by such peaceful methods, the consulting members.

8. The International Peace Association would constitute a great watchtower of peace, manned by the highest type representatives of the various member nations, and throwing great searchlights of publicity, understanding, reason, common sense, and moral appeals into every corner of every mind. It might, upon occasion, cast the red glare of deadly warning also, where aggression might seem to be again about to raise its sinister head.

The preservation of peace requires such a central instrumentality to mobilize the moral factors for peace at all times and under all conditions, and to keep them mobilized.

9. The International Peace Association would be a powerful restraining force in preventing well-intentioned, as well as evil-intentioned nations, from committing international blunders which might throw the world into the turmoil of war. For example, it is inconceivable that the Munich Pact could have received the approbation of this International Peace Association, had it been in existence. Certainly three of the proposed founding powers (Russia, the United States, and China) would have voted against it, and it is highly probable that the majority of the adhering nations would have given a vote against it, led by Czechoslovakia and Poland, and other small nations directly or indirectly to be vitally and adversely affected by the proposed appeasement of the dictators. Thus, Chamberlain and his government would likely have faced an adverse vote of four out of five possible votes by the International Peace Association. It is very doubtful if Chamberlain would have entered the appeasement betrayal plan in the face of such serious mobilized opposition on the part of a body constituted as is proposed under this plan; and, if he had defied its adverse recommendation, his government would likely have fallen.

10. The voting plan and general method of organization would give preponderant weight to the four great powers that chiefly won the war, the founding nations. And yet it would not grant them power to bind any of the other nations—or each other—to any course of action. All action would be

voluntary on the part of any member nation, of whatever class, as has above been stressed. But in the powerful moral act of voting recommendations for action, there would be a proper balance between the four great nations on whom has rested primarily the burden of winning the war and who must chiefly bear the future responsibility of maintaining the peace. It is proper that their votes should each carry more weight in proposing recommendations than that of any of the adhering powers. Small nations that must cry for help from big nations in times of war when they are assailed, may not expect to exercise equal influence on world policy with these big nations during times of peace.

It must be borne in mind that the four founding nations are strong enough to arrange a four-power alliance that would entirely leave out of consideration the adhering nations and the consulting nations. The International Peace Association is designed to avoid either dominance by coercion or entire disregard of the other and weaker nations. Under this plan, even the defeated Axis Powers would be admitted as consulting members if they chose to join. Their point of view would certainly be valuable, even though it might not coincide with the more enlightened attitude of the peace-loving powers.

11. The plan has flexibility. Note, for example, article IX.

12. All previous peace plans have measurably failed, due primarily to causes not inherent in this plan. Among these causes of failure of previous peace plans are the following:

(a) Commitments to go to war were imposed.

(b) Commitments not to go to war were imposed.

(c) National sovereignty was delegated to others or shared with other sovereignties or with external instrumentalities.

(d) Dependence was placed on the binding force of treaties, which frequently have been broken.

(e) Future commitments were made, based on conditions which were prevalent at the time they were entered into, but which frequently were radically different at the time the commitments were due to be executed.

(f) Lack of continuing machinery for exploring means of maintaining peace.

(g) Mutual suspicion generated by fear of embarrassment through commitments entered into by signatory powers.

(h) Long range agreements impregnated with serious contingencies or liabilities.

(i) Lack of the principle of voluntary, independent decision at all times by each nation.

(j) Sacrifice of national pride or even of national sovereignty.

(k) Contingent threats of punishment inhered in the arrangement.

(l) Lack of force to back up decisions, or unwillingness to use force for that purpose.

(m) Coercion within the framework of the plan by one or more powers upon others.

I submit that not one of the above factors which have defeated all previous peace plans is contained in this International Peace Association plan. It might be objected that (l) above—"Lack of force to back up decisions, or unwillingness to use force for that purpose"—is inherent in this plan and that it constitutes a weakness fatal to its success, as was true of the ill-fated League of Nations.

The answer is that this plan does not embrace the making of any decisions by the International Peace Association except decisions as to what to recommend to the member nations. Therefore no force would be required by the International Peace Association itself. The member nations would have adequate force with which to implement any of its recommendations. This is particularly true of the founding nations. They will possess the strongest land armies, the mightiest air armadas, the most powerful fleets—in fact, the greatest combination of resources of all kinds that ever existed in the world before. It is for the nations themselves to decide whether to use their force when and if the International Peace Association should recommend its use in a given situation to preserve peace.

It is, of course, not possible to prophesy definitely whether they would, or would not, do so. We believe, however, that the probability is in favor of such action. Having already expended so much blood and treasure to win the war, they would hardly refrain from employing a comparatively small additional fraction of their blood and treasure to avert another devastating war.

—

LIMITATIONS OF PEACE PLANS

One of the great dangers attaching to any proposed peace plan is that its proponents may lead the people to expect too much of it.

It is too much in the light of long and tragic historic examples, to expect nations always to keep their treaties, where peace and war are involved. There are some notable exceptions, it is true, but we cannot expect to maintain peace by dependence upon such exceptions.

We cannot maintain peace by military alliances.

We cannot maintain peace by a "balance of power" arrangement.

We cannot maintain peace by arbitration.

All these have failed in the past.

Perhaps you will be tempted to say simply, "Peace cannot be maintained by any method whatsoever." That may or may not be true—but the hope for peace must never be allowed to die in human hearts, and the striving for it must be an eternal quest.

All that can be expected of any peace plan is to provide an organization through which nations may do the following things:

(a) Join together in good faith, constantly to seek the attainment of world peace.

(b) Consult continuously to avoid war.

(c) Endorse and recommend to the various sovereignties a course of action, at the proper time and on time, by which the peace may be preserved.

(d) Respect each other's right of decision, without coercion and without encroachment upon their individual sovereignty.

(e) Constantly cultivate and create, through this instrumentality, good will between the different peoples, and thereby stimulate among the nations the will to prevent war.

(f) Bring the pressure of moral suasion to bear to enforce and preserve peace, but failing in this, powerfully to urge the necessity for warlike measures, if, as a last resort, armed force must be used to avert aggression.

(g) Operate actively a preventive policy, designed to keep wars from starting, rather than waiting until after war has begun, to stamp it out.

This is about all any peace plan can do. Nations cannot be forced to keep their treaties at all time and under all conditions, to maintain good relations with their neighbors, or to exercise good faith and idealism in all their dealings.

The League of Nations failed by reason of several defects not present in this plan. One of those defects was that the United States was not a member. Another is found in the treaty liability imposed by the League of Nations plan. There is no treaty liability or any other immediate or future liability under this International Peace Association plan. Another defect was the lack of any international unity and "will to peace," such as now prevails among the more powerful and enlightened nations. Even the League of Nations would have a better chance of succeeding today than following the First World War.

Any plan, to succeed, must have the backing of the United States, as well as of Russia, Great Britain, and China, and preferably of the remainder of the United Nations group. None of them should sponsor an arrangement based on a long-range military-alliance principle, on the balance-of-power principle, or on treaty war commitments of any kind. Certainly no undertaking should be entered upon which imposes a surrender of individual sovereignty by any country involved.

The only sort of plan that has a ghost of a chance of working out in practice is one such as we have outlined, which would depend entirely on voluntary action by the respective nations, founded on sensible practical recommendations, deliberately and reasonably arrived at by a body whose only function would be to advise the nations of the world how they might best maintain the peace.

Every country is eventually going to act according to what it considers its own best interests, no matter what sort of pact or plan it may have entered into, and no matter what its commitments may be.

Every country is bound to respect the findings, endorsements, and recommendations of a body international in character, which would constantly be studying practical ways to preserve peace. This body would come to know more about the prevention of war than any other organized group in history. It would receive the approbation of the majority of the human family, and the enthusiastic support of enlightened public sentiment in almost every nation in the world.

It would provide intelligent moral suasion for peace, backed up by a group of the most powerful countries on the globe, who would use force, if need be, to avert war, provided they might act voluntarily in each case, in the light of the current circumstances. The International Peace Association would provide the necessary facts and considered reasoning on which the several sovereignties might intelligently arrive at their decisions as to policies in any given instance.

Status of Pretheological Students in the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to an issue which has come to me from numerous sources during the past 3 weeks. I refer to the status of pretheological students. I am advised that national headquarters of Selective Service is currently giving study to this problem. They are now at work on a statement setting forth the historical background and the current status of deferments and exemptions as covered by section 5 (d) and other provisions of the Selective Service Act. Whether it is a matter which can be adjusted fairly and equitably by administrative action, or whether legislation will be necessary, apparently awaits the outcome of the present study.

In this connection I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial How Essential Is the Church? which appeared in the May 10, 1944, issue of the Christian-Evangelist, of which Dr. Raphael Harwood Miller, formerly pastor of the National City Christian Church, of Washington, D. C., is editor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ESSENTIAL IS THE CHURCH?

We get a little tired of repeated Government statements about the importance of religion and the essentiality of the church, accompanied by flagrant disregard of the interests and well-being of the church.

The Nation at war has called upon the church for "the greatest provision in history for spiritual ministry" to the men in the armed forces, and the church has responded with men and money even to the sacrifice of its work at home.

The church had men prepared to meet the exacting requirements for the chaplaincy—4 years of college, 3 years in seminary, and other years of experience in pulpit and pastoral service.

The appeal for more chaplains is a testimony to their essential place with the Nation's forces, and the church will pay the price to provide them.

On April 13, General Hershey, under a directive to draft all of draft age except those in "essential occupations," at the same time, canceled deferments for all pretheological students.

This order seriously affects the future supply of ministers for Protestant churches.

The Catholic Church may not be affected to the same extent. If it is, Government will hear a protest to which it will give heed.

Youth for the priesthood take their whole training in Catholic schools and can therefore be listed as theological students, even at the youngest draft age. But Protestant boys intending to enter the ministry take their pretheological work in public high schools and in liberal arts colleges. It is more difficult to register intended ministers as theological students.

Various Protestant communions have sent protests to General Hershey against what they consider an arbitrary discrimination against the church.

At its meeting April 17 the board of higher education, Disciples of Christ, expressed grave concern over the intention of selective service to cancel deferments for pretheological students.

The United Lutheran Church in America wrote to General Hershey, "As a church we express our unalterable position and vigorous protest against this action which will rob our country of this future Protestant leadership, particularly since the number involved, approximately 1,750 men for the country as a whole, is utterly insignificant as compared with the total Military Establishment."

The cancelation of deferments for pretheological students will close every Protestant theological seminary in the country within 3 years. The result will be disabling to religious life in America.

The protest of church leaders against the ruling was not because of desire to spare the minister or the church the sacrifices which all are called upon to make while the Nation is at war. It is just because the church knows what will be expected of it in the reconstruction period that it now petitions Government not to prevent the preparation of a limited number of ministers to be ready for the hour of the great demand.

Are not spiritual leaders as essential to the life of the Nation as are physicians and engineers?

Yes; war is hell. But a hell deeper and more awful than war will follow unless provision is made now to conserve and increase the moral and spiritual forces to recover the Nation and the world from the demoralization which threatens to engulf civilization even though a military victory be won.

Where are the ministers and missionaries and teachers for religious schools to come from if the supply is shut off at the source?

Either the Government should cease to classify the church as "essential" or act in harmony with its own declarations and remove unnecessary barriers from the church's power to serve.

The Montgomery Ward Case—A Sordid Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System's Network, May 9, 1944, from Washington, D. C.:

On December 8, 1941—the day after Pearl Harbor—the Congress of the United States recognized the existence of a state of war—a war thrust upon the American people by a treacherous sneak attack. In that resolution, which bespoke the unity and the determination and the sacrificial spirit of an outraged people, Congress told the world that, "to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."

This resolution did not pledge to our war effort all the resources of the country except those of Mr. Sewell Avery. The declaration of war did not exempt Montgomery Ward and Co. Today, by his contemptuous defiance of the National War Labor Board and the Commander in Chief, Mr. Sewell Avery has raised a fundamental issue. That issue is today before the courts, before the Congress and before the American people. Insofar as legal questions may be involved, they will be and should be settled by the judicial department of our Government. Attorney General Biddle has voluntarily submitted the Government's case for impartial adjudication in the United States District Court. Insofar as legislative policy may be involved, that policy will be and should be settled by the Congress of the United States. Insofar as issues of public sentiment are involved, those issues will be tried in the forum of free discussion.

The fundamental issue is whether the United States of America or Mr. Sewell Avery shall be supreme in time of war.

The National War Labor Board was set up to prevent those interruptions to the war effort which might follow if labor disputes were not finally and authoritatively disposed of by an impartial tribunal. The National War Labor Board derives its powers from a law enacted by this Congress. It was not the creation of executive whim. That law requires the National War Labor Board to assume jurisdiction over any labor dispute whenever the United States Conciliation Service shall certify that such a dispute may lead to substantial interference with the war effort. The Board is required to conduct a hearing on the merits of the dispute and—here I quote from the language of the statute—to "decide the dispute and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions * * * governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board." This Board is composed of outstanding Americans, four representing public, four representing industry, and four representing labor. It has settled 7,000 disputes, and has sent only 15 cases of noncompliance to the President, of which 2 involved Mr. Sewell Avery.

On January 13 the National War Labor Board ordered Montgomery Ward & Co. and its employees to continue for a temporary period the collective-bargaining agreement under which they were operating so that the National Labor Relations Board might conduct an election to determine whether the contracting labor organization represented a majority of the employees of the company. Six members sat in the case. The two public members, the two labor members, and one of the two industry members concurred in the decision.

Let me make it clear to you that this order merely preserved the status quo. It imposed no new terms or conditions of employment. The National War Labor Board simply instructed the company and the union to continue their old contract on a temporary basis until an election could be held. Certainly there is nothing novel, unusual, or unfair about such an order. It is the Board's standard procedure.

Over a period of almost 3 months Mr. Avery refused to comply with the Board's order. On April 5 the Board once more ordered Montgomery Ward to renew the old agreement. This order was unanimous. All our industry members joined in it. The company's answer was again to defy the Board's order. On April 12 the Board unanimously referred the case to the President for appropriate action. On the same day the employees went out on strike.

On April 23 the President sent identical telegrams to Mr. Avery and to Mr. Wolchock, president of the union. The President ordered the union to call off the strike and ordered the company to comply with the directive of the War Labor Board. The union complied. Mr. Avery, on the contrary, answered the President with an insulting and defiant telegram which was blazoned throughout the Nation's press in paid newspaper advertisements.

The President then had no alternative but to enforce the law. The Constitution of the United States, which the President is sworn to protect and defend, laid upon him a solemn obligation to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

The President could not shirk his duty. If he did not enforce the law against Mr. Avery, then he would have broken faith with millions of employers and employees who had faithfully complied with the orders of the National War Labor Board. Any other course would have encouraged all recalcitrant employers and employees to defy the Board's orders.

The President was obliged to act—and he did act. On April 25, the President ordered Hon. Jesse Jones to take possession of the properties of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago in order to prevent interference with the war effort.

The Under Secretary of Commerce handed to Mr. Avery a certified copy of the President's order. Mr. Avery's reply was a sneering defiance. The Under Secretary them summoned a number of deputy United States marshals. Mr. Avery once more refused to recognize the Government's authority. Pur-

suant to the President's order, and having no alternative but to impress upon Mr. Avery the authority of the Government, the Under Secretary then requested the assistance of soldiers to obtain possession of the property. On the morning of April 27, Mr. Avery defiantly appeared at his office and instructed all his subordinates to conduct a sit-down strike against the Government. Mr. Avery was asked to leave, but replied that only force could remove him. Having exhausted all other means to secure recognition of the Government's power and enforcement of the President's order, the Under Secretary then directed two soldiers to remove Mr. Avery from the premises.

Immediately, in order to secure a determination of the Government's legal position, the Attorney General voluntarily filed an action in the United States district court. A temporary injunction was issued to prevent Mr. Avery from interfering with the Government's possession of the premises, and tomorrow the district court will render its final decision. Meanwhile the National War Labor Board has ordered an election among the employees, which took place today, and soldiers have been withdrawn from the premises.

In this Montgomery Ward case, the President acted in precisely the same manner as he had acted when John L. Lewis defied the War Labor Board. But, when the mines were seized, Lewis recognized the law and called off his strike, but Mr. Avery in this similar situation cursed our Government and immediately ordered a sit-down strike.

Certainly this is a sordid story. It is enough to make every citizen feel a humiliation that the head of a vast commercial enterprise would thus, on the eve of unprecedented military operations, defy his Government and raise the standard of discord. Strangely, however, those who are determined to court martial the Commander in Chief have sought to make of this sneering outlaw a national hero. Mr. Avery has flown the skull and crossbones from the flagpole of Montgomery Ward. If Hitler and Tojo had been able to place a paid agent at the head of Montgomery Ward, he would have duplicated Avery's conduct in every detail. The President, by upholding the supremacy of the law and enforcing the order of the National War Labor Board, has run down the pirate's flag and run up the American flag. I do not believe that the loyal citizens of America, once the truth has been presented to them, will ever be fooled into believing that Mr. Avery's disloyal defiance of his Government is an act of patriotism. Of course, I do not assert that all those who defend Mr. Avery are disloyal; but I do assert that all those who are disloyal will defend and applaud him.

What argument have these advocates of dissension used to justify Mr. Avery's amazing conduct?

They have but a single argument. Montgomery Ward & Co., they say, is not in this war. The President's critics contend that, because this vast enterprise is engaged primarily in distribution rather than manufacture, it is not subject to the Government's authority.

Montgomery Ward & Co. is not a corner grocery. In 1943 it did more than $600,000,000 worth of business. It has more than 600 stores and establishments, located in every State of the Union. It employs more than 70,000 people. It owns four factories which make farm supplies and machinery, carburetors, propellers, and gun mounts. War Food Administrator Marvin Jones has stated, under sworn affidavit, that Montgomery Ward & Co. distributes supplies in every State of the Union which are vitally necessary for the production of critical foodstuffs. Officials of the War Production Board have sworn to the fact that Montgomery Ward & Co. has in thousands of cases been granted priorities and preference ratings for the distribution of essential goods. The company has received certificates of war necessity for large numbers of trucks, which are now operating for them in the 48 States. The company has contracts with the Government for the supply of essential items to the Navy and to our allies under lease-lend. Its headquarters in Chicago are located in the very center of a vast industrial region. It supplies thousands of war workers with civilian goods which are necessary for the maintenance of their productivity.

To compare this vast Nation-wide enterprise with the corner grocery and the corner filling station is so manifestly absurd as to convict of pure hypocrisy those who make the analogy. This is the smoke screen which has always been used by those interests which sought to exempt themselves from regulations imposed by Congress in the public interest. Our constitutional history is replete with distinctions drawn by the courts between enterprises of national importance and those activities which are purely local concern In every case where the Congress has sought to regulate the activities of enterprises which affect the national welfare, pleaders for special privilege have sought to shield themselves behind the corner merchant and the filling station.

I can vouch a special interest in the problems of small business in America. Ever since I have been a Member of Congress, I have fought the battle of the little merchant and the corner store. I am a coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act—the golden rule in business law—which is designed to protect the right of the small merchant to stay in business.

Incidentally, Montgomery Ward has been five times adjudged a violator of this law by the Federal Trade Commission. It has also been found guilty of disseminating false and misleading advertisements.

I am now chairman of a Special Small Business Committee set up by the House of Representatives in order to protect the little man from extinction during this war and during the period of reconversion which is to follow. Over all these years I have fought the battle primarily to protect little business against the ruthless encroachments of the national chain stores and the mail-order houses. Mr. Avery and his pernicious gang have a lobbying record that has never been paralleled in the history of this country in trying to destroy independent merchants and independent business generally before the legislatures of the 48 States and before the Congress of the United States. They have resorted to the cruelest methods imaginable, which were unfair, unethical, and illegal to ruthlessly strangle their weaker competitors. This record of Mr. Sewell Avery represents one of the slimiest trails that ever crossed the page of time. Had this effort been successful, there would have been today no corner store in which Mr. Avery could hide under the counter.

Now, then Mr. Sewell Avery, the head of a vast mail-order house, defies his Government and his Commander in Chief in time of war; he hides under the counter of the corner grocer and the small merchant to shield himself against the authority of his Nation.

We are now poised for a gigantic military offensive. There are 10,000,000 vacant chairs in the homes of America. Millions of American soldiers, sailors, and airmen, after months and years of rigorous training, are straining to go. Before many days have passed they will launch a terrific and destructive assault against the last bastions of Nazi tyranny. These boys have submerged every interest in life and every personal gain. They are ready to sacrifice themselves without questions, without stint or limit in order that our free way of life might survive. Their courage and their skill have brought pride into the hearts of our citizens at home. It is shameful and humiliating that in return for the example of self-sacrifice which they have set, Mr. Sewell Avery has sent to them a message of disunity and arrogant self-aggrandizement.

Our Commander in Chief, by his courageous and decisive action, has sent back to the far-flung battle fronts of the earth a message that the law is still supreme and the authority of the Nation is still paramount. To send a different answer, or to impair the effectiveness of the answer which the Commander in Chief has already sent, would be an act of cowardice and betrayal.

Our boys have struck terror into the hearts of the enemy. General Eisenhower has said, "Tell the American people to stick together." Here at home, let no act of disunity or discord permit Mr. Sewell Avery to give Hitler or Tojo a ray of hope.

My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, often have I been accused of disloyalty because, while agreeing that we should be friendly and cooperate with other nations, I have insisted that, when the issue was as to whether, in dealing with other nations, we should sacrifice our sovereignty, become a part of a united states of the world, the interests of my country, the protection of my country, should be given preference.

As the days go by, it is becoming clear that Stalin does not intend to sacrifice the interests or the sovereignty of Russia by any present or post-war agreement with other nations.

Churchill has many times stated it to be his unalterable purpose, not only to preserve the economic and territorial interests of the British Empire, but to expand that Empire at every opportunity.

While here at home an attempt has been made to attach a sinister meaning to the term "isolationist," Churchill and the dominion premiers, who recently met with him to reassert the policy of the British Empire, announced to all the world that Great Britain intended to think first of the Empire and its dominions; that it, as to the rest of the world, was an isolationist nation.

An editorial from the May 5, 1944, issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune clearly states the case. That editorial reads as follows:

ON ISOLATIONISM

The meeting of the dominion premiers with Mr. Churchill in London invites a reexamination by Americans of the term isolationism.

Obviously a nation can achieve isolation in either of two ways. It can, by its own will, hold itself aloof from foreign commitments; or the nations with which it might cooperate can refuse to play ball. A nation that is thrust aside is no less isolated than one which declines to entangle itself.

Now it is a curious fact that those American citizens who profess to be most alarmed

over isolation by our own choice are not disturbed at the prospect of this country's isolation through the actions of others. This is a curious fact, but by no means an inexplicable one. The people in this country who use isolationism as a term of reproach are, generally speaking, people who prefer another country to their own, as is shown by their desire to use the men and wealth of this country for the aggrandizement of the nations they so greatly admire. The objection of these Americans to isolationism sprang from the conviction that England, or Russia, had need of us. Of course, if England or Russia or both of them together decide to make other arrangements, those Americans whose opinions are guided by the desires of London or Moscow will accept American isolationism without serious protest.

And that is what appears to be happening. The American opponents of isolationism call their policy cooperation, but they have never thought of it as a two-way street. Thus they have not been disturbed by Mr. Churchill's recent announcement that the British islands off our shores are to remain British despite any desire that Americans may have to enhance our national security. Likewise our cooperationists have not been upset by the reports from the commonwealth conference in London. Nothing else was expected.

To these minds Premier Curtin, of Australia had a right to be as grudging as he was in acknowledging the debt of his country to the American soldiers and sailors (and taxpayers) who have saved it from a Japanese invasion. Your American cooperationist regards this as a normal, natural, and wholesome attitude toward America. Americans, it appears, have no more right to complain of this than of the presence at the conference, as a representative of India, of one of its native oppressors, as if to advertise to Americans the fact that they are fighting for the preservation of a particularly odious form of imperialism.

The fact is becoming increasingly apparent that any isolation of America from the British Empire that can be found today is at the initiative of the British. The commonwealth conference and, before that, the very close Anglo-Russian alliance established in the treaty of May 26, 1942, indicate all too plainly the lines on which our principal allies propose to operate after the war. The rest of the world, including ourselves, is to occupy a secondary position. To these extents we are isolated not only from Britain but from Russia as well.

It is worth noting, also, that, though we have saved Australia from the Japanese and have opened the Mediterrancan to British ships, and are about to furnish the great preponderance of troops and supplies for the invasion of the continent of Europe, Britain is giving us only negligible help against Japan, and Russia is actually helping Japan against us.

Yes, we are fairly isolated; and isolated, it should be noted, precisely by those countries which snobbish Americans are seeking to exalt at our expense. Quite evidently it was not isolationism as such to which these sycophants objected; it was isolationism for the benefit of America.

Before this war is over, Stalin, Churchill, Russia, and the British Empire will force an ever-increasing number of Americans to the realization that every nation, every people, are thinking of their land, of their interests, of their national integrity, first, and that they are acting upon that thought for self-preservation.

I see no reason why Americans should not now and hereafter insist that we here at home think of America first.

A Vote Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report of a survey made by the students of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., regarding the votes cast in that city at the primary election, April 25, 1944.

The result of this survey is thought-provoking and is, no doubt, more or less representative of the attitude of the people throughout all sections of our country:

ALLEGHENY STUDENTS EXPOSE CITY GROUPS' VOTING HABITS—CHALLENGE BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL MEN WITH SURVEY WHICH FINDS ONLY SMALL PERCENTAGE OF PROFESSORS, CLERGYMEN, AND DENTISTS AT PRIMARY POLLS APRIL 25

A group of Allegheny College students offered a sharp challenge to Meadville's business and professional classes as they announced results of a survey conducted this week in an attempt to allocate responsibility for the city's record low turn-out for the April 25 election primaries.

Statistics compiled by the political science students who checked on nine local groups revealed that only lawyers and "the Chestnut Street business man" provided a 50 percent or better response to the franchise opportunity.

And, judging civic interest by the group's turn-out, the survey exposed college professors, with their 28.4 percent response, as most detached from the political scene.

The history and political science majors who investigated a situation which found only 33 percent of the city's eligible voters at the polls are: Mary Lou Sweet, of Erie; Nancy Altman, of Whitman, Mass.; Marjean Moore, of Latrobe, and Joanne Rothrock, of Geneva, Ohio. They worked under direction of Dr. Paul H. Giddens.

Meadville's 17 lawyers, 15 of whom voted, recorded an 88.2 percentage and left a lapse of some 36 points between them and the next group, the businessman, which aggregated a 52.1 percent turn-out.

Percentages of response of other groups ranged from the labor union officers' 47.8 down to the college professors' 28.4 and included: Industrial leaders, 45.8; high school teachers, 37; physicians, 34.7; clergymen, 32; and dentists, 31.8. Clergymen, dentists, and professors, the survey indicated, fell below the entire county's 33 percent level.

A barometer of the community groups' political-mindedness as found in the table compiled by the students:

	Eligible	Registered	Voting
Lawyers	17	17	15
Chestnut St. businessmen [1]	46	42	24
Labor union officers	23	18	11
Industrial leaders [1]	24	23	11
High school teachers	27	21	10
Physicians	23	19	8
Clergymen	25	18	8
Dentists	22	16	7
College professors	45	36	13

[1] In these 2 cases not all, but a representative number from the groups were checked. Voting records of all in the other groups, however, were tallied.

A survey conducted of the business and professional groups' wives provided as interesting contrast, although their voting record percentages averaged considerably lower than their husbands'.

Lawyers' wives led the list with 46.4 percent; physicians' wives were next with 33.3 percent, while the dentist's wife set the record low for both men's and women's groups at 16.6 percent. Wives of college professors was the only group to outshine their husbands—their 29.6 percentage was 1.2 higher. Wives of Chestnut Street businessmen recorded a 31.1 vote; wives of clergymen polled a 28.5, and wives of industrial leaders a 27.2 percent vote.

Results of the check among women:

	Eligible	Registered	Voting
Wives of lawyers	15	15	7
Wives of physicians	18	16	6
Wives of Chestnut Street businessmen	45	30	14
Wives of college professors	27	19	8
Wives of clergymen	21	11	6
Wives of industrial leaders	22	20	6
Wives of dentists	18	11	3

In an over-all picture the college students showed that of 346 men and women in the various groups eligible to vote, only 136 exercised their franchise. Entire Meadville vote totalled some 1,600 against a figure of 5,300 eligibles.

Translating their results into accusations, the students asked, "How can a government function democratically when people take so little interest in expressing their preferences?"; "Are teachers and professors setting a good example by this attitude for their students?"; "Are businessmen and industrial leaders who oppose increased taxation, socialized control, and Government regulations justified in their criticisms if they neglect to voice their opinions through voting?"

The Organization of Congress—Remarks of Representatives Dirksen and Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the following observations were made by my colleagues, the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Member of Congress from Illinois, the Honorable A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, Member of Congress from Oklahoma, and me, to the national convention of the League of Women Voters in Chicago on April 26. The Honorable HAROLD H. BURTON, United States Senator from Ohio, also participated in the program.

REMARKS OF MR. DIRKSEN

While the Constitution creates a Government of three branches, yet our system of government rests essentially upon the powers conferred upon the Congress. A cursory examination of its powers will make this abundantly clear.

No inferior courts or agencies of government can come into being except as they are created by Congress. No taxes can be imposed save by authority of Congress. Not a soldier or sailor can be enlisted or conscripted

nor can a warship be built unless authorized by the lawmaking branch. Not a single dollar can be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury except in pursuance of law, and that means action by the Congress. No Executive order has validity unless it rests upon statutory authority, and that means authority derived from Congress. The lawmaking branch is the basis of our National Government.

POWER IN RETREAT

For a decade legislative power, here as elsewhere, has been in retreat. This unhappy condition began in 1933, when distress was upon the land, when the Nation demanded action, and when broad delegations of power became the rule rather than the exception. These grants of power were accompanied with blank checks, the creation of countless administrative agencies, an expansion of bureaucracy, the rapid rise of administrative law, and the expanded use of rules, regulations, orders, and directives. Such powers, when once granted, were difficult of repeal and we moved through a period of legislative drift and Executive mastery.

CONGRESS NOT ENTIRELY BLAMELESS

Congress is not entirely blameless for this unhappy condition. It must bear criticism for any failure to exercise its full constitutional responsibility and for any weakness in the congressional structure and processes which prevents it from operating as an efficient instrument of Government. If it fails to equip itself with the tools and techniques to carry out its full powers under our organic law, it is manifestly not exercising its full responsibility for economy, efficiency, and sound Government.

SOME CLARIFICATION

It should be made clear that in a complex economy there must be agencies to discharge ministerial and administrative functions and that certain powers must be delegated. Congress as such cannot well administer the railroads. It requires an agency like the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congress cannot handle the administrative details which are involved in a public power program. These must be entrusted to an agency like the Federal Power Commission. Congress cannot well make the intricate studies which are the basis of tariffs and duties. These must be made by an instrumentality like the United States Tariff Commission. But Congress can do this: It can first carefully define and delimit the powers which are delegated and spell out the guide lines under which such powers are to be exercised. It can establish the qualifications for the persons who are to be entrusted with such powers; it can then follow through to make certain that those powers are properly, efficiently, and economically administered for the general welfare. This, then, involves in a general way the delegation of authority, the supervision of that authority, and the appropriation of public money. How, then, can Congress improve its structure and processes in securing best results for the people?

SOME SUGGESTIONS

Within the limits of the time set, I should prefer to emphasize the fiscal aspects of this matter but want to embrace the opportunity to include a few general suggestions. In a number of special fields, and particularly in time of war, the use of carefully selected joint committees of House and Senate would be useful and fruitful in saving time because time is such an important element. An adequately staffed legislative reference service in the Library of Congress could be of inestimable value to both committees and Members in dealing with the complex problems and policies which come before Congress. A streamlined committee structure would be in the interest of efficiency. A better coordination of the revenue and appropriation functions of Congress could develop substantial results in the field of economy. A method for the sustained study of policy legislation in other countries and the results of such legislation might prove definitely useful in connection with our own problems. And finally there is the responsibility of Congress in so utilizing its investigatory powers to achieve maximum benefits for the taxpayers of the Nation.

FISCAL COMMANDOS

The fiscal processes of Government are not quite so involved as they appear. The bureaus and agencies of Government all appear before the Bureau of the Budget with estimates of their financial needs for the year that lies ahead. The Bureau investigates the request. Its staff is limited and investigations of projects in the field are rather casual. When agreement is reached with respect to various items of estimated expenditure, it is finally presented to the President. The estimates are then incorporated in the annual Budget and are submitted to Congress. Hearings are then held by subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and agency and department heads quizzed about the various items. They may be approved, increased, or reduced. The subcommittee which handles the matter then reports to the Appropriations Committee and the estimates then go to the House for approval. A similar technique is employed in the Senate. The funds then become available for expenditure. At that point, the congressional process becomes a kind of post mortem. In the following year, the subcommittee seeks to ascertain by means of cross examination, without benefit of real investigation by Congress itself, how the money was expended. It is not a very precise or revealing process. If Congress were equipped with an adequate staff of investigators to make researches in the whole structure of Government, year in and year out to determine how efficiently public funds are expended, whether there is overstaffing of the various bureaus, what Federal functions are of doubtful value and could be discontinued, whether there is duplication of overlapping, Congress would then be equipped with the basic and accurate information which is indispensable to a thorough discharge of the appropriating function of the law-making branch. This power of investigation is one of the most salutary and effective powers in the hands of Congress.

If it were placed upon a truly scientific basis and given the dignity and importance which should attach to an inquiry where billions of dollars of public funds are involved, it could become the greatest force in the land for genuine economy, the elimination of waste and extravagance, the elimination of unnecessary personnel from Federal rolls, the discontinuance of Federal functions which are more ornamental than useful or necessary, the adoption of sound and approved business practices throughout the governmental structure, the consolidation of duplicating activities, the coordination of related functions, the abolition of bureaus which have no bona fide existence, the revitalization of the morale throughout the Federal structure, and generate in the public mind a new and better respect for government. To do this requires facts and information. To obtain that information in a form that would be useful to Congress requires expert investigators. The use of the investigatory power must be made constant, expert, and scientific if real results are to be obtained. It is a responsibility of the Congress.

REMARKS OF MR. MONRONEY

In approaching the problem of improvement of the machinery of Congress, I do not mean to reflect upon the job that the Members do, are trying to do, and wish to do. The problem is bigger and more complex than one of personalities alone.

I don't believe that 435 saints, or even 435 Democrats, could possibly make the present congressional machinery fill the enormous strain that is placed upon it. It just doesn't have the potency, this 1,800-man legislative dog to wag the 3,000,000-man executive tail. It can't pull its load or outrun the fast moving and powerful bureaucracy any more than a Model T can outrun a Mercury of today.

When you consider that in this broad land of 48 States and 135,000,000 people, there is only one man elected with power to direct the executive machine of this Government with all of its ramifications, you can easily and plainly see the need for proper legislative supervision. This was intended by the framers of our Constitution—this is the job that the Members of both Houses of Congress are trying to do—yet the job is plainly impossible with present tools.

Congress is trying to run the world's largest establishment as its board of directors—holding a check-rein on the hundreds of agencies and allocating the money and prescribing policy that we wish to be followed. Yet this mighty business—about 100 times as great as Ford, General Motors, and General Electric all rolled into one—is being run by directors who still must sit on an old-fashioned high stool and in an antiquated ledger scribble notes with a quill pen.

Not even a board of geniuses could possibly run only General Motors without modern mechanical aids, a thoroughgoing modernization, and departmentization of its work and an adequate personnel to keep itself informed.

It must have a thorough understanding and knowledge of what is going on in the plant, the sales department, and the many other departments of the business. The problem is even more important in Government where the lines of authority are complicated and made complex by political machinery, political policy, and even in many cases by overzealous personnel.

To those who site great progress in democracy, I frankly admit that Congress, up to World War No. 1, was able, because of its limited duties and functions, so limited because the Federal Government's activities were only a small fraction of what they are today, to do an outstanding job. But because a bridge once was long enough to reach across the creek is no sign that it still can span a canyon. Increased Federal activities, a trend clearly indicated by the tremendous growth of appropriations, point to the need for improved congressional machinery.

The expenses of Government have increased from $426,027 in 1789 to $78,178,885,241 in 1943. Most of the legislative machinery was set up to handle a Government which spent only $318,040,711, which was the amount spent in the year 1890 when 95 percent of the existing committee set-ups were made and completed.

Naturally, if the size of the job has increased so tremendously, the facilities for doing the work must also be improved and increased. Without tools, no master workman can fashion his product, no matter how great his desire or his ability.

Congress has the right and the power to direct changes in Government. Many of the changes that have improved our condition have been directed by the Congress itself. Still other changes, improvements, and consolidations have taken place in the executive departments by Executive order. The Army and the Navy by facing the problems of modern warfare have completely changed their organization, equipment, and methods.

Congress must change its own procedure, since under our Constitution no one else but Congress has this right. There are dozens of suggestions for improving the techniques, organization, communications, and money appropriating systems of Congress. These range from such proposals as that made by Senator O'DANIEL to limit the term of Members of Congress to 6 years down to

many excellent ones by Congressman DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and particularly by Congressman KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, to provide for a question period of members of the Cabinet before the Congress at regular intervals. The number of proposed changes and the interest in this number indicates that Congress is aware of the need for change.

Because the problem is so varied and complex, it seems to me that the best course of action lies in an approach by a special nonpartisan committee of both Houses of Congress to study the organization of each House of Congress, the relationships between the two Houses, the relationships between the Congress and the other branches of the Government, the employment and remuneration of personnel by the Members and the committees of the Congress and the structure of and the relationships between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress.

We all know that there are many reforms that are needed, and to pass one without examining the other needs would do little to solve the problem of equipping the legislative arm of the Government with adequate power to do the job. Such a committee study would open up all of the proposals and would have the strength of a nonpartisan committee behind carrying their recommendations into concrete effect. Without this, one Member, fostering one bill, will have little chance of securing any reform.

I do not question the adequacy of the parliamentary procedure of the two Houses. There are some flaws, but they have stood the test of time in legislative practice. But everybody knows that the majority of the work of both Houses is done in committees. Beyond this, the adequate information and staff given to the individual Member is of vital importance.

As I view it, a proper study would embrace the following three courses:

1. Committee system.
2. Proper staffing of Congress.
3. Closer cooperation between legislative and executive departments.

I am not unmindful of the tremendous task of securing passage by the House and Senate of any legislation changing our present committee system. It is a good system, but I fear it is a loose and inefficient system, incapable of meeting the gigantic problems of today's government. The House has some 47 standing committees and 5 special committees. The Senate has 33 standing committees and 10 special committees.

These are just like Topsy—they just growed. As need arose for committees, the legislative machinery created them—just as now they should consolidate and reorganize them for efficiency in our operation.

More than 95 percent of our committees were established prior to 1890. In that year the Federal Government spent $318,040,700. Thus, we are bound by machinery designed for a work load of less than 0.003 percent of what it is carrying today.

There was nothing sacred about the establishment or the preservation of the committees, excepting inertia to change. Business of Congress was first handled by select committees and the Third Congress had 350 special committees. In 20 years this number had fallen to 70 and by 1813 it had fallen to 35.

Conversely, the growth of standing committees enlarged. While there were only 6 when the eighteenth century began, there were 10 in 1810 and by 1865 there were 40, the 50 number being reached in 1893. These committees were the result of added duties and needs. In the course of duty, Congress saw fit to remove the appropriations power from the Ways and Means Committee and give it to the legislative committees, then to place it in the Appropriations Committee. Likewise, banking and curernncy matters were removed from the Ways and Means Committee. The House Committee on Education and Labor because two committees and the Committee on Elections, following this ameboe system, became three in 1883. Still others were evidently the desire of a chairman of a special committee to continue his committee as a standing committee, witness the Census Committee of 1901.

I am suggesting not that committees be abolished, but they need to be reorganized, the lines of authority clarified to prevent overlapping and duplication as exists today, and that their procedures be improved.

Procedural changes are also badly needed. One of the worst systems is the lack of organization of hearings. Members begin hearings, often without an opportunity of having studied the legislation and a catch-as-catch-can-proceeding usually develops. Every committee, it seems to me, should plan in executive session before its hearings open the general framework of its study and discuss the issues of the case considered. Ample, but not superfluous, time should be allowed both the public and the Government for their statement of the case.

Now, under present system, a committee may spend months in hearing a case, taking evidence and studying statistics, but will then rush like mad to report the bill they have studied for so long within an hour or two after the hearings close.

A blue pencil for editing and briefing or condensation of hearings is badly needed, both by committees and by the membership itself. No Member can find time to read 2,000 pages of testimony upon a bill, yet unless he is willing to accept the inadequate skeletonized report, he has little or no information on the issue involved. Debate brings out a few of the high points, yet the art of digesting voluminous subjects has improved so much in recent years, a readers digest report on a 2,000-page hearing would be easy and practical to supply the membership.

More than anything else that Congress needs is some way to free itself from the avalanche of reading matter, and yet still be able to get a digest of the important facts and statistics.

Especially important is this in relationship to appropriation hearings. No Member can possibly read and understand completely the 900 page finely printed budget of the United States. Likewise, they cannot possibly digest the lengthy hearings that the Appropriations Committee hold on the money bills.

One simple procedure to put the figures in the budget on a punch-card machine and tabulate Government expenditures in a show-case accounting style. Another would be to improve their technique by having each department submit a uniform operations sheet, clearly showing the numbers of each class of employment, compared with previous years and also their other miscellaneous expenditures such as travel, telephone, and other expensive sidelines of government.

There are hundreds of ways in which improved housekeeping techniques in committees as they now exist would and could improve our operation were we not so wed to tradition.

One of the most important of these goes into the next subject but is closely alined with improving our committee work. That is the matter of staffing, no only the Members of Congress, but particularly the committees. While we struggle to pass policy-making legislation, we rely on a legal staff that is hopelessly small and inadequate. The House Drafting Service has only five attorneys on its pay roll and the Senate Drafting Service has three, although they are allowed five. The total cost is $83,000. Contrast this with the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture with 600 employees and an appropriation of $1,679,105 for 1944.

The staff of the Appropriations Committee consist of four clerks in the Senate and eight in the House, plus special investigators. Contrast that with Budget office of the same Department of Agriculture costing $609,584.

Contrast, too, the fact that none of the important major committees handling legislation of tremendous importance employ a single attorney on their staff, yet deal with agencies who have thousands. My Committee of Banking and Currency must pass on legislation that controls the following departments: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Housing Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Office of Price Administration, and the Commodity Credit Corporation in addition to the R. F. C. with the following branches, Defense Plant Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Corporation, Rubber Reserve Corporation, R. F. C. Mortgage Co., Federal National Mortgage Loan Association; Disaster Loan Corporation, and the War Damage Corportion. We have no committee consultants, attorneys, or specialists in any way on whom we can rely.

The most vital need, as I see it, is for legislation to be written by the Congress itself, yet because we fail to furnish ourselves with a legal staff, both in the drafting service and in the committees, we must rely on bills written and prepared downtown by the agencies that the legislation affects.

Likewise the Appropriations Committee largely must rely on the one-sided showing made by the departments in seeing money. I often think that a "house dick," empowered to knock on the doors of the agencies and ask, "Who are you, who have you got in there, and what are you doing?" would be a good thing.

An adequate system of staff aids is needed, both in research and in many cases in the Member's own office. I am more inclined to favor heavier research and digesting aids in the Legislative Reference Service as an arm of the Library of Congress. A quick comparison of the deficiency in the service that Congress has, compared with the avalanche of statistics, data, economic studies, and other material collected by the departments is amazing.

The Legislative Reference Service has only 66 on its staff, 6 of whom are stenographers and 44 are paid at $2,600 a year or less. For example, they have one specialist in banking and currency paid at $2,600. Contrast that with the hundreds of specialists downtown paid at $5,600 a year or more, yet these departmental employees are collecting facts and figures upon which Congress must base its decisions.

We have one specialist in social welfare paid at $2,600 while the Bureau of Labor Statistics spends more than $2,000,000 and the Social Security Board more than $3,000,000 in collecting and organizing studies of this same nature.

The service's lone expert on Foreign and Domestic Commerce is paid $3,200 while the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce employs 300 and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has 770 on its pay roll.

Throughout the entire Federal set-up you have this same example of mountainous executive staffs and microscopic congressional facilities to deal with and control them. Obviously, if the Congress is to do the kind of a job that the public has the right to expect it to do, if it is to hold down expenses and prevent abuses of legislative intent, it must have the facilities to cope with the problem.

I will leave to others here the problem of dealing with adequate staffing of individual Member's offices, but I do know that many representing extra large constituencies find themselves unable to cope with the demands

upon their offices. It has been estimated by many Congressmen that they spend one-third to more than one-half of their time answering requests for assistance, information, and service from their own districts. This reduces to too great an extent the effective time that the Member has to spend upon hearings and study of legislation and full attendance at the legislative sessions.

The third problem in my outline, that of bettering the relationships between the legislative and the executive departments would be improved by better management of the congressional duties. It might also be helped materially by such resolutions as Congressman KEFAUVER who proposes a question period at regular intervals of Cabinet members and other administrative officers before the Congress itself.

Now we are completely without any means of approachment of the ofttimes varying views of the legislative and executive bodies. Better committee relationships can, as in one outstanding case in the House, give us that improved relationship. I refer to the case of the House Naval Affairs Committee, where an outstanding job has been done.

A study such as we propose undoubtedly would develop other workable means of keeping the gulf from widening between these two all-important governmental branches. At least it is a problem worthy of a study and unquestionably could be helped materially by even informal suggestions. At the present the only way that the average Congressman has, when he feels that congressional authority as defined by law is being exceeded or the law is not being administered as planned, is to get up in the well of the House and lob a block-buster speech downtown at the agency. This adds to confusion and misunderstanding and does nothing to promote unity or efficiency in government.

The fact that such organizations as the League of Women Voters, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and others are interested enough in this question to begin its study leads me to believe that we can and must bring our legislative arm of Government up to meet the needs of today's problems.

Inertia, existing in all organizations, and particularly in legislative bodies, must not block needed reform.

Just as the committee system, our legislative rules and practices developed as the need for them arose, so should the renovation and reorganization of our machinery and workshop be made when the need for it clearly is shown to exist.

REMARKS OF MR. KEFAUVER

Next to winning the war the great job confronting the people of this country, and indeed the people of the world, is to secure and maintain a just peace. If after this holocaust we do not create a better world in which justice and neighborliness supplant tyranny and war, then the sacrifices being made by our fighting men will have been in vain.

If peace is to be maintained the United States must play a leading role and, if we are to play a leading role, there must be a better working agreement between the Executive and Congress on international affairs, and Congress must be better informed and more currently informed.

The sudden entrance of the United States upon the world stage in a leading role finds us horribly ill equipped for the part we must play. If we are to have a foreign policy over a long course of years, if we are to join effectively with other nations to prevent wars, we have got a lot of reorganizing to do. To play a leading role we must have a Government that speaks with authority. There must be one foreign policy—not one for the President and another for Congress. In international relations we must work in closer harmony—the ends of Pennsylvania Avenue must be brought closer together.

To do this it is necessary for Cabinet members and heads of agencies and Members of Congress to get together and talk things over. Congress must be kept fully and currently informed of the Executive's plans and commitments. Unless we do something to change the trend we may be heading for the same catastrophe that was visited on the American people after the last war.

Moreover, on the home front there is a desperate need for more direct liaison and for a clearer understanding between the legislative and executive branches of our Government. So long as the United States was half empty, prosperous, and well protected by broad oceans, the old system was tolerable. But now that the Nation is crowded, harassed by serious social and economic problems, and deeply involved in world affairs, better teamwork is necessary for our welfare and security.

There is nothing wrong with the membership of Congress. I have a very high regard for the ability, integrity, and patriotism of my colleagues. But the truth is, we need to improve the tools with which we work. Much of our mechanism is outmoded. We are not keeping pace with, and we cannot hold our own with the rapidly expanding bureaucracy. We are not kept currently or well informed on international affairs. We need fuller and more accurate information. We will continue to have difficulty with our legislation until we get it.

One of the basic techniques of democracy is a system for reporting by and interrogation of executive officials. One of the great virtues of the town-meeting plan of local government is that at any meeting a citizen may stand on his feet and ask for an explanation of the executive officials of the town. This process of open interrogation is good for the officials as well as the citizens. It provides the best possible opportunity to find how the people are affected by a given course of administration, and it enables the executive to find out what the people are thinking. It gives the executive an opportunity to explain his problems to the people and to defend his course of action. The citizen may, of course, not get what he wants, but he knows why he doesn't get it and he knows his interest is not disregarded. This tends to give him confidence in the integrity and fairness of the executive officials.

In the larger units of government, such as the Federal Government, the method of direct interrogation by citizens cannot be employed. Comparable results may be obtained through questioning by the elected representatives of the people. Any workable plan for this purpose would be beneficial to the Executive, the Members of Congress and to the people of the Nation. There are many things that should be done. These improvements are contemplated by the resolutions introduced by my able colleague, MIKE MONRONEY, and by Senator MALONEY. I hope their resolutions are passed. I am trying to give the kitchen a coat of paint. Mike and Senator MALONEY are interested in painting the whole house. Likewise, I am strongly in favor of the proposal by my distinguished colleague, EVERETT DIRKSEN. It is shameful that congressional committees do not have better staffing and that Congress as a whole does not have a more adequate information service. Senator LA FOLLETTE deserves much credit for his effort to rearrange the committees of Congress. Many committees should be abolished and the jurisdiction of committees should be redefined. I hope that Senator LA FOLLETTE has success with his proposal.

In House Resolution 327 I have proposed that we have a report and question period on the floor of the House of Representatives at least once every 2 weeks. During this report and question period a particular member of the Cabinet, or the head of an agency, would be invited to appear on the floor of the House and answer written questions, which had already been prepared and submitted to him by the legislative committee issuing the invitation.

This procedure would give the Executive an opportunity of preparing answers to the questions and the legislative committee would be able to direct the course the discussion is to follow. The last half of the period would be taken up with questions by Members from the floor of the House. The time for questions from the floor would be under the control of the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee which issued the invitation. The Rules Committee of the House would fix the length of time for the period, which in any case would not be more than 2 hours, and the Rules Committee would also fix the priority of appearances in the event more than one invitation is pending at any one time. The purpose of all of this is, of course, to bring the Executive face to face with the representatives of the people in order that the country may have the benefit of a free, open, and candid consultation between them.

There is ample historical precedent in this country for the closer collaboration of the Cabinet and the Congress. I think the men who wrote the Constitution intended that there should be a better teamwork. I do not think that the Constituion contemplated the Cabinet and the Congress should be so separated that they could not work together in the interest of the country. The precedents are that in the First Congress President Washington, with Members of his Cabinet, appeared on two occasions in the Senate to advise with the Senators in connection with a treaty which was pending at that time. During the First Congress several Cabinet officers appeared in person before the Senate and the House of Representatives. The reason I say the type of procedure I am suggesting was contemplated by those wise men who wrote the Constitution, is that Washington was the chairman of the Constitutional Convention. Many Members of the First Congress were members of the Constitutional Convention. Certainly they would not have started this practice if they had not thought it was in conformity with the intention of the Constitution.

In the House of Representatives the average tenure of membership is a fraction over two terms. There is no adequate way under our present system for Members of the House to keep abreast with the rapidly changing problems of Government. We have no easy way of finding out about the plans and problems of the departments. The committee system tends to make specialists of the Members of the House and it does not give us an over-all picture, particularly of international problems. The departments file annual reports, but these are voluminous and are postmortems. The system of securing information by resolution is clumsy and unworkable.

Congress could do its work better, the executives would be more alert, and the public would be better informed if a method for face-to-face discussion could be put into operation.

I am grateful to the National League of Women Voters for devoting a part of your program to the problem of revitalizing Congress. You are an intelligent group without any axes to grind. You are interested only in the general welfare. If the various chapters of your organization would put this subject on their agenda for discussion for the coming year, you will, indeed, have rendered the Nation and the world a great service. It is only by focusing the searchlight of publicity upon the shortcomings of democratic institutions that improvement can be secured.

On Guard Against the T. V. A. Assault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun:

ON GUARD AGAINST THE T. V. A. ASSAULT

Friends of orderly government will come to the alert again as the time approaches for another congressional show-down on Senator MCKELLAR'S anti-T. V. A. amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill. The first of these bills would disrupt the very efficient fiscal system on which T. V. A. now operates. The second would subject all appointments carrying more than $4,500 in salary to Senate confirmation. This latter amendment applies not only to T. V. A. but to all Federal jobs in the indicated range.

The show-down on these amendments will come in the conference between the two Houses which is now considering the independent offices appropriation bill. The House passed this bill, free of the McKellar amendments, on January 31 of this year. In the Senate the bill was considered in normal course by the Appropriations Committee. Senator MCKELLAR is acting chairman of this committee and he persuaded it to report favorably on his two amendments. The Senate adopted these amendments March 24. The conference will take them up according to present indications some time early in May.

Even to those who object in principle to the T. V. A. experiment, the flaws in the McKellar proposals are perfectly apparent. First, take the amendment having to do with T. V. A. finances. Senator MCKELLAR wants to force T. V. A. to turn its balances regularly into the Treasury and, consequently, to appear before Congress regularly as a petitioner for appropriations. But this would demolish the distinctive and valuable organizational form in which T. V. A. now does business. T. V. A. would be reduced to the status of just another Government bureau operated politically from Washington

As everybody knows, the perils of bureaucracy, of overcentralization, of Government red tape are too great to risk in a highly technical enterprise like T. V. A. It was for just that reason that the sponsors of T. V. A. experimented with a new kind of organization for Government enterprises. That organization is patterned closely on the private-business corporation.

This kind of structure, says T. V. A. Chairman David E. Lilienthal, in public as in private business, holds management "strictly accountable not only for what it does, but for how well it does it. Such fixing of responsibility increases initiative and gives an opportunity for enterprise and experiment." There may be room for debate as to the completeness with which this policy is carried out, but there can be no denying that the executives in the field must have responsibility.

In line with this theory of fixing responsibility, the present T. V. A. finance system provides for rigid audits of T. V. A. books by the office of the Comptroller General, who reports what he finds to Congress. Hence, Senator MCKELLAR cannot argue that the change he seeks is necessary to keep Congress informed on T. V. A.'s finances. Congress is amply informed under the present system—as it should be. And the present system has positive advantages which ought not to be jeopardized.

The second McKellar amendment is equally objectionable. It would sweep all the over $4,500 jobs, of which there are many, into the patronage mill. The significant appointments in Government—those to ambassadors, to Supreme Court justiceships, etc.—are rightly subject to Senate confirmation. Appointees to these high posts have a primary impact on policy, for one thing, as no mere $4,500 man does. And the very eminence of these posts is something of a protection against the gross kind of patronage finagling which the relative unimportance of the $4,500 jobs might invite.

Senator MCKELLAR, in brief, is wrong on both scores. Let the conference committee so find and let the House and Senate back the committee up in that finding.

State Control Versus Federal Control of Education for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a statement made by the American Council on Education representing 50 national organizations concerned with education. The statement speaks for itself.

The issue or difference between the educational provision contained in S. 1767 as amended and reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives and the bill reported by the Committee on Education of the House is Federal control versus State control of public education.

The Committee on Education had under consideration the subject of education for veterans for approximately 6 months and has given a great deal of time, study, and attention to the subject. The Committee on Education of the House is firmly of the opinion that education should remain under the control of the States and not become the subject of bureaucratic control in Washington.

Representatives of 50 national organizations concerned with education on all levels, both public and private, met today in Washington at the call of the American Council on Education. The pending legislation in Congress providing for the education of returning veterans was considered at length. The following statement was adopted unanimously:

1. The conference wishes to affirm its deep conviction in the wisdom of the traditional policy which reserves control of education to the States and localities, prudently left there, by the Constitution of the United States.

2. We are in agreement with the general purposes of the Clark omnibus bill recently passed by the Senate and the Rankin omnibus bill now before the House of Representatives. But the educational provisions of these bills violate this essential and fundamental principle of our form of government by setting up Federal bureaucratic control in education.

3. We believe that the educational provisions of the Clark and Rankin bills present the most serious threat to the existing State and local control of education that has yet appeared in this country.

4. We hold that if this menace to State and local control of education is to be defeated immediate action is needed on the part of all who oppose this invasion of States' rights by Federal agencies. To be effective such action must be taken before May 10 on which date it is reported that the House of Representatives will vote on this legislation.

5. The Barden bill, H. R. 3846, now before the House of Representatives, provides for State advisory committees, State selection of institutions, administration through State educational agencies, State counseling services for returning veterans, and the use of existing educational agencies and institutions. These provisions assure that existing facilities will be used under the direction of the several States, thereby providing greater educational benefits and services to returning veterans than would be possible under Federal bureaucratic control. We therefore urge that the Barden bill should be adopted. As an alternative we urge that the Rankin (H. R. 4357) and Clark (S. 1767) bills be amended by striking out title II, chapter IV, "Education for veterans," and substituting therefor the provisions of the Barden bill.

A. J. Brumbaugh, representing the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; O. C. Carmichael, chairman of the American Council on Education; J. H. Saunders, representing the National Education Association; John J. Seidel, assistant superintendent for Vocational Education, Maryland State Department of Education; Edward V. Stanford, O. S. A., representing the National Catholic Educational Association; members of the resolutions committee.

Road Construction Costs Are Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following letter from Hon. C. P. Newton, judge of the county court of Pulaski County, Ark., and an outstanding citizen of my State. I trust that this timely statement will receive the thoughtful consideration of the House and of administrative officials who are dealing with the important problem of controlling costs of road construction.

DEAR BROOKS: About once a year, perhaps not so often, I write a Congressman a nonpersonal letter, and this is mine for 1944. I am writing Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, a similar letter.

Despite the war, big things are brewing for the peace to come, among them being a gigantic program for road construction—National, State, and county highways. I have no suggestion to make about how the financing should be done, how it should be coordinated, but the primary object of my letter is to insist that the Congress take an interest in per-mile, per-square-yard, per-ton costs for such a program.

The outrageously high cost of primary road construction in the past has been a disgrace to everybody connected with it. At last, we do have a few experts who admit that road building expense per unit must be brought down. I refer mainly to material costs, and not so much to engineer-

ing and labor costs, which are high enough within themselves.

I do not know what Congress can do toward this end, but I am strongly impelled to ask that you look into it. As a matter of truth and justice, the United States Bureau of Roads should lead the way. The people simply cannot pay the price they have been paying in the past for hard roads. The "dehydrating" effect of this total war upon earning power and everything else is going to be devastating. We are due to revise our sense of values in every vital relationship of life. Of course, there must be no backward step in our American way of life, and it is the hope of all of us that our standards of living will not be lowered too much.

The laboratories of certain forward-looking corporations are working out some comparatively low-cost road materials, and it is the hope of every county judge in the land that some of these methods and materials will find their way into general use, without the trimmings of high fees or downright graft. I know you will welcome this suggestion of mine even if there is nothing you can do about it immediately.

With kind personal regards for you always, I am,

Fraternally,

C. P. NEWTON.

Congress Simplifies Tax Program—Tax Reports Less Complicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we have completed discussion and passed H. R. 4646, a tax-simplification measure submitted to the House of Representatives by its Committee on Ways and Means. Having carefully read the bill and the committee report, I can say that, with the exception of a few details and provisions, I am pleased with the excellent job the committee has accomplished.

This bill, H. R. 4646, when enacted into law, will eliminate to a great extent a controversy that has been raging between administration officials and Members of Congress. Each blames the other for the complexity of the tax laws and the tax forms.

It is to be hoped that in view of the splendid job done by the Committee on Ways and Means, that the Treasury Department will see fit to send out instructions with the tax forms phrased in language which can be readily understood by the average layman.

Since the first income-tax law was written nearly 30 years ago, hundreds of amendments have been added. Each amendment further complicated the tax structure.

With the event of World War No. 2, 50,000,000 Americans were required to file returns and pay Federal income taxes, Many of them had never heard of surtax, capital gain and loss, normal tax, capital assets, earned income credit, short and long term capital gains, and so forth. Most naturally, there came to be a clamor for an easier way of making out tax forms. The passage of H. R. 4646 will provide this relief.

It was my hope and desire that the House would so amend H. R. 4646 so as to not increase the amount of taxes now paid by the lower-income-earning groups. However, according to the rule adopted, only committee amendments and changes were permitted. According to the present terms of H. R. 4646, a married person with one child, earning $1,800 a year, will have to pay six-tenths of 1 percent more taxes than at present. A person in the same category, earning $10,000 a year, will pay only one-tenth of 1 percent increase under H. R. 4646 over what he pays under existing legislation. However, further changes, if any, now will be considered by the Senate.

With the increased cost of living, taxes on low incomes should not be increased.

A few days ago I received a letter from R. N. Nelson, a prominent attorney at Breckenridge, Minn., suggesting that farmers be given until at least February 15 to file their income estimates for the previous year.

The pending bill requires that this must be done by January 15. This is somewhat of an improvement over the existing law, which stipulates that estimates must be in by December 15. However, since most farmers close their fiscal year December 31, this means that all the farmers will be crowding into the offices of auditors, attorneys, and tax experts to have their returns made out during those 15 days unless the time is extended. I hope that this proposal for time extension is adopted in the Senate.

The first two pages of the committee report—No. 1365—on H. R. 4646 effectively outlines the intent and purpose of this tax-simplification measure and presents a brief summary of the changes in existing law.

It is herein reprinted:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for simplification of the individual income tax, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill is confined to the simplification of the individual income tax. In the preparation of this legislation your committee had in mind the following objectives:

1. To relieve the great majority of taxpayers from the necessity of computing their income tax.
2. To reduce the number of tax computations.
3. To simplify the return form.
4. To decrease the number of persons required to file declarations of estimated tax.
5. To eliminate some of the difficulties and uncertainties in the making of estimates required for declarations.

The bill accomplishes these objectives without substantially changing the number of taxpayers or the revenue yield under existing law.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

To accomplish these objectives, the bill makes several important changes in existing law.

First, for the surtax, there is a uniform exemption of $500 per person. Thus the taxpayer is allowed $500, the taxpayer's spouse is allowed $500, and there is a $500 allowance for each dependent.

Second, the Victory tax is repealed. The present normal and surtax are combined into a single surtax. A new normal tax of 3 percent is imposed on each person whose net income exceeds $500.

Third, a new simplified tax table, designated supplement T, is provided in the bill. This table may be used by taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000, regardless of the source of their income. In general, adjusted gross income is gross income less business deductions. The table is so constructed as to allow the taxpayer a standard deduction of approximately 10 percent of his gross income. The use of this table is optional with the taxpayer.

Fourth, taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of $5,000 or more are permitted at their option to claim, in lieu of their actual deductions, a standard deduction of $500.

Fifth, the present withholding system is modified, effective with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1945, so as to withhold, in the case of a taxpayer whose income is derived solely from wages, approximately the full tax liability on wages up to at least $5,000.

Sixth, in this bill taxpayers filing declarations are given an opportunity to amend their declarations on or before January 15 next following the close of the taxable year, for those on a calendar-year basis. Taxpayers may file, on or before January 15, their final return in lieu of the final declaration of estimated tax. Under present law, the final amended declaration must be filed on or before December 15.

Seventh, the bill makes two important changes with reference to farmers. A farmer is defined under the bill as an individual who derives more than two-thirds of his gross income from farming. Under existing law, an individual is not classified as a farmer unless he derives 80 percent or more of his gross income from farming. The other important change is that, under the bill, a farmer may make a final return on or before January 15 next following the close of the calendar year in lieu of making any declaration of estimated tax. If he is unable to make a complete return by January 15, he can make a declaration on an estimated tax on or before January 15 and file a final return on or before March 15. Under present law, a farmer is required to file a declaration of estimated tax on or before December 15 of the current year.

Eighth, the number of individuals required to file declarations of estimated tax is considerably decreased by the bill.

Under this bill those whose income not subject to withholding does not exceed $100 are required to file declarations only if their gross income exceeds $5,000, plus $500 for the spouse, and $500 for each dependent. Under present law, a declaration is required for those whose "other" income does not exceed $100 if their gross income from wages is over $2,700, if single, or $3,500 if married.

Ninth, the existing law has been amended with respect to deductions for charitable contributions so as to allow up to 15 percent of the adjusted-gross income (generally, gross income less business deductions) in lieu of the present law limit of 15 percent of net income. This has the effect of increasing the allowance for charitable contributions, and will enable the taxpayer to compute his charitable deduction without having to determine his net income.

Tenth, under the bill medical expenses are deductible only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of adjusted-gross income in lieu of the present law provision of 5 percent of net income computed without regard to this deduction. This will result in a slight reduction in the medical expense allowance but is believed justified in the interest of simplification.

Eleventh, the bill introduces a new concept, adjusted gross income. It is defined to mean gross income less business deductions, deductions attributable to rents and royalties, and losses treated as losses from

the exchange or sale of property. In the case of an employee, adjusted-gross income consists of gross wages or salary less expenses of travel or lodging in connection with employment while away from home, and any reimbursed expenses in connection with his employment. It will be seen, therefore, that in general adjusted-gross income means gross income less business deductions.

Taxpayers who desire a copy of the measure after it becomes law may write to their Congressman for it. Others wanting more detailed information may desire a copy of the committee report on the bill, and these also are available on request. For the information of constituents in the Ninth District of Minnesota, my address is 1620 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Are We Selling Our Liberties for a Mess of Pottage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which I wrote for the May issue of Liberty, a magazine of religious freedom, published in Washington:

ARE WE SELLING OUR LIBERTIES FOR A MESS OF POTTAGE?

Our forefathers who hewed this country out of a wilderness knew what they wanted in the way of individual liberty, community freedom, and central government.

They knew that they wanted—and each wanted—a maximum of personal liberty combined with dignity, all possible community freedom consistent with a recognition of the liberty and dignity of others, and a rigorously restrained and limited central government.

In their formative years the States, or Colonies, had existed under the exact opposite of these ideals. It was because of their existence for nearly 200 years under government antithetical to these ideals that the colonists had come to cherish and hope for the proclamation of their own individual liberties secured to them by their own government, designed for this purpose, and this purpose only.

The people of the United States declared their independence in 1773 and later established their Constitution for the very definite purpose of getting less government.

It was a natural result of living under a despotic government which had been guilty, in the words of the Declaration, of "a long train of abuses and usurpations."

It was inevitable that the men who were building a new order in a new continent should feel and should declare that their individual and inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" existed before and above governments and that the function of government was primarily to protect their rights and not to curb, curtail, or restrict any of them.

These men maintained—with words and, when the time came, with force—that government was and should be their creation; that they and their inalienable rights came first; and that government, being their creature, could not be greater than its creator.

They wanted to eliminate a government which had built up a "history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States."

The Colonists wanted no tyrannical central government over them and over their community governments. It was clear to them what evils must flow from a despotic over-all government, even though that government might aim to be benevolently paternal.

The evils of such a government, pressing relentlessly on their individual and joint affairs, the founding fathers set forth simply and clearly in their declaration of our independence. And later, when they established their own rigidly limited—as they thought—central government, they set forth the evils again, and to guard themselves and their posterity they wrote into our Constitution "no" after "no."

The two documents which are our heritage, the Declaration and the Constitution, were a defiance to a kingly despot and a pledge to make real that defiance and the results flowing from it.

Reading them now, many will read into them, not only a recital of past governmental wrongs but in some instances a warning to posterity in order that posterity might be on its guard to prevent a repetition of the evils which they were casting aside.

All over the world forces are loose which seem to be determined to bring into new birth the evils of despotic central government against which the Colonists rebelled and which they sought to banish forever from the United States at least.

In some countries these evils have already overcome the individual, scotched his rights, and ground him into a supine mass upon which tyrants tramp. In others, forsaking the ideals of individual freedom and seeking always to get from government more than a government of freemen can give, peoples have caused their governments to topple at the first push.

In our own country forces are building up which are inimical to our individual liberties and destructive of the form of government best suited to the preservation of such liberties.

Despite the warnings of the founding fathers, despite the pitiful examples of other peoples, we are falling more and more into habits of thought and habits of action which, if we persist in them, will suck from the Declaration of Independence all its vigor, and from the Constitution all its safeguards. When we shall have dined on this expensive bill of fare we shall have a mess of pottage.

Instead of realizing that our strength is in ourselves as individuals, instead of realizing that the strength of our Government comes from the same identical source, we as individuals and as groups are seeking to draw from the Government, in ever greater degree, that which it cannot give us.

Our Federal Government cannot give to us a single thing unless it takes that thing from some of us. Not one of us can be given a special privilege by government unless government takes some right from another.

And once it is established that government has the power and authority to take away a right from one of its citizens—even to confer privilege upon another citizen—then democracy, as born in the Declaration and the Constitution, ceases to exist.

This tendency of individuals and of groups to seek special favors from the central government is not new. But it has increased to the danger point. This is the logical result of yielding to the first pressure, for it goes in an everwidening circle. Each new group must be given increasing favors in order to offset the last favor given to the other group. And in the end there simply are not enough favors to go round.

This vicious yielding to groups produces a rot, not only in government, but in the groups and in the people themselves.

Under the operation of the system the individual gives up slowly and unthinkingly, perhaps, his guaranteed rights, his individual liberty, and dignity. He ceases to be a free man in a free country. He becomes the creature of his government—his government which he has created. It is a seemingly impossible, but nevertheless actual, condition.

Our freemen, our Americans, have in large part lost the faculty of thinking and acting as freemen and as Americans. They think of themselves as members of the pressure group to which each one thinks it most advantageous to belong. And each group tries to feed on the government—in effect, on all of us.

We have reached the point where many positions of trust in our Federal Government are not filled by free Americans, but are allotted to the various pressure groups. So many positions on this board are prescribed to be filled by industry. So many positions on that board are prescribed to be filled by labor. So many on the next go to farmers. So many positions on the next agency are to be filled by women. So many on the next board must be social workers. Everyone has to get his place and his emoluments except the free American man. We do not qualify for positions of national scope on that basis any more.

All over the country right now pressure groups are further insisting that representation of America at the peace table—when it comes—shall be not on the basis of representing America but on the basis of representing business, labor, the women, the various churches, the various races. At any moment we can expect the red-haired men to demand a special representative on the various boards and on the peace mission.

Of course, in order to meet, or to anticipate, these pressure demands, we have multiplied thousands upon thousands of Federal officeholders. We have sent them into every village and every hamlet to mingle in every conceivable kind of affair.

And this has been done by the descendants and heirs of those who, in drawing their indictment against the King of Britain, entered as one of the principal counts that "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

There are other counts in that indictment that might well be given thought in our present time—and all my expressions in this article are based not upon our country at war but upon tendencies which developed long before the war.

There was, for instance, the charge that the King had subverted the judiciary; that "He has made judges dependent on his will alone." That count the founding fathers thought justified rebellion, yet in our day and age there is a dangerous tendency to make our judiciary subservient to the same type of pressure already outlined.

And there was the count in the Declaration that the King had forfeited his right to rule over the Colonies "for taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments."

The forms of our State governments, which existed before the Federal Government, and which the Constitution was to protect, have already been altered fundamentally and the change is continuing. The same bribery which has been effective in inducing individuals to yield their liberties has been practiced against the States, and the States have taken the 30 pieces of silver. They will end, unless the course is changed, by destroying themselves.

Our liberties cannot be taken from us.

But we can give them up. Many have already yielded.

When we speak of liberties, of course, religious liberty is included. Religious liberty

is threatened the same as civil liberty. The same false principles of government that lead to loss of civil liberty open the way to the loss of religious rights. A people who sacrifice their right to protest, who learn to yield in minor matters, are not likely to give strong resistance to major aggression. We will do well today to heed James Madison's words: "It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties." We would do well also to recall what Benjamin Franklin said when he emerged from the Constitutional Convention and was asked what kind of government he had given America. He replied, "A republic if you keep it."

It is time—if it is not already too late—for Americans to reread our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution and once more, to their preservation and to their adherence, "mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Democracy on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here a book review written by Mr. Leon Jourolmon, member of the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of Tennessee. Commissioner Jourolmon has reviewed in a very excellent manner the book T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, by Chairman David Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The review follows:

BOOK REVIEW

T. V. A.—DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

(By David E. Lilienthal. Harper. New York. Pp. 248. $2.50)

The coming of David E. Lilienthal to the Tennessee Valley in 1933 is a landmark in the development of a region of the United States which too long has been neglected. Lilienthal was a young man whose experience singularly qualified him to erect an institution dedicated to bringing about a notable progression among an entire people. But beyond this he was a man with an underlying philosophy based upon a profound moral, if not religious, purpose; the meaning of this purpose is to be found in the unified development of regional material resources as a part of "a Great Plan: The Unity of Nature and Mankind." In the sincerity of his devotion to this moral purpose David E. Lilienthal has become known to the four and one-half million people who live in the Tennessee Valley region. The great advance that 11 years of his administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority have wrought in the economic fortunes of these people is his best monument—even more so than the 21 dams which constitute the Tennessee River water control system.

His book, which came from the press during the past week, is an account of how this basic moral philosophy has been translated into reality for the benefit of the Tennessee Valley region and its people. The account is an humble one and told in an objective way, nor is there any reference anywhere in it to his own part in bringing about the accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Throughout, the dominant emphasis is upon the advance of the people themselves who through their democratic institutions have been moving forward step by step. Yet those who know and understand the story of the T. V. A. and its accomplishments can read between almost all the lines the part that Lilienthal's philosophy and guidance have had in the realization of the T. V. A.'s purpose.

This book is the most well-rounded account of the Tennessee Valley Authority that has yet been published. It should be required reading for everyone whose economic well-being is associated with the Tennessee Valley. It does not place an overemphasis on any of the many features of the Authority's program. To many, the public power program represents all of the T. V. A., yet in this volume this is compressed into seven pages. Nonetheless, it is clear that a large part of the advance that T. V. A. has brought about is attributable to the spectacular reduction of rates for electricity announced in September 1933, and in the tremendous increase in the generation of electric energy which has multiplied the industrial productivity of the people of the region many times.

But beyond this the book is an account of how these advances have affected the lives of individual people, laborers on the construction projects, farmers who constitute the great majority of the citizenship of the region, and businessmen and industrialists to whom richer opportunities have been opened up as a result of T. V. A.'s development of the resources of the valley. The book is devoted to democracy at the community level and the story is told of how farmers have assisted and cooperated to secure a more comfortable living for themselves, their families, and their communities, through improvement of their soil, through education and demonstrations, and through utilizing the many appliances that an abundant supply of electricity makes available.

The ever present under-surface struggle to keep T. V. A. free of politics is the subject of a most absorbing chapter. Those who originally opposed T. V. A. did so declaring that it would be permeated with political influence. In their disappointment at the failure of their prophesies, some of these now welcome every effort of political leaders to change the T. V. A. administrative system and make it subservient to those with political pretensions. The success of the T. V. A. is largely dependent upon its nonpolitical character and those who would still like to see it fail clearly realize that if they can inject politics into its management the future progress of the Authority will be jeopardized.

That the T. V. A. principle and philosophy is successful is attested by the fact that in many remote parts of the world plans are going forward for applying the lessons learned in the Tennessee Valley to the reconstruction and rebuilding of the post-war world. In India, South America, China, Africa, Scandinavia it is proposed to develop other river valleys in order to bring about the multiple purpose river development which T. V. A. has brought about. Thus all around the world the T. V. A. has come to be thought of as a "symbol of man's capacity to create and to build not only for war and death but for peace and life."

T. V. A. is still in its youth, engaged in a continuing process to improve the physical environment of men. America's most eminent living historian, Charles A. Beard, looks upon Lilienthal as one who by virtue of his public services "has won a place for himself among the first citizens of the Republic." Such is the verdict of a historian, and the verdict of history which awaits the coming of future generations may well affirm this judgment.

LEON JOUROLMON, Jr.,
Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee.

Embargo Against Cane Spirits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have an amazing confession to reveal to the House today.

It is a blunt confession, of course, by the War Production Board, only after prodding and being backed into a corner that they frankly do not know what it is all about in connection with the embargo against cane spirits from Cuba and other South American countries.

Last week I directed the attention of this body to the double talk and run-around and obvious evasion of Mr. John Boyer, head of the Alcohol and Solvents Branch of the Chemical Division in connection with this problem.

Today I offer the documentary proof. It is an amazing confession and typifies more than ever the confusion with which this war is being conducted on the home front.

Where we go from here only God knows, and I am persuaded that even He is confused by the actions of such individuals in responsible positions in Washington.

After 6 weeks of futile effort to get a sensible and definite reply to my efforts to have some technique of policy adopted by the War Production Board, I tossed in the sponge and called the attention of the House to the chaotic conditions existing in the War Production Board, and called attention to the efforts of some people to drive this country into the evils of prohibition.

I refused to further discuss the matter verbally with this Mr. Boyer or anybody else in the War Production Board because I became aware that they intended to play on words and give the industry the run-around. I determined that all future contact with these individuals would be in writing because I at least wanted an even break on interpretation of their double talk. Frankly, I did not expect results as quickly.

Here is the irrefutable evidence of the double dealing, double talk, run-around game being played by the War Production Board in connection with the embargo on cane spirits.

On May 3, 1944, I addressed a letter to Mr. Boyer in which I asked this simple question which I am sure could have been understood by any teen-age child:

Can a liquor dealer in the United States import cane spirits gins from the Argentine?

And to this simple question here is the reply which I received on May 4, 1944:

In answer to your second question as to beverage cane spirits from the Argentine. I may say that the War Production Board has not announced quotas for importation of such spirits aged or new for the calendar year of 1944 under its order M-374.

I believe the various interested agencies of the Government did not establish this quota because there are no advices that there is cane production or stocks of beverage spirits

in the Argentine. Should that fact be later demonstrated to our satisfaction consideration could be given here with these interested agencies.

A splendid example of double talk and evasion.

Mr. Speaker, I am a simple man. My education is that of the ordinary American. I have graduated from a high school. I have 4 years at a university. I have 23 years experience in the newspaper business as a reporter. I have almost 4 years experience as a Member of this Congress. I do not hold a Phi Beta Kappa key but my associates, I humbly believe, respect my intellect as that of the average educated American.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree with me that it takes more than the average educated American to understand Mr. Boyer's answer to my simple question. I confess I couldn't draw any deduction from his reply and if a deduction was to be drawn any conclusion which I would have arrived at could have been disputed.

I have a burning and fervent desire to keep the records straight at all times, especially when I know and realize that I am being given the brush off with some fancy talk.

With all humility and still in quest of understandable information I immediately wrote Mr. Boyer again and this time I said:

With further reference to my letter to you of May 3 and your reply of May 4, I do not understand your answer to my second question. All I want to know is simply this: If cane spirits are available in the Argentine can they be imported to the United States? I think this question can easily be answered yes or no, without a lot of if's and and's.

Now, that is plain enough, is it not? Of course it is plain enough and simple enough and Mr. Boyer realized that he was caught in his trap of evasion because the reply is a bald and blunt confession that he does not know the answer although the War Production Board is supposed to announce "the technique of policy" some time between now and the time Gabriel blows his horn.

Here is the letter which I received today in reply to that simple question of whether or not cane spirits could be imported from the Argentine:

MY DEAR MR. HÉBERT: I have your letter of the 5th in which you ask for further explanation of our position on a prospective importation of beverage cane spirits from the Argentine. I regret that it is not possible for me to assert that we would or would not authorize such an importation if we were to receive an application therefor because our action would only follow consultation with several interested agencies of the Government.

As you know, all persons desiring to import are required to secure authorizations from us under War Production Board Order M-374. Since this order was issued as an outcome of the agreements reached between representatives of the United States and Cuban Governments and since we were not a party to those negotiations, we have reasonably agreed to discuss any authorizations for quotas for countries not listed in our announcement of April 30 with these interested agencies which include both the State Department and the Foreign Economic Administration.

The War Production Board does not know whether or not the spirits can be imported, but I direct your attention to the fact that the War Production Board and Mr. Boyer does know that it has the power to stop the importation of cane spirits almost overnight and without warning to the liquor industry, at least to a small segment of the liquor industry.

Notice also that the War Production Board now attempts to squirm out of its unenviable position in connection with this problem by shunting the burden to the State Department and the Foreign Economic Administration.

So here we are in the position of the War Production Board saying that all applications for import must be filed with it; promising an announcement for more than 6 weeks without an announcement forthcoming; continuing a policy of evasion and double talk when asked for information; finally pinned down to a "yes" or "no" answer and confessing that it does not know the answer at all.

Why did not Mr. Boyer tell me in the beginning that he did not know the answers? Why did not he tell me 6 weeks ago that the War Production Board was not the only agency involved? Why did he make promises of a decision when he did not have such powers; why did not he answer my first query relative to the Argentine proposition in the language that he replied to the second query; why did he compel me to pin him down and drive him into a corner before he admitted that he did not know the answer?

Is not this all conclusive proof, Mr. Speaker, of the practices with which we are confronted today? Is not this a confession, Mr. Speaker, that the American public is being given the run-around? What more proof could anybody ask than of these damning admissions of a man in high authority such as Mr. Boyer?

And American business, Mr. Speaker, is asked to have confidence in such administrative officials. And American business, Mr. Speaker, must place its future life in the hands of such incompetence, and I say incompetence with charity, because if such administrators are competent then they are deliberately misleading and confusing American business, which is a greater crime than incompetence.

But this is not all, Mr. Speaker.

I am waiting for another reply from Mr. Boyer in answer to a perplexing question this time.

While our little liquor dealers are left holding the empty sack because of the procrastination and obvious deliberate indecisiveness of Mr. Boyer and his associates in the War Production Board, the big fellow gets along all right.

I have been reliably informed that last week in the city of New Orleans there was witnessed the sorry spectacle of the arrival of the French steamer *Duc De Doumale* direct from Martinique, with 4,500 half puncheons of 55 gallons each, consigned to the Schenley Import Co. of New York, which steamer, I am creditably informed, departed from Fort-de-France, on or about April 20, or about a full month after the imposition of this embargo, March 15.

I am in a quandary to know how this could happen and why it is permissible for the importers of this particular lot to be in possession of approximately 100,000 cases of prime rum ready for distribution when the embargo is lifted—if it comes before judgment day—to the discrimination of every other law-abiding factor in the trade whose liquor will still be outside of this country and will, therefore, be without merchandise for distribution.

I wonder what Mr. Boyer's reply will be to that question. I will wager it will be a "lulu."

Mr. Speaker, why continue any longer?

It is time there be some action taken to prevent this sort of individuals from playing chess with American industry for their own amusement—or for other purposes and intentions which may not have come to light as yet.

I, for one, will fight and fight and fight until every little liquor dealer gets his just dues and every time I come into possession of such amazing confessions and facts which I have just presented I will present it to this House in order that all may be enlightened in the devious means and actions which are slowly bringing American small business to its knees.

There will be a day of reckoning, Mr. Speaker, and I hope and pray that day is not very far distant. It will not be distant if others join in this fight and not only demand justice for the little fellow but see to it that he gets it.

More Food Waste

REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that great waste in food continues. In an article in the New York Times this morning the War Food Administration calls attention to the fact that more than 700,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese are going to waste; also that some 500,000 pounds of off-grade butter from set-aside stocks, which have been accumulating for a year, are being liquidated in that they are being processed and converted into Carter spread and butter oil for lend-lease shipment to Russia. It is about time this waste of food is stopped.

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1944]

UNITED STATES OFFERS BIG LOT OF SPOILED CHEESE—PROCESSORS ASKED TO BID ON 700,000 POUNDS OF CHEDDAR STORED ON WEST COAST

The War Food Administration is offering to the highest bidder 700,000 pounds of off-grade cheddar cheese in storage in California and Oregon, it was learned yesterday. Most of the cheese is said to have been in storage for more than 6 months and is part of the hoard piled up by the Federal Government under set-aside orders.

Attachés of W. F. A. explained that the cheese was all off in one way or another, although it was still good for processing.

On some of the heads the protective paraffin covering is cracked, presumably as a result of handling. Descriptions of the product explain that it is off flavor, by which W. F. A. means it is bitter, and that some had a fruity smell. It also is described as crumby.

The cheese is offered only to authorized assemblers, and their bids must be in Washington by next Monday.

To date W. F. A. has sold more than 500,000 pounds of off-grade butter from the set-aside stocks it began accumulating last year. Of its stores of butter, which at one time were estimated at 235,000,000 pounds, the Federal Government carried over 82,000,000 pounds this spring. Of that amount, nearly 40,000,000 was earmarked for conversion into Carter spread and butter oil for lend-lease shipments to Russia.

H. R. 4357 Provides Bureaucratic Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, we will begin consideration of H. R. 4357, better known as the soldiers' aid bill, Thursday. This legislation as reported to the House definitely provides for bureaucratic control of education. This must be avoided.

Under permission to extend my remarks I include an important statement adopted by representatives of some fifty national organizations concerned with education who met in Washington Friday, May 5, at the call of the American Council of Education. Among those participating in writing this statement were A. J. Brumbaugh, representing the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; O. C. Carmichael, chairman of the American Council of Education; J. H. Saunders, National Educational Association; John J. Seidel, assistant superintendent of vocational education, Maryland State Department of Education; and Edward V. Stanford, National Catholic Educational Association.

The statement, which should be considered by every Member of Congress while H. R. 4357 is being debated, follows:

Representatives of 50 national organizations concerned with education on all levels, both public and private, met today in Washington at the call of the American Council on Education. The pending legislation in Congress providing for the education of returning veterans was considered at length. The following statement was adopted unanimously:

1. The conference wishes to affirm its deep conviction in the wisdom of the traditional policy which reserves control of education to the States and localities, prudently left there by the Constitution of the United States.

2. We are in agreement with the general purposes of the Clark omnibus bill recently passed by the Senate and the Rankin omnibus bill now before the House of Representatives. But the educational provisions of these bills violate this essential and fundamental principle of our form of government by setting up Federal bureaucratic control in education.

3. We believe that the educational provisions of the Clark and Rankin bills present the most serious threat to the existing State and local control of education that has yet appeared in this country.

4. We hold that if this menace to State and local control of education is to be defeated, immediate action is needed on the part of all who oppose this invasion of States' rights by Federal agencies. To be effective, such action must be taken before May 10, on which date it is reported that the House of Representatives will vote on this legislation.

5. The Barden bill, H. R. 3846, now before the House of Representatives, provides for State advisory committees, State selection of institutions, administration through State educational agencies, State counseling services for returning veterans, and the use of existing educational agencies and institutions. These provisions assure that existing facilities will be used under the direction of the several States, thereby providing greater educational benefits and services to returning veterans than would be possible under Federal bureaucratic control. We, therefore, urge that the Barden bill should be adopted. As an alternative we urge that the Rankin (H. R. 4357) and Clark (S. 1767) bills be amended by striking out title II, chapter IV, Education for Veterans, and substituting therefor the provisions of the Barden bill.

Service Activities of the D. A. V.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, long before Pearl Harbor the Disabled American Veterans decided that its best contribution to the Nation's national defense and all-out war effort would be for it to extend the expert advice and counsel of its service officers, national and local, to those Americans who may have become disabled by reason of war service in our armed forces.

No veteran organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of this essential national defense job than that maintained by the D. A. V.

FORMATION OF D. A. V.

Formed in 1920, and chartered by Congress in 1932, to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the Disabled American Veterans has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law No. 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the D, A. V. can be obtained only by those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities, incurred during or by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War No. 2 are becoming active members of the D. A. V.

Having been wounded while serving with our armed forces during World War No. 1, I am personally proud to be a life member of this select outfit.

During the more than 24 years of its service activities, the D. A. V. has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents. Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration.

D. A. V. NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Avenue, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the D. A. V. takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, Attorney General's opinions, Comptroller General's opinions, Veterans' Administration regulations, service letters, Administrator's decisions, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the D. A. V. is James L. Monnahan, Esq., of St. Paul, Minn., who as a national service officer and department adjutant during the preceding 15 years, has had a broad background of experience which qualifies him to lead an organization composed exclusively of disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-manager of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has for many years been the depository for the funds of both the D. A. V., and of its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service bureau of the Disabled American Veterans has had offices in the Munsey Building in Washington, D. C., during the last 24 years.

It is headed by my good friend Millard W. Rice, as National Service Director, who is now the dean among the national legislative representatives of the several recognized veteran organizations, with energetic, affable, Thomas J. Kehoe as assistant national service director, the Washington office of the D. A. V. is now staffed by 13 service experts. The activities of the nationally paid national service officers of the D. A. V., located in most of the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration and of its some 900 volunteer State and chapter service officers, also come under the supervision of the National Service Director. All of

these unselfish, self-sacrificing service officers are themselves disabled veterans. Every one of them personally knows of the difficulties and handicaps which have baffled thousands of disabled men to secure suitable gainful employment.

These D. A. V. service officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the United States Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, these D. A. V. service officers are naturally more sympathetic and therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits which they have earned.

D. A. V. SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The D. A. V. has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, vocational training, civil-service appointments, private employment, and pensions for dependents.

During the past 15 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the D. A. V. have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 852,006; hospitalizations and examinations obtained, 141,373; and total monetary benefits, $60,311,266.14.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for more than 150,000 disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds or thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed for service reports.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the D. A. V. that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy thing to do, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established. A disabled veteran may be conscientiously convinced that his disability was caused by his service without being able technically to prove that fact.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service incurred or aggravated.

The fight for justice for such disappointed, disillusioned, disabled veterans must nevertheless be carried on not only for them, but because of their wives and growing children.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies, or their health, in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are now baring their young breasts to the enemy, so that other young men, who in the future may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that, if they too should also be so unfortunate, they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the D. A. V. to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be supported as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and is practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to ever State, and to our country.

HOW D. A. V. SERVICE IS FINANCED

The D. A. V. has been able to maintain its extensive service program primarily out of funds contributed by disabled veterans themselves, by their payment of membership dues in the D. A. V., through its some 40 State departments and 900 chapters.

A national per capita tax of $2, plus a national service fee of $1, is paid each year to the national headquarters by every local chapter for each of its members.

Local D. A. V. chapters finance their own service and relief activities out of their portion of the annual membership dues, and by annual Forget-Me-Not Day drives, dances, and other propects.

Nationally, the D. A. V. has recently been endeavoring, with considerable but not enough success, to raise needed service funds through the sale of Ident-O-Tags—miniature automobile license plates—to be attached to one's key ring. The value of this key insurance is indicated by the fact that about 1,200 sets of lost key rings are returned each week to their owners.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS' SERVICE FOUNDATION

To make possible a much-needed expansion of its rehabilitation activities, the D. A. V. is hopeful that understanding fellow Americans will help to build up a needed trust fund of up to $10,000,000 by generous donations to its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation, 546 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

This D. A. V. Service Foundation has seven trustees, five of whom each serve for 5-year terms, one expiring each year and replaced by another as confirmed by the national convention of the D. A. V., and the other two of whom automatically consist of the national commander and national adjutant of the D. A. V. These trustees serve without remuneration.

Donations received by the D. A. V. Service Foundation may be placed into separate State trust-fund accounts according to State of origin, for allocation to the D. A. V., when needed, for the expense of maintaining one or more full-time national service officers in each such State.

WHY D. A. V. NEEDS OUTSIDE HELP

Many eligible disabled veterans do not become paid-up members of the D. A. V., and thus help to maintain its Nation-wide service set-up on behalf of less fortunate disabled veterans, for varied reasons; some because they know very little about the D. A. V., some because of indifference, others because of selfishness, some because of negligence, and many others because they cannot afford it. If they all understood the implications involved, every service-disabled veteran would decide that he should belong to the D. A. V.

The American public is, I am confident, desirous of fulfilling its obligation that those who return from hazardous military employment in the armed forces of the United States, handicapped by some physical or mental scars incurred by reason of such active service, shall be adequately provided for by a grateful Nation.

The D. A. V. is helping to protect and to promote the best interests of disabled veterans, and of the general public, by maintaining and further expanding its national service bureau in Washington, D. C., and its Nation-wide set-up of national service officers. To do the job properly, however, the D. A. V. needs to have at least three or four times as many full-time national service officers as it now has.

Such a service program deserves the solid support of all service-disabled veterans and of all Americans.

COMMENDATIONS OF D. A. V.

Among many statements commending the D. A. V. and its rehabilitation services, the following are a few examples:

The purpose of your Nation-wide rehabilitation program * * * to extend needed assistance to members of our armed forces who become disabled, as well as to disabled veterans of the World War and their dependents, is, indeed, a worthy one and merits the full support of our citizens. (Franklin D. Roosevelt, President.)

Please express for me to the Disabled American Veterans my continued appreciation of their services to the country. (Herbert Hoover, former President.)

It is, therefore, particularly gratifying to me to learn of the plans of the Disabled American Veterans to expand its already extensive service program so as to make available to the handicapped servicemen of World War No. 2, who are coming out of the present conflict in ever-increasing number, the valuable advice and assistance it has long rendered their fathers of World War No. 1. These new veterans and their dependents also will need a helping hand, and I hope that the organization will meet with complete success in its campaign to provide now for the extension to them of its worthy activities. (Gen. John J. Pershing.)

During the last 24 years national service officers of the Disabled American Veterans have rendered valuable assistance to disabled veterans and their dependents and, incidentally, have facilitated the work of the Veterans' Administration and its contacts for such service claimants. Your national service officers, being themselves disabled veterans, can be most helpful in instructing and impressing claimants as to the necessary legal requirements and limitations under the laws enacted by the Congress. (Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.)

In spite of its small number, I feel that the Disabled American Veterans has, in the years since I have been in Congress, been the most effective organization for the benefit of the ex-servicemen. (Senator Bronson Cutting, deceased.)

The Disabled American Veterans are a heritage of proven patriotism. Let's serve God by serving humanity. (Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.)

The Military Order of the World War passed a resolution endorsing the Disabled American Veterans * * * for the purpose of assisting disabled veterans in the preparation and presentation of their claims * * * a most important work. (Col. George E. Ijams, past commander in chief Military Order of the World War.)

I know of no organization that I can more heartily commend and support than the D. A. V., whose purpose is the rescue and helping of disabled veterans. Let us hope all loyal Americans will recognize the D. A. V.'s humanitarian objective and program as their opportunity to demonstrate loyalty and patriotism. The people of the United States must not and will not fail those who did not fail them. (Gen. Robert Lee Bullard.)

Be assured that we of the American Federaton of Labor, who have long relied upon the principle that unity develops strength, look with favor upon the valuable service-giving activities of the Disabled American Veterans' organization. (William Green, president of American Federation of Labor.)

Labor's heart goes out to the disabled veterans, many of whom come from its own ranks, and we are eager to do everything we can to help these handicapped veterans and their dependents to secure the fair and generous treatment to which they are entitled. (Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.)

It affords me real pleasure to heartily endorse the Disabled American Veterans * * * to assist individual deserving veterans in their local needs and in the technical prosecution of their equitable claims for compensation resulting from war-incurred disabilities. (James E. Van Zandt, past commander in chief Veterans of Foreign Wars.)

Helping disabled veterans to help themselves and getting the help of the Nation for those who need help, a big dividend-paying investment in real Americanism, is the self-appointed task of the Disabled American Veterans. (Representative ED. V. IZAC, of California.)

To see to it that worthy disabled veterans, of all of America's wars and their dependents, are enabled technically to establish their equitable claims for various types of benefits provided by existing legislation, the D. A. V. maintains the largest staff of nationally paid National service officers, one or more in nearly every regional office of the Veterans' Administration, of any veteran organization. (Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa.)

The D. A. V. is striving to see to it that justice is extended to the Nation's disabled war defenders of the past, present, and future. (Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana.)

Americans who help to provide security for America's disabled defenders thereby help to provide security for America. (Senator HOMER T. BONE.)

This comprehensive program of the D. A. V. is well integrated, looking to the welfare of our country, our communities, and our comrades. (Representative JAMES H. FAY, of New York.)

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Constantine Brown, entitled, "This Changing World," that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 6, 1944:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The question of the future of Poland is likely to become an important issue in America's domestic affairs, not because of the several million voters of Polish decent in this country but because Poland is a "test case" for the future reorganization of the world.

The people of the United States entered this war for several reasons, one being the desire to preserve the rights of the smaller nations which were trampled under the boots of Hitler's troops.

Great Britain declared war on Germany because Hitler would not listen to reason and invaded Poland with the definite intention of subjugating that country of 35,000,000 persons. But while the British Government for centuries has played power politics because the interests and security of the empire required, at no time in our history has power politics been envisaged either by the American people or their Government.

The European diplomatic puzzle brought Russia into the anti-Hitler camp in 1941. The Soviet follows a twofold policy—to defeat Hitler, thereby eliminating a permanent menace to Russian security, and to expand her territory to her 1914 boundaries. The latter consideration requires the suppression of the sovereignty of the so-called border states, Finland, the Baltic republic and Poland.

It is immaterial whether this is performed in a modern streamlined manner by incorporating them as partners of the U. S. S. R. or by organizing governments subservient to Moscow or, as in the case of the Baltic republics, by direct annexation through a spurious plebiscite. The important fact, as seen from this country, is that the border states in some cases will be allowed to choose their governments from the inside while Russian forces are in full occupation of their territory.

There are strong rumors, supported by some facts, that the Washington and London governments at the Moscow and Tehran conferences accepted the Soviet view regarding its influence on the border territories. If this were not so, Prime Minister Churchill, the cocreator of the Atlantic Charter, would not have expressed himself so openly last February 22 endorsing Russia's territorial claims on Poland.

After the Moscow Conference a new organization, called the European Advisory Committee, was organized, composed of the Ambassadors of the United States and Russia and a representative of the Foreign Office, Sir William Strang. This organization, we were led to believe, would handle all matters which had been left in abeyance at the conference of Secretary of State Hull, Foreign Secretary Eden and Foreign Commissar Molotov. It then would make recommendations to the respective governments. But there is no evidence that the Polish question has been submitted to the committee.

A large number of Members of Congress have taken advantage of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Polish Constitution to declare on the floor of the Senate and House that the people of the United States do not indorse any move depriving Poland of her sovereignty.

Last Wednesday 26 Senators and 82 Members of the House, representing a cross-section of Congress, from New Deal adherents to opponents of the administration, expressed clearly the view of their constituents who do not want to see power politics played at the expense of the smaller nations. Representatives of all parties, from Maine to California and from Florida to Oregon, had something to say about the necessity of maintaining Poland's integrity. The speeches were not preelection addresses. American voters of Polish descent are strong in only six States and the Members of Congress spoke under the guise of paying tribute to Poland, but in fact issued a warning to all concerned about how the American people feel.

The specialists on North American affairs in Moscow may take the hint that if there is going to be post-war cooperation among the present opponents of Hitler, it must be on an equitable basis in which the wishes of the American people should receive due attention.

An Expression on Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, there recently took place in the city of Plymouth, Wayne County, Mich., within the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent, a public debate on a question of public interest. The question debated was Should Congress Adopt Socialized Medicine? A time and place were agreed upon for the debate. Public notices were sent out under an organization known as the Plymouth Public Forum.

This forum was granted a charter by the State of Michigan giving it the sole right to use the name above indicated for 30 years. It is a body organized and planned to provide a neutral platform for the frank presentation of all sides of vital public affairs. It is a nonsectarian, nonpartisan and nonprofit organization.

At the conclusion of the recent debate on the subject, Should Congress Adopt Socialized Medicine? a secret vote was taken with the following result: Five ballots were cast for socialized medicine and 34 were against socialized medicine.

The forum has created, and I predict will create, general public interest in issues affecting the people.

Notices of the meeting informed the people that the result of the debate and

the ballot would be sent to their Representative in Congress. I present the result not only to the House of Representatives, but to the country.

I am attaching hereto a notice of the debate:

You are the judge.

It is time to vote on the pending new super security act which will cost about $200 per family per year.

Hear it debated: Should Congress Adopt Socialized Medicine? by a C. I. O. speaker, a doctor, and a lawyer. Hear it, discuss it, then vote. Ballots will be sent to Representative GEORGE DONDERO.

The fifth public forum, Friday May 5, 8 p. m., Starkweather School Auditorium.

Rhode Island Bends Every Effort To Help Its Citizens in the Armed Forces to Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the boys and girls in the armed service who because of their absence from home might be deprived of a voice in the selection of those who will be elected to run our Government beginning next January, the State of Rhode Island has taken every possible step. During the session of the general assembly, which closed a few days ago, legislation was enacted that will provide not only for recognition of the Federal war ballot but also for a complete State and municipal ballot to be furnished our people in uniform.

Under leave previously granted to me I include as a part of my remarks a digest of the legislation prepared by the chairman of the Rhode Island State Board of Election, the Honorable Albert J. Lamarre:

The legislative enactments to make possible an all-out servicemen's vote are contained in two acts, Chapters 1470 and 1472 of the Public Laws, 1944, copies of which are enclosed. The first act details the procedure whereby servicemen may vote irrespective of their being on current voting lists, thus waiving our registration requirements. Briefly, this is what chapter 1470 provides:

1. It applies to all members of the armed forces of the United States or of the merchant marine in active service and to any person absent from the State in the performance of services intimately connected with military operations. This last means persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations.

2. Naturally it requires that any such voter must be a citizen of the United States and prior to entering such service has lived in Rhode Island for 2 years and in his own town or city for at least 6 months. This right to vote shall exist during the tenure of service and for a period of 2 years thereafter.

3. Should any such voter happen to be within the State on election day he may vote in person at his proper voting place and should he have received a war ballot and still have it, he must surrender it, or if he has not received one or has lost or destroyed the same, he must make oath before his board of canvassers or town clerk to that effect, then he may vote in person.

4. Should he, having received not only a State and local war ballot but also a Federal war ballot, and return all of them, the State and local war ballot shall be counted and the Federal ballot declared void.

5. In order that war ballots may be sent to all Rhode Islanders in the services above referred to, the Secretary of State shall:

A. Honor applications for the same as made by personal form application by the voter.

B. Honor requests signed by any person other than the voter if the same contains the Rhode Island residence and home address of the voter and the address to which the ballots are to be sent.

C. Honor all post-card applications which may be received by a prospective voter as a result of the Federal War Ballot Commission's coverage of all servicemen and other persons permitted to vote war ballots.

6. Two sets of ballots are to be printed by the Secretary of State. One, a so-called State and Federal office ballot, and another for local, city, and town candidates. These ballots will follow the old form of paper ballot, except that in the case of Providence, which is split as to the congressional districts, the names of both party nominees for each party shall be printed on the face of the ballot, "with one square at the right of both names and a vote therefor shall be counted only as a vote for the candidate of the district wherein the voter resides and has his home." Of course, if the voter votes in the circle above the party column, this same condition holds true.

In the case of Providence with its 5 senatorial and 25 representative districts, and Pawtucket with its 2 senatorial and 10 representative districts, there shall be printed on the ballot "a statement to the effect that a vote to such office shall be counted for the appropriate candidate of the party in whose column the space for the office appears"; and on the reverse side of the ballot there shall be printed "the names and addresses of the candidates for Senator and Representative for each such senatorial and representative district." This same principle applies to other cities and towns having more than 1 representative district, and also for local tickets where ward or voting district candidates cannot be voted for as a city or town-wide proposition. Also, the ballot must contain a space for any referendum question authorized to be submitted to the voters. Split tickets are to be effected just as in the old-time paper ballot method.

7. Any voter qualified to receive these war ballots is required to vote them secretly, at any time after receiving the same on or before election day, November 7, 1944, and after voting he shall place the ballots in a so-called inner envelope, which must be securely sealed, and shall fill in and subscribe to an oath printed upon said inner envelope. On the outside of this envelope there will be printed the following:

"Official Rhode Island war ballots.
"Name of voter----------
"Rhode Island home address----------
"Street and number (if any) or rural route ----------
"City or town----------"

A form of oath is also contained on this envelope and must be attested to before any commissioned or noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant or petty officer or any other person authorized to administer this oath. This inner envelope must then be placed in an outer envelope which is provided to the voter and the same must then be returned to the board of elections on or before December 4, 1944.

8. As a safeguard against persons voting upon the names of service men and women who either are real-estate voters or registered before they entered the services, or at any time they were home on furlough, the Secretary of State after he has sent out the ballots shall furnish to the local boards of canvassers and town clerks a certified list of the names and addresses of all persons to whom ballots have been sent. It is the duty of said boards of canvassers and town councils to strike off of any voting list the names of all persons appearing on the voting lists and contained on the certified list from the secretary of state, and against each such name thus stricken the letters W B must be printed, stamped, or written. In this way it is illegal for any person to vote at the election on any name thus designated.

As a further safeguard against improper voting, if any serviceman presents himself on election day and surrenders his ballot or takes oath that it is either lost or destroyed, and if he is permitted to vote under the circumstances his board of canvassers or town clerk shall certify the names of such persons to the board of elections so that should a ballot appear after December 4 containing the name of such person, it shall not be counted.

9. Authority is given the board of elections to open the outer envelope of all ballots received before and up to December 5 so that each inner envelope shall be stamped with the proper representative and ward or voting district of the person thus voting. The reason for this is to facilitate the counting of the State ballots as well as to make it possible that when the inner envelopes are opened the local ballots may be properly stamped as to town or city and ward or voting district because these latter must be placed in packages and sealed and delivered to local boards of canvassers or town councils for local counting.

10. There are the usual penalties for violation of the act, and then in addition it provides that the Governor be authorized to certify to the United States War Ballot Commission that the use of the official Federal war ballot is permitted so that if any serviceman does not receive any of the State ballots he may properly use a Federal war ballot.

11. Chapter 1472 was enacted for the purpose of advancing the dates of both State and local caucuses and State conventions in order that war ballots may be printed and distributed at least by August 15 or September 1. This chapter provides for the usual procedure of local parties requesting dates for caucuses, posting notices of the same, and in the case of contests it is arranged that State caucuses shall be held between June 12 and 17 and local caucuses between June 16 and June 21. After these caucuses are held time is permitted for the holding of such conventions as may be necessary so that the final nominations for State offices shall be filed not later than 5 o'clock p. m., July 10, and local nominations filed with local boards of canvassers and town clerks not later than July 12 and subsequently filed with the Secretary of State not later than July 17.

The Soldiers' G. I. Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of World War No. 1, I believe I can discuss veterans' affairs with some understanding. It was my experience to serve

in the Army 2 years, 20 months of which was spent overseas with the One Hundred and Fiftieth Field Artillery.

Since World War No. 1, I have been active in veterans' affairs. The American Legion of West Virginia has honored me by election to the highest offices at its command.

As I, through necessity, will be absent from the House the present week, I will make a brief reference to the soldiers' G. I. bill.

I heartily approve of the measure in principle.

Aside from the obligation for the heroic services rendered by our service men and women, it is just good, common business sense to rehabilitate, both physically and financially, our returning men and women from our armed forces. Their prompt absorption into our economic structure on a self-sustaining basis is essential to our national security. This legislation affords a means by which they will become self sustaining and contribute to the national production and general welfare.

I hope I shall return in time to support the soldier's bill of rights.

As Fighters or Prisoners—Nazis Are Still Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I insert an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Record entitled "As Fighters or Prisoners—Nazis are Still Nazis." The editorial is as follows:

AS FIGHTERS OR PRISONERS—NAZIS ARE STILL NAZIS

Goebbels has done his work well.

Put Nazis behind barbed wire and they still think they are supermen. Place before them evidence of Hitler's failure in Russia, and they are unconvinced. Show them the proof of inevitable defeat, and they still dream of world conquest.

Even when they see proof of Goebbels' lies; when they observe with their own eyes that New York's skyscrapers are not in ruins, as he told them; that New York has not even been bombed, as he said it was; that America is not starving; that motorcars are still running—

Facts to the contrary, Nazis are still Nazis.

This is the grim lesson of the German prison camps in the United States. It is the warning that if Americans or Britishers or any other peoples let the soft sentimentalists in their midst run things after this war as after the last.

These men behind barbed wire in Jersey, Alabama, and other States will be on hand for World War No. 3 with their sons and daughters waiting for a third attempt at world domination.

A Fort Dix chaplain warned the other day that German prisoners of war are too dangerous to merit sympathy. He knew. He had worked among them at Fort Dix.

Recent stories of those prisoners at Dix mentioned that they have the same kind of food, drink, and barracks as United States soldiers. They have athletic events, their own orchestra, stage shows, etc.—but only once have they shown the faintest sign of appreciation for anything—when a military funeral, Nazi style, was given a prisoner who died.

Writing in the New York Times, F. G. Alletson Cook reported on more than a thousand German prisoners in a West Virginia camp. He inspected their comfortable living quarters and well-filled kitchens. They get butter, not margarine. But they are stiff, sullen, determined—and confident Germany eventually will conquer.

A similar account of Nazis in an Alabama prison camp was given by Peter Kihss in the New York Herald Tribune. Nearly 3,000 men there are living in comparative luxury, in excellent health—but still active Nazis—using the Nazi salute, sneering in demeanor, and sure of eventual victory.

In a camp near Colorado Springs only two German prisoners out of thousands returned United States officers' salute properly—all the rest used the Nazi salute. At Fort Custer, Mich., a great celebration was held for Hitler's recent birthday—even though such Nazi demonstrations are not authorized by the Geneva Convention.

Yes, there are a few non-Nazis among them. Some have been subjected to persecution, a number have been killed, including one found hanged at the Papago Park camp near Phoenix, Ariz.

But the overwhelming majority of these prisoners warns us—must warn us—that the greatest fallacy peddled to Americans today is that we need only beat the German Army and toss Hitler and a few top Nazis in jail—and civilization thenceforth will be safe.

We have, as the RECORD has stated so often, a mighty educational job. Many of these Nazis may be past mental delousing. Those who are will have to be policed. And education for the rest—for all Germany—will have to be kept in strict control for enough generations to civilize the master race.

Next time Dorothy Thompson cries: "Listen Hans!" and tells us we should have no ill-will toward the German people—

Let us look at the Nazis in our prison camps, der ubermenschen, who still have the lust of conquest in their minds and the lust of killing in their hearts.

Good Job, Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, we in Pennsylvania are all proud of the recent special session of the State legislature which enacted into law the best soldier-vote bill in the United States. No partisanship was shown, but a display of patriotism and statesmanship that is heartening compared with the sad performance with the soldier vote bill in our own Congress. I congratulate Governor Edward Martin, a retired United States Army general, who proved himself not only a real soldier but a generous friend of the G. I. Joe everywhere. I also congratulate members of the Pennsylvania State Legislature for their outstanding performance. I am happy to include as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the May 8 issue of the Pittsburgh Press, which is a deserving tribute to all of them.

GOOD JOB, WELL DONE

By their forbearance, their readiness to cooperate, and their patriotism in passing quickly a simple, workable, military ballot law, the general assembly and Governor Martin deserve the gratitude of every Pennsylvanian and every son and daughter in service.

Their performance was in such splendid contrast to the precedents of other legislative sessions in recent years, and to the spectacle of the current Congress in facing the same problem, that it is a refreshing and heartening example for everyone on the home front.

Factional and partisan differences were outlawed; even debate on the five ballot bills was found unnecessary. Nothing counted but prompt and effective action on the matter of insuring a vote for every Pennsylvanian in the service and in service-related war activities.

Thanks, Messrs Representatives and Senators.

Thanks, Mr. Governor.

Thanks, Mr. Democratic State Chairman and Mr. Republican Chairman.

You make us proud to be Pennsylvanians.

A Report on the Political Aspects of the London Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech made by me on May 6, 1944:

First, I should like to thank Ed Murrow for arranging and the Columbia Broadcasting System for giving the time for this broadcast. C. B. S. is always generous in its efforts to keep the American people advised of matters of real importance to them. Incidentally, I saw Ed Murrow in London last week and like everyone else over there, he is on the anxious seat waiting for the invasion. The rising tempo of the bombing raids and the preparations for the invasion, are naturally the center of everyone's attention.

I spent a day and a night with our boys at a Flying Fortress base engaged in bombing Germany. Words cannot describe the grim determination of these young airmen. With a selfless concentration on their job, they live, tense and restrained, in a world apart from ordinary mortals. To see them return from a raid makes one ashamed of ever having even mentioned the petty inconveniences which too often we call sacrifices.

It would be a fine thing for our sense of values if everyone could see our boys in action. We can rest assured that they will do their job. I only hope that we at home do as well. All the boys I talked with, many from Arkansas, are anxious to finish the job and they expect us to see that their sons do not have it all to do again. The nearer the approach of invasion and victory, the more urgent becomes the question of whether or not we are going to throw away the fruits of the efforts of these boys, as we did in 1919.

The only substantial benefit, other than a defensive one, that we can hope to obtain from our great expenditures of life and

wealth is some assurance of peace in the world. During the First World War, very little was done, before the end of hostilities, toward preparing for the peace. We are all familiar with the sorry spectacle of the peace conference and its failure. Not until the war was over did President Wilson present the League of Nations as a plan for the future. Regardless of the merits of the League as a plan, the fact is that it was not accepted here. The approach to this problem today is different and more promising. Compared to the last war, we have made considerable progress up to now.

Already, the House of Representatives has expressed its view that this Nation should participate in an international organization with power to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. The Senate has confirmed this policy, and the Executive has participated with our principal military allies in three great conferences at Moscow, Cairo, and Tehran. Furthermore, the United and Associated Nations, 44 of them, have already undertaken collective action in the field of physical relief and rehabilitation, and in the field of agriculture, begun by the food conference at Hot Springs. Now under consideration by these nations, is collective action in the field of education. Discussions concerning aviation, economics, and political relations are also taking place. In this way we are seeking to build an international structure, piece by piece, on sound foundations which, if agreement can be reached in particular controversial instances, will support a workable machinery for the maintenance of peace.

The delegation of which I was a member, sent by our Secretary of State Cordell Hull to confer with the representatives of 17 nations in London, has just reported to the State Department. Considerable progress was made at the conferences toward the creation of a United Nations organization for educational reconstruction. The most urgent function of this proposed organization will be to assist in the revival of education in the liberated countries during the period immediately after the cessation of hostilities.

Assistance in the provision of trained personnel, material aids such as books or materials for printing books, pencils, and tablets, visual aids, scientific apparatus, and library material is contemplated. For the several countries able to pay, this organization will simply coordinate the procurement and transportation of supplies. For those three or four countries without funds, financial assistance from other members is contemplated. While definite amounts have not yet been determined, it is estimated that the amount of money involved in the emergenc period will be a small fraction of that authorized for physical relief under the United Nations relief and rehabilitation program. No commitments have or will be made until the appropriate congressional committees have been fully informec and indicated their approval of the proposals.

The necessity for this assistance is based upon the proposition that the unrestricted education of the people of the world, and the free and unhampered interchange between them of ideas and knowledge is essential to the preservation of security and peace. Our Fascist enemies, recognizing the fundamental importance of enlightened citizens to a society of freemen, with calculated thoroughness, have destroyed the educational resources of great parts of Europe and Asia. The murder of teachers, scientists, professional men and intellectual leaders; the burning of books, and the theft of scientific apparatus has held a high priority with the Fascists. They correctly recognized the fact that to impose permanently their new order on the world, persons capable of leadership together with the means of acquiring knowledge and understanding should be destroyed in the conquered countries. Knowledge of such things as freedom of religion, of the press, of speech, of what we call in a broad sense, the dignity of the individual human being, is dangerous to a Fascist regime. Technical skills and the habit of obedience are the only civic virtues in Germany and Japan. On the contrary, to a democratic system of government by the people nothing is more fundamental and important than a high level of enlightenment and understanding. Thomas Jefferson acknowledged this by his great and effective efforts to establish the University of Virginia. We have only to look about us within our own 48 States to see the coincidence of high standards of education and enlightenment and a prosperous, progressive, and free people.

It may be asked by some that since there is room for improvement in our domestic education, why should we concern ourselves with improving the lot of others? This would be a valid point of view if we could isolate ourselves from the disturbances in the world caused to a great degree by ignorance, poverty, and bad government. It is my belief that since we have at last recognized that we cannot live apart from the world, it is to our own enlightened self-interest to assist in creating conditions which will promote the establishment of a stable order based upon the collective action of the nations. In view of the enormous cost of fighting a modern war every 20 years, it is plain common sense to spend at least a small fraction of that amount in an effort to prevent the recurrence of total war. This is not charity; it is sound conservative business to spend $1 now with a chance of preventing the expenditure of a thousand 20 years from now.

It seems to me rather futile to expend our efforts and money to feed the hungry peoples of Europe and Asia and then do nothing to encourage them in reestablishing free and decent communities. If educational opportunity is denied them, they may well become Fascists in their ignorance and desperation. Many of the young ones will know nothing of any other kind of society. To give them educational opportunity does not mean that we seek to impose our own doctrines directly upon these peoples. It merely means that we have faith in the basic rightness of our Christian democratic civilization, and that if people are permitted to seek the truth through education and the free and unrestricted interchange of ideas, they naturally will develop a society compatible with our own. We do not seek to create identical societies; we do seek enlightenment sufficient to enable diverse peoples to use reason rather than force as the arbiter of their differences.

These efforts by the United Nations in specific fields are logical steps toward the creation of a political organization with power to maintain peace. Aside from the particular merits of each organization, they will give us experience in cooperative action and create mutual confidence and respect among the participants. It is the custom or practice of solving problems by consultation and agreement rather than by war that is all-important.

We have declared it to be our policy, henceforth, to participate with other nations in an effort to create a more stable and peaceful world. The time has arrived to participate in concrete and specific undertakings. Elaborate blueprints of complicated political institutions are not likely to solve our problems.

On the other hand, man has, by the trial and error method, with many failures and disappointments, achieved in some parts of the world, notably in these United States, a fair degree of freedom and justice. By creating this educational organization in cooperation with the other United Nations, we shall acquire experience and shall have taken another step along the long, hard road toward a more peaceful world.

In view of the recent public declarations of our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, of Governors Bricker and Dewey, recognizing the world interests of this Nation and the inevitability of our involvement in all major wars, it seems to me that we are now united in our determination to take the leadership in creating the machinery for peace. However, and this is of vital importance, the unanimity on foreign policy which now prevails among our important leaders, is not in the nature of things political likely to continue for long. The time is right now and it is extremely urgent that we take advantage of this opportunity to set up military and political machinery, sufficiently strong to control the lawless 10 percent of humanity which, from time to time, insists upon trying to dominate its fellowmen by force. No one can deny that existing institutions of government are insufficient for our purposes.

Some new machinery with adequate powers must be created now if our fine phrases and noble sentiments are to have substance and meaning for our children.

Abundant America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of May 4, 1944:

ABUNDANT AMERICA

It seems almost like old times, like a little bit of normalcy, to have most of our meats restored to their prerationed status. No development could better typify the amazing abundance that is America.

As a fully employed nation, where consumer demands are greater than ever before in our history, we are feeding ourselves, and we are helping to feed our allies, and we are feeding the millions in our armed forces at home and overseas. By rights, we should expect to have to ration ourselves indefinitely, particularly because we are on the eve of the fiercest and most decisive events in the war. But at this moment, despite the immense drain on our resources, despite the fact that the requirements of our military forces are at a peak, we are able not merely to continue the feeding without let-up but to let meat—perhaps the most important of all food items—be sold on a virtually unrestricted market.

As explained by Price Administrator Chester Bowles, this development is attributable to a drop in lease-lend requests, a reduction in Army and Navy purchases, crowded storage facilities, and similar factors. Basically, however, although some die-hard critics of rationing may claim that the step could have been taken long ago, it can be credited first of all to the natural bountifulness of our land, and, after that, to the magnificent job done by the Nation's primary producers, by the processors, by the distributors, and by those men—in Government and out—who have been responsible for the over-all management of our food program.

In short, the fact that nearly all our meats are now point-free is a great tribute to anyone who has had anything to do with advancing our wartime food production, from the most obscure pig raiser on up. As for

the rationing process itself, if it has seemed at times excessively rigid, it has most certainly played its part well in keeping the country sufficiently and equitably fed. Three or 4 months hence it may have to be applied again to meats, but its past performance has been so creditable that no fair-minded citizen will object if that proves necessary.

The new order of things may, of course, create considerable marketing confusion at first, since it seems only natural that the sudden change will lead to a buying demand greater than supplies on hand in the stores. Moreover, the fact that consumers will now have to make their red points last 4 weeks instead of the usual 2, for butter, choice beef cuts, cheese, etc., may work out as a hardship of sorts in some cases. But all such difficulties ought to yield to solution in reasonable time. Meanwhile, it is instructive to recall that not many months ago more than a few gloomy commentators were predicting that this year the gaunt face of famine would be seen everywhere in our land. America is like that, it is always confounding the Cassandras.

The Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials, one from the Rochester Courier, Rochester, N. H., May 4, 1944, and one from the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N. H., May 5, 1944, on the Montgomery Ward case.

[From the Rochester (N. H.) Courier of May 4, 1944]

THE MONTGOMERY WARD CASE

From such information as is available, the Federal seizure of the Montgomery Ward & Co. Chicago store and the eviction from his office by the military of Sewell L. Avery, president of the concern, is an incident which demands the most searching inquiry by the Congress and the courts, and if proven unlawful, the prompt and proper curb on those responsible, including the President and the Attorney General of the United States.

The President, under his wartime powers, has the authority to seize and operate any private concern necessary to the successful prosecution of the war and which may fail to comply with wartime demands. Nothing, however, has yet been advanced which proves beyond peradventure that the Chicago store of the great mail-order house was, in fact, engaged in the production or distribution of goods necessary to the war effort. We have only the opinion given by Attorney General Biddle, who on at least one previous occasion has stretched the intent of the law to cover a Roosevelt directive.

Understand, the order was not directed against the entire company, which has somewhere around 75,000 employees throughout the country, but, at the Chicago store alone, which employs about 9,000 persons. The reason for the order: The refusal of the Chicago store to sign a new contract with the C. I. O.

A year ago, after the usual dispute between the C. I. O. and an independent union for the bargaining agency of the company, the President ordered Ward's to sign with the C. I. O. Under protest, the company signed a contract for 1 year. When it expired, the C. I. O. demanded a new contract and Ward's demanded a new vote, claiming that several hundred employees had quit the union. There is nothing to indicate the truth or falsity of the claim, but an honestly conducted election would have done so. Instead, along comes Attorney General Biddle with a tailor-made opinion which classes the mail-order house as a war plant within the meaning of the emergency measure. If Biddle's opinion is sustained, then Filene's of Boston is a war plant, Feineman's of Rochester is a war plant, ex-Mayor Boucher's clothing store in Somersworth is a war plant, and the Rochester Courier is a war plant and we may be tossed out on our rumps as was the 69-year-old president of the Montgomery Ward Co., for merely expressing this opinion.

We hold no brief for Montgomery Ward. They are a huge concern with all the feeling of independence that size and influence arouse. Their record for cooperation with the rights of their employees to collective bargaining may not have been good. But that is not the point. The courts were provided to prove that. The point is, that the President of the United States, acting under debatable authority of an unconfirmed legal opinion, seized a concern engaged in the retail sale of merchandise, which by common interpretation could not seriously hinder or advance the progress of this war.

Under our form of government, the judicial branch gives final interpretation of laws passed by the legislature and administered by the Executive. Considered in its most favorable light, the President's action is a page directly out of Mein Kampf and in complete contradiction of the ideals for which we are supposedly fighting on a dozen different world battle fronts.

Regarding the President's past record, it would be simple not to expect that his ill-considered action was taken with an eye to the coming election and its influence on organized labor and labor's considerable war chest. We doubt, however, if the sober-minded elements of labor will regard it with any less degree of alarm than does any other group.

If the Republicans wanted a campaign issue, they have one now. If there has ever been a time in the past 3 years of war when we were faced with the stark necessity of reaffirming our belief in government of the people, by the people, and for the people, or throwing down our arms and accepting Hitler's theories without a further fight, the time is now. If we had never had a reason for denying Franklin D. Roosevelt a life job in the White House, this high-handed action has provided one as has nothing else in his 12 years as Chief Executive.

Congress will be less than dilatory if it does not demand a complete and thorough investigation of this incident, and it will excite contempt if it does not support Ward's in forcing the matter into the courts for a show-down on whether or not we are still a sovereign people, or have unconsciously become the puppets of a power-hungry autocrat.

[From the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N. H., May 5, 1944]

ARE THERE NO LIMITATIONS?

It is all very hard for a small-town editor to evaluate this business of the Government seizing Montgomery Ward.

Boiling all reports down to simplest terms, it seems that the C. I. O. had a contract with Montgomery. The contract ran out.

Montgomery Ward demanded an election to see whether their employees wanted to sign up again with the C. I. O. or some other union as their bargaining agent. The Government said to sign with the C. I. O. and then hold the election. The company refused to do this. The plant was seized by the Army and the president set out onto the street by the soldiers.

It is understood that a broad interpretation of the law enabling the Government to seize struck plants was used in this case. Obviously the Government should have the right to seize a strike-closed plant producing war material, no matter whether or not the management is causing the dispute.

But this new interpretation of the law is that Montgomery was aiding indirectly in the war effort, and thus came under the regulation.

If this is so, then almost any law can be stretched in wartime to cover any situation that the Government wants to interfere in. A country store selling overalls and boots to loggers, gloves to shipyard workers, and gasoline to lumber trucks is certainly aiding the war effort as directly, or as indirectly, as Montgomery Ward.

It is impossible to sit back up here in the hills of New Hampshire and say definitely that the intent of Congress was far overdrawn in this interpretation of the War Powers Act. But it is reasonably safe to guess that this is the case.

If such broad interpretations continue, then it is fair to ask, just how long will we continue to live under our present form of a truly democratic government? Of necessity, the Government must have broad and sweeping powers in wartime, but there must be some definite limitation upon even those broad powers.

If there be no such limitation, then no man, no business, small or big, can make any definite plans for the future. Obviously, if a single official, or group of officials can place at will most elastic interpretation of the law, then we will have a government not of law, but of official whim and desire.

Simply because some injustice may have been done in the Montgomery Ward case is no reason for hair tearing and wild declarations that the country has gone to pot. Injustice has been done in this country, by Government, capital, and labor, and will be done again.

But, if a very thorough investigation is not made into this matter and an attempt made to hold officials to strict accountability for their interpretations of the law, both now and in the future, then there should be cause for concern.

The Adoption of the Constitution of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me in the House of Representatives April 30, 1942:

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] had to say about his personal experiences in Poland. I am reminded of experiences I had in that country back in the winter of 1919–20. I was there twice on business connected with the then Polish Government, and I had an opportunity to learn for myself the intelligence and the determination with which the Poles attacked the problem of the economic rehabilitation of that war-destroyed country.

In order that you may know the conditions which existed there, I need only to remind

you that Poland all down the centuries has constituted one of the great battlegrounds of all Europe. Armies have fought back and forth across that country since time began almost. This was especially true of the World War. The Germans and the Russians fought back and forth and back and forth across Poland time after time. Whenever one army was driven from the country, naturally it took with them everything that could be of any possible use to the retreating forces. All that could not be moved but could be used by the successful forces was destroyed. Consequently, one of the most beautiful farming countries I have ever seen was completely denuded of farm stock of every kind, of food, of everything which enabled a farmer to exist. As a result, when riding from Paris to Warsaw and passing through what I believe was one of the most beautiful agricultural sections I have ever seen, I noticed with amazement that hour after hour as I rode through that wonderful country I did not see the first sign of life, except those gathered at the railroad stations hoping to secure transportation to some city, where the bare necessities of life could be had.

When I reached Warsaw I discovered, very much to my amazement, that bread lines were everywhere. One could not walk a half dozen blocks in any direction from the center of that beautiful city without finding bread lines with long lines of half-starved men, women, and children waiting for their daily rations.

I was amazed then, as I still am when I look back to those days, to note that the people in the bread lines were not completely devoid of hope regardless of how desperate their situation was. It is true that they had no money; they had no work; they had no food other than that they were waiting for, but they were not hopeless. Why? Because Poland had been recreated. Poland was again a land of the free. Her people could again hold up their heads and look to the future unafraid. This feeling completely possessed the people of that country, and as a result there is no example in history where any people so completely destroyed economically as were they, who showed the same determination and the same intelligence and who earned the same success, made the same progress toward economic rehabilitation as was made by Poland following that period.

We, in Michigan, know something of the Polish race. They are a deeply patriotic people. We are privileged to have within our borders hundreds and hundreds of thousands of citizens of Polish extraction. In Bay City, my home town, during the days leading up to our active participation in World War No. 1, we had a demonstration of the quality of Polish patriotism. In my county between 20 and 25 percent of the citizens are of Polish extraction. When the third draft came, Bay County's quota for that draft was only 9 men. The reason was that we had had many hundreds of volunteers prior to that time. Whenever a man volunteered from a county, that county was given credit for that enlistment when the succeeding quotas were called for.

The amazing thing to me, and to everyone who knows of it, I believe, is that while the citizens of Polish extraction constituted only 20 or 25 percent of the total population of the county, that 20 or 25 percent had furnished 75 percent of those who had volunteered previous to that time. That is a record which will stand as a lasting tribute to the patriotism of the American citizens of Polish extraction.

Mr. Speaker, knowing the Poles as I do, knowing their determination to live as a free nation, I prophesy that those hundreds of thousands of Poles who are now fighting in the ranks of those opposed to the Axis Powers will form a nucleus around which Poland will again rise and take her proper place in the great family of nations.

Problems of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech I made last January at a meeting of the American Federation of Physically Handicapped.

I believe it will be interesting to those who may read this speech to know that the Rules Committee of the House has held some hearings recently on House Resolution 230, which is discussed in the address.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be with you this evening. I am interested in the problems of the physically handicapped and welcome this opportunity to discuss with you the situation of the handicapped today and their prospects for the future.

As for today, the war has offered the handicapped an unusual opportunity. It would seem that the humanitarian appeal should be sufficient to create an interest strong enough to unite full public support for aid. But we have not had interest in the employment of the handicapped until the need to produce war material to the limit of our capacity has encouraged industry and Government to discard many prejudices, laws, and regulations which have hindered the handicapped in finding places in the working peacetime world. The handicapped have been employed in all manner of work during this war, and by all reports have rendered a splendid account of themselves.

The handicapped, given this opportunity and showing in their valuable contribution to the war effort that they are fine workers, they are able to produce, they are loyal, and they are devoted, have made a place for themselves in industry and in commerce which, I believe, they will not lose altogether in the return to peace.

No accurate figures on the employment of handicapped persons since Pearl Harbor are available, but it is thought that about 400,000 have been put to work during this period of our greatest effort to produce the weapons for victory.

The Civil Service Commission recently announced that the Government had employed about 17,000 handicapped during the war years. In view of the large number of people who have come into the Government during this time, it is not clear that full opportunity has been granted to the handicapped to perform work for which they are fitted. I hope that we shall learn to make better use of our resources than this indicates.

Since coming to Congress, I have been unable to find any evidence that the problems of our handicapped people are being met by an adequate program, although I think that I have worked about as diligently as anyone in the Congress to discover what agencies are available to render service and aid to the handicapped.

I am told that there are approximately two and a half million handicapped persons in this country now who were not handicapped on December 7, 1941. They have been added to the twenty-five million who were in this country at the time. About one-fifth of us are handicapped. In peacetime we had about 800,000 persons added to the rolls of the handicapped each year.

During peacetime we had about 30,000 persons receiving aid under the Federal-State rehabilitation laws. Every year over 700,000 people becoming handicapped were left carelessly and wastefully and inhumanly outside the aid of these laws. No nation can waste its human lives in such a prodigal manner. I understand that two and a half million people have registered for rehabilitation, and that the Federal Rehabilitation Service has handled about 80,000 cases in the past year and a half. They have not the machinery for doing the job needed by those who have registered. They have certainly not the machinery for searching out the timid and uninformed who are in need and who have not registered.

We must provide for treating those who are seeking aid, and we must provide for the education of those who do not know that they may be helped.

When one sets about trying to find aid for handicapped people his task is a difficult one. If he is diligent, he may discover that many efforts have been made to solve some small phase of the problems of the handicapped, and that his search must lead him to many agencies before he finds the agency which will perform that service which is needed—he may find as many as 17 Federal agencies or, some say, as many as 80. What can the poor handicapped person do? What can the uninformed handicapped person do? He is bound to be confused and he is sure to be bewildered. I am.

There must be one agency from which handicapped persons may learn accurately and simply what help they may receive and what opportunities exist for their rehabilitation and employment.

We might coordinate the multitude of activities in this field in something like a bureau for the welfare of the physically handicapped. We in Congress need to know what is being done and what needs to be done. The general public and the handicapped need the efficiency of such an administration of rehabilitation. We cannot plan a world in which the second bill of rights is extended only to able-bodied citizens. The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation does not belong to the able-bodied man more than to the handicapped man, and certainly the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health, which our President spoke of the other day, should belong, first of all, to those most in need of it—our handicapped citizens. The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment, and all the other rights for which we now are paying with every hard-fought battle and every extended energy in the war against fascism, belongs alike to the sick and the well, to the able and to the handicapped. It is time to make a beginning to insure that this shall be an actuality.

It was with these things in mind that I introduced House Resolution 230, which I believe is a sensible approach to the problem. I think the purpose of the resolution is clear. It is: "Resolved, that the Committee on Labor, acting as a whole, or by subcommitee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, (2) to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped, (3) employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation, etc."

We cannot begin until we know where we are in solving the problems of our handicapped and their relation to our society. I believe that the Congress is the only organi-

zation equipped with sufficient power and facilities to gather from the many Government and private agencies all the facts about aid now possible for the handicapped. We need to know what has been learned by industry about the employment of handicapped persons during this war-production period. We need to learn from those social agencies which have worked on the problem just what sort of aid and how much is required effectively to relieve the physical, social, and economic misery of the handicapped.

I believe that only Congress can gather the information needed and develop from it a sound and progressive program which will effectively bring back the blessings of life to the greatest posible number of those now cut off from some of those blessings because they are handicapped, and because a world torn by wars and depressions and harried by changes has not taken the necessary action to insure their welfare.

The resolution provides for a complete and thorough study of all the problems relating to the handicapped and their needs. It provides for the study of the various types of handicapped—the blind, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the cardiacs, and amputees, the victims of tuberculosis and injury and disease and defects—their talents and abilities.

Before the United Nations has won the victory, we shall with sorrow add the names of thousands of young men injured in battle to the roll of the handicapped. We shall add thousands more men and women injured in our industrial plants. It is imperative that we begin the long task of making a place in our world for our less fortunate brothers and sisters. It is only a little less sacred obligation to our civilian handicapped.

I believe that we shall find we can extend the help of modern science and medicine, and the encouragement of human compassion and concern, to our handicapped, and that we shall find that we, ourselves, have profited by the addition to our national life of a group of people who bring us gifts of great value. We need the inspiration of the courage of our handicapped. We need the great works they can perform. We need to restore to production this group of people who are otherwise left at the mercy of a busy and preoccupied public. We need the miracle of healing and restoring to life and rehabilitation that is possible if we are willing to provide the agencies. So much has been learned, and so much more will be learned. Let us set about the work of making this knowledge available to those who are in need of it. I cannot foretell the miracles of science which will come out of the work our physicians will do during this war in caring for the wounded and dying. But I do believe it likely that they shall learn more about curing ills than they have ever known before. It is our job to see that the blessings of this knowledge shall reach all those who are in need of them.

Many stand in need of assistance now, and many more shall be added to the number before the war ends. The passage of House Resolution 230 will enable us to work for the first time toward a real method of insuring to the physically handicapped of this country the place in our national life which individually we all sincerely desire to see open to each one of the handicapped.

You will get exactly what you fight for, and nothing else. If there is to be a real move forward in a Federal program for the handicapped, then it is axiomatic that the handicapped, themselves, as chief prospective beneficiaries of such a program, must unite, and press it forward to achievement. You cannot do this by mere wishful thinking. You must organize, you must carry on a perpetual campaign of education, both of the public and your own people. You must see that Congress is continually reminded of your needs.

When we have discovered just what need exists, and just what is being done to meet the need, I believe that the people of this country will be surprised and appalled to know just how much work remains to be done before the minimum welfare of the physically handicapped is insured. We shall have to educate ourselves before we shall be able to educate those of limited ability to perform the work they are destined to do.

We shall have to enlarge our present conception of what is possible in rehabilitation, once we become really experienced in rehabilitation. So much lies before us to do and to accomplish. I hope that we may soon make a real beginning by securing the passage of House Resolution 230.

I believe that we shall win our victory and that we shall enter upon a new era of man's humanity to man. What we propose to begin when this legislation is enacted may, I hope, prove to be fruitful in human happiness and in human life.

St. Lawrence River Power and Seaway Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "St. Lawrence River Power and Seaway Development," delivered by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], at Watertown, N. Y., on Friday evening, May 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You people gathered here tonight are inaugurating a campaign for a constructive development which will be an important factor in determining the position which America will hold in the post-war world and which may also determine the extent of the security, prosperity, and happiness which the people of this Nation will possess in the future.

For many, many years it has been the hope of the people living in the Great Lakes industrial and agricultural empire that some day they might have free access to the seas and their rightful place in the commerce of the world.

For many years I, too, living in the neighboring State of Vermont from which State a great deal of this great northern New York country was settled and developed, have looked forward almost as eagerly as you have to the time when the great St. Lawrence River might be developed to serve the needs of our country and the needs of our neighboring country—Canada.

During all these years I little dreamed that the time would ever come when it would fall to my lot to introduce into the Congress of the United States a bill providing for this St. Lawrence River development. That day did come, however, and on September 28, 1943, I introduced S. 1385, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

Briefly, the bill approves the agreement entered into by the United States and Canadian Governments on March 19, 1941. This agreement provides for the construction of such works as will furnish a 27-foot waterway all the way from the head of Lake Superior to the sea. This waterway will accommodate all but the very largest ships of our Navy and merchant marine.

Since the agreement was signed, considerable work, including the reconstruction of the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, has been completed as a war necessity.

The principal work remaining is the development of the International Rapids section between New York State and Ontario.

The total cost of all new work will be approximately $421,000,000—of which the United States will pay $277,000,000 and Canada $144,000,000. The difference between the cost to the two countries is due to the fact that in 1926 a gentlemen's agreement was entered into by the United States and Canada providing that if one country expended money to improve the waterway, the other would spend an equal amount. Canada has spent, mostly for improving the Welland Canal, some $140,000,000, which we have thus far failed to match.

Of the $277,000,000 to be paid by the United States, $93,375,000 will be repaid by the State of New York over a 50-year period to cover that part of the cost allocated strictly to power development. The contribution from the self-liquidating power project in New York will thus reduce the net liability to the Federal Treasury under the terms of the bill to less than $190,000,000.

There is no question of State's rights involved since the right of New York State and Ontario Province to the power is clearly recognized. Under the terms of the bill New York would agree to permit the sale of St. Lawrence power to public and coperative distributors in other States.

The agreement also provides "for the preservation and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and for the most beneficial use of the waters of that river."

I understand that such beneficial works would be constructed at Niagara which would permit the additional use of 5,000 cubic feet of water per second by each country without impairing in any way the beauty of the falls. Such works would be of inestimable value to the cities of Niagara Falls, Buffalo, and surrounding territory.

Introducing this bill was not an idle political gesture on my part. I intend to do all within my power as a Member of the Senate to see that it becomes law. To enact this bill into law and to bring about the development of the greatest natural resource in all North America will require the concerted effort of American labor, American agriculture, and American industry and commerce. To secure the cooperation and earnest support of all these groups, it is necessary that they be informed as to what the St. Lawrence seaway and power development is and what the effect will be upon their lives and industries.

Ever since certain private interests 20 years ago failed to secure for themselves the right to acquire the mighty power resources of the St. Lawrence there has been conducted a campaign which reached from one end of this Nation to the other to prevent forever the development of this great river unless such development could be made by private interests for private profit.

The opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have resorted to all the tricks in the trade. They have told the coal miners that the development of power on the St. Lawrence would ruin the coal industry. This is utterly at variance with the facts, as has been amply proven in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority, where the use of coal increased 1,000 percent following the development of the water resources of that region.

It is true that the use of coal nationally has fallen off greatly in the last two decades, but in those areas where public power has been developed the use of coal has actually

increased. Will an increase of industry in any State reduce the amount of coal consumed? This claim is so ridiculous that it would not be worthy of attention if it were not for the fact that through propaganda methods thousands of coal miners have been led to believe that coal mining really would be injured by the development of the St. Lawrence and a great northeast industrial empire.

Opponents of the seaway have also sold other regions of the country, notably the Atlantic and Gulf coast ports, the idea that an increase in industry and agriculture resulting from St. Lawrence power and access to the sea would reduce the amount of business done by those ports.

The United States Department of Commerce has ably exploded those false assertions but the highly organized and financed group of self-seeking interests have done their work well. Many people in these sections actually believe that New York and New England can only increase their industry and commerce by taking it away from others. They cannot see that a great Nation-wide increase in peacetime production and prosperity would result in greater gains for all. We must make them see this.

It is true that a few people might have to readjust themselves, but a world wherein no changes are made would soon be a stagnant world.

It is probably true that if Buffalo steel could be shipped direct by the seaway to other markets that steel mills in Maryland and elsewhere would face new competition. Yet, the expansion of business created by the seaway development would undoubtedly mean more business for all.

The purposes for developing the St. Lawrence are, first, to provide an easier and direct access for the flow of goods to and from the Great Lakes Basin to the markets of the world.

Secondly, to harness the greatest undeveloped water power in North America.

The third reason for authorizing this development at an early date is the extremely important part which it would play in providing employment for a large number of persons during the post-war reconversion period and permanent employment for an even greater number in the years ahead.

The economic life of a nation depends upon the adequacy of its transportation. This will be truer than ever at the end of this war.

Production problems have largely been solved, but we have made far greater strides in the production of goods than we have in putting those goods into the hands of the people who would use them. Fully half of the wholesale cost of many foods is represented by transportation charges alone, thus contributing to a system of national scarcity and underconsumption. So long as a system of scarcity prevails in our country, we will have unemployment and undernourished, underclothed, and underprivileged people.

The greatest step which can be taken toward making this land of ours a land of plenty is the establishment of a coordinated transportation system which will include airways, highways, railways, and waterways. The greatest unfinished link in this system is the bottleneck which landlocks the Great Lakes Basin with its 45,000,000 population.

Once let the seaway be completed, and the products of farm and factory produced throughout our Great Lakes States and Midwest areas may be loaded on ships at any of the many ports of the Great Lakes for direct shipment to all parts of the world. By the same token, much of the goods and raw material imported into the Great Lakes region would be brought direct to the harbors of our inland cities instead of being unloaded at coastal ports and transported by other means overland at a considerable increase in delay and cost.

Shippers on the Great Lakes need have no fear that foreign boats would take their commerce from them because foreign shipping is not permitted to engage in coastwise traffic in the United States.

Among the important products which would be shipped in bulk from lake ports through the St. Lawrence would be automobiles, grains, soybeans, dairy products, machinery, iron and steel, wood pulp and newsprint, and packing-house products. Among the articles of import we would find coffee, citrus fruits, bananas, rubber, tin, sulfur, vegetable oils, burlap and jute, cottonseed, and lumber.

Can anyone visualize what this free access for shipping would do for our inland empire and still have the effrontery to say that it is not a good thing for America?

Opponents of the seaway have gone so far as to say that we should not develop it because it would benefit Canada. My answer to that is—thank God that it does. A strong Canada is a better neighbor and a better customer. A weak Canada would be a poor neighbor and a poor customer.

The economic welfare of the two nations is closely bound together and in general what helps Canada helps us and what helps us helps Canada. As nations we should grow stronger together for the day may sometime come when we will need that strength and unity far more than we do now.

Opponents of the St. Lawrence-power project have stoutly based their opposition on the grounds that plenty of power was available and there was no need for the development of the 2,250,000-horsepower which would be generated at the Massena Dam.

As recently as 1941 witnesses before a House committee testified that there was enough surplus power available in northern New York to meet all emergencies. How terribly wrong they were.

The war had not been in progress long before steam power generated on the Atlantic Coast was being transmitted hundreds of miles to make up a deficiency in the St. Lawrence Valley and the Secretary of Commerce was arranging for a hundred million dollars to be made available for the development of the aluminum plant and power project at the Shipshaw north of the city of Quebec. Now, we hear the critics saying again "Well, there will be surplus of power after this war, therefore, let's not develop power at Massena because it will not be needed and only contribute further to the surplus."

Let us see what happened after the First World War. In 1915 the total production of electricity in America amounted to 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1916, when we were preparing for war, the production jumped to 21,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1918 this had increased to 33,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The war ended that year. Did the use and production of electric power decrease? It most certainly did not. In 1919 it increased still further to nearly 39,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1920 it went up to 43,000,000,000. It dropped slightly in 1921 and then shot up to 47,000,000,000 in 1922. From then on production increased steadily until in 1929 it had reached the enormous total of 95,925,000,000 kilowatt-hours. There was a slight drop during the great depression years when our industrial plants were idle and then production climbed upward again. By 1940 it had reached the total of 144,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours and in 1943—the latest figures available show that the United States produced a grand total of 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity or nearly 10 time the amount which was used during the First World War.

There isn't the slightest doubt but that this power will be neded and used at the close of this war provided it is made available to the American people at reasonable rates.

We are becoming more and more dependent on electricity with each passing year and there is no indication that the saturation point is yet in sight. Every farm, every home, every industry in America will use more and more as time goes on.

We are entering the age of non-ferrous-metal production and use. The production of aluminum is now measured in billions of pounds. It requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce a pound of aluminum.

Magnesium has entered permanently into the field of commercial metal production and will be used more and more where the lightness of the metal used is important. We have plenty of material with which to manufacture magnesium here in this northeast section if cheap electric power is available in quantity.

The electric torch will be used upon public works, shipbuilding and construction projects to an extent not dreamed of before the war. The tremendous chemical industry with its scientific advances necessitated by war will continue as the peacetime servant of the people.

Farmers today are using low-cost nitrate fertilizer as a result of new discoveries which can only be utilized if electric power is plentiful and cheap. The farmers of America will never willingly go back to the days of high priced nitrogen. If perchance they are forced to do so, then they will be unable to compete with the rest of the world in the production of crops.

Since the war began, thousands upon thousands of farms in our north country have been equipped with electric milking machines and water coolers. Barns have been wired for lighting. Only through this increased use of electricity has the American farmer been able to produce the enormous crops which have been demanded of him. During this past year, in spite of the scarcity of material, the emergency has been so great that the War Production Board has authorized the extension of electricity to 78,000 farms on the rural electrification systems alone. How many more farms have been connected by the private utilities I cannot say, but the number must be very great.

There are still millions of rural homes and farms in America that are not served by electric light and power. We cannot consider our rural life in America very near perfect so long as this condition prevails. Many countries of Europe are far ahead of us in this respect. The countries of South America and other parts of the world are rapidly catching up. We must not be content until every farm home in America is equipped for electricity.

As I look into the future, I see millions of rural homes where farm families live richer and happier lives because of new electrical appliances. I see electric hay dryers making the farmer independent of weather conditions. I see on every farm and in every village home and even in the apartment houses of the cities quick-freezing facilities and storage which will tremendously cut the cost of living.

Farmers will be living on fruit and vegetables and meats of their own production the year around. Town and city people will be buying food in quantity in surplus seasons at low prices and storing it to use in seasons of low supply and high prices. They will use a great amount of electrical energy in doing this.

There will be no surplus of power for long after this war. There may be a year or a year and a half when consumption of electric power will drop. Then history will repeat itself and consumption will become greater than ever before. We will need not only

all that is being produced now, but a great deal more than must be secured from new sources.

The Massena Dam will have an annual average output amounting to 13,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In terms of annual output of electricity, it will be the largest project of its kind in the world and over three times as great as the great Dneiper Dam in Russia. It is estimated that St. Lawrence power can be delivered wtihin a 200-mile radius for not much over 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour This means that it could be sold at a price substantially below that which now generally prevails. It would mean that Northeastern United States could offer to industry equal inducement with the Southern and Western portions of our country where cheap power now prevails and thus maintain a balance in our national economy.

It would indeed mean that most of the companies distributing electricity would have to lower their rates, but they would sell a great deal more. Experience in a great many sections has proven that when electric rates are lowered, sales increase to such an extent that the profits of the companies usualy increase rather than decrease.

There has been some attempt to spread fear among the stockholders of utility companies that development of the St. Lawrence power would jeopardize their investment. The best answer to this is the statement of Leo T. Crowley, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, testifying before a House committee on July 3, 1941 Mr. Crowley said:

"It has been contended that the opening of this seaway would harm the railroads and public utilities of the northeast section of the country. If this were true in any appreciable degree, the security obligations of these businesses would suffer. Since the banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation hold about $350,000,000 of railroad security obligations and $625,000,000 of public utility security obligations, I could not support this legislation if I thought that the railroads and public utilities would, on the whole, be affected adversely. Fortunately the evidence indicates that the great advantages of opening up the Great Lakes to ocean traffic will not bring corresponding harm to the railways, and that the energy developed in the St. Lawrence will not hurt the utilities, but will rather fit into the long-term growth of our need for power.

"There is, therefore, little possibility that the investment character of railroad and public utility security obligations will be harmed by the legislation under consideration. Indeed, it may well be that their investment quality will be enhanced. * * *

"It is entirely reasonable to conclude that the eastern roads will be gainers rather than losers on balance."

Then Mr. Crowley goes on to say:

"What I have said relative to the effects of the St. Lawrence project on the railroads applies equally well to the public utilities. The power development will not hurt them and may indirectly benefit them. I have already pointed out that according to predefense estimates some 2,500,000 more horsepower of energy will have to be made available to the people of New York State in the next 10 years. Inasmuch as the American share of St. Lawrence power, about 1,100,000 horsepower, would provide less than half of this increase in anticipated demand, it is obvious that the hydroelectric development at the International Rapids constitutes no competitive threat whatever to existing public utilities."

These remarks which I have quoted are not taken from the speech of any Socialist orator, but from the statement made by one of America's hardest-headed businessmen and who is responsible for the protection of billions of dollars worth of bank deposits, a large percentage of which are invested in railroad and public-utility holdings.

A few days ago I received a telegram advising me that the St. Lawrence development was indefensible because it would require so many men to construct it and that we needed the men for other purposes.

This is in line with the testimony given by opponents of the seaway at the hearings before the House committee 3 years ago. It was maintained by opponents at that time that the seaway should not be constructed because it would require the labor of so many men.

War Department engineers estimated that the project construction work would require the labor of 10,000 men over a 4-year period. Opponents claimed emphatically that the 10,000 men required to do the actual work of construction was only a starter. They pointed out the thousands of men who would be required in transportation, in home construction, in the manufacture of materials, in the dredging of harbors and other work naturally accompanying the work of constructing the dam.

In fact, they insisted that construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would require the labors of 100,000, 80 percent of them skilled or semiskilled, over a 4-year period. They objected to this great development, they said, because we could not spare the manpower.

Now we are asking that this great undertaking be made a post-war project. Any project that will furnish employment for 100,000 men over a 4-year period is going to play a mighty important part in handling the load of unemployment which inevitably follows war. Giving work to 100,000 men means support for a half-million people. It means more than that. It means business for railroads; business for the coal mines; business for the merchants of every town in up-State New York. It means business for the stores and manufacturers of Rochester, Buffalo, Syracuse, Utica, and every other city. It means lightening the fear of returning soldiers that they will have to join the ranks of the unemployed. The opponents of the seaway have themselves made one of the most potent arguments in favor of its construction.

I have had enough of W. P. A. and relief rolls. I have had enough of "make work" projects and their humiliating environment. There is enough work in America that ought to be done to give every returning serviceman an honest job. If the St. Lawrence seaway development will use the services of 100,000 skilled and semiskilled workmen over a 4-year period, it will stand out as one of the most important public works that can be undertaken.

It will be one of the most important for more than the reason that 100,000 men may be employed because of its construction. It will be more important because when its navigation and power facilities are completed it will contribute to the employment and prosperity of every town and city in this great north country and contribute permanently to the battle against unemployment.

Some opponents of the St. Lawrence development take the position that providing benefits for most of the people can only be done by depriving others of what they consider rightly theirs. They ignore the fact that this is a growing nation.

The very fact that the electrical output of the United States has increased from 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1914 to 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1943 should convince anyone that our economic life is not static.

It is estimated by the Department of Commerce that the "average tons of freight originating in the decade of 1950 will probably be between 242,000,000 and 374,000,000 greater than the average of 1930–39. The 10,000,000 tons of additional American traffic which may use the St. Lawrence at maximum utilization would be but a fraction of the expected increase in railroad activity."

This estimate of the increase in freight tonnage was made in 1940. Since that time we have engaged in the greatest war in history. American servicemen, American ships, American corporations, American Government representatives are distributed over every part of this globe today.

The tremendous increase in shipping and in air transportation is opening a new era in world commerce. International commerce will be the world's greatest industry after the war. Production of American farms and factories will find its way to every country on the globe and the raw materials and goods from those countries will be received by us in return. The imagination cannot comprehend the extent of the increase in world commerce which is coming. We must be ready for it.

Much of the commerce of other lands will originate on inland waterways, or be loaded directly on ocean-going vessels. Five-sixths of the earth's area is covered with water. For the most part, the world's commerce will be water-borne, although most of the passenger traffic and enormous quantities of perishable goods will be transported by air.

It will be a highly competitive world, too. If we are to maintain the standard of living which Americans enjoy now, we must meet that competition.

Transportation and power will be vital factors in meeting it. Transportation must be both cheap and adequate. Manpower must be complemented with electric power if the high wage level of American industry is to continue.

The St. Lawrence seaway will contribute materially to both these factors. It will be almost indispensable. We have every right to demand that authorization for its construction be granted by Congress now.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials having to do with the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. They appeared in the Caledonian-Record, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., on May 5 and 6 of this year.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Johnsbury (Vt.) Caledonian-Record of May 5, 1944]

AIKEN AND THE SEAWAY

Pending in the Congress and referred to a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee is the bill of Vermont's junior Senator, GEORGE D. AIKEN, for the construction of dams and power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and for the completion of a deep waterway whereby grain and other products of the Plains States could be shipped directly to all parts of the world.

Alleged by its backers to be the last great national resource left on the North American

continent and comparable in importance with the Panama Canal, the St. Lawrence seaway project merits the consideration and study of all Vermonters.

From a political standpoint the project is also of significance. In lending his active support in promotion of the vast undertaking for harnessing the waters of the St. Lawrence, Senator AIKEN has been charged with inconsistency. How, it is argued, can he support the St. Lawrence and at the same time oppose the Dummerston project in the West River Valley of Vermont? Do not both involve the use of navigable streams for the purpose of constructing hydroelectric plants under public ownership?

Senator AIKEN expresses the belief that his attitude is consistent, logical, and that his action in introducing a bill to harness the waters of the St. Lawrence is in the best interests of the people of Vermont.

Before an analysis of the views of the junior Senator is presented, it is necessary to acquaint our readers with the highlights of the St. Lawrence seaway project—an undertaking national in scope and of economic import to the heaviest populated areas of this country.

In March of 1941 at Ottawa, the United States Government and the government of Canada signed a pact known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Agreement. This agreement included two projects. The first objective called for the construction of a dam across the St. Lawrence River, probably at Massena, N. Y.—a dam which would develop 1,100,000 horsepower of electricity within the boundaries of the United States.

As a part of the project is the authorization for a deep-water canal and locks to by-pass the dam. Once constructed, it would be possible for ocean-going ships to dock at Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Duluth or any other Great Lakes port.

Under normal conditions, about 3½ years would be required to build the dam. Total cost of the project to the United States has been estimated at $256,170,000. Senator AIKEN'S bill (S. 1385) calls for congressional approval of the agreement made by the two governments in 1941 and for immediate construction of works allocated to the United States. It further provides for the negotiation of an agreement with the power authority of the State of New York to result in a transfer to this authority of the power facilities at the proposed dam upon payment of the sum of $93,375,000 over a period of years.

The Aiken bill specifically includes provisions assuring a "widespread equitable distribution of the power to public agencies in other States, including municipalities, public-power districts and rural electric cooperatives with economic transmission distances. * * *"

With this as a background, we are in a position to consider in tomorrow's issue the particular effect of this vast internal improvement upon the Government's plans for the development of the resources of the Connecticut River and Senator AIKEN'S reasons for advocating the St. Lawrence project while opposing the ravaging of farms and village properties by the construction of a Government power project in the West River Valley of Vermont.

[From the St. Johnsbury (Vt.) Caledonian-Record of May 6, 1944]

AIKEN AND THE SEAWAY

In yesterday's issue we outlined the most important details of the bill introduced into the Congress by Vermont's Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN for the approval of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement and for the immediate construction of power facilities of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Is the Senator inconsistent in lending his support to this vast public-ownership project while opposing the construction of a Government power dam in the West River Valley of Vermont?

Senator AIKEN denies any allegation of inconsistency. On the contrary, he vigorously asserts that only through the development of St. Lawrence River power will there be decreased pressure to construct dams and flood the valleys of eastern Vermont.

The Senator bases his thesis on the need of more and lower-priced power, and in this he is supported by sources which assert that in the next decade the whole eastern industrial area is going to require a great deal more power than is now available or in sight through lesser developments. Apart from present and prospective demand originating in defense activity, it is said that New York State alone will require an additional 2,500,000 horsepower of electrical energy. In consequence, more and more pressure is brought to bear to construct power dams across the Connecticut River in Vermont.

In the opinion of the Vermont Senator, some of these dams can be built without serious damage to the development of the State. In other instances the damages to Vermont's future prosperity would outweigh the benefits received. In the latter category he places the proposed dam at Dummerston in the West River Valley. Senator AIKEN points out that hundreds of families have moved into this valley in recent years; that the development was proceeding at an accelerated pace at the outbreak of the war and will be resumed when the war ends. If the valley is flooded, the area cannot be used for future residential, agricultural, or industrial development.

Without minimizing the need of flood-control dams constructed at intervals on an entirely different basis, the Senator contends that one sure way to relieve the pressure for power dams in the Connecticut Valley and to provide cheap power needed if the Northeast is to hold its own with areas of the South and West is by development of the vast St. Lawrence power project. It is believed that St. Lawrence power could be delivered within a radius to include the cities of Burlington and St. Albans for about 2 mills per kilowatt and within a radius to include all of Vermont except a few towns in the southeastern part of the State for not more than 2½ mills per kilowatt. It is to be doubted that electricity developed from waterpower available in Vermont could be distributed at such a low cost.

Nor does Senator AIKEN slight the importance to Vermont farmers of a navigation project on the St. Lawrence River. With a gross reduction in unloading and reloading costs on bulk cargoes destined to all parts of the world, it is estimated that the average saving on the cost of grain to Vermont farmers would equal $2 per ton—amounting to a total saving of nearly a million dollars a year.

The Senator believes that the St. Lawrence development would stimulate industrial and agricultural enterprise in all the Northeastern States and bring about a population increase in the area.

Pointing to the non-partisan character of sponsorship, for the St. Lawrence project, Senator AIKEN calls attention to the fact that the project cannot properly be referred to as President Roosevelt's "baby." The development was first urged by Calvin Coolidge in his annual message to the Congress in 1923. The chairman of the St. Lawrence Commission in the Coolidge administration was none other than Herbert Hoover who continued to work for the project after he became President.

Aiken's sponsorship of the Senate bill indicates his intense interest in the St. Lawrence development. He is represented as being convinced that the only hope of preventing a further exodus of industry from the Northeast after the war is through completion of the project. He believes that St. Lawrence power would enable this section of the country to compete on even terms with other parts of the United States now having advantages in power costs and that unless this source of power now running unharnessed to the sea is utilized, the pressure to construct power dams and flood Vermont valleys will steadily increase.

We believe that the views presented by Vermont's able and conscientious legislator are logical and not subject to the charge of inconsistency. We believe that irrespective of the outcome of the pending legislation for development of the resources of the St. Lawrence River and in the face of known opposition, GEORGE AIKEN will pursue a course constantly characterized by an integrity of purpose and primary regard for the best interests of the people of Vermont.

Return to the Farms of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, many plans have been formed with respect to the opportunities to be afforded servicemen when the war shall have ended, and naturally the Senate would be much interested in what was in the hearts and minds of the servicemen themselves with respect to after-war plans. The Greater North Dakota Association has made a comprehensive survey to ascertain the wishes of men from North Dakota who are in the service, and I ask unanimous consent that the release on this survey, under the head "Servicemen want to buy North Dakota farms," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICEMEN WANT TO BUY NORTH DAKOTA FARMS

According to next of kin, 88 percent of the men who went to war from rural North Dakota want to return to a farm in this State.

This statement is backed by figures of a State-wide survey which has extended through 42 of the 53 counties, with answers tabulated from 6,285 North Dakota farm boys now fighting on the seven seas, several continents, and in the stratosphere.

The survey, conducted by the Greater North Dakota Association, is attracting attention of post-war planning organizations in several other States, where, it is indicated, the North Dakota plan will be inaugurated.

Perhaps this finding is not so surprising when it is considered that 5,039 servicemen, or more than 80 percent of those reported upon, were engaged in farming when called to the colors. Yes; and 1,575 of these boys were operating on their own before the war uprooted them from the soil.

Today, mothers, fathers, brothers have reported in reply to questionnaires that 5,523 indicate a desire to return to farms in their home communities. It is significant that this is 88 percent of the total number reporting.

Parents may be prejudiced, and heartsick wishes may have fathered, or mothered the opinion, but certainly figures gathered by township reporters in 779 townships do indicate a real love of the State which in 1943

was first in production of wheat in the Nation, produced a half billion in new wealth, and bought most War bonds per capita.

A number of the younger men want to complete school or attend college. Some 17 percent have no plans formulated.

However, the fact that the average savings of the men, the resources they have in cash, real estate, and War bonds, was $1,050 for each of the 6,235. As in more peaceful pursuits, some have not laid up a dollar, while savings run to $10,000 for certain individuals.

The survey was made at the request of a State-wide farmland fact-finding conference held in Fargo, February 11.

At this meeting a committee was named consisting of B. E. Groom, G. N. D. A. secretary; Rt. Rev. William T. Mulloy; Bradley C. Marks, president of the National A. O. U. W.; Roy Johnson, Casselton farmer, and Harry Schnell, Fargo real estate and insurance broker. This committee asked G. N. D. A. to use its State organization to conduct a survey to determine if North Dakota farm boys now in the service desired to farm in this State after victory.

GRASS ROOT REPORT

G. N. D. A. called upon each of its 53 county directors to work with the county auditor and chairman of the board of county commissioners in appointing a reporter for each rural township, to call on near relatives of men in the service to secure answers to a questionnaire.

The answers from two-thirds of the total number of townships in the State reported on 6,285 servicemen, of whom 1,300 were married.

REALLY WANT FARMS

Rather remarkable is the fact that 3,393, or 61 percent, want to buy farms, while 2,130, or 39 percent, desire to farm but feel they would like to start as renters. And 945, or 17 percent, own stock and farm equipment. The report shows that 675 men now own farm homes.

While 4,874 servicemen are indicated as desiring to practice mixed farming, 609 prefer power farming, not a surprising situation for men familiar with mass production methods in North Dakota, which fitted them especially for modern mechanized war. Only 40 were listed as preferring dairy farming, but few will have dairy herds at hand when they take off their uniforms. The fact that but 40 plan to engage in dairy farming should not be misconstrued as a lack of interest in dairying, for 4,874 returning servicemen plan to do mixed farming, in which dairying has ever been an important factor. But it will take time for either a buyer or renter to build a dairy herd and grow into the business.

When the survey was started it was hoped it might be completed in time to give complete information to the special session of the legislature. Deep snow interfered in some sections, and the canvass was delayed by sickness and absences in others.

"However," Secretary Groom says, "we feel we have a remarkably accurate cross-section picture of the entire State. The percentage of later reports indicate that there would be little change, except the increase in totals, if we had a check on every single serviceman in the State."

LEGISLATURE EXPRESSES THANKS

The North Dakota Legislature passed a joint resolution in appreciation of the survey as a service to the State.

"The contribution the Greater North Dakota Association is making through furnishing this reliable statistical data upon which to build our future land policy for the returned soldier is one of inestimable value," Gov. John Moses declared.

And Governor Moses signed a bill passed by the special session under which State departments and political subdivisions are required to retain farm land owned for returning servicemen until July 1, 1945, or until after the regular legislative session has been able to adopt a more comprehensive land-for-veterans program.

* * * * *

Returns are still coming to the office of G. N. D. A., where they are tabulated like election returns, showing the status by townships and counties and the total for the State.

"Newspapers in each county have been given individual county returns to date," Groom says, "and when complete figures have been secured we will have a record which it is felt will be of special value to the regular session of the legislature which will meet next January to make plans to aid returning soldiers. It will aid various communities in post-war plans."

Groom reports great interest in the survey. Post-war planning organizations of several States have written for the questionnaire, and for the printed forms used in the tabulations. It appears the G. N. D. A. plan will form the framework for at least three other States seeking information as to the desires of the returning serviceman.

CANVASS FIGURE TOTALS

Below is a summary of the North Dakota survey:

1. Number of married men, 1,300.
2. Number of single men, 4,985.
3. Number on farms when called, 5.039.
4. Number farming on own account when called, 1,575.
5. Number wanting to farm when discharged, 5,523.
6. Number who prefer mixed farming, 4,874.
7. Number who prefer power farming, 609.
8. Number who prefer dairy farming, 40.
9. Number who own land, 676.
10. Number having no land, 4,847.
11. Number having some stock and equipment, 1,554.
12. Number having no stock or equipment, 3,969.
13. Number having plans made for farming when discharged, 945.
14. Number wanting to buy land, 3,393.
15. Number wanting to rent, 2,130.
16. Number wanting land with buildings, 4,604.
17. Resources: Cash, bonds, real estate—average per man, $1,050.

The United States Housing Act and Its Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech I delivered before the National Association of Home Builders of the United States, May 9, 1944, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

In 1939 I made a rather exhaustive analysis of the operations of the United States Housing Act. You will recall that the United States Housing Authority came to Congress at that time with a request for an authorization to issue additional obligations to the amount of $800,000,000. The additional authorization requested would have brought the total authorizations up to $1,600,000,000.

It asked for a change in the Housing Act providing for annual contributions aggregating not more than $45,000,000 per annum in addition to the contracts theretofore authorized by the United States Housing Act.

Notwithstanding the fact that the United States Housing Authority did intensive lobbying in Congress to induce the acceptance of its request, it failed in that endeavor. Though its bill passed the Senate, it was defeated in the lower House by a decisive majority.

We might review a few of the more important points that were brought out in that analysis. The propaganda put out by Mr. Nathan Straus, Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, was that:

"Ours is a decentralized program in which the responsibility for carrying out housing programs rests not with the United States Housing Authority but with the communities themselves. * * * The United States Housing Authority program is entirely decentralized. The United States Housing Authority cannot turn a single spadeful of dirt or lay a single brick. It is purely a financial assistance agency, which makes loans and subsides to local public-housing authorities."

This was shown to be completely false. Instead, that program is in every sense a Federal program and completely centralized in Washington.

The United States Housing Authority instigated the enactment of laws to set up State housing bodies, and further instigated the State legislatures to pass enabling acts to create the so-called local housing authorities. In fact, the United States Housing Authority initiates, directs, and maintains complete control over every act relating to the development of the housing project down to and including a requirement that the rents of the occupants of the dwelling units must have its approval before they can be put into effect.

I followed the operations of this public-housing scheme very closely when an attempt was made in 1938 to locate one of its projects in the city of Marion, Ohio, my home town. I was mayor of Marion at the time that took place. Marion residents one evening picked up their daily newspapers and read in large headlines that Marion had been granted a million dollars by the United States Housing Authority for the building of a Federal housing project. Diligent search and inquiry revealed the fact that there had not been even the slightest demand on the part of anybody in Marion for any Federal-housing project. It was an election year and it had become generally known that I might be a candidate for Congress. I accepted the challenge and began informing our citizens of the real nature of the Federal proposal. Our city council not only refused to pass enabling legislation for the building of the project but it actually passed a resolution declaring that the city of Marion would have nothing to do with the proposal.

Armed with the power of eminent domain the United States Housing Authority tentatively drove its stakes setting off an area in the city of Marion for the location of its proposed housing project. The residents of that area were given to understand that they might at any moment be driven out of their homes onto the streets to make room for the project.

Opposition developed by the families in the area against the proposed action of the United States Housing Authority in trying to foist its will upon them. On one of the streets within the area selected for the location of the project 55 percent of the families owned their homes free of debt. I was personally acquainted with a great many of the families living in that area, having attended many of them at their bedsides in cases of illness and having assisted many of their mothers in bringing their babies into the world. So far

as I could see, the moral character of the people living in that area compared favorably with that of those living in any other area of comparable size in the city. Some of the houses they lived in were not of the most desirable kind, but by no possible stretch of the imagination could the area be considered as a slum area or the families living in it as slum dwellers.

Think of the people living in that section picking up their daily newspaper one evening and finding themselves referred to as slum dwellers. Further, that a slum survey for Marion filed with the State board showed that social diseases of various forms were found in that area, and that desirable tenants had gradually withdrawn from there until a low class of occupants had almost destroyed the livability of the structures and that—

"Among the comments made in the introduction to the survey were that * * * persons are living below decent levels in regard to sanitation and moral environment. * * * A low standard of living has been continuing for many years * * * and will, without a doubt, to the detriment of the city and community in general unless action is taken."

When the persons who were responsible for that malicious attack were driven by a self-respecting and righteously indignant people into an indefensible position, what do you suppose they said? Exactly what was to be expected: "We just followed instructions from Washington."

Not only were the people in the area affected opposed to the housing project but also the citizens of the community in general. Mass meetings were held to protest against it. At the same time agents of the United States Housing Authority were working secretively to overcome the opposition and propagandizing our people with their stock in trade, namely, falsehoods and deceptions.

Then the State housing board stepped into the picture, at the instigation no doubt of its creator, the United States Housing Authority. Using the high-handed and dictatorial procedure that is natural to this Federal-housing scheme, the State board ordered a public hearing to be held at Columbus, Ohio, for the purpose of determining whether Marion should or should not have a Federal housing project. Then the real meaning of the word "authority" became apparent. Citizens of Marion were to learn that it was not up to them to determine whether or not they should have a Federal housing project. The State housing board gave us to understand that it and not we would decide that question.

A group of representative citizens of Marion attended that hearing to protest against the project. Another group, headed by the local agent of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, also attended and urged the building of the project. The State housing board was very partial to the group favoring the project and extended to them every courtesy and consideration. On the other hand the board treated with contempt the plea of those of us who were opposing the housing proposal, heckled and cut us off time and again.

Well, the long and short of it all was that the United States Housing Authority did not construct one of its projects in the city of Marion, Ohio. Political calculations went awry somewhere.

One of the deceptions that is deliberately fostered by the public housing officials is that local housing authorities are independent bodies, that they arise out of local demand, that they are primarily responsible to the communities in which they are located, etc. The fact is that local housing bodies are nothing but dummies of the United States Housing Authority. The trust indenture that secures the bonds sold to local banks to raise what is erroneously called the local contribution to the development cost leaves no doubt as to who is boss over the local housing project. The local housing authority is by law not responsible to the community in which it is located for anything pertaining to the project. In fact the law of the State of Ohio, which is representative of the other State laws relating to this subject, provides that "the governing body, chairman, and counsel of the housing authority shall perform the duties of the municipal council, mayor, and solicitor respectively, * * * and the members of the housing authority shall, and are hereby authorized, to exercise and carry out municipal corporations by the laws providing for such corporation proceedings."

Further that "an authority created under this act shall constitute a body corporate and politic, * * * shall have the following powers in additional to others herein specifically granted."

In fact, the local housing authority is a municipality within a municipality and is owned and controlled by the United States Government as completely as the arsenals of the Army and Navy.

These public housing projects are exempted from taxation though their occupants receive all the benefits of the schools, police and fire departments, and other municipal facilities. This, of course, throws an extra burden of taxation upon the other citizens of the country. Through some mysterious social benefit which we are told will flow out of the housing projects taxpayers are supposed to be repaid with compound interest.

But the capital deception of the Federal housing program is the false impression which its operators give out that the United States Government lends money to local communities to build these housing projects. The United States Government does not lend to the local community one red cent to pay for the development cost of the housing projects nor does the local community pay any interest on their capital cost. All false propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding, the Federal Government pays the full amount of the capital cost of all housing projects constructed under the United States Housing Act of 1937. Although my analysis of the operation of that act in 1939 exposed completely the deception that the housing projects were being financed by local communities as alleged by the public housing officials, they nevertheless continue to propagate that deception. In that analysis I showed that the annual Federal contributions were sufficient to more than pay for the development costs of the projects. The amortization tables of George Holzman, which are regarded as standard, were used for making the computations upon which my statements were then made. I shall be able this evening to show by the use of those same tables, and figures supplied me very recently by the Federal Public Housing Authority, that to be as true today as it was then.

As of December 31, 1943, the Federal Public Housing Authority had completed the construction of 557 housing projects at a total cost of $752,409,000. This does not include the W. P. A. low-rent projects. Three hundred and thirty-seven of the projects are currently operated as low-rent houses. Forty-five low-rent projects have been transferred to war housing. One hundred and seventy-five war-housing projects have been built under Public Act 671, the defense amendment to the United States Housing Act.

Annual Federal contributions will be needed in the year 1944 on the 337 low-rent projects and the 45 low-rent projects transferred to war use. Although no contributions have been needed to date on any of the Public Act 671 projects two or three of them may need contributions before the end of the fiscal year 1944. The annual Federal contributions that will be needed in the year 1944 on the 337 low-rent projects and the 45 low-rent projects transferred to war use average 2.2 percent of their development cost.

The projects constructed under Public No. 671 do not enter into my computations, but only the so-called low-rent housing projects constructed under the United States Housing Act.

The immediate funds for the development cost of the housing projects are derived from two sources. The Federal Public Housing Authority, through its dummy, that is, the local housing authority, raises 33 percent of the development cost by the sale of bonds to banks and others in the local communities where the projects are built. Those bonds run over a period of 15 years and bear an interest rate of 2.08 percent.

The Federal Public Housing Authority furnishes the remaining 67 percent by the issuance of its own obligations and obtaining the funds directly from the United States Treasury. These funds are borrowed from the Treasury for a period of 59 years. The Federal Public Housing Authority makes the claim that it pays 1 percent interest annually to the Treasury for the use of this money.

Now, let us assume a Federal housing project costing $1,000,000 and see how all this works out. The dummy of the Federal Public Housing Authority, that is, the local housing authority, raises $333,000 of the cost by the sale of bonds to local banks and the public. Those bonds,, as stated run over a period of 15 years and bear an interest rate of 2.08 percent. The $333,000 amortizes at 2 1/12 percent interest over the 15-year period at $390,962. It should be noted that 2 1/12 percent is higher by a very small fraction than 2.08 percent, the actual interest rate given me by the Public Housing Authority as applying to those bonds. Two and one-twelfth percent was the nearest figure to 2.08 percent given in Holzman's amortization tables.

Remember we stated that the Federal Public Housing Authority claims it pays 1 percent interest per annum on the money it borrows from the Treasury. Accordingly the $667,000 which the Authority furnishes for the development cost of the million-dollar project would amortize over the 59-year period at $886,236.

Therefore, the grand total amortization charge on the development cost of the million-dollar project would be $1,277,295.

Let us now see about the annual Federal contributions and the part they play in this financing. The average annual contribution rate that is currently being paid on the development cost of all so-called low-rent housing projects constructed under the United States Housing Act is 2.2 percent. At this rate the total amount of contributions that would be paid on a $1,000,000 project over the 59-year period would be $1,298,000.

Therefore, since the total amortization cost on the million-dollar project would be only $1,277,298 it is seen that the annual Federal contributions would be more than sufficient by $20,000 to fully amortize the development cost of the million-dollar project.

Let me repeat that all of my computations are based on data furnished me in writing by the Federal Public Housing Authority within the last few weeks.

So it will be seen that the 1-percent interest which the Federal Public Housing Authority claims it pays on the money furnished to it by the Treasury is actually paid out of the annual Federal contributions, which are furnished by the Treasury itself. It is seen, therefore, that the lower this rate of interest is the less need will there be for annual Federal contributions. In 1939 when I made my study of the operations of this housing problem the United States Housing Authority, now the Federal Public Housing Authority, told me it was paying 1⅜ percent interest on the funds it obtained from the Treasury. So whatever reduction may have

been made in the annual contributions can be accounted for in part by the lower interest rate the authority claims it pays on the funds it obtains from the Treasury.

The United States Housing Act provides that no matter how high the development cost or how low the rents may be on the projects, or how inefficient they may be operated, annual Federal contributions can always be made ample to pay their capital cost and interest charges thereon. It is specifically written into the act that all amortization charges are a first lien on the annual Federal contribution.

The United States Housing Act is a grossly dishonest piece of legislation. It shows unmistakable evidence of having been deliberately written with the view of deceiving whom it could. Certainly it cannot be said that the housing act has failed in achieving that purpose.

Just to give you some idea of the juggling that is practiced in the operation of the act, let us briefly run through some of the transactions, not exactly as they appear on paper, but rather in accordance with the ultimate facts.

First, there is the machinery for operating the scheme. At the top stands the Federal Government. Next comes the Federal Public Housing Authority, which is but an agent of the Government, though an important one. Next in order come the housing bodies of the individual States, which, as stated, are creatures in fact of the United States Housing Authority, alias the Federal Public Housing Authority. The State housing boards are, however, largely passive bodies. Finally at the lowest level we find the so-called local housing authorities, also creatures de facto of the United States Housing Authority. As previously mentioned, the local housing authorities are nothing but dummies of the Federal Public Housing Authority.

Let us again assume a housing project costing $1,000,000. The Federal Government through the Treasury raises $667,000 of this amount through general taxes, pay-roll taxes, the sale of bonds to the public, Government printing-press money, and so forth. Having thus raised the $667,000 the Government turns around and lends this amount back to itself, that is the Federal Public Housing Authority, for an indefinite period at 1 percent interest.

Then the Government turns around the second time and relends back to itself, through the local housing authority, the same $667,000 for a period of 59 years.

Next the Government borrows through its Federal Public Housing Authority and local dummy the remainder of the capital for the project, $333,000, by the sale of bonds to the banks in the community where the project is to be located which run over a period of 15 years at 2.08 percent interest.

Next the Government over a period of 15 years raises, in the name of social uplift, through general taxation, social-security taxes, the sale of bonds to the public, printing-press money, etc., $390,962 to pay back with interest the $333,000 it borrowed originally from the local banks.

In addition, the Government raises, also in the name of social uplift, over a period of 59 years in the same ways $866,236 which is handed over to the Federal Public Housing Authority, which in turn is thence passed on to the local dummy, which in turn shuttles it back through the Federal Public Housing Authority to the Government itself in payment with interest of the $667,000 which it originally raised to finance development cost of the housing project and $20,000 besides.

We have, of course, touched only a very few of the high points. It would literally take hours to go through all of the shuttle and zigzag manipulations that are practiced.

I am of the opinion that there are plenty of laws on the statute books which prohibit private individuals from doing some of the things that are practiced in the operation of this housing scheme.

The money cost of this Federal housing program is very important to taxpayers. However, that is not the most serious part about it. The really challenging part about this scheme is that it is purely communistic. State ownership of the home, the cradle of civilization, is communism incarnate. Where the state owns the homes it owns the families living in them.

Karl Marx in his Communist Manifesto, said:

"The theory of Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."

And to have no doubt about what he meant he added:

"You reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so: That is just what we intend."

What Marx meant was not that communism was the abolition of property as such, but only the private ownership of property, and, of course, concomitantly its expropriation by the state.

The amount of communism that is involved in this public housing scheme is measured by the number of homes it places in the ownership of the state. There can be no escape from this conclusion.

Furthermore, as state ownership of homes takes place there must be a loss of private ownership of homes and other property in an amount at least as great as that taken over by the state.

This follows because the state has no resources except those which it obtains from the industrial group that produces the necessaries of life. The millions drawn by the state from the industrial group for the construction of houses are no longer available to that group for financing homes they can call their own as well as other private enterprises.

How far would this housing program go in communizing the Nation? The promoters of the scheme envision initially the building of from 4,500,000 to 6,500,000 houses at a money cost of from fifty to one hundred billion dollars. What would be left to be privately owned at the completion of this colossal undertaking? To pay for the cost would require the Federal Government to confiscate at least an equal amount of privately owned property involving our homes, farms, factories, bank deposits, social-security funds, investments, insurance policies, pension funds, et cetera. Karl Marx would smile in his grave if he could be apprised of this Federal-housing scheme.

State ownership of homes cannot possibly add to the sum total of human happiness, unless it be true that the state is endowed with those divine attributes which have up to now been denied to every individual human soul, namely, omniscency, omnipotency, and omniparency—infinite wisdom and power and the source and origin of all.

There are hardly many who believe the state has attained to any such godhood as this. Indeed, there is no reason to believe that the nature of the state is any different today than it always has been, and up to now it has been just about the worst of man's enemies.

The founding fathers realized this. The entire fabric of the Constitution was designed specifically to keep free the spirit of individualism and to protect us against the encroachments of the ever present cruel state.

We should distinguish between government and the state. True government protects men in keeping and enjoying the fruits of their labor. The state exists by expropriating the produce of others.

Gentlemen, if we would avoid the calamity of a totalitarian state and restore the heritage vouchsafed us by our forefathers, we must take courage and willingly sacrifice. This monstrous housing scheme is but a part of the challenge of communism.

The United States Housing Act, together with all public housing, should be abolished forthwith. The houses already constructed should be liquidated along with war surplus commodities. Every phase of home building should be left to private enterprise. There just is no such thing as compromising with communism. Either communism will destroy us or we will destroy communism. There is no other alternative.

The Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a joint resolution to reduce the tax from 30 to 15 percent on hotels, restaurants, and night clubs where entertainment is given to the patrons. Since the imposition of the tax, effective April 1, it has become obvious that within a short time the Government will receive less revenue with a 30-percent tax than with the 5-percent tax, as provided previously. Already many night clubs have closed, and hotels and restaurants that formerly paid the 5-percent tax, where entertainment was given, have now abolished the entertainment with the result that the Government does not even get the 5-percent.

I have in my possession a statement of the income of many hotels, restaurants, and night clubs that furnished entertainment to their patrons with their meals, and it shows a falling off in business for these concerns from 27 to 75 percent. Besides the loss of direct revenue from these diminishing returns, there is the further loss of revenue in income taxes not only of the concerns themselves but also in income taxes from their employees and other affiliated businesses.

It was never the intent of Congress to tax the hotels, restaurants, and night clubs out of business, but that will be the result in large part if the 30-percent tax is retained. I feel that 15 percent is the highest tax that can be imposed and at the same time permit this type of business to continue.

Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Archbishop Edward Mooney at the

conclusion of the pontifical Mass he celebrated in Blessed Sacrament Cathedral, Detroit, May 3, to mark the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791:

It is entirely appropriate that Americans of Polish origin or descent should keep alive the memory of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. The Cambridge History of Poland records that "posterity joins with the best contemporary opinion in regarding the constitution of the 3d of May as one of the greatest achievements in Polish history." It was hailed by Edmund Burke as the "noblest benefit received by any nation at any time." This charter of ordered liberty was, indeed, swept away in the unprovoked aggression of Prussia and Russia which ended in the second partition of Poland in 1793, and its extinction as an independent country in 1795. But the light of liberty kindled served as a beacon for Polish patriots during the long night of oppression that lasted for 125 years until the restoration of the republic after the First World War. In the present dark days of indescribable oppression and suffering which the Nazi and Communist aggression of 1939 brought upon Poland, the memory of the historic document that made Poland a pioneer on the continent of Europe in establishing freedom under law may again serve to inspire her people and rally the friends of freedom to her cause.

It is appropriate, too, that this commemoration should gather us round the altar to pray for the cause of freedom and religion in the homeland of your fathers. For on May 3, 1791, the king and members of the Diet who had adopted the epoch-making charter marched in procession to the Church of St. John in Warsaw, pledged anew their allegiance to the constitution before the altar and intoned a Te Deum of thanksgiving for the accomplishment it marked. I gladly take this occasion to assure the hundreds of thousands of Catholic Americans of Polish descent whom you represent that other hundreds of thousands of your brothers in the faith in this diocese join in your prayers that our victory will bring justice for Catholic Poland, and share your concern for the sufferings of your far-off kinsfolk and for the future of faith and freedom in the martyred homeland. They acclaim your proud boast that Nazi terror has failed to create a Polish Quizling to serve its destructive ends, and they echo your hope that Communist cunning will not succeed in setting up a Polish puppet regime to further designs that would be ominous alike to Catholic faith and human rights in Poland, the historic bulwark of Christian civilization in eastern Europe.

In the peace which, please God, our victory will bring, it may well be that the case of Poland, as so often before in history, may be the test whether right or might will prevail in the councils of the nations. A just and durable peace can be built only on moral principles that are rooted at least in the natural law implanted in the heart of man by God, our Creator. In the application of these moral principles two points stand out. One is international cooperation as against the selfish prosecution of merely national purposes. This implies the solution of questions in dispute between nations by discussion and agreement rather than by unilateral fiat. It is of record that Poland's recognized government stands ready to submit to this kind of peaceful settlement an important question presently at issue and even, in the interest of the common good, to defer the settlement of that question until the day of victory over a common foe.

Another point that stands out in the application of moral principles to international relations is fidelity to the plighted word. In this regard Poland's case is clear and may well determine whether in the post-war settlement we are going to descend from the lofty idealism of the Atlantic Charter to the cynical realism of the Congress of Vienna. That way lies not peace but only another interlude between wars.

Thank God our own country, despite the persistent propaganda of unmoral realism on the part of certain columnists and commentators, has made no commitments which prejudice the settlement of disputed issues on the basis of moral principles. In a recent statement (March 24) on foreign policy President Roosevelt said: "The United Nations are fighting to make a world in which tyranny and aggression cannot exist; a world based upon freedom, equality, and justice; a world in which all persons regardless of race, color, or creed may live in peace, honor, and dignity." If the spirit of that pledge is kept, the cause of Poland is safe. If the spirit of that pledge is not kept, the cause of stable world peace is desperate.

The Murray-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose a speech given recently before the Lions Club, of Waterloo, Iowa, by Dr. Thomas F. Thornton, also of Waterloo, in regard to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills, S. 1161 and H. R. 2861:

The Murray-Wagner bill (S. 1161; H. R. 2861) was introduced in Congress June 3, 1943, by Senator WAGNER, of New York, and Senator MURRAY, of Montana, in the Senate, and by Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, in the House of Representatives. In the Senate it was referred to the Finance Committee, and in the House to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The features of this bill plan a vast expansion of the Government social-security program to include unemployment insurance, sickness, disability, and maternity benefits, death benefits, old-age retirement, and State medical, laboratory, and hospital care. It is estimated that these provisions of the bill would add another 25,000,000 to the 37,000,000 people now carrying social-security cards, increasing the number to 62,000,000; and that they, together with their dependents, would make at least 110,000,000 people coming under the provisions of the bill. This bill to introduce totalitarian medicine in the United States by requiring 110,000,000 people to take out Government sickness and accident insurance, and whether they want it or not, seems to have been planned without any consultation with representatives of either the insurance companies or the medical profession. Inquiry by the American Medical Association of reliable sources in Washington indicates the probability that the actual designers and authors of the bill included I. S. Falk, Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board of the Federal Security Administration; Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, technical adviser of the Social Security Board; and Senator WAGNER'S secretary, Mr. Philip Levy.

In addition to the extension of the various phases of social security, the bill makes provision for the Government to furnish general medical, special medical, laboratory, and hospital benefits for more than 110,000,000 people in the United States.

It makes the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service (whoever he might be) a virtual Gauleiter of American medicine by placing in the hands of this one man the power and authority to:

1. Hire doctors and establish rates of pay.
2. Establish fee schedules for services.
3. Establish qualifications for specialists.
4. Determine the number of individuals for whom any physician may provide service.
5. Determine arbitrarily what hospitals or clinics may provide service for patients.

The bill provides for tax payments from, and insurance benefits to:

1. Practically every employed person in the United States.
2. Every self-employed person.

The bill provides that:

1. Section 960: Every employer shall pay a tax on wages paid to individuals up to $3,000 a year of 6 percent.
2. Section 961: Every employee shall pay a tax, deducted from wages on earned income up to $3,000 a year of 6 percent. (For the average person earning $2,400 a year, this deduction would amount to as much as, or more than, his income tax.)
3. Section 963: Every self-employed individual shall pay a tax on the market value of his services up to $3,000 a year, of 7 percent. (Under this would come the farmer, professional men and women, the small independent businessman, filling station owners and operators, barbers and cosmetologists, etc.)
4. Section 962: Federal, State, and municipal employees (under certain conditions) shall pay a tax of 3½ percent.

It has been estimated in editorials in such newspapers as the Chicago Daily News and the Washington Star that the passage of this bill would, at least for the present, accumulate deductions from many workers' wages of 20 percent for income tax, 12 percent for social security, a total of 32 percent, and in addition whatever is being deducted for War Bonds and other plant programs. It is, therefore, apparent that up to 50 percent of a man's salary might be deducted. Yet the C. I. O. and A. F. of L. are back of this program 100 percent. Obviously, labor can be expected to ask for and get a 6 percent raise to cover its cost for the program, hence passing this on to the public.

It has been estimated that the total annual income from this bill would be over $12,000,000,000, and that $3,000,000,000 would be placed in a separate account known as the Medical Care and Hospital Account. In considering figures of this magnitude it is well to make comparisons against familiar equals. For instance, the average annual total income of our Federal Government for the 10-year period of 1924–34 was $3,541,000,000. In the year 1938 the total expenditures of the French Republic and its vast colonial empire totaled $3,130,000,000. This staggering sum is the amount which is to be spent annually on medical and hospital care alone. And the remainder of the revenue from this bill alone, or three times the previously mentioned $3,000,000,000, namely $9,000,000,000, is to be spent on expansion of social security. To what astronomical figures the total annual cost of our Government would soar is unpredictable.

While the actual plans for allocation of this $3,000,000,000 are not made public, the Surgeon General could do the following:

1. Allocate 20 percent for administrative cost, $600,000,000.
2. Hire every effective physician in the United States at an average salary of $5,000 a year, $600,000,000.
3. Buy every available bed in every non-government-owned hospital (368,046) 365 days each year at $5 a day, over $650,000,000.

4. Pay $2.50 for each Government-owned hospital bed a day (1,051,781) 365 days a year, over $950,000,000.

5. Spend for drugs and medicines, over $150,000,000.

6. Assume the total costs of operating the 66 accredited medical colleges in the United States, over $21,000,000.

7. Pay 20,000 additional medical students $700 a year during the training period, $14,000,000.

8. Spend for other research each year, $12,000,000.

This bill would establish a national advisory medical board and hospital council appointed by the Surgeon General. The council would be purely advisory, as all authority and power are vested by the bill in the Surgeon General. The manner in which these advisory councils function in a bureaucratic government is well illustrated by the advisory committee of the Children's Bureau in the recent adoption of provisions for administration of emergency medical maternal and hospital care to the wives of enlisted men. There are on this advisory committee a few physicians, but none of them are in practice, being either Federal employees or faculty members. The physicians are so far outnumbered on the committee by social workers and Federal employees that they have no voice whatever in its deliberations. When the emergency maternity and infant-care program was completed, the Children's Bureau called the advisory committee into session, presented the plan to it, and asked it to approve it without revision, objection, or comment. In other words, "Here it is, for the sake of the record, approve it." And so a maternity and infant-care program affecting every serviceman's wife and involving the expenditure of millions of dollars was put into effect without counsel of any practicing physician or his representative national organization.

The Surgeon General could be a medical czar.

1. Physicians might practice only by the grace of the Surgeon General.

2. Patients might select their own doctor if he or she met the Surgeon General's standards, or if the physician's quota was not full.

3. Payments would be made to the physician by the Government according to a fee schedule established by the Surgeon General regardless of quality of service rendered.

4. The Surgeon General would pay the physician according to a fee schedule, on a per capita basis, or salary basis, or a combination or modification of these bases.

5. The Surgeon General would publish a list of institutions found by him to be participating hospitals, and his would be the only O. K. required.

6. He would also, within certain limits, determine the payment for each day of hospitalization, and on his agreement or disagreement would depend the medical care and hospitalization of more than 110,000,000 people in the United States of America.

Furthermore, the bill contemplates bringing dental, nursing, and other needed benefits under its authority in the near future. The bill gives the Surgeon General and the Social Security Board the task of ascertaining the most effective methods of providing dental and nursing care; and contemplates that they will report the results of their findings, with recommendations as to legislation, not later than January 1, 1946. The Wagner-Murray bill is being sponsored by powerful interests. President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, says that "it is the fruit of a 5-year study by experts on the staff of the American Federation of Labor, which will give the proposed program full sponsorship and support," and the social reformers and bureaucratic politicians will do their utmost to secure its passage.

The proponents of federalized medicine have often charged organized medicine with being "reactionary," and of disapproving any plan to further the extension of medical care. The medical profession, proud of the ideals of its heritage, and of its long record of gratuitous public service, has too long remained contemptuously silent. What are the actual facts?

The physician's creed of the best professional service to each patient regardless of race, creed, or ability to pay is almost too well known to bear mentioning, yet it should be emphasized. The medical profession has always made every effort to raise the standards of medical care. It has insisted on increasing educational requirements to keep pace with the broadening knowledge of medical science. It has attempted to protect the public from quackery by elimination of low-grade schools and diploma mills. It has attempted through the machinery of the American Medical Association to study and assist in the establishment of plans for the further extension of medical service to the public. To be more specific, the Bureau of Medical Economics of the American Medical Association acts as a clearinghouse to study and make available all types of plans for the group extension of medical care. These plans are available to all State and county societies. The recently formed committee on medical service and public relations is actively encouraging formation and operation of such plans. The committee on industrial health has a very active national campaign to reduce industrial hazards.

What has American medicine done? It has been estimated that the physicians give, in normal times, approximately $1,000,000 per day of medical care to the indigent. The Murray-Wagner bill does not cover the indigent. County funds for medical care of the indigent must still be raised by local taxation. Under the American system, American medicine and American doctors have developed the most effective and the most widely distributed medical care that has ever been provided for any comparable number of people anywhere at any time. In the last 150 years the average life expectancy has been nearly doubled from 35 years in 1790 to almost 62 years today. This is an increase of 12 years since 1900. In the last 40 years the national death rate has been lowered 695 per 100,000. Typhoid fever, smallpox, and diphtheria have been conquered; pernicious anemia, tuberculosis, diabetes, and many lesser ailments are being brought under control. The miracles of sulfa drugs and penicillin will be reflected in further increases in life expectancy.

It might also be worth while to examine the record made by American doctors in the war. On September 25, 1943, Lt. Gen. Mark Clark, of the Fifth Army, wrote a letter to Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the United States Army, eulogizing the medical units of his army for their "devotion to duty under the hazardous and trying circumstances of the landing in Salerno Bay. Many wounded officers and men who will eventually be restored to full health would have died but for the effective work of the Medical Corps. The beach medical service was superior. The whole performance of the Fifth Army medical service has been most heartening to me and has been of incalculable aid in the operation." Between 80 and 90 percent of all soldiers wounded in battle get first-aid treatment within an hour. The death rate in the last World War ran between 15 and 16 percent, but in this war it has dropped to between 2½ and 3½ percent, due to the medical care being rendered. Parents all over the country may rest easier knowing that their sons in service are receiving an extraordinarily high type of medical care, from the camps in this country clear up to the front lines of every battlefield.

The Wagner bill would scrap this system for federalized medicine, in which the physician would have little incentive to develop his skill. As in all centrally controlled organizations, efforts to economize by standardization would result in loss of initiative. It is conceded that should some personal request be made it might be met by the answer that "this is Washington's ruling." The tendency for advancement to depend on pull and political influence instead of professional ability would probably be evident. Such a regimented profession would have little attraction for the alert, enterprising youth. The more brilliant minds would be attracted to fields of endeavor where rewards are more commensurate with ability.

If medicine does not approve of federalized control, what then does it offer? First, the maintenance of the free and competitive system of the practice of medicine which has been responsible for our most enviable record; second, it offers maintenance of active national, State, and county professional societies to stimulate professional attainment and further educational standards. It offers an increase and further correlation of the activities of the allied professions of dentistry, nursing, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine, and thus a continued improvement in public health. It has pledged itself to further the extension of medical care to the low- or medium-income groups. This is best achieved by the organization of nonprofit, public-service plans for medical service based on prepayment of medical care, much like the blue-cross plan for hospital care. Such plans should be in accordance with local needs, developed by local authorities, and administered by the community concerned. In other words, a type of medical service should be developed to fit the community instead of fitting the community to a national plan. Plans such as these are now functioning actively in New Jersey, New York, Michigan, Washington, California, and other States. They represent a type of medical service which offers free choice of physicians, low cost to the public—no $12,000,000,000 per year to be raised by taxation—and stimulus to the physician to develop his ability.

In the last analysis, your answer to whether you want federalized high-cost medicine must be a personal one. When the time of critical illness comes to you or to your loved ones, as it must come to everyone, do you want a Government doctor on the job or do you want your own doctor there? The decision is yours. If you want your own doctor, let your Senator and your Congressman know that you will approve of his efforts to defeat the Wagner bill.

Address of Governor O'Conor, of Maryland, at Dedication of Pulaski Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a speech by Governor O'Conor at the dedication of the Pulaski Highway in Maryland, and a letter from the Polish National Alliance of Baltimore.

On May 3 Polish people all over the world celebrate Constitution Day. After years of yearning to be free, years of internal turmoil and political strife, the Polish constitution was adopted. It was patterned after our Constitution, which had been adopted only a few years before.

A strong bond has always existed between the United States and Poland. Both countries have much in common. Both are liberty-loving nations. Both have fought in the past for freedom's cause. Both are fighting today for the preservation of that liberty. General Pulaski fought that our Constitution might come into existence and it is therefore fitting that Americans should today fight to restore Poland to its former independence and liberty.

Poland's Constitution Day has frequently found that country torn and pillaged by forces that detest liberty and all that liberty stands for. However, physical properties may be destroyed and man-made institutions crumble, but the spirit of such a brave people can never be crushed. Ignoring overwhelming odds, refusing to submit to the yoke of tyranny, the Polish people have preferred to die fighting for honor, rather than live in dishonor.

I considered it a great honor to be present on that occasion in paying tribute to General Pulaski. I hope that the day will not be far when this Pulaski Highway will be extended to Savannah, Ga., where Pulaski died as he lived—a hero.

Governor O'Conor's address follows:

Every Marylander will join wholeheartedly this afternoon with our fellow citizens of Polish birth or ancestry in paying deserved honor to the memory of a gallant son of Poland, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Dedication of this highway as the Pulaski Highway will serve as a perpetual inspiration to the members of the splendid Polish colony within our State, and as a perpetual reminder to all the people of Maryland of the signal services rendered to the cause of liberty by General Pulaski.

He gave his life to help establish American independence. That, after so many years, the State of Maryland should so honor his memory is evidence, indeed, of the lasting esteem in which he is held by Americans of every racial extraction. Justly fitting is it, therefore, that here in Maryland, where General Pulaski was authorized by the legislature to recruit his famous Pulaski's legion, the first section of highway should be named for him. Because his services to his country covered a territory extending from New York to Georgia, where finally at the siege of Savannah he received a mortal wound, I sincerely hope that eventually there will be one continuous Pulaski highway stretching from the Hudson to the deep South. It is gratifying, indeed, that Maryland has shown the way in this regard.

Our own American patriots of the Revolutionary War have always been accorded the acclaim they so richly deserve. Theirs was a fight, however, for their own homeland. They were defending their loved ones, their possessions, against what they considered the unjust aggression of a country across the sea. Theirs was the primary urge for self-preservation, and they fought to the death for love of this new land, for the development of which they had struggled and suffered.

With General Pulaski, however, it was not a question of defending loved ones, or of preservation of his own country. He came to America, a strange country, through his own free will, and out of the gallantry of his nature, to aid a desperate cause—to fight for an ideal. To him the ideal of freedom was all-important. Even though the American settlers who sought to be freed from oppression were of another race, they had his sympathy. In the nobleness of his nature, to sympathize was to act, and he gave to the cause of the struggling American Colonies the utmost gift that any patriot has to offer, his very life.

Under such circumstances, is it to be wondered that the American people have always given special honor to General Pulaski and that little band of foreign patriots who not only helped with their personal services and means in our war for independence, but who, far more important, furnished a fresh inspiration for America's tiny Army fighting against such tremendous odds?

The debt owed by America to General Pulaski, therefore, is one that can never be repaid. That, in this dedication today the people of Maryland are seeking to perpetuate further the memory of his gallant deeds, is a tribute not alone to the brave man himself, but is a tribute likewise to the many splendid citizens of Polish birth or extraction who throughout the years and today have made so vast a contribution to the progress of our State in peace as well as in war.

From this day forward, therefore, throughout the years to come, the name of this gallant son of Poland will be inscribed on the records of the State of Maryland. Enrolled under a decree of the Maryland Legislature, Pulaski Highway will endure and serve continuingly to do honor to the general who did so much for America and to remind the people of Maryland of the many other compatriots of General Pulaski who constitute today so fine a group within our citizenry.

Proper is it, likewise, that these exercises, honoring an immortal son of Poland, should take place on Polish Constitution Day, a day replete with meaning and throbbing with promise to every loyal Polish heart. Americans rightly value to the fullest the American Constitution, with its extraordinary grant of privileges to all enrolled in its citizenry. Proud and happy are we because of the unbroken span of years throughout which our forefathers have lived and prospered under it, and have fought and suffered to strengthen the bonds of that great Constitution.

Little of such consolation has been available to the citizens of tragic Poland. Established as a national entity back in the years following our own War of Independence, the people of Poland, through their national Parliament, after 3 years of tumultuous debate, adopted a constitution on May 3, 1791, that paralleled in many respects the American Constitution ratified by the American Congress just 4 years before.

Hardly was the ink dry on the confirming signatures, however, before subversive influences in the nation, with help from outside the country, brought to naught all the good that had been accomplished, and Poland, after a period of dissension and internal struggle, disappeared in 1795 from the European scene.

With this partition of Polish territory, the Polish people, after their brief enjoyment of constitutional integrity, had but a memory to cherish for more than a century of troubled existence. Following World War No. 1, the restoration of Poland, resulting from the Treaty of Versailles, brought a revival of the constitution of May 3, 1791, and for a few welcome years the people of Poland were privileged to know the happiness of democratic self-government. The Nazi blight struck again, however, and first one and then another enemy nation descended upon Polish territory. Once again the benefits of constitutional government were lost. Once again stark tragedy engulfed the Polish Nation.

Surely no other people in the world could sympathize more deeply with the people of ravaged Poland than we who throughout all our lives, and throughout all the course of our national history, have known the priceless benefits of free, constitutional government. Today as we gather here in free assembly, to pay homage to a gallant man who gave his all in the cause of freedom, let us give voice to the hope that, in God's providence this horrible war may soon be brought to a conclusion, the only conclusion possible if justice is to be preserved upon the earth. That conclusion is victory, victory for the united forces of democracy and freedom, victory against a brutal foe whose every policy and action have sought to destroy the meaning of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

As we ponder Poland's plight, let us be resolved likewise to cherish with renewed fervor our love of America and all for which she stands. Let us work and pray unceasingly that, through the gallantry of the millions of fine Americans now fighting on many fronts or tensely awaiting the invasion that will free all Europe from the slavery imposed by Hitler and his hordes, freedom again may be brought to the unhappy people of Poland. May God grant that, once again established among the free family of nations, the Polish people may for all the years to come progress in peace and happiness toward that ideal of government envisioned by their great Parliament in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

As the chivalrous General Pulaski gave unstinted devotion to the cause of the struggling American Colonies in those dark days of the struggle for independence, so may the Almighty rekindle in General Pulaski's native land a flame of freedom that will never be dimmed. May the people of Poland be privileged to know soon again, and in fullest measure, the joys of that national and individual liberty which General Pulaski gave his life to help achieve here. And may this Pulaski Highway be for all time a shining symbol of the brotherhood of freedom that binds in closest friendship the land of his birth to the country of his adoption.

COMMUNITY 142, POLISH
NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
Baltimore, Md., April 27, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Congressman of the Third District,
Baltimore City, Md.

DEAR SIR: Council 142 of the Polish National Alliance has passed the following resolution:

On the 3d day of May 1791, the Kingdom of Poland, already reduced by the tripartite partitions, unanimously adopted a new constitution which provided for liberty and equal rights for all men. What other nations and people did with bloodshed, Poland with her long tradition of tolerance accomplished by peaceful means.

In these critical times, when not only Poland but the whole world is fighting against the dark forces of oppression and totalitarianism, it is fitting that this date be commemorated by us in the United States.

The Poles, always ready to support the democratic cause, were again the first to stand against the enemy of freedom. Again they followed their motto: "For your freedom and for ours."

Could you, sir, on the 3d of May call this fact to the attention of the American Senate? It is our duty as Americans to remember an ally who, though faced with insurmountable obstacles, would rather die than surrender.

The constitution of the 3d of May is another monument that testifies to the democratic spirit of Poland.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK GREGOREK,
President.
MRS. ANNA SPORA,
Secretary.

Home in Palestine for the Jewish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] before the seventh annual conference of the seaboard region, Mizrachi-Zionist Organization of America, Beth Tfiloh Synagogue, Baltimore, Md., April 30, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The difficulty for myself in addressing an audience of persons belonging to your great organization is that I realize that no matter what I may say, it could be better said by my audience. It would be useless for a person in my position to attempt to numerate to you either the doctrines or the hopes of your organization. You know these better than I do.

I might say at the outset that those of us who have studied the Bible must respect it as a history, a textbook, an incentive to greater accomplishments. Perhaps 90 percent of the population of the world believe in a supreme being. However, it is only those who have studied the book, which you call the Bible and which we call the Old Testament, who know the true God. The followers of Buddha believe in some sort of eternal life of happiness. The Mohammedan believes in Allah, and he believes in future rewards and punishments. The American Indian believed in the happy hunting ground where he could live forever in a land where he could pursue the sort of life for which he believed himself to be adapted and which he enjoyed. The heathen believes in a supreme being of some sort. He believes in what we call miracles. He believes in the setting aside of the natural law for his benefit. But the followers of all false gods failed to recognize their gods as the creators of the universe, the creator of man himself and the supreme being in the spirit world. When Jehovah selected from among the sons of man, Abraham to be his friend, He designated the man through whom contact with the true God was to be made possible for mankind.

It has always been my theory that you can judge an organization, a nation, or the individuals which compose either or both, by their accomplishments. A number of years ago I was in the valley where Salt Lake City was built. I looked at the desert surrounding that city. I walked on its streets. I saw its beautiful buildings, the wonderful temple built there by the Mormons, and I said that no organization that was bad could have accomplished such wonders. The Mormons have transformed a desert into a garden. The record of an organization either justifies its existence or fails to do so. The unanimous judgment of large bodies of people can usually be trusted. The judgments of generations of people are usually right. I can think of no greater accomplishment by any organization or by any people than that of preserving the traditions of the true God and passing down these traditions to those of other races and other beliefs.

What has been the general effect on mankind of these beliefs? I have never heard any man or woman question or contradict the moral teachings of the Bible. There are those who have different ideas as to the Deity. There are those who deny the existence of a God. I have never known any man to contradict the teachings of the Bible as to the moral law. I once knew an atheist who said that there was no God. However, he said the Bible was a good book to live by. He was a Bible student. The moral teachings in the Bible are the basis for the moral teachings of much of the world. I have been told that the moral teachings of Confucius and the moral teachings of Mohammed are largely in harmony with Biblical teachings.

Be that as it may, the world has been more widely affected by the teachings of the believers of the Bible than by the teachings of any other organization or sect in the world's history. But the consolation to the world furnished by your organization goes much further than the moral law. Since man's birth there has been no greater blessing than to give to him an explanation and a history of his origin and development, his creation, his existence, and his future state. These have been preserved and passed on to the world through your people and your teachings. I say these things not as a means of furnishing information to my audience, but as an acknowledgment to my audience of my own realization of those facts.

My observation has been that people are remembered in proportion to the efforts that they have made for others. I once knew a man of quite some prominence. He was 4 years a Member of the House of Representatives at Washington. I heard one of his constituents say that that particular man could have had anything within the gift of the people of the State if he could just once have thought of somebody else except himself. As we look back on the lives of those who have attained prominence in our Nation, and whose memories are revered, I first think of Washington. I think of that palatial mansion at Mount Vernon. I think of the comforts and conveniences that surrounded him there. I am told that he had under cultivation 2,700 acres of land. His name was respected throughout America. His honesty was recognized throughout the world. We are told that the products from his estate in Virginia were accepted in the West India Islands without inspection. He was a ruler in his neighborhood. He was monarch of all he surveyed. Yet he gave up in the prime of his life the pleasures, conveniences, and even the necessities which he was financially able to procure at his home, and devoted himself to the interests of his fellow Americans in establishing in America a government based on a new principle. He believed that all sovereignty originated and remained in the average man. He established on the Western Continent a democracy, and that democracy has spread to a large part of the world, and even today men are fighting on dozens of battlefields to make permanent the principles of democratic government.

I think of Robert E. Lee with his palatial mansion at Arlington. He was the only man whose military operations were so widely recognized that he was offered the command of each of the armies in our great Civil War. Yet he gave up the comforts and satisfaction of a life of ease to fight for what he thought was right. He fought for his beloved State of Virginia.

I think of Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, who left his homely surroundings in the State of Illinois to come to Washington, the seat of struggle between the great contending elements in American life, that he might struggle for the permanency of the Union. From the struggles and privations of George Washington a world has learned the benefits and blessings of the democratic form of government. From the military lessons taught by Robert E. Lee, the world is still studying military strategy. Through the efforts of Abraham Lincoln and those who believed as he did, the Union was preserved and slavery in the United States was abolished. These men are remembered and will ever be remembered for the sacrifices made by them for others.

In studying the history of your organization, I think of the blessings you are trying to afford to others. I think of the virtues represented by your organization. First, and underlying all your efforts, is the desire to furnish a home to a persecuted and downtrodden people. You in America are, for the most part, in a position where you could live at least in comfort by your work. You have taken upon yourselves the burden of your people. You are sacrificing your time and efforts for the benefit of less fortunate people. I have read of some of the work of your organization. You have tried to surround those who accept the blessings of this home in Palestine with the things which you believe to be necessary for their comfort, their strength and their refinement.

First, as is natural, I see that you have established synagogues in Palestine. You have properly emphasized the importance of the permanency of religion among your people. If Palestine is to become the land of promise, it must remain the land of the religion of the true God. If this land of promise is to be inhabited by people justifying the efforts that are made for them, they must be a physically strong people. In addition to the exercise which they would have in the development of this country, I see that your organization has made possible the first religious gymnasium, formerly in Jaffa and now in Tel Aviv.

Your organization has been instrumental in establishing 130 public schools and kindergartens in Palestine. They have established teachers' seminaries that these schools may be properly manned with an educated force. Girls' technical schools have been established, and are being maintained. Seventy percent of the stock of a banking institution has been subscribed through your efforts in America.

The only religious Hebrew daily newspaper in the world has been established in Palestine through the efforts of your organization. Linotype machines and other means of economical printing have been introduced in that land. Eighteen thousand trees have been set out in Palestine. Palestine, which is about the size of the State of Tennessee has a population of 1,600,000. This has greatly increased since the Zionist movement started. The Hebrew population has multiplied several times. Even the Arab population has greatly increased. Roads, universities, schools, agricultural production, as well as manufacturing, have greatly increased during this period. Why has all this development taken place? Why has this money been raised? Why have these sacrifices been made? In order to give a complete answer to these questions, it would be necessary to describe the persecutions of Poland, of Germany, and to a great extent all eastern Europe.

A comprehensive discussion of this question would involve the whole Nazi movement. It would involve the psychology by which Adolf Hitler has made himself the master of Europe. His appeals to racial prejudices, his animosity displayed toward the whole world, and particularly against the Jews, the mass murder of the Jewish people, is something which has not been equaled in barbarity since the Middle Ages. The fact that the Jewish people had many centuries ago been scattered from Palestine throughout the world, the fact that the Jewish people have no national home which they can call their own, the fact that they represent a minority in almost all of the jurisdictions of the world, the fact that as to their individual activities they have been successful, the fact that Palestine was not only the place of their greatest national development, but that it was also the home of their ancient temples and their ancient rulers, all these facts show their incentives. But their ancient defeats and their intelligent triumphs caused a widespread demand that Palestine should be made a national home for refugees from persecuted areas throughout the world. In line with this demand, the world heard the Balfour Declaration. This declaration was issued by the British Government on November 2, 1917, and pledged the British Government to use its best endeavors to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, but providing that nothing should be done which would prejudice the civil and religious rights enjoyed by Jews not in their country.

The American Congress approved this declaration. The declaration was almost unanimously acclaimed. The great movement was begun. However, as in all great movements, there was a difference of opinion. Many Jewish people do not approve of the Zionist movement. The Moslems of Palestine either are or are supposed to be antagonistic to the Zionist movement. The Moslems own a very large percentage of the land. However, they have never refused to sell that land to the Jewish people. The movement was proceeding in a fairly satisfactory manner until the British Government issued what is known as the white-paper declaration. By this declaration, the great migration of the persecuted Jewish people from many lands was stopped on the last day of March 1944. To the Arab population of Palestine there is little sentimental value to Palestine. To the Jew it is the home of his fathers, the promised land to the chosen people of his faith. For fifteen hundred years his people dominated the land of Canaan. Since the Balfour Declaration, and since Great Britain assumed the obligation to maintain peace in Palestine, there lies the great weight of that obligation upon Great Britain. Great Britain, at the conclusion of this war, should take steps to meet its obligation to the Jewish people.

By the Balfour Declaration, Great Britain encouraged the Jewish people throughout the world to expect that a home would be made in Palestine for its people. The Zionist movement demands, and has a right to expect from Great Britain at the termination of this World War a home in the land of its fathers. This accomplishment will be a victory for those who seek to establish a home. It will be a victory for those who seek to establish a religious capital for the Jewish faith. It will establish a home for those who now have no national home. It will end barbaric slaughter of Jewish people, and will result in the development of Palestine to an extent that will gratify and be pleasing to the Jew, as well as the gentile, to the faithful followers of Allah, as well as to every believer in national integrity and racial fair dealing. We, both Jew and gentile, shall see the ancient shrine of our religion revived, renewed, and revitalized.

Administration Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an ddress on the subject Are Administration Foreign Policies Making More Difficult the Formation of a Post-war Peace Organization of Nations? which I delivered in Cleveland last Saturday evening to the War Veterans Republican Club of Ohio.

I also ask to have printed, following the address, two editorials commenting on it, one from the Scripps-Howard papers, and one from the Cleveland Plain-dealer.

There being no objection, the address and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE ADMINISTRATION FOREIGN POLICIES MAKING MORE DIFFICULT THE FORMATION OF A POST-WAR PEACE ORGANIZATION OF NATIONS?

At this moment, when American boys are anxious waiting to be conveyed across the Channel onto the continent of Europe, or perhaps are actually on their way, it is right that we think through clearly the reasons why for the second time in 27 years we invade the continent of Europe. The thought and sympathy and deep concern of our entire people go with those men, many of whom may be wounded or lost thousands of miles from their homes. Why, it is asked, are they making this tremendous sacrifice?

Obviously the invasion is undertaken because the military authorities believe it is the best way to inflict an overwhelming defeat on Hitler and Nazi Germany. As I see it, our purpose in this war is to assure the freedom of the people of the United States and bring about a world condition in which they may work out, without invasion or threats of invasion by foreign nations, the destiny of the American Republic here at home. We are not fighting to spread the "four freedoms" throughout the world, although we hope that national and individual freedom may be promoted by our victory. We are not fighting to establish democracy throughout the world, though we hope that a victory over Germany may show the strength of democratic government and establish nations less likely to disturb the peace of the world. We do not and cannot undertake a crusade to spread the ideals which we approve without admitting the right of others to crusade for their ideals. A world of crusaders would be a world perpetually at war. We fight this war for the same reason we fought the Revolutionary War: "To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

To accomplish that purpose the first step is to inflict overwhelming defeat on the aggressor nations which set out to conquer the world. Nothing will discourage aggression in the future so much as the complete punishment inflicted by modern war on a defeated nation. After the present bombing campaign and the occupation of Germany it will be many years before any nation can again convince itself that it can defy and conquer the world. We invade Europe to inflict a crushing defeat on Germany because that is the best way to prevent the recurrence of German aggression. I believe, myself, that it is two-thirds of the job. Even if we should fail temporarily in our plans for a future peace organization it will be long before anyone again would dare to challenge the United States of America.

The second step, however, the formation of a peace organization, is just as essential for complete success in this war. I believe that military victory over Germany is a necessary prerequisite to any hope of setting up an association of nations with any chance of success, and we can only assure permanent peace and liberty in this country by the formation of some kind of association of nations to maintain the peace of the world. There has been tremendous debate on this issue, but there is also substantial agreement. The Republican Post-war Advisory Council at Mackinac pledged our party to responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world. The Moscow Declaration, approved by Secretary Hull, and the Connally resolution, adopted by the votes of an overwhelming majority of Republican and Democratic Senators, both recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Ohio on Tuesday will give an overwhelming vote of confidence to John Bricker as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. On April 26 he endorsed the Mackinac Resolution and stated his belief that the United States must take her place in a cooperative organization of sovereign nations, bent upon peace and supported by the will for peace among their peoples. Secretary Hull, Mr. Dewey, and other leaders of both parties agree substantially on the general principles of such a cooperative organization, that it shall not be a world state, that it shall not be based on exclusive alliances, but that like the old League of Nations it shall be based on the sovereign equality of all states, with more definite commitments to check aggression. A committee of Congress containing representatives of both parties is now working with Secretary Hull on the draft of a detailed covenant to carry out this policy.

There is not much use in debating it further until we can discuss the details, and that is probably another year. There is too much tendency on the part of our newspapers and commentators to belabor the issue, test every public man by his method of expressing general approval of the proposal, and so concentrate the spotlight that we can't see what is really going on in the dark field of foreign negotiation. The danger to the accomplishment of a League today does not come from so-called isolationists or any unwillingness on the part of our people to go ahead. It comes only from the demands of England or Russia and failures in our own current foreign policy.

First, a peace organization must rest on the firm foundation of organized justice in a free world. There is not much use in talking about an organization based on the sovereign equality of peace-loving states, unless we can be sure that such sovereign equality exists before we start. If we are going to abide by the decision of some international body on the question of what constitutes aggression and who is an aggressor, we want to be sure that England and Russia, at least, as well as all the other members of the League, are prepared in good faith to undertake the same obligation. It is impossible to expect success in protecting the freedom of independent nations unless we are certain that that freedom exists from the start, to be protected. The failure of the Treaty of Versailles did not rest entirely on the failure of

the United States to join the League of Nations. It resulted largely from the unwise terms relating to boundaries and economic relations.

The Atlantic Charter definitely recognizes the essential nature of national freedom as a basis of hopes for a better future for the world. It says, "First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." The policies pursued by our Government up to this time have not encouraged hope that these conditions will be met. As far as we know, our Government has not raised its voice at all in behalf of the freedom of Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. It seems doubtful whether this basic condition of a successful association of nations was mentioned at Moscow or Teheran. Although we have sent more than $4,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies to Russia to help carry out the first objective, of winning the war, we have apparently exacted no promises of any kind that will help the second objective, of winning the peace, except the very general terms of the Moscow Four-Power Agreement. Of course, this is not a time to determine exact boundaries, but up to this time we have not established even the principle of the freedom and sovereignty of these states. England went to war to protect Poland against Germany. Certainly the war becomes a grim farce if we are unable to protect the essential integrity of Poland against Russia.

Our attitude toward Finland is strangely inconsistent with our general professions for self-determination. We are apparently insisting that they accept a peace with Russia based on the transfer to Russia of large sections of completely Finnish territory, with the implied threat that if they do not do so they will get much worse treatment and possibly be deprived of their freedom altogether. Finland was first attacked by Russia without any provocation whatsoever. Its freedom throughout history has always been threatened by Russia far more than by Germany and naturally in a war between Russia and Germany it took the German side. But we are not at war with Finland any more than Russia is at war with Japan. It is futile even to consider a league of sovereign nations if the world is to be full of small nations governed by foreigners and yearning constantly for the restoration of their liberties. A league to be successful must eliminate political sore spots throughout the world, and not create a new rash even more numerous than those created by the Treaty of Versailles. I still have every hope that the Russians will agree to conditions on which permanent peace may be founded, but my impression is that Mr. Roosevelt did nothing whatever at Teheran even to suggest restraint to Mr. Stalin. Our policy seems to have been based on the delightful theory that Mr. Stalin in the end will turn out to have an angelic nature and do of his own accord the things which we should have insisted upon at the beginning.

Nor has there been any effort, as far as one can see, to suggest to the British a more liberal policy in the Far East to carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and make a sounder basis for peace. It is rumored that when Chiang Kai-shek raised the question of Hong Kong at the Cairo Conference, he was promptly slapped down by Mr. Churchill. Yet, to the layman, Hong Kong would appear to be a Chinese island, appropriately a part of a restored China. Apparently we are about to restore the Dutch East Indies to the Dutch without any conditions as to the freedom of any of those islands, or any arrangement for their determining for themselves their form of government. I believe a successful league of nations can probably be based on the former status of India and the Indies if there is some assurance of gradual independence or autonomy, but I cannot see that we are doing anything to urge even that policy upon our allies.

I do not wish to judge finally any of the problems I have discussed, but I do want to suggest that they are far more important and far more difficult than the theoretical discussion of the exact terms of a covenant of a league of nations.

Furthermore, there are other questions whose sound solution is just as important for ultimate peace. Economic sore spots are as likely to bring about war as are political sore spots. There is general agreement on the principle that every nation shall have access on equal terms to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity. It is furthermore necessary that in some way countries requiring raw materials have markets for their own goods by whose sale they may pay for these materials. Freedom from want for nations is a desirable and perhaps attainable goal, even though it is not attainable for individuals throughout the entire world. Here again we must base the whole plan on freedom and equality of treatment for every nation.

I admit that this whole problem is very complicated and difficult to work out, but, as far as I know, no steps have been taken in that direction at all. As usual with the New Deal, there is in substance only one solution suggested up to this time. That is that American money and American charity shall solve every problem. The proposed international stabilization fund and the proposed international bank are based on the same fallacy. Almost all the real money to go into these funds is to be supplied by the United States. It is then to be distributed by boards controlled by the financially weak and borrower nations. In both cases our initial contribution is limited, but we may advance additional money. Our initial contribution will be promptly exhausted, and we will then be told that unless we come to the rescue the whole plan for world stability will collapse. Like most spending solutions for domestic problems it resembles the pouring of money down the sewer, but it is just a little worse because our own people do not get any advantage from it.

Of course, we should consult with foreign nations as to their needs and sit in on international boards to discuss their problems. Of course, we are interested in helping them to stabilize their currency. But we must reserve our freedom of action to handle our own cash for stabilizing exchange or assisting other countries. I suggest that we first work out an agreement with England as to the relation of the dollar and the pound, and then consider one by one the condition of the other countries. Their currency status is only a result of one feature—their poor economic condition or poor budget policy. The way to deal with the matter is by direct loans in reasonable amount on definite conditions imposed by us. They should be only enough to enable the borrower to import raw materials and other goods necessary for the starting up of its manufacture and its production. Later, when the country has put its own house in order, England and ourselves can consider the question of stabilizing its exchange. The attempt to support exchange as a first step is utterly hopeless and would prove infinitely more expensive.

There is now in session in London a meeting of the Commonwealths of the British Empire. Mr. Churchill's policy of empire preference has been made very clear. The American people certainly never intended to approve the abolition of their tariffs, and will not do so, and they can hardly object to preferential tariffs among the British Commonwealth of Nations; but I think they could object and should object to any empire preferences which have the effect of imposing an export duty on raw materials. Exception to the Atlantic Charter or no exception, a peaceful world will depend on equal access to raw materials, and our Government should be making every effort to establish that principle. We should also be willing to sit down in a conference to determine what kind of modification of tariffs through reciprocity treaties should be negotiated in order to give the poorer nations a better market to which to export the specific goods on which their life depends.

Furthermore, there is evidence that cartels are already being planned by British trade interests, and even by New Deal Americans to control world trade in various raw materials. Clearly this is not in accord with Mr. Hull's principles. The Federation of British Industries has proposed a whole series of quotas, preferential tariffs, import and export controls. Surely there should be in progress today an international trade conference designed, not to increase our trade or British trade, but to remove economic discrimination which might tend to prevent the success of any organization for peace. We can perhaps be prosperous without any increase in our foreign trade, but many other nations cannot be. What has our Government done about this problem, except to propose plans for scattering American dollars around the world? Clearly our Government should be making plans of its own to solve the riddles of international trade, and discuss the details with others.

The real difficulty in Washington is the philosophy of spending which dominates our Government. The only policy we can see clearly is one of loaning money directly and indirectly and indiscriminately to every foreign nation that desires it in a fervor of international love, and with the fallacious idea that it will create a tremendous demand for our exportable goods. Of course this policy amounts to giving away the products of our farms and our labor, for the loans will never be repaid. It means inflation and more debt. It is a grand form of international W. P. A. hidden behind the jargon of reciprocal exchange and international cooperation. The sad thing about it is that charity is even more demoralizing to nations that receive it than it is to individuals who receive it. It discourages the nation from measures which are absolutely essential if ultimately it is to stand on its own feet. In the end instead of creating gratitude to the United States it brings abuse and hard feeling for Uncle Shylock.

There is another policy which threatens the success of any attempt to make peace by world organization. That is the policy of those who say that England and Russia and the United States must rule the world. It is suggested in Walter Lippmann's book, United States Foreign Policy, Shield of the Republic, in which he urges an alliance with England, Russia, and perhaps China. It crops out in the thinking of many editors and commentators and politicians. It is, in substance American imperialism.

Many are advocating that England, Russia, and the United States occupy Germany for a long period, perhaps in three separate zones of influence. The attitude of England today looks rather toward a policy of permanent spheres of influence than it does toward any bona fide league of sovereign and equal nations. Mr. Churchill has suggested that European problems be solved entirely by England and Russia and a 20-year alliance has been made looking in that direction.

My own view is that an alliance policy absolutely destroys the hope for a real or successful league of nations. The alliance, its

advocates say, must be so strong that no one can challenge it successfully. It becomes, therefore, the old balance-of-power policy. But the very existence of an alliance inevitably breeds another alliance. It would cut us off from our Latin-American good neighbors. Certainly England and Russia and the United States will have the most powerful military forces in the world for many years to come. Their support of a league as individual members is essential to its success, but the moment they make an alliance they subordinate the league to their own interests and relegate it to a secondary position. They substitute an ideal of force for a rule of law. In effect, a world dominated by a three- or four-power alliance is not a free world. We cannot maintain our freedom permanently by destroying the freedom of others.

The policy is absolutely contrary to Secretary Hull's views. He made it clear in his speech of April 9 that no conclusions of the four nations should be accomplished without the participation of the other United Nations. While emphasizing the importance of the four-power agreement, he has repeatedly used language which excludes the idea of alliances. But there are many New Dealers in power in the Government today who have the same itch to regulate the affairs of the world and of other nations as they have to regulate the farms and the homes and the businesses of the American people. I do not charge these gentlemen with being Fascists, but their philosophy is totalitarian. The world is too dumb to understand, they say, and a small group of "brain trusters" must manage their affairs.

I do not believe the American people will ever stand for such a policy. They want this war won and they want the boys home again just as soon as they can get home. They don't want to run the world and the boys don't want to run the world. They see no reason for occupying Germany longer after every military weapon has been destroyed. If any policing job is to be done in the future it should be done by a volunteer force recruited for that purpose. Incidentally, I don't see any basis for universal military service. The very purpose of this war, and of the peace to be made hereafter, is to prevent a condition in which America shall become an armed camp and be diverted from the progress, the liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for which this war is being fought on six continents. I see no reason why all the men required to carry out our defense and our share in enforcing peace should not be recruited on a voluntary basis if adequate pay and advantages are given. I believe it is important that the President make it perfectly clear that when this war ends it really does end; and that we give up any idea of ruling the world or telling other countries how to manage their own affairs. We do not propose to make the United States part of any world state and have our laws made for us by others. Nor do we intend to make their laws for them. Our plan is founded on the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states. We believe that a successful peace can only be based on that foundation.

Many efforts have been made in the past to insure permanent peace in the world. There is no lack of desire or determination to bring that about. The day for propaganda and pious declarations in favor of international cooperation is over. What we need now is:

First, definite steps to persuade England and Russia to join in making a political settlement which will give freedom to those peoples who are capable of self-government and desire freedom.

Second, a definite plan for world trade which will eliminate economic injustice.

Third, a definite stand against those who are determined that the United States with or without its allies shall dominate the world under perpetual New Deal dictatorship with streamlined W. P. A. and deficit spending. I don't see any indication that the administration is disposed favorably to any of these three principles. I have the highest respect for Mr. Hull's sincerity and principles, but he does not have much to say about these basic policies. There isn't much hope for peace as long as the administration deliberately rejects them.

[From the Cincinnati Post of May 8, 1944]

TAFT STATES THE ISSUE—DEMOCRATS MAY LEARN

If the administration is not careful, the Republicans will take the issue of international organization away from it. Already the G. O. P. politicians are leading the movement for world organization in line with their Mackinac declaration. The recent speeches of Governor Dewey and Governor Bricker are cases in point.

Another is Senator TAFT's address in Cleveland last Saturday. He put the emphasis on action rather than on words. As he said, there is substantial agreement on the need for an international organization of sovereign nations with power to prevent aggression and preserve peace, and the Senate, by overwhelming vote of both Republicans and Democrats for the Connally resolution, has approved the official declaration of Moscow to that effect.

But the rub is that the European powers, despite these pledges, seem to be moving in the opposite direction. They are not permitting the smaller nations to participate in decisions, but are rather setting up spheres of influence for themselves.

"The day for propaganda and pious declarations in favor of international cooperation is over," the Senator said. "What we need now is:

"First, definite steps to persuade England and Russia to join in making a political settlement which will give freedom to those people who are capable of self-government and desire freedom.

"Second, a definite plan for world trade which will eliminate economic injustice.

"Third, a determined stand against those who are determined that the United States, with or without its allies, shall dominate the world under perpetual New Deal dictatorship with streamlined W. P. A. and deficit spending."

TAFT credits Cordell Hull with sincerity, but complains that the Secretary "does not have much to say about these basic policies." We hope and believe Mr. Hull has much more influence than the Senator thinks.

But, certainly, it is high time the administration proves that the Hull policy is something it is fighting for.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 8, 1944]

TAFT POINTS TO THE FACTS

In a thoughtful address which reveals characteristic American impatience with the official platitudes currently fobbed as foreign policy, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT recalls his fellow citizens to that factual view of world affairs which alone will secure the objectives of this war.

Telling the War Veterans' Republican Club of Ohio that "we can only assure permanent peace and liberty in this country by the formation of some kind of association of nations to maintain the peace of the world," the Ohio senior Senator pointed to the widening gulf between our professions and our conduct.

The conduct of the Big Three among the United Nations leads away from that world organization which they proclaimed as their chief war aim in the Joint Four Nations Declaration of Moscow. The Atlantic Charter seems to have been forgotten, the Senator reminded his listeners. In a passage which sums up the view that all those who do not live in a dream world must share, Senator TAFT said:

"The policies pursued by our Government up to this time have not encouraged hope that these conditions (of the Atlantic Charter) will be met. As far as we know, our Government has not raised its voice specifically in behalf of the freedom of Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. It seems doubtful whether this basic condition of a successful association of nations was mentioned at Moscow or Teheran. Although we have sent more than $4,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies to Russia to help carry out the first objective, of winning the war, we have apparently exacted no promises of any kind that will help the second objective, of winning the peace, except the very general terms of the Moscow Four Power Agreement. Of course, this is not a time to determine exact boundaries, but up to this time we have not established the principle of the freedom and sovereignty of these States. England went to war to protect Poland against Germany. Certainly the war becomes a grim farce if we are unable to protect the essential integrity of Poland against Russia."

Thus the Senator makes clear the discouraging fact which has become increasingly evident to all in recent months that "the danger to the accomplishment of a league today does not come from so-called isolationists or any unwillingness on the part of our people to go ahead. It comes only from the demands of England or Russia, and the failures in our own current foreign policy."

At a time when the administration and the State Department—as far as actions go—seem to have forgotten completely what this Nation stands for in the world, and have joined with the other great powers in what appears to be a concerted effort to smother the small nations, it is refreshing to hear an American statesman say that "It is futile even to consider a league of sovereign nations if the world is to be full of small nations governed by foreigners and yearning constantly for the restoration of their liberties." The American sense of fair play and decency is not dead when such views can find expression from responsible sources at a time when our diplomacy seems bent only on aping the destructive realism of European power politics.

The United States is heading for disaster, internationally and at home, if it goes on with the notion that the Big Four can run the world, thus abrogating any effective world organization; if it thinks it can finance the world back to normal times by a grand form of international W. P. A. hidden behind the jargon of reciprocal exchange and international cooperation. We must cooperate with all nations, not attempt to dominate the world in our own way by manipulating the Big Four, mainly through financial subsidies.

"Our purpose in this war," as Senator TAFT sees it, "is to assure the freedom of the people of the United States and bring about a condition in which they may work out, without invasion or threats of invasion by foreign nations, the destiny of the American Republic here at home." This is a needed reminder. Sometimes it seems we were fighting the war to establish new spheres of influence for the Communist Russians and the British Empire. They have their rights to their objectives, but we should not lose sight of our own. And the way to secure our own is through world organization whch is based on equity for large and small in economic as well as political affairs.

This is the Ohio Senator's view and it is not new. He discussed these problems at great length in his scholarly address before the American Bar Association at Chicago on August 26, 1943. It is well, however, to have them restated as forcefully as was done in the Cleveland address, for it is all too easy to lose sight of the aims of this war.

Anti-Semitism Is an Un-American and Un-Christian Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Justice Frank Murphy at the national unity session of B'nai B'rith war service convention, Carnegie Hall, May 8, 1944:

For the better part of 2½ years this land of ours has been dedicated to the winning of a total and world-wide war. To this end we are pouring out ungrudgingly the vast riches of which we are possessed—the fruits of our soil, the products of our mills, and—greatest resource of them all—the lives of American men.

What is our purpose in so doing? Why this unparalleled expenditure of our national wealth?

We talk at length of war aims. But if we look to the root of this discussion, if we search for fundamentals, we come to one primary and elementary war aim which precedes all others and on which all other war aims depend. That war aim is the preservation of the United States of America and all that it signifies. More than all else, we want, and are determined, to protect and preserve this Nation as the founding fathers established it, as our forebears and we have molded it, and as the overwhelming majority of us so dearly cherish it. Only if we succeed in this can we hope for the fulfillment of our other objectives. If we fail in this, we fail in everything.

Military victory seems now a matter of time. We know that the Allied forces are relentlessly closing in on Berlin and Tokyo. But while our armies are saving this Nation on the battlefields of Europe and Asia, we here at home can, and may, destroy it without the firing of a shot. We can lose the war at home, and wreck the United States we have known, by failing to see and tenaciously cling to what is the glory of United States and the life of distinction our country represents.

What is it that we are fighting to save? What is it that the fathers established and that we and our forebears have so long cherished? It is not primarily our industrial system, or our great cities, or our system of communications, or any of our marvelous inventions. These are part of our country, but not the main part.

The essence of this Nation—the one thing that more than any other has made us great in the eyes of mankind—is the principle of individual liberty, the dignity and the equal status of man that underlies our entire political and social structure. Men unrelated in racial origin, drawn from every corner of the earth, and professing every known religious creed, combined their talents and their efforts to create a new world. They brought with them few material possessions, but they did "import" many cultural heritages which have greatly enriched our national life. They came to the new world to shake off rather than transplant the animosities of Europe. This was the goal of those diverse peoples who fled to these shores from the oppression, the bigotry, and the hatreds of the old world.

This deathless heritage was what the fathers sought to perpetuate when they declared in the Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal and were endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This was what they strove to protect when they wrote into the Constitution the guaranties of freedom of speech and press and religion, and of equality before the law.

And this, fellow Americans, is what our enemies seek to induce us to destroy by our own hand. They strive to set us at each others throats. They work to incite us to bigotry and hatred toward our neighbors. They disseminate the gospel of intolerance. They yearn to divide us in order that we will nullify the victory of our armies by civil war at home.

It is the appalling truth that this war upon our unity is meeting with no little degree of success. The dark specter of bigotry and persecution sweeps like an ugly phantom across the horizon. On every side we see sinister forces at work in this country to array class against class, religion against religion, and race against race. Torrents of venom and hatred, insidious propaganda, and falsehoods are daily being unleashed. Racial and class hatreds, systematically fomented, have led to the destruction of property, the physical torture and even the murder of our fellow men. The object is to substitute the Hitler way of life for the American way. These outrages threaten not merely the lives and property of a few unfortunate individuals but also the constitutional principles upon which this Republic was founded and upon which the freedom of all Americans depend.

Religious and racial persecution has been a pernicious strain in man since the beginning of time and has recurred again and again in different forms. When Saul of Tarsus was persecuting the disciples of Christ and was journeying to Damascus to find them in order that he might bring them bound to Jersualem, he fell to the ground as he heard a voice saying to him: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" These words resound through the ages whenever a wave of persecution arises to engulf a portion of mankind.

The first three centuries of the Christian era were a period of harsh and cruel persecution of Christians. Many were driven to live in hiding in the catacombs. Untold numbers were put to death by unspeakable tortures; some were burned at the stake and others were thrown to the beasts in the Coliseum. In the late Middle Ages the Inquisition in Spain was another manifestation of this deplorable tendency in mankind. After the Reformation, in some countries, there were cruel persecutions of Catholics, and priests were put to death in a horrible manner for celebrating mass.

Unfortunately, some of the hates and animosities of the Old World crept into the new American Continent. In colonial days, in New England, Quakers were heartlessly tortured for their beliefs. The nineteenth century brought the ill-famed Know Nothing Party, which desired to deny political rights to all persons who were not native-born Protestants. Closer to our own time, when the Irish immigrants began to come to our shores in great numbers, they were subjected to oppression in various brutal forms.

It is an inspiring fact that these alien movements were not in the mainstream of the American tradition and proved unable to divert the American people from their devotion to the principles of freedom, equality and fair play. But today, with the world convulsed by war, bigotry, and intolerance are once again abroad in the land. There is no more disturbing manifestation of this trend than the sinister thing we know as anti-Semitism.

Organized anti-Semitism is a weapon of the Nazi revolution. It is the most cunning of all the cunning methods devised by the Nazis to destroy democracies from within. It threatens not only the Jews, but the basic principles of democracy and Christianity as well. We shall win the global war on the field of battle. But if at the same time we accept and become permeated with this portion of the Nazi ideology, we have shall sustained a major defeat. Hitler knows that and has already boasted that the seeds of nazi-ism and anti-Semitism which he has sown will survive military defeat.

We must realize that unless the seeds which Hitler has sown are destroyed now before racial brutality and persecution come into full bloom, the long struggle to create freedom and equality for all shall have been futile. We shall then have capitulated to those forces of evil which use race hatred to achieve their goals of undoing our country, destroying its sense of brotherhood and unity, and undermining its moral and spiritual strength.

That is why, as I see it, anti-Semitism is one of the most challenging and significant problems in America today. And since anti-Semitism is not only contrary to the teachings of democracy but contrary to the teachings of Christ, Christians particularly must unite their efforts to combat it. The organization for which I speak was created for that purpose. It was organized solely by Christians. It is maintained and its activities are conducted solely by Christians, who also finance it completely.

This organization will be militantly opposed to anti-Semitism because of the dangers that it presents to American ideals and to Christian principles. We shall do our work in the American way. We shall not try to deprive those who may differ with us of their right to free speech and press. But we shall energetically and relentlessly oppose by every means at our command their vicious and insidious propaganda. We shall strive through a campaign of enlightenment and education to expose the tragic error of their teachings. We shall carry on the campaign in the market place and in the forum in order that the freedom for which our fathers fought and for which our children are fighting shall not perish from the New World.

To stop the assault upon the Jews, which is really an assault on democracy and religion, is not easy. It cannot be stopped merely by the passage of a statute or ordinance or by the rendering of a judicial decision. The solution lies only in the self-cleansing of our own hearts and minds of racial hatred. That may not be easy, but it is vitally necessary if we are to remain a free, united people.

It would be wise for every American, before permitting himself a single anti-Semitic word, a single anti-Semitic deed, or even a single anti-Semitic thought, to examine his conscience to determine whether such acts or thoughts square with the ideals of individual liberty and the dignity and equal status of man. This must be done if we would preserve this country we love.

What is the nature of the anti-Semitic virus that seeks to poison and destroy the American ideal of equality and freedom? Primarily it consists of assertions and suggestions that Jews are responsible for things that we do not like and that they have traits and qualities that are alien to our way of life.

Unfortunately some innocent and well-meaning people have accepted this historically false and morally wicked propaganda which would make the Jews the universal scapegoat for all that is evil. They forget that the early Christians were regarded as a socially inferior group, as alien traders and agitators, as peddlers and vagrants, and were charged with polluting the blood streams of other people. Everything that is now said against the Jews was once directed against the early Christians, who for 3 centuries were subjected to some of the most inhuman persecutions in the world's history. It is a

tragic thing that a religious majority like Christians, who were at one time a minority and the victims of what the Jews now endure, should become witting or unwitting carriers of vicious falsehoods which are not merely anti-Semitic but anti-Christian.

This is not to say that all Jews are without fault. As all intelligent persons well know, there are good Jews and bad Jews, just as there are good and bad Christians, good and bad Englishmen, and good and bad Irishmen. But many of us continue to talk Hitler-fashion about the Jews as if they were the root of much, if not all, of our ills. Our thoughts have become so affected by the poison of anti-Semitism that few of us are completely free of it. Occasionally someone will be heard to say that as soon as the war is over the Jews "will be put in their place." Others seriously propagate the utterly false and un-Christian theory of Aryan superiority and racial purity.

One cannot say or do these things without doing something base and cruel. One cannot say these things without diminishing the spiritual splendor in man. Yet they are being said every day. Unless we eradicate these attitudes and practices respecting racial minorities, there is grave danger that the American principles of freedom and equality will be hopelessly dashed upon the rocks of violent persecution and oppression. Once that happens, the cement of tolerance that has given America her national unity and her moral strength will be broken, and we will become a Nation hopelessly divided. Intolerance may first wreak its vengeance on the Jews, but remember this: It will not stop there. There is every reason to believe that the denial of elementary rights to the Jews would be followed by the denial of elementary rights to other minorities. And in America we are all in one way or another members of a minority group

Anti-Semitism is not only false in theory but futile in practice. It accomplishes no good, while wreaking incalculable wrong. Anti-Semitism, like all other racial hatreds, has never contributed in the slightest to the solution of any problem—economic, social or political. On the contrary, it hinders the solution of such problems by diverting our efforts from the finding of solutions to the making of a scapegoat. It not only falsifies the factual data concerning these problems by exaggeration and distortion, but it removes the preliminary conditions requisite to any practical settlement. For specific solutions of great human problems are conceivable only in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and collaboration. And racial hatred, far from providing such an atmosphere, utterly destroys the state of mind necessary to understanding and collaboration. Having done this, it proposes solutions that are completely futile—such as discriminatory laws and persecutory measures.

Racial hatred, in other words, cannot help us solve our problems. It can only add new and worse problems to the ones we already have.

But the falsity and the futility of anti-Semitism are far from being the only counts on which it must be condemned. Vastly more significant to every patriot in this land is the fact that anti-Semitism is anti-American. In spirit it is a revolution against that lofty ideal of liberty and equality that brought our forebears to find refuge on this continent. It is a reincarnation of the oppression and persecution of the Old World of their day. It is the modern counterpart of the early persecution of the Quakers, and of Know Nothingism. It is the living symbol of everything that the noble men who wrote our Bill of Rights so passionately desired to bar forever from our country. Anti-Semitism is the enemy and antithesis of the inspiring philosophy that has made the United States what it is.

And to all Americans who believe themselves Christians, I say that anti-Semitism is not only un-American, it is anti Christian.

It is impossible to understand how a man can hate or persecute the Jews and at the same time pretend to keep allegiance to the principles of Christianity. The very basis of the Christian faith is a belief in the essential equality and dignity of the individual man. According to the teachings of Christ, the first and greatest commandment is to love God above all things, and the second is like to the first: "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself." Real Christianity begets love in the heart of man. It was Christ who first taught men the real meaning of brotherhood, whose gospel was love for every man, woman, and child. And Christianity further teaches that all human beings are neighbors—whatever their race, color, or beliefs. To love one neighbor and not another, to hate and persecute our Jewish neighbors, is un-Christian.

A great Christian leader, Pope Pius XI, once said of anti-Semitism: "It is a movement in which we Christians can have no part whatsoever. Anti-Semitism is unacceptable. Spiritually we are Semites." The true Christian may hate falsehood and sin, but he cannot hate his brother man. He dare not hate or contribute to the persecution of those whose racial background or beliefs differ from his.

But in a larger sense, the true Christian will do more than merely tolerate such persons. In their hour of trial he will rush to their defense, bind up their wounds, and aid them in their search for security and peace. He will not remain aloof in the face of injustice that runs counter to the fundamental tenets of his faith. For in his conscience the true Christian knows that to be silent under such circumstances is to join hands with the forces of evil and forget that Christians themselves were the subjects of discrimination and persecution not so long ago.

This is no remote or academic problem that we face, my fellow Americans. This enemy is already within our gates. The tide is rising. The passions, the prejudices, and the fears spawned by anti-Semitism are mounting constantly. The time to quell them is now.

The battle must be fought and won through appeals to reason and morality in the public forums, the press, the schools, the churches, and the homes. But first, it must be won in the heart and mind of each of us—face to face with his conscience.

I cannot believe that it is our destiny to hate one another. I am convinced that in the heart of every normal human being there is a great yearning for the brotherhood of man. That goal is not impossible if we will but conscientiously strive to be that which is within the reach of all—good neighbors and friends with all our fellow men. Let us then look to the future, not as members of a nation confined in a spiritual and intellectual strait jacket of racism, but as a free people imbued with a respect for the dignity of each individual. Each one of us can be a better Jew, a better Protestant, a better Catholic, or a better citizen, whatever his faith may be. Then we shall be on the right road and the promise of a great free nation will not then have been shattered. America will be, instead, a stronger nation morally and spiritually, a nation wisely prepared to defend itself and able to play its manly part in world affairs with an intelligent and robust sense of justice.

Gripped in this great world struggle, let us ask ourselves, "Why pour out this blood if not to emerge a richer nation, enriched in our own way of life?" Why all this agony, if not to bring forth an America unravished by the hates and lusts of the Old World, an America that is a just power as well as a great one.

Let us hope that it will be so. Let us work together to see that it shall be. And when the task is done, let us walk humbly among men, proud less of our power than of our respect for the rights of all mankind.

Post-War Health—War Diseases Call for Plans Now for Preventive Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, good editorials from newspapermen will no doubt play a large part in our post-war planning. I am always thankful for suggestions we get from men who make a study of our civic needs. Most of our newspapermen have this thought foremost in mind when they sit down to write an editorial. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Austin Statesman and was written by a friend of mine and a very able newspaperman of the Associated Press staff, Mr. Homer G. Olsen:

POST-WAR HEALTH—WAR DISEASES CALL FOR PLANS NOW FOR PREVENTIVE PROGRAM

(By Homer G. Olsen)

Certainly not the least important of the post-war plans will be a world-wide health program, global conflict having scattered peoples everywhere and pointed up the increasingly difficult problems that lie ahead.

Thus declared Dr. George W. Cox, State health officer, in an address, highlights of which was published by the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Cox said:

"North American troops in the war theaters may return home contaminated with various tropical and other parasites and disease-producing organisms which are at present not found in sections of North America. Tropical countries will be opened to migration after the war by northern peoples who are not immune to the endemic diseases. We should begin to plan to meet the new public-health programs as they may affect North America, and, at the same time, our humanitarian interests dictate that we contribute to a world-wide health program."

"Since this Nation will probably be confronted with a serious post-war health problem, it appears most highly desirable that we now plan a definite health program along environmental lines so fundamentally sound and attractive that it will be acceptable to individuals, communities, States, and the Nation as a whole," Cox asserted.

Recommending preparation of plans which can be utilized the moment manpower is available to put them into effect, he suggested the program should cover at least in part the following projects:

1. Local health centers with laboratory and equipment to house local health personnel so as to enable sanitation forces to function at maximum efficiency.

2. Plans for water supplies and treatment where needed.

3. Sewerage systems and treatments where needed.

4. Municipal or cooperative abattoirs.

5. Municipal or cooperative oyster-shucking and shellfish-packing establishments.

6. Municipal or cooperative canning or food processing plants.

7. Recruitment and training of more sanitation personnel to carry forward sanitary work not only at home but in the republics to the south and other countries.

8. Planning of drainage systems where such drainage will minimize the mosquito-borne disease problem.

9. Planning of a mutual aid program in rodent control.

10. Planning of a cooperative program of garbage disposal.

11. The planning for the elimination of slum areas and making available adequate housing for the population.

12. The planning of a program which will provide adequate lighting, heating, and ventilation facilities in public buildings but more especially in schools.

13. An advisory program that would be helpful to industries in the elimination of industrial hazards.

14. Promulgation of plans which will insure the farm population safe living conditions patterned somewhat after the Farm Security Administration program which provided aid in the correction of farm water supplies, waste disposal systems, screening, and the like.

15. Setting up short training schools for food handlers, water and sewage plant operators as well as swimming pool operators, operators of food processing plants, such as pasteurization plants, and hygienists for industrial plants.

16. The initiation of immediate steps toward securing an appropriation to the public health service of necessary funds to inaugurate and carry out a direct emergency program of community sanitation, as has already been done in the case of malaria control.

Solution of Post-War Employment in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. James L. Whitley, former Member of Congress, of Rochester, N. Y.:

SOLUTION OF POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA

The solution of the problem will require most careful consideration by our ablest minds. We cannot accept the challenge lying down. World War No. 1 taught us a lesson: In time of war prepare for peace. The consensus of opinion by our military leaders is that the war in Europe will end in 1944 with victory for the Allies, and that the war with Japan will end in the same manner at a later date. After the end of the conflict in Europe, thousands of plants throughout the country will taper down in the production of war implements and the millions of men and women engaged in defense work with millions of ex-service men will await the green-light signal to start the greatest industrial era in the history of our country. As war production declines we should immediately start the production of tools and machinery necessary for civilian production. A Government agency should be set up without delay to make a complete inventory and description of all machinery under Government control. This would permit industry to secure machines for civilian production without delay and save millions of lost manpower hours even before semireadjustment.

REGULATIONS

Steps should be taken at this time to remove every possible obstacle regulating free enterprise, complicated, unnecessary, bureaucratic blanks should no longer be required for every move we make. Business should be given a free hand, subject only to regulations to insure against monopoly, fraud, and unfair practices. Business loosened from red tape will emerge with speed, and millions of idle dollars will find way into many free enterprises.

TAXATION

Taxes will be an important factor in any plan after we emerge from war to peace. With a high debt obligation which may exceed $300,000,000,000, we may expect to have the tax problem with us for some time to come. When the time arrives that taxes may be reduced such reduction should be for the encouragement of private enterprise and to stimulate consumption. There should be no double taxation. A stockholder in a corporation pays his proportion of the tax on the earnings of the company and an additional tax on the dividends received, while a bondholder in the same company is subject to a single tax on the amount received; to encourage investment this discrepancy should be corrected. Income-tax report blanks for the upward of 50,000,000 taxpayers should be simplified. The Government should have only two concerns, the amount of income and the amount of deduction. Two hundred million of manpower-hours would be saved by a simple tax return consisting of two pages; one for a list of all income, the other for exemptions and deductions allowed by law, the difference to determine the taxable income.

AGRICULTURE

The production of food is our most essential industry. At the termination of hostilities we will not only require food for our own consumption but upward of $1,300,000,000 will be required for the distribution of food and supplies for the millions of half-starved people throughout the world. Agriculture will have to expand to meet the demand. Plans by the Bureau of Reclamation are now underway to open up in the Middle West 20,000,000 acres of arid, sagebrush and cactus areas into irrigated farmland. To complete this vast work many thousands will be employed. The Government is owner of a large portion of the lands. I know of no better plan than to allot these farms to our returning veterans and to civilians with agricultural experience; the land to be sold on a time contract with a long-term, low-interest finance arrangement. The operation of farms should be left to the farmer and not the thousands of agents with their orders "No, you can't do this," "No, you can't do that," or "You must do so-and-so."

PUBLIC WORKS

The mere spending of money on public buildings may be laudable but the number of people employed on such projects will be negligible. Unless there is an acute necessity for this class of building the construction should be postponed. Plans and blueprints, however, should be ready in order that the work may be taken up at any tapering off of private industry. Owing to the lack of material and labor our highways have fallen into an alarming state, and the work of many thousands will be required in restoring them to safe condition. The program for the construction of a network of highways throughout all the States should be taken up at the earliest possible date. For several years the War Department and the highway engineering departments of the several States have mapped out a system of highways of 34,000 miles, connecting 550 cities, with a population of 10,000 or more. The National Interregional Highway Commission, in conjunction with the Public Roads Commissioner, has filed its final report with Congress on the vast project. The plan proposes the construction of roads to accommodate all classes of transportation, many similar in width and construction to the Harrisburg-Pittsburgh highway and the recently constructed highways in Westchester County and Long Island in New York State. The program calls for construction costing $750,000,000 annually. If started at once it will go a long way in solving the unemployment manpower and industrial capacity. It might be advisable to charge a toll on trucks, busses, and perhaps passenger cars on the arterial highways, which funds could be used for the upkeep and to amortize the cost of construction, also to prevent unfair competition with the railroads, so essential to our national security.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT

Federal, State, and local employment agencies should be set up at this time to aid our armed forces to find their places in civil life. The days of apple selling, shoestring, and pencil peddling by our returning veterans should be only recollections of past wars.

HOUSING

With 10,000,000 men in our armed forces, there is now a shortage of housing which will become more acute when they begin to return. It is estimated that more than 1,400,000 new houses will be necessary to meet the demand as soon as Government restrictions are lifted and building materials released. The $8,000,000,000 necessary for this vast program will provide work for upward of 4,000,000 artisans. Architects should start at this time the preparation of plans for single and multiple dwellings. Rent gouging should be continued to be curbed.

TRANSPORTATION

The railroads will constitute a big factor in the change from war to peace status. There is a probability that after the end of hostilities there will be a tapering off in both freight and passenger service. For upward of 2 years the equipment consisting of 45,000 locomotives and 1,700,000 freight cars has been taxed to the utmost capacity. This vast network of upward of 235,000 miles of roadbeds will require the service of many thousand workers in repairing them and the reconditioning of equipment. The expenditure to restore the roads to their prewar condition and to supply the much-needed new equipment will necessitate the spending of a vast sum of money and assure the employment of many thousands skilled workers. The railroads are in competent hands who know the importance of their tasks and it is safe to assume there will be no delay in converting this essential industry to meet the new demands in peace as it has in war.

In dealing with transportation we should not overlook the motor vehicle. In 1941 the registration of such vehicles, including trucks, busses, and passenger cars numbered 35,000,000. With the limited number of replacements it is safe to say that within 2 years after hostilities there will be a demand for 17,000,000 new cars, a number which will tax the capacity of the automobile and tire industries, working two or three shifts per day.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY

The dominant factor in post-war employment will depend on the attitude of labor and industry. For 18 months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, labor and capital

worked together without serious disagreement. Patriotism and fear of public opinion combined to speed war production in every branch of our war industries at a rate and speed beyond our most optimistic expectations. After final victory, patriotism to some extent will be lacking. Plans should be advanced at this time for cooperation between labor and management. Except in time of war, no constitutional law can be enacted to make an employee work against his will or to compel an employer to continue business against his desire. Strikes and lock-outs are expensive not only to labor and industry but also the general public, who, in the last analysis, pays the bill. In times of disagreements there should be no cessation in work.

Disagreements in any controversy involving labor and industry: Provisions should be made for a 30-day cooling-off period, during which time both sides should hold conferences with a view to the meeting of minds; if no agreement is reached during that period, at the request of either side to the controversy, the United States or the State Department of Labor shall designate some disinterested persons to mediate with the representatives of both sides. At the time of final settlement of any such dispute, the terms should be reduced to writing and should run for a specific time, thus insuring labor of its reward and enable capital to make contracts with confidence. The principle of collective bargaining should continue in force.

BUSINESS

The Government owns or has control of several thousand war-production plants extending throughout the States. What to do with these vast holdings in which billions of dollars have been expended will be a problem which should have careful consideration at this time. It is generally agreed that the Government should not compete with private enterprises. The laws which free the Government from the payment of real-estate and income taxes in itself would be an advantage with which no private business could compete.

When the war is won the Government will have on hand many millions of dollars' worth of clothing, blankets, shoes, and other articles of wearing apparel. These should not be thrown on the market to speculators to compete with private business. Millions of people in the enslaved nations, who for 5 years have been under the heel of tyrants should be the source to which much of the undisposed civilian supplies should be distributed.

Uniform policies should be devised by the Government for the prompt settlement of all just claims arising from the cancelations of war contracts. Prompt payment is necessary to permit the investment in private business. Referring such claims to the Court of Claims or other agency would end in long delays which would result in retarding of business to the disadvantage of all. A problem affecting business will be the fair allocation of machinery and material to every industry, large and small; the small business should not be discriminated against, and no industry should be permitted to get a jump on his competitor by reason of such discrimination.

There should be created at this time an organization appointed by the President or Congress, consisting of the ablest minds in labor, industry, finance, agriculture, education, and the white-collar worker. It should be the duty of such organizations to study every phase of the problem and with the cooperation of Congress secure the enactment of necessary legislation to be ready to carry on when the starting gong rings.

In conclusion, America should get busy, as it has so often proven it knows how, and do it now.

The Case of P. X. Component Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. C. FREDERICK PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing regarding P. X. component cases, the distribution of which has been declared so adequate that the senders of packages to our boys overseas have been asked to discontinue sending these packages.

This curtailment is a disservice to our boys, because in these packages people usually send the things the boys actually write home for and the receiving of these packages has done much to keep up the morale and spirit of these homesick boys.

It seems that each company receives a quota of P. X. component cases. Each case comes boxed and it must be accepted "as is." Take it or leave it.

The general complaint from the boys is the utter lack of good sense in making up these cases. To bear this out I shall elaborate somewhat about the various component cases. Take the toilet goods component case. The boys have received so much Barbasol that the name "Singing Sam" causes nervous breakdown. They cannot even unload it to the Arabs. The case here, an overabundance of shaving cream and a dearth of razor blades.

The tobacco component case is designated "assorted." The assortment is mostly Chelseas and Twenty Grands. The popular brands such as Chesterfields, Luckies, Camels, Philip Morris, brands that the boys desire most, are few and far between.

The case of an oversupply of undesirable brands and a lack of desirable cigarettes. And still every Friday and Saturday night a popular cigarette manufacturer gives a quarter of a million cigarettes free for each number sung by a certain singer on these programs.

Pipe tobacco, cigarette tobacco for rolling, and chewing tobacco, the boys report as O. K., but the present generation know very little about the fine art of roll your own, and the art of fancy chawing is practically unknown to them.

The candy component consists mostly of Life Savers and chewing gum. When they get chocolate, it is usually the Cadbury's ration brand. The English give this brand to their soldiers with cigarettes, free. Our PX sells this identical stuff to our boys.

To get a few cigarettes, our boys have to spend their hard-earned cash, for the worthless excess of some manufacturer, who cannot dispose of his wares in the U. S. A.

Mark you, all these things mentioned are paid for by our boys. Not free.

It is a pitiful condition that our boys are played for chumps and fools and forced to like it.

I think this matter should be brought to the attention of your colleagues, and I know that the boys shall appreciate the correction of this condition. Thanking you for any interest shown in their behalf, I am

Respectfully yours,

BRICE MOORE.

Pea Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. C. FREDERICK PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *February 10, 1944.*

DEAR SIR: There are too many strikes. I have worked 63 years and have seen many strikes. Most of them could have been settled better if there had been a little justice on the one hand and a little more brains and calm judgment on the other.

In my opinion an honest and free press could give a great deal of help by giving all the facts. A half truth is no better than a lie and one quarter is worse. So here are a few facts. If you are in doubt, I will submit the bills for your inspection. In 1898 we paid $3.50 per ton of 2,240 pounds and the coal was twice as large as it is today. I am referring to pea coal.

I hold no brief for John L. Lewis, but as Josh Billings used to say "facts is stubborn things." There has been a reduction of 10 percent in weight and an increase of 233 percent in price.

1898, $3.50 a ton of 2,240 pounds.
September 1940, $7.95 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
December 1940, $8.25 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
1941, $8.75 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
1941, $9 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
1942, $9 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
1942, $9.50 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
1942, $9.80 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
January, 1943, $10.50 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
1943, $11.20 a ton of 2,000 pounds.
February 1944, $11.69 a ton of 2,000 pounds.

There has been an increase of $8.19 per ton. Please let us know how much was the miners' share and who received the rest of the dough. Please print this so we can learn if the miners were justified in asking for a few crumbs from the rich man's table.

BERNARD E. BROGAN.

Reserved International Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reserved International Rights," by Philip Marshall Brown, reprinted from the American Journal of International Law, volume 38, No. 2, April 1944

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RESERVED INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS

The basic rights of the independence and sovereignty of nations naturally imply corresponding obligations. These obligations are due not only from one nation to another

but from all to each. Such rights do not depend solely on the power of any nation to protect itself. There exists a collective community interest that forbids either national self-help or intervention by one nation in the affairs of another.

This collective interest implies a supreme law which, in spite of the lack of effective sanctions, has its own justification and validity. It amounts virtually to a reserved right which no nation may exercise by itself alone.

No nation is free to do as it pleases either within or without its own borders. Violation of the rights of individuals or of states may vitally affect the interests of all nations. A kind of constitutional international law is gradually emerging that defines the rights and obligations of each and every nation. If a nation demands respect for its basic rights, it is obligated to respect certain reserved rights vested in the international community.

The main principle involved in the protection of the collective interests of nations may be formulated somewhat as follows: The international community reserves to itself the protection of rights essential to the safety and the welfare of all. The independence and sovereignty of nations is limited by, and is subordinate to, the general interest of the international community. This general international reserved right includes the following:

I. International security: The present war has become a war in defense of collective security. When it is successfully ended permanent guaranties must be established by the victorious nations, with the adherence of any other nations prepared to assume their international obligations. How this shall be achieved remains an unsolved problem calling for the highest kind of statesmanship.

II. The collective welfare of nations: This includes such matters as public health, essential raw materials, the migration of individuals, namely the unemployed, stateless persons, and criminals, standards of labor, and relief work. These and other cognate matters are gradually receiving recognition as of collective interest and concern. The Atlantic Charter is evidence of this fact.

III. Freedom of the seas: The slave trade and piracy have already been recognized as subject to international action. The use of strategic bases, straits, canals, and other inland waterways will become of increasing importance to the whole international community.

IV. Freedom of the air: There is general recognition of the fact that international aviation, when peace is established, must not be left to the arbitrary control of separate nations. It has become in a spectacular way a collective interest which concerns international security as well as the peaceful intercourse of peoples.

This general principle of reserved international rights finds especial significance when applied to the so-called right of self-determination of peoples. The slogan, which finds too easy acceptance, that no people are fit to govern another people, when critically analyzed, is seen to be superficial, false, and even dangerous in its implications. It has been unjustly used to disparage the achievements of such colonial nations as Great Britain, the Netherlands, and France, not forgetting that the United States also has its colonial responsibilities. The term "imperialism" has come to have a loose and unfair connotation of ruthless exploitation and tyranny that is unwarranted by the facts. Whatever the abuses of imperialism may have been in remote times, it may fairly be claimed that colonial administrations, with rare exceptions, have rendered immeasurable service to the subject peoples and to civilization in general. The proud assertion that the British Empire has been the greatest school for self-government ever created is well founded. Witness the experiences of the American Colonies, and the British dominions, not excluding India, whose vaunted national self-consciousness has emerged under British tutelage.

The sweeping assumption that all peoples are fit to govern themselves and to control their territories and resources in an exclusive manner is based on an inadequate understanding of the great problem of colonial administration. To imply that the more advanced and privileged peoples have no obligations toward the backward peoples of Africa, the Pacific Islands, Malaya, and India is as unrealistic as it is cynical.

The principle of a general reserved international right has special significance with respect to strategic territories and resources. The possession of such lands and raw materials is now being recognized as a collective trust, not only for the peoples immediately concerned but for the entire world community. The exploitation of dependencies, without due regard for the needs and interests of other nations, is rightly to be condemned. There exists the superior claim of international welfare and security. The doctrine of international trusteeship, whether of colonies, mandates, or of national domains, is gradually becoming recognized.

Any strategic base for trade, aviation, military, or naval use is to be held subject to the needs of the whole family of nations. No selfish, exclusive claims may be permitted to endanger the rightful interests of other nations. The Republic of Colombia never had the sole right to control the natural international highway across the Isthmus of Panama. Nor had the United States the right to claim that the Panama Canal should be for its own exclusive use. The Hay-Paundefort Treaty of 1901 was an eloquent tribute to this reserved international right. So likewise the Suez Canal belongs neither to Egypt nor to Great Britain; it is an international highway.

Hawaii, Hong Kong, Singapore, Gibraltar, and other strategic bases, are all outposts for the service and the defense of all peoples. Australia and New Zealand have discovered in the course of the present war that their own security is directly involved in the fate of India. Such bases will have immense significance in plans for post-war organization and security.

The doctrine of reserved international rights need not imply the violation of any of the bascic rights of nations. On the contrary, as in the case of the American Constitution, it should prove to be the supreme guarantee of all liberties, whether national or individual. While various races are emerging from barbarism and feudalism, the community of nations must exercise a collective responsibility for the welfare and safety of all. In some instances this responsibility may have to be assumed by certain of the older nations, such as Great Britain, the Netherlands, France, Belgium, Portugal, and the United States, acting in behalf of the community of nations for the good of all.

The clear recognition of the principle of reserved international rights should help greatly to clarify the thinking of critics of colonial administration. Failure to do so can only lead to confused counsels and unwise decisions. It is a principle deserving much more serious consideration than it has heretofore received. The publicists would do well to lay less stress on the basic rights of nations and to emphasize the reserved international rights.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

Flood Control on the Tennessee River

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I listened with much interest to the very able address made by the gentleman from Arkansas, with reference to flood control on the Tennessee River and some comparison as to the result a similar program might accomplish on the Arkansas, Missouri, and other rivers of this country. The Tennessee River is the most nearly completely controlled river in all the world and the work that has been accomplished there in the way of flood control is a very fine example of what can be done when a river is controlled by a unified program.

Recently some very good editorials and newspaper articles have appeared with reference to flood control, pointing particularly to the great difficulty that has been experienced recently along the Missouri, the Arkansas, and other rivers in the Midwest. At this point I include some of these editorials for the information of the membership:

[From the Alabama Journal]

Every time the Missouri River has another flood Missouri points to the Tennessee River and wonder why Missouri cannot be protected in similar manner. Under the unified development of the Tennessee River the waters are under such complete control by expert handling of the lakes and dams that the old-time floods are no longer possible.

[From the Washington Post of May 10, 1944]

PILOT OPERATION

In establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority, Congress directed that the resources of that valley were to be developed not separately, as in the past, but in a unified way. This is the distinguishing feature of T. V. A., the feature which has made it unique as an experiment in regional planning and development. T. V. A. Chairman David Lilienthal expressed his understanding of the congressional directive in a speech delivered the other day to the American Society of Planning officials:

"The river was to be seen as a comprehensive whole, not as a series of unrelated sites for dams. And each dam was to be seen as a whole, as a unity, and made to yield all of its potential value—not to yield only a navigation channel behind its concrete barrier or to yield flood control alone, as a separate asset, or power or recreation. We were so to design the dams that all those assets—navigation, flood control, and power—were to be made available to the people from each dam. And all the series of structures were to be dealt with as interdependent, interrelated—in short, a unity. * * * The river, under the T. V. A. plan of comprehensive development, was not to be seen separately from the land, as in the past. In nature the land and the streams are a unity. The way land is farmed determines the flow of waters both on the land and in the rivers. The same unity that exists in nature was to be observed as basic in the T. V. A. plan of development."

A demand for this sort of development has arisen in the valley of the Missouri River, too

often in the past devastated by floods and contributing to the periodic rampages of the Mississippi. It is unlikely to be achieved through the flood-control bill recently introduced by Senator BENNETT CLARK. This, like tremendous past investments in flood control, such as the Fort Peck Dam completed under P. W. A. auspices in 1940, would ignore the unity between land and stream, would fail to integrate the region's resources and potentialities. Farmers along the Missouri River now complain indignantly that the Army engineers in charge of the Fort Peck project, the largest earth-fill dam in the world, so concentrated upon flood control and navigation that they ignored the importance of the river for irrigation purposes. The farm lands of the area may be deprived of water forever because of unbalanced development.

It is high time that a long-term Federal plan for regional development, predicated upon national needs and the relative urgency of regional problems, be established. This is a fundamental sort of post-war planning. T. V. A. has furnished a pilot operation which should be a goad to the Government in remedying the problem which has arisen on the Missouri which, evidently, cannot be solved piecemeal.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 5, 1944]

HOW T. V. A. TAMES THE FLOODS

"The Tennessee Valley, too, had its almost annual inundations; now huge reservoirs on the main stream and its tributaries hold back or release water as precisely as a spigot; the winter torrent of 1942 is described to show how the first complete river-control system works." (From T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Board of T. V. A.; Harper & Bros., New York, publisher.)

Before the men of the Tennessee Valley built these dams, flooding was a yearly threat to every farm and industry, every town and village and railroad on the river's banks, a barrier to progress. Today, there is security from that annual danger in the Tennessee Valley.

With the erection of local protective works at a few points, this region will be completely safe, even against a flood bigger than anything in recorded history. A measure of protection resulting from the Tennessee's control extends even beyond this valley; for no longer will the Tennessee send her torrents at flood crest to add what might be fatal inches to top the levees and spread desolation on the lower Ohio and the Mississippi.

In others of the earth's thousand valleys, people live under the shadow of fear that each year their river will bring upon them damage to their property, suffering and death. Here the people are safe.

DESIGN FOR WATER CONTROL

In the winter of 1942, torrents came raging down this valley's two chief tributaries, in Tennessee and Virginia. Before the river was controlled, this would have meant a severe flood; the machinery of vital war industries down the river at Chattanooga would have stopped, under several feet of water, with more than a million dollars of direct damage resulting.

But in 1942 it was different. Orders went out from the T. V. A. office of central control to every tributary dam. The message came flashing to the operator in the control room at Hiwassee Dam, deep in the mountains of North Carolina: "Hold back all the water of the Hiwassee River. Keep it out of the Tennessee."

The operator pressed a button. Steel gates closed. The water of that tributary was held.

To the Cherokee Dam on the Holston went the message: "Keep back the flow of the Holston." To Chickamauga Dam, just above the industrial danger spot at Chattanooga: "Release water to make room for the waters from above."

Day by day till the crisis was over, the men at their control instruments at each dam in the system received their orders. The rate of water release from every tributary river was precisely controlled. The Tennessee was kept in hand. There was no destruction, no panic, no interruption of work. Most of the water, instead of wrecking the valley, actually produced a benefit in power, when later it was released through the turbines.

Back of the orders from the water dispatcher to the men who operate the dams is an elaborate system of reporting rainfall and gaging the flow of streams so the height of waters can be predicted for days in advance.

To the head of the T. V. A. forecasting division, from all over the watershed, from every tributary stream, from 300 stations, by teletype, telephone, and short-wave radio come reports of the river's stages, that is, its height.

Reports come in from hundreds of remote rain-gage stations, telephoned in by a farmer's wife, a crossroads merchant, a woodsman. From well-nigh inaccessible mountain streams ingenious T. V. A.-made devices send in their reports by short-wave radio without human intervention.

All the reports are combined and interpreted by engineers, so that they know almost exactly how much water will be swelling the river the next day and the next.

THE RIVER'S GREATEST YIELD

Yesterday's reports are checked with today's and revised tomorrow, and the best technical judgment is sent to the river control room; just how much water is being added to the river's flow in the French Broad, the Holston, the Clinch, the Hiwassee.

The operating orders go out, turning water off or on to meet the demands of the crisis along a watercourse from the headwaters of the Tennessee to the Gulf, almost as long as the Mississippi from its headwaters to New Orleans. The Tennessee River throughout its length is controlled, as water is retained at one dam, released at another. This valley has been made safe.

This is not true of other river valleys. No major river in the world is so fully controlled as the Tennessee, no other river works so hard for the people, for the force that used to spend itself so violently is today turning giant water wheels. The turbines and generators in the T. V. A. powerhouses have transformed it into electric energy. And this is the river's greatest yield.

The Rural Church and the Farm Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend remarks, I include an address by Mrs. Paul Palmer, of Ethlyn, Mo., national secretary of the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, delivered at the rural-urban conference dinner at the Statler Hotel here in Washington last evening.

Mrs. Palmer is one of the outstanding women in farm-organization work in the Nation today, and, with her husband and children, operates one of the most successful farms in my section of Missouri. She comes in daily and intimate contact with most of the problems of rural life and is in position to speak with the authority of personal knowledge on the social, economic, and religious phases of American agriculture. Her address on the rural church is particularly pertinent at this time:

The rural church is as old as America itself. As soon as our pilgrim fathers had provided shelter for their families, they set themselves to the task of constructing a place to worship. They were building for themselves a new world. The kind of a world they wanted to live in was one in which the individual had the right of religious liberty and freedom of thought.

As civilization pushed westward, the pioneer fathers followed the example which had been set for them, and they, too, established their churches. The church was as vital to the souls of those men and women as the spring of living water about which their homes were grouped was to their physical being. These, our first rural churches, were crude in construction but rich in power and influence.

A good friend of mine once gave me this valuable bit of advice. Said she, "When addressing the public, choose a subject that you know something about." So this afternoon I want to tell you folks about a rural church which I know so well. It is the little church in my home community, where I have attended services all of my life. One of my earliest memories was that of my mother and her barefoot brood of children walking to church Sunday morning. We always stopped in the grove adjacent to the church and there put on our ill-fitting, squeaky shoes before going into the services.

We children were not impressed with the fact that it was a hardship to walk that mile and a half to church. Neither were we made conscious of our queer looking clothes. The lesson we did learn was that it was not only our duty but a privilege to attend church on the Sabbath—that all good people go to church Sunday. A lesson I have never forgotten.

Today my little granddaughter who goes with me each Sunday is the sixth generation of my family to worship in this same church. The building is still standing and still in use which my great grandfather and his neighbors built so long ago. These men went into the forest, cleared the trees for the site, and with their own hands shaped those timbers into a church building. Each gave of his time and his talents. They built well.

These families so few in number forgot denominational differences. All of them worshipped together in harmony and unity. The name they inscribed up in the gable of the building bears testimony of that truth. The name "Union Church," the date "1861." That inscription has been carefully preserved.

They did not neglect to provide for the spiritual needs of the black man who came to church with his master. On one side of the building there was a door opening into a stairway which led to what was then known as the gallery. Here the black man and his family sat and enjoyed the same services with his master's family who sat in the pews below. Theoretically he enjoyed the same status as the white member. In studying the early records of the church, we find that on a certain Sabbath morning, Mandy, the black woman belonging to Squire Allen,

came forward and gave her heart to her Master and asked for church membership.

Instead of enduring the hardships of traveling long, cold, weary miles on foot or horseback, or in the big farm wagon to attend church, these pioneer fathers of ours could have remained quietly at home reading their Bible and truly worshiping God. They, too, in their youth had been taught the admonition of the Master when he said, "Neglect not the assembling of yourselves together for worship." Farm families, just now, perhaps, might feel perfectly justified in absenting themselves from church attendance when every precious gallon of gas must be conserved. Too, they can turn on their radios and in the comfort of their farm home, listen to the wonderful messages delivered by the most learned preachers and orators of our day. Should they remain at home they would not gain the strength which comes from having a part in the worship services. They would depart from their early training which taught them to thank God for a free church where they could worship in their own way, where they could listen to the honest thoughts of good men, even if those thoughts were not expressed so fluently. There is danger just now that the feeling of security which the American people have will lessen their spiritual endeavor.

This rural church which I have tried to picture for you is an unpretentious building. It has no spire reaching high into the heavens; neither does the sunlight filter through stained glass windows. It is just a low, white, frame building which has meant so much to the spiritual life of six generations who have lived under the shadow of its influence, a place dear to the hearts of the laymen and clergy of those generations; a spot to which they return to renew friendships or to partake of the old-fashioned basket dinners spread in the shade of the trees. They return to the old church when they are in the slough of despondency; when doubts creep into their thinking; and when their spiritual life is at a low ebb, in order that they might regain the religious steadfastness of their youth.

Probably one of the reasons for the long life of this church has been the fact that the younger generations have been given places of responsibility in the church and an opportunity to express their thoughts. New life must be injected into an organization if it is to survive and grow. I would appeal to you, the farm leaders of America, to maintain and strengthen your rural churches. If they have been abandoned, revive them. Now, as never before, our faith in Christian religion and the rural church should be strengthened. If we are to have a Christian democracy, we must have courageous Christian leadership. In the post-war era, religion must furnish the leadership for social improvement. There is no better place to train those leaders than back in our own rural communities.

In this period of transition the things we once did and the way we did them will pass away. We have every reason to believe that the church too will progress with the times. When it does let us hold fast to those basic fundamental principles of religion which characterized the faith of our fathers—the foundation of the rural church.

Our boys over across say, "We want to come back to find things as we left them." These boys are living in a world which has lost all sense of balance, yet they still cherish their ideals and beliefs. It gives them a feeling of stability to know that back home on the farm, just as always, mother, dad, and the children, hustle a bit faster with the chores Sunday morning so that they might be in their accustomed places in the little community church. I think that probably the things that they are fighting for have more meaning if they know that their places in the church will be waiting for them when they return.

Farm families of this great Nation of ours who can forget tenets, creeds, and isms, and sincerely worship together in spirit and in truth, will create an influence which will radiate to the four corners of the earth. That influence will be a potent factor in helping to make this world safe for differences. That is the kind of a world you and I want to live in.

Business Approach to Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered at Yale University by Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, which were printed in the Washington Post of May 9, 1944. The excerpts from the address were printed as a public service by the International Latex Corporation, of my State.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT

(Address by Chester Bowles, Price Administrator)

In spite of the many false starts and the many mistakes, in spite of waste and inefficiency, our Government has performed the essential tasks required of it in war and performed them brilliantly. What is more, it has carried out these tasks within the framework of the democratic process. Never before in our history has the democratic process worked with greater vigor and vitality than it does today.

We can be proud not only of what we have done but of how we have done it. We have given the world a demonstration both of our national strength and the vigor of our system of government. And yet there are few of us who do not look forward to the day when the war will be over and the role of government will shrink greatly from its present dimensions.

I fully share the view that the role of government must be greatly reduced after the war. I yield to no man in my attachment to the free-enterprise system. I am persuaded that no other system could serve us as well. But I am profoundly concerned, lest in our eagerness to shed ourselves of wartime government and give free rein to initiative and enterprise after the war, we conceive the role of government too narrowly. For if we are not prepared to accept enough government, we invariably end up with too much. It may be paradoxical, but it is true.

EITHER ENOUGH OR TOO MUCH

Our experience in the thirties yields a significant lesson. Because we did not promptly require Government to assume responsibility for stemming the growing depression in 1930, the complete collapse in 1932 left us with no alternative but for the Government to move in to put our economy back on the road to recovery. The lesson of that experience is plain and it is one that we must not forget as we look forward to the post-war period. By now we should know that it is a whole lot easier to keep a truck on the road than to haul it out of a ditch.

If we want to avoid too much government after the war, we must recognize in advance the proper functions of government and we must agree on the policies and on the appropriate organization to discharge those functions efficiently and democratically. If we don't act wisely it may spell our finish as a democratic nation. For if, after the war, we permit another great depression to overwhelm us, we shall be forced to resort to such a bagful of Government cures that we may entirely lose our character of a free economy and a free people.

I gravely doubt whether the seriousnes of the decisions that we must make is as widely understood as it must be. Although fear of post-war collapse is widespread, there is far too easy an assumption on the part of many that we have only to strip off the controls after the war and we'll go right back to peacetime operations without a hitch. There are two things wrong with that view: It won't be easy and we can't go back.

WE CAN'T GO BACK

It is no easy matter to pull seventy-five billions of Government spending out of our markets without precipitating a collapse of prices, incomes, and production. And having learned how amazingly productive our economy can be, having learned that it lies within our power to create a level of prosperity double anything we have known before, we won't be content to go back to the artificial scarcities, the unemployment, the poverty in the midst of plenty that we knew in the thirties.

There are many who will go along with the view that in the years immediately following the war only government can unwind the economy without a break-down and that government must accept this responsibility. What people are principally wondering about is what the role of government will be when reconversion is over.

To me the answer is plain. The function of government in a modern, highly industrialized economy such as ours must be at all times to sustain the level of the national income, to insure that markets are available for everything we can produce, and that jobs are thus provided for all who seek them.

This function does not entail any encroachment upon freedom of enterprise, any infringement of our personal liberties. For I do not conceive this function of government as one of regulation or compulsion. I conceive it as one of encouragement and support. I see the government of the future discharging this function not through regulation and directive but through broad fiscal and financial measures. When for any reason the flow of private investment and consumption expenditures diminishes, government can, by decreasing its taxes and increasing its expenditures, offset that decline. On the other hand, when the flow of private expenditures increases to a point which threatens inflation, through an increase of taxes and decrease of Government expenditures the economy can be kept on an even keel.

MARKETS FOR ALL

Our free-enterprise system has demonstrated itself to be the most dynamic and the most productive the world has ever known. But that demonstration has been only intermittent. In the past, for every year of boom our system has suffered a year of depression in which we lost much of the ground we had gained. As I conceive it, this central function of government will be to enable free enterprise to maintain, year in and year out, its amazing record of production, and to fulfill, year in and year out, its

promise of increasing material and moral well-being.

No businessman will deny that the fear of unemployment has been a powerful deterrent to the full use of current income for the purchase of homes and cars and all the modern conveniences and luxuries that our system can produce in such abundance. No businessman will deny that the fear of periodic depression, of collapsing prices and markets, has been an even more powerful deterrent to expansion of investment. Given the assurance that markets and employment and incomes will be sustained, the damping down of consumption and investment will disappear. It may well turn out that there will be ample private demand for everything we can produce and Government will not be called upon for large operations to sustain the national income.

It is certain that the more effective the guaranties made by the Government and the more widely these guaranties are accepted, the less will be the positive action which the Government will be called upon to make, for the more effective the guaranty the greater will be the confidence in the economic outlook and the more certainly will potential demand for goods and services be translated into orders.

It has taken a Second World War to press home upon us what our responsibility in international affairs must be. I hope it will not take a second great depression to teach us what is the appropriate role of government in the economic sphere.

As a public service, we present excerpts from an address delivered at Yale University.

INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORPORATION,
Playtex Park, Dover, Del.

Slogan Gone Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. C. FREDERICK PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial on the subject Slogan Gone Wrong from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 21, 1944:

SLOGAN GONE WRONG

The bill to exempt residents of other States from Philadelphia's wage tax has passed the National House.

Supporters of the bill in Washington may or may not believe the intended relief lies within the constitutional powers of Congress, but they are surely aware that there is no weight to the objection that the wage tax is "taxation without representation."

That slogan had its uses in the time and place of its origin, but if it were to be applied today as prohibiting the collection of taxes from people who had no voice in the levying there wouldn't be much left of our tax systems.

Residents of New Jersey who own property in Philadelphia never dream of claiming exemption from its real-estate tax. A Pennsylvanian never dreams of immunity from the gasoline taxes of the other States in which he drives because he can't vote there.

Since there probably isn't a tax in the country that is collected solely from those who can vote for the public officials who impose it and spend the proceeds, inability of nonresidents to vote for city councilmen is a rather pallid objection to the wage tax.

Let Us Have a Truly Representative Bipartisan Committee on Foreign Policy Which Gives Recognition to This House and to the Western Half of the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers report that the Gallup poll shows that 83 percent of the American public looks with favor upon the plan to appoint a bipartisan committee to advise with Secretary Hull on matters of foreign policy. I am glad, of course, that a small step has been taken in that direction by virtue of the fact that the other body has recently created such a committee.

I doubt very much, however, if the American public realizes that no member of that committee has been appointed to represent that great section of America west of the State of Iowa. I also doubt whether the public realizes that the House of Representatives is not included on that committee.

On the opening day of this session of Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 28, to bring about the appointment of a bipartisan Foreign Policy Planning Committee, which would include representation from this body. I hope we can get action along that line, because it is important that Members of all parties get together with the executive departments and consult on the formation of a program on foreign policy. I also trust that there will be representation on that committee from the House of Representatives, because foreign policy is worthless unless it is geared close to domestic policy, and certainly the House of Representatives, on matters of domestic policy, is the paramount body of this Congress. Whether or not action is taken on my resolution, I hope its suggestions are further adopted to the end that a truly representative and honestly bipartisan committee may start functioning without delay to develop a constructive, understandable, and acceptable American foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, it follows that since Asiatic problems will form such an important part of our post-war relations, that west coast representatives should be included on such a committee so that the opinion of the western section of this country may be given articulation here in Washington in the formation of our foreign policy. A copy of the Gallup poll is herewith attached as a part of these remarks:

BIPARTISAN GROUP IS FAVORED TO SHAPE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 9.—Senator TOM CONNALLY'S announcement of the formation of a Senate bipartisan committee to work with Secretary of State Cordell Hull in shaping this country's foreign policy meets with the approval of the overwhelming majority of voters, Republican and Democratic alike.

It is, of course, naive to assume that foreign policy will thus be entirely removed as an election campaign issue, but the present survey indicates that no matter what voters may think of our present foreign policy, a majority of them favor steps which will promote accord on foreign policy in this election year.

In measuring public opinion on the issue throughout the Nation, the institute had field reporters put the following question to a carefully selected cross section of the voting public:

"Secretary Cordell Hull recently suggested that a committee made up of Republicans as well as Democrats work with him in shaping our country's foreign policy. Do you think this is a good suggestion?"

The results:

	Percent
Yes	83
No	6
No opinion	11

Not only do Republican voters concur with Democratic voters on this question, they are actually in favor of the proposal by a larger majority than are Democratic voters, although the rank and file in both parties are overwhelmingly in favor of the move.

This is shown as follows:

Vote by 1944 party preference

	Percent
Republican:	
Yes	86
No	6
No opinion	8
Democratic:	
Yes	81
No	7
No opinion	12

Resolution on Montgomery Ward Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following resolution adopted by the Greater Detroit and Wayne County C. I. O. council at its reguar meeting on Tuesday, May 2, 1944:

Whereas the private war declared by Montgomery Ward & Co. against the United States is far more serious than an ordinary labor dispute; and

Whereas Sewell L. Avery, the company's head, has repeatedly and deliberately disobeyed the War Labor Board in his union-busting campaign against the United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees Union and is spending huge sums of money to advertise his defiance; and

Whereas in 1942, Avery refused to sign an agreement with the union chosen by his employees, defied the War Labor Board and had to be twice ordered by the President to comply; and

Whereas this year he went on strike against the Government, causing a shut-down of his Chicago plants by refusal to continue dealing with the union, as ordered by the War Labor Board; and

Whereas when President Roosevelt had to again step in, the union immediately complied with his orders, but Montgomery Ward continued to thumb its nose at the Commander in Chief, forcing Government seizure of its plants; and

Whereas Avery's disruptions of wartime morale and orderly industrial relations cannot be tolerated by a nation at war, and public opinion is already aroused against this provocator who carried his fight against labor, against the administration, and against our democratic procedures to the point of open rebellion; and

Whereas Sewell Avery is the front for a section of rabidly antiunion employers who hope to follow his example—if he gets away with anything—and who look on his actions as the opening shot in the union-smashing open shop drive they hope to see launched; and

Whereas there are also reactionary, isolationist, and antiwar political forces that hope to fan Avery's rebellion into a more general revolt against the administration's war leadership and domestic policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Greater Detroit and Wayne County C. I. O. Council wholeheartedly applauds the firm action of the President of the United States and the National War Labor Board and condemns the action of Senator VANDENBERG and Congressman HOFFMAN and others who are upholding Mr. Avery; be it further

Resolved, That we instruct the Michigan Representatives and Senators to support President Roosevelt and the War Labor Board, and to vigorously oppose any attempt to weaken the authority of the President and the National War Labor Board; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Michigan Congressmen and Senators, to President Roosevelt, Attorney General Biddle, the National C. I. O., the press, and all locals affiliated with the Wayne County C. I. O. Council, with a request that they take a similar action.

Free Ports for Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, for 11 years now Americans have been deploring the fate of Europe's refugees, first that of the refugees of Germany, and then those of Austria, of Czechoslovakia, of Poland, of France, of every great and small nation on the Continent which fell under the military or political sway of the Nazis.

While we deplored and lamented, millions of refugees were savagely murdered by Hitler's henchmen. Others escaped death only to wander as refugees across the face of a world which was sympathetic but coldly inhospitable. They have life but no place to live. They have not even been able to find a temporary haven of shelter until the storm of war blows over and they can return to their old homes or settle in a new and permanent home.

Americans have wanted to help them, but until recently we have not known how to help them, before the end of the war. On April 23 of this year, Samuel Grafton, the columnist, discussed an idea advanced by the War Refugee Board of aiding them which will not in any way hurt or inconvenience us and which will enable America to set an example for other countries of good will to follow. This idea—of free ports—for refugees deserves the most serious thought and investigation by those who want to offer some small comfort and hope to their stricken fellowmen.

A RADIO ADDRESS BY SAMUEL GRAFTON ON WOR APRIL 23, 1944

Last week, for a change, we had some good news on the refugee front.

The War Refugee Board of the United States, of which Mr. John W. Pehle is director, disclosed that the idea of establishing what are called free ports for refugees is being seriously considered by the administration.

It is important that we understand just what a free port is. We have long had in this country free ports for goods. There has been one on Staten Island, in New York City, for a number of years. A free port is a bit of land, a reservation, with a fence around it, into which foreign commodities may be brought without payment of customs duties. There are warehouses in a free port, and even factories, so that the foreign goods brought into the free port can be stored and even worked upon. Now if at some later time the owner of the goods decides to reship his merchandise to some foreign country, he does so, and he will never have paid any tariff or customs duty to this country. So long as the goods stay in the free-port zone they are not considered to be in the country, and this is a very handy legal fiction, because in normal times it gives a shipper a place to put his merchandise down while he makes up his mind what he wants to do with it, and it gives our own citizens storage business and factory employment they might otherwise not have had.

Now, we do not have any free ports for refugees as yet. But the thought that we could have them is based on exactly the same legal fiction.

Those who are supporting the idea of free ports for refugees point out that we could take a few acres of land somewhere in the country, say an abandoned Army camp, put a fence around it, have it constantly guarded, and permit refugees, even refugees without visas or papers of any kind, to come to that haven for temporary refuge. By exactly the same legal fiction which we use to set up free ports for goods, these refugees would not be considered to be on American soil at all. They would acquire no legal rights of any kind. Their entrance into a free port zone would not be considered legal entry into America, and their stay in a free port would not be considered legal residence in America. In other words, we would be conferring no rights whatever on these refugees, except the right to sit down; but to a family which has been hounded by the Gestapo and pursued by the Nazi murderers, that is a very precious right indeed.

A number of newspapers around the country have taken up the free-port idea. It is hard to see how there can be any objection to it. Those among us who make a political living for themselves by being anti-refugee could have the satisfaction of knowing that the refugees were not legally in the country, while those among us (and I believe it is a larger group) who are stirred by ordinary human feeling could have the satisfaction of knowing that the refugees were being cared for, and so each group could be happy, according to its kind.

Of course, it shouldn't be against the law, exactly, to give someone in a free port a glass of water, and it is even possible that some milk could be furnished to a few children without destroying the majesty of our legal structure. The important thing is that we would have a place in which to put refugees down, and that we would give up our present monstrous notion that if refugees cannot satisfy all immigration requirements there is absolutely nothing to be done except to invite them to float in the air somewhere until the war ends. But refugees cannot float in the air, and the alternative, whether we admit it to ourselves or not, is death, not self-levitation.

The refugees would not go into the free ports to live there forever. These would simply be temporary storage depots, so to speak, where they could be kept until they could be sent home. And if we look around, we will find more precedents than one for this type of rescue effort. We have, at this very moment, 130,000 Nazi prisoners of war in this country, and these Germans, Fascists almost to a man, have been taken in without reference to whether they had quota numbers or not. We don't worry about what we are going to do with these Nazis afterward; we know what we are going to do with them; we are going to send them back. And it will be a very odd thing if we cannot give our friends, the refugees, something like the same limited right of haven and refuge that we give to our enemies, these prisoners of war. It is an odd situation, really, when our friends, the refugees, have to beg and plead to be treated only as well, no better, only as well as we treat prisoners of war. They don't ask for our best; they just beg us for a little of our worst, and how can be deny them that?

It seems to me that this proposed solution, of free ports for refugees, is in harmony with the traditional ingenuity and resourcefulness of Anglo-Saxon lawmaking; we are an ingenious people when it comes to making law; we are masters of constructive legal fictions, and there never was an opportunity for a more constructive one than in this field. Hitler has made millions of people stateless. Well, let us answer him, not by fine words, but by setting up free ports, a kind of temporary stateless state for stateless humanity. The great final point is that once we have established free ports for refugees, we can go to the other United Nations, and to the neutrals, and ask them to do so also; and they will have to follow this example; whereas, if we don't set up free ports and ask the other countries to do so, we shall be answered only with a low, leering laugh or perhaps a mocking whistle.

The free port idea is not beautiful. But it will save lives. That is its only merit, but that is a merit great enough to rouse us to action.

Legal Liquor or Poison?—Make a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid editorial from the Philadelphia Record:

LEGAL LIQUOR OR POISON?—MAKE A CHOICE

Prohibition days are returning to the United States—without benefit of an eighteenth amendment or Volstead Act.

The evidence is on every hand. Bootleggers operate on an increasingly large scale. The increase in gangsterism is shown in police records.

Moreover, as supplies of legitimate liquor continue to dwindle, the illicit trade will expand in proportion and the quality of the bootleg product will degenerate from cut liquor to plain poison.

LIQUOR A NECESSITY?

No one believes liquor is a wartime necessity any more than cosmetics are a necessity. But experience has shown that if we cannot have legitimate items in the so-called luxury class we will have the bootleg variety. It is easier to satisfy twenty or thirty million people than to reform them.

The question facing the War Production Board and the Senate committee now investigating the liquor industry is simply this:

Will it be better to permit distilleries to resume part-time production of liquor and keep the business legitimate—paying heavy taxes to the Government—or will it be better to take our chances with a wave of gangsterism in wartime?

GRAIN IS AVAILABLE

If it could be shown that grain cannot be spared for liquor manufacture and that the distilleries could not resume partial production without lowering their capacity for producing alcohol for munitions, that would be one thing.

But the facts are otherwise. The facts are:

1. The distilleries of this country have been making no liquor at all.

2. Those facilities are not being used 100 percent.

3. The amount of grain required to produce the 100,000,000 gallons a year which the distilleries propose, by taking a 30-day holiday" from war production, would be only 20,000,000 bushels.

4. Those 20,000,000 bushels comprise only four-tenths of 1 percent of the Nation's total grain output of 5,000,000,000 bushels.

5. Resumption of liquor making, by the proposed holiday, would not curtail Government requirements or supply of industrial alcohol.

W. P. B. APPROVED PLAN

So reasonable are these arguments that the War Production Board several months ago approved the "holiday" plan. But the proposal was killed by War Food Administrator Marvin Jones.

Excuse was that all grain is needed for food.

That four tenths of 1 percent of the supply would make any real difference is difficult to believe. Especially when that small amount of grain is weighed against the consequences of a revival of all the old evils of prohibition and some new ones besides.

Reserve liquor stocks now are so low they would last barely 2 years on a rationed basis. The proposed stretching of that reserve by 100,000,000 gallons annually would stave off the evils of racketeering and bootlegging for years.

BOOTLEGGER THREAT

Unless such steps are taken, the whole trade will soon become an underworld monopoly.

The problem is simply one of the Nation's best interests: Whether they will be served best by permitting a holiday on liquor manufacture that will keep the business legitimate, or whether they will be served best by turning the trade over to gangsters, who soon will have little but poison to peddle.

The answer seems obvious. We believe the Senate committee is rapidly coming to the same conclusion.

One experience with prohibition is enough.

Education and Training of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, more and more people throughout the country are determined to resist any centralization of controls in Washington unless absolutely necessary for winning the war.

The set-up for providing education and training for veterans as proposed in title II of the G. I. bill of rights makes it possible for the Veterans' Administration to exercise a control over the education of the veterans which is certainly not necessary to the success of the program and which cannot give the veteran any better service, and might give him a lot worse service than if the actual conduct of the program is through the State and local agencies of education already established, experienced, and operating efficiently. The latter type of set-up is provided in the bill H. R. 3846, reported out after months of work by the Committee on Education which has been able to concentrate all its attention on this one particular feature of the several very important programs for the veteran in the whole G. I. bill.

I am including three typical telegrams of the many being received on this issue. The first is from the distinguished Governor of my State, who with his predecessor, Lt. Comdr. Harold E. Stassen, projected a sound and comprehensive program for Minnesota veterans long before the Federal Government bestirred itself. Therefore when he speaks for himself and those in Minnesota having to do with the veterans' program, it is on the basis of careful study and extensive experience with the practical problems involved.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 9, 1944.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Educational and veterans' officials favor assurance that veterans' education shall be conducted through regular established educational channels.

EDWARD J. THYE, *Governor.*

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 8, 1944.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
Washington, D. C.:

The college of St. Thomas agrees with the American Council on Education and the Association of American colleges that the educational provisions of the Clarke and Rankin bills are a menace to State and local control of education and we urge that either the Barden bill be adopted or that the Rankin and Clarke bills be amended by striking out title 2, chapter 4, "Education for Veterans" and substituting the provisions of the Barden bill.

REV. VINCENT J. FLYNN,
President, College of St. Thomas.

ROCHESTER, MINN., *May 8, 1944.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives:

Feel strongly that education section of Rankin or omnibus bill represents a dangerous trend in Federal administration of education. Provisions of Barden bill. H. R. 3846, more desirable since it conforms with our traditions, Constitution, and does not ignore the fundamental doctrine of States' rights.

R. W. GODDARD, *Dean.*

Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider the extension of the Price Stabilization Act. The Longmont Times-Call, of Longmont, Colo., on April 29, 1944, carried the following editorial. This editorial clearly indicates the thinking of the people at home on the changes necessary if a Price Control Act is to be continued:

SOME CHANGES NEEDED

Business isn't happy about the Emergency Price Control act which is again before both Houses of Congress.

Many agricultural leaders, businessmen and trade groups hold that the law should be reenacted but that some changes should be made.

The present Emergency Price Control Act, under which O. P. A. was set up and operates, expires June 30. It is assured that price control will be continued, but businessmen and industrialists, who have to live under the law and who know from experience how the law could be improved, are making a number of recommendations to their Congressmen and Senators.

There is a general feeling among businessmen and agricultural producers in Colorado that defects exist in the present law. A survey made by the Colorado State Chamber of Commerce of the consensus of opinion reveals a widespread conviction throughout the State that the Office of Price Administration has not been loath to ignore, in many instances, the plain intent of Congress in passing the original act in 1942. These leaders feel that the new legislation, now in process of being drafted, should recognize and whenever possible, correct the evils of price control that are burdening production and distribution.

The survey shows that practically all groups are agreed on certain over-all changes they want to see made in the new law. Some of the recommendations are:

1. Provisions for judicial review by Federal district courts or United States Circuit Courts of Appeals of price rules and regulations rather than solely by the O. P. A.'s Emergency Court of Appeal.

2. Clarification of the law so that it will make it definite that the primary function of O. P. A. is to control prices and not profits.

3. More granted authority to local price and ration boards to make adjustments in price regulations to relieve local or regional hardships.

4. Clarification of the highest price line retail clothing limitation to provide more adequate protection for consumers and retailers.

5. Discontinuance of the various classifications of stores on the basis of the volume of business they do.

6. The use of historical margins as a factor in determining ceiling prices, and stipulations that ceiling prices may be adjusted to reflect increased operating costs.

Many Colorado organizations, individual businessmen and agricultural leaders have communicated their recommendations to the State's congressional delegation in Washington.

The Colorado Retailers Association has sent a brief to the Senators and Congressmen outlining 22 proposed amendments to the present law. The Denver Real Estate Exchange has asked the lawmakers to consider 8 changes affecting rent control. The Colorado State Chamber of Commerce, the Denver Chamber of Commerce, the South Denver Civic Association, and the Colorado Trade Executives Institute, among others, either have sent recommendations or are in the process of preparing them.

Agricultural leaders throughout the State are making their position known to the Colorado congressional delegation. The national heads of the Grange, Farm Bureau Federation, and the Joint Livestock Committee already have appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and offered testimony. Colorado members of these organizations are following the lead and are communicating local recommendations to the Colorado Senators and Congressmen.

And while all of this indicates changes are needed, it should not be misconstrued to show that price control is not necessary. The opposite is true unless the Nation is to surrender to the forces of inflation.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 5, 1944

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, we commemorate Poland's Constitution Day. It is a memorable date. It is celebrated throughout the entire civilized world by all freedom-loving people, particularly those of Polish extraction. We, being a democratic, freedom-loving people, appreciate the value of those principles which were so outstanding in their constitution of self-government enacted on May 3, 1791, in spite of the feverish state the Nation was in, coupled with the political disturbances that existed throughout Europe at the time.

In celebrating this anniversary, let us not forget the parts played by Gen. Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko during the American Revolution when we were struggling to become an independent nation. Yes, they came to us as representatives of Poland with love of freedom in their hearts, to help us unite our Colonies so that we may enjoy this great gift which God has given to all mankind and which, today, a few individual maniacs wish to destroy.

We owe a great deal to Poland who today does not ask charity but seeks only justice. They are a proud, intelligent, and courageous people. Their splendid achievements, in spite of the many years of frightful suffering and unbelievable atrocities, Poland today stands out as an honored country who is deserving of all aid we can give.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting for us now, in this most tragic hour of Poland's history, to rightfully appraise her contribution to freedom and liberty, by assuring her of her integrity as a nation of self-government with full protection of her sovereign rights and her boundary.

Philosophy of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of May 9, 1944:

PHILOSOPHY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Whether the seizure by force of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago by order of the President of the United States was merely an isolated instance in which the laws of the land were violated and our constitutional guaranties were ignored, whether it was merely an isolated instance of an overreaching by the President of the powers granted him in the war emergency is one thing to consider.

Whether the right of the President to seize public property under his own initiative; the right to use the armed forces of the United States for this purpose is the philosophy of the present administration is quite another.

The former concept may be passed over merely as a bonehead play. The latter concept constitutes the greatest possible danger to the rights and liberties of the American people, indicates the peril of a pure dictatorship, and is a long stride toward exactly what happened in Germany, Italy, and in other countries in which men have seized power and regimented the people and their activities.

That the latter concept seems the fact in the Montgomery Ward case is exemplified by the arguments of Attorney General Biddle in the hearings in the case in the Federal Court. For example, Mr. Biddle argued that "no business or property is immune to a Presidential order." That means the President may at his whim order the seizure of any business enterprise, even a popcorn stand, and that by the same token he may at his whim seize the home—that being "property"—of any individual.

Again quoting from Attorney General Biddle's arguments: "In time of war, particularly, the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive."

That means, of course, that the right of appeal to and the protection of the court is denied every person in the land; that the order of the President is not subject to adjudication by the courts.

And again Mr. Biddle argued that the President had the right to seize the Montgomery Ward or any other property "because the War Labor Disputes Act does not specifically forbid him to do so."

This argument is in direct line with the opinion given many months ago by a department attorney that the rules and orders laid down by any department or bureau have the full effect of law unless the Congress by affirmative action repeal that rule or order.

Mr. Biddle went still farther in his argument. Said he: "The Government does not need and did not need a court order to take possession." Thus, if this argument is good, the powers of the President are greater than those of the courts and his desires are immune to the consideration of the courts. He would therefore be the only person in the entire United States who is enabled to act on his own judgment in the seizure of the property of any one of the 130,000,000 people in this country and likewise the only person whose acts would not be subject to court review.

That, of course, is pure dictatorship, nothing less.

Many times in the last nearly 12 years, President Roosevelt has been charged with dictatorial aims and ambitions. Of course he and his friends always have denied it. But in the Montgomery Ward case he acted upon the advice of the Attorney General.

The Attorney General in turn has set forth in his argument in the court what must be accepted as his and, therefore, the President's philosophy of government. That philosophy is the most dangerous that ever has confronted the American people. If permitted to survive, it can mean only the loss of every liberty and of every protection which the people hold most dear.

It can mean nothing other than a dictatorship no less oppressive and final than that of Hitler, Mussolini, or any other person heading a totalitarian government.

Approval of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times, May 10, 1944, on approval of treaties:

APPROVAL OF TREATIES

The Democratic State Convention in North Carolina a few days ago adopted a platform, one plank of which called for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for ratification of treaties by majority vote of both branches of Congress instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone.

The case in favor of this change is overwhelming. It is illogical that a majority of the House and Senate can declare war but that two-thirds of the Senate is required to effect peace. The two-thirds requirement puts it into the power of a Senate minority to block a treaty approved by a majority of the country. The present constitutional arrangement, moreover, shuts the House off from participating in a decision which in various ways it is later called upon to implement. A recent Gallup survey showed that 54 percent of the voters asked were definitely in favor of approval of treaties by a simple majority of both House and Senate, while only 25 percent favored continuance of the present system.

Yet so far no move has come from within the Senate itself to permit the American people to vote on whether they wish a constitutional change or not. One of the latest arguments put forward in favor of a do-nothing policy is that it takes too long to

amend the Constitution. This argument is not an impressive one in view of the historic record. It took less than 10 months to repeal the eighteenth amendment after Congress submitted the repeal to conventions of the States, which meant, in effect, to a popular referendum. The armistice came in the First World War on November 11, 1918. It was not until 8 full months later that President Wilson was ready to submit a treaty to the Senate for approval. It was not until 8 months after that—and this long delay was at least in part brought about by the two-thirds requirement itself—that the Senate finally voted on, and rejected, the treaty and the League of Nations.

These precedents indicate that even if, on the most optimistic possible estimates, the German war were to end tomorrow, if there were only a single over-all peace treaty and if it could be negotiated within the same time period as in 1919, in spite of what will probably be much more chaotic conditions in Europe than then, it is far from too late to submit a constitutional amendment and have it adopted in good time to be effective for the approval of the first post-war treaties.

Educational Opportunities for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following telegram dated May 9, 1944, sent me by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, concerning the amendment of title II of the Rankin omnibus bill to conform to H. R 3846, the Barden bill:

BOSTON, MASS., *May 8, 1944.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Washington, D. C.:

While I am entirely in sympathy with the purposes of the Rankin omnibus bill and am in full accord with its general provisions, I hope title 2 providing educational opportunities for veterans be amended so as to make it mandatory to clearly preserve to the States and educational institutions approved by the States, control of the actual education of our veterans along lines provided in H. R. 3846, the so-called Barden bill. I ask this because I believe the most fundamental basis of our American way of life is local control of our educational facilities and our State has always been a leader in the cause of freedom of education.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of Massachusetts.

United States Seethes in Anger Over Ward Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, May 9, 1944:

UNITED STATES SEETHES IN ANGER OVER WARD SEIZURE—AVERY EVICTION PHOTO USED ON G. O. P. POSTER

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

The spectacle of two soldiers carrying Sewell Avery out of Government seized and militarily occupied Montgomery Ward's, of which he is president, touched off a conflagration of public opinion fraught with political portents of the first magnitude.

The cities and towns and hamlets and farms are afire with protest against Government seizure of private property unconnected with war production, and with apprehension of the advent of dictatorship, if one may judge from the volume of mail swamping Members of Congress.

OPENED WAY FOR PROBE

Senators and Representatives say they do not recall a parallel of the state of public mind evoked by the seizure of the mail-order house.

It was this upsurge of popular indignation that swept aside the initial obstruction offered by administration leaders and cleared the way for an investigation of the episode by each House of Congress.

The incident has served to focus the spreading feeling in Congress, and the country at large, that President Roosevelt is steadily building a totalitarian dictatorship partaking of a combination of fascism and communism that, if he is successful in his undertaking, will doom domecracy in this Nation.

The Montgomery Ward affair suddenly has become the incarnation of a political issue of great moment in the approaching Presidential election. It gives form and substance to the Republican indictment of the Roosevelt administration for overriding the Constitution and seeking to establish the domination of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government by the Executive.

HELPS G. O. P. CAMPAIGN

Hence the Republicans have welcomed the incident as providential aid to their cause, and have adopted the picture of the two soldiers carrying Avery out of his place of business as a 1944 campaign poster.

Democratic leaders are a prey to misgivings that the affair bodes the fourth term no good. The seizure of Ward's had no more than been ordered than the Democratic high command recognized it as an egregious political blunder.

Feverish efforts were made to retrieve the mistake. War Mobilizer Byrnes got Avery on the phone, and implored him to comply with the Labor Board's order, promising an immediate election to determine whether the union had a majority of the employees.

BACKED BY DIRECTORS

Byrnes also brought pressure to bear on Ward's directors, including George Whitney, of J. P. Morgan & Co., to dissuade Avery from forcing a show-down with the administration. The move failed completely, the directors solidly supporting Avery.

The letters legislators are receiving from constituents emphasize fears of dictatorship, dwelling on Attorney General Biddle's assertion that the President, under his inherent powers as Commander in Chief, is at liberty to seize any man's business or other property or take any other step he deems necessary to effective prosecution of the war.

Most of the letters, according to Senators and Representatives, also cite the contrast of the President's seizure of Ward's with Mr. Roosevelt's attitude in the case of John L. Lewis' refusal to comply with a War Labor Board order.

Instead of cracking down on Lewis, Mr. Roosevelt testily demanded at a press conference whether he was supposed to write Lewis a pink note begging him to comply.

In the Republican indictment of the Roosevelt regime the seizure of Ward's is not an isolated instance of temporary resort to war emergency powers but merely the latest in a long list of acts in defiance of the Constitution that have marked the decade of the New Deal in peace as well as in war.

The outstanding example before the war of the new governmental structure the President is endeavoring to erect was his undertaking, in 1937, to pack the Supreme Court, thereby making it permanently subservient to the Executive. He was signally defeated in that effort, being deserted by the majority of his own party in Congress.

APPROACH TO DICTATORSHIP

No sooner was he curbed in that attempt, however, than Mr. Roosevelt put forward far-reaching measures proposing to enlarge the executive branch of the Government and transfer to it vast powers residing solely in the legislative branch.

The tremendous centralization of government, approaching dictatorship, involved in this project caused even some of the habitual New Deal apologists to condemn it as smacking of a combination of Mussolini's Fascist state, Hitler's Nazi regime, and Stalin's communism. Congress turned thumbs down on this scheme.

According to the Republicans, Mr. Roosevelt, if returned to power for a fourth time, will continue to flout the Constitution just as he did before the war and is still doing during the war.

They cite Mr. Roosevelt's letter to a Congress committee hoping it would "not permit doubts as to its constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

They cite the 4,000 Executive orders issued by the President and the myriad of regulations thereunder which have made laws exceeding the limits of the Constitution and congressional enactment.

It is such executive legislation in the Fascist mode that caused Senator MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to say that "nothing could be more violative of the principle of government by consent of the governed than a system under which laws are made by appointive officials, interpreted by the same or other appointive officials and administered by the same or still other appointive officials.

Although Congress inserted in the 1941 War Powers Act a prohibition of the creation of new functions and agencies, Mr. Roosevelt set up more than a dozen new executive agencies by Executive order.

Congress wrote into the Price Stabilization Act a formula for fixing the prices of farm products. The President issued an Executive order under which a different formula was adopted.

REJECTED BY CONGRESS

Congress rejected the President's proposal to limit incomes to $25,000, advocated by the Communists and Mrs. Roosevelt, but under an Executive order the limitation was proclaimed. It took action by Congress to repeal the Executive order.

In the conduct of foreign relations the President has made a multitude of international agreements not only without the sanction of the Senate but without even submitting them to Congress. Under article VII of the lend-lease master agreement the President undertook to establish a vast international W. P. A. at American expense. It was repudiated by unanimous vote of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Roosevelt also attempted to establish the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by Executive agreement, but Senator VANDENBERG (Republican), of Michigan, intervened forcefully and compelled submission of the plan to Congress.

"Honored One Hundred" Fourth War Bond Sales Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today the Treasury Department is honoring with a special program and special honorary awards 100 leaders of War bond drives throughout the United States. These 100 honored guests are the winners from 16,500 theater managers throughout our Nation.

We on the domestic front sometimes forget that this war we are engaged in is a total war. Not only is this war being waged by our armed forces on the battle front, but it is also being waged on the home front by our army of producers and the many public-spirited citizens who are participating in our civilian war agencies. Among the most important of these people on the home front are those who lead in our bond-sales campaigns. I want to commend at this time the part our theaters have played in this important work. Through their screen and publicity outlets, these theaters have contributed immeasurably to the success of these bond drives.

Mr. Charles P. Skouras, of California, the president of Fox West Coast Theaters, was appointed chairman of the National Fourth War Loan drive. Under his able leadership the theaters of our country were mobilized for bond sales. Contests were arranged between the 16,500 theater managers. A goal was set of a bond sale for every theater seat in the combined theaters of America. This goal has been greatly exceeded, and today Mr. Morgenthau announced that through the combined efforts of these theater managers, over $360,000,000 in bond sales were made.

From these 16,500 theater managers the 100 leading salesmen were awarded trips to Washington, D. C., where they received various honorary awards and conferred with the Treasury Department as to means and methods, gained from their experience, which could be applied to the coming Fifth War Loan. Many of these theater managers learned valuable lessons in the selling of War bonds. These methods and lessons will be used during the coming campaign.

My own Nineteenth District of California produced the winner for the State of California. The winner's name is Mr. Allen Martin. Mr. Martin is now and has been an outstanding public citizen. He is one of the foremost leaders in my district. Mr. Martin promoted through his energetic work and unique efforts, sales to almost 6,000 citizens, totaling over $4,000,000. As this was the outstanding record in California, he was chosen to represent the State of California before the Treasury Department where he was presented with various honorary awards.

In achieving this distinction for himself, Mr. Martin has conferred an honor on his community, State, and Nation.

It is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of this honorable body the fine contribution Allen Martin has made to the war effort.

It is through such unselfish actions of our public-spirited and patriotic citizens, that the victory we see approaching, will be achieved.

The Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech of Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, which was delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the evening of May 9, 1944:

I have been invited to offer some observations on the recent seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago.

The basic issues have been rather fully presented for more than 2 weeks by the press, the columnists, and the commentators. Perhaps a discussion of other aspects of the seizure might be timely, now that one has the advantage of a certain perspective which comes with the lapse of time.

The seizure was quickly consummated.

It was a short war on the home front.

Many of the facts will obviously be forgotten, and the fervor which gripped the country will gradually subside.

But the incident is truly historic and will live long in the minds of the citizenry.

It will be remembered as the seizure of a retail store by men in uniform, acting under orders from the Commander in Chief.

It will be remembered as a strange military exploit which was captained by a civilian general, namely, The Attorney General.

It will be remembered because of that amazing press photograph of two soldiers, acting under orders, carrying the executive head of the store from the establishment.

It will be remembered as a show of military force against a retail store because of a controversy between employer and employees over a clause in the union contract.

For the history books, it will become the Ward case.

It is important and significant, and it's importance will not be soon diminished because it touches a vital issue.

PART OF A PATTERN OF ACTION

The Ward case is important because it is the most dramatic of a long series of incidents, actions, and policies on the part of Government which have stirred vague fears in the people and which have been deemed an invasion of their civil rights.

When all is said and done, the Attorney General crossed freedom's frontier on the home front.

He did it in a manner and tone which cannot be concealed by legal argument or a discussion of the aggregate powers of the Commander in Chief.

When a soldier or policeman appears at the door, people quickly understand. They need no fine-spun legalisms.

This show of military force in the seizure of a retail store quickly crystallized a fear which many people have long entertained over the growth and exercise of Federal power.

That fear was founded long ago and has been growing.

It began nearly a decade ago when a humble pants presser in New Jersey was jailed for charging 35 cents to press a pair of pants in violation of a "blue eagle" code.

It was enhanced by the controversy between the blue eagle and "sick chicken" in the celebrated Schechter case, which went to the Supreme Court and ended in a victory for the sick chicken.

It was enhanced with the arrest of the owner of a small plant manufacturing automobile batteries in Pennsylvania because he sold batteries at a price other than the code price established by the National Industrial Recovery Act.

That fear gained force when Congress enacted and then repealed the celebrated Potato Act, under which the humble potato could not be sold by the grower unless he used the type and size of a container prescribed by Federal rules and regulations and to which a potato stamp had to be affixed.

That fear was nursed by the attempted purges of those public servants, who, because they dare assert the rights of the individual and the rights of States, were marked for political extinction.

That fear was enhanced by a proposal to place a penalty of 49 cents per bushel on every bushel of wheat which a farmer might sell if the gentle rain, a beneficent sun and fertile soil provided a yield over and above the quota established by Federal decree.

That vague, yet realistic fear assailed the people when a proposal was submitted to Congress to enlarge the Supreme Court, for the very obvious purpose of securing the kind of court decisions which a very determined administration desired.

That fear of Federal power and growth was further emphasized by a court decision which approved the contention that janitors and charwomen in a Philadelphia office building were under the provisions of the Wage and Hour Act, even though no goods were manufactured in that building which entered into interstate commerce.

These and many other policies served to demonstrate the growing power of the Federal Government and the Ward case is a conspicuous design in that pattern.

It served to emphasize in a dramatic way which the people could easily perceive, the growing conflict between the sovereign government and its agents on one side, and the individual citizen on the other.

Thus it developed a moral issue which will roll and tumble down the years ahead like ripples from a stone cast in the water.

The Ward case is truly important. It presented the issue as no amount of words or argument could do.

IT STIRRED THE SPIRIT OF THE PEOPLE

The Ward case is important because it stirred a resurgence of spirit on the part of the people that is at once heartening and assuring.

It brought a sudden recapture of that vital and living faith which is the very essence of this country, and which caused people to swamp Congress with protests.

There was a deluge of mail upon House and Senate alike, and it is interesting to determine who these people are.

They are humble folks. They till the soil and labor with their hands. They operate stores and shops and small enterprises. They are cab drivers and barbers. They are housewives and mail order patrons. Many of them were competitors of Ward's. Yet they spoke with vigor.

They are America. Here was a thing they could sense and feel. It was not like wading through an involved court decision or the abstruse language of a government directive.

Here was action speaking and they knew it. It was force. It was seizure by force. It was dramatic, and dramatically did they sense its implications and respond.

It was the kind of action that challenged submissiveness to Federal decrees where right and freedom and democratic processes were concerned.

How natural then, that this incident should evoke that same outpouring of spirit which energized the country 7 years ago when the bill to pack the Supreme Court engaged the attention of the Nation. The same people were speaking again.

This resurgence of spirit in every corner of the land bespeaks a new alertness to the encroachments of government. It needed only to be touched off.

It is a testimony to the eternal truth that the people have an instinctive sense of that which is reasonable and that when Government does the unwise and unwarranted thing, the people rise up to protest.

This resurgent spirit establishes a new pattern of hope for those who had fear in their hearts about the future of freedom and the representative process in America.

The Ward incident is important in days to come. The people so swiftly sensed that it could happen here.

A CONFESSION OF CIVIL IMPOTENCE

The Ward incident is important for still another reason. It stands like a tragic confession of the impotence of civil authorities.

Somehow, that impotence would denote a lack of faith in the reasonable and established processes of our country to serve the ends of justice.

As one reads the record of what happened, he is at once confronted with the fact that the agent of the Federal Government who appeared to take the store over was supported by a marshal and deputy marshals.

A demand was made to surrender the store. That demand was refused. There was some pleasant, although strained, conversation.

But no effort was made by civil and judicial process to carry out the mandate of Government. The marshal and his aides made no effort to discharge their responsibility.

Were they afraid of their own case?

Could they contend that enough deputies could not be deputized to do the job if they had a right to do so?

Had the case for military seizure already been worked out so that a show of civil force was only a bit of mockery which preceded the main event?

How can one do other than conclude that here was a rather sad confession of the abandonment of civil procedure before it had been tried.

In the light of the Ward incident, it is a bit hollow to speak of freedom and constitutional processes when the very legal process which has been developed by law and usage as a safeguard of the citizen is so patently ignored or abondoned.

It adds real significance to the Ward case.

STRANGE EXAMPLE FOR OUR ALLIES

Permit me to assign a fourth reason why the Ward case is important.

As we glibly roll the "four freedoms" over the tongue and speak of the bright new world of the future, where all shall be free to enjoy the pursuit of those very ideals which made America great, one wonders what the folks in China and Latin America and elsewhere will think about this incident.

Manifestly they will hear about it. They will wonder, discuss, and interpret it in their own way.

Will they not wonder why a Government which speaks so eloquently of the democratic ideal and its application to all the world, would suddenly falter in the application of that ideal to a sector of the home front?

They can say, and perhaps they will say, that while we so generously send troops and tanks, ships and lease-lend supplies, bombers and bayonets, food and fiber to every corner of the world to curb and punish aggression and to create the atmosphere in which freedom can live, that curiously enough we parted company with that ideal at home.

And they will be puzzled.

It will be difficult indeed to persuade a person in some far corner of the earth of our devotion to the cause for which we fight when we forsake that cause on our own doorstep.

It is a moral breach in the cause that must be quickly remedied because it also involves that delicate quality of morale.

In this field the Ward incident has great significance.

THE BEGINNING OF THE END OF ARROGANCE

Finally, the Ward case becomes important because it marks the beginning of the end of a strange kind of bureaucratic arrogance of which people have grown weary.

We've become a land of directives and orders, of rules and regulations.

In time of war much of this is necessary in marshaling our resources for victory.

But government by rule and regulation became an established pattern long before the war began. War only carried it to a greater degree.

The people have shown fine sportsmanship about it. They have accepted many things with a gentle patience that is truly astonishing.

But basic rights are here involved. People grow weary of the invasion of those rights and a new alertness begins.

It is not unlike that alertness which caused the barons and commons of England to summon King John to a meadow in the Thames River 729 years ago. To be exact, it will be 729 years on the 15th of next month.

There at Runnymede, they laid before the capricious King a parchment on which they had recited their grievances and their demands for relief.

King John was an apostle of force. He was adept in seizing lands and property and denying justice.

But justice would be done and in a single day, that parchment was discussed and signed. History knows it as the Magna Carta or Great Charter. It became the foundation for the freedoms which we enjoy today.

In similar fashion, the people are aroused to the implications of the Ward case and from this incident there flows assurance that in the days which lie ahead, the excesses of bureaucracy will be curbed.

It is but proof that any trend toward the arbitrary exercise of power by those to whom power has been entrusted by the people can be changed by the wills of men and the courage of the people.

The Ward incident will prove to be one of the most useful and fruitful forces in the last decade.

A Prayer for D-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the May 9, 1944, issue of the Boston Daily Record, which contains a prayer composed by the Reverend Theodore P. Ferris, rector of Trinity Church, Boston, Mass.:

A PRAYER FOR D-DAY

Believing that it is impossible for our own country or our allies to win the war or write a just peace without God's help and guidance, we suggested last week that all churches open their doors for mass worship as soon as word comes that the invasion of the European Continent has begun.

The suggestion was widely and enthusiastically accepted by churches and clergymen of all creeds and denominations.

Thus when our fighting sons face the greatest peril of their lives, each will be supported and sustained by the prayers of millions of persons back home.

The Reverend Theodore P. Ferris, rector of Trinity Church, Boston, has composed this inspiring prayer, which we are sure thousands of readers will wish to clip and recite many times during the trying days ahead:

"Almighty God, who doest from Thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth, look down with pity, we beseech Thee, upon us as upon children who know not what they do.

"Forgive us for our failure to live as one family. Help each to see his own mistakes as well as the mistakes of his enemy. Give to each the courage to forget himself in the interest of a greater good for all.

"Whatever is right in this bitter conflict, prosper it, and whatever is wrong in this Thy wayward family, purge it.

"Reveal to us in this hour of darkness the splendor of Thy Son, that, setting aside our disputes and prejudices our feet may be guided into the way of His peace, through Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, our Lord. Amen."

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith copy of resolution adopted at the last meeting of the Franklin County Republican Committee, urging early enactment of legislation authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as a post-war project:

The Franklin County Republican Committee resolves as follows:

"Whereas the welfare of the people of the State of New York is directly concerned in the successful completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

"Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will remove the last major obstacles to deep-draft navigation throughout the Great Lakes system to the Atlantic Ocean and the ports of the world; and

"Whereas the same development will simultaneously make available 1,100,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity, under a self-liquidating State power project; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15-16, 1944, by unanimous vote adopted a resolution declaring that this State urgently requires the prompt development of the St. Lawrence to furnish low-cost power to millions of industrial,

rural, commercial, and domestic consumers: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we appeal for the immediate enactment of such legislation as may be necessary authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as a post-war project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our United States Senators and our Representative in Congress and to the Republican State committee."

More Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Uncle Dudley from a recent issue of the Boston Daily Globe concerning the recent removal of most meats from the rationing list:

MORE MEAT

A high test of any system is its flexibility. So the removal of most meats from rationing is not only good news to consumers, but also an indication that our wartime controls can work both ways even while the war itself approaches its climax. The action of the O. P. A. yesterday takes 85 percent of all meat out of the ration list. This accounts for 57 percent in volume of all foods needing red points.

This is the third time in the 13 months of meat rationing that restrictions have been relaxed to meet an increase in available supply. Ever since last summer, point requirements for most meats have tended steadily down. The number of points for butter was reduced by one-fourth last Sunday. Lard was taken off the ration list in March, cooking oils and shortening in April.

The reasons given for taking most meats off the ration list are that lend-lease buying has been halted, that Army and Navy demand is reduced that storage places are filled, and that it is hoped by thus freezing the market channels to bring more meat to market this summer.

These are very practical reasons. They suggest that the supply needs for the invasion have already been met. The let-up in lend-lease demands is certainly, in some part, due to the defeat of the submarine which had been a terrific consumer of American supplies for our allies. There is a limit also to the possibility of building up supplies for the future. Storage space becomes filled, even with our immense facilities. This points to a problem that will arise upon any sudden end of the war. To distribute our war-built surpluses, then, without serious disarrangement of markets will tax our system of controls with a severity that rationing itself has hardly laid upon them.

The sudden release of meats from rationing is a sufficient answer to our considerable crop of calamity howlers. A noted novelist, who is a gentleman farmer, too, made alarm headlines last fall with the prediction that we should be starving by February. Instead, nearly all meat is removed from all restrictions by May. This may well serve as a warning in a new form of the old stock-market adage not to sell America short.

For there is no question that America has learned to organize a war. It takes time for any system that is new just to learn its own task. And the converse of that is equally true. It takes time for a great free people to reconcile themselves to a necessary pattern of controls. Rationing has restricted the habits of every American. The system has not worked without its halts and bungles, and it has not been accepted without a wholly normal amount of grumbling and complaint that is an inevitable part of a free people's reaction to any interference with its habits of life. But Americans learn fast and accommodate themselves to necessary conditions.

Adjustment was not a simple problem. We individuals, watching our few points and family books, really had it easy. To the food industry, the job of collecting and accounting for points, and of planning so that our family tables were provided with at least something, has been a major headache. Meat rationing has worked only because our marketmen burned midnight oil to make it work. Their troubles are not now ended, though possibly they are lightened. But the occasion is a reminder of the service they have rendered, for which they merit more than a passing nod.

Americans have been, through their history, the most adaptable of all people. They want only to know that a thing is necessary and that in its operation it makes sense. By and large they have been convinced that price controls are necessary in war, and that rationing of shortage goods makes sense. They will expect controls to be removed whenever they are no longer needed. So they are bound to greet with satisfaction the evidence in yesterday's meat order that their fellow citizens who have been called into the public function of running these controls feel the same way about it.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Failure of Governor Tugwell—Puerto Rico Going on the Rocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present an article I have written about conditions in Puerto Rico under Governor Tugwell, in answer to a mistaken and vicious article concerning the colonial policy of the United States with Puerto Rico published in the current issue of the magazine Fortune:

BALLYHOO OF HIRED PROFESSIONAL WRITERS

I have read with disgust the article on Puerto Rico published in the current edition of the magazine Fortune. I would not like to question the sincerity of its author, but said article is one of common features on Puerto Rico written by hit-and-run tourists or by people who do not know much of what they are speaking about, because to glance upon the complex Puerto Rican picture they have been taken over by the hand of interested private individuals or public officers. In fact, during the last 3 or 4 years the government of Puerto Rico has spent thousands and thousands of dollars in hiring professional writers to boost and ballyhoo the present undesirable administration of Governor Tugwell.

UNFAIR TO CONGRESS, TO THE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION, AND THE PUERTO RICAN PEOPLE

The article is full of global errors and falsehoods. It hides or neglects important shades of our insular life and government. It is also very unfair to the Federal Administration, to Congress, and to the Puerto Rican people. The author of the article has taken as a granted truth certain mistaken data furnished to him, and he did not bother to hear unbiased persons who really know conditions in Puerto Rico, or at least he neither took pains to hear all sides of opinion.

The remarks made about the congressional committees that recently investigated conditions in Puerto Rico are very unfair. The Bell subcommittee of the House Insular Affairs Committee and the Chavez subcommittee of the Senate Territories and Insular Affairs Committee that went recently to Puerto Rico and investigated conditions there made pretty good surveys and reports. The Senators and Representatives of said subcommittees did not go to grind any ax. Their fellow-citizens of Puerto Rico cannot reelect or defeat any of them. They went to Puerto Rico with a sincere desire to find out the facts and to help my people. Their recommendations are enlightened and noble, and the Puerto Rican people at large are grateful to them.

About the policy of the Federal administration toward Puerto Rico, to which the article is so reticent, it is true that so far the United States has not been committed frankly about the final political status of the island. But the United States has granted American citizenship to all Puerto Ricans, and during the American regime Puerto Rico has taken great strides in public education, health, roads and highways, and labor and social conditions. Industry, agriculture, and commerce have gone to high brackets. Production and income have increased more than twentyfold. Puerto Rico has progressed enormously under the American flag. Now the present Federal administration has recommended a greater degree of self-government. The measure pending in Congress, if approved, will practically make of Puerto Rico a self-governing dominion similar to the British dominions. Then the island would be on the clear way to final independence or statehood. The overwhelming majority of the Puerto Ricans aim that some day Puerto Rico will enter in the family of States.

The only blot in the relations of the United States with Puerto Rico is the present Governor, Dr. Rex Guy Tugwell.

Governor Tugwell is imposed on Puerto Rico without the consent of the Puerto Rican people. Governor Tugwell is opposed by political groups that polled in last election more than two-thirds of the people's vote. Governor Tugwell is opposed by the insular house of representatives, which adopted a resolution requesting his removal. Governor Tugwell is opposed by leading insular organizations of industry, agriculture, trade, and labor.

The article distorts the facts about the present situation of Puerto Rico, and it tries to hit the administration and Congress below the belt. But the article flatters and praises Dr. Tugwell. The author of the article might know why.

POLITICAL SITUATION

Speaking about the political situation, the article echoes that a Popular Party, run and bossed by a local fellow traveler to whom Tugwell is a marionette, swept in last elections in Puerto Rico. The author of the article did not bother himself in finding out the truth. The Popular Party was simply a

surprise party. It bribed voters with promises to give each voter a house or a farm with oxen, farming implements, seeds, milk cows, etc. It took advantage of incidental splits in all opposite groups. But the official statistics of last election show that the Popular Party polled only 30 percent of the registered voters. The coalition, split at the election and opposed by two defeatists groups that voted against the coalition candidates, nevertheless polled a majority over the Popular Party. Out of 571,000 votes polled at the general election, 355,000 voters did cast their votes against the Popular Party. Out of 76 counties or municipalities, the Popular Party lost 49. The Popular Party lost the house of representatives. The only candidate voted at large by all the voters of the island, the Resident Commissioner to the United States, was elected by the coalition. My physical presence in Congress is the best evidence that the coalition won the election, casting the majority of the votes.

THE GOVERNOR IS ALL-POWERFUL

The article further states that the Governor does not rule Puerto Rico. A high-school kid who had glanced upon the present Organic Act of Puerto Rico, knows that the Governor really reigns and rules and is all-powerful. In addition to the usual executive powers and prerogatives, the Governor of Puerto Rico has the appointive power over the insular judiciary, with the exception of the justices of the Supreme Court, who are appointed by the President, usually on recommendation by the Governor. All other insular judges, district judges, municipal judges all over the island, and even all justices of the peace and police judges are appointed by the Governor. The Governor appoints all members of his cabinet, with the exception of the attorney general and the commissioner of education, who are appointed by the President, usually on recommendation by the Governor. The Governor is the head of the insular police. The Governor appoints all police chiefs throughout the whole island, of all cities, towns, and rural districts. The Governor appoints the chairman of the insular election board, who supervises and controls the elections. The Governor himself has the casting vote in any tie in the insular board of elections. The Governor appoints the chairmen, who usually sway the casting vote, of all the local election boards.

The Governor has veto power over the acts of the insular legislature. This veto is practically absolute, because the legislature has no power to override his veto. The Governor is all-powerful on appropriations and disbursements of public funds. He can reduce or strike out any appropriation item approved by the legislature, notwithstanding that he approves the total bill. He has power to overrule at his pleasure the decisions of the insular comptroller general or auditor. All these tremendous powers are now entrusted to Rex Guy Tugwell.

THE LAND QUESTION

About the much praised land program, the author of the article is ignorant of the real facts. It is not true that the congressional limitation on landholdings was enforced by the Popular Party. It is a matter of contemporary history that it was the coalition that enforced said limitation on landholdings. A couple of years after the coalition assumed power, in 1935, for the first time legislative action was taken to enforce the 500-acre congressional limitation of such landholdings. The coalition approved laws to (1) providing civil proceedings to rush the enforcement of the 500-acre congressional limitation to landholdings, (2) to punish violations of said 500-acre limitation, (3) to appoint special prosecutors, (4) appropriating the necessary funds to carry on the judicial proceedings to break up the estates over 500 acres. All this was done by the coalition years before that man Tugwell came into the Puerto Rican picture.

The land law approved by the Popular Party is a different proposition. It has been instrumental in spending many millions in buying land, but the purchase dealings have been cloudy. Only some poor peasants have been able to get land, and only in petty parcels of one-fourth of an acre, most of the time barren and useless land. Not the farm, with seeds, farm implements, oxen, milk cows, etc., offered to the peasants as bribery for their votes. And the land law, in fact, violates the congressional limitation over 500-acre landholdings, because under the insular law the government gives tracts of more than 500 acres and even of thousands of acres to party stooges or privileged persons.

Tugwell is responsible for this insular land law. The law can expropriate high handedly any private property through an "authority" not elected nor responsible to the Puerto Rican people. Tugwell was not yet the Governor when the measure was approved, but he already was in Puerto Rico as a special investigator on the land question. It is of public knowledge in Puerto Rico that Tugwell drafted the measure, and he advised its approval.

TUGWELL'S HOLIDAY AND HORROR IN PUERTO RICAN PICTURE

Tugwell has enjoyed a spendthrift holiday with millions and millions of the people's money paid by Puerto Rican taxpayers, and also with millions and millions in unprecedented figures paid by continental American taxpayers, covered into the Puerto Rican treasury during the present boom years of rum taxes.

Governor Tugwell has squandered more than two hundred and fifty millions of public funds during his tenure of office in Puerto Rico. He has toyed with pet experiments and crackpot dreams. He has overburdened the insular government pay roll with 20,000 bureaucrats in useless new bureaus, boards, commissions, and authorities created by him. But there are now over 300,000 school children lacking public schools and teachers, more poor children out of school than when Tugwell came to Puerto Rico. There are about 1,000,000 Puerto Ricans suffering anemia, cancer, malaria, syphilis, and tuberculosis, more disease than when Tugwell came. There are now more slums than when Tugwell came over. When Tugwell took over there were only 66,000 unemployed; now there are more than 225,000 unemployed. Industry, agriculture, and trade have been destroyed or damaged. An exodus of capital and investments from Puerto Rico is taking place. Free enterprise is a devil to Tugwell and his government accomplices. The island is going on the rocks, and hunger and misery prevail now in Puerto Rico more than ever before.

War Profits and Legislative Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy," from the University of Chicago Law Review for April 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY

(By DAVID I. WALSH, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

Just as inveighing against sin is spasmodically a popular pastime, so too is inveighing against war-profiteering. With the latter, considerable success has been experienced in the last 2 years, and it seems doubtful that, as a result of this success, post-war investigations will reveal anything like the scandals which shocked the public during the two decades following World War No. 1.

From its earliest days this country has been confronted with attempts on the part of merchants and vendors "to avail themselves of the difficulties of the times, and to amass fortunes on the public ruin."[1] A condition which our people have faced in every one of their wars—and which other people have faced in their own wars—is perhaps best described by the Father of his County in a letter dated March 31, 1779. It is worth quoting in extenso:

"Our conflict is not likely to cease so soon as every good man would wish. The measure of iniquity is not yet filled. * * *

"Speculation, peculation, production, engrossing, forestalling * * * affording too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue * * * and too glaring instances of its being the interest and desire of too many who wish to be thought friends, to continue the war. * * *

"Cannot this common country America possess virtue enough to disappoint them? Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn?

"Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?

"Forbid it, heaven! Forbid it, all and every State in the Union! By enacting and enforcing efficacious laws for checking the growth of these monstrous evils, and restoring matters, in some degree to the pristine state they were in at the commencement of the war.

"Our cause is noble, it is the cause of mankind. And the danger to it is to be apprehended from ourselves."

The hopelessness of General Washington's position, his impotence to cure or even deal with "speculation, peculation, production, engrossing, forestalling," is akin to the difficulties which he had in maintaining his armed forces, whose personnel was wont to take off for home on the slightest whim.

This letter is worth quoting because it indicates the extent to which our groping for a solution to the problem of curbing war profiteering has advanced. In each of our wars adventurers have sought "to amass fortunes upon the public ruin." But in the present war such attempts are being dealt with effectively.

The problem is threefold—material, fiscal, and moral—with political overtones. Adequate appreciation of this triple nature of the problem is essential to an understanding of the history of attempts to meet it. For if attention is paid to the tone of only one or only two tines of the tuning fork, the results may be highly discordant.

---

[1] George Washington, in a letter to the President of Congress dated August 16, 1777.

PRICE OF ARMOR PLATE IN SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The most important of the threefold aspects of the problem is the material. For to an increasing extent wars have become matters of matériel. The point is illustrated by attempts by the Congress to control the price of just one item of matériel—armor plate—prior to and during the Spanish-American War. During the early nineties the Navy had paid from $574 to as high as $671 for armor plate.[2] In the belief that such prices were unreasonable, the Congress took action, and on March 3, 1897, a statute limiting the price of armor plate to $300 a ton was approved. Fiscal and moral considerations may have motivated such action, but that material considerations were not amply weighed is indicated by the ineffectiveness of this legislation. Manufacturers simply refused to accept contracts at the lower price. To avoid its having dire results in the prosecution of the war, the Congress had to raise the ceiling to $400. Notwithstanding this experience, the Congress subsequently tempted fate by reducing the ceiling once more to $300, with the result that manufacturers again refused to bid.[3] Finally despairing, the Congress gave the Secretary of the Navy authority [4] to procure armor "at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable." Thus, the Congress finally succumbed to the material aspect of the problem—the most important of the three.

Price and profit control must be so finely governed that the material requirements of a war will be satisfied. This means that, under the capitalistic system to which we are committed, there must be incentive to produce and to produce quickly in large volume. In peacetime, competition provides this incentive, and as soon as competition kills it, production ceases. The fittest survive. But in wartime the production of the least fit may be just as essential as the production of the fittest, so that prices and profits must be such that both have an incentive to survive. If the material aspects of the problem are not given sufficient weight, the question of the moral and fiscal aspects may become academic through the loss of the war which is being fought.

PRICE AND PROFIT CONTROLS IN WORLD WAR NO. 1

Attempts to control prices and profits of war contracts in World War No. 1 proved futile. Indeed, as in the case of the Spanish-American War, they boomeranged—but for a different reason. The material aspect of the problem was overemphasized by the adoption of cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts. These were designed to underwrite the contractor, inducing him to turn to war production because by such underwriting he escaped risk, and at the same time inducing him to produce rapidly in large volume. But by the very nature of these contracts, he was actually induced to increase his costs, for the ratio between profits and costs remained constant and the higher the dollar costs the higher the dollar profits. Thus, a fiscal fallacy entered into the adoption of this kind of a contractual arrangement. It should have been evident at the outset, but in this as in so many aspects of pricing, hindsight is superior to foresight.

Another fiscal error was made when attempts to limit war profits were supplemented by relatively high express profits taxes.[5]

As Bernard Baruch has stated,[6] high excess-profits taxes standing alone aggravate war evils.

However lofty may have been the motives of the country, the Congress, and the procurement agencies during World War No. 1, however much they may have had their eyes on the material and moral prongs of the tuning fork, they failed to tune in with the third—the fiscal. While, unlike the experience of the Spanish-American War, legislation did not in itself hamper satisfaction of the material considerations or discourage production, while attempts to limit profits satisfied lofty moral concepts, these attempts were abortive because insufficient attention was given to the fiscal aspect of the problem. Not only did cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts fail to curb war profiteering; they aggravated it. Not only did high excess-profits taxes fail to prevent war profiteering; they made for inflation.

Of the 168 bills and resolutions introduced into the Congress between the 1918 armistice and the fall of France for the purpose of coping with the problem of war profiteering, few were adopted and none recognized the threefold nature of the problem. Of those that were adopted, all were failures because they considered only the moral aspect of the problem. The only important piece of legislation of this nature was incorporated in the Vinson-Trammell Act, passed in 1934 [8] and subsequently amended three times—in 1936,[9] 1939,[10] and 1940.[11] By limiting profits on naval vessels (subsequently extended to apply to military and naval aircraft) to a percentage of the contract price, the Vinson-Trammell Act prescribed what, in effect, was not very alien to the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts of World War No. 1. The main difference was that the contract price rather than the cost was the base. While superficially this difference might appear to be great, in actual practice, it could be almost meaningless. Thus, because it did not give sufficient cognizance to the material and fiscal aspects of price control and profit limitation on war contracts, the Vinson-Trammell Act was ineffectual. More than that, in some instances the act discouraged shipbuilders and aircraft manufacturers from entering into contracts, and thus delayed the defense program.[12]

POLITICAL OVERTONES

During the twenties, the question of regulation of prices of war contracts and limitation of profits thereon became increasingly important from the political standpoint.

One of the most potent forces was the American Legion, whose political influence was growing rapidly. In 1920 it launched a campaign for what it termed "Universal service." [13]

In 1924 the two major political parties each included a plank calling for the close control of the munitions industry in time of war.

The Republican plank [14] read as follows:

"We believe that in time of war the Nation should draft for its defenses not only its citizens but also every resource which may contribute to success. The country demands that should the United States ever again be called upon to defend itself by arms, the President be empowered to draft such material resources and such services as may be required, and to stabilize prices of services and essential commodities, whether utilized in actual warfare or private activity."

The Democratic plank [15] read as follows:

"In the event of war in which the manpower of the Nation is drafted, all other resources should likewise be drafted. This will tend to discourage war by depriving it of its profits."

Apparently both major political parties felt that with the adoption of these two planks in 1924 the matter had been disposed of, for future party platforms ignored the subject. In view of the extensive newspaper publicity and general public preoccupation with the question of control of war profits that developed as the years went on, it seems strange that neither political party made an issue of the matter. Nor is it reasonable to explain this omission of the question from the party platforms by the fact that it was receiving so much attention in the Congress. The omission may be set down simply as a political phenomenon.

During the thirties, with World War No. 2 drawing nearer, agitation for a complete ban on war profits grew apace. Thus, a majority of the Senate Munitions Committee on June 18, 1936, recommended the nationalization of naval shipbuilding and manufacture of certain arms used by the Army and Navy.[16] The minority report of the committee expressed the belief that rigid and conclusive munitions control would be more effective than nationalization in promoting peace, defense, and economy. The majority recommendation was based on the conclusion, drawn from 2 year of investigation, that regulation of arms manufacture is easily evaded.[17]

On June 22, 1936, the Women's Committee on Suggestions for the Democratic platform recommended by unanimous adoption that the best way to preserve peace was by passing stronger neutrality legislation and taxing the profit out of war.[18]

Three months earlier, in one of the first polls conducted by Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, the people of the country had gone on record as strongly favoring manufacture by the Government of its own war materials. In the Nation-wide poll the vote favoring this change was 82 to 18 out of every 100, with about the same proportion of members of both political parties favoring the change.[19]

It was this agitation that, in part, led to the strenghening of the Vinson-Trammell Act of June 27, 1936.[20]

The political crescendo reached in regard to war profits control occurred in 1939 and 1940 and 25 bills were introduced in the Congress to deal with the subject more effectively than it had been dealt with theretofore. With war brewing and finally developing in Europe and with production of munitions mounting rapidly in this country, it was

---

[2] Hensel and McClung, Profit Limitation Controls Prior to the Present War, 10 Law and Contemporary Problems 187 at 191 (1943).

[3] Long, 1 The New American Navy 46 et seq. (1903).

[4] Act of June 7, 1900, 31 Stat. 684, 707; H. R. Doc. No 95, 55th Cong., 2d sess.; 31 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 934 (1898), 32 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2190–2191 (1899); report of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, attached to report of the Secretary of Navy (1905), 45–47.

[5] Revenue Act of Sept. 8, 1916, 39 Stat. 756, 780; Revenue Act of Mar. 3, 1917, 39 Stat. 1000; and Revenue Act of 1918, 40 Stat. 1057.

[6] American Industry and the War 415 (1921).

[8] 48 Stat. 505 (1934), 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 496.

[9] 49 Stat. 1926 (1936), 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 1155.

[10] 53 Stat. 555 (1939), par. 14, 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 496.

[11] 54 Stat. 676 (1940), 41 U. S. C. 1940 ed., note prec. par. 1.

[12] See debate on 1940 Excess Profits Tax, 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11,243, August 29, 1940.

[13] This was a 3-way program designed to: "(1) Promote peace, (2) take the profits out of war, and (3) strengthen the national defense." Note that the American Legion's second point was to "take the profits out of war"—not some of the profits, but by implication, all of the profits.

[14] See Republican Campaign Text Book of 1924 at 85.

[15] See Democratic Campaign Text Book of 1924 at 39.

[16] Baltimore Sun, June 20, 1936, Associated Press dispatch from Washington.

[17] Supra note 16.

[18] Philadelphia Record, June 23, 1936.

[19] The National Weekly Poll of Public Opinion, March 7, 1936.

[20] 49 State. 1936, 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 296.

only natural that insistence upon adoption of some form of control should increase. None of these numerous bills, however, was adopted, for the Congress was tending more and more to the belief that the problem could be dealt with by a high excess-profits tax.

Still clearly uncertain as to how to cope with the problem, the Congress side-stepped the issue in the Revenue Act of 1940. Finally, however, on July 1, 1940, shortly after approval of the Revenue Act of 1940, the President addressed a strong message to the Congress directing its attention to the National Defense Program and to the duty of the Congress to see that the burden of the program was equitably distributed according to ability to pay, and recommending the enactment of a steeply graduated excess-profits tax, to be applied to all individuals and all corporate organizations without discrimination.[21]

As a result, both Houses finally adopted a highly complicated measure involving a combination of the theories of average earnings and invested capital which represented a not very happy compromise.[22] The provisions for excess-profits taxes were subsequently amended in 1941 [23] and again in 1942.[24]

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT

An uneasy feeling that the high excess-profits taxes did not wholly accomplish the purpose of controlling prices and profits on war production continued to prevail in the Congress. During discussion of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of April 1942, Congressman FRANCIS CASE, Republican from South Dakota, introduced into the House a measure to limit the profits on war contracts to 6 percent.[25] While it was not specifically stated, it is to be presumed that this 6 percent was on a basis of before taxes, following the precedent established by the Vinson-Trammell Act. The measure passed the House by a vote of 70 to 8.[26]

As it went to the Senate, however, the procurement agencies along with the War Production Board pointed out that this arrangement would place a profit strait jacket on business and provide for the realization of excessive profits by companies which in the best of peacetimes were accustomed to making no more than 2 percent on sales, while at the same time it might force heavy industry companies into bankruptcy by not allowing them sufficient return. In other words, while the aim of the Case amendment was laudable, again the question of practicality was overlooked.

Meanwhile, recognizing that unprecedented volume of production was leading to excessive profits already indicated by 1941 corporate reports, the War Department had conducted a number of price renegotiations with prominent war contractors. Therefore, when asked by the Congress to suggest an alternative to the Case amendment, Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Chief of the Army Service Forces, presented a substitute on behalf of the procurement agencies. It was based on the theory that if every contract price could be reexamined by the parties in the light of actual experience under the contract, it should be possible to eliminate the bulk of excessive profits.[27]

Appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, gave the following reasons for opposing a set profit limitation:

"1. Effect of costs: In our view, the control of profits is an integral part of the problem of controlling costs and prices, and any method must be evaluated by its effects on all three aspects. From this point of view we feel that renegotiation is far superior to a fixed percentage limitation.

"2. Uniformity: In the second place, a flat percentage limitation does not really achieve its prime objective of uniformity of treatment. Although it allows a fixed uniform percent of profit on gross sales, this will be most unfair as applied to the diverse types of business engaged in war work. It takes no account of the fact that in different lines of business the same volume of sales may require widely different amounts of capital, skill, and work, depending on the rate of turn-over." [28]

This can be regarded as a perfect summation of the practical aspects of control of prices on and profits from war contractors.

As for political aspects, the startling revelations as to extraordinary salaries and bonuses paid by Jack & Heintz, Inc., as brought out in hearings before the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee,[29] crystallized in the public mind the extent to which war profiteering might lead. Public reaction, as reflected in newspaper comment and letters to the Congress, was immediate and intense. Under the leadership of Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democrat of Tennessee, the Senate Appropriations Committee adopted the principle of contract renegotiation in the form of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act.[30] Thus, politically, this final approach to control of war profiteering had its active sponsorship from a Republican in the House and a Democrat in the Senate. The 1924 party platforms had been fulfilled.

ANTIRENEGOTIATION CAMPAIGN

But the matter had not been fully resolved with enactment of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act and its section 403. Perhaps because there had been no debate in the Senate or the House on this section, some contractors subject to it took the position that it had been ill-considered and that it was designed to ruin American business.

In August of 1942 the campaign to repeal or emasculate renegotiation was launched by John B. Hawley, president and sole owner of the Northern Pump Co., of Minnesota, when he circularized the Congress and businessmen with a silver-covered 42-page brochure captioned "Dictatorship over United States industry under Public Law 528" and subcaptioned "Sabotage of production, development, and expansion—Towards losing the war." This was only one of a series of mailings sent out by one of the relatively few aggressive opponents of renegotiation—an excellent producer, it must be said, as are most of the other vocal business opponents. At about the same time a financial magazine carried an article by a prominent writer condemning renegotiation and basing his argument almost wholly on a theoretical case coinciding interestingly with Northern Pump.[31] This article, displaying a wide misconception of what renegotiation is all about, was subsequently reprinted in condensed form in Reader's Digest. The battle was on.

The departments engaged in renegotiation agreed with some of the more reasoned objections to the law which were voiced by businessmen of a less sensational stripe than Hawley, Jack, et al. Indeed, as the administrators began to work with the act, it became apparent that it did contain a number of minor flaws relating chiefly to mechanics. This was inevitable, since adoption and application of the principle of renegotiation represented pioneering. Certain recommendations for changes in renegotiation were adopted administratively by the departments and subsequently incorporated as amendments to section 403 in the Revenue Act of 1942,[32] jurisdiction for renegotiation having been transferred from the Appropriations Committee to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, where it has continued to remain.

A summary of some of the other changes effected through the Revenue Act of 1942 will indicate the manner in which the practical aspects of profit control were now commanding an increasing degree of attention—the moral, fiscal, and political aspects having been satisfied by the adoption of the principle embodied in section 403.

One amendment provided for final agreements. When a contractor or subcontractor renegotiated in good faith for a specified period and agreed to eliminate excessive profits for that period, it was clear that he should be entitled to assurance that the matter would not be reopened at a later date. The original statute did not provide expressly for any final clearance for liability for excessive profits. This amendment specifically authorized such final agreements for a specified past or future period.

Another change was embodied in two provisions affecting a statute of limitations on renegotiation. The first of these prohibited renegotiation after 1 year from the close of the fiscal year in which the contract or subcontract was completed or terminated. The second authorized a contractor to file financial and cost statements for prior fiscal periods and obtain clearance under the statute, unless the Secretary should begin renegotiation within 1 year thereafter. Few contractors availed themselves of this privilege.

Under the original law, when a contractor or subcontractor held a number of war contracts or subcontracts, the boards had found it desirable to renegotiate with him to eliminate excessive profits on these contracts or subcontracts as a group, or on an over-all basis, instead of individually. Section 403 authorized renegotiation of contracts individually. In view of the boards' practice of considering contracts as a group, the group renegotiation was formalized as part of the statute.

By one of the amendments, too, the Treasury Department was brought into the field of renegotiation, while other changes were largely of a technical and relatively minor nature.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Politically, the next important step affecting renegotiation was an investigation by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program (Truman committee) begun in the early part of 1943 under the

[21] H. Rept. No. 2697, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (June 31, 1940), a conference report on H. R. 10039. The bill was enacted into the Internal Revenue Code, 54 Stat. 516, 26 U. S. C., 1940 ed., pars. 12 et seq.

[22] H. Rept. No. 3002, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (Sept. 30, 1940), a conference report on H. R. 10413, which was enacted into the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1940 (Oct. 8, 1940), 54 Stat. 974, 975 ff., 26 U. S. C., 1940 ed., pars. 710 ff.

[23] 55 Stat. 17 (1941), incorporated into Internal Revenue Code, 26 U. S. C., par. 710 (Supp. 1941).

[24] 56 Stat. 798, act of Oct. 21, 1942, Public Law 753, 77th Cong., 2d sess.

[25] 88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 28, 1942, p. 3139.

[26] Ibid. at 3140.

[27] Brig. Gen. Albert J. Browning, Price Control and Renegotiation, 29 Cornell L. Q. 149 at 165 (1943).

[28] See testimony of Under Secretary of War Patterson at hearings before Senate Finance Subcommittee on sec. 403 of Public Law No. 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess (1942) 3.

[29] Hearings before House Naval Affairs Committee on H. Res. No. 162 (vol. I; March 23, 1942) 77th Cong., 2d sess.

[30] Public Law No. 528, sec. 403, 56 Stat. 245, 50 U. S. C., par. 1191 (Supp. 1942).

[31] John T. Flynn in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly for Aug. 31, 1942, Cost Plus, a World War Evil Returns.

[32] Act of Oct. 21, 1942, Public Law No. 753, 56 Stat. 798.

direction of Senator CARL M. HATCH, chairman of a special subcommittee on renegotiation. A report [33] issued by this subcommittee under date of March 30, 1943, in general, endorsed the principle of renegotiation in no uncertain terms, praised its administration, and made a number of recommendations designed to lead to further improvement in both the act and the administration.

Led by a small minority of businessmen, the attack on the principle of renegotiation became increasingly vocal as the year 1943 progressed. Thus it was that several score of industrialists thoroughly opposed to renegotiation appeared before the Naval Affairs investigation committee during its hearings on the subject in June 1943.[34] Also before this committee, on the other hand, appeared a number of contractors who favored the principle and the administration of the renegotiation statute. The transcript of these hearings is embodied in a 1,300-page document, which was supplemented on October 7, 1943, by a report of the committee itself.[35] The majority of this committee followed in the steps of the Truman committee by strongly endorsing both the principle and the administration of the statute. The minority endorsed the principle, praised the Government representatives in the price adjustment boards, but averred that renegotiation had served its purpose and should be repealed as to contracts made after December 31, 1943.

With attacks by certain business groups rising to a higher pitch, the House Ways and Means Committee—as part of its job in preparing the revenue bill of 1943—began hearings on renegotiation in September 1943, which continued off and on during the month. This testimony ran 1,100 pages.[36] The committee's report [37] outlined provisions for a new renegotiation act based on section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act. To the amazement of business interests, the renegotiation provisions prescribed by the House Ways and Means Committee continued renegotiation in the main as it had been conducted for nearly a year and a half. Major changes—including provision for court review of unilateral determinations and exemption of contractors having renegotiable business less than $500,000 a year—had been either recommended or endorsed by the administrative departments.

When the Senate Finance Committee had completed its hearings on renegotiation early in December of 1943, however, it soon became apparent that the majority of the committee was determined to make such changes in the House bill as would leave only an empty shell. The form would be preserved but the substance destroyed. All over the country newspapers reflected the public reaction to this attempted emasculation. Such a champion of private enterprise as David Lawrence at one extreme and such a "leftist" as PM at the other extreme sprang to the defense of renegotiation. Said the former:

"Undoubtedly there have been some injustices, and these ought to be revised by The Tax Court, or even some special court. But when a man like James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, whose peacetime job is investment banking in Wall Street, cries out against the efforts to emasculate the renegotiation law, other businessmen will want to ask themselves whether their tactics may not lead to a reaction and another wave of radicalism and antibusiness legislation when the servicemen come back home and get all the facts about wartime profits." [38]

Another advocate of private enterprise, Mr. Arthur Krock, in commenting on the attempt to amend renegotiation out of existence, said:

"If the Renegotiation Act is amended to the extent favored by the congressional committees, war corporate profits will reach levels that, when spotlighted after the war, as they are sure to be, may infuriate the country, produce a reckless and destructive backswing against industry and start all over again the cycle of pacifism and 'merchants-of-death' propaganda that helped so profoundly to send this Nation unprepared into desperate war." [39]

The preservation of private enterprise is certainly one of my chief concerns. Any legislation that would destroy or hurt it would be inimical to such a concern. Believing that renegotiation was not only in the general public interest but was of specific benefit to industry itself and convinced that any emasculation of renegotiation would be a serious blow to both the country as a whole and industry as an important segment, I presented on behalf of myself and Senators La Follette, Connally, and Lucas a document called Minority Views. [40] The response to publication of these views, which attacked certain of the provisions of the Senate bill that seemed to me to emasculate renegotiation, was instantaneous and dramatic. Newspaper editorial writers and commentators throughout the country, presumably reflecting a good cross section of public sentiment, made it clear that the public would not stand for renegotiation emasculation. It became crystal clear that the country would not tolerate a return to World War No. 1 profiteering and that it regarded renegotiation as the only sound preventive measure so far developed.

As a consequence, the Senate and House conferees, composing their differences, presented to the Congress what the Washington Post described as "a testimonial to the legislative process of study, discussion and compromise. It is," continued the Post, "a sound, workable law, acceptable to the executive agencies which must administer it and responsive to the rights of the contractors who must submit to it." [41]

In short, after long trial and error, the fundamental trio of considerations—material, fiscal, and moral—had been satisfied by successful legislative processes for the reasonable control of wartime profiteering.

No doubt, as time goes on, new flaws will appear in both the legislation and the administration. But as it now stands, the Renegotiation Act itself is the best solution of a difficult problem which human ingenuity and experience have been able to contrive.

[33] Additional report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program pursuant to S. Res. 71 (77th Cong.) a resolution authorizing and directing an investigation of the national defense program, renegotiation of war contracts, Mar. 30 (legislative day, Mar. 23), 1943.

[34] Investigation of the Progress of the War Effort; hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 1st sess. (Renegotiation of War Contracts, vol. 2, June 10 through June 30, 1943).

[35] Investigation of the Progress of the War Effort, report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Renegotiation of War Contracts, Oct. 7, 1943.

[36] Renegotiation of War Contracts, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 1st sess. on H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015, revised, Sept. 9 through 23, 1943.

[37] The revenue bill of 1943, Nov. 18, 1943, 78th Cong., 1st sess. House of Representatives Rept. No. 871.

[38] Washington Star, Dec. 14, 1943.

[39] How Business Can Make Itself the Postwar Goat, Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1943.

[40] The revenue bill of 1943, Minority Views, Jan. 6, 1944, 78th Cong., 1st sess. S. Rept. 627, pt. 2.

[41] Washington Post, Feb. 15, 1944, editorial page.

Treaty Ratification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it becomes increasingly more important each day that the Congress give consideration to a resolution submitting to the States a constitutional amendment that would provide for treaty ratification by a simple majority of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] made a very logical argument in favor of such action over a National Broadcasting Co. network a few days ago. Mr. Gossett and I have both appeared before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in support of resolutions proposing such an amendment which we have introduced.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include here the radio address delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

It follows:

I want to thank the National Broadcasting Co. for giving me this time to discuss a matter which many serious thinking Americans believe to be vital to the future peace and security of this country.

With reference to treaties, the Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall have power "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." This phrase "provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur" is the stump on which most of our important treaties have been wrecked. The great men who wrote the Constitution disagreed on this provision. The eminent jurist, James Wilson, wise old Benjamin Franklin, and other able members of the convention opposed this two-thirds requirement for treaty ratification. To permit a minority of one-third plus one of the Senate to defeat treaties was even then not in keeping with democratic ideals. This provision has been properly called the great mistake of the Constitution.

The two-thirds rule was written into the Constitution as a compromise between the large-State group and the small-State group. Of the 13 States then in the Union, 7 of them had only a fractional part of the entire population and considered this provision a matter of defense against large-State domination. Within 25 years after the adoption of the Constitution this reason for the rule ceased to exist. The reason the House of Representatives was denied participation in the ratification of treaties is given in The Federalist in this language:

"Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views; a nice and uniform sensibility to national character; decision, secrecy, and dispatch, are incompatible with the genus of a body so variable and numerous."

If this strange reasoning were ever sound, it has long since ceased to be supportable. The Senate certainly does not act in secrecy and seldom with dispatch. In fact, there are some who now contend, with great logic, that the power to ratify treaties should be left

exclusively to the House, without Senate participation whatsoever. The House is closer to the people, it more nearly reflects the popular will, its Members are elected each 2 years on a basis of population, and under the Rules of the House delay and filibuster are impossible. On the other hand, Senators are elected for 6-year terms. A Senator representing only a hundred and ten thousand people, as in the case of Nevada, has a voice equal to a Senator representing 13,000,000 people, as in the case of New York, while under Senate Rules of Procedure a small minority can filibuster any measure to death, even though it has the overwhelming support of the American people and, in fact, of the membership of the Senate itself.

Briefly, how has the two-thirds rule worked in practice? With one or two possible exceptions, no treaty of great consequence was ever ratified by the United States Senate, while many treaties of importance have been destroyed through Senate procedure and because of the two-thirds rule. In 1824 Secretary of State John Quincy Adams negotiated a treaty with Great Britain for the suppression of slave trade. The treaty was repudiated by the Senate with sad effect upon American history. In 1844 a treaty for the annexation of Texas to the Union was defeated in the Senate. President McKinley was unable to secure the annexation of Hawaii by treaty.

In both these cases Presidents were forced to resort to the subterfuge of joint resolutions in lieu of the constitutional process of treaty ratification. If Texas had not been annexed, at least one-third of our present domain would now be foreign soil. If Hawaii had not been annexed, Jap soldiers might now be fighting on this continent. But back to the record.

In 1897 the Olney-Pauncefote Treaty, which provided for the arbitration of disputes between this country and Great Britain, although it received a vote of 43 ayes to 26 nays, failed of ratification in the United States Senate and resulted in much hard feeling between this country and Great Britain. Again, President McKinley, thinking to avoid trouble in securing Senate ratification of the treaty ending the Spanish-American War, appointed three Senators from the Foreign Relations Committee on the commission of five to draw up the treaty. Notwithstanding Senate representation on the commission, notwithstanding the fact that we dictated the terms of that treaty, ratification was secured in the Senate only after a month of torrid debate and by the slim margin of one vote. About this time John Hay, one of our most able Secretaries of State, had this to say of the Senate's power over treaty ratification:

"The United States is rapidly coming to be regarded by the other great powers as a Nation which is not able to make a treaty. We have been trying to conclude important international agreements during the past 15 years, but have seen one after another of them go to wreck in the Senate. It is needless to enumerate the long and melancholy list. Whether the President was Cleveland or Harrison or McKinley, whether the negotiations were Democratic or Republican, the power of the Senate to ratify treaties has been mainly exercised as the power to kill treaties. Three valuable conventions with Great Britain have been broken on the Senate's veto. The Chief of State has made treaties with France and Germany, but the Senate has said with a sneer, 'They reckon ill who leave me out,' and has brought the whole work to the ground. With or without intention, we seem to the world to have stripped ourselves of a leading attribute of sovereignty—the power to make treaties."

In 1904 Theodore Roosevelt abandoned entirely the submission of nine treaties of arbitration because he feared the two-thirds rule necessary for Senate ratification.

In 1927 a treaty of amity and commerce between this country and Turkey received a vote of 50 ayes to 34 nays and failed of ratification. At different times Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Roosevelt urged American adherence to the World Court, yet none could secure the necessary two-thirds vote in the United States Senate.

But the all-time classic example of the futility of the two-thirds rule, the one about which whole libraries have been written, is the Senate consideration of the Versailles Treaty and of the League of Nations. Because of the shrewd and determined opposition of one or two Senators operating under the two-thirds rule, the Treaty of Versailles was repudiated and the League of Nations doomed to failure.

Senator Watson, in a brazen confession, tells of a conversation with Senator Lodge in 1919 during their conspiracy to destroy Wilson and the League. Watson told Lodge that 80 percent of the American people were in favor of adherence to the League, that 80 percent of the ministers of America were advocating it from their pulpits, and that the League could not be defeated. To this Senator Lodge replied that he did not expect to defeat the League by frontal attack but by the indirect method of reservation and delay. After many months of debate Senator Lodge was able to attach to the proposed treaty 14 separate and distinct reservations. On that fateful day, March 19, 1920, a final vote was taken in the Senate. Forty-nine voted aye, 35 voted nay. A minority had defeated the majority. Isolation became our foreign policy.

Students of the Senate debate on the Versailles Treaty generally agree there were four major reasons why a two-thirds vote in the Senate for ratification of the treaty could not be secured. Incidentally, these are continuing reasons, regardless of who the President is or who the Senators are, and because of these reasons one can safely predict that Senate ratification of any treaty of great consequence cannot be obtained.

Categorically, these four reasons are:

1. Party politics. A Senator may represent a State with racial or religious strains opposed to a particular treaty.

2. Senatorial pride and prerogative. Senators cooperate with each other and are jealous of the power and dignity of the Senate. For example, a treaty ceding the Isle of Pines to Cuba was held up in the Senate for 21 years, although urged by all Presidents, although reported favorably by all Foreign Relations Committees, although favored by the overwhelming majority of the Senators, simply because first one Senator then another would ask and receive delay for one reason or another.

3. Hatred of the President. When any President has been long in office, a distrust of, a dislike for, and sometimes a positive hatred of him will grow up in the hearts of some Senators.

4. A desire to return to isolation. There will always be a few Senators who honestly believe that we can live unto ourselves and should have no agreements with other nations.

Twenty years before he became President Woodrow Wilson referred to the treaty-marring power of the United States Senate. While president of the American Bar Association, John W. Davis, in condemning the two-thirds rule, said it does not "contribute to national influence or prestige or safety that the process of ratifying or rejecting treaties should degenerate into an effort to discover some qualifying formula acceptable to the minority."

From President Washington to President Franklin Roosevelt, from Secretary of State Jefferson to Secretary of State Hull, all Presidents and all Secretaries of State have had heart-breaking experiences with the two-thirds ratification rule in the Constitution. Without doubt all would testify positively that no good and much harm has resulted from this rule, and that it has always been a source of irritation, embarrassment, and injury to this Government.

Ninety-five percent of all patriotic societies and of all religious organizations in America have gone on record urging American participation in some form of post-war collaboration for the prevention of war and the preservation of peace. Both branches of the Congress have gone overwhelmingly on record for post-war collaboration. The Secretary of State and the President have spoken positively on this subject. All leading candidates for President now condemn isolation as a national policy. Notwithstanding this overwhelming sentiment in the private and official life of America, that the mistakes of 1920 be avoided, history is almost certain to repeat itself. Like causes will produce like results.

A majority of the Congress can declare war. Why should not a majority of the Congress be able to declare peace?

Shall we continue to have minority control over treaties? Must our international dealings be carried on through executive agreement without participation of the elected representatives of the people? Finally, are we to lose the next peace on a technicality?

Can anything be done about this, you ask? Yes; there is now pending in the Congress a number of resolutions seeking to amend the Constitution by providing that treaties be ratified by simple majorities of the house and the Senate. You might write your representatives in the Congress urging their support of such a resolution.

Our great Capital, the city of Washington, is now the hub of the universe. The representatives of the nations will probably meet here to draw up the treaties that end this global war. Following the signing of these treaties our representatives will doubtless play a leading role in the formulation of some kind of association, some new league of nations for the preservation of peace. After securing the agreement and consent of other nations to these documents, will a determined minority in the United States Senate again say, we'll have none of it? Will the greatest and most powerful nation in the world then be rendered shameful and impotent before all mankind? The Constitution should be amended in order to avoid such a possible and tragic catastrophe, and in order to facilitate America's rightful leadership in world affairs.

Clean Tokens Please Customers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my office is receiving complaints from constituents, because it is impossible for them to get cleaning fluids and materials necessary to operate dry-cleaning establishments.

In the congressional district which I represent in Congress there is a great shortage of manpower. Some of the territory is in a restricted labor area now, and hearings have recently been held looking toward placing the largest city in the district in a more restricted labor area. It is very difficult for retailers and merchants to furnish even the minimum service required by the communities. The State manpower director, as well as other war agencies, is seeking more la-

bor in the war effort. In short, those patriotic citizens carrying on the local retail business, the general store, the market, and the grocery are overworked to the breaking point. There is an end to the physical endurance of these people.

Having personal knowledge of the existence of these conditions, I am not surprised at the vehement protest of a constituent who calls my attention to a statement contained in the April issue of O. P. A. Food Guide for Retailers, published and sent out at public expense by the United States Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C. The statement is as follows:

CLEAN TOKENS PLEASE CUSTOMERS

Retailers can please customers by handing out clean, fresh-looking tokens in change for stamps.

You can clean tokens easily with alcohol or a mild cleaning fluid. Soap and water also cleans tokens, but not so quickly as alcohol does.

Never let tokens soak more than a few minutes in water or in any cleaning fluid. They cannot survive a soaking.

Mr. Speaker, there was much protest on the part of many people within the Government against the adoption of these tokens in the first place. Hundreds of millions of them have been manufactured and distributed, billions of them will be in circulation before rationing ends.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the feeling of the overworked merchant who is trying to comply with all the rules and regulations imposed upon him, when he is advised by his Government that he should use alcohol or a mild cleaning fluid to wash, cleanse, and make attractive these tokens which he is compelled to count, handle, and distribute. Yes, he is permitted the choice of washing with soap and water if he is not able to get the alcohol. These theorists who are advising the laundering of these tokens make it clear that the busy merchant should "never let tokens soak more than a few minutes in water or in any cleaning fluid" because "they cannot survive a soaking."

Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue, and I am wondering if that time has not arrived. The retailers in my district who are asked to wash these tokens, "in order that they may appear more attractive," are exasperated. When will such foolishness in the way of rules, regulations, and information on the part of Washington bureaus cease?

Rev. Stanislaus Orlemanski and Prof. Oscar Lange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have forwarded today to the Attorney General, Hon. Francis Biddle, relative to Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL BIDDLE: I am writing you in regard to the case of the Reverend Stanislaus Orlemanski and Prof. Oscar Lange, to whom there has been considerable reference in the press recently, as well as over the radio, in regard to their trip to the Soviet Union.

Under date of May 1, 1944, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Secretary of State and inquired as to the information the State Department had relative to this trip.

Under date of May 6, 1944, I received the following reply from Secretary Hull:

"The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 1, 1944, relative to the visit of the Reverend Stanislaus Orlemanski and Prof. Oscar Lange to the Soviet Union.

"In reply I wish to inform you that Father Orlemanski and Professor Lange proceeded to the Soviet Union on the invitation of the Soviet Government, which furnished their transportation to Moscow. They are making this trip as private American citizens, acting in their own individual capacities. They have no official status, and therefore are not in any sense representatives or spokesmen of the United States Government.

"On the basis of the fact that they were officially invited by a friendly Allied power to make this trip, passports were issued to them, valid for their journey to Moscow."

It is quite apparent from the foregoing letter of the Secretary of State that Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange were acting in their own individual capacities, as specially invited guests of the Soviet Union. I am, therefore, of the opinion that both Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange have directly violated the provisions of section 5 of the Penal Code of the United States.

Both Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange are well known in this country as Soviet sympathizers, and the entire purpose of their visit to the Soviet Union was to disrupt the unity of the United Nations. This country is committed to a policy of nonrecognition of territorial acquisition by force, and from the press releases and radio reports it is evident that they are endeavoring as individuals to convert the 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent to the Soviet's program in regard to Poland.

Reverend Orlemanski has been active for the Soviet cause and assisted in organizing the Kosciusko League in Detroit last fall, which is a Communist-controlled organization.

In the case of Professor Lange, he has been a naturalized citizen of the United States for a period of a little more than a year, and it is quite evident by his actions that his sole purpose of becoming a citizen of this country was to give him the protection afforded to Americans, and at the same time use that cloak of Americanism to protect him while spreading the doctrines of the Soviet Union. He certainly cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be accepted as a true American—one who believes in the American way of life and a democratic form of government. I am of the opinion that proper legal steps should be taken by the Department of Justice to take away from him his American citizenship.

Inasmuch as Reverend Orlemanski and Professor Lange have violated the provisions of our Penal Code, I am calling on you to take appropriate action, upon their return to this country, as it is quite apparent that they have been carrying on both verbal intercourse and written correspondence with a foreign government with the intent to influence the measures and conduct of that government in relation to the policies of the United States.

I am also calling upon you to take appropriate action as to these individuals in regard to their acting as agents for a foreign country without being properly registered by our State Department in accordance with existing law.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards and an expression of my highest esteem, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress.

PENAL CODE

SEC. 5. Every citizen of the United States, whether actually resident or abiding within the same, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or in any foreign country, who, without the permission or authority of the Government, directly or indirectly, commences or carries on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States; and every person, being a citizen of or resident within the United States or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and not duly authorized, who counsels, advises, or assists in any such correspondence with such intent, shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years; but nothing in this section shall be construed to abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects. (Revised Statutes, sec. 5335; Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, sec. 5, 35 Stat. 1088; Apr. 22, 1932, ch. 126, 47 Stat. 132.)

In Defense of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Jay Sheldon, entitled "In Defense of the Congress":

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONGRESS

(By Jay Sheldon)

There has been an unfortunate tendency, of recent months, for some thoughtless editorial writers and columnists, to smear the Congress of the United States, through an all embracing blanket indictment. Reference to the House of Representatives as the "House of Reprehensibles," is an outstanding instance.

It has been said that this was all part of a scheme to discredit the Congress in the eyes of the people. That may or may not be true. Certainly it is true that some writers, in their eagerness to pay homage to the executive branch, have gone to extremes. Constructive criticism of the acts of some individual Member of the Congress, or the suspected failings of some committee, has its proper place in a democracy. But to include the entire Congress shows an inexcusable ignorance of the basic principles upon which our kind of government has been founded.

On the eve of a national campaign, during which the merits and demerits of respective candidates will be discussed, it is vitally important that all of us prove our intelligence and consider the membership of the Congress in its true perspective.

As Senator JOHNSON recently said:

"Congress is but a replica of the people. Congress can never rise far above their aspirations and their ability. Congress is not only a cross-section of the people, it reflects their moods and their inner selves."

Ours is a government, not of kings and princes but of the people. Our founding fathers planned that Members of the House of Representatives would serve for terms of 2 years so that if the people did not feel their Representatives at Washington reflected their sentiments they could elect another. Our Congressmen, therefore, are closer to the people, more conscious of their wants, more accountable to their demands than are the Senators, who serve for 6 years, or the President, who serves for a 4-year term. Your Congressman has to face the voters every 24 months.

There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives. These represent more than 136,000,000 people of all shades of opinion, of varying sectional problems. Naturally, a legislative body that represents more than 136,000,000 people will appear at times cumbersome; sometimes confusing, seeking to compromise different sectional viewpoints. Striving to meet the changing trends of public opinion of such a large body of our citizenry, it is natural that minority groups, seeing only their side of a problem, may become impatient. But this is democracy in action. To condemn the entire Congress because, as a body, it does not agree with the opinion of any group is obviously unfair. There is no editorial writer, no columnist, no radio commentator so important that the American people would delegate to him the sole judge as to who they should send to Washington to represent them in the Congress. The people know their Congressman. If he is to be spanked, they will do it. They elect the type of man they want. You may not like their choice. But it is their choice. If the people want investigations, don't criticize the fact that there may be too many. Congress is merely doing what the people want them to do. When they do less, they insure their own defeat for reelection.

At the moment there is a certain conflict between the executive branch and the Congress. This is not the fault of the Congress. It springs from a lack of tolerance upon the part of the President's advisers as to the constitutional rights and dignity of the legislative branch. The President has created an impression he wants to be the whole works. He started with a "must" program of legislation which a "rubber stamp" Congress passed. But the people have clearly indicated, in the past two congressional elections, that they did not want "rubber stamp" representatives. As Senator JOHNSON says, in his interesting Evils of Concentrated Power, when the President sought to purge Members of Congress, of his own party, who refused to agree with everything he proposed, he met with a rebuff by the people such as no President had before received.

No matter who is elected to be our next President, one thing is sure: He must possess great tolerance; must seek to sincerely cooperate with the legislative branch, must subordinate his views to that of the majority; must have faith in the people and their chosen representatives in the Congress. Anything less would be dictatorship.

Congress has rewon its proper independence. The voice of the people has decided this. There may still be some "rubber stamps" to stand for reelection, but the great majority of the Congress speak for their neighbors; the voters of their congressional districts. If the Congress is wrong, then the people who elected them are wrong. If the entire Congress is to be smeared, then Hitler still has some friends in America, for those who would seek to destroy the faith of the people in representative government and substitute for it some totalitarian rule, are playing the game of our enemies and seek to destroy this Government which Lincoln so defined as "of the people, by the people, for the people."

People of Tennessee Valley Against Senate Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address delivered by Maj. Phil B. Whitaker before the Civitan Club of Chattanooga on the two amendments which have been added to the T. V. A. appropriation bill in the Senate:

Mr. President, members of the Civitan Club, and guests, I very sincerely appreciate being invited to speak to this club, of which I was a member for so many years, to present arguments opposing the adoption of amendments to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act which are incorporated in the Senate bill which passed the Senate on March 24. Shortly the bill is to go to conference of Members of the House and Senate before final action is taken by these two bodies. The issue is one which, in my judgment, is of paramount importance to all people of this country, and particularly to those of us who live in the Tennessee Valley. The final decision of the Congress will determine whether this Government-owned corporation shall be operated along business lines, with its policy dictated by sound business principles, or whether these business principles shall be emasculated by political considerations.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act as it now is, is found in title 16 of the United States Code. The act creates a Government-owned corporation with a board of three directors. It provides that it shall have succession in its corporate name, may sue and be sued in its corporate name, may make contracts as authorized by the act, may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, and may exercise many other powers which are common to private corporations. It is authorized to construct and acquire dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries for promotion of navigation and flood control and is further authorized to sell its surplus hydroelectric power to States, counties, cities, cooperatives, or private companies. To date the Government has invested approximately $800,000,000 in this vast enterprise, and today it is the sole source of hydroelectric power to the inhabitants of this area. The corporation is further authorized by the act to contract with commercial producers for the production of fertilizers, to arrange with farmers and farm organizations for large-scale practical use of the fertilizers, to cooperate in the prevention of soil erosion, to produce nitrogen for the manufacture of explosives in event of national emergency.

In other words, the corporation is set up along business lines to render a great and outstanding service to this area and to the entire Nation. It is required to file with the President and with the Congress in December of each year a financial statement and a complete report as to the business of the corporation covering the preceding governmental fiscal year. The act further provides that the Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the books of the corporation at such times as he shall determine, but not less frequently than once a year, with personnel of his selection. A maximum of $10,000 for the annual salaries of the three members of the board or any other officer or employee is provided by the act. For the purpose of showing how definitely the framers of the act decided that politics should not dominate or influence the acts of the corporation, I refer you to the section of the act which requires that no political test shall be given consideration in the selection of members of the board or any employee. I submit that it is the deliberate judgment of the overwhelming majority of the people of this section who have observed the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the past 10 years that this requirement of the statute has been strictly complied with. The Tennessee Valley Authority is not a governmental bureaucracy located at any place remote from the valley, but by terms of the act its board of directors are required to maintain their homes in the valley where they are in constant and daily contact with the corporation which they direct and the people whom they serve.

Two weeks ago today I was a guest of this club when Senator MCKELLAR addressed us supposedly in defense of the amendments which he proposes to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. The Senator spoke for more than an hour. For more than 50 minutes he mentioned no amendments, but chose to consume the major portion of his time in defending his record as a friend of the T. V. A. He did not mention the fact that as acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations he offered to the Senate 17 amendments to the House bill. Of these amendments, all except two were stricken from the bill as passed by the Senate, and one of the remaining two he did not mention at all. He only discussed, and this for not more than 5 or 6 minutes, the amendment affecting what is popularly but erroneously known as the T. V. A. revolving fund.

Everyone must admit, and so far as I know has always admitted, that Senator MCKELLAR rendered distinctive and outstanding service in support of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as originally passed and in bringing about appropriations for the construction of the various dams on the river and its tributaries. But from listening to the Senator 2 weeks ago, one cannot fail to conclude that he gives unto himself practically all of the credit for this major development. I know of no one else except Senator MCKELLAR who is willing to take the position that Senator Norris, of Nebraska, made but an insignificant contribution, if any, to the establishment and development of T. V. A. I am told by responsible parties, on the other hand, that Senator Norris gives to Senator MCKELLAR full credit for his own outstanding contribution to this development. Those of us who live in Chattanooga are thoroughly familiar with the outstanding work done by the late Congressman McReynolds in bringing about the construction of Chickamauga Dam. Strong local influences were exerted for years to bring about the construction of this particular dam, and through Congressman McReynolds the local advocates of this project received their primary support.

Without detracting for a moment from Senator MCKELLAR'S contribution to the success of the T. V. A. in the past, we yet say that it is no new thing in the history of the world for a man to attempt to destroy that thing which he has helped to create.

Many of us believe very definitely that Senator MCKELLAR has for the past 2 or more years and is now attempting to convert this Government-owned business corporation into a political instrument. He may believe that

this is not destructive of the purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority and that such action will not impede its progress. He may even feel that he is better qualified to shape its policies and determine its course than are trained experts.

It is rather a remarkable thing that Senator McKELLAR saw no need for the amendments which he proposed and for those which he is now supporting until personal differences arose between him and Director Lilienthal, of the T. V. A. board. The people of the valley and of the country are not primarily interested in a personal fued between Senator McKELLAR and Mr. Lilienthal, but what we are interested in is the continued maintenance of this vast public enterprise, free from the undue and improper influences either of politics or of personal animosities between persons in high position.

As heretofore indicated, 15 of the 17 amendments to the House bill as proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which Senator McKELLAR is acting chairman, were stricken from the bill as passed by the Senate. These proposed amendments are now important only for the purpose of demonstrating the lengths to which Senator McKELLAR is willing to go in injecting political considerations into the administration of T. V. A. Time does not permit the mentioning of all of them. We will only mention a few. I have before me the official report of the Committee on Appropriations for the Senate, which reads: "Mr. McKELLAR, for Mr. GLASS, from the committee" on "independent offices appropriation bill, 1945." It is well known that Senator GLASS, of Virginia, the chairman of this committee, has been in ill health for some time and that Senator McKELLAR has acted as chairman and to a large degree has influenced the committee.

He proposed to strike from the House bill authorization for the continued construction of the Watts Bar steam plant, in spite of the fact that construction on this installation has proceeded for many months under congressional authorization, in spite of the fact that a failure to make this appropriation to continue this construction would have wasted the money already spent, and in spite of the fact that this installation would add an additional generating unit of 60,000-kilowatt capacity, which is badly needed in time of war.

He proposed to strike from the House bill authority to continue work on the Fort Loudoun Dam, which consisted primarily of the completion of dredging work which would complete a 9-foot navigation channel to Knoxville, much of which work has already been done.

He proposed to limit to $600,000 the amount which could be used by the Authority in the next fiscal year for the construction of transmission lines without giving any reason therefor in his report and without apparently giving consideration to the fact that much larger sums conceivably might be needed to erect transmission lines vital to war plants and other users of electricity and without considering that this much money or more might conceivably be needed to make repairs to existing lines if seriously damaged by an act of God or the public enemy. He even overlooked the fact that this limitation of $600,000 made no provision for transmission lines to market power to be generated at the Kentucky and Fontana Dams now under construction.

It was further proposed by his committee that no part of the funds appropriated for the corporation should be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the corporation who takes an active part in political management or political campaigns or "who seeks to influence public opinion by means of lectures, advertisements, publications, public statements, radio, or otherwise, for or against (a) any candidate for public office or (b) any legislation or legislative proposal." The political activities of T. V. A. officers and employees are limited today by the general statute known as the Hatch Act, just as are the political activities of any other Government employee, but the Senator proposed to go further. These employees, though still American citizens, are prohibited so long as they draw compensation from the corporation, even from making a public statement with reference to any legislation or legislative proposal. So far as I know, such a proposed limitation on free speech has never before been advanced by any responsible public official. Plainly it is un-American, unconstitutional, and springs only from the mind of one who seeks to be a dictator.

Since all revenue measures originate in the House, the House first adopted an Independent Offices Appropriation bill and sent it to the Senate. This applied to appropriations for the National Archives, the Tariff Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the United States Maritime Commission and others. The Senator's committee when offering its report to the Senate proposed to amend the sections with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority by providing that every employee of the Authority who drew an annual salary of $4,500 a year or more should receive his position by appointment of the President "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate". The bill which passed the Senate on March 24 has made this provision applicable not only to the Tennessee Valley Authority, but also to all other employees of the bureaus, boards, commissions and offices referred to in the bill. This means that perhaps 30,000 employees of these various agencies may receive their appointments only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No skilled engineer or highly trained technician or other employee drawing $4,500 a year or more can, if this bill is adopted, be selected by the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless his appointment is approved by the Senate. The practical application of such a policy, as we well know, is that the Senators from Tennessee would pass upon every one of these employees who reside in Tennessee. Such a patronage grab is almost unprecedented.

It is wholly contrary to the provisions of section 831e of the act heretofore referred to which prohibits any political test or qualification for the appointment and promotion of employees of the corporation. In practical application it would mean that Senator McKELLAR would select every one of these important experts who are supposed to serve the Authority. The board of directors would have but little, if any, control over their employees. Senator STEWART has declared himself opposed to this amendment as well as the others. Senator McKELLAR alone wants it, and yet he has publicly declared that at his age he is not interested in patronage. We well remember that 2 weeks ago the Senator clearly showed his chagrin that the President requested Senator Norris instead of him to introduce the original T. V. A. act which contained this provision prohibiting a political test in making appointments to T. V. A. jobs.

It is generally understood that the Senator has but little hope for the passage of this amendment in the House. Therefore, I believe he would be willing to sacrifice this in conference with the House conferees if he were able to save his remaining amendment. That amendment refers to the so-called T. V. A. revolving fund. The act as it now is in section 26 provides that:

"Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the corporation * * * shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section, and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation."

The bill as it passed the House provides that for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Act the unexpended balance on June 30, 1944, in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944 and the receipts of the T. V. A. from all sources during the fiscal year 1945 subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 as amended shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945, to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944.

According to the report of the committee of which Senator McKELLAR is acting chairman, the unexpended balance in the account for 1944 is $19,262,298, and the estimated receipts for the year 1945, are $68,523,882, making an estimated amount which would be available under the House bill of $87,791,180. In lieu of this provision the Senate Committee on Appropriations proposed to appropriate from the Treasury $76,981,873, and to provide that the 1944 unexpended balance and all receipts for 1945 and subsequent years shall be covered into the general funds of the Treasury as and when collected. The bill as it passed the Senate, however, increased the appropriation from $76,981,873 to $79,134,882.

It should be borne in mind that the bill as it passed the House appropriated no new money. It reappropriated the unexpended balance which, together with estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1945, was expected to adequately finance the House-approved program of the T. V. A. The program approved on the basis of detailed examination was estimated to require $79,134,882. This is the exact figure in the bill as it passed the Senate. The House proposes in addition to this amount to leave in the Authority's fund a balance of $8,656,298, which would be available in the event work were ordered resumed on war projects authorized by Congress but ordered stopped by the War Production Board. Chief among these are the Wautauga and South Holston Dams, which Senator McKELLAR repeatedly advocates, and an elemental phosphorous manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala. It is rather remarkable that these three projects are included in those authorized by the report of Senator McKELLAR's committee and by the bill as passed by the Senate, and yet there is not included in the appropriation in the Senate bill 1 penny for the completion of these projects if the War Production Board during this fiscal year gives the go-ahead signal on these projects.

But far more important than the $8,000,000 difference between the House and Senate bills is the fact that the House bill designates the appropriation as one fund known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1945, while the Senate bill leaves the appropriation in the general fund of the Treasury.

Senator McKELLAR accomplished this most important variance in the two bills by striking the words "subject to the provisions of section 26 of the T. V. A. Act of 1943." Every T. V. A. appropriation bill which has ever been made has contained this wording of the House bill. It is no new thing as contended by the Senator in his speech here 2 weeks ago.

Under the terms of the House bill as always in the past the T. V. A. Board is empowered to exercise its discretion in the expenditure of certain funds in conducting the business of distributing electric energy, etc., as provided in section 26. Under the terms of the Senate bill it is stripped of this authority.

The Board loses all flexibility of business administration. The Congress instead of the Board shall determine even where a new transmission line shall be built to a new industry in the Valley. If a new industry desires to locate here it can no longer go to the Board and ask for service and expect a definite answer. The Board will be forced to reply, "We cannot agree to serve you until Congress is asked for authority." Can we expect new industry to locate here when faced by such delay and uncertainty? If the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee is from New England, can we expect him to look with favor on new industries being located here instead of there?

Senator McKELLAR should know that he is in error in designating the $8,000,000 difference in the House and Senate bills as the T. V. A. revolving fund. It is no such thing. It is an amount set apart in reserve to continue the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams and the Mobile phosphorous plant if and when W. P. B. says this can be done.

How in the name of common sense does the Senator expect to reduce electric rates by taking away money appropriated for new construction. He might as well have argued that he could have reduced electric rates by failing to procure, as he said he did, an appropriation to construct Chicamauga Dam. Any businessman knows that electric rates can be reduced only by reducing operating costs and by increasing operating revenues.

But the Senator contends that no other Government agency has what he terms a revolving fund. By this I assume he means that no other Government agency can use its earnings to defray the expenses of its operation. Again the Senator is in error. We need mention only a few, the Panama Railroad Co., the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and others. All of these are Government-owned corporations just as T. V. A. is. His comparison to the Post Office Department is wholly beside the point. This department is not a corporation. It has no board of directors. It is merely a department of the Executive branch of the Government headed by a member of the President's cabinet. Incidentally, it has always been the most fruitful source of both senatorial and congressional patronage. And incidentally also, Senator McKELLAR is Chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

It is a very remarkable thing that every member of the Tennessee delegation in the House and Senator McKELLAR'S colleague from Tennessee in the Senate, oppose the adoption of his proposed amendments and that these amendments are likewise opposed by the entire Alabama delegation both in the Senate and the House. Is it possible that they are all out of step but Jim? The Senator's proposed amendments are vigorously opposed by practically all of the municipalities and co-operatives purchasing power from the Tennessee Valley Authority in this area. There has been an almost universal condemnation of his proposals by the press of the Nation in the North, the South, the East, and the West.

Mr. Alfred Mynders, the brilliant and distinguished editor of the Chattanooga Times, had a noteworthy article on the Tennessee Valley Authority in his column in the Chattanooga Times on Sunday, April 16. He accurately states that what the T. V. A. has done for the individual is that which has won Nation-wide admiration.

"The farmer is better off because he has learned how to revive his land and make it pay; the small towns have T. V. A. for health and for progress through new industries located in the valley. The average person everywhere in the valley has benefited."

He points out that while the per capita income in the rest of the Nation was increasing 56 percent between 1933 and 1940 the per capita income in the Tennessee Valley was increasing 73 percent. He calls attention to the fact that the T. V. A. has attracted not merely Nation-wide, but world-wide attention, and that there has been much discussion of a Danubian Authority on the Danube River to serve the Balkan states in the same manner that T. V. A. has served this region. And, he states, the further and more remarkable suggestion is now being discussed in England that the great problem of India can be solved by copying the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is a tragic thing that an agency such as the Tennessee Valley Authority which has meant so much to the individual happiness of the inhabitants of this region, which has contributed and is contributing so greatly to the prosecution of this war, and which is today the inspiration for similar projects throughout the world should, because of personal malice or for any other reasons, be made a political football or the subject of unseemly and perhaps disastrous political manipulation.

Tennessee has too proud a record for independence of thought and independence of action to be willing to submit to the dictates of any one man or to be willing to live under such tyranny as results from enacting into law the whims and the fancies of any individual.

The Late Joseph McDonagh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, there are many casualties of this war outside of those serving in the armed forces. One such casualty occurred this week in the passing of a great friend of labor, Joseph McDonagh, who was well known to the Members in this House who are concerned with labor. He was formerly legislative representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L. Mr. McDonagh was a veteran of the Spanish-American War and devoted his life to the cause of the underprivileged. His contribution to progressive labor legislation was well known and appreciated not only by members of his union, but by all who believed in honesty and justice in the labor movement. Joe McDonagh died as he lived—in service to his God and to his country.

No words of mine can do justice to this man for whom I feel a great admiration and respect. The story of his life is told by Philip Pearl in a recent article in the American Federation of Labor News sheet. Under unanimous consent, I include this article as a part of my remarks:

FACING THE FACTS

(By Philip Pearl)

What makes a man devote his life to the union cause? What attraction is there in a career which takes so much out of a person yet offers such insignificant rewards in the way of fame and fortune?

These reflections spring from the news of the sudden and shocking death of a friend who made the trade-union movement his life's work, who accepted the philosophy of organized labor as his gospel—Joseph McDonagh.

McDonagh died as he had lived—in harness. He was attending a union conference in New York City and was reaching over to hand some papers to his colleague, Frank Fenton, when his heart stopped. He had no warning, no time or opportunity to utter a last word to those who will follow after him. Let his life speak as his parting message.

Joe was a little guy who went through life with his chin out. He was the kind of fighter who likes to pick out bigger and tougher opponents. He always had to battle against odds. Classrooms ended for him at an early age, but not his education. He served a thorough apprenticeship not only in his trade of electrician but as a soldier, a labor organizer, a legislative representative for his union in Congress and, finally, as secretary-treasurer of the A. F. L. metal trades department.

Perhaps Joe McDonagh's rebellion against oppression, against stupid authority, began during his service in the Spanish-American War, when he saw action in Puerto Rico. Uncle Sam didn't treat his boys in uniform too well in that war. It was then that Joe learned to hate brass hats.

A LIFETIME ENLISTMENT

Later, when peace came and Joe went back on the job, he discovered the same heartless attitude—the same cruel disregard for human life and human suffering—evinced by private employers toward their workers. What if there were industrial accidents? What if a mechanic fell from the rigging of a ship or had his fingers chopped off by a tool because proper safeguards were not provided? What if a man's energy and sap were burned out by too long hours on an intense job at too low pay? There were always others to take his place. Human life was cheap. It didn't pay to spend money to protect and conserve it, like machinery, which represented a cash investment.

This was the type of economic cruelty against which Joe rebelled and against which he waged war through his union. This was the cause in which he volunteered to serve a lifetime enlistment, and this was his victory—that by the time he left his home town of Brooklyn to assume a higher title and different duties in Washington the electrical workers of his community had won the highest conditions that laboring men anywhere in the world had ever enjoyed.

In Washington, Joe was at first regarded as something of a rough diamond. As legislative representative for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, he came into contact with Members of Congress and high-ranking Government officials who were well versed in the thousand different ways of the polite brush-off and painless double-cross. But they soon discovered that Joe had a disconcerting way of his own—a way of cutting through the double talk and getting down to facts—a way of demanding yes-or-no answers and getting them.

During the last 10 years of his life, Joe McDonagh made many enemies in high places—and also many friends. The phonies feared him, but the honest politicians trusted and respected him. Joe was a steady, plodding, legislative worker—not necessarily brilliant but always reliable and on the job. The great gains in labor legislation which the workers of America have won can be credited at least in part to the hard work done by Joe and others like him.

A PRACTICAL IDEALIST

Joe McDonagh was nearing the age of 66 when he died. To a certain extent he liked to live in the past. He loved to recount dramatic incidents of long-forgotten labor conventions and battles against tough employers. We used to sit and listen to him

by the hour on slow afternoons in Bill Hushing's office in the A. F. of L. Building.

If you didn't know better, you might get the impression from his casual conversation that Joe was a confirmed griper. He enjoyed sounding off on his pet hates, especially against the professors and theorists who abound in Washington. Joe would run into them frequently at meetings of various Government advisory boards on which he represented the A. F. of L. and some of their impractical theories with regard to labor regulations got into his hair. He had no patience with people who became overnight experts on matters with which they had never had any practical experience and he loathed red tape. The brass hats in the Navy and War Departments did not overawe him nor did they delight him.

But, as we've tried to indicate before, the dominating, driving power behind Joe McDonagh was a more positive thing than mere impatience with stupid officialdom or even hate of oppression. He was that rare thing, a practical idealist—the kind of idealist who expresses himself in action rather than talk. He liked his fellowman and he worked for him. He loved his country, and he served it. He clung to the independence that freedom gives a man and he was ready at all times to fight for it. He believed with all his being in the aims and philosophy of the American Federation of Labor and he lived and died for it.

This is just the kind of piece that would have embarrassed Joe to the utmost. He was the kind that appreciated a dig more than a compliment. But the workers of America owe Joe McDonagh more than a passing sigh. May he rest in peace.

War Refugee Board

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, when President Roosevelt recently declared how tragic it would be if the innocent victims of Hitler's fury should perish on the very eve of triumph over barbarism, the awful fate that threatens European Jewry was once more brought to the attention of the world. As the increasing military pressures on fortress Europe makes clear to the Germans the inevitability of their defeat and the frustration of their mad lusting for power and the domination of the world, the Nazi gang seems ever more determined to carry out their vicious program of slaughtering every Jew, including women and children, in the regions controlled by them. For this evil purpose they have converted Poland into a gigantic slaughterhouse. When Jews from the rest of Europe are deported there, there is no further hope for them; they are being sent to their death.

The civilized world is now uneasily and anxiously watching Hungary. What will happen as Hitler takes over the reins in Hungary to some 800,000 Jews who up to now have been comparatively secure from the Nazi blood spilling? The evil omens of impending slaughter already are commencing to appear. Registration of all Jews, compulsory wearing of the star of David, restriction to ghettos all spell out only one thing—the preliminaries to deportation to Poland and to death.

In the face of this monstrous slaughter it is vitally important that the civilized world cooperate immediately to do everything humanly possible to save these innocent victims of a brutal philosophy of power through slaughter.

The President has made an important beginning in his statement setting forth the policy of the United Nations to punish those who, directly or indirectly, participate in this inhuman persecution, and promptly supported by the prestige and power of the British Empire by Anthony Eden on the floor of the House of Commons. There will be many a functionary in Axis Europe, particularly in the satellite countries, who will hesitate to give effect to the murderous commands of the Hitlerite butchers when he sees in the not too distant future the unyielding accounting he will have to make to the victorious United Nations.

Even more important to this humanitarian task of saving the lives of the innocent victims of oppression has been the creation of the War Refugee Board by the President. For the first time in history a nation at war has established an agency devoted to the rescue of peoples of other nations in imminent danger of death, even when those people are technically enemy subjects. It makes one proud of his American heritage to witness in the creation of the War Refugee Board another illustration of our democratic and humanitarian ideals and traditions translated into action on the side of the forces of decency and progress.

We are fortunate, too, in the appointment of John W. Pehle as executive director of the War Refugee Board. Mr. Pehle, born in Minnesota and educated in the public schools of that State and her sister States of South Dakota and Nebraska, brings to the noble task of saving lives a great wealth of natural talent nourished and nurtured in the democratic and humane ideals and spirit of the Middle West. His ability to organize and to give drive to a new agency faced with novel and important wartime problems has been ably demonstrated by his excellent work as Assistant of the Secretary of the Treasury in charge of foreign funds control.

Already, after only 4 months, his work with the War Refugee Board is beginning to pay dividends in the form of human lives saved. The flow of refugees to Turkey through the Balkans, which had practically ceased prior to the creation of the Board has been greatly stimulated as a result of the efforts of the Board and Ambassador Steinhardt and Ira Hirachmann, the Board's representative for Turkey. Pressure directed against the satellite government of Romania resulted in the removal of over 40,000 Jewish refugees from concentration camps in the Dneister River region of southwestern Russia to Romania. Although these unfortunates have not been finally rescued, it is an achievement to be proud of, because God knows what terrible slaughter may have been the fate of these people, if the bitterly disillusioned and vengeful German Army, retreating before the mighty blows directed against them by the victorious Russians, had ever got their hands on them.

These results and others already achieved by the Board, under Mr. Pehle's dynamic leadership, illustrate anew the tremendous power and influence moral forces may have when translated into vigorous action. It is to the undying credit of the United States that at a time when the outlook appeared darkest for the victims of oppression, it seized the moral leadership of the civilized world by creating the War Refugee Board, thus, as always in its history, giving courage once again to the despairing and holding out to them, after years of darkness, the precious light of freedom and the hope of a better world.

Let all of us here, who treasure our American traditions of speaking out for the oppressed and offering them the sanctuary of our free institutions, assist the work of the Board by supporting its objectives, so that all the world will know that Americans are wholeheartedly united in the humanitarian task of rescuing those whom enemy brutality and terrorism threaten to annihilate.

The War Dads' Canteen at Springfield, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. F. E. Uhl, commanding general of the Seventh Service Command, has awarded a Citation for Meritorious Wartime Service to the War Dads' Canteen, of Springfield, Mo., for voluntary efforts and outstanding achievement within this command in behalf of the Army of the United States and its personnel. I want to add to the Army's citation the approval of Congress, for I know every Member of Congress will concur with me in such commendation when they hear the story of the War Dads' Canteen.

SOLVING LOCAL PROBLEMS LOCALLY

Sometimes, perhaps, we are prone to believe that all that must be done for the serviceman and the veteran must spring from Washington. Not so. I say that advisedly and as a member of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee of the House of Representatives, the committee which has been responsible for the constructive efforts being made by the Federal Government for rehabilitation of veterans and for their readjustment into civilian life. Whether or not this Nation and our form of government can withstand the shock to our national economy which will be felt when millions of men

are brought back into this country and begin searching for jobs will be determined not alone by Congress. It will be determined, also, by the extent to which local communities assume their share of the burden and responsibility. Alert citizens in Springfield, Mo., organized 1,000 strong in a chapter of War Dads, are alert to the situation and already are doing things which are the envy of every community in the land. The most outstanding project of the American War Dads Chapter, No. 6, is the War Dads' Canteen located in a building built by the War Dads adjoining the local railroad station at Springfield, Mo. Here the Springfield War Dads are already ministering to the needs and wants of the man in uniform. It is an interesting and unique story.

Mr. Lester E. Cox, president of the War Dads chapter in Springfield is credited with being the original spark-plug for the idea of a canteen. He is a believer in direct action. He went to St. Louis, Mo., and interviewed the president of the Frisco Railroad. Permission was granted by the Frisco to use company property for the canteen site. It is an advantageous location parallel to the railroad station, only a few feet from it, facing the tracks and bordered by a principal street of the city. Mr. Cox then obtained the pledges of 25 of his friends and other War Dads for $100 contributions toward building the canteen. This accomplished, the big fund-raising drive was turned over to another war dad, O. L. Robinett, who with War Dads I. V. Ewing and George Thompson raised the total of the voluntary subscriptions to approximately $10,000. Of this sum $8,800 was spent for the building and furnishings. Part of the labor was donated by the local unions in construction of the canteen.

After sufficient money had been raised to assure the building of the canteen, a campaign was launched for those people in the city who did not care to contribute to the construction work to make pledges for its upkeep. The pledges are for monthly contributions of $1 up. Some 300 people in Springfield, Mo., volunteered a total of approximately $1,500 per month for maintenance. This money is used to buy coffee, doughnuts and other items for the boys who visit the canteen.

SETTING RECORDS

Since the War Dads' Canteen was completed in November 1943 it has broken canteen records. It is pertinent to observe, for instance, that this War Dads' Canteen, in a small midwestern city, serves more coffee, milk, orange juice, and doughnuts than the famous Stage Door Canteen in New York City. More than 15,000 cups of coffee are served each month and doughnuts and cookies in tremendous quantities—all without cost to the man in uniform.

But this canteen is not just a place to eat, nor is it a play center. It is not possible to do justice to the canteen without seeing it. I hold in my hand some pictures of the canteen and the War Dads and the Red Cross canteen workers who have made it such a success. These pictures tell the story. The canteen is a large L-shaped building of stucco construction. A large Neon sign hangs at the door reading: "War Dads' Canteen. Servicemen Welcome." At the door, serving in shifts covering 24 hours per day, stand some War Dads to greet any serviceman who enters. Other War Dads meet each incoming train, board the train, and invite servicemen to visit the canteen. The environment provided by the canteen is a homelike environment. The canteen is beautifully furnished with new and comfortable furniture in gay but restful colors. There is a big fireplace. Radios are at hand and the latest magazines by well-placed reading lamps. Writing materials are at each desk and table. Post cards are furnished each visitor. The War Dads have a book in which visiting servicemen are invited to register. War Dads then write the parents of the visitor and tell them they have had the pleasure of serving him doughnuts and coffee, that he is well, and expressing the hope we all share that G. I. Joe will soon be able to return home in a nation at peace. Replies received from the parents are much too numerous and touching to dwell upon here. Indeed, letters of appreciation sent back to the War Dads' Canteen by servicemen who have rested and been served there are a story in themselves. These letters come from all over the world. Some of these letters are signed by scores of men, ranging from buck privates to major generals.

VOLUNTEER HELP

I want to say just a word about the Red Cross canteen ladies. A group of 100 of the leading civic-minded women of Springfield donate their services to the canteen. They have all taken a 2 weeks' course and are trained in canteen work. They donate their time to this canteen, which is operated 24 hours per day and open to everyone who wears a uniform of his country, regardless of creed, color, or rank. These Red Cross canteen ladies perform their duties neatly dressed in the distinctive uniform of their organization. The spirit of hospitality they have shown, together with their efficiency, has contributed to the fame of Springfield and the War Dads' Canteen. The whole community is back of this effort. The various churches rotate each week in having their various groups provide home-made cookies for the canteen. But this story must come to an end.

So far as I know, there is no other project exactly like the Springfield War Dads' Canteen. I hope, however, that the example will be copied in many places. It is democracy in action in a nation worth fighting for. It is a manifestation of local pride and local assumption of responsibility to which America must increasingly look in the days ahead. I take what I believe is justifiable pride in being the Representative in Congress for these progressive citizens in the Springfield War Dad's chapter, their affiliated Red Cross canteen workers, and the numerous similar groups throughout the Sixth Missouri Congressional District.

Industrialization of the Southwest and Discriminatory Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on November 9, 1943, I delivered an address on radio station KTSA at San Antonio, Tex., in which I discussed the effect upon Texas and the Southwest of the discriminatory freight rate differential. In February 1944, a meeting was held in Dallas for the purpose of organizing the Gulf Southwest agricultural and industrial conference. This meeting had for its purpose the formulation of plans for the promotion of the industrialization of the great Southwest. At that meeting I repeated some of the observations made in my earlier radio address and observed that it is useless to discuss the industrialization of the Southwest so long as the discriminatory freight rate structure exists. Mr. H. N. Roberts, chairman of the Texas-Louisiana Freight Bureau of Dallas took issue with the statements and conclusions made by me in both the radio address and in my remarks before the conference. Under date of February 16, 1944, Mr. Roberts gave wide circulation to a letter addressed to me by him in which he sought to deny some of the statements made in my radio address. Under date of April 24, 1944, Mr. Roberts addressed a letter to those present at the meeting of the Gulf Southwest agricultural and industrial conference, taking issue with my statements to the conference and enclosing therewith a copy of his circular letter of February 16.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to enter into a controversy with Mr. Roberts nor any of the other paid representatives of the so-called freight bureaus, which are largely responsible for the present discriminatory system and its perpetuation. By reason of the activities of these very men, the industrialization and development of the Southwest has been retarded. So long as they are able to maintain the present system our great Southwest will be strangled. They are paid to effect that very result. However, through the years they have conducted energetic campaigns of misinformation throughout the territories in which this discrimination exists. Therefore, I am interested in bringing the true situation to the attention of our people who have been long misled by these paid representatives of the railroads. In the Transportation Act of 1940 Congress created the Board of Investigation and Research and directed that it inquire into the freight-rate structures in the United States. This is an impartial board created by Congress and charged with this official duty. I have submitted both my radio address and Mr. Roberts' letter of February 16 to members of that Board, with the request that they analyze them and

report upon the merits of each. They have done so in a fair and impartial manner and have written me in detail with reference thereto. That Board has sustained every major statement made by me. It completely refutes the claims made by Mr. Roberts.

The Board makes it plain that so long as the discriminatory freight rate exists we cannot hope to industrialize the Southwest. Therefore, industrial employment will remain in the North and the East. Unless we develop our industry we cannot increase the wealth of our territory nor raise our living standards. All of our working people will be deprived of industrial employment. The railroad worker will suffer the greatest. During the war there is plenty of employment for all. When the war ends the demand will be for manufactured articles. The railroad worker of the North and the East will have an abundance of employment in transporting those articles. The railroad worker in the Southwest will find little to do. The freight-rate differential prejudices every man, woman, and child in Texas. Those who seek to maintain the present system are working contrary to the interests of all of them.

No one interested need accept my contentions nor those of Mr. Roberts. I include below the report on the situation as it is found to be by a fair and impartial instrumentality of the Federal Government:

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940
BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH,
Washington, May 8, 1944.

Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KILDAY: As requested in your letters, April 27 and May 1, I am glad to submit my comments on your radio address of November 9, and Mr. H. N. Roberts' criticism of February 16, with regard to Texas freight rates.

Your statement is correct that Texas shippers pay more per mile to ship their fabricated articles to market than eastern manufacturers pay to get to the same markets. Despite an occasional exception to this rule, the freight rate advantages enjoyed by eastern manufacturers in shipping their products are very substantial. On the whole, the freight rate disadvantages on products manufactured in Texas and shipped to the north and east are restrictive of the growth of manufacturing in Texas and favorable to the continued development of manufacturing in the northeastern section of the United States, rather than in the south and west.

The terms used to describe freight rates are sometimes confusing to the layman, and before proceeding further, I shall attempt to define them. For rate-making purposes, the railroads divide the different kinds of freight into groups or classes. These classes are designated by numbers, as first class, second class, third class, etc., or sometimes by letters, as class A, class B, etc. Rates are then published on each of these classes. The rates so published are called class rates. It is customary, in discussing class rates, to use the first-class rate for illustration, because the rates on all of the other classes are certain fixed percentages of the first-class rates; therefore, a comparison of first-class rates is sufficient to show the general relationship of all the classes, although only a very small proportion of the freight is actually charged the first-class rate.

Class rates are published on practically all articles of freight between all parts of the United States. They are generally uniform, or closely related, on a mileage basis, within each of the rate territories, but the levels vary widely in one territory compared with another, and from a point in one territory to a point in another. Between two given points, however, the rates are the same in both directions; that is, from San Antonio to New York, for example, the rate would be the same as from New York to San Antonio. But from any point in the South or Southwest to any point in eastern territory the rate is much higher than the rate on the same kind of freight for a haul of the same length within eastern territory. For example, the first-class rate from San Antonio to St. Louis, Mo., is $2.79 per hundred pounds. The distance from San Antonio to St. Louis (925 miles) is about 125 miles shorter than the distance from New York to St. Louis (1,053 miles). The first-class rate from New York to St. Louis, however, is $1.84 per hundred pounds, or 95 cents per hundred pounds cheaper than the rate for the shorter distance from San Antonio to St. Louis. This is typical of the average class-rate levels from the Southwest to the North and East, as compared with eastern class-rate levels. On the whole, the southwestern first-class rates are 61 percent higher than the eastern first-class rates. (For more detailed comparisons, see the Board's report on Interterritorial Freight Rates, H. Doc. No. 303, 78th Cong., 1st sess., p. 91 and preceding.)

The railroads also publish, on commodities moving in heavy volume, particularly on raw materials and a relatively few staple manufactures, specific rates which are lower than the class rates. These are called commodity rates, or exceptions to the classification. These rates are sometimes published generally throughout an area, sometimes only between specific points. Whenever commodity rates or exceptions are published, they take precedence over the higher-class rates. Sometimes these rates are very much lower than the class rates. They are fixed at whatever levels the railroads consider necessary to meet commercial and competitive conditions or to comply with orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission—or, on intrastate traffic, the State railway commissions. Commodity rates and exceptions frequently bear some mathematical relationship to the class rates, but many of them are entirely unrelated. Because of the wide variance in levels of commodity rates within and between each territory, it is possible to pick out some particular commodity rate in any territory which is higher, or another which is lower, than the rates on the same commodity for a like distance in another territory. Such comparisons can be, and frequently are, confusing rather than enlightening. There is not much value in comparing, for example, a carload commodity rate on cotton in bales between points in Texas, where the movement is very heavy, with the rate on cotton for a like distance between two points in the North, where there is no such movement.

The controversy over northern versus southern freight rates centers around the class rates, because these rates, or rates closely related thereto, apply on all less-than-carload freight and on the great majority of manufactured articles moving even in carloads. "Commodity rates" lower than the class-rate levels are published only on a relatively few manufactured articles, moving in heavy volume, where stresses of competition or other peculiar conditions have forced reductions from the class-rate levels. The smaller and newer manufacturers, especially if they are located in areas not highly industrialized, are generally forced to pay class rates on the finished articles they ship, while an old-established competitor in some other area may have been able to get a lower commodity rate. It is vitally important, therefore, for the encouragement and maintenance of manufacturing industry, particularly in the newer and smaller localities, that class-rate levels and relationships be fair and reasonable. High class-rate levels in the South and West, as compared with the lower levels of the North and East, unquestionably retard the development of miscellaneous manufacturing industries in the South and West, and restrict the markets of southern and western manufacturers who wish to sell their products in the North and East in competition with eastern manufacturers.

Defenders of the present freight-rate structure contend that the high class rates of the South and West, on which comparatively little freight moves, are offset by low commodity rates on the freight which moves in heavy volume, and that a reduction in the class rates would require an increase in the low commodity rates, which would injure the producers of the South and West, whose freight moves on commodity rates. It is true that comparatively little freight moves in the South and West on class rates. This is not surprising, because the rates are so high as to practically prohibit any movement in large volume. However, it is not true that, if the southern class rates were reduced to the levels of the eastern class rates, drastic increases in the commodity rates of the South would be necessary. It is possible that the increased volume of freight which would move on lower class rates would yield the railroads more revenue and greater net returns than the present rates. Even if this were not so, the studies of the Board of Investigation and Research show that economies can be made in loading, routing, and handling of freight which would more than compensate for any reductions in class rates, and in fact offer promise of lowering rate levels generally.

It is also argued that, for more than a decade, the South and West have been making greater progress in the development of manufacturing industries than has the East, and this is offered as proof that freight rates are not retarding the industrial development of the South and West. These arguments are generally based on percentage comparisons of growth, or loss, of wage earners or value of manufactured products in 1939, as compared with 1929 or 1919. The figures for the East show some recessions in 1939, when the country was coming out of depression, as compared with the boom years of 1929 and 1919; whereas in the South manufacturing had made so little headway that the boom years had comparatively little effect, and 1939 shows some increases. Such comparisons are of little value because they fail to take into account the tremendously greater volume of manufacturing in the East than in the South and West, and also the fact that such increases in manufacturing as have occurred in the South and West have been in a comparatively few lines of industry and have not been general and widely diffused.

A better idea of the progress of manufacturing in the East, as compared with the South and West, can be gained by tracing the growth in the forty-odd years of the present century, during which the United States changed from a predominantly rural and agricultural to a predominantly urban and industrial nation. In the 40 years, 1899 to 1939, the value of manufactured products in the Eastern States increased from $9,032,000,000 to $41,143,000,000, an increase of $32,000,000,000. In the same period the manufacturing wage earners in the East increased from 3,750,000 to 5,793,000, an increase of more than 2,000,000. In the 5 Southwestern States (Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas), from 1899 to 1939, the value of manufactured products increased from $256,000,000 to $2,593,000,000, and the manufacturing wage earners increased from 115,878 to 265,446. The growth of southwestern manufacturing, in dollars, was only

2,500,000,000, compared with 32,000,000,000 in the East, and in wage earners only 150,000, compared with 2,000,000 in the East.

The States above named, comprising the southwestern rate territory, occupy an area (18 percent of the United States) slightly larger than the States comprising eastern, or official, rate territory (15 percent of the United States). So far as location and natural resources are concerned, the South is unusually blessed and, in no sense, inferior to any other region of the United States. It has a healthful climate, energetic people, cheap water transportation, along its seacoast and the Mississippi River, vast agricultural, forest, and mineral producing capacity. With these assets, the southwest should be able to attract and sustain a much larger population and much larger and more diversified industrial activities than it has attained. Inequalities in freight rates, which retard manufacturing development, have no justification in the southwest, or anywhere else, in our national rate structure. Removal of such inequalities will be beneficial to the carriers and to the general public; they will advance the growth and prosperity not only of the South and West, but of the whole Nation.

Mr. Roberts lists in his letter to you, February 16, certain commodities on which he says "the freight rates in Texas are considerably lower than the rates in official territory." He admits, however, that "the average first-class rate in Texas is 51 percent more than the average first-class rate in the official groups." I doubt whether any extended discussion of these so-called averages would be helpful. Whether Mr. Roberts' averages are mathematically correct or not would depend upon what rates he has selected as freight rates in Texas, and to a considerable degree, upon what freight rates he picked as representative of rates in official territory. Furthermore, the commodities he mentions comprise only a small proportion of the entire Texas traffic. The Board of Investigation and Research has made a study of relative rate levels in the various rate territories, based upon the volume of traffic moving in 1939. These studies indicate that, on numerous commodities listed by Mr. Roberts as taking lower rates in Texas than in official territory, the general rate level actually is higher in the Southwest than the level in official territory. There are other commodities, however, in which the southwestern level is lower than the official territory level. Our studies indicate that, on the whole, the weighted average rate level of the Southwest is about the same as in the East—not more than 2 or 3 percent higher—and the cost of transporting freight is no higher, per hundred pounds or per ton per mile, than the average cost in the East. All this makes it perfectly clear, it seems to me, that there is no possible excuse for the maintenance of class rates in the southwest, or from the southwest to the East, on the present levels, which Mr. Roberts admits are more than 50 percent higher than the eastern class-rate level.

One other point mentioned in your radio address which has been challenged by Mr. Roberts is in regard to the fixing of rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the State commissions, and the rate committees of the railroads. The fact is that the class rates in all of the rate territories (except a part of the mountain Pacific area) have been fixed at their present levels by the Interstate Commerce Commission, based on rates formerly established by the railroads. In fixing the rates the Commission did not have before it the facts necessary to determine whether the varying levels in the different territories were unjustly prejudicial or discriminatory against one section and favorable to another. For the past 5 years the Commission has been conducting an investigation to determine whether the rates in the several territories should be harmonized. After decision is reached in this case some readjustments may be ordered to equalize present differences. It is the opinion of the Board of Investigation and Research, however, that additional legislation will be necessary before complete relief can be expected.

It is true, as stated in your radio address, that most tariffs filed by the railroads with the Commission take effect in 30 days, without being examined in detail by the Commission. However, the majority of these rates are in compliance with or in harmony with Commission orders. It is also true, as Mr. Roberts states, that railroad committees hold hearings and give interested shippers an opportunity to present their views before the railroads make any voluntary changes in their tariffs; and if shippers are not satisfied with the rates published, they have the right to file protests with the Commission and ask for suspension and hearing. Sometimes such requests for suspension are granted and sometimes they are denied. However, the prosecution of such matters before the Commission is a complicated and expensive process, which many shippers and communities, especially the smaller ones, are poorly equipped to undertake. The rates which are voluntarily established by the railroads are generally agreed to by majority vote of the roads, members of the rate committees, and are usually unanimously accepted by the railroads. As Mr. Roberts says, each railroad retains the right to publish its own individual rates independently of the rates fixed by the rate committee, but this right of independent action is seldom exercised, and there are many practical reasons which make it necessary for the railroads, as a rule, to conform to the rates established by the committees.

I hope this clears up the points about which you inquire. If any other information is desired which I may be able to give you, please let me know. I think it is fair to say that although your radio address was subject to criticism as to certain technical matters, there can be no question raised against the accuracy of your main point—that the high levels of class rates applying on manufactured products of Texas and other Southern and Western States are injurious to the industrial and general development of the South and West and are not justified by differences in transportation costs or other transportation or economic considerations.

Yours very truly,

C. E. CHILDE.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Benefits to Farm Homes and the Nation From Post-war Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project," delivered by Mr. Fred J. Freestone at Watertown, N. Y., Friday evening, May 5, 1944, under the auspices of the Watertown Building and Construction Trades Council, attended by representatives of the Grange, chambers of commerce, mayors, and civic bodies of New York State.

Mr. Freestone is a past master of the New York State Grange, and was chairman of the executive committee of the National Grange from 1930 to 1942. He is now president of the National Seaway Council, vice chairman of the Power Authority of the State of New York, and president of the National Grange Liability Co., with headquarters at Syracuse, New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to me to visit Watertown again and to participate in this meeting. You of the north country not only possess one of the greatest natural resources of the world, in other respects also you have been fortunate. For out of this community have come many leaders in industry and commerce, in the public service, and in the professions. We who had the privilege of serving with Delos M. Cosgrove, the first Vice Chairman of the Power Authority, delight to visit his home city. We revere in him the memory of one who by his rugged strength and keen vision helped greatly to advance the St. Lawrence project for the benefit of all mankind.

I have a message to present this evening from the master of the National Grange, Albert S. Goss. In his message Master Goss states the position of the oldest farm organization in the United States, with more than 1,000,000 members, on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and the Aiken bill. It is a pleasure to present this message in the presence of the author of the pending legislation, himself for many years an active member of the Grange.

On April 20, 1944, Master Goss wrote me from National Grange headquarters at Washington:

"Whether the St. Lawrence seaway development would rate as a war project or whether its completion would have to await the cessation of hostilities, the Grange favors its completion as soon as practicable in the light of war conditions.

"The National Grange passed the following resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway development, seventy-seventh annual session, November 10–18, 1943, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

" 'Whereas the National Grange has for years advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, nearly 90 percent of which is already completed, and opening this wonderful artery of commerce to carry the products of the interior of our country to the markets of the world at reduced costs; and

" 'Whereas the completion of this project would permit the development of vast electrical energy, now going to waste in the onrushing waters of this mighty river, resulting in cheaper electric power to all our people; and

" 'Whereas there is legislation now pending in Congress to bring this project to completion as soon as material and labor are available: Therefore be it

" '*Resolved*, That the National Grange reaffirms its position favoring completion of this project for navigation and power purposes.' "

I may state that the substance of this resolution quoted in the letter of Master Goss has been incorporated in the National Grange's platform for 1944 and has been presented in printed form to the Members of the House and the Senate at the present session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.' "

You will recall that extensive public hearings were held in the last Congress on a bill

to authorize the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, after which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors approved the proposed legislation by a 2 to 1 nonpartisan vote. That bill, offered in the House by Chairman MANSFIELD of Texas and subsequently by the late Representative Culkin, of New York, Representative PITTENGER, of Minnesota, and others, was identical in terms with the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN. At the 1941 hearings, the then master of the New York State Grange and the master of the National Grange joined in recommending authorization of the St. Lawrence development. That action was urged by the leaders of the Grange on broad national grounds as well as on behalf of more than 132,000 Grange members in farm homes in the State of New York.

At times we forget that New York is one of the principal farm States of the Union, ranking sixth in the value of its farm production and sharing with a few other Great Lakes areas leadership in dairy farming. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system thus forms a natural highway for the richest farm-producing area in the world, and its improvement is just as vital to agriculture in the East as in the West.

The seaway and power development authorized by the pending bill will be of immense advantage to producers and consumers in every section of our country. Any project that helps to create low-cost transportation and low-cost power will bring benefits that are general in character and not confined to any one section or locality.

The same navigation works which will be erected under this bill to give more than a dozen States on or near the Great Lakes access to the sea, will enable our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coastal areas to increase their intercoastal shipping in American bottoms and widen their market for products which cannot now be moved profitably by rail. The use of St. Lawrence power to raise the consumption of electricity at low rates, to extend rural electrification, and to lower the costs of production both in agriculture and manufactures, will be reflected in benefits to communities far removed from the site of the project. As in the case of the great projects on the Tennessee, the Colorado, and the Columbia Rivers, the advantage of low-cost power from the St. Lawrence will contribute to the economic and social well-being of the people of the entire Nation.

The security of this country rests today upon our possession of rich natural resources and upon our ability to utilize these resources in producing and transporting both agricultural and manufactured goods. The self-preservation of this country and its continued existence as a powerful and prosperous nation will depend, in the years that follow the present World War, upon the use we make of these resources.

At a time when we are enlisting the manpower of the Nation 11,000,000 strong for service on the battle fronts of the world, we cannot permit private interests to obstruct the use of resources which will always be valuable assets, both for defense and for the peacetime needs of our people.

In the pending bill Congress has an opportunity to provide the machinery by which the State of New York, after safeguarding this resource from private exploitation, may cooperate effectively with the Federal Government to remove the last major barrier to the completion of the seaway, at the same time utilizing St. Lawrence power exclusively for the benefit of the public.

From the earliest times this great natural waterway has played its part in the growth and progress of our country. It was through the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes that the tide of settlement moved westward into the interior of the continent. Chicago, Duluth, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other great cities sprang up on the lakes and, because of access to cheap water transportation, became centers for the manufacture of steel, automobiles, farm machinery, and other industries. The first grange in the United States met in Chautauqua County, N. Y., on the shores of Lake Erie, in 1868. In the following year the first State grange was organized in Minnesota at the headquarters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

More than 80 years ago, Abraham Lincoln foretold the growth of the Great Lakes region and warned against the danger of cutting it off, either by physical or artificial barriers, from any of its available routes to the sea. In his second annual message to Congress, Lincoln said:

"The great interior region, bounded east by the Alleghenies, north by the British Dominions, west by the Rocky Mountains, and south by the line along which the culture of corn and cotton meets * * * already has above 10,000,000 people, and will have 50,000,000 within 50 years, if not prevented by any political folly or mistake * * * A glance at the map shows that, territorially speaking, it is the great body of the Republic. * * * In the production of provisions, grains, grasses, and all which proceeds from them, this great interior region is naturally one of the most important in the world. * * * And yet this region has no seacoast, touches no ocean anywhere.

"Outlets, east, west, and south are indispensable to the wellbeing of the people inhabiting, and to inhabit, this vast interior region. Which of the three may be the best, is no proper question. All are better than either; and all of right belong to that people and their successors forever."

The United States and Canada have developed the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River to a point where it is now possible by removing the last remaining barriers to give the great interior region direct access to the sea, to the ports of our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, and to the markets of the world.

The pending bill simply modernizes an existing deep waterway, just as the harbors of our seacoasts have been progressively deepened over the years to keep pace with the enormous growth in size of oceangoing vessels.

Billions in public funds have been expended to create our existing transport facilities, not to serve a few narrow interests in local ports but for the general welfare. All sections of the United States and the whole people are the proper beneficiaries of any sound program to improve our system of transport by rail, highway, inland waterway, and harbor channel. It is in this spirit that we hail the action taken by Senator AIKEN to provide for the modernization of the St. Lawrence project and that we renew our support of the constructive measures he has introduced in the United States Senate.

Mexicans in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, several days ago there appeared in the Washington Post, in the column by Mr. Selden Menefee entitled "America at War," an article with reference to Mexicans in the war. The article by Mr. Menefee is most interesting and generally accurate. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICANS IN THE WAR

(By Selden Menefee)

One of the weak spots in our war effort is our failure to rally the Nation's second largest racial minority, the Mexican-Americans, to participate more actively on the home front.

The Mexicans are doing their full share of the fighting—250,000 of them, out of a total population of 2,000,000 being in the armed services at last reports. They have proved to be among the best of our combat troops.

San Antonio, with a population not much over 300,000, one-third of them Mexicans, has furnished some 51,000 troops. About 1,400 San Antonians have been listed as killed, wounded, or missing, nearly half of these being of Spanish-American or Mexican stock.

The first Army private to get a Congressional Medal of Honor in this war was a Mexican lad from Colorado named Jose Martines. His outfit was storming a height leading to Chichagof Harbor in the battle of Attu. The Japanese were well entrenched, and it looked like a suicide mission.

The commanding officer gave the order to advance. No one moved. The order was repeated. One man stepped forward—Martines. He started up the slope, and others followed, cleaning up machine-gun nests as they went. Martines ran out of ammunition and was killed. But the way was opened.

BAD HOME MORALE

The fighting war is very close to most Mexican-American families, for nearly all of them have one or two sons in the armed forces. Nevertheless, here at home a bad morale problem has developed among the Mexicans, and little is being done to overcome it.

Los Angeles, with its 250,000 Mexicans, has been called the second largest Mexican city in the world, being topped only by Mexico City. Ever since the so-called zoot-suit riot of last year resentment has been simmering just below the surface in the Mexican community.

The Mexicans of Los Angeles feel alone, tolerated but not accepted by the American community. Many war plants will not hire them, and little has been done to draw them into community activities in support of the war. The Mexican is proud, and this enforced isolation causes bitterness.

The Sinarquist movement with its totalitarian philosophy, has attempted to take advantage of this situation. Its propaganda appeals to the racial and national pride of the Mexicans. Its failure to win widespread support on this side of the border is surprising to those who know what the Mexican is up against.

One barrier to assimilation of the Mexicans is their tendency to retain Spanish as their first language. In the 1940 census 7 percent of all Californians and 13 percent of the Texans named Spanish as their mother tongue.

In part this is because the Mexicans are relatively recent immigrants, in part because they are segregated in their own sections of town in the southwest, where most of them live. In any case it makes the job of reaching them with news about the war difficult, though doubly necessary.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Our Government agencies have failed to meet this challenge. For a time O. W. I. had a Mexican-American editor from Los Angeles, Ignacio Lopez, writing broadcasts and news releases. He did an excellent job, from the reports I heard in Los Angeles.

But because of congressional sniping and slashing at O. W. I.'s domestic appropriation, that has gone by the board. For the past 5 months no Mexican has been on the staff of O. W. I.'s Foreign Language Division.

The agency puts out three 4½-minute radio shows a week to stations featuring Spanish-language broadcasts, but these are written in English and translated, and they fail to use the Mexican idiom. Occasional press releases issued to the 144 Spanish-language publications in this country are not much better.

The Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs has opened inter-American centers in Los Angeles, Chicago, and other cities, but their chief aim seems to be to develop an interest among American businessmen in post-war trade with Latin America. They do not reach the Mexican people.

One thing that is needed is to bring the war closer to the Mexicans. They do not have to be sold on the war itself, but only on their stake in it. They need to be encouraged to develop pride in the racial and national background, and in the contributions they have already begun to make in America.

They also badly need war information of the most rudimentary sort. In the absence of an adequate Spanish-language radio and press service in O. W. I., O. P. A. officials have had an increasingly difficult time explaining to the Mexicans the ins and outs of rationing. Mexican women with husbands in the Army frequently become Red Cross charity cases because they, or their husbands, do not understand the allotment system.

The Mexican wants to feel less like the forgotten man and more like an American. That is a modest enough wish, and deserves to be satisfied.

The Late Moina Michael, Founder of Poppy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Wednesday morning Miss Moina Michael, a distinguished citizen of my State, who is known throughout the world as the originator of Poppy Day, which has been the means of raising millions of dollars for the rehabilitation and support of veterans of the First World War, passed to her reward. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief article from the New York Times in regard to Miss Michael's life and work.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOINA MICHAEL, 74, FOUNDED POPPY DAY—ORIGINATOR OF IDEA THAT RAISED MILLIONS FOR WAR VETERANS DIES IN GEORGIA HOSPITAL

ATHENS, GA., May 10.—Miss Moina Michael, who originated Poppy Day in 1918 as a memorial to the war dead, died in a hospital here early today after an illness of several months. Her age was 74.

Known as the Poppy Lady, she also originated the annual memorial to soldiers and sailors who died at sea in the First World War, each year making a 7-foot anchor of poppies and setting it adrift at Savannah, Ga., until 1930. Thereafter the anchors were launched by naval authorities at Annapolis.

President Roosevelt told Miss Michael in 1938: "I know all about you. You started a wonderful work."

MEMBER OF GEORGIA FACULTY

Miss Michael was a member of the University of Georgia faculty for more than 25 years. Georgia paid tribute to her work in 1937 by unveiling a marble statue of her in the State Capitol.

She carried the Poppy Day idea to the American Legion, which sponsored it in August 1920. The British Legion adopted it in 1921.

Miss Michael spent her time since Christmas in a hospital room fashioning the poppy anchor which will be launched at the Naval Academy on Memorial Day.

With hands that were stiff and aching from neuritis she finished the last of the 300 paper poppies 2 weeks ago. Sitting in a wheel chair as she worked, she remarked:

"This may be my last poppy anchor."

INSPIRATION FROM WAR POEM

Miss Michael set November 9, 1918, as the birth date of the Flanders Field memorial poppy idea. Col. John McCrae's poem, "In Flanders Field," provided much of the inspiration, she said.

Poppies are now worn on Memorial Day in all States of the Union, in Great Britain, and 53 other foreign countries.

Profits from their sale in the British Empire from 1921 to 1940 were approximately $50,000,000. Miss Michael estimated that total profits throughout the world have been $125,000,000, all used for the rehabilitation of veterans or for the care of their dependents.

The idea brought no gain to Miss Michael.

FORMER Y. W. C. A. OFFICIAL

Born in Good Hope, Ga., the daughter of John Marion and Alice Sherwood Wise Michael, Miss Michael studied at Teachers College in Athens, Ga., and Columbia University.

She taught in the Georgia public schools and had been social director of Winnie Davis Hall and general secretary of the Y. W. C. A. at Georgia State Teachers College. She was president from 1915 to 1920 of the Georgia Council of Deans of Women and Social Directors of Schools and Colleges of Georgia. During the First World War she served with the Y. W. C. A., overseas headquarters.

Miss Michael received the American Legion Auxiliary's distinguished-service medal in 1930, the distinguished-citizen citation of the Georgia Legislature in 1931, and was nominated for the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award in 1934.

She was a member of the Bicentennial Commission of Georgia in 1933, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Daughters of the Confederacy, the advisory committee on women's participation in the New York World's Fair, and an honorary member of the Spanish-American War Veterans' Auxiliary.

Miss Michael was the author of a poem, "We Shall Keep the Faith."

British Air Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on British air policy appearing in today's New York Times, together with the attached statements, one of which is a special radio message from London on the air situation, and the other of which is from Ottawa. The entire article is to be included.

There being no objection, the article and attached statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH AIR POLICY IN LINE WITH OURS—BEAVERBROOK ANNOUNCES SHIFT FROM CANADA'S WORLD RULE PLAN TO "FOUR FREEDOMS" IDEA

LONDON, May 10.—Great Britain reluctantly has abandoned a Canada-backed post-war plan for central international control of civil aviation and has turned toward the American-sponsored idea of a "four freedoms" of the air, Lord Beaverbrook announced in the House of Lords today.

Lord Beaverbrook, Lord Privy Seal and charged by Prime Minister Churchill to form a post-war aviation program for the British Empire, said Britain had at first favored the Canadian plan, with its system of allocated quotas, but had turned to the American plan following United States opposition to the Canadian proposal.

The American plan to curtail competition by fixing standards and rates, Lord Beaverbook said, was based more along the lines of the "four freedoms" of the air—the right to fly, to land, to set down passengers, mail, and cargo, and to pick them up anywhere in the world.

Lord Beaverbrook said the British delegation went into the conference here recently with Adolf A. Berle, Jr., United States Assistant Secretary of State, favoring what is known as the Canadian draft convention which "laid down a detailed plan for an internation regulating authority of frequencies of air service and national quotas for international air traffic."

TOO RIGID FOR AMERICANS

"This program," he continued, "was considered by the Americans as too rigid as a basis for talks at the proposed international conference."

This conference will be held later this year, probably at Washington.

"The broad purpose," Lord Beaverbrook explained, "will be to draw up an international convention on air navigation to be supplemented by an international transport organization which would evolve standards, seek to eliminate uneconomic competition, work out for each nation a network of participation in world transport, and maintain a broad equilibrium between air transport capacity and transport offerings.

"On these general principles, the United States and Great Britain are in agreement. The powers of enforcement will be open to further discussion."

Noting that President Roosevelt had proposed for the future the right of innocent passage for all nations and the right to land anywhere, Lord Beaverbrook said he was authorized by Mr. Churchill to say:

"We are joined with Mr. Roosevelt to the fullest extent in subscribing to these principles."

Amid cheers, Lord Beaverbrook declared that the United States was prepared to make long-range aircraft available to Great Britain on a nondiscriminatory basis for civil aviation during the post-war period of adjustment of British plane production.

NEW TYPES OF CRAFT DESIGNED

He said he was able to give such assurance on the authority of Mr. Berle. But Britain, he emphasized, was not content to rest alone on the United States supply and everything possible would be done to provide Britain with her own passenger and commercial planes.

"We must admit," he said, "that the United States has a long lead over us in air transport, but we have a number of excellent designs for new types."

The arrangement by which the United States agreed to construct bombers while Great Britain comcentrated on fighters was "an admirable division of responsibility for war purposes," Lord Beaverbrook added, but it "plainly conferred on the United States advantages in post-war manufacture for the civil aviation market."

Outside Parliament Lord Knollys, chairman of the British Overseas Airways Corporation, told a meeting of the Royal Empire Society that the United States Air Transport Command had been flying planes from San Francisco to Australia by way of Honolulu in "well under 48 hours."

"CHOSEN-INSTRUMENT" STATUS

LONDON, May 10.—In answer to a question in the House of Lords today as to the status of the chosen-instrument policy by which the British Government now controls and operates air lines, Lord Beaverbrook replied:

"It is just as it was. It is fixed by statute and until Parliament decides to repeal the statute then the chosen instrument is just as it used to be."

Discussing British types of big commercial planes, Lord Beaverbrook said that the Shetland flying boat, first mentioned last month in an Australian areonautical magazine but the details of which were withheld here, will soon be ready for its first flight.

Built by Short Bros. and Saunder-Roe, the Shetland is a 100-ton craft powered by four Centurus engines. It can carry 50 to 100 passengers, depending upon length of hop and it has a range of 3,000 miles and a cruising speed of about 275 miles an hour.

CANADA TO ATTEND PARLEY

OTTAWA, May 10.—Canada probably will participate in a further post-war civil aviation conference along with the United Kingdom, the United States, and perhaps other countries, in spite of the rejection of a Canadian plan for fixed control, national quotas, and a central international enforcement authority, it was learned today.

Munitions Minister C. D. Howe, Canadian representative at recent conferences on post-war civil aviation, said he had no immediate comment to make on Lord Beaverbrook's statement.

Disposal of Surplus Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter, which discusses the very vital matter of disposal of surplus materials by the Government:

FORT WAYNE, IND., *May 8, 1944.*

Congressman GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: The time has come when we must give serious thought to the matter of surplus material accumulated by the Government in their various depots. As you know, this is a mobile war and our industry is vitally affected. It has been reported from reliable sources that the Government is now gradually disposing of these surplus stocks. For the interest and the preservation of our business, and for the security of employment and our economic system in the post-war era, it is imperative that we act now—together—so that proper legislation is passed for the protection of our established channels of trade so that no price wrecking speculators, who are now maneuvering to get control of this material, may have the opportunity to wreck our market.

If we permit this surplus material to be dumped on the open market it will definitely affect our economic system and send prices downward to the point that it would be impossible for any manufacturer to continue the sale of his merchandise on a reasonable profitable basis and this would prohibit the function of the automotive distributors until such time that the market has absorbed all this surplus material.

There are two thoughts on this matter: How shall we act with regard to the movement of the surplus material now during the prosecution of the war; and what shall be done with the material after the day of victory.

We have given considerable thought to this matter and our suggestions for action at present to Congress is—

1. The surplus automotive material which is accumulated at the various depots should first be used in he various governmenal agencies, such as Army, Navy, Air Corps, etc.

2. After the various agencies have taken all the material they require, the surplus should then be offered to contractors working on Government contracts who may be in a position to use this material and would be in the market for such a product. We would also like to point out that by offering this material to these contractors we would be saving the raw material necessary to produce these same products.

3. Then, the manufacturer of the product should be given an opportunity to purchase back his material for distribution through his regular wholesale channels of trade.

4. Last, that this material be offered to wholesale distributors at established market prices.

The disposal of surplus material in the post-war era is a gigantic problem. We believe that a certain quantity of this material can be disposed of to the various countries overseas, for they will have a need of equipment to furnish their standing armies. We, likewise, will also require a certain portion for our armed forces. The remaining portion of marketable products should be offered for sale through regular established channels of trade until such time as the reconversion of industry commences.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM C. KORTE, *Secretary.*

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a pamphlet published by the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on the St. Lawrence seaway:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—THAT HUGE BEHEMOTH!

The Buffalo Chamber of Commerce has long opposed the St. Lawrence seaway project. It has persistently, each time the need arose, presented its conclusions to congressional committees, to businessmen, and to the public, and it will continue to do so until this ugly behemoth of Federal politics is killed for all time.

Periodically, for half a century, the St. Lawrence seaway project has been revived. The issue met defeat in Congress twice in the last decade and the arguments in its favor are less convincing now than on those occasions. The fact that this Nation at the moment is devoting all of its energies and attention to the prosecution of the toughest war the world has ever seen does not prevent the politicians again from leading out their sacred cow. By the widest possible stretch of the imagination it again appears as a project "in the interests of national defense" in the bill (S. 1385) introduced by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont.

The Vermont Legislature, within recent weeks, completely repudiated Senator AIKEN'S proposal in a resolution passed with the thumping vote of 123 to 69. It is perfectly clear that Senator AIKEN'S bill which, for some reason, again endangers States' rights, is not wanted even in his own State.

In view of the military necessities in the utilization of time, of men, of materials, and of money, it first of all seems impossible today to justify the Aiken bill proposed, as it says, "in the interests of national defense and for other purposes." The Aiken bill states that "the work allocated for construction by the United States under said agreement (with Canada) and be undertaken immediately under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers * * *" It would seem, at the moment, that the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers are, or should be, quite fully occupied with the prosecution of the war without being charged with the responsibility of directing the United States in a billion-dollar project.

Two years ago the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce insisted that the St. Lawrence project would be costly in money, men, transport, and materials. Most of all, that it would be a prodigious and profligate misdirection of important critical materials when they are badly needed elsewhere now. This situation, true as it was 2 years ago, is infinitely more true today.

At a time when the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service organization are desperately scraping the manpower barrel of the country and urging the employment of more thousands of women in industry in order to provide the necessary war materials, it seems more than ever the height of folly to think of constructing the St. Lawrence seaway, which at this time would divert tens of thousands of men from the war effort to a construction project of doubtful or no value.

The issue of national defense is an overworked argument. Just what beneficial effect the seaway would have had, either in the last war or this one, is exceedingly obscure. There was not enough ocean shipping available in either war to waste it in the long transit through the St. Lawrence into the Lakes. Quick turn-arounds and efficient concentration of ocean shipping were imperative and the long journey into the Lakes would have been a profligate waste.

Experience has shown the wisdom of concentrating ocean shipping at our salt-water ports and funneling the necessary war materials into those channels by the expeditious use of our flexible inland transportation agencies.

The St. Lawrence seaway, either in war or peace, is bound to prove uneconomic and unsound.

POST-WAR

A recent statement credited to Secretary of State Cordell Hull that the Aiken bill should be enacted now authorizing this undertaking in the post-war period is a plain indication that the proponents have abandoned their main argument that the seaway and power development is a war necessity.

Does this statement by Secretary Hull forecast an attempt at a national policy of make-work projects for the days after the war? Is this the beginning of a program of paternalistic national spending on the assumption that a depression is inevitable after the war? If this to be a continuous policy, it may well lead to national bankruptcy.

Can it be that the present urgency to enact this bill as a post-war measure lies partly in the muted attitude of our northern neighbor and that to postpone action until after the war would revive opposition from that quarter?

SEAWAY

The ship canal, according to proponents of the St. Lawrence project, will make possible commerce between oceangoing ships and the Great Lakes. Engineers say the St. Lawrence Seaway will be open for navigation as little as 56 percent of the year. This is based upon navigation experience in existing channels over a period of 20 years.

Shipping interests have opposed the St. Lawrence project on the grounds that it presents serious navigation problems and is economically unsound in principle. Oceangoing ships would, of course, require special pilots for the channels and navigation for those used to the wide-open spaces of the open sea would be slow, hazardous, and difficult. Most ocean freighters could not operate under full draft. They would find it necessary to operate light and not at full efficiency, or not operate at all. Operation through the channel would be slow, even when navigable, and the highly-organized traffic in Great Lakes grain, ore, and coal would be seriously disrupted, affecting the business of Great Lakes ports and putting out of work large numbers of workers.

Oceangoing vessels are not adaptable to efficient operation in canals or relatively restricted navigation areas such as would be provided in the St. Lawrence Seaway. Eighty percent of the hull space of Great Lakes freighters are devoted to cargo while it is generally true that in oceangoing vessels only 33⅓ percent may be devoted to cargo. Experience has proved that navigation on the Great Lakes and through relatively narrow channels, as well as the particular cargo requirements in the Great Lakes carrying trade, makes the operation of the ocean freighter economically unsound and relatively impractical in this trade.

DOMESTIC COMMERCE

If the United States desires to play Santa Claus to foreign vessel-owning interests so that they may send their ships to our inland ports and seize the export-import carrying trade, that is folly of one kind, but there are also many obvious reasons why coastal trade in American bottoms through the St. Lawrence seaway would prove to be folly of another kind and also prove to be economically unsound.

Thanks to its proximity to the Lakes and to the people of New York State, who financed the State barge canal, the upper lake area already has a cheap transportation outlet to the North Atlantic that is not available to other American communities less fortunately situated. This is true also of the all-water route from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico via the Mississippi River system.

The distance via the St. Lawrence route from Duluth to New York or New Orleans is more than double that via existing water routes. Construction and operating costs of the ocean-type vessels that would have to use the St. Lawrence greatly exceed that of lake vessels and canal and river barges. Whereas, prior to the enactment of the Transportation Act of 1940, prospective operators in the lake-coastal trade would have been able to choose desirable traffic at whatever rates would be attractive, that act places such operators under the regulatory powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission. If they could get the necessary permits or certificates of convenience and necessity in face of existing competition, they would be required, in the case of common carriers, to file tariffs of rates and maintain a service available to all shippers. There is a vast difference between the carriage of selected commodities and an overall common carrier service at rates fixed by the Commission.

The rates of contract carriers would also be subject to I. C. C. supervision, and the Commission has the power, upon complaint, to fix minimum rates of both types of carriers.

All circumstances considered, it is extremely doubtful that capital could be influenced to invest in such enterprises.

(See accompanying comparative distance tables.)

POWER

Two years ago the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce said, "There has been no shortage of power in New York State." It pointed out that all present and contemplated requirements for power had been provided and that there was then a surplus of generating capacity in New York State. That statement was true 2 years ago and it is still true today. We are now in full war production and there is still no evidence of a power shortage.

The maximum demand for electrical power in New York State on December 14, 1943, between 5 and 6 p. m., was 4,198,600 kilowatts; and there is an installed capacity in the State of 5,346,200 kilowatts, which leaves an additional excess capacity of 1,157,600 kilowatts. There is no present need for additiona' electrical power.

Existing and future power surpluses can be supplied at Massena and elsewhere within the State by utilizing existing transmission lines. The Beauharnois Power Co. in Canada, only 50 miles north of Massena, is another possible source. It can furnish any additional power required up to 1,400,000 horsepower in from 1½ to 2 years, the period being determined by the time necessary to procure and install the additional generating machinery. The necessary treaty arrangements with Canada to utilize this facility could be readily negotiated.

The St. Lawrence project is being advocated, it seems, by a small, well-organized group of public-power proponents who are intent, even in the face of the war, upon substituting political for business management throughout the electric-utility industry.

SUBSIDIES

The promotion of foreign commerce brings into issue the competitive factor between foreign and American shipping. We would either have to surrender the foreign commerce of the Lakes to foreign operators or grant operating and construction differential subsidies to American operators to enable them to compete effectively against the lower operating and construction costs of foreign competitors. There is no other practical way of keeping this traffic in American bottoms.

If we decide not to surrender this commerce to foreign shipping, the extent of these subsidies to American operators must be considered as a part of the seaway cost, and it will not be a small item.

Consideration must also be given to the discrimination that would be created if such shipping were supported by Federal funds and the transportation agencies, railroads, trucks, and water carriers that presently participate in this traffic were denied relative monetary support.

The diversion of export and import traffic from the Atlantic and Gulf ports would disrupt the ocean freight-rate structures and seriously affect the successful financial operation of overseas shipping at those ports.

STATES' RIGHTS

Perhaps the most shocking element in the Aiken bill is its attack on States' rights. It represents nothing more nor less than legislation compelling a clear abdication by the sovereign State of New York to the Federal Government of its inalienable rights in and to the natural resources of New York State, comprised in the State's ownership of bed, water, power, and power sites upon, adjacent to, or within the watershed of the St. Lawrence River.

While New York State would be victimized by the Aiken bill, it also sets a precedent whereby other States may be victimized by encroachment of the Federal Government. It is that foot in the door which Federal bureaucrats have long been seeking and other States have felt in a Federal control of State resources under the guise of flood control.

While the Aiken bill would provide for the transfer to the power authority of the State of New York the "power facilities constructed pursuant to this authorization and the right to use the United States share of the waters," the bill ties a string to this provision. It states specifically: "In addition, the arrangement shall include provisions protecting the interests of the United States and assuring a widespread, equitable disposition of the power to public agencies in other States, including counties, municipalities, public power districts, and rural electric cooperatives within economic transmission distances * * *." This provision would give the Federal Government the right to dictate to New York State how it shall dispose of the power. It is a socialistic provision which would bar the distribution of the power by a private agency even if that proved, by virtue of ownership of transmission lines and other facilities already in existence, to be the most economical method.

The Aiken bill is one of the most subtle and iniquitous attacks on States' rights to appear in many years.

COSTS

Total cost figures for the United States and Canada for this project, including interest during the time of construction and the amortization cost over a period of 50 years, will reach the staggering figure of $1,130,121,924, of which the share of the United States will be $585,949,383. These figures are based on official estimates issued in May 1940, and costs will be higher at the present time.

Construction index costs since the last estimates were made for the St. Lawrence seaway project indicate a rise of 18.39 percent. The figures given herewith, the latest available, were prepared during the fall and winter of 1940. Taking the year 1926 as a base index of 100, the construction index had risen to 119.80 as of December 1940 when the estimates were made, but the rise since that time to February 1944, according to the Engineering News record, had risen to an index of 141.83, which is 22.03 points higher than the index for 1940, an increase of 18.39 percent.

(See accompanying cost estimates issued in a report of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board.)

The following table is based on the testimony of Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the United States Army engineers, and covers the foreseeable portion of what the cost is likely to be to the United States.

What the cost estimates of the St. Lawrence seaway reveal

Great Lakes system:	*Present estimate*
New locks at Sault St. Marie with approved channels	$8,000,000
Connecting channels, Detroit and St. Clair Rivers	66,029,000
Compensating works, Niagara and St. Clair Rivers	Omitted

St. Lawrence River:	*Present estimate*
Thousand Islands section	$516,000
International Rapids section:	
A. Works solely for navigation	48,857,000
B. Works primarily for power	78,550,000
C. Works common to navigation and power	100,210,000
Total	302,162,000
Deduct amount already expended	17,105,485
	285,056,515
Add 12½ percent for contingencies	(included above)
Total initial cost without harbors	285,056,515
Add—	
Harbors improvement:	
13 harbors, at average $7,500,000 per harbor	97,500,000
12½ percent for contingencies	12,187,500
	394,744,015
Add—	
Interest during construction, at 3 percent on basis 4 years	23,684,641
Total initial cost, including harbor, and interest during construction at 3 percent	418,428,656
Deduct amount to be reimbursed by New York State Power Authority	93,375,000
	325,053,656
Add—	
Interest at 3 percent, based on amortization of cost in 50 equal annual installments	243,790,242
	568,843,898
To which should be added amount already expended	17,105,485
	585,949,383
Total cost, both countries:	
United States	585,949,383
Dominion of Canada	544,172,541
Grand joint total	1,130,121,924

A STUDY IN DISTANCES

As illustrative of the competitive conditions that would confront prospective operators of vessels between lake ports and our coastal ports with the following comparisons of distances are significant:

	Statute miles
Buffalo to New York:	
Via St. Lawrence	2,070
Via New York State Barge Canal	504
Difference	1,566
Detroit to New York:	
Via St. Lawrence	2,292
Via Lake and New York State Barge Canal	765
Difference	1,527
Chicago to New York:	
Via St. Lawrence	2,924
Via Lake and New York State Barge Canal	1,397
Difference	1,527
Duluth to New York:	
Via St. Lawrence	3,017
Via Lake and New York State Barge Canal	1,490
Difference	1,527
Chicago to New Orleans:	
Via St. Lawrence	4,745
Via Mississippi River system	1,524
Difference	3,221
Duluth to New Orleans:	
Via St. Lawrence	4,838
Via Lake and Mississippi River system	2,332
Difference	2,506
Chicago to San Diego, Calif.:	
Via St. Lawrence and Panama Canal	8,214
Via rail	2,347
Difference	5,867
Chicago to San Francisco:	
Via St. Lawrence and Panama Canal	8,674
Via rail	2,279
Difference	6,395
Chicago to Seattle:	
Via St. Lawrence and Panama Canal	9,560
Via rail	2,224
Difference	7,336
Duluth to San Francisco:	
Via St. Lawrence and Panama Canal	8,767
Via rail	2,243
Difference	6,524
Duluth to Seattle:	
Via St. Lawrence and Panama Canal	9,653
Via rail	1,808
Difference	7,845

Obviously the vast amount of circuity between lake ports and Atlantic and Gulf ports via the St. Lawrence and the existing water routes would preclude any probability of the inauguration of service via the St. Lawrence between such points.

This is true also in the comparison of water and rail distances between lake ports and Pacific coast ports. One of the most liberal figures the Interstate Commerce Commission ever used in composing the competitive rates as between rail and water carriers was to equate the water distance on a basis of 3.6 miles to 1 rail mile. On that basis the water rates between lake ports and Pacific ports would be higher than the rail rates.

Admiral King Clears Congress in Guam Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article written by Phillip Warden of the staff of the Chicago Tribune under date of May 7, 1944:

ADMIRAL CLEARS BOTH HOUSES IN GUAM DISPUTE—KING EXPLAINS REMARKS ON FORTIFICATION

(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 7.—Demands that Admiral King, commander in chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations, explains the "false" and "unjustified" charges in his official report on the Navy at war that Congress was responsible for our failure to fortify Guam today brought an almost complete retraction of these allegations.

In a letter to Acting Secretary of Navy Forrestal disclosed today, Admiral King completely absolved the Senate and almost cleared the House of accusations that have been employed in primary campaigns against Senators TYDINGS, Democrat, Maryland; HOLMAN, Republican of Oregon; and NYE, Republican of North Dakota.

Admiral King's letter to Forrestal revealed that the question of fortifying Guam had not come up in the Senate at all and had been requested only orally in the House during committee hearings. No formal request for an appropriation to fortify Guam had been made to either House by the Navy Department or the President.

The letter in effect placed the blame for Guam going unfortified on President Roosevelt.

RECALLS HEPBURN REPORT

It said the "essential desirability" for fortifying Guam was communicated to Congress in the report of the Hepburn Board of 1939 and orally by the Chief of Naval Operations in the course of committee hearings on a House resolution to increase naval aviation facilities on Guam. It said these recommendations were never incorporated in the bill.

It was recalled that the report of the Hepburn Board, based on a survey of bases in the Atlantic and Pacific, was given President Roosevelt and he in turn transmitted it with certain recommendations to Congress. While Admiral Arthur J. Hepburn, the Commander in Chief of the Fleet, recommended fortifications costing $180,000,000 be built, neither the President nor the Navy made a direct request to Congress for such an appropriation.

BILL OMITS GUAM

Admiral King skirted these facts, however, in his letter absolving Congress.

In his letter to Forrestal, Admiral King wrote:

"The essential desirability of fortifying Guam was communicated to Congress in the report of the Hepburn Board in 1939 and orally by the Chief of Naval Operations in the course of the committee hearings on House Resolution 2880 (67th Cong., 1st sess.), but these proposals were never embodied in formal draft legislation.

"Though the question of fortification entered into the debate on said bill, it was not included in the bill as voted upon. The proposals relating to Guam that received adverse votes in Congress were (a) provision in House Resolution 2880 (changes to H. R. 4278) introduced February 1939, to establish, develop, or increase naval-aviation facilities at Guam; (b) a provision in the 1940 appropriation bill for improvement of harbor channels at Guam."

SENATOR WALSH PROTESTS

Senator WALSH (Democrat, Massachusetts), chairman of the powerful Naval Affairs Committee, was one of the first to demand that Admiral King expunge from his report the charge that "after considerable debate" Congress rejected a proposal to proceed with the fortification of Guam. Senator WALSH said the admiral's statement was "unjustified" because the facts were that Congress had never been asked to fortify Guam.

Senator WHEELER (Democrat, Montana) joined Senator WALSH in asking King to supply the official information upon which he based his "false" accusation against Congress.

Administration of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for over a year now the rules and regulations under the Price Control Act, which is being administered by the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of controlling prices, have been so rigid and applied so unwisely in some instances as to increase the pressure and power of inflation rather than to decrease it.

In many instances this organization has helped to keep prices from advancing too rapidly and its effects have been beneficial. It is regrettable that in many other instances it has operated to increase the threat of inflation. Inflation is increased when the goods people want to buy are held off the market because they cannot be manufactured, delivered to the retailer, and sold at a profit by either of them.

The Office of Price Administration in many instances has compelled manufacturers of the ordinary necessities of life to attempt to continue to produce goods at the price level of manufacturing of 1942, when the price was frozen, and have refused to take into consideration that the price of producing such goods has been increased by allowing wages to rise and because more efficient labor has been taken into the Army or has been lured into the high-salaried war-production plants which has cut down the production of such manufacturers by reason of losing the younger men and men who were skilled in bringing forth a great production in the same number of hours. Many such manufacturers have quit business and many of those who remain in business are working with only a skeleton organization, some of them losing money, some of them breaking even, and few of them making a legitimate profit.

The laconic directive in 1942 issued by the President in which he demanded that the Office of Price Administration's "hold the line" sounded well to the American people but it has not worked successfully because one end of the line has been held; but the cost-of-production end of the line to the little manufacturer and distributor has not been held, which has kept goods off the market.

One of the best ways to fight inflation is to encourage all of the production for civilian articles that is possible for which there is available material which is not needed for the war effort. Give the people all of the useful necessary articles which they are needing on their farms and in their homes and this will help to absorb some of the extra money and this will minimize the pressure to break the line.

Unreasonable and uneconomic practices imposed by the office of Price Administration which have depressed production, not only in manufactured merchandise but in many instances production on the farm, is not fair to the American people, not conducive to the best interest of our general economy, and is a practice that continuously increases the pressure of inflation.

The small businessmen's committee and many of the Members of Congress have conducted investigations and for the past year have tried to convince the Office of Price Administration of the necessity of following more closely the law which provides for mitigating inequities when they exist.

It does seem that the little businessmen and the Main Street merchants have become the forgotten men of this country. It raises the question as to whether or not those in charge of forming the policy of our Government are deliberately attempting to wipe out the little businessmen of the Nation.

In all of the history of this Government big business has never been so strongly favored by any national administration. For political effect they bemoan and cry out against big business at the front door and issue him special privileges at the back door. The big packers, the big dairy companies, the major oil companies, and big business generally have moved their power controls from Wall Street to Washington.

If there is a plan to socialize this Government little business must first be regimented, destroyed, or brought under control, and later big business can be more quickly brought under control of the Federal Government. There are many who believe such a program may be in the making.

In this connection I want to offer in support of the above statement and include in the RECORD a letter from one of the old, sound business firms of Teutopolis, Ill., which I received this morning from H. J. Weber & Co. who, for over a quarter of a century, have supplied the people in that little village with clothing, shoes, gents' furnishings, and general lines of merchandising to be found in the ordinary progressive stores in many of the small towns of this Nation. This is only one of the many complaints which the Members of Congress find coming over their desks daily.

TEUTOPOLIS, ILL., *May 8, 1944.*

Congressman CHAS. W. VURSELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a small independent merchant in a small town, we wish to register a complaint against the W. P. B., O. P. A., and various bureaus that are depriving us of clothing and shoes vitally needed by our farmers and workers. Our allotment of overalls, work shirt, shoes, work gloves, underwear, etc., is much too small to supply the demands.

When we write our sources of supply—the wholesalers and manufacturers—we receive the reply that, beside the shortage of labor and material, the cost of raw material and labor has risen to such an extent, that they are operating at a loss under the present ceiling set-up. Why does O. P. A. allow these things to happen?

The only reason we can see for all this, is to "freeze" all small merchants out of business and let the big operators control the retailing field. Any effort on your part to alleviate this condition will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

H. J. WEBER CO.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith copies of resolutions adopted at a meeting, sponsored by the Watertown Building and Construction Trades Council, in the interest of the St. Lawrence River power and seaway development, held at Watertown, N. Y., May 5, 1944:

Whereas the St. Lawrence River furnishes a natural outlet to the Atlantic for the five Great Lakes along the northeastern boundary of the State of New York and represents, by all odds, the greatest undeveloped natural resource for power and navigation in North America; and

Whereas prior to and during the present World War other great river systems of the United States have proved their worth when properly developed as invaluable assets to the Nation's strength, furnishing low-cost power for war production and supplementing other forms of transportation; and

Whereas 15 great dams have been erected in the Tennessee Valley, in the States of Tennessee, Alabama, Kentucky, and North Carolina, and Congress has appropriated since the initiation of this project by President Wilson more than $500,000,000 to build artificial reservoirs, dams, power works, and locks, thus creating one of the greatest combined systems of inland waterway and power development in the world; and

Whereas the great Boulder Dam in the Colorado River was authorized under the administration of President Hoover and its power works have now been virtually completed in combination with canal, navigation, and reclamation works, at an ultimate estimated cost for the entire system of about $300,000,000; and

Whereas the power, navigation, and reclamation works on the Columbia River, initiated by President Roosevelt, have been carried forward during the war to complete the Bonneville Dam and deep navigation locks, the Grand Coulee Dam, and other works, at an estimated ultimate cost of over $400,000,000; and

Whereas there are now pending before the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate the omnibus rivers and harbors bill and the flood control bill, authorizing additional projects on our great river systems aggregating over $1,500,000,000, including $200,000,000 to be applied to a half billion dollar project on the Missouri River, and more than $200,000,000 additional for the Mississippi; and

Whereas the Committee on Commerce also has had pending before it since September 28, 1943, the Aiken bill, S. 1385, to authorize construction of works to complete the St. Lawrence seaway and power development at a net cost to the Federal Treasury of less than $190,000,000; and

Whereas thorough and complete public hearings were held on an identical bill in the last Congress and it was at that time approved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and by every Federal and State agency directly concerned with the St. Lawrence development: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference appeals to the United States Senate and to the United States House of Representatives to take favorable action at this session of the Congress on the pending St. Lawrence project bills introduced by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont and Representative PITTENGER, of Minnesota, to the end that the Northeastern United States and the Great Lakes region may not be cheated of their birthright and the benefits which will flow from the development of the greatest natural resource available for post-war utilization in this populous and productive area; and be is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chairman to the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, junior Senator from the State of New York and also the only New York member of the Senate Committee on Commerce; to Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior Senator from the State of New York, who has declared his unqualified and active support of the Aiken bill; to the Vice President and presiding officer of the Senate; to the Speaker of the House; and to all Members of the New York delegation in Congress.

Whereas this conference on the St. Lawrence project has heard a masterly presentation of the seaway and power development in the address by the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, United States Senator from the State of Vermont; and

Whereas Senator AIKEN is the author of Senate bill 1385, providing for the immediate authorization and the post-war construction of the works needed to complete the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas there are present at this meeting representatives of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, the Building and Construction Trades Council, the Grange, members of the New York State Legislature, mayors, boards of supervisors, and numerous civic bodies and organizations of the State of New York; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will benefit agriculture, labor, business and industry, and all producers and consumers, of which this conference is representative; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference extends its hearty appreciation to the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, as the constructive, farsighted and courageous leader of the effort to secure prompt completion of the St. Lawrence project, and we further declare that it is our purpose to participate, in unity and with mutual cooperation, in this effort until the Aiken bill, S. 1385, is enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chairman to the President, to the Vice President, to the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, and to all members of the New York delegation in Congress.

Whereas the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey on March 27, 1940, in a public statement on the development of our natural resources, said: "I favor the St. Lawrence seaway and always have"; and

Whereas on October 10, 1942, he reaffirmed this declaration and clearly indicated, as reported by the New York Times, "approval of the entire St. Lawrence project" and "strongly advocated the development of the power resources of the State by government"; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15–16, 1944, by a unanimous, nonpartisan vote, and with the approval of the Governor, adopted a concurrent resolution recommending prompt measures to develop the resources of the St. Lawrence River, under the inalienable ownership of the people, to meet urgent needs for cheap hydroelectric power in this area; and

Whereas by his farsighted and consistent support of the St. Lawrence project Governor Dewey has contributed greatly to the advancement of this development under a sound program for the beneficial public use of the State's major natural resource; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference heartily commends the progress made in the State of New York in carrying forward this program as an outstanding accomplishment in the public interest; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, to the Lieutenant Governor, and to the speaker of the assembly.

Whereas this conference has received a message on the St. Lawrence project from the honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior Senator from the State of New York in the United States Senate; and

Whereas this message gives unqualified and affirmative support to the Aiken bill, S. 1385, to approve the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, to authorize construction of the State's public power project in the International Rapids section, and to authorize construction of works needed to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas Senator WAGNER has long advocated the improvement of the International Rapids section and has sought to advance and protect New York's interest in this development, under the terms of the pending agreement of 1941; and

Whereas the enactment of the Aiken bill will unquestionably furnish the most direct means of achieving the public benefits which Senator WAGNER envisions, on behalf of the people of the entire State of New York and of the whole Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Conference strongly endorses the statesmanlike action taken by Senator WAGNER in support of the pending bill, insuring for this constructive, nonpartisan legislation the powerful aid of the senior Senator from the State of New York in the United States Senate, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, and to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senator from Vermont, author of the pending bill, and to all Members of the New York delegation in the Congress.

Federal Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, there has been a vigorous fight waged against the Federal Security Administration. That fight is still going on. In support of that fight, some questions have been raised about F. S. A. projects that did not show a profit. Of course, anyone familiar with the subject knows that the purpose of the F. S. A. was to set up deserving persons in the business of farming, show them how to improve their yield, and help them to get on their feet and be an asset to their respective communities. The results have exceeded the expectations of those of us who favored and supported the F. S. A. Some of these results have been published in the Wisconsin Farmers Union News of May 8, 1944, and I take the liberty of making that article a part of my remarks. The opponents of F. S. A. should note the remarkable success in food production, as shown herewith:

F. S. A. BORROWERS COME THROUGH AGAIN WITH GOOD PRODUCTION RECORDS IN 1943—SHOW INCREASES IN WAR ESSENTIAL CROPS, RANGING FROM 14 TO 65 PERCENT

Farm Security Administration borrowers sold 49 percent more meat (live weight) in 1943 than in 1942, and made increases ranging from 14 to 65 percent in their production of five war-essential food and oil crops, the War Food Administration announced today.

A survey of F. S. A. borrowers' 1943 production compared with 1942 showed that these families made increases in the production of war foods comparable to the increases made by F. S. A. families in 1942 over 1941.

The families in 1943 sold enough milk to provide a year's supply for 8,739,000 active men; enough eggs for 7,515,000 men; pork for 4,437,400; mutton and lamb for 3,153,200; beef and veal for 2,694,000. These sales were in addition to production for their own needs. Their 1943 sales increases alone provided enough eggs for 1,789,300 active men, enough pork for 1,584,800 men, and enough milk for 1,344,500 men.

BROAD SURVEY

The survey represented 311,880 active standard rehabilitation borrowers of the Farm Security Administration who operated farms both in 1942 and 1943. They constitute about 5.1 percent of all farmers. Total sales of livestock and livestock products in 1943 from the farms of these families, and the percent increase over their sales in 1942, were:

Hogs, 532,361,500 pounds; 56 percent increase.

Cattle and calves, 432,360,700 pounds; 43 percent.

Sheep, 62,777,800 pounds; 30 percent.

Milk, 571,116,000 gallons; 18 percent.

Chickens, 66,069,700 pounds; 47 percent.

Eggs, 126,333,300 dozen; 32 percent.

In addition, these families produced for home use 149,146,500 pounds of hogs, 29,371,100 pounds of cattle and calves, 1,049,900 pounds of sheep, 163,089,200 gallons of milk, 35,683,000 pounds of chickens, and 42,916,200 dozen eggs.

WAR CROPS

In the principal war-needed food and oil crops, the total production in 1943 and the percentage increases over 1942 were:

Soybeans, 5,049,200 bushels, 37 percent increase.

Peanuts, 156,776,400 pounds, 22 percent.

Dry beans and blackeyed peas, 84,185,000 pounds, 15 percent.

Irish potatoes, 20,996,800 bushels, 65 percent.

Sweetpotatoes, 5,972,700 bushels, 14 percent.

The borrowers increased wheat acreage, but like other farmers, had smaller average yields than in the near-record year of 1942. Their total wheat production in 1943 was 26,950,300 bushels, 4 percent less than in the previous season.

The families surveyed had 49,579,300 acres in farms in 1943, 7.7 percent more than the year before, and of this acreage they had 19,521,300 acres in crops, an 11 percent increase over 1942.

The survey was made through a Nation-wide sample check of individual farm production records of F. S. A. borrowers in all types of farming areas. Statistical methods used were reviewed and approved by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

HELPED NATION

The high percentage increases in war-food production by Farm Security families, particularly their expanded production for the commercial market, are of great value not only to the Nation, but also to the families

themselves, Frank Hancock, F. S. A. Administrator, pointed out.

"The extra margin toward victory which these small, family-type farmers have contributed is of primary importance to the Nation at this moment," Mr. Hancock said. "Also, these families, who received credit and practical guidance from Farm Security when they could not qualify for adequate credit from other sources, have strengthened their own security for the years to come.

"Like all farmers, they have done more with less, for thousands of their sons and daughters have gone into the armed services and war industries. Many of these borrowers already have paid off their Government loans in full and have become independent and debt-free, while most of the others have made rapid advances toward that goal. As far as our resources permit, we are continuing to help additional small farmers help themselves and at the same time aid the country and our allies toward victory."

The Price-Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, delivered over the radio on Wednesday, April 26, 1944, by Representative WALT HORAN, Republican, of the State of Washington:

Two duties lie before America.

Our first duty is the continuation of nonpartisan unity to the end that this war will be over and our boys returned home as soon as possible.

Our second duty is to take advantage of the wisdom we acquired in our 10 years of depression and plan to put them to work in peacetime as we now are doing to win the war. The people themselves must understand the people's business and be about it.

During the thirties, we learned the economic facts of life. Producers on farm, forest, factory, or mine learned that there was little security in it for them unless people used what they produced—that consumption was the sole objective of production. Today our consumers are learning another hard fact also, that unless goods are produced they cannot be consumed.

And even a great and mystic government cannot conjure up what is not there. We now know that government can chill and stop the desire of a people to enter freely into production and the people's business of serving each other. There are times when the genius of administration lies in the restraints it places on itself.

I know we can all agree that we want our boys to return to a working America. A Nation happy in this business of producing for each other—at prices low enough to assure consumption—at prices high enough to make production secure.

We want our boys to return to a nation where the lumber of the great forests of the West and South makes for better shelter and living in the North, the plains along the estern seaboard; where the knives from Connecticut move freely to Florida, California and Washington, and trains of luscious oranges, apples and the other of Nature's bounty may move eastward in exchange.

We want our boys to return to the greatest area of free trade on the face of the globe—to a land of free production and free movement of goods. More and more the specific proposals for a world in which peace has a chance point to expanding areas of free trade—shall we deny this principle at home and propound it abroad?

Yes, we want our boys to return to God's country and reengage in their God-given heritage—creative work—equality of opportunity, and that most important privilege of all, unhampered production to a land where every encouragement is given the free flow, exchange, and consumption of man's produce.

We want this. Therefore, it is our business to get busy at the task of making this come true.

The vast majority of our population want to do what is right. It is the duty of government to counsel with them as to what is just and right and then give them both the opportunity and the responsibility of doing what is right. The people know where their security lies—in mutual production and the using of each other's products. It is like the ablution at the end of the harvest day, one hand washing the other.

Already responsible men are talking of the relationships of prices and the maximum use of products in the post-war era; of the tested formula of low profits on a great turn-over so ably promoted and protected by Henry Ford. They realize that individual enterprise and private property, to survive itself and restore this Nation to its proper freedoms must discipline itself. The glory of this Republic lies in the fact that self-discipline is far better than discipline imposed upon an otherwise free people by edicts and penalties.

Freedom concedes that honorable men are, when given the knowledge and responsibility, worthy of freedom. The ultimate strength of any form of government lies in its faith in its productive citizens—a faith sufficient to let civil law rule, civil law which says that men are innocent of wrong until proven guilty. Yet, today, we verge nearer and nearer a complete code of military laws under which all men are guilty until proven innocent.

We lie in danger. The very foundations of our free institutions are challenged by the inroads of an arbitrary expediency.

The operation of the Price Control Act can be made the means of restoring our maximum internal commerce and the faith of our citizens in each other.

What better opportunity could we have than the home front battle against inflation?

What better medium than an increasing assumption of the functions of price control by the people themselves?

I believe we must begin with this fact:

A low rate of profit on fully and continuously employed capital, thus achieving maximum total employment for American labor and maximum total earnings—in the long run—to the responsible proprietary interest; in short, it means the maintenance of God's bounty, man's purchasing power and national security.

Give our free American people an active and responsible part in this serious matter of inflation control. Justice and the whole principle of self-government demands it.

Let us keep faith with America and Americans. Yes, our future lies in a productive America.

A Washington paper recently headlined it this way, "Peak output, low cost held post-war need."

How achieve this?

Through expanding bureaucracy?

Under pressure this policy may appear successful, but it is an illusion. The end is something else than what we want.

Through continued badgering and penalizing of existing business?

The government we want must recognize integrity and faithful purpose wherever it is found. We should recognize the honest and the faithful.

Are we to delude ourselves that this peak output can be achieved by a resumption of the social revolution which rocked this Nation from the bank holiday until Pearl Harbor? Our task, today, is to so educate our people that no one will feel the need—nor permit another to promote a resumption of the social revolution of the thirties.

Our people have a heritage—it lies in our Christian teachings and traditions. our institutions and established way of life in government, commerce, and society. It assumes that there is a better side to every man and if we would have faith in our own future, we should lose no time in appealing to that better side of men.

Is it not just as possible to appeal to and enlarge the yearning for justice inherent in our people as it is to appeal to their prejudices and points of conflict?

We ought by now to realize that security itself can only come from justly rewarded work.

That is basic and a concept we can have faith in. The way to implement that faith is by giving the people themselves more control over their own business. The means of implementing that faith is through constructive modification of the Price Control Act under which the Office of Price Administration functions and through both of which we hope to control inflation.

If we are to have O. P. A. with us during the rest of the war and that crucial period after the war when we know that inflation is extremely contagious, we must, in my opinion, move in the direction of the people themselves, taking a full responsibility in this matter of price structures.

Mind you, I began this statement with the assumption that the Price Control Act, as passed by Congress, remain to guard against the possibility of industrial combinations in restraint of trade. If an industry proves that it cannot discipline itself when entrusted with this public responsibility, that is time enough to invoke the prerogatives of minute regulations.

The American people are citizens—responsible participants in the duty of self-government. They are not subjects of a benign and omnipotent temporal authority. They are that authority itself. We must not deny them a full part now in that which will determine their destiny for years to come.

There is far more in this matter than the mere discussion of price control. Far more than a debate on the rightness or wrongness of granting a limited extension of O. P. A.

A cynic has been described as one who knows the price of everything, the value of nothing.

Prices are relative—values are constant.

If we are to control inflation, we must fully realize the values we are protecting. We can do so with mutual understanding. We cannot gain that end with force.

Force and an appeal upon the basis of price alone will continue the destructive tendency for it stresses conflict and denies unity, hence it will complete the distrust in American individual enterprise and, by the back door of indirection, render us more and more a land of state capitalism and monopoly.

We are asked to exchange faith in each other for a spurious faith in Government. We are not reminded that government, to endure, must be founded upon our trust in each other.

Today, small businesses are at a low level. We must restore them and revive the faith of all men capable of self-reliant, individual enterprise. Government, as such, with one

hand in the Treasury and the other in the ballot box cannot effectively bring this about. The people themselves, in their daily tasks, can restore this. It must be achieved by producers who appreciate the consumer. It must be achieved by consumers who realize the indispensable need for producers.

There should be no wall between them. Each should realize the indispensability of the other.

The Price Control Act should be extended. It should be modified through the inclusion of four simple amendments, in addition to the terribly important administrative purpose of giving the people themselves a greater functional part in the business of inflation control.

1. Civil court review of O. P. A. directives. This is obvious. While the present administrator is doing much to correct the earlier mistakes, many inequities remain that could more speedily be adjusted by access to the courts by producers and consumers.

2. The industrial casualties reflected in the death of small businesses because of price control edicts should not be accepted inevitable byproducts of inflation control.

3. Clarification of the purpose of the Price Control Act's administration to assure the Nation that the act is being used to control inflation—and not merely to effect monopoly and a head start on post-war business. Indeed, O. P. A. is not alone behind this cloud. This is absolutely essential if the faith of small ambitions are to be restored in the American way of free and individual enterprise.

4. The sham of dual control should be ended as far as food production and distribution is concerned. The illusion of public benefit from continuous conflict between war agencies is false. Everyone loses, since the net result is distrust in Government and class distrust. One responsible head, responsible to the interests of both the consumer and the producer in the people's business, can act faster and with greater certainty. Confusion can only be ended in this way.

We want our boys to return to an America where men have faith in each other. Through this faith, a faith in our Nation.

Tomorrow, and have no doubts about this, our democracy within a Republic will once again be tested upon the fires of peacetime reconversion and rehabilitation.

We should lose neither time nor opportunity in the educating of all of us of our stake and part in the people's business. The future of ourselves and our posterity demands it.

Resolution of the Ancient Order of Hibernians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution passed at a meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America assembled in the city of New York, April 28, 1944:

We, the members of the national board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America and its ladies auxiliary, in meeting assembled in the city of New York this 29th day of April A. D. 1944, do hereby reaffirm our loyalty, fidelity, and continued support of our Government, the United States of America, in our all-out endeavor of winning the war on every battle front. We pledge the continued support of the membership of our order in the performance of our duty in the present war, as we have met the test in every national emergency from the birth of this great Republic.

We are deeply grieved over the strained relations between our Government and the government of Eire over the question of neutrality. We offer up our prayers to God and pray Saint Patrick, the apostle of the Gael, to intercede that this misunderstanding will be corrected by applying to Eire the principles of the Atlantic Charter—the principles for which our American blood is now being shed in all parts of the world.

Ireland, a nation for more than seven centuries fighting for these rights with no question as to her geographical boundary—until partition took from her 6 of her 32 counties, is under God and man entitled to the recovery of her liberty and territory, not part free and part slave, but all free and independent.

With this accomplished both our country and our allies will find the people of Ireland not only willing and anxious to join with us but to offer up her last drop of blood and pound of treasure in defense of liberty and justice: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we request our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and our Members of the American Congress to petition our ally, Great Britain, to remove at once the artificial political boundary that divides Northern and Southern Ireland, and that they and we remove from her shores all semblance of a violation of her neutrality until the Irish Nation of its own free will changes its course or follows its present course without interference; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and to the Members of Congress.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my duties as chairman of the subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, investigating production in shipyards, made necessary my absence from Washington on May 3, 1944. I had intended, if I had been able to attend that day's session of the House, to pay tribute to our gallant Polish ally on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

In these crucial days, when millions of lives have already been sacrificed in order that liberty may live, we remember with sorrow that the people of occupied Poland, deprived of their liberty, are suffering untold torments at the hands of a cruel and oppressive invader. Their suffering should forever be before us, in order to remind us as to what we are fighting for. Please God, we fight to stave off a fate for our country and our people similar to that which has befallen the great Polish Republic.

Our people are grateful to our Polish ally because, as Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski pointed out, the trend of the war might have been different if Hitler had launched his attack on France and Great Britain first, instead of attacking Poland. We also like to recall that both the Polish people and our own, at about the same time, established governments dedicated to the theory that they are the servants and not the masters of the people.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that, when victory is ours and the hordes of the invader shall be no more, we may witness the rejuvenation and the reestablishment of the great Polish Republic, which, by its example of democracy, has contributed so greatly to social progress.

Free Ports for Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Grafton and an editorial from the New York Times of May 4, 1944:

[From the New York Post of April 5, 1944]

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT

(By Samuel Grafton)

Free ports for refugees: A free port is a small bit of land, a kind of reservation, into which foreign goods may be brought without paying customs duties. There is one in the New York City area. Goods brought into it from overseas are destined either for transshipment to other countries, or for temporary storage. Such goods may even be processed while they are in the free port; manufacturing operations can, and are, carried out on them. Or the goods may just sit there for a while, giving their owner time to brood.

If, eventually, he decides to bring the goods into the country proper, he merely pays the normal customs duties, and the stuff may enter.

A PLACE TO SIT DOWN

A free port is a place where you can put things down for a while, without having to make a final decision about them. The few cases which constitute a free port are well guarded, so that nobody will smuggle a pair of alien garters or a foreign fry pan over the boundaries, in defiance of the tariff laws.

Why couldn't we have a system of free ports for refugees fleeing the Hitler terror?

Obviously, we need a place where we can put refugees down, without making final decisions about them, a place where they can be stored and processed, so to speak, without creating legal and political problems. Of course, it shouldn't be against the law, exactly, to bind up a wound in such a free port, or to give somebody a drink of water.

The need is for reservations of a few acres here and there, where a man who has been running for 10 years can sit down and catch his breath, and where somebody can tell a story to a frightened child; a few reservations where it would be possible for those who cannot satisfy the requirements of law to rest a bit, without violating the law. We do it,

in commercial free ports, for cases of beans, so that we can make some storage and processing profits; it should not be impossible to do it for people.

AS IF THEY WERE SHIPS

Let us look upon these refugee free ports as if they were moored ships, ships of land. Anyone who would step over the boundary of the free port into the country proper should be made to satisfy all requirements of immigration law, precisely as if he were proposing to come ashore from a ship. But surely it should not baffle our ingenuity to find some legal way in which to grant a Stateless woman the comparatively small bit of room which she needs in order to deliver a baby.

Of course, I am a little ashamed to find myself pandering to anti-refugee prejudices even to the extent of saying, "Yes, pile the legal disabilities on them, give them no rights, store them like corn, herd them like cattle"—but the need is so sharp, the time is so short, our current example to the world is so bad, that it is necessary to settle for whatever can be done.

And something can be done. It should not be really necessary to beg, storm, and plead for a few reserved acres in which, without creating legal or political problems, a man can be allowed to die without filing in all his papers, or in which a baby can drink a glass of that strange white stuff which an older European generation knew as milk.

OTHERWISE, A SNICKER

If we set up a system of refugee free ports, our fine new War Refugee Board can then properly appeal to other countries to do the same. If we do not go at least that far, the board will be answered with a snicker should it make such requests of other lands.

The refugees, Jewish and other, ask only for a few fenced-in acres of the poorest land in America. They don't want to keep it. They just want to sit on it until they can go home again. They are letting us off more easily than does conscience itself, for they don't even ask that we do our best for them. They plead for our worst.

[From the New York Times of May 4, 1944]

"FREE PORTS" FOR REFUGEES

When the idea of "free ports" in this country for war refugees was brought up in Washington recently there seemed to be two possible objections to it, one good and one bad. The first objection was that it would be inhuman to establish what might be regarded as concentration camps for refugees we were not willing to admit. The second was that some of these refugees might eventually get into the country, beyond the restrictions of the quota law. A study of the situation indicates that neither argument is valid. A refugee brought, say, to Ellis Island and there comfortably housed and fed and treated with consideration would be in heaven compared with the same person in Germany or Rumania. As for the danger of refugees escaping into the United States from their places of detention, this is hardly a menace to the safety of the Republic. We take this risk with our captive enemies. Why not with our luckless friends?

The War Refugee Board, as its director, John W. Pehle, has indicated, would be a logical agency to carry out the "free port" plan. Perhaps Army camps, vacated as the peak of training passes, could be used. After the war some of the refugees might safely return to their countries of origin. Others might find homes in other countries where immigrants might be needed and welcomed. Still others could in time be admitted regularly to the United States. The plan has nothing to do with unrestricted and uncontrolled immigration. It is simply a proposal to save the lives of innocent people.

Invention of the Flat Top Plane Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two letters received by me setting forth the excellent work of John L. Bogert, naval architect and engineer, who, it is claimed, is the inventor of the flat top plane carrier and its use as an escort to our cargo convoys across the Atlantic. I understand he made the original designs and drawings some time in the spring of 1917 and submitted same to the United States Navy.

The letters follow:

TRANSPORTATION ECONOMICS CONSULTANTS,
New York, N. Y., May 8, 1944

Hon. MATTHEW J. MERRITT,
Representatives' Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Because I am a "Flushing boy," having been born there on October 27, 1858, lived there all my life up to World War No. 1, I am writing to you, as Congressman from my own home town, to tell you that you can enhance the glory and credit of Flushing by trying to secure proper recognition for me in Congress, as the inventor of the flat-top plane carrier and its use as escort to our cargo convoys across the Atlantic.

I made the design and drawings of the first flat-top plane carrier way back in the spring of 1917, and I spent plenty of time in Washington trying to get the United States Navy to build one and have it escort the cargo convoys across the Atlantic.

I insisted that destroyers were more or less helpless in their efforts to protect convoys, because no one on the deck of a destroyer, or up at its masthead could look diagonally through the water and locate a submarine lurking at periscope depth. This anyone up in the air vertically over the submarine could do. Therefore the only strategy worth while was a plane carrier accompanying each convoy and planes from its deck constantly circling the convoy. As soon as a lurking submarine was spotted, the loom of its hull showing up through the water, the plane could drop a bomb at the exact spot where the destroyer or destroyers were to head for with their depth bombs.

I was unsuccessful in 1917 and 1918, in spite of all my efforts to interest the Allies, and the Government refused to permit any steel being used to build any such vessel. With the dawning of the armistice, submarine hunting became a dead issue. Nevertheless, the United States Navy, in 1923, 6 years after they had received my drawings, converted the collier *Jupiter* to become their first flat-top plane carrier.

With the outbreak of World War No. 2, I resumed my importunities, only to be rebuffed until the sinkings had risen to 1,000,000 tons a month. Then the Navy adopted my strategy, and sent a baby flat-top plane carrier with each convoy, and the sinkings ceased. That was in the winter of 1942–43. I am still waiting for public recognition from Congress that my ideas and my ideas alone were responsible for winning the battle of the Atlantic. Don't you consider that Flushing would be interested in having you insist from the floor of Congress that a Flushing man was entitled to a vote of thanks by the Nation?

Yours truly,

JOHN L. BOGERT,
Naval Architect and Engineer.

NEWPORT NEWS SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CO.,
Newport News, Va., February 3, 1944.

Mr. JOHN L. BOGERT,
Transportation Economics Consultants,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BOGERT: Thank you for your letter of January 25

I am sorry not to have known before that you were the original proponent of escort plane carriers back in 1917–18 and am surprised to hear that of all people Stocker should have turned down the idea, as he had a reputation for inventiveness and progressiveness. However, looking back to those days when I was personally engaged in sub hunting, operating from the coast of Ireland, I can see that perhaps the escort plane carrier would have been a useless luxury. Subs were not what they are now and operated singly in the channel and along the French coast but not west of 15° longitude. Planes were not so good then either, but they were used, also dirigibles, both land based, for scouting and searching for subs.

As submarines improved, permitting far greater radius of action, and as planes improved, the evolution of the escort plane carrier seems natural. This goes to show that you were ahead of time like Leonardo de Vinci.

I do think you should be given all manner of credit for the ideas which you put forward at such an early date and am surprised that the Navy is backward in doing this. Perhaps the patent situation has something to do with this. As for naming a ship, no doubt they will tell you that Government-owned vessels are not named after living persons. Next time I go to Washington I will make some inquiries.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

ROGER WILLIAMS.

The Sewell Avery Photograph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic episode staged by Attorney General Biddle at the request and pursuant to the demand of the Commander in Chief is well analyzed by Walter Lippmann under the title "The Sewell Avery Photograph" which appeared in the Washington Post under date of May 11, 1944. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

THE SEWELL AVERY PHOTOGRAPH

It may be that the the Montgomery Ward affair raises great constitutional issues. If so, learned judges and lawyers will have to separate them from the farce which the leading actors in the affair bumbled and stumbled into.

When the representatives of the Government entered Mr. Avery's office, they had with them a copy of the Presidential order directing the Secretary of Commerce to take

over the operation of the company. Mr. Avery refused to obey it. Thereupon, the Government officials had to decide either to go to court to prove their authority or to enforce the Presidential order with the authority which they believed they had. They decided, wrongly so it would seem, to enforce the order before going to court.

Having made this decision, it was then a question of how to enforce their order. They proceeded to confront Mr. Avery with nine Federal marshals. Mr. Avery would not yield peaceably to this civilian police power. On the other hand, the Government officials did not tell the marshals to remove Mr. Avery. For some reason nine armed marshals seemed to them an inadequate force to deal with the aging Mr. Avery and so they called upon the United States Army to replace the marshals.

Presumably, they hoped to overawe Mr. Avery. Whether or not he was temporarily overawed by the three Army trucks and the 44 soldiers is not clear, and may, alas, never be known to the conscientious historians. What is known is that the Army arrived shortly after 6 o'clock and that almost immediately thereafter Mr. Avery remembered that it was time to go home, and perhaps to fortify himself with a drink, his dinner, and some advice. Anyway he left peaceably, walking on his own feet. Thus Montgomery Ward had been evacuated and the United States Government and the Army were in physical possession.

Then the most absurd part of the affair took place. Mr. Avery was gone. Mr. Chatfield Taylor and Mr. Biddle were inside. The troops were there. The next morning Mr. Avery returned, without opposition, apparently by a back door because the Government had posted its men only at the front door. Then for the second time Messrs. Chatfield Taylor and Biddle had the problem of disposing of Mr. Avery. One thing to have done was to have given him a comfortable chair to sit in until later in the day when he again felt the need to go home for dinner, and then, when he had departed, to have seen to it that he did not come back the next morning. The physical presence of Mr. Avery in the building was not such a danger to the security of the Nation but that a powerful and courageous Government might have taken the risk.

It seems, however, that in their not very deeply considered judgment, Mr. Avery had to be removed at once from the premises. At this point they again had a choice. They might have ordered the marshals in civilian clothes to escort Mr. Avery to the door. Nine marshals with 44 soldiers in reserve could have done this without heavy exertion or severe casualties, and the Nation would have been spared the indignity of seeing a photograph of troops, armed as for the invasion of Europe, carrying a somewhat eccentric old gentleman into the streets of Chicago.

For it was the manner in which the troops were used, far more than the legal issues involved, which has made the affair so notorious.

Not having studied the legal issues, I do not venture an opinion on them. But it seems to me that the incident which is summed up in the photograph is probably more important than the exceedingly narrow legal question of how the statute is to be construed. And the incident is important because it reminds us that we are tending to forget the distinction, which is fundamental in a republic, between the civil and the military power.

The use of the military in civil disputes should never be resorted to unless the civil power is plainly inadequate to maintain law and order. That is why, assuming that the Government had the right to remove Mr. Avery from the building and assuming that it was wise to exercise the right, the removal should have been done by the marshals and not by the troops. To employ troops before the civilian marshals had made any show of force was exceedingly bad practice. In this case it merely produced a silly spectacle. But the Army of the United States should not be treated so carelessly that it becomes implicated in silly spectacles.

This episode is one illustration of a general slovenliness, which we need to check, on the whole question of how the civilian and the military powers are related. One of the worst examples of it is the sentimental and rhetorical use of the term "Commander in Chief" to imply that the President governs by a kind of vague and inclusive martial law. The true conception of the Commander in Chief is, I venture to think, quite the opposite: it is that because this is a republic, the President, who is a civilian and because he is a civilian, is always supreme over the military power. To talk as if he were a kind of generalissimo is a total reversal of the meaning of commander in chief.

The supremacy of the civil power is the essence of a constitutional republic. Here was the basic objection to nominating General MacArthur while he was still an active soldier. Here is the objection to making him Secretary of War, to making, as some suggest, Admiral Leahy the Secretary of the Navy, For in a republic, no matter how deeply we trust the military and wish to defer to it in time of war, the supremacy of the civil power ought to be zealously preserved. That truth is one of the basic principles for which we stand.

Medicine Man of Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an article from the magazine Coronet.

I believe Members will appreciate this well-written article about Dr. George W. Calver, to whom many of us are indebted beyond measure for his attention to, and advice concerning, our physical needs.

The article follows:

MEDICINE MAN OF CAPITOL HILL

(By David Brinkley)

During peaceful, unhurried sessions the work of keeping more than 500 congressional hearts, stomachs, and nervous systems in working order is difficult enough. But after 4 years in which Congress has had very little vacation, when debate on the war's conduct draws nerves tight and threatens to stop stomachs from working and hearts from beating, George Wehnes Calver's office on the ground floor of the National Capitol is one of the busiest spots in Washington—and that's saying plenty.

For example, take the events of a single week during the violent debate over food subsidies. Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama, had just made a fire-eating speech in the House while W. Warren Barbour, of New Jersey, engaged in hot debate in the Senate. Both men, who had apparently enjoyed normal health, suffered fatal heart attacks on the very same day.

During the same week around two dozen legislators showed up in Calver's office suffering stomach pains, which he diagnosed as the ailment he'd treated time and time again during his 16 years as attending physician to Congress. It was indigestion, brought on by tense, strained nerves. His prescription was the same as always—rest and relaxation, both physical and mental.

Only recently Senator Frederick Van Nuys, of Indiana, already one of Washington's hardest working legislators, was given the additional job of investigating the liquor shortage. After a few weeks of this work burden he also collapsed and died of a heart ailment. Calver will tell you without reservation that Van Nuys, had he remained in private life and avoided strenuous activity, would have lived longer. That holds true for most of the 13 other legislators who have died in office since January 1943.

When Calver called this epidemic of heart and stomach ailments to the attention of Capitol Hill he suggested that Congress slow down, take more frequent vacations, and relax whenever possible. His suggestion brought vigorous reaction from the public. Bales of letters arrived—and all took issue with him. Servicemen, they pointed out, work in trenches and fox holes for as little as $50 a month, while a Congressman begins work at noon and is paid $10,000 a year.

"That," says Calver, pointing to one of the letters, "is the prime reason our legislators are in a constant state of nervous tension. A private businessman has at most a few bosses to answer to. Folks don't realize that a Congressman has hundreds of thousands. He's afraid to relax, afraid to take a vacation when he needs it for fear his voter bosses will accuse him of lying down on the job.

"It's true that the House and Senate open at noon. But it's also true that every man on the Hill has a lot of duties he can't perform on the House or Senate floor. For one thing, he has reams of letters from his home State to answer, correspondence he can't afford to neglect.

"Then again, committee work—where the real work is done—usually starts before noon and continues long after the ordinary businessman's day is done. In addition to which, Congressmen are called upon constantly to run errands and perform favors for their constituents."

The work of a Congressman can't exactly be classified as a hazardous occupation. But a legislator who spends a day in a committee hearing matching wits with lobbyists, or who engages in strenuous debate on a chamber floor, has done more nerve-wracking work than most men in private life. As a result, says Calver, heart and stomach trouble and all the ills brought on by overwrought nerves have become the "occupational disease" of Capitol Hill.

On almost any day while Congress is in session, you can sit in his anteroom and watch patients stream in and out, among them the Vice President, Supreme Court Justices, Senators, Representatives, and a few stenographers and clerks who work in the building.

When your turn comes, you go into a half-dark office, sit in a big, black leather chair and face the graying, soft-spoken man who perhaps knows Congress more intimately than any other person.

Calver, a captain in the Navy Medical Corps, has been assigned to the Capitol since 1928 and still claims that his is the most interesting job in all of Washington.

On an ordinary day about 80 visitors—some sick, some not—will drop into his office. Those needing only a throat spray or minor care are treated by C. L. Block, a lieutenant in the Navy and Calver's assistant. Most, however, want to see Calver. They may seek relief from a head cold or just want to talk into a sympathetic and nonpolitical ear.

During the first few months after an election Calver engages in more of these heart-to-heart talks than at any other time. For ethical and political reasons he can't report on them, but he does say that visitors run

mostly to freshman legislators suffering from "buck fever," complicated by what he calls "a sense of frustration." From a home town where they've probably been the No. 1 citizen, they must suddenly adjust to being one politico among more than 500. And then in the Capital a Member of Congress doesn't always find the consideration he might expect.

Calver's favorite anecdote concerns a new Representative who, on arriving in Washington, had to wait 30 days while his predecessor vacated his space in the House Office Building. Nor could he locate a house, an apartment, or even a hotel room to live in. Finally, as he stood disconsolately on a street corner, a stray dog took a bite out of his leg. "How," the young legislator asked himself, "did that dog know I was a Congressman?"

Even an older hand is sometimes upset by the abuse and criticism heaped on him by home-State newspapers, political rivals, and the public. Usually the criticism results directly from some political action he's taken that the folks back home disapprove. The legislator, who has often based his decision on better information than that available to his critics, feels he's been wronged and wants to talk to someone about it.

Calver, following the policy of pills and politics don't mix, will treat a head cold and listen to a tale of woe; but he won't put his eggs into any political basket. Small doses of the usual nostrums, blended skillfully with big doses of sympathy and encouragement, comprise the therapy that has kept him in office for two administrations through a record turnover in congressional membership.

His story and the story of his job begin at the same time, for he is Congress' first and only physician. In 1928 Representative Martin B. Madden, of Illinois, collapsed on the floor of the House with a heart attack. The 2-hour delay incurred in finding a doctor so irritated Congress it called on the Navy to send over a medical man to minister to its ailments on a full-time basis. Calver was the man and he's been ministering to Congress' ailments ever since—but not on Navy say-so. For 3 years after his appointment, the Navy told him he was due for sea duty. Congress, having grown partial to his brand of pills and comfort, would not hear of it. Both Houses passed a resolution stipulating that he was not to be removed from office without congressional consent. In the 13 years since, consent has never been given.

Calver is a rarity in a town where nearly everyone is from somewhere else. Not only was he born in Washington but he grew up near the shadow of the dome under which he now works. His boyhood home stood on the land now covered by the Library of Congress. He studied at George Washington University's Medical School and interned at its hospital.

Both his daughters are married to physicians. From his conversation, it's hard to tell whether he's prouder of them or his basement carpentry shop. He will, in fact, talk more freely about the furniture he builds than the inner workings of Congress.

For his services, Calver receives only the Navy's regular pay for his rank. Instead of fees, he collects autographed pictures of his patients, and these profits of 16 years' service line his office walls. Most are inscribed with short words of thanks. Typical are photographs of President Roosevelt and former Vice President Garner in informal poses. Garner wrote: "To Doc Calver—Thanks for making me try to behave." To Garner's note, the President added: "To Dr. Calver—Keep on Trying."

Calver recalls that he gave Garner the same advice he still gives all freshmen on Capitol Hill, namely, to live as calmly as possible, eat wisely, exercise regularly, and relax at every opportunity. He has developed that advice into what he calls the ten commandments of health, rules which are printed on cards and distributed to all newcomers. They have been revised only once since 1928. Suggestion two read: "Drink plentifully." Calver has since gone through the stack of cards and with a fountain pen added the words "of water."

On his desk he has a wooden box bearing a row of small electric lights. For each patient who enters the outer office, Calver's receptionist flips a switch, flashing a signal to his desk. This array of lights has come to be a pretty reliable index to the state of affairs on the floors of Congress. When the debate grows hot and heavy, it won't be long until the outer office is full and all the tiny lights glowing.

Calver tells you he long ago forgot that his patients include many of the Nation's most distinguished lawmakers and jurists. "They come in here as patients and they get the treatment they need. If they need a cussing out, they get that too."

If Congress were not made of the exceptionally strong stuff that it is, the effects of a strenuous, seldom interrupted 4-year session would be even more serious. "These men," Calver says, "have come up through the process of elimination. They have survided one or many political campaigns and the weak have long since fallen aside. As a group, they're physically stronger than probably any other group of the same average age."

It is difficult, however, to tell whether today's lawmakers are in better or worse physical shape than their predecessors, for they are working under unprecedented strain. Calver doesn't believe there are as many infectious diseases as there once were, but he can prove that cardiovascular ailments—affecting the heart and blood vessels—are definitely on the increase.

He estimates the Senators' average age at about 65 and Representatives' at about 58. Sixteen years of treating patients of the middle-aged and elderly groups has taught Calver this: Most illnesses commonly associated with age can be delayed or avoided by moderate living, light eating, and exercising sensibly. That program, he says, holds good not only for a Congressman but for any middle-aged man or woman.

Quite often Calver is called on to decide whether the various cranks and crackpots who turn up around Capitol Hill should be sent to the police station or mental hospitals. The boy who stood up in the House gallery, flourished a gun and demanded the floor, was taken to him and promptly given a psychiatric examination.

When the bonus army marched on Washington the police fired tear gas at the marchers. But by standing to the windward, they succeeded in gassing no one but themselves. It was Calver who treated them.

Today at 56 he hopes to spend many more years at his office, changing in the morning from his gold-braided Navy blouse into a doctorish-looking tweed coat, listening throughout the day to the complaints of the men who make the Nation's laws.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Indiana (Pa.) Gazette:

MERITED TRIBUTE TO JIM FARLEY

By unanimously reelecting him to a ninth term as State chairman, New York Democrats paid James A. Farley a marked and well-merited tribute. There had been some talk of opposition to Farley, but it faded away and the Democratic State committee, without a dissenting vote, approved his generalship in this national election year.

There is no question that Jim Farley is one of the best-liked personalities on the American political scene and that his wide popularity is thoroughly deserved. He is a marvelous party organizer, with an amazing memory for names and faces. He is an affable gentleman, unruffled under pressure. Best of all, Jim keeps his promises. Not even his enemies—if he has any—could accuse him of unfairness or trickery.

We're glad the opposition to his reelection in New York didn't develop and that he will be, presumably, an active leader in this year's campaign.

A Patriotic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk of May 8, 1944:

A PATRIOTIC CONGRESS

Congress, at its best, has some faults, and at its worst is terrible. But it should be given its due. The way it has supported this war, and the people conducting it, is one of the brightest features of these unpleasant times. The latest example is the passage of the biggest naval appropriation bill in all history, by both Houses of Congress, without a dissenting vote.

This is by no means an isolated case. There have been several other notable examples of unanimity in Congress, and the whole handling of the war on the legislative side has been surprisingly free from opposition or delay. Regardless of political complications in an election year, and the inevitable antagonisms of policy and prejudice, first things have been put first, and there has been better cooperation so far than most observers would have thought possible.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, unselfish, untiring, eternally loving, that's mother.

An actual Army-Navy merger is just a pipe dream.

The devil and the deep sea for farmers is too little water and too much water.

Is Senator REED, by setting up headquarters, unopposed, practicing psychological warfare on possible opponents?

The three great post-war threats we face at home to our way of life are C. I. O. leadership, bureaucracy, and militarism.

It would be a ghastly coincidence if the second front and the Republican Convention should happen the same week.

The author of the Happy Warrior after 4 weeks of rest, comes back to try to laugh off the Montgomery Ward affair.

When our Army, Lend-lease, U. N. R. R. A., and F. E. A. get through doing things for foreign lands, it will be time to start a little improvement at home.

The Washington Monument is still 555 feet high, but Hopkins and Frankfurter never look at it—their air castles are much higher.

A near Socialist by the name of Herbert Hoover won in an open field for Lieutenant Governor of Ohio in the G. O. P. primary, which proves that a good name is a good thing to have anywhere.

How is this for a title? Division of Central Administrative Services of the Office for Emergency Management. There should be an Executive order slicing such names as the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Roanoke Leader of Friday, May 5, 1944, entitled "Another Red-Letter Day for Public Education."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER RED-LETTER DAY FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

The May campaign of 1905 is always referred to by friends of public education in Virginia as the first outstanding event in public-school circles, following the establishment in 1870 of the public-school system of Virginia, at the point of Federal bayonets, because, as a result of that campaign, our high-school system (Mr. Jefferson's academies), became a part of our public-school system and the stigma of pauperism which had dogged the steps of public-school children from the outset began to wane.

The increased patronage of our public schools and especially of our high schools placed a constantly increasing public-school expense upon the localities because the conservative machine politicians of the State could not forget the fact that they had been forced by "damnyankees" to establish our public-school system and would not, therefore, loosen their hold on the State purse strings.

In 1928, when the burden upon the localities almost reached the breaking point, the machine in control of Virginia politics chose to relieve the burden of the localities by taking over the public roads rather than by taking over the public schools, despite the fact that the Virginia Constitution imposed upon the State the burden of establishing and maintaining an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State. Incidentally, the State also took over practically all sources of taxation except real estate and tangible personal property.

As was to be expected, the constantly increasing popularity of our public schools and especially of our high schools again overburdened the localities. Since 1937 friends of public education have been demanding that the State make increased appropriations for public-school purposes. In 1940, again in 1942, and again in 1944 the machine politicians grudgingly increased State appropriations for public schools, but in each instance much less than the situation demanded, even though the State treasury showed a large surplus.

The striking thing in connection with the 1944 general assembly, which convened shortly after a special session thereof had set aside a fund with which to pay the entire State debt, was that it met with an enormous surplus accumulated at the expense of 17,000 underpaid public-school teachers and still refused to increase to $1,200 per year per teacher unit the State appropriation for public schools. It made no difference to the machine politicians that the State chamber of commerce had made an exhaustive study and report covering high-school education in Virginia, which showed the necessity for a greatly increased State appropriation for public education, and that the State superintendent of public instruction and the State board of education had recommended the $1,200 per year per teacher unit appropriation as a minimum appropriation.

Nothing that the machine politicians of Virginia could have done would have shown more clearly their contempt for the welfare of the children of school age in Virginia than their refusal to appropriate sufficient money to secure and to hold good public-school teachers during this critical period when efficient public-school teachers are being lured away from classrooms by offers of a living wage from industries of all kinds, and their places are being filled, if they are filled at all, by high-school graduates. Nothing that these politicians could have done would have shown more clearly their power over the people of Virginia who are denied the right to vote.

But another red-letter day for public education has dawned.

The spring conference of the Virginia Association of School Trustees (school board members), at Hotel Roanoke on May 1, proved to be the most significant meeting of friends of public education since the May campaign of 1905.

Representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Virginia Manufacturers Association, the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, the League of Virginia Municipalities, and the Association of Virginia Counties joined hands with the president of the National Education Association, the president and the executive secretary of the Virginia Education Association, the president of the Virginia Branch of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of public instruction of Virginia, two members of the State board of education, the president of the Association of School Superintendents, the president of the Association of School Trustees, and many other notables in the field of public education in Virginia, to discuss the past, the present, and the future of public education in Virginia, and to make plans to meet the crisis with which the public-school system of Virginia is now confronted.

It was the considered opinion of those present that the past of public education in Virginia is deplorable because the General Assembly of Virginia refused to take seriously the constitutional mandate to establish and maintain an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State; that the present of public education in Virginia is critical because the appropriation of State funds for public schools at the last session of the general assembly was not sufficient to secure and to hold efficient teachers in the face of competition of industries of all kinds; and that the future of public education in Virginia must be made brighter because education is a necessity, not a luxury, and because both the State of Virginia and the United States are financially able to pay the bill.

When business leaders and public educators reach an agreement along these lines, it can truly be said that another red-letter day for public education has come and that it is time for "machine" politicians to tremble in their boots.

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway and Power Project," which appeared in the Rutland Herald of May 10, 1944.

I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Development Could Play Major Role in Post-war Employment Plans," which appeared in the Montpelier Argus of May 10.

In connection with this editorial I wish to state that there is one slight error in it. The estimate that the St. Lawrence project would furnish employment for 100,000 men over a 4-year period was not made by the War Department engineers, but those were figures presented by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board when that organization appeared in opposition to the plan a few years ago.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of May 10, 1944]

SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Two recent addresses on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project by Senator AIKEN in Rutland and at Watertown, N. Y., have created considerable local discussion. We are prefacing our comment on the St. Lawrence development with the statement that this paper is for it, because we think it will benefit Vermont as well as the rest of the country in the long run from an economic standpoint.

Whether an individual, corporation, or organization is in favor of the St. Lawrence development or against it, however, will not affect the desirability of making plans to take advantage of its benefits and to attempt to forestall its detrimental aspects. Many business interests have long opposed the project, but we doubt that realistic industrialists have failed to outline a strategy of

action for the day when the development is authorized by Congress.

Senator AIKEN has offered a glowing picture of the benefits to be derived by Vermont, New York, and the Nation as a whole from cheap power and a new transportation medium which will be provided by development of the St. Lawrence. He has not analyzed so far the arguments of the opposition, and he hasn't dwelt upon the detrimental aspects of the project upon some individuals, interests, and sections of the country, as they may be expected to develop.

The opposition side of the case is important primarily because all drawbacks of the proposal should be carefully examined and every effort made to modify them by careful advance planning.

There are two points relating to the development which were not discussed in all details by Senator AIKEN, and which we consider important. One is the question of low power rates and their effect on industrial development in Vermont. Cheap power encourages new industries and expansion of industrial activity. While private utilities cannot compete with power delivered in Vermont at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, it would help their business if they could buy such power.

Industrial power rates in Vermont are comparatively low already. The last Government figures we have at hand show Vermont considerably lower on industrial rates than any neighboring State. In fact Virginia is the nearest State geographically to Vermont which has industrial rates lower than ours. Cheap power from the St. Lawrence would improve our position in this respect and place the State in an even more advantageous position on industrial power rates, except, of course, in competition with New York, which now has, or did have, among the highest industrial power rates of any State in the country.

A second point which is particularly important to this section of the State, which the Senator mentioned only generally, is the effect the St. Lawrence development would have on the Rutland Railroad. It seems to be generally understood that the Rutland would lose some of the business it now has and has had for many years, if the seaway is built.

It has been argued that in time there would be enough new industrial development resulting from the seaway and power project to give the Rutland Railroad a new lease on life. However true that hopeful prediction may be, the Rutland is in a condition which requires as much attention to short term economic influences as to the long-range viewpoint, if not more.

The railroad's condition makes it necessary to investigate any possibilities for new business as soon as the war is over. The Rutland road cannot wait for industrial expansion to come 10 or 12 years hence. If construction on the seaway is started immediately after the war, it would seem to offer the biggest and best chance so far for new business. The Rutland should stand to benefit more by the business activity which would be stimulated during construction of the seaway than any other railroad. It has been estimated that the services of 100,000 men for 4 years would be required to complete the project. This activity, requiring thousands of tons of construction materials, would be going on in any area serviced by the Rutland Railroad.

We know of no other post-war project or possibility which offers an equal opportunity to the railroad.

[From the Montpelier (Vt.) Evening Argus of May 10, 1944]

ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT COULD PLAY MAJOR ROLE IN POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT PLANS

Much has been said about the economic and industrial facets of the proposed St. Lawrence River power and seaway development bill introduced by Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and aside from those needed constructive aids is the fact that this great undertaking, as a post-war project, would employ some 100,000 men, 80 percent of them skilled or semiskilled, over a 4-year period, and a majority of them hired from the ranks of the returning war veterans. The tremendous undertaking of the St. Lawrence project would mean more than the surface hiring of 100,000 men—it means the support of a half million people, business for the railroads, the coal mines. More than that, too, it would play a major role in obviating such make-work projects as the W. P. A. and relief rolls, projects which have been proved to be of humiliating nature but which may have to be resorted to if the returning veterans cannot find honest jobs. If the St. Lawrence undertaking will require these 100,000 workmen (the figures presented by War Department engineers) then it will stand out as one of the most important public works that can be undertaken.

There is enough work in our 48 States that ought to be done to give the returning servicemen honest jobs that are worthwhile in every sense of the word. The United States is a growing Nation, and economic life is far from static, as may be seen in the statistics that the electrical output has increased from 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1914, to 220,000,000,000 in 1943.

The opponents of the seaway, maintaining that the project should not be undertaken because it would require the labor of so many men, have themselves made one of the most potent arguments in favor of its construction—the providing of work for thousands of returning soldiers in the post-war years.

The Columbia Basin Project—Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of F. A. Banks, Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, before the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash., on Friday, April 28, 1944:

The Cascades, which I crossed yesterday to accept this invitation to address you, form, as you know, the barrier which holds back from the eastern half of the State rain clouds drifting in off the sea, and makes it necessary, if we are to have sustained agricultural production in eastern Washington to utilize the water in our streams. This is the mountain range which corrals the cloud formations along the coast and causes this area to be showered by copious quantities of rainfall.

I wondered, as I crossed these mountains, if this natural obstruction, which so distinctly divides this State into semiarid and humid halves, is not also somewhat of a barrier, unnecessarily so, to the ready exchange of information and knowledge between the two sections. If this is true, it is high time, figuratively speaking, that we leveled these high peaks as we have literally leveled some of the hills at Grand Coulee Dam. For it is of paramount importance to the welfare of the State and to this region that you be fully cognizant of the results accomplished to date by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Columbia Basin project and understand thoroughly the many benefits that the State and this region will reap from its full development.

Engrossed in lumbering and trade, I suspect that some of you have been inclined in the past to look upon these lands somewhat as an empty backyard. But, as in other respects, time marches on. The first major step toward the development of these resources—the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam and its large power plant—has, in a very real sense, been the reason why Seattle and other coast cities have been able to take their important part in the prosecution of the war. The advancement of the development will aid materially in the solution of post-war problems, which I know many of you view with considerable apprehension. If you choose to make it so, this great region east of you can become an increasingly important and attractive part of your front yard.

Perhaps the Bureau of Reclamation has not been boasting enough about what it has done and is doing toward enriching your commonwealth—about progress on the project in the production of electric power for war and in laying a solid foundation for the post-war development and settlement of a million acres of desert land. To bring you up to date in both the fields of power and reclamation is the objective of my talk here today.

While I will confine my remarks primarily to the Columbia Basin Project, I want to point out that our interest in the Pacific Northwest is not limited to this development. There are many proposals for irrigation in this region, and we are launching a region-wide survey of the various proposals with the object of formulating a comprehensive post-war construction program. The Bureau of Reclamation is making numerous similar studies throughout the West with the same goal in mind. Incidently, the work in this area and elsewhere will be greatly facilitated through the recent establishment by Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore of six regional field offices, headed by Regional Directors of Reclamation. This decentralization seeks to bring the Bureau in closer touch with the people affected by its functions and with area problems and the needs and potentialities of each area. The region for which I have been given responsibility embraces, in addition to the State of Washington, the States of Oregon and Idaho, and the Snake River drainage basin in Wyoming.

On the Columbia Basin Project, production of electric power now holds the spotlight. Electric energy is one of the basic yardsticks by which this Nation's capacity for war may be measured. In modern war the strength of armies and navies is gauged by the industrial power behind them. Behind 90 percent of American industrial might is electricity. Highly essential in times of peace, it is a matter of life and death in time of war. Every new kilowatt brought into service has helped add to the mighty crescendo of thundering planes, tanks, guns, and ships that are destroying the evil forces arraigned against us. As the result of Yankee initiative and perseverance, the combined capacity of this country's powerplants is today without parallel in the history of the world.

But we were not always leaders in electric-power capacity. When the war clouds first gathered the yardstick found the United States short. It was producing a third less energy than the Axis Powers, and we had to stretch our muscles to the utmost to catch up with the threat across the seas.

The Pacific Northwest's natural resources played a major role in erasing our national power deficit and in accelerating the output of fighting equipment and supplies. When an unprecedented demand for power for war

production suddenly developed at the start of the war, the Bureau of Reclamation with its plant at Grand Coulee Dam, the Corps of Engineers of the War Department with Bonneville Dam, public and private agencies in Seattle, Tacoma, and other cities, and the Bonneville Power Administration, which distributes Grand Coulee and Bonneville energy, were prepared to meet the challenge.

Those who shouted "white elephant" during the building of the Grand Coulee Dam saw it turn into one of the greatest "work horses" the Nation has ever seen. More than 90 percent of its power output goes into war service, either directly over Federal transmission lines or indirectly over the lines of private companies. Between 800,000 and 900,000 kilowatts are now being generated, and there is capacity in the plant for more than twice that total. By way of comparison, and without seeming to speak disparagingly about the two systems serving this area, the present output at Grand Coulee Dam is about three times the combined production of all the plants operated by City Light and the Puget Sound Power & Light Co.

Three years ago last month the powerhouse at Grand Coulee was an empty shell. Not a kilowatt of electricity was being produced. Today, on the basis of output of the last 3 months, it is the world's largest power producer, its monthly gross generation averaging about 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The Grand Coulee installation is the key link in the Pacific Northwest power grid system through which 150 generating plants, publicly and privately owned, in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Utah, have been interconnected to make available to war industry every single kilowatt-hour in the region. This vast network of transmission lines, 13,000 miles in length, serves an installed capacity of 3,353,500 kilowatts—equivalent to that of all the power plants in the New England States. From 33 to 38 percent of the power transmitted by the Northwest power pool in the 5-State area is contributed by the Grand Coulee generators.

The immense blocks of Federal power made available in the Pacific Northwest has made possible its amazing industrial growth. Energy from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams drives half a dozen large aluminum plants and a magnesium plant, which, to a large extent, were instrumental in overcoming the pre-Pearl Harbor superiority of the Axis in the manufacture of these important light metals.

Energy for the biggest carbide plant west of the Mississippi comes from the two huge Federal dams through the Northwest power grid. Also served by this system are metallurgical plants, major shipyards, important air bases, Army, Navy, and Coast Guard bases, including a naval training unit, an Army quartermaster depot, a holding and reconsignment depot, airfields, and other military encampments.

The expansion of power-generating facilities for war will offer the Pacific Northwest a challenge in times of peace. We must assure the continuance of huge production to provide security and good life for all the people after the war has been won. We cannot tolerate idle generators, for if we do, we must tolerate idle industrial capacity, and if we tolerate idle industrial capacity, we must tolerate idle men. If we accept idle men, we will find ourselves in the midst of another emergency as perilous to the democratic way of life as is the present conflict.

Not only is it imperative that we utilize our newly found power in the furtherance of the peacetime pursuit of happiness, but if this region is to grow from its present state of economic immaturity to full stature of industrial and agricultural supremacy, we must harness additional quantities of the greatest potential block of cheap hydroelectric power in America.

We are inclined to, but we must not, take our natural resources as a matter of course. Said a California newspaper recently: "If the Columbia River would only flow through Los Angeles County, you could give Detroit and Pittsburgh back to the Indians. In such a case, southern California would be the greatest industrial empire in America."

We cannot sit in a rocking chair on the back porch while the other sections are "making hay." For this vast electrical empire, which we have just begun to build in this region, is yet in its infancy. It was little more than 60 years ago that the steamship *Willamette*, equipped with arc lights, steamed into nearby Elliott Bay, cast anchor, and exhibited the first electric light in the State of Washington. The first major hydroelectric plant in this half of the State was built but 40 years ago at Snoqualmie Falls. Even today we have developed less than a fifth of the potential water power available in the Pacific Northwest, the present combined hydro installation in the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho being about two and one-third million kilowatts as compared with a potential capacity of 15,000,000 kilowatts. Thirteen million of these are in the Columbia River and its tributaries.

Just as power produced at Grand Coulee Dam has filled a critical need in the Pacific Northwest during the war, so will development of the Columbia Basin play a major role in the region's conversion to a peacetime economy.

Because circumstances beyond our control have prevented a start upon construction of the irrigation works, some people have assumed that we have been idle on that phase of the project. Nothing, I assure you, is farther from the truth. In the remaining time allotted to me, I want to tell you about the place, as we of the Bureau of Reclamation see it, which the irrigation project can assume in the post-war period and about the preparations we have been making to assure that it does take that place.

The contributions which development of the irrigation project can make toward cushioning the impact of post-war demobilization are of two general sorts. First, in the construction of dams and canals and other irrigation facilities, employment can be immediately provided for thousands of men discharged from the armed services and war factories. If circumstances require it more men can be employed than were put to work on the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam during the slack employment period of the middle 1930's. Secondly, as canal construction is advanced down the hundred-mile length of the project, opportunities for permanent settlement will be opened for thousands of other families. In addition, of course, these developments by the Bureau will prime the pump for a related expansion in private construction and business.

How hard the demobilization may hit the Pacific Northwest you are undoubtedly better qualified to gage than I. In the minds of people who have studied the problem from a national standpoint, however, this region ranks high in prospective difficulties of post-war adjustment. With respect to your city, it is my understanding, studies of your chamber indicate that, even excepting the tremendous wartime expansion of the Boeing plant and of your shipbuilding industry, no less than 22 percent of all local industrial employees are working with firms which have no background of peacetime production. The prospects of maintaining wartime levels of employment, I dare say, are problematical in your minds, insofar as the years immediately following the war are concerned.

As one who grew up at the opposite side of the Nation, and then became attached to this part of the country, I can understand and I take heart in the fact, as I am sure you do likewise, that so many of the newcomers attracted here by war industries want and plan to stay. In the long-term growth of the Pacific Northwest the availability of adequate opportunities cannot be questioned. It is the readjustment immediately following the war which may be difficult, and which promises to tax our ingenuity and our preparedness.

Everyone hopes that the plans you in private business are preparing will assure a smooth transition from the war economy to a prosperous peacetime economy. We of the Bureau of Reclamation also have definite progress to report. Moreover, our plans promise to complement the developments initiated by private industry.

The Columbia Basin project is ideal as a post-war undertaking because the speed of the construction can be readily geared to the volume of employment needs. In the event that private industry is able to meet work demands, a relatively slow development, at a rate of perhaps 50,000 acres or less per year over a 20- to 25-year period, will be in order. If, however, it becomes necessary to take up slack in employment, the irrigation development can be hastened just as the anticipated peacetime schedule of power production at Grand Coulee Dam to meet war demands was multiplied many times. The construction will, of course, not be just a program to create work. Even if the job is done at a maximum rate, the contribution of every laborer will have tangible and lasting value in the many benefits that will accrue from the irrigation development.

The construction of the irrigation facilities will be a bigger undertaking than the building of the Grand Coulee Dam. About 140,000,000 man-hours of labor at the site—twice as much as has been expended to bring the dam and power plant to its present stage—will be required.

Furthermore, the Bureau's building activities will serve to stimulate a great development of private construction and energize activity in business channels of the Pacific Northwest. Farms will need irrigation machinery, houses, barns, and other structures, wells must be drilled, domestic water systems installed, and roads constructed to join farms with the towns. The new communities and existing ones will require additional housing, public and business buildings, paving, water and sewer systems, and electrical distribution systems. Jobbers will do a brisk trade in construction machinery, and retailers and wholesalers in clothes, automobiles, radios, and other supplies and equipment needed by the workers.

The number of settlement opportunities that can be made available each year, as the canals are extended, will depend, of course, upon the rate of construction. At a relatively slow rate, water can be brought to about a thousand farms a year over a period of about 20 years. With the rate of construction accelerated, the number of settlement opportunities available annually, would, of course, be increased accordingly. For every family taking up land, one additional family will find livelihood in the villages and towns that will spring up in the wake of the development, and a third family, elsewhere in the Nation, will gain a living by providing the farm implements, automobiles, etc., which residents of the new communities and farms will require.

At full development, the project area should support 200,000 to 250,000 people, and some estimates go substantially beyond these figures. That is to say, the 1940 population of eastern Washington would be increased by 50 percent. You probably would welcome the business involved in developing from scratch, let us say, a city the size of Tacoma. Although the character of the demands involved in developing the Columbia Basin Project obviously will be different, that development will be like adding two pre-war Tacomas to the State, insofar as the number of people are concerned.

To bring the potentialities of the Columbia Basin into being, to give the project development its significant and appropriate place in post-war years, three things will be required: One, the appropriation of funds by Congress;

two, the support and active participation in the development and settlement program by the people of the State and region, and by their agencies; and three, the completion of a workable plan by the Bureau of Reclamation—an understandable and acceptable blueprint—ready to put into effect.

We do not anticipate that Congress will make appropriations for construction available before the close of the war, or at least not until the end of the war can be foreseen more clearly than at present.

Certain groups within the State and region have been giving us loyal support and are participating enthusiastically in the formulation of project plans. That active interest must become more widespread and later find expression in State programs if the State and this region are to reap maximum benefits from the development.

Now, finally, what has the Bureau of Reclamation been doing to get a blueprint ready? The work accomplished covers so much territory that I shall be able to give you only the highlights.

Among the first steps taken toward ultimate irrigation of the project, after reconnaissance surveys indicated that more than a million acres of land were suited to irrigation, was to determine in detail exactly what the project lands were like and what they were worth. These steps involved: (1) A retracement survey of section lines; (2) a very detailed topographic survey; (3) a classification of lands to determine their utility under irrigation; and (4) an appraisal of the lands at their present dry-land value. Under antispeculation legislation, the noninflated appraisal values are the prices at which lands will be available to settlers.

These four basic studies were completed some time ago, and many of you are familiar with them. The classification and appraisal data for any tract in the project are available free of charge, upon request, at the Coulee Dam office of the Bureau, and no prospective settler should purchase land without first having obtained this information. There is no need to pay more for land than the appraised value.

One of the most important elements of the blueprint for the development of the Columbia Basin, obviously, is the layout of the dams and canals of the irrigation system. During the past 3 years the Bureau has made exhaustive studies to determine the most feasible location of these features. No less than 19 different plans have been considered. The most desirable plan has been selected and approved, and work will now go ahead on the detailed design for structures and on detailed field locations of the canals so that a great folio of work will be ready for immediate use when construction can be begun.

Design data for major features of the irrigation system are being accumulated rapidly. Preparation of designs for the pumping plant at Grand Coulee Dam and for its equipment has a high priority in our engineering office in Denver, and the work is well advanced. The 12 pumps to be installed, incidentallly, will be the largest in the world. Each will be capable of pumping a stream of water 12 feet in diameter. Just one pump operating only 1½ hours would meet all the needs of the city of Seattle for 24 hours.

The short canal leading from the outlets of the pumping plant to the balancing reservoir in the Grand Coulee has been designed and its final location in the field has been made. We are prepared to place this work under contract on short notice.

More than 75 percent of the land required for the balancing reservoir in the Grand Coulee has been purchased. Foundation drilling for the two dams which will form this reservoir has been completed and construction materials have been located. Specifications can be issued with little delay. Similar work has been completed for the dam at the foot of Long Lake, farther down the main canal, and drilling is well advanced at the site of the dam in the Potholes area behind which the return flow from the northern third of the project will be recaptured for use in irrigating areas to the south. This reservoir will be about 10 miles long and 5 miles wide. Final locations have been made for about 20 miles of main canal and preliminary locations for another 200 miles. The site for the Pasco pumping plant and its canals and laterals, which will serve 15,000 acres direct from the Columbia River in the vicinity of Pasco, has been selected and specifications can be issued quickly.

The land surveys and the layout of the irrigation system are basic preparations for bringing water to the Columbia Basin, but our concern does not stop with the mere delivery of water. The man who takes that water and uses it—the settler—is, in a sense, the keystone of the project.

To insure that the conditions under which settlement takes place provide the settler with every reasonable prospect for success, a comprehensive series of investigations of settlement and development problems were launched in 1939. Because the problems have local and State significance, and because their solutions will necessitate local and State action, the investigations were set up on a cooperative basis. Committees composed of representatives of local, State, and Federal agencies have been studying 28 separate but related problems. These studies, known as the Columbia Basin joint investigations, are now largely completed.

The reports of the investigating committees are not designed to collect dust on official shelves, and many recommendations which lie within the province of Federal action have already been put in force. The recommendations in other reports, in which representatives of State and local agencies have participated, will call for action by local and State groups. That needed action, we trust, will receive your consideration and support at the appropriate time.

Of key importance among recent preparations for the development of the project, which spring in part from the studies mentioned, is the Columbia Basin Project Act of March 10, 1943. The new act, which strengthens and supersedes the original Antispeculation Act of 1937, incorporates important changes relative to the size of the farm units to be established. Whereas the farm sizes were restricted by the act of 1937 to 40 acres for a single man and 80 acres for man and wife, the new act permits subdividing the land into farm units of such size, considering soil, topography, location, and other factors as will support an average-sized family at a satisfactory level of living. Sizes, recommended by one of the investigating groups, range from 45 to 60 acres on lands of the best class to 100 to 160 acres on lands of the poorest class for which water will be provided.

In accordance with recommendations of another committee, the act permits adjustment of farm boundaries to topography in such a manner that irrigation and other farm operations can be carried on with maximum ease and at minimum costs. Rights-of-way for a road net, in locations proposed by another committee, can be incorporated in the farm plats.

Also important is the provision of the act which gives the Federal Government authority to purchase project lands from private owners, to subdivide them into farm units, and to sell or lease them on equitable terms to settlers. This provision was found necessary for a number of reasons. It was demanded by the large landowners in the project area. Under the act which seeks to establish settlement opportunities for as many families as possible, these landowners will be allowed water for not more than 160 irrigable acres. To obtain water for such acreage, they must agree to dispose of their excess lands at the Government-appraised value. Inasmuch as many of these landowners hold hundreds, or even thousands, of acres, they would be compelled to subdivide their lands and go into the real-estate business in order to meet the project requirements unless the Government stood ready to buy up all of their excess land in one transaction. Hence, they urged a provision of the kind included in the act.

This provision also will afford the means for applying a settler-selection program. It has been demonstrated on other Bureau of Reclamation projects in the West that selection of settlers on the basis of experience, capital, and other qualifications is of great value in helping to protect from failure both the settlers and the projects. Such a selection can be made, of course, only for lands owned by the Federal Government. But 2 percent of the irrigable area of the project is now in the public domain. Funds for land purchase have not yet been made available.

The act of March 10, 1943, also provides that lands acquired by the Government may be used for town sites, and dedicated for public purposes. This will assist in the establishment of new towns in places best calculated to serve the needs of the settlers, and least apt to create wasteful competition between towns, which so commonly results in loss to everyone concerned except the promoter. Ability to dedicate lands acquired for public purposes will be helpful in developing an adequate system of parks and recreational areas. Major responsibility for such a program, however, will rest with the State. A thorough report on this matter has been prepared. The proposals in it are among those for which energetic State action will be required.

Before any construction work may be done on the canal system, a contract for the repayment of that part of the construction costs of the project allocated by the Secretary of Interior as repayable by irrigation must be negotiated between the Federal Government and the irrigation districts. The Bureau of Reclamation last month held preliminary discussions concerning the contracts with the boards of the districts, and a draft of contract, which promises to be acceptable to the Government and the districts, is now being prepared for presentation to the water users this summer.

You will be interested in some of the proposed provisions of the contract. The amount which the districts will repay for construction of the irrigation works will average $85 per irrigable acre. The total construction costs per acre will considerably exceed this figure, but the balance above $85 per acre will be paid out of power revenues. Extensive and difficult studies of project-cost allocations preceded the official establishment of the $85 per acre average construction obligation. The Federal Treasury is to be reimbursed for the entire cost of the project, except for a small allocation to navigation and flood control.

The terms of the repayment are very reasonable. No payments will fall due during a 10-year-development period. Thereafter, farmers will pay off the indebtedness in 40 annual installments. Those payments, moreover, will be adjusted in accordance with what is known as the normal and percentage plan. Without going into detail that plan involves adjustment of the average annual installment up or down in accordance with the relative value of the crop return. That is to say, in years of higher than average crop returns, the annual payments will be higher than the average payments, and conversely, in years of lower than average crop

returns, when the farmer needs relief in meeting payments, the amounts paid will be lower than average.

The burden of repayment will be equitably adjusted in another way. Everyone is well aware that the better lands in the project are more productive and will yield more than the poorer lands. The land classification was made in part to discover those differences in productivity. The better lands, therefore, can afford, without hardship, to contribute more to the cost of construction than the poorer lands. Accordingly, the amount allocated to lands of better than average quality will be more than $85 per irrigable acre and the amount allocated to lands of less than average productivity will be less than that amount. This adjustment will serve to give settlers on lands of differing qualities equal opportunities, and minimize the unfair burdens and not infrequent failures which have commonly been associated with poorer lands during the past.

These are some of the steps we have taken to insure that the conditions which the settler will face in the Columbia Basin are as favorable as possible for his success, and for the success of the project. Many other proposals directed to the same ends are springing from the work of the investigating committees. For example, the cost per farm of a domestic water system is apt to be excessive because ground water lies at comparatively great depths. It has been demonstrated that the cost per farm may be reduced from $1,000 or $1,500 to a few hundred dollars if a community system capable of serving several farms is installed instead of an individual well being sunk on each farm. Exhaustive studies also have been made of the types of farming which promise to yield the most satisfactory returns.

The results of all of these studies will be made available to the settler. The findings are tools, so to speak, made accessible to him. If used effectively, they will help in the task ahead of him. No one supposes, however, that they will automatically guarantee his success. That clearly will depend upon his individual initiative and ability.

As I have indicated earlier, many of the proposals made, and others to be suggested shortly by committees, on which State and local agencies have membership, lie largely or entirely within the jurisdiction of State and local agencies. I might cite the program advocating the establishment of State parks at some of the unusual and scenic sites in and close to the project area, or I might draw your advance attention to the State action which will be suggested by a committee, headed by your State planning council, to enable counties of the project area to discharge effectively the enlarged functions with which they will be faced when the project is developed. The prompt provision of roads will be another responsibility of State and counties. The counties, without adequate resources during earlier years, may well require financial assistance from the State. The provision of school facilities, as required, also lies within the province of State and local agencies.

I think it is clear by now that all of the major lines are entered on our blueprint for development of the Columbia Basin. Only relatively minor details have yet to be added. With adequate appropriations, we could start putting the plans into effect the day the irrigation districts, through adoption of the repayment contract, assume obligation for return of their portion of the construction cost.

In conclusion, let me say that of the 150 to 200 potential irrigation and multiple-purpose projects which the Bureau of Reclamation is investigating in the West, the development of the Columbia Basin rates as the No. 1 post-war development—first because of its huge size and the flexibility its construction affords in gaging employment to post-war needs, first because of the extent to which it will enrich the area in which it is situated, first because the plans for its construction are furthest advanced, and first because of the wholehearted and universal approval and support which the State and the region in which it is to be developed are giving it.

Address by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller at Convention of General Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, member of the advisory board of the National Woman's Party, at the convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, St. Louis, Mo., April 26, 1944. The Public Printer estimates that the address will occupy two and two-third pages of the RECORD, and that the printing will cost $138.66.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been 30 years since the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorsed the suffrage amendment. Many of you are too young to remember that momentous occasion, but those of you who do, know that it was this endorsement that put the suffrage amendment on the high road to victory. Today, I believe you are on the verge of another great endorsement—that of the equal rights amendment, which will be the final step in the long struggle for the emancipation of American women.

The opposition to the equal rights amendment comes as nothing strange, for all progressive ideas are opposed by persons and organizations who, though they may be sincere, seem to lack true vision—"the broad horizon's wider view." One of the most amusing chapters in the history of our country will be the story of the women who organized against their political freedom through antisuffrage leagues, but the most incomprehensible chapter of the world's history is being made right now and right here in our own country where women, who once worked for suffrage, now oppose the equal-rights amendment, which is but a corollary to the suffrage amendment. The suffrage amendment gave us only political freedom. We should now be granted legal and civil freedom.

The equal-rights amendment reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." We might understand that some men do not approve of equality under the law for women because it might interfere with their personal position or gain, but it seems incredible that women should organize to oppose other women who desire equality for all women. The opposition to the equal-rights amendment comes mostly from women whose motives may be humanitarian but whose sense of justice is still dulled by a Lady Bountiful approach of the mid-Victorian era.

When our Constitution was written it was based on the old English common law which considered women as chattels. Though our Constitution gives the greatest measure of liberty to the people of the United States, the courts generally have interpreted the laws in the light of the eighteenth century when women were not persons and, therefore, when women have been removed from the chattel class it has had to be done by special statutes. The latest available report of the legal status of women in the United States by the Department of Labor, states: "Any conclusions bearing on woman's status under the laws of the United States of America must take into account the common law, on which the fabric of the Nation's jurisprudence is woven. In general, it has been the rule that where specific statutes abrogating them have not been enacted, common-law principles apply." Hence, the need for the equal rights amendment as a part of the Constitution. I believe most of our opponents acknowledge that justice should not be based on sex, but until the principle of equal rights, like other basic principles such as freedom of religion, speech, press, etc., is placed in the Constitution, laws discriminating against women merely because they are women can continue to be enacted by State legislatures.

In a public debate on this question about 2 years ago, Miss Mary Anderson, director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, was asked if she believed "that justice should be meted out impartially to men and women." Her reply was: "It should not. I think justice has to be tempered with law and justice cannot be legislated. It is a matter of justice between men and women in everyday life, which no law can ever meet." A jurist, when reading that statement, remarked: "Justice is something fundamental. Laws are passed to insure justice and justice to be real must apply to all alike." Over the main portal of the beautiful white marble edifice which houses the Supreme Court in Washington are carved the words "Equal Justice Under Law." When Miss Anderson was asked why those words were there, her reply was: "Because we in this country are having equal justice under the law, but that does not mean we should have equal justice all through life." Why not? Isn't justice through life the aim of democratic governments? Now, I admire Miss Anderson for her long years of work to better the conditions of women and children in industry but I feel that her work has blinded her to what constitutes justice because her entire thought is centered only on women in industry and not on the millions of other women, who together with women in industry, suffer under unjust and unfair legal discriminations. Only last year Miss Anderson wrote "women are still the lowest paid workers." Why? Because for the most part women are still paid on the basis of sex.

Life is more than at the half-way mark for many of us and, therefore, it is for our children and our children's children that we must work and plan because in them we feel we have an earthly immortality and, as citizens of this great country, we want to insure for them the fullest measure of freedom and justice.

The United States Government almost daily makes a plea for women between the ages of 21 and 45 to join the Women's Army Corps which when first formed was under the Army. Now it is a part of the Army, just the same as the regiment in which your sons may serve. Among other enticements in this Government broadcast, the offer is made that any young woman wishing to join the service may have several choices

of jobs in the flying forces—she may ferry planes, she may work on the ground in various branches of the service; she may be sent overseas and may be ordered to carry a weapon to protect herself when she is in some lonely outpost transmitting radio messages for the safety of thousands of fighting men. Though there is a small proportion of married women among the WAC's, WAVES, Women's Marine Corps, SPARS, and WASPS, the majority of these famous organizations is made up of unmarried women and thus they can control their own property and earnings.

However, when the war is ended and these young women will marry and assume the duties of wives and mothers, they will no longer have the freedom they had before they said those binding words "I do." Let us suppose that one of them marries and settles down in sunny California and aids her husband in business. According to the California law, all property acquired after marriage is under joint ownership of husband and wife. This seems an excellent idea. However, at the death of the husband, the wife pays a tax on all this property acquired after marriage, but at the death of the wife, the husband pays no tax. Should one marry a generous West Virginian, who in the first happiness of married joy presents her with some property, she had better make sure he is not in debt for her property becomes liable for her husband's debts.

The aftermath of every war has meant that more women are obliged to earn a livelihood for, after the death of so many men, there just aren't enough husbands to go around and many unmarried women and wives are obliged to earn a livelihood to help out in the family income. Thus, should one of these new wives wish to enlarge the family income by taking a position, she better not choose Vermont or Virginia as a residence, where the husband will have the right to control her earnings. Nor should she move to Georgia, for there her husband may control her earnings unless there is some agreement to the contrary.

Some of these young women will naturally feel that their experiences have fitted them to engage in business, but they should not marry anyone from North Carolina or Texas, for there the husband will have to go to court to make them business women in their own right. Neither should they choose Nevada, for there the husband's creditors may prevent them from becoming business women in their own right. It would be a mistake to go to Michigan, for there they will have to have the husband's consent to enjoy their own earnings. In the State of New York, if a woman has a job outside the home, what she earns belongs to her, but if she does sewing or keeps boarders or engages in other business within the home her husband, even a drunken one, may take what she earns. In Ohio no woman may drive a taxicab, but in almost every part of the world today American women are driving cars and many of them trucks to help with the war effort.

Naturally, these women look forward to having children, and perhaps at some future date during times of sickness or stress, some of the children under age may try to earn a bit to aid the household. However, I want to warn any married women who live in Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Vermont, Virginia, or Wyoming, that the father has the right to the custody, services, and earnings of the children.

It may happen that the husband gets into some legal difficulty but if she lives in Indiana, the wife may not assume liability for her husband, however much she may desire to do so. Perhaps, through the sufferings of war, later on the husband may need a guardian, but she better not select Florida as a residence, because there the wife cannot serve as such.

Delaware is a fine little State, but whatever property is acquired there after marriage through the cooperative efforts of husband and wife is subject to the husband's control. In the neighboring State of New Jersey, since a married woman cannot make a valid contract of employment with her husband, either express or implied, she cannot recover, under the State's Workmen's Compensation Act, for any injury sustained while rendering service in her husband's business. Way down east, in Maine, though a woman assists her husband in his business, even caring for money which is the product of their joint labor, this does not make any part of the money her property. In the charming State of South Carolina a woman's clothes belong to her husband, but the North goes South Carolina one better, for it is reported that a Michigan judge decided a woman's hair was the property of her husband.

Suppose both husband and wife wish to go into business together and their property is defined as "common." If they live in Arizona, California, Louisiana, New Mexico, Texas, or Washington, the wife's earnings are under the control of the husband.

In some States the bond of a woman will not be accepted, even though she may be a successful businesswoman supporting her husband and family. In my own State of Pennsylvania a man may endorse a note of any sum for a friend, but a married woman dare not put her name down as an endorser even for a few dollars. In most States an unmarried woman is considered competent to handle her own affairs, but once she takes unto herself a husband, she somehow becomes incompetent in some way in every State. Suddenly she becomes a widow, and then she again becomes competent. Is this a reflection on husbands?

There is a curious confusion apparently, in men's minds who have made the laws, as to just when a woman is competent and when she is not. In Missouri, a woman must be 21 to make a valid will, but a man of 18 can will personal property. In Wisconsin a married woman can dispose of her property at 18 but an unmarried woman must be 21. After a careful study of the question, it appears that she is competent or incompetent according to the advantage it brings to a man.

The ambition of all married persons is to own a home and at death, living occupancy may be available to either survivor in 13 States, to the widow in 15 States, but not in Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Montana, or Nebraska.

Although men have always outnumbered women in the jails and penitentiaries, it is possible that some of these young women we have in mind may commit a crime or get into difficulty which will require a jury trial. The Supreme Court has decided—in the famous Scottsboro case of Alabama—that a Negro man could not have a fair trial unless there were Negro men on the jury panel. However, there is no assurance to our young women that they can have the same justice in Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, Missouri, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming, and what a famous Governor of Maryland used to call "the great free State of Maryland."

Many of the young women doing such wonderful work for freedom in the WAC's, the WAVES, the MARINES, the SPARS, the WASPS, are highly talented in lines other than the work they signed up for, but should some of them be musical, I advise them not to settle in Connecticut. Should they want to earn some extra money there by playing in a band or an orchestra, they are forbidden to do so after 10 o'clock at night. It might be well to add here that night work usually pays better so naturally men musicians in Connecticut feel that women should not stay awake after 10 o'clock, even to play a harp.

I might go on with many warnings and multiplications of discriminations ad infinitum, but I think I have given you sufficient proof for the need of the equal-rights amendment.

To correct State by State the thousand and one injustices under which women now suffer would take a hundred years and then all the gain might be dissipated by the next legislatures; therefore, the only way to make certain that women have equal justice under the law is to add this amendment to the Constitution.

You will recall that 2 years ago there was a very strong movement in Congress to pass a mandatory joint income tax law forcing husbands and wives to make such returns in order to bring in more revenue. This proposal, like many laws in existence, would impose a penalty on marriage, and again make a wife a chattel. Mrs. Roosevelt, in commenting on the joint income tax proposal, said, "some other way of obtaining money would be wiser than a measure which strikes at the roots of a fundamental principle which we in this country have been establishing over a long period of years; the right of women to be considered as persons." There is the heart of our argument—"the right of women to be considered as persons." We are persons everywhere when it comes to paying taxes but we are not persons in many States when it comes to controlling our own income, property, earnings, the right to earn a living, to sit on juries, to contract, etc. Women are not persons and wives are chattels, so in effect ruled the Comptroller General of the United States and two judges in Baltimore. This wasn't in the nineteenth century, but recently in the twentieth century.

We women gladly bear all the burdens and responsibilities of citizenship. Why should we not share all the privileges that go with these responsibilities? In our asking equality before the law, we are not opposing legislation which seeks to raise standards for labor or prevent the exploitation of workers. What we are asking is equal economic opportunity for all and fair legislation for all workers, men and women alike. The Fair Labor Standards Act which affects interstate industry, which is 90 percent of industry, declares for equal pay for equal work. Why should anyone approve of any other principle than the one for which we stand—that wages should be paid not on the sex of the workers but on the work accomplished. When women are unduly restricted in industry by special hours or minimum wage provisions the tendency is lowered wages for all, for during hard times men underbid women and the standard of living is lowered for both. Do you ever hear of men asking for minimum wages for themselves?

There is nothing confusing in the meaning of the amendment. It simply means that under the law all citizens, regardless of sex, shall be equal in rights and that the laws shall not apply one way to men and another to women. Women are now equally amenable to the laws with men and penalities for violation of laws apply equally to women as they do to men, and as previously stated, there is no distinction in rights when it comes to filling tax coffers. The amendment does not mean that all persons are equal any more than the Declaration of Independence means that. What it means is equal opportunity for all. Men's strengths and mentalities differ as women's do. Under the amendment women would have equal rights with other citizens and not be legally handicapped

by the Government or suffer under legal discriminations based on sex alone.

When we were struggling for the right to vote we heard a great deal about chivalry, and we were told by statesmen in heartbreaking tones that they did not want us to vote because we were too ethereal to enter such a base building as a voting booth and thus they could better represent us at the polls. There are still men in Congress who tell us they are opposed to the equal-rights amendment because of their chivalrous feelings. One statesman, only a few weeks ago, declared, "In my State we still place women on a pedestal," even though in his State a woman has no control over her earnings, little over her property, and less over her child.

Well, we agree the days of chivalry are not over, but now it goes by another name—protective legislation. Laws forbidding women from working certain hours or in certain occupations are only enacted when women are to be paid for the work; no chivalrous man ever suggests these so-called protective laws apply to women for work for which they receive no pay, nor for work in which men do not want to engage. It is only the competitive woman worker to whom these restrictive wage-and-hour laws apply. New York State passed a law a few years ago forbidding women to work in ice-cream parlors after 10 o'clock at night, when work is easier and tips higher. New York also has a law forbidding women in the printing and binding business to work after certain hours, and thus, when a rush order which might keep her an hour or two longer comes in, she loses the opportunity for overtime pay. Nurses, charwomen, telephone operators, and women in offices do not receive such tender thought. Can it be men do not want these jobs?

The "gay nineties" statesmen have now been joined by certain labor leaders and both not only want to keep women on a pedestal but keep her chained there. However, the war has temporarily broken her chains, for restrictions have been abrogated or winked at for the duration, because we poor weak females are spraying paint on battleships, oiling and cleaning steam engines, directing traffic, operating switches, riveting, welding, and speeding the war effort by filling millions of jobs previously done by men. The latest figure is 18,000,000 women in industry, and a radio call went out early in the month for a million more. There are no longer valid reasons against the amendment, so what possible excuse can there now be for still withholding from women equality of rights under the law?

These opponents are loud in their declarations that they believe in equal opportunity and equal pay for equal work. Why, then, did they not protest when Regional Labor Board III, including the cities of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, issued an order August 6, 1943, setting different standards of pay for men and women bookkeepers—men to receive $35 a week, women to receive $22.

Most opponents of the amendment base their opposition now almost entirely on laws affecting working women. This is particularly true of the League of Women Voters, which does not even recommend that their members make a study of the amendment, and the two Communist newspapers, the Daily Worker and the New Masses.

Why place working women in a class by themselves? That is not democracy. Why not make all women equal under the law and give all women the right of choice of occupation, hours of work, the right to control their earnings, property, etc., the same as men? There are working women who oppose the amendment because they have made gains under the system of taking half a loaf when they couldn't get a whole, instead of realizing that they may be reduced to a crust, because there is a determined movement among certain labor leaders to take women out of industry. Under the equal-rights amendment they could have the whole loaf.

Protection to properly protect must apply to both men and women. If certain machines and certain chemicals are hazardous and injurious to women, they are to men as well, and both should have equal protection.

Certain labor leaders state that under the equal-rights amendment women would be robbed of their rights and protections. This is entirely contrary to the Fair Labor Standards Act, and what has been done for labor in interstate industries could be done under intrastate industries. The amendment does not require uniformity among the several States. On this point the Senate Judiciary report of 1943 concurs. When the amendment is passed there would be no difficulty in the States adjusting their laws for equal protection for men and women. No rights would be taken away from either workers or the States, except the right which should not exist in a democracy—the right to base justice on sex alone.

Maternity legislation would not be affected by the equal-rights amendment. Under the amendment maternity aid could be granted to certain groups of women on the same principle that would permit aid to certain groups of men, such as pensions to veterans for service in wars. All women are not mothers any more than all men are soldiers.

Aid for dependent children would not be affected by the amendment. Such aid is for the benefit of the children concerned and is money voted for the children alone and may be administered by others than mothers. There would be no difficulty, as some have stated, regarding guardianship of children, as most States give equal guardianship to parents except when living apart, and then the courts decide according to the best interest of the child. The amendment would justly require husbands and wives to be treated equally in regard to the responsibility for support of the other spouse and the children, which is already the case in about one-third of the States with no dire results. In regard to alimony, the amendment would require husband and wife to be treated equally in the matter of support on the dissolution of marriage or during divorce proceedings. This is already the case in 13 States, where no unfortunate results have occurred because this equality was established.

The question is asked, "How would the amendment affect divorce laws?" In Kentucky a wife may not divorce her husband for drunkenness unless it is accompanied by nonsupport and property waste, but drunkenness on the part of the wife (though not accompanied by additional faults) entitled a husband to divorce unless it is shown he is equally at fault. Under the amendment such unjust provisions of law would be done away with in all States and any State could make its own divorce laws provided men and women could be divorced on the same grounds.

Fear has been expressed that under the amendment wives might have to support their husbands. Of course, this is something entirely unheard of, but such a fear has already been realized without the amendment, for in Long Island a judge ordered a woman to support her husband out of her own earnings though they were living apart.

The opposition to the equal-rights amendment comes from various sources; some is sincere, though mistaken; some is based on prejudice; much on fear of women as industrial and business competitors and, alas, much on ignorance of what the amendment really means. Incredible as it seems, there are persons who declare that supporters of equality under the law want to be like men in a physiological sense. This seems too ridiculous to be noticed but let me assure such objectors that under the amendment men would still have the right to be fathers and women to be mothers, but mothers would gain an added dignity and respect by being raised to the same legal status as men.

It has been stated that the words "rights" and "equality" would confuse the courts. May I suggest that anyone who makes this statement regarding the word "rights" is not familiar with the Constitution. The same word is used in our much beloved Bill of Rights. The Supreme Court has made clear in several decisions, one only recently, what the word "equality" means.

According to the wording of the equal-rights amendment, it would not take effect until 5 years after it is passed and thus the States would have ample time to adjust their laws to its provisions.

Every woman member of the General Federation is devoting some part of her life to the war effort. There is nothing that we, as women, would refuse to do in order to save the American way of life. We all believe in the "four freedoms," but how can we advocate those freedoms for the rest of the world when we still deny fully justice here to women?

There is a great invisible weapon which is as necessary to winning the war as any tank, gun, or bomber. It is the source of strength of the Chinese; it is what has kept England from being overwhelmed; it is what has kept Russia from being conquered; it is what has given Norway its strength to resist its Quislings; it is what has kept alive the hope of survival in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Greece. Though invisible it is an invincible weapon forged by the women of freedom-loving nations to protect the future of their children. It is this weapon plus determination which fills the hearts and minds of us women here tonight to make certain that the American way of life is preserved. Alas, however, this invisible and surely victorious weapon is constantly being threatened by the specter of fear—fear that when the war ends women will not have a right to their children, their wages, their property, their right to enter business and all those fundamental American rights which are denied us as women. To sum it up, all we ask is the right to live as free individuals, enjoying the same impartial measure of justice meted out to men. We women are made equal in war—will we want to continue unequal in peace? From all sides come praise for what women are doing to win the war, and we are doing it gladly and proudly. We are giving our times, our money, our strength, and our children. Can we do more?

Yes we can!

Though we cannot bring back from the far-flung battle fronts the men and women who have given their lives in order that we may live in a free world, we can make a better land for the young people who do return by placing both men and women on a status of equality. We are all equal in the sight of God, men and women of whatever race, creed, or color, and within each individual is something divine, something that no outer force can destroy—a God-given longing for justice and freedom that rises above all material things. Take away every external advantage and possession there still remains for each individual that greater thing—"the right under God to call his soul his own." It is the outward expression of this inner right which will come to every American woman through the passage of the equal-rights amendment.

Women of the Federation, you have done so much to enlarge the outlook and advance the interests of the women of the United States, yours is now the glorious opportunity to go forward for the equal-rights amendment. I know you will not fail the millions of other women who are awaiting your decision and your untiring efforts to speed the victory.

Dependency Allowances for Disabled Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the text of two amendments which I shall offer to the veterans' bill which is now before the House, unless some other Member does so. Both of those amendments, incidentally, are taken from bills introduced by the chairman of the committee which brings the bill before us and both of them have to do with the provisions for disabled veterans. Both amendments also are directly in line with legislation which has been on the statute books in Canada for many years. One of the amendments will provide for payment of dependent allowances to permanently and totally disabled veterans. The other one will provide for payment by the Veterans' Administration of any net loss suffered by any workman's compensation fund resulting from injury of an employed disabled veteran. The purpose of this latter bill is to remove any prejudice which may now exist against the employment of partially disabled veterans on the ground that they might become injured and thus over a period of time insurance rates might be increased. The fact is that the accident rate as to employed disabled people is frequently lower than that of the able-bodied, but this fact is not widely recognized.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The text of the two amendments follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 66, line 18, insert a new section, as follows:

"Section 2, part VII, paragraph 5, of Public Law No. 16, approved March 24, 1943, be amended to read as follows:

"'5. (a) It is hereby declared to be the major purpose of rehabilitation to restore employability lost by virtue of a material and permanent handicap due to service-incurred disability. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing service-connected disabled veterans in suitable gainful employment.

"'(b) To remove the prejudice against employment of honorably discharged veterans having 10 percent or more service-connected disability, and to aid in securing employment of such veterans, where an injury or death of such veteran is incurred under such circumstances as to result in payment of benefits under State employees' compensation laws or by recovery from or settlement with or on behalf of the employer, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reimburse the insurer or the fund from which such payment is made to the extent of the net loss suffered by such insurer or fund: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing payment of benefits under an Employees' Compensation Act for such injury or death, and under paragraph 4 hereof for the same period of time to a veteran or his dependents, but such veteran or his dependents may elect which benefit to receive: *And provided further*, That the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for any expenses incurred under this section.'"

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS: Page 78, line 24, insert new title, "Title VI":

"Paragraph II of part I of veterans regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(p) (1) If and while the disability is rated total or if and while the person is disabled as set forth in subparagraphs (1), (m), (n), or (o) of this paragraph and where the person has a wife, child, children, dependent parent or parents, the monthly pension, including as to total disability, increased pension, if any, under subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, shall be increased by the following amounts and subject to the conditions specified:

"'(a) If he has a wife but no child living, $25.

"'(b) If he has a wife and one child living, $40.

"'(c) If he has a wife and two children living, $52, and $10 for each additional child.

"'(d) If he has no wife and one child living, $15.

"'(e) If he has no wife and two children, $27, and $10 for each additional child.

"'(f) If he has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then in addition to the above amounts, $10 for each parent so dependent.

"'(2) If and while the disability is rated less than total under any one of the subparagraphs (a) or (i), inclusive, of paragraph II of this part and where the person has a wife, child, children, dependent parent or parents, the monthly pension, including increased pension, if any, under subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, shall be increased by a percentage of the increased pension that would be payable while totally disabled under subparagraph (p) (1) above.

"SEC. 2. Paragraph II of part II of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"'(p) (1) If, and while, the disability is rated total, or if, and while, the person is disabled as set forth in subparagraphs (1), (m), (n), or (o) of this paragraph, and where the person has a wife, child, children, dependent parent or parents, the monthly pension, including as to total disability, increased pension, if any, under subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, shall be increased by the following amounts and subject to the conditions specified:

"'(a) If he has a wife but no child living, $25.

"'(b) If he has a wife and one child living, $40.

"'(c) If he has a wife and two children living, $52, and $10 for each additional child.

"'(d) If he has no wife and one child living, $15.

"'(e) If he has no wife and two children living, $27, and $10 for each additional child.

"'(f) If he has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $10 for each parent so dependent.

"'(2) If, and while, the disability is rated less than total under any one of the subparagraphs (a) to (i), inclusive, of paragraph II of this part, and where the person has a wife, child, children, dependent parent or parents, the monthly pension, including increased pension, if any, under subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, shall be increased by a percentage of the increased pension that would be payable while totally disabled under subparagraph (p) (1) above.'

"SEC. 3. That paragraph I of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"'(i) If and while the disability is rated permanent total under paragraph I, part III, and the person has a wife, child, children, dependent parent or parents, the monthly pension under subparagraph (f) of paragraph I of this part shall be increased by the following amounts and subject to the conditions specified:

"'(a) If he has a wife but no child living, $25.

"'(b) If he has a wife and one child living, $40.

"'(c) If he has a wife and two children, $52, and $10 for each additional child.

"'(d) If he has no wife and one child living, $15.

"'(e) If he has no wife and two children living, $27, and $10 for each additional child.

"'(f) If he has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then in addition to the above amounts, $10 for each parent so dependent.'"

Urges Termination of Land-Grant Concessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's magazine, by D. B. Robertson, of May 1944:

URGES TERMINATION OF LAND-GRANT CONCESSIONS

(By D. B. Robertson, president)

(Arranged from comprehensive statement made by brotherhood's international president, appearing before subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 21, in support of H. R. 4184, a bill to amend sec. 321, title 3, pt. II, of the Transportation Act of 1940 with respect to movement of Government traffic.)

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, having a membership of approximately 117,000, is in favor of the proposed amendment to the Transportation Act of 1940, terminating the exception to section 321 (a). That exception, which permits the transportation of military or naval property of the United States Government, and of members of the military and naval forces on official duty at reduced rates over the so-called land-grant railroads, has a direct and unsettling influence upon the railroad industry, and adversely affects the welfare of railway employees. Its final repeal, we believe, will be of benefit to the industry and its employees, as well as to competing transportation agencies, to shippers generally, and to the governmental regulatory bodies whose task is to attain the maximum order and efficiency of American transportation service.

The history of the land-grant rate concessions is an illustration of how a small matter may grow into a major economic problem, notwithstanding the primary purpose fully justified its institution. The roots of that problem lie far back in American history, in those early days when the Louisiana Purchase and the Mexican War had made the people of the United States possessor of a billion and

a half acres of unsettled land. The Federal Government quite properly sought to make this land available to new settlers, and to encourage them to make new homes for themselves in the western Territories. The stream of migration that made the covered wagon a symbol of our national expansion at the same time proved that wagon transportation was too costly, too slow, and too limited to meet the needs of our rapidly developing lands beyond the Mississippi. Moreover, both before and after the Civil War, national leaders realized that if we were to insure American unity we must develop cheap, fast, and efficient transcontinental transportation.

That imperative need could be met only by extension of the railroads into the newly opened regions and across the continent. During the early period of railroad construction the foremost leaders of the Nation, including Henry Clay, Stephen Douglas, and Abraham Lincoln himself, sought by every possible means to assist the builders of railroads in the difficult, perilous, and expensive task of providing transportation in the Western States.

Such governmental aid took the form, in part, of grants of land to some of the companies building the railroads in the South and West. That land was the Government's only great resource; it was being given away to new settlers and being sold at nominal prices to all buyers. The late Commissioner Joseph B. Eastman estimated, after a study of the land-grant problem, that the average value of Federal lands when the railroads were being assisted was 97 cents per acre. On that basis, the 130,000,000 acres of land given the particular companies was worth approximately $125,000,000. Only 18,000 miles of railroad out of the 240,000 miles in the United States were actually constructed with the aid of land grants from the Government. Land-grant aid was thus supplied on only 7.5 percent of the mileage of American railways, and its total value was less than one-half of 1 percent of the investment in their construction.

PROBLEM OF MAJOR PROPORTIONS

In making these land grants, the Federal Government attached the condition that its materials and troops might be transported without "the payment of tolls." That phrase was later interpreted to require that railway rates for Government transportation over land-grant roads should be approximately one-half the regular rates for freight and 80 percent for mail. The Federal Government thus immediately began the recapture of the aid it had granted. That recapture has continued right down to the present time, with some variations in the method and scope, but with a steady increase in amount until today the land-grant rate reduction has become a problem of major proportions.

Among the primary causes of the growth of this evil was the extension of land-grant rebates to other railroads by the so-called "equalization agreements." That extension came about by this process: When Government agencies secured rate reductions over the land-grant roads alone, those roads were naturally given preference in the routing of freight, mail, and Government personnel. That preference not only cut down the volume of business of other carriers but it also had a considerable influence on nongovernmental shippers, whose business frequently tied in indirectly with Government activity in the developing regions beyond the Mississippi River. In order to get their fair share of Government transportation, therefore, and to escape the related effects of governmental discrimination, other railroads agreed to give to the Government the same rebate as was required of the land-grant roads. Consequently, this discrimination and the unstabilizing effect of unequal railroad rates went far beyond the railroads originally involved. Land-grant rate reductions became a national problem, one which should be solved as a part of the transportation policy of the Federal Government.

The total value of the land granted to the railroads during construction was only $125,000,000—and by the end of 1937, according to the late Commissioner Eastman, the Government had been given rate reductions totaling $155,000,000. The railroads had returned to the Federal Government not just the amount advanced, in land, but actually over 20 percent more than that advance, up to 7 years ago. At that time, and as a matter of fair dealing, it would seem the Government could have justified an action completely relieving the railroads of the obligation to continue land-grant reductions. The service rendered by the railroads, in opening up the West and in tying this Nation into a single great economic region, should have been recompense enough for whatever aid the Federal Government had advanced. But even in terms of dollars and cents, the Government had gotten back at least 20 percent more than the value of those early land grants.

This general situation was put before the United States Congress, through its Interstate Commerce Committees, when the land-grant problem came up for consideration in connection with the Transportation Act of 1940. As a consequence of the investigation then made, Congress included in the Transportation Act its section 321, which provided in its paragraph (a) that:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to the provisions of sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the full applicable commercial rates, fares, or charges shall be paid for transportation by any common carrier subject to such act of any persons or property for the United States, or on its behalf, except that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use or to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or of property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty; and the rate determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission as reasonable therefor shall be paid for the transportation by railroad of the United States mail."

We believe it was the expectation of the Congress—it was certainly our expectation—that this clause put an end to the manifold abuses growing out of the land-grant rate reductions. The remaining exception, that relating to movements of military and naval materials and personnel, we thought would be an annoyance to the carriers, but not enough of a problem seriously to unsettle railway accounting or revenue. We, of course, were not the only ones whose expectations were completely overturned by American defense preparations and our subsequent entry into the Second World War.

TRICKLE BECOMES A FLOOD

What has happened is that the volume of military transportation, which we thought would be only a trickle, has grown into a flood that is now the main current of railway business. Transportation of military and naval supplies and personnel is the major job of American railways today. The conversion of American industry to war production, and the expansion of our armed forces by millions of men, began almost immediately after the Transportation Act of 1940 became law. From that day until today the shift to military transportation has rapidly increased. The amount of freight and personnel movement upon which rate reductions must be granted is now a larger proportion of railway traffic than it has ever been before, in spite of the purpose and effect of the new Transportation Act.

The money value of the exception clause in the Transportation Act cannot be exactly calculated as yet, but it can be estimated with reasonable accuracy. In the middle of the year 1942 railway rate reductions arising out of land-grant provisions totaled about $20,000,000 per month, according to the estimate of the Board of Investigation and Research. The volume of Government transportation, both of war materials and the armed forces, has increased by leaps and bounds since that time. It is a conservative estimate that the average for the past 2 years has been $250,000,000—a total of a half billion dollars in rebates to the United States Government because of those ancient land grants.

The railroad industry has probably paid for that Government land twice a year—four times in all—since the attack on Pearl Harbor. And the land grants had already been paid for in full and more before 1938.

CAUSE OF GROWING CONFUSION

Problems incidental to these rate reductions have grown in proportion. It has become increasingly difficult to be certain upon just what freight and just what personnel movements the reductions apply. Large amounts of revenue are in question, pending final action by the General Accounting Office of the Government. The confusion even extends into the fields of collective bargaining, since in the discussion of wage changes railroad managements have felt it necessary to point out that they could not know definitely what revenues might be available to meet operating expenses until the land-grant reductions had been finally determined.

Your committee has doubtless been advised of the unanimity of opinion upon this question among all those interested in the railway industry. The railway companies, the shippers, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the employees of the railways, and even the Congess itself have expressed themselves on the desirability of eliminating this unstable and unjust regulation. We believe that the Congress intended in 1940 to remove all but a negligible element of the land-grant rate reductions; only the unexpected expansion of our military and naval establishments raised this minor remaining factor to a dominant position in railway finance.

During the years when the land grants were being made to aid in the construction of American railways the Federal Government was compelled to fight and finance 4 years of Civil War. Those 4 years of war cost the Government $3,065,000,000—about $750,000,000 per year. That was the scale of Government expenditures when the land-grant rate reductions were originated.

During the first 2 years of this war we spent $153,000,000,000; during the month of November, 1943, the Federal Government paid out in cash $7,800,000,000 for war purposes. In 1 month we spend 10 times the annual rate of Civil War expenditure, and twice as much as the 4 years of Civil War altogether. A governmental railway policy, devised in the days when a war involving our whole national existence was costing $2,000,000 a day, is being applied now when our war cost is $250,000,000 a day. The value of the war materials being transported must be roughly 125 times what it was when this rate reduction policy was laid down—and the railways are being required to reduce transportation rates on that tremendously multiplied volume of military traffic.

The President's Committee on the General Transportation Situation, appointed in September, 1938, was asked to consider the transportation problem and to recommend legislation. Reporting in December 1938 the committee recommended the repeal of the reduced rate provisions of the land-grant statutes. The need for complete repeal is today even greater than it was at the time that committee reported. The report and recommendation of the committee, of which I was a member, was as follows:

"Certain statutes by which grants of land were made by the Government in aid of the

construction of 17,627 miles of railroad in pioneer days stipulate that the Government shall forever have the use of such roads for the transportation of troops and property of the United States free of any toll or charge. Early in the history of these acts the Supreme Court construed them as not contemplating free transportation service for the Government but only free use by it of these roads in performing its own transportation service. It further found that about 50 percent of the total railroad costs was incident to the provision and maintenance of the roadway and tracks and so established 50 percent of the normal commercial rate as the proper basis of charge to be made by the railroads for transportation services performed by them for the Government over land-grant lines.

"Routes in competition with those containing land-grant mileage must meet the reduced rates of the latter on through Government traffic. The total so-called land-grant reductions in rates on Government traffic, including mail, now amount to about $10,000,000 per year. There are now 69 different agencies and departments of government which receive the benefit of these reduced rates, and the number is constantly increasing. This traffic has grown to a volume far in excess of anything that could possibly have been in contemplation of the parties at the time the land grants were made. The Government received more than full consideration for the lands granted in the enhancement in value of the adjoining lands retained by it which resulted from the construction of the railroads, to say nothing of the amount already received by it in the way of reduced transportation charges.

"The Government should recognize the inequity of requiring transportation for itself at rates below those fixed by one of its own regulatory agencies as reasonable for application to its citizens.

"We, therefore, recommend the repeal by the Congress of the reduced-rate provisions of these land-grant statutes."

The Shock Absorber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert an editorial which recently appeared in the official organ, Railroad Yardmaster of North America, Inc. The need for action along the lines suggested by Editor Franks are so apparent that the Congress should immediately apply itself to the problem of providing a shock absorber for American industry to be ready for operation immediately hostilities cease. I particularly commend the editorial to the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. The editorial follows:

THE SHOCK ABSORBER

Day by day our industrial highway is becoming more rough and at the pace we are traveling on this highway it will not be long until it becomes bumpy. Up to the present time little has been done to offset this condition. Speaking in plain language, our industrial condition today is nothing short of chaos, and simply because good business acumen is not being applied to offset an unnecessary shock which we will all face when this war is ended.

Industries, large and small, are being forced to operate on a basis absolutely contrary to good business tactics, through a system of taxation based on fabulous wartime production. Few industries are able to lay aside enough surplus to take care of a sudden emergency, such as the abrupt ending of this war. The ending of this war means the immediate reconversion of industries, and under the present system of taxation these industries face an inevitable crash.

It seems to this writer that our Government would do well to establish a plan whereby all business, large and small, would be allowed to set aside a reasonable amount of their profits to guarantee no stoppage of employment during the reconversion period. Or safer yet, allow all business enough surplus to guarantee stability. Some people believe 5 percent of the gross would be an adequate amount. This may or may not be correct. For gigantic industries, this would invariably be in excess of the requirement, and yet for small industries this amount may prove inadequate. This plan should be drafted to take care of conditions without making "fish of one or flesh of the other."

Under our system of free enterprise we must accept the slogan of "what helps business helps you," and by this same token we must recognize the fact also that what hurts business hurts you. Therefore it is important to all of us, whether we be workers, labor leaders, or the general public, to see to it that all legitimate industry be kept profitable, because unless it is, we are headed for another depression, which means unemployment and its natural effect—destitution for millions of workers.

To tax industry to the point of jeopardy is to place it at the mercy of tax collectors, bureaucrats and politicians who have little, if any, knowledge of how to operate business. This is a very serious problem and warrants attention right now—not after the war, or after the next election. That would be too late to save our industrial structure. We must act now.

With the ending of the war will come the ending of war contracts and the resumption of competitive business which has been the backbone of our American system of free enterprise. Unless all business is permitted, through sufficient surplus, to enter into this competition it will mean that business in general is going to go for a very rough ride over our industrial highway. And those who cannot stand the shocks are going to be shocked to death. Therefore, it is obvious that a reasonable amount of current profits set aside to surplus would be the shock absorber.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS, *Editor*.

Mother's Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, upon May 14, America pays its tribute of love and affection to the mothers of the Nation. God's harbinger of the spring, sweet flowers are worn by all in memory of man's best friend—mother. Pure white blossoms for the mothers who have departed this life, with its surcease of joy and sorrow, laughter, and tears. Bright red blossoms for those who are still unceasingly and with light or heavy hearts, in the sunshine or shadow bearing their burden until the end.

It is a day of joy and sorrow; joy for those who are blessed with a mother who shares with her children success and failure alike, and sorrow for those with only a blessed memory of a loved one gone to a place where care and sorrow are unknown.

Father Ryan, the poet of the South, in his beautiful and inimitable manner has penned a poem entitled "Mother's Way" which is particularly applicable to this day:

Oft within our little cottage, as the shadows gently fall,
While the sunlight touches softly, one sweet face upon the wall,
Do we gather close together, and in hushed and tender tone,
Ask each other's full forgiveness, for the wrong that each has done.
Should you wonder why this custom, at the ending of the day,
Eye and voice would quickly answer, "It was once our mother's way."
If our home be bright and cheery, if it holds a welcome true,
Opening wide its door of greeting to the many—not the few;
If we share our Father's bounty, with the needy day by day,
'Tis because our hearts remember, this was ever mother's way.
Sometimes when our hands grow weary, or our tasks seem very long,
When our burdens look too heavy, and we deem the right all wrong;
Then we gain a new fresh courage, and we rise to proudly say,
"Let us do our duty bravely—this was our dear mother's way";
Then we keep her memory precious, while we never cease to pray
That at last, when lengthening shadows mark the evening of our day,
They may find us waiting calmly to go home our mother's way.

Mother's Day is a blessed institution, memorable and memorial alike. It arouses in us blessed memories and inspiring sentiments that speak unselfish sacrifice for the happiness of humanity. Upon Mother's Day there comes to us a realization of the debt each individual owes to the mother that bore him, the journey into the valley of death cheerfully and uncomplainingly that we might come into being; the long weary hours spent in watchful care ministering to our every want, waiting for the only reward ever enjoyed by mothers, the hour when baby lips might utter the magic word—"mother."

Then the days of childhood when our troubles, always appearing so momentous, could find but one sympathetic soul to whom they could be unfolded.

Then manhood and womanhood and the battle of life, replete with failure and heartache, and there, ever patient, ever watchful, ever loving, the mother who bore us to comfort us in our afflictions, to cheer us in our sorrows, seeking but one reward—our affection and love.

During the day she does not mind,
There are a host of things to do,
Caring for ones he left behind;
Dishes and dusting, mending, too,
Flowers to tend by the garden walk,
Ribbons to tie in golden hair,
Voices uplifted in playtime talk,
Patter of feet upon the stair.

And oh, it means so much. It might perhaps suggest to our minds the words written by the most beloved of most recent poets, who passed to his great reward, a hero of the World War, Joyce Kilmer, who, speaking upon this particular subject, said:

Gentlest of critics, does your memory hold
(I know it does) a record of the days
When I, a schoolboy, earned your generous praise
For halting verse and stories crudely told.
Over those boyish scrawls the years have rolled,
They might not bear the world's unfriendly gaze,
But still your smile shines down familiar ways,
Touches my words and turns their dross to gold.

Or as has been so beautifully epitomized in a single sentence by our own beloved Washington who once said, "All that I am and all that I hope to be I owe to my mother."

The sainted Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, who touched every depth of sorrow, poverty, misery, and adversity, said that the inspiration of his life that made it possible for him to make any character of sacrifice cheerfully in behalf of some other individual was the inspiration that he received from his mother.

I sometimes feel that the real tragedy of Mother's Day, not only in our own land but in every land in the world, lies in the fact that the human family have always made provision to honor the destructive forces in the world. We build monuments to men who have displayed courage on the field of battle, unmindful of the danger and death that are daily faced by countless millions of women in the world, who go down into the valley of death that the human race might be perpetuated without complaining. So there is no tribute too great and no honor too glorious to pay to the mothers of men.

America has expanded amazingly in things material; but she has not held fast to the spiritual things that are the safeguards of national health and strength. There has been a distinct lowering of our ideals of character. Liberty has degenerated into license, and in many directions the standards of family life have grown lax; divorce is assuming the character of a national menace, making a mockery of motherhood, a jest of marital fidelity, and the home and its sanctities mere tradition.

And so, in the spirit of motherhood, I ask that everyone be just a little kinder and just a little more considerate of the mothers that are still with us, but whose stay is altogether too short, and not only on Mother's Day, but on Memorial Day bring some sweet token of affection to the places where the mothers rest who we shall never again know in life.

That eccentric genius of the Sierras, Joaquin Miller, in his tribute to motherhood, has epitomized the story of their contribution:

The greatest battle that ever was fought,
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
It was fought by the mothers of men.
Nay, not with cannon nor battle shot,
With sword nor nobler pen;
Nay, not with eloquent word or thought
From minds of wonderful men;
But down in a woman's walled-up heart,
Of a woman that would not yield,
But silently, patiently bore her part,
Lo, there on that battlefield.
With little cheer, no bivouac song,
No gleaming banners that wave,
And oh, those battles they last so long,
From babyhood to the grave;
But faithful still as a bridge of stars,
She fights in her walled-up town,
Fights on and on in endless war,
Then silent, unseen goes down.

At no time in the history of America will there be more mothers with heavy hearts, anxious for the security of their sons and daughters in the armed services of the Nation than upon this Mother's Day. For the sons and daughters which with heroic spirit they have gone down into the valley of the shadow to bring into being. It has been the same sad story almost from the beginning of creation, a story of sadness, a story of sorrow, a story of heartache and heart breaks, a story of tears and mental anguish upon the part of the mothers of the world. Ah, if we had the courage displayed by the mothers we could end this tragic situation which takes place with unfailing regularity every quarter of a century. It is a tribute to the greed, avarice, lust for power, and the cowardice of mankind. The opportunities are presented perhaps for the first time in the history of the world to end the slaughter of humanity in the settlement of national and international differences by resorting to arms and the killing of one another. Time and experience have proven that the system which has obtained in the past is wrong and has been wrong so long that there is no way in which to justify a further continuance of that system. At the end of the present war provided the Nations now allied with the United States of America continue united and are willing to substitute unselfishness for selfishness and aggrandizement they can make possible a program of peace and security for the world and serenity and comfort for the mothers of the future.

The Atlantic Charter, hailed as a panacea for the ills which have afflicted humanity in the past, must be preserved even though it may mean the relinquishment of the holding of territory and subjection of the people of India, of Ireland, of Hong Kong, and of other possessions by Great Britain, and even though it may mean the relinquishment of portions of Poland and the Balkan States by Russia and the withdrawal from Chinese territory by the Japanese. America presents at this critical period in the life of the world an example of the unselfishness and decency that the rest of the world must accept and follow provided we are to save the mothers of the future from the horrors of other wars—perhaps even more disastrous than the present one.

Unity among the Allies and adherence to the Atlantic Charter with control of the wealth of the world, the food supply of the world, the agencies for the conduct of war in the world, should make it possible to embark upon a program that would mean peace and security for the people of the world to the end that the mothers of the future might never again be required to look forward to the slaughter of their children.

The Ghost City of Kingsford Heights

REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the irresponsibility of the New Deal and its utter lack of concern for the taxpayers of America, and the staggering load that they bear, is nowhere better shown than by the story of the ghost city of Kingsford Heights, Ind.

In the early days of the emergency program, a large shell-loading plant, Kingsbury Ordnance Plant, was constructed in La Porte County, Ind., within the district which I have the honor to represent. Following that, the master minds of the New Deal housing program acquired some 775 acres of fertile farm land immediately adjoining the ordnance plant and constructed a city of 2,974 homes at a cost of some $13,000,000 and probably more.

They built 18 miles of streets; 72 miles of sidewalks; spent $133,350 for landscaping; built a permanent sewage-disposal plant at a cost of $166,738.40; a permanent water-distribution system, including wells, pumping station, concrete reservoir, and so forth, at a cost of $559,530. They bought, and thus removed from the market, 2,974 electric refrigerators and 2,974 bottled gas ranges—items that many of our people at home needed badly and were unable to acquire. Some of these have been removed to other projects, but 1,404 electric refrigerators still remain at Kingsford Heights, and many of our folks are still unable to get refrigerators for the preservation of food for their children and their families.

Three hundred and twenty-four families have moved into this ghost city of 2,974 homes. Two thousand homes of the ghost city of Kingsford Heights have already been dismantled, or are in the process of being dismantled and moved to other sections of the country. We are now told that the ghost city is to be stripped down to 500 homes, but there still remains, and there will remain, those 18 miles of streets and 72 miles of sidewalks running through those fertile fields of northern Indiana.

Now comes the crowning blow of all. Mr. William K. Divers, regional representative for the National Housing agency, has just announced that studies will be undertaken to determine the possibility of moving existing dormitory buildings from Knox and Walkerton, Ind., into the Kingsbury Ordnance Reservation in order to eliminate a major problem of transportation for future employees. While 2,400 homes from the ghost city, which adjoins this ordnance plant, are being dismantled and moved

to other sections of the country, the National Housing Agency plans to move other dwellings back into that same area. It is the most absurd, reckless, and wanton waste of public funds which could be imagined.

Mr. Speaker, under date of April 12, 1944, I directed a series of 30 questions to Mr. John B. Blandford, Jr., Administrator of the National Housing Agency, and he has supplied me with answers to these in a letter just received. My questions, together with Mr. Blandford's responses, concerning the ghost city of Kingsford Heights are as follows:

1. Question. When was the project planned?

Answer. January 16, 1942.

2. Question. When was the first land acquired?

Answer. April 14, 1942.

3. Question. When was construction begun?

Answer. May 5, 1942.

4. Question. When were the first units ready for occupancy?

Answer. March 20, 1943 (283).

5. Question. Please give me the name of the individual and present office who recommended the project, and also the name of the individual who gave final approval to the proposal to build Kingsford Heights.

Answer. The program was based on employment estimates of the War Department and the War Manpower Commission, as were later adjustments. The resulting recommendation was made on January 7, 1942, by Philip M. Klutznick, representing the former Division of Defense Housing Coordination.

Final approval was given by C. F. Palmer, then Coordinator of the Division of Defense Housing Coordination, January 16, 1942.

6. Q. How many acres of land comprise the area occupied by the project and what was the cost of same? (Please let me have this by parcels.)

Answer. Number of acres and cost of land comprising project by parcels:

Parcel	Amount	Acres
A	$6,449.55	109.99
B	2,657.00	53.14
C	4,796.00	59.95
D	414.00	4.14
E	2,150.00	22.01
F	5,024.72	40.43
G	6,750.00	40.45
H	1,867.50	24.90
I	2,531.20	36.16
J	5,138.25	79.05
K	6,488.25	86.51
L	1,881.00	20.90
M	11,198.05	148.09
N	7,692.85	49.89
Total	65,038.87	775.61

7. Question. How many one-bedroom units are there? Two-bedroom? Three-bedroom? Four-bedroom? What is the cost per unit of each size unit? (These figures to be based on completed project before present dismantling was begun.)

Answer.—

Units	Number	Cost per unit
1-bedroom	413	$2,509.67
2-bedroom	1,776	2,747.07
3-bedroom	779	3,137.13
4-bedroom	6	3,527.19

8. Question. How many commercial buildings were erected within the project, and what is the floor space of the various units? What was the cost of same? What is the rental of these units?

Answer. Three commercial buildings were built in the project, as follows:

	Square feet
Building A: A. & P. store and post office	12,600
Building B: General merchandise store and 5 small shops	14,400
Building C: Drug store and lunchroom, 1 large and 2 small shops	14,000

Total cost, $124,070.

Rental for 9,636 square feet, $982.16 for first quarter 1944.

9. Question. Were any other commercial units contemplated in the original plans? What were they?

Answer. Two additional commercial units were originally planned but not built: Theater building; recreational building, containing restaurant and bowling alleys.

10. Question. How many miles of streets are there within the project? How much of this is newly constructed roads? How much comprises roads already constructed in that territory and usable in laying out this project? What was the cost of same?

Answer. There are 18.2 miles of streets within the project—all newly constructed. Cost of streets, $174,488 (68 cents per square yard).

11. Question. How many miles of sidewalks were constructed within the project and what was the cost of same?

Answer. There are 72 miles of sidewalks, including all street and yard sidewalks. Cost of sidewalks, $212,713.20 ($1.68 per square yard).

12. Question. What was the cost of landscaping within the project?

Answer. Total cost of landscaping within project $133,350.

13. Question. What type of sewage-disposal plant was installed, and what was the cost of same? Is it a permanent type of installation?

Answer. A sewage-disposal plant of the Imhoff type was installed with primary and secondary treatment at a cost of $166,738.40. It is a permanent type of installation.

14. Question. What type of water system was installed, and what was the cost of same? Is it a permanent type of installation?

Answer. A complete water-distribution system was installed, including wells, elevated water tanks, pumping station, concrete reservoir, and fire hydrants. Cost of entire system, $559,530; permanent type of installation.

15. Question. What is the source of the electricity for the project? How is the cost of the utilities handled?

Answer. Northern Indiana Public Service Co. F. P. H. A. constructed electric distribution system on project, purchases electricity from the above company wholesale through master meter prorated to tenants as part of rent. Cost water and sewer based on cost of operation of these two utilities and prorated to tenants as above.

16. Question. How many school buildings were planned, and what was to be the cost of each? How many were actually built?

Answer. Three school buildings planned:

School No. 1	$135,300
School No. 2	157,785
School No. 3	135,320

School No. 3 was the only one built.

17. Question. What is the cost of maintenance of the project?

Answer. Cost of maintenance, July 1, 1943, to March 31, 1944, $24,124.12.

18. What is the cost of management and operation? (Give break-down.)

Answer. Cost of management and operation, July 1, 1943, to March 31, 1944, $23,080.62.

Cost of public services that are customarily provided by community (not included in above), July 1, 1943, to March 31, 1944:

Public safety	$17,624.04
Street and roads	214.10
Sanitation	7,253.77
Health education	45.23

19. Question. What is the present rent scale on the various size units?

Answer. Present "shelter" rent schedule:

	Per month
1-bedroom unit	$27.50
2-bedroom unit	30.00
3-bedroom unit	32.50
4-bedroom unit	35.00

20. Question. What is the total gross income?

Answer. Total gross income for period July 1, 1943 to March 31, 1944, $109,424.92.

21. Question. How many units are presently occupied? Of this number, how many are whites? Negroes?

Answer. Units occupied April 15, 1944, 324; of this number:

White	273
Negroes	51
Total	324

22. Question. How many units have been moved to other cities? What was the cost of moving in each case?

Answer. Units moved or scheduled to be moved to other cities—1,930 dwelling units. The unit costs of demounting, transporting, and reerecting these houses on the projects handled by this region are as follows:

Newton, Iowa, $1,300 per dwelling-unit project. Iowa-13,051.

South Bend, Ind., $1,234 per dwelling-unit project. Indiana-12,183.

Evansville, Ind., $1,154 per dwelling-unit project. Indiana-12,187.

Ottawa, Ill., $1,100 per dwelling-unit project. Illinois-11,212.

Indianapolis, Ind., $1,397 per dwelling-unit project. Illinois-12,180.

23. Question. Are any plans in process for the immediate removal of other units? Where will these go?

Answer. Plans are in process for the removal of 470 units to Detroit, Mich.

24. Question. How many are to be removed in all?

Answer. 2,400 units in all are to be removed according to present plans.

25. Question. How many units is it intended to keep at Kingsford Heights?

Answer. It is intended that 500 units are to be kept at Kingsford Heights. This requires that 70 units are still to be deprogrammed.

26. Question. How many electrical refrigerators are still there? How many were moved? Where?

Answer. One thousand four hundred and four electrical refrigerators are still on project. One thousand five hundred and sixty-nine have been removed as follows:

Port Clinton, Ohio	200
Wayne, Mich	749
Burns City, Ind	250
St. Mary County, Md	117
Jersey City, N. J	75
Belkamp, Md	176
Destroyed by fire	2

27. Question. How many "bottled gas" stoves are still there? How many were removed? Where?

Answer. Five hundred and sixty-eight "bottled gas" ranges are still on the project. Two thousand four hundred and six have been removed as follows:

Port Clinton, Ohio	200
Brunswick, Ga	913
Project MD. 18264	210
South Bend	51
Indianapolis, Ind	73
Newton, Iowa	80
Rittman, Ohio	100
Chambersburg, Pa	172
Ottowa, Ill	120
South Bend, Ind	100
Evansville, Ind	185
Senaca, Ill	200
Destroyed by fire	2

28. Question. Are there any bathtubs in the town?

Answer. There are 24 bathtubs on the project. Each dwelling unit is equipped with a shower bath.

29. Question. What is the outlook for continued maintenance of the town?

Answer. The project will be maintained by F. P. H. A. as long as it is required to house war workers.

30. Question. In the event Kingsford Heights is to be abandoned, what plan of disposal of all properties will be followed? Who will make the decision in each of these instances?

Answer. In the event the Kingsford Heights project is abandoned, the disposition of all properties contained in it will be in accordance with N. H. A.-F. P. H. A. procedures.

It is expected that F. P. H. A. will have final decision as to disposing of all properties after the project is abandoned.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLEY], at Wilmington, Del., on Sunday, May 7, 1944, before a meeting arranged by the Polish societies and clubs of Delaware:

This meeting, held in honor of Polish patriots who were instrumental in the adoption of the constitution of the 3d of May 1791, recognizes an achievement of lasting importance. Only last Wednesday exercises in commemoration of an event that took place 153 years ago were held in the National House of Representatives. On that day remarks were made by a large number of the Members from different sections of our country, and with reference to that same constitution. What was so significant about a constitution in 1791 that such attention should be given to it today? One answer is that it was unusual. Another is that it marked great progress forward in the age-old struggle for liberty.

As to its significance, the words of the English statesman, Edmund Burke, are most complimentary when he said:

"We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties; * * * not one man incurred loss or suffered degradation. All, from the King to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard-of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spoils; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none impoverished; none exiled. The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion, a unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know how to proceed as they have begun. Happy prince, worthy to begin with splendor or to close with glory a race of patriots and of kings and to leave a name which every wind to heaven would bear."

Under that constitution the Government was divided into an executive, a legislative, and a judiciary. A strong executive was formed by making the monarchy hereditary and increasing its powers. The King and the council of ministers were to form a permanent executive body responsible to the Diet. The Diet became a real independent legislative body. The idea of the state finally trumphed over provincial separation. The gentry gave up their immunity from taxation, the middle class was enfranchised, and municipal autonomy was restored. Complete toleration for all religions was confirmed. The peasants were taken under the protection of the law and freedom to all was advanced.

That millions of Polish descent consider this day to be the national holiday of their mother country, and that they continue to honor it by appropriate observances here and elsewhere is most remarkable. For Poland existed as an independent state under its constitution of May 3, 1791, only 4 years, after which it ceased to exist as such. Then for 123 years the Polish people were under the rule of others. Not until 1921, after the First World War, did Poland rise again under a government of her own choice. Then after an independent existence of about 18 years she was again invaded and overwhelmed by the forces of neighboring countries.

Poland was first to fight the German aggressors. By her people's enormous sacrifice and courage she gave Great Britain and us in America time to realize the danger and prepare. For her lone resistance against overwhelming odds Poland has paid a tragic price. Her people were made slaves. Her wealth was appropriated. Her culture, schools, libraries, were destroyed. Her churches were closed. Two hundred and sixty thousand soldiers and civilians (including 60,000 in the heroic defense of Warsaw) were killed during the military campaign. Two and a half million were executed or died in concentration camps. About 2,000,000 civilians and prisoners of war were made slave laborers in Germany. Some 386 villages were burned to the ground and all inhabitants killed.

These facts emphasize the lesson which the Polish people have impressed upon the liberty-loving nations of the earth. Only the unquenchable spirit of liberty and the desire for freedom that a century of foreign domination could not take away can explain the exercises of this day and the significance of the 3d of May to the Polish people everywhere.

Poland did not sign an armistice. In spite of merciless wholesale persecution, Poland is still fighting, has been fighting since September 1939—almost 5 years. Poland's armed forces now number fifth among the United Nations—over 200,000 men in the field.

If history in appraising the past has correctly informed us that we are indebted to ancient Rome for our law; to ancient Greece for much of our culture and to early Palestine for our religion, is it too much to assert that we are indebted to the people of Polish blood for an example of devotion to constitutional government that remains unparalleled in all the annals of mankind? Were there no other contributions that could be mentioned, if Polish blood had been spilled in no other worthy cause, this alone would entitle Poland to our everlasting gratitude and praise.

But this contribution, significant as it is, by no means stands alone. The history of many countries including our own contains the names of Polish patriots who participated in the struggles for liberty. In our own cause, Polish talents were expended and Polish blood was shed.

We must not forget that 1st day of September in 1939 when the Hitler forces attacked their Polish neighbor without any declaration of war. We must not forget the power that was hurled against a liberty-loving people that desired to live in peace with their neighbors. That people treasured so greatly the independent existence which they had so briefly enjoyed, that they were unwilling to surrender it without a struggle even when resistance seemed hopeless.

There are features so tragic in the history of the Polish people that we marvel at their continued devotion to the ideals and beliefs expressed in their constitution of 1791. Four times their country was partitioned by conquering and neighboring nations. Four times were the boundaries changed and the inhabitants placed under the domination of different rulers and peoples. And now after the crowning tragedy when the country had begun to function again under a constitution, after the murder and deportation of many of its people, it continues to resist and continues to cherish the hope of liberty and independent existence.

It is difficult to point to a nation with a history more tragic, and it is difficult to find a people who are fighting the enemy more desperately from day to day in this present conflict. Poles are fighting on many fronts of this war. They are fearless sailors and intrepid fighters in the air. They are on foot with the infantry and on horse with the cavalry. Everywhere they make their presence known—spurred to deeds of valor by their love of country and by burning hatred of a foe that has shown no mercy to their kinsmen and that has despoiled their homeland of its products and its treasures.

And now what can we say about the future of Poland? On August 14, 1941, the so-called Atlantic Charter was promulgated, which among others, sets forth these principles:

"1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

"2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

On September 24, 1941, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics endorsed these objectives, and on January 1, 1942, joined the other United Nations in dedication to "the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter." Poland is a party to these principles, along with us. If these principles mean anything, and I am hopeful they do, then Poland, as an independent, free nation, will rise again to her former glory. Certain it seems, the peace of Europe and perforce the world cannot be secure until the independence of Poland is restored. Its geographical location makes it the archstone upon which the foundations of everlasting peace must rest. There are certain facts with respect to Poland that must be considered when we think of future peace in the world. She is a country of small holdings of land—48,198,207 acres of her total cultivated area of 6 ,232,145 acres consists of small holdings of less than 123.6 acres, or 76.22 percent. In 1931 the density of her rural population was greater than that of Yugoslavia, greater than that of Germany or Hungary, greater than that of France. Land hunger and the attempts to forcibly appease it have been productive causes of war in the past. How can Poland's will to peace be strengthened if much of her territory in the East is to be taken by another nation and an Allied Nation at that?

It was not so with France. Two of her provinces were taken from her as a result of the Franco-Prussian War. She never ceased to desire their return. As a result of the First World War they were returned to her. Now they have been taken from her again.

Then, too, there are treaties which fix the eastern Polish boundary. That frontier was agreed upon in the peace treaty signed on March 18, 1921, by the representatives of Poland and of Russia, White Russia, and Ukrainian Soviet Republics. It was a compromise line accepted by a victorious Poland. It has been reaffirmed. Poland desires that agreed line to be her boundary. Can she be blamed for that, especially when she is dealing with an Allied Nation with which she concluded a nonaggression treaty? Russia is 54 times as large as Poland, and has the largest land area in the world. She has contributed mightily to the efforts of the Allied Nations. She will have much to say about the future peace of the world. We are concerned then about recent events with respect to the Polish eastern boundary.

Peace with justice was described by our State Department on July 23, 1940, as "The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak." That policy is sound. It should be restated and repeated. Peace cannot come from broken agreements and it cannot be based on injustice. First we fight for victory; first we fight to win in this terrible struggle; but beyond that day of victory we want to see a better world where peace will last longer than two decades.

With their tradition of liberty, it is not strange that the Poles who have come to our country have become owners of property, believers in stability, and staunch upholders of our Federal Constitution. These attributes can be observed among the Polish population here in Delaware, where almost their first objective is the ownership of a home. Once acquired, their homes are maintained with great care and pride.

Our own Constitution is the great unifying force in our country today. It will live only as long as it has popular support. May our devotion to its principles be as constant and unyielding as the shining example which the Polish people have shown to us and to the world.

And there is need for constancy in our devotion to our Constitution. Men urge that its provisions be relaxed for this reason or that, and that some clause be disregarded due to emergency such as war. But to relax or disregard one provision means that any may be nullified. Then what becomes of our liberties and rights?

To answer that question, it might be well to consider the case of one Milligan that was argued and decided near the end of the Civil War. Milligan was a civilian resident of Indiana. He had never been in the military or naval service of the United States. Yet, he was arrested by the military, tried by a military tribunal, and sentenced. Milligan insisted that the military commission had no right to try him and that he was guaranteed the right of trial by jury by the Constitution of the United States.

The following quotation from the opinion of the court in this case is worthy of our study:

"No graver question was ever considered by this Court, nor one which more nearly concerns the rights of the whole people; for it is the birthright of every American citizen when charged with crime, to be tried and punished according to law. * * *

"The decision of this question does not depend on argument or judicial precedents, numerous and highly illustrative as they are. These precedents inform us of the extent of the struggle to preserve liberty and to relieve those in civil life from military trials. The founders of our Government were familiar with the history of that struggle; and secured in a written Constitution every right which the people had wrested from power during a contest of ages. By that Constitution and the laws authorized by it this question must be determined. The provisions of that instrument on the administration of criminal justice are too plain and direct to leave room for misconstruction or doubt of their true meaning. Those applicable to this case are found in that clause of the original Constitution which says, 'That the trial of all crimes, except in case of impeachment, shall be by jury; and in the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of the amendments. The fourth proclaims the right to be secure in person and effects against unreasonable search and seizure; and directs that a judicial warrant shall not issue 'without proof of probable cause supported by oath or affirmation.' The fifth declares 'that no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on presentment by a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.' And the sixth guarantees the right of trial by jury, in such manner and with such regulations that with upright judges, impartial juries, and an able bar the innocent will be saved and the guilty punished. * * *

"Time has proven the discernment of our ancestors; for even these provisions, expressed in such plain English words that it would seem the ingenuity of man could not evade them, are now, after the lapse of more than 70 years, sought to be avoided. Those great and good men foresaw that troublous times would arise, when rulers and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper, and that the principles of constitutional liberty would be in peril unless established by irrepealable law. The history of the world had taught them that what was done in the past might be attempted in the future. The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false, for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence." * * *

Ridiculous Order Threatens to Close Small Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much criticism in Congress, in the press and over the radio about the ever-changing draft and manpower situations. Hardly a day passes but what some new regulation, some new interpretation, some new control is announced by those in authority. As a result, the War Manpower and Selective Service officials have created such a confusion that local boards find it increasingly difficult to interpret and administer the maze of instructions that is being heaped upon them.

The confusion is shared by the general public and has made a "no man's land of understanding." Selective Service registrants have been called for induction only to be told they were not needed. In the meantime, these men, many of them with families, disposed of their personal effects and property only to be returned to their homes to live in a state of wonderment until orders and regulations have been clarified.

We all appreciate that problems of this nature may easily arise. Selective Service has a tremendous task to perform. Meeting the military's manpower needs is a big job. After all, we were a Nation geared to peace when we entered this world conflict. We were not a militaristic power geared to war and privation. Our wartime controls are new and we must realize that mistakes are inevitable.

The job has been so complicated and so vast that cooperation of all existing Government and civilian organizations has been necessary to the full prosecution of the war both on the military and production fronts. Under acts of Congress and Executive orders, various groups have been assigned their particular jobs. The Army and Navy engage the enemy; the War Production Board furnishes the materials; the Selective Service System furnishes the fighting men; and the War Manpower Commission is responsible for gearing the manpower capacities of the Nation to all production requirements.

It is natural that there must be close cooperation between these various departmental groups. Solidarity demands an interwoven pattern designed to eliminate overlapping, duplication, and conflicting orders. This program must affect all phases of action, whether it be legislative, executive, military, or productive effort.

With such all-absorbing activities going on it is shocking to learn of some of the peculiar and damaging socialistic controls that have been "slipped in" under the pressure of the war effort.

Millions of men have been called from their normal walks of life into the various governmental agencies to aid in planning and prosecuting this gigantic war program. Our ablest business men and women head these bureaus and agencies. The majority are working shoulder to shoulder in the civilian effort which, together with the great industrial machine, has become known as the battle of production. Of course, many varied philosophies and personalities bring their individual influences into this great program. Some of these philosophies are good, others fair, and some have no place in the war effort. Some of these men and women are seeking to foist socialistic reforms upon America during this great crisis.

Some of these dreamers and planners are meddling in the programs of other agencies with damaging results. One of these instances was recently called to my attention. I investigated it, and as the

result of my findings I am in conscience compelled to bring it to the attention of this House.

A short time ago the owner of a laundry company in southern Michigan told me that he had been denied a locally needed designation by the War Manpower Commission. When I asked him why this designation had been refused he told me that the area director of the War Manpower Commission had denied this status merely because he happened to have a few women and school girls working in his plant who were receiving less than the going rate of pay established by the War Labor Board for that region.

I sought to determine just what the designation of "locally needed" actually meant. I not only learned what it was, but what it is and further what it could be if these dreamers and planners are permitted to continue in authority in government. Secondly, I learned the great importance of this designation to industry. I found, in the administration of this designation, the evolution of an order which is the product of the brain of one of those so-called long-haired professors whose sole effort in wartime is apparently directed toward changing the Nation's economic structure.

Mr. Speaker, early in the war, Selective Service asked the War Manpower Commission to establish a committee on essentiality. An interagency committee was formed with representatives of the War, Navy, and Agricultural Departments, Selective Service, War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission. The chairman of this committee is Mr. Collis Stocking, a college professor who has never met a pay roll, but has been placed in a position of power in the War Manpower Commission.

Soon after its formation this committee hastily designated a number of industries on what became known as list of essential activities. Persons engaged in these essential places of employment were to be considered by their local draft boards for deferments in order that the great production effort could get going.

It was not long until the War Manpower Commission found that the list did not include all of the war supporting agencies. However, rather than change, or to add to the established list on a national basis, the old dodge was used and a new program was born, and with it this so-called locally needed designation. Activities of this group were not to be raided of their employees for others. For instance, it was quickly found that unless the housewife could get her laundry done in a professional laundry she had to take time off from her employment in an aircraft plant to do the family wash. This automatically created an enforced absentee and production suffered. They found too, that distribution of food and fuel; that restaurants and hotels, laundries, dry cleaners, and linen suppliers were necessary to not only the war effort, but for the health, welfare, and morale of the Nation.

Therefore, the interagency committee surveyed the field and developed a list of activities for which the locally needed designation might aid in the general stabilization program. In a news release, O. W. I.–1413, dated March 10, 1943, the War Manpower Commission said:

In overcrowded industrial areas, the facilities required for serving the minimum needs of the community are extremely important to the maintenance of working efficiency in war production. These services and facilities, such as restaurants, laundries, dry-cleaning establishments, hotels, and milk, food, and fuel distribution, may require the same recruitment and placement services as any actively classified in the national list and index of essential activities.

Further—

Where the area director finds that certain activities, primarily local in character, are necessary to meet the basic manpower needs of the area, he may designate them for including in an area manpower stabilization program. However, the inclusion of such local activities in no way establishes their eligibility for consideration by the Selective Service System for occupational deferment. The designation of an activity as locally needed gives it the same status as essential activities under the employment stabilization program and permits the local United States employment office to give priority in service to such activities over other activities in the community not designated as essential or locally needed.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if the services of these various business places were considered as contributing to the war effort, they could be designated as locally needed. That is as it should be. That is good judgment, and right thinking. However, and unfortunately, the administration of this program came under the directon of the dreamers and the planners. As the result, the program has run into a succession of rules and regulations for compliance and subservience, reports and reports and more reports, and reams and reams of red tape.

Standards were developed, compliance with which was required for a businessman to obtain a "locally needed" designation. One part of the standards was designed to streamline the services and provide for full utilization of existing manpower. Frills were eliminated and basic vital services were made the basis of essentiality and to meet the demands of the community.

The Chairman of the essentiality committee, Professor Stocking, developed a manual of operations, or set of rules and regulations, governing the application of the locally needed status. These were in the form of operating instructions to regional and area directors. It is interesting to point out that members of the essentiality committee have never participated in the setting up or the continuance of these qualifications or specifications which must be met.

On March 13, in Field Instruction No. 15, area and regional directors were notified that the designation could be used only in groups 1 and 2 areas. These so-called areas are known as groups 1, 2, 3, and 4. The designation is determined by the stage of critical production and manpower in the area. For instance, areas in group 1 are considered as "tight or critical manpower areas," where needs are as great or greater than the supply of labor.

In addition to compliance on full utilization of available manpower, establishment of a minimum workweek and elimination of luxury services, this particular qualification was inserted:

Wage and working condition standards are comparable with similar types of activity in the area requiring similar skills.

No objection was found to such qualifications, and therefore many groups eligible for the locally needed designation, requested the designation and it was given to them. That was on March 3, and the program was announced, as I mentioned before, March 10.

Now, note this, Mr. Speaker, 2 months and 22 days later, Mr. Stocking, without consideration of the essentiality committee, mind you, sent a new and revised instruction to the field. In this revision, dated May 25, 1943, the "locally needed" designation was made available in areas group 1, 2, and 3. But, lo and behold, that little sentence on wages and working conditions underwent a tremendous transition. Let me read the new wage condition.

Wages paid to workers engaged in the activity are not below the lower limit of the wage rate brackets established by the War Labor Board for the occupations in the labor market area where the workers are employed, unless the employer has applied to the War Labor Board for approval to increase the wage rates to at least those levels.

Now, more evolution, more change, Mr. Speaker. Because the War Labor Board had established the figure of 40 cents per hour, below which was considered substandard throughout the United States, and in many tight critical areas handed down a higher minimum wage, socialized planning took another step. In W. M. C.'s Field Instruction No. 2, dated September 10, 1943, the evolution of this order became quite complete. In that order, the "locally needed" designation became available in all types of labor areas and the wage qualification was changed as follows:

Wages paid to workers engaged in the activity are not less than the rate established for the region or area by the War Labor Board as necessary to avoid substandards of living. If no such rate has been set and approved, the activity must be paying wage rates at least equal to 40 cents an hour.

Many establishments that had been assigned the "locally needed" status under the provisions of the first field instruction were told that they would have to comply with the new wage provisions or the "locally needed" designation would be taken away. It was taken away in many instances. Others, requesting it, were told that they could not be so declared unless they met Professor Stocking's qualifications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you see how an employer is required to meet certain minimum wage qualifications before he can get his business designated as "locally needed." In other words, to be recognized as contributing to the war effort the employer must certify that he does not have one single employee making less than an established war wage. If a man has 500 employees, 499 of whom earn at least or above the minimum rate, and one person, let us say a part-time school

girl, a messenger—just one person receiving less than the rate established by the War Labor Board—his business cannot be declared locally needed. If the service or product of a plant is essential to the community it is difficult to conceive how wages paid has any relation whatsoever to its essentiality.

Within the framework of the area stabilization programs providing for the recruitment of workers, it can easily be understood that U. S. E. S. is not, nor should it be, bothered with referral and protection of persons employed at substandard wages. That is protection for the individual. Criteria of the U. S. E. S. does not freeze those receiving lower wages in their jobs. Employers are required to present certificates of availability to such persons upon request and employees receiving wages in the lower brackets can move around from job to job without being frozen. Protection, on the other hand, is afforded the employer for those employees above the established wage rate so as to minimize movement of workers between one essential job and another.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that this minimum wage provision was written in to protect the individual employee. Unfortunately, it is applied not to one employee, but to an entire business. The application has been entirely in reverse. In actual practice today, through Professor Stocking's plan, employment is and may be considered "war contributing," based not alone on the essentiality of the service rendered, but on wages paid to any one employee in any one business place.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a lengthy definition and explanation of the "locally needed" designation. Now, let us see how all-important this program has become.

Originally, Selective Service took men for the armed forces based on the following: First, type of employment; second, age; third, family status; fourth, physical condition.

Gradually one type of employment would change in its direct importance to the prosecution of the war. Such changes resulted in revisions of draft requirements. It would be almost humanly impossible to describe the many phases through which changing draft regulations have passed. That is history.

Recently, however, as we approached the estimated peak size of the military forces, military officials began to stress the importance of securing men under 26 years of age. The draft had begun to take so many fathers and, as the backwash of complications and changes washed upon the shore of public opinion, insult was heaped upon injury by almost daily interpretations and misinterpretations of manpower requirements.

Finally, in a dramatic and unexpected order, General Hershey told draft boards that they were to withhold the processing of all men over 26 years of age who were considered to be in employment that was "contributing to the war effort." Because my constituent has laid his troubles also before the American Institute of Laundering, officials of that association wired General Hershey to determine if laundries were considered as contributing to the war effort. On April 21, General Hershey sent the following reply:

> Retel 20th: Laundry service may be considered war supporting activity where designated locally needed.

On April 19, Col. George H. Baker, Chief of Selective Service Manpower Division, wrote Mr. A. C. Hill, deputy vice chairman for civilian requirements on this subject. I quote from Colonel Baker's letter:

> The term "war supporting activities" is used in exactly the same sense as "activities in support of the war effort" in which registrants may be considered for deferment in class II–A. Such activities "in support of the war effort" are considered to be the list of essential activities designated by the War Manpower Commission plus those activities declared to be "locally needed." We believe that this is clearly understood by most local boards, but if any local board is in doubt about the matter it can obtain full clarification from the State director.

There has been so much talk about national-service legislation to better utilize physically handicapped persons in jobs "contributing to the war effort." In a combined newspaper release from General Hershey and Paul V. McNutt, dated April 7, please note the following sentence:

> Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, today said that draft registrants classified as IV–F, who are not already so employed, should seek employment in an activity listed on the War Manpower Commission's list of essential activities or in activities designated by the War Manpower Commission as locally needed.

That is how important the designation, "locally needed," is to the employer. If a business place has this designation, IV–F employees may not only remain in that employment, but those not so employed will be told by the draft boards to get into such work. Men over the age of 26 engaged in locally needed activities are to be considered for occupational deferment. Naturally, it follows that if the employer does not have this locally needed designation, he will lose his IV–F and overage registrants. Here is where the discrimination due to wage rates is made.

My constituent has been denied this designation by the War Manpower Commission. He does not have one single man in his employ making less than 70 cents per hour, but because there are a few women and school girls making less than 50 cents an hour he cannot qualify for the "locally needed" designation. I have in my possession a photostatic copy of the letter denying his application. Therefore, the entire plant of my constituent is denied the coverage and protection to which it is entitled. The owner is not considered as "in support of the war" simply because he cannot get the "locally needed" designation. If he raises a few women's wages he automatically will become eligible for the "locally needed" designation and can secure occupational deferments of his over-age men and also not lose his IV–F workers.

"Locally needed" designation is all important. Unfortunately, under Professor Stocking's standards, wartime essentiality is being based on wages paid any one employee in any one business.

Representatives of the laundry industry in a letter dated April 27 called this discriminatory practice to the attention of selective service officials. No answer has been given them to this date.

It is not my intention to appeal to this House to adjust the problems attendant upon wage controversies. I do, however, vehemently protest against these unethical and ridiculous provisions which are all too often important to the application or usefulness of a war program. This is a time to fight the war. It is the time for full and productive effort. It is the time to protect the health, welfare, and morale of our people. It is not the time to initiate social reforms. At least, they should not be used to the detriment of a full and orderly prosecution of the war effort.

Such participation by the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service in problems that involve controversial wage issues which tend to destroy the entire historical structure of one man's business is unethical and certainly unfair.

In Cleveland, Ohio, which incidentally is in the same labor region as southern Michigan. War Manpower officials have extended the "locally needed" designation to the laundry industry only to take it away because of this minimum-wage provision, then give it back to them, only to withdraw it later. On again, off again, gone again, Finnegan.

A week ago a Cleveland draft board called in a IV–F laundry employee and because the plant in which he worked had lost its "locally needed" status, he was told to get himself into other essential or locally needed employment. In this particular case, if the laundry owner would apply to the War Labor Board for a few wage increases, not for the IV–F man, but for some other employee, not concerned or considered in draft problems, he could retain this man and others in the IV–F classification. In my opinion such discrimination on a wage basis is ridiculous, unethical, and certainly an example of social reform injected into this all-important war program by our Professor Stocking.

My blood boils when I think this administration permits its little dictators to issue such discriminatory and bungling regulations in times like these.

Here is a case where a little "Nero" fiddles while laundries, dry cleaners, hotels and restaurants are being forced to close their doors because of the resultant drain of manpower. Service to industrial plants, military establishments, and civilians as well suffers the consequences.

I realize there is little Congress, as it is now constituted, can do about it aside from demanding the removal of all men from key positions who use their temporary authority to bring about reforms.

Progressives and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the State convention of the Progressive Party held in Milwaukee on Sunday, May 7, 1944:

Abraham Lincoln once said, "Whenever there is a conflict between human rights and property rights, human rights must prevail."

Wisconsin liberals in all parties have fought for that same principle for at least half a century. We are confronted with the same struggle today and must pledge ourselves to carry on. Again we must rally to fight for those liberal principles which hundreds of thousands of our people have carried on for several generations. Under the guise of war emergency, monopoly is acquiring a firm hold on the production of this country. Even the free production and commerce of food products is losing ground to these monopolistic practices. It is a strange paradox that we should spend billions of dollars and wreck thousands upon thousands of lives to crush our enemies abroad, only to be victimized by these enemies at home. It is your duty, and my duty, to protect our people from these practices in the future as we have done in the past.

PROGRESSIVES AND THE WAR

This war was not of our seeking. We Progressives pledged ourselves in our platform to give the people a referendum on fighting abroad. A similar pledge was in the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties of this State. As far as I know, I am the only one who kept that platform pledge. The people of my district had the opportunity to express themselves on that question. In my case, at least, it was not just campaign oratory.

We Progressives have been denounced for taking an ostrich attitude toward this matter and sticking our heads in the sand; that we were unrealistic and failed to understand what was going on.

Let's look at the record:

In 1935, the first year that I came to Congress, I found a small group, made up of all political parties, attempting to do something to strengthen the Air Force of the United States. That group was led by a Progressive, Jerry Boileau, of Wausau, now a circuit judge. Again and again we attempted to amend appropriation bills by adding an item for air power, but at most we could muster but 60 votes. Yet this war has demonstrated that a nation without air power is without strength, and cannot succeed against those that are mighty in the air. That fact has been reluctantly admitted after 9 years of debate on the subject, because air power today gets first priority. Were we unrealistic in this case?

Again in 1937, on two separate and distinct occasions, I introduced resolutions in the House calling for embargoes on arms, munitions, and implements of war and critical war material to Japan. Neither of these resolutions ever got a hearing, although some of us tried to be heard on this all-important subject. We have been advised that 60 percent of the critical war materials used against our boys were purchased in this country, and that 85 percent of such materials was purchased from the British Empire, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and the United States of America. Less than 6 percent of Japan's war materials have come from Germany and Italy. On March 19, 1941, I warned that Japan was getting ready to strike; that we should arm ourselves as speedily as possible, and strengthen our defenses so as to be ready when the blow fell. Was that being unrealistic?

On April 2, 1941, 2 months before it happened, I pointed out that Hitler would invade Russia and that when he did it would be the beginning of the end for him and his gang. I claimed that he could not conquer Russia because a second-rate paperhanger could never achieve what the greatest military genius of all time was unable to accomplish. Was that being unrealistic?

At the same time and in the same speech, I said that when we were sufficiently involved in the Atlantic Ocean, Japan would strike; that when she did strike, the Philippines would fall. Was that being unrealistic?

I also stated that it would take 5 to 6 years to defeat Japan. The late Secretary of the Navy said, in a statement before Pearl Harbor, that we could defeat Japan in 7 weeks, while a prominent Senator stated that we could blow the Japanese Islands out of the Pacific Ocean in 6 weeks, but they were called realistic while we were not.

Had there been a little more of our realism and a little less of our critic's realism, there never would have been a Pearl Harbor with a shocking loss of life and the worst naval defeat in our history. Someone was to blame for the 4,000 lives that were lost on that eventful Sunday, and as long as I live, whether in public office or out of it, I shall work for a full, free, and untrammeled investigation of the whole bloody business.

War has a strange fascination over man. You can pass a declaration of war through both Houses of Congress in an hour. You can pass an act conscripting the youth of this land through both Houses of Congress in 2 days, but you cannot pass an act through even one House of Congress conscripting war profits, although we have been trying to do so for 27 years. Worse than that, you cannot even bring forth to the light of day the income-tax reports of these war profiteers. Line up and regiment the farmer—tell him what he can sow and plant and reap—tell him what help he can have and what machinery he can use and what he can charge. Line up the laboring man and tell him to be a patriot—tell him to speed up production—take no time off no matter how many injuries result—and what he can charge for his work. But don't, whatever you do, don't do anything about profits. You are destroying the profiteer's morale. You are spreading disunity, you radical. Keep your mouth shut. Truly, "silence is golden—for the thief." Eight and one-half billions of dollars after taxes were made in profits by corporations last year. In time of peace that amount would be questionable; in time of war it is utterly unjustifiable. No law of God gives the right to such profits at the cost of others' misery, and no law of man ought to permit it.

Today, western civilization hangs in the balance—the great powers of the world are in a death grapple. It is the second time within the present generation that man has tried to destroy himself. When will it happen again? A poll just conducted by the University of Denver showed that 59 of the first 100 people interviewed said that the next war would take place within 50 years. If these recurring catastrophes cannot be ended, the white man and his civilization cannot survive. Is there nothing that we can do about it? I think there is.

Our first task is, of course, to win this war. It is my guess, and yours is as good as mine, that the war in Europe will be finished before the next election, but that the war in the Far East will not be over the latter part of 1945 or some time in 1946. The invasion of western Europe is now at hand. We know that the cost will be heavy in "blood, sweat, and tears." We know that there will be a blood bath of some of our finest boys in western Europe. Shall these sacrifices be made in vain? It would be an outrageous betrayal of our dead if we permitted a drifting back into the old order of things and made no determined effort to prevent its recurrence, if it is at all humanly possible to do so.

Our foreign affairs are in the hands of Cordell Hull, a man of vast experience. I have every confidence in Secretary Hull. He is a man of ability—shrewd, capable, and fully informed. No one is fooling him. He sees clearly and his feet are on the ground. However, no one man, no matter who he is, should have the power and authority to bind this country by any commitments with any foreign nation.

Last Tuesday I had an interesting visit with our Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull. I requested this interview because of certain statements made in Mr. Hull's talk over the radio a month ago on our foreign policy, so I said to him at our meeting:

"Mr. Secretary, I heard your remarks over the radio and have since read them twice. I am in accord with them, but there is one thing which I would like to have cleared up, and that is this: You say that we will drive out all Nazi and Fascist elements in control in Europe, and then later on you say that when peace has been restored, the people of the different countries will have an opportunity to vote for the kind of government they want. My question is this: What do you propose to do if the people of some country vote for a Fascist government?"

He answered, "Congressman, I think the people of Europe will be so sick and tired of Fascists and Nazis that they will be glad when we throw them out and will vote for a democratic kind of government. That is what I expect them to do."

I said, "Yes, Mr. Secretary, I am inclined to agree with you, but I recall that after the First World War, Germany voted for a republic and had one for a while, but it failed to get the support that it ought to have had from Britain, France, and the United States and collapsed, giving Hitler an opportunity to move in. I do not want to see the same thing happen again."

The Secretary replied, "Of course, there is the danger that governments set up following the war may be temporary, but if they are democratic governments, I feel we have got to help them stay on their feet and get themselves established, and it is my hope that we can get the support not only of this country but other countries in that respect."

I certainly can agree wholeheartedly with our Secretary in this regard, and I refer to this part of our conversation to indicate the difference between Secretary of State Hull's approach to this grave problem and that of General Patton and Winston Churchill, who are very friendly to an Anglo-American alliance. Personally, I believe such a move would be dangerous, as it would at once arouse the suspicion of other countries and create a countermovement on their part to offset it. This is just the thing we want to avoid, and I feel that Secretary Hull's efforts to promote the republic idea among countries of Europe is more in accordance with our ideals and will result in greater and more permanent benefits for the future, than the imperialistic idea.

For thousands of years man has settled his differences by force and violence. Again and again and again hordes of fighting men have overrun the earth and destroyed everything of value—spiritual, moral, physical, and financial. Might has made right, and he with the most powerful legions at the moment was the conquerer. But not for long, because other leaders, uniting temporarily for their own advantage, would destroy what had been done and all that went with it,

and so the merry dance of death has gone on down the pages of history through all recorded time.

One conclusion can be reached from these lessons, and that is this: That problems settled by force and violence are not settled right and therefore are never settled permanently. What shall we adopt in place of force and violence? To me it seems clear that agitators and demagogs find fertile soil wherein they can sow their seeds of envy and malice and hate, only when the people feel themselves sorely aggrieved. Popular discontent and popular unrest are the result of social injustice and economic insecurity. A happy people is not a warlike people. The best proof of that fact is our own country. We are not warlike—we do not covet another's territories nor his possessions. Our people are slow to anger and frequently will bear with ills rather than resort to violence. That is because we are a peace-loving people who are happy and content and do not make it easy for the agitator or the demagog to rouse us to a clamor for war. Bombs and bullets have never solved any national or international problem, and they will not do so in the future. Give the people of any country an opportunity for clean living, for decency, and for security, and they will not rush to arms.

I feel, therefore, that certain underlying principles must be patent to all of us.

1. No country can establish world peace by itself.

2. International cooperation is absolutely essential to any scheme for a lasting peace.

3. Social justice and economic security are a sounder foundation for law and order than might and brute force.

There are several corollaries that should go along with these three:

(a) No secret agreements by any government with any private firms or other nations should be allowed.

(b) Eventually all nations must be included in this family of nations, not only some; and

(c) All discussions among nations should be open and above board so that every member of the family can hear and take part in the discussion.

Therefore, I believe that a super state, with a super army and a super navy and a super air force, is not the answer to our problem, nor can these make a people happy, peaceful and contented. Some mechanism for participation in and cooperation with the nations of the world is absolutely essential, with a tribunal impartially composed to hear the grievances of those who feel themselves discriminated against. In this respect the League of Nations was an utter failure because peoples under mandate had no power to voice their complaint. In my judgment, the court of the world must be open to anyone who seeks redress from his wrongs, and such court must be as fair and impartial a tribunal as the frailties of human nature make it capable of being.

There is a group in this country that is more British than Churchill, and another group that is more Russian than Stalin. I admire both Mr. Churchill and Marshal Stalin. Churchill loves Britain and works for her morning, noon, and night. He makes no bones about his loyalty to Britain first. Marshal Stalin loves Russia and works for her morning, noon, and night. He bluntly says what he wants for Russia and is devoted to the task of securing these wants. I honor these men for their devotion to their countries. And I pledge myself to devotion and loyalty to the United States of America. I would rather be for America first, than for America last.

Giving away the wealth of the United States will not save the world, nor can we save it by destroying the standards of living of our own people. Some sacrifices will be necessary, but I would rather sacrifice a little of my money or my ease and comfort than the life of my son.

"Old men make war which young men have to fight," and every war is a confession that those in power were not able to solve their problems peacefully. There is no justice in sacrificing a generation because of the failures of its rulers. Every generation has its right to a normal life and should not have that right destroyed by a generation that preceded it and over which it had no control. Therefore, we are faced with the task of making the world secure for the next generation.

This is not a simple task. On the contrary, it offers so many disturbing and difficult problems that it will take years of slow and careful and persistent effort to bring it into working order. In Europe alone there are today 30 disputes over boundaries between countries, any one of which will produce vexations and irritations. Anyone who stops to think of unhappy Poland will realize the enormity of these boundary disputes. With boundary disputes will come trade disputes, and with trade disputes will come disputes over shipping, air lines, communications, and so forth. All of these have got to be worked out slowly and carefully, and with the least possible amount of friction. No single nation can or ought to be permitted to corner the markets of the world by tariffs, trade routes, shipping tonnage or international cartels. It will be a case of give and take, but not a case of put and take—we put and they take. Many of the old formulas will be brought up again, such as balance of power, spheres of influence, and union now. Let no one hold hard and fast to any of these because every one of them can and no doubt will have its hostile counterpart. "Pleasant relations with all—entangling alliances with none" is still a pretty good motto. That does not mean we must hold aloof—on the contrary, I firmly believe we must cooperate to the best of our ability, but I also believe that we should not tie ourselves up with any one nation, as it will at once create suspicion and hostility in the attitude of other nations.

The Western Hemisphere has demonstrated that a pan-American alliance can be had to the advantage of everyone concerned. No doubt other continents could profit by that example. Napoleon once said, "Europe will never be at peace until it is all Russia or a republic." It is my hope that it may be a republic within the next decade or two. Certainly it is something for them to strive for, as the lessons of peace must have told all of them that they cannot continue along the old lines. Russia is working out her problems with an amazing degree of success, and it is to be hoped that when the Jap is driven from her shores, China, too, will be a free and independent nation, fully united along the lines of democratic principles. The great nations of the world, China, Britain, Russia, and the United States, are charged with the duty and the burden of working out these problems along mutually agreed lines so that mankind may have security and peace.

Of these great powers, the United States is the oldest government without a major constitutional change. It is the wealthiest government and the most peaceful, and by precept and example we can show the world how to keep happy and prosperous. Our unselfishness in the past, and our willingness to help in the present and in the future, should be the surest indication of our national good will and the generosity of our people. It is your task and my task to uphold our Government in its efforts and to maintain peace and security at home and aid in securing peace and security abroad.

The eminent American historian, Charles A. Beard, summarized the Progressives' concept of the sound basis upon which a truly American foreign policy should be built: "The supreme object of American foreign policy should be to protect and promote the interests, spiritual and material, of the American people, and subject to that mandate to conduct foreign affairs in such a manner as to contribute to the peace and civilization of mankind."

Bureaucracy Is a State of Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 10:

THE MAN WHO WATCHED POLITICS

(By C. W. Dressler)

BUREAUCRACY IS A STATE OF MIND

Bureaucracy, said the man who watches politics, is a state of mind and not a condition of servitude, and while it is generally applied to Government service it is likely to appear almost anywhere given the proper combination of a little authority and the desire to exercise it upon the customer.

This term has become highly disparaging, said the man who watches politics, and it has almost come to the point where when somebody calls somebody else a bureaucrat he first looks around to see whether any ladies are present because everybody knows what he means although in general it is customary to put a couple of adjectives in front of it.

However, said the man who watches politics, the state of mind which is generally implied by the word "bureaucrat" shows up in various places, as for instance when the receptionist or clerk is very nasty about taking your name in to Mr. Big or when you are running for a streetcar and the motorman takes great pleasure in shutting the door in your pan just as you are about to get on the first step or when people in any walk of life take delight in demonstrating that you are a nuisance and are bothering them unnecessarily and make you feel like a heel for having interrupted them and you go away swearing at yourself for having come there in the first place, and when this happens, it is safe to say that you have just met a bureaucrat even if he or she, as the case may be, doesn't work in a bureau at all.

Now, said the man who watches politics, when the Government goes in a big way for bureaus to take care of this or that and hires a lot of people to tell the rest of the people where to get off and how, and why they can't do something they always did before without hurting the body politic, the Government makes it possible for many of these new employees, if they are inclined that way anyhow, to look down their noses at the taxpayers or even at Congressmen if they happen to be high enough in the scale of bureaus to get away with this practice, and this gives the rest of the people who work for the Government a bad name although as a matter of fact most of the people who work in this bureau are not bureaucrats at all but just ordinary citizens who have a job with the Government.

But it is also true, said the man who watches politics, that this disease takes on aggravated forms when it occurs in Government service because the average citizen approaching the Government is a little bit

scared about it anyhow, especially if he has been shoved around here and there before he finds the proper place to go, which is very likely to have happened to him because the citizen who hits the proper governmental bureau first crack out of the box is either very lucky or else has an I. Q. much above the average, and this is something the man who watches politics said he had never succeeded in doing himself but he has the highest admiration for anyone who can do it twice in succession.

So the average citizen who gets into a bureau starts out assuming that he is in the wrong place and arrives in an apologetic mood, said the man who watches politics, and this makes him a "sitting duck" for any bureaucrat who happens to be around because the customer figures he is in the wrong anyhow and this affords an incipient bureaucrat a perfect opportunity and one not to be wasted, whereas the same citizen in his normal habitat is not to be sneezed at with impunity and is likely to complain to the management.

And this is where the danger lies in bureaucracy, said the man who watches politics, since it is very difficult to complain to the management of a Government bureau who probably got there because he is on good terms with somebody higher up in the Government service and this is a vicious cycle which is hard to get to the end of because Mr. Roosevelt is busy with the war and other matters, and therefore bureaucrats can do about what they please and get away with it which is hard on the customers and leaves them in a state of mind which is not conducive to unity but, in fact, otherwise.

A Practicing Dentist of Washington State, a Distinguished World War No. 1 Veteran, Discusses the Dental Corps, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a warm personal friend, Dr. Harry Deegan, of Shelton, Wash., not far from my congressional district, has sent me an article in which he discusses his own appraisement of the Dental Corps and suggested improvements with respect thereto. Many friends have requested me to have the same inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It contains matter of wide interest to the dental profession, and constitutes an analysis of a controversial subject drafted by one of the most eminent dentists in the State of Washington.

Here is the article:

In the April issue of the American Dental Association magazine, Robert H. Mills, D. D. S., had an article relative to the Army Dental Corps. I am assuming that he is General Mills, ranking officer of the Dental Corps, United States Army. The history that Dr. Mills gave was interesting, but the history of the Dental Corps, previous to World War No. 1, is of little importance now. There are; however, some vital changes that would seem in order, for instance:

1. Just how long is the Dental Corps going to be subordinate to the Medical Corps and what has been done to correct this evil? If you will pardon the personal element, I might relate one experience out of my many while acting as Regimental Dental Surgeon under the direction of a major in the Medical Corps in World War No. 1. I was told to command a regimental dressing station about a half mile from our present location on the front. I stated to him he had picked out a poor site. He immediately wanted to know if I was afraid to go up to it, although he did not offer to go. With two medical men and a detachment of men we established the station and in a short time were shelled. One of the officers with me was killed instantly, the other critically wounded, and I carried him out of artillery range—he died later. When the smoke of battle was over the major received a Divisional Citation and I was discredited for my work. I just cite this case as an example as to what is sometimes handed the Dental Corps up in front by the Medical Corps. To my knowledge, the heads of the Dental Corps have never investigated the record of this officer. The thing that seems uppermost in their minds is the personal element of promotion. This is no reflection, however, on the Medical Corps work.

2. Just how many of the Regular Army Corps dentists that were in the Army a year before Pearl Harbor ever received front-line duty?

3. What has the Dental Corps done toward a post-war adjustment in regard to the dental equipment now being used that will be such a surplus after the war? Why not give the men that are using it a chance to buy it?

4. Why should there be 520 men to each dentist in the Army when there is only 1 dentist to every 2,500 civilians? The men in the Army should require less attention than the average citizen since they are supposedly healthy young men. I think a more equal division could be worked out and no one suffer.

5. Is it necessary to have a dental surgeon acting as a medical first aid man in the front lines when there is such a scarcity of dentists? Don't you think his place could be taken by a person more easily replaced?

6. A few months ago I was solicited by the Molsby Printing Co. to buy a book that, of which I believe Dr. Mills was coauthor, at a price of $10. What do you think about officers in the Dental Corps donating to the profession any knowledge they might have acquired while under Government pay and being educated by the Government?

7. According to the doctor's article, quantity not quality is the objective of his department. Taking his figures, I will give them a break and say there were 7,000 dentists on an average from Pearl Harbor to the date of his article. There were 335 working days. If these men worked every working day, they would have to do the following each day: 13.7 fillings, 1.38 prophylactic and pyorrhea cases, and 1 denture. One denture repair every 10 days, 1 bridge every 5 days, and there was no consideration for extractions, Vincents', post-operative pains or aching teeth. Harry Houdini might be able to perform this magic, but I do not think there are 7,000 Houdini's in the Dental Corps. The regretable feature about this mass production is the majority of these officers doing the work will return to civilian life, as will their patients. Most of these dentists will be building up a practice and if they mention they were Army dentists it will be a handicap rather than an asset.

8. In private practice a patient comes to his doctor through choice, some by reference from other patients. Why not make this a practice in the Army where possible? When a soldier comes to the clinic or infirmary where there are usually several dentists why not give him his choice? It would give the dentist a little more pride in his work and the patient a little more confidence in his dentist.

9. The higher ranking dental officer should not be expected to do paper work. If they are more valuable doing paper work than dentistry they should be in another department.

These are only a few corrections that could be made in the Dental Corps that might be beneficial to the Army, men, and the civilian dentist who, after all, is doing his share in shouldering his responsibility in this war.

HARRY W. DEEGAN, D. D. S.,
Shelton, Wash.

Red Lake-Clearwater River Project Should Be Undertaken Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the passage Tuesday by the House of the bill H. R. 4485, known as the omnibus flood-control bill, will be joyously received by thousands of people in the Red Lake-Clearwater River drainage area of northwestern Minnesota. The population residing in the following counties either directly or indirectly will be benefited by the ultimate results of this project: Pennington, Red Lake, Polk, Clearwater, Beltrami, and Marshall.

After the beneficial results of this program are determined it might be desirable to undertake a number of smaller additional projects to increase the benefits to the people in the surrounding areas, which now may not directly be a part of the present project. Citizens of this section can be sure that every effort will be made to undertake a project which will bring benefits to their communities.

At this time I want to insert into the RECORD a statement which I made before the House Flood Control Committee at the time that hearings were held on the Red Lake-Clearwater River project during the consideration of and hearings on the bill H. R. 4485. The statement I made to the committee at that time follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity that you have given me to present some additional testimony and evidence in support of the project known as Red Lake River and tributaries, including Clearwater River, Minn., the official information on which is found in House Document No. 345 of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

I also want to thank you for the hearings you held on this project on Wednesday, February 2, at which time you heard some excellent testimony in support of the project by Col. George R. Goethals, chief of engineers, War Department. Colonel Goethals certainly was right when he asserted that benefits will be forthcoming on the completion of this project to all of the people of the area.

There is, of course, an urgent need for the completion of this project at this time. There is a large area of good farming land in the section which is subject to floods, and if this project were completed, a great amount

of additional food would be produced to help win the war.

I am enclosing for consideration a copy of a letter which Gov. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, wrote to Mr. Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration, Washington, D. C., in support of the immediate construction of this project.

Incidentally, my predecessor, United States Representative R. T. Buckler, who retired without running for reelection and who supported me in my campaign, has been very actively interested in this project with me for many years. I give him great credit for bringing the project up to this stage of development.

On behalf of many men in public life and private citizens of the area as well, we also want to thank you and your committee for the excellent help and cooperation that you have given us and all of the others interested in this worthy project at this time and in the past.

It is our hope that your committee will find it desirable to include this project in the bill for presentation to Congress in the near future.

I am glad to say that the committee did include the project in this omnibus bill, and I want to express the appreciation of myself and the people of the area concerned for their action and their fine cooperation.

To add further information and arguments to the statement that this project should be undertaken during the war period as an emergency food-producing job, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following letter from Minnesota's Governor, Edward J. Thye, to Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, February 21, 1944.

HON. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator,
War Food Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: I wish to request your consideration of a matter of considerable importance to wartime crop production. This is the project for flood control in the basin of the Red Lake River and Clearwater River in northwestern Minnesota. I enclose a memorandum prepared by our State conservation department, describing the main features of the project, especially those bearing on crop production of wartime significance.

As you will note from the memorandum, the project has been approved in all respects by the War Department and has been submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War, with a printed report, House Document No. 345, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, Government Printing Office, 1943. The only obstacle is the reservation expressed in Secretary Stimson's letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated October 25, 1943, prefacing the report, to the effect that although the project appears desirable under normal conditions, it would not be of sufficient value to the war program to warrant the use of needed manpower, equipment, or critical materials, and that therefore no appropriation should be considered or construction initiated until after the war.

We are satisfied that the facts to which attention is called in the conservation department's memorandum, apparently not apprehended by Secretary Stimson, are more than sufficient to justify immediate construction of the project by reason of resulting increases in crop production. This is confirmed by what I personally observed on a trip which I made through the area with our State commissioner of conservation, Chester S. Wilson, in the early part of January of this year. There was evidence on every hand of widespread damage done to large areas of fertile improved farm land by successive floods, and it was apparent that a very substantial increase in crop production would be assured by protection against floods and by provision for drainage which would be afforded by construction of the project.

The proposed channel improvements will also make a material contribution to the war effort in another way, by augmenting the essential water supply of substantial communities and important industries located in the valley, thereby safeguarding against possible interruption through water shortage of the operation of plants engaged in handling and processing large quantities of food and fiber materials and in manufacturing finished products for Army, Navy, and lend-lease purposes, as well as for essential civilian use, including grain, flour, beet sugar, dehydrated potatoes, dehydrated eggs, milk products, flax fiber, and various other necessary commodities.

On a recent trip to Washington I discussed this project with the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Minnesota. They were unanimously of the opinion that it deserves immediate consideration, and that it should be possible to secure the necessary Federal appropriation to cover the Federal Government's share of the estimated cost, $902,910.

While I was in Washington Mr. LeRoy K. Smith, director of the north-central region, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Washington, D. C., was in St. Paul, and while there attended a conference at which the project was submitted and discussed by Mr. Wilson, commissioner of conservation; his deputy and chief engineer, Mr. E. V. Willard, and by representatives of the St. Paul offices of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Corps of Engineers. Mr. Smith can give you a report of the results of that conference, which, I am sure, will support the conclusions in favor of immediate construction expressed in the enclosed memorandum.

If detailed evidence is desired to substantiate the general propositions summarized in the conservation department's memorandum it will be found in abundance in the War Department's report above-mentioned and in the reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which are doubtless available to you. In case a conference or hearing on the matter should be desired either by your office or by a congressional committee or other interested agency, our State conservation department as well as the local agencies interested will be glad to send representatives to Washington for that purpose. However, I believe that an examination of the reports above mentioned will furnish ample proof of the merits of the project without further investigation.

I believe that a statement from your office to the effect that immediate construction is justified from the wartime crop production standpoint, if you so conclude after considering the matter, would remove all obstacles and clear the way for consideration by Congress of an immediate appropriation, as well as for the undertaking of construction by the War Department in case an appropriation is made.

Time is pressing, since work should be commenced as early as conditions will permit during the coming spring, if the essential features of the project are to be completed this year in time to be of benefit for the next following crop season. I therefore urge that you give this matter consideration at your very earliest convenience, and I hope that the project will receive your endorsement.

Thanking you, I am,
Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. THYE, *Governor.*

Seattle Chamber of Commerce Opposes Repeal of the Webb-Pomerene Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce has taken a strong position opposing the repeal of the Webb-Pomerene Act. It is contended by these distinguished businessmen that such an appeal would place an additional handicap on the exportation of lumber from the State of Washington. The lumbermen of my State are severely hampered in trade by the provision of the Ottawa Conference. Under this Ottawa agreement, the Douglas fir from British Columbia may be exported to any of the British possessions under a preferential duty. The preferential duties make it virtually impossible for the Washington State lumbermen to compete against their British Columbia rivals in any of the United Kingdom possessions.

But let the resolution speak for itself. Here it is:

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce opposes the adoption of H. R. 4493, introduced by Representative MCMURRAY, of Wisconsin, March 27, 1944.

The announced purpose of this bill is to protect and promote trade and commerce among the nations of the world, but it is believed that its enactment would have a diametrically opposite effect upon the foreign commerce of the United States.

In substance, the bill strikes at and would prevent any cartel arrangement or price stabilization program in foreign trade, thus handicapping, if not preventing, the foreign traders of the United States competing with foreign traders of other nations. With such a law on the statute books our foreign traders would find it very difficult, if not impossible, to negotiate with others in foreign countries in foreign trade.

The bill repeals the present Webb-Pomerene Act, which was specifically enacted to permit the foreign traders of the United States to form corporations engaged in foreign trade, and which corporations were authorized to have price-stabilization agreements and enter into cartel agreements in foreign trade. The Webb-Pomerene Act enables our foreign traders to compete on at least an equal basis with traders of other countries.

The following reasons are submitted in support of the recommendation to oppose this legislation:

1. That the repeal of the Webb-Pomerene Act would immediately subject corporations organized under such act to suits under the antitrust laws, with the result that trade built up under that act would have to be immediately discontinued.

2. This bill would establish another commission to investigate and submit findings with respect to trade arrangements with foreign nations, which is unnecessary in view of the already established Federal Trade Commission, and also in view of powers now possessed by the Tariff Commission.

3. If there is any necessity for further investigation, the Federal Trade Commission should be empowered to make such investi-

gation preliminary to any legislation on the subject, and that there not be set up any new commission for the reason that the Federal Trade Commission has much data already with which any new commission would have to familiarize itself. The same may be said with respect to the Tariff Commission.

4. The enactment of this bill would make every foreign trader in this country fear he might be a criminal, liable to such severe penalties as are provided, viz, "a fine not exceeding $25,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 2 years, or by both of said punishments, at the discretion of the court."

5. Before any legislation should be enacted, there should be international agreements specifying what citizens of each country may do with each other in foreign trade, so that traders with that country may know what is permissible and what is prohibited.

6. The proposed bill would throw all foreign trade of the United States into confusion, as its effect on foreign traders would depend upon constructions of any foreign trade activity by the Attorney General of the United States and the courts as to whether or not they were prohibited by the act. The terms of the act are so general that it is impossible to determine the limits of its scope.

7. It is believed that the Webb-Pomerene Act has been a great help to foreign trade and should not be repealed.

8. We are unable to see any feature of the proposed legislation that is desirable, and therefore not only is unanimously and strongly opposed, and it is urged that the Washington State congressional delegation vigorously oppose it.

The Fighting French

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of date May 10, 1944, entitled "The Fighting French," as follows:

THE FIGHTING FRENCH

Decortion of a French corvette and a number of its personnel, here in our own harbor last Monday, gave New Orleanians cheering evidence that the French are back in the war. The honored ship, flying the Cross of Lorraine flag of De Gaulle, was cited for 30 months' gallant service in the antisubmarine campaign in the North Atlantic. This reminder that French resistance was maintained during the war's darkest days was scarcely needed here. The decoration ceremony gave local emphasis, however, to the current news of France's military come-back.

According to the current United States news, the French Army of liberation numbers close to 500,000 men today, with 300,000 already equipped for action, the remainder being rapidly outfitted and thousands more awaiting their turn for equipment and training. Units are in the battle lines already. French warships are working with the Allied fleets in the Mediterranean and the Atlantic.

Within the homeland guerrilla forces estimated to total 250,000 are operating in the mountain and hill regions. The underground has enlisted a million more, already helping the fight for liberation and ready to play a larger role when the Allied invasion comes. This formidable muster inside the Nazi fortress has grown despite the most drastic attempts to destroy it and causes no little worry to Hitler and his generals. Its leaders maintain close touch with General De Gaulle and the French committee. When D-day comes, the Fighting French will give a good account of themselves wherever they are placed and whatever the tasks assigned them.

No Discrimination Against Negro Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, in which he sets forth with great clarity the policy of the War Department with regard to Negro soldiers, and in which he denies the charges of racial discrimination, and asserts that Army personnel is assigned according to their qualifications and abilities regardless of race or color:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 9, 1944.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: I have your letter of May 2 and enclosure from Miss Mary A. Willcox, 63 Oakwood Road, Newtonville 60, Mass., concerning the War Department's policy with regard to Negro soldiers.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter to Congressman FISH to which Miss Wilcox refers and wish to invite your and her attention particularly to the following observation which concluded that letter:

"Permit me to emphasize, in conclusion, that any implication that the War Department is deliberately attempting to avoid sending overseas, or to keep out of combat, troops of the Negro or any other race, is entirely without foundation. Our personnel is distributed and employed as required, on duties individuals are qualified to perform, regardless of their racial derivations. Large numbers of Negro troops are overseas or en route and will be given every opportunity to win battle honors and demonstrate their worth in actual combat. The War Department has every intention of continuing its past efforts to make the best possible use of its available manpower in the prosecution of the war without regard to race, religion, color, or other unmilitary considerations."

I feel that the above statement, which has been and remains the policy of the War Department, needs no elaboration.

With regard to the unsatisfactory record of the Nine Hundred and Thirtieth and Nine Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery Battalions, as mentioned in my letter to Congressman FISH, this is a factual situation which has been so presented in War Department correspondence on the subject. However, the statement has been distorted in some quarters both in its meaning and purpose. Numerous white organizations also have been found unsatisfactory, and many more white than Negro organizations have been converted to service units. It is not seriously maintained, I am sure, that the War Department would feel it was serving its own interests by finding the performance of any of its units, particularly a combat unit, to be unsatisfactory unless the facts warranted such a finding. My statement concerning these battalions was, I repeat, based on fact alone and had absolutely no racial implications whatsoever.

I might add here that all Negro officer personnel who were assigned to the Nine Hundred and Thirtieth and Nine Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery Battalions have been or soon will be assigned to the Ninety-second Division, and, unless found to be unqualified, will replace white officers presently assigned to that organization.

Miss Willcox refers to the World War record of the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry. As you know, the records of the personnel compcsing units which saw combat service in World War No. 1 have no bearing, and obviously could have no bearing, upon the capabilities of personnel now assigned to these same units. You will note, in this connection, that my letter to Congressman FISH does not reflect in any manner on the World War No. 1 record of any unit.

My comment in the attached letter that "many of the Negro units have been unable to master efficiently the use of modern weapons" also has been seriously misinterpreted in some quarters. As in the case of the unsatisfactory record of the Field Artillery units mentioned above, this is a factual situation solely and cannot properly be interpreted as a reflection on the Negro race. In utilizing Negro soldiers we have been faced with the fact that in civilian life large numbers of Negro inductees had inadequate educational opportunities. In a recent study of all men processed at induction centers since June 1943, 20 percent of the Negroes and 74 percent of the whites were rated in grades I, II, and III by Army general-classification tests; 80 percent of the Negroes and 26 percent of the whites fell in grades IV and V. These lower classifications certainly do not reflect either the intelligence of the men or their native abilities. However, they do indicate the nature and extent of the problem with which we must deal. To meet it, special training units for all men in class V, irrespective of race, have been established at several posts throughout the country. Courses of instruction are offered to give these men a basic education that will fit them for the proper performance of their Army duties. Very encouraging results have been obtained to date. In the first 6 months of these courses, out of 29,000 Negro trainees, approximately 90 percent were retained in the Army and assigned to more advanced training. Many excellent soldiers have been developed from men who have originally made a low score on the Army general-classification test.

I might add that our decision to convert certain combat units into service organizations has been necessitated primarily by the constantly increasing demands of overseas commanders for service units in excess of those available. This and other factors, some of which were brought out in my letter to Congressman FISH, have required the conversion of both white and colored combat units to meet military requirements. However, I wish to state most emphatically that we have labored diligently in an effort to avoid discrimination against any individual or group, and that all our personnel policies have been set for the past many years without regard to race or creed. Permit me to observe that if Miss Willcox's organization believes that the War Department has pursued a policy of deliberate discrimination against Negroes, this belief is the result of misinformation; and I feel that she would be rendering a signal service to the Nation and the Negro race by assisting in the correction of this misunderstanding.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Resolution of the Buffalo City Planning Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, which was adopted by the Buffalo City Planning Association on May 8, 1944, concerning the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

Whereas there is now pending before the the United States Senate Commerce Committee a bill introduced by Senator AIKEN (S. 1385), providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas it is our confirmed belief and conviction that this bill, introduced by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, represents nothing more or less than legislation compelling a clear abdication by the sovereign State of New York to the Federal Government of its inalienable rights in and to the natural resources of New York State, comprised in the State's ownership of the bed, water, power, and power sites adjacent to or within the watershed of the St. Lawrence River; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway could be used only during 42 percent of the year because of weather conditions; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway and power project considered in its entirety as an undertaking which includes navigation as well as power works, is unsound; and

Whereas the seaway would be so generally ruinous to American commerce and industry, labor and capital that its Nation-wide deleterious effects, particularly serious so far as New York State is concerned, would far exceed whatever claimed advantages might redound to the special interests; and

Whereas American industry would be damaged by foreign competition through the free use of the St. Lawrence seaway by alien tramp steamers. Foreign tramp ships manned by cheaply paid foreign crews would have predominant use of the seaway; and

Whereas no route for more profitable trade between American lake and coastal ports would be offered by the seaway because of the extra mileage involved. The distance from New York to Chicago via the seaway would be 2,900 miles; and

Whereas according to the pending agreement, the United States would defray most of the cost of the international rapids section of the project. The United States would virtually subsidize Canadian power to the extent of $55,000,000. Canada would have to pay only some $38,000,000 for power development, while New York State would have to pay over $93,000,000 for the same amount of power; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence project, based on the experience of similar public works, would undoubtedly cost much more than the estimated $1,145,000,000: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrance seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the Overton Committee, a sub-committee of the Senate Commerce Committee which now has the bill under study for report, and to Governor Dewey of New York, to Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER of New York, and to all the representatives of the Congress from the Niagara frontier.

Junior Commandos of Bridgeton, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER H. WENE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. WENE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a radio address of Mr. Jerry Alden, leader of the Stanley-WSNJ Junior Commandos of Bridgeton, N. J., who were recently selected to receive honorable mention in the George Foster Peabody Radio Award:

Ladies and gentlemen, you have learned earlier this week that the Stanley-WSNJ Junior Commandos were selected to receive honorable mention in the George Foster Peabody Radio Award. It is our pleasure, therefore, to bring to you this morning a special program, celebrating this honor. The George Foster Peabody radio award is the same thing in the radio industry that the well-known "Oscars" are in the world of motion pictures. A small group of awards is given each year to the best in the whole United States of America of certain types of radio programs. Bob Hope received top award in his classification; the Stanley-WSNJ Junior Commandos received second top award, or honorable mention, in theirs, which is outstanding service to a local community. And there are only nine possible classifications in all.

It seems difficult, looking back over the less than 2 years this fine organization has been in existence, to realize that the first little meeting of the Commandos in September of 1942, when there were but seven present, could have grown in this short time to the stature and renown it has achieved. But it is not difficult for those of us who have watched their activities and have seen them build, who have been with them at their meetings, in their campaigns, and who have participated with them in their fun. No individual member of the Junior Commandos, I am sure, would claim that he was exceptional, though some of them are. What the Junior Commandos have demonstrated, beyond all possible doubt, is the ability of children at all ages to participate, enthusiastically and effectively, in the doing of useful and valuable things, in a responsible and grown-up way.

The Junior Commandos now number 350 members, which by itself is not so important. But listen to this. In their less than 2 years, the Junior Commandos have collected 9½ tons of tin cans and 30 tons of general scrap. They assisted in the Red Cross drives for the past several years; in the first time, winding up last year's drive with the collection of $497 in a single day; this year handling the distribution of rotogravures advertising the appeal. It was the Junior Commandos who made the house-to-house survey enabling Bridgeton to launch its campaign last year for a child-care center. Of other efforts, the Commandos have taken part in too many to mention. And as to War bonds, which they were organized originally to sell, their total now runs some $300,000. It was the Junior Commandos who received, on March 8, a citation from the American Legion for this activity. And Maj. Jane McGuire, of the Commandos, received the Legion medal for the largest sale of bonds of any girl in Bridgeton. In addition to this, the Junior Commandos has received an important write-up in the magazine of the radio industry—broadcasting. And now comes this new achievement in the George Foster Peabody radio award.

They have earned the admiration of a community that has every reason to feel very proud and very grateful toward them. And I, Jerry Alden, would like at this time to offer some much-deserved thanks to Mrs. Lillian Viole and Mr. Stewart Brenneman, whose untiring work with the Commandos has done much to help put them where they are. Nothing I can say can add anything to this fine honor. But, I do wish to express appreciation for the many fine messages received from friends of the Commandoes throughout the whole country.

This Is Our Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial written by Miss Marjorie Burtscher, a student at Hays High School, Hays, Kans. This editorial won first place in a contest sponsored by the school of journalism at the University of Kansas. It is entitled "This Is Our Kansas," and reads as follows:

THIS IS OUR KANSAS

Since the war they have come—the welders from California; the soldiers and their families from New York, Pennsylvania, from Texas; the war workers from States all over this vast continent. They come to Kansas on business, to see their loved ones, or because Washington demands their presence here. Some of them call our people corn-fed; others say our State is barren and flat. "Where else," they ask, "do they have snow storms one day, dust another, and sunshine the next?" "The people here are so ignorant they don't know a washing machine from a typewriter," they comment. "Where else do you find that but in Kansas?"

"What's the matter with Kansas?" we ask.

"What's good about it?" they reply.

What's good about Kansas? Let them ask any Kansan, for we are proud of our State. Flat and barren? No, for where else but in Kansas do we see the torch of God when the sun rises in the early morning until it sinks again at night? The leaves on every bush, every shrub, yes every weed, if you will have it that way, reflect the glory, the clean shining glory of God. We Kansans corn-fed? The people are good in Kansas! God has taught us to be patient and thankful for the gifts He gives us. We have waited months at a time for a few drops of rain, for our crops to grow, for the dust to stop blowing.

We have great men who love us, too. Men from Dr. Hertzler, our "country doctor," to General Dwight Eisenhower, supreme commander of Allied forces.

We have our great heroes now dead, sung and unsung, Pvt. John Jones who gave his life at Bataan, Cpl. Tom Smith, who died on Guadalcanal.

We Kansans possess a fierce pride in our State, and to our eyes, dusty, dirty, and rain-starved though it may be, this is our Kansas.—M. B.

Address of Julius H. Barnes on St. Lawrence Seaway Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant developments in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway power project took place at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York May 4, 1944. This group has traditionally opposed this project. Mr. Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, Minn., offered a motion, and after listening to his talk, 40 percent of the members present voted in favor of his motion, which was to defer adverse action on the St. Lawrence seaway power project until a lot of inaccuracies could be corrected. Most people are asked to vote on resolutions on which they have no information or about which they are furnished with considerable misinformation. I talked with a Member of Congress today who frankly admitted that he did not know anything at all about the St. Lawrence seaway power project. In 1941 I talked to a prominent State official from one of the Southern States who made the same comment, and said that what applied to him was applicable to practically everybody in his State.

Mr. Barnes' short talk before the New York Chamber of Commerce is as follows:

Mr. President and fellow members, I have a good deal of sentiment about your organization and about this hall. In certain national positions which I held for some years this chamber was courteous enough to extend this hall for several national conferences over which I presided, both as President of Herbert Hoover's Food Administration Grain Corporation and later as President Wilson's wheat director; later also as three times president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; and later still, three times chairman of that body.

Only my sense of loyalty to my home town, Duluth, Minn., depending on this waterway, and to the 40,000,000 people in the Middle West, whom, I believe, constitute a large enough group to discredit the committee references to the benefits of this project as being "confined to a small group of our people," would lead me to take issue with the report of a committee of this body.

In all the conferences I have held here in this hall, men coming from all over this country have been impressed with the atmosphere of this room. They are reminded of its long history. The portraits, themselves, picture the men who have built this great port, but so also there are other parts of America, in process of growth, that have a right to appeal to you for fair play.

In this report there are six pages of reasons given against the waterway. I scan it in vain for one single reason in its favor. The national chamber, in putting out its referendums, always submits to its members the arguments for and the arguments against, carrying thus the presumption that a conviction expressed on such a showing has heard both sides. No such conviction follows this report as proposed today.

I have a simple action I want to suggest to you, and to illustrate why I do that, I point out to you two or three phases in which this report makes statements which, if you act on it without discussion, would prejudice you in the eyes of the great Middle West.

This statement is made, for example, on page 9, that this channel will not permit Liberty and Victory ships drawing 29 feet to use the 27-foot channel, making this "practically worthless except for shallow draft lake boats." Now, I have built ships in Duluth during two wars. My company built, at Duluth, last year the largest ocean-going ships ever built on the Great Lakes—seven of them for the Standard Oil of New Jersey. Being 360 feet in length, they cannot attain access to the sea through the outmoded 260-foot locks of the St. Lawrence which are 50 years old. They reached the ocean through the improved Chicago River and the Mississippi. But on that 9-foot channel, ocean ships thus built on the Great Lakes can only travel light and without cargo in or out. I say, as a ship operator for 20 years, operating a special type ship across the Great Lakes, down the Erie Canal and along our coast, that the statement is not correct; that a 29-foot ship by entirely customary lightening of fuel and its stores on the western end, completing them on arrival at the 30-foot channel at Montreal, can load its full pay cargo on a 27-foot channel.

The proof of that, beyond my single statement, rests on the fact that Admiral Land, who is not only Chairman of the Maritime Commission building these ships, but War Shipping Administrator operating them, in 1941, in writing, expresses the conclusion that the Maritime Commission, "after full consideration of all the factors, approved the project of improving the St. Lawrence seaway in this plan."

The next statement that I would criticize as not fair is on page 9 also. "Shipments through the St. Lawrence do not provide any saving in distance to most foreign ports." I assert, subject to the verification, which you can all make, that from Duluth at the head of the Lakes by water through the St. Lawrence, the distance is 500 miles shorter to Liverpool than through New York; and to Copenhagen, 1,000 miles shorter. Copenhagen typifies all the ports of Northern Germany, Poland, the three Russian Baltic States—Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark.

The statement is then made that "to the Mediterranean and most other foreign ports, the distance is much shorter through the New York Barge Canal."

On the contrary, there is not a port in the Mediterranean nor in all of northern Europe to which the water mileage is not shorter via the St. Lawrence than through the port of New York and the Erie Canal, on which I am a long-time operator and have a right to speak.

On pages 9 and 10 the committee quotes Moulton's report of 1929 analyzing a project at that time which had not yet taken form until the Treaty of 1932 and the agreement of 1941.

Moulton's analysis, with its high-cost estimates, applies to an entirely different project contemplating the development, partly in exclusive Canadian territory, of 6,000,000 horsepower for electric generation, whereas his present project contemplates 2,200,000. Of course, the costs are different, and what he then said in 1929 has no validity as applied to the Treaty of 1932, or the agreement of 1941.

I ask you, in view of these statements which discredit the report as partly inaccurate and inapplicable, whether it is right for you to take action today on that kind of a report. I beg of you not to do it, and I want to suggest instead an amendment to the resolution.

Gentlemen, you must realize there are some factors in favor of this project: Six successive Presidents of the United States, of both parties; the last four Governors of the State of New York; the New York Legislature, this March; Senator WAGNER, changing his position from former opposition to now being in favor; the Governors of seven of the Midwestern States appearing, in 1941, personally, and in writing, to testify their need for it. Don't act in opposition to this project with-

Mr. President, may I offer this amendment to the motion to adopt the report in opposition to the project?

"That the chamber defer action at this meeting and requests the interested committee to review their report eliminating any statements which on the committee's further consideration seem to them inaccurate or inapplicable, and that the president of the chamber be requested to secure a statement of factors favorable to the project, and that the members be provided at an appropriate future meeting with a statement of both sides, thus reviewed, before expressing their conviction on the merits of St. Lawrence seaway project.

The N. W. L. B. Stands Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I called the attention of the House to a very disturbing labor situation that existed in the San Francisco Bay area on that date. E. F. Dillon and Harry Hook, business agents of Lodge 68 of the I. A. M., had defied the National War Labor Board and were continuing their refusal to obey the N. W. L. B. directive ordering them to rescind their actions which prohibited work in excess of 8 hours per day and 48 hours per week.

On Wednesday, May 10, these two gentlemen were called before the National War Labor Board and asked to show cause why they should not obey the Board's directive. As a result of the public hearing the following telegram has been sent to Hook and Dillon and to Harvey Brown, president of the I. A. M.:

MAY 10, 1944.

The National War Labor Board acting pursuant to its powers and duties under the War Labor Disputes Act and Executive orders of the President and after a show cause public hearing, hereby reaffirms its order of May 2, 1944, which directed, "(1) that the union rescind its actions prohibiting work in excess of 8 hours per day and 48 hours per week; (2) that all parties comply in all other respects with the order of the regional War Labor Board." To effectuate this order we call on the local union officials to call an immediate meeting of the union and to use their best efforts to obtain a rescission of the union order which prohibits its members from working overtime. We further call upon the international officials of the union to assert their leadership in bringing about this result which is so necessary to a maintenance of the no-strike agreement with its provision that all disputes which cannot be

settled by collective bargaining or conciliation shall be finally decided by the War Labor Board. We wish to make it clear that the Board's order, when complied with by the union, will not require any employee to work overtime against his wishes. The purpose of the Board's order is to remove the restraint which the union has placed upon the individual's freedom of choice, and thereby to restore the status quo until the merits of the dispute can be settled in an orderly way. This is in accordance with the standard practice of the Board. It involves no prejudice to the rights of the union or its members. The Board regards it as unthinkable that in this situation the union would place itself in defiance of the Government at this critical period of the war.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
WILLIAM H. DAVIS, *Chairman.*

Americanism in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, recently in Jersey City there occurred the annual exercises held in connection with Americanization Day. For many successive years these exercises have been conducted under the supervision of Clinton E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Jersey City. More than 10,000 persons were gathered in Pershing Field, the terminus of the parade course, to watch 15,000 veterans of World War No. 1 and the Spanish-American War, with their ladies' auxiliaries and other organizations, pass the reviewing stand. Prior to the arrival of the parade these persons were addressed by Mr. Alexander Luken, of Clinton E. Fisk Post, V. F. W., who has been most active through the years in perfecting plans for this great day; by Hon. Frank Hague, mayor of Jersey City; Mr. Carl J. Schoeninger, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and myself. On the reviewing stand, in addition to those named, were Mr. Henry G. Roberts, State commander, Spanish War Veterans; Mr. Chris O'Dell, commander of the department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars; members of the city commission; Mr. William J. Dodd, past national commander of the Disabled Veterans of America; many officials of veterans' organizations and their ladies' auxiliaries; and Mr. Jean Brunner, senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who acted as marshal of the parade.

The highlight of the occasion was the able address, eloquently delivered by Commander in Chief Schoeninger, which it is my pleasure to include at this point:

This special observance of Americanization Day in Jersey City has become a magnificent traditional ceremony, and I am highly honored with the opportunity to help perpetuate and promote its significance.

In these critical days, when nearly every home in the land can display a service-star flag, patriotic emotions naturally run high. The average citizen who has a loved one in the service finds that his heart is suddenly deeply stirred by the sound of a marching band or the sight of the American flag on parade. War has definitely brought home to most of us a deeper appreciation of the meaning of Americanism and the importance of real patriotism.

It is good to know that the citizens of this area have always made it a point to celebrate Americanization Day with the same splendid enthusiasm we are witnessing today. It is also good to know that the members of our organization were annually conducting similar patriotic programs—even when the Nation was at peace and when the principles of Americanism did not appear to be in danger of immediate destruction by our enemies. In other words, it is gratifying to realize that those who have fostered this annual program did not need the impact of war to let the world know of their devotion to the ideals of Americanism.

In my opinion, the net results of our Americanism education are plainly evident in the character of our youth of today. Ever since we were organized as a veteran association we have made the promotion of Americanism one of our major objectives. There were those who laughed and scoffed when they accused us of waving the flag in times of peace. These cynics thought it was smart and sophisticated to ridicule veteran organizations such as ours, because were were constantly demanding respect for the American flag and the ideals for which it stands. There were those who stood on the side lines and smiled in friendly tolerance as we passed by on parade, because they were so sure, in their own minds, that there was little need for any organization to devote so much of its time and energy to Americanism education. They chided us with the insinuation that we did not want to forget that the last war was over, and that we were hypnotized by the desire to exhibit ourselves as alleged heroes.

I am happy to say that those who were loudly giving us the Bronx cheer, during those peacetime years, have been awakened to the real significance of our Americanism activities. They know today that millions of young Americans, who have taken part in our Americanism programs, are proving themselves to be real Americans because of the lessons they learned under our guidance.

I must even admit that we ourselves did not realize how thoroughly young America was absorbing the truths that we were constantly trying to emphasize in our Americanism program. The high degree of their understanding of the privileges of Americanism is clearly reflected today in their splendid services to the Nation as members of our armed forces.

We are all familiar with the fact that this is a "young man's war." War Department authorities insist that the average age of our men in the armed forces, who must do the real fighting, must not be permitted to rise above the age of 26. Have you ever stopped to think what this means? It means that those who are doing the actual fighting and dying in this war were born in the year of 1918 or since. Those who are only 26 this year were born while we A. E. F. veterans, of the last war, were still in France. We had barely suppressed Germany's efforts, during 1914–18, to conquer the world while the mothers were bearing children who were destined to endure the sacrifices of the present conflict. Countless thousands of those in uniform today are the sons of men who faced death at Verdun, in the Argonne Forest, and on the Marne back in 1917–18. The eagerness of those who composed the A. E. F., to defend the Stars and Stripes on the fields of Flanders, was stirred to new heights when they were told that they were fighting a war to end all wars. Inspired by this hope they were content to accept the hardships and sufferings of trench warfare against an enemy who was determined and ruthless.

But all that belongs to the pages of history. Today we must live in the present, and we must be conscious of the menace of an enemy who seeks vengeance for the defeat he suffered in 1918—plus the achievement of a cunning plan to control the world, by force of arms, no matter how long, or how cruel, his ambitious struggle might become.

Among those who have witnessed this great Americanization rally today, there are likely some who ask these questions—at least to themselves. Why are such demonstrations necessary in times like these? Why are patriotic ceremonies needed in times when every man, woman, and child is conscious of the fact that we are engaged in a great war?

To these skeptics—let me say this. There is still much need for education in Americanism among our people—and especially among those whose understanding of Americanism truths is no more than half baked. I speak of individual citizens who are inclined to believe that self-loyalty comes first. You know them as well as I. They are the ones who want the Government to regulate your business—but not theirs. They are the ones who buy, beg, borrow, or steal all the gasoline coupons they can get—but would promptly report you to the authorities if they did not think you were entitled to more than an "A" ration card. They are the people who patronize the black market in secret and then publicly damn the bureaucrats because they are unable to make black-market operations unprofitable.

When I speak of persons who lack the understanding of the real true meaning of Americanism—I speak of those men and women, among our own neighbors and friends, who seem to believe they have a special individual right to ignore certain fundamental Americanism principles which all other persons should recognize. They want the other fellow to observe the traffic laws—but they scream to high heaven if they are stopped by a traffic cop themselves. They want the other fellow to shut off his radio at a reasonable hour, but they resent complaints about their own all-night brawls which disturb the peace and keep the neighbors awake.

And then, there is the citizen who vigorously demands the opportunity to exercise his right of free speech. He is very jealous of that right, and he is ready to roll up his sleeves for a fight if he thinks you want to shut him up. But that same chap is also ready to throw you into jail, or to have you tarred and feathered, if you express an idea or an opinion with which he disagrees. If he can't think of an intelligent answer to your arguments—he promptly calls you a Communist, a reactionary, a Tory, Republican, or a new dealer—and with these smear labels he denies to you the same right of free speech which he demands for himself.

In my opinion we shall never be able to teach too much Americanism to a lot of people who profane the name of our Saviour by calling themselves Christians, but who conduct themselves in the manner of infidels. They are the persons who are constantly saying the things that encourage persecution, hate, and intolerance. They are guilty of the crimes which Christianity vigorously condemns—yet the principles of Christianity are undeniably the same principles which inspired the Bill of Rights of the American people.

I have observed that most of those who profess to be Christians, but look with scorn upon their fellow men who do not happen to be identified with the same denomination—are persons who have never even seen the inside of a church. If such persons were truly religious, or truly loyal to any particular church, they would know that religion, like the Bill of Rights, preaches kindness

and tolerance, and the right of the individual to worship his God in his own way.

Yes, we need Americanism education in time of war, especially for those hypocrites who are either too stubborn, or too stupid, to realize that 7,000,000 persons are in uniform today because we do not believe the people of Japan or Germany are superior to ourselves; because we do not accept the theory that we Americans—or any other people—are inferior mentally and morally to the Japs and the Nazis themselves.

One of the main reasons why we are fighting this war is our unwillingness to be the slaves of any other people on earth. Yet we have people in America, people who pride themselves on their understanding of Americanism, but simultaneously insist that certain groups of our own people belong to an inferior race—and should be treated accordingly.

I am confident—when the victory is won—that history will testify that America, as a Nation, fought its way to victory in World War No. 2 because we were inspired by an unconquerable desire to perpetuate the principles of Americanism. As a people we feel confident that future historians will make due note of our steadfast allegiance to the fundamental ideals of human liberty for which our own sons are giving their lives.

Whether or not we as individual citizens are doing what we should to earn the respect of our soldier dead proposes a question which each of us must answer for ourselves. In our own hearts we know how far we have permitted our patriotism to govern our personal comforts or our selfish desires. In our own hearts we know how well each of us is practicing the principles of Americanism for which millions are risking their lives to preserve.

Each man must be his own judge and jury. If the verdict finds him guilty of disloyalty to the principles of Americanism—then his punishment is inescapable. He may succeed in fooling others. But he is doomed to eternal damnation within himself when he remembers those who have given so much to preserve our Americanism when he was willing to give so little.

Salute to American Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maurice Milstone entitled "Salute to American Mothers" from the Washington Post, May 12, 1944:

SALUTE TO AMERICAN MOTHERS WHOSE SONS AND DAUGHTERS SERVE AMERICA IN THE ARMED FORCES, THE GOVERNMENT SERVICES, THE FACTORY, AND THE FARM

Make Sunday, May 14, a day your mother will long remember!

It takes all kinds of people to win a war. It takes soldiers and sailors, politicians and businessmen, farmers and laborers, wives and sweethearts, and mothers. Mothers because they are a part of the force behind the fighting force, because they wait for the peace that will send their sons home to them, and because while they wait, they work. In some ways their work is as important as that of their sons and daughters in service. Theirs is the important job of morale, of keeping intact the American home. For today, as in other wars, the home remains the port of happiness and safety to which men turn first when the war is won.

Because they are the unsung heroines of this war, let's make Mother's Day, May 14, one they will long remember. Because of the look of hope in her eye, because of her smiling courage, your mother this year, is truly the "lady of the hour." Let her know how proud you are of the job she is doing. Remember to tell her that you, like all Americans everywhere, deeply appreciate the letters of hope she sends, the hours of labor she spends in Red Cross work, the faith she has in you and all the others who are all-out to win the war. Tell her so with a gift, a visit, a letter, a phone call. If you want to give her something special inscribed "To Mother—with love."

War bonds sold in honor of Mother's Day will bring her loved ones home sooner.

MAURICE MILSTONE.

Women War Workers and Women's Bureau Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the war program with its abnormal increase in women workers has made tremendous demands on the Women's Bureau and far overtaxed its resources.

Today there are over 17,000,000 women in employment—6,000,000 more than in the spring of 1940. By 1944 there will be 18,000,000 or more employed women. They are being drawn into many new fields regarded as men's work in the past. I want to salute these women who have left homes and peacetime jobs to take over tasks far more strenuous than American women have ever been called upon to do. The women whose shoulders ache each night from riveting airplanes, the women whose faces show the effect of arc welding on the shipways in rain and zero weather, the girls who have garnered our market vegetables this summer; all are serving their country as patriotically as are our boys and men. The work that women do today in industry and on the farm is hard work. Many do such work and at the same time cope with all the problems of feeding and maintaining a household.

If these women are to carry on until we have won the war, as they must do to maintain production, consideration must be given to women's physique and home demands by all employers of women.

The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor is the one Federal agency created by Congress to promote the welfare of women workers. With the foresight that women would be called into war industries and the belief that maximum service to the Nation calls for women's assignment on the basis of physical fitness and aptitudes, this Bureau began, in 1941, without additional funds from the Congress to develop guidance material for the airplane and ammunition industries in order that management could know where women could be employed effectively. The Bureau has furnished and is furnishing scientific data as to the occupations, the reengineering of jobs to suit women's physical limitations, and conditions under which women should be employed, to thousands of employers and other Government agencies. It pioneered in getting over to management the idea that well-trained women counselors were necessary to familiarize homemakers with factory work and working conditions so that much of the strain of adjustment from home to factory could be averted.

In my own State of Washington, the Puget Sound Navy Yard asked the Women's Bureau to make a complete investigation of women's utilization with recommendations that could be used in revising yard policies. In several private shipyards they have advised on additional jobs women may do, on intake procedure, indoctrination courses, personnel follow-up, supervisors' training, as well as on eating and other necessary facilities. In other plants they have addressed the women workers at management's request in order that they might get a better understanding of the importance of the part they were taking in the war effort.

The West Coast Lumber Commission called on the Women's Bureau to make a special survey of several Spokane plant operations concerning the comparability of work performed by women compared to that done by men so that questions of wage differentials might be settled equitably. In fact, the women and men workers of the country are indebted to the Women's Bureau for insisting that the only equitable system of wage payment was based on the job, not on the sex or the race of the worker doing the job.

The Legislature of the State of Washington responded to the demand from our workers and public-minded citizens and enacted into law the principle that women shall receive the same pay as men when similarly employed or when employed on work formerly performed by men. This just legislation prevents anyone from employing women to undercut men's wage scales in peacetime, as well as in wartime. Never again can women be exploited at the expense of men in my State. The sponsoring committee for this legislation writes that the Women's Bureau "has set the record for timely cooperation in this effort."

It is because the Women's Bureau is helpful on all matters having a bearing on the effective utilization of womanpower that it is regarded as so helpful by industry. It gets an over-all view of the problems of a plant and swings into action at whatever point action is necessary.

But the Women's Bureau staff must be augmented if it is to meet practical problems with practical solutions. New problems arise continuously through the employment of this new group of women workers by persons who have never before employed women, on jobs women have never done before this year. There

must be sufficient fact finding on these problems to focus attention on the lines of action necessary to cope with new and specific problems. The Bureau is very modest in its request.

The country is dependent on womanpower to turn out its airplanes, its ships, its ammunition, its food. It is dependent on the Women's Bureau for policies that will maintain a stable, healthy staff of women workers able to carry on sustained high-quality production over an extended period of time under war conditions.

Polish Boundary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a copy of resolutions adopted at a meeting held in Wilmington, Del., on May 7, 1944, and sponsored by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, as follows:

We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Modjeska Hall, at Wilmington, Del., on Sunday afternoon, May 7, 1944, to commemorate the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, one of the world's great documents of freedom, like our Declaration of Independence, and to pay homage to creators of liberty and equality for the Polish Nation 150 years ago.

Further we, as Americans of Polish descent, upholding the American principles created at the birth of the United States, having our sons all over the world fighting the enemies of freedom, we at home making sacrifices in money and work, giving our Government full support, not only to uphold our American principles of freedom and independence for ourselves but also for all other nations, regardless of size, against all intentions and aims of enemies of freedom, liberty, and independence.

Whereas the progress of international affairs points strongly to the ruination of the Atlantic Charter, most precious to the United Nations in their fight against totalitarianism.

Whereas Poland, the first and most sacrificing ally in this fight with Hitler, is confronted today with the fear of aggression by the Soviet Russia totalitarianism.

Whereas the realization of the aggressive plans in Poland by Soviet Russia would not only constitute a dangerous situation toward the security of our United States of America but it would make the post-war peace conference a mockery for any future lasting peace or stoppage of future wars.

Whereas any pressure from United States or Great Britain upon the only legal and rightful government of Poland in London, to consent to a fifth partition of Poland by Soviet Russia would not only be a betrayal of the Polish Nation, its first ally to fight the might of Germany for freedom, liberty, and independence, but it would also be a betrayal of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" which would be an admittance of the weakness of our aims, for which this war is being fought. It would bring about distrust and condemnation from all people loving freedom, liberty, and independence.

We, patriotic Americans of Polish descent, appeal to you, Mr. President.

In consideration of the high ideals of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," for which our sons and brothers are fighting and giving their lifes on all battlefronts.

In consideration of the security of our beloved United States of America and in consideration of the future of Poland with its rightful and legal government in London, the most loyal and sacrificing ally of the United States.

To use all your great authority and influence to successfully defend the most sacred ideal of justice, liberty, and freedom toward Poland whose ultimate fate will prove to be glorious victory or a complete defeat of those ideals guaranteed by our American principles.

Furthermore, we here assembled, declare that all attempts aimed at endorsing the criminal action of the predatory powers of more than a century ago in again partitioning Poland and renewing the slavery of the Polish Nation will endanger victory and be ignoble, dishonorable, and contrary to right and justice.

ADAM J. ROSIAK,
Chairman.
MICHAL BUDRIK,
Secretary.

A Liberal Interpretation of Greek Dissension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion throughout the United States relating to internal Greek affairs and referring to recent changes within the exiled Greek Government and certain brief uprisings affecting some of the Greek armed forces.

Unfortunately, the American people have not been given the undiluted truth concerning the status of Greek protagonists of true independence.

It is time that the American people were fully informed concerning this fascinating topic. There is, in the city of Washington, D. C., a very talented and charming young lady, who is intimately familiar with every phase of Greek struggles and independence, historically and diplomatically. She has recently written a letter to that great daily newspaper, the Washington Evening Star, in which she discusses in eloquent fashion the whole story of Greece in this war. In this letter, she has incorporated such essential background material as to complete the picture.

I consider the article to be well worthy of study for those who would understand and appreciate all phases of the Greek struggle for democracy in the modern era.

The author, Madeline Karr, is profound and thorough. I commend the reading of this splendid and beautifully written short treatise to all who are sympathetic with our Greek friends.

Greece, historically, is the fountainhead of democracy. From that beautiful peninsula originated the democratic idea. Succinctly, Madeline Karr has given us the unvarnished and unveneered story.

Here is her letter, as printed in the Washington Evening Star of May 5, 1944:

A LIBERAL INTERPRETATION OF GREEK DISSENSION

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Last week you carried an editorial commenting on the current status of internal Greek affairs and particularly on recent changes within the exiled Greek Government and the prevailing difficulties within the Greek armed forces.

While it is true, as you state, that "Greek dissension is deep-seated," this dissension has a very sound basis which cannot be explained by those vague terms which you used, "intense factionalism and localism."

Trouble began in Greece when the Greek people created a new form of government and named it "demokratia." This "demokratia" is the basis of all Greek dissension. Not content with having the idea in abstract, the Greek people wanted to live under that form of government.

But as a great American once said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." In 1821 the Greek people began to fight for independence from the Turks. Similar movements developed all over Europe and in South America. It took the Greek people 10 years to gain their freedom—10 years of terrorism, starvation, and fighting. The final achievement of freedom was made possible by aid from the British and the Americans, for which the Greek people still are grateful.

After freeing themselves from Turkish suzerainty, the Greeks found that they still had not gotten democracy or individual freedom. There was an enemy within the country ready to grab the autocratic powers of the Turks.

Greece's key geographic position, as you pointed out, made her the prey of many countries which united with elements within the country to gain control against the wishes of the people. Foreign rulers (the present royal family comes from Saxe-Coburg) were foisted on the Greek people by foreign intervention. So the Greek people had to continue to fight for "demokratia."

Today the Greek people still are fighting for freedom and democracy. They are fighting the Germans and Bulgarians who invaded and desecrated their country. Again, in spite of starvation, terrorism, and exploitation, they continue to struggle for their freedom. They have fought for 4 years, and they continue with little equipment against overwhelming odds.

What you refer to as "mutiny" in the Greek Army and Navy in Egypt is just a continuation of that same struggle. Last August, representatives of underground groups fighting in Greece escaped to Cairo to ask King George to agree to stay out of Greece until a plebiscite could be held among the liberated Greek people to determine what form of government they desired. The delegation was composed of three former members of the Greek Parliament (two Liberals and one Royalist), one Independent Democrat, one Conservative, and one Communist. Contrary to your editorial, the Communists are not playing a major roll in Greek politics, as indicated by the make-up of this delegation. Remember, too, that before this war, the people of Greece had been fighting the domestic Fascist dictatorship of Metaxas, over which King George II reigned.

The delegation also asked that the underground resistance groups be given representation in the Greek Government-in-exile. For their efforts, the delegation was put under house arrest by the British and held incommunicado until they were returned to Greece. They received no answer from the

King, although the cabinet agreed to their demands.

Through the winter the demands of the EAM and EDES, whose guerrilla forces were risking their lives for Greece, continued to demand representation. Early in April high ranking Greek officers visited Premier Tsouderos and urged him to accept into the government representatives of the EAM, largest and oldest Greek underground movement, whose army is known as the Greek Liberation Army. This demand was considered "undisciplinary" by the Premier and he ordered that the officers be placed under arrest. When the escort joined the officers and freed them, Tsouderos had to resign.

The officers and men of three ships, the destroyer *Ierax*, corvettes *Apostolis* and *Sachtouris*, of the Royal Greek Navy, and soldiers from the crack Greek 1st Army refused to move until adequate representation was given their brothers-in-arms in Greece. This was the revolt that Vice Admiral Petros Voulgaris finally put down, with the moral support of the British Navy surrounding the Greek ships.

The future of liberated Greece is not an enigma. The people in Greece and the Greek soldiers and sailors outside of Greece have become familiar with that concept "demokratia" through the long years of struggle. After the war with Germany and its Fascist satellites is won the Greeks either will get democracy or keep on fighting until they do. They will not compromise, even if reaction bears a Greek name.

MADELINE KARR.

Poll-Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson warned his fellow countrymen that "a single consolidated government would become the most corrupt government on earth," and he again said that the road on which the United States would "pass on to destruction" would be "by a consolidation first, and then corruption, its necessary consequence."

A survey of history prompted Jefferson to again warn the people against centralization of power in these words:

What has destroyed the liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers into one body.

And again:

When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another.

The Poll Tax Issue, which appears in the Washington Post of May 12, 1944, is timely and should be widely read and digested:

POLL TAX ISSUE

(By Mark Sullivan)

FEDERAL POWERS

The proposal to abolish the poll tax as a requirement for voting in the eight States in which it still exists—and to do this by action of the Federal Government at Washington—fits into a tendency and process that has been under way for several years. It is a process of change in the whole pattern of American government and society—a change so far-reaching that if accomplished it would be, in the words of Dorothy Thompson describing it when it was getting under way some years ago, "profoundly revolutionary."

The attempted change follows four principal lines:

Enlargement of the power of the Federal Government at Washington, and of the Executive, at the expense of the rights of individuals—increased power of the Federal Government to regulate the individual and put compulsion upon him.

Enlargement of the power of the Executive at the expense of Congress.

Enlargement of the authority of the Executive at the expense of judicial discretion on the part of the courts—an enlargement suggested by Attorney General Biddle when, in asking a court to sustain the President's seizure of Montgomery Ward, he said, "Particularly in time of war the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive." (This elevation of the Executive was, of course, inherent also in President Roosevelt's unsuccessful attempt to change the Supreme Court in 1937.)

Immense enlargement of the power of the Federal Government at Washington, at the expense of the States and other local subdivisions of government.

Of all the attempted steps composing this tendency and process, possibly the most deep reaching is the proposal that a qualification for voting, practiced in a small number of States, shall be abolished by an act of the Federal Government. It is deep reaching because it would undermine the very existence of the States as units of government. Of all the functions exercised by any unit of government, that which has to do with voting is the most fundamental. Take that away and ultimately little would remain.

At present the whole function of voting is exercised by the States exclusively, none of it by the Federal Government. The present proposal is that some of this function shall be taken from the States and be exercised by the Federal Government. If, by passage of the pending measure, a part of this function is taken over by the Federal Government it will establish a principle and precedent by which other parts can be taken over. If the Federal Government can abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting in 8 States, it can by the same principle abolish or change other voting requirements in all the 48 States—such familiar qualifications as those having to do with residence in the State and voting district, citizenship, literacy, and the like. A Senator from New York, for example, who votes to abolish the poll tax as a voting qualification in Georgia, by his action asserts that Congress has power to abolish or change the qualifications of residence or citizenship or literacy or any other in his own State.

The merit or demerit of the poll tax is not the real question. It has come to be commonly disapproved. Member after Member of Congress from States which still have the poll tax, but who oppose abolition of it by action of the Federal Government, have said, in effect, to quote words of Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia: "I do not favor the poll tax." Because of this sentiment, the poll tax is being gradually abolished by action of the States themselves. Formerly common, it was abolished by Massachusetts some 50 years ago. An equivalent, requiring that some kind of tax be paid as a qualification for voting, was abolished in Pennsylvania as recently as some 15 years ago. North Carolina abolished the poll tax 24 years ago. Two other Southern States, Louisiana and Florida, abolished it within recent years. In three of the eight States in which it still exists, movements to abolish it are now under way.

One point should be borne in mind. The poll tax does not discriminate between Negroes and whites—a Negro can pay it and vote, as a white man can pay it and vote. There are voting devices in some Southern States which discriminate between the races—but the poll tax is not one of them. The organizing of Negroes in support of the pending measure before the Senate must have a motive other than resistance to discrimination. In the Senate debate it was asserted that the drive for the measure comes in large part from sources other than Negro.

Address by Glenn H. Bell, District Manager of Bonneville Power Administration, Before the Second Annual Convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very pleased to insert in the RECORD, the text of an address given by Glenn H. Bell, district manager of the Bonneville Power Administration, with offices in Spokane, before the second annual convention meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, held recently in Chicago, Ill. Mr. Bell's address is a masterly and challenging discussion of the Bonneville power development and the objectives of public power works and agencies, city, State, and national. But let Mr. Bell and his address speak for itself. Here it is:

President Tate, members of the board, and delegates of N. R. E. A., it is a distinct pleasure for me to be here. I have had a little part to play in the public power and cooperative progress out in the Northwest. At one time I was manager of a cooperative and later worked a short time for R. E. A. itself in regard to loans and applications. Later I went to the Bonneville Administration. That part is one nice job and it is really something for public power in the Northwest. Just a few minutes ago I got word that Dr. Raver's father passed away here in Chicago. I was hoping he would be here, as he is our Administrator. He is the one that carries the torch for public power in the Northwest and it is just unfortunate that he couldn't come.

I will tell you just a little bit about what is going on out in the Northwest and a little bit about our problems. The Bonneville Administration as set up doesn't own any dams, just owns the transmission lines. The Bonneville Dam in the lower Columbia was just completed. There are 10 generators in that dam of 55,000 kilowatts apiece, making a total of about 550,000 kilowatts.

Farther up the river about 300 miles is Grand Coulee. Perhaps most of you have heard about that. That is one of the largest, if not the largest, dam in the world. I am not going to try to tell you how big it is, how much cement, or anything like that, but it is awful big. The generators in that dam

are 108,000 kilowatts. When it is completed there will be 18 of them—9 in each powerhouse. Those powerhouses are on each side of the dam.

When the war struck us we didn't have two generators—two of the big ones. It was the only place in the Nation that they could immediately get power because it was the only place that they had the enormous dam, had the water, and could go ahead quickly.

It looked for a little time like we were going to be caught in a box for aluminum. Today a third of the Nation's aluminum is reduced in the Northwest by the plants and by the power on the Columbia River. I don't know what that is going to be after the war, but we do hope to continue with some of those plants.

Now, Bonneville has done its part and it is one of R. E. A.'s boosters in the Northwest. We furnish power to many of the R. E. A. borrowers in Washington and Oregon, and we hope to continue that as fast as we can get those transmission lines out.

There is a little difference in rates. Since I have been back here I heard all kinds of figures on wholesale rates. Some are a little foreign to me but our wholesale rate to the cooperatives in Washington and Oregon is in the neighborhood of about 5½ mills to 3 mills. Now that is only the beginning. Bonneville now has before the Federal Power Commission a new rate known as our EZ rating. It hasn't been approved yet but it will substantially reduce the wholesale rate to small cooperatives about 20 percent. So that will help.

When the entire development on the Columbia River is completed we will have, perhaps—the Army engineers think 40 percent of the potential power of the Nation that can be developed in the Northwest. There is still room for seven more dams, and that is not taking in the Clear River and the Snake River which is almost the same kind of river. If that development can go ahead perhaps these transmission lines can be extended eastward. If the water storage of Montana and Wyoming can be dammed and controlled, the rivers, I believe that these low rates will still be pushed eastward. I believe that it will be possible for Federal dams to be interconnected with Shasta and with Fort Peck and others to bring the same rate further east to more of our R. E. A. cooperatives. [Applause.]

The dam at Coulee isn't anywhere near completed. We have six of the 108,000-kilowatt generators now running. There are two 10,000-kilowatt generators that are used just to operate the plant alone. In addition to that, two 75,000-kilowatt generators that were brought from Shasta. They were already built so they were moved into Coulee. The only trouble with them, they are smaller and they rotate in opposite directions. That meant that they had to take and use three stalls to get two generators in. Now, after the war they will be removed and sent back to Shasta and the other 108,000 will go in. If it was just 108,000 kilowatts per generator that would be large, but during this emergency those machines have never stopped and they are carrying an overload now of about 20 percent. There is not a spare generator, not a spare part on any of the Federal dams to take care of any emergency, any break-down, or anything.

The power is sold. Ninety-seven percent of it is going into war industries. The total power now being generated by both Bonneville and Coulee is in the neighborhood of 1,300,000 kilowatts. Ninety-seven percent in war industries. We hope that we can keep that in industries.

We have in my particular district which is the northeastern part of Washington, some new developments. Spokane is now called the capital of the light-metal industry. We have there one of the Nation's largest sheet-metal rolling mills, a 6-pot-mill reduction plant for aluminum, and a magnesium plant. The magnesium plant has some 422 electrical furnaces. To get an idea of the load of the reduction plant alone, the city of Spokane has a population of approximately 150,000 people. The load in the city is roughly 70,000 kilowatts. The reduction plant load alone is 218,000 kilowatts. The magnesium runs about 50,000 and the rolling mill about 48,000. That is all going out of 1 Bonneville substation located just outside the city.

Much of the raw material for the magnesium plant—in fact, all of the material for the magnesium plant—comes out of the county just north of Spokane. The aluminum clay comes from Dutch Guiana and Mobile, Ala. Just recently Congress approved an appropriation for an aluminum clay plant. We have lots of clay deposits in Washington and Oregon and Idaho. This clay plant, if it proves successful, will give us the necessary clay in the future for the development of aluminum for plants located on the coast. We would be independent, after that, of South American clay, and I hope we continue to keep that going because we certainly were in a dark spot at the beginning of the war on aluminum clay.

Now, I am going to tell you just a little bit about some of our problems that we have. Even though we have the dams and we have the transmission lines we have public power and we have cooperatives. We have our problems, too, just like the cooperatives. The advertising that is being used now in the Northwest is just like that we saw here yesterday, only it is worse. I saw an advertisement on the train coming back here in a Great Falls, Mont., paper. I tried to get that paper, but I couldn't get it. The Puget Sound Power & Light Co., which is located in Seattle over on the coast, is advertising in papers throughout the West: "Rural electrification—postwar." They show beautiful farms, barns, silos, corrals, and a figure sitting on a fence with a roll of wire in his hand. At the bottom of the page is a section of land and it tells you to mark your location in that and send that into the company and you will get rural electrification immediately after the war. That is one of the ads that we have.

We also, in the State of Washington, have public-utility districts as well as cooperatives. Public-utility districts were formed before we had R. E. A., were voted in by the people with the right of eminant domain, the right to condemn, take over public or private companies' properties. One of the difficulties or one of the troubles that the people have had to get into business is the huge severance damages, the reason being that the company will have a plant in one location, transmission lines will run across several counties. That county, to condemn that property and get into business means they have to cut the utility line in two. They then take it to court and the company sets a valuation of so many million dollars. The district figures out so many millions and the court puts it in the middle, which is generally eight or ten million too much.

At the time that the districts were being formed, trying to get under way, R. E. A. came into the field and the people in the Northwest States immediately started the cooperatives in Washington. There are public-utility districts and cooperative in the same county, all one. Last month it was our pleasure in Spokane to listen to R. E. A.'s Deputy Administrator, Mr. Neal; Dr. Raver, our Administrator, when all of the power people of the State, the cooperatives and the public-utility districts were all called together. Today we have a united group of people in Washington to go out and win this fight for public power. It isn't going to be easy, for 2 years ago we had legislation passed in our State legislature allowing public-utility districts to combine and go together and buy these properties. But the public utilities were able to defeat that and refer it back to the people for a vote this fall. The companies are spending millions of dollars to defeat it. If it is defeated, we are set back many years.

Perhaps many of you have read a statement by Mr. Murphy. The Electric Bond & Share said it was time the Federal dams and Federal projects were put on the tax rolls to help pay off the war debt. Well, I don't know whether the people of the Northwest or the Nation are going to have that done or not. I rather doubt it. But that is the trend of what is going on.

We in the Northwest have a terrific fight. I noticed an ad, for instance, in Spokane before I left, where our local utility company raised the question, a great big ad, "How do you want your Grand Coulee power, by private business management or by political graft?" Then it went on to say that power being delivered to the industries in the area was over the company's line. The power companies haven't spent a nickel for the construction of transmission lines to war industries. The Bonneville Administration built transmission lines into the area far in advance of the market. And, it was for that reason only that they were able to put those defense plants in the Northwest; because there was power and because those lines were taken out far ahead of market.

The administration has believed that if the lines were developed and taken into the areas that the areas could be developed to load that line. That certainly has proved out in the case of the co-ops and in R. E. A. It is the same program.

At the beginning of the war the War Production Board requested the administration to interconnect with all of the utilities in the Northwest to furnish power. Before that was done our administration decided that if we had to furnish power to the private utility companies we certainly then should be in a position to transfer to the public agencies, the cooperatives. After much battling and fighting we were able to work out transfer arrangements with the utility companies to transfer power to all of the cooperatives in the area. We got that much out of the interconnection. In one case we have been able to transfer through two power companies to several cooperatives in the panhandle of Idaho.

Now, the power situation in the Northwest with all of our dams is still critical. The reason is the Rocky Mountains don't have enough snow this year. Along next fall power is going to be short in the Northwest and the utility companies are going to have to have power due to our interconnection. That is critical. The reason, perhaps, that some of our aluminum plants, some of our industries may have to be curtailed is because we have to furnish power to the private utility companies.

Since this interconnection has been made there has been an enormous amount of advertising. We call it the Northwest Power Pool. I don't know whether those ads are in the paper in this area or not but in the Northwest every paper you pick up there is a big ad in it, The Northwest Power Pool. The utilities show the new people what they think of the Northwest Power Pool. They are capitalizing on what the Federal Government has had to do in this emergency. All of the utilities from Salt Lake City west are interconnected. They are all controlled from Grand Coulee Dam. Now, in the Northwest Power Pool they would make you believe in their advertisements, they list all of the utility companies and the Federal Government's part down in the corner but they don't say what each one contributes. If you would take the Federal Government's dams out of

the Northwest Power Pool it wouldn't even be a puddle. But, they are now capitalizing on it. That is why I was impressed yesterday with the different ads and comments that were made by your people. I have felt for a long time myself that the cooperatives, that there should be an arrangement made whereby they could advertise to their own people and those people who did not know them. Our problem and the Federal Government's is that we cannot advertise. You people, it seems to me, could. I believe that if it were possible that you could put local ads in your paper. You could sell your program to those people outside, those people who don't know what your program is. I believe you people could reach many, many homes. I know that you have your local paper that you send out but that doesn't reach the outside people. I hope that after this year, that after the election that we all come out of this fight against us and that the Federal program and that the R. E. A. program can go ahead and grow because there is a lot of room and you are doing a lot of good.

Frank E. Gannett

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday May 11, on the floor of this House, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made the statement that one of my constituents, Frank E. Gannett, of New York, is head of an organization and is being assisted by a former Member of this House, Sam Pettengill of Indiana, to amend the Constitution in such a manner that it would prohibit Congress from levying taxes up to 25 percent of one's income. The distinguished gentleman from Texas also referred to Frank Gannett as a Fascist.

I have known Frank Gannett for 25 years and if there ever was a man who has a conscientious regard for the perpetuation of our great Republic, it is Frank Gannett. His honesty and integrity are above reproach. He is courageous and fearless and whether you agree with him or whether you do not, he cannot be in any way whatsoever termed as a Fascist, nor has he ever been in any way whatsoever associated with subversive activities.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is fundamentally, traditionally, politically, and of necessity a New Dealer, and he has proven and shown on numerous occasions beyond the shadow of a doubt that anyone in his estimation who does not agree with the New Deal is a Fascist or is subversive.

I am inserting in the RECORD today a denial by Frank E. Gannett concerning the charges of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I sincerely hope everyone will avail themselves of the opportunity to read Mr. Gannett's remarks.

PATMAN CHARGES FALSE, UNFOUNDED, GANNETT SAYS

Frank Gannett, who was mentioned yesterday by Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, on the floor of the House as one of the leaders in a lobby which was trying to put a limit on the power of Congress to levy taxes, today made the following statement:

"Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, like Don Quixote, fights imaginary windmills to give himself the hero's role. His every statement yesterday on the floor of Congress was false and unfounded. He also shows gross ignorance of the subject he discussed.

"Personally, I have never spent a cent nor spoken to a Congressman on the proposed amendment. The Committee for Constitutional Government has used about one-fifth of its income to educate the country on sound tax policy, to bring about expansion of private enterprise in the difficult post-war period. Its support came in average amounts of $17.30 per contributor.

"Every one surely is interested in taxation, which has been increasing by leaps and bounds. In wartime we expect to pay high taxes, but for the protection of everyone, from the humblest worker to the millionaire, there must be a limit on what the Government can take out of the pockets of the American people. This also would protect us against much wasteful spending and further development of bureaucracy.

CHARGES RESOURCES DRAINED

"Even before the war, unlimited taxing power by Congress was draining the Nation's resources to Washington and destroying the independence of States and municipalities by making them dependent on Federal doles. That is why the legislatures in 16 States have passed resolutions demanding a peacetime limit of 25 percent that the Federal Government may take from the earnings, income, gift, and estates of citizens.

"To say that this proposed amendment would turn this country over to the rich is silly and absurd. The power to tax is the power to destroy. If there is to be no limit on taxation, then our system of free enterprise will be destroyed and some form of collectivism or socialism take its place. With that will come the loss of jobs to millions now employed in our industries.

"Twenty-five percent taxation of the earnings of our people should be more than adequate to provide for all the real needs of our Government. Certainly it would not, as Mr. PATMAN says, prevent taking care of our soldiers and our social-security obligations.

CITES WORLD WAR NO. 1

"As a matter of fact, a lower rate of taxation will provide more money for the Government than an unlimited high rate. After the First World War, reduction of Federal tax rates from 46 to 25 percent was followed by such expansion in all fields of industry and enterprise that the Treasury's income was actually considerably larger under the lower rate.

"In the opinion of many who have given the question careful study, nothing would do more to provide jobs for returning soldiers and oncoming youth and promote the prosperity of the country as a whole than this plan to limit Federal taxation.

"Taxation and other problems that must be solved if we are to have post-war prosperity are too critical to be dealt with by any such misstatement of fact and demagoguery as Mr. PATMAN indulged in yesterday on the floor of Congress. What he said of me personally is not important, although it was all utterly false and unfounded, but his misrepresentation of facts that concern every wage earner in the country should not be allowed to go unchallenged."

The International Labor Organization Meeting in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of the issue of Saturday, May 13, concerning some of the actions taken at the recent world conference of the International Labor Organization at Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT STARRY-EYED

At one of the closing sessions of the world conference of the International Labor Organization in Philadelphia the other day, the two United States Government delegates—Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins and Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS—offered a proposal of particular interest because it expressed the official view of this Nation regarding the social objectives of the next peace.

Stated briefly, the proposal would make it a matter of international obligation to maintain a high level of employment and promote improved standards of living throughout the world. To this end, a set of clear-cut social principles would be incorporated in the treaties to be drawn up after the war, the chief of these principles being: (1) That all persons wanting to work be given the chance to do so at fair wages, under reasonable conditions and with protection against occupational hazards; (2) that the well-being of the different national populations be advanced through adequate programs of nutrition, housing, medical care, and education; (3) that minimum job standards be established to prevent labor exploitation; (4) that provision be made for the creation of sickness, injury, old-age, and unemployment benefits to insure a steady flow of income to individuals who would otherwise suffer, and (5) that there be general recognition of the right of freedom of association and collective bargaining.

To some critics such a proposal may seem to be a New Dealish effort to make the world New Dealish, but in point of fact it reflects the general sentiment expressed by most of the delegates from the 40-odd nations represented at the I. L. O. conference and is made of much the same substance as the Philadelphia Charter, the statement of social objectives unanimously adopted by the conference. The thing that distinguishes it is the fact that it constitutes an official move by our Government to have these objectives lifted in due time to treaty status, so that the signatories to any international peace pacts would assume more definite obligations in respect to social reform than would otherwise be the case.

Of course, for nations merely to agree in a treaty that it is their duty to maintain employment at a high level and to improve living standards, does not guarantee that the duty can or will be well performed. But the value of such an agreement is that it involves some compulsion to live up to the obligation by taking steps to achieve the objectives—more compulsion, at least, than a

broad statement of principles or ideals lacking the force or solemnity of a treaty. Although it may be faulty in detail, the American proposal thus has much to recommend it, especially because the soundness of the next peace will depend largely upon far-seeing and vigorous international action designed to provide a decent livelihood for the masses of people everywhere.

It is certainly true, at any rate, that demagogues and men on horseback thrive best in places where poverty and unemployment exist on a large scale. It is true, too, that national economics are so interdependent that when depression strikes one country, other countries are affected in varying degrees and that if the depression deepens and spreads, there develop those international frictions which all too often in the past have led to war. In the circumstances, the American proposal for a social-minded peace, promoted by treaty, or a similar proposal designed to effectuate the basic principles of the I. L. O., is by no means a starry-eyed idea. On the contrary, if something like it could be realized, the stability of tomorrow's world would be well served.

Declaration of Principles Adopted by Progressive Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a declaration of principles adopted by the Progressive Party Convention in Milwaukee on May 7.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate as to the probable cost of printing. The estimated cost is $156.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESSIVE PARTY DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

INTRODUCTION

Ten years ago the progressive-minded people of Wisconsin, the farmers, workers, independent business and professional men and women broke away from the old political parties and founded a new party for these profound purposes:

1. To revitalize representative government in Wisconsin and the Nation and to effectuate the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence.

2. To rehabiliate respect and recognition of the constitutional bill of rights.

3. For the development of progressive principles consistent with American ideals and the American form of government.

In the first campaign a decade ago, the Progressive Party declared its allegiance to all these fundamental principles, and specifically for the following:

1. The right of every American to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; to express his opinion through a free press and free assemblage; and to have an effective voice in his political and economic life.

2. The right of every American on the farm and in the city to earn his living by useful work and to receive for this work an income which the full productive capacity of society can afford.

3. The right of American youth to develop their talents through public education, adequately supported, and to find a place in the life and work of their country.

4. The right of men and women whose industry has helped to build the Nation to face their declining years free from the fear of want.

5. The right of every citizen to join with his fellows in cooperative efforts and to bargain collectively through representatives of his own choosing.

6. The right of every American to live under a government strong enough to suppress the lawless, wise enough to see beyond the selfish desires of the moment, and just enough to consider the welfare of the people as a whole.

Today, on the threshold of the most challenging era in all the history of America, we Progressives of Wisconsin reaffirm our devotion to these original principles, and, in rededicating ourselves to the struggle for political, social, and economic democracy in this momentous year of 1944, adopt the following declaration of objectives and principles.

POST-WAR ECONOMY

As victory in this war approaches, the American people will face the greatest economic challenge of all times. Simply stated, the challenge is this:

Can the United States, which has built the greatest and deadliest war machine in the world, harness its great skills and ingenuities, its men, money, materials, and machines—harness all these to build an economy of full employment and abundance for all?

Timid souls shudder at the future and shrink from the challenge of the age in which we live. Progressives are convinced that we have nothing to fear but inaction, reaction, hysteria, and fear.

Progressives are determined to fight for a dynamic program which will permit nothing to stand in the way of full production and full employment. We are convinced that it is the destiny of America to show to the whole world that men can have freedom and security, that men do not have to barter away their liberty for a loaf of bread, that economic democracy is possible under political democracy, that a free America can provide a higher and better standard of living for all its people than can any dictatorship or any regimented economy—whether it be of the right or left.

Progressives do not believe it is the function of an all-powerful government to operate or even to regulate our entire national economy. We do believe that it is the function of a people's government to provide equality of opportunity for all, regardless of color, creed, or class.

One of the most effective methods of providing equality of opportunity for all is to destroy the enemy of economic democracy—national and international monopoly. This, we believe, is one of the paramount tasks of our time—to free American enterprise from bondage to the corporate giants, national and international, who have for too long chained us to an economy of scarcity.

Specifically:

1. We demand that our Government prosecute and uproot monopolies which have masked their operation under the guise of wartime emergency.

2. We support strengthening of antitrust laws to permit a more efficient and more relentless campaign to abolish monopolies. We favor revision of the patent laws so as to permit immediate public utilization of all the benefits of science and invention.

3. We protest the administration's reduction of appropriations in its budget for the antitrust division.

4. We call for more effective Government aids to independent business, which is the backbone of a genuine American system of free enterprise. Monopolists have corrupted the expression "free enterprise" by acting as if it means the freedom of monopoly to crush independent business.

5. We advocate that independent business should receive preferential treatment in purchasing surplus industrial war machinery, plants, and materials.

6. We urge more extensive support of producer and consumer cooperatives and public corporations modeled on the Tennessee Valley Authority to provide a continuing yardstick by which to compel the adherence of monopoly business to a program of abundance and full employment.

RECONVERSION TO PEACE

It is important for us to remember that the issues of post-war economics are being shaped here and now. If monopoly is allowed to dictate the policies of reconversion to peacetime product, the consequences will be disastrous. The extension of economic activity in America after the war will depend in large measure upon the opportunity for independent businessmen to pioneer new industry. It will depend upon the ability of the competitive part of industry to prevail over the monopoly philosophy of scarcity.

The disposition of the $15,000,000,000 worth of Government plants will play a major role in determining the shape and course of our post-war economy. Progressives oppose letting these plants fall into the hands of monopolies. We advocate a policy for the disposition of these facilities which will strengthen independent business and at the same time provide employment for returning war veterans and displaced war workers.

Progressives believe in the preparation and formulation now of a sound program of useful public works, to be used only when and where necessary to take up the slack in private industry as may develop in the years after the war. If we wait until the acute need is upon us, the result can only be a hastily formed, ill-advised program of made-work—boondoggling. Action now would accomplish several major purposes:

1. Assure returning veterans that they need not go on bread lines or sell apples if private industry fails to provide full employment.

2. Provide the Federal, as well as State and local units of government, with useful inventories of needed work.

3. Create a reservoir of hope and confidence, so that each little recession need not create a panic. Such a program of public works would serve as an insurance against severe economic dislocations.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Progressives believe in the extension and liberalization of the present social-security laws.

We advocate the adoption of a sound program of health insurance.

We favor a national system of old-age pensions which will provide more generously and equitably for our senior citizens. Pending enactment of a national system we pledge a liberal increase in the benefits paid to pensioners and repeal of the State real-estate lien law. We are opposed to federalization of unemployment compensation and favor retention of Wisconsin's successful system of individual reserves.

MONEY AND CREDIT

Money and credit are the lifeblood of production, consumption, and commerce. Credit should be used and controlled by and for the public. We are for Government owned and operated central banks and the use of public credit for public investment in self-liquidating projects. This will raise the national income and provide adequate opportunity.

CIVIL SERVICE AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

We believe in the principle of the merit system in State and local government. We take pride in the Wisconsin civil service law and all the efforts of Progressive leaders to protect and improve the law. We condemn the breaking down of civil-service principles by the Republicans who have enacted legislation to give civil-service standing to ward heelers and party hacks. Progressives have brought Wisconsin to a position of Nation-wide leadership in good civil service. We favor liberalization of the conditions for retirement in both the State and municipal employees' retirement systems, and the lowering of the ages of retirement as one means of creating job opportunities in public service in the post-war period.

We favor the establishment of an adequate retirement system for county employees who are not now covered by any existing retirement program. We favor the adjustment of salaries of State civil-service employees to compensate for increased costs of living and the improvement of State salary schedules to reflect the present employment and economic conditions.

We favor the enactment of a law to provide a maximum work day of 8 hours and a maximum work week of 48 hours for employees of State institutions.

The Progressive Party pledges itself to maintain the highest degree of efficiency in the operation of Wisconsin State government by utilizing the newest techniques in personnel administration and employee training.

AGRICULTURE

Progressives believe that a sound and genuinely American farm program must be rooted in a philosophy of abundance, not scarcity. The foundation of such an American farm policy must be the family-type farm, operated by its owner.

We oppose the development of factory-style farming dominated by large financial interests. We pledge support of such agencies as the Farm Security Administration serving as a major instrument for the rehabilitation of family-sized farms.

Prior to the war the farmer was the victim of an unfair economic and political system. Much of his produce was sold in an unprotected world market while he had to buy in a protected domestic market. Progressives are determined to prevent a return of this unjust situation in the post-war period.

For many years the markets for dairy products have been brought more and more under the control of monopolistic corporations making enormous profits at the expense of both farmers and consumers.

Under cover of the war emergency Government policies are strengthening the strangle hold of these monopolies on agriculture in general and the dairy industry in particular.

We demand a drastic change in these Government policies to stop the growth of monopolistic control in agricultural products. We call for prompt and vigorous action by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to end the monopoly control already established.

Full employment and more adequate purchasing power during the war have demonstrated the Progressive position that an ample market exists for farm products.

We commend the important part played by Senator LA FOLLETTE in the development of the food allotment plan to provide a basic minimum diet for people in the lower income groups. We favor the adoption of this plan as a means of helping these people and as an instrument to assist farmers to meet the economic adjustments of war and its aftermath.

We demand that the Federal Government fulfill its promise by maintaining adequate support prices.

We favor a firm price floor at adequate levels to prevent the farmer from becoming the victim of every fluctuation of the market and to assure him of a fair price for his products. The Government should take whatever steps are necessary to maintain these correct floor prices.

Progressives established the Wisconsin Agricultural Authority to promote quality production at home and better markets outside the State. This program, unwisely abolished by the Republican administration, should be reestablished and given adequate support.

We support the soil conservation program and advocate its extension.

We are opposed to any tariff policies which give special privilege to industry at the expense of the farmer.

Progressives have always fought for pure food laws and under the Progressives the best pure food laws in the country have been passed. In order to prevent the consumer from an immitation and in order to protect the farmer from the competition of an inferior substitute the Progressives have had placed on the statute books laws which tax all oleomargarine which is colored or can be colored in imitation of butter. We are not opposed to the sale of oleomargarine under its own natural color and on its own merit.

CO-OPS

Genuine producer and consumer cooperatives have proved the most effective methods for farmer and consumer to help themselves. Certain powerful vested interests are attempting to curtail and cripple the development of the cooperative movement.

Progressives urge, as a means of building a sound post-war economy, the strengthening and extension of the cooperative movement.

SCHOOL LUNCH

We favor the continuation and expansion of the school-lunch program.

FOREIGN POLICY

Progressives believe that there can be no compromise with the forces of Nazi-ism and fascism. We shall continue to give our wholehearted support to vigorous prosecution of the war to an early and successful conclusion. We condemn all efforts to create disunity among our people for selfish political ends.

Progressives are convinced, however, that victory has been delayed by the failure of our Government and the governments of associated nations to formulate and proclaim to the peoples of the whole world a clear and dynamic declaration of war aims which would appeal to the peoples of all countries. Our failure to hold out hope to the appressed peoples of enemy, occupied, and neutral countries robs us of a powerful weapon of political and psychological warfare which could result in the saving of many American lives.

There never was a time when the need of humanity was greater than now for genuine cooperation among nations for the attainment of a just and lasting peace. But to attain this noble objective the basis of our cooperative action must rest upon an American foreign policy dedicated to the elimination of the causes of war.

These declared objectives must be the guiding policies of any organization of free, sovereign nations set up to preserve the peace.

Progressives will cooperate in supporting sincere efforts made by the United States representatives at the peace table to secure a just and lasting peace. We affirm our unalterable opposition to territorial aggrandizement for the purposes of imperialism, discrimination against races or peoples, monopoly or cartel control of trade, insupportable indemnities, the oppression of peoples or the selfish exploitation of their natural resources, and the prolonged military government of conquered or occupied nations.

We oppose the determination of boundary questions without the consultation of the peoples concerned, as in the case of Poland or any other people in similar circumstances.

Instead, we favor the right of self determination for small nations by referenda held under international auspices which will guarantee an expression of the popular will free from coercion in any form.

We believe that the peaceful solution of the complex economic, ethnic, and political problems of Europe manifested by hundreds of years of blood lusts can be solved democratically upon the basis of close cooperation of the nations in a united Europe.

Progressives are deeply concerned by omnious signs that our Government is repeating the tragic mistake which frustrated the fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of peoples everywhere in World War No. 1. Then we failed to secure the acceptance by our allies of our war aims as set forth in the 14 points prior to the conclusion of hostilities. The result was a peace treaty which violated these basic ideals and sowed the seeds of World War No. 2.

We urge the Government to use whatever bargaining power we still possess as a result of the astronomical amounts of manpower, money, material, and natural resources we are contributing to the war effort to secure now from our allies firm commitments. These commitments must lay the groundwork for a peace devoid of harsh indemnities and vengeance and prepare the way for a peace settlement which will strike at the causes of war; encourage the democratic forces in all countries to join with us in the attainment of political democracy and economic security; and promote cooperation on such specific issues as relief, health, trade, communications, and airways.

The people of this country are generous by nature and tradition. They wish to discharge their responsibility as citizens of a great and powerful nation. They know from bitter experience that the lasting friendship of peoples or nations cannot be bought by the prodigal distribution of our production, wealth, and natural resources. There is ample evidence that the realistic foreign policy of our most powerful allies is dictated by their respective national interests. If the United States is to attain its rightful place in world affairs, our foreign policy must have the continuing support of the American people. To command that support our foreign policy must be firmly based and vigorously conducted on the enlightened self-interest of this Nation.

The eminent American historian, Charles A. Beard, has summarized the Progressives' concept of the sound basis upon which a truly American foreign policy should be built: "The supreme object of American foreign policy should be to protect and promote the interests, spiritual and material, of the American people, and subject to that mandate to conduct foreign affairs in such a manner as to contribute to the peace and civilization of mankind."

Progressives reaffirm their profound conviction that in the last analysis our greatest contribution to world peace will be determined by what America does for Americans. Our primary task is to make democracy and equality of opportunity living realities here at home. By putting our own house in order we can prove to people everywhere that men can have both freedom and security. This is our manifest destiny, for as President Roosevelt has said: "Unless there is security here at home, there can be no lasting peace in the world."

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

Progressives favor the adoption of a constitutional amendment for the initiative and referendum. The necessary resolution to make this possible has been defeated by the votes of the reactionary Republicans and Democrats. We proposed to continue the

fight to lodge this extension of democratic control in the hands of the people, where it should be.

CONSERVATION

We believe that an effective, honest, and progressive conservation program is one of the first responsibilities of a State administration; that conservation is a basic need for Wisconsin, present and future.

We favor an integration of the forestry- and game-conservation efforts of the Wisconsin conservation department with the soil-conservation and management programs of the State soil conservation committee, the Wisconsin College of Agriculture, and the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture. We favor continued propagation of fish and game and a greater emphasis upon water and soil conservation as fundamental in a comprehensive conservation objective.

We believe that the farmer and rural landowner, custodians of the land with which all conservation activity is primarily concerned, should be encouraged to collaborate more closely with the game and forest conservation projects of the State government, and that the farmer should be accorded more generous benefits for the use of his land by city sportsmen through an accelerated public hunting and fishing grounds acquisition program.

We favor a continuation and extension of the principle of cooperative forestry by a restoration of forest crop law payments which have been reduced by preceding Republican State administrations. We propose an expansion of the State forests-and-parks program, to the end that the State may offer large tracts of virgin forests for the encouragement of the essential recreational industry.

In vast sections of Wisconsin where lands were denuded by timber barons in past decades local leaders and citizens know that the hope for a return to economic stability and prosperity lies in a revival of the forest industries. More than 1,000,000 acres of natural timberland in the central and northern counties of the State need reforestation. The tree-planting program of the State has lagged in recent years. We propose an intensive program of reforestation for the post-war period as the only feasible method of building the foundations for forest products and recreational industries in those sections in succeeding decades.

Conservation administration in Wisconsin has been weakened by political wrangling. Public confidence has suffered because of patronage disputes and political quarrels among members of the conservation commission.

We pledge the restoration of the Wisconsin conservation department to the highest level of efficiency in administrative conduct and leadership by adopting scientific techniques and employing research specialists for the solution of the many problems in the perpetuation and propagation of Wisconsin wildlife and the basic natural resources.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

We favor strict regulation of those public utilities which operate under private ownership and deplore the subserviency of the Republican-dominated Public Service Commission to the Power Trust.

We pledge an uncompromising fight against the Power Trust and its Republican political front in their efforts to smash the public-power movement and the rural electrification program in this State. We favor the expansion of the R. E. A. program as soon as materials are available and will oppose any further efforts to curtail its vital functions. We oppose the Power Trust drive to wreck the Tennessee Valley Authority and other great Federal hydroelectric projects.

We believe in the encouragement and fostering of public ownership at the municipal level as the best means of providing utility services at low rates and providing municipalities with the additional revenues they will need in the difficult post-war years.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

We favor immediate congressional action to make possible the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. We are opposed to the diversion of water from the Great Lakes to the Chicago Drainage Canal.

LABOR

We reaffirm our determination to protect the right of collective bargaining by act of the majority; and the strict enforcement of laws affecting the health, safety, and welfare of the working men and women.

In order to effectuate these principles we propose: The repeal or drastic amendment of the un-American Catlin-Peterson law; and we condemn the refusal of the Republican members of the legislature to eliminate provisions similar to this act already declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States; the reestablishment for labor of civil rights in industry including the right to join unions of its own choosing without discrimination; the outlawing of company-dominated unions; the establishment of a strong agency to enforce these rights, thus minimizing industrial friction; the enactment of minimum State wage and maximum hour laws in accordance with and along the lines of the Federal act.

The social gains of security for the workers must be protected. As we look toward the post-war period, plans must be laid to minimize the hazards and insecurity of employment.

PUBLIC WELFARE

The unfortunate people in our charitable and penal institutions are entitled to humane and scientific treatment and consideration. We support an urgently needed post-war building program for State institutions. We deplore the opportunistic political maneuvering with which the Republican legislature pushed such a program through the last session but refused to provide revenues to carry it out.

TAXATION

We reaffirm our support of the Progressive principle of taxation based upon ability to pay. We restate our opposition to the sales tax and favor the repeal of the State cigarette tax. We favor a tax reform program to lighten the tax burden upon real estate, farms, homes, and places of business.

We condemn the failure of the Republican Party in power to redeem its platform pledge to reduce automobile license fees. Progressives will continue their effort to accomplish such reduction until it is achieved.

We deplore the crushing blows dealt to the principle of taxation based on ability to pay by the Republican majority in the 1943 session of the legislature. We call attention to the words of the titular head of the Republican Party that these blows were struck to change the long-time policy of taxing upon the basis of ability to pay.

We applaud the courageous fight made by Progressive legislators against overwhelming odds to block this assault. We recognize that it was their devotion to the basic Progressive principle of taxation which prevented the Republican legislature, in the words of its own leader, from making "a gift of the State's money to an estimated extent of $5,650,000" to the wealthy taxpayers of this State.

Progressives are proud of the part played by their legislators in thwarting the Republican attempt to deprive Wisconsin citizens of their traditional free access to income-tax returns.

We condemn the failure of the Republican legislative majority to reenact the 60-percent surtax on incomes, thereby making another gift to millions to the wealthy taxpayer.

HIGHWAYS

We must preserve the money collected through gasoline taxes and license fees to carry out a highway-construction program at the end of the war.

We favor a constitutional amendment prohibiting the diversion of highway funds. We condemn the Republican Party for failing to submit such an amendment to the people and thus violating another of their platform pledges.

We favor granting of aid by the State to the townships for the repair and replacement of roads and bridges destroyed in floods, and we favor the setting up of a program to take care of such catastrophes in the future.

SAFETY

We believe that as part of a post-war program of public works there should be a survey conducted and a program launched to eliminate death traps and other hazardous features of Wisconsin highways.

We favor using our existing State agencies to step up the general accident-prevention program so that Wisconsin will take a place in the forefront in the field of accident prevention.

HOUSING

We believe that no citizen should be compelled to live in dwellings that are unsanitary or unsafe; and we reaffirm our pledge to support effective elimination of poor housing conditions wherever they may exist.

VETERANS

Progressives have always maintained that adequate and generous treatment for veterans of our wars was a part of the cost of war. During and ever since World War No. 1, Progressives have been leaders in every fight for generous compensation, pensions, the bonus, and hospitalization for war veterans.

We are proud of the successful effort made by Progressive members of the legislature in saving the 60-percent surtax, amounting to over $6,000,000, which is now available for veterans' rehabilitation.

Senator LA FOLLETTE led a successful fight to raise the pay of persons in the armed services to $50 per month. Progressives have given their wholehearted support to the G. I. bill of rights bill which has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives. They will vigorously oppose any attempt to reduce the benefits which the Senate bill provides.

We favor a paid-up life-insurance policy for every member of the armed services which will protect their beneficiaries now and give those who survive the war a real stake in our country.

Now and in the future Progressives will use every legitimate means at their command in Wisconsin and the Nation to provide generous benefits for the brave men and women who are in the armed services fighting our battles in this global war.

We are determined that returning service men and women shall have an opportunity to find useful and self-respecting employment at adequate wages.

EDUCATION

The American system of free education was established over a hundred years ago by a great victory of organized workers, farmers, and the common folks over the forces of reaction. Progressives are pledged to foster and support this great American tradition. To this end we favor:

1. Adequate financial support for education and the restoration of cuts made by the present administration.

2. Measures for the full preservation of academic freedom.

3. Provisions for teachers tenure that realistically suits the needs of urban and rural communities.

4. An adequate program of State and Federal aid.

5. Restoration of workers' education and of farmers' and workers' representation on the board of regents of the State university.

6. We are opposed to any tampering with the teachers' retirement fund.

CONCLUSION

Every proposal in this Progressive declaration of principles is rooted in the basic Progressive philosophy of equality of economic opportunity and individual political freedom. On this tenth anniversary of the founding of this Progressive Party we rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principle of a progressive democracy. "The will of the people shall be the law of the land."

Shortage of Farm Tools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the heading "Scandal seen in shortage of farm tools," published in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCANDAL SEEN IN SHORTAGE OF FARM TOOLS—W. P. B. "COVER-UP" HIT AS POLITICAL MOVE

A farm machinery shortage so serious that War Food Administrator Marvin Jones has refused to bring it out into the open for fear of the consequences to President Roosevelt's fourth term ambitions was threatening yesterday to become one of the major scandals of the war.

Blamed for this farm tool shortage that farm men say actually threatens "international disaster on the food front" are farm machinery officials of the War Production Board who allegedly "falsified" production figures and the "Big Eight" of the farm machinery manufacturers.

PROTEST DELAY OF PROBE

So serious is the situation that War Production Chief Donald Nelson is taking time off from his job of keeping the war factories going to take a special trip to Detroit the first week in June with leaders of the national farm organizations to make a personal investigation. To the farm leaders delay of the investigation until June is said to be "dangerously long," probably "too late."

GOAL MISSED BY WIDE MARGIN

As agricultural men viewed the situation, approximately 20 to 50 percent fewer farm tools have been produced than W. P. B. and W. F. A. assured the farmers would be produced during the winter for their use this year.

Instead of there being 30,000 two-row tractor-pulled corn planters—a machine absolutely essential in the midwestern Corn Belt this year where wet weather has so delayed the crops that planting "must be done in a hurry" if there is to be planted anywhere near the amount of corn the nation requires—only 16,000 had been delivered by the manufacturers up to April 1.

In addition, there are bad shortages of many other types of planting tools, according to W. F. A. Haying machinery production is lagging badly. The shortage of small combines for harvesting the small grain crops is considered by W. F. A. to be a real bottle neck.

TRACTORS, COMBINES HIT QUOTAS

Only the production of tractors, 2 percent ahead of the announced goals, and large combines have been produced in anything like the promised quantities, which are far below actual requirements, the farm men said.

Leaders of the national farm organizations, suspecting that the New Deal agencies were hiding something in their farm machinery production figures, Thursday sent Edward J. O'Neal, American Farm Bureau Federation president, to call on his friend Administrator Jones to "get the low down."

"DISHING OUT GLAMORIZED REPORTS"

According to the Washington Farm Reporter, a publication of the National Grange written by Agricultural Service Associates, a group of writers that work closely with leaders of all the major farm organizations, this is what took place:

"Could it be that the farm machinery division of W. P. B. wasn't going to fulfill its program?" O'Neal demanded of Jones. "Could it be that it was dishing out glamorized reports?"

It not only could be, but was, said Jones. He called in one of his specialists to prove it. Saying that he would do everything in his power to "needle" W. P. B. into action, Jones flatly refused O'Neal's demands that he do something about it immediately.

He let it be known that the White House had strictly forbidden any interagency squabbles between now and November 7, and that it wasn't going to be the one to disobey White House orders.

Price Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed for some weeks now the pros and cons of price control. We have heard its virtues extolled, and we have heard the opposition's attempt, with all the eloquence at its command, to prove that price control has not worked. We have been treated to endless facts and figures, many of them conjured up more to prove a point than to reveal an existing situation.

I have contended since the beginning that price control has worked extraordinarily well, in the face of great difficulties; and that it has stabilized our cost of living with remarkable efficiency. It has lessened the impact of war on this country to such an extent that the opposition is inclined to claim that we faced no danger in the first place. This, of course, is a far-fetched idea, and we need only to look to those other countries without efficient price-control methods, and see that the cost of living has doubled, trebled, quadrupled or multiplied so many times that only the wealthiest people can afford even the most common living requirements.

I have an exhibit I want to show you today which, in my estimation, proves beyond doubt the efficacy of our price-control methods. It is not a document conceived and written by an economist; it is not a voluminous analysis by a governmental department; it is not a politically inspired screed. Mr. Speaker, what I have to show you today is nothing more or less than a newspaper advertisement, which I tore out of the Evening Star last Monday—an advertisement for a grocery store.

This advertisement lists 330 articles—meats, soaps, coffee, household needs, canned soups, canned vegetables—all the things a housewife needs to run her home.

The prices of all these 330 articles added together total $69.64, as of May 8, 1943—a year ago; and do you know what the price of the same articles is as of May 8, 1944—last Monday? The total price as of last Monday was $69.10—54 cents less than a year ago.

Now, this store surely is not running at a loss, yet they are selling the same goods they sold last year, not for more money but for less money.

What does that mean? It means that the United States Government has done so excellent a job of holding down the prices of goods at the wholesale levels that this store can hold down its retail prices, and even in a few cases reduce its prices, and still make money.

What better proof can we have than this? This is fact. It is experience. It cannot be denied that price control has worked.

Letter From A. F. Whitney, President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, on Abolishing the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and challenging letter written by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Gleason L. Archer, chairman of the American Democratic National Committee, 105 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., under date of May 5.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND LODGE, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 5, 1944.

Mr. GLEASON L. ARCHER,
Chairman, American Democratic National Committee,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. ARCHER: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 22, in which you ask for my cooperation "as a true American in the job of abolishing the New Deal, root and branch, this year."

It so happens that I was not born yesterday, and the few years I have spent on this earth have taught me the folly of buying a pig in a poke. Therefore, I am not very much impressed by your assurance that if I will follow you I will be following the "American way." I shall, however, do you the courtesy of assuming you mean what you say, and therefore when you call for the abolition of the New Deal "root and branch," you must mean that we will restore the old order of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover era of bank failures, without guaranteed bank deposits; of swindling the public by the uncontrolled sale of securities and phony foreign loans; no social-security act, with its protection to the aged, the crippled, the blind, and dependent mothers; no program of soil conservation; no program for protecting the farmers against insurance companies who were liquidating them at a terribly high rate at the time the New Deal came into being; no Federal emergency relief administration to save starving people from a system of reckless laissez faire; no effective protection against the industrial exploitation of children; no floor under wages and no ceiling on hours, but a ruthless exploitation of the working people; no T. V. A. with its great benefits to thousands of farm families; a return to the outrageous conduct of public utility holding companies and exploitation of the people by monopolies and trusts; no legal assurance to workingmen that they are as free to join the organizations of their own choices as their employers are; no drought control and drought relief program designed to protect the very soil on which mankind must depend for human existence; no crop insurance and parity payments to protect the farmer and his business; no such programs as those embodied in the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, designed to protect the youth of our land against a cruel economic system; no slum-clearance projects and no interest in decent housing for American workers, both industrial and rural; no good-neighbor policy and reciprocal trade agreements whereby the welfare of the peoples of this Nation and our neighboring nations of the world can be mutually advanced. But why go on and call the long list of things the New Deal stands for? After all, they live not only in the memories but in the hearts and experiences of the masses of the American people. When you call for the abolition of the New Deal, "root and branch," it is well that you direct your appeal, as you do, to "American industrialists," for certainly you would make little appeal among the masses of the people of America.

There is one feature of your program, however, that I must protest vigorously. I have a very high regard for that great American, Thomas Jefferson, and as an American I resent your sailing under the banner of one so noble and so great. Can you, for instance, imagine Thomas Jefferson, who had such complete faith in the honesty and integrity of the common people, sending out a political document appealing only to businessmen and industrialists? You would be more honorable and fair were you frankly to say that it is your purpose to adopt the Hitler technique of divide and conquer, by establishing a new party, which you hope might draw enough votes away from the legitimate Democratic Party to elect a Tory Republican. Just as your late lamented predecessors, the American Liberty League and the Jeffersonian Democrats, you hope to profit by this un-American technique. But the American people next November 8 will give you the same treatment they gave the Liberty Leaguers and the Jeffersonian Democrats.

I note you refer to alien-minded philosophy. Jefferson was accused of being alien minded—a Jacobin. In short, your brothers-in-purpose of his day thought of him just as you think of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The only manner in which you are followers of Thomas Jefferson, as you profess to be, is that Thomas Jefferson is way out ahead of you, even though he lived a century and a half ago. You had better acquaint yourself with some of Jefferson's philosophy, for I am sure if you understood his philosophy you might come to hate him even worse than you hate Franklin D. Roosevelt. You refer to yourselves as the true Democrats and describe in most contemptuous terms the followers of Roosevelt as trespassers, wrongfully in possession of the Democratic Party. Listen to what Jefferson said of those of his day who fought him like you fight Roosevelt. Just as you today connive to use the legitimate Democratic Party, so did Jefferson's enemies, who were monarchists, try to appear as Republicans. In 1822 Jefferson wrote to Albert Gallatin as follows:

"You are told, indeed, that there are no longer parties among us, that they are all now amalgamated, the lion and the lamb lie down together in peace. Do not believe a word of it. The same parties exist now as ever did. No longer, indeed, under the name of Republicans and Federalists. The latter name was extinguished in the battle of Orleans. Those who wore it, finding monarchism a desperate wish in this country, are rallying to what they deem the next best point, a consolidated government. Although this is not yet avowed (as that of monarchy, you know, never was), it exists decidedly, and is the true key to the debates in Congress, wherein you see many calling themselves Republicans, and preaching the rankest doctrines of the old Federalists."

On the same issue Jefferson wrote Martin Van Buren as follows: "Tories are tories still, by whatever name they may be called."

You address your appeal to American industrialists. Of the economic royalists of his day Jefferson wrote to William Johnson as follows:

"Still further to constrain the brute force of the people, they deem it necessary to keep them down by hard labor, poverty, and ignorance, and to take from them, as from bees, so much of their earnings as that unremitting labor shall be necessary to obtain a sufficient surplus barely to sustain a scanty and miserable life. And these earnings they apply to maintain their privileged orders in splendor and idleness, to fascinate the eyes of the people, and excite in them an humble adoration and submission, as to an order of superior beings."

After noting such a statement from a man who uttered it 121 years ago, are you sure that you want to be "followers" of Jefferson? If so, why do you make your appeal to American industrialists? Before you answer that question maybe you should take into consideration what Jefferson wrote to H. Lee in 1824:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: 1. Those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. 2. Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise depositary of the public interests. In every country these two parties exist, and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write, they will declare themselves. Call them, therefore, liberals and serviles, Jacobins and ultras, whigs and tories, republicans and federalists, aristocrats and democrats, or by whatever name you please, they are the same parties still, and pursue the same object. The last appellation of aristocrats and democrats is the true one expressing the essence of all."

In your campaign appeal to American industrialists I am quite sure that Jefferson would class you among the "aristocrats" rather than among the "democrats." I note that in your Declaration of Chicago you took the following action:

"We recommend that the traditional two-thirds rule for the nomination of candidates be readopted as a safeguard against future attempts to subvert and destroy the Democratic Party."

In pressing for this undemocratic rule, I think you should again reappraise Jefferson as your ideal and inspiration. In 1790 Jefferson wrote: "The law of the majority is the natural law of every society of men." In 1792 he wrote President Washington: "The measure of the fair majority * * * ought always to be respected."

Again in 1809 Jefferson wrote:

"Where the law of the majority ceases to be acknowledged, there Government ends; the law of the strongest takes its place, and life and property are his who can take them."

I am confident that if Jefferson were among us today he would regard your use of his name quite like he regarded the action of the hypocrites and tories of his day who tried to put across their evil designs in the name of George Washington. In 1813 he wrote John Melish as follows:

"You expected to discover the difference of our party principles in General Washington's valedictory, and my inaugural address. Not at all. General Washington did not harbor one principle of federalism. He was neither an Angloman, a monarchist, nor a separatist. He sincerely wished the people to have as much self-government as they were competent to exercise themselves. The only point on which he and I ever differed in opinion was, that I had more confidence than he had in the natural integrity and discretion of the people, and in the safety and extent to which they might trust themselves with a control of their government. He has asseverated to me a thousand times his determination that the existing government should have a fair trial, and that in support of it he would spend the last drop of his blood. He did this the more repeatedly, because he knew General Hamilton's political bias, and my apprehensions from it. It is a mere calumny, therefore in the monarchists, to associate General Washington with their principles. But that may have happened in this case which has been often seen in ordinary cases, that, by oft repeating an untruth, men come to believe it themselves. It is a mere artifice in this party to bolster themselves up on the revered name of that first of our worthies."

You may accept this letter as my contribution to your cause, and I hope you will not entertain the opinion that I agree with you.

Sincerely yours,

A. F. WHITNEY,
President.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "As Coolidge Said," which was published in the St. Albans (Vt.) Messenger of May 11, 1944, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS COOLIDGE SAID

Twice in the last 10 days Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN has spoken out vigorously for his bill which would provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway power development. Last Friday, addressing a large radio audience from Watertown, N. Y., he cited the costs of the proposition, forecast the development of a great northeastern empire after the seaway's completion, and warned that private interests were fighting a proposal that would bring untold new wealth and industry to the New England States.

On Monday evening, in an address before the Rutland Rotary and Lions Clubs, Senator AIKEN enlarged upon the statements made in his Watertown address. He pointed to the enthusiastic support given the idea by that earlier Vermonter, the late Calvin Coolidge; and he cited the specific gains for our State that would result from erection of the power dam at Massena, N. Y.

Let us first look at the cost, as laid down by Senator AIKEN: Total, approximately $421,000,000, with the United States paying $277,000,000 and Canada $144,000,000. But, he recalled, Canada has already spent $140,000,000 on the Welland Canal in the system and New York will stand the cost of $93,000,000 for its own power development. Thus the actual cost to our Nation is reduced to $190,000,000.

Another point of great significance to Vermonters: The Senator remarked that there are large magnesium deposits supposedly right here in Vermont, and magnesium is the basis for light metal production. Hence he bolstered statements made publicly by Joseph Winterbotham, president of the Champlain Valley Council, and Publisher William Loeb of this newspaper, along these same lines. If these magnesium deposits can be developed by the cheap power to be available after construction of the seaway, Vermont is on the road to a mervelous post-war development.

Senator AIKEN further laid great stress upon the huge inland waterways shipping that would eventually result from the completion of the seaway and, finally, the Champlain Cut-Off. Thus the Middle West, the great grain States, and the Northeast would be linked commercially. Our State railroads, he proved conclusively, would stand to benefit. The mining of coal would receive an impetus; and the Gulf Coast and Middle Western States would likewise benefit from this general enlargement of our national productive capacity.

Northwestern Vermont, he continued, is within a 10-mile radius of the Massena Dam site; and all of Vermont, part of New Hampshire, much of Massachusetts, and a portion of western Maine are within a 200-mile radius. The power generated here would be the cheapest in the world, and closer to us than it is to either Buffalo or New York City.

The subject, analyzed so extensively by Senator AIKEN, could not possibly be summarized in this column. Suffice it to say that completion of the seaway should be our No. 1 post-war project as the Senator's bill provides. It would aid enormously in making Vermont progressive as it has never known progress before. And the words of the late President Coolidge are particularly appropriate and timely:

"This project is not incompatible with economy, for its nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which shall be reproductive. Upon this project depends much future industrial and agricultural progress * * * protection from floods, and the addition of a great amount of cheap power and cheap freight by use of navigation, chief of which is the bringing of ocean-going ships to the Great Lakes."

Farm Machinery

REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, if we take cognizance of what is in the daily press today, I think it is high time that the Committee on Agriculture in this House investigate the farm machinery situation.

We see this headline, "Scandal Seen in Shortage of Farm Tools." Let us see what this article in today's Times-Herald has to say:

SCANDAL SEEN IN SHORTAGE OF FARM TOOLS—W. P. B. BLAMED

(By Philip Warden)

A farm machinery shortage so serious that War Food Administrator Marvin Jones has refused to bring it out into the open for fear of the consequences to President Roosevelt's fourth-term ambitions was threatening yesterday to become one of the major scandals of the war.

Blamed for this farm tool shortage that farm men say actually threatens "international disaster on the food front" are farm machinery officials of the War Production Board who allegedly "falsified" production figures and the Big Eight of the farm machinery manufacturers.

PROTEST DELAY OF PROBE

So serious is the situation that War Production Chief Donald Nelson is taking time off from his job of keeping the war factories going to take a special trip to Detroit the first week in June with leaders of the national farm organizations to make a personal investigation. To the farm leaders' delay of the investigation until June is said to be "dangerously long," probably "too late."

MISS GOAL ON PLANTERS

As agricultural men viewed the situation, approximately 20 to 50 percent fewer farm tools have been produced than W. P. B. and W. F. A. assured the farmers would be produced during the winter for their use this year.

TRACTORS AND COMBINES HIT QUOTAS

Only the production of tractors, 2 percent ahead of the announced goals, and large combines have been produced in anything like the promised quantities, which are far below actual requirements, the farm men said.

Leaders of the national farm organizations, suspecting that the New Deal agencies were hiding something in their farm-machinery production figures, Thursday sent Edward J. O'Neal, American Farm Bureau Federation president, to call on his friend Administrator Jones to "get the low-down."

"DISHING OUT GLAMORIZED REPORTS"

According to the Washington Farm Reporter, a publication of the National Grange written by Agricultural Service Associates, a group of writers that work closely with leaders of all the major farm organizations, this is what took place:

"Could it be that the Farm Machinery Division of W. P. B. wasn't going to fulfill its program?" O'Neal demanded of Jones. "Could it be that it was dishing out glamorized reports?"

It not only could be, but was, said Jones. He called in one of his specialists to prove it. Saying that he would do everything in his power to "needle" W. P. B. into action, Jones flatly refused O'Neal's demands that he do something about it immediately.

He let it be known that the White House had strictly forbidden any interagency squabbles between now and November 7, and that it wasn't going to be the one to disobey White House orders.

O'Neal, according to the Farm Reporter, came away from W. F. A. boiling. He called an immediate conference of the other farm-organization leaders.

"A joint statement blasting the whole rotten mess wide open to the public view should be issued sooner than immediately," O'Neal reportedly told the farm men.

"Not so fast," retorted the other leaders. "Donald Nelson has been about the only big shot in the administration high command to give the farmers a break. Now, let's have a cozy chat with Mr. Nelson before we blow the wind."

And that's what happened. They visited Nelson's office Friday. According to their reports, he didn't "beat about the bush." He heard the farm men describe the situation as they knew it. He listened to O'Neal accuse the W. P. B. Farm Machinery Division of falsifying production figures by reporting output in dollar value rather than in numbers of machine units. "You can't raise corn with dollar signs," O'Neal reportedly shouted.

"MACHINERY TRUST" BLAMED

The farm leaders claimed the "big eight" among the manufacturers of farm machinery referred to by W. F. A. specialists in their conversations as the Machinery Trust, are actually responsible for the failure of the farm machinery industry to meet the announced production goals.

The farm men claim that last fall, when farm machinery quotas were being established, the big manufacturers, in an attempt to hold their competitive market positions, asked W. P. B. for larger quotas than they could fill, taking the business from the smaller manufacturers that could have produced the tools.

LITTLE MEN "AFRAID TO SPEAK"

They knew at the time they couldn't fill their quotas, the farm leaders said, and it was apparent to the entire industry before February that they wouldn't meet them by a wide margin.

But the small manufacturers were afraid to complain, the farm men said, because they knew if they lifted their voice in criticism of the big companies, they would be driven out of business after the war. Marvin Jones knew about it, but he wouldn't "squawk" audibly for political reasons. Thus, they said, nothing was done.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Committee on Agriculture in this House, or some appropriate committee, to look into this situation and see whether or not we are going to have sufficient farm machinery to produce the food that we need in this great country of ours, not to speak of the impoverished peoples of the occupied countries.

Fear of Inflation in New Ceilings and Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "People Fear Inflation in New Ceilings, Wages," published in the Washington Post of May 14, 1944, being one of the Gallup polls.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE FEAR INFLATION IN NEW CEILINGS, WAGES

(By George Gallup)

The effort being made by farm-bloc leaders to raise agricultural price ceilings and by organized labor to raise wages lacks widespread support at present from the American people. Undoubtedly fearful of the specter of inflation, the overwhelming majority of voters polled by the institute are content to keep price and wage ceilings where they are now.

While there is more sentiment for raising wages than for raising prices, it is interesting to note that even among wage earners polled in the survey the weight of opinion favors keeping wages at present levels. The typical American, although he is no expert on economics, is apparently conscious of the fact that higher wages for his work may simply lead to higher prices for the things he has to buy.

MAJORITY SATISFIED

The survey results do not mean that no injustices exist in present wage scales; nor do they mean that workers would be averse to getting more pay if it were offered to them. What the vote does signify is that the majority of workers are satisfied with their wages, and the majority of farmers with their prices. There is no popular ferment for change, no widespread feeling that the price-wage situation is unjust.

The issue of prices and wages was put to voters from coast to coast in the survey in the form of two questions, as follows:

"Do you think prices on most products should be allowed to go up or should prices be held where they are now?"

	Percent
Let prices go up	4
Hold prices at present level	91
Undecided	5

"Do you think wages for most workers should be allowed to go up, or should wages be held where they are now?"

	Percent
Let wages go up	18
Hold wages at present level	72
Undecided	10

The vote of skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled wage earners on the question concerning wage levels is shown below.

While about one in every four thinks wages are inadequate, and may feel vociferous about it, the great majority are apparently satisfied with what they are getting so long as prices remain unchanged.

Vote of skilled and unskilled labor

	Percent
Let wages go up	23
Hold wages at present level	67
Undecided	10

In the case of price ceilings, the greatest amount of sentiment for change comes from farm voters, who are obviously thinking about higher prices for their farm products. But even in their ranks only one in seven favors upward revision of prices.

The public's current support of price-wage control is easily understandable when one considers that the great majority of American voters favored adopting such a program fully 12 months before Congress put it into effect.

In September 1941 a Nation-wide survey found that 62 percent of all voters polled wanted a price-wage control measure as a means of combating inflation. This total included a majority of farmers and of labor.

Congress caught up with public opinion just 1 year later when it passed the price-wage control bill in October 1942.

Limiting Income Taxes to 25 Percent

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not contend that anyone who does not agree with me is a Fascist. I know a lot of old dealers would like to have us say that, but I do not say it.

As far as Mr. Frank Gannett is concerned, he is advocating a very damaging amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That amendment, if passed, will restrict even inheritance taxes to 25 percent; all gift taxes, estate taxes, incomes, corporate as well as individual, will be limited to 25 percent. That means we will never pay off the war debt; we will never be able to pay more than the carrying charges. That means that small business will be destroyed, because big business could keep so much of their profits that they could run all small businesses out of existence. It would mean there would be no aid to veterans. The veterans' aid laws now on the books would have to be repealed. There would be no aid to our servicemen. There would be no social-security benefits. We would only have enough money to pay the interest on the national debt and the running expenses of our Government.

So, I say it is a very dangerous and Fascist-inspired amendment to our Constitution.

DISGRACEFUL AND INSIDIOUS PLOT

A few days ago, May 11, I made mention of a foul and un-American conspiracy which is all too close to being foisted upon this Nation. I refer to the disgraceful and insidious plot to secure passage through the legislatures of our several States of the so-called twenty-second amendment to the United States Constitution.

CONGRESS WILL HAVE NO RECOURSE

This proposed amendment has now been endorsed by the legislatures of 16 of our sovereign States. Under article 5 of the Constitution, if 36 of our States express their approval of this program through their legislatures, the Congress has no recourse but to act as a clearing-house for the amendment's formal ratification.

VICIOUS PROGRAM SPONSORED BY GREEDY GROUP

If this amendment was only sponsored by persons whose reputation for patriotism and clear thinking was above reproach and these sponsors were people with whom others could sit down in rational discussion and sift through the arguments, pro and con, I would possibly not be as genuinely alarmed about this matter as I actually am. The true facts in the case, however, are that a little group of greedy men who place love of personal gain above love of their country's best interests are sponsoring this vicious program.

Let no man who reads the printed literature of the organization which sponsors this plan believe that such is not the case.

FOUNDERS OF COMMITTEE

Let us look specifically into the background and early history of this organization, the Committee for the Constitutional Government, Inc. Let us see who founded this committee originally and who runs its affairs today for all practical purposes.

I have in my hand a booklet put out by this committee. It bears a copyright mark of the year 1944 and is therefore recent enough for these purposes.

This booklet says that in the organization's early days it was known as the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, and was originally headed by Mr. Frank Gannett, as chairman, and that "to finance the committee's first operations, Mr. Gannett advanced a considerable sum before any cash came from the public."

The booklet, a little further on, then says:

As of January 21, 1940, former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill succeeded Mr. Gannett as committee chairman.

A little further on, the text says:

The old committee (meaning the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government) decided early in 1941 to disband. But many of its supporters, saying "we have just begun to fight," were determined to put the work on a more solid and permanent footing. The Committee for Constitutional Government, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, with Samuel B. Pettengill as chairman and president, began functioning in April 1941.

Therefore the new group is a continuation of the old one.

CHAIRMAN OF REPUBLICAN FINANCE COMMITTEE A LEADER

Mr. Pettengill continued as chairman of the committee until early 1943 and held that office during 1942 at the same time that he also held the office of Chairman of the Republican national finance committee, according to information supplied me through the office of Mr. Spangler, chairman of the present Republican National Committee.

AMEND AND THEN UPHOLD CONSTITUTION

Although the old committee (the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government) was technically disbanded in 1941, practically without exception its same officers and members of its board of advisers were named in similar capacities with the successor group the present Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. Mr. Gannett and Mr. Pettengill made the switch and are still listed as members of the board of advisers of the Committee for

Constitutional Government. They probably decided it did not look so well to advocate amending the Constitution before upholding it.

FASCIST GROUP

The gentleman from Illinois asked me why I chose to call this organization a Fascist group. Due to limited time, I only answered him briefly. Today I would like to direct your attention to one man whose connection with this committee is an established and admitted fact. This man, who has been described by the present acting head of the committee, Dr. Peale, as "an expert on machinery of organization" is, in my opinion, the real directing head of the organization in its manifold slimy and vicious activities and is the man principally responsible for the phenomenal progress which the organization has made in distributing its thousands of propaganda pieces and making such a successful presentation to the various State legislatures before mentioned.

AN EXPERT ON FASCISM ONE OF LEADERS

This man, aided and assisted by a once respectable newspaperman, one S. S. McClure, whose record shows that he spent 2 years in Italy studying the workings of fascism in that country, has for more than 25 years worked often in the name of McClure to accomplish those things he did not feel free to advocate in his own name. Even with this willing and corrupted stooge, this man could not possibly have accomplished what he has thus far succeeded in doing without the aid of the free-flowing purses of Mr. Gannett and his other rich and greedy friends.

I call your attention to one Dr. Edward A. Rumely, originally the cofounder with Mr. Gannett of the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government and the executive secretary of that committee until the eagle eye of a senatorial committee brought his present activities and sordid World War No. 1 record once more before public notice.

Incidentally, I have been informed since speaking May 11, that if I expected to link the Committee for Constitutional Government with Dr. Rumely, I would be making a grievous error because, they said, "Dr. Rumely severed his connection with that organization several years ago." Such is far from the case.

RUMELY IN DIRECT CHARGE OF NEW YORK OFFICE

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a letter signed by Mr. Homer Dodge in response to a letter addressed to the Committee for Constitutional Government. Mr. Dodge's reply, which is dated September 4, 1943, is written on the stationery of the Committee for Constitutional Government. He says as follows in reference to the activities of the committee:

> The principal office is in New York and is in direct charge of Dr. Edward A. Rumely, assistant secretary. The Washington office is used chiefly for the collection of information in which the Committee finds interest.

You will therefore see that Dr. Rumely, the evil spirit; Frank Gannett, the money and power-loving rich man; Pettengill, the Republican money raiser and the Fascist expert have been and still are the sinister influences which control the destinies of this flag-waving, but Nation-destroying insidious organization.

RUMELY CONVICTED FOR OFFENSE COMMITTED DURING WORLD WAR NO. 1

Time will not permit me to dwell overlong on Dr. Rumely at this time. For those who wish to know his record in World War No. 1, they have only to check the official court records of the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals—two hundred ninety-three Federal 532, approximately page 500 and thereafter—for a description of the crime for which he was tried and sentenced to serve a year and a day in the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary. For those who do not know the details, let it suffice for me to say that Dr. Rumely was tried and convicted for accepting the sum of more than a million and a quarter dollars from the German Imperial Government for use by him in this country during World War No. 1 and for failure to report his connections with Count von Bernstorff and Dr. Heinrich Albert, the paymasters of the Kaiser on all espionage matters at that time.

GANNETT ORGANIZED WITHOUT ANY ORGANIZATION MEETING

Let me read to you a little from the actual testimony of Dr. Rumely when he appeared before the Select Committee of the United States Senate Investigating Lobbying Activities in 1938. The date was March 18, 1938. The interrogator was Senator Sherman Minton, the chairman of the select committee. The exchange was as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. What is your business now?
> Mr. RUMELY. I am working with Mr. Frank E. Gannett of Rochester, N. Y.
> The CHAIRMAN. Doing what?
> Mr. RUMELY. Acting under his direction as executive secretary of a committee that he organized.
> The CHAIRMAN. What is the committee, Doctor?
> Mr. RUMELY. The National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government.
> The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been with this committee?
> Mr. RUMELY Ever since it was organized.
> The CHAIRMAN. Did you attend the organization meeting?
> Mr. RUMELY. Why, there was no organization meeting. Mr. Gannett formed it. He put out a statement. And then he asked me to cooperate in handling the mailings, and doing executive work under his direction.

FINANCES GO TO ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Then again, let me read from the testimony of Mr. Glen Hancock before the same senatorial committee on March 23, 1938. Mr. Hancock identified himself as the assistant secretary of the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government and stated that his superior was Dr. E. A. Rumely. The testimony went as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. Do you keep the financial records in New York?
> Mr. HANCOCK. No. As far as I know, they are kept in Rochester.
> The CHAIRMAN. Who keeps them?
> Mr. HANCOCK. So far as I know, the assistant secretary.
> The CHAIRMAN. Who is the assistant secretary?
> Mr. HANCOCK. A Mr. Franklin.
> The CHAIRMAN. His first name, please.
> Mr. HANCOCK. I am unable to say. I do not recall.
> The CHAIRMAN. But he does not stay in the New York office?
> Mr. HANCOCK. No.
> The CHAIRMAN. And it is your information that he keeps the records in Rochester?
> Mr. HANCOCK. Yes, sir.
> The CHAIRMAN. And no records are kept in the New York office?
> Mr. HANCOCK. No records of that nature.

Then again, on April 20, 1938, one Sumner Gerard, who identified himself as treasurer of the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government and who is at present the very active letter-writing treasurer of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., testified before this same senatorial committee.

Mr. Gerard, after acknowledging that he had been requested to bring certain financial information which is customarily in the possession of any organization, testified that he never handled the funds of the organization. He testified that such checks as happened to reach him personally by mistake were immediately turned over by him to Dr. Rumely, whom, he stated, he believed sent the money on to a Mr. Franklin in Rochester. Mr. Franklin, he said, he believed to be a certified public accountant employed by Mr. Frank Gannett.

Thus we see that the man of money handles the moneys which are contributed to this organization by, in many instances, well-intentioned persons whom I fear have been misled as to the real and underlying purposes of this efficient and definitely sinister propaganda machine.

I am now in the process of securing certain additional information on this organization, its purposes, and its executive personnel. I propose to submit this additional information to the Congress at an early date and to show, beyond the shadow of any reasonable doubt to any Congressman and citizen that this diabolical group, this sinister syndicate composed of a czar of journalism, a convicted enemy agent, a Republican money raiser, and a Fascist expert, all of whom have clasped and been clasped to the bosom of a great political party, are pressing upon this country a program which can only lead to a return to feudal practices, pauperism for the many, and power and riches for the few. What is this, I ask, but one step removed from the day when the rabble-rousing orator and the ignorant few who have followed for promise of reward move into the driver's seat, even then throwing aside those who have devised this nefarious millionaire's scheme, and throw this country into the chaos and confusion which preceded the accession to power of men like Hitler and Mussolini? What is this but fascism of the rankest sort swathed in its infant's clothes?

Remember, Vivian Kellems, who refuses to pay her income taxes and asks

other people to do the same is one of their platform orators.

I realize that these words of mine are but general charges. It is not my intention to let my case rest here. In a few days I propose to submit to the House more cold facts and figures to further support the assertions which I have just made.

I am inserting herewith a statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1938:

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO UPHOLD CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

(Extension of remarks of Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington, in the Senate of the United States, Thursday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 5), 1938)

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, the Portland Oregonian is one of the oldest newspapers on the Pacific coast. It is and has been conservative and Republican in its policy. Because of this background, the editorial printed in that newspaper on April 7 on the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government is of particular interest. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MISGUIDED EFFORT

"The so-called National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government has done and is doing vast harm to the movement to prevent passage of the reorganization bill in its present mischievous form. Through high-pressure propaganda methods, directed first at Senators and now against Representatives, it is hurting the cause it seeks to help.

"The voluntary sending of telegrams and letters of protest to Senators and Representatives by individuals or groups who sincerely fear the effects of the proposed legislation upon constitutional government is one thing. That kind of effort is legitimate and right. But the organizing of a mass campaign directed by a highly paid secretary to flood Congress with thousands of telegrams prepaid by the organizers bears an aspect that is repugnant to fair-minded people. There is altogether too much of a show about it of attempted coercion and of vast expenditures of money by sources not in the open. Even if disclosures regarding this campaign do not actually cause passage of the bill, there are bound to be later repercussions in lobbying investigations.

"This Dr. Rumely, who fronts for the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, is not much of an asset to any worthy public movement. He served a jail sentence back in the war years for having made false statements to the Alien Property Custodian in connection with his purchase of control of the New York Mail in 1915 with money furnished by an agent of the German Government. Surely sincere opposition to the pending reorganization bill could have found a better manager than he."

I am also inserting another statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1938:

MR. GANNETT'S COMMITTEE

(Extension of remarks of Hon. Sherman Minton, of Indiana, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 5), 1938)

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., in the issue of March 23, 1938.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE PROBE OF MR. GANNETT'S COMMITTEE SHOULD GO ON

"The loudest squawk of the week is coming from the headquarters of the so-called National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, Publisher Frank Gannett's anti-New Deal propaganda outfit that spent large sums of money fighting the Supreme Court reform bill last year and is now engaged, tooth and nail, in a costly assault on the President's plan to reorganize Federal departments.

"The reason for the loud lament is this: The Senate lobby investigating committee has recently come to life and is inquiring into the identity of the interests behind certain lobbying groups in the Nation's Capital. The National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government has come under the lobby committee's searchlight.

"Whereupon Mr. Gannett, in a furious statement widely circulated this week by his propaganda agency, declares that 'the infamous Black committee of the United States Senate is again at work in an effort to destroy one of the most vital liberties of the American people—the sanctity of their homes, the freedom of their thought, and the privacy of their papers.'

"Actually, Mr. Gannett's committee was asked by the Senate investigators to produce records showing the committee's source of funds and other pertinent information to which Congress and the public is certainly entitled. An organization that proposes to advise lawmakers what to do and what not to do should surely operate out in the open and not behind the anonymity of a high-sounding title.

"A subpena issued by the Senate investigators was served on the executive secretary of the Gannett organization, one Dr. Rumely. That gentleman, on the advice of a former Hearst attorney, defied the Senate committee and refused to produce the records.

"While the Senate probers consider bringing contempt proceedings against Rumely, the facts about the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government remain a secret.

"The Capital Times is not surprised at the Gannett committee's refusal to reveal its significant background. Some months ago this newspaper in an open letter challenged Mr. Gannett to make public the names of the individuals and organizations who financed its obviously expensive propaganda campaign.

"Mr. Gannett's reply was angrily evasive—the contributors to his propaganda jackpot were too numerous to mention, and the amounts each kicked in were almost all small, said he.

"We are not astonished, therefore, that Mr. Gannett should fly into a rage at the Senate Lobby Committee and shout about such irrelevant matters as 'the sanctity of the home,' even though nobody is threatening the sanctity of anybody's home or Mr. Gannett's 'freedom of thought.'

"The Capital Times hopes that the Senate Lobby Committee, now chairmaned by Senator Sherman Minton, of Indiana, will continue its investigation of Mr. Gannett's propaganda organization and exercise its full authority to bring out the facts.

"They should make interesting reading, judging from the extreme reticence of the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government to make them public."

There is inserted herewith an excerpt from a tax letter, as follows:

TRYING TO SNEAK THROUGH AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

ENDICOTT, N. Y., *March 27, 1944.*

DEAR TAXPAYER: * * *

Most serious of all, a lobby, or pressure group, working for the interests of large taxpayers, is trying to sneak through an amendment to the Constitution limiting income taxes after the war to 25 percent of a person's income. This will not save you money; it will cost you money, because what the wealthy save will be levied on the broke. The wealthy, whose fair share of taxes, even before Pearl Harbor, had been set from 25 to 90 percent of their incomes, will save huge sums of money which the Government will need to win the peace and provide employment for the veterans. You will have to pay for this lost revenue by a sales tax, which will be the inevitable result. As a taxpayer having a net income of under $5,000 and spending by far the larger part of your earnings for food and goods, you will be hit hardest by a sales tax. Again you will be carrying the tax burden for the wealthy who will be literally having a "piggy-back ride" on your shoulders. This lobby just failed by the slimmest of margins, but do not doubt for a minute that they won't try again.

During wartime it is necessary to pay more taxes. However, it is becoming increasingly evident that the tax increases are being thrust upon the smaller taxpayers while special interests and upper-bracket taxpayers are not only escaping their just share of the tax burden through the existence of loopholes in our present law which Congress has refused to close but are also seeking further relief at your expense.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. DAPOLITO.
MARVIN S. TANENHAUS.

S. K. F. Works, Philadelphia

REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at great sacrifice of life our fliers raided and bombed Schweinfurt, the Nazi ball-bearing center and location of S. K. F.'s German ball-bearing plant.

There is an American S. K. F. ball-bearings plant at Philadelphia. The main owner, as I understand it, of the American company is Count Hugo von Rosen, but in order to avoid the provisions of Alien Custodian property law a trust agreement was developed whereby normal control passed to William L. Batt, who was vice chairman of the War Production Board.

Batt votes 95 percent of the stock of S. K. F. Industries, Inc., of Philadelphia under said trust. The Swedish company owns a large block of S. K. F.'s stock, but Batt also votes that stock under the trust.

The Swedish company's head control rests in one Count Eric von Rosen, cousin of Count Hugo von Rosen, who is behind-the-scenes boss of the American S. K. F. Count Eric is the leader of the National Socialists in Sweden and former brother-in-law of Hermann Goering, second in power to Hitler.

Thus there is a definite affiliation between American S K. F. and Swedish S. K. F. The ball bearings sent by the Swedish company materially aids the Nazi war effort and tends to render abor-

tive and useless the activities of our brave fliers in bombing vital ball-bearings plants in Germany, particularly at Schweinfurt. We should not stand idly by and permit Swedish S. K. F. to bolster up our enemies despite the fact that Sweden is a neutral; every possible economic sanction should be invoked against S. K. F. either in Sweden or in Philadelphia or both.

The American S. K. F. at Philadelphia is protecting the Swedish S. K. F. by taking care of the Latin American customers of Swedish S. K. F. All ball-bearings shipments of the American company to Latin America should be stopped. All export permits should be denied by the Foreign Economic Administration. Let Mr. Batt and Count Hugo von Rosen in turn force Count Eric von Rosen to stop shipments of S. K. F. ball bearings to Germany with which to bolster up the Nazi Wehrmacht.

We are approaching a most critical period in the war. We must use every weapon at our command. Diplomatic niceties must go in the ash can in this regard. Either American S. K. F. forces its Swedish counterpart to quit aiding Hitler or we should crack down hard on American S. K. F., and if need be seize the Philadelphia plant and shut off all S. K. F. exports, and furthermore prevent any more moneys, dividends, and royalties from being sent from American S. K. F. to Sweden's S. K. F. These moneys are used to strengthen Sweden's S. K. F. in its increased supply of ball bearings to Hitler.

Unless we get tough with S. K. F. it all does not make much sense to me.

America's Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am setting forth a speech delivered by me in Louisiana over the radio and several other times during the months of March and early April 1944. It is as follows:

My friends, the problem of giving aid and preference to the returning soldier is not new to the Congress of the United States. The first Congress which ever met in this country received the problem and met it by giving to the soldiers of the Revolutionary War a pension of one-half pay. Since this time, veterans of all wars in which the Nation has engaged have received special preferences and benefits as recognition of their services to the Nation during its hours of crisis.

Your present Congress has this same problem and is now struggling with it. I can see definitely certain things which will come out of our work and will constitute some of the post-war benefits which our returning soldiers and sailors may expect to receive. The proposed program is divided now into five parts, namely:

1. Special civil service benefits to veterans.
2. Unemployment benefits.
3. Home and farm purchase program.
4. School program.
5. Continuation of hospital and compensation programs.

I will discuss these in the order named. As for the first, there is now pending in Congress legislation which will give every veteran from 5 to 10 points preference on every Civil Service application for a Government job. Proposals to give every position in certain Government Departments to veterans are now the subject of the attention of Congress; but Civil Service Associations and Leagues from over America are opposing such a proposition as not in the interest of true Civil Service.

The returning soldier and sailor of this war will present to this Nation its greatest employment problem. Between eleven and twelve million young men, and some young women, will be released from the armed services and returned to civilian life. Most of them will want jobs immediately and every agency of Government and every private plant will be called upon to aid in this great undertaking. Many will be immediately placed in suitable positions, but in the event the veteran cannot immediately obtain gainful employment, it is proposed that Congress authorize the Veterans' Administration pay him a sum ranging from $15 to $25 weekly until he obtains work. These amounts shall be payable as weekly wages and shall not exceed 52 weeks, which will give the veteran a year's protection against unemployment.

Another proposal which should interest every serviceman, and the families of these men, is that of aiding them in the purchase of farms and the owning of homes. To accomplish this it is proposed that the Government will provide loans up to 95 percent of the value of the property, these loans extending over a 40-year period, with a very low rate of interest. Under such a program men will be given employment in the building of new homes and at the same time the veteran will be given the opportunity of actually owning a farm or a home.

One of the proposals which gives me personally much enthusiasm is that of providing education for these taken from the schools of the Nation and placed in service. It is proposed that the Government return to school those taken away by war and give them a chance to finish their education. Of course, this might be done in a school selected by the veteran, public or private, provided the tuition is within certain limits; it might be either college education or vocational education; it might be only for 1 year or it may be for as much as 4 years, provided the work done by the veteran measures up to the minimum requirements of the school. And during the time he is in school he shall receive his tuition provided it is not in excess of $500 per year and he shall receive $50 per month living expenses.

One of the parts of the veterans' program which interests me very much is the matter of taking care of the disabled. Of course, under the present law, a disabled veteran is entitled to a sum ranging from $10 to $250 per month, depending upon his disability and his need of an attendant. The Congress will, no doubt, retain this compensation, or pension as it is presently called for the war's disabled. The present problem, however, is greater than this. It is the problem of taking care of the wounded and the diseased men promptly; and having them examined and rated for disability within a very short time after leaving service. With 12,000,000 servicemen and with a list of casualties which today has already passed the number of 165,000, we can easily see that a tremendous job is just about to be placed upon the Veterans' Administration. Already 223,000 claims for compensation have been filed by veterans of World War No. 2, and already 119,382 claims have been adjudicated, leaving 104,411 claims pending at the present time. In the month of November over 4,864 World War No. 2 veterans were in Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the country and over 40,515 had been in these hospitals throughout the Nation. The number grows monthly and the problem is just in its beginning. One great service organization in its hearings before the World War Veterans' Committee recently estimated that the load of disability cases would constantly increase from year to year from now on until, this witness thought, the maximum loans would be reached about 25 years hence, but at this time there would have been placed on the compensation or pension rolls of the country 1,250,000 veterans. Should these cases average $100 per month, the monthly costs bill would reach $225,000,000 or $1,500,000,000 per annum.

To hospitalize the load which is coming to the Veterans' Administration, it is estimated that 300,000 hospital beds will be required. Of this number, the Army and Navy have some 250,000 beds of which they can turn over to the Veterans' Administration about 100,000 beds. The Veterans' Administration itself has about 100,000 beds and this leaves about 100,000 hospital beds to be obtained in the long-range future. At the present time, there is no hospital construction program under way, but no doubt, in time the needs of the veterans will demand expansion to take care of these men, sick in body and spirit. In the immediate area, I am proud of the 400-bed hospital at Barksdale Field which is taking care of many of our boys each day.

Out of all of these figures, my friends, comes the problem of keeping abreast of the demands which will shortly be made upon the Veterans' Administration. We have already given this agency of Government a priority on manpower second only to the Army and the Navy. We have authorized expansion to take care of thousands upon thousands of additional employees. At the present time, however, the Army alone is discharging men from some 500 discharge centers; and it is impossible for the Veterans' Administration to have rating boards and advisory councils at each discharge center. Far better, from the viewpoint of the veterans would it be if the Army had only about 25 discharge centers and the Veterans' Administration had men to advise the disabled man as he leaves service, together with rating boards ready to immediately pass upon his disability and to tell him what percentage of compensation he is entitled to receive. Such is my proposal.

My friends, about 1 month ago I took dinner with a sergeant who had been wounded in Africa. This young man stooped down to pick up a land mine, and it exploded, blowing off his right leg, injuring his hearing, cutting his face, and paralyzing his right arm. For 7 months he remained in the Walter Reed Army Hospital at Washington while his amputated leg and his crippled arm healed. One morning he was discharged, with no job, no place to go, and no pension check to take care of him. The Veterans' Administration had done nothing during this time, and he was thrown back into the industrial world to compete with vigorous, healthy men who had stayed at home. I am glad to say, my friends, that we brought this man's case to the attention of the Veterans' Administration and that his case was adjudicated and his compensation started without the necessity of looking at any medical record—merely by looking at the wounds.

The Sunday just before leaving Washington the weather was nice and balmy. Gone was the ice and snow of a few days before, and in its place was the warm Gulf breeze, presaging the first touch of spring. Walter Reed Army Medical Center is the great Army

hospital located on the outskirts of Washington. On last Sunday afternoon, many Washington people visited this great institution and found every sick and crippled man who could walk out in the hospital grounds enjoying the warm sunshine of spring. The young ladies from Washington strolled by the great stone buildings, looking up on the second story porches where lay the men not able to leave their beds. They lay there in the awkward and ungainly positions which modern surgery requires those who have broken and amputated limbs. But sick as they were, everyone had a smile on his face. The only long faces were those of the spectators from the city of Washington. Repeatedly, they raised their heads from their beds which were all placed to the outside of the porch and waved to the young ladies passing by.

For those men, America cannot do enough. For them, regardless of whether our post-war program costs three and one-half or three hundred and fifty billion dollars, America will still be indebted to them. We cannot do too much. What we need is the same soldier courage which these men have and we, too, will get along.

During the next few months the Nation must produce as it has never produced before. Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, has recently announced in Washington that the war production has fallen down for the month of February, and that we as a Nation failed to meet Army requirements during this month. We can cry about vacations, shorter hours, better working conditions, and more pay. We can groan about the shortage of food, clothing, gasoline, or other things, and we can complain bitterly about the rationing of commodities. In the long run these are not important. It is important, tragically important, that these men be given every care and attention, and that their paths may be made easy as they move through the months and years ahead.

Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, Asks Vatican to Help Rescue of Hungarian Jews—Turkey Also Asked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker—

First. Reports from newspaper correspondents and foreign observers indicate the intention of the Hungarian regime and its Nazi cohorts to liquidate Hungarian citizens of the Jewish faith by inhuman annihilation. The New York Times of May 10 contained a dispatch from its correspondent in Istanbul, which confirms the worst fears. So-called baths or gas chambers are being prepared to slaughter not only the Jews of Hungary, but large numbers of their coreligionists, refugees from Poland and other Nazi-dominated lands, who have found asylum within Hungary's borders.

Second. According to the figures appearing in the Jewish Year Book, in July 1940 there were 444,567 Jews in Hungary out of a total population of 10,817,286. Of this number, 204,371 Jews resided in Budapest. It is estimated that following territorial changes, resulting from Hungarian expansion, and arising from refugee immigration, the Jewish population of Hungary now numbers close to one million. This figure includes also persons not previously included within these statistics, but who would be classified as Jews under the Nurmberg laws.

Third. Exigencies of war and political obstacles will prevent large numbers of Jews escaping through underground channels. Turkey is the closest neutral country. Undoubtedly the War Refugee Board is doing a splendid job under the admirable leadership of John W. Pehle, impressing on Turkey the urgency of the situation. The time has arrived for the strongest pressure because the lives of thousands depend on prompt action. It is therefore suggested:

a. Turkey be approached with a view of her permitting the entry of all genuine refugees. If necessary, she could assign specified locations, where temporary shelters can be erected. Such names could be designated free zones. The cost of upkeep and other expenses should be underwritten by the United Nations, through U. N. R. R. A. and other agencies created for such purposes. Private relief groups, i. e., the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, would be able to supplement the funds and provide personnel.

b. On the completion of hostilities these refugees should either be allowed to return to the countries of origin, or be permitted to emigrate to Palestine, and to other areas of settlement.

c. To overcome German and Hungarian objection, it is suggested that the apostolic delegate at Washington be approached with a view to enlisting the aid and cooperation of the Vatican. The Roman Catholic Church, which has already rendered such valuable aid to all refugees, might be able to influence the authorities in Budapest to permit the gradual exodus of Jews. The Vatican flag could be hoisted on the boats, to transport these refugees down the Danube through the nearest Turkish port. The Danube traverses Hungary, enters Rumania, forming the boundary line between Bulgaria and Rumania, reemptying itself in Rumania at Varna, on the Black Sea. From this point it is approximately 150 miles by sea to Istanbul, Turkey.

d. Passenger steamers ply on the Danube; the average boat could accommodate about 500 to 700 passengers. The Vatican might instruct its delegate in Budapest to hire 6 or more boats, which would travel under the aegis of the church and with the consent of all belligerents. The journey from Budapest to Istanbul should take anywhere from 3 to 6 days, under the present conditions.

Fourth. Simultaneous intervention might be undertaken through diplomatic channels in Washington, London, and Ankara. The War Refugee Board will be of inestimable value in this connection.

The Hungarian Jews represent the last remnant of European Jewry. They have resided in the Danubian country for centuries, contributing to its wealth and progress. Large numbers are orthodox, observing the tenets of their religion with genuine fervor. The theological schools—Yeshivot—of Hungary are world renowned. Its scholars and writers have brought their message to every country. To cite a few living examples: Dr. Joseph H. Hertz, Companion of Honor and Chief Rabbi of the British Empire; Dr. Stephen S. Wise and Professor Hans Kohn of Smith College. Both Theodore Herzl and Max Nordau were products of Hungarian Jewry. Constant daily reports of mass killings have deadened our sensibilities. The calamity is too grandiose for human comprehension. Let us imagine that the entire population of Boston were in jeopardy. Would we stand by idly? No; we would find a way.

The Promotion of Friendships Among Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. L. H. McDaniel from the Journal of the Arkansas Medical Society, January 1944:

THE PROMOTION OF FRIENDSHIPS AMONG PHYSICIANS [1]

(By L. H. McDaniel, M. D., Tyronza)

A few days ago I received a letter from our beloved secretary in which he requested that I write a short paper to be presented tonight. Recently I learned over the radio that whenever the President of the United States invited anyone to take breakfast or even to confer with him that there is no such thing as a refusal for the invitation amounts to a "command performance." The subject assigned me was The Promotion of Friendship Among Physicians. I wish to respectfully accept Dr. McCurry's invitation as a "command performance."

I wish to express my appreciation for the valuable radio that the society presented me in recognition of my humble services to the Society the past year. I heartily concur in the selection of Dr. Stroud as the other recipient of your generosity for I look upon Dr. Stroud as one of the outstanding men of the South—as a physician, as a citizen, as a father, as a brother in the profession, as a Christian gentleman. Surely his selection was timely. I accept the radio that you gave me as a token of recognition for the promoting of the Northeast Arkansas Medical Society program at Tyronza on May 7, 1942, a program that I have never seen surpassed in over 20 years cooperation with various medical societies. Again, gentlemen, I thank you.

There is something better, grander, and more valuable to be received at our medical meetings than the new knowledge or new skill that we may acquire, although I would not have you think for one moment that I am minimizing the importance of the brushing up and the freshening up on new drugs, new treatments, and new techniques that we obtain when we hear our brother physician report some new findings, new ex-

[1] Read before the Craighead-Poinsett Counties Medical Society, January 7, 1943.

periences, or new successes that he has achieved. In the Army this inexplainable and indescribable something is known as morale. The strengthening and reviving of our morale as a natural consequence of our medical society meetings is a prize that no physician should let slip by. Surely the failure to attend our medical society meetings exacts too heavy a penalty in the long run for the honest and sincere physician to have to pay. I hope you will not consider me overly sentimental when I tell you that I feel repaid for making the trip to the medical society when I receive the handclasp of my brother physicians and realize that there is a fellow worker who struggles against the same problems which I experience, who knows the same joy and exhilaration that I know on the completion of a job well done, and one who has the same heartaches that I suffer when an all-wise Providence sees fit to write failure to a case in spite of our most heroic endeavors. We are told in that great Book how the sinner received strength from touching the hem of the Master's garment. I mean no sacrilege when I tell you that your friendly handclasp does almost that much for me.

Last night I ran across a program of the Northeast Arkansas Medical Society for the meeting at Harrisburg, October 17, 1929. Prominent on the program were Dr. W. M. Majors, Dr. J. T. Altman, Dr. J. H. Lamb, Dr. Thad Cothern, Dr. C. W. Garrison, Dr. G. A. Warren, and others whose voices for honest and honorable medicine have been forever stilled and silenced, and then I wondered if we as physicians are showing the proper appreciation to men such as Dr. McCurry, Dr. Verser, Dr. Stroud, and others whose medical careers should serve as an inspiration to the younger physicians.

"If with pleasure you are viewing
Any mark someone is doing,
Tell him now!
Don't withhold your approbation
Until the preacher makes oration
And he lies with snowy lilies on his brow.

"For no matter how you shout it,
He will never know about it;
He'll not know how many teardrops you have shed.
So, if you think some praise is due him,
Now's the time to slip it to him,
For he cannot read his tombstone when he's dead."

Can't we express to our brother physicians both by word and deed our appreciation of him, beginning tonight?

While on the topic of friendships, the subject assigned to me tonight, will you permit me to give a description of a friend whom the commencement orator used the day I graduated from college, a description I often test in my mental classification of friends. May I dedicate this description to my friends, Drs. P. W. Lutterloh and Ira Ellis. I quote: "Oh, the joy, the unexplainable joy, of feeling safe with a person; having neither to weigh words nor measure thoughts—but pour them all right out—knowing that a faithful heart will take all, grain and chaff alike, keep those that are worth keeping and with the breath of love and friendship, blow the rest away."

When I think of the wonderful examples that my dear friends, Paul and Ernest Stroud, have before them constantly in the life and work of their father, I am reminded of another poem that I will read if Dr. Stroud will not think I am insinuating that he is getting old.

"THE BRIDGE BUILDER

"An old man going a lone highway
Came at evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm vast and deep and wide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim—
The sullen stream had no fear for him;
But he turned when safe on the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.

"'Old man,' said a pilgrim near,
'You are wasting your strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day;
You'll never again pass this way;
You've crossed the chasm deep and wide,
Why build you this bridge at eventide?'
"The builder lifted his old gray head:
'Good friend, in the path I've come,' he said,
'There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way.
This chasm that has been naught to me
To that fair youth may a pitfall be;
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim—
Good friend, I'm building this bridge for him.'"

Gentlemen, this society boasts of two physicians whose love for each other is a source of admiration and respect throughout the State. To watch these men struggle over a single penny in a game of chance or golf, knowing that they would give each other many thousands of dollars gladly, if the occasion demanded, it is true entertainment. May I get personal and quote a poem that fits them, Doctors McAdams and Willett of Jonesboro, Ark.:

"THE TWO PALS

"I called him John, he called me Jim,
Nigh 50 years that I knowed him
And he knowed me, and he was square
An' honest all that time, an' fair.
I'd pass him mornings goin' down
Th' road or drivin' into town,
An' we'd look up the same ol' way
An' wave a hand an' smile an' say:
'Hello, John.'
'Hirye, Jim?'
"I guess you don't real often see
Such kind of friends as him an' me;
Not much at talkin' big; but, say,
Th' kind of friends that stick an' stay.
Come rich, come poor, come rain, come shine,
Whatever he might have was mine and
Mine was his'n, an' we both knowed it
When we'd hollow on the road:
'Howdy, John.'
'Howdy, Jim.'
"An' when I got froze out one year,
He dropped in on me with that queer
Big smile an' layed two hundred dollars down,
An' says: 'No int'rest, understand,
Er note.' An' he took my hand
And squeezed it an' druv away,
'Cause there wusn't nothin' more to say.
'S'long, John.'
'S'long, Jim.'
"An' when John's boy come courtin' Sue,
John smiled an'—well, I smiled some, too,
As though things was a comin' out
As if we'd fixed 'em, just about.
And when Sue blushed an' tole me—why,
I sat and chuckled on the sly;
An' so did John—put out his hand—
No words but these, y' understand?
'Shake, John.'
'Shake, Jim.'
"An' when Sue's mother died, John come
An' set with me, an' he was dumb
As fur as speech might be concerned;
But in them eyes of his there burned
A light of love and sympathy
An' friendship you don't often see.
He took my hand in his that day
An' said—what else was there to say?—
'H'lo, John.'
'H'lo, Jim.'
"Somehow the world ain't the same
Today. Th' trees are all aflame
With autumn, but there's something gone—
Went out of life, I guess, with John.
He nodded that old grizzled head
On the pillow of his bed,
An' lifted up the helpin' hand
An' whispered: 'Sometime—understand?'
'Bye, John.'
'Bye, Jim.'"

I fear that I have taken too much time with our poems and will save the complimentary verses on the other members until a later date.

I wish to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, a story originally told by Dr. Russell H. Conwell, of Temple University, a story which he used as a central thought of a lecture, the proceeds derived from which he sent 1,265 boys through college; a story of a Persian farmer named Ali Hafed, who sold his farm, collected his money, left his family in charge of a neighbor, and went away in search of diamonds. He searched all throughout Persia, then he came around into Palestine, then wandered on into Europe, and at last when his money was all spent and he was in rags, wretchedness, and poverty, he stood on the shore of that bay at Barcelona in Spain, gazing out into space. When a great tidal wave came rolling in between the Pillars of Hercules, that poor, afflicted, suffering, dying man could not resist the awful temptation and he cast himself into that incoming tide and sank beneath its foaming crest, never to rise in this life again.

A few days later an old priest came in to visit Ali Hafed's successor and the moment that he opened the door he saw that flash of light upon the mantel and he rushed up to it and shouted: "Here is a diamond. I know positively that this is a diamond." Then together they rushed out into that old garden and stirred up the white sands with their fingers and lo, there came up more beautiful and valuable gems than the first. Thus, friends, was discovered the diamond mine of Golconda, the most magnificent diamond mine in all the history of mankind, excelling the Kimberly itself. My friends, there is a diamond mine in and around every physician's office in Craighead and Poinsett Counties, around every patient's home, in both counties, be it a mansion or be it a hovel, if you only choose to find them. With America trusting us physicians to keep the faith with our boys "over there" and "down under," can we afford to give anything but our best?

Now you ask me, "Why, Doctor, are you telling us this high-school-commencement story?" In just a moment I hope to make my point. Recently in going through the pages of a current magazine, I saw the pictures of five American marines in a Jap concentration camp in Shanghai. I am passing this picture around and ask each of you to study it for a few moments. The Japs originally published this picture in one of their propaganda sheets and an American diplomat who was repatriated managed to smuggle it home. These men are Americans and most of them are not 30 years old in spite of their prison-camp beards and mustaches. "Smile! Look happy"—one can almost hear the Jap photographer hissing the commands. And this was their reply—those faces you see staring back proudly, defiantly and a little contemptuously. Those faces could be duplicated by Drs. Reagan, Rush Barrett, Berry, Farris, Blanton, Paul Stroud, Jo Pierce, Joe Verser, and other physicians who belong to this medical society and who are now in our armed forces scattered all over the globe. Gentlemen, we must keep faith with those faces that I showed you. The best way we can keep faith is to look after these soldier boys' loved ones back home whether it be a humble home or a mansion in Cash, Jonesboro, Tyronza, or anywhere else.

A few nights ago, after a hard downpour, someone tapped at my front door shortly after I had retired after a busy day's work. Some ragged, wet, and ignorant old man wanted me to go and see his wife whom he described as "mighty poorly." I almost refused the poor and penniless old man. My weary bones and the warm bed cried loudly against the trip. The long trip, the bad roads, the wet, cold weather, each loomed up in my mind as obstacles too serious to tackle that night. But the pitiful tone of his voice,

"Doctor, she is mighty poorly," overcame the temporary surrender to ease and rest and I grudgingly went. After sometime I got to a hut that would have shamed almost an animal and rendered medical services to the best of my ability and before starting on the arduous return trip I struck up a conversation with the patient. I learned that this old lady who almost failed to get a physician to treat her for a case of pneumonia brought on by exposure had lost one son in action on the Solomons and another son was reported as missing following the fall of Corregidor and is probably in a Jap prison camp. Gentlemen, this old woman has never been presented with a bill for that night's services, nor will she be.

"He has not served who gathers gold,
Nor has he served whose life is told
In selfish battles he has won
Or deeds of skill that he has done.
But he has served who now and then
Has helped along his fellowmen."

Dodging the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 11, 1944:

DODGING THE ISSUE

While the action of the Government in restoring the Montgomery Ward plant to the management may, in a technical sense, have reduced the issue to a moot case, thus absolving Judge Holly from the necessity of rendering a decision, the public will hardly be in doubt as to the Government's unwillingness to submit the legality of its action to a court determination. In simple terms the Government has, for a second time in the Ward case, dodged the issue.

The fundamental issue raised in the Ward case had to do with the legal status of the War Labor Board, and a decision on that point the Government is apparently determined to avoid. Ward's previously challenged the legal right of the board to enforce certain orders, contending that the orders did not have the force of law. Ward's took the matter into court, but the War Labor Board, anticipating the current actics of Mr. Biddle, avoided a ruling on the legality of its orders and asked for a dismissal on the grounds that it was only functioning in an advisory capacity On this plea the case was dismissed without a decision. Another moot case. It was in the face of this admission that the President ordered the Army to take over the Ward plant.

In view of these two "duckings" on the part of the Government, no other conclusion can be reached than that the Government has not sufficient confidence in the legality of its acts to submit a determination of them to the courts. This is as unfortunate as it is undignified. Attorney General Biddle in his arguments before Judge Holly seeking a temporary injunction made several assertions, which to say the least are disturbing and which betray that the Government holds certain concepts of the law and the Constitution that are at least novel. His ideas of the vastness and vagueness of the Presidential powers under the Constitution must have astounded many persons versed in the law, and his broad intimation that the courts should not presume to pass on them, must have been somewhat shocking to those who have some knowledge of the theory of our Government.

His further contention that there is nothing in the labor disputes act which expressly forbade the President taking over the Ward plant is one that needs court approval. If the President may do anything that he is not expressly forbidden to do we are operating under a hitherto unsuspected principle of law and one of enough importance to have its constitutional validity quickly established.

Therefore, Mr. Avery's announcement that he will not sign the contract ordered by the War Labor Board is to be commended, as it may bring the issue into the courts in a manner that may make further "ducking" impractical. If the War Labor Board's orders have the force of law, let us know it. If the President has the legal right to take over from the management any business he may see fit, let us have it set down plainly in a court decision. If "no business or property is immune from Presidential order" and "particularly in time of war the court should not substitute its opinion for that of the Executive" as the Attorney General maintained, let us have it down in black and white so that there may be no future confusion about the matter, no further need for calling out troops, and the physica' eviction of citizens from their property.

Obviously the vote of the employees of Ward's has nothing to do with the major questions involved. No more has Avery's resistance to the closed shop. Whether the Government can exercise all the powers not expressly forbidden or whether it may only exercise those powers expressly given to it by the people, is a matter that transcends in importance any clause in a labor contract.

Termination of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following speech made by me to the Kiwanis Club of Birmingham, Ala., on April 18, 1944:

Our first job is to win the war. But following that the most important of all problems to be faced by a victorious America is the termination of war contracts and the disposal of surplus property. In many ways this task of reconverting private industry to a peacetime basis is going to be more difficult and more vexing that was the job of converting that industry to war. Disposal of surplus property is a subject calling for much thought, but today I propose to discuss the other phase—the termination of war contracts and the settlement of them.

This subject does not sound very glamorous. It certainly would never be selected as the subject of an oration nor used for the purpose of spellbinding an audience. It perhaps is not of particular interest to many of you. But the problem which it poses is one of great concern to all of us, for upon its solution may depend whether we are to have prosperity or deep depression after this war is over.

Today 60 percent of the Nation's productive capacity is engaged in making war goods. A great part of this has been converted from one type of production to another necessitating the change in varying degree of machines, tools, and equipment. Many plants do not have in them today a single machine that can be used by them in peacetime production. The machines they had in their plants have been scattered to all parts of the world. To get back into civilian production those plants will have to reequip themselves with machines and with tools. Not so long ago I had the privilege of going through the Packard Motor Car Co. plant in Detroit. Mr. Marks, vice president of that company, stated that there were 8,500 pieces of machinery in that one plant which are not useful in automobile production and that the displaced automobile manufacturing machines had been widely scattered. He stated that if the war contracts should be terminated evenly when the job is done without their being dragged out and terminated gradually and if permission should be given to remove at once those 8,500 machines and the unfinished work and materials, then his company could be back at the job of building cars in 6 months' time. The case of this company is probably an average typical case. At our best we are going to have a break in the continuity of production with its inevitable accompanying unemployment.

Not only are most private war plants cluttered up with machines and tools that do not belong to them and cannot be profitably used by them in peacetime production but all of them on that day when their contracts are terminated are going to be literally filled with work in process—in all stages of completion—and with materials. In nearly every instance the work in process will be absolutely without value to either the producer or the Government, and in most cases the materials will be without value to the producer because he is making for war a product entirely different from what he will make for peace. It is highly important that this unfinished work and these materials as well as the machines and tools be moved out of the plant as quickly as possible, for that plant can do no converting until it has its floor space and bins clear.

Another problem common to all war contractors and important in varying degrees to all alike is that of financing from the time the stop order is given until there has been a complete and final settlement. Our job is to see that every plant start readying itself for resumption of normal peacetime production at the earliest possible moment. Most companies cannot do this alone while money due from the Government is withheld pending final settlement. Particularly is this true with the smaller plants and the thousands of subcontractors who may have commitments of many times their capital worth.

The job of terminating contracts at the end of this year will be a tremendous one. We remember something about that following the last war. This one will be 10 or 12 times bigger than that. When the guns stopped firing November 11, 1918, the Government suspended approximately 27,000 prime contracts valued at nearly $5,000,000,000. Today the War Department alone—just one of several procurement agencies—has approximately 110,000 prime contracts for war production and well over 2,000,000 subcontracts. Most likely the value of the unfinished contracts of all war procurement agencies at the end of this war will be nearly $100,000,000,000.

The sudden stopping of the wheels of production in such magnitude is bound to be a terrible shock to our economic structure. We must do everything we can to lighten and to cushion that shock. The essentials for doing this were recently stated by Col. D. N. Hauseman, formerly stationed here, an officer whom many of you know and who is now serving as director of the division in the War Department to terminate and settle war con-

tracts. He named three general principles to be kept in mind. I quote:

"1. We believe that contractors' claims must be settled quickly with equal justice to the contractor, the Government and the public. Speed is of the essence here. Otherwise, we invite unemployment, frozen business, and inflation.

"2. In order to give industry a hard and fast title to the reimbursement paid it by the Government, the settlements must be final, and not subject to reopening except, of course, for fraud.

"3. Adequate means are necessary for financing the contractor by partial or advance payments or loans, over the rough period between termination and final settlement."

Fortunately this tremendous task is not to be thrust upon us all at once without a previous opportunity to try our hand. Because of the fluidity of the war and the necessity for changing weapons and fighting equipment many contracts are being terminated as we go along and new ones being substituted. Up to March 1 of this year the War Department alone had terminated or cut back 19,500 prime contracts. Of these 14,000 having an unfinished value of $3,900,000,000 have been settled. The amount spent in settlement was $85,000,000.

Contractors are presenting claims for settlement amounting to approximately $20,000,000 a month. In February of this year the War Department paid off claims amounting to $22,000,000, which indicates that it is catching up on the backlog of its claims. So far it has been settling cases and paying off claims at about 75 percent of the amount asked. It is felt that the 25-percent difference is due in some degree to the fact that contractors are not yet sufficiently familiar with the proper methods of preparing and presenting their claims.

The rate of settlement is also interesting inasmuch as the War Department has reduced the average time for settling claims of $10,000 or over from 8 months last fall to 6½ months this spring.

As to the War Department, it wishes to impress on the contractors that a great deal of delay is due to the fact that War contractors do not sumbit their claims speedily, in proper form and often not at all. For example, it already has on its books over 200 terminated contracts 6 months old or older which, of course, the Government can do nothing about settling because the contractors in these 200 cases have submitted no claims at all.

It was my privilege a few months ago to go as chairman of a group from the House Committee on Military Affairs to Chicago and spend 2 days in watching the War Department at work in the actual termination of contracts. We were all impressed with the thoroughness and fairness with which the job was being done. To us the need for negotiation, if there is to be speed, became apparent. It is a process of give and take and open discussion across the conference table.

One thing, I believe, that most people do not understand is that the negotiations are not conducted by a single individual. On the contrary, they are handled by an organization under a commanding officer usually of high rank and long experience. There is a staff of specialists, the number dependent upon the size and complexity of the contract that is being terminated. There are negotiators, accountants, engineers, legal, fiscal, and technical personnel, all of whom participate in the negotiations and are consulted when their assistance may be helpful.

The negotiations are conducted in accordance with comprehensive procedures established by whatever procurement agency has jurisdiction over that particular contract. My observation has been principally of War Department contracts and, therefore, I shall confine my remarks to such contracts. The War Department establishes the necessary procedures to insure that the Government's interests are fully protected and that the contractors' settlement proposals are adequately investigated and analyzed. In his testimony before our committee Under Secretary of War Patterson outlined the procedure as follows:

"The contractor is first required to submit a detailed inventory of work in process and materials and a sworn proposal for settlement of the amount due therefor, supported by adequate cost schedules. The inventories of property are studied by competent Government engineering, salvage, and other technical personnel. Then the property is either disposed of or retained by the contractor on terms approved by the Government, or it is transferred to the Government. The proceeds of any sale are credited or paid to the Government. The cost records of the contractor and his proposal for settlement are checked in substantially all cases by Government accounting personnel. This check ranges from an office review to a detailed audit, depending on the circumstances of each case. In practice the scope of the accounting and audit to be done in each case is determined by trained accounting personnel. To economize in the use of personnel and because of the necessity for speed, the principles of selective accounting analysis (or spot check) are employed wherever possible; the primary object is to test the reliability, general fairness, and reasonableness of the contractor's figures. In cases of apparent fraud or attempts to overreach the Government, intensive audit procedures are employed. In the check by the Government full use is required to be made of any information about the contractor's accounting methods and business, obtained in statutory renegotiation proceedings and in the Government's files.

"By these methods, the negotiators for the Government have available reliable accounting data and other information on which to reach a fair settlement with the contractor. The settlements eventually reached thus reflect the deliberations and advice of many different Government representatives, each a specialist in some particular field. In addition, the conduct of the negotiations and the final agreement are under the supervision of special agencies created for this purpose. These include a fiscal representative, under a duty to report to the commanding officer whenever, in his opinion, settlements are being improperly handled or considered. For each termination settlement appropriate records are kept of all important steps in the negotiations and all important actions by the contracting officer in order to indicate the essential date on which the negotiations were based.

"These various measures are carefully designed to provide all necessary protection for the interests of the Government."

In the summer of 1943 the War Department proposed that our committee take action on legislation regarding the termination of contracts. We had rather lengthy hearings and finally reported out a bill, H. R. 3022. A few days before we took final action on this bill the Baruch-Hancock report was issued covering not only termination of contracts but all phases of demobilization. We felt, however, that the termination of contracts was the most urgent and that it would be best to limit legislative action at this time to that one place.

H. R. 3022 follows in general the Baruch-Hancock report, so far as the termination of contracts is concerned, with one important exception. Whereas the Baruch-Hancock report recommended that these contracts be settled by the various procurement agencies without the intervention of the General Accounting Office for a preaudit, the majority of the members present at the committee meeting when the bill was reported felt that the Comptroller General should be given power over such settlements. Several of us felt otherwise. We filed a report setting forth our supplementary views agreeing as to the need for legislation but disagreeing as to the Comptroller General's part in the settlements. Thirteen members, exactly one-half of our committee, signed this disagreement—six Democrats and seven Republicans. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has advised me that he plans to ask for a rule within the next few days. At his request before I left Washington, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee joining in the request for the rule in order that the matter might be freely debated on the floor of the House. It is our purpose, as we stated in our disagreeing views, to offer amendments on the floor of the House to exclude the Comptroller General from the controlling position in which the bill as reported places him.

Of course, the first inclination of everyone is to have a close audit of various Government transactions by some independent agency. The General Accounting Office was established by Congress for that purpose. However, it has long been understood that the Comptroller General has no control over the termination of contracts in the absence of fraud, except to see that the payments finally made are in accordance with the settlement agreed upon. The action of the committee in giving him veto power is vesting in him additional powers. Our amendment would take nothing away from him but simply prevent these additional powers from being given to him.

We feel that there are several objections to the movement to give the Comptroller General veto power. First, it is inconsistent with the type of settlements that we contend must be made, that is, negotiated settlements. Again, I quote Under Secretary of War Patterson in his statement before us regarding this:

"The principles which we believe must be adopted if the first great objective is to be attained are as follows:

"1. Termination adjustments must be effected by negotiated agreements.

"2. The negotiations must be final and not subject to reopening by any independent agency, except for fraud.

"3. The negotiations must be conducted by the procurement agencies. * * *

"Inevitably the amount fairly payable cannot be determined by mere addition or mathematics. There is no way to arrive automatically at a dollar figure solely by mechanical auditing or accounting procedures. Each of the many decisions regarding the determination and allocation of the various elements of cost under a particular contract involves the exercise of sound business judgment. Consequently these questions are subject to honest differences of opinion even between qualified experts. That is why these termination settlements can be handled in a satisfactory and prompt manner only by negotiation. It is the method which businessmen use to settle such questions of judgment under similar circumstances.

"Negotiation does not mean that settlements are made without proper information. On the contrary, this procedure still requires adequate data regarding the costs of the contractor in order to provide a sound basis for negotiation. But the amount of information needed and its detail and precision are of the sort which a businessman would require to satisfy himself that he had reached a fair settlement. In other words, the advantage of negotiation is that it permits these matters of judgment to be decided on the same practical basis on which commercial business is ordinarily conducted."

The second contention is that whereas time is of the essence in the settlement of these contracts, the Comptroller General's method would delay them for such a time as might prove disastrous to the national economy in

stagnating production of peacetime goods and the employment of millions of returning servicemen and present war workers.

Even though our World War No. 1 experience was on a much smaller scale, yet many people can remember those settlements with much anguish when contemplating the present magnitude of war contracts.

Personally, I have always felt that people are inherently honest. Many tell us that we must include the General Accounting Office in order to prevent the Government's being defrauded of millions of dollars. I believe that most of the war contractors want to act honestly toward the Government and certainly that those in charge of negotiating these settlements, with their whole reputation a stake as well as their interest in the Government, will do their best to see that both the contractor and the Government are treated fairly. The General Accounting Office can certainly have no monopoly on honesty and integrity.

Furthermore, it was freely admitted before our committee that the General Accounting Office did not have a sufficient staff with which to do the job and that they would have to scour the land in search of accountants. They readily admitted that they would count on taking all of the workers that the War Department and other procurement agencies now have engaged in different activities and use them. I fail to see the force of the argument that the same people working for the War Department or some other procurement agency would be dishonest but would become honest and people of integrity immediately upon being switched to the General Accounting Office.

The property has to be sold in contract terminations. Buyers will not buy unless they can know the price with finality. If the price is subject to change 6 months later by a review board, prospective buyers will go elsewhere. Many contractors who finish their war production will have to reconvert their plants to reenter the peacetime market. They cannot and will not do this until they know finally where they stand, and how much of the money paid to them is theirs and how much the Government's. The bill in its present form does not make it clear how far prime contractors are to go in settling with their subcontractors. If this is to be done at all, a prime contractor may be able to get quick, final approval of a proposed subcontract settlement; otherwise he will let his subcontractors wait for their money until the board finishes with his case. Finality is just as important to contract termination as speed; and the system proposed by H. R. 3022 at present utterly fails to provide for it.

What I have said so far as to contract terminations relate particularly to those contracts that are to be terminated when the war ends. We must not forget that terminations are occurring now every day. It is at the present time a necessary part of war production.

It may not be generally realized how intimately contract termination is related to the continuing procurement of other needed war supplies. At the present time, when we are still facing the major battles of this war, the War Department has already terminated a larger face value of contracts than it canceled at the end of the last war. This has happened during a period when our production schedules are still rising, and is due to the fact that the shifting needs of war changed the character and quantities of supplies that have been needed. Canceled contracts were promptly replaced by others for different materials; and this process will doubtless continue until the war is over. The time and method of terminating such contracts, the speed of payment, and the interim financing to be given to the contractor, are all therefore closely bound up with his ability to continue in war production. To divide authority in this field between the General Accounting Office and the armed services who are responsible for war procurement is unwise and dangerous.

When peacetime comes, the need for a system which will operate quickly and smoothly is no less great if we are to avoid a major depression. At that time, the personnel of the procuring agencies will alone have the necessary experience and organization to do the job promptly and efficiently; and divided authority would be just as harmful then as during the war.

We have entrusted to the procuring agencies complete responsibility for the placement of contracts for war supplies. United States munition production has recently been running at a rate between five and six billion dollars per month. Expenditures for completed munitions of war will exceed by many times the amounts which will be involved in termination settlements. The termination of a procurement contract involves essentially the making of a new contract calling for a smaller quantity of the product and a lesser expenditure of money than the original agreement. Those whom we have trusted to do the larger job can certainly be trusted also with the smaller one.

The Mothers of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Mother's Day observance of Hose Co. No. 4, Harrisonburg Fire Department, Harrisonburg, Va., May 14, 1944:

In the midst of the most destructive war of history, we are gathered today in Harrisonburg to pay tribute and do honor to the mothers of men who, loving most, suffer most in time of war. While World War No. 2 was forced upon us by the ruthless dictators of Germany and Japan, we are fighting more than a defensive war. We are a part of a world revolution in which the democracies of the world are fighting not only for the temporary but for the permanent survival of the principles of personal liberty and self-government. If, from this struggle, a new world order dedicated to the principles of the Prince of Peace does not emerge, our sacrifices will have been in vain.

"I have lived, sir, a long time," said the venerable Franklin at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, "and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?" In this hour of our Nation's peril the sacred fortress of prayer which rises, with unerring faith, from the hearts of the mothers of our land is our strongest bulwark. Who can prevail against a protective love so deep, so true that sacrifice and service are the breath of of its existence? What evil force can conquer a nation whose devoted mothers, from coast to coast, are banded together in one mighty army before the throne of Grace? Undaunted they stand, believing in the power of that Grace to save the sons and daughters they love and to grasp and preserve for them the glory of a world made finer and more beautiful by the tremendous price they have paid. Words are no antidote for the sorrow of those whose sons have made the supreme sacrifice. But may it be some consolation to them to know that of their boys we will say, as Pericles did of the young men of Athens:

"So they gave their bodies to the Commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by, for the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men, and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

And when I repeat those words "woven into the stuff of other men's lives," I mean that through the travail of this war there will be firmly embedded in the minds and hearts of the American people the will for peace. Before victory is ours on the battlefield, it is unnecessary—indeed, it is undesirable—for us to attempt to blueprint our peace terms or our plans for a post-war world dedicated to a just and lasting peace. What is the meaning of democracy? What is the cost of war? What is the value of peace? "Whither wilt thou go?" For the determination of these fundamental issues there is no better time. Our Chinese Allies have a proverb which says, "A journey of a thousand miles is commenced with one step." Centuries have passed since the Lord said to Cain, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" Centuries have passed since the lowly Man of Galilee said, "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Centuries have passed since the Roman Emperor Justinian gave to the civilized world a code of laws by which personal and property rights of the individual could be determined by a legally constituted tribunal, and not by the whim of some despot.

Centuries have passed since St. Paul claimed the highest privilege of a Roman citizen when he said to Festus, "I appeal unto Caesar." Progress made by the human race through those centuries toward a higher code of ethics and toward a better world has indeed been slow, and yet the fact that progress has been made cannot be denied. I welcome this opportunity to repudiate the false philosophy that, because the past has been characterized by recurring war among nations, it is useless to plan for a permanent peace. Now is the time for us and for every peace-loving nation in the world to commence the journey to that goal. Now is the time for the democratic nations of the world to plan not the terms of the next peace, not a hard peace or a soft peace, but an encirclement of the Axis Powers with an Allied cooperation for peace. Had General Patton recently said that it is the destiny of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia to unite in the post-war era for a permanent peace, instead of uniting to rule the world, he would have been praised and not condemned. It is not our destiny to rule any other nation nor any other part of the world. We are fighting for the privilege of ruling ourselves and of extending that privilege to all other nations. However, it is our destiny, it is our solemn duty and obligation, by precept and example, to lead the way to a peace that is just and a peace that is lasting. Another global war and civilization as we know it will perish from the earth. A selfish and materialistic spirit that whispered that we could live alone and die unto ourselves betrayed the veterans of World War No. 1. If we are to have a Christian civilization, in which the orderly and duly constituted processes of law are to be substituted for brute force, we and our democratic allies must have a Christian conception of justice.

"It must include," as Woodrow Wilson said in The Road Away From Revolution, "sympathy and helpfulness and a willingness to forego self-interest in order to promote the welfare, happiness, and contentment of others and of the community as a whole. This is what our age is blindly feeling after in its reaction against what it deems the too great selfishness of the capitalistic system."

Through the centuries brutal and selfish men have echoed the cynical answer of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" In this world conflict, on the battlefield and under the flying hoofs of the Four Horsemen, more than 20,000,000 men, women, and children have already perished, and our invasion of fortress Europe has not yet commenced. When the war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled in the parliament of man, the federation of the world, may the mothers of men be permitted on behalf of the nations of the world to give to the framers of the new peace their answer to Cain's question, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Preventing Manufacturers From Being in the Retail Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, unless something is done to prevent it, a few large concerns will own practically all of the retail business within the next few years. I have a bill, H. R. 148, which is for the purpose of preventing the manufacturer from being in the retail business and vice versa. One of the principal means of monopoly is through the ownership of the different integrated units in distribution by one or a few concerns.

The following letter and statement to customers are self-explanatory:

VAN'S MARKETS,
Los Angeles, January 18, 1943.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Attached is a copy of a letter received by us from a manufacturer. I have also forwarded a copy to James Francis Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, setting forth my opinion that were chain stores permitted to continue taking over the manufacture of commodities it would thereby take away the source of supply for independent merchants. Also the effect it would have today in driving the independents out of business, inasmuch as the source of supply is limited under the present conditions of war.

I have heard of your bill H. R. 148, and I believe this letter is a good specimen of support for your bill.

Yours very truly,

E. WEINSTEIN,
Manager, Van's Markets.

JELL-WELL DESSERT CO., LTD.,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 15, 1943.

To the Customers of the Jell-well Dessert Co., Ltd.:

After nearly 25 years as active head of the Jell-well Dessert Co., Ltd., and its predecessor corporations, during all of which period I have been its largest stockholder, it is with sincere regret that I am announcing my retirement from that business in order to devote my time and efforts to other pursuits that will permit me more leisure.

Although I am not going to bother you with a recitation of my personal reasons for this move, I might say here that my health and capacity to meet present problems have not been up to par since a heart attack nearly 3 years ago.

In arriving at this decision, I also took advantage of an opportunity to dispose of my entire financial interest as sole stockholder of the Jell-well Dessert Co., Ltd., and I want to let you know that I have sold all my stock in this company to the Safeway Stores, Inc.

As a result of this acquisition by the Safeway Stores, further sales to the outside trade will not be solicited; but Safeway has assured me that every effort will be made to see that unfilled orders received by us up to this time are delivered.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank you all for the support you have given our product, especially those who have been on our list of customers and friends since the "red package" first appeared.

Sincerely yours,

A. H. LOEFFLER.

Rule by Whim and Wham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Iron Age, of May 11, 1944:

RULE BY WHIM AND WHAM

"No business in this country is immune from seizure," says Attorney General Biddle, defending the New Deal's taking over of Montgomery Ward. Also, adds this eminent administration law twister: "Our courts should bow to the will of the President." The latter statement seems somewhat gratuitous considering the judicial hand-picking and hand-packing that have taken place in the last 10 years.

Mr. Biddle is hired to interpret the law and he certainly does a job that should please the boss. Whether or not it suits the little fellows who wear the barrels and who pay his salary through taxes is another question that will be determined, indirectly, on election day.

When Sewell Avery was carried out of his office by steel-helmeted storm troopers, something much more important went out of the door with them. Out of that door at the same time went the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States, and through it, replacing them, stalked dictatorship. Dictatorship wearing the disguise of an attempt to protect and forward the war effort but actually a scurrilous and obsequious move to curry favor with and gain votes from a labor union which apparently has long had its headquarters in the White House.

There was no question in this case of damage to war production, for Montgomery Ward are distributors and, except for size, exactly like the general stores that you find throughout this country. And this company was continuing to do its normal business of distribution despite the fact that the New Deal, following its accepted practice of pressure, had applied the thumb screws of restricted postal service. The company merely insisted upon the American right of knowing with whom it was to do business before it signed a contract.

If Master Biddle's opinion becomes crystallized into precedent then these United States of ours are no longer governed by law and order but are to be ruled by whim and wham. And every proprietor or manager of any enterprise whatever, from the largest corporation to the smallest store or farm, will have good reason to listen for and to dread the approaching footsteps of a new and un-American Gestapo with the power to accuse, to try, to condemn, and to execute.

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago, Americans at the historic Boston Tea Party rejected the dogma that "the king can do no wrong." They thought and we did too that they had scotched this snake, but serpents have a way of coming to life again and this one is now showing its fangs once more.

Our forefathers then had no Congress to represent and protect them. We have, and it is about all of the protection that remains for liberty in this country. It is now time for Congress to act for the safety of our people and the safeguarding of the liberty for which our sons and brothers are dying.

J. H. VANDEVENTER.

Justice Is Blind and Sometimes Dumb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the courts move in mysterious ways their wonders to perform. We have all heard of the cow that gave a pail of rich sweet milk and then kicked the pail over and spilled all the milk. It was a queer quirk of the law and the laws enforcement that destroyed 2,700 jars of perfectly good peanut butter, because after shipping them across the continent their contents was a fraction of an ounce underweight. Destroyed at time of food shortage when most of us are going without real butter at a time when the august Senate restaurant has replaced real butter with tiny portions of peanut butter.

We know what is done with contraband liquor by the courts—sometimes. But to burn up perfectly good peanut butter by court order in wartime! What could our boys do with these jars of goodies among the starving population of Europe? No wonder the Lions Club of Idaho Falls is indignant as expressed in the following resolution:

Whereas on April 22, 1944, at Idaho Falls, Idaho, the Federal Government destroyed by fire a large quantity of peanut butter, approximately 2,700 bottles, on the grounds of being slightly underweight; and

Whereas the said peanut butter was nutritious and palatable, high in protein and fat values; and

Whereas this butter could have been used in these days of scarcity to feed starving allies, undernourished children, and the poor and needy through benevolent agencies near at hand; and

Whereas the said Government is working on food rationing, equal distribution of foods,

conservation of foods, fats, and all things necessary in a united war effort; and

Whereas the times forbid such wanton and unwarranted acts on the part of our Federal agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Idaho Falls Lions Club, That it condemns such wanton and unwarranted destruction of such valuable foods, as aforesaid, and condemns the destruction of any useful commodities that can be used for human sustenance, or that can help in any way the termination of this deadly war; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this club; that a copy be mailed to each of the Idaho Congressmen; that a copy be mailed to District Attorney J. A. Carver, and a copy to Judge Chase A. Clark, Federal officials of Idaho.

Done and passed at Idaho Falls, Idaho, this 27th day of April 1944.

IDAHO FALLS LIONS CLUB,
By J. T. EVANS,
A. A. MERRIEL,
Committee on Resolutions.

Great Britain Endorses Four Freedoms of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, international aviation in the post-war world has been the subject of keen interest and discussion in all Allied Nations during recent months. Lord Beaverbrook, who has been designated by Prime Minister Churchill to form a post-war aviation program for the British Empire, addressed the House of Lords on this subject on May 10. I believe his remarks to be most interesting and informative and I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the following excerpts from the Associated Press account of this speech which appeared in the New York Times of May 11, 1944:

Great Britain "reluctantly" has abandoned a Canada-backed post-war plan for central international control of civil aviation and has turned toward the American-sponsored idea of a "four freedoms of the air," Lord Beaverbrook announced in the House of Lords today.

* * * Britain had at first favored the Canadian plan, with its system of allocated quotas, but had turned to the American plan following United States opposition to the Canadian proposal.

The American plan * * * was based more along the lines of the four freedoms of the air—the right to fly, to land, to set down passengers, mail and cargo, and to pick them up anywhere in the world. * * *

This program (Canadian), Lord Beaverbrook continued, was considered by the Americans as too rigid as a basis for talks at the proposed international conference.

This conference will be held later this year, probably at Washington.

The broad purpose, Lord Beaverbrook explained, will be to draw up an international convention on air navigation to be supplemented by an international transport organization which would evolve standards, seek to eliminate uneconomic competition, work out for each nation a network of participation in world transport, and maintain a broad equilibrium between air transport capacity and transport offerings.

* * * Nothing that President Roosevelt had proposed for the future the right of innocent passage for all nations and the right to land anywhere, Lord Beaverbrook said he was authorized by Mr. Churchill to say: "We are joined with Mr. Roosevelt to the fullest extent in subscribing to these principles."

Lord Beaverbrook declared that the United States was prepared to make long-range aircraft available to Great Britain on a nondiscriminatory basis for civil aviation during the post-war period of adjustment of British plane production.

George Washington, Our First President, Realized Situation That Might Require a President To Serve Longer Than Two Terms or Even Longer than Three Terms in Great Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about our first President saying that no person should serve longer than two terms or by his actions indicating that a President should not serve longer than two terms. Let us refer to his own serious and thoughtful words written in a letter to Lafayette on April 28, 1788:

As for instance on the ineligibility of the same person for President, after he should have served a certain course of years, I confess I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you as to the necessity or expedience of rotation in that appointment. There cannot, in my opinion, be the least danger that the President will, by any intrigue, ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it. Under an extended view of part of this subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the service of any man, who, in some great emergency, shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public.

This was the final judgment of the Father of his Country. This was the judgment that prevailed among the fathers when they established our Constitution. Purposely they did not place in that Constitution any restriction on the number of times a man might serve his country in the office of President. It is as if they foresaw just such an emergency that the Nation faces today—a crisis that calls for the man who has guided us through one great era of peril and now, with calm wisdom and a knowledge of international affairs not matched by any other leader in the world, is safely guiding us through another.

Plan for a Netherlands Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter which I wrote to a constituent on the plan for a Netherlands Commonwealth:

MAY 15, 1944.

MRS. HELEN WILSHIRE,
Greenwich, Conn.

DEAR MRS. WILSHIRE: I am delighted to answer to the best of my knowledge the questions which you raised on May 10 on the plan for a Netherlands Commonwealth.

You ask first if I believe the Dutch are "on the level" with this plan, which was described in the clipping you enclosed from the New York Times. I sincerely believe that they are. However, I think the best way to answer your question is to review briefly the history and progress of the Netherlands Commonwealth plan.

Among the empires of Europe the Netherlands has always led in the progressive and generous treatment of colonial peoples. Its record in this respect has not been without scars and blemishes, but the Dutch have in recent years tried hard and, to a great degree, succeeded in a program of thoughtful, enlightened, and benevolent imperialism.

They have introduced in their territories in the South Pacific modern ideas of sanitation and health and they have given the native peoples a chance for at least limited civic, conomic, and educational advancement. Moreover, they have at all times studied and tried to understand the people they sought to rule.

Plainly, the next step in such a progressive attitude toward overseas territories is the granting of freedom or at least some form of autonomy to the inhabitants of these lands.

This step the Dutch have been considering for some time now, in fact, even before the invasion of the Netherlands East Indies. On December 6, 1942, the first anniversary of the Netherlands' declaration of war on Japan, Queen Wilhelmina said in a broadcast from London:

"I am convinced, and history as well as reports from the occupied territories confirm me in this, that after the war it will be possible to reconstruct the Kingdom on the solid foundation of complete partnership, which will mean the consummation of all that has been developed in the past. I know that no political unity nor national cohesion can continue to exist which are not supported by the voluntary acceptance and the faith of the great majority of the citizenry.

"I visualize, wihout anticipating the recommendation of the future conference (of representatives of all parts of the Netherlands Kingdom), that they will be directed toward a commonwealth in which the Netherlands, Indonesia, Surinam, and Curacao will participate, with complete self-reliance and freedom of conduct for each part regarding its internal affairs, but with the readiness to render mutual assistance."

As the clipping which you sent to me showed, the latest development in this plan for a Netherlands Commonwealth took place recently in Curacao, one of Holland's Caribbean possessions, when the Governor, Dr. Piet Kasteel, introduced in the legislature a plan to decentralize the governments of the six islands of the Netherlands West Indies group. Under this plan, each island

is to have its own insular administration, headed by a lieutenant governor and operating on a democratic basis.

Presumably, when war conditions permit, Surinam, the Netherlands colony on the mainland of South America, and the Netherlands East Indies, now almost entirely occupied by the Japanese, will start considering their part in the Commonwealth structure.

Now the point of all this is that little Holland is almost wholly dependent economically on its vast overseas empire, which is fabulously rich in bauxite, tin, oil, rubber, and quinine. The overseas empire of the Netherlands, it must be remember, is 65 times larger in area than the mother country and has eight times as many inhabitants. Yet the Netherlands Government in exile dares now, when there is so much talk of freedom for men of all colors and races, to grant autonomy to the brown people of Indonesia and the black and red and white people of the West Indies and Surinam. Only an empire supremely confident of the good will of its overseas subjects and earnestly concerned with its democratic responsibilities would attempt such a radical departure from the traditional policies of imperialism.

If the Netherlands carries through its announced policy, and there is every indication that it will, if the East and West Indies are granted autonomy in fact as well as in name, we may well be entering a new era of advanced thinking toward colonial peoples. The white man may at last be willing to law down his burden—which always consisted chiefly of loot from the natives and their territory—and extend to the people of Asia and other colonial regions a helping hand.

The people of the entire world, especially those who have long realized that freedom is not peculiarly the prerogative of the white race, will watch this venture of the Dutch with the greatest interest and the highest hope.

Americans would do well to remember, too, that on St. Eustatius in the Netherlands West Indies on November 16, 1776, the American flag was first saluted by a foreign power. The Dutch in 1776 honored our struggle for freedom and expressed confidence in the outcome. Now the Dutch are engaged with us in a war for freedom and may well also be working out a plan of colonial government which will be as inspiring to the world in this generation as our own Constitution was to the thinking of men on the national level in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This is an opportunity for us, after 177 years, to return that salute.

Sincerely,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

MOTHER

No matter where my steps may roam,
To this place or the other,
I think sweet thoughts of home, sweet home,
And my dear, darling mother,
Whose tender, soft, consoling voice
Once made my infant heart rejoice.

Each sunken furrow in her face,
That's daily deeper growing,
Was plowed to fit her for that place
To which she's some day going—
My evil ways helped guide the plow
That cut the furrows in her brow.

Her fading eye with age now dim
Is still a gem of beauty,
Her broken voice, a hallowed hymn
Of love and hope and duty,
Whose tender sweetness, soft and clear,
Is music always to my ear.

Her hand, one time so smooth and white,
Is now engloved in wrinkles,
Her hair, once dark, is growing light
With age's silver sprinkles—
Yes, many a shining, silver thread
Now beautifies her sacred head.

She taught me in my tender youth
To know and do my duty—
To live for peace and right and truth,
That life might beam with beauty—
If I had lived like mother taught,
My life would be more as it ought.

May her declining days be sweet—
Be free from anxious sorrow—
The rest she craves can't be complete
Till she, some sweet tomorrow,
Shall lay her weary body down,
To sleep till called to wear her crown.

O God, select, Thyself, the spot
Where soon must lie my mother,
And plant Thou one forget-me-not,
And let me plant another—
And let them, till the Judgment, be
A covenant 'twixt Thee and me.

M-an knows, though he has many a friend,
O-f this sort or the other,
T-here's one on whom he can depend—
H-is best friend is his mother—
E-'n when all others prove untrue,
R-eligiously, she sees him through.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Federal Aid for Readjustment in Civilian Life of Veterans of World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, we have now had 2 days of discussion on the bill, (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, and I do not believe I have ever seen more interest shown by the Members of this body on any former legislation. This shows that every Representative is extremely interested in our fighting men and all those boys and girls who are sacrificing their all for the freedoms and liberties we have always enjoyed in this Nation of ours. It was my good fortune to be able to see the picture shown by the courtesy of the House Military Affairs Committee, the Battle for New Britain. This brought right home to me what agonies our soldiers are going through. No one had a soft job or a "gold brick" in that encounter and that portrayed just one of hundreds of similar campaigns on the many war fronts.

Therefore, I want to congratulate the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation at this time for presenting us with a bill that seems to cover the problems that will face our returning soldiers about as near being perfect as is humanly possible. The committee gave every phase of this bill long and arduous study, and when the bill is finally adopted, with certain amendments offered and considered, I firmly believe it will be the best veterans' legislation passed by any former Congress or any other nation in the war. I am in full accord with each phase of the bill which covers the following provisions dealing with the veterans' civilian life after the war:

Title I: Hospitalization, claims and procedures.

Title II: Education of veterans.

Title III: Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property.

Title IV: Employment of veterans.

Title V: Readjustment allowances for former members of the armed forces who are unemployed.

Title VI: General administrative and penal provisions.

From the above I think all will agree that the needs of our returning veterans are amply covered. This bill is so written that the Veterans' Administration works in conjunction with the States on education, giving as little control as possible to our Government in Washington and as much control as possible to the States for the efficient effective administration of the law.

The enactment of this legislation should, first of all, take care of those disabled veterans, who well deserve the best attention possible and next deals with those able to go on from where they left off, prior to entering the service, properly rehabilitated, so America may live and our Constitution be preserved.

British Air Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following interesting and timely news story which appeared in the New York Times of May 12 on the subject of Britain's air policy and the use of the Western Hemisphere air bases in the post-war era.

BEAVERBROOK SEES AIR-BASE CONTROL—SAYS UNITED STATES GOT LEASES ONLY FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

LONDON, May 11.—Western Hemisphere bases, leased by Britain to the United States in exchange for 50 American destroyers, were leased only for military purposes and may not be used for civil aviation without British consent, Lord Beaverbrook told the House of Lords today.

Lord Beaverbrook, in the second day of debate on civil aviation, assured the peers that Britain would receive fair treatment

from the United States because Adolf Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, who recently discussed the subject with British authorities, "is a man we can trust and depend on with assurance he is going to give us a square deal."

Lord Winster asked if Britain should pay for the transport planes that Lord Beaverbrook said yesterday America would furnish Britain after the war until British production was resumed.

"I don't know," Lord Beaverbrook replied. "The Americans are treating us very well. We should be well treated."

Referring to post-war air basis, Lord Beaverbrook said that if Britain "is successful" at the planned international air conference an international authority would control use of the bases leased to the United States for military purposes.

The question of air and ocean traffic to South America was interwoven in the debate regarding the choice of the British Overseas Airways Corporation as the Government's "chosen instrument." Lord Winster said a group of five British shipping companies was "only awaiting the word to go" on an air line to South America, and he asked the Government's intentions.

Lord Beaverbrook replied that it was time for the shipping companies and railroads to come to the Government with their proposals "instead of asking the Government what is to be done about the Overseas Airways Corporation."

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, May 11.—The United States has accepted as a basis for negotiation the subcommittee report on international control of civil aviation that resulted from the British Commonwealth conversations, it was revealed today. Lord Beaverbrook, writing to Hon. C. D. Home, Canadian Minister of Munitions, made this statement in a letter of April 26. They were agreed on the principle of colonial cabotage (coastal traffic); that is, a nation had rights of cabotage on all air lines and within its colonies and dependencies, the letter said.

Declaration of Citizens of Wichita, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD a declaration of a group of responsible citizens of Wichita, Kans., who are organized under the title of the "Town Hall Committee." Their declaration speaks for itself.

Whereas a state of extreme crisis is recognized to exist in the affairs of this Nation; and

Whereas this Nation was founded upon the principles of liberty, equality, and justice among all men; and

Whereas, through the experience of more than a century and a half, we have found these principles to be good, to wit:

We are now engaged in fighting a war for the survival of freemen on this earth, the importance of which cannot be too greatly emphasized by any man. Our efforts and the lives of those given in our behalf would, indeed, have been futilely spent if we were to win the military victory, yet lose the purpose of our fight.

Liberty (or freedom) is all things to all men who would neither deny it to nor restrain it from others. Its source is God, not governments or other men—a thing of the spirit, the mind, and the heart. All history has proven that its possession is retained only by those who would have the courage and faith to use and defend it at all times against all enemies.

The real strength of this Nation from the days of its birth and through all its history has had its source in one simple thing—the liberty of its people. Knowing that our great strength is the liberty of our people, we cannot now afford its loss, lest both we and liberty perish.

The only true and imperishable unity of our people lies in their common devotion to individual freedom. Today, as never before, this unity is needed, that we as a people shall live again in safety and happiness.

The proof of what freemen can accomplish in competition with all others in all fields of human endeavor needs no recounting. Our Nation, but ours alone, is the shining example through the ages.

For the past several years the people and their various governmental agents have been experimenting with our Government in attempts to alter both its form and substance, thereby creating and spreading confusion, unrest, and disunity throughout the land. This procedure should now be ended. We should now return to the basic laws and precepts of our Constitution. So many of us, so many times during recent years, have avowed our devotion to democracy, forgetting that our Nation is a republic—forgetting that no majority (nor minority) rules us, but rather that law governs us—that this law—the Constitution—must continue to govern us if we are to retain the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

If we would be true to our God and country, our methods—both in peace and in war—must be those of free people. We shall need to practice freedom while we fight for it, so that in the end, when peace comes, we shall not have forgotten.

Therefore, in the exercise of those natural rights of freemen, retained by the people of the United States as set forth in our Constitution, we, the undersigned citizens of Wichita, State of Kansas, and of the United States, alarmed by the continuous increase through recent years of powers exercised by the Federal Government over and upon the citizens of the United States, these same to such an extent as to make evident a design on the part of this Government to effect such control over the habits, the activities, and the lives of the people as to eventually render them incapable of retaining and exercising their God-given rights and liberties, do hereby make devotion to these principles and truths, and for the universal recognition and perpetuation of which, do pledge to ourselves and to each other, the use of our humble talents and efforts to bring the facts of this condition to the conscious and active attention of our fellow men, with the hope and prayer that prudence will determine and guide the actions of all to the end that the people of these States shall return to themselves and their local governments those powers and rights which have been usurped from them by the Federal Government at Washington, D. C., in violation of the spirit and letter of our Constitution.

Declaration of Town Hall Committee, of Wichita, Kans., signed by:

E. C. Moriarty, John A. Bowdish, John W. Harwood, Cecil A. Jordan, L. B. Brown, Jesse Vowel, C. E. Scrafford, Neil C. Kreeck, Edgar C. Stewart, Henry J. Allen, S. R. Hawes, H. C. Brady, Bill Hoke, Geo. N. Pottorff, H. M. Gillespie, Geo. E. Reeves, Earl K. Duke, A. M. Denny, R. E. Mannis, Jr., Louis E. Potucek, Geo. R. Temple, Charles S. Ritchie, Phil H. Manning, Fred Cochran, Jr., E. W. Pyle, Dr. Geo. G. Anderson, H. C. Yarnell, F. Paul Jernigan, C. J. Chandler, C. H. Cunningham, Emerson Dole, Edwin N. Carlson, N. E. Black, Wm. L. Ainsworth, Percy G. Gibson, Elmer C. Moore, R. B. Campbell, W. Luke Chapin, O. A. Bell, Carl Moore, John H. Morrison, T. A. Morgan.

Handbook for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in preparing House Document No. 285, first session, Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War No. 2 and Their Dependents, Including Rights and Benefits of Veterans of World War No. 1 and Their Dependents," an effort was made to make it as complete as possible without making it too long. The section with reference to Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 includes most of the questions that are asked generally about the act. However, I have recently received an inquiry as follows:

May an enlisted man make a voluntary Class E allotment of pay in favor of a designated person, who is not dependent on nor related to such an enlisted man?

Title 10, article 895 of the Code of Laws of the United States, provides that an allotment of a serviceman's pay may be made for the support of his wife, child, or dependent relative or for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper.

Not being sure just what interpretation is being made by the Secretary of War on the part "or for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper," I asked the Secretary for his interpretation. Following is the information I have received from him:

Payments of allotments of pay to a person who is neither a relative nor a dependent of a man in service is considered to be outside the scope of the purpose of the administration of the allotment system by the War Department.

I am inserting this information in the RECORD at this time, thinking perhaps it will be helpful to Members who have had or will have this same inquiry.

An Excellent Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of May 11, 1944:

AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

The President's nomination of James V. Forrestal to succeed the late Frank Knox as Secretary of the Navy is certain to be a popular choice. It assures the mightiest fleet in the world a continuance of that capable direction through the Navy Department which the Nation's first defense received while Mr. Knox still lived. For, as Under Secretary, Mr. Forrestal was right-hand man to the late Secretary.

It is most heartening that the President boldly swept aside the normal considerations of party politics which would have had great weight in the selection of so important a Cabinet member in a campaign year under ordinary circumstances. The nomination of Mr. Forrestal gives recognition to a great ability and to loyal, highly competent service. His selection redounds to credit of the administration and gives new emphasis to the earnest concern of the Chief Executive in these dangerous times for first-rate talent.

The whole Nation extends its congratulations to the new Secretary and wishes him success in a task second to none in its importance at this hour of our country's history.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on May 13, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my Congressional District, so many affairs have come to my attention lately, I have not been given opportunity to review current activities of the Hall Furlough Clubs or do justice to the fine work of the patriotic women who are their members.

Of great interest to all concerned was the election of a new central council a few weeks ago to take charge of this entire section. Mrs. Dominick Virgilio, the enthusiastic president of Club No. 4, was designated as chairman of the council along with Mrs. June Phillips as vice chairman and Mrs. Mary Main, able president of Club No. 3 in West Endicott, as secretary-treasurer. Success to them.

Also of special interest was the formation last week of the seventh ward Hall Furlough Club. Everyone was pleased when Mrs. Reece de Vincentis was elected president, Mrs. Marie de John, vice president, Mrs. Joseph Pacth, secretary and Mrs. Anthony Di Mado.

The rest of my time this evening is going to be devoted to the folks of Johnson City, Westover, Endwell, Endicott, Vestal and the other places below Binghamton along the Susquehanna which are in the flood area. I'm going to read to you proceedings from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the flood control bill passed by the House this week.

The amendment which I presented and which the Congress accepted, provided for an extensive survey and examination of the Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City area of the Susquehanna River.

For the past few years, several flood-control organizations in these localities have called for action from the Army engineers. The Hall amendment assures such action and opens the way for substantial flood-control work at least after the war and possibly earlier.

Let me read to you from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, 1944 my remarks on this subject:

"The steps taken in flood-control work at that junction and in the Whitney Point Dam project did save the city of Binghamton itself from serious future flood ravages. Unfortunately, it did little or nothing for the municipalities of Johnson City, Endicott, and the village of Vestal, a few miles below, on the Susquehanna River. In fact, the construction of flood walls on the southern bank of the Susquehanna, in the city of Binghamton, may even have aggravated the situation farther down because as time passed, more and more sediment collected along the banks of the Susquehanna down near greater Endicott, and throughout the Vestal area.

Every year thousands of people are flooded out of the lowlands on each side of the Susquehanna as it courses down through Johnson City, Willow Point, Broad Acres, Vestal, and through the greater Endicott area. For this reason, I submit to the House that this job has been partly done. Nearly as many people are affected in these areas—and the distinguished Chairman is familiar with that section—as there are in the city of Binghamton. I hope the House will give serious consideration to further and additional flood-control work being done in the very near future by the Army engineers on those few miles beyond the confluence of the Chenango and the Susquehanna Rivers. Those people living in areas below the junction are just as much entitled to have their properties protected against floods as the good people in my own home city of Binghamton are. I am very happy about and satisfied with the work which the committee and the Army engineers have done in my home section. Nevertheless, I believe that the Army engineers owe it to the people of the municipalities farther down the river to see to it either that the river is dredged at Vestal and vicinity or that constructive and substantial flood walls are erected at these points so that floods will not in the future ravage and damage the properties of the people down there.

"I have appeared before the committee and I will say in all deference to the good chairman that he gave me a very sympathetic hearing. I have also talked with General Reber who at that time was in charge of the Army Engineer Corps. They have all been sympathetic with my proposal.

"If this amendment is adopted it will provide that those sections and those municipalities be added to the sections that have already been mentioned in this bill and that no steps can be taken until the provisions of this legislation I have applied to them, they to be subject also to such other legislation as should apply. Let me point out that no objections have been voiced by the Army engineers to this project so far as I know. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted and I ask the favorable consideration of the committee."

The Late Honorable Lawrence Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to former Congressman Lawrence Lewis, of Colorado, by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York bar:

CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE LEWIS OF COLORADO

(A tribute by Gilbert H. Montague)

Lawrence Lewis, Member of Congress from March 1933 until his death in December 1943, was one of those Members of the House of Representatives who are seldom mentioned in the newspapers, but who devote themselves to arduous and self-effacing service in committees and in the routine of the House, with no expectation of personal fame or any other reward except the approval of their own consciences and the respect of their fellow Members in the House.

My friendship with Lewis began in Harvard College in 1899, when Lewis joined in the middle of the course the class that graduated in 1901. Only one who has done this can appreciate the handicaps of a boy entering unknown and 2 years late into a college class. Lewis came to Harvard because he sought the opportunity of inspiring contact with scholarship and tradition. He was discerning enough to see that if friendships came to him as a newcomer a little more slowly, there were meanwhile valuable lessons to be learned in patience, fortitude, self-reliance, character, and hard work without self-advertisement. These were the qualities by which Lewis made his way throughout life and in the House of Representatives.

Lewis' father and mother came to Pueblo, Colo., when he and his brother Hume were very young. The first boy Lewis met in Pueblo was Alva B. Adams, who later became United States Senator on the same day that Lewis entered the House of Representatives. Adams was several years older than Lewis, but they were together in grade school and high school, after which their paths separated until 1933, when they again came together in Congress.

Lewis worked and saved money and went to the University of Colorado, but after 2 years his money gave out, so he worked another year and saved enough to go to Harvard, from which he graduated in 1901. He then went to work on the Pueblo Chieftain, of which his brother Hume was managing editor. For 5 years Lewis worked on this newspaper, and for the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., editing the company's publication, Camp and Plant, and writing articles on Colorado industrial and political subjects for various eastern newspapers and periodicals. In 1906 Lewis returned to Harvard and entered the law school, graduating in 1909. Meanwhile, he taught English composition as an assistant in the English department in Harvard College, and wrote articles for the Atlantic Monthly, World's Work, Travel Magazine, Harper's Weekly, Country Life in America, Outlook, Scientific American, and Engineering and Mining Journal. He also wrote a book entitled "The Advertisements of the Spectator" regarding the Eighteenth Century classic for which Addison and Steele wrote their famous essays. So outstanding was Lewis' study that in 1909 his book was published in America and England with an introductory note by George Lyman Kittredge, professor of English literature at Harvard for two generations, and one of the most distinguished literary scholars in the English-speaking world.

In 1909 Lewis settled in Denver, beginning in the law office of Edward C. Stimson. He opened his own office in 1913, and in 1928 he formed the law partnership of Lewis & Bond, which later became Lewis, Bond & Holland. From 1917 to 1918 he was member of the Civil Service Commission of Colorado by appointment of the Governor, and during World War No. 1 he was legal adviser of the adjutant general of Colorado, and associate legal adviser of the local and district selective-service boards. When the war ended he was attending the Field Artillery central

offices training school at Camp Zachary Taylor in Kentucky.

When Lewis first settled in Denver, he became a precinct committeeman, the lowest rung of the political ladder, as he called it, and this he continued to be for many years. His first nomination for Congress in 1930 was unusual. The Denver congressional district had long been a Republican stronghold. While the 1930 Democratic National Congressional Convention was in session in Denver, Lewis happened to come into the hall as a visitor and was promptly drafted as the candidate. He was the only congressional candidate in Colorado in 1930 who publicly advocated drastic modification and even repeal of the prohibition amendment, to which from its inception he had been opposed on principle. His Republican opponent had been in office for 6 years and won in 1930 by 1,744 votes, but in 1932 Lewis defeated him by a plurality of 14,225. Lewis was reelected in 1934, 1936, 1938, 1940, and 1942, once winning a plurality of 40,759 that was almost 2 to 1, with substantial majorities in 372 of the 373 precincts comprising the Denver congressional district.

Writing to his Harvard class secretary Lewis said: "To the efficiency, loyalty, and forbearance of my partners, I am indebted for the opportunity of engaging in my present—probably temporary and doubtless professionally injudicious—excursion into the field of national politics. * * * In 1932, when I was elected to the Seventy-third Congress by over 14,000, I fully expected to be a 'one-term Congressman.' I anticipated that opposition, sufficient to defeat me, would be aroused among the numerous well-organized and militant minority groups, which cut across party lines and which are continually demanding things some of which, in the general public interest, they should not have—and would not get with my vote. So, I was astounded in 1934, when I was reelected by over 25,000."

In Lewis' first term he was member of the House Judiciary Committee, and was one of the House managers in the impeachment proceedings against Judge Harold Louderbach, of California. Early Lewis became assistant Democratic whip for the Rocky Mountain zone, acting under the direction of the House Democratic majority leader. From 1935 until the end, Lewis was a member of the Rules Committee. Most legislation, except revenue and appropriation bills, can be brought to vote in the House only by a rule, so that most legislation must be weighed by the Rules Committee before it comes to the floor of the House. Lewis' work in this committee was extraordinary. Unmarried, he repressed every personal and business and social interest that might subtract from the total devotion of all his time and thought and strength to congressional business. "Like most positions," said Lewis in a letter to his Harvard class secretary, "that of Congressman is largely what one makes of it. An immense amount of hard exacting work is involved, including much routine drudgery and many duties never contemplated by the framers of the Constitution. Old-time Members say that, even during the World War, the pressure of work was nothing comparable to what it has been these last few anxious years. However, to one who tries to take his job but not himself seriously, it affords intense and vital interest and some opportunity for real service. All I can claim is that I have been trying to do the best I can."

Seats are not regularly assigned to Members in the House of Representatives as in the Senate, but for many years Lewis regularly occupied the front seat in the House, where he gave close attention and serious consideration to every Member who spoke. In his 10 years of service, until his health broke, he missed only 17 roll calls, from each of which he was excused because of official business.

"I doubt," said one of Lewis' colleagues, "if there is a Member of this House who worked harder on the legislation considered by this body than did Lawrence Lewis * * * there were few bills that were considered on the floor of this House that did not receive the closest scrutiny and study from this son of legislative toil. He regarded his duties here as a Representative of his people in this great legislative body as a high sense of trust. No legislation was treated lightly by him."

"I, too, know, as so many others have mentioned," said another of Lewis' associates, "of the long hours he spent and the midnight oil he burned, studying, planning, and thinking for the background of that official service which he gave as a Member while present in this Chamber. Many nights for several years I saw a light in his office when I left mine."

"He was opposed to anything that ever bordered on the demagogic," said another colleague. "He loved this country and he was concerned about these isms and doctrines and movements that apparently seemed determined to destroy our form of government."

"I knew years ago," said another associate, "that he had been overworking. * * * I have told him so and have remonstrated with him at times, but not with much effect * * * he kept on the job many more hours per day than most of us spend at our legislative tasks. He was one of the hardest-working Members of this body."

"I remember the day I arrived in Washington," said a Republican fellow Member. "Lawrence Lewis came to my office to greet me and made me feel at home. He told me that politics were largely forgotten after men were elected to Congress, and it then became our duty and privilege to work together side by side without regard to party affiliations."

"I know of no man with whom I have served here," said another associate, "whose nature was more gentle, whose attention to duty was more conscientious, and who was freer from criticism of his fellow men than Lawrence Lewis."

Lewis never obtruded his scholarly interests, but he never forgot them. He was secretary and a member of the board of directors of the State Historical Society of Colorado. He collected a great deal of material, apparently with a view to eventual publication, regarding the life and explorations of Lt. Zebulon Montgomery Pike, discoverer of Pikes Peak.

In some research for the Society years before he entered Congress, Lewis wrote to Dr. Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, and was deeply impressed by Dr. Putnam's prompt and intelligent reply. Lewis was a Member of Congress when Dr. Putnam retired in 1939, and Lewis took this occasion to deliver on the floor of the House an outstanding literary address reviewing the growth of the Library of Congress during Dr. Putnam's 40 years' service as Librarian.

To Lewis' literary instincts, the House of Representatives and its Chamber, with all the history associated with them, made an irresistible appeal. To Lewis' sense of duty, the House of Representatives and its legislative processes, with all their opportunities for public service, were a veritable religion.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill proudly calls himself a "House of Commons man." Lawrence Lewis was truly a "House of Representatives man."

The House of Representatives has many moods. Sometimes it is placid, sometimes it is turbulent, sometimes it is tense, sometimes it is expansive. In September 1943, after many months' absence because of illness, Lewis entered the House one afternoon, and took his accustomed front seat. In affection and admiration for his courage the entire House rose and applauded him. Nothing in Lewis' whole life, probably, gave him deeper satisfaction than this moment. Several weeks later he was again absent because of illness, and then came the end on December 9, 1943.

The House of Representatives is never more impressive than when it is in a memorial session. As one Member after another rises to pay the last honors of the House to the departed Member, the Chamber takes on the beauty, dignity, and solemnity of a great cathedral. A House of Representatives man has gone to join—

"* * * the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence."

This was the tribute that the House paid to Lawrence Lewis on the afternoon of December 9, 1943. This was the only memorial he would have liked. To him the House was always hallowed ground. This was his cathedral.

"Speak no more of his renown,
Lay your earthly fancies down,
And in the vast cathedral leave him,
God accept him, Christ receive him!"

Comptroller General's Annual Report to Congress for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, Admiral Land's review recently of so-called irregular practices discussed in the Comptroller's Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, discloses how easily erroneous conclusions may be drawn from that report indicating that the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration fail to cooperate with the General Accounting Office. The contrary is true. At times corrections are made subsequent to the expiration of the fiscal year in question, and such corrections do not find their way into the report.

This situation arose with reference to charge I, "Failure to account properly for receipts from revenue-producing activities such as housing, cafeterias, transportation facilities," and so forth.

Admiral Land says:

This charge we believe grows out of a complete misinterpretation by the Comptroller General's field staff of the character of the Commission's contracts and the relations between the Commission's prime contractor and his subcontractor, and overlooks certain provisions of the Merchant Marine Act with respect to the Commission's revolving construction fund.

The charge originally made was that the Commission was deliberately utilizing for its ship-construction program, funds which should have been covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and therefore defeating the will of Congress as expressed through its appropriations.

This matter was the subject of correspondence between the Comptroller General and our office during 1942 and 1943. In his communications of October 26, 1943, the Comptroller General departed from his original position, and then agreed with our view,

that the Commission had the option of having these funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the revolving construction fund, and there to be available for expenditure by the Commission or that where the Commission deemed it advisable and more practicable from an administrative standpoint, it was in order for the Commission to approve of the application, by the contractor, of the receipts from the subcontractor operating the facilities in reduction of the reimbursable costs of the construction work involved.

This understanding was reached subsequent to the expiration of fiscal year 1943, and possibly the time lapse before the Comptroller General made his report to Congress was not sufficient to allow the correction on this point.

Charge 3:

Reimbursement of improper expenditures such as for lectures on human engineering, excessive rentals, bonuses to officials and employees, and the cost of yard publications.

On April 26, 1943, the Comptroller General was advised in a communication from this office that the reimbursements heretofore made by the Commission to three shipyards on the Gulf coast for the expenditures made by them covering the cost of "human engineering" lectures had been subsequently disallowed, and that the amounts that had been reimbursed to the contractors had been deducted on subsequent vouchers presented for payment. He was further advised prior to the end of the fiscal year 1943, that two other yards which had expended their funds for this purpose had not and would not obtain reimbursement for this expenditure from the Commission.

It is an accepted practice in industrial plants to spend considerable effort and time on matters affecting working conditions, health and sanitation for employees to insure the best results for all concerned, and while the theory back of the "human engineering" lectures appears to have been of considerable merit, the Commission auditors immediately raised the question of the excessive cost and its value when going over the accounts of a contractor, and noted it for disallowance. This particular item was pointed out to the General Accounting Office auditor by the Commission auditor in the field as evidence of the disallowances he was noting.

In connection with the charge of reimbursement of payment of improper bonuses to officials and employees we surmise, in the absence of direct reference, that this refers to payments that were made to officials and employees of a yard now devoted to naval work. The reimbursements in this particular case were subsequently adjusted on the basis of the control plan referred to in connection with the second charge and in no case did the final adjustment represent any exception from that plan.

Most of the shipbuilding contractors building ships for the Commission as well as hundreds of other business concerns, large and small, put out publications at regular intervals devoted to upbuilding the morale of their employees. Experience has shown that properly edited publications of this nature are of very considerable benefit.

Meetings have been held on numerous occasions with the editors of the yard publications of most of the shipbuilding contractors handling commission construction in order to produce efficient and economical handling of these publications. The necessity of keeping the reimbursable costs of these publications down to a reasonable figure has been repeatedly stressed by the commission and its representatives.

Our regional directors of construction and our regional auditors check these costs, and the publications are constantly under review here in Washington.

There are other items discussed in Admiral Land's letter including certain special reports which have been disposed of through the medium of Congressional investigations.

The report says that during the past year three special reports were submitted to the Congress involving excessive prices paid for vessels, as follows:

Five vessels were acquired from the Waterman Steamship Corporation at a cost of $1,995,602.68 in excess of the amount required to be paid for five similar vessels which the Commission had a contract right to acquire. (See H. Doc. No. 840, 77th Cong., 2d sess.) The Commission has since acquired the five vessels in accordance with the contract, but there remains for consideration the reasonableness of the prices paid for the five vessels acquired in Decmber 1941, reported to Congress in House Document No. 840.

The Waterman Steamship case was considered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report thereon was made on November 12, 1943, and is House Report No. 859, Seventy-eighth Congress. The case was satisfactorily disposed of subsequent to the Comptroller General's report as evidenced in a letter of December 16, 1943, from the Comptroller General to the War Shipping Administration, which appears at length in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A570. In that letter, the Comptroller says to the War Shipping Administrator, after setting out the circumstances under which the charges are withdrawn:

Accordingly, you are advised that your understanding—that the charges originally raised against Waterman Steamship Corporation may be regarded as having been eliminated by subsequent developments—is correct.

Another case mentioned was the purchase of the *President Roosevelt* from the United States Lines was disposed of by the findings of the Congressional Committee on the Baltimore Mail case, which was submitted to the House on November 12, 1943, and is to be found in House Report No. 860, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The important points covered by the Comptroller General's report on the *President Roosevelt* were a comparison between the book value and the sale price and a discussion of the applicability of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act. The transaction referred to occurred on October 31, 1940. On pages 9 and 10 of the Baltimore Mail Report there is a discussion of the applicability of section 902 (a) to the transactions occurring before the President's proclamation of May 27, 1941, as well as a reference to "highly controversial factors" including book value, depreciated value, and market value.

Another case not mentioned in the Comptroller General's Annual Report but specifically reported to Congress was one involving the Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc., and Mr. George B. Howell, president of the company. That case was considered by the congressional committee and report made to the House on December 6, 1943, House Report No. 938, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Under date of December 18, 1943, the Comptroller General wrote the Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc., and Mr. George B. Howell, president of the company that the matter of indebtedness certified against each of them by the Comptroller General had been referred to the Department of Justice for appropriate action against each of them, and by letter of September 17, 1943, the Attorney General advised in substance that upon the basis of facts disclosed by the record and upon his analysis of the legal questions involved, he was of the opinion that there was no basis for bringing suit. Whereupon the Comptroller General advised the Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc., Tampa, Fla., and Mr. George B. Howell, president of the company, that by reason of the Attorney General's action in the matter, he had issued instructions directing the cancelation of the settlements previously made finding the indebtedness due and the matter will be considered as closed.

The Red Sea charters are still under study by a special subcommittee which is headed by the Honorable EDWARD J. HART, of New Jersey. A report is being prepared and will be submitted at an early date.

The Comptroller General's report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and Admiral Land's review of irregular practices, have been referred to the general counsel of the committee for investigation with the request that the two papers may be studied and investigations made of all matters requiring investigation as it is desired that the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration follow proper regulations and practices in their business operations and their expenditures of public funds.

Comparison of Overseas Troop Movement in American Ships in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article from Marine Age, April 1944, comparing overseas troop movements in American ships in World War No. 2 with similar movements in World War No. 1. It is gratifying to advocates of an American merchant marine to compare the results in this war with the work done in the last war.

When we consider those results and realize how our work in World War No. 2 surpassed our troop movements in World War No. 1, we learn how truly an American merchant marine is a guaranty not

only of our Nation's safety but also of her peace. It is my solemn conviction, frequently expressed, that if our Nation in World War No. 1 and in World War No. 2 had been prepared with an adequate merchant marine, we would never have been drawn into our last two wars.

The article referred to by me is as follows:

OVERSEAS TROOP MOVEMENTS

America's passenger liners, converted into troop transports, have carried 70 to 75 percent of the 3,000,000 United States troops sent overseas in this war, Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Commanding General of the Army Service Forces informed the American Merchant Marine Institute April 2.

"This estimate reveals that a greater portion of American troops is being carried by American ships in this war than during the last war," General Somervell stated.

War Department statistics on the transportation of American troops in World War No. 1 show that only 45.8 percent of the A. E. F. was carried by vessels flying the American flag. British liners transported 51.9 percent with French and other foreign flag vessels carrying the remainder.

In a recent speech, General Somervell announced that 3,000,000 men had already been shipped overseas By July 1, 5,000,000 Americans will be overseas according to President Roosevelt.

On the basis of General Somervell's estimate, Frank J. Taylor, president of the Institute, pointed out that American liners have already carried overseas 2,100,000 American soldiers as compared to 987,736 Americans taken to France in World War No. 1.

"The Nation was fortunate that it had passenger liners that could be converted into troop transports," Mr. Taylor said. "A good many of them were taken over by the Government before Pearl Harbor and were ready when war came. Not only are our liners carrying more men than in the last war but they must travel greater distances. In the last war they operated a 3,000-mile shuttle service to France. In this war the battlefronts and various bases are on sea lanes that total 56,000 miles."

It Happened Right Here, or the Night After Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a poem on farm conditions:

IT HAPPENED RIGHT HERE OR THE NIGHT AFTER CHRISTMAS

(By Dakota Cal, Minot, N. Dak.)

I met a queer old fellow in a dugout in the hills;
He'd fled the "great deliverance from economic ills";
Out 90 miles from nowhere, no one knew his age or name,
Where the buckbrush hid his cavern, on an old abandoned claim.
The wind was blowing wildly; it had just begun to storm,
And in desperation looking for a haven that was warm
I glimpsed him disappearing in a frantic sort of haste
As I scanned the landscape quickly, in its rolling desert waste.
I sneaked upon him quietly, this timid, furtive soul
Hiding in a scooped-out burrow, in the manner of a mole.
He cowered in his shelter, but I caught him e'er he fled,
Drew him out and learned the reason for the hermit's life he led;
In a voice half cracked from silence, in a rasping toneless wheeze,
And with halting words he told me what had caused his Q. E. D's.
I tell it as he told it; then, I thought him off his beam,
But I modify that verdict as I ponder o'er his theme.
Thus it ran:
"I farmed about a section, took all hurdles in my stride—
Ran my tractor through the pastures, pointed to my fields with pride—
But I found I couldn't lick 'em, they were always at my heels
With their planning and their theories, their regulating spiels.
I tried to do my business, but they thwarted every plan;
They roped me with their programs for regimented man.
Before that, I was raisin' grain, I'd bot myself machines,
And any time we had a rain, the dough was in my jeans;
Then came the drought, and round that bend, the agents came in flocks;
They told me what I had to spend, they damn near darned my socks.
They cut my wheat production down, and on it loaned me dough;
They called me weekly into town; at first I liked to go.
They took a mortgage on my plows, said when to ship my sheep,
Told where my cattle ought to browse, and where my dog should sleep;
They told me when my work was done, where I had made mistakes;
They supervised me on the run; they turned my fields to lakes.
They gave me aid I didn't need, and charged me up, for life;
They took their liens on next year's seed, they hypnotized my wife.
They dished out apples and relief, whenever I would groan;
They set up penalties for men who tried to stand alone.
And when I had learned to grow a crop the way they called the turn,
They switched the programs without stop and cash began to burn.
Three days in every week I spent, in town, preparing blanks
That went their way through every cent they got me, at the banks.
I asked them what I might not buy, and what I might not sell
If unadvised, I sold a pig, say brother, that was hell!
I used up tires and gasoline consulting them on means,
They gave me orders when to buy repairs for old machines.
I had to sign their slips before they countersigned my checks;
(My crop was reckoned now, no more in bushels, but in pecks.)
I had no time to watch the rains or work my well-known land;
I took the corners on their brains, on systems, they had planned.
They told me I should raise more stock, they engineered the sales
Our geese and turkeys went in hock, for rye-straw doled in bales.
When I woke up, my debts were high, and hogs were down in price;
(They didn't know the reason why, but offered more advice.)
I sat and heard them plan my feed, they said to trim my herds,
They worked out my tomorrow's need, protecting upland birds—
They told of subsidies to be, they said that stock was "out."
That grain was up again; that we would "change it all about"
They had me mortgaged to the teeth, and rationed to the bone
They couldn't see me underneath, I begged "leave me alone."
By now I didn't own a thing, in stock that I could slaughter,
I didn't own a crock by jing, in which to put my water!
My wife had loved me, but bereft of independent man,
One night aboard a freight she left; don't blame 'er; no one can!
I'd lost ability to think without some agent guide;
At night I couldn't sleep a wink; and hope within me died—
From Washington new rules would come, they said, to win the war;
Raise wheat, start over; don't be dumb; here I could stand no more.
T'was then I took my walking shoes, put on my sheepskin coat
And left it all to buckaroos who rule the realm by rote.
Their regulations stacked in piles, I burned before I went
They made a bonfire seen for miles, before the flames were spent.
The land bank has my acres now, the F. S. A. my sheep,
Farm Credit owns my only cow; but here, God lets me sleep;
I only hear the coyotes howl, and know the blizzards roar,
The quaver of the great horned owl, the groundhog's gurgling snore.
Across the seas, in Freedoms name, men now are waging war;
Good-bye; I love it, but its gone; for me it is no more!"
I left the hermit in his cave, his whiskers in his hands—
And turned my steps toward where the knave now regiments his lands!

School Lunches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 9 I introduced into this House H. R. 4777, a bill to assist the States to establish and maintain school-lunch programs. Since that time I have been receiving communications from organizations all over the country giving their enthusiastic support of and endorsement to the principles of this legislation.

The legislative chairman of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers writes me that she will do everything possible to aid the passage of the bill, and points out how very important the national P. T. A. views such principles. The president of the American Dietetic Association wires me from Milwaukee:

Sound nutritional practices and teachings are necessary in the school lunchroom pro-

gram. Good nutrition for our children must be paramount in our legislation. We feel your bill H. R. 4777 embodies these principles; therefore the American Dietetic Association wishes to go on record as approving and supporting the bill H. R. 4777.

A representative of the American Home Economics Association writes me that she hopes the bill will be extensively supported and passed; while the executive secretary and the legislative representative on school-lunch programs for childhood education lend their endorsement in the following language:

H. R. 4777 provides for the administration of school-lunch programs through the United States Office of Education. Not only is this good educational practice, but it is good government for the State departments of education to be made responsible for the program at the State legislatures. It is our privilege to endorse the principles in and to work for the passage of H. R. 4777.

Mr. Speaker, while we are engaged in the most serious war in our Nation's history we cannot afford to ignore such vital elements on our home front as the health of the children of this country. The school-lunch program is a most important factor in maintaining and improving the health of our children. I trust that the Members of this House, regardless of political affiliation, will lend their active support to speedy and favorable consideration of this legislation.

Chicago Sun Article on Sewell Avery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting in the RECORD the first of a series of articles, which appeared in the May 15, 1944, issue of the Chicago Sun, entitled "Sewell Avery Against the People—Mail Order Napoleon Threatens Machinery Stabilizing Economy."

The article is as follows:

SEWELL AVERY VERSUS THE PEOPLE—MAIL-ORDER NAPOLEON THREATENS MACHINERY STABILIZING ECONOMY

(By Thomas F. Reynolds and Charles O. Gridley)

WASHINGTON, May 14.—Sewell Lee Avery is at war with the people of the United States.

He has waged this war since 1933, when his formula of hard-boiled management and low wages began to turn a Montgomery Ward & Co. deficit of $5,686,784 into spectacular profits.

His rise to the top rank of profit-makers during the depression coincided with the advent of President Roosevelt's administration. Since then Avery has consistently produced heavy profits for his stockholders—and for himself—in Montgomery Ward and other companies.

Yet he has fought every inch of the way against measures enacted for national economic recovery and the betterment of the "little people" who comprise the bulk of his customers.

Most Americans know Sewell Avery as a bland old man of 69, hands folded across his stomach, being carried out of his plant by two soldiers. Few Americans know him as the shrewd legal intriger of great wealth whose obstructive tactics have snarled up the work of the most important Government agencies in Washington.

These tactics of legal delay and obstruction now approximate a formula which threatens the whole machinery by which the United States has sought to stabilize its economy in its hours of greatest crisis.

Seizure of Ward's Chicago properties by the Federal Government last month was merely another climax in Avery's effort to establish the principle that "the law applies to everybody but me."

Although the properties now are back in Avery's hands, the seizure is being capitalized by the Roosevelt-haters, the entrenched interests, the reactionaries, and the ill-informed as "confiscation," "Gestapo operations," and "fascism."

Those who hold this view have forgotten one important thing: If the seizure were all that they implied, Avery would be in a concentration camp today. Under fascism or under the Gestapo, that is the way things are done.

The story of Sewell Avery embodies no such principle of might versus right. It is the story of one man versus the people. It is as simple as that.

For more than a decade the shadow of this man has been cast across the path of national progress. He has battled social reform and economic reform with unrelenting vigor.

He has berated and fumed at the administration while accepting its bounty. Some of Montgomery Ward's largest sales were made in distressed areas where Federal relief and farm benefit payments gave the people the purchasing power with which to trade with his mail-order house and shoot its balance sheet from a red-ink deficit of $5,686,784 in the 13 months ending January 31, 1933, to a net profit of $2,227,957 in 1934, $9,161,054 in 1935, and $13,527,310 in 1936. Last year the company netted $20,437,583.

He has preached the gospel of the balanced budget. Yet this $144,810-a-year executive is in the forefront of a movement to place a ceiling of 25 percent on the amount of Federal taxes which could be imposed on any individual or corporation.

He fought with great bitterness the $25,000 net salary ceiling invoked by Mr. Roosevelt in 1943, but he sees nothing wrong with placing a 95-cents-an-hour top limit on the pay of Montgomery Ward workers below the grade of executive. In fact, he chortled amiably last week over the wage freeze now in effect, which, he said, would make it impossible for Ward's to grant its employees higher wages.

Avery likes to think of Herbert Hoover as the greatest President of contemporary times, and is considered a hero by many of his more reactionary colleagues. But the viewpoint of business is by no means unanimous. There are many conscientious men of capital and industry who look upon Avery as one of the gravest threats to the continued existence of free enterprise, whose cause he so volubly espouses.

Typical and revealing is the comment of H. L. Derby, president of the American Cyanimid Co., director of the National Association of Manufacturers, and former management member of the National War Labor Board, which Avery considers his arch enemy.

"Ward has done the greatest disservice to industry and the private enterprise system of any concern in the United States," Derby said.

Avery represents a small but exceedingly articulate group of industrialists and businessmen, but he does not represent them all, and certainly not a majority. As evidenced by Derby's denunciation, his tactics have been condemned by other industrialists as important in the business world as he.

On the nine occasions on which the W. L B. has voted on the Montgomery Ward case, Avery's position has been disapproved unanimously by the 17 industrial members of the board, with one exception. On this occasion one member voted in his favor.

The industrialists who opposed Avery's fight against the Government and his defiance of the acts of Congress are top-flight executives of some of the most prosperous and influential corporations in the United States corporate structure.

It is significant that of the 6,500 labor dispute cases which have reached the W. L. B. since its creation in 1942, only seven cases of defiance by employers—and 10 of defiance by unions—have been sent to the White House for action, and that of the seven employer cases, two involved Montgomery Ward and thus Sewell Avery.

Avery's tactics, which his lawyers faithfully pursued in the courts, have been to attack every act of Congress with which he did not wish to comply. And while these battles raged and Avery cried out against Government interference, Ward profits became so good, in fact, that he was able to become a member of the national executive committee of the Liberty League, and to chip in $5,000 to the Crusaders, both of which fought the process of national recovery, including the relief activities of the Work Projects Administration.

In addition, the record shows that Avery contested at every turn the measures by which the President and Congress were trying to throw off depression and better the condition of working men and women..

In 1935, he was snarling at the National Recovery Administration, which announced that Montgomery Ward could not use the "blue eagle" insigne because Avery refused to pay his company's assessed share of the cost of administering the retail code.

A year later he attempted to carry a fight to the United States Supreme Court for abatement of $39,110 in income taxes, which represented deficiencies for 1930, 1931, and 1932, during which his income was $927,805, before he deducted "capital losses." The Supreme Court refused to review the case after the Seventh Circuit Court at Chicago had found against Avery. During the argument in the lower courts counsel for Avery challenged the constitutionality of the Income Tax Act, and was overruled.

Avery undoubtedly still believes the application of the law to his income in this case was unconstitutional.

His opposition to labor unions came into the open after Congress enacted the Wagner Labor Relations Act. He began breaking lances against the law as Montgomery Ward employees, in plants scattered across the country, hurried to the newly created National Labor Relations Board with grievances and requests for protection of their bargaining rights.

Under his direction, Montgomery Ward took four N. L. R. B. cases to circuit courts of appeal, lost three and won a technical victory on a point of law in the fourth. N. L. R. B. records list 91 Montgomery Ward cases, 40 involving questions of election or representation and 51 alleging violations of the Wagner Act.

Montgomery Ward and Avery at that time were not content with passive resistance to unions. They were not above using labor spies to break up collective bargaining units inside the company's national organization. This is disclosed by an N. L. R. B. order, upheld by a circuit court of appeals on January 30, 1940, which instructed Ward's at its Portland, Oreg., plant to cease "employing detectives to investigate the activities of its employees in behalf of Weighers, Warehousemen and Cereal Workers Local 38-123 of the International Longshoremen's Association, or

any other labor organization of its employees, or employing any other form or manner of espionage for such purposes."

That order also directed Ward's to reinstate 23 employees discharged for union activities and compensate them for pay losses amounting to $32,000.

The scores of lawyers who carry out Avery's orders in his war against the Government were very busy in the late thirties. The Fair Labor Standards Act followed the Wagner Act, and it, too, met a prompt challenge from the mail-order Napoleon. The Wage and Hour Administration had to go to court to sustain its right to inspect the records of workers in the company's employee files. Again Ward's fought stubbornly through the lower courts, up to the United States Supreme Court, which once more sustained the Government's authority and refused to review the case.

When it became necessary to prevent prices from going through the roof and Congress enacted the stabilization law, Avery and his company were soon embroiled with the Office of Price Administration. Ward's was enjoined on December 3, 1942, from violation of general maximum price regulations after the Government had alleged a violation of ceiling prices.

The court found that 728 items in the Montgomery Ward Chicago catalog were priced over the ceiling, with violations ranging from 1 cent to $1.02 an item. In another O. P. A. action the company has carried its fight to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago.

Unable to break through two injunctions obtained by the Government in Chicago courts, prohibiting it from violating price regulations in its mail-order business and in its retail stores, Montgomery Ward now is following the familiar Avery legal pattern by attacking the validity of a key price regulation before a Federal emergency court of appeals.

While these major contests were in progress, the company also was carrying on a running and often embarrassing fight with the Federal Trade Commission against charges of misrepresentation of its products.

All of these court skirmishes were preliminary to what has proved to be Boss Avery's most spectacular battle—his clash with the W. L. B. He sought to evade the arm of the law, only to land in the arms of the troops.

Your Country's Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, a very fine and talented lady, Mrs. Stella Bohanan, of Cookeville, Tenn., has written a poem entitled "Your Country's Flag."

I believe many will enjoy reading it, and I include it in my remarks:

YOUR COUNTRY'S FLAG

I am more than just your country's flag
With stripes of red, white, and blue;
I am more than just plain bands of cloth
Swung in skies of azure hue.

I am your emblem of justice and power,
I am Old Glory as I wave on high,
I go before your conquering hosts,
And shot and shell defy.

I lead the way for marching feet
As they go forth to defend,
I proudly wave along your shores,
And to no monarch bend.

I bow my head in sorrow
When grief assails your land,
And speak to the world in sad acclaim
When your great sons pass beyond.

I've been dragged in dust and heroes' blood
But never put to shame.
Brave hands have hoisted me once more
Their victory to proclaim.

Then raise your hand in proud salute,
Wherever I may wave,
In peace or on bloody battlefield,
Where lie your fallen brave.

Rabbi Baruch Korff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter received today by me from Rabbi Baruch Korff, 160 Central Park South, New York, N. Y., who has given much of his time, labor, and effort to one of the most important subjects confronting our country; namely, the suffering, hardship, and privations of the thousands of unfortunate victims of oppression, the Jewish and other war refugees.

Rabbi Korff has been working untiringly for the establishment of free ports of refuge for these human souls and that other nations may be primarily interested in this most important subject matter. The entire Nation owes this man a debt of gratitude for his contribution to the various agencies of our Government in helping to solve this most difficult situation.

NEW YORK, *May 16, 1944.*

The Honorable THOMAS LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: I find your address and those of other Congressmen made in the past 2 weeks excellent and eloquent. All have called the attention of the House to the desperate plight of the Jews and other minorities in Hitlerite Europe. Needless to say, that with the sentiments expressed in those addresses, I am heartily in accord. Indeed, no American mindful of the long history of this Nation in speaking out against oppressions and offering refuge to the oppressed could do otherwise.

This Government has lived up to this noble tradition by establishing a War Refugee Board to deal exclusively with the pressing problem of rescuing victims of enemy oppression in imminent danger of death. The choice of a director for this great objective was very fortunate. In John W. Pehle, the President has selected a brilliant administrator who will bring to this urgent task a vigorous mind nurtured on the basic grassroots principles of democracy and humanity. His ability has already been vividly demonstrated by the excellent job he did in dealing with novel and tremendously difficult problems as Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, in charge of the administration of Foreign Funds Control. We can be thankful that Mr. Pehle's excellent talents will now be devoted to the humanitarian task of saving the lives of the oppressed.

The Executive order creating the War Refugee Board wisely makes use of the facilities of three great Departments of our Government—War, State, and the Treasury—and also requires other agencies of the Government to cooperate with the War Refugee Board to enable it to achieve its objectives. Armed with these facilities and under the brilliant leadership of Mr. Pehle, we can be sure that the War Refugee Board will leave no stone unturned in its gallant struggle to save the victims of oppression from the forces of evil.

It seems to me, however, that one step is essential if the War Refugee Board is to succeed in rescuing any appreciable number of victims of Nazi terrorism. I refer to the establishment of havens of refuge in the United States or its territories. Unless we are prepared to make this elementary humane offer, we stand convicted, along with the rest of the civilized world, of indifference to the pitiful appeals for help coming from the hunted, downtrodden, and terrorized victims of tyranny and persecution.

How can the United States, with her wealth of resources and noble traditions of providing aid for the oppressed and unfortunate, call upon other nations, with lesser resources and lacking our traditions, to extend refuge to fleers from oppression, if she herself is unwilling to do the same. Such appeals, unaccompanied by a similar offer by us, are empty, meaningless gestures, foredoomed to failure.

I am not suggesting that our immigration laws be thrown out or disregarded. That is not the question at all. The refuge that we can and should offer is a temporary shelter where persons who have been hunted for 10 years can rest awhile, secure of their lives, until the successful conclusion of the war permits the civilized world to cooperate to make orderly arrangements for their relocation and rehabilitation. I do not suggest that they be given the status of immigrants, but merely that they be accorded the treatment we offer merchandise in a free port or, at the least, enemy prisoners of war in internment camps.

In simple, artless language, Samuel Grafton, a columnist on the New York Post, states the moral issue so vividly that I am taking the liberty of quoting him at length:

"The need is for reservations of a few acres here and there where a man who has been running for 10 years can sit down and catch his breath, and where somebody can tell a story to a frightened child; a few reservations where it would be possible for those who cannot satisfy the requirements of law to rest a bit, without violating the law. We do it, in commercial free ports, for cases of beans, so that we can make some storage and processing profits; it should not be impossible to do it for people."

To those who would place legalistic objections over the demands of humanity by using the immigration laws as an insuperable barrier to this proposal, Mr. Grafton gives the complete answer. I quote him further:

"Let us look upon these refugee free ports as it they were moored ships, ships of land. Anyone who would step over the boundary of the free port into the country proper should be made to satisfy all requirements of immigration law, precisely as if he were proposing to come ashore from a ship. But surely it should not baffle our ingenuity to find some legal way in which to grant a stateless woman the comparatively small

bit of room which she needs in order to deliver a baby."

The moral and practical effect of establishing such havens is excellently summarized by Mr. Grafton:

"If we set up a system of refugee free ports, our fine new War Refugee Board can then properly appeal to other countries to do the same. If we do not go at least that far, the board will be answered with a snicker should it make such requests of other lands.

"The refugees, Jewish, and other, ask only for a few fenced-in acres of the poorest land in America. They don't want to keep it. They just want to sit on it until they can go home again. They are letting us off more easily than does conscience itself, for they don't even ask that we do our best for them. They plead for our worst."

It is not surprising that this simple, decent, humane proposal made by Mr. Grafton has spread like wildfire throught the country. Were our people's reaction otherwise, then we should really have been shocked into reexamining what had happened to us that we should have so far departed from the ideals and examples of our founding fathers.

Here are a few typical editorial reactions to Mr. Grafton's proposal:

The Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal:

"Grafton's suggestion ought to be carried out immediately."

The Seattle (Wash.) Star:

"As constructive and kindly a suggestion as a columnist has yet come up with—that is Samuel Grafton's suggestion of a free port for refugees. What finer gesture could the rest of the world make at this time?"

The Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic:

"By such action this country would be taking the lead in providing refugee relief and our War Refugee Board would be in a position to ask other countries to establish similar ports where they are badly needed.

The San Diego (Calif.) Daily Journal:

"A free port for human souls is certainly no less desirable, no less practical, than free ports for merchandise, and these have been integral parts of international commerce for years."

The Asheville (N. C.) Citizen Times:

"Here is a ray of hope for the homeless, destitute, and oppressed. There are today more than 130,000 German prisoners of war lodged in this country. They will not reside here after the war. It could be the same, if charity follows this counsel of wisdom, for the war refugees."

The Charlotte (N. C.) News:

"It seems to us that American opposition to British action in closing Palestine to Jewish refugees could best be expressed in the opening of free ports for refugees of our own and by later insistence that other nations follow our example."

The Wilmington (Del.) Star:

"It seems to us that this is the least we could do and should do at the earliest possible moment as our share in saving the lives of the helpless minorities who have so far escaped brutal slaughter.

"The Government could authorize the War Refugee Board to proceed with the establishment of such free ports, under whatever safeguards may be necessary to guarantee to human flesh and blood just what we already guarantee to inanimate goods—a stopping place en route to their final destination—a free port where they have no rights except the right to safe, temporary storage."

The New York (N. Y.) Times:

"When the idea of free ports in this country for war refugees was brought up in Washington recently there seemed to be two possible objections to it, one good and one bad. The first objection was that it would be inhuman to establish what might be regarded as concentration camps for refugees we were not willing to admit. The second was that some of these refugees might eventually get into the country, beyond the restrictions of the quota law.

"A study of the situation indicates that neither argument is valid. A refugee brought, say, to Ellis Island and there comfortably housed and fed and treated with consideration, would be in heaven compared with the same person in Germany or Rumania. As for the danger of refugees escaping into the United States from their places of detention, this is hardly a menace to the safety of the Republic. We take this risk with our captive enemies. Why not with our luckless friends?

"The War Refugee Board, as its director, John W. Pehle, has indicated, would be a logical agency to carry out the 'free port' plan. Perhaps Army camps, vacated as the peak of training passes, could be used. After the war some of the refugees might safely return to their countries of origin. Others might find homes in other countries where immigrants might be needed and welcomed. Still others could in time be admitted regularly to the United States. The plan has nothing to do with unrestricted and uncontrolled immigration. It is simply a proposal to save the lives of innocent people."

The prince of liberalism, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, House majority leader, stated in a telegram addressed to me:

"I am deeply moved by the human tragedy of your people and other minorities, and I am extremely grateful to you for calling my attention to the humanitarian activities of the War Refugee Board headed by John W. Pehle, its executive director. I am indeed wholeheartedly for any project that the War Refugee Board may devise. I am particularly for the measure of free ports. Consider the moral blow to the Axis and its satellites which this project will deal. Consider the effect this will have on the neutral countries, and above all consider the constructive safety of human lives the free ports will promulgate. It is the least we can do for the afflicted and oppressed peoples of the globe. The President of the United States has expressed the wish of the American people when he established the War Refugee Board and will in the future no doubt facilitate the rescue program of the War Refugee Board, including the project of free ports in this country for the admission of war refugees who are otherwise barred by immigration laws."

The Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, once again exhibited his devotion to American principles and as the globe-circling Senator is in a far better position to express the following:

"I am supporting the free-port project and will so advise the War Refugee Board and the White House. It is the least the United States can do under the circumstances to alleviate the suffering of so many unfortunate victims of oppression."

"President Roosevelt's Refugee Board should lose no time in translating this plan into reality. I am sure every liberty-loving American will welcome such action."

The lady of humane letters, an American at head and at mind, Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, from Connecticut, added her voice in an appeal for free ports.

Others were William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; the Y. M. C. A.; and many other notables and organizations.

I know that I am expressing the will of the American people when I call upon the War Refugee Board, in the interests of humanity, in accordance with our American ideals and traditions, to establish temporary havens of refuge in this country. Here, the oppressed and the hunted can find respite, until the overthrow of the oppressor permits their departure to permanent homes, in accordance with the orderly, humane arrangements to be cooperatively devised by a civilized, peaceful world.

Yours with great respect,

RABBI BARUCH KORFF.

Small Business in Post-War America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely and thought-provoking speech delivered by our colleague, Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER, of Missouri, before the sixty-second annual convention of the New York State Association of Local Insurance Agents, held in Syracuse, N. Y., on May 8 and 9, 1944:

There is at the present moment a plan in Washington to extend a war agency into the post-war period as a permanent "wet nurse" to small business. The agency to which I refer was created for the purpose of protecting and integrating the productive capacity of small business into the war effort. This plan follows the normal tendency of governmental bureaus and agencies to never let go—even after their emergency need has expired. The antidemocratic program sets up one man as the potentate over small business. This man would be equipped with a powerfully created and Government-financed corporation, which would have the power to determine the disposition of many billions of dollars of surplus Government property. He would be the official lobbyist for all small business, with power to intercept and distribute the lifeblood of trade. He could say whether this or that small business shall have a participation in these surpluses and, therefore, accordingly say whether or not this or that small business may live. Conversely, by the same power, he could exert influence to the end that no small business could enjoy such surpluses and, by the same stroke of power, play exclusively into the hands of the post-war surplus profiteers.

This man would be given the power to determine the financial policy of post-war small business. He would be empowered and privileged with the control of $1,000,000,000 of Government funds for this purpose. With this power he could put blood into or withhold it from any small business which he chooses. This same power is so broad that he may give this life to small business which operates under the profit system or to enterprise which operates under a socialistic pattern.

This program has a heavy sugar coating in two colors: One, the label of aid for the reconversion of small business to peacetime pursuits; two, preference for the veterans of the war. Both are most worthy objectives. But both will suffer by the heavy hand of paternalistic government.

This evening I wish to dwell briefly on these important objectives. To clearly do so I think a basic statement is essential: Independent small business is the keystone in the arch of free competitive enterprise. With time to think this statement over, I believe that all of us who believe in free competitive enterprise can come to agreement. To me this is basic.

The future of small business in post-war America can be either brilliant and prosperous—or dull and declining—dependent upon whether it is free or regimented.

War controls have caused many to contemplate the risk of compromising with some form of post-war regimentation or governmental supervision. This is dangerous to the future of small business. Small business, in my opinion, is the keystone in the arch of a free competitive enterprise—and the more units of small business operating in America—the more secure is the American way of life.

If this be true, then it follows naturally that anything that tends to stifle free competition, chokes off the opportunity for small business to prosper.

There are two great dangers against which we must continually fight if small business is to prosper. First, the danger of private monopolistic encroachment. Against this danger, the Federal antitrust laws should be strengthened, and in many cases State laws should be strengthened. Second, the danger of the paternalistic hand of government, which means eventually governmental supervision and regimentation. We must guard carefully against the temptation to extend war controls for any period of time longer than necessary to taper off and liquidate such agencies. Governmental agencies which have been protective in their service to small business during war could serve no other purpose than to become regimental tools in peacetime. A heavy paternal hand of government means eventual death to the prosperous free operation of small business.

All small business needs and wants, therefore, is protection against private monopolistic encroachments which are destructive by their very nature and freedom to operate.

Many preferences can and should be given the veterans of this war by both Government and business. The only preference to be offered to these worthy veterans under the program which I warn against is to be found in ostentatious print.

The insurance industry is one made up of hundreds of thousands of small business units. Its financial stability stems from great resources aggregated into fewer hands. Yet, these few hands, holding this capital as security, do not all begin to qualify as big business. In fact, most of them are small, secure, dependable, profitably managed small businesses, carrying an important public confidence and trust. These aggregations of capital perform two important functions in a free economy. They pay and spread the loss from myriads of hazards and feed into the economy many millions of dollars of risk capital annually. These dollars and their hundreds of thousands of agents could do more for small business in the way of distributing risk capital without one iota of impairment of security of funds for the payment of losses. These same dollars have competent agency representation in every nook and cranny of America. Insurance dollars, plus the insurance organization of the capital stock companies, have a great opportunity to directly aid the reconversion of small business from war back to peace. This is the private enterprise way of business helping its biggest customer—small business. Small business is the biggest customer of big business. Small business is the biggest customer of the insurance business. Why not follow through all the way and help our customers grow and prosper and reemploy the millions of veterans and other Americans after this war?

I remind big businessmen, Government regimenters, and small-business men alike, that—independent small business is the keystone in the arch of free, competitive enterprise. All that small business wants, therefore, is protection against monopolistic encroachments—and, freedom to operate. Business has the energy, the "know how" and the will to do all this for itself.

The Atlantic Charter and Mid-Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, 1944, there appeared in the New York Times a concise and illuminating editorial statement with respect to the application of the Atlantic Charter to the boundary dispute between Russia and Poland. The editorial follows:

BACKGROUND OF THE CHARTER

The Soviet magazine War and the Working Classes takes to task people in England and the United States whom it accuses of attempting to "use" the Atlantic Charter to bolster the "conqueror's pretensions of the so-called Polish Government toward territories in the Ukraine and White Russia." The Russian publication argues that the Atlantic Charter cannot properly be regarded from an abstract point in space but should be read in the light of the conditions actually obtaining when it was formulated.

If this is done, it seems to us that the record strengthens the case for collective action rather than unilateral action in the settlement of problems of this kind. For the record reveals four important entries so far as the Atlantic Charter and Poland and Russia are concerned: (1) On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked Russia, thus nullifying the Soviet-German treaties of 1939. (2) Five weeks later the Government of Russia and the same Government which it now describes as "the so-called Government of Poland" signed a treaty of mutual aid (July 30) in which the Russian Government "recognized the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity." (3) The 1939 partition of Poland was thus rubbed out officially when, in another 6 weeks (on August 14), the Atlantic Charter was proclaimed, with its pledge against any "territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." (4) Another 6 weeks later, on September 24, both the Government of Russia and the same Government of Poland signed an agreement in London in which they "made known their adherence to the common principles set forth" in the Atlantic Charter "and their intention to cooperate to the best of their ability in giving effect to them."

This is the sequence of events which made, and still makes, many people in England and the United States believe that the Russian-Polish border problem is essentially a United Nations problem which can be settled most fairly and most hopefully by discussion in common council.

Hon. Martin Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 15, 1944]

BRUTALITY, INC.

Congressman MARTIN DIES, chairman of the Dies committee and the Nation's most effective foe of communism and of other subversive activities, has announced his retirement as a candidate for reelection because of a throat ailment diagnosed as malignant.

The C. I. O. United Steel Workers' Convention in Cleveland greeted the news of Representative DIES' retirement with cheers, and C. I. O. President Philip Murray said: "I think it is the greatest single contribution he has made to the welfare of the country since he entered public life."

The brutality of the C. I. O. is clearly shown in the fierce joy these delegates and their president expressed on learning that Representative DIES has the most dread disease known to man. The public will know from this how to appraise Murray and his cold-blooded gang of revolutionaries.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 15, 1944]

RESIGNATION OF DIES SEEN FORCED BY C. I. O.—COMMITTEE HE ORIGINATED WILL NOT PASS, WRITER BELIEVES

(By David Lawrence)

Decision of Representative MARTIN DIES not to be a candidate for reelection from his Texas district has more in it than meets the eye. Mr. DIES probably didn't quit because of ill health as stated. He quit because the C. I. O. made it too hot for him and might have defeated him for renomination.

The significance of the episode, however, is not that the C. I. O. can reach into Texas and exercise a threat at the polls by concentrating its political weapons in a single district, but that amid great jubilation the C. I. O. is announcing also that the Dies committee is to end.

It would be a grave mistake for anybody to assume that the Dies committee was ever just the creature of MARTIN DIES. Back of the Dies committee inquiry which six times got a vote of confidence from the House of Representatives and almost all the funds it asked for were such powerful organizations as the American Legion and the American Federation of Labor as well as the Daughters of the American Revolution and many other patriotic societies, to say nothing of certain church groups which have deep-seated convictions about the introduction of communism or Communist ideas in America.

COMMITTEE WILL NOT PASS

MARTIN DIES may pass off the stage but it is a safe bet that the committee which he originated will not pass. The effort of certain groups in America to use Communist technique to transform American institutions may seem inconsequential to many, many citizens. It may seem even to be "seeing things under the bed," but the Dies committee wasn't organized to wait till communism got a foothold and real strength. It was organized to use the power of publicity to nip communism in the bud.

The principal opponents of the Dies committee have not been Communists in America, but left-wingers who resent the Communist label when tagged on to them. The most frequently heard charge from the left-wingers is that the Dies committee isn't hard enough on the Fascists. One reason is, of course, that the Roosevelt administration has been doing a very effective job in getting at the Fascists and the promoters of religious hatreds. The present sedition trials show that the administration has used the prosecuting arm energetically in the direction of the so-called lightists. MARTIN DIES, of course, can show by counting the pages of testimony and the volumes of words that

his committee has spent a good deal of its time exposing Fascist groups and those with a sympathy for nazi-ism.

The Dies committee has, to be sure, been clumsy at times in its methods and has engaged in rough and tumble fighting which is a bit uncomfortable for the leftists because since 1933 they have been so seldom on the receiving end of congressional smearing. But if they go back during the last 11 years and look at the behavior of congressional committees sponsored by the administration and the left wing, they will be reminded of how irresponsible and extreme a congressional investigating committee engaged in a witch hunt can be.

PART OF DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM

Investigating committees are an unpleasant but necessary part of the democratic system. So are extremists. The left wingers perform a function whether or not they admit that the ideas of Karl Marx or Stalin or anyone else on the subject of private capitalism are basic in their philosophy. The right wingers perform a function in resisting encroachment on private property and in their attempt to prevent communizing of American enterprise. These tidal waves of social upheaval will be helped toward the day of equilibrium and relative contentment by exposure to the healthy air of free discussion.

The danger in America is not committees like that headed by MARTIN DIES, not altogether the Communist or Fascist-minded groups that organize societies, but the persons with political and official power who have a totalitarian instinct. This is the instinct which first calls names and then persecutes people for their religious, racial, or economic views and then seeks to win the debate by exterminating the protagonists of the other point of view. The extremists do not really favor discussion. They do not rely on the correctives that an informed public opinion can bring even to smears by congressional committees. They want their opponents squelched or abolished. If those who have started out to abolish the Dies committee think that the withdrawal of the chairman means an end of the committee, they will have another guess coming. There will be another committee to keep the spotlight on un-American activities and it should avoid the blunders and injustices of its predecessor.

Address of Hon. John A. Byrnes, Chief Justice of the City Court of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech delivered at the annual communion breakfast of the United Holy Name Societies of the city of Mount Vernon, N. Y., on Sunday, May 14, 1944, by Hon. John A. Byrnes, chief justice of the City Court of New York:

In this era of doubt and uncertainty and questioning, in this day of assault on the cherished principles of religion, it is an encouraging and wholesome spectacle to witness so many men unafraid to do open homage to their faith, by their reception of the sacrament of the eucharist within this paschal time.

And it harmonizes beautifully with the spirit of Mother's Day that this communion breakfast be given by the Society of the Holy Name—a society whose fundamental designs are propagation of "true love and reverence for the holy name of God and Jesus Christ" and the suppression of the profanation of the divine name.

Thus we are assembled here this morning in observance of the second commandment, which admonishes us that we "shall not take the name of the Lord, thy God, in vain," as well as the fourth commandment, which charges us to "honor thy father and thy mother."

To revere and love our God and to honor our parents are not only holy commandments and a holy duty, but the observance of the commandments and the duty produces a spiritual satisfaction and a soulful peace and a physical contentment which have no substitutes.

No more appropriate occasion could have been selected for this Holy Name breakfast than Mother's Day.

Thackeray, in his Vanity Fair, truly says that—

"Mother is the name for God on the lips and in the hearts of little children."

Mother should also be the name for God on the lips and in the hearts of grown-ups.

Edgar Allen Poe gave utterance to the sublime thought that—

"In the heavens above
The angels, whispering to one another,
Can find, amid their burning terms of love
None so devotional as that of mother."

It is impossible to speak on this particular day without inviting the criticism of being sentimental. Well, if in recounting and emphasizing the selflessness of our mothers, of their myriad sacrifices, of their unyielding devotion, of their steadfast care, of their unmovable loyalty, of their inexpressible and ineffable love—if that, I say, be sentimentality, then you may register me as an incorrigible sentimentalist, and I am unashamed about giving expression to this sort of sentimentality, for I prefer a soft heart to a hard one.

Need I tell you—you who are sons of good mothers—that a mother's love defies logic, that it challenges reason, and that it triumphs over adversity?

As the poet Lowell beautifully voiced it:

"A woman's love
Is mighty, but a mother's heart is weak and by its weakness, overcome."

Yes, a mother's love makes the possible probable and the probable, reality.

But if this day is to be more than an occasion dedicated to mere vocal appreciation of our mothers, we must convey our expressed sentiments of fealty into deeds of worthwhileness. We must make our actions speak louder than words. For there is more eloquence and meaning and gratitude in performance than in promise. Fine thoughts which do not beget fine actions are akin to seeds which never flower.

Love and faith carry corresponding commitments. The more profound the love, the more unshakable the faith, the greater and more authentic must be our redemption of the trust. So, we can prove our love for our mothers by proving that we are worthy of their love for us.

And we must prove ourselves worthy not merely on Mother's Day, but on every day.

As the love of our mothers for us functions every day of the year, so our love for them must manifest itself throughout the year.

The spirit of Mother's Day calls for the never-ceasing exercise of our loyalty to them. The spirit of Mother's Day is not the celebration of a day but the consecration of our lives. We can render no higher tribute to our mothers than to so live day by day that they will justifiably be proud of us, or would be proud were they still in our midst.

And a mother wants no other reward than the knowledge that her self-sacrificing efforts have not been in vain; that her faith has not been misplaced; that her love has been, and is being, repaid by a devotion, not only to her but to society—by a devotion that manifests itself daily through righteous living.

Every man, no matter how humble or poor, can by reflecting the teachings of his mother be a living monument to her.

"'Tis an old proverb that one good mother is worth a hundred schoolmasters."

At no time in the history of the world has there been such a need, such a desperate, imperative, pulsating need, for those qualities which characterize a good mother. The sores of the world can be healed by the application of the wondrous, mysterious, but never-failing process of mother love. The world needs to be humanized. The world needs to be imbued with the self-sacrificing nobility of motherhood.

The world needs a heart that beats with warmth; the world needs blood that is compassionate; the world needs a tongue that speaks only the language of truth; the world needs arms that are always lifted for the right; the world needs ears trained to the rhythm of music, yet ears that hear and understand and sympathize with the woes and wailing of a distressed humanity; the world needs eyes that see the gutter as well as the stars; the world needs a voice that cries out for a genuine brotherhood; the world needs a soul that rebels against injustice.

Talk of war, preparation for war, instilling and propagating and fastening the fervor of militarism, the destruction of young manhood in warfare—these constitute the very negation of the spirit of motherhood. The warm, benign spirit of peace, not the mad, devastating spirit of war, is the spirit of the mother.

On this Mother's Day, our fervent prayer is that all nations treat their citizens or subjects with that tolerance and understanding and sympathy that mothers indiscriminately bear for their children—a treatment that has no regard for the beauty or the imperfection of the offspring.

The practice of that sort of love would make impossible the cruel treatment which Germany is meting out to her Jewish citizens; the practice of that sort of love would give the Catholics of Mexico, the Catholics of Russia and elsewhere, the same liberty of conscience and freedom of religious pursuit that is accorded to those of different faiths; the practice of such love would banish that racial, social, and economic discrimination and persecution which infects and poisons the world, and which wantonly debases the very name of mother.

Suffering would be alleviated, want would be lessened, industrial strife would be substantially abated, misery would decline, if we put into practice those concepts of decency which were taught to us by our mothers.

Yes, if those who are directing the affairs of the world and in control of its destinies would only talk less about their love for their mothers, and do more toward harnessing that love to the problems of the day, what a different, and better, and happier place this old world would be.

We would have been endowed with the true faith; yes, all the peoples of the world, have heard that voice of love and compassion; all mankind has seen those arms lifted in righteous indignation. All the world has turned a deaf ear, an unseeing eye. The voice crying in the wilderness of a world gone mad is the voice of holy mother the church, through its supreme pontiff.

The thought that I have earnestly endeavored to bring to you this morning is that not only on Mother's Day, but on each and every day, we consecrate our lives to the teachings of our mothers.

Then, and only then, will we be fulfilling the obligations which we owe to our mothers, and which they have a right to expect us to discharge.

Such a life, lived every day of the year, would be more emblematic of our love for mother than the mere wearing of a flower on Mother's Day. What really counts is the feeling in our hearts, the expression in our souls, the practice of our lives, and not the flower that adorns our lapels. The flower wilts and fades and loses its fragrance, and perishes. The love of mother is ever present, ever living, as fresh and as fragrant and enkindling today as the day we were born.

Highway Use Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 8, 1944.*

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLCOTT: During the current hearings before the Roads Committee on post-war highway legislation the subject of special highway user taxes has been referred to from time to time. In this connection views have been expressed and suggestions have been advanced that are wholly at variance with the facts as well as with the thinking of highway user groups generally. Hence we deem it important that the views of the latter, as represented by the organizations the signatures of which are attached hereto, be made a part of the record of the hearings.

We are all in complete agreement as to the importance of a planned program for post-war highway construction. As users we have a vital interest in the sound development of adequate highway facilities. However, as the users who pay an overwhelming part of the cost of highways, we are deeply conscious of the necessity for keeping special user levies on a sound basis and within reasonable and justifiable needs. Sound construction and sound financing must go hand in hand.

The ability to pay of those to be taxed is of primary importance. It is a factor which has been given too little consideration in the past with the result that in many instances the highway user taxes that already prevail are unnecessarily burdensome. Far from being a luxury to take or leave at will, the motor vehicle in its various forms has become a necessity. The family automobile has become a transportation necessity. It is normally used more for business and other necessary travel than for anything else. Our huge fleet of commercial vehicles is used for business exclusively. These vehicles are employed in competition with other modes of transportation which are given an unreasonable competitive advantage when the tax burden of highway users is made heavier. The farm truck, of which there are more than a million, is a vital tool used by the farmer in virtually every phase of his operations. Excessive taxes on that tool diminish or even eliminate the fruit of the farmer's labor. Failure to recognize these facts and to give due weight to ability to pay is to invite a popular revolt against the sound highway programs that are so urgently needed.

In testimony given before your committee several witnesses expressed the belief that it would be in order to increase special user taxes to defray the additional cost of post-war highway programs. One witness had this to say:

"We hear very little opposition to the highway user tax, so it is quite evident that the highway user would pay additional imposts if he can be assured that the money will be used for his safety and comfort by the improvement and the extension of our highway system."

We take direct issue with this and with all similar statements and inferences. Such views have come from persons who do not represent highway users and are therefore not qualified witnesses from the standpoint of what taxes the users should pay or are able to pay. The highway is essentially a community facility, with many groups and classes reaping direct and indirect benefits from its use and its availability. In view of this those users who pay the taxes will naturally resent the implication that every increase in cost, real or contemplated, is to be passed on to them in the form of higher rates. A study by the Federal Coordinator of Transportation (the late Joseph B. Eastman), published in 1940 by the United States Government, showed conclusively that motor vehicle owners and operators have been paying more than their fair share of highway costs. As representatives of the users who pay the taxes, we cannot find a vestige of authority for the statement quoted above to the effect that it is quite evident that the highway user is willing to support increased tax rates. There is, in fact, much criticism of various phases of the motor vehicle tax structure. It varies from place to place depending upon the conditions. What we want to stress is that your committee would not be warranted in basing a post-war Federal-aid highway program on the assumption that the highway users are prepared for the pyramiding of the levies they are now called upon to pay.

As a practical matter, there is no reason at all why the question of increased motor tax rates should be agitated at this time. State receipts from current motor tax rates are more than adequate to provide the highway user's fair share of necessary post-war highway facilities. What we need is not higher tax rates but better use and better control of the revenue derived from the taxes now paid by the users. In 1941, receipts from State motor vehicle imposts amounted to $1,468,554,000. The bulk of this revenue was applied in varying proportions to State highways, local and urban roads, and to the defrayment of charges on bonded indebtedness. However, there was diverted in 1941 alone to purposes wholly unrelated to roads, the huge sum of $215,039,000. During the 8-year period, 1934–41, a grand total of $1,350,837,000 was diverted. Until we have succeeded in stopping this unconscionable abuse of taxes paid by the motor vehicle operators for roads that they did not get, any talk of increased user taxes is manifestly ill-advised. As you well know, the Congress of the United States has stigmatized this practice as "unwise and unfair."

Tax rates should be determined on the basis of actual conditions and actual needs from State to State and from time to time, but always with due regard to "ability to pay." To us the immediate objectives are clear. We should move aggressively on every front to stop diversion, which is a glaring breach of faith with the highway users. We should seek to prevent dispersion, that is, the waste of road money due to lack of adequate controls of motor vehicle revenue allocated to local units of government. We should seek to get back on a pay-as-you-go basis in order that we may secure relief from the continuing drain of highway debt against current revenues. If we do these things we may well find that existing tax rates are more than sufficient to meet the cost of expanding highway programs. In that eventuality the users should get the benefit in the form of lower rates.

Not satisfied to tell your committee that the highway users are ready to foot increases in the rates of regular State levies—the gasoline tax and the registration fee—the witness quoted above went still further and suggested that tolls might be superimposed upon the State's tax structure. Said he:

"Another possibility of financing highway construction is the direct use tax in addition to the ordinary user imposts."

This suggestion warrants little consideration. The country would not look with favor on a post-war highway program which envisioned the return of the tollgate. Toll financing is justifiable only under exceptional circumstances and when surrounded with safeguards such as have been established from time to time by the Public Roads Administration as a matter of sound public policy. As highway user groups, it is our unalterable position that tolls should have no place in the planned financing of the post-war highway program that your committee is now considering.

Some of the witnesses who have appeared before your committee sought to establish a connection between Federal levies imposed upon highway users and Federal-aid highway disbursements. This is wholly contrary to the facts. Federal aid was originally conceived and was effectuated down through the years as a contribution by the Federal Government to the States in the interest of a limited road mileage that performed significant services for the Nation as such. Federal aid was never predicated on a special Federal tax levy on a special class of highway beneficiaries. The Federal automotive excise taxes were originally imposed by Congress as an emergency measure for balancing the budget. They were continued because of revenue requirements. This is equally true of the so-called "use tax" more recently imposed. Thus, historically and factually, Congress has always regarded these levies as a temporary expedient.

In this connection we beg to call your attention to the report of the Committee on Federal, State, and Local Government Relations, which was printed a few days ago as a Government document. This report was jointly sponsored by the United States Treasury and by the Institute of Public Administration. On the subject of the Federal automotive taxes, the report had this to say:

"For the motor-vehicle tax field, the coordination device recommended is the separation of sources, withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field as much and as soon as its fiscal exigencies will permit."

The user groups fully subscribe to this recommendation, with the difference that we would include in it the "use tax" as well as the Federal automotive excise taxes proper. We hope that your committee will be guided by it in weighing the Federal-aid problem and its various impacts.

In the event that you or any member of your distinguished committee should want any further information from the user groups on the subject discussed herein, we shall be glad to supply it, whether it relates to tax facts or highway user views.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATION, INC.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS.
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF PRIVATE MOTOR TRUCK OWNERS, INC.
THE NATIONAL GRANGE.
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ICE CREAM MANUFACTURERS.

That Horse, That Stream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, May 14, 1944, which editorial follows:

THAT HORSE, THAT STREAM

The Democrats held their annual $50-a-plate Jefferson Day dinner in New York a few nights ago; and at the ceremony the most probable fourth-term campaign strategy and tactics were broadly outlined.

Robert E. Hannegan, new Democratic national chairman, and "Dear" ALBEN BARKLEY rang the changes on the old familiar refrain, "Don't change horses in midstream."

Mr. Hannegan didn't quite compare Almighty God unfavorably with Franklin D. Roosevelt. But he did call the President a man of destiny, the best man among us to serve as Commander in Chief for the duration of the war, and the American best equipped to hold up our end in establishing a just and durable peace.

If we should vote Mr. Roosevelt out of office next November 7, Mr. Hannegan foresaw disaster for us. The "vision and idealism of Woodrow Wilson" would be "submerged by the cynicism and the opportunism of another Harding." Mr. Roosevelt was part of a great historical process which must be completed without interruption.

Mr. Hannegan then went into a long smear of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York—indicating that the New Deal leaders fear Dewey more than they fear any other possible Republican Presidential candidate.

Dear ALBEN BARKLEY, taking up where Hannegan left off, tried to grab for a Democratic administration, headed by a Democratic President, all the credit for the enormous United States war effort. Apparently American industry, American labor, and American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and taxpayers have had nothing to do with it.

The "don't change horses," "indispensable man" keynote was keened when Senator BARKLEY said that "we cannot afford" to let the disputes of a political campaign retard the momentum of our war effort—though he big-heartedly said that he personally was willing to see the election held as now scheduled by the Constitution.

During the political campaign it is now clear that the new dealers hope to sell the majority of the voters on the proposition that Mr. Roosevelt is indispensable, and that 135,000,000 Americans will be defeated in war, or ruined in peace, or both, if they don't reelect him.

The argument is a complete phony. No man is indispensable; no man ever has been.

The argument against changing horses in midstream is only another wording of the "indispensable man" argument; and it is equally phony.

Plenty of horses have been changed in plenty of midstreams, to the great benefit of the riders. England swapped Asquith for Lloyd George in World War No. 1, and Chamberlain for Churchill in World War No. 2, and British war fortunes looked up after each swap.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT CHANGES HIS MIND

Mr. Roosevelt himself once understood all this clearly, and took the horse argument apart in a crisp and forceful way. Winding up a Jefferson Day address at St. Paul, Minn., on April 18, 1932, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"There will be many in this Nation during the coming months who will implore you not to swap horses crossing a stream; there will be others who will laughingly tell you that the appeal should have been worded: 'Do not swap toboggans while you are sliding downhill.' But it seems to me that the more truthful, the more accurate plea to the people of the Nation should be this: 'If the old car in spite of frequent emergency repairs has been bumping along downhill on only two cylinders for 3 long years, it is time to get another car that will start uphill on all four.'"

Those remarks are to be found at pages 638-39 of volume 1 of The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The chapter carrying the speech is entitled: "The First Campaign for the Presidency, 1932; Part 1—Before the Nomination at Chicago, July 1, 1932."

The passage, too, stands on its own feet in the speech. Tacked to it are no qualifying remarks, no ifs, and or buts. That was the way Mr. Roosevelt felt about the "indispensable man," "don't change horses in midstream" tommyrot in 1932, when he was first running for President; and those were the words with which he torpedoed that tommyrot. A neat job of torpedoing it was, too.

Since that time, Mr. Roosevelt obviously has changed his mind.

One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter I received from Col. Gerard W. Kelley, present commander of the Fighting Sixty-ninth, known as the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry. I had the honor of serving with this regiment in the First World War. Its history is resplendent with victories during the early fighting of the Civil War. In the present war the regiment had the honor and glory of capturing the island of Makin in the Pacific, during which engagement the commander, Col. Gardner Conroy, was killed. The present commander, Gerard W. Kelley, is a boyhood friend of mine, he lived in the old section of New York, called the "Old Gas House District." The regiment is located in my district and most of its commanders and personnel were from the neighborhood. We are proud of Gerard Kelley and of our beloved regiment, and know that just as they were fighting at the gates of Sedan when the armistice was signed in the last war, they will be at the gates of Tokio when victory is achieved.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH
INFANTRY, A. P. O. 27,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR JIM: Thanks for your kind note of congratulations. The signatures of Rosemary and John and Mae Byrnes and Ed O'Connor made it that much warmer, because Eighteenth Street has never left me and is always a source of pride to me. I owe it so much.

Your letter gave me a pleasant boost because not many people (outside of Madaline, Violet and Gene) realize how much the Regiment has meant to me all my life. With all of West Point, Regular Army and other influences, I still thought and think that this is the greatest Infantry outfit in any Army. As a boy, under the influence of the Duffy's and then Allie Anderson I had hopes of belonging to it. I don't remember ever having confidence that I could command it. The commander of it was always a "big shot" in my eyes.

Knowing that you are one of the few people who can conceive of the above, I am sure you will understand when I write that I am very humble in the realization of my responsibilities.

In addition to training the individual to fight better than the Jap and thereby live longer, I am fighting for the gas house, New York Americans of Irish ancestry, and everything that has been dear to us, and our parents. That's a big order in anybody's book. I'm not afraid of it but I'm going to need the prayers of those at home. Even as we prayed for you a quarter of a century ago.

Please give my kindest regards to Hazel and all the Fays and the gang in the neighborhood who remember me.

My very best.

JERRY.

A President's Wartime Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 14, 1944:

A PRESIDENT'S WARTIME POWER

When the Government, on the eve of a decision on its application for an injunction in the Montgomery Ward case, withdrew from occupation of the Ward plant, it left Federal Judge Holly without an issue to decide.

Whether the judge would have ruled on the extent of a President's wartime powers may never be known. It is noteworthy that there never has come a conclusive ruling on this question.

Attorney General Biddle's declaration that "No business or property is immune to a Presidential order" seemed sweeping. Much was made of it. It does have elements that raise serious questions. More startling was Mr. Biddle's declaration that "particularly in time of war the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive." That is a doctrine which would logically mean there is no authority in the courts in time of war. This phase of the Attorney General's reasoning will not be accepted by a democracy which believes in courts as the protectors of constitutional right.

Mr. Biddle also declared that the President has "a great constitutional reserve of power." That is true, and how great that power is, what its limits are, has never been decided by final court authority. But how can it be if the question revolves around an emergency? The emergency is not known beforehand, and its shape is never predetermined.

Lincoln in his first inaugural dealt with complaints of Southern States that constitutional rights had been invaded. He said:

"No organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain, express provisions for all possible questions."

Lincoln wrote later: "If a commanding general finds a necessity to seize the farm of a private owner for a pasture, an encampment, or a fortification he has the right to do so and to so hold it as long as the necessity lasts." He telegraphed General Fremont in 1862: "You are authorized to purchase the 400 horses or take them, wherever or however you can get them."

This, it will be said, applied to military occasions, while our forces were facing an armed foe. But Lincoln went beyond that. He drew on what Attorney General Biddle calls "a great constitutional reserve of power." He operated for weeks at the beginning of the Civil War without any express authority from Congress. He suspended habeas corpus. He proclaimed the slaves free in regions in rebellion against the United States.

None of these acts was ever decided on its constitutionality. Why not? Because, with a war on, Congress accepted what had been done. The results of the war were satisfactory to the prevailing opinion of the country.

If now some court were to decide—and the decision might possibly reach the Supreme Court while the war is still in progress—precisely the limitations of a President's power, what would it mean? First, a demand for congressional authorization to the President. And if this were held unconstitutional, a demand for amendment to the Constitution.

Meanwhile an emergency might arise, unforeseen by Congress, unforeseen by the Court, but great enough to have the whole country demanding that the President act. That such an emergency might be far greater than Fremont's need of 400 horses 80 years ago will be generally agreed.

We have worked out in this country a way of living together in which no clearly written provision of the Constitution may be violated, but which leaves the Constitution flexible. This gives the President, any President, a reserve of power. His authority for its exercise may be taken to court, or the President may be impeached if the prevailing opinion of the country is that he has abused the power.

Meanwhile Government is not helpless in the face of emergency, as it almost certainly would be if some court, or many courts, had undertaken to draw up precise specifications of a President's wartime authority.

Placing American Legion Insignia on Veterans' Markers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I know of no organization that has done more to advance the cause of Americanism than the American Legion. For many years, their sole aim has been one of service to our country. Every member of this organization has the interest of our country at heart and they are willing to do everything possible in the interest of same. No sacrifice is too great for a member of the American Legion to make at this time, as each member is willing to go the length.

In my district, the American Legion Post at Albany, Tex., has passed a resolution recommending that markers furnished by the Government to deceased veterans provide for the emblem of the American Legion to be placed on such markers whenever requested to do so by the relatives of the deceased. I heartily agree with this resolution and in order to advance such a move, I am including herewith a copy of the resolution.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has provided for a headstone or grave marker with certain emblems and inscriptions thereon for deceased ex-servicemen, to be shipped, without cost to deceased's relatives, to point of destination; and

Whereas the said headstones are more than grave markers, they are testimonials of honest and faithful service by the Government whom they served, and are highly appreciated by Legionnaires and their families; and

Whereas the emblem of the American Legion is a symbol of service to community, State, and Nation in time of peace for those who served their country in time of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States further provide that the emblem of the American Legion may, and shall be, placed upon the headstone or grave marker of deceased Legionnaires entitled to same, at the request of relatives or responsible persons, accompanied by statement or certificate of post adjutant that deceased was a member of the therein-named Legion post at time of demise; be it further

Resolved, That the headstone or grave marker, when bearing the Legion emblem, shall have the religious emblem placed in the upper left-hand corner thereof with the appropriate date of birth thereunder, viz, 9-18-1890, and the Legion emblem placed in upper right-hand corner thereof, bearing appropriate date of demise thereunder, viz, 5-20-1942; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. TOM CONNALLY, of the United States Senate; a copy to Hon. SAM RUSSELL, of the House of Representatives; a copy to National Commander Warren H. Atherton; a copy to Department Commander Sam D. Forman, Jr.; and a copy spread upon the minutes of Guy Taylor Post, No. 61.

Approved and recommended by Guy Taylor Post, No. 61, Department of Texas, Albany, Tex., May 4, 1944.

JESS BARKER,
Commander.

Attest:

J. A. LAW,
Adjutant.

The 12 Federal Reserve Banks Should Be Public Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there must be jobs awaiting them when the men come home from this war.

No "ifs" and "ands" will do, nor can mistakes and blunders be excused.

Jobs there must be—good jobs and full opportunity. It is not a question whether this is to be done but how.

It will require a high rate of production and a high national income—at least at $125,000,000,000 a year. It will require full employment of all willing and able American workers, since, without that, 11,000,000 soldiers can hardly be employed, even with a preferential status. It will require, therefore, the one mainspring that can cause full employment and a high production rate—namely, a full home market, a correspondingly high level of consumer demand for goods.

It is altogether probable that a period of prosperity—perhaps even a period of boom—will immediately follow the end of the war. How long it will last, no one can foresee, but it will be followed by a time in which powerful economic forces will tend and work toward a deflation of our monetary supply and our country will be threatened with depression and a period of unemployment. While there is yet time, therefore, we must prepare to meet and to defeat these forces and we must develop a means whereby we can, above all, prevent any serious decline in the American home market for the products of our agriculture and industry.

There will be no single touchstone to success in this great battle to win the peace. A good many more than one measure will be required. But I know no more logical first step than for Congress to recover its constitutional power to issue the Nation's money. The simplest way to do this is for Congress to purchase from the member banks of the Federal Reserve System the stock of the 12 central banks which they now own and thus to make of those central banks a true national bank of issue.

In every Congress since I have been a Member I have introduced a very simple bill to accomplish that purpose.

BANK OF ISSUE SHOULD ALWAYS BELONG TO THE PEOPLE

Now this measure rests on two utterly unassailable principles of justice and good government. The first is that the function of original creation of money is essentially a governmental function and cannot be delegated away to any private agencies—as it is now delegated to the banking system—without violating the fundamental sovereignty of a nation. The second principle is this: That it is elemental economic justice that whatever advantages derive from the creation of any volume of the medium of exchange—whether by coinage or printing of money or by expansion of credit—should always accrue to the people generally and never to any privileged or selected group of them.

The ridiculousness of our present practice has never been more forcibly stated than by Christopher Hollis in his book, The Breakdown of Money, where he says:

Indeed the historian has to record that in almost every age there was some superstitution or other of utter unreason which strangely occupied the minds of men, otherwise of activity and vigor. He has to confess that he cannot explain how it was that

men once believed in the mystical significance of numbers or in the claims of astrology. We are sometimes ready to congratulate ourselves that our age has outgrown all superstitions. But the historian of the future will, I fancy, reckon in the same class as number worship and astrology and the study of the gizzards of birds the strange superstition that, whenever money is invented, a percentage must be paid forever afterward as a propitiation to a banker. It is on that superstition that the whole empire of Mammon is built.

RICARDO OF BANK OF ENGLAND

This is no new problem, nor are the two principles just set forth new principles. As long ago as 1824 the great economist, David Ricardo, left behind him at his death an unanswerable argument in favor of having the English Government instead of the private Bank of England issue the nation's money. In the course of Ricardo's argument he included the following paragraph, which has a strangely familiar ring to it:

If the view which I have taken of this subject be a correct one, it appears that the commerce of the country would not be in the least impeded by depriving the Bank of England of the power of issuing paper money, provided an amount of such money, equal to the bank circulation, was issued by government, and that the sole effect of depriving the bank of this privilege would be to transfer the profit which accrues from the interest of the money so issued from the bank to government.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

And Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party of the United States, has left behind him the warning which we may well heed today:

If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all their property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.

Today, however, the case for this move rests not alone on theoretical grounds, or on those of principle, but on the facts of the present situation as well.

BUSINESS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS TODAY

Twelve years ago only 20 percent of the earning assets of the 12 Federal Reserve banks consisted of United States Government securities. Today over 99 percent of their earning assets are United States Government securities. The detailed reasons for this change would take a long time to discuss. But the main fact is that the business of the Federal Reserve banks today consists almost entirely of creating money and lending it at interest to the United States Government. When the Federal Reserve banks buy Government bonds, they buy them with credit created for the purpose—with entries on their books. But the people of America pay interest on those bonds from that time on. This sovereign Nation has given to these privately owned banks the power to create its medium of exchange. But on the other hand, the Treasury of the United States must raise by means of taxes the money to pay the interest on or to retire the bonds which were purchased with costless credit by these private banks. We are paying interest to the Federal Reserve banks for the use of the credit of the Nation itself, which is all on earth the Federal Reserve buys the bonds with. This situation is wrong and should be ended by the purchase by the Government of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks from the present owners—the member banks. Then the bank of issue of America would be, as it should always have been, a bank belonging to the sovereign people of the Nation.

In a paper entitled "The Nature of the Federal Reserve Banks," written by Mr. E. A. Goldenwiser, Chief of the Research Division of the Federal Reserve Board, we find this statement:

The Reserve bank derives the funds available for its loans and investments from powers conferred upon it by Congress. The capital it has is prescribed by Congress and constitutes a small part of the funds at its disposal. The other sources of the funds of the Reserve banks is its power to issue notes and to accept and create deposits.

Note the words "create deposits." It is with these created deposits that bonds of the United States are bought.

WAR FINANCING

On February 6, 1942, a bill was presented to the House to permit Federal Reserve banks to purchase bonds of the United States directly from the Treasury. This was in the middle of a great war, but there was no special provision concerning the interest on the bonds. Interest was to be paid as usual, even in the midst of a war and dire national need, and even though the bonds were bought by privately owned banks of issue with the people's own credit. At that time I offered an amendment to the bill, which read as follows:

And provided further, That all obligations of the United States bought directly from the Treasury by any Federal Reserve bank shall be non-interest-bearing obligations.

But my amendment was not adopted. And the Nation as a whole, including the men actually fighting this war, were consequently committed to the continuance of the payment of interest on their own credit.

Thus, in order to finance this war, we print interest-bearing bonds at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and deliver them to the Federal Reserve Board. In payment for the bonds the Board simply creates what is called "Reserve bank credit" and enters such credit as a demand deposit in favor of the Treasury. The Federal Reserve has obtained ownership of a portion of the interest-bearing debt of the whole American people and has given back to the people a non-interest-bearing checking account in an amount equal to the principal of the bonds. Thereafter if there is need for Federal Reserve notes, those same bonds can be used as collateral for an issue of Federal Reserve notes. Those notes in turn are printed at the same Bureau of Engraving and Printing which originally printed the interest-bearing bonds.

According to the terms of the Federal Reserve Act, "Federal Reserve notes, to be issued at the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board for the purpose of making advances to Federal Reserve banks through the Federal Reserve agents as hereinafter set forth and for no other purposes, are hereby authorized." In other words, Federal Reserve notes can be "made available" to member banks of the System for their use, but cannot be "made available" to the United States Government unless it pays interest upon them. Should the Treasury of the United States seek to borrow any such money which is the principle currency of our country today, it would have to borrow it at interest from a private banking institution. Nevertheless, every Federal Reserve note bears upon its face these words: "Redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank." The only thing that lawful money could possibly be is money issued by the United States Government. Therefore, it is perfectly clear that the Government of the United States must stand behind and, if called upon, redeem every dollar of Federal Reserve notes which is issued.

And so the power to issue money, which has been given to the privately owned Federal Reserve banks, is, in the final analysis, supported, and the notes resulting from the exercise of that power are, in the last analysis, made valid by the constitutional power of Congress to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." The question inevitably arises, therefore, why Congress should not exercise this constitutional power in the first place instead of literally presenting to the Federal Reserve banks the interest which is now paid to them upon the credit of the Nation itself.

HOW THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT HAS WORKED

The original Federal Reserve Act, section 7, paragraph 1, provided that the Federal Reserve banks should pay a small rate of interest to the Government on all Federal Reserve notes issued. This was no doubt done because it was so plain that the money-creating power was being delegated by Congress to these banks. But by one method or another this requirement has been avoided, and no such interest has ever been paid. Again the original Federal Reserve Act, section 16, paragraph 4, required the payment of a franchise tax by the Federal Reserve banks to the Government in the form of the delivery to the Treasury of all surplus over and above the guaranteed 6 percent dividend on the stock. This provision was repealed in 1933, so that no franchise tax is now required. It was the hope in 1913 that the Federal Reserve System would prevent the growth of financial monopoly. Instead about 75 giant financial houses control about half the assets of the entire banking system of 15,000 banks, and the squeezing out of small independent banks proceeds apace with the march of branch banking and the growth of holding companies.

It was the hope originally that the Federal Reserve System would prevent booms and depressions. But the fact is that the worst and most disastrous depression in all American history took place with this system in operation, and was undoubtedly caused in part by the

deliberate and cruel deflation carried out in 1920 by the orders of the then Federal Reserve Board itself. And the present Board tells us that it has no power adequate to prevent either disastrous inflation or deflation if certain forces favorable to either of these conditions should assert themselves. Should inflation of bank credit start to take place the Board has not the power either to raise reserve requirements or to engage in open-market operations to a sufficient extent to check it.

Under the threat of inflation the Board ought to sell Government bonds so as to take money out of circulation. But if it did so, it might—in peacetime at least—contribute to a collapse of the Government-bond market and cause the price of such bonds to sharply decline. So this power is ineffectual. As to the even more serious menace of deflation there is nothing in the present Federal Reserve System that can effectively check it. For at present we solely depend for the supply of money to carry on the war work or peacetime business of this Nation upon the private banking system creating money in the form of demand-deposit figures for the purpose of making loans at interest. At the present time almost 85 percent of those loans are made to the Covernment of the United States rather than to private borrowers.

In times when there is need for additional money in circulation such as was the case during the depression, every bank in the Nation seeks to call in its loans, to restrict the making of new loans, and thus to bring about a more and more severe contraction of the monetary supply of the Nation. On the other hand in periods like the present when additional money is not needed and when the creation of additional money might contribute to a serious inflation, the banks attempt by every possible means to loan additional money, thus bringing on an inflationary expansion. It is natural enough that the banks should do these things. They are only seeking to protect their self-interest. But it is not either natural, logical, or right to permit the entire economic fate of the whole Nation to be subject to periodic booms and depressions by leaving the entire control of our monetary supply at the mercy of the self-interest of the private banking business.

I do not think it is necessary to go on. The 12 central Federal Reserve banks now belong to the member banks of the System. The stock is worth a par value of about $154,000,000. But with the ownership of that stock goes the power of control over the monetary system of America. The total paid-in capital stock of the 12 central banks—all the money the member banks have ever paid in for their stock ownership is $154,000,000.

By spending the $154,000,000 to purchase the capital stock of the central Federal Reserve banks from the private member banks Congress would do the following things for the American people:

First. Acquire an accumulated surplus of over $200,000,000.

Second. Reduce the public debt by some $11,500,000,000, the amount of United States bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills, and guaranteed securities held by the central banks on December 31, 1943, and bought with reserve bank credit, which, as has been explained, is the credit of the United States and the people thereof.

Third. Restore to Congress its constitutional duty and right to issue the Nation's money and regulate its value. The Federal Reserve banks are now the bank of issue of America. As such they should be—they should always have been—an agency of Congress and the property of the American people.

Fourth. Place our Nation in the position of being able to answer the problem of interest-bearing public debt.

Fifth. The purchase by Congress of the 12 central banks would mean that the Nation could earn its way out of debt, that when the Federal Reserve Board purchased—as it normally does—outstanding Government bonds from member banks in order to expand the volume of money and credit in circulation, in line with increasing production, those bonds would belong to an agency of the Government and would in effect have been retired without the necessity of any tax revenues being used to do so. Interest upon such bonds would, of course, be saved. Hence by increasing their production the people of the Nation would, if only the 12 central banks were a Government institution, be able to earn their way out of debt.

If Congress does not do this, we will have to account to the Nation for our failure to do it. We will have to try to explain to the people why we marshalled all other resources for national defense but left control of the Nation's own credit in private hands. We will have to tell them why we failed to take this constructive action, even when the welfare of a Nation was at stake. We will have to tell them we deliberately decided to afflict them with an interest-bearing debt when we might by a simple act have avoided doing so.

FUNDAMENTAL MONETARY PRINCIPLES

The bank of issue of America should be a Government bank belonging to the people and paying into circulation under the explicit direction of Congress such money or national credit as the national economy may require to maintain in our dollar a stable buying and debt-paying power in our domestic market. And such national money or credit must be placed in circulation debt free at the point of origin, which in every case must be the National Government. If this Congress did nothing else but pass a bill making the 12 central Reserve banks Government institutions, it would go down in history as one of the greatest Congresses of all time. This one measure will not solve all our problems, but it will put us in a position to attack them from a point of vantage that will give substantial hope of real and speedy success.

The text of my brief bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized and directed forthwith to purchase the capital stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and branches, and agencies thereof, and to pay to the owners thereof the par value of such stock at the date of purchase.

(b) All member banks of the Federal Reserve System are hereby required and directed to deliver forthwith to the Treasurer of the United States, by the execution and delivery of such documents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, all the stock of said Federal Reserve banks owned or controlled by them, together with all claims of any kind or nature in and to the capital assets of the said Federal Reserve banks, it being the intention of this act to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the said Federal Reserve banks.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The Federal Reserve banks are to all intents and purposes the banks of issue of the United States; they put Federal Reserve notes, our principal currency, into circulation. They have been given gold certificates which give them a lien against over $20,000,000,000 of the gold in Fort Knox. They create money at will in the form of Federal Reserve credit and when they do so they obligate all the resources of all the people to make that credit good. They execute the open-market policy of the Board, which determines largely the price of Government securities, as well as the volume of money in circulation; they rediscount for the commercial banks. But the Government and people of the United States own not 1 penny of stock in these banks. They belong lock, stock, and barrel to the commercial banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve banks should become the property of the American people and they should be operated as one central bank of issue under a specific mandate passed by the Congress. Their sole purpose should be to serve the general welfare of all the American people, their agriculture, commerce, and industry, by providing at all times a dollar of steady, stable, and constant buying power.

French Phoenix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an editorial from the Washington Post, of date May 16, 1944, as follows:

FRENCH PHOENIX

The brilliant fighting qualities displayed by the French troops at Bir Hacheim are being demonstrated anew in the present fighting in Italy. Entrusted with an important and difficult section in the Cassino area, the French and North African troops under General Juin have distinguished themselves. Theirs has been the honor of opening the first important gap in the Gustav Line by capturing two key strong points—the towns of Castelforte and Ausonia.

The symbolic as well as the practical significance of the French action in Italy can

hardly be exaggerated. It was 4 years ago next month that France went down to defeat under circumstances that left deep scars on the minds and hearts of democratic Frenchmen everywhere. The sense of humiliation was great, and everything that the Vichy regime has done since has only intensified that feeling. Fortunately there were Frenchmen who not only refused to accept the armistice—that was probably true of a great many inside France—but were also in a position to continue the fight against Nazi tyranny. They have nobly acquitted themselves. Now they stand shoulder to shoulder with Americans, Englishmen, New Zealanders, Indians, Poles, and other allied units in a campaign which marks the opening stage in the final struggle against the Wehrmacht.

It must be an inspiring moment for Frenchmen everywhere. As Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, commander of the Fifth Army, declared in a communication to Gen. Alphonse-Pierre Juin, the French commander, the French troops in Italy are "proving to an anxiously awaiting France that the French Army has returned, sacred to its finest fighting traditions." What has been done in Italy is an earnest of what will be done in France. In France there is another army of Frenchmen, a silent army, an army recruited under the very eyes of the Germans. Four years ago France was drinking the dregs of defeat and betrayal. France now awaits the hour of liberation, not passively but as a full-fledged participant in the common struggle. We share France's pride in French arms in Italy. There is a France.

Our Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we look toward the future and the post-war world, no one can do so without facing the haunting fear that the same disaster which confronted the American farmer following World War No. 1, will come again at the conclusion of this war. We need not come from districts which are wholly agricultural in order to share this great concern. It should be perfectly clear to all, regardless of the particular kind of economy he represents, that unless agriculture is prosperous, or at least it is able to receive a fair and reasonable return for the crops and livestock raised, there cannot be any assurance of prosperity for any of us. Agriculture is our basic industry, and its prosperity or its failure has a decided influence upon the lives of our people.

Without doubt, our American farmers are our greatest producers. By that same token they are our largest consumers. There has never been an overproduction of farm products, but there has frequently been an underconsumption of them. Our farmers have frequently been unable to consume desirable commodities produced by others, because they have been unable to purchase such desirable commodities—in other words, our farmers could not afford to purchase them because of their limited income. After this war is over—and we hope that glad day will soon come—our farmers will doubtless find themselves unable to purchase many desired commodities for their use precisely as they found themselves following the conclusion of World War No. 1. Our farmers had lost their markets, and they were unable to purchase, on the open market, those many commodities which they desired but which they were unable to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, after our farmers lost their markets they found themselves trying to discharge their obligations which had been incurred during the days of high prices while living at a time of greatly deflated farm prices. There are many pet schemes advanced for the salvation of the American farmer, but I do not know of any sound or adequate solution of this problem of preserving and improving farm prosperity, except to secure him against the loss of his market for his produce at a fair price therefor. Many people believe that the enactment of H. R. 1649, which has the support of many people in this Nation, and which measure should, perhaps, be designated as the national insurance plan, will aid materially in solving this portentious problem.

During this war we have witnessed the wholesome effect of a broad scale of the circulation of money, and the effect it has had upon increasing the national income. Certainly, if the national income can be raised in time of war, that same rule would apply to the advantage of all in time of peace. By the provisions of the measure, above referred to, it is planned to establish and maintain a sound and equitable market for the farmers, based upon the consumer's need and his ability to pay, and upon the cost of production to the farmer with a fair margin of profit assured to him in his own markets. Under this plan it is proposed that a tax be levied against all citizens, based upon the gross income, payable monthly and which tax would approximate 3 percent after exempting the first $100 of individual income, thereby creating a fund which would be available for use in creating the proposed circulation of money. Under this proposed plan, each month there would be apportioned, equally, among the aged people, who are unemployable because of age, illness, or infirmity, or because they are widows who are supporting children, and each recipient would be required to spend the money thus received within the next 30 days after the receipt thereof. The net result would be a tremendous circulation of money, and the money so provided would be kept in circulation. This plan has been proposed by many of our people as a means of meeting the post-war problems.

Mr. Speaker, the key to the maintenance of business, agricultural prosperity and every progress in our economic life is the turn-over of money. There is no other method of securing a sound and continued prosperity. The antitoxin which may be used against new and more terrible depressions in the future rests in the hands of the people. Legislation, such as is now proposed, has won for itself enthusiastic support from the general public and from many Members of Congress. It is claimed that it would aid materially in solving our post-war problems. In order to avoid great distress in the future among our people, and among our farmers, we should make every effort to get our own house in order to meet the serious problems of the future. The present is the time to act upon the program for the future. When the depression strikes it is then too late to apply the remedy. Let us look well to the future, and to the welfare of the people of this great Nation.

Federal Aid for the Readjustment in Civilian Life of Returning World War No. 2 Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, before recording my vote in favor of this bill, the object of which is to provide care, treatment, guidance, training and help for the veterans of this war, I have taken considerable time in analyzing its various provisions and in consultation and discussion with experts in every field encompassed by its provisions. I did this, not out of any distrust for either its objectives or provisions or the administrative machinery set up by it to insure the veterans' welfare. Too close to my heart is the solution of their problems, and alas! too vivid indeed are my memories of their distress, indignities, and sufferings after the First World War, in which I served and gave my right leg. With the fertility of these ever-present memories, I have as part of me, a firm resolve that the boys of today, the veterans of tomorrow, who are now suffering, shedding their blood and giving their lives, may have and hear the most eloquent assurances from the halls of this Congress, that theirs will be a different lot—a better lot.

With the purposes of this bill my heart and soul are in tune. But I want to be sure we are providing our veterans with something real, not merely crumbs, nor a political sop to lull them into temporary quiescence during a time of national political shadowboxing. Too often I have seen pacific, but highly inadequate measures rushed through the legislative mill for just this purpose. I do not lay any blame for this at the door of this honorable House nor any specific Member of it. The fault and cause lies in the huge volume of considerations before this body and the limitations of chronological time to deal better or more fully with them.

History will no doubt record the acts of this Congress as among the most stupendous and important ever entrusted to

the representatives of this Nation, during the most critical time of its existence. Our treatment of the veterans' problems and affairs will indeed be a criterion by which we shall be judged. And rightly so. Because as we legislate on these matters here and now will depend not only the welfare of more than 40,000,000 of our people in the years to come, but the quality and intensity of their devotion to their country and their willingness to suffer and die if necessary to preserve it. And, gentlemen, if economic cycles mean anything, our post-war conditions may well call for loyalty even beyond the hazards of war itself.

This act, cited in lines 9 and 10 of page 44 of the bill, as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is an excellent initial step, but calls for a great deal of amplification and clarification, lest its enforcement and administration go the way of so many legislatively well-intentioned programs which run afoul on the reefs of red tape or administrative arrogance. Consider the provision found in lines 19 to 24 on page 49 of the bill, which provides that no veteran will be deprived of the benefits of this act, for any wrongdoing in service while he was "insane." What shall the basis for such a determination be? After all, there is such a thing as shellshock, or as they have labeled it in this war, "Battle fatigue." Who shall judge that for the veteran returning from this war? Can we leave so important a matter to future chance, or the whims of theorists in the fields of psychiatry or neurology? I do not believe so, because as noble as these great professions are and as great as their services have been to us and to all mankind, we must remember that other noble callings have been burdened by unscrupulous and sometimes unconscionable men and that even the pulpits have given us a share of rogues and scoundrels. We must provide the standards for this condition and all similar broad conditions described in this bill, which will either grant or deny the veteran the benefits we are here attempting to assure to him. It is true the bill, in section 301, provides the machinery for reviewing the difficulties of a veteran who is not eligible for relief under this act by virtue of something he did, or did not do in service. But even this is too vague and the powers and limitations of the reviewing authority thus set up are too general ever to give it the humanity which the veteran had, when he fought and died for all of us.

Then there is the question of post-war education for the veterans as provided for in subsection 1 of part 8 on page 52 of the bill. This provides among other things that education or training will only be given if the veterans' "Education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interferred with by reason of entry into the armed services." If it was, he can get as much as 4 years of training and education at Government expense. If his education was not so interrupted, and so forth, he can only get a refresher course not to exceed 1 year.

Now why the distinction? The college boy who left his freshman, sophomore, or junior year to bear arms for his country certainly risked no more than many of the sons and daughters of your constituents and mine, whose education had either ended or never begun.

We are headed for a period in our history when we will need a great many more highly trained and skilled men and women to remake this world after the war and to reestablish our own economy and social order, than we have ever needed before. And who will most likely do as good a job at that as those who risked their lives and suffered to preserve it?

Gentlemen, that provision needs some serious thought and calls for some change. There are amendments to this bill now pending, and after listening most attentively to the discussions of them and the debates on them on the floor of this House I fully realize we are striving to insure the veteran a maximum of benefits. We must, however, provide for them with a minimum of administrative claptrap and a set of standards which will guarantee equal facilities to each and all veterans, with artificial discriminations against none of them. Remember, they are fighting and dying together without the slightest ideas about the next fellow's educational background. Let us provide adequately that those of them who return to us may grow and progress together. We cannot hope to do this by unequal educational facilities and opportunities.

May the record show clearly, however, that I am in favor of the act as a starter in the right direction. First, it provides and guarantees adequate hospitalization, treatment, care, and physical rehabilitation for the returned veteran. To this end it even ranks the administration of this care second only to the needs of the Army and Navy, and grants all priorities necessary to administer it properly. It provides for more hospitals and even sets up sub and local stations for treatment and care of the veteran. This makes available to the sick and ailing veteran the time-respected therapeutic value of proximate love from the veteran's family. There will be no self-imposed exiles such as there were after the last war, where veterans withered up and died in oblivion. Nor will there be any all-filled-up signs on any hospital where the veteran applies for treatment. There will be adequate beds and a prohibition against reducing their number. Never under this act will there be waiting lists for veterans' treatment. This bill makes someone guilty of a crime if such a thing ever happens again. It has teeth in it, and that is why I believe it is a good and healthy step forward. But we must not be satisfied with mere steps. We must keep on stepping until we have formulated a perfect routine for the veterans' future well-being.

Another World War No. 1 abuse which this bill eliminates is the easing out of a veteran before he is cured and ready to take his place in life. Under this act he cannot be discharged from a curative institution until he knows his rights and signs himself out. And even this must be explained to him by a responsible officer of the institution and his rights read to him. But even after this, if the veteran requires further care or treatment, he may return to the hospital and be sure of getting it.

Other phases of this bill which delight me no end provide for loans to veterans to enable them to buy or build homes, or farms, or to get into business. This time veterans will not be just tossed out of service and, with a few paltry dollars, told, in effect, to sink or swim.

We aim to send him back to life as healthy and well as science can make him; to train him for making a decent living; to help him get started in business by aiding in purchase of business or farm properties; to help him with employment placement. And finally, we aim through this bill to help him make his own home—the type of American living he fought to preserve for all of us.

My one great skepticism about the bill rests in its administration. Provision has been made in it for the various problems arising under it. These are fine. But I still intend fighting for my bill introduced at this session of the Congress, to put the responsibility for enforcement and administration of all veterans' laws, including this one, directly under the President of the United States. This can be accomplished, as I advised this House during March of this year, by having the head of Veterans' Administration, a member of the President's Cabinet.

Gentlemen of the Congress, I am voting for this bill, not as a cure-all for veterans' ills, nor the final pay-off for what they are doing for the Nation and for civilization. But I recognize and accept it as a beginning—a good beginning in the right direction, upon which a grateful Nation can build a lasting and suitable testament for history that the veteran to whom we owe our lives, our fortunes, and our futures, will not only be regarded as the savior of civilization—but rather the object, purpose, and measure of whatever civilization we may attain.

O. P. A. Rough-Rice Ceiling Does Not Make Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to again call to the attention of the Congress that I have been, together with the Senators and Members of Congress from the rice-producing States, protesting the placing of a ceiling price on rough rice by the O. P. A., and we have previously placed in the RECORD our arguments to the effect that such a ceiling price is unnecessary, unfair, unreasonable, discriminatory, will be ruinous to the rice producers and in-

dustry, and will, as a result, reduce production of this important food crop. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. has been intransigent in this as well as other instances, and since we are unable to obtain any consideration from that agency, it will be necessary for us to appeal to the Congress for relief by offering an amendment to the Price Control Act when the same is presented for consideration in the near future. Mr. Speaker, as a further evidence of the untenable position of the O. P. A. I desire to have included in these remarks a copy of an editorial from the Crowley Daily Signal, of Crowley, La., the rice center of America, as follows:

RICE CEILING DOES NOT MAKE SENSE

Anybody can make a mistake, and the people do not expect infallibility even in our Government bureaus. However, when a mistake is made and the fault is pointed out to the Government by experts who know the situation, and still nothing is done to remedy it, the people have a right to complain and question the capability of those in charge.

The O. P. A. made a mistake when it placed a ceiling on rough rice. The reasons why it is a mistake are very simple. They have been explained in Washington by men who know what they are talking about. The situation is not a complicated one, nor would it be difficult to remedy.

The plain facts of the case are that, because of the high cost of labor and material, growers must put out more money on crops, yet are not allowed to sell their rough rice at a price that will allow them any margin of profit. The farmer spends more but gets less. On the other hand, the millers, not hindered by such rigid Government control, are allowed to buy the rough rice at a low price, process it, and sell it at a fat profit. These facts are obvious to everyone but the men who are in a position to do something about the situation.

Even the most disinterested person will understand the unfairness of the ceiling, and common sense and fair play should convince anyone that it is a mistake. It is not difficult to understand why the O. P. A. has made the blunder which will prove disastrous if not corrected. The men who investigated and decided upon the case of rice ceilings were either not familiar with their subject or were working for the favor of rice millers who will grow rich under the regulations. The O. P. A. has done a half-way job by not getting to the bottom of the case.

And the incompetency in handling the situation will affect not only the rice growers, but the rest of the Nation as well. Laboring under the present regulations, the rice grower is not encouraged to plant as much as he formerly did. The Government tells us that rice is important to the war and we must grow more of it, yet prevents us from doing so by a foolish blunder which it refuses to correct.

Price ceilings are established to reduce inflation, and are a boon to our economic system when handled correctly. But the rough rice ceiling, instead of reducing inflation, is reducing production of a vital food. Today Japan controls 95 percent of the world's commercial rice. Yet we are placing our production in jeopardy by policies which will curtail that cutput. Unless price and production are placed in balance they will result in a program of subsidies. Subsidies will not help because they themselves are inflationary. Two of our greatest problems today are inflation control and production, and each must be handled separately. Price ceilings are not a cure-all, and they alone will not stave off inflation. Instead of jeopardizing our vital rice production with a remedy that will not work, the Government should concentrate on absorbed savings and taxation to do the job.

The issues at stake in the rice situation are too important to be tinkered and experienced with by men who continue to insist that the price ceiling is a remedy when common sense shows otherwise. The whole matter now lies in the hands of the O. P. A. It is they who made the mistake and they are the ones to remedy it. Our growers and Louisiana Congressmen have done all they can to make the Bureau realize its mistake and have suggested workable remedies. The fate of the Nation's rice production can be decided only by men who are jeopardizing it. We trust that common sense and fairness will cause them to change their present policy.

J. G.

International Air Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly concerned as to the welfare of our present and future international air-transport operations. Prior to the war this country was represented in the international field by the Pan American Airways System—an organization which did an outstanding job in placing the American flag at the forefront of international aviation. During the war, American Export Airlines and a large number of our experienced and capable domestic operators have been conducting air-transport operations abroad under contract with the Army and Navy. High officers of the Army and Navy agree that these contract operations have been of immense value in the prosecution of the war. They have actually changed the course of the war in important theaters. This, of course, has been the paramount benefit of the international contract service. But of almost equal effect upon the long-range welfare of this country has been the great accumulation of experience in international operations and overocean flying which these domestic air lines and American Export have acquired. This experience will be of incalculable value to this country when the war is over and our international air services must go out and meet vigorous competition from the air carriers of other nations.

During recent hearings before a subcommittee, of the House Committee on Appropriations considering the Navy Department appropriation bill for 1945, members of the subcommittee expressed doubt as to the wisdom of continuing certain of the civilian contract services—pages 875–881. These members indicated the belief that public funds could be saved by canceling these contracts, since the Navy had, since the war began, acquired experience in long-distance air transport operations. In the first place I am convinced that study would show that cancelation of these contracts would not save the public any money. Secondly, and more important, we would be playing into the hands of our future international competitors if we cut off these important contract services now. The British are not contemplating the adoption of any such short-sighted policy. The British Air Ministry is building up British Overseas Airways Corporation as rapidly as possible. I invite the attention of the House to the following quotation from a statement by Sir Archibald Sinclair, the British Secretary of State for Air, presented to the House of Commons on February 29, 1944:

The route mileage of the British Overseas Airways Corporation increased by over 20 percent in the last year, and, in fact was, in 1943, four times as great as the combined route mileage of Imperial Airways and British Airways in 1938. That does not look like putting civil aviation into cold storage. Their routes include the North Atlantic service, on which they have flown regularly during the whole of three winters, services to Stockholm, to Lisbon, down the west coast of Africa, to Cairo, and on to Turkey in the north and India in the south, besides the important route from Durban up to the east coast of Africa to Cairo, and so on by Baghdad and Basra to Karachi. So the horizons of the British Overseas Airways Corporation are in no respect narrowed by the coexistence of Transport Command, but are, on the contrary, expanding, and its resources are growing.

This country has long been a leader in international air transportation, just as it was a leader in merchant shipping during the era of clipper ships. Let us not, through the hasty adoption of a short-sighted and unwise policy, lose our supremacy in air transportation as we did in shipping.

Solicitude for the Veteran of All Wars Is Our Patriotic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 legislative days the House has had under consideration S. 1767, popularly known as the G. I. veterans' bill. This bill is one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation ever introduced in the House. The honor of writing this bill cannot be claimed by any individual. It is the culmination of the efforts of many individuals and organizations. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and many other veteran groups and veteran leaders have helped with their suggestions. The members of the World War Veterans' Committee have labored diligently and sincerely to produce the best bill possible. Several clarifying amendments have been accepted on the floor, and I am confident others will be offered and accepted. I shall be quite frank and say that the bill does not conform 100 percent to my personal ideas. There are some provisions I would like to see changed.

Many of the Members fear the concentration of power in the hands of one administrator, and on the other hand we know the waste and inefficiency that resulted after World War No. 1 by the division of services and responsibilities into various agencies. Therefore I feel that this bill in its many provisions is an attempt to compromise the views of many men into a practical workable piece of legislation.

The main purpose of providing just treatment for the veterans of World War No. 2 has been adhered to. The experience in dealing with similar problems after World War No. 1 has been invaluable. The long, hard fight of the veterans of World War No. 1 for decent treatment has formed the foundation for this piece of veterans' legislation.

The men and women engaged in this war, will reap with scarcely a struggle on their part, in a legislative sense, the results of all the experience and organizational strength of the veterans of the previous World War. The present Congress, which includes among its Members many veterans of World War No. 1, has shown a fine nonpartisan spirit in considering the present G. I. bill as well as many previous pieces of veteran legislation.

Since my first day in Congress I have supported all the legislation brought before the House for consideration, which had as its purpose the veterans' welfare. I yield to no man a higher regard or more sincere admiration for those men and women who have left their civilian paths and entered the armed forces of our country.

The resources of America which they are preserving, in many instances with their maimed and broken bodies, should be mobilized in such a manner that their rehabilitation and readjustment into civilian life can be assured.

Of course it will cost money. Of course it means more taxes for all of us, but without their efforts and sacrifices we would have lost all our physical possessions. Our tremendous natural resources and productive machinery would have been lost to a Hitler or Tojo. We would have lost those things more important than physical wealth. The wealth of the spirit. The liberties of free men and the dignity of our souls. Shall we draw back then at the expense necessary to partially show our appreciation? Our Nation stands secure today from the invader because of the bravery of these men and women of the armed forces, the veterans of tomorrow.

The future of our Nation will be in their hands when they return. In their absence we must take the necessary steps to prepare for that return. They must be assured of a place in our economy. The able-bodied must be provided jobs. The sick and disabled must be provided with adequate hospitalization. Where vocational or academic education is desired, it must be made available. Where homes or farms are needed, provisions for long-term, low-interest loans must be made. Many of these men and women will not return, their bodies will remain buried in strange lands. To their dependents we owe not only a financial obligation we must try to discharge, but a debt of gratitude which a thankful people can never repay.

I rejoice that the Seventy-eighth Congress has moved steadily toward the goal of veteran rehabilitation and readjustment. We have not been stampeded by a section of the press, which for its own gain has constantly criticized and denounced the present Congress. The record is being written for all to see. Much has been accomplished, more remains to be done. I am proud to have had a part in writing the record of the Seventy-eighth Congress in veterans' legislation.

New $8,500,000,000 Lend-Lease Item Astounds Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 6, 1944:

NEW $8,500,000,000 LEND-LEASE ITEM ASTOUNDS SENATE

(By William Moore)

The Senate, astounded by a new $8,500,000,000 lend-lease item, abruptly halted consideration of the administration's plea for a 1-year extension of the lend-lease program yesterday.

Senator TAFT (Republican), of Ohio, sharply questioned administration leaders on the possibility of efforts to carry lend-lease spending into the post-war period.

DELAYED UNTIL MONDAY

The Senate then postponed voting until Monday to give Members a chance to study an eleventh-hour report on lend-lease and related spending which disclosed an extra $8,500,000,000 of spending.

The report, made public Thursday by Chairman MCKELLAR of the Appropriations Committee after the Senate had begun consideration of the lend-lease measure, was crammed with facts which Senators said they would demand to know more about before voting to extend lend-lease.

Senator BUSHFIELD (Republican), of South Dakota, drew especial attention to this one: Although lend-lease spending reported before the $8,500,000,000 extra was discovered is charged to President Roosevelt's $24,500,000,000 lend-lease appropriation, lend-lease transfers up to $36,000,000,000 are also possible from funds appropriated to the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission.

SILVER MINTED IN BRITAIN

Some surprise was occasioned in the brief session today when Senator TAFT drew from Chairman CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, of the Foreign Relations Committee, the information that silver, supplied by the United States as metal, has been minted by the British. The coins thus produced, CONNALLY said, will be used in the Near East and other parts of the world.

The report over which the Senators expect to spend the week end is 36 typewritten pages long, accompanied by voluminous charts. Its subjects range from a project described by Senators as a "WPA" for banana trade work in Honduras to American buying aggregating $4,172,856,091 in foreign lands.

The report was compiled by investigators whom MCKELLAR's committee had assigned to get the entire picture of lend-lease from the various Government agencies. But the committee members had not even seen the report until MCKELLAR produced it Thursday as speed was being urged in passage of the extension.

The report showed that lend-lease reported as such now totals $21,794,237,819. But other spending in foreign lands, which Senators say is part of lend-lease operations, bring the actual total to $30,362,687,362.

NINETEEN BILLION TO BRITISH

The hitherto undiscovered $8,500,000,000 extra was spent, lent, or given away by a number of Government agencies, principally the Army and Navy, the foreign economic administration and the Export-Import bank.

Senator BROOKS, Republican, of Illinois, said this is the first time that the lend-lease spending of agencies which do not report directly to lend-lease authorities has ever been uncovered.

The largest share of the extra $8,500,000,000 went to the British. MCKELLAR reported that they got $15,640,479,250 of the funds actually reported as lend-lease. But the British share of the over-all total was $19,700,297,674.

M'KELLAR ERROR ADMITTED

Latin America received $2,327,378,789, as MCKELLAR explained the figures. But Senator BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, who recently charged that the United States has spent $6,000,000,000 boondoggling in South America, said MCKELLAR's statistics do not change the $6,000,000,000 estimate.

Senators said MCKELLAR has admitted being in error and that a statement mutually satisfactory to him and BUTLER will be made Monday.

The report said the Honduran banana workers were left idle by the halting of banana exports. So the State Department and Nelson Rockefeller's Inter-American Affairs Office put them to work building a road.

FOR COASTAL PROTECTION

Various agencies succeeded in spending $427,742,152 in Brazil. Of this $100,000,000 went into coastal protection on the theory that the Germans would travel 1,800 miles to invade the country. MCKELLAR reported that the investigators have the list of expenditures in each Latin-American country but can't make them public "for obvious reasons."

MCKELLAR and CONNALLY said in response to questions by TAFT that they don't believe lend-lease funds may be legally used for post-war projects. MCKELLAR and CONNALLY said further that they didn't think the Arabian oil pipe line could be charged to lend-lease, and agreed with TAFT that Congress should specifically pass on any nonwar lend-lease spending.

The United States History of Pensions and Veterans' Aid From 1636 to 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 26 it was my pleasure to participate in the program commemorating the second anniversary of the organ-

ization of the David A. Hurt Post, No. 203, Regular Veterans Association, at Groton, Conn.

It was my privilege to discuss with the large number of men and women who attended those ceremonies, the history of pension legislation in the United States, and the various steps taken by this, the Seventy-eighth Congress, to assist the men and women in the service of the past and present wars, and their dependents.

Under the unanimous consent accorded me by the House, I submit the address delivered by me on that occasion. It follows:

National Commander Floyd, of the Regular Veterans Association, Commander Bolen, and members of David A. Hurt Post, No. 203, members of the Auxiliary, and ladies and gentleman, I first wish to express my sincere appreciation for the hospitality that has been shown me since I have arrived here in Connecticut. I am quite sure that the men and women who are stationed here at this submarine base, as well as nearby naval bases and Army camps, coming from the several States of our great Union, have enjoyed as much as I have the hospitality of the good people of Connecticut. Now and then it's well to come up New England way. Its culture and history have had its effect on all of our 48 States, and, in fact, not only on our States, but our insular possessions. It was from the fine coast line of this State that the ships manned by Connecticut Yankees sailed the trade winds to the 4 corners of the earth, and the term "Connecticut Yankee" was known wherever trading ships touched foreign ports. It is the history of this part of our Nation that has always had a special intrigue to me. The history of Connecticut and New England is too well known to you folks for me to take up time to reiterate any of it to you.

This is a gathering of veterans and members of our armed forces and their wives and sons and daughters. I thought perhaps you would be interested if I would discuss briefly the history of pensions and pension legislation, and then some of the very recently enacted laws that are of benefit to our veterans and their dependents, particularly to the present members of our armed forces and those who have been discharged after having rendered an honorable service during the present conflict.

I wonder how many of you ever tried to visualize or, for that matter, given thought to conditions in the pre-Revolutionary War period, when the boys of the Colonies were frequently disturbed by Indian uprisings, and, for that matter, inter-Colonial scraps. The recorded history of our Colonies refer to many instances of relief of the wounded and maimed soldiers.

Probably the first pension law enacted in America was in 1636, when the pilgrims of Plymouth by their courts enacted a law that provided that any man who should be sent forth as a soldier and return maimed should be maintained competently by the Colony during his life. There had been a prior law enacted in 1624 by the Colony of Virginia, which passed a resolution which read as follows: "That at the beginning of July next, the inhabitants of every corporation shall fall upon their adjoining salvages, as we did last year. Those that shall be hurte upon service to be cured at the publique charge; in case any be lamed, to be maintained by the country according to his person and quality."

Incidentally, this act was ineffective because it did not receive the approval by the mother country. Thus, the Plymouth Colony, in fact, really enacted the first effective pension law in America.

In 1676 regular meetings in "Boston towne house" were held by a standing committee of the General Court of Massachusetts Bay to hear applications of wounded soldiers for relief. After the union of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay Colonies under the charter of 1691, the Province continued to make provision for the relief of disabled soldiers out of the public treasury.

A disability pension law was passed by the Virginia Assembly in 1644, and later this Colony made provision for the relief of the indigent families of soldiers who should be slain. In the colonial statutes of Maryland and New York similar acts are found. Rhode Island in 1718 enacted a pension law providing an annual pension for disabled soldiers, and for the wife, children, parents, or other relatives of one slain in the Colony's military service, so long as these relatives were unable to provide for themselves.

In the Maryland Colony a certificate from the country court was requiring stating that "he, she, or they are objects of charity," before payment could be made. These provisions for monetary benefits by the several Colonies were almost without exception offered as an inducement to enlist and were considered a part of the pay.

With the outbreak of the Revolution, the disability pensions provided by the various Colonies were, for the most part, continued until that terrible winter of 1777-78, when Washington became convinced that all would be lost unless something were done to stop the resignations among his officers. His solution of the problem was to promise all officers who should remain in the service to the end of the war, half pay for a period of years after its conclusion, or for life. The first national pension law was passed by the Continental Congress on August 26, 1776, and promised half pay for life or during disability to every officer, soldier, or sailor losing a limb in any engagement, or being so disabled in the service of the United States as to render him incapable of earning a livelihood. On May 15, 1778, half pay was promised for 7 years after the conclusion of the war to officers who should continue in service to the end of the war. Incidently this law was passed only after the most violent opposition on the part of many Members of Congress, to the establishment of what was designated as a "favored class." In the early trying days of the newly born Nation, the money was not always in the Treasury to pay the pensions after the same had been granted, much being promised but little realized. Many were paid in commutation certificates payable to pensioner or bearer and drawing interest at 6 percent, but these were not readily redeemable and many pensioners were compelled to part with their certificates as low as 12½ cents on the dollar. The earliest pension acts of 1789 and 1790 did not specify any procedure for the administration of the pension system other than to provide that the pensions granted should be continued under such regulations as the President might direct.

The President accordingly placed the administration of these earlier laws under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War, although Congress still retained control of the actual allowance of claims. Under the general pension law of 1792 the duty of adjudicating pension claims was imposed upon the United States circuit courts with the requirement that they should report their actions to the Secretary of War. This action brought objection from all the judges as an unwarranted interference with the judiciary and resulted in Congress enacting the law of February 28, 1793, which required the judges of the United States district courts or commissioners appointed by them to receive the evidence in the claims and submit it to the Secretary of War, who then placed the individual claims before Congress for action.

It will be noted that Congress still reserved the power of final adjudication. This law also was objected to by the judges, and a new pension law, which gave the Secretary of War final power to allow claims, was enacted in 1803. This authority remained unchanged until 1828, when the administration of the law granting pensions to Revolutionary War survivors was placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, and then in 1835 it was retransferred to the Secretary of War. Also during the period from about 1799 to 1832 pensions were paid from the Navy pension fund under the administration of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War. However, in 1832 the full management of the fund was placed under the Secretary of the Navy. On March 2, 1833, the Congress enacted a law providing for the appointment of a Commissioner of Pensions under the direction of the Secretary of War, who was charged with such duties.

When the office of Commissioner of Pensions was created James L. Edwards, of Virginia, who had served as principal clerk on pension work in the War Department for a number of years, was appointed the first Commissioner of Pensions at a salary of $2,500 per annum. His office force consisted of a chief clerk at $1,600 per annum, 4 clerks at $1,400 each, 2 clerks at $1,200, 5 clerks at $1,000, 8 clerks at $800, and 1 messenger at $300 per annum—a total force of 22 at an annual cost of $23,800.

At the beginning of the Civil War the personnel of the Pension Bureau numbered 72, with a total salary of $95,340. That part of the pension business transacted under the Secretary of the Navy was also transferred to the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Pensions. The office of Commissioner of Pensions was continued from time to time by subsequent legislation until the act of January 11, 1849, which gave the office a permanent status.

In this year the Department of the Interior was established, and the Bureau of Pensions became a part of the new Department. The Secretary of the Interior was given certain supervisory and appellate powers. The Bureau of Pensions continued in this status until July 21, 1930, when it was made a part of the new Veterans' Administration in conformity with the act of July 3, 1930.

VETERANS' ADJUSTED-SERVICE PAY ACT OF 1944

Earlier this evening, over the facilities of radio station WMLC, I discussed in detail the provisions of the Veterans' Adjusted-Service Pay Act of 1944, which I introduced at the request of your national commander, W. M. Floyd, and the heads of other national service organizations.

I know the questions that are put before Commander Floyd and his representatives when they appear before congressional committees in support of legislation like my bill, H. R. 4335. The very first question that the presiding Congressman or Senator asks him is, What is the membership of the Regular Veterans Association? Naturally, you have a young and growing organization, and it is not as large as some of the other organizations, but your national commander has the interests of the organization at heart and is working night and day to build up the organization He is ably representing them not only before the several committees of Congress but before the War and Navy Departments and the Veterans' Administration. He has been your national commander for less than a year, but I can attest to the fact that he is highly respected and has built up an enviable reputation as a champion of the veterans and the members of our armed forces.

It, therefore, proves that the harder you individual members work, both of the Regular Veterans Association and its auxiliary, the more support and the greater incentive your national officers will have. I say to you that it is to your advantage to go out on the by-ways and seek new members. You

have an excellent opportunity with all of the men in the armed forces in this vicinity, and it is apparent that both Posts 203 and 182 are alive and awake. I say keep up the good work and I trust that in the not too distant future you will have double or triple your present splendid membership. One never gets anything without working for it, and the harder the members of the Regular Veterans Association and the members of its auxiliary work, the better can be the results, and you will increase the prestige of your national officers in all of their activities before the several governmental agencies.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

I want to discuss some of the legislation that is of interest to men and women in the armed forces and to their dependents; also I want to call attention to legislation that has been passed which is very important to those who have been discharged on account of service in the present global war.

SOLDIERS' VOTE

Preliminary to this discussion, however, I want to mention the provisions of the law which entitles men and women in our armed forces to a vote in the coming elections.

Public Law, 277, Seventy-eighth Congress, which provides for such a ballot, became a law some time ago without the approval of the President. This legislation was designated in the newspapers as a compromise and I supported it. Prior to its enactment there was legislation providing for the so-called bobtailed ballot, which consists of almost a blank piece of paper and provided that men and women in the armed forces could write in their choice for President, United States Senator, and Member of the House of Representatives. There was no provision in the bill granting men and women in the armed forces the opportunity to vote for State and county and local officials. Public Law 277 gives men and women in the armed forces that privilege. The War Department under date of April 3, 1944, issued Circular No. 128, giving in detail the procedure to be followed in voting by members of our armed forces. Of course, the Minnesota Legislature has passed a splendid law which will facilitate the voting of every man and woman in the the service of their country. I take this occasion to suggest to relatives of every man and woman in the Army, Navy, or Air Forces to contact the county auditor of the county in which such person has legal residence and see to it that the county auditor is requested to have a ballot sent to the person in the service. Under the Federal statute, Public Law 277, and under the law enacted by most State legislatures there is no reason why every member of the armed forces cannot vote. Any statements to the contrary are false and circulated purely for political and propaganda reasons.

LEGISLATION AFFECTING MEN AND WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Congress has passed many laws which are to the advantage of those in the service of their country. I have always suggested legislation aiding the veteran of our armed forces, his wife or widow, his children or his estate. I would suggest that interested parties confer with the service officer of their local veterans' group because they have the necessary information and can advise fully as to rights and procedure. A great many people are not familiar with the rights and benefits under the various laws enacted by Congress, and I would again repeat that it is important that they confer with the service officers.

I have been informed that you have a most efficient one here at David A. Hurt Post 203, Lt. George B. Owens.

I will now discuss legislation in which you are perhaps more particularly interested.

BENEFITS PROVIDED BY LAW FOR VETERANS OF THIS GLOBAL WAR AND THEIR DEPENDENTS WHILE IN THE ACTIVE MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE

Active service in the Army or Navy during the present war includes active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and the personnel is composed of regular officers and enlisted men, members of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, female reservists, National Guard men called into active service, volunteers and selectees, and persons appointed to the armed forces from civilian life. The Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard are included among those in the active military and naval service. The Office of War Information, in its release of April 6, 1944, announced that the Army of the United States has reached its planned strength of 7,700,000 officer and enlisted personnel, but will require 75,000 to 100,000 men a month throughout the remainder of 1944 to maintain that strength. The Navy Department has estimated that it would reach a strength of 3,500,000, including the Marine Corps and Coast Guard personnel, by July 1, 1944, and that approximately 300,000 men will be needed to reach that net strength and at the same time provide necessary replacements. An additional 100,000 men will be added to the net strength of the Navy between July 1 and September 1, 1944.

ACTIVE-SERVICE PAY

The Pay Readjustment Act, 1942, as amended, increased the pay of privates from $21 to $50 per month, with proportionate increases for noncommissioned officers to $138 per month for master sergeant or chief petty officer, first grade. Longevity pay was improved by adding 5 percent to the base pay for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. A 20-percent increase is provided for enlisted men and 10 percent for officers on sea duty or in any place beyond the continental United States or in Alaska. Active flying duty increases base pay by 50 percent and active parachutists duty increases the base pay by $100 per month for officers and $50 per month for enlisted men. Similar liberal increase is provided for submarine and diving duty. The Pay Readjustment Act, 1942, as amended, also provided entitlement for retired personnel to adjustment of retired pay.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended October 26, 1943, provides family allowances for dependents of any enlisted person, male or female. A rate of $50 per month is provided for a wife where there is no child; $80 per month if there is a wife and one child, with $20 for each additional child; a rate of $42 per month if the enlisted man has no wife but one child, with $20 for each additional child; a rate of $50 is provided if the enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support, but no dependent brother or sister; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him, with an additional $11 for each dependent brother or sister; a rate of $68 per month is provided if the enlisted man has two dependent parents but no dependent brother or sister, with $11 additional for each dependent brother or sister. A rate of $42 per month is provided if the enlisted man has no dependent parent but has a dependent brother or sister, with $11 for each additional dependent brother or sister. The monthly pay of the enlisted man is reduced by or charged with the amount of $22 per month for any month in which an allowance is paid with an additional $5 if the dependents include more than one class of dependents.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, provides for a temporary suspension during the war and for 6 months thereafter of legal proceedings and transactions which may impair the civilian rights of persons in the active service. These rights involve rent, installment contracts, mortgages, insurance, taxes, homestead rights, and so forth. The primary purpose of this act is to relieve members in the military service from worry over their inability to settle their civilian liabilities by reason of reduced income because of military service. It does not relieve a soldier from the obligation but provides a means of relief. The courts are given jurisdiction to stay the enforcement of certain obligations.

In title IV of this act, which is administered by the Veterans' Administration, any person in active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of the law, upon application to the Veterans' Administration upon a form supplied by the Army and Navy may secure guaranty of premiums on the amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000 while he is in the service during the present global conflict. The premiums guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien and must be paid by the company out of any settlement. In the event of the discharge of the insured, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed, otherwise the indebtedness constitutes a lien upon the policy with interest. As of March 31, 1944, 72,204 applications, with insurance totaling approximately $178,000,000 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Members of the active military and naval service may at any time while in such service file application for national service life insurance, which is administered by the Veterans' Administration. If the service person applies within 120 days after enlistment or enrollment no medical examination is required, otherwise satisfactory evidence of good health must be furnished. Insurance in the amount of $10,000 with premiums paid by the Government is available for aviation cadets of the Army Air Corps; enlisted men detailed to schools as aviation students, participating frequently in aerial flights; cadets at the Military Academy while undergoing flight training; enlisted naval and Marine Corps Reserve or cadets undergoing training as aviation pilots; and aviation cadets of the Navy or Marine Corps are included within this protection. Upon being commissioned or released from flight duty they must pay premiums on the insurance. This insurance is against death and includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing more than 6 months and commencing prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy and is payable to specified classes; widow, widower; child, including stepchild or illegitimate child if designated as beneficiary by the insured parent, including person in loco parentis; brother and sister of the insured; and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary at any time. If the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted into an ordinary life policy, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration, without examination.

As of March 30, 1944, over 14,000,000 applications had been received representing a total of over $105,000,000,000 of insurance. The average policy is approximately $7,382.69; the average coverage per life is $8,926.74. In the event of the death of the insured the policy is payable as an annuity in 240 monthly equal installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary under 30 years of age at the time of death of the insured; otherwise it is payable in continuous monthly

installments throughout the life of the beneficiary with a guaranty of a payment of 120 monthly installments. Under the latter method of payment, the amount of the monthly installment is dependent upon age of the beneficiary. For example, if the beneficiary is 40 years old, the monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insuranee; if 50 years of age, $5.39 per each $1,000; if 60 years of age, $6.81 per each $1,000; or if 70 years of age, $8.51 per $1,000. Taking those particular ages and a policy for $10,000, the monthly installment would be $45 if the beneficiary is 40 years old; $53.90 if the beneficiary is 50 years; $68.10 if the beneficiary is 60; and $85.10 if the beneficiary is 70. Claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but the necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

GRATUITOUS INSURANCE

Any person in the active service on and after October 8, 1940, who, while in the service, and before April 20, 1942, died in line of duty without having in force at the time of death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, as amended, or the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, in an aggregate amount of at least $5,000 is deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance in the amount of $5,000. This gratuitous insurance is payable to the widow or widower; or if no widow or widower, to the child or children; or if no widow or widower or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living. Provision is also made for gratuitous insurance to those who within such period suffered line-of-duty disability for 6 months or more without having in force an aggregate amount of $5,000 insurance under the acts aforementioned. The law also provides for gratuitous insurance to those who, prior to April 20, 1942, were captured, besieged, or otherwise isolated by the forces of any enemy of the United States for a period of at least 30 consecutive days and extending beyond April 19, 1942.

DEATH GRATUITY

A death gratuity equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received by the veteran at the time of his death in line of duty is payable by the War and Navy Departments. Provisions for payment of this gratuity are administered by the Service Department having jurisdiction of the person in the armed forces, and the benefit is payable to persons within a certain class. Application for the 6 months' death gratuity should be submitted to the Chief of Finance, War Department, Washington, D. C., if the person served in the Army; Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., if the person served in the Navy; Commandant United States Marine Corps, headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., if the person served in the Marine Corps; and to the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Washington, D. C., in the cases of members of the Coast Guard.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

With certain exceptions set forth in the act of February 3, 1944, members of the armed forces discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941, may receive mustering-out pay. The rate is $100 if there was service of less than 60 days; if the person served more than 60 days in the continental United States, the rate is $200, payable at the rate of $100 upon discharge and $100 1 month later; if the person served more than 60 days and served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, the amount is $300, payable at the rate of $100 upon leaving service, $100 1 month later, and $100 2 months later This pay is in addition to whatever regular pay and allowances to which the person may be entitled. Persons entitled to base pay of over $200 per month or who are retired with pay, or who were discharged at their own request to take a job, or who served only as a student in the Army educational program are not included for mustering-out pay. If the person served overseas, however, he would be entitled to mustering-out pay, even though discharged at his own request. Mustering-out pay is exempt from taxation and is not subject to the claims of creditors.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Extensive programs of in-service education, including the retention in service of persons whose disabilities do not disqualify them completely for active service for readjustment into proper activities in the armed forces, have qualified and will qualify thousands of persons for lucrative employment after the war, and in a great many instances it has been possible for persons to supplement their education while in the active service, so that in many instances the handicap from an educational standpoint has been materially reduced.

REEMPLOYMENT

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, preserves employment rights of persons entering the military and naval training forces who occupied permanent positions at the time of entering service. These provisions are administered through the Employment Division of Selective Service. These provisions apply both to Government employment and private employment to insure restoration of the veteran to the former or similar position upon his discharge or release from the armed forces. It is necessary to apply for reemployment within 40 days after discharge.

The United States Employment Service, Veterans' Placement Service, with local agents, are ready to assist veterans in getting a job.

HOSPITALIZATION

Members of the armed forces are provided with all necessary medical care and hospital treatment, and their rights upon discharge as veterans of World War No. 2 will be stated later.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

These benefits are administered through the Federal Security Agency and the operation of State plans. Practically all of the States have enacted legislation protecting the unemployment-insurance credits of persons in the armed forces and legislation is pending to make certain that all necessary protection is afforded the insured workers who are in the service and to liberalize in any other manner which may be justified the laws governing these benefits.

RETIREMENT PAY

In addition to the regular retirement of officers and enlisted men of the armed forces, Reserve officers and officers appointed to the Army of the United States from civilian life and enlisted men with 20 years or more of service may be retired for disability incurred in service in line of duty and in such event they are entitled to three-fourths of their base pay, which is paid by the Veterans' Administration upon certification of eligibility by the War Department.

BENEFITS ADMINISTERED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AND PERTAINING TO WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration administers pension to disabled veterans of the present global war, their dependents, national service life insurance, hospitalization and domiciliary care, and vocational rehabilitation for the service disabled as well as some other benefits, which I will not enter into at this time.

The Veterans' Administration has 94 facilities throughout the country. To give you an idea of what has already taken place in connection with benefits to veterans of this war and their dependents, I will give you a few figures. From December 1941 to January 31, 1944, there had been paid to veterans of the present war for service-connected disabilities over twelve and one-half million dollars, and in addition approximately $700,000 in retired pay administered by the Veterans' Administration. There had also been paid approximately eleven and one-half million dollars in pension to dependents of deceased veterans of this global war, making a total expenditure of approximately $25,000,000. You will understand that this is an accumulated figure and the expenditures are of a continuing nature and are increasing steadily. Between December 1941 and January 31, 1944, the Veterans' Administration had paid national service life insurance cash benefits for death in the amount of approximately $20,000,000. Over the same period the cost of hospitalization and domiciliary care, veterans of this global war, was over $9,000,000. Through February 29, 1944, there had been approximately 52,500 admissions of veterans of this global war for hospitalization or domiciliary care. The number remaining under such care at the end of February 1944 was 11,622.

PENSIONS

Pensions are payable for disability or death incurred in or due to active military service in line of duty and not the result of the person's own misconduct. Disability pension is payable to any person honorably discharged depending upon the degree of disablement, ranging from 10 to 100 percent, with payments from $10 to $100 per month. For specific losses, as the loss of a hand or foot, blindness, and so forth, additional amounts are payable, the highest rate being $250 per month. Death pension is payable where the veteran of this global war died as the result of service-incurred disability. The rates of pension are: Widow, with no child, $50; widow, with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38, with $10 for each additional child; dependent mother or father, $45, or both, $25 each. As to the widow and children, the total amount cannot exceed more than $100 per month.

REHABILITATION (HOSPITALIZATION, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING)

The first step of rehabilitation is that of physical and mental repair for the service disabled. Medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, and domiciliary care are available to any veteran of the present war honorably discharged for a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably discharged, and also one not dishonorably discharged who is unable to defray his own expenses is entitled if he has tuberculosis or neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care. Any veteran of the present war, not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor is entitled to hospitalization or domiciliary care, notwithstanding the disability, disease, or defect is not shown to be due to service. This latter benefit is contingent of availability of facilities. It might be stated at this point that in the 94 facilities of the Veterans' Administration, as of March 23, 1944, there was a total of 92,019 beds. The Veterans' Administration also has 7 diagnostic centers. The present building program will raise the total beds to 100,000. The Veterans' Administration anticipates and expects an eventual need of 300,000 beds

to enable veterans of this global war and of prior wars to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the extent now provided. However, this is an estimated maximum and should not be needed until long after the war or require eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities, and it is anticipated that it will be possible to obtain another 100,000 beds from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

Vocational rehabilitation of the disabled veteran of this global war is provided by the act of March 24, 1943. It covers the veterans of the present war, honorably discharged, and who have a disability incurred or connected with such service which is pensionable or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay and who are in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of the disability. This benefit is administered by the Veterans' Administration through the Director of Vocational Rehabilitation in central office and the planning and control functions are performed there. The operations, which include the determination of the need of training, vocational advisement, induction to training, supervision, and selection of training facilities, are handled by the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in the facility of the Veterans' Administration in the territory where the veteran resides. There are 53 such facilities. The veteran while in training, unless his pension equals such amounts, is entitled to $80 per month if single; $90 per month if married, with $5 additional for each child and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required. Persons honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

TAXATION

Payments under any of the laws relating to veterans are exempt from taxation, exempt from claims of creditors, and are not liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by legal or equitable process. The exemption does not apply to certain claims of the United States arising out of such benefits or to property purchased in part or wholly out of such payments.

PENDING LEGISLATION

There are numerous bills pending in the present Congress proposing to grant additional benefits to veterans and their dependents and which would, if enacted, be applicable to persons who served in the present war. Exclusive of the bills to liberalize pensions and to change the existing law pertaining to national service life insurance, the major proposals are those which would grant aid to veterans of this global war in securing employment; provide reasonable allowances as a protection against unemployment; afford educational and training opportunities without the requirement of a service-connected disability producing a handicap, and centralize in one agency, namely, the Veterans' Administration, the services to veterans without physical transfer thereto of other established agencies or any part thereof.

In addition, my bill (H. R. 4335), which would provide adjusted service pay is pending. I discussed this in detail earlier this evening over Radio Station WMLC. If any person desires a copy of this measure, I'll be glad to send out a copy to anyone who writes me a card or letter requesting it. Furthermore, if any aid or help is ever needed, just write your Congressman. He'll be glad to help you on your problems and your case.

For the information of the people of the Ninth District of Minnesota, my address is: United States Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, 1620 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Thank you one and all, and good night.

Victory and Peace Not Election Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given to me by the House, I include a pertinent editorial from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, which is as follows:

VICTORY AND PEACE NOT ELECTION ISSUES

President Roosevelt now has the endorsement of the C. I. O. president, Philip Murray, for a fourth term, but it does not necessarily follow that the labor organization which he heads will accept his direction to the extent of casting its ballots en bloc in the November election.

Mr. Murray expresses the conviction that "the overwhelming majority of the people of this Nation, regardless of political affiliation, demand reelection" of Mr. Roosevelt. Thus, he would have us believe that Democratic and Republican Party lines will not be observed when it comes to the business of voting. That may be true, but it also may be true that members of the C. I. O. and of other labor organizations will vote primarily as American citizens, with personal feelings on the subject, rather than as union followers. It is difficult to believe that the head of any organization, be it labor or employer, be it church or be it lodge or luncheon club, will have the power to speak for those in the ranks when it comes to expressing their choice, as freemen, for the Presidency of the Nation.

Though not using the term, Mr. Murray suggests that the people will not want to "change horses in the middle of the stream." He says that "our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, is the man who, through his policies and action, has demonstrated the will, courage, and statemanship to forge the unshakable unity among the peace-loving common people for victory." But there are other men, among them possible candidates for the Presidency, who have the will, the courage, and the statesmanship, and who believe that unity is essential to victory and for maintenance of the subsequent peace.

Thomas Dewey, for one, has demonstrated courage and idealism equal to those of Mr. Roosevelt. There is every indication that the Republicans will be as determined for victory and for international cooperation to prevent future wars as the Democratic administration has been. There is no reason to believe that a change in the Presidency would upset either the war or peace plans. It is likely, and it is hoped, that this will be made clear, so far as Mr. Roosevelt's political opponents are concerned, long before election day.

The election cannot be permitted to have as one of its issues a question of how vigorously the war is to be waged, how much national or international unity there will be, or whether the C. I. O. or some other organization of workingmen or businessmen or industrialists or anything of the sort is to dominate national or international policies. President Roosevelt is regarded by many Americans as an able war leader, but surely it cannot be believed that he is indispensable to either victory or peace. He has already been in office nearly 12 years, and the strain has been severe, and if he should be obliged to retire from active service, someone else would have to assume the leadership. It has happened, and it could happen again, in the Nation's history. That is why Vice Presidents are provided, and it is why an order of succession among the cabinet members is prescribed by the Constitution.

If an overwhelming majority wants the President to continue in office, he should continue, but it is inexcusable, un-American defeatism for anybody to attempt to tell the American people that they can win the war and have a lasting peace only if Mr. Roosevelt is elected for a fourth term.

Our country has not developed and waxed great on such oligarchic one-man belief.

Benefactor to Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a statement of the achievement of Dr. George Harrison Shull. He has contributed much toward the production of food and has made a very important contribution to the Nation and perhaps the world in his creation and propagation of hybrid corn.

He may be one of the unsung heroes of the Nation. He deserves a high place in the history of food production.

It is a statement worth reading and was prepared by an able and talented student in the field of seed propagation, my friend, Gordon Morrison, of the Burgess Seed & Plant Co., of Galesburg, Mich.:

The prophetic slogan, "Food will win the war and write the peace," is spoken with confidence by military and agricultural authorities. We all appreciate the paramount importance of assured abundance of good food. We take pride in the demonstrated capacity of American agriculture, augmented by millions of family food gardens, to provide food for civilian needs, for war needs, for the needs of lend-lease participants, and for the use of millions of famished people presently being released from starvation diets imposed by their erstwhile Axis oppressors.

It is a tribute to the American vegetable and field seed industries and to the American food industries that we have been enabled to meet our own civilian and military needs for food and still be able to ship literally thousands of tons of seeds and millions of tons of food to lend-lease participants.

Nation-wide corn production is responsible in a large measure for our favorable food situation. We all know that corn in abundance is basic to the production of beef, pork, poultry, eggs, and dairy products to say nothing of the growing importance of corn and by-products in the chemurgic industries.

I reproduce herewith from the February 4, 1944, issue of Seed World, a trade magazine published at 211 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, a short article entitled "McCall Reads the Corn Record":

"Never until the last 2 years has the United States grown more than 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn in each of 2 successive years, and never before on as small an acreage," M. A. McCall of the United States Department of Agriculture pointed out recently. This result from the planting of hybrid corn, he cited as an example of returns from using intensive methods in crop improvement. "This experience," he said, "is almost certain to stimulate even wider use of intensive methods with other crops."

"In 1942, an unsually good corn year, hybrid corn, occupied 41,600,000 acres or more than 46 percent of our total corn acreage," he said, "and we produced the largest crop in our history, 3,175,000,000 bushels. In 1943, in many respects an unfavorable year for corn, hybrid corn occupied 49,960,000 acres or 52 percent of our corn acreage, and we produced 3,085,000,000 bushels, the second largest crop of record. The 1942 crop was grown on 89,000,000 acres and the 1943 crop on 94,000,000 acres. The 1920 crop, the third largest at 3,070,000,000 bushels, was grown on 101,000,000 acres.

"Never before have we grown more than 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn 2 years in succession and never before on as small an acreage. On the basis of hybrid corn acreage and yields during the last 6 years, and the average yields during 1923-32 (the last normal 10-year period before hybrid corn came in), it can be estimated that hybrid corn added 629,000,000 bushels of corn to our total crop in 1942, and 669,000,000 bushels in 1943. This is equivalent to adding each year almost one-fourth of a normal crop of corn in years before hybrid corn came into use."

I take this opportunity to call to your attention the individual whose ingenuity has been most largely instrumental basically for the phenomenal improvement in quality and yields of corn throughout the corn-growing industry during the last 15 years, and particularly during these war years.

I refer to Dr. George Harrison Shull who, upon his seventieth anniversary, was eulogized in the April 7 issue of Seed World as the "grand old man of hybrid corn." It seems appropriate to accord hereby general recognition to this great benefactor of mankind whose genius has made possible more bountiful food supplies for all of us.

George Harrison Shull was born in 1874 on a hard-scrabble share-cropping farm near the village of North Hampton in Ohio. The father was a Dunkard minister who farmed all week and preached on Sundays. The father and mother and six sons and a daughter had all they could do to scrape a living out of the farm under a system of rental which required hoeing one row for the landlord for each one they hoed for themselves. The father was a good farmer who paid careful attention to the selection of his own seed corn as he and his six boys husked and cribbed their hard-won crops.

Although the Shull children got their early education the hard way, mostly by study at home, this family of six sons and a daughter has contributed notably during the last 40 years to the advancement of American arts and sciences.

After a period as a youthful country school teacher, George Harrison Shull worked his way through Antioch College, where, during his college career, he was occupied variously as janitor, engineer of the steam-heating plant and waterworks, and as college plumber.

At 27 years of age, George H. Shull entered the University of Chicago, where he became a doctor of philosophy in time to accept, in 1904, a post on the first staff of investigators employed for research in the principles of plant breeding at the Cold Spring Harbor genetics laboratory and field station of the newly organized Carnegie Institution of Washington.

The Carnegie Institution of Washington was established to encourage investigation, research, and discovery in fields not normally covered by other agencies and for the application of newly discovered knowledge to the improvement of mankind. How well the Carnegie Institution planned and how well their first genetic investigator or plant-heredity investigator wrought is illustrated by my brief review of the productive corn researches of Dr. George H. Shull. The results of these researches proved a revelation to other investigators of 35 years ago. Practical seedsmen and corn growers were slow to appreciate and to apply Shull's technique. However, during the last 15 years the use of Shull's technique gained headway in field practice and has resulted in the tremendous improvements in yields and quality of corn that could not have been achieved otherwise.

Dr. Shull's problem in 1904 was to devise and organize fundamental biological research projects with plants, unhampered by consideration of economic consequences and with a conscious avoidance of duplication of work that was being done elsewhere. His corn research of 1904 to 1916 was an outgrowth of a project in pure science, mainly with Evening Primroses, designed to determine the basic principles of the origin and inheritance of new characters, a line of research inspired by the recent rediscovery of Mendel's Principles of Inheritance. However, a plant scientist of Shull's farm background could never treat any botanical research as merely an abstract and theoretical problem. He was, therefore, immediately aware of the practical value of hybrid vigor when it became manifest most strikingly through greatly increased yields of corn in his experiments which were designed primarily to determine the effects of cross-breeding as compared with self-fertilization or inbreeding on fluctuating variability.

In recognizing hybrid vigor, as it was displayed to him in his corn-breeding cultures following crosses between his highly inbred related lines, and in devising a practical method or agricultural technique for obtaining and utilizing hybrid vigor to the utmost through the use of hybridized seed corn, Shull demonstrated with striking clarity how research in pure science may lead to results of tremendous practical value.

The procedure which Shull devised for the practical production of hybrid corn and which he presented in 1909 before the American Breeders Association is in all essentials the basis of methods now used in producing seed of crossed corn for planting upward of 50,000,000 acres of field corn and sweet corn annually in the United States, including almost all of the Iowa corn acreage. The superiority and dependability of hybrid corn is demonstrated most markedly under adverse growing conditions. The trends in corn growing indicate that hybrid corn may soon replace ordinary corn almost completely for planting our annual acreage of upward of 90,000,000 acres. We have reason to believe that general use of hybridized corn seed may enable a somewhat reduced national acreage to produce an annual crop upward of 1,000,000,000 bushel in excess of the best national yields we enjoyed before we had hybrid corn.

Dr. George Harrison Shull and his wife now live in contented retirement at 60 Jefferson Road, Princeton, N. J., gratified that their six children, although scattered north, east, south, and west and even in the Southwest Pacific, are making their own vital contributions to the stirring events of these crucial times. Retirement because of age from his post of 27 years as professor of botany and genetics at Princeton has brought to a close a career of almost 40 years devoted to research in plant genetics because of concomitant withdrawal of funds which had provided running expenses for his projects in pure science. He is very regretful that so much valuable research material accumulated during these years of active research must be lost through failure to find the funds necessary for their continuation.

While hybrid corn now adds scores of millions, if not hundreds of millions, of dollars annually to corn growers' incomes, Dr. Shull has not profited a penny through devising the agricultural technique which is basic to hybrid-born production. He derives much comfort from the fact that his hybrid-corn research has come to be recognized as a classic example of work in pure science which has led directly to economic results of tremendous importance and which has proved of incalculable value in these war years and which may exert even more benign influence in the coming years of world recovery and reconstruction.

Report of the International Labor Organization Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and broadcast over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Co. on Saturday evening, May 13, 1944, from Washington, D. C.

This address constitutes a report on the activities and the resolutions adopted at the International Labor Organization's conference held at Philadelphia for the past 3 weeks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am here tonight to give a brief report on the great session of the International Labor Organization, which completed its work at Philadelphia last night after 3½ weeks of hard work on the problems of war and peace.

While I was there as one of the two United States Government representatives, I got some experience in making talks like this, because the Office of War Information asked me to deliver commentaries on the conference developments on the overseas radio channels. We made three reports a week during the whole of the conference, which were broadcast in many foreign lands, in the O. W. I.'s effort to tell the world what we were doing in Philadelphia to advance the cause of social and economic improvement over the world.

Official delegates representing employers and workers as well as governments were present from 41 nations. They included all the great powers except Russia. The presence of Australians, Indians, South and Central Americans, and the representatives of the European governments-in-exile, made it a very colorful and exciting event.

Miss Frances Perkins, our Secretary of Labor, was the other United States Government delegate, and she did a remarkable job of leadership. She and I introduced the resolution which was embodied in one of the major acts of the conference—the recommendation to the United Nations that full employment and social advancement, the recognition of every person's right to a job and to security—be made the primary aim of post-war policy, through international action as well as national and local action.

Before I discuss the specific accomplishments of the conference through the declaration of Philadelphia and the recommendations and resolutions which we drafted during the first 3 weeks and adopted in the last few days, I think I should say something about the significance of the meeting. Wartime disruptions of transport had made it impossible to hold an I. L. O. conference since

before Pearl Harbor. Only the active support of the United Nations made possible the visits of the delegates from many foreign lands, and many made great sacrifices to get to Philadelphia from their homes.

But the meeting was held, and we all met together and interchanged ideas and opinions. It is one of the beginnings of wisdom and tolerance and peace, to meet the other fellow and find out that, although we may differ on many points, he has aims and aspirations just like those of your own people. It has been heartening to note that Government leaders in wartime have met more and more often across national borders to plan our common cause and to work out methods of war and principles of peace. The International Labor Organization brought to Philadelphia the representatives of workers' organizations and of employers, in addition to Government representatives, and this fact, in my opinion, tripled the usefulness of our meeting.

The great documents which were produced by this conference may in future years compare in importance with the other great charters, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, which came from this same city of brotherly love, if the nations and the people of the world cooperate now as Americans cooperated in the early days of our Republic.

The declaration of Philadelphia is a declaration of war against want. It is a short document, and it lays the groundwork to carry out the promise of the Atlantic Charter's "four freedoms."

The declaration restates in simple language the need of man for a better world, along the lines familiar to everyone who is concerned with social and economic advancement. These aims, such as social security, child welfare, legislation to improve working conditions, and the like, have been the primary concern of the I. L. O. since it was established 25 years ago.

The declaration, however, goes into new territory, and calls on the nations of the world to put into effect, as far as possible, the principle of full employment.

It also enlarges the field of problems of international concern, by recognizing the interdependence of nations and peoples, and by stating the interest of all working people in economic and financial matters. It gives the representatives of all nations, including their workers and employers, through the machinery of the I. L. O., an opportunity to examine and consider all international economic and financial policies and measures in the light of this fundamental objective, which I quote from the document:

"All human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity."

It goes on to say that the attainment of these conditions must constitute the central aim—and I emphasize "the"—of national and international policy; and that all national and international policies and measures, in particular those of an economic and financial character, "should be judged in this light and accepted only insofar as they may be held to promote and not to hinder the achievement of this fundamental objective."

The declaration then sets forth that the I. L. O. should promote programs among the nations of the world which will achieve full employment, raise living standards, place workers where they can do the best job and get the most satisfaction, provide just wage policies and collective bargaining, extend social security measures, protect the lives and health of workers, provide for child welfare and materity protection, and equalize educational and vocational opportunity.

The declaration then cites the necessity of international action in other fields and pledges cooperation to the United Nations and to any international organizations set up to expand production and consumption, stabilize world prices of primary products, and to promote a high and steady volume of international trade.

Other recommendations and resolutions spell out in considerable detail the principles and policies needed to achieve the ambitious goals we have set for ourselves.

I have time here only for a brief survey of these goals. One of the most important of them is in the resolution on social provisions in the peace settlements. This document takes the lead in our effort to advance social justice in the post-war world. It embodies the strong stand taken by the United States delegation for immediate affirmative action, nationally and internationally, whenever practicable.

This proposal urges nations to subscribe to a set of principles, which are set forth in the form of a treaty. Here are the seven main points:

1. Opportunity for useful and regular employment to all persons who want work, at fair wages or returns and under reasonable conditions, with provision for protection of health and against injury in all occupations.

2. Raising standards of living to provide adequate nutrition, housing, medical care, and education.

3. Establishment of minimum standards of employment to prevent exploitation of workers, whether employed or self-employed, whose opportunities for high-wage employment are limited.

4. Provision for child welfare.

5. Provision for a regular flow of income to all those whose employment is interrupted by sickness or injury, by old age or by lack of employment opportunity.

6. The effective recognition of the right of freedom of association and of collective bargaining.

7. Provision of facilities for training and transfer of labor.

The post-war economic program of international and national problems, embodied in another resolution adopted by the Conference, includes the dynamic proposal introduced by the United States employer representatives for encouragement of enterprise, stimulation of production and technical progress, discouragement of monopolistic practices, and the development of incentives to encourage private investment in constructive peacetime business activities. The importance of well planned public works program, properly timed to help maintain standards of living, is emphasized in this plan, which was pushed also by the United States Government and worker groups.

One recommendation brings together what amounts to a code of social justice for the hundreds of millions of people in the dependent territories of the world, with emphasis upon measures to prevent the exploitation of workers, especially women and children. Among other things, this proposes to increase to 15 years the minimum age at which children may be employed in industrial jobs in these territories, and suggests that the nations controlling them should provide special aid to the workers' cooperative organizations among these peoples.

The Social Security recommendation is a forward-looking set of proposals which go beyond what we have been able to do, so far, in our own rich country. It demonstrates that even here we must go further to attain the full protection against the privations of old age, ill health, and unemployment, which any well-ordered country should provide for all its people.

The average American citizen who is listening to this speech will probably ask, at this point, "How is this I. L. O. program going to affect me? What does all this mean, in terms of action?"

My answer is, that we of the I. L. O. have charted a first small step toward the building of a post-war world in which men, women, and children will be happier and healthier. We have outlined a program which we are taking to the statesmen and politicians of the nations, and more important, to the plain people, too. We are saying to them, "If these things are put into the peace settlements, into your state and national laws, your people will be better off. There will be fewer opportunities for another Hitler to arise and plague the earth if you do these things."

The governments voting for these recommendations and resolution have undertaken moral commitments for which they will be held to account in every country where people realize the significance of these votes in Philadelphia.

We are also recognizing in the I. L. O. economic and employment programs the fact that no one nation can close its boundaries and live unto itself in peace and prosperity. International trade, better access to the world's raw materials, are necessary to get what we need to improve our standards of life and living.

A third point is that the democratic way is the way of peace and progress. We at Philadelphia passed no laws, nor did we issue decrees. We exchanged ideas, made compromises, and worked out a statement of our common cause. Now that statement is going to the governments and the peoples, with no threat of impairment of national interests or sovereignty. Our recommendations can be put into effect and enforced only through the processes of education and democracy. Public opinion is our mightiest weapon.

The declaration of Philadelphia and the recommendations and resolutions are couched in fine, brave words, and, as was the case with that great Declaration of 1776, they will require bold action, an the political battle fronts of peace, to be translated into deeds.

Most of the men and women I met in Philadephia are veteran crusaders in the cause of improving the lot of mankind. Nearly every one of them rose to eminence in his own country by fighting for social improvement. Tonight most of them are on their way home, to their 41 countries, to carry on the job of forward-looking education, to show their own people how they, and their neighbors, will benefit from this program.

I am confident the job can be done, for I believe it's what we are fighting for, in this most gigantic and costly of wars. Our boys are fighting and dying for a better world, a secure and peaceful world, based on cooperation, not conflict. The Philadelphia conference of the International Labor Organization demonstrated again that men of good will can work together despite varying interests, against those common enemies—want and fear. I am proud to have been able to take part, and I stand ready now to help carry out that program as the greatest contribution I can make to my own country's future welfare—the restoration of the damages of war and the well-being of the young people who must carry on when we leave off.

Address by Senator Tunnell to Delaware Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, our colleague the senior Senator from Dela-

ware [Mr. TUNNELL] delivered an effective and enlightening address before the Democratic State convention at Dover, Del., yesterday afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the time for the Presidential election approaches, it becomes more and more apparent that the average person is thinking less of partisan politics than ever before. This may or may not be for the best interest of the Nation. For more than 11 years the Presidency for the first time in American history has been held by the same man. There is nothing in the Federal law or the Federal Constitution which prescribes the number of terms for which the same man can be elected to the Presidency. However, in the early days of the Republic those who held the Presidential office were of the opinion that during ordinary times there was no reason for the election of the same man for more than 8 years. However, the founders of the Republic left the door open so that in periods of great stress or emergency the Nation could use a President for its Chief Executive, regardless of the number of terms he might have served. By no other means would the Nation be put in position of being able to choose its best citizen for President during an emergency.

Americans generally recognize that a great work has been done by the present Administration, both in domestic matters and as to our foreign relations. There is a spirit of fairness which permeates public men, regardless of party, with reference to their government in time of war. As I scanned the news account of the Republican State convention in Dover on April 20th, I found no recognition that anything had been done by the Democratic national administration which deserved the slightest commendation. There was no gratitude for aiding the Nation in its recovery from a state of economic confusion and bankruptcy to one of prosperity. There was no recognition of the tremendous strides that have been made toward winning the war. There was no recognition of any intelligent management of the war by President Roosevelt. This may be good politics. I don't think it appeals to the spirit of fairness of the American people.

In 1940, the American people sensed the approach of a second world war, and by a majority of approximately 5,000,000 votes elected for a third term Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as President of the United States. During the present administration, American territory and American ships have been attacked by the Axis Powers, and war was declared by them on this Nation. The United States did not attack the Axis Powers. They attacked the United States. Prior to December 7, 1941, there was a great division of opinion in America as to whether the Nation should prepare for war, or should it depend upon its isolation to protect it from harm in case of foreign complications. Many conscientious persons believed that the same arguments which applied when Washington gave his farewell address applied at this time. They believed that the Atlantic Ocean on the east, the Pacific Ocean on the west, the Gulf of Mexico, and a friendly neighbor on the south, together with a friendly border on the north, made it unnecessary for the United States either to take any interest in European affairs or to become involved in European wars. However, methods of warfare have changed rapidly within the last century. Guns are more powerful. Ships have greater tonnage. The military airplane has appeared in the air, and the submarine has made its appearance in the sea. The very elements of air and water which in 1797 were a protection against foreign encroachment have become means of communication through which the airplane and the submarine could attack American territory.

Instead of being isolated as were our ancestors, the territory of the United States is now within easy reach of European military weapons. This is a condition which our ancestors could not foresee or foretell. Another development in international affairs brought about partially by increased military facilities has been the attempt of one or two nations to dominate the economic and military world. While these struggles originated in Europe, their objectives included North and South America. Even in the days of the musket and bayonet, European wars spread to the western continent. For 200 years Port Royal passed alternately from French to English hands, and then back from English to French hands, depending on the fortunes of war between those two countries. A few foresighted statesmen in America foresaw that the United States would eventually be involved in the second world war. Our commercial, industrial, and Government interests compelled us to take note of world events and world struggles. Granted that it would be well if we could avoid becoming involved, such could not be and can never be in the future.

America is a world power, and as such has world responsibilities. It must always be a party to the settlement of world disputes. President Roosevelt was one of those statesmen who foresaw the coming struggle. Henry Cabot Lodge and his isolation associates had by their defeat of the League of Nations made certain that there would be a World War No. 2. Those who had shared the isolation view were particularly active in the year 1941 before the United States was attacked by the Axis Powers and Japan. The President had warned congressional leaders of the approaching storm. His advice had in the main been ignored, and every appropriation for the purpose of strengthening our defense was contested or criticized, on the ground that such appropriations were unnecessary.

At any rate, we are now in the war. We are now in the greatest war that the world has ever known. Three men have been responsible for our defense in World War No. 2. There have been the conferences at Quebec, at Casablanca, at Teheran, at Moscow, to say nothing of numerous conferences by subordinates. Our defense in the world struggle as it now shapes itself has been planned by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin. This planning has been masterful. There are none who can intelligently criticize the strategy of this war, nor question the leadership that has been responsible for that strategy. Instead of an insignificant Navy, we now have the greatest Navy in the world's history. Instead of an insignificant Army, we have perhaps the largest Army ready for combat ever assembled. Notwithstanding predictions as to food shortages, notwithstanding dire predictions as to every sort of catastrophe, the United Nations are proceeding toward victory. For partisan reasons, there are those who now say, "Let us change our United States leadership in this fight."

I saw a statement by a noted writer a few days ago arguing that a Presidential term should be 6 years, that it takes 2 years for a President to learn his surroundings. How many American lives might be lost while a new President is mastering his job? Some of them never do learn. It is a curious circumstance that during this great emergency from 1932 to the present, there have been few outstanding opposition political leaders developed in America. The reason for this has been that the best thought of America of both parties has agreed in the main with the administration. Again, our Nation has been passing through a period of unparalleled prosperity. When people are prosperous, they think little of Government. A vast number of people in America vote against something, rather than for somebody.

However, the people are becoming aroused in America today. They are interested because everything that they have is dependent on the success or failure of this war effort. The people are interested to have their best officers, their best soldiers, their best sailors, their best President in this world struggle. The result has been that America has resorted to what is known as selective service in order to place its young, most vigorous men in its fighting forces. There is a great demand in some sections of the country to induct men of all occupations into the branch of the work for which they are best suited. These people desire that a shipbuilder shall be inducted into the shipbuilding business, a farmer into agriculture, a tradesman into trade. In other words a planned and complete economy would place each man and woman where he or she could be of the greatest service to the Nation. The selective service may not be permitted to go that far. However, so far as the armed service is concerned, we now have forced induction. If we have forced induction for the private, the noncommissioned officer, and for the commissioned officer, why should there not be a forced induction for the Commander in Chief? Why not draft Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Where does this demand for the induction of Franklin Delano Roosevelt come from? It is not coming from the great industrial leaders. They have made too much money. They are dissatisfied. It is not coming from the great manufacturing interests. They have made too much money. They are dissatisfied. It is coming from the average man in every community of the United States. The average man and woman in every election district in the Nation is calling for Franklin Roosevelt.

I don't think there is a section or a community of any size in which the sentiment of the people is other than that the President of the United States should be retained, should be drafted for a continuation and a successful conclusion of the present war, if the war has not been decided before the Presidential election. The demand is coming from the rural school district, it is coming from the lowly home, both rural and urban. It is coming from our flyers over Germany. It is coming from our sailors sailing the seven seas. It is coming from our soldiers in the jungles of Burma, on the sands of Africa, on the beaches in Italy, and in the fox holes of the Pacific. Truly, the demand is coming from "Greenland's icy mountain to India's coral strand." It is coming from the best thinkers of the Nation, those whose sons and daughters are exposed in this conflict, those who would hesitate to say to the world that we are dissatisfied with our Commander in Chief for political reasons, in spite of the fact that he has been so successful in the war management.

It would take too long to point out to you by figures and dates, the increase in the Army, in the Navy, and in every form of military equipment. Nobody denies this, and the demand to which I refer comes from both Republicans and Democrats. In the recent Republican primary in Pennsylvania, we are told that 6,000 Republicans wrote in the name of Franklin Roosevelt as their choice for the Presidency. This was a Republican primary. This was a demand from the people, his political opponents, a demand from those who are anxious to see this war won. Those who oppose a reelection of the President do not state that they oppose him in order to sooner win the war. However, many things are said with a view to creating dissatisfaction in America. A few days ago I read an article which was published in the Sunday Star, a Washington newspaper, in which a United States Senator is quoted as having said: "The American people know their boys are dying not only to give the British Empire a new lease on life, but another opportunity to expand its imperialism."

He continued, "They know that we are depleting our precious national resources not only to help Russia survive, but to help Russia to become the colossus of Europe." Continuing he said, "They know that besides the precious contribution of human life and suffering, that we are incurring a financial debt that will be paid in American sacrifice all the days of our life."

This man voted to declare war against the Axis Powers, and then goes out and tells the people that the war is being fought to give the British Empire a new lease on life and to expand its imperialism; to help Russia to become the colossus of Europe; and he calls attention to the fact that the war is creating a financial debt. Could any party prevent the creation of a financial debt during this war? Are these tactics entirely fair? Are they patriotic? These statements must be discouraging to the mother of the boy in service if she believes the statements of the Senator. This war must be won. This war is being won. This war will be won, unless we are defeated by those who approach the line of sedition by attempting to convince the American people that this war is not in their interest, but in the interest of foreign powers. Is this sort of politics entirely fair? Is it patriotic? But not only must the war be won. There must not be a repetition of this war.

There must be some form of international organization to protect the next generation against a repetition of such World Wars as No. 1 and No. 2. Do the American people believe that our political opponents who sacrificed all hope of preventing World War No. 2 for political reasons would ever be responsible for any form of international organization for such purpose? They killed the League of Nations. They did not favor any other form of international organization with teeth in it. However, the opponents of the President in both his own party and that of the opposition say there is to be no issue of foreign relations in this campaign, and then have one of their senatorial leaders to speak and make public a statement attacking the very motive which actuates our Nation in defending itself from an attack by a foreign foe. Is this quite fair or patriotic?

Senator BARKLEY some time ago enumerated 34 different policies or enactments of the present administration. Practically none of these policies are being attacked openly by the opponents of the President within or without his party. Some of these are, first, a sound banking system; next, Federal guaranty of bank deposits; Home Owners' Loan Corporation; Farm Security Administration; rural electrification; soil-conservation program; farm mortgage acts; crop insurance and parity payments; public works carried forward in every section of the Nation providing income in critical periods; road building; National Youth Administration; old-age and retirement insurance; unemployment insurance; vocational training to the crippled and the blind; Federal aid to starving and undernourished persons; slum clearance; private home building and comfortable quarters for war workers; legislation abolishing child labor; minimum-wage and maximum-hour legislation; Securities and Exchange Commission; reciprocal trade agreements; the good-neighbor policy toward the nations of the Western Hemisphere; increased compensation to our service men and women. These are some of the accomplisments of the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Which ones of these great humanitarian and economic precautions will be removed? We defy our opponents to specify what they will abolish of the great program. Oh, we are told that the domestic affairs of the Nation are in a mess. Those acts show how much of a mess our affairs are in.

The Nation is in the best position morally, spiritually, economically, and politically that it has ever been in its history. Let us take the income from agriculture last year. It amounted to nearly $20,000,000,000. Labor: We are told that there will be by July 1 of this year 53,400,000 persons employed, and no unemployment of consequence. How about business prosperity in America? Well, we can best illustrate that by stating that the income of this great country of ours in 1943 was $148,000,000,000. During the last year of the Hoover administration the total income of the Nation was less than forty billions, or, in other words, there has been an increase of 250 percent. This administration took the country when it was in dire distress. We now see it in its most prosperous period of history. Those who criticize the present administration dare not openly attack these broad business and humanitarian policies. And yet they are the very policies which our opponents must attack if they attack the present administration. Oh, they tell us that this administration has been too political. It has appointed too many of its adherents to political jobs. If this administartion has made any mistakes—and I think it has—its most serious one has been the appointment of too many of its political opponents where their disloyalty would discredit the administration. And I refer particularly to the organization of the O. P. A. in Delaware, where approximately $200,000 in salaries was being paid to those who were not in sympathy with either the O. P. A. or the administration, through which their jobs had come. They attempted to discredit the whole O. P. A. for political reasons.

Our opponents tell us their issues are to be: (1) The preservation of free enterprise; (2) the abatement of bureaucracy; (3) the halt of paternalism; (4) the creation of post-war jobs through private industry; (5) the maintenance of labor's social gains; (6) the protection of our national interest. What do they mean by free enterprise? They mean certain advantages to special interests to prey upon the average man and woman of America. President Hoover was a great advocate of free enterprise. The only enterprise that thrived during his administration was the sale of apples on street corners. They tell us that they would abate bureaucracy. Do you know what a bureaucrat is? We hear a lot about him. A bureaucrat is a Democrat appointed to a position with the Federal Government in time of war. We are told that our opponents would cut 2,000,000 men and women from the pay roll. If they cut 2,000,000 men and women from the pay roll, they would hire 3,000,000 more in their places.

To say that they would discharge 2,000,000 men and women is equivalent to saying they would paralyze the war efforts of America. They say they will halt paternalism. Just what is meant by paternalism? We don't know, except that certain special interests are no longer able to control the Presidency of the United States, the Supreme Court, or Congress. These people don't object to paternalism. They simply object to the parents. Our opponents don't control them. They tell us they are in favor of post-war jobs through private industry. How far did they create jobs from private industry from 1929 to 1933? Where was private industry when Hoover's administration was sunk into the slough of economic despair? What was the matter with private industry then? Why didn't it furnish the jobs? Where was old Dr. Hoover when labor of the Nation was economically sick and helpless? They tell us that one of the aims of our opponents is the maintenance of labor's social gains. Labor must have made some social gains. They are going to preserve them. Why did our opponents fight so hard against the laws providing for social gains to labor? Why are they today fighting labor on every front? They tell us that they are going to protect our national interest. How and in what respect is our national interest to be protected? Who is to be the judge of that protection? Were they protecting the national interest when the soldiers-vote legislation was before Congress? We saw there 22 Northern Republicans combined with certain Southern Democrats to put through Congress of the United States a bill which they knew would not permit our soldier boys to vote.

The President called it a fraud. This was a very mild name for that piece of hypocracy. The Senator from Mississippi sponsoring this bill told the Senate that he was interested in preserving white supremacy, and for this reason opposed the Federal ballot. Senator HOLMAN, from Oregon, representing the Northern view, admitted that the opposition of the northern Republicans to a Federal ballot was because of the probability that these boys would vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt. He stated that if the President would announce that he would not be a candidate at the coming Presidential election, the opposition to a Federal ballot would disappear, and the bill could be passed in 30 minutes. We had the peculiar spectacle of 22 northern Republicans joining with 15 southern Democrats who were voting for white supremacy.

There was probably reason to fear that the boys in the service might favor President Roosevelt. Our opponents might also consider the possibility of the fathers and mothers, wives and sweethearts, brothers, sisters, and other relatives of the boys in the service voting for President Roosevelt. Perhaps they have some plan in mind to prevent the families of our boys in the service from voting. They did not disfranchise the relatives of the boys in service. They have succeeded in preventing our servicemen from having the vote. Representatives of both the Army and the Navy came before the Senate committee and told us that the chances of the delivery of the State ballots by soldiers from 48 States were very remote. Many of these States have hundreds of different kinds of ballots, depending upon the particular section or voting district. It was well known by those who opposed the Federal ballot that they were at that time removing the chance of thousands, and perhaps millions, of servicemen from having the opportunity to vote. Our opponents do not want the servicemen to vote, and they tell the reason why they do not.

H. V. Kaltenborn, the noted commentator, told of visiting the amputation ward of a veteran's hospital filled with maimed veterans of the Italian campaign. Mr. Kaltenborn asked these men how many of them had made up their minds to vote for Willkie. Not a man stirred or spoke. He then asked them how many had made up their minds to vote for Dewey. There was the same stoney silence. He then asked how many had decided to vote for President Roosevelt. The commentator states that the air was filled with the hands and the stumps of arms. Mr. Kaltenborn states that these boys have lost their arms and legs through the war and their opportunity to vote through Congress.

This administration has stood for those policies which benefit the average man and woman. It has stood for an increase in teachers' pay. The administration favored Federal aid for teachers throughout the Nation. It believes that illiteracy is a weakness for the whole Nation and not alone for the State in which the illiterate lives. I heard a prominent opposition United States Senator say when told that the teachers' salaries in the State of Ohio were too low that they could board with their parents. This is the sort of reasoning, and this is the sort of opposition that is being advanced in Washington to anything to benefit the average man and woman.

Another great class of Americans who have been recognized by this administration as

never before is the Negro. During this administration there have been employed by the Federal Government more than 400,000 Negroes. The only Negro Congressman in the United States is a Democrat. The Democratic Party has put Negroes in the Legislatures Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, California, West Virginia, and Missouri. It has placed two Negro judge in the municipal court in New York City. They have placed a Negro alderman in New York City, and one in St. Louis. The Negro has been given recognition by the Democratic Party, and he has his greatest opportunity in history.

We sometimes hear that labor has taken over the Government. I don't think that labor has taken over the Government. I do say that those who are employed, together with their families, are entitled to representation in the Government which they did not have before the Roosevelt administration. Let us ponder the great proportion of the American people represented by labor and their families. They would amount to at least 75,000,000 of people. The prosperity of this great number means the prosperity of the Nation. Their poverty means poverty and distress for the Nation.

Now the great test of our Government during the period of this administration is the fact that it has accomplished the great improvement in America's conditions with no scandals, no starvation, no unemployment, and no crooked elections. Let us compare the domestic policy of 1942 with the domestic policy of 1932. Let us compare the period of Franklin Roosevelt with any other period in American history. Let us compare the hopelessness and despair of America in 1933 with the confidence and prosperity in 1943. Let us compare the experience and proven executive ability of Franklin Roosevelt with any possible candidate of the Republican Party in the present campaign. History will credit the period from 1933 to 1945 as the greatest period in America's development. Democracy then had its greatest growth and development. What will the period from 1945 to 1949 be? The answer depends upon the management to which that period will be entrusted.

Commencement Address by Hon. Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, at Catholic University of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address which I delivered this morning at the Catholic University of America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commencement at a great university is an inspiring event. Colored as it is by the age-old traditions of academic life, it symbolizes each year the enduring continuity of scholarship. To those within the university circle, it must always be an occasion for the inner satisfactions of accomplishment. Long hours of research, and many days and weeks of lecture and study, reach at this time a fitting climax, as the work of the scholastic year is crystalized in the awarding of honors and degrees.

To those, like myself, who are invited from outside to join in these ceremonies, commencement gives another kind of inspiration. To us it means, most of all, that men and women of America have been called together once again to celebrate the priceless opportunities of higher education. When we see theologians and philosophers, men of letters and of science, doctors, lawyers, and priests, assembled with their students in the dignified splendor of academic robes, we are impressed by more than the grand pageantry of the event. We are moved by the fundamental demonstration that books and learning continue to live, and that the advantages of university training are being extended to an ever-increasing number of America's children.

It is natural, too, that I should be especially affected by the commencement at this center of Catholic education in America. I need not dwell upon the church's sponsorship of education through all the ages, nor upon the basic compatibility of religion and science, of which the flourishing of this university is itself convincng proof. None but the blind and ignorant would dare to dispute these matters. Nor need I emphasize that this foregathering of scholars in the Nation's Capital is an essentially American occasion.

The growth and development of this university during the past half century, with its increasing influence and authority as an educational force throughout the United States, has been a splendid example of the sublime consistency of deep religious devotion and high ideals of patriotism. It is not for me to recite the chronology of the Catholic University's participation in the educational development of our country, or to attempt an authentic summary of its ramified contributions to the uplifting of the Nation's intellectual outlook. But I am able to state my profound conviction that the educational activities of the church, as directed in large part by this truly national university, have done much to give to the American people that broader vision, that more generous tolerance, and that more complete understanding of spiritual values, which in this hour of extreme test have been recognized as bulwarks of national strength.

If this were a less stringent hour, if we were meeting together under the serene skies of a peaceful world, it would be appropriate to note the kinship of this university in the new world with the venerable institutions of Europe. But with Europe looming as the decisive battleground in a terrible war, detached views of historic associations are difficult. I am told, for instance, that this university was conceived as a modern replica of the great University of Paris. Under other circumstances it would be profitable to relate the expansion of this Catholic University in the western hemisphere to the preeminence of the University of Paris as the center of culture in the Middle Ages.

Certainly this university, to an extent greater than most institutions in the United States, has made significant contributions to the development of a truly pan-American culture. If the new world is the hope of the whole world, and if upon that hope is based the prospect of avoiding another Dark Age in the world's history, then indeed the mission of this university today is not unlike that of the great centers of learning in earlier centuries.

But the University of Paris and its sister universities of Europe are in the hands of our enemies—the enemies of peace and enlightenment. The immediate mission of the universities of the new world is in the hands of their stalwart sons, who at this moment stand in the legions of deliverance on the very shores of Europe. Theirs is the task to free Europe, and by that great victory to reestablish among nations the binding ties of scholarship.

Thus the time will come when the universities of America shall again extend the hand of friendship and confraternity to sister universities of the old world; when once more the stream of knowledge shall flow among all peoples. This, certainly, is one aspect of the high purpose of our battle.

It has always been true that scholarship, uncolored by the oblique purposes of world politics, has ignored nationalistic boundaries. The free intercourse of students of all nations in search of the truth is an elevating manifestation of the brotherhood of men.

Let us hope that when this war is ended the universities all over the world shall emerge as beacons of a new enlightenment, and that scholarship shall once more become a unifying influence for peace.

This world mission of universities in peace does not suggest impotence in war. Nor does it exclude the universities from sharing in a resurgence of patriotism when the country is in danger. I have said that scholarship ignores national boundaries; but I do not mean that American scholarship, or the scholarship of any free people, avoids national responsibility. On the contrary, where the cause is just, where national interest coincides with what is right, the scholars of a nation are among the first to take up its defense.

In this country academic freedom has always been an essential ingredient of the liberty we cherish. We have been proud of our university scholars because they have been the products of unregimented thought. We have been confident of their leadership in an hour of national danger, because they have equipped themselves with the unerring instincts of intellectual honesty.

Freedom is cherished in the heart, but it thrives in a man's mind. A free nation is a strong nation because its people give intellectual assent to the principles of freedom. That is why in every great fight for freedom the scholars of the Nation are among the staunchest of its warriors.

It is to be remembered that the first attack of nazi-ism was aimed at the universities of Germany. The destruction of academic freedom; indeed, the liquidation of scholars who would not surrender their intellectual integrity was considered by those who had seized the Reich as an initial step in their evil strategy of aggression. If they could throttle truth in their own country, so they thought, they would present to the world an overwhelming spectacle of unity by force.

Were they not also fearful lest, if a spark of liberty remain unextinguished in Germany, it might one day burst forth into a consuming fire of revolution? Did they not destroy the freedom of their universities because they dared not risk the resentment that might smoulder within those free precincts, as the mad rush of nazi-ism gained momentum?

It will be said that German science still heeds the command of Hitler; that we fight an enemy who still relies upon the potent resources of trained minds. We may be asked, does not that imply the surrender of the universities in Germany?

Such questions confuse the utilization of trained technicians with the intellectual leadership that springs wholeheartedly from the breasts of unfettered men of learning. Of course our enemies have their experts—men whose hearts are darkened and whose minds are warped by the inexorable pressure of regimentation. But note this—none of the German universities was prepared to sponsor the doctrines of nazi-ism until its free scholars had been destroyed and it had been reduced to utter servility. No great university figure in all of Germany has

emerged under Hitler as an inspiring leader of his country.

Consider in contrast the historic example of an eminent university scholar and priest who once stood embattled for freedom. Thirty years ago Cardinal Mercier was indeed the "Voice of Belgium." Consider how he led his countrymen in their hour of need. Writing from ruined Louvain on Christmas in 1914 he pointed to the destruction of that center of learning by the invaders and said, "All this accumulation of intellectual, of historic, and of artistic riches, the fruit of the labors of five centuries—all is reduced to dust."

But amid such desolation he rose up as the national as well as the moral and intellectual leader of his people. Listen to these words of the Holy Cardinal:

"Yet when, on the 2d of August, a mighty foreign power, confident in its own strength and defiant of the faith of treaties, dared to threaten us in our independence, then did all Belgians, without difference of party, or of condition, or of origin, rise up as one man, close-ranged about their own King, and their own government, and cry to the invader: 'Thou shalt not go through.'

"At once, instantly, we were conscious of our own patriotism. For down within us all is something deeper than personal interests, than personal kinships, than party feeling, and this is the need and will to devote ourselves to that more general interest which Rome termed the public thing, 'Res publica.' And this profound will within us is patriotism."

Many here today remember the tall, saintly Cardinal of Belgium when, shortly after the last war, he visited America. Many will recall the acclaim he received throughout the land as the personification of a valiant people. He was honored here by many universities, including this one—and he was honored not only as a churchman and a celebrated authority on philosophy, but also as a great patriot.

As our men gaze across the English Channel at the fields of Flanders today, I am sure they are fortified by the eternal blessings of the valiant soul of Cardinal Mercier.

The spirit of Cardinal Mercier lives in Belgium today and it lives among us. We, too, have our great patriots among men of learning. Our universities are not silenced—nor are they withdrawn from the fight. They fortify us not only by the precision of scientific method, but also by the intellectual leadership that comes from the reasoned conviction that our cause is just and our destiny noble.

There are many examples of this inspiring leadership. There are many spokesmen for America among the scholars of the day. If I single out one, it is because in a special way he has dramatized the moral and intellectual leadership of the learned men of America. By his actions and in his messages he has given glowing testimony of the inexhaustible courage that springs from love of country.

The world was electrified when the archbishop of New York, as military vicar of the armed forces of the United States, set out upon his flight across the seas to lift up the hearts of our fighting sons on several continents. Here was the unprecedented example of a priest and scholar of great dignity and authority giving by his personal presence in the war zones the moral and intellectual approval of a just cause.

It is appropriate, therefore, that to the assembled scholars of this university, with which he is identified, I should repeat Archbishop Spellman's moving dedication of all of us to "the road to victory," over which at this very moment men of America are moving relentlessly forward.

"As Americans," Archbishop Spellman says, "we proclaim the common necessity of the defense of our beloved country. We shall never see her enslaved. We shall never see the sacred heritage of liberty torn from her, the democratic forms of government shorn from her. And the best way to preserve our country strong and free, the fundamental basis of all victory, is the upbuilding of the citizen as an individual, as a man who knows God and keeps God's Commandments. This is the best and essential contribution that each of us can make to the winning of the war, the reestablishment of peace, and the gaining of true liberties for all peoples."

These words illuminate a high purpose. Better than my own they carry the message I would give to those who are honored here today.

Our country needs, the world needs, more than ever before, men and women who recognize that truth and knowledge are the gifts of God and therefore should be dedicated to His service. In America we want scholars who dignify their learning by giving to it an elevating character of spirituality.

To the scholars of 1944, who pass from the portals of this university today into a world at war, let me give a word of reassurance. You shall not be lost in the turmoils that surround you. If your peacetime plans must be deferred, you have the rare privilege of devoting your specialized knowledge to the cause of your country, and you have the even higher role of demonstrating by your work and your way of life, the true patriotism which Archbishop Spellman has so eloquently defined.

When peace with victory comes, perhaps sooner than we dare hope in this critical hour, you will find that even greater opportunities for your careers will be opened up to you—and you will be better prepared for those careers because of the part you have played in winning the war.

Let us all join in honoring also today those absent sons of this university who could not be here because they already have answered their country's call. In a profound sense this commencement of 1944 is also theirs. They honor their university because they fight for freedom. Theirs is the distinguished degree of courage, of bravery, and of sacrifice. Our hearts are with them. Our hopes are in them—may God bless them—and keep them.

One Hundred and Thirtieth Anniversary of Norwegian Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address honoring the Norwegian citizens of the United States upon this, the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Norwegian Constitution, this being an address which I delivered in Washington today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this 17th day of May the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the Norwegian Constitution, I rise to pay tribute to the enterprising, courageous Norwegian people throughout the world and especially so to the Norwegian pioneers and citizens of my own State of North Dakota.

The State of North Dakota owes a great deal to its Norwegian citizens. They and their families came to North Dakota for the purpose of establishing homes and giving their children a better chance at life than they themselves had had. It was their fundamental belief that education was the door to opportunity and so we find that among the Scandinavian people their first concern was the establishment of schools and churches. It is to them that North Dakota is particularly indebted for their high educational standards.

Closely associated with the Scandinavian faith in education was their almost religious belief in the necessity for active participation by the people themselves in their Government. I am sure that you will all agree with me that in no State in the Union do the people themselves take a more active and direct interest in the political affairs of their local, State, and National Government than do the people of North Dakota. As one evidence of this, contrast the proportion of people participating in elections in North Dakota with some of the other States.

The people of occupied but unconquered Norway are today celebrating their one hundred and thirtieth annual Independence Day. Thousands of Norwegians throughout the United States, Canada, and many other countries of the world will join in observing this significant anniversary of the establishment of democratic government. Each year, in spite of difficulties, the Norwegian people have managed to observe their Independence Day. Again this year they will find some way to celebrate the 17th of May.

The 17th of May is Norway's Fourth of July, a day for the patriotic observance of the nation's traditional freedom and independence. It was on May 17, 1814, that representatives of the Norwegian people at Eidsvold, Norway, approved a democratic constitution, modeled, to some extent, after the American Constitution.

Prior to 1814 Norway was united with Denmark as a separate kingdom. But after brief hostilities with Sweden, Frederick VI, the Danish King, by the Treaty of Kiel, concluded on January 14, renounced sovereign rights over Norway, ceding them to the King of Sweden. The Norwegian people objected. They held that Frederick was entitled to renounce claim to the Norwegian throne, but they denied his right to cede an unconquered country. The Norwegian view was that sovereignty now rested with the people. Therefore, Norwegians demanded the summoning of a constitutional assembly, based on a general election. The residing Governor, Crown Prince Christian Frederick of Denmark, was forced to yield to public pressure, and on April 10, 1814, the elected representatives met at Eidsvold. Six weeks later they adopted Norway's Constitution, the constitutional law of May 17, 1814.

From that day Norway enjoyed the privileges of democracy, and even now the Norwegian Government, with its headquarters in London, has continued to function in full adherence to the constitution of 1814.

The Norwegian Parliament, comprising elected representatives of the people, still manages to meet. By a unanimous vote it has instructed the executive branch of their Government to carry on the struggle for freedom even though it is necessary to establish temporary headquarters abroad. This mandate has been carried out. Thanks to the foresight of the elected representatives of the Norwegian people, the Norwegian Government is in a unique position, although in exile, to function on a strictly legal basis. This fact has been emphasized by Ambassador Wilhelm Morgenstierne: "There is an unbroken line connecting the Government with the constitutional past—and I might

add with the constitutional future of Norway."

It is the boast of the Norwegian Government that during 4 years of exile it has never undertaken an important decision without ascertaining the sentiment of the people at home. Inquiries are directed to the home front, and replies are received. Just how this is accomplished obviously cannot now be told. However, the courageous stand taken by groups and individuals in Norway is indicative of the rock-bound spirit and the limitless courage of these people.

Moreover, all actions and policies of the Norwegian Government in exile are constantly being referred to the people in Norway for their approval Thus, in radio addresses beamed to the people of Norway Prime Minister Johan Nygaardsvold has repeatedly given assurance that it is not the plan of his government to perpetuate itself in office. The spirit of the constitution must not be violated.

In a typical statement to the home front he said:

"This government has taken it for granted that the Norwegian people will, in a constitutional and democratic way, decide which lines of progress are to be followed and who is to exercise the administrative authority * * * It will be up to the Norwegian people to decide what things are to be done and who is to do the leading."

Famous Norwegians: Hjalmer Stefansson, Arctic explorer; Carl Ben Eielson, aviator; Thorstein Veblen, famous economist; O. E. Rolvoag, famous novelist; Martha Ostenso, novelist; Knute Rockne, football coach; Bernt Balchen, famous aviator flew with Byrd, greatest flier in world; Governor Nestos; Knute Nelson, Congressman from Minnesota.

Globe-Circling Senator—Review of Book Written by Senator Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, we have heard the saying, "O that mine enemy would write a book." Our very good friend and colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], has written a book entitled "Tell the Folks Back Home," and a most interesting review of it by Mr. Frank S. Adams appeared in the New York Times of last Sunday. As a possible contribution to a more proper understanding of the fruits of our journey last summer around the globe, I ask that the review be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOBE-CIRCLING SENATOR

(By Frank S. Adams)

Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, was one of the five globe-girdling Senators whose remarks caused a furor when they returned from their inspection of global battlefronts last autumn. They were scolded by many sections of the press, chided by President Roosevelt, spanked by Winston Churchill. Now the Senator from New York has written a breezy, brash, entertaining book in which he doesn't back down on a single one of the points in dispute between the committee and its critics.

Loyal New Dealer though he is, Senator MEAD still deplores the lack of a strong, coordinated American military, diplomatic, and economic policy in the warring areas. He is still annoyed that the British sometimes get the credit for American lend-lease purchases; still eager for us to get post-war rights to the air bases we have built on British soil; still apprehensive that we are draining our own oil resources to fight the war, while the British fields in the middle east are conserved for the future.

India made Senator MEAD angrier than anything else he saw on his 45,000-mile trip. He was shocked that, at a time when thousands of starving people lay on the sidewalks of Calcutta, the British authorities were still devoting precious space in freight cars for race horses en route to the Calcutta Gold Cup. He was angry that Reuters, the British news agency, should spread reports that heavy reverse lend-lease shipments of food to American forces were accentuating the shortage.

And yet, with the same poltical astuteness that marked his climb from railroad switchman to the United States Senate, Senator MEAD has balanced enough laudatory remarks about the President, about the British, and about the workings of lend-lease to make his book palatable to many to whom his criticism would be so many red rags. It is sentimental, occasionally acrimonious, but never dull.

In London he conceded that the King made as good an impression on the Senators as he hoped they made on the monarch. He was astonished when Churchill used a quill pen to sign Senator "HAPPY" CHANDLER'S short-snorter bill. The British Prime Minister talked freely to the touring Senators about the possibility of dual citizenship for Britons and Americans after the war.

In north Africa he was astonished by the magnitude of American supply installations—and found a fierce undercover battle going on for post-war advantages. He found the French anxious to take over American facilities and the British trying to assume control of Port Lyautey on the plea that it divided their operations between Agadir and Gibraltar. We answered that by taking over Agadir.

Through the steaming hot Middle East and across India he continued to be astounded by the number of homesick Americans he encountered, all participating in a miracle of supply. And everywhere he went Senator MEAD and his colleagues grew angrier about the oil situation, and particularly at the fact that no American official had even been assigned to take the question up with the British.

After a brief round trip over "the hump" to see China, and the first non-stop flight in a land plane from Ceylon, 3,200 miles across the Indian Ocean to Australia, Senator MEAD and his fellow-travelers found something to be glad about. They liked the Australians and decided that lend-lease has served to create a liking there for American jeeps, trucks, and planes that will open up a lasting market after the war for our mechanical products.

General MacArthur struck the Senator as a dynamic, theatrical personality. He told the tourists some ghastly stories about Japanese atrocities, faithfully recorded here. Continuing on into the South Pacific, Senator MEAD had enthusiastic things to say about Admiral Halsey and hi flag secretary, former Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota. Indeed, he was enthusiastic about most of the things he saw—but the meat of his book is in the comparatively few things with which he found fault.

Lethal Trends of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Reader's Digest by Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS of Texas, which should be read at this time by every person in America. It is a graphic description of our centralized bureaucracy and how it operates, and a prophetic warning of things to come unless lethal trends of Government are corrected. This article should be a challenge to all Americans who love their country and who want to see the Government of our fathers endure. It is as follows:

We all believe in democracy—democracy operated through representative government. Why is it, then, that in a land where everybody proclaims his devotion to it, representative government is withering before our eyes?

The bureaucrat is blamed for this. But he is not the cause. He is the effect. The seat of the trouble lies far deeper.

Our whole political system is based on the principle of local self-government. But two forces have been destroying this principle. One is the demand of the people for the Federal Government to intervene in problems of every community and every class. The other is the ever-growing practice of passing all these problems on to the Government in Washington. The last war gave this a big push. The post-war dislocation hurried it. The great depression raised it to avalanche proportions. The present war is completing the job. Every town and State, every trade association and trade union, every class and group and desperate minority brings its problems to Washington. And Washington is gladly accepting that responsibility.

But Congress is made up solely of mere human beings. And nature has not endowed any group of human beings with the sweep and grasp of intelligence necessary to handle the multitude of Federal and local problems dumped upon Washington.

Not being able to handle the impossible burden itself, Congress of necessity creates bureaus and passes on the overload to the bureaucrats. By bureaucrats I do not mean those Government employees once called civil servants because they were employed to serve the Government and execute the laws of Congress. I refer to the bureau chief and his squadrons of counselors and economists and specialists. I am not criticizing them but the system. They issue what are called directives, which actually have the force of law. One bureaucrat in the Securities and Exchange Commission said recently: "We do make the law. This order supersedes any laws opposed to it." Actually the bulk of what in effect are our general laws are now being made not by Congress but by bureaucracies.

This is not a new thing. It was under way 30 years ago when I entered Congress. I made a speech in the House warning of it in 1923 and again in 1932. I am not discussing the concentration of Federal power which has been made in order to fight the war. The present picture is merely the natural development of our policies over several decades. It is a procedure as old as tyranny. But it cannot exist in a democracy, because

where it exists government inescapably ceases to be a democracy.

The essence of democracy is that laws shall be enacted by representatives of the people, and that all sides have a hearing. But laws enacted by bureaucrats are fashioned behind closed doors. The real author is not known to the people. He is appointed, not elected. Generally the first the public knows of his directives is when they are proclaimed. The law, once thus announced, is subject to frequent and sometimes capricious amendment. The bureau enacts it, enforces it, and sits as judge in interpreting it. Most of these imperial bureaus are provided with tribunals equipped as courts and recognize a multitudinous bar which practices before them.

It is not easy to get a law passed by Congress. But the bureaucrat can toss off a directive while you wait. The very facility with which he legislates encourages the multiplicity of laws. The fact that he does not have to face a constituency makes him irresponsible to the people in the performance of this, the highest function of sovereignty.

The promoters of centralization are more and more resorting to the exercise of another unlimited power against which no constitutional barrier will ever stand—the control of the purse strings. By making the units of State government financially dependent on the Federal Government, that Government is acquiring the power to control the units of State government. When this is fully consummated, the sovereignty of the State governments will be liquidated.

This job will have been done with money sent by Washington in the form of loans and gifts to States, towns, school districts, individual citizens. This money has served to attach all these interests directly to the central government and make them subject to its power.

But we are approaching the day of reckoning. Up to now Washington has been borrowing money and scattering it among the States. I do not refer to war activities but to ordinary current Government activities. The Federal Government, long before the preparation for this war, was mortgaging the taxpaying ability of future generations to pay current expenses. The taxes to service these vast Federal operations and pay the interest on the debt must come out of the same pockets from which the States and cities must collect their funds. The Federal Government has first call on these funds. We are, therefore, moving rapidly toward a condition where there will not be enough left to run the States.

In weakening the States we weaken the whole fabric of free government. The inescapable price of free government is that we exercise it. The most destructive force in the world is nonuse. If we do not use our powers of self-government in the States we will awake one day to find that self-government has passed irrevocably out of our hands.

Government is exercised best in the local community. There the problems are perceived with greater clarity because they are close to the people and on a scale within their grasp. The self-reliance of the individual, town, and State is being destroyed as they are being relieved of the necessity of governing themselves. When people stop thinking for themselves there is always someone willing to step forward and do their thinking for them.

What shall we do about it? change bureaucrats? consolidate bureaus? abolish bureaus and turn the whole intolerable load back to Congress? None of these makeshifts touches the real problem. It is folly to talk about abolishing bureaus as long as we continue to pile on the central Government the problem of every State and town and social group in the Nation. The men who are trying to drive us toward government by bureaucracy understand this. The chief adviser of the National Resources Planning Board, recently abolished by Congress, prophesies crisply:

"Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax. * * * Congress will appropriate huge sums of money; will surrender its power of directing when and how the money will be spent.

"Other extraordinary powers, such as to effect great social reforms, will be delegated to the administration, which will retain most, if not all, of its wartime powers."

This is precisely the bureaucratic control we will have if we persist in makin Washington the guide, philosopher, big brother, supervisor, and master of every activity within our borders. The remedy—and the only remedy—is to send all these non-Federal functions back where they belong—to the States and the local communities, where they can be handled upon a scale within the comprehension of the limited mind of man.

Strangely, those in Washington who fight for this new bureaucratic central control call themselves progressives and those who oppose them are branded as reactionaries. Such is the power of labels. We are grasping at ancient evils, and call them progress.

This disease has been most devastating in Germany. In imperial Germany men already talked of the tyranny of bureaucracy. The republican government which succeeded the Kaiser greatly expanded it. It reached its full flower under Hitler. Indeed, national socialism may be described as government by bureaucracy. If we think Hitler's system is better than ours we should have the honesty to say so instead of copying while we denounce it.

The States must resume the status of responsible sovereign agencies of general government or democracy cannot live in America.

Something About Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published by the Spencer (W. Va.) Times-Record, the title of which is "Something About Jefferson," and relates to a speech made by the Honorable James A. Farley at the annual Jefferson Day dinner of the National Democratic Club in New York City.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING ABOUT JEFFERSON

James A. Farley, formerly head of the Democratic National Committee, had little difficulty in getting himself reelected Democratic State chairman of New York recently. There had been rumors that certain New Deal interests in the Empire State were seeking to supplant him on the theory that he is opposed to the fourth term and much of the New Deal ideology. The substance of these rumors, if any, evaporated in the spring sunshine and Mr. Farley had no difficulty in being reelected.

That genial Jim still regards Jefferson as the patron saint of the Democratic Party, or at least his own political mentor, is evidenced from an address which he delivered at the annual Jefferson Day dinner of the National Democratic Club in New York City. In part Mr. Farley stated:

"Jefferson believed that it was better for humanity to progress slowly, to learn from its own mistakes, than to take from the average man the liberty to make decisions for himself. He saw that while a dictator might for a short time provide great benefits and bounties for the people, ultimately the interests of a dictator and the interests of the people were deadly enemies. He would rather make progress slowly and be sure that it ended in security than to seek the illusion of security through the dictation of any one person or any small group.

"Moreover, he believed in local government. He believed that an infinite number of services should be reserved for the communties and the States. He believed that a proper distribution of power between the States and the Nation and between the States and their subdivisions was essential not only to liberty but to efficient government."

Here are some sound if homely truths which many of the left-wing Democratic leaders might do well to take to heart if they are still to regard the sage of Monticello as the patron saint of their party. Because in spite of some opinions to the contrary, Jefferson's views on individual freedom are as applicable today as they were when enunciated. In the waging of a mighty war to preserve our traditions of individual liberty against totalitarianism we are apt to forget some of them. As Mr. Farley pointed out "in fighting that war it is well to keep in mind that if freedom fails here it cannot be secured anywhere in the world."

Abolition of Poll Taxes by Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the direct and efficient road to poll-tax reform is by way of constitutional amendment. Yesterday morning the New York Times published an editorial pointing out that public sentiment in the country with respect to the continued existence of poll taxes as a qualification for voting is such that the country would probably speedily ratify a constitutional amendment. That has been my opinion for several years, and on January 7, 1943, I introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll-tax qualification. This amendment, under consideration in the Senate Judiciary Committee, failed of a favorable report early this year by a tie vote, 9 to 9. It may be that another opportunity will be presented to consider the joint resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial and the joint resolution as introduced by me be printed at length in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 16, 1944]

FOR A POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

The fight against the poll tax has come to grief again on the question of cloture—that is, of limiting debate in order to reach an

early vote. A majority of the Senators would probably have voted against the poll tax if the measure had been presented to them, but less than a majority yesterday were willing to vote for cloture. The argument is simple. A Senator may regard with distaste amounting to abhorrence the prospect of a Senate minority holding up legislation indefinitely in order to gain its own ends in the midst of a dreadful war. At the same time he may wish to retain his own right to talk a proposal to death when he, too, may be both in a minority and, as he thinks, on the side of the angels. Cloture is a real problem, which as yet there has not been sufficient legislative wisdom to solve.

The poll tax itself remains as much an evil as before. It is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, in that it trespasses on what we moderns mean by a "republican form of government." It carries States' rights further than those rights ought to go, in that it affects the election of Federal officials who make or carry out laws for the whole Nation. New York State has a just cause for complaint if eight other States choose Presidential electors, Senators, or Representatives in Congress by an undemocratic process.

Yet it now appears that the number of Senators who are narrowly and selfishly interested in a limited franchise in their States, plus the number of Senators who are honestly convinced that the poll tax cannot be constitutionally repealed by congressional act, is sufficient to defeat such a repeal, either now or in the foreseeable future. We believe that it would be wise for the repeal forces to abandon their present measure and substitute a constitutional amendment. We believe there is enough popular support of poll-tax repeal, on its merits, to secure the assent of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the States—and this is all that is required for a constitutional amendment. The sooner this proposal is brought forward the better.

Senate Joint Resolution 2

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to voting qualifications

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any tax or on account of any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

President Roosevelt and the Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Roosevelt Must Run," appearing in the Chicago Sun of May 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MR. ROOSEVELT MUST RUN

Millions of Americans who care little for political parties as such recognize with every passing day the Nation's continuing need for the kind of leadership Franklin Delano Roosevelt has given it. We think it time, therefore, that the people make clear their insistence that Mr. Roosevelt accept renomination and reelection.

The Sun knows nothing about Mr. Roosevelt's intentions. We can guess that if he consulted only his own convenience he would be happy to lay down the onerous burden of his high office at the end of his present term. But what one man may wish is a triviality when measured against the crisis that confronts civilization.

Whether Mr. Roosevelt wants to be President again or not, the people must make their own decision. They know now that he is the greatest man in his party. They know now that Mr. Willkie's defeat has eliminated any possibility of the Republican Party nominating a man of even comparable stature. They know now that Mr. Roosevelt should be reelected.

The invasion of Europe is about to begin. We are committed to the greatest undertaking the American people, in alliance with other liberty-loving peoples, has ever assumed. Would it not be national folly to shatter the continuity of leadership that has brought us to the verge of a glorious victory?

If somehow the issue of war leadership could be eliminated from the election—if, that is, total victory over all our enemies could be achieved by then—still the Nation could not permit Mr. Roosevelt's retirement. For we must march on beyond military victory to win the peace.

Throughout the war he has not spared himself to build, patiently and untiringly, the foundations of that permanent world cooperation which is indispensable to lasting peace. To throw away his experience and his insight, the friendship and confidence he has slowly built up among our allies, the priceless store of his preparation and planning for a better world; to put the world on notice that the United Nations may not stay united, and that in any case this country lacks faith in its own cause—this would betray the very purposes for which 11,000,000 men have taken up arms.

There is still another compelling reason for Mr. Roosevelt's reelection. He it is who offers the best prospect of leading America toward new pinnacles of welfare, justice, and democratic achievement at home. His liberalism, his faith in plain people, his determination that the powers of society shall be directed to alleviating the ills of society—these are the best assurance in an unsure age that this democracy can solve the exacting problems of adjustment to a new era of peace, freedom, and prosperity.

In a democracy no man is indispensable. But a democracy which fails to make use of its best leadership wrongs itself.

We have differed with Mr. Roosevelt in the past and expect to differ with him in the future. He has made mistakes. Yet he sums up the common aspirations of the American people. His shortcomings pale beside his strengths.

His retirement would delight our enemies, giving them the hope of a compromise peace or a breach in the United Nations coalition. His reelection will weaken Axis resistance and insure the total destruction of fascism.

His retirement would dismay and confuse our allies, drive them either to turn in upon themselves or take refuge in power politics as a hedge against the possible collapse of collective security. His reelection will insure the foundation of a peace structure within which men of good will can work for freedom from fear.

His retirement would raise for millions of civilians and soldiers the specter of another return to the subnormalcy of unemployment, poverty, and insecurity; would unsettle the country with dread of reaction; would aggravate the sources of domestic strife. His reelection will insure post-war reconstruction based on the ideal of a square deal for every man.

America demands the reelection of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

"Arch Seditionist" Is Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Arch Seditionist' Is Dead, a Little Man from Kansas," by Paul Mallon, publisher of the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, of May 9, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ARCH SEDITIONIST" IS DEAD, A LITTLE MAN FROM KANSAS

(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON.—The "arch seditionist" is dead—the 84-year-old man from a small town in Kansas, whom the mighty Justice Department and its F. B. I. thought of sufficient importance to indict for sedition with jailed Nazis and some other men and women agitators, and haul them all together into court here in one big trial.

He died in a rooming house with 40 cents in his pocket in the midst of his trial. He had told the judge he was a pauper and could not afford an attorney for his defense, so one had to be furnished to him free by the court.

The papers say his sedition consisted of running a little printed sheet in Wichita which some dignified by the name of magazine, others by the term "newspaper." He called it Publicity, a title which does not seem to disclose the nature or intent of his threat to this Republic.

His accusers reveal this with greater clarity, saying one of his contributions to our enemies was the coining of the word "Jewocratic." The word certainly means he was against the Jews, all right, as are a lot of small people with small minds, bigoted people who somehow think a religion makes all its people alike in pattern.

He was not discriminating enough to be against bad Jews or anti-American Jews, and for good Jews and patriotic American Jews who stand for the best that is in this country. That was his sedition, as far as the papers disclose it on his death. He could not see the realities of good and bad, which is largely a matter of ignorance rather than malice.

Moreover, he was a hateful little man on this subject, and, according to what the papers say about him, fell for much of the similarly hateful Hitler propaganda. But if he did anything about it except to write it

in his limited way, this has not been brought out.

I wonder how many people in Wichita paid any attention to him, or even knew who he was. I wonder what William Allen White, who was supposed to know everyone in Kansas, would say about him. My bet is his comment would be:

"Oh, he is some old fool out here that no one ever listened to."

At any rate, I wonder if he ever influenced many people with his foolishness, or if you ever heard of his sheet called a newspaper.

Apparently, he wrote his material all himself, pecking away at it in the long night hours in his cheap room, his landlady says, even while his trial was going on. His theory must have been that this is a democracy and, as such, it includes the right to be wrong, or to be anything—even a bigot. Freedom of religion, as Stalin cleverly has pointed out, includes the right to be against all religion.

One day this war will be over and we will look back at all its factors with a clearer vision, less strained by emotion. I wonder if then anyone will be proud enough to tell his grandchildren how the Republic was saved from the 80-year-old pauper, whose only real recognition in the publicity he always strove for, was his death. He never hit the front page before.

Well, anyway, he is now assured of a better judgment.

Politics and Racism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Anniston Star, of Anniston, Ala. I am not in complete accord with everything in the editorial, but I approve of much of it. It was written by Col. Harry M. Ayers, editor and publisher of the Star. Colonel Ayers resided for some years in China with his father, who was a missionary in that country. The editorial is worthy of thought and of preservation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND RACISM: AN APPEAL TO REASON

Some time before the recent senatorial contest in this State got under way the Anniston Star addressed a friendly letter to State Senator James A. Simpson in which we urged the rejection of the question of racism as an issue in the campaign, believing that an appeal to racial prejudice from the political rostrum would be injurious to the white and colored peoples of the State alike and that it would have also a deleterious effect on the war effort. Responsible and high-minded as he had proved himself to be, we believed that this appeal would meet with sympathetic consideration on the part of the Birmingham candidate, and the tenor of his reply confirmed our belief in this connection.

But out of sheer desperation, we like to believe, that issue was projected and the people of the State were subjected to a flood of propaganda by means of scandal sheets, public harangues, whispering campaigns, etc., the equal of which we never before had witnessed. However, now that the sane people of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida have in turn rebuked this sort of misbehavior as it was invoked by Eugene Talmadge against Ellis Arnall, by the Simpsonites against LISTER HILL, and by his four opponents in the race against CLAUDE PEPPER, it is to be hoped that racism will never show its urgly face in this way again.

And we make this statement as one who for a lifetime has been inured to the mores of the South, as one who was born and bred in Dixie. We make it because we ourselves have been the victim of racial prejudice and reviled in a foreign land. We make it because we believe in the Golden Rule and that law of noblesse oblige that imposes on the better advantaged race here in the South and throughout the United States an obligation to strive toward the uplift and not the suppression of our weaker brother of another chromatic type.

The Negro is the only race on American soil that did not come here of his own volition. He was brought here against his will, millions of his kind having died during the period of enforced enslavement. But now that he is here we want him to stay in peace and happiness, because we like him for his many innate virtues; because we entertain for him a sense of gratitude for having taken care of our women folk and children during the dark days of the War between the States, and because we recognize in him potentialities that will make a great contribution to the cultural and economic advancement of our common country once he is given equality of opportunity for self-advancement.

But it will be an exceedingly slow process if the Negro is forced to pull himself up the ladder of civilization by his own bootstraps. He must have, and is entitled to, the help of the white people of the country; and we do ourselves a disservice so long as we deny him education, better housing facilities, adequate medical care, and fair treatment before the law. In addressing the Associated Press annual meeting in New York a few days ago Col. John R. Allison said that he asked Maj. Gen. Orde Charles Wingate during their heroic exploits behind the Japanese lines in Burma if the colored troops at their disposal would fight, to which Wingate is said to have replied: "If they are not good fighters, it is because we are not good leaders."

And the same truism that applies in military life will apply equally well in civil life: the educated, sound thinking people of the South must furnish the leadership to lift the Negro out of the morass of ignorance, poverty and disease that make for criminality and economic liability. David L. Cohn, a highly intelligent Mississippian, recently stated in the Atlantic, one of our best monthly magazines: "Here each white is deeply affected by the Negro, just as each Negro is deeply affected by the white. The one is a problem for the other. If there has never been a free Negro in the South, it is also true that there has never been a free white man in the South since the Civil War * * * because the southerner's whole society and way of life are conditioned by the presence of the Negro * * * The southern Negro suffers mental aberrations because he lives among whites upon terms which they lay down, while the white suffers other aberrations because he lives among masses of Negroes."

Education is the best home remedy we know of to rid ourselves of those aberrations. There are today some 893,290 Negroes in Alabama, and if we could give each of them the value of a Tuskegee Institute training, thus more than doubling their earning capacity, the economic fructification to the State would be tremendous. Moreover, it has been stated often without refutation that no graduate of Tuskegee has ever been convicted of an offense against a white woman or of any other major crime. On the other hand, they have become uniformly good citizens and taxpayers, thereby lifting a burden from the shoulders of the white people where they reside. And this paper believes that citizens of that type should be allowed to vote, be they white or black. Indeed, this paper has come to the conclusion that the time has arrived for all southern States to abolish the poll tax and substitute therefor an educational test as precedent to the exercise of the franchise. But we are unequivocally opposed to force bills and believe the Congress should allow us to work out our own social and economic problems in our own way.

Neither is this paper favorable to efforts that are being made from the outside to abrogate segregation laws that have been established here in the South. For we believe those laws make for the betterment of both races, although we do believe Negroes to be entitled to better accommodations on common carriers. We also should like to see the white people of this section join with the Negroes in an effort to make Hobson City, the exclusive Negro municipality on our southern border, a model place of residence. For it is a laboratory in which they well could prove their capacity for intelligent self-government. A fine new school building recently has been erected there, but the place badly needs engineering and steps toward beautification.

Without segregation, there would be a tendency toward amalgamation, and that is something which races of differing types have fought against from the earliest eolithic period, which produced the so-called Heidelberg and Piltdown man, to the present time, according to Henry Fairfield Osborn and other authorities who are quoted in Dr. Jerome Dowd's scholarly work, "The Negro in American Life." Moreover, Westermarck in his three-volume "History of Human Marriage" points out that amalgamation is conducive to racial infertility and that even among the lower species and aboriginal tribes sexual intercourse of whites with blacks, especially on the part of the female, is decidedly repugnant. And if you must have biblical authority, consult Ezra or St. Paul, or consider the family row that ensued when Moses slipped over the line. Hence, it is to be desired that each race maintain its own integrity and develop itself to its highest possibilities.

But this does not mean that there cannot safely be an interchange of cultures and traditions. And to bring that about is the responsibility of the whole Nation. The South did not bring the Negro to this continent, but it has been the South that has had to shoulder the major part of the burden of his civilization. And insofar as education is concerned, the South's problem has been aggravated in the last few years by Supreme Court decisions that make mandatory equality of educational opportunity and equal pay for white and colored teachers. It was one of those decisions that prevented an 8-month school term here in Alabama under the Dixon administration, and it also was northern influence that defeated the Hill-Thomas Federal-aid bill that would have eased the burden of a dual school system in this region.

All of these problems can be worked out in time, however, and peaceful relations maintained, if the demagogues, both white and black, will but cease their agitation. Men of good will and of foresight everywhere want to see the backward races advance, and nothing is more true than Booker T. Washington's statement that the only way to keep the Negro in a ditch is to stay in there with him. And it also was Washington who cautioned his people against social equality with the whites, but who urged them instead to improve their own racial integrity.

C. I. O. Political Action Committee

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, within the last few months many pages have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the press of the Nation relative to the political activities of the C. I. O. political action committee. Many editorials and news articles have been printed giving the C. I. O. political action committee credit for a number of political scores and a number of political casualties. The biggest issue confronting the American people today is whether or not they shall elect a Representative to Congress typical of their views or allow labor agitators to veer them from the principles for which their sons and daughters are so nobly fighting.

Because my vote on all occasions has voiced the sentiment of the people I represent I have been marked for defeat by labor leaders, labor agitators, and labor racketeers. Two years ago the same issues were in vogue in the Third Congressional District of Oklahoma. The same men will oppose each other in the coming primary on July the 11th. From my point of view the cause which augments all these strikes was the passage of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. The National Labor Relations Act was voted upon in the House of Representatives on June 9, 1935, and my opponent whom I defeated in the primary of 1942, was then Congressman from the district I now have the honor of representing. No doubt, Mr. Cartwright voted for the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. I say, no doubt, he voted for the passage of this law, because according to the record he was in attendance of Congress on that very day and did not voice his opposition to its passage, for Congressman TABER asked for the yeas and nays on a motion to recommit and only 20 Members arose in support of his motion. Surely, had Mr. Cartwright been one of those 20 members he would have made some kind of record of his opposition.

I am further convinced that Mr. Cartwright supported the National Labor Relations Act because Charles Hathaway, President of the Oklahoma State Federation of Labor, on the 8th day of June 1942, issued an open letter of endorsement of then Congressman Cartwright and asked for contributions from the members of the union to defeat me. Hathaway who is not a resident of our district in his letter said:

> It is my desire to consolidate labor's strength against Stewart. Seldom is a Congressman 100 percent for labor, but Congressman Cartwright's record is outstandingly good.

Upon the passage of the Smith-Connally bill the National Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor in their Weekly News Service of June 8, 1943, listed me among 237 other Members of Congress to be purged in the coming election, and published this threat and warning to the world:

> Regardless of whether it is killed or adopted we shall endeavor to vote out of office any Member of Congress who supports it. Into this effort, the American Federation of Labor will pour every resource at its command.
>
> In compliance with this mandate, we publish herewith the names of 238 Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the adoption of this vicious antilabor bill.
>
> STEWART, Oklahoma, and 237 other Members of Congress.

Every resource at the command of A. F. of L. taking into account the tribute imposed upon the workers of this country in the way of a tax before they could work for their Government is staggering, and no doubt, along with the C. I. O. political action committee will endeavor to make good their threat.

The die is cast. The question is, Shall the labor organizations elect a Member of Congress for a district or shall the people arise in their might and accept organized labor leader's challenge and elect their own Congressman?

Mr. Cartwright was appointed a major in the United States Army from civilian life on the 4th of January 1943 without 1 day of basic training, and has enjoyed the salary of that rank up to this good hour with an income-tax exemption of $3,300 per year for him and his family, while I and my family are allowed only $1,200; and add to this the fact that he has not lost one single day in receiving pay from the Federal Government for almost 18 years. We began receiving our salary on January 3, 1943, and at this time a candidate for a second term, while he served eight terms, totaling 16 years.

SOLDIERS WITH 2 YEARS' FOREIGN SERVICE SHOULD RECEIVE A FURLOUGH HOME

Mention has been scant regarding our soldiers, sailors, and marines who have lived in fox holes on the firing line for 2 years without having received a furlough to visit their families. It goes without saying that most of our sons are in the ranks, having completed rigid basic training, as is very necessary in coping with the enemy; few, if any, were appointed from civil life with the rank of a major the very first day they entered the Army.

Mr. Speaker, we urge that every consideration in keeping with the successful prosecution of the war be given our armed forces who have put in two years fighting in foreign territory an opportunity to receive a furlough. It is indeed a contrast when just a few days ago 21 strikes were on in the production of critical war materials for the boys on a 24-hour shift undergoing bombings and spending 30 days and nights in fox holes and the jungles, risking their all that those on the home front might continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

A few days ago Mr. S. R. Creswell, Route No. 1, Madill, Okla., passed on to me a letter from his son Howard, who is a private in the Infantry in the Southwest Pacific, which reflects a story of real service to his country, with recognized citations for his outstanding bravery in two major campaigns. Naturally Howard is anxious to receive a furlough and return home for a brief visit with his loved ones He is of a good family. I am well acquainted with his sister, Mrs. Virginia Freeman, and she and her husband are doing everything they can in keeping the home fires burning to the successful end of this terrible conflict.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to include a letter from Pvt. Howard Creswell to his father, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1944.

DEAR DADDY: Have been pretty busy of late. So thought would try and write you while I had time. Has been about 2 weeks since I heard from you. Glad you received the coat but I guess it is too warm to wear it now.

Yesterday, Easter Sunday, we received our ribbons for the Guadalcanal and Vella Lavella campaigns with two stars for the two major campaigns. Also received a good-conduct ribbon. So you can see I have been a good boy. Was A. W. O. L. for 1 day in New Zealand and got 1 week's restriction for it.

You keep asking about when I am to get a furlough home. Virginia even writes that I must not want to come home. I am afraid you people back there will have to write the Congressman from our district and find out the score about why we are not getting a furlough after 2 years overseas. Also thank him for the generosity shown toward us in the mustering-out bill. Do they think they can afford to pay us a hundred more than a soldier who stays in the States where he has a barracks to live in, also hot water and sheets, something I haven't seen now in almost 2 years. If they would come out here, live with these malaria mosquitoes, go through about 500 bombings, spend about 30 days in a fox hole with mud and water up to their waistline, see your buddies get bumped off, have the smell of dead men all around you for said time, without a change of clothes, spend same amount of nights in jungles which are months long each night sweating some slant eye out to come in your hole with you, I think they would change their mind about us being worth only a hundred more than some soldier who has had to stay in the States and fight the strikers or zoot suiters. Well I guess I had better go to chow. Should have hash tonight.

Love,

HOWARD.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most amusing things that has happened in all my campaigns in running for public office is the newspaper advertisement of my opponent charging me with breaking my pledge in franking out a speech I made on the floor of the House on March 29, 1944. The ad in this respect says, "Why break his pledge against free mail to frank a speech to us?" It is really funny. After I had been sworn in as Congressman from the Third District of Oklahoma, and Mr. Cartwright had been appointed a major from civil life, he flooded the district with a speech he made together with 12 other Members of Congress, entitled "Till We Meet Again," yet campaigning with his frank while a major in the Army with a free frank, to say nothing of the many times he used his frank during the campaign of 1942. Another thing that is of interest—the speech he is complaining about being franked out—was printed in my own print shop, the Antlers American, and not printed in the Government Printing Office.

The Way Out—Public Confidence in Government Must Be Reestablished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the Vermont State Republican Convention, Montpelier, Vt., May 17, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, I have read that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth and man in His image and said, "Let him have dominion over the fish of the sea and the fowl of the air and the cattle of the fields, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth, in the air, on the sea, or under it."

The New Deal administration mistakenly assumed that God was directing a mandate to it.

Under color of a delegated power and by the unlawful and un-American use of authority it never has rightfully had, the Roosevelt administration has stretched its tentacles of federalization around and over a vast domain of vanishing States. Stretched but a little more and further, the power of the Federal Government over every phase of our national, local, and individual functions will be complete.

If the law as laid down by the Attorney General in the Montgomery Ward case is the law of the land—which God forbid—then no business, no home, no liberty is safe. It cannot be that we are so surely under a dictatorship that we cannot escape its penalties by united action to conserve and save our rights The situation is desperate.

War is being used as a cloak to cover totalitarianism. God save the state our forefathers founded.

Some labor leaders recognize the fact that the life or death of labor unions is a depth bomb in this Ward business.

What is sauce for the goose may well be that for the gander some day.

There is dynamite enough in this affair to blow labor unions into eternity, if necessary.

The New Deal is more dynamic than fascism, more revolutionary than communism, more undependable than the wind. It has build up new instruments of public power which in the hands of the political puppets of its selected economic autocracy have provided shackles for the liberties of the people for use against all of us, labor as well as capital.

The assertion that the seizure was made under "an aggregate of delegated powers" should give the people pause. This false assertion of the assimilation of vaguely defined powers as an authority is a dangerous doctrine unless constitutional government has been abandoned. Where does the authority of the President end as a dictator in a democratic republic? If he can seize a man's business and forcibly evict the operating head under his aggregate of powers, and without regard to specific legislation enacted by Congress to deal with such situations, what protection has any citizen against wanton abuse of power? It is no answer to say that Sewell Avery was a recalcitrant representative of big business, nor is there any comfort in the thought that the administration, for reasons best known to itself, has refrained from the use of strong-arm tactics in dealing with similar recalcitrance from such men as John L. Lewis and James C. Petrillo. Political and other considerations may shield the mass of the people from these exercises of asserted power today, but if the assertions are permitted to go unchallenged and unclarified, there can be no effective guaranty of such protection in the future for any of us any time.

Why cannot the people realize where they are? Let's wipe the cobwebs out of our eyes as Americans, first, and as patriots always. We must save ourselves to save our country. The time is at hand.

As Mark Sullivan suggests, and forcefully:

"Mr. Biddle's assertion about the 'aggregate' of the President's powers in wartime and the whole of his statements and actions justify a remarkable interpretation. It would mean that upon the outbreak of war the President would have unlimited powers; that he would not need to rely upon any grant of power from Congress; that as respects conduct of the war, Congress might as well suspend functioning. And conduct of the war may be construed by a President or an Attorney General to include anything the President judges it to include. In effect, upon outbreak of war, the constitutional safeguards of the person and property of citizens would be suspended.

There is a contrary doctrine. It is rooted firmly in one of the great key cases of American law and Government—the decision of the Supreme Court in the Milligan case. During the Civil War, Milligan, a civilian, was seized by the Army, tried by an Army court, and sentenced to death. Thereupon Milligan appealed to the civil courts, ultimately to the Supreme Court, which said that under the circumstances of the Milligan case, the Army did not have the power it had exercised, and that even Congress had no power to confer such authority on the Army. The Court said:

" 'The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in war and in peace; and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented * * * than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine would lead directly to anarchy or despotism.' "

It is not a question of preventing a dictatorship. It is one of getting rid of it now. We must choose between reformation and revolution before the canker of national socialism has become inveterate, before its venom has reached and spread so far into and over so much of the body politic as to be beyond eradication, control, or cure.

We can do too little, too late, and have. Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid—not of the party—but of themselves and their country, to save both.

The misuse of troops in the Montgomery Ward seizure was a discreditable, humiliating, and unnecessary spectacle, one to be long remembered by Americans who believe in equal justice under law. It should let the people know where they and their liberties stand in chancery now, and prevent any opportunity for such an action in the future.

I am for labor and its rights. I am not ready to permit any minority group to run this Government by a promise of votes. That spells the end of Americanism whether capital or labor undertakes to do it.

Liberties are lost by day as well as in a night. Mark well your ballot—while you have the right to vote.

No idea is more deeply rooted in the minds of the American people than the belief that nothing can deprive us of our long-established freedoms, yet, despite that fact and to disabuse the notion, I tell you that nothing but an explosion of public resentment and resistance to further extension and centralization of the Federal Government can raise a sufficient barrier to prevent the complete establishment of national socialism and the disappearance of the States as political entities and their complete federalization and strangulation. These are tragic days in the history of our country. Too many people will learn it too late.

We are today at the crossroads, stuck in the New Deal mire of playing class against class for votes. Free enterprise and loss of liberty mark the parting of the ways. We are losing or have lost both.

What is free enterprise? Free enterprise, my friends, means a lot of little things and is a mighty big thing to all of us. It comprehends our right to live our own lives, run our own jobs, manage our own businesses in our own way without needless Government interference It assures us our right to criticize the Government, bawl out the umpire, make a speech on the public square, travel where and when we choose, work or not as we please. It offers opportunity to everybody, rewards thrift, pays for hard work, initiates ingenuity, thrives on competition, encourages invention, stimulates research, promotes progress, maintains our standard of living. It offers each of us every chance to save and to invest and to build and to grow. Any man who has faith in his idea may take a risk to develop it. That is the way our railroads started as did our motor car industry, our oil and steel, our aviation, and our scientific, mechanized farming, our radio, and a hundred other similar advantages which have made life worth living. It is what made small shops and factories into big ones, started more small ones, made it possible for us to out-produce every other country in the world, hands down, when we had to fight.

That was free enterprise which some folks would like to obliterate and are obliterating as they undertake to change our American way of doing things, as they try to rebuild our whole country on a different thesis and under a new and different system. If those backing the New Deal program (try to rechristen it as they may) had their way, no individual would own his store, his farm, his business. He would be regimented. He would be told how to run his business, his farm, his family, and would belong to the State.

So, Mr. Chairman, I agree with those who contend that it is time for a change in a national administration whose policies would destroy and are destroying free enterprise and individual initiative. I subscribe to the doctrine that no one individual or any group of men is indispensable to our national welfare, the prosecution of the war, or the solution of world problems which shall follow the war Do not be misled.

The New Deal, which under any other name would smell as sweet, has been too long in power. It has grown arrogant. Its policies of unlimited spending and unlimited bureaucracy have practically destroyed republican-democratic government here. The constant encroachment of its policies on individual freedom and private enterprise, as recently exemplified, is a greater threat to the perpetuity of the progress of this Republic than is even the war itself, which is being fought to maintain both.

As Senator CAPPER well said the other day:

"The President has now abandoned the New Deal label. There is no longer anyone to claim this doorstep baby, except HENRY WALLACE. The life-term candidate clings to no lasting principles of government or truth. He changes with the shifting winds of public opinion. He is ready to alter his window dressing from day to day with the shifts of public taste—from the left to the right.

"Today he is seeking to restyle himself as a great conservative. He is shoving Baruch

and Jesse Jones, Clayton and Crowley, to the foreground, hoping they will make the public forget Henry Wallace, Milo Perkins, Tugwell, 'Harry the Hop,' 'Henry the Morg,' and 'Sammy the Rose.'

"Someone is being sold down the river.

"The President has repeatedly expanded and enlarged upon the powers delegated to him. Congress now fears to trust him any longer, and therein the representatives of the people reflect the fears of their constituents.

"It is essential to have in the White House at all times a President whom the Congress can trust. It is imperative now. It is impossible to get a wholly new Congress at one election. Therefore, we must either elect another President, abandon our system of government with its divided responsibility, or face a break-down in our national administration."

Never was "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" stated more clearly.

It is almost a crime the way this administration has hypnotized the American public to its ultimate destruction. It is only the truth which will make them free.

In 1937 "Tommy the Cork" told an interviewer: "The revolution is here. All we can hope to do is to canalize it. Our whole conception of private property is going to be changed."

That was in 1937, and right from the throne. We were blind, deaf, and dumb then as now.

What confronts us today is not the question of whether we are to lose our liberties but whether they have been lost irretrievably. While we still have a vestige of freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, and worship, on the other hand, freedom of enterprise, of labor, and of the smallest concerns of our daily lives are gone with the wind. We should face facts in a fighting mood. Our future is challenged. It is not partisan politics; it is self-preservation which is involved.

Never since the day of its birth as the saviour of the country did the Republican Party have so great an opportunity offered or so tremendous a burden of responsibility to bear as today. It is for the Republican Party to take over and to save a country burdened with a $300,000,000,000 debt, on which the interest alone is almost unpayable. What a job.

Three hundred billion dollars is an awful lot of money. It is a figure so astronomical as to be almost beyond our comprehension. Do you realize that, reduced to one-dollar bills and laid side by side and end to end, $300,000,000,000 would go 317,187 miles, or 13⅓ times around the globe in a highway running 20 feet wide?

If—to get back on the gold standard—we use in our experiment five-dollar gold pieces and pile them on top of one another until we have stacked up $300,000,000,000 worth, we will have made a monument of gold which will soar into the heavens 291,000,000 feet, or 55,113 miles. That is substantially one-fourth of the distance to the moon.

Again using dollar bills, end to end and side by side, we could cover 768,709 acres. That is an area in acres larger than the State of Rhode Island, the District of Columbia, Grand Isle County, and a considerable portion of Essex County, Vt., all combined.

Somebody will have to pick up these dollars sometime to put them or their equivalent back into the Treasury of the United States to keep us solvent.

What can the New Deal find of which to boast in such a sorry spectacle? Is there any reason to doubt that the American people if and when they come to their senses will relieve themselves of the incubus of such incompetence, wastefulness, and bureaucracy as found in the present administration of our internal economic affairs?

The problem which confronts the people, and most especially the Republican Party, is not how to prevent the coming of centralized federalization, for it has arrived. Our problem is how shall we get rid of it.

This administration has interfered in the affairs of the States and cities, taken part in the management of industry and finance and agriculture, assumed the role of a great banker and investor, borrowed millions and spent them on all kinds of projects through which it has undertaken to paralyze opposition and to command public support. It is now back of the theory for global planning, regeneration, and dominion to be consummated under the authority of a powerfully centralized government in which the executive will be a czar. The road to it is wide and plainly blue printed.

The sooner the American people realize the fact, the sooner they will arm themselves to put an end to a type of American socialism which now masquerades under the disguise of pseudo-democracy. The people do not realize that their lives, the affairs of industry, the local concerns of the States are prescribed and ordered and supervised out of Washington. They do not seem to understand that the industrial system is supported by raging floods of purchasing power through the medium of the constantly increasing national debt. Nothing short of a totalitarian government, somebody has said, supported by the weapons of ruthless coercion and the will to use them can bring us out unless we realize what we are up against. We shall be presently up against the final crisis; namely, the necessity of taking the last few steps of the last mile to Federal socialism, the ending of the prologue, the running up of the curtain, or else the inescapable revolution and convulsion. It is time for Republicans to wake up.

The framers of our Government knew all about regimentation, planned economy, colonizations, and other features and governmental schemes, the futility and folly and failure of them as repeatedly demonstrated in the days that had gone. They knew the story of kings and despots, of tyrants and bureaucrats—the beginnings and endings thereof—and definitely and positively would have none of them.

It is only by subversion, the ignoring of the limitations which these men prescribed in the Constitution which they made, the assumption and usurpation of unwarranted power and authority, that it has been possible for the administration autocratically to tell the wage earner what he may earn, how long he may work; the farmer what and how much he may produce on his own farm; the merchant at what price he may sell his goods; the manufacturer what addition he may make to his plant, how much he may produce; to control the flow of capital and savings; to enter into business in competition with private citizens.

State lines have been obliterated, the prerogatives of Congress have been usurped. The right to impose taxes in his discretion has been granted the Secretary of Agriculture. The authority to fix the value of money has been transferred to the President, a power so great over the lives of men it has never been enjoyed save by complete despots. And this is America. It is time to wake up, for the liberty of a people, as Edmund Burke said, has many times been lost in a night. He who loses it loses all. Human rights and property rights are inseparable.

Where does it all lead?

Jefferson said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread." That day is here.

I cannot believe that the American people will stand for a policy which undertakes to saddle this Republic permanently with policies and programs so un-American in conception and unconstitutional in fact and in law which can but spell its end.

The people of America see a world in shambles, business destroyed, broken homes by the millions; tens of millions of men and women sick in body and in mind; other millions whose careers have been interfered with; everywhere the peacetime pursuits of more than a billion people transformed into war pursuits, and a total war bill of nearly half a trillion dollars. They see hatred, vengeance, ruthless ambition, lust for power and more power, and cruel force as the world's arbiters.

They are confused, bewildered, almost helpless. Yet there is a way out for them as there was out of the desperation and hopelessness of their forbears. I think they can pay the price and the bill for today's war with the aid of science, invention, and engineering, and posterity, provided the Republican Party does not let the forces now seeking to do it place the blight of state socialism on the spirit of the masses.

Public confidence in Government must be reestablished. The use of extraordinary war powers, such as were utilized in the Montgomery Ward case without authority, must be limited to winning the war and not playing politics. Social objectives, political ambitions, and attempts to appease special interests must be exorcised and abandoned.

Our capitalistic system which frees enterprise and protects individual initiative and ingenuity, under the supervision of the guiding genius of those who direct the destiny of the Republican Party can show them the way out. That is its responsibility, its duty, and its destiny.

The Republican Party has been the party of action and progress and achievement, from the days of its founding, for more than half a century of our national life. The call and the need for its leadership is stronger today than ever before. The political party which has put into effect the principles and the policies which saved national unity, freed a race, resumed specie payments, established the national credit, fixed the gold standard, restored prosperity; in short, which always when it has been brought to a realizing sense of the responsibility resting upon it, has responded to the call and proven equal to the emergency, will once more respond, will continue to keep the faith, will provide the solution of our problems, and, true to its record, will lead this country out of the slough of despond into the sunshine of complete recovery and prosperity, contentment, and a lasting peace.

The Roosevelt Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at a meeting of the executive committee of the New York County Democratic Organization:

Whereas, it is the sense of this committee that the reelection of President Franklin D. Roosevelt is essential to the most efficient prosecution of the war and to the preservation of the social and economic benefits

which the country has derived from his administration, and

Whereas, the democracy of New York County subscribes to the liberal and humanitarian values which his administration has upheld, and

Whereas, the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt continues to exemplify these qualities of liberalism, humanity, and progress at home and assures the unimpaired prestige and moral weight of the Nation abroad; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York County committee urges Franklin D. Roosevelt to accept renomination at the grateful hands of his party for the Presidency of the United States.

Eliminate Threat to War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, while I am happy to advise this Congress that the executive board of the foremen's union has agreed to call off the Detroit strike, involving some 65,000 war workers, I believe it is time for us to act to make certain that there will be no repetition of this disgraceful and unwarranted walk-out.

In this connection I have today introduced legislation to amend the War Labor Disputes Act by prohibiting the unionization of supervisory employees for the purpose of collective bargaining, and I urge that it be given immediate consideration.

By no stretch of the imagination, Mr. Speaker, can this be considered anti-labor legislation. This bill will actually save collective bargaining, which is certain to be destroyed if both management and labor are permitted to sit on the same side of the bargaining table.

The Detroit strike clearly demonstrates the need of congressional action. It definitely proves that the unionization of supervisory employees will continue to be a definite threat to production in our war industries.

Here, on the eve of the greatest military venture in the history of this Nation, 65,000 workers in our most vital war plants were forced to leave their jobs by a few labor racketeers because they were demanding recognition of a union comprising approximately 3,300 foremen in the factories of the city of Detroit.

It was one of the most abominable things I have ever heard of. Precious lives of our soldiers and sailors have been jeopardized by a few inflated labor leaders, greedily reaching for more dues, and determined to rule or ruin America. In all earnestness I say that the men responsible for this strike should be tried for treason. Certainly they are not above the level of other saboteurs who have paid the penalty for their efforts to cripple our war production.

That they have sabotaged our war effort is definitely shown in a statement made today by Gen. H. H. Arnold that the strike for which they were responsible has cost our fighting forces at least 251 long-range Mustang fighter planes.

This disgraceful strike was continued for several days in spite of the fervent pleas of both the Secretary of the Navy and the Under Secretary of War for the men to return to their jobs. Both of these officials issued statements showing their grave concern over the crippling of the production of airplane motors and other matériel of war. In one of his statements the Under Secretary of War, I am told, went so far as to say:

> Our forces are bombing German war plants, but they do not have to do that to ours.

The bill which I have introduced today, Mr. Speaker, should have been written into the original War Labor Disputes Act. I know of no one in Government who believes that supervisory employees should belong to unions for the purpose of collective bargaining. In spite of rulings to that effect by the National Labor Relations Board there has been a continued agitation in the war industries of Michigan and the Nation for the organization of foremen for that purpose. This agitation constitutes a continuing threat to our production and it also raises the possibility that management may have to take time off from its war production job from time to time, to deal with the problem both in plant cities and before the National Labor Relations Board.

During hearings on the various manpower bills before the Committee on Military Affairs a year ago, the opinion of the N. L. R. B. was brought to the attention of the members. It was pointed out that the Board majority ruled that supervisory employees should not bargain collectively.

Chairman Harry A. Millis made the point in the opinion that the Wagner Act requires a decision in each case regarding the appropriate unit for employees. He said:

> To engraft upon the act an amendment which denies to a substantial segment of employees as a class the protection vouchsafed thereunto all employees, is not within the permissible bounds of administrative discretion. It is administrative legislation.

Under this reasoning legislation is needed to clarify the entire question. This bill will do it.

Under this bill there is nothing to prevent foremen from joining any organization they wish to join. The only provision would be that management would not be required to bargain collectively with any organization.

Secretary of Labor Perkins, under my questioning during the manpower hearings, stated that foremen are a part of management and said:

> I have never thought it very wise or proper to have foremen organized in the trade-union group, because the foremen really are representatives of the employers and the employers must have a representative at the operating level.

Supervisory employees voluntarily elect to become a part of management when they assume their positions as foremen. In this position, they, as a part of management, represent the owners of the business. In becoming foremen they assume something of a fiduciary position and they take on additional responsibilities, which include an obligation to act for and on behalf of the owners of business.

A parallel might be drawn with the doctor who voluntarily enters his profession and then is restricted from doing certain things, such as discussing the ailments of his patients.

It is logical to assume that if foremen organize for the purpose of collective bargaining, even though the organization itself may be an independent one, they eventually will be taken into one of the larger labor unions. Some may join one of the national organizations and some may join others. This could contribute only to confusion and interruption of production.

In addition, when they belong to a union, the leaders of that union are in reality their superiors. This certainly would be true in every case where a company had a closed shop or maintenance of membership agreement for the reason that dismissal from the union would mean that a man could no longer earn a living. This divided allegiance would be a serious obstacle to full war production.

Witnesses before the Military Affairs Committee a year ago submitted agreements reached between manufacturers and unions. In one instance an agreement between the coal operators and John L. Lewis, who at that time was seeking to organize foremen and supervisory employees, was read into the record. In each of these agreements supervisory employees and other representatives of management have been excluded from affiliation with the unions by mutual consent because these men actually represent management and there is no place for them in the union.

On page 6 of the hearings on H. R. 2239, H. R. 1742, H. R. 1728, and H. R. 992, dealing with the full utilization of manpower, Mr. John D. Battle, executive secretary of the National Coal Association, said:

> This is not a fight against unionism as such at all. Collective bargaining has been going on in this industry for more than 50 years. But supervisory forces and other representatives of management have been excluded from affiliation with the unions by mutual consent of the operating management and the union management. Because these men actually represent management, there has been no place for them in the union.

Former Senator Edward R. Burke, president of the Southern Coal Producers Association, said:

> There is a third reason why I wanted to come and give you my brief statement, and that is that there is a section of the bill which deals directly with one of the most important problems, as I see it, confronting industry and the economic welfare of this country that exists today * * * That is the attempt of organized labor to take within its ranks supervisory officials; to reach over to the other side of the table and drag over or pull over or persuade to come over to the side where union labor sits a very vital part of management.
>
> As has already been said by Mr. Battle, the understanding and agreement between the operators of the coal industry and the United

Mine Workers of America have always been that each had its own separate field. Throughout the years there has been in the constitution of the International Union of the United Mine Workers a provision that men connected with management were not eligible for membership in the union.

Now, how could anyone think that that provision was written into the constitution of the United Mine Workers and carried there throughout the years because the Mine Workers wanted to unduly restrict their membership or wanted to shut off a profitable source of income? There must have been another reason, and there was another reason, and it was this: That the union leaders, Mr. Lewis and his associates, as they thought about this matter calmly through the years, realized that collective bargaining could be a real success in this country only if the people representing opposing interests sat on opposite sides of the table, and carried on collective bargaining; that by mixing the two groups, by taking a substantial part of management over on labor's side, very soon there was going to be serious interference with collective bargaining.

Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corporation, appearing for the General Motors Corporation and the Automobile Manufacturers Association, said—page 65:

Management has inescapable responsibilities, which cannot be delegated to others. Such responsibilities are generally recognized and accepted, and the following provisions clearly defining such management responsibilities are included in all collective bargaining agreements which the General Motors Corporation has with unions. Similar provisions are incorporated in collective bargaining agreements of other corporations in the automobile industry. To quote from the General Motors agreement:

"The right to hire; promote; discharge, or discipline for cause; and to maintain discipline and efficiency of employees is the sole responsibility of the corporation except that union members shall not be discriminated against as such. In addition, the products to be manufactured, the location of plants, the schedule of production, the methods, processes, and means of manufacturing are solely and exclusively the responsibility of the corporation."

Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today is timely legislation. It is needed legislation. It should be given immediate consideration. It will prevent a few labor racketeers from destroying collective bargaining. As I stated in the beginning, we cannot have both management and labor on the same side of the bargaining table, and certainly we cannot permit another disruption in our war production as the result of racketeering agitation to organize supervisory employees.

It Looks More Like Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of May 16, 1944:

IT LOOKS MORE LIKE DEWEY

Nothing is certain in this world, but one of the higher probabilities just now is that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York will be the 1944 Republican candidate for President.

Governor Dewey's backers, looking around the political landscape, see a lot of scenery that pleases them.

The total number of delegates at the Republican convention will be 1,059. Mr. Dewey now has 268 elected delegates definitely pledged to support him. Actually, according to a survey published yesterday, 779 convention votes are in the bag in one way or another for Dewey. It takes only 530 votes to nominate.

This figure of 779 does not include California's hefty block of 50 votes, most of which the Dewey crowd expects to go for its man, or the 30 to 40 votes for Lt. Comdr. Harold E. Stassen which are expected to swing to Dewey after a formal gesture at putting Stassen up for nomination. Stassen's backers are reported more concerned about building him up for a nomination in 1948 than about making a serious fight for him in 1944.

Gov. John W. Bricker of Ohio, too, has been losing strength recently, after a fairly impressive showing at the start of this race for the Republican nomination. Ohio's neighboring State of West Virginia was expected to come through with 19 delegates pledged to Bricker, but when the smoke rolled away Dewey was found to have won 16 of West Virginia's 19. Dewey's backers are now optimistic about getting a good-sized part of the Texas delegation—maybe 25 out of the total of 33—whereas Texas was once expected to be solid for Bricker.

All in all, the Dewey nomination seems to be rolling along. Though there will no doubt be many a time bomb planted in our Governor's path and more than one hopeful dark horse straining at its tether, Dewey's nomination may come on the first ballot.

If Dewey does get the nomination, what then? He will still be Governor of New York, with 2 more years of his term to run. The term expires December 31, 1946.

DEWEY RESIGN GOVERNORSHIP?

It is to be expected that considerable clamor will be raised by Democratic opponents of Mr. Dewey for him to resign. There will probably be a good deal of talk about trying to eat his cake and have it too, if he doesn't quit the New York Governorship shortly after being nominated to run for the Presidency.

We can see no reason why Mr. Dewey should pay attention to such clamor. We can see plenty of reasons why he should go on being Governor of New York until the 1944 Presidential election is decided—and for some time after, if he is elected President.

If he keeps the governorship and loses the Presidential election, New York will continue to have a good Governor. If Dewey is elected President and has meantime held onto the governorship, he can wind up his affairs as Governor in an orderly and deliberate way, since the inauguration does not take place till January 20, more than 2 months after the November 7 election.

During the campaign, Dewey as Governor will be in position to head off various New Deal monkeyshines which may be cooked up with a view to cheating the Republicans out of a November 7 victory in New York State. The O'Connell machine in Albany, for example, is widely believed to have added about 13,000 votes to Lehman's plurality in Albany County in the close 1938 election for Governor. With Dewey officially in Albany during the 1944 campaign, the O'Connell machine and like-minded new dealers in other New York areas would have no such leeway for political larceny as they had in 1938.

There are several precedents for this suggested Dewey refusal to resign as Governor if nominated for President.

Theodore Roosevelt, nominated for Vice President in 1900 and elected, kept the governorship of New York till his term expired on January 1, 1901. Before him Grover Cleveland, nominated for and elected President in 1884, went on being Governor of New York—and conscientiously so—till his term expired on January 6, 1885. And the White House incumbent, Franklin D. Roosevelt, did the same thing. He was elected President in 1932 while Governor of New York; he had not resigned as Governor in order to campaign for the Presidency, and he served out his term as Governor to the beginning of 1933.

It seems to be lucky as well as wise for a Governor of New York to keep the governorship when nominated for President, until he is elected to the bigger job. We hope Mr. Dewey will see fit to do just that.

Address by Rev. William J. Kelley at Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an educational and instructive address delivered by the Rev. William J. Kelley, chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Commission, on the subject of the Social Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII, at the final banquet of the season of the St. Mary's Labor School in St. Mary's School Hall at Lynn, Mass., Wednesday, May 10, 1944.

TRIBUTE TO CARDINAL O'CONNELL

Ecclesiastical protocol prompts me to express my personal and my priestly sympathy to the people of the archdiocese of Boston, both clergy and laity, on the loss of their great prelate, His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell. During these recent days genuine and gracious virtues have been penned and voiced for this beloved churchman and citizen of Boston. Of the many interests of the beloved prelate, I single out one deserving of your personal and your collective meditation. That interest was his abiding concern for the good and welfare of the working classes. Permit me to refresh your minds. Upon my last appearance here, October 14, 1943, it was my privilege to declare some instances of this concern of his eminence for the workers. We cited first, his cooperation with Cardinal Gibbons when that prelate championed and advocated the rights of man to join the free trade-unions. He aided this able advocate of the workingmen in presenting the issues of the famous Knights of Labor when it was offered to the Vatican. He was in those days, Monsignor O'Connell, head of the North American College. The second instance that we cited in October, was the famous 1912 pastoral letter of his eminence in which he most eloquently pleaded for a charitable forbearance in industrial strife and in which he yearns to extend the kindly interest of religion and the church to the association of the workingmen. Since the October occasion, my

studies provided me with another instance of this genuine interest that the beloved prelate had for the workers, I refer specifically to the period when he was bishop of Portland, Maine, and established the Workingmen's Club of Maine. I quote:

"Looking out on the civil and social life of the Catholics here, Portland, Maine, I discerned that other needs than merely religion existed. The dock laborers stood in the cold of long winter nights without a roof to cover them or a fire to warm them, unless indeed, the roof and fire that led to bad company and vice.

"Today (September 1906) facing the wharves at the very place before intemperance lured them, stands a finished club house all equipped with every form of innocent amusement and where every form of food and drink, except those which destroy the body and soul, is at their disposal. That workingmen's club has transformed that district. It will do much to transform whole sections of Portland."

I join the priests and the people of Boston in their prayer. God grant eternal rest to this great prelate, to their beloved shepherd, to this fearless friend of the workingman.

THE ENCYCLICAL

Definition of an encyclical—it is a circular or open letter, one intended by the writer not for any particular individual, but for society. Usually, the encyclical letter is written in view of a particular circumstance that affects the welfare of society.

Chronology and reference to Leo's Encyclicals on Religio-Socio-Economic Interests.

1878: Encyclical entitled, "Quod Apostolici Muneris"—In the first year of his pontificate, Leo denounced Socialism, Communism, and Nihilism.

1879: Encyclical titled, "Aeterni Patris"—That is the study of scholastic philosophy. In this document, Leo referred to the problems of the working people and to the bitter strife of the day.

1882: Leo established a committee in Rome to study the labor question.

1884: Encyclical titled, "Humanum Genus"—Leo spoke here favorably of the guild which had aimed at protecting the worldly interests of working pepole.

1887: Annoncement that Leo had decided to issue an incyclical on labor.

1891: Encyclical titled, "Rerum Novarum"—the condition or the working clasess—Encyclical of May 15, 1891.

MONUMENTAL MAY MESSAGE

The month of May has brought many things of a pleasant nature to society. I single out one the memorable month of May and point to a most practical, profitable, papal pronouncement. The month of May 1891, brought a monumental message and that, from the pen of the then watchman of christendom, Leo XIII, of illustrious memory. The message was styled then and is styled today an encyclical. An encyclical is a circular or open letter, one intended not for any particular individual, but for a large group of people. It is a letter written in view of a particular circumstance—a circumstance which affects the welfare of society.

At the close of the nineteenth century and at the start of his Pontificate, this watchman of christendom was worried. Materialistic forces were awakening. Inventions starting rapidly possibilities appeared rapidly. Humanity seemed restless, demanding freer expression in laws, more liberty of thought, greater intellectual freedom. The worry of the Pontiff revolved about the people's parting with traditional Christian concepts and actions. The question that presented itself was: Should he call attention to the pernicious philosophy that was about? Coupling conviction and courage, Leo wielded his brilliant and facile pen. He admonished society to stop; to take account of itself. The voice of the watchman called out as follows: That the moral aberrations and the political desires of the day emanated from a false philosophy which ignored any authority over individual reason. He warned against the philosophy that would eliminate the supernatural order from the domain of the intellect; of private and social life. He cried out with all his vigor against the dethroning of supernaturalism and the enthroning of materialism, nationalism, and individualism.

The western world, in its desperate search for guidance and conscious of the gigantic tasks before it today, cannot ignore or be indifferent to the religio-socio-economic pronouncements that Leo made in '91. Too long have they been neglected and too few know them. This modern world has too long been a slave to the idea propounded by writers that the science of ethics and the principle of morality must be divorced from the science of economics; that law has no dependency upon ethics; that religion and religious teachers must live in a hermetically sealed compartment from which they dare not emerge to bring the light of religion and morality to bear upon the madness of a materialistic economic system. Leo, in '91 summoned economic enterprise to the courtroom of morality, there to be judged and there to establish right order.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND—OLD-ORDER CAPITALISM

To evaluate the content material of the encylical, we should refresh our minds with the following thoughts: When this document was written, two basic philosophies regarding the construction of the religio-socio-economic order were abroad. One, old-order capitalism. Two, Marxian-Socialism. As to the first—where did it get its origin? It originated from the religious revolution of the sixteenth century, the commercial revolution of the seventeenth century and the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century, and its philosophy was materialistic to the core. No one voiced the spirit of the day of old-order capitalism more vigorously than Adam Smith. He reduced to writing the convictions of the leaders and the scholars of old-order capitalism, and we note that this old man and these alleged scholars surveyed the current economic phenomena and drew conclusions calling their conclusions the fixed laws of economics. Now, let's look at some of these laws.

Said this school of old-order capitalism, man is one of the useful tools in the production of wealth. Therefore, his activities are subject to the law of supply and demand. The next fixed law—all men are urged on by self-interest. Just so long as no outside force interferes, the combination of economic laws will provide material prosperity and the resultant well-being for the worker. Any interference by the organized state with the operation of these economic laws is bound to end in disaster. Such was the social philosophy in vogue when Leo took up his pen. History testifies as to the results of such a philosophy. Some of the results I recall to your minds: First, low wages fixed in a labor market dominated by the ruthless application of the law of supply and demand; the second result was inhuman working conditions; and the third result, labor unions were proscribed as a criminal conspiracy. We have noted the philosophy of old-order capitalism, stated some of its results, and now we would like to indicate its influence. Old-order capitalism wrapped its tentacles around the British Parliament in the nineteenth century. It affected American legislation until late—very late—in the nineteenth century. For documentation of this declaration one only needs to analyze American court decisions up to 1930.

MARXIANISM

We pass from old-order capitalism to the great paradox of economic history. Old-order capitalism gave legitimate birth to the system which is today its most relentless enemy—Marxian socialism. Karl Marx, in his survey of the world under old-order capitalism, was quick to see how the operations of the old system were leading gradually to the concentration of wealth in an ever-diminishing number of hands. This he attributed to the system by which all the agencies of this production were privately owned. From this came his prediction that in the course of time the wealth of a nation being owned by an infinitesimally small number exploiting the so-called economic laws the masses of the proletariat. The same proletariat by sheer force of numbers would exterminate capitalism and the system of private property upon which it rested. Common ownership would take its place. Pursuing his prediction, Marx developed his celebrated materialistic concept of history. In that concept he saw all human events, all social and political changes, determined by the interplay of economic forces. The social system—one of ceaseless warfare between the two classes—the capitalist employer and the proletariat employee. Marxian philosophy was as fundamentally materialistic as the capitalistic system he sought to destroy, and historically a direct descendant of it.

Leo recognized the inherent dangers of old-order capitalism on the one hand, and Marxianism on the other. As early as 1887 Cardinal Marmillod announced that Leo had decided to issue a world-wide letter on labor. Three men aided in the preparation of this magna charter for workers. From Leo's many manuscripts and his pronouncements on labor (an outline of which is made part of this address), Cardinal Zigliara drafted this document. It was philosophical in its approach to the topics. Leo's two secretaries, Boccali and Volpini, revised the draft along more practical lines. The manuscript again found its way back to the desk of Zigliara for further philosophical preciseness. After a few more changes Leo himself added the final touches and the world received a monumental message on May 15, 1891. The message—the major premise of the papal announcement was to point out the false teachings of both old-order capitalism and Marxian socialism on the subject of private property.

THE REASONING FOR LEO'S CONDEMNATION

Leo condemned the materialistic premise on which both old-order capitalism and Marxian socialism rests. The pontiff points out that man has a higher destiny than that of merely furthering production of economic goods and therefore it is basically false in any scheme for man's social betterment to regard him solely as an economic tool; said Leo, human labor is not a commodity. The final end of man is God the Creator, not economic production. Every practice, every rule, every corollary of economic science must be squared with eternal science. That was Leo's conviction and because Marxianism denied man's supernatural character and because Pagan capitalism ignored it, Leo censured them.

POSITIVE POINTS OF THE ENCYCLICAL—PRIVATE PROPERTY

With the destruction of the ancient guilds, workingmen had been given over, isolated, and defenseless to the callousness of the employer and became the victims of a philosophy of unrestrained free competition popularly called economic liberalism. Leo enunciates in his document the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church regarding property. Private property is a natural right. Man is older than the state and holds the right of providing for his body before the

state was formed. The right to own property and to provide for oneself is a natural right which no state can destroy against the owner's consent. The encyclical deplores the abuse which some people have made of their right of private property; but, says Leo, the abuse of a right never destroys the existence of a right. Hence, we understand why Leo rejects socialism as a plan of living—because it would abolish private property. Yet this right of property carries with it a social obligation. Man may not exercise his natural right to harm society, but Leo offers some very telling points when he would have the economic order so rearranged that there is a complete distribution of possession of private property in the hands of all.

Under the socialist plan the workingman would be the first to suffer—and here is the reasoning: A man labors to earn money by which he can carry on his existence and provide for the future, but if a man cannot keep what he earns for tomorrow, he will have no interest, no initiative, for work. Therefore, man in the socialist scheme would have no interest in work because he and his family are the property of the state. Socialism is condemned because it not only destroys initiative but it deprives man of protection.

WAGES

The second major encyclical teaching is that which pertains to wages. The encyclicals are uncompromising in their statement that those who toil should receive a living wage. In this concept of the living wage there is contemplated a return to a just reorganization of the entire economic sphere—so that heads of families who are charged with the obligation to support those dependent upon them will receive a living wage large enough to support them and their families in reasonable comfort. We must see to it that a living wage is paid to the heads of families and then family stability will not be disturbed.

If the laborer has the right to a living wage, so industry has the right to be protected against abuses which would undermine it and which would prevent business from paying a just living wage to employees. All America knows the abuses—the strangulation of small business, the violent cutting of prices so as to choke off competition. Let it be remembered that while complying with God's manifest law of giving labor a living wage, we must also give industry safeguards which make industry's compliance with that law possible in the economic order.

THE DUTY OF THE STATE

The State, in a democratic society, exists to promote the good and welfare of all its citizens and to protect individuals and groups of individuals from one another. The multitude of those who labor have their God-given right to that kind of an economic existence which will not endanger their eternal destiny. Since man has this right, a corresponding duty rests upon society or the State to protect that right and here. Leo grows very specific:

"Whenever the general interest of any particular class suffers or is threatened with evils which can in no other way be met, public authority must step in to meet them."

It is not the purpose of the State to submerge or subjugate the individual or the family. The encyclical looks to the employers to put into practice moral teachings in relation to their employees. The encyclical recognizes that conditions may arise in which the State must lend its assistance to the employer in his good intention to give his employee a just, living wage. What type of assistance is this which is indicated? The State entering into the domain of private enterprise? No. Rather, the desire is for the State to correct the abuses of existing society passing legislation thereby removing the difficulties that an employer encounters who gives his employes a just, living wage. The encyclical does not ask merely for justice between employers and employees. It advocates understanding, friendship, and copartnership stressing the point that both are mutually interdependent—industry and labor. In the quest for economic justice, the encyclical is not unmindful of the difficulties but points out the way to remove the difficulties. My purpose in this discourse to you tonight has been to give you an indication of the encyclical's direction of thought and positive constructive recommendations. The talk has been deliberately designed to awaken your interest in Leo's document. For yours it is to determine the future course of reform in the American social scene. It is up to you to make Leo's recommendation a reality, namely, that all in a given industry should be united together in occupational groups.

CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGE

Catholic men of Massachusetts, Leo, the Pope of the workingman, has long since gone to God; William, the Prelate of Boston, the genuine friend of the worker, has recently gone to God. How pleasing and proud these two churchmen and friends would be if they saw a reawakening and a reassessing of the encyclical doctrines by the Catholic employers and the Catholic employees of the great Archdiocese of Boston. I leave you now with a challenge, the challenge comes from the pen of the beloved Pontiff Pius XII, now happily reigning:

"What a proud vaunt it will be for the American people, by nature inclined to grandiose undertakings and to liberality, if they untie the knotty and difficult social question by following the sure paths illumined by the light of the Gospel and thus lay the basis of a happier age."

Men of Massachusetts, there is a challenge to you. It deserves to be taken on. What say you?

Price-Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recommendations of the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce:

The board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, at its meeting on May 27, 1944, adopted the following recommendations of the special committee upon price control legislation:

1. That the extension of price control legislation be limited to the period ending June 30, 1945.

Statement: Because of the drastic controls involved, it is desirable that Congress limit the extension of authority to 1 year only, thus retaining the unrestricted right to end legislation or modify it in a comparatively short period.

2. That hearing and special court procedure be so modified as to permit reasonable access to the courts on the part of protestants or aggrieved parties.

Statement: The special court procedure provided in the present Price Control Act, goes almost the whole way in preventing access to courts by aggrieved individuals. Your committee believes it not only fair and just but essential to our form of government, that even in these wartimes, individuals should be permitted reasonable protection through the courts of our land.

(a) That the time limit of 60 days in the filing of protests be removed.

Statement: The regulations of the Administrator are published only in the Federal Register, and this is considered as constructive notice to everyone. A person affected by a regulation should not be deprived of his right to protest against the regulation unless he has actual notice of the regulation and a reasonable time within which to prepare his protest and assemble evidence in support thereof. Under the Price Control Act a regulation may be set aside only if it "is not in accordance with law or is arbitrary or capricious." There seems no justification for putting a time limit on protests which challenge the validity of a regulation. There is no time limit preventing citizens from attacking the validity of any statute passed by Congress, and there seems to be no reason for giving a greater sanctity to the regulations of an administrator than is given to a statute passed by Congress.

(b) Protests shall not be dismissed because of the absence of direct damage to the person filing such protest.

Statement: The necessity of proving that a person suffers direct damage as now required is an undue burden and, in the opinion of your committee, not essential to effective operation of the act.

(c) The regularly constituted courts shall have jurisdiction with respect to all matters pertaining to the price-control program, except the power to enjoin or restrain the price regulation.

Statement: It is a serious and questionable proceedure, at best, to depart from the regularly constituted court procedures in connection with any legislation. While the interests of war may justify some limitation on injunctive and restraining actions, it is not a desirable or healthful situation to otherwise restrict the normal operations of our courts.

Your committee would favor elimination of any special court provisions were it not for the fact that the act has already been in operation a considerable length of time, and much confusion might result from varying and conflicting actions by the many courts throughout the Nation with respect to injunctions and restraining orders.

(d) The Price Control Act should be amended to provide that where a citizen is prosecuted in any court for violating a regulation he should have the right to set up as a defense to the prosecution the invalidity of the regulation.

Statement: Under the act as it now reads, a citizen charged with the violation of a regulation of which he may have had no knowledge whatsoever is absolutely debarred from setting up in his defense the invalidity of the regulation. A citizen charged with the violation of any State or Federal law has the right to challenge the validity of that law or statute before the court in which he is being prosecuted. It is contrary to the basic principles of American justice that a citizen who is being charged with a crime should be deprived of the right to set up in his defense the invalidity of a regulation by an administrative agent of the Government for the violation of which he is being prosecuted. The Supreme Court has held, in the case of *Yackes* v. *The United States of America*, that the only protection which a citizen has against an invalid regulation is to challenge the validity of the regulation before the special court set up by the act, and this right to challenge is denied a citizen unless his protest is first filed with the administrator within 60 days from the time the regulation was issued and published in the Federal Register.

(e) The procedure with regard to filing protests before the Administrator should be amended to provide that after the petitioner has filed his protest with the Administrator, the Administrator shall advise the petitioner of the evidence upon which the Administrator will rely, and the petitioner then be given the opportunity of filing additional evidence to meet the evidence upon which the Administrator proposed to rely.

Statement: As the act now reads, a petitioner must set forth his evidence in his protest before he even knows what data the Administrator relied upon in promulgating the regulation in question. As stated by Justice Roberts: "It is hardly necessary to dilate upon the burden thus placed upon a protestant or the extent to which he is compelled to fill the record with what he may think relevant, only to find that he has been shooting at straws." A protestant is certainly entitled to know the evidence that he must meet. He is already at a serious disadvantage in being obliged to make his protest before an administrator who has already prejudged the case by having issued a regulation in a form objectionable to the protestant. Since the only evidence that the protestant can rely upon is that introduced with his protest before the Administrator, the protestant is certainly entitled to a fair opportunity to meet all the issues of fact.

(f) The procedure for filing complaints before the Emergency Court of Appeals should be amended to provide that the Administrator shall be required to incorporate in his transcript all of the evidence submitted by the protestant, and all of the evidence upon which the Administrator relied in issuing his regulation.

Statement: Under the procedure now established where a protestant has had his protest denied by the Administrator and files a complaint before the Emergency Court of Appeals, the Administrator is required to file a transcript of such portion of the proceedings as he considers are material to the complaint. The Administrator's statement of considerations without anything more, constitutes proof in the case. The Administrator is not obliged to include in the transcript any evidence that he does not desire to include, and is only required by the act to submit "a summary statement of the basic facts which justify the regulation." The protestant has no right to introduce any further evidence. His case is decided "on the record." Thus the Administrator has the right to make up the record in such way as he feels will best justify his regulation. The complainant has the burden to establish to the satisfaction of the court that the regulation "is not in accordance with law, or is arbitrary or capricious." The complainant must demonstrate beyond doubt, before the court is authorized to set aside the regulation, that the considerations or conclusions of the Administrator (which are generally based on a mass of economic opinion consisting of studies made by his own subordinates) cannot support the Administrator's judgment that what he has done by way of regulation or price schedule tends to prevent post-war collapse of values, or to prevent dissipation of defense appropriations through excessive prices, or to prevent impairment of the standard of living of persons dependent on life insurance, or to prevent hardship to schools—to enumerate but a few of the stated purposes of the act. As stated by Justice Roberts: "The Court review is a solemn farce, in which the Emergency Court of Appeals and this Court (United States Supreme Court), on certiorari, must go through a series of motions which look like judicial review, but in fact are nothing but a catalog of reasons why, under the scheme of the act, the courts are unable to say that the Administrator has exceeded the discretion vested in him."

(g) The act should be amended to provide that where the Emergency Court of Appeals issues a permanent injunction, the injunction shall immediately become effective and shall remain effective unless the decision of the Emergency Court of Appeals is subsequently reversed.

Statement: As the act now reads, the Emergency Court of Appeals may not issue a temporary injunction or restraining order (as can our courts of law in practically every other situation), but can issue a permanent injunction, but such permanent injunction does not become effective for 30 days, and if in the interim the Government appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, the permanent injunction does not become effective until after the Supreme Court of the United States has acted. If the Court of Appeals, in deciding one of these cases, decides that a permanent injunction should be issued, then there is no reason why that injunction should not become effective immediately and remain effective unless stayed in the usual manner provided by law applicable to litigation generally.

(h) The act should be amended to provide that in the event the Administrator does not issue his decision upon a protest within 30 days from the date of the filing of the protest, or within 15 days after the protestant has filed all of the evidence which he is permitted to file, whichever is the latter date, then the regulation shall be suspended until such time as the decision is rendered by the Administrator.

Statement: Businesses may be ruined and whole industries badly crippled by undue delay in decisions and protests. Your committee believes that the burden should be upon the Administrator to act with reasonable promptness.

(i) The Price Control Act should be amended to eliminate the provisions whereby in the event of the violation of a regulation or price schedule, the person who buys the commodity may bring an action to collect $50 or treble the amount by which the price exceeded the schedule, whichever would be greater, plus attorney's fees and costs.

Statement: Your committee believes it an unwholesome policy to provide by law for the rewarding of individuals for their participation in an unlawful transaction. It is reported that there have already been instances of individuals who have made a business of detecting minor or inadvertent violations and collecting $50 in each instance. In some cases these rewards have been collected where the individual did not originally uncover the violation.

3. That trade associations, general farm organizations and other interested groups of persons shall have standing to challenge price-control orders, even though they may not be directly affected in a precuniary manner.

The special court procedure wherein it is often necessary to make protests and pleadings in Washington, imposes a burden upon individuals of limited means who cannot possibly go to our Nation's Capital to present their claims. Therefore, it is our recommendation that farm and trade associations be permitted to appear in their behalf.

4. That where industry committees are asked to advise with the Administrator, the members of such committees shall be truly representative of the major segments of the industry involved, on as broad a geographical basis as possible.

Industry committees are appointed by the Administrator and in many cases are not truly representative of the industry and the various parts of the country involved, or properly qualified to speak in their behalf.

Tribute to Col. Irving A. Lindberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a distinguished citizen of Iowa, Colonel Irving A. Lindberg, has served some 30 years as high commissioner of the United States and general collector of customs in Nicaragua. Owing to a change in the international debt situation, that service has terminated, or is about to terminate, and President Somoza has issued a very enlightening and interesting comment on Colonel Lindberg's services. There has also appeared in the newspaper La Naticia, published in Managua, Nicaragua, an editorial dealing with Colonel Lindberg's 30 years of service. I ask unanimous consent that the statement and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY PRESIDENT GENERAL ANASTACIO SOMOZA TO A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE APRIL 15, 1944

The American administration of the Collectorship-General of Customs created as a guarantee for the total cancelation of the Ethelburga debt (sterling loan) could be discontinued at any moment; but we must acknowledge the wonderful work of the actual Collector, Irving A. Lindberg, whose honest, clean, and diligent task has made him worthy of the state's recognition. Col. Irving A. Lindberg is a national institution. I consider him identified with the destinies of Nicaragua, for which he has a sentimental and sincere feeling. We owe to this magnificent public functionary the reorganization of the customhouse system upon a firm basis, and we shall keep him in that post as an example of justice and in recognition of the good management of the interests entrusted to his experience and illustriousness.

[Translation of an editorial in La Noticia, Managua, Nicaragua, May 2, 1944]

COLONEL LINDBERG HAS GIVEN 30 YEARS OF GOOD SERVICES TO NICARAGUA

Thirty years have passed since Col. Irving A. Lindberg entered the Customs Service of the Republic of Nicaragua and was later appointed High Commissioner by the American Government. Colonel Lindberg's profession was banking accounting and railway engineering, and on 3 consecutive days he was offered three positions as administrator of customs, assistant general manager of the National Bank of Nicaragua, and assistant general manager of the Pacific Railway of Nicaragua.

He accepted the customs service, as he had come to Nicaragua to help install an accounting system for the Government of Nicaragua, and for 3 months studied the tribunal of accounts, the customs, and administration of internal revenues. He secured leave of absence for a year from the American Government where he was an efficiency expert for a time in the White House in Washington, but remained in Nicaragua and he has served

in all capacities in the customs as guard, checker, warehousekeeper, customs appraiser, bookkeeper, cashier, and administrator of customs, as well as on many commissions for the Government of Nicaragua and abroad.

The tasks of men engaged in such missions as Colonel Lindberg's require for successful prosecution more than professional competence. Their duties must be performed with tact and understanding. The inevitable clashes rising from differing practices and conceptions cannot be adjusted by arbitrary means if good feeling is to be maintained. The umpire must exercise tolerance as well as firmness; he must be explanatory as well as right; he must see two sides of a shield when those with whom he is in controversy see only one. His is a taxing job. Colonel Lindberg has performed it well, to the credit of himself and his country, and to the satisfaction of Nicaraguans.

Problem of European Ethnical Frontiers in Peace Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, appearing in the Washington Star of Sunday, May 14, entitled "War-Breeding Triangle Rises To Plague Peace Planners."

This is an exceedingly interesting and timely discussion of an important subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR-BREEDING TRIANGLE RISES TO PLAGUE PEACE PLANNERS—STRATEGIC-BORDERS PROGRAM IN EUROPE RUNS INTO AGE-OLD PROBLEM OF RIGHTS OF HUMANS TO GOVERN SELVES AS THEY MAY DESIRE

(By Constantine Brown)

There are at least two dozen sets of committees and commissions in Washington feverishly studying various political, economic, and military plans for post-war Europe. Thousands of officials—either permanent civil servants or outsiders—are members of these committees. Voluminous blueprints are being drafted to create a new world in which wars would be as out of date as is hunting with the bow and arrow or with the falcon.

The inspiration for these plans comes, of course, from the top policy framers in Washington and London. The directives are given by these trained diplomats who represent an odd combination of Metternich political philosophy with the most modern "a bottle of milk for every individual in the world" slogan of our most advanced political men.

Hours are being spent contemplating detailed maps of Europe—the focus of war infection for as many centuries as history is known. New terrtiorial lines are being drawn along strategic lines. Russia, which is just emerging as the foremost military power in the European continent, insists that all danger to her security must henceforth be removed and our diplomats are busy drafting boundaries which would give the Soviets the required security. The courses of the rivers and the strategic importance of the river banks are being carefully examined. The location of the marshes is being studied. The peaks and the character of the mountains which are to form the future boundaries of Europe form the subject of long dissertations on the part of the official specialists. A new Europe is being redrafted on strategic rather than human lines.

However, these excellent officers of the many commissions and committees appear to overlook one important element—the human being. They seem to forget that these valleys and mountains are inhabited by peoples who have their own ideas of how they want to live and be ruled.

WANT INDEPENDENCE

A quick glance at the map of Europe will show the problem in its naked truth. If one draws a line from, say, Tornio in Finland to the Adriatic, another line from the same spot to the Black Sea, and unite the two with a transversal line from the Adriatic to the Black Sea a triangle will be formed. In this triangle live about 100,000,000 persons who have national aspirations and who speak different languages and belong to different creeds and races. But they have one thing in common—an irreducible desire to be independent and to rule themselves according to their own standards.

For several hundred years most of the European wars have started from this area. Either the Slavs in the east attempted to subjugate the triangle, or the Germans from the west tried to deprive them of their freedom, or the barbarians from the south—the Turks in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also were described as such—conquered them and endeavored to keep them as a part of their empires.

They all succeeded for a while. But so long as the "triangle" nations—Finland, the Baltic provinces, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, Rumania, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece—were kept in servitude by any of their more powerful neighbors there was no peace in Europe. Either these strongly nationalistic states rebelled against their conquerors or other nations, thinking in strategic and military terms fought each other for them.

The wars between Turkey and Russia which lasted more than a century were waged by the Russian rulers, officially at least, for the liberation of the Christians in the Balkans from the yoke of the infidel. But actually they were prompted by Russia's desire to obtain better strategic frontiers. The first partition of Poland was the idea of the Prussian King, Frederick the Great. It started with the establishment of a cordon sanitaire—an expression frequently heard from Moscow now to prevent an epidemic of plague, which had broken out in Poland, from spreading into Prussia.

Troops were sent there for that purpose. Eventually, when it appeared to Frederick that he could not get away with the conquest under that flimsy pretext, he urged his powerful neighbors; Austria and Russia, to divide the spoils and the first partition of that independent but badly ruled kingdom occurred. For several centuries there were attempts by the powers east and west of the triangle to obtain a permanent foothold in this vitally strategic area of Europe but never have the people themselves been conquered.

In the peace intervals when the great powers were preparing for bigger and better wars of conquest, the nationals of the nations of the triangle were staging rebellions and revolutions which were always ruthlessly suppressed. The physical demonstrations were crushed but the nationalist feeling has always remained alive.

SOURCE OF PRESENT WAR

Even the present war broke out in the triangle when Hitler decided he could with impunity extinguish the national life of Poland. The organized resistance of the Poles was crushed in less than a month, but Hitler's action brought the whole world against him. The world, including the far-away United States, is paying dearly today for Hitler's attempt to extend the strategic boundaries of the Reich to the east.

President Wilson recognized the importance of the triangle's fight for life in 1917 when he issued his proposals for the settlement of a peaceful world on ethnical frontiers rather than on strategic boundaries. Whatever mistakes our World War President may have made in handling the international situation, he certainly put his finger on the only possible solution of the European problem when he forced the recognition of ethnical boundaries and created a new set of states on the principle of nationalities. It is safe to say that had the present war not been precipitated by the short-sighted policy of the European leaders, these new states eventually would have overcome their growing pains and would have become viable independent states.

They themselves recognized that there must be an economic unity among them and endeavored to organize an economic union such as the Danubian Confederation. But the jockeying for power on the part of France, Italy, and Germany prevented such an accomplishment by diplomatic action. These three powers agreed to the organization of such a confederation provided, however, that they individually had political control over it. As far back as the summer of 1931 this plan came close to fruition. It was killed at the eleventh hour when the friction over the confederation between the Rome and Paris governments threatened the peace of Europe. These two governments—until the war Russia still was politically ostracized—had agreed on zones of political and economic influence in the triangle, but could not agree to a constructive organization of the smaller states in Central and Eastern Europe.

History apparently teaches lessons which diplomats refuse to learn.

BALTIC STATES CITED

Today the attention of the British and American planners is concentrated once more on the remaking of the map of Europe on the basis of strategic rather than ethnical frontiers. There is, of course, an apparent difference between the old peacemakers of the last few centuries and those of today. Instead of discussing outright annexations they speak about the right of the people themselves to determine their future. Officially it sounds well.

But looking back only 4 years, it is, in fact, nothing more than playing the old game with different tools. The Baltic states, created under the pressure of President Wilson, were annexed to Russia under the guise of a popular plebiscite after most of the reactionaries—that is to say, the leaders who insisted on the independence of their republics—had been exiled to Siberia or the White Sea.

It would be a grave mistake for the policy framers of the United States to be emotional in discussing the future of Europe. By definition a diplomat should be deprived of any sentiment or emotion. As much as we may like or dislike the Poles, the Russians, or the Balts, and the rest of the people of Europe, the business of our policy framers is to avoid the recurrence of another war within the next or the third generation.

Establishing new frontiers in Europe in accordance with the strategic needs of some of the members of the United Nations would serve no good purpose but would prepare that strife-ridden continent for a sad series of rebellions and eventually wars. While the possession of strategically situated islands in the Pacific may discourage any potential enemy from another aggression, history has amply

demonstrated that the remapping of Europe on the basis of strategic needs—regardless of what pompous names these changes are being blessed with by diplomats—is conducive to new conflicts and war.

In the past we were merely spectators to the tragedy of Europe. Today, however, as has been shown, the lives and the wealth of the American people are being sacrificed in the European nations' struggle for power. And a resettlement of Europe on any other basis than ethnical is bound to draw the United States into still another blood bath.

Appointment of James Forrestal As Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Choice of Forrestal Held One of the Best," written by David Lawrence and appearing in the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOICE OF FORRESTAL HELD ONE OF THE BEST—WASHINGTON OFFICIALDOM IS SEEN NEEDING BIT OF REJUVENATION

(By David Lawrence)

President Roosevelt did much more than reward James Forrestal when he appointed him Secretary of the Navy. He really recognized the importance of putting younger men at the helm. For what official Washington needs nowadays is a bit of rejuvenation. Too many old men whose ideas are sound enough in their way but who are not equal to the tremendous problems that lie ahead are in key positions.

War is a young man's game. And so are the dilemmas of reconstruction. Most people are inclined to think that official Washington with its many desk jobs presents an easy time with lots of social leisure. As a matter of fact, 9 out of 10 men who occupy important jobs in Washington work 10 or 12 hours a day and then carry their business home in brief cases. The stories of those who drop by the wayside due to ill health are numerous, though they do not often get into the newspapers because many of these officials are not prominent enough to warrant attention.

But the whole war period has taken a toll of officials in high and low places. The war cabinet, which means not only the heads of peacetime departments but the heads of agencies dealing with war operations—civilian and military—are carrying burdens the like of which nobody in Government has ever known before. For while the World War was just as intense, it was not as lengthy. The strain on public officials who have now been hard at work since September 1939 is something new in American public life.

FEW PERIODS OF REST

Periods of rest and relaxation are occasional. Every now and then some official is authorized to take a vacation due to the physician's orders, but actually most of them work on until they are compelled to drop out.

The same is true of the legislators nowadays. Members of Congress find the war strain more severe than ever. Not only are they belabored by the usual problems of legislation but they are asked to run errands here for their constituents in connection with the war. Every Member of Congress finds the going harder than usual. Then on top of it all, the entire House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate must go before the people in a national campaign this year.

In many respects it is unfortunate that there has to be an election at this time. The Constitution, of course, provides for it and there is not the slightest intention of avoiding an election, as so many hostile critics have suspected and charged. It is one thing to say that an election will not be held and it is another to argue that it ought not to be held. There is no way that an election can be deferred because the Constitution provides for it. But neither the Canadian nor the British Governments have found it necessary to hold elections in the midst of war.

Under the Canadian and British parliamentary system, an election can be withheld. Thus if the parliamentary system was in vogue in America, an election could be postponed till peace is declared, when a new President would be elected instead of retaining one tired out from the labors of the war period.

RESPECTED BY LEADERS

The appointment of James Forrestal to be Secretary of the Navy brought a wave of satisfaction throughout official Washington. This was not merely because Mr. Forrestal is a competent official who deserves the promotion, but because he is a young man and the very type who ought to be given weighty responsibilities these days.

Mr. Forrestal has not only the respect of the people inside the Navy Department with whom he has worked intimately—both naval officers and civilian officials—but he has the respect and confidence of Members of Congress. This is most important because the Secretary of the Navy has much to do with Congress in getting appropriations and with keeping Congress informed on various changes in naval policy as the appropriations are put into use.

Mr. Forrestal will bring to the Cabinet table sound business judgment. He is neither an anti-new dealer nor a new dealer. He is what might be called a true liberal. He knows that neither people nor governments can remain static and that certain reforms are long overdue, but he has always insisted that because reforms are necessarily painful at times they should all the more be administered by those sympathetic to the problems of the citizenry. The Forrestal appointment is one of the best ever made by President Roosevelt.

The Treaty-Making Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and several articles from the Washington Post of May 16 and 17, 1944:

[From the Washington Post of May 17, 1944]

PEACE MACHINERY

We hope that every Member of Congress will take time to read Representative SOL BLOOM's pamphlet on the treaty-making power. It is by no means a denunciation of the Senate for that body's occasional abuse of its power to shape policy in the international field. Rather it is a thoughtful analysis of the background of the two-thirds rule in treaty making and of the reasons why the House was originally excluded from the process.

Two facts should be borne in mind, says Mr. BLOOM, in trying to understand why the founding fathers in this instance departed from the sound rule that questions of policy be decided by majority votes. First, the framers had been accustomed to a system of treaty making by Congress. Both before and after the adoption of the Articles of Confederation the negotiation of treaties had been handled directly by Congress. So the founding fathers supposed that the Senate would be intimately associated with the President in the negotiation of treaties in addition to passing final judgment upon them. No doubt that was an important reason why the larger House was given no part in these proceedings.

"The second fact to be remembered," says Mr. BLOOM, "is that the union could not have been formed without giving to the States equal suffrage in the Senate." The small States feared that their interests would be sacrificed if they didn't have an equal voice with the large States and the chance of defeating treaties which they might consider obnoxious. The New England States were concerned lest their fishing rights be bargained away by treaty. The Southern States were determined to keep the Mississippi open to navigation. In order to reassure the small States that their interests outside their own borders would be safeguarded, the convention accepted the compromise that now plagues a great and powerful Nation.

The important point which Mr. BLOOM makes is that the conditions which led to the adoption of the treaty-ratifying provisions have long since disappeared. Today the treaty-making power is important only in safeguarding and promoting our national interests. Indeed, the relations between ourselves and many of our allies in this war are as close as was the relationship between the several States when the Constitution was adopted. For the sake of preserving those relations in good order it is now imperative that we take away the power of a minority to control the making of treaties.

At best the two-thirds rule was a makeshift departure from sound principle. That it has stood so long while other features of the Constitution have been brought into line with democratic practices can be explained only by the comparative lack of interest of the American people in foreign affairs until recent years and by the growth of executive agreements as a means of effectuating foreign policies. Each day that now brings us closer to the peace table once more is a plea for a return to the sound policy that the founding fathers sacrificed to expediency.

[From the Washington Post of May 16, 1944]

STANDPAT SENATE

(By Merlo Pusey)

BLOOM'S FIGHT ON TWO-THIRDS RULE

Chairman BLOOM of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has launched an open campaign to democratize our treaty-making machinery. He will wait no longer for the hide-bound Senate to reform itself. That appears to be sound judgment. If our peacemaking system is to be modernized, apparently the House, the States, and the people will have to do it.

Members of the House have been reluctant in the past to demand a share in the treaty-making power. They have hoped in vain that the Senate would see the light and itself take the lead to wipe out the arrange-

ment which makes it possible for a handful of recalcitrants to hamstring international policies approved by the majority. But months have passed and the Senate Judiciary Committee has not so much as scheduled hearings on the Gillette resolutions for modification of the two-thirds rule.

Obviously, then, the standpat Senate must be prodded. What prods shall be used? Chairman BLOOM has given us a good example of what the House can do. The House is deprived of a share in policy making in a field that now promises to be our major national concern in the years just ahead. It has good cause to cry to high heaven against the discriminatory vestige in the Constitution which makes this possible.

Following up the devastating logic of Representative BLOOM's 14 points, the House can pass a resolution proposing amendment of the Constitution so as to make treaties effective when approved by majority votes in both branches of Congress. Members of the House can also unite in demanding planks in the platforms of the two major parties pledging modernization of our treaty-ratifying system. Then of course they could carry their campaign to the people.

The States also can make their influence felt. For example, the Democratic State Convention in North Carolina recently adopted a plank calling for a constitutional amendment to redistribute the power of approving treaties between the House and Senate. Still more direct action can be taken by State Legislatures. They can petition the Senate to act. They can even set the machinery for amendment of the Constitution in motion and bypass the standpat Senate.

The founding fathers did not give Congress sole power to start the process of bringing the Constitution into line with the current demands of the Nation. On application by the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States Congress is required to call a convention for proposing amendments. That right has not been used in the past, but there is no reason why it should not be used now if the obstinate Senate resists the popular demand for modernization of our peace system.

It is no answer to these demands to say that the present system had served us fairly well until Senator Lodge went on the rampage following the First World War. The Department of State once made an estimate that of 969 treaties submitted between 1789 and 1934, 682 were accepted by the Senate, 173 were amended, and 15 rejected. That would seem to be a fair record, except for the Wilson-Lodge fiasco for which the two men appear to be about equally responsible.

The significant point is, however, that the treaty-making function has now become infinitely more important than it was throughout the century and a quarter before World War No. 1. Today our relations with the rest of the world are so close that treaty making is of a piece with legislation. There is no reato consider it as a function apart. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to draw a line between the intermeshed affairs of the United States and the United Nations and say that what is on one side is domestic and what is on the other side is international.

The inescapable fact is that domestic and international interests meet in many comprehensive national policies, and those policies ought to be the product of a meeting of minds on the part of the President, the Senate, and the House. It is not only undemocratic but also dangerously unrealistic to set aside a segment of the policy-making function and say that within this area a minority may cast the deciding vote. The House, the States, and the people have a good cause, and the Senate will not be able to stand against them if they marshal their resources wisely.

[From the Washington Post of May 17, 1944]

PUBLIC FAVORS TREATY ACTION BY MAJORITY CONGRESS VOTE

(By George Gallup, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 16.—When the North Carolina Democratic State convention recently adopted a plank in its platform calling for a constitutional amendment to allow for ratification of treaties by a majority vote of both branches of Congress, it was reflecting a belief of an increasing majority of Americans.

The number of voters who think the best method of ratifying United States treaties is by approval of a majority in both the House and Senate—instead of by the present two-thirds majority of the Senate alone—is today 60 percent, as compared to 54 percent in a similar poll published last October.

The issue was put to a cross-section of voters throughout the Nation as follows:

"When the war is over, it will be necessary for the Allies to decide on peace terms for the Axis. Which one of these three ways would you, personally, favor as the best way to have peace treaties approved after the war?"

The three alternatives from which those interviewed chose follow, with a tabulation of their replies:

	October	Today
	Percent	*Percent*
Approval only by the President	7	7
Approval by President and a majority of whole Congress	54	60
Approval by President and two-thirds of Senate	25	19
Don't know	14	14

In view of the fact that this issue is one which involves a question not widely discussed or debated by the man on the street, it is of interest to compare the vote of informed persons—those who can prove their knowledge of present ratification requirements—with the views of all voters, both informed and uninformed.

When this comparison is made, the views of the informed group coincide with the views of all people, with majorities in both groups viewing approval of treaties by a simple majority in both branches of Congress as the best method.

The chief difference between informed opinion and the opinion of all voters is that fewer among the informed group are without opinions and more favor retention of the Senate two-thirds ratification rule than is the case with all voters.

Here is a table showing the vote of the informed group:

Informed voters:	*Percent*
Approval only by President	4
Approval by President and a majority of whole Congress	61
Approval by President and two-thirds of Senate	33
No opinion	2

S. K. F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the S. K. F.—Svenska Kullagerfabriken—means the Swedish Ball Bearing Corporation. It is primarily a Swedish concern that manufactures ball bearings. It also has interests in an American plant manufacturing ball bearings at Philadelphia.

The other day I made some statements to the effect that economic sanctions should be brought to bear against the American plant so that it would, in turn, induce its Swedish counterpart to stop shipping ball bearings to Hitler.

The head of the American plant is William L. Batt, who is also vice chairman of the War Production Board, a gentleman who has made personal sacrifices in this war. Any criticism I made is not aimed at him.

Mr. Batt is voting trustee of 95 percent of the stock of the American company. A good deal of this stock is owned by the Swedish company. Heretofore royalties and dividends have been paid out of the funds of the American company to the Swedish company. Anything that bolsters up the Swedish plant to that extent strengthens it in its aid to Hitler.

The American company is operated by American operators, management, and employees. However, the Swedish company should be compelled to limit shipments of its aircraft bearings to Germany. If this Swedish concern continues to ship these ball bearings, then it doesn't make sense to me to have our airmen, at great peril to limb and life, bomb and blast German ball-bearing companies like those at Schweinfurt. What the Nazis lose because of such bombings is compensated for by the ball bearings from the Swedish company.

I want the American company to bring every possible pressure to bear on the Swedish company to stop the nefarious practices of feeding the Nazi war machine. This may hurt and wound the sensibilities of Sweden, but the life of our boys come first.

I understand that the Treasury Department through its Foreign Funds Control Division, have now precluded the sending of royalties and dividends by the American company to the Swedish company and its principals.

The Swedish company has unfulfilled orders for ball bearings purchased by Latin American entities. These orders have been transferred for fulfillment to the American company. The Foreign Economic Administrator must grant export permits to permit export of American products to Latin American companies. One of the economic sanctions to be leveled against the Swedish firm is to have the Foreign Economic Administrator refuse these permits, so that the American concern couldn't carry out the commitments of the Swedish outfit.

We must use every weapon at our command in this global war. It is a struggle for our own existence. We should not stand idly by and see nullified our air raids over Schweinfurt and other ball-bearing works controlled by the Nazis. We must get tough if the Swedish concern continues to give aid and comfort to the Nazis.

We must get tough with the American S. K. F. so that it in turn will coerce and

compel the Swedish concern to do the right thing.

If all else fails, the alien property custodian should seize the Philadelphia plant. It would operate without friction and without difficulty. The Philadelphia plant has rendered yoeman service in our own war effort. It has been praised by the Army and Navy officials and all the armed forces. It is not without qualms that I would advise seizure as the last resort. But this war is not ping-pong.

We have representatives in Sweden now buying up Swedish ball bearings that would otherwise go to Germany. The English tried this. They bought S. K. F. ball bearings in vast quantities which the Swedish company gladly provided. But what did it do? It used the money in part to build and expand its own plant and thus expanded the facilities to help the Nazis in greater degree. If we buy these Swedish ball bearings from S. K. F. we should see that the proceeds of such purchases are not used, directly or indirectly, to expand the plant or equipment of the S. K. F. and thereby augment the opportunity of the S. K. F. to supply more ball bearings to the Nazis. This latter remedy may be difficult. It may be impossible to earmark these proceeds. In any event efforts must be made to put pressure upon Sweden to prevent this plant's expansion.

It is interesting to note that Russia is cooperating with Great Britain and the United States in diplomatic efforts to have Sweden cut off ball-bearing shipments to Germany. The Soviet Government is contemplating likewise the enforcement of economic sanctions. Russia means business in this matter, and will not tolerate any "shenanigans" by the Swedish company.

However, we must be ready to do the following:

First. Stop all monetary movements between the American branch of the parent company by the Treasury's Foreign Funds Control Section.

Second. There must be a seizure of the plant in Philadelphia if it is proved there is a preponderance of German ownership.

Third. We must blacklist the Swedish S. K. F. in every way.

Fourth. We must crack down with a whole series of economic sanctions not only by the United States but by Great Britain and Russia.

Fifth. In our preclusive buying of Swedish ball bearings, we must be sure that the proceeds are not used directly or indirectly to bolster up the Swedish plant so as to insure increased production.

Sixth. If all else fails, the Alien Property Custodian must seize the Philadelphia plant.

This should be the last measure.

We must see to it, however, that there should be no interruption in the ball-bearing production at the Philadelphia plant for use in our armed forces.

Remember, in this war for democratic existence, there can be no neutrals. There can be no neutrality between right and wrong. Sweden in this war is reaping rich benefits. She did the same with reference to the last war. She plays both ends toward the middle. We cannot permit Sweden to remain neutral and benefit Nazi Germany as she is doing.

I repeat my admiration for William L. Batt. What I say here is in no wise in derogation of his integrity of purpose, patriotism, and of the fine work he is doing for the War Production Board.

Sewell Avery Versus the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the RECORD the second of a series of articles, which are appearing in the Chicago Sun under the title of "Sewell Avery versus the People." Today, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the second of the series of articles, which appeared in the May 16, 1944, issue, entitled "Wards Before W. L. B. in More Labor Fights Than Any Other Firm."

The article follows:

WARD'S BEFORE W. L. B. IN MORE LABOR FIGHTS THAN ANY OTHER FIRM

(Second of a series)

WASHINGTON, May 15.—Sewell Lee Avery, chairman of the board of Montgomery Ward & Co., is the one outstanding American industrialist who has rejected the "no strike—no lockout" agreement by which labor and management in the United States have sought to cooperate to win the war of production.

Not content with flouting his agreement, Avery and his legal talent have perfected a new antilabor formula, the effect of which has been to lead the National War Labor Board down an endless maze of legal technicalities.

This Avery formula makes a 1,500-word legal brief an antilabor weapon that has supplanted in large part the spy system the company was forced to discontinue under a National Labor Relations Board order of October 29, 1938. The order was subsequently upheld on January 30, 1940, by a Federal circuit court decision.

While the company loudly proclaims that it has not fought and is not fighting unionism, Avery and Ward's have been before the National War Labor Board 235 times since the Board was created shortly after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

At a hearing in one of these cases on November 4, 1942, John A. Barr, labor relations manager for Ward's, said of the national "no strike—no lockout" agreement:

"It's in the record, but for your convenience I repeat * * * that Ward's does not recognize any authority which is based upon that so-called understanding, as it was not a party to the understanding and has not directly or indirectly accepted or ratified it."

In sharp contrast to Ward's position is the W. L. B. record of handling 6,500 cases of management-labor controversy. In these cases, more than 5,000 American companies and corporations have accepted its rulings in the interest of getting ahead with the war.

While many of the 235 Ward cases before the W. L. B. have been instances in which the company went before the Board without compulsion to ask approval of voluntary salary adjustments, the company nevertheless has been involved before the Board in more actual labor disputes—22 in all—than any other corporation in the United States.

This record was achieved despite the fact that a number of companies have pay rolls dwarfing Avery's which covers 70,000 employees in 48 States.

Avery's attorneys have fought unions with every legal device. Their attack has been centered since the start of the war against the maintenance-of-membership clause, which hundreds of other companies have accepted without protest to insure harmonious relations with their union employees for the war period. Ward's contends that the maintenance-of-membership clause constitutes a closed shop.

Few industrialists line up with Avery in his last-ditch fight against that clause. Robert Black, president of the White Motor Co., and an industry member of the W. L. B., took Avery's attorneys to task at the hearing on November 4, 1942. Black challenged Barr's contention that the maintenance-of-membership provision recommended by W. L. B. amounted to a closed shop.

Slack pointed out that a worker under maintenance of membership could design from a union at any time within 15 days after a contract had been signed, that there was no coercion on employees to belong to the union, and that the only requirement was that the worker make his own decision as to whether he wished to belong to the union for duration of the contract.

Despite this, Avery has waged an embittered struggle against the union security clause in the eight Ward cases in which the W. L. B. has issued directives. In five of these his lawyers are seeking to enjoin the W. L. B. in the courts of the District of Columbia from enforcing its directive.

It was this pattern of resistance at every turn that forced President Roosevelt to step in on April 26 and seize Ward's Chicago properties, after Avery's refusal to extend the union's contract for 30 days until a collective bargaining election could be held.

When that seizure occurred the company also was refusing to accept or comply with W. L. B. orders involving labor disputes in Ward plants and facilities in Oakland, Calif., Portland, Oreg., Denver, Detroit, Jamaica, N. Y., and in the plant of the Hummer Manufacturing Co., at Springfield, Ill.

Ward's has fought unions not only on the union security issue but on the additional issues of seniority, arbitration, wages, dues check-off, and grievance machinery. When the issues in dispute have come before the W. L. B. for public hearing Ward's has used every legal device of delay and obstruction. They have even played one labor agency of the Government against another after having previously fought both.

At a hearing in the Chicago case on December 16, 1943, Barr actually opposed the directive of the W. L. B. on the ground that the directive would impinge on the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board—an agency whose decisions Ward's, on four different occasions, had fought as high as Federal circuit courts of appeal.

In the same hearing, Barr complained bitterly that Ward's was being deprived of "its day in court."

"Ward's further objects to the Board's summary method of procedure because it operates to deprive Ward's of due process of law," he said.

Barr also fought the W. L. B. directive (to extend union contract for 30 days) on grounds that the Board "is without jurisdiction," that the company objected "to the Board's method of procedure," and on the assertion that the order "would compel arbitration of disputes in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States." With the customary efficiency of well-paid corporation lawyers, Ward counsel

have blandly contested the jurisdiction given the W. L. B. to settle labor-management disputes by two acts of Congress—the Stabilization Act of 1942 and the Connally-Smith Act of 1943.

The effectiveness of these tactics is demonstrated by the fact that Local 20 of the United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America (C. I. O.), which last week won the bargaining election at Ward's Chicago plant and established that it represents a majority of employees there, still faces Avery's resistance in its efforts to negotiate a new contract.

While Avery has fought this union tooth and nail for 2 years, the union has maintained contracts with such firms as Macy's, Gimbel's, Bloomingdale's, Stearns & Hearn's in New York, and the Fair, Boston Store and Marshall Field & Co., in Chicago. Some of these contracts include maintenance-of-membership clauses and others include a flat closed-shop provision.

While the rest of America has rolled up its sleeves and plowed ahead with the war effort, Sewell Avery and Montgomery Ward have concentrated their efforts on one battle—the legal battle to defend its self-asserted right to conduct labor relations as they were conducted at the turn of the century.

In his fight against union security in the Chicago plants Avery contended that he was immune from Presidential enforcement of W. L. B. orders because those plants were engaged in nonwar business. While taking national display advertisements in metropolitan newspapers to maintain this position, Ward's has not hesitated to use the war as a reason to its customers for inability to fill orders.

In a letter dated December 3, 1943, signed by W. A. Jones, central repair department of Ward's Baltimore plant, a customer in Ohio was informed as follows:

"We are sorry that there will be a little more delay than we expected in completing the repair of your merchandise. It is necessary to send to our factory for parts. Our factories are engaged in defense work and such, of course, comes ahead of all civilian needs. However, we are keeping in close touch with the factories and assure you we will complete your repairs as soon as we get these parts."

This was a mimeographed letter and duplicates were sent to Ward's customers, many of whom may have been greatly surprised when they read Avery's national advertisements proclaiming that Ward's was not engaged in war work.

One River—One Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 15 carries a very interesting editorial addressed to the editors of the Missouri Valley entitled "One River—One Problem." In view of the situation confronting the Congress in the consideration of legislation affecting the Missouri River, I am including as part of my remarks under the permission granted me this editorial. It follows:

ONE RIVER—ONE PROBLEM

To the Editors of the Missouri Valley:

The time has come to recognize that the Missouri River is one big river presenting one big problem.

It is not one thing in Montana and Wyoming, another thing in the Dakotas and Iowa, a third thing in Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado, and a fourth in Missouri. It is not primarily an instrument to be used for irrigation, or for navigation, or for power, nor is it primarily an evil force to be controlled against its repeated and disastrous flooding. It is a synthesis of all of these. Where is the plan that will solve the one big problem of the one big river?

The Missouri Valley must find that plan. The place to begin is with the newspaper editors up and down the 2,470 miles of the valley itself. In this editorial, we address them.

WHAT EDITORS ARE FOR

We address the editor of the Miles City Star of Montana, the editor of the Bismarck Tribune of North Dakota, the editor of the Pierre Capital Journal of South Dakota, the editors of the Sioux City Journal, the Omaha World-Herald, the Emporia Gazette, the St. Joseph News-Press. We address the editors of the Kansas City Star, the Jefferson City Post-Tribune, and all the other editors up and down the valley.

We address them because finding the plan is a job for all of us, working together; because time is precious if we are to master the river instead of permitting it longer to enslave us. The floods of this spring are the final and convincing proof that we have got to accept the river's challenge now.

We address them because the plan that will rule the river is one that must be chosen and formulated through public education, understanding and popular acceptance. Through such a plan, all dwellers in the long valley can be made neighbors, pulling together in their common task. This is the creative function of journalism. This is what editors are for.

THIS SPRING'S FLOOD

What happened this spring? While lands thirsted in Montana, water that might have made them fertile spilled ruin over the lower valley. They had too little water, we had too much. Water that might have fed the soil, water that might have turned turbines, water that might have been saved to steady the channel for navigation—all this was wasted. In the wasting, a million acres of life-giving land were despoiled. Fine topsoil from Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri was stolen from the farms as the river uselessly pushed its golden burden toward the Gulf of Mexico.

In its wake were homelessness and paralysis and ruin. Whole villages were swallowed by dark water. Transportation stopped. Food production stopped. Unfattened livestock was evacuated to the cities to glut packing houses. The Federal Government had to start the machinery for relief loans to countless farmers whose livelihood, through no fault of their own, had been sacrificed to our neglect of the river.

What would the unirrigated lands of Montana have given for the water—the same water—that has starved and destroyed so much of the lower valley? What would the river's navigators have given for a system which at once would prevent the hazards of flood navigation and at the same time keep their channels deep and free in all seasons?

TAMING OF THE TENNESSEE

This can be done. It has been done. There is nothing theoretical or dreamily visionary about a plan that could accomplish all these things and give the valley new wealth and power as well. It has been done in the Tennessee Valley. This year, despite a merciless rainfall that for February was the heaviest in 54 years, the Valley of the Tennessee presents a serene, an untroubled picture. The water is within its banks. Great barges ply their placid course. Power is generated in a steady flow that the vital works of war—aluminum, explosives, and the like—may be produced without interruption. The people of the valley are made prosperous by the river and are free from fear of it.

How has this been done? It has been done by building a great and integrated system of dams and reservoirs which hold back the water in time of heavy rainfall and which release it when and where it is needed. It has been done by improved agricultural and forestry methods to hold water in the land. It has been done because this system—its planning, its building, and its operation—is controlled by one regional, unhampered authority. It understands the valley. It does not have to run to Washington, or beg permission of half a dozen bureaus, to make vital decisions at the precise time they must be made.

BIG REGION, BIG PLAN

Under the Tennessee Valley Authority there has been no division of responsibility. There has been no conflict between the Reclamation Bureau and the Engineer Corps, between the people who are interested in power and those interested in flood control or navigation. This is because the Tennessee Valley, unlike the unfortunate Missouri, is one big region and one big river controlled by one big plan. Too many cooks do not stir the Tennessee River broth.

What the contrast and our own experience teach us is this: Never, short of a regional, autonomous, unified authority, can our valley be developed to the full measure of its resources. There must be an end to endless and futile struggle between one interest and another. We need unity, replacing civil war. There is before us in the Tennessee Valley an object lesson that sectionalism can give way to unity to the greater benefit of all.

These are the essentials of the T. V. A. idea:

1. A Federal autonomous agency, with full authority to make decisions within the region.

2. Responsibility to deal with resources as a unified whole, clearly fixed in the regional agency, not divided among several centralized Federal agencies.

3. A policy, fixed by law, that the Federal regional agency work cooperatively with and through local and State agencies.

PICK PLAN'S SHORTCOMINGS

Governor Sharpe, of South Dakota might say, as he did recently in the Christian Science Monitor: Why talk of a new plan when we already have a plan? He offers the Pick plan as the sovereign cure for all the ills of the river. It has merit. The trouble is that, first of all, it is less a plan than a statement of good intentions. It is a rough sketch of flood control and navigation proposals, with blank spaces left open for irrigation and power. In itself, it is a very good start on a unified program of development.

But the irrigation interests seriously object to the Pick plan—notably the provision in the river and harbor bill which would set aside for navigation virtually the entire average annual flow of the Missouri River on the basis of figures for the past 10 years.

In short, the irrigation interests don't trust the Pick plan or the Army engineers because they consider this provision in the river and harbor bill an attempt to steal their water. At this point Mr. Ickes, interested in reclamation only, comes forward with his plan for stealing water from navigation interests for the uses of irrigation. President Roosevelt's criticism of the river and harbor bill last Friday, on the ground that it

failed to make proper provision for irrigation, shows once again the fallacy of failing to consider a river and all its problems as a whole. And thus the conflict proceeds. There are, therefore, two major objections to the Pick plan:

The first, that it is impossible politically. The irrigation States won't support it. Obviously, any legislation that covers the whole region will have to have the whole region's support.

The second, it is defective in an administrative sense. It would have to be administered by the Army Engineer Corps, and the corps is restricted by act of Congress to navigation and flood control and barred from the field of irrigation.

The Pick plan, as comprehensively as it tries to approach our valley problems, actually demonstrates just what is wrong. It, or any proposal offered by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, or partisans of flood control, the navigation interests or any other single, restricted agency, cannot fail to throw the whole problem out of balance. All these problems, all the questions they raise, travel the same old road to the same old terminal: Where is the one big plan?

THE MISSOURI'S SPECIAL PROBLEMS

It is not our contention that the T. V. A. plan can be transplanted in its entirety to the Missouri Valley. Our river has its special problems, such as irrigation, which do not even exist on the Tennessee. The nature of the Missouri River itself is different. The many able and devoted men who have given years to the study of the Missouri know it to be a rogue elephant of a river, testing man's ingenuity and imagination to the fullest.

Yet the basic idea of T. V. A. can be brought to our valley. It is an idea that has passed its laboratory test with brilliance and is ready for use wherever men seek to make a river serve them. As David Lilienthal, Chairman of the T. V. A. Board, has written in T. V. A.—Democracy on the March:

"It was not conceded that at the hour of Creation the Lord had divided and classified natural resources to conform to the organization chart of the Federal Government. What God had made as one, man was to develop as one."

This newspaper confesses an error of the past—a preoccupation with the interests of its own section, to the exclusion of those of Montana, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. All along the valley, from the mountains at 13,000 feet to the low plains of the river's mouth, men have given a similar loyalty to the interests of their sections.

NEED FOR UNITY

Yet is this not our common problem? Will not all our interests be better served—be multiplied—by working together toward a common solution? In the past we have splintered our lances against each other's shields; blunted our swords to no purpose; divided ourselves into partisan camps in which the work of one was to nullify the work of the other.

There must be men up and down our valley who have a vision that transcends the futile rivalries of the past. The editors from Montana to St. Louis have it within their power to preach the gospel that the Missouri is one big river with one big problem, to work with the leaders of their communities, and through them, with the people themselves—the people whose destinies are shaped by the river as the Nile these thousands of years has shaped the destinies of those who share its valley.

We urge the editors of the Missouri Valley to lift up their eyes, to make stout their purpose. With unity we can conquer the one big problem that the one big river challenges us to solve.

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH.

Dr. W. B. Bizzell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret to advise the House of the death in Oklahoma Saturday of Dr. William B. Bizzell, president emeritus of the University of Oklahoma, and former president of the Texas A. and M. College.

Dr. Bizzell was a great citizen of both States and his life was given to the training of young men and women of the Southwest to leadership and responsibility in business, professional, and cultural pursuits. From 1910, when he first became president of the College of Industrial Arts at Denton, Tex., until his voluntary retirement from the active presidency of the University of Oklahoma, he had devoted his life to his high calling.

Today around the world thousands of young men who fight and direct the course of the war owe their inspiration in education to Dr. Bizzell's friendly and considerate interest in them and their problems. He was an educator of the highest standing with an active interest in all cultural pursuits. He was widely known as a collector of rare books, and particularly for his collection of Bibles, one of the finest in the Nation.

Dr. Bizzell's administration at the College of Industrial Arts was followed by outstanding service as president of the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College of the State of Texas, which post he held from 1914 to 1925. In July 1925 he became president of the University of Oklahoma and guided its course until 1941, when he became president emeritus. The greatest growth and progress of the university occurred under his leadership.

One of his outstanding contributions was his establishment of courses for outstanding students in leadership. Always a friend of the student, his was a great contribution to the advancement of the Southwest that will be felt wherever the graduates of the distinguished colleges of Texas and Oklahoma serve.

Post-War Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to House Resolution 1649, introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON]. This resolution contains what many of us believe to be the best plan to provide against post-war unemployment and economic collapse, that has been presented to the Congress.

We seem to agree generally that, come the end of the great war, and may God grant it may come speedily, there will also come the end to millions of jobs. Those engaged in the war industries number in millions. Other industries employ additional millions whose jobs indirectly depend upon the war market for their continuance. Then there will be millions in the armed forces, and millions that complement them, returning to civil life from the military. Where shall they find employment or other means of earning a living? This question has been raised again and again on the floor of this House. It has been used by most of us in our addresses to our constituents. It is heralded over the radio and through the press. It is discussed in the various districts in all public meetings and around the firesides of our people. Next to winning the war, and if even second so that is this very question. How much have we accomplished if we conquer our military enemies only to sink into the abyss of poverty and bankruptcy at home. Is it not possible to win the war and lose the peace?

As stated above these are not new questions. They have been raised in this House time and time again. But what has been done about them? What is proposed? Is there a Member of this body that will state that our present social security legislation is adequate to meet the situation with which we are faced? If there is one I have failed to find him.

House Resolution No. 1649 proposes the uniform retirement of all citizens over 60 years of age. Retirement under the resolution is not compulsory, but the benefits of the proposal are contingent on unemployment. In addition to those over 60 there is also included the permanently unemployable persons between 18 and 60. This group includes the blind, the deaf, the crippled, and the permanently ill. In addition, the mothers who have the sole support of children under 18 are also made eligible for the benefits of this resolution.

If we are to have unemployment, who is it that should be unemployed? If there are too many to work, who is it that should rest? We say it is those who are unable to work and those who have served the longest. Let us provide decent pensions to enough of them to solve this problem and do away with the nightmare called unemployment. If the groups referred to above can have a good cash income in the form of a Federal pension, they will be good customers in our markets, desirable citizens in our communities, and a continued asset to society. Their spending will afford the market that will sustain good employment conditions and substantial business for those not retired and thus all can have opportunity. The citizen who is alarmed today for our free enterprise way of life may well look into the provisions of this resolution.

The tax provision to raise the money by which the annuities or pensions are to be paid is most interesting. A small

rate of tax spread thin over a very wide base is proposed. Merely a 3 percent gross income tax on all incomes personal and corporate. In the case of personal incomes the first $100 per month is exempt from the tax. The resolution would also repeal titles 1 and 2 of our present social security law. It would also make unnecessary a lot of the existing emergency taxes. In this way the new tax would in large measure be a replacement tax and not an additional tax.

Again I should emphasize that this tax will benefit the average citizen far more than it will cost him. It will also pay handsome dividends to business and industry. I cannot visualize even a single citizen that will not be benefited far more than he will be hurt by this resolution.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we can tax and appropriate money when we feel it is necessary to do so. The speed and the magnitude of our efforts for the war have shown it can be done. Now if we do agree that this problem to which I now address myself is also of tremendous importance, shall we not at least give it careful and thorough consideration?

It was the neglect of this very problem that caused the nations of Europe to lose their freedom. It was this very thing that has brought about this horrible war with all its carnage, its blood, its toil, and its tears. If we can appropriate and tax for war, and we must and we should, we can also appropriate and tax for peace and the good of the people. While we drive the Hun from our door, let us also give attention to that other wolf called hunger.

The Indispensable Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a great deal in the days just ahead about the indispensable man. We are going to be told that he is the only one that can guide the ship of state safely through the war and establish the peace. We are going to be told that no American is as well equipped as he to guide our generals and admirals to victory. Well, this same indispensable man was Commander in Chief of our Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. He was the one who selected his personal friend Kimmel, jumped him over many other better qualified naval officers, and gave him the command of the Pacific Fleet. He was the one who gave Kimmel and General Short orders to put their forces on the alert for acts of sabotage and uprisings within the islands, with no threat from without, yet Ambassador Grew had warned the President that the Japs might strike without warning and that Pearl Harbor was the logical striking place. The President had also been told by Secretary Hull that diplomatic discussions with the Japanese representatives had reached a deadlock, and diplomatic deadlocks result in war. The blame for Pearl Harbor goes higher than Kimmel and Short. It rests directly upon the Commander in Chief, the indispensable man. No wonder the court-martial proceedings have been delayed. Court-martial proceedings would bring out the facts and place the blame where it belongs.

Veterans' Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news letter written by me and published in the Monroe County Democrat, Sparta, Wis., April 27, 1944:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER

(By Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON)

Recently passed by the Senate and now being considered by the House, is the so-called veterans' bill of rights. It is the most sweeping and generous piece of veterans' legislation in our history. It is an omnibus measure providing for hospitalization, academic education, vocational training, loans, special employment service, and unemployment benefits, with all members of our armed forces eligible under it when honorably discharged after at least 6 months of service.

One of the outstanding features of the bill is the educational provision. This is aimed primarily at insuring against a serious national loss of skills and potential leadership, the development of which has been interrupted by the process of taking young men out of school or apprenticeship to put them into the hard business of war. Subject to qualifying tests, all veterans will be entitled to special vocational training to equip them for jobs in private industry, or to a resumption of their formal academic studies. Under this arrangement, full-time students will receive $500 a year of tuition plus a subsistence allotment of $50 a month and an additional $25 monthly for dependents—in some cases, for a 4-year course in college or university.

Two other important features of the bill provide for loans and unemployment benefits. The loans, which will be interest-free for the first year and run up to $2,000, will be made to finance the repair, purchase, or construction of homes, farms, and business properties. Unemployment benefits amounting to $20 a week for a maximum of 52 weeks, and beginning 1 month after the receipt of mustering-out pay, will go to all veterans out of work through no fault of their own.

Several of its provisions are essential to an intelligent handling of the problems that will crowd in upon us when peace comes. This proposed legislation is far-sightedly designed to promote the war-retarded development of a precious national resource—the potential skills and talents of the millions of young men now in uniform.

Several weeks ago I addressed the House of Representatives advocating legislation that would take care of our returning heroes by reestablishing them in society through educational and vocational training, setting them up in business and on the farm, and for their rehabilitation when they have returned to civil life.

In this address I said: "For those who have been injured or disabled, there should be adequate hospitalization until they are ready to accept employment and to take the places in society they held before entering the service of their country. Our veterans should receive free treatment in Government hospitals until they have fully recovered.

"Those who left a university education to enter the service should have the right to continue their education after their discharge at the expense of the Government for at least as long a period as they have served their country, or as long as their interests and the interests of the public are benefited thereby.

"Those who do not care for further college education, and who need or request a vocational training should be given vocational training in the various vocational schools throughout the country at Government expense. Such vocational training should be designed for returning members of the services who have had no previous training or who desire to brush up on the training or skill they have in order to go back to their prewar occupations on an equal footing with others.

"Returning veterans who lived on farms before they entered the service, and who wish to reestablish themselves on farms should be given Government assistance to purchase tracts of good land upon easy and reasonable terms so that they may become good and successful farmers and farm owners."

The Relation of Soil to Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the writer of the following letter is a member of one of the pioneer families of his county. By thrift, hard work, and application of sound farm practices, including his achievement of being a specialist in the raising of melons, he has made a success of his enterprises. He has seen families come and go on the farms of his section, and his letter is an example of what is taking place in many sections of our country. The letter follows:

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

DECEMBER 13, 1943.

DEAR MR. BURNHAM: Picture 10 farms all joining each other in Springwater and Dayton 50 years ago and nearly all having large families, a total of 60 people. Today every place is vacant, not a living soul on them. For one place east of Twin Lake 50 years ago William Hannawalt was offered $14,000. Today I don't think the place would sell for $4,000. What is the cause?

Many reasons—long way to market; very poor mail service; many places being obliged to go 1 mile for the mail.

Nearly every one of the older people are gone, and the younger ones have gone to the city where they work half as many hours and receive much better pay, and their mail is brought daily to their door.

On the farm it was doing chores, haying, or working in the gardens as long as there

was any daylight, while in the cities the theaters, poolhalls, tenpins, and taverns are running full blast every day and night.

I read a few years ago about some white-collar person telling about soil erosion. Well, what is far worse is mankind erosion.

Those farms 50 years ago produced many hundred bushels of potatoes, grain, large droves of cattle, sheep, hogs, and horses.

The buildings were in good condition. Now some buildings have burned, some torn down, and others decaying and falling down.

I think our Congressman should have this printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as this is far worse than a dust storm or a ditch washed down a gully.

Yours truly,

GEORGE BUTTON.

Safeguards Needed in River and Harbor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the western States are thoroughly aroused over the implications in the river and harbor bill recently approved by the House, whereby State control of waters will be superseded by Federal control.

Use of water for navigation may be desirable, but the basic economy of these States is dependent upon the judicious use of water resources for domestic, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes. It is imperative that an amendment be adopted in H. R. 3961 to safeguard the interests of reclamation under State supervision. Reflecting the widespread interest of western residents in this vital problem is the following editorial published in the Blackfoot Bulletin at Blackfoot, Idaho, on May 10, 1944:

IRRIGATION IN DANGER

The utter incapacity of Congressmen from nonirrigation States of the East and South to comprehend the problems of the reclamation areas of the West was again demonstrated today, as well as the seriously renewed threat to control of the States over the streams within their own borders upon which depend their agricultural life, their present industries, and their future development.

Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on the House-approved rivers and harbors bill, declared himself emphatically and autocratically against an amendment suggested by Governor Bottolfsen, of Idaho, which would protect the rights of water users on the upper Snake River.

Governor Bottolfsen, testifying before the committee last week, suggested an amendment to the proposed bill providing a barge canal between the mouth of the Snake River and Lewiston, which would provide that in the operation of the project no demand could be made upon upstream users of water to provide stream flow at Lewiston to maintain navigation at that point.

Senator OVERTON, displaying his abysmal ignorance of the problems of western irrigation, and in complete disregard of the vagaries of nature which sometimes make rivers flow heavily and sometimes lightly, said "We are not going to hamper projects by amending them to give multiple control of States or bureaus outside the War Department, which controls navigable water as an agent of Congress."

It should be obvious to the Senator that without such protective amendments the proposed bill will place in the hands of Washington officials the power to condemn upper valley agriculture to death by demanding the water needed for irrigation.

Westerners are entirely unwilling to entrust the conduct of their irrigation water problems to Army engineers, particularly if the Army's attitude is accurately represented by the statement of Maj. Gen. Thomas Robins, Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, who said today he would like to see the entire barge canal project authorized but added, "I suppose they (meaning we westerners) would still want this crazy amendment." He was referring to an amendment offered by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, similar to that suggested by Governor Bottolfsen.

Westerners resent the accusation that they are crazy when they seek to protect the life-giving sources of their water from the constant and insidious encroachment of the Federal Government. We think the Army engineers are crazy if they think westerners will jeopardize the results of over 50 years of hard-won reclamation and development without a fight.

General Robins' statement was ill advised, to say the least, and will yet live to plague him. It was, however, fair warning to all Western States that they must unite their forces once more to combat the influences which have been fighting reclamation these many years. The battle has had to be won over and over again. Now it has reached one of its most crucial stages.

The Latest Challenge to Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I desire to include in the RECORD the substance of a radio address made by me on Monday evening, May 15, over Station WHN, New York City, as follows:

It should not be news to any thoughtful person that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Every generation of our country has faced assaults on the rights guaranteed by our Constitution, and, I am proud to say, every assault has been repulsed. Neither the attacks of enemies from without nor the subtle conspiracies of enemies within have been able to take away from us our rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, our free press, our trials by jury, our individual rights.

Today, once more, Americans are faced with challenges on two fronts. The first challenge is that of the enemy, who dares us to attack him. This we are doing and will continue to do until he is defeated beyond the shadow of a doubt. The second challenge comes from within. I believe that most thoughtful people recognize this challenge but there are many others who, busy with pressing personal and business affairs, have not pondered well the meaning of internal acts which threaten our security and our liberties.

This internal assault has been a subtle, behind-the-scenes, undercover campaign. It no doubt is being led by those men with minds more clever than honest—who have been able to work their way into the inner circle around the President of the United States, the very men who were described by Senator ALBEN BARKLEY in his recent isolated burst of candor on the Senate floor.

This internal assault is not a new one. It has been going on since the advent of the New Deal. It has as its purpose, of course, to socialize this Nation. These actions, apparently unrelated, really are part of the plan—the plan to make over America and to kill our liberties. If such an unholy plan were to come to pass, we would be ruled from Washington by the "Great Brain" and a lot of "little brains" who have proved that they would welcome such an assignment.

The latest evidence of the workings of this conspiracy to make over America is the seizure of the mail-order house of Montgomery Ward & Co. in Chicago on April 27, 1944, by soldiers of the United States Army, who were drafted or enlisted to fight against Germany and Italy and Japan, but who found themselves ordered by "Generalissimo" Biddle to fight against one of their fellow citizens, a man who has never been convicted of crime and even then was not accused of breaking a law of the land.

In an effort to make the seizure of Montgomery Ward less odious, the new dealers hastened to point out that Sewell Avery is a rich man, as if the very fact that he has been successful is something of which to be ashamed. The new dealers, by saying that Mr. Avery is rich, seem to imply that he has no right of civil liberties. My reply is that I do not care whether he is rich or poor; whether he is Catholic, a Protestant, or a Jew; whether he were black, white, or yellow. I declare that Sewell Avery is an American citizen, and that is enough for me in discussing this issue.

Before I go into a fuller discussion of the Montgomery Ward seizure, let me read to you one of the amendments to our Constitution. This amendment is headed "Searches and Seizures," and is a part of what is called the Bill of Rights, amendments adopted by a wary people who although they trusted the President then in office, knew well that in some distant future some man might be elected to the highest office in the land and use his official position to pervert his functions and to steal liberties from the people.

I quote, "The rights of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the person or things to be seized."

Notice that this amendment to our Constitution, solemnly adopted by the people of this country in a manner prescribed by the Constitution itself, perfectly plainly states that there shall be no seizures except those carried out with warrants which have been issued by judges, after supporting oaths of affirmations have been made by proper authorities.

But what happened when, in late April 1944, Franklin D. Roosevelt wanted to exert a little bit more authority than the Constitution gave him, and wanted to bring low a citizen of the sovereign State of Illinois? Without a warrant, without even having tried to get a warrant, Wayne Chatfield Taylor, another administration handyman, tried to take over the office of Sewell Avery. Wayne Chatfield Taylor was rebuffed. Mr. Avery refused to yield his office to an interloper, just as I am sure that you would refuse to give up your home tonight to a peace officer who appeared on your front porch. You would ask to see his warrant, and if he could not show a warrant, you would likely tell him to go jump in the lake.

Then, the next morning, Generalissimo Biddle arrived on the scene. Peremptorily, he ordered his soldiers to take Mr. Avery from his office. Did Generalissimo Biddle have a warrant? Not at all. Did Wayne Chatfield Taylor have a warrant? Not at all. Yet, as calmly as you would buy an ice-cream cone, they violated Sewell Avery's right to be secure in his office against unreasonable searches and seizures.

Later in the day, apparently sensing already that he had committed a most notorious and malignant act, Generalissimo Biddle rushed to get into court. Where was the Federal court before Generalissimo Biddle resorted to such an act? Was not the same Federal court in Chicago the day before the Ward seizure as was there the day after the seizure? Could not the New Deal have gone into court before, as well as after, this unheard of, uncalled for, and highhanded search and seizure, using American boys who had been drafted to fight the enemy? The answer is "Yes," of course, but the new dealers are not interested in civil rights. They are interested in upsetting civil rights.

Let me tell you, if Franklin D. Roosevelt can exercise such illegal and pernicious powers today against a rich man named Sewell Avery, without being stopped by public opinion, he can exercise the same power against you tomorrow. We must put our faith in the Congress, for the time being, to protect us from this would-be tyranny, but in the long run we must put our country in the hands of new men who believe in our Constitution and who want to increase the liberties of the people, not decrease them.

There may be those who have been misled into thinking that this is a partisan fight—this intention of the Congress to investigate the Presidential seizure of Montgomery Ward. Let them not be deceived. The fight is between men who believe in Constitutional, Bill of Rights Government and men who do not believe in it.

On April 28, the day after Generalissimo Biddle seized Ward's, Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, introduced the Senate resolution to investigate the act, declaring:

"Today the American people are in the hands of a centralized and entrenched bureaucracy such as America has never before known. It is imperative, so as to preserve our freedoms, that we safeguard the rights of individual citizens to appeal to the courts. * * *"

I personally know that this act by the Roosevelt regime caused widespread concern from citizens of every class and station in life. In addition to the hundreds of letters which I received, even before the ink was scarcely dry on the pictures published showing the soldiers carrying Mr. Avery out of his office, other Congressmen and Government officials have received letters by the thousands, and, it is said, by the tens of thousands.

The seizure of the mail-order store of Montgomery Ward is one of the most flagrant exercises of power ever dared by a President of the United States. The public morale has been grievously undermined.

The White House would like to see the issue posed by the Montgomery Ward case forgotten. But the President cannot, by ridicule, divert the people's attention from the great constitutional issue that is involved; he cannot convince the people, as he has tried to do, that the press has presented a biased picture in reporting the matter; and he cannot make us "laugh off," as an imaginary bugaboo, the unwarranted use of the military power of the country in enforcing his capricious edict to seize the Montgomery Ward store.

Men who will resort to such things as the Chicago tyranny are of even greater threats to our liberties and our institutions.

The fight is against unbridled power, despotic power. And this fight we shall win this coming November. Every American should be girded for it. The outcome may well determine whether we shall be free citizens or servile subjects.

They're Here Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me by the unanimous consent of the House, I am extending my remarks and including therein an editorial appearing in this week's National Tribune and the Stars and Stripes under the caption "They're here again."

This very able editorial calls attention to the so-called American Veterans' Association and the National Economy League. We are informed that the American Veterans' Association is made up of a small number of wealthy men who have seen some service and is the offspring of the so-called National Economy League. This organization of veterans does not speak for the great body of veterans and their dependents. They have almost a perfect record of opposition to legislation helpful to the veterans and their dependents. Their most important contribution was in helping to force through Congress the so-called Economy Act of March 30, 1933, under the present administration. This vicious act is well remembered by the veterans and their dependents of World War No. 1; the Spanish-American War; the Civil War, and the Indian Wars. This was the greatest act of ingratitude ever shown to the defenders of our country and their dependents. Let us indulge the hope that no Congress will ever give sanction to another such measure.

The editorial is as follows:

THEY'RE HERE AGAIN

Once more the so-called American Veterans Association is coming to life. That means there is being resurrected also that illicit sire of the A. V. A., the National Economy League.

Just as surely as the American Congress responds to the wishes of the people and enacts some long-needed relief legislation for the aging veterans of our wars and for their dependents in want, the illegitimate offspring of the old Economy League leaps up with a strangled cry of "racketeer" and "Treasury raider." His keepers, who must help foot the bills of Government generosity, push the button and this small but well-oiled group of veterans goes into action to tell the suffering taxpayers what a god-awful end they are coming to.

The veterans of this country and the widows and orphans of those who have died need no educating as to this combination. They recall well "an act to maintain the credit of the United States Government" that was passed in 1933 and which sent thousands of veterans and widows to premature graves. They remember the inception of its sponsors late 1932 down in Chattanooga, Tenn. They have real reason to know about the birth of that infamous Economy Act the following spring, and they know something too of the many high-minded and even subsidy-seeking bankers, and others of the N. E. L. advisory council who renounced the association they had made when they learned that the fine-sounding purposes they endorsed were but a cloak utilized to cover a sneak attack on the Nation's defenders.

Many will recall that these lofty-souled individuals even wheedled into their fold the commanding general of the A. E. F. and that Gen. Pershing later denounced them roundly when he learned that the founding principles of membership were being so vitiated that they jeopardized the rights of his war associates. The list of supporters read like Who's Who, and most of those who stuck it out to stab war veterans in the back were actually so enrolled. We do not forget either that those of them that were veterans allowed their names to be placed on the roster of that so-called veterans' organization, the A. V. A.

It was long years ago when these saviors of down-trodden taxpayers stole into the Congress like a thief in the night, wriggled serpent-like into the graces of a new administration, played upon the fears of a bewildered populace and sold a bill of goods that carried such a stench it succumbed from its own odor. Yes, that was years ago—a half-score of them—but our veterans can not forget. Their souls were seared by cruel hunger and desperate suffering, by broken homes, and by death through violence of the innocent victims of this act to "maintain the Nation's credit."

For a time father N. E. L. and son A. V. A. rode high, wide, and handsome. Every time the Congress considered a veteran's bill, they hollered murder. But soon they were unmasked, and the louder they yelled, the more they were investigated by aroused friends of the country's veterans. When it was determined finally that both existed more on paper than in reality, their influence disappeared to the vanishing point. About the last loud croaks that were heard from N. E. L. and A. V. A. were just before the present war engulfed us in 1941. N. E. L. shouted high defense costs and A. V. A.'s national president who boasted of a membership of "about 13,000 * * * some of whom paid dues * * * but not 'set' dues," appeared before a Senate committee and labeled two veteran proposals "sneak legislation" and "tricky bills." The same bills had passed the House previously, and had been before the Congress for years, but this witness, seeking to create a sensation and speaking for his masters with the moneybags, attempted to cause confusion by false testimony.

Since the war broke out much legislation has been enacted for the coming veterans of World War No. 2 and for their widows and orphans, but we have not heard a single peep from A. V. A. or N. E. L. about that. The legislation is costly, too, very costly, but they dare not squawk. If these great patriots stuck to their time-worn arguments they would say that they have always contended nothing was too good for the service-connected veterans or the widows of the deceased. We have heard them say that often, but we have never heard of their going before the Congress on their own initiative to do anything about it; they appear only to oppose something for former servicemen, something that bears a cost in the coin of the realm. No, the truth is that the boys have been lying low for awhile.

Recently, however, the second great national commander of the A. V. A., Robert B. Luchars, of New Jersey—the first one is said to have disappointed his sponsors and to have fallen into disrepute—let loose a blurb in the press against pensions in general and in opposition to some Spanish-American War and World War No. 1 legislation in particular. The release is from his "national headquarters" in Washington, an institution that is

as fictitious as the organization itself, and indicates that the little but loud outfit he represents is about to get its second wind, along wih its sire, the N. E. L. No doubt, too, the "executive headquarters" claimed to exist in New York City will again come to life and the rent will be supplied by its who's who list of contributors.

No powers of divination are required to ticket the new activity. This war is costing a lot of money. The big-moneyed boys who claim they pay the bill, but don't are feeling the pinch. So out comes the serpent again from his hole in the wall, speaks in the name of veterans whom he does not represent, and wails about the benefits being paid to aging men and women who are the wards of Uncle Sam and the sufferers of war.

To us there is nothing so loathsome as he who will fight in war against a common enemy and then desert his comrade in need. There is nobody so lacking in honest patriotism and common decency as he who will cherish his pocketbook above the care of those who protected him when his country's defeat would have denied him not only a livelihood but also his very liberty. History can and will repeat itself. An economy wave will again come, scoffers to the contrary notwithstanding. It behooves all organized veterans to watch closely the stealthy moves of their mortal enemies. They're here again.

Full Employment for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Millard W. Rice, national service director Disabled American Veterans, over radio station WINX, Monday, May 15, 1944:

Your two questions are really one big question, namely: What plans and arrangements have been made for full employment during the post-war period for returned disabled veterans and other discharged veterans, and citizens generally?

Such a comprehensive question cannot be adequately answered in just a few sentences. It is too all-inclusive.

Since shortly after World War No. 1, I have repeatedly stated before veteran gatherings that full employment for America's veterans could be provided for primarily by one of two divergent methods: first, by effective perferences for veterans for all private and public employment, and, second, by full employment for all employable Americans, and, therefore, including all of its veterans.

Inasmuch as veterans will constitute between 20 and 25 percent of the total number of all employables in this country, following the termination of World War No. 2, it is quite apparent that it will not be practicable to provide full employment for all employable veterans merely by attempts to provide effective preferences for veterans as to all public and private employment. To try to solve the problem by the preference method alone would tend to divide up the economy of America between veterans and nonveterans, which would lead eventually to bitterness, disillusionment and confusion.

The Federal Government now has about 3,000,000 civilian employees in addition to its eleven or twelve million employees in its armed forces. Upon their discharge from employment in the armed forces, eight to ten million discharges cannot possibly obtain governmental civilian employment. Most of them will, therefore, need to look for employment under private employers.

It is true that section 8 of the Selective Service Act in effect provides that if a discharged veteran of World War No. 2 makes application within 40 days after his discharge for restoration to his former permanent job, the Federal agency by which he was employed must reinstate him; State, county, and municipal agencies are under obligation to do so, and private employers must do so, if it is at all practicable.

Some months ago, in a personal conversation with Col. Paul H. Griffith, Chief of the Veterans' Personnel Division of the Selective Service System, and followed up by letter, I estimated that probably not more than 20 percent of the veterans of World War No. 2 would be reinstated to their former jobs under this law. Probably at least 10 percent of those who will have served in the armed forces did not have any permanent jobs when they went into active service. Probably another 25 to 30 percent of them had temporary jobs previously held by other servicemen who would be entitled to preferential reinstatement thereto. Probably 25 percent would find that their jobs had been abolished by business failures, production changes, and technological developments; and probably another 20 percent would fail to make application for reinstatement to their former positions within the required 40 days because of illness, restlessness, change of residence, a desire to have a different kind of a job, or because of not wanting to cause the discharge of some woman or older person from such job. A careful survey ought soon to be conducted to find out what the situation will be, as per our suggestion then conveyed to the Selective Service System, as well as to the United States Employment Service, and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and others, so far without any tangible results. To make such statements does not sound particularly helpful, but I think that we ought to face the facts frankly, and then take the necessary corrective steps.

At this point, I want to emphasize that we do believe that effective civil service and employment preferences should and can provide suitable, gainful, permanent employment for every service disabled veteran.

Parenthetically, let me say that service-connected disabled veterans constituted less than 10 percent of the total onumber of veterans of World War No. 1. That percentage will probably be "upped" as to veterans of World War No. 2.

Even if there should be as many as two and a half million partially handicapped service disabled veterans following the termination of this war, they would form not more than 5 percent of all empoyables. The Federal Government ought to set the example of giving preference of opportunity to the Nation's service disabled veterans by employing considerably more than its proportionate share.

Civil-service preferences for disabled veterans have not heretofore been nearly as effective as they should have been. The present attitude of the Civil Service Commission gives high hope that much more effective preferences will hereafter be extended to America's war disabled. Through H. R. 4115, the so-called Starnes bill, which has already passed the House of Representatives by unanimous vote, and due to be considered by the Senate Committee on Civil Service next Friday, Congress is on its way to provide more effective preferences as to all Federal employment for service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of disabled veterans who are not able to qualify for civil-service positions, the widows of veterans, and, to a lesser degree, for other war veterans generally. Some few classifications of positions would, under the new proposed civil-service preference law, in effect be set aside exclusively for service-disabled veterans. Moreover, negotiations have been going on during the last several weeks relative to vocational training courses within Federal agencies for service-handicapped veterans.

If as many as 20 to 25 percent of all of the employees of all Federal agencies should finally consist of service-disabled veterans—which is a reasonable expectancy—that, however, would give jobs for only a small percentage of them. The big majority of our war-disabled would nevertheless need to find jobs in private industry.

Although several surveys have indicated that disabled persons are, generally speaking, more careful and cautious, more reliable and productive, and less likely to lose time because of illness, than is true as to able-bodied persons in most types of employment, most employers have nevertheless continued to be under the misapprehension that they would run the risk of increasing their State workmen's compensation costs by their employment of disabled veterans.

Such unwarranted fear, it would appear, cannot be removed by education alone, but by the adoption of legislation similar to that which has been in effect in Canada since 1921. To that end, the Disabled American Veterans has sponsored the introduction of H. R. 2950—introduced by the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation—in effect to provide that the Veterans' Administration should reimburse every private employer, insurance company, and State workmen's compensation fund as to all payments made to service-connected disabled veteran employees on the basis of the operation of any State Workmen's Compensation Act.

The D. A. V. considers the enactment of such proposed legislation to be of first importance if service-disabled veterans are to be extended an equalized opportunity for suitable permanent employment following the termination of this war, when there will no longer be a manpower shortage. Even now, during time of war, however, this fear of bringing about an increase in workmen's compensation costs is definitely a deterrent to the employment of disabled dischargees in those areas where there is a surplus of manpower. The enactment of such legislation would, in our opinion, avoid the necessity for mandating by law, as was done following World War No. 1 in several European countries, that a certain percentage of the employees of all employers having over a certain number of employees, must consist of veterans having service-connected disabilities. If needed, such legislation in this country would be justifiable.

The D. A. V. believes that every employer should grant preferential seniority to every pre-war employee who has returned with a service-connected disability for any job for which he can qualify. Following the precedent already established by some, every labor union ought to specify in its contracts with management that all of its service-disabled veteran members are entitled to preferential seniority as to any job for which they have the qualifications.

Adoption and actual application of such proposed policies and preferences as to service disabled veterans would, in the opinion of the D. A. V., solve the problem of providing suitable permanent employment for every service-disabled veteran not totally disabled. Incidentally, it should be kept in mind that only about 10 to 15 percent of all service-disabled veterans are rated by the Veterans' Administration as totally disabled; most of America's service-disabled veterans should, therefore, be regarded as employable.

Although preferences can absorb some of the able-bodied veterans into suitable perma-

nent employment, preferences and procedures alone cannot give the opportunity for full employment to all returned veterans, and I am strongly convinced that that objective can be accomplished only on the basis of detailed advance planning aimed toward full employment for all employable Americans.

Starting out with a 2-day conference held last November by the National Council of American Veteran Organizations, many 1-, 2-, and 3-day conferences have during the last several months been held by various groups, looking for the solution. Many counties, municipalities, and States, but not nearly enough of them, have had functioning post-war planning committees, which give much promise for the future. The over-all picture, from the national standpoint, however, has not as yet been clarified. Briefly, the problem is to convert some 20,000,000 employees from the production of war matériel to the production of peacetime commodities, and to absorb eight or ten or twelve million armed forces dischargees back into useful productive civilian living.

Parenthetically, may I state that the attempt to solve the economic maladjustments of veterans, solely from the veteran angle, such as appears to be the purpose behind the so-called G. I. bill of rights, now being considered by the House of Representatives, whereby all post-war adjustments for all veterans would unwisely be delegated to the Veterans' Administration, will more probably lead to veteran doles rather than permanent useful employment.

If able-bodied veterans are to be given the opportunity for suitable permanent employment, they should be integrated into our civilian population and not set aside as problem cases, by concentrating all authority concerning all veterans within the Veterans' Administration, which is already overloaded with its primary responsibility on behalf of service-disabled veterans and their dependents.

Full employment for all employable service-connected disabled veterans, however, can and should be solved by special exemptions, provisions, policies, and preferences. Full employment for millions of able-bodied veterans, however, cannot be solved solely by preferences and procedures, but only by the adoption of policies designed to furnish the opportunity of full employment for all employable Americans.

In conclusion, may I quote from a statement formulated last November, by the National Council of American Veteran Organizations: "Working together, Americans can quickly develop America's resources so that an abundance of the necessities and comforts of life can be made available for all freedom-loving Americans, while still keeping America's representative form of government and the freedoms for all Americans guaranteed under our Constitution, and, at the same time, not only thereby set an example to be followed by, and in, all other countries, but also materially to assist all peoples to attain freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a resolution adopted by the Franklin County Board of Supervisors on May 5, 1944, urging Congress to enact legislation authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as a post-war project:

Whereas the welfare of the people of the State of New York is directly concerned in the successful completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will remove the last major obstacles to deep-draft navigation throughout the Great Lakes system to the Atlantic Ocean and the ports of the world; and

Whereas the same development will simultaneously make available 1,100,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity, under the self-liquidating State power project; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York on March 15-16, 1944, by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution declaring that this State urgently requires the prompt development of the St. Lawrence to furnish low-cost power to millions of industrial, rural, commercial, and domestic consumers: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we appeal for the immediate enactment of such legislation as may be necessary authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as a post-war project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our United States Senators and our Representative in Congress.

Political Interlude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, while passing through New Orleans I read a very appropriate editorial in the Times-Picayune of Sunday. In inserting it in the RECORD, pursuant to permission heretofore granted by the House, I call attention to the fact that Louisiana is not one of the eight Southern States which collects a poll tax for school purposes, and that it is, therefore, not feeling the weight of this particular antisouthern attack by those gentlemen not citizens of the States concerned, who would glibly set the Constitution aside for political purposes.

POLITICAL INTERLUDE

Rampant politicos in the Federal Senate take time out this week for periodical genuflection to their great god politics. That hardy political perennial, the anti-poll-tax bill, will start its election year work-out in the "House of Elders" today. It comes up with a proposal to limit debate. Enforcement of cloture requires a two-thirds majority. Denial of the cloture bludgeon, according to Washington report, will cause the measure to be laid aside.

Real or imagined political exigency may frighten to its support a few who know the measure to be unconstitutional, a dangerous threat to the constitutional rights of the States and an example of political legislation at its worst and untimeliest. But we cannot believe two-thirds of the Senate membership, no matter how great the political pressure, will vote to shut off its discussion.

Opposition to the pool tax is not the salient issue before the Senate, as all the Senators know. That State levy has been imposed by nearly all the States at one time or other—without challenge of their constitutional right to adopt it—and abolished voluntarily by all but a handful. The issue before the Senate is the coercion of these remaining States—and the incidental but nevertheless menacing extinction of a State power exercised since the Nation's establishment.

There are two valid, constitutional, democratic ways of ending the centuries old "capitation" or poll tax—through its repeal by the legislatures of the States retaining it, or by an amendment to our Federal Constitution. The Senators know that, too.

Neither of these time-honored American methods suits the rabid politicians who back the pending measure. A lot of them probably have no other purpose than to exploit the issue for political profit. Others may be supporting it as a club to destroy the constitutional rights of the States and center all governmental powers of every kind in Washington. Some Americans believe in that centralization of power under a benevolent Hitler. This so-called anti-poll-tax bill, designed to lynch a State right established and unchallenged for more than a century, constitutes a long step toward that centralization. Other purposes are professed for it, but it has no other attainable objective.

Thoughtful Americans in private life who take the trouble to study the matter are not fooled, and American Senators who believe in our American system and Constitution should neither be fooled nor frightened by its political ballyhoo.

Spencer Canary, of Bowling Green, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Spencer Canary, editor of the Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last Spencer Canary, of Bowling Green, Ohio, was 70 years of age. He is one of the distinguished newspapermen of my district. He came up the hard way, and has earned his high place among the journalists of Ohio. His application, study, and experiences have given him a seasoned philosophy.

I want to pay tribute to him on his birthday and extend my sincere congratulations and include his reverie of Three Score Years and Ten.

THREE SCORE YEARS AND TEN

When a person reaches the age of 70, as the editor will on Saturday, his mind goes back through the past, compares it with the present, and speculates upon the future.

It has been a privilege to live those 70 years, because in them practically all the inventions and improvements that make life more enjoyable for the individual and for society as a whole have either come or been so vastly expanded as to make them absolutely new to all but relatively a few inhabitants. That is true of electric power and lighting, railroad transportation, sanitary sewers, and inside toilets, community water plants, refrigeration, bath tubs, hospitals, educational facilities, newspapers, care of the mentally sick and the infirm, to say nothing of interurban traffic facilities, linotypes, fire protection, telephone exchanges,

motorcars, good roads, wireless, phonographs, radios, and movies.

To the editor life has been a splendid adventure and still is. The changes in population from 55,000,000 to 135,000,000 inhabitants and the changes wrought by inventions and society's progress toward greater interest in all its members have made life an interesting one. Political conceptions ranging from absolute monarchy to communism with their economic ideas have appealed to the imagination and developed arguments, controversies, and wars. Talented and despicable persons have come and gone; but to the editor the average citizen of today is like the ones of his boyhood and youth and, as he reads history, like those of centuries ago. Human nature has not changed much; but its manifestations have differed with the changing periods. At heart the average person of today is like him of the 1880's and like him of the Biblical days, days of the Crusaders, days of revolutionary fathers. There is simply adaptation to the changed conditions, just as our servicemen are adapting themselves to conditions in the Pacific jungles, Africa, Italy, and Alaska.

And that average person is a pretty good fellow. He differs in ambitions, education, environments, and experience; and consequently his viewpoint differs from others, but he is essentially honest in his opinions and actions, kindly and considerate of others. He is cynical at times and errs in his judgments of others' purposes, but for the most part he has real faith in people as a whole and faith in "a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will."

The editor has had throughout the years, and still has, high respect for the ultimately settled convictions of this average citizen taken collectively, while at times he has been amazed at what seemed to him the erroneous judgment of the majority without proper consideration of the facts in relation to themselves and to minorities. But he pities the person who has not enough sense of humor to recognize that he may be wrong and not enough faith in his fellowmen and in the Diety to believe that the affairs of this old world will ultimately be settled on a basis of personal freedom and justice for all.

These are strenuous times, and problems are baffling. So it has been to a degree for a greater part of our life, but that is what makes life interesting. It is not the red glow of the setting sun that most delights us but its rays thrown against the clouds that accompany it to bed, and the greatest thrills come from the lightning playing among dark clouds and the roar of thunder. So, too, the trials and dangers through which one passes in life, the defeats as well as the successes, thwarted ambitions, and the pleasure of accomplishments all make life an adventure that for each individual is full of drama, and in those who are dying under normal conditions there is a benign majesty which the editor hopes may be his when the thread of life grows weaker and weaker and finally snaps.

Uruguay: A Social State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Uruguay: A Social State," by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of sociology at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and visiting professor of social history at the University of Havana.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sign, Union City, N. J., of February 1944]

URUGUAY—A SOCIAL STATE

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of sociology at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and visiting professor of social history at the University of Havana)

The Republic of Uruguay, although the smallest country in South America, takes first prize on the continent with respect to social progress. Operating a national territory about the size of Minnesota, the cowboys of "the Purple Land," as William H. Hudson styled the people of this miniature cattle empire, display qualities of moderation, good neighborliness, self-discipline, and teamwork. When John Gunther coined the expression, "Uruguay is the Denmark of South America," he was not as far wrong as he usually is, although he probably would have been more felicitous in describing the "Banda Oriental," or eastern bank of the River Plate, as "the Wisconsin of the other American Republics."

Just as Madison served as a laboratory for workingmen's compensation acts and diverse forms of labor insurance in North America, so Montevideo, capital of Uruguay, pioneered among the good-neighbor capitals in favor of the 8-hour day and minimum-wage laws for both factory workers and farm laborers. For many years, despite disappointments and setbacks, Wisconsin and Uruguay blazed the trail for a comprehensive system of social security that would protect mothers, children, the unemployed, and the aged. Neither milk producers nor cattle raisers were despoiled in "the dairy State" or in "the sheep and cattle kingdom." Rights were respected wherever they were just. The extreme claims of employers and employees were modified, adjusted, whittled down, and tailored to meet the needs of a balanced economy.

In recent years, however, Uruguay has stepped up the tempo of social change. Today the only political entity that maintains the pace of our tiny good neighbor has its headquarters on the other side of the world at Wellington in the Antipodes. It is my own opinion that Uruguay, with its national monopolies of banking, insurance, electricity, communications, storage, fuels, beef packing, and fisheries, constitutes the most ambitious experiment in state socialism that has been attempted within the framework of democracy. In this sense, the buffer republic, wedged in between Brazil and Argentina, can best be described as "the New Zealand of the New World."

Like its opposite number "down under," Uruguay is struggling with the financial burdens that apparently are inseparable from government ownership and operation of a number of the social tools of production. Although the system works beautifully in an era of expanding markets and domestic prosperity, it has its difficulties when export trade slumps and home producers, whether governmental or private, have to meet their pay rolls and continue to eat. Both Uruguay and New Zealand, it may be observed, found the going unusually rough in the last world depression. Now, when foodstuffs and raw materials are in strong demand, the two countries are sharing in the upswing that is natural among producers of primary products. The real test for both social economies will come, of course, in the days of post-war reconstruction and will depend in no small measure upon the nature of world juridical institutions and the flow of international commerce.

In the meantime, it is fair to consider the two republics as committed to the organization of new ways of community living which aim to combine the virtues of private enterprise with reasonable measures of state initiative and state supervision. If successful, these social states can chart the middle way between the rocks of rugged individualism and whirlpools of leftist totalitarianism.

The Uruguayans, certainly, are not Marxists, and they were never Nazi-Fascists; cherishing their families, their farms, and their church, they believe that these institutions can perform a useful function in the cooperative commonwealth. Nor would they quarrel with those commentators who, like Dorothy Thompson and Walter Lippmann, would be inclined to characterize Uruguay as a social democracy.

One reason among others that may give confidence as to the future of this Republic springs from the fact that, unlike the situation in Chile, there is no sizable organization of Communists among the people. Politically, there are only two major parties, the Colorados and the Blancos, or, as we would say, the Pinks and the Whites. (More caustic commentators sometimes speak of these two groups as the Crudos and the Asados; that is to say, the Raw Ones and those Well-cooked.) The former have had a rather long lease on power, but one always subject to constitutional limitations which accord to the minority party a definite representation in the government and administration. Again, in the establishment of this principle as well as in its actual manifestations, one is impressed by the Uruguayan sense of proportion and fair play. The whole system seems to be pervaded by the spirit of that famous precept of Roman and English equity, "Use your own rights in such a manner as not to infringe upon the rights of others."

In the practical order there is a basic feature insuring the stability of Uruguay's social state. As in every one of the American Republics, land is the most important source of wealth and income. But, unlike the condition in the other countries in the Latin-American orbit, we find a comparatively large number of Uruguayan ranchers and farmers who own the fields they cultivate as well as the flocks and herds they tend. Almost 50 percent of the rural population hold the title deeds of their pastures and wheat lands. Peonage and tenant farming are virtually unknown. To be sure, there are agricultural workers as in every other part of the world, but these sheep herders, gauchos, and farm laborers are embraced in the national system of social security. They look upon themselves and are regarded by their employers as something decidedly more than "hired hands." They feel they have their stake in the national wealth and some claim upon the nation's dividend. If not yet partners in the productive enterprise, they believe they have a right to expect their government to create conditions which permit them to graduate into the land-owning class.

It has often been remarked by Uruguayan intellectuals that this development fits squarely into the framework of the recommendations of Pius XI and Pius XII, who have called for an extension of the principle of private ownership. Cooperative management and profit sharing, it is noted in these circles, are twin corollaries of the same principle.

Although the social state is engaged in numerous business activities, chiefly through the medium of autonomous entities, or agencies, created by and responsible to the State, it should be emphasized that the administration does not and cannot consider positions or jobs in these corporations as political plums. In the selection and ap-

point of personnel, strict civil-service rules prevail. Consequently, an ideal of public interest similar to that which rules in Great Britain has been developed, quite outside and above the sphere of partisan politics.

Commenting on this feature of Uruguayan administrative practice, one of the cabinet members, on the occasion of a recent visit to Montevideo, remarked to me: "Ordinarily, a political appointee is about one-fifth as efficient as a worker chosen on the basis of talent and experience. In Uruguay, where our population does not exceed 3,000,000, almost every citizen is aware of the abilities and merits of his neighbor. Each voter, man or woman, can scrutinize the record of the directors, technicians, and clerks in our National Administrative Agency for Fuels, Alcohol, and Portland Cement. The least sign of political corruption can be instantly aired and penalized. The managers of these state corporations have to operate in a goldfish bowl. As a result, we have had few scandals in the field of public administration. Moreover, our budget would not allow much margin for graft and pork-barrel appropriations. A few extra thousand would be immediately reflected in stiffer taxation. Since all governmental revenue is derived from customs duties, a new tax would stand out like a sore thumb. This in turn would raise a storm of protest and criticism from people who, in our tiny country, live cheek by jowl with our politicians and public servants. Up to the present, we have had relatively rare cases of job stealing."

It may be that there is another explanation for the low rate of political racketeering in Uruguay. Reference has already been made to the national constitution, which vests executive power in a president assisted by a council of ministers composed of nine members. These cabinet officers are selected by the president from the two political parties polling the greatest number of votes in the presidential elections. Six of the ministers are chosen from the major party, leaving three for the minority. If we could imagine Wendell Willkie, Senator Charles McNary, and Representative Joe Martin associated in the current administration in the United States, we could form some notion of how the system is intended to function. Similarly, in the senate the seats are divided between the two parties, with 15 assigned to each in a chamber of 30.

Most important of all, perhaps, is the provision that the president cannot be reelected for the term immediately following his constitutional period of 4 years. He is eligible for another term after an interval elapses. The vice president, who, like his chief, is elected directly by the people, is subject to the 4-year restriction.

Another interesting check on the executive is the so-called Permanent Commission, composed of four Senators and seven Representatives, whose duty it is to see that governmental executive acts follow the course indicated by the constitution and laws of the general assembly. When the bicameral general assembly is in recess, normally from December to March every year, the permanent commission exercises its power of supervision. The legislative branch of the government, it may be added, elects the ministers of the supreme court of justice. Voting is more than a privilege, it is a legal duty for citizens, both men and women, with a substantial fine applicable to those who fail to exercise the franchise. This is enough to indicate that the Uruguayan Constitution is not a slavish copy of any other organic law, whether the latter originated in the United States or Europe. Although the constitution of this "social state" follows the broad outlines of the United States document, it contains original features.

Throughout Latin America, Uruguay is celebrated as "the Left Bank" of Buenos Aires. This is understood not so much in a political as in a social and recreational sense. Montevideo is the mecca of Argentinian honeymooners, sun worshippers, and pleasure seekers. Along the Uruguayan coast, stretching in both directions from the capital, gleam 150 miles of golden sands. The shore line is dotted with hotels, bathing beaches, race tracks, tennis courts, golf courses, polo fields, and gambling casinos. Luxurious "boites" and night clubs are to be found at all the principal seaside resorts, where internationally known orchestras provide enchanting music, and dancing only ceases with the dawn. Tourist business on "the Left Bank" is a national industry in a rather unique and thoroughly realistic sense: The majority of the hotels, cabarets, and casinos are owned and operated by the community and constitute a lucrative source of income for the government. For that reason, among others, there has been relatively little criticism of the Argentinians by the press of Uruguay, whereas a veritable cyclone of protest against the isolationist policy of Buenos Aires has originated in Santiago de Chile.

The Uruguayans, with an eye to a gigantic revival of tourist traffic from Argentina in the post-war period, have no intention of antagonizing their powerful, wealthy customers. Just as Palm Beach, Miami Beach, and St. Petersburg, Fla., depend upon rich northerners for the prosperity of their subtropical empire, so the Uruguayan municipalities cherish their affluent blood relations, like themselves predominantly of Spanish and Italian descent, only a few hours distant across the estuary of the La Plata. Uruguay, with the most equable climate of any country in the Western Hemisphere (average winter temperature 50° and summer 70°), hopes not only to retain its old friends, but also to win votaries among the tourist population of North America.

At this point, it should be emphasized that Uruguay can point to a record second to none for cooperation with the United Nations. When the *Admiral Graf Spee* was stricken off her coast she gave the German skipper 24 hours to reach the open sea. The day after Pearl Harbor the authorities in Montevideo declared their ports open to the warships of the United States. The President of the Republic and the general assembly joined hands to institute compulsory military training for all men between the ages of 18 and 45; increased the civil and military aviation budgets; added to armaments; froze Axis funds; restricted the activity of Axis nationals; and stigmatized as "criminal" any attempt to bear arms against an American nation or to spread antidemocratic ideas. Despite angry protests from Argentina, the Uruguayans incorporated themselves wholeheartedly in hemisphere defense by conceding the use of air and naval bases. Gasoline and fuel oil were rationed, an office of civilian defense established, and two national defense bonds issued to the public.

With excellent political judgment, the Committee for Political Defense of the Hemisphere, comprising representatives of all the American Republics except Argentina, set up its headquarters and held its first meetings in Montevideo. Recently, this committee announced that the activity of enemy agents, sabotage, spying, and other conspiratorial efforts had been reduced to the vanishing point. It is likely that the Inter-American Advisory Committee for Political Defense will maintain a center at the Uruguayan capital after the war.

Uruguay's cooperation in the economic sphere has been proportioned to her resources. In July 1942, she signed a reciprocal trade agreement with the United States. Wool from her sheep for uniforms and hides for industrial and military purposes have been a useful contribution to the arsenal of the United Nations.

This fine collaboration is in complete harmony with what the former President of the Republic, Gen. Alfredo Baldomir, said to me in 1938. His words were prophetic:

"Our tradition of friendship for Great Britain and the United States is the most powerful element in our foreign policy. We admire parliamentary institutions and have faith in the dignity and liberty of the individual. The British, of course, buy the bulk of our meat and leather, while we reciprocate by riding on the railroads they have built in our country on a scale which surpasses, relatively speaking, any transportation network in Latin America. You can see for yourself that we prefer American motor cars. We boast one motor vehicle for every 33 inhabitants and the market, as everywhere else in South America, can absorb more. Our politics and economics will remain definitely in the Anglo-American orbit."

It is true that, thanks to a beautifully planned program of paved roads, Uruguay had witnessed a 67 percent increase (from 39,000 to 65,000) in the number of automobiles from 1932 to 1940. This jump is symbolic of the potentialities of the Latin-American market for manufactured products. With expanded purchasing power and a higher standard of living, it is estimated that Latin America could buy 10 times as many motor cars as are operated below the Rio Grande. In Uruguay, where a liberal wage and labor policy have achieved notable reforms, one can see what Latin America, at its best, offers in terms of better living and better business.

Without doubt education has been at the foundation of much of this progress. Literacy, although still an ideal rather than an achievement, is increasing. Compulsory instruction on the primary level dates from 1909, while industrial training is fostered by 19 technical schools. A number of mobile units conduct courses in the country on practical farm economics. The School of Veterinary Medicine, so important in a pastoral nation, is regarded as a model throughout the Americas. Six normal colleges providing a 4-year general course rounded off by 2 years of intensive professional study, supply a steady stream of competent teachers for the public schools. Private religious schools, both Protestant and Catholic, number over 170, with an enrollment of 21,000. Crowning the whole educational system is the Central University at Montevideo. The university includes schools of law, medicine, social science, dentistry, pharmacy, chemistry, engineering, architecture, economics, and agriculture. Educationally, the Uruguayans are in the forefront of Latin America.

While trying to secure proficiency for their sons and daughters in letters and numbers, the people of Uruguay do not forget bodily health. By means of private donations and state contributions, hundreds of school canteens for the feeding of undernourished children have been opened. Thousands of free meals are served every day, while the copa de leche, a glass of fresh milk for each pupil, is almost a national institution. Food is also available at a reasonable rate in the so-called popular restaurants. When students fall victim to illness, they are able to attend 1 of 20 open-air schools or to receive treatment in summer camps and colonies. There is even a camp for run-down teachers.

Again it was no accident that the International Council of the International Institute for the Protection of Childhood recently held its meeting at Montevideo. Upon her return to the United States, after attendance at this conference, Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, had this to say:

"The South American countries have not only advanced in a material way; they have made outstanding strides in social progress.

In many respects they are far in advance of us, particularly in their social-security programs which, notably, stress child welfare and medical care."

It may be that North Americans have something to learn from their Good Neighbors, particularly the Republic of Uruguay. The acre of diamonds, or social paradise, for which our world planners are groping may lie in our own backyard. Unquestionably, the Uruguayans have been coming to grips with the most acute political and economic problems which confront the modern world. In moving from the domain of the individual to that of the collectivity, it may be enlightening to study the social solutions which are in the alembic on the left bank of the River Plate. In an atmosphere of freedom, comparative prosperity, and peace, there is evolving a new type of socio-democratic state. Uruguay may not have all the answers to our prayers for the world beyond military victory, but it has some extremely attractive, workable suggestions. The latter have the merit of being more Christian than pagan, and more American than Asiatic.

War Training Service Instructors Are Forgotten Men of World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the May issue of the American Pilot, an outstanding aviation magazine in the United States. The article is entitled "Airviews":

WAR TRAINING SERVICE INSTRUCTORS—THE FORGOTTEN MEN

As we went to press with this issue, we read a report filed from Washington to the effect that Representative RAMSPECK from Georgia, who functions as chairman of the House Civil Service Investigating Committee, was about to light a fire under the Army Air Forces in an effort to determine why they were spending millions of the taxpayers' money training WASPS when thousands of trained civilian pilots were being released as the Army pilot-training program began to taper off.

In a lighter moment we would be tempted to call that the $64 question, but we will wait and see how bright the flame burns and how high it reaches. The WASPS, as everyone knows, is headed up by the ever-charming Jacqueline Cochran, and have something like five-hundred-odd ladybirds ferrying planes, towing targets, and doing similar tasks, with another 500 in training, and an equal number already signed up and waiting to enter training, at a minimum cost, the report states, of $6,540 each.

As this is written, the committee had not ended its investigation, but there were indications that it didn't think too much of what it had found. To quote Representative RAMSPECK, he said, "They're (the Army) spending a large sum of money training these women, when evidence tends to indicate that there are available several thousand pilots partially or adequately trained who are being let out. That's the question we're posing to the Army—why train people who have relatively little experience—men or women—when you have people who already have much training?"

Perhaps we should have capitalized Mr. RAMSPECK'S "why," as so many other people have been asking that same question, including us. The fact that they are women has nothing to do whatever with the matter and is not even a consideration in the committee's investigation or our thoughts. We are simply concerned with facts. We know that as a result of the curtailment of the Army and Navy's pilot-training programs, almost 1,000 pilot instructors working on War Training Service and Army primary schools have been released and they are, for the most part, "at liberty." To make matters even worse, it is expected that on June 30 another 4,000 will be released in further curtailments. Added to this will be some 4,000 men pilots who were studying to be instructors.

Eloquently stating the case for all his brothers were the remarks of R. B. Jackson, of Chagrin Falls Airport out in Ohio, and reported by Tex Wurzbach in the Cleveland Press:

"This whole program, War Training Service, now has been stopped and by mid summer we will have trained our last Army student. But that leaves us pilots, many having 800 to 1,600 hours flying time, to either enter anywhere in the Army except the flying department or be drafted. We don't feel bad about going into the service, but we were turned down when many of us tried to enlist in the Ferry Command or Air Transport Service. They told us we were frozen to our training jobs and to return to them because that's where we were needed. Meanwhile, everyone was calling us draft dodgers when we couldn't do anything about it. Then the draft boards began to draft us and the Army and Navy then took us to the induction centers and reassigned us back to these (same) jobs. But now that the program is being stopped, we have the choice of going into active service or asking for a discharge in which case we will be drafted. Our claim is that the Government is taking WASPS who have 35 hours of flying time and training them to ferry planes from factories to points of delivery. Here we are, already seasoned pilots and we stand a good chance of going to a cook or baker's school. All over the Nation the thousands of us War Training Service instructors are trying to arouse public opinion so that a few regulations can be changed so our experience will not go down the drain while millions of dollars are being spent to train others to learn to do what we already can do."

That, as we first started to say, is the $64 question, but now we know that it is the $6,540 question and we are wondering how the Army is going to answer it. Meanwhile, stand by for the jack pot.

Post-War Relationship Between Agriculture and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address delivered by myself at the annual meeting of the Millers' National Federation, held in Chicago on Chicago on May 4, 1944:

I appreciate the invitation to attend this meeting and to appear upon your program. I am especially glad of the opportunity which it gives me to become better acquainted with your members. My anticipations in this respect are happy ones because I know some of you already. This acquaintanceship has been so pleasant that I can only look forward to its extension with pleasure.

As some of you at least know, I represent in Congress a great wheat-growing district out in southwest Kansas. In times past that country has been described as being a place where you could look farther and see less than anywhere else in the world. That's not true now but you can look anywhere in any of a number of counties in my district and see more wheat than you can see anywhere else that I know of. During the past 15 years the 33 counties which comprise my district have produced almost one-tenth of all the wheat produced in the United States. Naturally, with all that wheat, the milling business is important also and Kansas leads the Nation in flour production.

The subject assigned me is the relationship between agriculture and industry and I'm going to get to that presently. Mr. Fakler suggested that perhaps you might be interested in having me say something on the subject of subsidies. Well, I can say a lot on that but unfortunately, from your standpoint and mine, I'm afraid anything I may report will be rather discouraging. Not that the arguments against food subsidies aren't just as good as ever, but rather, because this doesn't seem to be a case where the best argument wins.

The simple fact that the American people as a whole are eating better today than they ever have in our history and are spending a smaller proportion of their national income for food than ever before, demonstrates that there is no real need for the Federal Government to contribute to our individual grocery bills. Today about 20 percent of our national income goes for food and if we were eating the quantity and quality of food which we were consuming during the 5 years preceding the war, we'd be spending only 16 percent of our national income. This, of course, applies to flour and bread just as much as to other foods. Neither flour nor bread prices are above the average for the last 25 years, during most of which time the national income averaged less than half what it will be this year. To take the subsidy off of flour would result in an increase of less than 1 cent in the cost of a loaf of bread and it would still be the cheapest as well as the best of all staple foods.

Not only are subsidies unjustified economically, but they are unfair to the coming generations which will have to pay the bills. At the best, they only conceal rather than prevent inflation, and at the worst, they contribute to inflation because they increase the amount of money available for spending as compared with the goods and services available.

It's idle, however, to discuss food subsidies from an economic standpoint, because their origin and continuation are based upon strictly political considerations. They are purely and simply a gesture of appeasement on the part of the present administration to the leaders of organized labor.

Twice both Houses of Congress, by large majorities, have prohibited food subsidies. Twice this prohibition has been vetoed. Now, with the extension of price control about to come up, there is a further opportunity to ban food subsidies. However, in the end it is likely that the result will be the same as before. Without a two-thirds majority to override a veto, we are helpless.

However, I think that the fight against subsidies has accomplished something in that it has probably prevented their extension on a much larger scale. In the beginning there was talk of two or three billion dollars in food subsidies, and I have no doubt but what we would be paying this much or

more had it not been for the fights which have been made.

I do not want to deprecate the work of the Office of Price Administration in its efforts to hold down prices and prevent inflation. The fact remains, however, that one of the principal reasons that the cost of living has not advanced more is because of the miracle of production which we have seen in this country during the past 3 years. It is simply amazing. In the first place, there were few people who believed that we could produce the quantity of war material which we have and there was no one who felt that if we did we could keep our production of civilian goods where it has been. What we have done has been to produce this prodigious quantity of war production and, on top of that, make almost our normal peacetime output of civilian goods. It is this as much as any one factor which has prevented inflation.

This achievement in production proved that American industry, labor, and agriculture, working together, are unbeatable. It did something else. It gave our people renewed confidence in their country and its traditional institutions and policies. For 10 years before the war we had been following a defeatist philosophy. Our governmental policies, in a large part, were based upon the principles of certain economists who held that we had reached in our development what they called a mature economy. They said, in effect, that we were incapable of further expansion, that we had reached the last frontier, and that free enterprise as we had known it in this country was pretty much a thing of the past. The more extreme proponents of these theories held that about the best we could do from now on was to let the Government see that what little we had left was divided equitably among the people.

One of the most significant actions taken by Congress in recent years was the refusal last year to appropriate funds for the continuation of the National Resources Planning Commission. This agency had been set up by Executive order early in the present administration. It did a prodigious amount of work, especially in surveying our natural resources and their potentialities. Much of its research will be helpful in the future. The trouble with the Commission, however, was that it got off on the mature economy theory and most of the plans it formulated were based on the idea that in the future most of our development would have to be through Government programs and Government spending .

Some people got the idea that when Congress stopped the work of this Commission it mean that Congress was opposed to planning. It meant nothing of the kind. It simply meant that Congress could not agree with the defeatist philosophy which appeared to be the basis of all the Commission's planning.

Congress does believe in planning and the best evidence of it is that there have been set up in both the House and Senate, Committees on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. I happen to be a member of the House committee and can testify to the fact that it is giving most thorough and conscientious study to the problem. Both the House and Senate committees are getting the advice and suggestions of the best business and economic brains of the country and are coordinating their activities with the work of the numerous committees which have been set up by industry, agriculture, and labor, on post-war planning.

These congressional committees are not proceeding on the theory that there is no room for further expansion and development in this country. They take the view that this Nation and its people are standing on the threshold of greater opportunities than we ever have had before. They believe, as I think you do, that if the American people can successfully meet and solve the great problems arising out of the war, that by using the same energy, ability, and spirit of cooperation, they can successfully solve their post-war problems, national and international.

This is not said with any idea of minimizing these problems. They are indeed great—greater than have confronted us in our entire history as a Nation. Even if the war ends at the earliest date for which we dare hope, we will find ourselves with a national debt of between two hundred and fifty billion and three hundred billion dollars. A few years ago Congress solemnly debated whether it was safe to increase the debt limit to fifty billions. We will have also the great problems of disposing of our surplus war supplies, of changing over from war production to normal production, of finding jobs for our returning servicemen and helping them make the necessary adjustments from military to civilian life. If we're going to meet our obligations with respect to employment, we'll probably have to find jobs at living wages for some ten or twelve million more people than were employed before the war. The immediate pressing problem, one that cannot wait because it's right on our doorstep now, is to find some fair, quick, and simple method of terminating war contracts.

One reason for thinking we can solve these great problems comes from the fact that all over America our people are giving their best thought and consideration to these matters. It is said that there are nearly 300 national and regional groups and organizations which are working on post-war planning and perhaps 3,000 local groups which are working along the same lines.

There are those who criticize these activities. They say that America should give its undivided attention to winning the war and that when the war is won there will be plenty of time to work out post-war policies. I agree that we must not let post-war planning take our minds off of the war or divert our attention from the fact that winning the war should be the primary consideration of everyone of us. There is no way, however, by which we can swing from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy overnight. Our defense program began in 1940. It has just hit its peak this year. It may not take that long to convert back from war production. We hope not, but it will take time. The fact is, it's a continual process. It's going on right now. In certain lines of war production we have reached our goal, orders are being canceled, production cut back, and employees discharged. This thing is going to continue. The fact that we are fighting two wars and that one will probably be finished before the other, is going to mean that there can be much conversion before hostilities end.

There is no reason why plants which have finished their jobs of war production should not convert to civilian production unless they can be used in some other type of war production. Why should they stand idle if there are men and materials available for the production of needed civilian goods? Of course, I realize it is not quite as simple as that. We must be fair to those industries which have converted to war production and which still have large orders ahead. Is it right that their competitors who have completed their war contracts should get the jump on them when it comes to the civilian market? Perhaps not, and yet I think all will agree that unless we hold up all conversion and thus jeopardize recovery, some companies will get their goods on the market first. In order to be as fair as possible in the matter, I think that this situation might well be taken into consideration in adjusting contract settlements. Try as we may, however, there are bound to be cases which canot be worked out fairly and equitably, and to put too much emphasis on that phase may delay recovery.

There is also the problem of disposing of Government stocks. Already this is causing concern because we have reached the point where some supplies are ready for disposal. I know it is a matter of importance to the food industry, because if stocks of food, which may become surplus, are thrown on the market recklessly and without consideration as to the effect on supplies and prices, the situation might become rather chaotic. This matter has been covered by legislation which is now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture.

I have spoken of our remarkable production achievements and of the renewed confidence which this has given to our people that our American system of free enterprise, combined with our know-how and driving energy, can out-produce any other system ever set up. Paradoxically, the great demonstration of our productive capacity is the thing which is giving us our greatest worry now. We are wondering whether we have the consumptive capacity to match it; whether we will have enough buying power to absorb the production of which we are capable.

This realization of the nature of our problem has resulted in widespread discussion of what is referred to as an economy of abundance. I know of no public discussion of post-war problems, either on the part of industry, labor, or agriculture, which are not in harmony with this thought. The only dissenters which I have heard are a few in Government or in academic circles who, even after our experience during the war years, still contend that we have reached the limit of our ability to expand.

But, with all this talk of abundance, there still remains the question as to whether or not in actual practice such a policy can and will be worked out. If we have a real economy of abundance in this country, industry, labor, and agriculture will all have to change some of the policies which they have been following in the past.

This has been especially true of industry and labor. As far as agriculture is concerned, its experiments with a scarcity economy have been forced upon it because of the prevalence of such practices on the part of industry and labor. Anyone who knows farmers knows that more than any other group they are in favor of abundant production. The farmer hates any program which is based upon curtailed production. His every instinct and inclination are to produce all he can. It is this fact which accounts in large part for the marvelous record during the war period. Yet, the very fact that the farmer believes in abundant production has been his undoing. Too many times he has been the only one who believed in that theory. The idea of killing pigs and plowing up crops never originated with the farmer. Nevertheless, there have seemed to be times when that was the only alternative to ruinous prices and impending bankruptcy. The curse of the farmer as far as abundant production is concernd is that this course, in so many cases, has resulted in extremely low, if not disastrous, prices. If the farmer is to produce abundantly some way must be found to protect him from being destroyed in the flood of his own abundance.

The great dilemma of the farmer is that he buys in a market where prices are fixed by the seller and sells in a market where prices are fixed by the buyer. He plants his crop or breeds his livestock from 6 months to a year before he can put the finished product on the market. When the operation begins he has no idea what price he will receive or whether he will have anything to sell in the end, because he has to take all the risk of weather, insect pests, and plant and animal diseases, risks for which, generally speaking, there is no insurance.

That has been the position of the farmer in the past except where Government programs have intervened. What of the position of industry and labor on this matter

of abundant production? While we cannot generalize as to all of industry or all of labor, there can be no denial that in the past there has been a tendency on the part of large segments of both toward monopoly and fixed prices. There has been a constant effort to do away with competition.

I have been a member of State or national legislative bodies for the past 23 years. I've seen much legislation proposed and some enacted at the behest of industry and labor. Never, however, have I seen either group propose anything to bring about more competition. This was true, irrespective of the nature of the legislation, no matter whether it dealt with tariffs, wages, hours, prices, or business practices. The sponsors of such legislation were for competition, of course, but always for the other fellow.

Certainly, if we are to have an economy of abundance, labor organizations will have to abandon a lot of rather common practices of the past. There is no better example of monopoly than the closed shop. There is no better example of scarcity economics than some of the labor practices known as featherbedding.

It is not fair to say that the practices and policies which I have mentioned have been followed by all branches of industry or by all labor organizations. That they are widely prevalent in both industry and labor is a matter of common knowledge.

I think all of us believe in fair wages and fair profits, but we can't have an economy of abundance if we have excessively high wages or excessive profits. There is too much of a tendency for labor leaders to talk about increased wages without any thought of increased production, and of business leaders to talk about increased profits without basing them on increases in production.

One of the great gains which has come out of the war has been improved technological processes. In some lines we've made as much progress as we might make in 10 or 15 normal years. This has resulted in lower production costs. Perhaps some of the results of this increased efficiency should be passed on in the way of wages and profit, but the best way to benefit everyone and promote abundance is to give those savings to the public in the way of lower prices.

One thing sure, if we are going to employ 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 more people in production and distribution after the war we'll have to produce much more than we ever did before. We'll have to sell those goods after we produce them. Will we sell more or less if we have moderate profits and moderate prices, as contrasted with large profits and high prices? What we must have if we are all to do business with one another is something like a fair relationship between prices, wages, and profits. If one group, through organization, legislation, or monopolistic practices gets more than its share of the national income that slows up the exchange of goods and services—it moves in the direction of scarcity.

I think this brings me up to what I am supposed to discuss—relations between agriculture and industry. I've been a long time getting there, but I'm not going to detain you much longer. From what I've already said, it's fairly obvious that I don't believe we can have a policy of abundance in one segment of our tconomy and scarcity in another; we can't have half the Nation operating under free enterprise and the other half regimented; we can't have the law of supply and demand operating as to one industry and monopolies operating in another. In the long run, we've got to operate straight across the board, one way or another.

For years labor and industry have pretty well controlled their prices. Agriculture operated in a free economy. It was the only way 6,000,000 competing producers could operate. It was the way they wanted to operate. However, as the interdependence of industry, labor, and agriculture became greater agriculture, in self-defense, was forced to seek the protection of fixed prices and fixed production. The only way this could be done was through governmental action, because there is no way by which the millions of widely scattered farmers in this country could function as a unit otherwise. And so, we've had Government price supports for farm products and we've had the inevitable accompaniment of price fixing—production and marketing controls. I'm referring now not to war-food programs, but to pre-war policies. Just as sure as industry and labor, in the post-war world, attempt to eliminate competition, fix prices, and follow other scarcity-promoting practices we'll have farm price supports and marketing quotas again. Not because farmers want them—they don't—but because they are rather more pleasant than foreclosures and bankruptcy.

I'm sure that all of us want the same thing, and that is less Government control and planning. Yet, I think that in any program for the post-war period, there is a place for Government. In the first place, the Government must necessarily determine our fiscal policy. It must deal with taxation and with expenditures for public works if there are to be any. Certainly, our tax policies for the next few years are going to be all important in determining the course of our business development. Whatever we have in the way of a social-security policy will have to be operated by the Government. I'm thinking now particularly of unemployment insurance which may be needed to bridge the transition from war production to normal production. Then also, whatever is done in the important field of terminating contracts and disposing of surplus supplies must be done through Government. Relaxation of wartime controls is something which depends almost wholly upon governmental action. I have already said that anything in the way of farm programs must necessarily be under Government sponsorship.

Now there is no particular reason why I should make this sort of an address to the millers. As far as I know, yours is at least a reasonably competitive business. It is an old-established business with long and honorable traditions. It is a most fundamental and necessary business. What I have said has been addressed to you, not as millers, but as leaders in the business community who will have a great deal to say about the relationships between Government, industry, and agriculture in the important months and years ahead of us.

What we have to have, if this country is to keep off of the rocks of unemployment, bankruptcies, breadlines, and foreclosures, is a combination of business statesmanship, labor statesmanship, agricultural statesmanship, and governmental statesmanship. I'm talking to you because you can and must furnish a part of the leadership along this line.

It would be presumptuous for me to make suggestions as to a post-war program for your own industry. I know that you are working on it. I cannot refrain, however, from saying that, in my opinion, the opportunities for progress and development in the production, processing, and distribution of food have never been as great as they will be in the post-war period.

Never at any time in the history of the world has there been so much interest in food and nutrition. Here in this country we usually take food for granted. It is only when rationing and other controls incident to war touch us that the average American gives any thought to food. Yet the nutritionists tell us that a considerable part of our population is undernourished even in good times. As for the rest of the world, there are hundreds of millions who suffer from constant and continual hunger. Never in all the history of mankind has there been a time when the human race has had enough to eat.

The United Nations Food Conference was a recognition of the fact that this world is food conscious today as it has never been before. Whatever may eventually come out of this organization, it is a landmark in world nutritional history. Along with this increased interest in food, the war period has seen marked technological advances in food processing and distribution. Quick-freezing, dehydration, and compression all appear to have great possibilities.

There will never be a time in the years immediately ahead when the world will not need all the surplus food we can produce in America. It is only a question of buying power on the part of other nations and, of course, our willingness and ability to accept goods in exchange.

I think that after the war this country should make a special effort to stimulate the export of wheat and wheat products. It will take some effort. Our experts may probably have to be on the basis of a lower price level than that which is received for domestic consumption, and if this is done, the mechanics for doing so will have to be worked out.

I still think the old McNary-Haugen idea is worth considering. We made a great mistake in not trying it out when it was advocated back in the twenties. Recently a new plan known as the Pickert-Bearman plan has been worked out to promote the export of surplus farm products. Some of you may be familiar with it. There is not time to discuss it here, but I think it has real possibilities.

But in the long run, the milling business and every other business can prosper only as we all prosper. The war has furnished another convincing demonstration that in this country we all go up and down together. We can't have prosperity unless men are employed at good wages. We can't have employment unless there are men who are ready to risk capital and contribute managerial ability to make profits and furnish jobs. We can't have either jobs or profits without sound governmental policies. The city man cannot get along without the farmer or the farmer without his customer in the city. America in the future can achieve its destiny only as we all work together. Each of us can achieve success only as we work with the other fellow.

I found this thought most effectively presented the other day in a little publication called the Buddgette, gotten out by the Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co. I want to conclude by reading this little article entitled "What's Going to Happen to Me":

"That is the most important question there is in our lives. In these troubled times it becomes harder to answer than ever before. It is a personal question. It sounds selfish, but it is not that so long as we do not add, 'and to hell with the other fellow.'

"'What happens to me' is closely tied up with 'What's going to happen to us.' There are many who haven't learned this yet. Some are nations; some are politicians; some businessmen; some are labor leaders; and mostly they are just plain folks.

"It's the plain folks who count. The leaders will reflect their attitude. Life is getting too complicated to let the thinking be done by a few, or to have it self-centered.

"We know, for instance, that we are all in this war together. We are going to have to learn that we are all in this life together, too. The excitement of war makes it easy to remember the first. The let-down following the war period is going to make it harder to recall the other. But we are going to have to do it for our own individual good.

"What's going to happen to me? Frankly, I don't know. All I know is that it will be nothing very good unless something good happens to you, too."

The Political Economic Views of Andrew Jackson Higgins, One of America's Greatest Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following as taken from the Eureka News Bulletin:

THE POLITICAL ECONOMIC VIEWS OF ANDREW JACKSON HIGGINS, SR.

From time to time Andrew Jackson Higgins, Sr., has expressed his political economic views before universities, business clubs, commerce associations, American Legion posts and on the air. Well-known columnists and national magazines have carried interviews from Mr. Higgins which left no doubt in anyone's mind as to his position.

Some ultra-conservative bankers and industrialists have raised their hands in horror and we have heard them exclaim to Mr. Higgins, "Surely you have been misquoted. Surely you, one of the largest employers of men in the South, the South's leading industrialist, have no socialistic inclinations!" to which Mr. Higgins replied, "Wouldn't you rather see this country a little pink than totally red?"

This great conflict, of which World War No. 1 was a part, is a world-wide battle for both political and economic freedom; a conflict of two radical schools of thought, made possible because of a dissatisfied world.

It must be remembered that less than a century ago slavery was a part of the economic system of the United States. Even today, slavery is a recognized legal practice in certain areas in East Africa. Some American industralists of today would want restored the unregulated capitalism of the last century—the days when there were no income taxes and corporations were ruthless and the big steel mills paid a man a dollar and a half a day for 11 hours work, and starvation faced he who was too old to work—the glorious days of free enterprise—the days of Vanderbilt's "public be damned" policy, when railroads would charge one person a certain rate and his neighbor ten times more. Those days are gone forever. The pendulum has been gradually swinging to the left.

The various social reforms since World War No. 1 such as social security, employment insurance, shorter working hours and better working conditions, have been brought about not because they were forced upon America by Roosevelt's brain trust, but because the majority of right-thinking Americans wanted such social benefits.

Ultra-conservative industrialists of the old school looked upon labor as a purchasable commodity which could be treated as any other material with wages based upon the law of supply and demand, regardless of the cost of subsistence.

From the earliest days Higgins has looked upon the honest workingman as a partner. To the man who cheerfully gave his best to Higgins there was no limit to his reward. Higgins, now, or at any time in the past, has never had any use for the shirker or the parasite. They had no place in Higgins industries. Higgins knew that the majority of workingmen were honest craftsmen who worked both for subsistence and for the pleasure derived from a fascinating occupation.

The honest workingman knew that Higgins was his friend, and as a result, management and labor has worked together to make Higgins Industries what it is today. They worked together as a family. They have had their differences. What family hasn't? But the differences were always settled in Mr. Higgins' office—not in the newspapers and not in Washington. As a result, labor recketeers and gangsters have never gained a foothold in the unions affiliated with Higgins Industries, Inc. Under the craft unions, or the C. I. O. system of collective bargaining, the "fly in the ointment" is that there is not much incentive to the workmen. By collective bargaining in their union, they have ruled out the recognition by management administering capital of merit among the craftsmen; that is, to recognize in pay one individual more than another—in face of the fact that there are no two people exactly the same, mentally or physically, or with the cleverness of their minds or their hands.

Management and labor in Higgins Industries have come a long way together, and they have a long open road ahead.

One can visualize five systems applicable to America's industrial societies:

(1) Unregulated capitalism functioning as "free enterprise"; (2) capitalism regulated for the benefit of the whole people; (3) capitalism controlling government or (4) controlled by government for the benefit of a privileged minority; (5) socialism. The first never existed in its pure form, does not exist today, and becomes increasingly impossible with every addition to the complexity of the industrial order. Politically, it is a euphemism to protect the third system.

Because fascism represents absolute loss of political liberty, and communism a loss that is somewhat less than absolute, anybody faced with a choice between fascism and communism will prefer communism if he places primary value upon liberty. But for that same reason he will seek to evade such a choice by reaching economic and social decisions through the processes of democratic self-government.

In a recently published book just off the Bobbs-Merrill press, The Road to Peace and Freedom, by Irving Brant, we have an expression of the political economic "pink" policy of Andrew Jackson Higgins. Brant expresses this philosophy in the following words:

"In a self-governing society ruled by intelligence, there need be no aping of any system developed outside its borders, but there will be no rejection of any system because it developed outside. Believers in capitalism are frightened by the fact that every additional step in the regulation of capitalism is a step in the direction of socialism. So, too, on a mountain road, every step away from a landslide is a step toward a precipice. Shall one therefore let himself be crushed by falling rocks?"

Whenever the businessmen, technicians, statesmen, and journalists of the United States recognize that regulated capitalism is the only alternative to socialism, they will cease to fear their movement in the direction of socialism. They will cease to fear it because they will be hunting constructively for the place at which they can stop, and if there is no stopping place, they will know there is none and adjust themselves to the fact. There is just one thing that can drive the country into socialism without necessity for it. That is the blind resistance to regulated capitalism which makes it impossible to see the stopping place, if there is one, on the road to socialism.

To realize what a vast difference the attitude of businessmen and political leaders makes, consider the fact that in Russia the socialistic industrial system is managed by men who correspond to our business executives and engineers, working as hard as American businessmen do, and with the same basic incentive of self-support. The entire force of government is directed to the same end. It is obvious that the Russian system would break down if it did not have the support of such men of ability.

A Socialist regime in the United States would break down without a similar support. What our businessmen, technicians, and statesmen fail to realize is that they are breaking down the only alternative to socialism—regulated capitalism—by offering the same kind of opposition to it that they expect people to offer, with fatal results, to socialism. If this attitude remains unchanged for but a few more years it will destroy the system of private enterprise in the United States.

A few far-sighted American businessmen realize the truth of this, but their views have not dented the general attitude of the business world. It has not even penetrated the consciousness of organized labor sufficiently to produce a unified political policy. Since there is no present indication that American business and political leadership is capable of preventing this catastrophic conflict, it is all the more imperative that the people of this country assert their unity in all matters which now bind them together. The greatest of these is their common desire for freedom and self-government.

The American people share with the British the longest heritage of personal freedom and governmental responsibility to be found anywhere in the human race. They should therefore be better able than any others to hold to their rights through the adjustment of society to this complex new age of titanic industrial and financial power.

The surest defense of American freedom is a free and peaceful world. The strongest assurance of a free and peaceful world is American devotion to it. Thus the defense of the United States against its dangerously looming domestic hazards leads us once more to the international field—to the choice between world responsibility and isolation, between cooperation and grasping chauvinism, between democratic revolutions and the cold fears of visionless diplomats, between a world organization for peace and a Third World War. We are at the junction of the roads, one leading to war, slavery, and death, the other to peace and freedom. The ways are open, the paths are broad and plainly marked. It is for us to choose between them.

W. T. S. Instructors and Trainees Peel Potatoes While Army Plans to Put Through WASP Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the April issue of Contact magazine, which is an outstanding aviation publication:

WANTED FEMALE—IMPERSONATORS

On the page opposite this editorial is a story from our I. N. S. Washington correspondent concerning commissions in the A. A. F. for women pilots. Kindly note the concluding paragraph of that story: "We realize that some people are saying that we are depriving men who have had some training in this program. However, we cannot

lower our standards just because a man has had a few hours in the air."

Now this sort of pap—no matter who hands it out—is misleading and deceptive. Just who are these men pilots who have had "some training"? What sort of malarky is this that would lead the American people to believe women pilots are being trained to displace—not replace, mind you—men pilots because "we cannot lower our standards just because a man has had a few hours in the air."

More specifically we think this story and another on page 6 of this same issue of Contact, is plain unadulterated hogwash of the familiar Washington brand. Here are the real brief facts:

Encouraged by the Army, the War Production Board, the American Legion, and various Washington wind machines, thousands of men, on their own time and money, at real personal sacrifices, became highly trained W. T. S. flight instructors. These instructors trained thousands of Army Air Corps cadets in the W. T. S. program. That program has now been scrapped. These flight instructors are, for the most part, right back where they first started—candidates for the walking Army. As for the "few hours in the air" so glibly passed over we have seen one petition signed by many of these men in the Enlisted Air Corps Reserve, whose flying time averages 700 hours per man. Among other things these able, experienced male pilots—about 5,000 of them so nonchalantly tossed aside by the A. A. C.—are told they may join the Air Transport Command, if they can meet the A. T. C. requirements, viz.: Minimum of 1,000 hours flying time with 200 hours logged on planes powered with 200-horsepower engines or better. Mark you, this is a standard for male pilots. Now, how about Jackie Cochran's glamour girls—35 hours total time, a student permit and no license necessary? ("The A. A. T. will train you from scratch for you are badly needed"—Jacqueline Cochran, Ladies' Home Journal, March, 1944.) Why this discrimination? Who is throwing their weight around in Washington? Is somebody making a play for the 1944 female vote?

Our esteemed contemporary—and we do mean esteemed—Gill Robb Wilson, writing in his column for the New York Herald Tribune, sympathizes with these 5,000 discarded men pilots; but Gill thinks they should not be yelling for airplanes just because they are flyers. They should be willing to peel potatoes, clean windshields for women pilots or what have you to help win the war. By the same token we hear Uncle Sam is in need of thousands of nurses. How about some of these 35-hour female wonders swapping their flying togs for nurses' uniforms? But that would be downright rub-and-scrub work—no glamor there—and we do mean glamor—we sort of remember the "Airport Annies" who buzzed around our pre-war airports.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication signed by Gold Star Mothers present at exercises held at Webster, Mass., on May 14, 1944:

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Mother's Day. We are Americans devoted, above all, to this beloved country of ours—the United States of America. Many of us have already made the supreme sacrifice, offering the very blood and lives of our sons on the field of battle, with only one consolation in mind—that this sacrifice will bring truth, justice, and liberty to all humanity.

Will the United States of America betray Poland?

To those who writhed in anguish at Poland's agony on September 1, 1939, when he signaled his forces to roll over the boundaries of Poland, Hitler, with all his vision, had he devined that men who would be free could not be intimidated by might, however monstrous, would not now be struggling to fend off the hands that reach for his throat. Our memories certainly would be short, indeed, if we forgot that it was in the same year of 1939 that Russia, now presumably our ally, stabbed Poland in the back by seizing and occupying eastern Poland while fighting the Nazi hordes in the west. Is not Russia just as guilty as Hitler in violating Poland's inborn rights to national unity?

Will the United States of America betray Poland?

Indeed, Mr. Congressman, the future of Poland is very black and our hopes are all beclouded by the German brutality and the Russian stubborn, greedy, and ignorant passions. At this moment our faith is highly uncertain by the apparent indecision of both our American and Allied diplomats who, swayed by un-American propaganda, are belittling the legal Polish Government in London, forgetting that this august body was elected after the tragic death of General Sikorski on July 4, 1943, strictly in conformity with the manner in which governments in Poland had been formed for a long time before the outbreak of the present war. Sir, we mothers, who are giving and sacrificing our sons in the defense of the "four freedoms," trust in your sense of justice that you will do your utmost and that you will enlighten those who have been swayed from the truth by this false, malicious, and diabolical propaganda.

Poland will rise again, rise from her knees to which she was beaten, rise in red scars and scorched tatters as a living example of the madness of the militarists, rise to point an unwavering and accusatory finger at the Nazi and Russian criminals who wantonly slew that they might rob. It has been so long, and so many others have become victims like her, that there may have been moments when we forgot that it was Poland who bore the first onslaught and the most savage battle, not for days, but for weeks, in a nightmare of pain, sustained only by faith in God and the ancient will to fight for freedom and liberty.

The fire that destroys now meets the fire that cleanses, and in the greatest battle men ever waged on earth against the powers of darkness, the salvaging flame of the free will light Warsaw again, tinting the ruins which shall be monuments eternal to Poland's unsurpassed heroism.

In our labors, our discomforts, and our sacrifices, whether on the firing line or on the production line, we have the spiritual satisfaction of knowing that the United States of America is on the right side in this war as she has been in every war; that our beloved country is maintaining unbroken the record of never having engaged in a war of conquest, spoils, or aggrandizement.

America's hero dead here or wherever they may rest, gave up their lives only in righteous and sacred causes—for liberty, for unity, for the preservation of human rights, for the freeing of the oppressed, for the championship of great ideals. Our proudest boast is that America always has played only one role in its history—that of the defender of precious principles—of truth, of justice, of right.

American fighting men, our sons, are giving their lives for these ideals in this war.

Will the United States of America betray Poland?

At the Mother's Day exercises held in the Municipal Auditorium at Webster, Mass., on May 14, 1944, and in the presence of many Gold Star Mothers, 642 mothers with 974 sons in the armed forces of the United States of America from the towns of Webster and Dudley in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, it was unanimously voted and resolved that the foregoing appeal be forwarded to the Honorable DAVID I. WALSH, in the United States Senate, Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS, in the United States Senate, and to the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN, in the House of Representatives.

Witness the hands and signatures of the Gold Star Mothers who were present during the exercises so held.

Mrs. Stasia Miller, six sons in service, one died in action; Sofia Troub, three sons in service, one died in action; Mrs. Mary Marcinczyk, one son, died in action; Julia Loska, one son, died in action; Mrs. Annie Wysocki, one son in service, one son dead; and Mrs. Mary Wagner, one son dead.

Address of Col. Ruth Cheney Streeter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Col. Ruth Cheney Streeter, United States Marine Corps, Director, Marine Corps Women's Reserve, before the seventh annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, in Boston, Mass., May 11, 1944:

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Saltonstall, Mayor Tobin, distinguished guests, and members of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, it was a gracious gesture on your part to include a representative of the women in military service on your program tonight. I came with pleasure because it seems to me that your very name is an inspiration.

Have you ever noticed how in times of stress we tend to lose our individuality, but having stood up and been counted we become symbols of the cause with which we have allied ourselves? This meeting seems to me a symbol of two things—freedom and team play.

Nowadays we hear much about "four freedoms," and then people are apt to add their own ideas of extra freedoms. Tonight most people would regard this occasion as being a splendid example of "freedom of religion," and so it is, but it is also more than that.

Personally, I have always been troubled by a conviction that the word "freedom" is singular, not plural, and that if you refer to the one word alone you include therein all the decent independence which people have a right to expect and for which they are willing to fight and die.

Many years ago, Tom Paine described, in stirring words, "freedom" and the price which apparently must be paid for it ever so often. We all know the first words: "These are the times which try men's souls." But we may have forgotten that he goes on to say: "The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country, but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny like hell is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheaply we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

You ladies and gentlemen are showing by your presence here tonight how highly you rate "so celestial an article as freedom."

The second thing which it seemed to me was symbolized by this group is "team play." Kipling described it well when he wrote:

"For the game is more than the player of the game
"And the ship is more than the crew."

In our day, the ship is this present war and the crew consists of soldiers, sailors, marines, and the people on the home front. They differ greatly from each other. For one thing, they differ in matters of religion; but that does not interfere with their all working together as one crew. For another thing, the crew—even the uniformed members of it—now consists of both men and women. There were a few women in the military services in World War No. 1, but there are now many more and they are doing very valuable work.

It was a kind and thoughtful gesture on your part to ask me here to represent those women. I cannot make you an erudite speech, but perhaps I can tell you a little of what being in a military service means to the women whom you so generously honor tonight. I happen to be a marine, but tonight I speak for all my colleagues in the service—WAC, WAVES, SPARS, Army and Navy nurses.

In the first place, we women recognize, of course, that our contribution in no way equals that of the men, who undergo hardship and danger; and that the special honor and glory which belong to the fighting men are still reserved exclusively for them.

But the women are doing much of the home work for this war, and doing it often under conditions of isolation, monotony, and regimentation which represent an enormous contrast with their ordinary lives, and doing it extremely well, nevertheless.

The commandant of the Marine Corps Women's Reserve schools at Camp Lejeune, a much-decorated, regular officer back from Guadalcanal, was talking with me the other day, and remarked solemnly, "I used to think I knew all about women."

"Yes, sir," I replied, "that is a common masculine misconception."

He blinked a bit, but continued valiantly: "You know, they aren't at all like what I thought they would be. We men thought they would weep on our shoulders every time they didn't get their way, but not at all; they are perfectly good sports. Then we thought they would all want to be prima donnas, but they don't; they pull together extremely well and they are often better than men at the sort of work they are doing."

It is occasionally part of my job to inspect the barracks at our recruit depot. I am less likely to look for dust or disorder than to look for the names and faces of enlisted women who are standing so rigidly at attention at the foot of their bunks. They are keen, young faces, and the names on their name tags are from every country, and I am sure represent all forms of religion. But they are in the process of becoming marines, and this common purpose is greater than possible differences.

Of course, we women in uniform are awfully proud of the opportunity to share the military obligations of our generation. Pride in the corps and the resolve to uphold its honor, no matter what the cost to ourselves, are traditions which have been rapidly absorbed by the women. And no wonder, for American women have always gone pioneering with their men. They came over on the *Mayflower;* they went West in the prairie schooners; and now they are learning from observation and experience much of what it takes to carry out the oath they took "to protect and defend the United States of America against all its enemies whomsoever."

I am well assured that the only way they can withstand this strenuous experience is by developing the resources within themselves. First among these are the religious resources. Chaplains of all faiths are at hand to help them—not only in spiritual matters, but often in very practical matters, too. For the chaplain—not being in the chain of command—has many privileges; and frequently acts as a safety valve for all kinds of problems. Both officers and enlisted personnel are glad to avail themselves of his services.

Though military service is a strange and strenuous experience, the crucible of this war is showing up a pretty fine generation. There is nothing wrong with the crew of this ship; the men and women of the military services are working splendidly together; and are becoming something of a mutual admiration society.

I had an example of this fellowship as I was traveling to one of our big camps last winter. A very young boy in a marine uniform stopped by my chair and said: "You're Colonel Streeter, aren't you?" And when I said, "Yes," he said, "Do you mind if I talk with you a minute?" Now this lad was obviously homesick, and since I had been a mother for a good many years before I was a colonel, I said, "Sit down and tell me all about it."

Well, it seems he was having rather a tough time having just bilged out of officer training school. But he didn't want to talk about his troubles; he just wanted to tell me how fine he thought my girls were—particularly one of our recruiting sergeants in New York. He ended by saying "You know, I can't seem to take much interest in civilian girls any more. But your girls understand what it means to be a marine."

They do, indeed; and I believe this sharing of a common experience will be a very great source of strength to our country. Its young men and young women are standing side by side in our defense; and though we may regret the fate which lays such a heavy burden on this generation, they are not sorry for themselves. They are no more defeatists than your own Mr. Justice Holmes who, after serving throughout the Civil War and being wounded three times, was still able to say:

"The generation that carried on the war has been set apart by its experience. Through our great good fortune, in our youth our hearts were touched with fire. It was given to us to learn at the outset that life is a profound and passionate thing. * * * But above all we have learned that * * * the one and only success it is man's to command is to bring to his work a mighty heart."

The men and women in the services do have "mighty hearts" and you have a right to be proud of them, for they are your own children. You have probably observed that this war is being fought without slogans. It is a longer and harder war than most of us expected, and it requires all the time and effort of the people who are fighting it. They haven't much energy left for talk; and they have learned to value actions more highly than words. Consequently, such an action as your gathering here tonight in this demonstration of unity and good will means much to them. You are giving them encouragement and support; and helping them to preserve that "celestial article, freedom" for which they are working and fighting.

F. E. P. C.—Symbol of Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Rabbi J. X. Cohen, chairman of the Commission on Economic Problems of the American Jewish Congress. I have known Rabbi Cohen personally for a relatively short time, but I have had occasion for many years to observe with great admiration the work of himself and his commission on economic problems. When I read this article in the Congress Weekly of the American Jewish Congress, I felt its soundness was such that it was desirable to have it drawn to the attention of the Members of this body:

F. E. P. C.—SYMBOL OF LIBERATION

(By J. X. Cohen, B. S., C. E.)

The day after the battle many sun-bloated bodies grotesquely floated on the shallow tropic sea—dead United States marines. When their landing craft stranded on the uncharted coral reef they had waded waist deep toward death on Tarawa Beach. Machine-gun bullets no longer sprayed upon them; only the slight swell of the untroubled sea gently lapped and swayed them—as bits of decomposing driftwood. In the Signal Corps movie they appeared as nameless dead.

I wrote an item about Lt. Peter G. Lehman for our bulletin. I had known the lad as a child, watched him grow to promising manhood and his father to high honors. I wrote about Peter's several awards for bravery in combat. Between proof sheet and press time news came that he had died in aerial preinvasion maneuvers over England.

Lt. (j. g.) Charles David Pack, only child of members of the Free Synagogue, was a brilliant youth, who resigned his Washington post of achievement and distinction to enter the Navy. Months later from his small vessel he was rushed to a hospital ship, to a New Zealand base, then to a San Diego base hospital. Shortly thereafter his comrades in arms sorrowfully bade him their last farewell; taps sounded as I recited the Kaddish. The heart-rending final three volleys was the amen.

These boys, and thousands of American comrades on a hundred global fronts, died that American freedoms be preserved and enlarged. Have they died in vain?

Once upon a time—it seems so long ago now—America was but the arsenal of democracy. In those days America did all it could to aid the United Nations, "short of war." In those early days, and even in the critical war days that followed, many Americans were denied work in the arsenal plants of democracy. They were barred because of race, or creed, or color.

Imagine the bitter ironies which enter the hearts of certain American soldiers who now serve, and even die, as war heroes in planes, tanks, and ships built in certain American plants which had denied them jobs before they were called to the colors. Will they, too, have served, and died, in vain?

The zero hour for the invasion of Europe is fast approaching. It may even be upon us when these words reach the reader. Life in England, we're told, "is almost unbearably anxious," for the gigantic combined operations will form the crucial test for western civilization. Will *Festung Europa* hold firm, or will civilization get a new lease on life when the zero hour comes? But on the civilian front we are long past the zero hour. The home-front battle for the values of peace has long been raging. It is a battle to preserve and enlarge American freedoms. It will not count for much in history's ledger if the men and women in our services, fighting on many military fronts to protect human liberty, will return—many of them maimed in body and mind; others only as memories in broken hearts—to find liberty limited by race, or creed, or color.

At English bases, and elsewhere, our boys are grimly training for the deadly days when they are to sweep forward to victory with their United Nations comrades in arms. At home we, too, must unite with neighbors to prevent enemy propaganda and blind bigotry weakening us through false fractions of race, creed, and color. America's heroes, from the days of the founding fathers to the present bloody hour, must not have died in vain.

They will have died in vain if fascism takes root in America. The imported seed is sown, has been nurtured by Nazi propaganda, is well fertilized by native subversive influences. A test for the reality of American freedom, for proving that fascism has not attained rootage, is the survival of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee, now under grievous attack by certain political and industrial blocks. The F. E. P. C. has become a symbol of liberation; its survival will be one of the keys to the character of post-war America.

We will need the F. E. P. C. during the demobilization period, which will be measured in years rather than months. Wisdom will have to control the rate of return from military life to civilian activity. It should also certainly call for the extension to returned veterans of fair practice in their reemployment. The F. E. P. C., or the equivalent agency, will be the assurance to all veterans that we will keep the promise made to our fighting men and women that the peace will produce an economic order rich with the "four freedoms," available, without distinction, to all Americans. We will need the F. E. P. C. to ameliorate and control the tensions that will surcharge the transition from war to peace in our industrial life. Many industrialists will find this transition lifting them from "the featherbed of cost-plus profit" into the harsh reality of competitive enterprise, tempting some to return perhaps to unwholesome pre-war practices.

The F. E. P. C. is essential to a complete reconversion plan. If it did not exist, the acute problems that will arise when wartime controls are unwound would make its creation inevitable. Though we failed adequately to plan for the war that a few wise men predicted was inevitable, we dare not fail to plan for the demobilization and peace that all men realize is inevitable.

During the reconversion period, and for a while thereafter, what the English called distressed areas will likely spot the American scene. These may include more than the areas near gigantic industrial plants returning to former peace products, requiring months-long periods of retooling. It will certainly include areas near our mushroomed shipyards, our distended aircraft factories, and especially our nonconvertible munitions works. We built all these to operate our present forced-draft economy, the war blowing the bellows.

Many of the workers in these areas will return to their normal status—housewives to their domestic duties; youths to their schooling; the elderly to their deserved leisure. But the bulk of the workers will need the resources of Government, including the F. E. P. C., to assure equitable distribution of the limited employment opportunities available during the transition period.

As I have pointed out in the *Menace of Post-War Unemployment* (Congress Weekly, December 31, 1943), the pressures produced by mass unemployment during what we hope will be no more than a flash depression will demand the controls of a regulatory body such as the F. E. P. C.

When Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation he initiated, on a national scale, a code of fair employment practice. This historic document, born in a state of civil war, remained to a considerable degree solely a pattern for action. When Franklin Roosevelt issued his historic Executive order, nearly 3 years ago, creating the F. E. P. C., he enormously accelerated the achievement of fair employment practices and broadened their scope, to the benefit of all previously afflicted by economic discrimination.

The Emancipation Proclamation was resisted by force of arms. The Executive order is being resisted bitterly by bigoted employers and prejudiced politicians, with procedures only malice can devise. Nonetheless, as we approach the third anniversary of Executive Order No. 8802, real progress is discernible.

The F. E. P. C. has accomplished much that is of benefit to the Nation in our hour of international peril. Every minority group in America has been a beneficiary of its efforts to help achieve democracy in our economic life. Industrial, political, and moral values have been created, of permanent merit. But these intrinsic values, now demonstrably achievable, must be protected and preserved; protected from the political bloc which would destroy it, preserved for the enrichment of the peacetime economy of our country. The F. E. P. C., a hard won prewar gain, must not become a wartime political casualty.

The sweep of passionate prejudice now directed against the F. E. P. C. in and out of Congress, is the measure of its effectiveness. The effort to emasculate and destroy its potentialities must be matched, and then surpassed, by the labors of those Americans who place America's ideal, and its world destiny, above parochial and personal prejudice.

In the face of those who would eliminate the F. E. P. C. now functioning under a wartime Presidential order, we must labor to establish its statutory status as an integral element of our post-war national life. We need an authoritative governmental body that will promote equality of employment opportunity, that will assure equality of compensation, and equalize upgrading on personal merit; all these without un-American screening by race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Commission on Economic Discrimination of the American Jewish Congress, a Jewish pioneer at work in this field for nearly 15 years, realizes the acute political problems the President faces in this critical hour. To preserve and even strengthen the F. E. P. C. is certainly one of his ardent hopes. But we realize the very heavy burdens of state, civil and military, national and international, which bear upon him. We know, too, of the cesspool of prejudice whose stench befouls the cloakrooms of Congress, shocking the public whenever it disgracefully spills out upon the floor of Congress. We have stood appalled at the tangled maze of the present complex political interplay. Hence, though strongly we urge the President and his advisers to make firm and lasting the national policy of fair-employment practice which he projected, we do so with a clear understanding of the disabilities and complexities of the moment.

There are times when haste is best made slowly; when the rate of progress is less important than facing the right direction. The right direction for us as American Jews, as for all Americans, has been toward the American policy of equality of opportunity and the American ideal of fair play.

As American Jews, we do not seek a proportional representation in any industrial plant or any field of economic activity. We reject the principle of a quota standard, no matter how high or favoring it may be. We ask only for fair play; for admittance to a job, or rejection, on the basis of capacity to serve. When an employer, seeking to correct an "imbalance" says, as have some, "Hereafter we will add nothing but Jews to our staff to correct the grievous situation you have called to our attention," we declare emphatically that this new proposal is as unfair—and unwanted by us—as the previous Jewish exclusionist policy. We want all men and women judged on their personal merits, without racial or religious test. The American Constitution prohibits the making of a religious test for public office. We hold that truth to be applicable to employment in any field charged with public interest or public concern. That means all areas of employment, except the circumscribed sectors of sectarian and domestic service.

Some find discouragement today in the mustering of the reactionary elements who are attacking the F. E. P. C. as spearhead and symbol for bringing democracy into our economic life. We rather find this attack a sign of progress, a token of achievement. The opposition is no longer indifferent; it is alarmed at the advance made. No progress, no protest; much progress, many protests. That is the social equation being formulated today. Its significance is hopeful for the future.

Indeed, as has been correctly said, "it may well be that the increased volume of opposition to democratic practice in racial matters in America is being stimulated by the very fact of the disintegration of many of the older racial stereotypes, under the stress of war."

A few legislators in Washington appear determined to destroy the F. E. P. C. Theirs is a painfully partisan and grievously misguided attitude. The great body of Congress realizes more clearly that the work of the F. E. P. C. is of fundamental importance. It is hardly necessary to urge upon them that the budgetary request of the F. E. P. C. now pending before Congress merits full grant. They realize that the F. E. P. C. must not only continue its present wartime program but that it also should be converted into an integral peacetime agency of Government.

The imperious demands of wartime production created the F. E. P. C. The equally imperative demands of full-scale peacetime production should force us to maintain all elements of the population as producers as well as consumers. Men will either be allowed to work and produce their keep or else their consumptive power will be governmentally sustained. Our post-war economy will be unable to survive a multitude of unemployed and disadvantaged peoples.

Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Chief of the Army Service Forces, recently declared, "There are not going to be any apple sellers on the street corners after this war if we

can prevent it." The primary responsibility of the Army, of course, will be the wounded veterans. "It will help them," said General Somervell, who was head of the W. P. A. in New York City during our last post-war depression, "to become self-reliant, self-supporting members of their communities." The Army will have the cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, the Selective Service, the civil service, and the United States Employment Service.

This admirably conceived program is fine for the wounded veterans, whose number may run into many hundred thousands. Surely the men fortunate enough to come through unscathed, numbering seven millions, will when demobilized deserve similar consideration. They will include about half a million Jewish soldiers, sailors, flyers, and marines, about 1,000,000 Negroes, and a very large number of other minority groups who had been subjected, as peacetime civilians, to employment disabilities because of race, creed, or color.

To assure the successful rehabilitation and reintegration of these nonwounded veterans the F. E. P. C. must be added to the list of governmental agencies above enumerated. In fact, the F. E. P. C. may even be found essential to round out the Government program for rehabilitation of the wounded veterans. In any event the continuance of the F. E. P. C. is so clearly indicated one would feel restrained in belaboring the point if the opposition were not so vociferous and so strongly entrenched. It is therefore essential that we make clear the need of the democratic principle, upon which the F. E. P. C. is based, for our peacetime national economic well-being.

Our wartime economy has demonstrated that the only limit to our productive capacity is manpower. Economists have declared "manpower sets the only upper limit to what the United States can do." To deny ourselves the use of available manpower now—as do plants at present guilty of discrimination—is treason to the war effort. This the F. E. P. C. is effectively laboring to reduce.

To deny ourselves available manpower, through discrimination, during the critical days of conversion to peace production, will be treason to the better America for which our men are fighting. We will need the F. E. P. C., or its Congress created counterpart, to counteract this evil practice, to protect our fighting men when they seek to reenter productive civilian life. More than that, we will need all their productive capacity, all their manpower, to help build that amazingly generous producer-consumer economy which the war production schedules have demonstrated America can achieve.

They are being achieved today through inter-racial, inter-faith, inter-group cooperation on all production fronts. Our men and women at work are taking their cue from our men and women on all fighting fronts.

Those who would deny continuance to the F. E. P. C. would deny fundamental American ideals. They would betray the men and women whose lives are being freely given on our battlefronts. Whether consciously or not, they would promote race hatred and anti-Semitism. Race hatred and anti-Semitism are "blood brothers of fascism." D-day for fascism is swiftly approaching. *Festung Europa* is reeling under the devastating preparatory blows of our bombers. Fascism, at bitter, bloody cost to us in the lives of American youth, will certainly be destroyed. With the help of the United Nations, it surely will be extirpated from Europe. It must find no rootage in America. Here, too, it must be destroyed. To that holy end we must again, in Lincoln's solemn adjuration, "highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

Jury Trial in Property Condemnation Cases

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in S. 919, providing jury trials in cases where land is taken by the Federal Government, including lands taken for flood control. We were able to pass this bill in the House during the Seventy-seventh Congress, only to have it defeated in the other body. S. 919 has now passed the Senate and we should lose no time in passing it here.

In pressing for passage of this bill providing jury trial of cases where the Government seeks to condemn the property of the landowner for flood control I am impelled by the desire to see that the landowner in these cases may be able to get fair and reasonable pay for his lands if taken from him by force.

It comes close home to me, for in my district large areas were taken by the Government on appraisals and reports of commissioners, and in many instances the landowner has been forced to see his home, his land, and his all taken for an inadequate price.

When I was elected to Congress the Government was putting into operation reservoir flood-control plans, including Sardis and Arkabutla Reservoirs; the lands had been taken and steps made to flood great areas of fertile lands over the protest of the landowners.

In some few cases commissioners' hearings had been had, but payment had not been made. I made trip after trip to the War Department in an effort to secure an increase in price. The War Department, as it seems always to do, would not question the decision of its appraisers. In many cases they claimed the landowners had willingly signed options. Of course, we know that if they did it was because they were faced with condemnation in a commissioner's court. As stated, the bill providing for jury trial passed the House only to fail to pass the Senate. These cases were finally determined, leaving no way to compensate the owner for the real value of his property.

In one instance a whole town was moved. One of the finest small towns in Mississippi, Coldwater, with beautiful homes, old shade trees, and a history in which its inhabitants rightfully took pride, had the property of its citizens over their protest taken at the price of the War Department, with no chance for a jury to determine its value.

Under authority granted it in 1938, 3 years before I became a Member of this body, the War Department plans to further expand its flood-control projects in that area. Of course, the people affected are seriously disturbed, and rightfully so. They sent me thousands of protests, which I placed before the War Department and the President in company with representatives from Water Valley and Enid, Miss. Additional protests were made to the President and to the War Department on the use of manpower and materials during this war emergency for such purpose.

Finally on this basis construction was held up for the duration of the war. The War Department still insists that these dams at Enid and Coffeeville must be built.

The only chance which these citizens have to prevent this construction is that no appropriation for their construction be made. I have assured them that their every protest will be filed with the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, and every argument and all evidence against the construction presented. What the chances to protect them are I do not know. If the appropriation cannot be held up they will face the same situation as faced the people in the Sardis and Arkabutla areas in spite of all help.

One of these proposed projects, the Enid Dam, if constructed will take a wide and fertile area of land which normally produces a bale of cotton to the acre. Should the project go through practically all the trade areas of Enid, a small town in my home county, will be taken and the trade of this little town lost. It will also cut deeply into the trade area of Water Valley, one of the most prosperous towns in our section and will cause many of the best citizens of the community to have to abandon their homes.

Another project, the Grenada Dam, if the War Department secures an appropriation, will take a great part of the lands in the Yalobusha and Schuna Valleys, lands of great fertility and production. It will wipe away most of the trade area of Coffeeville, a fine, historic town, and an old established trade center. Waters will be backed to the very limits and into this town. Taxes will be lost and the outstanding bonds placed on the remaining lands. These projects have been held up for the duration of the war, but with the authority already granted in 1938 and the War Department determined, no one can say what the future holds.

For over 2 years I have worked persistently to get some relief for the landowners in the Arkabutla and Sardis area. I have tried to get some hearing and some consideration for them. The Senate failed to pass the jury trial bill, the War Department refused to do anything, and the committees of Congress cannot go behind the decision of the commissioner's court. S. 919 should be passed so that the property owner would have an opportunity to secure the real value of his property.

There is another very unfair result from the construction of the Arkabutla and Sardis Reservoirs before-mentioned Many thousands of acres of land were taken off the tax rolls. In Panola, De Soto, Lafayette, and Marshall Counties particularly, did this work a great hardship. The various supervisors' districts

had outstanding indebtedness as well as the various school districts and other taxing districts. The Federal Government did not pay off any of such bonds. This meant that these bonds were placed on the lands remaining in these districts and thereby the tax rate increased. This action has seriously crippled local government and makes it nearly impossible for them to operate.

In Benton, Tippah, and Marshall, Union, and Yalobusha Counties lands were taken for other Federal purposes, all before I became a Member of this body. In none of those cases were any of the outstanding bonds paid off and a tremendous hardship has been placed on the county governments and on the people.

Sometime ago I introduced a bill providing that in all those cases the Federal Government would be required to pay off a share of the bonds outstanding of any taxing district in which it took lands in the same proportion that the value of the lands taken had to the lands in such taxing district.

This bill is now before the Public Lands Committee, and with the support it has I believe it should be and will be enacted into law.

I sincerely trust that the House of Representatives will pass S. 919 and H. R. 4515, which I have discussed. Give to the people and to local government the rights to which they are entitled.

If the American citizen is guaranteed the right of trial by jury when charged with a criminal offense; if individuals in a suit at common law where the amount in controversy is $20 or more are guaranteed a jury trial; if the individual landowner who has his property taken for an Army camp, a naval base, or for the erection of a post office or other Federal buildings has the right of trial by jury to fix his damages or compensation, how can there be any excuse for refusing such right of jury trial to his neighbor who has his property taken not to further the war effort but to improve other lands? To refuse to such individuals the right to a jury trial is to deny to them equal rights under the law. I cannot believe the membership of this House believes in such unfair treatment.

I do not know what the future holds, but I do know that in removing a man from his home many things aside from the simple sales value of the lands must be considered. The fact that he has become sentimentally attached to the lands, that he knows his neighbors, he has his church connection, his family are buried in the nearby cemetery, his children know the other children in the school, and that it has been the home of his father, his mother, and his forefathers all endear the old home to him.

Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!

These are matters that jurors with like feeling and like surroundings will consider, matters that Government appraisers and commissioners may not see and they are matters that in the eventual long run the Government should allow to be paid.

In other words, being elected by these people and living as we do in a land of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty should I not make the strongest fight possible for the interest of these, my people, and do all within my power to save for them the thing most dear to them, their homes.

Sewell Avery Versus the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the third of the series of articles appearing in the Chicago Sun under the title of "Sewell Avery Versus the People." This article, which appeared in the May 17, 1944, issue, is entitled "Ward Sit-Down Strike Against Labor Peace Told in W. L. B. Records," and is as follows:

WARD SIT-DOWN STRIKE AGAINST LABOR PEACE TOLD IN W. L. B. RECORDS

(Third of a series)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—Records of the National War Labor Board and of Federal courts in the District of Columbia make it plain that Sewell Lee Avery and his Montgomery Ward & Co., are on a sit-down strike against the Government's program for labor-management peace on a cooperative basis.

One of the best illustrations can be drawn from the record of the W. L. B. hearing conducted here on January 20 in connection with the dispute at Ward's Hummer Manufacturing Co., subsidiary in Springfield, Ill. The hearing developed a union charge that Avery's firm had declared it would not comply with the W. L. B.'s directive in the case unless it were compelled to do so.

John A. Barr, Avery's labor relations counsel who represented the company at this hearing, did not bother to deny the charge when it was made by H. A. Schrader, spokesman for the International Association of Machinists (A. F. of L.). Referring to meetings between the Hummer management and the union, Schrader told the board:

"* * * The company in these conferences had told the union that they would absolutely not comply with the National Labor Board directive, they would have to be compelled to comply. * * *"

That unchallenged statement explains why Avery and Wards have more disputed cases pending before the W. L. B. than any other American company or corporation.

It also explains the tactics by which Avery and Montgomery Ward have kept cases before the Board for more than 2 years. These time-consuming tactics have cost the American people thousands of dollars in direct governmental expenditures — the exact amount cannot be determined—and much in the way of lowered morale.

Delay in settlement of labor cases causes unrest, brings on strike threats and spreads the germ of disaffection throughout the country.

Take, for example, the eight Montgomery Ward cases, out of 22 pending, in which the W. L. B. has issued final directives. These cases came to Washington from all sections of the Nation—Denver, Detroit, New York, Portland, Oreg., St. Paul, Minn., Oakland, Calif., San Rafael, Calif., Springfield, Ill., as well as Chicago. They involved approximately 7,000 of the men and women who last year helped Avery to net a cool $20,677,098 profit for his company, on net sales of $595,932,821.

Three of the eight cases have been before the W. L. B. since 1942, the remainder since the spring of 1943. But the origin of the disputes, in most instances, goes back much further, to the days when Avery defied the National Recovery Administration and the National Labor Relations Board.

While these eight cases have ground slowly toward final decision, Ward's attorneys have been burbling Avery's assertions of the illegality of Government action and his protestations of a fundamental friendship toward unionism, like a broken phonograph record.

And when the W. L. B. was able finally to reach a decision in these eight cases, Avery's attorneys hurried into Federal courts of the District of Columbia seeking injunctions to prevent enforcement of five of the decisions. These suits are still pending.

In the other three cases the W. L. B. decisions have been of such recent date that the company as yet has not indicated what its course will be. But the Avery reliance on the delay which can be generated through the courts is not likely to be overlooked, officials believe.

As Avery's legal labor expert, Barr, observed at the W. L. B. hearing on January 20 in the Hummer case:

"Let's remember that the courts are established by the law and not by the people."

The list of the eight cases reveals the motive behind Avery's sit-down strike—his implacable determination not to grant union security to the employees of Montgomery Ward and unwillingness to extend to them the arbitration rights enjoyed by two-thirds of American industry.

The case came to the W. L. B. on June 2, 1942, after the Rt. Rev. Francis J. Haas, now bishop of Grand Rapids, Mich., acting as Federal conciliator, had been rebuffed by Avery in attempts to bring the company into agreement with the United Mail Order, Warehouse, and Retail Employees Union (C. I. O.).

The union won a partial victory in the first round, a 5-cent-an-hour increase in wages—a third of what it had asked—after unanimous action of an investigating panel had been ratified by the W. L. B.

Ward's accepted that, but when the panel came up with an unanimous O. K. of union security, arbitration, and seniority rights, the company's lawyers went into action. They challenged the Board's jurisdiction, on the ground the company was not in war production. The Board, nevertheless, took jurisdiction on June 26, 1942, ruling that Ward's was engaged in work "which contributes to effective prosecution of the war."

At that point, Sewell Avery had the choice of accepting the decisions of the Board, set up to deal with wartime labor disputes, or continuing his private war against labor unions. He chose the latter, and continued to insist that everything the Board did was illegal.

He did concede, however, that he would accept the Board's order if directed to do so by the President. President Roosevelt, on November 18, 1942, issued such an order, and Avery negotiated a contract with the union.

But when he sat down to sign it on November 30, the company incorporated a statement that it was being signed under duress and only because the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief in time of war, had expressly ordered that the union security clauses be included.

The union refused to sign a contract containing such a disclaimer, and wired the W. L. B. for support to enforce its original directive. The W. L. B. proposed a liberal compromise, which Avery spurned.

On December 12, the President again directed the company to comply with the Board's order, and Avery yielded. The agreement was finally signed on December 8, for a period of one year.

Thus the pattern of Avery's resistance to the Federal Government was set. When the contract was about to expire, Avery served notice that it was canceling the agreement, and upon its expiration challenged the claims of the union that had represented a majority of Ward employees. From there on the facts leading to the seizure are well known.

The union now is approximately on the position it was on June 2, 1942, again moving into position to get a contract with Ward's.

W. L. B. rulings in the Chicago case were setting precedents for Ward's on the issues involved—seniority, arbitration, wages, union security and the jurisdiction of the W. L. B.

But despite these rulings, which established an over-all policy for Ward employees everywhere, Avery refused to extend the Chicago terms to other Ward plants, with the result that their unions were compelled to come to the W. L. B. to obtain the rights to which the Chicago rulings entitled them.

Virtually identical issues were raised in the joint case of the Denver-Detroit-New York plants which reached the Board on December 15, 1942, the St. Paul case certified on February 13, 1943, the Portland case certified on February 18, 1943, the Oakland case, certified March 26, 1943, the San Rafael case, certified April 19, 1943, and the Hummer case brought before the Board on August 11, 1942.

On the principles established in the Chicago case, the Board began reaching approximately identical conclusions in the new cases, but under the situation which Avery had created, each case had to be handled separately with protracted and costly hearings and with individual opportunities for ingenuity in causing delay.

These delays weighed more heavily on the unions than on Avery and Montgomery Ward, who had originated this form of legal obstructionism.

After hearing the broken Avery phonograph record again and again, the Board's feeling was epitomized by Emil Rieve, a labor member, who broke into one of Barr's circuitous arguments at a hearing early this year to say:

"I am getting a little sick of sitting here and listening to representatives of the company putting on record misleading and lying statements, and they know it, when they called this form of union security a form of closed shop, when they mention arbitration on any issue that the union may raise. They don't say that the company also may raise any issue. They are lying and they know it and I don't think we ought to waste our time with that type of misrepresentation."

Nevertheless, the Board already is in the process of handling 12 other Ward controversies which have been certified on issues that have already been decided.

These involve plants at Cheyenne, Wyo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; East St. Louis, Ill.; Washington, Pa.; Baltimore, Md.; Trenton, N. J.; Kansas City, Kans.; Pueblo, Colo.; Barre, Vt.; Oakland, Calif.; Menands, N. Y.; and, of course, the still unsettled renewal of the Chicago case.

Avery and Montgomery Ward operate 8 mail-order houses and 631 retail stores and warehouses. If Avery brings cases on each of these units up to the Board 1 by 1 his expensive legal staff need fear no post-war depression.

Flood Damage in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce will come to the House shortly by way of conference from the Senate. This bill will include appropriations for our Weather Bureau. Among items in this bill are those which include funds for carrying out the Flash Flood Weather Warning Service, which I sponsored some years ago and over which there has been some discussion. I call the attention of the House to the fact that in my district we have had disastrous floods resulting in great property damage and in many cases loss of life.

One of these disastrous floods occurred in my district and apparently concentrated in my home town of Norfolk, Nebr., early last Friday morning, May 12, resulting in approximately $1,500,000 damage; covering the entire business section and much of the residential section; necessitated the evacuation of 400 persons and resulted in the injury of several people.

I call your attention to this disaster in my home town and district in order to assure Members that their vote in favor of the appropriation for the relief of flood victims, passed only a few days ago, was not only timely but meritorious. I also bring this matter before you in order to urge an unanimity in the passage of appropriations for the Weather Bureau, especially, to continue the Flash Flood Weather Warning Service, which, in my opinion, resulted in the saving of some lives, the saving of some livestock and some property due to advance information of the coming of this flood through the representatives of the Weather Bureau who are engaged in this important work.

The flood at Norfolk, Nebr., and the surrounding territory resulted from heavy rains and the overflowing of the Elkhorn and North Fork Rivers and although certain precautions have been taken in that area by the organization of drainage districts, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Committee on Flood Control in order that some invesigation can be made by the Army engineers to give the officials in my district the value of the expert advice of the flood-control organization of our Government so that some development can be started immediately to prevent the recurrence of these floods. Considerable legislation has been passed by this House in connection with flood control in the Missouri River Basin and I feel some investigation should be made immediately in order that similar legislation can be developed for the alleviation of these continued damages done by the floods which occur frequently in the Elkhorn Valley and elsewhere throughout the Third Congressional District of Nebraska. I have taken these matters up with the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control and other Members of the House who have to do with flood control and also with the Army engineers. I feel that the organizations we have set up can be of some assistance to the city, town, county, and State officials so that some immediate action can be initiated in order to assure the people in my district that preventative measures can and will be taken to assure them that similar disastrous floods will be controlled.

The loss at Norfolk, Nebr., will be virtually complete, in my opinion, due to the fact that partically every basement in the business section of the city was flooded and most of the stock stored in the basements were either destroyed or damaged beyond salvaging. I am informed that very little flood damage insurance was carried. From the information given to me from my home town on the morning during the flood, it was not uncommon for residents to see in their yards pounds of coffee, oranges, grapefruit, chick food, telephone poles, oil cans, oil barrels and cans of various products cluttering up their lawns. This indicates the great damage which was done by the flood to necessary foods and supplies in one community.

There were many instances of heroism displayed by the men and women in this flooded area. There were many thrilling rescues. I am sure the House of Representatives will be interested to know that the Red Cross organizations, both the men and women workers, the physicians, the city officials and volunteers worked as a unit in order to safeguard life, health, and saw to the feeding of the evacuated citizens and participated in many other activities in bringing relief and comfort. This was carried out in such a manner as to bring great credit upon those individuals and officials who worked untold hours during a community crisis. I cannot refrain, Mr. Speaker, from complimenting the Federal Communications Commission for granting immediate permission to the Radio Station WJAG at Norfolk, Nebr., for unlimited time to broadcast warnings and information regarding this flood. I am informed through authoritative sources that this radio station, being flooded out at its regular studios, moved its facilities to the location of its transmitting station on higher ground and from that location informed the people throughout the territory of the conditions of the flood and in many cases was responsible in preventing the loss of life and property.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should not only continue the Flash Flood Weather Warning Service which was inaugurated in my district but that we should expand it in such way as to make it available to all of the citizens who are affected occasionally by these flash floods in order that they can be given ample warning for the purpose of saving life and property by advance information.

Mr. Speaker, two flood control or flood relief bills have been passed by this House. One is House Joint Resolution

280 which appropriates $15,000,000 to provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1944 in order to enable them to continue farming operations to produce food for the war effort. Another is H. R. 4793 which authorizes appropriations of $12,000,000 to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods. Both of these measures were passed by this body at about the time the communities in my district were being ravaged by the flood waters of the Norfolk and Elkhorn Rivers. Both pieces of legislation will be of valuable assistance to my district. However, this legislation has not yet been passed by the Senate, and I am making these brief remarks in order to call attention of the Congress to the time element involved and the necessity of having this legislation completed and made into law.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have referred to should bring temporary relief to my district but it is necessary and should be enacted into law as soon as possible.

My interest also is centered upon some permanent work on the Elkhorn and Northfork Rivers through the Army engineers. I believe a survey should be made as soon as possible in order that this section of my district can be brought into new and proposed permanent flood-control legislation. It is for that reason I have taken the matter up with the Army engineers and also with the Honorable WILL WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the House Committee on Flood Control. I have received sympathetic attention to my requests for a survey and report which I am sure the people in my district who have suffered much as the result of these floods will appreciate.

Address of Vice Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vice Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy, the Chief of Naval Personnel, before the seventh annual dinner of the Massachusetts Council of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, Boston, Mass., May 11, 1944:

I am glad to be here tonight and to find myself in such distinguished company. As I understand it, your council exists to foster good will among various religious groups. You work to create mutual understanding, convinced that the old enmities, the old hostilities, will dissolve if men of good will only take the trouble to know each other. It is an example that is sorely needed and I wish you continued success. Your meeting tonight is an island of harmony and reasonableness in a cantankerous world. I congratulate you on your intellectual courage in facing an old and troublesome issue with the determination to do something about it. To find Catholics, Protestants, and Jews searching out what they have in common should of course occasion no surprise—it is the kind of conduct we might well expect in any land that pretends to be civilized and emotionally mature. Yet we know this is a relatively new idea. You in this council are giving a demonstration of joint endeavor that can't help but inspire imitation. You are countering the flow of malice and bitterness by putting new and healthier ideas into the national thought-stream.

I am not a psychologist, and would not pretend to know how religious prejudices are born and nourished. I suspect that these old distrusts are deep rooted and have the durability of weeds. Many of us not only protect our prejudices with considerable care but cherish them. Perhaps the best most of us ever do is to admit the other fellow's right to be dead wrong. To displace intolerance, to substitute the spirit of live-and-let-live, will take the efforts of our best minds and most stalwart leaders. It is ironic, of course, that so many of history's ugliest chapters have been written because of religious persecution and in the blood of men who believed themselves exclusively enlightened.

It would be pointless to deny that bitterness over religion still exists in this country and can still be provoked into flame. Archbishop Spellman has remarked with deep concern that bigotry in some ways seems more widespread and virulent now than ever before. No one need be reminded of the disgraceful symptoms. The excitement of war may contribute to this. There is inevitably a lot of loud talk and loose thinking. The atmosphere is highly charged, nerves are worn thin.

We are, nevertheless, making visible progress. We are getting away from the idea—and it has been a tenacious one—that men of different religions must inevitably be natural enemies. We have reached a stage where some of the burning issues of the past seem not only disgraceful but preposterous.

We find it fantastic to read that in one of our most enlightened States a man once could attend Quaker meetings only on pain of having his ears cut off. We read with mingled disgust and amusement how the president of a great college once was compelled to resign on the charge—made with great heat—that he was a Baptist. The State was Massachusetts. The college was Harvard.

But I did not come here tonight to speak in generalities about intolerance and religious persecution. Instead, I thought I would tell you some things that come under my scrutiny as the Chief of Naval Personnel. They concern a side of Navy life that has a direct bearing on the problem in which you are interested. We have a Navy today of about 3,000,000 men and women. The striking truth is that we shall shortly have almost as many craft, of all kinds, as we had officers and men in 1933. Now, 3,000,000 make up a considerable population group. The statisticians need far less than that to get an adequate cross-section of the entire Nation. And this is a diverse group, too, coming from every corner of the country, every conceivable family background. We have men from the most devout and orthodox of homes; we have men of every possible denomination and every conceivable variation of religious beliefs and customs. I thought it might be of real interest to you to hear how this works out, since it is very closely connected with the goals you have set for this council.

There are parents who have wondered, I imagine, whether their son is given the kind of religious services in the Navy that he found at home, services in accordance with his training. Some may have feared men in the service would have to be content with some sore of amalgamated, all-purpose religion that would attempt to fit all faiths. A kind of spiritual emergency ration, in other words, I want to quiet any such fears. There is no such wartime makeshift. On the contrary, I believe many of the home front would be mildly astonished and greatly pleased to see how closely religious life even in the forward action areas corresponds to the same thing at home. No man is ever asked to attend services other than his own; no man is ever invited to alter his allegiance. The Navy chaplains scrupulously respect a man's right to be anything he pleases. That is the whole keynote of the Navy's religious program—respect and deference for the other fellows right to be different.

The Navy does not attempt to compose religious differences; the Navy is not interested in finding some kind of a religious compromise or middle ground. We recognize that differences exist and do our level best to honor them. Chaplains work as hard to provide services for men of other faiths as they do for their own. The Protestant chaplain who finds himself responsible for Catholic and Jewish men makes it a point of honor to provide services for them, as well as for men of his own faith. As an instance of consideration for the other man's views, I might cite the fact that the military ordinariate of the Roman Catholic Church prefers having Catholic chaplains called chaplain rather than father. This is out of consideration for the Protestant boy who might want to talk to a clergyman and yet finds the unfamiliar word "father" a trifle embarrassing. Of course, I might add that the men themselves are likely to solve such problems in much simpler fashion—all the chaplains are likely to be called padre; nor do the men seem much concerned about which chaplain it is who writes letters for them, ministers to the wounded, or gets that pay account straightened out. A shaving kit provided by a Catholic chaplain, they tell me, will cut off Presbyterian whiskers as well as one provided by a Presbyterian.

It isn't always easy to provide services for all three major groups, but the chaplains do their best, and their best is very good. They are versed in all kinds, as I shall mention later. Indeed, our Director of Chaplains, Capt. Robert D. Workman, recently was given an honorary degree of doctor of divinity by the Jewish Institute of Religion, and Captain Workman is a good Presbyterian. Of course, the men themselves are a lot of help when a chaplain gets in a tight spot.

One of our Catholic chaplains found himself in an advance marine base where he had no chance of finding a Protestant chaplain for his Protestant charges. The good father, there in the wilds of Oceania, was perfectly competent to produce a good grade of Protestant church service but he labored under one handicap. The hymns were strange to him, and he worried a little about getting the music started. Fortunately, it turned out he had a couple of good bull-voiced baritones in the crowd who sang so sturdily the chaplain's own halting performance couldn't be heard anyway. But one Sunday morning as the chaplain took his place before the congregation he saw to his dismay that his two song leaders were missing. And to his chagrin, the chaplain could not for the life of him remember how the opening hymn began. He stood there in growing embarrassment. There was a moment of silence. Then a Texas voice sang out a word of encouragement from the rear of the congregation. "That's all right, preacher," the marine called out, "We'll take care of the singing—you just give us hell."

I think you would be stirred by the men's eagerness for church services, and the ingenuity they show in building altars even in the wilderness. It has been said there are no atheists in fox holes. However, that is, we know that church attendance in the Navy is large, even when services must be conducted under conditions of extreme difficulty. Services are held so close to the enemy that the men on watch dare not bow their heads to pray. On many of our fighting ships a prayer is standard preparation for battle. On a famous carrier, with planes warming up on the flight deck, the skipper asked the chaplain to pray over the bull horn. It was a devout prayer, and a humble one, but it was certainly audible. The chaplain's words were amplified so much that men in vessels a mile away could say "Amen."

At times services must be conducted during antiaircraft firing, with the men covering their ears and opening their mouths as the guns speak. Services have been conducted in shipyards, with the chaplain trying to make himself heard above the clamor of riveting machines. Services are conducted with enemy planes all but overhead and enemy submarines hoping to ram home a torpedo any minute. The pews may be ammunition boxes, the pulpit a mess table. One outfit has a set of chimes—made from large caliber antiaircraft shells. Yet you would never doubt the sincerity of this worship, and you would be impressed I think, to see how carefully services in the action areas duplicate services at home. The hymns are the familiar hymns, and I shouldn't wonder but what the sermons are a little familiar, too. There is one difference, and I may as well make a clean breast of it. Aboard ship one familiar Sunday morning feature is missing. We don't take up the collection. I have to report that we get little or no complaint about this omission.

I would not conceal from you that many a chaplain has entered the service troubled deeply about what will happen to his own religious beliefs. Many have wondered whether they can retain their own faith and still minister, as they must, to men of other faiths. I know of an orthodox Rabbi who had grave misgivings on this score. I am proud to say he finished the chaplains' school glowing with enthusiasm. He found not the slightest necessity, he said, for diluting his own convictions. "Not only were differences taken for granted," he said later, "but with the proverbial 57 varieties of religious denominations represented, each group was expected to be different * * * differences were not the exception but the norm. The basic philosophy was harmony, not uniformity. An ideal relationship was cultivated because we all sought to understand and appreciate the spiritual values and religious symbols of our colleagues."

No one in the Chaplain Corps, in other words, need ever compromise his conscience. On the other hand, the men who train at the Chaplains' School in Williamsburg, Va., do learn a great deal about other religious customs. The chaplains live in double rooms there, and they are assigned space not according to their denomination but in the order of reporting for duty. Thus any combination may be found in any room—Catholic and Jew, United Brethren and Unitarian, and so on. Many lasting friendships are made. They learn mutual respect, they learn how to live together in harmony, and if they didn't learn anything else they would learn how to get along without stepping on the other fellow's feelings. They learn to cooperate, as someone has aptly said, without compromise.

I do not pretend to know what the terrible and often inspiring experiences of this war will to the 9,000 clergymen serving as Army and Navy chaplains. That is for deeper minds than mine. I do know that the chaplains are doing a wonderful job and that many a skipper considers his chaplain the single most important officer aboard, for the hope and the strength the chaplain can impart to the men. The way the chaplains are conducting themselves, the bravery and devotion they are showing, is writing a deeply moving chapter of this war. The churches owe them—all churches owe them—a great debt of gratitude. Organized religion couldn't possibly have representatives—I almost said "demonstrators"—whose services are more appreciated, who stand higher in the eyes of the men. They are ministering to our fighting men in the fullest, finest sense of the word "minister." Their help will not soon be forgotten. Along with winning respect they are winning real affection. In one battle, the chaplain and the dentist manned a forward dressing station. The men joked afterward that—for a couple of ill-assorted amateurs—they made a great team. "The dentist patched up the wounds," they said, "and the chaplain prayed that the dentist was doing the right thing."

Just what new wisdom these hundreds of battle-tempered chaplains will bring back with them I don't know, although it is an interesting subject for speculation. They have seen humanity at its worst and at its amazing best, on the invasion beaches, under attack by bombing planes, and in the terrible, clear light of star shells. I think it may give the chaplains a depth of understanding that will greatly enrich our national thinking. And I cannot believe men of their experience ever will lend themselves to the petty bickering of small-minded bigots.

By the same token, I think the officers and men are learning a great deal about the good that is common to all religious faiths. The Methodist from Iowa who forms a firm friendship with a Catholic from Baltimore is going to be hard to convince that Catholics are something sinister. The Catholic from Chicago who flies in the same plane with a Jewish boy from Brooklyn is not going to become a Jew-baiter. I hope "antis" of all kind will find slim pickings among our returning servicemen. They may give us a needed transfusion of good will. You might be interested in a heart-warming episode that took place in the naval training station, Newport, R. I., last winter. Christmas Eve, and Christmas Day, naturally found many men with duties to perform. More than 500 Jewish men stepped in, gave up their free time, to take over the duties of tha^ many of their Christian shipmates, so the Catholics and Protestants might attend Christmas services. The Jewish men in many instances took over 8-hour watches. The suggestion came from a Jewish chaplain, and the men did this voluntarily, simply out of respect for the other man's religion. That is something finer and more concrete than mere negative tolerance.

The years ahead may very well be the most portentous in our history. We need all our national strength, we need cool heads and calm judgment. It is encouraging to see a group like yours, searching for the things which may unify us, so we may go forward as one Nation, indivisible.

A year ago you had as your guest the late Frank Knox, a former resident of Boston who always had a warm spot in his heart for this city. He is lost to us now. I know you share my sadness at his passing. Frank Knox was a man to whom patriotism was something more than a pleasant emotion. Every ounce of his energy, every bit of his ability, was his country's to command. There were no "ifs" or "buts" about it, he made no selfish reservations, he held nothing back. He was no summer patriot, no part-time American. He was an American who really worked at it. The country could use more of his fine spirit.

The Montgomery Ward Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of letters I have received from my district protesting the seizure of Montgomery Ward are clear evidence that the people of this country are fully aware of the threat to our constitutional liberties inherent in such an arbitrary, dictatorial abuse of wartime powers. The people of the Nation well realize that over and beyond the immediate implications of this unwarranted action is the danger that in similar fashion could all our freedoms be abridged and no one be protected from enforced submission to a dictatorial will.

For this reason it is essential that Congress thoroughly investigate the Montgomery Ward seizure and clarify completely the powers which have been given to the Chief Executive in the interest of speedy prosecution of the war. Such an investigation should make clear that there has been no delegation of power which would warrant such total disregard of our constitutional guaranties. I know that the American people are ready and willing to undergo any suffering and privation necessary to bring this war to a speedy conclusion, but I know also that they will not silently submit to defiance of the republican principles our boys are giving their very lives to defend.

I should like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel. It seems to me that this editorial points up the most important question involved in the Montgomery Ward affair; that is, the preservation of the Constitution, which, in turn, means the preservation of the three independent branches of our Government. Surely, when the Attorney General suggests that "The court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive," he is making an unequivocal demand that we disregard forever the Constitution of the United States.

The editorial follows:

IT IS HAPPENING HERE

Today, this Nation is perilously close to the end of its period of existence as a representative Republic.

The scheme by which this may be accomplished is emerging, and the shape of it is becoming clear, as the struggle between the new forces of autocracy and those of the Republic reaches a tense climax in the neighboring city of Chicago.

If you doubt that, you have only to watch what is transpiring.

Adolf Hitler has his Himmler.

Mussolini had his roving castor-oil squadrons.

Lenin had his Trotsky and his Stalin.

When the initial phase of the battle of Montgomery Ward's was ended the other day with the military coup d'etat, President Roosevelt sent down to Chicago the man who is in the Cabinet as Attorney General of the United States.

It could be that Mr. Biddle has had, all along, the conviction that he was writhing in the womb of destiny, and that one day his time would come.

At least, something was a-borning in Chicago, and Mr. Biddle was there. This was to be his hour.

What he had to say at the hearing before the Federal district judge leaves no further doubt about what the Washington oligarchy intends to do.

And what it intends to do, it will do—unless the Nation's people, who have been drugged with fake promises and phony talk and poisonous theories for the last decade, rise up in some new-found wrath and seize the Government back into their own hands, where it belongs.

Mr. Biddle is more candid than his superior. He minces no words.

The scheme is clear in his own mind, and he knows where he's going—and how.

"Particularly in time of war," said the Attorney General, "the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive."

He was addressing Federal Judge Holly. He was telling Judge Holly that he no longer had jurisdiction. That the war had transcended all civil rights guarantied by the American Constitution.

He was telling him that the courts, in time of war, should be powerless; that they must subjugate their will to the will of the President.

This is Mr. Biddle's own construction.

He knows the Constitution grants no such authority; that it makes no provision for a fuehrer who is to be supreme in time of war.

He knows that for America to concede such a point would be to admit that the Constitution was a scrap of paper. He knows that the courts were created by the Constitution to protect the people against just such men as Mr. Biddle and Mr. Roosevelt and all the others of the oligarchy.

He knows it, but apparently doesn't care.

Listen again:

"The President," said Biddle, "has a great constitutional reserve of power. * * * No business or property is immune to his order."

Mr. Biddle has forgotten which constitution he's talking about.

Germany has a constitution, too. So does Russia. So did Italy.

And under them, Mr. Hitler and Mr. Stalin have (and Mr. Mussolini did have) a great "reserve of constitutional power"—a reserve backed by the bayonets of their armies.

Our own American Constitution says, clearly, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Note, also, Mr. Biddle's final sentence above: "No business or property is immune to his order."

The Attorney General is not only placing his own construction on the laws which Congress has passed. He is trying to make his own laws, and trusting that somehow he can make them stick.

So, no business or property is safe from confiscation by any platoon of soldiers, acting on Presidential order. Mr. Biddle says so, and if we agree to this construction of the law, it is so.

That, of course, is government by Executive fiat.

It is government, not by law, but by the bayonet.

Let's look further.

Mr. Biddle says that the President had a right to seize the Montgomery Ward store because: The War Labor Disputes Act does not specifically forbid him to do so; and, that Congress intended to include retail stores among those businesses which could be seized by the President, but neglected to do so.

Such reasoning as this is so specious, so asinine, and yet smacks so much of the reasoning of European dictators that it is as frightening as it is unbelievable.

By such vicious standards, the President can do anything that no law specifically forbids him to do. That covers a lot of territory; it covers enough that the President could, on the basis of it, take dictatorial control of the whole country at his whim.

Mr. Biddle's prattle about what Congress intended to do exposes the New Deal mind for what it is—a mind warped to the will of the leader who considers that both the judicial and legislative branches of our Government should be, and indeed are, subsidiary to the Chief Executive.

Mr. Biddle would at once be lawmaker and judge. He would make the laws that are expedient, and he would interpret those that are already passed, to suit himself and the leader. (The German word for leader is fuehrer.)

He would put words into the mouths of the people's Congress and read into a law an intent that is clearly not present, and obviously never intended to be present.

Mr. Roosevelt has reached the place where he thinks his word is the law, and feels the time has come to put his belief to the test. Mr. Biddle in the last few tumultuous days has been doing the spade work.

He is now standing by for destiny.

In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein In Memoriam written by Maj. Manfred A. Pakas, a resident of my congressional district:

IN MEMORIAM

(By Major Pakas)

On May 30 America celebrates Memorial Day, the day set apart when Americans pay tribute to the illustrious dead who sacrified their all that this Nation might live.

Reverently, gratefully, we decorate the graves of those who gave their last full measure of devotion that the people of the United States might enjoy peace, security, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness.

We cannot hold the rights of liberty unless we accept the responsibilities of liberty. We cannot exercise the privileges of freedom unless we assume the obligations of freedom.

These priceless inheritances must be safeguarded zealously—held inviolate for future generations. We, the living, are trustees charged by the dead with the sacred duty of preserving and protecting our precious liberty. This glorious birthright must pass on, untarnished and intact, to the world of tomorrow.

Americans and all who have declared their intention of becoming citizens, emulate the noble example of those we honor on Memorial Day. Solemnly resolve to dedicate your loyalty to the perpetuation of our country and its institutions.

Pronounce proudly your allegiance to the United States.

Renounce absolutely fealty to any other government.

Denounce unequivocally any invasion of the rights and privileges we sacredly cherish.

In memory of the debt we owe, let us consecrate our lives anew to the sublime task of carrying the torch our forefathers kindled to shed the light of liberty amidst the darkness of a war-torn world.

"To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

Legion G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting here an address of Hon. HARRY P. JEFFREY of Ohio, delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on a Nation-wide hook-up, at Washington, D. C., on May 16, 1944.

The address follows:

Several weeks ago I received a letter from a soldier in a far-away land. In substance he wrote: "We have been hearing about this G. I. bill of rights for veterans. But what is it? What will it do for us?" More recently I received a letter from a mother asking the same questions.

Today in most homes throughout this broad land there is a vacant chair at the dining-room table. These represent a youth or a man and in some cases a girl, a son, a husband or daughter, who have forsaken family and fireside in the defense of their country. Some day, and please God it may be soon, the young manhood and womanhood of America will return. And so I would like to talk especially to those who are fighting our battles for us and to their parents, wives and families.

The purpose of this G. I. bill of rights is to enable the returning veteran to help himself. It proposes to help him back to school, to a job, to the ownership of a home or a farm. The need arises the day he is mustered out. This measure, it is hoped, will bridge the gap between separation from service and the return to a place in the home community.

The inspiration for this comprehensive measure was furnished by the American Legion. It is endorsed both by the Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

What does the bill provide? Our first duty is to the disabled veteran. The injured, the maimed, and the sick must be our first consideration. The very first title of the bill seeks to insure such care. The Senate bill authorized $500,000,000 for the construction of additional hospital facilities. The House bill threw out this restriction. It inserted—and I quote—"such sums as may be necessary." No less can or should be done.

The bill also authorizes the Army and Navy to turn over to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs all hospital buildings, equipment, and supplies no longer needed.

Equally important, the Veterans' Administration is declared an essential war agency, entitled to priorities second only to the Army and Navy both for personnel and materials. Such priority status is needed for the building of hospitals and, perhaps even more, to staff them with doctors, nurses, and attendants.

Next after the country's obligation to the disabled is that to young men and women

whose schooling was interrupted by war service and to those in need of a refresher or retraining course to enable them to pick up the tools of civilian employment.

In the judgment of many this education title is the most important section of the bill—important alike to the servicemen and to the country as a whole. Give our returning veterans the opportunity to finish their educations or equip themselves to follow a trade or a business, and the problem of readjustment to civilian life will be measurably solved.

The G. I. bill provides for 1 year of education for every veteran who served at least 3 months and whose education was interrupted or impeded by service. In addition, every veteran who satisfactorily completes this year of work in a college, university, or training school is entitled to receive additional education for a period equal to his period of service but not exceeding 3 additional years.

Many servicemen may not wish to return to school for more education. Many of these, however, will be in need of a retraining or refresher course for their former trade or business. For these the bill very wisely provides a year of training. During this period of training they may better equip themselves for farming, radio, airplane, and automotive work or in whatever field they may desire.

While these veterans are receiving education or training the Government will pay tuition fees to the school of their choice up to $500 for each school year. In addition it will give them an allowance of $50 per month if single and $75 to the veteran with dependents. The Veterans' Administration estimates that perhaps 1 out of every 10 will seek additional education or technical training. If we have twelve to fifteen million returning veterans, more than a million will be afforded the finest type of preparation for self-help, will be helped to bridge the gap with permanent benefit to themselves.

Many returning servicemen will not need or desire additional training, but they will want to establish a home, buy a farm, or engage in business. For them the bill provides loans.

As reported to the House the measure provides that the Government, through the Veterans' Administration shall guarantee one-half of a loan or loans up to $1,500 made to a veteran for the purchase or repair of a home, or the purchase of a farm, or to enable a man to engage in a business of his own. It is hoped that this guarantee will take the place of a down payment. In addition the Government will pay the interest on the amount guaranteed for the first year.

The procedure is simple. The veteran makes application to his local bank or other lending agency. If the Administrator of Veterans Affairs finds the loan appears practicable, the guarantee is made. This system does not place the Government in further competition with private lending agencies, but on the contrary should serve as a stimulant to private enterprise. It does help the veteran become the owner of his home, farm, or business.

To many returning veterans the need for a job will be of paramount importance. Even though the Selective Service Act assures the man his former job, standing alone this is insufficient. Some types and places of employment will no longer exist. In many cases new skills will have been developed in the individual as well as maturity and qualities of leadership. In these cases the old job is not the answer. The bill establishes in the Veterans' Administration full responsibility for job counseling and employment placement.

Under this section of the bill the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is directed to place a representative in every State to work with the public employment service of that State. These men and women have fought for the right to work in a free land. It is our duty as a nation and the responsibility of this service to assist in securing suitable employment without delay.

There has been considerable discussion concerning unemployment compensation for veterans, particularly as to the number of weeks the returning veteran should be entitled to receive it. Also, there has been criticism of the payment of any unemployment compensation, with the suggestion that all returning service men and women should receive 6 months' base pay whether or not employed.

It is the opinion of many that the question of adjusted compensation or a bonus, as it has been termed by some, should not be considered at this time. The war is still in progress. No one can say how many men and women will see service. Likewise no one can accurately forecast the financial condition of the Government 2 or 3 years hence. Finally the returning veterans themselves should have a voice in determining this important question which so vitally affects the economy of the Nation and their own welfare.

But it is only just that the man and woman who has served this country in uniform should be entitled to receive compensation if he is unable to obtain suitable employment on his return. Those who have remained at home and worked in factories and elsewhere have had an opportunity to establish unemployment benefits for themselves under existing law. The serviceman has been denied this right. For his service to his country he should not be penalized but rewarded. I am satisfied that as finally passed this measure will provide that the returning soldier if qualified will receive unemployment compensation and will not be a subject of charity while looking for a job. A grateful Nation can do no less.

This is not an adjusted-compensation or bonus measure. And it provides that the value of all benefits received by a veteran under it shall be deducted from any amount which may hereafter be authorized for payment to him as adjusted compensation.

What will it cost? The best available estimate is that of the Veterans' Administration based upon fifteen million returning veterans. That estimate for the entire period of time that the bill will operate is $6,000,000,000.

This is the G. I. bill of rights. It is not a law yet but has passed the Senate and is scheduled to be voted on in the House on Thursday. It is in no sense a reward. The military service of the manhood and womanhood of America is not for sale. The bill is, we hope, a bridge over which the returning soldier and sailor may pass to his normal, rightful place in his home community.

Even as they fought for freedom and will have preserved it, so in the years to come will the destiny of America remain in their hands. Ours is a Republic. We pledge allegiance to the flag they have followed and to them the redemption of an obligation, that they may be better able to hold aloft, in peace as in war, the torch of human freedom and liberty.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when the history of a country is written, usually long years after the dust of the moving-wagon wheels of progress has died down on peaceful settled valleys, that history is the narration of the total progress of an indivisible nation. The Nation does not move forward or register its influence on our world and times, by races, religions, sections, or political parties. There is no color line in the front lines nor in the graves.

In the light of this fact, common honesty should impel us in the daily and contemporary record of events to embrace each act of devotion and heroism in our common effort, without suppression or disparagement by reason of race or religion. I am pleased, therefore, to note in the daily newspapers a frank recognition of the soldierly qualities of those Americans of the Negro race who are meeting on a plane of equality the test of valor and patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, the Negro race in America has done much in the past century with what it has had to do with. Its members have helped themselves as much as they have been helped. From the days of Booker T. Washington they have rightly placed emphasis on education as the door to opportunity. To those who desire to bring up the average of our whole citizenry rather than emphasize their claim to excellence on the deprivation of the Negro of the common opportunity we all cherish, I commend an editorial on the United Negro College Fund Campaign, which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, May 15, 1944, as follows:

COLLEGE APPEAL

The best indication of what American Negroes wish to do in the future probably is to be found in the record of what they have done in the recent past. No other group in the whole history of the world may be said to have accomplished so much in so short a while. There is no need to cite statistics to prove the increase of health, wealth, culture, constructive idealism, and cooperation among colored citizens of the United States within the lifespan of living observers. It is a fact which is part of the experience of every thoughtful individual.

But the end, of course, is not yet. On the contrary, a new chapter in the history of Negro progress is opening, and convincing evidence of its power and vitality may be discovered in the United Negro College fund campaign which currently is going on. Twenty-seven leading institutions of learning have pooled their interests so that a single appeal may be made for all. Walter Hoving is chairman of the drive, John D. Rockefeller, jr., chairman of the advisory committee, and the Reverend Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes a member of the executive committee. Such names insure the efficiency as well as the high social character of the endeavor. The goal is a relatively small sum—only one and a half million dollars.

Ten or twenty times that amount usefully could be spent to develop the facilities of education for which hundreds of thousands of young Negro men and women, boys and girls, are reaching out. Less than half of the potential student body is being accommodated under prevailing conditions. Yet it requires no argument that if Negro youth is to be trained in American principles of responsible self-dependency and integrity, the task cannot be left to the grade schools exclusively. There must be adequate provision for the cultivation of the instinct of self-improvement in the upper levels of academic endeavor. A casual visit to Hampton, Tuskegee, Morehouse, or Fisk will suffice to convince any doubter. The work of these and other institutions of the same general class is outstanding, and its benefits are

not limited to Negroes. It influences the entire Nation to the profit of every constituent element.

Headquarters for the campaign are at 38 East Fifty-seventh Street, New York City.

Price-Control Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to note that the Honorable John Cashmore, my esteemed friend and president of the Borough of Brooklyn, has proclaimed the week of May 17 to 24, 1944, as price-control week.

The inflationary spiral will become even more dangerous unless there is earnest cooperation between the people and the Government. It avails us little to collar and punish offenders of price control who happen to be the sellers unless we likewise instill into the heads of the guilty purchasers the enormity of their crimes. The observance of a price-control week as indicated by the foresight and wisdom of Borough President John Cashmore should do much to make the good citizenry of Brooklyn conscious of their obligations in this regard.

I want to congratulate Borough President John Cashmore. Being a good loyal Democrat of my borough and a lifelong resident therein and imbued with the fine traditions of that bailiwick, he could do no less.

I herewith set forth his proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas an effective price-control program is an integral part of a successful war effort, essential for the health and welfare of the people, for a strong and stable economy, and for high war production; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, in the face of many difficulties, has effected great savings for the consumers of our Nation; and

Whereas the Emergency Price Control Act, to be effective in its objectives, requires the understanding and support of every individual citizen and the participation of all in the campaign against all efforts to undermine it;

Now, therefore, I, John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, do hereby declare the week of May 17 to May 24, 1944, Price Control Week.

I urge the citizens of Brooklyn to devote that week to the educating of the public to the significance of price control in the war effort and to the need of active participation in the fight against the black market.

Let all groups unite to strengthen the war against inflation. Let the people of Brooklyn carry an understanding of the importance of price control and the O. P. A. into the homes of our borough, to the end that our national stabilization program be continued in the interests of winning the war.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Borough of Brooklyn to be affixed.

JOHN CASHMORE,
President, Borough of Brooklyn.

Attest:

LLOYD I. HERZKA,
Secretary to the President.

The Constitution—Guaranty of the Rights and Privileges of the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very able address delivered by Miss Daphne Pitt on the subject The Constitution—Guaranty of the Rights and Privileges of the Individual. This oration won first prize at the Bronx County oratorical contest held in our county on March 31, 1944. I had the pleasure of hearing it delivered by Miss Pitt at the monthly meeting of the Grand Street Boys Association, of which I am a member, an April 11, 1944.

The address follows:

THE CONSTITUTION—GUARANTEE OF THE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF THE INDIVIDUAL

One hundred and fifty-six years ago our Constitution came into being. One hundred and fifty-six years since the growth of an idea and an ideal in the minds, and in the hearts, and in the souls of great men striving to establish an even greater Nation.

Men of imagination? Yes.

Men of faith and belief? By all means.

Men of intelligence? Definitely.

Men of foresight? That is a question.

Perhaps when we today refer to them in our debates and discussions as men of foresight we actually mean men of high hope. Perhaps I sound a bit cynical in saying this, but if I do, it is because of human obstinacy and lack of enough imagination to believe that such a marvelous gift of deliberate foresight could possibly have been granted to any mortal man.

For instance, how could those inspired founders of our democracy, intelligent, and imaginative as they were, know of the dire need that we today would have for such as the Bill of Rights. And yet, what would we in this country be without such a document?

That is not a hard question to answer. Heaven forbid, we would be another Japan, another Germany, any other irresponsible, tyrannical, totalitarian power, and I probably wouldn't be here talking to you under these auspices, and in this fashion.

But call it what you will—call it foresight or necessity—call it chance or fate—call it high destiny, if you will * * * they gave us our Bill of Rights. That is the important fact—now, today, for you and for me.

And what about us? Do we owe anything in return? Wait, I'm not talking about payment to a dead past, nor tribute to dead men, nor loyalty to outmoded traditions and ideals. The past is still—thank God—very much alive; and the men—the men of that unforgettable past will never die.

But as for the Constitution that is our responsibility: to keep its spirit alive; to put teeth into its mandates; to uphold its ideals in all our attitudes and all our acts, in all our contacts with all our fellowmen of all colors, all stations, and all creeds; in the very thoughts we think, in the very sentiments we express, and in the very air we breathe. That is our bounden obligation.

Some doubt the fiber, the lastingness, the resourcefulness of such a document. To the scorner and the doubter, to the scoffer and the maligner, I say that only lack of faith in man's dignity can dampen its ardor, humble its spirit, or degrade it to base uses.

You see, our Constitution is a glorious compound made of dreams and stark realities. It is made of material such as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press; the kind of material that bars the way to dictator and destroyer—to any who would tear down all that has been built of the blood and the sweat and the tears of the people of this Nation.

It is made of the material that makes us realize that this is our country, "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and that, by and large, it still is the most wonderful place in all this world of ours for common man.

It is made of all the countless and nameless longings and strivings, prayers, and hopes that are the essence of the American dream.

It embraces within itself all those precious, priceless things which are being threatened by dark waves and storms of reaction and hate breaking in on us from the pits of savagery and barbarism abroad.

It is the battlement here at home, erected by us to combat the perils that face us the moment we begin to listen to the cheap rabble-rouser using the privilege of free speech to destroy free speech. The moment we begin reading the hate-mongering newspapers using the privilege of the free press for the very destruction of that free press, the moment we begin to support subversive organizations using the privileges of freedom of assembly for the base purpose of setting us against one another, or the moment we begin to tolerate any abuse of our privileges, by any party, or any faction, no matter what its guise or proffer, then we face the consequence of forfeiting our precious liberties of having them blown to the four winds.

Does that seem far-fetched?

If it does, then I know that the full significance of the Constitution is not completely understood. And if that is the case, I fail to see that poor words such as mine can play any but a very minor role in attempting to remedy it.

If you still are dubious, stop for a moment, cross the oceans, look upon the totalitarian states there found, get the full picture of black shirts and of brown shirts, of pillage, of plunder, of rape, of murder; regard the young, deprived of their youth, cheated of their birthright, fed upon the doctrine of hate; ponder the vision of human beings like you, and like me, beaten, starved, tortured; and why? Why? Because of the monstrous myth of race superiority.

Think, think about all this; then I beg of you, turn away quickly—some sights sicken the soul. Return with me to America, my country, your country, and what do you see there?

You see a beautiful lady standing proudly at the gateway to the new world, torch held high to light the way for those unfortunates who have lived in darkness so long. You hear her vibrant spirit in the throb of every American heartbeat; you know that she is the spirit of our American world, Liberty.

And then you realize more than ever before, that behind that spirit is a ghostly host, a timeless heritage, a code of duly constituted law, a way of life—yours to cherish, yours to defend, yours to preserve—the Constitution of the United States of America.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following newspaper items:

[From the Boston Post of April 22, 1944]

FARLEY CALLS IT GOLD BRICK—BLASTS NEW YORK STATE SOLDIER VOTE LAW

NEW YORK, April 21.—James A. Farley, State Democratic chairman, tonight called the New York State soldier vote law a goldbrick law and urged Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to call a special session of the legislature to remove its obvious defects.

Farley spoke over the same CBS State-wide network on which Dewey, a week ago, reviewed his administration, and termed the State war ballot "a simple, workable formula for soldier voting."

[From the Boston Post of April 19, 1944]

UNSOLICITED

It was not that James A. Farley was unanimously reelected as chairman of the New York State democratic committee, despite the efforts of the O'Connell machine in Albany to drive him out, that was so surprising. But the fact that Mr. Farley did not ask for a single vote, or in no way campaigned for reelection, makes his selection an outstanding event. But New Yorkers know Jim Farley. They value his worth to the party. That he was again selected as State leader is a glowing tribute to his ability and his honesty.

[From the Hampshire Gazette, Northampton, Mass., of May 5, 1944]

James A. Farley, a rugged American himself, pays a nice tribute to Americans in general for their soundness of character in this war both at the front and at home, after their careless and pleasure-loving ways in peacetime. Let us hope that the attitude taken at this time will be carried into peace and into the years that follow so that America may never again be found as weak as she was in 1914 and in 1939. Both weaknesses had something to do with our getting into both wars.

Address to the Alumni of Providence College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the alumni of Providence College, Sunday, May 7, 1944, at Providence College, Providence, R. I.:

The occasion of a communion breakfast is memorable in anyone's life. The opportunity and privilege to receive our Divine Lord into our souls is a tremendous thing in itself, and I am deeply grateful for the graces and blessings that I have received this morning. I had thought that my first day in the halls of Congress was a great one in my life, but, gentlemen, it is no empty phrase when I tell you that today is an even bigger one. Providence College means so much to all of us, and I trust you will believe that I am sincerely grateful for the privilege and honor you have accorded me. Many of you gentlemen here this morning represent pioneers in the foundation of this great Dominican institution. We can all be thankful to Almighty God that there is such an institution of learning. Extraordinary graces and blessings have been bestowed on the college spiritually, intellectually, and financially. Extraordinary success has enriched the lives of many of you professionally, socially, and financially. As you have grown into maturity, so has your alma mater grown. Today she opens her arms to welcome back the oldest and the youngest of her sons, not as a test of their loyalty to her; rather as a manifestation of their faith in God. We all appreciate the fact it is not everywhere in the world that such an expression of faith is possible.

I know only too well it has been the popular style to lampoon the system of education such as prevails here at the college. I am well aware that it has been the accepted thing to scoff at that philosophy which has answered the basic question in man's heart, which tells men who and what he is, from whence he came, whither is his ultimate goal.

It is not only popular but is considered the mark of genuine intelligence, to deny the existence of objective truth. When we insist that truth is eternal, that there is a moral law, given to His creatures by God, that this same moral law applies as well to nations as to individual men, we have been ridiculed as being steeped in medieval superstition. The popular philosophy of our day has been termed utilitarianism or realism, and we are admonished to be practical and cease our day-dreaming.

In our time we have witnessed the growth of this realism, we have seen its tenets become the policies of nations. We have seen the world immersed in a bath of blood because men found it easy to justify their conduct on the ground of expediency.

In Germany and Japan there rose to power men motivated by this doctrine of expediency. To them there was no truth as a changeless thing, to them truth was a tool, a weapon. To them there was no falsehood, no treachery. These things were only instruments to be used in advancing the purpose of the almighty state, a purpose declared by those men alone, not by the people for whom the state was created.

Here was conduct, by the leaders of great nations, as immoral as any to be found in the pages of history. Immoral, that is, if our beliefs, learned at the feet of the noble men who are followers of the great Aquinas, are correct, and the pragmatists wrong. But if we permit ourselves to subscribe to the "practical" doctrines of the extreme realists, then we should doff our caps and pay humble tribute to these disciples of expediency. Surely they applied their energies, with vigor and violence, to the task at hand. Their plan was brilliantly conceived, its execution flawless, and hardhearted realism should have won for them honorary degrees from the great universities of our critics.

This great land of ours—founded on the dignity of man and subscribing to the morality of nations—was brought into being by men who were motivated by principles as much removed from the theories of materialists as is the dark of night from the noonday sun. Certain truths, they declared, were self-evident. They affirmed the existence of God; they affirmed the dignity—the inviolability—of human nature and the rights that belong to that dignity; they affirmed the primary purpose of government to be the protection of a person in the exercise of those rights; they affirmed the right of the people to determine for themselves the form of government they deem best suited to their needs.

Fortified as we are this morning—with the grace of God—there can be no better time to consider our place in this Nation of ours—in a land to which the pagan, irreligious world has flung her challenge of contempt and ridicule. There is no better time than now to determine honestly what contribution we can make toward the safeguarding of those rights and principles to which we lay claim.

In God's good time—we have all prayed this morning that day is not far distant—the tumult and the shouting will have died. The princes and the kings will have departed, and the little people of the world will stand in awe at the great conclave of peacemakers. The giants will again assemble, and the mothers and fathers of the future generation of men and boys will stand and wait, in silent prayer, that from this meeting will come, in truth, the peace and security for which they have cried aloud to their God. When the bombed and shocked people of Europe and Asia come to dig their cities out of the rubble created by the inventive genius of man, when soldiers lay aside the brilliantly constructed instruments of death and destruction—human nature being what it is—it may be too much to expect that there will be a laying aside of the ambitions of men and nations.

It may be that in that day—when men no longer fear the aggression of their enemies—they will learn to fear the suggestions of so-called friends, still poisoned by selfishness.

Once before, in our time, we witnessed men and nations, who had been motivated by lofty principles—who called on Almighty God to award victory to their arms—turn in time of peace to power politics—and an abortive attempt to provide for their own security through the execution of selfish compacts.

I know it is popular to sneer at democracy in action—that one who attests his faith in representative government receives a cynical smile. But I do know this—the future security of the people of America lies within reach of each individual, the winning of that security calls for the untiring effort of every individual. If we will have peace—peace it will be. If we will have agreements, compacts, cartels, and all the lock, stock, and barrel of self-seeking international relations, that we will have.

One of the most powerful injunctions—one of the most important contributions to society—was written by St. Paul in three words—"Be a man." He recognized the full scope and power of the dignity of man. He recognized fully the tremendous power potentially held within the limits of the human intellect and will. He evaluated correctly man's position in the divine plan.

Would to God the thundering voice of St. Paul would echo and reecho across the land today.

Be a man in the fulfillment of your nature; know and use the power and the glory and the dignity of your being. Live in the full stature of your manhood—in justice, in honesty, and in truth. Enjoy the privileges of manhood, but be awake to the responsibility, the obligations, imposed by that manhood. Reach for the stars like a man—not for the earth like a dog.

Yes, the alumni of Providence College are attending today a communion breakfast—would to God that the Providence College men scattered across the world could be with us this morning to share our happiness.

Here the philosophy of St. Thomas taught young men to live—a system of philosophy became a philosophy of life. If it wasn't just routine teaching—if the principles received here were true—then lives were made fuller and richer, and immature boys were fashioned into worth-while Catholic men; and Providence College men—in a PT boat in the South Pacific—in an LCI in the Mediterranean—or a flying fortress over Europe—have something upon which to pin their faith and hope for the future.

This morning at this communion breakfast we should rededicate our lives to God

and determine, as individual men, as part of a great Nation, to accept the tremendous responsibilities placed in our hands, live according to our teachings, live American according to America's principles—be men—the kind of men God created us to be.

The Great Game of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Evening Star:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—VENEER OF IDEALISM USED FOR 12 YEARS IN ADMINISTRATION "POLITICS," SAYS WRITER

(By Frank R. Kent)

One of the interesting things about this administration is the extraordinary manner in which for 12 years it has managed to camouflage the most sordid and practical kind of politics with a false and glittering veneer of idealism. For the purpose of reelecting the President, this twice has proven an exceedingly effective combination. As he reaches for a fourth term it is still the main dependence.

For example, the present propaganda is based on the assumption that Mr. Roosevelt is the only man capable of assuring victory for the United Nations; that no other is fit to be trusted to make the peace or handle the post-war problems; that to "change horses" in 1944 would invite calamity; that only knowledge of these things and the overwhelming demand of the people could persuade the President to forgo his personal desire to "lay down the burden" and spend 4 more years in the White House. Essentially, these are the same arguments used to promote the third-term effort.

However well they may go with the gullible, there was not then—and there is not now—anything in the record to sustain these arguments, and they have been pretty well refuted by the facts. The real refutation, however, comes from their source—the White House aides who devise and distribute them. Obviously, if they believed them they would rely upon them. But they do not rely upon them at all—less this time, in fact, than in the third-term "draft."

NEVER WAS A "DRAFT"

It wasn't a "draft" then and it isn't a "draft" now. The "draft" and the "overwhelming demand" were clearly manipulted in 1940 and they are being manipulated now. This is not to say there is no genuine sentiment for Mr. Roosevelt; it is to say that the sentiment would be insufficient and ineffectual unless heavily stimulated and worked up.

It was Governor Dewey who, 2 years ago, said that no man was ever 'drafted" for the Presidency without conniving in the draft. Undoubtedly, Mr. Dewey is conniving in his own "draft," but no more than Mr. Roosevelt is conniving in his.

One difference is that Mr. Roosevelt has vastly more power to bring about a draft than Mr. Dewey—and to make it seem real. So long as he is in the White House, the great weight of the Federal machine is sufficient to insure any number of renominations for the President. It prevents any formidable candidate from arising within the party. It keeps down real convention competition.

Thus for the renomination this year, as in 1940, reliance is not upon altruistic arguments and public sentiment, though that is the pretense, but upon the powerful Federal machine with which, through patronage, are linked the big city bosses such as Hague, of New Jersey, the O'Connells, of Albany, Laughlin, of Tammany, Kelly, of Chicago, and others.

SAME TALK OF SACRIFICE

Barring bad health, through these instruments the fourth nomination will be obtained. But, both before and after, the same altruistic arguments will be used, the same talk about sacrifice will be maintained and the credulous, though perhaps diminished in numbers this time, will be deluded. Much can be done with these arguments, because administration publicity advantages are great. But by no means can enough be done to elect Mr. Roosevelt a fourth time. The reliance for that is not upon argument, but upon certain concrete political assets totally impervious to argument.

First, there are the 3,000,000 civilian Federal employees whose hope of staying on the pay roll is tied up with the Roosevelt candidacy; second, there is the C. I. O. with its huge campaign funds, its all-out for Roosevelt declarations, its country-wide organization, and its leaders who are recognized as having the major part in the management of the fourth-term campaign; third, there are the American Labor Party in New York, the Communists, who themselves will have no Presidential candidate this time, and other of the radical groups; fourth, there is the great Negro vote in the pivotal northern and border States, the bulk of which has been Mr. Roosevelt's twice.

Unquestionably, the most important of the four is the Negro vote. This is the biggest single voting group in the country. Should Mr. Roosevelt lose much of his previous support from it, his chances would be greatly diminished. Signs that it is slipping disturb the White House politicians more than anything else.

Evidence of this is given in the almost frantic efforts being made by the left-wing press and administration politicians to convince Negro leaders that Governor Dewey is a wicked man who will betray them if elected President. It is rather a degraded performance, but typical.

President Presents Gold Star to Lt. Comdr. Edward H. O'Hare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the late Lt. Comdr. Edward Henry O'Hare has again been recognized by the President who presented this outstanding flyer with the Gold Star in recognition of his distinguished service.

As it is known, Lieutenant Commander O'Hare was presented with the Congressional Medal of Honor as a result of destroying five Japanese planes in a single action February 20, 1942, which saved his carrier from destruction. Lieutenant Commander O'Hare was shot down trying to break up an attack of 30 to 40 torpedo planes against a United States carrier task force on November 27, 1943. This latest citation is a result of operations October 5, 1943, against Japanese forces at Wake Island.

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Commander O'Hare was my personal friend. I appointed him to the Naval Academy and under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the citation. It follows:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Flying Cross to Lt. Comdr. Edward Henry O'Hare, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For heroism and extraordinary achievement in aerial combat as commander of Fighting Squadron Six during operations against enemy Japanese forces at Wake Island on October 5, 1943. Sighting three hostile fighters south of the island, Lieutenant Commander O'Hare overtook the planes and singlehandedly destroyed one while his unit accounted for the other two, pursuing the stricken planes down to the runway on Wake Island where, in the face of terrific Japanese antiaircraft fire, two twin-engined bombers and a fourth fighter were destroyed on the ground. Continuing his daring tactics, Lieutenant Commander O'Hare intercepted a third hostile bomber, closing for the attack, and leaving the enemy a crippled and vulnerable target for final destruction by another plane of his unit. His inspiring leadership and gallant fighting spirit under the most perilous conditions reflect great credit upon Lieutenant Commander O'Hare, his command, and the United States naval service."

For the President,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Education of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following telegram from Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which is dated May 17:

BOSTON, MASS., *May 17, 1944.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building:

On May 8 wired you regarding the educational features of the G. I. bill of rights, and also joined with executive committee of Governors Conference in a telegram. I am anxious that the bill provide that actual education of veterans be in the hands of State educational organizations and institutions. I certainly oppose the creation of any new Federal bureaucracy, and aside from wanting it made clear that the States are to control the veterans' education, I am entirely in favor of the G. I. bill of rights.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of Massachusetts.

State Taxation of Interstate Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House to an editorial appearing in the Washington Post for May 18, 1944, discussing the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Northwest Airlines against the State of Minnesota, decided May 15, 1944. This decision makes possible the imposition by the States of burdensome multiple taxation upon the aircraft of interstate air lines.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee attempted to deal with this problem in advance in the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, but so far the pressure of railroad and steamship interests have prevented consideration of this bill by the House.

The Post editorial follows:

TAX ON AIRPLANES

It is not surprising that the Supreme Court divided 5 to 4 in deciding the rather baffling Northwest Airlines case on Monday. That case took to the Court for the first time the question of constitutional limitations on the power of the States to tax airplanes. The Court searched all the precedents and apparently found no doctrine that could be applied to vehicles of the air with full satisfaction. So it split four ways. While Justices Jackson and Black agreed with Justices Frankfurter, Douglas, and Murphy in the final disposition of the case, they wrote separate concurring opinions. Chief Justice Stone and Justices Roberts, Reed, and Rutledge dissented.

The effect of the decision is to permit Minnesota to tax all the planes operated by Northwest Airlines in several States. Justice Frankfurter reasoned that Minnesota is the company's domicile and may therefore tax all of its property operating out of that State. "It is not a charge laid for engaging in interstate commerce," he wrote, "or upon air lines specifically; it is not aimed by indirection against interstate commerce or measured by such commerce." So the Court permitted this tax to stand for the time being until Congress steps in and makes more definite rules for the taxation of interstate commerce by air.

In our opinion, the nub of the whole matter is contained in this sentence from Justice Jackson's concurring opinion: "It seems more than likely that no solution of the competition among States to tax this transportation agency can be devised by the judicial process without legislative help." That is certainly an invitation to Congress to step in and straighten out the mess, as could be done by a reconsideration of the pigeonholed Lea bill. Obviously, individual States cannot be permitted to tax airplane companies operating out of their borders at will. That would create chaos in aviation. Yet the courts are naturally reluctant to step in and establish special rules to govern this delicate problem of taxing air transport.

We hope, then, that the decision will revive interest in the Lea bill. Congress must deal with the whole problem of regulating air transportation, of which the taxes are an intricate part. Certainly it should not postpone action any longer than is necessary to get a comprehensive view of what ought to be done.

Soldier Ballot Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I wrote to Hon. Chauncey B. Hammond, member of the New York State Senate, outlining to him the provisions of the Federal soldier ballot law and asking him to reply and explain the provisions of the soldier vote law enacted by the Legislature of New York State.

Because of the extensive interest displayed when this topic was being considered by the Congress, it seems advisable that the people be informed as to the provisions of both acts so that they will know what steps are to be taken in order to cast their ballots.

Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I am having my letter and Senator Hammond's reply inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1944.

Hon. CHAUNCEY B. HAMMOND,
Member, New York State Senate,
Albany, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR: Widespread national interest was evident when the question of the soldier ballot was pending in the Congress and now that a Federal soldier ballot law has been enacted, as well as a State soldier ballot law, I deem it advisable that we explain to our constituents the provisions of each so that they, in turn, will be in a position to advise their relatives and loved ones who are in the service. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of communicating to you my understanding of the Federal law with the hope that you will reply by explaining the provisions of the State law and its relationship to the Federal law.

The Federal law as to duty outside the United States affects members of the armed forces, merchant marine, and persons serving with the American Red Cross, Society of Friends, Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations. It applies to them only if the Governor has certified prior to July 15 that the State has made no provision for State absentee ballot and that use of the Federal ballot is authorized by the State laws or if the Governor, prior to July 15, has certified that the use of the Federal ballot is authorized by State law and if (the Governor not having certified the existence of a State absentee ballot) the individual soldier states in his oath that prior to September 1 he made application for a State absentee ballot but as of October 1 had not received it.

The Federal law as to duty inside the United States applies only to members of the armed forces. It applies to them only if the Governor has certified prior to July 15 that the State has made no provision for State absentee ballot and that use of the Federal ballot is authorized by the State laws.

Since New York has recently enacted a State absentee ballot law, it would appear that the Federal ballot is not only unnecessary but its use not authorized. Therefore, it seems appropriate that you outline to me the provisions of the State law and the steps which a soldier must take in order to obtain and cast his ballot.

In addition, the Federal law provides for the establishment of a Federal War Ballot Commission and makes available the facilities of the War and Navy Departments for transmission and delivery of the State ballot procedures.

I am sure you will agree with me that the opportunity to vote by our men and women in the services should be extended to as large a number as possible and that the ballot include all public officers. Your explanation of the procedure for them to follow in obtaining and casting their ballot will be most helpful in accomplishing this objective.

Sincerely yours,

W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress.

THE SENATE,
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, May 16, 1944.

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have not replied to your letter with regard to the soldier vote at an earlier date as I desired to await any possible ruling of the State war-ballot commission. I think the arrangements are now all set up to follow the law. The matter of the ballot is covered by the constitution of the State of New York. It provides that every citizen of the age of 21 or over who has been a resident of the State for 1 year, of the county for 4 months, and of the election district 30 days shall be entitled to vote in the election district of which he or she shall at the time be a resident, and not elsewhere, for all officers that are or may thereafter be elected by the people. It also provides that in time of war no elector in the actual military service of the State or of the United States, in the Army or Navy thereof, shall be deprived of his or her vote by reason of his or her absence from such election district.

The State constitution therefore plainly provides that every citizen in the armed services who is eligible to vote shall be given the right to vote not only for President, Vice President, and Members of the Congress but for every candidate in his or her district to the lowest town officer. Under the State ballot law any man or woman in the armed forces who would be entitled to vote if he or she were home will be entitled to vote in the coming election for every office to be filled if he or she desires to vote. To receive a ballot all that is necessary is for such member of the armed forces to ask for one. Any one of the following methods will insure the mailing of a war ballot to those in the service: (1) Fill out and mail to the secretary of state or to the State war-ballot commission at Albany, N. Y., the post-card form distributed by the Federal Government; or (2) fill out and mail the post-card form of application provided by the State war-ballot commission. This application form will be sent to every member of the armed forces whose name and military address is furnished to the war-ballot commission or the secretary of state; or (3) write a letter to some immediate member of the family indicating a desire to have a war ballot, giving home and military address. This letter turned over to the secretary of state or to the war-ballot commission will bring a war ballot to the applicant; or (4) register personally with the election board in the county of residence. This, of course, can only be done by those who reach home on a furlough or otherwise.

You are correct in your assumption that the Federal law will not operate in New York State as the State has provided a method and set up the mechanics for voting. Furthermore any ballot that does not provide members of the armed forces opportunity to vote for every candidate running in his or her election district would not follow the State Constitution and would quite likely be

invalid in this State. Ballots received by voters wherever located will contain proper instructions both as to manner of voting and as to the return of the ballot in the envelope provided for that purpose.

As it is the purpose of the State war-ballot law to give every eligible member of the armed forces who desires to vote an opportunity to do so it would seem advisable that some member of the family here at home write to the member of the family in the armed forces advising him or her to make application for a war ballot in one of the four methods stated above, being sure to give his or her military and home address. It should be urged upon all members of the armed forces who receive a ballot on application that this ballot be voted and mailed back in the envelope provided immediately upon receipt so that it may be distributed to reach his or her election district in time to be counted.

I have not recited herein the mechanics and the dates for handling the war ballots as this would be of no particular interest to the voter. The essential interest to the voter is to make the application for the ballot and the rest will follow in due course.

Sincerely yours,

CHAUNCEY B. HAMMOND.

Others in the Service Should Be Entitled to Mustering-Out Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is not always possible for Congress to deeply penetrate the future with its eyes and see at a glance all of the problems and injustices that might arise in connection with any one piece of legislation. However, this body has through the decades been very fair-minded, and where wrongs have been done or where unfair omissions have been made it usually took appropriate action.

There are many citizens who feel that we have done an injustice in denying mustering-out pay to the servicemen over 38 years of age who voluntarily applied for release to return to war plants or to the farm. I believe their complaint is full worthy of our serious consideration, since both our War and Navy Departments have held that most of these men are not desirable as soldiers at this stage of the fighting.

Many of these men were inspired by a patriotic fervor to enlist or serve in our armed forces. Some feeling that they would surely be drafted anyway, they wanted to get in the branch of service to their liking so they enlisted after selling their business, their home, their automobile, or other possession of considerable monetary value, or gave up a good job in war industry.

Then came deferments for farm men so that the farm man over 38 would not have been called at all had he remained at home. Then came word from the Army and Navy that they did not want any more men over 38, so the man who awaited his call from his draft board and kept right on working and living at home with his family, experienced no interruption in his life.

With the new policy of confining draft quotas to younger men, there became a shortage in many defense plants. Soldiers over 38 years of age who could show that they had a job waiting for them at a bench in a defense plant were told they were eligible for release. Some of them had served over a year. Many of them felt that they would be of far greater assistance in the war effort on the farm, at the lathe, or at the throttle, or in the laboratory, or in hundreds of other vital key war positions, so they applied for release, presenting a statement from their former or prospective employer.

Then Congress passed the mustering-out pay law, but this group of men were denied the right to participate. Of course, there are thousands in this over-age group still in the Army. When the Army life proves too strenuous for some of them, they are given a medical discharge, and draw mustering-out pay. The over-age man who acted in good faith and returned to war industry with an honorable discharge gets no mustering-out pay whatever to assist him in his multitude of adjustments incidental to the return to civilian life.

As an example of how some of these veterans feel about this situation, I desire to incorporate in my remarks a letter I have received from a man in this group, whose name I shall omit for obvious reasons. It reads as follows:

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Veterans of this war, over 38, who requested a discharge to accept employment in an essential industry, shall not be eligible for the mustering-out pay, says the law.

Will the lawmakers who drew up this distinction between veterans please explain why they should not be eligible?

What have they done to be excluded in this law? Is it merely because they spoke up and asked for their honorable discharge?

When a man has served from 6 to 12 months he needs a vacation to readjust himself to civilian life before going back to work, even if he did request his discharge for that purpose.

For veterans over 38 who requested a discharge it would have been quite an easy matter to get a disability discharge, but who would know that a disability discharge was so much better than an honorable discharge.

Many veterans in this over-38 group who requested a discharge served a year or more. Some were good soldiers who also served in the First World War.

The most unfair part of this law is the fact that everybody who received a disability discharge is eligible. That is, those who admittedly had their disabilities prior to entering the service, and not contracted while in the service. Those who made a practice of complaining to the Army doctor (most likely exaggerated) and were useless to the Army. Yes, if you had gotten a disability discharge, giving for reason such as poor eyesight, hard of hearing, flat feet, high blood pressure, or rheumatism, etc., you would be all right for the mustering-out pay. But an honorable discharge—no use, if you asked for it, regardless of merit.

Some in this group of veterans were handed a disability discharge the day after they arrived in camp. I know of one case where the serviceman was not in service long enough to receive his uniform. He had passed his physical, but 4 days after he was sworn in he received a letter saying he could not be accepted for service on account of high blood pressure.

He was not in the service long enough to get into uniform, but he was in long enough to get his mustering-out pay.

It is understood that individual cases cannot be considered, but there must be thousands who have received disability discharge (for disabilities that they had before entering service) shortly after they arrived at training center, and sent home, being unfit for hard training.

With due respect, but why favor them? They also go back to civilian work just as well as those who requested a discharge for that purpose.

They wave their mustering-out checks under our nose and give us the horse-laugh.

We may be no heroes, but we did spend many sleepless nights guarding Government property.

We ask no charity—only a fair deal.

When men who served less than 1 month, and were handed a disability discharge can get it (because they did not ask for their discharge) and men who served 1 year cannot get it, merely because they asked for a discharge, then something is wrong somewhere. Is merit and length of time served totally ignored in ths law?

Action speaks louder than words—or doesn't it? A fair law should have been to the contrary.

I urge all veterans of this war, over 38, who requested a discharge, and feel unjustified about the mustering-out-pay law to do something about it. We are scattered all over the country and we cannot very well form a bonus march to Washington. But you can write a letter to the House Veterans' Committee, Washington 25, D. C., or to the American Legion, asking them to sponsor an amendment to this unfair law. Maybe an amendment of the mustering-out law could be written into the so-called "G. I. bill of rights" now pending in Congress.

If we do nothing about it—nobody else will. So let's fight for our rights, using words for ammunition.

DISAPPOINTED VET.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the House Committee on Military Affairs will give this matter serious consideration at an early date.

Hon. Everett Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, the friends of EVERETT DIRKSEN, in this House, who are backing him for Vice President, have faith in his ability and integrity, and in the ultimate judgment of the people to realize his fitness for this great public office. His broad experience as a Member of Congress for 12 years qualifies him in a peculiar way and would form a much needed connection between the executive and lawmaking branches of the Government. The people will have a complete freedom from fear that his elevation to the Presidency might be a calamity to the country.

Great Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.:

GREAT TEST

The greatest test lies immediately ahead. The war program shaped for the next few months will put America to a test far beyond any that has yet developed during this terrible world conflict.

The American fighting forces are now facing the greatest battle of all time, the invasion of the European fortress. Hundreds of thousands of carefully trained men are just waiting for the signal to go.

The activity of the armies in Italy, the marvelous exploits of the Air Forces, and the work of the Navy constitute a great prelude to the invasion leading up to the unconditional surrender of Germany. The strain leading up to this test is indeed severe but proves that those great American heroes of 1944 are worthy of their ancestry. They are living up to every American tradition of courage, bravery, and stanch manhood.

Those brave young men of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces are well cared for as far as food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and entertainment are concerned. The best in all those lines is provided on the best standard possible under existing conditions in every theater of war the world over. There is one thing, however, that neither the United States Government nor the executives of all the warring branches can do for those in the armed forces and that is keep up the line of communication between them and their homes and home communities. That is something that must be done by their families, friends, neighbors, and community officials.

Never since this horrible war started was the demand for morale building greater. There is no better builder of morale for the men away from home than letters from home. Gifts, foodstuffs, and goodies are splendid but are definitely secondary to letters. The day that a man answers mail call and gets none is a bad day for him. Even if it is only a few lines or a card it means much to him and lightens the burden that he is bearing for those at home. No matter how many letters we write in a day or a week, no matter how our fingers get cramped from pen or pencil it is nothing compared to what those heroes are doing for us.

A letter received recently at this office suggested the sending of pictures either with letters or separately. That constitutes a splendid idea or suggestion. Pictures of members of the family or of scenes around the home or neighborhood mean so much to those lads that they should be sent as frequently as possible.

Those in uniform are meeting the demands of this greatest test as perfectly as is humanly possible. Those at home should face the test, too, and do their part comparably well. There must be no strikes or suspension of operations in war-production works. The approaching Fifth War Loan drive should go over with a bang that will resound throughout the world. Appeals for cooperation in all activities in the support of the war effort must be responded to unanimously, wholeheartedly, and patriotically. And all should resolve to write letters and cards and send pictures to our fighting men without let-up until the day that they are homeward bound.

House Joint Resolution 149

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under eave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, favoring the passage of House Joint Resolution 149, introduced by Representative REED, of Illinois, to increase the salaries of the judges of the United States district courts from the present level of $10,000 to $15,000:

Whereas the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut has urged and advocated an increase in the salaries of United States district court judges for the past decade and has repeatedly petitioned the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate for legislation permitting an increase; and

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress by Congressman REED of Illinois, House Joint Resolution 149 to increase the salaries of judges of the United States district courts from $10,000 to $15,000 per annum; and

Whereas the salaries received by the judges at the present time are the lowest paid to any judges in comparable judicial office in the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut; and

Whereas State judges receive as high as $25,000 per annum; and

Whereas it is contrary to public policy that the judiciary be underpaid; and

Whereas the jurisdiction of the Federal courts is more comprehensive than that of any of State courts, and includes criminal, admiralty, bankruptcy, patent, copyright, civil, and equity matters; and

Whereas members of this association who practice extensively in Federal courts as well as in State courts believe that the caliber and ability of the Federal judges in these districts is equal to that of the highest State judicial officers; and

Whereas in the future the position, by reason of its meager salary, will not continue to attract able and competent men, to the detriment of the public interest; and

Whereas the present salaries after income tax do not allow the judges sufficient to maintain themselves adequately and in a manner compatible with their position or to properly support their families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association unequivocally endorses House Joint Resolution 149 and urges that similar action be taken by all other bar associations; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of this association appoint a committee of nine members to wait upon Congress, to attend any hearings before appropriate committees of the House and of the Senate, to urge all Senators and Congressmen to vote in favor of the bill; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Henry P. Chandler, Administrator of United States Courts, Attorney General Biddle, to the President of the United States, and to all Members of the Congress.

HENRY WARD BEER,
President.
EDWARD A. ALEXANDER,
Chairman, Executive Committee.
M. H. COHN,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee.
ADELE I. SPRINGER,
Secretary.

"Swoose" Thinks WASP Program Smells of Some Kind of Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial by Ruth Sarles from the Washington Daily News, May 18, 1944:

"SWOOSE" THINKS WASP PROGRAM SMELLS OF SOME KIND OF RACKET

(By Ruth Sarles)

"Guess I'm just a swoose." It was Dick Goodrich, of St. Cloud, Minn., speaking. Dick is an instructor in the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service program. He has 1,300 hours' flying time. He's due to be thrown in the ash can along with 5,000 other instructors by September unless the Army and Congress decide to make some use of his flight experience on noncombat duty.

Since he and his friends don't see much chance of that happening, after the way they've been kicked around, he came to Washington to find out why.

HE WEARS UNIFORM

Here's why Dick thinks he's neither a swan nor a goose:

He wears the Army uniform and carries an official-looking card saying he's a member of the Enlisted Reserve Corps. He's 1–C, which means he's in the Army. His draft board considers him in the Army, and doesn't bother with him. He couldn't take a Navy commission, junior grade, that was offered him because he's in the Army.

Yet, apparently he isn't in the Army. Because he doesn't have any Army privileges, he is refused U. S. O. privileges, and an M. P. in Milwaukee picked him up and told him he had no right to wear the uniform. When Dick explained, the M. P. said, "There's nothing in our manual that describes a guy like you. I'll run you in if I see you around here again." When he was in training he got board and room only, not the Army private's pay of $50 a month. And the little shack where he and five others lived was so badly heated that the boys stole coal from a W. P. A. project to keep warm.

Tired of his on-the-fence situation, Dick has asked for his release because he thinks he can do something else more useful to the war effort. But there may be a snag; maybe he can't get a private job because he's still I–C in the Army. That means unemployment insurance at $80 a month.

TALK ABOUT HARDSHIP

Dick says he speaks for a lot of his friends in the same position when he talks about hardship. "Many of them have lost their

homes and cars and sent their wives and children to live with relatives."

Dick joined up in July 1942. He was III–A, a pre-Pearl Harbor father. But he had a brother on Bataan, and he knew how to fly and had a private pilot's license. He gave up his job; his wife took a job; they farmed out his 2-year-old youngster with a relative; he started training under the C. A. A.-W. T. S. program with only board and room. His wife sent him $5 a month for spending money when she could.

The training was to be for 6 months. By that time they would be washed-out pilots or service pilots. But at the end of 6 months the boys didn't get the commission they had been led to believe they'd get. So they took another course, and another. Each time they were told, "Take this one more course and the Army will want you." So he trained for 13 months. There didn't seem to be any chance to get out.

Finally he started instructing and was kept at it for 9 months. "The first training the Army cadets got we gave them," he said, "and one of my students got a decoration in combat."

But the Army says it has plenty of flyers, Dick, since the pilot attrition has been less than expected. What if they just can't use you and the 11,000 others, including the trainees?

"Then why are they training women—the WASPS—Women's Air Service Pilots—for noncombat flying with only 35 hours when they had 5,000 instructors averaging 1,000 hours?" he wanted to know. "If the Army has pilots running out of its ears, why is the Army Air Forces running a full-page ad, as it did this week in Collier's, to recruit boys of 17 in the Civil Air Patrol, auxiliary of the Army Air Forces? It's the same issue that has an article on why I support Roosevelt.

"We could release for combat duty the men of combat age now instructing.

CAN FLY ANYTHING

"They say we haven't had the hours in the 'hot' planes, training that the 35-hour WASPS are getting. We take issue with the statement that we can't qualify because we've flown only light planes. Any of us who has had 205 hours in the air can take a 10-hour check-out and fly any plane there is. I know I'm old for a pilot (he's 32), but I know I'm as good a pilot as a 20-year-old girl with 50 hours."

There's a bill before the House that if passed would commission Dick and the rest of the C. A. A.-trained men. But it's attached to the bill to militarize the WASPS which the Army supports, and some interested Members of Congress fear that no matter what kind of bill they pass the Army will somehow set the requirements so high the men can't qualify.

Anyhow, Dick isn't supposed to talk to his Congressman about it. Notices have recently gone up on training center bulletin boards telling them they are not to contact their legislators about any matter except soldier relief.

"We are not asking for anything except that the Government make good on its promise. They might at least give us a military record or put us on active duty for 1 day, so we'd have the rights of a soldier.

"What I'm really here for is to find out what the people who run the Army and Congress and the whole United States have against us. I want to know how they can allow this situation to go on, and welch on the Government's agreement to us, whether it's from lack of information or something deeper. I don't know much about politics, but from where I sit it smells like a racket of some kind."

Frank J. Hogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star. It is a tribute to one of the most distinguished and prominent members of the bar whose life should certainly be an inspiration to every member of the legal profession:

FRANK J. HOGAN

When Alexis de Tocqueville in 1835 declared that "the profession of the law is the only aristocracy that can exist in a democracy without doing violence to its nature," he anticipated the achievement and the position of Frank J. Hogan. No other employment would have given him the opportunities, the occasions, and the successes that he developed. Certainly, his talents were such as to have indicated that he would not fail in any career to which he might have chosen to devote them; but the work for which nature seemed to have intended him was that of an advocate, a courtroom pleader, a defender of defendants, an appellant for appellants.

To see Mr. Hogan in action was to witness a magnificent performance. He was a master of the arts of inquiry and persuasion. The skill with which he cross-examined was a legend. His comprehension of legal logic rarely has been equaled by any contemporary. He dealt with evidence as a mathematician deals with figures or a chemist with the natural elements. The function of justice in the world, as he conceived it, was philosophical, if not religious. At the climax of a case his audience invariably would sit in a rapt silence such as would characterize the listeners of an inspired prophet.

Yet Mr. Hogan was no fanatic. The native sweetness and charity of his heart influenced his mind in the interest of an equitable attitude toward the vast majority of humanity. He was generous to a fault. His patience was monumental. It was on that account possibly that he so profoundly admired Shakespeare's doctrine of inclusive mercy. Let it be said without reservation that his celebrated wit even at the sharpest was not cynical, never mean, in no sense mocking. He loved life, valued all classes of people, helped many, hurt very few—and those not by intention. Some trace of his youth stayed with him to the end. He never quite ceased to be a boy.

Mr. Hogan will be remembered not for what he wrote nor for what he said nor even for what he did. It will be for his personality that he will be recalled by later generations. Young lawyers who glimpsed him only in passing will tell of him to attorneys still their junior, and so, as in the instances of Rufus Choate and Sir Edward Marshall Hall, he will continue to be an instructive force for generations. His presidency of the District Bar Association and of the American Bar Association have assured his place in the formal history of the law. More important, however, is the continuance of the grand traditions of patriotism, service, fellow feeling, and good will to which he contributed himself throughout his days.

United States Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered Sunday, May 14, 1944, over Stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis.:

Ladies and gentlemen, last week I had a very novel and interesting experience in visiting the United States Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., as a member of the official Board of Visitors of that academy. All of our four service schools have these boards of visitors—the members of which are appointed by the respective chairmen of the committees handling their legislation and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States who, of course, serves as President of the Senate.

In our party leaving Washington Friday morning were three Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives. There were in addition from Coast Guard headquarters here, two rear admirals and one captain and his aide. The Coast Guard Academy among our several service schools is unique in that it has connected with its organization, in addition to the Board of Visitors, an advisory committee composed of outstanding educators in the United States.

When we arrived at New London, after 8 hours on a very hot train, we were met by four members of this advisory committee. Leaving the train, we were taken to the Academy by boat. It has been my pleasure in the past to be on the campus of the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis—both of which are beautiful and, to say the least, marvelous institutions. I am frank to say, however, that the view from the water of the United States Coast Guard Academy on the hillside at New London literally took my breath away. It is indeed fully comparable in beauty, although much less in size, to our famous Military and Naval Academies.

The United States Coast Guard is the oldest naval establishment in our Government. Its history dates back to the commissioning of the 10 cutters authorized by the first United States Congress in the act approved August 4, 1790. That was 9 years before the United States Navy, as such, was ever heard of. The Coast Guard has remained steadfast to its appointed duty throughout all of these years.

The history of the service has been marked by two consolidations of the services engaged in promoting safety and security at sea, the original purpose for which the Coast Guard was organized. The first of these was the amalgamation of the Revenue Cutter Service with the Life Saving Service as the Coast Guard in 1915. The second was the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard in 1939. Both consolidations have contributed materially to the effectiveness of the Coast Guard's operations in time of peace.

The United States Navy was organized in 1799. In time of peace the Coast Guard serves under the United States Treasury. In

time of war—under the Navy. It has never failed its mission to either branch of our Government. The Coast Guard Academy at New London is designed to furnish officers for this great branch of our armed forces. Due to the highly specialized type of work performed by the Coast Guard Service, neither our Army nor Navy schools were found satisfactory to provide the officers for this specialized service and thus in 1876 the Congress established a separate Coast Guard school at New Bedford, Mass. This school was moved to Baltimore, Md., in 1900 and finally to New London, Conn., in 1910. The Coast Guard Academy which I visited was built in 1933 and it is a great institution—believe me—at which you and I would love to have our boys in attendance. The traditions of the Coast Guard are based on the ability of officers and men in seamanship.

Appointments as cadets are offered to young men standing highest in a Nation-wide competitive examination held in May of each year which is open to all who are able to meet the prescribed standards. The mental requirements are in general those required for admission to a high-grade engineering college, or, I should have said, the very highest grade of engineering college. The figures show that on the average for the past 10 years approximately 2,500 boys file applications to take the examinations for admission to the United States Coast Guard Academy. Of these approximately 500—or 20 percent—succeed in passing the rigid entrance examinations in mathematics and English. Of these 500 approximately 150 are selected based upon their scholastic attainments in the test and their superior physical qualifications. Thus it is perfectly easy to see that the United States Coast Guard in picking 150 of an initial application of 2,500 is theoretically and practically accepting only the "cream of the crop," and those are the type boys who I saw passing in review as the cadet battalion at the lowering of the colors at retreat shortly after my arrival at New London. Their marching technique and their smartness under orders in small-arms drill is fully comparable with and not surpassed by either the midshipmen at Annapolis or the cadets at West Point.

The United States Coast Guard Academy at New London occupies approximately 45 acres situated on the west bank of the Thames River. The principal buildings, which are of Colonial Georgian architecture—including the cadet barracks and mess hall for 312 cadets; an administrative building; a library containing more than 17,000 volumes; a completely equipped hospital with X-ray and dental laboratories; an academic building housing classrooms and physics, chemistry, electrical, and radio laboratories; an engineering laboratory which contains a complete marine boiler and engine plant; also in this laboratory are a number of various types of engineering units which are completely torn down in cross section so that the students can visually study each and every part of the essential driving elements of any ship afloat or in the air; a lecture hall and engineering shop, a large armory and gymnasium with swimming pool in the basement; and numerous buildings of lesser importance. The insufficient playing fields include a football stadium and tennis courts. On the river front are a wharf, boathouse, and a field with ramps for seaplanes.

But this Coast Guard Academy is obviously deficient in certain things. It is obviously deficient in the number of small sailing craft to provide these boys with the necessary training in seamanship they require and which they can attain only by being on their own in their leisure hours, in a sailing craft. Secondly, it is deficient in the fact that there is not sufficient athletic equipment and space to permit those who do not make the varsity team or the scrub team to have all of the opportunities and the facilities that they desire or need to properly condition their bodies. Those are the problems to be solved by legislative authorization for which the Board of Visitors was created, and to learn of which we make our annual inspection.

The worst deficiency, however, at the Coast Guard Academy is the need for a chapel. What I cannot understand is this. That an academy built way back in the thirties and on which the public has spent something like $2,500,000, should have been built or even conceived in the first place without ample chapel facilities having been provided in the initial construction. Our Board of Visitors appointed a special committee to study this problem and to introduce legislation to see to it that adequate chapel facilities—church-like in appearance and atmosphere—should be made available at the earliest possible opportunity—and, incidentally, ladies and gentlemen, this will give you as big a kick as it gave me—we had before us in our meeting the student cadet commander of the cadet corps and asked him for his recommendations as to what he thought the boys needed at that school—the very first thing he told us was—they needed a chapel, they needed greater opportunity to meet with their Maker in a churchlike atmosphere; and I thought that was a fine spirit from a fine man and I wish you could have seen this young fellow because he is outstanding and the type boy that you and I would love to call our son.

While we were at New London overnight, the Board of Visitors and the advisory committee were all quartered in the homes of the various officers who serve as instructors at this great institution. After a review of the cadet battalion on Saturday, each of us was escorted by cadets from our own State into the main mess hall for lunch. I was very glad to find seven boys from our State of Michigan in the mess hall and with whom I was privileged to have lunch. My escorts were Cadet (2d cl.) C. R. Howard, of Detroit, and Cadet (3d cl.) C. I. Foss, of Pontiac. I was glad to have seated at our table Cadet (2d cl.) R. L. Kallin, of Escanaba, and Cadet (3d cl.) W. Schweinsberg, Jr., of Marquette.

All of these boys were disturbed by the fact that too few of our boys from the Great Lakes area are seen in the academy and that probably is due to the fact that they do not appreciate what a great institution the United States Coast Guard is nor what a great school they have at New London. As of May 1 this year, there are, for instance, 47 students from New York State, 33 from California, and only 7 from Michigan. Wake up, Michigan—appreciate what you have, and you kids there in Michigan come in there and join the Coast Guard—the greatest and the oldest branch of our armed navies there is afloat today.

And by the way, before I close—what about you girls? They are commissioning SPARS up there at New London after an 8 weeks' course. There are now approximately 60 of those girls at New London and they put on a close-order drill that made all of us sit up and take notice. The SPARS are being trained mainly to do office work, but their drilling is par excellence, believe you me. On our way back to Washington, Representative JOHN D. MCWILLIAMS, of Connecticut, and myself dropped off in New York for a few hours to see the new Coast Guard musical comedy entitled "Tars and Spars" playing at the Strand Theater. That show is scheduled to appear in Detroit sometime in July. If you get an opportunity to see it, folks, please go because I know it will tickle you pink.

It is an outstanding presentation full of the finest music produced by boys who have been in action on the coasts of Africa, Sicily, and Salerno in Italy. The star of the show is none other than Victor Mature, the famous motion picture and stage star, who, on combat duty with the Coast Guard, was within 300 yards of the famous Coast Guard cutter *Escanaba* when she was torpedoed and sunk in a space of 19 seconds. The whole show is an outstanding performance. It is designed primarily to increase the enlistments in the SPARS branch. Girls, you can serve your country by enlisting in the SPARS or in the WAVES or in the WAC's and relieve an able-bodied man for active combat duty at a time when his services are most needed by Uncle Sam.

Indeed the entire trip was the most enjoyable inspection trip it has been my privilege to make since coming to Congress. It is a distinct honor and privilege to serve as a member of the Board of Visitors of the United States Coast Guard Academy, the mission of which is "To graduate young men with sound bodies, stout hearts, and alert minds, with a liking for the sea and its lore, and with that high sense of honor, loyalty, and obedience which goes with trained initiative and leadership; well grounded in seamanship, the sciences, and the amenities, and strong in the resolve to be worthy of the traditions of commissioned officers of the United States Coast Guard in the service of their country and humanity." The academy's motto, "Scientiae cedit mare" (the sea yields to knowledge).

In closing, I sincerely hope that more of our boys from the Great Lakes area will become interested in the Coast Guard and, above all, in putting forth the necessary competitive effort to qualify for admission to this outstanding educational institution dedicated to knowledge of the sea and the defense of our beloved country. If any young man would like descriptive literature on the United States Coast Guard Academy, same is available upon request at my office.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the invasion, whether imminent or remote, will keep us all on the qui vive till it happens.

Dear Alben marched up the Hill and then marched down again. Sewell Avery marched up the hill—period.

The greatest need in Congress today is for more men like Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Representative JOHN TABER who fight the loose spenders.

MARTIN DIES, although endorsed by William Green for reelection, suffered a lot for 6 years from the Communists and the Roosevelts.

Some news commentators are saying there will be long years of prosperity after the war. They want us to understand that wars are worth while.

Dr. Eugene B. Elliott, Michigan superintendent of public instruction, warns that the States "must fight to retain control of public education."

Bert Culp, director of farm labor in Kansas, is the man to follow the next 2

months. The sun will be hot and the days long but the call is "Come over into Macedonia and help us."

The C. I. O. committee for political action, the Hague and Kelly big city political machines, the Federal bureaucracy, and the horse in the middle of the stream are the four corner pillars of the fourth term.

Jergens lotion last Sunday night gave figures to prove that the Communist Party was declining. The reason is they have joined the Nudeal party along with Walter and Sidney. Even Earl Browder is supporting F. D. R. now.

"Now, you must pioneer again through the be-wilderness of complex world-war problems toward new horizons of peace and progress that only planning, work, and determination can make come true"—Rickenbacker to North Carolina women.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me to note that the Senate added an amendment to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1945 providing an appropriation to carry on a program commonly known as the school-lunch program.

The House Appropriations Committee, in the first instance, made no appropriation in the appropriation bill submitted by the Committee on Agriculture for the purpose of conducting this program, and it was my personal belief at that time, and is now, that conservation by eliminating this worth-while project was false economy.

I am firmly convinced that malnutrition is our greatest producer of ill health. I say, provide good meals for our children now and avoid physical defects later. I respectfully urge every Member of the House to give due consideration to this plan and expend funds for our children now which will pay incalculable dividends later. I am including in my extension of remarks an outline of the school-lunch program and how it operates:

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM AND HOW IT OPERATES

I. Who is entitled to participate in the school-lunch and milk program?

Every boy and girl in America of school and pre-school age.

II. What agencies are eligible to operate a program?

A. Schools:

1. Public.

2. Parochial (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, etc.).

B. Welfare centers.

C. Nursery schools.

III. What is a school lunch?

There are three types:

Type A (9 cents): A complete lunch providing one-third to one-half of the day's nutritive requirements and consisting of at least: (1) One-half pint of milk as a beverage; (2) 2 ounces of meat or fish, or 1 egg or 2 ounces of cheese, or one-half cup of dried peas, beans, or soybeans, or one-fourth cup of peanut butter; (3) 1 cup of vegetables or fruit, or one-half cup of each; (4) 2 slices of bread or 2 muffins or other hot bread, made of whole grain or enriched flour or cereal; (5) 2 teaspoons of butter or oleomargarine with added vitamin A.

Type A (7 cents): Same as above except without milk.

Type B (6 cents): A lunch less adequate nutritionally and consisting of (1) one-half pint of milk as a beverage; (2) 1 ounce of meat or fish, or one-half of an egg, or 1 ounce of cheese, or one-fourth cup of dried peas, beans, soybeans, or two tablespoons of peanut butter; (3) one-half cup of vegetables or fruit; (4) two slices of bread or two muffins or other hot bread, made of whole grain or enriched flour or cereal; (5) one teaspoon of butter or oleomargarine with added vitamin A.

Type B (4 cents): Same as above except without milk.

Type C (2 cents): One-half pint of fluid milk.

IV. Is the school-lunch program served without charge?

No; except in cases where the child cannot afford to pay. Children who cannot pay are not embarrassed. No distinction or discrimination is made by the sponsor. In all about 10 percent of the participants are served free.

The price of milk to the child is served at about a maximum of 2 cents per half pint.

The type B lunch is served at a cost of 5 cents to the child.

The type A lunch is served at a cost of 10 to 20 cents to the child. In most cases the child, the community, or local sponsor pays more than 50 percent of the cost of the lunch.

V. How much does the Government pay for each type of lunch?

Type A: Complete meal with milk, 9 cents.

Type A: Complete meal without milk, 7 cents.

Type B: Light lunch with milk, 6 cents.

Type B: Light lunch without milk, 4 cents.

Type C: Milk only, 2 cents.

State participation in Illinois is 2 cents for a type A lunch. In the type C lunch a subsidy of 1 cent is added to the Government aid.

VI. Is this program intended to be solely a Federal-aid program?

No; with additional States enacting legislation, the program is taking on a Federal-State-and-community sponsorship, with each sharing the expenses.

VII. Is there regimentation in evidence?

No; each sponsor handles his own program. The school principal or lunchroom manager buys the food from the local meat and grocery store and submits a claim for approval to the county superintendent of schools, or the State superintendent of public instruction in States where the State is participating. In States where appropriations have not yet been authorized by State legislatures the claim is sent to the supervisor of the local department of agriculture.

VIII. Are there prescribed menus the agencies must use?

No; the Department of Agriculture sends out monthly bulletins with suggested low-cost menus for well-balanced meals filled with vitamin content. However, the lunch must conform to nutritional standards prescribed by the Department of Agriculture. The sponsor is given a widespread choice of foods that are considered nutritious.

IX. Does the Government provide for the cost of labor?

No; the Government subsidy provides only money for food. The community's local sponsor, or the child's payment, defrays labor costs. In some communities the P. T. A. and other organizations prepare and serve lunches on a voluntary basis. The responsibility for preparation and serving is placed on the local agency and not on the Government.

X. How many schools now participate in this program?

About 30,000 schools, totaling nearly 5,000,000 children. In Illinois 1,600 schools, with an enrollment of more than 600,000 participate.

XI. Are children forced to participate in the program?

No; children may or may not participate, according to their own wishes. However, in schools where formerly less than 10 percent of the children bought milk at 5 cents per bottle, nearly every child now receives the milk at a cost of 2 cents or less under the Federal school-lunch programs.

XII. Are surplus foods used in the lunch program?

Yes; when they are available. After the war all surplus foods, particularly those in warehouses, can be placed to good use through school-lunch channels under the supervision of the United States Department of Agriculture.

XIII. To what extent will the lunch program develop in America?

Because it is health insurance it is expected every child in America will soon receive the benefit of school lunches. It is just as important as learning the A B C's to have a strong body and a sound mind. In the depression the program kept children from being hungry; now it serves to prevent children from being undernourished.

XIV. What do parents in general think about the program?

A tremendous amount of inquiries has been made by parents as to how to prepare food for home use that the children have learned to eat at school. A wider spread diet is also in evidence in the homes of children who eat school lunches. In areas where only pork and starches were used before now there is a great demand for lamb, veal, fowl, beef and assorted vegetables.

XV. What is the motive behind the program?

Strong and healthy future citizens.

With the steady increase each day of mothers in war work it is most important that the Government cooperate to assure each school child that his health will not be neglected.

Federal-State and community participation is now resulting in community cooking schools to teach American housewives the necessity and responsibility of the use of more healthful foods.

XVI. Why can't the entire cost of the school-lunch program be borne by the local community?

Even though the economic structure in the Nation has in the main increased, there are still many millions of wage earners who have received little or no pay raises whatsoever. This is especially true in certain sections of the country. The white-collar man has perhaps suffered more than anyone else in this regard.

XVII. Is it not possible that the State should assume the entire cost of this program?

This will take time. The program is now operating with State aid in cooperation with the Government in 26 States. Because the mechanism is not set up to continue the program, without Federal assistance more than half of the agencies receiving these benefits would be eliminated. Work is being done along these lines for State and community aid.

XVIII. What agency is best prepared to carry on this program?

The Department of Agriculture is best fitted to carry on this program because that

Department specializes in food itself and also because it would avoid duplication if the program is assigned to another department. This is especially true in the case of the handling of surplus foods when they will be available in greater quantities in the future.

In summing up the school-lunch program in general, it is imperative to the health of our children that House bill 4278, which calls for at least a temporary set up, should be passed.

Calling F. D. R. Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean, of May 16, 1944, entitled "Calling F. D. R. Again."

It is my belief that the editorial which follows expresses the sentiment of a vast majority of the American people in these crucial and critical days:

CALLING F. D. R. AGAIN

The emphatic action of Democratic State conventions and of Democratic voters in the election of delegates to the forthcoming National Democratic Convention already have cinched the fact—which, furthermore, has never really been in question—that Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term is the choice of the Democrats of America by an overwhelming majority.

The President, if he shall be a candidate, will be nominated by the convention in Chicago on the first ballot, and there is no doubt but that the nomination will be by acclamation.

This newspaper fervently hopes that Mr. Roosevelt will accept the honor and the service that is offered him by his fellow Democrats; that he will take up the nomination in the spirit of duty; that in this spirit he will accede to the unmistakable call of his country that he continue another 4 years in the White House to guide the Nation wisely through the war to victory, and through the hazards that threaten the establishment of a lasting peace afterward, the public welfare requiring it.

The Tennesseean appreciates, as does the vast majority of Americans, that in the past 12 years Mr. Roosevelt has given to his country a service of devotion that entitles him to the peace and rest which he may choose. Whether or not he continues at the post a: which destiny and the will of the people have placed him, his chapter in history as one of the greatest of the Presidents of the United States and one of the great world leaders of his day is secure.

This newspaper shares with most Americans the conviction, nevertheless, that Mr. Roosevelt, because of the singular experience he possesses in dealing with the momentous problems that have been brought to our Nation and to the world by war, because of the quality of his vision toward the future, because of his manifest and unwavering humanitarianism, and because of the high confidence and affection he holds in the hearts of the people, is the citizen best found to administer and protect the affairs of the Nation in the decisive years immeditately before us.

We see nowhere on the contemporary scene a figure more capable of coping with the duties and powers of the American Presidency, and certainly none in whom so great a popular trust reposes.

The Democratic Party is making no mistake in displaying its all-but-unanimous choice for Mr. Roosevelt even though the President has not indicated a willingness to accept the nomination again. To have made any other choice would have shown the party to be without understanding of the desires of the American people. And it is because the party speaks not only for the political organization, but for men and women of America in all walks of life, that Mr. Roosevelt should deeply consider the compulsion of the popular claim upon him which the proffered nomination expresses.

The common yeople of the United States have neither forgotten their affection for the man who led the Nation out of the economic and spiritual distress of its greatest depression nor their esteem for the patriot and statesman who so clearly understood the national jeopardy in the rise of totalitarian aggression in the world and ceaselessly strove to prepare America to defend its security. Unquestionably it is their judgment that their welfare best will be assured, at home and abroad, by the Presidential guidance with which they are familiar. And there could be no happier outcome of the American political question in 1944 than that Mr. Roosevelt should bow to the people's bidding to continue to serve.

There is hardly a family in the United States that does not have a son or a father or a cousin or an uncle in the armed forces, or a daughter or sister in the WAC's, the WAVES, the SPARS, the Nurse Corps, or the Red Cross. These are defendants of the Nation in the greatest military force America has ever built—and the President is their Commander in Chief. With the really crucial days of the war now arriving, it is impossible to imagine that the Commander will leave his command—or that the Nation would not uphold the Commander.

Cooperation of Air and Surface Carriers for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly pointed out the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board in opposition to transportation by water in connection with the use of airplanes. The efforts of surface carriers to secure necessary permits to use air transportation in connection with water transportation by merchant marine ships are of the prime importance in the national defense and in the promotion of foreign trade for this country.

Decisions have been made by the Board which I conceive to be wholly incorrect and are serving effectually to establish a situation which is wholly inconsistent with a correct national post-war military policy. As a member of the Post-war Military Policy Committee, I wrote recently to the chairman of that committee calling for certain material which I conceive to be essential to a correct military policy. I am a member of that committee, and I believe that the information is very necessary and desire the fullest information possible concerning the effect of the present and future policies of the present Civil Aeronautics Board on the future military policy of the United States. The letter which I wrote Chairman WOODRUM, and which I have sent to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1944.

Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM,
Chairman, Special Committee on Post-war Military Policy, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: In connection with our study of post-war military problems, I think that there should be submitted by the Navy to our committee a comprehensive survey of the needs of merchant marine as well as Navy ships during the post-war period and the volume of tonnage with different types that will be required for an adequate Navy. It is possible that the volume of merchant marine tonnage required as an auxiliary would vary as to different programs of the Navy, for example, assuming a Navy size (X) covering combatant ships and auxiliaries permanently going with and belonging to such a combatant Navy there would be required a merchant marine of size (A); for a Navy size (Y), a merchant marine size (B) would be required; and for a Navy size (Z), a merchant marine size (C) would be required, etc.

From a national defense angle there is a direct relationship between the Navy and the merchant marine and it is believed the General Board of the Navy could give our committee valuable advice regarding the post-war requirements and the relative sizes of both.

Anticipating that we will maintain our present naval strength, how large a merchant marine should be maintained to meet any emergency? That is, for every million tons of naval ships, how many tons of merchant shipping will be required as an auxiliary to meet such an emergency?

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND.

There are many applications pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board. It seems to me that the Board ignores all ideas of national defense and pursues a policy devoted to monopolistic protection for air transportation and a policy which ignores the importance of air transportation connected with ships in the defense of the country. The legalistic construction placed upon existing statutes by the Civil Aeronautics Board gives evidence that it feels that it is responsible only for the promotion of air transportation, while the course of the present war shows that all agencies must cooperate and be used cooperatively for the defense of the country.

The endeavor of surface carriers to engage in air transportation has aroused serious controversy as a result of the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in a case wherein the American Export Lines, Inc., sought to obtain the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 408 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Board of 1938, as amended, of its control over American Export Airlines. The underlying principle of this decision has made it difficult, if not impossible, for steamship companies to enter the field of operation. The recent introduction

into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a letter from the Pacific American Steamship Association to the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A1786 and the reply thereto by the Honorable LYLE H. BOREN appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A2161 may give rise to unnecessary confusion as to the present effect of the rulings of the Civil Aeronautics Board relative to the participation of the maritime industry in aviation. There is no possible doubt as to the present attitude of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. Harllee Branch, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, on November 11, 1943, stated:

The Board has determined that the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act rigidly restrict the participation of the older forms of transportation in the air transport field, and this determination is amply supported by well-established congressional policy.

George C. Neil, general counsel of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in the Georgetown Law Journal, May 1943, on Some Phases of Air Transport Regulation, said:

The American Export case (decided by Civil Aeronautics Board) may lead to the exclusion with few exceptions of surface carriers from the air transport field.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, contains the following proviso which is the essential part of the issue presently effecting the American merchant marine in its endeavor to obtain rights to enter the field of aviation. Section 408 (b) of the act provides in part:

Unless * * * the Authority finds that the consolidation * * * or acquisition of control will not be consistent with the public interest or that the conditions of this section will not be fulfilled, it shall by order, approve such consolidation * * * or acquisition of control, upon such terms and conditions as it shall find to be just and reasonable and with such modifications as it may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Authority shall not approve any consolidation * * * or acquisition of control which would result in creating a monopoly or monopolies and thereby restrain competition or jeopardize another air carrier not a party to the consolidation * * * or acquisition of control: *Provided further*, That * * * the Authority shall not enter such an order of approval unless it finds that the transaction proposed will promote the public interest by enabling such carrier other than an air carrier to use aircraft to public advantage in its operation and will not restrain competition.

On August 23, 1943, the Civil Aeronautics Board in the matter of the application of the Boston & Maine Railroad and Maine Central R. R. Co. with respect to their interest in Northeast Airlines, Inc., under section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, stated:

The provisions of section 408 carry into the Civil Aeronautics Act a well-established national policy that the various forms of transportation should be mutually independent. That this has long been the prevailing congressional intent is conclusively established by the legislative background of the various transportation acts and by the language of the Civil Aeronautics Act itself. We are convinced that a construction of this act which rigidly limits the participation of other forms of transportation in the air-transport field is in harmony with the intent of Congress, and is necessary to attain a full and sound development of our national air-transportation system.

Congressional action clearly indicates a conclusion that the public interest requires that the various forms of transportation be kept distinct, so that each can operate in its own sphere independently of the others. We must therefore scrutinize carefully each situation in which there exists a relationship between an air carrier and another common carrier in order to determine, first, if there has been an acquisition of control within the meaning of the act; and if so, whether such acquisition would be consistent with the public interest and in accord with the provisions of section 408 (b).

On January 26, 1944, L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in testifying before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, on House Resolution 52, a resolution authorizing investigation of the national defense program as it relates to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, said:

Since we were told by the court that we had to apply the second proviso of section 408, we looked to see what construction a similar section in the Motor Carrier Act had received when Congress enacted it again in the Civil Aeronautics Act. The broad general policy that that construction had laid down was that this proviso was quite a strict proviso and required the services which were to be controlled to be auxiliary and supplementary to the surface carrier operations. We felt bound by that general policy that Congress had laid down.

Mr. Pogue further stated, in discussing the growth of air travel and the problems of maintaining a strong American merchant marine if shipping companies are not allowed to compete in aviation in foreign commerce:

To the extent that passenger business does take to the air the large investments in the steamship passenger vessels will have to be written off one way or the other. That is one of the prices we have to pay for what you call progress and that writing off will have to take place regardless of whether or not the steamships are in the air business. * * * We have to apply the proviso in all cases. We are doing it. I want to be frank and make it clear that we are not in favor of changing the law or removing the restrictions now that it has gone that far.

Mr. Pogue, in answer to a question, stated at this hearing that he presently did not think the policy of Congress should be changed from either the standpoint of the merchant marine or the security of our country because he thought that the most vigorous development and growth of foreign air transportation would result from a continuance of the present policy adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board by retaining the restrictive proviso which is now in the law because in the over-all picture the development of aviation would be better served if it were left to independent air companies although not to new companies necessarily.

Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, has stated:

The decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board appear to overlook the problem of control of air lines as one affecting the position of the United States in world trade. Progress is a fact and world changes demand administrative genius unhampered by local convention or rule. America is to Persia or China or Russia but a far-off place to be reached quickly for its wealth and opportunity. Persia, China, and Russia must be actualities to America. These places are reached now by our merchant marine. American commerce, its development and growth, must not be stinted and thwarted by any administrative ruling which would say to the maritime industry in effect, "You cannot have new rights, new hopes, new ambitions. What was good enough for father is good enough for you." Such is not the spirit of America—yesterday, today, and will not be tomorrow. I believe that there should exist equal opportunity in the air for all, under progressive constructive governmental regulations, whose objectives are a prosperous and secure foreign trade as well as domestic commerce, national defense as well as international greatness, preclusion of the merchant marine from aeronautics stifles these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, the language of the official representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board is clear. Can there be any doubt that the attitude of this governmental agency is one of restriction against and limitation upon steamship company participation in aeronautics.

Disenfranchisement by order of an admittedly partial, prejudiced, Civil Aeronautics Board is neither a fitting nor just reward for the magnificent maritime contribution toward ultimate American victory.

I Am an American Day, May 21

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 21, is the day set aside by Presidential proclamation as the day the Nation, with soul-stirring democratic ceremonies, recognizes all American citizens who have either attained their majority or become naturalized during the past year.

On that day, throughout the length and breadth of our glorious land, thousands of our citizens will take the oath of allegiance, with proper and solemn observances.

In effect, our founding fathers speak to these new members of the grandest fraternity of free men and women ever established on this earth, saying: "You are now Americans. As Americans, you acquire certain unalienable rights, among them, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As Americans, you also assume certain responsibilities coequal with these rights: among them, your full share of the day's burden, true tolerance, and patriotism, complete and unqualified. As Americans, you enter upon a proud heritage of hope and opportunity and freedom, bought with bloodshed and sacrifice and toil and

tears. See, then, that you bear yourselves toward your fellow Americans, toward your city, your State, and your country, in all things whatsoever so that the spirit of Jefferson may rejoice and the soul of Lincoln be gladdened. Welcome, new Americans, and God preserve, protect, and prosper you."

Never, in our entire history as a nation, has the privilege of being or becoming an American citizen carried with it greater duties and greater responsibilities. Our country is now engaged in a titanic struggle against the most ruthless and treacherous tyranny the world has ever known. Thousands upon thousands of our new citizens, shoulder to shoulder with their native-born brothers and sisters, are fighting and falling heroically on all the far-flung fields of battle; every beach head, from Tarawa to Anzio, has been enriched with their blood and their courage; the dangerous seas and the desperate skies have resounded with their deeds and their deaths. In common with their brothers-in-arms, on the war front and the home front, in the savage assault of some hell-defended hill or in the grinding toil of farm and factory, these new Americans are dedicating their lives, day and night, to the eternal principles of liberty and equality and justice, to the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter, freedom of speech and freedom of conscienee, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

In this momentous hour, it is especially fitting that all Americans, as loyal and patriotic citizens of this great Republic, should meet together to reaffirm our allegiance to Old Glory that waves over one Nation indivisible and to the ideals for which that Nation stands. It is indeed incumbent upon each and every one of us to rededicate ourselves with all our strength, with all our hearts and souls, under God, to the tremendous task of victory and the long labor of peace.

Commissioner of Indian Affairs

REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this brief time in order to read to the House a letter I have written to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which, in my judgment, disqualifies him for the office he now holds. I, therefore, feel justified in respectfully demanding that the Commissioner be removed from office. The letter giving one of the high spots of the evidence furnished me by the Comptroller General is as follows:

MAY 18, 1944.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 8 I addressed a communication to you advising that your Commissioner of Indian Affairs had testified before the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor of being chairman, with reference to the use of Government funds in establishing a so-called legal residence in the State of Nevada during last summer.

Members of the committee had understood from his rambling testimony that the Commissioner claimed to be on active duty the entire 42 days required to establish a legal residence in the State of Nevada. Today I have been furnished with a statement of the travel performed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States. According to the records before me, as certified by the Comptroller General, the Commissioner drew per diem of $6 per day for a total of 27 days, from July 6, the day he left Washington, D. C., to secure his divorce, until and including August 4, 1943. The Comptroller General's letter further discloses that he stopped over in Chicago for 2 days between July 6 and 8 and took up residence in Nevada on July 11. The pretext that he was on active duty "inspecting Indian reservations" for a total of 27 days during this time, for which he received $6 per diem, is, of course, absurd. Also, the fact that he immediately upon arrival in Carson City took annual and sick leave is further convincing evidence that the only purpose of the trip was to secure a divorce at Government expense.

In my previous letter to you concerning this matter I mentioned other reprehensible conduct on the part of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and indicated that my committee is strongly of the opinion that the Commissioner is unfit for the position he holds and has lost the confidence of the Members of Congress, the Indians, and others who know of his general inefficiency. To say that he is a weak administrator is indeed to be charitable. He should be immediately removed from office.

May I express the hope that you not further ignore this matter but that you immediately investigate the things referred to. I am enclosing herwith a copy of some of the information I have received from the Comptroller General as to the expenditure of Government funds by the Commissioner.

In addition to the above facts, gleaned from the record of the Comptroller General, permit me to remind you that the over-burdened taxpayers of the United States paid all of the expenses of transportation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs by train and otherwise to and from his sojourn to Nevada in order that he might establish his residence for the aforementioned purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JED JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations.

Measure Your Congressman by These Three Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Robert Lasch, which appeared in the Chicago Sun of May 15, 1944:

MEASURE YOUR CONGRESSMAN BY THESE THREE TESTS

It is a fascinating thing to study the voting record of your Congressman. The rhetoric and oratory that normally clothe him fall away, and he stands naked and revealed before you. Here he is, the essence of him, enshrined in ayes and nays. Here is the sum of his past behavior, and here the best index of his future behavior.

Different people measure their Congressmen in different ways. A farmer may look at the votes on farm measures, a worker at the labor issues, and so on. This year, for average citizens with no strong group affiliations, the best test is a triple one.

AN ISOLATIONIST?

First I'd want to know how my Congressman voted on issues of foreign policy. The House had three such issues before it during the past 2 years—extension of the Trade Agreement Act, the Fulbright resolution for a peace organization, and the United Nations relief authorization. A man who stood against these three measures, or against two of the three, has branded himself an isolationist, and unfit, in my opinion, to sit in a Congress which may make the peace.

Since foreign policy is not the only great issue before us, I'd also want to know how my Congressman voted on economic questions, and particularly on inflation control. A man who did not stand up for effective price control during the war is not one I'd want to trust with the critical economic problems of the post-war transition.

Finally, to get a clue toward his general outlook on democracy and civil rights, I'd look up my Congressman's record on pertinent questions in that field. The most pertinent of all is the soldier-vote bill. A second is the Dies committee, which has hounded decent people for years because they had liberal convictions. A third is the anti-poll-tax bill. I'd want my Congressman to be right on at least two of these three measures. Above all I'd want him to be right on the soldier vote. For if he was unwilling to give the servicemen free and simple access to a ballot, what might he not do in a future test of democratic rights?

DEMOCRATS VOTED RIGHT

You may like the six Democratic Congressmen from Chicago or not, but the fact is that their voting records in these three test areas are uniformly good. Representatives DAWSON, GORDON, GORSKI, O'BRIEN, ROWAN, and SABATH all went down the line for a foreign policy of international cooperation. They supported effective price control at every opportunity. They opposed the Dies Committee and supported the Federal ballot for soldiers.

House Resolution No. 547

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star, one of the great newspapers of America, published by Eugene C. Pulliam, approves House Resolution No. 547, which I have introduced, which provides for a nonpartisan congressional investigation of the Federal bureaucracy and unconstitutional trends of Government. The Star's opinion of

this proposal was expressed in an editorial, which I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

CURB BUREAUCRACY'S MENACE

Representative LUDLOW has introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution asking Congress for official recognition of the menace of bureaucracy. He proposes to take the bull by the horns. There has been a lot of talk about the baleful effects of bureaucracy, but talk without action accomplishes nothing. He calls on Congress to do something, and do it now.

Mr. LUDLOW'S resolution would authorize the Judiciary Committee of the House to make an investigation of "bureaucracy" and the "unconstitutional trends of government" and report its findings to the present Congress. "The number of alphabetical agencies has outgrown the number of regular departments of government 10 to 1," the resolution states, and threatens "the form and mold of our government."

The purpose of his resolution, Mr. LUDLOW declared, "Is to take the first step to bring our Government back within the bounds of the Constitution and keep it there." He does not start with any false notions of the critical state of affairs. He recognizes that, in following the development of bureaucracy, we are out of bounds and running wild.

Representative LUDLOW does undertake to salve some official consciences regarding the growth of bureaucracy by the suggestion that "many of these aberrations are due to the exigencies of war and the unusual character of the times through which we have been passing." We were well on the way, however, long before the war.

Mr. LUDLOW voices the hope that corrective measures may be undertaken in a spirit of cooperation and "free from the sordid dictates of politics." That is optimism carried to the *n*th degree.

Unfortunately not all who might be expected to lend assistance have Mr. LUDLOW'S candor. Some do not concede there is any deviation from the Constitution. Others admit there has been, but contend the Constitution should be interpreted to cover what they are doing.

He thinks the investigation should have the support of every Democrat and Republican in Congress. He is right. It should be a patriotic, nonpartisan survey made to determine just what is the situation and what should be done. The task should be the responsibility and obligation of new dealers as well as of Democrats and Republicans, all Americans together.

Tonnage Output Under Program of Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Admiral Vickery, of the Maritime Commission, showing tonnage output under the Maritime Commission's program through April 1944. The information shown on the chart is similar to the information contained in the letter and for this reason the chart is omitted.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1944.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it will be of interest to you, I am enclosing a chart showing tonnage output under the Maritime Commission's program through April 1944.

During April, United States merchant shipyards delivered 154 ships, the total deadweight of which was 1,593,691 tons. This exceeded March deliveries, and the total for the first 4 months of this year, 5,709,642 tons, surpassed the 5,360,712 tons completed during the corresponding period in 1943. Merchant shipyard output from December 7, 1941, through April 30, 1944, aggregated 3,215 ships of 33,130,175 tons, or more than half the estimated world tonnage at the time of Pearl Harbor.

Ship-production rates, however, are now governed principally by manpower, the supply of which is diminishing. This limitation has already forced some revision of ship-delivery schedules, and accordingly the Commission is concentrating upon the types of vessels most urgently needed in order to avoid or minimize delays in their construction. As a result, more fast cargo ships, standard tankers, and transports were delivered last month than ever before.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY, *Commissioner.*

The G. I. Bill of Rights Worthy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of S. 1767, the G. I. bill of rights. It has been given thorough consideration by various groups interested in veterans' legislation and by the Appropriation Committees of the Senate and of the House. It has many features of great interest to them to know that we are thinking of their welfare while they are fighting on the battlefields of the world.

All American citizens want every possible consideration shown these disabled, in mind and in body, as a result of this war. The facilities available to the veterans of the last war will be likewise available to those of this World War. The 100,000 hospital beds of the Veterans' Bureau will be immediately available when they are needed, and in addition to this, 100,000 additional hospital beds will be available under this bill by loan from the Army and the Navy to the Veterans' Administration. If the hospital load is heavier than this—additional hospital facilities will have to be built. This bill gives the Veterans' Administration full authority to build the additional facilities which may be needed from time to time, subject only to the necessary appropriations available.

The new hospitals to be built when needed should be made of permanent material, and they should be as fine as engineers can devise and money can buy. They should be built throughout the length and breadth of the land where they are needed, and in locating them, reference should be made to the climate, geographical advantages and general environment.

The statutes which are presently available to disabled veterans of World War No. 1 should likewise immediately be made available to veterans of World War No. 2. These statutes will give pensions to our disabled ranging from $10 to $250 per month, depending upon the nature and the extent of the disability.

After the last war our governmental agencies were not so constituted as to begin promptly to function. Many disabled veterans filed their applications timely, but found to their misfortune that no action was promptly taken. A great "log jam" of applications from veterans, all disabled, had paralyzed the hands of the Veterans' Administration.

The fact that this bill gives the Veterans' Administration a priority on personnel, second only to the Army and Navy, is our guaranty that this distressing situation will not repeat itself. The further fact that Congress is proceeding at an early date to enact necessary enabling laws is further guaranty that our Government will act promptly this time, and that this situation will not repeat itself.

More than 5,000 veterans monthly are moving through the Veterans' Administration hospitals at the present time. Already over 40,000 have been hospitalized, and the number is constantly increasing. It was testified at the House hearings on this bill that the peak load of disabilities may not come for 25 years after the war, and at that time it may reach a total of 1,250,000 men and women veterans who have disabilities of some character. This is an enormous number but whatever the number may be, it is our obligation as citizens of a grateful Nation to make sure that these disabled veterans are properly cared for.

I am also greatly interested in the advantages this bill gives veterans to carry on their education and to learn an avocation or profession. Some people will say that it is too early to pass a bill of this kind. I do not agree with this conclusion. Many servicemen have already been discharged. We should have the machinery set up to give them hospitalization and educational advantages as quickly as possible. We must do everything possible to minimize the time lag between the time when a serviceman is discharged and the time when he can take his proper place in civilian life. The educational features of this bill have been well worked out. I am glad some of the amendments suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] have been agreed to. I think the compromise is a fair one. Other improvements will no doubt be made in the bill in conference.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this legislation is fair and certainly it is timely. The least we can do is to do justice to returning servicemen. The early passage of this bill will enable the Veterans' Administration to be preparing for the big job that it will have. I am glad that they are to be able to get an early start. I hope the legislation passes without a dissenting vote.

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my remarks made in Detroit on Sunday, May 21, 1944, on I Am an American Day:

The human race all over the world has fought for freedom and liberty. It was in America, however, that the greatest victory for the common man was achieved. Our Constitution, our form of government, our principles of democracy represent the greatest achievement in the peoples' struggle for liberty and freedom. Here to America have come the persecuted and downtrodden of every race and creed and nationality, from every corner of the world, to be fused together in the great American crucible. Out of this vast mass of diverse nationalities and peoples from all over the world has emerged the greatest miracle of the world—an American. The skeptics could never comprehend that it was possible to throw into this crucible, this melting pot, the United States of America, these various peoples from all over the world and have anything else but a Babylonia of confusion.

But the people who thirsted and hungered for freedom and liberty have proven to the world that they can be melted and molded and stand forever united in their struggle to preserve democracy and the principles of Americanism. These Americans have shown to the world that they can build not only spiritual fortresses but physical fortresses as well to defend their liberties from all threats. Freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion are sacred principles for all of us and no enemy must infringe on these God-given liberties.

We have had five major wars in our history. We are engaged in our sixth great struggle for American ideals of freedom. This war has a meaning far beyond its causes or its origins. It started as a struggle of powerful groups for political mastery and military supremacy. It has grown into a struggle to make sure who shall build the future. It is a struggle of minds, as well as men and machines. Into this struggle have been poured all the problems that touch us most vitally—race, religion, politics, economics—the very subsistence of entire peoples.

It is not enough that professors, economists, and politicians understand American principles and American ideals. It is the duty of every American citizen to be informed, to be well read, to have a deep and sincere understanding of America and American ideals and principles. Each and every one of us is duty bound to be intelligently informed and sacredly pledged to the support of the principles of freedom and liberty and to have the sincere conviction that if the universal dissemination of the true American principles is applied that we can guarantee that the chance of new wars occurring in the post-war world will become remote. We must, in other words, become salesmen for Americanism.

The system of the American Government is our great heritage. The democratic spirit is our inheritance. It must be cherished and preserved. This spirit of freedom is inborn, invincible, and ineradicable in the true American.

Americans are good people. America is great because she is good. When America is no longer good, then she will no longer be great. We must speak up for the "four freedoms" for the Atlantic Charter; we must support lowered trade barriers and tariffs, a freer world trade, a better standard of living for all of the people. We cannot become isolationists and remain aloof from the world.

In 1831, 113 years ago, a brilliant Frenchman toured the United States. Our country was still very young then. The name of this Frenchman was De Tocqueville. On his return to France he wrote the following:

"During my journey throughout America I sought for the secret of the genius and the greatness of America; I sought for her genius and greatness and growth and glory in her rich soils, in her rich mines, her great forests, her fallow fields, her ample rivers and noble harbors; but I did not discover it there. I further sought for the reason for her growth and her glory and her genius and her greatness, and I found it in her matchless Constitution; I found it in her schools, churches, and homes, ablaze with righteousness. It was there in her Constitution, in her homes, in her schools, in her churches that I found the true secret of the source of America's genius and greatness."

Dictators and militarists come and go. But America—democracy, our great Constitution, our form of government—stands firm and solid. On this day let us solemnly reaffirm: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Let us pray and give thanks to the Lord for His blessings. Let us humbly give thanks for our privilege and inheritance—"I am an American."

C. A. A. Flyers To Forestall Attempt To Set Physical Limit Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the May 19, 1944, issue of the Washington Daily News, written by Ruth Sarles:

C. A. A. FLYERS TO FORESTALL ATTEMPT TO SET PHYSICAL LIMIT TOO HIGH

(By Ruth Sarles)

Congressional supporters of men non-combat flyers grounded through abandonment of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service program will move to forestall an expected attempt by the War Department to set the physical requirements so high the men cannot qualify, it was learned today.

This plan came to light yesterday, along with the report that the Army Air Forces will apply their "brush-off" regulation (No. 50–7) to the C. A. A.-W. T. S. men, revising them to set the qualifications beyond the men's reach. This regulation specifying requirements for Army flyers is reported to be a flexible one, used in some cases to keep men out, and in others to get them in, and can be changed overnight.

IN AMENDMENT

The congressional move will take the form of an amendment to the bill militarizing the WASPS (Women Air Service Pilots) and the C. A. A.-W. T. S. men, expected to reach the House floor next week. The amendment will provide that the men shall not be required to meet different standards than those required at the time of enlistment in the Reserve Corps.

In the background of the congressional move was a case at a southern training center where a group of C. A. A.-W. T. S. men, passed by Army doctors in September 1943, were rejected for physical reasons the following February. In the 5-month interim, apparently, some of them had developed flat feet, too much height, and other defects that could not possibly have developed within 5 months.

MOOT QUESTION

Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces, appeared yesterday before a closed session of the Ramspeck civil service investigating committee, it was reported, for the purpose of "calming down" the impending committee report on the WASPS, said to recommend complete abandonment of the WASPS. The women fliers' program has been under fire on the ground that there is no need to train women fliers with as little as 35 hours' flying time for ferrying and other noncombat duty while a pool of around 11,000 CAA-WTS men with from 200 to 2,000 hours is available.

Whether General Arnold's visit to the Ramspeck committee will result in changing the tone of the report is a moot question, since reports of the impression he made vary.

General Arnold was said to have defended the WASP program as he did before the House Military Affairs Committee and assured the committee that the men were getting every break for flying jobs they were qualified to fill.

The committee will meet again to take action on the report submitted by investigators.

The general's testimony came in the face of reports of mounting dissatisfaction among Army officials at high command support of the WASPS. One report from a reliable source says that Army flying officers who have refused to take WASPS at their fields, because they already have enough pilots, are being forced to take them.

ANOTHER WASP DIES

Meanwhile, news of one more WASP death trickled into Washington, bringing the total to 21. Miss M. E. Sharon, Long Beach, Calif., is reported in a Tecumseh, Nebr., paper to have been killed on April 12.

Early reports were confirmed that a contributing factor in the defeat at the primaries of Representative JOHN M. COSTELLO, Democrat, California, was his sponsorship of the bill to militarize the WASPS, with news that grounded unemployed pilots in his district quietly worked against him through friends and families.

Survival of American Free Government and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Will American Free Government and Free Enterprise Survive?" by Hector M. Aring, member of the Board of

Review, the George Washington University Victory Council, Washington, D. C. This is an exceedingly vital and thoughtful article, and I believe it should be of general interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL AMERICAN FREE GOVERNMENT AND FREE ENTERPRISE SURVIVE?

(By Hector M. Aring, member, board of review, the George Washington University Victory Council; vice president, Johns-Manville International Corporation)

Any rational analysis of the question of the survival of free government as we know it in America, meaning government by consent of the governed, necessarily involves an analysis of free enterprise. By free enterprise I mean the orderly process of production and distribution of goods on a properly regulated competitive basis under a system of competitive capitalism.

The first declaration for free government and free enterprise in the United States of America is found in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Our American system of government would not have survived the vicissitudes through which it has already passed had it not been that our economic system was based on free enterprise. Conversely, free enterprise would never have grown to its present magnitude and efficiency had it not been based upon and protected by free government as expressed in the Bill of Rights.

It is difficult to conceive of free government existing where a controlled enterprise operates. It is not possible to conceive of free enterprise remaining free under conditions where the compulsions of governmental control, as differentiated from proper governmental regulations, are substituted for the compulsions and incentives of free enterprise, initiative, imagination, and courage. Competitive capitalism has persisted in the United States because in the last analysis American public opinion has been unreceptive to the postulates and practices of alternative economic systems.

This Nation was originally founded upon the concept of free agriculture and free industry, operated by men who had cast off the fetters of a foreign tyranny. Free enterprise, motivated by individual initiative, has grown from the right of men to own the land they tilled, the oxen they drove, and the boats they operated on the waterways, up through every gradation of community industry and, finally, into the modern concept of aggregated industries. Regardless of the existence of many large-scale corporate enterprises, it nevertheless remains a fact that the foundation of free government and free enterprise in the United States of America is still in the small, locally owned and operated industries.

Industries employing 500 persons and under give work to 64.8 percent of all the wage-earners of the Nation. They produce 60.6 percent of all the goods and services produced in the Nation.

Free enterprise is the essence of free government because it is the people, the consumers, who are constantly exercising in their choice of goods and services that high degree of selectivity which in turn constitutes both a compulsion and an incentive for competitive enterprises constantly to strive to produce better goods and services and to reduce costs and prices. Such a constant, discriminating selectivity could not possibly be exercised by any government, no matter how able and efficient the heads of governmental bureaus might be. It was precisely through such wise compulsion and incentive that the American free enterprise system was forced and encouraged to experiment, to study, to strive for better quality and more efficient methods until we reached that state of productive efficiency which has enabled American industry to overcome in about 3 years the concentrated efforts and all of the skill in war preparation exercised in Germany for 12 years under Hitler; in Italy for 20 years under Mussolini; and in Japan for 40 years under the War Lords.

Economic democracy is inseparable from political democracy. Our free Government is always under the same system of discriminating selectivity because every 2 years the people choose all of their Representatives and a third of their Senators, and every 4 years select their President. Such frequent elections also characterize State, county, and local governments. The people's privileges under the Bill of Rights have enabled them to exercise the same degree of criticism, the same degree of acceptance or rejection, the same degree of approval or disapproval of the acts and policies of their public servants that they have exercised in their selection of goods and services produced by their industries. Those compulsions, and those compulsions alone, operated to inspire and build our great system of American free government, as they operated to inspire and build our great system of free enterprise in this Nation; and those two great systems plus the rich, natural resources with which this Nation was blessed, compose that bounteous heritage which has come down to us from our ancestors, not as our absolute possession for this generation alone but as our trust for the generations to follow us.

Thomas Jefferson saw this fact clearly and expressed it in these words:

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * *

"Private enterprise manages * * * much better (than the Government) all the concerns to which it is equal. * * *

"Dependence begets subservience and venality, suffocates the term of virtue, and prepares fit tools for the designs of ambition."

Lincoln declared on July 1, 1854, that—

"The legitimate object of government is to do for the community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when Governor of the State of New York, voiced this same fundamental concept of free government and free enterprise when he said in 1930:

"As a matter of fact and law, the governing rights of the States are all of those which have not been surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution or its amendments. * * * In the matter of a great number of * * * vital problems of government, such as the conduct of public utilities, of banks, of insurance, of business, of agriculture, of education, of social welfare, and of a dozen other important features—Washington must not be encouraged to interfere.

"The proper relations between the Government of the United States and the governments of the separate States thereof depend entirely, in their legal aspects, on what powers have been voluntarily ceded to the central Government by these States themselves. What these powers of government are is contained in our Federal Constitution either by direct language, by judicial interpretation thereof during many years, or by implication so plain as to have been recognized by the people generally.

"The preservation of this 'home rule' by the States is not a cry of jealous commonwealths seeking their own aggrandizement at the expense of sister States. It is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country. * * *

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by 'master minds,' in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years. Were it possible to find 'master minds' so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost God-like in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country, but there are non such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history."

It is conceivable that we could win the conflict at arms in which we are now engaged, and lose the peace which must sometime follow. All of the sacrifices of blood and treasure we are making to protect our American system of free government and free enterprise could be rendered futile, and worse than futile, if we were to lose our liberty and our free government; if the Bill of Rights were to be impaired; if free enterprise were to become throttled by the deadening hand of bureaucracy. The peace could be lost precisely through those shackles referred to by President Roosevelt when he said:

"We have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government, this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people. Give them their way and they will take the course of every autocracy of the past—power for themselves, enslavement for the public."

Free government can survive only through the survival of the free enterprise system. The free enterprise system can best operate only in an expanding post-war economy. An expanding economy can be achieved only in steadily increased production, constantly improved quality of products, under ever increasing efficiency of production methods resulting in decreased prices to the consumers. Such an expanding economy rests not upon a premise of limitation of opportunity for some, but upon a basis of equal opportunity for all. Free enterprise can succeed under proper governmental regulation; but is bound to fail under governmental domination and competition. Prosperity and security in this Nation lie in free enterprise fairly conducted.

American business is generally honest and law-abiding. It must be preserved and encouraged. The dishonest element should be controlled without penalizing the honest.

The task which will confront us when war ceases will be far greater, both in magnitude and difficulty, than any we have ever been called upon to meet in our history as a Nation.

The war alleviated temporarily our great problem of unemployment which had not been solved throughout the years of the depression, despite the tremendous expenditures of public funds. When peace comes, the task of readjusting the workers of the Nation into jobs will emerge as the greatest problem in our American life.

The capitalistic system will face the most stupendous test in all history. It has been said that free enterprise and unemployment cannot long exist side by side in the same country. The capitalistic system means the right to private property and a right to the reasonable share of the fruits of one's industry.

The free-enterprise system as developed in America has learned to produce on an amazing scale; but, if it does not master the

problem of distribution, free enterprise will be supplanted by some other system. Free government cannot survive protracted unemployment of great masses of the people.

During the depression era unemployment brought about unprecedented governmental controls. If there is a post-war depression, the Government will assume more and greater controls. Numerous business leaders have repeatedly sounded these warnings. They see clearly the challenge which will be presented to our free-enterprise system to provide peacetime employment for the millions now engaged in war work.

These spokesmen have insisted that the national welfare will be advanced only in the measure that private employment is provided by the free-enterprise system. If under the capitalistic system we can solve the unemployment problem in the post-war era the result will be not only the elimination of mass unemployment but very much higher standards of living than we have ever known.

If under the free-enterprise system we fail to meet this challenge to solve unemployment through improved production and distribution methods, we will face one of two dangerous developments—mass unemployment and social disorder, or widespread governmental employment with vastly increased governmental controls.

Department of Commerce figures generally accepted by men of business as being fairly accurate show what a stupendous task will confront us:

There are now, if we include those in our armed services, approximately 62,000,000 Americans gainfully employed. In 1940 the total of gainfully employed was about 46,600,000, including some 600,000 in the armed services. There were also unemployed somewhere between 6,000,000 and 9,000,000 workers.

Not all of the present labor force will be seeking post-war work. Many women will go back to their housekeeping; older workers will retire; many younger workers may return to school. Nevertheless, the Department of Commerce experts estimate that the total number of those who will be seeking work after the war (assuming the war will be ended by 1946) will be about 59,500,000. Assuming that two and a half million men will remain in the armed services, we will face the necessity of providing some 57,000,000 jobs.

Full employment, as Brookings Institution has pointed out, does not imply complete employment. There are always chronic unemployables; workers moving from one job to another; seasonal lay-offs; illness, technological changes, etc., which prevent complete employment. These causes result in from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 workers being idle at any given time in a so-called full-employment economy like ours.

The Baruch report on post-war readjustment policies recently issued points out the difficulties of the readjustment. It will be comparable with nothing ever experienced in this Nation. The report reminds us that America will emerge from the war with the greatest opportunities any people ever had. It agrees that a post-war depression is not inevitable. Half the world will need rebuilding. Enormous demands, accumulating during the war, will be added to the pre-war demands, awaiting satisfaction. Much depends on the settlement of the peace. If it inspires people with hope—not fear—for the future there will be plenty of work for all willing hands.

There are certain rules which must be strictly observed if the problem of employment, production, and distribution is to be solved. The free-enterprise system must include low-interest financing so small units of business, which constitute the very foundation of the free-enterprise system, can find capital for reconverting to civilian activities and participation in post-war production and distribution of goods and services. To the end that the widest distribution of such goods and services may be achieved, a system of low-cost financing of installment and other credits must be instituted. Business, large and small, must be conducted on a fair and freely competitive basis.

Whether free government and free enterprise shall survive and prosper in America depends not alone on statesmen and business leaders, but upon the people themselves. John Stuart Mill stated this fact explicitly and well thus:

"A people may prefer a free government, but if from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if, by momentary discouragement or temporary panic or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it."

Down through history many men have forseen the dangers which beset free government and free enterprise.

The question confronting us today is whether or not the signs of the times indicate clearly enough for us to reach a conclusion that these processes of disintegration and ruin are actually at work in our Nation and in our time.

There are those, and they are many, who believe the signs of the times do indicate an exceedingly dangerous trend in the direction of those forces which inevitably would disintegrate and ruin our free Government, our free enterprise system and lose the peace for us after the war is won.

There are others, and they, too, are many, who have a profound faith in the wisdom of the people. There does seem to be some intuitive perception on the part of the people which even propaganda and misinformation cannot effectually destroy. Lincoln was profoundly convinced of it!

I share that profound faith in the intuitive perception of the people. There have been periods throughout all history, and there have been periods within the life of our own Nation, when hope seemed gone, when all seemed lost, when a sense of utter futility and a state of chaos appeared imminent; and yet in every case that inherent perceptive wisdom on the part of the people has triumphed. Were that not so, there would be no free government anywhere on the globe today.

Although the progress of man toward higher spiritual and cultural achievements has seemed at times in the past to have been slowed down or temporarily to have ceased, looking backward down the vista of history we can perceive that this was not so. Slowed it may have been, stopped it never was. The present is the proof of that.

Knowledge always brings enlightenment. Enlightenment always brings an insistent and irrepressible demand for liberty. The demand for liberty eventuates in free government and free enterprise.

The printing press, education, the radio, the telephone, the railroad, the modern steamship, the airplane—all these have broadened and deepened the contacts, the experience, and the thinking of the masses.

Where, in the past, only the sparks of enlightenment glimmered here and there, today the great torch of knowledge lights up the way to liberty for the world. As education and enlightenment spread, the demand for liberty grows, and will continue to grow. No power on earth can stamp out that knowledge which makes men free.

Therefore, it seems clear that within our own hands in this generation rests the answer to this problem: Will American free government and free enterprise survive? I believe they will survive.

Sewell Avery Against the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting in the RECORD the fourth of a series of articles appearing in the May 18, 1944, issue of the Chicago Sun, entitled "Sewell Avery Against the People—Ward's Fights O. P. A. as Well as Labor, Court Records Show."

It is as follows:

SEWELL AVERY VERSUS THE PEOPLE—WARD'S FIGHTS O. P. A. AS WELL AS LABOR, COURT RECORDS SHOW

(By Thomas F. Reynolds and Charley O. Gridley)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—Sewell Avery, who is making a last-ditch fight against measures which protect his workers, is waging an equally bitter battle against wartime price controls that protect the millions of customers who buy his goods.

In an advertising campaign that cost him half a million dollars, Avery has set himself up as a self-styled champion of freedom and American traditions.

But these advertisements have made no mention of the fact that the Federal Government had to go into court twice to compel his Montgomery Ward & Co. to obey the price-control law by which Congress has sought to protect this country from a disastrous inflation.

Neither did the advertisements mention that Avery currently is applying his formula of litigation to price-control regulations. They did not mention that he now is trying to escape from a Federal injunction in the circuit court of appeals and in the Emergency Court of Appeals, is attempting to invalidate a regulation designed to hold down the prices of essential clothing.

While the Avery formula of obstruction and litigation has tied the War Labor Board into a knot and has thus far defeated efforts of Ward employees to win union security, it is not, however, working so well in the Federal courts.

The mail-order Napoleon may have met his Waterloo in the person of United States District Judge John P. Barnes, a Republican appointed by President Hoover, and who now sits on the Federal bench at Chicago.

Upon complaints filed by the Office of Price Administration, Barnes has issued two injunctions which compel Avery to comply with price controls first in his multimillion dollar mail-order business, and finally in the more than 600 retail outlets which Ward's operates across the country. These injunctions were:

First. December 21, 1942.—Barnes issued a permanent injunction restraining Ward's from selling any articles or commodities at prices in excess of general maximum price regulations established by the O. P. A. This injunction followed O. P. A. charges that Ward's had exceeded ceiling prices on 434 items in its fall and winter catalogs 1942–43.

Second, October 6, 1943.—Barnes restrained Ward's from continued violation of an O. P. A. regulation which prevents retailers from abandoning sales of low-price clothing and outerwear and concentrating on high-priced lines to skim the cream of wartime high wages. Barnes made this injunction so broad that it covered every phase of price control except those regulations to which he had previously bound Avery's company in the first injunctions.

In his decision in the second case, the Federal jurist excoriated Ward's from the bench in a manner seldom heard in a Federal court of justice.

Avery's attorneys, according to Barnes, had not denied the violations of which they were accused. Instead, they based their defense on the contention that the Government lawyers could not prove the violations—because Ward's sales records in retail outlets made such proof impossible.

His denunciation was in support of O. P. A. Regulation No. 330—the order which prevents retailers from abandoning low-priced lines to the detriment of the customer who has limited funds.

"The court is satisfied that the defendant has violated Regulation 330," the 63-year-old jurist told Avery's attorney, Stuart S. Ball, in an oral decision from the bench. "And it is further satisfied that the defendant has not made any attempt to comply with that regulation.

"When this matter first came on, counsel for the defendant asked and was granted an opportunity to answer the charges of the plaintiff and when * * * the matter came on to be heard * * * the court gathered * * * that the defendant did not deny that it had done what the plaintiff (the Government) charged it had done, but that it did deny that the plaintiff could prove that it had done what the plaintiff charged, and the court has not changed its mind about the attitude of the defendant to this moment.

"The attitude of the defendant has been, generally speaking, not that it did not do what it is charged to have done, but that the plaintiff has not proved and cannot prove that it did do those things.

"Basing the conclusions the court is about to express upon the affidavits which have been filed, upon the evidence produced here in open court, and what has been said and done in the case, the court is satisfied that the defendant has not made any attempt to comply with Regulation 330."

In bringing the action against Avery's company, the Government had asserted that the issues were much greater than the mere violations by Ward's—that, in fact, the issue was the welfare of the people of the United States and the success of their war effort. An affidavit filed as a Government exhibit by Joseph Forer, Chief of the Apparel Enforcement Section in the O. P. A., asserted:

"The defendant's violations will, if permitted to continue, cause immediate and irreparable injury to our national economy, to our war effort, and to numerous consumers who purchase garments, and will enhance and promote inflation and inflationary practices, and stimulate and encourage, by reason of defendant's prominence as a retailer, violations of maximum price regulations by other sellers."

It is the injunction in this case from which Avery now is trying to escape. His appeal to the Chicago Circuit Court of Appeals now is pending and may be called up for action in the next few weeks.

But even before the injunction had been handed down, Avery's attorneys had launched a frontal attack on Regulation 330 by attacking the validity of the measures before the O. P. A.

This challenge was filed with Prentiss M. Brown, the then Price Administrator, on April 19, 1943, and was overruled by Brown on May 20 of that year. Avery's attorneys promptly took the challenge into the Emergency Court of Appeals, where it still is pending.

The Government's case against Avery for violating the low-priced-line order was based upon specific instances of alleged violations in 25 cities—Burlington, Vt.; Burlingame, Calif.; Kansas City, Mo.; Bismarck, S. Dak.; Sacramento, Calif.; Des Moines, Iowa; Sioux City, Iowa; Batavia, N. Y.; Westchester, Pa.; Brattleboro, Va.; Lewiston, Pa.; Trenton, N. J.; Bluefield, Va.; Courtlandt, N. Y.; Staunton, Va.; Kingsport, Tenn.; Santa Rosa, Calif.; Salem, Oreg.; Corvallis, Oreg.; Reno, Nev.; Clinton, Iowa; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Fremont, Nebr.; Greeley, Colo.; and La Grange, Ill.

The violations ranged from a dollar over the maximum permissible charge for outerwear to a maximum overcharge of $18.02 per item.

A typical instance as charged by the O. P. A. was at Ward's retail outlet in Salem where the highest priced Ward line of women's coats in March 1942, was $24.75. The Government investigation showed that in March 1943, the same store had a price of $38 for their top line of women's coats which, under Regulation 330, represented an overcharge of $13.25 an item.

In defending Ward's in a losing battle, Ball attempted to prove that Ward records were so incomplete in retail outlets that neither the Government nor the company could say definitely what had been charged for specific items in the previous year.

His defense caused the Government attorney, John F. Mainierre, to exclaim that "it is obvious that they (Ward's) are trying to hide behind these wholly inadequate store records" and prompted the judge to issue his critial decision at conclusion of the case.

The initial O. P. A. case against Avery found the mail-order magnate in a position where he had little defense. His prices were listed in a catalog and in bold black type contradicted arguments that they were not violations of O. P. A. ceilings.

In its complaint and request for an injunction in Barnes' Federal Court, the Government charged 434 items were priced above proper ceilings, with violations ranging from 1 cent to slightly over $1 per item.

The Government charges revolved around a miscellany of items such as could be mustered only by the big Montgomery Ward catalogue, which is Sewell Avery's pride. These included shipping bags, window shades, tables, pillows, kitchen cabinets, yard goods, rayon hose, men's hose, runproof panties, umbrellas, turkish towels, crepe robes, house coats, dish towels, angora yarn, men's sport shirts, men's sweaters, wall and floor lamps, mittens and many more items.

This catalogue had been distributed to more than 4,000,000 customers when the O. P. A. slapped the injunction suit against Ward's and called the company on its prices.

Avery's defense was that he had filed 17,000 listed item prices with the O. P. A. as his catalogue went to press and that there were unavoidable errors which his lawyers sought to describe as minor.

"This is a suit which should never have been brought," the lawyers declared for Avery, who is rapidly establishing a new all-time record for litigation against Federal laws and regulations.

When Barnes had examined the evidence, however, he found that there had been 728 items in Ward's catalogue over the O. P. A. ceiling.

He noted that Ward's issued price reduction orders to its mail-order houses to bring the prices into line, but specifically pointed out that this order was issued by Avery's company on November 4, 1942, when the O. P. A. had Ward's on the carpet—"subsequent to the filing of the complaint in this cause and to the service upon the defendant of notice of a motion for a preliminary injunction herein," as Barnes put it.

"Seven hundred and twenty-eight items were priced in defendant's Chicago catalog No. 137 for fall and winter 1942–43, at prices in excess of the maximum prices theretofore determined and reported by the defendant under said section, 140 of said 728 commodities were reduced in price during the summer of 1942, 118 other commodities of said 728 commodities were subsequently covered by price regulation other than the general maximum price regulation; of the remaining 469 commodities of said 728 commodities, 343 were sold at prices not in excess of 2 percent over the maximum price theretofore as computed and reported by the defendant under the provisions of said section," Barnes said in his decision.

"The defendant has made one or more sales during the period August 4 to November 4, 1942, from its Chicago catalog * * * for fall and winter 1942–43 of substantially every one of the commodities, goods, or items listed or described in exhibit A hereof (the list of alleged overcharges) at the prices listed therefor in said catalog. * * * Defendant's sales from its Chicago mail-order house for August and September 1942 aggregated millions of dollars."

Barnes entered a temporary injunction against Ward's in this case on December 3, 1942, and when the company declined to contest the case further, made the injunction permanent 18 days later.

Almost a year later, Ball, Avery's counsel, was arguing the second Ward case before Barnes, and the judge mentioned that Wards had been in his court once before on an O. P. A. issue.

Ball attempted to pass off the first O. P. A. injunction as a minor matter where the company made a few technical errors.

"The circumstance of the first case was a case of inadvertence which, I think, the court was familiar with," said Avery's attorney.

"I am thoroughly familiar with that," said Barnes, "and there was no shadow of a defense made to the case in the pleadings."

The judge liked that statement so well, he repeated it:

"I am thoroughly familiar with it, and there was not a shadow of a defense in the pleadings in the first case."

Three-Mile Doctrine Menace to Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, the operations of Japanese fishermen in Bering Sea threatened to deplete and eventually exhaust an important part of the Alaska salmon fisheries. That action was possible by reason of the 3-mile-limit doctrine, never an accepted part of international law.

The war affords us a singular opportunity to forever renounce that doctrine and to protect our national fisheries against invasion by citizens of other nations.

It therefore gives me pleasure to invite the attention of the House to the

following illuminating editorial by the able and eminent Dr. Joseph Walter Bingham, formerly of Stanford University, renowned for his knowledge and exposition of the law of nations, which appeared in the Log, a leading Pacific coast shipping magazine, annual edition, July 1943:

THREE-MILE DOCTRINE MENACE TO PACIFIC COAST—NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SAFETY IS INVOLVED IN EXTENSION OF OUR SEAWARD JURISDICTION—UNITED STATES CONTROL OF MICRONESIA IMPERATIVE

(By Joseph Walter Bingham)

PALO ALTO, CALIF.—A war such as the one in which we now are engaged never results merely in military victory or defeat with expenditure of lives and wealth. It always has enduring economic, social, and political consequences in the peacetime life of mankind. Against the wastage and suffering of war can be credited the very considerable benefits in accelerated progress in many phases of human affairs which are the consequences of modern war. To applied science, to medical practice, to industry, to invention, to education, to technical training, to politics and public spirit, to development of resources, the pressures of modern war bring an acceleration of specialized progress which often entails permanent advantages in social life. These pressures also often accelerate enduring changes in the relative industrial and commercial importance of communities, of geographical regions, and of financial interests.

Thus, one of the evident consequences of this war is the increased importance of the Pacific coast in the industrial and commercial life of the country. That this stimulated growth is not a temporary war phenomenon, but will have lasting consequences of significance to our national destiny should be clear to anyone who is aware of the underlying revolutionary forces and the stirring developments which are changing rapidly the life of the world. Mention of only one of these revolutionary forces and developments may suffice to illustrate this meaning—the airplane and progress in its use for rapid transit over the entire face of the globe.

IMPORTANCE OF WESTERN STATES UNDERESTIMATED

It is an interesting fact of our history that continually people east of the Mississippi, and especially the eastern statesmen and politicians who have directed our domestic and international policies, have underemphasized the political and social importance of the West and its significance to the destiny of the United States. Similarly their interests in the Far East and indeed in the whole Pacific Basin until recently has been casual and spotty.

During the past quarter of a century the great majority of the American people believed that our practical interests in the Orient were of such slight consequence that we should willingly sacrifice them for the sake of peace. The sentiment for freeing the Philippines grew steadily for a similar reason. Our people believed that the Philippines could not be defended in case of war with Japan and that the chances of such a war would be diminished greatly if we terminated our responsibility for their protection.

Even on the Pacific coast many vigorously asserted that our chief practical interest in the Orient was our trade with Japan, and that the mutual advantages of this trade would keep at peace the two peoples with no important cause for dissension. Consequently, they said, American Pacific policy should be based on sympathetic appreciation of the role of modern civilized Japan in maintaining order along the eastern coasts of Asia—for were not the Chinese a poverty-stricken people given over to banditry and other disorders and corruptions and a natural hotbed for communism; and was not Soviet Russia a great menace to the peace of the Orient and the world?

CONGRESS RESPONSIBLE FOR DEFENSE FAILURE

The Congress responding to dominant popular opinion for 20 years after World War No. 1 blocked the efforts of our military experts to establish sea and air bases in Alaska and the islands of the western Pacific. The last revived effort to fortify Guam in 1939 was nullified by determined opposition in the Congress, for the expressed reason that to fortify Guam "would offend Japan," whose military leaders were loud in their menacing opposition to the proposal. With similar ostrich-like oblivion to manifest portents, instead of insisting on a two-ocean Navy our Government of the decade following the Peace of Versailles, influenced by the pressure of business and property interests for low governmental expenditures and taxes, lent a willing ear to pacifist and foreign suggestions that we sink part of our fleet and keep the rest within limits too small for adequate defense of our interests in all the oceans and along all our extensive coasts.

It has seemed impossible until recently for the eastern statesmen who directed our international affairs to turn their backs on Europe and the Atlantic sufficiently to appreciate the tremendous significance to the future of America of the countries of the Pacific Basin and the consequent strategic business and political importance of the Pacific coast.

To the eastern politician and officeholder, the far West has been an outlying province, mildly interesting as a playground and fabulous producer of food and minerals and, of course, deserving of attention at elections, but otherwise so unimportant socially and politically that it has not been worth while in recent peacetimes to place one real westerner in high influential position in our Washington Government.

When we of the coast think of the West we do not begin at Buffalo and Pittsburgh, nor even at the Mississippi. We think of the territory west of the Rockies; and when we speak of a westerner we do not mean one who was born in the West or spent his boyhood there, but one who has spent his adult business or professional life there and knows and appreciates its problems and prospects.

ALASKA FISHERIES "INVASION" ALARMED CONGRESS

One of the incidents which served to awaken official Washington to the looming political importance of the Pacific Basin was the "invasion" of the salmon fisheries of Bristol Bay, Alaska, in 1935 by the Japanese. This invasion was of far greater significance than the lawyers of eastern States and, at first, even our Department of State, realized.

To eastern lawyers it was only a casual incident affecting limited local business interests—a few corporations and fishermen—and consequently they assumed that the controversy could be compromised easily—that of course the Japanese, fishing only outside our territorial waters, were right legally and nothing should be done in prosecuting our claim which would violate the traditional tenets of international law—among which almost all American lawyers placed unquestioningly the Anglo-American 3-mile limit doctrine. Even the bare value of the American economic interests involved was grossly underestimated in the East. The other more serious implications of the case were quite beyond the knowledge of most eastern lawyers, and amazingly still remain so to many of them.

By the leading ardent opponents of the Japanese, including Miller Freeman, Sr., and Edward W. Allen, of Seattle, Delegate Anthony Dimond, of Alaska, and Benjamin Kizer, of Spokane—although not by all the interested parties to the case—these major serious phases of the invasion were recognized and the necessity of immediate frank abandonment of the 3-mile doctrine by the United States in the interest of national security and protection of declared objectives of our national policy was appreciated and urged upon our Government continuously during the following 7 years. This campaign is unfinished, for the 3-mile doctrine continues to be a menace to our interests, not only in Alaska, but throughout the Pacific Basin and in Latin America. Here are the facts.

JAPAN'S BELIEFS AND AIMS

In the economy of Japan fishing has held a very important place for centuries. The Japanese believe that they are the best fishermen in the world and the designers of their economic and political future claimed that dominance of all profitable fisheries should accrue of right to them. Indeed, the Japanese Government skillfully fostered and supervised the Japanese fishing industry and made it a component part of its scheme of world domination. The invasion of our Bristol Bay salmon fisheries was an important planned campaign in pursuance of this scheme.

Not only was the fishing industry an important part of Japan's economic fabric, but it also was a valuable means of infiltration into the coastal and island countries of the Far East and of the Americas and an aid to Japan's military designs in several ways, including spying.

In the spread of its fishing campaigns to foreign coasts the Japanese have been helped greatly by the Anglo-American international law doctrine limiting coastal State control over fisheries in general to a belt no wider than 3 miles seaward from the coast. This doctrine never has been international law and always has been opposed by the majority of States with any interest in the matter, including France, Russia, Italy, and especially almost all small coastal countries.

Japan, however, adopted this Anglo-American doctine enthusiastically because it was a legal support for her piratical invasions of the valuable coastal fisheries of the world, including those of the Philippines, Mexico, Argentina, Peru, and lately Australia, Canada, and the United States. Consequently, when the Japanese invaded the salmon fisheries of Bristol Bay outside the 3-mile belt of territorial waters in 1935, their Government blandly supported their claim of right to do so under international law by the argument that this accorded with traditional Anglo-American-Japanese doctrine and practice.

THREE-MILE DOCTRINE AIDED JAPAN

In fact, the estoppel of the unbroken diplomatic practice of our Department of State for over a hundred years gave the Japanese an almost unassailable legal defense as long as our Government did not renounce its dogmatic 3-mile doctrine. This was a matter which threatened vital interests of the United States and certain war with Japan independently of the outbreak of World War No. 2, unless we acquiesced in her imperialistic purposes. Fortunately, Japan's enmeshment in strife in Asia at the time of the Bristol Bay episode made it expedient for her to consent to a truce without settlement of the controversy, and she agreed to a temporary withdrawal of her fishing boats from the Alaskan salmon fisheries.

This incident was a piece of luck for us. The danger to our Pacific interests which it signified and emphasized awakened our Government fully to the disastrous mistakes of policy which the political oblivion of the American people had caused us to make since 1918.

Immediately there was a recrudescence of efforts with increased tempo and political support to establish sufficient naval and air bases in Alaskan waters and through the Eastern and Southern Pacific—a movement which Navy officials had favored for many years, but which political opposition always had frustrated. The controlling purposes of our Government now were evident: (1) To prevent the spread of Japan's imperialistic invasions in Asia beyond the danger line of vital American interests, and (2) to delay the inevitable war until our tardy defense preparations in the Pacific were as far along as possible.

Hence, the so-called appeasement incidents. The scrap iron and oil problems were not as simple as complaining commentators believe. They were very complicated in economic and political and strategic factors, and no kibitzer's public criticism of the courses followed which I have read or heard has been fair to the Government or comprehensive of the essential facts.

ENDING FUTURE MENACE

Now that war has come and that the American public at last is awake to the menace in the Pacific, the following points should be emphasized to stimulate and to continue after the war is won our thought and interest concerning the prospect that lies before the Nation in relation to the tremendous future social, economic, and political developments all around the Pacific Basin.

1. We must at once secure our coastal fisheries from destructive invasions by foreigners by extending our jurisdiction and the operation of effective conservation laws as far seaward as necessary. This means abandonment of our traditional 3-mile limit doctrine. In the case of Alaskan waters and those of various other areas of the Pacific, extension of our seaward jurisdiction has more important purposes than protection of fisheries. It involves our national defense and safety. Indeed for this reason we must have full jurisdiction of the eastern part of the Bering Sea.

Also, we must insist on complete control of all Micronesia, now held by Japan, and of many other aeronautic stepping stones in the western and southern Pacific. Air and sea bases throughout these regions are essential to our national safety. One of our most costly diplomatic blunders, due no doubt in largest part to the uninformed state of public opinion, was the failure to insist on American, instead of Japanese, control of Micronesia after the last World War. This blunder was a major cause of our present expenditure of billions of wealth and many lives. If we make the same sort of mistake again, it may prove utterly disastrous.

DEVELOPMENT OF PACIFIC BASIN

2. It should be obvious that the most significant economic, social, and political prospect of the next 100 years is the development of the peoples of the Orient. With their growth in production of wealth, in purchasing power, and in standard of living, these millions will offer the greatest foreign market for American products in the world.

Undoubtedly our trade with South and Central America also will increase; but there are many factors including European competition which make the extent of that increase along the Atlantic coast uncertain. The vast potential markets of Asia, however, are available to us for development on as favorable a basis of competition as our social, political, industrial and business abilities suffice to produce. This is a long-term prospect.

3. Meanwhile the war has given a great impetus to development of our Pacific coast industries and resources and has accelerated the construction and use of public works—especially water power—and means of communication in the northwest which will be of great peacetime importance.

In addition to our traditional mining, timber, agricultural, fishing, and shipping, interests, the war has developed (a) shipbuilding and aircraft organizations with mass-production techniques which, so far as excess post-war capacity is concerned, may turn their managerial and technical abilities to other new manufactures under stimulating visions of American enterprise such as those of Henry Kaiser; (b) great producers of light metals, especially through the use of ample electrical power such as that furnished by Grand Coulee and Bonneville and proposed enlarged and new power plants; (c) inspiring predictions of a great new light metals and plastics age succeeding the age of steel; (d) a new steel plant with many post-war problems of competition to solve; (e) a recently initiated collaboration of the Governments of Canada and the United States in studying the possibilities of developing and populating the vast territories, at present sparsely inhabited, of Pacific Northwest America, in the mutual economic and defense interests of the two countries. (See Miller Freeman Publications, Mining World for May 1943, editorials p. 3, Outline of an International Development Program for the North Pacific Region; p. 6, Pacific North America—Strategic in Peace as in War; p. 12, art. by Dr. R. H. Harrington, The Light Alloy Age.)

FUTURE OF PACIFIC COAST STATES

4. The war has brought a great increase in population, in fundamental developed capital wealth and in financial resources to the Pacific coast and much of this increase will be retained after the war. To what effect it will be retained and used will depend on the will, ingenuity, energy, and fighting qualities of our social, industrial, and political leaders and workers.

No doubt there will be opposition to the maximum development from eastern competitive forces—all those competitive forces of established financial and industrial power which have been concentrated in eastern centers, and which have vested interests in eastern establishments that might be affected detrimentally by the prospective new developments. Ultimately—within the next hundred years—the tide of American commerce and industry will run strongly westward to the Pacific Basin. It is not too optimistic a prediction that midway of the next century the greatest American cities will be the Pacific ports, San Francisco, Seattle, and Los Angeles.

How strongly the flow of industrial and commercial power will run on this coast soon after the close of the war, cannot be forecast with any degree of certainty. There are too many variable human factors in the field of possibilities. But that the war has accelerated the inevitable trend is certain. Henceforth, America must look with prime concern westward over the Pacific—in her best interests and especially in the interest of national security.

Always the American spirit has been associated with a restless movement westward. From Revolutionary days the tide of emigration westward has been unceasing, and it is in the far Western States that one finds preserved the strongest flavor of our heritage from the early years of our national history. To our people of the Pacific coast the post-war decades will raise a challenge—a call for traditional American individual ingenuity, foresight, adventure, energy, courage, and good will in developing the possibilities which Northwest America's remaining unpopulated frontier, a territory one-third as large as the combined areas of all our States, and the rising peoples across the Pacific offer us.

The Montgomery Ward Case—Rights of Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of a radio address I made in Dallas, Tex., May 4, 1944, about the seizure of Montgomery Ward private property, and to which I am giving the title "The Crucifixion of American Private Enterprise on the Brazen Cross of the C. I. O. by Decree of a Modern Pontius Pilate."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRUCIFIXION OF AMERICAN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE ON THE BRAZEN CROSS OF THE C. I. O. BY DECREE OF A MODERN PONTIUS PILATE

How do you do ladies and gentlemen, and hello there boys and girls. This is your United States Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas speaking from Dallas. Last week we witnessed in this Nation one of the most disgraceful events in the long history of America. It was the sorry sight of a businessman being bodily carried out of his store and dumped outside by armed soldiers acting on orders from higher-ups. It was so drastic that it rocked and shocked the Nation. When this Montgomery Ward seizure took place I promptly denounced the action on the floor of the United States Senate, and then caught the next train for Texas so that I might speak to you folks here at home, both by radio and face to face, about this tragic Chicago event, and the things that layed the foundation for this event. I wanted to talk to my friends here in Texas because I am personally acquainted with so many of you who own little stores, cafes, filling stations, barber shops, factories, banks, and other kinds of business both small and large which you have built by hard work and thrift throughout the years. I wanted to warn you that if a store in Chicago could be seized, your places of business for which you hold a deed and a key, may also be subject to seizure, and you may be the person who will be next carried out by our soldiers at the point of a bayonet, unless you do something promptly to stop this high-handed onslaught against private business enterprise by the Washington Dynasty which is controlled by the labor leader racketeers of this Nation.

I am very much concerned about the future of this great Nation and the future of our Democratic form of government. I believe with all my heart that the year 1944 will be a milestone in the history of this great Nation. During 1944 we will either make some definite progress toward returning to that form of government which was set up by our forefathers—a true and tried democracy—or we will most certainly drift further into the mire of socialism where the bureaucrat rules by directive and the executive by Executive order; we will drift further into a government of men and further away from a government of law.

No man is wise enough to foresee the future because no one knows when the great rank and file of the American people are go-

ing to wake up and realize the situation into which the domestic affairs of this Nation have been steadily drifting during the period of the last 10 or 11 years. The mothers and fathers whose sons are today on foreign battlefields, willingly giving their lives that America and the free institutions of America may live, have a right to be proud of the kind of men who compose our fighting forces. The Nation today stands as a unit behind the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, to carry this battle to a successful conclusion. A demonstration of this was given a few days ago when the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed a bill to appropriate more money for the further extension of the United States Navy than had ever been passed before in any appropriation bill by this or by any other nation. And as I have observed the Congress of the United States on other measures, I have found practically 100 percent support from both Republicans and Democrats for any and all legislation designed to carry this war to a successful conclusion. I have been proud to have an opportunity to give support to such measures and I shall continue to give undivided support to doing all of those things necessary to win the war as quickly as possible and bring the youth of America back home.

But, my friends, you and I who have stayed at home, have another obligation and that is, to bring the youth back to a free America and not to an America where we have allowed the labor racketeers, the Communists, and the Socialists and all others who believe in all of the foreign "isms" to destroy our whole domestic economy. We have a responsibility to see that when our youth return to America, they shall return to a nation of law and not to a nation where one man governs the domestic affairs by edict and Executive order like the edict or Executive order which caused the seizure of the retail store in Chicago. As already stated, just before I left Washington I discussed this matter on the floor of the United States Senate. Time will not permit me to quote the Senate speech now, but I will be glad to send a copy of it, also a copy of this radio speech, to all who write me. Address Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, Washington, D. C., or in care of this station.

Now, my friends, this incident of the Federal Government moving in and taking over a system of retail stores simply because these stores would not bow their heads and get down on their knees to the labor-union racketeers who have lived and grown fat under the New Deal, proves to the American people without question of doubt the grave situation which we now face. I want to say to you that it is my considered judgment that this Nation cannot continue to exist as a democracy unless we repeal some of the laws which have been written on the statute books of this Nation which have made possible the establishment of the reign of the bureaucrat and the dominating power of the labor-union racketeer.

For 10 years the Congress of the United States has performed like trained seals to write in the form of law all of the legislation which we now have on our statute books which virtually takes away from management the power to own and to operate its own business. The Congress of the United States passed this National Labor Relations Act which places in the hands of the labor-union racketeers power to extract dues from American citizens for their God-given right to work and these racketeers have built up great slush funds in the treasuries of their labor organizations and they are now seeking to use this power which the Congress by its votes has given them.

I repeat those words—please ponder them well:

"These labor-union racketeers are now seeking to use this power which the Congress by its votes has given them."

No man can read the National Labor Relations Act and come to the conclusion that it was ever even designed to be fair to the employer. No one can read this act and come to the conclusion that it was ever designed to protect the rights of the laboring man. It is a piece of legislation which was conceived in the minds of the politicians who wanted to satisfy the labor racketeers, who carried the "slush" funds in their pockets, and who promised that they also controlled the votes.

Today we are witnessing the results of this kind of legislation that the Congress has been passing for the past 11 years. We see the power of the United States Government, including an arm of the United States Army, brought into force to take away from a retail merchant the right to own and to operate his business, not because he was not complying with the law, not because he was not paying good wages, not because of any dispute as to the working conditions or hours of labor, but simply because he refused to give the labor unions an absolute monopoly on the jobs in his establishment, and the right to lock out honest American laboring men and women who do not belong to certain unions, and because he refuses to become a dues-collecting agency for the labor unions. The labor union racketeers demanded of those public officials whom they helped elect to office that something be done about it and something was done about it.

No one, of course, denies or for a minute questions the right of the United States Government, through proper agencies, to take over and operate any business establishment where it is essential that it be done to carry forward the war effort, but I think America resents the attempt to use the war effort as a camouflage to pay off political debts to a bunch of labor union racketeers.

On the 8th of January 1942, when the O. P. A. bill was before the Senate, I spoke against it and called it an anti-agriculture bill. When it was being pushed through Congress by all the bureaucratic power that Washington could command, I predicted then that if we followed the lead of these New Deal Democrats and set up the O. P. A. to reign over the people and direct the activities of the people, the result would be a complete dislocation of the markets and that where legitimate trade now existed, black markets would take their place. I stated then that if we listened to the voice of those who were pleading for this legislation and gave them the right to control a few commodities, it would not be long before they would be forced to control all commodities. I said then that it was inevitable if this country was to avoid a food shortage, the limitations which existed on the production of foodstuffs would have to be lifted. I said then that to my way of thinking it was absolutely foolish to talk about controlling the price of foods which did not exist, that we faced essentially a problem of production and I urged then that the Government not wait but that it remove the artificial barriers which were then preventing this Nation from producing food and from producing feed for our livestock. I said then that it was foolish to talk about a surplus of cotton and forget that cottonseed was the chief source of protein feeds for the cattle throughout the South.

I urged then that we embark upon a program of preventing inflation by removing all artificial curbs against production and at the same time levying a 100 percent excess profits tax on profits which were shown to be excessive when measured by a standard of a 3 or 4 year period prior to the time we entered the World War. I warned the Members of the Senate then that if we passed this Price Control Act, it was inevitable that it would result in so impoverishing our farmers that the Government would in desperation in order to secure production be forced to resort to the payment of subsidies in order that the Nation might be supplied with food.

I have lived now long enough to see every single one of these predictions come true. I have witnessed the spectacle of seeing cottonseed meal shipped from Texas to feed Illinois cows and soybeans shipped from Illinois to feed Texas cows. I have seen these smart-alec bureaucrats in Washington beg the farmers to produce more poultry and then fix the price of poultry below the cost of production. I have seen the subsidy checks begin to roll out of Washington. It is not difficult to figure out what the Washington dynasty is going to do. Almost everthing they plan or do is based on how it will affect the coming election. Several weeks ago I told my friends to watch the Washington dynasty remove rationing restrictions as we came closer to election day. Your newspapers since then have been full of reports of articles being released from rationing. Rationing will be practically abandoned and subsidy checks will be flooding the countryside by election day. But if the New Deal gang wins the election, look out for more and more rationing, and fewer and fewer subsidy checks after election day.

Of course, you know 1944 is election year. It is necessary for the Washington dynasty to hold the cost of living down in the cities in order to get the votes of the consumers and it is also necessary to send subsidy checks to the farmers in order to get their votes. It is necessary to use the power of the Federal Government to go out here and take over a retail business establishment in order to satisfy the longings of the big labor union racketeers who if they cannot secure members for the union by persuasion, want to secure them by force of the power of the Government itself. And still this chain of weird events "marches on".

My friends, it is going to continue to do this marching on so long as we have government by directive of the bureaucrats in our domestic affairs. If these things which I have mentioned to you stood alone, they would not be so alarming; if these things which I have mentioned had grown up only during the war effort, they would not be so alarming, but, my friends, that is not the case. During a period of 11 years the Congress of the United States has passed law after law creating these boards and bureaus that rule the whole domestic economy of this Nation by orders and directives issued out of the city of Washington. They did not wait until we got into war to start passing these laws. The worst laws we have had their foundation laid long before we ever entered the war, and collectively the Members of the present Congress of the United States are the ones who are responsible for this situation.

Yes, I know that many of these same Congressman and Senators who voted for these laws to build these great bureaucratic departments in Washington are today, as election day draws nigh, howling loud and long against the rule of the bureaucrats. My friends, the people of this Nation have become aroused against the fact that day by day their liberties and their right to carry on their own business has been destroyed. The people have become aroused because of the fact that the Congress has, through legislation passed during the last 11 years, built up in this country a dictatorship of labor racketeers which is today greater than the power of government itself. The people have commenced to ask why this situation

exists, and Members of the Congress, in both the House and in the Senate, are seeking a plausible excuse. They are seeking an alibi for laws which they themselves passed, and so today you hear them from every housetop screaming about their support of the fundamental principles of the Constitution. But just go back, if you will, and get the record and see how they voted on the laws passed during the past 11 years which created this situation.

And when you get the record, I think you will agree with me that the only remedy for the situation which now exists is a thorough housecleaning in Washington from the cellar to the attic. I believe you will be inclined to agree with the principles laid down in the constitutional amendment which I proposed in the United States Senate which provides that no man can serve in the office of President, or Vice President, for a period of more than 6 years. It also provides that no man can serve in the House of Representatives or in the United States Senate for a period of more than 6 years. I believe you will agree with me that after 6 years these public officials should be permitted to go back home and try to make an honest living under the laws they, themselves, have passed.

I believe you will agree with me that the situation has got so bad that the time has come for the American people to stand up and fight for their rights. I think you will agree with me that the time to begin fighting is right now and the place to begin is at the place where you vote, in the 1944 election.

If the people of this Nation will get behind the movement to conduct a thorough housecleaning in Washington this year and then write in the Constitution a complete inhibition against any man serving in Washington more than 6 years, it will break up the rule of these bureaucrats—it will destroy this stranglehold control which has been established by the labor racketeers in Washington. Let us turn the Government back to the American people. Not long ago the President of the United States complained that legislation was being influenced too much in the cocktail lounges and bars around Washington. Well now folks, if you want to know how to break up the control of these groups who live in Washington always, and who make it their business to see that the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate vote as they are told, I will tell you exactly how you can accomplish this, and that is, adopt a constitutional rule of letting the boys stay up there just 6 years, and no longer. That will definitely and completely break up their club and ruin their game. If you will do this, they won't have time to become so well acquainted with the members of the "third" house that operates in the cocktail lounges and Washington's bars. They won't be so chummy then with the big labor racketeers who claim they control volumes of votes because they won't need their votes—they won't be running for reelection—there will be no reelection. When a man knows he has one term, and only one, he will not perform like a trained seal and begin to hedge and dodge every time one of these big labor bosses or one of the big industrial bosses shows up and tells him how to vote.

Now, of course, I know that whenever you talk about having a thorough housecleaning in Washington you will incur the opposition of a good many folks who have some Senator in the United States Senate or who have some Representative in the House who serves as office boy or chore boy for them. In other words, you will find throughout the country some men who will agree with the housecleaning plan which I am suggesting, as a matter of principle—they will agree that the representatives of the people should be changed often if they are to really and truly represent the people, but they will have some pet trained sealed serving in either the House or the Senate they want to keep up there because they want him to perform for them. They want to retire all the Senators and Congressmen except their own pet seal upon whom they have spend considerable time and money in training him to lie down and roll over every time they say "flop."

So if the plan which I am talking about is ever made effective in this country, it is going to have to be made effective by the great rank and file of the people—it is going to have to be made effective by the people who do not have any special axe to grind in Washington—it is going to have to be made effective by the people who want just one thing out of Government and that is, honest, fair treatment.

I am very much concerned today about the future of agriculture when this war is over. If we have to endure about 4 years more of what we have endured in the last 11 years, we will, I think, complete the process of making peasants out of the American farmers. I think agriculture, as you and I have known it, with independent ownership, independent control, will be at end. It will be "gone but not forgotten"—dead. I think that unless there is a change, 10 years from now American agriculture will be organized on about the same basis that agriculture is now organized in Soviet Russia.

I am also very much concerned about the average workman, the man who wants a job, the man who wants to do an honest day's work for a fair day's pay. Freedom of employment, freedom of opportunity cannot continue to exist for the man who toils in this country if he is made the slave of a few labor union bosses. I am very much concerned to know whether or not the great rank and file of the people will realize this soon enough to avoid the calamity. We are already perched on the edge of the precipice poised for the crash.

I am very much concerned about the whole future of private industry in this country, our system of free private enterprise. One thing I am certain of: These Communists, fellow-travelers, and New Dealers who moved into Washington about 11 years ago who, day by day, have placed themselves in key positions, have no intention of moving out. They plan to go right ahead when the war is over and complete their plans for 100-percent Government ownership, Government operation and control of every line of business and every individual citizen. The only hope which America has is that in 1944 the people of this country will fill the office of Chief Executive of this Nation and fill the offices of Congressmen and Senators with new men—men who really believe in the Constitution of the United States—men who do not look upon the Constitution as something that grew up in the horse-and-buggy age and should be buried with the horses and buggies—men who seek methods to live by the Constitution and not methods to evade the plain meaning of the Constitution.

You people who are listening to me, and especially do I appeal to the great rank and file of the people who do not have much of this world's goods, but who, after all, have always been the very foundation of the greatness of this Nation, I appeal to you to remember that when your boys return from the service or when those children who today are playing around the fireside, go out into the world to meet life's obligations, you will probably not be able to give them much money. But I tell you there is one thing that you can do, you can see to it that a democratic government is maintained in this country, and that free enterprise is maintained. You can see that the road of opportunity is kept open. You can see to it that a government is preserved which will guarantee that every boy and girl in America will have an opportunity to advance in proportion to his or her diligence, ability, and willingness to work. After all, that is what has made America great.

And I say to you that in a nation built on a system which destroys free enterprise, which makes of our people dependent slaves, is a system which will sound the death knell of our future progress and will close forever the door of opportunity to the youth of this land.

What under the name of high heaven is it going to take to arouse the people of this Nation to action? When the soldiers with guns or bayonets, on orders, march into your store and carry you out bodily and throw you in the street or gutter, what more will it take to arouse you to action to protect your freedom and liberty? It matters not whether it is in accordance with law, so far as you are concerned. If it is according to law, is it not time to retire those who made such laws? If it is not according to law, is it not time to be aroused and alarmed? I am old-fashioned enough to believe explicitly in our form of government as outlined in the Constitution. I have no new theories or new philosophies to expound. I want to cling to the original. I want our Government to truly be a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I want the people to recover their own government by the peaceful and constitutional methods of honest elections.

I wish I could make all of you people who are listening to me realize just how serious I am in what I have been saying to you. I have no personal ambition in this matter. I am subjecting myself to the bitter tirades and all of the persecution that this New Deal gestapo can invent. I am doing this for one purpose and for one purpose only, and that is to warn the people how serious I think the situation is in our domestic affairs—to warn the people how determined I believe these fellow travelers, bureaucrats, and the whole New Deal gang are to convert our democracy and our private-enterprise system into a completely communized governmental set-up. I believe as firmly as I believe anything that the freedom of the average workingman will within the next 10 years be a thing of the past unless the people of America act now to upset the plans which for 11 years these fellow travelers have so carefully laid. I am deadly serious when I say that I think within 10 years American agriculture will be reduced to the status of the peasants of Europe and regimented as it is in Soviet Russia unless the people act now to stop this tendency. I believe with all my heart that private enterprise, consisting of little shops and stores, small business, and large industries will come to an end in America in the near future unless we act now to bring about a change.

You ask me, what can we do? My answer is that prior to 11 years ago when they established the reign of the New Deal in Washington, we had a government by law according to the Constitution. The men whom you elected to the Congress of the United States, both in the House and in the Senate, have, during the past 11 years, changed all that. They have filled our statute books with laws written by the bureaucrats, and sent to the Congress by the Executive Department with an order that they must be passed. Now when you ask me what we can do, I tell you very frankly I am afraid to risk this Government during the post-war period in the hands of the Members of Congress who traded the birthright of the American people for a mess of New Deal pottage long before we ever entered the war.

I say to you that the situation is too critical to risk the welfare of America during the period of post-war adjustment in the hands of men who as Members of Congress in the past have performed like trained seals and voted for everything they were ordered to vote for. Oh, yes, there may be a few good ones in the bunch; as a matter of fact, I think there are. But let me warn you people to check the record and see how these who

say they are good now, voted. If during this 11-year period they voted for all these New Deal laws that have wrecked the whole economy of the country, then do not pay any attention to their loud pre-election promises now about their love for constitutional government. Some of these Congressmen and Senators now are waking up to the fact that the American people have found out what they have done and many of these trained seals are today parading around over the country howling like a bunch of coyotes as they cuss the bureaucrats which they themselves voted to create.

So far as I personally am concerned, I am not worried about whether the Washington housecleaning results in eleminating Republicans or Democrats; what I am concerned about is the type and character of men who succeed those who are eliminated. I want to see a Congress and I want to see the office of President of the United States filled with new men who believe in the fundamental principles upon which this Government was founded and who will act accordingly. I want to see men elected who do not look upon the Constitution as something to be relegated to the dark ages and spoken of as belonging to the horse-and-buggy era. I want to see Congress composed of men fresh from the people who know the trials and tribulations, also the aspirations and desires of the people. And I want to see the Constitution so amended as to guarantee that in the years to come we will always have this type of men fresh from the ranks to represent "We, the people," in the Congress of the United States.

To Almighty God I lift my humble voice asking that He guide all of us so that our united actions may forever retain in America a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Jefferson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Samuel D. Jackson, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] at the Jefferson Day dinner held in Pittsburgh, Pa., May 17, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Chairman Hannegan, Senator GUFFEY, and my fellow Democrats of Allegheny County, it is indeed an honor to be asked to share the speaking honors on this pleasurable occasion with the distinguished chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Robert E. Hannegan. In his short tenure he has demonstrated an organizational ability unsurpassed by anyone in our generation and a leadership which will carry us on to certain victory next November.

The pleasure I have in coming here is doubled at the thought that I have an opportunity to speak in the home city of one of the most eminent Members of the United States Senate, the Honorable JOSEPH F. GUFFEY. No one ever has to ask JOE GUFFEY twice where he stands on a controversial question. He needs no encomium from me. He has worked a lifetime for the Democratic Party. At every turn in the road he has stood by his administration on the floor of the Senate. All he needs is a new colleague. This you can give him and at the same time make him a senior Senator if you will send Francis J. Myers to Washington.

This is a Jefferson Day occasion and I respond to the toast, "Thomas Jefferson." I stood within the Jefferson Memorial at Washington. Every Democrat, who can, should stand there on that hallowed spot. I looked up at the great figure of Thomas Jefferson. Around him were his words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; Almighty God hath created the mind free; God who gave us life gave us liberty; I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind * * *. With the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

I could feel the power of the Father of the Democrat Party. The sculptor and the architect wrought with such perfection that I had a sense of the presence of the great President.

I know there are men today who delight to distinguish between Jeffersonian Democrats and New Deal Democrats. That has been much overdone.

The language patterns used in this new experiment in free government we call America are not the same now as then. At their political leisure, I have no objection to Democrats exploring these differences. But in a campaign year, I always look for a motive when I hear a man who ought to be a Democrat say, "Im a Jeffersonian Democrat, but—". But what? A man is a Democrat or he isnt a Democrat. I hope tonight I address an audience comprised of men and women who are patriotic American citizens, joined by the ancient ties of the party of Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Again I take my place beside the great figure of Jefferson as he looks northward beyond the Tidal Basin, right at the White House, the Washington Monument at his right, the Lincoln Memorial at his left. I. seems to me he understands all this idle talk about different kinds of Democrats, and as he looks there to the White House, it seems I can hear him say, "There lives the greatest Jeffersonian Democrat of them all."

We are in an election year, sad and disturbing as that fact may be. But such things are necessary and of the very essence of the democracy for which we wage war, and as Jefferson would have it.

Jefferson said: "I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man, who in some great emergency should be deemed most capable of serving the public."

Some there are, like Job, who lament the fact that the present emergency and Roosevelt meet on the threshold of a fourth term instead of that of a first or second, but of such unexpected combinations of fact is the grim business of history.

The campaign is to be pitched on the plane of this great need of America and to the tone of the American faith that the Atlantic Charter is a monument to liberty, the "four freedoms" a vehicle of human hope. We walk humbly before the people, remembering that America's greatest crisis is at hand during this year, this campaign, and at this election.

Our adversaries seek to draw us to the level of the hustings of peacetime. They wail, "How long should we keep the Democratic Party in Washington?" There is an answer to that question.

How long? Until the escutcheons of this Government shall have been cleansed of the debauchery of the administration of Warren G. Harding.

How long? Until the economic and financial structures of this Republic shall have been healed of the rampant and unchecked pirating during the do-nothing administration of Calvin Coolidge.

How long? Until the last farmer, businessman, and worker shall have been made whole of the devastation wrought by the unfortunate and unsung administration of the great engineer.

How long? Until that permanent peace promised to the heroes of World War No. 1 shall have been kept in spirit and in truth.

How long? Until all these high ends can be reached or until the people have lost their faith in the possibility of their accomplishment, for there is not a mustard seed of hope for their achievement in the capacities of Mr. Dewey. Not even with the aid of his mentor and sponsor, Herbert Hoover.

One of the most spectacular events ever to occur on the floor of the Senate was Senator BARKLEY's now famous address. He played a single dramatic role with the United States Congress as his theater, the whole civilized world as his audience. This was a part of nothing more than a political incident, concluded in a few hours. Yet, within that time, this event, because its implications were adverse to the Executive, sky-rocketed Axis morale.

If this passing occurrence could accomplish that result, it is frightening to speculate the damage to the Allied effort if the party in power should be removed completely and with finality now in the midst of the conflict. No political speculation can escape this overwhelming factor.

They say a change of administration would not impair the war effort, but already we have a forecast of the tragic cost involved in changing the wartime administration.

We were impressed with Mr. Willkie's spectacular withdrawal from the Presidential contest. The results of the Wisconsin primary have been construed, at least by a part of the press, as a repudiation of Mr. Willkie's firm international policies, and a victory for the tenets of isolationism. Within 10 days, encouraged by this turn of political events, G. O. P. isolationist leaders urged a general slackening of the European war effort, and most flagrant of all, a Representative from our own State, Congressman EARL WILSON, openly advocated the abandonment of the war against the Axis. On the floor of the House of Representatives he said:

"Yes, today it is becoming clearer and clearer that our war is in the Pacific, and unless the objectives of the European war can be clarified in the minds of our people we can expect little more progress than is being made at Cassino, and, therefore, unless or until a better understanding is brought about we had better pull out of Europe and fight our battle in the Pacific."

Think of it! What do you think that does to the mercury in the Nazi morale thermometer?

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, before the annual banquet of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington recently discussing a growing disposition to set apart the Army and Navy from those in civilian life, stressed the fact that such an attitude of mind, such an illusion, is all wrong and that in disunion lies the only possibility of our ultimate defeat. Secretary Stimson said: "From the very beginning they (meaning the Axis propagandists) have continuously and consistently preached to their armed forces and to their people that the United States was too soft, too self-interested, too divided to wage war on the gigantic scale which they would force upon us. They (still referring to the Axis leaders) believe it now. They have staked their future on it."

Yes, a change would play into the hands of the Nazi propagandists with deadly result.

That the Axis Powers despair of survival is assured. They are fighting through 1944 in the hope that there will be a political upset in te United States next November, sufficient to remove the present administration from power. The Nazis hope they may get something less than unconditional surrender from some other administration.

A change would mean, at least, interruption. It would mean, inevitably, some change of plan—perhaps in the grand strategy itself. It would mean a change of surgeons in the midst of the operation. The sharp scalpel, the delicate hemostat, the deadly anesthesia, would pass from trained hands and cool heads to—what hands and what heads, no one knows. Who would select the successors to General "Ike" Eisenhower, General Douglas MacArthur, and Admiral Nimitz, and on what basis?

If I may quote from a new campaign song published by the Democratic National Committee written by Paul Porter:

"Don't change horses in the middle of the stream if you want to keep your britches dry.
My wise old pappy done told me, "Don't ever change your bet.
You know what ya got when ya got it, but you don't know what you're gonna get."

This war is not being fought by the members of any one political party. When a Jap sniper draws a bead on a marine in an island jungle he can't see a campaign button. War and partisan politics cannot mix.

Recognizing this fact, President Roosevelt gave many of the most important war posts to prominent Republicans. Mr. Henry Stimson, Secretary of State under President Hoover and Secretary of War under President Taft, was made Secretary of War. The late Col. Frank Knox, who had been the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1936, was made Secretary of the Navy. Judge Robert Patterson, a Republican, was made Under Secretary of War and placed in charge of the entire procurement program for the Army, and a long list of Republican industrialists and businessmen have been placed in key war positions, clothed with ample powers.

From a pacific nation in 1940 we have become the strongest military power on earth in 1944. The United States of America has accomplished more in 3½ years than the combined military and naval achievements of the Japs in half a century and the Nazis in a decade.

This is the result of Democrats and Republicans having peeled off their partisan coats, and going to work in their American shirt sleeves. But it has been achieved under Democratic leadership. If the American electorate is to act upon the principal that a political party is to be regarded for its leadership, then no justification appears to support a change in 1944.

What about the writing of the peace? At the peace table Churchill, Stalin, and Chang Kai-shek will be grasping each for his own post-war advantage, and justifiably so. The people want our representative to have an equal chance, to be big enough to hold his own. In Franklin D. Roosevelt is to be found a combination of knowledge and fervor rising to the heights of the growing soul of America, and matching the sublimity of the people's prayers for a just and durable peace. He knows the men with whom we shall have to deal. He knows the forces which will be brought into play. He has an enthusiasm for the field. The welfare of the United States—and in fact the welfare of the world—are at stake in the planning of the peace, and the best is none too good for the United States of America.

One thing is sure—the people of the United States do not want Gerald L. K. Smith—or anybody like him, representing us at the peace table when this war is over. They don't even want Herbert Hoover.

Shortly after the Wisconsin primary, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey surprised the United States by venturing into the press with a sage pronouncement on peace and post-war adjustments. He used language indicating that as to basis principles and main objectives, he has imitated the foreign policy of the President. Mr. Dewey spoke of durable cohesion and solid relations, among the United States Great Britain, Russia, and China.

He urged "prompt measures to establish a system of general international cooperation" and "conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability."

In 1940 when the President was imploring the Nation to follow him in preparation for war, Governor Dewey was demanding a foreign policy which would, to use his own words, "keep completely out of the affairs of Europe," calling the recognition of Russia a "fuzzy-minded departure from sound policy"; attacking Lease-Lend as threatening, to quote him again, "an end to free government in the United States." Now he suggests that Uncle Sam is, quoting him again, "a benevolent but slightly senile gentleman who seeks to purchase the goodwill of his poor relations by distributing among them the dwindling remains of his youthful years."

The Chicago Sun, in commenting upon Mr. Dewey's statement of international peace policy, characterized it as giving the isolationist Republicans a swift kick—and the followers of Wendell Willkie an olive branch—saying that he had divorced himself so completely from the reactionaries who killed off Mr. Willkie's candidacy that he cannot retreat into isolationism henceforth and stay honest.

The Chicago Tribune, in commenting upon this address, said "Mr. Dewey read a speech that the English press has hailed as the picking up by Mr. Dewey of the mantle that Mr. Willkie dropped when he fled," and added in its editorial comment, "there is a good deal in the speech to justify this interpretation."

But this is not Chicago. This is Pittsburgh. Here we would say this hopeful promise for a just and durable Christian peace is "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal"—a tale told by a candidate full of sound and fury seeking nothing. Man asks for a fish and Mr. Dewey gives him a stone. "Durable cohesion," he says. It if were not so pathetic it would be amusing.

While mankind the world around continues to "expunge itself," "to sing hymns," to "build bombing airplanes," to "convert again into explosives, the bewildered ammonia and the distracted cellulose" and to "convert into putrescent matter the hopeful bodies of the young," Mr. Dewey proposes to this mad and suffering race of men that we hold the world together with a few strips of adhesive tape.

If he would pluck some feathers from the wings of his imagination and stick them into the tail of his reason, this Walt Disney candidate for President would fly a course much nearer to the beam.

Let us recall clear historical proof to the effect that a change of administration may affect the peace prospects.

The election of 1918 went against President Wilson following his request for a Democratic Congress. This was the first and irretrievable step in the defeat of the Treaty, the ratification of which, through the League of Nations, had potentialities sufficient to have prevented World War No. 2.

The change of world outlook and policy effected by the psychological ultimates of that simple political fact ruined the peace prospects in 1920. Isolationism is not dead. It is not even dormant. It is simply lying back behind its natural camouflage preparing in a wily manner to strike at the earliest safe opportunity. If we change administrations, we change policy, and we may expect to see our dreams come tumbling down upon us, the wreckage of what might have been the cathedral of a just and durable peace.

Sitting in the Senate Chamber, I sometimes realize I can look down upon the very spot where the best prospects for peace this old world ever had was killed. There are the blood stains from the sacrifice. It was a sacrifice to the gods of partisan greed; and that by unhallowed hands. One can feel the chill of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, riding out of nowhere, and dashing again back through the dark recesses of that same chamber, screaming like frustrated vampires, in search of a soul, which, found, would give them liberation and rest.

Unprinted in the Senate record, but none the less real, are the voices from Flanders fields, moaning that the torch they threw their statesmen was doused in the filthy vats of party hate. The Lodges of Massachusetts, the Watsons of Indiana, and the Boise Penroses of Pennsylvania, were not above striking down peace hopes to their partisan gain. Their modern prototypes, the backers of Thomas E. Dewey, many in Pennsylvania, are not above the same murderous blow for the same unholy cause.

I pray the United States Senate may be redeemed of this assassination, and that right early, that from that sepulchre where she now lies slain, Peace may rise, resurrected in the sunrise of man's new day, that they who lingered longest in her defense be the first to greet her on the morn.

We shall win in 1944 because the peculiar circumstances of the case compel it. But let me hasten to warn that no Democrat must seek in these circumstances any narrow partisan gratification. This year we fight for America, not for party. Every worker should be touched with the livid fire of high conviction that Franklin D. Roosevelt is the most valuable individual public servant in the world today, and that to retain his party in power until the job is done is a noble cause, and the greatest service to the memory of Thomas Jefferson.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health Insurance," from the Washington Post of May 19, 1944. I should particularly like to urge the distinguished chairman and members of the Finance Committee to read the arguments advanced in this editorial for early consideration of the bill S. 1161 which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I have introduced to amend and revise the Social Security Act. I should like to quote the two last paragraphs of this fine editorial:

The medical and hospital insurance features of the bill have been violently attacked by officials of the American Medical Association. They have contributed very little to sober consideration of the measure on its merits by referring to it as socialized medicine. If this is socialism, then so is the public school system. Good health, like good education, is one of the cornerstones of a democratic society. Under our present sys-

tem of private medical practice, great portions of our population are compelled to go without adequate medical care, either because they cannot afford to pay for it and will not ask for charity, or because they live in rural areas to which doctors are not attracted. Under the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, workers would be able to pay, through insurance, for their own medical and hospital care, and doctors would be able, in general, to earn better incomes.

The various aspects of the proposed insurance program require, of course, the most careful study and consideration. We do not suggest any slapdash validation of them. But it is by no means too early, in our opinion, for Congress to start work on a program of this sort. The need is beyond denial. A genuine and comprehensive system of social security is the best possible foundation on which to build our post-war hopes.

If we are to have a sound social-security system in operation to meet the human problems of the reconversion and post-war period, we must start congressional consideration of this entire matter now—before the war is over.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE

Nearly a year ago Senator WAGNER introduced, for himself and Senator MURRAY, a bill "to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act." Representative DINGELL introduced it in the House. It was an exceedingly complex bill, 90 pages in length, designated not only to bring within the Social Security System great segments of our population not now protected by it but also to make the protection itself much more comprehensive—chiefly through establishment of a Federal system of medical and hospitalization benefits. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, and there it has languished ever since, ignored if not entirely forgotten.

The Post had, and still has, certain misgivings about this bill. We said in our initial comment upon it that it seemed to us "unwise to launch a new program of social insurance in wartime requiring additional contributions of $5,000,000,000 annually from employers and employees." As a piece of concrete, practical postwar planing there is, on the other hand, much to be said for it.

We are inclined to agree with a defense of the measure offered in a speech last month by Senator MURRAY: "If we are to assure an orderly demobilization from wartime to peacetime conditions of full employment, we shall need a strong national unemployment insurance program and a national employment service. Our bill, if enacted soon enough, will carry unemployed workers and their families through the weeks or months while industry is reconverting. It will enable older workers to retire after the extra years of service they have given during the war. It will help returning service men and women to make the reajustment to civilian life. It will give all of us the security of knowing that we can have adequate medical care for ourselves and our families when it is needed and a continuing family income in case of sickness or disability.

The medical and hospital insurance features of the bill have been violently attacked by officials of the American Medical Association. They have contributed very little to sober consideration of the measure on its merits by referring to it as "socialized medicine." If this is socialism, then so is the public school system. Good health, like good education, is one of the cornerstones of a democratic society. Under our present system of private medical practice, great portions of our population are compelled to go without adequate medical care, either because they cannot afford to pay for it and will not ask for charity, or because they live in rural areas to which doctors are not attracted. Under the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, workers would be able to pay, through insurance, for their own medical and hospital care, and doctors would be able, in general, to earn better incomes.

The various aspects of the proposed insurance program require, of course, the most careful study and consideration. We do not suggest any slapdash validation of them. But it is by no means too early, in our opinion, for Congress to start work on a program of this sort. The need is beyond denial. A genuine and comprehensive system of social security is the best possible foundation on which to build our post-war hopes.

The Constitutional Issue in the Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Scuttling the Constitution," published in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., of May 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCUTTLING THE CONSTITUTION

The vital issue involved in the anti-poll-tax bill, now before the Senate, is whether the Constitution of the United States is to be nullified, or whether it is to be upheld.

In certain States of the South a citizen, in order to qualify as a voter, must have paid a poll tax. This newspaper does not approve that qualification, and has urged that it be abolished. But the fact is that no power to abolish it resides in the Congress. The Constitution makes that perfectly clear in providing that Representatives and Senators in Congress shall be elected by the people, and that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the must numerous branch of the State legislature. The States alone have the power, limited only by the Constitution, to determine the qualifications of voters. Congress certainly does not have it.

For political purposes, and presumably as a bid for the Negro vote, some Republican Senators are teaming up with the New Deal Democrats to pass the anti-poll-tax bill, which already has been approved by the House. Many of them have been severe critics of the administration on the ground that to accomplish its ends, it has been willing to violate the Constitution. Some of them fought the Federal soldier ballot bill on that ground. Yet now they are themselves showing a willingness to scuttle the Constitution by supporting a clearly unconstitutional law.

By so doing they are guilty of the same evil practice for which they have condemned, and rightly condemned, the New Deal, and are throwing away one of the most important issues on which to appeal to the American people for support in the coming election.

Negroes who are victims of the poll-tax laws of the South, although by no means the only victims, naturally want to see them repealed. But they will lose much more than they can hope to gain through enactment, by Congress, of a law which definitely undermines the Constitution. If that charter of liberties can be breached in the passage of the anti-poll-tax law, it can be breached in other ways, and soon we shall have no Constitution, and the rights of the people which it now protects will be at the mercy of any majority in the National Legislature.

Effect of Taxation Upon Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Shock Absorber," written by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the Railroad Workers Journal, and published in the issue of that periodical for April 1944. Mr. Franks is an intelligent and enlightened labor leader, and I believe his editorial will prove to be interesting to everyone who reads it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHOCK ABSORBER

Day by day our industrial highway is becoming more rough and at the pace we are traveling on this highway it will not be long until it becomes bumpy. Up to the present time little has been done to offset this condition. Speaking in plain language, our industrial condition today is nothing short of chaos, and simply because good business acumen is not being applied to offset an unnecessary shock which we will all face when this war is ended.

Industries, large and small, are being forced to operate on a basis absolutely contrary to good business tactics, through a system of taxation based on fabulous war time production. Few industries are able to lay aside enough surplus to take care of a sudden emergency, such as the abrupt ending of this war. The ending of this war means the immediate reconversion of industries, and under the present system of taxation these industries face an inevitable crash.

It seems to this writer that our Government would do well to establish a plan whereby all business, large and small, would be allowed to set aside a reasonable amount of their profits to guarantee no stoppage of employment during the reconversion period. Or safer yet, allow all business enough surplus to guarantee stability. Some people believe 5 percent of the gross would be an adequate amount. This may or may not be correct. For gigantic industries this would invariably be in excess of the requirement, and yet for small industries this amount may prove inadequate. This plar should be drafted to take care of conditions without making "fish of one or flesh of the other."

Under our system of free enterprise we must accept the slogan of "what helps business helps you," and by this same token we must recognize the fact also that what hurts business hurts you. Therefore it is important to all of us, whether we be workers, labor leaders, or the general public, to see to it that all legitimate industry be kept

profitable, because unless it is, we are headed for another depression, which means unemployment and its natural effect—destitution for millions of workers.

To tax industry to the point of jeopardy is to place it at the mercy of tax collectors, bureaucrats, and politicians who have little, if any, knowledge of how to operate business. This is a very serious problem and warrants attention right now—not after the war, or after the next election. That would be too late to save our industrial structure. We must act now.

With the ending of the war will come the ending of war contracts and the resumption of competitive business which has been the backbone of our American system of free enterprise. Unless all business is permitted, through sufficient surplus, to enter into this competition it will mean that business in general is going to go for a very rough ride over our industrial highway. And those who cannot stand the shocks are going to be shocked to death. Therefore, it is obvious that a reasonable amount of current profits set aside to surplus would be the shock absorber.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS, *Editor.*

Deliverence and Independence of Jewish People—Appeal by Hebrew Committee of National Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "A Call by the Hebrew Nation for Help in Its Mortal Struggle for Life and Liberation," issued by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL BY THE HEBREW NATION FOR HELP IN ITS MORTAL STRUGGLE FOR LIFE AND LIBERATION

We Hebrews, descendants of the ancient Hebrew nation, surviving today on God's earth amidst the dreadful catastrophe of torture and death that has befallen our people, have joined together in the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation to dedicate ourselves and our lives to secure the deliverance and independence of the remaining millions of our desperate people, struggling for life itself in the vast hell of German-occupied Europe.

What has happened to the Jews of Europe was not sudden. It is the culmination of centuries of oppression and persecution, centuries of ghettos and pogroms, economic strangulation, and endless humiliation and insult.

In this war this cumulative attack has resulted in the staggering climax of 3,000,000 innocent men, women, and children deliberately massacred.

In the face of such disaster, the bitter status quo of the Jews in Europe must give way to a new, bold, and total attempt at salvation.

These Jews today have no effective protection of citizenship from any nation. They can no longer be considered Rumanians, Hungarians, Poles, Germans. Certainly they are not Axis nationals. They are the first and bitterest enemies of the Axis. They belong to no nation and have no nation of their own. That is why the murder of 3,000,000 Jews—a number as large as the total population of many a European nation—has been possible.

Common disaster brings them together, even as death has hunted them together.

We therefore proclaim to the people of this land, and through them to all civilized men the world over, that the dry and tormented bones of the Jews in European lands have now been united, that the blood of our 3,000,000 dead has done more than fertilize the earth of the people who have murdered them. It has molded the survivors into a single living entity. It has brought forth a renascent Hebrew nation.

The Jews who live today in the hell of Europe, together with the Jews of Palestine, constitute the Hebrew nation.

There is no other nation to whom they owe allegiance but the Hebrew nation.

It is as a part of these millions that we exercise the rights of self-determination; that we proclaim the existence of the Hebrew nation and its determination to speak for itself and its elementary right to be represented by its own sons.

We confidently believe that the present-day heirs of the American Revolution will understand, recognize, and support us in this mortal struggle for our life and liberation.

It is proper that we have chosen Washington as the site for this historic rededication of the Hebrew nation as a democracy—Washington, eternal symbol of democracy and of the greatness of the human spirit and of its revolutionary demand for justice, decency, and freedom.

Let it be clearly understood that the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation does not attempt to speak for the Jews of the United States. They are an integral part of the American Nation; an integral part of a nation made up of people of every descent.

These Jews are Americans of Hebrew descent. They do not belong to Palestine and thereby to the renascent Hebrew nation any more than Justice Frank Murphy "belongs" to the Irish Nation, or General William Knudsen "belongs" to the Danish Nation; though both certainly are proud of their ancestry.

And let there be no confusion because the vast majority of Americans of Hebrew descent are faithful adherents of the Jewish religion.

Hebrews and Jews are not synonymous terms. Religion and state are separate. The common adherence of members of the American Nation and of the Hebrew nation to the Jewish religion is no different than the common adherence of Americans and Germans to the Protestant religion; or the common adherence of Americans and Italians to the Catholic religion. Everywhere in the world people share religions without sharing nationhood. The people of the Hebrew nation, and Americans of Hebrew descent, whose religion is the same, are no different from the others. They still are members of different states.

We proclaim that Palestine, in its historic boundaries, is the territory of the Hebrew Nation by the will of God as was set forth in the Bible. In our own time this was politically ratified by 52 nations who, in 1922, "recognized the historic connection between the Hebrew people and Palestine."

Although it is the national territory of the Hebrews, Palestine is to be a free state in which the present Arab and other non-Hebrew residents of the land will share full equality and privileges of citizenship and government—will be full partners in the upbuilding of a free country and a democratic civilization.

In the present condition of our Nation we are dedicated primarily to only one task—the rescue of our people. We, therefore, proclaim that the Hebrew Nation postpones the settlement of the political and boundary problem of Palestine until after victory, when, as one of the United Nations, we hope to partake in the post-war settlement of political territorial problems. Until that time we shall cooperate and assist Great Britain as the mandatory for Palestine.

We do, however, insist, in the name of humanity, that the right and the ability of all Hebrews in Europe to find shelter in Palestine be facilitated by the mandatory power, lest it be guilty of sacrificing them to their ruthless German murderers.

We proclaim the Hebrew Nation a cobelligerent in the United Nations' war against Axis tyranny. Our dead, who have bloodied the steps of civilization, can no longer be considered useless victims of insane massacre. They are honored casualties in the United Nations' common war for freedom. Our surviving 4,000,000 people in Europe are prisoners of war, and the International Red Cross should do everything it can to succor them even as it deals with all other prisoners of war.

But not all of our people have been victims.

We have contributed more fighters to the common struggle than most of the United Nations. Thousands of our men have fought and are daily fighting the enemy—whether as Hebrew guerrilla units harassing the enemy's lines in Poland and Yugoslavia—whether in the numerous underground sabotage groups, or as regular fighters and commandos as part of the 30,000 Hebrews who are serving in the Palestinian regiments and in other units of the Middle Eastern British Army. They have fought and died all the way from El Alamein to Cassino and from Syria to Addis Abbaba.

Because we are, in fact, a cobelligerent against the Axis, we consider ourselves one of the United Nations and seek recognition as such, and as the nation against which more atrocities have been committed than against all the other United Nations combined we surely should be represented on the Inter Allied Commission on War Crimes.

We also seek a seat on the Board of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and all other United Nations councils in which the interests of our nationals are involved.

In addition, the tens of thousands of Hebrew fighting men should now be given the elementary right to fight the Nazis under their own banner and in their own name—as the Hebrew army—with a status comparable to that of the armies of the other nations which have been overrun by the Nazis.

These are the minimum needs of our nation at a time when the very existence of its people is at stake. Their denial by the United Nations would be contradictory to the very aims for which the war is being fought; would be a defeat of justice now and in the future; would be an endless threat to peace in the world of tomorrow. For in ignoring the principle for which the war is being fought, we can cheat no one but ourselves and our children.

The Hebrew Nation can no longer endure the status quo. An intolerable whirlpool of death and disaster has shattered this status quo. There is a limit to the blood and suffering any people can endure.

It is in this spirit of desperation, and with humility and reverence that we of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation have undertaken to be the servants and spokesmen of the Hebrew Nation, until such time as our nation shall be free to elect its own spokesmen and representatives in a democratic form. We solemnly swear to serve our nation with all our energies and might, and not to falter if we should need sacrifice life itself, so help us God.

WASHINGTON, *May 17, 1944.*

Recent Developments in Petroleum Products by the Petroleum Administrator for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, before the oil subcommittee of the House—Lea—Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, May 17, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it has been about 6 months since I last appeared before your committee so I appreciate this opportunity to tell you of some of the more recent developments in the Petroleum Administration.

When we last met I was able to report that the critical domestic transportation situation had been greatly improved. At that time overland facilities had been developed sufficiently to permit us to place all sections of the country on a basis of parity as to the supply of such petroleum products as were available after satisfying military requirements.

ONE-HUNDRED OCTANE AVIATION FUEL

Today, I can report to you on another accomplishment—one that is providing the fighting fuel for our Army and Navy air men from the South Pacific to the Straits of Dover in their relentless destruction of the enemy. As of this date we are producing 100-octane aviation fuel at a rate in excess of 400,000 barrels per day. For comparison, in December of 1941 we produced in the United States alone some 45,000 barrels per day of this aviation fuel, and in a normal peacetime year our needs were amply satisfied with only 5,000 barrels per day.

You will be interested in how the huge increase was achieved in the United States during the first 2 years of the war.

1. Through new plants and facilities: Under a program sponsored by the Petroleum Administration for War the total cost of all new aviation fuel facilities will be in the neighborhood of $900,000,000. Eighty-five percent of that program is complete; $760,000,000 of that program will be spent for plants in this country. Some 41 major units have been completed from the first shovelful of earth to the fitting of the last high pressure valve. As you will see from the chart attached, these plants have added 35½ percent of the increased output of this fuel.

2. Through conversion of existing refinery units to production of aviation fuel: Seventy-two small units were converted from making motor gasoline blending stock to turning out 100-octane ingredients. Fourteen catalytic cracking plants, similarly employed on motor gasoline, were changed over to production of base stock for aviation fuel. We gained 14 percent of our increase from mechanical improvements and 13.8 percent by conversion.

3. Through new blending agents: American technical skill and ingenuity found for us chemical substances such as cumene and codimer to step up the quality of available base stock to 100-octane level, accounting for 31.9 percent of the increase. The addition of more tetraethyl lead, use of toluene, and other blending agents account for the balance.

The meteoric increase in actual output by the United Nations from Pearl Harbor to the present is shown on the second chart herewith.

More than 450 refineries and natural gasoline plants over the United States are linked to some phase of the 100-octane program. All of the principal refining districts in the country have contributed to the program and the general location of most of the plants is shown on the map which is chart No. 3.

As to finance, probably no other major war industry will have so small a proportion of Government participation. Of the $760,000,000 domestic program, $550,000,000 is private capital and the balance, through Defense Supplies Corporation, is Government investment, largely used to aid smaller refineries in the program.

I have stressed the volume of present output and the fourth chart presents a compelling reason as to why it takes so much aviation fuel to keep our bombers over Europe. This is the impact of distance on our supply problem. To get 1,000 barrels a month into the bomber's tanks, we must always have 3,000 barrels in reserve behind the lines in the war theater itself, and 2,000 barrels in manufacture and in transit.

Though the current world production of something over 400,000 barrels per day of 100 octane must be increased even further to meet our ultimate goal, I think we may be justifiably proud of the progress made in the supply of this No. 1 petroleum war product.

IMPACT ON CIVILIAN GASOLINE SUPPLIES

In peacetime a 42-gallon barrel of crude yielded some 18 gallons of automotive gasoline and one-half gallon of aviation fuel. Today that 18 is reduced to 11½ gallons of automitive gasoline to make way for aviation gasoline, toluene, TNT, butadiene, and increased amounts of fuel oil for heat and power. The difference between 18 and 11½, or 6½, are the gallons that have gone to war, as is clearly shown in chart No. 5. In spite of this decreased yield, however, we must continue to meet our essential farm, industrial, bus, truck, and passenger-car needs.

CRUDE PRODUCTION

The fountainhead of our supply is, of course, crude production, and today we are drawing from American wells 4,700,000 barrels daily of crude oil and other petroleum liquids—an increase of half a million barrels per day over May of last year. As a result, we are nearly at our limit of maximum efficient capacity in all areas. In addition, we are now importing 100,000 barrels per day to the east coast and hope to increase this substantially by the end of the year.

TRANSPORTATION

Victory in modern war is vitally dependent on the movement of troops, planes, tanks, ammunition, and supplies. The somber phrase "too little and too late," coined early in the war, decried the tragic inability to move supplies at home to battle fronts abroad. Transportation is no less significant in oil, and each new project completed has meant another battle won in our civilian campaign to meet Army and Navy demands for the right product at the right time and place.

In the last several months our transportation system has been further augmented by the completion of important additional facilities. These include the completion of the Government-owned 1,475-mile 20-inch products pipe line all the way to the eastern seaboard; Sinclair's 243-mile products pipe line from East Chicago, Ind., to Toledo, Ohio; the Stanolind's 385-mile crude pipe line from west Texas to Drumright, Okla.; and Magnolia's 381-mile crude pipe line from west Texas to Corsicana, Tex.

All told the total mileage of new pipe-line construction, reversals, and conversions completed up to April 1 of this year is 11,388 miles. The projects remaining to be completed in the next few months will add another 600 miles.

Today, 1,700,000 barrels per day are flowing to the eastern seaboard through pipe line, tank car, barge, and lake tanker, as against 1,369,000 barrels per day a year ago.

Present overland petroleum movements to the east coast are even higher than movements pre-war when ocean tankers were carrying 95 percent of the oil to the eastern seaboard. The magnitude of this changeover is clearly shown in chart No. 6, illustrating the four transportation media and the proportion of the total carried by each. You will note the dwindling tanker load and the sharply increased tank car and pipe line volumes.

This achievement in wartime transportation sponsored by the P. A. W. has made it possible for us to meet, barrel for barrel, the huge demands of the Army and Navy.

REFINING

Crude runs to refineries are programed at 4,468,000 barrels per day, or more than three-quarters of a million barrels per day over May of last year.

The committee has indicated its interest in the problem of the division of crude oil among refineries as among the different areas of the country and as among refineries within the same areas. I should like to report to you on this situation.

The Petroleum Administration for War has been charged with the responsibility of insuring production of the petroleum products that are necessary to meet military and essential civilian requirements. To accomplish this objective available crude oil supplies and available transportation must be provided first for those plants that manufacture critical war products; whatever is left is divided among other refineries. However, it should be understood that normal distribution channels are disturbed or restrictive measures taken only when a real need arises, and that such measures are terminated at the earliest possible time and they are confined to the smallest possible area.

As you know, shortly after Pearl Harbor it became necessary for the armed forces to withdraw most of the tankers which then were supplying crude oil to refineries on the east coast (Petroleum Administration for War's district 1). This withdrawal created a severe emergency in refinery operations in this area, and endangered production of critical war products, such as aviation gasoline and toluene for TNT. To insure maximum production of war products in this area nearest to the European and African war theaters and to insure that plant capacity would not remain unused, a plan was worked out to divide the available crude oil in such a manner as to provide a minimum crude supply to all plants for maximum production of war products. Any crude above that required for the manufacture of war products was divided among the war and nonwar plants according to their relative throughput of crude during a certain pre-war base period. This general plan was put into effect as early as May 1942 and has been continued in a somewhat modified form up to the present. Improvement in transportation, as exemplified by the Big Inch war emergency crude oil pipe line and the 20-inch war emergency refined products pipe line has allowed crude runs to be increased as the demands of war plants have increased. The actual crude runs in the district have increased from somewhat less than half a million barrels a day in May 1942 to more than three-quarters of a million barrels a day. Approximately 95 percent of this crude is used in production of critical war products.

The situation on the Gulf coast (Petroleum Administration for War's district 3) has been the converse of the situation in district 1. In district 3 there has been adequate production of crude oil, but transportation has been

the limiting factor. In normal times much of the volume of products refined had been transported by tanker. The production of critical war products, such as aviation gasoline, toluene, and components used in the synthetic-rubber program, was seriously endangered. The Petroleum Administration for War recognized the danger and took remedial action.

Transportation required by war plants was determined, and available transportation in excess of this amount was divided among the refineries so that maximum war products were made with no plant being reduced below 70.5 percent of its crude run during the last 6 months of 1941. The yield of motor gasoline was reduced to increase the yield of fuel oil, which was needed by the railroads. Subsequently refinery programs have been developed so that minimum crude runs for all war plants have been continually corrected to correspond with the ability of various plants to produce war products, and the remaining available transportation has been divided so that all war and nonwar plants share equitably.

With increased efficiency of tank-car movements, the construction of the 24-inch crude line, and of the 20-inch products line, crude runs could be increased. Conditions had improved to such an extent by the summer of 1943 that the Petroleum Administration for War was able to remove the restrictions cited above.

The effect of the war period on the mid-continent area, known to the Petroleum Administration for War as district 2, has been due in large part to the declining productivity of the oil fields in this area. Also, transportation facilities such as pipe lines were available to bring crude from district 2 to war plants on the east coast and, therefore, these inventories were used in meeting the military demands made on such refiners. A directive was issued on November 19, 1942, in which crude runs in district 2 were reduced by approximately 5 percent and not over 10 percent in order to supply emergency requirements on the east coast. However, the directive was later modified in January of 1943 to increase the production of much-needed residual fuel oil, and by May 8, 1943, steps had to be taken to balance the operations of refineries in district 2. On that date a directive was issued by the Petroleum Administration for War which provided for a general adjustment in refinery runs in district 2 to approximately 85 percent of normal capacity. (Normal capacity being defined at that time as operations of the last half of 1941.) By these adjusted runs, applicable except in cases involving maximum production of critical war products, additional crude oil was made available to refineries whose inventories had been depleted below minimum working-stock levels. Also, plans were worked out whereby excess crude carried in storage by certain companies was divided among refineries, large or small, so that the industry could be kept in a balanced condition that would permit maximum operation under existing conditions. Since the summer of 1943, additional crude has been made available to refineries in district 2 and, therefore, such restrictive measures have been modified.

INCREASING DISTRICT 2 SUPPLIES

It has been a real problem to increase the availability of crude supplies to district 2 and we have taken full advantage of such means as were at our disposal. For one thing, the great crude-oil reserves of west Texas were opened to district 2 refiners by the construction of the Stanolind 385-mile crude pipe line from west Texas to Drumright, Okla., with a daily capacity of 65,000 barrels. In addition, transportation-compensation arrangements have been worked out so that west Texas crude can be moved to district 2 refiners by tank car.

More recently steps have been taken to encourage increased barge shipments of Gulf Coast crudes and tank-car shipments of crudes from the Wyoming area through compensatory arrangements that cover the added transportation costs for these movements.

It is a matter of interest that, despite the fact there is still some additional refining capacity available in district 2, the crude runs in this district were at the very high level of 1,153,000 barrels a day in April of this year, which is 283,000 barrels a day above the average peacetime runs of 1939.

UTILIZING SMALL PLANTS

At this point you may be interested to know what the general effect of Petroleum Administration for War regulations has been on small refineries. Studies which have been made indicate that fewer refineries are idle now than during peacetime, that the average throughout of refineries of less than 5,000 barrels a day rated capacity has increased and that more small refiners have been able to increase plant capacity than was the case in the period from 1936 to 1941.

It has been the policy of the Petroleum Administration for War to encourage all refineries, and especially the smaller refineries, to produce critical war products. A few examples will be cited.

One small Texas refinery with capacity of 3,000 barrels a day, was in a position to produce components of aviation gasoline and was interested in installing equipment for the manufacture of still others. With the aid of the Petroleum Administration for War the company proceeded with the installation of equipment for cumene production and completed the construction by the first of 1943. Thereupon the crude runs of the company were increased sufficiently to allow for maximum production of this critical war product.

A small refinery in Oklahoma could not meet the Petroleum Administration for War's directives as to product output. However, it was found that the plant was refining a crude which would produce base stock for 100-octane aviation gasoline. With priorities arranged for by the Petroleum Administration for War, equipment was installed so that the base stock could be fractionated, and from December 1943 up to the present time, between 175 and 280 barrels a day of this essential material has been produced by the company. Further, a polymer plant owned by the company was converted to produce maximum yields of another very important component of aviation gasoline. This production of critical war products has entitled the company to even more than normal crude runs.

Again, a refinery in the east Texas area, had been shut down and idle for several years because of the competitive nature of the gasoline sales in that area. In answer to the Petroleum Administration for War's request for maximum production of all aviation gasoline, especially 87-octane, the company submitted a proposal for the reconditioning of its plant so as to make 73 or 87-octane aviation gasolines and butane-butylene fraction needed for the production of alkylate or synthetic rubber. The Petroleum Administration for War approved the proposal, aided the company in obtaining the necessary priorities and made the necessary crude available for the maximum production of war products.

Our prime objective always has been to secure the maximum production of the petroleum products most urgently needed by the armed forces, and to assure an adequate supply of products essential to war industry and to the civilian economy. We have heard it said that crude runs were restricted arbitrarily. However, the facts indicate that all possible information and advice has been obtained previous to the taking of action, and that the measures it has been necessary to take, such as the restricting of crude runs in district 2, have been rescinded just as soon as possible in keeping with our overall program. It has been necessary to adopt different policies in different areas of the country, reflecting variations in the situations of each. But, looking back over the last 3 years, we feel it justifiable to say that the war program has benefited by the utilization of the crude supplies, transportation facilities, and refining capacity which have been made available, and that the measures taken, while necessarily worded in restrictive terms, have actually resulted in higher crude runs than could have prevailed otherwise.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTS

Now as to the problem of the distribution of petroleum products to distributors, as between the different areas of the country, and as between units of the industry within the same areas, in which the Committee has indicated its interest.

Inasmuch as the east coast (Petroleum Administration for War's District 1) was hit the earliest and hardest because of the tanker diversions it might be well to comment first on the steps which had to be taken to apportion the drastically curtailed supply in such manner as to satisfy the current rationed needs of all consumers within the district. This has been accomplished throught the issuance of three Petroleum Administration for War regulations—directive 59 and Petroleum Administrative Orders 1 and 5. Together these regulations constitute the basis for a comprehensive supply and distribution program designed to make available to district 1 the maximum amount of petroleum products from all available facilities.

Directive 59, issued in September 1942, divides district 1 into six zones. The current rationed needs of consumers in each zone are determined by the Petroleum Administration for War each month and supplies are directed to meet these requirements.

Experience under the directive proved that adjustments in supply had to be made from time to time in order to meet unexpected variances in demand between suppliers doing business in the same trade area.

Consequently in December of 1943, directive 59 was amended to provide a method by which any supplier whose available products were insufficient to meet the current rationed needs of its customers could secure a reassignment of additional supplies to make up this deficiency. This redistribution provision thus provides that consumers receive products according to rationed demands.

The administration of Directive 59 is very complicated, but with the suggestions and assistance of two representative industry committees (the supply and transportation committee and the marketing and distribution committee), the directive is proving itself a successful device for attaining the Petroleum Administration for War's fundamental objectives of bringing the maximum amount of petroleum products into district 1 and of distributing these products fairly and equitably among suppliers. These industry committees are established by the Petroleum Administration for War and function under the direct control and supervision of the Petroleum Administration for War.

The great bulk of all petroleum products shipped into district 1 is scheduled under directive 69; however, there are some additional shipments which are not covered by directive 59 but which must be controlled, if the total east-coast supply is to be dis-

tributed in accordance with consumer requirements.

Upon the delivery of petroleum products to suppliers in district 1 under directive 59 and Petroleum Administrative Order No. 1, the Petroleum Administrator for War has two obligations to fulfill, namely:

1. To assure the military forces and to farmers for nonhighway uses all products which they require.

2. To distribute remaining supplies among all units of the industry so that each unit, whether it be primary supplier, secondary supplier, distributor, jobber, or dealer, receives its current rationed demand.

In order to carry out these obligations, the Petroleum Administration for War issued in December 1942, Petroleum Administrative Order No. 1. This regulation provides that the military forces and farm nonhighway uses have first call on all petroleum supplies. It further provides that after these preferred uses have been satisfied each supplier in distributing the supplies remaining must serve every one of its 1942 customers, and supply all customers to the extent of their current rationed requirements.

In view of the increasing quantities of products being taken for military use from other districts, and the resulting increase in the problem of meeting essential civilian requirements in such districts, the Petroleum Administration for War is now considering, in consultation with industry, a revision and extension of Petroleum Administrative Order No. 1, to be effective in any district where its need is indicated.

MAINTAINING ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN ACTIVITIES

The Petroleum Administration for War in cooperation with the several agencies which present civilian claims to the Petroleum Requirements Committee: namely, War Food Administration, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Civilian Requirements, Office of War Utilities, and Office of Operations Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, has made every possible effort to determine as nearly as possible the quantities of petroleum products required to maintain essential civilian activities throughout the country. When available supplies are insufficient to meet all requests, the most equitable distribution of the supply available is determined through consultation with the claimant agencies and the quantities available to each agency are then certified to these agencies which in turn ask the Office of Price Administration to effect the distribution through its Petroleum Rationing Branch. In no instance has the Petroleum Administration for War failed to make available at least the quantities certified by it to the Office of Price Administration.

The main point to remember is we are supplying from continental United States to the military almost 1,000,000 barrels a day more than we were called upon to supply in 1941. This great increase has been met while the over-all supply of petroleum products to the civilian and industrial economy has been reduced only 12½ percent. At the same time the gasoline demand for essential trucks and busses and for nonhighway use, the demand for kerosene, the industrial use of distillate and residual oils, are all greater than they were in 1941. Thus, the reduction has been only in gasoline for passenger cars as shown in chart No. 7 and in the civilian use of distillate and residual.

Some uninformed individuals, possibly misled by supply figures, have made statements to the effect that there is no further need for restricting civilians' use of gasoline and other petroleum products. Statements of this kind are as unfortunate as they are misleading.

Although substantial gains have been made in the production and refining of petroleum and by the material contribution by the public in the reduction of its use of petroleum products, they have been more than offset by these enormous military requirements. Any deficiency has been made up from previously accumulated inventories of crude oil and petroleum products, with the result that present inventories are far below normal.

A glance at the attached chart showing comparative stocks of civilian grade motor gasoline in the United States for 1941 and 1944 will show the extent to which the draft on stocks of this product has been necessary. At the end of 1941 inventories stood at 79,095,000 barrels, and on the last day of April this year they were at the relatively low figure of 50,491,000 barrels.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize again that to meet the current total military and essential civilian demand, which today is substantially greater than the last normal pre-war year—1941—has taxed our productive capacities and in addition has required a heavy draft upon above-ground working inventories of crude oil and all petroleum products to the extent that inventories are far below normal. In the face of current abnormal demand they, therefore, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be characterized as surplus.

Wishful thinking or uninformed or irresponsible statements cannot alter the facts; we are on the eve of military events the precise effect of which no one can foretell. The outcome of these vast pending military operations must determine what supplies of petroleum products can be made available for civilians. I think we shall do well to meet the Nation's essential wartime petroleum requirements until the war is won.

Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mother's Day, the second Sunday in May, has been authorized by act of Congress since 1914, as a day on which to memorialize the deepest, most abiding devotion known in the world. It emphasizes to us each year, the perennial mother-love that speaks a universal language, regardless of race, color or creed. It is understood in all lands, in all ages, from the cradle to the grave, for it is constant through riches or poverty, in sickness and health, success or failure.

The love of home, family, country—our very spiritual life itself, is but the lengthened shadow of some mother-love, yours, mine, everybody's. We all remember with answering hearts Kipling's immortal poem:

If I were hanged on the highest hill,
Mother o' mine,
I know whose love would follow me still,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.
If I were drowned in the deepest sea,
Mother o' mine,
I know whose tears would come down to me,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.
If I were damned of body and soul,
Mother o' mine.
I know whose prayers would make me whole,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.

Our mother taught us our first prayers; we listened to her lullaby till sweet sleep came to us in her loving arms.

God give us more and more worthy mothers who will produce the stalwart children this Nation so greatly needs, to maintain its honesty, its integrity, its responsibility, and its high endeavors.

The mother of the founder of Mother's Day began her community work in a Sunday School of which she was superintendent for 25 years. Her endeavor was known as mother's work—working for better mothers, better homes, better children, better men and women.

As a very young woman, she attended a public meeting called in the town square of Philippi at the very beginning of the Civil War. This town was on the border line of the North and South. The presiding officer called for a volunteer prayer to bless the meeting. No one would come forward because "the first man to make a move might be shot," writes a person there at the time. With courage, devotion, and calmness, Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis came forward and asked God to bless that meeting and their soldiers.

After the Civil War, when enmity still divided the families in Grafton, W. Va., where the family had established a home, this same mother of the founder of Mothers' Day sent out invitations for a mothers' picnic. From all over the county the mothers responded and brought their sons with them. Ere the day was over, under the spell of mother love and the gladness to be home, the soldiers forgot their bitterness, extended their hands to one another, and decided to be friends again. And so—

As one lamp lights another, nor grows less,
So nobleness enkindles nobleness.

When Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis died, her daughter, Anna M. Jarvis, began her Herculean task to establish Mothers' Day as a loving tribute to all mothers, planning to have the day permanently authorized in every State, with national and international recognition. On the second Sunday in May 1907 the first Mothers' Day was sponsored in the city of Grafton, W. Va., to honor her mother there. The day was to honor not only her mother, but all mothers who had worked with her, and all mothers who had given their best, their all, to build the eternal principles of right and righteousness into the life and fabric of their community.

The second celebration, in 1908, was held not only in Grafton, but in Philadelphia, as well, for the family had moved to Philadelphia after the father's death. To this meeting, in Grafton, Miss Anna Jarvis sent 1,000 white carnations from Philadelphia, to be given to the mothers of Grafton. The white carnation, her mother's favorite flower, has since been made the official emblem of Mothers' Day. Miss Jarvis repeated this generous gesture for more than 10 years.

Little did she think, but deeply did Miss Jarvis hope, that Mother's Day would so soon become world-wide in its acceptance, for by the third celebration, in 1909, 45 States, Puerto Rico,

Canada, and Mexico joined in its observance. This year, 35 years later, by proxy, Miss Jarvis recently made contact with the representative of Mexico, in Mexico City.

In 1913 Miss Anna M. Jarvis was sent as a delegate to the World Sunday School Convention held in Zurich, Switzerland. While abroad, she continued to internationalize Mother's Day. And today, besides those nations already mentioned, Mother's Day is observed in Australia, Sweden, Latvia, Brazil, Italy, Egypt, New Zealand, India, France, Great Britain, Switzerland, Russia, China, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands.

Miss Jarvis said some time ago that the happiest day of her life was the day on which President Woodrow Wilson signed the congressional resolution calling for the display of the flag on Mother's Day. That day was May 8, 1914. The joint resolution to honor mothers and the flag simultaneously reads as follows: "For displaying the American flag, and for the public expression of our love and reverence for the mothers of the country." After President Wilson signed the resolution, he graciously presented the pen he had used to Miss Anna Jarvis. It is one of her treasures. She reminded us that this resolution was the second time that congressional legislation had ever referred to the flag.

Recently, Miss Jarvis presented a United States flag to Admiral Richard E. Byrd, to take with him on his latest trip to Antarctica. This flag was to signify that a mother's love, as well as the loyalty to the flag, reaches to the uttermost parts of the earth. Admiral Byrd generously returned it from Antarctica, thoughtfully timing its arrival so that Miss Jarvis would receive it about the time of Mother's Day. This flag she has added to her famous flag collection connected with Mother's Day.

Miss Jarvis' correspondence on Mother's Day has been voluminous and deeply interesting. Mark Twain, Theodore Roosevelt, David Lloyd George, and John Wanamaker were among the writers. General Pershing himself sent the following letter to all his commanding officers in the First World War:

> I wish that every officer and soldier of the American Expeditionary Forces would write a letter home on Mother's Day. This is a little thing for each one of us to do, but these letters carry back our courage and affection to the patriotic women whose love and prayers inspire us to victory.

This year, in tribute to Miss Jarvis, who is ill and totally blind, her friends constituting the Anna M. Jarvis committee urge, as never before, that mothers shall say to our enemies, through their beloved sons, "You shall not pass"; and that sons will echo the immortal testimonial of Lincoln, the great savior of his country, "All I am or all I hope to be, I owe to my angel mother." And they hope as well that these sons in the armed services may truthfully repeat the testimonial of Washington, the Father of his Country, who said of his mother, "If I have been of any service to the United States of America, the credit all belongs to my wonderful mother."

The committee in charge is grateful to all the 38 Governors who have responded so far with proclamations for Mother's Day.

We quote from four proclamations sent with letters from Governors: Gov. Chauncey Sparks of Alabama says they are "honoring particularly those mothers who are so courageously carrying on while their sons and daughters are in the service of our country."

Governor Ray Smith of Indiana mentioned "mothers whose sons are defending the Nation's sovereignty, integrity, honor, freedoms, and traditions."

Governor Homer Adkins of Arkansas says in his proclamation:

> Whereas in the midst of an unholy and unnatural war the fortitude and the faith of the mothers of this Nation is an inspiration to the world; and
>
> Whereas it is but fitting that we should on this day venerate the love and affection of mothers who have shown themselves worthy of the love and respect of sons and daughters who are supporting this Nation in its hour of trial.

Governor Edward Martin, Pennsylvania's great wartime Governor, says:

> Closer to the human heart than any other influence is that of mother love. Here the hopes and aspirations of men find their highest and most beautiful expression.
>
> Today the mothers of our land, called upon to bear the greatest share of war's anxieties, are facing the ordeal with heroism and sacrifice, true to the tradition of pioneer mothers who braved the perils of the wilderness to make our Nation great.
>
> Mother's Day, which will be observed Sunday, May 14, has deeper significance in these troubled times. It is a day on which we manifest our highest admiration, our warmest love, and most sincere veneration to our mothers and pledge ourselves anew to be worthy of the love by which we are blessed.
>
> I therefore urge the citizens of Pennsylvania to join in the celebration of Mother's Day and to participate in Mother's Day ceremonies in the schools and churches and other public ceremonies throughout the Commonwealth.

May God bless Mother's Day in 1944, and may it be observed on land and sea, uniting us all in the challenge to render tireless devotion and loving service to our country, thus fittingly honoring our mothers who gave us love, loyalty, and the inspiration to be worthy of those from whom we received the blessed privilege of life.

G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on the splendid formulation of the G. I. bill of rights, an over-all veterans' benefits measure, passed by the House of Representatives May 18.

Being a veteran of World War No. 1, I know how much the opportunities contained in the provisions of this bill will mean to the veteran of Warld War No. 2. When we veterans of the last war returned after serving many months overseas we were faced with extreme hardship in our effort to rehabilitate ourselves and secure a job in order to keep body and soul together. Our bonus was $60, a sum so small and insignificant that it was of very little assistance in our efforts to take up where we left off in 1917.

The G. I. bill of rights provides for 26 weeks of unemployment compensation at $20 weekly; additional hospitals for veterans, through new construction and exchanges between the Veterans' Administration and the services; the right to attend schools of their own choice for a maximum of 4 years at Government expense provided tuition and other fees do not exceed $500 annually; qualified veterans without dependents would receive $50 monthly for subsistence while in school, with $75 for those with dependents; however, veterans who were over 24 at the time of entrance into service would be required to show that war service had interfered with their schooling or that they were in need of a refresher course. The veteran would be allowed to attend a college, trade school, or vocational school of his own choice, provided it was approved by State educational authorities or the Veterans' Administration.

This legislation has been drawn up and passed in the American way, and bills such as this one provide the continuance of private enterprise and the continuance of our constitutional form of government. Our boys want rehabilitation—not charity. They want to be independent and self-sustaining. You cannot pay for patriotism with dollars and cents, but you can pay to educate a man and place him in a position where he can depend on his own efforts. Under this bill a soldier can borrow the money in his own home town at any loaning agency he chooses and at the lowest rate of interest available. It is my belief that most of the returning soldiers will borrow from their local banks at a lower rate of interest than the Government agencies charge at this time.

Many of the Members of Congress today are veterans of World War No. 1 and are determined that the boys who return after this conflict will receive the rights and privileges which they so justly deserve. The various veteran organizations who worked unceasingly to perfect this legislation deserve much of the credit and the highest tribute that can be paid them for their interest at all times in our boys who are fighting today on the far-flung battle fronts of the world so that we may continue to refer to our beloved America as "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I desire to include in the RECORD a letter written me by Mr. Don E. Huddleston, a member of the Malone (N. Y.) War Price and Rationing Board, in reply to a letter written me by Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration:

MALONE, N. Y., *May 17, 1944.*

Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KILBURN: Enclosed is Mr. Bowles' letter of April 26, which I am glad to have had an opportunity to read.

I would go along with Mr. Bowles in his argument that there should be some basic regulations, but it seems to me that present regulations have gone considerably beyond this stage. It would appear that the national office might well determine what goods and services are most essential to the war effort and their relative importance. Also, it would seem that the national office might well determine the quantity of rationed goods available and supervise their distribution to the various parts of the country. However, to set up by regulation the eligibility of a specific user seems to be going too far. I believe local boards are in a much better position to determine individual eligibility within a necessary industry than is anyone in Washington. Under present conditions, boards are sometimes forced to refuse a worthy applicant because of regulations.

Mr. Bowles apparently feels that regulations are necessary in order to insure uniformity. I do not entirely agree with this point of view. Uniformity throughout the country is not necessarily needed because the importance of any particular industry varies greatly in various parts of the country. Here again I think local boards are in a much better position to determine who, in their area, can make the greatest contribution to the war effort.

Mr. Bowles does not need to worry about boards allotting gas for fishing trips while other essential users are being denied. Local public criticism will take care of this stiuation adequately.

I would also be willing to go along with Mr. Bowles by saying that the problem I have brought out here could be very greatly reduced if we had a State office staff in whom we had complete confidence and who had indicated to us that their major concern was service to the public. However, after such things as Mr. Herzog's memo and the political and religious survey, any confidence I ever had in the present staff has been destroyed.

With regard to the chief clerk, I feel that the confusion still exists. Mr. Bowles implies that approval of the chief clerk must be made by the district director in order to prevent favoritism on the part of the local board and in order to obtain a high-grade clerical employee. Evidently, he does not trust our ability or fairness, but he expects us to trust and have complete confidence in his district director who has indicated that he intends to consider politics and religion. Here again the problem could be reduced to the minimum if we had a district office staff who had the ability to create complete confidence on the part of board members. Lacking this confidence, I constantly have the feeling that the district director may be trying to do just what Mr. Bowles says he is trying to prevent.

I do not agree with Mr. Bowles that the Board members are now elected democratically. You will notice that the local war council only recommends. The appointment is actually made by the district director. It is too easy to find an excuse for not appointing a particular individual. Therefore, I do not consider the present system democratic when final approval is based upon the decision of one individual, and particularly when that individual has already done things to create suspicion.

With regard to my last complaint, Mr. Bowles has entirely evaded the issue. The questions were:

1. Who instructed Mr. Herzog to issue a memorandum demanding that board members resign whenever they felt it desirable to criticize the O. P. A.?

2. Who instructed the district office to make a political and religious survey of present board members?

I might also add this question: Is this practice going to continue or can we expect a little more cooperative and sympathetic attitude from the district office?

Sincerely yours,

DON E. HUDDLESTON.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the board of directors of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale with resolutions adopted by them on the reenactment of the price-control law. This letter was addressed to my distinguished colleague the Honorable THOMAS E. SCANLON:

MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 15, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS E. SCANLON,
Chairman, Congressional Committee for the Protection of Consumers, Room 422, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Midland board of directors today adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Price Control Act has thus far done much to check an extreme rise in prices and prevent an inflation which would be disastrous to our war effort; and

"Whereas such an act is absolutely essential to the winning of the war, even though it subjects some special interest groups to temporary inconveniences and annoyances; and

"Whereas it may be necessary and desirable for the benefits of the Price Control Act to be extended for some time yet in order to hold and expand the gains so far made in the battle against inflation; and

"Whereas it may be necessary and desirable for the Price Control Act to remain effective for some time after the war in order to prevent a post-war economic runaway of prices and spending: It is hereby

"Resolved by the board of directors of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, in behalf of some 180,000 member-patrons of Midland and affiliated retail cooperatives in the Central Northwest, That extension of the Price Control Act as of June 30 is highly desirable and is urgently recommended.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
"MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE."

We are sending this resolution to Mr. John Carson of the Cooperative League of the United States of America for transmittal to the Conference to Save the Price Control Act.

Yours sincerely,

A. J. SMABY,
General Manager.

International Economic and Currency Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 18, 1944:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

WHAT HAVE WE PROMISED?

More or less in the public eye are three global financial proposals for the post-war era. One would set up a so-called stabilization fund. Another calls for a world-wide reconstruction finance corporation. These two are sponsored by the Treasury, and have been the subject of negotiations between American experts and those of other nations. The third proposal has been offered by Representative CHARLES S. DEWEY, of Illinois. Under the Dewey proposal the United States would set up a $500,000,000 fund to be used in cooperation with other nations.

On Tuesday Harry D. White, whose name is attached to the Treasury plans, testified before a congressional committee adversely to the Dewey plan.

Favorable action on the Dewey plan, Mr. White said, would disappoint those working with the Treasury, and "to experts the world over there would be a let-down with passage of this bill." The reason for this anticipated disappointment is the limited scope of Mr. DEWEY's bill.

It seems to us that instead of condemning the Dewey bill, Mr. White revealed something about his own work, and that the revelation deserves further congressional investigation immediately.

Mr. DEWEY proposes to make Government loans to other nations. He proposes that those loans be 50 percent American money with the other 50 percent contributed from other sources. The lenders would carefully supervise expenditures of the money to see that it was applied as agreed.

Mr. White says that any such procedure would cause "disappointment." It must be assumed then, that a great deal more than this has been impliedly promised by the American negotiators. What more? And what grounds are there for believing that promises which have been implied will be fulfilled by the only competent body, which is Congress?

This newspaper has more than once expressed the opinion that one of the weaknesses of the Treasury operations is that they are of the character Mr. White intimates;

that they are implying the ability to do things which Congress will not permit. If that is so they are piling up trouble because nations which will receive help far less in amount and on far less open-handed terms than they have been led to expect will be resentful.

We do not wish to be understood as endorsing Mr. DEWEY'S proposal, or any other proposal to lend money of this Government to other governments. However, the Dewey plan has one advantage over Mr. White's. Its meaning is clear and its limits are defined. Mr. White's testimony has not lessened the unpleasant impression that the Treasury proposals are purposely vague.

Commando Sgt. Charles E. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I gave at the public testimonial to Commando Sgt. Charles E. Kelly at West Park, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 26, 1944, and to include also the proclamation of the Honorable Cornelius D. Scully, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, and an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press:

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Commando Kelly, Mrs. Kelly, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of my fellow Congressmen from Allegheny County and on behalf of the entire House of Representatives, I want to express the deep gratitude which all Americans feel toward Commando Kelly.

This brave soldier has brought great glory not only to Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, but to the United States Army and to the Nation. Words are poor tools to express properly our gratitude. They are too easily forgotten.

Yes; we owe much more to Commando Kelly, and the millions of our sons and daughters who are daily risking their lives, than speeches or any public celebration could signify. Our debt is eternal.

We cannot pay off that debt with bronze memorials or with pensions, bonuses, and other cash payments. These are all well earned and justified, but you simply cannot buy the brave deeds of Commando Kelly and his buddies with money either today or tomorrow.

The leaders of industry and labor, public officials, the responsible citizens of this Nation, all of us, must begin at once to prepare to properly discharge the debt we owe to the men and women of our armed services.

We must give our returning heroes what every man desires most of all—a right and the opportunity to earn a living, to reunite or establish a family, to buy a home, to educate his children, to enjoy life in the full and accepted American way.

Those who return unable to work at their former occupations must be taken care of; must be fully rehabilitated not in the spirit of charity but in the spirit of gratitude, because they were incapacitated fighting for you and for me.

An editorial writer for the Pittsburgh Press rightly asked, "After the parade, what?" That's my answer, and I believe it's the answer of every person here and throughout the Nation, including the editorial writer.

PROCLAMATION OF HON. CORNELIUS D. SCULLY, MAYOR OF PITTSBURGH

Whereas Sgt. Charles E. Kelly, a resident of Pittsburgh, by his heroic exploits against the enemy in Italy, has again proven that out of this great arsenal of democracy comes the finest fighting man of any nation; and

Whereas in recognition of Sergeant Kelly's prowess and conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty a grateful Nation has awarded this Pittsburgh boy its highest military honor—the Congressional Medal of Honor; and

Whereas Sergeant Kelly's heroic deeds have reflected glory upon the city of his birth and education, again definitely establishing that valor, self-sacrifice, and American patriotism are not mere catchwords and platform phrases in Pittsburgh; and

Whereas this typical Pittsburgh boy, better known to his buddies in the war-torn villages of southern Italy as Commando Kelly, is honoring his native city by returning today to visit his aged mother, two younger brothers and those of six additional brothers who are or may be granted furloughs from the armed forces;

Now, therefore, do I, Cornelius D. Scully, mayor of Pittsburgh and Federal coordinator of civilian defense for western Pennsylvania, on behalf of the citizens of Pittsburgh and in official recognition that Sergeant Kelly brought great and distinguished honor to himself, his family, and the citizenry, herewith proclaim this day as Commando Kelly Day.

And further, I urge that every conceivable tribute be paid to this valiant son of Pittsburgh and that there be full attendance at the formal function to be held in Commando Kelly's honor tonight at West Park, Northside; and that our citizens turn out en masse for the military and civic parade which will immediately precede the Northside celebration, traversing the downtown and Northside business areas;

All to the end that none of us ever diminish in any degree our war effort on the home front, mindful of the fact that millions of American boys daily offer their lives to the proposition that America shall endure a free and democratic nation.

Done this day, April 26, 1944 A. D., at the office of the mayor in witness whereof I hereunto set my signature and cause the great seal of the city to be affixed.

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

AFTER THE PARADE—

There are some people among us homefronters who, perhaps because of a slightly extended sense of humor, seem to be getting a certain kind of pleasure out of the discomfiture which Commando Kelly's mysterious absence has imposed on the officials who have been arranging a great welcome-home celebration.

Perhaps, although Sergeant Kelly apparently hasn't been consulted about these plans, the parade and other civic demonstrations in observance of the sergeant's well-earned furlough are a fitting manner of doing honor to a soldier of his distinguished achievements.

But while the public leaders are fretting about the sergeant's whereabouts, there is another matter to which they and the community at large might well be giving serious thought.

What happens when the parade is over?

The parade and other festivities are likely to prove more embarrassing than anything else to a hero like Sergeant Kelly. And while he, or others like him, may be impressed with the community's eagerness to emblazon its appreciation of his fighting qualities, it would not be extraordinary if the sergeant, all the while, were giving an inquiring thought to what opportunities will become available to him when the war is won.

Sergeant Kelly, as an individual, has shown an exceptional capacity for taking care of himself. But, as a symbol of all of America's fighting men, will he have a real chance in the post-war era to reestablish himself in civilian life?

Will those who now prepare to celebrate his conspicuous bravery be as enthusiastic in the future to do him honor by giving him a fair opportunity to a constructive existence? To occupational training, to a job, to rehabilitation, if necessary?

Five years or ten years hence, will the community's leaders—without benefit of publicity—be as concerned about the war hero's welfare?

Today's applause will lose its glitter of sincerity unless those questions, now and later, are answered in the affirmative.

[War Department release]

TECHNICAL SGT. CHARLES E. KELLY

Technical Sgt. Charles E. Kelly, 23-year-old Infantryman who won the Congressional Medal of Honor, has returned to the United States from Italy under the Army's rotation policy. The medal was presented to him on March 11 in the north African theater of operations for a series of voluntary exploits against the enemy on September 13 and 14, 1943, following Kelly's landing with Fifth Army forces at Salerno, Italy.

The medal, awarded by direction of the President and in the name of Congress, was the first of its kind to be won in fighting on the Italian mainland. At the time of his exploits, Sergeant Kelly was a private first class. At the time the citation for his award was prepared, he was a corporal. The citation follows:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life above and beyond the call of duty.

"On September 13, 1943, near Altavilla, Italy, Corporal Kelly voluntarily joined a patrol which located and neutralized enemy machine-gun positions. After this hazardous duty, he volunteered to establish contact with a battalion of United States Infantry which was believed to be located on Hill 315, a mile distant. He traveled over a route commanded by enemy observation and under sniper, mortar, and artillery fire; and later he returned with the correct information that the enemy occupied Hill 315 in organized positions.

"Immediately thereafter Corporal Kelly, again a volunteer patrol member, assisted materially in the destruction of two enemy machine-gun nests under conditions requiring great skill and courage. Having effectively fired his weapon until all the ammunition was exhausted, he secured permission to obtain more at an ammunition dump. Arriving at the dump which was located near a storehouse on the extreme flank of his regiment's position, Corporal Kelly found that the Germans were attacking ferociously at this point. He obtained his ammunition and was given the mission of protecting the rear of the storehouse. He held his position throughout the night.

"The following morning the enemy attack was resumed. Corporal Kelly took a position at an open window of the storehouse. One machine gunner had been killed at this position and several other soldiers wounded. Corporal Kelly delivered continuous aimed and effective fire upon the enemy with his automatic rifle until the weapon locked from overheating. Finding another automatic rifle, he again directed effective fire upon the enemy until this weapon also locked. At this critical point, with the enemy threatening to overrun the position, Corporal Kelly picked up 60-millimeter mortar shells, pulled the safety pins, and used the shells as grenades killing at least 5 of the enemy.

"When it became imperative that the house be evacuated, Corporation Kelly, despite his sergeant's injunctions, volunteered to hold the position until the remainder of the detachment could withdraw. As the detachment moved out, Corporal Kelley was observed deliberately loading and firing a rocket launcher from the window. He was successful in covering the withdrawal of the unit, and later, in joining his own organization.

"Corporal Kelly's fighting determination and intrepidity in battle exemplify the highest traditions of the armed forces of the United States."

Kelly's comrades later learned that after he had fired the last bazooka shells he slipped out of the storehouse, made his way down a hill, and came upon an abandoned 37 mm. antitank gun. While the ammunition supply lasted he fired it against the oncoming enemy.

One of the few men to escape injury in earning the Medal of Honor, Sergeant Kelly volunteered for each of the missions for which he was cited, just as he volunteered for military service at Pittsburgh May 26, 1942.

In some 70 days of active combat, Sergeant Kelly has become something of a legendary figure to his fighting buddies of the Thirty-sixth Division, who have nicknamed him "Commando."

He has a reputation for being in the right place at the right time, and it has become an axiom that "where there's a tough battle, there's Kelly." Yet he has come through the bloody Salerno, San Pietro, Rapido River, and Cassino operations with injuries no more serious than a scraped nose and tiny lacerations on his hands, inflicted by shell fragments. Against this, he is officially credited with killing 40 of the enemy.

During the struggle for the heights around San Pietro, Kelly fought as a squad corporal and then section sergeant.

In the Rapido River "battle of guts" he crossed the stream three times as a platoon sergeant, but was forced to withdraw each time because of overwhelming enemy strength. He was one of the few noncommissioned officers in his outfit to come back unscathed after that struggle, and for a while served as acting first sergeant of his company.

Born at Pittsburgh, September 23, 1920, Sergeant Kelly is one of seven sons of Mrs. Irene Kelly, 332 Shawano Street, Pittsburgh, all of whom are in the fighting forces. One brother is stationed in England, another in the South Pacific, another in the merchant marine somewhere, and the others are in this country.

He received his elementary education at East Park Grade School in Pittsburgh and attended North Side Lattimer High School there until he suspended his studies to contribute to the support of his widowed mother, who has been deaf for several years. He was employed by a bottling concern prior to enlisting in the Army.

What Will the Repeal of Land Grant Railroad Rates Cost the Taxpayer?

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1944

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the railroad companies are putting on a tremendous drive to repeal land-grant railroad rates. In this drive they have apparently enlisted the help of the organized railroad workers as well as the chambers of commerce and business organizations throughout the United States. I opposed the repeal of this law some time ago because of the amount that the Government would have to pay in increased railroad rates. Personally, I am sympathetic with the railroads. We have to have railroads. Railroads have to have earnings or the investment is gone. However, I cannot support a bill which would add from three hundred million to five hundred million dollars a year tax burden on the taxpaying public. I am informed that the railroads admitted in the hearings before the Interstate Commerce Committee that the repeal of the railroad land-grant rates would cost the Government $240,000,000 a year.

The War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is now holding hearings on a $50,000,000,000 War Department appropriation bill. Major General Gross, Chief of the Transportation Division of the United States Army, testified before our committee yesterday. He testified in effect that he was conversant with the terms of the Boren bill which would repeal land-grant-railroad rates. He testified in answer to my question that this $50,000,000,000 War Department appropriation bill is based upon the assumption that the present land-grant rates are continued; that if the Boren bill is passed and the land-grant act is repealed, the War Department would have to come before our committee and before Congress for an additional appropriation of approximately $200,000,000 for the coming fiscal year to pay the additional freight rates levied by the railroad companies by reason of the repeal of this law. In addition to this amount, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, Lend-Lease, in fact every department of government would have to come before our committee for additional funds to meet the difference between the rates levied under the land-grant act and those levied or applied if the land-grant act is repealed. There is no question in my mind but that the additional cost to the taxpayers for additional rates would run anywhere from three hundred and fifty to five hundred million dollars a year during wartime. To hand over to the railroad companies of the Nation this vast sum of money at a time when they are making more money than they have ever made in their history and when a large part of the freight is being paid by the taxpayers of the country, seems to me to be very unwise, to say the least.

Some time ago I obtained a breakdown from the Internal Revenue Department as to the amount of taxes that will be paid this year by each income group in the United States of America. I was told that 21,600,000 income recipients will receive this year—1944—$19,200,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 or less, or an average of approximately $900 each. Of this group, 9,270,000 are heads of families. The Labor Department states that the average family consists of four people, a man, his wife, a child of 13 and a child of 8. We therefore find that 9,270,000 individuals are trying to support approximately 37,000,000 people in family groups of four on an average income of $900 per year. This entire group of 21,600,000 individuals with incomes of $1,000 or less will pay this year $500,000,000 in taxes, one of the reasons being the fact that Congress has reduced the income-tax exemption as low as $500. As far as I am individually concerned, I am not going to take that $500,000,000 from these 21,600,000 individuals and turn it over to the railroad companies of the United States in additional freight rates by repeal of the land-grant rates at a time when these railroad companies are making more money than they ever did in the history of the Nation.

I shall be glad to give consideration to the repeal of the land-grant rates after the war is over and when the Government has gone back to peacetime shipments. Nothing I say here should be interpreted as being antirailroad. I believe in the railroads. I believe they are doing a splendid job, and I believe they are entitled to the support of the public, but I cannot justify a repeal of the land-grant rates in view of the above facts.

Support the Hawkes Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, nearly one-fifth of all evaluated property in the State of New Jersey is tax exempt. A sizeable portion of this is Federal property acquired for wartime purposes. The New Jersey Senate has memorialized Congress "to provide municipalities with compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of Federal Government acquisition of property," and the United States conference of mayors has urged the Congress to enact legislation for Federal payment to local tax districts in amounts "equal to tax paid by privately owned property."

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Senator HAWKES, has introduced a bill, S. 1737, to alleviate the burdens now being imposed on the States and their political subdivisions for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes, and I present today an editorial appearing in the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News endorsing this timely measure. I am sure the House will realize its merits and do its part in the enactment of legislation:

SUPPORT THE HAWKES BILL

Pointing out that the costs of the war should be borne by all citizens of the Nation, and that local taxpayers should not be forced to pay increased levies because of tax exemptions due to Federal acquisition of properties in their municipalities for military installations and industrial purposes, New Jersey Taxpayers Association today is asking all county and municipal governing bodies to

urge support of Senate bill No. 1737, introduced in the upper House of the Congress by Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES, of New Jersey.

The Hawkes bill would require the Government to make annual payments to the municipalities to the full amount of taxes lost on properties that have been acquired for war purposes since the declaration of the emergency on September 8, 1939, that otherwise would be bearing their share of local government costs, but now pay nothing, with the result that other taxpayers have to make up the difference in higher taxes.

Last August our State senate memorialized the Congress to enact legislation "to provide municipalities with compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of Federal Government acquisition of property," and like action was taken at a recent Nation-wide conference of mayors.

It seems the only fair and just thing for the Government to do. One-fifth of all evaluated property in this State is now tax exempt, and a large part of this total is represented in Government acquisitions. When such exemptions occur in any municipality all the others in the county are affected through a decrease in the ratables and the resulting rise in tax rates.

The same situation obtains in all the States, but the burden is heaviest in those where there is the greatest concentration of war activities. It is a cost that should be borne, not by some taxpayers in some districts alone, but by all taxpayers everywhere throughout the Nation.

Hon. Charles A. Eaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, I am given the opportunity to pay tribute to one of the cultured and distinguished leaders of the House of Representatives, and my privilege is enriched with especial pride because he is also the dean of the New Jersey delegation.

"Doc" EATON, as he is affectionately known by all of us, is one of those blessed souls who delights in living in harmony with all sorts and conditions of men. Saturated in patriotism and with inspired vision, tempered by the wisdom of experience, he "looks up, not down; out, not in; forward, not backward; and lends a hand." In a word, he is an inspiration, which, interpreted by Webster, is a creative influence of genius.

This editorial appearing in the Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N. J., on May 17, is well captioned "Congressman EATON speaks for millions of Americans":

CONGRESSMAN EATON SPEAKS FOR MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

Representative CHARLES A. EATON, veteran New Jersey legislator and one of the most respected Members of Congress, traces with incisive clarity the steps which the United States must take when the war ends.

The foundation of our post-war economy, as he sees it, will rest upon profitable, permanent employment for our fighters as soon as they are mustered out of the service. War contracts must be terminated in such a way as to do full justice to industry which has contributed so much to the war effort. Government-owned war plants must be absorbed by private industry. Currency must be stabilized and an annual national income of $125,000,000,000 must be insured. The enormous need for new housing must be fulfilled, and the agricultural economy of the Nation must be maintained on a just basis.

After these prime economic needs, EATON finds political problems which must be solved. He urges an end to what he characterizes as the "legalized warfare" between employer and employee, promoted by the New Deal. Endorsing the care of the aged and the unfortunate, he strikes out against foreign ideologies and states the need for a government by law rather than a government by men, which, he says, is "hateful and odious" and has been fastened upon America by the New Deal. Striking out against usurpation of power, he urges returning power now taken over by the Executive to Congress, freeing the judicial system from political control and giving back to the States authority seized by the Federal Government. Finally, says EATON, "We must free the individual citizen from Federal bureaucratic dictatorship so that all Americans may once more live as freemen under a free government of their own making."

As dean of New Jersey's congressional delegation and as one of the Nation's leading statesmen, Congressman EATON is a man whose opinions are entitled to consideration and respect. His indictment of the New Deal reflects the opinion of millions of Americans and his statement of the problems which America faces now and will face in increasing measure in the future is a challenge to every thinking American.

Soldiers See It! Do We?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Wednesday, April 19, 1944:

SOLDIERS SEE IT! DO WE?

From the shell-torn Anzio beach head, an Associated Press correspondent writes of the Nazi effort to break the morale of Allied soldiers in that most uncomfortable spot.

The Nazi pamphlets dropped on our beach head area "try to pit one ally against another * * * by telling one that the other has failed to support it. There are also subtle suggestions that whichever Allied Nation is in command on a given sector of the front is safeguarding its own men at the expense of the others."

Could there be a more accurate parallel to and summary of the utterances of the isolationist press, the hate Roosevelt more than we hate Hitler crowd in Congress, the fascist pamphleteers, and the rest of the suspicion mongers on the home front?

The Associated Press correspondent in Italy says the Nazi propaganda doesn't produce the hoped for reaction. That is an assurance for which we can all be thankful. Can we assure our men on the battle fronts that we, back here, are just as determined not to be deceived by the same kind of propaganda on the home front?

Price Ceiling Regulations of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement by me in support of an amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News in connection with the statement.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I favor the continuance of O. P. A. for the protection of our economy. I voted for it on every occasion in the past.

The present Director, Mr. Bowles, has improved the administration of O. P. A. However, there is still room for improvement, especially in the Meat Section.

One of the most vexing problems that your Small Business Committee has had to deal with in the past 2 years is the squeeze put on independent and small businesses in many trades and industries as a result of O. P. A. price ceiling regulations which do not permit a fair and equitable operating margin. The Senate Small Business Committee, through many conferences and public hearings, has been successful in assisting the Price Administrator in adjusting such price ceilings so as to permit equitable and just margins under which the independent small-business men of the country may continue to operate.

One such industry has, however, continued to operate under a terrific handicap. I speak particularly of the meat-packing industry, especially those slaughterers who are set up primarily for the slaughtering of beef, veal, and lamb. The condition among those slaughterers has now reached a critical stage where some have been forced into liquidation, many others have been forced to curtail their operations, and some are wholly shut down. All are threatened in a greater or less degree with bankruptcy if a remedy is not found.

Normal remedies lie in the Emergency Price Control Act and in the hands of the Price Administrator and his deputies who have it within their power to make the necessary adjustments. Those officials, however, within the Meat Section of the Office of Price Administration have stubbornly resisted adjustments in price ceilings in the face of the fact, (1) that the law says price ceilings shall be such as to provide generally fair and equitable operating margins; (2) these same Meat Section officials admit over and over again that the independent slaughterers of beef, veal, and lamb must lose money under the present O. P. A. price ceiling; and (3) that in the case of one major city, Buffalo, where 28 local meat packers have been closed for more than 6 weeks, it has been shown O. P. A. officials that through use of subsidies and a readjustment of 1½ cents per pound between packer and retailer ceiling, these Buffalo packers can open for operation without loss to themselves and without an increase in the ceiling price to the consumer.

Under these conditions, the administration of the Meat Section of O. P. A. is placed under a shadow of grave doubt as to whether the meat industry, as far as O. P. A. is concerned, is being administered in the public interest or for the benefit of the monopolistic interests in the meat-packing industry. I am told some employees of the Meat Section

were formerly with one or the other of the big packers. The principal executive in the Meat Section of O. P. A. comes from one of the major packers, Armour & Co. He has been the key man in the Meat Section of O. P. A. from the very beginning. And from the very beginning, the 600 or more independent meat packers of the country have complained of unfairness toward them in the rules and regulations of the O. P. A. Meat Section and of advance leaks on rules and regulations to the big monopolistic packers.

A word of explanation is here necessary in order to understand the true economic function of the independent beef, veal, and lamb slaughterer, and why through the years he has successfully stayed in business in the face of the all-powerful monopolistic forces of the major packers. The reason the independent packer has been able to do this is because he is a local packer, he slaughters locally, and he puts out his meat in the form desired in the local area. His meat is fresher when it reaches the consumer through the local independent butcher shops. For these reasons there has always existed a price differential which the local retailer has been willing to pay to the local slaughterer. This historical differential is in the neighborhood of a cent and a half per pound. This cent-and-a-half-per-pound differential is a very important matter. It is the difference between profit and loss for the local independent packer. If we put this in another light, we have a clearer understanding of the present O. P. A. meat-pricing difficulties. In order for the big packer to ship his beef into a local trading area from some far-distant point, he has found that he must undersell the local packer if he is to sell any beef locally.

The history of the industry, therefore, shows that the major packers have been accustomed over the years to taking a loss on their beef. They can only do this because they are also big meat processors; they enjoy a large volume in specially prepared and packaged meats and meat products of all kinds. They sell tremendous quantities of other types of commodities, especially in the dairy-products field. From all of these varied lines they make enough profit to absorb their losses on unprocessed beef.

Now comes O. P. A. and its Meat Division, under the unchallenged say-so of an employee of a major meat packer. This man, through his control of O. P. A. price ceiling regulations, has destroyed this old historical preferential premium which the local independent packer has received for years. He has done this by requiring price ceilings for the local packer to be the same as the big packer who has used these particular meat products as a loss leader in times past.

In the case of the Buffalo meat packers, which I have mentioned, they have repeatedly sought and been refused the restoration of this historical margin of a cent-and-a-half premium for locally slaughtered beef, veal, and lamb.

The Small Business Committee of the Senate, headed by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, is charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the interests of small, independent business. We realize there will be casualties, all too many of them, in the field of small business.

The blighting results of these losses will affect adversely the system we are endeavoring to preserve in this land of opportunity. We realize the vital need for price control, but within that favored province we must defend little business and prevent its destruction wherever possible.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of May 10, 1944]

CONSUMERS IN MIDDLE

Buffalo consumers are caught in the middle of the conflict that has developed between the closed-down Buffalo meat packers and the Washington O. P. A. over price ceilings and meat subsidies. The Washington authorities have issued conflicting statements about the local meat supply situation and, after making some concessions to the packers' demands for a fair-profit margin, have announced that they will go no further.

The tacit admission of the O. P. A. Meat Division that Buffalo's supply of meat was only 30 percent of normal was contradicted by O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles, who wrote in a letter to Senator JAMES M. MEAD that the O. P. A.'s latest report is that there is no critical meat shortage here. Unless Mr. Bowles included the black market—which is expanding rapidly as a result of the shortage of legally slaughtered and legally priced meat—in his calculations, any Buffalo housewife or retail butcher can offer first-hand evidence to dispute them. The removal of rationing restrictions on most meats has proved a farce in Buffalo, in view of empty meat shelves.

Briefly the situation is this: 35 local meat packers in 28 plants have been closed down for 2 months, protesting that if they observe the ceiling prices fixed by the O. P. A. in their sales to retail meat stores, they will lose money. They claim only the right to maintain a traditional charge of 1.5 cents a pound dressed weight over the amount now allowed—a charge which has always been absorbed by the retailers and would not affect the ceiling price paid by consumers. Their contention that their profit margin would be more than wiped out if they follow the strict O. P. A. regulations is generally supported by local O. P. A. authorities and by those familiar with the local situation.

The Washington O. P. A. has granted a partial concession—admitting tacitly that the packers have not received a fair deal in the past—by shifting Buffalo to a higher-price zone and granting a subsidy of 80 percent of freight to offset shrinkage losses on cattle shipped here from the West. Altogether, this amounts to about three-quarters of a cent a pound in the additional price allowed. It would seem that there is some basis here for a compromise between the stand of the O. P. A. and that of the packers, but both sides are adamant against further concessions. Meanwhile black-market operations are on the increase throughout western New York. Uninspected and poorer grades of meat are sold at top-grade ceiling prices or at black-market prices, and the average Buffalo consumer is drawing no benefit from the national surplus of meat.

In taking a hard-and-fast stand on the matter, the Washington O. P. A. office is making no contribution to the relief of the shortage here. It is another example of bureaucratic procedure, without benefit of any adequate investigation of the local situation. Whether or not the packers are right in their contention, such an investigation, followed by prompt action to rectify any mistakes, is in order.

The Blind Do War Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, few realize what the blind have been doing on the home front in connection with the prosecution of the war. An outstanding example can be found at the Mines Equipment Co., of St. Louis, Mo. This company has been doing a great deal of work for the Government, especially the Signal Corps and the Air Corps of both the Army and Navy. The president of this concern, J. E. Miller, is an outstanding patriotic citizen of St. Louis. At his own expense he increased the facilities of his plant so that he could be of more assistance to the Government during the war period. He has likewise spent a great deal of money in research, perfecting equipment that has proved to be very beneficial.

What the blind have accomplished at the Mines Equipment Co. can be accomplished in other branches of industry.

Mr. Miller has written an article which appeared in the St. Louis Commerce under date of May 17, 1944, and under the permission granted me I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

WASTED MANPOWER

(By J. E. Miller, plant manager, Mines Equipment Co.)

St. Louis industry has, in the blind men and women of this community, a great source of potential manpower which in many cases is being completely overlooked.

Employers for many years have had an inherent prejudice against using blind workers in industry. They ask, "What can a blind person do? How can they get to work? Won't they get in the way?" It has been this attitude of refusing to recognize that a blind person might be a capable worker that has brought about this situation of wasted manpower.

At Mines Equipment Co. we have found that the blind are perfectly able workers and have found in them part of the answer to current manpower shortage problems. We have 23 blind workers employed in our plants, working on all types of jobs and at all rates. And every one of them is doing his job efficiently and on equal terms with our normal employes.

Here are some of the positions which are being filled by blind workers in our plants; storeroom clerk, drill press operator, inspector, assembly worker, press operator, and box packer.

This is abundant proof that blind people can do important and necessary work in industrial plants. A simple rule of thumb that can be used to determine what jobs can be done by blind workers in your plant is this: Just close your eyes and visualize what jobs in your plant can be done without the use of eyes. The answer is as simple as that.

Using this rule as a measuring stick, you can see that there are a number of job families into which blind workers fit very easily. For example, they can be used effectively in such positions as these: stringing beads for insulation, drilling on a drill press, gauging with plug gauges, gauging with thread gauges, answering telephones, packing boxes, inspecting, sorting bolts, nuts, and screws, and doing simple assembly work.

Blind people have a sense of touch that is equalled by none. Their fingers are to them what eyes are to a sighted person. Their sensitive hands are an asset to any employer who can find a use for this specialized ability where sight is not necessary.

Our experience has shown that blind workers have no more transportation difficulties that do ordinary employees. They can ride street cars without danger, and they are always helped across the street. They'll get there and they'll be on time every day, too.

In addition to being a capable worker, the blind employee is a good morale builder. He inspires his fellow workers to better production. He is dependable, accurate, and consistent.

The theory which we use at Mines Equipment Co. is that if a blind person can do the job, it relieves an able-bodied worker for another job. If in each State 500 or 600 blind were hired by industrial concerns, which, in Missouri as in most States would mean less than 1 or 2 workers per plant, you would find a total of about 28,000 jobs in the United States that could be filled by blind people. This amoun would almost take care of the employable blind available for war jobs, and would release the same number of normal workers for other jobs.

There are a number of companies in St. Louis who have hired blind people for various types of work and are glad of it. Many others could follow their example.

The United States Employment Service office can give any employer all necessary information on the use of blind workers in industry and can supply such workers on request.

Interscholastic Conference at Phillips Exeter Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Exeter News-Letter, Exeter, N. H., on Thursday, May 18, 1944. This was written by Henry Phillips, Jr., a political columnist for that paper. The subject of this column should be of interest to all who are concerned that the young people of our country should consider seriously their responsibilities as citizens:

Over the last week end the Herodotan Society of the academy was host to a keen group of delegates who came here to talk about politics and government. They came from public and private schools in four New England States. The number included both boys and girls.

The idea for the conference sprang from the interest in the subject developed by students in the academy who, as members of the host society, have been considering the national political scene. They got to wondering what other schools were doing along the same line and began writing letters to find out. When the replies began coming in and it was apparent that interest had been aroused, one thing led to another and in a few weeks almost 50 delegates from 23 schools were on hand in Exeter.

Two discussion meetings were held Saturday afternoon. The first, led by Prof. Benjamin F. Wright, professor of government in Harvard, concerned the responsibilities of citizens toward government service as a career or as a part-time interest, and some of the opportunities open in such service. Dr. Wright emphasized the continuing need for men and women of broad general education in administrative positions in government. Technical training without a background of liberal education, he said, does not fit a person to solve the human equation which is involved in every occupation.

Led next by Mark F. Emerson, instructor in political science in St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H., the delegates discussed practical ways and means of furthering interest in public service. An inclusive list of common barriers to wider interest in Government service was drawn up, e. g., general aversion to politics on the part of many young people of good education; the insecurity of elective positions, the low pay of others.

Between the afternoon gatherings and the dinner meeting a half hour summary of the conference was broadcast over Station WLAW of Lawrence, Mass. The program originated at the Exeter Inn and was presided over by E. Hartwell Daley, C. B. S. announcer. A feature of this program was an informal discussion among some of the delegates of the accomplishments of the conference.

The dinner meeting was as distinguished an occasion as Exeter has seen in many years. Most prominent of the guests was Acting Secretary of the Navy Forrestal and Mrs. Forrestal who had come on a brief visit to their son, a member of the Herodotan Society. Accompanying Secretary and Mrs. Forrestal were United States Senator Joseph H. Ball, of Minnesota, and Mrs. Ball. The conference was honored also by the presence of Gov. Robert O. Blood, of New Hampshire, who spoke on the radio program and was one of the after dinner speakers. Another guest prominent in the business and political life of the State was John D. Langmuir, of Nashua, executive director of the State Federation of Taxpayers Associations.

Dr. Lewis Perry, principal of the academy, welcomed the delegates and guests among whom was John Lary, chairman of the Exeter Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Langmuir, first of the evening speakers to be introduced by President Leonard S. Zartman, Jr., of the society, asserted that there is no reason to be ashamed of politicians. He defined politics as "diplomacy, tact, and getting things done amicably instead of by a fight."

Governor Blood urged the delegates and their hosts seriously to consider entering public life and "to do a real job in it." "There is no field," the Governor stated, "in which you can contribute more to your community or State than in public life."

Secretary Forrestal, in introducing Senator BALL, remarked briefly that because of the too prevalent belief that democracy is automatic and for that reason cannot fail, there is a tendency for the vast majority of people to refrain from participating in it, and to let the Government handle all their problems. He said that the only way to prove to other nations the value of democracy is to make it work here.

Senator BALL'S topic was World Peace. He warned against the danger of state socialism if we are required again to join an armaments race with other nations. Unless we can enter upon some form of international organization, based on those democratic principles under which our Republic was organized and thrives today, the Senator said, we shall have to keep up our armaments, introduce peacetime military service and get ready for another world war. He stated that a post-war trend toward nationalism or isolationism is very likely, going on to assert that: "There will be a tremendous challenge facing you delegates to provide the type of leadership that will reverse that trend, and steer the Nation's course toward peace and stability and away from war and chaos."

At a short final session of the conference held Sunday morning delegates voted to make the organization permanent under the title "The Interscholastic Association for Politics and Government." As chairman of the association the group unanimously elected Michael V. Forrestal. An executive committee of five was also chosen to act as a committee of correspondence and to arrange for a second conference next year. The committee will use every means possible to stimulate further the awakened interest in politics and government among high schools and preparatory school students.

Farm Price and Farm Income Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, May 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely letter from Mr. Herman Hurst, of Oswego, Kans., who discusses the farm price and farm income situation. Mr. Hurst is a fine citizen who has given much thought and study to the question of an adequate income for the farm and farm family.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OSWEGO, KANS., *May 11, 1944.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: I have received two letters of your addresses you sent me and would say that I agree with you and hope you will keep up the fight for the farmer.

Being a farmer, I don't see how anyone can say that the farmer is a profiteer and gets abnormally high prices for his produce. I have read articles accusing him of being unfair to the consumer and I wonder if anyone knows that the farmer has nothing to say about the prices he receives for his produce. In the matter of livestock he has no more to say what his cattle, hogs, or sheep will bring than the stock being sold. If he goes to market early, he is told that they haven't gotten the market yet, which is set in the large centers, and when it comes the farmer has not been consulted about what it costs to produce said animals, but on a price set by a processor, who figures cost of processing and a profit. I believe the processors are so organized that they set the buying price on livestock and also set the price on the processed meat.

It is the same with grain. The farmer takes his wheat to the elevator and he has no more to say what he gets for it than the tractor that was used in the production. He has nothing to say about the tests, nor does he see it weighed. He is paid a price that the processor can feel he will not take any loss. Of course, the processor does not always make the profit he had expected to, but he had the privilege to try. This is absolutely denied the farmer.

A good crop in some foreign country often brings down the price of grain in the United States. A rain in the fall and winter often brings the price of wheat down 6 months before harvest. A rain in the summer and the papers say it was a million-dollar rain for the corn month before the corn is ripe for harvest. The papers often state that the farmers' income for certain years have been so many billions of dollars, but they fail to figure on the cost of making those billions and that this amount must be divided between more than 6,000,000 farmers. Farm implements and machinery are maintained at an even price the year around, yet the grain produced by using said machinery fluctuates between 10 to 30 percent in 1 year. You might buy an implement for 200 bushels of wheat now, but next year it may take 300 bushels to buy the same machine. The Government asks the farmers to produce more meat to win the war. I believe the annual average pig crop is about 40,000,000 to 45,000,000, but the 1943 crop was 121,000,874, so they cut about $2 per hundred off the price, with

a threatened other reduction of $1.25 per 100 for the crop of 1944. I don't believe the consumer gets the benefit he should by the reduced cost. The Government asked the farmer to produce more chickens, which he did. Now they are cheaper. A month ago eggs were 42 cents, but a few weeks of warm weather and they said there was a surplus of eggs, so took off 11 cents per dozen. I do not believe there are many farmers, with the help of wife and children working, getting more than one-half as much as railroad people and miners are getting—that is, after the cost has been taken out of production. The papers in reporting the price received by the farmers for livestock stress the top prices paid. I do not believe over one-half of the receipts bring over one-half of the top quotation. There are several organizations trying to help the farmer to produce more, but I believe we could produce enough to feed the United States without any county farm agents. There is too much spread between the producer and the consumer. If anyone needs a subsidy, it is the man who produces and has to contend with the chinchbugs, grasshoppers, droughts and floods, and the processor.

Very truly,

HERMAN HURST.

Pay Readjustment Act of 1942—Vote in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, May 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing the final vote in the House of Representatives on Senate bill 2025, to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Congressional Record of May 13, 1942]

VOTE ON INCREASING PAY OF SOLDIERS

PAY READJUSTMENT BILL OF 1942

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The motion was agreed to.

* * * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 359, nays 1, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—359

Allen of Illinois, Allen of Louisiana, H. Carl Andersen, Anderson of California, Anderson of New Mexico, August H. Andresen, Andrews, Angell, Arends, Arnold, Barden, Barnes, Barry, Bates of Massachusetts, Baumhart, Beam, Beckworth, Beiter, Bell, Bender, Bennett, Bishop, Bland, Bloom, Boehne, Boggs, Boland, Bolton, Boren, Bradley of Pennsylvania, Brooks, Brown of Georgia, Brown of Ohio, Bryson, Bulwinkle, Burch, Burdick, Burgin, Butler, Byron, Camp, Canfield, Cannon of Florida, Cannon of Missouri, Capozzoli, Carlson, Carter, Cartwright, Case of South Dakota, Celler, Chapman, Chenoweth, Chiperfield, Clark, Claypool, Clevenger, Cluett, Cochran, Coffee of Nebraska, Coffee of Washington, Cole of New York, Collins, Colmer, Cooley, Cooper, Copeland, Costello, Courtney, Cox, Cravens, Crawford, Creal, Crowther, Culkin, Cullen, Cunningham, Curtis, D'Alesandro, Davis of Ohio, Davis of Tennessee, Day, Dewey, Dickstein, Dingell, Dirksen, Ditter, Domengeaux, Doughton, Douglas, Downs, Duncan, Dworshak, Eaton, Eberharter, Edmiston, Elliott of California, Elston, Engel, Englebright, Faddis, Fellows, Fenton, Fitzgerald, Fitzpatrick, Flannagan, Fogarty, Folger, Forand, Leland M. Ford, Ford of Mississippi, Thomas F. Ford, Fulmer, Gale, Gamble, Gathings, Gehrmann, Gerlach, Gibson, Gifford, Gilchrist, Gillette, Gore, Gossett, Graham, Grant of Indiana, Green, Gregory, Guyer, Gwynne, Haines, Edwin Arthur Hall, Leonard W. Hall, Halleck, Hancock, Hare, Harness, Harris of Arkansas, Harris of Virginia, Hart, Harter, Hartley, Healey, Hébert, Heffernan, Heidinger, Hendricks, Hess, Hill of Colorado, Hill of Washington, Hinshaw, Hobbs, Hoffman, Holbrock, Holmes, Hook, Hope, Houston, Howell, Hull, Hunter, Imhoff, Izac, Jackson, Jacobsen, Jenkins of Ohio, Jensen, Johns, Johnson of California, Johnson of Illinois, Johnson of Indiana, Luther A. Johnson, Johnson of Oklahoma, Johnson of West Virginia, Jones, Jonkman, Kean, Kee, Keefe, Kefauver, Kelley of Pennsylvania, Kelly of Illinois, Martin J. Kennedy, Keogh, Kerr, Kilday, Kinzer, Kirwan, Kleberg, Klein, Knutson, Koppleman, Kunkel, Landis, Lane, Lanham, Lea, Leavy, LeCompte, Lesinski, Lewis, Ludlow, Lynch, McCormack, McGehee, McGranery, McGregor, McIntyre, McKeough, McLaughlin, McLean, McMillan, Maas, Maciora, Mahon, Manasco, Mansfield, Marcantonio, Martin of Iowa, Martin of Massachusetts, Mason, May, Merritt, Meyer of Maryland, Mills of Arkansas, Mills of Louisiana, Mitchell, Monroney, Moser, Mott, Mundt, Murdock, Murray, Myers of Pennsylvania, Nichols, Norrell, Norton, O'Brien of Michigan, O'Brien of New York, O'Connor, O'Hara, O'Leary, O'Neal, O'Toole, Pace, Paddock, Patman, Patton, Pearson, Peterson of Florida, Peterson of Georgia, Joseph L. Pfeifer, William T. Pheiffer, Pierce, Pittenger, Ploeser, Poage, Powers, Priest, Ramsay, Ramspeck, Randolph, Rankin of Mississippi, Reed of Illinois, Reed of New York, Rees of Kansas, Rich, Richards, Rivers, Rizley, Robertson of North Dakota, Robertson of Virginia, Robinson of Utah, Robsion of Kentucky, Rockefeller, Rockwell, Rodgers of Pennsylvania, Rogers of Massachusetts, Rolph, Romjue, Russell, Sacks, Sanders, Sasscer, Satterfield, Sauthoff, Scanlon, Schuetz, Scott, Shafer of Michigan, Shanley, Sheppard, Sheridan, Sikes, Simpson, Smith of Maine, Smith of Ohio, Smith of Pennsylvania, Smith of Washington, Smith of Wisconsin, Snyder, Somers of New York, South, Springer, Starnes of Alabama, Steagall, Stefan, Stevenson, Stratton, Sullivan, Sumner of Illinois, Sumners of Texas, Sutphin, Sweeney, Taber, Talbot, Talle, Tarver, Tenerowicz, Terry, Thill, Thom, Thomas of New Jersey, Thomas of Texas, Thomason, Tibbott, Tolan, Traynor, Treadway, Van Zandt, Vincent of Kentucky, Vinson of Georgia, Voorhis of California, Vorys of Ohio, Wadsworth, Ward, Wasielewski, Weaver, Weiss, Welch, Wene, West, Wheat, Whelchel, White, Whitten, Whittington, Wickersham, Wigglesworth, Williams, Wilson, Winter, Wolcott, Wolfenden of Pennsylvania, Wolverton of New Jersey, Woodruff of Michigan, Woodrum of Virginia, Wright, Young, Youngdahl.

NAYS—1

Disney.

NOT VOTING—71

Baldwin, Bates of Kentucky, Blackney, Bonner, Boykin, Bradley of Michigan, Buck, Buckler of Minnesota, Buckley of New York, Byrne, Casey of Massachusetts, Clason, Cole of Maryland, Crosser, Delaney, Dies, Dondero, Drewry, Durham, Eliot of Massachusetts, Ellis, Fish, Flaherty, Gavagan, Gearhart, Gillie, Granger, Grant of Alabama, Harrington, Jarman, Jarrett, Jenks of New Hampshire, Jennings, Lyndon B. Johnson, Michael J. Kennedy, Kilburn, Kocialkowski, Kramer, Lambertson, Larrabee, Maciejewski, Magnuson, Michener, Nelson, O'Day, Oliver, Osmers, Patrick, Plauché, Plumley, Rabaut, Rankin of Montana, Reece of Tennessee, Rogers of Oklahoma, Sabath, Schaefer of Illinois, Schulte, Scrugham, Secrest, Shannon, Short, Smith of Virginia, Smith of West Virginia, Sparkman, Spence, Stearns of New Hampshire, Tinkham, Vreeland, Walter, Worley, Zimmerman.

So the bill was passed.

The Meaning of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Dr. Willard H. Dow at the Biltmore Hotel, New York, May 13, 1944, on receiving the gold medal award of the American Institute of Chemists:

Everyone everywhere is trying to look into the future. The world about us is being torn into shreds, and we do not know how or by whom it may be reshaped. Countless millions are longing for what they call security and seem willing to pay any price for any package labeled security. The sands of man's belief in himself as a being created in the image of God are running out. Men and women are trying to escape today by dreaming of tomorrow. Tonight I shall not talk about post-war planning or post-war hoping. Instead I am going to ask you to explore with me the simple elements on which we of America have founded our lives, to the end of discovering whether or not, in much of our planning, we have not overlooked that one element without which our plans will be futile. I am going to ask you to consider freedom and what it means. And I am also going to suggest to those who think in such terms that freedom also has a cash value. But let us think in terms of the dignity of man and not of messes of pottage.

Let us be highbrow in order to see if in being lowbrow—call it practical—we are not in danger of missing the very thing that we are trying to get. To be concrete. How many of us are really willing to accept the challenge of individual responsibility and make our own futures?

How many of us, I wonder, are watching for a chance to break out of the lockstep of thought in which we as a people are now maching and to do a little walking at our own gait? And how many of us are just watchfully waiting for the line to break of itself, or, better yet, to be broken by someone we elect or select for that purpose? In other words, how many of us have the burning passion to

step out for freedom? And how many of us are beginning to think of freedom as something we would very much like to have given to us? There is a whale of a difference between the two approaches.

Freedom is not a condition of life. It is the absence of a condition of life. The moment we think of it as a condition, we recognize—no matter what we may say to the contrary—a super power which can tell us not only what is and what is not freedom, but also just how and why we must like it. I am reminded of that marshal of Napoleon's who, entering a captured town, summoned the citizens to the market place. "My friends," he declared, "I bring you the perfect freedom. But be prudent. I shall shoot the first man who stirs."

Take the slogan "Free enterprise." Everyone seems to have gone overboard for free enterprise. But it appears that the securing of free enterprise is a very complicated matter, and I should hate to be given the task of reducing some of the prescriptions I read to an algebraic formula. "Free enterprise," if it is to be anything but a name, is not a permitted way of business. It arises out of an absence of a permitted way of business.

We seem to be forgetting that a government cannot grant freedom of religion or of speech or of enterprise. When we speak of granting or receiving freedom, we exactly reverse the processes of thought that moved those great men, the founding fathers, to evolve for themselves and their posterity—that is, for us—the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We of America never wrung a Magna Carta from a king. Our forefathers fought and gained the right to think and act for themselves. The Declaration of Independence was a living, fighting thing and not just a nice resolution casually adopted at a convention. We did not derive our freedom from any government. On the contrary, we set up a government and lodged with it only such small parts of our freedom as we thought necessary for the preservation of a reasonable order. Our wise fathers were so fearful that even these little trusteeships of freedom might be abused that they delegated supreme power to no man and to no group of men, in the fervent hope that no government could ever be established as a thing of itself and apart from the people.

We today, without thought of our words, speak of the Government or of Washington as a ruling power, and there are many who would propitiate that power in much the way that the courtiers of old are said to have fawned on their monarchs. Our forefathers simply would not have known how to do that sort of thing. They did not depend upon a government. The Government depended on them.

They derived their freedom to worship, to speak, and to carry on from Almighty God and not from anything fashioned by man.

The utter reversal that has come about in our manner of thinking—a reversal which holds much evil and no good, is being driven in by a parade of authorities through committee rooms, through lecture halls, and even through pulpits, solemnly warning us and exhorting us not to be hasty in getting rid of our wartime controls so as not to lapse into another dreadful era of tooth and claw. We are being warned against the dangers of freedom. We are being openly counseled to follow the cultures and even the diets of nations that never knew freedom. In the twenties, foreign missions were inspecting us to see how and why we managed so well. Now in the forties we are being taught that whatever we did in the past as a people was crude and quite wrong and that our future lies in being something other than American.

All of which, to me, is rot, for I do not happen to be one of those who believe that the United States is a failure. And although we have a lot to learn, and, if we keep our balance, we shall always have a lot to learn. I think that what we have to learn from abroad is in the way of what not to do and not in the way of what to do. For if the cultures of Europe and Asia have brought them to their present pass, we have nothing to learn from them. So I am thinking and I would ask you to think about the moral basis on which this country is going to operate after the war. We hear a great deal about post-war planning, full production, and full employment. These questions are all materialistic. But what about the individual? Where is he going to get off? Or has he vanished entirely?

We are in an era of controlled economy. It is said, and for the purposes of this evening I will grant, that these controls are needed for the war. We are being told that controls are not in the American spirit, but that we must ease out of them and that chaos would follow their sudden ending. Some of those who advise us to go slowly have records of achievement in business and finance and therefore would seem to speak out of experience.

But by the very nature of our present controls we cannot ease out of them. We can only ease into permanent control and the kind of society in which the individual never has a chance to express himself. For one control breeds another. We have already seen how quickly price control leads to subsidy. And also we are witnessing how price control brings artificial gluts and shortages. Every housewife is becoming a ration-coupon speculator and in a measurable time we shall have to eat on a fixed-quantity schedule. The next step must be forced labor, for in a controlled society it is out of the question for the individual to determine either the kind or the amount of labor he will contribute. Then we shall have exactly the same sort of freedom from want and from fear that the lifer enjoys in his cell.

For, although control is not a harsh word, economic control by its very nature must be harsh, because really it means the substituting of bureaucratic discretion and in the end the individual must be deprived of his responsibility and his dignity. We shall have to decide whether we want to be Americans and have government of our own choosing or be something else. There is no half-way point in human dignity and responsibility. It either is or is not.

The control mania—I cannot use a nicer word—has struck the sciences. Every few years a group of sincere and good men, as in a cycle, comes out with the recommendation that all advancement should be in the control of a single group of scientists.

The decisions recommended by them would govern our future development. Chemistry and physics offer possibly greater opportunity for the expression of new ideas than any of the other sciences. Each scientific brain has an approach or a way of looking at things that is entirely its own. Using this brain power can bring about greater results than could possibly be achieved by a wiser Solomon than has ever yet appeared.

Can you conceive what would happen if any group of scientists—now matter how able—were made the masters of research and discovery—if their composite experience were to make all the decisions? We discard the very thought as nonsense.

An idea, no matter how weird, may grow into a constructive thought and enlarge to a new approach. Then a new industry is aborning. Experience, ideas, research—all accumulate and produce a new approach or a new product or a new thought. Each borning is cherished by the one seeing the vision and is often communicated to others, but these visions are things coming only to those who have prepared themselves to accept them.

My own experience in research is such that I would dread the day when the bright spark of the young man who is searching the infinite might find himself in a thought prison with a keeper—no matter how well-intentioned and sympathetic that keeper might be. You all know that the best known and ablest of our authorities turned down the making of the cyclotron as useless. My company is making bromine from sea water, but, before finally getting under way, it was conclusively demonstrated, not only once but three times, that it could not be done. And lest I seem to be taking on airs, I will tell you that some years ago I maturely decided that, although the future of magnesium was unlimited, it would always be a specialty metal. But even at our present prices it is by volume among the cheapest of metals. We have learned that if a research laboratory is to produce results, the men must be allowed the freedom to be a bit crazy. If we were to control closely, we would miss the great idea that is found only by those with the courage to be crazy.

Chemistry and physics stand out nobly in the modern world of science. They are ever ready to give much and to accept little in return—which is the reverse of the modern world where the tendency is to receive all and give little. We are now in a terrible war—a war of complete destruction or maybe even elimination. Have we, as scientists, failed in our effort to humanity and permitted the operation of forces to work against instead of for civilization? Have we listened to the wrong teachers, to pedagogs of a wrong theology? Have we not been inspired by wrong thinking and gotten our quanta of energy confused with the molecules? Have we forgotten the only being worth remembering—the individual human being?

This is briefly what we have done. We have permitted the fostering of ideas our intelligence says are wrong. By pretending a knowledge we do not have, we have duped ourselves into false security. There is only one security and that grows out of the individual thinking for himself and that honestly and sincerely. This we know. But we are discarding all of our experience, traditions, or past prosperity and our entire knowledge of success with individualism. We are, in short, discarding Americanism and all it stands for. That means we are discarding our moral basis.

There is much loose talk these days about after-the-war planning. In typical propaganda style, industry is held up as having the sole responsibility for taking care of all employment after the war is over. I, for one, do not believe this is possible and think it is just another scheme to dodge responsibility. For industry is always a servant and never a master. The responsibility is yours and mine. We must all make our contribution and resolve that there shall not be unemployment after the war. But we shall need to define what we mean by "employment" and by "unemployment." Everyone can be employed. But everyone cannot be employed at exactly the kind of job under exactly the conditions of wages and hours that he or she may want. And "full employment" comes perilously near to "directed" employment. There is no "right to work" but there is a responsibility to work. We need to do some hard thinking about rights and responsibilities, for there cannot be a right without a responsibility nor a responsibility without a right. And that gets us right back to the individual.

In writing the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the fathers of our country were moved by the unalterable purpose to free themselves and their posterity from the oppression of the Old World and elevate the individual to sovereign dignity. They believed that thus they were fulfilling the will of God. They builded with imperishable stone.

The elemental situation has not changed from their day to ours. Instead of a country

of a few million people, we have a country of 130,000,000 people. That means more and not less opportunity. The world around us is much greater than theirs because, where their frontiers were limited by the map, our frontiers are unmapped, for they are far off somewhere in the great new world of physical discovery. Nothing has happened to make necessary a change in our concept of individualism.

The upheaval which has come about in our manner of thinking is, I feel, due to two causes. One is the influence upon our basic thinking by European systems of thought generated by failure and the other is our neglect to cherish and foster the great freedom—the freedom of the ordinary, everyday American.

It is not easy for a nation to keep its freedom and history teaches us that many have failed. But there never was a freedom born like the American. Our job is to prepare and to guard that freedom so that the way to greater accomplishments may be opened. Our successes are small in contrast to that which will eventually be accomplished. Our efforts are good and bad building stones of the future. There is always much room out in front—room for all without crowding—and work for generations to come. Let us now dedicate ourselves to avoiding the stumbling blocks and the unnecessary delays on this road of progress.

We must once again take up the belief that the only divine power is within man himself—he is the creation of God. If the American system has failed, it is because we, as individuals, have failed. In man alone can we find hope for a future. Whatever may be the seeming dangers of throwing off our controls and once more being Americans, they are as nothing in contrast to the dangers of being merely a tended herd. It all depends on whether we have what it takes. I think we have.

National Maritime Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the sailing of the *Savannah* for Liverpool, a voyage which consumed 29 days and 11 hours, has been set apart by Congress and proclaimed by the President as National Maritime Day. Today we pay tribute to our great merchant fleet and its valiant personnel.

The United States of America in the span of a little more than 2 years has become the greatest maritime power in the history of the world. Our ships manned by our citizens circle the globe. The American merchant marine has covered the stretches of the sea carrying food, clothing, armaments to our armed forces wherever they may be. Millions of our boys and girls have been transported in safety on vessels flying the Stars and Stripes.

The bridge of ships constructed by and under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission is one of the miracles of mankind. The maintenance of this magnificent fleet under the supervision of the War Shipping Administration is a proud accomplishment of our national ingenuity and industry. We are grateful for the contribution these outstanding Government officers and all those serving under them have made in carrying on this war which in extent and fury eclipses the imagination and dulls the significance of our successes.

The members of our merchant marine have been great in the valorous struggle for freedom they have made and will continue to carry on until the last man has been returned from his fighting post. Not a ship has failed to sail and these civilians, who have given their all for the ideals of our Nation, have been the necessary element in the successful conduct of the war. It is well to remember that the millions of tons of shipping of which we boast would be but empty hulls in turbulent waters if there were not a healthy, able, and willing merchant marine to man the vessels and direct their course.

The declaration of policy of Congress, set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, reads:

> It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine * * * composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

The United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration have followed the mandate of this congressional policy and have striven zealously to accomplish the objective therein contained. The President, speaking of the merchant seamen, stated last September:

> They are making an all-out effort and a vital contribution to the preservation of our freedom. We—and all other liberty-loving people of the world—are deeply indebted to them for their devotion and heroism.

The millions of shipyard workers, their executives and associates, have all performed their duties, day after day, in the American way for our American triumph on the seas.

The congratulations of a grateful nation is due the maritime industry on this day while we pause in our deliberation to pay tribute to the more than 5,000 seamen who have died in the service of their country and to be mindful of the service for mankind being rendered by those who live by the sea.

The School-Milk Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following official table is from table 601, page 519, of the 1943 agricultural statistics:

TABLE 601.—*Quantities distributed and amount of payments made by the Food Distribution Administration under the relief-mi' and school-milk programs, fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and totals for earlier years*

State	School milk	
	Quantity	Cost
	Quarts	
Arizona	13,054	$4,814
Colorado	33,852	2,280
Illinois	1,531,095	71,786
Iowa	233,536	12,923
Kansas	2,579	128
Maine	54,669	3,723
Massachusetts	1,488,652	105,836
Michigan	26,895	1,508
Minnesota	143,528	8,069
Missouri	418,908	22,912
Nebraska	37,097	1,908
New Hampshire	191,321	12,884
New York	18,385,059	1,136,164
North Carolina	1,569	130
North Dakota	24,312	1,185
Ohio	28,737	2,005
Texas	773	50
Vermont	23,156	1,344
Wisconsin	429,765	23,171
District of Columbia	881,094	60,921
Total, 1941-42	24,029,651	1,473,801
1940-41	12,541,401	592,103
1939-40	25,556	756

You will note the following facts revealed by this official report:

First. That one State, New York, receives over 75 percent of the milk and over 75 percent of the funds appropriated from Federal funds for this project.

Second. That no one of the States of the United States with low per-capita incomes were included in the project.

Third. That about 90 percent of the expenditures went to three States, Illinois, New York, and Massachusetts.

Fourth. That if the present time table is used and the present formula is followed the program will eventually be harmed. To be permanent, any Federal program must go straight across the board, otherwise accusations of being Santa Claus to the few and Shylock to the many will be made.

Fifth. That Washington, D. C., where there has been twice the national per-capita income, participates, though the States with low income are not included.

The foster homes of our country, with an enrollment of 242,000 in 2,240 homes, are entitled to first consideration when preparing a program for milk or general food distribution. If allocated on the basis of enrollment, fairness would be insured. No thoughtful person could object to this method of distribution. No vote bribing charges could be made, as there are not votes to be obtained.

There is another angle of this school-milk problem and that is the skim milk with a little chocolate added which when sold is being distributed at 20 cents per quart. These children are entitled to natural milk with the vitamin A in it, and the school-milk program should not be used as a method of disposing of excess skim milk after the fat has been removed from the milk. It is hoped that the base will be broadened if the program is continued.

Maritime Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on this National Maritime Day 1944, the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the day when the Savannah crossed the Atlantic Ocean, it behooves us to take stock of the present and individually as well as collectively to plan for the future.

Certain data compiled by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration is illuminating. It is as follows:

Dead-weight tonnage of American merchant marine end of 1941	11,000,000
Dead-weight tonnage built Jan. 1, 1942, to Apr. 1, 1944	31,444,300
Number of ships built Jan. 1, 1942, to Apr. 1, 1944	3,052
Number of workers in Maritime Commission yards	616,000
Number of ships under control of War Shipping Administration	8,100
Number of men employed aboard ships (add 10 percent shore reserve)	130,000
Long tons of cargo moved out of the United States in 1943	62,000,000

I submit also other material worth our study. It is the Shipping Outlook, an editorial appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce on April 4, 1944, written by Stanley Ferguson.

THE SHIPPING OUTLOOK

(By Stanley Ferguson)

A MATTER OF DISCRIMINATION?

No matter from what angle the subject is approached, it is difficult to avoid the impression that the shipping industry is once again becoming the victim of political discrimination in Washington.

Between 1941 and the end of last year corporate earnings generally increased by more than 40 percent while those of railroads and other domestic transportation groups increased more than 100 percent. During the same period earnings of ship operators declined approximately 66 percent. Twenty-eight representative shipping lines earning $149,000,000 before taxes and $114,000,000 after them, in 1941, earned last year $56,000,000 and then had $32,000,000 left after making deductions for estimated taxes. If this trend continues the financial resources of the shipping industry will be skimpy indeed by the time the war ends.

It is difficult to find a rational explanation for the disparity in the earnings of these different industries. Corporate and railroad earnings went up because the volume of business expanded greatly in that period. So, however, did the volume of business handled by ship operators. While it is true that sinkings and requisitioning have cut the commercial earning power of privately owned fleets, it is also true that most lines are now handling far more ships than they ever handled before. As general or time charter agents for the War Shipping Administration, private operators are handling nearly twice as many Liberty ships alone than there were vessels in our pre-war fleet, more ships all told than those of all the rest of our allies combined. There was never a time when the shipping community had as much work to do, or when its experience and resources were more urgently required to do it. Why, then, the sharp decline in earnings?

For more than 2 years the question of ship values and earnings have been passed around Washington from agency to agency and from committee to committee without once arriving in any office where anybody will accept full responsibility for it. W. S. A. wanted to adopt a certain scale of values, but the Comptroller General declared it was too high. The Comptroller did not have the authority to disallow payments and therefore he could not take the responsibility for it, but merely complained to Congress. W. S. A. felt it did have the authority, but hesitated to flout the Comptroller and entered into inconclusive negotiations with him instead. Three eminent judges were finally called in by the President to advise on the matter, but there is still no agreement on their own conclusions and the trend of earnings is still downward.

Surely it is time for Congress to look into the matter and find out what is wrong. If it is the law, the law should be changed. If it is a question of authority, the authority should be clarified. The Maritime Commission is already wondering why operators are unwilling to commit themselves to buy new ships. The situation will have to be cleared up soon and responsibility for it established if operators themselves are to be assured they will actually have anything with which to buy them.

Our production from and including 1936, and to and including March 1944, is as phenomenal, and is as follows:

	Number of vessels	Dead-weight tonnage
1936	9	107,938
1937	18	194,788
1938	25	289,765
1939	28	341,219
1940	55	641,656
1941	99	1,137,163
1942	746	8,089,732
1943	1,896	19,238,626
1944:[1]		
January	124	1,204,730
February	134	1,372,864
March	152	1,538,357
Total, 1936–44	3,280	34,156,238

[1] Production decline in early 1944 reflects conversion of high production yards to Victory ships and military types.

Our record is not phenomenal alone in ships, but also in our distribution of seamen whose estimated record has been beyond the power of language to describe. The following estimate as of April 25, 1944, tells the story:

Estimated distribution by States of seamen in the United States merchant marine, or engaged in seafaring activities (based on selective-service files totaling 140,000 registrants reporting such skills)

Alabama	1,540
Arizona	280
Arkansas	560
California	17,500
Colorado	420
Connecticut	1,680
Delaware	420
District of Columbia	980
Florida	5,040
Georgia	1,260
Idaho	280
Illinois	5,600
Indiana	1,260
Iowa	980
Kansas	420
Kentucky	1,260
Louisiana	3,920
Maine	1,540
Maryland	3,780
Massachusetts	7,280
Michigan	8,120
Minnesota	2,100
Mississippi	840
Missouri	2,240
Montana	140
Nebraska	420
Nevada	140
New Hampshire	280
New Jersey	7,000
New Mexico	280
New York	23,240
North Carolina	1,540
North Dakota	140
Ohio	6,580
Oklahoma	420
Oregon	2,800
Pennsylvania	6,300
Rhode Island	1,120
South Carolina	560
South Dakota	140
Tennessee	1,260
Texas	4,480
Utah	140
Vermont	140
Virginia	2,940
Washington	7,980
West Virginia	700
Wisconsin	1,820
Wyoming	140

I include in my extension of remarks the following statement by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land (C. C.), United States Navy, retired, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administrator:

National Maritime Day, May 22, takes on a significance this year beyond the commemoration of the sailing from the port of Savannah on May 22, 1819, of the *Savannah*, the first vessel with steam power to cross the Atlantic.

This year our country is awake to what our merchant ships are doing in the United Nations war effort. Thousands of men and women, particularly in the area between the Allegheny and Rocky Mountains, who heretofore had little, if any, knowledge of the merchant marine, now have a close association with this great arm of our national defense. This present national-defense arm in normal times can play a most important part in our national economic life.

This close association has arisen from the extent to which different equipment, fittings and part of the vast fleet of vessels which we have built and are building have been manufactured and fabricated throughout the entire Nation. In addition it has arisen from the knowledge gleaned from the men from these areas serving on our merchant vessels on all seven seas, and the men of our armed forces who are traveling to far-flung battlefields on these ships—perhaps the very ships on which some of the equipment these men and women had a part in manufacturing is installed.

Consequently, the United States, as a Nation, is far more interested in its merchant marine than it has been since the days of the clipper ships which carried such a large portion of the Nation's foreign commerce and made such a wonderful reputation for speed and service.

Following out the declaration of policy regarding the maintaining of an adequate merchant marine made by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, it is the duty of each and every one of us to work to maintain, and even intensify the interest that exists today in the merchant marine, so that never again will the country be without an adequate fleet of merchant vessels; first, to serve as auxiliaries to our armed forces in case of emergency such as exists at the present time; and, second, sufficient to carry all of our domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign water-borne commerce.

We, however, must not lose sight of the fact that our merchant vessels are but the

tools which we use to carry to the buyers the merchandise that we sell, and to bring home for our own use those raw products and finished goods which we either must obtain abroad, or which we can find abroad in a quantity that will enable us to improve our living conditions.

Under normal circumstances, we produce in this country approximately 10 percent in excess of the needs of our own people. If that excess production is kept here, it tends to force the prices down with a consequent reduction in pay rolls and a lowering of living standards. If we sell that excess abroad, we can maintain our living standards, and in exchange for what we ship abroad we can bring home the products of other countries that will still further improve our living standards.

To maintain the adequate merchant marine we must develop and expand our waterborne commerce. To maintain that adequate merchant marine at the lowest possible cost to the country, we must see that American-flag ships sail full and down.

National Maritime Day, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the proclamation of the President of the United States of America declaring this day to be National Maritime Day, 1944:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Congress by a joint resolution approved May 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 73), designated May 22 of each year as National Maritime Day, in commemoration of the sailing from Savannah Ga., on May 22, 1819, of the *Savannah*, the first steam-propelled vessel to cross the Atlantic, and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day; and

Whereas the Congress, in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, approved June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985), has declared it to be the policy of the United States to foster and encourage the development and maintenance of a merchant marine "(a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping services on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel"; and

Whereas many thousands of American men and women have toiled through long hours in shipyards and factories in order to construct in the shortest possible time the fleet of vessels needed to carry out not only the long-range program envisioned in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 but also the emergency program necessitated by the global war in which we are involved; and

Whereas many men have already given their lives, and thousands of others are daily risking their lives, on our ships traversing dangerous seas to carry men and materials to the far-flung battlefields; and

Whereas it is fitting that the patriotism, courage, sacrifice, and labor of these men and women, ashore and afloat, be publicly recognized:

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe May 22, 1944, as National Maritime Day by displaying the flag at their homes or other suitable places, and I direct that the flag be displayed on all Government buildings on that day.

I add the following remarks by Admiral Land on the subject How About Our Post-war Ships?

HOW ABOUT OUR POST-WAR SHIPS?

(By Rear Admiral Emory S. Land)

No one knows how many ships we can maintain in profitable post-war service. Two obvious post-war economic phases are involved: one, the period of transition from war to peace—two, the era of resumption of normal world-trade conditions. In the transition we will be called upon to play a leading part in the rehabilitation and restoration of much of the rest of the world. This will mean more ships than our merchant marine has ever required in peacetime.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 isn't my bible; but it does provide me and my associates with a working theology and a directive to do specific things. This world-wide war has served to accelerate the tempo of a big job and it is bringing us closer to a goal that should benefit every man, woman, and child in the United States.

This is a war of transportation. It has established us as one of the world's strongest maritime powers. Our merchant marine now the largest in its history, and rivaling any other for size and quality, is primarily a war-created resource. We have, however, at the same time amplified the long-range ship-construction program inaugurated in 1938, so that when the war is over we should have a fleet of merchant vessels composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of cargo vessels for our commercial needs. Our problem now that our shipbuilding industry has reached its production peak and is fully capable of meeting its goals, is to continue our merchant marine in the post-war future as a basic resource. If we are to keep our merchant fleet up to full efficiency we must make normal replacements each year. We must not repeat mistakes made in the wake of the last war.

We of the merchant marine have often stated that our objective should be to merchant ships to carry a substantial portion of our Nation's foreign commerce, both import and export—a greater portion than ships under the American flag have carried for many years. Since 1900 there have been times when they have carried as little as 8 percent, and seldom have they exceeded the 30-percent mark.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 says specifically:

"It is necessary for the national defense and the development of the foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine sufficient to carry its own domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States."

What is a "substantial" portion? Webster defines the word a meaning "of real worth, or considerable amount." All I can say is, that if a man promised me a "substantial" piece of an apple, and then gave the core and bit of the skin, I would consider myself cheated.

The suggestion has been made that a sound merchant marine of from 15 to 20 million deadweight tons would fully meet with our mounting economic and security demands. Opponents of a strong and unswerving merchant-marine policy have countered with a statement that a merchant fleet of the proposed strength would be entirely out of line and would be responsible for the creation of much international jealousy and discord.

The critics, with the best of intention, have failed, however, properly to appraise the arithmetic and the denominators involved. These must be clearly defined, otherwise, a distorted viewpojnt is inevitable.

Not all of the proposed merchant-marine fleet would be engaged in foreign service. Normal peacetime requirements incident to domestic transportation necessities alone would absorb no inconsiderable volume of the proposed tonnage. Ships in this category are always the first to be utilized in case of national emergency.

Great Lakes shipping would have a peacetime requirement of approximately 3,500,000 deadweight tons; our great rivers now have about 6,000 miles of navigable water and would need about 2,500,000 tons of shipping, while 3,800,000 deadweight tons of shipping could be used in coastal and intercoastal transportation, leaving about 7,500,000 tons more or less to be used in foreign shipping, certainly not an alarming proportion. During a normal peacetime year, less than 4,000,000 deadweight tons of American shipping were engaged in foreign trade. Is it impractical to say this would be increased approximately 50 percent in the post-war years? Our own domestic shipping requirements will never impinge upon our relations with other nations.

The future of the merchant marine will be subject to international policies and adjustments. Ships which go abroad are instruments of foreign policy and must be treated as such. The United States has no desire to thwart the legitimate operations of other nations at sea. Shipping is more important to some nations than to others. We, for example, have learned by experience that a sizable merchant marine, backed by a healthy and virile shipbuilding industry, is essential to our economic life and national security. We try to understand the necessities and urgent needs of our friends in other lands—and I think we have earned the right to expect that they will do the same for us.

There should be a mutual appreciation for each other's needs and some frank and friendly collaboration. This happens to be one of those things which everyone favors in principle, but few support in practice. In other words, everybody wants to cut the pie but no one wants to take a small piece. There are only so many pieces in the pie. The only alternative to taking smaller pieces than we would like to have is to increase the size of the pie. We have not scratched the surface of our foreign-trade potential. I recommend that we bake a bigger pie. American industry has a great productive capacity for making things the world will need; it can provide much that should be in strong demand for many years by other nations.

Our schedule for 1944 calls for approximately 1,700 merchant ships at least half of which will be fast ships that can serve most effectively and economically in the post-war world. We will need more of these ships if we subscribe to the practical theory that this Nation cannot survive and prosper without an adequate merchant marine and the facilities and personnel to build and repair our ships. We cannot meet our world-wide obligations, particularly those we are incurring during this war, without sufficient ships—fast, efficient, modern ships—in operation under our flag, and under private ownership and operation.

In resuming normal trade relations with other nations, we may well profit by the example set by our great merchandising establishments in expanding and developing their trade. The progressive grocer, baker, and brewer have proved an efficient delivery eyetem of their own—an adequate fleet of trucks—to be a prime essential in building their business and expanding it. If we, as a great industrial and agricultural nation, support a merchant marine which can render that type of service to other nations, it stands to reason we can profit from the service we render.

The clipper ships of a century ago proved that to be true; the trade and prestige resulting made a great contribution to the rapid and healthy growth of a young nation where free competitive enterprise was proving to be a dominent and constructive force.

The expansion and stability of our merchant marine and the maintenance of a substantial share of our vast and highly efficient shipbuilding industry will be, in part, dependent upon our international trade agreements. It would not be amiss, however, to point out that it will be equally dependent upon the measure of support given by the American people themselves. It is regrettable that for many years neither the Government nor the shipping industry made any intelligent, intensified effort to win support for our ships. It is time we did so.

It took the tragedy of a global war to bring home to America the importance of ships and a shipbuilding industry in being, ready to produce ships in a hurry and when an emergency exists. We must not forget this lesson. We need a broader and more sympathetic public understanding that ships and shipbuilding have strong and essential importance in peacetime. I want America to be deeply and acutely conscious of these things.

We can never be too ship-minded.

War Manpower Commission—City of New Orleans

REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the more I hear about the War Manpower Commission and its ludicrous floundering in its sorry public effort to convince somebody that they really know what it is all about the more I have before my mind the picture of the country boy who came to the big city driving his broken-down flivver and got caught in a traffic jam on a one-way street going in the wrong direction.

That is the best description that I know of the War Manpower Commission and the manner in which it functions, and I say "functions" with a great degree of charity.

The War Manpower Commission is the strange driver in the big city going in the opposite direction on a one-way street.

How it can be extricated from such a jam only time will tell, if it can be extricated at all.

I have observed the War Manpower Commission in action for a long time but have held my peace until the blow struck home.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, it is like death. None of us realize how terrible a thing death is until it strikes in our own home. That's the way it is about the War Manpower Commission. I did not realize just how bad it was until its stupidity rung the bell in my own city of New Orleans.

Right now the War Manpower Commission, headed by a group of local misfits unfit to handle so important a problem, is warning the citizens of New Orleans that they will be placed in a group L classification because of the lack of available manpower in that area.

While the voices of these warnings are still ringing in the ears of New Orleanians, their eyes are reading in the daily newspapers huge advertisements placed with the authority of the United States Employment Service, urging labor in New Orleans to go to the Pacific coast and other areas.

It would take more than a Solomon to reconcile such policies.

That is typical of the confusion which reigns in the War Manpower Commission.

Although there is some shadow boxing going on in New Orleans about placing that city in group 1, the fact is that the city has already been placed in that group by regional experts from Dallas and the official announcement is only being delayed because the War Manpower Commission has been caught red-handed with the goods that they do not know what it is all about.

There is supposed to be a 30-day suspension in order to soothe the New Orleans people. It is going to take more than a 30-day soothing sirup to soothe the tempers of my people in New Orleans, and the War Manpower Commission had better realize it now and look the situation squarely in the face. They had better start cleaning their own house before they make any attempt to place New Orleans' labor house in order.

Anybody who knows anything about labor conditions in New Orleans are fully cognizant of the situation there.

Only today I received a letter from E. J. Foster, chairman of the manpower committee of the Central Trades and Labor Council, who tells me that W. H. O'Kelley who is the acting area director of New Orleans, admitted to him that he knew of no labor shortage in New Orleans at this time but anticipated one during the latter part of the year.

If the War Manpower Commission in New Orleans and the Dallas region had been on their toes as they should have been they would have known and anticipated the situation months ago. They attempted to bluff their way through, however. I think the time of bluffing has stopped and it is now Paul McNutt, Administrator of the War Manpower Commission, or somebody else to do something about.

In the face of this supposed manpower shortage the War Manpower Commission, after suspending recruiting of New Orleans labor for 1 day for work elsewhere, the recruiting was thrown wide open, in fact it was opened on an even larger scale.

In the beginning recruiting was limited but now the Hanford Engineer Works, Pasco, Wash., a subsidiary of the du Pont Co., is being allowed to recruit for all types of workers in New Orleans while the War Manpower Commission cries from the housetops that there is an impending shortage of labor in New Orleans.

As a matter of fact some "expert" recruiters were sent to New Orleans from Dallas to put on a house-to-house recruiting campaign in all Negro neighborhoods for workers for Hanford. This has never been done for New Orleans establishments badly in need of Negro labor.

In addition a representative of the Civil Service Commission has appeared on the scene in New Orleans recruiting skilled workers and helpers to send to Pearl Harbor and navy yards on the west coast. All this, Mr. Speaker, in face of the War Manpower Commission's alarms about a critical labor shortage.

There could be a lot said about this Mr. O'Kelley, the so-called expert who is in charge of the New Orleans office. The facts surrounding him, and his liquid extracurricular activities, is common knowledge among his associates if it is not known to his superiors. That is only natural because the regional directors and executives of the War Manpower Commission seem to be the last ones to learn anything about matters of which they should be first informed.

Mr. O'Kelley, in trying to impress New Orleans' industrialists, talks glowingly about "expert technicians" who are making a study of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a high-sounding term, but these so-called expert technicians are in truth nothing but a bunch of ex-country school teachers and social workers who have never had industrial experience in their lives. The employees of the War Manpower Commission in New Orleans have what they refer to as the Gold Brick Club. You may draw your own conclusions as to what they mean.

The absentee and turn-over rate in the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service, which is a branch of the War Manpower Commission, is much higher than in any private industry in the city of New Orleans. How can such a set-up advise industry as to proper personnel management?

All figures produced by the War Manpower Commission as to labor supply and manpower are purely guesses. I know because I know some of the people who were asked to make these guesses, later published in the Labor Market Report put out by the War Manpower Commission.

It goes even further than that, Mr. Speaker. The field men who go out and get these screwy figures have always referred to themselves as the crystal gazers, and one of them went so far as to buy a crystal ball and keep it on his desk to the great glee of the rest of the boys.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of efficiency which speaks ex cathedra for the manpower of this Nation.

O tempora! O mores! Is there any wonder that there is such confusion and chaos in the manpower situation in this Nation if what is going on in the Dallas regional office and the New Orleans area is typical of the rest of the country.

What is Mr. McNutt's reply to this going to be?

I asked him about it the other day in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1944.

Hon. PAUL MCNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCNUTT: My attention has been called to the fact that the War Manpower Commission in New Orleans has stated that the labor conditions there is so acute that unless there is a change New Orleans will be classified as a group 1 area.

In spite of this statement, I am informed, large newspaper advertisements by the United States Employment Service are appearing daily in New Orleans endeavoring to recruit laborers and skilled workers of all kinds for transfer to the Pacific coast. It is my understanding that these advertisements are published on the authority of the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission. I don't know how you can reconcile such actions which is further evidence of the lack of cooperation and coordination in connection with the administration of the War Manpower Commission during this emergency.

If the New Orleans situation had been placed in capable hands and a better understanding given to the problem we would not be confronted with the acute situation with which we are confronted in New Orleans today. As far back as January the War Manpower Commission organization in New Orleans and the regional headquarters in Dallas, were fully cognizant of the situation but did nothing about it.

My information is that you have already decided to name New Orleans as a group 1 area, and all this fanfare and conferring is merely a lot of shadow boxing. Don't you think the time has come when the War Manpower Commission should adopt some policy of decisiveness as well as understanding in local communities, and not permit a situation as now exists in New Orleans?

I don't see how you or anybody else can defend statements that the labor situation in New Orleans is acute and at the same time authorize advertisements in newspapers urging labor to leave New Orleans and transfer to the Pacific coast.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

Of course, I have not received a reply yet. I will probably get an answer next month or so which will be as confusing as what is going on down in New Orleans.

The Central Trades and Labor Council of New Orleans of the American Federation of Labor advises me that if Mr. McNutt will have qualified and adequate people make a real survey of New Orleans a surplus instead of a shortage of labor would be found.

I am not alone in my position, Mr. Speaker.

The New Orleans Association of Commerce, composed of New Orleans business leaders, are as perplexed as I am.

The New Orleans Item recently published the following editorial which I believe sums up the entire situation, and I submit to you it expresses the opinion of all right-thinking people in New Orleans.

What is Mr. McNutt's answer?

What is the answer of the War Manpower Commission to such conditions and policies?

What defense can the Dallas regional office make for allowing such conditions in the New Orleans area?

What justification can the War Manpower Commission officials in the New Orleans area have for drawing their salaries from the taxpayers of the United States?

They are all $64 questions in my book.

Here is the editorial from the New Orleans Item:

THAT LABOR SHORTAGE

We have been reading the War Manpower Commission's ideas for getting 20,000 more workers for Orleans industries by next fall, and statements that unless these are adopted our city will be declared among those to which their present contracts are not extended and new ones are not awarded. We have also heard considerable discussion of the plan among manufacturers, large and small, who would be seriously affected by it. But the more we have read and heard the less we seem to understand about it or to grasp the necessity for it.

The proposal, for instance, to put all industry in the city on a compulsory 48-hour week is beyond our digestion. In the case of a wide range of small enterprises and some large ones, that would not expand the labor supply available for use in other plants but it would certainly impose severe inconvenience and losses on many of them. This and perhaps other considerations commend it to us as a very dubious expedient indeed.

Meantime, if anybody can throw any real light on this question we should be glad if he would do so.

And, incidentally, since labor is so scarce in New Orleans that the Federal Manpower Commission is threatening it with dire measures, we wish it would inform us why its Federal Employment Service is trying its best to drain labor away from here to the Pacific coast. Why is advertising in our newspapers this week the most seductive inducements to take skilled labor workers in half a dozen lines away from us? Is the Commission not marching in opposite directions at the same time? Why is it not trying to bring men workers into New Orleans instead of lure them away?

A Future for the Armed Forces With the G. I. Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. PRATT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, today in most homes throughout this broad land there is a vacant chair at the dining-room table. These represent a youth or a man and in some cases a girl, a son, a husband, or daughter who have forsaken family and fireside in the defense of their country. Some day, and, please God, it may be soon, the young manhood and womanhood of America will return. And so I would like to talk especially to those who are fighting our battles for us and to their parents, wives, and families.

The purpose of this G. I. bill of rights is to enable the returning veteran to help himself. It proposes to help him back to school, to a job, to the ownership of a home or a farm. The need arises the day he is mustered out. This measure, it is hoped, will bridge the gap between separation from service and the return to a place in the home community.

The inspiration for this comprehensive measure was furnished by the American Legion. It is endorsed by the Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This legislation has been drawn up and passed in the American way, and bills such as this one provide the continuance of our constitutional form of government. Our boys want rehabilitation—not charity. They want to be independent and self-sustaining. You cannot pay for patriotism with dollars and cents, but you can pay to educate a man and place him in a position where he can depend on his own efforts. Under this bill a soldier can borrow the money in his own home town at the loaning agency he chooses and at the lowest rate of interest available. It is my belief that most of the returning soldiers will borrow from their local banks at a lower rate of interest than the Government agencies charge at this time.

To many returning veterans the need for a job will be of paramount importance. Even though the Selective Service Act assures the man his former job, standing alone this is insufficient. Some types and places of employment will no longer exist. In many cases new skills will have been developed in the individual as well as maturity and qualities of leadership. In these cases the old job is not the answer. The bill establishes in the Veterans' Administration full responsibility for job counseling and employment placement.

Under this section of the bill the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is directed to place a representative in every State to work with the public employment service of that State. These men and women have fought for the right to work in a free land. It is our duty as a Nation and the responsibility of this service to assist in securing suitable employment without delay.

There has been considerable discussion concerning unemployment compensation for veterans, particularly as to the number of weeks the returning veteran should be entitled to receive it. Also there has been criticism of the payment of any unemployment compensation, with the suggestion that all returning service men and women should receive 6 months' base pay whether or not employed.

It is the opinion of many that the question of adjusted compensation or bonus, as it has been termed by some, should not be considered at this time. The war is still in progress. No one can say how many men and women will see service. Likewise no one can accurately forecast the financial condition of the Government 2 or 3 years hence. Finally,

the returning veterans themselves should have a voice in determining this important question which so vitally affects the economy of the Nation and their own welfare.

But it is only just that the man and woman who has served this country in uniform should be entitled to receive compensation if he is unable to obtain suitable employment on his return. Those who have remained at home and worked in factories and elsewhere have had an opportunity to establish unployment benefits for themselves under existing law. The serviceman has been denied this right. For his service to his country he should not be penalized but rewarded. I am satisfied that as finally passed this measure will provide that the returning soldier if qualified will receive unemployment compensation and will not be a subject of charity while looking for a job. A grateful nation can do no less.

This is not an adjusted-compensation or bonus measure. And it provides that the value of all benefits received by a veteran under it shall be deducted from any amount which may hereafter be authorized for payment to him as adjusted compensation.

What will it cost? The best available estimate is that of the Veterans' Administration based upon 15,000,000 returning veterans. That estimate for the entire period of time that the bill will operate is $6,000,000,000.

It is in no sense a reward. The military service of the manhood and womanhood of America is not for sale. The bill is, we hope, a bridge over which the returning soldier and sailor may pass to his normal, rightful place in his home community.

Even as they fought for freedom and will have preserved it, so in the years to come will the destiny of America remain in their hands. Ours is a republic. We pledge allegiance to the flag they have followed and to them the redemption of an obligation, that they may be better able to hold aloft, in peace as in war, the torch of human freedom and liberty.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce Sets an Example Other Chambers of Commerce Should Follow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is no class of people that have more at stake in stable government and a sound national economy than the people represented by the chambers of commerce of our towns and cities. The larger the city the more their businessmen have to lose in the collapse of credit and business in times of financial depression. There is an old saying, "Forewarned is forearmed," and businessmen of Los Angeles are to be congratulated on the foresight of the leaders of its chamber of commerce in recognizing and bringing to our attention the unfavorable trends in business management and government finances, and in presenting these facts to its members and the country at large by publishing and distributing illuminating articles on business and finance for the information and guidance of the people of this country.

There is inserted herewith for the consideration of the Members of Congress excerpts from an address of General Manager Leonard E. Read, of the chamber, which is one of a series of articles which has been distributed by the Los Angeles Chamber:

It is a function of government to insure an honest money system. Counterfeiting, for example, increases the volume of money, but the increment is money which does not originate out of a need for more money in the productive and distributive process. Counterfeiting is, therefore, suppressed by government. This is as it should be.

Let us consider counterfeiting and see what happens. To make an example simple let us assume that the population be composed only of us in this room. We have instituted a money system which honestly accommodates itself to the exchange of the goods and services which we severally produce or perform. Now, assume that one among us, who produces nothing in the way of goods and services, prints counterfeit bills to the tune of $25 per day. He takes those bills and buys your eggs and my shoes and the other things he wants and we make. Can we not describe what would happen by the introduction of these counterfeit purchase orders, counterfeit not merely because they were illegal but because they also were unrelated in any honest or economic way to our exchange system and its requirements?

Before the counterfeiter invaded our premises, our purchase orders (money) increased or diminished as our production fluctuated in volume and as our distribution speeded up or slowed down. Our money system being sound, our purchase orders were related quite accurately to the exchangeable goods and services and to the rate of their distribution among us. But now along comes a counterfeiter who has produced nothing and performed no service yet has purchase orders for which he can secure our goods and services.

COUNTERFEITER EPITOMIZES INFLATION

In the first place an injustice is done. This fellow who has earned nothing and made no contribution succeeds in sharing the fruits of our labor. We are penalized to the extent of his counterfeiting while he is benefited to the same extent. Purchase orders gradually come to be more abundant than available goods and services. We find ourselves with more and more money and with less and less goods and services. Supply decreases; demand increases; prices rise accordingly. If we leave counterfeiters among us long enough, they will own a substantial part of our homes, our farms, and our factories.

We are doing legally just what the counterfeiter does illegally. We are issuing purchase orders which have no sound relationship to the production and distribution of useful and exchangeable goods and services.

Actually, what we are doing, regardless of the wisdom of doing it, is more harmful and uneconomic in its effect than what the counterfeiter does. The counterfeiter only introduces into the economy purchase orders manufactured out of thin air. Nothing is lost to the rest of us by what he does, except the goods and services he receives for which nothing is given in return. The purchase orders the American people are now introducing into the economy arises from the fabrication of great quantities of our resources designed for destruction. Or, if they are not destroyed they will have little, if any, value as useful or exchangeable goods and services (wealth). These purchase orders, thus issued, have precisely the same claim on such useful items as food and clothing as do the purchase orders (money) received for producing food and clothing.

This money, as we shall some day discover, is not purchasing power as we have known it. Neither are comparable funds held by corporations and individuals.

The normal effect of inflation, that is, the normal effect of purchase orders increasing disproportionately to the production and distribution of exchangeable goods and services, is for prices to rise. If the purchase orders are in great abundance in relation to available goods and services moving in the channels of trade, the price rises will be sharp and pronounced. The franc had one-tenth its value following World War No. 1. The mark lost all its value.

These so-called surplus moneys are, for the most part, the creations of inflation. They would not exist had inflation not been practiced on a gigantic scale. The genesis of these moneys has provided the desert air which will bring about their own evaporation. For, in the post-war period, we shall find that prices for goods and services will rise so greatly that these "surpluses" soon will cease to exist. This will be true unless we take the ration and price-control route, in which case these moneys will, for the most part, be as useful as last year's gas coupons. We shall still have them in our portfolios, but they will be exchangeable only for those limited goods and services available to control boards for priority disposition.

There appear to be several attitudes and ways of thinking worthy of consideration:

Look the fiscal situation squarely in the eye. Remember that inflation is the "nursery of tyranny, corruption, and delusion" and that many men made prominent in easier times have, in all inflations, advised wrongly and led into ways of error the millions who listened. Plan only on identifiable facts.

Buy long-term War bonds—all you can. And insist that the Government permit War bond interest rates to seek a more natural level.

We must learn to say "No" quickly, loudly, and often to proposals for adding to the duties, and powers of the various local, State, and Federal agencies of government. In fact, we must go further and begin demanding the dismantling of the bureaucracy which has already been created.

Don't fall into the trap of blaming post-war personalities, confusions, and behaviors for the difficulty. Put the blame where it belongs, on the war and the inflation we thought we had to have to conduct it.

Look not to government but to thyself for America's strength.

St. Lawrence Seaway Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the able representative of the

Washington bureau of the Watertown Daily Times, Mr. George Daly, recently paid high tribute to my colleague, Congressman WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Duluth, Minn.

In the Daily Times for May 18, 1944, the following news item appeared and has some very interesting comment in connection with our colleague [Mr. PITTINGER].

The item reads:

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Congressman WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, to whom opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project are "infidels," has a primary fight on his hands back home in the Eighth Minnesota District that is of interest to northern New Yorkers.

Congressman PITTENGER is the seaway's champion in the House of Representatives today, having picked up the cudgels when Judge Francis D. Culkin, long-time seaway advocate and defender, died. The seaway bill introduced originally by Judge Culkin was introduced at the current session by Congressman PITTENGER and consequently his political fate is of major concern to northern New York.

Once the seaway is cleared through the Senate under the guidance of Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, sponser of the bill in the upper House, Congressman PITTENGER will become the leading figure in the fight in the lower House and around him will gather the forces attempting to make the big project one of the Nation's first post-war developments.

Pathfinder, a weekly publication devoted to the Washington scene, has this to say regarding Congressman PITTENGER and the seaway in its current issue:

"Representative WILLIAM PITTENGER, Republican of Minnesota, is running around the halls of Congress these days with a handful of colored maps sticking out of his pocket. They are not war maps but sketches of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. It's the Congressman's pet project and he's a happy man because of it. Says things are looking up and prospects for the seaway are brighter than ever before."

Congressman PITTENGER's advocacy of the seaway goes back to the days when he first entered politics as a member of the Minnesota House of Representatives in 1917. He has been in the thick of the fight for the project since.

Judge Culkin always conferred with Representative PITTENGER on matters pertaining to the seaway and for years the Minnesota Member was regarded as the second in command to Judge Culkin in the House on the seaway. Since Judge Culkin's death he has emerged as the strongest advocate of the measure in the lower House and today he is in constant contact with Senator AIKEN on the progress of their joint bill to make the project a reality.

The Republican primaries in Minnesota will be held on July 10. Representative PITTENGER is being opposed by two opponents, Mrs. Marjorie Johnson, active in Duluth women's clubs, and Warren Moore, a real estate operator.

Asked what the issues were in the primaries, Representative PITTENGER declared:

"Golly, I don't know. So far nothing has been said."

It is questionable if Representative PITTENGER will take any extended time away from Washington for campaigning. He remained here through the Easter recess because of the press of his legislative duties, and if he returns home to any campaigning it will only be for a week or so.

"My record here speaks for itself. The folks at home know where I stand on every issue and it is up to them to decide if they want me to continue in Washington," he declares.

Representative PITTENGER's defeat in either the primaries or the election would be near tragedy for proponents of the seaway as there is a very good chance that if the Republicans capture control of the House this fall and he returns he will become chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the committee of key importance in the fight for passage of the seaway bill in the lower House. Representative PITTENGER is now the third ranking Republican on the committee but the two members ahead of him are both believed slated for other committee chairmanships in the event of a Republican victory.

An easygoing, affable Member of Congress, Representative PITTENGER becomes caustic and sharp when dealing with opponents of his pet project on the floor or in the cloakroom.

Once recently he was interrupted on the floor while speaking on the seaway by an opponent of the measure.

"Will the gentleman yield for a question," asked the seaway opponent.

"Yes, for a question but not for a speech," replied Congressman PITTENGER sharply to head off an antiseaway speech.

Another time when the figures on the cost of the seaway were challenged, Representative PITTENGER jumped to his feet and declared:

"I do not like for anybody to challenge the integrity of the War Department engineers," thus putting the opposition in a position of contesting the good faith of the War Department itself.

The result of this type of tactics has been that few opponents of the seaway will get to their feet to challenge the seaway while he is in the House. They have learned that he has figures at his fingertips and can quote sources of such integrity that the opposition usually limps away from the battle licking its wounds.

"I want you all to get acquainted with the War Department engineers, because they are a great bunch of boys. They do not report favorably on a single project that is not in the interest of this country," he told opponents of the seaway in a recent debate on the question.

A graduate of Harvard Law School, Representative PITTENGER is regarded as one of the ablest parliamentarians in the House. Few men in the House are able to trap him by parliamentary rules or tricks, as many have found to their sorrow.

A veteran of 23 campaigns, Representative PITTENGER is not particularly worried about this year's primary contest. He has come through too many political battles to permit one more or less to upset him. He was first elected to Congress from the Eighth Minnesota District, with a population of 290,000, in 1928. He was reelected in 1930, but was swept out of office in the first Roosevelt landslide of 1932. He returned in 1934, but was turned out again in the second Roosevelt sweep of 1936. He came back in 1938 and has been steadily reelected since.

Keep an Eye on Mr. Fly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, May 21, 1944, comes an article as follows:

One of the most important men in Washington is James Lawrence Fly, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Fly is smart, tough, and he knows what he wants.

You can judge what he wants by what he does.

And what he does is to bully people who come within his reach.

Mr. Fly's latest bullying hasn't worked out altogether according to plan, however, and deserves a little thoughtful attention both for what it shows about him and about ways of dealing with him. To begin with, some background about Mr. Fly himself.

This gentleman came to the Federal Communications Commission from the Tennessee Valley Authority, where he had worked himself up to be general counsel.

Before joining T. V. A. he was just another obscure, small-size governmental lawyer, but with that outfit he had made himself a considerable reputation as a legal sharpshooter in the cause of the Government as against private power companies.

Now, on the other hand, consider the Federal Communications Commission. It was created in 1934 for the purpose of regulating radio, telephone, and telegraph "in the public interest, necessity, and convenience."

Noble-reading words, indeed, but, as you can easily see, wide and vague enough in meaning to accommodate just about any kind of interpretation.

The F. C. C., from its very first days, was a flop. It had enormous powers, but no idea how to use them.

Result: Chairman and members fell by the wayside in a steady stream. Congress complained and the people doing business with the F. C. C. were baffled. By 1939 the demand for a really able chairman was universal.

And through the influence of Thomas Gardiner Corcoran, the all-over-the-place handy man of the New Deal in his day, up to Washington came Mr. Fly, September 1, 1939.

On the whole people were glad to see him. He was young, as men of his rank go, vigorous, and positive. Radio and the telephone and telegraph business hoped he would knock the Commission into businesslike condition.

He did. But what kind of business?

Mr. Fly knows only one kind of business—the Government harassing the businessman. He knows that all too well.

So he began to put on pressure. He lectured the radio companies as to the kind of programs they should use. For instance, he hates "soap operas," the universally popular radio serial dramas that run night and day because the public likes them, and has told the radio industry to cut that kind of thing down if it hopes to hold its place in the "public interest, necessity, and convenience."

So, what with one thing and another, the House of Representatives finally decided Mr. Fly's administration of the F. C. C. needed investigation. It appointed a select committee to do the job.

Incredible as it may seem, Mr. Fly licked that committee to a standstill by sheer generalship. He is smart.

But he didn't lick its collection of testimony, not quite.

And that is where the business of beating Mr. Fly comes in. A publication called Reader's Digest sent a reporter down here to get the committee's evidence and Fly's rebuttal, put the two together, and see what would come out in the way of a balanced analysis of Fly's career.

The Reader's Digest story hasn't yet been printed in Reader's Digest, but last week it got considerable publicity.

For it was disclosed before the House committee aforementioned that Fly has been nailed in an attempt to kill the story.

You may have read about all that, but, in brief, it was disclosed by the Digest reporter that she got one set of facts from the committee files, tried to check them with Fly, and that he refused to see her.

Then, having refused the reporter that chance to present him with the charges, he threatened dire consequences to Reader's Digest if it should print the story he himself admits he had never read.

That, friends, is bullying in high fashion.

The way to combat it is to keep pulling Mr. Fly out into the open and onto the record. Let his actions speak for themselves.

But don't go to sleep at the job. Keep your eye on Mr. Fly. He believes in governmental control of radio—which means, when it goes through to its final stages, the end of free speech in America.

Tribute to Hon. John H. Overton, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for yielding to me for unanimous request to extend my remarks in regard to the appeals being made to our senior United States Senator, the Honorable JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana, to reconsider his announcement that he would not be a candidate to succeed himself. Mr. Speaker, while in Louisiana I issued a statement on March 20, 1944, calling to the attention of the people of my State what an important matter this was to our beloved State as well as to the entire United States, and outlined to them the great work that Senator OVERTON had done for Louisiana, not only in flood-control matters, not only by bringing many important war industries to our State, not only to the establishment of naval and Army installations in Louisiana, but to the many other important services which Senator OVERTON performed for the State and its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that Senator OVERTON was one of the most influential and powerful Members of the Senate due to his seniority and long experience, that due to his ability, independence, loyalty, and consideration for his colleagues, that he was one of the most esteemed and respected Members of the Senate of the United States. That due to that fact it would take many years for a successor to attain this position, and to be of the value to our State and the Nation as that enjoyed by Senator OVERTON, and that due to the great knowledge of Senator OVERTON with respect to national and world affairs that in these crucial times his withdrawal from the Senate would be a great loss to our Nation, as well as to the State of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that I understand that for the first time in many years, the people of Louisiana are casting aside political factionalism and are requesting Senator OVERTON to reconsider his intention of not becoming a candidate for the Senate, and in addition to the thousands of personal solicitations and pledges of support by letter, many of the most prominent and influential newspapers of the State of Louisiana have published editorials paying tribute to the service of Senator OVERTON and calling upon him to reconsider and file for nomination in the forthcoming primary.

Mr. Speaker, one of the finest tributes, and one of the most unusual, paid to a colleague by the Members of the United States Senate was the petition signed by all of the Democratic Members of the Senate in Washington when the same was circulated by Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, calling upon Senator OVERTON as a patriotic duty to remain at the helm, and with your permission I wish to include an article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, dated May 18, which includes the petition of the Senators, the reply of Senator OVERTON, and a statement by Senators ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, to wit:

MAKE RACE AGAIN, OVERTON URGED—PLEA MADE IN PETITION BY 46 SENATORS

(By Paul Wooton)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—A petition urging Senator JOHN H. OVERTON to reconsider his decision not to run again for the Senate has been signed by 46 Democratic Members of the Senate.

Senator OVERTON, in expressing his gratitude for the action taken, says the suggestion will receive his thoughtful consideration.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER states that in his opinion Senator OVERTON will not be willing to fight to retain his seat. He says Senator OVERTON made known to him 2 years ago that he was contemplating retiring at the end of this term. He thinks the only way Louisiana will continue to have the benefit of Senator OVERTON'S seniority and experience is for the political factions to get together and agree to support him. He suggests that this is the best way for Gov. James Houston Davis to implement his often reiterated preelection statement that Louisiana should have political peace. He calls attention to the fact that his chairmanship of two Senate subcommittees, which are of great importance to Louisiana, should be taken into consideration and that everything should be done in Louisiana to induce him to reconsider his decision.

Senator ELLENDER'S reference is to the Naval Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce which handles flood-control and river and harbor developments.

GIVEN CREDIT

"Senator OVERTON must be given credit," Senator ELLENDER adds, "for the fact that so much of Louisiana is safe from flood at a time when so many are suffering heavy losses on streams which have not been so well harnessed as the Mississippi River."

The petition is in the form of a letter written Senator OVERTON by Senator ELLENDER. The text of that letter reads:

"We, your colleagues in the Senate, are very much concerned over the decision you made some time ago not to offer as a candidate for reelection in the Louisiana primaries next September. We hope that you will reconsider your action and remain in the Senate.

"Because of your long experience in the Senate and your intimate knowledge of our Nation's affairs during this the most perilous period in her history, it is your patriotic duty to remain at the helm. We urge you to run, and we feel that the people of Louisiana will rally to your support because we believe they feel, as we do, that your services to our country are invaluable."

The letter then was signed also by Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, who circulated it among the Democratic Members of the Senate.

There are 57 Democratic Members of the Senate; that is, 56 in addition to Senator OVERTON, Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, did not sign because he is crusading for legislation which would limit all senatorial terms to 6 years. Senators CARTER GLASS, of Virginia; HOMER T. BONE, of Washington; and JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, of Nevada, are absent from the Senate because of illness. Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS, of Florida; ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma; D. WORTH CLARK, of Idaho; MON C. WALLGREN, of Washington; JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana; and HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, are absent from Washington.

Senator ELLENDER states that the idea of the petition originated with Senator MCKELLAR.

M'KELLAR'S VIEW

Senator MCKELLAR, in a statement today, said:

"I was one of the first to urge Senator OVERTON to reconsider his determination not to run for the Senate again. Senator OVERTON and I serve on the Appropriations Committee together, and he is the head of the subcommittee on naval affairs. We have seen eye to eye together on building up a great navy, and we still see eye to eye together in the matter of holding that navy intact after the war is over. I think it would be a great loss to our committee and to the best interests of the Navy for Senator OVERTON to withdraw from the Senate now. Without knowing, I should think the people of Louisiana would be tremendously interested in the Navy too.

"In addition, Senator OVERTON and I see similarly about the Mississippi River and flood control, and he is chairman of another subcommittee on flood control. I certainly hope he will change his mind and run for the office."

The full text of Senator OVERTON'S acknowledgment, addressed to Senator MCKELLAR, follows:

"It is with a sense of gratitude and pride, unequalled in any other happening of my public life, that I have read the letter written to me by you and other Democratic colleagues in the Senate, conveying to me your regret that I have decided not to offer for reelection and expressing the hope that I shall, upon further reflection, conclude to present my candidacy to the electorate of Louisiana.

"Permit me to say that I prize this evidence of your esteem for and confidence in me above any tribute that has been, or could possibly be, paid to me by my colleagues, and very earnestly and sincerely do I express to you the great admiration and warm affection I entertain for you and my other fellow Senators.

"This unsolicited and generous joint action by you and other Democratic colleagues is, I am informed, without precedent in the Senate, and your suggestion unquestionably merits and will receive my thoughtful consideration."

Those whose names were signed to the petition are:

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana; KENNETH MCKELLAR, Tennessee; TOM CONNALLY, Texas; LISTER HILL, Alabama; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, California; JAMES M. MEAD, New York; JOSIAH W. BAILEY, North Carolina; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado; DAVID I. WALSH, Massachusetts; ELMER D. THOMAS, Utah; J. H. BANKHEAD, Alabama; TOM STEWART, Tennessee; A. B. CHANDLER, Kentucky; DENNIS CHAVEZ, New Mexico; RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; BURNET R.

MAYBANK, South Carolina; ABE MURDOCK, Utah; ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky; WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, Missouri; PAT MCCARRAN, Arizona; CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida; JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, Pennsylvania; GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Maryland; E. D. SMITH, South Carolina; MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming; THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island; HATTIE W. CARAWAY, Arkansas; BURTON K. WHEELER, Montana; ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Michigan; ARTHUR WALSH, New Jersey; H. M. KILGORE, West Virginia; SAMUEL D. JACKSON, Indiana; HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia; CARL HAYDEN, New Mexico; ROBERT F. WAGNER, New York; CARL A. HATCH, New Mexico; G. M. GILLETTE, Iowa; PETER GERRY, Rhode Island; JAMES M. TUNNELL, Delaware; THEO G. BILBO, Mississippi; FRANCIS MALONEY, Connecticut; SCOTT W. LUCAS, Illinois; and JAMES D. EASTLAND, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask further permission to include an excerpt from a front-page editorial from the Shreveport Times, of Shreveport, La., entitled "Let's Forget Factions and Think of Louisiana," wherein the editor says in part: "We, therefore, unhesitatingly cast aside all past political affiliations to request fellow Louisianians to join with us in urging Senator OVERTON to reconsider his announcement not to seek reelection." I would like to quote further from the editorial mentioned above, as follows:

LET'S FORGET FACTIONS AND THINK OF LOUISIANA

The magnificent tribute paid to Senator OVERTON by nearly 50 Democrats in the United States Senate in signing a personal appeal to him to reconsider his decision not to be a candidate for reelection probably is unprecedented in American history. Certainly no Louisianian ever before has been accorded such unsolicited and unanimous recognition, for services to his State and his Nation, by so large and so important a group of public officials.

That appeal must not be permitted to go unheeded in Louisiana, either among the people or among politicians.

It is not merely an appeal from fellow Senators to Senator OVERTON.

It is a wartime, patriotic appeal from the entire Democratic Party in the United States Senate to the people of Louisiana not to deprive their Federal Government of the wartime and post-war services of a man whose proven capabilities are looked upon by those Senators as essential to their part in conduct of the war and establishment of the peace.

It is an appeal that comes from Senators who are the elected representatives of Democrats in 35 of the Nation's 48 States—from all of the States having Democratic representation.

It is not an effort to interfere in Louisiana politics, but an earnest appeal that Louisiana politics should not be permitted to interfere in any way with the proven competency of the State's wartime representation, in the person of Senator OVERTON, in one of the Nation's highest governmental branches.

Against this background, what political aspirants now can offer themselves, regardless of past political factionalism, as opponents to Senator OVERTON and still contend that their only ambition is to serve their State and their Nation? When placed beside the studied evaluation of Senator OVERTON by the entire Democratic membership of the United States Senate, any such contentions by opponents of the Senator wither and vanish in a fog of plain political hypocrisy.

Senator OVERTON'S services in the Senate are essential to Louisiana at this time. He is chairman of the commerce subcommittee on flood control. Under it comes legislation vital to every square foot of Louisiana soil from the north Louisiana area of proposed lateral Red River canals to the intracoastal canals down on the Gulf; from the Boeuf Basin areas in east Louisiana to the Sabine sections in the west.

No matter how capable any successor to Senator OVERTON might be, he still would be a Senate rookie, requiring years to gain the committee seniority that Senator OVERTON now has. Those who thoughtlessly have cried for Senator OVERTON'S scalp had better start thinking of some of these things—had better start thinking of Louisiana.

Senator OVERTON naturally has agreed to give careful thought to the appeal from the Democratic Party in the Senate. If a similar appeal goes to him, dispassionately and without thought of political factionalism, from the people and the political leaders of Louisiana, he undoubtedly will cast aside his personal desires for the quiet of retirement and agree to reelection.

We believe that Louisiana should give Senator OVERTON quick and wholehearted assurance that no political leader in this State will place his own ambitions above his State's welfare and his Nation's needs, as stated in the appeal of nearly 50 Democratic Senators.

We believe that Senator OVERTON should be assured at once that if there is any opposition to his reelection it will not be from organized political machines or factions, but that it will be no more than the usual opposition of petty publicity seekers who make a practice of running in every race for every office.

We believe that such a course is the true course of political loyalty and patriotism to State and Nation in such times as these.

As for our own position, we reiterate the statement published on this page on March 18, signed by the editor and publisher of the Times, which closed with these words:

"Like all of us, Senator OVERTON is human and has perhaps made mistakes, but he has been a good Senator, and such a record should be continued, not ended. * * * We therefore unhesitatingly cast aside all past political affiliations to request fellow Louisianians to join with us in urging Senator OVERTON to reconsider his announcement not to seek reelection."

We urge that all with the wartime welfare of Louisiana at heart join in this appeal to Senator OVERTON. We urge—even more—that they appeal to their own political factions and factional leaders here in Louisiana to follow the same course.

Mr. Speaker, I further beg leave to include in my remarks an article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 19, 1944, in regarde to Senator OVERTON reconsidering his decision to retire from the Senate and indicates the interests of Washington in his behalf.

Mr. Speaker, this further shows the interest in Senator OVERTON'S decision and the article states that "Senator OVERTON, Democrat, of Louisiana," is recognized as "one of the District's stanchest friends in Congress." The article follows:

OVERTON STUDIES COLLEAGUES' PLEA, MAY REMAIN IN SENATE

Senator OVERTON, Democrat, of Louisiana, one of the District's stanchest friends in Congress, hinted yesterday that he may reconsider his decision to retire from the Senate at the end of his present term on January 3.

OVERTON intimated that he might change his mind and enter the Louisiana primaries next September after 46 of his Democratic colleagues joined in an unprecedented appeal to him to remain in the Senate.

Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, who circulated the joint letter to OVERTON, said it was signed by every Democratic Senator who was in Washington on May 13, the day on which it was written.

"Because of your long experience in the Senate and your intimate knowledge of our Nation's affairs during this perilous period in her history, it is your patriotic duty to remain at the helm," the letter stated.

In expressing his gratitude for the expression of esteem and confidence by his fellow Democrats, OVERTON stated in a letter to MCKELLAR:

"This unsolicited and generous joint action by you and other Democratic colleagues is, I am informed, without precedent in the Senate, and your suggestion unquestionably merits and will receive my thoughtful consideration."

A Mail Carrier Resigns as Protest Against Hounding by Investigators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a talented and able young mail carrier in the city of Renton, in my congressional district, in the State of Washington, was recently the victim of a series of investigations in which it was charged he was subversive and a "red." This mail carrier resented very much the fact that Government officials impugned his patriotism. He has expressed indignation in his letter of resignation which I am appending herein below. This letter reveals a condition which should be corrected.

I have repeatedly complained against the unjust treatment accorded liberals in the Federal service. Apparently in the minds of some reactionaries, it is criminal offense for a Federal employee to entertain a liberal viewpoint. Tories apparently regard anyone who is not a conservative Republican as disloyal, dangerous, subversive, yet we are told we are fighting this war for the "four freedoms," one of which is free speech. Why do not these investigators manifest some interest in pro-Fascist activities on the part of Federal personnel? It has reached the point where a Federal employee feels he should never say a word in commendation of the courage, military prowess and grim determination of our Soviet allies, yet the U. S. S. R., the most powerful of our allies, is contributing mightily to the defeat of the Axis. On the other hand, a certain Connecticut industrialist, who was exposed as carrying on a correspondence with a Nazi agent—seeking advice from him, was befriended by the reactionary press of America and those who had the temerity to expose her were reviled, insulted, and libeled in the American press. These conservatives were not alarmed that an industrialist who was manufacturing secret equipment for the Army and Navy, who refused to pay her own income tax and advised fellow industrialists to do

likewise, was in close association with an agent of the Nazi government. In fact many newspapers showed great solicitude for this Nazi and referred to him only as a "German businessman," though he has been blacklisted by many of our Allied Governments. The privacy of the correspondence of this lady was what was concerning these conservatives. Here we have an amazing contrast—liberal Americans being insulted while those in close association with Nazis are defended.

But let the letter from the mail carrier speak for itself. Here it is:

RENTON, WASH., *April 30, 1944.*

Mr. JOHN LOTTO,
Postmaster, Renton, Wash.

DEAR MR. LOTTO: As you know, I have been working in the Renton post office for something over a year. I think you will certify that I have given good, conscientious service. Since I am too old to serve in the armed forces in this war, as I did in the last, I have been proud to work here for Uncle Sam. Furthermore, I have enjoyed working under your supervision and with the fine corps of assistants you have in this office. I join with them in their admiration of you, in their appreciation of your fairness and intellectual honesty, as well as your aim at efficiency without officiousness. I say it has been a pleasure to work with these fine people under you. Therefore, I regretfully feel forced to write this letter.

I am a thorough American. My ancestors have all lived in this country since about the time of the Revolution. We were brought up in full admiration of those valiant men under General Washington who left their bloody footprints on the frozen roads of New Jersey and in the snows of Valley Forge. With admiration also for Thomas Paine, Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson, all my life I have been a student of the basic meanings of democracy, and have been passionately partisan to the intendments of the preamble to our Constitution. I believe that it heralds the true philosophy of our Government—a philosophy devoutly to be cherished and preserved. I believe that the Bill of Rights was calculated largely to give all Americans who love fundamental democracy a chance and a right to preach and practice that philosophy.

To me, a poor man, one of the dearest intendments is the promotion of the general welfare of all citizens. This I believe is the basic plank of every philosophy of true democracy as well as the basic aim of our Government. Consequently I have always been receptive to any idea or suggestion, no matter whence the source, which might further that end. I have never been afraid of an idea, no matter however much it jarred my previous prejudices or preconceived notions. I have therefore tried ever to avoid being blinded overmuch by prejudice or made stupid by old-fogyism. Openmindedness is the only true attitude when investigating opinions of others.

In this frame of mind I have read many books, among them The Federalist; the lives of many Presidents, including Lincoln and William McKinley; the works of Paine, Jefferson, Marx, Parrington, Rousseau, Laski, Stuart Chase, James Truslow Adams, Charles Beard; and I have gone to public meetings to listen to William Howard Taft, Eugene V. Debs, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, Charles E. Hughes, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and even Earl Browder when he came to Seattle. So far as I know, all these speakers had a legal and constitutional right to expound their various theories of government. In other words, I have read the same books and heard the same speeches and lectures that millions of other American citizens have read and heard.

Nevertheless, with that diversified background I made the mistake of taking a job under the Post Office Department of this great Nation. Although my small pay of about $100 a month as mail carrier on the streets of this small city is barely enough these days on which to live and I have to attend strictly and solely to the wearying duties of my small job; though I am a veteran who saw service in France and am somewhat broken in health; though I keep my mouth shut and attend to my own business, I have recently been singled out by the F. B. I. and post-office inspectors as a dangerous man. I have been required to answer a thousand questions about what I have done in the past, what I have read, whom I have listened to, where I have gone, who my relatives are, what persons I associate with, and so forth. I have undergone this third degree not once but several times. I have been required even to go to Seattle to be further quizzed and subjected to trick questions. No; not because I have committed any such simple crime as theft, robbery, or murder, but solely because I am suspected by somebody—I don't know whom—of being a Communist.

I am not a Communist. I have never been. Nor have I ever attended a single Communist meeting except to go and listen to a public speech of Earl Browder, if such can be called a Communist meeting. It is true, of course, that I have read some of the literature they have distributed from house to house or sent through the mails, just as I have read the stuff of Gerald K. Smith sent through the mails. This, I presume, makes a synthetic culprit of me. And I now realize that attending that single public meeting of Earl Browder's was a most heinous crime in the eyes of the civil service hierarchy in the Post Office Department in Washington. Oh, yes; one other heinous crime is that I have a sister who is alleged to have attended a Communist Party meeting.

In other words, in recent weeks I have been hounded for the same reasons and in pretty much the same manner as Germans who were suspected of having Jewish blood. The only difference is that this to which I have been subjected is aimed at Communists (though really in fact at lovers of democracy) not at Jews. Only the brutal beatings were lacking to distinguish it from that of the Nazis; only the rack and the screw were lacking to distinguish it from those of the Middle Ages.

I know, Mr. Lotto, that you have not been a party to this in any manner whatsoever. You are too noble an American to resort to such unwarranted practices. But I realize nevertheless that you are necessarily governed by the system under which you hold office. If you tried to be just to me, you would call down upon your own head all the sinister influences which caused these polite gentlemen of the F. B. I. and postal inspection to be parties to these obvious Gestapo methods. They and you are probably as ignorant of the source of this secret and truly subversive un-Americanism as I am.

Who are my accusers? I have never been given their names. I have not had the lawful right to have them face me, nor a chance to cross-examine them. I am as much in the dark as you are as to their character, their standing, their motives, their prejudices. All I know is that I was accused by somebody either of being or having been a member of the Communist Party or had attended its meetings or, at least, that I have relatives who are accused of it. I have had no chance to be heard in any court, to have counsel, to be faced by my accusers. It is all underground, but I realize that if I do not resign the chances are that orders will come to you from Washington requiring you to discharge me. God forbid that I should, by my own selfishness, bring down upon your head the evil frowns of the type of Prussianistic mind behind all this, yet, if I were to be concerned only by my personal inclinations, I would fight this thing to the bitter end.

I have written this letter of resignation at length because I know that hundreds of other devout Americans who believe in genuine democracy as I do instead of corporate feudalism, who believe in free enterprise for the lowly individual and not for the rich corporations, who are opposed to exploitation and oppression of every form, are probably being subjected to this same infamous treatment; and if I and they take it, without remonstrance, soon thousands will be similarly hounded, harassed, and victimized until the only logical ruler of this country will be some man of the breed of Lawrence Dennis or Gerald K. Smith.

Appreciating your many kindnesses to me while in your service, I hereby tender my resignation.

Sincerely yours,

L. PERRY WOOD.

Playing Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, through the press and sometimes in letters we are admonished to stop playing politics. Almost invariably those who give that advice advocate political policies of their own, thus demonstrating once again that many oppose the very thing they do themselves.

The President, a candidate for a fourth term, has frequently appealed to all to forget political issues, but he has taken a part in political campaigns. He sought to purge members of his own party; he took an active part in the New York election for Governor.

Just last week Chester Bowles, head of the O. P. A., found it necessary to order some 258,000 O. P. A. employees to keep hands off the forthcoming national election or face instant dismissal. He said, "We have been very tough on the question of politics, and we can be a hell of a lot tougher. We have had to dismiss some of our people for engaging in controversial political activities. We probably will have to let more go." But Bowles is the exception and no doubt other administrative agencies will continue to use their power for a fourth term.

Perhaps all that should be expected from those who seek to establish a dictator dynasty, but there is no reason why we who believe in a constitutional government should not protest, criticize, and attempt to defeat that effort.

DISTRACTED

Aside from political issues directly connected with the fourth term, altogether too many other issues are distracting our attention from the main, the vital, issue—which is the winning of the war—as speedily as possible and that with the least possible loss of life.

Almost every mail brings to my desk requests and demands that I devote my

efforts to some objective which, however desirable, does not directly contribute toward the winning of the war.

For example, there are powerful lobbies here demanding now anti-poll-tax legislation, post-war planning, establishment of a United States of the world, equal rights for women, national prohibition, enactment of the Townsend plan, increased compensation for certain classes of civilian employees, enactment and enforcement of fair employment and practices legislation, the adopting of technocracy, and a dozen or more other plans or theories.

Why at this time, when every single day brings us a long list of those who have died, of those who are missing, or are prisoners in the hands of the enemies, argue controversial issues which may well wait until the war has been won? Why quarrel among ourselves over things which, however good or desirable, can well wait the decision on the issue which is all important to every individual in this land, as well as to us as a nation?

Labor and management have performed a miracle in war production, but war production has been hindered and hampered by unjustifiable strikes. For example, a union at Muskegon, protesting, of all things, the high rate of production of a union member, went on strike because the company would not discharge him.

Three C. I. O. union stewards at Detroit were discharged because they threw out of the plant an A. F. of L. driver of a truck delivering soft drinks. Because of the discharge, 3,000 workers who would have produced war materials went on strike.

In Detroit 64,000 war workers went out on strike, and Under Secretary of War Patterson and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal said that on the "eve of our greatest battle" the lives of American soldiers and sailors were being endangered by that strike.

Cannot the question of whether the man who delivers soft drinks to the workers join the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O., of whether a war worker produces too much, wait until the war is over? Must the pilots in the air over Germany lack planes for reinforcement just because someone in Detroit gets angry?

It is my judgment that our whole attention, our every thought, and our every act should be given to the defeat of our enemies, and that there will be ample time when that task has been accomplished to settle these other issues.

Bus Problem for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Orrin C. Evans from the Philadelphia Record:

HOW ONE GENERAL SOLVED BUS PROBLEM FOR NEGROES BY DEAL WITH COMPANY

(By Orrin C. Evans)

The bus drivers around Petersburg, Va., didn't like Negroes any more than those in any other part of the South.

They refused to pick them up, threatened them for not saying, "Sir," and otherwise made life miserable.

The 6,000 Negroes at Camp Lee, some 3 miles from the town, had as tough a time getting to and from Petersburg as did those in Maxwell Field, who still stand hopelessly on street corners while busses pass them up.

Now, things are different. Any Negro soldier who is in town can always get a bus back—with no Jim Crowism and no more than ordinary delay, such as happens on busses everywhere.

SOUTHERNER RESPONSIBLE

The "revolution" was accomplished by white-haired Brig. Gen. George Horkan, a West Pointer, a Georgian and a man whose name will be treasured in the hearts of many northern Negroes all their lives.

On my 3,400-mile tour of seven southern States, I spent a full day in Petersburg, talking to Negro civilians and soldiers. I found morale unusually high, and virtually no evidence of race friction.

It was one of the first camp towns I visited, and—in view of the stories I had heard from soldiers and their relatives in Philadelphia—I was amazed at the friendly atmosphere.

I called the public relations officer at the camp. He suggested I come out to see him. Within 5 minutes of my arrival, I was talking with General Horkan himself.

"I want you to be my guest at the camp for a day or two," said this Georgia officer. "You can have my car and driver; go anywhere you want and see anything you want."

It didn't take me long to find out that Negro soldiers at Camp Lee were high in morale, proud and snappy. And I learned the reasons.

GENERAL TOOK ACTION

A major one was this:

General Horkan, within a few days after he took command, learned about the intolerable bus service—that Negro soldiers were jammed into inadequate Jim Crow seats, or passed up altogether and forced to walk to and from camp. There had been a few minor fracases on busses, the general told me—the kind of thing that leads to deep resentment, if not to race riots.

"I knew something had to be done," the general said. "Also, I knew I couldn't do anything about the State (Jim Crow) law."

So, he simply made an agreement with the Petersburg-Camp Lee bus company under which an adequate number of vehicles were operated between town and camp exclusively for soldiers. He established a depot in the Petersburg business section, equally convenient for white and Negro soldiers.

There is no segregation on the busses. The rule is first come, first served—and there has been no trouble.

NO COMPLAINT ON FOOD

General Horkan simply will not have race friction in his camp, although he follows the general rule of dividing the post into white and Negro areas.

Incidentally, I didn't hear one complaint about the food given Negro soldiers at Camp Lee. I mentioned it to a mess sergeant.

"You're damned right, we have good food," he said. "The general's apt to walk in and inspect the kitchen any minute."

This general, in fact, seems to have a way of getting things done right by direct action.

DICIPLINES FIVE WHITES

One day his car stopped for a light on a Petersburg street. Five white noncoms were shouting insults to two Negro soldiers.

General Horkan called the white men to his car, took their names. Back at camp he gave them their choice: Court martial or discipline by him. They chose the latter. He handed them a knife, and, one after another, they stripped off their own chervons.

Within 24 hours, every soldier in camp had heard what happened. The pace was set.

It didn't take any act of Congress, or War Department order let alone a miraculous elimination of southern race prejudice to accomplish what General Horkan did. He simply exercised his leadership.

As he said to me: "You can only exercise leadership when you're right inside. Whenever you find a camp or camp area where there's constant racial friction, you know the man at the top isn't right."

In the entire South, I found only one other camp area where any direct, intelligent effort was made to solve the intolerable bus problem.

That was at Hattiesburg, Miss., in whose Camp Shelby there are some 9,000 Negro soldiers, including many from the North.

SPECIAL SERVICE ARRANGED

Hattiesburg was the scene of some dangerous clashes between Negro soldiers and bus drivers in some of which white soldiers from the North sided with Negroes.

Maj. Gen. George M. Halloran, a Mississipian, has arranged for special busses for Negro soldiers. The Tri-State Bus Co. operates special trailer-type vehicles from a depot in the Negro area.

That keeps the undesirable Jim Crow aspect of travel, but it does provide transportation.

Moreover, the Army has set up a Negro M. P. station in the town—the only real Negro M. P. outfit I saw on my travels. The Negro M. P.'s carry arms, halt white soldiers attempting to enter the Negro section, and otherwise have full authority. I personally saw one stop and search a white man.

NATIVES RESENT "YANKEES"

It will be noted that the commanders of these two camps which I regard as the best, from a racial standpoint, of any I visited are Southerners.

I made some inquiries as to the reasons for their success. One answer was that the civilians of the towns "take more" from a Southerner than from a "Yankee." He can make them treat Negroes decently without arousing animosity. I throw that in for what it's worth. I do know that in one camp a New Englander aroused deep resentment by removing large "off limits" signs which kept Negroes out of certain areas. His Southern successor refused to put them back and the population took it with a shrug.

In Hattiesburg, one finds, incidentally, a strange potpourri of the old and the new, of blind prejudice and intelligent effort at racial cooperation. Perhaps what I saw and experienced there is a sort of microcosm of the South as it is today.

The Negro M. P.'s weren't forced on the town. They are there partly at the insistence of Dr. B. D. Blackwelder, the city health officer, who happens to be a native of Georgia. There is an excellent U. S. O. for Negroes.

Prominently displayed in business establishments in the Negro area are signs reading: "Approved for military patronage. Inspected by the United States Army."

CAB DRIVEN BY WHITE

I saw no such signs in Negro sections anywhere else. Also, it was only in Hattiesburg that I was permitted to ride in a cab driven by a white person—and, it happened, the driver was a woman. I understand white cabs will take Negroes in some other areas, but I saw none.

In Hattiesburg I found enlightened white men like Frank Tatum, operator of a saw mill and veteran of World War No. 1, who is credited by Negroes throughout the community with a major share in bringing about racial tolerance.

But in a tour of the city I found only seven Negro homes which could be classed as better than slum dwellings.

And, I learned, a lieutenant—a white man—recently was beaten by a mob of rural hoodlums, for no other reason than that he was a Yankee. He was attacked as he stood on the station platform waiting for his mother.

CONDITIONS INTOLERABLE

In every camp community I visited except Hattiesburg and Petersburg I found the bus conditions intolerable. My tour included Camp Claiborne, Alexandria, La.; Camp McCain, Grenada, Miss.; Fort McClellan, Anniston, Ala.; Fort Benning, Columbus, Ga.; Craig Field, Selma, Ala.; Camp Sibert, Gadsden, Ala.; Camp Wallace, Houston, Tex.; Maxwell Field, Montgomery, Ala.

At Anniston a Negro staff sergeant from Jersey City told me: "I don't come into town much, because I'll be damned if I can bring myself to say, 'Yes, sir,' and 'No, sir,' to those ignorant bus drivers. And I don't want to get my head whipped by one of them. So I walk."

At Houston I found Negro soldiers, civilians, police, and bus drivers at daggers' point. Negroes are virtually banned from busses.

An extraordinary, almost incredible, practice prevails at Camp Wallace. Army trucks take soldiers, white and Negro, into Houston on a Jim Crow basis. The trucks for white soldiers also provide return transportation. The Negroes are left to get home the best or worst way they can, which is usually on foot or piled up in expensive taxicabs.

As I stood on Milan Street watching a group of Negro soldiers three busses passed them by.

THREATENED BY DRIVER

As the fourth approached, the soldiers fanned out in front of it.

The driver, club in hand, opened the door.

"I've got a club and I'm goin' to whup some —— —— nigger's haid," he said.

"Please, mister," said one of the soldiers, "don't go crazy and lose your head."

They piled on then as the driver decided to give in.

Those particular men got a ride that particular time, but none of them is going to be writing a cheerful letter home—or is likely to feel any too enthusiastic about being a good soldier.

They are more likely to share the feelings of a young Negro soldier who said to me at Camp Pickett, near Blackstone, Va.:

"Being in this man's army has given me a dying complex. I feel that if I go on to the other side I'm going to die anyhow, and since I have this stuff on (his uniform) I'd just as soon die here and take a couple of these 'pecks' with me, where it might do some good."

Certainly, a simple solution of the bus problem—which, as General Horkan proved, isn't a real problem at all—would do more than any one thing to help make life more tolerable for Negro soldiers in the South.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly be called upon to vote on an appropriation providing funds for the continuation of the school-lunch program. In order that I might obtain information as to the acceptance of this program in the district which I have the honor to represent, letters were addressed to various school authorities in my district requesting information as to what extent the school districts are participating in the program and as to the attitude of school administrators in reference to the same. This inquiry provoked a variety of answers. I desire to quote from the letters received:

1. From my observation I can say: (a) Cities and villages do none, except in one high school where lunch is served for a charge. (b) Rural schools vary—20 percent prepare a hot lunch; 50 percent follow the "pint can" method; 30 percent do little or nothing.

2. The grade principal informs me that the consumption of milk has, in fact, not materially increased since the introduction of the 1-cent milk program.

3. We have tried several times to get the school-lunch program going effectively in the county. Originally it was intended to be set up with W. P. A. labor preparing meals. Our rural areas never had much W. P. A. labor and our relief department couldn't furnish any. About 60 percent of our schools received surplus commodities 3 or 4 years ago and used these for lunches in schools. Now, I would say less than 10 percent have lunches under a meal subsidy plan. The so-called penny milk subsidy program is going in three of our city schools with desultory results. The plan sounds appealing from the health standpoint, but I think, and I know the other schoolmen in the county are less than lukewarm to the plan at present.

4. I am sorry to say that the schools of our city are not participating in the school-lunch program. I feel the program is a good thing if facilities for carrying it on are present.

5. We have been able, with the help of Federal subsidies, to serve from 140 to 170 rural boys and girls who are attending our high school with a hot lunch consisting of a vegetable, meat or a meat substitute, bread and butter, a dessert, and milk, for 15 cents. If we had to finance this lunch ourselves, we would have to charge at least 35 cents to make ends meet. About 90 percent of our rural children participate in this hot-lunch program, and I feel that it has been an excellent thing. I am very much in favor of the continuance of this program.

6. We have conducted these programs just as before when Government aid was not available, but now receive $300 to $400 per month from the Government as a subsidy. This covers more than the usual increase due to increased labor and food costs. We do not use Government subsidized food in any of the six school domestic science rooms. As far as the need of Government aid goes for our city, we could get along just as well without it. We realize that other cities have their baskets out to catch whatever may drop from heaven, so our basket is out, too.

7. I wish to state that a program promoting better nutrition for school children is both desirable and needed. The county nurse, supervising teacher, and I should like to go on record as favoring the continuance of the school-lunch program. However, for best results as a school activity, we feel that its administration should be through each State department of public instruction rather than through an agency apart from the schools, as I believe it has been in the past. Our latest records show that 59 of the 84 schools in the county have, in varying degrees, promoted participation in hot-lunch programs.

8. The public grade schools of our city are using for the second year the Government penny-milk program. In this project pupils pay a penny a day toward the cost of a half pint bottle of milk. The balance of the cost is distributed between the board of education and the Government. This project is worth while, especially in those cities in which the board of education could not carry the whole load. In the high school we took part in the surplus commodities program as long as that program continued, and felt in general it enabled us to help feed some children who would otherwise not get a good lunch. My reaction in general is that the idea of helping school systems to give suitable lunches to pupils is fundamentally sound. My criticism of the program as now conducted is that the set-up is too complicated, involves too much red tape, and is too narrowly applied.

9. I wish to advise you that we feel the school-lunch program is worthy of continuance.

10. We have had a milk program at our school this year which has been quite successful. About 200 children are participating in the program. We do not offer any other lunch program. We have tried to do that but the children of our community have not been interested in it and it seems that parents do not particularly like to have a hot lunch. We are anxious, however, to sponsor such a program.

11. We have sponsored the school-milk program, but have not served lunches. There have been no problems involved, and we consider the distribution of milk successful and quite favorable.

12. Personally, I do not favor the program as it has been operated in the past. I believe, too, that this opinion would be shared by the majority of parents, teachers, and children of our county. The schools under my jurisdiction are all rural or small village situations. There are already three or four local organizations that are working in the interests of proper nutrition and school lunches. These organizations are: My own office, the home demonstration agent, and the county nurse's office. Besides these, there are local organizations such as P. T. A. that sponsor lunch programs. Few of our schools have facilities for preparing lunches according to the Federal program of the past. One-room schools need kitchens and utensils to carry on the program. These are unobtainable at present. We feel that this is a local problem. We also believe that our boys and girls are well fed and healthy.

13. We have used the Federal school-lunch program for several years and find it highly satisfactory. We serve about 150 pupils each noon and the parents are very happy about the arrangement.

14. The public schools in our city participated in a school-lunch program for a year or two during the depths of the depression. As soon as the employment situation improved, we no longer took advantage of this Federal program. Frankly, I cannot see why the Federal Government should underwrite a program of this kind during good or even normal times. When there was a large surplus of foodstuffs and fathers were out of work and unable to buy the proper foods, I believe that we were justified in receiving this Federal aid in the form of a school-lunch program. I cannot justify the program at any other time.

15. May I say that throughout the elementary grades our schools have participated about 90 percent in the school-lunch program. In the junior and senior high schools the participation has been about 33⅓ percent, consisting primarily of those from rural areas and those in town living a considerable distance from school. I am quite positive that the lunch program has increased the number taking milk by quite a considerable amount and has also provided hot lunches for

a number of students who otherwise would not take lunches. For these reasons I believe that once having been started, it should be continued—at least for the duration of the war. In general, I am opposed to the Government doing this type of thing, or rather was opposed to it at the time it started, but like so many other services which the Government renders, once it is begun it is almost impossible to discontinue, and I doubt that it could be discontinued now without serious results. My second reason for believing that it should be continued is that it seems to me that so much money is being wasted and spent so foolishly by the Government that the expenditures of a little more for a type of program which provides food for many needy individuals is probably as wise a use of public money as can be made.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering these quotations from letters received on this subject in order to demonstrate the wide variety of opinion with respect to this program. I think it is fair to say on the basis of the replies received that the opinion is generally shared that the program has been worth while and should be continued.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an article from the Atlanta Constitution of May 13, 1944:

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR FOOD PRODUCTION,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1944.

Hon. BROOKS HAYS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAYS: The Emergency Committee for Food Production, whose sponsors are representatives from the following organizations: National Child Labor Committee; American Federal of Labor; National Board of the Y. W. C. A.; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Association of Railway Labor Executives; National Consumers League; Congress of Industrial Organizations; National Farmers Union; National Federation of Settlements; Domestic Mission, Protestant Episcopal Church; and other men and women prominent in church and civic affairs makes this request of you.

Please have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the attached article on the Farm Security Administration by Mr. Ralph McGill. Mr. McGill is the editor of the Atlanta Constitution and this article appeared in his paper on May 13.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. M. E. TILLY,
Acting Director.

A House committee in Congress has recommended abolition of the F. S. A. (Farm Security Administration), the one Government agency with the fewest mistakes to its credit and the most successes; the one agency which has sincerely devoted itself to those covered in the original statement about "the forgotten man."

In all States, more especially in the Southern States, the landless family, destitute, ragged, sick, shiftless, "no-accounts" were familiar figures.

The F. S. A. found that these people were, for the most part, of good Anglo-Saxon stock and could be rehabilitated. Many could, and have, become farm owners.

Now comes the House committee recommending abolition. It states that the F. S. A. actually controls its clients to the extent of telling them "how to raise his children" and "how to plan his home life."

Well, my goodness, we should hope so.

A great many housewives go to housekeeping, homemaking schools to learn how to manage their home life. It is an important thing to know. The tenant family should be no exception.

The F. S. A. prides itself that by teaching its families how to raise their children, by caring for diet and schooling, the children have ceased to be sickly and "dull." They make grades as good as any other children and their health is as good.

In other words, the families become assets, not liabilities.

They become citizens, not charges.

The plain truth is, the foes of the F. S. A., who do not want the so-called little people helped, have seized on a few errors and on a few catchword phrases in an effort to destroy it. It is to be hoped that Congress will not be led astray and burn down the barn to kill a few mice.

THE RECORD

Only stubborn prejudice or greed can face the F. S. A. record and not admit that it has worked and is working. The records for 1943, showing increases over 1942, record one of the finest contributions made to the war insofar as food is concerned.

The survey represented 311,880 active standard rehabilitation borrowers of the Farm Security Administration who operated farms both in 1942 and 1943. They constitute about 5.1 percent of all farmers. Total sales of livestock and livestock products in 1943 from the farms of these families, and the percent increase over their sales in 1942 were:

Hogs, 532,361,500 pounds; 56-percent increase.

Cattle and calves, 432,360,700 pounds; 43 percent.

Sheep, 62,777,800 pounds; 30 percent.

Milk, 571,116,000 gallons; 18 percent.

Chickens, 66,069,700 pounds; 47 percent.

Eggs, 126,333,300 dozen; 32 percent.

In addition, these families produced for home use 149,146,500 pounds of hogs, 29,371,100 pounds of cattle and calves, 1,049,900 pounds of sheep, 163,089,200 gallons of milk, 35,683,000 pounds of chickens, and 42,916,200 dozen eggs.

In the principal war-needed food and oil crops, the total production in 1943 and the percentage increases over 1942 were:

Soybeans, 5,049,200 bushels; 37-percent increase.

Peanuts, 156,776,400 pounds; 22 percent.

Dry beans and black-eyed peas, 84,185,000 pounds; 15 percent.

Irish potatoes, 20,996,800 bushels; 65 percent.

Sweetpotatoes, 5,972,700 bushels; 14 percent.

In the name of the best interests of this country; in the name of common decency and honesty, what do they want the F. S. A. clients to do?

Until the Congress can answer, those opposing the F. S. A. must stand convicted of caring only for the persons who would keep the tenant farmer and the sharecropper in the status of a laborer instead of helping make him a landowner and a citizen in the real meaning of the word.

Polish Government Misuses United States Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Polish government in exile has misused funds received from the United States Government, according to reliable information which has reached me.

These funds were turned over to the Polish Government for the specific purpose of supporting the underground movement in Poland against the Nazi occupation forces. These funds were turned over in United States currency to the Polish Government. It is now established that at least part of these funds never left the United States. The Polish Government violated the agreement to use the funds exclusively within Poland when it diverted the funds to finance activities within the United States.

Fifty-dollar and one-hundred-dollar bills, part of the funds earmarked for Poland's underground workers, have been found circulating within the United States. According to the agreement between the Polish Government and the United States, this currency was to be carried by Polish diplomatic pouch to London and from London through Polish Government channels into Poland. The presence of these bills in the United States is a clear-cut violation of its agreement with our Government.

Already there is evidence that the activities of the Polish Government in the United States are illegal. This is not the only case where the Polish Government-in-exile has violated the laws of the United States. For example, when officers of the Department of Justice recently examined the books of the Polish Information Center in New York, they discovered that that agency was paying out funds to American citizens and to an American organization not registered with the Department of Justice as foreign agents.

Furthermore, the Justice officials discovered that the Polish Information Center was spending sums far in excess of the moneys they had reported to our authorities.

The Polish Government maintains a huge propaganda machine in the United States. In addition to the Polish Information Center, the Polish Government supports several press agencies, subsidizes a number of publications, uses its consulates in the United States for propaganda purposes, and even goes so far as to have operating on American soil a military intelligence of its own.

It has been apparent for some time that these instruments of the Polish Government have created confusion and promoted disunity among our people.

In the light of these developments: First. The huge propaganda machine maintained within the United States;

second, the payment of funds to American citizens not registered in accordance with the law; third, the diversion of American moneys to purposes in violation of the aforesaid agreement, it is indisputably clear that an explanation is very much in order and must be forthcoming.

A Myth Exploded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of May 19, 1944:

A MYTH EXPLODED

The gratuitous prattle of most advocates of so-called "international cooperation" regularly features the theme, the utterly mythical theme, that the United States withdrew from the world after World War No. 1, and decided to crawl into a shell and to go it alone.

One of these globalist pleaders, the other day, said: "After the other war, we refused to take any part in any program of international agreement and cooperation designed to stop future wars."

The plain facts of history will prove that that simply is not so.

But our globalists, taking a leaf from Hitler's Mein Kampf, seem in innumerable instances committed to der fuehrer's theory that any falsehood will be believed if it is only big enough and is repeated often enough.

Now, we hate to see any really well-intentioned person fall for any such falsehood as is embodied in the globalists' myth of American isolation after World War No. 1.

So we avail ourselves of this opportunity to list a few elementary historical facts which, together, refute all such contentions.

Surely America was not going it alone when she took a prominent part in promoting the far-eastern settlements embodied in the Washington treaties of 1922. Those settlements were unquestionably faulty. But we were not standing aloof from the deliberations which produced them. And we made a reasonably earnest effort to reduce the faultiness to a minimum.

Nor were Americans "going it alone" when they committed themselves to the administrative and territorial integrity of China, some 20 years ago. It is open to debate whether such American commitments should have been made, but it is not open to debate that they were made.

Nor was this country "standing aloof from world affairs" when it gave Europe the Dawes plan, the Young plan, and the Hoover debt moratorium to ease the harsh burdens imposed under the unrealistic settlements made at Versailles.

Could anybody honestly or sanely contend that Americans were "isolationists" when they gave as no other nation on earth, to relieve famine and to bring aid to the victims of other disasters in China, Russia, Armenia, Greece, Japan, and other countries?

Was America being "isolationistic" when millions upon millions of her people's dollars were loaned for investment in all sorts of developments in foreign lands?

And how about America's firm stand against Jap aggression in Manchuria—a much firmer stand than was taken by any other nation on earth?

And how about our initiative in the advocacy of sanctions against Italy when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, in the midst of Anglo-French dickerings with Il Duce, which evolved the Hoare-Laval agreement?

Was President Franklin D. Roosevelt guilty of a misstatement when, with unconcealed pride, he declared, just a few short years ago:

"Today the United States is cooperating openly in the fuller utilization of the League of Nations machinery than ever before"?

Was the President guilty of "isolationism" when he immediately followed up that statement with this one:

"We are not members of the League; and we do not contemplate membership. We are giving cooperation to the League in every matter which is not primarily political and in every matters which obviously represents the views of the good of the peoples of the world, as distinguished from the views of the good of political leaders, of privileged classes, and of imperialist aims."

Was President Roosevelt guilty of building an evil "Chinese wall" around America when he declared:

"Political profit, personal prestige, and national aggrandizement attended the birth of the League of Nations and handicapped it from its infancy."

As for the stupidly sentimental argument that America, by declining to get mixed up in the League's promotion of imperialist power politics, made Hitler the military menace that he ultimately became, let London's liberal-internationalist journal the New Statesman and Nation bear witness that "the power of Britain and France in Europe was absolute."

They could have stopped Hitler cold if they had had a mind to do so. They could have stopped him before he ever got a good start.

Let the London globalist magazine, above quoted, speak further:

"Until Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland in 1936 (3 years after he came to power) the combined powers of the League could have kept Germany disarmed without adding a gun to their armaments. They failed to do so, not for lack of arms, but because they preferred a strong Germany as a bulwark against the Soviet Union. No one doubts today that, in 1935, they could have upset the ramshackle empire of Mussolini if they had desired. In fact, however, they approved fascism and praised the words of the Duce."

Indeed, those praises were widely echoed in America—even in Fort Wayne, if you please—by leaguist ladies and gentlemen who now, however, declare that if we had only been members of the League we could have thwarted the aggressions of dictators whom they once admired.

And these same ladies and gentlemen now praise the Roosevelt-Hull philosophy of foreign policy and fanatically support New Deal globalism—neglectful of the fact that Mr. Roosevelt himself once said that we were not isolationists except insofar as we strove to isolate ourselves from foreign wars and intrigues.

As for the Europeans, he said, and said wisely—

"We want to help them all that we can; but they have understood very well that help is going to be confined to moral help, and that we are not going to get tangled up with their troubles in the days to come."

Well, we did get tangled up, but it was not because we had ever been isolationists.

Let's get that straight—once and for all!

In All Fairness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 18, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] spoke in reference to a newspaper article and picture that depicted two men pouring gallons of milk down the drain in Atlanta, Ga. I saw the picture, and on the side of the picture was a smaller one showing a child starved to death, lying in a gutter in India. That picture was published in the Washington Daily News. In Saturday's Daily News was an editorial on the subject, and under the title "In All Fairness" the picture was published again, together with an editorial from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of May 16. I commend the Washington Daily News and Atlanta Journal for showing that no Government agency was responsible for this.

Under the permission granted me, I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

Perhaps you saw these two pictures in our paper last Wednesday in dramatic juxtaposition; milk being dumped in Atlanta, and a child starved to death, lying in a gutter, in India. They were an obvious and ironical commentary on the limitations of human society and our over-all human stupidity, so we said in the caption, "Write your own editorial * * *." Well, Representative GEORGE GILLIE, Republican, Indiana, did yesterday, on the House floor, taking as his text a line in the caption which stated that the milk dumping followed an O. D. T. order forbidding Sunday deliveries. We don't know how deeply Representative GILLIE has inquired into the matter, but we don't want to be guilty of causing any misapprehension on his part or your part. Therefore, we print below an editorial from the Atlanta Journal of May 16, commenting on the event.

POURING OUT MILK

The pouring into the gutter of 1,000 gallons of milk Monday afternoon was an act of propaganda. It was a stunt planned and carried out in the intention of shocking public sensibilities and modifying or controlling public opinion.

All the circumstances of the act confirmed the fact. Signs were to be prepared and displayed indicting the Office of Defense Transportation for responsibilities for the wanton waste. The act was to be performed in front of the O. D. T. offices. Newspapers were informed.

The fact that the act was made a sort of Roman holiday, the fact that it was executed with the glee of a press agent staging a publicity stunt can hardly add to the dignity and the worthiness of the position taken by the Milk Producers' Confederation.

The essence of the conflict of opinion and of will is this: The Office of Defense Transportation nearly 2 years ago laid down rules governing the delivery of milk. Retail deliveries were confined to every other day; Sunday deliveries by wholesalers were banned.

The purpose of the Nation-wide order was to conserve tires and manpower.

On the whole, the Nation-wide order has worked well. There has been tremendous conservation of rubber and manpower.

The Georgia Milk Producers Confederation, a cooperative enterprise, which has served its members with considerable effectiveness, has been insisting for several months that the no-Sunday delivery works a special hardship on it and has sought to have the Nation-wide regulation excepted from application to it. The O. D. T. has held protracted and presumably thorough investigations and reports that "the milk cooperative has made no effort to rearrange its delivery schedules and operating practices in an effort to conform to the O. D. T. order."

The O. D. T. further says that "every major processor in Atlanta has informed the O. D. T. that they would gladly take a portion of any surplus milk at current market and ceiling prices."

The milk producers, on the one hand, and the O. D. T. on the other have one duty far more important than self-interest. That duty is to serve the good of the public.

How that good may be served in the present controversy is a matter to be determined by cooperative action and by the elimination of anger and stubbornness. Certainly it is not served by such an exhibition as was staged in Atlanta Monday afternoon.

Said Representative GILLIE: "This horrible occurrence must not be repeated. I am not frequently moved by an almost uncontrollable rage, but I can find no other words to express my reaction—reaction to two pictures I am sure you all noticed. * * * The caption said the milk was being destroyed because orders of O. D. T. forbade Sunday delivery, and it stated further that this 1-day milk ration would have provided a quart of milk for 4,000 children. What can be the reaction of the country * * * to build up food-production goals they have been called to meet, when they learn of such outrageous waste brought about by Government red tape and regulations? Surely, someone with common horse sense could have found a way to use this milk."

Well, the News also has been told that a Government official in Atlanta offered to dispose of the so-called surplus milk on a few minutes' notice, but the cooperative refused, and insisted on staging its dumping show.

Our pictorial commentary still stands, of course; its a lopsided world when children starve as milk is dumped. However, the Atlanta Journal seems to be pretty sure the O. D. T. isn't the sole villain in the piece, to put it mildly.

Veterans and Closed Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. WAISIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 20, 1944:

VETERANS AND CLOSED SHOPS

The House rejected an amendment to the G. I. veterans' rehabilitation bill intended to free the returning veteran of the necessity of ever becoming a member of a labor union in order to get a job. The amendment would have permitted a veteran to hold a job in a closed shop without joining the union—in other words, without meeting the conditions which every other worker there had to meet.

If the closed shop is not sound socially and economically, then it should be unlawful for labor to demand or the employer to grant such a contract, and then no man should be required to join a union to get any job, or to hold it.

But if we sanction a closed shop anywhere, under any conditions, then the veteran should meet the union requirements in that shop as any other employee does. The veteran is entitled to aid in his rehabilitation and certain preferential treatment from the Government that called him to service, but when he again becomes a civilian, dealing with other civilians, he cannot expect, and we think does not expect, to live and work under an entirely different set of rules.

The House was sound in defeating this anti-labor amendment, because it was one of the many wrong ways that have been proposed to pay our debt to the servicemen. We must never set up two classes of citizenship in America.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert excerpts from a letter written by J. F. McCarty, of Ottawa, Kans., together with an editorial and news items from the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald, calling attention to the effect of rent control as it is being administered in that community.

Attention is invited especially to the inequalities as between privately owned properties and housing facilities constructed by the Federal Housing Administration. In one instance the revenue from rentals for 10 months are required to pay the cost of repairs alone, to say nothing of taxes, insurance, and other expenses; but public housing properties which are being built to be sold for but $6,000 are renting in a nearby community for $50 per month.

As is indicated in the excerpts from the letter which are here inserted, agents of the O. P. A. all over the country are admitting to the owners of properties that ceilings are too low but that they are powerless to afford any relief. If that authority does not now exist it would seem appropriate that the Congress grant the authority in the legislation now being considered to extend the life of the O. P. A. If O. P. A. can order the reduction of rentals to conform to its determination of the fair rental in the area where property is located, it should likewise have authority to order an increase of rentals where because of extraordinary circumstances the existing rental is below that fair rental.

The letter, editorial, and news items follow:

OTTAWA, KANS., *May 16, 1944.*

Hon. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: Enclosed are articles from the local paper here which will give you some idea of our situation relative to housing conditions.

As probably has been called to your mind, we were caught by the O. P. A. ceiling rent situation with the lowest rents in this part of the State, so far as we have been able to learn. Labor was short here after the shops were moved, factory closed down, and we could take what people offered for properties or let them set idle. So houses were anyway 25 percent below any other like town in this part of the State when the ceiling came on.

We had been advised to paper, roof, repair and make the places attractive for the tenants who were to come here as the result of the plant at De Soto. Many did that and then we were not permitted to get rent comparable to the improvements.

Other towns have been given priorities for units and have made such improvements. In most cases the rents are so much higher than we can get here that people continue to live here and go 35 to 40 miles to work.

People who have places for rent are holding them, when vacant, for sale, and the situation is becoming acute. I had the house here where the O. P. A. rentman went in with a pass key, and we did not like that sort of thing.

To be specific, I have a good 6-room house on North Main, full bath up, half down, half basement, double garage, screen in back porch, on which the ceiling is $15. I spent $133.39 this year to home some repairs and improve the accommodations, and the O. P. A. cannot grant any increase. These men admit there is an injustice there but they have no power to remedy it. What we want to know is, where do we have an appeal? Is it possible that some set of men can set up a regulation and admit there is injustice, yet we have no recourse? Can our Congress give us no relief? I realize this is a small matter to be considered while you men have such problems as you do to handle with reference to the war and home problems, but when there is money to be raised they ask us for our proportion just the same as the other places.

In a block here are two houses: One, the more desirable house, with a ceiling of $15; the other, which was occupied by the owner when the ceiling was put on. The owner worked with the O. P. A. and finally got a top of $40. Accommodations are not anything like—yet the difference in rent income. Both houses are priced for sale now at practically the same dollar.

Is there no place for us to appeal?

Very truly,

J. F. MCCARTY.

UNFAIR RENT CONTROL

Under Secretary of War Patterson has gone to bat before Congress against a change in current rent regulations "which might involve weakened controls over rents and evictions." He says it would endanger the Nation's wartime price structure and adversely affect War Department interests.

The owners of rental properties in thousands of communities like Ottawa have no

quarrel with the principle of rent control. But they have had a grievance since the start of rent control against abuse of the principle to the point of depriving many of them of a fair income. It is the red tape and unjust administration of rent control that has brought the demand for easing the restrictions. When a property owner is prevented from increasing rents to permit of a just increase of income to offset improvements and maintenance, he has a right to kick. There ought to be some way of enforcing rent control without forcing the property owner to close his property or sell it short to avoid further loss. A property owner under the democratic system certainly is entitled to a hearing of his grievances, but under rent control he is ignored. His petitions are pigeonholed. Those who boast of how they hold down prices during this war hadn't better have the nerve to mention the autocratic manner in which they have administered rent control.

TO BUILD 33 NEW HOMES IN TOPEKA

TOPEKA, KANS.—Authorization for priorities for the building of 33 new homes at a total cost of $198,000, to be occupied by essential war workers, was granted by the Federal Housing Administration. The houses will be of the 5-room bungalow type, built of frame construction, and will be 33 by 24 feet. The cost will be $6,000 each. Ten will be offered for sale to war workers at $6,000 each. The rest will be rented for a ceiling price of $50 per month.

O. P. A. COMPLICATES RENT SITUATION

Low rent ceilings, imposed by the O. P. A., which is causing many owners to sell, has complicated the problem of finding homes to rent, according to Ottawa realtors. The O. P. A. rule giving the renter 90 days before he has to move after the house he occupies is sold adds to complications.

Martin Strafuss, of the Mansfield Land Co., pointed out that owners who have brought their grievances to him contend that the costs of maintaining houses have doubled, while low rent ceiling prices have been set by the O. P. A. Reasoning that they must rent the house at an infinitely small profit—if not at an actual loss—the owners say the only way they can get value received for the house is to sell it.

Justice J. F. McCarty said rent cases before him in justice court have increased about 75 percent since the first of the year. Before O. P. A. rules entangled themselves with Kansas rent laws, cases of that kind were completed within 10 days on most occasions, McCarty said, and cited a recent case that went on for weeks because of continuances. He pointed out that stubborn renters can drop behind on rent payments during the 90-day interval and that the owner may have to bring the case to justice court before getting the rent, while he is still unable to evict the renter.

In the final analysis, Strafuss said that most of the renters and owners do not blame one another. The renter usually finds it difficult to find another place and, in some cases, circumstances do not warrant the purchase of a home. The owner, realizing that he may rent the house at a loss, often close it up until he finds a buyer. Observers say that several men in the armed forces who rent homes near their camps and move their wives and families there close up the vacant homes here in order to avoid the rent mix-up.

Observers commented that the population probably will not decrease, due to the fact that workers at the Sunflower ordnance plant near De Soto prefer to live in Ottawa, where the prices of rent, food, clothing, and utilities are at reasonable low levels.

Servicemen's Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me, which was published in the Republican Journal, Darlington, Wis., for May 4, 1944:

WASHINGTON NEWS FROM OUR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—PROVIDE TRAINING FOR DISABLED VETERANS

In a series of articles appearing in this column during the next few weeks, I propose to outline what Congress has done for our men in the service, their families, and their dependents. In this news letter I wish to discuss servicemen's benefits and training for disabled veterans. Preference should and will be extended to veterans, whether disabled or not, by both public and private employers. As a matter of public conscience, over 11,000,000 of our young men and women cannot be taken from their normal pursuits and asked to make every kind of sacrifice and then be cast aside to shift for themselves, deprived of previous jobs and new opportunities after the war has been won.

FEDERAL PLEDGE

The Selective Training and Service Act specifies that persons who have left positions in the Federal service and have entered the armed forces shall be restored to the positions they left or to like positions of seniority status, and pay. This is the obligation of every appointing officer of any Federal agency and there is no question that this obligation will be carried out conscientiously and honestly. The act specifies that the veteran who formerly worked for the Government has a right to return to his old position or to a position with similar seniority, status, and pay, if he is still qualified to perform the duties of such position.

NEW TRAINING

This means that in many instances disabled veterans will have to be trained to do things which they have never done before. Fortunately, this training will be provided by several agencies; for instance, the Veterans' Administration through its vocational rehabilitation program, which is already functioning in Wisconsin, the Federal Security Agency, the Army, the Navy, and the War Manpower Commission. All these are by law required to see to it that the disabled veteran is given some type of special training to utilize his skills and background in the best possible manner so that the veteran may take up his peacetime way of living without serious disruption. Other enabling laws will doubtless simplify and coordinate these efforts. For some time past, the Civil Service Commission has been working on the rehabilitation phase of the veteran's problem. Over 2,500 different positions in the Government embracing millions of job opportunities have been examined and surveyed to find out what jobs can be filled by handicapped persons.

This survey has disclosed just what abilities and what faculties are needed in particular jobs. Already civilian persons who are handicapped, have been placed in many of these positions on the basis of war-service appointments, and there is no question that these people are making a magnificent contribution to our war effort. Since October 1942, more than 15,000 physically handicapped persons have been placed in the Federal Government as the result of this special rehabilitation activity of the Civil Service Commission.

REAL SERVICE

There is no question but that our disabled veterans will be able to take over these and many other positions in the Federal Government without interfering with the status of faithful and efficient regular employees. Armed with factual information obtained by various surveys, the Commission will be in a position to render real service to all former Government employees who have been disabled as a result of their war service. The Government will work with the handicapped veteran in finding jobs which can be filled by persons with the abilities and faculties which he possesses, even though he may be regarded at the same time by the Veterans' Administration as a physically handicapped person. There is no question but that the handicapped veteran will be given preferential treatment once it has been demonstrated that as a result of special training he can do the job required. Appointing officers who pass over veterans must now submit in writing their reasons for so doing.

It is evident that in pursuance of long-established congressional policies our administrative practices are being shaped to accord to returning veterans, especially the disabled, decisive preferences and widespread employment opportunities for training and placement.

Please direct your inquiries for further detailed information to the United States Civil Service Commission, the Veterans' Administration, your county veterans' service officer, or write to me, Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

A Strike Helps the Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 20, 1944:

A STRIKE HELPS THE DAIRYMEN

Last October, A. F. of L. union employees of Milwaukee dairies asked the War Labor Board to authorize certain wage increases which already had employer approval. On Thursday the regional W. L. B. at Chicago granted the raises, retroactive for 6 months. The decision, so long delayed, finally came only after a strike by some of the dairy workers in protest at the failure of the W. L. B. to act.

Why does it happen so often that strikes bring decisions more quickly from this War Labor Board? Why is it that the Board permits itself to get into a situation where the strike, which should be definitely banned for the duration, remains the one seemingly effective weapon that labor has?

Admittedly the War Labor Board has more work than it can handle. Despite real effort, it has been getting further behind every month. But does it have to penalize those who play the game by giving first attention

to situations where a strike is in progress or is threatened? And if it must, does it have to reward the strikers by making their pay raises retroactive to the time the petition for wage adjustment was filed?

It seems to us proper that a general policy should be developed whereby, in the final adjustment of wage cases, a retroactive adjustment would be made only if the petitioners had a record of uninterrupted work during the period needed for investigation and decision.

If it were generally understood that existence of a strike would not speed decision, and that it would operate to bar recovery of raises back to the date of application, then the strike, instead of being the effective pressure it now is, would become the liability it should be in time of war.

In most cases the strikers now lose nothing from having struck. In most cases they gain at least to the extent of having a more immediate adjudication of their demands. If we are serious in our desire to bar striking for the duration, we certainly are not showing it in the way we handle these cases.

Life Insurance in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, here is how America's 68,000,000 owners of life insurance are helping to preserve the financial health of every American, whether or not he is a policyholder.

First, they are fighting rising prices. By putting their wartime money into life insurance they are doing one of the things our Government recommends. They are making their dollars work for our national welfare instead of spending them on today's scarce civilian goods. Spending in wartime makes prices go up like bidding does at an auction and rising prices mean "less and less for your money."

Then, too, in behalf of these policyholders and the general public, life insurance companies in America last year published messages every 2 weeks in newspapers throughout the entire country. These messages showed what makes prices go up and what every American could do to help keep prices down.

This fight against run-away prices has been won thus far, and the American public deserves much praise for the sensible way it is handling its wartime money. But the danger of rising prices is still with us and even more critical days may be ahead unless every citizen continues this fight.

Besides helping to keep wartime prices down, these 68,000,000 policyholders are making important social and economic contributions to America through their life insurance. Here is the simplified story of how these contributions benefit you and your country.

Life insurance owned:

1943	$139,000,000,000
1942	130,333,000,000
1939	113,977,000,000

This is the greatest financial security ever achieved by any people in the world through their own initiative. However, fine as this record is, it can still be greatly improved because the amount of life insurance owned in 1943 was only about as much as the national income for that year.

HOW LIFE INSURANCE DIVIDES UP

Number of policy holders:

1943	68,000,000
1942	67,000,000

In 1943 an average of $65 per person was put into this form of protection. When you stop to think that each of these 68,000,000 policyholders named one or more beneficiaries, then you begin to grasp what a great number of people life-insurance benefits directly.

Average amount per policyholder:

1943	$2,044
1942	1,945

The number of policies for $1,000 or more bought in 1943 was almost one-third larger than in 1942. Americans each year become more aware of their need for more adequate life-insurance protection. Today, America's workers are buying larger life-insurance policies.

Average amount per family:

1943	$4,124
1942	3,907

Life insurance is constantly being made more available to people in all walks of life through broader and more flexible policies designed to fit every different family need, every set of financial circumstances. This has helped to increase the average amount owned per family.

Life-insurance assets:

1943	$37,675,000,000
1942	34,931,000,000
1939	29,243,000,000

These are funds held by life-insurance companies to guarantee payment of obligations to the policyholders. Meanwhile, they are put to work to earn what they can with safety. This makes your insurance cost less, and provides a flow of money that helps keep up America's standards of living.

HOW THESE ASSETS WORK FOR YOU

In U. S. Government bonds:

1943	$12,730,000,000
1942	9,390,000,000

Over one-third of all life-insurance assets are invested in United States Government bonds. Your life-insurance dollars protect both you and your family and at the same time they also help to provide planes, ships, tanks, and guns for our national security.

In business investments:

1943	$10,270,000,000
1942	10,200,000,000

While life insurance greatly increased its investments in Government bonds, it also increased its investments in business and industry—maintaining its financing aid on the home front for factories, railroads, light and power. These investments improve the public welfare.

In real-estate mortgages:

1943	$6,670,000,000
1942	6,680,000,000

This total shows further how well life insurance maintained its flow of capital into the home front while buying more Government bonds. The balance of assets not pictured here are accounted for in policy loans, State and municipal bonds, real estate, and cash.

Total received by American families:

1943	$2,403,000,000
1942	2,365,000,000

These payments cover the many purposes for which you own life insurance—income, education, retirement, disability, and emergencies. An average of $6,480,000 was paid out every day. These payments plus the increase in policy reserves amounted to about 3 percent more than the total premiums paid in.

HOW THESE TOTAL PAYMENTS WERE DIVIDED

Payments to beneficiaries:

1943	$1,098,000,000
1942	1,003,000,000

Death benefits were paid out on 1,180,000 policies. These payments not only helped the families receiving them; they were also a stabilizing force in your community. Most of this increase was due to the fact that there was a greater amount of life insurance in force.

Living benefits—Disabilities annuities, matured endowments, dividends:

1943	$978,000,000
1942	953,000,000

Last year $318,000,000 were paid out on matured endowments alone—$167,000,000 in annuities, $89,000,000 on disability contracts. These payments are "living benefits" that the policyholder himself can make use of and enjoy during his lifetime.

Emergency calls on policy funds:

1943	$289,000,000
1942	447,000,000

Every life insurance policy, other than term insurance, develops a cash surrender and loan value that generally increases as the premiums are paid. These values help families confronted by emergencies. This shows that the need for financial aid was less during 1943.

The foregoing figures represent the United States business of over 300 legal reserve life insurance companies in America.

With a Song and With a Smile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

WITH A SONG AND WITH A SMILE

In these times of war and worry,
To distress and to destroy,
With so much hurrah and hurry,
To disturb and to annoy,
With restrictions interfering
With all business all the while,
Let us help things by veneering
All these troubles with a smile.

In these times of grief and sorrow,
Suffering, and real regret,
Terrified by heartless horror,
Tho "The worst is coming yet"—
So 'tis said—and, tho we fear it
May be true, however wrong,
Let us, from our hearts, veneer it
With a hope-inspiring song.

In these times of lamentations,
That suppress the voice of prayer,
When it seems that all the nations
May be verging on despair,
Thru the rainbow, we inherit
God's own promise, most worth while—
Let's revere it, not veneer it,
With a song and with a smile.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Button Your Lip, Mr. Babson—Tight!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I read with deep concern a succinct editorial which recently appeared in the Memphis Commercial-Appeal. The subject matter is of such extreme importance it should be called to the attention of the people and the Congress particularly. The editorial follows:

BABSON SHOULD EXPLAIN

Roger Babson, well-known economist, wrote in a column printed in the Commercial-Appeal and many other newspapers on or about Friday, May 12, that "Churchill will not let Germany crack until after the November elec' ons. If the European war so continues, there will then be a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. Hence, there is probably no use of now discussing Willkie, Dewey, Bricker, or anyone else. The Republicans' opportunity will come in 1948."

What Mr. Babson has said in effect is that Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain is keeping Germany in the war against Germany's will. The charge as he phrases it is far worse than it would have been if he had claimed Mr. Churchill was deliberately holding the hand that could crush Germany now, but in either case the indictment is of a gravity that cannot be overestimated. The distinct, inescapable conclusion to be drawn from what Mr. Babson says is that Mr. Churchill is deliberately sacrificing lives, maintaining millions of people in the occupied lands in misery, keeping countless millions of the relatives and friends of allied fighting men in agonized suspense, and needlessly spending substance, all for partisan political advantage.

The Commercial Appeal has never had even the slightest tinge of sympathy with the rumors that have crept about that Mr. Churchill would prolong the war to assure the reelection of President Roosevelt, and it does not believe for one fleeting second that Mr. Roosevelt would be a party to an arrangement for delaying victory, no matter who proposed it or for what end. There is nothing in the record of either man to suggest that they would jointly or severally be guilty of such infamy, and there is every sign that they have worked with every energy to produce a complete allied victory at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Babson should explain the grounds on which he makes this charge, or else he should apologize from the housetops for having made a statement of fearful significance without adequate reasons and irrefutable proof. This indictment of Mr. Churchill should be cleared up one way or the other, and without the loss of a minute.

I thoroughly agree, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Babson should explain. On several occasions I have heard the most verbose utterances made that Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt were acting in concert to deliberately prolong the war for political reasons. The evil, alarming statements are without even the slightest foundation and should be allayed. Undoubtedly they are inspired by underground enemy propaganda for the singular purpose of undermining the Nation's morale. It is to be regretted that some of our people have unwittingly allowed themselves to be duped into the dissemination of such iniquitous gossip.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been no rubber stamp for the President. On several occasions I have found it necessary, in keeping with the dictates of my best judgment, to disagree with him. These statements are not made in a sense of chesty boastfulness. It is a simple truth that there are no two men in the country who see eye to eye on each and all of the thousands of issues which have confronted the Nation, nor will there be any two individuals who will see eye to eye on the thousands of issues that will confront us in the future. That, I repeat, is a simple truth supported by the fact that the Creator of man made no two alike. On the other hand, I have supported and shall continue to support the program for prosecuting the war as outlined by the President, as Commander in Chief, and high military and naval personnel. Who will question the fact that the job to date has been well done? Since it has been well done, whereof is the evidence that the President's or Mr. Churchill's war aims for tomorrow do not point to the same effort and success?

Mr. Speaker, the President has three sons in this war—in uniform; Mr. Churchill one son and two daughters. To say nothing of many other good and sufficient reasons which they, as any other citizen, have for an early victory, but giving consideration only to the inherent fatherly love which they as all men have for their own children—their own flesh and blood—is overwhelmingly sufficient to refute the scandalously smearing charges that they would for even 1 single hour delay the war's end.

Mr. Speaker, a deliberate delay of the war by Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill for any reason is indeed a very, very grave charge. And when it is charged that they would do so for political reasons that in no sense alleviates the gravity but aggravates it. To drive a wedge between us and our British allies and another between the people of our own land is precisely what loose lip talk of this kind is calculated to do. This is indeed a very dangerous thing. In the first instance, there is not even the slightest foundation for such charges. They are dangerous, damnable falsehoods.

As has been well said, there is every sign that Mr. Churhill and Mr. Roosevelt have worked with every energy to produce a complete allied victory at the earliest possible moment. Results as of this date prove it beyond any peradventure of doubt.

Let these stupid charges against Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt be allayed.

Yes; let Mr. Babson explain or apologize. Better still, he should button his lip and keep it buttoned—tight!

A Local Citizen Answers Criticisms of the Administration's Policy as to the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of my valued constituents has written me a letter in which he discusses newspaper criticism of the administration's war, domestic, and foreign policies, which is worthy of insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author of the article discusses the Japanese foreign policy and Japanese history. He reveals a profundity which entitles his views to respect here. Here is the letter:

PUYALLUP, WASH., *May 6, 1944.*

Hon. JOHN COFFEE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COFFEE: DeWitt MacKenzie's War Today column, in a recent issue of the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., advances this view: We must treat with great respect the Mikado of Japan, and be especially careful of our remarks about his Divine Majesty, because he is not only their supreme temporal ruler but the spiritual head of the state, and his people worship him as a divine being. But nevertheless, as far as temporal affairs are concerned, he is a figurehead who only speaks the words put into his mouth by the warmongers of his country, led by Tojo. This religious belief in the divinity of their ruler having become an integral part of their patriotism, Mr. MacKenzie believes that it would be very impolitic to criticiz' him from any angle for that would only make his people and his soldiers venerate him the more and cause them to hate and fight us more fiercely. Also their fraudulent imitation of a God may be very useful to us in helping to educate his people against the evils of militarism which has controlled them for so long. These views he claims are also supported by the British Broadcasting Co., and our own Office of War Information.

However that may be, whoever supports that view is making a serious error in judgment that may well delay and make our victory more costly.

Judging from the treacherous furiosity with which the Japanese have prepared and prosecuted this war, nothing we may do or say can cause them to be more implacable than they have shown themselves to be. The religious beliefs of a people in the true sense of the word have to do with the spiritual aspirations and moral well-being of its followers, and are on a higher plane than the temporal affairs of men. The Mikado of Japan is not the head of a religion, but the hereditary ruler of a nationalistic and racial cult which seeks the domination and exploitation, not only of its own, but of all other peoples. Treachery, robbery, rapine, and murder are the avowed tenets of this cult. When such an organization has grown to be a world menace and we are compelled to go to war with it in our own defense, its leader becomes a major military objective.

There is no evidence that the Mikado is a figure head, but is the active intelligent, aggressive, and willing leader of a militaristic class that has always dominated Japan all down through its long and piratical history ever since its emergence from the darkness of time. Through ages of education to that end, the masses of Japanese do believe that their Mikado is the direct descendant of the Sun Goddess Amaterasu and that he is not only their temporal ruler and the high priest of the nation, but also a god, and as proof thereof they point with fanatical pride to the historical facts that they are the only nation in the world which has been ruled by one unbroken line of rulers for over 2,600 years and that they have never been defeated in war. Why this should be accepted as proof that their Mikado is divine and they the chosen darlings of the gods is not explained. The Japanese also believe that they are destined to rule the world and all other peoples will be as dust under their feet. The fanatically loyal Japanese seek no higher aim in life than to serve their divine master whose commands are their highest law, to lay down their lives at his feet the greatest joy, and their reward, immortality in the palaces of the sun.

Whether the Mikado believes in palaces in the sun we are not informed. He does believe in having palaces on earth, and has one covering 10 acres on the crest of a hill in the heart of Tokyo, where he lives in purpled ease and plots the plunder of his peaceful neighbors. As to using the Mikado as an instrument of educating the Japanese people against the evils of militarism, that can be done best by dropping a few blockbusters on his palace, preferably with him in it, laying his cities in ruins, sinking his fleet, destroying his armies, shooting the last Zero from the sky, and allowing his people to feel the unmeasured wrath of an outraged democracy.

Then, after Tojo and his clique, in an attempt to save face, draw their bejeweled swords and ceremoniously cut their guts out, the Japanese people will have a chance to commence to be civilized, and themselves and the world to profit from the genius of a remarkable people.

Down through all the annals of Nippon, the land of Yamoto, there is not a single gleam of democracy. Learning the first arts of civilization from China, they absorbed none of China's democratic ideals, produced no democratic philosophers of their own, nor learned any of the democracy taught by those immortal teachers of China—Lao Tze and Confucius—but carefully preserved all the paganism of their remote past, presented it to their people of today as their most cherished heritage armed with all the modern weapons of war.

The imperial Empire of Japan is a political monstrosity. It belongs with the prehistoric reptiles of the past, is a menace to the peace of the world and a curse to its people, and its exit is long overdue. Twenty-six hundred years is far too long for it to have encumbered the earth. Anyone who seeks to preserve its very foundation for any purpose is making a grave mistake.

A. E. APPLEGATE.

Price Control Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the proper extension of Price Control cannot be exaggerated.

Price Control Week has been launched throughout the country by proclamations from mayors in approximately 50 large cities in the United States, ranging from Hartford, Conn., to Santa Clara, Calif., including St. Louis, Mo.; Kokomo, Ind.; Detroit, Mich.; Camden, N. J.; Minneapolis, Minn., and so forth.

Farmer-Consumer-Labor Committees, whose chief purpose is to see that the Price Control Act is continued without weakening amendments, are organized in such cities as Detroit, Madison, Minneapolis, New York, and so forth.

In my own State the California Farmer-Labor-Consumer Committee to Combat Inflation, having representatives from San Francisco, Alameda, Sonoma, Santa Clara, Fresno, San Bernardino and San Diego Counties includes members of several Granges, American War Mothers, the California State Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Townsend Club of Sonoma County, the Western Cooperative Dairymen's Union composed of 3,000 members operating dairies in the San Joaquin Valley. Together they are supporting Price Control Week, and state:

High food prices, even in years of relatively high wages, do not solve farmers' market problems. We oppose every effort to open the floodgates of inflation and favor the policy heretofore adopted by Congress to stabilize all living conditions for the duration.

Observations on the Coming Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker—

THE REAL CAMPAIGN ISSUE

The real issue confronting the voters is centralization of government in Washington versus States' rights and local home rule. This issue cuts across party lines; it overshadows platforms, and it divides voters into two camps. The one camp is composed of voters who believe that our form of government, under which this Nation has achieved a standard of living far above that of any other nation in the world, should be preserved and retained. The other camp believes we should scrap the form of government our fathers established because they claim it is outgrown and no longer usable, and should adopt in its place a collectivist form of government that would provide a planned economy, with regimentation, restriction, and control from Washington, similar to the plan of government now in effect in Russia. We used to call such a philosophy of government socialism or communism, but now it masquerades under the New Deal banner.

The campaign will not be a campaign between Republicans and Democrats as we have known them in the past, but rather it will be a battle royal between those citizens who want a benevolent ruler to look after them and regulate their affairs and those citizens who prefer to govern themselves under our American form of government, based upon the principles of liberty, justice, equality of opportunity, and religious freedom and tolerance, as laid down and defined in the greatest charter of human rights ever written, our Federal Constitution.

During slave days there were a few benevolent slave owners, but that did not make slavery either right or desirable. In olden days there may have been a few benevolent kings, but what American would prefer a kingdom to a republic? There may yet appear upon earth a benevolent dictator, but none of us want to be ruled by one.

Note: The above is an exact quotation from a speech made by me during the campaign of 1936. It is more true today than it was 8 years ago.

DEWEY AND DIRKSEN

I recently attended a dinner conference of some 50 Republican House Members. The group was unanimous in its opinion that Governor Dewey would be nominated for President on the first ballot cast at the Republican Convention. In a discussion of the possible candidate for second place on the ticket, the name of Congressman DIRKSEN was a 9 to 1 favorite. DIRKSEN has initimate knowledge of congressional procedure, has the confidence and respect of the Members of both the House and the Senate, and has perhaps a better grasp of the problems that confront the Nation today than any other Member of Congress. These qualifications, together with the fact that he has a tremendous capacity for work and is unsurpassed as a platform orator, make him the leading contender for second place on the ticket. As Vice President he would insure close cooperation and teamwork between the executive and legislative branches of the Government—something that has been sadly lacking during the past 4 years. Dewey and DIRKSEN would make a great team, an unbeatable team.

Post-War America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday May 22, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, May 21, I addressed the graduating class at Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa. This was the ninety-third graduation exercise of this classic institution of learning. Upon this occasion, I was honored with having conferred upon me the degree of doctor of laws. My remarks to the graduates were as follows:

President Stewart, members of the graduating class and guests, not only am I conscious of the high honor paid me, but I am deeply impressed with the responsibility that comes to the one chosen to deliver parting words to the graduates of this historic and classic institution. As you go forth into a confused and groping world, I hope you may be inspired by a sincerity of purpose and a willingness to freely offer your unselfish service to an age that so sorely needs your vision. I never stand before a graduation class that I do not recall the somewhat impertinent utterances of our educator President, Woodrow Wilson, who to a group of rich young college men once bluntly said:

"Most of you fellows are doomed to obscurity. You will not do anything. You will never try to do anything, and with all the great tasks of the country waiting to be done, probably you are the very men who will decline to do them. Some man who has been up against it, some man who has come out of the crowd, somebody who has had the whip of necessity laid on his back, will emerge out of the crowd, will show that he understands the crowd, understands the interests of the Nation, united and not separated, and will stand up and lead us."

We expect of you much more than that. Today there is the clarion call to you for leadership. Vast, baffling problems challenge us. Problems international and problems domestic—challenges to our political freedom and to our economic security. The future of our country is at stake.

POLITICAL FREEDOM

When our forefathers came to live in this western world they formed a new government, fashioned along new lines. They were primarily concerned with securing and perpetuating political freedom and liberty. There was fresh in their minds at that moment the oppression which they had borne from the rules of the Old World—of an old order—which this New World determined in its heart to throw off forever. So they laid out a pattern of government along broad and comprehensive lines, based upon firm and fundamental principles of right and justice.

Naturally, they were concerned principally with securing for themselves and their offspring the right to choose their own rulers, to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, the right to trial by jury, due process of law, security of property, freedom of speech, a free press, freedom of the ballot, and, all in all, a government which in its essential principles would be a representative democracy, where the will of the majority of the people should govern in all important matters. In later years we have added to these tenets the rights of labor—the right to bargain collectively and to have the protection of the law against exploitation; freedom of enterprise—the right of a citizen to engage in competitive business, with the assurance from his Government, so far as that assurance can be lawfully given, that he will have a fair break in the scheme of things; the right to work—to labor and to acquire and own property; indeed, the distinctively American right to start at the bottom and go to the top. These are precious rights. Our forefathers fought to attain them, and we fight now to preserve them.

In these essential principles of liberty and freedom and of a representative democracy America has grown and flourished. This temple of representative government, where the will of the people is supreme, stands today in its beauty and grandeur upon the foundation erected by the forefathers without a "pillar fallen or a marble fractured." The blessed heritage of this new political order has been preserved through the years and today America stands in the vanguard of the great nations of the earth as the outstanding shining example of the right and capacity of a people to govern themselves, and in all essential respects to order their own lives.

Today a world conflagration gravely threatens the peace and security of America. We have come to recognize in this disturbance much more than a periodic contest between two contending nations of Europe. We see it as a challenge by the undemocratic, un-Christian dictators against the Christian democracies. In the outcome of this epochal struggle the fate of liberty and freedom among the peoples of the earth may well depend.

STATUS OF THE WAR

At this critical period in the world conflict, Americans can feel a sense of satisfaction that our armies in every theater of the struggle are making a great contribution to its successful conclusion. As we look forward to the day of final victory we are cheered. If we look backward, we see a tortuous path over which we have struggled to our present state of high perfection, against great difficulties and handicaps. It is not the time nor place to talk too much of the past, but one cannot help recall that almost every effort of our farsighted leaders to prepare America prior to Pearl Harbor met the most stubbon and persistent opposition. We have overcome those difficulties and have practically accomplished the impossible. In the raising of an army and navy, the building of merchant and battleships, the manufacture of munitions and war supplies, and in the production and transportation of food, America has set a record that history will record as phenomenal. It is a tribute to the unity and spirit of our people.

WAR AND PEACE

We are impressed at every turn of the road with the unspeakable horror of war. Its pathway down the years has been strewn with the wreckage of men and nations. Its blighting breath has withered the hopes and aspirations of mankind. Its mailed fist has impeded progress and has destroyed morale. It is the only game at which men play where everyone is the loser. Ever in its wake there is devastation, suffering, heartaches, and death. Therefore, we turn with eyes lifted heavenward and with a fervent prayer upon our lips for the dawning of that blessed day when the battle flags will be furled, and when the war-weary nations of the earth will turn away from their killing and destruction and set about again upon the slow and tedious process of rebuilding the world.

The ideal of peace is comforting. The millennium would be here if we could banish the cause of war. If we could expel from the hearts of men and nations jealousies, thirst for power and territory, and ancient hatreds and intolerance, no doubt there would dawn the day when men could live together in peace and tranquility. That would be a glorious era. Until, however, we can remove these causes and irritations we must be prepared to protect ourselves. The poet has said, "Only he deserves liberty who is prepared to win it for himself every day."

"FREEDOM

"O freedom! Thou are not, as poets dream,
A fair young girl with light and delicate limbs,
And wavy tresses gushing from the cap
With which the Roman master crowned his slave
When he took off the gyves. A bearded man,
Armed to the teeth, art thou; one mailed hand
Grasps the broad shield and one the sword; Thy brow,
Glorious in beauty tho' it be, is scarred
With tokens of old wars; thy massive limbs
Are strong with struggling. Oh, not yet
May'st thou unbrace thy corselet nor lay by
Thy sword; nor yet, O freedom, close thy lids
In slumber; for thine enemy never sleeps,
And thou must watch and combat 'till the day
Of the new earth and heaven."

Now let us turn to the home front for a moment:

FISCAL AFFAIRS

"Peace hath her problems no less renowned than War."

American citizens would be most shortsighted, and those of us in authority would be derelict in our duty if we did not feel grave concern over the fiscal status of America from now on out. We will emerge from this war with a stupendous debt, probably $300,000,000,000, most of which went for war purposes, but it's a debt just the same. We will have outstanding billions of dollars in War bonds. These solemn obligations of the Government will be found in banks and in the lock boxes of our citizens in every walk of life. In many cases they will constitute the life savings of the individual. Any impairment of these bonds or Government obligations would be a shock to the financial structure of the Nation of the most far-reaching and disastrous proportions. We must not let that occur. In addition to the above, we will be called upon in the post-war period, certainly for years to come, to support and maintain a military establishment, for our security, vastly larger than anything we have ever had in peacetime. This will call for large expenditures. All of this points up to one conclusion—we must cut down the overhead costs of government; war agencies must be liquidated immediately the war is over: regular Government establishments must be streamlined and curtailed; we must stop the parade to the Public Treasury; we must insist upon the States assuming their fair and proper proportion of the responsibility and costs of social and reform activities. We must not only talk about these things, we must do something about it. If we should fail in this duty, in my judgment, chaos and disaster will come upon our people. We will for a while stagger along under a back-breaking tax burden and then finally collapse under its weight. With that collapse, we will see again long lines of the unemployed asking for work when there is none. Again, we will hear in the market place and on the farm the chilling cry of the auctioneer as he sells business, home, and farm for debts that cannot be paid. The American people must arise in their might and demand of their representatives that the fiscal house of this Nation be set in order.

WAR CONTROLS MUST END WITH THE WAR

I think most of us realize that the gigantic undertaking of this Nation in the field of industrial mobilization for war and food production has made it necessary to have certain controls and regulations relating to business as well as individuals. Many of these necessary controls have been most irritating—some that have been necessary have been poorly administered. In any event, it should be the purpose of the Government to release these controls and regulations just as rapidly as may be possible consistent with an orderly transformation from our present high-geared war economy to a peacetime era. Government by executive decree and regimentation are not only distasteful to the American people but are essentially contrary to our way of life. Such procedures can only be justified as a war necessity. When the war ends, these controls must end.

POST-WAR AMERICA

When we look beyond the present conflict there are certain things that immediately come to mind.

1. I think it can be said that the decisions which will have more to do with the future peace of the world, and the future welfare of the American people, will be made not on the battlefields but at the peace table. It will be from these decisions that our course over the next generations will be chartered. It is, therefore, most important that the American policy in the international field be definite and positive, and that it be supported by a united home front.

2. If we have learned one lesson from this war it should be that we must have in the post-war period, for our security as well as our prestige, a strong military establishment, on the land, on the sea, and in the air. We must not repeat the blunder of World War No. 1 when we dismantled our Navy and demobilized our Army. Certainly for many years to come America must be in a formidable military posture.

3. On the home front the post-war period will be a challenge to America's economic leadership. Of all the nations engaged in the war, at its conclusion our economic position will be the most favorable. We will have wealth and natural resources; unlimited highly trained manpower, a greatly expanded industrial system, and a vast fleet of ships capable of bringing to us needed raw materials and of carrying to other nations the products of our factories and fields. There will be plenty of customers. American citizens will be in the market for the purchase of every manner and type of consumer goods. There will be much building to be done, and many municipal improvements to be made. In the foreign field, a devastated world will look to America for tools, machinery, manufactured products, and everything necessary for its rehabilitation. If the economic leadership of America has the intelligence and the wisdom to move in and chart the course for this critical area, there should be ahead of us in the post-war period a decade of unprecedented prosperity and well-being.

NO GROUND FOR PESSIMISM

I have spoken of the war and its effect and recounted some of the problems that lie ahead of us. I cannot overestimate or emphasize too strongly the many difficult and perplexing problems that this Nation will have to meet. It is truly a critical period. There is plenty of ground for grave concern, but I would not be true to my own feelings if I did not say that I belive there is no doubt about our ultimate triumph, over not only our enemies on the battlefield, but over our economic and social ills on the home front. There are two words that need to be our watchwords as we face the future: Courage and faith. These will bring us through; and let us remember if you please, that our Nation has many times before faced very critical periods and each time has emerged greater and stronger for the test.

If the hour looks dark, and we feel discouraged, I would like to bring you just a word of consolation. May I read you a short article from a popular magazine:

"TODAY

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years—not in the lifetime of most men who read this—has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time.

"In our own country there is universal commercial prostration and panic, and thousands of our poorest fellow citizens are turned out against the approaching winter without employment, and without the prospect of it.

"In France the political caldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty; Russia hangs as usual, like a cloud, dark and silent upon the horizon of Europe; while all the energies, resources, and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried, and are yet to be tried more sorely, in coping with the vast and deadly disturbed relations in China.

"It is a solemn moment, and no man can feel an indifference—which happily, no man pretends to feel—in the issue of events.

"Of our own troubles (in the U. S. A.) no man can see the end. They are, fortunately, as yet mainly commercial; and if we are only to lose money, and by painful poverty to be taught wisdom—the wisdom of honor, of faith, of sympathy and of charity—no man need seriously to despair.

"And yet the very haste to be rich which is the occasion of this widespread calamity, has also tended to destroy the moral forces with which we are to resist and subdue the calamity." (From Harpers Weekly, vol. 1, p. 642, issue of Oct. 10, 1857.)

If you are disturbed about political trends, I would like to quote from a prominent newspaper:

"We saw the Executive power grasp in one hand the sword and the purse of the Nation, and in the other the legislative and judicial authority, and hold them in a relentless grip to the complete annihilation of our constitutional rights.

"We saw trade disordered, Government finances ruined, an enormous debt piled incalculably high, intolerable taxes. We saw the superb Constitution, under which our country has grown great and respected, torn to shreds." (From Salem (Ill.) Advocate, November 13, 1863. In the middle of the first term of Mr. Lincoln.)

SPIRIT OF AMERICA

Courage, faith— these are the watchwords that will take us through. The spirit of America that guides us today—that spirit to be found in civilians on the home front, and in the unconquerable hearts of our men on the fighting fronts—that spirit will lead us to victory.

A great Virginian, the late John Goode, was fond of telling this story:

When he was in London in the eighties he was the guest of the American Ambassador at a dinner given to foreign ambassadors and their attachés. At this dinner there had been "flows of richest wines and richer flows of wit and repartee."

One member of the French Legation exhilarated beyond discretion, and remembering the deep wound which Germany had made into the side of France by the cutting away of Alsace and Lorraine, proposed thi- toast:

"Here's to the French Republic: Bounded on the south by Spain, Portugal, and Switzerland; bounded on the west by the Atlantic Ocean; bounded on the north by the English Channel, and—"

Here he paused, and glaring angrily into the face of the German Ambassador—

"Bounded on the east by the River Rhine."

The American Ambassador gasped with amazement at this breach of social etiquette, but a young Englishman with rare presence of mind sought to interpret it as a bit of harmless braggadocio by prosposing:

"Here's to the British Empire: Bounded on the north by the North Pole, on the south by the South Pole, on the east by the rising sun, and on the west by the setting sun."

When old Rodley D. Evans, of the county of Floyd, in the State of Virginia, then a captain in the United States Navy, rose slowly and deliberately to his feet, and in his deep, sea voice exclaimed: "Here's to the American Republic—not her physical boundaries, for she wants no more than she has, but here's to the spirit of America: Bounded on the north by the Aurora Borealis, on the east by the creation of man, on the south by the procession of the equinoxes, and on the west by the day of judgment."

And, my friends, what Rodley Evans said was true. For the spirit of America has taken of the earth old hopes and hungers of the human soul, builded of them a structure of society and government rising full high above the corruption of selfish, and the confusion of reckless, thought, and in the structure, as in a temple of human liberties, has lighted an enduring flame which shall, in God's providence, grow brighter and brighter unto the perfect day.

Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, some criticism has been heard on this floor and elsewhere concerning certain actions of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. John Collier. Convinced as I am that all of us wish to hear both sides of such a controversy, I am inserting here as part of my extension of remarks a report from Mr. Collier to the Secretary of the Interior, which should help to clarify this whole picture:

MARCH 24, 1944.

Memorandum for the Secretary:

I am informed that my last summer's field trip has been criticized by one Purl Willis, who appeared before the House Appropriations Committee while I was in Chicago. I have requested of the committee that I be heard, but in the meantime I supply you full information.

My trip took me from here to Chicago, and I spent 1 day at the office, and from Chicago I went to Albuquerque by overnight flight. From Albuquerque I went to the pueblos of Isleta, Laguna, and Acoma, en route to Window Rock. At Window Rock I met for 2 days with the Navajo Tribal Council, thence I flew to Las Vegas, Nev., where I was met by Superintendent Foster and the extension agent of the jurisdiction. Explanatory of the use of air transport, I point out that rail connections with southern Nevada are indirect and slow; that if I had not flown it would have been necessary for Superintendent Foster and his staff member to meet me somewhere along the Santa Fe Railway, probably at the Walapai headquarters, using 2 days and nights of their time and some five to six hundred miles of automobile travel, and using approximately 3 days of my time.

Departing from Las Vegas, we went to the Moapa Reservation for the day, and thence on to Stewart, through the Walker River Reservation. Arriving at Stewart, our agency headquarters, I made this place my center, occupying guest quarters there, and from Stewart for the next 3½ weeks, I visited at different reservations of Nevada, going over all of the types of problems and meeting with the tribal councils. By the end of that time I had visited all of the Nevada reservations, except McDermitt and Western Shoshone, which is to say more than a dozen of them. During this same time I worked through the problems of the agency, rather systematically, i. e., the school and health programs, the extension and credit programs, meeting with the staff and, indeed, with all of the personnel, and incidentally addressing the Lions and Rotary Clubs at Carson City.

I should have continued this active duty for another week or so, but on August 4 I developed a streptococcus infection of the right eye which involved the other eye sympathetically and which all but blinded me and, indeed, but for sulfa drugs, I should have lost the eye. This infection continued from August 4 to August 18, and for this period I took sick leave. Actually, I worked pretty steadily through this time, likewise receiving my office correspondence and having it read to me and dictating the responses. After sick leave ending on August 18, I took annual leave consecutively until September 12, and my leave extended for a total of 37 days.

During this time, i. e., on August 23, I obtained a divorce at Reno, and thereafter I remarried.

Resuming active duty on September 12, I proceeded to complete my inspection of the Indian areas, going with Superintendent Foster to McDermitt for a day and a night, and thence on, by Government car, to the Hopi Reservation in Arizona for 2 days, and thence to the Navaho Agency for a day, and thence in another Government car to Albuquerque. Superintendent Foster drove me to Keams Canyon and then departed on official business which he had to transact at Phoenix, Pima, and Poston, Ariz.

At Albuquerque I worked 2 days at United Pueblos, meeting with various of the Pueblo

groups, and I departed by train on the 21st for Chicago, and thence, after 5 days at the office in Chicago, on to Washington by train.

I am unable to decipher clearly the basis of complaint about the above record. Nevada is one of our important Indian areas, and the latest of my previous inspections meetings there had been as much as 4 years ago. I had never visited Moapa and McDermitt before. In successive years I had held out to the Indians hope that I would come, but had not taken the time because of the demands of other areas. The Indian area of Nevada represents a considerably wide area of Indian country, i. e., the whole region where relatively small groups of Indians, islanded within white populations, are being rehabilitated through the mechanisms and resources being made possible by the Indian Reorganization Act. Perhaps nowhere else has the happy transformation from Indian life been achieved as in five or six of the Nevada reservations like McDermitt, Duckwater, and Reese River. Also, Nevada is an area where certain of the Indian groups, through the reorganization act, have progressed so far that the withdrawal of much Government supervision is possible and is in fact planned and in one case being achieved now.

Nevada also is a State where public relations are of first importance; hence I made contact while there with the Governor, with Senator SCRUGHAM, with the attorneys in charge of our water adjustments at Walker River and along the Truckee River, and with the press.

During my time in Nevada, I obtained a divorce. That circumstance I take it concerns nobody, the only question being whether, during the fraction of my time that I was on active duty in Nevada, I was on genuine and important public duty. Manifestly I was.

Due to the loss of time through the eye infection, I could not get to western Shoshone, but instead Superintendent Beck came to see me, and I promised the Western Shoshones that I would make a visit there this year if it were humanly possible.

JOHN COLLIER,
Commissioner.

P. S.—I failed to include mention of the item, called attention to by the Comptroller General, that my plane trip from Window Rock to Las Vegas was charged against Navaho Agency funds. That was done because it is the Navaho Agency which has the contract with Mr. Cutter's plane. The charge has been, or will be as a matter of routine, shifted to our headquarters travel fund, being properly a charge against that fund; the Navaho Agency being reimbursed from that fund.

J. C.

Post-War Federal Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a speech I made at the seventh annual meeting of the Institute of Accounting at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, on Saturday, May 20, 1944:

I hope you will forgive a Kansas farmer and livestockman for presuming to come here and speak to you Ohioans about government. Your Buckeye State has produced seven Presidents, and manages to keep a contingent of Senators and Representatives of outstanding caliber in Washington. Virginia has given us eight Presidents and I see by the papers you've got a Governor who is willing to have Ohio tie this record.

It is my private opinion that I was asked here for an infusion of your higher learning; that you folks decided after looking over the tax situation to do something for the Nation and quietly bring in someone from the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress for indoctrination in some of your own hard-headed, time-worn principles which make for progress and wel' being.

In all seriousness I am honored by your invitation to come and speak to you. It is a most serious assignment. I wish I had the eloquence to inflame this whole Nation to the vital importance to all of us, collectively and individually, of planning right now the tax program we shall require for peacetime happiness and prosperity.

Why is this so important?

Here's why: All those warm, delightful freedoms that we talk about and preach about—economic freedoms and personal freedoms—can be as completely destroyed by vicious and short-sighted tax policies as they would be by the rule of a conquering Tojo or Hitler.

For instance, in our Federal tax structure we allow tax credits for gifts and contributions to churches, educational institutions, and philanthrophies. Now just suppose the Congress changed this sound policy. Suppose that tax laws made it practically impossible for our churches and other private institutions to exist.

What, then, happens to our cherished freedom of worship?

Suppose we let some of our professional business baiters have their way about taxing private industry. Suppose rates which now range up to 95 percent are carried over into the post-war period.

How then could our business concerns make up the gap in our economic life which will come about when Government spending drops from a war level of more than $100,000,000,000 to an anticipated peacetime level of eighteen to twenty billion dollars?

If we make it impossible for our factories, our arms, and our stores to busy themselves in peacetime activities, what then happens to our freedom of opportunity and the job holders freedom from want?

The point is, with the war on its way to being won, this is no time to grow careless of our national economy. It has had a terrific shock, with taxes reaching toward the point of diminishing returns. But, after all, our American economy is one of the very things we are fighting for.

Our national policy in taxation, as well as in other matters, must clearly encourage our people to depend upon themselves first and upon Government second. I hold that government is the servant of the people, unless as Thomas Jefferson said, we can find an angel in the form of a king.

When government uses its power to levy and borrow in reckless manner, the pattern traced throughout all history is of government becoming the master of the people, and inevitably a decline in national strength with lowered standards of character and living. The great mass of people ultimately have suffered from unsound fiscal policies.

Look down the centuries—Jerusalem, Babylon, Athens, Rome. Old glories buried in rubble, empires broken down by tax loads, skeletons in history's closet that rattle in our ears.

Today the rubble is piling up again in Italy, also in Germany. Let's look at their mileposts to infamy.

They began with bewildered, muddled statecraft and a confused, desperate national economy. Comes the depression and a dictator who knows all, does all. The people barter freedom on a false altar of security. Then came juggled deficit financing, huge public works, big armies, bitterness between labor and capital. They called it National Socialism. Inevitable social unrest must be blamed on something, so minorities are persecuted and finally a nation sees an answer in the spoils of war.

More and more we hear discussions of a post-war world where peace is to be fostered by international harmony and economic stability. Yet these things must begin at home. International relationships never can be satisfactory unless internal conditions are sound. One of our greatest contributions to the future peace of the world can be to put our own financial house in order by establishing a national policy of wise Government spending, a stable currency, balanced budgets, and a positive program of debt retirement.

This is our traditional fiscal policy. With its help these United States grew fast and strong so that today the world almost takes for granted that we shall not only perform a modern miracle of war production, but that we shall be strong enough to underwrite the peace as well.

This year the Federal Government has a budget of $104,000,000,000, mostly for war purposes. We will pay in only about $45,000,000,000 of taxes. The difference is a big deficit, yes; but $45,000,000,000 of taxes is more in volume and more per capita than any nation under the sun is paying or ever has paid.

One hundred and four billion dollars going out; forty-five billion dollars coming in. That is the way this year's books do not balance. We are just borrowing that balance. It can be called deficit financing, although plain people simply refer to it as going in the red.

I don't have to tell you we couldn't raise even close to $104,000,000,000 by taxation. If we tried to raise that amount by taxes, our war effort and everything else would stop functioning. Taxes, even in wartime, reach a point of diminishing returns. In a way it is good that they do, for it is a constant reminder that the precious things bringing us victory today—labor, enterprise, industry, and national muscle—grew on a land relatively free of taxes, and I don't think they will grow in any other soil.

Let's take a look at our rising tax thermometer. At the turn of the century, taxes were 5 percent of the national income. Taxes were 14 percent in 1920. In 1944, the economists predict they will amount to 38 percent of the national income. Only patriotism in time of war will tolerate such great diversion of income to government.

One of the most effective ways of improving the Treasury's position is to carefully scrutinize the expenditure side of the budget. Every dollar that can be saved means one less dollar of present or future taxes. I am afraid we have become too careless with hundreds of billions and other astronomical figures in recent years. Fifty million taxpayers are awakening to the fact it is their money that is being so loosely tossed about.

So much for the immediate problem, which is only a small taste, only a beginning of the critical days ahead. In considering the post-war tax program, we are trying to determine what our needs will be, for it will be a tragic travesty on a glorious and costly victory if that program is not wisely planned and soon.

We shall come out of the war with a debt of $300,000,000,000. You have to put down some figure. That's the one I put down. The debt is not all for war; it is the accumulation of 14 years of deficit financing. We haven't had a balanced budget since 1930.

Now, if we pay 2-percent interest on that $300,000,000,000 debt, we shall have $6,000,000,000 to pay in interest annually. Not many years ago, $6,000,000,000 would have carried the whole Government cost.

So we'll have interest on the debt, and we must try to write off the principal as we

go along. If we should set aside as much as $10,000,000,000 annually for debt and interest repayment, it would take three generations to get a clean slate.

Here are some other major items that will be saddled onto the Nation's taxpaying power in the coming days of peace.

We are going to maintain a big Army and Navy.

We are committed, with our allies, to help rehabilitate destitute nations.

We are committed to muster-out payments for our sons and daughters coming home from war.

We are committed to the hospitalization and rehabilitation of veterans and their dependents.

We have made extensive investments abroad in facilities for war and trade—South America, Canada, Egypt, and elsewhere—to maintain—or liquidate.

The cost of our post-war economy, including these major items, is variously estimated from $18,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000 annually. But this figure is not nearly so important as the figure it must derive from—our national income.

Today we are able to collect $45,000,000,000 in taxes simply because our national income is around $150,000,000,000. Had we tried to collect $45,000,000,000 in 1932—it would have been necessary to confiscate practically every cent of income.

Right here is the major point of everything I have to say. Government, with its tax policy, must be as eager to promote a constructive peace as it was a destructive war. The soundest maxim we can follow is the American device of low rates and high volume. This is the only way to avoid subterfuges of inflation or debt repudiation. It is the American way. No imported false economies here. And it will bring us the volume of tax revenue needed to pay our bill like freemen; to thus preserve our savings, our insurance, our pensions, the buying power of our wages.

Suppose for a moment we just consider the opposite conception of taxation from our time-proved way. Suppose we say, Let's have high tax rates and low volume. What happens then? Why, the American family car will become a sharecroppers' mule, and the missus will go back to the washboard and spinning wheel of her grandmother's day. The guy who holds the mortgage this time will be Uncle Sam and his crew of tax collectors.

High rates and low volume is nothing more than government of the Government, by the Government, and for the Government.

How do we pay off? I offer you a constructive program of six points.

1. By stimulated civilian production, freed of governmental control. Farms, factories, mills, utilities, trains, steamships, stores must earn money to pay taxes. They won't have income to tax, if government continues directives, regulations, priorities, and confiscatory taxes. Some controls, I grant, are needed to hold back inflation and black markets until production can more nearly meet the pent-up consumer demands at the close of war. But production must be freed of restrictions at the earliest moment.

I like to think that tomorrow's peaceful world will hold tremendous opportunity. The opportunity system made our Nation great. It can make it great again. And it can bring it nearer to a sound position more quickly than any other system which has sprung from the mind of man. Let's have no more of class legislation that stifles ideas for production and keeps idle the wealth that should be producing national income and making jobs.

2. Small companies and new enterprises should be spared at least a part of the tax responsibilities of established concerns until they achieve footing in the economic life. The automobile, the radio, and the airplane all came out of small shops. Continued progress is inseparable from free enterprise of the individual, which of necessity starts from small beginnings.

The war has played havoc with small concerns. A Department of Commerce study showed 273,000 firms, mostly small ones, went out of business from June 1940 to June 1942—an average of 450 each working day.

Small business not only brings vigorous growth to our economic life, it also has a profound social significance. The small businessman is an important part of our community existence. Many of our returning veterans will establish their own enterprises as a way of life as well as a means of earning a living. The independence and vigor of small companies shall be encouraged by definite tax concessions.

We Kansas farmers think we particularly have common cause with the small-business man. A livestockman is just as much in the meat business as your corner butcher or the meat packer. We stockmen are small-business men. And that it why I know that all business, big and little, needs only the chance to prove that economic and national progress are one and the same thing.

3. Obstructions to the flow of capital into productive industry should be removed. So it is a healthy sign to hear so much discussion of eliminating all or part of the double taxation on corporate dividends. The workingman has a great stake in this, for it takes about $6,000 of plant, machinery, and working capital to provide one person with a job. A wise tax structure will bring venture capital into productive, employment giving enterprises.

Many of you no doubt noticed Ralph Robey's article in Newsweek of what happens to investments for venture capital for new business. Mr. Robey analyzes what happens if 10 men, each with a taxable income of $50,000, should put up $100,000 for a million-dollar corporation and it should have the luck to earn $100,000 the first year before taxes. The minimum Federal tax such a corporation would pay would be $40,000 leaving $60,000 to be paid in dividends, apparently a return of 6 percent to the stockholders. But as each stockholder is in the $50,000 income-tax bracket he would have to pay a tax of $4,500 out of each $6,000 dividend. This would leave each stockholder a net return on his $100,000 investment of $1,500, or 1.5 percent. This stockholder would no doubt figure that a return of 1.5 percent would hardly compensate him for taking the risk of putting his money into new ventures. Now, if he had a lower taxable income of say $14,000 a year his return would net him a glittering 3 percent. But, if his income was $14,000 he probably wouldn't have $100,000 to invest in this new enterprise.

I suggest we revise our tax structure so that individuals will be encouraged to put their savings to work in post-war America, as savings have been put to work in this Nation since its beginning.

4. The pending tax bill, the so-called simplification bill, goes a long way toward wiping out taxpayer perplexities. But the tax law should be simplified even more. As you know, the simplification bill deals only with personal taxes—business taxes are still to be considered. The entire code on Federal corporate taxes must be scrutinized, and unproductive but bothersome tax levies eliminated. For instance, the declared value tax and the related capital stock tax, which actually produce only an extremely small net revenue, should be eliminated.

Please do not think I am here trying to inject personalities or politics, but I feel it my duty to tell you quite frankly that we Republicans anticipate having to carry the weight of the responsibility in meeting the coming historic fiscal crisis of staggering debt and post-war tax problems. That is the reason our minority leader, Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, has named a committee on taxation of which I am a member. We are preparing for the job. And I am particularly anxious concerning the future of the corporate income tax, for it is my special duty in this Republican group, as chairman of the corporate tax subcommittee, to formulate an incentive tax program, And if any of you can help a Kansas cattleman, I urge you to give me the benefit of your ideas.

Also, at the close of war we should terminate the excess-profits tax. In this country and in foreign countries the excess-profits tax has been used primarily to capture war profits, but the very nature of the tax has made necessary various optional methods and innumerable relief provisions which have added reams of confusing technical provisions to our tax statutes. In dropping the excess-profits tax when peace comes we can simplify our tax law and regulations in very substantial degree.

5. Hand in hand with simplification, our future tax policy must contemplate an improvement in the administration of the tax laws. We must encourage tax officials of the highest caliber and make it worth while to remain in public service and free them of domination by political forces.

The cost of tax compliance in the United States is tremendous. Business taxpayers particularly feel the impact of more than 175,000 tax collecting bodies. The Federal Government is, of course, the number one tax collector, and the administration of the Federal tax statutes involves billions of dollars of manpower and effort on the part of both taxpayers and Government. I believe we have a serious responsibility in the Congress to examine the matter of tax administration and to write tax statutes which will foster certainty and equity.

The intent of Congress must be made so plain there will be little chance of inequity or misinterpretation. As a matter of principle the executive branch of Government should not be empowered to determine income, deductions, and taxes within its own discretion, for it will be only a question of time that such powers will be used for political or punitive purposes.

6. And, finally, when we have our house in order and our economy at work on a truly democratic basis, we must intelligently gage our earning power, set our tax sights on the maximum business and trade and employment—and cut the cloth accordingly.

I believe some economists hold that if taxes go beyond 25 percent of the national income, they begin to reach a point of diminishing returns. That is to say, a 40-percent rate might produce less money than a 20-percent rate simply because business production and taxable incomes would begin falling off under such a tax load.

Well, we are now taxing the Nation about 38 percent of its national income. That's more than economic law allows. The only reason we get by with it is because Uncle Sam is underwriting practically every major industry and service. When he steps out of this responsibility and releases those controls, my friends, we must cut the tax rate.

If our national income after the war runs at a rate of about $125,000,000,000 yearly, it is my belief that we would be foolhardy to attempt to levy more than $10,000,000,000 in State and local taxes and about $18,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 in Federal taxes. If this is our post-war tax limit, we must keep the expenditure side of the budget within governmental income.

We would do well to remember that $18,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 of Federal Government is a lot of government. We used to get along quite well in the 1920's, for instance, on one-sixth as much. There is no magic in large-scale spending by Government. If it has any virtues at all, they lie within narrow and temporary limits.

I have a great faith in our future. I know there are those who look to Government as the cornucopia from which all blessings flow. But that frame of mind is a foreign importation. When our young manhood returns from the four corners of the earth they will bring with them—and to us—a better appreciation of American standards of self-dependence in a framework of self-government.

Why, we've had some professors tell us we'd be better off with trillions instead of puny millions of debt. But, as a friend of mine says, those fellows have upside-down brains. I'll venture they have a hard time running a farm or grocery store on that theory.

Our eternal hope, now as always, is the moral fiber of America. We spent hard dollars; we borrowed hard dollars, we will pay back hard dollars. What's done cannot be undone—as Lady Macbeth said—and so with honest purpose, let us get on with the job of making our own future.

Sewell Avery Versus the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting in the RECORD the sixth and last article of a series of articles which have appeared daily in the Chicago Sun under the title "Sewell Avery Versus the People." This article appeared in the May 20, 1944, issue, is entitled "W. L. B. Records Show High Job Turn-over in Ward's Plants," and is as follows:

SEWELL AVERY VERSUS THE PEOPLE—W. L. B. RECORDS SHOW HIGH JOB TURN-OVER IN WARD'S PLANTS

(Last of a series)

(By Thomas F. Reynolds and Charles O. Gridley)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—Montgomery Ward & Co. has not passed a dividend on its common stock since 1933. In the years since Sewell L. Avery took command of the mail-order house, Ward has piled up net profits totaling $197,470,000.

In the same period, Avery's operating policies in his own plant were of a nature that caused a War Labor Board investigating panel to report "a wage scale which is very low" and "an abnormally high [personnel] turnover, indicative of employee unrest."

"The Montgomery Ward turn-over, however," this W. L. B. panel reported officially on September 6, 1942, "is excessive and not to be explained by seasonal lay-offs and rehirings alone, or even by inductions into the armed service. Almost half of the regular workers in the [Chicago] retail store, the Schwinn warehouse, and more than one-fourth in the mail-order house have been with the company less than 6 months. Further, 57 percent, 62 percent, and 44 percent of the workers in the three establishments, respectively, have been with the company for 1 year or less."

In explaining its statement that Avery's wage scale was "very low," the official report said that a wage study had shown that 81.7 percent of the workers in the mail-order house and 83.7 percent of those in the warehouse were paid less than $27 a week. As a result of this report the W. L. B. unanimously ordered an increase of 5 cents an hour for 6,800 of Ward's Chicago employees.

In that year, Ward's had net sales of $635,006,979, and was able to pay a dividend of $3.65 per share on its common stock, out of net income totaling $20,437,583.

For the last 12 years Avery's compensation has never been less than $140,000 a year, the bulk of which came from Montgomery Ward & Co. Records of the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission, however, show that his stockholdings in Ward and other companies boost his annual income far above the $140,000 figure.

The latest proxy files of the S. E. C. show Avery's salary scale for 1934 as follows: Ward, as chairman of the board and director, $100,600; Armour & Co., of Illinois, as director and member of the executive committee, $1,060; Pullman, Inc., as director, $500; United States Steel Corporation, as director, $1,400; the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., as director, $800; Pure Oil Co., as director, $200; United States Gypsum Co., as chairman of the board and director, $40,000; he was also listed as a director and member of the executive committee of Armour & Co., of Delaware, a wholly owned consolidated subsidiary of Armour of Illinois, but the company's annual report does not show any director's remuneration.

The S. E. C. files also revealed his stockholdings as follows: Ward, March 1, 1944, 67,547 shares of common, then quoted at 44½, and 200 shares of class A unbuoted; Armour & Co. of Illinois, December 1943, 100 shares of $6 par preferred, quoted at 68, and 200 shares of common quoted at 4½; United States Steel, February 1, 1944, 1 share of preferred quoted at 120½, and 400 shares of common, quoted at 53; Pullman, Inc., reported February 25, 1944, 200 shares of common quoted at 41½; Peoples Gas Light & Coke, December 31, 1943, 101 shares of common quoted at 53⅞; Pure Oil Co., February 1, 1944, 500 shares of common quoted at 15½; United States Gypsum Co., January 18, 1944, 26,040 shares of common, quoted at 73¾.

Representatives of industry have in some cases strongly condemned Ward's methods.

Harry L. Derby, president of American Cyanamid & Chemical Co., and a director of the National Association of Manufacturers, bitterly assailed Ward on December 8, 1942, after the company had used full-page ads to criticize the board for it, decision in favor of the union. Derby was then an employer member of W. L. B.

"When this board, constituted as it is on a tripartite basis (representing the public, management, and labor) can't decide these things in the light of justice, the way we see it, without being subjected to untruthful attacks, then * * * this form of government is seriously jeopardized," Derby said for the record. "* * * In my humble opinion, Montgomery Ward has done the greatest disservice to industry and the private enterprise system of any concern in the United States, and I feel that just as strongly as I can.

"The ads that you [Wards] put in the papers and broadcast Nation-wide were statements of untruth or half-truths, and the statement that you make this morning that you want to comply with the order of the President of the United States because Ward is so terrifically interested in doing that in time of war doesn't square with the attitude that is expressed here today and * * * I don't care whether Montgomery Ward thinks I represent the viewpoint of industry or not.

"Now, if it is the intent of Montgomery Ward to embarrass this board and the President of the United States, that is all right. We can deal with that, and I have no doubt the President can deal with it. If that is the purpose of all this, taking up the time of this board, when we have such terrifically heavy burdens on our shoulders to carry in this time of war, if that is good citizenship, then perhaps I don't know good citizenship."

On December 25, 1942, Roger D. Lapham, board chairman of the American Hawaiian Steamship Co., then an industry member of the board and now mayor of San Francisco, directly accused Avery of bad faith. In a letter to Avery, Lapham said:

"On November 13 you said you would accept the orders of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief in time of war; on November 18 the President directed you to do so; on November 21 you said you would promptly comply; on December 8 you refused compliance, unless a clause of your own wording was inserted in the agreement. This I hold to be a breach of faith for by your first letter you had committed yourself to a certain course of action and failure to live up to that commitment in spirit if not in actual fact was, I repeat, bad faith. That was my opinion on December 8, and I have had no reason to change it since then."

Criticism of Avery's policies, however, was by no means limited to members of the National War Labor Board. It has been widely voiced by scores of former high executives of Ward's, who resigned or were fired when their views clashed with those of the "boss" upstairs.

They include such highly placed business leaders as Walter Baumhogger, president of United Cigar Stores, Inc.; Raymond Fogler, whom Avery disposed of as president of Ward's without giving him advance notice, who is now president of the W. T. Grant chain of stores; Walter Moving, president of Lord & Taylor, New York department store; Howard Jordan, president, Pennsylvania Rubber Co.; Howard Hudgins, president, Slone Blabon Co.; George W. Vaught, first vice president, Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co.; Frank Folsom, vice president, R. C. A.-Victor Co.; John C. Wilson, vice president, United Wallpaper Factories, Inc., Chicago, the Nation's largest wallpaper manufacturers; Brig. Gen. A. J. Browning, chief of purchases for the Army services, and thus the world's greatest buyer (Browning is president on leave of United Wallpaper); and John Donaldson, vice president of Butler Bros., of Chicago.

These are just a few of the group which calls itself the Montgomery Ward Alumni Association and whose critical opinions of Avery are as voluminous as the Montgomery Ward catalog.

When Folsom, once vice president of Ward's, in charge of merchandising at $71,000 a year, was under consideration for vice president of R. C. A-Victor, Folsom relates, Avery used every ounce of his not inconsiderable financial influence to prevent his former executive from getting the job. But Folsom got it.

Not Tomorrow But Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave just granted to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely and pertinent editorial from the Kansas City Star on one of the most pressing domestic problems of the day. It is not only one of the major post-war problems confronting the Nation, but it is a problem of the immediate present. We

will not be able adequately to meet tomorrow's emergencies unless we begin today.

It is not a new problem. It is as old as the white man's occupancy of the Missouri Valley. And we are not without enlightening and admonitory information on the subject gained through the expensive and agonizing school of practical experience.

Our colleagues are urging the adoption of flood-control plans involving the development of a vast acreage of marginal lands. It has a familiar ring. During the last depression when we were plowing under the pigs and desperately seeking an outlet for mountainous surpluses, these same interests were advocating reclamation projects to bring into profuse production empire-like areas which had never produced a blade of marketable grass.

That is precisely the situation confronting us today. With every warehouse and cold-storage plant filled to capacity; with a total of $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus food on hand which must be loosed on the open market when the armistice is concluded in either the European or Asiatic theater of war, we are asked to bring into cultivation and production 4,000,000 excess acres of land—and do it at the expense of the Federal Government—with no promise or prospect of reimbursement. This is the subject discussed in the accompanying editorial from the Kansas City Star, published in the geographical and financial center of the bread basket of the Nation.

May I earnestly urge the careful consideration of the following editorial by all who are interested in practical flood control and the welfare of American agriculture:

WHY ADD 4,000,900 ACRES

Now that the purpose of the irrigationists and land development companies upriver to control the waters of the Missouri for their own local developments has been brought into plain view, it is time to stop and ask ourselves a question which is highly important but has not much entered into the discussions so far.

What is the need of 4,000,000 extra acres of irrigated land? And especially, what is the need of it when these lands are of such secondary nature that the Governors of the upper Plains States have admitted that these lands cannot of themselves bear the cost of irrigation, and must therefore get free water from reservoirs built by the people's money for other purposes, if they are to be irrigated?

In an address delivered at Chicago late in March, Secretary Claude R. Wickard had some things to say which are very pertinent to these questions. "One of the biggest problems facing American agriculture after the war," he said "will be to find a good market for all the American farmers want to produce and can produce within the limits of sound farming methods."

Estimates by the Department of Agriculture indicate that with high prices and intensive educational campaigns, the farmers of the Nation can, within the next 6 years, on lands now under cultivation, increase their production to 60 percent above the average of 1935–39. Even with moderate prices and only the usual educational methods, this production can be increased up to 40 percent above the pre-war level.

On the other hand, population estimates indicate that by 1950 there will be not more than a 10-percent increase over the average for 1935–39. In other words the agricultural production per capita could be immeasurably beyond any figure comparable in the past.

We did not have the right answer to the farm surplus problem before the war. Looking to the period after the war, the problem remains one which will cause headaches for agricultural and economic leaders.

Under these conditions, a critical condition could be created by the addition of crop surpluses produced on 4,000,000 acres of land which would be made productive only at the expense of the Nation at large. The reclamation bureau estimates an annual raw crop value of $130,000,000 for this acreage—considerably more than one-third of the total value of all Missouri crops in 1942, which was a year of abnormally high acreage yields.

These are all estimates on the conservative side, but they illustrate the competitive weight against the present crop total which would be thrown by such a project as the irrigation interests are advancing. And this added weight is greater when the small list of irrigated products is considered—grains, sugar beets, legume hay, and perhaps flax. Competition in these categories would be excessively punishing.

The total crop production of the new irrigated land might amount to only 1 or 2 percent of the national production—but virtually all of this would be surplus. After the last war, be it remembered, when the wartime production hit the peacetime reduction in demand, a reduction of only 3 or 4 percent in the exports of our surplus rapidly created an unmanageable domestic pile of farm products. The result—the farm depression of the early twenties.

The situation would be different if the farmers of the upper river States were going to expand their irrigation farming by their own efforts. At least there would not under such circumstances be ground for a reasonable objection—even though the rest of the farmers of the Nation did not like it and knew it was affecting directly their own pocketbooks and the living standards of their own families.

But what is being proposed here by the up-river interests is, in a nutshell, a form of parasitism. They desire to levy upon the free water impounded for other purposes, to develop these potentially disastrous competitive areas. Further, they propose to obtain priorities on all up-river waters, even when the rights to the use of them down river have been established by many decades of use for antedating the claims of the dry-land development companies.

The old State rights cry has been raised—a convenient red herring. Senator WHEELER cried "States' rights" in a recent speech—and yet demanded Federal money to carry out his program of irrigation development. In this instance, obviously, the aegis of State rights is meant to apply only to Senator WHEELER's little bloc of States. It is a poor principle that works only one way. There are State rights also involved in the necessities of the down-river States—rights every bit as cogent as those of the Senator's bailiwick.

To return again to the question of the 4,000,000 acres of secondary, public-expense, free-water irrigation land proposed by the Reclamation Bureau, the land companies, and the immigration companies of certain railroads, it may be of interest to note that there are far cheaper and better ways of increasing national food production, whenever we shall need it in the future, than this method. It can be done at comparatively small cost by protecting the bottomlands from flood and by improving the uplands of the present established farm area.

Already there is enough farm land available for the next several generations. The values of this land are established, and the equities therein. The opening of a great new area of farm land could very easily cause loss to the people who have been working this soil for decades, and create serious economic dislocations.

We have a surplus of food now in the midst of war. We have had a prodigious experience in the past of striving to meet periodic peacetime surpluses. We know we can, if need be, greatly increase our present crop production. Why, therefore, the necessity of an additional 4,000,000 acres of land which could never support the cost of being brought under irrigation? And particularly in view of a comprehensive river plan such as the Pick plan which is not a sectional plan, not an irrigation plan, not a navigation plan, not a flood-prevention plane alone, but a fair combination program for advancing the interests of all sections, in relation to the combined interests of all.

The Real Truth and Facts Behind Montgomery Ward & Co.'s Defiant Position Obscured From the Public

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has called attention to the fact that the Government was obliged to take over another Montgomery Ward & Co. plant, the Hummer Manufacturing Co., at Springfield, Ill., of which Mr. Sewell Avery is president, and where gun mounts and other essential war products are manufactured. When the company's Chicago plant was taken over and Mr. Avery insisted upon being carried out by uniformed soldiers so that photographs might be taken for campaign purposes, it was charged that the President had exceeded his authority and that the Montgomery Ward & Co. was a mere mail-order house. At that time Mr. Avery and the company officials, as well as the press if it had the information, withheld from the public the fact that the company controlled quite a number of manufacturing plants which are part and parcel of the great Montgomery Ward institution.

I mentioned then that the company and its divisions not only manufactured but handled many hundreds of articles needed in the prosecution of the war. I repeat, these facts were withheld from the public and the Republicans were using this incident for political purposes, and I reiterate my statement now. Not only was the President charged with exceeding his authority but the opinion strongly voiced by many on the other side of the aisle that no business, however small, was safe from being taken over by the Government, and many other ridiculous charges were made. To these statements I replied that the President had jurisdiction under the Constitution, saying nothing as to the various acts of Congress which gave him authority to

act. Today, after having read the opinion of an outstanding jurist of a United States court in Kentucky, handed down a few days ago, I am fully satisfied that the action of the President in the Montgomery Ward & Co. matter was entirely in keeping with the powers granted him under the Constitution and the several laws enacted by Congress. For the information of the House and the country I shall include the decision of the learned Judge MacSwinford as part of my remarks and a reading of it by any fair-minded person will satisfy him beyond the question of a doubt that the President did have jurisdiction in the Montgomery Ward & Co. matter as in the cited case of the Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corporation, of Owensboro, Ky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave to insert the opinion of the court at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The opinion referred to is as follows:

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, OWENSBORO DIVISION, NO. 132; KEN-RAD TUBE & LAMP CORPORATION, OWENSBORO, KY., PLAINTIFF, V. CARROLL BADEAU, DEFENDANT

OPINION

This case is before me on the plaintiff's motion for a permanent injunction and on the defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint. The record is complete and it is finally submitted for determination on its merits.

The plaintiff, the Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corporation, of Owensboro, Ky., seeks to permanently enjoin the defendant, Carroll Badeau, from placing in effect, in any of its plants, an order of the National War Labor Board, pertaining to certain wage readjustments in the plaintiff's plants and to permanently enjoin the defendant from seizing, or holding possession of, or operating any properties of the plaintiff.

The plaintiff is, and has been for many years, successfully engaged in the manufacture of radio tubes and incandescent lamps, with plants located at Owensboro and Bowling Green, Ky., and Tell City, Huntingsburg and Rockport, Ind. It employs approximately 5,000 people.

The defendant, Carroll Badeau, who is a colonel in the United States Army and acting under orders from his superiors, has seized possession of the plaintiff's properties.

The entire plants and properties of the plaintiff, insofar as this lawsuit is concerned, have been, were at the time of the seizure, and are now and will continue to be admittedly devoted exclusively to the manufacture of essential war material.

The source of the authority claimed by the defendant for his action in seizing the property is an order of the President of the United States, dated April 13, 1944, and addressed to the Secretary of War. The order is preceded by the following recital:

"Whereas after investigation I find and proclaim that there is a threatened interruption of the operation of the plants and facilities of Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corporation and Ken-Rad Transmitting Tube Corporation, located at Owensboro, Ky., as a result of a labor disturbance, and that the war effort would be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption: Now, therefore,

"By virtue of the power and authority vested in my by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as President of the United States and commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, it is hereby directed as follows:"

It is contended by the plaintiff that the seizure is without authority of law; that the order of the President was based primarily upon a report to him of the War Labor Board that the labor conditions in the plaintiff's plants were in an unsettled state and that production would be hampered, retarded, or stopped by labor disputes and threatened strikes; that all of this was caused by the fact that the plaintiff had refused to put into effect an order of the War Labor Board.

The plaintiff admits that it declined to abide by the order of the War Labor Board but states that the order was void and of no effect, because of the failure of the Board to accord the plaintiff a hearing, the unlawful assumption of the rule-making power by the Board, the unlawful reduction of the beginner's training period, the unlawful retroactive effect of the order, the unlawful participation of employee representatives in the Board's order, and the imposition of confiscatory wage rates, which did not comply with the provisions of the act that any order of the Board should be fair and equitable.

To summarize the plaintiff's position in this effect, it reasons that since the order of the President directing the seizure of the plant was based upon a fear of threatened strikes and the threatened strikes were the result of the failure of the plaintiff to abide by an order of the War Labor Board and the order of the War Labor Board was invalid because of the above-enumerated reasons, then the order of the President was invalid and there could, therefore, be no seizure.

I do not think that the determination of this case depends upon whether or not the order of the War Labor Board was valid or invalid.

The decision must be based upon either constitutional or statutory authority vesting in the President a legal right to issue such an order. If he had that right, by statutes, or in the absence of adequate statutes, the right under the Constitution, the plaintiff has failed in the case and its complaint should be dismissed. Or if it be determined from the record that, even though he might have had the right, he acted arbitrarily and without cause in issuing such an order, then the prayer of the plaintiff's complaint should be sustained and an equitable order entered.

It is my judgment that this case, and all others like it, may be reduced to a simple formula: Did the President act arbitrarily in ordering the facilities to be taken over by the Army? Proof that he did so act shall be upon him who asserts it.

If this seems to be an extreme view, it should be called to the attention of those who so claim that, with the country at war, fighting for its very existence, extremities are commonplace. No war hysteria should prompt the adoption of basically unsound legal reasoning; neither should blind complacency or a false sense of the country's security cause the court of the land to grant to those charged with preserving the Nation less than the full measure of constitutional and legislative authority.

Before going into the determination of this case on its merits it is necessary to consider and pass upon certain defenses. It is first contended that the suit here is one against the United States to which the United States has not consented. In support of this position the defendant cites: *New Mexico* v. *Lane* (243 U. S. 52); *Louisiana* v. *Garfield* (211 U. S. 70; *Minnesota* v. *Hitchcock* (185 U. S. 373); *Nagenab* v. *Hitchcock* (202 U. S. 473). I do not believe any of these cases warrants the court in dismissing this proceeding. While I of course, acknowledge the general rule as laid down in each of these cases, it is a well recognized exception, that where the Government acquires property from a party to a pending suit, its rights in such property are subject to the result of the litigation the same as would be those of an individual. Re *Ward et al.* v. *Congress Construction Company* (99 F. 598); *Philadelphia Company* v. *Stimson* (223 U. S. 605); *Miguel* v. *McCarl* (29 P. U. S. 442); *Payne* v. *Central Pacific Railway Co.* (255 U. S. 229).

In the case of *Work* v. *Louisiana* (269 U. S. 250), the Secretary of the Interior was proceeded against for injunctive relief by the State of Louisiana to present the rejection of a claim to land upon what was alleged to be an erroneous interpretation of the law. The opinion stated:

"It is clear that if this order exceeds the authority conferred upon the secretary by law and is an illegal act done under color of his office, he may be enjoined from carrying it into effect. *Noble* v. *Union River R. R.*, (147 U. S. 165, 171, 172), *Garfield* v. *Goldsby* (211 U. S. 249, 261, 262), *Lane* v. *Watts* (234 U. S. 525, 540), *Payne* v. *Central Railway* (225 U. S. 228, 238), *Santa Fe Pacific Railroad* v. *Fall* (259 U. S. 197, 199), *Colorado* v. *Toll* (268 U. S. 228, 230). A suit for such purposes is not one against the United States, even though it still retains the legal title to the land, and is not an indispensable party. *Garfield* v. *Goldsby*, supra (p. 260, 262); *Lane* v. *Watts*, supra (p. 540)."

In the recent case of *Ickes, etc.*, v. *Fox* (300 U. S. 82), it was sought to enjoin the Secretary of the Interior from enforcing an order, the wrongful effect of which was to deprive respondents of vested property. The question was made that the United States was an indispensable party, but the Supreme Court held that such a suit could be maintained without the President of the United States and that its proceeding rests upon the authority of many cases from that court. Certain cases were cited among which were some of those to which I have referred.

It is further contended that the suit should be dismissed for lack of indispensable parties. It is urged that Carroll Badeau, the defendant, had no choice other than to comply with the order of the President and that he was acting purely in a ministerial capacity and that if the injunction would lie, it should have been brought against his superior, even to the extent of making the President a party.

I think the action here is one in which the right of the parties may be determined, where the injunction is sought against the agent with as much propriety as if it were thought to restrain the principal, had he been within the jurisdiction of the court. *Osborn* v. *Bank* (9 Wheat. (22 U. S.) 738).

In the case of *Ryan* v. *Amazon Petroleum Corporation* (71 F. (2d) 1), and more particularly identified as the now historic "hot oil" case, the circuit court of appeals said:

"(1) 1. The Secretary of the Interior is not personally doing or threatening the acts of trespass and of prosecution which are thought to be enjoined. Although the actors may be authorized and incited by him so that he would be a proper codefendant if he were within the court's reach, the court has power to stop the trespassing by those within its jurisdiction, irrespective of their claim that they are acting for others (*Osborn* v. *Bank of the United States*, 9 Wheat. 738, 6 L. ed. 204; *State of Colorado* v. *Toll*, subt., 268 U. S. 228, 45 F. Ct. 505, 69 L. ed. 927). This is not a bill to cancel the Secretary's regulation, but only to test their efficacy to protect defendants in their alleged trespasses against complainant's right. There is no more need to make the Secretary a party for this purpose than to make the President a party because he promulgated the code or of the Congress because it enacted the statutes."

It should be pointed out that in this case, or cases, since it embraced also the Panama Refining Co. case, the Supreme Court reversed the circuit court of appeals in its decision, but not on the jurisdictional grounds to which the language above quoted is addressed.

I must conclude that the jurisdiction of the court must be sustained.

We now come to the determination of the case on its merits. I must confess that the

position of the plaintiff is somewhat obscure and it is not entirely clear to me just what it is seeking to have done. The original complaint asks, among other things, that the defendant be permanently enjoined from "holding possession of or operating any properties of the plaintiff." In the brief which was filed after the oral argument the plaintiff seems to undertake to convey to the court the idea that it has no serious objection to the using of the property so long as the present occupant does not put into effect and force the order of the President as it directs incompliance with the wage increase and back-pay provisions of the order of the War Labor Board.

It must be obvious to the plaintiff that these two things cannot be separated in a proceeding of this kind, and it cannot expect to resort to the general equity powers of the court on its prayer for general equitable relief. If the President, by reason of the statutes or by his constitutional powers, has authority and is justified in the exercise of that authority, to take over the plant, he would certainly have authority to determine and designate the basis on which it was to be operated.

This plant is at present being operated by the Government with Government funds. The method of the Government in operating any business which it has the right to operate cannot be questioned on the basis of a complaint which attacks its right to operate business at all.

The War Labor Disputes Act, by section 3, amends section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940. For the purpose of clarity, I think it is best to quote this section in full:

"SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a basis to comply with any such provision, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interest of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any article or material which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as the result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort:

"'*Provided*, That whenever any such plant, mine, or facility has been or is hereafter so taken by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event more than 60 days after the restoration of the production efficiency thereof prevailing prior to the taking of possession hereof.

"'*Provided further*, That possession of any plant, mine, or facility shall not be taken under authority of this section after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or after the termination of the War Labor Disputes Act; and the authority to operate any such plant, mine, or facility, under the provisions of this section shall terminate at the end of 6 months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed.'"

If this is a constitutional enactment and there is no showing that the President acted arbitrarily, coupled with the acknowledged fact that the plants in question were engaged exclusively in the manufacture of essential war materials, the defendant's position must be sustained.

It is not claimed that this act is unconstitutional. The records fail to disclose any grounds upon which the court could find that the President, in issuing the order, acted arbitrarily or without cause. He was not bound by the finding of the War Labor Board that even though they might have been based upon erroneous procedure or wrongful construction of facts, the President may have had other facts on which he determined his course. It is certain that there is ample evidence in the record that there was a threatened strike and a serious threat to production by reason of that fact, that even had the records not conveyed that, it is my judgment that section 9 does not confine the President to any one field of information but that he may make his own independent investigation and, subject to the determination by the courts that his action was not arbitrary, may act to prevent a cessation of operation of any plant or business or other agency which might be utilized to contribute to the war effort.

I further conclude that without an act of the Congress there was sufficient authority by the terms of the Constitution itself to justify the action of the President in this case. The President has no power to declare war, that belongs exclusively to Congress. But when war has been declared and is actually existing, his functions as Commander in Chief become of the highest importance and his operations in that connection are entirely beyond the control of the legislature. There develops upon him by virtue of his office a solemn responsibility to preserve the Nation and it is my judgment that there is specifically granted to him authority to utilize all resources of the country to that end.

The Constitution is nothing more than a charter of rights and authority from the people to their Government. That Government consists of the individuals who as officials are in charge of its affairs at a given time. In order to determine what the people had in mind when they made this specific grant of power we must necessarily consider it in the light of circumstances as they existed at the time of the grant. We must recall that at that time the Nation was very weak. Its preservation from invasion or occupation by a foreign power was uppermost in the minds of the people. Although the Government was weak, it ruled a vast and rich country which attracted the dictators and excited the avarice of war lords of that day as it does now. It should be borne in mind that while modern instruments of warfare make America more vulnerable than in times past, then what is now the territory of the United States was actually occupied by armies of foreign powers.

I mentioned these things merely to emphasize that it must surely have been uppermost and foremost in the minds of the writers of the Constitution of those whom they represented and those who later adopted it, that the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States was not to have to resort to a lengthy procedure in order to defend at a moment's notice the very agencies which he might be seeking to use.

Charged with the grave responsibility of preserving a government which guarantees the property rights of individuals, the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief must not be hampered in the prosecution of the war effort. His exercise of authority to this end is subject only to the review by the court that his actions are not arbitrary or without reasonable justification. With this limitation there need be no fear that constitutional government as we know it in these United States will be abolished, destroyed, or impaired.

The prosecution of the war is the business of the executive branch of the Government. What is necessary to that end must necessarily rest in the authority of the officials of that branch of the Government. Their decisions must necessarily, in many instances, be based upon facts which they cannot make public or submit to debate. There has never been a time in the history of the world when such a policy was more properly applied than in this present emergency, with the United States engaged in prosecuting a defensive war on many fronts scattered over all parts of the world and with implements of modern warfare subjecting her territories and mainland to imminent danger of actual invasion in the course of a few hours, and with a part of her possessions occupied by enemy forces. It is sheer folly to say or pretend that the Government should admit of the slightest delay for any cause of the production of war materials made by the plants involved in this lawsuit.

This position is not only substantiated by reason and principle but is merely a restatement of what has always been accepted as the correct judicial interpretation of the functions of the President in times of war or emergencies.

It is well said in a recent case, *Alpirin* v. *Huffman* (49 Fed. Supp. 337): "Defensive measure which a century ago might have awaited deliberation and the orderly course of judicial process, must now be taken resolutely and immediately. Science has changed not alone the methods of formal warfare, but also and especially the relationship to it of the civilian population."

In the old case of *United States* v. *Russell* (80 U. S. 623, 13 Wall. 623), the court said: "Private property, the Constitution provides, shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, and it is clear that there are few safeguards ordained in the fundamental law against oppression and the exercise of arbitrary power of more ancient origin or of greater value to the citizen, as the provision for compensation, except in certain extreme cases, is a condition precedent annexed to the right of the Government to deprive the owner of his property without his consent. Extraordinary and unforeseen occasions arise, however, beyond all doubt, in cases of extreme necessity in time of war or of immediate and impending public danger, in which private property may be impressed into the public service, or may be seized and appropriated to the public use, or may even be destroyed without the consent of the owner. Unquestionably such extreme cases may arise, as where the property taken is imperatively necessary in time of war to construct defenses for the preservation of a military post at the moment of an impending attack by the enemy, or for food or medicine for a sick and famishing army utterly destitute and without other means of such supplies, or to transport troops, munitions of war, or clothing to reinforce or supply an army in a distant field, where the necessity for such reinforcement or supplies is extreme and imperative, to enable those in command of the post to maintain their positions or to repel an impending attack, provided it appears that other means of transportation could not be obtained, and that the transports impressed for the purpose were imperatively required for such immediate use."

Who can say that at this time such an emergency, as contemplated by the language of this opinion, does not now exist? See also, *Mitchell* v. *Harmony* (54 U. S. 115, 13 How. 115); *Marbury* v. *Madison* (5 U. S. 137, 1 Cranch 137); *Mississippi* v. *Johnson* (71 U. S.

474, 4 Wall. 475). The case of *Alpirin* v. *Huffman, supra,* is an excellent opinion and has an accumulation of authorities on this and related points of law.

The Attorney General of the United States has recently made the following pertinent statement in an opinion on a similar situation. I quote:

"The fact that the initial impact of these disturbances is on the production or distribution of essential civilian goods is not a reason for denying the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the power to take steps to protect the Nation's war effort. In modern war the maintenance of a healthy, orderly, and stable civilian economy is essential to successful military effort. The Congress has recognized this fact by enacting such statutes as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; the act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes'; the small business mobilization law of June 11, 1942; and the War Labor Disputes Act."

In addition to the long and unbroken chain of authorities for what I believe to be a most rational view of the situation presented by the record in this case, the Supreme Court in the now famous case (decided June 21, 1943) of *Hirabayaski* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 81), on page 93 of the opinion said:

"The war power of the National Government is 'the power to wage war successfully.' See Charles Evans Hughes' War Powers Under the Constitution (42 A.B.A.Reports 232, 238). It extends to every matter and every activity so related to war as substantially affect its conduct and progress. The power is not restricted to the winning of victories in the field and the repulse of enemy forces. It embraces every phase of the national defense, including the protection of war materials and the members of the armed forces from injury and from the dangers which attend the rise, prosecution, and progress of war. Prize cases, supra: *Miller* v. *United States* (11 Wall, 268, 303–14); *Stewart* v. *Kahn* (11 Wall 493, 506–7); Selective Draft Law cases (245 U. S. 366); *McKinley* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 197); *United States* v. *MacIntosh* (283 U. S. 605, 622–67, 623). Since the Constitution commits to the Executive and to Congress the exercise of the war power in all the vicissitudes and conditions of warfare it has necessarily given them wide scope for the exercise of judgment and discretion in determining the nature and extent of the threatened injury or danger and in the selection of the means for resisting it. *Ex parte Quirin,* supra (28–29; cf.). Prize cases, supra, 670; *Martin* v. *Mott* (12 Wheat 19, 29). Where, as they did here, the conditions called for the exercise of judgment and discretion and for the choice of means by those branches of the Government on which the Constitution has placed the responsibility of war-making, it is not for any count to sit in the view of the wisdom of that action for substitution of its judgment for theirs."

I am of the opinion that the President's order was valid, that the motion for a permanent injunction should be denied and that the defendant's motion to dismiss should be sustained.

Since I conclude that the order of the President does not rest upon the validity of the order of the War Labor Board, it is not necessary or proper that I should pass upon the question which the plaintiff poses as the "unlawfulness of the War Labor Board order."

The United States must, of course, compensate the plaintiff for the use of the property and a determination of the validity of the War Labor Board order would more appropriately arise in the determination of what is to be just and adequate compensation.

Proper orders should be submitted in conformity with this opinion.

MACSWINFORD, *Judge.*

Date: May 9, 1944.

Attorneys for plaintiff: Thomas G. Sandidge, Owensboro, Ky.; Wilbur K. Miller, Owensboro, Ky.; Mac O'Rell Truitt, Washington, D. C.; Carl McFarland, Washington, D. C.

Attorneys for defendant: Francis M. Shea, Assistant Attorney General, Washington, D. C.; Eli H. Brown, III, United States Attorney, Louisville, Ky.; Joseph Fanelli, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that the opinion of Judge MacSwinford carries many decisions of circuit courts as well as of the Supreme Court and I invite all the Republicans as well as the writers of some newspapers who have charged the President with exceeding his authority to read it in its entirety. If they do so, I feel they will hang their heads in shame for making these accusations.

I feel that the President and the Department of Justice have been too lenient with this man Avery who, as chairman of the Board of Montomery Ward & Co., as director of the Pullman Co., and many other corporations, has fought and resisted the efforts of the President and the administration, despite the granting of many favors at its hands. He surely, saying the least, does not show any patriotic spirit.

SUPPORTED THE RESOLUTION FOR AN INVESTIGATION

Mr. Speaker, during the debate when House Resolution 521 providing for an investigation was up for consideration, being obliged to yield most of my time to others, I was unable to explain fully the underlying reasons for my support of its passage. I was at first opposed to the resolution, not so much to the resolution itself as to the spirit of bitterness in which it was introduced and to the rash and hasty action implied in the efforts to force immediate action. When the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] joined with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the other Republican members of the Committee on Rules to push it through, my suspicions were aroused that it was being rushed for political reasons.

But, having learned over the week end that the real truth and facts behind Montgomery Ward & Co.'s defiant position were being obscured from the public, I then resolved to support the resolution, feeling satisfied that a strong committee would be named to conduct the investigation.

The developments of the last few days have justified my position. As I stated on the floor, the plant was returned to the company, the union proved by a fair election its right to represent the workers, and now today, in spite of that, you have the spectacle of the company and this man Avery refusing to renew the old contract for 30 days, and stating in advance that he will not negotiate on maintenance of membership.

Now that the first flush of excitement over the Government's temporary possession of the plant has cooled, sober second thought prevails, and we begin to see the picture as a whole in its true light. Investigation should proceed into every phase of the situation on the basis of fair and impartial inquiry into facts and background, instead of in a prejudiced atmosphere.

By all means let us have this thorough and deliberative investigation, not an inquiry generated in partisan heat and conducted for purposes of political propaganda and to vent anti-Roosevelt spleen. Indeed the very gravity of the issues raised, as from several points of view, imposes upon the committee the responsibility of holding public hearings in proper spirit and for ascertainment of all the underlying conditions involved.

Let us check not only into the action of the President, in seeking to make effective a law which Congress passed over his veto, but let us also check into the conduct and the motives behind the conduct of the corporation head who was responsible for the Presidential action.

LONG RECORD OF NONCOMPLIANCE

Montgomery Ward & Co. has a long record of noncompliance in national economic-recovery programs, dating back to 1935, and of actual, open defiance of duly constituted authority of this Government and the law of the land in labor matters frequently since 1939. The committee will not be getting a full and a clear picture of events leading to the climax of this affair if it overlooks that record.

We have heard much about the rights of Montgomery Ward & Co. in this case. The corporation's lawyer and the corporation's defenders in Congress have expatiated at length upon these rights allegedly having been violated, and upon the idea that our whole system of free private enterprise has thereby been jeopardized.

I listened patiently but did not hear these same gentlemen say anything about the responsibilities and duties of this corporation. Perhaps they prefer to ignore it, but the elementary truth is that any private corporation exists only by reason of the public grant to it of certain privileges.

Under our form of government liberty does not mean license to impede or endanger the common welfare. On the contrary the enjoyment of rights and the exercise of privileges, whether by individuals or corporations, imposes at the same time a responsibility and a duty toward the Government which was set up to protect those rights and which granted those privileges, and toward the whole community and the social and economic order of which the individual or the corporation is a part.

These are fundamentals of our civilized society, our form of Government, and our democratic way of life. If these great truths are to be cast into the discard, if a single corporate entity is to be permitted to set itself up as a power beyond the authority of Government, and greater than the Government of the United States itself, then, indeed, is our Nation in danger of defeat at home while our Army and Navy fight abroad.

It is not for this House or the Congress as a whole to render a judicial decision in this case; but there are a number of observations I should like to offer which should be considered in connection with the charge that the President exceeded his authority in taking possession of the plant and in utilizing the military arm to do so.

The purpose and intent of the Smith-Connally Act, which the President vetoed and which this Congress approved in spite of that veto, was to give the executive branch an authority and a power to exercise against recalcitrants. It was legislation passed in the heat of indignation over the obstructive tactics of John L. Lewis in the coal strike; to make certain that no one individual may put his own interests, or that of a single group, above the welfare and the war effort of the Nation at large.

SERIOUS DEFIANCE COMES NOT FROM A LABOR UNION, BUT FROM A BIG CORPORATION

But the first real test of the War Labor Board's authority to settle a labor disturbance under the Smith-Connally Act, the first serious defiance comes not from a labor union, not from the workers involved—they complied with the Government's order to go back to work—but it comes from a big corporation.

Ah! Can that be the reason for all the hullabaloo? Does the shoe pinch because it is on the other foot? Why is such an uproar created in this one case that exceeds all the publicity, the anguished protests, the cries of dictatorship in all 17 other cases of plants taken over by the Government since June 1941?

And mind you, out of 6,000 wartime disputes settled only these 17 had to be referred to the President for action. In 12 of these 17 instances in which the Government temporarily took possesison of private plants the Army and Navy were used by the President. But in none of those cases was a similar hue and cry raised.

Why was it wrong, dictatorial, high-handed, to cite a few of the adjectives applied, for the Executive to take action in this case similar to that taken in the first, the fifth, or the fifteenth cases?

Can it be because Montgomery Ward & Co. is a powerful corporation whose directorate is composed of men who also sit upon the boards of a score of other great corporations and of men who politically are opposed to the President of the United States?

Can it be that the importunities, the pressure, the demands, the outcries directed at this House arise from an organized effort to stampede us into some brash, ill-considered action?

Can it be that the wave of telegrams and letters, which some Members of Congress proudly exhibited and flourished as evidence of an outraged public opinion, are merely the result of a planned campaign such as was exposed in connection with the Utility Holding Company Act?

These are all questions we must consider. And there are more.

Is it mere coincidence that many of the same elements which cried loudest for curbs upon labor in the name of the war effort now protest against their application to violators outside the ranks of labor?

ACTION WAS PURSUANT TO ENFORCEMENT OF A LAW ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS

After all, the action against Montgomery Ward was pursuant to enforcement of a law enacted by the Congress. This House, together with the Senate, charged the Executive with the duty of enforcement. Now, when it is enforced with equal vigor against a big corporation, are we to recede from our intent?

Was the law placed upon the statute books for a definite purpose, to meet a specific need? Or was it a mere gesture and jest? Was it given approval by this body merely to appease the demands of one special-interest group at the expense of another?

Did we not intend that compliance with the law—by all—should be secured? If so, how?

In the 6,000 other disputes of a similar nature it was brought about by unions ending their strikes and by employers also complying with Board orders; in other words, by ordinary voluntary cooperation with the Government—that same government administered by officials the people themselves have elected.

In those few—those 17—cases where compliance was not voluntary, what was to be done by the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief, engaged in the supreme task of marshaling all the Nation's resources for a mighty, world-wide conflict?

What was he to do when the dignity—the authority—of our sovereign Government is flouted by one man, setting himself, and the corporation he leads, above the law? In this Montgomery Ward case the President acted as he did in many of those others. He took the only step possible under the circumstances. He called upon the military for assistance when this man deliberately and arrogantly defied United States marshals. The President exercised his police powers in the interest of the common welfare.

But this was no sudden, impulsive action upon the part of the Executive, and no departure from precedent established in earlier similar cases. The same lawful procedure was followed as in those other cases. No; this was not the initial move to enforce the order. This was the last—the final—resort to which the Government was driven by the arbitrary, obstinate, and provocative stand of the head of Montgomery Ward, and after all civil means of action had been exhausted.

Was Montgomery Ward to be treated any differently than any other offender because it is an $81,000,000 corporation, or because its 1943 profits amounted to more than $20,000,000?

Should we have one law for the rest of the country and another for Mr. Avery?

It has been rightly said that there are serious issues involved here, but let us be sure that we give consideration to all of them. What can be more serious than open defiance of the Government in time of war—defiance based upon a selfish private interest as opposed to the common good of all?

Marquis Childs, a Washington writer, who is so esteemed for the fairness of his accounts as to be chosen successor to the late Raymond Clapper's column, raised this very same question. I quote:

> Congress is going into this dispute, but I wonder if they'll really get to the root of it. There is an attitude of contempt toward the Government in both the Lewis and the Avery cases. * * * But in wartime you can't make your own rules. In a complicated industrial society the umpire has to have authority.

Mr. Avery and his lawyers very well knew what could be the only outcome of his defiance. They planned it that way, it is quite evident. Mr. Avery was quoted in the newspapers as saying that he was carried out of the building because he preferred it so. He deliberately chose the role of self-made martyr.

But this brings up another question. Why was the issue raised at this particular time? More than 2 years ago, in February 1942, after the union won the right to represent his employees in a lawful election and was certified as bargaining agent by the National Labor Relations Board, he signed a contract. The President at that time was forced to twice command Mr. Avery to sign. He balked once and then, after the second order, he signed.

WHY DID NOT MR. AVERY HAVE A SHOW-DOWN 2 YEARS AGO

Mr. Avery could have had his showdown 2 years ago. He chose to postpone it. Why? To await a more "favorable," a more "opportune" moment? Why did he wait until now?

Because this year is 1944. Because the people are again to elect a President. Because the interests of which Avery is the symbol and the spokesman hate the President more than they hate America's enemies. Because to them it seems more important to defeat the man in the White House than to win the war.

Of all times—at this crucial juncture in our Nation's history; with millions of our youth poised for the greatest military venture ever attempted; with the very fate of humanity's future dependent upon the success of that venture; and with every nerve and fiber of the American people straining to make it a success—of all times, this moment is chosen by a little group of willful men to hatch their political plot against our Commander in Chief.

This is their D-day that they have selected to dramatize the false issue of "dictatorship"; to try to delude public opinion, and to stampede this Congress. I say the public is not fooled and I am confident that Congress will not permit itself to be fooled. The bugaboo of "dictatorship," worn out by overusage in 1936 and 1940, still has no substance. This cry did not work then and it will raise only hollow echoes now. But we may be sure that all of the financial and propaganda powers that have tried to put it over in the past are banding together again to carry on their campaign of villification, abuse, and falsification against the President of the United States.

The opening gun of the modern "copperhead" rebellion has been fired by Sewell Avery in Chicago, appropriately

enough. In the McCormick-Patterson press one of its favorite writers predicts that the picture of Mr. Avery being carried out of his office by soldiers will be the prize Republican campaign document.

So, there you have the secret motive behind this incident. You have it from Avery himself, when he screamed: "You New Dealer" at the Attorney General of the United States, and you have it from the McCormick-Patterson press. After all, the Tribune Tower and Montgomery Ward's offices are only a few blocks apart, and they share the same political thoughts.

But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, politics—opposition to an administration—is one thing. Defiance of the Government and enforcement of its laws and the Constitution are something else.

Mr. Avery has chosen his battleground and he has chosen this unfortunate hour to wage his battle. He has flung a challenge and his challenge is being met.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation will proceed and the people will obtain all the facts and, when they are ascertained, I am sure that Mr. Avery and those behind him will stand condemned in the eyes of the American public and the fair and patriotic stockholders of Montgomery Ward & Co. who, in their own interest, should seek his removal as an official of the company.

Sewell Avery Versus the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the fifth of a series of articles appearing in the Chicago Sun under the title of "Sewell Avery Versus the People." This article, which appeared in the May 19, 1944, issue, is entitled "Conflicts of Wards Over Trade Practices Shown in F. T. C. Files."

It is as follows:

SEWELL AVERY VERSUS THE PEOPLE—CONFLICTS OF WARDS OVER TRADE PRACTICES SHOWN IN F. T. C. FILES

(Fifth of a series)

(By Thomas F. Reynolds and Charles O. Gridley)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Not only have Sewell Lee Avery and Montgomery Ward & Co. been fighting the War Labor Board, Office of Price Administration, and the National Labor Relations Board, but also the Federal Trade Commission which has many times accused them of "false and misleading advertising" and violating rules of fair business competition.

When Avery was carried out of his Chicago plant last month, opponents of the national administration sought to rally little business—"the corner groceryman"—to his defense. But Chairman PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), of the House Small Business Committee, charges that in reality Avery and the financial interests he represents are dedicated to the objectives of eliminating small-business men from the American cimpetitive scene.

It was PATMAN who called attention to Avery's brushes with the law and pointed out that Montgomery Ward "had been five times adjudged a violator" of the Robinson-Patman Act which establishes rules of fair competition in private enterprise.

PATMAN'S references to Ward's violations of fair trade practices, related to a Federal Trade Commission complaint which sought to cast Avery in the surprising role of a salesman for pills.

In a complaint filed on September 22, 1943, against Montgomery Ward & Co., the F. T. C. accused Wards of selling Dr. Pierce's Purgative Pellets and Ward's Bile Salts Compound & Cascara Tablets, which the Federal agency charged are "potentially dangerous."

The F. T. C. charged that the failure of Ward's to disclose in its advertising that the use of the preparations under conditions prescribed in the advertisements "or such conditions as are customary and usual may be potentially dangerous has had and now has the tendency and capacity to and does mislead and deceive a substantial portion of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that each of said preparations is entirely safe and harmless and may be taken at all times without ill effects to the user and to induce a substantial portion of the purchasing public, because of such erroneous and mistaken belief, to purchase said medicinal preparations."

The F. T. C. complaint was filed last September 22.

Although hearings have been held on this issue, the F. T. C. has not yet ruled finally on the citation. But even before this issue was placed formally on the docket by this Federal agency, the F. T. C. had found Ward's guilty on charges that it had "disseminated and has caused the dissemination of false and misleading advertisements."

For example, this finding was made on October 12, 1942, on a complaint demanding that Ward's cease advertising cosmetics:

"Ward's creams contain vitamins A and D superfine creams—doubly rich in vitamins. When made, 1,400 U. S. P. units of vitamin A and 300 U. S. P. units of vitamin D are added to each ounce of cream."

After investigation the Trade Commission found that this advertisement, along with similar advertisements, for "skin-softening cream formerly called 'Ward's tissue cream,'" and "Double vitamin cream for dry skins," plus blurbs for "Kleer skin" and "Lady Carole vita facial pak," could be characterized as follows:

"The foregoing representations and advertisements * * * are grossly exaggerated, false, and misleading.

"In truth and in fact, the respondent's (Ward's) various cosmetic cream preparations will not, because of the addition thereto of vitamins, therapeutically treat or benefit the skin to which said preparations are applied and will not aid said preparations in keeping the complexion clear and smooth.

"The external application of vitamins to the skin will not therapeutically affect such skin in the same manner as would the internal consumption of vitamins therapeutically affect the health of the body."

Although the Commission found that Wards halted such "false and misleading advertisements" for cosmetics "a short time" prior to issuance of the complaint, it nevertheless followed through with the case and on October 12, 1942, issued an order directing Avery's company henceforth to discontinue the misleading use of "vitamin" in connection with its cosmetic products.

The cosmetic case, however, was by no means the only time that Montgomery Ward was called on the carpet by the Federal Trade Commission. From 1935 through 1938 the record shows that it was "once a year" for the company.

By stipulations with the Federal agency, Wards conceded the rightness of F. T. C. objections to its methods and modified its merchandising techniques in several instances, including the following:

1. April 6, 1935: Wards agreed to stop advertising or selling a diluted form of neatsfoot oil, branded as "neatsfoot," unless the brand was accompanied by an equally prominent label which clearly indicated that the product was not composed wholly of this waterproofing fluid.

2. May 20, 1936: Ward's agreed that in sales of "turtle oil" it would drop its advertising claims that this fluid was "a corrective for wrinkles * * * ideal nourishing cream * * * aids in retainment of youthful complexion, contains ingredients that nourish the skin." The F. T. C. said this advertising claim of Avery's company was calculated to confuse, mislead, or deceive purchasers into the belief that said product applied externally will nourish the human skin, or act as a corrective for wrinkles."

3. January 15, 1937: Ward's agreed to abandon "false and misleading advertising" in connection with what the company had been proclaiming as "rich oriental wood and butt walnut veneers." This agreement was made by the F. T. C. to apply to all of Ward's wooden furniture products that were not totally covered with veneer, with the enforcing understanding that "if such products are not wholly covered with veneer and the above words or phrases * * * are used to describe such products, the other woods of which the exposed surfaces of such products are composed, shall be * * * described in * * * advertising matter."

4. August 25, 1938: Ward's admitted that it had fallaciously advertised a gas floor furnace as having certain advantages unavailable in products sold by its competitors, that its highly advertised product was capable of leaking gas around an unsealed top, and that it had falsely claimed that the furnace provided "perfect combustion," whereas the fact was that "furnaces have not yet been developed which will produce complete combustion of all fuel consumed."

5. June 7, 1941: Wards agreed to halt "false and misleading advertising" for electrically charged fences, for which the F. T. C. found that Avery's company had made unjustified claims in its advertising.

6. June 29, 1941: The F. T. C. directed Wards to put precautionary labels on its hair dye products, "Inecto" and "Clairol," which said: "Caution: Use only as directed on label" and "Caution: This product contains ingredients which may cause skin irritation on certain individuals and a preliminary test according to accompanying directions should first be made; this product must not be used for dyeing the eyelashes or eyebrows; to do so may cause blindness."

The small merchants came before the House Small Business Committee in the last year to detail specific charges that Montgomery Ward & Co.'s retail stores were driving them out of business by unfair competition. Their charges were such that the chairman of the committee, Representative PATMAN, declared that Avery's "merchandising tactics crucified the smaller merchants wherever they are in competition with Montgomery Ward & Co. and represent monopolistic methods of the worst type."

No Federal court and no Federal agency which takes complete evidence has ruled on these complaints of little business, however.

Address of Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at I Am an American Day Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have embodied in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address which I delivered on Sunday, May 21, 1944, at I Am an American Day meeting held at Central Park Mall, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mayor LaGuardia, my friends, by common consent we have dedicated this day to Americanism. And since Americanism is a thing of the spirit, this day takes on the character of a religious event. It is in a mood of sacred devotion to cherished ideals that we are assembled here.

Our purpose is not to indulge in jingoistic pride that we are Americans. This is not the time to gloat over our great power now exhibited on all the continents of the earth. Rather, have we met to reaffirm or undying faith in America as a great ideal; to recharge the fires of our belief in democracy; and to consecrate ourselves to the service of democracy, not only as an inheritance to be preserved but an achievement still to be attained.

This Nation has behind it 168 years of history—a history of accomplishment unparalleled by any other people. But history alone would not justify these exercises. It is because America not only has a history of a glorious past put represents the prophecy of a happier future that you and I proudly proclaim "I am an American."

From the Arctic to the Tropics our boys are fighting to make that prophecy come true. On the seven seas they are risking and giving their lives to make America's promise secure for ourselves and our children. In the fighting we are also learning. War is a ruthless schoolmaster. It is teaching us a lesson the world should have memorized long ago; that no man and no nation are sufficient unto themselves; that we are all brothers under God; that if our brothers are enslaved our liberty is imperiled; if our brothers are hungry our plenty is a myth; if our brothers are attacked we are not safe. This lesson derived from all the great religions has been brought home to us by the total war which we are fighting.

Of this I am sure: We cannot attain the American ideal; we cannot fulfill the promise which that ideal holds, unless we achieve the defeat of our enemies and bring this war to a victorious conclusion. Everything—everything we hold sacred and precious depends upon victory.

Since this is so it follows that no one can truthfully say, "I am an American" who has shirked his duty, or has given less of himself than he was able, or has spread distrust of our purposes, suspicion of our allies, or disunity among our people.

When victory is assured, as with the help of Providence it will be, then the energies now being spent upon the battlefield must be concentrated upon the furtherance of the American ideal. This is not the time to formulate a precise blueprint of all that involves. But at least we can briefly indicate the direction we must take.

First and foremost is the organization of the world for peace. I do not mean the adoption of pious resolutions. I do mean the creation of the tools for maintaining the peace—powerful tools, backed by us in common with other peace-loving nations. These tools include peaceful means for settling international disputes and forceful means for restraining those who refuse to abide by the laws of civilized society. If this generation should fail in this, as the last generation failed, civilization may not get another chance. We have a covenant with our children sealed with the blood of our heroes that this time we shall not fail.

Our second objective is the vigilant preparation of our own Nation at all times to defend our liberty and security. Our enemies will hereafter know that the treachery of Pearl Harbor cannot be repeated.

Our third objective is to maintain in the future as we have in the present a government which is the servant of the people and not its master.

Our fourth objective is the maintenance and prudent expansion of the whole system of social security, including protection against the risks of industrial accident, unemployment, and poverty in old age.

Fifth, we must enlarge the scope of social security so as to make available to rich and poor alike the benefits of modern medical science, not only in the cure of disease but in the promotion of a higher standard of health among the entire population.

Sixth, one of our immediate tasks is the mobilization of both public and private means to clear away our slums, build in their place decent housing, and bring a home it can love within the reach of every family.

Seventh, a cardinal requirement of democracy is that every boy and girl shall have an education which is not limited by the ability of their parents to pay for it. All of our children must have an equal chance to make the most of themselves. Only in this manner can the Nation be assured that it is getting the full benefit of the capacity of all classes of the population without regard to previous station in life.

The same reasons dictate the necessity of equalizing opportunity in public and private activity for all of our people regardless of race, creed, or color. In a democracy, merit and merit alone should determine the heights to which any man can reach.

Our ninth goal is the preservation and extension of the great freedoms to think, to speak, to write, and to worship without molestation so that man may attain that high dignity which the divine plan comprehended when He created him in His image.

Finally, let us never forget that all our hopes and dreams can come true only through the courage and devotion of the men and women in uniform. They have first call upon our love and upon our resources. It is our task to build a nation fit for such heroes to live in.

The great virtue of democracy is that it cannot be measured by a mechanical yardstick or confined by a rigid definition. It is an ever-expanding concept. As we reach new heights of understanding we see ever wider horizons, embracing more people, greater liberties, and more elevated standards of human well-being.

To be an American today is to strive for the attainment of such goals. For these aims millions of Americans—sons, husbands, wives, sisters—have left their loved ones, interrupted their careers, gone to the battle fronts, there to face whatever destiny awaits them. Can we do less than to hallow their mission, cherish it in our heart and, like them, sacrifice unceasingly upon the altars of democracy?

Speech of Dr. Luis Manuel Debayle, Director of Public Health of Nicaragua, at the Washington Chapter of the Pan American Medical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech by Dr. Luis Manuel Debayle, Director of Public Health of Nicaragua, given at the Washington Chapter of the Pan American Medical Society, Washington, D. C., Sunday, April 23. This meeting was attended by a large group of health officers from all the Central and South American countries who were in Washington for a conference under the supervision of the Sanitary Bureau of the Pan American Union. It is an excellent example of the fine spirit of cooperation in all fields as well as in matters of public health which we are receiving from our neighboring nations of the Americas.

The speech follows:

Gentlemen, we are at present confronting the greatest crisis that humanity and democracy have ever faced. The foundations of social organization, born of idealism, great sacrifice, and noble perseverance, are being tested. Storms, unleashed by insane ambitions, are endangering the most sacred conquests of civilization. As the greatest apostle of democracy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has said it is now being decided whether the existence of a free world shall continue; whether the inhabitants of the earth shall have the opportunity to enjoy the liberties which the eminent North American statesman deems fundamental to worth-while existence; whether the equality of nations, respect for foreign rights, freedom of the seas, and other ideals sacred to the meaning of the Atlantic Charter are to be a radiant reality, or merely an empty symbol of the lofty desires of two great national leaders.

Before the dilemma confronting the world the nations unite around the flags that represent their highest aspirations. All nations which are in a position to do so work to strengthen the lines of democracy which guarantee their existence, because the desire for liberty is born in the individual. It is inconceivable that a man, born with this prerogative, should despise his birthright to the extent that he would sacrifice it and thus become the instrument of his own death. Similarly, only circumstances beyond its control can cause a nation to serve adverse interests at the expense of its own welfare. In the depths of a man's soul burn the fires of rebellion againt slavery. That is why the pathetic drama of the European nations, subdued at the feet of Hitlerism, provides the world with the most powerful incentive to revolt against this violation of human dignity, and for this reason the hour has come for

us to form a united front of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, a united family of nations which lives, hopes, and fights at this critical moment for the world, with faith in the final victory which will save humanity. Our faith in democracy, foremost among the requisites for human happiness and the success of this system of government and of the people who believe in it; our passion for liberty and the advantages of greater comprehension among men of different races and creeds; and, above all, the knowledge that we are living in a critical period, a dangerous period, surrounded and threatened by the brutal conception of life, of those who embrace totalitarianism—all these have inevitably placed us in a position of total and united American defense.

In order to be able to arrive at a practical and adequate inter-Americanism, the fundamental principles must be clarified and fully understood by all the nations. Culture, science, and politics will play an important role. Do not fear the heterogeneity of the American nations. This is not at all incompatible with homogeneity because the basis of this union lies in our spiritual needs and is determined by our community of moral and material interests.

Good faith, clear and wholehearted, must replace any insincerity that may have existed in inter-American relations. Prejudices which have created disunion should be forgotten forever. The ephemeral interests of yesterday must give place to the permanent interests of today and tomorrow.

Let us not say that the menace of Italian-German-Japanese totalitarianism is the cause of our alliance in the defense of Democracy. No! If it were not for the inspired foresight and sincerity of the good neighbor policy of President Roosevelt, which has conquered the heart and the confidence of Latin America, and the great teachings of Bolivar, the first of disunity and distrust would still be latent in the American peoples.

We, the sons of America, let us pronounce with reverence the names of Simon Bolivar, Thomas Jefferson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They, by the impulse of their broad continental conscience, opened the road along which the American people now march to their glorious destiny.

And now, focusing our attention on one point of American unity we come to the very important issue of scientific collaboration among the Americas. In choosing this topic, I am fully aware of the fact that it is not new. I feel, however, that during my years of service to the Nicaraguan Government, acting at various times as Minister to the United States, as Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and as director of public health, I have had a good opportunity to observe at first hand the value of international cooperation in achieving improvements in public health, as well as the need for further efforts in this field.

Visits to sister republics in Latin America have convinced me that many of their problems are similar to our own in Nicaragua. In the accelerated history of the past 10 years a new truth has been established, that is, that isolationism is not tenable in wartimes. As public servants and leaders in an important branch of community life we must anticipate the future, and accept, as a companion truth, the fact that isolation is no longer tenable in peacetime either. This concept must in the future govern our activities in all ramifications of government, and must not be limited solely to those activities which are obviously international, such as international commerce. I feel very strongly that each of us must accept as part of our responsibility the duty of carefully surveying our work and problems to determine possible points of cooperation on an international scale.

Excellent progress has been made in this direction by various well-established agencies. One need only mention the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, as important factors in building a structure of international cooperation. No complaint can be made about the excellent progress of these agencies to date. In Nicaragua our department of public health was established largely through the efforts of the Rockefeller Foundation. Significant help has been forthcoming from the Pan American Sanitary Bureau and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. A long road, however, lies ahead. Each individual present at this conference, as well as the group, should throw his full weight behind this development in the evolution of social philosophy.

A brief review of our needs in Nicaragua may help clarify the problem and possibly indicate methods of procedure.

1. Vital statistics: We are handicapped by inadequacy of census data and inadequacy of personnel trained in gathering vital statistics.

2. Food and drug administration requires careful thought and planning: Steps must be taken toward the standardization of production and adequate control of drugs placed on the international market. It is impossible for the health officer of a small country to evaluate the mass of new products placed on the market each year. Ignorance of the true value of biological preparations, vitamin preparations and drugs, leaves the medical profession and public, as well as responsible drug firms, easy prey for poorly controlled or unscrupulous concerns.

3. Environmental sanitation: Most tropical countries have been left behind in the newly awakened interest in housing. There is much to be done in the field of development of techniques of construction of low-cost housing suitable for tropical climates. Such study is beyond the reach of a small country working alone.

4. Local health administration is a fertile field: Some countries have gone far to develop an extensive program of local health administration while others, including Nicaragua, are just starting. I am certain that we would all gain by a conference organized with the purpose of evolving standard administrative practices for the administration of local health programs. I make this statement with the full understanding that variation will be necessary according to local needs, and local resources. The pooling of experience, however, and free discussions of programs now in operation can do a great deal to speed the development of this phase of public-health work in many countries where this development has been slow.

5. Our methods of hospital administration are primitive: Although this is not directly a health-department function, it is so closely related to a health program that it deserves our careful attention.

These are just some of the problems which face us in the development of an efficient health program in Nicaragua. I have taken the liberty of reviewing our needs in Nicaragua because similar problems exist, though possibly not as acutely, in some of the other countries of Latin America.

I should, therefore, like to present the following proposals for your consideration:

1. We should strengthen and elaborate the administrative machinery already established for international cooperation in health, particularly the Pan American Sanitary Bureau. Representatives of each of the various essential subdivisions of the organization should be appointed in each country.

2. Conferences of key personnel in various fields should be organized in order that they may dissect and study the various specialized problems and propose schedules of activity and development.

3. Journals in special fields, printed in four languages, should be established to stimulate and maintain the interest of personnel and provide a greater opportunity for pooling of ideas.

4. Promote the publication of technical literature in Spanish and Portuguese. The lack of published material of a fundamental nature becomes immediately apparent in planning training programs.

5. Creation of a board to work on standardization of technical education and to develop teaching centers where appropriate material is most readily available.

This is our front in the war. We must attack the problem as energetically and directly as if it were a military objective. We must develop patterns which will spread across oceans to other continents in order to help develop in practice, as well as theory, a true community of nations. By pooling our resources all of us are that much richer. In working separately we are that much poorer—all of us will lose.

Colorado Proposes Regulations for Interstate Air Carriers

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, an event has occurred which further demonstrates the farsightedness of the Interstate Commerce Committee and the soundness of the provisions of the Lea aviation bill. The Members of the House probably are aware that one of the salient features of that bill is to prevent the imposition by States of burdensome, conflicting, and duplicating regulations upon interstate air commerce. There has just come to my desk a set of regulations which are proposed by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission for imposition on air carriers operating within the State of Colorado. This set of regulations is 43 typewritten, single-spaced pages and covers the operation of both interstate and intrastate air carriers in the greatest of detail.

The regulations even go so far as to prescribe ash containers in passenger cabins and pilot cockpits and require that all pilots carry a flashlight with them. I have not had time to analyze this lengthy and complicated set of regulations sufficiently to determine the full extent of the conflict between them and Federal regulations, and the duplications of regulation and administration which must result from their promulgation. However, a quick reading reveals to me that the imposition of such regulation upon interstate air carriers will result in constant interference with their operations and a tremendous increase in their costs of operation. While it may not be

any concern of the Congress, it also is perfectly plain that the taxpayers of Colorado will have to pay large sums for the administration of regulations which not only fail to improve air carrier service but will actually make such service more expensive for those same taxpayers.

In order that the Members of the House will be able to see for themselves the effect of these proposed regulations, I will touch upon a few of the outstanding requirements.

In the first place, it will be necessary for those interstate air carriers operating in Colorado to secure from the Colorado Public Utilities Commission a certificate of convenience and necessity in order to haul intrastate traffic within that State. The implications of this are plain. If Colorado has the power to grant this certificate it also has the power to withhold it and prevent the interstate carrier from hauling intrastate traffic. While the revenue from intrastate traffic has been very limited, if this rule were applied in all of the States through which a particular air carrier operates, it could be deprived of a substantial amount of revenue. Thus the interstate air carrier that the National Government has fostered by reason of its value to the commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense will be deprived of financial support necessary for its full development. In addition, Colorado will be able to parallel the interstate carrier with new operations wherever it sees fit and further impair its financial integrity and the integrity of the national air transportation system which has been built up over many years.

While this is obviously contrary to the national interest the interstate carrier could probably survive the onslaught if this were all, but it is not all. The Colorado regulations provide page after page of safety regulation. The Colorado Public Utilities Commission will designate the route over which the air carrier must fly in going through Colorado. The Federal Government under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 now prescribes the route that the air carrier must follow in flying through Colorado as well as through other States. I am sure I cannot say what will happen if Colorado picks one route and the Federal Government picks another. Members of the House are undoubtedly aware that the same airplane that carries the interstate passenger also carries the intrastate passenger and it will be quite impossible for that same airplane to fly more than one route at a time.

In addition, Colorado will determine whether or not the air carriers' aircraft are safe. The Federal Government does that now and will continue to do so. The most elaborate provisions have grown up through the years which are designed to make certain that aircraft are fully airworthy before the public is permitted to ride in them. The Federal Government's engineers carefully observe every step in the design and construction of a new airplane and elaborate tests are made on it to make sure it is structurally sound and its performance characteristics are satisfactory. In addition to these measures, before an air carrier can operate an aircraft in scheduled service the air carrier inspectors of the Civil Aeronautics Administration make certain that that particular aircraft is a safe one for the particular service involved. Now after all that is done Colorado will make a fresh determination as to whether the aircraft being used by the interstate carrier is proper for the carriage of intrastate traffic. Again I cannot anticipate what will happen if the Federal and State Governments disagree with respect to a particular aircraft because as I said before the same aircraft must carry interstate as well as intrastate traffic.

The proposed Colorado regulations provide that the Public Utilities Commission will determine whether the crew of the aircraft are competent to perform their duties. This job is also done by the Federal Government. Under the Federal regulation air-line pilots and copilots must have long experience and must pass detailed written and practical examinations before they can operate aircraft in scheduled service. In addition to that the air lines themselves give their pilots elaborate tests and require first pilots to serve long apprenticeships as copilots before they actually can assume command of the aircraft. Now Colorado proposes to do the same thing with respect to the same pilots. It is difficult to say how an interstate air carrier could operate through Colorado in the event that the Federal and State authorities should disagree as to the competence of the particular pilot.

In addition to this Colorado has reserved the right to tell air carriers how many crew members they shall have. This right is also reserved by the Federal Government and the general rule on the air lines today is that they have a pilot and copilot. Colorado may determine that every air line carrying intrastate traffic in Colorado must also have a radio operator and a flight engineer, thus doubling the necessary crew. This, of course, will require the redesign of the airplane in order to make provision for these additional crew members, and thus Colorado regulation will require the conversion of the entire fleet of any air line operating through Colorado.

Another example of a type of regulation which could completely hamstring our air transportation system is that which reserves to the Colorado Public Utilities Commission the right to prescribe the equipment which must be carried on air-carrier aircraft. The Federal Government now prescribes such equipment in great detail. For example, the Federal Government has by regulation required that the navigation lights on aircraft flash on and off so that the aircraft can be more easily identified at night. If the State should prescribe that these navigation lights throw a steady beam, it is difficult to say how the interstate carrier could even carry interstate traffic through Colorado. It would be possible to repeat examples of this type of conflict almost endlessly.

Conflict in administration of the Federal and State regulations cannot possibly be avoided. One example appears on the face of the regulations. The Colorado regulations say that no person can manipulate the controls of an air-carrier aircraft in flight except the pilot, copilot, other qualified air-line personnel, or an air-carrier inspector of the Public Utilities Commission. The effect of this, of course, would be to prevent the Federal air-carrier inspector from carrying out his duties in Colorado. Presumably the Colorado regulation would apply whenever intrastate passengers were on board, which in all likelihood would be true on most flights through the State. Notwithstanding the fact that a large percentage of the passengers would be interstate, the Federal air-carrier inspector would not be able to check the operations of the aircraft or the ability of the pilots in Colorado.

Another clear conflict with Federal regulations is the proposed Colorado regulation which would require the pilot to take up the tickets of the passengers. This is, of course, a hang-over from regulations applying to railroads and trolley lines, which probably are also under the supervision of the Colorado Public Utilities Commission. If this regulation were enforced with respect to air transportation, the pilot on an interstate air carrier would be required to be in two places at once. The Federal regulation, in effect, restricts the pilot to his technical duties in operating the airplane. Before take-off he is required to check weather conditions en route, confer with his dispatcher and meteorologist, check his instruments, radio, engines, and controls. This would permit him very little time or opportunity to be standing at the door of the airplane taking the tickets of the passengers as they come in.

In describing these regulations I have picked only a few examples of the restrictive effect such regulations would have. I will not attempt to describe any more because I am sure the Members of the House will see in these examples the effort of permitting duplicating State regulation of interstate air carriers. In considering the conflicts that I have mentioned you must remember that I have been discussing conflicts between Federal regulations on the one hand and those of one State on the other. If Colorado can impose detailed regulations of the type I have just been discussing, there is no reason whatsoever why all the 48 States should not do the same thing. Thus, instead of having conflict between two regulating agencies, you would have conflict between 49. One large air carrier, such as American Airlines, would have to abide by the regulations of 23 States in order to conduct its operations.

Because we are a United States we have been the envy of those Europeans interested in the development of air transportation. Recently the British Labor Party made a study of European transportation, and after pointing out the inadequacy of the European system and the high subsidies required to keep even that system going, our national air transport service was discussed as follows:

Turn now for comparison to the United States. There, the mileage flown was far higher than anywhere else in the world; standards of efficiency, comfort for passengers, were much higher than elsewhere; an airmail service began as early as 1918; and a network of air lines lighted for flying by night covered the whole vast area. A passenger could board an airplane one evening in New York and alight next morning in San Francisco, 3,000 miles away.

Why was America ahead of Europe in this respect? One reason was the geography and climate of the country; another was the high ability of American designers and technicians, and the vast industrial resources available to them. But the chief reason was that the United States is the United States. A single Federal authority could organize and finance the ground organization on a uniform basis, right across the continent; which meant that no part of a chain of airports, beacons, etc., would be left out because of a local lack of resources. Controlling the ground organization, the Federal authority was in a key position, enabling it to secure a measure of unity in the system and a measure of protection for the public interest. In Europe no such authority existed.

Thus we have the word of an important part of British opinion to the effect that our supremacy in air transportation comes in large measure from the fact that our air lines are supervised and regulated by a single Federal authority. This conclusion is correct up to the present but unless something is done promptly our air lines will have good cause to look with envy upon their European counterparts, who have only 18 or 20 regulatory agencies to deal with, instead of 49.

In considering these proposed Colorado regulations it occurred to me that if I were desirous of preventing the development of air transportation and depriving the public of the benefits of this development I could not devise a better way than to subject this new form of transportation to the type of conflicting regulation I have just described. It will not be possible for air carriers to perfect new equipment if its development must be supervised by 49 regulatory agencies. It will not be possible for them to reduce the costs of their operation so as to make their service available to more people if their expenses are being constantly increased by duplicating regulation. It will not be possible for them to perfect operating procedures which will tend to greater safety if those operating procedures must be agreed upon by 49 separate regulatory agencies.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was aware of all these problems. It recognized fully that if air transportation was to be subject to duplicating and burdensome State regulation our plans for the development of the world's finest air-transportation system would have to be discarded. It wrote into the Lea bill provisions for the protection of the industry against just the type of regulation that Colorado proposes to promulgate, but as I pointed out previously before this body the competitors of air transportation have seen to it that this salutary legislation has not received consideration by the House.

Individual Income Tax Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD H. McLEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a comparison of sections 11 and 12 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the pending tax bill which has come to be known as the Individual Income Tax Act of 1944, showing the surtax rates under existing law and as proposed; also a table prepared by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Treasury Department showing the estimated number of income recipients in various surtax brackets.

The use of this comparison and the table is necessary in determining the revenue yield of the pending measure.

(Excerpt from comparison of the Internal Revenue Code before and after its amendment by the individual income-tax bill of 1944, as reported by the Finance Committee. (Unchanged language appears in Roman, new House language in italics, language repealed is enclosed in black brackets.)

SUBCHAPTER B—GENERAL PROVISIONS

PART I—RATES OF TAX

SEC. 11. Normal tax on individuals.

There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every individual a normal tax of [6] *3* percent of the amount of the net income in excess of the credits against net income provided in section 25 (a). [(]For alternative tax [, if gross income from certain sources is $3,000 or less, see section 400] *which may be elected if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000, see Supplement T.*[)]

SEC. 12. Surtax on individuals.

(a) Definition of "Surtax net income": As used in this section the term "surtax net income" means the amount of the net income in excess of the credits against net income provided in section 25 (b).

(b) Rates of surtax. There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual the surtax shown in the following table:

If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Not over $2,000	[13] *20%* of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	[$260] *$400*, plus [16] *22%* of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	[$580] *$840*, plus [20] *26%* of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	[$980] *$1,360*, plus [24] *30%* of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	[$1,460] *$1,960*, plus [28] *34%* of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	[$2,020] *$2,640*, plus [32] *38%* of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	[$2,660] *$3,400*, plus [36] *43%* of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	[$3,380] *$4,260*, plus [40] *47%* of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	[$4,180] *$5,200*, plus [43] *50%* of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	[$5,040] *$6,200*, plus [46] *53%* of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	[$5,960] *$7,260*, plus [49] *56%* of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	[$6,940] *$8,380*, plus [52] *59%* of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	[$9,020] *$10,740*, plus [55] *62%* of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	[$12,320] *$14,460*, plus [58] *65%* of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	[$15,800] *$18,360*, plus [61] *69%* of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	[$19,460] *$22,500*, plus [63] *72%* of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	[$23,240] *$26,820*, plus [66] *75%* of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	[$29,840] *$34,320*, plus [69] *78%* of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	[$36,740] *$42,120*, plus [72] *81%* of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	[$43,940] *$50,220*, plus [75] *84%* of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	[$51,440] *$58,620*, plus [77] *87%* of excess over $90,000.

Estimated number of income recipients incurring liability for surtax, distributed by surtax net income brackets, under the Revenue Act of 1943 at levels of income estimated for the calendar year 1944

[Number of income recipients in thousands]

Surtax net income bracket	Number of income recipients		Percentage	
	Simple	Cumulated	Simple	Cumulated
[$000]				
0-2	35,215.4	41,213.0	85.447	100.000
2-4	4,497.1	5,997.6	10.912	14.553
4-6	607.9	1,500.5	1.475	3.641
6-8	256.0	892.6	.621	2.166
8-10	132.3	636.6	.321	1.545
10-12	117.7	504.3	.286	1.224
12-14	80.2	386.6	.195	.938
14-16	56.6	306.4	.137	.743
16-18	39.8	249.8	.097	.606
18-20	30.0	210.0	.073	.510
20-22	20.0	180.0	.049	.437
22-26	31.4	160.0	.076	.388
26-32	34.6	128.6	.084	.312
32-38	29.0	94.0	.070	.228
38-44	14.8	65.0	.036	.158
44-50	12.6	50.2	.031	.122
50-60	10.9	37.6	.027	.091
60-70	6.7	26.7	.016	.065
70-80	4.4	20.0	.011	.049
80-90	3.0	15.6	.007	.038
90-100	2.2	12.6	.005	.031
100-150	5.8	10.4	.014	.025
150-200	2.1	4.6	.005	.011
200 and over	2.5	2.5	.006	.006
Total	41,213.0		100.000	

Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Apr. 28, 1944.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the school-lunch program is before the House today for consideration, I wish to insert for the benefit of my colleagues a telegram of protest received from one of the leading county superintendents of Illinois. I heartily concur in the sentiments expressed in this telegram:

DANVILLE, ILL., *May 22, 1944.*

Hon. NOAH MASON,
House of Representatives Bldg.,
Washington, D. C.:

Do all you can against hot lunch provision in House bill 4278 or any other Federal hot lunch appropriation. The schools of Vermilion County do not need Federal hot-lunch aid. Everybody in Vermilion County has a job if they want to work. Seven hundred German soldiers were even brought into Ver-

million County to help out the labor situation. Parents should assume responsibility for their children since plenty of work and ample wages are now available. School boards in Vermilion County are opposed to State and Federal aid for school hot-lunch programs. In several meetings with county superintendents of schools the great majority of them howled their heads off against the hot-lunch procedures in Illinois. Only politicians have promoted and backed hot school lunches in Vermilion County.

Parents in arguing to me for school hot lunches said that there was plenty of Federal and State money for them and they might as well have a piece of that money. Parents and children are being taught to be parasites by having hot lunches handed out to them on a silver platter. Already some of the hot-lunch sponsors have become disgusted and stopped the hot lunches. Out of the 1,668 pupils receiving Federal hot lunches in Vermilion County all of them are in strong Democratic precincts except 200 of them. Please stop these Federal hot-lunch appropriations and may the gods themselves send you their choicest blessings like the flow of milk and honey on a May day in June.

L. A. TUGGLE.
County Superintendent of Schools.

The Relief Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table gives the relief milk figures:

TABLE 601.—*Quantities distributed and amounts of payments made by the Food Distribution Administration under the relief-milk and school-milk programs, fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and totals for earlier years*

State	Relief milk	
	Quantity	Cost
	Quarts	
Illinois	22,456,928	$818,574
Louisiana	3,305,926	75,907
Massachusetts	15,363,720	614,549
Missouri	1,806,772	58,157
New Hampshire	402,264	15,789
New York	20,997,594	773,318
District of Columbia	978,403	39,136
Total 1941-42	65,311,607	2,395,430
1940-41	68,823,947	1,518,726
1939-40	37,298,557	692,271

Source: Food Distribution Administration.

You will note the following facts from the above tables:

First. Over 90 percent of the money for relief milk went to New York, Massachusetts, and Illinois.

Second. Only 6 or the 48 States had any relief fluid-milk distribution.

Third. That the large number of States with the lowest per capita income did not have any participation in the program whatsoever, while Washington, D. C., with double the per capita income as that enjoyed by the United States is in the program.

Fourth. It would appear that this milk is not being distributed on the basis of need as far as incomes are concerned.

T. V. A. on the Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "T. V. A. on the Jordan," written by Hon. George W. Norris, which appeared in a recent issue of the New Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T. V. A. ON THE JORDAN
(By George W. Norris)

The T. V. A. idea has gone round the world. Its fame has spread to every place where men have struggled with the problems of nature, for it is a blueprint turned into a reality. Actually, it is a very simple idea, based upon the principle of preserving the natural resources of the country.

Until the advent of the Tennessee Valley Authority men built dams upon streams almost solely to develop power, and the location of one dam had no relation to the location of any other on the same river system. The T. V. A. considered a whole river system as a source of power, and prepared to develop it as a whole, not piecemeal. Before the T. V. A. our fertile valleys were being depleted of their soil and their natural fruits. Annual floods swept through them at terrible cost to life and property. Erosion was unchecked upon the hillsides, and the swollen rivers carried thousands of tons of top soil down to the sea. The dams built by the T. V. A. prevented flood damage, and also kept open navigable channels.

A comparatively small additional sum enabled the Authority to utilize the waters impounded behind the great dams for the generation of huge amounts of electric power. This power has been carried into the homes of farmers and provided amenities they never knew before; it furnishes cheap electricity to city dewellers; and in factories and industrial plants throughout the South it is contributing mightily to the war effort and bringing prosperity to the people.

From the very beginning, as soon as the T. V. A. revealed the tremendous scope of its plans, the project excited the curiosity and admiration of engineers and scientists the world over. Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, eminent soil conservationist, scholar, and world traveler, was one who expressed his deep interest, and in 1938 the United States Department of Agriculture sent him to make a survey of the use of land in the Near East, in the interest of land conservation in the United States. Dr. Lowdermilk returned with a project for the reclamation of Palestine which he recently presented in book form under the title "Palestine, Land of Promise." He calls the project, which is modeled after the T. V. A., the Jordan Valley Authority. "The Tennessee Valley Authority," he says, "has set the pattern whereby agriculture, power, and manufacturing can be developed in a coordinated way in the highest interests of the people of a given area. And this pattern can be applied to Palestine."

Centuries ago Palestine was a prosperous country, covered with fertile fields and forests. Its fertility was destroyed by man's failure to conserve its natural resources. After Palestine was set aside as a Jewish homeland, it became a great experiment in reclamation. The Jews built cities and formed agricultural colonies and brought the soil back to abundant production. But the area of their efforts was necessarily limited, and vast stretches outside "the fertile crescent" lay untouched. "It is practically impossible," says Dr. Lowdermilk, "to estimate what the final absorptive capacity of Greater Palestine could be if all its unoccupied and underpopulated areas were rejuvenated by the same vigor and understanding love of the land as have characterized Jewish efforts on a tiny fraction of the land, and if such an all-inclusive reclamation program as that of the J. V. A. were put into effect."

Dr. Lowdermilk advocates a system of dams on the Jordan River and its tributaries to irrigate the arid lands of the Jordan Valley. He points out, too, that in the rush of the river down to the Dead Sea, more than a thousand feet below sea level, there are wonderful possibilites for the generation of hydroelectric power. Enough electricity, he says, can be developed upon the Jordan River and its tributaries to supply the entire country with an abundance of electric power for all purposes. But power and irrigation are only part of Dr. Lowdermilk's project. Like the T. V. A., the J. V. A. would include water conservation and flood control among its activities. Supplementing the work of the Jewish Agency and the government, it would reforest lands unsuitable for farming or grazing and would undertake to extract important minerals from the Dead Sea on a far greater scale than is now being done.

This work would be extended into the Negeb, the south country, which has an area almost equal to that of the rest of Palestine, and into Trans-Jordania, transforming these regions from desolate wastes into thriving agricultural and industrial communities. The Jews, says Dr. Lowdermilk, who has become a convert to the idea that Palestine can be developed by the Jews as a national homeland, would be made the custodians of this work and directors of the Jordan Valley Authority under the United Nations. "If the forces of reclamation and progress that Jewish settlers have introduced," he says, "are permitted to continue, Palestine may well be the leaven that will transform other lands of the Near East. Once the great undeveloped resources of the countries are properly exploited, 20 to 30 million people may live decent and prosperous lives where a few million now struggle for a bare existence. Palestine can serve as the example, the demonstration, the lever, that will lift the entire Near East from its present desolate condition to a dignified place in a free world.

Other reclamation projects patterned after the T. V. A. have been proposed, though none have been so carefully worked out as Dr. Lowdermilk's. Some time ago the president of the National Association of Manufacturers declared that we were not fighting this war to supply Hottentot babies with milk or to build a T. V. A. on the Danube. He spoke derisively, implying contempt for the idea of the T. V. A., but the expression "T. V. A. on the Danube" took hold, and many thoughtful progressives began to wonder whether the idea was not a good one. If the T. V. A. could be developed here without regard to

States lines, why could not Europe, the Near East, or any other region develop a T. V. A. without regard to national boundaries?

The economic backwardness of the eight countries which form the Danube Basin—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Greece—does not derive from a lack of natural resources. The region has always had a great agricultural potential and rich mineral deposits, and in the Danube River it has a tremendous source of hydroelectric power. Its economic backwardness stems from a surplus farm population, causing overcrowding and a hunger for land, from neglect of scientific farming methods and a lack of working capital, and from the resulting low monetary yield. A program of industrialization such as a T. V. A. on the Danube would make possible, would absorb workers no longer needed on the farms and stimulate agricultural production. The political-economic structure of all these countries is based on the peasantry. Were the peasants granted the benefits which would flow from a great scientific project patterned after the T. V. A., who knows what the effect would be on the future peace of the world?

While the T. V. A. idea reaches out to the Near East and Central Europe, opposition to it, strange as this may seem, is displayed in the land of its birth. This opposition comes primarily from the private power interests, properly known as the power trust, and is aroused by the generation and sale of hydroelectric power by the T. V. A. There would be little or no objection to the T. V. A. if this aspect of the project had been turned over to private power interests. The power trust opposes the T. V. A. because it interferes with its profits and with a monopolistic domination which extends over almost the entire United States.

The Power Trust has thrust a hand into every field of American politics. It is active in every election, whether it be that of a district school board, of Members of Congress, or of a President of the United States. It has controlled and corrupted State legislatures the country over, and it has lobbied unceasingly for the passage of laws that would legalize its greedy claims and take from the people the control and management of the natural resources of their country.

Paradoxically, much of the opposition to the T. V. A. has come from the South, which has derived the greatest benefit from its success. It is startling, indeed, that a Tennessee Senator is now fighting the completion of the T. V. A. program, and with telling effect. I do not mean to charge that opponents of the T. V. A. have always been moved by selfish considerations. Many opposition leaders in the Senate and House of Representatives have honestly believed that the National Government should not go into the business of developing and transmitting electric power. But what other instrument would have been able to carry the project through? No State, no corporation organized by a State, could properly develop a system extending into many States. The only agency great enough to plan and implement such a development was either the National Government itself or a corporation created by and representative of the National Government. The Government entered a field where no private corporation had ever ventured, where, from the very nature of things, no corporation could successfully venture.

The evil and dominating influence of the Power Trust made the T. V. A. a necessity if we were to attain the happiness, comfort, and prosperity that can come from the preservation of our God-given gifts and from respect for the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. The forces which seek the T. V. A.'s destruction must not be allowed to halt the tide of progress.

The War in Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The War in Review," delivered yesterday before the annual luncheon meeting of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, at Brooklyn, N. Y., by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], regarding the work of the special Senate investigating committee which he heads.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored to be invited here today to take part in the annual meeting of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

Such organizations as yours have played a prominent role in the building and development of our great Nation. The importance of the work of the chamber of commerce throughout the country will be demonstrated in the post-war period, when all our resources and our material wealth must be mobilized to bring us through the transition period from war to peace. It is a difficult and complex future we are facing, but I do not hesitate to voice this belief: it will be a good future if we have the wisdom and courage to make it so.

In this war we have had to create an enormous number of new regulations and controls. That is part of the price which we must pay for war. It is no greater than the price being paid by our allies and our enemies. It is what we must bid to purchase victory and freedom.

These wartime controls have no relation to politics. They were imposed solely because of war needs. Nearly all of them were suggested by industry and labor. Most of the Government representatives dealing with them came from private life. And these representatives are about evenly divided between both parties.

These restrictions must be maintained just as long as they are required to assure victory—just that long, and no longer. Personal and business liberties and freedom from regimentation are not only abstract ideals. They are concrete realities which impinge daily on our lives. They seriously affect our happiness and prosperity. Anyone whose duties relate to the war must keep this always in mind.

The Senate War Investigating Committee, of which I am chairman, was among the first to insist on conversion of industry to war production. We are now greatly concerned with the even more difficult problems of dismantling the colossus.

But before pursuing this question further I wish to tell you something about the committee. The committee consists of 10 Senators, representing both major political parties and every major section of the country. It has been an honor to serve with them and as their chairman. They have shown an earnest and active desire to find the facts and apply them to the best interests of the Nation.

It was decided at the outset that political considerations of either party would not be allowed to affect in any way the action of the committee. The Democrats expressed a willingness to bring to the administration factual and constructive criticism. The Republicans expressed an equal willingness to emphasize and praise accomplishments.

I am very proud to report to you that the members of the committee on both sides have strictly lived up to this understanding. At all times the committee has let the facts speak for themselves. As a result, we have been able to agree about our investigations. Although 30 reports, some of them hundreds of pages in length, have been submitted to the Senate, there has never been a minority report. More than that, every single report has been unanimous, although in one or two instances one or more of the members of the committee have said that, except in the interest of unanimity, they would not have made some of the statements in the report.

It has been possible to obtain this unanimity only because the committee has sought to search out the facts whatever they might be and wherever they might be found. It has limited its conclusions to those which were compelled by an orderly marshalling of the facts. Reasonable men who approach a subject without bias or prejudice seldom differ as to facts. Where the facts are known, conclusions take care of themselves.

From the outset the committee has sought to obtain information from those who should know the facts. It has attempted to deal with witnesses in the manner best calculated to obtain results. As in the work of all other committees, the public hearings have been important sources of information. But they are only one source of information, and not even the most important one. In many cases, it is not possible to obtain all of the necessary facts through a public hearing, no matter how long or extended, or how carefully prepared it may have been. Frequently, high officials of both industry and labor, as well as Government, hesitate to speak frankly in public hearings because of their fear that they may be misunderstood, or that their working relations with others may be hampered. In such cases, it is much better to proceed through private hearings, or even through private informal discussions of which no record whatever is made.

In many cases the detailed facts are not known to the highest officials and can be obtained only by a painstaking examination of documents and records and by discussions with the subordinates who have actual personal knowledge. In the preparation of your legal cases you know better than anyone else how important it is to look at the actual documents and records and to talk with the persons who have first-hand information. You also know the importance of dealing fairly with witnesses and respecting their rights and their personal problems.

In preparing its reports the committee has welcomed and even sought criticisms and suggestions of a factual nature. The reports are prepared in draft form and submitted to every Government agency and private company involved. Their suggestions are studied with the greatest care and are adopted wherever it is possible to do so without violence to the facts.

This has had the additional advantage of making available to the committee and through us to the Senate, a vast fund of information from the most authentic sources. There can be no question but that the committee is well informed, except on issues involving the actual strategy of combat operations. Those issues have been left strictly to the military. Persons with military training and experience are best fitted for making such decisions, and the committee does not desire to obtain secret information with respect to matters of high strategy.

On the other hand, a great deal of information has been obtained by the committee

that has been considered by the armed services to be confidential or secret. In all such cases, even those regarded by the committee as downright silly—and there are many such cases—the committee has refrained from making any of the information available to the public until it has been cleared by the armed services themselves.

The committee has sought at all times to get the war over with and to get it over with just as soon as possible and with the least possible loss of life and property. For that reason, in 1942 the committee was insistant that war contracts should be spread widely among small businessmen and not confined to a few large contractors. It urged that the capacity to produce basic commodities such as aluminum and steel should be increased vastly irrespective of the effect upon vested interests. It declared that all civilian industry capable of producing war articles should be converted promptly, irrespective of the fact that some of the industries wanted to keep up their peacetime production to the detriment of vast war contracts which they also desired.

In 1942 the committee pointed out that manpower as well as basic commodities was going to be scarce. It warned against the assumption that the complicated manpower problem could be dealt with by such unwieldy means as a universal manpower draft. The committee stressed that the chief way to alleviate manpower shortages would be to use efficiently the manpower we have. It made 18 practical suggestions as to how government, labor, and industry could cooperate to achieve more efficient utilization of manpower. Many of these suggestions were adopted. Some were not. There is considerable room for further progress.

In 1943 the committee reported with respect to various phases of rationing and submitted detailed reports with respect to the progress which had been made in coping with the problems previously reported on. It also called attention to many instances of waste and to production of defective materials, particularly aircraft engines and steel plates.

Nor did the committee neglect essential civilian industry. It stressed the necessity for providing sufficient farm machinery and equipment and transportation facilities to carry on essential farming and transportation. Such farming and transportation are just as important as the production of war matériel. It was natural that the armed services should have placed their needs first. But the committee insisted that the programs be better balanced.

Last November, the committee outlined a number of problems that would have to be solved before it would be possible to reconvert to peacetime activities. We urged that immediate attention be given to solving those specific problems. They included termination of contracts, reduction of inventories, disposition of surplus materials, removal of Government property from private plants, disposal of Government-owned plants and facilities, and labor and public works programs. Substantial progress has been made in those fields, particularly through the studies by the Senate committees headed by Senators GEORGE and MURRAY and by Mr. Bernard Baruch. The outline of the action to be taken is now well known and is generally agreed to. The job now is to do the hard grubbing detailed work necessary to put the outline into effect.

The tools, as they are termed by Mr. Baruch, must be provided quickly and used effectively.

However, there is a basic question that must be determined before real progress can be made. I believe, and the committee has stated, that the time has come to begin to relax rather than to increase the number of restrictive regulations. Of course a military setback or a change in the course of the war could reverse this situation. But a wartime government must be flexible. The present trend requires that thought be given to reestablishing a free and self-sustaining industry. It requires that some action be taken now in this direction. Already one concrete problem has appeared.

We now have the capacity to produce some basic commodities in quantities greater than required for dwindling war needs. We must determine whether, and to what extent these should be utilized to make additional goods available to civilians. No one is willing to argue against civilian production as such, but there are many who believe that it should be delayed and retarded. You are all familiar with their arguments, which have been stated at great length in recent months. They are set forth in considerable detail in the committee's recent report. Basically, they are that maybe we will need a lot more than our present estimates—that manpower is still short in certain restricted areas—that a surplus of manpower, their way of referring to what I call unemployment, is desirable for the purpose of forcing the unemployed to seek out areas of manpower shortage—and last, and in my opinion least, that unnecessary sacrifice and hardship at home would better the morale of those in the armed services.

Some of those in the armed services have opposed any reference to the fact that many of our requirements, particularly those of the War Department, either have been met or shortly will be met. They believe that the truth should be kept from the public in order to avoid overconfidence. This is a strange argument. I think the public is entitled to know the facts at all times. I have noted that the armed services show little inclination to play down their military and naval accomplishments, and I agree that they should not. But if overconfidence is not caused by such disclosures, it will not come from telling the facts about war production.

The committee has said that we are on the way to winning the battle of war production. That is a wholly separate and distinct thing from winning the war. The committee agrees that we would be very foolish to indulge in any optimism until we have witnessed the course of events on the European front. But the problem at hand has nothing to do with a state of mind. The only result of a false pessimism about the state of our war production will be to create a trough of inactivity in which our economy will lose momentum. Should victory find us in this unprepared state at home, our returning soldiers and sailors may well wonder what we have been doing while they were meeting their severest tests.

Just as it was not possible to prepare for war overnight, it is not possible to prepare for peace overnight. We have all witnessed the difficulties and unemployment that ensued when business adjusted itself to the needs of a single customer, a customer with unlimited resources and an insatiable desire to purchase war items. We can readily appreciate the problems that will develop when that customer sharply curtails his purchases and industry turns back to 130,000,000 customers with almost as many different needs.

For these reasons and in order to provide for the healthiest possible civilian economy to support as long a war as may be necessary, the committee recommended in the strongest possible terms that all of our capacity to produce basic commodities should be utilized now to the utmost. Surpluses not required for war materials or essential civilian items should be made available to all manufacturers. They should be free to use them without restrictions, except that manufacturing operations should not be commenced in manpower-shortage areas or continued if contracts for war materials are offered to them. Such a program is necessary in order to avoid unemployment and hardship in areas where war contracts already have been completed or terminated, or soon will be.

This program also will provide consumer goods and greatly lessen the danger of inflation from suppressed buying power. It will permit an orderly and gradual resumption of peacetime operations without the shock and violence to the economy that would result from artificially damming and blocking it off until the end of all or part of the war. It will provide opportunities for small business and for new enterprises.

The committee cautioned, and it is important that full attention be paid to the caution, that its program does not contemplate the immediate resumption of large-scale production of civilian items. In many cases, there can be no civilian production for many months. This is particularly true of large and complicated items, and of products requiring materials which are still scarce. All that the committee advocates is that we use our resources to the utmost and that we use them in such a way as to prevent unemployment and hardship. This program will facilitate the resumption of civilian production on a full scale when the circumstances permit.

The committee is firmly of the opinion that we must try now to limit and, as fast as possible, to remove wartime orders and restrictions. The committee is opposed to the creation of new and more involved regulations and restrictions such as the manpower draft advocated by the armed services. We are opposed to suggestions that Government agencies should determine what manufacturers should be permitted to make civilian goods, what goods they are to make, and under what circumstances they can sell those goods. We must not create a whole new system of controls over civilian operations on the attenuated theory that they are necessary to war production. The experience of the past does not indicate that Government agencies, staffed with dollar-a-year men from industry, have either the experience or the ability to select from tens of thousands of manufacturers, those who are to be permitted to produce, and from thousands of items, those which are to be produced. The decisions that would have to be made are too numerous, complex, and interlocking, and there is too much scope for bias and prejudice. It is normal and human for the men who are now regulating industry to think that industry cannot get along without the regulations. Each person tends to believe that his job is the most important. But this war is being fought to preserve freedom and individual initiative. We must take care that in winning the war we do not create some of the evils which we have fought against.

It is not enough just to restore, as nearly as possible, the pre-war situation. It is impossible for a nation, or for that matter for an individual, to stand still. It must go forward or backward. We are determined that the United States will go forward. We are determined that we will not again go back to the situation that existed in 1939 when we had 9,000,000 unemployed and 5,000,000 persons not listed as seeking employment but who have subsequently been employed in war work. This means that we must be resolved to utilize the new productive capacity of the splendid plants built during this war. We must use them to provide jobs for the men in our armed services and for the war workers. We need and want their

products. By creating the goods and the spending power to purchase them we will provide the foundations for the soundest and most prosperous economy that the world has ever seen. With the inventions and the new production techniques that have been discovered in this war, it should be possible to provide more and better goods and services for everyone than we have ever before enjoyed even in this, the most prosperous and advanced nation in the world. Our future security is dependent upon our doing so.

Fortunately, I can assure you from discussions that I have had with leading manufacturers, bankers, and businessmen that sound plans to this end are being made and that unless we permit artificial obstacles to be created there is a real basis for believing that that prosperity will be obtained.

To do so, however, will require the utmost cooperation and mutual understanding between Government, business, and labor.

Government will have to provide a sound and fair tax system that will encourage the development of new business and the expansion of existing small and intermediate business. It will have to content itself with formulating the rules of the road, it must not attempt to occupy the driver's seat, either as to business or labor.

Business will have to avoid cartels and combinations and to concentrate on producing more and better goods. It must learn to earn its income by working with small margins of profit on a vastly increased amount of business.

Labor will have to concentrate its efforts on its legitimate desires for high wages and good working conditions. It will have to avoid stoppages, make-work practices, and resistance to the development and installation of new and better production techniques designed to lower costs. In that way labor can achieve its aims and still do its part so that the workingman can lead a more abundant life.

We can face the future with confidence, if we avoid bickering and disputes, and if we work for the common good of all.

Irrigation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Add 4,000,000 Acres?" published in the Kansas City Star of May 14, 1944. The editorial refers to some of the grandiose irrigation projects now being brought forward.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY ADD 4,000,000 ACRES?

Now that the purpose of the irrigationists and land development companies upriver to control the waters of the Missouri for their own local developments has been brought into plain view, it is time to stop and ask ourselves a question which is highly important but has not much entered into the discussions so far.

What is the need of 4,000,000 extra acres of irrigated land? And especially, what is the need of it when these lands are of such secondary nature that the Governors of the Upper Plains States have admitted that these lands cannot of themselves bear the cost of irrigation—and must therefore get free water from reservoirs built by the people's money for other purposes, if they are to be irrigated?

In an address delivered at Chicago late in March, Secretary Claude R. Wickard had some things to say which are very pertinent to these questions. One of the biggest problems facing American agriculture after the war, he said, will be to find a good market for all the American farmers want to produce and can produce within the limits of sound farming methods.

Estimates by the Department of Agriculture indicate that with high prices and intensive educational campaigns, the farmers of the Nation can, within the next 6 years, on lands now under cultivation, increase their production to 60 percent above the average of 1935–39. Even with moderate prices and only the usual educational methods, this production can be increased up to 40 percent above the prewar level.

On the other hand, population estimates indicate that by 1950 there will be not more than a 10-percent increase over the average for 1935–39. In other words the agricultural production per capita could be immeasurably beyond any figure comparable in the past.

We did not have the right answer to the farm surplus problem before the war. Looking to the period after the war, the problem remains one which will cause headaches for agricultural and economic leaders.

Under these conditions, a critical condition could be created by the addition of crop surpluses produced on 4,000,000 acres of land which would be made productive only at the expense of the Nation at large. The Reclamation Bureau estimates an annual raw crop value of $130,000,000 for this acreage—considerably more than one-third of the total value of all Missouri crops in 1942, which was a year of abnormally high acreage yields.

These are all estimates on the conservative side, but they illustrate the competitive weight against the present crop total which would be thrown by such a project as the irrigation interests are advancing. And this added weight is greater when the small list of irrigated products is considered—grains, sugar beets, legume hay, and perhaps flax. Competition in these categories would be excessively punishing.

The total crop production of the new irrigated land might amount to only 1 or 2 percent of the national production—but virtually all of this would be surplus. After the last war, be it remembered, when the wartime production hit the peacetime reduction in demand, a reduction of only 3 or 4 percent in the exports of our surplus rapidly created an unmanageable domestic pile of farm products. The result—the farm depression of the early twenties.

The situation would be different if the farmers of the upper river States were going to expand their irrigation farming by their own efforts. At least there would not under such circumstances be ground for a reasonable objection—even though the rest of the farmers of the Nation did not like it and knew it was affecting directly their own pocketbooks and the living standards of their own families.

But what is being proposed here by the upriver interests is, in a nutshell, a form of parasitism. They desire to levy upon the free water impounded for other purposes, to develop these potentially disastrous competitive areas. Further, they propose to obtain priorities on all upriver waters, even when the rights to the use of them downriver have been established by many decades of use far antedating the claims of the dry land development companies.

The old State rights cry has been raised—a convenient red herring. Senator WHEELER cried "State rights" in a recent speech—and yet demanded Federal money to carry out his program of irrigation development. In this instance, obviously, the aegis of State rights is meant to apply only to Senator WHEELER'S little bloc of States. It is a poor principle that works only one way. There are State rights also involved in the necessities of the down river States—rights every bit as cogent as those of the Senator's bailiwick.

To return again to the question of the 4,000,000 acres of secondary, public-expense, free-water irrigation, and proposed by the Reclamation Bureau, the land companies, and the immigration companies of certain railroads, it may be of interest to note that there are far cheaper and better ways of increasing national food production, whenever we shall need it in the future, than this method. It can be done at comparatively small cost by protecting the bottom lands from flood and by improving the uplands of the present established farm area.

Already there is enough farm land available for the next several generations. The values of this land are established, and the equities therein. The opening of a great new area of farm land could very easily cause loss to the people who have been working this soil for decades, and create serious economic dislocations.

We have a surplus of food now in the midst of war. We have had a prodigious experience in the past of striving to meet periodic peacetime surpluses. We know we can, if need be, greatly increase our present crop production. Why, therefore, the necessity of an additional 4,000,000 acres of land which could never support the cost of being brought under irrigation? And particularly in view of a comprehensive river plan such as the Pick plan which is not a sectional plan, not an irrigation plan, not a navigation plan, not a a flood prevention plan alone, but a fair combination program for advancing the interests of all sections, in relation to the combined interests of all?

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over Station WHN, New York City, on May 22, 1944:

More than 2 years ago when the Congress of the United States after lengthy hearings and much controversy, passed the Price Control Act, there were grave doubts by many who supported it as to the widom of placing so much power in an executive agency. Past history revealed, however, that during war times when there is a scarcity of commodities and an overabundance of money, inflation always sets in, and great masses of our citizens suffer from lack of purchasing power. Especially is this true of the great white-collared class of Americans whose income increases very slightly during war times, and whose dollar value shrinks as the cost of living rises. We who supported the act felt that there was no alternative but to experiment with artificial controls. Price controls have, as we expected, proven unpopular since they

were foreign to our system of free enterprise. Yet I am convinced that without them we would be witnessing an inflationary spiral that would be ruinous to our entire economy. Even with price control in operation there has been more than a 30-percent increase in the cost of living since 1941 and an increase in the cost of food of more than 40 percent. It is also common knowledge that black-market operations are taking place on an extensive scale. We cannot permit prices to go much higher, else millions of our people with low incomes will suffer great hardship.

The administration of the act has at times been far from perfect. In fact, most of the criticism has been directed at its administration rather than at the act itself. I feel that if it is administered expeditiously, intelligently, and fairly, most of these attacks will subside or disappear. Many aggrieved citizens feel that under existing law they are not afforded an opportunity to have their complaints against the O. P. A. thoroughly and speedily reviewed by the courts. That is why I have chosen as my topic tonight judicial review of the O. P. A.

The act is now before Congress for renewal. Both the Senate and the House have held lengthy hearings and are now in executive session to determine the future of the Price Control Act.

Under the law as it now exists there is an Emergency Court of Appeals which has exclusive jurisdiction to consider the validity of any regulation, order, or price schedule. There is no injunctive relief granted short of the United States Supreme Court. However, before the citizen can have the merits of his case considered by the Emergency Court of Appeals, he must first exhaust all administrative remedies within the O. P. A. itself. It has been testified by the O. P. A.'s general counsel that the average case takes 110 days to be reviewed by the O. P. A. before it can reach the Emergency Court of Appeals. Some cases I know of have taken much longer. In fact, in two instances the Emergency Court of Appeals threatened to mandamus the proceedings because of unreasonable delay, before the O. P. A. finally acted. When the citizens' case finally reaches the Emergency Court of Appeals, that body is bound to pass on the record presented by the Administrator. If the protesting citizen does not have an aggressive and competent attorney, the record which reaches the Emergency Court of Appeals may very well be too meager to fully and completely present the citizens' side of the issue. The informality of the administrative procedure leaves to the Administrator, in my opinion, too much discretion as to what the record forwarded to the Emergency Court of Appeals shall contain.

On the other hand, in the enforcement of the act, the situation is quite different. All of the Federal courts are open to the Price Administrator for the exercise of enforcement tools which includes the civil injunction, the criminal penalty, the treble damage suits and the license. No court, however, is open to the citizen who must face this formidable array of legal armor, except the Emergency Court of Appeals. In the court in which he is sued or indicted, where he is to be enjoined or penalized by the loss of a license to do business, a citizen charged with the infraction of a price regulation may not plead in defense, that it is illegal or unconstitutional, that the Administrator has acted arbitrarily, capriciously or even corruptly. He is deprived of his defense of illegality by the act itself. The court in which he stands charged may not even consider it.

Is it not indeed a novelty in our jurisprudence, that a citizen may be indicted, tried, and convicted for violation of an illegal regulation made by an executive agency beyond the grant of power received from Congress? The situation is incredible, but true.

The law also provides that unless a protest is made against a rule or regulation of the Administrator within 60 days of its issuance, its illegality cannot be questioned. Therefore, it is possible for the Administrator to create law himself, which is more sacred from attack than the act of Congress which he claims as his basic authority. The average citizen would never know of the existence of the rule or regulation until he is charged with its violation. It is contrary to American Democratic and legal principles to deny a citizen the defense of illegality at any time. Furthermore, to give a rule or regulation more force and effect than the basic law from which it was issued, is a legal absurdity.

All of us are aware of the peril of inflation. Congress is overwhelmingly in favor of effective price control. I have no doubt that the act will be continued without any crippling amendments. At the same time, if we are to preserve the freedom for which our Nation is fighting, we cannot deprive a citizen of his day in court. He must be protected from an executive agency which can through its rules and regulations, and acting beyond the scope of its authority, deprive him of his constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities, as a citizen of the United States.

Such protection to the citizen will in no way impair the effectiveness of price control. The Administrator has full freedom to carry out the purposes of the act. The citizen must have the right to challenge the Administrator's acts through the courts, if he feels aggrieved. The average American citizen is a patriotic individual. He may grumble occasionally about bureaus and bureaucrats, but in his heart he knows that during wartime many sacrifices must be made. The overwhelming majority of Americans know that inflation is the greatest threat to our Nation on the home front. They are convinced that O. P. A. and many other wartime bureaus are necessary evils. Nevertheless, they feel that they should not be faced with the threat of civil or criminal prosecution without the right to defend themselves on the grounds that rules or regulations are illegal or unconstitutional. The American citizen takes these rights for granted, and he should.

I feel, therefore, the the Price Control Act should be amended as follows:

1. Compel the O. P. A. to completely review a protest and to render a decision within a definite period of not more than 60 days so that there will be no unreasonable delay in reaching the Emergency Court of Appeals.

2. Give the Emergency Court of Appeals the right to grant a temporary injunction.

3. Give the citizen the right to set up the defense or illegality or unconstitutionality in a civil or criminal proceeding brought by O. P. A. against him.

4. Abolish the 60-day statute of limitations so that illegality or unconstitutionality of rules or regulations may like acts of Congress be attacked at any time.

5. Establish within the O. P. A. an administrative procedure that will guarantee to the citizen the opportunity of making a complete record from which he can, if he wishes, appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals.

In conclusion, I believe that it is only fair to state that Mr. Bowles, the Price Administrator, and his legal staff recognize the justice of some of the criticisms which I have made tonight, and they have agreed to meet with a subcommittee of lawyers of the House Banking and Currency Committee this week for the purpose of agreeing on amendments to the act.

It is my hope that we agree on whatever amendments are necessary to correct the present deficiencies of judicial review before the bill reaches the floor of the House, so that it will be less open to attack by opponents of any price-control bill whatsoever.

Post-War Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the American Aviation Daily for Monday, May 22, 1944:

BRITISH CHOSEN INSTRUMENT NO MONOPOLY

Reading of the official transcript of the 2-day House of Lords' debate, May 10–11, on post-war civil aviation reveals the following:

1. The British do not consider a chosen instrument to be an operational monopoly; it is only a monopoly of direct subsidy.

2. The British Post Office Department can make contracts for carriage of mail with any carrier it chooses.

3. There is no statutory prohibition against operation of air lines by shipping companies and railroads and a reading of the debate reveals that both interests intend to operate air lines.

4. All questions of landing rights abroad for British air lines will be handled by the Foreign Office which appears to be in a dominant position.

The following statements by Lord Beaverbrook pertaining to the chosen instrument, B. O. A. C., and monopoly, including the first thorough definition of a chosen instrument given to date from the British viewpoint, were taken by the Daily from the official transcript:

"LORD BEAVERBROOK. I now come to the question of the chosen instrument and the monopoly. As my noble friend put it, is it still a monopoly or no monopoly? At any rate, it is still what it was. It is fixed by statute, and until Parliament decides to repeal the statute the chosen instrument is just what it used to be. I will endeavor to tell your Lordships how it seems to me, but possibly others might take a different view."

ONLY MONOPOLY OF SUBSIDY

"The present position is that the British Overseas Airways Corporation has a monopoly of subsidy of overseas airways. That is, a monopoly of treasury grants for the development of air transport service. To that extent the British Overseas Airways Corporation is the chosen instrument of the Government. Before the war Imperial Airways received aggregate contributions of £900,000 a year, the Postal Administration taking part in the scheme on the basis that all contract mails would be carried by air on the Empire routes.

"The B. O. A. C. is in this, as in other respects, the contractual successors of Imperial Airways. Apart from this, the Postmaster General has the power to award a mail contract to any transport concern which seems to him to offer the best service on any particular route. That is the briefest and clearest explanation I can make of the statutory position of the B. O. A. C. It is a position which is perhaps not easily grasped—I have some difficulty in grasping it myself—but if you read it in Hansard tomorrow it may seem clearer than the explanation I have given to you."

At this point the Marquess of Londonderry asked: "That is a decision to maintain the act of 1939 in being?"

"Lord BEAVERBROOK. The question of the act of 1939 rests with Parliament. The decision must depend on Parliament. What decision Parliament will take I could not anticipate. But there is the statutory position—monopoly in the sense that it is a

monopoly of subsidies and a monopoly of certain payments from the various States concerned with the transportation of mail, but no monopoly in the respect that no lines are forbidden to fly over the seas or that the Postmaster General is forbidden to make payments for carrying mail even on a similar route.

"There is no statutory position that could prevent any concern from operating British air lines overseas as long as that concern conforms to airworthiness and other regulations—none.

"In time of war the flight of civil aircraft inside the limits of the United Kingdom and its territorial waters is controlled by the Air Navigation Order, 1939, and must be subject to any restrictions which may be necessary on operational grounds. That is a war measure."

PERMITS THROUGH FOREIGN OFFICE

"Any concern which wishes to operate, whether a shipping company or any other organization, must have permission to land at its destination, and will need aircraft and trained personnel, both air crews and ground crews. Permits to land at foreign airports may be sought through the foreign office. At present there are no suitable transport aircraft available, apart from those in service, nor can skilled and experienced personnel be spared from wartime duties. I am sure that the House will find no fault with that statement.

"While this is the present position, it is clear to all of us that we are entering an era of change and experiments. There are many uncertanties, and we must be ready to adapt our policy to the conditions as we find them and not to hold on to the position which at present exists.

"We must be swift to seize on all the opportunities presented to us and be sure that is the purpose of the Air Ministry and also of the committee over which I preside.

"Now, some good judges think that air transport will rapidly attain to a self-supporting basis. Many Americans go so far as to say that air transport over the North Atlantic will be a self-sustaining venture, and that in a few years air transport over the North Atlantic may reach not only economic operation, but profitable conditions. There are others, less optimistic, who say that a few aircraft will supply all the services we require.

"The committee is not prepared to base its policy on these predictions either way. We are committed to the pursuit of an efficient and enterprising civil aviation, and we are committed to the furthest expansion of British air transport that conditions in this country and the Empire will permit. We are looking for our proper share in the world traffic. We have set our faces against the wasteful and improvident subsidy race. That, I think, answers the questions that my noble friend has raised on the order paper."

In the second day's debate, after reiterating his previous statement that any concern has the right to apply to the foreign office for granting of landing rights, Lord Beaverbrook returned to the chosen instrument as follows:

"Now may I pass on to the chosen instrument. It is not really a monopoly. I do not object to the interpretation of those who regard it as a monopoly, but it is not a monopoly. It is a monopoly of subsidy and of subsidy only, and you cannot say that a monopoly of subsidy is an operational monopoly. It is not. Operational monopoly does not exist. There is no monopoly of operation, but there is a monopoly of subsidy. There is really a difference—there is a great difference. There is nothing clearer than our compelte freedom in relation to operations. There is no monopoly whatever so far as operations go. That is the only definition that I can give of the chosen instrument."

C. I. O. Political Action Committee Declared Directing Fourth-Term Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of May 19, 1944:

C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE DECLARED DIRECTING FOURTH-TERM DRIVE

(By Frank R. Kent)

The extent to which Mr. Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Committee on Political Action and custodian of its large political funds, is taking over the direction of the Roosevelt fourth-term effort is beginning to arouse mixed emotions in several quarters.

At the rate Mr. Hillman and his C. I. O. colleagues are going there is considerable chance that long before election they will overshadow the Democratic National Committee. For the first time we shall have a labor organization as the dominant factor in the management of a major Presidential candidacy, with the regularly constituted party committee keeping up appearances, but really playing a secondary role.

As that picture suits neither one, it is likely this will be denied by both the C. I. O. and the party committee. But the denials will not alter the facts.

The basic fact is that the C. I. O. is better organized, more aggressive, and better financed than the national committee. Further, it was not only earlier in its demand for Mr. Roosevelt to run again (being preceded only by Mr. Earl Browder, the Communist leader), but is far more enthusiastic and united, there being some members of the national committee who are, to say the least, lukewarm about the fourth term, though the futility of opposition to renomination keeps them quiet. On the contrary, the C. I. O. leaders, from Mr. Murray and Mr. Hillman down, are a truculent and extremely articulate unit—with lots of money.

CAMPAIGNING WITH VIGOR

In addition, they have already taken the lead and are conducting the campaign with a vigor never before evinced by a labor organization in politics. From its publicity department, fourth-term statements and arguments flow in a steady stream, Mr. Hillman and Mr. Murray alternately—and sometimes jointly—beat their breasts, proclaiming the necessity of keeping Mr. Roosevelt in the White House. Resounding resolutions are passed every week or so by C. I. O. locals. Mr. Hillman assails Congress as sabotaging the policies of our great President, and the Republicans, particular Governor Dewey, are disparaged.

On Tuesday in Cleveland, Mr. Hillman gave out a fervid statement, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America passed a highly eulogistic resolution, and Mr. Murray, in the name of 5,000,000 members, exhorted the C. I. O. delegates to roll up your sleeves and get behind the drive to get President Roosevelt to run again and fight for his election."

Clearly, the postconvention C. I. O. campaign will be of greater intensity, because, after the nomination, there will be a real fight and now there is none. Therefore, it will be maintained and the committee hard seems reasonable to believe the C. I. O. lead put to it to keep pace. The situation is such that it will be compelled to give the C. I. O. a pretty high managerial position.

Certainly, this wholehearted C. I. O. activity is an asset for Mr. Roosevelt. The Republicans have nothing like it. But it has liabilities. For example, there are the farmers. Conservative at heart, antagonized anyhow by the C. I. O. Communistic saturation and the extreme radicalism of the American Labor Party now dominated by Mr. Hillman, the C. I. O. leadership in, and sponsorship for, the fourth-term attempt is well calculated to increase farmer opposition.

RESENTED IN CONGRESS

Also, Democratic Members of Congress, resentful of C. I. O. bullying and the blatant denunciation from the Messrs. Murray and Hillman, are ill pleased at the set-up.

It is easy to believe, too, that it is distasteful both to the regular Democratic politicians and to other labor leaders. Actually, the C. I. O. has taken possession. It has established its claim as the chief promoter of the Roosevelt candidacy. Mrs. Roosevelt is to address its annual convention. It is, in reality, conducting the campaign.

In the event of success, its position would be very strong, indeed. It would have a right to expect—and beyond doubt would get—even greater preferential treatment than before. Naturally, this is not a pleasing prospect for the regular party people or for the A. F. of L. bosses. Nor is it one the average citizen can contemplate happily. It would end all chance to correct the one-sided, unjust and unconstitutional labor legislation, which the New Deal, under labor pressure, has put upon the statute books.

It would put the more radical labor leaders in commanding position. It would give them a right to contend that at last they had elected a President.

The reelected President, his Attorney General and all other officials who otherwise would go out with a change of administration, would be heavily in the C. I. O. debt. It would, in fact, give us a union labor Government to a far greater degree than we have had—and a labor government in which not the best but the cheapest class of labor leader wielded the most influence.

It is hard to believe the American people are ready for this sort of government. It is hard to believe the men in the armed forces, once they understand the closeness of the link between the C. I. O. and the fourth term, would want it. Yet, the closeness of the link cannot be exaggerated. So far as the campaign is concerned the C. I. O. has practically taken over.

Monopolies and Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on March 14, 1944, I obtained consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from Hansard, the official report of the proceedings of the British Parliament, of January 25, 1944, dealing with the subject of monopolies and cartels. It developed that the printing would exceed by 1⅓ pages the 2 printed pages allowed under the rule. The Public Printer estimates that the cost will be $150. I ask unanimous con-

sent that the excerpt be printed notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUSTS

Lord Strabolgi rose to ask His Majesty's Government, whether they will state their policy with regard to trusts, cartels, and combines, national and international, in post-war reconstruction; and to move for papers. The noble lord said: "My Lords, I beg leave to move the motion standing in my name, and before the noble lord opposite who, I understand, is to reply for the Government gives the answer to the question which I venture to put, may I remind your Lordships very briefly of the recent history of this subject? During the last war, the First World War, the growth of combines, monopolies, trusts, and cartels aroused a good deal of anxiety, and my noble friend who sits below me, Lord Addison, who was then Minister of Reconstruction, appointed a committee of investigation to look into the whole question. The committee reported on the 24th of April 1919. This was a very remarkable committee; remarkable in the eminence of its personnel. I have the report in my hand. The chairman was Mr. Edward Shortt, who resigned in the following June on becoming Chief Secretary for Ireland, when his place was taken by Mr. Charles McCurdy. Amongst the members of this committee were two very well-known economists, Mr. J. A. Hobson and the former Mr. Sidney Webb, who was afterward such an addition to your Lordships' House as Lord Passfield, and a trade-union leader of whom we have heard a great deal since, Mr. Ernest Bevin."

The terms of reference were as follows:

"In view of the probable extension of trade organizations and combinations, to consider and report what action, if any, may be necessary to safeguard the public interest."

If your Lordships will permit me, I will epitomize the report. In the main report the most relevant passage, I think, was as follows:

"In the United Kingdom combinations operating in restraint of trade are, through not criminal, unlawful if shown to be against public policy, as public policy is understood by the English courts, where these words are construed in a somewhat narrow and technical sense."

A great deal of evidence was taken from scores of great combinations, cartels, and trusts, and many other witnesses. In essence the recommendations were these: First of all, that machinery for the investigation of monopolies should be instituted—similar to that in existence in the United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa; secondly, that the board of trade should gather information about the workings of these monopolies; thirdly, that a tribunal should be established and that the board of trade should recommend state action to remedy grievances established by this tribunal of investigation. There was an addendum to the report by Mr. Sidney Webb (as he was then), Mr. Ernest Bevin, Mr. Hobson, and another member in which they recommended that monopolistic enterprises should not remain in private hands.

That was the report, and I was always interested to know what the Government did about it. In November last, I ventured to ask His Majesty's Government what had happened, and my noble friend Lord Templemore was good enough to tell me that the action taken on the recommendations of this committee—and here is the mountain in labor giving birth to a mouse—was the Profiteering Act of 1919, a ridiculous measure which many of your Lordships will remember very well, and with which we had a great deal of fun in the House of Commons. It never worked. It dealt in the main with the grievances which housewives might feel against shopkeepers, and did not touch the main subjects of the investigation of the committee at all; and, as Lord Templemore admitted, the act lapsed in 1921. The act also charged the board of trade with the duty of obtaining information about the nature, extent, and development of trusts and similar combinations. That was always the duty of the board of trade. There was no provision in the act for the board of trade doing anything about it, although the whole essence of this valuable report was that the board of trade in certain instances should do something about it. As I say, the whole act lapsed in 1921.

It will be common knowledge that between the two wars, and indeed during this war, monopolies and cartels, both national and international, have greatly increased. When various measures of Government control are introduced during a war, as they have to be in a modern war, it is inevitable that the result is to stimulate combines and associations. The Government departments do not want to deal with individual manufacturers and traders, and, if there is not a manufacturing or trade combine in existence, they tell the people concerned to get together and form a trade or manufacturing association so that they can be dealt with as a corporate whole. That is quite natural and not objectionable in itself, but it has the result of stimulating and assisting the formation of combines, associations, trusts, and eventually monopolies, and these can be harmful to the general public, as this report has said, and as other authorities whom I will venture to cite have emphasized again and again.

Why the matter is so urgent and important now, when we are considering plans for the post-war period—and we must be considering them; that is the reason for the existence of the office held by the noble lord, Lord Woolton—is that any combinations or trusts which by their nature are restrictive must be against the public interest. The Government, I understand, is committed to an expansionist policy, and the very object of the modern cartel is to restrict production and to limit it to the supposed capacity of the market. An expansionist policy, whatever may be the desire of the cabinet and of Lord Woolton, will not be possible if these cartels, which are now so extensive, are allowed free play nationally and internationally. Without an expansionist policy—and here I know that I have Lord Woolton with me—the Prime Minister's declared program of work, food, and homes for all will not be possible. I suggest, therefore, that a Government policy with regard to cartels is one of those branches of the activities of Lord Woolton where action can be taken now and legislation introduced. It is not one of the great phases of reconstruction which will have to wait upon events and be delayed until the end of the war. This matter can be dealt with now and, as I hope to show to your Lordships' satisfaction in a moment, it is necessary to deal with it now to guard against a very serious danger.

We have heard a good deal lately, in various discussions on reconstruction and post-war economic policy, about the value of private enterprise and of freedom for the energetic entrepreneur. We are told what a good thing it is to have individual enterprise in business and free competition, and I seem to hear silent cheers from the Liberal benches on my right. Under a cartel system these things are all impossible. You cannot have free competition. There is no room for the able, young, energetic, and usually, so we are told, liberal businessman to break in on the combine; the whole object of the cartel is to prevent him from starting a new enterprise and competing. In fact, the defenders of monopolies and what they call rationalization talk of this free competition, which forms the theme of the perorations of many of the great speeches which I hear from some of your Lordships, as "cutthroat competition"—something evil. They are against it; they want to stop it, and if they can coerce or seduce the trade unions into helping them they will do so.

I ventured to say on a previous occasion, and I must repeat it now, that our rearmament and the American rearmament in the years immediately before this war, and in the early years of this war, was hampered and hindered by the prior restrictions of trusts and monopolies. Some of these were actively encouraged by the governments of Baldwin and Chamberlain; to give only three examples, shipbuilding, textiles, and agriculture. There was a deliberate damping down and prevention of production. I have quoted in your Lordships' House in pre-war years, with indignation but without support, the case of a Yorkshire farmer friend of mine who was fined for growing potatoes. That is but one example of many of the general principles of restriction and rationalization which destroyed looms in Lancashire and shipyards all over the country.

I am glad to say that in this matter I am no longer a voice crying in the wilderness. I do not expect to convert any of your Lordships who have not already come to the same conclusion from an independent study of this great subject, but I will fortify myself by quotations from prominent statesman on both sides of the Atlantic. I hope that your Lordships will forgive me if I make one or two quotations, which shall be very brief, from their speeches. I will begin with my right honorable friend, the Home Secretary, Mr. Herbert Morrison, a colleague of Lord Woolton in the War Cabinet. I may say that in all these quotations the language is a little more extravagant than I usually employ, and in some cases a good deal more picturesque than any of which I am capable; but these are quotations, not my own words. Speaking at Leeds on April 3 last, Mr. Morrison said:

"Let us face the fact that such monopolies are restrictive in their very essence. That is the reason for their existence. You will never alter their nature by patching and tinkering with them. Their whole set-up and relation to the community must be profoundly altered. I am convinced that the only answer consistent with national well-being is full and effective public control."

Let me break off here to say that if we had a normal party government at the present time in which any cabinet minister was speaking for the collective body of the Government, I should not bring this motion forward. That would satisfy me. But we know now from various statements by the Prime Minister that Cabinet ministers are allowed to think aloud at public meetings. It does not necessarily represent the policy of the Government. And where the Government have not got a policy, members of it are either condemned to silence or they must state their own policy.

I must again draw on the vast store of wisdom from the speeches of my right honorable friend by quoting two other sentences from another speech he made—and this is the version in the Times of November 1. This was a speech made in London:

"Vast concentrations of economic power were a political menace, however efficient they might be in their economic conduct. They had within their grasp power over fields of public well-being and public policy far greater in practice than Parliament itself yielded in the great majority of its legislation. * * *

"What I do feel strongly is that the semi-accident by which restrictive practices, which would be outside the law in America, have been able to be built up under cover of the law in this country, is something deserving of early and zealous attention. Once the law is changed and the old doctrine of conspiracy

in restraint of trade is given new force in relation to price fixing and other restrictive arrangements, you have made it possible to put the industry which wishes to take such steps in the position of having to justify what it wants to do before public authority, and to prevent any action unless this authority gives specific consent. In some instances, again, I would not rule out the possibility of allowing certain types of grouping to continue for a time to operate under a continuous measure of public supervision of some kind."

And here may I take the opportunity of publicly thanking my noble friend Lord Nathan for sending me this morning a very scholarly article written by him which appeared in one of the great literary reviews this month on this whole subject of monopolies. My noble friend Lord Nathan stresses the evils of cartels and monopolies and the need for legislative action, and I am reminded of it by those last words of Mr. Morrison. But my noble friend does not deal with the international problem, no doubt for reasons of space; he deals only with the domestic problem, and in the speech which I have ventured to quote from Mr. Herbert Morrison your Lordships will notice that it is the domestic problem that he is concerned with. I am far more concerned with the international problem.

Again I quote Mr. Herbert Morrison, and this is from the Daily Mail of June 20—an unimpeachable source:

"Before the war our industrial system was in many of its key areas, both in production and in distribution, not genuinely a system of private enterprise at all, but a system of private semimonopoly governed by restrictive agreements and arrangements which were the absolute negation of enterprise. The result was that our country was falling into a decline. Its productive power was dropping back by comparison with other countries, particularly America. In plain English, it was not earning as good a living as it could have done."

I could quote a great deal more—all on the same lines, obviously showing that Mr. Herbert Morrison, Home Secretary, member of the War Cabinet, and a very respected member of my own party, is unhappy about this state of affairs and hopes there will be legislation. I imagine his views are shared by my noble friend Lord Woolton.

The MINISTER OF RECONSTRUCTION (Lord WOOLTON). Imagination.

Lord STRABOLGI. I beg your pardon.

Lord WOOLTON. I was merely congratulating you on your imagination.

Lord STRABOLGI. Why? Because I venture to suggest that Lord Woolton's and Mr. Morrison's minds might be working on the same lines? Surely there is nothing extravagant or imaginary about that. Has the whole theory of government collective responsibility gone by the board since Lord Woolton became Minister of Reconstruction? It is no laughing matter; my noble friends on this side of the House will be interested and the country will have something to say about it, too.

But now I will quote the Minister of Aircraft Production as reported in the Manchester Guardian of November 20. The quotation is quite short, but Sir Stafford Crips is a master of the spoken word and his legal training allows him to put matters in a very few sentences which mean a great deal:

"Another problem which we shall have to face is the political and economic power of the great monopolies. Monopolies in vital industries must be run as public undertakings by the Government through appropriate organizations. We want to get out of the 'can't afford' attitude * * * and we must give our Government the authority to use all the controls strictly necessary to achieve that end."

Those are quotations from prominent members of His Majesty's Government, and I could have, of course, no better companions in my case.

But now may I quote from two members of the United States administration? The first is Mr. Wendell Berge, the United States Assistant Attorney General. He was addressing the American Pharmaceutical Association on December 14 last. This is what he said, according to the Daily Express. I do not quote the Daily Herald in these matters, not because I do believe it to be more reliable than all the other papers put together, but because some of your lordships might not believe it. This is what Mr. Berge said about cartel domination:

"Cartel domination of essential medical products has jeopardized the health of millions. Because of cartel and patent agreements American drug manufacturers have, in some cases, been denied the chance to develop the industry to its full possibilities. The myth of German superiority in the production of organic medical compounds has been dispelled for many years. This prestige rested not on superior skill, but on the abuse of monopoly and patent privileges."

That report is sent by Reuter.

Lastly, may I quote the Vice President of the United States, Mr. HENRY WALLACE. He spoke in Chicago last September, and the speech was extensively reproduced in The Times and in the Sunday Times. Quoting first the report in the Times I find the following very pregnant sentences:

"There must be power to deal with those international cartels which are strangling production, competing unfairly, or using methods which lead to war."

Mr. WALLACE said:

"Isolationism is the screen behind which special privilege seeks to entrench its control. Isolationism and special privilege spoke with equal force to produce the peace of Munich. Wherever isolationism is being pushed most vigorously, there, in the background, can usually be found, furnishing money and power, monopolistic cartels. These cartels are customarily seeking tariffs, quotas, subsidies, or other governmental favors which are the breeding ground of isolationism. Wherever the forces of monopoly are found our job is to fight them. Those groups which rule over economic empires have usurped the sovereignty of the people in international relations."

I notice that the language has much the same bearing or meaning as that of Mr. Herbert Morrison.

"If we plan aright, there can be freedom from hunger and freedom from the fear of a poverty-stricken old age. The farmer can be free from his fear of impossibly low prices for what he sells and outrageously high prices for what he buys. The businessman can be free from the fear of those monopolies and international cartels which use unfair practices in buying from him, selling to him, or competing with him."

In the same speech—I shall not trouble your Lordships with the quotation—he goes on to explain that he is not really attacking business as business, that he is acting as the champion and friend of the American businessman who is in danger of being crushed and obliterated by the growth of this cartel system in the United States. And, of course, what applies to the United States applies also—though not quite so glaringly—to a great extent to this country.

I must now refer to what I consider is the gravest aspect of this whole problem, and that is the international aspect. Your lordships, I am sure, know now that the international cartel system helped Germany very much indeed in her military preparations before the present war. The German cartels induced their partners in Britain, America, and other countries, but particularly in Britain and America, to rationalize and restrict production, and in exchange, of course, their partners were given a monopoly in certain markets. The German cartels secured closed markets in their own areas. Then, under the Nazi system, when they became in effect part of the Nazi totalitarian government, they built up their own war potential. Profits did not matter to them; the German Government saw to that. They were able, under this cartel scheme in their closed markets, to build up an enormous war potential, the results of which we saw soon enough. They obtained manufacturing secrets and formulas from their copartners in Britain, America, Italy, Japan, and other countries. There was, of course, some reciprocity, but that did not matter, because the cartels in Britain and America were not part of a Government plot to prepare for war. Neither Britain nor America was preparing for war, they could give away a few secrets and manufacturing processes and it did not seem to matter at all. But in Germany they were preparing for war under the cloak of the Nazi system.

Now what has happened since the war? The greater part of Europe has been overrun or dominated, as in the case of Spain, by Germany, and behind the German Army have come the German industrialists and monopoly financiers, the men who built up and controlled these trusts and cartels. In France, Czechoslovakia, and the Low Countries particularly, and in other countries as well, they have got control of the great key industries, the great heavy industries, the manufacture of electrical equipment, iron and steel, coal mining, and so on. There they are, in virtual control of all Europe's industry.

In German-occupied Europe and in countries like Switzerland, Spain, and Sweden, which until recently have not dared to refuse anything on the economic plane, they have got a complete network of industrial, manufacturing, and trading control. They have their "hide-outs," if I may use that word—their financial hiding places—in Spain, in Switzerland, possibly in Sweden (I do not know about Sweden), and probably in the Argentine and Bolivia.

However the war ends, and probably while the Governments of the United Nations are busy rounding up war criminals and disarming Germany, the leaders of German monopoly-finance will try to reestablish contacts with their old friends in Britain and the United States of America. They will have an economic and financial empire of great potential value to offer. There may be political difficulties in unscrambling the omelet of the German-dominated cartels in France and other countries. It will depend a great deal on the nature of the Governments in those countries. I understand that, in France particularly, the German control of French industry has been most cleverly concealed—nominee shareholders, Quislings, and so on, hiding the real power behind the majority shareholders—and they will have a great prize in this almost complete European monopoly of great basic industries. This is not fanciful. I do not say for a moment that they will get a response in this country; I cannot answer for the United States. I do not suggest that for a moment, but that is the danger, and we cannot rely on its not meeting with a response, even an innocent response. On the very eve of the outbreak of this war spokesmen of the Federation of British Industries were closeted with the leaders of heavy industry in Germany—your lordships will all remember that, but forgive me for reminding you—to try to come to some such arrangement for partitioning out great portions of the globe for monopoly trading operations.

The leaders of the United Nations must be prepared to deal with this situation, and it cannot be left to the last moment, left to the confusion and congestion of business following an armistice—by, among other measures and this is the only real safeguard, the control of their own cartels. That does not mean nationalization necessarily. It means

knowing what is going on and being able to intervene if arrangements are being come to which are contrary to the public interest here. Unless we take measures in time to prepare for this situation, I suggest that a successful expansionist policy of reconstruction, which I understand is Lord Woolton's aim, will be impossible. You cannot do it if you have great international combines controlling key products and strategic raw materials all over the world. All this talk of "food, work, and homes for all" will be mere words. This matter is vitally important. It is most serious, and from the international point of view it cannot be ignored. It should be taken most seriously. This is not a joke, I beg Lord Woolton to believe. I ask him to take it seriously. I do not ask him to deal with me seriously, but I ask him to deal seriously with this subject. I beg to move for papers.

LORD WOOLTON. My lords, I am sorry that the noble lord thought I was not dealing with him seriously when I made what I hope was a pardonable interjection when he said something about Mr. Herbert Morrison. Perhaps I misunderstood him, and if I caused him any inconvenience by my interruption, I beg him to accept my apologies. This is the third time the noble and gallant lord has raised this matter in your Lordships' House. I hope I am not going to disappoint your lordships in my reply. The subject is one which he need not fear I shall take lightly. It is a subject to which I have already, in the comparatively short time in which I have been in my present office, given very detailed consideration. The noble lord is right in saying that it is a subject which is part of an expansionist policy to which I most certainly am committed. He is also right in saying that it is a subject which is not one for this country alone but one in which we shall have to take conference with the other parties in the United Nations. We have already taken some of the first steps toward that conference.

I make no apology to your Lordships for not following the noble Lord into the many things he has said and the many quotations that he has given us today from speeches of some of my colleagues. When I undertook this responsibility I said in the first speech I made to your Lordships that I should put first things first. Well, I have found myself, on assuming office, confronted with a great mass of reports and very much wisdom. This requires to be canalized into some legislative form and I am busily engaged on that, primarily with the object of seeing that the housing problem is tackled first of all, because that is the most urgent problem which is before the public, and it has, indeed, taken most of my time and the time of several of my colleagues who are associated with me in this work. We are already engaged in the process of preparing our views on the question as to how we are going to obtain full employment in this country, and when we came to that subject then we found ourselves faced with the problems that the noble Lord has raised this afternoon. In due course His Majesty's Government will lay before the House a Paper embodying those views. I think it would be ill-advised on my part to enter into a discussion on this problem now and that it would be better to wait until I have had further time to digest everything in regard to it in order to bring it into line with all the other problems with which, as the noble Lord has said, it is associated.

When that time comes—and I hope my Lords it will not be long before it does come, because we are all working very hard on this problem of reconstruction at the present time—then your Lordships will have the Paper, for which the noble Lord now moves before you. It will be part of a Paper embodying the whole subject of employment. I hope that will satisfy the noble Lord as regards today's debate. I apologize to your Lordships for not having entered more fully into many of the arguments that have been put forward. There were many temptations that the noble Lord gave me to enter into a political argument with him today but that, I am sure, would have been very unwise of me. I do not ask the noble Lord to withdraw his resolution demanding papers, because I have every intention of putting those papers before your Lordships. I hope the other members of the House will not feel that I have treated this subject too lightly because I have ventured to withhold a final opinion until I have had a fuller opportunity of dealing with all the facts.

LORD ADDISON. My Lords, I am sure every member of your Lordships' House would wish to avoid any attempt to hustle the noble Lord. We recognize the vastness of the undertakings which are committed to his charge and we would not, for a moment, wish to embarrass him in his work. At the same time I confess to a great disappointment at the small extent to which the noble Lord has referred to the most important matter brought before the House by my noble friend. I gather—and this is the only reason for my rising—that the proposal is that the question of the influence of combines and trusts on the possibility of the provision of employment or the restriction of employment will be dealt with in a forthcoming paper dealing with employment. If that is so I am glad the noble Lord has decided that it shall be dealt with.

LORD WOOLTON. That is so.

LORD ADDISON. But I would like to be quite clear. It will not be a mere aside? This is a vital question relating to the possibility of employment and perhaps the noble Lord will give me a little more extended information on that.

LORD WOOLTON. I will give the assurance that it will not be an aside.

VISCOUNT SAMUEL. My Lords, this question of industrial monopolies is second to none in importance. It is fundamental in framing the economic side of the post-war world. At the same time I think it not unreasonable that the noble Lord, Lord Woolton, fresh to the great office that he now holds, should ask for more time before making a considered pronouncement on behalf of the Government upon this wide and complicated issue. He told us that it would not be long before a statement of policy will be made. I hope that it will not be so long as the period we have experienced in the case of town and country planning and the decisions on the various reports that have been made which have been in abeyance for a length of time that has caused widespread dissatisfaction. If the noble Lord can hold out a hope that the time will indeed be short, a question not of years but of months and if possible of weeks, then I am sure the House, as a whole, will not demur.

LORD WOOLTON. My Lords, I must not mislead the House—not of weeks. I must first deal with the reports to which the noble Viscount has just referred, upon which I think the country is waiting for some pronouncement, but certainly within a very few months I hope that we shall have presented your Lordships with this report.

VISCOUNT MAUGHAM. My Lords, I hope your Lordships will forgive me saying something, not from a Government point of view in the least, in reference to the very important topic which is before the House. I have long been interested in this matter of combines and cartels, and I have done what few members of this House can have done, studied the Sherman Act and endeavored to understand the vast difficulties of the problem with which the United States Government have found themselves confronted after the passing of that act. I am acquainted with some portion of the very many actions that have been brought in the United States to enforce the act and am aware of the fact that the great majority of them have failed. No more difficult problem could be before any legislature than that of attempting to deal with this question. It is a very important one, and the difficulties at the root of it can be appreciated by anyone.

The noble lord who opened this debate declared himself in favor of the view that every combine to limit production was wrong. I wholly disagree with that proposition. It seems to me perfectly and demonstrably a mistake. The noble lord forgets for the moment the terrible effects of unrestricted effort by people to compete against each other. Unrestricted competition is a terrible thing in an industry. I am only going to say a very few words, but I cannot help mentioning one industry with which I was at one time very well acquainted, that of rubber. There was unrestricted competition at one time in the matter of rubber. The trees take 7 years to grow and be in a condition to be tapped. When they are ready to be tapped everyone wants to get rid of his rubber. It cost at that time about 1 shilling sixpence a pound to produce.

Of course that has greatly diminished now. Yet by unrestricted competition the price went down, I think, to 2 pence a pound. That was a wholly unremunerative result. It threw a great number of growers, especially the smaller growers, into a state of bankruptcy, and plantations were sold for a song. Nobody, I think, can reasonably suppose that it would be unfair in a case like that, or that it was unfair in that case, to make some sort of bargain between the various growers in the different countries concerned so as to prevent ruin to the industry as a whole.

That is only a single instance. There are instances that could be given of other products all over the world. Take the question of coffee in Brazil. Coffee grows so easily in Brazil that Brazilians have found it perfectly impossible to sell their coffee in a large measure, and in order to prevent it being sold at half or one-third the cost of production the government have stepped in and thrown the coffee into the sea. I believe that was going on a year ago. I do not know if it is still going on. You want some limitation there. You may say that the government should intervene, but the noble lord has enough experience of governments to know that if you wait for the government to intervene probably all engaged in the industry will be ruined. This problem sounds so easy to state, but it is difficult to deal with. Every combination which has for its object to enable goods to be sold at a reasonable price to the public, including a reasonable and not an unreasonable profit, is perfectly fair. Every combination which is directed to raise the price to an extravagant amount, so that the public do not get properly served in connection with that particular article, is wrong. I challenge the noble lord to produce a bill which will carry out those two objects. The United States have done their best, but, if I may say so without any offense to that country, they have not been particularly successful in their efforts.

LORD STRABOLGI. My Lords, I am very much obliged to the noble Lord for accepting my motion. I understand it will not be very long before we get a white paper on the subject. May I thank my noble friends, Lord Addison and Viscount Samuel for their support? It is the first time in my life I have ever had support from spokesmen of two separate parties of their respective eminence. I hope my noble friend, Lord Woolton, will take warning from that fact. It is a very big subject and the public is really very interested and in some ways exercised about it. I am sorry the noble Lord, Lord Woolton, is not even doing what my noble friend, Lord Addison, did in the last war, that is to set up a strong committee to look into the present development of the subject. It did not take a long time for the inquiry to produce its report before and the report could have been acted on. However, we shall see what the

white paper contains. I am sorry if I displayed any irritation because I thought the noble Lord was taking the matter somewhat lightly. I know now from what he says that he is not taking it lightly, and I am glad to realize that he and I agree that it is a serious subject.

The MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY. My Lords, I do not understand whether the noble Lord withdraws his motion or not. The wording of the question is:

"To ask His Majesty's Government whether they will state their policy with regard to trusts, cartels, and combines, national and international, in post-war reconstruction."

The noble lord has come up against a brick wall of the Government declining to disclose their policy, and the motion holds good.

Lord STRABOLGI. I understand that papers are going to be laid.

The MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY. If the noble lord cannot get an answer he must withdraw his motion or continue.

Lord STRABOLGI. The Government have accepted it.

On question, motion for papers agreed to.

Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I have received a communication from the Order of Railway Conductors of America, signed by Vice President and National Legislative Representative W. D. Johnson, of that organization, to which is attached a report by Mr. Lawrence A. Appley, Deputy Chairman and Executive Director of the War Manpower Commission to Director Paul V. McNutt. In the letter transmitting the report to me this paragraph occurs:

The attached memorandum contains information of public interest on the general manpower situation, which the Railway Labor Executive Association thinks should be made available to all Members of Congress and the general public. We would, therefore, like very much to see it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with any comments you care to make in connection therewith.

Mr. President, I have gone over the article and the report quite carefully, and find that the report does contain much very valuable material, and I know this organization would not make this request if its members did not think it contained valuable information which should appear in the RECORD.

The report is longer than is permitted to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD without an estimate being made of what it will cost to print. I have an estimate, which shows that it will cost $286. I ask that the report be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 20, 1944.

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman.
From: Lawrence A. Appley, Deputy Chairman and Executive Director.
Subject: Annual report.

INTRODUCTION

On April 18, 1944, the War Manpower Commission entered its third year. It is appropriate that I should give you at this time a summary of the progress of the administrative machinery of the organization, placing that summary against a back-drop of the various phases through which the manpower situation in this country has passed.

This report divides itself into four basic parts. The first deals with the manpower conditions to which our administrative machinery has had to adjust itself from time to time. The second part outlines the development and gradual improvement in the administrative machinery itself. The third part contains a few reflections of the kind of a job that has been done. The fourth outlines some basic difficulties we continually face.

I. THE CHANGING SCENE IN MANPOWER

The manpower situation in this country has passed through very definite phases. Each was easily discernible while we were in it. Each was, and still can be, clearly defined. The beginning and end of each phase can be clearly associated with calendar dates. It must be kept in mind that all characteristics of each of these phases have existed continually through all periods mentioned. What is being emphasized here is a matter of degree. During certain periods certain characteristics predominated.

A. The War Manpower Commission came into existence in the midst of a manpower situation which may be described as the period of mobilization and allocation of an adequate supply of manpower. This period extended from April 1942 to April 1943. It contained certain fundamental characteristics.

1. The war production schedule was all green lights. Full speed ahead was the signal. Anybody who could produce anything in the way of finished products, component parts, or basic materials, was urged and helped to do so. Goals were unlimited. Incentives were high. The manpower program and organization are always sensitive to war production schedules because war production is the biggest claimant for manpower.

2. The armed forces were growing in leaps and bounds. There was much confused thinking as to what the maximum goals should be. The manpower program and organization are likewise sensitive to the needs of the armed forces because they also constitute a major claimant for manpower and their requirements have to be carefully balanced with those of other claimants.

3. The manpower pool was large and appeared to some to be inexhaustible. There were millions of unemployed. There were hundreds of thousands of physically handicapped, minority groups, women, youngsters, oldsters, and other available and willing groups of potential manpower. Extensive prejudices existed against the use of much of this potential manpower and grave doubts existed as to their possible performance.

B. In May of 1943 the manpower situation quickly shifted into a new phase which we now identify as a period of mobilization and allocation of an inadequate supply of qualified manpower. This period extended to the end of 1943.

1. During this time the war-production program was still full speed ahead. The incentive scheduling techniques of the procurement agencies were still in operation. The actual manpower needs of individual employers, of particular segments of the production program and of the whole program were still highly exaggerated. The cry was for greater utilization. Few seemed to realize or accept the fact that greater utilization was inevitable as time progressed and the job "know-how" increased.

2. The demands of the armed forces for men had now become very specific and definite goals had been set and accepted. The goals were so high that it was evident that certain groups of able-bodied men would now have to be opened up to the armed forces which had been previously considered fairly immune. This, some failed to believe and accept. Action along this line was to some degree delayed thereby.

3. The pool of potential manpower had been fairly well consumed. Certainly those who were willing and anxious to enter the war program had been mobilized to a large degree. Serious shortages continued and increased in critical skills and in critical industries. Many of these shortages had been created by the unwillingness of some to believe a year earlier that we would ever reach the situation in which we now found ourselve. They were, therefore, slow in adopting training measures and other devices of securing and developing replacements.

C. The current phase of manpower identified itself about as quickly and sharply as any phase herein discussed. It started in January of 1944 and will extend until the course of events in Europe becomes more clear. It would be safe to say this period will close with the defeat of Germany. It may be described as a plateau period—a leveling off of total manpower needs with sudden and radical adjustments within a stabilized total requirement.

1. Total war production has reached a peak. Red lights are now flashing on many schedules. There is even a slight decrease in totals. Sudden adjustments, many of them unanticipated, are taking place frequently and rapidly within the total. This creates a situation of not knowing what is wanted when or where from one week to the next, and makes the problem of supplying manpower a most difficult one. Manpower, unlike material, cannot be stock-piled. Neither can it be moved from one place to another suddenly upon the signing of an order or a requisition. Such a situation creates many emergencies which are inevitable by the very nature of warfare.

2. The goals of the armed services in terms of net strength either have or will have been reached within the next few months. The Army is at its peak; the Navy will be shortly thereafter. It then becomes a matter of replacements to keep the services at net strength. This, like war-production schedules, causes great uncertainties in the manpower situation. Replacements can be scheduled only as there is more definite knowledge of casualties and discharges for other causes.

3. National statistics alone are no longer significant. Local situations control the pattern of action. Great flexibility in programs and in administration are required. Tight labor areas are loosening up. Loose labor areas are tightening. Some critical labor areas are getting more critical. Unemployment is developing in some communities while serious labor shortages are increasing in others.

D. To anticipate the future is difficult. To prophesy in time of war is hazardous. To have some basis for planning, however, we must sometimes guess and gamble. We are safe in naming the next phase of manpower which we will enter. It can be identified with two words—partial demobilization. Partial demobilization will follow the defeat of Germany and will blossom into full bloom with the defeat of Japan.

1. The war production program may drop from 35 to 50 percent after the close of the European campaign. We are entering to a small degree some phases of demobilization right now because of the lead factor in the manufacture of component parts. Whether there will be complete demobilization of war production activities will be determined by the course of action decided at the peace tables. Quite probably we will never go back to the low level of munitions production preceding this war.

2. Demobilization of the armed forces will follow much the same pattern as that of war production. Like munitions production, it is reasonable to assume that the size of the armed forces following the defeat of Japan will not go back to the low level of pre-war days.

3. The return of war workers to civilian production and the return of the veterans to civilian life is a simple phrase and an easily identified period in the manpower situation. It will present, however, more serious problems, a greater challenge, and a more difficult job than mobilization. This must be a subject for a separate report which will outline the nature of anticipated problems and plans for meeting them.

II. INTERNAL ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENTS OF THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Ever sensitive to the changing nature, to the certainties and uncertainties of the war-production and military programs, the administrative growth of the War Manpower Commission is a fascinating story in public administration and voluntary cooperation of all of the forces involved. Continually riding through storms, always the recipient of complaints and abuse, this agency of government finally emerges with her head above water and still on her course. The administrative organization of the Commission has, like the over-all manpower situation, gone through very definite and definable stages of development.

A. The first period in the life of the War Manpower Commission may be defined as the establishment of a War Manpower Commission organization. This period extended from the time of its birth in April 1942 until the 1st of July 1943 The time is long because the birth was not complete upon its appearance in this world. Arms and legs were added over a period of months by Executive orders of the President, which gave to the Commission added responsibilities and brought into its fold additional organizations.

1. The first job was the establishment of an organizational pattern. It was necessary to determine whether we would operate as a staff and line organization or as a functional organization. It was also necessary to determine the number of levels essential to do the job and yet small enough in number to permit streamlined operations.

It was finally decided that the most efficient type of organization would be the staff and line pattern. This meant a single line of responsibility from the Chairman of the organization to the most outlying local unit. All other parts of the organization were established as having a staff relationship to the line. The basic concept that it was necessary to get over to the entire organization in order to make this pattern work was that staff and line responsibilities, while different, are equally important to the successful attainment of objectives.

2. The amalgamation of many different Government agencies into one single streamlined operating unit was not simple. Each agency had a different organization structure, had its own budget, its own basic concepts, loyalties, suspicions, and desires for the perpetuation and growth. These are natural instincts since organizations are constituted of human beings. As in a marriage, each must give up certain individual privileges and thereby gain greater privileges and stature which come from a successful union. This can be accomplished by faith in the union and faith is not easy to develop.

3. Our most significant administrative development was in establishing and maintaining a mechanism for making full use of advisory groups, of management, labor, agriculture, women's organizations, minority groups, etc. This is the very heart of a voluntary system.

It was necessary to build working relationships between and within these advisory groups, to tear down preimposed barriers that existed. This could be done only by individuals and groups of individuals becoming acquainted with and gaining confidence in each other. There were periods of resignations of individuals and groups of individuals and of representatives of various organizations. Sometimes this rose to the heights of righteous indignation.

This development has been successful and none of the symptoms just now outlined have existed for many months. This has been a major contribution, not only to the groups involved, but to the manpower job as a whole.

4. Another major administrative development was putting into operation the principle of decentralization. This was a determination to which we held religiously and unwaveringly. It was accomplished in the face of the natural tendency of bureaucracy to center everything in Washington and of local communities and representatives of local communities to come to Washington for decisions.

It is safe to say that there are few Federal agencies and certainly no wartime agencies that have accomplished the degree of decentralization that has been accomplished by the War Manpower Commission. That can be proven by many facts but the most significant one is that our headquarters staff has been cut in half while our field staff has been growing slightly. Comparison of the two is likewise striking because we now have about 1,300 people in Washington and over 24,000 in the field.

B. In July 1943 our attention was directed intentionally and specifically to pulling together the established parts of a manpower program and placing them in a sequence which would constitute a complete whole. While many of the parts had been tested over a long period of time there were some few parts that had to be developed. This period in our administrative progress can be identified as the development of a war manpower program, and it extended to the end of the calendar year of 1943.

It would be a mistake to imply that we had not given consideration to this earlier, but it would likewise have been a mistake to have given most of our consideration to it before we had the administrative machinery to make the most effective use of such a program.

1. Running all through program considerations has been the basic uncertainty in the minds of many as to a voluntary system versus a compulsory one. Late in 1942 the War Manpower Commission felt that a national service act was inevitable if the job was to be done as it should be done. There were many, including the President, who at that time did not think national service was advisable. We, therefore, as an organization, definitely committed ourselves to make the voluntary system work.

Even though we had sincere doubts as to the possible effectivness of the voluntary system we went all out for it and had a grim determination to make it work. This determination on our part was largely influenced by the confidence of the advisory groups working with us in such a system and by the all-out cooperation which those groups gave us in making it work.

It was in the late summer of 1943 that we realized the voluntary system was working and the job was being done. We would be no less than frank if we did not admit that we were both surprised and pleased to see a voluntary system in America accomplishing results far beyond the fondest hopes of many authorities in the manpower field.

2. There has exisited throughout this history another basic difference in thinking which has made the formulation and full effectiveness of the voluntary system difficult. It grows out of the radical difference between the methods of dealing with military and civilian manpower.

In mobilizing and utilizing military manpower there are certain authorities and facilities that do not exist for the mobilization and utilization of civilian manpower. In the case of the military there exists the power to select, transfer, transport, house, feed, pay, and clothe. Likewise, the facilities are provided for such activities. Furthermore, there always exists the power to court martial. In dealing with civilian manpower none of these powers exists. Furthermore, they cannot exist in as clear-cut, simple, and maneuverable a pattern. Circumstances are completely different and the uses to which manpower is assigned are dissimilar.

Failure to recognize this leads to impatience on the part of some with the apparent slowness and indecisiveness of the voluntary system. Such reactions lead to convictions on the part of some that a voluntary system is not working or cannot work. This, of course, is a basic error in reasoning. At the same time, it has contributed to much of the confusion in the manpower program and has delayed the development of confidence in the country in the effectiveness of a voluntary program.

3. The ultimate evolution of a very definite program pattern was finally expressed in the recommendation of the National Management-Labor Committee to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission on November 6, 1943. This committee, made up of top-ranking executives of management, labor and agriculture, was able to watch the activities of the Commission much more objectively than those who were a part of the machinery. Their analysis of the situation has proved to be a very sound one.

Quoting from his committee report of November 6: "The War Manpower Commission has had widespread and varied experiences with locally developed manpower programs under decentralized administration and with controls of one form or another in various critical situations. In the opinion of the committee, out of these experiences has emerged a practical approach that is basic to the solution of any critical war manpower problem, whether it be local or national in character.

"The elements of this approach constitute a basic outline of the program this committee believes should be used to solve the war manpower needs. These elements are:

(a) "The facts as to manpower needs and available supply must be determined as accurately as is humanly possible. The War Manpower Commission must make these determinations in close cooperation with management and labor of any given area."

The end result of the measures taken toward this end is expressed in the form of area classifications. There are four such classifications. Group I areas are those in which there is not sufficient immediate manpower supply to meet the demand. Group II areas are those in which the demand is expected to exceed the supply within six months. In group III are found those areas

in which the supply is expected to be adequate to meet the demand for at least 6 months. Group IV includes areas of labor surplus with no anticipation of a shortage. These classifications represent the conditions as they exist in relation to manpower supply and demand.

Because of the vital uses of these classifications it is imperative that demand and supply figures be as accurate as possible. Up to the present time we have been basing demand upon figures given to us by employers which in turn are adjusted for anticipated increase in efficiency, for selective service withdrawals, and for known inaccuracies in estimates.

There are further steps to insure the accuracy of these demand figures. Our utilization people, who know considerable about manpower needs in relation to production, check these figures. In addition to that, procurement agencies certify their accuracy from the knowledge that they have of the plants from which the figures come. It is sometimes necessary to conduct utilization surveys in cooperation with the management of these plants in cases of doubt as to actual need.

This triple check on the demand estimates per plant results in the establishment of ceilings on manpower requirements in certain critical labor markets. Those ceilings represent the very best estimate that can be secured as to the total manpower required to meet the known production schedules. These ceilings, of course, are adjusted to changing schedules, but they represent a more realistic demand figure than we have received in many instances on the monthly and bimonthly reports submitted by employers to the United States Employment Service.

(b) "The relative urgency for products and services must be determined in each local area by the agencies of government responsible for procurement and production. Such determinations must be made as close to the source as possible by local representatives of those agencies acting together in close cooperation with the local representative of the War Manpower Commission within the framework of national policy."

The machinery for bringing this about is now known as the Area Production Urgency Committee. That committee is made up of the representatives of the procurement agencies, of the War Manpower Commission and a chairman from the War Production Board. These committees are being granted authority such as has not existed at the local level before. They have been given the authority to review contracts and facilities and to take such action in relation to them as necessary in order to bring about a balance between production requirements and available manpower.

Previous to the establishment of these committees the various procurement agencies and production officials were competing against each other in tight labor markets. There was little coordination of the contract and facilities activities. The functioning of these committees improves that situation considerably.

At the present time there are 11 of these committees in existence which have full authority as just outlined. There are the 5 original committees on the west coast plus those in Hartford, Conn.; Akron, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; Cleveland, Ohio; Buffalo, N. Y.; and Chicago, Ill.

(c) "The relative needs of individual employers for workers must be determined in each area. Such determinations must be made by local representatives of the War Manpower Commission in close cooperation with local representatives of procurement and production agencies of Government with the counsel and advice of the Managament-Labor War Manpower Committees."

The machinery for fulfilling this objective is known as the Area Manpower Priority Committee. It is the function of this committee to establish the needs of individual employers for workers and to express such needs in terms of manpower ceilings. On these committees are representatives of the procurement agencies, of the War Production Board, of the Selective Service System, of the Congested Area Committee, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and of other agencies which may be concerned from time to time in the problems involved. The Chairman is a representative of the War Manpower Commission.

This committee is under the general authority of the Area Management-Labor War Manpower Committee. The Management-Labor Committee performs four very definite functions in relation to the Manpower Priority Committee: It nominates a chairman; it recommends standards which are to be used in the establishment of manpower priority; currently reviews the actions of the Manpower Priority Committee; and it hears all appeals. These are most important and vital responsibilities.

This is not the only function of the Manpower Priority Committee as will be revealed in the next point to be considered in this program.

(d) "The causes for failure to meet and maintain required employment levels in individual employing establishments must be identified and wherever possible removed. To accomplish this the War Manpower Commission must secure and coordinate the full and cooperative efforts of employers, workers, the community and other Government agencies."

In the accomplishment of this objective the area manpower priorities committee plays a most important part. When it has been determined what the relative urgency is for the production or services of each employer, and when it has been determined what the manpower needs are in terms of demand for each employer, it is then necessary to discover why the employer does not have, cannot secure, or cannot keep manpower.

This would seem to some practical minds to be a little bit academic. It happens to be, however, the very heart of the manpower problem. If there are bona-fide causes for failure to meet and maintain required employment levels, those causes must be removed. Following are some of the common ones: Antiquated personnel policies, inadequate housing or transportation, unreasonable wage differentials or levels, underutilization, untrained or unskilled supervision, substandard working conditions, and many minor practices which are irritating and unnecessary.

Such causes must be identified and programs worked out with each individual employer for their removal. There are many conditions beyond the control of the individual employer. It is, therefore, necessary to get the full support and cooperation of the community and of the Government agencies involved where their help will remove the difficulty. If, after all reasonable attempts have been made to meet and maintain required employment levels, there is still failure to do so we then have left only one alternative, and that is to put the business somewhere else.

(e) "The flow of available manpower must be guided to the points where it will contribute most to the war effort. In accordance with plans formulated with local Management-Labor War Manpower Committees, the War Manpower Commission must guide this flow of workers in any given area."

If the steps just outlined have been followed, we now have an intelligent basis for allocating manpower supply. We know where it is most needed, when it is most needed, and what has to be done to secure and keep the labor at such points. It is necessary, therefore, to guide the labor to those points.

For this purpose there has been developed what is known as a controlled referral plan. This is many times misinterpreted as regimentation, as usurpation of rights, and as an imposition of government upon workers and employers. That is far from the philosophy of the plan.

It is our basic belief that the average American worker wants to contribute where his skills or abilities are the most needed in the war effort. We believe he will do so when he knows where his skills and abilities are most needed. The controlled referral plan, therefore, says to such a worker, "If you will go to the United States Employment Service or to other agencies with which arrangements have been made and which have been identified for that purpose, you can find out where you are most needed." It is intended entirely as a service and as a guide and if used as such it will be extremely effective.

The controlled referral system is one of many provisions contained in local stabilization plans for guiding or curtailing the movement of labor. These stabilization plans are the medium of the voluntary system. While they are worked out within the framework of national policy, they are primarily the product of local development and are administered locally. The entire country is now blanketed by hundreds of these stablization agreements.

There are different degrees of controlled referral according to the provisions of the local plans. In some cases there is controlled referral for critical skills which are found on the national list. In others the controlled referral system covers locally critical occupations. Some cover all male workers, others cover male workers and women workers in essential activities, and there are a few that cover all workers in the local area. The stringency of the local labor market determines the degree of the controlled referral system in effect.

(f) "The volume of production allocated to or retained in any given area must be balanced with the ability to supply the necessary manpower. The coordinated agencies of government responsible for procurement, production, and manpower should make such allocations."

This becomes a function of the area production urgency committee and was fairly well outlined under step (a) above. There are further points of view, however, that may be of value in understanding it.

Human beings are not like material. When you move a human being you tear up roots, you destroy homes, you separate friends, and you create a need for terrific mental and physical adjustments. Furthermore, you cannot keep human beings in stock piles waiting for needs to arise for their services as you can material.

Because of this simple truth we are guided by a fundamental policy. Our first attempt is to take production facilities, material, and equipment to the places where there are workers to produce. When we, therefore, find a community where the demand far exceeds the supply of manpower our attempt is to remove some of the business, thereby reducing the demand and taking that business to labor-surplus areas.

There is, of course, some business that cannot be moved. Time and the nature of the facilities do not permit moving production facilities from some localities. In such cases we must recruit workers from other areas and bring them into those communities until the demand is met. These workers are volunteers and must be treated as individuals who are coming as the result of a request and of a need that exists for their services.

It is not an easy task to bring production and manpower supply into balance. It is necessary, however, that it be done if we are to meet the accelerated production schedules that the military programs require.

(g) "All of these actions must be based on the initial conception that the agencies of Government are to service the people by informing them what has to be done, when and

where it must be done, and that the people of the Nation are the ones to determine how it shall be done."

This states the central theme and philosophy of the entire program. Throughout all of our considerations of the question of manpower and throughout recommendations and resolutions there has been and is a deep conviction that "fully effective mobilization and utilization of the national manpower will be achieved; when all agencies of Government concerned with procurement, production, and manpower, are administered under the coordinated and well-understood arrangement in which Government defines the war needs, enunciates the fundamental policies of 'rules of the game', confines itself to a minimum of control and administrative detail, and provides the maximum of real assistance to those who must do the work, namely the people of this Nation in each community; when all the people understand their personal obligations as related to the war needs, and know where and when to apply their services in such manner as best to aid in the war effort."

This program, as finally pointed up by the Management-Labor Committee, first began to take shape in Buffalo in the spring of 1943. That was a hectic experience and some mistakes were made. Taking into account the successful features and the mistakes, an even clearer pattern was expressed in the west coast manpower program recommended by Mr. Baruch and issued by Justice Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, in September of 1943. Mr. Baruch, in making his recommendations, was very carefully guided by the Buffalo experience and by the recommendations of the War Manpower Commission growing out of its experience in other areas.

The reason we state that this report of the Management-Labor Committee on November 6 pointed up the voluntary program in very definite form is that no policy or significant change in policy has been issued by the War Manpower Commission since the 14th of August, 1943. We can now say with confidence that there is a War Manpower program, and that it will meet manpower situations regardless of how critical. All of the activities of the Commission are specifically related to one of the seven steps just outlined.

C. Having consciously developed a dynamic, streamlined, and decentralized organization by July of 1943, and having evolved a very specific manpower program by the end of 1943, we entered a third stage of our internal administrative development in January of 1944. This may be described as the period in which we are placing emphasis upon the development of capable War Manpower Commission administrators and administration.

Having an organization and having a program, it was now necessary to analyze and perfect our individual and collective capacity to make the organization function effectively in the application of the program. This period will extend until July of this year (it must be understood that these phases we are identifying by definition and by calendar dates are periods of primary emphasis. Consideration is being given to these matters continually, but emphasis is being placed upon various segments at different times.)

1. Very careful attention is being given to the selection and training of executives and supervisors throughout the entire organization. We, like any employer, are suffering from the inroads of the Selective Service System upon our key personnel. We, like others, accept the policy that the first duty of any man is to serve his country in uniform. The duty of others is to replace him quickly and effectively when his country calls and to carry on in his absence, not only to perform the functions he has left, but to support him in the job he has to do at the front.

2. Emphasis is now being placed upon the function of management as such rather than upon the substantive problems with which management deals.

A common error in all management is that executives and supervisors get so involved in the problems that the organization is solving that they do not pay sufficient attention to managing the organization in such a way that it operates most efficiently and solves the problems promptly and with relative ease.

(a) A War Manpower Commission management program has been established. This program encompasses: First, an appreciation of the basic principles of management. Second, a simple management formula which, if used, will guarantee the application of these principles. Third, a system of program control which evaluates the results of management in terms of the actual attainment of goals, which makes possible preventive action rather than just curative, and which reduces the number of emergencies. Fourth, a conference system by which every employee meets with his immediate supervisor at regularly appointed times for the purpose of establishing a two-way channel through which the suggestions of employees and lower echelons of supervision may get to the top and by which the thinking and the policies of top management may reach the lowest echelon in the quickest possible time and the simplest possible form.

(b) Our own training-within-industry program is being given from the top of the organization down for the purpose of improving the quality of supervision by training supervisors in the sound methods of supervision. This has been effective in the War Manpower Commission as it has been to other organizations to whom we have rendered this service.

(c) Our utilization program is being applied at all levels of the organization. Comprehensive studies have been and are being made of individual and group effectiveness on the job. Recommendations for improved operation are continually being made, accepted, and put into practice. This has resulted in a marked decrease in turn-over and in absenteeism, so that we are not only below the Federal agency averages, but likewise below national averages for industry. Turnover at headquarters, for example, has dropped from 9 percent a month a year ago to between 3 and 4 percent a month now.

(d) Definite morale-building programs have been put into effect within the organization itself. Approximately once a month all employees within certain geographical areas are brought together at central points for programs put on by both management and employees. Questions of internal policy, organization, and program are discussed. Significant events in the history of the Commission are celebrated. Moving pictures are used extensively which contain the feel of the manpower situation in the country and of our own efforts in particular.

It is our objective to see that each employee appreciates the significant part that his or her particular job contributes to the manpower program and thereby to the war effort.

D. As to the next phase in the development in the administrative organization of the Commission we must again go into the realm of prophecy. This is always dangerous. We are, however, willing to consider that which is fairly well assured. We will enter the next period about the 1st of July and it will continue for the duration. It may be described as the period of adjustment to demobolization and post-war activities.

1. The organization and program for dealing with war conditions being firmly established and under the leadership of carefully selected and ably trained executives and supervisors, attention will have to be directed to the problems of adapting organization and program to demobilization and post-war activities when they come.

The War Manpower Commission will find inself in a very difficult situation of going in two directions at the same time. Mobilization for changing and continued war production and for military replacements will be necessary while demobilization will be increasing rapidly. This will not be an impossible task but it will be one which will require conscious administrative attention in order to keep both in proper balance and in order that one will not be sacrificed for the other.

III. THE MANPOWER JOB THAT HAS BEEN AND IS BEING DONE

So far this report has dealt with various phases of the manpower situation as a whole and with specific stages in our administrative development. It is now necessary to turn our attention to results. Has all of this been to any particular avail? This particular question has been greatly confused and may have been misleading by the unlimited and sometimes wholly unjustified attention that has been given by people in high positions of responsibility to certain specific difficulties and emergencies. This has completely thrown out of perspective in the public mind the accomplishments that have been attained.

A. The most significant single accomplishment is one peculiar to the War Manpower Commission. This agency, under the determined leadership of the chairman, has proven that the voluntary forces of any community can solve any problem regardless of how serious. When they understand what the problem is, what has to be done, and when they are willing to fully cooperate with each other, no job is too tough if they are supplied with adequate Federal guidance with an absolute minimum of Federal control.

Cooperation between the forces of labor, management, agriculture and Government has been the proposal of many orators and political aspirants. It has been a grand theme song. Few, however, have actually utilized it in the accomplishment of a sizeable task. The War Manpower Commission has put this principle to work to the extent that this country has been able to do a tremendous war job on a voluntary basis and has had to do it on a much larger scale than others in a much shorter time and without the always helpful incentive of the war being fought in its streets.

There are those who feel that this country has not wholly gone to war simply because in some instances we have not made the personal sacrifices that have been required by others whose homes were in the midst of a battlefield. The country is a bit fed up with this thinking because the average citizen sees no sense in sacrifice just for the sake of sacrifice. At the same time he measures up to whatever sacrifice is required.

B. By far the largest armed forces in the history of this country have been mobilized on time (despite conflicting figures to the contrary) and have been fully supplied in record-breaking quantities. If circumstances require increasing the strength of the armed forces, they will still be met and on time. There were many who, only a few years back, maintained this could never be done in the numbers then discussed. The stark fact is it has been done.

C. War production has exceeded the fondest hopes and again in a record-breaking time. No country ever converted as quickly and completely to war production as did this country. He who believed 4 or 5 years ago that it could be done was a dreamer and accused of having a mental disease of the type that men are now being discharged from service for having. There are tens of thousands of planes available. There are ships, tanks, munitions. They will continue to be available in the quantities needed and at the right time and places. Those who wish to criticize may do so, but the cold stark fact is the war production job is being done.

D. Another interesting accomplishment that few seem to realize is the degree to which civilian production has been maintained.

Production of civilian goods and civilian services has reached a peak during wartime that we were setting as a goal during depression. The percentage of decrease in civilian production in 1943 as compared with 1939 in terms of 1939 dollars is negligible.

The per capita consumption of food and clothes and other basic civilian goods was higher in 1943 than in previous years. Some reliable research institutions are reporting that the standard of living has increased substantially.

E. All this did not just happen. Who did it? People did it. People are manpower. This manpower or human effort had to be mobilized and utilized. This required some central leadership. The agency that was set up to supply that leadership was the War Manpower Commission. I suppose there are those still unreasonable enough to say that it was done in spite of the War Manpower Commission but at the same time there are those who are willing to give credit where credit is due.

At the same time it must be pointed out that the War Manpower Commission is not just a group of Federal employees. It is made up of thousands of volunteers and is merely the catalytic agent which has made all this voluntary effort possible through a coordinated machinery and program. It is necessary likewise to avoid any possible misunderstanding that we claim any credit for war production or for military mobilization or for civilian production. We are simply speaking of that particular part of the total job which was our responsibility and that is seeing that there is manpower available at the proper places at the proper time and in the proper quantity. Immodest though it may be, we have to believe that manpower is the most important element in the attainment of any objective.

F. Aside from the evidence just cited of accomplishment, there are other indicators which seem to support our reaction that the Manpower Commission organization is well established and functioning and that the program is clean-cut and effective.

1. The United States Bureau of the Budget has been very close to our development and most helpful in it. It was the reaction of that Bureau, which keeps its finger on the pulse of all agencies, that we were a bit confused and possibly on dead center a year and a half ago. Our negotiations with the Budget Bureau on our annual budget during February and March of 1943, while pleasant, were a bit chaotic. It seemed at that time a hopeless task to ever get any order out of the situation that then existed.

The experience on our supplemental budget in the fall of 1943 was quite different. The Budget Bureau indicated that they saw some order developing from the chaos. They began to see an organization pattern and they began to see a program to which budget justification and work loads could be related.

During the recent month or six weeks our annual request for the fiscal year 1944–45 has been before the Bureau of the Budget. This has been so radically different from our experience of the year ago that it would be unfortunate not to mention it. Ranking officials of the Bureau of the Budget have stated that "here is an outfit that seems to be moving in the right direction, that seems to know what it wants and where it is going." These same officials have stated that this agency has found itself and is no longer a matter of primary concern to them. Again it is important to cite that our relationships with that bureau have been one of the basic reasons for our accomplishments in better internal business management.

2. It is interesting to read and compare the reports of the congressional committees before which we have appeared for appropriations. In the spring of 1943, the Appropriations Committee of the House was severely critical. It was difficult for them to understand our organization, our programing, and our Budget requests. As a result we were only reasonably successful.

The report of the House committee in the fall of 1943, is quite to the contrary. With the exception of a few policy items which only the Congress could determine, we were granted everything for which we asked. We were complimented for the clarity of our presentation and for the rapidity with which we had corrected the difficulties cited by the committee in the spring of that same year.

It is our hope that we shall have a similar experience with the Congress upon our appearance for our next annual budget. We have conducted searching administrative reviews within our own agency. Every item is clearly identified and justified. We are asking only for what we are convinced we need beyond any question of a doubt and are making no predictions as to the future. Any curtailment in our budget by the Congress will be a very serious matter administratively.

It is interesting to note that with an increasing load, with much more work to do, we are asking for less money for the next fiscal year than we were granted on an annual basis for the last fiscal year.

3. There is evidence that the trends outlined in this report are being recognized in local communities. Favorable local press and editorial comments are increasing in number. The country is slowly becoming conscious of the job that has been done. Editorial and press releases in Washington are indicating a greater appreciation of the problems with which we have dealt and the effective way in which we have tackled them. There is also indication of increasing appreciation of the uncertainties and difficulties with which we have had to deal.

IV. CAUSES OF CONFUSION

It is unfortunate that each manpower difficulty cannot be placed in its proper perspective. When we are all engrossed in meeting a particular emergency it is difficult to realize that that emergency involves one fraction of 1 percent of the total picture. That, however, is inevitable. There are certain basic causes for some of these emergencies and for the confusion resulting therefrom which must be kept in mind.

A. If needs for manpower were clean-cut and definite, manpower organization and program could be stabilized and kept on a straight line toward a given goal. The nature of war, however, makes that impossible. The uncertainties of the armed forces as to what they need, when they need it, and where they need it are always reflected in uncertainties in the manpower scene. Our plans, programs, and actions can be definite, long range, and without confusion only to the extent that the needs of war production and of the military for manpower can be the same.

One of the elements from which we have suffered are the inaccuracies in the information supplied by the production and military authorities as to what they have in terms of manpower. These inaccuracies are undoubtedly explainable and excusable in time of war, but it is significant to realize that they are what confuses the manpower picture. There have been recent and striking illustrations of this situation.

B. Another factor that creates difficulty is the human desire of the production authority to want to solve his own manpower problem. When he is faced with an emergency in manpower he is inclined to create an organization or to send out paratroopers or to set up a special program for solving that manpower problem in his own way and to meet his own needs.

Such an attempt, of course, always creates confusion. If all the claimants for manpower were permitted to crash around in the labor market at their own free will the result would be general chaos. There would be uncontrollable competition for labor through various devices and incentives. One of the indirect results of such a practice would be inflation.

Many of the production authorities deal with manpower as a side line and only in connection with emergencies as effecting that particular production. The Manpower Commission has the responsibility of keeping the whole picture in balance. Whenever the production authority has a manpower problem and submits it to the agency whose responsibility it is to solve that problem, it gets solved and with a minimum of chaos and confusion. When, however, that production authority endeavors to solve it in a special way without consideration of the over-all manpower program, confusion, misunderstanding, and friction result. All this does is to delay the accomplishment of the objective because ultimately the Commission has to perform its responsibility and straighten out the situation.

There are times when it appears that this condition is on the decrease, and there are other times when it appears to be on the increase. It will always interfere with effective mobilization and utilization of manpower in this country. The best illustration of the point being made here is this: If a man's house gets on fire the best thing for him to do is to call a trained fire department. If, however, he wishes to organize a fire department of his own and get the equipment and train them in methods of fire fighting, the chances are his house will burn down and he will either have to build another one or go homeless.

C. Another basic difficulty which we have is the fact that the average citizen does not understand the nature of the manpower problem and how we are dealing with it. This is our responsibility, and we are definitely directing our efforts toward the accomplishment of a better understanding by the public at large. We hope, in the very near future, to have this all spelled out in such a simple fashion that the average citizen can very easily and very quickly understand what our problem is, what the program is, what the organization is, and from this he can determine what is expected of him and how he should go about fulfilling his particular responsibility.

IN CONCLUSION

While ending this report on the subject of difficulties it would be unfortunate if we left the impression that they are insurmountable. Our experience has been to the contrary. They are merely the sand that gets into the machinery, but the machinery keeps running.

The people of this country have done a grand job. The purpose of this report is to give you an indication that we really believe this organization has contributed tremendously to the accomplishment of this job. As the deputy chairman and the executive director responsible for the administrative operation of this organization, I report to you that our goal is to see to it that we contribute more and more as the months pass.

LAWRENCE A. APPLEY.

The Late J. William Ditter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep affection that I recall the fond

memory of our colleague, J. William Ditter.

Bill Ditter was a friend, steadfast and true. His literary genius and his oratorical skill will be remembered by all of us. He was a stanch partisan and he served his country and his party well.

Although we differed on many issues, I am proud to think of him as a friend. We had many talks and I recollect that in our quiet moments together he told me of his great devotion for his family.

His untimely death was a shock, but the memory of Bill Ditter will linger long in these hallowed walls.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on May 20, 1944:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, this week I received an invitation from Trustee P. Clay Knickerbocker, of Endicott Village Board, expressing his satisfaction with the recent passage by Congress of the Hall amendment providing for a survey of the Susquehanna River in the Endicott-Johnson City vestal area. I appreciate Mr. Knickerbocker's kind references and also thank him for the invitation he extended me to be present at his flood-control meeting at the Municipal Building in Endicott on Thursday evening, June 1, 1944. By that time I expect to have some interesting reactions from the commanding general of the Army engineers as to what immediate future possibilities are.

The American Legion's G. I. bill was debated in Congress this week. I am pleased to report to you folks back home that I fought for it on the floor of the House and voted for its passage.

But let me read to you my speech in favor of the G. I. bill as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Mr. Chairman, late last year back home before the Endicott Furlough Club I made a few proposals which I later incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 6, 1943. I called my proposals the elementary three r's of veterans' legislation. I outlined in these proposals rehabilitation, reeducation, and readjustment.

"I was most happy, I can assure you, when early this year the American Legion came forth with the G. I. bill and incorporated a great many of these proposals in it. At this time may I compliment the committee members for the efforts they have put forth in drawing up and writing this G. I. bill. In the face of great opposition, in the face of pressure from many groups, the members, from the chairman of that committee on down, are entitled to great credit.

"Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most outstanding pieces of legislation which ever has or ever will come before the Congress. It proposes to rehabilitate the veterans of World War No. 2 and provides for a system of completion of education and a system of employment placements which has never before been conceived by any nation in the world. It is a step in the right direction. Of course, subsequent legislation will have to be proposed to different parts of the bill. Nevertheless this constitutes a blazing of the trail along which we must go a great way in relation to the boys in the service.

"I mentioned the three R's as the fundamental steps in veterans' legislation. A great deal has been done in connection with rehabilitation. Hospitals and medical attention have been provided for those who will return from World War No. 2. If I were to give a title to the present G. I. bill I would call it a bill to adequately equip the veterans of World War No. 2 for post-war pursuits by providing them with education—vocational, specialized, and advanced. These words, in my opinion, aptly describe the G. I. bill and those fundamental precepts that I mentioned late last year. I am so glad to hear that the committee is unanimous or almost unanimous on these points.

"Mr. Chairman, as time goes on I hope we will be able to go even farther on the course we have charted to date. The war has lost several million years to this generation in their educational pursuits. There is no reason why these millions of years cannot be made up. They should be made up and the veterans of World War No. 2 should be provided for in such a way as to make up for this great loss.

"Those brave men and women of our armed services will find America a better place to live in if we pass the G. I. bill now and provide them with the future of rehabilitation, of reeducation, and of reemployment which they deserve for the sacrifices they are making in this awful struggle."

Efforts of C. I. O. To Defeat Hon. John M. Costello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, as a further example of misrepresentation by the C. I. O. political action group, I want to insert in the RECORD a letter from a personal friend, which very cleverely describes the extent to which the C. I. O. went to defeat Mr. COSTELLO and others:

Last night I was lounging in the easy chair in my den, and thought of how I'd put on my campaign coat and ten-gallon hat and go out and whoop it up for your reelection. Says I to myself, here's our good friend and fellow accountant, NORRIS POULSON, staying in Washington and slaving for us at a time when he ought to be out here mending his fences so that he can go back to Washington and slave for us another 2 years for a measly ten grand a year.

Well, would you believe it, Norris no sooner had I gotten the words out of my mouth, so to speak, when I twiddled the radio dial and heard a deep-throated gazookus announce the beginning of a program to advocate the election to Congress of candidates who would support the war effort and vote for the interests of the people. He means our good friend, NORRIS POULSON, I thought, for your circular says you did all of those things and more, so I decided to listen.

The master—or rather mistress—of ceremonies was Olivia de Haviland, and the program began with that deep-throated bird singing a ditty about our grand Commander in Chief and how we ought to back him up. Somewhere in every line or two were the words "Commander in Chief" or "Franklin D." all made up in rhyme. It was real purty at that, but the tune was a little off key.

By that time, Norris, I began to smell a rat, but decided to stay with it anyway, for I figured after reading your circular that they could say only good about you. Olivia started right down the list, beginning with JOHN COSTELLO. I always thought this fellow COSTELLO was a right guy, even if he is a Democrat, but if his ears weren't burning last night it wasn't Olivia's fault. According to her, COSTELLO hasn't voted right on anything since he's been in Congress, and she called on Rita Hayworth and Gloria Stuart to back her up.

But speaking of ears burning, Norris, yours should have been the color of a nice ripe beet, too. It seems that you voted 17 out of 20 times against the people, voted against war measures, lend-lease, etc., and in general failed to support our dear Commander in Chief. Rita and Gloria both agreed heartily with Olivia that you should be retired to private life.

About this time the basso profundo again sang the Commander in Chief ditty. Incidentally, Norris, one of the best statements I have seen on the functions of the Commander in Chief, as envisioned in the Constitution, is in the article on the Montgomery Ward case by that eminent New Deal apologist, Walter Lippmann, appearing in the Pasadena Post today.

Olivia, Rita, Gloria, and the others continued down the list and proceeded to slam my friend and Congressman, CARL HINSHAW. It seems that CARL, COSTELLO, and you are reactionaries, isolationists, obstructionists, and worse, and if the country is to be saved we had better vote for your opponents. The tip-off came when the gals and guy went overboard for Ellis Patterson and SHERIDAN DOWNEY, citing the latter's outstanding record in the Senate as the reason for advocating his reelection. The program came to an end with another snappy rendition of—you know what—and the announcer said it was under the auspices of the C. I. O. committee or some such organization.

All I can say in closing, Norris, is that you are a great disappointment to me, instead of representing us in Congress, as you are paid to do, all the time you were stabbing us in the back. You and your partners in crime, COSTELLO and HINSHAW, will have a tough time talking yourself out of this, for if Olivia, Rita, Gloria, and the what's-his-name say you are heels, it must be so.

I guess I must be a reactionary, too, Norris, for I am still for you and working for your renomination in the primary on May 16.

Sincerely yours,

S. S. WEBSTER, Jr.

Marriages Stay Put at Harper, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress from Iowa and other Midwestern States are often spoken of as "being close to the soil," and I think this may partially account for our good living, and particularly in good living together. In general, our State is made up of small communities and it is here that we find the most harmony and happiness. There is no finer example anywhere than in the little town of Harper,

Iowa—Keokuk County—population 210, where on the invitation of Rev. J. J. Schoenfelder, pastor of St. Elizabeth's Catholic Church, nine couples who have been married for more than 50 years recently met together and were introduced to members of the press. An illustrated news story in the Sigourney (Iowa) Review, May 17, 1944, tells about these fine folks, and I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short paragraph about each couple. It has been pointed out by our Iowa State Department of Health that there is a definite connection between the longevity and happy marriages of the Harper folks, and that happiness contributes to mental well-being and lack of mental strain adds years to life:

Mother's Day in Harper was a great day that will live in the memory of nine prominent couples who have been married more than 50 years and who have lived there practically all their lives.

The Reverend J. J. Schoenfelder entertained these couples at a special breakfast at the parish after they had attended early mass at the St. Elizabeth Catholic Church Sunday morning.

The Reverend Mr. Schoenfelder states: "He is proud of these couples; they all belong to his church, which has a membership of 500, and out of this number 200 are relatives of these couples."

In an interview with Mrs. Honnas Smith one day last week, she related, "That they all were surprised, as they did not know what the Reverend Mr. Schoenfelder wanted with them last Sunday when he asked them all to remain after the service, and invited them to the parish, as he was prepared to take pictures of us. He had a photographer from the Des Moines Register there to take our pictures."

Henry Streigel, 88, and his wife, 82, who was Mary Besser before her marriage, was the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Nick Besser. They have been married 64 years, have 8 children and 41 grandchildren, 9 great grandchildren, all living. Two of their children are dead and 9 grandchildren are in the service.

Honnas Smith, 88, and his wife, 82, was Mary Feckley before her marriage, the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Feckley. They have been married 63 years, have 5 children, 33 grandchildren, and 37 great grandchildren, all living. Seven grandchildren are in the service.

John Peiffer, 82, and his wife, 77, was Anna Berg before her marriage. She was the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Nick Berg. They have been married 57 years, have 11 children, 40 grandchildren, all living. Two children, one a daughter, Lt. Edythe Peiffer, an Army nurse, stationed at New Orleans, La., and four grandchildren in the service.

Mike Peiffer, 78, and his wife, 71, who was Barbara Berg before her marriage, was also the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Nick Berg. They have been married 51 years. They have 8 children and 28 grandchildren living; 4 of their children are dead. They have 2 grandchildren in the service.

Matt Weber, 81, and his wife, 78, was Lena Peiffer before her marriage and was the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Peiffer. They have 6 children, 20 grandchildren, 2 of whom are in the service.

Mike Adam, 81, and his wife, 78, who was Mary Heiberger, the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Jake Heiberger. They have 6 children, 23 grandchildren, 16 great grandchildren, all living. They have a son and 4 grandchildren in the service.

August Klein, 75, and his wife, 72, who was Minnie Goeldner before her marriage, the daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. August Goeldner. They have been married 52 years, have six children and nine grandchildren, all living. One grandchild is in the service.

Joe Clarahan, 72, and his wife, 70, who was Yetta Besser, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Peter Besser. They have 6 children, 32 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren, all living. Three children are dead and they have one grandchild in the service.

Mike Sondag, 73, and his wife, 74, who was Mary Peiffer, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Mike Peiffer, were married 50 years, they have 3 children, 16 grandchildren, and 7 great-grandchildren, all living. One child is dead and one grandchild in the service.

There were two additional guests, Mrs. Joseph Haupert, 84, whose husband died in 1936. They had been married 56 years. Mrs. Haupert was reared in the home of the late Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Helberger. She was the mother of six children, one child is dead. Four grandchildren and one great-grand child living.

Mrs. Peter Adams, 73, whose husband died 1942, was Anna Yeager, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Ambrose Yaeger. She has 7 children, 40 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren. Five grandchildren are in the service.

These folks, who all had the honor of celebrating their golden weddings, are pioneers of Keokuk County and the community in which they live.

All the couples but one lived on farms near Harper. They attribute their long years together to their mode of living. These couples had many hardships, but both husbands and wives worked together. When the women had their housework done they would take their children and go to the fields to work.

They didn't stop when the clock struck 6 in the evening. They would toil on until nearly dusk and then come in to do their chores. Many a supper meal was served by lamplight.

In after years, when their work was done and they had accumulated their fortune, they moved to Harper to settle down and take life easy.

They purchased property with an acreage and kept a cow, several hogs, and chickens, and put in large gardens, and in this way made a good living while in town.

John Peiffer and his wife were the only couple that did not live on the farm. They settled in Harper, where Mr. Peiffer operated a hardware store and was the community undertaker. He was active in business until the last 2 years, when he decided to quit business and take it easy.

The Review wishes to join the many friends of the couples in congratulations for the many years they spent together.

Leave It to Dr. Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Chief of the Wildlife Service, is a resident of my district and for many years was engaged in the program of the conservation of wildlife resources in our State prior to the time he took over his present position. On May 16, 1944, there appeared an editorial in the Portland Oregonian with reference to Dr. Gabrielson's service, paying a well deserved tribute to his excellent work in the conservation of our wildlife resources, which I include as a part of my remarks. The editorial is as follows:

LEAVE IT TO DR. GABRIELSON

On his return from the North American Wildlife Conference in Chicago, State Game Supervisor Frank B. Wire reported that, owing to many complaints of the damage of crops by wild ducks and geese, it is probable the present shooting restrictions will be somewhat liberalized. Supervisor Wire admitted, however, that Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Chief of the Wildlife service, made no promises in the matter. Here in Oregon we know how strongly the plump Dr. Gabrielson would feel about increased shooting without most urgent indication, for it was here, before he became head of the Service, that Dr. Gabrielson dreamed of a day when intelligent conservation measures should restore our waterfowl resources to their pristine abundance. This ambition, which was shared by all genuine sportsmen, now has been in large part redeemed.

Yet for all his zeal as a conservationist—a practical zeal that has proved most fortunate for America—Dr. Gabrielson regards himself as a custodian of our natural wealth of migratory waterfowl, and this he considers a crop that should be reasonably and annually harvested. He is the hunter's friend rather than the spoilsport. When an issue is made of the proportion of the harvest that may safely be taken, it must be remembered that Dr. Gabrielson is the foremost authority on our wildlife resources, and that his decision in the matter can only be the best and most impartial decision it were possible to obtain. If the chief of the wildlife survey concludes that our waterfowl regulations may safely be liberalized, his advice should be followed; if his finding is to the contrary, again it should be observed.

This is neither the place nor the time, if ever, when political pressure should be brought to bear upon competent authority. Like many another bystander we are inclined to believe that the waterfowl regulations could be liberalized without hazard, though with possibly some few exception, but we are waiting for Dr. Gabrielson to give us his views. To make the decision is part of his job. That's what we hired him for.

Lend-Lease in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two of a series of articles by Stanley Johnston relating to the furnishing of money to South American countries, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 21, 1944]

FINDS UNITED STATES CASH BUYS US FOES IN SOUTH AMERICA—DOLLARS DISRUPT ITS BALANCE OF POWER

(By Stanley Johnston)

The New Deal policy of pouring money into Latin America in an attempt to buy good will actually has contributed to the forma-

tion of an anti-United States bloc of countries in lower South America.

The anomalous situation is the result of United States dollars disrupting the normal balance of power among these neighboring countries and, consequently, sending each of them scurrying for new ties of security.

This reporter's observations of the friction caused by our good neighbor policy confirmed the conclusions of Senator BUTLER (Republican, Nebraska). After an inquiring journey through Central and South America last summer, BUTLER reported to Congress that our "hemispheric hand-out is neither good nor neighborly."

CASH STARTS ARMAMENT RACE

In an audited report submitted to Congress, BUTLER said $5,733,953,534 had been spent by the United States in Latin America for lend-lease, gifts, outright loans, purchase of supplies, and development projects. He said the amount already spent or committed for lend-lease amounted to $800,000,000.

The golden stream flowing southward from rich Uncle Sam has altered the financial strength of these countries, built air fields for them, distributed weapons and brought them military training from United States Army officers. The result has been an armament race and a recasting of protection bonds to the detriment of their lavish northern neighbor.

Despite occasional accusations, there appears to be no direct evidence of Axis influence motivating the anti-American coalition in Latin America. The fact that neither Germany nor Japan is in a position to give aid to any state in the Western Hemisphere is as apparent to the South Americans as to us, their comprehension of international affairs being in no way inferior to ours. Their attitudes toward their neighbors stem from nationalistic aspirations fertilized by New Deal money.

ARGENTINA LEADS "ENEMY" BLOC

Comprising the bloc in which dislike of the United States is growing are Argentina, its nucleus and principal member; Chile, Paraguay, and Bolivia. Pressure to join is being exerted heavily upon Uruguay and the southern part of Brazil. The turn of affairs has brought great discomfort to our friends, such as Peru, Uruguay, and Brazil, for they are forced to make difficult decisions to protect themselves from the clique without openly disrupting old relationships with members of the anti-American bloc.

Although no lend-lease aid has gone to Argentina from the United States, she benefits indirectly from that source by the lend-lease, spending, and gifts in nearby countries who in turn are enabled to increase their purchases from her. This is in addition to more than $100,000,000 annually spent by the United States in buying Argentine exports, and purchases made by Britain as agent in behalf of the United States in a program of allied purchasing of meats, dairy products, poultry, and eggs.

A "CHICAGO" OF SOUTH AMERICA

Argentina, whose capital, Buenos Aires, is the Chicago of South America, is the natural leader in her sphere by virtue of an excellent economic position, progresive development, and the highest standard of living on the continent—all objects of admiration by her neighbors.

Holding such a position, Argentina is in reality a potent rival of the United States in acquiring influence in South America. She was the last Latin-American nation to accede to our wishes to join the Pan-American front against the Axis and the moment her current dictator made such a move he was overthrown by a palace coup. Consequently, the present junta government has not been recognized by the United States and this reproof adds to the tension between the two countries. Furthermore, Argentina's trade being mostly with Europe—principally with Great Britain, who also has vast investments in the country—her greatest interests are in that quarter rather than helping our plans to fruition.

Instead of remedying this situation, our scattering of money aggravated it. Argentina has a natural rivalry with Brazil, the only country on the continent which is larger than Argentina. However, their strength was approximately on a par until the United States stepped into the picture and altered it. Brazil's military strength was sharply improved by our spending, industrialization and transfer of weapons to her. Argentina's answer has been formation of the anti-United States coalition.

ANOTHER RIVALRY BLOSSOMS

The expedient met with ready acceptance by some of Argentina's neighbors, including Chile. As in the case of Argentina and Brazil, Chile had considered her strength equal to that of Peru in the pre-war period, but by United States largess Peru was supplied with weapons, new airfields, improvements to existing fields, and expert training for her defense forces.

Chile had not joined the majority of the Latin-American countries in breaking with the Axis Powers following the Montevideo conference in 1942. She believed she could negotiate a more profitable arrangement by dealing directly with us later. During the year prior to Chile's decision to join the anti-Axis combine, Peru worked closely with the United States and profited accordingly.

When Chile belatedly appealed to Washington, D. C., for arms and her plea was not heeded, her generals awoke to the fact that she had been outdistanced by Peru. Frantically they turned to other sources for weapons and found a ready helper in Argentina.

CHILE SWINGS TO ARGENTINA

Argentina has industrial equipment but lacks steel. Chile had obtained an important concession from the United States—a loan to finance erection of a steel plant expected to produce 100,000 tons annually. However, she lacks machines for turning the steel into the weapons she wants to bring her up to the military level of Peru.

And so it was arranged that Argentina would take 75,000 tons of Chile's steel annually and in return supply Chile with weapons. The mutually satisfactory arrangement gave Chile a good reason for following Argentina rather than the United States.

Paraguay, an impoverished but warlike nation, also turned to Argentina's lead at the first call despite United States financial efforts to help her 1,000,000 population obtain a decent living standard. A similar tack to influence her was taken by Brazil, who last year canceled an old Paraguayan war debt and tried with a gift of $5,000,000 to induce Paraguay to eschew Brazil's rival, Argentina. But, just as American spending failed, so did Brazil's effort to buy good will, and Paraguay entered Argentina's sphere of influence.

CURB CLAMPED ON BOLIVIA

It is not surprising that Bolivia tossed her lot in with Argentina in view of Washington's attempt to discipline Bolivia's violent politics by refusing to recognize the new Government—the Villarroel junta—despite its pro-Americanism.

Thus cut off from the Allies, Bolivia turned to other fields to find supplies of vital food and materials. She found Argentina ready to provide at least some supplies and the weight of her friendship to counterbalance the pro-Allied linking of Peru and Brazil.

Uruguay, almost the only democratic country in South America and a steadfast friend of the Allies from the beginning of the war, is being heavily pressured to join the Argentina bloc.

Efforts to force this little country of 2,150,000 population away from the Allies' camp were apparent during the writer's recent visit to Montevideo. At that time Argentine military officers were there, stirring up feeling between peaceful Uruguay and her northern neighbor, Brazil.

THREATS AGAINST URUGUAY

The officers were offering guaranties that, in the event of international strife among South American countries, a push against pro-Allied central and northern Brazil would be joined by southern Brazil. The southern section is populated largely by Germans and contains most of that country's expanding manufacturing industry.

Meantime, Argentina was threatening an "economic sanction" against Uruguay with a campaign to dissuade Argentines from vacationing at Uruguayan beaches, which provide much of that little country's foreign income. The move was patterned after Hitler's coercion of Austria by preventing German tourists from visiting there. But Uruguay has continued to hold out.

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 22, 1944]

HOW NEW DEAL SWINGS LATINS' TRADE FROM UNITED STATES—SOUTH AMERICAN CREDIT POOL BUILT UP IN LONDON

(By Stanley Johnston)

While the New Deal with one hand lavishes millions of dollars on its good neighbor policy in South America, it is disbursing with the other hand huge sums which are being used to help amass in London a vast store of credit that will give Great Britain an advantage in competing with us for post-war South American trade.

More than $220,000,000 of such credit already has been built up by two Latin-American nations—Argentina and Uruguay—and is continually growing. These credits have been frozen for the duration of the war and at its end can be spent by Argentina and Uruguay only in trade with Great Britain. The result is bound to be an impediment to United States trade in those markets for years to come.

ALLIES SOLE BUYER

Our part in closing a trade door upon ourselves results from Britain being permitted to act as our agent in making purchases for us in its role as the Allied Nations' sole buyer of various supplies from South America.

During a first-hand study of the effects of our policies in Latin America I was told of the singular situation by a United States financial authority in one of those countries. The procedure that brought it about is similar to the system of barter used by Hitler, which, incidentally, both Britain and the United States denounced as a threat to world trade and peace.

Argentina, a leader of its continent and long a hold-out in severing relations with the Axis, is a prosperous, ambitious, and productive country. Argentina's principal trade is with Britain and it always exports more to Britain than it imports from there. Consequently, a balance in favor of Argentina formerly accrued annually, which normally was used in meeting payments on Argentine bonds and other investments held by Britain.

BALANCE INCREASED

Since the war, however, Britain's expanded purchases from Argentina—part of which are made in behalf of the United States—and Britain's lowered exports to Argentina, have led to a greatly enlarged favorable balance for the South American country in London.

Instead of settling the account currently, the two countries entered into a war-time agreement to freeze Argentina's surplus credit in London for the duration. Argentina's total credit now amounts to £50,000,000 sterling or more than two hundred million. It is still growing. Based on Argentina's

population of 14,000,000, the frozen credit amounts to more than $14 for every man, woman, and child in that country.

The same thing also is true in Uruguay. That small country, one of the few real democracies in the dictator-dominated continent, already has amassed a credit balance of twenty million in Britain. Spread over Uruguay's population of 2,000,000 this means that every person in that country has frozen in England $10 of credit which can only be spent in trade with the British after the war.

BUDGET $12.50 PER PERSON

What these sums represent to South Americans is indicated by the comparison given by Senator HUGH BUTLER (Republican, Nebraska) who reported to Congress, after a trip through Latin America last summer, on this country's vast scale of spending on the good-neighbor policy. He observed that the total of all budgets of 20 Latin-American countries was $8.45 per capita in 1941 and $12.50 in 1942, as contrasted with the United States' budget of $461 and $769 per capita for those years.

Britain's designation as sole purchaser of South American meat, poultry, and dairy products for the Allied Nations was made last year by the combined Allied Food Board. It was announced that most of the beef which the British Ministry of Food would buy in Argentina and Uruguay would be resold to the United States Army.

Subsequently, it was learned the Roosevelt administration had taken funds from the United States Treasury to pay for more than 2,000,000 pounds of turkeys bought by the British Government in Argentina. The Commodity Credit Corporation made the purchase from the British and turned the turkeys over to the War Shipping Administration, which put them in the Allied food pool where they were made available for stocking the merchant ships of any of our allies at no cost to that nation.

At the time of Britain's designation as the Allies' sole buyer in South America, foreign trade authorities expressed surprise that the United States would agree to the delegation of this authority to the British. They observed that the millions spent in pursuit of the good-neighbor policy appeared to have been counteracted by the administration's permitting an arrangement under which Britain can build up competitive advantage in South American trade.

It was considered significant that Argentine newspapers, on learning that Britain would buy the country's exportable meat surplus for the next 2 years, did not mention that much of the funds for purchase of the meat would be supplied by the United States.

"Again the British have come to our rescue and purchased our meats," one newspaper said.

What part of the vast frozen credit in London actually results from purchases made for the United States was not ascertained but the indications were that our contribution is considerable.

ADVANTAGE TO BRITAIN

My informant, a United States representative in South America, added his observation that the constriction of this huge credit until the war ends, coupled with Argentina's normal excess balance of trade with England of more than fifty million annually assures Britain a powerful advantage in keeping our country from full participation in the Argentine market for years, especially in the immediate post-war period when all countries will be scrambling for trade.

"We're helping Britain to build up a big stick to wreck our trade with Argentina after the war," he commented. "Regardless of what we have to sell them, Argentina will buy from Britain to utilize the frozen credit. And besides, we are giving away the psychological credit actually due us for the money we're spending in this trade."

A Platform for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, former Governor Alf Landon, of Kansas delivered an able address entitled "A Platform for America," before the one hundredth and forty-seventh Rotary International district conference, in Chicago, Ill., on May 16, 1944. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the objects of Rotary is international goodwill. I know of no civic organization that has made a greater contribution to that objective dear to the hearts of the common people everywhere.

In considering a platform for America, the No. 1 requirement is a good manager for our Nation's affairs; one who will not interfere with our military and naval experts in winning the war.

This conflict has demonstrated once again the old truth that there is nothing of greater concern and importance to all people, than the kind of government under which we live as well as the kind of administration we get from that Government.

The everlasting confusion over manpower and draft—to mention only two items out of a long list—brings the realization to every home in America of the great need for an efficient administrator in the White House. The true test of a good executive is his ability to formulate wise and sound policies for the general welfare, his ability to pick capable associates, and his willingness to delegate authority. That executive capacity is all the more vital at a time when squeezing the last possible dollar from the taxpayer will cover only a fraction of our astronomical Government expenditures and when Federal wastage is visible to every eye.

When we think of the almost daily headlines, "Confusion in draft," "Confusion in foreign policies," "Confusion in taxes," "Truman committee reports confusion in war," etc., then we think back a few years to similar headlines, "Confusion in relief," "Confusion in recovery policies," etc., we are forced to the conclusion that something is basically wrong in the executive branch of our Government. I am not discussing the intrinsic merit of the New Deal policies of the past 11 years. I am simply pointing out that you can scarcely remember one that has not needed clarification and the clarification has needed clarification and so on ad infinitum.

The same thing is true in our foreign policy. I believe the American people are not adverse to taking a full responsible part in world affairs, but if we are going to avoid the fumbling of the past, we must make a new start in mobilizing public opinion on a more sound base than it is now.

Every unbiased observant citizen knows that a lack of information and clear direction—the failure of Franklin Roosevelt to enlighten his countrymen concerning his plans—the failure to clarify the differences between his general pronouncements and his actual performance—the failure to crystallize, in terms more comprehensive than unconditional surrender of our enemies, our aims in this war, have all confused and disappointed our citizens.

Then also, there must be in America no East nor West in assuming that intelligence and patriotism in foreign affairs is a matter of geography. That adds to the confusion not only at home but abroad. There must be an end to the hallelujah yammering that gives the impression that Europe and the rest of the world is to come first—and America last.

There must be an end to the policy which deliberately conceals from the American people the political conditions existing in the world.

We must face the fact that both Churchill and Stalin are pursuing an independent course to protect their national interest. I do not know whether from the start the British and Russian Governments have been unwilling to make the concessions necessary for permanent collective security, or whether there has been a real change in direction as a result of the President's failure to formulate a practical, clear, and stable foreign policy. The fact that the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Interior take turns in making and altering our foreign policy, must have affected the attitude of our allies toward post-war settlements. They cannot rely on our leadership in that respect, any more than we can.

No matter who is to blame, we must immediately make a fresh start in the attempt to forge lasting bonds of amity with all peoples. The lack of a better-informed public opinion here of political conditions in the world increases the danger of misunderstandings. The American people have no desire to return to the old order of things, in either the domestic or foreign field. But enduring peace depends on the stability of its foundation, and that requires a broader base than the closely guarded secret conferences of three men.

The fundamental need for building step by step the vital cooperative attitude among the United Nations—for building the vital public opinion to back up that cooperation—is a task which a United Nation's world council can best solve.

The first step to tackle is the relief of economic friction. If we cannot work out sound economic collaborations, what hope is there of working out enduring political collaborations?

No territorial redistribution of the world can equalize opportunities for all nations. But we can make the differences less irritating and burdensome by facilitating international trade. That not only means lower tariffs but also it means that as soon as possible all governments abandon artificial control of currencies and exchange, quota restrictions, and imperial preference. The Johnson Act, restricting the financing of foreign loans in the country, should be repealed in name as it has been repealed in fact by lease-lend.

Each nation must be encouraged to reorganize gradually and painfully on a sound financial basis rather than lean upon a world monetary organization for support. It is time the statesmen of the world, including America, take seriously once more the prudent care of national finance.

I reject the New Deal theory that an unbalanced budget and a spendthrift psychology is a national asset. It threatens all the social gains of generations. I view a permanently unbalanced budget as a national menace, and we should strive by economy and efficiency its earliest possible balancing.

Just as territorial redivision after every war is a menace to enduring peace, so are Government-sponsored cartels, monopolies, tariff, and trade barriers and "blocked" exchange. We cannot have a high level of employment unless there is by and large, world economic stability. Furthermore, I believe dictatorships in the world will fade with the rise of true prosperity.

We can make our currency the soundest in the world. We have the largest and most modern merchant marine. We have the most efficient mass-production system. I believe it is to the interest of America to unite with other nations in a spirit of mutual concessions and mutual responsibility in removing economic frictions.

Our position as the world's leading creditor Nation—the world's leading manufacturing Nation—the world's leading merchant marine Nation, makes it imperative that we change our tariff policies.

I believe that our reconstruction and world reconstruction requires a more liberal tariff policy on our part. Our present tariff and world credit financing policy means a closed system and progressive delay. No system of extravagant spending on public works will bring the prosperity that the waiting markets of the world will bring.

I believe that this is the only way we can enjoy solid prosperity, and I believe it is a necessary contribution to social and economic relations between people upon which peace is ultimately based.

I believe the peace and happiness of our country is linked with the happiness and prosperity of all countries.

Of course it is folly to ignore the political and spiritual forces indigenous to every country. I fear an attempt to reform the world on the basis of the good old American tradition, "There ought to be a law," and then thinking everything is "Jake." There is too much talk about coercive principles without considering the removal of evils which precipitated the war. The aggressor nations, in past history, have not always been the same ones.

Here in America good citizens are devoting themselves to the cause and removal of racial tensions. They are not content simply to rely on a police force to suppress them. Haven't we the same situation in the world?

Peace can best be maintained over the years if we frankly recognize now that it's base rests on justice, humanity, and Christian fellowship for all races—yellow, black, brown, as well as white. I am more concerned at this moment with keeping the base on the proper level than in the forms and blueprints.

I believe in a committee of nations on which smaller countries are represented to guide mandated territories of hitherto subjugated peoples until they are capable of achieving political autonomy.

The courage and fighting ability of our incomparable soldiers and sailors stirs the depth of our emotions. But in recognition of their sacrifices, our Government must decide whether this war is a conflict of principles or whether it is just a grab for world dominion.

We should have had long ago the long-promised report from the President on his conferences, conversations, and agreements with Stalin and Churchill. There is a marked difference between Woodrow Wilson's public diplomatic exchanges and the personal secrecy of Mr. Roosevelt. Wilson led in public debates formulating American public opinion, but we do not know under Mr. Roosevelt whether, as a result of his conferences, we are headed in the direction of a superinternational state, a league of nations, a federation of nations, a world court, or a balance-of-power alliance between Russia, Britain, and America, with the world divided into three spheres of influence, or a direction not yet made known.

We do not ask for perfection because we know that shaping the post-war policies depends on others as well as ourselves.

We do ask to know what is the best the President has been able to obtain in a definite line of policies in order that this war may build up peace and happiness for America.

Domestic issues and international issues are not separate and distinct from one another. They are in fact similar, and are determined one by the other. We must seek economic peace and harmony abroad and at home. We scarcely can expect to have much influence on such conditions in the world's sphere, if we cannot set our own house in order.

The Nation's Chief Executive must have respect for his own branch of Government as well as an equal respect for the legislative branch, with the realization that the two must work together to accomplish the best results. The history of Mr. Roosevelt's relations with business, labor, agriculture, and Congress is one of intermittent wrangling and uneasy truce, but with no permanent peace.

Plainly, we cannot continue that way with the President's chip-on-the-shoulder attitude. Far reaching issues can only be solved by an Executive and Congress who bring to the task mutual good will and a common determination to treat the American economy as an indivisible unit. Unity of labor has been deliberately upset by White House politics. The whole country has suffered from such maneuverings.

We are all interdependent and no group can suffer a disadvantage without the others suffering also. All should have a voice in post-war planning. We fought a civil war to establish political unity in this Nation. How much more grief will we have to undergo before we understand how indispensable is its economic harmony.

Any program for America's progress, calls for a scientific revision of our antiquated tax structure. It has been patched so many times that no one knows for sure how to interpret it. A whole new tax law should be written from the ground up. That, of course, is a monumental task. It should be aimed at adequate revenues—ability to pay—increased encouragement for venture capital and the fair distribution of excessive wealth and concentrated economic power, so as to maintain the balanced economy without which all talk of the free enterprise system is meaningless. We must keep open the doors of opportunity for every individual. That is particularly vital with 10,000,000 soldiers returning to take up their rightful places in the Nation's business life. The benefits of technological progress as well as production efficiency, must promptly be passed to the consumer and wage earner.

Good government calls for a prompt and thorough revision of our antiquated pension acts. The present laws very seriously need codification so that the veterans and the administration as well can be sure what the law is and can give the veterans and the Government both a fair deal. Like the tax laws, there are so many rules, regulations, and interpretations of them in our pension acts that no one can be sure that justice will be done the Nation's service men and women.

I favor repeal by the Congress as soon as the war is over of all acts delegating emergency powers to the President.

I favor the election of a President this fall who will use these great emergency powers with discernment and according to the plain intent of the Congress.

Republicans and anti-New Deal Democrats march under the banner of a Government conceived by and for Americans. We desperately need a President who will not attempt to eliminate the Congress from its historical and traditional place of responsibility as the New Deal has done.

To mention one vital matter out of many that illustrate the great, important, and vital place the Congress plays in our lives: The average citizen would have been helpless against Washington bureaucratic inertia, arrogance, and stupidity if he had not had repeated action by vigorous and intelligent and experienced Members of the Congress.

We cannot hope to remove racial and religious conflict abroad and at the same time ignore its aspects at home. World recovery depends on helping other peoples to help themselves by increasing their productivity and thereby raising their standards of living. Our own recovery depends upon exactly the same thing, and our ability to obtain the general cooperation of all groups and interests in that objective will be a pretty fair index of what we shall be able to achieve in the world community.

Again I remind you that we must keep in mind that our international and our domestic policies cannot be separated. Only the unthinking will vote for a candidate simply on the claim that he has a strong foreign record. A man can't be a statesman abroad and a failure at home and be of much use in the period ahead, either to America or to the world.

Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday the House of Representatives passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which is commonly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights. I appreciated the opportunity, as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to have had a part in the drafting of this liberal and constructive legislation. The G. I. bill not only had the approval of the various service organizations but the hearty endorsement of a grateful American people. It represents a sound investment in the future of our Nation.

This morning I am in receipt of a letter from Gov. John Stelle, chairman of the Committee on Rehabilitation Legislation for World War 2 Veterans, and the Honorable Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of the National Legislative Committee of the American Legion. This letter, which I treasure most highly, and my reply, are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Legion is most grateful to you for the earnest, intelligent consideration and effort you have given to S. 1767 which provides Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

It was gratifying to observe that the House of Representatives appreciated the work of your committee. This was reflected in the members following the leadership of Chairman RANKIN and the committee members when the measure was up in the House for consideration.

Naturally, we of the American Legion are very proud of our part in this program. We feel when the measure becomes a law that the proper plans may be made for the day when the war will have been won and there will be mass demobilization of the present day members of the armed forces.

We believe the privileges which will be afforded by the terms of S. 1767 to World War

No. 2 veterans is a sound investment in the future of our Nation. The proposal represents an intelligent approach to the problem of readjustment in civilian life of World War No. 2 veterans.

Again, we express our appreciation for your splendid work in connection with S. 1767.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STELLE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Rehabilitation Legislation World War No. 2 Veterans.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1944.

Hon. JOHN STEELE,
Chairman, Committee on Rehabilitation Legislation World War No. 2 Veterans.

Hon. FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director,
National Legislative Committee,
The American Legion,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: It is with deep and profound appreciation that I acknowledge receipt of and thank you for your very kind letter of May 19, relative to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which is commonly referred to as the "G. I. Bill of Rights." For me it was indeed a rare privilege and great honor to have had a part, as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in the molding and enactment of such rightful and worthy legislation.

I cherish deeply the direct opportunity which my assignment to this committee offers to be of real service to the servicemen and veterans of all wars. I shall be ever alert and at your service in their behalf.

Again thanking you and with personal regards, I am,

Cordially and sincerely,

THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
Member of Congress.

Report of John S. Knight, Publisher, Detroit Free Press, on Conditions in England

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include this most interesting and informative report. John Knight, the publisher of the Detroit Free Press, has spent nearly a year in England, and I am sure that his statement which appeared in the Free Press on Sunday, May 21, 1944, will be enjoyed by every Member of Congress:

Since returning from London, where I have spent most of the past year as London director of the Office of Censorship, all sorts of questions have been thrown at me from every conceivable direction.

How do our boys get along in England? What do the British think of us? How's the food? Has the invasion really started?

There are many others but most of them are the natural, human inquiries that spring from man's emotions and a curiosity that is increased ten fold by the 3,000 miles that separate us from the tiny islands where several million beautifully trained and well equipped Americans are rubbing elbows with their indomitable allies, and getting acquainted with noisy air raids, village pubs, Brussels sprouts, tiny taxis, pink gin, and the English counterpart of our teen-age American "slick chicks."

Because so many of the queries that are most frequently posed to a recently returned American fall into a few well-defined categories, perhaps I can pin point the answers as I found them into a few brief pararaphs. Here they are:

1. What about the appearance, spirit, and general attitude of the English people now in their fifth year of war?

Answer: They look extremely well, their spirit is excellent, and since the famous blitz of 1940–41 they have never doubted the ability of the Allies to win.

Quite naturally, everyone in England is fed up with the war, but it has been going on so long that adjustments have been made and the routine of living under the necessary restrictions is now generally accepted without complaint.

Unlike us, the British have learned to be patient and they have no illusions about winning the war within the next few months.

The food is adequate but ordinary. There is some meat available but poultry and fish predominate the menus. Sprouts, marrow, spinach, and potatoes fill in the rest. How those Englishmen can fill up, as they do, on quantities of starches without developing gargartuan girths is more than I could ever understand.

As Ernie Pyle has already told you, Scotch whisky is daily becoming scarcer and there is literally no rye or bourbon in London. The liquor is all low proof—which is probably just as well. Everyone drinks beer or lager with meals unless they can afford wine. You rarely see any water—except in the bathtub, and that is limited to 5 inches.

The theaters and movies are packed to capacity. The London stage abounds with good plays, spritely musicals, and excellent concerts. The cinema, or "flicks," depending in what circles you move, get the latest Hollywood "superdoopers," and weave them in with the more subtle, restrained British productions. Needless to say, Betty Grable, Bob Hope, and Betty Hutton draw the crowds. British documentary films are unexcelled anywhere.

Everyone works in England, regardless of station. Under a universal service act, all women from 18 to 45 are called up. The more fortunate drive cars, help in Red Cross canteens, or serve in the various Government ministries. The rest work in factories or toil in the fields as part of the Women's Land Army.

It is quite common to see Lady X, attired in coveralls, handling rivets in a Spitfire plant. In at least one instance with which I am acquainted, a titled lady is a union-shop steward as well.

All men come under the same call-up system until they are 51. Owing to a shortage of mine workers, every boy upon reaching the age of 18 may either be assigned to the forces or put to work in the mine pits. The latter group are called the Bevin boys, because Ernest Bevin, the Minister for Labor, devised the plan. Needless to say, it is not too popular, but is typical of British realism.

2. How badly has London been bombed?

Answer: Well, London is a battlefield and has been the scene of one of the decisive battles of this war—a battle in which the Germans were licked. It still looks like a battlefield, and a view from the air would show a city pockmarked with gaping holes and destruction. There is virtually no repair work being done. After a raid, the rubble is cleared away and buildings not damaged too badly are propped up and made safe.

Cellars are used as emergency water tanks, to be used to combat the incendiary bombs dropped in a fire blitz. The most recent raids of last winter and early spring were quite severe and came as a bit of a surprise to most Londoners who felt the Luftwaffe could never again reach the outskirts of the city.

For a time, they had grown quite casual about the sirens which precede a raid but this attitude no longer prevails. Crowds again seek the cover of the shelters and the underground at night. The Luftwaffe does not fly in formation, as do our daylight bombers, but darts in from all directions. The night bombing Jerries are commonly termed in the British press as "scalded cat" raiders because they dive from an altitude of 20,000 to 25,000 feet, release their bomb loads and then scoot for their airdromes in France.

The raids are terrifically noisy due to the rocket guns and antiaircraft barrage that is put up by the batteries defending London. It is not uncommon to see half a dozen huge fires burning in various parts of the city following a big raid and the screaming sirens of ambulances and fire trucks give one an eerie feeling of danger and insecurity.

The greatest danger to pedestrians during a raid comes from the "flak" thrown in the air by the British antiaircraft defenses. Literally hundreds of people have been killed or injured by our own "flak."

I was definitely cured of the great American habit of sticking my head out of a window to see what was going on when flying fragments of steel knocked out the large window in the living room of my apartment. Fortunately, I was out that night.

But life goes on, raids or no raids. During the performance of a play or a movie, the alert sign, which warns that a raid is on, flashes on the stage, but it is seldom that anyone leaves his seat. I remember the night that two American G. I.'s were seeing a show and the rail signals lighted up over the orchestra pit. They looked at each other rather uneasily, wondering what they should do. When no one made a move for the exits which lead to the shelters, one G. I. turned to the other and said, "Gee, these limeys sure have guts."

The only reason for recurring raids on London is that Dr. Goebbels needs them for home consumption. The people in Germany know only too well what is being done to them by the combined day and night bombing of the Yanks and the Tommies as they are commonly called in Hitlerland. The German propaganda minister is well aware that their will to endure these devastating raids can be intensified and prolonged if they feel that England, and particularly London, is being subjected to the same lethal dose of fire and high explosive.

After a "scalded cat" raid on London and the towns on the southern coast of England, the Berlin newspapers paint a frightful and lurid picture of the waste and destruction that is being dealt out to their hated foes. Strategically, there is nothing to be accomplished by bombing London. And it is much too late to destroy British morale. It might have been cracked during the big blitz but, having withstood that and with mounting confidence in Allied superiority of the air, the average Londoner views these hit-and-run raids as a "damned nuisance," but his step is still juanty and his confidence in ultimate victory as firmly established as ever.

The morning following a sizable raid, all conversation turns on the damage done and the probability of the "Jerries coming back tonight." Be it barkeep or baronet, the raid of the previous evening is the sole topic of discussion. The chief plaint is that our antiaircraft guns never knock enough Jerries out of the sky to suit anyone. The difficulty can well be imagined when these raiders fly in at a speed of 300 to 400 miles an hour, drop their bombs, and scurry away to the safety of their own airdromes.

During a raid, the sky resembles a Fourth of July celebration magnified tenfold. The raiding planes drop flares that light up the

city like the Polo Ground at a night baseball game.

The wonder is not that so much destruction is done but that the Luftwaffe fails to hit really important targets. Tragically, the poorer sections of London suffer most. When the raiders are driven away from their objectives by the intense barrage of antiaircraft fire, they loose their bombs wherever they can and the huge flats where hundreds of families are housed and which lie below the raiders' return line of flight get the full impact.

Shelter elsewhere is found almost immediately for the survivors and a system of fire watching and protection has been organized to a high degree of efficiency.

As I said before, these German raids actually accomplish very little except to furnish ample propaganda for home consumption. And how they need it!

Well, that's all the space we have at our disposal this week but if a friendly talk of this sort over the morning coffee holds any interest, we'll be glad to take up a few more aspects of life in wartime England next Sunday.

Your questions are respectfully invited.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Resolution of Minnesota United Nations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution adopted by the membership of the Minnesota United Nations Committee at the second annual meeting, at the Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis, on April 22, 1944

Whereas on November 1, 1943, the Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and China, at Moscow, declared: that they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security"; and

Whereas on November 5, 1943, the United States Senate, by a vote of 85 to 5, adopted the Connolly resolution incorporating the language above quoted from the Moscow Declaration; and

Whereas encouraging progress has been made by the United Nations in various conferences, such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Conference; and

Whereas the Secretary of State of the United States has requested the appointment of a bi-partisan committee of Congress to help in the formulation of plans for the establishment of an international organization; but

Whereas numerous questions have arisen which may substantially affect the nature of the peace and which should be determined by and through such an international organization rather than unilaterally by any single one of the United Nations or by conference between a few; and

Whereas further delay in the taking of steps looking toward the formation of a general international organization may gravely jeopardize its formation and its ability to function; Now Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, cooperating with the bi-partisan leadership of Congress and collaborating with our allies, to call a meeting of the United Nations at the earliest practicable date, to develop plans for such an international organization; and we urge both political parties to support such action.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President, Secretary of State, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committe, the Senators and Representatives from Minnesota, and Minnesota delegates to the national conventions of both political parties.

The Veterans Express Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted by the House, I wish to extend in the RECORD the following telegram I received on May 6, 1944, showing the position of the Missouri Department of the American Legion on the G. I. bill of rights which was reported by the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, of which I am a member:

The Missouri Department of the American Legion, representing 40,000 veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, urgently request your active support of S. 1767 as reported by House Committee. Further request that you oppose all amendments from the floor such as amendment of education or the addition to or substitution of any adjusted compensation amendment in place of the unemployment compensation title.

HARRY F. DUGGAN,
Department Adjutant.

Mr. Speaker, the following letter is a letter of appreciation I have received from the national legislative committee of the American Legion, approving my work for the veterans, signed by Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of the committee, and by Hon. John Stelle, chairman, American Legion special committee on rehabilitation legislation for World War No. 2 veterans. Mr. Stelle is a former Democratic Governor of the great State of Illinois. Both men have many years of experience in veterans' problems and their advice and counsel was of great value to our committee in perfecting this constructive legislation which will be so important to the veterans of this war and to the future of our country:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 20, 1944.*

HON. MARION T. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Legion is most grateful to you for the earnest, intelligent consideration and effort you have given to S. 1767 which provides Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

It was gratifying to observe that the House of Representatives appreciated the work of your committee. This was reflected in the Members following the leadership of Chairman RANKIN and the committee members when the measure was up in the House for consideration.

Naturally, we of the American Legion are very proud of our part in this program. We feel when the measure becomes a law that the proper plans may be made for the day when the war will have been won and there will be "mass demobilization" of the present-day members of the armed forces.

We believe the privileges which will be afforded by the terms of S. 1767 to World War No. 2 veterans is a sound investment in the future of our Nation. The proposal represents an intelligent approach to the problem of readjustment in civilian life of the World War No. 2 veteran.

Again, we express our appreciation for your splendid work in connection with S. 1767.

JOHN STELLE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Rehabilitation Legislation World War No. 2 Veterans.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee, American Legion.

PLEASE FORWARD TO SOMEONE IN THE SERVICE

Mr. Speaker, when H. R. 1767 was before the House of Representatives on May 12, 1944, I spoke on the measure and analyzed its provisions. This legislation is a matter of great public importance. It should come to the attention of all citizens. I hope that those to whose attention it comes will forward it to those now in the service who are unable to get such data through the regular channels. As a member of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, I have been called upon by many servicemen, veterans' and their dependents, for information about veterans' legislation. It has been a pleasure to serve these people. There is so much legislation on veterans' problems that it hardly can be distributed in pamphlet form to all who are interested in it. However, I am always glad to furnish any information or to help with any claim presented to me by one of my constituents. One of the real satisfactions I have derived from my service in Congress is the pleasure which has come from handling thousands of inquiries of this kind.

What Can Our Young People Returning From the War Expect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I am including in the RECORD an address by our colleague, Representative LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, made at Glens Falls, N. Y., May 20, before the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, officers and members of the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, I join with the other speakers in expressing to you my sincere appreciation for your very kind invitation to address you here tonight.

It has been most pleasant meeting old friends—valued friends—friends I made during my service in the New York State Assembly.

However, I note with very considerable regret, that many additional old friends are not here. They are absent fighting in our armed forces. And, in their service, their patriotism, their aggressiveness, their desire to serve their country—they are reflecting the same characteristics they showed as Young Republicans—young Americans, in their service to their organization, to the Republican Party, and to the general welfare of the people of their own communities, the State, and the Nation.

We recall, pridefully, that our great Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, began his political career in this State as a member of the Young Republicans.

Similarly, Paul Lockwood, executive secretary to the Governor, was, as you know, chairman of the board of your organization, and worked as a Young Republican in Kings County.

Another of many of your bright stars, is Herbert Brownell, campaign manager for Mr. Dewey in his successful contest against Mr. Bennett, and more recently, campaign manager for Lt. Gov. Joe Hanley.

Then, there's George Sibley, State Senator Tom Desmond, Secretary of State Tom Curran, State Senator Walter Mahoney, Archie Dawson, Supreme Court Justice Dave Peck—the list is endless—because, the young Republicans have a happy habit of attracting to themselves real talent—real energy—men with a capacity for service—and filled with aggressive spirit.

In mentioning these names I have omitted many other famed young Republicans, or former young Republicans, who blazed their own trails of success through the political forests and often peril-beset jungles of statecraft. I say to you, young Republicans—keep at it—stay in there and keep punching.

Your good president, in writing to me, suggested that I speak to you tonight on this question, "Can young people returning from the war expect freedom of opportunity and freedom from governmental restraint?"

This is a very timely question indeed. I have no doubt that your president had much in mind, when he posed the question, what has been happening in these United States since the advent of the New Deal. He, like the rest of us, has seen signposts which indicate clearly that an attempt is being made to make over America. This attempt is being made by a coterie of men who have been able to work their way into the inner circle group around President Roosevelt. They operate in a subtle, behind-the-scenes undercover way.

Should the New Deal stay in power my answer to the question would be "No"—an emphatic "No."

Under normal conditions it would seem unnecessary to discuss such a question with any gathering of Americans. But the conditions are not normal—the record of events, ominous in character, are not conducive to a peace of mind as to the future of America.

Looking back over the past 11 years of the New Deal, normal developments have had nothing to do with the assaults that have been made on constitutional government. Each of these assaults was studied, planned; each fits into a general pattern—an attempt to socialize or sovietize America.

It will do no harm to recall to our minds once again some of those assaults against our system of government.

The attempt to pack the Supreme Court was the first glaring example of the mental operations of this palace-guard group. No more dastardly attempt was ever made by a President of the United States to make another independent branch of government subservient to him and a pawn in his hands. But outraged public opinion, Liberty men and women, from every corner of this great country of ours, wrathfully hurled back this grab for despotic power.

Tnen along came the bill to reorganize Government departments, under which many legislative functions would have been taken over by the Executive. Again, public opinion was felt and the bill was defeated.

The utter disregard and lack of respect on the part of the President for the Congress has been shown on at least two occasions recently.

Of course, our President, always grasping for more power, does not like a strong Congress. So we find the President joining with that group which would discredit the Congress in the minds of the people. Just for a moment let us consider the message of the President to the Congress on the soldier vote bill. In so many words, he accused the Congress of attempting to perpetrate a fraud on our soldiers. No more insulting message was ever penned by any President.

Again, on the tax bill, we find the President accusing the Congress of aiding the greedy instead of the needy.

Those acts, those messages, are not isolated accidents—they are all a part of a plan to put all power in the Executive. Of course, Congress would have to be entirely discredited before the people would accept such a plan.

These incidents, but a few from the record we know, show the design that the long-haired boys are trying to weave. Thoughtful people are aware of what is going on. Many of us are too busy with business and personal matters to give it the attention it deserves.

It took the recent seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co., in Chicago, to shock the people into a complete realization of what is going on. Without a warrant of any kind, a civil officer of the United States used the United States Army to remove the president of that company from his office. Boys who had enlisted or been drafted to fight our enemies from without were used to attack a citizen of the State of Illinois—and who was in charge of the Army? Generalissimo Biddle, Attorney General of the United States.

Oh, yes; Generalissimo Biddle did go to court after the people became incensed over the seizure of this mail order house. But he went to court after the seizure and not before the seizure. Why, we are entitled to ask, did not Generalissimo Biddle go into court the day before the seizure instead of the day after?

Some people may feel that these questions are partisan. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is not a party question at all. Rather, it is a battle between those who believe in constitutional, Bill-of-Rights government and those who believe in personal, despotic government.

For the time being, Congress must be your only defense against these actions, but as time runs to January 1945, it will be necessary for the people to make a change in those who are in control of our Government today. They must be replaced by men who believe in constitutional government.

When Congress was told that the President must have certain emergency powers, because the enemy was virtually hammering at the Golden Gate in California, and might well be expected to blitz our great cities along the Atlantic seaboard, the Republicans were willing to go along on the basis of patriotism; on the basis of submerging political conflicts for the duration so that the Nation might be unified and the war effort pressed to its most energetic conclusion.

In the public interest, I say to you, with all the emphasis at my command, that a test should be made of these wartime powers of the President—and immediately—because the original powers granted the President as a matter of course, as a tool for efficiency in the conduct of the war, have been utterly misinterpreted and misapplied, viciously and definitely misapplied. And this assumption of power becomes more dangerous as we find the President holding secret meetings with other nations without any but very few Senators having the remotest idea what has been done, what is being done, what the Nation, through the President, proposes to do in the future.

That, my friends, is not constitutional government. It is a dictatorship no matter how you look at it.

The appetite for power and more power has not only touched the Chief Executive. There isn't a New Deal henchman or handyman who isn't trying to outdo his administration colleague in broadcasting edicts and decrees, and preparing drafts of Executive orders by the scores. The regimenters are having a field day, with the housewife, the industrialist, the laboring man, being told from day to day what they may and may not do. And the planners are multiplying apace.

Just now one of the great planning efforts—if you can dignify the attempt in such a way—currently being made is for industry—industry reconversions, private job making.

All industry, we know, ever since and even before Pearl Harbor has obeyed the dictates of the War Production Board and other wartime boards. And industry has long understood that, at the earliest possible moment, reconversion from war to peacetime manufacture would follow. But here again industry which, with labor, helped to bail out this Nation from defeat at the hands of well-prepared enemies—enemies pressing a war on either side of the world—has apparently been listening to another New Deal siren song—a song of half truths, suppositions, innuendos, and in the "draw whatever conclusion you want to draw" philosophy.

With the exception of the Baruch report, with other somewhat discursive reports from New Deal agencies—with constantly changing promises made in succeeding editions of newspapers—little else has been worked out looking toward rapid reconversion of industry either when peace comes, or now, or at such other time when we are "over the hump of war production in any given field."

Constantly we read that this or that industry is about to get the green light to swing part of its wartime production back over to the making of badly needed peacetime goods, but the green lights only seem to swing in newspaper columns and not in the vast arsenal of the Nation's manufacturing facilities. And don't misunderstand me, I don't want war production slowed down at the expense of our men at the fighting fronts, manning our airplanes or battlewagons. On the contrary, all of us are willing to make every possible sacrifice to the end of winning this war in the shortest possible time.

But what I resent—and what millions of people in this country resent—are the incessant barrages of New Deal contradictory reports on this and that important question, whether the question be the imminence of industrial reconversion, the showing of green lights to industry, or what the War Manpower Commission does or does not want done, or what will or will not be the immediate future of men within draft ages and the moot questions arising from weird interpretations of these ever-changing draft regulations.

But, specifically reverting to industrial questions:

Whereas industry believed that before peace came, and with the coming of peace, there would be announced plans and orders for industrial reconversion, thus to keep apace with the Nation's needs and post-war manufacturing and economic situations, nothing concrete has materialized.

And every day in every way the situation becomes more and more confused, more and more involved in reams of apparently endless contradictions, "red tape," and constantly changing orders, more and more a cat-and-a-cradle device representing the puny imaginations and the mental bankruptcy of some

New Deal theorists charged with the duty of aiding industry to be efficient.

My friends, you know and I know that industry is never efficient when forced to obey the dictates of men who do not know industry, and who know economics only from the textbooks of slightly "pink" professors who haunted ivy-covered walls before being spirited therefrom to Washington to "save" the Nation.

Now, the New Deal administration has encouraged post-war planning by industry—in fact, some Government agencies have been sending out very insistent questionnaires demanding to know what given corporations and companies have done and are doing about post-war planing.

But, the pay-off is—and I use the vernacular advisedly—almost coincidental with the distribution of the questionnaires having to do with post-war planning—the various New Deal agencies issue a series of contradictory reports which make scientific post-war planning utterly impossible.

In connection with the foregoing, I mean to say that, with thousands of industrial firms engaged in trying to draw up post-war plans—the New Deal agencies have made announcements to the effect that "it cannot be determined at this time exactly what materials or to what extent varying materials, or in what quantity materials will be available for release to manufacturers in the early post-war days."

Consequently, many manufacturers have written me, and with heat, asking.

"How the devil can we draw up post-war plans when we don't know what material the Government will release in post-war days, or before post-war days? And what is the use of planning if you don't know what to plan, or on what to predicate any given plan?"

Others have written to say that, apparently we propose to not only do much in feeding the world in the post-war days, but in reconstructing a considerable portion of the bombed-out areas of the world, or furnishing material by and through which such construction may be had. All of which prompts the question in the minds of those writing me: "If this be so—where do we come off—what of our American industry—where do we get the necessary materials—and what proportion of materials do we get?"

Yes; I know, the two statements are similar—merely phrased differently—but the whole New Deal system, planning, discussions, publicity, alarms, emergencies, backing, and filling are so completely cockeyed that they don't make sense to anybody, particularly the men who, in the final analysis, will have to lead this country back into the pathways of industrial reconstruction and economic stability.

Immediate stability of Government and reconversion of industry will not and cannot come in the post-war period if the Roosevelt administration continues in power. How, under such a set-up, can young people returning from the war expect freedom of opportunity and freedom from governmental restraint?

Should the New Deal be reelected come November, it will then place in full force and effect the most despotic powers ever seen in the administration of this Nation. I am not using empty words in saying this. Nor am I speaking lightly. Similarly, I am not speaking for political effect.

Should the New Deal be returned to even greater power this fall—it is my considered view that the regimentation of the American people would rise to unparalleled heights—heights which, eventually, would bring great internal disaster to this Nation of ours.

And mark you well, returning servicemen and women will be in no mood for regimentation—for limitation of opportunity—for a spit-and-polish form of Government with the fighting men the virtual servants of several million Government employees—and there still are almost 3,000,000 of these Federal employees.

I say to you, in great seriousness, the New Deal must go. It must be replaced by an understanding administration—one not desirous of constant appeals to hatreds, class consciousness, the perpetual array of capital against labor and vice versa.

We must have a Republican administration. We must have a thoroughly competent, orderly, lawful, law-abiding administration based on democracy. We must have a restoration of government by and with the full consent of the governed.

You Young Republicans, and thinking citizens everywhere, can help make this possible.

Thank you very much.

Negro Soldier Morale Endangered in South—Bus Lines Chief Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Orrin C. Evans from the Philadelphia Record:

NEGRO SOLDIER MORALE ENDANGERED IN SOUTH—BUS LINES CHIEF CAUSE—DISCRIMINATION BY TRANSPORT FIRMS NEAR CAMPS VICIOUS AND HEARTLESS—CLUBS STANDARD EQUIPMENT FOR DRIVERS

(By Orrin C. Evans)

Since the beginning of the war, 400,000 or more Negroes from Northern States have been inducted into the Army and sent to southern camps for training.

And, as their number increased, reports of mistreatment and persecution of Negro soldiers, both by military authorities and civilian population, have grown at an alarming rate.

Stories widely circulated—and almost as widely believed—in Negro communities in Philadelphia and other northern areas have brought about a tragic lowering of morale—even to the extent of impairing patriotism among thousands of the folks at home.

War bond sales among Negroes have decreased; bonds bought on the pay-roll deduction plan are cashed far too often; even the Salvation Army—which always had a good standing among Negroes—finds support dwindling.

PROPAGANDISTS ACTIVE

Propagandists have been alert to take every fair and unfair advantage of the fact that Negroes have been sent south to train—a wartime necessity, according to established military principles, for the simple reason that in a warmer climate there are more days suitable for drill and maneuvers.

The propagandists have twisted any incident they can lay their hands to into declarations to the effect that "the administration is sending Negroes down south to be kicked around and is doing nothing to help them."

The reports from the South—by propagandists, by grapevine and in direct letters from Negro servicemen—add up to a mass of rumor, which it is impossible to judge from a distance.

RECORD REPORTER HUNTS FACTS

For that reason, the Record sent me on a 3,400-mile tour of southern camp areas to get the facts. I am a northern-born Negro. I had never been in the South before. In those respects I was like thousands of Negro boys who have been sent to southern camps.

I was in and about 14 camps in 7 States. I talked to hundreds of Negro soldiers from the North.

WHAT HE FOUND

On the basis of what I saw and heard, I can report these facts:

1. In every camp, the Negro detachments are separated from white troops with definite Negro areas and white areas, with one exception: At Fort Benning, Ga., Negro and white officer candidates—by voluntary agreement—train, live, and eat in the same quarters, with no friction.

2. With rare exceptions, northern Negro soldiers stated without qualification that the food, quarters, entertainment facilities, and treatment generally in these areas were as good as among the white soldiers.

CASE OF DELIBERATE DISCRIMINATION

3. In only one camp—Gordon Johnston, Fla.—was there evidence of downright, deliberate discrimination. There, Negro soldiers are forced to perform menial tasks (such as latrine duty) for the entire post, thus being made, in effect, servants to white soldiers.

4. In towns near camps, Negroes are subject to the severe segregation prevalent in the South. Most southern Negroes defended this to me with such statements as: "We know where we can go here, and don't pretend, like you northern Negroes, that we can go anywhere. When did you rent a room in the best hotel in Philadelphia?" Northern Negroes resent the obviousness of the segregation, but, with rare exceptions, take it philosophically.

NEGRO OFFICERS RESENTED

5. Negro officers are resented by white civilians and some white soldiers. Sometimes the officers take off their insignia before going into town, in order to avoid unpleasantness.

6. Despite all propaganda to the effect that racial tension is increasing in the South, Negro leaders to whom I talked were unanimous that the situation has improved unbelievably, with the exception of a few areas in Alabama and Texas.

Those are the broad general facts—and not a bad picture basically; not a picture, indeed, which justifies the deep concern felt by many friends and relatives of Negro soldiers.

But I did find one condition which is so irritating to Negro soldiers (especially those from the North) that I could understand why one of them said to me recently: "I feel that if I go on the other side, I'm going to die anyhow. Since I have this stuff (his uniform) on, I'd just as soon die here and take a few of these 'pecks' (white Southerners) with me."

CAMP TRANSPORTATION BAD

It is a problem which seems trivial to tell—so trivial that one wonders why nothing has been done about it—and yet which wrings the hearts and embitters the minds of men wearing their country's uniform.

I refer to public transportation—not transportation for long and important trips, but the simple matter of getting to town and back when a soldier has a week end (or a few hours) off duty.

I can pretty well sum it up by telling what I saw one night as I stood on a busy corner of Oak Street in the heart of the Negro section of Montgomery, Ala.

There was a bus stop sign on the corner.

A group of Negro soldiers from Maxwell Field, which grew larger as the minutes passed, stood with me.

DRIVER ARMED WITH CLUB

Along came a bus, a rather ramshackle affair, operated by a local company. The

driver was a tobacco-chewing, not-well-shaven "cracker" type of man—the sort of person who is referred to in the South as "poor white trash." He was armed with a club nearly as big as a cattle stick. Clubs are standard equipment for southern bus drivers these days; some of them even carry pistols; one shot a Negro soldier dead in Alexandria, La., a few weeks ago.

The traffic light was red. The driver slowed down, trying to avoid a stop. He didn't make it. But he didn't pull up to the curb.

The Negro soldiers surged out as the bus stopped.

FOR WHITE PEOPLE

Without opening the door, the driver shouted: "This bus for white people. Cullud bus jest behind."

The light changed and the bus moved on. The disappointed soldiers dropped back to the curb.

Another bus came up after a few minutes. The driver said the same thing.

The third bus stopped.

"Going to Maxwell Field?" shouted one of the soldiers.

"Naw," said the driver, "This ain't no Maxwell Field bus."

He drove on, too.

WANT NO COLORED SOLDIERS

"That driver's lyin' to you," volunteered a native. "They just don't want no colored passengers, especially not no colored soldiers."

That incident on Oak Street in Montgomery is important not just to the few dozen or the few hundred soldiers who had to walk 10 miles back to camp after a "free evening." It is important to the entire Nation.

In fact, I feel safe in saying that:

At least 60 percent—probably 80 percent—of the justifiable resentment of Negro soldiers in the South (which, of course, is transmitted to their relatives and friends in the North) is due directly to the heartless, vicious discrimination of the local bus lines.

It seems unbelievable that the conduct of a few score bus companies and a few thousand drivers should be a major factor in national morale.

CAPITALIZED BY PROPAGANDIST

It seems incredible that the resentment aroused by rowdy bus drivers should furnish a major part of the resentment capitalized by such propagandists as Edgar G. Brown, the bewhiskered Negro who has been sponsoring profitable causes for 20 years and is now known in Chicago as Col. Robert R. McCormick's "favorite son."

Brown can take one letter from a Negro soldier who has been pushed around by bus drivers and use it to prove that the administration hates and persecutes Negroes.

It does, indeed, seem strange that this condition has been allowed to continue—especially when the Army authorities could remedy the whole thing in 24 hours, as has been proven in one camp area and to a lesser degree in another.

OUTGROWTH OF JIM CROW LAWS

The bus situation is, of course, the outgrowth of the Jim Crow laws of the Southern States. These laws provide for segregation of the Negro and white passengers on public vehicles. On trains separate coaches are provided. Somewhat to my surprise I found that in general the railroads are providing adequate space for Negroes.

Sometimes the Negro cars are overcrowded and there are empty seats in the white coaches. More often it's the other way around. For instance, as I was going down from Washington at the start of my trip there were vacant seats in the Jim Crow car. At Quantico, Va., the marine training base, three white persons came into the car—two marines and a woman.

JIM CROW IN REVERSE

The Negro porter came in and told them they would have to leave—that the coach was for Negroes only. They refused.

"There isn't a seat in any other coach and I'm not going to stand all the way to Richmond," said one of the marines.

The porter brought in the conductor.

"I and the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad," he said, "don't make the laws of this State. It's the law that Negroes and whites can't ride in the same coach. You'll have to get out."

They did.

"Hot dog," said a Negro sailor. "That's why I love the South. Jim Crow in reverse."

He laughted. He was a Northern Negro. In his laugh was bitterness and humor and resignation. The bitterness was there, all right, but he had taken the discomforts of Jim Crow cars himself when they were overcrowded and he could get a little fun out of that experience—his first of the kind.

DENIED TRANSPORTATION

With busses the situation is such that even the most tolerant, the most peace-loving Negro can't continue to take it with a grin.

A man can be shoved off into a Jim Crow car or a Jim Crow waiting room and console himself with the thought that a law based on prejudice and race hate forced the humiliation upon him—and that some time, through education in true tolerance, democracy will end that sort of discrimination.

But when discrimination reaches the point that a man—and a man in his country's uniform, at that—is forbidden to use public transportation at all, the breaking point has been reached. That becomes the final straw which produces despairing letters to the folks back home. And the folks back home stop buying bonds and supporting the Red Cross.

FEW SEATS "RESERVED"

On busses, the Jim Crow system "reserves" a few back seats for Negroes.

In Houston, Tex., I found the division quite rigid. The back 6 seats were for Negroes—room for 12 persons—plus the standing room in the aisle up to the division line.

In New Orleans there was a movable sign, reading "White" on one side and "Colored" on the other. Negroes and white passengers could move the sign forward or backward, as the occasion warranted.

But in many places the bus rule was, whites fill from the front, colored fill from the rear.

ONLY TRANSPORTATION AVAILABLE

That meant that white people entering the bus took seats from the front in order, and Negroes did the same from the rear. The Jim Crow division thus established itself in accordance with the number of white and Negro passengers.

It is obvious that as more Negroes are taken on the busses of this type, there is room for fewer white people.

The bus drivers, whose only claim to distinction and respect is that they are white men—don't want Negro passengers. And they don't take them.

Bus transportation is virtually the only way a soldier can get from camp to town—for an evening or on a highly prized and often hard-earned week-end pass.

The tobacco-chewing, club-toting cracker bus drivers—obviously with the approval, if not under the direct orders, of their employers—won't provide that transportation.

NO FUN WALKING 10 MILES

There isn't any fun in a trip to town if you have to walk 10 miles each way.

To end this situation would remove the chief cause of complaint of Negro soldiers.

It can be done without moving the soldiers back North or without repealing the Jim Crow laws or without educating the South to democratic tolerance.

In fact, it has been done by one camp commander.

LACK OF FACILITIES IN SOUTH FOR NEGROES HITS MORALE OF SOLDIERS AND FAMILIES

(By ORRIN C. EVANS)

(Third of a series)

I was in Fayetteville, N. C., tired enough to drop, and with no place to stay. It was 11:30 p. m.

I considered stretching out on a bench in the Jim Crow waiting room of the railroad station. But I was advised against it:

"They're apt to arrest you for vagrancy."

So I asked a Negro taxi driver if he couldn't find me a place to sleep—any place.

He looked me over, and paid a compliment to my somewhat disheveled costume by saying: "Don't think I can find a place you'd want."

I told him I had to have a place.

"I'll take you to a place, then," he said. "It ain't so clean, but it's safe."

DRIVEN TO HOVEL

He drove me to a house which was no more than a hovel. The slovenly "landlady" showed me a room, about 9 by 9. The floor was grimy. The furniture was a repulsively dirty cot and not much else. I gritted my teeth and asked the price.

"What time you goin' to get up?" she asked.

I told her I hoped to sleep late—perhaps until 10 a. m.

"If you git out by 8," she said, "it'll be $5."

And if I stayed until 10?

That, she said, would be another day, and it would be $10. After some more talk, we compromised. I paid $7.50 for the room until 10—a matter of 75 cents an hour or more for a room that wouldn't be more than two bits a night in a Philadelphia flop house.

SOLDIERS' PROBLEM

In that experience—and many another like it—I came face to face with one of the problems of Negro soldiers stationed in the South, and particularly of their families.

The service facilities open to Negroes in the South—rooms, taxicabs, restaurants, taprooms, etc.—are limited. Because of the low economic status of the Negro, they have been not only limited, but generally far from good—ranging from fair in the larger cities to indescribably bad in small communities.

The war has brought an influx of Negroes, increasing the demand. At the same time, local Negro civilians are more prosperous, earning $25 a week up, instead of $5 to $15.

Soldiers' families are, according to southern Negro standards, "rich."

Army pay plus allotments give many a Negro family an income beyond its fondest dreams.

PRICES SKYROCKET

Prices for the inadequate services have skyrocketed. The O. P. A. may be efficient in some areas, but apparently has no time to control prices in Negro communities.

I mentioned in another article that I rode in a taxicab driven by a white woman in Hattiesburg, Miss. I add now that she charged me 25 cents. For the return trip, a Negro driver charged me 50 cents. Both worked for the same company. The Jim Crow driver apparently considered he had a special license to gyp his passengers.

I haggled with a Negro cab driver over a trip from Montgomery, Ala., to Hayneville, a distance of 18 miles. He wouldn't come down from $20. I finally got another one to take me for $10.

80 CENTS FOR BREAKFAST

At the Greenleaf Cafe in Petersburg, Va., I paid 80 cents for breakfast of fried eggs, potatoes, bread, and no butter. Eggs were 32 cents a dozen in stores, or 20 cents from street vendors.

Whisky can be bought around camps for $5 a pint. "Shots" of questionable origin run 50 cents or more in back-street saloons.

These conditions constitute a direct injustice, which while not ranking with the bus scandal—account for much of the dissatisfaction among Negro soldiers in the South. It would seem possible that the Government—which rightly builds emergency homes for migrant war workers and establishes reasonably priced cafeterias in the Pentagon Building—might do something to make the matters of eating and sleeping more tolerable for its citizen soldiers and their families.

CLAIM CITED

They have a claim equal to that of the war workers, it would seem. The Negro soldiers were sent South because the climate there is suitable for training, just as war workers go to Philadelphia and other cities because that's where they are needed on certain jobs The case for emergency facilities appears to be the same.

In my 3,400-mile tour of Southern States, I found good mixed with the bad, as Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told me I would.

I found that Negro leaders generally are not too despondent—although they often are disheartened by discrimination and segregation, which arouse cumulative resentment.

OVER-ALL PICTURE

Carter Wesley, editor of the Houston Informer, Negro newspaper, expressed a general opinion when he said to me:

"The over-all picture throughout the South in regard to improved conditions for Negroes is unbelievably better."

It was inspiring to find that conditions in communities where Negroes were stationed in World War No. 1 generally are better than those where Negroes have been brought in for the first time.

That makes one feel that people can get along together if they know each other.

I discovered on this, my first trip through the South, that it makes a lot of difference what particular person you happen to be dealing with. My experiences on two dining cars illustrate that point.

TABLE RESERVED

The southern railroads reserve a table or two at the end of the car for Negroes. Sometimes a curtain is hung between them and the white tables, sometimes not.

On the Seaboard Airline, I and three Negro soldiers went to the dining car a few miles above Raleigh, N. C White passengers occupied the table reserved for us. We waited until they finished. The steward beckoned us forward, then motioned us back, and gave the table to a wizened old Chinese, who had come up behind us. He wore no coat, collar, or tie. But he ate at our table, all alone, while we were made to wait.

On the same railroad some days later, another Negro and I went into the diner, just behind four white men. They took the only remaining seats—which were at a Negro table. This steward (a southerner, like the other), came up to us, told us he was sorry, but we would have to wait a moment. He then told the white men they must move. One of the white men glared at us, but they all moved, and we were seated.

CONTRASTS NUMEROUS

It is possible to find such contrasts all over the South. The unfortunate thing is that propagandists have not been able to see the true picture, but have picked out the bad, ignoring the good and taking advantage of every justifiable resentment.

Thus bus drivers—and the type of men who bulldoze Negroes on station platforms—furnish grist for the mills of such men as Edgar G. Brown, referred to in an earlier article as a leader in the movement to stir up Northern Negroes with half truths.

Brown was a new dealer until about a year ago, when he decided the "other side" was more profitable. In the words of David Kellum, executive of a Chicago Negro newspaper, he became Col. R. R. McCormick's "favorite son."

AIDED NEGRO MERCHANT

About all he has ever done for Negroes in the South was to induce a well-to-do Negro merchant to run for United States Senator in Mississippi. When Brown got through with him the "candidate" wasn't a merchant, let alone a Senator; he wasn't even a Mississippian. Nobody knows where he went.

Now he is telling Negroes that their sons and brothers and friends are being persecuted in the South. He claims credit for reversing the political trend in some areas.

It is true there was a reversal last year—as noted in the seventh, fourteenth, twentieth, thirtieth, thirty-second, thirty-sixth, fortieth, forty-fourth, forty-seventh, and fifty-second wards here, which swung to the Republicans.

Much of the real credit for the swing—if it is based on resentment, as a great deal of it seems to be—should go to those bus drivers who won't let Negroes ride, to the people who gouge them for poor meals and lodging, and to the scattered bigoted Army officers in a few of the camps who seem unable to submerge racial prejudices in the interests of a united America, or else just don't care.

It may seem a little thing, but it is important to the men who have to suffer in the South.

I know, because I have been there.

Defeat of Hon. John M. Costello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that the people of this country are greatly concerned over the defeat of one of California's outstanding Congressmen, JOHN M. COSTELLO, in the primary election. Coming from the adjoining congressional district, I can say that the campaign conducted by the C. I. O. political-action group against both JOHN COSTELLO and myself was of the dirtiest and lowest type.

The editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News, written by Judge Harlan Palmer, which I insert in the RECORD, has aroused a virtual storm of favorable comment because it definitely hits the nail on the head:

BEHIND

Congressman JOHN M. COSTELLO was defeated Tuesday for the Democratic nomination for reelection as Representative from the Fifteenth District (central Hollywood). Though he is a Democrat, he won an overwhelming plurality of the votes for the Republican nomination but under the law he cannot have the nomination of another party unless he also wins the nomination of his own party.

The election results decree that the country is to lose the services of one of the ablest, most conscientious Members of Congress—a clear thinker from whose intelligence in finding a sensible way through governmental problems the whole country has been profiting.

Congressman COSTELLO was defeated because he would not accept the dictation of Hollywood Communists.

Of course, the people who voted against him, with few exceptions, did not realize that they were aiding the Communist cause or accepting the Communist propaganda. Had the voters realized that, COSTELLO would have been reelected with a splendid endorsement equal to those he has received in previous years.

We doubt that COSTELLO's successful opponent, Hal Styles, realizes that he was a mere ignorant instrumentality that the Communists used in their efforts to make good on their earlier vows that either COSTELLO would accept their dictation or would meet political defeat. We think that Hal Styles has an idea that most of the people think that he has the qualifications of a good Congressman. The most of the people who voted for Styles know nothing about his lack of qualifications.

Congressman COSTELLO was not defeated with the contention that he was opposed to the Marxists who masquerade under false fronts in the Hollywood area. He was defeated with a campaign of misrepresentation that makes one wonder if the upholding of the highest standards of public service is a worthy activity.

He was defeated with circulation of such falsehoods as: That he was opposed to Roosevelt; that he was anti-Semitic; that the Japanese were putting money into his campaign.

As to such falsehoods it might be said, that the Democratic National Committee realize that it is losing one of its finest representatives; that he numbers many Jews among his best friends; that the Japanese would spend money for his defeat rather than for his victory; that there is no stronger friend to he servicemen in Congress that he has been; that he has made the ablest fight in Congress for a fair, sensible administration of selective service.

The people who voted against him in the main did so with an absolutely false picture in their minds as to the character and the ability of the man and as to his standing among democratic leaders of the Nation. Their false picture was obtained as a result of the ruthless, honorless campaign cleverly directed from behind the scenes by the Communists.

The success of the Communists in defeating COSTELLO doesn't mean that they are going to run this country. Nor does it mean that they are going to win out in the final election. The Republican county central committee must now select a candidate to oppose Hal Styles in the final election and it has an opportunity to provide a man around whom all those opposed to the schemes of the Communists can rally.

But the success of the Communists in defeating COSTELLO does reveal that there is ample reason for concern over the possibilities that a comparative few can devise schemes to get control of the Government.

The success of the Communists in defeating COSTELLO reveals that there is reason why everyone should be concerned in the false front organizations that the Communists create and into which they intrigue thousands of good citizens through dishonest appeals.

If there are not enough intelligent voters in the fifteenth district to defeat the Communist schemes at the November election, then there should be an end to the talk that there is nothing in the Communist movement for Americans to worry about.

Our Heritages Are in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Peoria Journal-Transcript, of Peoria, Ill., a very persuasive and analytical editorial dealing with the Montgomery Ward case, and I insert it in the RECORD so that it may come to the attention of a larger group of readers:

OUR HERITAGES ARE IN DANGER

Some precious American heritages are in peril.

Attorney General Biddle told Judge William H. Holly, in Federal court in Chicago, that the President's order to seize Montgomery Ward & Co. was not based on the type of goods handled by the mail-order house, but was motivated by a desire to halt the threatened spread of a labor controversy.

"It is the basic duty," he added, "of the President to prevent a spread of labor trouble during the war. There is nothing in the War Labor Dispute Act to prevent the President from taking such action."

Maybe there isn't. But there ought to be. Here is why:

If we reason from Attorney General Biddle's statement we find ourselves facing some horrible possibilities—possibilities which, if they ever eventuated would actually destroy the American Republic and establish in this land a dictatorship which would put Hitler's to shame, and would make the sacrifice of American blood on the altar of human freedom a wasted and futile thing. Let us suppose Biddle's reasoning were applied in the case of American newspapers, both daily and weekly. Let us suppose that a newspaper, or all the newspapers in the land, refused to heed a maintenance of union order issued by the President. Let us suppose the President then seized editorial direction of the papers. What would happen under these conditions to the hard-won, the greatly cherished thing Americans call freedom of the press?

Perhaps you are thinking that is a too self-serving analogy, since this is a newspaper editorial. O. K. Let us take another example.

Suppose the board of trustees of a large Protestant church in a big city, employing half a dozen or more janitors, or the bishop of a Roman Catholic diocese employing a large number of janitors, were to become involved in a labor dispute with those employees. Suppose the War Labor Board ordered the board of trustees or the bishop to grant maintenance of unions to those janitors. Suppose the board of trustees or the bishop refused, and—still on the theory that it is justifiable for the President to take violent action to prevent the spread of labor difficulties—men with bayonets were sent into that church or that diocese to operate the religious institution or institutions under the board of trustees or the bishop. And suppose, going further, that the president of the board of trustees or the bishop refused to vacate the premises and was, thereupon, carried out by a couple of soldiers with bayonets dangling from their belts.

What would become of the hard-won and greatly cherished thing we call freedom of worship in these United States?

Manifestly, these hypothetical cases, based, truly enough, upon suppositions, are not likely to happen. But if the argument of Attorney General Biddle be valid, if the President of the United States can order the seizure of any institution—whether it is purely human or whether it believes it has Divine connection—because the human beings in charge of that institution become involved in a labor dispute, then the President is assuming prerogatives which no human being should ever have. Attorney General Biddle justifies the seizure on the grounds that the President's action would prevent labor disputes. So might the seizure of a newspaper, seizure of a church, or, for that matter, the seizure of a State government, if that State government became involved in a labor dispute, under analogous conditions.

The argument leads directly to tyranny. Its justification stems from the philosophy that makes dictators.

O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an aditorial from the Crowley Daily Signal, Crowley, La., entitled "Regardless of How Hard You Try" as follows:

REGARDLESS OF HOW HARD YOU TRY

The buyer had his priority certificate.

The firm had the truck to sell. Both the seller and the buyer checked the "little book" on the ceiling prices. They found what they were sure was the right figure.

The deal was made.

A few days later the seller was notified he had violated the ceiling price and he owed some $100 or more to the O. P. A. He checked the little book. He checked with the buyer. They found that instead of violating the ceiling price he had cheated himself half of the sum requested from him by the O. P. A.

A few days later he received the demand to send in the money. He was given a time limit.

He feels he is right and is waiting, ready to fight.

The next incident is about a business concern which wanted to install some machinery. That priority had to come from Washington. It came through fast. Another request was being made to use material which was on hand to install a new floor. That request and priority had to come from the State office. It is still hanging fire, still being delayed, and the businessman cannot move because of Government red tape. Yet he needs to get that plant ready now.

And the third incident is the double meaning in O. P. A. regulations. It has to do with meters, light and power meters. One place the instructions say that the company can have $1,800 worth in the State. In another they say $850 worth in the State. Which is right? What can the firm do?

If they do one thing they are in violation. If they do the other—they are neglecting those they should serve.

How does the O. P. A., the Federal Government, or anyone else expect them to serve the best they can when even the Government isn't sure what can or can't be done?

This is happening today. Business is being unnecessarily handicapped because of unnecessary, confusing, and complicated regulations.

Industry asked to do a job is being prevented from doing that job because of red tape of that very Government asking industry to do that job.

If tire certificates can be issued locally and they can; if gasoline certificates can be issued locally and they can; if meat stamps, and sugar stamps, and other matters can be handled locally—why must the businessman or a firm travel to Washington or New Orleans or to Dallas for priorities on things, which could and should be handled here and in which common sense can be used to clear these matters and handle them?

Citizens and taxpayers, we believe, could demand that local governing board or panels or committees be named to handle every single thing which is rationed or controlled with priorities. These matters can be handled locally much fairer; much easier; and much more satisfactory.

And we are sure that some of the confusion arising today could be eliminated.

It is rather a serious thing when honest dealers, honest buyers, honest sellers are accused without hearing; without facts; and even convicted without a trial.

That is done under the O. P. A. And it will continue to be done until there are those with sufficient courage to battle through this form of bureaucracy until the law is administered in the manner in which Congress intended that it be administered.

Western Industrialists and Asia Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the eminent writer and editor, Mr. Lowell Mellett, recently wrote an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 16, discussing the business future of the far West and the plans of western industrialists to secure a share of the American market in the Orient following the war.

The article ably summarizes the problem and is of interest to the whole country. Here it is:

WESTERN INDUSTRIALISTS LOOK TO ASIA IN THEIR SEARCH FOR POST-WAR MARKETS

(By Lowell Mellett)

If I were President and Congress, I'd be paying particular attention to the far West.

When this war ends the West may suddenly take the place of the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem—and opportunity. Planning to meet the problem and seize the opportunty can hardly begin too soon.

New war industries, shipbuilding, and plane manufacture have added vastly to the population of the coast and nearby States. The problem is what to do about these people when the demand for wartime products gives way to more normal demands. Western communities are making their own plans to absorb a part of this new population, while reabsorbing the hundreds of thousands of their native sons and daughters now in the armed services. But if the war plants all closed tomorrow the west coast might have a situation on its hands that would make the days of the Oakies and Arkies seem like a pleasant memory. Because it is not to be expected that all these workers and their families will immediately pick up their be-

longings and head back East. They know, most of them, that the communities from which they came are not prepared to receive them, not prepared to provide them with jobs and homes.

POPULATION NOT EXCESSIVE

The population in these Western States is not excessive by any means. There is still plenty of room. When the West begins to realize the future which every Westerner envisions, the population will be much greater than it now is.

The future seen by the West is one which includes great industrial development. Thanks to the war, the West is now demonstrating what it has long claimed, that it has everything to make it a great industrial region. It always has had the raw materials, the fuel, the power. Now it has the people, the skilled workers. But it still has its own handicaps. Chief of these are discriminatory freight rates and discriminatory finance. With the Government financing the factories and the Government paying the freight, these handicaps have been eliminated so far as war industry is concerned. They are still right there so far as other industry is concerned. These Western States have their eyes on a share of the American market for those things they think can be made best in the West. They have their eyes likewise on the great potential markets of Asia. Given an even chance at the domestic market and Government support in the development of the Asiatic market, the new industrialists say their section need never be an economic problem for the rest of the country.

But they know that the West, in the past, has had no more success in the matter of freight rates and industrial finance than the South has had.

GOVERNMENT HAS HELPED

When I say what I'd do if I were the Government, I'm not being fair, since that implies that not much is being done. Actually both the executive and the legislative branches are devoting very particular attention to the West. Last September Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, acting for the Senate Committee on Post-war Planning, held hearings in San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle to learn the general views and the local plans. His report has been made and printed.

And a few weeks ago the President signed an act of Congress authorizing the construction of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products. West coast industries should be the principal beneficiaries of this act, which carries an appropriation of $30,000,000, to be spent by the Interior Department. Since Secretary Ickes has long been a prophet of the industrial development of the West, it can be anticipated that he will put his well-known energy into this undertaking.

But there remain freight rates and finance—more serious problems than fuel. A teaming up of the West with the South to break these barriers would seem indicated.

New Deal Victory in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article in the Washington Calling column of Marquis Childs, published in the Washington Post May 20, 1944:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

NEW DEAL VICTORY IN ALASKA

Here's another straw, a small one, blowing in the stiff political wind. They had an election up in Alaska not long ago and the New Deal candidates won a clean sweep.

You don't think of Alaska as voting, but they elect members of a Territorial legislature and a Delegate to Congress.

The big contest was over the Delegate's job. After a dozen years in Washington, ANTHONY J. DIMOND is retiring from the House of Representatives to be Federal judge for the first Alaskan judicial division.

The race to succeed him was concentrated in the Democratic primary since, curiously enough, in the far North as in the deep South, Democratic nomination is today equivalent to victory. That has been true in Alaska since the Democratic triumph of 1932.

Three candidates sought the Delegate's post. A. H. Zeigler, of Ketchikan, hammered away at bureaucracy, by which he meant the New Deal. Henry Rodan, veteran Territorial attorney general, took a more or less neutral course with respect to the administration in Washington.

The Roosevelt candidate was 40-year-old Edward L. "Bob" Bartlett, who had the active backing of Ernest Gruening, liberal, New Deal Governor of Alaska. In the sharp campaign Gruening's support of Bartlett was made an issue. His pro-New Deal record was paraded.

Betting on the outcome was uncertain. At one time or another all three candidates occupied the position of favorite. Yet Bartlett won by a landslide, carrying all four of Alaska's election districts. In the Second District, which includes Fairbanks, he had a majority over the field and he even carried Juneau, the capital, where Rodan had been rated the favorite.

One of the issues was statehood for Alaska. Bartlett was strong for it while his opposition soft-pedaled this question. Most of the big industries in the Territory—chiefly salmon fishing and gold mining—are against statehood if only because it would increase taxes.

Incidentally, if you still think of Alaska as a far-off place, you'll have to move into the air age. By slow Army transport it's only 15 or 16 hours from Chicago to Fairbanks. By fast plane, after the war, the time will be cut to 8 or 9 hours.

If Alaska were a State, it would take far less time to reach Washington by plane than it took the Virginia delegation to come across muddy roads to those early sessions of Congress. After the war a week's fishing or hunting trip in Alaska will be perfectly feasible.

As I say, this is a very small straw. Nevertheless it seems to me to be one more proof of the old axiom that you can't beat something with nothing.

Ernest Gruening has been a good Governor. Attacked as an outsider and a new dealer, he has worked quietly for the Territory. Gruening was largely instrumental in organizing Alaska's native population for defense when the Japanese were attacking in the Aleutians. He's made friends with Indians, Eskimos, trappers, salmon fishermen. In short, he has had a program. He stands for something.

That's what people were voting for. Down with the New Deal, down with bureaucracy, has a negative sound. Americans are positive. Put Alaska alongside the New Deal victories—against heavy odds—in Florida and Alabama.

Now the Republican National Committee is mailing out a first batch of 25,000 pictures of Sewell Avery being carried out by the two soldiers on one side and a purported picture of the arrest by storm troopers in Germany of a pushcart peddler on the other. Above is the caption, "It did happen here."

The committee seems to want to make Sewell Avery a Republican rallying cry.

This is the negative approach. Twice before the G. O. P. has tried it. Apparently they think it will work the third time.

Maine—A Political Barometer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by my distinguished and able colleague the gentlewoman from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, before the Maine State Republican Convention, at Bangor, Maine, during April of this year.

Thank you, Mr. Morton, for your introduction and for the distinct honor which you have given me. I shall try to carry out your plans as efficiently and as effectively as you have arranged them.

I shall confine my remarks to matters of general interest to Maine Republicans, and refrain from commenting on any political issues of controversial nature because that is the prerogative of your delegates to this convention.

It is a very great privilege to serve in Congress during these historic days, especially when associated with the alert, conscientious, and able Senators and Representatives now serving this State of Maine. No Congressional delegation of similar size serves on more major committees, receives more special committee assignments, works more harmoniously together, keeps closer to the needs of the State which they represent than does the Maine group. The Maine delegation is outstanding in its participation in America's international picture. I value the opportunity of serving with this distinguished group.

This is not just another meeting. It is a convention of great importance, not only to the Republican Party but to the Nation. We cannot say when this war will end, but we know victory is certain and after it we will be faced with the crucial post-war period. Everybody watches Maine because we have the first election. This means that Maine Republicans have a most serious obligation, as well as a splendid opportunity, to serve as a barometer for the rest of the country.

Our primary purpose is to formulate policy and prepare a platform. Our platform must be keyed to the future. It must present concrete and definite plans on matters that vitally affect the lives of the people of Maine; it must avoid petty criticism; it must be constructive. Any criticism must be accompanied by definite substitute proposals. We must meet the issue, for the voters want to know, and they are entitled to know, exactly what we offer. They are tired of catchy phrases and idle promises. The people want action and plain talk, which means that our platform must be sound and forward looking.

This is a time for us to forget ourselves. This is a time to think of the Republican Party and all that it can contribute toward our return to a sane and safe government. We are fighting a horrible war, but when it is won our job is only partially completed.

There will be weighty domestic problems—issues that have been neglected because of the desire to be united in the war plans.

The Democrats know that President Roosevelt is their indispensable man—that he has become greater than the Democratic Party itself—and that they haven't the slightest hope for victory with anyone else. As we know it today, the Democratic Party is but one man—Mr. Roosevelt. He is not only their one hope for the Presidency but their sole hope for retaining control of the House and perhaps of the Senate. The Democratic Party knows that the people are tired of experiments and unrealistic theories. The President acknowledged this weariness by discarding the term "New Deal" and attempting to replace it with the slogan "Win the war." The present administration will be judged by its record, not by smart slogans.

We should profit by the errors of the opposition. The Republican Party is greater than any one man or any group of men. It is not limited to one. It has many men capable of being a good President.

However, it is the privilege and duty of every voter to work for the candidate of his choice, but he should avoid tearing down the other fellow's candidate. Animosities that will be troublesome after the convention must not be created. We must and will select our candidate carefully. This is our job, yours, mine, and that of all Republicans. This is serious. Our only difficulty is that we have so many good men to choose from—our choice is not limited.

Although it is generally accepted that the Democratic Party cannot win in the general election, we must not underrate the present Chief Executive. It is true that we hear every day that everybody is opposed to him. We hear that he can't be reelected. We heard that in 1936. We heard that again in 1940, but he won each time. The time for us to glow with victory is after the general election, not before. We can win this battle with—

1. A constructive platform.
2. The best candidates we can nominate.
3. Hard, sustained campaigning before the day of election.
4. Getting every Republican voter to the polls on election day.

STATE OF MAINE

The future of the State of Maine is closely tied to the Republican Party. We must have a State administration that will encourage individual enterprise and not hamper it. We must encourage new industries to come in. With the inevitable strategic Army and Navy air bases in this northeast outpost of America, and as an air terminal for trans-Atlantic commercial flights, Maine is destined to become n aviation center after the war. In this rapidly expanding and highly important field our own Senator BREWSTER is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities in Congress. This and his visits to the battle fronts of the world last year are among the reasons why he is a member of the Special Committee on Post-war International Aviation.

There will be a great expansion in the production of consumer goods in the post-war period. This means that the State of Maine should concentrate on reconversion plans and give special emphasis to measures that will attract capital to Maine and provide jobs for Maine labor. We must not hamper these people with any more regulations than are necessary.

Maine has always been the vacation land of this country. She will continue to be in an increasing degree. The many developments and new inventions will bring better agricultural opportunities and shorter work hours and good pay. This will in turn give more time and money for recreation and travel. Maine will then be more than ever the desired vacation land of the East, both in summer and in winter.

When the war needs are taken off our railroads more attention will be given to quicker and cheaper transportation. War has developed our air industry incredibly and after the war these developments can also be turned to quick and cheap transportation. Improved air transportation will open markets over the entire country for Maine fishermen. Even now there are plans in process for delivery of fresh sea food to far distant points by air.

Automobile companies are already planning on great prosperity on developments of travel over the highways. Both the Federal Government and the State are planning a great integrated highway system which will make Maine's mountains, lakes, and coast more rapidly accessible.

Maine lost much of her naval and maritime importance after the last war. This must not be repeated. It will be necessary to maintain a large Navy. Maine has become more than ever a strategic point in the supply lanes of the Atlantic. War has brought to the forefront the importance of our Maine bays and harbors. This recognition created by the war emergency will continue in peacetime because maritime and naval officials appreciate more and more the anchorage facilities and shipping advantages of the Maine coast.

SERVICEMEN

Returning servicemen must be given A–1 priority. Nothing is too good for those who have risked their lives in combat. We cannot wait until they come back. There should be specific legislation and machinery in process now. Action toward this result has been initiated, but it must be accelerated as much as possible. These men were sent out proudly—they have suffered and they will suffer. They are entitled to the best of everything when they come back home. They must be assured of good jobs with good wages. We should help those who want to go into agriculture, locate and acquire good farms. These men must be given financial stability during the difficult period of transition. They should have special tax consideration. Those who shed their blood for our safety should not have to bear as heavy a burden when they come back as those of us who did not have to pay that dreadful price. I am not talking about pensions and medical care because it is understood that the Congress will provide these necessities.

But above all, we must receive these servicemen proudly—not just sympathetically. We must have particular consideration for those with disabilities—they do not want pity. They want to be treated as ordinary human beings and given a chance to work, to earn, and to live as they aspire to.

FEDERAL TAXES

Taxes must be simplified. They must be realistic. We should pay for as much of the war as we can while war business is booming. Revision of our entire tax structure is basic and essential. Mr. MARTIN, House minority leader, has appointed a special committee from the Republican side of the House to make a study and report. Maine is represented on this committee by the Representative from the First District the Honorable ROBERT HALE. This group has a real job to do.

SOCIAL SECURITY

After the war our older people who have done their bit in agriculture and in industry through the years should have a well-earned retirement. We must have an expanded social-security law. The record of the Republicans in support of sound social security legislation in State and Nation is one to be proud of. Social security must be expanded into larger fields and under Republican leadership we can look for further accomplishments along this line.

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

American war production is one of the marvels of the ages. The team of American labor and American management has made this production possible. Labor and management have worked together for war. If they will continue this friendship into peacetime production, it will be one of the surest guaranties that there will be prosperity.

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC WORKS

The young people of our Nation are our greatest national asset. They are our Nation's future. But they can easily become a liability. The war has interrupted the education of many young people. The war has undermined our teaching staff; many have gone into other work. The war has taken students from our colleges. The war has increased juvenile delinquency.

Education and good home environment are the foundations of democracy. Good home conditions will flow from the economic prosperity which we Republicans believe can be produced only under a system of private enterprise. It is our duty to give increased educational opportunities to our young people.

Public works must not be used as a substitute for the employment of millions of workers after the war. Unemployment should be avoided by the expansion of private business. Public works must be provided but only where the motive is the need itself, and should, as far as possible, be financed and controlled by the States, counties, and cities. The end of the war will find local governments in a better financial position than for many years. The Federal Government will have little money when the war is ended—necessary huge war expenditures—and unnecessary pre-war waste and inefficiency will have dangerously drained Federal finances. The dominance by the State and local governments in the public-works field will help restrict production only where there is proven need. It will eliminate boondoggling projects. Federal aid in this field must be kept to a minimum.

FOREIGN POLICY

We must maintain unity on foreign policy regardless of party affiliation. But unity is not a one-way street. One political party must show as great an interest in cooperating as the other. If there is any disagreement we should thrash it out quickly, and agree upon the best possible compromise.

To have a true American policy there must be friendly cooperation between the Chief Executive and the Congress, but in order to have unity on a sound basis there must be frankness and understanding on the part of the President and a willingness on the part of Congress to wholeheartedly back the program adopted.

No one is making a greater contribution in the foreign relations of this country than is Maine's United States Senator, WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr. It is a great honor to the State of Maine to have Senator WHITE minority leader of the Senate. Secretary Hull regards the Senator's opinion so highly that he invites him into many conferences where international problems are being discussed. This is a recognition of Senator WHITE's experience and understanding of foreign affairs. He is looked upon by all as an outstanding authority on communications, as a man whose objective and fine judgment is valuable in affairs of State. If we can be assured of frankness and understanding on the part of the administration and know that men like Secretary Hull and Senator WHITE are in conference on this subject week after week, we will have more confidence that we will have a true American foreign policy.

Now to turn to the business of the day. It is pleasant to meet here in Bangor, in the home city of my distinguished and able col-

league, the Honorable FRANK FELLOWS, to see old friends, renew acquaintances and make new ones. There is no way that we could spend 2 days to a better advantage. This is not a junket. This is the initial step in deciding upon our nominee for President.

I have always been proud of being a Republican, proud to know that time and time again the Republican Party has been the salvation of this country. I believe we again have the opportunity to restore confidence in our Government. I am confident that our platform will be sound and forward looking and that our Republican delegates will be men and women who will go to Chicago, not to play politics but to formulate a constructive national platform and help nominate a man who will accept his obligation and carry out the pledges of the party without reservations.

As there is danger of overconfidence to the Nation in its 1944 war effort—and I believe there is very great danger—there is the danger of overconfidence to the Republican Party in its political effort. The Republican Party is on the road to victory, but we must not allow the glamor of apparent victory to blind us. We are going to win, but we must keep our voting machinery working on all cylinders. Republicans, let us get together and select a good driver, support him to the limit, and be ready for a free and prosperous postwar world.

Federal Regulation of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the conclusion of the American Bar Association committee report on parts of the Wagner-Murray bill, S. 1161, relating to Federal regulation of medicine, and generally called the "socialized medicine bill." The committee report was, I am advised, adopted February 28, 1944, by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association. I am making the request, Mr. President, at the instance of Dr. P. T. Talbot, secretary-treasurer of the Louisiana State Medical Society. Dr. Talbot has done me the courtesy of sending me a printed copy of the complete report of the American Bar Association. The excerpt I ask to be printed is to be found on pages 19 and 20 of the reprint of the report under the subheading Conclusion.

There being no objection, the conclusion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSION

The American Bar Association is limited to an expression of opinion and judgment with respect to those fields which relate to the administration of justice and which directly affect the safeguards and protection of the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country. Under normal circumstances, therefore, it is not the function of this association to attempt to influence substantive legislation by the Congress of the United States. But when, under the pretext of the general welfare, legislation is proposed in Congress which either inadvertently or with deliberate subtlety constitutes a direct attack on the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country, it becomes the duty of this association actively to voice its objections, a summary of which is as follows:

1. Local self-government must be preserved in our Federal system. State governments directly responsible to the will of the people are best adapted to exercise such supervisory control as may be instituted over the health and medical care of our citizens.

2. S. 1161 seeks to invest in the Surgeon General, who is not an elected servant of the people and who is not amenable to their will, the power arbitrarily to make rules and regulations having the force and effect of law which directly affect every home.

3. The measure furnishes the instrumentality by which physicians for their practice, hospitals for their continued existence and citizens for their health and that of their families can be made to serve the purposes of a Federal agency.

4. The bill fails to safeguard the rights of patients, citizens, hospitals, or doctors with respect to disputes arising or rights denied through the arbitrary or capricious action of one man.

5. The bill fails to provide for any appeal to any court from the action of the Surgeon General.

6. The vicious system whereby administrative officials judge without court review the actions of their subordinates in carrying out orders issued to them is extended in this bill to a point foreign to our system of government and incompatible with the adequate protection of the liberties of the people.

The Constitution of the United States is designed to protect the citizens of this Republic in the exercise of the rights of freemen. The provisions of that instrument can be rendered impotent when our citizens, for the sake of an apparent immediate benefit, surrender to their Government such direct control over their lives that Government, by imposing a constant fear on them of having those benefits withheld or withdrawn, can compel from them obedience and subservience to its dictates.

Respectfully submitted.

W. E. STANLEY,
Chairman.
WILLIAM LOGAN MARTIN.
CLEMENT F. ROBINSON.

FEBRUARY 25, 1944.

Need for Congressional Action on Air-Line Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an article in the American Aviation Daily for May 18, 1944, which contains important information for the Members of the House to consider. The article points out that in view of the recent Supreme Court decision in Northwest Airlines, Inc., against the State of Minnesota, congressional action is necessary in order to prevent the burdensome multiple taxation upon interstate air lines authorized by that decision.

Air line attorneys, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board and one of the Nation's leading newspapers today saw in the Supreme Court decision in the Northwest Airlines tax case (Daily, May 15, 17) an invitation to Congress to establish an over-all Federal policy on the taxation of air transportation. Fear that the decision will throw open the gates to multiple taxation in many States was expressed, and one suggestion that passage of the Lea bill would solve the problem was put forward.

S. G. Tipton, counsel for the Air Transport Association, told the Daily:

"It seems to me that two important conclusions flow from this decision. The first is that the decision points the way to the imposition upon air lines of local tax burdens heavier than those of any other interstate carrier. On the basis of this decision there is a strong possibility that an air line's entire fleet may be taxed in one State and portions of it taxed again in all other States through which the air line operates. The second conclusion is that the Court apparently feels that if the decision results in burdens upon interstate commerce by air the Congress and not the Judiciary should deal with the matter."

RHYNE CHARGES INCONSISTENCY

Charles S. Rhyne, well known aviation attorney in Washington, said:

"The Court really divides 4 to 4 in its reasoning with Mr. Justice Jackson reasoning one way yet voting the other. While all the Justices agree that the air lines should pay their share of the cost of State government, they disagree as to how far the States can go in taxing air transportation.

"Mr. Justice Stone and the three who join him in his able dissenting opinion are clearly correct in their conclusion that the theory of tax apportionment which applies to railroads should apply also to air lines so as to prevent unfair multiple taxation. Mr. Justice Jackson rightly states that if Minnesota taxes all of Northwest's airplanes, no other State should be allowed to tax the same planes. He then votes in a very inconsistent manner to allow Minnesota to do the exact thing he condemns.

"Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the majority opinion seems to fail to comprehend the practical effects of his decision. He mentioned the taxes paid by Northwest on its airplanes in six mother States but then brushes those facts aside as presenting matters not before the Court, so he need not consider the multiple-tax problem, which to me is the major issue in the case. He states that the tax-apportionment theory has been 'painfully evolved in working out the financial relations between the States and interstate transportation' and that it should not be carried over into the air-transportation field, yet he offers no alternative method of preventing multiple taxation of the air lines."

OSWALD RYAN SEES STEP TOWARD FEDERALIZATION

Oswald Ryan, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, issued the following statement regarding the decision:

"The majority upheld the power of Minnesota to assess the tax upon the entire fleet of the air line, but refused to decide the question whether the other States through which the air line operated these planes had the right to tax any part of the fleet, saying that this question was not before the Court. Justice Jackson concurred in the majority decision, but thought the Court should have gone further and held that Minnesota's right to tax the fleet was exclusive. The Chief Justice dissented from the majority decision on the ground that the taxing of Northwest Airlines' fleet for their full value by Minnesota constituted an unconstitutional burden upon interstate commerce.

"The Minnesota decision leaves unsettled the question of burdensome multiple taxation. It is, nevertheless, a significant decision. The majority decision makes reference

to the power of Congress to control the taxation of interstate air lines. Justice Jackson, in a concurring opinion, points to the power of Congress to control this field of taxation, adding that Congress has not exercised its power to do so. Justice Black in a separate opinion says that "these problems call for congressional consideration and action." Thus the various opinions strongly suggest that Congress can supply the answer to a problem which, unless it is taken under control, may create a situation which many feel will make it impossible for our air lines to survive economically.

"One of the significant opinions delivered in this case was that of Justice Jackson in which he pointed out the inherent national character of air transportation. Pointing out that the high court had interpreted the commerce clause of the Constitution to lift navigable waters of the United States out of local controls and into the domain of Federal control, he stated that 'air as a navigable medium of transportation is even more inevitably federalized by the commerce clause than is navigable water.' He adds that local exactions and barriers to free transit in the air would neutralize its (that is, air transportation's) indifference to space and its conquest of time.

"This view, if accepted by the Court, would settle the present controversy over the question whether the Federal Government should exercise exclusive regulatory power over air transportation."

SAYS LEA BILL IS SOLUTION

Suggesting that passage of the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, would provide a solution to the tax problem, the Washington Post said editorially today:

"The case took to the court for the first time the question of constitutional limitations on the power of the States to tax airplanes. The court searched all the precedents and apparently found no doctrine that could be applied to vehicles of the air with full satisfaction. So it split four ways. * * *

"In our opinion the nub of the whole matter is contained in this sentence from Justice Jackson's concurring opinion: 'It seems more than likely that no solution of the competition among States to tax this transportation agency can be devised by the judicial process without legislative help.' That is certainly an invitation to Congress to step in and straighten out the mess, as could be done by a reconsideration of the pigeonholed Lea bill. Obviously, individual States cannot be permitted to tax airplane companies operating out of their borders at will. That would create chaos in aviation. Yet the courts are naturally reluctant to step in and establish special rules to govern this delicate problem of taxing air transport."

Smoke Screening the Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have shown to many of my colleagues on the floor the vicious political smear sheet put out by the C. I. O. political action group against both JOHN COSTELLO and myself. I am asking to insert in the RECORD an editorial which very aptly covers this situation:

[From the Highland Park News-Herald, Los Angeles, Calif.]

ALONG POLITICAL ROW

(Candidate publicity for May 16 primary election)

SMOKE SCREENING THE REAL ISSUE

(By Oliver B. Jaynes)

When labor lobbyists called upon Congressman POULSON in Washington before a vote was taken on the Smith-Connally bill, he was told that it would be political suicide for him to vote in favor of the measure. Nevertheless, he voted for it.

But instead of attacking him on this issue during the present campaign, and letting the voters decide how they feel about it, labor leaders put on a campaign to smear the incumbent. They say little about the real issue and try to confuse voters with a lot of trash that doesn't mean a thing. Facts are thrown to the winds. They even get so intent on defeating the official that wouldn't go along with them that they almost forget to say a few nice things about their candidate.

The smear POULSON crowd did say though that their candidate didn't have a "campaign pay roll." No pay roll, perhaps, but what a bankroll! Who is paying for all this anti-POULSON campaign propaganda? We believe it is largely labor-financed.

We do not believe, however, that labor is 100 percent back of the smear campaign. As a matter of fact, one of POULSON'S other opponents, Calvert S. Wilson, claims that the rank and file of union membership is behind him, and that the union meeting which endorsed another opponent was "stacked."

The News-Herald, as our readers know, does not make a practice of endorsing candidates. We prefer that the voters get the facts and make up their own minds. We see no reason why a person should vote for a man because he is endorsed by any newspaper. Endorsements are overdone in political campaigns, anyway.

But we do not, however, like to see a real campaign issue hidden behind a smoke screen of smear propaganda. Why can't labor come right out and ask the voters to defeat POULSON because he voted for the Smith-Connally bill? It can only be assumed by their methods that they do not think they can defeat him on this issue. So they drag a red herring across the trail; the soldier vote bill and the tax bill, for example. Does anyone think for a minute that this crowd is losing any sleep over the soldiers or the taxpayers? Don't you believe it.

There is certainly nothing wrong with labor attacking any public official for any of his acts that, in its opinion, hurts the labor cause. That is its right, especially when that official is running for reelection. But labor, or any other group, should be willing to stick to the issue and fight it out on that basis. Threats and smear campaigns should not be tolerated.

Address of Hon. James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, the Republicans of Pennsylvania met in convention under the laws of the State to elect the officers of the Republican State Committee and to make necessary assignment to the Republican National Convention.

One of the principal speakers at that convention was Senator JAMES J. DAVIS, who has enjoyed a long and distinguished career as the representative of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania on this occasion is a clear exposition of the fundamental and sound policies of the Republican Party, to whose standard he has brought lasting credit through his years of public service.

This statement by Senator DAVIS describes the stand which the Republican Party might well take on the issues of foreign relations and the various domestic problems which confront this Nation. It is a statement which can be read with great advantage by all Americans who are sincerely interested in preserving constitutional government and human freedom in America.

A member of five outstanding committees in the Senate—Finance, Foreign Relations, Naval Affairs, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and Mines and Mining—Senator DAVIS has capably represented all of the people of Pennsylvania in his efforts here, whether they come from the ranks of labor, or agriculture, of industry, or of the professions, and I am sure that one who has maintained such cordial and understanding relations with the vast multitudes of Pennsylvania citizens, both as Secretary of Labor in the Cabinet of three Presidents and as the Republican Senator of the Keystone State, is well qualified to speak in their behalf on the pressing issues and problems of the times.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I therefore include in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania before the Pennsylvania Republican State Committee in Philadelphia on May 20, 1944:

In 1932, the present administration went into power pledged to a policy of national economy and to the solution of certain fundamental economic problems.

Twelve years have passed and the problems are not solved, the ills are not cured. Temporarily obscured by the impact of war, the problems of unemployment, labor relations, the lack of balance between industry and agriculture, a sound taxing system, and proper relationships between Federal, State, and local governments, are with us yet, and they shall reassert themselves with full vigor in the very near future.

With all its vows of economy forgotten the present administration adopted the doctrine of deficit financing, and its only accomplishment in the years of peace—1933–39—was to increase the national debt from nineteen to thirty-eight billion dollars.

The good Doctor—Dr. New Deal—who was to have achieved so much has failed so miserably that even those who created have disowned him and declared him officially dead. But there is every reason to believe that the theories which the good doctor advocated still dominate and control the policies of the present administration.

Why has the present administration failed so completely in the face of the glittering

promises with which they beguile the American people? A score of detailed answers can be given to explain the failures of the present administration, but in my mind, they boil down to two:

1. The basic philosophy of the present administration is unsound. It makes the welfare of our people dependent upon illusory promises of the good life; upon centralization of all authority in Washington; upon the paternalism of a managerial clique who think they know the interests of the people better than the people themselves do; upon a concept of an economy of scarcity.

2. The administration's methods of putting such a philosophy into action are unsound, inefficient, and in complete violation of the basic democratic concepts upon which this country was founded and developed.

REPUBLICAN PHILOSOPHY

The Republican Party, like all other American people who believe in sound constitutional government, repudiates the philosophy of the present administration and rejects the methods it has used to control the affairs of our country.

We base the progress of our country on the initiative, individual integrity, and self-reliance of our people.

We believe that the Government should serve, but not control the destiny of our people.

We believe that agriculture, industry, labor, and business should plan for themselves and discover the best means of coordinating their private efforts for the good of all. No society and no economy can be effectively directed by a small handful of political planners in Washington.

We reject the idea of a scarce economy. American attainment is based on an expanding economy, and America must return to an ever-increasing production of the goods and services upon which the health, security and happiness of our people depend.

WIN THE WAR

In action, our first purpose is to win this war. We must prosecute this war to the complete and decisive defeat of all our enemies.

We must brook no compromise with those who plunged the world into this dreadful struggle. We pledge ourselves to a military victory so complete that it will thoroughly crush the war-making powers of our present enemies, and discourage aggression for all generations to come.

This means full support of the war with all the trained manpower, equipment, resources, production, money and moral forces which our great Nation can mobilize and throw into the scales of battle.

It means confidence and faith in our military and naval leaders, and no interference with their operations.

It means wholehearted cooperation with our allies in every part of the world.

These things the Republicans pledge themselves to do to the end that the scourge of war shall be driven from the world.

WIN THE PEACE

When war is ended, we are determined to win the peace. This means that we shall have to see crystal clear what the causes of war really are; and then adopt such policies and provide such instruments as will abolish future wars.

Our task is nothing less than the framing of an international order founded upon justice and right-dealing among nations to the end that war will no longer be relied upon to solve those conflicts which cause people to resort to military force.

We must find a proper working basis upon which American national interests can be harmonized with American responsibilities to the world. Our Nation cannot remain aloof from the currents of world affairs. We will cooperate with other nations and extend all possible aid to those peoples who are in need, but we will not impoverish our own people or destroy the security of our own country.

I am certain that a proper medium can be found by which we can protect our legitimate home interests and at the same time fulfill those international obligations which our world position requires of us.

If this Nation is to fulfill its international obligations in the post-war world it must not be averse to full participation in an international organization to preserve the peace. Far from being averse to full participation in such an organization, the American Nation must assume a positive and leading role in its creation.

This organization must be open to the participation and support of all nations, including those nations who now stand pitted against us in this war—after these nations become adjusted to and accept the principles of peace. No organization for peace can possibly endure or succeed which is restricted in membership or which is concerned solely with the negative problems of policing the world.

The type of organization which the world requires is one which will be directed toward positive progress. This organization must foster all the peaceful methods for settling disputes—conciliation, mediation, arbitration, and full judicial process. It must provide agencies for the solution of economic and social problems of world-wide import. It must build institutions that depend upon popular support for their primary strength.

And if it should be found that a proper world organization must be supported by positive sanctions, we shall not fail to encourage their establishment.

These are the broad outlines to which we must devote our organizing genius, to the end that the welfare of all people is enhanced and that the destructive force of war may never again engulf the world.

PRESERVATION OF THE ENDURING PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN LIFE

There is a third and probably a more pressing problem which the Republican Party must pledge itself to examine and to cure. That is the problem of restoring and strengthening the American way of life, both in its political and economic aspects.

Constitutional government is in danger of collapse in America today. The people of this Nation are greatly disturbed and resentful at the continuing invasion of their personal rights and privileges by the Government.

Recent events have caused countless numbers of our people to abandon all hope that the party in power will ever return to a government based upon a division of authority among the three branches of government as set forth in the Constitution.

Executive order and administrative command are the prime tools of government in this administration. An uncontrollable desire to create bureau after bureau, agency after agency, to more closely control the various activities of our people, has dominated the present administration since its very inception.

The Republican Party must devote itself to leading the people and institutions back into the processes of constitutional government. The Republican Party must abolish government by directive, and it must free our people from the strangling grip of rampant bureaucracy. The Republican Party must see to it that this Government once again becomes a government of laws and not of men.

In the economic realm the Republican Party and the people of America face a prodigious work, if ever this Nation is to return to sound fiscal policies and intelligent economic progress.

Today this Nation labors in the shadow of a staggering national debt. Before the war is over this debt may well exceed the astronomical figure of $300,000,000,000.

We are now on the threshold of tremendous economic adjustments in America. The post-war era will be the most crucial era in the history of our economic life.

Either we will continue the policies of deficit financing, economic scarcity, government regulation, and mounting debt, sponsored by the present administration, or we will refute those policies.

As the present administration will not of its own volition return to the paths of constitutional government, neither will it abandon the restrictive and unsound economic policies to which it has adhered these many years.

If competitive enterprise and the policy of abundance are ever to be restored in America, they must be restored by the Republican Party. If sound finance and economy in government are ever to be practiced in America, they, too, must be restored by the Republican Party.

The stand which the Republican Party must take in this important area of economic policy is abundantly clear.

1. We must pledge ourselves to the abandonment of the policy of scarcity, and carry out a vigorous policy of expanding production.

2. We must devise a national fiscal policy which will place the affairs of government on a pay-as-you-go basis, and which will provide for the gradual and businesslike retirement of the national debt.

3. Republicans must achieve and maintain a high national income to insure a strong, effective purchasing power among America's consumers.

4. We must adopt effective measures to maintain full employment for all Americans—a positive employment at high wages in the productive enterprises which contribute to the growth of the Nation—and not the negative employment at low wages in the unproductive projects of government relief.

5. We must establish a rebirth of American agriculture which will free our farmers from the restraining hand of Government regimentation and restriction.

6. We must seek to establish industrial peace in America by giving full recognition to those sound principles of industrial management and fundamental trade unionism—collective bargaining, arbitration and conciliation. If labor and mangement are to remain free, they must come together on a common ground, and they must guard against surrendering their rights and responsibilities to the central government, for such a course will lead the entire economic life of America into regimentation and slavery.

7. We must encourage (not dominate or destroy) competitive economic enterprise in America, and thus maintain freedom of opportunity for all men.

This is a program far different from that pursued by the present administration. This is a program designed to free the people and restrain the Government, not to saddle the people under the yoke of government.

The American people are prepared to make their stand for freedom now. The Republican Party must stand with them and come forward with sound policies and sound leadership in order that the American people shall not fail in this struggle against bureaucracy and against the unrestrained power of irresponsible government.

I say again that these are grave hours. But if the hour is grave, so, too, is it opportune. Our party must meet the challenge of the times. Our party must lead the people of America out of the abyss of confusion into the clear light of positive action and continuing progress.

Our party must say to America and demonstrate to the world that we stand ready to

lead this Republic into the vanguard of human progress on all fronts, that we stand ready to pursue those ideals and carry out those policies which will restore this Nation, and lead all men into a freer, more purposeful and more abundant life.

The Republican organization of this great commonwealth has been well chosen and it is well informed. I know that the delegation which Pennsylvania sends to the National Republican Convention will devote its full effort to meeting the problems of the times. I know they will select candidates who are worthy and capable of carrying out the principles and policies under which the country has grown great with Republican leadership. When we sound the call of freedom and progress, I feel sure the people of America will support us with an overwhelming victory in November.

The Stewart Pension Bill—Eliminating All Red Tape and Making Age and Citizenship the Only Requirements

REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, there is so much confusion among the old people who are drawing old-age assistance with respect to reducing their monthly allowance or striking them from the rolls that I have introduced a bill (H. R. 4545) which provides that age and citizenship shall be the only requirements for securing a pension.

Under the terms of my bill all red tape is eliminated. The proof of age and citizenship makes the applicant eligible for an equalized pension and all will receive the same amount, and then, when an old person sells a dozen eggs or hauls a load of wood to town to sell he will not be penalized by having the price of eggs or wood withheld from his monthly check.

Many cases have come to my attention of late where the sons and daughters in the armed forces have made an allotment to their father or mother drawing old-age assistance and because of this allotment they have had their old-age assistance taken away from them. The passage of my bill would make all our fathers and mothers happy and they would not live under an eternal strain of having a reduction of their monthly check for doing a little work for pay, or selling their milk and eggs, or cutting and selling wood, or any other commercial activity in which they might desire to engage.

And right here, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that just 2 days ago the House of Representatives passed a straight-out pension for the laborers who constructed the Panama Canal, and nowhere in the bill were there provisions for the reduction of their checks one single cent once proof is made that they were employees of the United States Government in the construction of the Panama Canal. As a matter of fact, all the pension laws we know anything about except the present old-age assistance law are for a definite amount when once allowed.

And then, too, my bill provides that the old folks shall receive their checks on the first day of each month, which will allow them to meet their obligations in a satisfactory and businesslike manner. The truth is that every old person in the beginning of legislation of this kind was working and fighting for a pension, not old-age assistance, and had I been a Member of Congress at that time I would have put forth every effort to have amended the original bill as H. R. 4545 provides.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced is as follows:

H. R. 4545

A bill to equalize State old-age assistance payments under the Social Security Act

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury to any State under title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, unless the State plan for old-age assistance provides that the only limitations with respect to eligibility for old-age assistance are (1) an age requirement of 65 years or more, (2) United States citizenship, and (3) a residence requirement complying with the provisions of such title I. Such old-age assistance payments within such State shall be equal in amount for every person eligible therefor, and shall be made by check to be received by every eligible person at his or her post-office address on the first day of each calendar month.

Global Phonetic Shorthand Printing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1944.*

Hon. LYLE H. BOREN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LYLE: You asked me in your letter of April 29 if I had considered the effect of phonetic printing on the economic production and competition between nations. Your question is partially answered by the experience of other nations using the phonetic alphabet in printing.

RUSSIA

Russia, in less than 2 decades, has through an educational system based on a phonetic alphabet of 35 letters, increased its national income and production over 400 percent. The Russian phonetic alphabet has abolished illiteracy and vastly increased the knowledge and intelligence of its people. It has created hundreds of thousands of technicians from illiterate people.

The evidence of what Russia has done through the phonetic alphabet is set forth with clearness by Rhys Williams in The Russian; by Hon. Joseph Davies, our Ambassador to Russia; in Mission to Moscow, by Hewlett Johnson, great engineer and dean of Canterbury in Soviet Power. With equal force the same results were convincingly set forth in the history by Davies and Steiger—Soviet Asia, covering the huge country, Kazakhstan, between Russia, China, and India.

KAZAKHSTAN

Kazakhstan, containing over a million square miles, a land of oil and cotton and of modern technique, as large as Texas, Louisians, Alabama, and Mississippi, has developed marvelously under the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic using the Phonetic alphabet. (See Soviet Asia, by Davies-Steiger, Dial Press, Inc., New York.) What Russia has done in the European Russian Republic is better known to America because American engineers employed by the Russian Government have led the way in developing water power, electricity, etc.

TURKEY

The Russian example was followed by Turkey under Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the George Washington of Turkey, by the law of November 1, 1928, Act No. 1353, by which after June 30, 1930, all books, documents, papers in the Turkish language in Turkey were required to be printed in a new Turkish phonetic alphabet of 29 letters, a copy of which alphabet is in my possession.

GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

On April 10, 1944, George Bernard Shaw, one of the greatest brains in the world, wrote to the London Times as follows: "The fact that Russia, with its 35-letter alphabet, can spell my name with two letters (Wo) instead of four may conceivably make it impossible for us to compete economically in the world with Russia." Mr. Shaw went further and stated he proposed to leave his entire estate to establish an English phonetic alphabet of 42 letters. (My petition to the Senate will show that I propose to use 36 letters and 6 compound letters, total 42 letters.)

LAUBACH PHONETIC SYSTEM

Following the example of Russia, Kazakhstan, and Turkey, in 1930, Rev. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., Christian missionary, gave the Moros of Mindanao in the Philippines a phonetic alphabet of 16 letters. With it they abolished illiteracy and opened the door wide to the knowledge of modern art and science. Laubach had an example of authority because Moses wrote the Book of Genesis with 22 phonetic letters some 2,700 years before.

The Moro success was contagious. It spread to the Philippines, to Malaya, to India, to 50 nationalities in Africa, to Jamaica, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Puerto Rico, and to various nationalities in South America.

This great work has taught over 80 nationalities to read, write, and print their own native language in the phonetic alphabet of various types under the guidance of the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature representing the cooperation of 123 foreign missionary societies. Dr. Laubach is the guiding spirit.

Over 300 local languages have abolished or are abolishing illiteracy by using each one a phonetic alphabet of his own. It is a world revolution nothing can stop.

LEPSIUS (1863)

In 1863 Professor Lepsius and the linguists of his time examined 600 languages and dialects with a view to establishing a universal alphabet by which each and every one of them could be written phonetically. See the book of Lepsius illustrating these alphabets, Standard Alphabet. Lepsius found that the primary sounds of the human voice were about 50, including all languages, but no world alphabet was ever agreed upon by any competent authority for obvious reasons then existing but which have disappeared with the airplane and radio.

The great value of the phonetic alphabet in all nations using it is that an illiterate person, young or old, can learn to read and write it in 24 hours of instruction and study.

The evidence of how this can be done is fully explained in detail in Dr. Laubach's book, The Silent Billion Speak, which I reviewed in a letter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman MONRONEY, July 8, 1943. This wonderful book tells the most brilliant story of the war on illiteracy, ignorance, poverty, and human misunderstanding.

The supreme importance of a world language to the establishment of world understanding, world abundance, and a world of peace is well understood by many informed men. The ministers of education of the United Nations have passed resolutions urging a world language following the war.

Our Army has been making great and commendable efforts to teach our soldiers, sailors, and representatives of the United States a conversational knowledge of the languages of the countries with which they are now in contact. Nearly 30 of such languages are being actively taught by printed books, by the phonograph, and employed instructors, but the Moro invention of "each one teach one" has been overlooked except by Dr. Laubach and his associates and friends teaching the Laubach system. Russia and Turkey are compulsory systems—Laubach's is voluntary. The Laubach system is working successfully and being received with enthusiasm everywhere by the common people and by their leaders.

EACH ONE TEACH ONE

When Dr. Laubach had his funds impaired by the panic of 1932, the Moros invented a method of "each one teach one," making it a point of honor that each Moro who was taught the phonetic alphabet was honor bound by an endless chain to teach another Moro until all Moros could read and write.

Enthusiastic individual Moros did not confine themselves to one Moro. Some of them taught as many as a hundred individual Moros, and it was taught in classes and rapidly spread until the Moros claimed illiteracy in Mindanao was abolished.

The same system can be now employed in using the global alphabet by printing any given language—Russian or Portuguese—in global letters in parallel lines of identical meaning so that a Portuguese child could not only read the Portuguese phonetically but with equal ease read the English or equivalent meaning and read it intelligibly. Thus one book could teach a Portuguese child and an American child the Portuguese language and the American language. A Portuguese child could pronounce the Portuguese however delicate the inflections. The American child could do the same for the Portuguese child. "Each one teach one" would thus use the eye and the ear and each one would be compensated with what he got from the other in the way of service and friendship and innumerable ties would be established between the people of Brazil and the people of the United States.

ADVANTAGES OF GLOBAL ALPHABET

The value of the global alphabet to all people: First, it can be learned in a day or two of instruction and study. Second, it can enable people to read and pronounce any language intelligibly, at sight. Third, it can thus teach conversational English to the whole world at high speed and at negligible cost. Fourth, it would be self-sustaining and self-expanding. It would require only half the paper, composition, storage, mail, and transportation costs. It would open the doors of modern knowledge to the people of every nation in the world almost immediately printed in their own native tongue on the monotype, linotype, intertype, and the typewriter. The whole world could write in shorthand their own language as well as any other language which they might know.

In abolishing illiteracy and ignorance, the income and production and creative power of every nation using it would be multiplied 5 or 10 times, enabling them to use the best modern methods of production, distribution, transportation, and by abolishing want abolish fear of want, abolish exploitation of ignorance and poverty.

Above all, it would save the children of the world many years of loss of time now employed on the Western Hemisphere and in western Europe in mastering the unphonetic orthography of English, French, German, etc. This saving of time in the life of the youth of the world is of absolutely incalculable value because such values not only are saved but they generate compound interest in the field of production, distribution, and human understanding.

In Russia inability to read and write is a civil misdemeanor. As a matter of public policy it is justified because each citizen should as a civic duty equip himself for maximum production and service through reading and writing and because he can learn to read and write Russian phonetically within a day.

To demonstrate that the global alphabet which I have invented could be employed, I submitted copies of Senate Document 133 to several hundred professors of languages in and out of our universities.

Among others, to Professor Pei and his associates, to whom the world is indebted for Languages for War and Peace, reviewing all the languages in the world of importance and teaching English-speaking people how to quickly learn such languages conversationally. Professor Pei's book was published by Vanni & Co., New York. Eleven such languages are treated in special individual books by Professor Pei and his associates. He approves in principle my global alphabet and approves the teaching of English as a world language as a means of establishing throughout the world mutual understanding, world peace, security, and abundance.

The Chinese and Japanese experts of the Office of War Information have expressed the opinion that Japanese and Chinese can be written in my phonetic alphabet. I have the testimony of other professors and men learned in the Russian language, and many other languages to like effect, but the commendation which I received from Rev. Frank C. Laubach comes from an authority which is unsurpassed on earth as to the phonetic alphabet, and he says frankly that my alphabet is the best he has seen.

To demonstrate the ease with which the global, phonetic, shorthand alphabet can be learned, I invited Mrs. Frances D. Dorman to teach it to the children in her classes in the Ben Murch School, Chevy Chase. Her children were from 8 to 10 years of age. I enclose a few lines from her as a part of my reply to you—exhibit 1. She taught 50 or 60 children to read and write the alphabet beginning with 15 to 20 minutes of instruction a day. At the end of 5 such lessons of 15 minutes each they could read the alphabet, and with some practice could write, so it is fair to say that in a few days anybody of ordinary intelligence could learn to read and write the alphabet, and with it read and pronounce intelligibly any language in the world printed in this alphabet. This is of an incalculable benefit enjoyed by no other alphabet in existence.

The matrices for the monotype machine have been ordered by me and expected about August 1, and then the printing of books by modern machinery in this alphabet can immediately begin.

In 1939 Russia published about 30,000 new books in the phonetic alphabet. These books were books of instruction to the people of 16 republics, involving one-sixth of the inhabitable land of the world and nearly 200,000,000 people. The Russian avowed objective is to surpass the per-capita production of the people of the United States.

George Bernard Shaw is right in saying that the Russian system will surpass the English system of unphonetic printing. The proof is overwhelming. Asia, Africa, eastern Europe, and the Philippines have accepted the truth of the value of the phonetic alphabet.

So impressed have I been with regard to this revolutionary movement that on February 24, 1944, I wrote to the Commissioner of Education of the United States, Mr. John W. Studebaker, calling his attention to the vital facts of this new system of educating the youth of the world. My letter was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 29 in Mr. MONRONEY'S remarks.

In a letter to me from Rev. Frank C. Laubach, he said:

"I have long since learned that the greatest single obstacle to the use of English as a universal language is its chaotic spelling. Experience in 80 languages shows that if we can adopt a phonetic spelling it will be exceedingly simple to pronounce every word correctly. We then have only the problem of acquiring the meaning of words to make English universal.

"I grow increasingly satisfied with your alphabet as I experiment with it, for I find it easy to write connected letters, and it is swift, since there is but one stroke for each letter. I believe your idea of writing above and below a line and of using curves upward, downward, and straight lines is the best ever yet devised.

"Yours for a great cause,

"FRANK C. LAUBACH."

The midnight hours from 1 to 6 of the American radio could be employed to teach the global alphabet to the whole world within a few months. The matrices of books in the global alphabet could be furnished to every nation of books printed in the global alphabet and teaching the English language to the people of every nation at a cost and at a price which would pay its own way and expand the system at the same time through the "each one teach one" plan.

My dear LYLE, we are entering a new world of knowledge and abundance through the radio and the airplane. I am devoutly thankful and deeply desire to contribute what I can to the establishment of a world of knowledge, abundance, genuine friendship, and cooperation.

With kind regards,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Picketing of the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, never was the solemnity and dignity attached to our Capitol Grounds so basely abused and so pitifully besmirched with filth and slime as when last week a bunch of Negroes, led by a few people whom God had given the privilege of belonging to the white race, engaged themselves for 3 or 4 days in what they called picketing the Senate. With pity and shame I watched big, husky, oxlike Negroes, bearing their masters' burdens, carrying

banners of condemnation of the United States Senate because its Members voted as they pleased on a measure and would not be dictated to by a bunch of New York Communists, followed by white women with similar banners.

On the first day the parade was composed of practically all Negroes, but each day the whites increased and the Negroes decreased, until on the last day there were scarcely any Negroes. After looking at the whites and analyzing their nationality and character as best I could from their appearances, it occurred to me that the Negroes became ashamed of the company they were keeping and quit.

This demonstration was in protest of the Senate vote on the anti-poll-tax measure. It is common knowledge that this disgraceful spectacle was organized and executed by the Communists' interest in New York and for the deliberate purpose of exciting more feeling and hatred between the races. This bunch of prostitutes of freedom and justice have no means of boring into the heart of this democracy except through minority groups whom they can excite by claiming to have for their purpose the correction of wrongs, or imaginary wrongs, that they claim such groups have been subjected to by the majority. It is nothing short of tragic to see the Negro people and some labor organizations taken in by this gang of destroyers. If they are not stopped in their efforts, and are permitted to communize this country, labor and the Negro will suffer hardships and deprivations unknown to the slave system before the Civil War. Every move they make is toward a dictatorial power under which the common people always have and always will become serfs and slaves.

I would like to here and now warn the Negro, and, for that matter, all the people, that you may accept this bunch of destroyers as a Moses who will lead you out of the wilderness, but in the years to come you will realize that they are the monsters that blinded you with deceit and moved you on your own power from the beauties and blessings of a free land into a state of serfdom with all its horrors and pains. You will condemn yourself; your posterity will look back through the pages of history and damn you for the chains you shackled them with. Why cannot you see your shadow falling across the path of progress in this beautiful garden of democracy and enjoy its flowers without destroying them?

When I looked down from my window on this ugly sight, I would think of the dreadful price to be paid for the few dollars those pitiful specimens of humanity were getting to walk up and down the sidewalks around our State buildings carrying ugly and disrespectful banners. I thought of the boys in the fox holes and on the battle fronts under heavy fire, and being swallowed up by the waters of the seven seas, dying to preserve and extend what these human carcasses were trying to destroy.

I thought of the hours these miserable creatures were wasting which were sorely needed to produce needed equipment and supplies to help those who were then facing an early call to invasion when blood will run like the waters of a flood, and souls will be thrown into eternity by the thousands per second. Oh, miserable creatures, cannot you feel the blood of these boys rushing over and burning your bodies in condemnation of your filthy acts? How can you ever face one who has fought for you?

This dastardly demonstration was sponsored and paid for by those of the same stripe that met in the name of their organization, and demanded the resignation of Senator BILBO as chairman of the Senate District Committee because he had spoken in favor of white supremacy.

It was rather interesting that a disabled World War veteran fell in line and marched with this bunch of bums carrying a banner with these words, "BILBO for President," inscribed thereon. At first thought I wondered why they did not throw him out of formation, knowing how they hated Senator BILBO. It then occurred to me that from their appearances none of them could read the English language. I noticed by the press that this gang of un-American bigots met in New York last week and dissolved the Communist Party to which their secretary, Earl Browder, has given much publicity. Let me warn the American people that you had better get on your guard. When a skunk takes on a robe of purity he is just beginning to stink. When the deadly serpent hides in the grass and conceals himself, he is just fixing to strike and pour his deadly venom into the blood streams of his prey, and this is what this gang of outlaws are fixing to do to our form of government. They realize the strength they have built up, they think they are ready for the kill, and they have shrouded themselves with this pretense to throw our people off their guard.

If this democracy is to be saved America must wake up. I have through the years warned you, and if our people will not accept the warning, your children and mine cannot damn me for the living hell your slumber and cowardice has condemned them to.

Managers Told Labor, Capital Must Face Self-Rule or Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 19, 1944:

MANAGERS TOLD LABOR, CAPITAL MUST FACE SELF-RULE OR RUIN

Labor and industry were challenged yesterday by William H. Davis, W. L. B. chairman, to build up their own structure of "collective bargaining and mutual understanding" if they would bring an end to Government controls after the war.

"Industry and labor will never develop their leaders by looking to the Government for an answer to their problems," Davis said, speaking before the final session of a 2-day forum of the Society for Advancement of Management, in the Statler Hotel.

WARNS OF TREND

He warned both industry and labor against letting the Government carry on the burden of leadership in labor-management relations, saying that extensive Federal regulations of such relations, particularly as to wages, may well mean regulation of all phases of our economic life.

Turning to disputes between both camps, Davis urged that both increase efficiency of present grievance machinery and make the most of their current agreements.

"Both sides should live up to their contracts," he declared. "Both should abide by the spirit of their agreements," adding that mutual agreements should be specific in what is included and excluded through collective bargaining.

SMALL BUSINESS WOES TOLD

The plight of small businesses was spotlighted by Maury Maverick, Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation, and W. P. B. Vice Chairman.

Most small business, Maverick said, die like children abandoned in war, because of inadequate capital investment, lack of management advice, and the heavy impact of taxation.

He urged financial assistance for the little fellows in order that production of war essential civilian goods could be started now, or at least planned, in factories where management, manpower, and raw materials are available and not needed for war production.

Maverick recommended that financing be accomplished through standard free-enterprise banking, averring that 85 percent "of our banks are themselves small businesses."

STRENGTH IN NUMBERS

A strong peacetime economy can be built, he declared, by assisting the little man with technological advice and aid, giving him access to surplus properties and material and by assisting little prime and subcontractors in contract terminations, now and through the reconversion period.

"Small business can be helped," Maverick said, "by arranging production adjustments during the war."

Needed now, he said, and capable of being produced by small business, are clothing, kitchen utensils, sheets, washing machines, farm equipment, house-repair supplies, tools, and spare parts.

Typically American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by Dezauche—himself, publisher of the Sweet Sheet, about a soldier in my home town, Opelousas, La., and which I am sure will be of interest as this is so typically American. The article follows:

Got a barber shop down here on Main Street where I go to shave quite often—the shop is just like the shop in thousands of small towns all over the old U. S. A., kind of a spot where lots of folks meet and

rake the folks of the town over the coals. Presidents are elected, generals and admirals are made and remade every day, battle strategy that can't miss is shaped up here from opening to closing hours. Lots of kidding and kibitzing, and a jolly good place to pass a little time while waiting for your whiskers to be pulled out or make a blood donation to the barber.

Well, there used to be a fellow in this shop that would get me down and pull 'em out and I'd raise H—— about the way I suffered so that he could make a living, and the more I talked the more I'd get sliced—so suffer in silence wasn't a bad idea. Well, this boy disappeared for about 18 months—we'd hear from him like we did all the other boys. He was a handsome fellow, tall, black hair, fine personality, but just another fellow. A couple of weeks ago he came back, pretty well shot up, shrapnel all over his once perfect physique, about 4 inches of bone out of one arm, and no more the sound body that once was his, mind off the peaceful pursuits of life. For this boy, Lee Cormier, landed at Salerno and made it safe until his patrol tackled the hill at Cassino, and he was the only one who survived. It was a volunteer mission, took a stout heart and one unafraid to step forward; for hours he lay there bleeding, praying, with thousands of thoughts flitting through his mind, saved by the skill of our medical attachments and that precious blood plasma. Blood from some American went to the front to save this fellow, for, as he put it, "If it hadn't been for that blood plasma I wouldn't be back here today." And so this barber boy that shaved me so many times was up there on the front fighting and suffering so that I might continue to go to this same barber shop and go through what I called suffering. Well, when Lee comes back he can pull 'em out one at a time and I'll never say a word about it. No, sir; I'll take it on the chin and suffer in silence, for when men can go through such Hell as those places are, the least we can do is keep our traps shut, for we don't know what hardships are.

Fellows like this boy come from your town, too, and it might have been the blood donor from your town that saved this boy so that he might come back to us, and we hope those of us who gave will save the boys from your town—but let's give again and again.

Potatoes: Forgive me for inserting a commercial here, but we are really moving some Louisiana triumphs now—and they are arriving good, satisfying, and getting repeat business. Need I say more to you fellows who want to make a little dough and are having trouble?

Next time I'm going to tell you about an Opelousas boy that has made all the papers—his picture was perhaps in your town paper. These American boys are really go-getters, and you never can tell how much man is wrapped up in those kid skins until the test comes—they make good every time.

Guess I better get those diversions attended to or some of you guys will say your car missed the boat. As ever,

DEZAUCHE (himself).

Minnesota Plans Prayers for D-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Minnesota are among those taking the lead in the movement spreading through this great Christian Nation for a solemn hour of prayer when the announcement is made that our American and the British forces have started the invasion of continental Europe.

It will be no day of celebration. That will come later. It must be a day when on our bended knees we ask Almighty God to direct and protect our boys fighting for a Christian cause and against the evil forces who have attempted to place themselves in the position of the Divine Being and to erase from their sphere any semblance of Divine authority.

This special hour of prayer is not at all new. Innumerable instances of prayer for the forces fighting for right may be found in the Bible.

Mr. Speaker, an example which other cities might well follow is one set by the board of directors of the Civic and Commerce Association of Fergus Falls, Minn., which is in the Ninth District of Minnesota, which I represent in Congress. Their plan is outlined in their public announcement which follows:

The board of directors of the Civic and Commerce Association respectfully request—

The suspension of all business and manufacturing in Fergus Falls and the holding of services for 1 hour following the announcement of the invasion by our armed forces and allies if this announcement comes during business hours.

That each business, office, service, etc., close its doors for that hour to permit each person to join in special prayer service at his or her own church, or in his or her home.

That all flags be on full display throughout the day in both residential and business districts.

The hour of invasion will be announced in Fergus Falls by three long blasts of the fire siren at half minute intervals.

This will be a solemn day in the history of our Nation, in the life of our community and in the hearts of our citizens. It is not a day for rejoicing.

As the men and women of our community join those of other communities and our allies in the march on Berlin, our thoughts will be serious, our prayers will be sincere and heartfelt.

Pastors of all Fergus Falls churches will announce to each congregation or parish their plans for special prayer services on D-day. Church doors will be open continuously for silent or special prayer.

Fergus Falls business will cease for an hour in order that united prayer and thought may be with our fighting forces to victory.

Additional Support for the Hawkes Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, additional support for Senate bill 1737 by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. HAWKES, is emphasized in the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of last Thursday. Senator HAWKES' bill would require the Federal Government to compensate local taxing districts for the full amount of tax revenue losses suffered from Federal property purchases for war purposes since the emergency declaration of September 8, 1939:

One of the problems with which many New Jersey municipalities and their taxpayers, as well as those of other States, are confronted results from land-tax exemptions caused by Federal acquisition of property, which of necessity means that this loss in taxes will have to be made up by the property in the district remaining in private ownership.

This condition is especially prevalent in our own State, as the Federal Government, for war reasons, has taken over much property for the development of bases, ports, and other purposes incidental to the carrying on of the war. Hoboken presents a convincing example of this, for during World War No. 1 the Government took over—and still retains—that city's choicest water-front property, with the result that the municipality has lost $12,000,000 in taxes over the 25-year period. Similar conditions prevail in Monmouth, Burlington, and other counties.

We all realize that the Government would not take over this land unless it was necessary, but most taxpayers feel that the cost of the war should be borne by all citizens of the Nation and that local taxpayers should not be forced to pay increased levies because of tax exemptions forced by Federal acquisition of property in their municipalities.

A remedy for this is provided by a bill introduced by Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES, of New Jersey, known as Senate bill No. 1737, which would require the national government to compensate local taxing districts for the full amount of tax revenue losses suffered from Federal property purchases for war purposes since the emergency declaration of September 8, 1939. War imposes necessary hardships, but in a democracy these should be equally borne by the American people as a whole, instead of by a community of taxpayers who happen to live in an area where the Nation needs a military establishment.

In view of the fact that the present situation is obviously an unfair one, and may affect many other sections of the State and country as the war progresses, it would be well for citizens to urge upon their representatives in Congress strong support for the enactment into law of the Hawkes measure, for it is obviously a remedy which will relieve taxpayers who are carrying a burden which should be shared by the people of the whole country.

Congress at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald, of May 19, 1944:

CONGRESS AT ITS BEST

When the House or the Senate goes nonpolitical and gives nonpartisan attention to a subject of national importance the debates are usually admirable. Comparing them with discussions in the House of Commons, or those in Washington during the days of Webster and other giants of the past, many

a reader must lay down the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a feeling of gratification that broad problems have been studied and expounded so thoroughly and conscientiously. To take a specific example, the debate in the House a few days ago on flood control shows that Chamber at its best.

Although a great deal has been said about the inadvisability of damming Vermont's West River, the most important tributary of the Connecticut, the problem affects other portions of New England vitally. As Representative CLASON of Massachusetts, a member of the Flood Control Committee, pointed out, in an exhaustive excellent speech: "Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut have suffered heavily from the ravages of the Connecticut River. Today it is one of the few basins of comparable size in the United States without adequte flood protection." The floods of 1927, 1936, and 1938 caused an expense of about $144,000,000, took 28 lives, and occasioned a great deal of hardship and heavy local expense. This situation, paralleled in various parts of the country, is what Congress proposes to correct. The engineers have been studying the matter for years and now the time has come to do something substantial.

The weakness of the case made by Congressmen PLUMLEY of Vermont, FISH of New York, and one or two others is made obvious by the debate. State rights will not be endangered. No power octopus is lurking in the Green Mountains. There is no insidious, unholy plot to "federalize and control the raindrops, the fog, and the dew," as Congressman PLUMLEY declared, or to "beat God" and "stop God" and defy "Nature's God." Congress is engaged, belatedly, in carrying out projects of the kind which President Theodore Roosevelt urged a generation ago. Once they understand the facts, residents of the four New England States which have been at the mercy of the overflowing Connecticut will applaud the House. They will be grateful to Representative CLASON and the committee chairman, Congressman WHITTINGTON of Mississippi, for their broad comprehension of our need and their impressive presentation of the people's case.

Little Steel Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted at a meeting of the city council, city of Lynn, Mass., April 25, 1944:

Whereas in the spring of 1942, President Roosevelt gave to Congress and the country his seven-point stabilization program covering wages and salaries, profits, taxes, and cost of living and announced for the specific purpose of stabilization of the war economy; and

Whereas stabilization of wages and salaries was established by the War Labor Board by setting general wage ceilings at 15 percent above Bureau of Labor Statistics January 1, 1941, figures, and known as the Little Steel formula; and

Whereas, the freezing of wages and salaries was an integral part of the seven-point program with the promise that the cost of living would be stabilized accordingly; and,

Whereas the cost of living has continued to rise, due mainly to the failure of Congress and administrative agencies to control the national economy to conform with the principle of the seven-point program; and,

Whereas this failure to conform leaves only wages and salaries frozen at 15 percent, compared with a 23.4 percent United States Bureau of Labor Statistics rise and a 43.5 percent rise, according to labor's special committee on cost of living; and,

Whereas every worker, both manual and white-collar, in war industries and in every other economic endeavor for which salaries and wages are paid in the community, is affected by this freeze edict: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Lynn, in meeting assembled, records itself as appealing to President Roosevelt, Senators Walsh and Weeks and Congressmen Lane and Bates, and Chairman Davis of the National War Labor Board, to do their utmost to abolish the 15 percent Little Steel formula or so modify it that wage and salary adjustments can be made in conformity with the true increased cost of living.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell in the Washington Times-Herald of May 23, 1944:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

"I sometimes think that never blows so red
The rose as where some buried Caesar bled."
—*Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam.*

The inevitable title for any report on recent political moves on the fourth-term front must be—"So Red the Roosevelt."

Within the last week, the present White House occupant has become the '44 Presidential choice of Mr. Earl Browder's Communist following; of Mr. Sidney Hillman's well-bank-rolled C. I. O. Political Action Committee; and of both wings of the radical American Labor Party.

And with the White House nomination already handed to F. D. R. by these groups all that now remains for the bleeding Caesars of the ancient Democratic Party is to wrap their togas about their heads; meet political extinction bravely at the Chicago convention, and gasp out a formal endorsement of the White House candidate picked by Browder, Hillman, Dubinsky, and the other chieftains on the left.

Now gulping down a Communist White House dish and saying they like it will be very grim business for some of the ancient democratic worthies and will sit vilely on their political stomachs.

But we can see no escape for them. The Democrats ordered this Roosevelt table d'hote back in '40 when they went for the third-term "draft."

And if they smacked their lips over the appetizer, there's no reason why they should gag now over the '44 main course.

As a matter of fact, the situation of the old-time Democrats is no more embarrassing than that of F. D. R. when he faces the task of writing out an acceptance speech graciously welcoming the Communist and Red endorsement.

Just 3 years ago, as we remember, Mr. Roosevelt could look across the White House lawn and see the parading followers of Mr. Earl Browder picketing the White House and carrying banners denouncing F. D. R.'s foreign policy and howling to the heavens of Washington that the brawl in Europe was a "capitalist war" and our good lord Franklin was hell-bent for shedding the blood of the American workingman on foreign soil.

Of course, those were the days when Pal Joey in the Kremlin and Hitler were buddies and the pair of them were digesting the remains of a neatly carved up Poland.

And that was also the time when the Federal gendarmes tossed Comrade Browder in the hoosegow for a little passport monkey business.

Now to make a speech of acceptance, welcoming the support of Brother Browder and his followers, might be a difficult task for many White House aspirants but we will lay dollars to doughnuts that F. D. rises to the occasion.

And we haven't the slightest doubt but that those ringing words of virtuous denunciation which F. D. R. intoned from the White House when Pal Joey jumped on "brave little Finland" will be glossed over, now that the Communists with United States ballots in their hands have seen the Roosevelt fourth-term light.

Of course, that was a pretty savage judgment that F. D. R. passed when he declared, in those days:

"The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, known to you and known to all the world, is a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world.

"It has invaded a neighbor (Finland) so infinitestimally small that it could do no injury to the Soviet Union, and that seeks only to live in peace as a democracy, and a liberal and forward-looking democracy at that."

Well, things certainly have been changed since those days. We even remember F. D. R. winding up his third-term campaign among his Hudson Valley neighbors and proclaiming at the cross road that his '40 drive for the White House would be his final Presidential campaign.

Paterson, N. J., Salutes Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Paterson, N. J., one of America's greatest defense cities, remembered Maritime Day last Monday and the Paterson Evening News of that date paid the following editorial tribute to the courage, fortitude and devotion of the thousands of loyal officers and men of our merchant marine, who are doing so much to bring about victory for the Allied Nations in this war:

America today celebrates National Maritime Day and pays deserved and earned tributes of memory and honor to the loyalty, courage, and fortitude of the 140,000 merchant marine officers and men who perform their vitally important task of delivering the goods to our men on the fighting fronts of the world, regardless of danger, hardship, or privation.

Paterson has a special interest in the celebration of this day.

Under the flag of the United States Maritime Commission, the liberty ship *Edward B. Haines,* named for the founder of the News and the Call, is out on a wartime mission on one of the seven seas.

Our own Congressman, GORDON CANFIELD, is a member of the House Maritime Commission, which controls the destinies in Congress of the merchant marine, and Mr. S. W. Richards, of Ridgewood, N. J., is public-relations consultant for the United States Maritime Commission, and has just completed an important and outstanding job in supplying the newspapers of the Nation with the finest, most complete, and most interesting general publicity for Maritime Day which has ever been issued from Washington.

The United States today celebrates its rebirth as a maritime nation and hails the approaching victory in the battle of the supply lines.

Maritime Day observances are being held in scores of coastal cities and inland shipyards as a tribute to the brave and intrepid men who sail the world's greatest merchant fleet, the men and women who build it, and the 5,000 who have died in its wartime service.

The ceremonies have an added keynote—the determination, already voiced by the Maritime Commission, to keep this country in the forefront of the world's seafaring peoples.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago today the merchant ship *Savannah* dropped down the muddy red waters of the Savannah River under steam power and set out for Liverpool on history's first ocean crossing by a vessel carrying a steam engine. Today honors that event and also honors, by virtue of an act of Congress, the American merchant marine, grown suddenly under the forcing fires of the war to the largest carrying fleet in the world. The native enterprise and technical ingenuity exemplified in the *Savannah* have not always been applied, over the last century, to the business of ocean shipping, but they were still available in the last war, when abruptly we needed them, and they have been available in this war to create an astounding system of maritime transportation, moving huge armies with all their intricate paraphernalia over colossal distances and supplying them with the mountains of food, ammunition, gasoline, and equipment which they consume—all on a scale unknown in the long history of the ocean highways.

It is a less romantic achievement than that of our globe-circling airways, but quite as remarkable in its way. It is compounded out of many things—the courage of the crews who have fulfilled their civilian tasks what was often the front line of military action, the labors of the shipyard workers, the skills and energy of the operating companies, the industrial managers, the designers, and the training schools.

The stretches of sea being covered are enormous. The supplies for the armed forces are immeasurable and incredible to the layman. Day after day and year after year the convoyed merchant ships are feeding, clothing, and arming, and are furnishing countless instruments, vehicles, machines, material of all sorts to our widely scattered forces. And we mustn't forget in the cargo the passengers. Millions of fighting men have been transported to ports of new strange names which appear in the news every day.

How often have we read of their dangers, of their battles for life in waves flaming with oil, of their long exposure on rafts to hunger and thirst, of their rescue in extremity or their death. It is indeed most fitting that America was silent for the minute after 11 this morning in memory of our merchant seamen dead in the service of their country and in prayer to God for the safety of those surviving.

Resolution of Chicago City Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the city council of the city of Chicago at a meeting held recently adopted a resolution requesting that any veterans' hospital or hospitals for the Chicago area be located within the confines of the city, convenient to mass transportation. It is stated that in many instances large veterans' hospitals have been located at sites far removed from population centers with very inadequate transportation facilities. The resolution follows:

Whereas it is recognized that additional veterans' hospital facilities will be required in large metropolitan cities such as Chicago, which has contributed so fully of its young-man power to the war effort; and

Whereas the past practice of locating these hospitals at sites removed from the centers of population has been a cause of complaint from patients and their relatives and friends, because of the travel distance involved, and the difficulties of reaching such locations; and

Whereas, there are a number of sites within the limits of the City of Chicago which are suitable for this purpose and which are adjacent and easily accessible to local street car and bus lines; and

Whereas, it is understood that the Federal Works Agency is now giving consideration to the required number and most suitable sites for the construction of additional veterans' hospitals as a post-war program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the city council of the City of Chicago hereby requests the Federal Government to locate and erect one or more adequate and modern veterans' hospitals, together with all necessary and desirable appurtenances, within the confines of the City of Chicago; and, be it further

Resolved, That any site so decided upon be located convenient to the local mass transportation system of the City of Chicago; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the City Clerk to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and to each member of the Congress from the State of Illinois.

Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following poem entitled "Mother's Day," by John "Kerry" Finnegan, which appeared recently in the Irish Echo, New York:

MOTHER'S DAY

Don't forget your mother as you have but one,
And one is all you'll ever have until life's work is done,
Of friends you may have many and you may love one another,
But you can depend on one true friend—Mother, yes your mother.

Just think what she suffered at the hour of your birth,
And how that mother fondled you when you came upon this earth,
She toiled so hard just for you and never ceased to pray
That the good Lord would watch you and guide you on your way.

She nursed you and she cared for you since you were one hour old,
You were more precious to her than your weight in gold,
You spoiled her sleep—yes, many a night and took her time by day,
Now don't forget that mother, today and every day.

Mother was so kind to you, so kind in every way,
When you were very little she taught you how to pray,
She dressed you, sewed and washed for you, she loved you like no other,
No wonder then we name a day in honor of that mother.

When you first started off for school, your mother took you there,
She washed your little hands and face and your breakfast did prepare,
She also fixed your lunch for you in that good old-fashioned way,
So don't forget your mother—remember Mothers' Day.

She smiled and looked so happy, she was proud and why—
When time for you to graduate, her heart was full of joy,
She knew you were growing big, bigger every day,
And you had your mother's blessing as for you she'd always pray.

Now when you started your first job, Mother was so proud,
She watched you round the corner go and said good-bye so loud,
She waited for your coming home, and she, too, had toiled all day,
Now don't forget your mother when she is old and gray.

Should cares and troubles come your way, of course you'd seek relief,
Mother's always willing to bear part of your grief.
How patiently she'd talk to you and soothing words would say,
So let's remember Mother—make all days Mother's Day.

There's no love like a mother's love we all should bear in mind,
And there's no friend who could ever be so loving or so kind,
So always try to help her, and you to God should pray
That He watch over your dear, kind mother until the judgment day.

We may be far apart just now, three thousand miles or more,
But mother's love is just as strong as in days before,
A mother's love is a blessing we've often heard folk say,
Now let us honor Mother, today and every day.

—*John "Kerry" Finnegan.*

Avoid Politics, O. P. A. Aides Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 19, 1944:

AVOID POLITICS, O. P. A. AIDES TOLD—OR ELSE LOSE JOBS, IS BOWLES' WARNING

Price Administrator Chester Bowles last night ordered some 258,000 paid and volunteer O. P. A. employees and officials throughout the country to keep hands off the forthcoming national elections or face instant dismissal.

He said he soon will issue a written warning against political activities to all State and local O. P. A. workers, as well as those employed in headquarters here. After they read these instructions, he said, "there won't be any doubt in their minds about what will happen to them if they don't obey."

Bowles said that his office has sought repeatedly to impress upon O. P. A. personnel the absolute necessity of remaining aloof from political controversies and campaigns because of the politically vulnerable position they hold in the various communities.

"I feel, however, that it is important on the eve of a national election to spell out our position so that Republicans as well as Democrats see plainly where we stand—on the sidelines," he declared.

Bowles, a Democrat, said he took over the helm of O. P. A. with the "distinct understanding by all hands" that he would not engage in political activities, and that his agency was not to be considered a part of any political network.

With this understanding, he said, he has been guided in making O. P. A. appointments and promotions solely by the standard of ability and not by the political yardstick.

Four Freedoms and the Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April issue of the Washington News Digest:

FOUR FREEDOMS AND THE POLES
(By A. N. Butterfield)

What has happened to the "four freedoms" so far as the brave people of Poland are concerned.

According to the United States Bureau of the Census of our foreign born population, as reported in the 1944 edition of the World Almanac, Poles rank fourth in numbers in the United States with Italians, Germans, and Russians ranging first, second and third in respective order. To politicians in the limited number of localities where the Polish vote might be considered a factor, the plight of Poland, if Mr. Stalin is to have his way, is a matter of real concern. However, this writer sees the issue from a much broader viewpoint than politics. To him it is a matter of whether the "four freedoms" on their first test, are to prove mere political oratory, or whether the promise is truly to be performed.

One should not censure Mr. Churchill for expressing sympathy with Mr. Stalin's view on the Polish-Russian border issue. Britain has a relatively small Polish population and England's Prime Minister has a wholesome respect for Mr. Stalin's intention to run things pretty well as he pleases on matters concerning countries adjacent to the Soviet Union. No, Mr. Churchill will not jeopardize what he views as much larger issues, from England's standpoint, by standing on the letter of the promised "four freedoms." With the President, it is another matter. He made the promise and thoughtful Poles, except for those who can be bought with political plums, will expect to see the promise fulfilled.

One can understand how the Polish people feel to see the country for which they fought so bravely become the victim of power politics; to have part of their soil taken from them and then be supposedly compensated by receiving some territory from their defeated enemy, regardless of the wishes of the population now occupying the territory so gained.

Poland's record in this war is inspiring. Not only has it 100,000 trained soldiers in the Near East and 50,000 in England alone ready for the invasion of the second front; it contributed 12,000 flyers to the grim battle of Britain; it is fighting side by side with our American fighting men in Italy; it fought magnificently in the Battles of Narvik and Tobruk. It is one of the oldest democracies of Europe, and while Mr. Stalin has objected to men now serving with the Polish Government in exile, now in London, these are the elected representatives of the Polish people and until others are chosen, have the confidence of the people of Poland.

It seems the fate of America, whenever she goes to war on the side of justice and idealism, to find, when peace is declared, that many of the promises of American politicians, turn into mere scraps of paper. We come to learn that when it comes to European politics, we are star-gazing amateurs. President Wilson found it so. That appears, too, to be the future fate of President Roosevelt.

Perhaps we have promised too much in the "four freedoms." It should not be so. Perhaps they were well-intentioned phrases which did not take into consideration that stark and brutal realism actuate the policies of the leaders among our allies; that, after all, countries are like individuals, each seeking to place his country's interest first. A realist can find no fault in that but one can sometimes wish that America might itself learn to think first of its own interests and remember that only grief and disappointment may come from promising too much with too little grim determination to see it through.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from a prominent newspaper publisher in Cambria County, Pa., concerning boys of 18 years of age, who have been drafted into the service and who have not been given the promised adequate training before being sent overseas. This letter is typical of many such communications which I am receiving from worried mothers and fathers throughout my congressional district. This is an alarming situation.

The letter follows:

CAMBRIA COUNTY, *May 15, 1944.*
Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARVE: On February 14 my son, Richard, 18 years old, was taken out of high school and drafted into the Navy. On that day he left home for Sampson, N. Y. He was there 5 weeks, given a 7-day furlough, returned there, and after a day was sent to the receiving station in Brooklyn, N. Y.

On Easter Sunday, less than 2 months after he was drafted into the service, he was sent overseas. In a letter I have just received from him, postmarked May 5, less than 3 months after he was put into the service, he states that he had been taken from Scotland to England and placed on an L. S. T. ship, *No. 382.*

My terrifying concern naturally is whether this represents the adequate training our boys were promised by the military that they shall receive before being sent overseas. It seems more to me like a determination that the teen-age boys are being looked upon as something only to be liquidated.

Sincerely yours.

Servicemen's Benefits—Insurance Paid According to Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Vernon County Broadcaster, of Viroqua, Wis., May 11, 1944:

WASHINGTON NEWS FROM OUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—INSURANCE PAID ACCORDING TO AGE

It is appropriate that my people be informed as to just what dependents and next of kin of veterans are entitled to as a result of the loss of a son, a daughter, a husband, or a father. If a casualty visits your family or your immediate neighborhood, you ought to know the rights of certain relatives. Basically, there are four money benefits, as follows:

1. A 6-month gratuity payment. This payment is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran; or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. This 6-month gratuity is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. If unmarried, he must designate beforehand that the parents or brothers or sisters receive the 6-month gratuity payment. As a result, it might be well to advise the unmarried man

in service to designate his parents or brothers and sisters to receive this payment. If this is not done, the parents or brothers and sisters are not eligible for this payment.

The amount of the gratuity payment depends on the rank of the serviceman. For example, if the casualty is a private, it is $300. If he is a corporal, it is $396. If he is a sergeant, it is $468. The payment is 6 times the monthly base pay of the man or woman in the service. This payment is made in addition to insurance and is payable even if the serviceman has no insurance.

2. Monthly insurance payments: This insurance is not paid in a lump sum. It is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary. On a $10,000 policy a beneficiary under 30 years of age will receive $55.51 a month for 240 months. A beneficiary over 30 years of age will get a guaranteed 120 equal installments—and if they survive beyond 120 months, it is paid for life. The amount paid to beneficiaries over 30 depends on their age. The older the beneficiary, the higher the monthly payment. The serviceman can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, parents, brother, or sister, including those of halfblood.

PENSIONS, BACK PAY EXPLAINED

Besides, the 6-month gratuity payment and the monthly insurance payments benefits to veterans and their dependents include pensions and arrears in service-personnel pay. A pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible and children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school at the time of death. If the child marries before 18 or 21, he or she is not eligible for this pension.

Parents who have been dependent upon the serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are receiving a pension. One parent, $45 a month, two parents $25 each. A widow under 50 gets $45. In addition she receives $10 per month for the first child up to 10 years of age. She also receives $15 per month for each child between 10 and 18 and this continues up to 21 years of age if the child is in school.

It is important to note that a widow, a child, or parent receives the insurance payments, if a policy has been taken out by the enlisted man, in addition to getting a pension. Both may be collected, the pension and the insurance.

BACK PAY

Arrears of pay is a possibility sometimes overlooked. When a casualty occurs, there is always a chance the veteran has back pay due him. When men are at the front, there is always the possibility they may have missed several pay days. All this back pay is paid directly to the next of kin. Inquiries should always be made about possible arrears of pay so it can be collected by those entitled to it.

In the event there should be any difficulty in getting these payments from the Government, see your County Veterans Service Officer, or write me, Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Montgomery Ward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Ernest Lindley and Marquis Childs from the Washington Post of May 24, 1944:

MONTGOMERY WARD

(By Ernest Lindley)

WORKERS IN CIVILIAN INDUSTRIES

The practical question at the heart of the recent Montgomery Ward (Chicago) case has been set forth succinctly by Chairman Davis of the War Labor Board. It is whether workers outside the direct war industries are to be relieved of the no-strike pledge. If the employees of Montgomery Ward in Chicago were not subject to the no-strike pledge then, according to Mr. Davis' estimate, approximately 15,500,000 other employees engaged in distribution, transportation, and various service trades also would be exempt.

Most of these workers are engaged in supplying civilians. Civilians who work in war plants have to be fed, clothed, and transported. So do the farmers who produce the food supply. And so do the civilians who provide the things needed by war workers and farmers. Suppose that these 15,500,000 workers were to go on strike—all of them, or 10,000,000, or 5,000,000, or 2,000,000 of them? Does anyone suppose that the war effort would not be seriously affected?

Some civilian activities are less essential than others. Some are not essential at all to the prosecution of the war. But, in general, distribution of the necessities of life is essential. And certainly the supplying of automotive accessories and motorized equipment to farmers is essential. Montgomery Ward is not a night club.

If the workers in wholesale and retail distribution and in various civilian services are to be held to the no-strike rule, they must have machinery for adjusting their differences with their employers. In the more important cases in which conciliation fails, the War Labor Board provides this machinery. The Board has been unanimous in considering Montgomery Ward within its jurisdiction.

The War Labor Disputes Act empowers the President to back up the War Labor Board by taking possession of mines, plants, and facilities engaged in manufacture or production. It may be that Congress did not intend that the President should have the power to seize facilities engaged in distribution of essentials to civilians. That certainly was the opinion of Sewell Avery.

But if Congress did not intend that, it left a dangerous gap in the law. For it said, in effect, that strikes on the part of some 15,000,000 workers were all right.

In the opinion of the Attorney General, the gap is so obvious and so dangerous that the President has the power to fill it without express authorization of Congress. In this connection, it may be worth noting that on May 9 Federal Judge MacSwinford, of the western district of Kentucky, held that even without an act of Congress the President has the power to seize a plant to prevent or stop an interruption in production essential to the war.

Judge MacSwinford said:

"The President has no power to declare war; that belongs exclusively to Congress. But when war has been declared and is actually existing, his functions as Commander in Chief become of the highest importance and his operations in that connection are entirely beyond the control of the legislature. There develops upon him by virtue of his office a solemn responsibility to preserve the Nation and it is my judgment that there is specifically granted to him authority to utilize all the resources of the country to that end."

In this instance, the seized properties belonging to the Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corporation were engaged directly in war production. But Judge MacSwinford quoted with approval the Attorney General's recent opinion: "The fact that the initial impact of these disturbances is on the production or distribution of essential civilian goods is not a reason for denying the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the power to take steps to protect the Nation's war effort. In modern war the maintenance of a healthy, orderly, and stable civilian economy is essential to successful military effort."

The further determination of the President's powers may be left to the courts. The question which the Members of Congress and others who have assailed the President and the War Labor Board in the Montgomery Ward-Chicago case have to answer is: Do they propose to exempt some 15,000,000 workers from the War Labor Board machinery and so from the no-strike pledge? If their answer is "yes," then, as Mr. Davis has pointed out, the result almost certainly would be "a complete disintegration of the existing machinery set up by Congress to preserve industrial peace."

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

SIDELIGHTS ON WARD INVESTIGATION

Beginning quietly enough, the House investigation into the Montgomery Ward case promises to produce some sensations before it ends. The committee, four Democrats and three Republicans, may come out agreeing on an objective report, but I doubt it.

The whole business is hub deep in politics. The Republicans at this point seem bent on making Sewell Avery an issue in the 1944 campaign. They may have a change of heart before the hearings are concluded.

The C. I. O. is preparing a blitz on Avery, based on a careful scrutiny of his entire record. According to present reports, this blitz will be unleashed in the course of the hearings, probably during Avery's cross-examination by members of the committee.

Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, a Democrat, is going ahead with plans for a separate report by his own committee in the Senate. He now says that possibly he'll make it public in a week, timing it, perhaps, with Avery's appearance before the House committee.

The Senator from Nevada is having his own little private war with the C. I. O., which throws an interesting light on the strange politics of this unprecedented year. When war industries were being located in various parts of the country, MCCARRAN prevailed on the War Production Board to put a big magnesium plant in his State. That, he has since discovered, was by way of hauling in the Trojan horse.

At the Las Vegas magnesium plant are some 30,000 employees, most of them newcomers to Nevada. They voted not long ago in favor of the C. I. O. as a bargaining agent, and while the issue is in dispute with the A. F. of L., the fact remains that a majority are on the C. I. O. side.

Now, it doesn't take a great political seer to divine the influence of 10,000 to 15,000 new voters in a State that was shown by the 1940 census to have a total population of 110,247. If the C. I. O. does the kind of job in getting those voters registered that it has done elsewhere, they could swing the election.

MCCARRAN has been a conservative, yes, an ultraconservative. So the new threat of the C. I. O.'s political power is a real one. In his report on Montgomery Ward, the Senator from Nevada may have a chance to express some of his pent-up emotions.

The House hearings began with an able presentation of the War Labor Board case by Chairman William H. Davis. Davis, who has the face of an earnest cherub, is intently hard working and intensely sincere.

"We think," he said, "we have the best program for settling labor disputes that exists anywhere in the world."

This may be put down to the understandable pride of a man who has sacrificed much for a job he never wanted. But Davis added that no system could be perfect, and you certainly have to agree with that. There's no way in a free country to end strikes by fiat.

In the course of his statement, Davis quoted from the remarks of two former industry members of the War Labor Board who were sharply critical of Montgomery Ward and its behavior in the past. One was Harry L. Derby, president of a big chemical company, and the other was Roger D. Lapham, west coast shipping executive and now mayor of San Francisco. From first-hand experience they knew what obstacles had been put in the way of a fair settlement.

All the fuss of hearings and reports is not likely to produce anything that gets at the nub of the matter as nearly as the comment made recently by Malcolm W. Bingay in his column in the Detroit Free Press. He said:

"To me it seems supremely asinine to contend that a government in wartime can take a man away from his family, his property, and his job to fight for his country and to give up his life—which no court or no act of Congress can restore to him—but it must not interfere with an angry old gentleman who wants to settle a private feud with a man named Roosevelt who happened to be President."

That puts it in the proverbial nutshell.

Price Stabilization Must Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein the following article entitled "Price Stabilization Must Continue," which appeared in the New York Packer on May 13, 1944. Since the House will soon be considering legislation having to do with the extension of the Office of Price Administration, I commend this excellent presentation to the reading of all of the Members:

PRICE STABILIZATION MUST CONTINUE

Nowhere on earth exists the freedom there is right now in America. This is true despite the emergency measures made necessary by war. Price control, rationing, wage stabilization—whatever has been done—had its inception in the over-all necessity of winning the war. Obviously, the war must be won at home before we can overcome the enemy at arms. Inflation must be prevented, there must be ample supplies of foodstuff and vast production of war matérial in order that victory be won overseas.

It appears that the big primary home battles have largely been won. Dangerous inflation has been prevented, food supplies have been ample, and production of war equipment has attained a magnitude that amazes the world. There must be no softening of effort in carrying on measures that have been instrumental in gaining our present position in these home-front battles, for inflation especially can grow from a small beginning into a monster that would mean catastrophe. Inflation can rise from many sources. Shortage of foodstuff, uncontrolled production of supplies not essential to the war effort, runaway wages, black markets—any one of these could well be the beginning of a dangerous inflationary condition in America. And, remember, inflation could cause us to lose the war right on the eve of victory.

Utmost freedom has always been the lot of our people. We've been accustomed to buying anything we wanted at any price we wanted to pay and doing what we pleased in general. Possibly that heritage is one reason why some have felt that at least some of the wartime restrictions have been uncalled for. Probably it is true that some are not necessary, but as time proves this point of view, revisions can be made in the regulations without endangering the whole structure. Basic restrictions are necessary in the war effort, and will continue so until victory comes.

The fresh fruit and produce industry has been beset with black markets, one of the primary causes of inflation. Ethical operators in this industry have found regulations in many instances unfair and unworkable. We believe those responsible for administering the Emergency Price Control Act themselves recognize these facts now. It may have been different at first. Possibly when O. P. A. was first established, some of those in authority looked upon the law as a sort of "reform" measure which in fact it was never intended to be. Be that as it may, the attitude now seems to be different than at its inception.

The measure is again before Congress. It should be continued, with amendments to the end that every factor in the industry be treated fairly and black markets in fresh fruits and produce made an impossibility. Price stabilization must continue, and every measure necessary to bring this about must be extended if America is to plow to the end of the row and achieve victory.

Creation of Allied Council Now To Plan Lasting Peace Is Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 22, 1944, by Maj. George Fielding Eliot:

CREATION OF ALLIED COUNCIL NOW TO PLAN LASTING PEACE IS URGED—EXTENSION OF UNITY OF BATTLEFIELD TO POLITICAL SPHERE WHILE WAR IS ON DECLARED IMPERATIVE, LEST ALLIANCE DISSOLVE WHEN VICTORY IS WON

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

On every battle front of this global war the essential military unity of the United Nations is being cemented with the blood of their sons. On every battle front the very words "United Nations" become, with every added day of conflict and of sacrifice, more of an established symbol of existing fact, and less the expression of a vague and distant aspiration.

In Italy the flags of Poland, Great Britain, France, and America fly together above the ruins of the abbey on Monte Cassino. The men of those nations, yes, and the men of India, of Morocco, of South Africa, and of New Zealand, died to set those flags on high, agleam in the sunshine of victory. Not only nations, but the continents, the four corners of the earth, were there assembled in arms against the forces of darkness.

In the British Isles the young men of those islands, and of Canada, and of the United States gather in their hundreds of thousands for the decisive battle of the west. With them are Poles, Belgians, Dutchmen, Czechs, Norwegians, ready to die that their countries may again be free. Meanwhile the airmen of all these nations fly ceaselessly, day and night, over the enemy's crumbling citadels, smashing the centers of his power, preparing the way for the final battle of the nations.

Along the vast eastern front the battle-tried legions of Russia are gathering for their part in the final struggle. Poles and Czechs are with them, too, and their ranks include men of all the great and varied congeries of peoples who go to make up the population of the Soviet Union.

UNITY ON BURMA FRONT

In Burma Americans and Britons, Chinese and Indians, little Gurkhas from Nepal and Kachin tribesmen from the northern hills are breaking the back of the Japanese power in all the region north of Mandalay, are carrying forward the road that will bring fresh help to the long-suffering people of China.

In the Indian Ocean a fleet under British command, composed of British, American, French and Dutch warships and planes, is hammering away at the enemy outposts in Sumatra and Java. In the Southwest Pacific, American, Australian and New Zealand forces are pushing back the Japanese from their last footholds on the island-continent of New Guinea. Meanwhile, Chinese armies supported by American aircraft fight stoutly for the vital lines of communication within China itself, and in the north and central Pacific a vast American amphibious power poises for new blows against the Japanese island defenses.

Thus, on the fighting fronts, the United Nations are truly united. Their efforts are coordinated. Their soldiers and sailors and airmen give loyal obedience to the orders of commanders in chief who may not be of their own land or their own service, and loyal cooperation to each other when battle is joined.

But when we look elsewhere for the same unity, we do not find it. The military unity which we have achieved will end when the need for it has passed with the defeat of the common foe. The political unity which will then be needed to reap the harvest that has been so dearly bought, to perpetuate the victory that has been won at such sacrifice, does not yet exist, and cannot then be created. For the pressures which now hold the nations together will be relaxed, the common danger will be dissipated, and the centrifugal forces of greed and suspicion and selfishness will be at work upon the minds and hearts of all of us.

DELAY IMPERILS FUTURE

It is only now, while we are united in a great common effort, while the sons of all the United Nations are dying side by side upon a hundred battlefields, that we can hope to forge enduring links of a permanent association to preserve the peace that they are dying to win. Every day that passes without accomplishment in this direction is a day lost which can never be regained. If we continue to postpone, to delay, to wait, to dilly-dally with the fate of the world, one of those days will be the last day; one of those days will be too late.

The time has come for the American people to ask their Government why we must postpone further the formation of a United Nations Council as a beginning toward the political unity of the United Nations which must be achieved if our victory is to be worth the winning. Why must we wait to take the lead in asking our Allies to join with us

in this first and essential step? Why must there be further delay in saying boldly and clearly what we are fighting for, and the sort of world we want to live in, and asking those who are fighting at our side to help us erect this definite symbol of our continued unity? Why cannot we now begin the task of creating the instrument of that unity which is essential if the vast and complex problems of the peace to come are to be solved, if the great alliance is not to dissolve on the day after victory is won, as every other alliance in history has dissolved?

This is no subject for partisan debate. This is no political football. This is a matter which concerns the future of every child in America, of the Nation as a whole, of the world as a place in which human beings may live and work and pursue happiness—or which they can, if they continue along the blind and stupid courses of the past, make into a hell which will beggar the imagination of a thousand Dantes.

Why can't we begin now to lay the foundations of that unity with which all the hopes of all humanity are so irrevocably bound up?

Privileges and Responsibilities of an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of an address entitled "Privileges and Responsibilities of an American Citizen" by Bob Ripley, of Kalispell, Mont. This young man is now 17 years old and has just completed his secondary school work and graduated from the Flathead County High School in Kalispell. While in high school he was the student body president, was awarded the honor of being named the best student officer during his high school career, has won the State oratorical contest conducted by the American Legion, Department of Montana, for the past 2 years and this year in addition to winning the State contest he has won the regional title as well and placed third in the national meet. He has been an outstanding athlete, has carried on numerous school and outside activities and has been a regular radio announcer over Station KGEZ for the past 2 years. During his entire high school career he has been a high honor student.

I have read his manuscript very carefully and, knowing Bob as I do, I am not at all surprised that he has been able to express his beliefs and the beliefs of millions of other American boys in a clear, logical, and concise manner. We of Montana are proud of Bob Ripley and know that our great country can face the future confidently because of him and others like him who will become the leaders of tomorrow.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the House the oration which took third place in the national meet conducted under the auspices of the American Legion:

Honorable judges, ladies and gentlemen, these are troubled times, that see America engaged in a terrible battle of survival, whose magnitude and intensity surpasses human understanding. This war we are waging is a bitter war, a total war, a people's war. We realize in this third terrible year of a people's war that we are not facing a weak or irresolute foe, but a determined, prepared, and paganistic one that will stop at nothing to reduce us to slavery—to take away our rights and privileges, our heritages, and our freedom. We fight a barbarous foe. And so it is that we, as Americans, are vitally interested in the subject. The privileges and responsibilities of an American citizen, with its interrelated bearing on the war and the peace to come. We are not only interested as Americans, we are concerned and challenged in a way that only a bitter war of survival can bring.

It is my privilege this afternoon to tell you of several important problems that face us, problems that require the attention of every thinking American that desires to remain truly free. It has been ably said that there is no privilege that does not depend upon a responsibility, and the fate of this war, total uncompromising war, has shown Americans that the prvilege to remain free to live, to work, and even to play as they please, demands the responsibility of preparedness, readiness and eternal vigilance both within and without. On December 6, 1941, we were a smug and complacent people, content with our neighbors and ourselves, accepting our freedom without question. Pearl Harbor changed that complacency to awareness, that smugness to the stark realization that security is measured in preparedness—the stabs in the back which followed and the subsequent defeats are engraved indelibly on our minds as living proof that failure to guard zealously our precious and all-encompassing privilege of freedom means losing that freedom.

The sacrifices we have made in this war are small indeed to those made by our allies. Small in the face of the countless numbers of our allies in Russia that have fallen at the hands of the common foe. Small in the face of the shambles and destruction that was London and Coventry. Small in the face of the devastation and desolation that is China today. And they are infinitely small in the face of those sacrifices we must make to obtain unity of purpose for lasting peace. We have the privilege of leading mankind into the light of freedom and we have the responsibility.

In order that America may lead in the world to come she must continue to prove to the world that she is the example of freedom and progress; and to do this, when peace comes, she must attack with vigor the evils that have been bred by a war economy. And the greatest of these is the loss of free enterprise without which America ceases to live and grow. Under the necessity of centralization for war production, Uncle Sam has become our senior partner with supreme power. In a nation that is fighting, it may be expected that business and industry shall sacrifice individual gains and follow the leadership of government. But in peacetime such a policy would make our country completely unsure of its future. It is therefore the responsibility of every American to see that as soon as this war is won, and we pray that is soon, economic power is immediately redelegated lest the specter of despotism should walk in upon us at home and become more of a menace than despotism abroad. In short, we must protect this privilege of free individual enterprise with every fiber of our being.

As we look ahead at the post-war world, which must be considered now, we see one great danger for America, the growth and extension of politocracy. What is politocracy? It is a new word coined recently, and its definition is misleadingly simple. Politocracy is the change in America that is daily becoming more apparent from a government of the people to a government of the official. A government of the party, for the party, a government based on reelection not upon promises. It will be for you and me and our soldier sons, brothers, husbands, and sweethearts to decide this peace, for it is we who will derive the benefits or detriments, rather than pressure groups, blocs, or politicians whose aims too frequently parallel their own personal desires and ambitions.

There is yet another great privilege. It is the hope of mankind. That privilege is the American home. We are charged with the responsibility of protecting the purity of youth, now and in the future. In placing our hopes upon the shoulders of youth, which today is more than ever deserving of it, we must take ourselves to task for its education and instruction. It is a commonly known fact that juvenile delinquency is largely parental delinquency, and the home is the supreme moulding institution. It is therefore a great privilege to train our youth, not through the State as our enemies do, but through the home, where the principles of our democracy are best typified. And, consequently, it is also a great responsibility to see that the home unit is the type of democracy that youth must champion. Youth—with its unbounding enthusiasm and optimism. I fail to feel the pessimism that floods the minds of some youth authorities. Their views upon the softness and looseness of youth fail to strike a responsive key in anyone who will only take the time to analyze the record of youth in this war. Was it a soft and degenerate youth that stormed the beaches of Salerno, or north Africa, Sicily, or Guadalcanal? Was it a nation of weaklings that stood the trial and horrors of Bataan or Corrigedor? No. It was and is a firm resolute youth that sees clearly the task of winning this war and the preserving of future peace. A youth that is more discerning and demanding than any other because of the conditions through which it developed and progressed. A youth that saved America through courage under fire, and will continue to save those things for which we fight. We must look to youth with hope and encouragement, not skepticism and doubt. It is our sternest task, duty, and privilege to see that mankind's hope in youth is not undermined by a lack of faith, backing, and guidance from the American home.

As we look more and more toward the future as the day of victory approaches, we must consider another great privilege, the right to think. And more important, that of the responsibility entailed, that of not just to think, but to think clearly, to analyze and to understand. Now, that we know the price of total war, and envision the price of total peace, we must use this privilege of thinking to its fullest extent—for when in history has there been a greater need for clear thinking, for understanding our neighbors at home and abroad than at this present moment? Our minds must grasp the problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction, politics and its weaknesses, world government and order, and most important peace and progress.

This afternoon we have discussed the basic privileges and responsibilities of an American citizen.

First: We are a Nation of free men. Free with a freedom based not upon an ocean or a line of guns, but upon a determined united people who must always bear upon their hearts the responsibility of preparedness and unity, that America will continue to lead the

peoples of the world into the light of freedom.

Second: We enjoy in peacetime the right of free enterprise that has made America the land of opportunity and progress. We must guard this individual freedom as we do any other freedom, redelegating the power when peace comes to those who by law are granted it—the people.

Third: We are a democracy in which you and I control all policy. Our duty is to see that we do not change to a politocracy in which a few selfish men control our future.

Fourth: Our Nation and our generation is young with the virility and enthusiasm that marks youth. We must look to the American home to protect the youth of today and tomorrow by the backing, faith, and guidance of the family circle.

Finally, we are privileged to think as we please, to plan and build as we please, we must then think constructively not destructively, with the hope of benefiting not undermining the lot of our neighbors at home and abroad.

As we have discussed these privileges and responsibilities of an American citizen, all over the world American citizens in uniform are accepting without question those demands made upon them to win this war of survival. They fight and die without question for they have faith in us at home and our plans for the future for them. That faith puts the greatest responsibility of all upon us, that of proving that their trust has not been misplaced.

After this war is over, after the fighting and dying, when bleeding and killing is done, these responsibilities we talked of will become sterner realities. We must then put our thinking into action. It is then that we all must safeguard and nurture these heritages, freedoms, rights, and privileges for which our heroes have fought and died. We must then be determined to provide a better world, to preserve our code of decency, to build upon peace.

We must not in remembering our privileges and responsibilities be sentimental, soft, or weak. We must be prepared and, with clear thinking, be unshakable in our demand that all peoples shall be free and equal, hopeful and content. We will build a future of free opportunity that lies far above the realm of past experience. By preserving the privileges I have mentioned, and by keeping our responsibilities ever before us, we can and will as American citizens, continue to build this Nation strong and great. I thank you.

Federal Aid for Readjustment in Civilian Life of Veterans of World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, after April 6, 1917, the orators stood on the courthouse steps and in the name of the community God-sped the youth of the land into the armed forces to make the world safe for democracy. They were patriots and heroes-to-be and lauded to the skies. They were promised much, and least of all their place back in the community, their job, and an opportunity to finish their schooling.

While they were fighting to make the world safe for democracy the shirkers and war contractors waxed fat and wealthy.

After the armistice and when these boys came back home, there was no one on the courthouse steps—those promises never bore fruit, they became a dream to the returning veteran. He was high and dry, with no job, and no help to put him back to the place he earned in his community.

To the war-rich, he was an unwelcome guest and Treasury raider who needed help. There was no place for the war veteran. He should take the hindmost. That was the reward of a thankless Government, expressing the shoddy gratitude of those who benefited most. There was disappointment and sorrow in the hearts of these men. It remains, even today. That time out of his life can never be recovered. These men do not want to see it happen again.

I believe that the present bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans will lessen the shock to our veterans of this war, and ease their return to civil life, to help them carry out their ambitions and desires and again live the American way of life.

An Analysis of the So-called Roosevelt Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress and the country an interesting and informative article written by our colleague, Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and appearing in the Republican magazine for May in the monthly feature written by Mr. MUNDT under the title "This Month in Washington."

In my opinion, Mr. MUNDT makes a pointed analysis of the deficiencies prevailing in the so-called Roosevelt foreign policy and clearly demonstrates the need for replacing ambiguities with action in the field of foreign policy:

THIS MONTH IN WASHINGTON

(By KARL E. MUNDT, Member of Congress, South Dakota)

April was a month for asking questions in Washington. May, June, and most of all, November may provide answers for the questions asked in April, but the interrogation point was the most used punctuation mark in Capital City typesetting machines all last month.

What was the real significance of the historical Wisconsin primary election? Who will be the Republican nominee for President? When will occur the opening of the second front in western Europe? Do Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt all three agree upon its need and wisdom, or is Churchill holding back with his approval? What are the actual tenets of the much-discussed, little-defined Roosevelt foreign policy? Which party convention will select the next President of the United States? Will Roosevelt run again? How seriously have the President's recurring illnesses and deteriorated health reduced his effectiveness as a wartime Executive? These and other questions were those which many did ask but few could answer during April of the third year of American participation in World War No. 2.

Among the questions asked and most eloquently evaded were those revolving around the central theme, "What is our American foreign policy?" All together, it seemed, Americans were awakening to the sickening sensation that their administration had no clear-cut foreign policy and that their President and State Department either had no post-war program and foreign policy proposals or were concealing them from those to whom they meant the most—the folks in uniform, and their families who were sacrificing so prodigiously to bring the victory which an accepted and acceptable foreign policy alone could make secure and fruitful.

Like a huge forest of countless individual trees coming to life in the spring, the American public from coast to coast was questioning the executive department, "Whither are we bound on foreign policy?" The glad promises and the fascinating phrases of the Atlantic Charter and the declarations following Cairo, Tehran, and Moscow had echoed and reechoed across the land. Now Americans were asking, "How achieve these goals? Have we a policy in mind for attaining the principles of justice so frequently repeated in these statements? If so, what is it? What is the working formula to be? Will Stalin follow it? Will Churchill? Does Roosevelt have a foreign policy in mind, since 'policy' is, after all, not a recital of desirable objectives but the process for getting them achieved?" Funneled into Washington from every town and city came an unending stream of questions about what was to follow the war.

Sparking the growing crescendo of voices, big and small, in and out of Washington, calling upon the President and the State Department to answer these questions, was the publication of the significant and somewhat startling (to New Dealers) result of the latest Twohey Analysis of Newspaper Opinion, which showed that editorial approval of the Roosevelt foreign policy had dropped from 80-percent support to a present-day low of 20 percent during the first 4 months of 1944. The decline of public approval of the Roosevelt handling of foreign affairs had been surprisingly persistent since the first of the year and had sharpened its precipitous drop noticeably in March and April. This was, indeed, a danger signal for the New Deal, whose campaign orators already were rehearsing their preliminary stump speeches to the effect that the President, and he alone, saw the world situation clearly enough to understand the type of foreign policy by which America could best serve itself and its associates in the family of nations. This was striking directly at the part of the propaganda campaign which was intended to secure the most votes. Hurried and harried conferences worked far into the night to do something to reverse the steady slide of public opinion away from the New Deal, away from the State Department, and away from President Roosevelt with respect to their administration of American foreign affairs.

At this juncture, 29 Republican "freshmen Members" of the House, headed by Congressman HALE of Maine, added fuel to the fire by writing a list of specific questions to Secretary of State Hull requesting that he reduce

his theories and pretty phrases on foreign policy down to specific principles and tell them how he proposed to harness these principles into an operative foreign policy for approaching the goals he had in mind. As a result, a 2-hour conference was held between the Republican freshmen and the venerable Secretary of State, but out of it all came only the report from disillusioned House Members that "if America has a definite foreign policy, the Secretary of State did not tell us what it is." Then came the Secretary's radio address of Easter Sunday with more pretty phrases and additional noble objectives but a continued failure to take the people into his confidence as to the formula of action (i. e., policy) whereby we were to reach these goals.

In the meantime, Governor Dewey, Governor Bricker, and other Republican spokesmen were speaking of the world after the war and the methods of procedure by which the United States could fulfill its rightful role as a leader among nations. Even though Republican candidates and spokesmen lacked access to the diplomatic pouches, the tripartite conferences, the direct communication with foreign statesmen, the information secured by our system of counterespionage, and certain secret military data, the suggestions and statements of Republicans were fully as specific and appealing as the even more general and indefinite rhetoric coming from the President and the Secretary of State. In April, it became obvious that a great myth was being destroyed. The highly vaunted ability of the President to exemplify American leadership in foreign affairs was nowhere in evidence. Just as the "doctrine of indispensability" had long ago been exploded in connection with American domestic affairs, it was now being exposed as fallacious in the field of foreign relations.

A SERIES OF REACTIONS

As Americans heard from their executive officials new and strained redefinitions of what was meant by the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow Declaration, etc., they began to realize that what President Roosevelt was apparently providing us was a series of compromising reactions to proposals from Moscow and London rather than a clear-cut and courageous series of constructive suggestions stemming from American heritage and expressive of American concepts. The mightiest nation in the world in the fields of production, finance, and military prowess was becoming the most mute nation of them all in the field of foreign relations. The bargaining power of the United States in foreign affairs was rapidly being drained away, and opportunities, now neglected, might never again arise to enable this Republic to exert its influence for sanity and soundness upon a distraught world. Private citizens throughout the country, always alert to manifestations of ineptness by their leaders, joined with American editorial opinion and the Members of Congress in the growing conviction that either ill health, or ineptitude, or ill-concealed political ambition, or something was preventing the President from exerting appropriate and effective American influence in the determination of foreign affairs both with regard to the day-to-day decisions now being made and the post-war era in which the absence of wise decisions and determined leadership on our part might provide such a bloody aftermath.

A NEW DEAL RESPONSE

Near the month's end the administration made a frantic effort to stop the growing discouragement and discontent over its do-nothing attitude on foreign affairs. Secretary of State Hull at long last (the author of this column suggested the procedure in H. J. Res. 28, which he introduced the opening day of the 78th Cong.) agreed to the appointment of a bipartisan congressional committee to counsel with the State Department in the formation of an American foreign policy. Eight Senators were forthrightly selected, but for some as yet inexplicable reason the program by month's end had not been expanded to include a similar group of counselors from the House of Representatives. Stranger even than that, however, was the fact that nobody was selected on the Senate advisory committee to represent any State in the Union west of the Missouri River.

The entire Pacific coast region and the western section of the United States, vitally interested as it is in the problem of the Pacific and our post-war relations with the Orient, was deprived of representation on the senatorial bipartisan advisory committee. This writer addressed the House on April 26 with a recommendation to Secretary of State Hull that he "rectify this unfortunate oversight immediately" by the expansion of the eight-man advisory committee to include four Republicans and four Democrats from the House "chosen so as to give generous representation to the western area of the United States."

The eight Senators selected are able men and should be helpful in aiding the State Department to develop the outlines of a working and workable foreign policy to replace the magnificent but largely meaningless phrases which up to now have largely comprised what the administration would have Americans accept in lieu of foreign policy. The eight Senators are: CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas; GEORGE, Democrat, Georgia; BARKLEY, Democrat, Kentucky; GILLETTE, Democrat, Iowa; LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, Wisconsin; VANDENBERG, Republican, Michigan; WHITE. Republican, Maine; AUSTIN, Republican, Vermont.

THINGS THAT MAY HAPPEN

Among those who made news in Washington during April that may well create additional discussion in May were the indefatigable Vice President HENRY WALLACE. Since his promotion to the Vice Presidency from his former position as Secretary of Agriculture, HENRY WALLACE has become one of the most persistent orators of the New Deal. Sometimes referred to as the head of America's "boondoggle bund," the Vice President resurrected the New Deal the day after the President pronounced it dead, and from coast to coast has continued his appeals that new dealism continue to dominate the thinking and planning of the party in power. It is indicated that he is making considerable progress, that perhaps even "the Chief" secretly encourages his apoplectic appeals to the extreme leftists while he seeks support from constitutionalists on the ground that the extreme experimentalism of the New Deal is a thing of the past.

As this is written, it is expected that HENRY WALLACE will be sent to China as an ambassador of good will in the Orient and (perhaps) as a build-up to secure for him the additional prestige he may require to be F. D. R.'s running mate if the President seeks to extend his regime to 16 years.

Attorney General Biddle also stirred speculation in Washington as April ended by issuing orders resulting in the United States Army's taking possession of Montgomery Ward's Chicago store to add a new chapter in American history by making it the first time that an American Army has been used to deprive private owners of the right to operate their own department store. It is reported that Nazi history books record several such operations by Nazi storm troopers, but in America such a use of the powers of Commander in Chief of the armed forces is a strange, albeit unwelcome novelty. The entire Illinois Republican delegation in the House supported a resolution by Congressman DEWEY of Chicago to investigate this action and, the day this is written, forced through a resolution in the Rules Committee calling for an investigation of the whole occurrence including the use of the Army physically to eject Sewell Avery, president of Ward's, from his office. The picture of American soldiers in helmets and uniform being used to carry an American businessman forcibly from his own premises appeared in most of the country's newspapers as April made way for May. It deserved the space it received because it definitely made news as well as history in this Republic. But it also gave cause to serious thought on the part of many Americans of all political affiliations and all walks of life as they reflected upon the results of stemming from an administration left too long in power and given (or seizing) too much authority.

Price-Control Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the Price Control Act, I submit the following:

"Price Control Week," so designated at a citizens' conference held in the Old House Office Building April 19 and 20, by 400 delegates representing over 200 organizations, has just ended. I would like to tell you of the response this week has brought forth throughout the country. For every locality, from California to Connecticut, from individuals and organizations among farm, labor, and consumer groups have come resolutions, statements and telegrams, proving that the overwhelming sentiment among the people is to continue the Price Control Act with no weakening changes.

Mayors in 31 major cities, including Detroit, Chicago, Santa Clara, New York, St. Louis, Hartford, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, and scores of minor ones, including Alexandria, have officially proclaimed Price Control Week, calling on the citizens of their cities to cooperate with the local governments and O. P. A. in observing this week. Community activities in the form of mass meetings, door-to-door leaflet distributions, and so forth, in many cases sponsored jointly by a farmer-labor-consumer organization, set up specifically to educate the people on price control, have been carried on in over 50 cities throughout the country. In one city the board of education officially set aside one week as Price Control Week. In addition, I have received copies of resolutions and statements from local C. I. O., A. F. L., and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen groups, and from prominent individuals in different localities, all asking for immediate renewal of the Price Control Act with no amendments. The following is a statement sent me by 21 residents of northern Virginia:

During this week of May 17–24, designated "Price Control Week" by a citizens' conference called by the Congressional Committee for the Protection of the Consumer

("Fighting Sixty," THOMAS E. SCANLON, chairman), we, as residents of northern Virginia, feel it particularly appropriate to join with the hundreds of organizations and thousands of individuals throughout the country who are calling on Congress to renew the Price Control Act without any weakening amendments. We believe that a return to the inflationary policies of the last war would not only cause serious hardship to the individual budget, but would result in a general economic instability which would be disastrous to the successful prosecution of the war.

Those Members of Congress who will say they want to continue price control but are supporting a series of amendments which would emasculate O. P. A.'s enforcement powers and result in an immediate rise in rents as well as food prices, are in effect advocating inflation.

We urge you to vote down all amendments and to fight and vote for renewal of the Price Control Act with adequate enforcement funds for O. P. A.

Mrs. Anne C. Chew, Mrs. Ivan A. Booker, Mrs. Eugene Duffield, Mrs. Douglas Murray, Mrs. Virginia Durr, Mrs. Clark Warburton, Mrs. Dorothy Mooklar Surrey, Mrs. Janet W. Wiecking, Mrs. Chandler Morse, Mrs. David Wing, Mrs. Elizabeth B. Magruder, Mrs. Joseph Beard, Mrs. John Ide, Mrs. John W. Aldrich, Mrs. Jamieson C. Hollway, Mrs. Alexander C. Zabriskie, Mrs. Stanley Stewart, Mrs. Ernest L. Akerley, Mrs. Katherine Stone, Mrs. Louise Miller, and Miss Sarah Hartman.

Legislation in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the legislative program which has engaged the attention of Congress since the 1st day of May has made it impossible for me to spend this month campaigning in my home State of New Mexico in anticipation of the primary to be held on June 6. This is our third State-wide primary and I regret my inability to cover my home State as fully and leisurely as I would have desired. During the first campaign in 1940, at which time I was first nominated for Congress, I covered virtually every corner of the State by automobile and I enjoyed the experience of those weeks.

In the campaign of 1942 we were in the midst of the war and while I was able to be in New Mexico for a part of the primary period, my work here kept me in Washington for much of it.

This year, however, I find conditions greatly changed. In serving on the House Appropriations Committee I have found my presence required here in Washington almost every day. The subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee to which I am assigned have been holding hearings steadily since the Easter recess and usually have held them simultaneously. I have felt that my place is here in the Capitol because of my association with the committee.

In addition, there have been matters of legislation in which I was particularly interested. First of all, of course, would come the so-called G. I. bill advocated by the American Legion and the great mass of service men and women in this country. It turned out that the vote was so overwhelming in support of this bill that I need not have been concerned about its passage, but there were important amendments and proposals being made on the floor when it was before the House. It seemed to me that my place was here.

When that bill passed, I had hoped to return immediately to New Mexico. However, the legislative program made provision for action on May 23 on the Boren bill to repeal the land-grant rates on railroads. I had received strong petitions from all classes of citizens of New Mexico urging me to be on hand to support this legislation. The railroad brotherhoods were outspoken in their support. The shippers of New Mexico and particularly the wholesale and retail stores of our State wanted the Boren bill passed and asked me to aid in that endeavor. I spoke twice while the bill was under consideration and did my part on the floor of the House to assist in its passage. We were all delighted that it passed by a substantial vote.

On May 24 the legislative program called for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill on which I had worked as a member of the subcommittee. Naturally I could not leave until after action on that bill had been completed.

The full Appropriations Committee had been called to meet on Thursday, May 25, to consider and report out the bill carrying funds for the national war agencies. Again, though it is my desire to be in New Mexico participating in a primary campaign, I find myself compelled to remain in Washington until after the war agencies bill has been reported to the House.

Under those circumstances I have had to abandon the plans which I had earlier formed to speak over every radio station in New Mexico and to visit as many towns as I could reach in a short but vigorous campaign. Instead, I have prepared a radio address which I have transcribed and which I am sending to the stations. In it I have tried to summarize my interests in the present national situation and my hopes for the future. I have tried to say to the voters of my State what things would interest me most if I am renominated and reelected to the Congress.

Following is the full text of this address:

Ladies and gentlemen, my fellow citizens of New Mexico: We are nearing our third primary election. Again I am asking the Democrats of New Mexico to nominate me for Representative in Congress, and I am using this means of reaching voters in the State. If conditions were more normal it would be much better to visit every section of New Mexico and discuss matters in the national field. But these are far from normal times. Transportation between towns is difficult to arrange and hard to justify. In addition, a whole series of appropriation bills has been clearing through the committee to which I am assigned and it has seemed to me better that I remain in Washington and attend to the tasks which involve the provision of funds for all types of agencies engaged in the prosecution of the war.

I hope that every citizen of New Mexico will understand that no one regrets these circumstances more than I do. I like to campaign. I like to go from one town to the next and meet people and talk with those whom I have met on previous trips. The necessity of bringing a message to the voters is no hardship to me, but this is not the year for the ordinary campaign and I will therefore restrict myself in travel and in time to the barest minimum.

When you vote in the Democratic primary for a nominee as Representative in Congress you seek to select someone who can handle in the Nation's Capitol the many individual problems that arise to perplex the citizens of the State. At the same time you look for a lawmaker whose vote on national issues will be representative of the sentiments of the people who have picked him,—someone whose experience and background may fit him to be an advocate of the development of all the diversified natural resources with which a State is blessed.

I would like to review a few things that might aid you in your consideration of the candidates for the Democratic nomination to Congress. The Democrats have been good enough to give me that nomination twice, and now, as I enter a third campaign, I feel in fairness to myself I should remind you of some of the things which the past few years have brought us. There are items which are peculiarly associated with the past 4 years and to which my vote has made its contribution.

For example, the first important vote that I was called upon to cast was on the question of lend-lease. This was early in 1941. The Congress was divided on the question. There were men in both political parties who took the floor of Congress to fight lend-lease legislation as vigorously as they could. All over America there arose America First committees to urge that we take no part in this overseas activity. It required no small amount of courage to vote for lend-lease in the face of the vigorous opposition that developed against it, but today with Russia still carrying the brunt of the fighting on the European Continent, the wisdom of lend-lease has been demonstrated.

I am glad that my first important vote as a Representative in Congress was for the furtherance of a policy which insured on the European Continent a vigorous opposition to the forces of Adolf Hitler and which in the intervening years has been used to strengthen the arm of Chinese fighting men as they have struggled against uneven odds to keep the forces of Hirohito out of Asia. We in America know who our enemies are because they have attacked us. We know that those foreign policies which started us on the road to preparedness for the inevitable conflict which came to us out of the skies at Pearl Harbor were wise and good.

I did not fail you on a single issue that related to foreign policy or the defense of America in those fateful months when the issue was not clear and when good judgment was necessary to determine what position your Representative should take on pending legislation. It is easy, now that we are in the war, to say that the supplying of goods and munitions to England, Russia, and China was both wise and timely, but it was not so easy in 1941 as will be testified by many of my friends in Congress who voted against the lend-lease program and have lived to regret it.

With the beginning of my second term as your Representative I was assigned to the Appropriations Committee. We as a young and growing State need sympathetic treatment from the Appropriations Committee of the House because it is in the House where all money bills, either for the raising of revenue or the expenditure of funds, must originate. I have tried my best to make my presence on that committee count for the benefit of New Mexico and if you send me back to Congress, I shall continue to look out for this State.

But it has not been only the interest of New Mexico that has attracted me to the Appropriations Committee. Every piece of legislation which calls for any expenditure of funds, either in its operation or its administration, comes before the Appropriations Committee for a final review. A bill may pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President, but unless money is appropriated for its administration it never becomes effective. Therefore, there must pass in review before this committee all the activities of a Government in peace and at war. We, as members of the committee, come to know the programs, policies, and personnel of the Government agencies. In that work your Representative has a chance to be constantly on guard for the welfare of his home folks.

Just recently these appropriation bills have been coming from our committee to the floor of the House. In them are items for the welfare of agriculture. I need not remind my Democratic friends how during this administration the farm-credit system, which had known a complete collapse under President Hoover, has been reborn and revitalized until it is of service to the farmers of this State and this country. We know that it has saved millions of dollars annually to those who labor in the production of food. We know that with it there has been a program of soil conservation aimed to preserve the soil and its fertility to serve us and the generations which follow us. We know that the agricultural adjustment program seeks to assure for the farmer economic equality with his friends in industry and that under it the gross income of the farmers of this country has moved upward from a total of $5,000,000,000 in 1932 to more than $22,000,000,000 in 1943.

It has been my pleasure as a member of the committee to hear the stories of these agricultural developments so vital to our State, and then to realize that in other fields there are parallel accomplishments. The Securities and Exchange Commission is dedicated to the task of protecting the investor's dollar. The social-security laws grant the aged a refuge against the threat of poverty and give aid to the blind and to dependent children.

The Congress has just enacted a tax-simplification law which relieves 30,000,000 of our 50,000,000 taxpayers from filing individual income-tax returns, a reform which will be generally approved throughout the Nation.

Yes, we see accomplishment all up and down the line. In the last few days we have been seeing it in our relationships to the soldiers, sailors, and marines now in the uniform of this country. The Congress has done a proper thing in the passage of what is known as the "G. I." bill because it recognizes that now is the time to guarantee to the men and women on the firing line decent hospitalization, proper educational opportunities, and adequate chances for employment or for the acquisition of land when the war is over and demobilization comes. The men and women who come back from this war will be more justly treated, more adequately housed, more properly trained and educated, and in cases of prolonged illness they will be cared for in more efficient and numerous veteran facilities than any group of people who have ever worn the uniform of America. The G. I. bill which just passed involves billions of dollars to insure that this job is properly done.

This veteran will come home—to what? He must not come home to a country where the transition from war to peace has plunged every type of industry and activity into depression and unemployment. We experienced that once and we should be capable of planning our future so that we need not experience it again. There are committees at work in both Senate and House to make sure that this transition will not be too abrupt nor will it be planned. Bills for the termination of war contracts are now coming out of these economic planning committees. The Government, of course, must be determined to close every war plant no longer needed for the war effort and must divert effort from those plants to the production of civilian goods and the restoration of our peacetime economy. We cannot and shall not submit to the temptation to keep war plants open solely because closing them will involve displacement of employees, but we must close the unneeded plants now while the employees can find other jobs and can still make a contribution to the war effort in those new positions. The Congress is at work on this, and I can assure you of my interest in the program and my desire to help in carrying it out.

In these stabilization plans for post-war years it is not industry alone that is receiving attention. The farmer has been given his safeguards for this difficult period. The Congress has authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans on basic crops at a 90 percent of parity rate for the first 2 years that follow the end of the war. This means that there will be no sudden chaos in farm prices, that the bottom is not going to drop out of everything the day that peace is signed.

But it is not alone in the interest of the farmer that legislation like this is enacted. After the last war we experienced a disastrous collapse in agricultural prices. Within 2 years the net income of the farmers had been slashed one-half. The farmers quit buying, and the factories closed. When the factories closed, the railroads had no business. Here started the vicious cycle that leads to depression and disaster. As a Nation, we experienced it all. Now we are determined that it shall not happen again when this war is over.

I can assure every voter in New Mexico that the intense interest which I have many times previously evidenced in forward-looking planning for the future of our State, will be continued during another term in Congress. I know of no subject which attracts me more than the utilization of the resources of New Mexico. Fluor spar has been brought into development in New Mexico. We have seen a tremendous expansion of our potash industry, and I am revealing no secrets when I say that in the files of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey there are reports on many other minerals which promise a post-war future of industrial activity in our State.

We must not overlook the chance of grasping the hand of every forward-looking western Commonwealth that plans now for a better future. We can retain our industrial and agricultural activity. There is in the Congress a committee specifically charged with the responsibility of decentralizing industry Nation-wide and spreading it through the Western States where power and fine climate tend to beckon the industrial worker. It is not an accident that Florida, New Mexico, and California, all sunshine States, were the three fastest-growing States in the Union by the figures of the last census. We must continue this pace. We must be one of the builders of the West, builders of a new industrial empire which feeds and in turn is fed by the solid agricultural background our rich valleys have known for four centuries. I am happy to rededicate my efforts to such a cause. I can assure you that if I am returned to the Congress, the seniority which I have thus far developed and all the influence and prestige that I can build will be used to promote for New Mexico an era of unprecedented industrial and agricultural growth.

Water is a great resource of our State. I will continue to urge the fullest utilization of it and to protect the waters belonging to us against adverse appropriation by other Commonwealths and other claimants. We have not utilized as yet either the full flow of our rivers or the power possibilities which that flow creates. Your Representative in Congress must be constantly alert to opportunities to safeguard and develop every irrigation possibility.

Our future, however, is not alone in the earth or on the earth. It may lie as well in the skies. Aviation promises to be a great new field when this war is over and I am happy that from the very first day I came to Washington I have worked for the development of airports all over the State. Many of these which were surveyed originally by the Civil Aeronautics Administration have become Army training fields and air bases, and we must be constantly alert to see that they are fully utilized in commercial aviation in the post-war period.

But we shall not live our life in the West in isolation from the rest of America. Nor can America live its life in isolation from the rest of the world. I believe in and stand firmly for our country taking its position as a leader of the nations of the world in a cooperative effort, based on our natural resources and in response to what I am sure are the laws of God, to take steps that will bring about a future permanent peace that will save the next generation from undergoing the horrors of another war.

Our children today wear the uniform of our Nation and face the hazards of the most destructive fighting that the world has ever seen. We cannot help but wonder if civilization itself could stand a third war of these proportions. I shall not be indifferent to such a challenge. If I am a Member of the next Congress, as I have been the past two, I will try by my votes to insure your ultimate welfare as I did by a vote for lend-lease and for a whole host of steps which helped to prepare us for the struggle that was so definitely in our pathway.

I have appreciated the honor of serving you for 3½ years. They have been among the most difficult years in the history of this country. They give me a background for the task of representing you again and make me thereby better fitted to serve you.

If you feel that the record of my service in Congress has been good, if you feel that the position I occupy on important committees gives me a greater chance to serve New Mexico and the current war effort than any newcomer could have, if you feel that these momentous years have given me a background for a better understanding of the problems now arising, then I would indeed be appreciative of your vote for me on June 6.

Government Protection to Widows and Children of Deceased World War Veterans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a service officer in the community, I have witnessed the last rites of many

World War veterans. These men earned the full mantle of citizenship by service in the armed forces.

With the blowing of taps another hardship began. The widow had to carry on, not only alone, but without the bread-winner. Even though the veteran had earned his full right to citizenship, yet this Government forgot his faithful wife. Widows of veterans of other wars were always recognized. Never in the world has such shabby treatment been given to widows of war veterans.

These women have earned this right as the attentive spouse of men who have fought to preserve this country. To many it has come too late. I am privileged to assist in enacting this worthy legislation, long delayed by those who merely give lip service to the veteran.

Address by Mark Ethridge Before the Oklahoma Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Louisville Times, before the Oklahoma Democratic State convention at Oklahoma City, on May 15, 1944. I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate that the cost of printing the speech will amount to $173.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Harrington Wimberly has made a long-shot bet in asking me to Oklahoma to speak before this Democratic Victory Dinner. In the first place, I confess I never made a political speech in my life, and when I get through there will undoubtedly be those of you who will regard the record unbroken. In the second place, I find myself a little naive about politics. I'm the sort of person who, in spite of all their coy evasions to the contrary, regard it as certain that Roosevelt and Dewey will oppose each other in the fall elections. Both of them seem to me to be running as hard as horses at the head of a stretch in the Kentucky derby. Why they don't say so may be one of those imponderables or mysteries of politics which the lay mind is not supposed to penetrate.

Nevertheless, in what I say tonight I'm going upon the assumption that short of providential interference, the President will be nominated again, regardless of whether he wants to run and that, in fact, the only way he can refuse the nomination is to say "No," after it has already been made and that his opponent will be Governor Dewey.

I think it's a true assumption, and, besides, it makes this speech much easier; it makes a condition rather than a theory. It also makes it a good deal simpler for a good many people to make their choices without hesitation. Willkie's nomination by the Republicans would have disturbed independents and liberal democrats. A good many of them would have had to do some praying before they voted. But the course of the independents is now clear, and it is the liberal Republicans who will have to do the praying. Once again they have watched the history of their party repeat itself; once again the hands of the Old Guard within the Republican Party are bloody from the carcass of an assassinated liberal minority.

The plain truth is that only twice in the entire history of the Republican Party has the liberal element prevailed. In both instances Presidents representing that wing come to power entirely by accident. Abraham Lincoln represented political reform and the expression of human rights. He was elected because the Democratic Party was hopelessly split. Theodore Roosevelt represented political reform and the reassertion of human rights over the property rights and exploitation of the robber barons. He came to power through the assassination of McKinley and through the fortuitous circumstance that he was made Vice President because Boss Platt wanted him out of New York State.

Every other liberal movement within the Republican Party has been choked off. When Lincoln was killed, the party slipped into the reaction of Thaddeus Stevens and stayed there until Roosevelt came. When Theodore Roosevelt challenged reaction under Taft, he was almost bodily thrown out of the party. When La Follette challenged the reaction of Harding and Coolidge in 1924, the price of wheat suddenly went up and his movement was choked off. The Willkie of 1944 was a John, the Baptist crying in the wilderness of a Republican reaction. The same thing happened to Willkie that happened to John the Baptist.

When it is normal, the Republican Party is always reactionary. We had an eminent Baptist divine in Mississippi who said that if other denominations would leave poor white people and Negroes alone, all of them would be natural Baptists. By the same operation of natural laws, left alone, the Republican Party is the natural home of privilege seekers such as Joe Grundy; of labor baiters like Sewell Avery; of Liberty Leaguers, of American Firsters, of Roosevelt haters like John L. Lewis and Gerald L. K. Smith and Clarence Kelland and Colonel McCormick; of isolationists like Nye. There are of course a great many decent and nice people in the Republican Party, but they are in such bad company. Unfortunately, the bad company is in the ascendency and apparently in the driver's seat in the Republican Party this year.

Without too much justification, as far as I can see, but because they hate that man in the White House, because they yearn for the days of the twenties, because they want to be "rid of bureaucracy," because they want to smack labor down and go back to the good old days of goon squads, the Republican Old Guardsmen have undertaken to build a pretty fair Governor—and nothing more, nothing less—into a monumental intellect, into the white hope of the Republic. It is not that they are for Dewey; it is that they are against Roosevelt and all that he and his party stand for. They care no more for Dewey as a person than they do for Roosevelt; it is that they recognize in him an instrument for the destruction of the New Deal.

This, then, is a year of major decisions. This is not the year for a choice between personalities; a choice between a dashing young gang buster who has made the grade as Governor and a charming President. It is not a choice of Commanders in Chief to carry on the war. I shall discuss Mr. Roosevelt and the war later, but it is not as Commander in Chief, as good as he is in that role, that he has primary claim upon the affections and respect of the people of this country. The real choice the American people must make this year is between philosophies, between ideas that lie deep in their conflict. This year is the year of referendum upon the attitude toward the function of government and the works of the New Deal for the past 12 years. Domestically, the choice is between the destruction of the New Deal and the eradication of its emphasis, which is all the Republican Party has so far offered, and the preservation and implementation of the central idea of the New Deal, which is that the person is more important in a civilization than property; that government itself must, and should, be used to make freedom the expanding force it can be when the individual has the opportunity to develop his own soul. In the international field I'll believe the choice is between a good peace and a bad one.

I have no shame in confessing that I am, and have been, a new dealer for years. Yes; I'd like to see the budget balanced and always have felt that in normal times we should tax for what we spend. Yes; I get irritated by a good many things about the administration and with a good many people in it. Yes; I'd change a great deal of it. But I can say in all honesty that I'd infinitely rather have had Franklin D. Roosevelt for the past 12 years than Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover for their 12 years. In theory I don't like third and fourth terms, but I'll take a fourth term of Roosevelt with thanks to God for the chance in preference to a first term for Dewey, with all the forces that are behind him.

I sense every now and then a note of apology in Democratic voices. I'd like for somebody to tell me what the hell we should apologize for; or, since MIKE MONRONEY is an Oxford graduate, for what the hell should we apologize.

Is any Democrat ashamed that we took a banking structure which had had 5,770 failures in the 4 years of Hoover, with a loss to depositors and stockholders of more than $3,000,000,000, and restored confidence, virtually eliminated failures, insured losses?

Are Democrats ashamed that the H. O. L. C. has saved some 3,000,000 homes from foreclosure at a cost, in 10 years, of $65,000,000—with no net cost in the long run—where we had been willing to put a billion dollars into it? Are we Democrats ashamed that in the process of bailing out home owners, we rescued banks and trust companies, savings and loan associations, finance, mortgage and insurance companies and individual mortgagors? Are we ashamed that we lent public credit to rescue homes, to build new homes through the F. H. A., to rescue farms, to buy farms, to reduce tenancy, to stimulate cooperatives—things that cost the Government nothing, but meant everything to the individuals who received benefits they could not otherwise have received because credit sources were paralyzed by fear?

Are we not proud that through housing projects all over this country, we have taken people out of the squalor and filth of a rat-infested slums and given them a chance to breathe good air and their children a chance to be something better than gutter rats?

Are we ashamed that through the stimulus we have given to R. E. A. twice as many farms have been electrified in the past 8 years than were electrified in the 50 years before that? That the work of farm housewives everywhere has been lightened?

Do we apologize for the fact that we did tackle the problem of the Dust Bowl? That we have provided water facilities for more than 3,530,000 acres of arid land? That through soil-conservation measures we have rescued eroded, depleted, and abandoned land to the extent of more than 30,000,000 acres that are now in production in this war effort?

Are we ashamed that the cankerous growth of farm tenancy has been checked and that through the Farm Security Administration's

efforts 950,000 small farmers have been led out of despair and back into useful, productive, and happy lives?

Are we ashamed that we took people off submarginal land and resettled them upon good lands? Are we ashamed that we have given encouragement to the reforestation of lands that had been denuded in the ruthless exploitation of timber barons? Or that a good deal of that reforestation work was done by C. C. C. boys we took off the blind baggage of railroad cars—boys who were prowling the country for jobs we could not give them?

Are we ashamed of T. V. A. and of its 21 dams? Of Grand Coulee, Roosevelt, and other great dams that have been built under this administration? But particularly of T. V. A., with the blessings it has bestowed upon the people of that 650-mile valley? Do we apologize for the fact that its influence has reduced electric power rates all over the country? That it has provided flood control and opened new lands to farmers? That it has provided in this war 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity without which our war production could not have approached what it has been? Do we apologize for the fact that its research department has opened up new means of livelihood for the 4,500,000 people of an area as big as Scotland and England? Do we apologize for the fact that a once-desolated, flood-ravaged, poverty-stricken valley is now not only one of the great demonstration laboratories of the earth, but one of the happiest place in which to live? Do you people of Oklahoma apologize for that? Certainly the people of that valley do not?

Are we ashamed of our more enlightened treatment of the Indians under John Collier? Of our new national parks and national monuments? Of the public works program which added permanent wealth in the way of roads, bridges, dams, stream control, public buildings, playgrounds, parks, swimming pools—recreational centers of all kinds?

Are we ashamed that we gave vocational education to a great many youngsters who have since used it in the shipyards and factories of the country in the war effort?

Are we ashamed that we fed the poor and the unemployed? Are we ashamed that because of us, old people are drawing pensions all over the country and businesses and employees are jointly setting up more retirement funds and more unemployment funds? Are we ashamed that through us, the crippled and the blind receive aid from the Government? Do we dare apologize for the fact that we have enlightened child labor laws, or minimum wage and maximum hours laws?

Do we have to apologize for what we have done for, or to, business? In 1932 alone, 32,000 small businesses failed. The country's net income was 40 billions of dollars; its employment 37,000,000. In 7 years after that national income had risen to 70 billions, employment to 45 billions; small business failures were negligible and the profits of industry, which had begun to regain confidence and cry about the New Deal, were bigger than ever. Net profits of 2,480 index companies in 1939 had risen more than $1,250,000,000 from the year before. War, of course, has carried national income to $150,000,000,000, but I have deliberately not used war-year figures. Long before the war came, the country was over its Harding-Coolidge-Hoover created headache.

Did we do any injustice in the Truth-in-Securities law, or in the Securities Exchange law, under which the honest broker is given a virtual certificate that his stocks and bonds are honest and the crooked broker is driven out of business with the crooked promoter? Do we have any apology for the holding company law, for utilities regulations? For our attacks upon monopolies and cartels that have as their purpose gouging the consumer?

Have we any apology for what we have done for labor? Let us face that question honestly. Of course, wartime strikes have irritated us all; the only wise thing that Coolidge ever said was that nobody has a right to strike against the public safety anywhere, any time. I have no defense of any wartime strike, but I do want to point to the report of the Truman committee that strikes in mining, manufacturing, and construction in 1943 resulted in a loss of manpower of less than one-fourth of 1 percent of manpower actually used. In the same year, total manpower contributed by labor exceeded that used in 1939 by 76 percent.

The strike picture has been exaggerated deliberately to discredit labor. But it is not the strike picture which primarily irritates the enemies of labor. It is that they cannot reconcile themselves to the fundamental principle of the Wagner act: That labor has as much right to organize for bargaining as capitalists have to pool their money to conduct a business. When the Sewell Averys, the Tom Girdlers, and the Ernest Weirs learn that, this will be a happier country.

Of course we need new labor legislation; I advocate Federal chartering and Federal regulation of labor unions, particularly when they enjoy national power. I advocate legislation that will bring them under common antitrust laws; that will drive out the racketeers; that will make them thoroughly democratic and responsible in every way. I have no hesitation in saying that, but neither have I any hesitation in saying that I want to see the labor code of rights and charter of responsibilities written by a friendly even if sternly insistent administration, not by one determined to destroy organized labor itself. Labor's advances have been bloodily won or grudgingly granted by the opinion of this country. We have translated them into fundamental law. I do not want to see a few men in the Republican Party take them away, or restore to America the form of industrial fascism we had until the late twenties.

If we have no apology to labor, we certainly have no apology to the farmer. He has been the chief beneficiary of the Roosevelt administration.

When Roosevelt took over, farm mortgages had risen 300 percent in 20 years to $9,600,000,000; mortgage interest took 11.4 percent of the total cash farm income. More than a million farms had been lost by foreclosure and farmers were forcibly preventing foreclosures in some sections of the country. Farm income had dropped from twelve billions in 1929 to five billions in 1932. Wheat was down from $1.30 a bushel to 53 cents; cotton from 17.9 cents to 5 cents.

Today, the gross cash farm income, because of the war, is almost $20,000,000,000, or 400 percent more than in the darkest Hoover days, but again, I shall not take war figures.

In 1939, farm mortgage charges were 40 percent below 1928; the average rate on farm mortgages had gone from 5½ to 6 percent to 3½ to 4 percent and mortgage interest took 4.4 percent of the total cash income as against 11.4 under Hoover. Rehabilitation loans had increased the net worth of borrowers by 37 percent. Farm income had almost doubled from 1932 to 1937. The farmer's income in relation to industrial income, to take-home pay of the industrial workers, is at parity where it was at 82 percent of parity at the depth of the depression.

No class of American citizens has benfited nearly as much as the farmer from the 12 years of Roosevelt. Before that, from the beginning of the deflation of 1921 until 1932, he was the most despairing of all our citizens; the most hopeless and the least helped. It must be said in all fairness that most of the things that were done to benefit him were done at his request: Restricted production, holidays in production, subsidies, crop control, soil conservation. No matter how some of his professional representatives, or lobbyists feel about it now, the farmer has profited more than any other citizen.

I have not found much in this record to be ashamed of. Are you people in Oklahoma a little shame-faced when "PAPPY" O'DANIEL travels here to tell you that you should get rid of some of those 3,000,000 bureaucratic "flunkies"? If you are, I suggest you look into the fact that two-thirds of them are civilian employees of the Army and Navy; that 6 percent of them are in purely war agencies such as War Shipping, O. P. A., W. P. B., etc.; and that of the remaining 29 percent, 12.4 percent are employed in the Post Office, with its greatly expanded war service. "Pappy's" 3,000,000 "flunkies" finally get down to 467,841 employees for all other agencies of Government, such as Commerce, Treasury, State, Agriculture, and the independent agencies. If "Pappy" were truthful, he would probably say that he saw no sense in any such foolishness as social security, Federal crop insurance, wage and hour, National Labor Relations Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal deposit insurance, the T. V. A., and the United States Maritime Commission—the new major bureaus or agencies created by the New Deal. That's where the new permanent bureaucracy has come in. But, oddly enough, it has not been against these bureaus that the great howl against bureaucracy has come; it has been largely against war-created agencies.

The greatest complaint of all of us has been against those agencies that have made us pay taxes to buy the instruments of war for the boys we have sent abroad or into training; against the agencies that won't allow us to make as much money as we want to out of the business of mass killing or that will not allow us to salt away as much of this blood money for post-war spending as we want to; that won't let us have butter and nylons when we want them; that won't let us have all the gasoline that we want to have; that take our boys and don't take somebody else's boy.

I remember hearing from Oklahoma the complaint that you were being rationed on gasoline when you had gasoline and oil running out of your ears. I could not help applying that type of thinking to Kentucky. We have about 50 percent of all the synthetic rubber the country makes. Suppose we had said, "Keep your damned gasoline, but you can't have any rubber for your cars." You'd have been back in that surrey with the fringe on top very shortly. Or suppose that we, making a good deal more than 50 percent of the legal whisky that's made in this country (and pretty nearly 100 percent of all that's fit to drink) had taken the position: "All right, you people in Oklahoma have oil running out of your ears; we have whisky running out of our noses. You keep your oil and drink it and we'll keep our whisky." The drought that brought your Dust Bowl condition would have seemed like a monsoon season to you.

You see how silly is this business of complaining against rationing. No honest person wants any advantage out of it; no patriotic person wants anything more than that the sacrifice shall be equal. Nobody wants it to last any longer than the war makes it necessary, and nobody intends that it shall. The most contemptible position the Republicans have taken during the whole war is to try to capitalize upon dissatisfaction about purely wartime restrictions.

We Democrats have no apology for our conduct of the war. It is the most effective and most efficient war ever fought. Our people at home are better cared for, better fed, and better informed than they have ever been. Prices have been better controlled; in comparison with the rise in prices in World War No. 1, O. P. A. has saved the American people $87,000,000,000, or $169 per person, since the

war began, at a cost to them of $1.82 per person.

Our civil liberties have been better preserved than ever before. Sewell Avery can still call the President a liar without being shot—and has.

Our soldiers are the best equipped in the history of the world. We are not borrowing guns from anybody, as we did in World War No. 1. We are lending or leasing or giving our allies great parts of their implements of war. Those who sneered at the President's promise for 50,000 planes a year, including Mr. Dewey, have eaten their sneers in the face of a production of 100,000 or more planes a year. In 2½ years we have built an armada greater than the world has ever known, and with it a bridge of merchant ships making a highway of the seven seas. From inland yards that never knew a sea-going ship, landing crafts and destroyer escorts set their course for Tarawa and Kwajalein. No nation in world history has so quickly summoned its natural and physical resources, its factories, and its manpower to its defense. As Jonathan Daniels put it, "We as a people are the makers of the most amazing mobilization of force for a purpose in the annals of mankind." That purpose, of course, is freedom. That we are so well aware of our purpose and that we are so willing to throw so much into the preparation for the great sacrifice upon which we are about to embark with the invasion, is due primarily to the leadership of the President.

If all these things be true, what is there left to apologize for? For a huge debt? Certainly we have it; the war has been responsible for most of it and will be responsible for more. Without what the debt is buying, we would have no freedom. Without what it bought in the days of peace before this war, we would have had the continued erosion of the soil and of a people. We had a big debt when the war started, but we had all this restored land, all this created wealth, all these rescued souls of a despairing people to show for it. We have physical resources, human resources, and spiritual resources to put into the asset column and dwarf the liability.

Is anybody inclined to count Mrs. Roosevelt a party liability? If so, I think Florida and Alabama have answered that. She was made a direct issue there in the nastiest sort of campaign based on race hatred that could have been devised. And those who made the issue got the rebuke they deserved; the rebuke they will get from people all over this country. There is nothing about Mrs. Roosevelt for which to apologize. She does deserve an apostrophe; it can be found in the Twenty-third Psalm: "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

I have one final question of Democrats: Have we anything to apologize for in our foreign policy?

Are we ashamed that long before we knew we should need their friendship and their help, we reversed our policy toward the republics on this hemisphere, abandoned imperialism and dollar diplomacy and entered upon the good-neighbor policy which has been so productive for all of us?

Are we ashamed that Mr. Hull worked unremittingly to tear down the tariff walls which surely must come down if the world is to live at peace?

Are we ashamed that Mr. Roosevelt saw so far ahead of the rest of us? That he saw ahead what Hitler had in mind, what Japan had in mind and that from 1936 on he tried desperately to warn us to prepare while he was trying to stave off what became inevitable?

Have we anything to apologize for, in the light of history, in the whole record of the Democratic Party in foreign affairs? For the fact that every major declaration, every major advocacy touching international cooperation for the maintenance of peace has been made by a Democratic President in this century?

The country should take warning at the moment that while the Republicans are "talkin' purty" (as the lyrics writer has you saying in the play Oklahoma)—while the Republicans are "talkin' purty" again in international affairs, it is the talk of opportunism. The Republican Party is isolationist at heart. It opposed this war until Pearl Harbor made opposition moot. It has made no declaration as a party equivalent to the Atlantic Charter or to Mr. Hull's outline of our foreign policy. Mr. Hannegan was entirely correct when he referred to Governor Dewey as a man who copies down the answers on his little slate when the examination is all over.

Mr. Dewey was against "deals" with Russia; by two stages he has now come to the idea that maybe Russia and China ought to be let in on the Anglo-American government of the world. Governor Dewey was against lend-lease when it was proposed. He told reporters in Philadelphia January 15, 1941, that it "would bring an end to free government in the United States, to abolish Congress for all practical purposes." In his Wisconsin campaign of 1940, his philosophy was to keep away from Europe; in 1944, he wanted to "discourage the growth of rampant nationalism."

If Mr. Hannegan is not right that Governor Dewey copies the answers after they are all in—after the polls and State elections tell him public sentiment—then he is, in the words of the song from Oklahoma, "Jus' a fellow who cain't say 'no.' His corn is as high as an elephant's eye." There is not the slightest consistency in his foreign policy because there is no sincerity in it.

Therein lies a great danger to the American people. Dewey is playing with us the same deceptive game that Harding played. Harding stood piously on his own front porch at Marion and solemnly assured this country that he was for a society or an association of nations to preserve the peace. In a speech on August 28, 1920, Mr. Harding said:

"There are distinctly two types of international relationship. One is the offensive and defensive alliance of great powers * * *. The other type is a society of free nations, or an association of free nations or a league of free nations animated by consideration of right and justice instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace, but so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility.

"Such an association I favor with all my heart and I would make no fine distinction as to whom credit is due. One need not care what it is called. Let it be an association, a society or a league or what not. Our concern is solely with the substance, not the form thereof."

With that assurance from Harding, 31 of the most eminent men in the Republican Party, including Lyman Abbott, Robert Brookings, Nicholas Murray Butler, John Grier Hibben, Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, A. Lawrence Lowell, Elihu Root, Henry L. Stimson, Oscar Straus, Henry W. Taft, William Allen White, George W. Wickersham, and Lyman B. Wilbur, went to the country with a statement that the "true course to bring America into an effective league to preserve peace" was to follow Mr. Harding.

"The Republican Party," the statement said, "is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course until the declared object is obtained * * *.

"We therefore," the statement ended, "believe that we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote peace by supporting Mr. Harding for the Presidency."

Mr. Harding was elected, but did these honorable men in the Republican Party prevail? Were they able to redeem that faith which they had pledged for their party? History gives the answer to that. It also gives eloquent testimony to te innate determination of the Old Guard that, as Mr. Dewey said in Wisconsin, we shall keep "completely out of the affairs of Europe," no matter how badly the course of those affairs jeopardizes the peace and civilization of the world.

Domestically the Republican Party for most of its life has been the instrument of big business, the exponent of laissez-faire, the protector of the propertied. Internationally it has symbolized imperialism rather than the good-neighbor spirit, the spirit of mutual security. There is nothing in its present policy or in the roster of its candidates for the presidency to indicate that, having choked off its liberal movement, it is not again at the dead center of normalcy in domestic affairs and in an imperialistic mood internationally.

That is not good enough. Anything short of taking our full place in world affairs is an invitation to another war. Anything short of recognition that what we are going through is in fact a counterrevolution against the tyrannies of authoritarianism and that the trend of the world when this war is over will be toward the greater emphasis upon the dignity of the individual—the trend to the left, if you care to call it that—will put us out of step with the peoples we have fought to save. Anything short of the recognition that there is no turning back in our domestic affairs; that we cannot go back to 1914 or even to 1940, is the sheerest stupidity.

Anything short of the recognition that we cannot go back to this will-o-the-wisp thing called free enterprise, which never has existed since the first regulatory law was passed by the Continental Congress, will lead us into trouble. We must know in our hearts that there must be full employment for employables and that if private business doesn't provide for it, Government must. We must know in our hearts that we will never go back on the standards of fair working conditions or wages that we have set. We must know in our hearts that we will never relax regulations made in the public good—regulations born of the necessity of protecting the individual from the brute power of pooled money or influence.

We must know that the demand for an earned security—particularly for greater medical security in the rural areas—will not die out, but will swell in chorus until the Government does what the medical profession cannot do. We must know that the standards of health, housing, nutrition, and all the other things that make for a good life are not matters to be left lightly to free enterprise, but are matters of concern to all of us as a people who make a Government; as a people determined to use their Government as an agency to secure the welfare and enhance the happiness of all of us.

A great decision is to be made this year. Both the mind and the heart will figure in it. Both of them argue for a Democratic victory.

Keynote Speech by Gov. Raymond Baldwin, of Connecticut, Before the Vermont Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut, before the Vermont Republican State Convention, at Montpelier, Vt., May 17, 1944. I am advised that printing the address will exceed by one-third of a page the two pages allowed under the rule, and that the printing will cost $121.33.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the invitation came from your Governor and from your State committee to address this convention I felt highly honored. I was pleased—because this grand old State of Vermont is the symbol of sound Republicanism, of faith in the American ideal, and I told my good wife that to be asked to address your convention was perhaps an indication that your stanch Republicans here in Vermont agreed with my brand of Republicanism. But she said that that didn't necessarily follow—that Vermont was such a strong Republican State that nothing that I might say could do any harm. But I do feel highly flattered at your invitation.

For a long time now I have known and admired the leaders in your party. Your Governor, Bill Wills, is a warm personal friend. I admire him for his forthright leadership, for his statesmanship—for his outstanding Vermont and New England qualities. He is known for these qualities, not only throughout New England, but throughout our broad country.

We all admire his insistence that the rights and powers of the States in matters of State and local concern be preserved. First by the taxing power—then by the depression—and now by the exigencies of war—there are those who believe in boosting the Federal power to the control of everything, hoping thereby to build up a bureaucracy, supported by the Federal Treasury, to destroy the States and keep themselves in power indefinitely. Independent, vigorous State governments are the best guaranty we can have against the tyranny that centralized bureaucracy may bring. We all love the United States. We all support our common, united country, with our blood and with our treasure. But we want our country to continue as the United States of America—and not become a multiplication of bureaus filled with political favorites and incompetents.

Your Senators, WARREN AUSTIN and GEORGE AIKEN, are likewise known, not only in Connecticut but throughout our country, for their statesmanlike qualities. It was a rare and happy experience to work 4 years ago with GEORGE AIKEN who was then your Governor. And in these recent months it has been an inspiration to be associated with your Senator, WARREN AUSTIN, particularly at the Mackinac conference, where he made such an outstanding contribution to the thinking of our people in the important field of foreign affairs. And I have known and admired your Congressman, CHARLES PLUMLEY, for his many and able works in the public interest, not only of his own people but of all New England and the country as well.

We folks in Connecticut feel a strong kinship with you folks here in Vermont. Back in the early days many of our people migrated to your beautiful State and played an important part in its founding and development. We are proud of our State of Connecticut, and it is, indeed, a tribute to Vermont, that any Connecticut Yankee would prefer the Vermont hills. And we Republicans down in Connecticut feel a strong kinship with you Republicans in Vermont. There have been years recently when we turned our longing Republican eyes to Vermont and to Maine—the only two Republican States to keep their Republican faith in spite of everything. For in those unhappy days of the depression, which ended in a World War, many Americans went off after strange and unknown gods. The golden calf looked pretty good to them—at times it looked almost productive. But that never happened in Vermont. Vermont set up no new and strange altars. Vermont hauled down no banners. She maintained her faith in her American heritage. She clung to the American ideals of thrift and hard work and rugged honesty, both in thought and deed, and, above all, she kept her faith in the American way.

This convention is an important part of the American process of choosing a President of the United States. I am convinced, that the man whom your delegates select as their candidate will win the November elections. Yours is a solemn, as well as a vitally important duty. Some people have said that it is unfortunate that we have to go through a political campaign in these days of war. Such talk demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of our American system. It shows a lack of comprehension of American methods and American traditions. We would give to our Axis enemies one of the best propaganda weapons that they could possibly have if we did not go through with this election in true American fashion. They would say that our American system, which we boast so loudly about, is too important to stand the ravages of war. They would say that the American people were afraid to hold an election, that they were too weak to carry out the processes of their Government on the home front, while their men and women are fighting to maintain them on the battle front. This campaign and election, carried out in true American style, will demonstrate to our enemies and to all the world that we believe firmly in our American institutions of government and can make them work—war or no war.

You have no doubt heard some people say that criticism of the administration in power will breed disunity. Let me say to you that our kind of government lives by criticism. In no other way can the thoughts and the opinions of all of our people be made vocal, and being made vocal, be translated into action—action that means a more effective prosecution of the war on the home front—action that means more vigorous support of our fighting forces on the battle front, action that means building ever stronger the States and the whole United States to solve the problems of an ever-changing future.

No; we Americans know what this campaign is all about. Perhaps our enemies don't. But whether they do or do not is of no consequence to us. Whatever may be our political affiliation we are first of all Americans. When we make a decision by our ballots, we stand by it—we are more firmly united—more determined than ever.

You will no doubt hear a lot of talk in these coming days and weeks about not changing horses in the middle of a stream. On that very point I would like to submit to you an answer that was once given to this argument in another period of emergency. It is a good answer. I quoted it to the Maine Republicans a month ago. It seemed to appeal to them. I think it will appeal to you. I quote:

"There will be many in this Nation during the coming months who will implore you not to swap horses crossing a stream. But it seems to me that the more truthful, the more accurate plea to the people of this Nation should be this: 'if the old car, in spite of frequent emergency repairs, has been bumping along downhill on only two cylinders for 3 long years, it is time to get another car that will start uphill on all four.'"

Now that appeals to me as a bit of sound thinking. It was never sounder than it is in these days. But I am not the first one to say it. In fact a Republican did not say it. It was said on April 18, 1932, by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This year's election is no ordinary contest between political parties. Such a contest at such a time—with our very destiny hanging in the balance—would be intolerable. This, however, is a contest which does involve our very destiny. This is an election in which the American people will choose—not merely the party that will govern them, but more important than that—they will choose the direction in which, in the dangerous period that lies ahead of us, they will go. No; this is not a contest merely between Republicans and Democrats. It is a contest between two different ways of life, two fundamentally different philosophies of government. Into such a struggle the Republican Party enters with confidence—confidence borne not of self-esteem, but confidence borne of esteem in the American people. The American people know where they want to go. They want a leadership that will begin to get them going. The American people know what they want to achieve. They will demand a leadership that believes that what the people want is worth achieving. The American people know what kind of a world they want to see when this war is victoriously ended. They will choose the kind of leadership that believes in the kind of a world they want—believes in it, not in word only, but in the innermost reaches of their hearts and minds.

I believe that the Republican Party has come to the Nation for such a time as this. We do not mean one thing when we are out for votes and another thing when we get down to business. We are not a house divided against itself—half Socialist and half free enterprise; half Democratic and half New Deal; one thing north of Mason and Dixon's line and another thing south of it. The Republican Party is the same party, all the way through, from Vermont to California and from northernmost Michigan to the Deltas of the Mississippi. The Republican Party is not a carry-all or omnibus for all sorts of warring minorities. It is a Nation-wide vehicle for the American faith. What it really is and the direction in which it truly is going are what the American people want. And they are going to vehemently express that want by their votes in the election next November.

Our task in this campaign is a twofold one. It is on the one hand to change; on the other hand to build up. But it is not to tear down all of that which has been put on our statute books in the last 12 years. Much of that, we believe to be in imitation of the best Republican tradition, the tradition of William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge. No; our task there is to build those things up so that they will really and truly work, so that they will be supported by a sound American economy and not have to depend upon multitudinous, confusing regulations, ever-increasing taxes, and constant drains upon public savings. We believe that social welfare depends upon the productivity of all of our people. We believe that social progress comes from increasing and expanding our agricultural and industrial production. We do not believe that either can be permanently achieved through a redistribution of the life savings of our people.

In the post-war years we must change the spirit of defeatism that comes from the belief of the New Dealers that there are no more frontiers. We must preach that it is an American virtue to first ask about opportunity—that it is an American virtue to expect a bill of duties to accompany every bill of rights—that it is an American virtue to regard government as a joint undertaking among equals in behalf of the common good. Those are the things that are going to count most after the victory is won in this war. But through the long years before this war we have been told that America's economic progress had come to the end of the road—that as Americans we are no longer required to get up and get going but rather that all that is expected of us is to settle down

through youth and age as permanent dependents of the State. We cannot forget that our economic ills, after 9 long years of tinkering, had not been solved by this New Deal administration's "planned economy," when war began for us.

We know now that one of these days we will win this war. We know that because the men who are fighting that war for us are the winning kind. They have the stuff that makes victories. We know it too because on the home front—in factories and on the farms—in multitudes of civilian activities—the American people are demonstrating, too, that they have the stuff. On our global battle fronts and here at home where the materials for those battle fronts are being made Americans are showing every day and every hour that our country will never accept a spirit of defeatism—that our country is a growing, vital thing—that our American system built up through long years of toil and sacrifice is the best system in the world.

But while the victory of our arms now seems certain, what we are going to do with that victory is not so certain. When we have won this war, we will have a world on our hands that is bruised and broken. We will have an America that is dislocated and confused. Indeed that day of our certain victory will at the same time be filled with many uncertainties. It will be a day of joy. It can be a day of great opportunity—the greatest that the American people have ever had spread out before them.

Well, as we look forward to that day, there are, it seems to me, three things of greatest consequence. These three things are the things which in their hearts the American people truly want.

First, we want our victory to be speedy—we want it to be sure. We want no halfway victory. We want an all-out victory, a victory that this time can be made to stick.

That is the first Republican obligation—not merely to win, but to speed the day of our winning. If the victory comes slowly it will not be for lack of courage among those who fight. It will not be for lack of military leadership among the great soldiers and sailors who direct the fighting. If victory comes slowly—it will be because a speedy victory calls for more than the genius of our military and naval leaders and the courage of our fighting men. Speedy victory calls for an aroused Nation—a Nation that is not only doing the best with its hands and its mind—but a Nation that is unselfishly doing its best in its heart and in its spirit.

We have been a long time in this war. We have come a long way. But too many have almost come to accept this war as a part of our everyday lives. We need a revival of spirit, a new and fresh leadership, some new players on the team who can carry the ball from the 25-yard line across the goal. A Republican victory will add nothing to the experience of our military and naval leadership—it will add nothing to the superb courage of our fighting men. But it will add new life to the home front and produce a new, vigorous, fighting spirit that can and will bring speedy victory. When the people know that they are firmly on the American road and that the same spirit which made America great in the first place will continue after the victory is won, a tremendous lift will be given to our whole country. Republican leadership will give a new and fresh start to the solution of the still unsolved and intricate problem of the home front.

Secondly, when our boys come home, they will want from us an America in which there is a place for them. They will want jobs, good jobs at good pay, pay out of which they can build their own homes and raise their own families, as independent, self-respecting Americans, looking and finding opportunity, making their own future secure, taking their part in building an even better America.

There is nothing that Government, in and by itself, can do to see that after the war there are opportunities enough and jobs enough to go around. Jobs come from an ever-increasing and expanding production. Jobs do not come from Government, because Government does not produce. Government lives off the production of others.

If, after the war, there are jobs enough to go around, it will be because America is a producing America. But if Government cannot produce jobs, Government certainly can prevent their production. Government can hamper and hobble and hamstring the instruments of production. It can keep the productive genius of America under a cold shower or in a dog house where for 9 long years before the war the present administration did its best to keep it. There are no jobs in that. All there is is a job in the W. P. A.

What is required of us as Republicans is really the unleashing of America's productive capacities. We can meet that requirement, for the Republican Party is the party of production. It has in it an overwhelming majority of the men who make our American productive system click. That is why so many Republicans were let out of the dog house and called to Washington in such a desperate hurry when the war first hit us. That also is why in 26 States—the States where the greatest part of our war materials are being produced—American citizens have elected Republican administrations. The people knew that this was no time for tinkering. The Nation needed the goods. The people, therefore, called on those who knew how to deliver.

Our Republican victory next fall will produce jobs in this post-war world, because Republicans know what it is that jobs are produced by. Republicans know that government dependence may be good enough for an economic old age, but they also know that only the full-blast operation of our productive system is good enough to provide the jobs that are in turn good enough for our economic youth. If there is one thing above all others that this war has demonstrated it is this irrefutable fact—the American productive system is sound and good. It is workable and efficient. If it had not been we would never, in this short space of 2½ years, have been able to turn out the materials of war in a manner to make the whole world marvel at us, in a manner that really even surprises us.

Finally, when this war is won, when the American productive system is on its way again, then we will want, for ourselves and for our children, some insurance that there will be no more war. That is something that will require more than a formula. That is something that it will take more than mere words to win. You can't get world peace out of a formula. The threat of war cannot be driven from America and from the children of America by pious declarations or secret conclaves or one-man statesmanship. The peace must be a people's peace. That is the only guaranty that it will be permanent.

Some people say that they like the President's foreign policy but that they do not like his domestic policy. But we must all remember this. If you reelect the present administration you must take its domestic policy along with its foreign policy—you must take what you say you like with what you say you dislike. We are coming rapidly to understand that our domestic policy is quite as important in world affairs as our foreign policy. Indeed, they are inseparable. If we are to assume our rightful position of trust and responsibility to ourselves and to the rest of the world, in organizing the world for peace, we must be very strong at home. We won't get very far in settling world problems if we can't settle domestic ones. A sound national economy therefore is prerequisite to our successful participation in plans for world peace. We cannot then separate our domestic problems from our world problems.

We are now being told, and we will be told over and over again in this coming campaign, that the peace of the American people is something which only one man can bring to pass. If we accept that counsel, there will be no permanent peace. What we are trying to disclose to our neighbors in the world, is not the desires and the idealism of one individual. What we must try to disclose to the world are the desires and the idealism of the American people as a whole, the desires and the idealism that come, not from one man or from one political party, but spring from the hearts and minds of all Americans of good will, regardless of party. We tried a one-man peace last time. To the people of Europe the President of the United States was their sole savior. And let me say, as a Republican and as a veteran of the last war, that I admired tremendously the courage and the idealism of that great man. The unfortunate part of it all was that, to the people of America, the President of the United States appealed as their sole advocate. And the peace failed. It failed because it was not made the people's peace. It was a one-party, and in large part a one-man, effort. This time the peace effort must be a common, united American effort.

The tragedy of the present is that history is now repeating itself. The people of Europe are being told, and the people of the United States are being told, that only one man and only one party understands America, understands world problems, and hence alone is capable of making a lasting peace. As Republicans, we can point with unbounded pride to the efforts made by leaders of our own party in the past to bring permanent world peace. Root, Taft, Hughes, and many others in their day labored diligently and effectively and patriotically in the interests of world peace. But when, after the armistice in the last war, we approached the settlement of world affairs, these Republicans were left out. The approach to the peace table was a partisan approach—it was a one-man approach—and it failed.

And while there has been able and intelligent leadership in the interests of world peace in the past—so is there now in these days. The people of Vermont in future years will look back upon their Senator WARREN AUSTIN as one who has made a lasting contribution. As a Republican, and as an American, I say that to date there has been no better, no sounder, no saner declaration of American policy in the post-war world than that announced at Mackinac last September, a statement in which your Senator took such a leading part in framing. I think that it should become a plank in the Republican platform. I quote it to you:

"1. Prosecution of the war by a united nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies including (a) disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis; (b) disqualifications of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war; (c) permanent maintenance of trained and well equipped armed forces at home.

"2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

A Republican victory next November will lift the peace above partisanship. It will make it an enterprise—not for the indispensable man, not for the indispensable party—but the common, united purpose and enterprise of the American people. Specific plans and measures, specific methods of

world organization, the building up and the sustaining of an international law that will govern the relationships of nations as our own laws govern the relationships of men—these all in due time will be required of us. But the first thing that will be required of us is that we, ourselves, out of our own American common sense and our own practical idealism, help shape the things to come, help build a world in which war will be no more.

There is a big job ahead. There is a historical opportunity. But the job is not too big for us to do or the opportunity too great for us to grasp. They are not too big or too great for us, because they are what the American people want to bring to pass. And to the American people, when they are united in a common purpose, when their mind is made up, with God's guidance and help everything is possible.

The Political Situation in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, in response to inquiries relative to the political situation in Oregon during the recent primary election held there, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio speech which I made on the evening of the 18th instant, just a week ago.

The C. I. O. political action committee, the Communists, the special-privilege-seeking crowd, the new dealers, and those internationalists who resent my efforts to restrict immigration for the duration of the war at least, and who, through the centuries have been such a pregnant force in fomenting strife and wars, made common cause and coordinated their resources and efforts to conduct an effective smear campaign. Every "for-hire" political hanger-on, and all the purchasable publications were employed by them.

The same subversive forces, with their apparently unlimited financial resources and the same unscrupulous methods, will be likewise effective in other elections.

I submit this statement for whatever benefit it may be to those Members of Congress who desire an effective prosecution of the war, the preservation of representative government under the Federal Constitution, and the promotion of the welfare of the American people.

Forewarned is forearmed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, fellow Oregonians, tonight I am going to make some statements which are decidedly not politic in a campaign for election, but I am not so much concerned with what may happen to me personally or politically, as I am fearful of what may happen to our country if present political trends are not halted.

These are the times that try men's souls. The Communist, the war profiteer, the internationalist, and the new dealer coordinate their efforts to secure advantages to themselves which the haste and confusion of our war efforts make possible, while 12,000,000 young Americans are sacrificing their future prospects for happiness and their very lives in mortal conflicts all over the world. A controlled press disseminates censored and propagandized news to a gullible public. Patriots are made to appear as idlers and traitors while scoundrels are extolled as saviors of our country. Unless these rampant and subversive forces are halted and brought under control now, the end of the American Republic is not far distant.

At a time when all those who truly love their country are diligently apprehensive of the existing destructive trends of national policies, and are urging unity of patriotic purpose and action on the part of all Americans regardless of race, religion, or country of origin, in order that we may not be conquered or lose our form of government, Mr. Roosevelt and his adherents in both the Democratic and Republican Parties are fomenting dissensions among us by inciting class hatreds and vicious accusations, charges, and countercharges among public men.

The new dealers and their gullible dupes encourage the despicable Walter Winchell and his ilk, and quote as from an authority the discredited book Under Cover and other irresponsible and unreliable publications.

Tomorrow's election may be the most important election in the history of our country. If the people fail now to recapture the control of their Government from the sinister and subversive forces which now administer it, I doubt if the people ever again can rally sufficient strength to do so peaceably.

The President, who now refers to himself as the Commander in Chief, together with those who with his cooperation have wormed themselves into strategic places of Government and who permeate all the Federal bureaus and departments, has been extending his and their political powers and expanding their personal authorities until already the Supreme Court is subservient to the Executive, the New Deal majorities in both houses of the Congress constitute it a "rubber-stamp" Congress, and the people are regulated in the most intimate details of their daily lives. Free enterprise, independent labor, untrammeled agriculture and commerce are rapidly disappearing in our country while we pretend to be carrying the "four freedoms" to the remote corners of the world for the benefit of those who know, and accept, nothing but dictatorship. In the meantime our war casualties exceed 100,000 a month and the big fighting has not yet begun.

The Republicans are brought face to face with these sinister forces in this present primary election. I have opposed the socialistic, wasteful extravagances, the tardy preparations for war, and the once complacent toleration of the resident Japanese situation on the Pacific coast, which have characterized this New Deal administration, while my opponent, Professor Morse, has accepted employment under, and carried out the policies of, the New Deal; although now, he pretends to be opposed to it. The outrageous misuse of war-time authorizations in the President's seizure of Montgomery Ward's store in Chicago was based upon the decisions of this same Professor Morse when recently serving as a New Deal bureaucrat on the War Labor Board. He now berates the seizure of the Montgomery Ward store. The professor may be clever, but is he honest?

While, as a member of the Senate Committee for Immigration, I was supporting legislation to restrict immigration and to deport Harry Bridges, the Communist and trouble-making alien, Professor Morse was testifying to his good character. Have you forgotten the beating-up of our good American workingmen, the destruction by fire of our lumber mills and forests and the intimidation of our operators which characterized the reign of terror prevailing throughout our own State of Oregon 6 years ago? Harry Bridges, the Communist and violent labor-leader, was an important factor in these subversive activities.

While I deplore strikes in defense industries in wartimes, the honest, patriotic workingman has never had a better or more effective friend in the public service than I am and always have been. I refer you to my record as Commissioner of Multnomah County, as member of the State Board of Control, and in my private operations. I approve of labor unions. There is a necessary and legitimate place for them in our domestic economy. I have suported Federal legislation authorizing collective bargaining. I oppose the exploitation of those who work by those who do not. I am opposed to the purposes and methods of the C. I. O. political action committee.

I am encouraged to believe that my service in the Senate must be meritorious since my record there must be falsified to enable those who are opposing me to criticize it.

Who are those who apparently are acting for the invisible forces of the special privilege-seeking crowd, of the internationalists and new dealers in this campaign to purge me in this election. Obviously, there is more money being spent for the purpose of defeating me than is being spent for, or against, all other candidates combined in this election.

Never before have I presented my candidacy for public service to the people of Oregon when I have been so well fortified by duties well, timely, and faithfully performed. I have been diligent, constantly on the job, and effective and patriotic in the performance of my duties. In over 6 years I have had no vacations. A thorough examination of the official RECORD and a truthful interpretation of it will verify this statement. Senator McNary said on several occasions that in his quarter of a century of continuous service in the United States Senate he never had known a Senator who had accomplished so much for his State and Nation in an equal period of time as I had.

Although my opponent asserts that I am difficult to get along with, yet the fact is I never have quarreled with honest men.

Then why all this extravagant and slanderous effort to defeat my reelection, particularly when the effectiveness of a Senator is cumulative with the length of his continuous service. Note the example of Senator McNary's long and faithful service and the advantage of it to our State.

Let me remind you that a great fund, accumulated to finance this campaign against me, was hawked about and up and down this State hunting for a popular citizen of Oregon to accept it as a campaign expense fund.

Not a single well-known Oregon citizen so approached would accept this political slush fund. So, with the cooperation of one Palmer Hoyt, who served the Roosevelt fourth-term propaganda organization known as the Office of War Information—it should be designated as the Office of War Misinformation—Prof. Wayne Morse was found in a Federal bureau to be an available candidate for Senator. This Federal bureaucrat was prevailed upon to resign a $10,000-a-year place on the Federal pay roll to enter the campaign against me.

In a similar campaign in Texas, Judge Allred was persuaded to resign his lifetime position on the Federal district court and to become the New Deal purge candidate against Senator O'DANIEL. After the defeat of Judge Allred in the Texas election, the President promptly appointed Judge Allred to the Federal circuit court of appeals. Mr. Roosevelt always takes care of his lame ducks.

The Oregonian, a newspaper managed by Palmer Hoyt, stated that Professor Morse is

a lawyer and a farmer in Eugene. I was in Eugene last week and could not find him listed in the telephone book as a lawyer, or of having any legal clients; nor could I find anyone who knew of him being a farmer although he has a suburban residence. He may be a farmer in the city of Eugene. The once great independent newspaper, the Oregonian, as now under the management of Palmer Hoyt, is, in my opinion, little more that a house organ for Aaron Frank's department store. He, too, is opposing me.

Who else beside Palmer Hoyt, the New Deal O. W. I. editor, is openly sponsoring the vicious campaign against me? Well, there is Paul Dunham. Do you know him? No; of course you do not, because I have exposed this fraud in the United States Senate. There is no such person as Paul Dunham; yet news items purporting to be reported by him under a Washington date line are printed in various Oregon publications and these pretended news items are intended to damage my reputation before the voters of Oregon.

Then there is Florence Lawrence. I have tried diligently to locate Florence Lawrence, but have not been successful. She, too, makes assertions about me which the facts do not substantiate or justify.

Then there is the notorious Tom Burns. Do you know him? He purports to have heard me make a speech in the Portland auditorium denouncing a large section of very worthy citizens. Is it not strange that Tom Burns is the only one who heard this ghostly speech?

Then there is Senaca Fouts. Do you know him? He bobs up at frequent elections and opens his mud guns upon reputable men.

Then there is Charley Robison, some of whose racketeering labor clients were sent to the Oregon penitentiary as a result of the disastrous labor troubles of 6 years ago.

Then there are the Communists—need I say more?

All these and the new dealers and the seekers of special privileges and the internationalists, who would relax and repeal our immigration laws, are opposing my reelection and supporting as their candidate the Professor Morse.

I do not want the support of these people. I am unalterably opposed to them. I want no traffic with them. The Professor is welcome to all of them.

However, I do want, and I am receiving, the support of many of those American citizens who love their country, who are loyal to the Government under the Federal Constitution and who make every possible contribution to win the war at the earliest possible moment, with the least loss of life and with the most efficient use of our material wealth.

As a result of my initiation, cooperation and active support of Federal legislation, our country was much better prepared for war when finally war came than it otherwise would have been. By attending faithfully to my duties as a member of the Senate Committee for Military Affairs I was delegated with other members of it to ascertain the true condition of our Pacific coast defenses. As a result of these activities every man, woman, and child in the Oregon country is now, and has been for the past 18 months safer in his home, employment, and schoolhouse than otherwise he would have been. Of course, while employed in these duties neither I nor the other Senators with whom I was associated were idly answering "Present, Teacher" to roll calls in the Senate; nor were we expected to be. We were performing more important Federal work elsewhere, and upon our return, our reports and recommendations were translated into reforms, authorizations, and appropriations which have been of vital importance to the defense of our country, the prosecution of the war, and the welfare of the American people. We committee members were so employed right up to and at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

As a Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee I have secured or cooperated in the authorization and appropriation by the Congress and the allocation by the Federal departments, of every dollar of Federal funds spent in Oregon for any purpose during the past 5 years. These Federal expenditures run into hundreds of millions of dollars and have been disbursed in Oregon for wages, materials, and improvements of every kind and description. An ounce of performance is worth a pound of preachment.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again.

Fortified by the accurate knowledge of national affairs and war information which you do not have, I assure you if again I had the decisions to make which I have made, I would again vote under the conditions then prevailing, as I did vote.

I have done my full and patriotic duty as your United States Senator. I leave the cause for which I fight in your hands. Now, the decision is yours.

Can this election be bought?

Let us not go the way of France.

Thank you and good night.

The Future of Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address entitled "The Future of Communications," which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System from the rotunda of the Capitol Building, Washington, May 24, 1944, on the occasion of the celebration of the centennial of the telegraph.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressman BULWINKLE, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we have met here today to commemorate the anniversary of a great event in the lives of mankind and to pay honor to the memory of a great man. The event was the first important public demonstration of the wire telegraph; the man was Samuel F. B. Morse, a New England Yankee who persevered through years of adversity to accomplish his objective. Just 100 years ago this morning, in a room below us in this Capitol Building and before distinguished men and women of that day, Mr. Morse tapped out, fittingly enough, a verse from the Bible, "What hath God wrought!" Forty miles away in Baltimore, his coworker, Alfred Vail, received the message.

It is particularly appropriate that these commemorative ceremonies take place here for it was a congressional grant of $30,000 which enabled that first telegraph line to be constructed.

This was a major achievement in the use of electricity. It paved the way for the oceanic cables, for the telephone, and the radio. It created world-wide interest in that little-known force—electricity—and is largely responsible for the electrical world in which we live, and for the electronic wonderland of tomorrow.

But even more important, I believe, was the economic and social impact of this new and speedy method of communication. Nowadays, all of us take telegraphing or telephoning across the country, or around the world, as a matter of course. To me it is important to remember that only 84 years ago our citizens still looked upon the pony express as a new wonder of the world. In Europe and in America, carrier pigeons and semaphore posts were agencies of what was regarded as fast communication.

The telegraph brought our Republics together; it permitted citizens to know what men thought and what they were doing elsewhere. It implemented the economic and industrial development of our own Nation and of the world.

The past is history and history is only a prologue to tomorrow. What then may we expect from this new art which is still in its infancy?

First, let us consider communications, the business of sending information from one to another quickly. After all, a motivating force behind Morse was the fact that word of his wife's death in New Haven did not get to him here in Washington until 7 days after her funeral.

Avoiding technical details, there are two basic means of telegraphic communication—over wires and over the ether without wires. The latter—which we know commonly as wireless or radio—was made possible by the development of the vacuum tube. It is a newer art, a refinement of communication by wire, but it has not outmoded wire communications. Both are in use today; both will be in use side by side for years because each has a function to fulfill.

Communications, written or spoken words, music, pictures, and even your own handwriting, can be and are transmitted over vast distances by both means.

For example, it is now possible to send hundreds of simultaneous messages over one pair of wires. A few years ago only two or four messages could be sent at once.. You remember when every town and the countryside had poles with hundreds of wires? If it wasn't for that development, it would require a forest of poles for all the wires necessary to carry today's amount of communications.

Another device permits not only many simultaneous messages to be sent over land and ocean but to send them in a steady, uninterrupted flow so that the conductor is used to maximum capacity.

Still another device allows the sending of messages over a conductor which is used for other purposes—for example a high-power line carrying vast amounts of electric power from one area to another can be used to transmit messages without interfering in any way with the normal use of the wire.

Already in use is a device which enables you to drop a message or a picture into a box, much as you drop a letter into a mail box. In the cabinet your message is scanned by an electric eye and is transmitted in your own writing to a central receiving point for subsequent transmission to its destination.

Actual facsimiles of important papers in the sender's own writing are now transmitted across continents. Right now in China, for example, that system is followed by our Army to avoid delay and difficulty in transmitting Chinese characters.

Everyone knows of the teletype—that amazing electrical typewriter so widely used here and abroad to facilitate the transmission of lengthy correspondence.

At this very minute in New York a press service using radio telegraph is picking up more than 400 words per minute from Moscow and last night Moscow was receiving 200 to 300 words a minute from us.

A metropolitan newspaper using radio telephone talked with Australia at the rate of

250 words per minute, and this morning we read the story.

Not only words but pictures of battle scenes on the Russian front, the Italian front, the South Pacific, come flowing in every minute of the day. Our ships in the far reaches of vast oceans are in instant and constant communication with their bases, or with one another, if it is desirable or necessary. Our airplane pilots, bombing enemy targets, talk with one another, or with their commanding officer on a carrier hundreds of miles away. They are guided in to landings—on hidden jungle airfields or on board ship—by radio devices. Through radio, navigation has become so exact a science that vessels will not miss a designated point by 100 yards. Through radio, we know far in advance, not only of the approach of a fleet of warships or of airplanes but how many, what kind, and their exact location from minute to minute. A commanding officer may give orders to his troops which at the very moment are engaging the enemy over an area too large for visible signal communication.

But I am beginning to talk about things that are better left unsaid now. These and many other devices so amazing that ordinary minds cannot comprehend their wonders are actually in operation today—now. They will affect and change the lives of all mankind after this war.

Perhaps here we should take a glimpse into the future of this electronic fairyland: Mail sorted and distributed by electric automatons; automobiles protected from accidents at dangerous crossings by electric eyes; railroad train crews always in full communication with each other and with the dispatcher; railroad trains protected by automatic stopping devices; airplanes, spanning the earth, flown by means of a master pilot, guided to landings automatically, and their passengers receiving or sending messages; automatic automobile driving on main cross-country highways by means of a master pilot; electric eyes which, unfortunately for some of us, tell police stations far ahead just how fast the driver is going; facsimile newspapers and television newsreel scenes, not only in the home but even in the automobile as we drive along; the transmission of electric power, not by wire but by wireless; cooking and heating homes by radio; the processing of metals and plastics by heat induction through radio; even the production of electric power from the sun through use of vacuum tubes.

All of these things are not only possible—many are already accomplished, practical, working facts. Only a few are still in the experimental stage. And all this, mind you, is only the beginning.

I have touched on the future development in this industry for one important purpose; I am firmly of the opinion that it makes clear that a new world is opening up before us and succeeding generations, a world in which there will be the greatest economic opportunity for men who have the courage and intelligence to cope with its problems.

Those jeremiahs who preach of an already finished economy, of an age which must adjust itself to a worn-out industrial economy, are blind to the facts. They are the descendants of those who called Morse a crank and a fool 100 years ago and laughed at his financial backers as having wasted their money.

Incidentally, it may be interesting to note here that the Whigs of that day criticized the Democrats of that day for appropriating $30,000 for the construction of that first telegraph line. Now we appropriate $30,000,000,000 in as many minutes as it took months then.

But this new world is not going to happen of itself while we sit idly by and do nothing. No; it will require patience and cooperation and hard work by all men, but it is full of opportunity for those who wish to make something of it for themselves.

What is important is that communications and other new industries will afford thousands of jobs for our young men who will come back from the war anxious for a secure economic existence. These industries will bolster our economy and strengthen our social and economic structure if we today have the intelligence to prepare for their advent with sound governmental policies, policies which will encourage the maximum of development by private enterprise, but without permitting such new developments as television and facsimile to become the private monopoly of either a few individuals in a Nation or of any particular country.

The life of Samuel Morse whom we honor today—this man who was 52 years old before he achieved his goal after years of struggle—must give all of us renewed courage and faith in our own personal futures and the future of our country.

Let us follow the precept of the great Justice Holmes, "Have faith and pursue the unknown end."

Address by Bernard M. Baruch in Accepting the Churchman Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important and instructive address by a great American, Bernard M. Baruch, delivered by him on the occasion of his acceptance of the Churchman award, at a dinner held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on May 23. I hope everyone will read Mr. Baruch's very able address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My deep thanks for the compliments paid me by the Churchman's Medal, by the distinguished speakers, and by your presence here.

After the flattering words, spoken about me, I should like to say a few kind words about a certain relative of mine—a relative of yours—the one who made me possible—the one who makes you possible—our Uncle Sam. We gaze on him with a sort of toleration and amusement, but he is a pretty sturdy soul. He is always on the side of right—sometimes a little slow getting there, but when he does arrive, he makes himself felt. He is better than we think, he is stronger than we know. Let me state a few of his claims to your respect.

There is a tendency among us to wonder whether he—let us say we—have done all we should have done in the world cataclysm. We search our souls for reassurance.

Perhaps we have not done as well as we should have done, or as we could have done. Nor yet will do. But, even so, we do not have to hang our heads. Without us, could the Russians have held? Could the Japanese have been stopped? Could the valiant Chinese have done as well as they have? And what of the magnificent fight of the British? Were we not of help to them? Churchill has proclaimed his debt to us. Even Stalin has admitted the effect upon his battles of the war-making power of America. Today the bloody Nazis and the Japs face a defeat that without us could not be.

STRESSES WORLD-WIDE TASK

We are fighting—and helping—not on limited fronts, but on the whole circumference of the globe, and from the North to the South Poles. Even now our men are poised ready for the great invasion and the blow at Japan. We feed the hungry and we clothe the naked. We build roads, airports, harbors, and plants. We supply our allies all over the world with machines of death and supports of life, in food, medicine, and shelter.

We are the most powerful nation in the world. Let us not forget that. By keeping it in our mind we shall not ignore the obligation power carries with it—to use it justly and helpfully. And we shall be a force, perhaps the greatest, when the peace of the world is set.

When the war is over no country will be able to improve the well-being of its people without our help. Peace will be almost meaningless without betterment of daily existence. In that crisis Uncle Sam will show himself to be neither profligate nor parsimonious. He will be fair, and that means to himself as well as to others. I have no economic radar to penetrate the future, but we can make it what we will it to be. Of that I am sure.

In assessing our position, let us remember that great as our physical strengths are, they are made even greater by the fact that our spiritual armor is untarnished by self-gain; all our steps toward self-protection are steps to save the world—to bring peace to all nations of good will.

America has never forgotten—and will never forget the nobler thing that brought her into being and that lights her path—the path that was entered upon only 150 years ago—a little more than twice my own age. How young she is. It will be centuries before she will adopt that maturity of custom, the clothing of the grave, that some people believe she is already fitted for.

FIGHTING WITH HIGH PURPOSE

Our people are hard bitten. They owe only to themselves what they have, but, somehow, they have always preserved the chivalry and idealism that others mistakenly assume is softness.

Soft? Who dares say that? Have we not fought whenever the test showed that fighting meant national existence and self-respect? When did we ever fail to fight? And when did we ever fight without high purpose, with one possible exception?

I see the leaven of time at work. The precepts of the great Woodrow Wilson are bearing fruit. Both of the major parties have consecrated themselves to the principle of international cooperation and force. This may have the effect, as has been said, of "taking the peace out of politics and politics out of the peace." That is the way it should be.

Today we are deep in war, where we shall be for some time to come. We can survive only through victory, and that will come by tensing every muscle on the job and by making every effort of spirit. Then, with the vista of peace before us, a peace which we shall make beautiful—or distort—we will have the contentment that comes from duty well done, or the contempt of failure.

In another day, Cicero said the proudest boast a man could utter was "Civis Romanus sum" (I am a Roman citizen). It is my prayer that our conduct may always be such as to carry greater praise in the accolade, "I am an American."

One last word. Some ask why we fight. This is my answer: We fight for—

"Ancient rights, unnoticed as the breath we draw,
Leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the law."

My thanks again.

American-British Influence in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article entitled "United States Carrying Britain's Ball in Running Against Argentina," by Stanley Johnston, published in the Washington Times-Herald for May 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CARRYING BRITAIN'S BALL IN RUNNING AGAINST ARGENTINA—SO WRITER SAYS, DECLARING ENGLISH PROTECT THEIR TRADE WHILE WE HANDLE TOUGH TALK

(By Stanley Johnston)

The United States' efforts to bring Argentina into active opposition to the Axis ignore the fact that Great Britain's superior influence in that Latin American country makes her the logical source of such pressure.

While we are attempting to tell Argentina what she should or should not do, and attracting disfavor for our pains, Britain is taking care not to place any strain upon her long and valuable trade ties with recalcitrant Argentina.

British influence in the big pampas country is in direct relation to her investments there. Britain's investment in that country in 1943 was one and one-half billion dollars, as compared with the United States' three hundred and eleven million, and the rest of Europe's nine hundred million. Thus the United States had only about 11.5 percent of the foreign investment in Argentina as compared with Britain's 55.5 percent.

Britain owns the railroads, river transportation, and sea-shipping facilities in Argentina. She is the principal agent not only in buying Argentina's exports but in filling that country's needs from all other parts of the world.

Last year Great Britain, acting as the Allied Nations' sole buyer, contracted to purchase Argentina's entire meat supply up to September 1944, at the highest prices paid since 1926. The reason for the high price, in the light of Britain's record as a close bargainer and the fact that no one else bid or was in a position to transport the produce, is a matter of some speculation.

BRITISH STAND TAKEN LATER

It was to refrain from disturbing Britain's influence in any way, some Argentines believe, that Britain did not issue a note jointly with the United States when our State Department withheld recognition of the new regime of Gen. Edelmiro Farrell in an effort to bring Argentina into a solid pan-American front against the Axis.

Lagging several days behind Washington's instructions to Ambassador Norman Armour at Buenos Aires to "refrain from entering official relations" with the new Argentine administration, British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden announced that Britain felt similarly about the matter. A statement on the subject Eden made in the House of Commons came still later.

The result was that Argentines, in discussing the actions of the two big countries, observed that, "Our friends, the British, do not desire to take steps against us, but, being allies, they have to follow Washington."

STUDY ARGENTINA'S NEEDS

That the United Kingdom anticipates no trouble from the Argentine Army group is indicated by the dispatch from England last September of a powerful business delegation whose members announced, upon their arrival at Buenos Aires, that they would study requirements of shipping, railroads, and other industries in contemplation of the greatly expanded trade they expected Argentina would enjoy with Europe in future years.

The British colony in Argentina, several generations old, now numbers more than 70,000 as compared with fewer than 2,500 United States nationals in that county.

Indicating the shallowness of United States influence in Argentina and that the lower South American country looks to Europe for its business is the fact that the ink had hardly dried on our State Department's favored nations trade agreement with Argentina several years ago before that country nullified the pact's effect in dealing with her good neighbor to the north.

CHANGED MONETARY VALUES

The regime then in power restored discrimination against the United States by the simple expedient of giving the pesos—Argentina's monetary unit—a different value, dependent upon whether Argentines are buying or selling.

For the sale by Argentines of grain and grain products to the United States, the value of the peso is fixed at 3.2582 for each United States dollar. But the peso's buying power is lowered to 4.55 pesos a dollar in the purchase of automobiles, refrigerators, and various electrical goods, which are the United States chief exports to Argentina.

Views of Governor Dewey on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it appears that during the present spring an attempt has been made on the part of the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development to create the impression that Governor Dewey of New York is not in favor of this great project. On May 17 Governor Dewey held a press conference in which he reiterated his stand in favor of the development, and I ask leave to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD some press reports of the conference. One is from the Watertown Daily Times, headed "Dewey affirms seaway views; Have not changed since he expressed favor here in 1942." The second is from the Albany, N. Y., Knickerbocker News of May 17, headed "Dewey sticks to seaway project." The third is from the New York Times of May 18, headed "Dewey still for seaway." The last is from the Buffalo Evening News of May 17, headed "G. O. P. favors State power in new policy."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of May 17, 1944]

DEWEY AFFIRMS SEAWAY VIEWS—HAVE NOT CHANGED SINCE HE EXPRESSED FAVOR HERE IN 1942

(By William W. Tyler)

ALBANY, May 17.—Governor Dewey's views on the St. Lawrence seaway have not changed since he expressed favor of the project in 1942, a press conference discussion disclosed today.

Dewey, outstanding possibility for the Republican Presidential nomination, was asked for his current opinion of the seaway project and let it be known that what he had said in the past still stood.

As a candidate for Governor in 1942, Dewey said in an interview at Watertown that he favored power development of the St. Lawrence and he recalled that in 1940 he had endorsed the entire project.

The Republican-controlled 1944 legislature adopted a resolution, favored by the Governor, urging "prompt measures' for development of St. Lawrence power resources.

Adoption of the resolution was construed at the time as taking the issue out of the 1944 Presidential campaign.

[From the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News of May 17, 1944]

DEWEY STICKS TO SEAWAY PROJECT

(By John Mooney)

Governor Dewey today, as in the last few years, views the St. Lawrence seaway project not only as desirable but as inevitable.

This is the position Republican leaders expect him to take in the forthcoming campaign for President if he is nominated.

Indeed, Governor Dewey himself today disclosed that his views on the controversial St. Lawrence development have not changed and that he stands today where he publicly declared himself on several previous occasions.

The substance of those declarations was: "I am for the St. Lawrence seaway development."

A recent editorial in the Rochester Times-Union quoted Mr. Dewey in this respect, and because the editorial raised some doubt about the Governor's position as of today, an effort was made to clear it up.

FAVORS PROJECT

Mr. Dewey dispelled, without added comment, any question about where he stands, his position being, he said, the same as it always had been, for the seaway project.

Members of the Governor's staff recalled that he had asserted himself publicly for the St. Lawrence project on at least three occasions, twice in New York State and once in the Midwest, over the last 4 years.

Public development of St. Lawrence hydroelectric power in some form is another thing to which Mr. Dewey may be committed. At least the G. O. P.-controlled legislature this year adopted a strong resolution calling for full public development of the water power of the St. Lawrence River.

Although Buffalo, Albany, and New York City navigation interests are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway as potentially detrimental to their shipping, it is apparent Mr. Dewey has not been swayed by their arguments. He is represented as considering the seaway to the Great Lakes, via the St. Lawrence River, as inevitable in the development of the commerce and trade of the Nation.

[From the New York Times of May 18, 1944]

DEWEY STILL FOR SEAWAY—REFERS QUESTIONERS TO 1940 AND 1942 STAND OF ST. LAWRENCE PLAN

ALBANY, May 17.—Governor Dewey expressed himself in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway development in 1940 and 1942 and has not changed his views.

Because of some expressed disagreement up-State whether the Governor favors or opposes the project, which has the support of President Roosevelt, he was asked to clarify his position. He referred questioners to his 1940 statement, in which he said:

"I favor the St. Lawrence seaway and always have."

Chief opposition to the project comes from New York City, Albany, and Buffalo navigation interests, while it has strong support in northern New York. The 1944 legislature sidestepped the issue, but adopted unanimously a resolution calling for prompt development of the hydroelectric resources of the St. Lawrence River.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of May 17, 1944]

G. O. P. FAVORS STATE POWER IN NEW POLICY—PARTY REVERSES ATTITUDE OF NIAGARA, ST. LAWRENCE RIVERS, HOPES TO MAKE ADDITIONAL POST-WAR JOBS

(By Ray Borst)

ALBANY, May 17.—The Republican Party in New York State, it became apparent today, has abandoned its traditional opposition to State development of the hydroelectric resources of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, and now favors speedy development of cheap power in order to bring new industries into the State.

Governor Dewey stands squarely behind his party in its new policy with relation to the development of the power resources on the two rivers.

At a press conference today, Mr. Dewey was asked for his current opinion of the seaway and power projects, and let it be known that what he said in the past still stood.

In 1942, when he was running for the governorship he came out squarely for development of the State's power resources.

"I have always strongly advocated the development of the power resources of the State by Government for the benefit of all the people, and not for any private monopoly," said a statement issued by Mr. Dewey in Watertown.

For many years the Republican Party, through its control of the legislature, opposed State development of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers on the ground that such a step would put private power companies out of existence.

The 1944 session of the legislature, however, by unanimous vote adopted a resolution putting the State and the G. O. P. clearly on record in favor of State development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River.

In the opinion of many Republican leaders, New York State definitely will undertake the development of the power resources of both the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers immediately after the war. Such a project, it was pointed out, would provide work for thousands of men now employed in war industries.

Twenty years ago when Alfred E. Smith was Governor he constantly was battling with the Republicans in the legislature over State development of hydroelectric power.

Mr. Smith made State development one of the major issues in his campaigns for the governorship and years later the Republican leaders admitted that that issue had brought thousands of votes to the Democratic Party in the State.

With the Republican Party in this State now definitely on record in favor of development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence, the old issue between the two major political parties has completely vanished, much to the regret of the Democrats.

It also became apparent that if Governor Dewey is nominated for the Presidency he will not hesitate to reiterate a statement which he made in 1940 in favor of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

The Governor is known to feel that eventually the seaway will be put through in order to provide greater and cheaper transportation facilities.

Centennial of the Telegraph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, remarks made by me in the Capitol of the United States on Wednesday, May 24, at 11 o'clock a. m., upon the presentation of a plaque commemorating the centennial of the telegraph and honoring Samuel F. B. Morse.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This celebration commemorates the faith, humility, genius, and unfaltering persistence of Samuel F. B. Morse. It glorifies the omnipotence and benevolence of God, working through the human spirit. It exemplifies victory for inventors over skepticism.

The act of Congress, today proclaiming its gratitude for what God has wrought, in terms of human security and freedom, unity and happiness, through Morse's invention of the telegraph a century ago, records in durable bronze and in vital history the triumph of character over resistance and ridicule.

His constant regard of the possible progress of man to higher levels of civilization through almost instantaneous communication across boundless space held the inventor to his work and inspired his word.

Here, as in many other first applications of ideas to material and practical service, the blessings of a free government and a capitalistic system of economy sustained the lone individual who beheld the vision.

Overcoming all obstacles, after 9 years of experiments and demonstrations, he persuaded Congress to appropriate $30,000 for testing the capacity and usefulness of the system of electromagnetic telegraph, invented by him, for the use of the Government of the United States.

The subsequent transmission 100 years ago today from the Supreme Court room of the Capitol to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad station in Baltimore of the first official telegraphic message, carried in one flash the news of an epoch begun and the acknowledgment of Divine inspiration: "What hath God wrought!"

The rapidity of development of telegraph communication evidences the operation of a free economy to energize and drive forward a new service to mankind.

This celebration, therefore, is an occasion for recurring to fundamental principles and for redeclaring our adherence to the institutions which had for 60 years, and for 100 years since have, kept open to every individual opportunity and incentive to explore and experiment and to pursue visions of human amelioration and uplift.

After each night a new dawn appears over the mountains.

Mr. Chairman, I have the great honor to present this bronze memorial plaque in commemoration of Samuel F. B. Morse, and of what transpired here 100 years ago today.

Announcement for Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me May 16 over a State-wide hook-up in Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this statement is to announce that I am a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate.

In making this announcement it is proper that I should report to those I am privileged to represent and state, briefly and frankly, the platform upon which I am asking for support and votes.

I am not asking that you elect me to any new office.

I am not asking you to throw any man out of office in order to make a place for me.

In all my political career, I have never run against a Democratic official.

I am asking that you keep me in the office I now have so that I may continue the work of representing the people of Oklahoma in the Senate of the United States.

In asking to be returned to the Senate I submit for your consideration first, the record that I have made and, second, a brief statement of the principles and policies for which I stand.

I take this plan of placing my candidacy before the voters of Oklahoma.

The old-time political parades, meetings and rallies cannot be held because automobiles, tires, and gasoline are rationed.

I am reminded daily that candidates should place their claim before the voters in a plain, simple, and serious manner and then depend upon the good judgment of the voters to make nominations.

I shall conduct my campaign in harmony with the war effort. I shall expend my meager funds first, to express my appreciation for what Oklahoma voters have done for me and, second, to place my program before the people.

In 1933 the Democratic Party came into power and since that time my party has been in control of our Government.

In order to explain and justify the laws passed and the programs adopted during the past 12 years, it is necessary that we recall the conditions that existed when we came into power.

The New Deal will be an important issue in the pending campaign.

With respect to this issue the people are entitled to know the facts.

What is the New Deal?

To answer the question, we must first define the term.

To have a new deal, we must have had an old deal; hence, an added question arises—

What was the old deal?

The old deal is alleged to have brought on the depression, which broke upon the country in 1929.

All remember the unemployment, causing millions of men to tramp the streets and highways, begging for work.

All remember the vast surpluses of goods and commodities and consequently the low prices, yet the people could not buy because of a lack of money and buying power.

All remember the bankruptcies and business failures leading to still further widespread unemployment.

All remember the soup lines and the demand for governmental aid.

All remember the looting of stores and the rebellion against foreclosures.

The people have not forgotten the bank holidays leading to the closing of all the banks.

With all banks closed; with millions of men and women unemployed, ragged, and hungry; with soup lines in cities and towns; with stores and stocks being looted and with widespread rebellion against foreclosure, something had to be done.

The old deal had cost and was costing the people more money than had been lost in all the wars in which we had been engaged.

It was obvious that the people could not protect themselves.

Cities, counties, and the States could neither check nor relieve the misery, suffering, and damage being caused by the depression which broke upon the people in October of 1929.

Conditions finally became so bad that it was not a question that something should be done, but rather that something must be done and done at once.

The New Deal was the remedy proposed to cure the ills of the old deal.

Inasmuch as practically all the people were in distress, practically all had to be helped.

Two classes of relief were provided: First, temporary relief to tide the people through and, second, policies intended to be permanent were provided to prevent a recurrence of the terrible times the people were experiencing.

The temporary relief was provided by such agencies as the Work Projects Administration, the National Recovery Act, the National Youth Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

As the ills of the old deal were cured, the depression abated and by 1939 prices of farm commodities were better, unemployment was relieved, and the country was enjoying a degree of prosperity again.

Just as fast as these temporary agencies and policies had served their missions they were liquidated, so that now they are matters of record only.

The depression brought about abnormal conditions which had to be met by special legislation and relief programs. The administration, supported by Republicans as well as by Democrats, acted, and all groups of our people were assisted in working out of the most terrible depression of all time.

At this point let me ask—what might have happened to our banks, trust companies, railroads, insurance companies, factories, farmers, the unemployed, and all who serve these groups, had not something been done?

What were some of the permanent policies provided by the Congress and the administration to prevent a recurrence of a damaging depression?

GUARANTY OF BANK DEPOSITS

One of the first New Deal laws passed by the Congress was the guaranty of bank deposits.

During the era of the old deal, bank and trust company failures were common occurences.

At the end of the last war we had over 30,000 banks and, when a failure occurred, the depositors, as well as the stockholders, stood to lose their life's savings.

The old deal witnessed the permanent closing of over one-half our banks, causing hundreds of millions of dollars of loss to stockholders and depositors.

This most important policy was established by the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Under this policy banks are not failing now but, instead, they are the safest, soundest, and the most prosperous in history.

The guaranty of bank deposits is a New Deal policy and, unless repealed, it is here to stay.

PROTECTION AGAINST WORTHLESS STOCKS AND BONDS

The Securities Exchange Commission is another New Deal policy created to regulate and supervise the issuance of stocks and bonds and therefore to regulate the several securities exchanges and the over-the-counter markets operating in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails.

The purpose of the act was to insure the maintenance of fair and honest markets in stock, bond, and security transactions.

For generations corporations and exchanges had been issuing and selling stocks and bonds in such amounts as the public would buy, all without legal rules or regulations and without any Federal supervision whatever.

Many people are convinced that the great 1929 depression was brought about by the speculation in worthless or near worthless stocks, bonds, and securities.

ELECTRICITY FOR FARMS

The Rural Electrification Administration provides Federal aid to farmers in securing electricity; such aid being in the form of studies, investigations, reports, and loans to cooperatives for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of lines to furnish electric energy to farms and persons in rural areas.

Under this New Deal policy transmission lines have been constructed in all parts of the country and, unless repealed, this program will become a permanent institution in all the States of the Nation.

Hence, the R. E. A. is another New Deal activity and those who are against the New Deal must favor the abolition of this program.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS, AID TO CRIPPLED CHILDREN AND THE BLIND

In order to protect the aged, to assist the blind and crippled children, the Congress enacted the Social Security Act and has provided funds to be used in cooperation with the States in maintaining and developing the program.

The "old deal" program permitted crippled children and the blind to get along as best they could.

For our senior citizens who pioneered and developed the United States, the "old deal" provided only the poorhouse.

Today poorhouses are practically nonexistent and will never be seen again unless the New Deal program is repealed.

I introduced a bill to permit those receiving assistance to work and earn money without having their pension checks reduced but in passing the measure we had to limit the work to the production of food for the war effort.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Still another New Deal program was provided to prevent soil erosion and to protect and improve the food- and feed-producing lands of our country.

All know that we are dependent upon the soil for the production of our food. All know that for many years soil erosion has been destroying many millions of acres of our farm land.

In 1935 the New Deal set up a Nation-wide soil-conservation service for the purpose of saving the fertility of our soil.

Already, with the guidance of this service, soil-conservation districts have been organized all over the Nation by the farmers and landowners.

If this New Deal soil-conservation program is supported and not abolished, it will stop erosion and depletion of the soil, restore our forests, reduce dust storms, and control, if not prevent, disastrous floods.

IF NEW DEAL IS VOTED OUT

If the so-called New Deal becomes the paramount issue in the November election, and if the anti-New Deal party wins, then the Congress will have a direct and positive mandate to repeal all the laws passed and the policies inaugurated during the past 12 years for the benefit and protection of the masses of the people.

A vote against the New Deal is a vote against such policies as the old-age pension system, against aid to crippled children, and against aid to the blind.

Such a vote will be construed as being against the Federal supervision of the issuance of stocks, bonds, and securities, against the continuance of the rural electrification program, against the guarantee of bank deposits, against the Federal Communications Commission, against the Civil Aeronautics Board, and against the entire Farm Security Administration, including the Soil Conservation Service.

The Government has relinquished all control over the planting of crops, but such benefits as soil conservation, loans on farm commodities, and the broad program of farm loans generally will be retained unless the whole so-called New Deal is scrapped.

In the coming election this question must be answered:

Do you want to get rid of all these New Deal institutions and go back to the policies which caused the depression?

I favor and shall vote to retain and support the laws and policies which have helped the people.

My legislative policy is based on the conviction that sound prosperity is based upon the buying power of the masses of the people. The degree of prosperity depends upon the amount of buying power and by "masses" I mean farmers, wage earners and the small and average business and professional men and women of our country.

I contend that when farmers and producers have good prices and workers have jobs at fair wages, business of all kinds is good, but when commodity prices are low and wage earners are unemployed, business, big and little, is bad and panics, depressions, and recessions are inevitable.

The history of the past 12 years sustains my policy.

RATIONING AND CONTROLS CAUSED BY WAR

In 1939, at the identical time when the people were working out of the depression, the Second World War broke upon the world, and then on December 7, 1941, our country was attacked by the Japs at Pearl Harbor.

Since that fateful day we have been compelled to live under a strict war economy rather than under the program provided for a peace-loving people residing in a peaceful nation.

In order to meet the concentrated power of our enemies we have had to concentrate

our economic and military power in the hands of our Commander in Chief, the heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, and the Departments charged with the responsibility for clothing, feeding, and equipping our armed forces as well as our people here at home.

In order to mobilize and concentrate our power we have had to do things that we would not even consider in times of peace.

Since the war started, conditions have been and are abnormal, and our people should realize that the things being done are war necessities, and such rules, regulations, and policies will cease as soon as the war is over.

At that time our major task will be to promptly liquidate the war agencies, thereby permitting the people to return to normal conditions as quickly as possible.

BUREAUS—BUREAUCRATS—BUREAUCRACY

During the coming campaign we shall hear much about bureaus, bureaucrats, and bureaucracy; hence, an explanation is in order.

A bureau is a department of the Government such as the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which prints all our paper money and all the various forms of stamps and bonds.

Then we have, among others, the Bureau of Internal Revenue—which collects the taxes—the Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of the Budget, the Bureau of Census, the Bureau of Pensions, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of Education, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of the Mint, the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This latter Bureau was created to investigate and suppress crime.

Likewise, the special agencies created to help the people work out of the depression and to help win the war are additional bureaus of the Government.

The War Production Board, the Offices of Price Administration, the Office of Censorship, the Selective Service System, the War Food Administration, the War Shipping Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the Veterans' Administration are all bureaus of the Government.

The officials managing these departments, boards, and commissions are sometimes called bureaucrats, and the services provided are by some called bureaucratic government.

If we are to have these services, we must have the bureaus, and to have the bureaus we must have men and women to supervise and perform the work.

Who is there among us who would abolish the takers of the census, the forecasters of the weather, or the inspectors of our mines?

Who would abolish the coiners and printers of our money, the writers of our pension checks, the teachers of our schools, or the investigators and detectors of crime?

Those who oppose the New Deal deny that they want to go back to the old deal.

Instead, they say that they favor a better deal.

Those who support and defend the New Deal, as herein defined, say to those who oppose that at any time they suggest and bring forth a better deal for the masses of the people the Democratic Party will support their proposal.

At this point let me ask a question:

What has been the effect of these laws and policies?

All must admit that the relief policies proposed and executed by the Democratic Party were successful in bringing the people through the depression.

Now, all must likewise admit that the war policies of the administration have been successful and that under such policies we are winning the greatest war in history.

MY SENATE COMMITTEES

Again let me be frank and report that I have charge of the appropriations for the War Department in the United States Senate.

The War and Navy Department have been provided with all the necessary laws and ample money with which to wage this war.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations contains some 20 members, and I am now only third from the top.

It has taken me 18 years to reach this position, and should I be replaced it would take my successor perhaps a longer time to reach the height which I now hold on this all-important committee.

In addition, I am a member of the Agriculture Committee.

On this committee I rank next to the chairman; and if for any reason the first place should become vacant, I would move up to the position of chairman.

In addition to the foregoing, I am chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, which takes care of the needed legislation for the 150,000 Indian citizens of Oklahoma.

Let me say a word to the Indian citizens of Oklahoma.

Since I have been in Congress I have tried to secure for them every right and benefit that could be justified.

Indian schools have been expanded and made more efficient.

Hospitals have been increased and likewise improved.

I am opposed to the removal of restrictions until such time as the owners of the land make application for such removal.

I am opposed to the Moore bill and assure you that same will not pass the Congress, if I can prevent, so long as I am a Member of the Senate.

Again—should I be replaced, my successor would have to take committee assignments that the older Senators do not want.

In such an event, during the next generation, Oklahoma may be without effective representation in the upper House of the National Congress.

Some of those who may read this statement may wonder what high places on important committees means to Oklahoma.

Only recently an unfriendly editor asked me the question, What bacon have you brought to Oklahoma?

Limited time permits the mention of only a few items.

In 1933, within the first 60 days of the new administration, I introduced and had passed one bill that made a profit in gold to the Treasury of $2,800,000,000.

The profit in this one law alone will pay my salary for the next 280,000 years.

What was that law and how did it operate? In March of 1933 prices for the things we produce in Oklahoma were so low that our people were frantic. Corn was selling for less than 15 cents per bushel, wheat sold for less than 25 cents per bushel, cotton was selling for less than 5 cents per pound, hogs and cattle were selling for less than 3 cents per pound, and oil was selling for less than 15 cents per barrel.

Prices had to be increased or bankruptcy for all was inevitable. The value of the dollar measures prices so that when the dollar value is high prices are low, and when the dollar value is low prices are high. To raise prices we had to reduce the value of the dollar so that my bill providing first, for reducing the size, hence the value, of the gold dollar; second, for an increased use of silver for money; and third, for an expansion of bank credit, was passed and became law on May 12, 1933.

In order to cheapen the dollar the President, acting under the authority of the law, reduced the size, hence value, of the gold dollar by 40 percent, and such 40 percent in gold became profit for the Treasury. When this transaction was completed it was found that the 40 percent reduction in the gold content of our gold dollars when revalued in weight by the new and smaller gold dollar amounted to the sum of $2,800,000,000.

In my statement above I referred only to the profit to the Treasury in gold and did not refer to the increased buying power due to higher prices coming into the hands of our producers of commodities in Oklahoma. The beneficial effects of this law were not limited to Oklahoma but were Nation- and even world-wide.

Early in the present administration I introduced and had passed the bill appropriating the money with which to build the Grand River Dam.

In 1936 I introduced the bill which authorized the construction of the Altus-Lugert irrigation project in Jackson County.

This great project, covering some 50,000 acres will be completed within the year and if it is the success we think, then other similar projects will be developed in western Oklahoma.

The Mangum, Fort Supply, Canton, Foss, Lower Cobb, and Mountain Park projects will all be constructed if the landowners want irrigation.

In eastern Oklahoma flood-control works are an absolute necessity.

Already the following projects have been constructed: Pensacola, Fort Supply, and Great Salt Plains.

Other projects are authorized as follows: Fort Gibson, Markham Ferry, Wister, Tenkiller, Oologah, Mannford, and Hula.

My War Department subcommittee handles the money for this class of development.

In the last year, before the war stopped such works, out of a total appropriation of seventy million for the entire United States, Oklahoma secured $14,000,000.

Money is now available to start work on three of these dams as soon as the necessary material may be secured.

Again—should I be replaced it is not likely that another Oklahoma Senator will ever have direct control of funds to build irrigation works in western and flood-control works in eastern Oklahoma.

In passing I might suggest to my critical editorial friend that while I was a member of the State Senate of Oklahoma I financed the construction of the State Capitol building without resort to a bond issue.

Also, I might suggest to him that I was one of four State Senators to vote against the fifty million road bond bill and that after the proposal was submitted to a vote I campaigned the State against this issue and in the election the people voted down the bonds by over 100,000 majority.

PROGRAM FOR POST-WAR

I suggest the following issues, my position regarding same, and my plans to accomplish the ends desired:

1. Win the war quickly to save lives, property, and money.

Inasmuch as I am chairman of the Senate committee having charge of the funds to meet war expenses, I shall vote for sufficient money to furnish the best food and the best war equipment that it is possible to secure.

2. Establish and maintain a just peace.

I favor the establishment of a just peace and the development of an international tribunal for the purpose of preventing all aggression and future war.

3. Take proper care of our returning soldiers.

I favor the soldiers' bill of rights, which provides for hospitalization, rehabilitation, education, loans, and preference for Federal positions and on Federal works.

I voted for the increase in pay for our soldiers and sailors; also, I supported the bill to give the members of the armed forces the opportunity to vote in both the primary and general elections.

In the future, as in the past, I will safeguard the security of the sons and daughters of Oklahoma in the armed services of our country.

4. Guarantee farmers full parity prices by amending their parity formula so as to include all costs of farm labor.

I have a bill pending in the Congress providing that farmers shall have all labor costs added to the parity formula.

5. Retain and expand the soil-conservation program.

I am supporting liberal appropriations to support this most valuable farm activity.

6. Irrigation and flood-control developments where needed and where favored by landowners.

My committee has control of the funds for the development of irrigation and flood control, and I favor the construction of such projects as the landowners want.

7. Convert war plants into peacetime factories.

I favor a plan whereby existing war plants may be converted into factories for the making of peacetime commodities.

The bomber plants at Tulsa and Oklahoma City should be retained to make planes for peacetime services.

8. Stabilize bond market by authorizing financial institutions to keep and report their security holdings at par.

I have a bill to accomplish this purpose now pending in the Senate.

9. Repeal all emergency boards, commissions, and bureaus as soon as their missions are completed.

I shall work and vote to accomplish the purpose stated.

10. Retain, make wholly Federal, and increase old-age pension benefits.

I am supporting amendments to the social-security law to liberalize the system, to increase the assistance, and to make the payments uniform in all the States.

11. In order to protect our returning soldiers and sailors stop all immigration for a period of 5 years after the close of the war.

To accomplish this purpose I have a bill pending in the Congress.

12. I favor increasing the price of oil to full parity with other commodities.

Should this be done the price of the standard grade of oil will be approximately $2 per barrel.

Such a policy will promote and serve the war effort and, in addition, such an increase will add revenues to our State treasury, will help our farmers, our Indians, and all the counties and cities of the State where oil is produced.

Upon my record made in the State senate, in the National House of Representatives, and in the United States Senate, and upon the program outlined for the post-war period, I respectfully solicit the support and votes of the people of Oklahoma in the Democratic primary election to be held on July 11.

What Happens After the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Happens After the War?" by the Honorable Chester Bowles, printed in the Washington Post for May 4. The address has been printed in the public interest by the International Latex Corporation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THE WAR?

(Address by Chester Bowles, Price Administrator)

Today our industrial production stands 125 percent above the levels of 1939. Today our farm production stands at the highest levels of history. Today jobs go begging and anyone can sell anything that he can produce.

But let's not forget that this unprecedented level of business activity is built directly upon war demand, for directly or indirectly Government is now providing half the jobs and half the pay rolls of the country.

When the war is over and when our huge war expenditures disappear, what happens then? Will there be a market for all the goods we can produce? Will there be a job then for everybody who seeks one? Will we sustain the present high level of production, employment and national income in building an economy of abundance? Or will we again return to the unemployment, the artificial scarcities, and the low standard of living which plagued so many millions of our citizens before the war broke out?

No one man or any group of men can begin to have all the answers. But we know it will take expert management and a firm hand to bring us through the reconversion period with a whole skin. War contract termination settlements will have to be made and they will have to be made on a basis of fairness and speed. Millions of war workers will have to be placed in new jobs. Millions more will be returning from the armed services.

These adjustments will all be difficult. But no one should doubt our ability to make them successfully, provided that the national buying power can be sustained and markets found for all the goods we can produce. Can we find these markets? I think the answer is yes.

The demands of a vigorous, expanding America can fill the void that will be left when Government war expenditures are tapered off. They can keep our economy running indefinitely at peak capacity. But we must remember that these are only potential demands. Whether they will materialize in actual orders on the books will depend, first of all, upon how effectively we plan the job of unwinding our wartime economy. The job will not be an easy one and a slip may well spell disaster.

THE THREAT OF POST-WAR COLLAPSE

If when the war is over we fail to take full and immediate advantage of our export opportunities, if we are not prepared to throw in public works when they are needed, business activity will slow down. If that happens, employment, pay rolls, and prices will begin to fall and the vast potential demand of 132,000,000 consumers and of 3,000,000 businesses will dry up and disappear.

Men who have lost their jobs don't buy that new refrigerator and they don't buy that new car, nor do they make a first payment on a new home. Permit employment levels to shrink and fear will hold most of the hundred billion dollars of wartime savings off the market.

Businessmen don't invest in a falling market. When prices are dropping, there won't be much replacing of equipment and building of new plants. To a large extent the twenty-five billions of reserves that business has accumulated will remain right where they are, in reserve.

What I am saying is that if we permit the economy to sag immediately after the war, we face a tailspin. We face the menace of deflation feeding upon itself, with no one knowing how fast the economy will fall or how far. It seems to me imperative that we see to it now that this will not be permitted to happen.

PROGRAM FOR THE RECONVERSION PERIOD

Full advantage must be taken of our export markets. The world will need vast quantities of our goods. If we are to have this business—and have it we must—we shall have to provide broad export credits. We must make the decision now that these credits will be extended.

Further, we must determine now that needed public works—Federal, State, and local—will be thrown into the breach at precisely the time and in whatever quantity is necessary to keep the wheels of industry running and to keep men at their jobs. Public works must be planned today and the programs at all levels of Government must be coordinated so that they may be instantly available if the need arises.

And finally, we must determine now that any broad deflation of our present price and wage structure will not be permitted. We have placed ceilings over prices and wages to prevent wartime inflation. In the reconversion period, we must protect prices and wages to prevent equally disastrous deflation.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER RECONVERSION?

I think all reasonable men will agree that only wise management on the part of Government and business can bring us through the reconversion period with our economy still sound.

What deeply troubles many of us is the question, When does the Government step out? Do we have to reconcile ourselves to a regulated economy indefinitely? For my part, I am convinced that if extensive Government regulation is long continued, the springs of our vitality will dry up and our present free society will gradually decay.

It may be that for other peoples other systems may work effectively. But free enterprise is the system with which we in this country have converted a wilderness into the greatest industrial civilization ever built. In the past, free enterprise has served us magnificently. It can continue to do so, but very frankly I have no patience with those who can see only its virtues and are blind to its past defects or unwilling to take steps to correct them.

As our free enterprise system has worked in the past, it has periodically yielded us many years of depression. During the years of the upsurge of the business cycle we took giant steps forward only to lose, in the years of depression, a valuable portion of the ground we had gained.

It has meant that we have periodically condemned the Nation, every part of it, to idleness and poverty, to foreclosures and bankruptcies, to insecurity and despair. And this was the more galling because men went idle and mouths went improperly fed in a country that was recognized to be the richest and most plentifully endowed on this earth.

There was a time when these periodic break-downs of our economy could be tolerated. It was not so long ago when no American was more than one generation from the farm. Forty years ago, when depressions hit, when plants closed down, the industrial worker could often return to his family farm and find there a living for himself and his family.

That time has passed. Today, the industrial workers of Detroit cannot retreat to the farms. It is here—on the assembly lines of your own Detroit—that they must make their living and find their security.

There was a time when we believed that the business cycle was a disease of our system for which there was no cure. It was

bitter medicine. But knowing no alternative, we accepted it.

Today we know better. With good planning, with close cooperation between Government and business, we know that the level of business activity can be sustained. We know that resulting jobs can be provided.

DEPRESSIONS CAN BE PREVENTED

In my opinion, the Nation will never again accept poverty in the midst of plenty. No longer will our people accept insecurity in peacetime, when the power of our economy to create abundance has been so vividly proven in time of war.

It has been claimed that economic security is incompatible with the free-enterprise system. That, in my judgment, is nonsense. It is nonsense because it fails to distinguish between the risks of competition, which are and must be part of our system, and the risks of depression, which no man, however efficient, however enterprising, can overcome.

During the periods of depression it is not the inefficient business alone that goes under, but the efficient as well. In depression, it is not the inefficient or the lazy worker alone who cannot find a job, but the efficient and the industrious one as well.

Americans are overwhelmingly in favor of a system in which the efficient will thrive and the productive and the resourceful can find rewards commensurate with the contribution they can make to our society. To attain this goal, it is imperative that markets be maintained for all who can produce and that resulting job opportunities be provided for all who are able and willing to work. The free-enterprise system can never fulfill its promise unless this is done.

Let me state most emphatically that this does not mean Government competition with industry or Government control of industry. It means a Government that encourages, that stimulates, that supports free enterprise and the initiative of the individual. The essential role of Government in our economic future, backed by the will of all of our people, must be to underwrite a high level of business activity and thereby to release the full energies of all our people under our democratic free-enterprise system.

And let us never forget that we are the Government. The Government responds to our will and our direction. That point will bear constant repetition because fear of government may be the most dangerous single stumbling block in the path of a vigorous, dynamic, expanding, free-enterprise economy in the years following the war.

As a public service we present this important contribution to American thinking.

INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORPORATION,
Playtex Park, Dover, Del.

Presidential Election in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article entitled "Argentines See Opportunity To Elect Their President," by Stanley Johnston, published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARGENTINES SEE OPPORTUNITY TO ELECT THEIR PRESIDENT

(By Stanley Johnston)

Out of the political confusion caused in Argentina's national affairs by repeated coups d'etat in recent months are emerging indications to inspire hope among her people they may be granted the first election held in the dictator-governed republic in 7 years.

But realization of the hope is tangled with the political destiny of Col. Juan Peron, a strong man credited with the behind-the-scenes control of the present Army clique regime.

PERON HAS AMBITIONS

Informed Argentines contend that Peron has aspirations to become the nation's chief executive. But because he has a craving to be a popular figure and is being frustrated in that desire by increasing public disfavor with his junta government, these observers say his vanity may induce him to call an election at which he will be a candidate for President.

Peron emerged from virtual obscurity as a mid-rank officer to head the Army group known as the coloneis' lodge, which has engineered two revolts in the past year. He now operates from the background position of Acting Minister of War in the present Cabinet nominally headed by President Gen. Edelmiro Farrell.

The last Argentine election was held September 5, 1937, when Roberto M. Ortiz was elected President. Because of near blindness, he resigned June 27, 1942, and the Presidency automatically was assumed by the Vice President, Ramon S. Castillo.

ELECTION BLOCKED

Castillo's conservative government was overthrown on June 4, 1943, while preparing for the next constitutionally provided election, which was to have been held last fall. Castillo was removed by a swift coup headed by Gen. Pedro Ramirez, who had been minister of war in Castillo's cabinet.

Ramirez became president after his colleague, Gen. Arturo Rawson, had ruled for a few days, but was turned out February 24 in a palace coup, details of which only now are becoming known. His post was taken over by Farrell, who had been his vice president.

When Ramirez moved to join other Latin American countries in breaking with the Axis, he was opposed to the small pro-Nazi group in the Argentina foreign office and by the strongly nationalistic forces. The latter contended their country's future lay in following an independent ccurse to maintain its trade with Europe after the war.

Ramirez finally severed diplomatic relations with the Axis on January 26. Immediately the American State Department took credit for the break and hailed it as a result of our administration's good neighbor policy.

Taking advantage of the dissent in the power group, Peron moved another front man forward, Ramirez was ousted in February and Farrell became executive vice president.

It was said in Buenos Aires that Ramirez wrote into his resignation the charge that on the night of February 24 he was seized by military officers acting for Peron and Farrell, and taken to a house in a Buenos Aires suburb. There he was accused, he declared, of having lied when he explained that he broke with the Axis because of Nazi espionage in Argentina. He actually acted, his accusers contended, because he had given way under pressure from the United States, as indicated by our claim to credit for the Argentina break.

WRITES ACCUSATIONS

Ramirez submitted his resignation but wrote into it these events and accusations and his denials.

Despite efforts during the intervening 15 days to hide from Argentines the fact that Ramirez had resigned, the news leaked out, and the people learned, to their distaste, of the fight for personal power within the junta.

The Farrell junta moved early to control the press of the country. In addition to imposing a close censorship on Argentina newspapers, the new government attacked on technical allegations two United States world news services, the United Press and Associated Press, and for a short time halted their operations.

Adding to the unhappiness of the Argentines over these domestic matters was their concern over the United States' failure to recognize the new government, which has reopened the entire question of Argentina's support of the Allies against the Axis.

It is this growing disapproval, many Argentines believe, that will induce Peron to call an election.

Essential Need of an Adequate Peacetime Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the recent address of Mr. Almon E. Roth, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., in San Francisco on May 22, 1944, at a Maritime Day luncheon jointly sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Marine Exchange, the Propeller Club, and the Commercial Club of San Francisco:

As a nation we have learned some bitter lessons out of the cruel experiences of this war. One such lesson is the essential need of an adequate peacetime merchant marine—prepared to serve in time of war.

There should be no doubt in the mind of any American citizen that the cost of this war in terms of time, lives, and money has been greatly increased by our lack of sufficient merchant ships to serve as Army and Navy auxiliaries at the outset of hostilities. The tragic lack of ships and the extent to which this deficiency hampered our fighting forces run like a theme through the recent reports of Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet, and Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Admiral King said, in part—I quote—"no maritime nation has ever been able to fight a war successfully without an adequate merchant marine—something we did not have when the two-ocean Navy was authorized. Although we had made some progress and had for some months been increasing our defenses in the Western Hemisphere, our armed forces and our production were not adequately expanded and developed to permit our taking the over-all offensive in any theater. The Army Ground and Air Forces and our shipping were not yet prepared to

move overseas in sufficient strength for an offensive, and the Navy, even without the losses sustained at Pearl Harbor, could not alone carry the war to the enemy. We were, therefore, forced to assume the defensive in both oceans, while preparations for an amphibious war were intensified."

General Marshall in his report said, in part, I quote, as follows: "Our developments were made in the light of limited resources in troops and equipment at the time and a continued lack of sufficient ocean tonnage or landing craft, or both, and were influenced also by the length of the turn-around required of ocean shipping and the limited dock facilities available. For both Great Britain and the United States, military operations in the Pacific area and in the Far East, created unprecedented logistical problems with respect to shipping. Time and space factors dictated our strategy to a considerable degree. To land and maintain American forces in Australia, required more than twice the shipping tonnage necessary for similar American forces in Europe or north Africa—shipping limitations precluded the early dispatch of large bodies of ground troops."

Still quoting General Marshall:

"In planning the north African campaign, the military desired to make initial landings to the east of Algiers, but the lack of shipping and of landing boats and aircraft carriers at the time made this procedure impracticable. It was desired to carry out the operation early in the fall, but it was necessary to delay until November in order to receive a large number of craft from the shipyards and provide and train the crews for the operation of these vessels." End of quote.

In speaking of the volume of shipping required for the conduct of modern warfare, General Marshall said, "the tremendous amount of shipping required for a modern army is not generally understood. For instance, in computing initial shipping requirements, an average of six measurement tons of cargo space per man is required. Maintenance requirements average one measurement ton per man per month."

These reports furnish convincing expert evidence of the vital part which shipping has played and will continue to play in the conduct of this or any other war.

But the value of an adequate merchant marine does not rest alone upon its usefulness as a means of conducting successful warfare. Ample shipping facilities are also a potent form of insurance against war.

No one can doubt that Japan's decision to wage war against this Nation, and its dastardly attack upon Pearl Harbor, were predicated upon the knowledge that this country lacked not only fighting ships, but also the merchant ships which would be required to wage an immediate and effective war throughout the broad expanses of the Pacific.

By the same token, Germany certainly counted upon the inadequacy of our shipping facilities in appraising her chances for success when she plunged the world into conflict.

It is generally recognized that the principal hope for maintaining future world peace depends upon the willingness and ability of the Allies to police the world against future wars. Our Nation's responsibility, in this connection, will require the maintenance of a navy several times the size of our prewar fleet. This means that our merchant marine, as an auxiliary to that Navy, must be strengthened correspondingly.

As a result of the difficulties which we have faced due to the lack of shipping, and because of the important role which merchant ships will continue to play throughout this war, the American public is for the moment merchant-marine minded. There is hardly a family in this broad land which does not have a very direct and personal stake in the adequacy of our American merchant marine. Millions of our sons and daughters have been carried to far distant shores in merchant ships. The speed with which they will be returned to their homes and families, when the war is ended, will depend largely upon the number of ships available for their transportation. In the meantime, their comfort, their health, and their efficiency as fighting men, will depend upon our ability to furnish them with requisite equipment and supplies. No single factor bears more directly upon the probable length of this war than our ability to transport men and equipment by ships, and to keep them properly supplied.

But we must not be misled into false security.

If history repeats itself the popular interest of the moment is no guaranty of continued support for a strong merchant marine once the war has ended.

For many years it has been the declared national policy to maintain a merchant marine adequate for purposes of defense and sufficient to carry our domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign trade.

Unfortunately, however, we have been long on preachment and short on practice.

The First World War, like this conflict, found us woefully unprepared with shipping facilities. Then, as now, we built shipyards and ships without regard for cost, in a frantic race against time.

When the war ended we immediately folded our hands and allowed our new merchant marine, built at such great cost and effort, to rust and rot. Believe it or not, we did not build one new dry-cargo ship in the United States for use in foreign trade between 1922 and 1936. We became a fifth-rate maritime power. There grew up in this country a considerable body of fallacious public opinion which held that we did not need a merchant marine; that, indeed, an adequate merchant fleet was a positive national detriment because other countries, unless allowed to sell us shipping services, would not buy our products.

When this war struck the United States, two fortuitous circumstances saved us from the full consequences of our folly.

Fortunately, in 1936, Congress authorized a program which called for the construction of 500 ships during the next 10 years. Although the first ship under this program was not launched until April 1939, the Maritime Commission, under the able chairmanship of Admiral Land, and the efficient vice chairmanship of Admiral Vickery, had done much valuable planning and spade work before the outbreak of war. This pre-war planning greatly facilitated our ship construction program.

We had, at the outset of the present war, the wholly inadequate tonnage of only 6,800,000 gross tons. The output of our shipyards for 1943 totaled approximately 20,000,000 tons. In 1944 we shall reach the incredible total of 30,000,000 tons. You can gain some conception of the significance of these figures when I remind you that, at the outbreak of war, the total combined shipping tonnage of the entire world amounted to only 60,000,000 tons.

The task of recruiting and training crews to man our new ships has been carried out under the competent direction of our fellow San Franciscan, Capt. Edward Macauley. In the short space of 2½ years, our sea-going personnel has been more than tripled.

The second fortuitous circumstance, which too often has been overlooked, was that, notwithstanding the lack of popular interest in our merchant marine, we did in fact have at least the nucleus of an efficiently managed and operated maritime industry. This nucleus has proved invaluable in our war effort. The shipping industry began converting to a full wartime basis well before Pearl Harbor. Today it is the only major transportation facility in the country which is wholly devoted to war purposes. Every one of its ships, and practically all of its shore establishments, have been engaged in full-time war pursuits since Pearl Harbor.

Not many Americans understand that, while the Maritime Commission has carried on and supervised the gigantic tasks of building ships, the major portion of our American tonnage is actually operated by American private shipping firms. In cooperation with the War Shipping Administration our private operators have kept our ships moving in all the seven seas, and to and from ports where American ships never have called before.

The construction feats of the shipbuilding industry and the heroic services of our officers and crews quite properly have been widely acclaimed. Little, however, has so far been said about the spendid contribution which the management side of the shipping industry has made to the conduct of the war. So far as I know, no E's or M's have yet been awarded to shipping management.

As a part of our Maritime Day celebration, it is altogether fitting that we pause to pay tribute to the thousands of American officers and seamen who have lost their lives in the service of their country, and to applaud the many thousands who today are braving storms and military destruction to convoy our troops and equipment to the far-flung corners of the earth.

More than 10,000 American seamen have seen their vessels destroyed. One seaman has served on 13 different torpedoed ships. Notwithstanding these hazards, our seagoing personnel has increased by voluntary enlistment from 50,000 to approximately 150,000 men.

It is a significant and heartening fact that approximately 95 percent of our crews are American citizens.

We should also pay tribute at this time to the many old-timers who, at the call of their Government, voluntarily have returned to the sea from other walks of life, to assist and train the inexperienced men who comprise such a large proportion of our new personnel.

Government, management, and labor, with splendid teamwork, are accomplishing the most gigantic transportation undertaking in all history.

It remains to be seen whether we shall be able, by similar teamwork, to establish and maintain an adequate merchant marine in peacetime.

In appraising the chances for successful post-war private operation of a greatly enlarged American merchant marine, we must be realistic and take into account certain difficulties and handicaps which lie ahead.

We cannot close our eyes to the fact that even before the war our operating costs were approximately 35 percent higher than those of our foreign competitors. The cost of constructing a vessel in an American shipyard was almost twice the cost of foreign construction. One of our most difficult problems will be to meet the post-war competition of foreign maritime nations without undue sacrifice of the living standards of our operating personnel.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 takes cognizance of this fundamental difficulty and authorizes the payment of so-called construction and operation subsidies to equalize American costs with foreign costs. It should be noted, however, that these allowances are available only to vessels which are engaged in foreign commerce. They are not available to our domestic ships.

Incidentally, construction differentials are not bounties which are granted to ship operators. They are, in effect, equalization allowances which merely make it possible for an American shipowner to obtain ships from American shipyards at a cost no greater than that at which they might be purchased in foreign yards. Their primary purpose is to encourage the construction of American vessels in American shipyards. It has sometimes

been improperly charged that these equalization payments constitute a form of unfair international competition. Nothing could be farther from the truth. There is nothing unfair in equalizing the amount of capital which which the American shipowner invests in his ships with the amount which a foreign shipowner pays for his fleet.

There are many uncertainties which make it extremely difficult to envision the future of the American merchant marine.

No one can forecast, as yet, with any degree of certainty, what the post-war volume of either domestic or foreign trade will be. Among the many indeterminable factors which enter into the foreign trade picture, are such items as embargoes, tariffs, rates of exchange, national incomes of various nations, and the rapidity with which devastated countries are rehabilitated.

The volume of foreign trade, which will be available for American ships may depend, in part, upon international understandings which will not be arrived at until the peace conference.

At present we do not even know to what extent or on what terms American-owned ships will be turned over to our foreign competitors.

Until some of these uncertainties have been resolved into known facts, it will be impossible to determine the amount of tonnage which can be soundly employed in our American merchant marine.

There is every indication that we will end the war with more ships than we will require for our own use. Unfortunately, however, many of these vessels cannot be readily utilized in some types of service. The Maritime Commission now is concentrating, very wisely, upon the construction of fast vessels of the C type. But even these fast ships do not meet all the requirements of some trades and routes. It is certain that our foreign competitors in due course will rehabilitate their decimated fleets with the most modern and efficient types of vessels. In view of our high wage scales, it is extremely important that our post-war merchant marine should likewise be equipped with equally efficient ships. No one can foretell how many of the more suitable types will be accessible for commercial use, or how soon they will become available.

We must not overlook the fact that more than half of our operating tonnage at the beginning of the war was engaged in domestic commerce. If this important segment of our maritime industry is to survive, it must be able to keep its operating costs within rate ceilings which are geared to the cost of other forms of domestic transportation.

As already pointed out, our domestic trade is not eligible to receive either construction or operating differential payments from the Government.

Some way must be found to replace and expand our domestic fleets on a capital structure which will enable them to earn a reasonable return.

A factor of prime importance to both our domestic and foreign lines is the possibility of developing more efficient and economical methods of handling cargo. Few people realize that in many instances the cost of loading and discharging cargo constitutes as much as 40 percent of the total cost of handling and transportation.

An exceedingly important item in determining whether the American merchant marine will be enabled to compete in the world shipping markets is the question of whether our steamship companies shall be permitted to operate air transports in conjunction with their surface operations.

American shipping companies have a great background of experience and foreign contacts which can prove most valuable in promoting the interests of American air transportation. Their overseas staffs are familiar with customs and other regulations, and much of their existing personnel and knowledge can be utilized to give efficient and economical air service. Common sense dictates that these valuable assets should not be wasted.

It is common knowledge that our foreign shipping competitors are prepared to integrate their surface traffic with overseas air service. Some were so doing before tne war. Others are preparing now to offer their customers a combined sea and air service after the war. Yet today it is still an open question whether this Government will permit our own merchant marine to meet this competition on an even footing.

It would be folly to ask our shipping industry to engage in a fiercely competitive enterprise while bound in an economic strait jacket. Yet that is precisely what some short-sighted persons would have us do. Fortunately, I think we can rely on plain American common sense to take care of this situation.

In this connection, I am happy to report that our own San Francisco Congressman, the Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH, is taking a leading and effective part in the effort to establish the right of steamship companies to engage in foreign air-borne commerce.

A fatal error into which we as a nation must not fall is the philosophy of "let the Government do it." We have been much too prone in the past to shrug off our responsibilities as citizens and turn the job over to Washington. In wartime, of course, there has to be a great measure of central direction of our whole economy and of its individual units, and shipping certainly has been no exception. But the shipping industry does not propose to shirk its responsibilities in planning for the peace, and I am confident that the public will lend the required support.

Admiral Land has expressed the Maritime Commission's attitude in these words—I quote:

"These war problems have obviously necessitated a considerable governmental control and direction of private business. But it is well to bear in mind that a return of that control to private business when the war emergency no longer exists is a definite part of our program. That, as you well know, has been the intent of Congress and the Maritime Commission since its establishment. There has been no change in that policy. It is evident that post-war plans for a greater merchant marine must be based upon that premise. It is equally evident that the American merchant marine must serve as the mainstay of transportation in the economic restoration of world commerce when the victory has been won"

If we are to have a strong and healthy merchant marine and keep it so in the years to come, it must attract private capital. That means that conditions will have to be such that our shipping can earn a reasonable return and present to capital a long-range incentive.

That is why, in my opinion, it is of first importance that the Government chart its own course at the earliest possible date as to those issues which fall solely within the province of government. How much merchant tonnage does the Navy think will be required to meet its needs for auxiliaries in the post-war era? How much of our present tonnage does the Government propose to turn over, if any, to friendly competing nations, and on what terms? How much does it propose to lay up as a reserve, and what types of ships are to be placed in that reserve? What commitments, if any, will our Government make as to allocation of foreign-trade routes?

We of the shipping industry pledge our wholehearted cooperation with government in arriving at answers to these and the other vexing problems which lie ahead. At the same time we pledge that we shall bend our own best energies to the solution of those problems which lie in the shipping industry's own province.

We are all agreed, I take it, as to objectives. The job now is to find the ways and means. To that end let us all—in government, in the industry, in labor, and as good citizens—dedicate ourselves on this Maritime Day.

The Communists Know What They Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an article by Frank R. Kent, as follows:

BROWDER ENDORSEMENT OF FOURTH TERM DECLARED BOTH LOGICAL AND CONSISTENT

(By Frank R. Kent)

For the Communist Party, which now calls itself the Communist Political Association, to favor Mr. Roosevelt's fourth-term candidacy is entirely logical and consistent.

This was forecast many months ago by the declaration of Mr. Earl Browder, whom Mr. Roosevelt released from prison "in the interest of national unity" nearly 2 years ago, and will surprise no one.

In his demand for a fourth Roosevelt term, Mr. Browder was so far ahead of all others that he easily can establish his claim to being the original fourth termer.

The C. I. O. leaders, the city bosses, such as Hague and Kelly, all followed Mr. Browder—they did not precede him. Moreover, Mr. Browder is not swinging his party for a fourth term because of the presidential pardon. In all probability he would have taken the lead in the movement if he were still in jail.

Support of Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal has been a Communist Party policy since 1936. The Communists supported Mr. Roosevelt even when they had a Presidential candidate of their own. They supported him even when he found it politically expedient to say he did not desire their support. And the reason the Communists have been for Mr. Roosevelt so long and are for him so unitedly this time is very clear indeed.

MOVE TOWARD "OUR GOALS"

They have publicly declared it upon various occasions. In brief, it is that the Roosevelt policies and the New Deal tend in the Communist direction and, better than anything else, help move the country toward "our goals." Communist platforms have said this in so many words and Mr. Browder, the Communist leader, has proclaimed it in his speeches.

Until quite recently, one of the clearly understood goals of the Communist Party was to bring about an economic chaos in this country out of which communism would emerge. The New Deal being clearly headed toward economic chaos, the Communist support was clearly intelligent from their standpoint.

Early in 1942, during the deportation proceeding against Harry Bridges, radical West coast C. I. O. labor leader, Attorney General Biddle characterized the Communist Party as an agency which advocated the overthrow of the United States Government. A very short time ago through Mr. Browder, it was announced that the Communist Party would

put no Presidential candidate in the field this year and intended to dissolve as a political party.

At its convention on Sunday it changed its name and adopted a constitution in which expulsion was pronounced upon all those who seek to "subvert, undermine, weaken, or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy." Thus, the leopard changed its spots—or at least, such is the idea sought to be promulgated. Of course, none but the most completely credulous believe any such thing.

The change in name means nothing. The abandonment of the separate party idea relieves the leaders of both labor and expense. It in no way weakens their position as a solid voting bloc. It involves no change in either leadership or aims. It increases their political potency.

EASIER "TO BORE FROM WITHIN"

It makes it easier for the Communists to "bore from within," and anyone who does not think they have been successfully boring might ponder the completeness with which it now has taken control of the American Labor Party in New York. It would also be illuminating to read the long list of C. I. O. leaders, white and colored, who attended the first gathering of the Communist Political Association on Sunday in New York.

Certainly, that list goes a long way toward confirming the frequent charges of Mr. John L. Lewis and others that the Communists are in key positions inside the big C. I. O. unions and wield the real power within the organization. As things stand now, Mr. Browder, representing the Communists, and the Messrs. Phillip Murray and Sidney Hillman, representing the C. I. O., are the most ardent and articulate advocates of the fourth term.

The "Liberal" party, composed of the defeated right wing of the American Labor Party, has also declared for Mr. Roosevelt. So has the Daily Worker, the Communist organ, and all the other left-wing newspapers, magazines, and organizations.

It is not true, of course, that all of those who want Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term are crackpots and radicals. But it is true that all the crackpots and radicals want a fourth term. That vote he has with complete solidity.

Moreover, the activity of this element is so great, its propaganda facilities so extraordinary and its finances so strong that it seems bound to color the fourth-term campaign—even, some think, likely to have more to do with its real management than the Democratic National Committee, itself.

It is not surprising that, as they observe these radical elements rushing to the front, regular Democrats are somewhat appalled. It is not surprising that there should be speculations as to whether in the event of another Roosevelt election, the communistic C. I. O. would not be in position really to take over the Democratic Party. At any rate, there is a great deal more fourth-term enthusiasm evinced at this time among the radicals than among the regulars. And that is logical, too.

A Partisan War Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence says unions are out-guessing the War Labor Board. Here are his comments:

When Chairman Davis of the War Labor Board says that it is necessary to seize plants in order to prevent the no-strike pledge from being ignored by labor itself, he is in fact saying that it is necessary to put pressure on the employer in order to win over the employees.

For in many cases the employee unions have maneuvered the situation into one where, after they have called a strike, the War Labor Board has been unable to get jurisdiction over the strikers except by seizing the plant. The administration has never recommended the use of any penalties for striking labor unions, and the idea that the no-strike pledge has been kept is based upon the equivocal statement that strikes which are unauthorized do not count in the tally.

As a matter of fact, labor union leaders frequently maneuver the War Labor Board into the position of seizing a property in order to prove to their constituent members that they are doing something to justify their positions.

AWAKENS TO TENDENCY

The War Labor Board has recently awakened to this tendency and has started to apply some sanctions to striking unions. The National Labor Relations Board has assisted in the process only to receive the condemnation of labor unions. The fact is that as long as the labor unions can get favorable decisions from the War Labor Board and the National Labor Relations Board, they support these decisions, but once the decisions go against them, they assail the members and either withdraw from participation in the boards or ignore the hearings.

The real reason for this is that labor unions have not really appreciated the fact which employers have already recognized, namely, that the War Labor Board has taken unto itself the power of compulsory arbitration. No labor leader in his right mind will accept Government compulsion in peacetime and very few of them have been willing to accept compulsory arbitration in wartime.

The truth is that every suggestion or proposal of legislate compulsory arbitration has been rebuffed by the labor leaders. The idea that a Government tribunal can order a settlement is not relished by labor unions when the orders are unfavorable to the employee, but most of the orders of the War Labor Board have been against the employers. That is why the War Labor Board without any authority from Congress, has ordered "maintenance of membership" contracts.

The War Labor Board consists of three groups, namely, labor representatives, management representatives, and so-called public representatives. The public representatives, as reflected in their decisions, are in the main favorable to the labor unions. The policy of ordering the "maintenance of membership" clauses in union contracts has been consistently supported by the three public members of the labor boards.

THEORY BEHIND CLAUSE

The theory behind the "maintenance of membership" clause is that the labor unions should be given some sort of reward for their loyalty in not indulging in strikes. It is contended that labor unions are unable, on account of wage stabilization, to get much for their members, and this would result in a drop-off of members, and hence in the amounts of labor dues, unless the Government put into effect the "maintenance of membership" clause requiring members to stay in the union once they join.

There is no such reward for the employer who fails to lock out employees in wartime, or maintains his plant even at a loss in order to keep going in the hope of eventually getting into the black. There is no reward for the employer who is the victim of jurisdictional disputes between employees. Nobody has ever suggested that he, too, be compensated for the loss he incurs while unions fight it out. Indeed, there is no fairness in the Roosevelt administration policies where the employer is concerned.

To argue, therefore, that it is necessary to seize plants in order to prevent an epidemic of strikes is merely to scratch the surface and ignore the fundamentals. If the War Labor Board had a policy that applied equally between the employers and employees there would have been very little clamor over the seizure of the property of employers who were recalcitrant.

Must We Bankrupt Industry's Supply of Trained Technicians?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the hysteria of war we rush from one extreme to the other. First we must have unlimited supplies of raw material and commodities of every description, then we find we are oversupplied with many things we cannot use. Now we are draining our schools of the student material on which America must depend for the future technical operation of its industries—if we are not to go into a hopeless recession after the war. This mistaken policy on the part of our Government is brought to our attention in a recent communication from Mrs. J. V. Edeskuty, of the Minneapolis Federation of Women's Clubs, which is inserted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

MAY 16, 1944.

WAR SERVICE COMMITTEE,
Vocational Training Chairman,
Fifth District, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: May I ask your cooperation and help on the following information, please?

The war effort, as well as the peace and reconstruction, will depend on our industries and their trained technical men.

What have other countries done to insure an adequate supply of technical men?

Germany and Russia have retained perhaps half their technical students of science; England and Canada conserved most of their students in engineering; Canada has more than twice the pre-war number.

WHAT ARE WE DOING?

For the past 2 years no high-school graduates were permitted to enter engineering colleges. This reduced the present number of engineering students from 108,911 to 45,404 in October 1943. In January 1944 this was sharply reduced to 10,000. Of this number 6,800 are now in school. They consist of seniors and juniors.

The latest order is that all engineering students now in school must join the armed forces after June graduation exercises whether they complete their courses or not. (Quoted from article by Dr. S. C. Lind, dean of the Institute of Technology of the University of Minnesota, in the May Ben of Tau Beta Pi, magazine of an honoraby engineering fraternity which only the best students are privileges to enter.) A great majority of

these students are given scholarships by industry for post-graduate work, and most of our research workers are developed from this group. They should be permitted to continue their studies.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE INSTEAD?

In 1944, 2,586 Tau Beta Pi students and graduates have been inducted into the armed forces, and 22 of these have been killed. Such a short-sighted policy can only lead to disaster to our industries, and eventually to our war effort and the peace and reconstruction. All will depend on our trained technical men who cannot be replaced for years to come.

May I urge prompt consideration be given in order to prevent the closing of our engineering colleges? That the present students be permitted to finish their courses in science. That high-grade student graduates be readmitted to colleges for post-graduate work, and that present personnel in essential jobs as essential to the winning of the war, and the winning of the peace be deferred.

With faith in your ability to help in consideration of this appeal.

Very sincerely,

MRS. J. V. EDESKUTY, M. F. W. C.,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

A Tax That Backfired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS ROLPH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, an editorial captioned "A tax that backfired" recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner.

The article calls attention to the present 30-percent Federal tax added to bills charged by those cabarets and cafes which offer entertainment. Prior to the current tax law, 5 percent was charged. In other words, the tax was raised 500 percent. Legislation is before Congress to reduce the 30 percent rate to 10 percent.

Unless granted relief, many well-known cafes throughout the Nation will be forced to close. Net result drastically reduced Federal revenue plus numbers of people thrown out of employment. The editorial is quoted in full as follows:

A TAX THAT BACKFIRED

There is a stable axiom in economics called the law of diminishing return. It is taken generally to mean that increase in capital or labor applied beyond a certain point causes a less than proportionate increase in production.

That law has never been repealed in industry—nor in taxation.

Congress, in its recent revision of the Federal tax bill tried to repeal it in the case of night clubs and cafes which offer entertainment—but the old law stands—unrepealed.

Congress put a tax of 30 percent on the bill charged in these resorts, and the result is that patrons stayed away.

That has caused loss to the establishments, and they have discharged entertainers or omitted entertainment entirely so that this new tax need not be levied on their customers.

Many of the places throughout the country have closed up, thousands of musicians and dancers and comedians have been discharged, with resulting decrease to the Government of income-tax payments which could have been collected on their usually generous salaries.

Like bad money drives out good money, bad taxes kill revenue.

Congress overreached itself in this tax, and has lost its balance in cash. The high tax defeated its purpose.

Now let Congress be sensible and practical. Admitted that cafe entertainment is a luxury, but people—including servicemen—want some luxuries and are willing to pay reasonably for them—but will not stand extortionate taxes.

So Congress should hasten to repeal that particular unsound clause in the revenue bill, make the tax reasonable and collect reasonable revenue where now it collects nothing.

Preservation of Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the clash between the legislative and executive branches of government precipitated by President Roosevelt's veto of the tax bill and his recent action relative to Montgomery Ward & Co., had to come sometime if the trend toward totalitarianism is to be halted and constitutional Government is to be preserved. Not until Mr. Roosevelt became the resident of the White House, was there any noticeable evidence of a concerted and organized campaign to place extraordinary powers in the hands of the Executive, through transfer of authority from the legislative to the executive department. The first attempt to justify this change was under the guise of the emergency caused by the depression. Another emergency, created by the war, then developed. While we are all in complete accord with every activity necessary to the winning of the war, yet advantage has been taken of this critical situation to obtain from Congress authority which was vested in the legislative branch, by provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we find that we now have scores of agencies set up by Executive directive, and, to a great extent, government by bureaucratic decree instead of government by legislation. Under this management, Government bureaus have the power of life and death over practically every individual and private business enterprise in the country.

The people are aroused, Congress should be aroused, and at once put a stop to the power of these Government bureaus which are practically destroying private business through the imposition of penalties. These bureaus have a control over industry, business and civilian life, and by directives make our laws and then serve as prosecutor, judge, and jury.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, while we are fighting the greatest war in history, to preserve our freedom, we do not want to lose our own constitutional form of government. If we continue to allow bureaucratic control and government by Executive decrees, it will not be long until the legislative branch will be so stripped of authority and the executive department so entrenched that any attempt to recover constitutional government will be doomed for defeat.

So again I say, Mr. Speaker, we, as Members of Congress, can and must stop bureaucratic control or government by Executive directives. We represent the people and we stand between government by representation on one hand and government by bureaucracy and dictatorship on the other. We must lead the fight for the survival of our American institutions, our American people, and our American form of government.

Not Feasible for Rehabilitation, Now Producing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH MRUK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, in my home city of Buffalo, N. Y., there has been successfully established one of the most amazing business innovations of our modern day, Handicapped Persons Industries, Inc.

This worthy enterprise was launched for the specific purpose of utilizing the services of and training those usually termed "not feasible for rehabilitation," and it employs today aproximately 30 persons who are either deaf, blind, have lost an arm or leg, or are otherwise disabled by congenital defect, injury, or disease.

Handicapped Persons Industries, Inc., is unique in more than one way. Not only does it pay the prevailing wage to its employees but also it pays unemployment insurance, does not seek exemption from the Minimum Wage Act, and enables every worker so employed to become beneficiary of social-security and unemployment-insurance benefits. The objective is not only to perfect our economic system by utilizing the talents and abilities of individuals ordinarily consigned to the "human scrap pile" but to lighten the tax load by taking these people off relief rolls, and so forth.

This industry, a nonprofit, beneficent, educational corporation, was conceived and founded by my fellow townsman, its president, Harold J. McMahon, himself a cripple, but possessed of a burning desire to aid his fellow handicapped. I understand that this movement is spreading to other areas, no doubt because of the fact that the enterprise has proven itself to be practical and adaptable to the needs of any given community.

Mr. McMahon is also a national vice president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., with headquarters in Washington, D. C. This

federation, as is well known to Members of Congress, is vigorously campaigning for a national program for all the 25,000,000 physically handicapped in America, and now has pending before Congress House Resolution 230, providing that the House Labor Committee shall investigate, survey, and develop a national program for all the physically handicapped; House Joint Resolution 69 and Senate Joint Resolution 34, National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; H. R. 1867, establishing an office of personal catastrophe loans; and House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 43, establishing a division for the physically handicapped in the United States Employment Service.

A. F. P. H. has officially endorsed the Handicapped Persons Industries, Inc., and anticipates assisting in establishing similar units in various parts of the United States of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Four-F Digest, a publication devoted to the interests of handicapped people, edited by Mr. Willard H. Woods, of Springfield, Mass., descriptive of Handicapped Persons Industries, Inc., and I trust this will be read by every Member of Congress as well as those of the general public who are interested in the welfare of the millions of our handicapped citizens:

NOT FEASIBLE FOR REHABILITATION, NOW PRODUCING

(The physically handicapped were hired in the last World War and were replaced by able-bodied after the armistice. They were always the last hired and first to be fired so Harold J. McMahon spent years planning to establish a factory for them. Handicapped considered "not feasible for rehabilitation" under the Federal-State rehabilitation program are now producing in their own factory.)

Here is an introduction to America's most interesting and possibly most useful industry. It is new, unique, dramatic. It is as human and humane as the flag itself and stands for the same thing—The Handicapped Persons Industries, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.—an organization that is operated by and for physically handicapped people in its entirety.

It is the culmination of a dream of a man who had lost a leg 33 years ago who never let that prevent him from being independent and self-supporting. However, in his years of dogged determination to succeed, he observed that there were many thousands of physically handicapped individuals who perhaps did not have the same opportunity as he had.

The story is an interesting one—it certainly is a great achievement—the organization has tremendous possibilities and from the success so far met, its activities are spreading into other cities and will spread further.

The president and founder of the organization is Harold J. McMahon—Mac to his employees. In 1911 he became infected with osteomyelitis. His left limb was amputated above the knee. For nearly a year he battled to save his left arm, which also was infected with osteomyelitis. The doctors were only able to accomplish this by removing one of the bones from his lower arm. In October 1912, because of a bone deterioration, he fractured his right leg above the knee. For three and a half years he had to fight the doctors to prevent them from amputating that leg. He was only a boy and already seemingly insurmountable obstacles had to be pushed aside in order for him to live. Fight was instilled in him. He won his battle and has been winning ever since.

STARTED AS PRINTER

Shortly after his recovery, with only a grammar school education, the boy started out in the printing trade. By hard study and perseverance he was able to go through the printing industry from the composing room on up through positions of foreman, purchasing agent, to positions as sales manager, and sales promotion manager of several prominent printing and advertising specialty houses.

Experience in other trades was gained by McMahon when, at times, jobs were scarce in the printing business. This versatile experience has been valuable to him in establishing this industry for physically handicapped people.

McMahon's idea was really in his mind since the last World War, and it took years to cultivate until it became a reality. In 1917 McMahon was engaged in a war manufacturing plant just outside of New York City. Like today, there was a manpower shortage. The management of this company was confronted with idle machines. Visualizing that these machines could be operated by physically handicapped people who could be quickly trained. McMahon proposed to the management that such people be engaged. Doubt existed in the minds of the foremen and superintendent. By working nights in the various departments he, himself, became trained and soon learned that he could run these machines. This proved to the management that what he believed, could actually be done. By his initiative a plan was effected to employ physically handicapped people. About 60 were engaged in this factory.

Shortly after the armistice of 1918 McMahon returned to the printing industry. Several years later he went to the factory to visit some of his old cronies who walked with crutches or braces. He was deeply annoyed and aggravated when he found they had been discarded and replaced by able-bodied people. Concerned as to why industry did not have room for the disabled, he began a long study of investigation and observation to determine the reason.

CLOSELY OBSERVED REHABILITATION

No one associated with rehabilitation in America has more closely observed the growth of the Federal-State rehabilitation program as has McMahon, beginning back in the early 20's when the first rehabilitation program was instituted in the State of New Jersey under direction of Dr. Fred H. Albee, noted orthopedic surgeon of New York. Dr. Albee was the surgeon who saved McMahon's right leg by a bone-graft operation, and he had become an admirer of Dr. Albee ever since. Silently he observed the doctor's efforts in behalf of the physically handicapped. That was when McMahon began to find out why the physically handicapped were not wanted in industry and commerce, and he has never once lost sight of the fact that something should be done for them.

A Philadelphia bread line back in 1930 gave McMahon a jolt that caused him to decide that something definite should be done for the physically handicapped. "Of 30 people in that bread line, 9 were on crutches," McMahon recalled. "It was a touching illustration of a fact I had long known—the handicapped worker is always the last hired and the first fired. Watching that bread line, I determined that I would some day found a factory for the handicapped, where they would get an even break in which to develop their abilities."

Born with the realization that, if the physically handicapped did not want to exist for the rest of their lives on relief rolls or charity funds, they must band themselves together into an organization and operate their own industry.

Believing that handicapped persons are creative as well as industrious, and having faith in society to sustain him in his idea, McMahon began to lay plans for his organization. For 10 years he worked in his spare hours to lay the plans for a factory-training school with versatile vocational training opportunities, planned several industries, department by department he constructed each industry, tearing up his plans and beginning again in order to gain absolute perfection.

Prior to America entering the war, McMahon abandoned his ideas somewhat, believing that the heavy demands on industry would absorb all the physically handicapped when the manpower shortage became acute. Soon McMahon learned that the war production boom was no boon to the physically handicapped. Contrary to the belief of many, that as war production expanded and the demand for workers increased, the opportunities for the handicapped would be greatly enhanced, McMahon knew different. He says, "There still remains thousands of unemployed handicapped persons. A goodly number with exceptional skills were hired, where there was a shortage of that skill. However, after seeing what occurred in the last war, I could not help but believe that these handicapped boys and girls who had been hired in defense plants would be the first to be dismissed as soon as war production ceases and with the many still unemployed that the time had arrived to found the factory." In opposition to the advices of many business leaders that "this is no time to begin a new non-war industry—wait till the war is over," McMahon felt now was the time to prove to the world that he had the right idea.

ESTABLISHED FACTORY

Searching various industries for a line that could be manufactured and sold during a war, he hit upon the wood toy industry. "There was a shortage of wood toys," McMahon said, "many toy factories had turned to defense work. There was a ready market."

During the summer of 1942, The Toymakers Guild, a division of the Handicapped Persons Industries, Inc., was established. The parent organization had already been incorporated in 1942. McMahon set out to procure some other physically handicapped persons who thought along the same lines as he. He surrounded himself with four others, all physically handicapped, and started to set up his toy factory. They formed their board of directors and elected officers.

The other officers are Vice President John Krucenski, minus a leg, teacher of four instruments at the Wurlitzer School of Music; Secretary M. Irvin Chriswell, a member of the faculty of the Buffalo Technical High School; Treasurer Harry W. White, who though able to walk only with the aid of crutches, is a master watchmaker in a leading Buffalo jewelry store. White, incidentally, learned watchmaking without the aid of any instruction. As the organization gained publicity, other interested ones were absorbed into the board of directors. They are Mrs. Gertrude Evans, housewife, who for nearly 15 years has been afflicted with arthritis; Miss Ann Ramonda, a victim of infantile paralysis, walks with aid of crutches and wears braces, employed at the famous Kleinhan's Music Hall; Bernard Aikin, arthritic victim, who is employed at an assembly bench in the factory of the Colonial Radio Corporation; Louis Varga, paralytic victim, a set-up man and supervisor in a Buffalo defense plant, and Charles Edenhofer, spinal affliction, who once worked with McMahon in a wood jewelry box factory.

These people all have lucrative positions and put in their spare time to help organize and operate the Toymakers Guild, which is the name of the toy factory the industries

is known by. Only two of them received any compensation, and that has been for only a few weeks. The others received no financial remuneration whatsoever. They are happy over the fact that they are making possible jobs for other handicapped to earn a living wage. Samples were designed and produced. Arrangements were made with a selling organization. A showroom is maintained in the Toy Center in the Fifth Avenue Building in New York City.

MORE THAN $100,000 IN ORDERS

During the toy fair which ran for 2 weeks in New York orders totaling over $100,000 were procured from the best toy buyers, representing leading department stores and jobbers throughout the country. The factory is now in operation. More workers and equipment are being added. Every day brings new employees from the ranks of unemployed or relief rolls. The type of people who are provided employment are those who were considered "not feasible" for rehabilitation under the Federal-State rehabilitation program, and those who are considered "unemployables" in normal lines of industry and commerce. The aggregation of years on relief rolls of the first 21 people put to work was 125 years.

According to McMahon, the Handicapped Persons Industries does not ask exemption from the Minimum Wage Act; assures every worker of social-security benefits, including unemployment insurance; pays time and a half for every working hour in excess of the 40-hour week. It is not subsidized by private philanthrophy.

The financing of Handicapped Persons Industries, Inc., in the beginning was carried by McMahon and his coworkers on the board of directors. A plan was devised with the assistance and counsel of a number of competent businessmen serving as an auxiliary board of directors without compensation, for expansion by the issuance of "tax conserving bonds" in the denominations of $25, $50, and $100, and offered for sale to the public. The bond is redeemable at option of the board of directors without monetary interest. In the event of liquidation the bond will participate in the sale of physical properties. This being a non-profit organization, surplus earnings are earmarked for expansion. Already requests have come from other cities, urging the establishment of factories in those areas with offers of assistance and cooperation. This fits in with McMahon's original idea.

The spirit of unselfish service exhibited by the executives permeates the entire organization. Blind Alice Barber, McMahon's stenographer, opens a letter with her strong hands for Gertrude Evans, whose hands and feet are affected by arthritis. And when Alice must have a telephone number, Gertrude looks it up for her with equal willingness and pride.

HELPING ONE ANOTHER

Because of the difference in their physical limitations, these people know the satisfaction of helping one another. "Handicapped men and women can earn their way if given an opportunity," Mr. McMahon maintains. He left an executive position in a defense plant with loss in income to back up this organization. He says, "A handicapped keeps his mind alert constantly, to devise ways of doing things regardless of his limitations." That accounts for their aptness. These people are getting their first chance to make good. They know that only if every one of them to their very best can their organization continue. Ninety-five percent of the plant production-workers are doing jobs that are new to them.

Besides McMahon, the chief instructors are one of his board members and a former trade-school instructor. Some of the people who are engaged in this toy factory never had a work opportunity before in their lives.

EACH EMPLOYEE'S HISTORY

An insight into their case history gives a picture of why they are so happy and contented in this new work. Here are a few of them:

Clara Cross, age 44, uses crutches on the street but can walk with cane inside; contracted spinal meningitis at the age of 4 and spent 19 years in wheel chair; a year and a half at the Ithaca, N. Y., Reconstruction Home brought back partial recovery; never employed; not considered feasible for rehabilitation by the rehabilitation bureaus; she enjoys every minute of toy assembly to what she calls "fascinating work."

Mary Ciles, age 30, had infantile paralysis at the age of 2, affecting motor nerves, causing instability in her walk; a high-school graduate with 4 years of business training; never before regularly employed; now works as typist in direct-mail department, her first real job.

Elizabeth Buczka, age 18, born with spastic paralysis; never before worked and now regularly employed as a top packer. Unsteadiness of her hands no detriment to her efficiency.

Fred Egger, aged 54, partially paralyzed right arm, and semiparalytic right leg. Uses cane outside; unemployed for 4 years before coming to Handicapped Persons Industries, now engaged as chief spray gun operator.

Nina Fecher, age 33; almost totally deaf from bad cold 6 years ago; widow with two small children; developed a fine technique for painting faces on a clown toy although she had never done any related work.

Ruben Pratt, age 69, arthritis, as result of sprain; had been machine shop instructor at two technical high schools; is shop foreman and instructor; teaches new help, sets up machines, and builds models and works on new ideas.

Stanley Rzyski, age 59, paralyzed left arm and shoulder caused by accident at 17. Worked in mines until 1929 when the depression closed the mines in his home town; has done odd jobs since; is factory general handy man and maintenance worker; a humorous person and an indispensable part of Handicapped Persons Industries. Stanley is evidence, too, that brains are sometimes more practical than brawn. When the paint spray booth was being installed on the second floor it was necessary, from a practical standpoint, to put the 900-pound air compressor in a cool hall on the second floor and install it in a space just large enough for it. Professional movers and riggers said it couldn't be done. Today, that compressor is in its place, thanks to Stanley, who used his head and one good arm, along with the help of Fred Egger, and a husky block and tackle.

Anna Hoffman, age 38, arthritic; uses crutches; unemployed for 12 years until coming to Handicapped Persons Industries. Now paints and assembles toys quickly with only several days training.

Vincent Oberfill, age 50, arthritis; caused by strain working as plumber's helper 30 years ago. In complete charge of office routine, shipping, and expediting of orders; while unable to stand erect, he does a swell job; finds the people congenial, nice to work with.

William Nowak, age 63, amputated left leg 35 years ago in railroad accident. His regular job here is assembling toys. He is willing and cheerful to do anything he is asked to do, even to running errands on a pair of crutches.

Alice Barber, age 26, totally blind; progressive blindness since age of 7; totally blind past 8 years; high-school graduate; postgraduate year in 6 months of general stenography, substituting dictaphone for shorthand; made high-school course of 4 years in 3; regular business college course of a year in 6 months; held a responsible position in the New York State Division of Parole and also in the Erie County comptroller's office. She is one of President McMahon's secretaries, taking all of his dictation and transcribing it from the dictaphone; types 800 to 1,000 lines per day.

Leora Keith, age 26, another secretary to the president; born with progressive paralysis; affecting motor nerves, only manifest for 15 years; unable to walk outside without support; unbalanced equilibrium and stiffening of left arm and right leg muscles. Never employed until coming to Handicapped Persons Industries; keeps pay-roll records, cost records, interviews applicants for employment, and takes care of salesmen and other callers of which there are many, permitting only those in the boss' office that are necessary for him to interview.

President McMahon assures the Four-F Digest that he welcomes and will correspond with anyone who desires seeing similar industrial workshops established in their community. He believes that now is the time to prepare for employment opportunities for the physically handicapped who will again be the "forgotten men and women" when this world catastrophe is at an end.

Mr. Farley Retains Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

MR. FARLEY RETAINS POST

Retention of James J. Farley as chairman of the Democratic State Committee in New York is scarcely a surprise. Expected opposition failed to materialize at the annual meeting, and he was the unanimous choice for the ninth consecutive year.

Although Mr. Farley does not see eye-to-eye with the powers in Washington, New York would find it difficult to replace him. He is among the Nation's shrewdest politicians and one of its most popular. Only a man of his stature could break with former associates and increase his prestige.

Mr. Farley not only is a loyal Democrat, but he is a good American. With him, his country always comes first, although he has been in the thick of party politics. If he had been willing to compromise he might have been in Washington today.

As chairman of the Democratic State Committee in New York he will continue to play an important role in national politics as well.

Tribute to Hon. John H. Overton, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Washington Star of March 14, 1944, and the Monroe (La.) Morning World of May 17, 1944, which have reference to United States Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1944]

REMEMBERING A FRIEND

Senator OVERTON's announcement that he will retire from the Senate after this term is a disappointment to the Washington community, which he served in a singularly effective and unselfish manner. He took a personal interest in Washington that went beyond the formal responsibilities of his office. The Overton plan, providing a systematic measurement of the National Government's financial obligation in Capital City financing, did not become law. But the Senator's fight for an equitable division of expenses left its mark in the improved relationship—following a period of injurious deterioration—between the House and Senate Committees on District Appropriations, with distinct benefit to Washington. It is probable that Congress eventually will turn to some form of the Overton plan, which establishes a ratio between the annual Federal appropriation and the excessive amount of Federally owned tax-exempt property in the District. Washington citizens will not quickly forget Senator OVERTON'S courteous attentiveness to their interests, his sincere sympathy over the lack of all semblance of representation in their Government, and his readiness to act in their behalf in Congress.

[From the Monroe (La.) Morning World of May 17, 1944]

OVERTON URGED TO SEEK REELECTION—50 SENATE COLLEAGUES SIGN PETITION IN UNPRECEDENTED ACTION

(By B. H. Timmons)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—Senator JOHN H. OVERTON was urged to seek reelection in a letter signed by nearly 50 of his Democratic colleagues in the Senate and in acknowledging receipt of the request the Senator said, "It unquestionably merits and will receive my thoughtful consideration."

In the unprecedented action the Senators paid high tributes to OVERTON and urged him to offer for reelection because "Your services to our country are invaluable."

The Senator announced several months ago that he would not seek to return to the Senate where he is rounding out his second term and that he would retire to his home in Louisiana.

"We, your colleagues, in the Senate, are very much concerned over the decision you made some time ago not to offer as a candidate for reelection in the Louisiana primaries next September," the letter signed by every Democratic Senator except a few who were either ill or out of Washington said.

"Because of your long experience in the Senate and your intimate knowledge of our Nation's affairs during this, the most perilous period in her history, it is your patriotic duty to remain at the helm," it continued.

"We urge you to run and we feel that the people of Louisiana will rally to your support because we believe they feel as we do that your services to our country are invaluable," it said.

The letter was dated May 13 and OVERTON'S reply sent to all who signed it was dated May 17. Both were released today by Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, who with Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana's junior Senator, were the first signatures on the petition.

"It is with a sense of gratitude and pride unequaled in any other happening of my public life that I have read the letter written to me by you and other Democratic colleagues in the Senate, conveying to me your regret that I have decided not to offer for reelection and expressing the hope that I shall upon further reflection conclude to present my candidacy to the electorate of Louisiana," OVERTON replied.

"Permit me to say that I prize this evidence of your esteem for and confidence in me above any tribute that has been or could possibly be paid to me by my colleagues and very earnestly and sincerely do I express to you the great admiration and warm affection I entertain for you and my other fellow Senators," he continued.

"This unsolicited and generous joint action by you and other Democratic colleagues is, I am informed, without precedent in the Senate and your suggestion unquestionably merits and will receive my thoughtful consideration," he said.

Talking with newsmen later, OVERTON did not elaborate and referred them to his letter. He reiterated his sense of pride and gratitude and said the request unquestionably merited his careful consideration.

Senator MCKELLAR, in a statement, paid tribute to OVERTON'S efforts on the Appropriations Committee, as chairman of the subcommittees on Naval Affairs and Flood Control.

He said it would be a great loss to the committee and to the best interests of the Navy for OVERTON to withdraw now. His statement in full follows:

"I was one of the first to urge Senator OVERTON to reconsider his determination not to run for the Senate again. Senator OVERTON and I serve on the Appropriations Committee together, and he is the head of the Subcommittee on Naval Affairs. We have seen eye to eye together on building up a great Navy and we still see eye to eye together in the matter of holding that Navy intact after the war is over. I think it would be a great loss to our committee and to the best interests of the Navy for Senator OVERTON to withdraw from the Senate now. Without knowing, I should think the people of Louisiana would be tremendously interested in the Navy, too.

"In addition, Senator OVERTON and I see similarly about the Mississippi River and flood control, and he is chairman of another subcommittee on flood control. I certainly hope he will change his mind and run for the office."

MCKELLAR said other Senators who signed the petition urging OVERTON to offer for reelection are:

CONNALLY of Texas, HILL of Alabama, DOWNEY of California, MEAD of New York, BAILEY of North Carolina, JOHNSON of Colorado, WALSH of Massachusetts, THOMAS of Oklahoma, BANKHEAD of Alabama, STEWART of Tennessee, CHANDLER of Kentucky, CHAVEZ of New Mexico, RUSSELL of Georgia, MAYBANK of South Carolina, MURDOCK of Utah, BARKLEY of Kentucky, GEORGE of Georgia, MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, CLARK of Missouri, MCCARRAN of Nevada, PEPPER of Florida, GUFFEY of Pennsylvania, RADCLIFFE of Maryland, SMITH of South Carolina, TYDINGS of Maryland, O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, GREEN of Rhode Island, CARAWAY of Arkansas, WHEELER of Montana, MCFARLAND of Arizona, WALSH of New Jersey, KILGORE of West Virginia, JACKSON of Indiana, BYRD of Virginia, HAYDEN of Arizona, WAGNER of New York, HATCH of New Mexico, GILLETTE of Iowa, GERRY of Rhode Island, TUNNELL of Delaware, BILBO of Mississippi, MALONEY of Connecticut, LUCAS of Illinois, and EASTLAND of Mississippi.

Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
May 19, 1944.

The Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the meeting of the Council of the City of Los Angeles held May 19, 1944, a resolution that the council memorialize Congress to reenact the Emergency Price Control Act without any weakening amendments and that the council request Congress to supply adequate funds and authority for enforcement of this act, was adopted.

In accordance with council instructions, I am forwarding a certified copy of this resolution to our State senators and to each Member of Congress from Southern California. You will find your copy enclosed.

Yours very truly,
WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.

Whereas in the interest of the war effort price controls must be continued to prevent inflation, and any interference with price controls at this time is a direct blow at our war effort itself; and

Whereas the Emergency Price Control Act expires on June 30, 1944; and

Whereas the renewal of this act now is being considered by congressional committees; and

Whereas Mayor Bowron has proclaimed the week of May 17 to May 24 as Save Price Control Week and is calling upon the people of Los Angeles "to urge the Congress to retain inviolate the principles and purposes of price control": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles City Council hereby memorializes Congress to reenact the Emergency Price Control Act without any weakening amendments and also requests Congress to supply adequate funds and authority for enforcement of this act.

One Hundred Years of Telegraph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Hon. James L. Fly, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, at telegraph centennial dinner, Statler Hotel, May 24, 1944:

The first practical use of the telegraph 100 years ago today was the beginning of communication by electricity, a method of transmitting intelligence which has led to the development of the land-line telegraph system; the ocean cable system; point-to-point radio communications; radio broadcasting, and the telephone. While many forms of communication are currently in use, by far the largest number of fast messages are sent by one or more of the methods utilizing electricity for power. Samuel F. B. Morse was the first to successfully harness electrical current for communication purposes. Indeed this was probably the earliest practical use of electricity. It staggers the imagination to endeavor to project the tremendous sweep of scientific development following in the train of the telegraph.

Morse began with two stations and a single line on poles between Washington and Baltimore. Today there are over 240,000 miles of telegraph pole lines and 510,000 miles of telephone pole lines in this country

alone. Western Union has 33,000 telegraph offices and agency stations serving 90,000 points in the United States, and there are approximately 26,000,000 telephone stations. In addition, there are 350,000 miles of ocean cable line and many radio point-to-point circuits connecting numerous points throughout the world.

Morse first visualized his electromagnetic telegraph in 1832. He struggled for 12 years to develop his instruments and convince the public that telegraphy could be put to practical use. This spade work took place during an interesting period in American history. It was a time when the White House was occupied first by Jackson, then by Van Buren, Harrison, Tyler, and Polk in rapid succession; when congressional scenes were dominated by John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and John C. Calhoun who all lived to see the telegraph and then all died within 10 years of its official recognition. It was a time when the list of lesser lights in Congress contained such names as John T. Stuart, Lincoln's law partner; James I. Roosevelt, Henry L. Pinckney, Millard Fillmore, and Franklin Pierce. The steamboat was 25 years old, and the first railroad was a budding infant. It was a time when some Congressmen were for and some against the carrying of mails on Sunday. Pennsylvania Avenue was a mudhole after a heavy rain. It was a day of horses, if you please, and horsey men; when Gen. Felix Gundy McConnell, of Alabama, appeared in Congress dressed in a blue swallow-tailed coat, light woolen pantaloons, and a scarlet vest, and accompanied by two lovely French girls dressed in native dancing costumes.

Into this scene stepped Morse, an artist of considerable renown but a novice at mechanics. He had been struck by the slowness of communications when it took 7 days for news of his wife's death to travel from New Haven to Washington. He had seen the semaphore system in operation along a French highway into Paris and he knew its limitations. He had been told that an electric current would travel instantaneously over many miles of wire and that its presence could be made visible at any point on the circuit. He constructed his crude instruments and they worked. He succeeded in arousing the interest of Alfred Vail, an expert mechanic, who got his father to finance early experiments and permitted Morse and young Vail to use his Iron Works at Morristown, N. J., as a laboratory.

After successful experiments in New York and in the White House before President Van Buren, Morse spent 5 years attempting to get public recognition and a congressional appropriation to finance further work. Finally, a bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Commerce. On February 21, 1843, Representative Kennedy, of Maryland, moved that the House consider the telegraph bill to authorize expenditure of $30,000 to test the merits of Morse's telegraph. The Congressional Globe for that day reports that Mr. Cave Johnson, of Tennessee, wished to have a word to say upon the bill. As the Congress then had done much to encourage science, he did not wish to see the science of mesmerism neglected and overlooked. He therefore proposed that a half of the appropriation be used for experiments in mesmerism. It was suggested the motion was out of order as not germane to the bill but the chair refused to so hold because, as the chair put it, a scientific analysis would be necessary to determine how analogous the magnetism of mesmerism is to that employed in telegraphy.

Mr. Edward Stanly rose to say he would have no objection to the appropriation for mesmeric experiments, provided the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Johnson, was the subject, to which Mr. Johnson replied that he would have no objection provided the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Stanly, was the operator.

Mr. George S. Houston, of Alabama threw in the suggestion that the Millerites, who were currently predicting the end of the world, should be recipients of part of the money.

The Johnson amendment received only 22 votes and was defeated, but there were many others who opposed the expenditure and the telegraph bill barely passed the House by the slim margin of 89 to 83. It lay in the Senate for several days, and was one hundred and fortieth on the list of bills up for final consideration March 3, 1843, the last day of the session. It passed the Senate a few minutes before midnight and was signed by President Tyler.

Morse and Vail began immediately to make plans for the construction of a line from Baltimore to Washington. Morse appealed to Louis McLane, president of the 16-year-old Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, for permission to use the railroad's right-of-way. This permission was granted, and from that day to this the railroad industry has been closely related to the domestic telegraph.

Morse originally planned to lay the line underground and got Ezra Cornell to supervise the development of a special plow for this purpose. When the construction crew was 9 miles out of Baltimore it was found that the wire wasn't properly insulated and the line wouldn't work. Rather than admit this preliminary failure and provide skeptics with additional ammunition, Cornell suggested that they break his plow, but make it appear accidental so the public would assign the lack of a special plow as the only reason for abandoning the underground method and adoption of the aerial method of stringing wires on poles. The line was finally complete, and on May 24, 100 years ago today, with Morse sending and Vail receiving, the first message "What hath God wrought!" was slowly tapped out.

The exhibition a success, skeptics became enthusiastic supporters. Representative Cave Johnson, a jesting critic in 1843, stated 3 years later that the telegraph was "an agent vastly superior to any other ever devised by the genius of man for the diffusion of intelligence."

There was a resultant period of telegraph mania. Fakirs combined short-distance telegraphy with ventriloquism to entertain and fool the public. There were precious stories of the rustic woman who insisted upon ascertaining from the operator how the letters were sent through the insulators. Within a short time the principal cities of the Union were linked by the intelligent throbbing wire. Then came the harvest for telegraph company speculators. One historian tells us that "two out of every three New England and New York villages were visited by gentlemen of the wooden-nutmeg peddler style of biography," who announced themselves as "telegraph constructors" and who proposed, on condition that a certain amount of stock be subscribed and a certain amount of "clean cash" paid down, to bring their wire into town and connect the hitherto isolated Podunk with the nearest metropolis. The inhabitants relaxed their purse strings. A flimsy line was constructed. A few salutory messages sent and for a few days business boomed. Additional stock payments were cheerfully made. Then it was that Sir Plausible, the telegraph builder, took his departure for new territory and fresh victims, and the community was left with an enterprise which proved a failure as soon as the novelty was gone. Morse must have wondered: What hath God wrought.

The Civil War spurred the use and development of telegraph. When the war began, the Army Signal Corps was still relying upon the semaphore system. When McDowell advanced in July 1861 to fight the battle of Manassas, he had no field telegraph, and the only sign given or received was the signal gun announcing that the attack should begin. Civilian telegraph operators were called to Washington and before the war was over, armies in the field from Appomattox to Arkansas were constantly informed of each other's movements. President Lincoln visited the War Department telegraph office thrice daily for late news from the battle fronts, and it is said that during the course of the war he spent more time there than at any place except the White House.

Soon thereafter the telegraph reached from coast to coast and fortunately some years before Morse's death in 1872.

In those days equipment used consisted chiefly of the Morse key and sounder. Operators could send only one message at a time over each wire, at the rate of 30 words per minute. Today, the modern teleprinter has replaced the key and sounder. It is possible to send over 250 messages at once over a single pair of wires. Efficient operators transmit at the rate of 75 words per minute. By use of modern multiplex and carrier system methods, it is possible to achieve a word volume capacity from 250 to 1000 times as great as was possible with early equipment. By a transmission process called facsimile, pictures, diagrams and tables can be sent over the wires.

It is interesting to note how many of Morse's original ideas, at first thought impracticable, are back in use today. His first receiver made pencil marks on a tape. Today, after 60 years of reception by ear, the industry has developed and adopted the teleprinter which again records messages on a tape. Morse originally planned to plow his lines underground but failure properly to insulate forced him to rely upon an aerial system with wires strung on poles. Today, after 100 years of overhead lines, the trend is to cables plowed directly into the ground with a specially designed plow similar to that invented by Ezra Cornell and used by Morse. The original telegraph transmitting and receiving apparatus designed by Professor Morse was fully automatic—a crude forerunner of the present day teleprinter.

From the Civil War to the turn of the century, the history of the telegraph industry in the United States was largely one of merging companies and warding off agitation for Government ownership of all lines. In 1856 the Sibley and Cornell interests had combined and Ezra Cornell had proposed that the merged company be known as Western Union Telegraph Co. By 1867 they had acquired 340 smaller companies.

As the Western Union's grip on the telegraph business in this country grew, there were increased demands for Government ownership. The industry definitely experienced economic growing pains. Charges of poor service, discrimination, high rates, excessive profits, retarding of technical improvements, and failure to serve small communities were hurled by the advocates of a Government-owned system who argued affirmatively that telegraph is only a more rapid method of transmitting letters, and hence a normal Government function. Many of these evils were inherent in the competitive situation where it was always possible for a new company to spring up and grab off a part of the cream of the business by serving the larger cities while permitting the small communities to remain communication Saharas. Such evils as were inherent in the prevailing competitive system have been offset by growth of the regulatory process and the recent merger in the domestic telegraph field.

The telegraph industry has come a long way from the days when it cost $7.50 to send a 10-word message across the continent. Likewise, speed of service has greatly improved since the time it was possible for Professor Ely to send a message 400 miles, give it a 24-hour start, and then beat it there by train. Nevertheless, room for improvement of the speed of service still exists, and telegraph rates must continue to go down if

the industry would successfully compete with air mail and the telephone. Also, it is highly desirable that telegraph rates be made uniform, like mail rates. The accident of distance must no longer prevail as the all-important factor in determining rates.

In the congressional attitude toward problems in the telegraph industry there has also been a great development. From the jesting attitude of 100 years ago we see today a Congress with both Houses apprised and well aware of the potentialities of this industry. As a result of this congressional development, many of the evils of the past century have been eliminated by merger of the domestic telegraph companies under enabling legislation passed by Congress.

Today we see a Congress which likewise has been apprised of the problems in the field of international communications. There, American companies are at a constant disadvantage in competition with Government-owned or Government-boosted monopolies abroad. Legislation permitting or requiring merger of American communication facilities in the international field is badly needed in order to eliminate this disadvantage. It is needed still more, however, in order to place this country in a position to take the lead in enunciating and making effective a democratic program assuring the unfettered flow of intelligence to and from all points in the world.

Last November I outlined five things sorely needed in the field of international communications. They were and are (1) a uniform rate for all messages throughout the world in all directions, (2) a low rate of a few cents per word to any communications gateway in the world, (3) instantaneous radio communications between all important areas on the globe, (4) uniform and low press rates throughout the world and, finally, (5) complete freedom for all peoples of the world to communicate directly with each other.

In order to encourage and insure accomplishment of these ends, America must first put her own house in order. We must place ourselves in a position to consistently advocate lifting the barriers that now prevent the free flow of facts and information throughout the world. The next step in this direction is to accomplish merger of United States facilities for international communication in order that we may present a united front in our struggle for adoption of these principles just outlined.

There is no better way to safeguard the future peace than to make possible the free flow of communications throughout the world and at rates which all can afford. In human affairs, knowledge is power. It is also understanding. Perhaps these thoughts were in his mind when Professor Morse first began his search for a more rapid means of communications. In any event, the benefits of his invention and those which have followed, are full upon us and it is our responsibility and our duty to insure their world-wide operation to constructive ends.

Ex-Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy's Address at the Maritime Day Dinner at Boston

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very able address delivered by ex-Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy at the Maritime Day Dinner held in the Copley-Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass., on the evening of May 22, 1944:

I would be pretending indifference if I did not tell you how good it feels to be with you again here in Boston. I am very much pleased and gratified that some folks in my own home town should invite me back to discuss future problems with them.

Nothing I have ever done has given me more pleasure and satisfaction than my work as chairman of the Maritime Commission. Therefore, I can discuss the subject of shipping sympathetically. Maybe it is premature. I like Lieutenant General Knudsen's comment that he always thought it was necessary to catch the bear before dividing up the hide. And this bear—the war—is not yet caught. But, as the discussion of post-war shipping has already started, I feel it the duty of everyone at all experienced in shipping administration to lend a hand to pilot thoughts thereon into safe channels.

That is why, for the first time in several years, I venture suggestions upon a public topic.

It was 7 years ago tonight that I first attempted to discuss the merchant marine in public at a Maritime Day meeting in New York. How simple the shipping business looked to me as a beginner. You just built some ships and then sailed them—with subsidies, if necessary. It wasn't long, however, before I realized that shipping was a very complex problem which had to be handled with great care if the very equilibrium of the whole world were not to be upset.

The Commission made an exhaustive study of the whole subject. Fifteen men, each an expert in some phase of one problem, were brought in to do the job. They were told to take nothing for granted and they gave the merchant marine, I venture to say, a going-over which has rarely, if ever, been duplicated in this country.

NOW BUILDING VESSELS AT RATE NEVER EQUALED

The crux of the problem, of course, was the need for replacements. We made a rather sensational start by having the United States Government go into partnership with the Standard Oil Co. for the construction of 12 large high-speed tankers. It was the first attempt, as far as I know, to have the Government participate in the additional cost of putting speed into tankers so that we would have vessels capable of following the fleet in time of war.

Admiral King has since told me that when war started those tankers were worth their weight in gold.

The Commission also perfected designs for modern cargo vessels and launched a program calling for the construction of 50 vessels a year for 10 years.

Now, in the heat of conflict, we are building ships at a rate never before equaled. More than 3,000 vessels have gone into the water since Pearl Harbor. Additional vessels are going down the ways at the rate of 5 a day. It is an incredible achievement, and one for which the Maritime Commission deserves the gratitude of a country at war. I am proud to have had a part, small as it was, in laying the groundwork for this great problem.

SURPLUS OF VESSELS IS POST-WAR PROBLEM

The end of the war—which, God willing, should not be too distant—will present us with a new kind of shipping problem. Our problem in 1937 was a lack of vessels; our problem now is going to be a surplus of vessels.

When I was in England, as Ambassador, and any discussion came up about the future of the British Navy, someone would be likely to recite a jingle which has been handed down from the time of King James I. It goes something like this:

"God and the Navy we adore,
In times of danger, not before,
The danger past—all is requited,
God is forgotten and the Navy slighted."

This has happened to the American merchant marine more than once and unless we plan with great care will probably happen again.

In laying out a plan for the future of our merchant marine we must take into consideration two very definite factors. They are, one, our attitude toward other countries after the war and, second, the speed with with the economic and social life of all countries revives after this international catastrophe, particularly with respect to foreign trade.

The answer to all these problems does not rest with us alone. We are living in one of the great periods of changes comparable to the Napoleonic era or the age of religious wars. What will the post-war world be like?

HOPES RUSSIAN JUGGERNAUT RESTS AFTER AXIS BEATEN

Forces have been unleashed which may require years and years to bring under control. It is difficult to visualize, for instance, what may occur in Asia after the war. In Europe will new powers have egress to the Mediterranean? Will the continent fall under the domination of a single great power?

Will another balance-of-power system come into existence as it always has in the past so that an armed truce is the best we can expect? The answers to these vital questions lie not in the State Department nor in the Foreign Office, but in the mind of a single statesman in Europe today—Mr. Stalin.

Let us devoutly hope that the great Russian juggernaut which has so successful routed the Nazis will come to rest when the Axis has been soundly beaten. If the Russian land power finishes its magnificent job and then goes home, turning swords into plowshares, we can be more confident of a firm basis for an enduring peace.

Now the second point that limits all the post-war problems is the question of just what foreign trade will be generated. If this increases, as our Department of Commerce feels that it will, the problem of our Merchant Fleet will be eased. If the complications of world affairs and the domination of certain countries shall grow greater, our foreign trade may well shrink.

UNITED STATES TO HAVE 5,000 VESSELS AT WAR'S END

Let us consider the post-war merchant marine problems in terms primarily of what we can do ourselves and secondly, what we would be willing to do for others.

The United States will have, from all accounts, about 5,000 vessels at war's end. This is four times as many ships as we had before the war. Foreign fleets, in the meantime, have been cut in half and the net result of all this should be that the United States will have well over half of all the shipping in existence.

For a time we should be able to employ most of our vessels. There will be millions of men and vast quantities of supplies to be brought home; devastated areas to be rehabilitated; allies, neutrals, and even belligerent peoples to be fed; stock piles of raw materials, including those which may become available under reverse lend-lease, to be transported to the United States.

MIGHT TURN OVER SOME SHIPS TO OTHER COUNTRIES

Eventually, however, emergency jobs will have been discharged. Foreign fleets, depleted by the war will begin to resemble their former selves. At that point, the American merchant marine will be presented with one of the recurring crisis which have characterized its history for the past 150 years.

That might be a very good time to turn over small portions of our fleet to some of the countries which can man them and operate them much more cheaply than we, so these nations can start bringing food and materials to their own peoples. It will give them a chance to get started. The amount of ships required would be very small and the gesture would meet with great favor in these small seafaring nations.

The big inescapable question is, What about our own merchant marine after the war? How large shall it be?

The questions go to the heart of this evening's discussion. It is both challenging and provocative.

SHIPPING OTHER FELLOW'S GAME; LET HIM PLAY IT

Now, I fully realize that I am defying the lightning of public criticism when I even suggest that there is anything to do with our surplus ships but retain all of them and wave the American flag around them.

I want no part of a merchant marine maintained merely for sentiment. I think my recital will show you merchant marine shipping is not our most profitable form of activity. It's the other fellow's game; let him play it.

I have seen the conditions under which the citizens of European countries live who live "by the sea." I refuse to believe that the dignity of the average American seaman would permit him to tolerate the only conditions of wages, quarters, family life possible to him if American shipping is to compete with foreign shipping manned as it was before the war.

In the hubbub and excitement of war we have overlooked these important differences. Economics go out the window when war enters upon the scene so that all we have been thinking about was to build as many ships as fast as we could regardless of any other factor.

After the war we must consider other factors and these I should like to enumerate to you now.

ARMY AND NAVY SHOULD MAINTAIN ADEQUATE TONNAGE

I think that the Army and Navy, having decided on what merchant ships they need to complement their fast building navies, could set aside adequate tonnage from our present fleet and see that they are taken care of and maintained. It is much easier for the Army and the Navy to get appropriations than it is for the Maritime Commission. Moreover, since these ships are reserved primarily for defense, the Army and the Navy should assume responsibility for their upkeep.

A nucleus could be maintained by replacements for our merchant fleet and possibly some arrangement with the Navy whereby their older ships, being held as a sterile group, could be scrapped and replaced by new ships. Now this, with Navy building and merchant building of the new type, would keep shipbuilding industry busy.

After the Army and Navy have taken what ships they want and after we have decided what vessels are required for our merchant marine (as we shall try to determine later) I think we should then negotiate for the transfer of tonnage to foreign countries—taking into consideration, of course, just what effect the use of these ships by foreign nations will have on our own merchant marine. After that has been done, I have no hesitancy in saying: Scrap the rest of the fleet.

MERCHANT MARINE THRIVES ONLY UNDER PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

The attitude of labor will have a great deal to do with the success of our post-war fleet. We can't expect to maintain a healthy merchant marine without providing more permanent employment for our seamen than we have in the past.

Young men should be encouraged to make a career of the sea, rather than to use it as an excuse for adventure or an escape from reality. The Merchant Navy Reserve Pool of England has revolutionized conditions of employment for British seafaring men by assuring pay and adequate leaves between voyages. We should seriously consider some similar system in this country.

Underlying my approach to the shipping problem is a conviction that our merchant marine will thrive only under conditions of private ownership and private operation. We need a merchant marine in this country, but we don't want one that will prove unduly burdensome to the taxpayer, nor do we want to ruin those nations that have to depend on the sea for a living, especially since some of these nations happen to be our best customers.

We will come out of the war with plenty of good, fast ships. We should use them to mold a compact, efficient, competitive fleet in which the operators will have a substantial interest that they can reasonably expect to make a profit. That kind of a merchant marine will have at least a fighting chance of survival.

In Norway, for example, 18 percent of the national income is derived from the sale of ship services. The figure for the United States is 0.03 percent. Obviously, the loss of shipping revenues would be catastrophic for Norway, trifling for us. The United States, to be as dependent upon shipping as Norway, would have to earn twenty or thirty billion dollars from this source.

There is also the added factor that, due to a lack of natural resources, Norway would not be able to make up the loss of shipping receipts by exporting something else. The United States, on the other hand, would only have to increase its exports by a small percentage to cover the earnings of vessels in foreign trade.

Ship services are Britain's greatest export. They are six times as important, from the standpoint of national income, as they are in the United States. Moreover, Britain has to rely on vessels to link up the far-flung units of the Empire.

LET US FOR ONCE THINK OF OURSELVES

Getting the world back on its feet is what we are after and that in the long run will help everything, including shipping. And for once, let us think of ourselves, and not forget our best customers. We can always remember that in 1929, when international trade was at its peak, China with its 450,000,000 persons, imported only 1½ American gold dollars worth of goods per head. India, with a population of 350,000,000 imported only $2.60 worth per head. On the other hand, Poland imported $11.90 worth of goods per head; Sweden, $78.30, and Great Britain, $117. So the possibilities of increased foreign trade are boundless if we use ordinary business sense, cultivating the most promising markets to the mutual advantage of buyer and seller.

Now in determining to what extent we wish to go into world shipping let us consider the various factors involved. First as to costs: It costs about twice as much to build vessels in the United States as it does abroad and it normally costs about half again as much to run them under the American flag. The differential may be equalized with subsidies but that does not alter the fact that you are running at a loss.

We must consider quality. We want a merchant fleet which our American passengers will seek out and be proud of. We want a merchant fleet which our exporters will depend on because of its superior service. If we are to become a great seafaring Nation again we should insist upon quality—the best—not the biggest.

Our merchant fleet today is not a quality fleet. It is two-thirds composed of the slow-moving cumbersome Liberty ships. When these were first designed in 1941 they were christened "ugly ducklings." Some of them have cracked up, as we all know, but in wartime we needed ships fast and we had to take short cuts to obtain them. They have built a bridge to Europe and to our forces overseas and have run a fierce Nazi gauntlet to Murmansk. They have served America well. However, they would be of doubtful commercial use to this country after the war. We will want a quality fleet of fast long-range vessels for the peacetime merchant marine.

We must consider size.

WE MUST TAKE GOODS AND SERVICES OF OTHERS

Having said, therefore, that we want not the biggest, but the best—let me explain why I think we cannot insist on the biggest. Others have something to say about this.

To Britain, Norway, and Denmark, for example, a merchant fleet is not a matter of of dalliance but of day to day survival. With these nations it is import or starve. Before the war the British paid for one-tenth of their imports by shipping services. Holland, Greece and other nations over-run by the Nazis also depended heavily upon shipping to earn their daily bread. The United States ordinarily sells more than she buys.

We want to be the world's greatest exporter of goods—we want to be great on the sea and in the air, and we want to dominate international communications—we want to be the world's banker.

Now, there is no sense in talking about expansion of foreign trade after the war unless we give other nations an opportunity to acquire dollars, and that, unfortunately, is a thing which we resist.

The money we spend with others is the ceiling for what we can sell. Having grasped this fact, the next thing we have to decide is, What do we want to sell? Do we want to sell goods? Do we want to sell shipping? Do we want to sell air transport? Do we want to sell communications? And, finally, do we want to sell money? Remember, the amount you buy is the ceiling, and the more you sell of one item the less you sell of something else.

SHIPPING VITAL FOR NORWAY BUT TRIFLING FOR UNITED STATES

American farmers have a lot of cotton, tobacco, fruits, and meat which can't be absorbed by the domestic market. We also want to sell automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and machinery. The more ship services we export the less we are likely to export of something else. Let's not lose sight of this fundamental fact in our consideration of the shipping problem.

It is quite possible that, for defense or some other reason, it would be well worth while to reduce our exports in some other direction in order to have a larger merchant marine. This is a matter of national policy which will, no doubt, be settled on other than economic grounds. Let's not fool ourselves, however; we cannot have our cake and eat it, too.

After all, one of the ideals we are fighting for is to make the world safe for peaceful nations. There isn't much point to it, if after winning through to victory we then deprive them of an opportunity to make a living.

GENERAL PUBLIC INDIFFERENT ABOUT MERCHANT MARINE

What is true of Britain and Norway is true—to a greater or lesser degree—of many other countries

In citing these factors which, in my opinion, must be taken into account when we decide upon a shipping policy for the United States, I do not mean to imply that we should not maintain a merchant marine of substantial proportions under the American flag.

If this were a perfect world, never beset by the menace of war, we might well depend on foreign vessels for the carriage of our goods. However, we are obviously not living in a

perfect world—yet—and it behooves us to keep substantial shipping that will be subject to our own control in time of emergency.

The plain fact, which we might as well face, is that the general public is quite indifferent about the merchant marine. Millions of people think it has something to do with the Marines; other millions are vaguely aware that we should have an American-flag fleet, but they don't relish the idea of paying taxes to support it. The 1936 act passed the House with a margin of eight votes.

Even those who give lip service to American shipping haven't strained themselves to support it. American shippers before the last war gave 90 percent of their cargo to foreign lines, and they have rarely given less than two-thirds; three-fourths of our travelers, at least.

TEN MILLION TONS OF SHIPPING ADEQUATE TO SERVE US

There is another factor we should not lose sight of—one which has affected shipping in the past and threatens to affect it even more in the future. That is the competition of other forms of transportation. The railroads, the motortruck, the bus, and the automobile have been cutting in on shipping for years. Now we have the airplane to contend with.

The airplane brings a brand new threat, especially in the carrying of passengers. I believe the ocean liner has reached its peak in speed and in size, and it probably will decline from now on as revenues are diverted to the air lines. I don't think we have to worry about cargo, for a long time to come, but I'll be surprised if we don't lose at least a substantial percentage of our passengers. Mail, of course, hitherto a good source of revenue for shipping, will all go by air.

What, then, is our forecast of a post-war merchant marine? That question was asked in the House of Commons recently of the Ministry of War Transport, and with all of the experience and tradition of England's marine history at his disposal the very wise Secretary replied: "I believe the British Government would be unwise to state any fixed mercantile marine tonnage that we intend to have and by what methods we intend to secure it."

Nevertheless, not being a member of a government or a ministry, I dare to make a concrete suggestion. Not 7,000,000 tons—not 50,000,000 tons—as popularly proposed, but a merchant marine large enough to serve us adequately, starting with a base figure of 10,000,000 tons, is my earnest recommendation.

BEAVERBROOK MISTAKEN ON POST-WAR AVIATION PLAN

I remember spending a few hours with Justice Louis Brandeis before his last illness, and I shall not soon forget a recipe he gave me. "How much better we do things," he said, "when we act leisurely and not from necessity."

I have suggested that we work out cautiously our post-war merchant marine program, and by cautiously I mean with full knowledge, painstakingly, and not hurriedly. We should realize what we need, what we want, and what other peace-minded nations need to make resort to war less and less frequent. This counsel I venture to offer for the solution of all post-war problems. Until we can see clearly the shape of the new world, nothing should be concluded, though, meanwhile, all can be analyzed and made ready for final negotiation.

Blueprints, but not contracts, should be in the briefcases of those who will meet in the conferences of peace. The contracts can be let after the designs have been carefully inspected for fundamental errors that can be corrected on the blueprint but not in a finished structure.

I was interested to note in this connection that Lord Beaverbrook was mistaken when he told the House of Lords the other day he had with us what amounted to a post-war aviation contract, and to learn, instead, that our Government had merely looked at his drawing of free skies over the United States and paid it a polite compliment.

If we give away nothing we need for our basic security and to maintain our standards; if we keep nothing we do not need for these; if we help others in every reasonable way to earn and support the blessings that have been ours, and yet treat no other people as mendicants whom destiny obliges us to finance for the whole world, then we shall lead the nations to enduring peace and prosperity. That is the formula I have sought to apply in my outline of a post-war American merchant marine.

Acceptance by the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker, House of Representatives, of Plaque Commemorating the Centennial of the Telegraph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Speaker of the House, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, in the small rotunda of the Capitol yesterday:

Miss Morse, Senator AUSTIN, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to participate in this ceremony commemorating the centennial of the telegraph and, at the same time, to pay tribute to the genius, life, and character of the American inventor, Samuel F. B. Morse.

The transmission of the first official telegraph message 100 years ago was an unparalleled event in the history of our Republic. The Congress of the United States a year before appropriated $30,000 for testing the capacity and usefulness of the system of electromagnetic telegraph invented by Samuel F. B. Morse, of New York, for the use of the Government of the United States. This is the only time in the history of the country that the Congress has ever made such an appropriation, and likewise it is the only time that the Congress gave an inventor the privilege of using the Supreme Court room as the inventor's office or laboratory.

Again the Congress acted, for on Tuesday evening, April 16, 1872, 2 weeks after the death of Professor Morse, a joint session of the Congress was held to pay tribute to the memory of this great American, a man who never held a public office, who was a great artist but who, by invention of the electromagnetic telegraph, benefited mankind for all generations.

In accepting this bronze memorial which is placed here in this small rotunda close to the old Supreme Court room, now the law library, which was the scene of Professor Morse's labors here in the Capitol, I deem it appropriate for me to quote part of the resolution of the Congress on April 4, 1872, 2 days after Professor Morse's death:

"His distinguished and varied abilities have contributed more than those of any other intellect of our generation to the development and progress of the practical arts. His invention of the electromagnetic telegraph, which was at first received with incredulity by the people, and with the meager favor if not distrust of Congress, has during his life attained an eminence which, so long as human thought is disseminated by the lightning will form an ever-growing tribute and enduring monument to his fame. While his name will be forever associated with those of Gutenberg, Watt, Fulton, and others, who made science useful, benign, and civilizing, his purity of private life, his loftiness of scientific aim, and his resolute faith in truth, render it eminently proper that the Representatives of the people and the Senators of the States should solemnly testify to his worth and greatness."

Mr. Chairman, I accept this plaque for and in behalf of all Americans and I dedicate it as an ever-present reminder to those of our fellow citizens who, in the days to come, will by their genius make possible future benefits for mankind the world over.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein copy of resolutions adopted at a seaway dinner meeting of the Massena Chamber of Commerce, at Massena, N. Y., on Monday, May 22, 1944, urging the enactment of legislation authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT SEAWAY MEETING

MASSENA, May 23.—Three resolutions on the St. Lawrence seaway project were passed at the seaway dinner meeting of the Massena Chamber of Commerce, Monday night at the town hall here. The resolutions follow:

URGE MEAD SUPPORT

"Whereas the President of the United States on March 3, 1944, again strongly recommended the authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and gave full approval to the terms of the pending Aiken-Pittenger bill; and

"Whereas ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior Senator from the State of New York, on April 20, 1944, declared his active support of this measure, stating that its prompt enactment provides the most direct means of insuring substantial and lasting benefits to the people of the State, through construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

"Whereas the President and the senior Senator from the State of New York, by this action have sought to redeem the pledge contained in the New York State Democratic platform of 1942: "We urge the construction of the St. Lawrence power and seaway project"; and

"Whereas JAMES M. MEAD, junior Senator from the State of New York, was a candidate for the nomination for governor of the State of New York on the platform adopted in 1942 and has consistently voted for hundreds of millions of dollars of appropriations for multiple purpose power, navigation, and flood-control projects of benefit to labor, agriculture, and industry in the areas served by such projects: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference on the St. Lawrence project calls upon JAMES M. MEAD to give his active, able, and valued cooperation to the President, to his colleague in the Senate, to the War and Navy Departments, to the Maritime Commission, and to other administrative agencies which have joined in recommending this development; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this conference appoints a committee of three to wait upon Senator MEAD and to acquaint him with conditions in the State of New York which make this development imperatively necessary in the interest of industry, agriculture, and labor and to insure equality to this area with other sections, under pending plans for post-war development of navigation, power, and flood-control projects."

COMMEND DEWEY

"Whereas the Associated Press on May 7, 1944, reported in a dispatch from Albany that Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, at a press conference on that date reaffirmed his support of the St Lawrence seaway and power development, recalling that on March 27, 1940, and again on October 10, 1942, he had endorsed the entire project, and publicly declared: 'I favor the St. Lawrence seaway and always have'; and

"Whereas the Governor also gave his approval to the Graves-Daniels resolution, unanimously adopted by the New York State Legislature, March 15–16, 1944, placing the State of New York definitely on record in favor of 'prompt measures' for development of the St. Lawrence River to meet urgent needs for cheap power for industry and for 4,000,000 commercial, rural, and domestic consumers in this area; and

"Whereas the Aiken-Pittenger bill now pending before the United States Senate and the United States Houre of Representatives authorizes the St. Lawrence seaway and power project on terms consistent with the position taken by the Governor and by the Legislature of the State of New York; and

"Whereas President Hoover, President Coolidge, and many other Republican leaders for more than a generation urged the need for this development to provide low-cost navigation and low-cost power; and

"Whereas President Roosevelt has likewise repeatedly endorsed the St. Lawrence development and has recommended the enactment of the Aiken-Pittenger bill as a nonpartisan measure; and

"Whereas events of the World War have confirmed the soundness and foresight of advocates of this development and of the program embodied in the Republican platform of 1932, declaring that 'the Republican Party stands committed to the St. Lawrence seaway project,' and that 'its completion will confer inestimable benefits' upon producers and consumers in all parts of the Nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference in the St. Lawrence project, representing civic, farm, labor, commercial, and industrial organizations in the States of New York and Vermont, commends the position taken by Governor Dewey and looks to him with confidence for active support in every effort to obtain prompt enactment of the pending Aiken-Pittenger bill; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this conference appoint a committee of three, to be designated by the chairman, for the purpose of conferring with the Governor at the earliest possible date, to present this resolution, and to discuss the means of securing the development of New York's principal natural resource through prompt enactment of the Aiken-Pittenger bill."

PRAISE BILL SPONSORS

"Whereas this conference on the St. Lawrence project has received a message from WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, Representative in the United States House of Representatives from Minnesota, and author of the bill (H. R. 2280) authorizing construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

"Whereas a companion measure has been introduced in the United States Senate by GEORGE D. AIKEN, United States Senator from Vermont, and

"Whereas the joint authors of this legislation by their vision, courage, and constructive statesmanship have brought the St. Lawrence seaway power project to the point of successful accomplishment and have helped to give this great multiple-purpose improvement its deserved place as the No. 1 project in any sound program for post-war development and reconstruction: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference on behalf of all its constituent membership in northern New York and Vermont extends its hearty commendation to the joint authors of this legislation and acknowledge with sincere thanks the inspiring message received from Representative PITTENGER; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chairman to Senator AIKEN, to Representative PITTENGER, and to the membership of the Vermont and Minnesota delegations in the United States House of Representatives."

"What Hath God Wrought!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

"WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT!"

One hundred years ago today,
From Washington to Baltimore,
The telegram first found its way
Along a wire, and safely bore,
Officially, its message through,
Exclaiming, as it did, and ought—
As wonders and amazements grew—
In wisdom's words, "What hath God wrought!"

One hundred years ago began
A great network, expressly wired,
To take the messages of man,
As his necessities required,
Both back and forth, without mistake,
A true transcription of his thought,
Which followed swiftly in the wake
Of this apt wire, "What hath God wrought!"

One hundred years we have enjoyed
The blessings of the telegraph—
Delays whereby we were annoyed,
Before Morse wrote their epitaph,
Have ceased to be, and we rejoice
That time and distance seemed as naught
For years, before we heard the voice
By telephone, "What hath God wrought!"

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

MAY 24, 1944.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, trouble is brewing between the Army and the Navy over the inequality of decorations.

It is devastating to Washington the beautiful to have so much talk about a rat-control bill.

Wars will continue until the end of time unless the great powers abandon imperialism.—Alexander Wilson.

When O. W. I. was asked how the praising in Europe of the T. V. A. aided the war effort, the answer was—unsatisfactory.

The argument during the consideration of the (eighteen) war agencies bill was—do not cut it for that might affect the invasion.

The stage is getting set for Congress to recess June 24 till after Labor Day, for the O. P. A. extension is finally coming out in June.

Decoration Day this year should be a day of prayer for those who are ready to fight in the greatest battle the wicked world ever knew.

After pensioning the Panama Canal workers of 40 years ago, some are proposing to pension all persons who did 90 days or over on W. P. A.

It is difficult to reason how a nation can lend-lease in reverse into the billions as reported, when she refused to pay the interest on old war debts.

When the President pardoned the Communist Browder from the Atlanta Federal prison he said it was for national unity. It proves to be for political unity.

The Jeffersonians, F. D. R., and Browder have all been in the same political bed, only now Earl has pushed the Democrats over and gotten in next to the Chief.

WALLACE will be back from China in time to accept second place on the ticket which has been his all the time, even when he was knocking down the ears of Jesse Jones.

The Star and the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Kansas City Star, issue of May 21, 1944:

THE STAR AND THE RIVER

For many years the Star has been advocating a Missouri Valley program of development which would be comprehensive, just, and constructive. Such a program is now under discussion in Congress. It is the Pick plan for flood control, navigation, and irrigation under Army administration.

Since the policy of the river program has reached a decisive focus, it seems time to restate the principles for which the Star has stood in the years past, and for which it now stands.

This newspaper has been one of the pioneers in the long fight for a comprehensive program for dealing with the waters of the Missouri and all its tributaries. That fight began years ago, first as a struggle for navigation, because of the freight-rate situation. It has been a long fight, with many ups and downs. There has been a continual development in scope and vision and today, although

navigation is still an objective, it has become a relatively small feature of a much larger and more complete program, with flood control of first importance.

Some years ago the Star was instrumental in the organization of the Missouri River Association to bring unity of plan and purpose in the development of a Missouri River program. The depression slowed up major developments, and then came the war. But by dint of constant missionary work, Congress was induced to vote money for a comprehensive survey and program, not only for the Missouri, but for its tributaries.

This survey was carried out by Col. Lewis A. Pick, a brilliant officer of the United States Corps of Engineers, who, because of his competency, was subsequently promoted to brigadier general, and assigned to the construction of the great Ledo Road to connect China with India. The program which he worked out is known as the Pick plan.

It was the first time a detailed program for the development of the Missouri and its tributaries had been reduced to real engineering form. The tributaries enter into the scheme as fully as the main river. The projects for Kansas alone are large in scope, as are those for the other valley States.

The Star has devoted many columns to this program. It has sent its reporters up and down the river, to meetings from Fort Peck to St. Louis. Before it launched into the program it made a study of the T. V. A., to obtain lessons for application to the Missouri Valley.

Throughout the long history of the project Kansas City has taken the lead in the fight to get something down on paper which would be practical and form a goal to strive for. Large delegations from Kansas City, headed by Mayor John B. Gage and the chamber of commerce, have been attending meetings up and down the river, pushing for adoption of the Pick plan as the most feasible yet offered. Delegations from this city have also attended hearings in Washington, not once but many times.

The Star does not care by what name the program is called. What it desires is results. Twice in the last 2 years a flood with ghastly potential consequences to this city has been averted by the narrowest of margins. The two States which the Star primarily serves, Missouri and Kansas, have sustained damages amounting to many millions of dollars because of inaction upon a river program.

It is to be recognized, of course, that during wartime any work must be of limited scope, since all effort is concentrated upon the war effort. Yet there are certain phases of the flood-control program which the Star feels are so imperative that all preliminary work at least should be done now, so that with the firing of the last shot immediate work can start on them.

Questions of method have been raised in the discussions of the program. The Pick plan is not perfect, of course. For one thing, it does not provide for the extremities of drought, such as those of the 1930's. If such droughts should occur again there would have to be restrictions both up and down the river. The engineers, on the other hand, contend that such occurrences are too infrequent to warrant the huge expenditures which would be necessary for the additional reservoirs to take care of every possible contingency.

The whole question of the advisability of adding millions of additional acres of Government-irrigated land to the present crop-producing area is susceptible of considerable debate. Yet the Pick plan does not, as has been charged, overlook a basis for irrigation. The various reservoirs provided for could develop enough power to pump impounded water over the 4,000,000 acres that it has been suggested should be added to our cultivated land through irrigation. The fall of these streams is of an entirely different character from the fall in the Tennessee Valley. The T. V. A. can be primarily a power project, whereas there are no such power possibilities in the Missouri Valley, although, as has just been said, a certain amount of power can be developed. The Pick plan, then, provides for a reasonable amount of irrigation, a limited power program, flood control, and, finally, a 9-foot navigation channel from the mouth of the Missouri to above Omaha.

The run-off of the western streams is so rapid that flood peril is always hanging over them. The Star believes that if Missouri River development is to be a national project, nationally paid for, the lower States have a right to protection from floods from the same waters the upriver States would exploit. Furthermore the farmers of the lower river, faced with overproduction and low prices until war temporarily altered the situation, have certain rights against land which would have to be forced into production against them at excessive costs in the way of Government subsidy for irrigation.

The more the Star has studied the Pick plan, the more convinced it is that a happy medium has been struck for a meeting of flood control, navigation, and even irrigation interests. If the program is short anywhere it is on power, and even there it does not propose to waste any possible source that can be developed.

As the result of many meetings and the fine work of the engineers, a real program for the Missouri and its tributaries has been placed before Congress, so that the minute the war ends a useful, constructive project can be launched. Not until this work was completed did the superirrigation or reclamation interests enter into the picture.

The Star does not challenge the good faith of many of the proponents of the amendments and counterproposals which have been brought forth in Congress—not even of the sponsors of so obviously dangerous a measure as that which would declare all water of tributaries west of the ninety-seventh meridian subject to State control, even though the irrigation projects were to be Government financed.

It is an old war between Secretary Ickes and the Reclamation Bureau on the one hand and the Army engineers on the other. The Star is not concerned over who does the job, except that it knows the Reclamation Bureau loses its interest entirely the moment it passes below Montana, the Dakotas, and western Nebraska.

On the other hand, the engineers have viewed the flood-control aspect as of major importance. The engineers also assert that a 9-foot channel from St. Louis to Omaha will in no way impair the proposal for irrigation in the upper valley as proposed in their report. The Star has sent members of its staff upriver to talk with Governors in the upper States, and it believes enough unity can be brought about to obtain adoption of the program in its general phases.

So the Star stands for the general principles proposed in the Pick plan for the following reasons: It is the only comprehensive plan thus far brought forward; it is fair to all interests and sections, and if it were discarded a delay of years might be required to prepare a substitute for it—with the danger that it might not even be adopted by the Congress.

There are details to be completed in the Pick plan, and there is ample time to work them out satisfactorily before the end of the war. The major thing, as the Star sees it, is that efforts of special interests should not be permitted to sabotage a flood program already under way for the entire valley, nor should there be any disagreement over the final authority.

It would be a shameful waste to throw away the engineering of years and the efforts of unselfish, public-spirited citizens from South Dakota to the Missouri's mouth because of differences over details. The Star above all urges that the valley be ready to move when the war ends, and that the basis of approach should be kept on the solid engineering that has been done, with the perplexing details where local interests enter to be worked out as the program goes along.

Honor the American Lineman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago yesterday, Samuel F. B. Morse sat in the United States Capitol and tapped the keys which sent out the words "What hath God wrought!" on the first telegraph line, Washington to Baltimore. The anniversary was fittingly observed with special congressional exercises and a statement by the President coupling Morse's invention with "conquest of the air" as the two greatest achievements in modern history.

Special salutes were accorded the men at the keys and properly so. Honorable mention, however, must also be awarded those hardy stalwarts who have built and maintained the lines—we have more than seven million miles of telegraph wire in the world, one-third of them in the United States.

From the time I was a small lad I have always admired the American lineman. I came to know him well because my father is his prototype. Since 1899 he has been building and keeping clear the lines of telegraphic communication for Western Union.

What a thrill it was for me as a boy to see my father run up and down a 60-foot pole, to handle the hot wires, to ride the messenger for the running of cables. In my 'teens I learned to do the tricks myself in summer vacations, and it was most natural for me in 1918 to join the Army's Signal Corps.

The American lineman is rugged, strong, clean. He loves to see a job well done. He likes nothing better than to accept the challenge of blizzard or storm. He is at his best in sub-zero weather, in war he always performs a major role.

Next time you see the man on the pole or come across a line or cable gang, just think how much we owe to those who have united us by communication. Usually, the lineman smiles first. He always returns one.

Bureaucracy With Bayonets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1944, there appeared in the Peoria

Journal-Transcript, of Peoria, Ill., an unusually persuasive and analytical editorial dealing with the Montgomery Ward case, and I insert it in the RECORD so that it may come to the attention of a larger group of readers:

BUREAUCRACY WITH BAYONETS

One of the soldiers who carried 69-year-old Sewell Avery out of the mail-order store of Montgomery Ward & Co. looks a bit shamefaced, in the picture published in yesterday's Journal-Transcript.

It is easy to understand why. What happened in Chicago when the Army—armed with bayonets—marched into the Montgomery Ward offices is not in the American tradition.

The issues behind the controversy between Ward and the Government are not particularly important. No dispute between employer and employee, between capital and labor, or between stockholders and workers is ever one-half so important as the general welfare of the country. If Montgomery Ward & Co. were a war plant, its seizure would be entirely justified. If it were engaged in the production of matériel for the armed forces, Sewell Avery would be guilty of an unpatriotic act in refusing to accede to the orders of the Commander in Chief, no matter how much he might believe the order to be unjust.

But Montgomery Ward & Co., in Chicago, is a retail store. It is engaged in merchandising. The operations of a mail-order house are not essential to the welfare of the country. Indeed, there was a time—just before Sewell Avery took over at Montgomery Ward & Co.—when there was grave danger there might not be a Montgomery Ward & Co. for very long. The company was then doing business with a deficit of nine millions. He turned that nine millions into a nine-million profit—demonstrating once again, that sound business methods can justify themselves in the preservation of any merchandising service.

If the situation which has developed between Montgomery Ward & Co. and the President of the United States were one which involved winning the war, the seizure would have had the support of patriotic citizens. If Montgomery Ward & Co. were a coal mine, a railroad, a munitions plant, an aircraft factory, a newspaper plant, a radio station, or some other war-essential service, none could defend Avery's action.

But it is none of these things. The President ordered the seizure of the Chicago offices of Montgomery Ward & Co., because the management refused to accede to a W. L. B. order. Whether the order was justified or not is beside the point. There are still courts in this land to determine the rights of both workers and employers. There are—we sincerely hope—courts in the land to determine the rights of individuals even against a government. And in their hands is the Nation's welfare in this matter.

The Constitution provides protection against the seizure of property without due process of law. No law, either written or based on common sense, can justify the argument that Montgomery Ward & Co. is needed to win the war. It could go out of business tomorrow, and the war effort would not be seriously hurt. The facilities seized by the Army are not engaged in the manufacture of any goods. They are not engaged in the wresting from the soil any natural resource. They are not engaged in the physical task of distributing civilian goods, save as they supply civilian goods to those who wish to buy them.

This time Franklin Delano Roosevelt has gone too far. He has made a laughing stock of Uncle Sam, has invited the disdain of thoughtful Americans. The seizure of a retail business at bayonet's point merely to enforce an order issued by bureaucrats is highly dangerous and dangerously high-handed.

Winston Churchill's Survey of Main Trends in British Foreign Policy in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 25, 1944:

THE TEXT OF CHURCHILL'S SURVEY OF MAIN TRENDS IN BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY IN WAR

The meeting of the Dominion Prime Ministers, which covered the best part of 5 weeks, is now concluded and very full statements to Parliament and the public have been made individually by the Prime Ministers themselves and collectively by the declaration to which we have all subscribed.

I should not pretend that we have arrived at hard and fast conclusions or precise decisions upon all questions which torment this afflicted globe, but it can be fairly said that, having discussed a great many of them, there was revealed a core of agreement which will enable the British Empire and Commonwealth to meet in discussion with other organizations in the world in a firmly knit array. We have advanced from vague generalities to more precise points and agreements and we are in position to carry on discussions with other countries within limits which we have imposed upon ourselves by this debate upon foreign affairs; and nothing was more remarkable than the cordial agreement which was expressed by every one of the Dominion Prime Ministers in the general conduct of our foreign affairs and in the principles which govern that conduct, or, I should add, in the skill and consistency with which they have been treated by the Foreign Secretary.

CONFIDENCE IN EDEN

The utmost confidence was expressed in him and in his handling of all the very difficult affairs, in spite of complications by which they were surrounded, in spite of the need for prompt action, which so often arises, by the mother country before there is time to have a full consultation.

In spite of all those difficulties, the utmost confidence and pleasure were expressed in the work which my right honorable friend had done. We therefore embark upon the present debate with the backing and hearty good-will from all representatives of the Commonwealth and Empire.

The word Empire is permitted to be used, which may be a great shock to a certain strain of intellectual opinion.

We embark on the present debate, not only with this backing of hearty good will but with the feeling that this meeting of Prime Ministers from all over the Empire and the representatives of India in the midst of a second deadly war is in fact that highest pinnacle which our world-wide family association has yet reached.

At this time, in policy and in war, our objective is the same—namely, to beat the enemy as soon as possible. And I am not aware of any action, or any studied inaction, for which His Majesty's Government is responsible that has not been directly related to this single and dominant purpose.

The duty of all persons responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs in a world war of this deadly character and of all who in different ways exercise influence is to help fighting men perform the heavy task entrusted to them by insuring them of all possible ease in execution and advantage in victory. Every one who is in position to guide public opinion, like members of this House, or of another place, or newspaper editors, broadcasters, and columnists, and others, should keep this very clear duty before their eyes.

They should always think of the soldier in battle and ask themselves whether what they say or write will make his task easier. We long for the day to come when this slaughter will be over and when this additional restraint which imposes itself upon every conscientious man in wartime can be relaxed or will vanish away entirely.

SEES PRECEPTS FOLLOWED

I must make my acknowledgment, first of all, to the very great degree with which these precepts are followed among those who accept the task of guiding public opinion and of those especially in this House, which is always so careful of public interest, and which in other ways has shown itself to be possessed of those steadfast and unyielding qualities in the face of danger and fatigue for which it has always been renowned, but never more renowned than now.

I shall try to practice what I have been preaching in the remarks I have made and I am sure the House will remember how many different audiences I have to address at the same moment, not only here but out of doors not only in this island but throughout the empire, not only among our allies great and small west or east and finally among our enemies, besides, of course, the satellites and neutrals of various hues. I must therefore pick my way among heated plowshares, and in this ordeal the only guides are singleness of purpose and a good, or at any rate, well-trained science.

Since I last spoke here on foreign affairs just about 3 months ago, almost all of the purposes which I mentioned to you have prospered severally and collectively.

First of all, let us survey the Mediterranean and Balkan spheres. A great disappointment which I had last October when I was not able to procure the necessary forces for gaining command of the Aegean Sea following collapse of Italy and gaining possession of the principal Italian islands—that disappointment has, of course, been accompanied by an exaggerated attitude of caution on the side of Turkey.

The hopes we cherished of Turkey boldly entering the war in February or March, or at least according the necessary bases for air action—these hopes have faded.

After giving £20,000,000 worth of British and American arms to Turkey in 1943 alone, we have suspended the process and have ceased to exhort Turkey to range herself with the victorious united powers with whom she has frequently declared that her sympathies lie and with whom I think there is no doubt that her sympathies do lie. But Turks in those discussions at the end of last year and at the beginning of this have magnified their danger.

Their military men took the gloomiest view of Russian prospects in south Russia and the Crimea. They never dreamed that by early summer the Red armies would be on the slopes of the Carpathians, drawn up along the Pruth and Sereth Rivers, or that Odessa and Sevastopol would be liberated and regained by the extraordinary valor, might and energy of the Soviet onslaught.

FINDS TURKS ERRED

Consequently the Turks did not measure with sufficient accuracy what might occur or what occurred in Rumania and Bulgaria nor, I might add, Hungary, and what would be the result on those countries of those tremendous Russian hammer blows struck even in months which are particularly unsuitable for operations in those regions and which would be normally devoted to the process of replenishing advancing fronts for future action.

Having overrated their dangers, our Turkish friends increased their demands for supplies to such a point that, having regard to means of communication and transport alone, the war probably would be over before those supplies could reach them.

We have, therefore, with great regret discontinued the process of arming Turkey because it looks probable that, in spite of our disappointment in the Aegean, the Allies will be able to win the war in the Balkans and generally throughout southeast Europe without Turkey being involved at all, although, of course, the aid of Turkey would be a great help and acceleration in that process.

This, of course, is a decision for Turkey to make, and we have put no pressure other than the pressure or argument, of not giving supplies we need for ourselves and other nations that are fighting upon our side, but the course which is being taken and has been taken so far by Turkey will not, in my view, procure for the Turks the strong position at the peace table which would attend their joining the Allies.

I must, however, note the good services and significant gestures rendered to us by the Turkish Government. Recently—and it is said that it has been rendered to us on the personal initiative of Turkey's honored President, General Inonu—namely, the complete cessation of chrome exports to Germany.

It is not too much to expect the assistance given us in respect to chrome will also be extended in a short time to cover other commodities, export of which, even if of less importance than chrome, is of material assistance to the enemy. If so, we shall endeavor to compensate the Turkish people for sacrifices which their cooperative action may entail by other means of importation.

PREMIER SPEAKS BLUNTLY

I thought it right to speak bluntly today. Turkey and Britain have a long history. They entered into relations with us before the war when things looked very black, and they did their best in very difficult times. Notwithstanding anything I have said in criticism, we hope with increasing confidence that still a better day will dawn for the relations of Turkey with Britain and, indeed, with all of the Allies.

Always in recent decades there has been in the Mediterranean a certain tension between Turkey and Italy on account of Italian ambition in the Greek islands and also, possibly, in Adana Province of Turkey. The Turks could never know which way the Italian dictator would take his would-be conquering sword. On that score Turkey's anxiety has been very largely removed.

The fate of Italy is, indeed, terrible, and personally I find it difficult to nourish animosity against the Italian people. The overwhelming mass of the Nation rejoiced in the idea of being released from the subtle tyranny of the Fascists, and they wished when Mussolini was overthrown to take their place as speedily as possible by the side of the British and American Armies, who, it was expected, would quickly rid the country of the Germans. However, this did not happen.

All Italian forces which could have defended Italy had either been squandered by Mussolini in the African deserts or by Hitler amid the Russian snows or were dispersed in combating, in a half-hearted way, the patriots of Yugoslavia.

Hitler decided to make great exertions to retain Italy, just as he has decided to make great exertions to gain the mighty battle which at this moment is at a climax south of Rome.

It may be that after the fall of Mussolini our action might have been more swift or audacious. It is no part of my submission that no mistakes are made by us or by the common action of our allies. But anyhow, here is this beautiful country suffering the worst horrors of war, with the larger part still under the cruel and vengeful grip of the Nazis, and with the hideous prospect of a red-hot rake of battle lines being drawn from sea to sea right up the whole length of the peninsula.

HOPES TO SPARE ROME

It is clear that the Germans will be driven out of Italy by the Allies, but that will happen on moving battle fronts; and what the Germans will do on their way out in the way of destruction to a people they hate and despise, and who they allege have betrayed them—that cannot be imagined or forecast. All I can say is we shall do our utmost to make the ordeal as short and as little destructive as possible.

We have great hopes that the city of Rome will be preserved from the struggle of our armies.

The House will recall that when I last spoke on foreign matters I expressed the view that it would be best that King Victor Emmanuel, and above all Marshal Badoglio, should remain as head of the executive of the Italian nation and armed forces until we reached Rome, when it was agreed by all that a general review of the position must be made.

Such a policy naturally entails differences of opinion which were reflected not only among the Allied Governments but inside every Allied country. However, I am happy to say that, after various unexpected happenings and many twists and turns, the situation is now exactly what I ventured to suggest and as I described it to the House 3 months ago.

In addition to that, far beyond my hopes, an Italian Government has been formed of a broadly based character around the King and Badoglio, and the King himself has decided that on capture of Rome he will retire to private life forever, transferring his constitutional titles to his son, the Prince of Piedmont, with the title of Lieutenant of the Realm.

I have every confidence in this Italian Government which has been formed. It will require further strengthening and broadening, especially as we come more closely in touch with the populous industrial areas of the north. But, at any rate, it is facing its responsibilities manfully and is doing all in its power to aid the Allies in their advance.

We are doing our best to equip the Italian forces willing to fight for us and not under the power of the Germans. They have played their part in the lines on more than one occasion. Their fleet is discharging most useful and important services for us, not only in the Mediterranean but in the Atlantic, and the loyal Italian air force has also fought so well that I am making special efforts to supply them with improved aircraft of British manufacture.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE GIVEN

We are also doing our best to assist the Italian Government to grapple with difficult financial and economic conditions which they inherited from fascism and which, though improving, are still severe behind the line of the Army.

It is understood throughout Italy, and it is the firm intention of the United Nations, that Italy, like all other countries which are now associated with us, shall have fair and free opportunity, as soon as the Germans are driven out and tranquillity is restored, of deciding whatever form of democratic government, whether monarchical or republican, they desire.

I emphasize the word democratic because it is quite clear that we shall not allow any form of fascism to be restored or set up in any country with which we have been at war.

From Italy one turns naturally to Spain, once the most famous empire in the world and down to this day a strong community in a wide land with marked personality and distinguished culture among the nations of Europe.

Some people think that our foreign policy toward Spain is best expressed by drawing comical or even rude caricatures of General Franco, but I think there is more than that. When our present Ambassador to Spain, Sir Samuel Hoare, went to Madrid almost exactly 4 years ago to the month, we arranged to keep his airplane waiting on the airfield, as it seemed almost certain that Spain, whose dominant party were under the influence of Germany because Germany had helped them so vigorously in the recently ended civil war, would follow the example of Italy and join the victorious Germans in a war against Britain.

Indeed, at this time the Germans proposed to the Spanish Government that triumphal marches of German troops should be held in the principal Spanish cities, and I have no doubt that they suggested to them that the Germans would undertake, in return for a virtual occupation of their country, the seizure of Gibraltar, which would then be handed back to Germanized Spain.

HEAVIER TASKS AVERTED

This latest feature would have been easier said than done. But there is no doubt that if Spain had yielded to German blandishments and pressure at the juncture, our burden would have been much heavier.

The Straits of Gibraltar would have been closed, and all access to the Mediterranean would have been cut off from the West, and the Spanish coasts would have become a nesting place for German U-boats. I certainly did not feel at the time that I would have liked to see any of these things happen, and none of them did happen. Our Ambassador deserves credit for the influence he rapidly acquired and which continually grew.

In his work he was assisted by a gifted man, Mr. Yencken, whose sudden death by an airplane accident is a loss which I am sure has been noted by the House. But the main credit is undoubtedly due to the Spanish resolve to keep out of the war. They had had enough war, and they wished to keep out of it. I think some sentiment may have been due to the fact that looking back, the Spanish people should remember that Britain had helped Spain free herself from Napoleonic tyranny 130 years ago.

At any rate the critical moment has passed.

The Battle of Britain was won. The island power which was expected to be ruined and subjugated in a few months was seen that very winter, not only intact and far stronger in the homeland, but also advancing in giant strides under Wavell's guidance along the African shore, taking about a quarter of a million Italian prisoners on the way.

But another very serious crisis occurred in our relations with Spain before the operation designated as "torch." That is to say, the descent of United States and British forces upon northwest Africa was begun.

Before that operation was begun the situation of Spain or Spain's power to injure us was at its very height. For a long time before this we had been steadily expanding our airfield at Gibraltar and building it out to sea, and for 1 month before the zero hour on November 7, 1942, we had sometimes 600 airplanes crowded on this airfield in full range and full view of Spanish batteries.

SPANIARDS KEPT CALM

It was very difficult for Spaniards to believe that all these airplanes were intended to reinforce Malta, and I can assure the House that passage of these critical days was very anxious indeed.

However, the Spaniards continued absolutely friendly and tranquil. They asked no questions and raised no inconvenience. If

in some directions they have taken an indulgent view of German U-boats in distress or have continued active exportations to Germany, they made amends on this occasion, in my view, as far as our advantage was concerned, for these irregularities by completely ignoring the situation at Gibraltar where, apart from the aircraft, enormous numbers of ships were anchored far outside neutral waters inside the Bay of Algeciras, always under command of Spanish shore guns.

We should have suffered the greatest inconvenience if we had been ordered to remove these ships.

If we had been, I do not know how the vast convoys could have been marshaled and assembled.

I shall always consider it a service rendered at this time by Spain, not only to the United Kingdom and the British Empire and Commonwealth, but to the cause of the United Nations.

I have, however, no sympathy with those why think it clever and even funny to insult and abuse the Government of Spain whenever the occasion serves. I have had the responsibility of guiding the Government while we have passed through mortal perils, and, therefore, I think I have some means of forming a correct judgment about the values of events at critical moments as they occur.

I am very glad now, after prolonged negotiations, that a still better arrangement has been made with Spain which deals in a satisfactory manner with the Italian ships which had taken refuge in Spanish harbors and which has led to the hauling down of the German flag in Tangier and the breaking of the shield over the consulate, and which in a few days will be followed by the complete departure of the German representatives from Tangier, although they apparently still remain in Dublin.

Finally, it has led to an agreement about Spanish wolfram which has been reached without any affront to Spanish dignity and has reduced the export of wolfram from Spain to Germany during the coming critical months to a few lorry loads per month.

VICTORIES AIDED ACCORD

It is true that this agreement has been helped by the continuous victories of the Allies in many parts of the world, and especially in north Africa and Italy, and also by the immense threat by which the Germans conceive themselves to be menaced by all this talk of invasion across the channel. This, for what it is worth, has made it quite impossible for Hitler to consider reprisals on Spain. All his troops have had to be removed away from the frontier, and he has no inclination to face bitter guerrilla warfare because he has got quite enough to satisfy himself in so many other countries which he is holding by brut- force.

I am here today to speak kindly words about Spain. Let me add this hope: That she will be a strong influence for the peace of the Mediterranean after the war.

The internal political arrangements in Spain are a matter for Spaniards themselves. It is not for us to meddle in these affairs as a government.

(Laborite Emmanuel Shinwell here interposed: "You said as regards the restoration of government in Italy it could not be effected. What is the difference?")

The reason is that Italy attacked us. There is a clear line of distinction between nations who go to war with you and nations who leave you alone.

(Laborite Haden Guest asked here: "Is not a Fascist government a preparation for attack?")

We do not include in our program of world renovation any forcible action against any government whose internal form of administration does not come up to our ideas, and any remarks I have made on that subject refer only to enemy powers and their satellites who will be struck down by the force of arms. They are the ones who have ventured into the open and they are the ones whom we shall not allow to become again an expression of those peculiar doctrines associated with fascism and nazi-ism, which undoubtedly have brought about the terrible struggle in which we are engaged. Surely anyone can see the difference.

(Mr. Shinwell asked, "What is the difference?")

There is all the difference in the world between a man who knocks you down and a man who leaves you alone. You might conceivably take active interest in what happens to the former in case his inclination should recur, but we pass many people in ordinary daily life about whose internal affairs we do not feel ourselves called upon to make continued inquiry.

We speak plain words to the Spaniards in the hour of our strength as we did in the hour of our weakness. I look forward to increasingly good relations with Spain and extremely fruitful trade between Spain and this country, which I trust will grow during war and expand after peace

Iron from Bilbao and north Spain is of great value to this country both in war and peace.

AMBASSADOR RETURNING

Our Ambassador goes back to Spain for further important duties, and I have no doubt that he goes with the good wishes of a large majority of the House and of all thoughtful and unprejudiced persons.

Mr. Shinwell made a further remark, and Mr. Churchill said to him: "No one more than Mr. Shinwell would wish that he should be successful in anything that would do good for the common cause." Mr. Shinwell nodded and Mr. Churchill smiling broadly, added: "You have failed as a real opposition figure because you never could conceal your satisfaction when we win—and we sometimes do."

I am happy to announce a hopeful turn in Greek affairs. When I last spoke of them I described them as the saddest case of all. We have passed through a crisis of serious character since then. A Greek brigade and a large proportion of the Greek Navy mutinied, declaring themselves in one way or another on the side of an organization called E. A. M.—Greek Freedom Movement—and, of course, against the King and his Government.

The King of Greece, who was in London, was advised by nearly everyone concerned in Cairo not to go back and warned that his life was in danger. He returned to Cairo the next day. The situation was then most serious.

The Greek brigade was encircled by British forces some 30 miles away from Alexandria, and Greek ships which had mutinied in Alexandria Harbor were lying under the guns of both shore batteries and our superior naval forces, which had rapidly gathered.

This tension lasted nearly 3 weeks. In due course the mutiny was suppressed, the disorderly ships were boarded by Greeks under the Greek Government, and, with about 50 killed and wounded, the mutineers were collected and sent ashore.

BRITISH QUELLED MUTINY

The mutinous brigade in the desert were assaulted by superior British forces which captured the eminences surrounding the camp, and 4,000 men there surrendered. There were no casualties among the Greeks, but 1 British officer was killed in an attack upon an eminence. This is a matter which cannot be overlooked.

The greatest patience and tact were shown by the British military and naval authorities involved, and for some weeks past order has been firmly established and the Greek forces who were misled into evil deeds by subversive movements have been interned for the time being.

The then Prime Minister, Mr. Tsouderous, had already tried, before this thing happened, to arrange a meeting of all representatives of Greek opinion and to construct his administration so as to include them. He acquitted himself with dignity, and was helped by Mr. Venizelos, son of the great Venizelos whom we all esteemed so highly in the First World War.

At this moment, there emerged upon the scene Mr. Papandreou, a man greatly respected who had lived throughout the war in Athens and who was known as a man of remarkable character and one who could not be swayed by party interests, his own party being a very small one.

Mr. Papandreou became the King's new Prime Minister, but before forming his government he called a conference which met last week in Lebanon. Every party in Greek life was represented, and there were included the E. A. M., Communists, and others—a dozen parties or more. The fullest debate took place and all expressed their feelings freely.

This disclosed an appalling situation in Greece. Excesses of elamas, which is a military body operating under the E. A. M., had so alienated the population in many parts that the Germans had been able to form security battalions of Greeks to fight the E. A. M. Those security battalions were made up in many cases of men who would far rather have been out in the hills maintaining guerilla warfare. They had been completely alienated.

At the same time a state of hostility and suspicion, which led last autumn to actual civil war, existed between the E. A. M. and other resistance organizations, especially the edes under Colonel Zervas, who commands the undivided support of the civilian population in his area and has always shown the strictest compliance with orders sent him from Allied general headquarters in the Middle East, under whom all these forces have been placed.

CONFEREES REACHED UNITY

Thus it seemed to be a question of all against all and no one but the Germans rejoicing. Now after prolonged discussions, complete unity was reached at the Lebanon conference and all parties will be represented in a new government.

It will devote itself to what is, after all, the only purpose worthy of consideration—namely, the forming of a national army in which all guerilla bands will be incorporated and the driving with this army of the enemy from the country or, better still, destroying the enemy where he stands.

On Monday there was published in newspapers a very agreeable letter which I received from the leaders of the Communists—which is more than I received from the honorable gentleman [William Gallacher] who represents the party here. I received a very agreeable letter from the leaders of the Communists and Extreme Left Parties, and today there have also been published in the papers a letter I have received from M. Papandreou and another to the Foreign Secretary, expressing the hopes which he has for the future of his Government and thanks for the assistance we have given in getting around these troubles which I call diseases of defeat in Greece, which she now has a chance of shaking off.

The present situation—I hope and pray this may be so—indicates that a new and fair start will come to Greece in her struggle to cleanse her soil from the foreign invader.

And I have also to report to the House that a very marked and beneficial change has occurred in the situation in Greece that I could not give when I last spoke on this subject.

There was trouble with a destroyer we were giving Greece here, and matters remained so uncertain we were not able to hand it over, but I hope that as part of this reconstructed government and this new start which has been made this ship will soon be manned and will go to strengthen the Greek Navy as it returns to discipline and duty.

I gave some lengthy accounts last autumn of the position in Yugoslavia and our relations with the different jurisdictions there. The difficulty and magnitude of this business are very great. It must be remembered that not only three strongly marked races—Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes—are involved, but farther south Albanians in the area also are making a bold bid from German rule. They, too, at present are split into several competing and even antagonistic groups.

AVOIDS TAKING SIDES

Nothing is easier than to espouse any one of the various causes in these different countries with all their claims and counter claims, and one could find complete satisfaction in telling the tale from that particular standpoint. It is possibly the easiest kind of speech to make, to take a particular case and run it home on a single-track mind without any consideration for anything else, but we have to think of policy as well as oratory.

We have time to think of the problem as a whole and also to relate our action to the main purpose which I proclaimed at the beginning of my speech, namely, to beat the enemy as soon as possible and to gather all forces together for that purpose in priority to any other purpose. I can only tell you today the further positions which have been reached in Yugoslavia as a result of unremitting exertions of our foreign policy. They are, in my opinion, far more satisfactory than they were.

I have received a message from King Peter that he has accepted the resignation of Mr. Puritch and his Cabinet and is in the process of forming a new and smaller Cabinet with the purpose of assisting active resistance in Yugoslavia and of uniting as far as possible all fighting elements in that country.

I understand that the process of forming a new government involves the severance from the Royal Yugoslav Government of General Mihailovitch in his capacity as Minister of War, and I understand also that the B. A. N. of Croatia is an important factor in the political arrangement around whom or at the side of whom certain other elements may group themselves for the purpose of beating the enemy by a united Yugoslavia.

This, of course, has the support of the British Government. We do not know what will happen in the Serbian parts of Yugoslavia. The reason why we have ceased to supply General Mihailovitch with arms and support is a simple one. He has not been fighting the enemy, and, moreover, some of his subordinates have made accommodations with the enemy from which have arisen armed conflicts with the forces of Marshal Tito, accompanied by many charges and countercharges and the loss of patriot lives to the German advantage.

POSITION STILL POWERFUL

Mihailovitch certainly holds a powerful position locally as the commander in chief, and it does not mean that his ceasing to be Minister of War will rob him of his local influence. We cannot predict what he will do or what will happen.

We have proclaimed ourselves strong supporters of Marshal Tito because of his heroic and passive struggle against the German armies. We are sending and planning to send the largest possible supplies of weapons to him and to make the closest possible contacts with him.

I had the advantage of having long conversations with General Velebit, who has been over here on a military mission from Marshal Tito, and it has been arranged among other things that Marshal Tito shall send here a personal military representative in order that we may be kept in the closest touch with all that is being done and with the effect of it in Yugoslavia. This is, of course, additional to the contacts established with Marshal Tito and General Wilson's headquarters in the Middle East and in Algiers, and will, of course, be coordinated therewith.

It must, however, be remembered that this question does not turn on General Mikhailovitch alone. There is also a very large body, amounting perhaps to 200,000 Serbian peasant property owners, who are anti-German but strongly Serbian and who naturally hold the view of the peasant ownership community in regard to property. They are not as enthusiastic in regard to communism as some of those in Croatia and Slovenia.

Marshal Tito has largely sunk his communistic aspect in his character as a Yugoslav patriotic leader. He has repeatedly proclaimed that he has no intention of reversing the property and social systems which prevail in Serbia, but these facts are not accepted yet by the other side.

The Serbians are a race with a historic past. It was from Serbia that there came the spark which fired the explosion of the First World War. We remember the heroic retreat over mountains, and a very large number of Serbians are fighting with Marshal Tito's forces.

Our object is that all forces in Yugoslavia and the whole united strength of Serbia may be made to work together under the military direction of Marshal Tito for a united independent Yugoslavia which will expel from native soil the Hitlerite murderers and invaders until not one remains.

CITES EPIC OF RESISTANCE

The cruelty and atrocities of the Germans in Greece and Yugo-Slavia exceed anything of which we heard, and we have heard of terrible things. But the resistance of these heroic mountaineers has been one of the most splendid features of the war, and they will long be honored in history. I am sure that children will read the romance of these struggles and will have imprinted in their minds that love of freedom, that readiness to cast away life and comfort and all there is around one, in order to gain the right to live unmolested in your native home.

All I can say is that we must be given a little reasonable latitude to work together for this union. It would be quite easy to take wholeheartedly one side or the other. I have made it very plain where my sympathies lie, but nothing would give greater pleasure to the Germans than to see all these hardy mountaineers engaged in internecine strife against one another.

We cannot afford at this crisis to neglect anything which will obstruct real unity throughout the wide regions where, at the present time, upwards of 12 German divisions are gripped in Yugoslavia alone and 20 in all—that is, another 10 in the Balkans and the Aegean Islands.

All eyes must be turned on the common foe. Perhaps we have had some success in this direction in Greece. At any rate, it sums up our policy toward Yugoslavia, and the House will know that all questions of monarchy or republic or leftism or rightism are strictly subordinate to the main purpose we have in mind.

In one place we support a King, in another a Communist. There is no attempt by us to enforce particular ideologies. We only want to beat the enemy, and then, in happy and serene peace, let the best expression be given by the will of the people.

For a long time past the Foreign Secretary and I have labored with all our strength to try to bring about a resumption of relations between the Soviet Government and the Polish Government which we recognized, and have always recognized, since the days of General Sikorski.

REFUSES TO SHIRK TASK

We were conscious of the difficulties of our task, and some may say that we should have been wiser not to attempt it. We cannot accept that view. We are an ally of both governments. We went to war because Germany made an unprovoked attack upon our ally, Poland. We have signed a 20 years' treaty with our ally, the Soviet Union, and this treaty is the foundation of our policy.

Polish forces are fighting with our armies and have recently distinguished themselves remarkably in Italy. Polish forces under Russian guidance are also fighting with the Soviet armies against the common enemy. Our efforts to bring about a renewal of relations between the Polish Government in London and the Soviet have not succeeded.

We deeply regret that fact, and we must take care to say nothing that would make an agreement more difficult in the future. I must repeat that an essential part of any arrangement is the regulation of the Polish eastern frontier, and that in return for any withdrawals made by Poland in that quarter she should receive other territories at the expense of Germany which will give her an ample seaboard and a good, adequate, and reasonable homeland in which the Polish nation can safely dwell.

We must stress that we are all engaged in the struggle with the common foe and that nothing can surpass the bravery of our Polish allies in Italy, on the sea and in the air, and in the heroic resistance of the underground movement to the Germans.

I have seen over here men who came only a few days before from Poland and have told how they are under orders of the present Polish Government in London. I am most anxious that this underground movement shall not clash with the advancing Russian armies, but should help.

Orders have been sent by the Polish Government in London that the underground movement is to help the Russian armies in every way possible. There are many ways possible whereby guerrillas can be of assistance, and we must trust that statesmanship will find some way through.

I have an impression that things are not so bad as they may appear on the surface between Russia and Poland. I need not say that we and, I think I might add, the United States would welcome any arrangement between Russia and Poland, however brought about, whether directly between the powers concerned or with the help of His Majesty's Government or any other government.

NO QUESTION OF PRICE

There is no question of price on our part, but only sincere good will to both and an earnest and anxious aspiration for the solution of a problem fraught with grave consequences to Europe and the harmony of the grand alliance.

Meantime, our relations with the Soviet and Polish Governments remain as stated and regulated by public statements which have been repeated from this bench during the course of the present war.

I leave this question, and I trust that if it is dealt with in debate those who deal with it will always consider what we wanted—namely, a united action of all Poles with all Russians against all Germans.

We have all rejoiced at the skilful and brilliant fighting French, Moroccan, and Algerian divisions, brilliantly led, as they have been, by their officers in the heart-shaking battle to which I have referred and which is now at its climax.

The French Committee of National Liberation in Algiers have the credit of having prepared these troops which were armed and equipped by the United States under President Roosevelt's personal decision. The French committee have also placed at the full service of the Allies its powerful navy, including the *Richelieu*, one of the finest battleships in the world.

They guide and govern a vast empire, all of the strategic points of which are freely placed at the disposal of the United Nations. They have a powerful underground army in France, sometimes called the maquis and sometimes the underground army of the interior, which may be called upon to play an important part before the end of the war.

There is no doubt that this political entity, the French National Committee of Liberation, provides and directs forces at the present time which, in the struggle against Hitler, give it fourth place in the Grand Alliance.

The reason why the United States and Great Britain have not been able to recognize it as the Government of France or even as the provisional government of France is because we are not sure it represents the French Nation in the same way as the Governments of Britain, the United States, and Soviet Russia represent the whole body of their people.

The committee will, of course, exercise leadership in the matter of law and order in the liberated area of France under supervision, while the military exigencies last, of the Supreme Allied Commander in Chief.

WANTS MORE INFORMATION

But we do not wish to commit ourselves at this stage to imposing a government on any part of France which might fall under our control without more knowledge than we now possess of the situation in the interior of France. At the same time, I must make it clear that we must have no dealings with the Vichy Government or with anyone tainted with that organization, because they have decided to follow the path of collaboration with our enemies, and many of them have definitely desired and worked for German victory.

In Norway and the Low Countries it is different, for there we shall find that the continuity of lawful government is maintained by governments which we recognize and with whom we are in intimate relations.

The Governments of King Haakon and of Queen Wilhelmina are lawfully founded governments with perfect and unbroken continuity and should our liberating armies enter those countries, we feel that we should deal with them, and also with the Belgian and Danish Governments as far as possible, although their sovereigns are prisoners.

On the other hand, we are not able to take the decision, at this time, to treat the French Committee of National Liberation, or the French Provisional Government, as it has been called, as the full, final, and lawful embodiment of the French Republic. It may be that the Committee itself will be able to aid us in the solution of these riddles. And I think their decree governing their future action constitutes the most forceful and helpful step in that direction.

With the full approval of the President of the United States, I have invited General de Gaulle to pay us a visit over here in the near future.

I have just received a telegram from Mr. Duff Cooper [British Minister] in Algiers saying he will be very glad to come. There is nothing like talking things over and seeing where we can get to. I hope that he will bring some members of his Government with him so that the whole matter can be reviewed.

As this war has progressed it has become less ideological in its character, in my opinion. The Fascist power in Italy has been overthrown and will, in a reasonable period of time, be completely expunged, mainly by the Italian democracy themselves. If there is anything left over after that, we will look after it.

CHANGES IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Profound changes have taken place in Soviet Russia. The Trotskyite form of communism has been completely wiped out.

(William Gallacher, Communist Member, interposed: "There was never such a thing.")

The victories of the Russian armies have been attended by a great rise in strength of the Russian state and a remarkable broadening of its views. The religious side of Russian life has had a wonderful rebirth. The discipline and military etiquette of the Russian armies are unsurpassed. There is a new national anthem. [Laughter and interjection by a Member, to which Mr. Churchill replied: "The honorable gentleman had better be careful to keep in step."]

There is a new national anthem, the music of which Marshal Stalin sent me and which I have asked the B. B. C. to play on the frequent occasions when there are great Russian victories to celebrate.

The terms offered by Russia to Rumania make no suggestion of altering the standards of society in that country and were in many respects, if not all, remarkably generous. Russia has been very patient with Finland. The Comintern has been abolished—that is sometimes forgotten.

Quite recently some of our representatives from the Ministry of Information were allowed to make a considerable tour in Russia and found opportunities of seeing for themselves what they liked. They found an atmosphere of candid friendliness and keen desire to see British films and hear of our country and what it is doing in the war. Children in schools were being informed about the war on the seas and of its difficulties and perils and how the northern convoys got through to Russia. There seemed a great desire among the people that Britain and Russia should be friends.

These are marked departures from conceptions which were held some years ago for reasons we can all understand.

(Mr. Gallacher interposed: "On both sides." Mr. Churchill replied: "Certainly, on both sides.")

AFFIRMS UNITY WITH RUSSIA

We have no need to look back to the past and to add up a tale and tally of recriminations. Many terrible things have happened, but we began 30 years ago marching forward with the Russians in battle against the German tyranny of the Kaiser then. We are now marching with them, and I trust we shall until all forms of German tyranny have been extirpated.

As to nazi-ism, the other ideology, we intend to wipe that out utterly, however, drastic may be the methods required. We are all agreed on that in this House, I think, whatever our political views or doctrines may be. Throughout the whole of the British Dominions and the United States and all the United Nations there is only one opinion about that.

For the rest, whatever may be said of former days, there is nothing which has occurred which should in any way make us regret the 20 years' treaty we have signed with the Russians and which will be a dominating factor in the relations which we shall have with them.

I see in some quarters that I am expected today to lay out quite plainly and decisively the future plan of world organization and also to set the Atlantic Charter in its exact and true relation to subsequent declarations and current events. It is easier to ask such questions than to answer them.

We are working with 33 united nations, and in particular, with two great allies, who, in some forms of power, far exceed the British Empire. Taking everything into consideration, including men and money, in the war effort and expanse of territory we can claim to be the equal of these great powers but not, in my view, superior.

As the head of the British Government or, I may add, as speaking to this House, as a most respected institution in the grand alliance, it would be a great mistake for me or the House to take it on ourselves to lay down the law for all these countries, including two great powers with whom we have to work if the world is to be brought back into a good condition.

BRITAIN'S POST-WAR ROLE

This small island with this marvelous structure of States and dependencies which it has gathered around it will, if we all hold together, occupy a worthy place in the vanguard of nations, and it is idle to suppose that we are the only people who are to prescribe what all the other countries for their own good are to do.

Many other ideas and forces come into play, and nothing could be more unwise than for the meeting of prime ministers for instance to prescribe the way that all countries should have to go.

Consultations always are proceeding between the three great powers and others, and every effort is being made to explore the future to resolve difficulties and to obtain the greatest measure of common agreement. A few things have already become quite clear and were very prominent at the conference just concluded.

The first is that we must fight on all together until Germany is forced to capitulate and until Nazidom is extirpated and the Nazi Party is stripped of all continuing power of doing evil.

Next is that the Atlantic Charter remains the guiding signpost, expressing the vast body of opinion among all the powers now fighting together against tyranny.

The third point is that the Atlantic Charter in no way binds us about the future of Germany. It has no quality of a bargain or contract with our enemy. It was no offer to the Germans to surrender. If it had been an offer, that offer would have been rejected.

But the principle of unconditional surrender which has also been promulgated will be adhered to as far as Nazi Germany and Japan are concerned, and that principle itself wipes away all idea of anything like Mr. Wilson's 14 points being brought up by the Germans after their defeat, claiming they surrendered in consideration of those 14 points.

I have repeatedly said that unconditional surrender gives the enemy no rights, but it relieves us from no duty. Justice will have to be done and retribution will fall upon the wicked and cruel. Miscreants who set out to subjugate first Europe and then the world must be punished. So must their agents who in so many countries have perpetrated horrible crimes. They must be brought to face the judgment of the populations they have outraged to the very scenes of their atrocities.

NO GUARANTY TO REICH

There is no question of Germany enjoying any guaranty of any kind that she will not undergo territorial changes if it should seem that the making of such changes would render more secure and more lasting the peace of Europe.

Scarred and armed with experience, we intend to take better measures this time than could previously have been conceived to prevent a renewal in the lifetime of our children or our grandchildren of the horrible destruction of human values which has marked the last and present World Wars.

We intend to set up a world order and an organization equipped with all necessary attributes of power in order to prevent future

wars or the planning of them in advance by restless and ambitious nations. For this purpose of preventing wars there must be a world-controlling council. I am not talking about our purposes, but for the purpose of preventing wars there must be a world council comprising the greatest states which emerge victorious from this war who will be obligated to keep within certain minimum standards of armaments for the purpose of preserving peace.

There must also be a world assembly of powers whose relations to the world executive or controlling power for the purpose of maintaining peace I am in no position to define. If I did I should be stepping outside the bounds which are proper to us and our allies.

The relations of three bodies and their relations with each other can only be settled after the formidable foes we are now facing have been beaten and reduced to complete submission. It would be presumption for any one power to try to prescribe in precise detail exactly what solution we found. The mere attempt for us to do so and to put forward what is a majority view on this and that might prejudice us in gaining consideration for our arguments when the time comes, and I shall not even attempt to parade the many questions and difficulties which will arise and which are at present in all our minds.

Anyone can write down on paper at least a dozen large questions of this kind: Should there be united forces of nations or should there be a world police, and so on? There are other matters of highly interesting character which should be discussed, but it would be stepping out of our place in the forward march for us to go beyond the gradual formulation of opinion and ideas which are continuously going on inside the British Commonwealth and in contact with our principal allies.

QUESTIONS UNANSWERABLE

We must not suppose, however, that these questions cannot be answered and that these difficulties cannot be overcome, and that complete victory will not be a powerful aid to the solution of all problems and that good-will and practical common sense which exists in the majority of men and the majority of nations will not find its full expression in that new structure which must regulate the forces of every people as far as they may clash with another people.

The future toward which we are marching across bloody fields and frightful manifestations of destruction must surely be based upon broad and simple virtues and upon the nobility of mankind. It must be based upon a rule or law which upholds the principle of justice and fair play, which protects the weak against the strong when the weak have justice on their side.

There must be an end to the predatory exploitation of nationalistic ambitions. This does not mean that nations should not be entitled to rejoice in their traditions in all the splendor of their achievements, but they will not be allowed by armed forces to gratify appetites of aggrandizement at the expense of other countries just because they are smaller and weaker or less well prepared, and measures will be taken to have ample armies, fleets, and air forces available to prevent anything of that kind coming about.

We must undoubtedly in our world structure embody a great deal of all we have gained for the world by the structure and form of the League of Nations. We must arm our world organization and make sure within the limits assigned to it that it has overwhelming military power.

We must remember we shall all be hard put to it to gain a living, to repair the devastation which has been wrought and to give all the wider life and more comfortable life which is so deeply desired.

We must strive to preserve the reasonable rights and liberties of the individual.

We must respect the rights and opinions of others while holding firmly to our own faith and conviction. There must be room in this great new structure of the world for happiness and prosperity of all, and in the end it must be capable of giving happiness and prosperity even to the guilty and vanquished nations.

There must be room within this great world organization for an organism like the British Empire and Commonwealth, as we now call it, and I trust there will be room also for a fraternal association of the British Commonwealth and the United States.

We are bound by our 20-years' treaty with Russia, and beside this—for my part, I hope to have deserved to be called a good European—we should try to raise the glorious Continent of Europe, parent of so many powerful States, from its present miserable condition as a kind of volcano of strife and turmoil, to its old glory as the family of nations and as the vital expression of Christendom.

I am sure these great entities I have mentioned will in no way disturb the general purpose of a world organization. The British Empire, the conception of a Europe truly united, a fraternal association with the United States—they will in no way disturb the general purpose of a world organization

In fact, they may help powerfully to make us run smoothly. I hope and pray all this may be established and that we may be led to exert ourselves to secure those permanent and glorious achievements which alone can make amends to mankind for all the miseries and toils which have been their lot and for all the heroism and sacrifices which are their glory.

House Resolution 547

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 I introduced in this House a resolution (H. Res. 547) for a congressional investigation of bureaucracy and unconstitutional trends of government.

I believe that no greater duty ever rested on the Congress of the United States in all of its history than the duty of demobilizing the bureaucracy which has taken a lethal grip on our Nation. To curb this bureaucracy and to restore Government to its ancient bearings where it will operate within the boundaries of the Constitution is the responsibility of Congress. A logical first step in that direction would be the adoption of the resolution I have introduced and which is now before the Committee on Rules.

This is the resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to make a study of the Washington bureaucracy with a view to initiating as soon as may be practicable a program of limitation and liquidation of said bureaucracy and the restoration of government within recognized constitutional bounds.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The committee is directed to report its findings and conclusions to the House of Representatives before the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter which I have sent to every Member of Congress, regardless of politics. The issue involved is in no sense political. The correction of unconstitutional trends of Government is not a job for Democrats alone; it is not a job for Republicans alone; it is a job for Americans. The Congress of the United States represents all Americans. I believe this resolution is the voice of America.

The text of the letter referred to is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The enclosed resolution undertakes to translate into concrete form the widespread national demand that something shall be done about our Federal bureaucracy. That bureaucracy stands indicted in public opinion on many unts for encroachment on congressional rights, for taking over legislative functions, for harassing the people with intolerable orders and directives, and for all but destroying local self-government in America.

To correct these trends in Government, which nearly all of our citizens believe to be unwholesome and which many believe to be lethal, is not a job for Democrats; it is not a job for Republicans; it is a job for Americans. There is nothing in the slightest degree partisan or political about the resolution I have introduced.

There is not, and there will not be, any effort on my part to inject politics or personalities into the investigation which I propose. To say that a great deal of the amazing growth of bureaucracy is due to war does not do away with the fact that these conditions exist and should be corrected if we are to save our American form of government.

Besides, bureaucracy is not entirely a recent development. Bureaucracy has been flowering for more than two decades. Eighteen years ago HATTON W. SUMNERS of Texas proposed a similar investigation and made a speech in the wel` of this House forecasting with far-seeing vision events which have since taken place. He told the House last year that his efforts 18 years ago did not attract enough attention at that time even to provoke adverse criticism. The world now knows how wise he was.

If this resolution is adopted Judge SUMNERS and the members of his able Committee on the Judiciary will go into this subject thoroughly and will bring in a report before the present Congress adjourns which will offer definite recommendations in regard to controlling bureaucracy, decentralizing the Federal Government to constitutional bounds, and restoring the local self-government that has been taken away from the States and communities. This will be an incalculable service to America. Under our form of Government Congress has a special responsibility as the guardian of constitutional rights. This investigation is distinctly a job for Congress.

I am sending a copy of the resolution and this accompanying statement to every Member of the House to try to get a consensus of opinion as to the advisability of this proposed investigation. If you approve this approach toward a rational control and ultimate demobilization of the Federal bureaucracy of which the entire country is complaining I will be grateful if you will give me the benefit of your advice in a letter

which I may be privileged to use in speaking on the subject in the House and over the radio.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Policy of Great Britain Toward Palestine

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I spoke on the floor of the House about the Palestine policy of the British Government, and called attention to the sad fact that under the policy laid down by the British white paper Jewish immigration to Palestine completely ceased on March 31, 1944.

Until that date there was still the hope that our Government would exercise sufficient pressure on the British Government to keep the doors of Palestine open for the thousands of Jews who are being completely exterminated by the ruthless policy of Hitler and his satellites. But it seems that the protest fell on deaf ears and that the policy laid down in the white paper is being continued and has by now become fully established.

Now the last hope of the Jews has turned into despair and yet a prominent magazine, the Reader's Digest, sees fit to publish in its current issue an article entitled "Report on Palestine," in which this policy of the British white paper is apparently accepted with approval.

The Reader's Digest starts out with a seeming desire to be fair and impartial. The statement is made that its correspondent in the near-eastern theater, one Frederick C. Painton, was commissioned to obtain the true facts of the situation, which as the Reader's Digest states "is so thoroughly obscured by passion and by politics."

This special correspondent made a trip to Palestine, interviewed leaders of both sides, and claims to present a report which is "as honest and objective as it is in his power to write."

The editors of the Digest apparently fully approve of Mr. Painton's conclusions, for they say that although this report was originally intended to be merely a memorandum for the editors "it is so informative and so important as to warrant publication." Now, what does this report state? It tells us what we all know—that the British white paper intends to repopulate Palestine on the basis of one-third Jews and two-thirds Arabs. In other words, the Jews of Palestine will always remain a minority. But, then, the author of the article does not think that the poor Arabs were really properly taken care of by the British. It goes on to say that "the Arabs look around them and see autonomy in Lebanon, Iraq, Trans-Jordan, and Saudi Arabia. The Palestinian Arab would like that autonomy too, but does not see how he can get it."

I do not know how much of an expert on Near East affairs Mr. Painton really is, but I cannot for the life of me see how a Palestinian Arab can envy the lot of an Arab in Saudi Arabia. The King of that country has full power of life and death over his subjects. From his decisions there is no appeal. All the big offices of state are preempted by the King's large family, his brothers, and his cousins.

The cultural standing of the Arabs in Saudi Arabia is on the level of nomad barbarism. It is amusing to think that any Palestinian Arab who has been able to observe the effects of modern civilization in the many fine communities which were built by the Jews in Palestine in the last 25 years can look upon the status of his brethren in Saudi Arabia with anything but contempt.

Nor are conditions much better in either Trans-Jordan, or even Lebanon and Iraq. Of course, the populations of Lebanon and Iraq are not Arab. The people of Lebanon are Syrians and predominantly Christian, and there surely is no basis for comparison between the Palestinian Arab and the Christian Syrian.

The Palestinian Arab until 25 years ago lived under very primitive conditions. Most of the land in Palestine was owned by rich Turkish landlords, and the Arabs were exploited by their masters under conditions approximating serfdom or peonage.

Twenty-five years ago, when the Balfour Declaration opened the doors of Palestine to the Jews, fresh capital came into Palestine. The land was put under effective cultivation and many Arabs for the first time in their lives became owners of property, where heretofore they were merely slaves for Turkish masters. It was because of the enterprise and the ingenuity of the Jewish settlers that the same thing happened in Palestine which happened in these United States 300 years ago. Just as the American Indians never understood proper cultivation of land until this country was settled and colonized by the Anglo-Saxons and others who came to these shores from Europe, so did Palestine begin to thrive only after Jewish immigration to that country began.

As a matter of fact, Britain recognizes the Jewish contribution to the settlement of Palestine, because they feel that without the Jews Palestine will again become a barren waste as it was 25 years ago. But Britain would like to have its cake and eat it. It wants to retain the Jewish population of Palestine, but it wishes to curtail future Jewish immigration, so that the Jews of Palestine will become a helpless and hopeless minority and be forever the wards of the British, instead of a self-dependent and autonomous community.

I am sure that a great deal of the opposition to the free Jewish immigration into Palestine is due to subtle anti-Semitic propaganda which found its way into the councils of Britain from sources inimical to the Jewish people, which perhaps can be traced to German origin.

I am positive that there can be no real objection to free Jewish immigration, that a Jewish Palestine will be a boon not only to the Jews but to the Arabs, and that without Jewish enterprise and the pioneering spirit exhibited by the Jews in the settlement and development of Palestine that country can neither grow nor prosper.

Retired Commissioned Officers in Civilian Positions

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that there is a bill in the Civil Service Committee of the House which I introduced last December, which, if enacted, would be of great help in the war effort, inasmuch as we are told that there is a great shortage of manpower in the War Department. This bill is H. R. 3872, to remove for the duration of the war certain limitations upon the appointment and compensation of retired commissioned officers in civilian positions by the Government. Mr. Speaker, there are 3,000 retired officers experienced and exceptionally capable who, under the present law, are denied the privilege of accepting employment in or under the executive branch of the Government if they happen to be on the retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service. Under the present law, these experienced men are prevented from doing their bit for the present war, and yet at the same time, we do not let them accept jobs which would lessen the shortage of manpower.

I have taken this matter up with a number of people and I thoroughly believe that if we can get this bill acted on by the committee and permit these officers to help in the war effort, we shall have righted the wrong suffered by these retired officers for many years and, also, we shall have aided greatly in the war effort. Although the committee has submitted this bill to some half a dozen agencies for a report and received an adverse report by each of them through the Bureau of the Budget, I request that the Civil Service Committee hold hearings on this bill and consider the bill on its own merits. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Civil Service Committee is very busy all this week and next with important matters and I therefore respectfully request that he immediately appoint a chairman of a subcommittee to conduct hearings on this very important bill, that the matter may come to the floor of the House before the summer recess.

The bill referred to follows:

H. R. 3872

A bill to remove for the duration of the war certain limitations upon the appointment and compensation of retired commissioned officers employed in civilian positions by the Government

Be it enacted, etc., That, nothwithstanding the limitations of existing law, any commissioned officer on the retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service may be appointed to, or may hold, a civilian office or position in or under the executive branch of the Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and may receive both the pay attached to such civilian position and his retired pay.

SEC. 2. This act shall be in effect during the period beginning on the date of its enactment and ending 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President.

American Prisoners of the Japanese Government

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Chairman BLOOM, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, recently appointed a subcommittee to investigate the facts relating to the possibility of accelerating the further exchange of American citizens interned or held as prisoners of war by the Japanese Government, and also to investigate as to the condition and treatment of such persons, and to aid in sending supplies to them, and so forth.

I was named as chairman of this subcommittee, and the other members of the committee are Mr. RICHARDS, of South Carolina; Mr. BURGIN, of North Carolina; Mr. VORYS, of Ohio; and Mr. SCHIFFLER, of West Virginia.

This committee had its initial meeting last week with representatives from the State Department, and secured much valuable information as to what has been done and is being done, but we have not yet concluded our investigations and will shortly have another meeting and continue to do everything we can to secure all information and devise all possible ways and means toward the accomplishment of the purposes for which this committee was appointed.

Our Government has been very active and doing everything possible in regard to this important matter. Publicity of what is being done or what is proposed to be done would hurt rather than help, and for that reason very little information can now be made public. Some of the information ascertained at our hearing is contained in a press release issued day before yesterday by the State Department, and same is submitted herewith:

The War Prisoners' Aid of the Young Men's Christian Association was recently informed by its Stockholm office that the Japanese authorities in the Philippine Islands had extended permission to the neutral delegate there of the War Prisoners' Aid to purchase locally relief supplies to an amount not exceeding $25,000 monthly for shipment to civilian internment and prisoner-of-war camps in the Philippine Islands. United States Government funds have been made available for expenditure by the War Prisoners' Aid delegate for this purpose. These funds are in addition to monthly remittances of official funds which are being transmitted regularly through Swiss Government channels to the executive committees of civilian internment camps in the Philippine Islands under authorization obtained from the Japanese authorities in August 1943. Although information has been received that the American Red Cross relief supplies sent on the exchange vessels to Japan and Japanese-occupied territories, including the Philippine Islands, have been distributed by the Japanese authorities, permission has so far not been given by the Japanese Government for the inspection of civilian internment camps or of prisoner of war camps in the Philippine Islands by representatives of the Swiss Government, which represents American interests in the Far East, or by representatives of neutral organizations. The United States Government is continuing to press the Japanese Government to grant full reciprocity in this respect.

States' Rights Include Justice for Negro G. I.'s

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of May 23, 1944:

STATES' RIGHTS INCLUDE JUSTICE FOR NEGRO G. I.'S

One point stands out above all others in the recent illuminating series by Orrin C. Evans in the Record on the treatment of Northern Negro soldiers in southern camps:

Application of good will and common sense can and does provide easy solution to what at first may appear a difficult race problem.

In touring 14 camps in 7 Southern States, Evans founds that, while discontent among Northern Negroes was greatly exaggerated, one abuse particularly promoted bitterness.

That is the failure of local transportation firms to serve the needs of the Negro soldiers. Purely on the basis of race discrimination.

Unwanted as bus passengers, badgered and bullied by club-toting drivers, they are compelled in seeking free-time recreation to hike miles from camp to neighboring towns—and then back.

Either that or, as increasing numbers of Negro soldiers are doing, they remain in camp denying themselves a holiday in order to escape degrading slights and trouble.

They have before them the shocking, inexcusable violence visited upon one of their comrades, Pvt. Edward Green.

Green was shot and killed by a vicious quick-triggered bus driver in Alexandria, La.

Unfortunately, as the Attorney General of the United States discovered after an inquiry, there is no Federal statute under which the driver can be prosecuted.

Since Louisiana, where intolerance and prejudice corrupt the law, has taken no action, the driver is a freeman—free to shoot down other American soldiers.

There was impassioned southern oratory in support of States' rights when the soldier-vote and poll-tax bills were debated in Congress. Here is a State right and a State duty for Louisiana:

Prompt arrest and trial for a man charged with a brutal slaying.

Genuine hatred has been promoted among northern Negro soldiers. It is reflected in the decreasing purchase of War bonds by their families at home. Here is a cancerous condition.

It has been seized upon by the politically unscrupulous and the out-and-out enemies of this country, multiplied a hundredfold in order to foment disunity.

Yet such problems as transportation failure at the camp exist, only because somebody lacks will or imagination to solve them.

Brig. Gen. George Horkan provided an answer pronto at Camp Lee near Petersburg, Va.

He entered into an agreement with the local bus company to furnish busses exclusively for soldiers, white and Negroes alike, to travel from camp to Petersburg.

That didn't take genius. A simple solution Yet, with but one other exception, Camp Lee is the only one visited by Evans to do anything about so serious a problem.

Perhaps the War Department—now apprised of the transportation problem if hitherto uninformed—should establish adequate service at all the camps.

It would be only fair treatment to hundreds of thousands of American soldiers. It would be a shot in the arm to national unity and a shot in the heart to sponsors of race hatred.

As We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Fred McCollam for the Forest City (Ark.) Times Herald of May 19, 1944:

AS WE SEE IT

(By the Editor)

The speaker at the young businessmen's club last evening gave an outline of the expanded social-security program, as contemplated by those in charge of the program. It will be asked that it be enlarged to include medical and hospital care, total and permanent disability, and that it be made all-inclusive in scope. We have previously discussed the so-called socialized medicine program in this column, and we are still of the opinion that it is un-American.

The speaker made a very able presentation of his subject, but we still do not agree with the proposed plan of enlarging the present benefits of the security program. We think it illtimed to carry on social reforms and experiments, with resultant heavy increases in taxes, what with our war to be financed and paid for, and with the many staggering problems of post-war settlement which will soon be demanding an immediate and expensive action.

The speaker made the statement that social security was not an experiment, that it had been in actual practice in England and in other European countries for more than 200 years. Since we have been called upon to feed Europe from time to time, lest her inhabitants die of starvation—since we have lent her large sums of money, and later been forced to cancel the debt without repayment—and since we have been required to supply her with armament and munitions to fight her wars, we question the advisability of imitating any national plan that might lead us to be placed in any positions similar to these. At any rate, we don't want to accept the European formula too readily unless we can be given the name of the country that is to wet-nurse and care for us after we have reaped the permanent benefits (?) of any such system.

The speaker also made the statement that because of a scarcity of office space in the National Capital, the Social Security Board was forced to go to Baltimore, a distance of some forty-odd miles from Washington, in order to secure adequate office space for the force necessary for keeping the social-security plan in operation, and for storing the voluminous records necessary to be kept. He defended his particular board by saying that they only employed approximately 4,000 in this department. But with 200 departments of comparable size, this gives us an army of approximately 800,000 employees. That is nearly a million persons who leave their homes in various States, and are congested in the small area adjacent to the Capital of our Nation, where they live in apartments, furnished rooms, governmentally operated hotels and dormitories, with a relative few in their own private homes.

This giant army must be fed and clothed, and provided with shelter, just the same as a fighting army in the field. They produce not a head of grain, not one stalk of cotton, they drive not an individual rivet in any war industry; in short, they create no wealth or food. They are supported entirely by tax money.

If security were all we are born to experience, we question the right of many of us to occupy the space we do on this globe. And to us, the present social-security program seems to sap all individual initiative, and personal desire to accomplish, to succeed, and to provide for the individual members of the family.

Do you know the people who enjoy the most complete security on the face of the earth today? They are the inmates of Alcatraz, the Federal Government's rock-island prison off the coast of California. Jesus Christ could have chosen security over death on the cross, but the world would never have recovered from the loss, had His choice been security over service to mankind.

The pages of history are composed of the deeds of those who choose rather to accomplish than to sit supinely and securely secure. Columbus, Magellan, Drake, DeSoto, Marco, Polo, Dr. Livingstone, Cecil Rhodes, our own Daniel Boone, Lewis, and Clarke, and countless other discoverers and explorers enriched the world because they clung to individual initiative, rather than leaned upon personal security. In the list of world heroes, Charlemagne, Constantine, Caesar, Lord Nelson, General Wainwright on Bataan, General Stilwell in Burma and China, the tail gunners on every Flying Fortress shot down over bloody and war-torn Europe, John Paul Jones, George Washington, Stonewall Jackson, Robert E. Lee, Abraham Lincoln, all discarded security for accomplishment. In religion, Martin Luther, Charles Wesley, Lord Calvert, our Puritan fathers, all displayed the sparks of initiative accomplishment, rather than eat the soft sop of security alone.

These figures contributed to the greatness of our present-day world. If we are to preserve it, we must not be content with the spine-softening security, as offered in present-day planning. We must preserve the sparkling talent God gave us, and use it intelligently and bravely.

We must stand up and be men, face the issues squarely and win by conquering our problems, rather than by evading our responsibilities.

Patrick J. McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorials:

[From Facts, of Bayonne, N. J.]

EX-POSTMASTER M'GRATH

After serving as acting postmaster for a period of 2 years, Patrick J. McGrath was nominated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt for permanent appointment after having attained the highest rating in an examination conducted by the United States Civil Service Commission, but the Senate refused to confirm him just because the junior United States Senator from New Jersey, ARTHUR WALSH, had said that "McGrath is personally obnoxious to me."

We realize that Senator WALSH of New Jersey is a bosom friend of former Gov. Charles Edison, and in an effort to show antagonism to Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, McGrath became the innocent victim of the circumstances.

Regardless of what the Senate of the United States decrees in such matters, one thing is certain—that McGrath was the best news source the representatives of the press ever had in Bayonne, and therefore from standpoint of personal friendship and admiration the newsmen of Hudson County are exceedingly sorry to hear that McGrath was not confirmed.

The fact is that McGrath enjoys the finest reputation in Bayonne. He is endowed with a gift of executive ability, business acumen, and an understanding heart. There must be a mistake. There must be a misunderstanding. The smartest F. B. I. agents working for the Post Office Department had been in Bayonne looking into the record of McGrath, and their report was too obvious when the United States Civil Service Commission certified him as being a man with the highest reputation, honesty, and integrity.

Unless Senator WALSH of New Jersey can prove anything concrete against the record of McGrath, we feel that the Congress should demand an investigation; otherwise the people of Bayonne would feel with a spirit of hesitation and distrust to our august body of Senators at Washington.

The publisher of Facts hopes that McGrath's name may be submitted to the Senate again for vote, and it is more than likely that there would be a change of heart.

[From the Jersey Journal of May 22, 1944]

THE CASE OF POSTMASTER M'GRATH

In forcing the rejection under so-called senatorial courtesy, of Postmaster Patrick J. McGrath, United States Senator WALSH of New Jersey said Mr. McGrath was "personally obnoxious to him."

The Senator's statement was pure bunk, such obvious "bunk" that even Mr. WALSH of New Jersey and his political and business godfather must be able to appreciate the facts.

The reason for the rejection of Mr. McGrath's nomination for further service as Bayonne's postmaster is that he is a Hague Democrat caught in the middle of the Hague-Edison fight. Mr. WALSH's motives were blatantly political. He would have made a much better impression if he had honestly admitted his motives.

Mr. McGrath was not "obnoxious" to George B. Mettam, a high executive of the Standard Oil Co., nor to Eugene Newkirk, head of the Bayonne Trust Co.; nor to Patrick Fraher, Broadway Businessmen's Association; nor to Harry Dembe, Broadway National Bank; nor to Joseph McCormack, principal of the Horace Mann School.

These men signed his references for appointment. They are his neighbors, and it is said a man is known best by his neighbors. A gentleman who enjoys himself much of the year in the beautiful suburbs of Essex, in Essex County, and on occasion has enjoyed truffles and steel-head salmon and other things at the "Little White House," at Sea Girt, is not likely to know much about a fellow from Bayonne.

Mr. McGrath's personal record is also worthy of comment. He has a wife and four children—a fine family. Having served in the armed forces in the previous World War, he is a member of the American Legion, Post 19, and the Catholic War Veterans. His party regularity is indicated by the fact that he is a charter member of the Bayonne Democratic Club, not counting other similar affiliations. On top of all that is the fact that he stood first man on the civil-service list.

Senator WALSH of New Jersey indulged in a cruel procedure.

Address of Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article from the New York Times, Wednesday, May 24, 1944, being the text of Baruch's speech in urging the United States to lead the world:

My deep thanks for the compliments paid me by the Churchman's Medal, by the distinguished speakers, and by your presence here.

After the flattering words, spoken about me, I should like to say a few kind words about a certain relative of mine—a relative of yours—the one who made me possible—the one who makes you possible—our Uncle Sam. We gaze on him with a sort of toleration and amusement, but he is a pretty sturdy soul. He is always on the side of right—sometimes a little slow getting there, but when he does arrive, he makes himself felt. He is better than we think, he is stronger than we know. Let me state a few of his claims to your respect.

There is a tendency among us to wonder whether he—let us say we—have done all we

should have done in the world cataclysm. We search our souls for reassurance.

Perhaps we have not done as well as we should have done, or as we could have done. Nor yet will do. But, even so, we do not have to hang our heads. Without us, could the Russians have held? Could the Japanese have been stopped? Could the valiant Chinese have done as well as they have? And what of the magnificent fight of the British? Were we not of help to them? Churchill has proclaimed his debt to us. Even Stalin has admitted the effect upon his battles of the war-making power of America. Today the bloody Nazis and the Japs face a defeat that without us could not be.

STRESSES WORLD-WIDE TASK

We are fighting—and helping—not on limited fronts, but on the whole circumference of the globe, and from the North to the South Poles. Even now our men are poised ready for the great invasion and the blow at Japan. We feed the hungry and we clothe the naked. We build roads, airports, harbors, and plants. We supply our allies all over the world with machines of death and supports of life, in food, medicine, and shelter.

We are the most powerful Nation in the world. Let us not forget that. By keeping it in our mind we shall not ignore the obligation power carries with it—to use it justly and helpfully. And we shall be a force, perhaps the greatest, when the peace of the world is set.

When the war is over no country will be able to improve the well-being of its people without our help. Peace will be almost meaningless without betterment of daily existence. In that crisis Uncle Sam will show himself to be neither profligate nor parsimonious. He will be fair, and that means to himself as well as to others. I have no economic radar to penetrate the future, but we can make it what we will it to be. Of that I am sure.

In assessing our position, let us remember that great as our physical strengths are, they are made even greater by the fact that our spiritual armor is untarnished by self-gain; all our steps toward self-protection are steps to save the world—to bring peace to all nations of good-will.

America has never forgotten—and will never forget—the nobler thing that brought her into being and that light her path—the path that was entered upon only 150 years ago—a little more than twice my own age. How young she is. It will be centuries before she will adopt that maturity of custom—the clothing of the grave—that some people believe she is already fitted for.

FIGHTING WITH HIGH PURPOSE

Our people are hard bitten. They owe only to themselves what they have, but, somehow, they have always preserved the chivalry and idealism that others mistakenly assume is softness.

Soft? Who dares say that? Have we not fought whenever the test showed that fighting meant national existence and self-respect? When did we ever fail to fight? And when did we ever fight without high purpose, with one possible exception?

I see the leaven of time at work. The precepts of the great Woodrow Wilson are bearing fruit. Both of the major parties have consecrated themselves to the principle of international cooperation and force. This may have the effect, as has been said, of "taking the peace out of politics and politics out of the peace." That is the way it should be.

Today we are deep in war, where we shall be for some time to come. We can survive only through victory, and that will come by tensing every muscle on the job and by making every effort of spirit. Then, with the vista of peace before us, a peace which we shall make beautiful—or distort—we will have the contentment that comes from duty well done, or the contempt of failure.

In another day, Cicero said the proudest boast a man could utter was "Civis Romanus sum" (I am a Roman citizen). It is my prayer that our conduct may always be such as to carry greater praise in the accolade: "I am an American."

One last word. Some ask why we fight? This is my answer: We fight for

"Ancient rights, unnoticed as the breath we draw,
Leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the law."

My thanks again.

The Great Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, again I am calling attention to the disposition of surplus property which must be disposed of by the Government. There is a tremendous amount of surplus property available now, and it is my contention that those in charge of disposing of this property should lose no time in getting it on the market. First, if it is sold now, the Government will not in any way be interfering with business because the commodities are not available on the open market. On the other hand, there is a tremendous demand for such commodities. As you are aware, the agency in control of surplus property is now operating under an Executive order. The President waited a very long time for the Congress to provide proper legislation for the disposal of surplus property before he issued his Executive order.

The House passed a bill in the last session of Congress that had to do with the disposition of surplus property. Extensive hearings were held by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That bill has been in the Senate and seems to be peacefully sleeping. I have urged time and again that the Senate consider the House bill, even if it does nothing else but strike out everything after the enacting clause and substitute new language. If that is done, the bill can go to conference, the question will be wide open, and the conferees should be able to write a satisfactory measure for the consideration of both bodies.

No less than seven committees of the House have from time to time taken up the question of surplus property. Jurisdiction properly lies with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to handle this matter. Situations have developed since the passage of the House bill that warrant many amendments; but, as I said, if the Senate will pass the bill, the conferees can iron out the disagreements without trouble.

A timely editorial on this subject appears in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; and under the leave granted me, I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

THE GREAT SURPLUS

Creation of an advisory board, in legislation pending in Congress, would carry the Surplus Property Administration to a fairly well advanced stage in the setting up of machinery for the most gigantic selling job any nation has ever attempted, but not as much can be said for the setting up of policies.

When and how is the extent of surplus in every one of the great number of items to be determined? Is the small manufacturer to have a chance at the enormous plants and the enormous amounts of equipment the Government has on hand? Is the small retailer to be allowed to compete on equal terms with big business for consumer goods? Will sales be by bid or by fixed price? Will the Government explore every method of making continuing use of its war factories—by lease and by Federal operation as well as by sale?

These and other major policy determinations are even more important than matters of machinery. So much, at least, we learned from the unbusinesslike way in which we disposed of the surplus left from the First World War. Then, there was only too much machinery for doing the job. Failures occurred, to an overwhelming extent, on points of policy. The Government never made up its mind what was to be done, or when or how it was to be done.

Surplus stocks in 1918 amounted to $6,000,000,000. Because of our vague and vacillating national policy concerning them, they were handled with tremendous waste and delay. Yet, they represented 22 percent of the whole cost of the war to our Nation.

The surplus that will be left from this immeasurably greater war has been estimated at amounts varying from twenty-five to one hundred fifty billions. It will be so big as to give the Government an alternative of accomplishing almost the impossible or of making a mess of things for which we shall continue to pay for many years to come.

Some of the surplus will be useless for peacetime purposes. A great deal of it will be not only useful but direly needed, in our country and in many other countries. Upon our manner of putting it to use will depend, in large measure, the health or illness of our productive economy in the years after the war—the ability of industry to produce and find markets and earn profits and, above all, to employ people.

The Government will have airplanes and army trucks and jeeps to put to peacetime uses, aluminum and rubber and steel manufacturing plants, merchant vessels, shoes, clothing, blankets, cots, food, and virtually every other thing required either for peace or war.

Shall we muddle through again as we did after 1918? The costs of muddle-headedness a quarter-century ago were heavy.

We sold $750,000,000 worth of armaments to the French Government for $400,000,000, and, unpaid for, it rusted and was ruined on the fields of northern France. Fifty-two thousand bales of cotton rotted for a year in the rain and sun at Nitro, W. Va. Eleven thousand Army cars, some of them never uncrated, were exposed for a year at Baltimore.

Two years after the war was over the Army still had 3,000,000 wool coats, 2,000,000 leather jerkins, 6,000,000 flannel shirts, 1,000,000 woolen trousers. Six years after the armistice, $100,000,000 of surplus was still unsold and unused.

These failures were largely failures of policy. The automobiles abandoned in the elements were left to ruin because—according to the only explanation ever given—someone in control was ordered by someone else not to sell them.

The lesson of the First World War surplus is clear: We must have surplus-disposal policies. They must be clearly defined. They must be conceived and executed with courage. They must be brought into existence, and into action, now.

As We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by W. Fred McCollum from the Forest City (Ark.) Times Herald of May 16, 1944:

AS WE SEE IT
(By the Editor)

Added to the other agitation for "equal rights" for Negroes is the question of their voting in the Democratic primaries of the Southland. A recent Supreme Court decision has apparently granted to them this right. If they are fully qualified Democratic voters, the Court may have ruled correctly. If they are not, they have no more right to vote in a Democratic primary than any other member of any other party. They have never been denied the right to vote in general elections.

Because we are a sincere friend of the Negro race, we are writing today with them as our subject in our column. We would suggest to those who clamor loudest for the "equal rights" privilege, that the question is not one of racial color alone. Many white people do not have "equal rights," either socially, economically, or politically, with others of their own race. Unfortunate as it may be, this is undeniably true. After having been expounded for more than 1,900 years, the golden rule has not yet been accepted as the standard of living, and we have not yet accepted the statement that "I am my brother's keeper."

It may be hard-boiled, but the facts are that most of us, both white and black, get what we deserve out of this life. Fortunately for some of us, our treatment is even better than we deserve; rarely is it worse.

As to the matter of voting in our elections, we seriously question that it would be advantageous to the large body of Negroes as a whole to have this occur at this time. As most of us know, many of our so-called politicians are long on promises and short on performance. They depend upon fooling the electorate with high-sounding phrases and glib words; then when once firmly seated in the saddle of authority of the position to which they are elected they immediately "sell out" the interests of their constituents for selfish gain, and, so to speak, actually prey upon the ones who elevated them to office. In the case of the Negro as a voter, many of them would not be able to determine the good from the evil, and the selfish and scheming conniver could sway them to his own selfish plan, and in the end penalize them and their white friends alike.

We would rather suggest to our colored friends a parallel civilization alongside of ours, rather than what some strangers to the two races suggest. With better educational facilities becoming available both to the white and to the colored, better opportunities are being offered for both to carve out their own destinies and to have more to do in shaping the particular pattern these destinies may follow.

Look around you here in St. Francis County. You see members of the Negro race prospering and enjoying the fruits of their labor. They own some of the best farm land in the county; they fill professional positions; they own rental property—and none deny to them the fruit of their labors.

"Equal rights" is no magic formula that can be conferred by any legislation or any so-called social reformer. Equal rights are the fruits of long years of honest labor.

In this connection, we would urge our Negro leaders to advise our colored people as to who are their friends, as proven by the years past, years that have been filled with common disasters and common periods of depression and of prosperity. Some of the agitators come from areas in the United States where the Negro population residing there have been abused the most. Very few of them have ever studied the Negro mind and manner of reasoning. They are foreigners to you and you to them. Far too many of them have a "dues collecting" angle to their work they say is being done solely in your behalf.

We have always felt, and we are still of the opinion that the white man of the South is better acquainted with the Negro, is sincerely more concerned about his problems and their solution, and can aid him more in advancement than can any individual or group whose motives are directed either by selfishness or ignorance, or both.

We hope this expression will be received in the spirit in which it is written—and that it may serve in a small way to help both our white and colored friends solve their problems. After all, it seems to us that most of them are mutual problems of equal concern to both races. We are certain they can be solved more satisfactorily by our working together than they can by any distinct outsiders.

Can the Government Discharge 3,000,000 of Its Employees, or 2,000,000, or 1,000,000, or Any Large Number, and Continue to Function Efficiently in War Effort and Domestic Matters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months it has become a common practice for certain enthusiastic writers and speakers to hold up their hands in horror and bemoan what they term to be the tremendous growth of a great bureaucracy and a political machine which they say has fastened itself in a permanent fashion upon the American people. I do not believe that one unnecessary Government employee should be permitted to remain on the Government pay roll, but we cannot dismiss them without doing so in an intelligent way, and in a way not to cripple efficient Government service.

These charges have naturally aroused my curiosity. To determine their validity or lack of basis, I have sought information from what I believe to be a qualified and unbiased source of information—the United States Civil Service Commission.

This is what I find:

In March 1944, 63 percent of all Federal employees in this country, a total of 1,791,000 civilian employees, were working in field establishments of the War and Navy Departments. These civilian Federal employees were all engaged in performing services directly related to the war program and were engaged in industrial work concerned with war production, construction, storage, distribution, supply, communication, inspection, testing, repair service, and other related war activities which are the direct functions of the War and Navy Departments.

In addition to the above civilian employees, 419,111 other civilians were employed at that time by the War and Navy Departments in March. The breakdown on these other essential employees was as follows:

Those employed in departmental headquarters' offices of both War and Navy Departments in this country	65,111
Those employed outside the continental limits of the United States:	
By the War Department	288,600
By the Navy Department	75,800
Total	419,111

This means that, in March 1944, 2,210,511 of all of the civilian employees of the Federal Government were employed by either the War or the Navy Departments on matters directly connected with the war program.

For anyone to assume that these employees in these two vital departments are part of a great political machine which has fastened itself upon the American people is nothing short of ridiculous, in my opinion. What do these critics think is required in terms of employment to do this job of winning this war? Do they propose that the officials of the War and Navy Departments stand idly by and attempt to perform all of the vital services for which civilian as well as uniformed labor is required with only that skeleton organization of peacetime employees regularly employed by those two departments in times of peace? Should they take that attitude and not increase their working staffs just for fear that they might be criticized and accused of building up a political machine? Is that what Secretary Stimson and General Marshall are doing—building a political machine by hiring these extra civilians? I, for one, resent the implication and classify it as unpatriotic, to speak mildly.

The record shows that on March 31, 1944, 180,731 civilians were employed in what are known as our emergency war agencies. This constituted less than 5½ percent of all known Federal employees at that time; 173,831 of these persons were employed in this country, 6,900 were employed abroad.

The record shows that in June 1939, the Post Office Department employed 288,979 persons. In March 1944, that department employed 348,076 persons, an increase certainly justifiable in view of the added load of wartime mail.

In June 1939, the old line nonemergency agencies had 436,045 employees. In March 1944, in the midst of war, they had 471,348 employees. Surely this increase is more than justified by wartime loads which have added to the burden of these regular agencies. A substantial part of these are employed by the Veterans Administration.

I just wonder if these critics would have preferred that the Government should only have permitted the War and Navy Departments to have added to their essential employees through enlistment or through Selective Service and would have preferred that these additional employees only be recruited into the service of these departments as uniformed soldiers and sailors at the prevailing wage scale of uniformed personnel. The answer to that is obvious.

I feel that we should be fair in these matters and if persons are going to decry the admitted increase in Federal civilian employment, I hope they will take full cognizance of the duties which have been assigned to these wartime employees and not imply that there is no patriotic justification for their services.

Submitted herewith is a letter from the Honorable Harry B. Mitchell, President of the United States Civil Service Commission, which contains the official figures upon which I have based the above remarks:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1944.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following information on Federal employment in March 1944 is provided in accordance with your verbal request of May 15.

Paid civilian employment in the United States totaled 2,839,366 in all executive departments and agencies combined as of March 31, 1944. Of this number, 1,193,641 were in the War Department; 652,470 in the Navy Department; 172,831 in emergency war agencies; 348,076 in the Post Office Department; and 471,348 in all other departments and agencies. These figures do not include 285,000 persons serving without compensation or at the nominal compensation of $1 per year or per month—90 percent of these are local board members of the Office of Price Administration and Selective Service. Also these figures do not include approximately 415,000 persons who are employed outside continental United States.

Of the 2,839,366 Federal employees, a total of 1,791,000 civilian employees, or 63 percent, were working in field establishments of the War and Navy Departments throughout all sections of the country. These civilian workers were performing services directly related to the war program and were engaged in industrial types of work concerned with war production, construction, storage, distribution, supply, communication, inspection, testing, repair service, and other related war activities. (This figure excludes all civilian employees in departmental headquarters' offices of the War and Navy Departments but includes all workers in these field establishments regardless of whether performing white-collar, mechanical, or manual work.)

A break-down of the 1,791,000 civilian employees reported in field establishments of these two Departments, according to type of work, is as follows:

Approximately 349,400 were employed in Government navy yards building battleships, submarines, cruisers, and other naval craft as well as performing repair and service work on naval vessels.

Approximately 84,100 were engaged in naval procurement activities concerned with supply and maintenance work, and the inspection of naval machinery, ordnance, aircraft, and material.

Approximately 51,600 were employed in naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, and other naval ordnance plants.

Approximately 71,800 were employed at the naval air stations and reserve aviation bases.

Approximately 22,800 were in naval training stations, reception and induction centers, and other field personnel activities.

Approximately 51,700 employees were engaged in miscellaneous naval activities, such as hospitals, medical supply depots, dispensaries, operating bases, proving grounds, research, etc., including civilian personnel in Marine Corps and Coast Guard.

Civilian employees in various operating activities of the Army Air Forces were distributed as follows: 176,300, Air Service Command; 34,700, Materiél Command; 59,600, Training Command; 13,500, Air Transport Command; 35,900, First, Second, Third, and Fourth Air Forces; 10,000, all other commands, stations, and centers.

Approximately 330,100 were in service commands of the Army Service Forces.

Civilian employees in the technical services of the Army Services Forces concerned with such activities as the manufacturing, storage, and distribution of tanks, guns, bombs, bullets, and other material; construction, repair, and maintenance of utilities; procurement of munitions of war and related work were distributed as follows: 25,200, chemical warfare; 78,700, engineers; 8,500, medical; 170,500 ordnance; 74,200, quartermaster; 46,700, signal; 76,800, transportation; 17,000, miscellaneous.

Approximately 1,900 were in miscellaneous services.

It should be noted that these figures include all civilian employees working in field establishments in the above categories of work and represent, therefore, an industrial or actively classification as distinguished from an occupational distribution of employment. Only a small proportion of such workers in the above categories was working in the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area.

The attached table provides a comparison of the number of Federal employees and their distribution among war and other agencies at the end of March 1944, November 1941, and June 1939.

If we can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President.*

Paid civilian employment in war and other agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government June 1939, November 1941, and March 1944

Agency	June 1939		November 1941		March 1944 [1]	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total executive service	920,310	100.0	1,545,131	100.0	*2,839,366	100.0
War agencies total	195,286	21.2	738,631	47.8	2,019,242	71.1
War Department	109,886	11.9	431,082	27.9	1,193,641	42.0
Navy Department	85,400	9.3	281,773	18.2	*652,470	23.0
Emergency war agencies			25,776	1.7	173,831	6.1
Post Office Department	288,979	31.4	320,023	20.7	348,076	12.3
All other agencies	436,045	47.4	486,477	31.5	471,348	16.6

*Preliminary.

[1] Does not include employment outside the continental limits of the United States, distributed as follows: 288,600 in War Department, 75,800 in Navy Department, 6,900 in emergency war agencies, 1,100 in Post Office, and 42,700 in all other agencies.

Amendments to the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech on the subject of amendments to the Price Control Act which I broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, May 20, 1944:

Everyone favors the extension of the Price Control Act. No one would dare to oppose its extension while the Nation faces the greatest dangers of inflation in its history. Nobody can openly advocate knocking down our defenses against economic chaos or permitting industry, landlords or agriculture to profiteer out of the war. Nobody will openly accept responsibility for creating an enormous national debt, required to finance an inflationary war-production program, with its crushing burden to present and future taxpayers.

For these reasons, one never hears anyone suggest that the Price Control Act should be permitted to expire. The actual proposals now before Congress all relate to amendments, to changes in the provisions of the act—sometimes the change of a single word. All these proposals are made by people who declare that they are strongly in favor of price control during this emergency, "but * * *" These "buts" are what the American people must watch, for they may mean the difference between effective price control and a mere sham battle against inflation. I want to discuss a few of these "we want price control, but" amendments, in order to bring home to the American people the fact that freedom from inflation, like freedom in general, requires the vigilance of all citizens and their representatives.

Before looking at the proposed amendments, let's look at the record, to judge the effectiveness of the act as it now stands. We will see then why any proposal to alter the present act and the policies which have been followed under it should be greeted with great skepticism. The stabilization program has worked, and when any program so difficult is working it should not be disturbed except for very strong cause.

Most of you remember that during the last war the cost of living rose by 65 percent before the armistice was signed and by 106 percent—more than double its 1944 level—before the inflation ran its course and we tumbled into deflation and depression. In this war, by contrast, the cost of living has risen only about 25 percent, and over the last full year, since the President's hold-the-line order was issued, it has been held absolutely stable. Industrial materials—the things we pay for with our taxes and War bonds in the form of tanks, ships, planes, and guns—rose in price by 165 percent during the inflation of the last war, but have risen by only 22 percent since this war began in 1939. Steel plates for our ships and heavy equipment rose in price by 700 percent in the last war. In this war their prices have been held absolutely stable.

Think what this has meant to you as consumers and as taxpayers. It is reliably estimated that the cost of war munitions and construction would have been some $65,000,000,000 greater since our defense program began if we had had to pay for them at World War No. 1 inflated prices. An additional $22,000,000,000 has been saved by American people as consumers. That is, if the goods and services you have consumed since June 1940 had risen as much in price as they did during the comparable period of the last war they would have cost all of you combined an extra $22,000,000,000. A program which has already saved Americans more than $65,000,000,000 as taxpayers and $22,000,000,000 as consumers should not lightly be scuttled by "but" amendments.

But, say those who seek to amend the act: What about production? Has not our price-control program been at the expense of industrial and farm production? Shouldn't we ease up on control to insure full-blast production?

When you look at the facts it is pretty evident that, far from stifling production, the stability of costs and prices which the stabilization program has provided has enabled industry and agriculture to achieve the most remarkable production records this country has ever known. Industrial production has risen about 130 percent over the course of this war. In the last war it rose by only about 25 percent at the peak and slumped in 1918 and 1919 when inflation really got going. Farm production in the last war rose about 5 percent. In this war, despite the great difficulties agriculture has had to face, it has risen about 21 percent. What accounts for these differences? I think it is safe to say that a good part of it is explained by the fact that the disorganization which always accompanies inflation was present in the last war and not in this—thanks to our stabilization program.

Have these results been achieved only at the expense of reasonable profits for industry and the farmer? Some would think so if they listened to those who want to change the Price Control Act in one way or another. I think you will know by looking around you that this is not true. But here are some facts: The profits of American industry in 1943, even after war taxes, were 156 percent above the average for the 4 years immediately preceding the war. Almost every branch of industry shared in these gains and no important branch has fallen short of peacetime levels. Business failures were at an all-time low in 1943. Most small businesses, from all indications, were doing just as well as the larger ones in their industries. Consider food stores: In 1939 small independents did about 68 percent of the total business. In 1943 they got a larger share—about 67 percent.

Farmers, in general, have also prospered under the present Price Control Act. In 1940 American farmers' net income, after all operating costs, was slightly more than $4,500,000,000; in 1942 their net income reached $10,000,000,000; in 1943 it rose further to almost $13,000,000,000. The highest previous level of net farm income was less than $9,000,000,000—in 1919—when the farm dollar brought much less than it does now.

The income of landlords operating under rent control has likewise shown an advance over peacetime. The average increase in net operating income for a large number of apartment houses under rent control by O. P. A. was about 27 percent between 1939 and 1943. The average increase for 10,000 small dwellings was about 44 percent.

Keep all these facts in mind when you hear that the Price Control Act should be amended.

Now let's look at some of the amendments which are being considered in the committees of Congress. More than 100 have already been proposed. I can deal with only a few, which will fairly represent the whole lot. They all have one thing in common. They would weaken our inflation controls and lead, directly or indirectly, to higher prices. These amendments can be divided into three broad groups. First, those which attack the principles used in setting or adjusting ceiling prices or rents; second, those which would weaken the enforcement of the act by technical or procedural changes; and third, that large number which looks for special favor for some group or other.

First, the attacks on pricing principles. My sample will illustrate that the mere changing of a word here or there may mask a destructive attack upon the whole program. At present the Price Control Act requires that ceiling prices be "generally fair and equitable." One of the proposed amendments is to strike the word "generally" and leave the words "fair and equitable." What difference could this make? Well, it is quite clear from what its advocates say that this proposal is meant to require ceiling prices which will insure that every last seller, no matter how inefficient, unlucky, or unfavorably situated, will make a profit. This amendment means, first, that the ceiling price will have to be fixed so high that most of his competitors will reap extortionate profits, since, in general, the price must be the same for all sellers of a given commodity. Secondly, it would amount to a guaranty of profits under the guise of maximum price control designed to protect buyers in wartime when competition no longer operates effectively. Such a guaranty has no precedent in peacetime, when competition fixes prices at which many firms, for one reason or another, make losses. Thirdly, it amounts to cost-plus pricing, since the ceiling would have to be raised as the costs of the high-cost producers rose. It would thus encourage inefficiency, waste, and spiralling costs, and, of course, would mean spiralling prices. No wartime price control act in history ever sought to apply such a self-defeating principle. Even in World War No. 1, when our price control was pretty lax, prices were fixed at fair levels for the bulk of the industry and it was up to the individual producer to conduct his business enterprise to keep within those limits.

A second basic principle in our present price control is that prices should not be raised if the earnings of an industry substantially exceed its peacetime earnings, adjusted, of course, for any increased investment. In other words, higher profits made from increased business volume, the streamlining of production, or reductions in selling or other costs should provide a cushion against those costs which do increase, and prices should not be raised unless, on balance, normal earnings are threatened. This is not only fair and equitable; it is imperative if the cost-of-living line is to be held. Yet many are those who would amend the act to require O. P. A. to raise a price whenever any element of cost increases, even though profits may still be inflated. Some want prices adjusted upward on a cost-plus percentage basis, thus actually increasing prices and profits whenever costs rise. The only grounds put forth for such cost-plus pricing is the slogan, "O. P. A. should control prices, not profits." As if one can fix a fair price without considering the net return which the buyer is asked to give the seller. Clearly the test of a fair price in wartime is a reasonable yield.

Similar proposals are made for raising rents in defense areas.

Some short-sighted representatives of farmers propose to alter the time-honored principle of parity for fixing ceiling prices on agricultural products. The argument for this is usually that wage rates have risen since the parity base date back in 1910–14. The proposal ignores the facts that labor costs affect various farm products very differently and that increases of productivity and reductions in unit costs of producing many farm products have far more than offset the increased costs due to higher farm wages. It blandly ignores the astonishing increase in net farm income after all expenses, including labor, which I have already mentioned.

I think most farmers will agree that their prices are already high enough. I think they also realize that the loosening of our inflation controls will raise the cost of the things they buy, including farm labor, and result in a severe post-war agricultural depression, leaving them in a prostrate condition similar to that after the last war.

Such "but" amendments aimed at present pricing principles would destroy the very basis of our stabilization program.

But it is not necessary to attack basic pricing principles to cripple the program. It would be done as certainly by amendments affecting administration, procedure, and enforcement. Let me mention a few of these.

There are, for example, proposals that O. P. A. must follow the methods recommended by industry in setting its ceilings. In other words, real authority over ceiling prices would pass from Congress, the Chief Executive and their appointed agents to representatives of each industry. O. P. A. now consults industry. But this proposal to let industry make its own rules is going too far. Similar proposals ask for a much greater voice for trade associations in regulating prices. This country, I am sure, does not want its prices fixed by trade associations or cartels.

There are other procedural amendments, such as to prevent consumers from suing for triple damages or $50 when overcharged, or reducing the fine which manufacturers and wholesalers must pay for overcharges from triple the amount to little more than the excess they have charged. Another proposal would restrict the publication of ceiling prices where, as in food stores, ceiling prices differ as between chains and independents. These are examples of how technical amendments might destroy the actual effectiveness of price control.

The strongest attack along these lines, however, is against the court review provisions of the act. Under the act, a business which objects to its ceiling price must first protest to the Administrator, and, if the protest is not granted, take its appeal to a special court of judges appointed by the Chief Justice of our Supreme Court. It can appeal from there to the Supreme Court itself. Lower Federal courts and State courts are prohibited from entertaining his complaint or enjoining enforcement of the price regulations.

The purposes of this procedure are to prevent lack of uniformity in enforcement of price control throughout the country; to set

up an orderly procedure for adjustment of prices; to insure that the courts which consider price-control cases will understand the problems with which they deal; and, finally, to expedite final appeal to the Supreme Court. The emergency nature of price control in wartime requires such procedure. If any lower court anywhere in this country could strike down price regulations at any time, it would simply be impossible to make control effective. Those who argue that the Emergency Court of Appeals is too distant overlook the fact that it can and does sit in every part of the country and gives prompt consideration to all cases. This legal limitation upon business is a very small price for the protection which effective stabilization provides.

I come finally to those amendments which seek special favor for special groups, those which say in effect, "Yes, I want effective price control, but I deserve exception. The prices I pay should be firmly controlled but those I charge should be higher."

Some producers want their products exempted from control on the grounds they are luxuries. Their products are unimportant, they say, regulation is irritating, and O. P. A. should concentrate on essentials. Why cannot such a line of distinction be drawn?

In the first place, who is to define a luxury? In the second place, these products compete with necessities for plant facilities, raw materials and labor. If prices for luxuries could rise without limit while prices of necessities were controlled, much bigger profits could be earned by producing luxuries, and production of goods vital to the war effort and civilian needs would suffer at the expense of nonessential goods. Exemption of luxuries would also be unfair discrimination. Dealers in luxuries could make a killing while the prices and therefore the profits of those who produce the things we really need would be restricted by government action. These are the reasons why the scope of O. P. A. control must be left, as at present, to administrative discretion

A number of industries would set up special standards or procedures for regulating their prices, while leaving the standards applied to other groups unchanged. Oil producers, for example, want Congress to legislate a price increase of 75 cents per barrel, and want oil prices to be fixed to bear the same relationship to other wholesale prices as in 1926, almost 20 years ago. This is proposed despite the fact that earnings of oil producers are at record highs, that 1926 price relationships bear no necessary relation to present costs and, therefore, to fair prices, and that the principle of adjusting every price upward to the average would, by continually raising the average, lead to a continuous spiral of inflation.

Cotton textile mills want their prices fixed on a parity price for raw cotton, even though the price the mills actually pay is below this and raising textile prices could not possibly raise the price of cotton to farmers under present surplus cotton conditions. The textile industry also wants, on top of this, a separate cost-plus factor for manufacturing expense on every single kind of textile product they produce, plus what they call a reasonable profit on each. At present some textile prices are much more profitable than others, although all of them adequately cover cost for the great bulk of producers. The slimmer profits made on some types of textiles are more than compensated by very high profits made on others. As a result, profits of 148 cotton textile mills have risen by more than 800 percent before taxes and by 288 percent after taxes, between the years 1936-39 and 1943. There is obviously no injustice being done to textile producers, and the present pricing system is helping hold the line in the very difficult wartime clothing situation.

These are outstanding examples of the "special favor" amendments. Somewhat similar ones are being asked for by miscalled representatives of dairy farmers and cattlemen, by growers of certain vegetables, and by some retail trades. The general standards of the act protect all consumers, all taxpayers, all farmers, and all businessmen, by protecting the economic future of this country. We must not let them be undermined by "everybody but me" amendments.

In conclusion, keep your eye on the amendments to the act. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator and Judge Vinson, the men who have the tough job of administering price control, testify from experience that the act is good as it stands, and they oppose any weakening of its provisions. The records bear them out. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Chairman of the War Production Board also want the act extended without any weakening. Even the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce asks the Congress to reject all amendments that would directly or indirectly have the effect of raising prices during the war. In this he is accurately reflecting the long-run interests of American business as a whole, rather than the short-run interests of special business groups. It is clear that even a few of the proposed amendments would cripple its effectiveness. I urge all citizens to protest against these "price control but" amendments, and thus help insure our safety from inflation.

What the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway Means to the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, after hearing Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief Army Engineers, and other experts, answer the arguments of the opposition, the Senate Commerce Committee has restored the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway project to the river and harbor bill, by an overwhelming vote.

The argument presented by General Robins was simply unanswerable. He is not only Assistant Chief of Engineers, but he is one of the ablest men who has ever occupied that position. He was on the Board that made the original report recommending this project, and forcibly sustained that recommendation in his statement before the committee.

General Robins said that if the Army Engineers were to assure the Congress that they could provide a slack water route up the Mississippi River to Cairo with the amount it will cost to construct this Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway, "You would all stand up and cheer." Yet, he said, this Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway would do that very thing—and more. That it would provide a slack water route up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee River, and a downstream route from there to Cairo, and at the same time save the swift current on the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

Now come people from the Northwest and point out what this barge traffic means to the farmers of that section of the country. Mr. L. R. McKee, of Muscatine, Iowa, says:

We have noted from time to time that some Members of Congress have expressed their opinion that the farmers and the producers of grain along the interior water-ways do not receive the benefit of low water transportation. No statement can be farther from the truth. The farmer does and is at this time receiving the benefit of lower rates on corn from this district to southern points.

The Government itself acknowledges that the farmer is receiving the benfits because at the present time we have a ceiling price at Muscatine delivered on barge of $1.14¼ for No 2 yellow corn and we are paying today to the producer $1.11¾. The price which we receive, namely, $1.14¼ is applicable only to water shipment. It we were to sell by rail we could only receive $1.1.07⅝ and the bid to the producer would be $1.05⅛. Therefore, at this very moment the farmer is receiving 6⅝¢ more per bushel for his grain at Muscatine than he would receive if it weren't for river transportation.

If the Senators or other interested parties desire to check up on this, refer them to Second Revised Maximum Price Regulation 346 which was effective as of February 21, 1944.

We shipped the first barge of corn from Muscatine on the Mississippi on the completion of the 9-foot channel and there has never been a year when water transportation was open but what we were bidding from 4 cents to 8 cents a bushel more for corn than we could have paid if this grain was shipped by rail.

We believe the information given above will dispel any doubts in the mind of any reasonable person that the farmer or producer does receive the benefits of the water rates.

You will note that Mr. McKee says that in shipping grain to the South these barge lines enable them to pay the farmers from 4 cents to 8 cents a bushel more for their corn.

If this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is provided, so that those barges can return by this slack water route for about 50 percent of what it now costs them to return against the swift current of the Mississippi, it will further add to the price the farmers of that section may receive for their grain, and when the 9-foot channel is provided to Omaha and Sioux City, it will further extend the benefits of this cheap transportation.

Mr. J. O. McClintock, of the Continental Grain Co., Chicago, has this to say:

The writer is very much interested in the outcome of the pending legislation of the rivers and harbors bill and the flood-control legislation. This interest reaches back to the producers in the territory tributary to the Illinois, Mississippi, and lower Missouri Valley.

We wish to oppose any legislation now that would tend to limit the navigation possibilities that now exist on the streams above referred to. There is no question but what the producers have received substantial benefits from cheap water transportation that has been available on these rivers for the past several years.

The writer has engaged extensively in the development of water transportation from the movement of grain out of the Illinois Valley into Chicago and distributing it into eastern consuming territories, and has some familiarity with the advantages accruing to the origin areas. There is one area along

the Illinois River, not over 75 miles in length and not over an average of 50 miles in width, that has been developed more extensively than any similar area along the inland waterways. Due to the cheapness of water transportation into Chicago, there has during the past 5 years been a sum of money (at least $3,000,000) left in the communities above described that would not have remained there had this same community been obliged to depend only on rail transportation.

Three million dollars saved to a community of this size is a creditable sum. This sum of money is more than the combined capital stock of all the State and National banks in the same area. It represents the value of one hundred and fifty $20,000 farms; it would build a fine agricultural college or a fine hospital, and subsequent annual savings would likely maintain such institutions.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, that entire area benefits vastly from the use of this great inland waterway, and will benefit immeasurably more when this slack-water route is provided for the upstream traffic.

From Kansas City, Mo., Mr. Paul F Bartlett, president, Hart-Bartlett-Sturtevant Grain Co., writes:

We are prompted to write you thinking that our experience in handling grain may be of some interest. Our firm operates two terminal grain elevators, one of 3,000,000-bushel capacity located in Kansas City, Kans.; the other of 2,500,000 capacity at St. Joseph, Mo. In adition, we operate country elevators in 5 States in the Middle West Grain Belt. In the writer's opinion, when and if a 9-foot channel is provided on the Missouri, it will not be at all unusual for a producer who sells his grain to a country elevator equipped and able to load and transport grain on barges, to receive from two to five cents per bushel more than he otherwise could.

As I have pointed out before, the opposition to this great inland waterway is coming from certain railroad interests that have fought every project for the development of an inland waterway that has ever been proposed. The following statement by the Mississippi Valley Association will explain that opposition:

Our records show that in the years 1941–43, 5,203,700 bushels of grain and grain products were shipped by water from Kansas City to Chicago, St. Louis and other points on the Mississippi River system, although the movement was greatly curtailed in 1942 and 1943 due to the transfer of barges to other waterways for emergency war use. The comparative rates for water and rail representative destinations, and the savings when shipped by water are as follows:

From—	To—	Water	Rail	Savings per car of 80,000 pounds
		Cts. per cwt.	*Cts. per cwt.*	
Kansas City	St. Louis	4¼	12	$62.00
Do	Chicago	9½	16	52.00
Do	Vicksburg	12¾	21½	74.00

If the 1941–1943 water movement of grain from Kansas City were equally divided between St. Louis, Chicago, and Vicksburg, the saving in freight rates would have amounted to $244,562.

What is true with reference to the shipment of grain, is also true with reference to the shipment of beef, pork, flour, meal, cheese, condensed milk, hides, oil, gas, machinery, and all other manufactured products.

Every barge that goes downstream must return, and by the development of this Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway, the cost of that return trip will be reduced approximately 50 percent; while at the same time the swift current on the Mississippi, Missouri, and other rivers for downstream traffic will be preserved.

I again call your attention to the statement of Colonel Feringa of the Board of Army Engineers, and ask you to examine the figures at the close of his statement showing the amount of savings this inland waterway will provide for upstream traffic.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF COL. P. A. FERINGA, UNITED STATES ARMY, RESIDENT MEMBER, BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS

Colonel FERINGA. Is it your wish that I just go ahead and briefly describe the project, like the other projects?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; if you will.

Colonel FERINGA. The Tombigbee River rises in northeastern Mississippi. The point where it rises is about 20 miles from the Tennessee River. It flows in a generally southerly direction for about 410 miles until it joins the Alabama River, and from its confluence with the Alabama River it becomes the Mobile River and flows to the south 45 miles to enter Mobile Bay.

The Mobile-Tombigbee-Warrior system is a more or less parallel developed river system serving Birmingham. It is a developed waterway 9 feet deep, minimum width 200 feet. I looked up the latest figures before us and I found that in 1941 that developed waterway carried over 2,000,000 tons of commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, which one was that?

Colonel FERINGA. That is the Mobile-Tombigbee-Warrior system. I thought the figure would be interesting as the actual figure of traffic that is moving over an existing waterway generally in that area, although possibly it is not as fortunately situated.

The Tombigbee River itself has 4 feet of water from its confluence with the Alabama River to Columbus, Miss.

However, that 4 feet is available only about 4 months of the year. That again, is a waterway which is hindered by the lack of all-year-round water.

The Tombigbee is further developed slightly, just by snagging and removing of obstructions, for the next 135 miles above Columbus, Miss., so that there presently exists a waterway from the Gulf through Mobile Bay, the Alabama River, the Tombigbee River above Columbus, Miss., to fairly close to the Tennessee River. That waterway farther up its length, though not developed, through its tributaries reaches within 20 miles of the developed Tennessee River. The basin, like the Alabama-Coosa River, is rich in resources. Foremost would be agriculture, and when I was stationed in that area not so many years ago, I was struck by the richness of the soil. It goes through parts of Alabama and Mississippi where some of the most prosperous looking farms are located that I had seen up to that time. They call that part of the country the Black Belt, and it is remarkable for its development. They have recently gotten much into cattle raising, and it is a wonderfully prosperous country.

Mr. RANKIN. It is called the Black Belt because the land is black?

Colonel FERINGA. That is right, sir. It is also rich in timber resources and in minerals. The principal minerals are coal, sand and gravel, limestone, copper, zinc, iron ore, and in addition to those principal minerals there is a long list in the report showing the lesser minerals that could be developed if it were economically feasible to do so.

Before this report was submitted to Congress, to your committee, several routes were given consideration in order to develop the best one and that there might be no hesitancy on account of lack of information. It was found that the best route was from the Pickwick Pool in the Tennessee River, then down Yellow Creek, which flows, or flowed originally, into the Tennessee River and now flows into the Pickwick Pool, and Mackys Creek—Mackys Creek flowing into the East Fork of the Tombigbee, down the Tombigbee into the Mobile River, and down the Mobile River to Mobile Bay and into the Gulf.

The construction contemplates a cut through the summit. That cut would be about 39 miles long and would provide a waterway 12 feet deep by a minimum width of 115 feet. I would like to mention the fact that, although this report was made some years ago, even at that time consideration was given and the figures which support this report were based on a 12-foot excavation through the cut, possibly the most expensive part of the work, and also through the lateral canal. That was done, as it was seen that 12-foot navigation probably would be a fact in the future, and that therefore any of these expensive cuts or locks should be developed to their logical dimensions.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Colonel, that 39-mile cut, how deep would that cut have to be made?

Colonel FERINGA. That is 39 miles long, and at its deepest portion, but a comparatively short portion, I think, would reach around 175 feet from the very top of the existing ground to the very bottom of the proposed canal.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the bottom of the 12-foot cut?

Colonel FERINGA. Of the 12-foot cut. And that canal would be dug deep enough so that we would have 12 feet of water throughout its length, even though the Pickwick Pool might be lowered, due to possible inordinate low stages of water in the Tennessee River.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the bottom of that cut be on a level with the pool, Pickwick Pool?

Colonel FERINGA. The bottom of the cut would be 12 feet below the lowest possible elevation in Pickwick Pool, so we would have slack water navigation from Pickwick Pool through the summit cut until we came to the dam and lock at the end of the summit cut.

The CHAIRMAN. Where would the first lock be down from Pickwick Landing?

Colonel FERINGA. The first lock would be at a high dam and lock which would be constructed at a location called the Narrows, and that would be on the southerly end of that land cut.

The CHAIRMAN. Of that 39 miles?

Colonel FERINGA. That is right, sir. After we go through the summit cut we come to a point where there now exists the east fork of the Tombigbee River.

Mr. RANKIN. Colonel, I think you ought to explain to the judge at this point that the bed of the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, where this cut begins, is more than 100 feet higher than the Tombigbee River 20 miles away, so while we must have a lake-level canal down to the first lock, there will be a drop of 100 feet down to the level of the Tombigbee. That is correct, isn't it?

Colonel FERINGA. Yes. I think so.

Mr. RANKIN. The Tennessee River is up on a plateau 100 feet above the Tombigbee just 20 miles away, but by cutting through this sand ridge, the peak of which you said would be a little over 100 feet—by cutting through this sand ridge the canal would be on a level with the Pickwick Lake from the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, down to

the first lock, where it drops down to the level of the Tombigbee River.

Colonel FERINGA. That would be the high lock and dam. The proposed waterway would then join the present valley of the East Fork of the Tombigbee. The East Fork of the Tombigbee has a comparatively wide flood plain and is a tortuous, winding stream, so it has been found cheaper and in the interest of the project to dig a lateral canal rather than develop this tortuous part of the river. This lateral canal would be 41 miles long, again would be 12 feet deep, and a minimum width of 170 feet.

If I may, I would like to digress back to where I described the Narrows and say that that waterway, although narrow, 115 feet, would have passing places about every 4,000 feet, so that up- and down-bound tows would be able to negotiate the waterways successfully.

The CHAIRMAN. They can do that on 115 feet, cannot they, without difficulty?

Colonel FERINGA. I think they could, sir, but it might possibly be desirable to have a tow tie-up, and there would be passing places. I think it depends a whole lot on how wide the tows are, that will be carried. It was found better to have passing places available.

Mr. RANKIN. What width do you provide for these locks; 110 feet?

Colonel FERINGA. Seventy-five feet.

The CHAIRMAN. On the Intracoastal Waterway the channel width in some places is only 90 feet.

Colonel FERINGA. Yes, sir.

The lateral canal which I have been talking about would have at its lower portion one lock and dam at the mouth of East Fork, and the drop of the lateral canal to its southerly extremity would be accomplished by a series of 10 locks. From the lateral canal you go into the main stream of the Tombigbee River, which flows 211 miles to Demopolis. However, it is also a tortuous stream, and it is proposed by a series of cut-offs to reduce its length to 180 miles. This stream would be developed to 9-foot depth and 170-foot width. The locks, however, would provide for future improvement to the full 12 feet.

There is also proposed in the bill a new dam at Demopolis, and that dam would have a decidedly beneficial effect for this proposed project, and by means of that new dam at Demopolis and six other locks they would have slack-water navigation all the way up to where the Tombigbee joins the lateral canal.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Demopolis a place where the Tombigbee and the Black Warrior join?

Colonel FERINGA. Yes, sir. The total number of locks proposed for the project is 18. The locks would be 75 feet wide and 450 feet long. That is inside dimensions of the lock chamber.

The total cost of the project, which has been conservatively determined, is $66,000,000, and $500,000 for annual maintenance.

I think I have given you the over-all picture.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so; yes. Thank you very much, Colonel.

Mr. RANKIN. Colonel, this connection with the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers here would shorten the water distance from the Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico by 630 miles, would it not?

Colonel FERINGA. I think that is right, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. And it would shorten the distance from the Tennessee River to Mobile itself by approximately 1,000 miles?

Colonel FERINGA. The water distance; yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, traffic going from Mobile at the present time to the Tennessee River would have to go across to the Mississippi River and then up that tortuous stream to Cairo, Ill., and then go up the Ohio for a short distance and then up the Tennessee River. It would have to travel upstream on the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Tennessee, and go approximately 1,000 miles out of the way, whereas, if this project were completed, it could go up, as you say, the slack-water route on the Tombigbee less than half the distance, and the fuel cost for propelling the barges, boats, and so forth, would be infinitely less than it would going around the other way.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the water distance from the Tennessee River to Mobile down this Tombigbee inland waterway is about as far as it is from Vicksburg, Miss., to the mouth of the Mississippi River on the other route. So you can make those comparisons and see the vast difference it will make when this inland waterway is opened up. It will not only provide a shorter route, cut the distance for all downstream traffic on the upper Tennessee River as far up as Knoxville, and all traffic going upstream to points on the upper Tennessee by anywhere from 630 to 1,000 miles; but it would also save fighting this terrific current on the Mississippi. It would have the same effect on traffic going down this stream from the mouth of the Ohio River. It would save more than 200 miles in distance, and the up-bound traffic would probably save 50 percent of its fuel cost.

In other words, all the ascending traffic on the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Allegheny, the Monongahela, and the Wabash would use this inland slack-water route, and traffic going up even to Memphis, Tenn., from Mobile could much better afford to follow this slack-water route to the mouth of the Ohio River and then down the Mississippi to Memphis. There is only 8 miles difference in the distance of the two routes between Memphis and Mobile.

It would really be much cheaper for them to follow that route than it would to go up against the current of the Mississippi River to Memphis.

This would also furnish a protected inland water route and at the same time greatly shorten the distance from all these points, even from Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Gulf, by more than 200 miles, and it would also furnish an additional route for this traffic and furnish a slack-water route for the ascending traffic. It would be of untold advantage to the shippers who are bound to use those streams in the years to come.

Now, the engineers have gone over this proposition time and time again. There was a proposition to bring this route down what they call Bear Creek, which empties into the Tennessee River exactly on the line between Alabama and Mississippi, but it was found that in order to do so we would have to have a lift coming up to the top of the ridge from the north as well as one from the south, with no sufficient water supply at the summit.

Individuals appeared here to advocate cutting across from the Warrior River to the Tennessee, but they found it would be impractical because they would have to have lifts through that mountainous country in there, hilly country—they would have to have lifts from the Warrior River up to the crest of the ridge, and also would have to have lifts from the Tennessee up to the crest of the ridge——

The CHAIRMAN. Those routes have all been rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. And there was no water supply at the summit, but on this route your summit is in the Pickwick Lake, so you have ample water, all the water that is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. How high is Pickwick Landing Dam? Do you recall, Colonel?

Colonel FERINGA. I have seen it, but I don't know its height.

Mr. RANKIN. The Tennessee River, I will say to the chairman, was about 100 feet above the Tombigbee before the Pickwick Landing Dam was built. The Pickwick Dam raised the water level at the mouth of Yellow Creek about 50 feet. So really, the Tennessee River now is approximately 150 feet above the Tombigbee.

All the locks on the Tennessee above Pickwick Landing are narrow, I believe, 60 feet. That is right, isn't it?

Colonel FERINGA. I think you are right.

Mr. RANKIN. And the ones below Pickwick Landing are 110 feet. There are only two below Pickwick Landing—Pickwick and Gilbertsville, and they are both 110 feet wide, so these 75-foot vessels would have no trouble in going into the Mississippi River coming from the Tennessee, and all the vessels that now use the upper Tennessee would be able to use this Tombigbee route.

The CHAIRMAN. If I remember correctly, the locks on the Warrior River are about 50 feet, are they not?

Colonel FERINGA. They are, sir. There is one larger one, but all of them except one are 50 feet.

Mr. RANKIN. With the exception, Mr. Chairman, of one other place, and that is the connection of the Don and Volga, there is no other place on earth that I have ever been able to find where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to the other with so much saving in distance, so much ease, and so little expense.

So there, with a short connection and with these locks down to the mouth of the Warrior River on the Tombigbee, we can complete one of the greatest inland waterways in the world and connect it up with the entire island waterway system of the whole United States. I hope I have not overdrawn that picture, Colonel.

Colonel FERINGA. I don't think you have a bit, Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important waterway projects in America. With the possible exception of the one in Russia, connecting the Volga River with the Don, which I have mentioned before, there is no other place on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, at so little expense, and with such enormous saving in transportation costs and distances.

It is now 1,121 miles by water from the junction of this proposed Tombigbee inland waterway with the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, to the Gulf at New Orleans, and 156 miles from New Orleans to Mobile.

By this new Tombigbee route, it would be 491 miles from the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek to the Gulf at Mobile, or 630 miles nearer than to the Gulf at New Orleans down the present route, and 786 miles nearer to Mobile. In other words, instead of following the old route down the Tennessee, the Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers down to New Orleans, 1,121 miles, and then going along the Intracoastal Waterway 156 miles to Mobile, a total distance of 1,277 miles, traffic would simply go down this Tombigbee route to Mobile, a distance of 491 miles, saving, as I said, 786 miles, or almost two-thirds of the distance.

All points on the upper Tennessee River clear to Knoxville would be 786 miles nearer to Mobile by water than they are today and 630 miles nearer than to the Gulf at New Orleans.

All points on the Ohio above Paducah would be 356 miles nearer to Mobile and 200 miles nearer New Orleans.

All points on the upper Mississippi and its tributaries, all the way up to Chicago, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, would be 108 miles nearer to New Orleans by water and 264 miles nearer to Mobile.

Even Hickman, Ky., which is on the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Ohio, would be 36 miles nearer to New Orleans and 144 miles nearer to Mobile; while Memphis, Tenn., would be 38 miles nearer to Mobile via the Tombigbee route than it is by the present route, and only 123 miles farther from New Orleans.

This new route would reduce the water distance from Birmingham, Ala., to the Ten-

nessee River from 1,687 miles by the present route to 441 miles by the Tombigbee route—a saving of 1,246 miles, or approximately three-fourths of the distance. It would place Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, and Demopolis 1,246 miles nearer to Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia, Guntersville, Chattanooga, or Knoxville, by water transportation than they are now, and provide a slack-water route for the ascending traffic that would greatly reduce the fuel cost per mile traveled.

It would restore navigation on the Tombigbee and cut the water distance from Columbus, Miss., to the Tennessee River from 1,635 miles to 133 miles, a saving of 1,502 miles, placing Columbus 1,502 miles nearer Chattanooga or Knoxville.

It would reduce the water distance from Aberdeen, Miss., to the Tennessee River from 1,673 miles to 95 miles, placing Aberdeen 1,578 miles nearer all points on the upper Tennessee, and greatly reduce the distance to all points on the upper Ohio, clear to Pittsburgh, Pa., as well as to all points on the upper Mississippi and its tributaries.

It would cut the water distance from Amory, Miss., or Cotton Gin Port, to the Tennessee River, from 1,690 to 78 miles, placing it 1,585 miles nearer to all points on the upper Tennessee, to say nothing of the saving in distances to all points on the upper Ohio and the upper Mississippi and their tributaries.

It would cut the water distance from Fulton, Miss., to the Tennessee River from 1,711 miles to 57 miles, placing Fulton 1,654 miles closer to all points on the upper Tennessee, and likewise reduce the distances to all points on the upper Ohio and the upper Mississippi.

Columbus, Aberdeen, Amory, or Cotton Gin Port, and Fulton were at one time served by steamboat traffic on the Tombigbee River. This project will restore that traffic with these enormous savings in distance, as well as in the costs of transportation.

I know it will be said that the Army engineers never approved this project until 1939. But it must be remembered that it was not considered as feasible as it is now until the present dams were constructed on the Tennessee River. Those dams not only made the Tennessee River navigable but the Pickwick Dam raised the water level 50 feet at the mouth of Yellow Creek, the terminus of this Tombigbee Canal, making it possible to construct and operate this project without any lifts from the Tennessee River, since the summit of the project will be in the Tennessee River, in the lake behind Pickwick Dam. The water level in the Tennessee River at this place is now about 150 feet above the level of the Tombigbee River, only a few miles away, with just a slight sand ridge to cut through to make the connection.

Again, I say, it is the most feasible project of its kind to be found anywhere in the United States.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is any way to overdraw that picture, and I don't think anything can be added to what JOHN RANKIN has said. He has been making a study of this all his life and certainly has it well in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been very long.

Mr. BOYKIN. No; not very long, and when he gets to talking about this he gets younger, and what I hope is that we will be able to put this in pretty soon, while we are all here to see it. It is just what he says about it, one of the greatest undeveloped waterways on earth.

Mr. RANKIN. It will provide employment, Mr. Chairman, for about 6,000 men. Is that right?

Mr. BOYKIN. I think the figure has been stated at 6,000 that it will employ. Is that right, Colonel?

Colonel FERINGA. I think that figure has been stated, but I really don't recall.

Mr. RANKIN. Between five and six thousand, if I remember correctly.

Colonel FERINGA. I think it practically stands on its own feet regardless of the employment feature, and the employment benefits will just be an added feature.

Mr. RANKIN. I think you are entirely right, but I want to add this proposition: One of our greatest problems when this war is over is going to be the absorption of unemployment.

Mr. BOYKIN. And that is one thing this committee wants to do.

Mr. RANKIN. This is one project that will take up five or six thousand men and keep them employed for several years, until this project is completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McCann has given me the figures on the Pickwick Landing Dam. The height of it is 110 feet, and the lift at the lock is 61 feet.

Mr. RANKIN. Pickwick Landing is some little distance below the mouth of Yellow Creek, and m recollection is that it raises the water only about 50 feet at that point, so it makes the Tennessee River at that point about 150 feet higher than the Tombigbee River, 20 miles away. That is my recollection, Colonel.

Colonel FERINGA. I don't know the exact figures, but it will be taken care of by the high dam and the canal through the narrows and the slack-water pool, which is really an extension of the Pickwick Pool.

Mr. RANKIN. That's right. Down to where the first drop takes place it will merely be an extension of the Pickwick Pool. Now, some gentlemen from Tennessee got excited for fear we were going to take water out of the Tennessee River and let it go down to the Tombigbee, but this will just take enough water to run that first lock. The water used for operating the other locks on this project will come from Browns Creek, Mackys Creek, and the Tombigbee River itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is any portion of the Tombigbee above Demopolis now under improvement for navigation?

Colonel FERINGA. Yes; there is 4-foot navigation for 4 months of the year from the confluence with the Black Warrior all the way to Columbus, Miss. For 4 months of the year there is 4 feet of water.

Mr. RANKIN. And the river is legally navigable up to the confluence of Browns Creek and Mackys Creek.

Colonel FERINGA. That is about 160 miles farther up.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the decision in the New River case it is navigable anywhere.

Mr. RANKIN. But the point I make is that in the old days when my grandfather first went there the steamboats during the high-water season, in the latter part of the winter and early spring, navigated that river up to a place called Walkers Bridge, just a few miles below the confluence of Browns and Mackys Creeks.

I can remember when the steamboats came up above Aberdeen. There was a time when they not only navigated the main stream of the Tombigbee, what the chairman calls the East Fork, but they also navigated the West Fork of the Tombigbee, which does not show on this map, to a place called Comargo. That was my great-grandfather's shipping point. He shipped his cotton from there to Mobile, up to about the time of the Civil War. The Mobile & Ohio Railway went through there in 1856, and the railroads have been fighting the waterways ever since. But up to that time that river was the main artery of commerce, and by putting in these locks and making these improvements you will not only add a most necessary length to our present inland waterway system but you will also provide one of the most necessary and most feasible developments of its kind on earth, as I said before, except that one connection between the Don and the Volga Rivers down near Stalingrad, I believe it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, who will we have next?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as the lawyers say, the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur takes care of this proposition. That is that the thing speaks for itself, and with the colonel's explanation, and with those maps and the physical facts, I think they are sufficient to answer any arguments against it.

Colonel FERINGA. Mr. Chairman, Mr. RANKIN asked me, with your permission, to put into the record the saving in waterway distances to Gulf ports. May I place that table in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(The table of waterway distances to Gulf ports referred to and submitted by the witness is as follows:)

Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway

WATERWAY DISTANCES TO GULF PORTS

From—	To Gulf at New Orleans via Mississippi River	To Gulf at Mobile via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings	
			Miles	Percent
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,718	1,610	108	
Chicago	1,398	1,290	108	7½
St. Louis	1,043	935	108	10
Cairo	860	752	108	12½
Hickman	824	788	36	4
Pittsburgh	1,841	1,641	200	11
Cincinnati	1,379	1,179	200	14½
Louisville	1,236	1,036	200	16
Paducah	906	706	200	22
Chattanooga	1,370	740	630	46
Wilson Dam	1,165	535	630	54
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal	1,121	491	630	56.2

DISTANCES VIA TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY VERSUS EXISTING WATER ROUTES

From—	To—	Distance via present waterways	Distance via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings in miles via Tennessee-Tombigbee	
		Miles	*Miles*	*Miles*	*Percent*
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal.	Fulton, Miss.	1,711	57	1,654	96.7
Do	Aberdeen, Miss.	1,673	95	1,578	94.3
Do	Columbus, Miss.	1,635	133	1,502	91.9
Do	Demopolis, Ala.	1,507	261	1,246	82.7
Do	Birmingham, Ala.	1,687	441	1,246	73.9

Mr. RANKIN. Colonel Feringa, I wish you would insert, at this point, a statement of the comparative average costs of water transportation via existing routes and via the proposed Tombigbee-Tennessee waterway.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"COMPARATIVE AVERAGE COSTS OF WATER TRANSPORTATION VIA EXISTING ROUTES AND VIA THE PROPOSED TOMBIGBEE-TENNESSEE WATERWAY

"The following computations are based on the average performance of a representative tow of one 1200-horsepower Diesel towboat and 8 barges of various standard types and dimensions loaded with a typical mixed cargo, at 55 percent load factor, of 3,500 revenue tons, to and from locations previously mentioned:

"Over-all cost per hour	$21.25
Average speed of tow in slack water (miles)	5½
Cost per mile in slack water	$3.86
Average current in Mississippi River below Cairo (miles per hour)	2½
Cost per mile against 2½ miles per hour current	$7.08
Cost per mile with 2½ miles per hour current	$2.66
Average lockage time:	
Tennessee-Ohio River section 30 minutes	$11
Tombigbee section 45 minutes	$16
Warrior section 1 hour	$21
New Orleans to Cairo via Mississippi River, 860 miles in slack water (no lockages)	$6,273
New Orleans to Cairo via Tombigbee-Tennessee, 908 miles in slack water, $3,504; 24 lockages, $364	$3,868
Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	2,405
New Orleans to Paducah via Mississippi River:	
866 miles against current	6,273
46 miles in slack water	177
2 lockages	22
	6,472
New Orleans to Paducah via Tombigbee-Tennessee:	
826 miles in slack water	3,327
22 lockages	342
	3,669
Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	2,803
New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Mississippi River:	
886 miles against current	6,273
261 miles in slack water	1,007
4 lockages	44
	7,324
New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Tombigbee River:	
647 miles in slack water	2,497
20 lockages	320
	2,817
Saving per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	4,507"

Similarly, the cost comparisons between other points on the inland waterways via the two routes are as follows:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi River			Via Tombigbee River			Saving per trip via Tombigbee River
		Running	Lockages	Total	Running	Lockages	Total	
Mobile	Cairo	$6,875	0	$6,875	$3,221	$364	$3,585	$3,290
	Paducah	7,052	522	7,074	3,044	342	3,386	3,688
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	7,882	44	7,926	2,214	320	2,534	5,392
Port Birmingham	Cairo	8,458	279	8,737	2,710	579	3,289	5,448
	Paducah	8,635	301	8,936	2,732	557	3,089	5,847
	Tombigbee junction	9,465	323	9,788	1,702	535	2,237	7,551
Demopolis	Cairo	7,763	32	7,795	2,015	332	2,347	5,448
	Paducah	7,940	54	7,994	1,837	310	2,147	5,847
	Tombigbee junction	8,770	76	8,846	1,007	288	1,295	7,551
Columbus	Cairo	8,257	96	8,353	1,521	268	1,789	6,564
	Paducah	8,434	118	8,552	1,343	246	1,589	6,963
	Tombigbee junction	9,264	140	9,404	513	224	737	8,667
Aberdeen	Cairo	8,403	128	8,531	1,375	236	1,611	6,920
	Paducah	8,580	150	8,730	1,197	214	1,411	7,319
	Tombigbee junction	9,410	192	9,602	367	192	559	9,043
Fulton	Cairo	8,546	224	8,770	1,229	140	1,369	7,401
	Paducah	8,726	246	8,972	1,051	118	1,169	7,803
	Tombigbee junction	9,556	268	9,824	221	96	317	9,507

It should be noted that the cost tables have been prepared using the best figures presently available. An average current of 2½ miles per hour against upstream traffic has been set up for the Mississippi, this rate of flow being assumed in the tables to compensate for the necessary double tripping through the cut-offs and crossing from bank to bank to avoid breasting the full force of adverse currents. Arbitrary time factors for lockages of one-half hour for Ohio River types; three-fourths hour for the proposed Tombigbee type; and 1 hour for Warrior type locks have been used in the absence of any definite figures therefor and lack of time for having test runs. No time was available for field check; hence the figures were prepared from composite office data.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to me under date of November 3, 1943, Colonel Feringa also submitted figures to show the cost per ton-mile of transporting oil by rail, by tankers, by pipe lines, by barges, and by railroads. I quote from that letter, as follows:

There is also herewith a table showing comparative costs per ton-mile of tankers, barges, pipe lines, and railroads. These figures were used by the Chief of Engineers in his address at Corpus Christi, Tex., on April 18, 1942, at the dedication of the extension of the Intracoastal Waterway:

	Mills per ton-mile
Rail tank car	8.3
Deep-draft tanker	1.25
Pipe line	3
Barge	2–5.5

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said before, and what the testimony of the Army engineers shows that this great project will not only furnish water transportation for a great section of the country that is in dire need of it, and greatly shorten the water distance between all points on the Gulf of Mexico and all points on the Tennessee River, the Ohio River, the upper Mississippi River, and the Missouri River, and all their tributaries, including the Cumberland, the Wabash, the Allegheny, and the Monongahela, and in that way greatly aid the marketing of products from these areas, but it will also furnish the cheapest possible method of transporting the great oil supplies of the South and Southwest to the markets of that area at reduced costs to both producers and consumers.

It is the most feasible and the most desirable inland waterway project to be found in America.

Important Matters Affecting the Nation After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, in the great northwestern State of Montana, that I have the honor to represent, our hardships are not altogether due to the remoteness from market, the severity of our winters, nor the droughts that frequently visit us. My people are fully aware that political denseness, oversight, and neglect on the part of their national lawmakers can be as devastating and calamitous to them as the vagaries of climate. And they are with justice asking that certain alleviating laws be enacted by the Federal Government which would do much toward mitigating the physical hardships their environment forces them to undergo.

My people are as ready as ny other on earth to sanction a good-neighbor policy toward all the world, but they are not willing to impoverish themselves in expressing their desire to be good neighbors to the rest of the world. They cannot see that to lower their standard of living will in any manner help to raise the standards of backward countries. And they are firm in their belief that the best way to demonstrate their interest in their less fortunate foreign neighbors is to show them by example that the broad highway to prosperity lies through adopting the American methods of production and then to cooperate with us in attaining constant improvement in equitable distribution. My people believe that the good-neighbor policy should begin at home; that before going abroad with our benevolence we should see to it that no American citizens shall be compelled to live in abject poverty and ignorance such as afflicts millions of subjects living in the countries toward which we have almost forcibly been wafting our good-neighbor policies.

My people are chiefly engaged in agricultural pursuits and in stock raising. They cannot see that to lower our tariff barriers and allow the grains and the meats to pour across our borders from countries whose living standards are far below ours and competing with them in our own markets can possibly be of benefit to the foreigners or to us. Our own importers are the only ones who benefit from these foreign shipments, for, of course, they buy the grains and meats in foreign markets at the prevailing pauper prices abroad; these importers exhibit a total disregard for the good-neighbor principle as it applies to our own citizens who live by producing these same food products. Millions of bushels of grains and millions of pounds of meats from abroad are flooding our markets every year with the effect of holding prices for similar products down below the cost of production. My people are strenuously objecting to this. They are vehement in asserting that to continue this national neglect to rectify the tariff laws not only fails to benefit the foreigner but does drastically injure them—my people—through curtailing their buying power for American-made goods and thus injuring all Americans.

My people have gone through terrible hardships during the past decade, due to unjust freight rates, inclement weather, and the great depression. They have suffered most from the latter cause, and while they know that the control of the weather is beyond them, they are firmly convinced that depressions are man-made affairs and that there is no rational reason for permitting them to afflict us with their devastation. I am in thorough accord with them in this decision. I am convinced and my people are convinced that a proper control of money by the Government would make depressions impossible, while banker control will make their recurrence inevitable. I do not attribute any Machiavellian purpose on the part of bankers to force depressions on the Nation, but bankers are human beings, subject to timidity and fear, like the rest of us. They are a comparatively small group in our population. To allow them entire control over the circulation of money—a commodity that is so essential to the welfare of all of us—is as senseless as it would be to give control of all the water we use to a handful of men.

Money is the lifeblood of commercial business. To restrict its use, its flow into any community, is to sound the death knell of business in that community and destitution of its people. Money can be likened to the blood in our bodies. Deprive any member of the body of its blood and in a short time that member will die for want of nourishment. Leaving the control of this vital blood of business in the exclusive hands of bankers is folly of the first magnitude. We saw what happened in 1929 when the banking fraternity became fearful of their investments and ordered all banks to call their loans and restrict their credits. Business was paralyzed from one end of the country to the other. The 10-year depression that followed this unofficial order ran up a cost on the citizenship of America beyond all computation. It must not happen again. The control of the flow of money must inhere in the National Government itself. We must never again resort to the folly of trying to offset the shortage of money movement by restricting the output of goods—plowing under crops, killing off meat animals, and so forth, for the purpose of holding prices at a high level.

When this war ends, if we are not foresighted enough to insure against it, we are likely to see business paralyzed again by a tightening up on the flow of money. We are bound to have a period of great unemployment when the war ends. Unless our Government establishes a system that will take the place of wage spending, which is now going on at an unprecedented pace, and sets up a compensatory movement of money in lieu of wages, there will be an immediate business slump that will discourage all new business ventures, frighten capital into hiding and precipitate us back into a worse depression than we have ever dreamed of. Every family in this land of ours is saddled with a share of the national debt to the tune of more than $10,000. If business is permitted to die, how will that debt ever be paid? No; we must not let business die. We must insure, now, that it shall not die for want of wage and salary expenditure.

But how shall we insure against this threatening collapse of business? The answer is obvious: Something must be done, some system adopted that will serve to keep money flowing steadily into every community in the land in lieu of wages and salaries. If money is moving steadily and dependably in every community, no matter how it gets there, business will not die. Little business will be encouraged to open up and big business will be sustained.

Such a system has been offered the Government for the past 10 years and the offer has been flouted. It is offered to this Congress and has been available to it since the Congress first convened. This system is embodied in House bill numbered 1649. It is a proposed national, mutual, all-citizens' insurance against the hazards of life, such as the incapacities of old age, sickness, accidents that cripple and maim, widowhood, with the support of children entailed. One-tenth of our entire population can at all times be classified as unemployable if we include the men and women above the age of 60 years together with the sick, crippled, blind, and otherwise helpless. The bill proposes that movement of money be maintained at all times by paying these incapacitated ones an equal amount each month from an insurance fund that will be collected each month through a gross income tax of 3 percent levied against all individual and business incomes of whatever character that results from the selling of goods and services. The tax will be collected monthly and paid out monthly and will be distributed into every community in the land in the proportion that the unemployables bear to the entire population, which on the average is 10 percent.

Thus the steady flow of money throughout our population will be established under national control and become our national insurance against depressions; insurance against the national ravages of disease and crime and despair that afflict a nation when millions of its citizens are dead broke. Here is a proposed law that will cost the Nation nothing if enacted, for it will set in motion a movement of money that will be collected from the profit stream monthly and returned again into it monthly, but it will steadily augment business, and business is the only thing that I know of that creates wealth. I advise all my colleagues to study H. R. 1649.

Encroachment on American Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address delivered by me May 25, over the Blue Network, entitled "Encroachment on American Liberties":

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, President Roosevelt and his governmental creatures, with the open aid of the Communist Party, are attempting to bring to an end the traditional American way of life.

Law means as little to the New Deal as its broken promises. The President's loyal satellites will tell you that plain English does not mean anything.

Justice Felix Frankfurter, of the United States Supreme Court, in a dissenting opinion, recently observed: "The notion that because the words of a statute are plain, its meaning is also plain, is merely pernicious oversimplification."

Let it be said about the New Deal and its bureaucratic satellites they have never engaged in any oversimplification in their interpretation and administration of the acts of Congress—at least, not in recent years; nor have they indulged in any degree of oversimplification in the drawing up and issuance of their thousands of edicts and regulations which have provoked the citizens of this country into a state of confusion never dreamed of.

What Justice Frankfurter say in this "learned" opinion is that Congress, the representatives of the people, do not really mean what they intend when they enact a law, but that it remains for the brilliant and superendowed New Deal "brain trusters" and bureaucrats to interpret and construe what the Congress really had in mind. This is dangerous dictum for Justice Frankfurter and a dangerous practice for the bureaucratic hierachy. They should keep in mind that if our democracy and system of government is to survive, it must function as the Constitution intended and not by White House directives and bureaucratic edicts. Congress is the law-making branch of our Government. This simple and yet essential fact has deliberately and wantonly been ignored by many of our Government officials

who have seized upon the emergency of war to attempt to relegate the Congress to an insignificant role in our governmental system.

I regret to say that in recent years there has developed within the New Deal administration, a growing and dangerous trend to ignore and treat with contempt the Congress of the United States. This trend, however, is not limited to those in the bureaucratic New Deal but extends and gets strong encouragement from certain groups in the United States who are intent upon destroying our Republic and substituting a totalitarian system. Their attack is aimed at the Congress because they know that so long as the parliamentary system prevails unimpaired so will our democracy live. I do not have the time tonight to deal with the outside groups who are bent on this course, but I should like to go into some detail regarding the efforts within the Government to defy and undermine the legislative branch of the Government.

A number of things have happened recently which should focus attention on this strange and undemocratic procedure. The President's order to seize control of a great department store in Chicago, which resulted in the physical eviction of the head of that concern, was never authorized by the Congress. Of late the President has not found it necessary to come to the Congress. All he need do is to command his obedient Attorney General, who can forthwith, without the slightest deliberation, furnish him with a decision to justify almost anything, whether it be the seizing of a business concern or refusing on the grounds that it's "against the public interest" to supply the Congress with the subversive record of a Government employee.

When Congress empowered the Office of Price Administration to establish rationing and price control it was believed that this action was being taken solely to combat the rising tide of uncontrolled inflation. But within a year Congress learned that this agency it had created had a far broader conception of its powers over the American way of life.

So confident was O. P. A. of its opportunity, and of its legal or illegal right, to devise its own bureaucratic program, Congress was forced to conduct a searching investigation of its complex and amazing activities. "Near dictatorship" was the verdict issued by the special House investigating committee, headed by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia. The Smith committee complaint required a 30-page report, which charged O. P. A. with flagrantly misinterpreting acts of Congress, setting up its own Nation-wide system of espionage and judicial tribunals, scheming to establish control of profits without sanction of Congress, maintaining an army of snooping enforcement officials, and attempting to avoid legal review of its self-written edicts of the war as the supreme opportunity to dissolve the fundamental rights of the American people.

When the President decided to set up an agency to engage in economic warfare with the Axis, he didn't bother to consult the Congress, he simply issued an Executive order and brought into being the Board of Economic Warfare, an agency which he placed under the direction of Mr. HENRY WALLACE, that dreamer of dreams who loves the stars and imagines in his simple faith that they are all ardent New Dealers. This Bureau, which the President created, spent millions and millions of dollars and employed thousands of experts, including such outstanding economists as Maurice Parmelee, authority and practitioner of nudism and John Bovingdon of dancing fame, before the Congress had an opportunity to pass upon its worth or activities.

And then there is that strange phenomenon in our governmental set-up known as the Writers War Board. It is neither fish nor fowl. It was certainly not created by Congress, but, nevertheless, it is very much a part of that much-discussed agency known as the Office of War Information. That this Board enjoys the privileges of a quasi governmental agency is clearly evident from a most recent statement of Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of O. W. I., which I quote:

"Neither the members of the Board nor any of its writers are paid for the service they render Government agencies. In consideration of their usefulness and the value of their contributions, however, this Office [O. W. I.] furnishes office space, clerical help, and some research assistance in connection with writing projects undertaken at the instance of the Government. Projects undertaken by the Board without Government sponsorship and writings by individual Board members are, of course, undertaken on their own responsibility in the capacity of private citizens."

In other words, the Government furnishes the facilities and some of the research assistance and the Writers War Board furnishes the brains. Now this Board is headed by one Rex Stout, who may be remembered as a former associate editor of the Communist magazine New Masses. Mr. Stout recently wrote and published A Message calling for the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt and pointing out how disastrous it would be should a Republican be elected. Let me quote for a few moments from this fourth-term propaganda message written by the head of this quasi-government board:

"Imagine him (a Republican President) at a table with Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek. They will know, and he will know, that he is there because our isolationists, our chauvinists, our reactionaries, our labor-baiters, our anti-Semites, our home-grown Fascists, helped to put him there. Even if he possessed a loftiness of mind that enabled him to ignore the obligation of an elected person to service the interest of those who helped to elect him, the other three could not know that and would under no circumstances believe it. Whenever he spoke they would cock their ears and watch him like a hawk."

A more ridiculous and insulting message to the electorate of the United States was never written, and when we consider that it was penned by the head of a fourth term propaganda mill financed and maintained by the Government and without any authority from Congress, it is, to my mind, time for a housecleaning.

Last year the Appropriations Committee of the House investigated certain Government officials who had been termed "unfit for Government service." After careful hearings and review of these cases, the Congress amended the appropriation acts to provide that no part of the funds should be paid to these employees. Such action was necessary because the executive heads refused to obey the mandate of Congress and dismiss them. The President promptly replied to this action on the part of Congress by stating that the Congress had no right to say who would be on the Government pay roll. He was again supported in this contention by the Attorney General, who publicly suggested that these Government employees remain on the pay roll and file action in the Court of Claims for their salary. Mr. Biddle advised the Congress that he would not defend the Government in the suit, and it was necessary for the House of Representatives to employ special counsel to defend the Government.

Recently the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, served a subpena on the President of the Civil Service Commission, asking him to produce the complete files of 30 Government employees who had been charged with subversive and disloyal activities. To our surprise, the President of the Commission wrote back that he declined to comply with the subpena and that he was acting with the approval of and at the direction of the President of the United States. He gave as the reason that it would be "against the public interest" to supply the Congress with the personnel files of these suspected Government employees; and here again we find one of the Attorney General's "celebrated" opinions being relied upon by the President and the Commission in refusing to supply this information to the Congress.

Now I ask, Why should the President take such extraordinary precautions to keep the Congress and the public in ignorance of the records of 30 persons in key positions in the Government whose loyalty to our American system has been questioned? What information or evidence could there be in the files of a Federal employee which would be "against the public interest"? I can easily understand that certain information in these files would probably be against the interest of the New Deal but certainly not against the interest of the Nation. Is it not fundamental that if the Congress is to provide the funds to pay the salary of a Government employee that certainly it should have the right to examine the files and records of those who are suspected of disloyalty?

As a matter of fact, the Attorney General seems to be so busily engaged in preparing opinions that he has not had time to prosecute any of the Communist officials who, 4 years ago, were cited by the Congress for contempt. Not one of them has been brought to trial as is provided under United States statutes, and I am sure it is confusing to you to understand why the Communists in this country, whom the Attorney General himself has found "advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence," enjoy such a privileged status with the New Deal. The Congress cannot get the files of Government employees accused of Communist activities. The Attorney General refuses to carry out the law in prosecuting Communists in contempt of the United States Congress. Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party, is pardoned from a Federal penitentiary by the President in the interest of "national unity," and the Department of Justice recently announced that they would not deport Mrs. Browder, who was illegally in the United States.

Although difficult to appreciate, the answer is plain why Communists are treated with such favor by the New Deal. It is politically expedient to keep them happy. The Communist Party has developed a tremendous following in our Nation, with the encouragement of the administration, and their strength at the polls—100 percent for the New Deal—is something to be reckoned with.

That this Communist coddling has borne fruit is ably summed up in an article by Mark Sullivan, appearing in the Washington Post this past Monday. Mr. Sullivan states, and I quote:

"The most radical political party in the United States, the Communist (now calling themselves the Communist Political Association), endorsed President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

"In another left-wing political party, the American Labor Party, a group led by the party's head passed a resolution declaring, '* * * steps are being taken to mobilize the great army of A. L. P. voters * * * behind President Roosevelt.'

"Another left-wing party, a split-off from the American Labor Party, somewhat less left wing than the latter, calling itself the Liberal Party, formally nominated President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

"The most left wing of the national labor organizations, the C. I. O., acting through its committee for political action, endorsed President Roosevelt for a fourth term."

Now then, what can we do about this—this flaunting of the law—this riding rough-

shod over the will of the people as expressed by their duly elected representatives—this bending the knee to the Communists, the avowed enemies of our America? There is only one way to meet them and that is for every man and woman in America who loves his country, who loves our Constitution, and who venerates our Declaration of Independence, who believes in the system of free enterprise, and the opportunity of every citizen to live his life under our system of law, to go to the polls in November and vote to rid ourselves forever of this New Deal and its leaders. Wake up, America.

New Ward Plant Seizure Exposes Avery's Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of May 23, 1944:

NEW WARD PLANT SEIZURE EXPOSES AVERY'S HYPOCRISY

The House of Representatives yesterday began its investigation of the Army's seizure of the Montgomery Ward store in Chicago. Not many hours before the Government had seized another subsidiary of Montgomery Ward, the Hummer Manufacturing Co. plant, 70 percent of whose output is for the war effort.

Neither of these developments, however, changes the basic picture. That picture should not be confused. It boils down to this:

Sewell Avery and the Ward management will not cooperate with the War Labor Board or the Federal Government or obey the orders of either.

Much legalistic controversy has been employed to confuse the public on seizure of the Ward store in Chicago. It was not, we were told, a war plant. The W. L. B. therefore had no authority where it was concerned. It was argued that the C. I. O. union did not represent a majority of Ward employees, and hence there was no necessity for Avery to bargain with them.

But the one thing that mattered, the cause of the strike was: Avery refused to sign a maintenance-of-membership contract with the union as directed by the W. L. B.

He had refused that a year ago, when the C. I. O. union won a plant election. After the recent second election, in which the C. I. O. won again, Avery still insisted he would not sign the contract specified by the W. L. B.

That same issue is behind the dispute in the Hummer plant.

Avery is boss of this plant, too. Here, again, the management has refused to sign a maintenance-of-membership contract.

But in the Hummer case all the legalistic obfuscation woven about seizure of the Ward store is stripped away. The firm is clearly engaged in war work. The W. L. B. has jurisdiction beyond dispute or quibbling. There is no claim that the union does not represent the employees.

The only real issue here, as in the case of the Ward store, is whether Sewell Avery can tell the United States Government to go to hell in the midst of a war for survival—and get away with it.

Any congressional probe which does not keep these facts clearly in the record will not be worth the taxpayers' money spent on it.

Finally, to those who are anxious to be legalistic about this matter, we cite a recent decision by Justice MacSwinford, in the United States District Court for western Kentucky. Denying a plea for an injunction to end Army seizure of the Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp plant, of Owensboro, Ky., after its officials defied the W. L. B., Justice MacSwinford said:

"Did the President act arbitrarily in ordering the facilities to be taken over by the Army? Proof that he did so act shall be upon him who asserts it.

"If this seems to be an extreme view, it should be called to the attention of those who so claim that, with the country at war fighting for its very existence, extremities are commonplace. No war hysteria should prompt the adoption of basically unsound legal reasoning; neither should blind complacency or a false sense of the country's security cause the courts of the land to grant to those charged with preserving the Nation less than the full measure of constitutional and legislative authority."

Here, in essence, was the argument of Attorney General Biddle in the Ward case.

Our courts seem to know there's a war on, even if Avery does not.

The Road Through China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the lend-lease extension bill appearing in the RECORD of April 19, 1944, I drew attention to a new offensive Japan has started along the Peiping-Hankow railway line—a move which, according to the A. P. correspondent in Chungking, is interpreted by military authorities there as the beginning of a Japanese drive to establish a north and south land communication line across China. I pointed out that as Japan's shipping lines continue to suffer it is only natural that she will attempt to strengthen her land communications, especially in China, where she is not only vulnerable to attack but in which country she will conceivably require to make her last line of defense outside of the home islands themselves.

On April 20 the New York Times carried an editorial headed "The road through China," in which this latest Japanese move is regarded as an attempt to better their land communications because of the damage Chennault's planes and American submarines are inflicting along their shipping lanes:

THE ROAD THROUGH CHINA

Resumption of fighting in China may mean merely that spring has come again. But the direction of the present Japanese attack suggests that the invader is being forced by necessity to open an alternate land route to supply his armies in Burma. General Chennault's bombers and our American submarines have made the convenient sea lanes through the Formosa Strait too hazardous.

The Peiping-Canton railway cuts straight down through the heart of China. It is the natural land link between Japan's great pool of military strength in Manchukuo and her forces assembled in Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, and Burma. But it is a broken link. The Chinese hold long stretches of the trunk line both north and south of Hankow, the central junction in which the enemy is firmly established. Since the beginning of the war the Japanese have repeatedly tried to open this road to traffic, thus far in vain. Last year they were blocked on the southern section by their failure to take Changsha. This year they are attacking the northern section, halfway between Peiping and Hankow, in a three-pronged drive from Chungmow in Honan Province.

It will take a real offensive to wrest this railroad from the Chinese, as the latest reports of heavy fighting attest. If the enemy succeeds in the north an even greater effort will be required in the south toward Canton. Rail communication was not absolutely vital to the Japanese as long as their water routes remained open. But now their marine transport is cut by an estimated third and their remaining ships must run a gantlet along the China coast, with American planes frequently overhead. Even though their vessels sail chiefly by night their losses are growing. Meanwhile Allied pressure in Burma has increased supply problems on that front as Imphal holds and Allied forces redouble their efforts at Kohima to the north. British naval forces are gathering in the Bay of Bengal and the American fleet is closer to the Philippines. If the Japanese are ever going to establish through communications on the continent itself this spring and summer may offer them their last chance.

Mr. Churchill Keeps Us Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 25, 1944:

MR. CHURCHILL KEEPS US INFORMED

It's a good thing for war news-hungry Americans that Prime Minister Churchill from time to time makes a full-dress report to the British Nation.

By this means we are able to pick up items of interest upon which our own Government either maintains a dark and mysterious silence or which it mentions casually with a disquieting lack of clarity and thoroughness.

Thus we learn from Mr. Churchill's address to the Commons yesterday that Turkey, by failing to join up with the Allies, has sacrificed a strong position at the peace table; that internal strife and mutinous conditions in Greece some weeks ago were very serious; that in Jugoslavia Mihailovitch is definitely out of allied favor and Tito definitely in.

We learn, moreover, that Britain and America are in closer agreement on a policy toward France than had been thought and that General de Gaulle is going to London for belated talks; that Britain is fully committed to a lenient attitude toward Spain and will not tolerate criticism of the Franco Government; that, in British estimation, the Atlantic Charter in no way binds the Allies in determining the future of Germany.

The important point about Mr. Churchill's speeches, apart from the news they invariably contain, is that they not only highlight the course of the war but present a full satisfying political picture of the world.

From no member of our own Government do we obtain reports comparable in breadth, depth, and perspective with those of the Prime Minister. That we do not receive from our own officials well-rounded statements on the political as well as the military scene is an injustice that should be corrected.

However questionable the British policy of soft-soaping Spain, Mr. Churchill's insistence that unconditional surrender will be required of Germany and Japan and his vigorous insistence that a world structure for the enforcement of peace must have overwhelming military power are heartening.

Unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan is not a new objective in this war, but it is one that should be emphasized again and again. In the last few months an increasing number of quavering voices have been raised in opposition to such a policy.

The plea is made that by harping upon the theme of unconditional surrender the Allies will only stiffen German resistance and prolong the war, and that, in any event, the unconditional-surrender demand is unfair.

Such reasoning is utterly unsound. The main purpose growing out of this war is to prevent future wars. The sort of world organization envisioned by Mr. Churchill will, we trust, help to do that. But first the German people must be made to understand completely the enormity of the crime which their power-crazed leaders perpetrated. Without unconditional surrender such an understanding would be impossible.

Germany must be made a respectable member of the family of nations. The German people must be given every possible aid toward establishing economic and governmental stability. But the first essential toward this goal is Germany's unqualified capitulation to the Allies.

Mr. Churchill again has given the British Commonwealth of Nations a clear, explicit view of his government's, and, in part, the Allies' policy. We recommend that our own Government do the same and do it regularly. Our people are not children. They are interested not only in American victories, but in world politics and trends. They are certainly entitled to broader, more thorough information along those lines.

Seventy-three Percent of Veterans Ask Job Priority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Providence Evening Bulletin of May 24, 1944:

SEVENTY-THREE PERCENT OF VETERANS ASK JOB PRIORITY—SURVEY OF FORMER SERVICEMEN NOW IN FACTORIES ALSO SAYS 90 PERCENT BELIEVE IN UNIONS

NEW YORK, May 22.—Seventy-three percent of this war's veterans feel they are entitled to job preference, the Iron Age reported after a survey of former soldier now working in eastern and middle western factories.

The balance, the magazine said, believed that the welfare of the Nation depended on jobs for all, soldiers and civilians.

The majority group answers, the Iron Age said, included one comment that "ex-servicemen will get what they want. There are too many to get pushed around."

"All wanted private enterprise to provide jobs, but 14 percent thought the Government should supply jobs in civil service if industry defaulted," the report on the survey said.

"Ten percent would give industry about 8 months to prove its ability to provide jobs and then should private enterprise fail to do so the Government should by subsidies maintain these industries which could not absorb sufficient workers."

Questioned regarding unions—some analysts have held that soldiers resent strikes and would direct that resentment at unions—the magazine said 90 percent believed "unions were good things," since they were the only voice an employee possessed. Of this group, it added, 10 percent inclined toward the description "necessary evil" and 24 percent felt union political power should be curbed. Sixty-four percent thought unions should keep the power to strike, and 59 percent would permit the closed shop.

Furlough Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., under date of May 24, 1944:

FURLOUGH GAS

Gas rationing for service folks on furlough is becoming a much-discussed question, and the families of many are becoming so aroused that unless new policies are adopted by O. P. A. officials some concerted action may be taken toward a show-down.

The rule locally and as far as is known throughout the State is to grant 5 gallons of gasoline to any person on furlough whether it be for a few days or for a few weeks. The exception to this is in the case of denial of gasoline working a hardship. There is already considerable agitation for liberalization of the policy because it is regarded as it is carried out today as manifestly unfair and inequitable.

The feeling about this matter has increased lately because more who have seen foreign service are returning home on furloughs and bear messages from those in the ranks to relatives and friends at home. In some instances it is pointed out that these messages involve considerable mileage and cannot be conveyed otherwise because of time limitations.

One strong argument forwarded in favor of a readjustment affecting those on furlough is the presence of so many autos at the race tracks, at amusement places, beaches, and places that allow for a doubt as to the necessity of the presence of the occupants of those cars. The frequent and regular use of autos by persons whose right to do so seems questionable is also forwarded as a reason for liberalizing the allotments to those on furloughs.

Stories of plenty of gasoline in the tanks of many dealers but no buyers because of lack of coupons also stand out as proof of the demand for some action. Stories to the effect that bootleg or black-market gasoline is easily obtainable for those who are willing to pay the bonus per gallon are not comforting to the families of servicemen home on furlough and particularly those who are enjoying a few precious days of home life after traveling thousands of miles from far off scenes of battle. The fact that there are in existence many counterfeit coupons and the fact that thieves are active in breaking into service stations to get coupons is proof positive that there is far more gasoline in this area than necessary to meet the demands of the legally authorized use under the coupon system.

There are many circumstances and much in the way of evidence that seems to warrant a revised policy. If there is enough gasoline to provide cars with fuel to take them back and forth daily to race tracks and places of amusement, and enough to honor counterfeit coupons and to sell to those who would patronize the black markets, then there must be enough gasoline to liberalize the allowance to those of our armed forces who are on long awaited furloughs. If there is gas for the pleasure seeker and for the black-market patron there must be gas for the soldier.

The Maryland Tradition and Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, as the keynote address at the Maryland State Republican Convention, Baltimore, Md., May 23, 1944:

THE MARYLAND TRADITION AND SPIRIT

Ladies and gentlemen, I find rare pleasure in the fellowship of this convention.

Here in Maryland one receives new inspiration for the tasks which lie ahead.

Here one receives fresh courage to serve our greatest legacy, the heritage of freedom.

Here in one of the Thirteen Original States, whose delegates affixed their names to the Declaration of Independence and covenanted with their lives, their fortunes, and their honor to secure and preserve those inalienable rights, one finds an energizing force to do no less in preserving those blessings for our people.

The tradition of homespun freedom is so deeply imbedded in the hearts of your people as the star upon the flag which marks the exalted place of this State.

You are the heirs of a great trust and nobly will it be administered.

REVERENCE FOR THE LIVING AND THE DEAD

In the air is a memorial spirit.

We approach that day which has been set aside for honor and reverence to those who in every generation have so nobly served that great unseen mistress, the Republic.

Men and women of Maryland, like the men and women of every Commonwealth in the land today, man freedom's frontier.

The blessed endowment of remembrance gives us sacred kinship with the spirit of those who freely gave their lives for the Nation and awakens our prayers for those who are ready to take the tasks which destiny may assign.

As we ponder their absence and reflect upon the grim business to which they have been called, may it give us a living faith, a swelling hope, and a new reverence as we approach our own responsibilities upon the home front in a year of great decision.

The battlefront is but an extension of the home front.

Faith, hope, and honesty, all of which are so necessary to give a durable purpose to victory, are not rationed.

It requires no points for a supply of courage with which to meet the tasks at home.

It requires no priority for materials with which to fashion our vision of a greater and nobler future when war shall be no more and amity dwells upon the earth.

In this spirit, we best memorialize the living and the dead by a reaffirmation of our faith in genuine freedom.

In this spirit we breath a prayer that they who are now away on service may manfully endure the hard tasks before them and on their return, will find us practicing freedom and justice.

THIS IS A YEAR OF DECISION

This is a year of decision.

Even as young Americans strike for victory on every battle front, so we must strike with the peaceful weapons of free government on the home front in order to give victory a dynamic purpose.

This year will be one of time's crucibles.

It will and it must yield leadership, policies, purpose, and faith to meet our common task and bring a revitalized confidence to the Nation.

How priceless, even in time of conflict, is the right of people to assess policies and leadership and save the Nation.

Government by the people is the greatest gift to freedom.

How strange it is that even before our great party has spoken on men and issues, that the sergeants of smear should already be at work

Those charged with the conduct of Government so glibly welcome popular judgment upon their accomplishments but entertain a singular fear of letting the record speak for itself.

Those charged with the conduct of government so earnestly urge judgment upon their stewardship but somehow lament the close scrutiny of the citizenry and the growing demand for change.

They claim a rendezvous with destiny but entertain grave doubt about the coming judgment of destiny.

They have a troubled conscience as the day of decision draws near.

HIGH PURPOSE

Let us be moved by no small purposes.

Let us seek victory as befits a party with great traditions.

Let us hew to the line of abiding principle and seek power, not for it's sake only but for the sake of what we can do with power in serving the general welfare and preserving freedom.

Let us seek leadership, not for it's own sake but for the sake of giving direction to the Nation in a period of confusion.

Let us seek power to provide durable solutions for the problems that have stalked us through a foggy decade.

A CHALLENGE AND A HOPE

I know of no better place to find inspiration for this occasion than that quiet bivouac of the dead, not far distant from here, where, in 1863, a humble man from my own State, with deathless magic phrased the challenge and uttered the hope that has been our guiding star in every generation since.

There at Gettysburg, Lincoln phrased the challenge.

Whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality can endure.

There he uttered the throbbing hope that "This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

That challenge is vital in this anxious hour.

That hope is like the steady light of a candle in an hour of darkness as we see freedom menaced by the forces which are loosed in the earth.

OUR TASK

Our task in a year of decision is to analyze confusion.

It is to assess the state of the Union.

It is to get a basic sense of direction and not be di.erted.

It is to distinguish between duties and issues.

It is to strip away the froth and go to the heart of vital issues.

Our task is to rediscover the spirit of our land.

It is to make certain that young men, suckled upon the soil of this Republic, and those who are now the living instruments of freedom upon some farflung battlefield will not have served and die in vain.

It is to make certain that there will be no erosion of time's greatest gift to man, the freedom and dignity of the individual.

UNITY AND MORALE

In time of bewilderment, fear, and uncertainty, let us as the task force of the home front, examine into our assignment.

We agree that the preservation of the fabric of unity and morale is our first business.

It is the foundation for victory.

It is our secret weapon to combat weariness as war draws close to every hearth and fireside.

It furnishes the spiritual reserve upon which we must draw as the lengthening casualty lists throw their shadow upon the Nation.

It is the steady quiet force which enables us to make the second mile.

This responsibility we freely embrace.

We best discharge it by an alertness to every national problem and by bold and constructive criticism of blunders, incompetence, extravagance, and of every subtle endeavor to encroach upon the ideal for which young men daily die.

In that spirit, let us here remind those conducting the affairs of government that it also shares this responsibility for national morale.

In its every act, there should be a fine restraint and that measure of common sense which is conducive to, rather than destructive of, unity.

Can it be said that the use of troops, active under the command of a bewildered Attorney General, to seize a retail store and carry its executive head from the establishment is in the interest of unity and morale?

Can it be said that a government which at once confesses the impotence of its civil authority before it has been tried and resorts to the glistening symbolism of the bayonet serves that quietude of spirit and fortitude of mind which is the essence of morale?

Can so gross a breach of civil liberty develop a resurgence of faith in the cause for which young men bravely fight and die?

Government should be the first to defend and the last to infringe by military force the rights of people in an hour when many of them seek a restatement of war aims and freely wonder whither we are tending.

There is complete agreement on our duty to preserve the very foundation upon which the structure of victory must be built and we propose to discharge that duty. It is not in issue.

VICTORY

Our second task is victory.

But it is not an issue.

It is on the "must" list of every American.

There is no cleavage of thought or spirit here.

It calls for the best brains and brawn of the Nation.

It is not the personal or peculiar domain of those in charge of government. It is the business of the Nation.

The bitterness of defeat or stalemate would be visited upon every citizen alike.

Mistakes, blunders, and incompetence will be measured in the tears and taxes of every father and mother in the land.

There is no party label on a casualty.

Audacious action and speedy victory is a solemn duty and that cause can be fruitfully served by ending ideological wars on the home front.

PEACE

Our next task is peace.

It is the people's business.

There must be no frustration this time.

To fail in giving peace a chance to endure will be a reflection upon our moral courage and our leadership.

To fail in achieving durable peace will make a mockery of every sacrifice.

A peace treaty may record but does not assure peace.

It requires something more than parchment.

It must be written in the minds and hearts of the people and must come from the bottom up.

Peace is not an issue. It is a solemn duty.

It is for those in authority to freely and abundantly inform the humble citizens whose sons are the instruments of victory, concerning every aspect of peace and peace preparations that we may not again have the spectacle of leaders becoming the prisoners of public opinion.

COOPERATION

Cooperation is the law of human progress.

We have a duty to responsibly cooperate that aggression might be curbed and justice applied to the frictions which produce conflict.

To participate in the world's affairs is one thing, but to shoulder all of its burdens is another.

Our problem is not to cooperate, but how to cooperate.

The world remains gracious and solvent when the promises by which men and nations live are fully kept.

Broken faith is the bitter fruit of broken promises

How important then that we explore our present and future capacity in the light of every promise which might be made and to promise no more than we can reasonably expect to perform.

As the arsenal and larder of all the world, we have the responsibility of moral leadership in a confused world.

Shall that leadership be impaired by promises which we cannot perform or by a glamorous optimism which is unwarranted by realities.

No greater catastrophe could befall the world than for our own land to fall from the pinnacle of moral leadership through broken faith.

But this is not an issue.

Republican leadership meeting at the Mackinac conference in the autumn of 1943 enunciated a foreign policy which is vital, inclusive, restrained, and geared to reality and expressed the hope that a matter so

vital to our national welfare might be removed from the arena of politics.

It is a duty.

THE ISSUE IS FREEDOM

The agreed tasks of unity, victory, peace, and participation we freely embrace.

They become every citizen's responsibility.

But the real issue is freedom.

The real issue is the preservation of human dignity, personality, and the moral basis upon which it rests.

To abandon even a small part of the freedom we have known and which accounts for the greatness and leadership of this land is to abandon the greatest spiritual adventure of civilization.

Without it there can be no full healing at home

Without it there can be no strength to bring succor to a confused world.

One of our greatest attributes is our power of example to bewildered people everywhere.

As we boldly announce our devotion to the "four freedoms" shall we set a dismal example for other peoples in an hour of doubt and confusion by departing in the slightest degree from the ideal for which we fight?

If so, we may well ask why young men fight and die.

To the Congress the President in his annual message spoke of a second bill of rights.

How can there be a second bill of rights if the first Bill of Rights is impaired?

How can there be security unless the freedom of action and the incentives to achievement are kept intact to provide that security?

Long ago we had a legacy of freedom and today it is in issue.

WHAT FREEDOM HAS DONE FOR US

What has the climate of freedom and incentive done for us?

Ours is a young civilization.

Compared with China, we are as infants in the cradle of time.

Yet, consider our accomplishments in one and one-half centuries.

We have but 7 percent of the world's population.

That 7 percent enjoys one-half of all the telephones, one-third of all the railway mileage, and one-third of all the surfaced highways of the world.

That 7 percent owns four-fifths of all the life insurance and 80 out of every 100 motorcars in the world.

We spend more on education than the rest of the world combined.

We have a radio for every three people.

An hour of labor in this Nation will buy more of everything than an hour of labor in any other Nation on earth.

Since that day when the Maryland delegates affixed their names to the Constitution in 1787, the real wages of our people have increased from four to seven times while hours have been measurably reduced.

The right to freely own land and the genius for making the land produce has made us the leader of the world.

In every field of human endeavor we have gone far and done much.

All this we have done, not because we have a monopoly of skill, intelligence, and resources, but because these resources of mind and soul and nature could be generously processed in a climate of freedom and an atmosphere of reward.

NOR HAS IT REMAINED UNCHALLENGED

That freedom was not without challenge in our national life.

Consider the ferment of ideas and schemes in other generations.

Our history reveals countless experiments in communal life and socialism.

There has been an unending stream of cults and crusades.

The whitened bones of utopian schemes and collectivist endeavors can be found in every section of the land.

Migrants from Europe, and native citizens as well, entranced with the idea of a collective civilization, have for a century made assaults upon the citadel of individual freedom, but it remained intact and we went forward to new accomplishments.

TODAY IT IS THE TRANSCENDENT ISSUE

Today that basic freedom is threatened.

It is the real issue, for every other apparent issue leads to it.

It is threatened with the gospel of collectivism which would subjugate the individual to the group for the common good.

The collective philosophy is but another name for totalitarianism.

It is the spiritual weapon with which individual freedom is encircled and with which man can be enslaved.

The very thing against which young men fight and for which they die has raised its ugly head in subtle fashion back home.

It began a decade ago.

To make life more abundant, freedom was to become less abundant.

The forgotten man became the common man and it became the purpose of Government to keep him common.

THE SUSTAINED ASSAULT ON FREEDOM

Consider the growth, the centralization, and the ruthlessness of Federal power.

It begins with the delegation of broad powers to the Executive and the issuance of more than 3,600 Executive orders in the first 10 years of the present administration.

There is the unending stream of directives and orders and the building of a structure of administrative law which prompted one administrator to say: "We do make the law."

There is a wilderness of alphabetical agencies, so baffling and varied in character and number as to bewilder citizens and public servants alike.

There is a staggering public civil pay roll of nearly 3,000,000 persons, half of whom are not directly engaged in the war effort.

There is the subtle management of public opinion by more than 30,000 full-time and part-time persons who annually release hundreds of millions of pieces of literature to keep the people submissive.

There has been the use of more than one-half billion in blank checks by the Chief Executive.

There is the calculated erosion of the lawmaking power of the Congress by means of Executive orders.

There was the noxious scheme to pack the Supreme Court for the purpose of securing packed decisions.

There was the shameful use of relief funds with which to debauch free elections.

There is a brigade of financial magicians, who because of an enormous debt, much of which was created before the demands of war began, are now suggesting that our fiscal solvency demands that controls continue and that they become the managers of the people's business.

There is the constant effort to keep emergency agencies alive, despite the fact that the emergency has long since ceased to exist.

There is the habit of taking objectionable personnel from agencies liquidated by Congress and transferring them to other agencies that their bold radicalism might continue to ferment in Government.

There is the practice of agencies created by the Congress, prohibiting their employees from testifying before courts or committees of Congress concerning the contents of their files.

There is the coddling of "reds" in various agencies of Government to such an extent that Congress felt impelled to exercise its power over the purse to dislodge them.

What is all this but a part of the design to centralize power, destroy government by the people, and thus destroy individual freedom.

THE EXPANSION OF THE COMMERCE CLAUSE

There has been a slow and steady expansion of the commerce clause of the Constitution to the point where States become but convenient geographical designations for tourists.

By this expansion janitors and charwomen in a Pennsylvania office building come within the scope of the Federal Wages and Hours Act only because certain products manufactured in that building move in interstate commerce.

A modest Illinois dairy, producing and selling milk wholly within the State must knuckle under a Federal order becaue the milk which it produces and sells might come in competition with milk which moves in interstate commerce.

When the Federal Government becomes so powerful that all human endeavor becomes subject to Federal law, what happens to our Federal Union, what happens to the grass roots, what happens to freedom as we knew it?

THE ASSAULT UPON THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

For a decade there has been an erosion of the lawmaking powers of the Congress.

The planners are steadily planning for continued controls which lodges in the hands of bureaucrats complete power over the people.

The Congress is regarded as but a convenient appendage of Government to provide authority and funds for such plans.

When it displays some independence of spirit it is forthwith castigated and vilified that the duly elected representatives might be demeaned in the esteem of the public.

It had its culmination in the calculated assault upon Congress by the Executive which reached such proportions that the majority leader of the Senate displayed his anger and resentment by proclaiming on the floor of that body: "This is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress of the United States."

When the courts and the Congress become the object of attack by the executive branch to bring about personal government in this Nation, what happens to freedom, to balanced government, and to government by the people?

CONCLUSION

These are but some of the exhibits which rise from the record of the past to plainly indicate that human dignity and personality must be sacrificed for the common good and that the spirit which made America great must be made over.

It finds its fruition in the statement of the Attorney General that, "No business or property is immune from Presidential order."

It is the march of collectivism, of defeatism, and of the gospel of maturity toward a managed nation.

Every effort will be made to divert attention from this, the larger issue, but we shall not be diverted.

There is no twilight zone between collectivism and freedom.

There is no halfway house between freedom and complete domination by bureaucracy.

From ringside seats, we are watching the destruction of the Republic, the impairment of freedom, and the abandonment of the American way of life in a turbulent hour when young men die for freedom.

What do we propose to do?

It is later than you think.

Pennsylvania Soldier-Voting Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under the magnificent leadership of Gov. Edward Martin, Pennsylvania has passed the most liberal and practical soldier-voting law of any State in the Union. It is recognized as such everywhere. Governor Martin deserves great credit, not only for this achievement but also for the manner in which it was accomplished—that is for securing unanimous agreement from the members of the legislature of both sides. He proved conclusively that real leadership can achieve unity on potentially controversial domestic issues during wartime. It would be well for our Nation and for our war effort if our executives in Washington would study the methods of our distinguished Governor and put them into practice in the Nation's capital.

The fine cooperation of the Republican and Democratic legislators must also not go unnoticed nor unsung.

With the thought that this will be of interest to everyone, particularly those in the State of Pennsylvania, I am including as part of my remarks a summary of the essential provisions of the soldier-voting law enacted by the Pennsylvania General Assembly at the special session of 1944, prepared under the direction of William E Habbyshaw, chief clerk of the lower house, and William P. Roan, its secretary:

SUMMARY OF THE ESSENTIAL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLDIER-VOTING LAW ENACTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1944

1. Any qualified elector serving in the Army, Navy, Merchant Marine of the United States, American Red Cross, Society of Friends, Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the U. S. O. attached to and serving with the United States armed forces, may vote by an Official Military Ballot, whether registered or not and absent anywhere during the war and 6 months thereafter.

2. The Official Military Ballot will be sent or delivered to such elector in military service at least 65 days before election by the county boards of elections (county commissioners), as well as to such electors whose names are brought to their attention later.

3. The names of all electors entitled to military ballots will be supplied under supervision of the State Council of Defense through the local and district councils, or they may be submitted by anyone, to the precinct election boards sitting on a date proclaimed by the Governor as Military Ballot Day (on or before August 1, 1944).

4. Military ballots will be mailed with two envelopes. On the smaller one shall be printed "Official Military Ballot" and on the larger one, an affidavit with the name and address of the county board.

The ballot may be marked by crayon, ink, or pencil in the presence of a person or officer authorized to administer the oath but in such a manner that he cannot see how the same is marked.

It is then placed in the small envelope, sealed, enclosed in the larger envelope, the affidavit taken, dated on or before election day, and mailed to the county board.

It must be received on or before 10:00 a. m. of the third Wednesday following election to be valid.

5. An alphabetical list of electors to whom military ballots were mailed will be posted in a conspicuous public place at its office by the county board of elections 45 days before, and a supplemental list, 5 days before election day. Such elector may in writing request a military ballot from the secretary of the Commonwealth or his county board of elections, giving citizenship, residence, age, voting district, party choice in case of a primary, name, rank military address, branch, and serial number. The application shall be verified from the district register or from the lists prepared as in 3 above.

6. Such elector may also vote by a "military ballot" in person at his precinct voting place and in the same manner as if he were away. Such ballot shall be counted by the county board as in the case of mailed ballots.

7. In cases where there is not sufficient time for the county board to print the names of the various candidates on the ballot, blank spaces shall be provided in which the names may be inserted. In such cases, a list shall be furnished to the electors containing the names of all candidates legally nominated.

8. A qualified elector, under the Constitution and the Election Code, is a person 21 years of age, a citizen of the United States for 1 month, a resident of the State for 1 year, (unless having formerly resided here, has returned and resided here 6 months) and resides in the election district 2 months preceding the election.

9. A commissioned officer, any member of the merchant marine designated by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, or any person of any State or territory of the United States authorized to administer oaths, may take the oath of electors voting by military ballot.

10. The judges and inspectors of election will sit from 7 a. m. to 8 p. m. (eastern standard time) on "Military Ballot Day" and be paid the same compensation as on election day.

11. The counties will be reimbursed for the actual expenses incurred in preparing, handling, mailing, delivering, counting, and storing official military ballots.

12. Candidates nominated at the primary must withdraw at least 105 days before the general election and substitutions must be filed at least 95 days before the general election.

13. Penalties have been provided for violating the provisions of these laws.

Congress a Prey to Minorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by James Morgan which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, Boston, Mass., under date of December 19, 1943:

CONGRESS A PREY TO MINORITIES—THIS A PERILOUS TIME FOR LEGISLATIVE HALLS TO BE TURNED INTO SWAP SHOPS FOR SPECIAL INTERESTS

(By James Morgan)

If you should see your Congressman while he is home for his Christmas vacation, pray, do not tell him which way to vote on any of the legislation pending in Washington. On the contrary, ask him to stop letting anyone tell him whether to answer "yea" or "nay" on a roll call—or else. Beseech him to have the courage, the self-respect, to listen only to the promptings of his own conscience or judgment as to what is best for the country as a whole.

It is none of our business, as private citizens, nor is it within our competence to solve the complex problems of a government at war. We have chosen an administration and a Congress to do that for us. But it is our duty to understand the existence of those problems and to see that our Representatives provide a solution for each of them.

TIME TO SOUND A WARNING

I know it is an old American custom to nag Congress. There always has been a studied and patient avoidance of that in this place because of an awareness that the first weapon of Fascists, at home as well as abroad, is to cast discredit on representative institutions.

Nevertheless, candid friends of Congress are in duty bound now to sound a sharp warning that many favorably disposed minds are seriously disturbed by what has been going on at the Capitol recently. The National Legislature appears to have been falling apart into a lot of little, irresponsible blocs of special interests. Too many Members have been playing partisan politics with the national welfare or cravenly jumping through the hoop at the crack of a whip by a pressure group in the lobby.

FEAR OF AN ELECTION YEAR

Let us take a look at our major problems in legislation and at what our legislators are doing about them. Start with taxes. The Treasury asked for an increase of some ten billions in revenue this year, and it presented a scheme for a rather clumsy distribution of that added burden. Congress is cutting the increase to some two billions, or to one-fifth.

We well know that we can afford to pay more than that at a time when the national income is at the highest point on record. We know, too, that it is not right for us to shirk our fair share of the costs of the war and leave it as a mortgage on our people when they may be less able to carry it, when the bottom may have dropped out of war wages and war profits. Congress would admit this fact and face it if it were considering the interests of the country, instead of its own political interests in an election year.

Next, take the question of inflation. The administration is trying to hold the line against rising prices with subsidies, which are designed to compensate and encourage producers. That plan may be faulty, but we know that it cannot be as bad as no plan at all. Yet the House light-heartedly voted to stop the subsidies without putting anything in their place. The House also has overruled with a whoop the administration's denial of a big boost in the price of oil, and the Senate has almost unanimously voted a larger wage increase than a White House ruling granted to a category of railroad labor.

The action of the House on subsidies would remove the ceiling, take the roof off the price structure, and leave prices—and wages—free to soar like a rocket * * * and to come down like a stick after the war. We know the evil of that course in the other war, which was followed by a boom and a collapse that left us floundering in a 10-year depression.

SIDESTEPPING AN ISSUE

What is happening to the urgent problem of securing to the millions in the armed services their right to vote in the 1944 election? A plan was presented for the Federal Government to distribute and collect their ballots for President and Vice President and for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The bill impliedly admitted that Congress had no authority to make provi-

sion for the choice of Governors and State officers, and its opponents insisted that the Constitution leaves to the States the conduct of all elections.

As too often happens, the States have neglected their rights and duties. The legislatures of 41 States met early this year and did nothing about the soldier vote. Only 7 or 8 legislatures will meet again in regular session before the election.

But even if all the States should wake up and call extra sessions, it would be absurdly impossible to have 48 sets of State officials holding elections in training camps and at the fighting fronts, with a separate ballot for every one of the some 3,000 counties.

This will be our first Presidential election in wartime since 1864, when 14 of the 25 States within the lines of the Union Army provided for the soldier vote and the remaining 11, including Massachusetts, made no provision for it. It was such a slipshod affair that it produced only 150,000 votes from among the many hundreds of thousands of boys in blue.

The Senate has rejected the bill for a federally conducted election and substituted an ironical invitation for the States to do their constitutional duty. That merely sidesteps the issue. There must be sufficient constructive statesmanship for harmonizing this conflict of authority. If Congress has the power to draft men by the million, it is morally bound to see that they are not disfranchised. It is obligated to do nothing less than provide a framework in which the States could effectively function. The one thing we cannot afford to do is to stultify a war for government by ballot by denying the ballot to the men who are fighting it.

NO TIME FOR BLOCS AND PRESSURE GROUPS

There is another thing we can still less afford in this crisis. That is a Congress divided into labor, farm, oil, and sectional blocs. Such divisions are a treasonable betrayal of our cause in the face of the enemy.

Free government is the best means ever devised for harmonizing the rights and interests of minorities with the general welfare. This result can be defeated by a cowardly surrender of Congress to minorities with their hired lobbies. Our legislative halls must not be turned into swap shops for special interests. There is where Hitler and Mussolini came in and there is where France fell, with governments paralyzed by self-seeking factions.

This country is in no such peril. The American people are not and never have been politically divided into farm or labor or sectional blocs. Even in the tragic schism of the Civil War the misleaders of the South dared not submit their ordinances of secession to a vote of the people.

There would be no solid South today if any opposition were permitted down there in those totalitarian States, where public opinion is stifled by a one-party system. A minority maintains control of the political machine only by devices for preventing a vote by the whole people, including the disfranchisement not only of the colored population but of large numbers of whites as well.

We have a Federal union for the purpose of reconciling the interests of States and sections with the over-all interests of the entire country. If minorities in Congress can successfully conspire to thwart the will of a majority of the people, the purpose of the union will be defeated.

The excuse for the existence of political parties is that they are a necessary evil in welding minorities into a majority that can govern. But Congress lately has not been voting along party lines. Instead, we have seen States' rights Democrats of the South combining with federalist Republicans of the North against the Soldier Vote bill. "Sound money" Republicans of the East have alined themselves with traditional inflationists of the West and South to remove the curbs on inflated prices and cost of living.

The great unorganized public has no hired officials, press agents and lobbyists, with form letters and telegrams signed with names grabbed by the fistful out of telephone directories. Yet, it never fails to wake up and somehow contrive to make itself heard when organized minorities wax too insolent and begin contemptuously to push it around.

The latest illustration of that is the halting in the Senate this past week of the runaway movement to wipe out subsidies as a means of price control.

We cannot afford to lose faith in Congress now while we are fighting a war to save it from the fate of the German Reichstag. But lately there has been a rapid growth of an estrangement between it and public opinion. This is a perilous breach in our democratic armor when our youth are being maimed and killed that Government by the people shall not perish from the earth. Every one of us, in Congress and out, needs to search his heart to make sure that he is doing nothing, saying nothing, thinking nothing unworthy of that sacrifice.

The Coming Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

THIS SHOULD SHOCK YOU

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, sincerely believing that our national and individual welfare depends upon the maintenance of constitutional government here at home, realizing that our men are supposed to be fighting to establish liberty and freedom throughout the world, I have been bitterly opposed to certain New Deal policies which smack altogether too much of Hitlerism and despotism. Being so thoroughly convinced that our liberty and freedom were being taken from us, many harsh criticisms of the New Deal have been made by me.

DON'T TAKE MY WORD FOR IT

David Lawrence, a skilled, accurate observer of national events here at Washington, editor and publisher of the United States News, long a Roosevelt admirer and frequently outspoken in praise of the New Deal, just cannot go along with all the program of this Administration. May 23, after commenting that the Democratic Party was being taken over by the American Labor Party, the Communist Party, the C. I. O. Committe for Political Action, and the recently formed so-called Liberal Party, he among other things wrote, and I quote:

> The fact that Earl Browder and the Communists have indorsed President Roosevelt for a fourth term and will now become active in the Democratic Party is not relished by the Democrats of the South.
>
> Also, it is apparent that a large slush fund has now been made available for the left-wing groups to enter the Democratic primaries and unseat the regular Democrats. Although Congress, while writing the Smith-Connally law, adopted a provision amending the Federal Corrupt Practices Act so as to prohibit labor unions from making political contributions, this has not as yet cramped the style of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee or any other labor unions.

BAYONET AIDS DUES COLLECTION

> Many millions of dollars have been collected by assessments, membership dues or otherwise from the labor union members throughout the country. This drive is, curiously enough, being assisted by the Federal Government itself, which is using the armed forces of the United States, to compel employers at the point of a bayonet to accept clauses in union contracts whereby members of the union cannot withdraw from such unions once they join. This helps increase the amount of dues collectible by the unions. * * * There really is no authority in law either for the maintenance-of-membership clauses, but the President feels that he has sufficient power as Commander-in-Chief to use the bayonet to compel maintenance of membership in labor unions.

Lawrence then called attention to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which for years has prevented corporations from contributing to political campaigns, but which, even if amended, Attorney General Biddle holds does not apply to primary elections or the present activities of labor unions, and stated that Congress might hold a Congressional investigation.

He then wrote:

> The difficulty about a congressional committee investigation is that the administration can put rubber-stamp members into control of the committee. * * * Eleven years ago when the Roosevelt administration came into power, it talked a good deal about driving the "money changers from the temple". It professed high ideals. It spoke of itself as a liberal administration. But it has turned out to be not a bit different from its Republican predecessors—ready and anxious to use political funds and public power to perpetuate itself in office.

WORSE IF POSSIBLE

But the foregoing is not all of the shocking story. As is well known, the Communists have been exerting a powerful influence in certain (by no means all) C. I. O. unions and, while the Communist Party last week went out of legal existence, the same powerful group headed by Earl Browder formed the Communist Political Association, which is the old Communist Party under another name, and that organization has joined the C. I. O. in endorsing Roosevelt for a fourth term.

Members of the governing body of the old Communist party are members of the new party and control its action. Browder, released from prison by the President, is now out making political speeches for his reelection. Browder, secretary of the old Communist Party and twice its presidential candidate, is the newly elected president of the new association demanding the President's reelection.

It should not be forgotten that the 1940 Communist Party platform carried the following plank:

> Combat the imperialist acts and policies of the President. * * * No aid to the imperialist warmakers in London. * * * Oppose all war loans and credits to the warring imperialist powers. * * * Stop the sale and shipment of munitions to the bel-

ligerents. * * * Resist the militarization and armaments program of the administration and Congress. * * * Not a cent, not a gun, not a man for war preparations and the imperialist war.

An editorial in a local paper, commenting on the foregoing quotation, reads:

That was when Russia, under its nonaggression pact, was a de facto partner of Nazi Germany. Now that Russia is at war with Germany, the American Communists have adopted a new line and changed their name. But the spots remain the same.

It is apparent that the Communists, the C. I. O., and the new dealers, are now taking over the Democratic Party organization and that, in the coming November election Mr. Roosevelt, if renominated, will be the candidate of the Democratic Party, the Communist Political Association, the American Labor Party—left or Communist wing—and of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

The issue now clearly defined and in the open, as heretofore it has been buried and under cover, will, of necessity, be between the new dealers, the C. I. O. committee for political action, the Communist Political Association on the one side, and Republicans and Democrats who believe in constitutional government in the American way of doing things, on the other.

There is no longer any excuse for anyone who reads and thinks to be deceived as to the importance of the coming national election.

Reclamation in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, reclamation has played a prominent part in the development of the arid West, and our irrigated farms are producing vital foodstuffs during this wartime emergency. Many projects, such as Grand Coulee, have also contributed materially to the power needs of the Nation and to our war industries. In the post-war era reclamation development will help to cushion the impact of demobilization.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an interesting address delivered at the annual meeting of the Idaho State Reclamation Association on May 13, 1944, by Mr. F. A. Banks, Regional Director of the Bureau of Reclamation:

The new regional organization of the Bureau of Reclamation and the manner in which it will affect dealings between us undoubtedly will be of particular interest to you. The area which has been assigned to me and to Mr. Newell is Region No. 1 of six regions. In addition to Idaho, Region No. 1 includes the Snake River Drainage Basin of Wyoming, the States of Washington and Oregon, and the extension of the Klamath development in California. In recognition of the importance of reclamation in Idaho, Boise has been named regional headquarters.

I propose to tell what I can of our plans for this region. Before doing so, however, I should like to speak briefly about a few matters with which I know you are familiar, but which have such importance to the developments ahead, both in Idaho and in the rest of the region, that they will bear repeating.

One of these things is the relative importance of alternative ways in which the waters of the region may be used. You all count, I am sure, a wide variety of natural resources among the foundation materials on which you have built and will continue to extend your commonwealth. I suppose that none of you would dispute the point, however, that arable land and water are your most valuable resources. One automatically thinks of land and water together, because in so much of the State and region you have to put them together to make them mutually productive. Mining developments have come; some of them have gone; and still others will make their addition to the tangible wealth of the area when favoring conditions permit. Your forests have provided a basis for an important industry and, with careful management, will continue to do so. Scenic resources will contribute further to the growth of the region through further development of a recreation industry.

It is water and land together, however, on irrigated tracts that make the enduring base for support of the farm and dependent town populations which have come so largely to constitute the population of Idaho. Together they will provide the basis for substantial further growth within the region. Used separately for other purposes, they offer far fewer opportunities for earning a livelihood, and for adding to the real wealth of the region. Among alternative uses for water, therefore, its application to arable lands is of primary importance.

The familiar fact that the water supply is limited raises even higher the priority which must be given to use of the available supply for irrigation purposes. The Northwestern States Development Association, in which Governor Bottolfson has been the moving spirit, has indicated that in the event of competitive uses for water, use for irrigation should in general rank only below use for domestic purposes.

In attainment of the fullest practicable use of water of the region, we plan full cooperation with other Federal agencies and with State and local agencies. Arrangements with respect to the cooperation of the Federal agencies involved—the Corps of Engineers, Department of Agriculture, Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation—have already been made through establishment of the Interagency River Basin Committee composed of representatives of the agencies in Washington, D. C., and through establishment of procedures designed to promote cooperation in the field. In subsequent studies the Bureau's general position will parallel that of the Northwestern States Development Association indicated above, namely, that in event of competitive demands, the use of water for irrigation should be given a dominant priority.

The limited supply of water makes important also the relative weight given to alternative irrigation uses. The manner in which the limited supply is used for irrigation will affect the extent and character of the development ultimately achieved. Most everyone will agree, I suppose, in the general proposition that water should be applied to those lands and in that manner which will result in maximum benefits. It may not be so easy on occasions to reach agreement as to what maximum benefits are. Questions are involved which in the last analysis people of the State and region must answer. It seems clear, however, that the long-run interests of Idaho and of the region will be best served if water is so used as to provide the maximum practicable acreage with an adequate, but conservatively used supply. If maximum benefits defined in this way are to be obtained, such things will be involved as giving preferences among prospective developments of otherwise equal promise to those from which return flow will be available for reuse on other lands. Attainment of such maximum benefits also will entail, not a sacrifice of essential water by those with a generous supply, but a careful use of water to the end that the total area irrigated may be extended to the greatest extent practicable. An immediate answer to the question of what constitutes maximum benefits has been provided in the first objective of your association stated on the program. That objective is to provide an adequate supply of water for lands already under irrigation. In this I concur. The other considerations mentioned must be realistically faced in the future, however, if maximum benefits from the use of water for irrigation are to be achieved.

It is a familiar fact that irrigation developments have been growing more and more costly. Equally familiar, however, is the fact that the multiple purpose projects undertaken in recent years have more widespread and varied benefits than the simpler projects of earlier years.

The feasibility of future projects will probably turn to an increasing extent upon the value of benefits other than those directly chargeable to the irrigation farmer. The farmer can, and will be expected to, repay only in proportion to his benefits. The balance of the cost must be shouldered wherever the benefits accrue. The willingness of water users and other beneficiaries to carry their fair share of the burden under the established principle of reimbursement has made Federal funds more readily accessible to aid in irrigation developments of the past. This will be even more significant, I am confident, in securing the funds requisite for carrying out the program being planned for the years following the war—years in which it seems likely that requests for Federal funds will be very closely scrutinized by Congress.

The contribution of reclamation developments to the war effort, though of great importance, I shall not dwell upon. Through participation in war-food programs, many of you know better than I the contributions which are being made to that phase of the effort in Idaho. Similar contributions on old lands, and the development of new lands to swell the production of war foods, are being made in the Yakima project, Klamath project, and others within the region. I take pride in the power we have been in a position to generate at Grand Coulee Dam for use in war industries. Ranking currently as the world's greatest power producer, with an average output during each of recent months of about 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours, more than 90 percent of which goes into war industries, the Grand Coulee power plant has provided from 33 to 38 percent of the power transmitted by the northwest power pool in the five-State area served by it. A half dozen aluminum plants, a magnesium plant, a carbide plant, major shipyards, and various military installations are among the industries to which power is being delivered.

Ahead of us, the contributions which reclamation developments can make toward cushioning the impact of post-war demobilization are of two general sorts. First, in the construction of projects, employment can be provided immediately for thousands of men discharged from the armed services and from the war factories. Second, as the development of projects involving new lands is advanced, opportunities will be opened for thousands of other families as settlers on the lands, and as merchants, carpenters, mechanics, and the like in the project towns.

Developments by the Bureau, of course, will give rise to a related expansion in private construction and in business. Contractors will need vast amounts of equipment, materials, and supplies. New farms will need machinery, houses, barns, and other structures; wells must be drilled; domestic water systems installed, and roads constructed to join farms with the towns. The new communities springing up on the projects will require additional housing, public and business buildings, paving, water and sewer systems, and electrical distribution systems.

Although the nature and extent of the problems to be encountered in the post-war period are problematical, it seems likely that demobilization will hit the Pacific Northwest relatively hard. In the minds of people who have studied the problem from a national standpoint, this region ranks high in prospective difficulties of post-war adjustment because of the great expansion in industries with little or no previous peacetime background.

Another significant aspect of the post-war outlook is the fact that a high percentage of people who have moved to the Northwest to work in war industries have indicated the intention of remaining here after the war. Having come from the East myself, I can readily understand the reason for this. In the long run, this is highly desirable from the standpoint of regional growth. In the long run, the availability of adequate opportunities to care for these and additional newcomers to the Pacific Northwest cannot be questioned. It is the readjustment immediately following the war which may be difficult and which promises to tax our ingenuity and our preparedness.

The provision of employment on a large-scale construction program of reclamation projects, supplemented by the provision of farm opportunities as demands of qualified settlers develop, will help fill the needs in prospect. The program will include works to provide supplemental water in some areas and to provide for the irrigation of new lands in other areas.

Of further significance is the flexibility of such a program. If plans being made by private industry largely fill requirements, then a construction program of moderate proportions, extended over many years will be in order. If, however, especially large demands for employment should develop during the years when private industry is converting to peacetime production, the program could be greatly speeded up.

Now to look briefly at where we stand in the preparation of a blueprint for developments within the region. Among the list of projects currently under development is the Anderson Ranch Dam on the Boise project. In the Columbia Basin, finishing work in connection with the dam and powerhouses continues, and land is being purchased for the balancing reservoir in the Grand Coulee. Construction of the irrigation works we expect will await the conclusion of the war. The repayment contracts with the three irrigation districts formed within the project will soon be negotiated; plans for the distribution system have been prepared; sites for four dams on the project have been explored; some canal locations already have been staked out; and designs are rapidly being worked up to the end that contracts for construction can be made promptly at the conclusion of the war. Other projects now being developed in the region include the Deschutes, in Oregon; the Modoc unit of the Klamath project in Oregon; and the Roza division of the Yakima project in Washington.

Here in Idaho, the Post Falls unit of the Rathdrum Prairie project has been authorized. The Cascade Dam and the Black Canyon pumping unit are ready to go as soon as relief from war conditions permits. Another, the Palisades Dam, is approaching the same state of readiness.

The list is long of the additional projects which are scheduled for continuing investigation so that, if proved feasible, they may be added to the others already planned for construction in the post-war period. The list includes, incidentally, projects emphasized by the Northwest States Development Association for prompt post-war development.

High on the list for further investigation are the Mountain Home project and four units in the Weiser Basin. Others in Idaho are the Challis project, rehabilitation of the Lewiston Orchards development, and the Rathdrum Prairie project in the northern part of the State. The full program of continuing studies also includes many projects in Oregon and Washington.

The work done on these projects and on drainage basin studies will provide the backbone for a comprehensive report on the Columbia and Snake drainage, setting forth a full program for irrigation development in those basins. The objective, working with people of the region, will be to select, schedule, and forward the development of those projects which promise to contribute most to the growth and stability of the region.

Experience on lands settled in the recent past has suggested that further studies and preparations can profitably be made which are designed to forward the success of the settlers. It has been possible to make extensive studies of this nature for the Columbia Basin project. They promise to put the settlers, and to put us, and the State and local agencies in a better position to attain the kind of development everyone wishes to see than has been the case on some projects in the past where such preparations have not been possible. Studies looking toward the same ends on other new projects are included among our plans for the region. Without going into detail, they include such things as more complete studies of the type of farm economy which settlers may expect to find profitable; studies looking to the closer adjustment of the size of farm to capabilities of the land to provide satisfactory farm income; the adjustment of farm boundaries to topographic conditions in the interests of saving time and money in irrigation and in other farm operations; the establishment of programs to provide settlers with qualified assistance in the preparation of raw lands, the laying out of farm distribution systems, and the like.

The furtherance of these briefly outlined plans and an increase in the effectiveness of all reclamation activities within the region are the principal objectives of the new regional organization.

To begin with, that end of the Bureau's organization with which your direct contacts have been largely limited in the past, there are the field offices of various kinds. These have included offices for investigation, construction headquarters, and project offices for operation and maintenance. In the past these offices have reported directly to corresponding parts of the Chief Engineer's office in Denver. That office, in turn, reported to the Commissioner. Differing from this organization were the legal arrangements, with an office of district counsel reporting to the main legal department in the office of the Commissioner. The territory served by the district counsel's office, which in the past has been located in Portland, Oreg., is essentially the same as the territory included within region No. 1.

As the number and complexity of projects have increased it has seemed that the remoteness of contact between you and the field offices on the one hand, and between the field offices and Denver and Washington on the other, left something to be desired in expediting activities of various kinds. You may have had the feeling on occasion that a full appreciation of your problems and of the action required on them has not carried through the several steps involved.

Comparative figures indicate the expansion of our activities which have contributed to problems of these sorts. Ten years ago the Bureau served 2,000,000 acres of land on 25 projects. Today, the acreage receiving water from our systems and the number of projects in operation are twice those totals. In addition, more than 20 other projects are in various stages of construction. Expenditures during the last 10 years have averaged about $60,000,000 annually, as compared with early-day outlays of $10,000,000.

To bring closer to you representatives of the Bureau with greater authority and responsibility than it was practicable to confer on the many field offices, regional directors were appointed under the new organization to head up the work of the Bureau in the 6 regions. The field offices are to be continued. The regional office will coordinate construction activities in the region, but construction offices will be closely tied to the office of the Chief Engineer. Other field offices will be responsible to the regional headquarters. The regional office will maintain general direction over the operation of all projects in the region. The Regional Directors, in turn, will report to the Commissioner. The Denver offices, under the reorganization, have been designated as branches of the Commissioner's office. They will assist and act for the Commissioner in many matters, and also are to assist the regional offices in their major problems. The office of District Counsel, hereafter to be known as Regional Counsel, is being consolidated with the regional office in Boise. All contract negotiations and renegotiations will be undertaken by the regional office.

To quote the statement concerning the purposes of the new organization made by Secretary Harold L. Ickes in announcing the plans: "The increasing number of interrelated and complex problems arising from the construction and operation of the many Bureau of Reclamation projects for irrigation, power and related problems makes it imperative at this time, in the interest of maximum efficiency, to establish area offices to coordinate the organization's activities in each of the six areas. The plan developed by the Bureau under former Commissioner John C. Page, will bring the Bureau into closer touch with the people affected by its functions. It will provide for a more thorough understanding of area problems and of the needs and potentialities of each area than has been possible heretofore through the Washington, D. C., headquarters and the Denver office. Close coordination of Bureau operations and the full consideration of local operation, essential in meeting the Bureau's wartime responsibilities and the preparation for post-war needs, will be realized."

Or, to put it in more personal terms, and with reference to this region, Mr. Newell and I will be accessible; we will be in close touch with the field offices, and with your problems and those of other groups in the region; and we stand ready to assist to the best of our ability in planning and in forwarding developments which promise to bring the maximum benefits to you and other residents of the region.

We are moving as rapidly as practicable toward the full discharge of the new regional responsibilities, but we contemplate that this will necessarily and advisedly be a rather gradual process. Difficulties will be experienced in obtaining qualified personnel. Problems originating in the past have many threads running throughout the earlier organization which will be time-consuming and difficult for the regional office to pick up and follow out. In general, we look toward a greater and more immediate contribution of the regional office to the solution of current

problems and the advancement of the post-war program.

In short, although you are not to expect us to act immediately and independently on any and all matters which you may lay before us, you may rest assured that your problems will receive not only our careful consideration, but our best efforts for prompt and satisfactory solution.

Handbook of United States of America by O. W. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD at this time an editorial, which appeared in the May 10, 1944, issue of The Independent, published at Grand Island, Nebraska, entitled "The Controversial Handbook."

The article follows:

THE CONTROVERSIAL HANDBOOK

The recently published Handbook of the United States of America, which was published for distribution to foreign countries for the information of their officials, newspaper editors, commentators, and others, has aroused a good deal of controversy and not a little ridicule at home.

The Independent, taking its information at second hand, had a little fun a few weeks ago at the expense of the O. W. I. for publication of the handbook. The result was that the O. W. I. sent this newspaper a copy, with the request that it be thoroughly read.

After a thorough reading of the handbook, we have decided that the original critics, from whom we derived our information, were searching diligently for an excuse to be critical. The handbook could have no political significance since it was not published for distribution either among the American troops overseas or at home. It is purely informational, and the information it provides is valuable, and so far as we can tell factual.

The handbook does devote considerably more time in its chronological record to the last decade than to previous American history, but as Elmer Davis points out, so does the World Almanac. This is a picture of the United States now, not the United States as it was in 1789, 1861, or 1896.

There will be campaign issues against the New Deal between now and next November. But this handbook will not be one of them.

INTERESTING REPORT ON O. W. I. BY APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE

I am also inserting a portion of the Report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the national war agency appropriation bill for 1945, relative to the officer of War Information.

It is as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

1944 appropriation	$38,222,504
1945 Budget estimate	64,390,000
Committee recommendation for 1945	58,625,367
Recommendation exceeds 1944 appropriations	20,402,863
Recommendation less than Budget estimates	5,764,633

The Office of War Information is strictly a war agency engaged in minor degree in connection with war informational activities on the home front and extensively and in major part in psychological warfare and propaganda activities on the foreign front. In this latter effort it is a supplement to, and, in large part, integrated with the operations of the military and subject to their directives. It seems hardly necessary to repeat the value of propaganda and psychological warfare as an adjunct to purely military operations. Such methods have been employed throughout the history of wars and the Nation which does not use them is as much at disadvantage in waging its war as though it were short of men and weapons. The enemies we are fighting in this war are past masters in the employment of propaganda. They started long before the war to deceive, intimidate, and weaken the peoples they sought to conquer and destroy, and their success in conquest was due in no small degree to their unscrupulous propaganda and psychological methods. They are still at it on a broad scale, seeking to poison the minds of peoples in occupied and neutral countries as to the war aims of the United Nations, the alleged weaknesses and impotence of the democracies, and the might and ultimate success of the so-called master races.

The Nazis and Japanese are following the same pattern but the latter with not so much skill or resources as the Nazis but still effectively. The Nazis have skillfully endeavored to picture the people of the United States and our institutions as those of a soft, decadent, pleasure-loving population. They circulate literature and pictures which are misrepresentative of what America stands for. They employ the radio, motion pictures, publications, and the lavish use of money to carry on this deception in the neutral and occupied countries. Their facilities are expansive and the amounts they expend for propaganda and psychological warfare are fantastic compared to those of the United Nations. The London Economist recently placed the German figure of expenditure for these purposes at $540,000,000 a year. The German Government owns or directly controls every newspaper published in Germany and the entire German radio system is operated by the German Government. Those who are interested in obtaining more complete details of the methods and resources of propaganda utilized by the enemy will find an informative and interesting memorandum on the subject commencing on page 30, part 2, of the hearings.

The Office of War Information is the instrumentality of the United States, the "voice of America," to tell to the people of the world the truth about this war, our part in it, the power of the United States, to convince the German and Japanese people that their defeat is certain, to encourage the people in occupied countries to continue their resistance, and to convince enemy soldiers through leaflets and otherwise that continued resistance is futile, and to induce them to surrender.

The great proportion of this work is directly and indirectly a supplement to the military operations. Military men participate on the work of the committee which weekly prepares the directives governing the issuance of propaganda by the Overseas Branch. In the psychological warfare operations in the field, the operations of Office of War Information are directly integrated with the operations of the military and subject to the immediate control and jurisdiction of the respective theater commanders. If the theater commander is an officer of the United States Army he has as a part of his forces the personnel of the Office of War Information, and the Office of Strategic Services and their counterpart organizations and personnel from the British forces. If the theater commander is a British general, the same situation exists.

The New York Times, in a recent editorial, stated: "The Nazis have to be beaten on two fronts, on the military front and on the propaganda front." The Office of War Information is the agency of the United States authorized to conduct propaganda against the enemy. If it is to succeed it needs to be implemented adequately with the personnel and material for that task. It needs to do this with news, broadcasts, leaflets, pamphlets, motion pictures, posters, and every material suitable and proper to influence the feelings of the people abroad. It must be done incessantly, intelligently, and truthfully.

The Office of War Information requested a large budget for the fiscal year 1945, which, all hope and believe, will be the crucial year of the war. With the exception of a very small amount, the entire increase is asked for the operations of the Overseas Branch and specifically for the Outpost Service. The invasion of Europe is an impending event and these additional amounts for the Office of War Information are funds required for the support that is needed for the propaganda and psychological warfare to aid in military operations.

The total amount recommended for the next fiscal year is $58,625,504, which is a net increase of $20,402,863 resulting from a decrease of $502,444 in funds for the Domestic Branch, an increase of $20,676,031 for the Overseas Branch, and an increase of $229,276 for the Administrative Branch.

The committee has made a decrease of $5,764,633 in the Budget estimates. This amount consists of $264,633 in the Domestic Branch, $1,000,000 in the specific allotment to the Overseas Branch, and $4,500,000 in the contingency fund for allocation, when approved by the President, to the Overseas Branch in conjunction with actual or projected military activities. The contingency fund was requested in the sum of $10,000,000 for the entire fiscal year and has been allowed in the amount of $5,500,000, a sum which the committee believes adequate considering the fact that Congress will be available for further consultation as the fiscal year progresses if unforeseen needs develop. The decrease of $1,000,000 in the amount for the Overseas Branch is not specifically applied, the distribution of the cut being left to administrative determination. The reduction in the Domestic Branch is discussed later in this report.

Aside from $229,276 in administrative expenses, the entire increase of $20,402,863 is for the psychological warfare and propaganda work of the overseas branch of which $5,500,000 is for a contingency fund for use in connection with projected or actual military operations.

The major part of the increase is for the Outpost Service now maintained at 20 major offices and 18 branches in 22 countries of the world scattered from Sweden to Australia. They are the focal points from which is distributed much of the material of the O. W. I. which is prepared, directed, and sent from the United States, as well as conducting local informational activity. Most of these centers are engaged in pyschological warfare in some form. Those which work directly under the Army on psychological warfare are at London, Algiers, New Delhi, and Sydney, and at Honolulu with the Navy. At other outposts, psychological warfare constitutes a large part of their activities, such as Stockholm, Bern, Madrid, Lisbon, and Istanbul, because they are on the perimeter of Europe and are in a position constantly to see that material goes into occupied and enemy countries.

The increase for the Outpost Service and the contingency fund are for this type of psychological warfare operation. Provision

is made for the establishment of 35 new outposts at the direction of the military authorities. These additional funds are for the establishment of new outposts in Europe and the extension of psychological warfare activities in the China-Burma-India theaters. The London office of the Office of War Information has received specific instructions from the Army, covering some 500 pages, approved in detail by the Combined Chiefs of Staff, and providing for the establishment of outposts at 27 points in Europe and the Balkan area following invasion activities. The funds for these are included in the bill.

The committee has expended a considerable amount of time in examination of the activities and operations of the Office of War Information. Five days were given to the testimony and cross-examination of Director Davis and his assistants. The printed testimony takes up 333 pages of part 2 of the hearings. The committee invites each Member of the House to examine these comprehensive statements. Mr. Davis' statement commences on page 2; the statement of Mr. Robert Sherwood, Director of the Overseas Branch, commences on page 68; the statement of Mr. Edward W. Barrett, Executive Director of the Overseas Branch, commences on page 71, and Mr. Owen Lattimore, Deputy Director, Overseas Branch, in charge of Pacific operations at San Francisco, on page 170.

Committee investigators were sent prior to the hearings to the New York and Washington offices and to the training school on Long Island to obtain information for use in the hearings. Members of the subcommittee preparing this bill personally went to New York and went through the Overseas Branch operations in that city. They listened to broadcasts, talked with executives and employees, examined the preparation of scripts for broadcasts, inquired into the preparation of publications and material for distribution abroad, witnessed a remarkable motion picture that has just been completed at request of the Army for use in one of the liberated areas, and examined such confidential directives and other material as could be crowded into one day of investigation.

The subcommittee found the New York office functioning 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and its personnel enthusiastic and highly interested in the work they are doing. This finding is also corroborated by the report of committee investigators who previously had visited these offices. It is regretted that the subcommittee did not have an opportunity to visit the Pacific Branch of San Francisco, headed by Mr. Owen Lattimore, formerly personal political advisor to General Chiang Kai-shek. His interesting testimony on the organization, direction, and correlation with the Army and Navy as to propaganda and psychological warfare in the Pacific, commences on page 170 of the hearings. The Pacific office is also on a 7-day, 24-hour schedule. From New York and San Francisco offices, the Office of War Information employs 28 radio transmitters. From these stations go approximately 3,500 radio programs a week; 2,650 from New York and 875 from San Francisco. On a daily basis this means approximately 380 from New York and 125 from San Francisco. From New York the programs are divided into 22 basic languages depending upon the direction of the program and from San Francisco into 10 basic languages and 13 dialects. United States station operations are also carried on from ABSI, a new station in Great Britain, and from stations in north Africa and Italy. The United States will operate 36 transmitters in the next fiscal year compared with more than 60 of the Germans and 46 of the Japanese. The combined number of United States and United Kingdom transmitters is less than the combined number of stations of the enemy.

The committee believes that the Office of War Information is making a valuable contribution to the war effort of the United States and in direct aid of the military operations. It bases this belief not only on its own examinations but on the testimony of men competent to judge and whose responsibility in connection with the war effort enables them to speak with authority. These expressions come from our representatives in the military and the diplomatic field.

A letter from the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, appears on page 20 of the hearings. On pages 78 and 79 are communications from Ambassador Winant in London, Ambassador Harriman in Moscow, and Mr. Merrell, Acting Chief of the United States Mission at New Delhi, India.

The committee, in connection with its previous hearings and reports on appropriations for the Office of War Information, has printed letters from military leaders as to its usefulness. These are in House Report 852 of this Congress on the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944, and came from General Marshall, Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Lt. Gen. Jacob S. Devers, and Maj. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton. In the present hearings, on page 79, is a message from Maj. Gen. T. G. Hearn, chief of staff to Lieutenant General Stilwell, of the China-Burma-India command. Last session the committee also had before them Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure, now on General Eisenhower's staff in charge of psychological warfare. His testimony will be found commencing at page 1251 of the hearings on the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944.

Last summer a committee of five United States Senators visited the battle areas of the world where United States activities were being carried on. In November, following their return, Senators MEAD and BREWSTER appeared before the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate to inform that committee of the work of the Office of War Information in the foreign-propaganda field which had come under their observation. Their testimony is found commencing on page 344 of the Senate hearings on the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944. Their observations were complimentary to the work of the agency and Senator MEAD in response to a direct question as to whether it was being overdone replied, "In my judgment, it is too thinly spread about."

The committee has not relied entirely upon these various judgments, upon its own visit, nor upon the testimony of the officials of the Office of War Information. Chairman CANNON of Missouri prior to the preparation of this bill, addressed a letter to General Marshall, Chief of Staff, citing the fact that both the Office of Strategic Services and the Office of War Information had requested increased sums for the fiscal year 1945 for operations in the foreign field and had based these increases upon enlarged and continuing activities in connection with military operations. General Marshall was asked to express an opinion as to the part of these organizations in connection with military operations and also as to whether it was desired to have their work continued in civilian status or transferred to the military arm. He was further requested, if he felt it necessary, to contact the commanders in the various theaters of operations on these points.

A confidential answer has been received from Lt. Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, Deputy Chief of Staff, replying in the temporary absence of General Marshall. His letter includes the confidential comments from the theater commanders who were contacted. These comments indicate increased and important use to be made in military operations of both organizations. The committee, with special permission, can quote the two concluding paragraphs of General McNarney's letter:

"The War Department believes that both the Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services are performing essential functions overseas. Approved plans do call for increased activity on the part of both of these organizations, and as military operations expand, it is to be expected that their work will increase.

"No further militarization of the Office of Strategic Services and the Office of War Information is planned. As you know, the Army is finding it difficult to remain under the present manpower ceiling of 7,700,000 men and still furnish all military personnel and units required for planned operations. Because of our manpower limitations, it is mandatory that the Office of Strategic Services and the Office of War Information be manned so far as possible by civilians."

The Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information is recommended to receive $2,200,000, which is $502,000 less than the 1944 funds and $264,633 less than the Budget estimates. The new Director, Mr. George Healy, Jr., is an experienced newspaperman, formerly vice president and treasurer and managing editor of the Times-Picayune Publishing Co., of New Orleans, and on leave from his paper for work with the O. W. I. for the duration.

The part of the Domestic Branch is clearly stated by the following excerpt from Mr. Healy's statement, found in full commencing on page 241:

"The Domestic Branch plays the part of a service institution in getting information about home-front needs to the American people. Charged with responsibility for their information policies, Office of War Information works with Army, Navy, and the civilian agencies as counselor and colleague. On the other hand, it provides a welcome service to newspapers, radio, magazines, and other mediums of public expression which carry information about home-front needs to the people. These privately operated channels depend on the Domestic Branch of Office of War Information to tell them what home-front needs require greatest attention.

"May I call to your attention the booklets which you have before you? Page 2 of your booklets asserts that 'a well-informed public is America's greatest security. The Office of War Information is dedicated to that practical ideal.'

"Office of War Information serves as a coordinating and liaison agency doing four basic jobs.

"On page 3 we place our No. 1 job: Getting out the war news to the American people. This includes home-front information as well as battle-front information.

"In reality, what we seek to do is to see that the established news-gathering agencies have an opportunity to present a clear and accurate picture of the war's progress. Mr. Davis and I consider ourselves advocates for the people in obtaining prompt release by the War and Navy Departments of all the news which will not endanger American lives or jeopardize the American cause. Daily conferences in the Director's office and frequent consultations at the Pentagon and Navy buildings are part of this procedure.

"The Branch Director and O. W. I. deputy directors follow a similar procedure to obtain prompt release of adequate home-front news by the several civilian war agencies. Developments deserving public attention frequently involve two or more agencies, and O. W. I. tries to see that this overlapping does not result in agencies escaping responsibility for keeping the public informed.

"The respective deputy directors are assigned to specified war agencies and are responsible for supervision of the information programs of those agencies. Periodically the information officers of the agencies themselves meet in the O. W. I. conference room to discuss their joint and separate problems. When a development is impending which

might concern several agencies, an O. W. I. deputy takes precautions to insure that responsibility for releasing information concerning this development is accepted by the proper agency.

"In addition to serving the various agencies as information consultants, the deputies assist in the conduct of special war information programs concerning the agencies to which they are assigned.

"Our ask No. 2 is: 'Eliminating confusion by coordinating news from all Government war agencies.

"No matter how carefully worded an official release by one agency may be, there is a possibility that this announcement will go beyond the functions of the issuing agency and refer to the practices or policies of some other agency. O. W. I. gives the second agency an opportunity to say whether references to it are accurate. There are cases also where a release by one agency concerns a problem which affects several other agencies whose expressions should be published with that of the first agency if the public is to have a clear picture of the whole problem.

"Job No. 3 of this Branch is: 'Enlisting public support of measures deemed essential to the prosecution of the war, such as avoidance of careless talk, waste-paper salvage, staying on the job, and Victory garden planting.'

"Under the philosophy outlined by Congress for this Branch, our responsibility is discharged when we make available to established publishers, broadcasters, picture producers, billboard owners, advertisers, or other regular channels of expression, information about war needs. We supply the various mediums with facts obtained from official sources concerning the urgency of war needs. How they handle these facts is their decision. It is my opinion that all of these private institutions are serving patriotically and well as avenues through which Office of War Information informs the people of things they can do to help the war effort.

"Our fourth task is: 'The clearance of all speeches and statements by policy-making officials in the executive branch. Also clearance of Government printed material of an informational nature.'

"In connection with the latter responsibility, Office of War Information has 'killed hundreds of publications and thousands of propaganda items of the type Congress wishes eliminated.' If you will turn the page you will see that this quotation is from the Report on the Reproduction and Distribution of Printed Matter for Executive Agencies to and at the request of the Bureau of the Budget submitted by the Printing and Distribution Control Branch of the War Production Board on March 25, 1944.

"In discharging this fourth responsibility we promote conservation by eliminating duplication and waste of printed material and prevent confusion by clearing the public speeches and magazine articles by officials in the executive branch. In this instance, clearance means checking for accuracy with other officials whose policies or practices might be involved."

The Domestic Branch has been operating within the philosophy prescribed by Congress in connection with the drastic reductions that were made in the appropriations for this fiscal year. The current appropriation of $2,702,444 provided funds for liquidation of the more extensive operations that were under way and $295,335 will have been obligated for that purpose, leaving a total of $2,407,109 for other operating expenses in 1944. The Budget estimate of $2,464,633 provided an increase of $57,524 represented by overtime pay absorbed in the fiscal year 1944. The committee has provided $2,200,000 which is $204,107 less than the 1944 funds, exclusive of liquidation funds, and $264,633 less than the Budget estimates. In making this decrease the committee has eliminated the Surveys Division of the Special Services Bureau ($61,000) and a contract item ($43,500) for sampling polls of the effect of domestic programs. The committee believes that these may be desirable but are not a necessity. With the home front better organized and the requirements for citizen cooperation with programs more clearly established, the committee feels that as the fiscal year 1945 progresses the Domestic Branch will be able to apply the remainder of this cut without impairment of the war effort.

The Domestic Branch is fulfilling an important function as now organized and conducted and the committee is glad to report to the House that its action at the last session has had a beneficial effect and an improved service from the Office of War Information on the home front.

O. W. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Inasmuch as the Office of War Information is primarily a news organization, the public may be interested in the policies which it is following in dealing with news of the Presidential campaign.

We are a war agency, staffed by members of both political parties or of no party, existing to serve a national interest which would not be served by any partisan misrepresentation or misinterpretation of the news. Our Domestic Branch has no concern with political news; its sole function is to provide information to the American people on the status and progress of the war effort, and the war policies, activities, and aims of the Government.

Our Overseas Branch, however, performing the same function for foreign nations, conducts a more general news service. Its purpose is not to furnish news to American citizens overseas, whether military or civilian; but to provide foreign peoples with such news as will serve our objectives. These objectives are, in enemy countries, to undermine the morale of enemy populations and thus to promote the disintegration of the enemy's war effort; in enemy-occupied countries, to keep alive the hope of liberation and to stimulate resistance to the forces of occupation; in neutral countries, to convince the populations of the inevitability of our victory and to win their moral support to our cause; and in Allied countries to counter propaganda aimed at dividing the United Nations, to enhance the confidence and determination of our allies, and to foster a better understanding of the United States—this last in the confidence that the more foreign peoples know about us the better they will think of us and the more effective shall we be at the peace table.

These must be the objectives of an American war information agency, regardless of what administration may be in power; they will still be the objectives on January 21, 1945, no matter who may have been inaugurated as President the day before. Accordingly, we have followed and shall continue to follow the policy laid down in May 1943, with my complete approval, by Robert E. Sherwood, Director of the Overseas Branch. This declaration, which to my knowledge has never been published, is as follows:

"We should advertise and dramatize the fact of the campaign and the free election as a demonstration of American democracy continuing freely in the midst of war. Every attempt should be made to create the best possible impression of both candidates, with absolute impartiality; for one or the other of them will become the President of the United States, and it will then be our duty to convince the world of his good faith, his statesmanship, and his wisdom in handling all the manifold problems of the war and beyond the war."

In accordance with that policy, and in pursuance of the objectives outlined in the foregoing, we conduct our foreign news service. It is as accurate and truthful as possible but its content is determined to some extent by the interest of foreign audiences, most of whom care little about the details of American politics. Generally speaking, what they want to know about the forthcoming election is simply this: Will whoever may be elected be determined to conduct the war to complete victory, and will the successful candidate and party be willing to cooperate with other nations in some form of collective effort to keep the peace hereafter?

On both these points the Office of War Information is able to reassure the peoples of the world. Every possible nominee of either party is determined to carry on the war to the total defeat of all our enemies; and the overwhelming support by Congress of the Connally and Fulbright resolutions, the Mackinac declaration of Republican leaders, and the statements of administration policy enable us to speak with confidence on the second point.

Beyond that, much news of great importance to the American public is of little or no interest overseas. This is true of most purely domestic issues; though the self-governing nations of the British Commonwealth and such neutral democracies as Sweden and Switzerland have a good deal of interest in the workings of American democracy, and in such of our problems as happen to resemble problems of their own. In such cases our staff is under instruction to report the issues objectively, without partisanship or editorializing on either side. Otherwise we say little about domestic issues to foreign audiences. We endeavor to maintain a general balance between Republican and Democratic statements that will give the world a fair impression of the principles of both sides, but we do not aim at a rigid mathematical equality; we make as wide as possible a selection of quotations from political personalities of all parties, and we use whatever there may be in their statements that serves the purposes of a war agency promoting the national interest abroad.

The policy outlined above has been detailed, in recent months, in a number of directives to the staff of our Overseas Branch. The full text of those directives will be found in the report of our hearings before the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, which will soon be published.

Montgomery Ward Seizure Must Be Probed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, although the administration has attempted to abandon the legal proceedings in the initial Montgomery Ward

seizure, yet the issue of that wanton and unnecessary act is by no means settled. The Sunday seizure of its subsidiary, The Hummer Manufacturing Co., is not directly pertinent to my remarks.

The House committee will proceed with its investigation of the seizure of the parent company without let or hindrance, so that the American people may settle in their own minds the limits of the Executive power. Indeed, the House investigation may well cover the whole War Labor Board set-up, because the Ward seizure is merely a part of a whole plan.

The action of the administration sets uneasy in the minds of the American people; they want to know the motives, the attitude of mind, of those who prompted that action.

The issue is presented in the words of the Attorney General:

> The President has a great constitutional reserve of power. The President clearly had the power to take the action he took here. The statutes recognize that the right is there. In time of war, it is true that in taking over plants the Government is subject to the regulation of the fifth amendment (that is, no person to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law) but no business or property is immune to his order * * * particularly in time of war, the court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Executive.

Virtually all Americans heard about the initial seizure of this retail organization. The War Labor Board determined in the Montgomery Ward case that the company was an essential war industry, but in the case of Sears-Roebuck, engaged in the same business and practically with the same set of facts surrounding that company, the War Labor Board held that Sears-Roebuck was not an essential war industry.

The American people are confused by the conflict of decisions on the part of the administration agencies. No man in this country knows whether the Government will take over his property, irrespective of military necessity.

The public supports the position of the company in its opposition to the administration's illegal action, and they do not believe that Montgomery Ward is an essential war industry.

At no time did the Congress contemplate authorizing the President to take over property not essential to the war effort. This was clearly determined at the time of the passage of the Smith-Connally Act. The issue was raised at that time and the administration claimed to reject any thought of such purpose. Hence, no specific barrier was then raised against the administration.

The subsequent change in attitude on the part of the administration requires that such a specific statutory barrier be raised by the Congress. To this end, the House Investigating Committee must determine the facts to support such congressional action.

It has been clearly ascertained that the Government exceeded its rights, and the great majority of the American people support this view. I am constrained to believe that the majority of the American people refuse to support the Government seizure of plants that are not engaged in the war industry, in order to enforce the War Labor Board's decisions.

Thoughtful Americans know that such illegal seizure is identical with the arbitrary and capricious acts of the dictators whom our armed forces are fighting and dying to overthrow. Yet at home the same issue arises. This unnecessary seizure of Montgomery Ward cannot be justified by the widest stretch of the imagination. Only capricious and irresponsible officials would attempt such action.

The courts have not shown themselves disposed to assume the responsibility involved in interpreting and applying the basic law, due to the paramount power of the Executive. The action of the Supreme Court in excluding labor unions from the conspiracy restraint of the Antitrust Act in the Hutchinson case from St. Louis, which involved carpenters' and teamsters' jurisdictional disputes, and in the Jersey trucking case, wherein the Court held that farmers had to pay union truckers extra to haul their produce into New York City notwithstanding the fact that the Antiracketeering Act barred such extra-pay requirement under the circumstances of that case, clearly show that the Court, in failing to interpret the basic law, implies that the Congress must again do what it had already done. The legislative history of the Antiracketeering Act clearly shows that the bill was so broad as to include all persons without naming any group or class.

The Congress is the last bulwark of American freedom. Capricious and irresponsible officials take advantage of the chaos of war, under the cloak of war necessity, to further their personal ambitions and schemes.

Philosopher H. D. Thoreau, in his Essay on Civil Disobedience, 1849, says:

> There will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly.

The issue in the initial Ward case and the action of certain Government officials requires that the House Investigating Committee make a searching investigation.

I quote another view:

> Whatever crushes individuality is despotism, by whatever name it may be called.

Only last week in Washington, an incident arose which I think perfectly illustrates the possible consequences of capricious and irresponsible acts by officials. The press reported that a policeman arrested a streetcar motorman for a traffic violation. Witnesses said the policeman motioned the car forward and then stepped into its path. Boarding the car, the officer wrote out a traffic summons as the car proceeded to the next stop, opposite the Treasury. En route the policeman and the motorman discussed the merits of the case. The press reports that the motorman stated he was "burned up," and thereupon stopped the car. While policeman and passengers stared, the motorman gathered up his lunch box and change carrier and quit the job. In seconds, street cars were lined up behind the stalled vehicle and passengers, piling out of the cars into Pennsylvania Avenue, blocked automobile traffic. That was a small matter, but in Detroit at the same time a Foremen's Union strike caused the failure to produce and deliver 250 P-38's, fighting planes badly needed at this time. The armed forces must not be made to submit to capricious whims, and they will hold those accountable at home who impede the war efforts.

Had the policeman foreseen the consequences of his ill-considered action, the incident would not have arisen. The same is true of the Ward seizure. Irresponsible officialdom must be curbed before the consequences ultimately destroy us. The House investigating committee has a necessary duty to perform; not because the Ward plant was seized, but because any non-war plant was or could be seized.

The words of Samuel Johnson, spoken in 1768, are as true today as when they were uttered:

> They make a rout about universal liberty without considering that all that is to be valued, or indeed can be enjoyed by individuals, is private liberty. Political liberty is good only so far as it produces private liberty.

The seizure of the Hummer Manufacturing Co. plant on May 21, which is so recent that it has not fully developed, does, however, raise certain fundamental questions.

In that case I note the President cited his authority for seizure, but the Army Public Relations officer announced, according to the press:

> That the wage scale approved by an order of the War Labor Board on April 14 would be paid. With a general increase of 4 cents an hour, this ranges from 60 cents to $1.24 an hour.

The authority cited by the President for his action also contains the provision that—

> Such plant, * * * while so possessed, shall be operated under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant * * * was taken.
>
> When possession of any plant has been taken * * * (the Government or the union) may apply to the War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment * * *. Upon receipt of such application and after such hearings and investigations as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes.

The clear mandate of the statute would seem to require an order of the Board after May 21, 1944, when the Government took possession.

The failure of the administration to follow the clear will of Congress makes it essential that the House investigating committee investigate thoroughly, and do so without delay.

Rent Control in Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1944.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Every Member of Congress, I understand, recently received a copy of a booklet with an orange cover on which there appeared "Exposed Warner Alleges Report by O. P. A. Psychologically Is an Intended Fraud."

We cannot let charges of this nature go unchallenged. So I am attaching a copy of a reply to Mr. Warner by Paul M. Green, Director of Accounting of the Office of Price Administration. If you will read this you will agree, I believe, that there has been no misrepresentation in our presentation. It followed recognized practice of real-estate accounting and made no claims for conclusions not warranted by facts shown.

Maximum legal rents in Minneapolis were established at the levels of March 1, 1942, about 20 percent above the 1934–35 low level of the depression. At that time nonfarm real estate foreclosures in the Minneapolis area were at the lowest point in 17 years. By 1943 they had declined from a depression high of 2,302 in 1933 to an 18-year low of 73. A recent survey disclosed that during the first year of rent control Minneapolis rental housing was in a substantially better operating position than in each of the years 1939, 1940, 1941, and also showed improvement over 1942. Even Mr. Warner, it is worth noting, does not deny that residential rental real estate is doing considerably better under wartime rent control than it did before the war.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1944.

H. L. WARNER,
President, Constitution Forever, Inc.,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. WARNER: A booklet attacking the statements made in the publication, Income and Expense Under Rent Control—Minneapolis Rental Housing, has reached our office. I shall attempt to answer the specific and implied criticisms of the accounting survey set forth in your booklet as well as correspondence will permit.

Among other duties, my office is charged with the responsibility for collecting operating revenue and expense data from rental properties for submission to the Rent Department of O. P. A. It should be understood that there is a clear line of demarcation between the Rent Department and the Office of Accounting Service within the Office of Price Administration. The publication you have criticized was prepared by the Rent Department on the basis of data included in the report of the Office of Acounting Service on the operating experience of Minnneapolis property owners.

1. TIME OF SURVEY

It is stated on page 9 of your booklet that the survey was made in the early summer months of 1943, and the implication is made that O. P. A. waited 9 months to release the report. Our records show that the accountants left Washington, D. C., for Minneapolis on September 27, 1943, and left your city on November 5, 1943. Our report to the Rent Department was dated November 13, 1943, and the Rent Department published their analysis in February 1944.

2. NET OPERATING INCOME

The statement is made on the same page that "the terms 'net operating income' and 'total expense' as used in O. P. A. chart 1 are but a half truth" and upon this statement you have based practically all your conclusions. Yet you have admitted that if a person took time to read the explanations of the chart the correct interpretation would be evident.

You have criticized the use of the phrase "net operating income" primarily because interest and depreciation were not included in its determination. (In regard to our exclusion of interest on investment, please refer to Accountants' Handbook, pp. 144 and 145, Ronald Press Co., 1943.) In support of this position, a letter to you from Mr. J. L. Lonegren is presented wherein he defines gross operating income, net operating income, and total expenses, assuming that all these terms were used in the same statement of operations. Mr. Lonegren has been asked to define terms removed from their context and, as a result, his definitions cannot be accepted as valid. Contrary to Mr. Lonegren's definitions, if these terms are used in the same statement, the amount of interest incurred on borrowed money, including debt discount and expense properly amortized during the year, and income and profits taxes accrued would be excluded from operating expenses in determining net income from operations. Financial expenses must be considered in determining net profit but they are not operating expenses. It is unfortunate that Mr. Lonegren included income and profits taxes accrued since they are not an expense. They are a charge against net profit and should be treated as such. Unlss there is a profit, there is no income and profits tax. Technically speaking, there is serious question as to whether they accrue since they cannot be determined until the year end. Also, you do not follow Mr. Lonegren in your discussion of interest since he properly qualifies it as interest on funds borrowed and you show interest on the actual value of the land; the actual replacement cost of the buildings and their furniture and equipment (less depreciation) regardless of its debt ratio.

Your attention is called to the September 1941 issue of the National Real Estate Journal, wherein Mr. W. H. Carpenter, of the Governing Council of the Institute of Real Estate Management, in an article on management accounting, uses the terms "total expenses" and "net operating income" in the same manner as these terms are used by O. P. A.

This office recognizes the depreciation of fixed assets as an expense, but it has been our practice to arrive at an amount for net operating income before depreciation. This practice has resulted from the fact that in the overwhelming majority of cases it has been absolutely impossible to find any reasonable record of depreciation. Minneapolis properties do not show depreciation on their records even though you properly point out that it is an important element of expense. Any accountant from our staff is ready at all times to report depreciation on the property if it can be shown that reasonable depreciation has been recorded. As you well know, records on property operated by management companies are, in the great majority of cases, set up to furnish reports to the owner showing cash received and cash disbursed. In order to determine the depreciation on such property, if it can be determined at all, the accountant would be forced to visit the owner personally and convince him that it is to the owner's advantage to submit copies of his income-tax returns for examination. Such a procedure would be not only costly but extremely cumbersome. The records maintained by persons operating their own property are also incomplete. In these cases it is usually necessary to develop the records from check stubs, scraps of paper, and other miscellaneous sources with the difficult job of separating personal from business transactions and finding all the data necessary to determine the operator's income and expenses. The weight of accounting opinion seems to be that even if we could have determined the depreciation charges, those charges should have been based on original cost and not on replacement value as shown in your figures. Graham, in volume 15 of the Accounting Review, as quoted in the 1943 Accountants' Handbook, page 811, states: "This argument (that depreciation included in operating charges should be based on replacement cost) is directed more toward the determination of selling prices than to an accounting for profits. Undoubtedly many of the data employed in accounting for profits * * * are an invaluable aid to the management in determining future selling prices and in estimating what the results of future years may be. Recognition of this fact, however, does not imply that predictions as to the future should be injected into the summary of past operations, or that the costs involved in the computation of profits for a past period determine selling prices for a future period." The determination of interest expense actually incurred poses the same problems plus the difficulty arising from the secrecy which often surrounds this element of expense. Up to the present time any advantages that might be obtained have not appeared to be important enough to warrant undertaking the tremendous job of searching out these elements of expense.

3. DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

You have stated that "any sound businessman knows that a reserve must be built now to pay for deferred maintenance which will require to be performed later." (Warner, page 19). However, there is some question as to the amount of true deferred maintenance that "must be performed later." Certainly you are not contending that interior painting formerly necessary to maintain the earning power of your property but now made unnecessary in the present market for rental property is a maintenance expense that must be made good in the future. There may be some true deferred maintenance existing today because of the lack of material and labor supply but your claim is grossly exaggerated. My office has extensive material available to establish this point. Further, you have stated that "every sane apartment-house operator is setting aside a reserve for future expenses of repair and maintenance." In our examination of property records in Minneapolis and in other cities we have not been able to find such provision being made and reflected in the books and records.

4. INCOME RESIDUE

You have objected, on page 14, to the statement that the net operating income (as defined in the O. P. A. publication) less interest and depreciation results in profit. The statement would have been more inclusive if it had also spelled out the fact that the same calculation may result in a negative profit figure known as a loss. However, the possibility of a loss is implied, since this is generally accepted terminology.

In your criticism of the above statement a table is presented which, according to your views, proves the statement "fallacious" and a deception. Let us examine the case presented.

First, you have assumed an arbitrary value for purposes of calculating interest and depreciation. The basis of the value given to this hypothetical property is known only to you, but it is apparent that the amount of interest and depreciation can be varied by changing the value used. Secondly, you have seemingly used hypothetical interest in your calculation—interest that is neither paid nor accrued.

The gross rental income of the property producing $188 net operating income amounts to $465 per unit, or $11,160 for the 24-unit building you have assumed in the illustration. The present value of the theoretical property is 7½ times the gross rental which would be high under normal conditions and is especially inflated in comparison with the depressed conditions you ascribe to Minneapolis real estate at the present time. As a result, the depreciation and interest figures used by you are inflated even if some way could be found to justify your basic reasoning. The conclusions which you draw from this presentation and expect the reader to draw are fallacious. You have assumed the property to be worth $84,000, and in your calculations you have applied 6-percent interest on $84,000. The only conclusion possible in accordance with Mr. Lonegren's letter is that the property must have a mortgage against it for the full present value. Consequently, the owner's equity in this property would be zero, and the return upon the owner's equity would be infinite. Your statement on the same page that "A landlord is entitled to a percentage net return on his investment" is not now nor never has been true. As a real-estate man, you know that at all times there have been thousands of properties that have not earned enough to cover their operating costs when depreciation has been properly determined. There are many and varied causes for this situation; but it exists, has existed in the past, and in all probability will continue to exist in the future. As this is the case under normal business conditions, there is no responsibility on O. P. A. to attempt to alter it at the present time. Your so-called net operating deficit might better be labeled "Return desired by landlord less net operating income." No financial statement based upon accepted accounting principles will show imputed interest as an operating expense as yours has done.

5. PROPERTY SURVEYED

You have objected to the properties included in the Minneapolis survey because some may have been secured from management companies. The sole criticism appears to rest upon a misconception of law and fact. A management company, operating property for an owner, acts as an agent of the owner, and the laws of agency apply to this relationship. The owner does not lose control of the amount of money to be spent for repair and maintenance. Is this not the same situation that exists when the owner manages the property? Further, your generalization that few, if any, properties operated by management concerns are possessed for permanent estate is not in agreement with the conclusions to be drawn from from a study of properties operated by management concerns. Many properties may be placed in the hands of management concerns for sale, and institutions that have acquired bankrupt property may turn it over to these companies for operation; but your statement implies that all property managed by these companies is of this type. This is not in accord with the conclusions drawn from the study of management-company records from coast to coast.

You have alleged further that a 4-percent sample of properties in Minneapolis is too small to determine "an accurate graph of actual facts." How is it, then, that you can consider 244 units adequate in your analysis (see Warner's chart 2), but 3,111 units inadequate when presented by O. P. A.? If 3,111 units are 4 percent of the Minneapolis rental properties, then your 244 units are only three-tenths of 1 percent of the rental properties in Minneapolis. Furthermore, our examination of approximately 200,000 dwelling units in leading cities substantiates the results found in Minneapolis.

Further, you have implied that the sample was picked by the O. P. A. as the "most suitable for their purposes." Our accountants have been instructed to secure a cross section of rental property, and to the best of our knowledge they make an objective selection. If you have any evidence whatever in support of your suggestion, we should appreciate your citing us the specific cases where such selection occurred.

Much of your criticism is fundamentally an indictment of the accounting records maintained on rental property. The property management industry has suffered in its account preparation because of the separation of owner from manager, and the large number of property owners operating their property as a side line. A good accounting system is one that will provide the owner with the information he needs in such a way and at such times that it will be most useful. It seems that the methods generally in use are not fulfilling their purpose, since they do not set forth properly the condition which the owners and managers constantly contend is the true state of affairs. The only correction can come from within.

Our accountants are willing to accept all costs that have actual existence and have been reflected in the books of account. However, records are looked at in terms of accepted accounting practice and any information of real estate records that adheres thereto is made a part of our report to the Rent Department.

On page 10 of your booklet you contend that O. P. A. implies that landlords in Minneapolis are enjoying a 16.4 percent better return for 1943 than they did in 1939. The O. P. A. report, in table 1, states that net operating income increased 16.4 percent in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, over the calendar year 1939. On the basis of figures given to us by property owners in Minneapolis this statement is correct. Your contention is that Minneapolis property suffered constant losses from 1930 or for over 10 years before rent control and apparently you complain that rent control has not cured these alleged ills of previous years. Regardless of whether you are right or wrong in your contentions, Minneapolis landlords generally are still in a substantially better position than they were in the years before rent control.

Although this letter does not reply in detail to all the charges made in your letter and in the attached booklet, I believe that I have pointed out enough of the serious errors and omissions to show that these charges are erroneous. My office is attempting to do a sound job of accounting and my knowledge of the Rent Department convinces me that it is doing a sound job of rent control, both departments cooperating in their part of the war effort. The accounting principles and practices used by us are those followed by the best-known accountants in the United States, and we have worked in close association with all the leading national accounting associations. Your statements and implications that buildings may have been deliberately selected to show a desired result or that acccounting figures may have been developed in such a way as to prove a desired point have no foundation whatever. If you have any trace of support for such contentions, I shall appreciate your stating the specific buildings which you think were selected to show a desired result and also citing competent accounting authority to show any place where you may think that our accounting methods have been incorrect.

Very truly yours,

PAUL M. GREEN,
Director of Accounting.

More About Swapping Horses in a Stream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., of May 24, 1944:

MORE ABOUT SWAPPING HORSES IN A STREAM

This newspaper has pointed to the fact that President Lincoln, reputed author of the saying about swapping horses while crossing the stream, never hesitated to change horses when the national welfare and safety demanded it. He changed them frequently until he found the right kind of horses, just as the Nation changed horses in the inception of the great Civil War when it sent Lincoln to the Presidency. The historical reminder was made in view of the fact that the new dealers and their huge army of Federal pay-rollers are making use of the Lincoln saying in this campaign just as they did in the third-term campaign.

But the Lincoln practice was not the only one. There are numerous historical instances of horse-swapping while crossing streams made to great advantage.

In November 1917, Georges Clemenceau took over the supreme command in France's darkest hour of the First World War, ousting the wabbling Malvy cabinet and organizing a real victory cabinet.

In March 1918 the Allies, in another black hour—a black hour—displaced the generals in command and made Marshal Ferdinand Foch commander in chief of all the allied armies, one of the most vital steps taken toward ultimate victory.

In December 1916 the British King and Parliament ousted Herbert Asquith as Prime Minister and made Lloyd George supreme. The First World War began in 1914.

A strikingly comparable political situation to that which exists today obtained in 1918. President Wilson made a partisan political plea to the American people before the fall elections to give him a Congress that would uphold his policies—a rubber-stamp Congress. Although this country was still at war, and there was uncertainty in the public mind as to how long it would continue, the voters of the United States answered by electing an anti-Wilson Congress. That is to say, they changed horses while yet crossing the stream. They objected to being told that there was an indispensable man in the White House, yet, despite the overwhelming defeat of all the Wilson policies in 1920, the United States went on to achieve greater and greater things along the path of its political destiny.

In the present global war, another vital change was made on the Allied side also in another dark hour. Great Britain had de-

clared war on Germany (September 3, 1939), and thus had entered upon its greatest struggle for existence; but on May 10, 1940, it decided that changing horses in the middle of the stream was necessary, and it reformed its government entirely, making Winston Churchill prime minister, succeeding the appeaser Chamberlain.

But the present incumbent of the White House, who is being rated by his supporters as the indispensable man of the hour, himself, repudiated that theory in the course of a speech delivered April 18, 1932, at St. Paul, Minn., with particular reference to the horse-swapping idea.

"There will be many in this Nation during the coming months," he said, "who will implore you not to swap horses while crossing a stream; there will be others who will laughingly tell you that the appeal should have been worded, 'Do not swap toboggans while you are sliding downhill.' But it seems to me that the more truthful, the more accurate, plea to the people of the Nation should be this: 'If the old car, in spite of frequent emergency repairs, has been bumping along downhill on only two cylinders for 3 long years, it is time to get another car that will start uphill on all four.' "

The phrase "for 3 long years," should now read "for almost 12 long years," with which slight alteration the analogy is as applicable now, even more so, as it was when originally proffered.

Address by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas of Utah, on Tenth Anniversary of the American Birobidjan Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York on May 16, 1944, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Jewish autonomous region, Birobidjan, in the U. S. S. R., and on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the American Birobidjan committee—Ambijan.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure indeed to meet again with the Ambijan Committee tonight. Especially on such an occasion as the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Jewish autonomous region of the Soviet Union—Birobidjan. And especially at the moment when the United Nations stand poised for the final blow against fascism.

Eight years ago, when we met together for the first time, it was to honor the man who was then the representative of his great country to ours—Alexander Troyanovsky. It was also to consider the rescue of some 1,000 Jewish families from the tragedy which fascism was making of their lives. The Jews in Germany and their brothers and sisters in eastern Europe were the first to learn the full meaning of fascism—as it is now known around the globe. Hitler was consolidating his power in the newly organized Third Reich. His ideology was still a matter of debate outside the borders of the unhappy countries where the people were beginning to feel the power of its blows. There was still easy talk about the trains running on time in Italy, complacent opinion on order coming out of chaos in Germany, order restored by one strong man.

The diplomatic representatives of the Soviet Union were the first to call out to an unheeding world for unity against this new order—this common foe. It was they who pointed to collaboration among the great free nations to save the world from the fire and the sword.

Coming as I do from the recently completed conference of the International Labor Office, where the unity welded on bloody battlefields is beginning to be practiced in the corridors of peace—I want to draw attention to another lesson we have learned from that great country. It was clear to all the delegates at the I. L. O. conference that the hope of a high standard of living in peace is intimately related to attaining the objective of full employment. The productive possibilities of full employment impress us most strikingly when we recall that it was possible for the Soviet Union to raise the standards of its people by conscious effort. Unbelievable improvement took place as 5-year plan succeeded 5-year plan. It took the war to show the whole world that the Soviet Union had used the skills of its own scientists, professional people, managers, and workers to bring about not only a marked improvement in the standards of living of its people, but in addition it has created the apparent miracle of the Red Army.

The Red Army has covered itself with undying glory. It has earned the admiration and the gratitude of all freedom-loving people. What is one of the elements in the many that went into the making of this great army?

It is an army that is composed of as many peoples as go into the family of nations which is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These peoples—Mongols, White Russians, Georgians, Ukrainians, Jews—thanks to the far-sighted policy of their government in regard to national minorities—received more than the legal—constitutional—right of full equality. They were given every opportunity and encouragement to live as equals. The history of Birobidjan—whose anniversary as the Jewish Autonomous Region we are marking here tonight—is an outstanding example of that policy. It was to fulfill—to implement the equal rights of the Jewish people that the Russian Government set aside for them a territory. Its settlers would then add to their general rights as citizens representation on the national councils of the family of nations of the Soviet Union. The true—the genuine equality which is shared by all the national groups in the Soviet Union has shown the way to all the world. It is the unshakable foundation from which Jewish soldiers in the Red Army were able to strike such heroic blows—strike hard—against the murderers who were exterminating their brother Jews with machine-gun bullets—fired into their backs—as they stood on the edges of the common graves they had themselves been forced to dig.

Fascism and Hitler have only slavery—torture—death in sealed gas chambers to offer to national minorities. The Soviet Union gave them full and untrammeled equality. Hitler used anti-Semitism as a banner with which to rally the scum of the earth into his legions of death. In the Soviet Union, anti-Semitism is severely punished as treason against the entire nation.

The debate against Hitler and his morality is now being conducted in simple, fundamental language. His dream of world conquest lies crumbled in the ruins left by the pounding he is getting from the skies over his fortress. His plans for lebensraum are left weakened for the kill by the most powerful blows of all—the blows at Stalingrad, the defense of Leningrad, the beating at Moscow, the crushing defeat at Sevastopol. The united might of the United Nations led by the United States, the U. S. S. R., and Great Britain, will seal his doom.

Democratic America hates fascism and all it stands for.

To the American people, the ideal of unity and of equal rights for national minorities is part of our great heritage. Our country was settled and has grown into its powerful present from multi-national and racial beginnings. Our strength is the strength brought to our shores by all the national groups who came here longing to be free. These pioneers of liberty founded a great nation.

Its charter of liberty, the Declaration of Independence, was the first to say for all the world to hear, "That all men are created equal, that all are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The author of that Declaration made no reservations separating freedom from happiness nor relegating them to one section of the population as against the other—granting them to Gentiles but not to Jews. "The equal rights of man and the happiness of every individual," said Thomas Jefferson, "are now acknowledged to be the only legitimate objects of government." Today these equal rights of Thomas Jefferson and the "four freedoms" of President Roosevelt are being fought for and won on a battlefield that covers the earth.

To insure the rights of all people to equality, to assure their right to work out their own destinies freed forever from the threat of enslavement and domination by a "master race," a united peace must follow a united victory. The friendship of the United States and the Soviet Union in war must be followed by a permanent unit, a permanent alliance, in peace. In such an alliance lies the only guaranty of lasting peace, of equal rights of the individual, the only guaranty to the rights of nations.

One almost wonders if Jefferson foresaw the present struggle in which the survival of democracy depends so much on the successful cooperation between the democratic powers of our day, when he said: "These nations, holding cordially together, have nothing to fear from the united world. They will be the models for regenerating the condition of man, the sources from which representative government is to flow over the whole earth."

Victory for democracy is in sight. But the price we, of America, will yet have to pay for its achievement is great indeed. The price in the lives of our youth. The price in widows and orphans left to face the future alone. Thanks to the sacrifices of the Russian people, that toll will be smaller than it might otherwise have been.

I feel, therefore, that the work of your Ambijan committee, in behalf of the orphans of Russian heroes, of orphans of the tragic Jewish refugees driven from land to land before the Nazi scourge, is a great and patriotic effort, an effort worthy of the great generosity of the American people. It is small payment to make on a debt of eternal gratitude. It is a fine thing to participate in the restoration of the lives of the children of those who died for freedom. For it is a fundamental of the concept of freedom and liberty that although they are gained by one, all profit. Freedom and liberty cannot be clutched selfishly by one. If it is, it is lost.

The orphans in Russia paid a great price for our freedom and for the freedom of our children. Sharing with the Russian people in their care is a fine expression of the unity which has saved the world from barbarism—and will preserve a lasting peace for generations to come. It is a fine way of cementing the bonds of friendship between peoples.

Some day, when the Russian children at Stalingrad and the Jewish children in Birobidjan have grown up into strong and splendid men and women, fully equipped to enjoy the equality of opportunity their country offers them, they will remember that the people of America and their children, through such efforts as those of your committee, stood with them and by them.

United together—these citizens of the future—in a world made truly safe for democracy by the permanent unity of the thre most powerful nations in it, they will be able, with happiness and confidence, to live as strong world citizens in a strong world—a world of freemen—where Jew and Christian, black man, yellow man, and white, will live together in peace and security.

In the tragic lesson of the slaughter of the Jewish people we have learned at great cost that an attack on one is an attack on the whole. Let us hope that in the world catastrophe it launched we will have learned the great lesson that our wisest policy is peace and friendship with all mankind.

How Shall We Pay for the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent and timely address entitled "How Shall We Pay for the Peace?" delivered by the very able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] on May 26, 1944, in Boston at a meeting of the Boston Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of the annual observance of Research Day in Boston.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I understand this meeting is dedicated to research. I am not here primarily to discuss this subject, but, before I proceed, I do want to pay my respects to research both in peace and particularly in war.

In normal times no business can expect to progress or even continue to exist without a considerable expenditure of time and money in research work. This is axiomatic. The war, however, for perhaps the first time, has popularized and dramatically illustrated the necessity for research and, when victory is won and the story can be told, I venture to prophesy that we in this country and the United Nations generally, will clearly understand how hard put to it we should have been but for the stupendous contribution made to the war effort by the scientists and research men who operate under the overall supervision of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. The contribution these men have made is incalculable and I for one do not believe that we could possibly foresee victory today or hope to maintain ourselves as a nation tomorrow without continuous and constructive effort along the lines pursued during this war by the patriotic Americans who have been in charge of this branch of our war effort.

In looking forward to the post-war world, it must be clearly apparent that the accelerated pace of research brought on by the war is truly going to produce a new world in which to live when industry takes the ball after the war starts to run with it on a peacetime basis. Outstanding developments in the fields of electronics, plastics and synthetics, in aviation and in many other lines, are not only going to give our people a better world in which to live, but are going to prove a stimulus to productive enterprise in this country, the results of which in my judgment will dwarf into insignificance the tremendous spurt ahead into mass production by the automobile after the last war. It is singularly appropriate that we pause today to pay some attention to research which may well be titled the keystone of our arch of industrial development and expansion.

As I have pointed out, however, it is not my intention to discuss this subject in any detail. What I particularly want to touch on today are some aspects of post-war fiscal policy which, in my mind, all add up to the question, How shall we pay for the peace?

It might be in order, in phrasing a question of this character, for me to apologize for introducing a post-war discussion of any character, because I am one of those who strongly believes in taking care of first business first, first business today being to dispose of the Nazis and the Japs. However, post-war planning seems to be the vogue, and on the assumption that we shall have several problems to plan for and to solve, I have no hesitation in posing the question, Not how shall we pay for the war but how shall we pay for the peace?

Some years ago, after 6 years of endeavoring to administer the city government of Newton, I recall making a statement to the effect that innumerable individuals and groups of individuals had been to see me during my several terms of office urging me to recommend this or that appropriation, but that in all the 6 years I recalled not even a single, solitary voice being raised in opposition to the expenditure of money. At that time, at least, it just wasn't the fashion to oppose the expenditure of public funds, and as I see the post-war picture beginning to unfold through the spy glass of legislation presently in the hopper in Washington, I am quite impressed that those who oppose excessive and unwise expenditure of public funds are still to a considerable degree crying alone in the wilderness.

As we take stock and try to find out where we are going—as we survey the route—I should like to start off with a short simile.

When the modernistic era commonly known as the New Deal took off in 1932 there commenced the process known as pump priming or boot-strap lifting. Deficit financing became the order of the day.

After 8 years of injecting this type of morphine into our system, the day of reckoning began to approach, when suddenly—out of a clear sky—the evil day was put off by the use of a new and powerful stimulant, known as war economy; comparable in effect to the drug marijuana. There isn't any doubt in any one's mind that the type of financing indulged in since 1940 drastically stimulated the patient. There is no argument about the use of this latest and most powerful stimulant because we are in a life and death struggle and must do whatever is necessary to win regardless of cost.

However, we expect this war is some day going to be won and over with and then is when we have to begin to stop, look, and listen, because when we start off the post-war period with an estimated indebtedness of $250,000,000,000, we're just going to be faced with one fact: the fact that science hasn't yet discovered a financial drug powerful enough to continue to keep us whipped up as we have been for 12 years, and so we have to begin to level off and get back to the point where we can live a normal life without depending upon financial drugs and stimulants.

Prof. W. L. Crum of Harvard University, chairman of the Conference on Research and Fiscal Policy, in his latest forecast of budgetary prospects for the first post-war decade, estimates expenditures will average $24,000,000,000 annually over this 10-year period. To this we must add a rough total of $13,000,000,000 for the cost of State and local government. Thus on a minimum basis it will cost the American people $37,000,000,000 per annum in the post-war period for the luxury of being governed, and in this Federal Budget, estimated at $24,000,000,000 average, I would point out most forcibly that there is no provision whatsoever for debt retirement. From a perusal of the debate last month on lend-lease in the House of Representatives, however, it would appear that at least one Member of the House, Mr. MCMURRAY of Wisconsin, is a complete devotee of the Alvin H. Hansen school of thought on the question of indebtedness. Mr. MCMURRAY on this point about the debt is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

"Mr. MCMURRAY. On this point about the debt, remember that every dollar of public debt also represents in the pockets of certain American people, that much assets. We are no worse off, as a total economy, because we have that debt; because the debt is property in the vaults of your own banks and of your own accounts, and if you cancel the public debt completely—do not misunderstand me on this—if you cancel that public debt completely, you would not increase the wealth or decrease the wealth of the United States of America one cent. You would merely redistribute the wealth.

"Mr. KNUTSON. How about the people?

"Mr. MCMURRAY. Some people would gain, and some would lose. You take the money out of one pocket and put it into another pocket, but the two pockets are in different pairs of pants.

"Mr. KNUTSON. I know the President says our national debt is not a debt, because we owe it to ourselves."

And a little later in this interesting colloquy:

"Mr. MCMURRAY. I said that if this debt were repudiated—let us assume the debt is $300,000,000,000—if the debt is repudiated, all the American people would gain $300,000,000,000; all of them put together, and some of them would lose the $300,000,000,000 which is represented by the bonds they now own.

"Mr. KNUTSON. I get you. It is a bookkeeping transaction."

I suppose if we were to follow through with this interesting bit of economics that it would be next in order to legalize theft and highway robbery on the theory that by such action all that happens is that some of the people lose while others gain.

Now in estimation these post-war budget figures and prospective tax receipts, the conference on fiscal policy assumes "at least a resolute and intelligent attempt by those responsible for public policy to balance the Budget." Possibly an elaborate assumption, but let us start with it and now assume this picture: A debt of two hundred and fifty billions, which of course economists of the Rooseveltian school think is really no debt at all, because it is owed to ourselves; an annual cost of government, for the 10-year period after the war, of thirty-seven billions each year with the Budget supposedly balanced but with absolutely no provision whatsoever

for retirement of the debt, and here we have a picture which seems to be serious enough without looking for the further difficulties which I am now about to describe.

I see a tendency evidenced by pending legislation which unless restrained, will, I can promise you, throw our Budget out of balance in perpetuity. There isn't time today to go into great detail nor do cold figures ever add much to a discussion of this character. However, let me just touch on a few of the bills which are pending before the House and Senate and which would create new obligations in addition to the prospective Budget figures I have just discussed. We find that they cover a multiplicity of subjects—agricultural relief, post-war public works, post-war highway construction, veterans' relief, adult education, farm home aid, flood control, reorganization and readjustment of aviation, Federal housing, assistance to small business, world-wide relief programs, world-wide economic adjustment, stabilization of international finance, as well as many others. It is impossible to give any accurate forecast as to what the aggregate cost of this proposed new legislation might be. The great majority of the bills merely authorize that a particular thing be done or a certain form of relief be granted and that the necessary moneys to carry such programs into effect are authorized to be appropriated without any estimate or provision in the bill for specific authorizations. However, to give some idea of the staggering figures involved, I list herewith a few of the bills which do specifically authorize the appropriation of Federal funds:

Adjusted-service pay, fifteen billions.

Several different kinds of highway bills, totaling approximately eight billions.

A bill for municipal development, one billion.

For highways and airport systems, twelve billions.

For Federal-aid post-war planning, public works, eighty-five millions.

Varied agricultural bills totaling approximately seven hundred and twenty-five millions.

Adult education, per annum, fifty-six millions.

Fifteen millions for farm homes, and the same amount for Hawaiian highways.

Five hundred millions for a central reconstruction fund and so on, almost ad infinitum.

One sample of the spirit of the times was well evidenced the other day in the Senate in connection with the passage of the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945. Included therein was an item of $50,000,000 for a project titled, "School Lunch Program." This is in the picture only for the next fiscal year but there are several bills presently before the Senate designed to make the project a permanent fixture.

Now it is a difficult proposition for a man in politics to stand on his feet before any audience and appear to oppose a project which seems to be as worthy as this one. In such remarks as I may make to illustrate my point, however, I am not opposing lunches for school children as such, but I am distinctly questioning the wisdom of having lunches for school children in the city of Newton or the town of Brookline, and in the 350-odd cities and towns in Massachusetts paid for by the Treasury of the United States—in whole or in part.

I am a firm believer in home rule and State rights and in having the Federal Government leave to the States and the States to the local communities all projects which can possibly be so directed. There is no city or town in Massachusetts that cannot afford to take care of a school-lunch program in its budget. If by chance, there is a community which cannot, then it should seek help from the State Government. But when we start to Washington to dip into the Federal Treasury for a project of this character, we start a procession which can end in only one graveyard—the graveyard where bankrupt governments have been laid to rest.

To the general subject of post-war Federal expenditures above and beyond the twenty-four billion budget total, before referred to, there may be added another item—aid for foreign countries—evidenced already by the recent authorization of Congress—the initial U. N. R. R. A. authorization, totaling $1,350,000,000. I voted for this initial authorization and I shall be glad within reason to vote for further authorizations and appropriations but I say to those who evidence a desire and a willingness to extend aid to the peoples of the war-devastated countries, that the question is, how far can we go in this direction without wrecking our own country. Obviously no one ever saved a drowning man by jumping in and drowning with him—no nation can save another nation by merely becoming poverty stricken with it, and only by staying a solvent, sound, free America can we help the peoples anywhere in the rest of the world to help themselves back into a state of peace, prosperity, and progress. In this phase of post-war expenditures as in every other phase, emotionalism and worthy desires must be tempered by cold figures, hard facts, and common sense.

Had I time, I should like to more than just mention another leak in our post-war financial stability, a device recently grown in favor in Washington—the device of Government corporations.

Previous to 1916 the corporate form was being very sparingly used by the Government and, when used, it had been the general policy to liquidate such corporate entities as soon as they had served their purpose. The New Deal administration seems to have abandoned such a policy and favors the use of the corporate device for governmental operations because it appears to have flexibility and speed of action plus the ability to achieve complete absence of control. In the past 10 years Government corporations have increased their assets 500 percent. Some have no limit on their authority to issue obligations. A partial list of these corporations shows a total of 110,000 employees with an annual pay roll of $228,000,000. Thirty-two are not even under the supervision of the General Accounting Office. Their total assets over a year ago were upward of twenty-three billions. These are a few high spots in this picture which becomes vastly more disquieting when we find that any attempt to analyze these corporations and their operations is practically frustrated by the complicated and mixed up nature of their financial control. Investigation agencies have thus far had great difficulty in securing a complete list by name alone. New corporations seem to appear suddenly. Dormant ones seem to become active overnight.

The great danger here is twofold. The first is that these corporations, without the knowledge of the Congress or the people, have obligated the taxpayers to stand behind scores of billions of dollars of commitments. The second danger is that these corporate agencies compete with private business, do it without control, without accounting, without good business operation and at the expense of the taxpayer including the business taxpayers with whom they compete. Here then in the Government corporate device is another nail in the coffin of prospective Government chaos and bankruptcy unless we can, when the war is over, induce the appropriating branch of our Government, the Congress of the United States, to learn the lesson of uncontrolled Federal expenditure.

I do, however, want to say to you and to every citizen of this Commonwealth, that unless minority groups interested in their own pet projects, unless the type of worthy but in my opinion misguided citizens who have been deluging me with pleas to have the United States Treasury pay for the lunches served in the cafeterias of our schools in Massachusetts, unless all of us here at home can learn to practice some degree of restraint and take the pressure for appropriating money for this, that, and the other thing off the backs of their Representatives and Senators, you and I will never live long enough to see a balanced budget or anywhere near a balanced budget in these United States as far as the Federal Government is concerned.

I need not remind an audience of this character that in the post-war world, people can, of course, have what they want. They can have state socialism or free enterprise but they cannot indefinitely have a mixture of the two.

The Treasury of the United States Government is just as good as the productive capacity of the free people in the United States, and no better, and when you mix your economic drinks as we are trying to do in this country, a drink of state socialism will crowd out the productive growth of the economic garden just as weeds will destroy the Victory garden on which you hope to subsist this summer.

We are going to win this war, because it has been clearly demonstrated that American fighting men are as good as they ever were in the history of this country and because they are better than the enemies they must conquer. They could not win, however, without the tools of war which have been produced in this country on a scale never even imagined or dreamed of and never thought even remotely possible by Hitler, Tojo, and their satellites who so tremendously underestimated the productive capacity of a free people. These tools of war in turn could never have been produced even by a free people unless a few brilliant and patriotic souls were fortunately at hand and available and able by the inexhaustible processes of research and development to give to industry the know-how to produce these tools which our enemies have not yet been able to equal.

So in the final analysis, brains in the research field, ability in the management field, know-how in the field of skilled tool makers and mechanics and the quick adaptability of the average American workman have given us the equipment with which to wage a successful and victorious war, and in the post-war world, we need have no fear of unemployment, of distress or hardship or of a low standard of living, just so long as the Treasury of the United States is run on a prudent basis just as your business and mine as well as our own personal affairs must be run. If this example can be set us in the post-war world by the Government of the United States, research, management, skilled and unskilled workmen under the aegis of free enterprise will do the rest. If this pattern is not before us, no man in this room will live long enough to see the end of the difficulties which will face the American people.

India's Soft Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am attaching

hereto an interesting and informative article from the May issue of Common Sense. The proper approach and solution to the problems of India and Asia are of vital importance in the Gargantuan tasks of winning our war in the Pacific and helping to develop a new era of prosperity and peaceful advancement in that section of the world.

INDIAN'S SOFT SPOT

(By Louis Fischer)

The presence of Japanese troops on Indian soil is much more than a military fact. It has explosive political possibilities. Japan, of course, cannot conquer India or any large part of it by force of arms. Tojo will therefore try to win India with a weapon called Bose.

Subhas Chandra Bose is the stormy petrel of Indian politics. He has fought Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, India's nationalist leaders. India knows him well. In 1938, he was elected president of India's biggest political party, the Congress. Today he is the chief of the Indian Nationalist government formed in Singapore under Tojo's umbrella.

If Japan seizes an important Indian city, Bose will plant his government on Indian territory and appeal to his fellow Indians for support. As head of his so-called free India he would ask Indians to rebel against the rule of the British Raj.

Bose is not only the prime minister of Tokyo's quisling Indian government. He is also commander in chief of an Indian army. When the Japanese quickly occupied Hong Kong, Malaya, Singapore and other British colonies in the Far East shortly after Pearl Harbor, they captured thousands of Indian soldiers. Later, these prisoners of war were released and, together with Indian residents of Japan, Burma and the Dutch islands, they were organized into Japan's Indian army estimated at 100,000 strong.

Several times each day, Nippon's radio now announces that it is not Japan which is invading India; it is this Indian army that is coming home to expel the British. Already Bose is calling on Indians in the British Army to refuse to fight their Indian brothers under his command.

India's strange climate may facilitate the task of this Tokyo puppet. By May the monsoon rains start and any Japanese forces that are entrenched in India at that time will remain until the dry season begins late in October. More than 100 inches of rain falls in the Assam border area during the 6 monsoon months, and fighting stops. So Bose would have until the end of 1944 to foment an Indian mutiny.

Irrespective of military developments, Subhas Chandra Bose is a person to be reckoned with in Indian affairs. Many Indians regard him as a romantic, fanatic, fiercely-intransigent foe of British rule. He is tubercular and tempestuous. In college he organized a strike of the student body and attempted to beat up a British professor who had spoken disparagingly of Indians. He was suspended from school for 2 years.

During this interval in his educational career he underwent a strange religious experience. Bose's father was a prosperous, worldly lawyer but his mother was devout and well versed in Indian religious philosophy. Under her influence, he decided to dedicate himself to the search for God. One still night in 1914, Subhas Chandra Bose, in his late 'teens, stole away from his family like Buddha and started walking to the Himalaya Mountains, the traditional home of Indian spirituality. He trudged from one height to the other consulting holy men and viewing shrines. He did not find what he was seeking. So he descended into the valley of the Ganges, bathed at sacred Hindu sites and debated with the pious.

A serious illness cut short the young man's quest. Penniless and unknown, he languished in dirty huts until, by chance, someone learned of his identity, telegraphed his parents who had been tracing him for months, and arranged that he return to his home in Calcutta.

After this shaking adventure, he was admitted to the Scottish Churches College in India. Subsequently he was an honor student at Cambridge University in England. Upon his return to his native land, he became a civil servant.

Then, in the early twenties of this century, Mahatma Gandhi launched his first noncooperation movement against the British. Disregarding the entreaties of his family and friends who endeavored to convince him that a brilliant official career awaited him in the service of the British, Bose resigned his government post and joined the nationalist movement. He edited publications, sat in jail, made speeches, and organized. His former friends, whom I met in India in 1942, look upon him as an excellent political organizer.

Bose's talents and energy won him followers and nation-wide popularity, but his individualism and impetuosity made him a disruptive influence in Indian politics. He threatened to split the Congress Party led by Gandi and Nehru. Yet he could not be downed, and in 1938 he became the president of the Congress Party.

At the annual convention, Bose made a ringing plea for socialism. He spoke warm words for the Soviet Union. India could only gain her freedom, he declared, "if Great Britain becomes a Socialist state." As for India, he asserted, "socialism is not an immediate problem for us; nevertheless, Socialist propaganda is necessary to prepare the country for socialism when political freedom has been won." And he added, "I have no doubt in my mind that our chief national problems relating to the eradication of poverty, illiteracy, and disease and to scientific production and distribution can be effectively tackled only along Socialist lines." At that time, however, he believed that there should be more than one political party; he did not favor dictatorship.

Numerous Indian leaders differed sharply with Bose. These differences were accentuated when the Second World War broke out in September 1939. Without consulting India's leaders, the Viceroy immediately announced that India was at war. Gandhi nevertheless interviewed the Viceroy and promised not to obstruct the war effort. But Bose protested and launched his own antiwar Forward party. The British threw him into jail. With the help of the Indian underground, Bose fled abroad in January 1941.

Mystery now veiled his movements. Some said he was in Moscow beseeching Stalin for aid to liberate India; Russia then had a pact with the Nazis, and the Communists were antiwar. Others presumed to know that he was in Berlin. Details of his interview with Hitler were reported. Soon, from an unidentified foreign radio station, he began broadcasting regularly. India listened. When I visited India in the summer of 1942, his whereabouts were the subject of much discussion. Was he in Germany? Or Japan? By 1943, it was definitely established that he had joined the Japanese in Singapore. There he set up his Indian Nationalist Government and began recruiting Indian war prisoners for his army which is now making thrusts at the British in India.

During my week as Gandhi's house guest, I asked the Mahatma about Bose. Both the Indian and foreign press had reported that Bose had been killed in an airplane accident over Japanese-held territory. On hearing the news, Gandhi sent a telegram of condolence to Bose's mother.

Sitting on the earthern floor in Gandhi's tiny mud-walled, bamboo-roofed hut, I said to my host, "I was rather shocked when I heard that you had telephoned to Bose's mother."

"Do you mean because I had reacted to news which later proved false?" Grandhi asked.

"No," I replied, "rather because you had praised a man who went to Fascist countries and identified himself with their ause."

"I did it," Gandhi affirmed, "because I regard Bose as a patriot of patriots. He may be misguided. I think he is misguided. I have often opposed Bose. Twice I kept him from becoming president of Congress. Finally he did become president though my views frequently differed from his. But suppose," Gandhi continued, "he had gone to Russia or America to win help for India. Would that have made it better?"

"Yes, of course," I said, "it does make a difference to whom you go for assistance."

"I do not want help from anybody to make India free," Gandhi asserted. "I want India to save herself." Later he said, "The Germans and Japanese proclaim every day that they do not want to lay hands on India, they merely want to help us get our freedom. I do not want their sympathy or help, for the simple reason that I know they are not philanthropists. All I want is a respite for India from all foreign domination."

I made it my business while in India to interrogate every Indian leader on the question of Bose. In Wardha, a town in central India near Gandhi's village, I interviewed Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Moslem who succeeded Bose as president of the Indian Congress Party. Although he understood a good deal of English, he did not trust his knowledge of the language and so Jawaharlal Nehru was acting as interpreter. When I asked Azad about Bose, Nehru laughed and exclaimed, "The Test Question," for he knew that I was judging Indians by whether they rejected Bose or justified his conduct in going to Axis lands.

"Bose has taken the crooked path," Azad said.

On my second day in India, I talked at great length with Nehru in New Delhi. Among other things, I inquired about Bose. Nehru is a passionate anti-Fascist and has proved his antagonism to Hitler and Japan by activity on behalf of Abyssinia, Loyalist Spain and China. In conversation with me, Nehru denounced Bose. He said, 'People here think Bose politically wrong and morally wrong. But no Indian regards him as a traitor. He has been in touch with the Axis because he wishes to serve India. That's a misguided deed but it is not treason to India."

It is this attitude which makes Subhas Chandra Bose a factor to be reckoned with in the present Indian situation.

The big puzzle now is whether Bose's propaganda will impress Indian civilians and Indian soldiers. Two years ago, the Indian people heard many anti-Japanese statements from their recognized political leaders. The threat of a Japanese invasion of India first arose in the spring of 1942, after Burma fell. On April 26, 1942, the following appeared in Gandhi's weekly English-language magazine, Harijan:

"Question: If the Japanese really mean what they say and are willing to help to free India from the British yoke, why should we not willingly accept their help? Gandhi's answer: It is folly to suppose that aggressors can ever be benefactors. The Japanese may free India from the British yoke but only to put in their own instead. I have always maintained that we should not seek any other powers' help to free India from the British yoke. That would not be a nonviolent approach. We should have to pay a heavy price, if we ever consented to take foreign aid as against the British."

In the same magazine, on June 14, 1942, Gandhi wrote: "I do not want the help of the Japanese—not even to free India."

But Gandhi's correspondents pressed: "What to do if the Japanese come?"

"These questions," Gandhi replied, "come from Andhradesh where the people rightly or wrongly feel that the attack is imminent. My answer has already been given in these columns. Neither food nor shelter is to be given nor any dealings to be established with them. They should be made to feel that they are not wanted. But, of course, things are not going to happen quite so smoothly as the question implies. It is a superstition to think that they will come as friendlies. No attacking party has ever done so. It spreads fire and brimstone among the populace. It forces things from people. If the people cannot resist fierce attack and are afraid of death, they should evacuate the infested place in order to deny compulsory service to the enemy. If unfortunately some people are captured or fall into the enemy's hands, they are likely to be shot if they do not obey orders, e. g., render forced labor. If the captives face death cheerfully, their task is done. They have saved their own and their country's honor."

A week later, in Harijan, Gandhi replied to a question about Subhas Bose's policy. "I have never attached the slightest importance or weight to the friendly professions of the Axis Powers," Gandhi declared. "If they come to India they will come not as deliverers but as sharers in the spoil. There can therefore be no question of my approval of Subhas Babu's policy. The old difference of opinion between us persists."

This was not only Gandhi's personal position. It was the fixed point of view of the Congress Party, which carries considerable weight in India. An April 1942 resolution of the All-India Congress Committee affirmed that "the committee repudiates the idea that freedom can come through interference or invasion by any foreign nation, whatever the professions of that nation may be. In case an invasion takes place, it must be resisted. * * * We may not bend the knee to the aggressor nor obey any of his orders. We may not look to him for favors nor fall to his bribes. If he wishes to take possession of our houses and fields, we must refuse to give them up, even if we have to die in the effort to resist them."

Since August 9, 1942, however, Gandhi, Nehru, Azad, and thousands of other prominent Indian nationalists have been in jail and are silenced. They can no longer caution Indians against listening when Bose summons them to rebel against the British. One leader is still free. She is Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Indian poetess and a former president of the Congress Party. She was dangerously ill when the wholesale arrests of nationalists took place in 1942 and therefore remained at liberty. On January 27, 1944, the Hindustani Times, of New Delhi, published a statement by Mrs. Naidu in which she said, "We have been consistently against any form of foreign invasion, no matter what label it may bear, because we have had quite enough of foreign invasions. There are no two opinions among us on this." Speaking for the central committee of Congress, she added, "We of the working committee have always been anti-Japanese. We would be anti-anybody who tried to invade us. We are against all forms of aggression as we are against all forms of exploitation. That is the position of the working committee."

Since making this anti-Japanese statement, Mrs. Naidu's public utterances have been put under a ban. In any case, she has less influence than Gandhi or Nehru or Azad. Besides, in the last 2 years India has lived through much turmoil and a famine to boot, and these may have caused much bitterness which would be grist to Bose's mill. According to an official report given by Sir Reginald Maxwell, home member of the British Government of India to the legislative assembly, the political disturbances between August and December 1942 resulted in considerable bloodshed. On 538 occasions, Maxwell stated, the military and the police fired on crowds, killing 940 demonstrators and injuring 1,630. In 5 places airplanes were used to disperse crowds.

These events, coupled with the continued imprisonment of the nationalist leaders, would naturally sow resentment against the British. Undoubtedly, Bose's underground followers in India have exploited the mood.

I find this item in my Indian diary: "Bombay, June 17, 1942, stand-up buffet dinner at Mrs. Krishna Huthesingh's, Nehru's sister. Mrs. Reed, an Indian woman married to a Scotsman who edits an English paper in Calcutta, told me that recently a street demonstration took place in Calcutta in favor of the war. Most of the people in the parade, she said, were Communists. In a central thoroughfare a Bose supporter rushed up to the marching column and stabbed a marcher to death. * * *"

Bose is from Calcutta, the home of Indian terrorists. Now he is broadcasting to them as head of an Indian nationalist government and announces his approach to liberate India. This cannot but stir the imagination of those who, unlike Gandhi, believe in violence, and, who, unlike Gandhi, Nehru, and the Congress Party, would join with the Japanese or the devil to achieve independence.

The next few months will see a sharp, monumental struggle between the philosophy of 75-year-old Mahatma Gandhi, ill in a British jail, and the opposing philosophy of young Subhas Chandra Bose, Japanese puppet in India. The stake in the struggle is the part which 400,000,000 Indians are to play in the war and in the post-war. Indians constitute one-fifth of the human race. The tendency in India today is toward extremism and away from Gandhi's nonviolence and Nehru's reasonableness. Bose, the prophet of violence, will affect India's political thinking even if he never gets much further than the Burma border. There is no doubt that Gandhi's influence has waned since he went to jail on August 9, 1942. In the storm that is raging in Indian minds and hearts, Indians find Gandhi's ideas too temperate and his methods too slow. Ever since Gandhi became the dominant figure in Indian affairs—"The biggest thing in India," as the Viceroy said to me—he threw his weight into the scale of moderation, gradualness, and peaceful means. Perhaps his star is sinking. There is a new star in the Indian heaven—Subhas Chandra Bose. This incalculable comet today moves within the orbit of the "Rising Sun," and the bulk of politically-minded Indians therefore turn away from it. But Indians are losing hope; they despair of getting national freedom from the British after the war. Their discouragement may be Bose's opportunity.

Churchill's November 10, 1942, statement: "I have not become the King's first minister in order to liquidate the British Empire" made numerous Indians doubt the sincerity of the Cripps offer of March 1942, which was designed to create the impression that India could leave the empire. Nevertheless, liberals and moderates in India tried to make themselves believe that the end of the war would see a change of heart in London and New Delhi. Such illusions die hard because they are born of a last hope. But on April 20, 1944, Emanuel Shinwell, cosistent labor critic of the Churchill government, stridently backed Churchill on empire, and Arthur Greenwood, labor leader and often opposed to the government's policy, "approved everything Shinwell said and stressed the resolve of the British people to keep the Empire together after the war." That made it easy for Churchill to close the discussion with a reiteration of his "no liquidation" statement.

So it is obvious that India will not be given freedom. The Indian nation can expect no help from inside England or from the United Nations. China would like to oust the British from India in order to reinsure her own freedom from imperialist pressure. But China lacks the power.

Thus, far from advancing the cause of Indian freedom, this war has set it back. The resultant bitterness will dominate the political minds of Asia in the post-war period and conduce to the flowering of extremists like Bose.

The pattern of the peace settlement—and India's place in it—are already pretty clear. Field Marshal Smuts and Lord Halifax, among others, have revealed the official British views. Smuts foresees a trinity—Russia, America, and Britain—dominating world politics and making the peace. But Russia and America are strong; Russia, Smuts says, will be the "mistress of Europe." Britain is weak. How then can England establish a balance of power within the trinity? To match Russia's sphere of influence in eastern and central Europe, Smuts urges England to carve a sphere of influence for herself in western Europe and gather her empire more closely around her.

Thus, Russia's expansionism confirms British imperialism. Or is it the other way round? Does Britain's insistence on preserving the past impel Russia to restore her past? In any case Churchill's "hold our own" and Stalin's announced intention to get back what the Czar owned make up the quickly emerging pattern of the peace to come. America's response may be a new American imperialism on the islands of the Pacific and along the course of a pipe line in Arabia.

With each of the three major powers seeking to acquire new sources and symbols of strength, how can anyone expect England to surrender India? If the peace is written in terms of nationalism and spheres of influence, there is no hope for a free India. What this will mean to half the human race that inhabits Asia we will know in years to come.

Free Speech in Newark, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WALSH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I as unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "See Here, Mr. Farley," published in the Newark, N. J., Evening News of May 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEE HERE, MR. FARLEY

No stranger to Jersey City, its mayor, and its ways, James A. Farley returned to Journal Square last week. He returned not in his old capacity as Democratic national chairman bearing gifts, but as a guest speaker before the local Kiwanis Club. Introduced by Harry Moore, an old friend, who knows Mr. Hague, too, the former Postmaster General spoke, in part, as follows:

"My name is added to the rather cosmopolitan list of those who have spoken, started

to speak, or attempted to speak here despite the rigorous restrictions against speeches delivered and undelivered. This has served to make Journal Square known throughout the Nation. From the conflicts that have occurred, history is bound to note this spot as one of the battlegrounds where free speech was firmly established, together with the American way of life."

Ah, but "those conflicts," Mr. Farley, were in the long, long ago. In the intervening years Mr. Hague has seen the light, also a Federal court order and the fourth term. The old ban on Communists no longer exists. The C. I. O. comes and goes without hindrance and more often it stays. His honor is a last-ditch defender of the Constitution—New Jersey's old one, that is. The Communists, New York branch, have adopted Mr. Hague as one of their own heroes, only slightly to the right of Brother Browder and Pravda. C. I. O. organizers and speakers are no longer driven into the outer darkness and the Erie ferries.

So you see, Mr. Farley, times have changed and Mr. Hague with them. And no more cracks, please, about free speech in Journal Square. It's practically as free as air, if sometimes not so clear.

Allotments of Appropriations for Federal Agencies and Corporations

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, at times such as we are now experiencing there should be full cooperation between the President and the Congress. Such an attitude is most beneficial to the war effort.

I regret to say I see a quarrel in the making, and only a determined stand on the part of the Members of this House can prevent it.

As you are aware the President has by Executive order set up many agencies and instrumentalities to assist in prosecuting the war. In many instances he has provided the necessary expenditures from funds voted by the Congress in a lump sum without restrictions. So far as I am aware only one agency has been openly criticized, that being the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. There is a strong minority at the moment seeking to abolish that agency. Evidence of that effort was apparent last week when an amendment was offered to strike an appropriation from the war agencies bill. As you know the amendment prevailed in the committee but on a teller vote in the House the item was restored by a vote of 123 to 119. It now goes to the Senate.

When the independent offices appropriation bill was considered in the Senate an amendment was added. The bill was sent to conference and a conference report is about to be filed. In that report is the Senate amendment I refer to. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and must be brought back for a separate vote. This amendment is very far reaching. While it is directly aimed at the Fair Employment Practice Committee it also includes dozens of other agencies. The Senate amendment provided that after July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation shall be allotted or made available to any agency or instrumentality, including those established by Executive order, unless the Congress has appropriated money specifically for such agency or instrumentality, or authorized the expenditure of funds by it.

The Comptroller General says 26 agencies will be affected by this amendment and aside from that it has not been definitely determined as to whether or not certain corporations would be affected. It is my understanding that the chief counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is of the opinion that subsidiaries of that corporation are affected. The Comptroller General also names 19 corporations which might be affected in some way by this provision. The list of agencies named by the Comptroller General are:

Liaison Office for Personnel Management.
Committee for Congested Production Areas.
Board of War Communications.
Committee on Fair Employment Practice.
American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe.
Committee to Investigate Racial Discriminations in Certain Fields of Railroad Employment.
Federal Interdepartmental Safety Council.
Federal Real Estate Board.
Interdepartmental Committee to Consider Cases of Subversive Activities on the Part of Federal Employees.
Interdepartmental War Savings Board Committee.
President's Committee for Education of Men Demobilized From the Armed Forces.
President's War Relief Control Board.
War Refugee Board.
Federal Fire Council.
Patent Planning Commission.
Coal Mines Administration.
Puerto Rico Legislative Committee.
Wage Adjustment Board.
Foreign Economic Administration—some functions.

The list of corporations named by the Comptroller General are:

American President Lines, Ltd.
Cargoes, Inc.
Colonial Mica Corporation.
Copper Recovery Corporation.
Defense Homes Corporation.
Federal National Mortgage Association.
Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation.
Panama Railroad Company.
Puerto Rico Cement Corporation.
Steel Recovery Corporation.
Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.
United States Spruce Production Corporation.
War Emergency Pipelines, Inc.
War Hemp Industries, Inc.
War Materials, Inc.
Warrior River Terminal Company.
Defense Supplies Corporation.
Metals Reserve Company.
Petroleum Reserves Corporation.
Rubber Development Corporation.
Rubber Reserve Company.
United States Commercial Company.
Institute of Inter-American Affairs.
Institute of Inter-American Transportation.
Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.
Inter-American Navigation Corporation.
Prencinradio.

Most of these agencies and corporations are engaged solely in connection with the war effort and were set up by the President under Executive order. It is my understanding that the House conferees have agreed to accept the Senate amendment with an amendment. A motion will be made to recede and concur with an amendment. This House amendment strikes out the date in the Senate provision which was July 1, 1944, and makes the effective date January 1, 1945. In other words, it simply delays the death sentence 6 months. This amendment is of such importance that I think all Members of the House should familiarize themselves with the situation that will confront the Executive branch of the Government if it is approved.

If the House does not vote down the amendment it will be in the bill when it goes to the White House. I cannot conceive the President will be willing to sign the bill if it contains such a provision as it directly affects so many war agencies set up by him. I feel he will hold it will impede the war effort. The amendment would, so far as affected agencies are concerned, prevent the President from allocating any money under his control for expenses.

I insist the passage of this amendment by the House will invoke a quarrel with the President. In my humble opinion the public will overwhelmingly side with the President. Congress will be labeled as having gone on a strike and deserting those behind the guns.

Members should not permit their views on the Fair Employment Practice Committee to be used as an instrumentality to interfere with the efficient operation of other necessary war agencies. Let each project be judged separately, not collectively.

Should this amendment become a law, Congress would either be required to authorize appropriations for each or make a direct appropriation for each before they could legally continue after January 1, 1945. As I said at the outset, this is no time for a quarrel between the President and the Congress.

I appeal to the Members of the House to study this amendment carefully so you can vote intelligently when the motion is offered. I am sure if you will do this the motion will be defeated.

A Word to the Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, all people with good sense know that labor unions have their proper place in the American way of life; that they are necessary and desirable; that they are here to stay.

It is equally true that the overwhelming majority of our people know and admit that they are subject to the same manipulation by ambitious politicians and racketeers as are many other organizations. Many of those who do not believe in our form of government and in particular the Communists have infiltrated themselves into labor unions and exercise a power out of all proportion to their number or their real worth.

Nothing is gained by condemning all unions; nor is anything gained by insisting that all unions are perfect.

Action, vigorous and positive, but tolerant and understanding, will correct the intolerable situation which has all too long prevailed and which at the moment is causing many good citizens and many overseas men to be resentful of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee's program.

Reform should come from within the union ranks.

It may go too far if it comes from without. It may destroy as well as reform.

An editorial from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 24 states one phase of the problem clearly. That editorial reads as follows:

Today, as set out in a story on page 1 of today's Journal, a young women's organization is to be addressed here by a Rev. Charles C. Webber. The meeting is to be held in the Y. W. C. A. building. The Reverend Mr. Webber is billed to speak as a representative of the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee.

The speaker's background is of interest. Formerly he was one of the originators of the National Religion and Labor Foundation, of which Sidney Hillman was the first president.

A committeeman for the foundation, writing in its official organ, made this significant observation:

"It is no longer a question of the need for revolution; the question is as to the method of bringing the revolution to pass * * * the work of revolution would have to be carried through a Lenin leadership. * * * Consequently, our concern is to build the understanding leadership from those who are ready to digest the strong meat of direct revolutionary preparation."

This quotation gives, it appears to us, a pretty clear indication of the religious character of the foundation which Webber represents.

But that is not all.

What Webber himself stands for seems to fit in perfectly with the official viewpoint of the foundation. To a conference of Middle Atlantic Seminary students he is quoted as saying:

"The missionary of tomorrow will show the workers how they can bring about the abolition of capitalism. * * * He will sustain the workers in their efforts by picketing with strikers. * * * He will assist in establishing labor colleges where * * * the contribution of Soviet Russia in her attempt to establish a new social order will be discussed."

The appearance here of Rev. Mr. Webber, and the appearance in other parts of the country of large numbers of individuals of his viewpoint, raise a question that has for long disturbed us and, no doubt, others.

That question, which is addressed not only to the leadership of the C. I. O., but even more particularly to the rank and file members of C. I. O. unions, is this:

Why does a great and powerful union organization, composed of probably 98 percent loyal and patriotic Americans, permit their movement to be spearheaded and led by men and women who are as hostile to the traditions and institutions of freedom in this country as Hitler himself?

That this is so, that such leadership is tolerated and even encouraged, is one of the great puzzles of our time.

Millions of C. I. O. members are working faithfully and loyally in the country's war industries. They have contributed of their thought, strength, and industry to making this Nation an allied arsenal. They have had their part in the greatest saga of mass production history has ever unrolled.

Not only that, but these same patriotic citizens, C. I. O. members, have contributed to the limit of their ability to the financing of the war. They have bought bonds; they have taken part in the Red Cross drives; they have responded to every appeal for community support of the war effort on the home front.

Most important of all, these C. I. O. members have sent their sons by the hundreds of thousands into the armed forces of their country to fight and die, if need be, on any one of a dozen different battle fronts of the world.

These things bespeak more loudly than words the same love of country among C. I. O. members that burns in the hearts of any other group of United States citizens. These acts constitute a pattern of patriotism that is as easily identifiable and as unmistakable as a sunrise.

Yet it is this same great body of highly organized workers, who even now are continuing to answer the call of their country in its hour of peril, who sponsor and set the imprimatur of their approval upon individuals such as this same Rev. Mr. Webber, whose obvious objective is not the welfare of the worker but the effectuation of the Moscow party line.

Under such leadership political action becomes nothing less than the avowed destruction of the American system of life under which, of all the nations on the globe, including Russia, for more than a century and a half our people have enjoyed freedom and the highest level of economic prosperity the world has ever known.

In following such a course, the C. I. O. leadership arouses in the minds of millions of otherwise friendly United States citizens growing fear of its purposes. It alienates, from the C. I. O. and all other branches of trade-unionism, that support which most of us feel should be properly given unionism of the American brand, but feel just as strongly should be withheld from the Russian variety.

If there is an answer which can be given to this baffling misdirection of the purposes of the millions of loyal American citizens in the C. I. O. membership, we should like to have it. Mind you, we said an answer, not the usual denial that the broad Red streak in either the C. I. O. leadership or its political action committee exists.

Mr. Paul Christopher is head of the C. I. O. in Tennessee. An explanation from him of this situation would be of interest, not only to us but, we are confident, to thousands of C. I. O. readers who are doubtless as mystified by the course their union is taking as we are.

Mr. Speaker, the unions should do their own house cleaning.

Cooperation on the Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the flood-control and irrigation interests of the people of the Missouri-Mississippi system cannot be integrated. We should not be fighting one another because our interests are mutually interdependent. The people of the arid and semiarid States want to keep their water and the people in the flood-control areas want them to keep it and not send it down to flood their lands or, for that matter, to improve navigation.

Flood control and irrigation are of prime importance to the life and welfare of all our people. If we can store our waters upstream we can help to control the floods downstream and, at the same time, bring more and more land into cultivation.

Water can also be used for the creation of power which in turn can be used to develop our resources for the benefit of all. Units of power derived from coal and oil cannot be replaced but units of energy obtained from water are replaceable. To conserve water and to use it wisely is to conserve, as well, our coal and oil reserves.

If we will forget our differences of the moment and plan for the future we can coordinate our efforts so that the upper and lower States' needs and interests will be considered and an equitable plan worked out for the benefit of the whole. Surely we are big enough and smart enough to plan for the comprehensive development of the whole basin so that all sections will benefit and the Nation, as a whole, will be the gainer.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement by O. S. Warden, president of the National Reclamation Association, as it appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently, and an editorial from the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune, of May 23, 1944:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

STATEMENT BY O. S. WARDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, BEFORE COMMERCE COMMITTEE, UNITED STATES SENATE

The National Reclamation Association, which has an affiliated membership representing the water interests in 17 Western

States to the west of the ninety-seventh meridian, was organized 13 years ago to cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Reclamation and thereby promote the irrigation of western lands.

In thi great western area, there has always been a short water supply. We need every gallon we can get. We can use all that we have to advantage in the economy and the careful development of land and water resources, which are the abiding foundation of our progress—State and regional.

Quite naturally, we treasure every flowing stream and every storage for future use. Quite naturally, again, the whole West is up in arms if there is a proposal to take any of our water hundreds of miles away to be used in another place for a purpose other than the protection of property or the creation of production values.

BIG INCREASE IN CROPS

Under the Reclamation Act of 1902, plus private enterprise, about 22,000,000 acres of land have been made productive. Crop production has been increased annually $625,000,000. Property values have been created in the amount of $16,000,000,000.

Ninety percent of our agricultural production is used at home. These 17 so-called reclamation States purchase a billion a year in goods and services from outside their boundaries. If they can have first use of the water that flows out of their mountains, they will double these purchases of goods and services.

Fifteen million people live in these western States. We can make homes for 15,000,000 more if we are able to build projects, for the most part multiple in character, all of which can meet the test of benefit to the region where they are located, as well as add to the general welfare of the Nation.

This great work in the West is just about half done. We can 'rrigate 22,000,000 more acres if we have first use of the water. We can repay the cost over a period of years.

DIFFERENCES IN RAINFALL

Do not forget the limited water supply. There is a rainfall west of the ninety-seventh meridian of from 5 to 30 inches a year. East of this meridian there is a fall of from 30 to 60 inches.

These differentials in rainfall cannot be controlled by man. What we can do is to plan wisely and direct the use of the water. We can avoid conflicting plans. We owe this much to ourselves. I am sure there is an existent responsibility the Congress will wish to share.

There have come into the picture apparent differences, as plans have been prepared by the Army engineers and the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation for development of the land and water resources of the great interstate Missouri River watershed, with its 2,500-mile river system reaching all the way from Three Forks, Mont., to St. Louis.

Nine States are involved—Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Colorado. These States have a regional association organized to settle differences peacefully. Nine Governors and 16 committee representatives, in conference a few weeks ago, voted unanimously to wait until the over-all plan of the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation was ready, and to urge a coordination of all plans into a harmony of policy in advance of action by the Congress.

LACK OF HARMONY

Now, what has happened? The engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation have finished a 5-year study and a plan for an over-all development of the entire Missouri watershed. The desired and requested coordination has not taken place. Meanwhile, there are the river and harbor bill (H. R. 3961), and the flood-control bill (H. R. 4485), that distinctly have to do with the use of the waters of the Missouri River, pressing for legislation advantage.

This is not the way to get along. These are the reasons we are here supporting an amendment to H. R. 3961, hoping to clear the atmosphere and to establish policies that look to mutually satisfactory conclusions.

I am sure the people of the West are for irrigation, for flood control and for improving navigation. They firmly believe there need be no conflict between irrigation and flood control, if these purposes are properly put together—that is, with a mutual assistance one to the other.

NATIONAL IRRIGATION POLICY

Furthermore, if there is a shortage of water for all desired irrigation and navigation, there ought to be a reckoning of resulting values—regional and otherwise. A blunt question intrudes: Do we need additional facilities for transportation more than we need self-supporting homes?

My confidence for the future finds strength in the record of Congress as it has prepared land and water legislation all the way through the 140 years following the Louisiana Purchase.

Under the Homestead Act of 1860 and the Reclamation Act of 1902, which was really an amendment to the Homestead Act, first 160 acres was made available to the settlers, then 320 acres, and then 640 acres. But without irrigation, settlers could not make a living on any size tract.

In these later years, there has been a narrowing of acreage with diversity of production as irrigation and reclamation have become a national policy. With such a record, Congress and the Government cannot—indeed, will not—wish to back away from the responsibility of today.

The time has arrived to clear away the cobwebs of uncertainty, to define policies and to write legislative definitions of what each Government agency having a part in the development of our land and water resources shall plan to do. Conflicts and striving for advantage are undesirable and unnecessary.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 23, 1944]

PUT THEM TOGETHER

Some of the upper Missouri River newspapers have declared uncompromising war on the lower river States over the issue of the allocation of the stream flow. Insofar as it is necessary to fight for our rights in the use of the water against efforts in Congress to deprive us of them, we will all unite up here to do battle. But that war between the upper and lower States is not the right approach to the beneficial development of the basin or of that of any other western river systems.

In the first of a series of editorials on the subject the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently made the point, with which the Tribune agrees, that the upper and lower States should agree on a river plan that will benefit all of them or both regions will suffer in the fight for sectional advantage.

Competent Army engineers have fully studied the flood-control and navigation problems of the Missouri. The Reclamation Bureau engineers with equal competence have thoroughly studied the irrigation problems of the same basin. What is needed first of all is to put those studies and plans together into one over-all program. That certainly can and should be done quickly to the benefit of both sections. The Post-Dispatch is right that a drawn-out interstate battle for sectional advantage will damage the interests of all parts of the basin.

Resolution To Investigate Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, no one could be more interested in the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped than I am, nor is anyone willing to do more than I am to rehabilitate these unfortunate citizens.

With a view to learning just what the Government and the States were doing in connection with this subject, I wrote the Honorable Paul McNutt, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency; also Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. He sends me a very interesting letter, going into detail in reference to the activities of the Government and States. He specifically points out what is being accomplished under Public Law 113 approved July 6, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, about a week ago I placed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. James E. Miller of the Mines Equipment Co. of St. Louis telling of the experience he has had in the rehabilitation in the factory of his company of the blind. He also has men who suffered from amputations that he is rehabilitating, including a veteran of the present war. What Mr. Miller has accomplished in this respect can be accomplished by other corporations if they can be induced to take an interest in such a program.

The Rules Committee last week reported a resolution providing for an investigation of this entire subject by the Committee on Labor.

Whether or not we should set up another investigating committee is, of course, for the House to decide.

Under the leave granted me, I include Mr. McNutt's letter as a part of my remarks:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, May 25, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COCHRAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 20, in which you request advice concerning the information available in the War Manpower Commission and the Federal Security Agency with respect to the subject of House Resolution 230. That resolution authorizes the appointment of a congressional committee (1) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped; (2) to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped; and (2) to study and investigate the employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation. I am happy to inform you that both the Federal Security Agency and the War Manpower Commission have been very actively and continuously engaged in programs which

deal with the problems of the physically handicapped and have available extensive data on the subject.

The War Manpower Commission was charged by the President with responsibility for assuring the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war. From the point of view of our civilian manpower resources, a handicapped person is one having a physical or mental deficiency, peculiarity, or impairment which requires that he be selectively placed. The United States Employment Service has been continuously engaged in studying the occupational significance of such handicaps in determining the type of work which a person having a particular kind of handicap could and could not do. Obviously, some handicaps prevent a worker from continuing in his usual occupation. In such cases selective placement or training for other kinds of work is required. Some handicaps require special consideration in order to protect a worker from being placed in employment which would aggravate his condition, or employment in which he would jeopardize the health or safety of others. The files of the United States Employment Service will reveal thousands of instances in which physically handicapped persons who had been either unemployed or engaged in insubstantial work have been trained for and placed in highly useful war jobs.

In the War Manpower Commission we have been concerned, since the creation of the Commission, with the training, utilization, and placement of the physically handicapped. On the basis of a national health survey conducted in 1935-36, the United States Public Health Service has estimated that there are at present approximately 23,600,000 persons in our population, exclusive of those in institutions, who have some physical defect or chronic disease. Of these, 16,300,000 are between the ages of 15 and 64, exclusive of 1,000,000 who are virtually invalids; these 16,300,000 persons consist of about equal numbers of men and women.

Not all the physically handicapped in the labor force are vocationally handicapped; our experience has indicated, however, that practically all persons included within the above figures as physically handicapped have a disability which constitutes an employment handicap at one time or another, either because of employer's specifications or prejudices or because of necessary readjustments or physical difficulties which are involved in shifting to a new job or a new occupation. Our experience indicates that all physically handicapped persons need special care at some time in making their employment adjustment; some require more attention than others. Of the 8,100,000 physically handicapped men between the ages of 15 and 64, the United States Public Health study revealed that approximately 6,700,000 need only selective placement, 1,000,000 require rehabilitation before they can be employed in industry, and nearly 350,000 require extensive rehabilitation and can be employed only in sheltered work.

Physically handicapped persons who were unemployed constituted potential entrants into the labor market for our war effort; they were used by the War Manpower Commission as a valuable reserve of manpower. A vigorous placement and training program, together with a widespread program to promote employer acceptance of the physically handicapped employee, was initiated by the War Manpower Commission and has produced outstanding results. In 1940 the total number of placements of physically handicapped persons was only 27,703; in 1941 this figure was almost doubled, the total placements reaching approximately 53,000. In 1942, 91,000 placements of physically handicapped persons were made; but in 1943, 194,129 physically handicapped persons were placed in employment. You will note that the 1943 figure represents an increase of 112 percent over the 1942 figure and an increase of over 700 percent during the 4-year period. We hope that this trend will continue in the post-war period.

The United States Employment Service has made special studies to determine the effectiveness of our program for the training and placement of handicapped persons in Connecticut, Ohio, and New York. The results of these studies will be made available to you upon request.

The War Manpower Commission is cooperating with the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, in making studies of the experience records of a representative group of employers in their employment of the handicapped. Included in the information which will be collected in these studies are data concerning the accident, productivity, absenteeism, and turn-over experience of the handicapped in comparison with the nonhandicapped. The studies will be made in a sufficiently large number of plants to present an authoritative picture of the experience of the handicapped in competitive employment. An advisory committee, including representatives from the War Manpower Commission and the Federal Security Agency, will advise the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the conduct of this program. We believe that the information so collected will present an authoritative answer to the objections very frequently voiced against the employment of the handicapped—that the handicapped are accident prone or are substandard in performance.

You may also be interested in a pamphlet published by the National Association of Manufacturers, entitled "Rehabilitation and Training for Post-War Employment." It contains a panel discussion, participated in by representatives of the Selective Service System, the War Manpower Commission, the Veterans' Administration, and of private industry, of the rehabilitation and training of disabled and medically discharged veterans.

Subsequent to the introduction of House Resolution 230 on May 6, 1943, Congress enacted legislation (Public Law 113 approved July 6, 1943) which provides a complete program of rehabilitation services for all types of handicapped persons including the physically and mentally handicapped.

These services are administered by the State boards of vocational education. Rehabilitation of the blind is administered by the State agencies for the blind, where such agency is legally authorized to administer rehabilitation services for this group. The Federal Security Agency is charged with the responsibility of certifying Federal funds, establishing standards, and providing consultant services to the States. Within this agency an Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has been created to discharge these Federal responsibilities.

The fiscal provisions have also been liberalized by Public Law 113, the old limitation of three and one-half million dollars appropriated annually by the Federal Government for matching purposes having been removed. Funds are now certified in accordance with the States' needs. The scope of services available now has been broadened to include any services necessary to render disabled persons capable of engaging in remunerative employment. These include:

1. Early location of persons in need of rehabilitation to prevent the disintegrating effects of idleness and hopelessness.

2. Medical diagnosis and prognosis coupled with a vocational diagnosis as the basis for determining an appropriate plan for the individual.

3. Vocational counseling to select suitable fields of work by relating occpational capacities to job requirements and community occupational opportunities.

4. Medical and surgical treatment to afford physical restoration and medical advice in the type of training to be given and in the work tolerance of the individual.

5. Physical and occupational therapy and psychiatric treatment as a part of medical treatment where needed.

6. Vocational training to furnish new skills where physical impairments incapacitate for normal occupations, or where skills become obsolete due to changing industrial needs.

7. Financial assistance to provide maintenance and transportation during training.

8. Placement in employment to afford the best use of abilities and skills in accordance with the individual physical condition and temperament, with due regard to safeguarding against further injuries.

9. Follow-up on performance in employment to afford adjustments that may be necessary, to provide further medical care if needed, to supplement training if desired.

Other changes made by Public Law 113 concern the groups of disabled individuals to be served. Mentally as well as physically handicapped individuals are now eligible for rehabilitation. Specific provision has been made for the rehabilitation of the blind and war-disabled civilians, the latter of whom are defined to include members of the citizens' defense corps, aircraft warning service, civil air patrol, and the merchant marine. Disabled veterans who are not eligible for rehabilitation services under the program administered by the Veterans Administration, as well as disabled members of their families, can avail themselves of the services under the civilian rehabilitation program.

Reflecting the increased services which the handicapped have been receiving is the record of the State vocational rehabilitation agencies in the rehabilitation and subsequent placement of handicapped persons. These figures represent the number of persons actually rehabilitated and subsequently placed in employment. They should not be confused with the figures of placements by the War Manpower Commission given earlier in this letter, as those figures include placements made without specific rehabilitation work during the placement year.

The annual average number of disabled persons reported as rehabilitated by the States for the period 1920 to 1942 was 9,100 per year. During the fiscal year 1943 the number increased to 42,124 disabled persons rehabilitated and placed in employment. This is an increase of 192 percent over the year 1941. Evidence from the States indicates 53,000 disabled persons will be rehabilitated in 1944, and approximately 80,000 persons will be rehabilitated and placed in employment in 1945.

Of the 42,124 disabled persons rehabilitated, 31 percent, or 13,058, had never worked or been employed. Furthermore, 85 percent, or 35,806, were unemployed at the time they applied for rehabilitation services. The average weekly wage of the 15 percent who had employment, including those on work-relief programs, was $18. The total annual earnings of the 42,124 disabled persons after rehabilitation was therefore increased from $5,913,648 at the time of application for rehabilitation services to $65,165,828 after rehabilitation. This record was accomplished with the expenditure of a total Federal-State appropriation of a little more than $5,000,000. Through rehabilitation these persons were transferred from tax consumers to tax producers.

Cooperative working relationships have been established with other Federal agencies for the full utilization of their facilities in accomplishing the total task of rehabilitation and increased employment opportunities for the disabled. Among the Federal agencies with which cooperative agreements have already been established

are the United States Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, the Bureau of Public Assistance, and the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Board, the War Shipping Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the United States Employees Compensation Commission. For the guidance of the program there has been established a National Rehabilitation Advisory Committee and a Professional Advisory Committee. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is represented on the committees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the United States Civil Service Commission, which are studying the employment of handicapped persons.

Cooperation between the State vocational rehabilitation agencies and the local offices of the United States Employment Service is also being emphasized, and a joint statement concurred in by the Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the United States Employment Service implementing this policy is now being issued to the field offices of the War Manpower Commission and the State agencies cooperating with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Recent reports from the field indicate that this cooperative relationship is producing substantial benefits to the handicapped in their search for productive employment.

Although much is still to be done for the remaining reservoir of handicapped persons, the above record reveals the rapid increase in the number of disabled persons being served throughout the Nation. Every service necessary to rehabilitate disabled persons is now available in every State and the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico under the State-Federal rehabilitation program.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency;
Chairman, War Manpower Commission.

A Great Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote speech delivered by me at the invitation of the State central committee of the State convention, Yakima, Wash., May 13, 1944:

I am again honored to accept the invitation of the State central committee to keynote the convention. The size of the convention and the overflowing hall attest the enthusiasm of those here. You have met in response to your duty to the Democratic party. The party has—for over 150 years—similarly met in response to its duty to the American people. Specifically, for 12 years it has borne the brunt of that duty to the American people effectively and proudly. Today we enter upon a new era of responsibility, unsurpassed in all our political history.

The opposition early in the year received some encouragement in isolated congressional elections. Recently we can point to encouraging signs in further elections. Neither are convincing nor conclusive, but do point to the alertness of the American people to their problems and the necessity of the Democratic party to well carry out their responsibility to meet continued public approval.

Many have been misled by partisan analysis of these results. True analysis will show the progressive spirit of the people more alive than ever. The failure of this liberal attitude to express itself at the polls by actually voting is alone responsible for the opposition totals. If voters turn out in force, the reactionaries lose. Republican party leaders know this to be a cold, political fact. They, therefore, seek to slant deductions from the results their own way.

Proof of this is their continued reluctance to give more than lip service to registration and voting drives. Concrete proof in this State was the veto by the Republican State administration of the amendment allowing the polls to stay open an extra 2 hours. This would have given better opportunity for war workers and farmers to cast their ballot. It would also save for war production thousands of work hours.

The veto was one of the most undemocratic actions ever thrust on the people of this State. It should be considered a personal affront to those who toil all day in war plants and on the farm and who have little or no opportunity to leave that work to go to the polls. It should so anger them that despite this denial of opportunities they make extra effort to vote their protest.

It is obviously one vital duty of this party to bend extra effort toward registration drives.

Inasmuch as we must stand or fall on our record, it is well to recall here today some party history. The Democrats were called to duty in 1932 with the country on the verge of national bankruptcy. Necessity required drastic action. The opposition, on being called to account in the eyes of the people, sought to belittle that action. Over the years they have heaped abuse upon you in the Democratic ranks. The party and its members, because of the necessity for this drastic action, have been subjected to more unfair political attacks than at any time in its history. Paradoxically, those who complained the loudest were the ones to reap the most benefits as the country was again placed upon a sound basis. Our American system was saved for them, in spite of themselves.

Many of these attacks were personal. They were often so consistent and continuing that you became individually discouraged. It was made hard to fight back. It is therefore only in retrospect that we can truly evaluate whether or not it was a job well done.

I think as good proof as any is the conclusive fact we have succeeded in converting the vast majority of the American people of both parties toward approval of our actions.

This should be some satisfaction to those of you who were called radical, communistic, unpatriotic, and other names during the years you worked to effect these gains for the plain people of the country. It should be some satisfaction to know that today—leaving out professional Republican politicians—the country admits what was done was good.

Along with that satisfaction, I know it must be some source of amusement for many of you to now listen to those who opposed bitterly necessary progressive moves in this State now maintaining not only that they were fine things but using them as political capital to attract votes to themselves. Take, for instance, the old-age assistance program. Fourteen years ago, as a member of the State legislature, I remember vividly our initial fight to abolish the poorhouse. Republican leadership in that body not only opposed it but called myself and other sponsors red and radical. They have slyly attempted to sabotage over the years every improvement of this program. But now, finding the people of this State in unanimous approval of it, they not only seek to take it over but would lead the people to believe that they have always been alert to the necessity of old-age pensions. This, of course, is typical of Republican Party leadership. They fight an issue as long as it seems desirable, but when it becomes politically profitable to join in they change like a chameleon.

The most amazing example are the private power companies of this State. During the same fight over these years to establish public power they sought by every sinister means to block every action. The names they called Senator Bone, Senator Wallgren, Warren Magnuson, Henry Jackson, Charles Leavy, Judge Schwellenbach, John Coffee, Grange members, and others, are unmentionable on a public platform. Now they say that Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and other public power projects are marvelous achievements. They feel so kindly about them now, their instincts have become maternal. I understand that they would like to adopt them for their own.

Let us go back again in review so that you might feel even a further sense of satisfaction. During the past 12 years it was politically fashionable, from the reactionary viewpoint, to castigate, attack, and sneer at the term "New Deal." Many of you got that in great big doses.

What is the truth about the New Deal?

1. Its first step was the Deposit Insurance Act. Banks were in a panic. Business had given up. It restored the confidence of the people in the banking system and literally saved the financial structure of the country. Anything wrong with that?

2. It created next the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, preventing mortgage companies from grabbing millions of workers' homes. Was that bad? Incidentally, it is paying off dollar for dollar.

3. The next move was the Farm Credit Administration, paralleling the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to forestall the foreclosure of thousands of farm mortgages. Was that a mistake? Incidentally, it is showing returns to the Government.

4. Then the A. A. A. and Soil Conservation Acts followed. They gave the farmer voluntary participation in necessary regulation to save his economy from 1932, with wheat at 32 cents a bushel as compared with his present sound financial position. Anything wrong with that?

5. The passage of the Securities Exchange Act was next achieved. It stopped the floating of worthless stocks by institutions that had been running rampant under the Republican administrations. The public was saved untold millions. Wall Street didn't like this. It is now quite difficult for them to catch suckers. Was that bad?

6. The Congress, with administration leadership, next delved into the basic problem of social security. Old Age Assistance, Unemployment Insurance, Federal aid to the crippled and the blind, was the result. Will these critics tell the people that this was unnecessary?

7. Instead of providing food for starving animals, as did Hoover, we decided to provide food and sustenance first for humans. The W. P. A. and Public Works acts were the most humanitarian in all history. The opposition let the people starve for 2 years. Were those acts bad?

8. Minimum wage and hour laws were then enacted to protect humans from the exploitation of their employers. Was that a mistake?

9. The C. C. C. and National Youth Administration were next. They put a stopgap in the deteriorating processes that had set in among our young people cast adrift by the depression and forgotten by the Hoover administration. The C. C. C. did a dual job. It also rehabilitated many of our natural

resources. Its work in this State in the forests saved ten times its cost alone in prevention of forest fires. What was wrong with that?

10. Private home building was encouraged by the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration. It not only gave jobs to many, but aided in establishing real home life. Was that bad?

11. The Rural Electrification Act has now made us the leader of the entire world in electrified farm homes. Prior to 1932 there were more electrified pig pens in Sweden than electrified farm homes in this State. Private power rates and the cost of lines had made the benefits of electricity prohibitive to the farmer. The power companies did nothing to rectify this as they collected their profits. This act made electrified farm homes cheap and possible. We need not point out to the farmer, nor the farmer's wife, what this means. We do ask our critics, however, if this was a mistake?

12. Next followed the National Labor Relations Act, cementing and guaranteeing certain rights the working man had been fighting for, for many years.

13. Foreign policy took shape. And, last but not least, a program of national defense was instituted over the protests of Republican isolationists and the America First crowd, which were so inexorably tied in with Republican leadership at that time, no one could separate them.

That is the so-called New Deal. I could go on thusly for an hour. Some of its purposes have been served. Others still continue.

I review this with a definite purpose. The unfair attacks, the abuse, and the bitter partisan criticism of this so-called New Deal has placed too many Democrats—and too many Americans who believe in it and know it was a job well done—on the defensive. Too many of us explain and apologize. It is high time that those who played a part in building this great monument should take the offensive and shout to the high heavens that you are proud of the part you had in this great record. It is the greatest record of political action for the common people ever made by any administration in all history. It certainly defies those who would belittle, attack, or sneer at its accomplishments. Such action is again a personal affront upon the millions of Americans who know that it helped them and saved the American system.

The country, under Democratic Party leadership, met that crisis during the past 12 years. We have been recently asked by the American people to meet another crisis. The war has become the most tremendous task of all times. Our party has the political responsibility thereof. To date we have soberly and effectively carried on. We resent any attempt to make this solemn duty a political issue.

Already, though, one hears whisperings from the anti-Roosevelt politicians attempting to make as much political capital as they can of this sober responsibility of leadership.

The war should not be a campaign issue. We are winning the war. I warn you, however, that there will be those who delve into cheap and unfair political attacks directed at its conduct. Not that we should not constructively criticize and have our definite ideas regarding this great struggle but my warning is to those who deliberately cause disunity for political purposes.

For instance, you will be met with political propaganda built upon a premise that Roosevelt got us into the war. What trash.

The administration, time and time again, before Pearl Harbor, attempted to warn the people of the emergency and what might be coming. During my service in Congress, the President sent message after message urging national defense. Need I tell you who opposed the suggestion? The main opposition came from the Republican side of the aisle.

We are actually at war because a slimy group of Japanese imperialists, aided and abetted by the Fascists of Europe, attacked us in one of the most infamous, below-the-belt actions since the dawn of time.

And because of the Japanese attack we were called upon to immediately gear a great democracy for war to protect our freedom. The true facts are, because of the constant failure of the opposition to give us aid in preparing ourselves, it became a more stupendous task than it should have been. Intelligent people know gearing a democracy swiftly and effectively for actual warfare requires the stepping upon of many civilian toes. So stupendous was the job and so filled with complexities and details was the task, that both the military and the administration has made mistakes. These mistakes can be played up by the opposition press to look like mountains. Again, the fact is that we believe in admitting them and criticizing and correcting ourselves. The party, in political responsibility during time of war, should so do, because this is everybodys' war.

The country should therefore commend the excellent work along these lines of the Truman committee of the Senate, and the House Naval Affairs Committee in seeking out these things and correcting them. Our own Senator WALLGREN is a member of the Truman committee, and your speaker, the House Naval Affairs Committee. These two groups have been constructively looking into the war effort. They are both controlled by members of our party. They both have the blessing of the administration in their work, because we feel we owe a duty to tell the people the truth about the war effort when possible within the bounds of national security.

But let us look at the actions of Republican leadership on this matter. They have attempted—and will during the campaign—to stir up the people for political purposes over what they know are the necessary privations of war. Haven't they slyly and consistently intimated that rationing, priorities, the draft, and other necessary privations—that none of us like—would be removed if you would but place these pseudo-great administrators in power.

Either they know better and are deliberately deceiving the people for political purposes, or their understanding of this tremendous task is so lacking they are not fit to assume leadership.

At their political party conventions they rise to great puffed-up heights, with solemn pronouncements, "We will take the politics out of the war." The people know, and I assure you they will realize it even more forcefully by next November, as between the two parties who is playing politics with the war. The people know that since Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt has stuck to his post of duty with the heaviest burden of any man in all history despite all this picayunish sniping. Thank God he is too big a man to let it divert him from the war effort.

Another good example is the very well-devised whispering campaign during the last few weeks that he was in a state of collapse. I can say that he is as fit as any man of his age—and I can suggest that most of the people feel that he could better lead us to victory—sick—than could anything the Republicans have trotted out—well. They even went so far last month as to begrudge him a vacation, if one would read some eastern Republican editorials.

So honest have we been in our attempt to take the war out of politics and keep it nonpartisan that the appointed heads of the Army and the Navy are those associated with the Republican Party.

The great job of production has been turned over to business itself. The War Production Board from top to bottom is manned by businessmen and production experts, regardless of party. The wisdom of this has been proven. We have literally become the arsenal of democracy. The personnel of other war agencies are picked on the same basis. Military personnel have achieved rank through ability, and in a few short months we have not only out-produced the world, but have established the greatest Army and Navy the world has ever known. Recent events prove it is a fighting Army and Navy.

It therefore seems with our critics not a question of "Who is playing politics with the war?" but rather, "Whose politics you are playing?" Theirs, all right. Ours, no.

I had intended to discuss the Republican platform concocted at Tacoma last week. I frankly hoped they would meet issues head-on. Not only because that makes it easier for us, but mainly because the public could more intelligently analyze the aims of the two parties. I was disappointed. I read the full accounts of their convention. It can be dismissed with one sentence. A prominent Republican attending the convention remarked to me the day following, "We could just as well have held that convention in 1903, no one would have suspected any difference."

I was mainly disappointed over their failure to approach the most vital problem of the day—foreign affairs. Their declaration on this was the muttering of a lot of nothing. It sounded like a similar declaration by the national leaders at Mackinac Island last summer. It was a cellophane bandage on a running sore. And this, despite the fact that for months they have been attacking the foreign policy of Roosevelt and Hull.

They offer no constructive criticism, but again pick on the matters that they know are subject to many interpretations and many difficulties. They never offer constructive criticism.

That old-guard leadership is a fine crew to be criticizing. Any contrast between their foreign policy of the twenties—from the vicious defeat of Wilson's League of Nations by a group of willful Republicans in the Senate to the disarmament conferences resulting in the scrapping of our proud Navy—makes Hull's achievements stand like a beacon light. Must we remind them further of their isolationist history through all these years? Need we remind them of the segment of party leadership even today flirting with the idea of negotiated peace?

After all, there need be no conflict between the jealous maintenance of our domestic matters and our duty in international affairs. It is only the failure of a major political party to analyze the matter that causes the conflict. I accuse Republican leadership of this failure.

But what the American people do know is that a humanitarian approach will prevent a World War No. 3. And unless we follow the precepts laid down by Hull in his recent report to the people another war cannot be prevented. We can sum up our Allied conferences with one word—security. We add to that the knowledge that unless we have security here at home there can be no peace in the world.

And, thusly, Hull steadfastly maintains it is important there be strong, progressive, popular governments in Europe and Asia, dedicated like our own—toward improving the social welfare of their peoples.

This includes the common efforts of the Allied nations for the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all people.

Such is the clear basis of our policy. Only those who are concerned with pettyfogging detail can assume we have failed to chart a course. Future generations need this kind of policy. It is hardly to be supposed all of

the boundary questions in Europe can be settled while fighting is in progress. But many questions can and have been settled by friendly conference, under our leadership.

We can give further support to the agreements of Moscow, Teheran, and Cairo. We can resolve the war will be carried forward to unconditional surrender and complete destruction of fascism. We can declare for free Yugoslavian government and the fight of Tito. We can pledge support to the heroic struggle of China and aid to her freedom after the war. And lastly, we can advocate leadership in a society of nations designed to prevent by force, if necessary, any and all aggression. We can make firm our intention to join a permanent court of international justice. That is our clear foreign policy. This is the course we have pursued.

It is the most important of all and leaders of both parties and those who have been attacking Hull and Roosevelt, including Dewey and Bricker, ought to take the opportunity to second these efforts.

For if another world war comes because this generation fails in its duty in establishing an international means of keeping peace, the blood of American boys, who are the sons of both present-day Republicans and Democrats, will be shed a third time to defend the freedom of America.

To that end the plain people of America have the definite feeling they want one who has been tried and true to those principals sitting in the fourth chair at the peace conference. Not a Dewey—not a Bricker—but one they trust—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Let us look at some of the other issues. We will be condemned as coddling labor. What is that record? It can only be seen in the light of the fact that prior to 1932 labor had little consideration. During the depression the laboring people of America suffered all out of proportion. Proof that our labor laws are intelligent is the fact that Republicans admit they will not be repealed, but that they are permanent documents.

The antiadministration crowd have made much of strikes. Strikes are dramatic and receive attention in headlines. Soldiers and sailors properly resent them. The public properly resents them. Labor has a policy against them. There are members who violate that war pledge. However—and we condemn those who violate that pledge—in 1943 less than one-fourth of 1 percent used was lost by strikes, whereas labor contributed more than 76 percent man-hours over 1939. In the meantime management and labor have accomplished the greatest production record in all history.

To condemn the whole labor movement in view of these facts would be like condemning the Army because some soldiers go A. W. O. L.

The farmer plays a vital and important part in the issues that will arise between now and November. It has been said by the opposition that the farmers of this country are antiadministration. In view of the close liaison between the farmer and his Government after the depression years, and in view of his present stable financial position under the Democratic administration, it is difficult to believe this to be true. After all, the farmer and the working man have the same problems, and those are the problems that have met the undivided attention of our party for the past 12 years.

The future of the western farmer is bright if we continue the consumer markets and maintain industrial stabilization in this area. We should commend the farmer for his marvelous production record, made under the severe handicap of manpower shortages. The Democratic Party of this State and the Democrats of the West should encourage the Grange and give them every aid in the development of processing plants, so as to eliminate the vicious two-way freight price control on finished products. It is difficult to see why the farmer should be inclined to the Republican banner, in view of the fact that it is the power of the eastern Republicans that has always stifled western development, and in particular kept intact vicious freight differentials and other eastern domination always a stone around the neck of the western producer. His continued hope is in the liberal and progressive viewpoint of the Democratic Party.

The most important thing about 1944 will be the progress we make toward the defeat of our enemy. A united America under present leadership has made that defeat a certainty. But it must be remembered we first had to meet a challenge behind our own lines. We had to literally arm the Nation over the protests of men of little faith. Had we not strengthened Britain, sent munitions to Russia, and aid to China, I shudder to think of where we might have been today. In addition, our lend-lease policy has been a sound approach toward keeping the war from our shores and saving many American boys. But despite all attacks on this program, victory for our fighting men can no longer be a true political issue.

The real issues of 1944 are peace and jobs. A nonnegotiable peace and negotiable jobs. They are not certainties, because there arises again the same challenge of isolationism and a promise to return to the same policies that brought us both unemployment and war.

The American people must again decide whether to sacrifice new ties for old tariffs. Whether or not to follow a leadership that internationally returns a handclasp with an itching palm. Whether or not to entrust our Government into the hands of the same old Ohio gang and eastern groups that gave us three succeeding administrations—in the first, political corruption. In the second, unbridled inflation. In the third, the depression. These are the real issues.

A powerful minority wants to go back to that national condition. I contend it would again be a regime that would wreck the peace and reestablish reckless finance that would repeat the lack of jobs.

However, I don't think the people nor the fighting men will be deceived because when you tear off the false front of those who are today sitting on the mourners' bench and bewailing the death of free enterprise—a death that has not taken place and never will in this country—you will find die-hard reaction at its old stand.

Our promise for peace is in keeping with a tradition a quarter of a century old in the gallant struggle of Woodrow Wilson.

And so, too, runs the contrast on the issue of jobs—the Republican Party offers the same old record of closed banks, foreclosed farms, and disclosed scandals.

If that again succeeds it will take the future out of the hopes of those at the fighting front. Their post-war security would be again blasted. We owe a duty to every soldier, sailor, marine, and war worker to prevent that. Let us so dedicate our party action.

On the issue of jobs—toward that end let us reexamine what has been done in the Pacific Northwest on one development alone by our political action. I speak of public power.

Again, prior to 1932, it was the dream of every resident of the Inland Empire that the Columbia River be harnessed by a series of dams so that potential hydroelectric power would be available to the people at the cheapest rate. Frankly, no Republican President evidenced any interest in this project, although time and time again the local groups urged it. Roosevelt saw that what wheat and corn are to the Middle West, cotton to the South, automobiles to Detroit, hydroelectricity is to the Pacific Northwest. Grand Coulee and Bonneville were the result. Prior to 1932 fewer than 10 percent of the farm homes of America had electricity. Today the figure is 45 percent, and the State of Washington leads them all with 81 percent. The result of public power has enticed great new enterprises to our area. For instance, on the banks of the Spokane River we have more manufacture of aluminum than was in the whole of the United States a few years ago. More magnesium is made in Spokane than was made in the entire country 10 years ago. If we become the light-metal producing center of the world the political credit must revert to your State Democratic Party. Public power is going to bring many jobs to many a veteran. The people of this State can further be assured this party is pledged to the full completion of the Columbia Basin development. That will mean homes for veterans.

As a matter of fact, we in the West are playing for a new empire, and we of this party are laying the political foundations for the Pacific Northwest industrial freedom.

The apathy of the opposition party of this great challenge is indictable. We know we have to break away from the domination of the East to build these new interests. We know shot through the entire fabric of the West's blue print for its future is a pattern of help needed from Government. The tremendous war growth has occurred under a Democratic administration and, if the Republican Party comes to power, we wonder how it will treat the aids required for the West to fight a victorious battle for self-determination. The people know that the most influential supporters of the Republican Party are tied to the industrial and financial pattern of the East. Rationally, then, it would seem that the western farmer and industrialist could not, with all the attendant danger of breakage, put his eggs in the Republican basket. If western industrialists and farmers should happen to support a Republican candidate, there will have to be some novel and interesting planks heretofore unknown to their platform.

The Democratic Party has the responsibility to continue the potentialities for this State. It has been the party of action on these matters for 12 years.

Closely following that responsibility, because power will play the greatest part in this development, comes another duty.

I need not review our fights on public power. We, as a party with the State grange, have always taken that leadership. Progress has been made step by step. Another step should be made. I refer to Referendum No. 25, which presents an effective means whereby local control of the tremendous electrical potentialities of the region can be realized. By means of this referendum the people of the State can, in the most efficient manner, acquire and/or operate the properties of the private electric systems in the State, where the electors have indicated that this is their desire.

Private electric companies are masking their attempt to make the most gigantic steal in history under charges of bureaucracy and Federal control. The real objective behind these charges of socializing the power industry is to gain control of the tremendous Federal dams on the Columbia River, to seize the power generated at the dams, and turn its benefits over to eastern stockholders. You perhaps have seen advertisements showing how, under the reorganization of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. in December of 1943, when $21,000,000 was lost by investors in the company stock, how in these advertisements the Puget Sound Co. is now home owned.

The real truth is that only 700,000 shares of the common stock are owned in the State

as against 1,200,000 shares of stock owned by outsiders.

The Democratic Party of the State of Washington believes in furthering private enterprise, which will benefit the region and the people there. Referendum No. 25 will further private enterprise legitimately by offering tremendous blocks of low-cost power to assist in initiating new industries—a definite and vital move in our fight for economic self-determination.

We, as a party, have sponsored much humanitarian legislation. Republican leadership has always been reactionary on this great need of the people.

It has been pointed out, "Unless we have security here at home, there can be no peace in the world." Truly, jobs for all who can work, plus social security for those who cannot work or who are unavoidably unemployed during the period of conversion of industry from wartime to peacetime production, are the keystones not merely of a sound national policy but of a sound international policy of peaceful collaboration with England, Russia, China, and the other nations of the world.

President Roosevelt's brilliant program, known as the second bill of rights, is already embodied, at least in part, in bills pending before our National Congress. Of these, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill is the most comprehensive, and I urge upon the delegates here today your strongest support of this measure. S. 1161, the number of the bill, provides, among other things, for greatly liberalized old-age insurance, for coverage of approximately 15,000,000 now excluded from the social-security program—farmers, self-employed, domestics, maritime workers, professional, and governmental employees. It extends unemployment compensation, raises the rates at which it is paid, provides for temporary disability and sickness compensation, and creates a badly needed system of prepaid medical and dental care for the covered groups.

Here in our own State an initiative, No. 157, known as the Little Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, is now being circulated and will undoubtedly be on the ballot in the November elections. I wish strongly to commend this initiative, and the sponsors, the Washington State Social Security Council, which includes A. F. or L., C. I. O., Railroad Brotherhood locals, pension groups, and many other organizations, for the opportunity presented to raise our social-security standards here in Washington State, so that now as in the past our State can be in the forefront of all States in this fight.

Initiative No. 157 raises the miserably inadequate $40 pensions which are now the maximum grant paid to Washington's elderly citizens—who have contributed so much to building our State. Under No. 157, $50 is set as the minimum grant to be paid, to be raised to $60 when the Federal matching funds are increased. Unemployment compensation rates are also increased—from $15 a week for 16 weeks maximum to $25 a week for 20 weeks. No. 157 also provides badly needed maternity grants for working mothers, and provides for a survey of the medical needs of the people of our State. One other major proposal included in No. 157 is free tuition for returning Washington service men and women, plus increased unemployment compensation, and up to 40 weeks of State aid in helping them in securing additional training and education to prepare them for their return to civilian life. No. 157 is in line with our program of securing "freedom from fear and freedom from want" to our people, and I cannot too emphatically urge the convention to endorse this measure and the Democrats in our State to give it the same support we have always given to such needed social gains for the common man.

Finally, every Democrat has a responsibility to do his job. In line with the above program we have assumed the task. Regardless of what your neighbors may be doing, it is not your right to even make comparisons. You have said to the people that these are the things we are going to do and it is your personal job to dig in and fight for them. Let the others, if they wish, stumble around—let the professional Republicans mumble their nothings—but don't let it divert you from the task at hand, because if we do that job the people will reward us with their respect.

In doing this great work do not be discouraged by those who hate Roosevelt. It must always be remembered that these people do not hate him for himself—but they hate him for what he represents—a decent future for the common man of America.

And when all is said and done, you can be sure of one thing—if our job is well done—that the people of this country, come November, are going to prefer a "fourth termer" to a "fourth rater."

Every mother and father, wife, brother and sister, or relative of those in the services know that the defeat of Roosevelt would give more aid and comfort to the enemy than guns and ammunition. It would prolong the war and add to the casualty lists, and surely have a psychological effect that would be world-shaking.

It is not difficult to reverse the procedure and realize what the defeat of Hitler or Tojo would do to the fighting morale of this country. Leaving out one of the greatest administration records of all times, this fact alone, known by every man in the services and his loved ones, is sufficient not to allow it to happen.

When the men and women of this country, therefore, go into their polling booths alone with themselves and their God, they will make their decision, not upon their personal feeling regarding picayunish and necessary personal irritation of civilian life within a Democracy at war, but will base their decision upon what they think is best for the country—the whole country—in 1944. To that there is only one answer—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In Tunisia and Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, note the contrast as set forth in the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1943. The article reads:

IN TUNISIA—AND HERE

In Tunisia: "These bloody and bitter Tunisian battles. * * * A thin line of men. Four days and nights they have fought hard, eaten little, washed none, and slept hardly at all. Their nights have been violent with attack, fright, butchery, and their days sleepless and miserable with the crash of artillery."

In Milwaukee: Because of a jurisdictional dispute between members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union (C. I. O.) and members of the United Leather Workers' Union (A. F. of L.), 198 workers of the 250 employees on the first shift at the J. Laskin & Sons Corporation walked off the job Thursday, with more workers going out later. The company, an innocent third party, has appealed to the Government for guidance. The company, incidentally, has long been 100 percent in war production.

In Tunisia: "The men are walking. They are 50 feet apart, for dispersal. Their walk is slow, for they are dead weary. * * * Every line and sag of their bodies speaks their inhuman exhaustion."

In Jacksonville, Fla.: Several thousand shipyard workers were delayed in getting to their jobs; production in the yards and elsewhere was thrown out of gear, other war work in the city of 295,000 was disrupted. Why? Because the busses of the transit company—there are no streetcars—were stopped due to a strike, a strike growing out of a jurisdictional dispute between two A. F. of L. affiliates, the International Association of Machinists and the Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric and Motor Coach Employees.

In Tunisia: "The men dig in on the back slope of the hill before any rest begins. Everybody digs in. This is an inviolate rule of the commanding officers and nobody wants to disobey it. Every time you pause, even if you think you are dying of weariness, you dig yourself a hole before you sit down."

The labor racketeers are riding high, but, as the news of the death on the fighting front of the sons and brothers of the factory workers comes filtering home, there will be a day of reckoning and those who are responsible for these unjustifiable strikes will answer to the men of their unions.

A Timely Message in Regard to Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the importance of food for war needs and domestic use has been keenly appreciated. Our former colleague, the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, is charged with the responsibility of food production. Anyone familiar with the broad field of food production and processing together with the complicated factors involved realizes the magnitude of the task.

The following splendid radio address by Mr. Jones most assuredly gives a very acceptable picture of the food situation as of today:

At no time in history has so much of the world, and even civilization itself, placed so much dependence upon American food. It requires hard work to produce food. There is no other way. Our present favorable food supply is in itself a great tribute to the American farmer and livestock producer.

To these farmers and their families who have worked longer hours than any other group, to the women, to the older men, to the boys and girls, to the city people who have helped in the harvest time, the Nation owes a debt of gratitude which no language can adequately express.

There are 166 farm commodities, more than 40 of which are of great importance to our food supply. There are many grades and types of each commodity, and these are

processed into an infinite variety of food products.

The fact that of all these farm commodities it has been necessary for the War Food Administration to ask that only a very few be rationed, in spite of the increasing demands for our armed forces, our civilians and our fighting allies, is added proof of the war contribution of the American farmer and livestock producer.

By their tremendous production the farmers have made rationing much easier by assuring a reasonable supply of food not only for our armed forces and our allies, but for civilians as well. Our country has been peculiarly fortunate in this regard. It has also made it possible to hold the price line. Without the all-out effort of the farmer, price stabilization would have been vastly more difficult.

Under the Executive order of the President the War Food Administration has charge of the production of food. It also has charge of the allocation of food; that is, it determines how much of our supply of food shall be allotted to our armed forces, how much through lend-lease to our allies, and what percentage shall go into the civilian supply.

It is also our responsibility to determine when the supply of any commodity is so limited as to make rationing necessary. In the event it is determined that rationing is necessary, we authorize the Office of Price Administration to institute it. When such determination is made, the Office of Price Administration takes charge of the actual mechanics of rationing.

Recently it was found possible to remove temporarily point rationing on pork products, veal and lamb, and the cheaper cuts of beef. These changes were made after consultation between officials of W. F. A. and O. P. A. Some people apparently gained the impression that the food problem was largely solved. This is not true. Food is and will remain a problem throughout the war. It is an essential weapon.

As to how long pork and other meats can remain free from rationing, no one can intelligently forecast. We have a tremendous supply of livestock, so much so that livestock and our feed supply are somewhat out of balance.

There are approximately 82,000,000 head of livestock, including 27,000,000 dairy cows. There are more than 120,000,000 hogs. If the livestock continues to come to the market in sufficient numbers to keep the processing facilities of the country fully occupied, there should be a reasonably adequate meat supply for some months to come. The flow of livestock to the processing facilities and other packing centers and slaughtering places is also determined by many factors. The supplies are in the hands of individual farmers, and they determine for themselves when it is wise for them to market the particular animals and when they are best suited to go to market. We feel that livestock producers will be acting wisely and in their own as well as the public interest if a considerably larger number than usual of beef cattle as well as a continuing supply of hogs flows to the market within the next few months.

We have endeavored to present the facts as to the livestock situation to the producers throughout the country. The livestock organizations of all types have cooperated in getting this information into the hands of the producers, and the prospect for considerable marketings of meat animals of all types during the next few months appears favorable at this time.

Food is a temporary thing. Much of it is perishable. A large supply is frequently followed by a shortage. The need for food in the coming months will be greater than ever. The armed forces will need more, our allies will need more as the war expands, and later on as each area is liberated, these areas will require food in order to protect the supply lines for our armed forces.

Some confusion in the public mind has resulted from the numerous statements that have been made, predicting shortages and even famine in connection with our food supply. These critics were no doubt sincere. They believed in their predictions. The trouble is that they did not know the mettle and stamina of the American farmer. They did not know his determination and industry. If they had read history, they would have known that since the ax first rang in the wilderness of the new country, the farmer has done his part in every national crisis, and he will do his part in this, the greatest of all crises. If they had read history, they would have known that it never pays to sell the American farmer short.

It is impossible to forecast accurately what food supplies will be available. There are too many uncertainties in its production. The questions of labor, of machinery, repair parts, fertilizer, soil conditions, and many other elements of uncertainty affect production. Then, too, after all these have been met, the farmer must face the uncertainty of weather conditions which can nullify almost his entire efforts. Droughts, floods, insects, and pests of various kinds can eat into the production of crops and make it impossible to forecast with accuracy just what the production will be.

The War Food Administration, utilizing facilities of the Department of Agriculture as well as its own, will probably be in position to make the best estimates as to what the food supplies will probably be.

Through thousands of community, county, and State committeemen, farmers were contacted all over the country prior to the planting season. The farmers set their own goals after hearing of the amount and nature of production that was needed. This information was assembled by the War Food Administration and announced. Fortunately, the farmers had determined that in spite of the hardships they would plant even more in 1944 than they planted during the record year of 1943.

Each month the Department issues a statement as to crop conditions and as to crop prospects as they exist at that time. Then every 3 months a complete review is made of the planting and crop conditions. These are all carefully compiled on the basis of factual reports from the field. From time to time in between we make announcements of weather conditions, floods, droughts, and other natural uncertainties that affect favorably or adversely the food production and its prospects. This is the most reliable and definite information that can be given. When anyone goes beyond this and undertakes to predict with certainty, it but adds to the confusion and detracts from public understanding.

According to available information, the current prospect as to vegetables is as follows. This is, of course, subject to change as conditions change.

Fresh market supplies: Current supplies of fresh vegetables and fresh market truck crops continue adequate at the present time. A slight increase in vegetables for processing is indicated by current reports.

The only way for the War Food Administration to determine whether or not rationing is necessary as to any commodity is to wait until it is produced and the actual supply of that commodity has become visible.

In making allocations preference must be given to the Army and Navy and all branches of our armed forces. Civilians must have adequate supplies for good nutrition, and we must help supply our fighting allies with food. I think all true Americans will agree that the armed forces must have preference. No thinking person wants to deprive an American soldier, sailor, or marine of the foods that are essential to fighting strength.

After these allocations are made, if the War Food Administration finds that the demand for food is materially greater than the supply, there is no choice for us but to make the determination and ask the Office of Price Administration to institute rationing as to that particular commodity.

The War Food Administration will watch the situation closely. We will not ask that any commodity be rationed unless it is necessary, and we will recommend that such rationing be ended as soon as the supply of the commodity will justify such action. We hope that it will be kept as simple as possible. On the other hand, we will not hesitate to certify to the Office of Price Administration the necessity for rationing a commodity whenever the war needs require it. I am sure the public will cheerfully respond to that necessity.

The only way to keep food even reasonably plentiful is for farmers to be able to continue their all-out efforts. This can be done only if he can get essential machinery, labor, supplies, and fertilizer materials. Then, too, it is all-important that victory gardeners continue their fine work and that the public generally cooperate in preventing waste. As in war, it will require the cooperation of everyone. We cannot afford to take chances.

In his all-out war effort, the farmer is building for the future of the Nation. In that future he expects to conserve and rebuild the soil. He looks forward to an expanded program of good roads, rural electrification, water use, decentralized industry, and home ownership. But before these things he thinks first of winning the war and of the young men from every neighborhood in America who are fighting its battles. Upon these young men and their gallant allies rest the security and the hope of the free peoples of the earth.

Appeal by President of United Automobile Workers, C. I. O., to the Members of His Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very remarkable statement issued by Mr. R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O., to the members of his union, printed in the Philadelphia Record of May 28, 1944, and entitled "Any Person Who Sets Up Picket Lines Acts Like an Anarchist." I hope every Member of the Senate will read it.

There being no objection, the appeal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNION LEADER TELLS HIS MEN: "ANY PERSON WHO SETS UP PICKET LINES ACTS LIKE AN ANARCHIST"

DETROIT, May 28.—Following is the text of the appeal made by R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O., to the members of his union:

"The U. A. W.-C. I. O. today faces one of the greatest crises in its history. On the

outcome of this crisis will depend the possibilities of our survival in the post-war period. The test is this: Are the membership of our union and its leaders willing to abide by the democratic decisions and mandates of our constitution and our conventions?

"To most of our more than a million members this statement will come as a surprise. Most of you, virtually all of you, are engaged at work in your plants.

"But a union is only as strong as its weakest link. A minority, even a handful, can do a union irreparable harm, even destroy it.

"The workers who insist on taking part in unauthorized strikes may be such a minority. Within recent weeks there have been too many wildcat strikes. Public opinion has become inflamed against our union. Word of these strikes is going to our millions of men in uniform.

"Our union cannot survive if the Nation and our soldiers believe that we are obstructing the war effort. Our loyal membership must face that fact.

"They must see to it that the good name of our union is maintained, that the acts of isolated handfuls are not permitted to continue to the detriment of all of us.

"Today our armed forces are poised for an attack on the Nazi war machine. Already more than 35,000 of our American brothers have been killed in action. Many more have been maimed, many of them for life. These figures will increase manyfold in the months to come.

"Does any reasonable and responsible person believe that, in the face of these terrible facts, our union can tolerate wildcat strikes in war plants and still survive? It can't be done.

"Either we set our own house in order at once, cease all wildcat strikes, or we will face an attack such as no union can withstand.

"Let us all resolve today to obey our constitution and the no-strike pledges made by our conventions.

"There can be no such thing today as legitimate picket lines. Any person who sets up picket lines is acting like an anarchist, not like a disciplined union man. Such picket lines should be ignored.

"I need not be reminded that the maintenance of production requires the cooperation of management and governmental agencies, as well as of our union and its members. I know that Government agencies are too slow, and that managements in many cases are trying to provide strikes, or at least to take advantage of the no-strike pledge to weaken our union.

"These things are true, but to me they are only additional reasons why we must exert every bit of self-control we have to prevent the provocation from achieving its intended results—strikes and the blackening of our union.

"This war must be won. If management will not sincerely work toward that end, then labor must do so.

"We may have to take it on the chin here and there for a time, but if we can present the Nation and the returning soldiers with a clean labor record, we will gain after the war for the sacrifices we are making today.

"We will keep the record. The truth will be told. But there will be no gain in keeping and publishing our wartime record if that record is marred by wildcat strikes in war plants.

"I appeal to our membership. If you value your union, if you want it to live and serve us after the war—we must restrain ourselves and our hot-headed brothers today. If we do not, there will be no union after the war.

"In fact, restrictive legislation, worse than anything now on the books, will be enacted before the war ends and we will be behind the eight-ball before we even have a chance to do the post-war job that will be required."

Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion post of Bloomfield, Iowa, adopted a resolution recently which I desire to call to the attention of the Congress with reference to conscientious objectors. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the resolution of the Verne O. Reed American Legion Post No. 78, Department of Iowa:

BLOOMFIELD, IOWA, *May 26, 1944.*

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Congressman from Iowa,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LECOMPTE: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of Verne O. Reed American Legion Post, No. 78 of Bloomfield, Iowa:

"Be it resolved, That this post deplores the fact that conscientious objectors who refuse to serve with the armed forces are permitted to be sent and are sent to college for education at Government expense in training in the field of education that they desire, while other boys are fighting and giving their lives to preserve this Nation and to protect the property and interests of the citizens residing in this Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That this post urges the enactment of a statute that prohibits any conscientious objector who refuses to serve with the armed forces and claims exemption from noncombative military service be denied the right to own and acquire title to real estate in the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That such statute provide that such person be denied the privilege of voting in national, State, and municipal elections. Further that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress representing the State of Iowa."

According to the direction therein I am sending a copy to you. We feel that there are matters contained therein that should be given serious consideration.

Yours very truly,

E. R. WHITE, *Adjutant.*

Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter and an unusually interesting advertisement of the Cunningham Drug Stores, of Detroit, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of May 20.

The advertisement deals with a broadgage and progressive plan under which honorably discharged servicemen can avail themselves of free pharmacy scholarships.

I am impressed with the brief outline at hand because I foresee in this bold and progressive stroke by a great business enterprise a lead which will be followed by other generous and farsighted industries.

This is another example of generosity and service which doubtlessly has been inspired by Nate S. Shapero, the president of the Cunningham Stores, and is in line with his well-established record in the community.

I trust this plan, covering 4 years, which will provide employment, vacations with pay, group life insurance, health and accident insurance, and other important features during the terms of scholarship, will serve as a guide and inspiration for others to follow. I intend to circulate the idea among industrialists in the hope it might prompt similar action.

YOU'VE DONE YOUR PART—NOW LET US DO OURS

Cunningham drug stores wants to be the first to say "welcome home" to returning servicemen, in the only way that counts.

We are happy to offer free scholarships for future pharmacists.

These scholarships are offered in recognition of the vital importance of the post-war employment problem, and in the hope and belief that this precedent will encourage the American people to give serious thought to a duty which is vital to the future of our Nation. It is also to help meet the needs of present-day planning that Cunningham drug stores makes available now an opportunity to qualify for free pharmacy scholarships to returning servicemen.

Cunningham drug stores is seeking youth with vision—sound young thinkers and inspired young dreamers of today, who, having honorably discharged their duties to their country, are now ready and able to become the interpreters and leaders of America tomorrow. Young men who can look ahead to the great future in pharmacy—who can do for it tomorrow what others have done for it in the past.

CUNNINGHAM DRUG STORES, INC.,
Detroit, Mich.

(Operating 150 retail drug stores: Marshall's, Shapero's, Cunningham's in Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.)

HERE'S HOW YOU CAN GET YOUR SCHOLARSHIP

The free 4-year scholarship competition is open to all honorably discharged servicemen, who are high school graduates, throughout the United States and its territories, and the Panama Canal Zone. An opportunity to earn while attending college will be provided successful candidates. For application blanks and further information, write to Cunningham Drugs Stores, Inc., Detroit 16, Mich.

The Lambert Pharmacal Co., recognizing the significance of this announcement, has gladly transferred to the Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc., its priority on this advertising space.

DETROIT, MICH., *May 17, 1944.*

GENTLEMEN: That an organization without national distribution should have a story to tell all America through the pages of a magazine like the Saturday Evening Post is unparalleled. But so is the message, in the opinion of this company. The widespread comment which followed the appearance of the advertisement reproduced in this booklet are, we feel, justification for this departure from precedent.

Cunningham plan pharmacy scholarships are not, in a strict sense, new with us. For years we have maintained 32 scholarships at Wayne University and the Detroit Institute of Technology for our own employees.

This announcement, and the program before us, are a natural and, we believe, timely extension of our policy. In offering the benefits to others beyond our present employees, and in increasing the number who may profit by specialized training, our purpose is twofold:

True, as druggists, we are primarily interested in the development of future pharmacists. But even more important is the opportunity we here at Cunningham's have to frame a pattern for industry to say, practically and constructively, "Welcome home!" to the returning serviceman.

What we are doing can, and should, and will—we are sure—be done by all branches of business.

Industry in the past has relied on the business administration schools for its junior executives. Today these schools are closed. The men are no longer available; they are in the armed forces.

The Cunningham scholarship plan, and those others which we know will duplicate its broad objective in other fields, are a debt we owe to the young men and women whose careers have been interrupted by war. It is to them we must look for the ambition, the knowledge, the performance that make for achievement, and for the responsibilities that will come with leadership in a world at peace again. Helping them equip themselves for the task is the least we can do.

Yours cordially,

NATE S. SHAPERO,
President, Cunningham Drug Stores.

THE PURPOSE OF THE SCHOLARSHIP

To help you who have so valiantly played your part in the fight for the freedom that is America; that you may prepare yourself to enjoy to the fullest our way of life, we make available now this scholarship plan for you as a returning serviceman.

It is also to help the needs of present-day planning that Cunningham Drug Stores makes available this opportunity for you to qualify for a free pharmacy scholarship.

EMPLOYMENT DURING TERM OF SCHOLARSHIP

Successful applicants will be assured employment sufficient to defray the cost of room, board, clothing, and incidental expenses by the Cunningham Drug Stores during the term of scholarship.

Hours of employment will be regulated in cooperation with the colleges of pharmacy.

Scholarship students will enjoy the same benefits as the regular employees of the company, including vacations with pay, group life insurance, health and accident insurance, employee purchase discount.

QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANTS

The following are the qualifications necessary in order to apply for a Cunningham Drug Stores scholarship:

1. Free scholarship competition is open to all honorably discharged servicemen throughout the United States and its territories, and the Panama Canal Zone.

2. The applicant must be a citizen of the United States.

3. The applicant must be a graduate of an accredited high school with credits acceptable to the College of Pharmacy.

BENEFITS OF THE CUNNINGHAM DRUG STORES SCHOLARSHIP

The scholarship plan provides for a 4-year course in pharmacy at either the Detroit Institute of Technology, or Wayne University. These colleges are located in the city of Detroit, Mich.

Matriculation, tuition, laboratory, library, special courses, text and reference books, student activities, health clinic, diploma and graduation fees.

All of the above college expenses will be paid by Cunningham Drug Stores, for the duration of the scholarship.

HOW TO APPLY

1. Answer all questions on enclosed application blank.

2. Attach letter from a former employer or from some other responsible person who is not a member of your immediate family.

3. Attach letter of recommendation from your high school principal or high school counsellor.

4. Attach to application or have your high school principal forward transcript directly to Cunningham Drug Stores. Transcript of high school record is important.

The application must be filed with the personnel director of Cunningham Drug Stores, on or before June 30, 1944, for admission to the September 1944 class.

HOW SCHOLARSHIPS WILL BE AWARDED

Successful applicants will be interviewed by a committee of judges to pass upon their qualifications for a pharmacy scholarship, at the offices of Cunningham Drug Stores, Detroit, Mich., between August 1 and 15, for admission to the September 1944 class.

It will be necessary for the applicant to present himself at Detroit, Mich., at his own traveling expense. All expenses of the applicant will be paid by the company during his stay in Detroit.

The scholarship benefit will continue only while the applicant is employed by Cunningham Drug Stores, and while he maintains satisfactory grades in his pharmacy course.

NUMBER OF SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS

This plan provides for a minimum of 100 scholarships. The company may award additional scholarships in proportion to the number of applicants that qualify.

MEMBERS OF THE JUDGING COMMITTEE

C. J. Schoeninger, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

R. T. Lakey, dean of College of Pharmacy, Wayne University.

E. P. Stout, dean of College of Pharmacy and Chemistry, Detroit Institute of Technology.

F. W. Baxter, general manager, Cunningham Drug Stores.

J. L. Allen, personnel director, Cunningham Drug Stores.

This scholarship committee will be the sole judge in determining the scholarship awards and may make such regulations as they consider advisable for this purpose, requiring the applicants to pass written or oral examinations if the committee deems them necessary.

The Montgomery Ward Case and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Montgomery Ward Case and the Constitution," delivered by me over the Columbia network on Saturday, May 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The incident of the forcible seizure of the Montgomery Ward store by the Army is of the foremost importance currently. It has become a landmark in American history. It was based upon no constitutional, statutory, or inherent power of either the President or the Commander in Chief. It was an unparalleled act of tyranny. The Constitution applies equally in war and in peace. Any wartime power of the President is derived from congressional action. The President's constitutional power as Commander in Chief is confined exclusively to the military. In the language of the Supreme Court:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in war and in peace; and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented * * * than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine would lead directly to anarchy or despotism."

The Montgomery Ward case grew out of a labor dispute for which procedures for adjustment and settlement are provided under the laws of our land, enacted by the Congress. Such constitutional procedures have been ignored, and instead Mr. Roosevelt, acting under the advice of the labor racketeers that now control our labor unions, has chosen to travel the road of tyranny and despotism. Such is the Roosevelt doctrine.

Well do we remember the message to Congress of January 3, 1936, when Mr. Roosevelt said: "In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people."

Well do we remember Mr. Roosevelt's characterization of the business enterprise of our country as forces of selfishness and expressed the hope that it might be said "of my first administration that in it (they) met their match."

Of his second administration he declared: "I should like to have it said * * * that in it these forces met their master."

We have in fact now witnessed the master of tyranny take shape in his third administration.

Mr. Roosevelt's order, under which this business establishment was seized by the armed forces, was issued pursuant to the thin and sleazy opinion of Attorney General Biddle, who has properly been called "the American Himmler." In Mr. Biddle's opinion to the President he said:

"I believe that by the * * * aggregate of your powers of Chief Executive and commander in chief, you could lawfully take possession of and operate Montgomery Ward & Co., if you found it necessary to do so to prevent injury to the country's war effort."

Mr. Biddle, as a lawyer, knew that no such constitutional powers were vested in the Chief Executive unless reposed there by congressional action.

In Mr. Biddle's argument to the court in Chicago, in which he sought confirmation of that which had already been done, he says that no business or property is immune to a presidential order.

In his brief to the court Mr. Biddle said: "In time of war, the courts will not substitute their judgment for that of the President, or review his determination as to the gravity of the emergency or the necessity of the taking of the particular property."

The Hitlerian philosophy of government as expressed by Mr. Biddle contravenes every intent and purpose of the Constitution. It

is in direct conflict with every precedent of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject.

Within the last year the Supreme Court has said:

"It does not follow * * * that the broad guarantees of the Bill of Rights and other provisions of the Constitution protecting essential liberties are suspended by the mere existence of a state of war. It has been frequently stated and recognized by this Court that the war power * * * is subject to the limitations of the Constitution * * * that there are constitutional boundaries which it is our duty to uphold."

Chief Justice Taft said:

"There is no undefined residuum of power which he (the President) can exercise because it seems to him to be in the public interest."

The Montgomery Ward incident is the epitome of one-man government, instead of one of laws; a government by bureaucracy, instead of constitutional form. It is an example of the destructive forces of an administration that has constantly attacked our business enterprise and our American traditions; destroyed our legitimate labor unions and delivered us into slavery under union racketeers. It is the reflection of a philosophy that had led us into the holocaust of war by an administration that is now unable to tell us for what we fight.

An unconstitutional and despotic invasion of the liberty of a single citizen of this country is a threat of the despot against all the liberties of all the people.

The trampling feet of armed soldiers under orders to carry out the dictates of a despot are no more acceptable to America because they march at the instance of a despot who has risen among us instead of a despot who threatens us from without.

But in solemn frankness to ourselves, it must be said that in all these weary years from the Chicago of 1932 to the Ward case of 1944, the signposts have proclaimed whither we were traveling—not so plain in the beginning, but as we descended the rocky way, it became crystal clear that despotism was our destination.

As to any power Mr. Biddle may claim for the President or for the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy under the War Labor Disputes Act, commonly known as the Smith-Connally Act, I call attention to the discussion on the floor of the Senate when that legislation was being considered. Senator CONNALLY, in charge of the bill, assured the Senate that:

"The plant has to be one which is equipped and suitable for the production of national defense articles. The fear about making a wholesale attack on property, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio, has no foundation in fact. * * *

"The bill now pending simply gives to the President the added authority, wherever production is delayed or suspended by reason of labor disputes."

It was suggested by a Senator that provision be made in the Smith-Connally Act for the seizure of any business establishment by the President. To this proposal Senator CONNALLY said:

"I will say to the Senator that I would not favor the idea which he has advanced with reference to giving the proposed legislation application to all plants. * * * I do not think the Senator's amendments would ever pass the Congress."

Congress did not adopt the words "any business establishment."

The argument that a retail merchant is a producer is of the same farfetched character as the claim that an elevator operator in an office building is in interstate commerce. This interpretation is part of the war against the integrity of words which has been in process for some years. Civilization is based upon the integrity of words. If constitutions, statutes, and contracts can be twisted to mean whatever is desired by the twisters, we have substituted government by men and bayonets for government by laws. Faith and confidence in the predictability of government action, so necessary to the planning of business, is thereby irreparably impaired. The post-war jobs of millions of men hinge upon a steady and justified confidence in the meaning of words.

It seems clear that the Chief Executive, either as President or as Commander in Chief, has acted without authority of law and beyond the bounds of his constitutional limitations. The President, Mr. Biddle, Mr. Jones, and all others who participated in the affair must stand charged with failure to preserve and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America. The Congress itself, however, must share in the responsibility for the deflection of our ship of state from its constitutional course. It is difficult for Congress to condemn the President for unlawfully twisting the Constitution to fit despotic desires, when Congress itself has on so many occasions acquiesced in the demand for unconstitutional legislation.

In this connection, I am remembering those days of the N. R. A., the A. A. A., the Bituminous Coal Act, and other legislation which the Court had the courage and integrity to strike down. I am remembering the message of the President of the United States to the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1936, when he said in connection with the Guffey coal bill:

"I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

And I am remembering that the Congress, at the behest of the President, ignored its grave doubts and enacted the legislation, and it was later declared unconstitutional by the courts.

More recently, I remember the debates in Congress when the so-called soldiers' vote bill was under consideration, and the position of some of its Members that the Congress should usurp the rights of the States in providing for the balloting of our armed forces. I am remembering the statement of one Senator that he did not wish to discuss the constitutionality of the bill. I am remembering the statement of another that he approved such action without passing upon the question of the constitutionality of the legislation, because in time of war a higher law than the Constitution commands us.

And still more recently I am remembering the proposal of some Members of the Congress that the constitutional right of the States to impose a poll tax upon their own electors as a qualification to vote should be denied by Federal legislation. I am remembering that there were some Members of the Congress who resisted the soldiers' vote bill but who favored the poll-tax repeal, although both proposals involved the identical principle.

As aptly said by the Supreme Court:

"If the provisions of the Constitution be not upheld when they pinch as well as when they comfort, they may as well be abandoned."

Certainly the time is upon us when we must take a firm and immovable position upon the Constitution. It is our mooring and our only anchorage of the Republic. If we shall fail to do that now, I say, with all the conviction of which I am capable, that the time is short when we shall have the opportunity to do so.

We should never cease to repeat the words of Washington, when he said:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modifications of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

We should ever be impressed with the warnings of the Supreme Court in the Milligan case that:

"Wicked men, ambitious of power, with hatred of liberty and contempt of law, may fill the place once occupied by Washington and Lincoln; and if this right is conceded, and the calamities of war again befall us, the dangers to human liberty are frightful to contemplate."

The platform of the American people must be a return to constitutional government. The Constitution was created and adopted by the people as a blueprint for government and as a protection against those entrusted with the power of public office. No other guaranty of the preservation of the liberties of freemen exists in America. Its desecration and its impairment, either by the assumption of power by the Executive, or the unconstitutional delegation of its powers by Congress, or failure to uphold the observance of its provisions by the courts, is a betrayal of trust, for which all men who may be guilty should be publicly condemned.

We talk of political platforms, of panaceas, of proposed legislation and of programs that will appeal to the voters. In these perilous times, such talk is base demagoguery. The platform for which the American people are crying is a return to the principles of constitutional government, and when that shall have been accomplished, we will build upon that foundation a stable and enduring government.

The President has belittled our alarm over the seizure of Montgomery Ward by commenting that we were "looking under the bed." Perhaps it is the shadow of piled bayonets in secret places that has struck terror in our hearts and opened our eyes to the tyranny that threatens us. The Montgomery Ward incident is a challenge to every thinking American; a warning to all who can read the signs of the times: "It did happen here—it is later than we think."

Remarks of Hon. James F. Byrnes on Presentation of Churchman's Award to Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, on the occasion of the one hundred and fortieth anniversary dinner of The Churchman in New York, May 23, 1944. The remarks were made in connection with The Churchman's award to Bernard M. Baruch, adviser to the Office of War Mobilization, "For the promotion of good will and better understanding among all people."

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I esteem it a very happy privilege to join you this evening in the presentation of the Churchman award "for the promotion

of good will and better understanding among all peoples" to my good friend, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch.

I was going to say to Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, of South Carolina. But if I should so describe him I am afraid that the many New Yorkers here, who also claim him as their own, might break up this good-will gathering. So I shall generously refer to this native South Carolinian, in whom the whole Nation takes pride, as Mr. Baruch, of the United States.

For many years Mr. Baruch has been my friend. Like all men who have worked with him, I know that he has always been devoted to the promotion of good will and better understanding among all peoples. With him it is no newly acquired asset. It has been, is now, and always will be a part of his very life and being.

The theme of this evening's meeting, America in the Post-war World, is a theme very dear to the heart of Mr. Baruch. Through no fault of his, America did not take her proper place in the world after the last war. No one labored more unremittingly than he did to help President Wilson awaken America to accept her new responsibilities.

In 1918, a few days before the armistice, I talked with General Bliss, our representative upon the Supreme Council at Versailles. He said that each passing day he heard less of world peace and more of lust for power and spoils. He believed the only chance to save the situation was for President Wilson to attend the Peace Conference. Upon my return I so advised the President. He stated that General Bliss had already conveyed that opinion to him. He deplored his inability to speak French, and realized the difficulties he faced in appealing through interpreters to the peoples of other countries. He did not want to go to France. But he had determined that no matter what set-backs he personally might suffer, he would spare no effort to redeem the pledge he had given to the mothers of the world to end all wars. The peace he brought back was not perfect. But history will record that the peace failed not because of the shortcomings of the treaty, but because of our failure to support the League of Nations, which in time might have remedied those shortcomings.

Then we blamed Wilson. We blamed England. We blamed France. But the truth is, that a quarter of a century ago we lost the peace, not on the battlefield, not at the Peace Conference, but at home—in the forum of public opinion and in the Senate of the United States.

This time all of us, Republicans and Democrats, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, must be on our guard to see that America takes her proper place in the community of nations.

Our material power and moral influence today is not exceeded or even matched by any other nation. If we now fail to take our proper place in the post-war world it will be because we have not the wisdom to know what we want or the internal unity necessary to achieve it.

It is not enough that we say, as most of us do, that we want to see America assume her rightful position in a world order. We must agree among ourselves as to what the rightful position of America is and what kind of world order we want. We must face the fact that if we cannot agree among ourselves we will lose the next peace as we lost the last peace.

Of course, there are conflicts in interest among nations as there are conflicts in interest among individuals. But the common interests which should unite nations in an interdependent world are far more important than the conflicts in interest which tend to divide them. By her example, America must show how nations can live together, not how they can live apart.

Resolution by Pennsylvania Democratic State Committee in Support of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was adopted at the Democratic State committee meeting at Harrisburg on Wednesday, May 24.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT RESOLUTION

We salute our leader, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in this, the twelfth year, of his administration—12 years of useful accomplishments unparalleled in the history of any nation.

The campaign, as framed against him, is officered and financed by organized greed and fueled by malignant personal hatred. The same interests that seized the machinery of the Republican Party in 1912 and that then accomplished the political assassination of Theodore Roosevelt are running the Republican show in this campaign. It is the same crowd that was responsible for the fake "return to normalcy" in the administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover; 12 years of depression, disorder, and disaster.

The real issue in this campaign is spread for all to see in the record of the 12 years of Republican maladministration during the period 1920 to 1932 as opposed to the record of the Roosevelt administration, 1932–44.

In the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era, we find looted and broken banks, bread lines, broken homes, widespread poverty, suicides, and broken promises.

In the 12 years of the Roosevelt administration we find a restored and stable banking system with guaranteed deposits, restoration of homes, schools, and farms, social security and old-age provisions, restored national confidence, and a new spirit of international statesmanship. We find real regulation of piratical utilities and the recognition of human rights. We find respect for the dignity of labor, the welfare of the farmers, and the creation of an era of good will.

President Roosevelt foresaw the inevitable and personally directed the preparation for the new World War. Through his leadership, Russia, China, and England were provisioned and armed. An Army of 11,000,000 men and women were summoned from American civilian life and this enormous armed force, under the President's direction, was provided with such skilled and dauntless leaders as the world has ever known. Marshall, Eisenhower, Arnold, Wainwright, Bradley, Doolittle, Spaatz, MacArthur, Halsey, King, Nimitz are some of the names that will live forever.

The leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt stopped Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo dead in their tracks. Through the dynamic leadership of Roosevelt, we are on the eve of the greatest victory over the forces of evil this world has ever known.

Through the genius of President Roosevelt, a victory on the home front has been won over the forces of isolation. He has assembled beside him patriotic men from the Republican Party who are loyally aiding in this struggle.

We appeal to our fellow citizens of every political faith, of every race and creed to join with us on the home front in sustaining the hands and the ideals of our President.

To repudiate him now would be unthinkable. It would be a betrayal of American ideals and our common heritage. The millions in our armed forces are chancing their lives and enduring countless privations in battles to preserve the American way of life so nobly championed by their Commander in Chief. We rally again to the Commander in Chief at the most critical moment in this war.

These things being true: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the State Committee of the Democratic Party of Pennsylvania, record our unanimous determination to draft Franklin Delano Roosevelt as the nominee of the party to the end that Pennsylvania will again be enrolled in the Roosevelt column next November.

Sane Union Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Pontiac Daily Press of Pontiac, Mich., of May 27, 1944, showing a heartening and encouraging attitude on the part of a prominent labor leader in the Detroit area, one of the great centers for the production of war material:

SANE UNION MANAGEMENT

Two recent happenings in the administration of the United Automobile Workers' C. I. O. union provide encouraging evidence of the growing sense of responsibility and duty to the public and Nation felt by that organization's leadership.

The first was the disciplinary action taken by the U. A. W. executive board against those responsible for the "soda pop" strike which idled nearly 12,000 Chrysler employees and closed 7 of that corporation's Detroit plants.

President William Jenkins and 13 other officers of Chrysler local union No. 490 were removed from office for calling and refusing to halt the walkout which arose from a jurisdictional dispute as to whether an A. F. L. or a C. I. O. teamster should be permitted to deliver soda pop to one of the company's plants.

The second was the unequivocal warning of U. A. W. President R. J. Thomas that if delegates failed to renew their "no strike" pledge to the Government at the convention in September he would refuse to be a candidate for reelection.

These events reveal the right kind of thinking by the U. A. W. leadership.

Members of the executive board and President Thomas have shown that they haven't forgotten the United States is fighting the most crucial war in our history.

They have demonstrated by their actions that they oppose misuse of the strike weapon.

Publicly they have reiterated their intention to keep the faith with the American people and our millions of fighting men who are risking and losing their lives in battles fought to preserve with other liberties the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

Their actions should encourage and win the approval of both friends and critics of labor.

They herald the dawn of an era of a saner and an economically and socially sounder administration of unions.

Price Control of Barber and Beauty Service Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JOURNEYMEN BARBERS', HAIR DRESSERS' & COSMETOLOGISTS' INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA, LOCAL NO. 709,
Tucson, Ariz., May 23, 1944.

Hon. RICHARD F. HARLESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The officers and members of this organization have been informed that Representative CRAWFORD, of Michigan, has proposed to the House Banking Committee that barber and beauty service be placed under wartime price control.

We are unalterably opposed to this proposal; we do not sell, manufacture, or process any commodity; both are personal-service trades, and, in our opinion, should not be placed under O. P. A. any more than the medical or legal professions. Therefore, we are protesting the placing of barber and beauty service under O. P. A., and asking that you use your influence and vote against this proposal.

Trusting we may have your support on this measure, we are,

Very respectfully,

L. E. MOYE, *Secretary.*

Our Only Course, Our Sole Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Polish-American Congress, May 28, 1944, at Memorial Hall, Buffalo, N. Y.:

Mr. President, right reverend bishop, reverend fathers, and fellow Americans, I am proud indeed to be able to respond to your invitation to address this assembly of representative Americans of Polish antecedents and to express as forcefully and as briefly as I am able what I believe to be the sole and the only course which we as Americans in justice and in good faith can follow. It is not only a privilege but a patriotic duty to do so.

Our course is as clearly defined as is our goal and that is to win the war at the earliest possible moment with the least possible expenditure of American lives and to secure a just and a lasting peace. Toward that end we must concentrate all of our efforts and we must not be persuaded even for a moment to swerve from the course. There must be no distraction or foreign attraction, however slight, which might mean even a temporary reverse and the loss of precious American lives. We must concentrate and unite all of our vast resources, employing to the limit not only our arms, our finances, and our mechanical and productive genius, but we must also unite intellectually and morally to bring about the complete destruction of the common enemy.

For my part, there is no need today for an extended discourse. I believe that the printed Aims and Objectives of the Polish American Congress contains every essential of a genuinely American expression and is so eloquent and forceful that it is a sheer waste of time to try to add to or detract from this very able and patriotic exposition of objectives. I sought to study and analyze the declaration in order that I might find and concentrate upon the most important paragraph but I find that they are all important, so important in fact that we must recognize and endorse in its entirety this historic declaration.

We must, however, inform the people of America, our fellow American citizens, of every creed, of every color, and of every nationalistic origin what we Americans of Polish ancestry stand for. The reaffirmation and acceptance of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the "four freedoms," together with the right of self-determination on the part of all of the smaller nations is genuinely and traditionally in accord with American fair play. We can and we must pledge ourselves to the carrying out of this historic declaration.

We must unfalteringly give endorsement to American foreign policy under the peerless leadership of the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and of Cordell Hull, the very able and distinguished Secretary of State. The problem of the Americans of Polish antecedents is chiefly one of making known to the great bulk of our American people the legitimate and historic claims of the land of our forefathers.

In recent months with increasing interest and intensity the question of Poland's eastern boundary and the legitimacy of the Government in exile has been debated by friend and foe alike. Unfortunately, elements both in this country and abroad have initiated a campaign of misrepresentation with regard to Poland's legitimate territorial claims and have attacked the Government in exile. The 1939 eastern boundary without a question of a doubt is fortified, not only by the Treaty of Riga and subsequent Polish-Russian agreements but has also been reinforced by treaties between the two countries since the German attack upon her former Russian ally.

The Polish Government in exile has the support of these latter treaties by virtue of the negotiations which were carried on with the Polish authorities at London. But aside from this signed admission there is a constitutional continuity which sustains the existing Polish Government, and no outside influence can properly be recognized as having any authority to interpret the constitutionality or the legitimacy of the present Raczkiewicz government in exile. What we Americans are chiefly concerned with at this time is that our own Government has recognized the inviolability of the eastern boundary as of 1939 and has consistently recognized and dealt with Sikorski and the successor regime.

Of course, we Americans of Polish ancestry and we who know Polish history, who understand her problems, and are familiar with her sufferings, not only in this but in past wars, need not make any apologies to anyone for our sympathies and predisposition toward Poland's territorial and other legitimate claims. We can and properly should discuss them among ourselves and publicly. We have the constitutional right to even disseminate this information to the people of these United States, for the millions of friends of Poland in this country seek the truth, and only truth will overcome erroneous anti-Polish and pro-Russian propaganda.

Americans, as I stated before, are as fair as they are fearless and they will not sell Poland short. But there are certain difficulties which cannot be discounted at this moment, and we must all recognize that some of these difficulties are well-nigh insurmountable, particularly if interposed at this particular juncture. No segment of our American population has a right to project highly controversial problems which may cause estrangement between the allies and thus impair or delay the winning of the war. It is obvious to me as it is to many who are concerned over the turn in events that our problem is one of fully informing the American public and insofar as is possible the people of the world that Poland's territorial claims are sustained by historic and ethnographical considerations. For instance, how many people in America, even among Americans of Polish lineage, know that the 1939 Polish boundaries constituted approximately 40 percent of Poland's terrain at the peak of her greatest expansion. How many know, for example, that after the last war there were between one and a half and two million Poles who inhabited traditionally Polish terrain and who were abandoned for the large part, to the tender mercies of Germany. Sundry and sound arguments that are absolutely unimpeachable can be made out in behalf of the rightful claims advanced by the Polish Government, and millions of friends in America and countless others can be won over on the side of truth, and that is the responsibility, and I say the duty, of those of us who know something about the matter, to disseminate this information. The truth will sustain the position of the administration at Washington. It will lend support to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State, and it will have a positive and helpful effect in pulverizing propaganda emanating from unfair sources.

No one in America will challenge the right of free discussion and the assumption of definite cleavage on one side or the other. But it must ever be borne in mind that however important might be the problem affecting the future of any other nation, even the closest ally, it must never interfere with the prime objective—the winning of the war at the earliest possible date with the least possible expenditure of American lives, and the establishment of a just and lasting peace. All other considerations are secondary.

The consequences of imposing upon Poland a boundary that will expose her to her enemies and the reduction of her domain to a point where it will impair her growth and virility, or the gerrymandering of her frontiers so as to deprive her of essential raw materials, such as timber, oil, peat, and certain valuable minerals, which will reduce her to dependency and weakness instead of making her independent and strong, will prove disastrous and a threat to future peace. Poland, as the key to peace in Europe, must at this late date be so recognized.

I feel that I know the attitude of the administration and of the Secretary of State, and that I can with propriety presume to say that the injustice of the last war and the shortcomings of the Treaty of Versailles insofar as they applied to Poland will not be repeated at the conference table following World War No. 2.

Our greatest asset and our ability to render the greatest amount of good are centered in our ability to unite in support of America's foreign policy as enunciated by the President and the Secretary of State in sustaining the Atlantic Charter and our insistance upon the "four freedoms." The administration has never forsaken these expressions. The President of the United States went so far as to offer the aid of his good offices in the ironing out of the differences between the Polish and Russian governments. It is unfortunate that the changed attitude of the Russian government

after Stalingrad was such as to refuse this friendly proffer on the part of our Government. This friendly American gesture is one which commends itself to our continued respect and to our undivided support.

I think at the proper time it will yield dividends toward the welfare of Poland and toward the establishment of a lasting and just peace.

The average American is not only fair but he is friendly to the cause of Poland but altogether too frequently he is either uninformed, misinformed, or because of the great amount of base and erroneous propaganda, he is confused and it is, therefore, the problem of Polonia in these United States to make known the just claims of the government in exile on behalf of the people of Poland. This can be done without losing sight of the objective or without deviating from the well-defined and prescribed patriotic course. It will be of great service not only to the people of Poland but also to our fellow Americans who seek the truth.

We must look ahead to the day when the war is over to the peace conference, to a time when Poland will have to rely upon her friends at the conference table to sustain her legitimate claims. We must, therefore, not permit petty personal differences or the excursions of individuals into comic spheres to cause consternation and disunity. We must always remember first and above everything else that we are Americans and we have a war to win and a permanent and just peace to secure. I am confident that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State have never departed one iota from their previous declarations. In fact we have the declarations of Cordell Hull delivered in the form of a personal report to the Congress of the United States as authority for this, my statement. Subsequently, he has made another and a forceful public declaration over the radio and I was unable to detect in either instance any digression from the original purpose and declaration or any faltering weakness.

Now let us have confidence in our friends. Let us not permit selfish interests to arouse suspicions among our people here in America or among our brethren in other parts of the world, for we might only weaken our case by creating animosities. Let us stand united with confidence that the administration, definitely on record, will fulfill its every pledge in spirit and in detail. Millions of Americans of Polish extraction with hundreds of thousands of sons fighting for the perpetuation of American ideals and the liberation of the subjugated peoples, victimized by this war look to this Congress, to this assembly of representative American citizens to redefine the course, to rededicate themselves to the objectives of winning the war, supporting the War bond and Red Cross drives and all other worth-while wartime activities and, above all else, to sustain the Commander in Chief toward the end that we may win the war and secure a lasting and just peace with the least possible expenditure in the lives of our American fighting men who are waging an armed crusade for religion, democracy, and the preservation of our beloved country.

What is the meaning of this repeated emphasis upon the early and successful ending of the war? Translated into simple, understandable language it means:

Driving the unspeakable German Hun back to his foul lair and the crushing of this hydra-headed monster.

It means abrupt stoppage of the flow of heroic blood, of suffering, and of the sacrifice of our own brave warriors and those of our gallant allies.

It means that the foul paws of the German rapist, plunderer, and murderer, clutching at the throat of millions of unfortunate victims, will be shaken loose and paralyzed in death. The yoke of German enslavement and the forged shackles of the supermen will be broken, and the liberated hands of the peoples who bore them will be the very ones to break and stretch the neck of the aggressors. The day of retribution will be at hand.

Desecration and destruction of the churches of God will come simultaneously with the end of the Hun. Then a Te Deum will be sung in harmony with the peal of the bells, if any remain, in Warsaw; the bells of Paris, Prague, Brussels, and the capitals of all the liberated and Allied countries will join in one grand paeon of a rejoicing world.

On that day of liberation, when the millions of brave Americans fighting side by side with their Allied comrades in arms force the unconditional surrender of the marauding German horde, every mile of subjugated terrain in all Europe will be freed and every foot of blood-drenched Polish soil made sacred by the sacrifice of its millions of martyred dead will be cleared of the invader. The cloven-hoof marks of the biped swine will be erased and the earth once more consecreated to the wholesome purpose of giving sustenance to its rightful owners. That day marking the end of the war will reestablish the broken family ties, severed by the fiendish Germans. It will bring together, from all points of the compass, such remaining husbands and wives as might survive the separation and the enslavement within the hell on earth known to them as Germany. God grant that on that day abducted children of Poland and of other countries, and the countless Polish orphans shipped into Deutschland for corruption and Germanization, will be found, freed, and returned to their native country.

In a word it means the promised deliverance of millions who for nearly 5 long years have suffered the pains and anguish of hell. It means that the word of our President on that day will become the flesh of reality and of liberation for all who suffer beneath the heel of German fiendishness.

Finally and most important, it will be the historic day our boys suffered, died, and went through hell in order to break the grip of the Hun, and on that day millions of American mothers and fathers, yes, millions more throughout the world, will heave a sigh of relief as they prayerfully look to the return of their sons and daughters who freed the world from the greatest curse ever brought down upon humanity.

And on that very day, even before our victorious soldiers begin their westward trek for home, I warn you people of America, beware, for the cunning, whining, scheming Hun, ever on the alert, will plead for mercy and understanding as he treacherously prepares another blood bath for a gullible and sloppily sentimental world.

If you do not make him impotent, or at least put a ring in his provocative nose to restrict him from terrain reserved for others, you will have but yourselves to blame for your indifference, and you will have another war to fight in 25 years.

We have but one objective, but one job to do, and to do it promptly it must be done thoroughly and unitedly. That objective is the winning of the war.

Strikes in War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from California comes a letter this morning containing a newspaper clipping which reads as follows:

Lumber: Two thousand lumbermen and woods products workers walk off jobs in nine sawmills in Seattle and Tacoma, Wash., in protest against N. L. R. B. refusal to grant wage increases to 130,000 sawmill and logging employees in Pacific Northwest. Spread of strike feared.

Copper: Two hundred miners at Anaconda copper mines in Butte, Mont., strike in protest against shift boss, affecting vital production of ore.

Motors: Despite settlement of teamster dispute in Detroit, 3,000 Chrysler workers remain on strike over trucking privileges at plant.

Transportation: Cleveland Transit System workers threaten strike that would halt operation of streetcars and busses effective Saturday night as plans for emergency transit for war workers being formulated. Transit men seek wage increase.

Strike of 56 drivers tied up busses of Schuylkill Valley Lines, Inc., main transportation company serving 100,000 persons in Norristown and about 20 smaller communities in southeastern Pennsylvania. Thousands of workbound war workers stranded. Strikers out in disagreement over bonus wage plan.

Building supply: Building-supply workers in Toledo, Ohio, strike on heels of walk-out of 600 municipal workers, seeking higher wages.

Tugboats: Strike of tugmen in Cleveland area prevents movements of large vessels moving up Cuyahoga River to war plants. Dispute certified to W. L. B.

Appliances: Dispute over discharge of union stewards causes 940 workers to walk out at Murray-Ohio Manufacturing Co., in Cleveland.

Steel: Two strikes in Birmingham, Ala., area coal mines halt operations at the Bessemer plant of Pullman Standard Car Company. Nearly 2,000 men affected. Failure to settle minor wage disputes cause of strike. Eighteen hundred diggers reported idle.

Asbestos: Strike at Johns-Manville plant at Alexandria, Ind., left 499 workers idle. Company produces rock wool for Navy. Workers demand better working conditions.

Machinists: War Labor Board directed union leaders to call off strike of 125 members of A. F. of L. International Association of Machinists at Granite City, Ill., steel company. Controversy resulted in idleness of 1,800 workers.

STRIKES CLOSE LUMBER MILLS—13 NORTHWEST YARDS HIT; LABOR UNREST GRIPS 6 OTHER STATES

(By Gerald B. Healey)

Strikes closed 13 lumber mills in the Pacific Northwest Friday night while other labor disturbances, mostly in war plants, spread through 6 States.

Latest reported walk-outs came at Seattle and Tacoma, Wash., where nearly 2,000 men left their sawmill and logging jobs over refusal of the N. L. R. B. to grant wage increases.

Seven of Tacoma's major lumber mills were shut down and 11 other mills in Tacoma and surrounding area, which are under union jurisdiction, may close tomororw.

NINE YARDS PERILED

Nine other retail lumber yards in that city also may be affected by the walk-out.

In Seattle 1,000 men were out in 6 mills.

Union headquarters in Tacoma reported that about 4,000 workers in sawmills and plywood plants would not report for work Saturday.

A. F. L. officials said they tried to "hold the men in line" but were unsuccessful. They termed the walk-outs an "unofficial vacation."

MINERS STRIKE

Two hundred miners struck in protest against a shift boss at the St. Lawrence mine of the vital Anaconda Copper Mining Co. at Butte, Mont. The mine has been producing more than a million pounds of copper per month under Government war contracts.

Despite settlement of a jurisdictional dispute between A. F. of L. and C. I. O. teamsters unions in Detroit, 9,000 Chrysler Corporation war workers remained on strike. It was the Chrysler dispute over trucking privileges that started the teamsters' factional trouble.

Cleveland and Toledo were hit hard by a series of labor difficulties that struck with startling rapidity.

Most serious threat was the impending walkout of 4,100 employees of the Cleveland Transit System.

Nazis Playing Last Cards as Allies Prepare to Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I draw your attention to the following previously mentioned article by Constantine Brown from yesterday's Sunday Star. I have always followed a rule of not inserting any extraneous writings in the RECORD. I make this exception because the article contains facts which should be known by every American citizen. The invasion is premature and should be postponed.

NAZIS PLAYING LAST CARDS AS ALLIES PREPARE TO STRIKE—INVASION TO BRING BITTEREST BATTLES OF WAR, WITH END OF FIGHTING SEEN SOON IF SUCCESS COMES WITH ATTACKS

(By Constantine Brown)

There will be no unfurled flags or military bands and beating drums when the Allied forces begin the invasion of western Europe. It will be a series of grim battles of men armed with the latest destructive devices. Escorted by thousands of planes and warships of all types, invasion barges will land hundreds of thousands of men who will strike out front on the beaches to meet the enemy.

The German divisions will be concealed behind the latest and most improved fortifications which will have to be pounded out of existence by the cross-fire of the Allied artillery.

Both sides realize this will be the most momentous battle of the war. Neither the Allies nor the Germans have much margin for error. The invasion must click with chronometer-like precision; the defense forces must gather at the threatened points—the only thing constituting surprise in the impending offensive—with equal split-second precision. Even a short delay or confusion of orders at a vital point might have dire consequences.

The Germans are playing their last card in Europe. Their veteran military leaders, Marshals Gerd Von Rundstedt and Erwin Rommel, are fully aware of this. So are the younger and enthusiastic Allied generals who are leading the invasion forces.

LAST MAJOR BATTLE

The Germans, officers and soldiers, are fully aware that this is the last major battle of the war.

A defeat in western Europe at the moment the Russians are poised to strike at the Reich from the east would mean the complete collapse of the Germans and probably the end of the Reich for a good many years. All the shrewd work of Germany's generals and statesmen from Frederick the Great to Prince Otto von Bismarck, the Iron Chancelor, who completed the unification of the German kingdoms and principalities into a German Empire, would disappear. Germany will be reduced to a number of weak states as she was in the days before Frederick. It will be many years before she can lift her head again and it is doubtful that another German empire will be created for many generations.

Students of Germany's military history believe the German generals in charge of the present operations will follow the old tradition which consists of regarding war only as a campaign. If it is lost, peace must be made at once to save manpower and permit the generals to prepare, on the basis of the learned lessons, for another war. This has occurred again and again. Marshal Paul von Hindenburg and his chief of staff, Gen. Erich Ludendorff, advised the civilian powers, after the Kaiser's flight to Holland, to make peace with the Allies in 1918 at any price. They realized as early as the summer of 1918 that the war could not be won, and thus, they reasoned, Germany must get a breathing spell to prepare for a better war in a generation or so.

MUST BE DIVIDED

This time the Germans will not be given this chance. Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, with the full concurrence of their smaller associates have decided to eliminate Germany as a military power in Europe. This, they believe, cannot be done by imposing terms—regardless of how harsh they may be—on a united Reich. They agreed at Teheran that Germany must be divided into her component parts and the former kingdoms, principalities, and dukedoms must be prevented from uniting again. Individually, they may be allowed to prosper economically in confederations which are not of their own making. The Allied leaders believe a forced estrangement, with parts of Germany joining the western confederation under the leadership of Britain and other posts joining an eastern confederation headed by Russia, is about the only way to crush Germany's militarism and military power in Europe.

This general outline of Germany's future has not been hidden from the Germans. Official announcements from London, Washington, and Moscow leave no doubt as to the intentions of the Allies. The German generals and the men under their command are fully aware of the consequences of a defeat. The morale of the German defense force cannot be determined with any degree of finality. From available reports and judging by the men we have captured in Italy the morale is unbroken. But the Germans are not supermen and how they will be able to withstand the most murderous fire they have ever seen from ground and naval forces is a matter which no man can foresee.

The German military preparations are said to be as perfect as modern human genius can produce. Underground hangars for the Luftwaffe, underground communications permitting German forces to move from one point to another without interference from Allied gunnery, and many other devices are believed to have been established over an extensive area of the invasion front. British military authorities still speak about surprise weapons such as a rocket gun capable of hurling between 6 and 10 tons of explosives at a distance of 100 miles. Whether such a gun actually exists is difficult to ascertain at this time, but within the next few weeks—or days—we will find out. If the allies succeed in establishing a wide and deep beachhead where they will be able to pour their invasion troops and all the necessary material and organize airfields, it is doubtful if the German resistance will extend much longer than this fall. Faced with 2 powerful armies, 1 in the west and the other in the east, the walls of the European fortress are bound to crumble in a shorter time than the average observer believes.

On the other hand, it would be rendering a disservice to the peoples of the Allied countries if the risks of the first few weeks of the battle against the Germans were not sufficiently emphasized. There is a possibility that the German defenses, manned by determined and experienced troops provided with ample quantities of material, will keep the Allies from establishing a firm and continuous beachhead. The consequences of such a failure would be grave, particularly for Britain.

GIGANTIC PLANS MADE

The Allies will not make a demonstration such as the Dieppe affair in 1942. They will attack in all earnestness with everything at their disposal. For 2 years we have been preparing for the most gigantic amphibious operation ever known in history. A large number of troops who have been concentrated in the United Kingdom over this period will be involved. The losses will be considerable if we crack the German wall, but they will be even larger if we fail. The morale of the British and American troops is at least as good as that of the Germans, although the purpose of the war is so different.

The Americans will give their utmost because they want the war to end and they want to return to their homes.

The British have an even greater scope. The British leaders, as well as the Tommy in the ranks, realize that the fate of the empire depends on the results of the great battles which will develop. If, by misfortune, these battles should end without our forces having established themselves permanently in the designated areas, there is no saying what political conditions will develop in Europe this year.

Russia is determined to synchronize her actions with the actions of the other United Nations. But failure to break through the German wall in the west would place the Russians in a difficult position. Their aim is said to be a march through Prussia to Berlin and the Elbe River. The Germans have a large army on the eastern front—about 190 divisions, out of which about 35 or 40 are said to be satellite troops.

Should the Allies in the west fail in their objective the power of Nazi resistance in the east would be greatly increased and the Germans would so strengthen their defenses against the Russians that any hope of breaking through would be frustrated.

Under such circumstances it is difficult to gage what might happen in Europe politically. In view of the long period of time which would be required for the western Allies to prepare another large-scale offensive, many observers are inclined to believe that Russia might be willing to come to terms with Germany on the basis of a Soviet expansion in Europe to the boundaries of June 1941.

Much of the rivalry between Britain and Russia in Asia has now been eased by the common purpose of the Allies to defeat the Germans. This defeat would offer Russia one or more exits to the Mediterranean, that is to say, to warm seaports. Should the Nazis not be defeated as a result of our invasion, Russia might be led to consider the possibility of obtaining access to a warm seaport in another area such as the Persian Gulf.

That threat to British supremacy in the Middle East and eventually to India has been recognized by British statesmen for a long time. The agreements reached at Moscow and later at Teheran are said to have fully safeguarded Britain's interests in those areas. Russia does not particularly care where she obtains the outlet without which the Soviet remains stifled.

The agreements signed at Teheran provide for certain military action on the part of Britain and the United States. Otherwise the political understandings regarding the future map of Europe lose their value. Stalin is willing to live up to his part of the bargain, which, however, is predicated on an Allied victory in the west. If this is not forthcoming the Teheran accord will be a dead letter and the Soviet government will be fully entitled to adopt the best policy in the interest of Russia. Premier Stalin has proved himself a strictly realistic political man. There is no emotional streak in him regarding foreign affairs. In international matters he has no more feeling than a surgeon who operates on a patient he has never seen before.

There is no question that the Russian leader fervently hopes the Allies will be successful in their impending offensive. But should they fail, the interests of Russia will be the predominant factor in Stalin's mind and if they have to conflict with those of Britain, it will be unpleasant, but it can't be helped.

These facts are known to the British leaders and are probably being realized subconsciously by the British fighting men.

The battle in western Europe will exceed in bitterness and determination anything we have ever seen in the world before. According to some observers a decision can be expected within a few weeks after the first Anglo-American waves have landed; others say it will take a few months. But the bulk of the American and British authorities believe the final verdict will come this summer.

Increase in Fluid Milk and Cream Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following letter:

MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEVENSON: Recently we had some conversation regarding the increase in fluid milk and cream sales. I believe I told you that I felt the increase had been very much less than the percentage mentioned by you in your talk reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yesterday we received the official figures issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. This shows an apparent civilian consumption of fluid milk and cream on a per capita basis as follows:

	Pounds
Average 1935-39	340.1
1941	350.6
1942	371.8
1943	403.4
1944 (estimate)	396.2

(1944 expressed as a percentage of 1935-39 average is 116 percent and as a percentage of 1943—98 percent. You will see from the foregoing figures that the increase from 1941 to 1943 was 12 percent.)

It may interest you to know that according to Foundation tabulations comparing class 1 milk sales in 15 city markets for April with March 1944, the total sales show a decline of 2.23 percent. It is pretty evident that the War Food Administration conservation program is working well.

Very truly yours,

BENJAMIN F. CASTLE,
President.

Citizenship in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Charles S. Stough, past commander of the American Legion in my State and a veteran of World Wars No. 1 and No. 2, at an I Am an American Day function in Douglas, Ariz., on May 21, 1944:

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted the invitation of Chairman Foster to address you briefly today upon the subject of citizenship in time of war.

Citizenship in a democracy entails certain responsibilities, as well as certain privileges. The freedom we as citizens of the United States enjoy is only maintained by the assumption on our part of the obligations this citizenship imposes.

There are nations where the people who inhabit the land are not permitted the political rights and the privileges we, as Americans, enjoy. Because they have no political rights they are unable to bring about political reforms or economic reforms by the use of the ballot in free elections, so the only recourse left to those people if they desire reform is revolution. In a democracy we bring about reforms by other methods.

Democracy is a relatively new thing. It was just 168 years ago that this Nation by its Declaration of Independence established this the now oldest democracy upon the face of the earth. On that July 4 in 1776, when those patriots signed their Declaration they said to all the world, I am an American. Prior to this time they were subjects of Great Britain and the Crown of England, but upon that day they became citizens of the United States of America, and they assumed the responsibilities of citizenship. The rugged road which this patriotic band of self-sacrificing citizens were forced to travel was not yet visible to them, but there were no weak hearts; they faced the future with determination, and after many serious military losses, they turned what looked like disaster into a glorious victory and the firm establishment of the present democracy, the United States of America.

Since those early days there have been other crises, and other pioneer Americans have never failed their duties. As citizens, they have manned the armies and the navies when it became necessary to fight a foe to defend themselves against the encroachments of forces which would destroy their freedom. In the War of 1812, and the French and Indian Wars, and the War with Spain, and later in the First World War, it was the citizens who made up the fighting forces and won the victory. Likewise it was the citizens who fought and won the battles against economic ills which followed the war and which took from free men their freedom and their right to live and to enjoy their lives as Americans should.

Today we find our Nation engaged in another war. We call it World War No. 2 because it is a continuation of a war which is being fought by the same belligerents, and over the same territory as the great war of 1914 to 1918. Many of us participated in that great struggle. Many of us crossed submarine infested seas, and slept and fought in the same French mud which soon will mire down our own modern armies, as they carry the fight forward toward Germany and the evil philosophies of Prussianism. We who embarked to foreign soil in the early days of 1917 and 1918 remember well the heartbreak days when our efforts to advance seemed in vain. We can recall quite vividly the great enemy advance, when our armies were forced backward, and backward, when the French inhabitants left the territory with their belongings in hand carts, and by every other means of transportation. Those were the days when the future looked dark and victory looked very far away. Those were the same kind of days of which Tom Paine wrote, in Revolutionary times, when he said: "Those were the times that try men's souls," but this was the time when there awakened in these great citizen armies the indomitable will to stop the onslaught of the advancing German armies. It was the same American will that saved the day at Valley Forge, and it was the same American will that saved the day for Andrew Jackson at New Orleans, and it is the same American will which will overcome Hitler, and the Nazis in Europe, and the Japanese in the Pacific.

Some of us have witnessed first hand, the spirit of the American armies in this war. It was my extreme privilege to have been a part of the Fifth Air Force which is now carrying the fight to the Japanese in the Southwest Pacific. In the early days, before the Battles of Buna and Gona, I can assure you the chips were down in Australia. In those days of 1942 and early 1943, no one knew what might happen. The continent of Australia was in danger of invasion. Darwin had been bombed off the map, and our Army was holding precariously to one little spot on New Guinea, and the Japs were advancing across the Kokoda trail toward Port Moresby. It was a magnificent citizen army, the National Guard of Michigan and Wisconsin if you please, who made that wonderful trek across the 1,300-foot high Owen Stanley Mountains, and met and defeated the Japanese at Buna and Gona. This remarkable victory was accomplished in spite of greater trials than any infantry has ever been called upon to negotiate before, or since, and they whipped the enemy in spite of lack of supplies, and equipment. After this great victory, the Air Corps carried the fight to the enemy across the waters of the Bismarck Sea, and New Guinea was saved, and Australia was not invaded. It was a distinct honor to have served with those fine Americans who turned the tide in the Pacific. In all of my life, I never was more proud to say "I am an American."

It seems to me that perhaps the first objective of all citizenship in time of war is the orderly procedure which is being followed at the present time. I find the citizens who are best fit physically doing their jobs well in the armed forces, and I find the citizens who have found their work in the factories and plants carrying on in marvelous fashion. Never before in the history of the world has a nation harnessed its manpower to the necessities of production to carry on a successful war, as we are witnessing at the present time. Our people are working hard to win the victory. There have been a few instances when people who work have placed their own personal troubles ahead of the cause of victory, but

it is a great tribute to the workers of the Nation to know that just a fraction of 1 percent of labor in the war effort has been lost because of work stoppages and strikes. Labor has maintained this fine record in spite of many objectionable working conditions which should not exist. It is likewise a great tribute to management that this low percentage has been maintained. On a few occasions management has chosen to forget its obligation to the cause of victory, but methods have been devised to take care of these situations, and it is a tribute to management that they have seen fit to place the cause of the Nation ahead of their personal gains. This exemplification of harmony in the production of the needs of the Nation in time of war is another example of the greatness of democracy at work. It conclusively demonstrated the fact that freemen can remain free and work together to defeat a common enemy, even though that enemy commands its subjects like slaves and destroys their individuality. In America today industry is still free, and labor is still free, and it is one of the duties of all citizens to insist that it ever remains that way.

To those of you who feel that we have failed to keep production up to its maximum, to those of you who complain of strikes and work stoppages in America, let me refer you to any of the men in the armed services who have spent any time abroad. I assure you they have seen real strikes and disastrous work stoppages. They have seen the war effort hindered by the selfishness of workers and employers in other countries and if these soldiers complain about conditions they feel exist at home, it is because they have been misinformed about the conditions here, and when they get home and look the situation over they are loud in their praise of the job both industry and labor has done in the war effort, in America.

As long as we the people, the citizens of the United States, insist that the men and women of America shall remain free, just so long will we remain great. So long as the people recognize and exercise their political rights, this Nation shall remain free and unconquerable by any Nazi or Fascist idealogy. Democracy however, recognizes the right of everyone to freely express his opinions. There are those who would take away this freedom of thought, but the great men of the past have warned us against it. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson founded their whole philosophy of thought upon the freedom of the individual to think as he pleased, and to ask for reform in an orderly fashion, by the will of all the people, expressed in ballots at the election booth. We in America have never experienced any trouble as long as we have followed these precepts. There have been times when attempts have been made to overthrow our Government by seditious methods, but they have always failed and they will continue to fail because Americans have always accepted their responsibility of citizenship when a crisis comes. These times in which we live are important in the history of our Nation. The emergencies which face us now demand that a few of our liberties be given up for the benefit of the common welfare. These are not ordinary times.

We have been forced to draft men for service in the armed services. We have been forced to tax the people to maintain the battle against the enemy, and the emergencies of the times have forced us to accept rationing of food and gasoline and other materials so vitally necessary to the war effort. These things have happened with our wholehearted acceptance, as necessary to win the victory. We do not like it, and we ofttimes complain, but all this sacrifice is made, because we agree it is necessary. It is this free acceptance of the restrictions war brings which make us a great Nation. We will continue to deprive ourselves of these things until the victory is won, because we know this is the way to end the war quickly and successfully and bring home our men and women who are facing the enemy on 75 war fronts today.

We are facing facts today. America is demonstrating an austerity which a few years ago seemed impossible of reality, and she is doing it with a determination which is unbelievable. Citizenship in time of war demands clear thinking and concerted action. It demands even in time of war the selection of officials who shall guide the Nation in this great time of trial. There are those who honestly believe elections in time of war are hazardous, but being free people we have faith in the will of the people freely expressed even in time of war. We in America will tolerate no dictatorship, even in time of war, for we have confidence in the will of the American people, so we are not afraid of elections. Much has been said about our first President saying that no person should serve longer than two terms, or by his actions indicating that a President should not serve longer than two terms. I would like to refer to a letter Washington wrote to Lafayette on April 28, 1788, in which he expressed his own opinion in the following thoughtful words: "As, for instance, on the ineligibility of the same person for President, after he should have served a certain course of years, I confess I differ widely myself with Mr. Jefferson and you as to the necessity or expediency of rotation in that appointment. There cannot, in my opinion, be the least danger that the President will, by any intrigue, ever be able to continue himself one minute in office, much less perpetuate himself in it. Under an extended view of part of this subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the service of any man, who in some great emergency, shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

This, I take it, was the fixed opinion of the Father of our Country and others who were guiding the Nation at that time. You will note that the question of perpetuity or dictatorship was in the minds of those great men who established our Republic, yet they placed no constitutional restrictions upon reelection. They had confidence as we now have in the will of the people.

It seems to me the greatest responsibility of citizenship today is the selection of proper men to steer the ship of state through these troublesome times. We owe a responsibility to the men and the women who are now fighting our battles at the front. We should see to it that the men most able are selected to represent us in Washington and in our state and community governments. We should look well into the qualifications of the candidates who present themselves for our choice, and we should look well into their records before we cast a vote in their favor. Find out who they are, who ask to be sent to the State legislature and to the Nation's Capital. Look well into the cause which motivates their desires to represent us, and be sure they do represent us and not some special interest or private ambition.

And so, as I view the thing, citizenship in time of war entails the doing of our job as near perfection as possible. Whether it be in the armed forces or on the farm or in the factory or plant. Citizenship in time of war demands a freedom of thought by the individual. Be careful that you do not found your thinking on false doctrines and half truths. Citizenship in time of war demands that we gear ourselves to the emergencies of these times. Let us accept rationing and taxes as part of the cost of war and tolerate it gracefully. And, finally, citizenship in time of war demands careful selection of those men who will represent us in our many branches of government. If we approach these manifold war problems along these lines, I am sure we will be fulfilling our obligation to our Nation as a citizen in time of war, and the future of America will be safe and secure.

Dr. Samuel Clyde Fittz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the closest friendships I ever formed was with Dr. Samuel Clyde Fittz of my home town, Winnfield, La. In his death which occurred May 14, 1944, I have sustained the greatest loss of personal friendship. Dr. Fittz for more than a quarter of a century was my family physician. For a great many years we had adjoining offices. His sudden death has removed one of the most influential and useful citizens which my section of Louisiana has ever produced. Always sympathetic, always courteous, always ready to serve his fellow man, Dr. Fittz really gave his life for others. He worked in the heat, in the cold, in the night, and in the day, without sleep, without rest to minister to the needs of others.

His death marks the end of a great career, but the good which he has done will not die. The memory of this patient, careful and sympathetic physician in the homes of our people will last longer than the memory of those living. As his neighbor and friend, I loved him in life and I am proud to honor his memory in death. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks I wish to include an editorial from the Winnfield News-American under date of May 19, 1944:

LOSS TO WINN PARISH

The loss to Winnfield, Winn Parish and this entire area in the death of Dr. Samuel Clyde Fittz is irreparable. His sudden death on Sunday morning stunned the whole community and mourning was widespread. No highly electrically charged line could have brought more consternation and dismay than the words, "Dr. Fittz is dead." His passing is accounted a serious loss.

His sudden death is attributable mainly to the excessive strain he had been under for the past few months caused by overwork necessitated by the increased demands on his time and energies. And truly it was one of his outstanding characteristics to give of himself unstintingly in all his services to humanity and his friends.

Dr. Fittz built and made of himself an institution in our midst. He was an upright and fearless citizen, a Christian gentleman, and a public benefactor. A native of Winn Parish reared on a farm near Montgomery he attended the public schools of his home community and later studied medicine at Tulane University, New Orleans, from which school he graduated and later served his internship at Charity Hospital in Shreveport. In 1908 he began the practice of medicine in Winnfield. During his 36 years of service to the people of Winn Parish comparatively few families have not had the privilege of his visits for relief of suffering in mind and body. His presence was comforting and old and young accepted his decisions with assurance.

Not only was he a man of understanding, but a man of great vision. He was frank with his friends and was free from malice or ill feeling. He was a friend and a neighbor to his large clientele, and because of such admirable traits he became one of the best

known and most beloved men by adults and children, both white and colored. His service to the people of this area cannot be measured. It is something that is priceless, not only in today's fleeting hours, but in the tomorrows and the years ahead. Winn Parish and the whole world has need of more men such as he—men of his understanding, patience, tolerance, and real ability, men of his broad view of service, and, most of all, men of his honor and strength of character. We mourn as kinsmen for one beloved for his many acts that bespoke his interest in humanity. We love him for his admirable personal traits—his geniality and kindliness which endeared him to everyone. His death is regretted by thousands, and Winn Parish has lost one of her best friends and most useful citizens.

The Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again call attention to the discriminatory nature of the 30-percent cabaret tax as it was included in the recent revenue bill.

All information which I have received would indicate that the Government is losing revenue because of a reduction in attendance at most places where the 30-percent tax has been imposed. Furthermore it is extremely unjust to our men and women in the service who deeply resent having to pay the increased tax at the few places of amusement which they can still attend. I sincerely trust that the Congress will act speedily to reduce the tax to not more than 10 percent.

Indicative of the type of communications which all Members of Congress are receiving, I wish to include in my remarks a letter from the manager of the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco, which reads in part as follows:

Actually, in the tax brackets in which most hotels find themselves these days it is unimportant, but it does seem a shame that the brunt of the tax is borne by men in the military service. This is particularly true of San Francisco as it is the main port of embarkation and debarkation on the Pacific coast. Nightly we receive bitter complaints in our supper room from the officers and men who have just returned from service in the Pacific area and who have looked forward for a considerable time to an evening of dining and dancing in this or other San Francisco hotels which have supper rooms.

The tax has caused a reduction in attendance in most places from 30 to 50 percent. I believe the public as well as men in service would not resent a 10 percent tax, but most certainly 30 percent is entirely out of reason in the minds of most of our patrons.

Also of interest is the following wire from the manager of the Hotel Californian at Fresno:

We are appealing to you to use your influence for the reduction to 10 percent in cabaret tax. Anything above 10 percent will still hurt that business. People will not pay more. As we have had surveys made Government will make more out of it at 10 percent or less. It not only puts people out of work who pay income taxes but it is seriously resented by all personnel in the armed forces.

Address of Very Rev. Msgr. James H. Griffiths in the Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a sermon broadcast on the Church of the Air Program, delivered by the Very Rev. Msgr. James H. Griffiths, chancelor to Archbishop Spellman in the military ordinariate for the armed forces, on the sixth annual memorial mass offered in the Amphitheater at the Arlington National Cemetery on Sunday, May 28, 1944. The mass, sponsored by the Washington general assembly, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, in association with the National Capital Committee of Catholic Societies, was offered for all the war dead, regardless of race, creed, or color.

At the occasion, I was honored to represent the Catholic Order of Foresters of Chicago, Ill., by placing a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

"Thus saith the Lord God: come, spirit, from the four winds, and blow upon these slain, and let them live again * * * and the spirit came into them, and they lived: and they stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army." (Ezekiel 37, 9–10.)

For nearly 5 years now the night skies of the world have been ablaze with orange, red, and yellow flames; with dancing, dazzling showers of golden sparks, rivaling in rapid, terrifying grandeur the flashing northern lights; indescribably surpassing the cosmic majesty of apocalyptic visions, as the earth has reeled and shuddered beneath the hammer blows of the Vulcans of war. For nearly 5 years, fire has been falling from the heavens; a fire which has seared and scorched and blackened the green hell of the jungle and the checkerboard of humble hamlets and mighty cities crawling with human beings. Through the ever increasing progress of material science, men have soared up to empyrean heights to snatch, as it were, the ancient fire, that zooming, they might hurl it down on their fellow men until the swarming, helpless masses have come to regard the heavens as the source of death; until they have been cowered and beaten and broken in spirit and limb and have dreaded to raise their eyes to the skies. From out the deep vault of the blue, from out the starry spangled skies there now descends a fiery fury striking into men's breasts the spirit of fear and flinging them down into the depths of despair and desolation.

Ignis desursum! Fire from heaven! What an astounding contrast between this awful vision of modern, mechanized aerial warfare and the fire from heaven which descended in a dozen tongues of flame on the first Pentecost to settle on the heads of a cowering group of artisans and fishermen locked in a gloomy supper room. Fire from heaven—not the fire which blasts the bodies and the souls of men; not the fire which reduces strong men to bleeding masses of whimpering flesh; not the fire which shrivels the human spirit and leaves a man a gibbering, skulking remnant of his former self.

No; the fire which fell from heaven on the first Pentecost is not the death-dealing fire of man's ingenuity but the life-giving fire of redeeming Divinity. The fire which we commemorate in the Holy Sacrifice on this Pentecost Sunday is the fire of God. It is the symbol of the Third Person of the Adorable Trinity, the Comforter, the Strengthener promised to the world by the Lord Jesus. It is a fire which was carried through the crooked alleys of Jerusalem on the wings of a mighty wind which shook the ancient city walls to their foundations. It is a fire which transformed a group of timid, disillusioned, ill-prepared Galileans into a fearless, irresistible phalanx of conquering apostles, vowed to no less an objective than the conquest of the world for Christ. It is a fire which once hurled upon the earth will burn brightly and unquenchably, in spite of every effort human and satanic, to extinguish it. This fire of God when once ignited in the hearts of men, drives them on relentlessly to the ends of the earth broadcasting to the end of time to those who sit "in darkness and in the shadow of death," a message of peace, of justice, of mercy, of brotherly love, of the precious dignity and the unfading immortality of the human soul. This is the fire blazing forth from the heart of God which inevitably withers and inexorably consumes in its avenging flames the evil, the cruelty, the hatred, the injustices and impurities which corrupt and pollute the souls of men. In very truth, this is the divine fire out of whose depths alone are born the true heroes of humanity—the men who reckon as naught their lives, their limbs, their fortunes, and their fame when the rights of God and the God-given rights of man are endangered by the demoniacs who have forged in the fires of hell the chains of human slavery.

It is, therefore, a coincidence, but a happy coincidence, that this Sunday on which we are gathered here to pay homage to the fallen heroes of this Republic, should likewise be the festival of Pentecost. This feast marks the official inauguration of the redemptive or liberating mission of the church. It marks the D-day of Christianity when the apostles, the commandos of Christ, set their faces toward the horizons of the world, following the four winds toward the blood red sunset of martyrdom which was journey's end for each of them and which destined each of them to a hero's niche in God's heavenly hall of fame. On this day they set forth to bring new life and an evangel of liberty to all the earth. In His parting words the Master had commended them to "teach all nations" the truths He had revealed to them. There was consequently no room in their poor baggage for fantastic blood myths and race fables. The blood of the Christ which spattered the wood of the Cross and purchased liberation, was given indiscriminately for the black man and the white, the yellow and the brown. They had been the witnesses on Calvary of that divine blood transfusion which alone could make us all brothers in the highest and finest sense—brothers in Christ and sons of His eternal Father.

From the upper room on Mount Zion to the green shores of the Potomac is a far cry. And yet as we assemble this May morning in this imposing amphitheatre inspired by the pure classicism of Athens and the sturdy charm of Roman Provence, the same flames invisible fall on our glowing souls while we raise on high the golden chalice of suppli-

cation containing the same blood which was shed on the brow of Calvary for the freedom of the human race. Under the blue baldachin of our American skies we hold up to the Eternal Father the blood of appeasement, the blood of his soldier son, to beg everlasting rest and peace and forgiveness for the silent legions of our soldier dead who are foregathered here in their last encampment. Here under the rolling greensward repose the whitened bones of our forefathers, a pentecostal grouping of men who came to these shores from every country and every clime, "the bound who would be freed, and the sowers of wild seed." Here lie the men who avidly grasped the sputtering torch of liberty as it fell from mangled hands and held it high until it flamed fiercely once more in the struggles of our history. These valiant cohorts sleeping in the fields of the dead, this austere marble block enshrining the ashes of the Unknown Soldier, are, after all, but a symbol of the myriads of other hero dead whose remains are entabernacled in the brown bosom of the earth or rocked in the sapphire cradle of the deep all the way from Concord to Cassino and the Coral Sea; from Bull Run to Bizerte and Bataan.

This polygot army of the Sons of the Western Star caught in the sanctuaries of their venturesome but peace-loving souls God's fiery rain from heaven. They heard the clarion call from above, each man in his proper tongue, and they girded themselves with the sword that those imperishable ideals on which this land was built might not vanish from the face of the earth.

In spite of the scorn and taunts about flabby, soft democracies, at this very moment their brethren in arms, faithful to the trust, are scaling hostile peaks and plunging through the jungle depths. Their life blood too is seeping into the thirsty lips of mother earth and crimsoning the restless waters of the deep.

During all these years, in all these changing scenes, foreign potentates, whose thin blood crawls down from some victor in a border brawl, have asked themselves, what has been the mysterious force which has driven forth these money mad men of America from the village forge, the assembly line, and the counting house. What strange dynamism has transformed these farmers and laborers from peaceful civilians into sturdy warriors? It has not been greedy imperialism seeking El Dorado for they live in the midst of plenty. It has not been a swaggering militarism impatiently eager to try its mechanized efficiency, for their standing army has been a toy display. It could not be an arrogant nationalism, drunken with the false mysticism of racial superiority, for every racial stock and strain under heaven make up their ranks. No, none of these factors have constituted the driving power behind the armies of these victorious dead. It is no secret that most of them uprooted themselves and ventured across the western sea, precisely that they might rid themselves forever of these festering sores of an older world.

But within them was the spirit abiding and breathing, breathing forth against insolent might in its determined efforts to annihilate justice and right. Within these humble breasts of God-fearing men was the spirit operating and driving them to defend their sacred liberties and their hearthstones against unjust aggression. Within them was not blue blood or brute force, but divine strength. Within them was the unshakable conviction that victory depends not only on firearms but even more so on the fire of God. In this faith they have feared none save the Almighty as they have marched forth and sailed away to defend with their blood the sacred altar flame of liberty burning brightly in the city of God.

It has been this life-giving spirit of God which has animated our warriors from the beginning in achieving victory. It has been the conscious, aye, the almost palpable, presence of that Spirit which has been the force guiding our illustrious leaders since that wintry night at Valley Forge when Washington fell to his knees in the snow of the wilderness and pleaded with the Almighty for his ragged, disheartened militiamen. We were poor then. We were weak. We were humble. We were conscious of our inability to triumph through our own unaided physical and material strength. We called on God and His Spirit descended on and has abided with us.

The wilderness has been conquered. The frontiers have disappeared. Soaring palaces of steel rise on the site of forest glades where two generations ago the Indian stalked the deer. Long, shining, serpentine trains race across the fertile prairies with a speed that mocks the vanished buffalo. Plow, saw, and engine, guided by brain and brawn, have worked this modern miracle which has linked the Atlantic to the Pacific in a vast expanse of empire and has built a haven of refuge for the persecuted and a golden granary for the starving.

And yet this glorious epic of God's goodness, of struggle, defeat, and success begot in some, indeed, too many, a sense of smug complacency. But to others, to wise men who invert the hour glass of history that the sands of time may trickle in reverse, this epic becomes a grim warning that the fate of other peoples may well become the destiny of our own land. The words of the poet are still too literally true—where wealth accumulates men decay. While the horn of full and plenty continues to pour forth a seemingly endless golden stream of wealth, men are impatient with prophets of gloom. But when calamity levels a commonwealth with sorrow and misery and want, a cry goes up from the startled multitudes, a cry which questions the Heaven which they have ignored and which challenges the inscrutable wisdom of God. In their anguish men too completely forget that whom the Lord loveth, He chastiseth.

America will never wipe away the memory of villainy which perpetrated that day of infamy at Pearl Harbor. Who among us can forget the shock and the humiliation, the sheer panic which possessed whole communities on that Monday morning when the billowing, black clouds of smoke were still rising from the waters of Hawaii? The invincible power of vast, rich America had been assaulted. The deadly blitzkrieg seemed to hover in our skies. Then almost instantaneously, almost too late but certainly too vividly, we realized that the ideals which we had neglected, the way of life which we had taken for granted, were actually in danger.

We had lost much of the original fire, but the glowing embers were still there on our native hearthstone. Adversity, austere mother of the brave, fanned those embers into leaping flames. We girded ourselves materially. In the most gigantic mobilization in history, carried out in the face of a two-ocean war already being waged against us, we assembled our men and munitions and materials and fashioned a mighty machine which now drives on toward victory.

Did we mobilize spiritually? Those who have their fingers on the pulses of men's souls; who can hear the heartbeat of America will tell you that a spiritual renaissance is sweeping across the plains, through the jungles, and over the mountain tops. Men and women confronted reluctantly with the stark realities of suffering and sacrifice, of life and death; perplexed with that all-consuming concern regarding immortality, personal, conscious survival after death, have turned to God and faith and prayer which too many for too long took also for granted. To be sure this is not intended as a pious oversimplification. We are fully aware of the moral break-downs, of the bitter cynicism which have shown themselves throughout the land. The dislocation of family life, the much talked of juvenile delinquency problem give national and local leaders ample food for thought. But in spite of these and various other disturbing elements, the fact remains that in fox holes and camp chapels, in village churches and lofty cathedrals, in the quiet of their rooms at the foot of their beds, increasing millions of men and women in America are going down on their knees.

Would that our bitter lesson may never again be forgotten. Would that this spirit of God might truly abide with them not only in these troubled times when we feel the pressing personal need of Him but in the days that are to come. Would that all this carnival of carnage may not be a useless expending of blood with mere military victory over others and with no lasting victory over ourselves. Would that the Holy Spirit of God may, hover over the peace table in the form of a dove, as He did before over Christ in the Jordan. Would that the spirit of God, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, may exert His influence in the world of tomorrow, in the fields of government, of business, and of education. Then indeed we might hope for a peace and not for a truce. Then indeed would we keep faith with the soldier dead of the Nation, to whom we pay homage today. We would keep faith with those who have laid down their lives with the glowing hope that their sacrifice might in some small way make possible not a bigger America, not a richer America, not a more powerful America, but a better America. If this, their dying dream, come true, these slain shall live again. But God will never forgive America if we break faith with Him, with them, again.

Babson Sidesteps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on May 22 I inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal commenting on Mr. Roger Babson's statement to the effect that Mr. Churchill will not let Germany crack until after the November elections. I charged then, and now repeat, that such statements are the results of underground Nazi propaganda. Mr. Babson was called upon to explain or apologize. He has done neither. He has dodged the issue. On this score the following editorial taken from the same newspaper under date of May 25, 1944, is quite interesting. The editorial follows:

BABSON SIDESTEPS

Economist Roger Babson, in a column published in the Commercial Appeal and many other newspapers on Friday, May 12, made use of the following language: "Churchill will not let Germany crack until after the November elections." In editorial comment we said, in effect, that Mr. Babson should either apologize for having made a baseless indictment of Prime Minister Churchill in a matter of fearful significance or else explain in detail his reasons for preferring a charge of the sort.

A reader of the Commercial Appeal clipped the editorial and sent it to Mr. Babson with a note expressing his approval of the stand taken. Mr. Babson answered with a penned note on the bottom of the original letter to

him that reads: "Dear Brother: I will answer you on November 8. In the meantime, suggest you closely read the English newspapers." It seems to us Mr. Babson is sidestepping more vigorously than gracefully. We do not get all the English newspapers, of course, but those we do see contain nothing that would even remotely bear our Mr. Babson's contention.

It looks to us as though Mr. Babson has talked without thinking, and has now chosen to remain perched precariously on the limb onto which he has clambered—if we may mix figures of speech. We still think he ought to explain thoroughly or else come through with an honest admission that he was guilty of recklessness. As newspapers know as well as anyone and better than most, it is rather painful at times to admit error, but it is at once the honest and sensible thing to do when one pulls a boner.

It occurs to me that the intelligent Mr. Babson, like so many other people, has allowed himself to be unwittingly duped into the dissemination of enemy propaganda.

Air Lines' Safety Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, May 26, dealing with the splendid safety record established by the commercial air lines during the year 1943:

AIR LINES' SAFETY

On a day when a record fleet of 5,500 warplanes of the United Nations was dealing death and destruction over Europe the eighth annual air transport safety award was made by the National Safety Council in this city. It celebrated a notable performance. With more than half of their aircraft in military service and much of their experienced crew personnel operating in the far corners of the earth for the Air Transport Command and the Naval Air Transport Service, 16 of the domestic airlines operated on regular schedules 1,225,000,000 passenger-miles without a passenger fatality in 1943. In fact, under conditions of stress and emergency, when air transport has proved as never before its value to the Nation, the airlines set up their second best record in more than 17 years of operation.

As in previous years the top award winners were divided into 3 groups on the basis of accumulated mileage flown safely. In group A, Eastern Airlines received the award for a total of more than 635,000,000 passenger-miles without a passenger casualty. In groups B and C, Braniff Airways and National Airlines were the winners. In addition, 14 other lines received certificates for safe operation. The over-all record of the winners was equivalent to transporting the total population of Nevada, Wyoming, and Vermont, plus the total population of 12 medium-sized cities, 200 miles from their homes and back again in complete safety.

All that has been learned of the potentialities of air in war cannot be applied without restudy to the purposes of peace, but the record for safe operation of the air lines under the American flag is one that gives sound cause for satisfaction.

Hon. Robert Ramspeck

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to throw a bouquet at our good friend BOB RAMSPECK and the members and staff of the Civil Service Investigating Committee.

Under House Resolution 550 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the Committee on the Civil Service was authorized to investigate the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments, agencies, and Government-owned corporations.

The committee is composed of an able and diligent group of our fellow Members: ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, chairman; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, CARTER MANASCO, of Alabama, NAT PATTON, of Texas, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina, THOMAS E. SCANLON, of Pennsylvania, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, CLARENCE E. KILBURN, of New York, RICHARD P. GALE, of Minnesota, H. H. CARSON, of Ohio, WINIFRED C. STANLEY, of New York, CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, C. FREDERICK PRACHT, of Pennsylvania, and CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois. The committee was exceptionally fortunate in assembling such an outstanding staff: Col. E. J. McCormack, director; George Shillito, chief investigator; Miss Buckner Blackerby, investigator; Miss Utha Gray Smith, investigator; Edward MacDonald, analyst and investigator; A. H. Stricker, management consultant, and three secretaries, Miss Peggy Palmer, Miss Mary Rosa Bartholomew, and Don Vaughan.

This committee, the staff, the House of Representatives, the Government, and the Nation are to be congratulated upon the most efficient and effective work that has been and is being done.

The distinguished editor and journalist, Merlo Pusey, has written a well-deserved appreciation of this work, which appeared in the Washington Post recently, which with your unanimous consent I quote:

PAYS DIVIDENDS IN USE OF MANPOWER

When the medals or bouquets for outstanding war service on the home front are passed around, something rather special ought to go to the Ramspeck committee. With a minimum of ballyhoo, this committee has applied itself to the difficult task of pruning the Government pay rolls of unnecessary employees. Its aim has been the elimination of waste and enhancement of efficiency. It has achieved that aim not by yelling to high heaven but by pointing out to many different agencies that their manpower was not being effectively utilized.

If you want to get an idea of what the committee has done, look into the story of A. N. E. P. A.—the Army-Navy Electronic Production Agency. Not many people have heard of A. N. E. P. A. because its work was a deep, dark military secret. The fact that its operations were highly confidential was supposed to keep congressional snouts out of its affairs. But that did not stop BOB RAMSPECK. He discovered, as chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, to which the important task of investigating Government employment policies had been assigned, that A. N. E. P. A. was wasting manpower. The confidential nature of its assignment was no protection for that sort of policy.

When the committee turned the spotlight on A. N. E. P. A.'s employment practices, it had more than 1,000 persons on its pay roll. Many of them were inexperienced and some were overpaid for the type of work they were doing. The committee reported its findings to the Army and Navy. As a result, A. N. E. P. A. was put through a reducing process. Still the committee was not satisfied. Probing deeper, it found the A. N. E. P. A. was duplicating work done by the Army and Navy expeditors and the War Production Board.

Nine months after the Ramspeck committee began this particular investigation A. N. E. P. A. was liquidated. In a series of conferences with committee members Army and Navy officials agreed that it could be abolished without damage to the war effort. The consequent saving is estimated at $5,000,000.

That is only one relatively small item to the committee's credit. Its timely work was undoubtedly reflected in the abrupt halt in the expansion of governmental pay rolls last summer. Mr. RAMSPECK and his colleagues put agency heads on notice that they would have to justify swollen personnel lists before a fair-minded but nonetheless prying and critical committee. That was a great incentive to combing over lists and trimming exorbitant demands.

In 8 months after the employment peak was reached last June the number of Government employes fell by approximately 175,000. Other factors contributed to this decline, but the Ramspeck committee can reasonably claim a substantial part of the credit. Savings on personnel in the War Department alone, resulting in large part from the work of this committee, are estimated at $290,000,000.

Yes, BOB RAMSPECK is doing a splendid piece of work in this respect. He is also doing the same high order of work in representing his district, the State of Georgia, and the Nation. In whatever capacity BOB has been called upon to serve, he has discharged his duty to the full, with rare judicial poise, and outstanding ability.

Too frequently we overlook opportunities such as we now have of paying compliments to those who have earned them. So it is with gratitude to Mr. Pusey for having called attention to the most creditable performance of this committee, its honored chairman, and its equally praiseworthy staff, that I quote from his tribute and add a posy or two.

National War Agencies Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, as the title shows this bill applies solely to war agencies. In passing this bill as re-

ported by the committee we are making a contribution toward victory.

I cannot conceive it would be possible for a committee to have made a more thorough investigation than did the Appropriations Committee. You have two volumes of hearings touching on every phase of the activities.

These agencies are charged with grave responsibilities and there is no doubt in my mind they are contributing toward our success.

The only outstanding controversy is the appropriation for the Fair Employment Practice Committee which has delayed the final vote.

To me it is hard to believe one is justified in voting against this bill because one section does not meet with his or her approval.

I voted for the F. E. P. C. appropriation and I hope it will not be stricken from the bill in the Senate.

Who Determines a Nation's Destiny?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, George W. Berry, an estimable lawyer of Piqua, Ohio, and Republican county chairman of Miami County, Ohio, has forwarded to me a sermon by Rev. Arthur K. Wilson, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Piqua, Ohio. I ask leave to extend in the RECORD the address of Rev. Wilson entitled, "Who Determines a Nation's Destiny?":

WHO DETERMINES A NATION'S DESTINY?

(By Rev. Arthur K. Wilson)

Text: Isaiah, 9:16: The leaders of this people cause them to err.

These are days in which very provoking and challenging questions are being raised. For example, What shall we do with Germany after the war? What shall we do with Japan? What shall be our attitude toward Great Britain? How shall we be able to live with Russia? While we do not speak disparagingly of any of these questions, nevertheless there is a far more important question which ought to be foremost in our minds as we face the post-war world. The question is, Who determines a nation's destiny, the leaders or the people? When a nation rises or falls, who should assume the responsibility? There are two schools of thought regarding this question. One would have us believe that the entire responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the citizens of that nation; their argument being that the people make the leaders and if the people have made a colossal blunder in their choice it is the responsibility of the people. The other school would have us believe that the leaders are wholly responsible for the rise and fall of a nation. For example, on every hand we hear those who are advocating severe punishment for the leaders who have perpetrated the great crimes of today. I recognize that this is a controversial question and that the people are not wholly blameless and must share the responsibility. However, I am inclined to believe the major part of the blame should fall upon the leaders. There are two kinds of leaders. The true and the false. In order to differentiate between these two types let us take a look into history, sacred as well as secular. The Bible is full of history and reveals more than other books the character of the leaders of the people.

I. THE TRUE LEADERS

Let us consider, first, the true leaders, those who are genuine, sincere, and honest in all their aspirations and ambitions.

Sacred history contains a long list of illustrious leaders such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Solomon, Elijah, Isaiah, and Moses. We consider Moses the dominant figure of Jewish history. He made a very definite contribution not only to his own generation but also to all succeeding generations. He was a man with a definite purpose. He was a product of the common people, yet acquiring wealth, luxuries, ease, becoming finally a prince in Pharaoh's household. However, Moses was not happy. His heart bled for the welfare of his people. Then came that memorable day when he could no longer endure the thought of his people being in bondage. He gave himself to the task of being not only their emancipator but their leader. Moses was not a perfect man; he became discouraged and disheartened like all other men. You will recall that in a moment of righteous indignation he broke the tablets upon which he had inscribed the Decalog of God. The secret of Moses' success was the fact that his life was God-centered and God-controlled.

Fortunately, Israel has no monopoly upon great and noble leaders. We do not think of this glorious land of ours without thinking of George Washington, "first in the hearts of his countrymen." Washington would not be considered an abnormal child. He was not spectacular or dramatic, having a limited formal education. He was fortunate through marriage to have acquired wealth, position, and prestige. However, when the great call came he was willing to sacrifice all to lead this Nation through those frightful days that characterized the Revolution. When the war was concluded, Washington desired to retire, but great men, especially leaders, are rarely permitted to retire. He, therefore, responded to the call of his country and assumed greater responsibility. The years immediately following the Revolutionary War were among the hardest that this Nation has ever known. There was disunity throughout the country. We staggered under an enormous war debt. Soldiers, as well as civilians, were expected to share in the liquidation of that debt. Even the problem of unemployment became exceedingly acute. Through it all this methodical leader carried on, because, like Moses, his faith was in God.

Another great crisis came to America in the middle of the last century. Rocked by sedition and disunion, our very pillars were crumbling. Again the need for a great leader. Abraham Lincoln heard that call and, like Washington, responded. Lincoln was not a product of the schools, but he was a great thinker. Lincoln had a great character, which was undergirded by a profound faith. He believed in God, he believed in the Holy Scriptures, and practiced private devotion. He was a temperate man, not only an abstainer himself, but always discouraged the use of intoxicating beverages. Lincoln could not tolerate profanity. The story is told that upon one occasion a visitor used profane language in his presence while in the White House. The President rose and said, "I thought Senator C had sent me a gentleman. I see I was mistaken. There is the door. I wish you good night." Lincoln was the true leader.

The world, even in its chaotic state today, is not without its good and true leaders. What keeps China, in such an hour, from complete disintegration? There is but one answer. Leaders, Gen. and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. What is the secret of their power? Their faith in and devotion to the Man of Galilee.

True leadership must not be merely for material gain. To make material gain the main motive is to forfeit the title of a real leader. Power, money, position, prestige are to be desired, but to make these things the objective in the reach for leadership is to invite disfavor and ultimately political ruin. Some men are elevated to positions of power and honor because they have merited them. Others attain these positions because of good connections and money. Others who are entirely without money likewise reach the pinnacle, but it will be of short duration. It is this latter type of leader to which we now refer.

II. THE FALSE LEADERS

Just as good leaders can and do lead a nation upward so can bad leaders lead a nation downward. The Bible has something to say about "blind leading the blind, and both going into the ditch." False leaders can easily deceive the populace because they are spectacular and glamorous. They may possess enchanting personalities, they make rash promises which they know cannot be fulfilled. They have little sympathy for the good in life. These men are often arrogant, selfish, and dictatorial. They can be classified as the Herodian type. Who was Herod? He was the ruler of a subjugated people, the Jews. He was a lover of power. He lived in luxury, occupying at times a magnificent palace at Jerusalem. He surrounded himself with all the advantages then known to the oriental world. He was crafty and a schemer. He lacked the intellectual equipment of some of his predecessors, but determined to secure the throne nevertheless. This he did by cultivating Caesar, and lavishing upon him costly gifts. In order to make an impression upon the Jewish people he suddenly appeared to manifest a keen interest in their religion. Their temple had been built several hundred years before and through neglect needed costly repairs. Instead of repairing the temple Herod caused it to be razed and replaced with a new and more beautiful edifice. His true character, however, he could not long conceal. He was jealous of any and all who opposed him and brutally persecuted those who stood in his way. His program of purging resembles very much the work of a modern Gestapo. Many of his people were caused to be slain, and he imprisoned countless numbers of his followers, including members of his immediate family; his wife, her father and mother, her grandfather, and others of the household were numbered among that list. But the light of that dictator was soon to be dimmed. He succumbed to a long-dreaded disease.

We find another example of false leadership in the person of Absalom, son of King David. He was a handsome young man, his beauty being unrivaled in that day. His money, his position, and his power, that of prince were enviable. There developed within his soul an uncontrollable ego. He felt that he was the last word, that he had all the authority. We are all too familiar with his type. Launching a program of revolt he lead a political and social rebellion against his own father. He openly and privately criticized his father and the way he administered the kingdom. He said "dispose of my father and elect me and great changes will come to pass for the betterment of all mankind." All Israel was grossly deceived. He was crafty enough to disguise his true nature, he even feigned religion to deceive his own father; and used it to foster his atrocious designs. Temporarily he succeeded, but, he went down to an inglorious defeat.

The modern Herods are on the march today. Hitler and Tojo. But their kingdoms are even now in a state of collapse. They deceived their people and lead them to believe

that they were divinely chosen to build a new order in this old world. Alas! A Waterloo awaits them all. Our sympathy goes out to the millions upon millions of deluded people. The leaders are responsible.

III. LEADERS WILL DETERMINE THE DESTINY OF AMERICA

After this great global conflict is over, American democracy will undergo a severe strain. Leaders will determine to a large extent our destiny. What kind of leaders shall we have? Those who believe only in force? Those who believe only in economics? In such an hour as this, in the midst of a great storm, it is not strange that we should measure leadership in terms of force and machinery. If we are to rebuild America, and America, in turn, is to have a part in the rebuilding of the world, we must have leaders. We must see to it that they are true leaders. Only as we select and develop true leaders, will we have an enduring Nation. Whenever we cease producing true and real leaders the doom of our Nation is sealed.

The leaders of yesterday laid the foundation for our national greatness. We have not yet attained the ideal. The real America is in the future. God give us great men. God give us great and true leaders.

It's Time Congress Woke Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the War Department, the Army Air Forces in particular, are again about to ask for more money to squander. When the War Department asks for another $6,000,000 to train women flyers when we have thousands of male flyers walking the streets, it is time Congress did something about it. I ask permission to include an editorial from Aviation News on this subject to give Congress a clear picture of the proposed waste of people's money:

THE WASP PROBLEM

As Representative RAMSPECK'S House Civil Service Investigating Comittee launched an inquiry into the WASP training project, a group of 122 instructors at one civilian contract primary school last week wired the President and other officials protesting the Army's failure to plan utilization of their flying ability and experience in the war effort although the WASP training program continues, with 1,000 graduates planned by June.

Indignation is rising among experienced civilian airmen as they leave their instructor jobs at schools no longer being used by the Army and face Selective Service induction. They point out these facts:

Civilian men pilots with thousands of hours of flying are ineligible for combat because of logical reasons such as age, but they are also deemed unfit for the Air Transport Command if they do not have 200 hours' time in planes of 200 horsepower or more. Most of their work has been with power below this figure.

Yet civilian girl pilots are accepted for training with 35 hours. Upon completing a 6½ months' flight training course paid for by the Army and taught by a civilian contract flight school, the Wasps are graduated with about 210 hours' instruction, plus the original 35 hours that made them eligible. These graduates are then given assignments denied men pilots with thousands of hours flying time and years of experience.

The statement that all men pilots will be sent out of the country to fly and therefore necessitate use of women pilots to replace them is sound logic as far as it goes, airmen say. But those thousands of civilian men pilots, who are "ineligible" for the A. T. C. are also ineligible for combat. Thus, the argument of replacing all civilian pilots with women appears illogical.

One major example of inefficiency is in transitional training after the WASP has been graduated from her 6½ months' course by the civilian flight school. This transitional flying involves about 100 hours' training on heavy four-motored bomber equipment or high-speed fighter aircraft. Thus, the girls are given an additional 100 hours of flight training by regular A. A. F. pilot instructors, and each hour that the girl pilot receives this training from an Army pilot in Army planes she is taking the place of a combat pilot. Why not utilize more Army men pilots?

In addition to using the present backlog of civilian pilots, the Army might well assign 2 or 3 months of cross-country ferry flying within the United States to its young men pilot graduates. They could thus polish off their navigational cross-country techniques and at the same time deliver aircraft to domestic ferry points.

Furthermore, Army flyers returning from combat areas could ferry planes in the interval before their reassignment, keeping their flight techniques sharp without combat strain. Large numbers of these men are being made available for domestic ferry operations in the United States.

The evidence so far indicates someone has blundered. The costly and impractical WASP program deserves close scrutiny.

ROBERT H. WOOD

University Students Make Their Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we are living in days when people are thinking most seriously. The people of America are prayerfully debating, discussing, and questioning all known factors involving the future course of the United States. The young men and women in America are doing their part in an admirable manner.

I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter from the clerk of the fourth annual University of Nebraska intercollegiate debate and discussion conference, which was held at Lincoln, Nebr., on February 25 and 26, 1944, and the resolutions and minority report adopted at said conference. These documents are as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., May 10, 1944.

Congressman CARL T. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: One hundred and twenty-five students representing 26 colleges in 7 States participated in the fourth annual University of Nebraska intercollegiate debate and discussion conference which was held at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., on February 25 and 26, 1944. The theme of the conference was United States post-war foreign policy.

The legislative assembly of this conference convened to consider a resolution drawn up by a committee of the participants in the conference. This resolution was written to express the views of the members of the assembly. The resolution was considered in division, amended, and adopted. The 11 dissenting voters were granted their request to formulate a minority report.

I am enclosing the majority resolution and the minority report for your consideration. We college students feel that an expression of our opinion is our contribution in the shaping of the foreign policy of the United States.

Yours truly,

ANNE WELLENSIEK,
Clerk of the Assembly.

Whereas we desire international security which presumes national security through cooperation; and

Whereas tariff barriers, excessive reparations, and problems of rehabilitation stand in the way of cooperation; and

Whereas the preservation of freedom of each nation is requisite to international security; and

Whereas the problem of excessive armaments makes international security impossible; and

Whereas an expression of organized public opinion is of influence in shaping the foreign policy of the United States: Be it

Resolved by the delegates to the fourth annual University of Nebraska intercollegiate discussion and debate conference:

First, that a spirit of internationalism be fostered by the United States;

Second, that there be an elimination of unnecessary trade barriers and that there be a gradual reduction of excessive trade barriers to the point at which foreign and domestic goods are on a competitive basis;

Third, that an international organization with a nucleus of the United Nations be established to provide a system of collective security in which each nation enjoys that amount of sovereignty which is compatible to an equal amount of sovereignty in all other nations;

Fourth, that the international organization should enjoy a monopoly of the world's heavy armaments;

Fifth, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congressmen and State legislators of the seven States in which the 26 colleges represented at this Fourth Annual University of Nebraska Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate Conference are located.

MINORITY REPORT

1. The minority groups proposed the deletion of the words "to the point at which foreign and domestic goods are on a competitive basis," in Resolution No. 2, as it seems inexpedient to make such a far-reaching and specific commitment without examining the problem more thoroughly.

2. The minority group opposed the adoption the fourth resolution on the grounds that we should not assign a monopoly of our heavy armaments to an organization, the extent of whose powers are not defined.

3. An amendment providing: None of these provisions should be adopted which would prove detrimental to the security of the United States, was defeated by a majority vote of the house. The reason given by the majority group for rejecting the amendment was that it might be interpreted in such a way as to nullify the intent of the other provisions of the resolution. In the opinion of the majority, nothing in the orig-

inal resolution could jeopardize the security of the United States. The minority group wishes to let this proposed amendment stand on its own merit.

4. With these exceptions the minority group accepted the majority report.

Death Claims Isaac Harry, 101, Veteran of Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, in the turmoil of the present war and with the memories of World War No. 1 fresh in our minds, let us not forget the veterans of that other war among ourselves—a war that set the record for bravery, valor, and devotion to the principles for which they fought and bore greater and deeper consequences to ourselves than all other wars.

On May 17, 1944, there passed away Mr. Isaac Harry, a veteran of the Civil War, at the age of 101 years. He lived at Licking, Texas County, Mo., within the Eighth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in this body. He was the last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic in our district, and he wore that little bronze button of the order with honor and credit. I do not know of a Confederate veteran alive today within the district. Thus an era of the past history of our country has been closed, locally at least, from all human contact with its actors.

I knew Mr. Harry for many years and enjoyed his friendship, as I have done with so many hundreds of wearers of the blue and gray. I have lived through a period—from 1871 to now—and learned first hand that aftermath strife and hatred in bitter form, in a section of our country overrun by both sides. On one side of that fratricidal conflict was my father and his brothers, from New York; on the other side, my mother's relatives from Kentucky. I never could love one and hate the other. I tried to love both. I knew one side was right and the other wrong. I had to take the side of the right, but extended forgiving love to the wrong. During these years, I have tried to allay that feeling, and think I did, to some degree, within the narrow limits of my life. Thousands of these good old veteran friends knew my feeling, and extended to me their help to bind up the wounds. To do this, I have made speeches to, and fraternized with, organizations representing both sides. Now, most of that animosity is gone. Only now and then does someone give vent to that ill feeling arising from this old war strife. Only a few scars remain, and they have grown dim with passing years. They will wholly disappear as our welfare increasingly binds up in national unity for a common purpose. May all the evil outgrowths of that war, too, pass away, leaving us one Nation, one people, and one flag.

So today I, as a Member of this Congress, on the floor of this House, say to my old friend, the last one I know of that grand galaxy of heroes of America: "Goodbye."

We know their lives and deaths were not in vain, and our faith in their work gives us courage to face the troubles of our times with the never-failing confidence in the rising of a new sun and a brighter day of goodness and glory for our country.

[From the Licking (Mo.) News]

DEATH CLAIMS ISAAC HARRY, 101, VETERAN OF CIVIL WAR

Death last Wednesday evening at 6:30 o'clock claimed Texas County's oldest citizen, Mr. Isaac Harry, age 101. Mr. Harry was not only our oldest citizen, but the last Civil War veteran in this vicinity. He was also the last survivor of the One Hundred and Twenty-third Illinois Regiment in which he served 3 years during the Civil War. He fought in many engagements, including the battles of Chickamauga, Perryville, Ky., and Selma, Ala. In all he was in 111 engagements and never received a scratch.

Last year in May Mr. Harry celebrated his one hundredth birthday and a great crowd of neighbors and friends gathered to celebrate the occasion. This year he was ill on his birthday and could see only a few close friends. Through his illness his mind remained clear only when under the influence of medicine, and he enjoyed the many cards and greetings coming to him from distant friends and relatives.

In the passing of Isaac Harry Texas County has lost a grand and notable citizen.

Isaac Harry was born in Williamsburg, Ohio, May 3, 1843, and passed away at his home south of Licking, May 17, 1944, at the age of 101 years and 14 days. When a young man he went to Charleston, Ill., where during the Civil War he enlisted in Company A, One Hundred and Twenty-third Illinois Infantry, serving 6 months on foot then the remainder of the war in the Mounted Infantry. He was in the service more than 3 years.

After the close of the war he returned to Charleston, Ill., and later went to Knox County, Mo., where he was married to Miss Kate Bishop, November 30, 1870. To this union five children were born: Mrs. H. P. Mitchell, Mrs. R. P. Higgins, Mrs. O. C. McBride, W. F. Harry, and Mrs. E. W. Kofahl.

He moved to Texas County, November 14, 1884, and soon after bought the farm where he passed away. His wife preceded him in death May 21, 1915.

He leaves to mourn his going his son W. F. Harry, with whom he made his home, and Mrs. O. C. McBride of Licking; 19 grandchildren, 25 great grandchildren, and 2 great, great grandchildren.

Soon after his marriage he was converted and united with the Methodist Church where he was a member at the time of his death. On account of his age he was not permitted to attend church services for several years. He was loyal to his home, country, and to his church.

After spending 23 winters in Florida he has been confined most of the past few years in his home. Though having reached this advanced age, he has been patient, thoughtful, and kind. Among his last words were, "I am 101 years old and I want to go home."

Funeral services were conducted at Boone Creek Church Friday in the presence of one of the largest groups of people ever assembled there. He was dressed in the uniform of the Union Army—a splendid looking old soldier even in death.

Services were in charge of his pastor, Rev. A. B. Garrison, of Licking, assisted by Rev. Warren Smith, pastor of Boone Creek Church, Rev. G. M. Sherrod, of Licking, and Rev. J. R. Halbrook, of Houston. Mrs. Virginia Ruth Hutcheson sang "Death Is Only a Dream."

Burial was in Boone Creek Cemetery by the side of Mrs. Harry, who died several years ago, under direction of Smith & Ferguson, undertakers.

Active pallbearers were Coy Higgins, Leo Higgins, Leslie Kofahl, and Elmer McBride, grandsons, Earl Self, husband of a granddaughter; and Clyde Green. Honorary pallbearers were old-time friends—J. S. King, Bert Thornton, Webber Wilson, C. W. Roy, E. C. Halbert, and A. N. Hickle.

More About Proposed Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in proposing the WASP bill the Army Air Forces department is proposing to shelve trained pilots and throw into the discard thousands of boys who were promised positions and who are now walking the streets. This proposal is indefensible from all angles. To give a clearer picture I ask permission to include a resolution, very enlightening on this subject:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 27, 1944.*

Contained herein are a list of resolutions to be presented for congressional investigation by Minnesota Chapter of the National Aviation Trades Association at an authorized meeting. These resolutions are presented by a representative group for 5,000 war training service flight instructors. Adopted March 28, 1944:

"We resolve—

"1. That this statement to be sent to the White House demanding an investigation as to why Congress is allowing the wasteful disposition of 5,000 Government trained flight instructors now engaged in teaching the primary phases of flying to the Army Air Corps cadets. These Enlisted Reserve pilot instructors face activation as privates in the Army on a nonflying status now that many of the Army elementary flight schools are closing.

"2. That this investigation demand to know why the Military Affairs Committee and Congress can subscribe to any more appropriations for training additional pilots other than cadets for the armed forces when they have available 5,000 skilled and experienced men who are ready to serve on active duty after being trained for flying at a cost to the Government of $70,000,000.

"3. To demand to know why the Navy is activating their enlisted reserve instructors, when the Navy schools close, into commissioned and noncommissioned flying duty commensurate with their experience and qualifications, while the Army is not.

"4. To demand to know why civilian instructors, draft deferred to train Army personnel, cannot make application for commission or rank commensurate with their experience and qualifications rather than face induction as a private on nonflying status.

"5. To demand to know why Congress can justify their passage of a bill which appropriated $70,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to have these flight instructors trained by War Training Service under the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 when they are now willing to scuttle the training and the experience that these instructor pilots now

represent, by placing these men on nonflying status simply because one phase of the Army's flight training is to be discontinued.

"6. To demand to know why the authorities in Washington allowed a Government agency, such as War Training Service, to make promises of placement and commission in the armed services as a result of enlisting and taking their flight courses or serving as an instructor in their flight programs.

"We resolve to let it be known to the public the following facts pertinent to the development of this situation:

"1. That in June 1942 there appeared in the press and on the radio, appeals for those interested and who could qualify to enlist in the reserves, and to take flight training to qualify themselves to receive commissions as service pilots in the armed forces.

"2. That thousands of young men, both with and without previous flying time, who thought they were answering a call by their Government to serve as a pilot in the armed forces, signed up to take what they were told was to be 6 months of flight training, and upon satisfactory completion of which they would be activated and serve as service pilots.

"3. That after 6 months of flight training, upon inquiry these men who had enlisted found that they were not being trained under Army auspices, but that they were being trained by War Training Service with appropriations from the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, and that War Training Service did not have means, upon the trainees completion of the program, to put these men in active duty with the Air Forces.

"4. That upon learning of the true character of the training program many trainees made application for active duty in any branch of the armed forces, which was denied them by both the Army and the War Training Service.

"5. That these trainees were encouraged to continue through additional courses given by War Training Service, and were promised that upon completion of these the Army would surely use them.

"6. That at this time some of the less docile of these trainees demanded an investigation of War Training Service, and how they could be placed by them in such a situation as they found themselves. The investigation was held in the spring of 1943 in Washington by a Senate investigating committee, headed by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, the results of which are now public documents in Washington. These documents contain a history that shows management amounting almost to a farce in this matter.

"7. That as a result of this investigation it was decided to limit the number of courses which the trainees would have to complete. Those who were near the final stages of completing these courses were to be allowed to continue in their enlisted reserve capacity, and were to be paid $50 per month, whereas they were paid nothing before, and were, for the most part, in dire financial straits.

"Those in the more elementary phases of training were put on active duty as privates in the Air Forces, while they were allowed to continue their training.

"Advanced trainees completing the course were assigned either as War Training Service instructors at one of their many flight schools, or were released by War Training Service to answer a plea put out by the Army for flight instructors. This absorbed many of their trained men.

"However, those who had become activated, and were in their elementary phases of flight training were to continue on through the War Training Service flight schools, and then as per plan, were to take off active duty, to be made civilians again, to instruct at Army schools.

"It is here noted that this quirk of being in and out of the Army at convenience never came about however, as the whole War Training Service flight instructors training program blew up shortly thereafter.

"These activated men, after having had six to eight thousand dollars per man spent on them of the taxpayer's and the bond purchaser's money to the extent of $32,000,000, are now doing duty in the same capacity as if they had never received any Government flying training.

"8. That the Army and Navy now contracted with 152 former War Training Service flight schools to train the members of these branches the indoctrination flight course which the Army and Navy asked them to do, as an important part of their pilot's training. Instructors for these programs were furnished by War Training Service from their flight programs.

"After 11 months the Army and Navy announce that they would discontinue training at half of these schools, and that training in even more advanced schools, where the instructor personnel were enlisted reserve pilots, was to be curtailed also.

"9. That the public should know that if the Army does not activate the instructors on these programs on a flying status that their Congress, by the passage of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, has allowed for the training of approximately 5,000 flight instructors, whose flying hours will average 1,500 per man, and an expenditure of nearly $70,000,000. (These figures are estimates arrived at by aviation magazine editors, and those figures brought to light in the McCarran investigation in the spring of 1943.)

"10. That at the same time Congress has passed a bill making women pilots who have only 35 flying hours eligible to take training and receive commissions in the armed forces.

"Also that their Congress and Military Committees, and organizations set up by the present administration to direct the skilled abilities of this country for the furtherance of the war effort have failed to take any action after this fact has been pointed out to them to see that this fund of trained pilots, who at a cost of $70,000,000 to the taxpayer and bond purchaser be placed in the armed services in a flying capacity where they would be most useful. (We refer to such branches as glider, artillery, liaison, intelligence, reconnaissance, courier, troop carrier, ferrying, evacuation of wounded, target towing and tracking, and many others.)

"11. That we are fully prepared to substantiate the facts herein mentioned in the hope that it will arouse the sentiment of the public, whose bond purchasing and high rate of taxpaying help made this program possible, so that they may see to what use their money has been put before this group, who asks nothing more than active duty commensurate with their training and acquired skill, is put into the Army in a nonflying duty. We feel that it is our patriotic duty to let these facts be known and these demands be heard."

Federal Defense Housing in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations, Inc., I am inserting copy of a reply by the latter to the letter of Commissioner Emmerich of the Federal Public Housing Authority dated March 30, 1944, and appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages A1653–A1654. The Federation states that inasmuch as Mr. Emmerich's letter was inserted in the RECORD, it is only fair that its statement should be inserted as well:

FEDERAL DEFENSE HOUSING IN NEW ENGLAND

On March 23 last, Herbert Emmerich, Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority, addressed to Chairman LANHAM of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, a letter purporting to be a defense against charges raised by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations against certain policies and practices of his agency. These charges were contained in a memorandum reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8.

Inasmuch as Commissioner Emmerich has informed Congressman LANHAM that the charges contain "serious errors and distortions of fact" it seems necessary to examine his current statements in the light of what actually was charged, and in the even more important light of conditions now apparent in the field.

It should be pointed out that while Mr. Emmerich comments at length (seven pages of typescript) he appears to make no adequate reply to these specific charges:

1. That defense housing in the New England area was constructed in an amount far in excess of possible occupancy and often over the repeated protests of local public officials who insisted that the projects were unnecessary. (Pittsfield, Mass., Holyoke, Mass., Southbridge, Mass.)

2. That site selection was made without reasonable attention to factors of cost, convenience, desirability for construction purposes or with ordinary health and safety considerations in mind. (Bath, Maine; Groton, Conn.; Weymouth, Mass.)

3. That unit costs were unconscionably high on many projects. (South Portland, Maine; Pittsfield, Mass.; Groton, Conn.)

4. That structural design and equipment were unsuited to either the climate or the needs of potentional tenants. (Pittsfield, Mass.; Chicopee, Mass.; Bath, Maine.)

5. That faulty design caused large expenditures for "contract extras" and change orders, particularly to protect against inherent fire hazards and to provide adequate heating facilities after failure of initial installation. (South Portland, Maine, and Groton, Stratford, Bridgeport, Conn.)

6. That F. P. H. A. officials ignored and rejected suggestions for corrections in specifications that were obviously needed. (Weymouth, Mass.; Bath, Maine.)

7. That no proper supervision of the construction work was maintained by F. P. H. A. representatives with the result that contractors ignored specifications. (South Portland, and Bath, Maine; Groton, Conn.)

8. That careless, inexperienced, or unintelligent borings and soil tests were made by the F. P. H. A. which resulted in the needless expenditure of many thousands of dollars. (Bath and South Portland, Maine; Weymouth, Mass.)

MR. EMMERICH'S DEFENSE RIDDLED

It is not the intention or purpose of the federation to make a categorical answer to all of the obviously inaccurate statements of the F. P. H. A. commissioner. We feel that a few instances of glaring mishandling of the facts should be sufficient to indicate that the reply must not be taken at face value.

Mr. Emmerich denies the federation charge that the cost of the Red Bank Village project in South Portland went one and one-half million dollars over the estimated cost. He says the completed job cost only $1,000,000 more than the estimated cost. He gives a mumbo-jumbo of alibies as to why the total cost jumped $1,000,000. Still, Casper Ranger, the

contractor who built the project, disagrees with Mr. Emmerich. Mr. Ranger supports the federation's contention the completed price was one and one-half millions over the estimated cost. He agrees with Mr. Emmerich's figures that the change orders cost only $63,000 instead of $200,000 as claimed by the federation. Mr. Ranger says the federation's figures are nearer the actual amount spent if deviations from specifications not considered as change orders are listed. Mr. Ranger should know something about the cost of the project and the cost of the alterations, whether changes or deviations. There were actually 106 deviations and change orders on this one project.

If the federation's charges of F. P. H. A. inefficiency and waste were confined to Massachusetts alone, there might be more substance to Mr. Emmerich's excuses. But when the charges of bureaucratic blundering in Massachusetts are magnified one hundred-fold from Bath, Maine, to Long Island Sound, and for that matter throughout the entire country, then the mistakes encountered in this commonwealth are merely typical of a deplorable situation that is Nation-wide.

Mr. Emmerich says (page 2, par. 2), "only 138 accommodations for single persons in temporary dormitories have been built in Massachusetts." In the Directory of Public Housing, published by the F. P. H. A. and giving all of the public housing projects of New England as of September 30, 1943, the following data appears: Ayer, 19 dormitories; Edgartown, 40 dormitories; Falmouth project 19071, 210 dormitories; project 19072, 200 dormitories; project 19087, 144 dormitories; project 19088, 100 dormitories; project 19089, 100 dormitories; Southbridge, Harrington Hall, 98 dormitories; total 1087. It is taken for granted, of course, that Mr. Emmerich is not familiar with all of the projects and that his information comes from his subordinates, but it is to be hoped that his other statements on housing projects are more accurate and reliable than his figure on dormitories.

The federation, in its original bill of particulars, demanded a cut in personnel, declaring the pay roll was entirely too high. Mr. Emmerich, in his reply, says "current employment of the region 1 office is 200." Still, under date of March 4, 1944, about the same date as Mr. Emmerich's reply, Sumner K. Wiley, region 1 director, in thanking the F. P. H. A. employees in his district for War bond purchases declared "561 of us participated" in the drive. Is Mr. Emmerich deliberately attempting to mislead the Members of Congress or is he simply misinformed again? The first hypothesis is, of course, untenable so we must accept the second to be the true state of affairs.

In the same Public Housing directory, the project at Curtis Terrace in Chicopee, comprising 250 family units at development cost of $772,000 (does this include change orders?) is listed as "permanent family." A footnote states: "This site is to be used for temporary dwellings for the duration of the emergency." Did Mr. Emmerich include this three-quarter of a million dollar project as a permanent or temporary project in his compilations? Was the F. P. H. A. trying by subterfuge to classify these barracks type, cellarless structures as a permanent project to be dumped on the city of Chicopee?

Mr. Emmerich's figures on the Fort Hill project in Groton, Conn., are illuminating. They prove more strongly than anything could, except perhaps a view of these shanties, the federation's charge of squandering and blundering. Mr. Emmerich states that $1,687,307 was spent on site improvements on 300 acres. With an evident attempt to show that the site was put in good shape he states this amount was nearly $400,000 more than the estimated cost of $1,291,030.

There are 1,100 demountable family dwellings on these 300 acres, or slightly more than three units to an acre. Therefore nearly $6,000 of the taxpayers' money was spent to improve each acre, or approximately $2,000 per family unit.

Even if no further evidence were available this example of willful, deliberate waste would be sufficient to condemn the F. P. H. A. What excuse does Mr. Emmerich offer to the charge of blundering site selections and wasteful spending when it is shown that it cost nearly $6,000 to improve an acre of land to bear three of the cheapest shacks imaginable? Is this the economy that Mr. Emmerich speaks of when he says on page 3, paragraph 3, "economy was a major objective of the F. P. H. A.?" He must have had his tongue in his cheek when he wrote that statement.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Emmerich is not as equally frank in revealing some of the change order costs on the New England projects. For instance, what is the cost of changing heating equipment at the Fort Hill project, after 12 fires had brought orders from the State of Connecticut officials that heating changes must be made? Or the heating changes at Stratford, Conn.? Or the water drains at Bath, Maine, or Weymouth, Mass.? Or for the 106 changes on the Red Bank, South Portland, project?

It is interesting to note that while Mr. Emmerich discusses at some length elevation above sea level of the Pittsfield project, he carefully avoids any mention of the inflated cost of these dwellings. His reticence on this touchy subject is readily understood when it is considered that the 100 family units of prefabricated, cellarless buildings cost, according to the Public Housing Directory, $519,000, or more than $5,000 each.

Mr. Emmerich deplores the criticism of site selections, but in this instance the site improvements cost more than one-third of the unit cost and any builder will readily admit such a ratio is entirely too high. Much of this high site improvement cost is directly attributable to the fact the project is erected on a solid ledge. It is conservatively estimated that the total cost will run well over $6,000 per unit, or twice the average cost per unit permitted by the congressional (Lanham) act setting up the Federal Public Housing Authority.

PROJECTS MENACE LIFE AND HEALTH

F. P. H. A. projects in the New England region are definitely a menace to the life and health of the people who occupy these dwellings. Flames have snuffed out buildings in but a few minutes. Occupants have been awakened from slumber in the dead of night to find their quarters ablaze.

EVEN LITTLE CHILDREN HAVE PERISHED IN THE ALL-CONSUMING FLAMES

One building was destroyed in 7 minutes flat.

No less than 12 fires have broken out in the Groton, Conn., project.

Even Sumner K. Wiley, F. P. H. A. administrator in region 1, has admitted that heating equipment in some projects was inadequate.

Sewage conditions in several places have become so bad that local officials have condemned certain installations and threatened court action unless the foul conditions were remedied.

In Bath, Maine, on March 13, 1944, two young brothers, one 5 years and the other 18 months old, were burned to death in the F. P. H. A. project in that city. Another brother was rescued but died of burns a few days later. The heating equipment in this project has been criticized as improperly installed.

On March 3, 1944, while the housing committee of the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce was condemning F. P. H. A. projects in that city fire broke out at night at the Burr Court dormitories and 21 men occupants barely escaped with their lives. This fire caused $25,000 damage.

The Bridgeport Post of that date quotes Harold C. Poole, executive director of the Bridgeport Housing Authority, as saying that the fire started in the hot-air exhaust duct of the heating system which became overheated. "The flames spread rapidly through the duct in the false ceiling which extends the entire length of the building," the Post article declares. It adds: "Ceilings and upper walls of the building were almost completely burned, the boiler room was destroyed, and the front waiting room was extensively damaged. When fire apparatus arrived flames filled all the doorways and firemen were forced to chop out sections of the building through which to run lines of hose."

The danger to the lives of the occupants at the Groton, Conn., project became so pronounced that the fire-prevention division of the Connecticut State police had to step in and order that changes be made. The flues were found to be made of asbestos with a thin strip of wood at the edges, with the result that the overheated flues would ignite the wood and then the walls surrounding the flues would catch fire.

Also, at the suggestion of the State police, the F. P. H. A. has built a fire station and obtained some fire-fighting equipment.

In December 1943, when winter had come in earnest to the snow-capped Berkshires, fire "of undetermined origin," as the newspapers frequently refer to it, snuffed out one of the 100 tiny F. P. H. A. "chicken coops," as they have been referred to by Pittsfield city officials. In only a few minutes the 100-unit project, which cost nearly $6,000 per unit, had been reduced to 99.

In Stratford the heating equipment was unquestionably inadequate. The furnaces were too small. The fans were too small. It was decided to remove both furnaces and fans. But where they had been installed only recently, their sudden and early removal might have provoked criticism. So it was decided by F. P. H. A. experts to let the furnaces remain but to install larger fans. Now the larger fans are pushing the heat through so fast that the larger furnaces will now have to be installed.

Experience from previous mistakes should have demonstrated to F. P. H. A. officials that this heating equipment was inadequate. But the policy of the F. P. H. A. is to ignore obvious specification deficiencies, to follow the blueprints to the minutest detail and then to make changes to correct mistakes. This sort of pass-the-buck program costs money.

Of further evidence of the bungling, waste, and inefficiency of the F. P. H. A. is needed, let us take it from the files of the region office. On March 7 last a memorandum was issued with the subject matter entitled: "Forecast of contracts to be awarded in March."

Here are only a few of the items listed:

Groton: Project 6141, fire-damage repairs, $6,300; project 6013, fire-protection alterations, $15,000; project 6012, repairs to heating equipment, community building, $2,000; projects 6011, 6014, and 6015, protective features, insulation of flues, total, $15,500; project 6015, fire-alarm boxes and street lights, $1,460.

The same memorandum has these notations on Bath, Maine, where some of the dwellings were erected by F. P. H A. on peat bogs; project 17022, fire protection, $4,200; project 17023, regrading, drainage, crawl space fill, surface roads, walks and parking stubs, $130,000. The F. P. H. A. was specifically warned against building on this site because of the drainage difficulties, but the F. P. H. A. experts knew better.

Numerous items are listed for other heating changes and installation of water drains

throughout the New England area. Incidentally there is an item for the erection of a school building at South Portland to cost $59,000. And it must be remembered that these proposed expenditures, which will total thousands, are for 1 month only, the month of March 1944. Is it any wonder, then, that the taxpayers demand to know how much has been spent for other changes, alterations, and repairs of defects that could have been readily foreseen by the use of a little common sense?

Apparently the texture of Connecticut soil has the F. P. H. A. "experts" stymied. Again challenging Mr. Emmerich's figures on change orders, the federation charges that thousands upon thousands have been squandered to correct sewage disposal difficulties which were, or should have been, by the exercise of ordinary intelligence, apparent before the projects were started.

Federal officials ran into a tartar in the person of Dr. Louis M. Allyn, chairman of the Board of Health of the Town of Groton, Conn.

Dr. Allyn found the sewage situation so bad that he ordered 65 of the houses closed at various times.

In some instances, Dr. Allyn stated, cesspools and septic tanks were installed at levels above the dwellings they were supposed to service. In one case a tank was sunk 13 feet in order to get gravity flow from the dwelling it served.

The Fort Hill project consists of 1,100 two-family one-story structures. It is located on an old potato farm. This is the spot Mr. Emmerich admits cost $1,687,307 to whip 300 acres into a site for his shacks.

According to Dr. Allyn, the floors of many of these buildings warp d after construction leaving spaces along the walls big enough to sink your foot into. In some instances the studs were not cut evenly with the result that the upper sidewall would stick out about a foot beyond the base line, giving the buildings the appearance of corn cribs back on the farm.

This is the project, according to F. P. H. A. figures, which cost the taxpayers of the country $5,478,000 for construction alone. Only Heaven and the F. P. H. A. know how much more was spent here—and apparently F. P. H. A. won't tell, although the federation has asked for a statement of change order costs.

THE BRIDGEPORT FIASCO

The federation's accusations of excessive heating costs are particularly timely in view of the public charges of "willful, extravagant, and inexcusable F. P. H. A. spending and waste of taxpayers' money" made by the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce Housing Committee. In March this committee demanded that the National Housing Agency halt immediately the installation of new heating equipment in 1,900 dormitory units in that city, including 2 projects which had been closed because of lack of tenants.

Most of the complaints made public by the Bridgeport group have a decidedly familiar ring. They reflect, almost in the same words, the charges made by the federation. These charges refute, perhaps even more strongly than words of ours might, the futile excuses of Mr. Emmerich. Let us quote a few of the chamber's accusations:

"These projects were thrust upon our community by irresponsible planners who ignored and disregarded the recommendations of those who knew conditions best and had the interests of the community and Nation at heart.

"If this work (on the heating system) is not immediately stopped and the contract canceled, it will be prima facie evidence of scandalous, willful, extravagant, and inexcusable spending and waste of the taxpayers' money as well as additional incompetent, blundering mismanagement on the part of the National Housing Agency."

Chairman Arthur Clifford, of the chamber's committee, in recalling that protests against the construction of these projects had been made by the chamber of commerce, the Bridgeport Manufacturers Association, city officials, and the Bridgeport Housing Authority, declared that "in spite of these protests, the units were all constructed at great cost—also completely and extravagantly outfitted. Two of the projects have already been abandoned, yet equipment for them continues to roll into the city.

"At this writing there is a carload of draperies on the siding. Other items just received include love seats and sofas, also ping pong tables and other expensive luxury items"

The committee demands answers from N. H. A. and F. P. H. A. to two questions, both of which have previously been asked by the federation, but to which Mr. Emmerich carefully avoids making any reference.

The questions are:

"1. How does it happen that former administrator of the United States Housing Authority, Mr. Nathan Straus, has, through his company, Nathan Straus du Parquet, Inc., furnished the high-grade cafeteria equipment—also the best equipment and the most expensive in its field?

"2. Who, specifically, is the man behind the man who insisted upon building dormitories in the Bridgeport area against the better judgment and oft-expressed protests of our local housing committees, including the mayor of Bridgeport, and the housing authority? We knew the housing needs in our community but our findings and recommendations were completely ignored. Why?"

An interesting commentary on the cafeteria equipment is that this priority-restricted material, which housewives are unable to obtain, began to arrive in Bridgeport within 2 days after the contract had been let in Washington for the construction of the dormitories and even before the foundations for the buildings had been set. The Bridgeport committee very properly asks: "Who was in such a hurry as all that to unload this cafeteria equipment?"

Recently the federation attempted to learn whether or not bids had been called for on this cafeteria equipment. No definite information has yet been obtained on the matter although an interesting sidelight is thrown on the subject in the reply of Coleman Woodbury, Assistant Administrator to Mr. Emmerich, to a direct query from State senator Murray of Connecticut. A paragraph in Mr. Woodbury's letter reads:

"The statement questions the award of contracts for cafeteria equipment to Nathan Straus du Parquet, Inc. The policy of the Federal Public Housing Authority is to purchase such equipment from the most economical and efficient source of supply. The details of this contract as well as of any other contracts, are, of course, open to scrutiny by Members of Congress at any time. I might add that Mr. Nathan Straus has had no connection with the Federal Government since January 1942, prior to the establishment of the National Housing Agency and its constituent, the Federal Public Housing Authority."

Repeated reading of the paragraph breeds some interesting conjectures but let us consider one of several. Why was the F. P. H. A. in such a hurry to dump this equipment into Bridgeport that it could not wait until the project for which the equipment was intended could even be started. Why was it necessary to buy this equipment in such a hurry only to store it at Government expense and then leave it idle and unused in the abandoned dormitory projects which it was presumably purchased to serve?

Let's have the answers to these queries Mr. Emmerich.

THOSE VACANCIES AGAIN

The Federation reiterates its charge that temporary war housing was not needed in Massachusetts. Mr. Emmerich states that on January 31, 1944, 90.4 percent of the war housing family units built by the F. P. H. A. in Massachusetts were occupied, but fails to differentiate between permanent and temporary family units, in his tenancy figures, undoubtedly because the temporary family occupancy picture is so blurred with vacancies.

There are five temporary family unit projects in Massachusetts: Victory Hill, Pittsfield; Chestnut Heights, Southbridge; Curtis Terrace, Chicopee; Liberty Park, Holyoke; and Riverview Apartments, Springfield.

On April 1, which in some cases is fully a year after the completion of the project, these occupancies were reported: Victory Hill, 40 units occupied, 59 vacant, one destroyed by fire; Chestnut Heights, 8 units occupied, 72 vacant; Curtis Terrace, 46 occupied, 204 vacant; Liberty Park, 9 occupied, 35 vacant; Riverview Apartments, 75 occupied, 117 vacant.

This means that of 666 F. P. H. A. temporary family units constructed in Massachusetts, 487 are vacant and only 178 occupied as of April 1 in spite of the fact that some time ago they were thrown open to the general public. How does this reconcile with Mr. Emmerich's occupancy figures?

WHAT PRICE BUREAUCRACY?

The cost of these temporary projects according to the F. P. H. A. Housing Directory is as follows: Victory Hill, 100 units, $519,000; Chestnut Heights, 80 units, $203,000; Curtis Terrace, 250 units, $772,000; Liberty Park, 44 units, $137,000, and Riverview Apartments, 192 units, $610,000, total, $2,241,000.

In connection with the Riverview Apartments it must be remembered that many of these 192 units are the "zero" type, so-called by the F. P. H. A. because the bedroom, living room, and kitchen are all just one room, and not big at that.

It must also be remembered that these costs are costs as of September 30, 1943, and do not include the additional expenses incurred since that date in improvements, changes, and "deviations"—the secret which the F. P. H. A. so zealously guards.

Address of Hon. John M. Carmody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John M. Carmody, United States Maritime Commission, before the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce on Maritime Day, May 22, 1944:

The occasion of this visit to St. Louis is twofold—first, to give account of our stewardship to the people who, through their representatives in the Congress, created the United States Maritime Commission, and, second, to solicit the advice and aid of the citizens of this great Mississippi Valley area in the solution of special problems that have arisen in connection with the creation and disposition of a wartime fleet of cargo ships and naval auxiliaries. Many of you are familiar with the Nation's maritime history.

The story of John Paul Jones and Commodore Barry and other early American ship masters is fresh in our minds. We have read with quickened pulse the exploits of the traders in Colonial days who brought sugar and molasses and rum and other tropical products under sail from the islands in the Caribbean to Boston and New York and Philadelphia. Here were stout ships and stout men and enterprising traders. And then there were the famous American clipper ships. I wish we had time to review their exploits—their very names command attention—*Bald Eagle*, launched in Boston in 1852, rounded the Horn to San Francisco in 107 days, *Witchcraft, Southern Cross, High-Flyer, Golden West, Fearless, Starlight*, and *Grace Darling* are some of the names the staid old men of the 1850's gave their ships. The *Flying Cloud* made 374 nautical miles on her best day on her way to Hongkong.

This is Maritime Day, so proclaimed by the President, to commemorate the sailing this day 125 years ago of the steamship *Savannah* from Savannah, Ga., to Liverpool, England, the first steamer to cross the Atlantic. It is well, I think, that we pause to take stock of our maritime status because our progress has been neither regular or stable nor in step with our general economy. It has been discouragingly and sometimes embarrassingly uneven. For instance, World War No. 1 caught us wholly unprepared to move men and materials in our own ships. We rushed into a hastily conceived shipbuilding program.

The result is history; a huge shipyard, cargo ships delivered after the armistice, laid up in fresh water and later either dumped on the market at a fraction of their cost or broken up for scrap. Good men and good minds applied themselves for the next 15 years or more to the problem of creating an American merchant marine consistent with the responsibilities the United States had assumed among the nations of the world and the prestige inherent in the wholesome discharge of those responsibilities. Many complex problems were involved in this search for a workable plan for an American merchant marine. Among them was the degree to which shipbuilding itself could be developed as a reasonably stable industry here at home. There was the question, too, of whether the admittedly miserable conditions under which merchant seamen lived and worked could be abolished and replaced by a living wage, sanitary and reasonably comfortable living quarters, and tolerable working conditions. Many of you are familiar with the report made by the then Senator and now Mr. Justice Black and Postmaster General Farley and the congressional hearings which followed in 1933 and 1934 and which resulted in a message from the President to the Congress, in which he said:

"In the event of a major war in which the United States is not involved, our commerce, in the absence of an adequate American merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral peaceful foreign trade.

"In the event of a war in which the United States itself might be engaged, American flag ships are obviously needed not only for naval auxiliaries but also for the maintenance of reasonable and necessary commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war."

The Congress passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Briefly, this act provided for the construction differential and the operating differential recommended by the President. It provided, also, for a domestic shipbuilding program of 50 ships per year for 10 years, or a total of 500 new modern ships.

There is no mystery about the need for these differentials. They are understood in every port in the world. Every shipper is aware of them. The first task of the Commission was to clear away the debris that had accumulated since World War No. 1, reorganize services on a sound basis, and get new ships designed for a revitalized American Merchant Marine.

So much for history, but what of the present and the future? Before the 10-year program had got under full head, the war in Europe broke out. This immediately increased the demand for ships. Shipbuilding capacity was pitifully inadequate. What took place by way of expansion is best told by this simple tabulation of ships built from 1938 to date:

	Ships	Dead-weight tons
1938	25	291,000
1939	28	341,000
1940	55	641,000
1941	105	1,142,000
1942	746	8,089,000
1943	1,896	19,238,000

The schedule for 1944 calls for 20,000,000 dead-weight tons. It will be exceeded if needed. The story of this tremendous increase in ship production is one of the great romances of the war. Nothing like it was ever done before. Almost the total capacity of the few established yards was taken immediately by the Navy. A few old yards, chiefly tanker yards, were expanded 3 to 6 times. New Maritime Commission yards were built in strategic locations on the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf coasts and on the Great Lakes. Men and women—nearly a hundred thousand women—many of whom had never seen a shipyard or a ship were recruited. Training courses were established in the yards and sometimes in vocational schools in cooperation with local school officials. New houses were built, nearly 50,000 of them for shipyard workers alone; new schools, new fire houses, dormitories, restaurants, and even stores. Shipyards worked 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; 700,000 workmen and work women and their families brought together swiftly in a few areas made immediate heavy demands on community facilities, private and public. Transportation became a desperate problem. Ferry boats were bought or leased and new slips built. Several miles of streetcar or railroad track were built, and cars bought and rehabilitated for immediate use. Busses were bought and frequently leased to local operators to supplement services totally inadequate to the driving needs of so dynamic a production program.

Simultaneous with this development, other activities had to be greatly expanded. Men and women alone do not build ships or sail them. Millions of tons of materials of all sorts must be processed from the raw state to finished pieces. More than 7,500 manufacturers in almost every State in the Union processed and shipped parts to Maritime Commission shipyards.

St. Louis itself and the towns and cities of the Mississippi Valley have contributed heavily to this essential production. To do this they, too, built new plants or added to old ones, bought new machinery, employed new people, and had all the training, housing, and transportation problems the shipyards had. Tonnage of materials handled by the railroads has been unprecedented. Our freight bill alone is in excess of $130,000,000 per year. The Maritime Commission pays or reimburses contractors for paying $15,000,000 per year for electric power.

That none of these services has broken down under continuous severe strains seems to me to be a tribute to the initiative and energy and "sticktoitiveness" of workers and managers alike in every office, shop, transportation system, power house, and shipyard over the land. Through rain and sleet and snow, through heat of day and dark of night, they got to the job and did it.

Less has been said about the men who man these ships and the schools in which they are trained than about the production in our shipyards. This is natural. Large-scale production is spectacular; education or training, even the intensive procedure developed to meet special war needs, is just a tough grind. To man the merchant marine fleet for war purposes several fine new schools have been built in strategic places on the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf.

I am sure you will be interested in this list of schools, a brief description of the function of each, their capacity, and the number of students they have prepared for service to date.

Merchant Marine Cadet Corps: United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y. Basic training schools: Pass Christian, Miss., and San Mateo, Calif.

State maritime academies (for officers): Castine, Maine; Hyannis, Mass.; Fort Schuyler, N. Y.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Vallejo, Calif.

Maritime Service (officer schools): Alameda, Calif.; Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn. Apprentice seamen training stations: Avalon, Calif.; Hoffman Island, N. Y.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; St. Petersburg, Fla. Radio school: Gallups Island, Mass.

There are seven training ships.

In 1943 the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps graduated a total of 1,161 young men as ships' officers. More than half came from 4 States in which maritime activities are traditional—New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts. Yet, the States of the Mississippi Basin contributed a tenth of the total of the men who graduated from the academy last year into command of our merchant vessels.

The Maritime Service, a well-integrated organization that runs the gamut of training from apprentice seamen to candidates for ships' officers had more than 42,000 in its various courses last year. Almost a fourth of them came from the Mississippi Valley area. Illinois furnished 2,100, Missouri, 1,500; Mississippi, 1,500; Minnesota, 1,400; Wisconsin, Indiana, Kansas, and Oklahoma sent hundreds, and 7 other States made up the remainder of the 10,000 Midwest boys who underwent Maritime Service training last year.

All of this, of course, is in addition to the men who normally follow the sea, men recruited by the Recruitment and Manning Organization of W. S. A. and through the special efforts of the various maritime unions who share the responsibility for recruiting and training men for the sea.

There is scarcely a community in the Middle West that is not represented somewhere on the high seas and in the war ports of the world by these men and boys, products of local schools and shops. They have a front seat in the great drama, Rebuilding a World. They have a front seat but they are paying front-seat prices—a tough training course that demands the best they possess in physical and mental equipment to undergo a vigorous life at sea under discipline new and strange to many of them, and danger—ever present danger—in almost every area into which they travel. Losses have been high among merchant seamen. Rescued men have suffered untold hardships but they go back. Many have been decorated, men and officers alike, with the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal, some of them posthumously. In any consideration of the future of our American merchant marine, they must be kept in mind. They represent a trained body of skilled craftsmen—citizens who still have the feel of their hometown

in their blood but now know world trade lanes and something of the customs and the tastes of far-flung peoples of the earth.

We come now to a disposition of this new fleet. The war is not over. Some of the bitterest fighting lies ahead. While we concentrate on making every ship available for immediate crucial needs, we ask those of you who have responsibility for determining the flow of commerce to give thought to the problem. This program as already executed and projected through June 30, 1945, represents an investment of approximately $18,000,000,000. When I tried, a few days ago, to get some idea of what $18,000,000,000 means in terms of something an ordinary business man like myself can understand, I discovered, for instance, that the cost of the Revolutionary War is estimated at seventy-five to one hundred million dollars. The United States Government was 60 years old before its expenditures passed the billion-dollar mark in 1848. The Treasury says that as of June 30, 1847, the figure was $999,161,758.

The gross public debt in 1918 was $12,243,628,719. The gross public debt in 1927 was $18,510,174,276. Eighteen billion dollars will clothe and feed 40,000,000 soldiers for 1 year. In less than 3 years we will have spent for ships, for facilities, and for what it takes to operate them an amount equivalent to the total gross public debt in 1927. It is for this that five men appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate to be members of the Maritime Commission are responsible as trustees. Do you wonder that we ask you to put your minds to this task with us?

What I have been saying about responsibility for this huge investment was better said a few days ago by a soldier in Charlotte, N. C., when he parked a jeep beside a parking meter. A bystander said, "Better put a nickel in the meter, soldier." With some asperity the soldier replied, "You put a nickel in, mister, it belongs to you as much as to me." Yes, jeeps, and guns, and bombers, and fighting planes, and ships all belong to you and to me. We pay for them when we pay our income taxes or when we buy a package of cigarettes or a bottle of wine or theater as baseball tickets. We pay for them when we buy a War bond or a War stamp. They serve special war purposes. Some of them will have peacetime usefulness. Some ships will; many will not. They are good ships. They will have done their job as the guns and tanks and jeeps will have done theirs.

As we look to the future, however, we have the choice, it seems to me, of attempting to force the use of these ships built for special war purposes into peace-time competition for the sake of having the largest merchant fleet afloat, or of taking our place in the new world of commerce with the best merchant fleet on the high sea on a quality basis. Is it not the part of wisdom to emphasize quality; quality of service; quality of ships—modern in design and speed? Do not misunderstand me; we have such ships and more are now on the shipways. These are the ships that we think you will want us to retain. This means a tonnage of ten to twelve million tons—approximately what we had before the war but infinitely better and more effective because it will be modern.

It is estimated that this fleet will carry what is generally considered to be our fair share of our foreign commerce, 50 percent of the total. These ships belong to the American people. They paid for them. We want to sell them. We want to sell them to American operators. We want to sell them at a price that is fair to you who paid for them, taking into account an appropriate write-off for war service, and at a price that will enable a prudent and competent operator to render adequate service and make a profit. If there be those among you who see a way to use 20,000,000 or even 10,000,000 additional tons on an economically sound basis, we will be pleased and relieved to have suggestions because the figures I have given you are tentative and subject to change, depending on the length of the war and the nature of the peace terms.

I wonder if I may close by quoting a paragraph from an address made by Mr. Joseph Kennedy, first Chairman of the Maritime Commission, on an occasion similar to this.

"The American Merchant Marine is our own flesh and blood, our own treasure, our own ships, and our own money. Get behind it with the pride, the enthusiasm, and the patronage that other nations emotionally and financially give to their own. Has the time come when we turn our back on American genius and enterprise? Congress has given an emphatic 'No!' No American can do less than give it his wholehearted support."

Gannett-Pettengill Political Action Committee

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute at this time to the members of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

As was the case in Louisiana just a few days ago, so ran the pattern in Ohio during the last and ninety-fifth session of the general assembly of that State.

The Gannett-Pettengill-Rumely gang quietly sold their proposed twenty-second amendment to the United States Constitution to the upper body of that assembly. The senate, on sponsorship of Mr. Jones, of Portage, passed Senate Joint Resolution No. 19, endorsing a constitutional amendment to limit taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts to 25 percent.

House Joint Resolution No. 48, the companion bill, was introduced by Mr. Van Aken, but fortunately the measure died in taxation committee of the house to whose members I pay special tribute.

IT WAS A SNEAKING AFFAIR

The following letter I have just received from the Honorable William Rasey, the alert chairman and legislative representative of the Ohio State Legislative Board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, gives this story in some detail. Note that Mr. Rasey also understands the insidious and underground methods of this dangerous gang when he says:

It was a sneaking affair until it arrived in the house and it was called to our attention in the last 2 weeks of the session.

Let no man think that efforts of this Fascist-minded group, this so-called Committee for Constitutional Government, are to be taken lightly. Let us not underestimate the persistence of this un-American organization with its wealthy backers and others whose pocketbooks have been appealed to because of the lure of more wealth for the wealthy even if such means less for the white-collar worker and the laboring man. We must be eternally vigilant or their effort will succeed and we will be hopeless to combat it when it reaches the Congress under the plan they are now following.

Attached herewith is Mr. Rasey's letter, above referred to:

OHIO STATE LEGISLATIVE BOARD,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Sandusky, Ohio, May 24, 1944.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Congressman, State of Texas,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Recently I noted in the labor paper, issue of May 20, your statement regarding the lobby seeking to cut taxes of the rich. I am wondering if you would send me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the date you made these statements. If it is not asking too much I would like two or three copies. If, by chance, you would have copies of your speech printed I would like several copies of that also.

I am enclosing you copy of Senate Joint Resolution 19 that was introduced during the ninety-fifth session of the General Assembly of Ohio and passed in the senate with slight opposition. It was sponsored by Mr. Jones, of Portage, one of the most reactionary senators. House Joint Resolution 48, also enclosed, was sponsored in the house by Mr. Van Aken, one of the outstanding antilabor members of the house. It was a sneaking affair until it arrived in the house and it was called to our attention in the last 2 weeks of the session. It died in the house taxation committee. But they were not able to get it across during the ninety-fifth session of the general assembly, and we assure you it will not go across in the ninety-sixth session as we are now preparing ourselves to combat this type of bill.

Thanking you in advance and with best wishes, I beg to remain

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM RASEY,
Chairman and Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

I am also inserting an editorial and a letter to the Altoona Tribune which are self-explanatory:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of May 19, 1944]

PATMAN WARNS CONGRESS

It is good to see that Congress has been warned in vigorous terms by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN against the proposed twenty-second amendment, allegedly supported by Mr. Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government * * * and which seems to be anything but that. Just what it is, even the literature issued by the committee and Mr. Gannett is very vague about.

But the alarming thing, which Mr. PATMAN called to the attention of a rather surprised Congress, is that approval of this proposed amendment has been sneaked through 16 of our State legislatures.

And under article 5 of the Constitution if 36 of our States express their approval of this program through their legislatures, as Mr. PATMAN says, the Congress has no recourse but to act on the amendment's ratification.

Says Mr. PATMAN: "The true facts of the case are that a little group of greedy men who place love of personal gain above love of their country's best interests are sponsoring this vicious program."

The proposal, called the "millionaire's amendment," would place a 25-percent limit on all Federal taxes.

The Congressman from Texas says, "As far as Mr. Gannett is concerned, he is advocating a very damaging amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That amendment, if passed, would restrict even inheritance taxes to 25 percent; all gift taxes, estate taxes, incomes, corporate as well as individual, would be limited to 25 percent. That means we would never pay off the war debt; we would never be able to pay more than the carrying charges.

"That means that small business would be destroyed, because big business could keep so much of its profits that it would run all small business out of existence.

"It would mean there would be no aid to veterans. The veterans' aid laws now on the books would have to be repealed. There would be no aid to our servicemen. There would be no social-security benefits. We would only have enough money to pay the interest on the national debt and the running expenses of the Government."

And more than that, it would be the most unfair proposition ever inflicted upon the American people. For under the 25-percent limitation, the rich man's taxes, now much more than that, would be reduced and the poor man's taxes, now less than that, would be increased. It would mean inevitably that the rich would get richer, and the poor poorer.

On what excuse and through what explanations this amendment was given approval by the Pennsylvania Legislature, we should like to know, and we think the people of this Commonwealth are entitled to know. Certainly, there was little if anything said about it when the action took place about a year ago. And certainly there are few Pennsylvanians who know anything about it.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of May 19, 1944]

RAPS GANNETT AND TAX PLAN IN OPEN LETTER

Mr. FRANK GANNETT: I have read your book, Organized Leadership. Your reference to a pseudonymous book. The results when your bill reached the floor. Your request: "Don't blame the Congressmen and Senators for not doing a better job today." We hope no Congressman or Senator will vote for your twenty-second amendment to the Constitution. You lay claim to all the credit for the defeat of the President's court-packing bill. I know better, so do you. I never read anything so oily as your little book with "Whatsoever diminishes the authority of Congress impairs the security of your liberty" yet the supreme purpose of your committee for constitutional government is to repeal the sixteenth amendment, taking from Congress the power of taxation and putting it in the hands of we know not who, and of enacting a twenty-second amendment to the Constitution to lay a tax of 25 percent on all incomes from zero to the top and you call that equation—yes of tax, but not of income. How hard that would hit perhaps a hundred million Americans.

You deny WRIGHT PATMAN'S statements, and I suppose you will deny that 16 States have endorsed your secret plans, Pennsylvania being one of them. Where the intelligence of our legislators was when they voted that way is another mystery. Voting away 25 percent of their biennial salary of $3,000 and $500 for special sessions, if any, doesn't show good sense; unless they got or expect some very attractive substantial special concessions for doing so. Such legislators should be driven out of politics forever.

You say the "lights of liberty have gone out all over the globe." Well, that would about put ours out. You ask, "Will they shine bright and clear from windows when our soldier sons come home?" On that kind of taxation, they will not. You and Pettingill and Rev. Vincent Peale are the kind of men who create revolutions. You make the common people and the soldier hate you and all your kind, and if you persist in forcing such unholy and burdensome taxes and making them pay the debt of the war they fought, it would be no wonder if some of your lights would go out. You, with your oily, deceitful methods, are endeavoring to weave a net around a giant, who, if aroused, will destroy them that weave it.

There is no better time than now for you to pull your lobbyists out of Washington and throw your printed matter and your new bill of taxation in the fire.

J. D. SHADLE.

Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Fowler McCormick, president of the International Harvester Co.:

Everyone knows of the tough problems American industry had to meet in converting from normal production to war production. The record industry made speaks for itself.

Everyone hears much these days of the tough problems industry will have to face in reconverting from war production to normal production.

This is the record of one company, International Harvester, which has already had to do both these tough jobs since Pear Harbor; a company which was largely converted to war work, which is now partly reconverted to normal work; which is carrying both loads, meeting the difficulties of each despite obstacles, it is a record which we are proud of, and we want our friends to know about it.

Told at full length the story would be long and complicated. But a few facts are outstanding:

Since Pearl Harbor we have furnished to farmers $326,000,000 worth of farm equipment and service parts despite the fact that Government restrictions practically put us out of the farm-equipment business for months. That total includes the highest volume of service parts ever built. The figure in on the basis of prices which are frozen, most of them at the pre-war level.

Since Pearl Harbor we have built $550,000,000 worth of war products for the fighting services.

Three of our tractor plants have won the Army-Navy E and our oldest and largest implement factory, McCormick Works, has just been awarded the Army-Navy E for outstanding achievement in the delicate and extremely precise production required by the Navy's aircraft torpedo.

In the first 6 months of our 1944 fiscal year we have built approximately the same amount of farm tractors and parts as we produced in all of 1943.

In the first 6 months of 1944 we have provided for American farmers more farm equipment—tractors, implements, and parts—than we did in the same period of 1940; almost as much as we did in the same period of 1941, and more than twice as much as we did in the same period of last year.

We are not getting rich out of the war. In 1943 our total sales were $83,400,000 more than in 1941. But our 1943 profit was $4,921,000 less than our 1941 profit. Our 1944 profit will be still smaller.

The history of our war production and our farm equipment production is closely interwoven. In 1942, the first year of the war, the Government permitted farm equipment production at about 80 percent of the 1940 levels. Farmers generally did not feel that reduction much, for we had large inventories of machines manufactured in earlier years, which were sold along with current production. Our farm equipment plants remained fairly busy on farm equipment. War work was undertaken in our motor truck plants and in available areas of tractor plants. Implement plants generally were not suited to war work, either in type of buildings or equipment, but did do their part when they could.

Then in the fall of 1942 the Government issued Farm Equipment Limitation Order L–170, governing production for the year from November 1, 1942, to October 31, 1943. Under the terms of L–170, our company was cut back to about 14 percent of 1940 production. On more than half the items we normally make, we were allowed no quotas.

This took place simultaneously with the period of greatest need by the armed services for new sources of war production. Naturally, this company and other large companies of the farm equipment industry, undertook extensive war contracts in those plants which could handle the type of manufacture required. Since many implement factories could not handle a great amount of the work, they were almost shut down, except for minor war production jobs and except for production of farm equipment service parts. In our implement plants, thousands of trained employees had to be laid off. The great majority immediately sought and obtained work elsewhere.

The situation in late 1942 and early 1943, therefore, was that large manufacturers were practically out of production on farm equipment. Inventories of finished machines no longer existed. They had been sold out during 1942. The food-production program imposed greater demands on farmers and the attractions of war industry and the inroads of the draft had stripped farms of labor.

The protest of farmers against Order L–170 was immediate and vigorous, since their need for farm equipment was enormous. Farm equipment producers, who had protested against the order before its issuance, continued to present their views to the Government. In March 1943 the War Production Board issued an amendment, enlarging the quotas for some machines. Finally, in June 1943, the War Production Board issued a new order, L–257, which replaced L–170 and covered the period from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944.

Order L–257 contained greatly increased quotas for farm equipment, the quotas being different for different machines. The W. P. B., appreciating farmers' large needs, allotted to the industry an amount of materials estimated by the W. P. B. to be about 80 percent of the amount used in 1940. In addition, the industry was told to carry on, along with L–257 production, the remainder of L–170 production which had been planned for the period between July 1 and October 31, 1943. This had to be done with no interference with production of much-needed war materials.

In July 1943, therefore, less than a year ago, our situation was that farm equipment production was very low, the normal flow of materials and purchased parts and supplies had been broken. Plants or parts of plants had been converted to other production. Many trained employees had scattered to the four winds. Yet we had suddenly received orders to greatly increase farm equipment production and to do it right away.

The flow of materials and parts had to be reestablished. Plant rearrangement had to be carried out. Employees had to be recalled and many new employees had to be trained. In addition, it was the period of greatest scarcity in the supply of manufacturing materials and parts. Between the placing of

an order on a steel mill and the actual receipt of steel at a plant, months had to intervene.

This company and the others of the industry nevertheless bent every effort to the reestablishment of farm equipment production, realizing at the same time our obligation not to take steps which would damage the flow of war production which we had promised the armed services. As always in manufacturing, progress was slow at first and we were criticized for failing to meet schedules. But materials finally began to flow, production lines were reestablished, employes were trained and production began to move upward, slowly at first, then with a rush. By early 1944 machines were moving out to hard-pressed farmers in real quantities.

A job has been done, and the figures show it. The figures below represent daily production of certain important machines, as between the low point under Order L–170 and the situation in May of 1944.

Daily production

	L–170 low	Present
Tractors	46	311
Hay loaders	23	50
Hay rakes	29	76
Mowers	122	289
Hammer mills	0	45
Peg harrows	32	377
Corn planters	31	117
Grain drills	8	55
Combines	51	59

Several facts should be noted about the figures shown. In the first place, the hammer mill is typical of the many machines which we were not allowed to produce at all under L–170 as first issued. The combine represents the other extreme. There were higher combine quotas under the low period of L–170 than was the case with other machines. Finally, practically all the figures in the column showing our present situation would be higher if it were not for the shortage of labor.

We have already noted that when we started to increase production of farm equipment materials presented the most pressing problem. That situation changed for the better as time went on, partly due to cut-backs in war production and partly due to assistance rendered our industry by the W. P. B. Unfortunately, as the materials situation grew brighter the manpower situation grew steadily worse.

The manpower problem comes in two forms; first, the difficulty of getting enough employees to man plants adequately and achieve all the production that machinery and facilities make possible; second, the problem of keeping the employees who are hired. The most acute of all our employment problems has been that of trying to find adequate foundry labor, both for gray-iron foundries and malleable-iron foundries. This particularly affects production of farm implements, which requires large supplies of both types of iron castings.

What do we mean by a manpower problem? Some figures will show:

In the 4 weeks ending April 15, 1944, our company hired a total of 3,259 new employees, but our total employment went down by 702 persons. For in that same 4 weeks 3,961 had left. Or take some specific plants. In the period ending April 15 our East Moline works, which makes combines and corn pickers, hired 123 persons and lost 143. Our most important farm-tractor plant, Farmall works, hired 301 new employees but lost 390.

Part of this manpower problem is due to the requirements of the armed forces, for there are 16,500 Harvester men in military service. (Our total employment now is about 72,000.) And a very large part of it is due to the restlessness of employees who are new to industry, who get a job, work a month or two, hear of another job they would like to try, and drift on.

We are doing everything we can think of to meet this problem and our production is still going up. Despite lack of manpower, we have completed or will complete within the period scheduled by order L–257 our full quotas of all but three of the 60 general classifications of farm machines which we build. These three classifications are grain drills, corn pickers, and combines.

By July 31, when our W. P. B. authorization to manufacture grain drills expires, we expect to have built 92 percent of our grain drill quota. By September 30, when our authorization to make corn pickers expires, we expect to have built 96 percent of our corn picker quota. The lag will affect only one model, the one-row mounted picker. By September 30, when our combine authorizations expire, we expect to have built 84 percent of our combine quota. The lag in combine production represents a shortage of self-propelled models (a new type, never in production before) and also represents our inability to make a number of combines which were not part of our original L–257 quota but were authorized later as a supplemental quota.

One thing we have done that we are pretty proud of. We have balanced our production of farm equipment. We have not been shipping out tractors with no implements to work with them. Generally speaking, we have been able to see that the implements went along with the tractor.

Recently the Government issued the quotas for farm equipment for the year beginning July 1, 1944. These are known as schedule B of order L–257. Schedule B provides quotas somewhat larger than those we have been operating under. And, unless the manpower situation gets even worse than it is now, that will mean considerably more farm equipment for farmers.

Even more important, however, is the fact that schedule B gives us a running start on production for the first time since the Government began to limit production. The W. P. B., War Food Administration, and other interested Government agencies have told us what the quotas are and have told us far enough ahead of time so that production can be planned intelligently instead of being a wild scramble for materials. This will be particularly helpful in the production of highly seasonal machines.

At present our war production is diminishing, because of cancelations of contracts, cut-backs in schedules, and completion of contracts which are not renewed. This reflects the general cutting back of most types of war production. If that trend continues, and our information at present indicates that it will, we should be able to transfer more employees and more manufacturing facilities to farm equipment production.

Meantime, we will keep on doing what we have done from the first day of the war—making both war products and farm equipment products, doing both jobs, and doing them both the best we know how.

Wild Ducks in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Ducks Unlimited is an organization of farsighted citizens interested in preserving and intelligently protecting duck life in the United States.

A few years ago, the duck population in this country fell to the alarmingly low figure of 35,000,000.

By careful study and constructive suggestions furnished to the Federal authorities, Ducks Unlimited, cooperating with similar groups of public-spirited Americans, have been largely instrumental in increasing the population to an estimated total 1944 flight of 200,000,000 birds.

Ducks Unlimited has prepared certain further data. As part of my remarks, I include special committee report, copy of which was recently handed to me in San Francisco.

Feeling sure this report will find widespread interest throughout the Nation, I quote it in full as follows:

FURTHER DUTY FOR DUCKS UNLIMITED

1. Ducks Unlimited has successfully played a leading part in recreating the breeding grounds in Canada, resulting in a greatly increased wild fowl population. Eighty percent breed north of the United States boundary.

2. These birds winter for the most part in the United States and Mexico, where they must find feed and sustenance.

3. It is possible that 200,000,000 birds will migrate south in 1944, which will be approximately 50,000,000 above the $150,000,000 estimated for 1943 by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

4. Increasing human population, reclamation of marsh areas in many States leaving a greatly depleted area, increased agriculture, much of the crop suitable for wild fowls food, with other areas formerly natural feeding places now planted to crops unsuitable for food, have caused the greatly increased wild fowl population to become a severe menace to the food crop with resultant heavy loss to the farmers.

5. Agricultural interests are aroused to a point that they are demanding relief, threatening drastic action if it is not forthcoming.

6. Some means must be found to provide food for the birds that will in a measure draw them away from lands concentrated to the raising of grains and corn.

7. It is good conservation and at the same time provides needed food to take the reasonable surplus of any game crop.

8. Survey has shown that present bag limits and regulations, together with illegal shooting and natural losses in migration and winter hazards, take about 12,000,000 birds a year.

9. It seems, therefore, that with the great number of birds, even counting the hazards of drought and disease, it is safe and wise to allow a larger take, both for food and to control in a measure the menace to crops.

10. The restrictions placed at a time when wild fowl numbers were depleted to an alarming low of about 35,000,000, according to the Wildlife Service, are no longer applicable.

11. The present restrictions against feeding, the restrictions against sensibly handling planted natural feed, and placing grit so badly needed by any fowl, are unwise, and in the light of the present situation, add to the tremendous harm to grain crops and to the farmer.

12. The economic value, from a business standpoint, of the pursuit of fish and game, besides its great recreational and health-giving value, call for every inducement to be made by governmental authorities to allow for reasonable regulations within sound practice.

13. Increase in refuge areas over those now in use will not solve the problem, nor will feeding these areas anywhere near crops do anything to draw the birds away.

14. If these premises are sound something must be done to correct the conditions, viz, the wild-fowl population having been greatly increased, action should be taken to care for them on their wintering grounds by the Fish and Wildlife Service and all other interested bodies. Recognizing that in certain parts of the country strong antipathy is expressed toward artificial feeding, nevertheless we affirm that so far as the Pacific flyway is concerned, in the light of the above fundamentals, the viewpoint is wrong, and that by proper and reasonable regulations with regard to this practice, the antipathy is ill-founded.

Ducks will migrate to their natural winter habitat. They are going to eat wherever they can find food. Nothing can be done to entirely prevent their taking human food crops, but much can be done to reduce this menace.

Therefore, what methods will reasonably decrease the menace to crops and at the same time give sustenance to the birds?

1. Feeding by governmental authorities, both State and National, and by any others who for any reason are willing to do the job.

2. Artificial feed supplied by authorities to be placed as far as practical away from concentrated crop areas to points where other conditions are favorable and attractive to wild fowl.

Shooting clubs to be allowed under permit to feed their grounds and not be subjected to the fantastic rules of 1943 as laid down under any emergency in California.

3. Authorities, land holders, and shooting clubs have been encouraged to plant natural feed but under such drastic restrictions that are in many cases unpractical, fowl need grit for digestive purposes, yet even in localities where there is no natural supply, the regulations forbid placing it where the birds may get it.

4. Bag limits should be increased to take a greater toll of the surplus.

5. Longer seasons so set as to help the farmer as near as possible to keep the birds herded from crop areas. The present zoning plan is unwise and cannot be properly applied to a country as large as ours. Even if feasible, the picture of Oregon and Washington being in the middle zone seems out of reason, as is the east side of the Colorado River adjacent to California being in the southern zone and the west side in the middle zone.

CALIFORNIA'S CASE

It is impossible to include in this report total conditions affecting every section of the country, but the Pacific Flyway and particularly California has a condition that merits attention.

1. It is one of the great wintering grounds in the country.

2. It has 900 miles of coast line extending to the Mexican border.

3. The season should be divided, placing the area north of Tehachapi in a middle zone with earlier opening and closing dates, and south of the mountains in the southern zone with later dates.

4. Claim will be made that hunters will seize the opportunity to travel from one zone to the other. The number finding it possible to do so will be negligible.

5. California is a great rice-growing State, with crops ripening and harvested in the midst of great migrations. Most of the rice is grown in a highly concentrated area in the northern Sacramento Valley, a fair acreage in northerly San Joaquin, and also in the Imperial Valley. Other grains are harvested in July and early August before the great migrations appear. The present practice is for farmers to use ammunition to herd ducks off their properties, killing many thousands which they are not allowed to use in any way. An October 1 or 15 to January 1 or 15 season will greatly help Sacramento and San Joaquin farmers. In the Imperial Valley and generally south a later season, from November 1 or 15 to February 1 to 15, will again help the farmer and make it unnecessary to allow unlimited shooting, as was permitted this year in January on account of the supposedly heavy damage to early planted vegetable crops.

6. California, through reclamation, has a very small natural marsh area, so that, aside from the bays, the ducks are dependent on artificially flooded areas. These are supplied by several hundred duck clubs. They are willing to do their part to give wild fowl harbor and food. These areas, including the coastal waters, are amply sufficient to harbor all the ducks coming to California without more refuges. These grounds are never shot more than three times a week for a few hours so that for the balance of the time they form the best-watched refuges to be found anywhere. Feeding should be permitted under reasonable rules and not as in 1943, when, through a 500-yard limit, only 5 percent of the clubs could feed at all. They should be encouraged to plant feed in such a way that it will be of practical attraction to the fowl.

There is little or no rain until December, so that natural feed is scarce and what there is is quickly eaten in August, September, and early October. Few feeds will grow on our salt marshes, also mosquito abatement laws prohibiting any flooding up to 2 weeks before the opening of the duck season leaves these grounds dry with little food growth. Elsewhere ordinary duck foods are smothered out by rank tule growth which quickly obliterates all shooting water and is a constant source of trouble. Therefore, artificial feeding should be encouraged.

It is admitted that hunters are selfish. Had it not been for their enlightened selfishness in applying money to increase them, wild fowl would have been gone practically beyond recovery now. They have a right to take a reasonable percentage of the increased bird crop they have created without apologies to anyone.

It is time that they, through their representatives in Congress, demand a change in governmental attitude.

It is therefore requested that the California delegation take the leadership in this objective and we hereby ask their approval of and participation in action that will accomplish the results herein set forth.

Pay of Combat Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over a national hook-up on the so-called pay bill for combat soldiers, together with a letter from Ernie Pyle, written from Europe, and a copy of Senate bill 1787.

There being no objection, the address, letter, and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Tonight I speak to you on behalf of the nurses and fighting ground troops of our armed forces, and to explain the features of a bill which I introduced in the United States Senate on March 16 to provide for a 50-percent increase in the monthly pay of our men in the fox holes and mud of the combat areas and our nurses serving in these combat areas. The suggestion came to me a few weeks ago direct from the Anzio beach head in an article written by Ernie Pyle, Scripps-Howard writer, who has been on an extended tour of the fighting fronts and more recently has been with our boys on the Anzio beach head. He writes as follows—I quote:

"In my usual role of running other people's business, I've been threshing around with an idea. It's to give the combat soldier some little form of recognition more than he is getting now.

"Everybody who serves overseas, no matter where or what he's doing, gets extra pay. Enlisted men get 20 percent additional and officers 10 percent.

"Airmen get an extra 50 percent above this for flight pay. As a result, officer flyers get 60 percent above their normal base pay, and enlisted flyers, such as gunners and radio operators, get 70 percent.

"All that is fine and as it should be, but the idea I was toying with is why not give your genuine combat ground soldier something corresponding to flight pay? Maybe a good phrase for it would be 'fight pay.'

"Of any 1,000,000 men overseas, probably no more than 100,000 are in actual combat with the enemy. But as it is now, there is no official distinction between the dog-face lying for days and nights under constant mortar fire on an Italian hill and the headquarters clerk living comfortably in a hotel in Rio de Janeiro.

"Their two worlds are so far apart the human mind can barely grasp the magnitude of the difference. One lives like a beast and dies in great numbers. The other is merely working away from home. Both are doing necessary jobs, but it seems to me the actual warrior deserves something to set him apart. And medals are not enough.

"When I was at the front the last time, several infantry officers brought up this same suggestion. They say combat pay would mean a lot to the fighting man. It would put him into a proud category and make him feel that somebody appreciates what he endures.

"Obviously, no soldier would ever go into combat just to get extra fight pay. That isn't the point. There is not enough money in the world to pay any single individual his due for battle suffering.

"But it would put a mark of distinction on him, a recognition that his miserable job was a royal one, and that the rest of us were aware of it."

No one of us here in America can have an adequate conception of what goes through a man's mind and the extension of his hardship and suffering as he faces the full and continued blast of enemy fire, day after day and night after night under the most trying of conditions. He feels alone and apart from the rest of the world. For him life may be a matter of minutes, hours, or days. All that he has cherished he has left behind him here in America. The least we can do is to give him some small but material recognition—the same recognition in fact that we have been giving for years to men and officers engaged in flight duty, submarine duty, and parachute duty where such activity is held to be hazardous.

Before introducing my bill for additional pay to our men in actual combat, I carefully reviewed the committee report and laws passed by both branches of the Congress from as far back as 1913. Few have known how long standing is this principle of giving additional compensation to men serving in what the lawmakers have termed "hazardous occupations." In that year of 1913 the Congress provided an additional pay of 35 percent for

officers serving on aviation duty. In 1914 this service was extended from officers to aviation students who were given 25 percent additional pay and to military aviators who were given 75 percent additional pay, when engaged in flight duty.

There is no sound reason why our ground troops who are actually participating in battle should not be placed in the same position as our parachute troops, our men in the submarine service, and our flying men. No man can say that they are not all in equally hazardous duty.

In 1941 the Congress enacted a law providing a minimum additional pay for parachute troops of $50. Let me read from a letter which Secretary of War Stimson wrote on March 7, 1941, to the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, recommending this additional pay for parachute troops and, as I read it, see if you do not agree with me that the same reasons advanced by the Secretary of War on behalf of the parachute troops do not apply with equal force to our ground troops lying in the foxholes and mud in actual combat. I quote:

"DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: There is enclosed the draft of a bill to provide for increased pay for certain military personnel while engaged on parachute duty which the War Department presents for consideration of the Congress with a view to its enactment into law. * * * The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize increased pay for the officers and warrant officers who participate in this hazardous type of duty. * * * It is obvious that this personnel incur greater risks than those who fly as passengers or pilots of military aircraft for, in addition to the hazard of injury or death due to a crash of the airplane, there is the constant and continuous risk of the parachute jump which must be made as a routine operation not required by other flying personnel."

As a result of this request of the War Department, the Congress on June 3, 1941, passed a law, granting its officers in the parachute division, additional pay at the rate of $100 per month and providing $50 per month additional pay to enlisted men in the parachute division. This increase was granted solely with a view to the risks involved in that type of service.

It is not questioned that the risks and hardships being experienced by our ground troops in actual combat are just as great, and I hold that they are entitled to the same consideration.

On April 6, 1942, Secretary of the Navy Knox wrote to Speaker Rayburn of the House of Representatives, recommending enactment of proposed legislation to extend the increase in pay provision for officers and men serving on submarine duty. In favorably reporting the bill, the House Committee on Naval Affairs wrote in part as follows. I quote:

"Since the pay authorized for diving operations is designed as compensation for hazardous duty, the committee is of the opinion that it should accrue to a person whether such duty is performed in depth greater or less than 90 feet, so long at it is in fact of a hazardous nature."

On June 27, 1942, the Congress enacted this bill into law and the bill had been introduced at the request of the Navy Department. Again I saw the same reasons for passage of that bill for men in the submarine service apply with equal, if not greater force, to my bill to provide for similar recognition to our men of the ground forces in the actual combat areas.

The question presented by my bill is, "Shall the members of our armed forces who are engaged in the hazards of actual combat service be given the same recognition that we give to our men in submarine and flight service?" The men in submarine and flight service receive additional pay on the ground that they are engaged in hazardous duties.

Let us not forget that our ground forces engaged in actual combat are face to face with the enemy in an all-out death struggle. They know what it is to wait in the night for the second and the third and the fourth and the endless counterattacks that are inevitable. They are the ones who become prisoners of war. They are the ones who lie in the yellow mud and face the hazards of disease and wounds. They are the ones for us to think of tonight and in the months to come.

If you feel that the man serving in the equally hazardous duty of actual combat is entitled to this same recognition that is being given to the man on submarine duty and in flight service, then you have the right and the opportunity to write to your Senator in Washington, asking him to support the Tobey bill—S. 1787. Your Senator will be glad to send you a copy of this bill if you make the request for it.

Now is the time for action. Tonight thousands of the men in our combat troops are in the thick of indescribable hardship and fighting on the Anzio beachhead, in other parts of Italy and on the isles of the Pacific. Though we are bombing the cities of Europe, day and night, most Americans feel that in the great invasion to come, it will be the ground troops—the men who crawl through the barbed wire and face the machine guns and the enemy mortar fire—who will meet the test of actual invasion and bring final victory to the United Nations. It is to them that we owe a debt which we can never pay. It is of them that we are thinking tonight as we consider this bill to give them the recognition which they more than deserve.

Modern warfare is waged through many activities. Each compliments and supports the others.

There is the onslaught of broadsides from our naval ships, preparing the way for invasion and advance of ground troops.

There is the work of demolition and destruction, so terrible in its results, as hundreds of tons of bombs are dropped from our great bombing planes.

There is the effective work of our artillery, as it sets up barage after barage of shellfire, to destroy enemy positions and supply stations.

But, in the last great effort to take enemy positions, and to clean out its forces, it has long been recognized that our final reliance must be on the infantry, the foot soldier, the combat troops.

So they carry on, bravely meeting the savage onrush of the enemy, digging in to hold their advance, facing the most trying experiences of warfare, often coming to grips with the enemy in fierce hand-to-hand fighting.

I hold a brief for these combat troops, and I maintain that justice and gratitude should stimulate us to give them the recognition of their heroism, in our behalf.

As we live our lives here at home, enjoying the daily contacts with family and friend, remote from the actual conflict, and the hell our boys are going through, that we may be victorious, let us put ourselves in their place, as far as we can visualize it, and by enacting this legislation, give them tangible evidence of the love and gratitude we hold for them.

LETTER FROM ERNIE PYLE

ENGLAND, *May 21, 1944.*

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Thanks for your nice letter of March 30, which was a long time in reaching me. I do appreciate your interest in the "fight pay" suggestion, and thanks for that, too.

There's a very fine point of distinction about who should be eligible for "fight pay," and I'm afraid that's where you may run up against a nub.

I have a feeling that Congress may be not quite getting the point of what the proposal was made for, will want to give it to anyone who is ever in danger from enemy action. If it is made that way, it will be so broad as to destroy the value in doing it at all. Our original motive was to give recognition to that poor old ——— who lies up there in the mud and cold and rain for weeks at a time, never dry, never warm, eating cold food out of cans, dirty and unshaven and sleepless, and constantly under mortar, artillery or rifle fire. Usually he is an infantryman, although others do sometimes come into such sustained combat, such as Rangers, paratroopers, and S. S. troops.

Lots of other people die, too, in war—but differently. The sailor lives well until he dies. So does the nurse, comparatively. And so do the wide fringe of other combat troops who do have casualties but know nothing of the prolonged mental and physical misery of the old front-line rifle trooper who lives like an animal.

For instance, I suspect that the average person discussing this proposal, would want to give fight pay to everyone who served on the Anzio beachhead, for they were all certainly in danger. Yet the bulk of our troops up there, the supply troops and reserves, and what not, were living either in houses or dugouts, and were living comfortably.

I think a captain on the beachhead proposed the finest qualification for fight pay that would limit it to the people we mean. He suggested it be given only to those who served at least 4 days a month within small arms range of the enemy. That would automatically rule out all those except the poor old duffer up there in the mud.

I'm just throwing these things out to you as a suggestion to do anything with that you wish. I do feel that the whole point will be destroyed if too broad a definition is given and too many people taken in. Some of our medals have become almost valueless because we give them too freely.

Many thanks for your time, and best of good wishes to you.

Sincerely,

ERNIE PYLE.

S. 1787

A bill to provide additional pay for members of the armed forces engaged in combat service

Be it enacted, etc., That section 18 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows:

"Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard, who are not receiving additional pay under the foregoing provisions of this section, the provisions of the act of April 9, 1928 (45 Stat. 412), as amended, or the provisions of the act of April 10, 1943 (Public Law 23, 78th Cong.), shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in actual combat against the enemy or to serve regularly and frequently in immediate combat areas with troops engaged in actual combat against the enemy. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and shall, whenever practicable in their judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned."

Does War Suspend the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the People's Forum in the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant of Monday, May 22, 1944:

DOES WAR SUSPEND THE CONSTITUTION?—IMMEDIATE EXECUTIVE ACTION IS ALSO POSSIBLE BY THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS OF CONGRESSIONAL DECISIONS

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

Attorney General Biddle's assumption in the Montgomery Ward case that Mr. Roosevelt, as Chief Executive, possesses extraordinary constitutional war powers is, I think, without any substantial legal basis. Such powers are vested in the Congress and in it alone.

One of the main purposes for which our National Government was established is to provide for the common defense. Under the Constitution that task, with all its attendant problems, is entrusted to the Congress. It alone is authorized to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and see to it that the militia is organized, armed, and disciplined. It alone may make the rules for the Government and regulation of these armed forces. Obviously, countless unnamed legislative powers must necessarily be implied in order to perform these essential yet complex duties. By legislative powers I mean power of the Congress to decide what shall be done, how it shall be done, and who shall do it.

Justification for such implication is found in the closing paragraph of article I, section 8, of the Constitution. The Congress is there authorized "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Here then, in the Congress, is a vast reservoir of express and implied war powers—with emphasis on those implied—for no one could foretell all the things that might be required to preserve and defend the Nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S WAR POWERS

By contrast the President's constitutional powers in respect of war are very limited indeed. "The President," says the Constitution, "shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States. * * *" This is all there is to it, except that with the advice and consent of the Senate he appoints the commissioned officers of the armed forces.

As head of our Military and Naval Establishments, the President is as completely subject to the rules prescribed by the Congress as is any one of his subordinates. But, as Chief Executive, he has an additional obligation, namely, "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (art. II, sec. 3).

The eminent jurist, Benjamin R. Curtis, said: "The military power of the President is derived solely from the Constitution. He is the general in chief; and as such, in prosecuting a war, may do what generals in the field are allowed to do within the sphere of their actual operations, in subordination to the laws of their country, from which alone they derive their authority." But he added this warning: When a general in chief disregards those laws, "he superadds to his rights as commander the powers of a usurper; and this is military despotism."

Of course, in time of war, the Congress may very properly vest in the President such unusual powers, consistent with the Constitution, as the efficient prosecution of the war may seem to demand. Where these powers affect civilian life, they must be given to the President as the civil magistrate, not as the military commander. In no other way can the military be kept subordinate to the civil power.

CHECK PERSONAL GOVERNMENT

The duty of the legislative and judicial branches of Government to support and defend the Constitution, should make them especially vigilant to check any tendency on the part of the President to exercise powers not traceable directly to clear and explicit legislation. This is particularly true these days, when personal government is in the air everywhere and its consequences are visible in the charred and blackened ruins of Europe and Asia.

There are those among us, of whom Attorney General Biddle seems to be one, who act as though they believe that war suspends the Constitution for its duration. If written constitutions mean anything, such a view is untenable. The Constitution of West Virginia makes this quite clear.

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States and of this State, it says, are operative alike in a period of war or in time of peace, and any departure therefrom, or violation thereof, under plea of necessity, or any other plea, is subversive of good government and tends to anarchy and despotism. (art. 1, sec. 3).

This declaration is of especial significance, because West Virginia was born during the Civil War. Its constitution was drafted by a citizenry loyal to the Union and approved at the time by the Congress, whose members presumably knew and understood the principles for which that war was being fought.

POLITICIANS TO BLAME

But, say the molders of our "new social order," the war will not wait for the decisions of the Congress. It requires immediate Executive action. Those who take this view have no faith in the American people. They must doubt both our patriotism and our ability to govern ourselves. They underestimate the capacity of a President to get quick action, provided he has shown that he knows his proper place and that he intends to stay in it.

In the midst of a war for our survival as a nation, any forthright Chief Executive could count upon the wholehearted cooperation of every Member of the Congress. Our representatives would never refuse him any legitimate request. But debate will be prolonged, and action delayed, when Executive proposals are just too clever, when they suggest the presence of ulterior purposes, or when experience has shown a disposition in the executive department to give meanings to statutes quite opposite to the legislative intent.

These are the things that make the democratic process seem inefficient. The system is not to blame. The blame should fall upon those unprincipled politicians who use the war or any emergency for their own selfish ends—men who believe it is easier to manage a single individual, though he be a President, than to control a Congress; who, for that reason, ignore the Constitution and claim for the Chief Executive unlimited war powers.

As an American, I abhor personal power in the hands of any man. As an American, I believe the Constitution of the United States is our only effective shield against dictatorship. And as a Republican, I hope the candidates and workers of my party will, in the coming campaign, keep that Constitution constantly before the voters as the living symbol of their liberty, and convince them that it, and it alone, is the supreme law of our land.

ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON.

NEW CANAAN.

Each Candidate for Congress or for State Legislative Office in 1944 Should Be Interrogated on His Stand Concerning the "Proposed Millionaires' Amendment to the Constitution"—There Is Real Danger—The People Must Wake Up and Defeat This Wicked Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, every candidate seeking a legislative office in the United States in the year 1944, be he a candidate for a post of State legislator or for Congress, should be interrogated on his personal stand in respect to the proposal of the sinister, sordid lobby that is now, through undercover tactics, trying to exempt the wealthy few from adequate taxation and to make impossible the payment of benefits for veterans, their dependents, farmers, the aged and other recipients of social-security assistance, and, in addition, to almost immediately crush small business.

LEGISLATIVE BOOBY TRAPS BEING SET

On Monday, the 29th, I paid tribute to the alertness of the legislative board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in the State of Ohio in discovering a last-minute attempt on the part of the Gannett gang to slip one of these resolutions through the Ohio General Assembly in the closing days of the 1943-44 session of that body. Principally through the vigorous work of Mr. Rasey and his associates and with the able assistance of a few more far-sighted public officials, then employed by the State of Ohio, consideration of the measure was blocked for the balance of that session. Another session of that assembly is in the offing, however, and let no man think that the gang is not now once again digging its underground fortifications and preparing once more to set off its legislative booby traps when the next, the ninety-sixth, session of that body convenes.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN DISTURBED

I am highly gratified to have received a letter on this subject from one of our national leaders, a real labor statesman, the Honorable A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and to find that the efforts being made by

these un-American and ruthless trespassers against free enterprise and liberty have been noted and are a subject of real concern to the entire national organization of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

UNDERCOVER MANNER

Accompanying this letter, which is dated May 26, is an advance copy of an article on this subject which Mr. Whitney has written for publication in the June 1944 issue of the Railroad Trainman. Both Mr. Whitney's letter and his article indicate clearly the full awareness which he and his organization have of the devastating intent of the program being so insidiously and continuously propagandized by this group of native American Fascists—Gannett, Rumely, Pettengill, and McClure.

Mr. Whitney, in his article, says:

It should be noted that in every State this resolution is handled in a most undercover manner. In Kentucky, it was even omitted from the daily legislative digest and many reports have come to me stating that members of State legislatures vote for this vicious piece of legislation without knowing it.

He says also:

The technique generally used is to slip it through in the closing days, along with hundreds of other resolutions. I have never heard of public hearings being held in State legislatures on this resolution.

Mr. Whitney also lists the States which he understands have officially adopted one of these nefarious resolutions. He makes note of the fact that the Legislatures of Pennsylvania and Indiana also adopted the resolution, but that the Governors of these two States vetoed them.

I regret to correct an impression that Mr. Whitney may have in respect to the status of this resolution in Indiana. The resolution is in effect in Indiana today. I base this upon a letter I have just received from the Honorable Rue J. Alexander, secretary of state for the State of Indiana. Mr. Alexander, in supplying me with a copy of chapter 322 of the acts of the Indiana General Assembly for the year 1943, which chapter is based upon House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, says:

As may be seen by the context of the resolution itself, you will notice that it was adopted in the House of Representatives. It was adopted by a voice vote and later concurred in by the Senate by a similar type of vote. It is not necessary for the Governor in this State to sign a resolution of this type to make it valid and Governor Schricker did not sign it.

Consequently, I am afraid that Mr. Whitney will have to add one more State to the already too-long list of those States which have succumbed to the tactics of this quiet, but very effective machine.

Mr. Whitney concludes his article with statements which I heartily endorse. He says:

The fate of Democracy and the fate of America hangs in the balance on the 1944 elections. Ask all candidates for public office, State or National, how they stand on this ominous issue. Smoke out the reactionaries that are trying to put over this stupid proposal. In this war against world fascism, battles must be won on the home front as well as on the battle fronts.

The full text of Mr. Whitney's letter and article is appended herewith:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 26, 1944.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have read with genuine interest your address in the House of Representatives as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 1944, pages 4328–4330, regarding the vicious proposal to place a 25-percent ceiling on all income, estate, and gift taxes.

Enclosed herewith is an advance copy of an article that will appear in the Railroad Trainman, our official monthly publication, which will be of interest to you.

It is noted you state that 16 States have adopted this resolution. I have been in constant communication with the representatives of this brotherhood in the several States, and according to the best information I can obtain, the following States have officially adopted this resolution: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin The Legislatures of Pennsylvania and Indiana also adopted the resolution, which was vetoed by the Governors of those States.

The Governor of Pennsylvania indicated in his veto message that the reason he vetoed this resolution was only because of the war situation. The State of Massachusetts adopted a somewhat similar resolution, but it is not the same. It proposes that additional revenues not be raised by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes. Accordingly, it would appear that only 11 States have officially adopted the 25-percent tax ceiling resolution, but even that number is most threatening.

I genuinely appreciate your service to the country in exposing this vicious Fascist-minded piece of legislation, and let me add that if you think it would be helpful, I should be glad to have you insert my article, enclosed herewith, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
A. F. WHITNEY, *President.*

[From the Railroad Trainman of June 1944]

THREAT TO DESTROY OUR GOVERNMENT

On May 11, 1944, on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, exposed the threat of native American Fascists to amend the Federal Constitution in such a manner as to destroy our Government. (Read CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 11, 1944, pp. 4328–4330.) Notwithstanding this sensational charge, the "free" American newspapers did not print a word of it, so far as I have been able to determine. Why? This is an undercover movement that has already succeeded in 11 States of the Union, passed the legislatures of 2 additional States, but was vetoed by the governors and was adopted by another State in a modified form.

Congressman PATMAN referred to the proposal to amend the Federal Constitution so as to place a 25 percent ceiling on all income, estate and gift tax rates. PATMAN charges that Frank Gannett, of New York, owner of the reactionary Gannett newspapers, and former Indiana Congressman Samuel Pettengill, a renegade Democrat, who became chairman of the finance committee of the Republican National Committee in 1940, head up this movement. For a time Pettengill was also connected with the Transportation Association of America, an organization dedicated to the purpose of putting over a vicious railroad monopoly in the United States. PATMAN denounces Gannett and Pettengill as leaders of native American fascism and declares:

"Whenever you permit the Gannett-Pettengill amendment to become the twenty-second amendment, you destroy this Government."

The Gannett propaganda machine boasts that it has sent out:

Eighty-two million pieces of literature, 760,000 books, more than 10,000 radio transcriptions, 350,000 telegrams, full-page ads in 536 newspapers, and thousands of weekly releases to newspapers.

This from a man who tried to suppress the sale of the book Under Cover.

Barrels of money are being raised for the campaign for the 25 percent ceiling on income, estate, and gift taxes under the selfish appeal to the rich that for every $1,000 they contribute to this campaign they will save 10 or a hundred times that much in income taxes. Where a millionaire pays about $800,000 taxes on a million-dollar annual income, he would pay but $250,000 and have $750,000 free of income taxes, under such a constitutional amendment. Joe Doaks who now pays about $175 income taxes on a $2,000 income could, and no doubt would, have his taxes boosted to $500. If the rich are so relieved of taxes, naturally the poor will make up the deficiency, unless, as suggested by Congressman PATMAN, our Government is destroyed.

PATMAN'S remarks came up in connection with the debate on the veteran's aid bill. He stated that if this limitation of taxes on the rich were to come to pass, "We are just rendering lip service to the veterans and their dependents." He declared:

"We will not be able to take care of the men who have sacrificed; we will not be able to pay a penny to those who have lost eyes, legs, and arms, and are permanently disabled; we will not be able to pay anything to the widows and to the dependents of those who have given their lives upon the field of battle to save our country in time of war if this sinister organization succeeds in what is known to be its primary objective. Furthermore, there will be no old-age assistance; there will be no social security."

PATMAN quotes Vivian Kellems as saying:

"There is on foot, and well under way, a move to repeal the sixteenth amendment (the income-tax amendment)."

Miss Kellems is the woman who refused to pay her income taxes and advised others to do likewise. She is the woman whom Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington, revealed on the floor of the House of Representatives, March 31, 1944, as having correspondence with a Nazi agent. She is actively supporting the Gannett-Pettengill constitutional amendment. PATMAN declared:

"Well, now, the gentlemen on the Republican side, of course, can laugh about it, as they indicate they would like to, but when you sit idly by and let this United States Constitution be amended that way, and then you can say to the veterans, 'Yes; we tried to help you. We wanted to give you thousands of dollars apiece, but we had no way of paying it,' why, it will become a very serious matter."

DEWEY TAKES NO STAND

Under date of March 13, 1944, I wrote Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and called his attention to the fact that the resolution favoring this constitutional amendment was then before the legislature of his State. I emphasized the threat to the welfare of this Nation, of the inevitability of a feudalism of inordinately rich and poverty-stricken peasants, if this taxation ceiling ever became a part of our Federal Constitution. I asked Governor Dewey what his position was on this vicious legislative proposal and urged him to make it public in the interests of our national welfare if he agreed with me that this

legislation constituted a real threat to our national welfare. Under date of March 17, 1944, I received a reply to my letter from Lawrence E. Walsh, assistant counsel to the Governor, reading:

"I know the Governor will appreciate your interest in writing to him and will give the views you express his careful consideration.

"I should like to point out that none of these resolutions has been adopted by the legislature."

The New York Governor appears to be keeping intact his policy of never evading an issue he can avoid. By very diligent action on the part of our brotherhood, this vicious resolution was defeated in the New York Assembly, although it had previously passed the New York Senate. It should be noted that in every State this resolution is handled in a most undercover manner. In Kentucky it was even omitted from the daily legislative digest and many reports have come to me stating that members of State legislatures vote for this vicious piece of legislation without knowing it. The technique generally used is to slip it through in the closing days, along with hundreds of other resolutions. I have never heard of public hearings being held in State legislatures on this resolution.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen was the first organization to bring this to the Nation's attention and to start the fight against it. As long ago as September 1943 I addressed communications to all of our State legislative representatives, advising them of this resolution and urging them to watch for it and do everything possible to bring it out into the open and kill it. The thing that amazes me is why so many good organizations and good people in America can be so apathetic about so ominous a proposal. If 32 States adopt this resolution, the Congress must call a constitutional convention for this purpose, and then if 36 States adopt the proposed amendment, it becomes a part of our Federal Constitution and no Congress could thereafter tax at a higher rate than 25 percent the incomes of corporations or individuals or the gifts and inheritances of the wealthy.

The fate of democracy and the fate of America hangs in the balance on the 1944 elections. Ask all candidates for public office, State or National, how they stand on this ominous issue. Smoke out the reactionaries that are trying to put over this stupid proposal. In this war against world fascism, battles must be won on the home front as well as on the battle fronts.

TEXAS INVADED BY GANNETT-PETTENGILL-MCCLURE-RUMELY SO-CALLED COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

It is interesting to discover that no publicity has been given the effort to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution and insert in lieu thereof the twenty-second amendment.

Although millions of pieces of literature have been mailed advocating this proposal, legislatures have been persuaded to adopt it, it will absolutely change our form of government, all this is being done practically without mention in the public press.

The legislature in our own State of Texas on May 10, 1943 considered this question. Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 64, which was practically the same as the resolution in other States, contained a "whereas" as follows:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts and inheritances, and providing a limit on taxes thereon, and

Whereas the people of the State of Texas are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation—

This statement in the resolution was absolutely incorrect. There was not pending in the Congress of the United States, either House or Senate, at that time, or since, a proposal to so amend the Constitution of the United States

ADOPTED BY TEXAS SENATE

To that extent, at least, the premise upon which the resolution was based was incorrect. The resolution was read and adopted by the Senate of Texas on May 10, 1943. No record vote was recorded.

On May 11, 1943, the next day, the house of representatives in the Legislature of Texas, a motion was made to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution 64. A motion was made to suspend the rules for the purpose of taking up the resolution. Yeas and nays were demanded, and the motion to suspend the rules was lost by a vote of 52 yeas to 58 nays.

The ones who were pushing this resolution were evidently a persistent group. On March 29, 1943, almost 2 months before Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 was adopted in the senate and before it was defeated in the house, an effort was made to pass a similar resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 37—in the house of representatives to memorialize Congress in regard to limitation of taxes on incomes. The record for March 29, 1943, of the proceedings of the house discloses the resolution had been read a second time and referred to the committee on revenue and taxation. The committee on revenue and taxation having recommended the adoption of the resolution, the speaker of the house laid it before the house for consideration. A motion was made to table the resolution and the motion prevailed by a vote of 63 yeas to 58 nays.

Evidently since there was so much interest in the passage of this resolution in 1943 there will be another attempt made to pass it next year. It is my hope that every candidate for the legislature in Texas will promise, if elected, that he will not vote for the passage of such a resolution but will do everything within his power to prevent it.

THE NAME, "COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT," A FAKE

The Committee for Constitutional Government is a misnomer. It is a committee to destroy the Constitution by amending it in a way that a Fascist state will be set up in the United States.

This group is sponsored and controlled by Frank Gannett—Republican candidate for the Presidency, a large chain newspaper publisher, Samuel B. Pettengill, a money raiser for the Republican Party; Edward A. Rumely, an ex-convict who was convicted during the last war and may be considered the Nazi representative on this committee; and S. S. McClure, a Fascist instructor who boasts about having spent 2 years in Italy being educated on fascism.

LOBBYING ORGANIZATION WITH UNITS IN TEXAS

This is strictly a lobbying organization of the most sinister and sordid type. In their handbook published only a few months ago, on page 43, it is stated as one of their immediate objectives "To mobilize 1,000,000 constitutionalists, 1 to 4,000 in each congressional district, organized to support our constitutional system."

ANOTHER EYE-OFENER PROMISED

This group has perfected organizations in several cities in Texas, including Dallas, San Antonio, Houston, and at least one city in the First Congressional District of Texas, which I shall be pleased to fully discuss later. I promise this will be an eye-opener.

Since this has been the policy of the organization for several years, evidently all the congressional districts are now organized or most of them at least. One can imagine the power such an organization would have by getting these so-called constitutionalists in their district to wire their Member of Congress about something this Republican, Nazi, Fascist group oppose. The ones doing the wiring would probably know nothing about it, but their wire would have great effect just the same.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF THOSE WHO ARE NOT ENTIRELY FAMILIAR WITH THE TAX LIMITATION PROPOSAL

The proposal of the Gannett-Pettengill-Rumely-McClure political action committee, alias the committee for Constitutional government, its terms would:

First. Repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution which permits Congress to levy income taxes.

Second. Provide that Congress may levy taxes on incomes—individual and corporate—gifts and estates, but not to exceed 25 percent. Some rates now in excess profits caused by war, monopoly and patents are as high as 95 percent.

Third. That a constitutional convention be called for the purpose of submitting the proposal to the States to be effective when ratified by three-fourths of the States.

An effort is quietly being made to get 32 States to ask Congress for this convention on the theory, undoubtedly correct, that when 32 States request the Congress for the convention, the Congress is compelled under article 5 of the Constitution, to call the convention. If Congress does not call the convention this group will declare Congress is violating the Constitution and proceed to call one themselves, submit the amendment to the States and when ratified by three-fourths they will proclaim its adoption and insist upon constitutional government. In this way it will be possible to bypass Congress. When the convention is called, anything can be submitted. This proposed amendment may repeal any part of the Constitution or the submission of a whole Constitution may be submitted by the convention.

If this sinister and sordid lobby that is backed by the chain newspaper's Republican candidate for President, Gannett, and money-raiser for the Republican Party, Pettengill, and the Nazi ex-convict Rumely, who was convicted for illegally dealing with Germany in the

First World War, and McClure, the Fascist instructor, succeeds in slipping through the proposal, the results will be:

RESULTS

First. A few families in a generation will own and control 98 percent of the wealth of the United States. Heretofore arguments have been made in favor of reduction of income taxes while the taxpayer is living with the understanding that a large part of a big estate so acquired would be taken at death—but never before has anyone been so brazen as to advocate a 25-percent limitation upon both income and estate taxes.

Second. It will be impossible to support the necessary expenditures of the Federal Government when the war is over. The carrying charges for the national debt—that is, interest charges—will be more than all the cost of the Federal Government per annum before the war. In addition, a large standing army of from three to five million men will be very expensive for several years to come.

Third. With the other necessary operating expenses of the Government and with this tax limitation, nothing else can be provided by the Federal Government.

Fourth. Therefore, there will be no aid for the dependents of those who have given their lives on the field of battle during this war and prior wars. All present benefits will stop.

Fifth. There will be no aid for the crippled, maimed, shell-shocked, and otherwise disabled men who suffered upon the field of battle in any war.

Sixth. There will be no aid for the dependents of disabled men.

Seventh. There will be no educational opportunities, business opportunities, mustering-out pay, or other benefits to be given by a generous and grateful Government to our protectors in time of war because our generous Government, with its big heart, will have its taxing ability restrained by this constitutional amendment to the extent that no financial aid can be given, although provided for by Congress, since Congress will be unable to raise the money to pay for it.

Eighth. Aid for the aged, the retired workers, the unemployed, and other benefits through Social Security will have to be stopped, as there will be no money available to pay them.

Ninth. All Federal farm benefits will stop.

Tenth. Small business will fold up since big business will be able to keep so much of the excess profits that they make that little business unable to compete will be quickly and easily crushed and destroyed.

ABILITY TO PAY PRINCIPLE REPEALED

These are just some of the things that will result. In addition, the main thing is that the sound principle of taxation "ability to pay" will be destroyed for the adoption of this amendment will cause people to pay on what they owe to support a large part of the cost of our Government in order to exempt from taxation the greedy rich who are sponsoring this proposal.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial on the question of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, which appeared in the Washington Post of last Saturday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

F. E. P. C.

The House Appropriations Committee showed a wise tolerance, we think, in recommending the allotment of half a million dollars for continuation of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee. If the recommendation is approved by both Houses of Congress, as we very much hope it will be, the F. E. P. C. will cease to be merely a Presidential agency and will have independent status under congressional authorization. This is as it should be. The Post has expressed endorsement, in principle, of Senator RUSSELL'S proposal requiring all Federal agencies set up by Executive order to secure an appropriation from Congress after they have been in existence for a year. We should regret very much indeed, however, to see this sound general requirement employed, as some intended, to end the F. E. P. C.'s useful career.

There is particular need of the F. E. P. C. at the present time. To Negroes, the minority most urgently in need of its protection, the agency symbolizes the Government's recognition of their plight. Through the activities of the F. E. P. C., war employment otherwise barred to them because of racial prejudice has been opened up to Negroes. The war effort of the Nation has been accelerated by the utilization of their skills and energies. By gradual, patient, constructive effort the areas of discrimination are being reduced. The effort must not be abandoned now if we are to keep faith with the democratic principles we profess.

Campaign Expenditure in Oregon Primaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I gave a statement to the Associated Press of which I have the text. I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am just advised by receipt in today's mail that the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944, in compliance with Senate Resolution 263 adopted March 3 last, is inquiring into the amount, source, and use of campaign funds by all candidates for the Senate in the recent Oregon primaries.

I believe a thorough investigation of this subject is necessary if our elections are not to become a farce. It may be that there was more money spent to accomplish my defeat and the nomination of Professor Morse (Wayne L. Morse), a new dealer, than was spent in the combined campaigns of all candidates for all offices in both the Republican and Democratic Parties in Oregon. It seems to me the cause of good government in our country will be well served by letting light into the dark places of the amount, source, and use of campaign expenditures in this particular primary election.

In this connection I observe that today is Memorial Day and we are reminded that all over the world little white crosses mark the thousands upon thousands of graves of fine young Americans already sacrificed in this war, and in previous wars, while our hospitals are inadequate to care for the great number of greviously wounded patriots who seek succor in them.

It is estimated that the peak of the demand for hospitalization will not be reached until 1965. The peak of the demand for hospitalization for the last war is only now, 25 years after it.

When our combat veterans return I can look them all in the face with a clear conscience. I did not curry political favor from Mr. Sidney Hillman and the political action committee of the C. I. O., and the racketeers of American labor who foment strikes in war industries in the time of war and thereby withhold from production, transportation, and use the weapons, food, and supplies needed by our combat forces, not only for battle purposes but actually to defend themselves.

At Dutch Harbor, Alaska, in August 1942, I saw the newly made graves of some fifty fine young Americans who were slaughtered there because they had no adequate means with which to defend themselves when the Japanese bombed that place. The reason they lacked the facilities with which to defend themselves was because strikes in war industries had retarded the production and delivery of the needed weapons, material, and supplies with tragically fatal results.

The President's Responsibility and Power in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter that appeared in the New York Times of a recent date, written by Arthur Dunn, chairman of Parents and Wives of Fighting Americans, Inc.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1944.

EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Last Sunday's Times contains two Gallup polls. The question asked in one was: "Do you think the Government did the right thing in taking over the Montgomery Ward plants, or was it a mistake?" Sixty-one percent thought it was a mistake.

In the second poll 66 percent believed that "the public is not taking the war seriously enough." The second poll proves the truth of the first; for if the home front took the war seriously enough, 100 percent would condemn the action of Montgomery Ward in defying the Commander in Chief of the armed forces. Instead, the anti-Roosevelt newspapers and publications are trying to use a really unimportant incident to help the presidential election. Many seem to be much more interested in winning the election than in winning the war.

We listen to speeches and read editorials as to whether the President exceeded the war powers granted by Congress—whether Montgomery Ward is a war industry—whether the President might treat the corner grocery the same way that he has treated Montgomery Ward—whether he acted unconstitutionally.

Of course he can take over the corner grocery, and will take over any corner grocer who insists on defying the O. P. A.

Very few seem to have a real understanding of the responsibility and power of the President in time of war. Responsibility without power has no meaning. It is inherent that power must be as great as responsibility. The President's responsibility and power do no depend upon Congress or on the courts. Both his responsibility and power proceed right out of the Constitution itself.

Article II, section I, paragraph 7 provides: "Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.'"

Immediately following the above, section II, paragraph 1 states: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States."

Unless the Commander in Chief is victorious over Hitler and Hirohito, there will be no Constitution to preserve, protect, and defend. To preserve, protect, and defend is his solemn responsibility, and responsibility without limit. Therefore, his power as Commander in Chief must be without limit. And he must make his own decisions. If he decides a certain course of action is vital for victory, neither Congress nor the people can decide otherwise.

If they think they can find a better man to be both President and Commander in Chief Congress can remove him by impeachment or the people can remove him at the polls. There is no other remedy. Once having put him in command, we must back him to the limit till we decide we want someone else. That is both good constitutional law and sound common sense.

At least Abraham Lincoln thought so, for he carried on the Civil War for several months without authorization from Congress and without bothering to summon that body even for the purpose of declaring war. His Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves was not authorized by the Constitution nor by the Congress. He considered it vital for victory. His action was denounced by many in the North.

Perhaps F. D. R. thinks likewise. At any rate, on September 7, 1942, he demanded of Congress that it pass the so-called anti-inflation bill, and threatened Congress that if it failed to do so by October 1, he would put on the price ceilings himself. On October 2 Congress passed the bill.

The test of every act of every citizen, of every corporation, on the home front is not whether any business is a war industry; whether a particular act is constitutional; whether we like it or don't like it. The single test is, does it promote or retard the defeat of our enemies?

During the very last hour of the war thousands of our youth will be killed, many more thousands will be made legless, armless, sightless, and be otherwise disabled. When any civilian does anything to unnecessarily prolong the war a single hour, he will be actually killing and maiming thousands of soldiers at the front. To have to pass on such petty matters as the Montgomery Ward case and to have to prepare a statement explaining the same takes up the time of our Commander in Chief, which he would otherwise use in the prosecution of the war.

As stated in the 66-percent Gallup poll: "A criticism voiced by many soldiers returning from the battle fronts is that the civilian population in the United States does not take the war seriously enough." The time has come when those with loved ones in the services demand that we cease bothering with trifles and get on with the war.

ARTHUR DUNN,
Chairman of Parents and Wives of Fighting Americans, Inc.

Eggs and Egg Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Post dated April 6, 1944, entitled "W. F. A. Will Buy Eggs to Bolster Market," and an article appearing in the Washington Post of May 30, 1944, entitled "Eggs Going Into Animal Feed."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 6, 1944]

W. F. A. WILL BUY EGGS TO BOLSTER MARKET

(By Christine Sadler)

War Food Administrator Marvin Jones yesterday assured midwestern Congressmen—flooded with protests against low egg prices—that buying agents would be designated by W. F. A. this week to purchase eggs throughout the South and Middle West at not less than 26 cents a dozen.

The new procedure is designed to reach the farm level in all heaviest producing areas and thus support a market glutted with more eggs than the country has ever had to handle at one time before.

Buyers will be granted a bounty of 90 cents a case to furnish a good shipping case and cover expenses of getting the eggs to market centers. In addition, the W. F. A. will begin buying eggs on the New York and Chicago mercantile exchanges, Jones said.

JONES OUTLINES OTHER STEPS

Other W. F. A. steps for protecting the farmer against losses and assuring full utilization of the egg crop were outlined by Jones as follows:

1. Drying plants have been instructed to buy eggs at not less than 30 cents a dozen and to certify each week the amount paid. The Government buys dried eggs for lend-lease and military purchases, and recently drying plants have been cleaning up, it is claimed, by buying for next to nothing while continuing to collect the higher set prices.

2. Grocers and other dealers have been urged to sell eggs at retail prices in keeping with their costs, without regard for O. P. A. ceilings fixed before the market was glutted. In some parts of the country, O. P. A. officials said, stores have been selling below the ceiling but the practice has not been general.

3. More cold-storage space for shell eggs is being found, Jones told the Congressmen, and more egg cases are being made available to handle the bumper output.

4. The W. F. A. is pushing civilian consumption, urging at least one more egg per week for each consumer. Jones said more than 60,000,000 dozen additional eggs could be disposed of during the next 6 weeks, if everyone cooperated.

After listening to the Jones presentation, Senator HUGH BUTLER (Republican, Nebraska) declared, "I give W. F. A. credit for their attempt, but more work will be necessary. A 26-cent floor won't permit the necessary continued production."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin) said, "The complete answer must be in increased consumption by encouraging higher prices for the producers and cutting the spread between the producers' return and the price the consumer pays."

The W. F. A. program "makes pretty good sense," declared Senator JOSEPH H. BALL (Republican, Minnesota), but he added the hope W. F. A. would give poultrymen some "reasonable assurance" of what they can expect next year.

[From the Washington Post of May 30, 1944]

EGGS GOING INTO ANIMAL FEED—STORAGE FACILITIES LACKING—W. F. A. ACTS TO SUPPORT PRICES

(By Jean Craighead)

Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, is converting surplus eggs into animal feed in order to support egg prices, the Department of Agriculture announced yesterday.

At the same time the War Food Administration reported that an exceptionally heavy milk output, expected during the next 2 months, has changed previous reports of a stable ice cream production ceiling, and boosted quotas 85 percent for June and 75 percent for July.

Due to inadequate storage facilities for the tremendous egg surplus, a limited number are being turned into feed, which is short in supply, the administrator said.

"Purchases of eggs by the War Food Administration to support producer price levels have reached such volume that suitable cold-storage space is inadequate. These conversions will be made in such volume and for such time as necessary to carry out price support commitments," Jones stated.

Ice cream also will be richer during June and July W. F. A. officials said. W. F. A. raised the milk solids content from 22 to 24 percent. During August, both production and richness will drop back to previous wartime levels.

Despite surplus of eggs and milk, the manpower shortage on the Nation's farms still looms as a danger to 1944 production. The

War Food Administration has made arrangements to bring approximately 900 workers to the United States from Barbados, British West Indies, for agriculture employment during the summer and fall months.

The recruits are expected to arrive about the middle of June and work on the farms of the Middle West.

Besides the West Indies colonies, Mexico and Newfoundland also are supplying farm workers to the United States, the War Food Administration said.

Report by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas of Utah on International Labor Organization Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, because of its interest and historical significance, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the recent conference of the International Labor Organization submitted by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who served as a governmental delegate by appointment of the President of the United States. The Public Printer has submitted an estimate showing that the cost of printing the matter will be $442.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

About 2 weeks ago I returned from Philadelphia, where I had been attending the conference of the International Labor Organization as a governmental delegate appointed by the President of the United States. Members of the Senate have, no doubt, read of this conference in the newspapers. The journalists reported it fully and accurately, yet I feel a responsibility to give to this body some of my own impressions of the proceedings.

I should point out first that the I. L. O. is a unique type of world organization, or association of governments. There are more than 40 member governments, and 41 sent delegations to the conference. It is in the composition of the delegations—4-man delegations—that we find the unique quality of the organization, since 2 delegates from each country represent governments; 1 of the remaining delegates represents the labor organizations of his country, and the fourth represents employers. Miss Frances Perkins and I represented the Government of the United States, Mr. Robert Watt was the workers' representative, and Mr. Henry I. Harriman was the employers' delegate. Great Britain sent Mr. Tomlinson, a Member of Parliament, as a governmental delegate; New Zealand sent Mr. Walter Nash, its Deputy Prime Minister, who was elected president of the conference, and who speeded our labors with rare insight and great parliamentary skill. Half a dozen other countries sent delegates of ministerial rank.

Each delegation had advisers. Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Congresswoman from Maine, was one of the advisers, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5 has made an interim report to the House on the activities of the conference. Many of the advisers, from our own country and abroad, were distinguished students of public affairs. I name only a few: Sir Walter Citrine; Mr. Bertil Ohlin, of Sweden; Mr. Mulherkar, of India; Mr. Lubin, of the United States.

One of our important allies was absent, namely, the Soviet Union. Though the Conference and particularly the representatives of the other United Nations regretted the absence of so important a friend, it is doubtful whether the absence of her delegates reduces the value of the work done.

I should next, by way of general explanation, note that this Conference may be looked upon as one of a series of general international technical conferences whose aim it is to put together the fragments of a broken world—two of its predecessors being the Food Conference of May 1943 and the U. N. R. R. A. Conference at Atlantic City. Events seem to suggest that the forthcoming peace settlement will be built on a broad, firm base, with dozens of minor, technical matters talked out and thought out before the great political issues are settled and agreed upon. It is my firm belief that such a peace will be more enduring than one which—so to speak—is worked out in one prolonged session, where both technical and political matters are threshed out together, at the same time. Perhaps it is not always possible to separate the technical from the political, but it can be said of the recent International Labor Conference that it approached questions primarily from the technical point of view.

The Conference worked hard. It had a heavy agenda. The newspapers reported charges of stalling, I believe, during the first few days. It did take a little while for new delegates to understand international procedures, and for nations to discover what position other nations were going to take on various issues. But once these necessary preliminaries were over, things moved fast and—toward the end—even breathlessly. At one time, I am told, 17 committees and subcommittees met on the same day. Miss Perkins was chairman of one of the largest and most important committees, which met at night to complete its labors. In the last days, when delegates were straining to go home after more than 3 weeks' work, a few votes were held up until the necessary documents could be rushed from the printers.

Perhaps the most important resolution of the conference was the so-called Declaration of Philadelphia. This resolution, which may prove to be not the least of several great historical documents produced in Philadelphia, affirms the right of all human beings to material well-being and spiritual development under conditions of freedom and dignity and under conditions of economic security and opportunity. It holds that the attainment of those conditions must constitute a central aim of national and international policy. The resolution states that the worthiness and success of international policies will be measured in the future by the extent to which they promote the achievement of this end.

Another document created at the Conference may have even greater historical interest than the Declaration of Philadelphia. A resolution was adopted suggesting to the United Nations the kind of social clauses that might appropriately be included in a general or special treaty of peace. This remarkable resolution, drafted in a form suitable for incorporation in a treaty, binds the signatory nations to accept the principles of the Declaration of Philadelphia, which I have just summarized. It goes on to state that signatory nations recognize their duty to expand production, to liberate economic activity from unreasonable restraints, to maintain high levels of employment, to exchange social statistics and other similar information, and, through the I. L. O., to call a special emergency conference when levels of employment fall dangerously. It is doubtful whether responsible delegates, acting on instructions from their governments, have ever before drafted proposals such as these with a view to incorporating them in a peace treaty. Our Australian friends were particularly concerned about the maintenance of high levels of employment after the war and considered that our own proposals were rather unprogressive.

A complementary resolution was voted outlining the economic policies required to attain the social objectives referred to. This document, after acknowledging the importance of the work of U. N. R. R. A. and the Food Conference, endorses the establishment of a sound international monetary system, of trade on a multilateral basis, and of orderly migration. Liberated countries, it declares, should receive priorities in materials required for reconstruction. It urges that monopoly be discouraged and technological progress fostered.

The Conference adopted a recommendation setting forth the general employment principles to be adopted in the transition from war to peace, and suggesting specific methods of applying these principles. It is recommended that all necessary information be gathered to provide an accurate picture, nationally and locally, of the skills in supply and those in demand; that policies governing demobilization, based in fairness, should be clearly stated and adhered to; that additional productive facilities called into being during the war should not be kept out of use if they can supply human wants. The labor supply should be trained or retrained to meet demand, and educational doors be unlocked to those whose schooling was interrupted by the war. School-leaving ages should be raised, and the redistribution of women workers in the economy be done on basis of complete equality of men and women.

There was considerable discussion of the role that the I. L. O. should play among the international organizations in existence or to be created. Much of this has been left to a committee of its governing body to work out. Perhaps the best summary to give here is to say that the I. L. O. is consolidating the strong position it already has among international organizations, and that the next few years will make great demands on the organization's service functions.

I have only told you a few of the most important things achieved in Philadelphia. A host of lesser resolutions and decisions were made. Certain quite technical recommendations were adopted concerning the problem of tropical poverty and social security. I omit entirely the interim procedural machinery that is to convert the resolutions of this conference—ultimately—into drafts of treaties—treaties that will be laid before member states for their action. I must not, however, omit the conference decisions to hold regional conferences: One to serve the Near East and one to be held immediately after the end of the Pacific war, to serve the Far East. I have sometimes felt that the I. L. O., in its long and useful history, has perhaps neglected the shores of the Pacific Ocean, but the decisions of the recent conference have reassured me.

The Conference, to sum up, threw out a few handfuls of extremely difficult problems at an embattled world and raised some of the most important issues of a stable peace. It has, I am glad to say, found no panacea, for panaceas do not exist; it has not solved the problems or met the issues, of course, but it has offered hope that the problems are not insoluble, the issues not unsurmountable. It has created follow-up machinery in the form of governing body committees to advance the work begun in Philadelphia, while its secretariat has the mandate to undertake studies and organize further meetings—all of which tend toward the goal of peace through social justice.

All delegates were shocked and grieved at the death during the period of the Conference of two of its members, Mr. Oscar Hieremans Brockmann, of Chile, and Mr. Abdelmagid Ramzy, of Egypt.

I wish to close my account of the Conference on a personal note. Miss Frances Perkins, as head of the United States delegation, and chairman of its most important committee, performed a difficult task in a way which won admiration from all. Her vigor and skill in negotiation commanded respect; her personal charm and humor brought her the affection of all delegates. The International Labor Organization owes much to her vitality and forcefulness.

In order to expand this bare sketch of the Philadelphia Conference, I beg the unanimous consent of the Senate to introduce the following documents into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

1. Text of the Declaration of Philadelphia (contained in Provisional Record No. 16, pp. 2, 3, 4).

2. Text of the resolution concerning social provisions in the peace settlement (contained in Provisional Record No. 34, pp. 7, 8, 9, 10).

3. Text of the resolution concerning economic policies for the attainment of social objectives (contained in Provisional Record No. 28, pp. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12).

4. Text of the recommendation concerning employment organization in the transition from war to peace (contained in Provisional Record No. 33, pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14).

5. Text of resolution concerning constitutional practice of the I. L. O. and its relationship with other bodies (contained in the Provisional Record No. 21, pp. 2, 3).

[From the International Labour Conference Provisional Record, No. 16]

TEXT OF THE PROPOSED DECLARATION CONCERNING THE AIMS AND PURPOSES OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION SUBMITTED BY THE SPECIAL DRAFTING COMMITTEE

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation, meeting in its Twenty-sixth Session in Philadelphia, hereby adopts, this day of May in the year nineteen hundred and forty-four, the present Declaration of the aims and purposes of the International Labour Organisation and of the principles which should inspire the policy of its Members.

I

The Conference reaffirms the fundamental principles on which the Organisation is based and, in particular, that:

(a) labour is not a commodity;

(b) freedom of expression and of association are essential to sustained progress;

(c) poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere;

(d) the war against want requires to be carried on with unrelenting vigour within each nation, and by continuous and concerted international effort in which the representatives of workers and employers, enjoying equal status with those of Governments, join with them in free discussion and democratic decision with a view to the promotion of the common welfare.

II

Believing that experience has fully demonstrated the truth of the statement in the Preamble to the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation that lasting peace can be established only if it is based on social justice, the Conference affirms that:

(a) all human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity;

(b) the attainment of the conditions in which this shall be possible must constitute the central aim of national and international policy;

(c) all national and international policies and measures, in particular those of an economic and financial character, should be judged in this light and accepted only insofar as they may be held to promote and not to hinder the achievement of this fundamental objective;

(d) it is a responsibility of the International Labour Organisation to examine and consider all international economic and financial policies and measures in the light of this fundamental objective;

(e) in discharging the tasks entrusted to it the International Labour Organisation, having considered all relevant economic and financial factors, may include in its decisions and recommendations any provisions which it considers appropriate.

III

The Conference recognises the solemn obligation of the International Labour Organisation to further among the nations of the world programmes which will achieve:

(a) full employment and the raising of standards of living;

(b) the employment of workers in the occupations in which they can have the satisfaction of giving the fullest measure of their skill and attainments and make their greatest contribution to the common well-being;

(c) the provision, as a means to the attainment of this end and under adequate guarantees for all concerned, of facilities for training and the transfer of labour, including migration for employment and settlement;

(d) policies in regard to wages and earnings, hours, and other conditions of work calculated to ensure a just share of the fruits of progress to all, and a minimum living wage to all employed and in need of such protection;

(e) the effective recognition of the right of collective bargaining, the cooperation of management and labour in the continuous improvement of productive efficiency, and the collaboration of workers and employers in the preparation and application of social and economic measures;

(f) the extension of social security measures to provide a basic income to all in need of such protection and comprehensive medical care;

(g) adequate protection for the life and health of workers in all occupations;

(h) provision for child welfare and maternity protection;

(i) the provision of adequate nutrition, housing, and facilities for recreation and culture;

(j) the assurance of equality of educational and vocational opportunity.

IV

Confident that the fuller and broader utilisation of the world's productive resources necessary for the achievement of the objectives set forth in this declaration can be secured by effective international and national action, including measures to expand production and consumption, to avoid severe economic fluctuations, to promote the economic and social advancement of the less developed regions of the world, to assure greater stability in world prices of primary products, and to promote a high and steady volume of international trade, the Conference pledges the full co-operation of the International Labour Organisation with such international bodies as may be entrusted with a share of the responsibility for this great task and for the promotion of the health, education and well-being of all peoples.

V

The Conference affirms that the principles set forth in this declaration are fully applicable to all peoples everywhere and that, while the manner of their application must be determined with due regard to the stage of social and economic development reached by each people, their progressive application to peoples who are still dependent, as well as to those who have already achieved self-government, is a matter of concern to the whole civilised world.

[From the International Labour Conference Provisional Record, No. 21]

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION AND CONSTITUTIONAL PRACTICE OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL BODIES

The General Conference resolves that:

1. During periods of emergency when, in the judgment of the Governing Body, the efficient operation of the Organisation or of the Office will be advanced thereby, and the Governing Body so notifies the Members of the Organisation, it shall provide that, supplementary to the normal procedure, the following communications should be transmitted through the Director:

(a) the communication to members of certified copies of Recommendations and Conventions in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article 19 of the Constitution of the Organisation;

(b) the communication by members of the information concerning the action taken in regard to Recommendations required by paragraph 6 of Article 19 of the Constitution;

(c) the communication by Members of the formal ratifications of International Labour Conventions in accordance with paragraph 7 of Article 19 of the Constitution and the relevant provisions of the individual Conventions;

(d) the communication to members of all notifications required by the terms of International Labour Conventions.

2. The Conference requests the Governing Body:

(a) to take effective steps as promptly as possible to deal with problems common to a region or to a particular industry, with due regard to the Constitution and principles of the Organisation, and its competence, and

(b) to report to the next general session of the Conference the steps taken and plans for the further regionalisation of the Office and of the Organisation and for special consideration of the problems of particular industries.

3. The Conference requests the Governing Body during the period of the deliberations of the committee to be established under the terms of this resolution and of the development of an overall pattern of international institutions, to take appropriate steps to assure close collaboration with and a full exchange of information between the I.L.O. and any other public international organisations which now exist or may be established for the promotion of economic and social well-being, and in the furtherance of this objective it may instruct the director to arrange with such organisations, on conditions mutually agreeable, for

(a) the exchange of information, views, reports, studies and other documents regarding policies and measures of mutual interest and concern at appropriate stages in their formulation and execution, and:

(b) the exchange of representatives without vote, at meetings convened by this Organisation and such other organisations, and:

(c) the creation and maintenance of such joint committees as may facilitate their effective co-operation.

4. The Conference requests the Governing Body.

(a) to appoint a committee as soon as possible to consider the future constitutional development of the Organisation. The committee shall particularly consider the following matters in active collaboration with the office, and in the light of the Report on Item I submitted by the office the resolutions and amendments submitted to the Conference, the views expressed in the Conference and any suggestions which may be communicated to the office by governments:

(1) the relationship of the Organisation to other international bodies;

(2) the constitutional practice of the Organisation and its clarification and codification;

(3) the status, immunities and other facilities to be accorded to the Organisation by Governments as necessary to the efficient discharge of the responsibilities of the Organisation;

(4) the methods of financing the Organisation;

(b) after receiving and considering the Report of the Committee to bring to the attention of the Conference at its next general session such matters as in its judgment require action by the Conference.

5. The Conference requests the Governing Body to appoint representatives with power to negotiate, if necessary prior to the next general session of the Conference, with international authorities on behalf of the Organisation concerning any constitutional questions which at any time require immediate action, including the matters referred to in paragraph 4.

6. The Conference authorises the Governing Body to decide the place at which the Twenty-seventh Session of the Conference shall be held. In the event of a maritime session being convened in the near future, this authorisation shall apply to the Twenty-seventh and Twenty-eighth Sessions.

[From the International Labour Conference Provisional Record, No. 28]

A. PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING ECONOMIC POLICIES FOR THE ATTAINMENT OF SOCIAL OBJECTIVES

Whereas the prospect of a complete victory of the United Nations makes it possible to prepare a better world order directed towards the achievement of the social objectives which these nations proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter in expressing their desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security; and

Where as these objectives of the United Nations coincide with the basic principles of the International Labour Organisation, and the International Labour Conference, meeting in New York in 1941, pledged the full collaboration of the International Labour Organisation in their implementation; and

Whereas the International Labour Conference is called upon by Item II on the Agenda of the present Session to make recommendations to the United Nations for present and post-war social policy concerning more especially the measures required to be taken internationally and nationally to ensure full employment, social security and rising standards of living; and

Whereas the initiative with regard to international policy lies with the United Nations at the present time, and it is desirable in order to attain the objectives referred to that all nations should pursue an appropriate national policy; and

Whereas the attainment of full employment and high productivity by the various nations after the war is essential to the achievement of freedom from want, the attainment of increasing living standards, the realisation of genuine economic security, and the continuation of peaceful economic progress; and

Whereas full employment can be achieved and maintained only through the adoption, by governments, industry and labour, of policies and measures which effectively encourage the continuing expansion of production and improvement of distribution; and

Whereas the speedy achievement of full employment requires the prompt and orderly reconversion, reconstruction and expansion of industry, trade, commerce and agriculture after the war, and the subsequent maintenance of employment and production at high levels requires the creation of an economic and social environment conducive to a progressive and expanding economy;

The Conference adopts the following resolution:

I. INTERNATIONAL POLICY

1. Believing that the relief of war-stricken peoples, repatriation of prisoners and exiles and resumption of agricultural and industrial production are matters which will be of the utmost urgency immediately on the liberation of occupied countries and that on the successful handling of these problems the possibility of achieving the long-range objectives of social and economic well-being will largely depend,

The Conference welcomes the creation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, urges all States concerned to co-operate actively in the achievement of the tasks entrusted to it and assures the Administration of the readiness of the International Labour Organisation to assist it in every appropriate way.

2. In view of the fact that for varying periods after the end of hostilities many essential commodities and transport facilities will be in short supply, and that international arrangements will be needed to ensure a fair allocation of available supplies and prevent excessive price movements,

The Conference considers that the Governments of the United Nations concerned should arrange to continue in operation, for such periods as any serious shortages may persist, the existing machinery of international co-ordination and control subject to such modification, and in particular to such enlargement of the membership of the authorities concerned, as may contribute to the equitable and efficient operation of such machinery in the transition from war to peace.

3. The Conference endorses the declaration of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture held in May 1943, that while the primary responsibility lies with each nation for seeing that its own people have the food needed for life and health, each nation can fully achieve this goal only if all co-operate in appropriate international action, and urges the setting up of a permanent international organisation, as recommended by the Conference on Food and Agriculture, to raise the level of nutrition and improve the efficiency of agricultural production and distribution.

4. Recognising that a satisfactory international monetary system is essential to the full development of mutually advantageous economic relations between nations, and consequently to the raising of standards of living.

The Conference attaches great importance to the establishment at the earliest possible moment of effective international machinery for settling balances arising out of international trade and other transactions and for maintaining stability in rates of exchange, notes with satisfaction that the Governments of the United Nations are giving careful attention to this matter and urges that they include in any agreement establishing such machinery a provision requiring the authorities responsible for its application to have regard in framing and applying their policies to the effect of their decisions on employment and living standards.

5. Noting that imports of capital will be needed for reconstruction, development and the raising of living standards in many countries, and believing that the provision of such capital will contribute to the maintenance of full employment in the lending countries,

The Conference:

(a) considers that the existing machinery of the international capital market should be supplemented by the establishment of appropriate international machinery for the purpose of promoting the international movement of capital;

(b) considers that the promotion of full employment and higher living standards should be regarded as a primary objective of any such international machinery;

(c) considers that the authorities responsible for the operation of such international machinery should consult the International Labour Organisation as to the appropriateness of including in the terms under which development works financed in whole or in part through such machinery are to be carried out, provisions regarding the welfare and working conditions of the labour employed; and that such provisions should be framed in consultation with the International Labour Organisation;

(d) affirms the readiness of the International Labour Organisation to render every assistance in its power in determining the appropriateness of the inclusion of such provisions and in their framing and application and in the promotion through the operations of such international machinery of the general objectives of full employment and higher living standards.

6. Recognising the great contribution which the international exchange of goods and services can make to higher living standards and to high levels of employment,

The Conference:

(a) believes that the measures proposed in the foregoing paragraphs for the promotion of exchange stabilisation and international lending will contribute to the expansion of international trade, but considers that the United Nations should also examine wartime changes in industrial capacity, and arrange for exchange of information on post-war industrial programmes and should take vigorous action to promote the expansion of international trade by appropriate commercial policies; and considers that all countries, creditor as well as debtor, should adapt their commercial policy in such a way as to enable them to settle all obligations arising out of international transactions;

(b) considers that the United Nations should initiate measures to facilitate the co-ordination through appropriate international machinery of the commercial policies of all countries for the purpose of promoting a steady expansion in world trade on a multilateral basis;

(c) considers that in such co-ordination special consideration should be given to the need of countries which are highly dependent on returns from exports to take measures to ensure a high degree of stability in the level of their economic activity and observes that the need for these measures will decrease to the extent that international collaboration proves successful; and

(d) considers that in such co-ordination special account should be taken of the dislocation and the accumulated needs resulting from the devastation caused by war operations and from the prolonged diversion from peacetime production in countries which have been engaged for a long period in a sustained and total war effort.

7. In order to lay the foundation for rising levels of consumption throughout the world and at the same time to ensure more stable and adequate incomes to those primary producers whose services are needed for the production of essential raw materials and foodstuffs.

The Conference considers that the United Nations should initiate concerted action designed to ensure the constant availability to all purchasers of adequate supplies of such commodities at prices which gave a reasonable return to the efficient producer and are held sufficiently stable to afford protection against major short-term fluctuations in supply or demand; and that such international arrangements (a) should provide for adequate representation of consumers as well as producers, representing both importing and exporting countries, in all authorities responsible for the determination and application of policy, and (b) should aim to assure to all workers, including the self-employed, engaged in the production of the commodities concerned, fair remuneration, satisfactory working conditions and adequate social security protection, having regard to the general standards in the countries concerned.

8. Believing that migratory movements may play an important part in the development of a dynamic economy, and that disorderly international migration may create economic and social dislocation in the countries concerned and involve serious individual hardship for the migrants themselves, while desirable migratory movements are often hampered by technichal and financial difficulties which can be overcome only through international cooperation,

The Conference considers that:

(a) The United Nations should encourage by appropriate measures, with adequate safeguards for all concerned, the orderly migration of labour and settled in accordance with the economic needs and social conditions prevailing in the various countries, and in this connection should note the Conclusions adopted by the Conference of Experts on Technical and Financial Co-operation with regard to Migration for Settlement held at the International Labour Office in 1938;

(b) Arrangements should be made for close co-operation between the International Labour Organisation and any public international agency established to deal with migration;

(c) The Governing Body should take steps to bring before an early session of the Conference a report of a representative commission, with such technical assistance as it may require, on the means necessary to protect the interests of labour, on the one hand, against barriers which prevent migration from areas of limited resources, and on the other hand, against the lowering of the labour standards that might result from immigration at a rate exceeding the capacity of the receiving countries to absorb immigrants.

9. In order that re-employment may be expedited and healthy living standards established within a period of minimum duration in areas liberated from Axis occupation,

The Conference recommends that arrangements be made by those nations whose productive capacities have been maintained during the war, by all other nations which are in a position to make materials available and by the appropriate international organisations, to give the highest priority consistent with the exigencies of war to immediately supplying the territories liberated from Axis occupation with materials and equipment required for industrial installations, agriculture, transport, public works and utilities of an essential character.

10. Believing that the best possible conditions for a rise in the standard of living and the maintenance of full employment in the world can only be obtained by mutually consistent national economic, financial and social policies and by co-ordination of the activities of the different international institutions in this field.

The Conference considers that appropriate international measures should be taken which guarantee sufficient contact and consultation with regard to such policies between governments as well as between the different international institutions.

II. NATIONAL POLICY

11. In order that full employment at productive peacetime pursuits, freedom from want, rising standards of living and genuine economic security may be achieved with a minimum of delay after the war,

The Conference urges that governments and employers' and workers' organisations formulate comprehensive and co-ordinated programmes, suited to the particular needs of their countries, for prompt and orderly reconversion, reconstruction and economic expansion, and that such programmes be prepared and applied simultaneously with the consideration of the international measures referred to in the preceding paragraphs.

12. Recognising that the economic situation will differ markedly among the various countries at the war's end, varying particularly with the degree and type of industrial development, the extent to which the peacetime economy has been disrupted by the war, and whether the country's territory has been occupied by the enemy; and recognizing that national post-war economic programmes must vary accordingly, in order to meet most effectively the needs of the country in which they are to be applied.

The Conference urges that, with due allowance for difference in national economic situations, programmes for economic reconversion, reconstruction and expansion include the development of sound policies and procedures to provide:

(a) Effective arrangements for the orderly and expeditious demobilisation and repatriation, and for the early absorption in productive peacetime employment of members of the armed forces, civilian workers, prisoners, persons who have resisted deportation, deported persons and refugees, for the prompt termination of contracts and settlement of claims, the prompt determination of policy on the peacetime use of Government-owned war production capacity and equipment and the disposition of surplus materials, with a view to the use of these items to satisfy human needs, and liberal provision for the maintenance, educational training and retraining of persons unavoidably out of employment as recommended by the 26th Session of the International Labour Conference in its Recommendation concerning employment organisation in the transition from war to peace;

(b) Retention, as long as shortages exist, of such war-created economic controls—for example, price and exchange controls and rationing—as are necessary to prevent inflation, and the relaxation of such controls as rapidly thereafter as is consistent with the public welfare;

(c) Adjustment of tax systems to encourage rapid reconversion, reconstruction and economic expansion, while maintaining an equitable distribution of tax burdens and avoiding financial measures which tend to increase the dangers of inflation or deflation;

(d) Development of effective mechanisms for adequate financing of the reconversion, reconstruction and expansion of industry, trade, commerce and agriculture, and particularly to assist the establishment of new and efficient enterprises.

13. The Conference urges that all practicable measures be taken to maintain a high and steady level of employment, to minimise fluctuations in business activity, and to assure a steadily expanding volume of production, more particularly by means of:

(a) Fiscal, monetary and other measures, including useful public works, to sustain the volume of demand for goods and services at a high level while avoiding the dangers of an inflationary spiral of prices and wages—in this connection attention should be paid, among other measures, to such methods as an adequate income security system, and to properly timed public works financed by borrowing in periods of depression, in accordance with the Public Works (National Planning) Recommendation, 1937;

(b) Measures to discourage monopolistic practices and to encourage technological progress, to maintain a reasonably flexible system of prices and wages, to encourage the transfer of workers and productive resources from declining to expanding industries, and to attain a high degree of mobility of resources and freedom of access to alternative employments;

(c) Measures to provide adequate incentives to engage in and expand constructive economic activity, to encourage private investment and to maintain the rate of investment—among the measures which warrant careful consideration in this connection are the adjustment of tax systems, removal of artificial barriers limiting access to resources and markets, the relaxation of unreasonable restrictions imposed by governmental agencies or by business or by labour organisations, and the maintenance of a high and stable demand for goods;

(d) Measures to provide adequate opportunity for workers to engage in productive activity and to obtain advancement—among the measures which warrant careful consideration in this connection are the provision of improved and more generally accessible educational and training facilities, provision of higher nutritional and health standards, improvement of public employment services, increased provision against economic insecurity, the maintenance of wages at a high level, and the protection, extension and improvement of collective bargaining procedures.

[From the International Labour Conference Provisional Record, No. 33]

TEXT OF THE RECOMMENDATION (No. —) CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT ORGANISATION IN THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE, SUBMITTED BY THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Philadelphia by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-sixth Session on 20 April 1944, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the organisation of employment in the transition from war to peace which is the third Item on the Agenda of the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of a Recommendation,

adopts, this ——— day of May, of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-four, the following Recommendation which may be cited as the Employment (Transition from War to Peace) Recommendation, 1944:

Whereas the promotion of full employment with a view to satisfying the vital needs of the population and raising the standard of living throughout the world is a primary objective of the International Labour Organisation;

Whereas in order to achieve full employment economic measures providing employment opportunities must be supplemented by effective organisation to help employers to secure the most suitable workers, to help workers to find the most suitable employment, and generally to ensure that, at any given moment, the necessary skills are available and are distributed satisfactorily among

the various branches of production and the various areas; and

Whereas the character and magnitude of the employment adjustments required during the transition from war to peace will necessitate special action, more particularly for the purpose of facilitating the reemployment of demobilised members of the armed forces, discharged war workers, and all persons whose usua' employment has been interrupted as a result of the war, enemy action, or resistance to the enemy or enemy-dominated authorities, by assisting the persons concerned to find without delay the most suitable employment;

The Conference recommends the members of the Organisation to apply the following general principles, and in so doing to take into account, according to national conditions, the suggested methods of application, and to communicate information to the International Labour Office, as requested by the Governing Body, concerning the measures taken to give effect to these principles.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

I. Each Government should collect whatever information is necessary regarding workers seeking or likely to be seeking employment and regarding prospective employment opportunities, with a view to ensuring the most rapid reabsorption or redistribution in suitable employment of all persons who desire to work.

II. The demobilisation of the armed forces and of assimilated services and the repatriation of prisoners of war, persons who have been deported, and others, should be planned with the objective of maximum fairness to individuals and maximum opportunities for satisfactory re-establishment in civil life.

III. National programmes for industrial demobilisation and reconversion should be planned, in co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations, and other adequate measures taken, in such manner as to facilitate the most rapid attainment of full employment for the production of needed goods and services.

IV. In the organisation of full employment in the transition period and thereafter, the widest possible use of employment service facilities by employers seeking workers and by workers seeking employment should be encouraged by the competent authorities and by employers' and workers' organisations.

V. Each Government should, to the maximum extent possible, provide public vocational guidance facilities, available to persons seeking work, with a view to assisting them to find the most suitable employment.

VI. Training and retraining programmes should be developed to the fullest possible extent in order to meet the needs of the workers who will have to be re-established in employment or provided with new employment.

VII. With a view to avoiding the need for excessive movements of workers from one area to another and preventing localised unemployment in particular areas, each Government should, in co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations, formulate a positive policy in regard to the location of industry and the diversification of economic activity. Governments should also take steps to facilitate any necessary mobility of labour, both occupational and geographical.

VIII. Efforts should be made during the transition period to provide the widest possible opportunities for acquiring skill for juveniles and young workers who were unable, because of the war, to undertake or to complete their training and efforts should also be made to improve the education and health supervision of young persons.

IX. The redistribution of women workers in each national economy should be carried out on the principle of complete equality of opportunity for men and women in respect of admission to employment on the basis of their individual merit, skill and experience, and steps should be taken to encourage the establishment of wage rates on the basis of job content, without regard to sex.

X. Disabled workers, whatever the origin of their disability, should be provided with full opportunities for rehabilitation, specialised vocational guidance, training and retraining, and employment on useful work.

XI. Measures should be taken to regularise employment within the industries and occupations in which work is irregular, in order to achieve full use of the capacities of the workers.

METHODS OF APPLICATION

I. Advanced collection of information

1. Each Government should arrange for the coordinated collection and utilisation of as complete and up-to-date information as possible on:

(a) the number, educational, and occupational backgrounds, past and present skills, and occupational wishes of members of the armed forces and of assimilated services, and as far as possible of all persons whose usual employment has been interrupted as the result of enemy action or resistance to the enemy or enemy-dominated authorities;

(b) the number, location, industrial distribution, sex distribution, skills and occupational wishes of workers who will have to change their employment during the transition from war to peace; and

(c) the number and distribution of older workers, women and juveniles who are likely to withdraw from gainful employment after the war emergency and the number of juveniles who are likely to be seeking employment on leaving school.

2. (1) Comprehensive material on prospective labour requirements, showing the probable extent and timing of the demand for workers from each major industry, both in total and by major skills, should be collected and analysed before the end of the war.

(2) Where such information is in the possession of any administrative authority, it should be made available to the authorities primarily responsible for the collection or utilisation of advance information on labour supply and requirements.

(3) The material on labour requirements should cover more particularly:

(a) the probable contraction of labour requirements resulting from the closing of certain munitions undertakings;

(b) the probable rate of contraction of the armed forces and of assimilated services upon the termination of hostilities;

(c) probable fluctuations and changes by areas in the labour force of industries or undertakings which will, with or without a period of conversion, continue in operation to meet peacetime needs;

(d) probable labour requirements in industries which will be expanding to meet peacetime needs, in particular in industries the output of which is most urgently needed to improve the standard of living of the workers, and in public works, including works of a normal character and works held in reserve for the provision of supplementary employment in periods of declining economic activity; and

(e) the probable demand for workers in the main industries and occupations under conditions of full employment.

3. Prospective labour supply and demand in the various areas should be kept under constant review by the appropriate authorities, in order to show the effect of the war and the probable effect of the termination of hostilities on the employment situation in each of these areas.

4. Members should co-operate in collecting the information referred to in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 1 in respect of persons transferred out of their own countries as a result of Axis aggression. Each Government should supply such information in respect of nationals of other Members living in its territory, in Axis territories, or in territory occupied by the Axis who are awaiting repatriation, even where the information available is merely of a general character.

II. Demobilization of the armed forces

5. Close contact should be organised and maintained between the employment service and the authorities responsible for the demobilisation of the armed forces and assimilated services and for the repatriation of prisoners of war and persons who have been deported, in order to ensure the speediest re-employment of the men and women concerned.

6. (1) The rate and order of demobilisation should be controlled according to clearly expressed and clearly understood principles which should be given wide publicity in order that they may be clearly understood.

(2) In the process of demobilisation, which should in general be as rapid as military necessity and transportation facilities permit, consideration should be given to:

(a) the desirability of regulating the rate and distributing the flow of demobilisation so as to avoid local concentrations of ex-service men and women disproportionate to the capacity of their community to provide opportunity for employment or training;

(b) the desirability of arranging, where necessary, for an early release of workers whose qualifications make them indispensable for urgent reconstruction work.

7. (1) Schemes for reinstating in their former employment persons whose usual employment has been interrupted by military mobilisation, enemy action, or resistance to the enemy or enemy-dominated authorities, should be adopted and carried out so far as changed post-war circumstances allow.

(2) The fullest possible employment and advancement opportunities for these men and women, on the basis of their qualifications, should be assured through Government action and collective agreements.

(3) Immediate alternative employment should be secured for the workers displaced by the operation of these schemes.

8. In addition to schemes for re-employment, immediate consideration should be given to the provision, wherever justified by prospective opportunities to make a living, of adequate financial and other assistance to enable qualified demobilised persons to settle or resettle on the land, to enter or re-enter a profession, or to take up other independent work.

III. Industrial demobilisation and conversion

9. (1) Each Government should, in cooperation with employers' and workers' organisations, formulate a national industrial demobilisation and reconversion programme to facilitate the rapid and orderly conversion of the economy from wartime to peacetime requirements during the period of reconstruction, account being taken of the urgent need of countries devastated by the war, with a view to attaining full employment with the least possible delay. All information in regard to the demobilisation and reconversion programme should be made available to the authorities responsible for collecting advance information on labour supply and requirements.

(2) The co-operation of employers' and workers' organisations should be invited with a view to working out comprehensive industry and area demobilisation and reconversion programmes to facilitate the change-over from war to peace production in a manner that will minimise transitional unemployment.

10. (1) Each Government should, so far as possible before the end of the war, determine its policy in regard to the peacetime use of Government-owned war production capacity and equipment and in regard to the disposition of surplus materials.

(2) Special consideration should be given to the early release of factories and equipment urgently needed for peacetime production or training.

(3) In general, factories, equipment or materials should not be destroyed or kept out of use where human needs are unsatisfied or where no excess production would exist at reasonable prices under conditions of demand associated with full employment.

11. Each Government should, in formulating its policy and procedure for the termination or adjustment of war contracts, given special consideration to the possibilities of continued employment or rapid re-employment of the workers affected or of favourable opportunities for employment in other areas. Governments should also arrange for the prompt settlement of claims under terminated contracts, so that employment will not be held back by needless financial difficulties of contractors. Contractors in countries at present occupied who have worked voluntarily in the interest of the enemy should not be granted the benefit of such arrangements.

12. (1) Arrangements should be made to ensure that administrative authorities give information at the earliest possible moment to the employment service and contractors regarding any circumstances likely to cause dismissals or lay-offs.

(2) Procurement agencies should give contractors both at home and abroad and the employment service as long advance notice as possible of cut-backs in war orders. In no case should the notice given be less than two weeks.

(3) Employers should give the employment service at least two weeks' advance notice of proposed dismissals affecting more than a specified number of workers, in order to enable the employment service to make plans for alternative employment for the workers concerned.

(4) Employers should give the employment service at least two weeks' advance notice of proposed temporary lay-offs affecting more than a specified number of workers, together with information to show the probable duration of such lay-offs, in order to enable the employment service to find temporary public or private employment or training for the laid-off workers. Employers should so far as possible inform the laid-off workers of the expected duration of such lay-offs.

IV. Applications for work and for workers

13. (1) Vacancies on public works and in undertakings working on public orders to the extent of 75 per cent. or more of their operations should be filled through the employment service.

(2) Consideration should be given to the advisability of requiring employers in specified industries or areas to engage their workers through the employment service in order to facilitate the readjustment of employment.

(3) Employers should be encouraged to give advance notice of their labour requirements to the employment service.

14. Persons applying for employment on Government-sponsored projects, as well as persons applying for publicly supported training programmes or transfer assistance, or claiming unemployment benefit or allowance, should be required to register with the employment service.

15. Special efforts should be made to assist demobilised members of the forces and war workers to find the most suitable work of which they are capable, making use wherever possible of the skills acquired by them during the war.

16. Every effort should be made, by the authorities, and in particularly by the employment service, in co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations, to encourage as wide a use as possible of the employment service by employers and workers.

V. Vocational guidance

17. Special and immediate attention should be given to the development of suitable methods and techniques of vocational guidance for adult workers.

18. In cases of prolonged unemployment, the use of vocational guidance facilities should be made a condition for the continued receipt of unemployment benefit or allowance.

19. The competent authorities should, in co-operation with the private bodies concerned, develop and maintain adequate training facilities for vocational guidance officers.

VI. Training and retraining programmes

20. On the basis of information concerning labour supply and demand in the post-war period, each Government should, in close co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations, formulate a national training and retraining programme, geared to the post-war needs of the economy and taking into account changes in the different skill requirements of each industry.

21. Every possible step should be taken to facilitate the occupational mobility necessary to adjust the supply of workers to present and prospective labour requirements.

22. Training and retraining programmes should be extended and adapted to meet the needs of demobilised persons, discharged war workers, and all persons whose usual employment has been interrupted as the result of enemy action or resistance to the enemy or enemy-dominated authorities. Special emphasis should be placed on courses of training designed to fit the persons concerned for employment which offers a permanent career.

23. In addition to apprenticeship schemes, systematic methods of training, retraining and upgrading workers should be developed to meet post-war needs for the reconstitution and expansion of the skilled labour force.

24. Persons undertaking training should be paid, where necessary, remuneration or allowances which provide an inducement to undergo and continue training and are sufficient to maintain a reasonable standard of life.

25. Men and women whose higher training and education has been prevented or interrupted by war service, whether in a military or civilian capacity, or by enemy action, or by resistance to the enemy or enemy dominated authorities, should be enabled to enter upon or resume and complete their training and education, subject to continued proof of merit and promise, and should be paid allowances during their training and education.

26. (1) Qualified vocational teachers and instructors who have been engaged in other work during the war should be encouraged to resume their previous occupation at the earliest possible moment.

(2) Refresher courses should be organised in case of need:

(a) for vocational instructors returning to their work after a lengthy absence; and

(b) for teaching new methods and techniques.

(3) Additional vocational teachers and instructors should be trained in the numbers required to meet the needs of the training and retraining programme.

(4) Members should co-operate, where necessary, in reconstituting and expanding vocational training and retraining, by such methods as:

(a) the provision in one country of training as instructors for persons from another country to enable them to acquire broader skill or training not available in their own country;

(b) the loan of experienced vocational instructors and teachers' from one country to help meet shortages of vocational training staff or new industrial needs in another country:

(c) facilitating the return to the territories of member countries of subjects thereof living in the territory of another member country who are qualified for teaching and instructing in their home country; and

(d) the provisions of training handbooks and other equipment to assist instructors and persons in training.

27. Training and retraining services should be co-ordinated on a national, regional and local basis, and should be closely associated at all levels of operation with guidance work, with the placement work of the employment service, and with the training activities of employers' and workers' organisations.

VII. Geographical mobility

28. With a view to facilitating the necessary mobility of labour, the employment service should take action to overcome the obstacles to transfers from one area to another and to assist the movement of workers to areas needing labour, thereby helping to bring together available skills and available employment opportunities and thus preventing unemployment.

29. (1) Where a worker is transferred from one area to another on the initiative or with the consent of the employment service, arrangements should be made to grant travelling expenses and to assist the worker to meet initial expenses in the new place of work by granting or advancing him a specified amount, fixed according to the circumstances.

(2) Where a temporary transfer made through the employment service involves the separation of the head of the household from his family, arrangements should be made to grant an appropriate separation allowance to cover the added costs of maintaining double living quarters.

VIII. Employment of young workers

30. (1) The policy of revising upward the school-leaving age and the age for admission to employment should be considered by all countries as a primary factor in planning employment policy for the transition period.

(2) Maintenance allowances should be granted to parents by the competent authorities during the additional period of compulsory education referred to above.

31. Student-aid programmes should be developed to enable young persons above the school-leaving age to continue their education in secondary schools or high schools, and for those beyond the secondary school level, subject to continued proof of merit, in technical or higher education schools or courses on a full-time basis.

32. (1) Vocational guidance services adapted to their needs should be available for all young persons, both prior to and at the time of leaving school, through the school or the employment service.

(2) Free pre-employment medical examination should be provided for all young persons. The results of this examination should be incorporated in a certificate to serve as a basis for periodical re-examinations during a period to be prescribed by national laws or regulations.

(3) In countries in which war conditions and enemy occupation have undermined the health of young persons, particular attention should be given to the health supervision of such persons from the time of their admission to employment through the period of adjustment to working life, and, where necessary, measures of physical rehabilitation should be adopted.

(4) Members should co-operate, when requested, in providing for the training of medical and nursing staff, and the loan of experienced doctors, surgeons, nursing personnel and appropriate equipment, in order to facilitate the physical rehabilitation of the young persons referred to in sub-paragraph (3) above.

33. (1) Young persons whose contracts of apprenticeship have been interrupted owing to the war should be entitled to resume apprenticeship on the termination of their war service.

(2) State aid should be made available to enable a person whose apprenticeship has been resumed in accordance with sub-paragraph (1) above to be assured of an income which is reasonable, having regard to his age and to the remuneration he would have been receiving had his apprenticeship not been interrupted.

(3) In all cases in which military service, raw material shortages, enemy action, or other war circumstances, have prevented young persons from entering or continuing apprenticeship, arrangements should be made to encourage them, as soon as circumstances permit, to resume their apprenticeship or to learn a skilled trade.

(4) With a view to encouraging the resumption of interrupted apprenticeships, arrangements should be made to review the provisions of apprenticeship contracts and to vary them where this seems equitable to take account of training, skill or experience acquired during war service.

(5) Existing apprenticeship programmes should be re-examined, in co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations, with a view to giving wider opportunities to learn a skilled trade to the younger workers who have not been able, owing to the war, to enter apprenticeship. More particularly, consideration should be given to making arrangements for varying existing restrictions on admission to apprenticeship and for taking into account any training, skill or experience acquired during the war.

34. Employers should be encouraged to introduce programmes of systematic in-plant training to enable all the young workers employed in the undertaking to acquire training or to improve their skill and broaden their knowledge of the operations of the undertaking as a whole. Such programmes should be developed in co-operation with workers' organisations and should be adequately supervised.

35. In countries which have been invaded during the war, and in which there are young persons who have been compelled to abstain from work, or, without regard to their aptitudes or desires, to work for the enemy, special attention should be devoted to the readjustment of such young persons to work habits and to supplementing their vocational training.

IX. Employment of women

36. The redistribution of women workers in the economy should be organised on the principle of complete equality of opportunity for men and women on the basis of their individual merit, skill and experience, without prejudice to the provisions of the International Labour Conventions and Recommendations concerning the employment of women.

37. (1) In order to place women on a basis of equality with men in the employment market, and thus to prevent competition among the available workers prejudicial to the interests of both men and women workers, steps should be taken to encourage the establishment of wage rates based on job content, without regard to sex.

(2) Investigations should be conducted, in co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations, for the purpose of establishing precise and objective standards for determining job content, irrespective of the sex of the worker, as a basis for determining wage rates.

38. The employment of women in industries and occupations in which large numbers of women have traditionally been employed should be facilitated by action to raise the relative status of these industries and occupations and to improve conditions of work and methods of placement therein.

X. Employment of disabled workers

39. The criterion for the training and employment of disabled workers should be the employability of the worker, whatever the origin of the disability.

40. There should be the closest collaboration between medical services for the disabled and vocational rehabilitation and placement services.

41. Specialised vocational guidance for the disabled should be developed in order to make it possible to assess each disabled worker's capacity and to select the most appropriate form of employment for him.

42. (1) Wherever possible, disabled workers should receive training in company with able-bodied workers, under the same conditions and with the same pay.

(2) Training should be continued to the point where the disabled person is able to enter employment as an efficient worker in the trade or occupation for which he has been trained.

(3) Wherever practicable, efforts should be made to retrain disabled workers in their former occupations or in related occupations where their previous qualifications would be useful.

(4) Employers with suitable training facilities should be induced to train a reasonable proportion of disabled workers.

(5) Specialised training centres, with appropriate medical supervision, should be provided for those disabled persons who require such special training.

43. (1) Special measures should be taken to ensure equality of employment opportunity for disabled workers on the basis of their working capacity. Employers should be induced by wide publicity and other means, and where necessary compelled, to employ a reasonable quota of disabled workers.

(2) In certain occupations particularly suitable for the employment of seriously-disabled workers, such workers should be given preference over all other workers.

(3) Efforts should be made, in close co-operation with employers' and workers' organisations, to overcome employment discriminations against disabled workers which are not related to their ability and job performance, and to overcome the obstacles to their employment including the possibility of increased liability in respect of workmen's compensation.

(4) Employment on useful work in special centres under non-competitive conditions should be made available for all disabled workers who cannot be made fit for normal employment.

44. Information should be assembled by the employment service in regard to the occupations particularly suited to different disabilities and the size, location and employability of the disabled population.

XI. Regularisation of employment in particular industries

45. In industries in which operations are irregular, such as construction and port transport, the schemes for the regularisation of employment adopted or extended during the war by Member States should be maintained and adapted to peacetime conditions in consultation with the employers' and workers' organisations concerned.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING SOCIAL PROVISIONS IN THE PEACE SETTLEMENT

Whereas the Conference is called upon to make recommendations to the United Nations for present and post-war social policy, and more particularly concerning the social provisions to be inscribed in the various general or special treaties or agreements to which the United Nations will jointly or severally become parties;

Whereas the prospect of a complete victory of the United Nations makes it possible to prepare a better world order directed towards the achievement of the social objectives which these nations proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter in expressing their desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security;

I

The Conference considers that the principles stated in the following draft are appropriate for inclusion in a general or special treaty or agreement between nations desirous of giving early effect to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and Article VII of the Mutual Aid agreement:

The signatory governments

Having pledged themselves to provide conditions which will ensure an increasing measure of freedom from want to their own peoples and to all peoples;

Recognizing, therefore, their common obligation to foster expanding production and employment on a sound basis, free from disruptive fluctuations, and to ensure that workers and productive resources shall not be allowed to be idle while the needs of large parts of the world remain unsatisfied;

Realizing that the economic life and conditions in each nation are increasingly dependent upon the economic life and conditions of other nations, and that hence the attainment of the above-stated objectives requires increasing collaboration among nations;

Have agreed that:

Article I

The Declaration of the Aims and Purposes of the International Labour Organisation adopted by the International Labour Conference at Philadelphia, 1944, the text of which is annexed, is hereby reaffirmed.

Article II

Each government recognizes its duty to maintain a high level of employment. Accordingly, all arrangements by and among the signatory and other like-minded governments for international economic cooperation should be framed and administered to serve the objectives set forth in Article I. They should be directed to the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods and to the liberation of economic activity from unreasonable restrictions. Particular consideration should be given to measures for promoting the reconstruction of economic life in countries whose economic and social life has been disrupted as the result of Axis aggression.

Article III

The following matters are of international concern and should be among the social objectives of international as well as national policy:

(1) Opportunity for useful and regular employment to all persons who want work, at fair wages or returns and under reasonable conditions, with provision for protection of health and against injury in all occupations;

(2) Raising standards of living to provide adequate nutrition, housing, medical care and education;

(3) Establishment of minimum standards of employment to prevent exploitation of workers, whether employed or self-employed, whose opportunities for high-wage employment are limited;

(4) Provision for child welfare;

(5) Provision for a regular flow of income to all those whose employment is interrupted by sickness or injury, by old age or by lack of employment opportunity;

(6) The effective recognition of the right of freedom of association and of collective bargaining;

(7) Provision of facilities for training and transfer of labour.

Article IV

The International Labour Office may, under standards constitutionally determined by the International Labour Conference, as occasion requires, collect from, and interchange with, the signatory governments, uniform statistical and other economic information on the following matters which are among those of direct interest to the International Labour Organisation and are of international concern:

(1) Employment, wages and conditions of work;

(2) Standards of living and the distribution of income, with particular reference to wage and salaried workers;

(3) Technical education and training for employment;

(4) Industrial health, safety and welfare;

(5) Industrial relations;

(6) Social security; and

(7) Administration of labour and social security legislation.

Article V

With respect to the matters set forth in Article III

(1) The governments, through appropriate international agencies, shall develop standards and statistical measures, and shall maintain uniform statistics and other information.

(2) The governments shall interchange among themselves and make available to the International Labour Organisation such information and reports as may be required to assist them and the Organisation to develop recommendations with respect to such matters.

(3) The government shall take appropriate steps to assure close collaboration and full exchange of information between the International Labour Organisation and any other international bodies which now exist or may be established for the promotion of economic advancement and social well-being.

(4) The governments shall take appropriate steps to have placed on the agenda of the International Labour Conference annually the subject of the extent to which the social objective set forth in Article I have been attained and on the measures taken during the year toward the attainment of the objectives.

Article VI

With respect to draft international conventions and recommendations adopted by the Conference in accordance with Article 19 of the constitution of the International Labour Organisation, the signatory governments undertake to report to the International Labour Office as requested by the Governing Body on the status of legislation and administration and, in so far as practicable, of practices under collective agreements between employers and workers.

II

The Conference recommends that the Governing Body of the International Labour Organisation:

(1) call a special conference of the Organisation when in its opinion there is a danger of a substantial fall in general employment levels for the purpose of recommending appropriate national or international measures to prevent the development or spread of unemployment and to establish conditions under which high levels of employment may be maintained or restored;

(2) correlate the activities of the I. L. O. toward the end of maintaining full employment with those of any other international agency or agencies which may be designated by the United Nations to have primary responsibility in related economic fields.

III

The Conference Recommends that:

(1) The United Nations should undertake—

(a) to apply to any dependent territories in respect of which they have accepted or may accept a measure of international accountability through any international or regional commission or other body the principle that all policies designed to apply to dependent territories shall be primarily directed to the well-being and development of the peoples of such territories, and to the promotion of the desire on their part for social progress;

(b) to apply to such territories the provisions of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930; the Recruiting of Indigenous Workers Convention, 1936; the Contracts of Employment (Indigenous Workers) Convention, 1939, and the Penal Sanctions (Indigenous Workers) Convention, 1939;

(c) to make a periodical report to the International Labour Office in respect of each such territory indicating the extent to which effect has been given to the provisions of the Social Policy (Dependent Territories) Recommendation, 1944;

(d) to ask the International Labour Office to appoint, in continuation of the collaboration established in the case of the Permanent Mandates Commission, a representative on any Committee which may be entrusted with the task of watching over the application of the principle of international accountability, and further to ensure that any facilities which may be afforded, in the form of inspection or otherwise, for the better implementation of this principle, shall include appropriate measures for examining the application of the above-mentioned Conventions and Recommendation.

(2) When determining the future status of dependent territories which on 1 September 1939 were controlled by Axis Powers, the United Nations should specifically require the application thereto of the arrangements provided for in the preceding paragraph.

(3) In making international arrangements concerning transport by air, land, and inland waterway, the United Nations should have due regard to the repercussions of such arrangements on the working and living conditions of persons employed in transport, and should consult the International Labour Organisation in regard to such repercussions and more particularly in regard to the working and living conditions of persons who, in operating such transport systems, work in or under the jurisdiction of more than one country.

(4) The International Labour Organisation should make available to the United Nations any information or assistance calculated to facilitate the implementation of the proposals contained in the resolution concerning economic policies for the attainment of soial objectives and the present resolution and should be prepared to participate in any international conference which may be considering such proposals.

IV

Believing that the exceptional opportunity of the negotiations of the peace settlement should be taken to secure a concerted advance in the acceptance of binding obligations concerning conditions of labor;

The Conference reaffirming the principle of the association of management and labour in the framing of such standards,

Recommends

(a) That throughout the peace settlement the United Nations should wherever appropriate include provisions for labor standards. In a number of cases such provisions might properly be taken from conventions or recommendations that have been or may be adopted by the International Labour Conference.

(b) That the Governing Body should appoint a consultative committee on labour provisions in the peace settlement. This committee should hold itself in readiness, together with the Director of the International Labour Office, to give advice with reference to such provisions on the request of the United Nations or of particular groups of the United Nations. This committee should have the right to coopt additional members of special competence with respect to the particular sets of provisions under consideration.

(c) That the United Nations should make full use of this committee in any way in which they consider it appropriate to include labour provisions in the peace settlement.

V

The Conference recommends to Governments that a Conference of representatives of the Governments of the United, associated, and other Nations, willing to attend, be called at an early date, in association with the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, to consider an international agreement on domestic policies of employment and unemployment; and this Conference pledges the full co-operation and the assistance of the I. L. O. in calling such a conference on employment, and in helping to carry into effect appropriate decisions it might make.

Henry Bascom Steagall

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying a brief tribute to my beloved colleague and friend the late HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama.

When I first came to the House he was then a Member and had been for a number of years, and during his continuous service until he passed away last November, I knew him intimately and well. He was one of the outstanding Members of the House and was always one of the leaders, and his high position as Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency gave him the privilege of shaping and molding much legislation during his service here.

I heard the last speech which he made in the House only a day or so before he passed away, and it was one of the ablest and most forceful speeches that he made in the House during his entire career. He was a sick man at the time and was violating his physician's orders in participating in debate, but call to duty was so strong with him that he ignored his own health and safety, and in spite of his illness made one of the greatest speeches of his career. Little did those of us think at the time that he was speaking that this would be his last, but the quality and effectiveness of his speech made it most appropriate that he should end his career in such a manner.

We speak of casualties of the war, and HENRY STEAGALL was one of these casualties, for he gave his life in service to his country. I prize very highly my friendship with him and shall miss him, as will his district and the Nation.

Francis Dugan Culkin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANCIS DUGAN CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the sorrowful news of the death of our colleague Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN on August 4, 1943, made many hearts heavy. He was personally known, respected, and loved by tens of thousands of people in all walks of life. There was a hush of sadness in his native city of Oswego when the last rites were held and the whole community mourned.

FRANK CULKIN had served his city, his district, his State, and his Nation long, faithfully, and brilliantly. He was a soldier in the Spanish-American War, captain in the National Guard for 7 years, district attorney for 10 years, county judge for 7 years and Member of Congress representing the Thirty-second District of New York from 1928 until his death. Nine times he was elected to Congress by huge majorities, so great was his popularity and the confidence of his constituents in his ability and in his fidelity to his truth.

In Congress he was an active and valued member of the committees on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and on Rivers and Harbors. He was vigilant and alert in the work of those committees, in the committee room and on the floor of the House.

It was natural that he should seek membership on those committees because of his great interest in nautical matters. He was born and brought up on the shores of Lake Ontario and found his greatest joy in sailing on its waters.

Quite fittingly all that was mortal of our late colleague rests on a high knoll overlooking the beautiful lake he loved so well.

May it assuage the grief of his bereaved family to know that he was held high in the esteem and friendship of his coworkers in this House, that they honor his memory and deeply feel his loss.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in the death of ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER this House lost one of its ablest and most beloved Members. All of us who worked and served with him during his years in this body lost a great and dear friend.

Mr. GUYER was a statesman, a great orator, an able legislator, and an accomplished scholar. He was gifted in many ways but perhaps his greatest gift was his gift for friendship. He loved people. That is one reason for his outstanding success as an educator in his early life. It accounted for much of his political success. Everywhere he went he made friends. He not only made them, but kept them.

Mr. GUYER's father was a minister of the Gospel. This meant, as is frequently the case, that the family lived in a number of different communities while Mr. GUYER was a youth. To his dying day, he retained friendships with people whom he had known and met in those communities where his father had preached. In his young manhood Mr. GUYER was for 5 years principal of the high school at St. John, Kans., in my congressional district. Those years meant a great deal to him. The associations which he formed then with his pupils and their parents were lifelong. Notwithstanding the fact that he left St. John more than 40 years ago and never returned there to live, he always seemed to regard that spot as home, and it was his expressed wish that he be buried in the cemetery there by the side of his parents.

I doubt if any teacher ever took more genuine interest in his pupils not only while they were in school but throughout their lives than did Mr. GUYER. Until his last illness he kept in close and constant touch with all of his former pupils, some of whom were scattered to the far ends of the earth. With many of them he carried on a regular correspondence and he shared their sorrows and joys as only a friend could do.

Mr. GUYER's sincere affection for the beautiful little city of St. John and its people reflected the simplicity, friendliness, and goodness of his nature. These qualities were readily apparent to all of those with whom he was associated.

Mr. GUYER and I came to the Seventieth Congress together. Previously he had served during a part of the Sixty-eighth Congress as the successor to his friend and fellow townsman, Col. E. C. Little. Before coming to Congress my acquaintance with Mr. GUYER had been slight. I soon learned to know him and love him, and as the years went on our friendship became stronger and dearer. I often sought his advice and counsel, which was always freely and unselfishly given.

Mr. GUYER was an authority on the history of Kansas and the United States. He was exceedingly well versed in world history. He revered his country and its institutions. He was an authority on the Constitution. During the last years of his service here he took a great interest in the painting by Howard Chandler Christy entitled "The Signing of the Constitution of the United States." That picture was painted in Washington and while the work was in progress there was hardly a day in which Mr. GUYER did not visit the studio. When the painting was unveiled he was one of the speakers and delivered a masterly address.

Mr. GUYER was a great orator in every sense of the word. He was a moral crusader. Yet, he was never a fanatic nor a crank. He sincerely believed in national prohibition and devoted many of the best years of his life to fighting for it. He was a strong advocate of woman's suffrage when the issue was not popular. Yet, no matter how controversial the issue, Judge GUYER retained the friendship and respect of his opponents. His kindly, friendly nature made it impossible that it could be otherwise.

Above all, Mr. GUYER was a Christian gentleman. His early environment of plain living, and high thinking, as the son of a minister of the gospel influenced his entire life. After his father's death his devotion to his mother was outstanding and characteristic.

In 1919 Mr. GUYER was married to Della Alforetta Daugherty. His home life was happy and congenial. Mrs. Guyer was an ideal helpmeet, taking an interest in all of his political and legislative activities. To her goes our deepest sympathy in her loss and bereavement.

Frederick Van Nuys

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS late a Senator from the State of Indiana

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana has produced its share of public men who have measured up to the true heights of statesmanship. Outstanding among these was FREDERICK VAN NUYS, to whom we today pay our tribute of respect and affection.

FRED VAN NUYS was an anomaly in our public life. The dictionary defines anomaly as "Deviation from rule, type, or form." His talent and energies before he entered the public service were largely devoted to political organization. He served in many organizational capacities. He was chairman of our Indiana Democratic State Committee in the lean years and was an inspirational force of great influence in inculcating party discipline. Judging from his earlier background one would naturally have assumed that when he became United States Senator he would have been prone to resolve politically controverted questions by the yardstick of partisan advantage.

Yet, as the history of recent times shows, no man ever served in the Senate of the United States who was less moved by political considerations than he was. He always stood inflexibly for what he believed to be right. He was a fundamental Jeffersonian Democrat and was passionately devoted to the democracy of our fathers. He was willing to fight

and die, if necessary, to protect those fundamental institutions. But when theories of government were proposed which seemed to him to be alien to our democratic philosophy and to impinge upon those fundamental concepts, he stood firm in his tracks and defied the waves of criticism which would have overcome a less determined character.

It was inevitable that Senator VAN NUYS, because of his inherent and unshakable belief in the fundamental democratic tenet that ours is a tripartite system of government in which the three branches are independent of each other, would immediately object to any proposed legislation which he believed would infringe upon this basic theory of democracy. When the proposal to reorganize the Supreme Court so as to influence the tenor of its decisions made its appearance he immediately became the leader of the opposition. By unanimous choice of the Senators opposing this measure he was selected as chairman of the steering committee in the fight and was consulted assiduously as to strategy and procedure. Thus he helped in a great way to win a victory on what fundamentalists regarded as a most vital issue.

Senator VAN NUYS was a direct descendant of Johannes Van Nuys, who immigrated from Holland and settled on Long Island almost 300 years ago. There was something about him, perhaps it was the Dutch blood he inherited from his ancestors, that made him stubborn to the last degree in standing for what he believed to be right. As the political kaleidoscope changed and new measures were brought forward and proposed in place of old principles he found himself the target of fierce criticism which seemed to reflect the overwhelming public opinion, but he never swerved an inch. According to his way of thinking, God and the right comprise a majority and that was the majority with which he always sought to align himself. There may be a difference of opinion as to Senator VAN NUYS' attitude on some of the highly controverted questions. I am not attempting to say here and now whether in any particular instance of this character his judgment was right or wrong. This is not the time for a discussion of any such question, but I will say that there never was a critic of him who would not admit that he never failed to take a position, openly and courageously, and that that position, whatever it was, reflected the honest judgment of an honest man.

So much for the Senators's political uprightness and consistency. As a human character he was one of the finest I have ever known. He was born in a dreamy little hamlet named Falmouth on the Rush-Fayette County line in Indiana a few months after I had been born in a log cabin 3 miles away. His father, Dr. David H. Van Nuys, was our family physician, and once when my left arm was dislocated by too much exuberance in play the elder Van Nuys set it back in place. I cite these facts merely by way of explanation that my acquaintanceship with the man we are eulogizing was not casual, but was intimate and of ancient vintage. I knew the well springs of his nature.

The Senator's rise from a poor country boy to a place of high distinction in the world's greatest law-making body shows what can be accomplished by individual initiative in this free country of ours. With such assistance as his father could give him, he worked his way through Earlham College and then through the Indiana Law School of Indianapolis where he received his LL. B. degree in 1900.

Forty-one years ago he went to Anderson, Ind., and opened a one-room law office in the old Union Building, with three law books and two chairs, one for himself and one for his creditors, as he used to tell the story. His industry, his determination, his faithfulness to his clients, made a favorable impression from the start, and he succeeded because the community soon came to recognize his worth. In later years he often referred to those days of hopes and aspirations and struggles, when he was "so happy and so poor." As he grew in popularity he was elected prosecuting attorney and was then sent to the State Senate of Indiana, where his ability was recognized by his election as Democratic leader. In 1920 President Wilson appointed him as United States attorney for Indiana, and 2 years later he resigned to join the Indianapolis law firm of which the late Senator Samuel M. Ralston was the senior member.

When the rank and file of the Democratic Party in Indiana in 1932 sought a candidate who could wrest the Senate seat from the veteran and formidable Senator James E. Watson, it turned to Mr. VAN NUYS as its practically unanimous choice, and he was elected by a large majority. In the Senate he soon arose to high position as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and as chairman of the powerful Committee on the Judiciary.

In his everyday relations with people FRED VAN NUYS was true and genuine, a delightful companion, whose devotion to his friends never faltered or failed. In his home, happiness reigned supreme. To his wife, the former Marie Krug, and their son Billy, he was an ideal husband and father, and today as we reverently pay our tribute to him who was the idol of their affections our hearts turn to them with sympathy and love.

To make a happy fireside clime to weans
and wife,
That's the true pathos and sublime of human
life.

I am sure that was the most important thing in the life of the man we mourn today. He had very fundamental convictions on theological matters, but was not ostentatious in his religion. Rather it should be said that he lived his religion in his daily life. He had a fascination for politics, but he played the game for what he could accomplish by it for the public and not for what he could get out of it for himself. While I doubt if anyone ever loved his party more, he unquestioningly chose the path where his conscience told him to walk, and he proceeded to walk in it, however thorny and stony it might be. For this all men who knew him admired him and respected him.

Less than a month before his sudden death, Senator VAN NUYS sent to Dr. William C. Dennis, president of Earlham College, a letter that succinctly expressed the philosophy that had guided him in his public career, He and Dr. Dennis were boys together at Earlham, almost half a century ago. The Senator wrote:

I have no doubt made mistakes, but they have been mistakes of the head and not of the heart. My chief objective has been to guard and preserve our constitutional democracy and ways of life, and I am much encouraged over future prospects. My attitude has not made my 11 years of public service a bed of roses, but that is immaterial.

I was present in the Flanner & Buchanan mortuary at Indianapolis when Dr. Dennis preached the funeral sermon over our dead friend lying in the casket by his side, and I thought how this poem read by the preacher, described the nobility and strength of character of the deceased:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and
ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the
fog
In public duty and in private thinking.

Such a man was FREDERICK VAN NUYS. As Shakespeare said of one of similar mold:

The elements were so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, This was a man!

James Aloysius O'Leary

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES ALOYSIUS O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York

"Another bark has put to sea,
Another boat has left the shore,
As fair a soul on board has she
As ever left the land before.
And as her outward port she tends—
Sit closer, friends!"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have served here with many affable and able Members, especially from the great State of New York, but I do not know one who ingratiated himself and acquired the good will of the membership of the House more readily than did our friend Mr. O'LEARY.

Our late friend was, in addition to being a sound legislator, a very successful businessman. We often hear the question, when assessing the worth of a man, "Has he ever had to meet pay rolls?"

Mr. O'LEARY successfully and many, many times met pay rolls. On that account, then, many, from the materialistic viewpoint, designate him a successful man; but I prefer at this time to remember him because in every phase of human activity in which he engaged he was true and loyal; he possessed a spotless record for high character and integrity; he was honest, generous, and sincere. Ever precise in promise keeping, he built an enviable reputation for superior citizenship.

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere,
In action faithful and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private end,
Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.

It affords me extreme gratification to pay this simple, though inadequate tribute to the memory of our departed friend, whose passing is a real loss to us, who are his friends, his State, and the Nation.

And so, with sorrowing hearts and warmest personal recollections, we bid him today an official and affectionate farewell.

Lawrence Lewis

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LAWRENCE LEWIS, of the First District—Denver—of Colorado, was elected in November 1932 and served in this body until his death in December 1943. Coming into the House as a new Member January 1941, I found in Congressman LEWIS a real friend and helper, always ready and happy to assist in any way possible to supply the information and answer the questions every new Member of the House must have as he accepts the responsibilities and assumes the duties of a representative of his people in this republican form of government.

Congressman LEWIS as a member of the Rules Committee was a busy man, but never too busy to lend a helping hand on problems troubling me. He made you feel he wished to assist and help you. I appreciated greatly the personal assistance and the advice given me by this great citizen and Representative of Colorado in the first year of my service in the House of Representatives.

On May 15, 1944, Congressman E. E. COX, of Georgia, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute paid to Congressman LEWIS by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York bar, and I wish to quote from that very fine tribute:

LAWRENCE LEWIS, Member of Congress from March 1933 until his death in December 1943, was one of those Members of the House of Representatives who are seldom mentioned in the newspapers, but who devote themselves to arduous and self-effacing service in committees and in the routine of the House, with no expectation of personal fame or any other reward except the approval of their own consciences and the respect of their fellow Members in the House.

I doubt if there is a Member of this House who worked harder on the legislation considered by this body than did LAWRENCE LEWIS—there were few bills that were considered on the floor of this House that did not receive the closest scrutiny and study from this son of legislative toil. He regarded his duties here as a representative of his people in this great legislative body as a high sense of trust. No legislation was treated lightly by him.

Also upon the death of Congressman LEWIS I received a letter from the Honorable John O'Connor, a former Member of the House and chairman of the Rules Committee of which Mr. LEWIS was a member. I enclose the letter, which is a tribute of the highest character:

DECEMBER 16, 1943.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HILL: The death of Representative LAWRENCE LEWIS, of the First District of Colorado, constituted a personal loss to me. Very few Members of Congress knew him as long as I. Our friendship started when we were fellow students at Harvard Law School and lived on the same street, walked to class together, and were militant members of the Harvard Democratic Club. LAWRENCE LEWIS was a real Democrat then, but a great American first, a conservative—to honor his memory—as contrasted to what is known as a liberal today. In no sense was he a foreigner.

When he was elected to the House in 1932, our friendship, abated for 23 years, was renewed and closely. In 1935 he became a member of the Rules Committee, of which I was chairman, and for 4 years our friendship was the more cemented. He was more than ordinarily intelligent and at all times indefatigably industrious. His evenness of temperament, his loyalty to American ideals, and his "straight shooting" endeared him to every member of our committee, especially. It was my pleasure to speak with him at gatherings in New York City, where he was highly respected as a legislator.

One of the best measures to apply to a Member of Congress, or any other legislative body, is the esteem in which he is held by "the help," the clerks to his committee, the page boys in the House, etc. If they are attracted to him, he is not misplaced. He fits. LAWRENCE LEWIS won the affection of everybody with whom he came in contact, from page boy up. His passing is a real loss to Colorado and the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR.

The Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo., carried as an editorial the following tribute to the fine service Congressman LEWIS had rendered to Colorado:

LAWRENCE LEWIS was never given to grandstand plays, but he was constantly given to steady, conscientious service to his constituency—the fruits of which are evident in many developments that have characterized Denver's advancement during the last decade.

With a fine educational and legal background, LAWRENCE LEWIS had a true conception of public service, carrying with it responsibility to render the greatest good to the greatest number; so that as a national legislator he was as earnest in advocacy of progressive measures for the whole society as he was energetic in securing benefits for his immediate community. Without spectacular performances but through tireless and effective devotion to duty, LAWRENCE LEWIS commanded the respect of all Coloradoans and of his fellow legislators and has left a record of achievement few western Congressmen have attained. His death is a genuine and deep loss to Colorado and to the Nation.

This Nation of ours, this House of Representatives, has suffered a tragic loss in the untimely and early death of our beloved Congressman, LAWRENCE LEWIS. His application to the task at hand, his quiet, unassuming manner of discharging his every obligation to his country and to his people should be an inspiration to all of us. This country and its free institutions profited by his having served them. We humbly bow before the Divine Spirit and offer our thoughts of prayer and appreciation for the soul of this great man who has so patriotically served his country.

Edward Wester Creal

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. EDWARD WESTER CREAL, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Kentucky and this Nation lost a devoted public servant in the passing of EDWARD W. CREAL.

It was a pleasure and privilege to know Mr. CREAL during the entire period of his service in the House and especially during the latter part of that service when he was a member of the Committee on Agriculture. Mr. CREAL was an able legislator, thorough and careful in everything that he did, a giften orator, and a master logician and debater. In his work in the Committee on Agriculture he displayed a wide knowledge of agricultural problems and a profound interest in the welfare of the agricultural producers of this country. His advice and counsel were always sought and considered whenever important matters of legislation were before that committee.

The later years of Mr. CREAL's service in the House were marked by ill health. In spite of this, he carried on with a rare devotion to duty which won the respect and admiration of all his colleagues.

Henry Bascom Steagall

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

"Like as the waves make toward the pebbled shore,
So do our minutes hasten to their end."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, our deceased friend, Mr. STEAGALL, had a

rugged honesty of motive and effect which none could dispute. His loyalty to his party was keenly appreciated, not only in his own State but throughout the Nation. He fought for his party and at times with excessive zeal; but high over all he had foremost in mind and purpose the highest welfare of the whole United States. And, happily, his political opponents could not criticize or find fault with his attitude toward them or toward the party they represented, because he was a diplomat.

Mr. STEAGALL was a born leader, and in his busy day filled the part admirably. He not only had the intelligence and breadth of view of a leader, but a personal charm of the highest type which attracted men to him. In his capacity as leader of the great Committee on Banking and Currency he continued to grow in the minds of this membership. No doubt it is accurate to say that no other committee in the history of our country has dealt with so many important questions in 10 years as has the Committee on Banking and Currency during the last decade. He, more than any other man, should be credited with evolving the important Federal Deposit Insurance Act. Many other laws dealing with our financial structure were initiated or perfected by the genius of this useful legislator; and these beneficial laws will ever be his outstanding memorial. I especially appreciated the valuable assistance he gave me in evolving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.

Incessant and arduous work of the last dozen years left its imprint upon our friend, but, despite advice of physicians and counsel of myriad friends, he could not slow his legislative activities. As a result, we have lost a dear friend, his district has lost an able representative, and the Nation has lost his wise counsel and the benefit of his exceptional attainments which preeminently qualified him to participate in consideration of all the great questions before the country in many years that exacted great strength of mind and body.

By the memory of our deceased colleague let us resolve to cultivate and preserve the qualities that made him great and useful; and let us determine to meet the call of patriotic duty in every hour of our country's danger or need.

Lawrence Lewis

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the death of LAWRENCE LEWIS, of the First Congressional District of Colorado was a distinct loss to the public service.

During his years as a Member of the House, Mr. LEWIS was recognized as an able and conscientious Member. He was a hard worker and in these strenuous times there is no doubt but what his devotion to duty contributed to his untimely death.

I became acquainted with Mr. LEWIS early in his service. I learned to admire and respect him and to appreciate his friendship. He was intensely devoted to his country, patriotic and loyal to an unusual degree. His wise counsel and friendly spirit will be greatly missed in this body.

John William Ditter

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when words seem so inadequate to express the extent of the loss which Montgomery County, Pa., has sustained in the death of my predecessor, the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER. He was loved and respected by all who knew him, and his reputation for integrity and ability traveled far beyond the limits of his district.

He was a teacher, a successful lawyer, and a conscientious Member of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to meet him and be taught by him while at high school. His classes admired him for his thoroughness, his fairness, and his honesty. He was elected to Congress from the Seventeenth District of Pennsylvania in 1933 and regularly thereafter until his tragic death during the night of November 21, 1943.

BILL DITTER, as his many firends knew him, rose to a position of eminence in this Nation. He believed in hard work. His life demonstrated his deep abiding faith in the opportunity of an individual to rise in this country, by reason of his ability, his devotion to duty, and his intense application to the task set before him. His life was an outstanding example of the possibilities open to all who will strive diligently and intelligently.

He was a Christian gentleman. He taught Sunday school classes for years, and the value of his efforts can be proven in the lives of many people today.

As a debater on the floor of the House he had no equal. He was always fair and considerate to the opposition. Not by trickery, but by the logic of his statements did he win his arguments. Recognition of his ability to assemble facts, and use them persuasively, came when he was selected to be chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee.

J. WILLIAM DITTER loved his country intensely. Well versed in the ideas and ideals which made this Republic great, he sought at all times, and with unselfish devotion, to cherish and hold fast to the traditions which he believed should endure. His death occurred while engaged in activities for his beloved country.

Blessed with a faithful wife and loving children, he was a devoted husband and father. No sacrifice was too great for him in order that they might be happy. His family life was beautiful and wholesome, and he left behind him a train of lovely memories.

J. WILLIAM DITTER was taken from this earth while at the height of his distinguished career. The acts of God are sometimes difficult for our finite minds to understand. That He had other purposes for him seems likely. Whatever those plans may be, his many friends wish him well in the Great Beyond from which no traveler has ever returned.

Nearer my Father's house,
Where the many mansions be;
Nearer the great white throne,
Nearer the crystal sea.

Nearer the bound of life,
Where we lay our burdens down;
Nearer leaving the cross!
Nearer gaining the crown!

Francis Dugan Culkin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANCIS DUGAN CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, FRANCIS D. CULKIN and I began our service in the House of Representatives together as Members of the Seventieth Congress. During all the intervening years and until his death, we were fast friends. In his passing this Congress has lost an able Member, a hard-working legislator, and a man of the highest qualities of heart and mind.

FRANCIS CULKIN had a long experience in public life before coming to Congress. The confidence and respect in which he was held by the people of his community and district are shown by the number of times they elected and reelected him to positions of the highest honor and responsibility.

FRANCIS CULKIN was a hard fighter, an able orator, and a conscientious public servant. He was an authority on waterway transportation and one of its ablest advocates in the House of Representatives. He was likewise exceptionally well versed and informed on the questions affecting agriculture. He represented a district in which dairying was a most important industry and the dairy farmer had no more ardent and outspoken advocate in the Halls of Congress than he. Mr. CULKIN's death is a great loss to this Congress and the Nation. His place will be hard to fill.

John William Ditter

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we meet today to pay our respect to the memory of our colleagues who have departed, we solemnly realize the deep personal loss that we have sustained in the tragic death of our beloved and esteemed friend, J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania. Throughout the years he has ever been at his post of duty, and it is my privilege to express the very high esteem and the warm affection in which he was held by all Members of Congress. He was my personal friend, and it is with that treasured memory of him that I speak these few words in eulogy of his attainments. He was an outstanding American, a good citizen, a great statesman, and a loyal and sincere friend.

WILL DITTER, as we affectionately called him, was a great American. He was born and reared in the great State of Pennsylvania, and he loved that Commonwealth and her people with the ardor and affection of an illustrious son. In that environment and among the people he loved he came to the bar, and he became one of the great lawyers in his State. His practice was extensive and in his chosen profession he was unusually successful. His people finally called upon him to render a greater service, and he was sent by them as their Representative in the Congress of the United States. During his service in the Congress, as the years passed by he grew in stature and in his attainments. He became one of the outstanding legislators in Congress and his service on the Naval Affairs Committee in the House was outstanding. He was sound in thought and deliberate in action. He was kindly and he was brave.

When I became acquainted with my friend—and that was at the beginning of my service as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Seventy-sixth Congress—I then recognized in him those rare and outstanding qualities which appeal to all of us. He was a man of the highest character and his sincerity of purpose and his honesty was never doubted. I knew him when he faced the stress of turmoil and anguish respecting our own country, and its future. I knew him when his constant concern was for the welfare and progress of all the people in our land. I knew him when he was pleading for our form of government and for the Constitution. He loved our form of government and he revered the American way of life. He was a true patriot. He was a constant American.

When great men pass across the stage of life and disappear, their acts and deeds will continue after them—the precedent has been established which others will follow. So with our friend. He has fixed the standard. He has touched into activity forces which, influencing still others, will move onward forever. I will long cherish the memory of my friend because of his unswerving Americanism, for his constant struggle for the people he loved, and for his sterling character and honesty. With these ideals he lived; with these same ideals before him, he died. Thus this brilliant man passed from the stage of life, leaving the rest of us to take up his labors where he left them.

WILL DITTER needs no eulogy today. His life and his living of it stand before us in beauty and in splendor—a beacon light for others. In bidding my fond—my last—farewell to him, I speak those words which were uttered at the passing of a great hero in the years gone by—"This was a man!"

Francis Dugan Culkin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANCIS DUGAN CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Representative FRANCIS CULKIN. With his death, the New York delegation lost an able and distinguished Member, and the House of Representatives has been deprived of the services of a statesman of high intelligence and idealism.

Mr. CULKIN'S earnestness of manner, his profound knowledge of legislation, and his diligence in working for the welfare of his constituents impressed me very much. His personal kindness in welcoming me as a new Member of our State delegation and in offering his assistance will always be remembered. His countless good deeds will live long in our memories. His intense interest in the development of New York State, and his fine work on the important Rivers and Harbors Committee were unusual.

This is not loss, life is a promise;
At the end of the lane and fulfillment, we rise again.

James Aloysius O'Leary

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES ALOYSIUS O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with sorrow that I heard of the death of our colleague, Representative JAMES A. O'LEARY. Although I did not enjoy the privilege of knowing him well, my association with him was of the most pleasant kind. He worked hard in the interests of his constituents and yet was never too busy to help his colleagues with assistance or advice.

Our New York delegation will suffer through his loss. To his family I send my most sincere sympathy.

John William Ditter

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, on November 21, 1943, was a great shock to his colleagues in the House of Representatives. To me, it meant the passing of a dear friend and a man for whom I entertained a very high admiration and much affection.

As an able, hard-working member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. DITTER came to exercise great influence on both sides of the aisle. His eloquence, his forcefulness in debate, and his skill in presenting legislative matters, made him a formidable antagonist on the floor. Yet, so kindly and generous was his nature that no matter how heated the debate became, Mr. DITTER'S opponents remained his friends. He kept their respect and confidence.

Mr. DITTER'S place will be difficult to fill. He will be missed by all of us. He was an able legislator, a great leader, and a sincere friend.

William Howard Wheat

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, the 30th of May, by custom and by legislation, has been designated as Memorial Day, at which time we pay tribute to our departed dead, whose services to their country have endeared their memories to State and Nation. It is a fine tribute for a nation to pause in the midst of a great global war to pay tribute to these departed heroes because it shows that the heart of the Nation is fundamentally sound and appreciative.

Likewise, Congress, by long custom, has established a memorial day, on which occasion tribute is paid to those departed Members, who have endeared themselves not only to the Members of the House and Senate, but to their constituents at home.

Since the last memorial roll call, 3 Senators and 10 Representatives have departed this life, leaving their memories embedded in the hearts of their surviving colleagues.

On this memorial-service day, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of my former colleague and friend, WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, who for 5 years represented the Nineteenth District of the State of Illinois faithfully and well. Since the first day that I met my departed colleague, I felt the impress of his splendid character and outstanding virtues.

WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT became a member of the great Naval Affairs Committee, and it was there in our committee that I learned to appreciate fully his great integrity as a public servant, his fine views of public affairs, and his zeal toward the successful termination of the great war in which we are now engaged.

Our Nation needs more men of the character of WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, and I think the poet had men of his type in mind when he said:

Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess a conscience and a will,
Men who have honor, men who will not lie—
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog.

In the hectic days of Congress, WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT remained calm and thoughtful. When others were excited, he was well poised and deliberative. He was modest in demeanor, earnest in action, faithful to his trust; and when the shades of eternal night descended upon him, it could be said of him, as of the Apostle Paul, "He has fought a good fight, he has finished his course, he has kep the faith."

Francis Thompson, in one of his beautiful poems, said:

For there is nothing lives but something dies,
And there is nothing dies but something lives.
Till skies be fugitives,
Till time, the hidden root of change, updrives,
Are birth and death inseparable on earth,
For they are twain yet one, and death is birth.

WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT was an outstanding Congressman during his period of service, a great believer in constitutional government, a preserver of those fine institutions which have made America great, and a faithful, conscientious, and efficient public servant.

Tennyson, in that beautiful poem of his, says:

And the stately ships sail on
To the haven under the hill,
But, oh! for the touch of a vanished hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still.

And while we no longer hear the voice of our departed colleague, no longer grasp his friendly hand, yet his memory will linger with us through the years to come, like the aroma of beautiful flowers.

Lawrence Lewis

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of LAWRENCE LEWIS, who at the time of his death last December was dean of the Colorado delegation in this House.

Soon after my election to Congress in the fall of 1940 I received a letter from LAWRENCE LEWIS which made a deep impression upon me. He gave me important information on the organization of the House and offered his services, as well as those of his staff, in helping me get settled. The day I arrived in Washington he called at my office to extend a personal welcome and to give me valuable suggestions and advice.

In attempting to find words with which to appraise our deceased colleague, there are two that stand out conspicuously. LAWRENCE LEWIS was kind and gentle. I never heard of him having any enemies. I cannot conceive that he ever offended anyone. He was always so gracious and courteous to all.

He was faithful to his task. During the 11 years that he served in this body LAWRENCE LEWIS had but one purpose—that was to represent the First Congressional District of Colorado to the very best of his ability. He considered public office a sacred trust. Because of his devotion to his official duties he worked long hours and sacrificed his health.

By his passing Colorado lost a most efficient public servant. His large majorities in Denver testified to the public esteem in which he was held. The Nation suffered a heavy loss and all who knew him lost a true friend. I think the following lines accurately portray the life of LAWRENCE LEWIS:

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private end,
Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.

John William Ditter

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, soon after he became a Member of the House, I became acquainted with J. WILLIAM DITTER, of the Seventeenth Pennsylvania District, and as the years passed and we came to know each other better, we became good friends.

We belonged to different political parties, and in debate and in the votes in the House, he was what might be termed a partisan, but he was conscientious in his views and his votes.

He was one of the best debaters in the House, and at times seemed stern and severe in what he said, but he had a warm heart, he loved his fellow man, and his personality was such as to draw men unto him. He was a man of sympathy. I recall that when I lost my daughter, about 6 weeks before his death, he wrote me a beautiful letter of condolence, and followed it with a personal conversation, and I shall never forget the tears in his eyes as he told me, from the depths of his heart, how much he sympathized with me.

When news of his sudden and tragic death reached the House, there was genuine grief and mourning of the entire Membership on both sides of the aisle.

He was a real American, a loyal friend, and an able legislator, and his death removed one of the most outstanding and ablest Members of the House.

Francis Dugan Culkin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANCIS DUGAN CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

"All human things are subject to decay
And, when fate summons, monarchs must obey."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when the names of the members of the Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations were announced, I, as chairman of that committee, and the remainder of the members of the committee were very much pleased that Mr. CULKIN had been named a member.

I had very much admired this modest, many-sided gentleman ever since he came to the House November 6, 1928.

Mr. CULKIN was very conservative, of a judicial temperament, and never allowed partisanship to affect the deliberations of our select committee. He could with singular success separate a subject from the cross winds of personalities and the down-drifts of partisanship.

The qualities of this good man are shown by his simple autobiography in the Congressional Directory, which says:

FRANCIS E. CULKIN, Oswego, N. Y.; Republican; lawyer; married.

He very much shunned publicity, knowing that the great use of life is to spend it for something that outlasts it.

A selfish, unilateral aspiration never entered his thought.

The life and service of our honorable and departed friend will ever mark him as a useful, good, sefless man. He was active in many walks of life. He had many and varied interests. He honored all activity and endeavor in which he engaged with the highest character and ability.

As a leader of men he was commanding and strong; as a lawyer he was profound in the knowledge and practice of his profession; as a statesman his talents and genius were of the highest order. In his friendships and associations he was always courageous, magnanimous, and tender. His accomplishments in all lines will always stand cut as an inspiring example for the ambitious who follow.

It is fortunate that our country has and has had men of such sterling qualities these uncertain days.

Verily this honorable deceased was a great rock in a weary world.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the passing away of Hon. U. S. GUYER on June 5, 1943, I expressed here in the House of Representatives the loss and bereavement of all of us who were associated with him in any way.

Today, in memoriam, we again pay tribute to the departed one. In the passing of ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER the House of Representatives lost one of its outstanding Members. For 20 years he represented the Second Congressional District of Kansas, and he represented it well.

My service in the House began in the Seventy-fourth Congress, and during the years of our legislative association I learned to love him and to hold his opinions in highest regard. As his office was only a few doors from mine, often did we counsel and visit together.

He was a man of wide information and of unquestioned integrity He was a faithful attendant of the sessions of the House, and only upon rare occasions was he absent from his accustomed place. He was strong in the belief that the principles of government advocated by the political party with which he was identified were most likely to advance the prosperity and happiness of the people, and he sturdily advocated his beliefs. His views were not altered by shifting majorities or changes of political sentiment. He stood as firm and as unyielding as the oak, and I am one of those who believe that the country is better served by one who is fearless and honest in his convictions.

As a young man Mr. GUYER followed the profession of teaching and was principal of the St. John High School and superintendent of the city schools of St. Johns for several years. These were among his most enjoyable years, and his love for the community was so great that he selected St. Johns as his final resting place. When he gave up teaching he took up the practice of law in Kansas City, Kans., where he enjoyed a lucrative practice for many years. In recognition of his ability and sterling character the citizens of Kansas City elected him mayor, and he also served as judge of the first division city court of Kansas City.

Judge GUYER, as his friends were wont to call him, was a modest and lovable man. I knew him before I came to Congress, but during the years I worked with him in the House, I came to know him intimately and to cherish his friendship. His services to the country were most valuable. He commanded the respect of all men, the good will of opponents, the deep affection of his friends. He will linger long in the memory of many men who respected, admired, and loved him.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life. character, and public service of Hon ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, we meet today to pay tribute to our colleagues who, during the past year, have passed on to greater reward. Among this group is the name of the Honorable U. S. GUYER, Representative from the Second Congressional District of Kansas.

Judge GUYER was the dean of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives. In his passing Kansas and the Nation lost a valuable servant. His life has been one of devotion and service, not only to the people of his Congressional District and the State of Kansas, but to the entire Nation as well. He was a scholar, a jurist, a statesman and, above all, a Christian gentleman, and he exemplified in his daily life those Christian virtues. The lovable character that he possessed endeared him to the hearts of his many friends.

It was my privilege and good fortune to have known him intimately and today I pay my tribute of love and respect to this fine character who guided me with a fatherly hand and gave me the benefit of his broad experience in my first term as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Lawrence Lewis

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

"He was a man, take him for all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to meet Mr. LEWIS the day he entered the House, because some of my friends in Denver whom I had not seen in many years chose Mr. LEWIS as an obliging medium to convey their felicitations to me.

Before our honorable dead came here I had read of his inordinate success in the legal field, and, after conversing with him a few times, I readily understood why he stood so well in his profession and the esteem of his constituents. As I remember, the late Mr. Edward T. Taylor had mentioned to me Mr. LEWIS' good work for the great State of Colorado before Mr. LEWIS joined us.

While Mr. LEWIS possessed a very good educational background, he could not have risen to a big place in public life and ascended to the heights of legal fame he attained without his sterling personal virtues.

His constituents loved him, as is evinced by their five times electing him a Member of this honorable body. Their allegiance to him was reciprocal. In their esteem no man had greater rectitude or virtue.

His leadership was undoubted and supreme. When he left his district to come here, the well wishes of every constituent came with him. They gloried in his success. He maintained the same attitude toward them. Never did he waver in loyalty.

Mr. LEWIS well understood and scrupulously followed the highest and most exacting principles of Americanism; he was well grounded in the science of good government, whose tenets he so luminously expounded. He rose to high place on the strength of moral greatness and manifold genius. He was a modest and conservative man, a complete stranger to megalomania, adventurism and quixotism. His high talents were never soiled by ignoble use.

When there was a vacancy on the Committee on Rules and it seemed that the far West had a just claim to the position, some leaders of the House discussed filling the vacancy with me and I unhesitatingly agreed with them that Mr. LEWIS would make a worthy member of our committee. And when he became a Member of that committee he did not disappoint the high expectation of everybody, but labored zealously and intelligently for the general weal of the country.

It will be remembered that our late friend was, due to illness, much absent from his duties here for about a year next preceding his passing. He regretted this very much. He attended one or two meetings of the Committee on Rules about 2 months before he passed, and it was my good fortune to talk to him somewhat at length after one of our meetings. I soon saw that the same will to achieve was with him, but the ailing body would not support that will. He disliked the thought of retiring to quietude, but he had an approving conscience. While he did not say so in actual words, yet he implied that he knew that "Death plucks my ear and says, Live—I am coming."

And then the day of grief came. The sunshine of rest had settled on his brow. "And light as broad noon's light was cast on the settled face of death." The race and the duty and the honor in the life of our late friend were finished.

LAWRENCE LEWIS is gone from this earth, but he is not gone from my heart. And I can still be comforted by the primary tenet of his faith. I can still believe, as he did, that deep within humankind there is an ancient nobility which in the end must emerge—tarnished, perhaps, but triumphant—from the darkness and anxiety of the years we now live.

Leonard William Schuetz

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LEONARD WILLIAM SCHUETZ, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved when I learned that my colleague, Hon. LEONARD W. SCHUETZ of Chicago, had passed away.

During the 11 years that he served as a Member of the House from the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, I learned to know him and to have a very high regard for him, and he was my good friend.

No member of the House was more regular in his attendance upon its sessions, and he paid close attention to all legislation considered, and kept himself well informed, and his votes always reflected his mature judgment, for what he believed to be right and best for his country.

During the dark days just before the present war began, when many members were failing to follow the foreign policy of our Government, he always voted for those measures designed to protect our country and to prepare it for the inevitable conflict, and his record of loyalty to his country was one hundred percent right.

He was quiet and unostentatious, seldom spoke, but he contributed much in shaping and moulding legislation which was enacted during his service here.

I shall miss him as a friend, his District and the Nation will miss him as an able, wise and safe legislator and one who rendered his country a great service in one of the most critical periods of our history.

John William Ditter

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life and character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, when events of a happy nature transpire, words flow smoothly and easily from the lips of one who would refer to them. But when one is faced with great sorrow, words become almost obstacles, halting that person who would express the sadness brought about by death.

It is thus impossible to express adequately the keen sorrow with which I heard the news of Representative WILLIAM DITTER's death. As a new Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I was privileged to know him only for a comparatively short time. During these few months, however, my admiration and respect for Mr. DITTER's great intelligence, his unusual ability as a speaker, and his skill as a lawyer increased daily.

Even more important than his intellectual brilliance was his infinite capacity for kindness, tolerance, and understanding. Representative DITTER was always just as willing to talk over legislative matters with a new, unimportant Member as he was to discuss legislation with one of the congressional leaders.

Three or four days before his tragic passing, I introduced to him a young man from Buffalo, N. Y., who was about to begin service in the United States Navy. In wishing him good fortune, Mr. DITTER expressed his own love for our country so eloquently that I will never forget his words, nor will the boy to whom he give such timely inspiration.

There will never be elected to Congress a better Representative or a greater American than WILLIAM DITTER. Everyone will miss his splendid service as a legislator and his many kindnesses as a friend.

It has been well said that no one is entirely gone who is remembered by his friends. The memory of kind, lovable, superbly talented Representative WILLIAM DITTER will live long in the hearts of all of us.

Leonard William Schuetz

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LEONARD WILLIAM SCHUETZ, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1944, I was shocked and distressed to learn of the sudden and wholly unexpected death of my friend LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of Chicago. I met him for the first time when the Seventy-third Congress convened. The acquaintanceship then commenced soon ripened into a warm friendship; and when a vacancy occurred last year on our Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, knowing of the interest of Mr. SCHUETZ in the out of doors and in hunting and fishing, I requested Speaker RAYBURN to assign him to my Conservation Committee, which was done. He became an interested and valuable member of our committee, and his fellow committee members and I mourn his passing.

LEONARD SCHUETZ was a businessman in politics, quiet, thoughtful, efficient, valuable in committee work, but on the floor preferring for others to do the speaking and to seek the limelight. Much of his life was spent as an executive for Swift & Co. In 1923, he left Swift & Co. to form a corporation called the Schuetz Construction Co., of which he was president up to the time of his death. As an employee of Swift & Co., and later in the construction business, he accumulated a substantial personal fortune, most of which was invested in bank stocks. When the banks in which he had invested his life savings failed, and he not only lost his investment but was required to make future payments under the Stockholders' Liability Act, he never complained nor did he permit his financial reverses to embitter him. He was scrupulously honest himself and the last to suspect dishonesty in others. He was true and loyal to his friends and received friendship in return. The best evidence of that is to be found in the fact that while on a vacation in Florida in 1930, with no thought of politics in his mind, his friends circulated in his behalf a petition for him to become the Democratic candidate from his congressional district. He was elected a Member of the Seventy-second Congress and each succeeding Congress, including the Seventy-eighth, his major committee assignment being that of naval affairs, in the work of which he took a great interest. But his greatest interest was in a small summer home on a beautiful lake in Wisconsin in a village called Nippersink located about 70 miles from Chicago. Every available week end he would spend at this retreat, fishing in the nearby lake, and in the spring and summer

months raising flowers and garden vegetables. Here he could find the peace and quiet he so loved; here he could play on his piano his favorite music; here he could commune with nature and refresh his spirit. Some day I hope to have the privilege of visiting his last resting place in St. Adalberts Cemetery at Niles, Ill., which adjoins Chicago. It was a pleasure to have served for nearly 12 years with a man like LEONARD SCHUETZ. I valued his friendship; I mourn his loss.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of the great personal loss that we have sustained, I rise to add my humble tribute to the life, character, and achievements of my warm and devoted friend, the late ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, of Kansas. I express my deep gratitude for this high privilege of expressing by testimony the very high esteem and the deep and abiding affection with which our colleague of former days was held by the Members of the House of Representatives, and with that treasured memory I speak these few chosen words of my colleague. May I say that Judge GUYER, as we affectionately called him, was a good citizen, an outstanding American patriot, an outstanding statesman, and a fine and loyal friend.

Representative GUYER was born in Indiana. Later, with his parents, he went to Kansas where he grew into manhood; there he attended the public schools, and there he met and knew the people; he loved the people of his great State, and there he became a teacher, a lawyer, the mayor of his great city and later the people sent him as their representative in the National Halls of Congress.

I first met him, when I came to Congress, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, in the House. In our work on that committee we became fast friends. Quite soon I recognized in him those rare qualities which especially appeal to us; he was a man of high character, whose honesty and sincerity of purpose was never doubted. I knew him in those intimacies of a favored friend, in which those closer contacts are forever reserved for but a few, and I knew him in the stress of turmoil and anguish when the constant concern was that our country survive, and that our people go forward as a free and enlightened race. His constant endeavor was to aid all of the people in this Nation; he loved our form of government; he was a true patriot.

Great men live after they make their exit from the stage of life. Their acts and deeds establish a precedent which others follow. I will long cherish the memory of Judge GUYER—my friend—for his unswerving Americanism, for his unabated struggle for the people he loved, and for his sterling character. With these ideals he lived—and with them he died. Thus the brilliant career of a brilliant man was terminated.

He needs no encomium. His life and his living of it stand before us as a beacon light for honor and for good. I bid my final farewell to him—my friend—and we are assured—

Behind the dim unknown
Standeth God, within the shadow,
Keeping watch above His own!

William Howard Wheat

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT this House lost one who was an outstanding Representative of that quality of citizenship of which his people are so justly proud.

Born in Missouri of God-serving parents, he, in common with the average American boy, attended public school, college, and business college. He settled in Rantoul, Ill., where he married. He became a successful farmer and banker. He was elected to the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, and was serving in the Seventy-eighth Congress when he passed away.

I feel that all who here knew him share with me difficulty in expressing our real depth of sorrow and our profound regret.

Unassuming, caring little for the spotlight, yet quietly and effectively tireless in his efforts in behalf of his constituents and his country, he was of the mold that is at once great and humble.

His memory will remain a precious heritage to those of us who have been privileged to know him and to serve with him, and he will stand as an example to all who may succeed him.

His clear, intelligent vision, spotless character, calm courage, steadfast devotion to principle, forgetfulness of self, all served as a source of strength to those closely associated with him. His forgetfulness of self was manifested in the fact that though for weeks in ill health, he insisted upon carrying on in the interest of his country and the splendid people he had come here to serve.

BILL WHEAT, as we affectionately called him, moved with measured strength to the sanest end; worked with perfect poise to the surest point; held a glorifying faith in enduring things; was honest without getting excited about it; patriotic without bragging about it. A true American. A true friend. A true man.

Mr. Speaker, there is a delicacy which forbids a too great intrusion upon the sacred circle of a family sorrow, but perhaps it may be a comfort to those he loved, in the assurance that in his passing he left an indelible impress upon all who were privileged to know him and serve with him. To those near and dear to him, all of us here express the hope that the God of consolation may visit them with the comfort that garrisons the heart against the devastating effect of pain and sorrow, and that in time they may come to feel and know that in his life he typified the most sacred meaning of the soul in life's devotion. With this realization may there come a peace that no black cloud of today's sorrow may obscure, and no lonely threat of tomorrow defeat.

Frederick Van Nuys

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS, late a Senator from the State of Indiana

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of a great personal loss that I rise to express my humble tribute to the life and character of my devoted friend, the late Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS, of Indiana. It was my happy privilege to have known him throughout his lifetime, and it is a high privilege to bear witness today to the very high esteem and the deep and abiding affection with which our colleague was ever held by all who knew him, and with that treasured memory I speak these few words of my warm friend who was a good citizen, a great patriot, a constant humanitarian, and an outstanding statesman.

Senator VAN NUYS was native of Indiana. He was born in the township in which I spent the formative period of my life; there he received his early education, and there he came to know the people and there he enjoyed the pleasantries of youth. The ambitions of his life were formed there. Later, when he, with his good father, Dr. Van Nuys, and his family, moved into a larger community—they going to Anderson, Ind.—he entered the practice of the law, after completing his education, and there he met the privations and hardships incident to the early practice of his chosen profession. He became deep-rooted in his great affection for all those about him. The people of his State soon learned that he was a staunch and loyal friend in whom was reposed the choicest ideals of life. He was elected to the office of prosecuting attorney, in which office he served with distinction; he was later selected to the post as United States District Attorney, for the District of Indiana, in which office he discharged his

duties with outstanding ability; he then came to the United States Senate, by the vote of the people in his native State, and in that high office he exemplified the finer principles of true statesmanship; he was a patriot; he was a stalwart American.

Throughout the years I have known my fine friend, Senator VAN NUYS. In our early association, in the law, I recognized in him those rare qualities which directly appeal to men. I knew him in the intimacies of those very close contacts which are forever reserved by each one of us for but a few. I knew him in the stress and turmoil of contested litigation, and in the multitudinous questions and worries incident to the deliberation on weighty problems of state; I knew him, too, in the solemn meditations of sadness—when the heart bleeds and the somber voice pleads for rest and solace; I knew him when he voiced the prophecy of his mediations and sound logic respecting the future of his country—the land he loved and the form of government he professed with unerring devotion. He was gentle and he was brave. Thus I knew my fine friend in the days gone by.

My colleague, whose memory I will long cherish, lived as he died—and he died as he lived—with the weight of the livid problems of the people before him. He continued with his duties to the very end. He was unafraid. He cautiously stole away from his labors, going to his home where he could be alone with God, and there he wrapped the draperies of his couch about him and laid down as if to peaceful, happy dreams.

Thus the life work of my friend was ended. The brilliant career of a brilliant man was thus terminated. But the fruit of his labors will continue throughout the coming ages.

FREDERICK VAN NUYS needs no encomium. His life and his living of it stand before us in beauty and in splendor. As my farewell tribute to him—my friend—I give in the words spoken of a great hero—in the days gone by—"This was a man."

Our Departed Colleagues

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we are met here today to honor the memory of our departed colleagues and friends—to listen to the roll call of those who have been taken from our midst. It has been the good fortune of each of us to know some of these Members intimately—our misfortune to know others not so intimately. We all know that they all strove to make their State and Nation a better place to live in; to make this a better world for their having been.

We know that they were but human—part of us. They did not claim to be infallible. They knew that human wisdom was limited. They strove with the light they had in a war-mad world. They, too, hoped for a just and permanent peace. They strove for perfection knowing that that goal could not be reached—but approached.

In honoring these dead we honor ourselves. We honor them not as partisans but as colleagues and fellow citizens of a great Nation. Partisanship ends at the grave. All earthly strife and difference of opinion comes to an end at the tomb. When the line that divides life and death has been passed, strife ends and there is perfect and permanent peace.

Let us hope that the spirits of our departed friends are present with us here today. Let us hope that they will guide us to ever higher ideals not only here on the floor of this House, but throughout the Nation and throughout the civilized world.

James Aloysius O'Leary

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES ALOYSIUS O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, once again death has stilled the hand and mind of one of our most beloved members of the New York delegation, my warm friend and colleague, JAMES A. O'LEARY, affectionately known to his legion of friends as Jim.

I had the pleasure of meeting JIM O'LEARY when he first became a Member of this House. During many years of association with him in this Chamber I found him to be a sincere and honest legislator, conscientious and untiring in his efforts here. On his work here in Congress I need not dwell. We are all familiar with his fine grasp of legislative procedure and his ever constant desire to serve his constituents. JIM O'LEARY always gave the best that was in him to the problems of his people and his country. I am sure that every Member of this body who served with him held for Jim an affectionate regard, and appraised him as a man of outstanding ability, integrity, and patriotism.

JIM O'LEARY will be greatly missed by the Members of this Chamber as well as his neighbors and friends whose interest he always had at heart.

When he died not only did his family suffer a great loss, but his community, the people of his district, and the State of New York lost a faithful and sincere public servant. I have lost one of my best friends and colleagues.

Lawrence Lewis

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of our meeting together to pay final tribute to our colleagues who have been taken from us during the past year, it is my wish to speak of my good friend, the late Representative LAWRENCE LEWIS, who represented the First District of Colorado.

LAWRENCE LEWIS served in the Congress of the United States from January 1933 until the time of his death in December 1943. He was an able lawyer and industrious public servant, having served as legal adviser to the adjutant general of Colorado and on the civil-service commission of that State. His experience in business and newspaper work helped to make him a most capable and efficient Representative.

Men by their achievements may gain a place in the annals of history. However, it is by their character and consideration of their fellow men that their memory is lovingly revered in the hearts of all who knew them. LAWRENCE LEWIS did not seek fame—he preferred to accomplish what he thought was best for his people in a modest manner; he sought no reward—except the personal satisfaction of a job well done; he sought no acclaim; he directed his energies in service.

His gentle and kindly demeanor, his innate courtesy, his honesty in his dealings, his great ability, and high intelligence all contributed to make him the very fine gentleman we respected and loved. Not only his native State of Colorado has felt his loss but those of us here who were privileged to work with him and know him well miss him and the assistance and cooperation he cheerfully gave when called upon. He accomplished much for the people he represented, and he had the interests of his country at heart.

A conscientious statesman and true friend has left us. The example he set—the pattern of unselfish endeavor which he created, remain for us to emulate.

Frederick Van Nuys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. SAMUEL D. JACKSON, of Indiana, on the life, character, and public service of Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS, late a Senator from the State of Indiana:

With the passing of Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS, the Nation lost one of its most colorful characters and Indiana one of its greatest Senators.

Senator VAN NUYS at the time of his passing, January 25, 1944, was the senior Senator from Indiana and chairman of the Judiciary Committee and one of the Senate's most influential and beloved Members.

FRED VAN NUYS was long known in Indiana as an exponent of the Democratic Party. He had been State senator, prosecuting attorney, county chairman, State chairman, United States district attorney, and was finishing his second term in the Senate at the time of his unfortunate demise. He was born at Falmouth, Rush County, Ind., and grew up in the smaller towns and cities of central Indiana. His father was a country doctor and the Senator was fond of telling how, when a boy, he used to ride with his father over the country roads, and delighted to relate that his father used to say that all the medicine people needed to keep well was plenty of quinine and voting the straight Democratic ticket.

He was educated at Lebanon and attended Earlham College at Richmond, where he was graduated in 1898. He later attended Indiana University Law School and was admitted to the bar at Shelbyville in 1900. His political career began at Anderson several years later with his election as Madison County prosecutor. He also served as chairman of the county Democratic committee. He was a member of the State senate from Madison County in the 1913 and 1915 sessions, and became president pro tem of the senate in 1915. The Indiana Democratic State Central Committee elected him as State chairman in 1918, and he was named United States district attorney at Indianapolis by President Woodrow Wilson at the completion of that campaign. FRED VAN NUYS was a lawyer at Lebanon and at Indianapolis, practicing in the best tradition of his profession. At one time he was a partner of Samuel M. Ralston, former Governor and Senator. The stocky, forceful Senator VAN NUYS had long been connected with the liquor problems of America, having won election in 1932 as an advocate of repeal of the eighteenth amendment and modification of the Volstead Act. At the time of his death he was conducting a Senate investigation of the current liquor shortage. Throughout his career he retained his interest in State politics, acting as keynote speaker at a number of State conventions and as a member of the State Democratic executive committee in several campaigns.

Senator VAN NUYS' death was mourned by Democrats throughout Indiana. Outstanding members of both parties paid high tribute to his service. All Indiana had faith in his fidelity to duty, his unswerving patriotism, and his personal independence.

Senator and Mrs. Van Nuys, the former Marie Krug, had one son, a lieutenant in the Naval Air Corps serving overseas.

Senator VAN NUYS was buried at Anderson, Ind., after appropriate and beautiful services in Indianapolis conducted by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, and attended by a large delegation of Senators and Congressmen and a host of loyal friends.

The Fort Wayne Journal Gazette, during the years of Senator VAN NUYS' most active participation in Democratic politics, was published by two of his most intimate friends, Edward G. Hoffman, former Secretary of the Democratic National Committee, and Lew G. Ellingham, former secretary of state. It is now published by William A. Kunkel, Jr., and its editor is Frank Roberts. Both these men were great admirers of Senator VAN NUYS, and following is the editorial run in the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette a few days after his passing. It speaks the sentiment of all of Indiana:

"SENATOR FREDERICK VAN NUYS

"FREDERICK VAN NUYS, senior United States Senator from Indiana, whose death occurred early Tuesday morning in Washington while he slept, was one of the Hoosier State's most distinguished sons.

"His ancestry, his ability, his education, his character, and his personality, all combined to fit him for the high role he was to play in the affairs of State and Nation.

"Senator VAN NUYS was a descendant of Johannes Van Nuys, a Dutch immigrant who came to America and settled on Long Island nearly 300 years ago. His father, David H. Van Nuys, was a country doctor who was widely known and respected.

"The Senator was a graduate of Earlham College and Indiana law school. From his youth he was a profound student and a leader.

"His first public office was prosecutor of Madison County, which he held for 6 years. He was elected to the Indiana State Senate in 1913 and became the Democratic leader. In 1917-18 he served as Democratic State chairman and was then named United States district attorney for Indiana by President Woodrow Wilson. As a legislator he displayed great common sense and progressive tendencies, as a district attorney he was able and fearless.

"In the meantime he had moved his residence from Anderson to Indianapolis and became a member of the law firm of which the late Gov. Samuel M. Ralston was the senior partner. He was one of the outstanding lawyers at the Indiana bar.

"Soon the former district attorney became a legend in Democratic politics in the State. He was regarded as one of the most authentic spokesmen of the party, serving as keynote speaker at State conventions and helping to write party platforms. He was often importuned to seek elective public office, but refrained from doing so until 1932. In that year when the Nation faced the never-to-be-forgotten internal crisis growing out of the depression, he offered himself as a candidate for United States Senator and was elected over the veteran Republican James E. Watson, by a plurality of landslide proportions.

"His ability was quickly recognized in the Senate when he was named chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee. He was also a member of the important Foreign Relations Committee. Senator VAN NUYS was re-elected to the Senate in 1938.

"His career in the Senate was marked by independence. His guides on all legislative matters were his own conscience and his own judgment. He never hesitated to join with the opposition because he feared it might affect his popularity. He was never a mere yes-sayer to President Roosevelt. He was a firm believer in the principles of Jeffersonian democracy, and they were his chart and compass throughout his politica. life.

"He was, as we have said, a profound student. His knowledge of law and his understanding of human nature were matched by few of his colleagues in the world's greatest law-making body. He was forceful in debate and wise in his counsel in committee rooms.

"No one ever questioned his integrity or his patriotism, for honesty of purpose and love of country were the ruling forces of his heart and mind.

"In personal relationships he was kind and courteous. His many admirable qualities brought him respect, admiration, and love.

"Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS fought a good fight. His life is crowned with many years of notable public service. Citizens of Indiana regardless of party affiliations, are proud of him."

Lawrence Lewis

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to serve in this House with LAWRENCE LEWIS, but I did have the pleasure of knowing him for over 30 years. During this time I learned to honor and respect him, first as an eminent lawyer, and for the past 12 years as a statesman of unquestioned honesty, ability, and integrity.

LAWRENCE LEWIS was a quiet, friendly gentleman of the old school. Born in St. Louis, Mo., June 22, 1879, he received his early schooling in the atmosphere of the busy, young western city of Pueblo, Colo. He attended the University of Colorado for 2 years and received his A B. and L. L. B. degrees from Harvard. He started practicing law in Denver, Colo., in 1909 and in his long and active law practice had the reputation of having never lost a case, preferring to settle matters out of court in his fine diplomatic way rather than resorting to lengthy and expensive court action.

LAWRENCE LEWIS was always ready and willing to help his fellow man with any difficult situation and did it in such a gracious manner that one would almost get the impression that he himself was the beneficiary.

On December 9, 1943, when the saddening news of the death of LAWRENCE LEWIS was flashed to the Nation, we in Denver, Colo., felt a pang of deep sorrow and regret. His passing was a distinct loss to this House and the country as a whole, as well as to the First Congressional District of Colorado, comprising his beloved Denver. Many of the Members here have spoken to me about him and always have the finest things to say about his wisdom, loyalty, and the tireless work which he performed in his duties here.

Although of different political faiths, I consider it a privilege and an honor to serve in this House as a successor to as grand and good a man as LAWRENCE LEWIS.

William Howard Wheat

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, we pause in these troubled days to pay tribute to

a beloved colleague and friend, the late WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, of Illinois, known to all as Bill.

Congressman WHEAT, whose home was in Rantoul, Ill., was serving his third congressional term at the time of his passing. His quiet willingness to aid and assist when within his power endeared him to all with whom he came in contact.

His memory is dear to thousands who delighted to call him a friend. He has reared by his conscientious public service an enduring monument. No greater tribute can we pay to any man than that we believe is justly due our departed colleague, when we say that he was faithful to the trust committed to him by a people whom he delighted to serve.

He was an able statesman; he loved his country and took pride in serving it, according to his convictions as to what was best for the country.

While we shall mourn his loss from our midst, our loss will be his gain. For he has gone to that Congress of Saints, where toil and strife are no more and where all is peace, happiness, and rest.

Our memory is enriched for having had the pleasure and privilege of associating and working with Bill.

James Aloysius O'Leary

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES ALOYSIUS O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, God in His wisdom has seen fit to reach out and take from our midst one of our very dear and loyal friends, a valuable asset to the House of Representatives. JIM O'LEARY was a true friend and a good American, a man who at this moment has one son giving his very best so that we can continue in this deliberation in which we are taking part this afternoon. The things that Jim stood for were pronounced by his every deed and his every action up until this present moment. His suffering was tremendous, not only his physical suffering but his mental suffering as well, having just suffered the loss of his dear wife. I am sure his son and daughters will be happy in the knowledge that he has left behind him many, many friends. We stood here no more than 2 weeks ago and uttered practically the same words in behalf of another departed colleague. But, just as often as we repeat those words, just as often are we that much more sincere in our eulogy of the passing of a great and dearly beloved friend.

JIM'S absence is a tremendous blow, not only to the constituents in his district, and to his family, but especially to his friends, among whom I am happy to know that I was numbered.

Thomas Henry Cullen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, we were born to die and we die that we may live. This is the whole philosophy of human existence. I dare say that the passing of our dear friend, TOM CULLEN, will be just that, and his memory will be eternal.

A man possessing the soul of wit, an Irish gentleman such as our dear friend, was bound to have many, many loving friends. I am very happy to think that I could be considered in that category.

Even before I had the opportunity of taking my first oath in this House 10 years ago, and upon my election, he called at my office. Being a young man, realizing that he had an abundance of knowledge and experience, I was indeed proud to know that he would suffer himself to come to my office and offer me the benefit of his experience in this great body.

Yes, his voice has been stilled, but I am sure that I speak not only for myself but for the other Members of this House and his friends when I say that his very kindness, his memory, will linger in our hearts forever.

Frederick Van Nuys

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS, late a Senator from the State of Indiana

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, on this Memorial Day, the Congress of the United States pauses to honor the memory of those Members who have gone to the Great Beyond. It is with pride that we Hoosiers pay tribute to a noble son of Indiana, Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS. On January 25, 1944, death took Senator VAN NUYS from our midst, and the Nation lost a true American, his State a loyal and efficient representative. By his colleagues he will always be remembered as a worthy example of true statesmanship, the bulwark of constitutional government. His loyalty to principle, his devotion to duty, and his untiring efforts on behalf of those he represented are the cornerstones of a monument which will remain long in the memory of the people of Indiana.

Senator VAN NUYS was born at Falmouth, Ind., April 16, 1874, the son of Dr. David H. and Katherine Custer Van Nuys. He was graduated from Earlham College in 1898 and from the Indiana Law School in 1900, and received the degree of doctor of laws in 1930 from Earlham College. He began the practice of law at Shelbyville, Ind., in 1900. He later filled with distinction the office of prosecuting attorney, was a member of the State senate, and was appointed United States attorney for the district of Indiana. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1932 and reelected in 1938. While serving in the Senate, Senator VAN NUYS was honored with two of the most important committee assignments in that body, and served as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Judiciary Committee, of which he was chairman at the time of his death. He is survived by his wife and one son, William, who is serving his country as an officer in the United States Navy.

Senator VAN NUYS gave his best to the cause of good government, and lived, studied, and worked for the welfare of his fellow countrymen. We mourn his passing today, and we shall continue to mourn his loss as long as we cherish the principles and ideals of government he served and upheld so faithfully and so well.

There is great comfort in the realization that though men like FRED VAN NUYS be gone, their good works live on, and this great Nation of ours is an everlasting monument to their devoted and selfless efforts in the fight for the preservation and extension of liberty.

To the end of the road with a course well run,
what epitaph more could say?
That he held to the faith as he journeyed
through and smiled as he won his way.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, on this day we are commemorating the memory of such distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, I want to pay my respects to the late Congressman PHIL A. BENNETT, of Missouri.

Throughout his term of service in the House, Mr. BENNETT was my sincere friend. I learned to love and respect him with increasing admiration. I never knew him to cast a vote on any great issue without first consulting his conscience. His votes reflected conviction rather than political expediency.

Although his distinguished son, Congressman MARION T. BENNETT, now represents his district ably and well, his loss

will long be felt in Congress. When the people choose more men like PHIL A. BENNETT our country will be sure of direct and genuine representation in Washington.

John William Ditter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Senator JAMES J. DAVIS, of Pennsylvania, on the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania:

This past year has seen many of our colleagues taken from us. In both Houses of the Congress, the fell clutch of death has stilled the labors of outstanding public servants in both major parties. And these losses lay not lightly on a Nation faced with the problems of grave emergency.

The State of Pennsylvania was not spared by the invasion of death, for it yielded up one of its most beloved and gifted sons—J. WILLIAM DITTER—to that timeless conqueror of all men.

J. WILLIAM DITTER represented the Seventeenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania with an ability and sincerity known to few men. His labors were always in behalf of the best interests of this great Nation which he knew and loved. And it is indeed fitting that he met his death while in the active service of his country.

The untimely passing of BILL DITTER, in the very flower of his life, was and will be deeply mourned by all those who knew him; for with his passing, the Congress lost one of its outstanding Members, the people of Pennsylvania lost a faithful and an earnest Representative, and the Republican Party lost an ardent and a fearless standard bearer.

Representative DITTER was above all else a straightforward American citizen, a sincere and tireless servant of the American people, in whose cause and whose behalf he was always proud to labor and to serve.

The inspiring example of service and honor which was J. WILLIAM DITTER will long outlive the earthly years of a life which he willingly gave to the public service and to the progress and stability of the America which he loved.

The memory of BILL DITTER'S good name and fine deeds will live forever in these Halls and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which gave him to the service of America.

How the People Feel About the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am in receipt of a concurrent resolution from the Legislature of Louisiana calling upon me, and upon the other members of our delegation to "vote against any further appropriation for the continuance of the Office of Price Administration unless the Office of Price Administration fix higher ceiling prices on rough rice and strawberries."

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the fact that such a resolution should be enacted by the legislature of any State indicates conclusively the temper of the people in respect to the Office of Price Administration, and shows the widespread dissatisfaction and resentment of the people in regard to the high-handed and bureaucratic administration of that agency.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are not only disappointed with the administration of O. P. A. in the rice and strawberry sections of Louisiana, but also in the entire State where there are great oil, cattle, potato, and fur industries. Notwithstanding the protests of our people, as well as those of the Members of the Senate and Congress, the O. P. A. has failed to give us any consideration in the administration of their programs in connection with the industries named. This is especially true of the oil business. Our people cannot understand why the O. P. A. is able to ignore two-thirds of the Members of Congress who represent the people, when two-thirds of the membership vote for a bill to give a small increase in price to the oil industry to save the industry as well as furnish oil which is so critically needed in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the O. P. A. is of the opinion that the Members of Congress cannot vote against them—that they—the O. P. A.—are supreme and not the representatives of the people, and it may be that when the legislation for appropriations for the O. P. A. is presented, someone is going to get a surprise. I desire to include in these remarks a copy of the house concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Members of Congress from this State not to support any further appropriation to the Office of Price Administration, unless the Office of Price Administration fixes higher ceilings on rough rice and strawberries

Whereas the farmers of the State of Louisiana are doing all within their power to assist in the prosecution of the war against our enemies, but that the producers of rice and strawberries are handicapped by the existing ceiling prices on rough rice and strawberries: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana concurring), That this legislature do request and recommend to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the State of Louisiana that they vote against any further appropriation for the continuance of the Office of Price Administration, that the Office of Price Administration fix higher ceiling prices on rough rice and strawberries; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to forward official copies of this resolution to each Senator and Representative of the State of Louisiana in the Congress of the United States.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, no person can fill the vacancy left by the death of ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER. One can but succeed him—succeed him on the floor of this House in humbl recognition of inadequacy.

In succeeding U. S. GUYER, his achievements, record, and conduct are the star upon which my course has been, and will be, guided.

At home, in Kansas City, Kans., which city he at one time served as mayor, he was affectionately known as "Judge," "Sam," or "U. S." He loved mankind, and was beloved by all who knew him. I have seen him on many occasions, as he made his way up and down our streets, stopping for a kind and pleasant word with all he met—in the shops and stores, on the corners, at the court house, with always a pleasant greeting whether it was the laborer in overalls, or the man in business. SAM GUYER was a friendly man, as you who served with him well know.

Upon my graduation from Kansas University Judge GUYER took me into his law office—and his heart—putting it all at my disposal and asking no favor in return. It was there, from him, that I first learned to really know the Constitution—to know it as a live, vital force. Thus knowing it I came to love it, and, loving it, I have determined, as Judge GUYER before me had done, to defend it to the fullest of my ability against all attackers.

As a student of history, and especially of American history, he was without peer in this body. To him every historical character was a personal friend. I am sure that upon many occasions he must have held converse and communion with Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, Madison, Lincoln.

Before the days of the microphone, I have heard Judge GUYER hold huge audiences spellbound with the power of his oratory—his mastery of diction and the music of his voice—bringing smiles and tears, joy and sadness, and deep conviction to his listeners. He was an artist with words—more than that, he was a virtuoso.

As a Christian gentleman, SAM GUYER never felt any hesitancy about rejoining his Master. His death was merely the return of the son to his Father's house.

In the passing of ULYSSES S. GUYER, Congress and the Nation lost a states-

man; Kansas—though he was born in Illinois—lost a great Kansan. Mrs. Guyer lost a loving husband; all of us who knew him lost a sincere friend; and, added to that, my personal loss was that of a wise counselor and guide.

Lawrence Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado on the life, character, and public service of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado:

On a winter day at high noon we laid him to rest in Cincinnati beside the parents who bore him—the parents whose memory he revered and worshiped; and we said with feeling and with truth, "Well done, good and faithful servant." LAWRENCE LEWIS set a high mark indeed in public service. He thought little of his own comfort and welfare when there was a public job to do. Midnight oil was his companion and every step he took was measured with meticulous study and care lest the slightest error creep in.

One acquires a renewed confidence in the successful venture we call America when he contemplates the deep loyalty and sturdy devotion for God and country as exemplified by the late LAWRENCE LEWIS. The soil of his beloved country is now his physical home henceforth and forever, and his soul is an integral part of the spiritual force that rules the earth and the stars and urges men to walk with humility and good will. So mote it be!

Thomas Henry Cullen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, all our hearts were saddened by the passing of our dear friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable THOMAS H. CULLEN, of the Fourth Congressional District, New York, on March 1, 1944. He was affectionately known to all of us as Tom. For years the dean of our New York delegation, he left a record behind of which any man could be proud. When I came to Congress 18 years ago, he was one of the first men I met. At that time he willingly offered me his good counsel and advice on the intricate legislative procedure of this body. Through the following years of our personal friendship and close association I learned, on countless occasions, the true warmth of his heart and the kindliness of his spirit.

Words are mere phrases and meaningless in attempting to say that which comes to my heart in the loss of one whom I was privileged to know most intimately for many years. He was a public-spirited man, kind and humane. If any of his friends were ill or confined to the hospital, it was nothing for Tom to call on them time and time again and do everything possible for their comfort. His life was full of useful deeds.

He was a good husband, a good father, and a good friend. He has left to his family the heritage of a good name and the record of a statesman upon which the whole State of New York can look with pride. In his passing I have lost a very dear and close friend, the State of New York has lost a devoted son, and the Nation an able and accomplished legislator whose work will long be remembered.

Small Business in the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Washington, D. C., on May 30, 1944. The title of this very able address is "Small Business in the Post-war World."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My talk this evening is on the problems of American small business. In using the term "small business," it is not to be understood that small business is necessarily engaged in any conflict with big business. There are certain basic industries in our country which require big plants and enormous capital through which they are able to accomplish a high rate of production at low costs. These large enterprises have played an important role in the history of American industry and the development of what has come to be known as the American way of life.

At the outset, therefore, I wish it to be understood that there is a place in our country for both big and little business.

During many years, however, we have been witnessing a trend in this country toward monopoly and the gradual elimination of the smaller business concerns through consolidations and concentration of industry in the hands of large industrial organizations. These combinations have a tendency to control prices and stifle competition. It is against this tendency which the Congress is aiming. These larger aggregations are able to direct and control markets and engage in many unfair business practices which drive the smaller concerns from the field. Now, the preservation of small business is essential to our system of free competition and democratic way of life.

The Congress is interested, therefore, in opposing this undue concentration of business and development of monopolies which seek through the exercise of great financial power and unfair practices to drive out of the field the smaller independent concerns and thus bring about a collectivistic or totalitarian economy in our country like they have in Germany.

America was built and grew to its present great power on the principle of free competition maintained through free markets. The wealth of our country has been wrought from her natural resources—her fertile lands, her vast forests, and rich mineral deposits—through our system of free competition carried on by independent business enterprise.

Fifty years ago American business consisted almost entirely of small and medium-sized enterprises. Then America had a truly competitive economy. But the trend toward large combinations and monopolies in industry which I have mentioned began in the 1890's and by the 1930's had grown to such proportions that the continued existence of independent small business was seriously threatened along with our traditional American system of free enterprise itself.

It was the iron necessity of this global war which made us realize the enormous importance of small business to the national welfare. At first the small plants were neglected. They were given no war work and many were compelled to close their doors. It soon became apparent, however, that without fully utilizing the small-plant capacity of the country, our war production goals could not be met.

So it was, that in June 1942, the Congress unanimously passed a lew establishing a Government agency known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, sponsored by the Senate Special Committee on Small Business Problems. That act gave to the Smaller War Plants Corporation various powers to mobilize the productive capacity of the small concerns in the war effort.

That was pioneer legislation of its kind. Here the Congress recognized for the first time in our history that the Nation's small business has an indispensable part to play in our system of free enterprise. We could not afford to permit it to be destroyed.

I am glad to report to you this evening that the war record of the smaller plants of the country has more than justified the expectations of the Congress.

The highest leaders in Government and industry have paid repeated tribute to the splendid contribution of small plants to our miraculous production record in this war. We have won the war of production largely through the cooperation of the small plants. They have performed thousands of contracts and subcontracts calling for the most intricate parts, components, assemblies and subassemblies. They have shown exceptional aptitude in acquiring the necessary engineering skill and production "know-how."

In this record of performance, the Smaller War Plants Corporation has played a valuable and significant part. Under its present chairman, Mr. Maury Maverick, I am confident that the corporation will prove equal to the urgent problems of reconversion that are now developing as we pass the peak of war production and begin to witness cut-backs and contract cancelations.

The small concerns at the outbreak of the war did not have the resources of capital and credit, or equipment and manpower that their larger competitors enjoyed. They were especially hard hit by the drastic reductions in civilian materials, the shortage of manpower and the many controls which were necessary in the conduct of the war. Shortage of civilian materials forced them out of civilian production and without war work

they faced bankruptcy. When given an opportunity, however, as I have pointed out, they made an enviable record in war production. But now those small concerns which converted to war production are confronted with cut-backs and contract terminations with all the resulting hardships and uncertainties. The closing of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation which you have read about in the papers is an example. This plant has hundreds of small subcontractors affected by the cut-back.

It was to deal positively with these problems that on May 12, 1944, I introduced in the Senate, as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, a bill known as the Small Business Act of 1944 (S. 1913). Any businessman who wishes a copy of this bill and the accompanying report should address the Senate Small Business Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Let me give you a short summary of the Small Business Act of 1944. First, it extends the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to July 1, 1947, to cover the expected reconversion period, and its name is to be changed to the Small Business Corporation. It increases its capitalization from one hundred and fifty million to a billion dollars.

The corporation is to be the Government agency responsible for representing small business interests in Government affairs generally and particularly in connection with the allocation of materials and equipment for the reconversion of small concerns to civilian operations.

The bill also establishes an interpartmental committee of important Government agencies to consult on all policies and procedures affecting small business. It assures proper representation by small-business men on the many trade and industry committees now functioning in the various Government agencies.

It further authorizes the Small Business Corporation to insure loans made by banks and other private financial institutions to small concerns for their reconversion to civilian operations and to reestablish those which have been forced to discontinue by war conditions. In this way, it is hoped to encourage the flow of private capital and credit to small concerns so that they can continue and eventually increase their production and employment.

It will enable small-business concerns to obtain on fair terms a proper share of the estimated $75,000,000,000 of surplus Government war property which ranges all the way from food and clothing to jeeps and heavy machinery. To accomplish this, the surplus disposal agencies are directed to consult with the Small Business Corporation and to fix the types and quantities of these surpluses for disposal to small concerns. Such a provision is essential to prevent these huge piles of surplus property from being disposed of in such a way as to encourage the expansion of larger concerns at the expense of the smaller ones.

The Small Business Act will give to small concerns a fair opportunity to participate in the use of the new industrial techniques and processes which the Government has acquired or developed during the war, including the 45,000 patents which have been seized from enemy aliens.

This Government agency is further authorized to make arrangements for providing small concerns with the research facilities of the Federal and State Governments and of educational and other private institutions.

In the administration of the Small Business Act, all honorably discharged war veterans are to be given suitable preferences according to methods which the Small Business Corporation is directed to work out with the appropriate veteran authorities of the Government.

I have given you a very brief and hurried summary of the Small Business Act of 1944. In my opinion, it is the most important legislation on small business to be introduced during my 10 years in the Senate. It is the result of extensive study by the Senate Small Business Committee and consultation with many experts and businessmen both in and outside the Government.

There are some people, of course, who, while professing undying devotion to the cause of small business, are found attacking this measure as socialistic and paternalistic. They say it would wet nurse and regiment small business.

Of course, it would do nothing of the kind. It is, in fact, the very opposite of socialism or regimentation. Its entire purpose is to preserve that freedom of opportunity which is the foundation of our American system. It seeks to offset the swift wartime concentration of industry and protect the competitive position of small concerns in the reconversion period. It would aid small business without regimentation or interference.

My experience is that attacks of the kind just mentioned are made by those who wish to play politics with the problems of small business and wish to avoid any discussion of its concrete problems on their merits.

These same people did not cry "socialism" or "paternalism" when the Government in 1932, under Mr. Hoover's administration, established the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which doled out billions of Government money to the banks, railroads, and public utilities and saved them from economic ruin. I make no criticism of that program, but it seems to me that when a modest measure of assistance to small business is proposed in the present crisis, it should be given the same consideration that was given to big business in the Hoover period.

I am confident that the many small-business men who have suffered so deeply from the unavoidable dislocations of the war will not be fooled by this misrepresentation of their interests and welfare. Businessmen have demonstrated their support of the bill by a stream of letters to the Senate Small Business Committee. They realize that their own economic survival and the preservation of free enterprise itself require this Congress to adopt measures which will maintain their freedom of opportunity in the trying period of reconversion which lies ahead.

In conclusion, I should like to paraphrase the famous remark of Mark Twain about the weather: "Everybody talks about small business, but nobody does anything about it."

This bill offers a real opportunity to do something about it. I appeal to all American businessmen in their own interest to make the most of this opportunity.

One Hundred and Thirtieth Anniversary of Norwegian Constitution

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the United Norwegian Seventeenth of May Commission, at Milwaukee, Wis., on May 17, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today is the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the Constitution of Norway. We commemorate the event when the Norwegian peasants at Eidsvold, in their homespun clothes, swore to maintain Norwegian freedom, "Enig og tro intil Dovre Falder."

I have come from Washington, fellow Americans, to do three things:

1 To pay tribute to that sturdy people—Ibsen calls them "det klippe faste klippe folk"—from whom many of us have stemmed.

2. To join with you in rededicating ourselves as Americans to make Norway free again.

3. To talk to you about some of the things in which we are all interested and which relate to both America and Norway.

It was my privilege as a representative of this country to attend the last meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union held at Oslo, Norway, in August 1939. This was 2 weeks before Hitler invaded Poland.

On our way to Oslo, we spent a week in England, visiting London, the Shakespeare country, the lake country, Glasgow, Edinburgh. From there we sailed across the North Sea to Bergen.

Bergen, the city I had heard my father speak of so often. There we visited the fish markets, took the tramway up to the heights, and beheld the magnificent view of the fjords and the islands. The next morning we took the train to Voss where we saw the snow on the mountains reflected in the lake. That evening I visited with some Norwegian soldiers and bought them refreshments.

We motored to Stalheim, passing numerous waterfalls and lakes, and had lunch at the hotel, which is beautifully situated, overlooking the magnificent Narodal Canyon. We proceeded by auto to Gudvangen, there taking a steamer on the Sognefjord to Flaam, and spent the night at the Fretheim Hotel. We continued by automobile through the wild and rugged Flaamsdals Valley to Vatnahalsen, where we were transported by little horses and carriages up to the mountain to the railroad station.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union meetings were held in the Storting at Oslo. On August 18 I had an audience with the King and Crown Prince of Norway. I had luncheon in Nansen's home and stood by his grave. I was privileged to speak in the Norwegian Parliament, to have lunch with our American Minister, Mrs. Harriman, but, most of all, I was privileged to look up the home of my mother and my father.

Mother was 3 years old when her folks left the old country. Her home was located on a mountain top, where Gausdal branches off from Gudbrandsdalen. We found in the sturdy mountain hut an old relative some 90 years of age. I can still see her waving her hand as we left. I can also see in my mind's eye that beautiful valley up which Hitler's forces later marched and ravaged.

I also visited my father's home, which was up in Numedal about 7 miles north of Kongsberg. Some 30 distant relatives were on hand, and I took movie pictures of that gathering. I have since tried to reach some of them by mail but have been unable to do so. Some day, when this terrible war is over and peace has come again, I hope to go back to the Land of the Midnight Sun.

Let us go back for a moment to 1939. At that time the Norwegian Nation was a lighthouse to the world. It had practically solved its economic problems. The people were healthy, happy, and peaceful. They wanted to live at peace with the world.

When I had an audience with the King of Norway I remember suggesting to him the need of the democratic nations banding themselves together. A charged atmosphere existed in Oslo at that time. The King hoped

that Hitler would refrain from invading Norway, but, of course, Hitler thought otherwise. Norway hadn't really been invaded since the Middle Ages. Scandinavia's neutrality survived the First World War, but it could not survive this war. Norway was absolutely unprepared. At the end of 3 months she was conquered, but she made Hitler pay a price and now the sons of the Vikings are fighting again. It was their forefathers who, almost a thousand years ago, invaded France and Britain.

So Norway forgot to build an army and navy. She believed in treaties, in cooperation between nations. She believed in the pledged word. And now we are fighting to reestablish the faith of the world in the beliefs which she had.

April 9 was Easter. It was 4 years ago, on April 9, that the peaceful nation of Norway was visited by Nazi ruthlessness. Invading Nazis immediately began a planned campaign to exterminate civilization within these lands. The Nazi campaign has failed. It has never attained its fixed goals. In Norway the light of freedom still shines, undimmed, eternal.

There are over 140,000 Americans of Norwegian descent living in Wisconsin. Almost all of us have some family ties with the motherland. The tragedy of Norway today is painfully close to our hearts. In Milwaukee County there are over 10,000 Americans of Norwegian descent. The entire population of Norway is about that of our own State. It is a small nation as numbers go, but it has had a tremendous effect upon the history of America. The folk songs, the legends, the schools, the music, the literature, the faith and character of the Norwegian people have been closely woven into the fabric of Wisconsin and American life.

The first Norsemen came to American shores around the year 1000, when the storms on the North Atlantic drove Leif Ericson westward. The second Norse immigration came only a few years later. Its purpose, as the saga of Erik the Red states, was to find Leif Ericson's Vinland.

We in America, especially those of us whose homes are located in the great Middle West, know and appreciate the sterling qualities of the Norwegian people. Their contributions to science, industry, finance, literature, and the arts have been recognized in this country. Innumerable Americans of Norwegian descent have become vital parts of the American community, State, and Nation. Americans of Norwegian origin have exerted powerful influence upon the progress of our schools, our free press, our churches, our business, and agricultural life.

It is the wide, general knowledge of Norwegian character which prepared Americans for the manner of Norwegian resistance to the Nazis. Generations of law-abiding citizens had passed on a heritage of staunch devotion to liberty, and, above all, a sense of humor. The Norwegians have utilized these qualities to the fullest possible extent

It is a paradox that sabotage should appear among a people famed for their close observance of law. Yet, sabotage has appeared; organized sabotage. The humorless Nazis have not only suffered from the efforts of these Norwegian patriots; more—they have been made ridiculous.

When the Nazis—after 2 months of bitter fighting—temporarily subdued the heroic efforts of the Norwegian Army—resistance in Norway did not cease. It went underground. A large portion of the Norwegian Navy and the Norwegian merchant marine eluded the Nazis and made their way to neutral or Allied ports. Many Norwegian ships and thousands of Norwegian sailors are serving the cause of world liberation today. Scores of Norwegian pilots, trained in Canada, have taken their places beside their comrades of the U. S. A. A. F. and the R. A. F. in the stepping-up of the air war against the heart of Nazi war industry and transportation. Units of Norwegian ground troops eagerly await the coming Allied invasion of western Europe.

Of equal importance to the military accomplishments of the Norwegians wtihout the boundaries of Norway are the accomplishments of the Norwegian underground and the manner in which the Royal Norwegian Government has established and maintained the best of relations with the Governments of the United Nations.

The Nazis sought through pressures applied over long periods of time to control every phase of Norwegian life. But, they reckoned without the determination of Norwegians to retain their national characteristics, unaffected by the cruelty of barbarous enemies or by the kindness of trusted allies. No more striking instance of the independence of Norwegian thought exists than in the matter of the conscious successful attempt at preserving the purity of the Norwegian language. At home, the Norwegian underground has effectively prevented the Nazis from Germanicizing the Norwegian language by the planned popularization of certain Germanic terms and phrases. In Great Britain and in the United States, where the English language prevails, I have had occasion to observe the manner in which free Norwegians have carefully, courteously—yet firmly—preserved the lingual practices of their nation. Americans admire and respect the Norwegians for their determination to retain every attribute of their nationality.

Within Norway, the Nazis have followed their old technique of using all possible measures to turn individual against individual, profession against profession, and class against class.

How miserably Hitler has failed.

The Nazis sought to turn the Norwegian people against their clergy. By promises of special privileges—and when that failed—by threats of concentration camp and death itself, the Nazis vainly tried to identify the Norwegian clergy with their degraded standard. The Norwegian clergy was impervious to pleas and punishment alike. They not only retained their integrity as a group, but they won the eternal loyalty of their parishioners by their unwavering stand for freedom.

Like assaults on the honor of Norwegian athletes, teachers, lawyers, doctors, legislators, labor and businessmen, met with the same results. Cold contempt. Studied lack of cooperation. Meanwhile, no Nazi or no Nazi military installation or factory or railroad was secure from the organized sabotage of the Norwegian underground. Norwegians receive information on the true state of world affairs from allied radio. Norwegian underground newspapers continue to publish facts. Norwegian sources keep an unabated flow of information in motion to allied military leaders on the situation within Norway. The allies often learn of Norwegian events before the Nazis and the Quislings know that they have taken place.

For 4 long years there has been no slackening of the hate of Norwegians for the Nazis. When Norway is liberated—and Norway will be liberated—each Quisling will be meted out just punishment. There are comparatively few Nazi-collaborators among the Norwegians, but each and every one of them is known to the underground. Moreover, when Norway is free, every Nazi soldier on Norwegian soil will find himself a prisoner of the people.

Norway has endured much from the Nazis. Norway has contributed much toward the certain United Nations victory. Norway has earned—and Norway will receive—an honored place at the peace table.

April 9—the day when peaceful Norway was ruthlessly invaded by the Nazis—will not always be a day of sorrow. When the militarists of Germany are brought down to defeat, April 9 will be an emblem of endurance, a symbol of the spiritual strength of the great and respected peoples of Norway.

In America, we must see to it that we are not tainted in this critical period by a weak faith, a skepticism as to America's ability to meet the issues of war and peace. A period of trial is up ahead, but America knows how to meet trials.

We are Americans, creatures of independence. We—sons and daughters of pioneers, shaped and made self-reliant by the atmosphere of America—hate regimentation. We face the future expectantly, willing to adventure, take a chance. We can smile at tough circumstances, crack a joke in danger.

We love freedom and want to live as individuals. We are practical, but have great dreams. We are a young Nation, full of ingenuity and strength—and rich in resources. And we are dedicated to make our dreams of peace come true.

We are looking hopefully toward the future—toward a resurrected world of peace and good will among the peoples of the earth. And in that picture a resurrected Norway will have a significant place.

The Recent Oregon Senatorial Primaries—Campaign Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, last Tuesday I received a communication from the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the Expenditures of all Candidates in 1944 for the Offices of President, Vice President, and Senator, of which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is chairman, and the learned and vigilant Senators STEWART, TUNNELL, BALL, and FERGUSON are members. I request unanimous consent to have my reply to that communication printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 31, 1944.

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1944, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I acknowledge receipt of the communication addressed to me as a candidate for nomination as United States Senator in the recent (May 19, 1944) primary election in Oregon, wherein I am required to furnish within a limited time factual data relative to my expenses and the expenses and contributions of others in support of my candidacy. Be assured I shall comply willingly and to the best of my ability with your demands and in every way possible I shall be cooperative in my compliance. I shall so inform those who voluntarily conducted my

political campaign in the confident expectation that they, too, will be cooperative with you and your Senate committee in the discharge of your official duties.

May I request that your committee go very thoroughly into all the details of every phase of the subject of the amount, source, and use of funds in behalf of every candidate for nomination as United States Senator in both parties in Oregon. Friends have remarked to me that there may have been more money spent to defeat me and to nominate Professor Morse on the Republican ticket than was spent to elect or defeat all other candidates for all offices on both tickets.

Incidentally, you may be justified in inquiring into what or who prompted the candidacy of Mr. Earl E. Fischer, of Washington County, whose candidacy undoubtedly vitally divided the vote I otherwise most likely would have received.

Very respectfully yours.

C. I. O. Political Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Senate Inquiry Demanded Into C. I. O. Political Tactics," by Turner Catledge, from the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE INQUIRY DEMANDED INTO C. I. O. POLITICAL TACTICS—BUTLER CHARGES VIOLATION OF CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT—HILLMAN AIDES SAY THEY WILL READILY APPEAR

(By Turner Catledge)

WASHINGTON, May 31.—The Republican effort to counter or nullify the pro-Roosevelt activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee was taken into the Senate today with a demand by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, for an investigation of the organization by the Privileges and Elections Committee.

Supporting the attack made against the C. I. O. yesterday by Harrison E. Spangler, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Senator BUTLER demanded that the Senate take a hand because of the alleged failure of Attorney General Biddle to call the political action committee to account under the Corrupt Practices and Hatch Acts.

He charged that the Attorney General "has gone out of his way" to make excuses for violators of the two election laws, "and as a result Mr. Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. Political Action Committee continues to go its merry way, spending moneys collected from many reluctant union members, in the interests of the fourth term and the election of new dealers to the Halls of Congress.

"This flouting of the election laws of the United States on the part of the political action committee," Mr. BUTLER told the Senate, "threatens the entire structure erected by Congress to guarantee the people of this Nation free and clean elections."

The attitude of C. I. O. headquarters to the thrusts of Senator BUTLER and Mr. Spangler was one of "thanks for the mention." Officials of the P. A. C. said they had nothing to hide, either as to their intentions or their activities. They indicated their willingness to appear at any time before any committee having jurisdiction over such matters, to lay their whole story before Congress or the country.

"Yes, we are in politics," one of them said, "and we are doing our best to organize right down to the precincts. We hope to make ourselves effective in national and State and congressional elections next fall, and in some of the primaries between now and then."

The C. I. O. spokesmen confirmed Mr. Spangler's assertion that the P. A. C. had gathered a fund of about $750,000 from its unions, with which to start the campaign.

They disclosed that, as of May 1, the committee had disbursed about $134,000, of which $15,000 was spent in the unsuccessful attempt to elect the Democratic candidate for Governor of New Jersey last fall. The remaining $119,000, about 85 percent, had been spent for salaries, literature, and promotion, a C. I. O. official said.

"We have nothing to hide," said one of them. "We will be glad to inform Mr. Spangler, or anyone else, of these matters. We opposed an inquiry by the Dies committee because we did not think that body had either jurisdiction or valid interest in what we are doing."

The political action committee claimed another success in the renomination yesterday of former Representative Luther Patrick over Representative JOHN NEWSOME in the run-off primary in the Ninth Alabama District. Full or part credit already had been given to the committee, or claimed, for various results in Florida, Alabama, California, and Oregon, and for the decision of Representative MARTIN DIES, of Texas, not to run for reelection.

The P. A. C. is now engaged in organizing its forces throughout the country for the fall campaign. It has divided the States into 14 regions, with each regional office under a full-time, salaried director.

The work is being carried on under the chairmanship of Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and under the day-to-day direction of C. B. Baldwin, of Radford, Va., who formerly was assistant to Vice President WALLACE when he was Secretary of Agriculture. Later Mr. Baldwin was Farm Security Administrator. The national offices of the committee are at 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

The committee's national job is to campaign for the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt, who, it assumes, will be renominated, and for the renomination and election of Vice President WALLACE. As to Members of the House and Senators, and other officials in whose campaigns it participates, the committee intends leaving the selection largely to its local affiliates.

LABOR RECORD NOT SOLE STANDARD

"We are working on the local and congressional district level," an official explained.

He emphasized that the P. A. C. did not set up a 100-percent perfect labor record as the sole criterion for a candidate receiving its support. He indicated that the committee might support several Members of the House and Senators who, for instance, voted for the Smith-Connally antistrike bill.

In assaying a candidate's virtures, the P. A. C. will take a forward-looking point of view on international questions of paramount importance, committee officials said—on a virtual par with his labor record.

"Of course we will support candidates who have generally friendly attitudes toward labor, but that is not enough," one official said.

In preparation for the fall campaign, the P. A. C. is conducting a sort of correspondence course for its local workers, teaching them how to organize political groups and "clubs," how to ring door bells and stir up interest in candidates and measures, and, above all, how to get their prospective voters registered. One of the principal jobs which the P. A. C. has tackled is that of registering, and otherwise qualifying for voting, the large shifting labor population.

AS TO COMMUNIST SUPPORT

When asked if the P. A. C. would accept Communist support for its candidates and measures, a committee official said:

"We have no Communists that we know of in our organization, but we will accept votes from any source."

As to the suggestion that they had torn a leaf out of the book of the late Wayne B. Wheeler, highly successful lobbyist and political organizer for the Anti-Saloon League, the P. A. C. official smiled and replied that if Mr. Wheeler developed any good, effective political methods, the C. I. O. was in the market for them.

"We are out to be effectitve," he said.

He made essentially the same reply when asked if the P. A. C. intended to work with or use tactics of such organizations as the Kelly machine in Chicago, the Hague machine in Jersey City, or the Crump machine in Memphis.

"We will join forces with these organizations if we are working toward the same end, but we won't get tied up with them permanently," the official said.

The P. A. C. has called a national conference of its officials and regional directors in Washington June 16. The purpose of the meeting is to lay more definite plans for the campaign.

Development of Upper Missouri Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "What We Owe the Upper Valley."

The future development of the river systems of this country demands the coordination of all uses to which water may be put, as well as the coordination of the jurisdiction of the various public agencies, State and Nation, which deal with water uses.

As a representative of one of the States in the upper Missouri River Valley, I welcome the intelligent attitude of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE OWE THE UPPER VALLEY

The basic obstacle to development of the Missouri Valley was ably stated in the Post-Dispatch yesterday by E. G. Leipheimer, editor of the Montana Standard of Butte. "We fear the Government bureaus," he wrote in an appraisal doubly valuable for its candor. "They have all been here to investigate our water resources, but always with a view to taking our water away for the use and needs of people elsewhere, far below."

The people of the upper Missouri Valley do not trust the Government bureaus, and—let us not delude ourselves—they do not trust us of the lower Missouri Valley. If we are willing to face all the facts—which is the

only way in which we shall ever get anywhere—we must admit that they have good and sufficient reasons for not trusting us.

We of the lower Missouri Valley have not been sympathetic to the needs of the upper valley States for irrigation. We have not bothered to inform ourselves about irrigation. We have stood by without protest when measures to develop the Missouri River for our benefit have proposed to penalize the irrigation of the upper valley.

The first steps that will have to be taken before the two great subdivisions of the Missouri Valley can learn to trust each other are up to us of the lower valley.

First, we must repudiate and demand correction of the inequity of that act of Congress which forbids use of any of the waters of Fort Peck Reservoir for irrigation. It is not enough to suggest, as the Army engineers suggest that, when additional reservoirs are built on the Missouri, the waters of Fort Peck may be used for irrigation. Why should Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas have to trade with us for water that is rightfully theirs?

Why should they have to wait on our pleasure for water that is rightfully theirs now?

Second, we must repudiate and demand withdrawal of the efforts of the Army engineers to set aside, by law, a specified amount of the water of the Missouri River for navigation—to take it away, by arbitrary act, from irrigation. Such flagrant disregard of the other fellow can only provoke in him a similarly flagrant disregard for our rights. We need, on both sides, to repudiate the method of grabbing water by congressional second-story work.

When we, of the lower valley, have done these two things, we will have shown ourselves willing to be reasonable. We can then expect our neighbors of the upper valley to be reasonable toward us in response. Until we have performed these duties, it will be idle to talk of cooperation between us, for we have first to justify the trust that makes cooperation possible.

Retirement Refund Delays

REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. JEFFREY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the House to a condition that is creating resentment among the people against their Government. That is the inexcusable delay in refunding to former Government employees the money deducted from their pay for retirement purposes. This situation is both shameful and unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, the matter has been brought to my attention by a succession of complaints from constituents who at one time or another have been employed at Wright Field, or at Patterson Field, both of which are near Dayton, Ohio. These civilian employees of the War Department have had two painful experiences with delay and bureaucratic red tape. One arose in connection with the Government's delay in delivering to them war bonds purchased under a pay reservation plan. The other comes when they leave Government service and try to collect the money deducted for retirement purposes. The first of these I brought to the attention of the House some time ago. The second I wish to emphasize today.

The files at my office show that applications for refunds filed as long ago as September 1942 are still not paid. In fact I know of 15 such cases dating from 1942. There is, of course, a greater number dating from 1943 and the total including 1944 seems to be increasing rather than decreasing. This failure to refund the money rightfully theirs is something the average citizen cannot understand. Many of their letters remark that although the Government requires promptness of the citizen in many matters, there is no promptness required of the Government. To make matters worse some of my constituents have been depending on these refunds to aid them in their daily expenditures.

For example, one applicant is described as badly in need of funds with which to pay debts arising out of the last illness and burial of his wife. Another constituent—a woman—writes:

> We have no other source of income and unless this money is forthcoming soon I shall be forced to break up my home, as I'll lose the furniture.

Also, there was an angry father who wrote:

> When the Government wanted my boy for military service, he had to go on a specified date. When I owe income tax the Government expects it to be paid by a very definite date. When the Government owes me something, they seem to feel that it can be taken care of at their leisure.

Then there was this classic commentary on the way the whole business is being delayed and bungled:

> Attached is a letter—
>
> A constituent wrote—
>
> which proves that Wright Field has inefficiency perfected to the *n*th degree. Eleven days to send a completed form to Washington and over 8 months to tell Washington how much they'd deducted from my pay in 13 months. Eleven days to send a request to Washington and 8 months later they send the information necessary for Washington to fulfill the request. May the good Lord have mercy on us if Wright Field handles all their business as efficiently as they've handled the matters mentioned in this letter.

Incidentally, I do not blame the man for being angry; his claim has been pending since November 30, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, responsibility for this shameful situation is not easily fixed. Part of it must rest, of course, with the United States Civil Service Commission, which has charge of the retirement program. Part of it must rest with the War Department. Time after time I receive letters from the Civil Service Commission saying that some man's record has not yet come from the War Department.

Some time ago I paid a call on the head of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Mitchell. He received me most courteously and listened to me sympathetically. He even urged me to send any hardship cases to his office so he could expedite their handling. In one case I did this, but without any success to date, although that was several weeks ago. The Civil Service Commission points out—and they have the figures to support their statements—that the remarkable increase in the turn-over of Government employees has swamped them with work. On the other hand, I have heard it said on the floor of the House that red tape also contributes to the delays. I do not undertake to tell either the War Department or the Civil Service Commission what administrative steps to take to correct this condition; that is their business. I do demand that they take some corrective action, and that soon.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a part of our democratic Government is represented by the responsibility of the Government to the people. I think the Government should be as prompt and as courteous in dealing with its citizens as it demands them to be in dealing with it. I realize that the Government is large and that it moves slowly. But even this cannot excuse delays of nearly 2 years.

If any two departments of the Government are under an obligation to be prompt and courteous, these are the Civil Service Commission and the War Department. When I came down to Washington I had a high regard for the Civil Service Commission. I still have a high regard for the principle of civil service.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission, which was established to make merit the basis for serving the Government, should set an example of efficiency instead of demonstrating the lack of it. I believe it has that important obligation to fulfill. The same is true of the War Department, but for different reasons. The Army has long emphasized promptness; it punishes severely the soldier who is a few minutes late returning from a week-end pass. Yet it seems unconcerned about a delay of nearly 2 years in returning to its former employees money that belongs to them.

I call these matters to the attention of the House with the hope that the two departments—which seem strangely impervious to individual protests—will take immediate action to correct these conditions.

Lt. Dale F. Spencer

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the congressional district of New York which it has been my honor to represent these many years has furnished its full quota of heroes in each branch of the service in all wars in which the United States has participated.

I call attention to the heroic exploit of Lt. Dale F. Spencer, of Clymer, Chautauqua County, N. Y., in demolishing in 1 minute four Nazi planes. This display of courage by Lt. Dale F. Spencer is a

manifestation of the spirit of the youth of America when called upon to fight for their country's honor and prestige.

My faith in the American youth was established long years ago in witnessing the fighting qualities of our young men in all branches of athletics, and since then this faith has been confirmed over and over again by youthful deeds of valor displayed in the infantry, in the air, on the sea, and wherever duty has called our fighting forces.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks at this point an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald May 30, 1944:

"MAD PILOT" GETS FOUR NAZI PLANES IN ONE BATTLE

LONDON, May 30.—A "mad fighter pilot," Lt. Dale F. Spencer, of Clymer, N. Y., celebrated his first wedding anniversary yesterday by hurling his Mustang against four twin-engined German fighters and shooting all down in less than a minute, it was revealed today.

The action occurred near Cottbus, Germany, on Spencer's seventh combat mission.

"The first three didn't know what hit them, it happened so fast," Spencer said. "The fourth tried to get away, but he was too late. I went down and took pictures of three of them burning on the ground and then headed home, hoping I wouldn't go into the channel with all of that good film in my plane."

Spencer's wife, the former Miss Arlene Robbins, lives at Corey, Pa.

Flight Officer James Duffy, of Bronx, N. Y., witnessed Spencer's feat.

"That boy had more guts than brains," Duffy said. "He came down on them from behind, seemed to spray them with lead and then go after them one at a time.

"The first two went down in flames. Number three began smoking badly and the fourth twisted down out of control. It happened right after we left Cottbus and plenty of our men saw it if he needs any witnesses."

Importation of Beverage Cane Spirits Into the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I unfolded to this House the amazing story of favoritism by the State Department to the Schenley Corporation, one of America's largest liquor importers.

I believe anybody who will examine the speech which I made on that occasion will find justification, sound logic, and reasoning behind the conclusions which I drew.

At the time when I appeared on the floor I gave to the House the benefit of Schenley's side of the discussion, and repeated the denials made by Schenley that there had been no violations or intention to violate on their part. In subsequent press releases from New York the Schenley Corporation made it appear that I had ignored them completely in my address on the floor and had deliberately not presented their side.

Of course the record speaks for itself as to what the true facts are, not only in that instance but in the instance as to who was favored in connection with the issuance of rum permits through the intercession of the State Department.

After I delivered the speech on the floor I made the offer to Schenley, through mutual friends, to put in the RECORD any statement or refutation which that organization would care to make in connection with my representations on the floor of this House. My sense of fairness and a desire to get all the facts to you certainly left me no alternative even if I had desired at any time to hide all the facts surrounding this amazing transaction.

On Tuesday morning I had a telegram from Mr. Lester E. Jacobi, president of the Schenley Corporation, which I ask permission of the House at this time to include in these remarks and which repeats the position of Schenley as I stated it on the floor of the House in my original address.

I urge you to read this statement carefully. It is the statement of the president of the Schenley Corporation himself. After reading it I ask you to decide for yourself whether or not Schenley was shown any favoritism.

In reading the statement of the Schenley Corporation let me direct your attention to the sentence which says:

We made no application to the War Production Board other than the general application referred to above.

As far as I know, and according to the instructions in the original order, individual applications were to be made for specific authorization to import rum. Of my own personal knowledge, and as a matter of record with the War Production Board, all the little fellows who filed applications not only had to prove that negotiations had been entered into before the effective date of the embargo but in addition were repeatedly called upon to furnish documentary evidence that they had suffered financial loss and had issued letters of credit which impaired their financial standing in their banking transactions.

They were repeatedly asked for further evidence and documentary proof. I give you these facts in contrast to what actually happened in the Schenley case where they made an application for a blanket importation permit, quite different from the applications made by these little fellows in distress.

They offered no documentary evidence of loss, yet, admittedly in their own statement, without application or request from the State Department, the State Department gratuitously ordered handed them two authorizations for specific importations of rum.

Obviously, I could continue further to discuss this amazing case in which favoritism has been denied, but why take up the time of the House when the record is so clear in the case?

I might add that I have heard nothing from the State Department or the Department of Justice in connection with these revelations.

I herewith submit to you the statement as telegraphed me by Mr. Lester E. Jacobi, president of Schenley Distillers Corporation, and ask that you read it carefully and consider Mr. Jacobi's explanation in the fullest:

SIR: With reference to your speech in Congress today concerning shipments of rum from Martinique to the United States we desire to confirm the following statements previously made to you. We trust that in fairness you will feel it appropriate to insert these facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that you will take such other steps as you reasonably can to undo the serious damage to our reputation and good will resulting from unfounded charges concerning our company.

The facts are as follows: 1. After March 9, 1943, when the War Production Board's order M-374 was issued, Schenley authorized no shipments of rum from Martinique and Guadeloupe to the United States. To the contrary, we specifically instructed the French West Indies shippers to make no further shipments until permits had been obtained.

2. Schenley, in accordance with War Production Board regulations, on March 27, 1943, filed with the War Production Board an application for authority to import in 1944 a quantity of rum from Martinique and Guadeloupe equivalent to our 1943 importations.

3. On April 19, 1944, Schenley was advised by Messrs. W. R. Zanes & Co., customs brokers in New Orleans that fifteen hundred casks of Martinique rum were arriving at New Orleans consigned to Schenley. We instructed the customs brokers, confirming the advice by writing as follows:

"As explained over the telephone, this shipment was not authorized by us, and we have absolutely no intention whatsoever to claim same on its arrival."

4. We made no application to the War Production Board other than the general application referred to above.

5. Schenley has made no representations whatsoever to the State Department in connection with the matter.

6. On April 26, 1944, Schenley received a telegram from the War Production Board signed by J. Joseph Whelan, reading: "Pursuant to paragraph (C) of order M-374 you are hereby authorized to import fifteen hundred barrels young rum from Martinique now held United States Customs, New Orleans, La. The number of your permit in accordance with paragraph (H), order M-374, is FWIM-1."

7. On May 12, 1944, Schenley received the following telegram from the War Production Board: "Pursuant to paragraph (c) M-374, you are hereby authorized to import forty-five hundred barrels of young rum containing 360,000 proof gallons from French West Indies. The number of your permit in accordance with paragraph (H) is FWI-3."

8. Use of the rum at Schenley's plants was not begun until May 22, 1944.

Respectfully,

LESTER E. JACOBI,
President, Schenley Distillers Corporation.

Can We Feed the World?

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I for a few minutes dis-

cuss the theme of our capacity to feed the world. Official propaganda promises a new world, with freedom from want for everybody after the war. Apparently all the world is being encouraged to depend on the United States to bring this about.

Does it ever strike you, sir, that if humanity could not in 5,000 years of known history devise means to prevent wholesale starvation among teeming millions of Asiatic peoples; if we could not, even in this the most efficient, the most prosperous of all countries, prevent large numbers of our own people from being ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed, how shall we hope to achieve freedom from want for all the world as well as ourselves, as a result of long years of world-wide war, with its attendant destruction of the resources of the world?

How can we expect better days than ever before in history at a time when almost every man and woman has been uprooted from his or her peacetime work? Is it not more likely that we in America shall have to start all over again while nursing the wounds of war and having a bitter struggle to reestablish our own economy? The economic problems ahead of us are infinitely greater than have been those of the past few years.

The press reports of May 22, 1944, state that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations gave this picture of the food situation in Europe:

Austria and Czechoslovakia, the situation remains passable, but food standards are lower than in Germany proper. Poland, much worse than in any other area with the exception of Greece. Liberated Italy, a large portion of the population must continue to depend on imports. Occupied Italy, unsatisfactory due to growing unrest among farmers, and disruption of distribution. France, a 1943 harvest better than 1942 prevented a further decline. Belgium, food consumption remains low with dependence on Axis-controlled areas. Finland and Sweden, better than a year ago. Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, taken as a whole, are in a more favorable position than in 1941-42. Greece remains unsatisfactory, especially in urban areas.

Hence, in the light of all the circumstances, Greece and Poland offer the only great problems of food relief. They must be helped. But we Americans cannot feed all the world. If we solved our domestic problem of assuring every American an adequate amount of food, we should have very little left over with which to help others. Even if we were all willing, because of the magnitude of the world catastrophe, to make great sacrifices, to go on with food rationing for several years, even then our surplus would be but a drop in the bucket. A fine gesture of good will, but very little more.

Experts tell us that it requires 2½ acres of land to feed and clothe the average American. In the world at large, there are but 2 acres of crop land available for each inhabitant and the land is not evenly distributed. Actually, American farmers this year intend to plant 374,000,000 acres of crops, which compares with the 374,000,000 acres in the peak year of 1932. In 1943, the crop yield came from 361,000,000 acres, and the 10-year average was 354,000,000 acres. How difficult it is to expand the average and how impossible it is to do it in an efficient way may be gathered from the plans of the United States Reclamation Bureau for free irrigation of 4,000,000 acres of submarginal land in the upper Missouri Valley. It is called free, but it would be free to the owner of that poor land only. The cost, every dollar of it, would have to be carried by you and every taxpayer in America.

How can we produce a sufficiently substantial surplus to be of much help in feeding the war-devastated nations? One may argue that we could produce more by using more machinery, better fertilizer, and using better farming methods. To some extent this may be true. However our practical experience up to this very day is that the contributions of science, great though they may be, have been fully offset by the deterioration of the natural soil fertility, as has been pointed out recently by Dr. Karl Sax, in an article in the January 1944 Scientific Monthly. He says:

We are little more than maintaining crop yields at a stationary level in spite of remarkable advances in agricultural science.

And he adds that:

We could produce more food by more intensive cultivation and by using more submarginal land, but this could be done only by lowering the living standards of the entire population.

The Office of Foreign Aricultural Relations states:

Up to now the German people have fared much better with respect to food than in the last war, because of seizures of food stocks from occupied countries and due to the efficiency of the Nazi food distribution system. The cumulative effect over the war years of shortages in agricultural manpower, fertilizers, draft power, farm equipment, and machinery does not augur well for crop production this year in Germany.

The same is true in America. Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, in a recent Chicago address, stated:

One of the biggest problems facing American agriculture after the war will be to find a good market for all the American farmers want to produce and can produce within the limits of sound farming methods.

Thus we have contradictory views among the experts.

However, America is rapidly approaching an event in her economic history which will be of great consequence to our way of living. We apparently are near the point where we cannot feed many more people at present-day living standards. We have reached that stage of population growth where the annual increase becomes ever smaller, as in the Scandinavian countries, and it will in time be altogether eliminated, as it is in France. Even the other countries, such as Canada, the Argentine, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa consume an ever-increasing part of their abundant food production themselves so that the surpluses available for export are dwindling rapidly.

In Europe and Asia there is but one country, namely the Soviet Union, which has the natural agricultural resources to feed a larger population than she sustains at present. In India, in China, and in Japan, there is no possibility whatever of feeding the people on local farm products. There is little we can do about it. Temporary relief measures are only stopgaps. There is nothing we can do to create in this world a Utopian order, with freedom from want. It is unrealistic and it is unfair to ourselves, and to those we so thoughtlessly deceive with false promises.

I do not desire to discourage generosity and sacrifice in helping those in need, but I do want to suggest that we, along with the other people in the world, will face problems that will be the bitter aftermath of the war. All nations will have these problems, and all will try within their limitations to solve them as best they can. I see no reason why we should bring upon ourselves a world-wide responsibility we obviously cannot carry.

There is another phase of this whole question which must be given careful thought; that is, if we work up a propaganda in this country, calling for the cultivation of all the land under uneconomical conditions of excessive fertilization and other unsound agricultural methods, all to be carried out at the expense of our taxpayers through governmental grants or operation, we might very easily produce a condition of complete depression for American agriculture. In other words, if we attempted free of charge to feed all the war-devastated peoples, it is obvious that we could not continue to do it indefinitely. It is also obvious that those countries will not, in the next two or three generations, have the money with which to pay us for our products. Nor can they produce other products by which to repay us. For years everything we have imported which does not compete with our own producers, has been on the tariff free list. Therefore, we must give some thought to the danger which may arise of encouraging overproduction of agricultural products in this country, and of producing a condition such as resulted in the deflation of American agriculture after World War No. 1.

If such problems were so flexible that they could be made susceptible of a short-term policy of a year or 2 years, or a few months, then we might think about engaging temporarily in an over-expanded agriculture. However, such problems are not susceptible of a short-term policy. We ought not to fool ourselves.

Already many of those who are best acquainted with farming problems in the West are beginning to fear that we may encourage agricultural overproduction on submarginal and other uneconomical land that would lead into a governmental competition with private farming. This could be brought about by the Government undertaking to finance or to farm the uneconomical land at the expense of the taxpayers, in order to give the food away to peoples elsewhere in the world.

This whole problem will have to be settled not by impulses of the heart, but by calm reasoning of the head. We all regret that we cannot wave a magic wand and take the "four freedoms" to all the other peoples in the world—although there are some who doubt that that would be the best thing for some peoples. I have in mind India and Mr. Churchill. However, this is not a question to be controlled by emotionalism; it is a cold, hard question of fact and actual conditions. It is not a question of what we would like to do, it is a question of what we can or cannot do.

It does appear, when viewed from all these angles, that the propagandists are planting a great crop of deception, which will blossom into intense hatreds of us on the part of other nations if we do not begin to make the world understand that ours is not a great productive and inexhaustible horn of plenty which can pour forth a ceaseless stream of food, and raiment, and shelter, for the destitute of all the world.

It has not been so many years since we were called "Uncle Shylock" because we ventured to suggest that solemn obligations of war debts be met by other nations. This time we have not fooled ourselves, except that the false term "lend-lease" should have been designed "give" in the first place, so the American people would understand what is happening.

We in America, of course, want to do all we can to relieve suffering humanity, but manifestly we do not want to turn our own citizens out into the highways and byways destitute of food, clothing, and shelter here in America in order to provide food, clothing, and shelter for the other peoples of the world.

Dedication of Cities Service Plant at Lake Charles, La.

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, an event of national importance last Friday, May 26, 1944, in Lake Charles, my Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, where I participated, and of which I, my constituents, and the people of Louisiana are duly proud, was the dedication of one of the world's largest 100-octane and butadiene plants.

With this giant plant at Lake Charles, La., Cities Service, in cooperation with the Government, takes a tremendous stride toward meeting two most vital war needs.

Where the pine trees grew on the banks of the sleepy Calcasieu River a few months ago, stands today this mighty symbol of American brain and brawn.

Sired by the necessity of war, the plant means more power to the armed forces, for it turns out great quantities of high-octane aviation gasoline and ingredients for synthetic rubber.

Created from the ground up, it includes the very latest, up-to-the-minute discoveries and inventions; and when peace comes, its efficiency will be devoted to higher standards of living everywhere.

Wholly dedicated to bringing the war to an earlier close, this great accomplishment is an outstanding example of what can be achieved by the winning team of Government and industry, working together, shoulder to shoulder, in the battle for freedom and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks a few of the high lights about the great Cities Service refinery and butadiene plants near Lake Charles, La.

First. Over 2,250,000 tons of dirt were removed in dredging.

Second. Over 1,200,000 tons of dirt were excavated for foundations.

Third. Over 150,000 cubic yards of concrete and over 3,500 tons of reinforced steel were used.

Fourth. Over 1,500,000 board feet of lumber was reclaimed from the trees cleared from the plant site.

Fifth. Fifteen miles of improved roads are within the plant site.

Sixth. Fourteen miles of railroads are within the plant site.

Seventh. Over 1,500 major high-precision instruments used in controlling operations.

Eighth. Largest two-stage absorption-type refrigeration plant in the world manufacturing more than 6,500,000 pounds of ice per day. This is sufficient to supply ice to several cities such as Cleveland and Baltimore.

Ninth. An electric power plant of 50,000-kilowatt capacity which is large enough to furnish electricity to a city such as St. Paul, Omaha, and Akron.

Tenth. Uses over 43,000,000 gallons of water per day, or more than enough to supply the residential requirement of the city of Chicago.

Eleventh. Processes 100,000 barrels of crude oil per day.

Twelfth. Has over 500 electric motors.

Thirteenth. Will produce 37 intermediate and finished petroleum products all vitally important to the war effort and, as major war products, produces more than 300,000,000 gallons per year of 100 octane aviation gasoline—enough fuel to put 1,000 bombers over Berlin every day.

Fourteenth. Will produce approximately 60,000 tons of butadiene per year for the manufacture of synthetic rubber approximately 10 percent of the pre-war rubber requirements of the United States. Equivalent to approximately 12,000,000 average passenger tires per year which would provide one tire per year for every motor vehicle on the road.

Fifteenth. Over 700 pumps used in the operation.

The dedication, attended by thousands of workers and Government, industrial, and military officials, was held on the site of the actone plant which produces 25,000 barrels a day, with Ford Bond, network radio announcer, as master of ceremonies.

DEDICATED TO SERVICEMEN

The plants, the largest integrated plants in the world, were dedicated to the boys on the front and to Temple W. Tutwilder, president of the Cities Service Refining Corporation. W. Alton Jones, Cities Service Co. president, made the dedication.

Prominent persons seated on the platform and taking part in the program included Admiral Mathews, Brig. Gen. Henry C. Pratt, Mr. Jones, Mr. Tutwilder, Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator; Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., president, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; George H. Hill, Jr., executive vice president, Defense Supplies Corporation; W. E. O'Brien, Assistant Rubber Director; Gov. James H. Davis; Former Gov. Sam H. Jones; and Henry D. Larcade, Jr., and James H. Morrison, Louisiana Congressmen.

HONOR FIGHTING MEN

In making the dedication Mr. Jones said it was to honor the fighting men and Mr. Tutwiler, who had "dreamed big dreams and as had the ability and capacity to make these dreams come true."

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include in my remarks my address delivered at the dedicatory ceremonies in Lake Charles, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, as your Representative of the Seventh Congressional District it is an honor to accompany the high officials of our Government and Cities Service Co. present here today to dedication ceremonies of great war and peace industries built under their supervision. I say war and peace because these industries will not only serve our Nation in war, but also in peace.

All of those who contributed to the location and building of these great industries here are due our thanks. Those who planned and supervised them, those who bought bonds to pay for them, as well as labor who worked so expeditiously and loyally to build them.

Most people are apt to think of Washington, the Nation's Capital, as the source of the country's power and wisdom, but we who represent you there know this is not true. The source of any country's strength and wisdom comes from the farms and hamlets and cities and parishes.

Washington is not the giver of every good gift: It can only distribute what the people provide.

So, today, I realize this truth more than ever as I view these magnificent plants. Just as from the broad stretches of this fair land come the young men and women to defend us when danger impends, so the implements of warfare come from the grass roots and crossroads of the Nation.

That is why I am always glad to steal away whenever possible and visit home. It renews one's faith in our institutions; it arouses the greatest patriotic emotions to see here at home the energy and resourcefulness displayed in translating Louisiana oil into power to drive the planes and tanks and ships our soldiers drive through the jungles and into Hitler Europe on invasion barges.

Together, America's freemen on battle front and home front will gloriously uphold our traditions and thus keep shining a beacon light of hope for the other countries of the world.

Hon. Everett M. Dirksen

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, several months ago my distinguished colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN] from the Sixteenth District of Illinois formally announced his candidacy for the Republican nomination for President of the United States. He has since traveled many thousands of miles, visiting State after State, industrial cities and farming communities. Everywhere he has been enthusiastically received.

The people who have been privileged to meet and hear EVERETT DIRKSEN quickly saw in him what we who have served with him in Congress so well know to be the character and ability of the man. He has convictions and, equally important, he has the courage of his convictions. And, too, he is endowed with the ability to express his convictions persuasively. On many occasions we have seen him win his point here on the floor through the power of his oratory.

It is not simply that he has the ability to speak well on the floor of the House or on the public platform. It is not just excellence in elocution. The power of Congressman DIRKSEN's oratory seems to me to spring from the fact that he fearlessly expresses his convictions, arrived at only after a painstaking examination of facts, without thought of whether the opinion may be popular or may have political repercussions. While we may not always agree with his conclusions, I do not think there is a single Member of Congress—Democrat or Republican—who does not have respect for his views. His sincerity no one can fail to recognize, to appreciate and admire.

When EVERETT DIRKSEN yielded to the urgings of his colleagues in Congress to become a candidate for the Republican nomination for President, he was not seeking to satisfy some personal ambition. He is simply seeking an opportunity to serve the country. If you followed the speeches he has been making you will have noted that he has refrained from personal attacks, has not sought to extol himself, but rather has dealt with the fundamental issues.

Twenty-one out of the 31 Presidents of the United States served in the House or Senate or both. Legislative experience is invaluable for one who would lead the people, and in the difficult reconstruction period, we will need in the White House someone who understands the relationship between the executive and legislative. EVERETT DIRKSEN is such a man.

It may be that he will not be nominated for President, but the Republican Party and the country will still have the benefit of his unusual talents if he is selected as the candidate for Vice President. If Governor Dewey should be the Republican choice for President, I can think of no better combination than Dewey and DIRKSEN—a distinguished State executive and a distinguished national legislator.

The Late Dr. W. T. Lowrey

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the entire South is in mourning over the death of one of her most valuable sons, Dr. William T. Lowrey, of Mississippi, who passed away at the home of his daughter in Waco, Tex., on last Sunday.

Dr. Lowrey was a brother of our former colleague, Hon. B. G. Lowrey, a son of General Lowrey of the Confederate Army, and one of the great educational and spiritual leaders of the South.

He was at one time the head of the Blue Mountain Female College, which his father founded. At another time he was head of Mississippi College, and at another time he was head of the Gulf Coast Military Academy. During his long and eventful career I dare say there was not a man in America who contributed more to the educational, moral, and spiritual uplift of American life than did Dr. William T. Lowrey, of Mississippi.

He was one of the greatest forces for good our State has ever produced.

An editorial in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which came to my desk today, says:

> Dr. William Tyndall Lowrey died on Sunday morning at the home of a daughter in Waco, Tex. In the length of his life's span—he was 86 years old—he had far exceeded man's usual allotment of time on earth, but even more notably had he surpassed the ordinary in the kindly, constructive, and Christian purposes to which he had unswervingly dedicated splendid talents of mind, heart, and spirit.
>
> Dr. Lowrey's work for education in Mississippi is written large and clear on the records of the State. He had served with distinction as head of Blue Mountain College, where he wisely directed the institution's destinies for 27 years. He had been of like service to Mississippi College, Hillman College, Clarke College, and Gulf Coast Military Academy. While most of his life was devoted to educational endeavor, he also served Baptist pastorates with fidelity and zeal, especially in his earlier years.
>
> From the founding of the Baptist Hospital here in Memphis until early this year, Dr. Lowrey had been president of the institution's board of directors, and at all times was a tower of strength and inspiration to it. Particularly was he instrumental in helping the hospital to the firm foundation it now occupies financially as well as in point of service to the community. Dr. Lowrey also wrote clearly, and was widely read all through the South.
>
> The Christian character of Dr. Lowrey shone through and permeated everything he accomplished to add immeasurably to the intrinsic values of his many contributions to the progress of his State and section. That physical memorials will be raised to honor his memory is certain, but the greatest monument is found in the countless lives he touched, enriched, and influenced for good.

With those sentiments the people of the entire South will agree.

Purchase of Dresses for Relief Purposes Oversea

REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25, on page 5006, a statement was made by my esteemed colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] on the question of dresses purchased for relief purposes overseas. I deeply regret that the gentleman did not have the correct information about this matter and I am sorry that the proper department was not requested to furnish the correct data, for a great deal of publicity has been given to these erroneous statements. I have here a letter addressed to me under date of May 29 by the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, setting forth the real facts. No dresses have been purchased for distribution abroad by the U. N. R. R. A. Some dresses, averaging a cost of $1 per dress, at the specific request of the War Department, are being purchased under the supervision of the Foreign Economic Administration for distribution by the United States Army to meet vital civilian needs during military operations for the liberation of Europe.

This is an integral part of the military program to furnish an essential minimum of food, clothing, and other civilian supplies necessary to sustain life during the period of active fighting, and, as Mr. Crowley points out, the great majority of these supplies will be distributed through regular commercial channels and paid for.

I sincerely hope and trust that in the future rumors and statements of the sort made the other day will be carefully checked with the proper Government authorities so as to prevent the dissemination of erroneous and misleading information.

> FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
> *Washington D. C., May 28, 1944.*
>
> Hon. SOL BLOOM,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLOOM: In accordance with your request, I am supplying you, as the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, with the facts concerning the dresses referred to by Congressman HARTLEY in his

statement which appeared on page 5006 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25, 1944.

No dresses have been purchased for distribution abroad by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. None will be purchased for this purpose until an appropriation is voted by Congress for the purchase of supplies for U. N. R. R. A.

At the specific request of the War Department, some dresses are being purchased under the supervision of the Foreign Economic Administration for distribution by the United States Army to meet vital civilian needs during military operations for the liberation of Europe. Provision by our Army of the essential minimum of food, clothing, and other civilian supplies necessary to sustain life during the period of active fighting is, of course, an integral part of our military operations. The great majority of these supplies will be distributed through regular commercial channels and paid for.

The total number of dresses up to now placed in procurement at the request of the War Department for this program is somewhat less than 850,000. This figure includes all types of cotton dresses for children, girls, misses, and women. Of this total, there will be less than 250,000 manufactured from the fabric to which Mr. HARTLEY referred as "seersucker." This fabric is a cheaper substitute for genuine seersucker. It is known technically as plisse. It is a printed cloth. Genuine seersucker is woven. Since we have not seen the dress which Congressman HARTLEY displayed, we do not know whether it was made of this substitute material. No genuine seersucker has been purchased for the Army-F. E. A. civilian supply program.

Virtually all of the plisse dresses are manufactured out of goods originally purchased by the Quartermaster General for fatigue uniforms for the Women's Army Corps. These goods were in excess of the needs of the Women's Army Corps and were, therefore, made available for the purposes stated. The cost of these dresses to the Government, including the cost of the fabric, the cost of manufacture and the cost of packing for export (which is necessarily a more expensive type of packing than the usual packing for the domestic market) averages approximately $1 per dress. It is clear that at this price these dresses must be of simple and inexpensive grade.

Congressman HARTLEY displayed two other dresses costing $3.95 and $4.95, which he referred to as the "most expensive seersucker dresses that are available for purchase by American women." Actually, I am informed, such dresses are sold regularly in retail shops in this country of a quality which commands prices up to three and four times the figures Congressman HARTLEY mentioned.

In meeting the requirements of the United States Army for dresses and other civilian clothing to be distributed in connection with our military operations, every effort has been made to tap sources of supply which would yield the needed clothing with a minimum impact against civilian supply in this country. We have been utilizing old C. C. C. and W. P. A. stocks, second-hand clothing from the commercial market and from voluntary donations, military "rejects," obsolete Army goods, and other army clothing which is declared surplus from time to time and which we are having reconditioned for use in the Army-F. E. A. program. The specifications for such civilian clothing as is newly manufactured for the program call for low cost, durability, and practicability.

Our shipments will go to peoples who have been virtually without clothing replacements during the past 4 or more years. The need is acute. Our information indicates that during the past winter deaths from exposure in occupied Europe were at least equal to deaths from starvation.

The total number of garments of all types up to now in procurement under the Army-F. E. A. program for shipment to the peoples of liberated Europe is an extremely small percentage of the clothing which is manufactured for and sold to civilians in the United States. This is, it seems to me, hardly an excessive contribution to make toward providing some of the minimum necessities of peoples who have maintained with unflinching courage and at untold sacrifice their underground resistance to the Nazi aggressors and who will rise to join with us in the battles for the liberation of Europe and the winning of final victory.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

Fair Employment Practice Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the Tarver amendment reaches the floor of the House for a roll-call vote it will be defeated. This amendment seeks to destroy the life of the F. E. P. C. and the protection that it affords the Negro in industry. I am opposed to this.

The order creating the F. E. P. C. contains the following language:

> It is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In sincerity I ask, What is wrong with such a policy in wartime or peacetime? The opponents of F. E. P. C. contend that it creates dissension and disunity in plants devoted to making the implements of war. On the contrary, I deny this. Instead, every impartial person must concede that to win this war quickly and effectively we must produce more, faster than our enemies do. You may be sure that such a result will produce dissention, disunity, and ultimate defeat for our enemies and only victory for ourselves.

For months we have heard frantic appeals from the War and Navy Departments, from the Manpower Commission, and from the Director of Selective Service about the manpower shortage and the need to conscript labor, while at the same time there is an abundance of Negro manpower in this country of skilled and unskilled labor who are literally knocking at the door of industry and begging for the opportunity to fill the jobs for which their hands and brains are suited.

Despite the admitted manpower shortage, there have been instances in my home city of St. Louis where Negroes were denied positions in specialized fields of civil service, and cases, too, where the Manpower Commission made no apparent effort to place them in industry. Instead of a Presidential order prohibiting discrimination against persons in defense industries because of race, creed, or color—which has proved to be unenforcible—I favor the passage of the bill introduced by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE], which would make the F. E. P. C. permanent and provide the legislation necessary to insure complete protection to those against whom discrimination in employment is generally practiced, the Negro. For years I have fought against discrimination, intolerance, and bigotry in every form. Wherever and whenever it has raised its hideous head, I have tried to destroy it.

Last September, as a member of the Republican Post-war Advisory Council, at its meeting at Mackinac Island, I proposed the following declaration of policy, which was unanimously adopted by the conference:

> The Republican Party insists upon equality of opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed in the economic, educational, political, and military life of the Nation.

That is the creed of my party—that is the American doctrine of fair play—those are the precepts which I have followed in and outside of this Congress.

The opponents of fair play and equal opportunity assert that there is no foundation upon which F. E. P. C. can rest—that the committee is a nondescript collection of individuals acting without authority and contrary to the public policy of the Nation. This argument cannot stand the test of an honest inquiry. Let me remind them that it was Lincoln in his emancipation proclamation who plowed the first furrow for F. E. P. C. when he struck the shackles of bondage from the Negro and led him for the first time upon the high ground of freedom and equality of opportunity. And that is all that I am contending for here today—but that is something which I shall continue to contend for until final victory is assured.

That discrimination does exist in employment, no one can safely deny; that these abuses should be corrected, it must be admitted; and that there is authority, precedent, and national policy for action by this body can hardly be questioned. In fact, in 1870 the first of the civil-rights statutes was passed—Eighth United States Code, section 41—which provided equal security under the law for all races against economic or employment discrimination. Then, in later years, the Congress has consistently enacted legislation concerning relief and public works in which it was forbidden to discriminate against any person because of race, color, or creed. And the same provision has been inserted into legislation dealing with the national defense program and the Selective Service Act.

In searching for precedents for F. E. P. C. or a national policy approving it, let me remind you also that our Federal civil-service system provides that employees shall be selected upon a basis of personal fitness and ability, and shall not be discriminated against because of race or color.

The national policy has been defined and firmly established in numerous decisions of our Supreme Court dealing with the proposition that all Americans are entitled to fair treatment, equal opportunities and equal rights, and that

race or color is no excuse for denying to any citizen the protection enjoyed by another citizen.

Again, when large sums of money were appropriated to land-grant colleges and for educational assistance to the States, it was the general opinion of Members of the Congress that all groups should benefit equally and without injustice to any creed, class, or race.

Although Congress provided for the training of defense workers without discrimination on account of color or creed, if after such persons have been trained they are discriminated against in obtaining employment in defense industries, then I contend that Congress is, and most certainly should be, concerned as to whether these provisions of the law are being respected and faithfully executed.

Let us examine the record and frankly determine if there is need for congressional action. I have given some examples within the range of my observation in my home city. What is the picture from a national viewpoint? The most reliable information on the subject reveals that only 7 percent of those employed in defense industries are Negroes. Civil-rights legislation or antidiscriminatory laws mean little if they are merely left idle to mold on the statute books. They must be backed by the power and the will to enforce them.

The legislation which we are now considering provides the funds to ferret out and bring to light the manifold instances of discrimination which have occurred. This amendment would take away the appropriation and destroy the committee whose duty it is to point out cases which violate the laws that have already been enacted. To kill this committee would be very much like shooting the bloodhound upon whom you depended to locate and stalk the felon who has committed a crime.

Let us cast aside sectional shortsightedness and provincial prejudices and focus our vision, our efforts, and our energies upon the all-important and all-consuming task that lies ahead—the job of winning this war, preserving permanent peace, and a sound prosperity for those at home and those who will return home.

It is empty to talk about this Nation becoming the arsenal of democracy unless and until we are willing to employ the sinews and skills of idle thousands of American Negroes who are anxious to show and are just aching for the opportunity to prove that they can man the machines and fill the positions created by the manpower shortage. What the arsenal of democracy does will be felt around the world, but what we do about making democracy work at home will forever afford a test of our faith in the institutions of free government.

Can anyone in this Chamber assert that there is not authority for our opposition to this amendment or cause for the continuance of a program that provides a protection against discrimination in employment? Have you ever considered the bitter ironies that come to American Negroes who serve and die in war planes and ships built in American factories which deprived them of jobs before they were called to the colors? What a pathetic parody upon patriotism if the men and women fighting upon freedom's front should return to find this liberty of action and opportunity is limited by color, race, or creed. We speak of the liberation of the continent of Europe in the coming invasion. I speak for the liberation of men from the prejudices of the past in order that they may enjoy equality of opportunity now and equal protection of the laws in the future. This is a just request and calls for no apology, as it finds its precedent in our public policy and its counterpart in our Constitution and its amendments.

In the reconversion period these principles and precepts will be truly tested and tried. Remember the old saying that "the Negro is the first to be fired and the last to be hired." Following the war we shall see tremendous plants devoted to national defense reconverted to peacetime production. It will take time to retool—this will call for a period of patience—but we must make sure that this will not be used as a pretext for keeping patriotic American Negroes off the pay roll.

If we will but make F. E. P. C. a permanent law and provide it with the authority and force to insure all Americans equal opportunity and equal protection of law in employment, then we can proudly proclaim to the world that those who have died shall not have died in vain, and that at last we have made democracy work in America.

Rehabilitation of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an article written by Col. John N. Smith, Jr., director of the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City, which was published in the Catholic Charities Review for May 1944.

Now that our disabled soldiers and sailors are beginning to return, there is a renewed interest in rehabilitation. It is the duty of our Government to send them back to civil life properly equipped to resume their former civilian pursuits, if possible. If not, then to rehabilitate and train them in some other field which minimizes their disability and will enable them to take their proper place in society.

The manpower shortage has perhaps made us realize more than any other single factor the value of disabled workers. Those who have not been properly rehabilitated are competing with able-bodied workers in practically all fields of commerce and industry.

Colonel Smith's article describes the programs of the armed forces of the Veterans' Administration and the Joint Federal-State program for disabled civilians. Because of his long experience in rehabilitation work, Colonel Smith is able to present a clear definition of these programs as well as the ultimate objectives sought under them.

The article follows:

PUBLIC REHABILITATION PROGRAMS—A SURVEY OF THE FIELD

(By Col. John N. Smith, Jr., director, Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, New York, N. Y.)

Rehabilitation has been defined as the "restoration of a handicapped (disabled) person to the fullest physical, mental, social, vocational, and economic usefulness of which he is capable." If we accept this definition we find many programs under the auspices of Federal, State, and local public agencies which provide some phases of rehabilitation for various classes and groups of individuals and for various specific purposes. This discussion will be confined to the programs of the Veterans' Administration for disabled veterans of World War No. 2; the joint Federal-State program for disabled civilians; and those conducted by the armed forces with a view to returning disabled members thereof to further military or naval duty or assignments within the scope of their remaining physical capacities.

ARMED FORCES PROGRAMS

While the present war is in progress it is essential for the conservation of manpower that no man or woman, trained in military or naval duty, be discharged from the armed forces who can be rehabilitated to an extent that he or she can be assigned to other duties within those forces commensurate with the disability. With this end in view, all of the components of the armed forces have set up rehabilitation programs, generally under the supervision and direction of their medical services. These programs are known under various names but extend from the application of physical and medical measures alone, to include all of the other measures involved in the broad definition of rehabilitation previously quoted.

The effort has been very successful and many men and women who, if serving in the last World War would have been discharged from the armed forces for disability, are now being saved for further military or naval duty. Naturally, however, there are others who cannot undertake these programs successfully because of severity of disability. These are being discharged but not until they have received the best of medical, physical, and other care by the armed forces. After discharge they are entitled to further rehabilitative treatment by the Veterans' Administration dependent, generally, upon whether their disabilities are service connected, whether they received honorable discharges, or whether they meet certain other requirements under existing law. If not entitled to such treatment by the Veterans' Administration, they are, as civilians, entitled to service through the Federal-State civilian rehabilitation program, if they meet the conditions imposed by law for entitlement to that program.

VETERAN REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Under existing law any veteran of World War No. 2, not dishonorably discharged, who has a service-incurred disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or who has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment, is entitled to medical treatment, hospital treatment, prosthetic appliances, and domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration.

In addition, but contingent upon availability of facilities, any veteran of the present war, not dishonorably discharged, suffering from a disability, disease, or defect, who is in need of such care and unable to defray the expenses thereof, regardless of whether the

disability, disease, or defect was due to service, is entitled to hospital or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 24, 1943, provides:

1. That any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war;

2. And was honorably discharged;

3. And who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for receipt of retirement pay; and

4. Who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

The courses of training prescribed may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war. While the disabled veteran is in training, his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, is increased to $80 per month, if single, $90 per month if married, with $5 additional for each child and $10 additional for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required. In carrying out the vocational rehabilitation program, it is the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing.

In addition to medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, domiciliary care, and vocational rehabilitation, the Veterans' Administration provides pensions, disability compensation, and other monetary benefits, insurance, and other services to veterans. Generally, applications for any of these benefits are made to the local Veterans' Administration facility having jurisdiction over the territory in which the veteran resides. There are 53 of these facilities bound, generally, by State boundaries, with some States having more than one. It is suggested that private voluntary agencies obtain the following documents for general information respecting veterans' benefits: Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War II and Their Dependents, House Document No. 394, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1944; and Veterans' Legislation, House Committee Print, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1943, printed for the use of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. It is suggested further that voluntary agencies make contact from time to time with the officials in their local Veterans' Administration facilities.

JOINT FEDERAL-STATE PROGRAMS

Public Law No. 116, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 6, 1943, known as the vocational rehabilitation amendments of 1943, provides for a comprehensive program of rehabilitation for civilians. The scope of services available to disabled persons includes any services necessary to render them capable of engaging in remunerative employment or to render them more advantag ously employable. These include, within certain limitations, surgical or medical care, hospitalization, therapeutic treatment, artificial appliances, vocational guidance and training, maintenance during training, and placement in employment.

It is a joint Federal-State program where the Federal Government assists the States financially in carrying out State plans for rehabilitation meeting certain standards and conditions set up in the law and regulations made thereunder. At the Federal level, it is administered by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency. Sole responsibility for the administration, supervision, and control of the federally approved State program rests with the State boards of vocational education. Where there is a State commission or other agency for the blind, that commission or agency administers the part of the program pertaining to that group.

The new law broadens the services in the joint program established by the Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act of June 2, 1920, principally through the inclusion of the various measures of medical and physical restoration. Medical officers of the United States Public Health Service have been assigned to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to organize and administer these new features. It is the expressed intent of the officials in charge that there be cooperative effort not only with other Federal and State agencies engaged in various phases of rehabilitation, but also with the private voluntary agencies engaged in such work, and that these agencies be utilized in the program.

The regulations provide for advisory committees at both the Federal and State levels, composed of representatives of various fields—corrective surgery, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, psychiatry, guidance and welfare agencies, education, labor, management, and the like. A National Rehabilitation Advisory Council at the Federal level was appointed on October 8, 1943. Included among its 26 members are Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D. C., and Rev. John J. Bingham, director, division of health, Catholic Charities, New York City. It is understood that committees at the State level are now under consideration for appointment by the State boards of vocational education.

It is suggested that agencies interested or engaged in the field of vocational rehabilitation for civilians obtain a copy of the Regulations Governing the Plans and Program of Vocational Rehabilitation, title 45, public welfare, chapter 6, issued by the Federal Security Administrator, Federal Security Agency, dated October 9, 1943, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. An excellent paper entitled "The Administration of War and Post-War Rehabilitation of Handicapped Patients," issued by Mr. Michael J. Shortley, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C., February 10, 1944, gives a very clear description of what has been done and what is contemplated under the law. There has recently been published also a section of the Manual of Policies governing the requirements and recommendations for physical restoration services, by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, F. S. A., United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Voluntary agencies engaged in the field should also make contact from time to time with the rehabilitation services of their State boards of vocational education.

Relief for American Prisoners of War and Civilian Internees in Japanese Prison Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1944, I wrote to Secretary of State Cordell Hull concerning the authenticity of press reports that Japan was now prepared to allow the movement of relief supplies from Vladivostok to American prisoners of war and civilian internees detained in the Far East. On May 27 I received the Secretary's reply and while noting that negotiations were going forward I was disappointed that nothing concrete had as yet been accomplished. I realize the State Department is doing all it can do under the circumstances, but time is the essence in matters of this sort. For over 2 years our people in Japanese prison and concentration camps have been living in hope and praying for relief and deliverance. It is the sincere wish of all of Congress, I know, that the negotiations now being carried on will turn out successfully so that relief supplies can be sent in to sustain our people until their day of deliverance by our forces. We are on the offensive all over the Pacific now and, God willing, we are determined that Japan shall pay for all of her offenses against this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Secretary Hull and his reply and enclosure:

MAY 10, 1944.

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I note from press reports that there is a possibility that the Japanese Government will declare its readiness to dispatch a vessel to Vladivostok to pick up United States supplies sent there for the relief of American war prisoners and civilian internees in Japanese hands. According to the newspaper account carried by the Associated Press, "a definite plan for the purpose has been communicated to the United States through the Swiss Minister."

Will you please send me whatever pertinent information you may have concerning this particular situation. As you know, Mr. Secretary, I have been extremely interested in getting assistance to our boys who were taken prisoner by the enemy and who are now incarcerated in Japanese prison camps throughout the Far East, in Japan proper, in Formosa, Shanghai, Manchuria, and the Philippines.

I would appreciate receiving from you at your earliest convenience a detailed account of what is being done and what is contemplated on the basis of this newspaper report.

Thanking you and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 27, 1944.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have received your letter of May 10, 1944, in which you refer to recent press reports that the Japanese Government is now prepared to implement the onward movement of relief supplies from Vladivostok to American prisoners of war and civilian internees detained in the Far East. You ask to be supplied with whatever pertinent information may be available to the Department regarding this subject.

As will be noted in section 6 of the enclosed statement summarizing the steps taken by the Department up to March 12, 1944, for the relief of American nationals in Japanese custody, efforts have beeen made for some time past to find a means acceptable to the Japanese Government for forwarding to our prisoners of war and civilian internees in the Far East necessary relief supplies.

A proposal by the Japanese Government concerning the onward movement of relief

supplies shipped last fall as far as Vladivostok and those to be sent subsequently via Soviet territory has now been received. Several of the conditions incorporated therein affect the interests of other governments. The matter is being dealt with diligently and it is hoped that in the very near future we will be in a position to reply to the Japanese communication, either accepting the conditions which have been laid down or making an acceptable counter proposal.

The Department has not yet given full publicity to the details of this proposal, believing that to do so at this time would only serve to prevent the attainment of our objectives through possible misunderstanding of our motives at Tokyo and elsewhere.

I may add that an agreement has recently been reached with the Japanese, with the Soviet Government's cooperation, whereby mail may be transported to and from Japan by the Trans-Siberian rail route. This should tend to expedite the exchange of communications between our prisoners and civilian internees in Japanese custody and their relatives in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

SUMMARY OF STEPS TAKEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE IN BEHALF OF AMERICAN NATIONALS IN JAPANESE CUSTODY

1. TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIAN INTERNEES

Upon the outbreak of war between the United States and Japan the United States Government, in an endeavor to insure humane treatment for American nationals in Japanese hands, confirmed its intention to observe the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention (convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and ratified by the United States in 1932), and to apply its provisions to prisoners of war and, so far as its provisions might be adaptable, to civilian internees. The Japanese Government, which had signed but had not ratified the convention, thereupon notified the United States Government that it would apply the provisions of the convention, mutatis mutandis, to the treatment of American prisoners of war and to the treatment of American civilian internees so far as its provisions might be adaptable to civilian internees.

The United States Government has also obtained assurances from the Japanese Government that it is applying the Geneva Red Cross Convention (convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and the sick of armies in the field, which was also signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and which was ratified by the United States in 1932 and by Japan in 1934).

The conventions named above provide a humanitarian standard of treatment for prisoners of war. Specifically, they provide that prisoners of war shall be treated humanely and held in honorable captivity—not imprisoned as criminals. They establish as the standard for the shelter and diet of prisoners of war the corresponding treatment of the garrison troops of the detaining power and they establish fundamental rights regarding correspondence, medical care, clothing, pay for labor, satisfaction of intellectual, recreational, and religious needs, and the continued enjoyment of full civil status. For persons generally referred to as "protected personnel," that is, doctors, nurses, and other sanitary (medical) personnel, and chaplains, they provide certain special rights and protection.

The Department of State is constantly alert to insure observance of the conventions. Whenever the United States Government learns that the terms of the conventions are not being observed in any respect, it transmits through the Swiss Government, which represents American interests in Japan and Japanese-occupied territories, demands that the Japanese Government take immediate steps to remedy each such situation and to prevent its recurrence.

2. EXCHANGE OF CIVILIANS

In the first exchange of nationals between the United States Government and the Japanese Government, which took place in the summer of 1942, over 1,300 United States officials and nonofficials were repatriated from the Far East. Further negotiations lasting more than a year culminated in a second exchange of civilians late in 1943, resulting in the repatriation of approximately 1,240 nationals of the United States, including a small number from the Philippine Islands, and 260 nationals of the other American republics and Canada.

The Government of the United States, recognizing that all American citizens have an equal right to consideration, did not select individual Americans for inclusion in the exchanges or discriminate in any other way between individual Americans desiring repatriation. Since all Americans could not be accommodated in one exchange, the Swiss representatives in charge of American interests in Japan and occupied China were given broad humanitarian directives for their guidance in compiling passenger lists for the *Gripsholm*. These directitves gave preference to (1) those under close arrest; (2) interned women and children; (3) the seriously ill; and (4) interned men with preference being given, other things being equal, to married men long separated from their families in the United States. The Japanese Government did not permit even these broad directives to be applied in the Philippine Islands, contending that the provisions of the exchange arrangements were not applicable to Americans who were in the Philippines, Wake, and Guam when those territories were occupied by the Japanese. Only after months of negotiations did the Japanese Government finally indicate that it would return to the United States in the second exchange a small number of civilians from the Philippine Islands. The Japanese Government exercised complete control over the departure of those desiring repatriation and even refused to permit the repatriation from occupied China of a number of Americans whose inclusion in the exchange Swiss representatives in charge of American interests endeavored to arrange on humanitarian grounds.

The Department of State has endeavored to arrange for a third exchange. The Japanese Government has so far refused to discuss further exchanges, contending that it desires first to receive "clarification on certain points respecting the treatment of Japanese nationals in the United States." Spanish representatives in charge of Japanese interests in the United States have been requested to supply the information requested by the Japanese Government and there is reason to believe that they have complied with this request. However, the Department of State is not in a position to offer encouragement for the early repatriation of American citizens in Japanese custody. The Department emphasizes that responsibility for this situation rests not with the United States Government but with the Government of Japan. In time of war an exchange of nationals with an enemy is fraught with difficulties. This is particularly true of exchanges of the magnitude of those that the United States has twice been able to arrange with Japan and hopes to be able to arrange in the future. Such exchanges cannot be accomplished by unilateral action. No matter what efforts are put forth by the United States Government, and they have been many and continuous, an exchange cannot take place unless the enemy is willing to cooperate and deliver on its part the Americans in its custody.

The refusal of the Japanese Government to continue discussions of further exchanges of nationals is not deterring the United States Government from taking all necessary and proper steps to keep the question of such exchanges continually before the Japanese authorities and to make such preparations as may be possible to insure the speedy execution of any further exchanges of whatever character to which Japanese agreement may eventually be obtained.

3. REPATRIATION OF SICK AND WOUNDED PRISONERS OF WAR

Artice 68 of the Prisoners-of-War Convention provides that:

"Belligerents are bound to send back to their own country, regardless of rank or number, seriously sick and seriously injured prisoners of war, after having brought them to a condition where they can be transported.

"Agreements between belligerents shall accordingly settle as soon as possible the cases of invalidity or of sickness, entailing direct repatriation, as well as the cases entailing possible hospitalization in a neutral country. While awaiting the conclusion of these agreements, belligerents may have reference to the model agreement annexed, for documentary purposes, to the present convention."

The model agreement defines the degree of incapacity that shall be considered sufficient to qualify a prisoner of war for repatriation. This Government proposed to the Japanese Government that the model agreement be observed on a reciprocal basis and made insistent demands that the Japanese Government honor the obligation imposed by the convention to repatriate sick and wounded prisoners. The Japanese Government replied, after long delay, that it could not make a favorable response to the United States Government's proposal. The Department of State has formulated, in consultation with other agencies of the Government, further proposals in an effort to induce the Japanese Government to enter into negotiations for the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war. Whenever the Japanese Government agrees to reopen discussions for further exchanges of nationals, these proposals for the repatriation of sick and wounded prisoners of war will be advanced by the United States Government as an integral part of any arrangements to be made.

4. REPATRIATION OF SANITARY PERSONNEL

Article 9 of the Red Cross Convention provides, in part:

"The personnel charged exclusively with the removal, transportation, and treatment of the wounded and sick, as well as with the administration of sanitary formations and establishments, and the chaplains attached to armies, shall be respected and protected under all circumstances. If they fall into the hands of the enemy they shall not be treated as prisoners of war."

Article 12 of the same Convention provides, in part:

"Persons described in article 9 may not be detained after they have fallen into the power of the adversary.

"Unless there is an agreement to the contrary, they shall be sent back to the belligerent to whose service they are attached as soon as a way is open for their return and military exigencies permit.

"While waiting to be returned, they shall continue in the exercise of their functions under the direction of the adversary; they shall be assigned preferably to the care of the wounded and sick of the belligerent to whose service they are attached."

Pursuant to the provisions of article 12 of the Red Cross Convention, it was proposed to the Japanese Government that the repatriation of the personnel protected under the Convention be begun, since facilities for their return to the United States could be made available on the vessels employed for the exchange of civilian nationals. In order, however, not to deprive American prisoners of war of the care that they may require

and might not otherwise receive, the United States Government also proposed to the Japanese Government, on a basis of reciprocity, that the right of repatriation be waived for protected personnel needed and permitted in prisoner-of-war camps or hospitals to render spiritual and medical assistance to compatriots who were in the care of that personnel at the time of capture. This Government further proposed that the selection of protected personnel to be repatriated be made by the senior officer of the unit captured.

The Japanese Government agreed in principle to the repatriation of protected personnel in connection with exchanges of civilians but reserved to itself the decision whether the retention of that personnel was necessary for the care of American prisoners of war and civilian internees under Japanese control. The department accordingly requested the Swiss Government to endeavor to arrange for the accommodation of American protected personnel in future American-Japanese civilian exchange operations.

Although it repatriated five nurses from Guam at the time of the first civilian exchange, the Japanese Government apparently did not find that it had in its power surplus American-protected personnel available for repatriation in the second exchange as no such personnel was included in the lists for that exchange. However, the Department intends, when conducting negotiations for further exchanges of civilians, to convey again to the Japanese Government the expectation of the United States Government that protected personnel whose repatriation proves possible shall be included in future exchange operations.

5. EXCHANGE OF ABLE-BODIED PRISONERS OF WAR

There is no customarily accepted practice among nations nor provisions of international law or conventions for the return or exchange during hostilities of able-bodied members of the armed forces of one belligerent who may be captured by the forces of an opposing belligerent. In the circumstances, there is no prospect of obtaining the release and return to the United States of able-bodied members of the American armed forces taken prisoners of war by the Japanese.

6. SHIPMENT OF RELIEF SUPPLIES TO THE FAR EAST

Early in 1942 the American Red Cross in conjunction with the interested agencies of the United States Government made efforts to find a means acceptable to the Japanese Government for forwarding to our prisoners of war and civilian internees in the Far East necessary supplies of food, medicine, clothing, and comforts such as are regularly sent to American citizens in corresponding circumstances in other enemy-held areas. A neutral vessel to carry such supplies to Japan was obtained and chartered in the summer of 1942. The Japanese Government, however, refused to give it safe conduct for the voyage of the vessel to the Far East. In response to repeated representations the Japanese Government indicated that it was unwilling for strategic reasons to grant any non-Japanese vessel safe conduct to move in Japanese waters and that it had no intention of sending one of its own vessels to any neutral area in order to pick up relief supplies for United States and Allied prisoners of war and civilians as was suggested by the United States Government. Upon the recepit of this Japanese reply the United States Government pointed out its expectation that the Japanese would modify their position as soon as strategic reasons would permit, and suggested for the interim the immediate appointment of International Red Cross delegates to Japanese-occupied territory who might receive and distribute funds in behalf of American nationals. This suggestion was eventually accepted by the Japanese only for Hong Kong and certain areas in occupied China. They have not accepted it so far for the Philippine Islands, Malaya, and the Netherlands Indies. Efforts to induce the Japanese Government to abandon its position against the use of neutral ships to carry relief supplies into its waters were continued and new avenues of approach were fully canvassed, including the possibility of sending relief supplies in transit through Soviet territory. One suggestion proposed the sending of supplies by air to some point where the Japanese might lift them, with particular reference to medical suplies which might be scarce in Japan. No reply to this particular proposal was ever received. Another proposal was that the American Red Cross would provide a cargo ship to go to some point in the Pacific where a Japanese crew might take it over in order to conduct it to the ports where relief cargo should be discharged. This proposal was rejected by the Japanese. Numerous other proposals were considered but were either abandoned because of obstacles interposed by other enemy governments or were found to be otherwise impossible of accomplishment.

In March 1943 the Japanese Government, in response to repeated representations stressing its responsibility to cooperate in solving the problem, stated that strategic reasons still prevented neutral vessels from plying the Pacific waters but that it would explore other means of permitting the delivery of relief supplies. In the following month the Japanese Government stated that it might consent to receive supplies overland or by sea from Soviet territory. There have ensued since that time long and complicated negotiations with the Japanese and Soviet Governments. Each detail of the negotiations had be dealt with through a long and complicated procedure involving the handling of communications at Tokyo, Bern, Washington, and Moscow and in reverse direction through the same channels. Despite these difficulties, it has now been possible with the Soviet Government's cooperation to create a stock-pile of prisoner-of-war relief supplies on Soviet territory. Moreover, the Soviet Government has given assurances that it will facilitate the transit through the Soviet Union of such relief supplies on a continuing basis when a satisfactory arrangement for the onward shipment of these supplies is reached between the Japanese and American Governments. In spite of the Department's repeated endeavors to bring this matter to a conclusion, the Japanese Government has not thus far indicated the means by which it is prepared to receive these supplies. The Department will not relax its efforts to induce the Japanese Government to agree to an arrangement for the movement of relief supplies on a continuing basis to interned American nationals in its custody.

While the foregoing negotiations have been in progress it has fortunately been possible to take advantage of the two exchanges of civilians with the Japanese Government, one in July 1942 and the other in October 1943 to send to our nationals in the Far East an important quantity of relief supplies by means of the exchange vessels.

Reports of the distribution of relief supplies which left the United States on the first exchange vessel in 1942 were in due course received from the Far East. There was placed on the motor vessel *Gripsholm* when it left this country to effect the second exchange of civilian nationals another large cargo of assorted relief supplies, American Red Cross standard food parcels, next-of-kin parcels, and mail for distribution to American prisoners of war and American civilians interned in the Philippine Islands, occupied China, Hong Kong, Japan, the Netherlands East Indies, and Malaya. Valued at over $1,300,000 and weighing 1,600 short tons, these supplies included 140,000 food parcels of approximately 13 pounds each; 2,800 cases of medical supplies, including surgical instruments, dressings; 7,000,000 vitamin capsules, and so forth; 950 cases of comfort articles for men and women; 24,000,000 cigarettes; from 20,000 to 25,000 next-of-kin parcels; and important supplies of clothing for men and women. This entire cargo was transferred to the Japanese exchange vessel at Mormugao and dispatched eastward. Information has been received to the effect that this shipment has arrived in the Philippine Islands and in Japan, and it is hoped confirmation of distribution in the camps will be received.

In addition to the shipment of relief supplies on the exchange vessels, and the other measures above-mentioned, the Department of State and the American Red Cross are continuing to give close attention to all other phases of the subject.

7. PROVISION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN NATIONALS IN THE FAR EAST

Since the Trading with the Enemy Act as amended prohibits, among other things, individual remittances to enemy and enemy-occupied or enemy-controlled territory, unless licensed, and since the issuance of such licenses is contrary to the policy of the Government, the Department of State, shortly after this country's entry into the war, made provision for the extension of financial assistance from public funds in the form of loans to Americans in such territories through representatives of the Swiss Government representing American interests there. Appended to this memorandum is an information sheet explaining how such assistance is extended and how funds so advanced may be reimbursed to the United States Government. With certain exceptions in territories occupied or controlled by Japan, the enemy governments have permitted payments to be made to qualified American nationals in the manner described. The Japanese authorities, however, have thus far refused to permit the Swiss Government's representatives, in certain areas under Japanese control, to extend financial assistance to American nationals in those areas on the same basis as elsewhere. The Department, therefore, has had to find other means of making funds available to Americans in such areas.

At Hong Kong, where the Swiss Government has not been permitted by the Japanese Government to act in behalf of American nationals, the International Red Cross delegate has been authorized to provide assistance to qualified American nationals there from public funds made available for the purpose by the Department.

Immediately after the fall of the Philippine Islands, the Department endeavored to arrange for the extension of financial assistance to qualified American nationals there. In June 1943 the Japanese Government permitted the transfer of $25,000, representing a contribution by the American Red Cross, to be made to the executive committee of the Santo Tomas internment camp at Manila, and later allowed the transfer of a second Red Cross contribution of $25,000 for the relief of American nationals interned in Manila.

It was not until July 1943 that the Japanese Government indicated that it would agree in principle to permit payments to American nationals interned in other ports of the Philippine Islands, and to allow further payments to the internees at Manila. Accordingly, the Department in August 1943 authorized the Swiss Government to make remittances, in accordance with the need and the number of eligible individuals, to the executive committee of the American internment camps in the Philippine Islands beginning

with the month of August or as soon as feasible thereafter. Funds delivered to the executive committee under this authorization may be used (1) for the purchase of available supplies considered necessary to supplement the diet provided by the Japanese authorities, (2) to pay for essential services obtained outside of camp, (3) to provide each internee with a small amount of money for personal use, and (4) to advance funds, against promissory notes if possible, to indigent internees for delivery to such members of their families as may be at liberty.

The Japanese Government has recently consented to monthly transfers of United States Government funds to the Executive Committee of the Santo Tomas internment camp to be used for the relief of American nationals at Santo Tomas, Los Banos, Baguio, and Davao which, according to latest available information, are the only civilian internment camps now maintained by the Japanese in the Philippine Islands. These transfers are now being effected from such funds on deposit with the Swiss Government for the purposes mentioned above.

The Department's standing instructions to the Swiss representatives in charge of American interests in enemy-held areas are that funds provided by this Government may be made available to American prisoners of war as well as to interned American civilians for necessary personal expenditures in accordance with their established needs over and above the food, shelter, and other necessities provided them by the detaining power. Such assistance has already been made available through the local International Red Cross delegates to American prisoners of war near Shanghai and Hong Kong. The Department of State is pressing for the extension to American prisoners of war in the Philippine Islands of the system of financial assistance referred to above which the Japanese have agreed to make available to civilian internees.

8. INTERNMENT STATUS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS IN AREAS UNDER JAPANESE CONTROL

Article 77 of the Prisoners of War Convention of 1929 reads, in part, as follows:

"Upon the outbreak of hostilities, each of the belligerent powers, as well as the neutral powers which have received belligerents, shall institute an official information bureau for prisoners of war who are within their territory.

"Within the shortest possible period, each of the belligerent powers shall inform its information bureau of every capture of prisoners effected by its armies, giving it all the information regarding identity which it has, allowing it quickly to advise the families concerned, and informing it of the official addresses to which families may write to prisoners.

"The information bureau shall immediately forward all this information to the interested powers, through the intervention, on one hand, of the protecting powers and, on the other, of the central agency provided for in article 79."

In accordance with the provisions of the article quoted above, the Prisoners of War Information Bureau, Office of the Provost Marshal General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C., was established as the official agency of this Government to handle matters of this kind. The Bureau exchanges lists of prisoners of war and civilian internees with similar bureaus in enemy countries and transmits to the next of kin and to those persons in this country who have indicated their interest such information as it receives with respect to the internment status of Americans detained by the enemy.

If they have not already done so, persons who desire to ascertain the internment status of American nationals in areas under enemy control may make appropriate inquiries of the Prisoners of War Information Bureau and record their names and addresses with that Bureau.

9. TRANSMISSION OF MAIL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND AREAS UNDER JAPANESE CONTROL

It is understood that at the present time the Post Office Department is sending mail to the Far East via the Soviet Union. According to reports received from the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva, this mail is reaching the Far East, although it is, of course, subject to the delays and uncertainties of war and once it has reached the Far East its delivery to Americans is dependent upon the cooperation of the Japanese authorities. Mail to and from the Far East has also been exchanged during each civilian exchange operation and in the event of future exchange operations provision will be made for the carriage of prisoner of war and civilian internee mail. The United States authorities are continuing actively to explore the possibility of developing more expeditious channels of transmitting mail to the Far East.

Letters to American nationals who have been officially reported to the Prisoners of War Information Bureau as under Japanese detention may be sent through regular mail channels but must not exceed 24 words in length since the Japanese Government has indicated its intention to refuse to pass letters of greater length. There is no limit on the number of such letters which may be sent; however, owing to censorship difficulties in Japan, the number should be kept to a minimum.

It is ordinarily not possible to communicate through regular mail channels with Americans in enemy or enemy-controlled territories who are not officially reported to be prisoners of war or civilian internees by the detaining power pursuant to the provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929. Special arrangements have been made, however, for the acceptance of mail addressed to persons in the Far East who have been reported to the Prisoners of War Information Bureau as prisoners of war or civilian internees by persons who returned from the Far East on board the exchange vessel *Gripsholm*. Letters should be addressed to Americans so reported at the place of internment or address of record in the files of the Office of the Provost Marshal General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Communications to American nationals who are not known to the United States Government to be interned by the Japanese may be sent only through Red Cross facilities. Persons who wish to send communications to American nationals in this category should make inquiry of the nearest chapter of the American National Red Cross for information in this regard.

10. SENDING OF INDIVIDUAL PARCELS TO AMERICAN NATIONALS INTERNED BY THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

No means of transportation are currently available for the sending of any supplies to American nationals in Japanese custody. In the event the Government's further efforts to arrange for the shipment of such relief supplies as those discussed in section 6 of this summary should be successful, the Department would expect the Japanese Government reciprocally to accept and to deliver next of kin packages sent by the same means of transportation for delivery to interned American nationals, both military and civilian, in Japanese hands.

The Office of the Provost Marshal General, War Department, has jurisdiction over the issuance of labels permitting next of kin to send parcels to American nationals in enemy custody whenever facilities for this purpose are available. All persons desiring to be provided with such labels, in the event facilities for shipment of individual packages to the Far East should become available, are advised to communicate with that Office for information in this regard.

11. PRISONERS OF WAR CONVENTION AND RED CROSS CONVENTION

Any person who wishes to obtain the complete official text of the Prisoners of War Convention or the Red Cross Convention may do so by writing the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., and enclosing 10 cents for each copy of the Prisoners of War Convention and 5 cents for each copy of the Red Cross Convention. The Prisoners of War Convention is Treaty Series No. 846 and the Red Cross Convention is Treaty Series No. 847.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *March 12, 1944.*

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN EXTENDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN NATIONALS IN TERRITORIES WHERE THE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES ARE REPRESENTED BY SWITZERLAND

The Department of State has completed arrangements for financial assistance to American nationals in territories where the interests of the United States are represented by Switzerland.[1] Those able to qualify for such assistance will be entitled to receive from the Swiss representatives monthly payments corresponding to their established needs and the prevailing cost of living in the country concerned. All recipients will be limited to the monthly payments established for their place of residence, regardless of their ability or the ability of others interested in their welfare to repay amounts greater than the sums advanced. It is realized that a limitation upon the amount that American nationals may expend in enemy territory, even from their own resources, will entail some hardship. The conservation of foreign exchange, however, is an essential factor in the present economic policy of the United States, and it is expected that Americans everywhere will willingly share with those in the armed forces the sacrifices that must be made in winning the war.

Based upon the latest ascertained cost of living in the various countries concerned, the maximum monthly payment for the head of a household will range from $60 to $130, with smaller allowances for additional members of the household. The monthly payments are subject to revisions from time to time to meet changing living cost. In addition, the Swiss representatives are authorized to make special advances for such extraordinary expenditures as may be essential to the health or safety of American nationals for medical, surgical, or dental care, for hospitalization, for reasonable legal defense against political or criminal charges, or for a decent though modest burial where such is not provided by friends or relatives locally nor by the local authorities.

Wherever prisoners of war and interned civilians are supported by the detaining power, it is expected that payments made to them will generally not exceed a small sum sufficient to provide spending money for miscellaneous personal needs not supplied by the detaining power. However, no payments will be made to officers or to persons of equivalent status held as prisoners of war, who receive pay under the convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929.

Swiss representatives charged with the representation of the interests of the United States will explain to the recipients that such financial assistance should not be considered as public bounty but as loans from public

---

[1] Switzerland represents the interests of the United States in Germany, Italy, and Japan, in territories occupied by these countries, and in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

funds to American nationals finding themselves in an abnormal position by reason of war. It is accordingly expected that all sums advanced will be repaid either by the recipients themselves or by relatives, friends, business associates, employers, or legal representatives in the United States.

Receipts embodying promises to repay without interest the sums advanced will be taken for all payments. Private deposits to reimburse the Government for sums advanced shall be made with the Department of State. Persons wishing to make such deposits should indicate the names of the beneficiaries and should remit by postal money orders or certified checks payable to The Secretary of State of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 12, 1944.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on May 29, 1944:

MEMORIAL DAY

Memorial Day, in all its great sentimental significance, will be observed tomorrow throughout the land, yes, throughout the world because wherever there is an American following the colors there will be a Memorial Day observance, even though it be only a silent prayer.

Memorial Day has grown and developed into one of America's greatest institutions of democracy. In parades behind the colors, to great amphitheatres and to beautifully kept cemeteries, along country roads, to quaint old burying grounds and even along wooded trails to single graves, Americans, high and low, rich and poor, strong and weak, young and old, will join the throng.

At those graves of departed heroes, men and women of fame, and those less known whose memories are kept alive by those who are staying on just a little while longer, garlands of flowers will be placed, eulogies will be delivered, services will be held, prayers will be said, and memories revived with an intensity that grows with each year. Americans from all walks of life will march to those hallowed places and kneel side by side at those graves. They will pray and pay the tribute to those whom they loved and honored in life as they know others will do at their graves after their call to the Great Beyond has been sounded.

Memorial Day is essentially a day of memories, and from those memories America draws strength for the hard task of war. America is not really a remembering nation, coddling the past, but it does have abiding gratitude for those who, in national crises of the past, offered everything to their country, not counting cost. That gratitude gave rise to the custom of paying tribute to the hero dead and, as years passed, to all our dead. That day set aside for remembering the hero dead became known as Decoration Day and Memorial Day. It manifests most emphatically that America as a nation, and Americans as individuals, continue to harbor in their breasts love and sentiment, faith and religion, courage and patriotism, and that human element that nurtures tolerance and understanding.

This year those who assume the responsibility for the military part of the program will see to it that those who are the latest to join the ranks of the silent heroic dead are not forgotten. There will be fresh flags and fresh markers on the graves of those of tender age who have already joined the ranks of men who have paid the supreme sacrifice for the honor and glory of their country, the heroes and casualties of World War No. 2.

As morning dawns tomorrow there will be activity in many homes and at the headquarters of all veteran organizations preparing for the sacred tasks of love and memory that lie ahead. Music will be heard, as will be the chant of prayers, and tears of sorrow and of pride will be shed as America pays tribute to her honored dead.

As dusk comes, taps will be sounded, and the line between the living and the dead will once more be drawn, the hours of communion will have passed, and the living will return to their homes to precede their well-earned rest with prayers for the eternal rest and happiness that God is asked to grant to their beloved dead.

What American Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

WHAT AMERICAN DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(Written by a 16-year-old school girl, Niles, Mich.)

There is not a day in my life in which I have not enjoyed some benefit of our Constitution. American democracy influences my thought, my actions, my plans for the future, and even my daydreams.

I have the right to think for myself with unhampered access to the truth. No Hitler can tell me that I must think that Jews are devoid of all virtue and ability at the same time stopping me from hearing Mendelssohn music or reading Heine or Thomas Mann so that I will not doubt his word. I can read both Mein Kampf and the Communist Manifesto, and then Browder. I may read and hear all viewpoints discussed for my country believes that no group of men is superhuman enough to have the ability to tell other men what the unprejudiced truth or correct way of thinking is.

I am at liberty to act on my own convictions and spread them. I may speak and write about anything. I may go to any church I wish to—or none at all.

No labor conscription can force me to work unwillingly in times of peace. All my adult life I am free to do what I wish. The Government will not interfere as long as I do not hurt my fellow citizens nor act seriously against the good of the whole.

Under American democracy I can plan and look forward to the future with assurance. I know that those I love will be justly treated because the Constitution and the Bill of Rights protect each citizen against any bullying majority. My friends and relations cannot be imprisoned unless an impartial court judges them guilty of a crime defined by law. Through my vote I can influence the policies of the Government under which I live. I know what I have rightfully earned will not be arbitrarily taken away. The Government can never take away without just recompense that little shack in the woods which I hope to have someday.

My future depends upon my own efforts. If I work hard and intelligently, I can rise. America gives help in the upward struggle by furnishing a free education. One born in a farmer's or a laborer's family does not have to stay a farmer or a laborer. Anyone is free to change his own position through hard work and ingenuity. More wonderful still, the average citizen respects and admires the self-made man.

I owe to our Constitution freedom of expression and thought; the right to struggle and hope for what I desire; and security of future justice. Is it any wonder that I believe that our Constitution and the American democracy which it sustains are the most important forces in my life and that I love them accordingly?

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the last break the New Deal has had was when the Senate voted to postpone the Kimmel-Short trial to December 7.

Increased money by millions is asked for O. P. A. to step up its enforcement program and to simplify price controls What a paradox.

Sewell Avery will be compelled to walk into the hearings here June 6. He will have no such service as the Army afforded him in Chicago.

A recent broadcast of an historic play, O. K.'d by F. C. C., treated the Revolutionary War as a civil war—not a war for independence from a foreign country.

Winchell criticized Churchill severely Sunday night, Eleanor slightly on Monday, and Franklin on Tuesday. What have I told you about that week-end liaison?

The big impetus communism has received in this country in recent years comes, sorry to say, from the joint occupants of the White House, our own White House.

The present leaders of the Farmers Union, the New Republic editors, the C. I. O. chieftains, and the New Deal "Yes" men are all drinking now from the same gourd.

Half of the people who attended Decoration Day in Arlington were those who took part, and it was a perfect day. Do we care less or is it just another cemetery now?

Flag Day will soon be here, but the Stars and Stripes will not be so conspicuous as in days gone by. The Fourth of July is receiving dwindling attention in recent years.

Constitution Day was scarcely mentioned last year. However, the old Thanksgiving Day has come back, Christmas is still Christmas, and Easter is hallowed yet.

America Speaks to the Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Truslow Adams.

AMERICA SPEAKS TO THE COMMON MAN

"This long almost empty land," we might imagine her as saying, "is for you, the poor and the oppressed, the weary and the heavy laden. It is not for those who would live softly and easily or from the toil of others. America is not a pampering land. You must have fortitude, high courage, and willingness to work. You and your families may have to suffer and take great risks, even to your lives. You may have to forego much that has made life seem normal and safe and pleasant in the homelands from which you and others may come, but in exchange you will find a new life, a life of freedom to be yourselves, to make the most of yourselves that you can, to win perhaps great prizes, and, above all, to take your place as free men and women in the building of a better life for all than has yet been dreamed of in the war-torn and shackle-bearing nations of the past. I welcome you with open arms to my wide expanse, 3,000,000 square miles of woods and mountains, of fields and prairies and plains, of riches unthinkable. Take me and use me for yourselves and all humanity. Yours is the opportunity of all the ages. Use it well and a new heaven and a new earth may dawn for man. Misuse it, and man's last hope may break. For you—and you—and you—the chance has come."

At first the prospect held little cheer. Moreover, the blueprint planning for the colony by the theorists at home had included the idea of communism, which has never worked in a civilized community but which crops up every now and then to allure certain types of minds which ignore the realities of human nature. The colonists were to work not for themselves as individuals but for a common store into which the results of their labor were to be placed and from which they would draw for their necessities. The experiment went on disastrously for some years. Without the incentive of personal gain for personal thought and work, ambition disappeared and the morale of the community fell to almost zero. Anything more different from the wisdom of Queen Elizabeth in enlisting the energy of every man in the state by allowing the able and adventurous to reap the full rewards of their energy and daring could not be conceived.

When under the rule of Sir Thomas Dale as governor a new course was taken, and each man was allotted three acres of his own and, as John Rolfe wrote, they could sit under their own "fig tree in safety, gathering and reaping the fruits of their labors with much joy and comfort," the effect was instantaneous. Capt. John Smith commented that "when our people were fed out of the common store, and laboured jointly together, glad was he (sic) could slip from his labour, or slumber over his taske, he cared not how, nay the most honest among them would hardly take so much true paines in a weeke, as now for themselves they will doe in a day: neither cared they for the increase, presuming that howsoever the harvest prospered the generall store must maintaine them, so that wee reaped not so much corne from the labours of thirtie as now three or four do provide for themselves."

A man could at last work for himself and his own. The free winds of America were blowing.

Responsibility and Cooperation in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a most interesting and engaging article written by Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, of Memphis, Tenn., former president of the American Bar Association. Mr. Armstrong is one of the Nation's foremost students of government and this article, which appeared in the June issue of the American Bar Association Journal under the title "The Kefauver Resolution," will be of interest to Members of Congress and everyone interested in improving the relationship between the executive and legislative branches of our Government:

The separation of governmental powers in our Constitution was in part due to what has been called "the brilliant misconception of Montesquieu." The Frenchman thought that he perceived this separation in the British Government of his day and, although he realized that it was incomplete, he apparently expected its further development. Precisely the opposite happened at least as to the executive and legislative departments. The king has become a symbol, the executive is the instrument of the legislature and the Prime Minister and other cabinet members merely agents of the House of Commons. Confronted by an adverse vote of the House, the Cabinet has no alternative save dissolution or resignation.

Even under our system the separation was from the beginning incomplete. The Senate participates in the executive process by confirming appointments by the President, ratifying or rejecting treaties, and Congress must implement many executive powers.

The President is performing a legislative function when he proposes action by Congress and when he signs or vetoes bills.

DEVELOPMENT OF EXECUTIVE LEGISLATION

In recent years the separation has become even less marked. Congress has passed many acts which are but the framework of a complete legislative scheme. These acts authorize the executive or his agencies to complete the scheme, and thus in effect to legislate. This delegation of legislative power has to a large extent been sustained by the Supreme Court so that not infrequently the final form of a law depends upon executive legislation.

The most noteworthy change, however, has been the fact that strong executives have assumed the leadership of their parties. They are not content to leave to Congress the initiation of legislation and to consider themselves as having the single function of executing the laws. They formulate a legislative program and personally and through party leaders in the two Houses urge its adoption. No one is left in doubt as to what pending bills are administration measures.

The great advantage of this development is that it not only provides leadership, but centralizes responsibility in one who is accountable to the nation as a whole and not merely to a single constituency.

However, if the work of Congress and the executive is to mesh, a primary essential is that each be fully informed as to the work of the other and that the people be cognizant of the functioning of both.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Available to the executive department and to the people is adequate information as to the work of the Congress. Both its sessions and committee hearings are public. They are reported fully enough at least to put all interested on notice as to what is being considered and additional information is always accessible.

It is, however, extremely difficult for either an ordinary citizen or a Member of Congress to be adequately informed as to the working of the Executive branch. This branch consists not only of the President and the members of his Cabinet, but of multiple departments and agencies.

The ordinary sources of information are: the messages of the President, the reports to Congress of Cabinet members and of departments and agencies, appearances before committees, press releases, and conferences and interviews between Members of Congress and department and agency heads.

INADEQUACY OF PRESENT METHODS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

No one of these and the sum total of all do not furnish adequate information either to the Congress or the public. Obviously the messages of the President do not and cannot deal with the minutae of the conduct of the departments and agencies. It is impossible even for a Congressman, pressed for time, to read all the reports, and frequently significant facts are either not dealt with or are buried under a mass of irrelevancies. Appearances before committees are often unsatisfactory. Ordinarily a committee is concerned with only a single phase of concrete legislation. Its proceedings may not be publicized nor come to the attention of other Members of Congress. No one of its Members may be qualified to elicit information which would be valuable to Congress as a whole. Different committees may be interested in a single department and separate appearances before them mean an increasing waste of time of the witness or witnesses. Press releases are mere ex parte statements, usually of little value. Press conferences are but little better. The reporter has no definite public responsibility and has primarily in mind the news value of the information he seeks. Frequently he does not have the experience and information necessary for the formulation of pertinent questions. In dealing with him the executive officer is not dealing with a responsible coordinate branch of the Government and is free to give or withhold information. The content of conferences between Members of Congress and department and agency heads is not only not known to the public but sometimes their occurrence raises the suspicion that some sinister deal is being worked out.

Many statesmen and publicists have recognized the inadequacy of the present methods of communication between the Congress and the executive branch as a defect in our governmental structure and have suggested changes. Among them are William Howard Taft, Chief Justice Hughes, Elihu Root, John W. Davis, James A. Garfield, Woodrow Wilson, Justice Story, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler and Dr. Charles A. Beard.

QUESTION PERIOD "TO PUBLICIZE THE WORK OF CONGRESS" AND THE CABINET

The most recent as well as the most constructive proposal has been made by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. Mr. KEFAUVER has offered in the House of Representatives a resolution which would amend the rules of that body by providing that there shall be at least once every 2 weeks, and not oftener than once a week, a question period during which heads of independent departments and agencies shall be requested to answer orally, written and oral questions propounded by Members of the House. Attendance by the executive officials will be voluntary. Written interrogatories will be submitted in advance, but may be supplemented by oral questions, one-half of the "question period" being reserved for this purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER's resolution has been enthusiastically received by the press and is now pending before the Rules Committee of the House. Its merits are obvious. Indeed, the resolution is entirely in line with what should have been the logical development of our form of government. The founding fathers envisaged some such consultation between Congress and the executive department. President Woodrow Wilson's personal appearance before Congress was not an innovation, but the return to a practice that had been inaugurated by Washington and discontinued by Jefferson. The statute organizing the Treasury Department, passed in 1789, made it the duty of the Secretary to make reports and give information to either branch of the legislature in person or in writing—as he might be required. During the first Congress there are about 14 recorded instances where a Cabinet member appeared before the Senate, and 8 of appearances before the House of Representatives.

The Constitution of the Confederate States was in some respects, when dealing with subjects which were neither divisive or controversial, an admirable document. The men who drafted it had one advantage over the members of the original constitutional convention. From personal experience and their reading of history they knew how the Constitution worked in actual practice and thus learned how it was susceptible of improvement. Profiting by this experience, they wrote into the new constitution this provision: "Congress may, by law, grant to the principal officer in each of the executive departments a seat upon the floor of either house, with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department." Although this plan was actually practiced under the provisional government of 1861, because of the exigencies of war, it was never fully carried out.

Mr. Kefauver's proposal does not go nearly so far as the practice contemplated by the Confederate constitution which would have permitted a Cabinet member to appear at his pleasure and participate in any debate that concerned his department. The resolution requires an invitation from the House which may be accepted or declined. If accepted it is followed by a brief period of questioning not by a debate participated in by the executive. It is much further removed from the British Parliamentary system under which each Cabinet member is a member of Parliament not only with full privileges of debate and vote, but with the responsibility of defending his department at all times on the floor. Under our Constitution, it is not possible, even if it were desirable, to put into effect the British system. The President is not accountable to Congress as the Prime Minister is to the House of Commons. He is responsible to the people. If the House of Commons fails to sustain the Prime Minister as to any single major measure, he must either resign or submit his case to the people in a general election. Had the House of Commons differed with Mr. Churchill on a tax bill in the way in which Congress did with President Roosevelt, the Prime Minister would have had the choice either of resigning or dissolving Parliament and calling an election for a new House of Commons. The tenure of the President, however, is unaffected by any number of adverse votes of both Houses.

The Confederate plan, while it gave full recognition to the separation of the legislative and executive branches, embraced some of the merits of the British system.

It is not in the public interest that there should be a rift between the legislative and the executive, especially when the President and a majority of both Houses of Congress belong to the same party. This condition makes for a stalemate. The public business goes forward to the best advantage when the President formulates a definite legislative program about which Congress is fully informed, which is constructively criticized and on which substantial agreement is finally reached. Because of the nature of his office it is perhaps not practicable for the President to participate in such a program other than by formal messages delivered either in writing or in person. There is, however, no reason why members of the Cabinet should not be permitted full participation in debate. In addition to the advantages of such a practice already suggested it would tend to enlarge the caliber of appointees to the Cabinet.

Even strong Presidents have not always had strong Cabinets. Perhaps they have not felt the need for them; possibly they have been willing "to bear no brother near the throne." In the last half century there have been few Cabinets which have not contained at least two or three members who did not measure up to their responsibilities. As President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia has said: "Were such a custom established an almost certain result would be the selection as heads of the great executive departments of men of large ability and personal force—men able to explain and to defend their policies and measures before the Congress of the United States in the face of the whole country." There can be but one answer to President James A. Garfield's questions: "Who does not know that the enactment of such a law will tend to bring our ablest men into the Cabinet of the Republic? Who does not know that if a man is to be responsible for his executive acts and also be able to tell why he proposes new measures, and to comprehend the whole scope of his duties, weak men will shirk from taking such places?"

The rule proposed by the Kefauver resolution, though more limited in scope, would tend to have the same effect. The heads of departments would not participate in debate, but they would be subjected to both written and oral questions. Their answers to the latter would necessarily be extemporaneous. Cross-examination is a ready detector of incompetence and ignorance. One who is called upon before a full House to answer a relevant and significant question put by a responsible Member is on his own. He cannot shield himself behind a written statement prepared by a so-called expert of his department.

Much of the legislation which touches the people most closely is shaped neither by the President nor any Cabinet member and is enacted piecemeal, without Congress as a whole ever coming in contact with and sometimes without that body being aware of the identity of those responsible for its form.

PROPER REGULATION OF BUREAUCRATIC AGENCIES

So true is this that but one illustration need be given of the value and desirability of Mr. KEFAUVER'S plan. The greatest menace to our form of government is bureaucracy—evidenced as it is by the virtually uncontrolled conduct of administrative agencies.

The result of the method in which these agencies have been created is little short of chaotic. The representatives of one agency have appeared before one congressional committee at one time and the representatives of other agencies before different committees at different times. The only unity has been the persistent and insistent desire of each agency to obtain a maximum of power and a minimum of supervision. With this in view they have urged that they be given blank checks—that the legislation creating them be in the broadest and most general terms and that they have delegated to them by Congress the power later to write the act by filling in the blanks. They have advocated the unimpeded selection by themselves of all employees. They have resisted adequate review of their conduct by the courts and whenever possible have insisted that the action be subjected to no review whatsoever.

They have usually obtained what the particular committee was at the time willing to grant. These bills have been voted upon at separate times and Congress, largely dependent upon the report of its committees, has enacted them without relation to and frequently without knowledge of prior legislation. There is such a wilderness of this legislation that the most competent lawyer in general practice is unable to keep abreast of it and small law firms in medium-sized cities find it necessary to add to their staffs a specialist who devotes his entire time to these subjects.

The proper regulation of these agencies will be one of the major post-war domestic problems which will confront the Nation. If it is to be solved the factual background must be brought to the attention of the whole Congress and the situation visualized in its entirety. Few if any Members of Congress are thoroughly familiar with all phases of the subject. All Members know something of the harassment caused by the exaction of redundant and often useless information, of the overlapping and grasp for power by these agencies and of their fondness for promulgating minute, multitudinous, and complex regulations. Few realize the extent to which they have managed really to write the laws under which they function by filling in, supplementing, and sometimes extending the acts creating them. Nor do many understand how almost completely the courts have been ousted of jurisdiction to review their findings, with the result that they cannot be checked when they act as investigator, prosecutor, and judge.

Mr. KEFAUVER, who is now serving his third term, is one of the most competent and diligent Members of the House. Yet he has stated that his realization that he is not fully acquainted with the organization and operation of these bureaus is one of the reasons why he offered his resolution.

If Congress, which created them, lacks information as to the organization and operation of these agencies, how much greater is the need of the public? True, almost everyone knows something of the practical working of a few bureaus for there are not many citizens so fortunate as to have their lives regulated by only one. But the people should have exhibited to them the picture as a whole, for upon them as upon all other problems in this country final judgment will be pronounced by public opinion.

If the House adopts the proposed rule and uses it to deal with this subject, the public will then too be informed. This is true because one of the greatest merits of Mr. KEFAUVER'S resolution—one not yet sufficiently stressed—is its value in acquainting the people with the work of Congress.

Under the present practice the messages of the President constitute the public's only authentic source of information as to communications between the Executive and the Congress. It is impracticable for the people to familiarize themselves with the voluminous reports made to Congress or even with the committee hearings. Such private conferences between department heads and Members of Congress as are publicized are

reported in such a fragmentary and uncoordinated way as not only to be of no practical value, but frequently so as to arouse apprehension as to the methods being used. If the consultations between the heads of the departments and the Members of Congress are dramatized, as they would be under the new rule, the attention of the entire country would be focused upon them. That this is true is demonstrated by the extent to which even in this country the Question Hour in the British House of Commons is reported and the interest which it attracts.

The result of enlisting the attention of the people to the business of Congress would be an alert and informed public opinion such as is now impossible.

What has been said about the use of the proposed rule in dealing with the bureaus has been largely illustrative. There are many other phases of the business of the House to which it would be equally applicable. But if this were not true and if the only function it could perform would be to make a contribution to the eradication of some of the evils of a swollen bureaucracy, this alone would abundantly justify the adoption of the Kefauver resolution.

The Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, while no one with any knowledge of the facts wishes to detract from the outstanding work of the Seabees—a service that cannot be too highly praised—it is well to remember that other branches of our services are equally devoted and efficient. And, therefore, since I have some personal knowledge of operations in Alaska, it gives me pleasure to offer for the RECORD the attached copy of letter written by Robert Sherrod, of Washington, D. C., and printed in the American Mercury. I believe that every statement concerning the engineers embraced in Mr. Sherrod's letter is amply justified:

SIR: This is not to detract from the Seabee—heaven forbid!—for he is a marvelous fellow who can do almost anything with the tools of the construction trades. But my friend William Bradford Huie's article in the January 1944 American Mercury prompts me to say a few words for a poor fellow who apparently has no advocate—the muddy, sweaty Army engineer.

All those things Mr. Huie says about the Seabees are true, but, understandably, Mr. Huie is guilty of a few errors of omission. Of Attu Mr. Huie says: "On the tenth day after we got there, we had movies in a prefabricated mess hall, our cats had ripped off 6 feet of tundra and opened up a road system; and Fortresses could land on our steel mats." Mr. Huie neglected to mention that, while it was the Seabees who built the Navy mess hall, it was the Army engineers (who were still eating emergency rations) who built the road ystem and the air strip. Mr. Huie tells about the Seabee who killed a Jap sniper. O. K., but when a thousand Japs broke through our front lines on May 29 and headed for our rear installations, it was a battalion of Army engineers who stopped them. They killed several hundred Japs, and the spot where they killed them has been named Engineer Hill. The Seabees, through no fault of their own, were still back at the beach building the mess hall.

Adak is another case in point. Mr. Huie says: "The roadbuilders reached Adak 9 months ago to find a treeless, tundra-matted mountain top jutting out of a thousand fathoms of icy water. * * *" True, but those roadbuilders were a battalion of Army engineers under the command of young Lt. Col. Carlin Whitesell, who got a medal for his ingenuity in floating roads on top of tundra—on Adak the tundra is so deep that a bulldozer could scrape until 1950 without reaching hard surface.

Last summer when I was in the Aleutians somebody sent a clipping of a picture titled: "Adak Airfield—Before and After the Seabees Got There." The picture showed great mounds of mud which are characteristic of the Aleutians, then it showed a fine, steel-matted runway. The only trouble with this picture was that the Army engineers built the airfield. I chided the Seabee publicity man about it—the engineers had no publicity man—and he said: "I didn't do it; I swear some overzealous guy in Washington must have released that one."

The Seabee is an expert before he joins up. The Army engineer is just an average guy named Joe who got drafted. But Joe learns, and he, too, has accomplished some near miracles of construction, and of fighting, in this war. I just hate to see him neglected.

ROBERT SHERROD.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Facts About the Helicopter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, much confusion has arisen in the minds of certain people in their consideration of the Lea civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420, which bill is now before the Rules Committee awaiting action, as to the place which the helicopter will fill in civil aviation during the next 10 years or so.

For the information of all Members of Congress I insert herewith certain extracts from an article written by Col. H. F. Gregory in the Saturday Evening Post of May 27, 1944. As the Saturday Evening Post said in a boxed headline:

There has been a good deal of fiction about this air-age marvel. Here are the facts from the Army's top helicopter authority.

Distorted stories and distorted testimony was presented to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on this subject. I am sure every Member of Congress will be interested in reading the following extracts from Col. Gregory's article:

These are the helicopters you thought were in existence, but which only now are coming out of the factory—still new, still with many bugs in them.

Contrary to beliefs, the helicopter will never replace the automobile as a common conveyance. * * * No true parallels can be drawn in comparing it with the automobile * * *. Flying a helicopter is and always will be a specialized art. * * *

A great deal of schooling will be necessary to teach the embryo helicopter pilot the technique. * * *

The helicopter, in its present state, is much more difficult to control than the conventional airplane. * * * It must be flown by a specially trained pilot, and that means schooling far more extensive than merely teaching a man how to drive a car or fly a light plane.

I was completely worn out after the flight from Washington to Dayton. * * * It demanded a perfect sense of equilibrium, which some people never have, and perfect coordination.

Records show that only qualified airplane pilots have mastered the helicopter. * * * Landings in small places * * * require precision flying. Helicopter pilots who can negotiate these ins and outs require precision training. As of this writing, the Army has less than 20 qualified helicopter pilots. * * *

The element of uncontrollability eliminates the helicopter from the "U-drive it" category. Likewise it is assured that the skies will never blacken with windmill planes, as some people have visualized, since getting an operator's license will be as difficult as getting a private pilot's license. * * *

Furthermore, the helicopter, by the very virtue of its whirling rotors, creates a powerful downdraft of air * * *. It would cause a small hurricane on the street or roof top when it landed.

This is one undesirable feature of the helicopter, and it is often forgotten entirely by the prognosticators, who would have you believe that the helicopter can just land anywhere. Actually, the downblast from the big rotor or rotors is so strong that you feel that you are bucking a 40-mile-an-hour gale when you stand near the ship as it takes off. The same is true in landing. * * *

Because of the terrific downdraft, it naturally would not be wise to operate a helicopter from a small space littered with objects that could be blown about. * * * The helicopter could land * * * provided the ground is specially prepared. * * *

The helicopters in existence today must have many little mechanical difficulties smoothed out before they will be practical for general use.

Eskimos as Fighting Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, so little is known about the Eskimos and the part they are taking in the war that I am happy to present the attached copy of an article appearing in the New York Times of May 30, 1944.

The Eskimos, as well as other Alaskan natives, are 100-percent loyal. Not a single instance has been found of disloyalty, sabotage, or even indifference among them, a record that can never be surpassed and is seldom equalled in any nation or among any race:

ESKIMOS CALLED TO WAR—ALASKAN VILLAGERS, TO LAST MAN, RESPOND AT ONCE

EAST ALTON, ILL.—The story of how war came to an Alaskan village is told by Charles E. Gillham, former Government biologist, explorer, and big-game hunter.

It is the story of Hooper Bay, brine-swept little inlet on the Bering Sea. The Japs had attacked Pearl Harbor, were fanning out in all directions. By amateur radio to adjoining Eskimo villages went the word that the men, all men of draft age, must register for service.

The response was an amazing demonstration of loyalty to America. Afoot and by dog team, wading or swimming the swollen rivers, the silent, sloe-eyed Eskimos streamed into Hooper Bay for registration at the schoolhouse. They said simply:

"We come help Uncle Sam fight Japs. When we start?"

Gillham, now on the game restoration staff of Western Cartridge Co., said registration of the Eskimos was a considerable task. Hardly a half dozen knew their ages. Many with gray hair—and an Eskimo rarely grows gray before 50—blandly told the draft board interpreter they were "about 20."

Finally, two or three to whom names had been given in the mission school were chosen as "gages." By the use of the mission Eskimos, with older Eskimos as "referees," approximate ages for most were established.

Unable to cope with Eskimo names, Alaskan traders had given some of the registrants English equivalents many years before. Solemnly, they gave these names in registering.

H. R. 1649

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the June 1944 edition of the All Veterans News, in regard to H. R. 1649:

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

To the EDITOR, ALL VETERANS NEWS:

The article Jobs For Veterans Still the Problem, in the May edition of All Veterans News, is one of the most thought-provoking items ever published in your valuable paper.

To provide permanent jobs in private industry and adequate medical care for all our soldiers after this war, is the primary duty—and privilege—of this grateful and indebted Nation. However, as commendable and desirable as this responsibility is, it is not enough if we are to preserve the American principles for which our soldiers have sacrificed so much. It is the patriotic duty and responsibility of us here on the home front to find ways and means whereby all ablebodies citizens can find steady employment in private industry, after the shooting stops, if our American system of free enterprise and individual initiative is to be saved for posterity. Our American way of life cannot survive half free enterprise and half public-work programs.

Because American genius has solved the problem of production through the application of power, science, and chemistry, unemployment has become a dangerous national problem. It is not a local problem and, therefore, it cannot be successfully solved by solely local means.

The problem of Nation-wide unemployment must be attacked on a national unified scale and with the same patriotic determination as that which we manifested on December 8, 1941, when this aroused Nation went to war. Anything less will eventually prove disastrous.

It is more regretable that our present enthusiasts for "more production * * * better goods * * * lower prices" after the war cannot—or will not—recognize the vital truth expressed in the following paragraph taken from the above-mentioned article: "Let's remember that no factory will employ veterans to produce goods that can never be sold. There will be no security for veterans in agriculture if farm products must be left to rot in the fields because prices are too low. No manufacturer will employ veterans as salesmen if his jobbers refuse to buy or if the public lacks the necessary purchasing power." During the early 30's America possessed a superabundance of everything. Our goods were the best in the world. Prices were the lowest in many decades. Net results, the longest and most devastating depression in our Nation's history. We never have had, and never will have, full employment and prosperity when things become too cheap. Nevertheless, that is the very post-war program that many are deliberately planning now.

In 15 long years—during both Republican and Democratic administrations—our industrial leaders, economic specialists, tax experts and politicians could not—or would not—provide us with a sound workable solution for the twin economic "cancers" of unemployment and poverty, although we are living in the richest, most productive, and scientific Nation on earth. The greatest tragedy is, these gentlemen still have no sound or permanent solution for these economic ills, once the war ends.

It should be obvious, therefore, that some new economic course must be pioneered. A sound and permanent solution must be immediately found and adopted if we are to avoid eventual economic chaos in America. Regardless of what others may say or think, there is only one way to solve this problem of unemployment in our modern America, namely, through the scientific control of buying power, placed in the hands of all adult citizens.

How can this be done? By the simple demand of the American people that the Congress of the United States tax this buying power into existence * * * that Congress adopt a scientific pay-as-you-go tax program for the specific purpose of creating and permanently maintaining this vital buying power.

Impossible? Fantastic? It can't be done? Here is undeniable proof that buying power has already been greatly increased by scientific taxation; some 30 years ago our automobiles were greatly limited and harassed because of our old mud roads. The highway department had very little money to build good roads. In 1919—after many years of bitter opposition—our scientific pay-as-you-go gasoline-tax program was adopted and put into operation. That year the revenue from the gasoline tax was only $1,022,000. However, this tax program proved so successful that 6 years later 38 States had adopted it. In 1941 the gas-tax revenue was approximately $1,200,000,000. In other words, we taxed into existence, for the highway department in 1941, a buying power that was approximately twelve hundred times greater than it was in 1919. What State would now abolish this great constructive tax program? Destroy the gasoline tax and what would happen to our great highway system, automobile, oil, and rubber companies, tourist trade, etc.? The unparalleled success of the gasoline-tax program should forever silence those skeptics who proclaim that, "* * * you can't increase buying power by taxing one group of citizens and giving the revenue to another group of citizens to spend." It all depends upon the conditions involved and the scientific principles used.

Now we must construct another great highway in post-war America. An economic highway of buying power over which our manufactured goods, farm products, medical services, etc., all the necessities and conveniences of life, can travel uninterruptedly to every home and consumer in America. This can only be successfully done by the use of another scientific tax program on a national scale. In other words, a Federal insurance program protecting every American citizen, 18 years old and over, from the loss of his or her buying power when overtaken by chronic illness, permanent disability, old age, or left a widow with one child, or more, to support.

Congressman CANNON'S Federal insurance bill, H. R. 1649, now pigeonholed by the Ways and Means Committee in Congress, embodies the scientific pay-as-you-go principles that will tax into existence this vital civilian buying power. This bill merits the immediate consideration and support of every American veteran and his organization. The time for united militant action is here. Cooperation with proponents of this bill is urgently and respectfully requested now.

CHARLES F. MARTIN.

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it has been often charged that Mr. Fly, of the Federal Communications Commission, uses the licensing power of the Commission to control the broadcasting industry, and to influence the editorial policy of newspapers engaged in broadcasting. It has been charged that he is striving to bring all media of communication under the same kind of despotic control that it is generally admitted he holds over the radio industry. It was not, however, known to me until a few days ago that he is also engaged in the endeavor to control freedom of the press generally, including magazines of national circulation.

Recently the committee investigating the F. C. C. made an astounding revelation. It developed the fact that Mr. Fly, through the use of intimidation, suppressed the publication of an article in the Reader's Digest, one of the Nation's most popular and powerful magazines.

This article had been carefully written by Mrs. Gretta Palmer, a staff writer for the Reader's Digest, and, as she said, at the suggestion of Wendell Willkie.

Knowing that this article was being written, Mr. Fly, on December 29, 1943, addressed a letter to the editor of Reader's Digest, which was as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 29, 1943.

Mr. DEWITT WALLACE,
Editor, Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: I have been more than shocked recently to receive word that one of your writers, Mrs. Gretta Palmer, has been assigned the task of "doing a job" on me.

She has made it clear to me and to others that the writing which she is doing will be based upon information and documents collected by the Cox committee. This committee has attained a Nation-wide reputation as being the most notoriously unfair of all the so-called investigative committees that purport to do constructive work on behalf of the Congress. I am reluctant to believe that by treating with this one-sided subject matter you would have the Reader's Digest brought down to this lowest of levels.

I want to advise you that, although this disreputable effort to "get" me has been going on for a number of months, neither I nor the Commission has ever been permitted to put a witness on the stand, to ask a single question of any witness, to offer a single document in evidence, to correct the record so that the deleted portion of documents are reinstated to refute charges wrenched from context, or to answer by document unfounded and irresponsible charges that literally have been forced into the record. In short, no word of ours has been permitted to be uttered or placed in the record; our files have been culled for the dirtiest masses that innuendo could contrive; countervailing evidence studiously avoided. Thus you have the most serious and scandalous of charges thrown out publicly and with the sole aim to destroy without any respectable or responsible evidence to back any of them up and without the slightest opportunity extended to me to disprove them. While the title of this committee is the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission, the record is replete with examples which conclusively prove that it is I, and I alone, that this committee and its counsel set out to destroy.

The procedures of the Cox organization and of its unscrupulous counsel have been condemned on a wider scale than in the case of any other congressional committee within my knowledge. Despite all of this the present counsel (although not the new chairman) is determined to do a destructive job upon me by any and all devices regardless of the low character these devices might ultimately assume. One of the effective ways of accomplishing this is to use a respectable publication of the widest circulation like the Reader's Digest to give the charges repeated currency and through countless repetitions a seeming validity. I understand that counsel for the committee has cooperated most graciously with your Mrs. Palmer. With his ends clearly in mind, why not?

It is true that Mrs. Palmer offered to talk to me. However, you, she and the Reader's Digest must bear in mind that it is quite impossible for me in the course of a few hours or even days to lay out before her the oral testimony, the voluminous documents, and the great bulk of evidence which eventually will be submitted by me and the Commission to utterly disprove every one of the serious and unfair assertions. This proof, I can assure you, will be overwhelming. The committee and the committee counsel have spent this past year raking among disgruntled and disappointed persons who have had dealings either with me or this Commission and you must readily appreciate the physical impossibility of my meeting this case in any other way than by having my day in court; only the forum where these charges were initiated can be the proper forum where they will be of a certainty proved false. I must hereby notify you that all charges will be met and will be met fully and convincingly in the course of months when presumably we shall be given the opportunity to put our evidence into the record.

In fairness to myself and in fairness to you and the Reader's Digest, I am obliged to warn you of the complete falsity of these charges and of my confidence in affirmatively disproving each and every one of them. It cannot be sufficient for your purposes under these circumstances that you rely upon the word of this lawyer or that you rely upon the rumors or hearsay statements put into the record or that you rely upon any single document or seeming authority written or spoken by some disgruntled individual. Wherever there is a written or spoken word seeming to give any basis for the scandalous charges of this lawyer, they can be traced back either to irresponsible rumor or hearsay. The best the committee's counsel has had to offer to date has been one superdisgruntled individual who for that very reason was an irresponsible person and witness. I want to repeat that when we get an opportunity to put our case in before the committee, neither you nor the Reader's Digest will have any doubt as to the falsity and the extreme scandalous character of these numerous charges and statements.

I am indeed reluctant to assume that you have known anything about this project. I am even more reluctant to assume that you would knowingly become a party to any such undertaking. I am certainly not conscious of the fact that the Reader's Digest has ever, with full knowledge of the facts, set out to spread a series of grave libels against any person. I think, too, that you will readily appreciate the fallacious legal foundation for your promotion of such libels. Even the record thus far, so obviously incomplete and one-sided and publicly recognized as unfair, cannot be used as a screen to hide behind by anyone as a privilege in destroying me.

Pending word from you I choose to assume that you and the management of the Reader's Digest have not known what is afoot. I shall appreciate word from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, is this the language of a brave man? Just what is it that makes Mr. Fly's "heart knock on his ribs"? Was it the fear of truth that "shocked" him into threatening the Reader's Digest and abusing the committee of Congress investigating his commission? If the record that he has made is bad, must it forever be suppressed and kept from public notice in order that Mr. Fly be not "shocked"? What is Mr. Fly but the hired servant of the people?

The documented story that Mr. Fly was trying to suppress was as follows:

ONE BUSINESS OUR GOVERNMENT RUNS NOW

(By Senator Blank Blank)

Wreaths and garlands, laid at the feet of Free Enterprise in recent months, sometimes carry a poignant suggestion that these may be funeral offerings. In chamber of commerce resolutions and in letters to newspapers, American businessmen express their fear that our traditional system of competitive business may never rise from the sickbed to which wartime Government controls have brought it. Some businessmen have even begun to question whether the patient should survive. Would a greater peacetime supervision of business from Washington be, necessarily, an evil thing? Would the "planned economy" of the New Deal, after all, offer a richer way of life than the free enterprise it would replace?

A convenient preview of business run by Washington is at hand, for our consideration, there is one group of businessmen, radio broadcasters, who have been forced, since 1927, to look to Washington for consent to stay in business. As a result of the acknowledged need for a Government agency to allot wavelengths among applicants, every owner of a radio station must win the consent of the Federal Communications Commission to start his business. Once granted a license by the F. C. C., he must return, at least once every 3 years, and prove his fitness to have the license renewed. If he displeased the F. C. C. he may be put on his good behavior with a "temporary license," good for from 3 to 6 months. In the 2-year period ending in the spring of 1943, 457 of the 900 stations were, actually, reduced to a "temporary license" basis.

Any transfer of control, expansion of services, or even replacement of materials for a radio station must be approved by the Commission, headed by Chairman James Lawrence Fly. This seven-man body derives its powers from Congress, but its members are personal appointees of the President; on the present Commission only one man—T. A. A. Craven—had any significant experience in the radio field before his appointment. Mr. Craven has consistently opposed the decisions of the majority.

The F. C. C. is the shadow cast before it by a post-war planned economy; it is sometimes a very dark shadow, and its shape may offer a warning to men in business not yet subject to Washington's decisions in time of peace.

How does it work? Let's see:

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS FAVOR THE POLITICALLY FAITHFUL?

In 1937 two groups of local businessmen applied to the F. C. C. for a license for a radio station in Watertown, N. Y. Hearings were held and the F. C. C. decision read: "Public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served by granting the application of Black River Valley Broadcasts, Inc., and will not be served by granting the application of Watertown Broadcasting Corporation." The former company, granted a construction permit, spent over $12,000 in erecting a tower and preparing a building. They felt safe in doing this—a District of Columbia court had ruled that receiving a license to operate a radio station is a "necessary consequence" of receiving a construction permit.

Six weeks after construction began (on December 2) Marvin McIntyre, White House secretary, forwarded to the F. C. C. a letter from Howard H. Vrooman, a Watertown citizen. He had written President Roosevelt that several of the Black River stockholders were Republicans. "What," he asked, "will that mean to the future of the Democratic Party in northern New York? Your seaway and utility program has been fought from the very start by these same birds to whom you are now giving this radio station. It is inconceivable. I don't think you know these facts or you would not permit such a mistake to go through." Another letter to the President, from F. S. Rodenhurst, had also been forwarded to the F. C. C. by Mr. McIntyre. It urged that the Watertown license be revoked "to assist those who are working for the seaway and other parts of your program."

On December 3—the day after the F. C. C. received the Vrooman letter—Black River Valley Broadcasts got a telegram from the Commission saying that their license had been set aside. No explanation was given then or later. A license has since been granted the rival applicant, Watertown Broadcasting Co.—of whom the F. C. C. examiners first reported that "the record does not justify a finding that the applicant is legally qualified." This company is operating in Watertown today.

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS PUNISH MEN FOR THEIR POLITICAL BELIEFS?

The F. C. C. is subject to the Communications Act of which Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter has said: "Congress did not authorize the Commission to choose among applicants upon the basis of their political, economic, or social views."

In Wilkes-Barre, Pa., the holder of the license WBAX was put on a temporary license

basis in 1938 and definitely refused a renewal on March 31, 1942. The Commission gave him to understand that this was due to alleged misrepresentations in his required financial report. While the licensee (John Strenger) continued to operate WBAX on a temporary license, hearings were held before the F. C. C. to decide which of the several applicants should be granted the Wilkes-Barre license instead. On April 27, 1942, after full hearings, the Commission declared in favor of Northeastern Pennsylvania Broadcasters, Inc., whose president, Robert J. Doran, Jr., is a local businessman active in American Legion affairs. Mr. Doran owned 10 percent of the stock of the station.

Appeals from decisions of the Commission may be made, by interested parties, within a limited period; during the last possible days, an appeal was entered (on August 4) by the Wyoming Valley Victory Committee, a union labor group with no apparent radio connections. This group did not ask for a license; it merely protested the granting of a license to Mr. Doran's company.

The F. C. C. prepared to hold new hearings, and its preparations were interesting. F. C. C. Agents Marcus Cohn, Philip Baker, and Raymond Lewis visited Wilkes-Barre and interviewed 125 persons as to Mr. Doran's political beliefs. (He was chairman of the local Legion Americanization committee). These agents seized Mr. Doran's files, including a large collection of anti-Communist pamplets he had gathered in his Legion work. A memorandum from the F. C. C. to a local labor leader (item 396, p. 182) suggests that he dig up evidence to offset the fact that Mr. Doran, as a liberal, had once negotiated a 40-hour week for a brewers and soft-drink workers union. F. C. C. agents even visited New York to check the political beliefs of Homer Chaillaux, whose sole connection with the Wilkes-Barre case lay in the fact that he was national chairman of the American Legion Americanization committee and, therefore, occasionally corresponded with Mr. Doran.

Hearings were held in Washington; they lasted from the early autumn of 1942 through January of the following year. Mr. Doran, called to the stand, was asked to define "pink"—to explain why he had opposed having Norman Thomas speak in Wilkes-Barre—to tell whether he had opposed having peace councils march with the Legion in an Armistice Day parade. Mr. Chaillaux was also summoned and was asked his opinion of the Sacco-Vanzetti trials and whether he considered Oswald Garrison Villard a radical.

It is now 3 years since the F. C. C. first concluded that Mr. Strenger was unfit permanently to operate WBAX; he is still operating the station under temporary license. The Commission, specifically forbidden to consider the political or social views of applicants for licenses, has several thousand pages of data on the political and social views of Mr. Doran and Mr. Chaillaux, gathered at the expense of the taxpayers of America and used, apparently, to withhold a permanent license from Mr. Doran's company.

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS REWARD ITS POLITICAL FRIENDS?

Certain of the broadcasters have "played ball" with the present chairman, helping him to build up rival trade associations to challenge the National Association of Broadcasters, which has fought his politics. Among Mr. Fly's supporters has been Walter J. Damm, general manager of Station WTMJ, Milwaukee, Wis.

In 1941 Mr. Damm launched an impressive plan—the building of a "radio city" in Milwaukee; before construction had proceeded far, he ran into conflict with the defense program, which limited the u. of steel to pressing military uses. Mr. Damm appealed to Mr. Fly who answered, in a letter dated November 2, 1941, that Government priority officials had refused Mr. Damm's request. "They say," Mr. Fly added, "that even an application to construct a hospital 25 percent complete has been turned down * * * You might proceed with all construction which does not involve priorities and file separate applications after you have proceeded further. You will then be able to show a higher percentage of completion of the project."

It seems unlikely that Congress set up the F. C. C. to advise chosen broadcasters on how to circumvent the rulings of Government agencies preparing the country for war.

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS RESIST INVESTIGATION FROM CONGRESS, FROM WHICH ITS POWERS ARE DERIVED?

Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine, active minority leader and the ranking radio-legislation specialist in Congress has said in Senate hearings to the F. C. C. chairman: "I am surprised, even shocked, that the commission feels it appropriate to oppose the study * * * I have been in Congress quite a while * * * and this is the first time so far as my knowledge goes that a regulatory body of the Government, a creature of the Congress itself, has felt it appropriate to challenge either the wisdom or the right of a committee of Congress to review its acts and the policies which it is undertaking to put into effect" (June 2, 1941).

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS ENTER INTO SECRET AGREEMENTS WHICH ENDANGER THE PUBLIC WELFARE?

In June 1940 the F. C. C. required all radio operators of American merchant ships to file fingerprints with the Commission. This had resulted from Navy concern over Communists abroad. In September of that year J. Edgar Hoover requested of Mr. Fly that these be turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which had been designated by the President (September 6, 1939) as the clearing-house for "all investigative information pertaining to the national defense." For the next 21 months repeated requests from Mr. Hoover and, later, from Attorney General Francis Biddle, failed to induce Mr. Fly to surrender the fingerprints; his excuse was that he had agreed with the radio operators' labor union representatives that these should not be used to check the possible criminality of the holders.

On December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor was attacked, and the United States entered into a state of war. On January 2, 1942, Mr. Biddle wrote to Mr. Fly: "You explained that you had obtained the prints under a promise that they would be kept confidential"; he reminded Mr. Fly that the labor leaders to whom the promise was made were to be asked to "release" him. Mr. Biddle went on: "The evidence is strong that messages have been surreptitiously transferred to our enemies by radio and that military attacks upon the territory of this country may have been furthered thereby." This strong plea brought no satisfactory results; Government in business defied the F. B. I. and the Attorney General.

On May 6, 5 months after Pearl Harbor, Mr. Fly wrote to Mr. Biddle: "I am today drawing the matter again to the attention of the labor leaders." Eventually, and under protest, Mr. Fly transferred the fingerprint records to the Department of Justice June 26. The Nation had then been 6 months at war; 21 months had elapsed since the F. B. I. first undertook to weed out dangerous men from the ranks of the radio operators. The F. C. C. Chairman had chosen to take advice from civilian labor leaders rather than from the men in whose hands the security of the Nation rested.

(There has been testimony before the select committee that over 3,000 of the radio operators were found to have criminal records; 45,575 of the 200,000 fingerprints were returned to the F. C. C. by the F. B. I. as worthless, because of the inadequate technique used in recording them.)

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS PUNISH GROUPS POLITICALLY OPPOSED TO THE ADMINISTRATION IN POWER?

In the 1936 Presidential campaign only 34.5 percent of the country's newspapers supported Mr. Roosevelt (Editor and Publisher). In 1937 it was suggested that newspaper owners be restrained from owning radio licenses. At that time the F. C. C. general counsel, Hampson Gary, reported that the Commission lacked authority for such a ruling. His opinion was further supported (March 16, 1938) when the United States Court of Appeals ruled, in the Tri-State case, that discrimination against newspaper owners, as a class, would be illegal.

In 1940 another Presidential election was held; this time only 20.1 percent of the newspapers endorsed Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy. Angell, counsel of the Council for Democracy, the first of these was given to Gordon

In early March 1941—6 weeks after the inauguration—Mr. Fly broached the matter of newspaper ownership, and his Commission voted against considering the matter. On March 19, Mr. Fly visited the White House. The next day he again brought up the matter in a Commission meeting and this time he was able to win a vote to investigate "whether or not joint control of newspaper and radio broadcasting stations tends to result in impairment of radio service under the standard of public interest, convenience, and necessity."

The matter was, and remains to this day, of doubtful legality; but the Commissioner has consistently refused to appeal to Congress or to the courts for a clarification of the point; instead he has proceeded with the investigation. Discrimination in this case has been branded, by minority members of the F. C. C. itself, as "tantamount to saying that carriage makers cannot go into the business of manufacturing automobiles, and the automobile manufacturers may not make airplanes."

In early 1941, 300 of the 890 broadcasting stations had some newspaper affiliations; since the Communications Act says (sec. 307A) that renewals of licenses must be granted on the same basis as original grants, all newspaper owners were unnerved by the new resolution.

Hearings were announced and applications from newspaper owners for radio licenses were, from then on, placed in the "pending" file of the Commission, to be considered after the newspaper ownership controversy had been decided. They rest there today. At least 65 such applications are still pending, and 65 communities are deprived of the radio service they might have enjoyed.

Hearings on the matter were announced in 1941. A 14-page questionnaire was prepared and sent to all radio stations, many of whom were forced to hire special accountants to fill it in. It included such queries as: "Give a listing of the personnel who perform, arrange, write, or create program material who are in any way connected with a newspaper." (The F. C. C. is specifically restrained, by law, from censoring the program content of radio broadcasting.)

Field investigators descended on widely scattered and politically unsympathetic radio-newspaper offices and rifled the files. In Des Moines, Iowa, the files dating back 6 years were taken away from the Cowles station. (Mr. Gardner Cowles, Jr., had been a close associate of Wendell Willkie in the 1940 campaign.) Other stations whose files received particular notice included the Hearst radio, which operates four stations, and those of the Kansas City Star, WDAF. These ques-

tionnaires were never introduced into the hearings nor, indeed, mentioned by the Commissioner during the past 3 years.

In the hearings the attempt of the F. C. C. to discriminate against newspapers was branded by Arthur Garfield Hays, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, as raising "a problem of free speech and a substantial one." The legality of the movement was questioned by Dr. Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of Harvard Law School, by Ernest Angell, counsel of the Council for Democracy, and other legal experts.

The arguments of the Commission centered around the possibility that pipe lines to the public might become concentrated, within a community, within the hands of a single group of men if newspapers and radio stations were jointly owned. But the F. C. C., in granting several licenses within a single community to a single licensee, had already brought such pipe lines into the hands of favored applicants in Boston, New York City, Buffalo, Cleveland, Albany, Fort Worth, Dallas, Cincinnati, Chicago, Des Moines, Fort Wayne, Lincoln, Denver, Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle, Spokane, and several smaller towns.

Two and a half years after the newspaper-ownership hearings were closed 3,500 pages of testimony had been received, 52 witnesses called, 407 exhibits introduced, and a quarter of a million dollars expended. Yet, by the end of 1943, no decision had been reached and no action taken on the scores of applications in the pending file. Newspaper applicants have been deprived, for several years, of what many legal experts consider their rights—and with no chance of redress by the courts of the land.

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS DECEIVE THE CONGRESS?

In 1942 the Appropriations Committee granted the F. C. C. an additional $254,000 for the specific purpose of hiring 148 additional persons subject to "clearance with the Bureau of the Budget"; the F. C. C. hired only 31 additional persons and diverted the rest of the money to increasing the salaries of 172 old employees.

When Mr. Fly appeared before the congressional committee to ask for these additional funds he based his plea on the need for expanding the work of his Commission in "shaping foreign and military policy" and "countering enemy propaganda." Within a week of receiving the money, one of the Commission's chiefs announced that it happily provided funds for "personal reorganization." Some of the salaries raised were in the Publications Division—far removed from "shaping military policy."

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS EXEMPT CERTAIN "TEACHER'S PETS" FROM ITS OWN RULINGS?

In early 1942 all newspaper applications for radio licenses were being thrown into the "pending file"—even when the newspaper owned a small minority interest in the broadcasting company.

But in March 1942, John W. Clarke, a Chicago investment banker, applied for permission to buy the Chicago station WHIP. He admitted that $150,000 was to be raised by giving debentures to Marshall Field III, publisher of the Chicago Sun, a newspaper militantly sympathetic to the New Deal. Mr. Field has also received a stock interest. Editor and Publisher, in reporting the sale, said, "The purchase represents a personal investment by Mr. Field * * * the Chicago Sun will be one of the largest users of time on WHIP for promotional purposes." This statement was introduced into an F. C. C. hearing and was used as an argument, by one Commissioner, against approving the transfer. Nonetheless, Messrs. Field and Clark won their license. Soon the "Chicago Sun Hour" was one of the programs on WHIP.

Applications of newspaper corporations for frequency-modulation permits have been habitually put into the pending file for 2½ years. A few PM permits have nonetheless been granted to newspaper owners; the first of these was given to Gordon Gray, owner of both the Winston-Salem Sentinel and of station WSJS in that town—and a heavy contributor to the Democratic campaign funds in 1936 and 1940. Further exceptions were made in favor of KTRH, the Houston, Tex., Chronicle station (in which Secretary of Commerce Jones has an interest), and WTMJ, the Milwaukee Journal station of Walter J. Damm, a supporter of Mr. Fly.

IS GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS CARELESS ABOUT FINANCIAL IRREGULARITIES?

Ralph W. Horton, owner of the largest single interest in the only morning newspaper in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., 27 percent, applied for F. C. C. permission to buy the local station WFTL. This was granted him on July 1, 1941 "on assurances that he had divested himself of all newspaper association." Let's see how Mr. Horton carried out this Commission order.

Mr. Horton, in June, took $9,000 worth of notes executed by the newspaper and placed them in the Barnett National Bank of Jacksonville in trust for his daughter. He "sold" his interest in the newspaper to a lawyer friend for three vacant lots, which later reverted to him, without further cash transactions, and on which he has paid taxes. He continued, in 1942, to pay the debts of the newspaper of which he had "divested" himself. * * * He deposited $1,500 on September 10, 1941, and $750 on June 11, 1942, in the paper's account in the Broward Bank & Trust Co.

Or take the case of J. Frank Burke, owner of KPAS, Pasadena, Calif., supporter of F. C. C. policies who recently testified at hearings on the White-Wheeler bill at Mr. Fly's suggestion. Mr. Burke admitted, under questioning, that he no longer owned the 1,025 shares of stock of his station which F. C. C. records showed in his name, and that he had not reported the transfer, as the law requires. He had only 125 shares left, having "given stock to people who helped put the license through." Mr. Burke—a member of the Democratic State National Committee in California—received a permit to double the power of his station, in February 1943, 9 months after a stringent freeze order forbade such increases to save materials; this was granted Mr. Burke without a formal hearing.

In the case of WORL, Boston, F. C. C. records in 1941 showed that the license holder was Greoge Crockwell, attorney for Natalie Whitwell, who had lost all stock interest in the station 4 years earlier. Much of this was transferred to Harold LaFount, a former F. C. C. Commissioner who had been made president of WORL's corporation without F. C. C. consent, in 1937 (as required by law). F. C. C. records in December 1943 did not show that Mr. LaFount had also, 3 years before, acquired the stock interests of Robert A. Nordbloom, whose name was still carried on the F. C. C. records. The legal department of the F. C. C. had recommended, in 1941, that the financial affairs of WORL be investigated; nothing was ever done through December 1943 at which time attorney for an elderly spinster, Miss Natalie Whitwell, testified that she had been defrauded of over $60,000 by a former licensee.

Or look at Station WGKV, Charleston, W. Va., whose licensee, Worth Kramer, was approved by the Commission 2 days after his application was made and before a Dun & Bradstreet report had been received. Mr. Kramer stated that he would finance purchase of the station through $10,500 borrowed from the Park National Bank of Newark, Ohio (which never lent him this or any other sum). Instead, Mr. Kramer received the money from John Kennedy, owner of several other West Virginia stations—and the money has been traced through cashier's checks and odd-amount withdrawals, by a congressional committee. Stock in the station was transferred from Mr. Kramer to Mr. Kennedy 4 days after issuance, but Mr. Kennedy's name does not appear in the F. C. C. records of WGKV.

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS VISIT REPRISALS AGAINST THOSE WHO SPEAK AGAINST IT?

Mark Ethridge, of the Louisville Courier-Journal and of Station WHAS, was asked by President Roosevelt to make a study of the radio licensing situation in 1941. Mr. Ethridge, a Democrat and a supporter of the New Deal, reported (December 1941) (hearings, 1941):

"Here is an industry that was born of regulation. The Government was its midwife: It has certified in granting licenses to the legal, moral, and financial responsibility of everybody who runs radio stations. * * * If there be monopolies, the Government made them, frequently by granting licenses to favorites. * * * I know of three instances in which the Commission laid down principles, or had the determination of principles under consideration, and violated them by almost immediate action in favor of people who were not unfriendly to the administration. There has been a breach of faith, and I am perfectly certain that it can be pinned directly upon the Commission majority. The Commission resorted to sharp administrative practices."

The F. C. C. granted a license for a new radio station in Louisville to Emmanuel Levy, a local leader at loggerheads with Mr. Ethridge (November 1941) (Louisville, a city of 308,000 was already served by four local stations * * * the same number as Cleveland, whose population is 900,500).

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS PERMIT LEAKS?

James Alfred Guest, senior field attorney for the F. C. C. New York office admitted under oath that he sometimes sent copies of his confidential reports on Italian-language broadcasts to a civilian Harvard professor, an Italian; these reports were United States Government property.

DOES GOVERMENT IN BUSINESS SEEK TO MAINTAIN POWER BY DEFYING THE MILITARY COMMANDERS?

Since Pearl Harbor the F. C. C. has been repeatedly urged to surrender its monitoring activities to the Army and Navy for reasons of national security. The testimony of one admiral, now on active duty, states, "The F. C. C. is a very amateurish outfit. * * * All they are doing is annoying us." He has testified that, having no ships at sea, the F. C. C. cannot give the triangulations necessary to establishing the source of enemy broadcasts; in one case the Navy, acting on F. C. C. information, spent days trying to find a Japanese "ship at sea" from which radio reports were emanating. It turned out to be a station on the mainland of Japan.

Commissioner Craven of the F. C. C. has testified that the whole Pacific Fleet was once set to chasing a Japanese ship at an appallingly wrong spot because of F. C. C. bearings. He has also stated that "illegal" stations detected by the F. C. C. monitoring services included (1) a station rigged up by schoolboys on a radiator in Omaha and (2) a Long Island station conducted by our own F. B. I.

Moreover, Commissioner Craven has sworn that Mr. Fly's pressure on the Secretary of the Navy effected the "cashiering" of Admiral D. C. Hooper, who was, for 25 years,

top radio executive in the Navy and its representative, until recently, on the intergovernmental radio committee.

"F. C. C. reprisals against members of the armed forces," he said, "are a well-known fact."

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS RISK THE NATIONAL SECURITY?

On February 8, 1943, President Roosevelt received a letter signed, jointly, by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. This stated that 5 months earlier the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been asked to study the radio monitoring situation and that after "thorough and comprehensive study" they recommended that "participation of the F. C. C. in radio intelligence should be discontinued. Radio intelligence activities of the F. C. C. tend to be less and less progressive as the art progresses. This is due to integration into proper radio intelligence systems of large quantities of secret military information, which for obvious reasons cannot be disseminated to an agency such as the F. C. C.

"The attempted duplication by the F. C. C. of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence. In view of the foregoing it is concluded that better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the F. C. C. and confining such activities to the Army and the Navy. The foregoing conclusions are supported by the views of the Army and Navy commanders on the field who are charged with the responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence."

The normal run of private businessmen would retire from the radio intelligence field, at such a request. But Government in business took its quarrel to the White House and—after 7 months—won a letter from Mr. Roosevelt suggesting that such disputes between Government agencies be submitted to the Board of War Communications, of which Mr. Fly is chairman.

IS GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS EQUIPPED FOR THE CULTURAL REQUIREMENTS OF ITS JOB?

Several years ago the F. C. C. informed owners of Station WTCN, Minneapolis, that its application for a license renewal would be granted only after a hearing to discuss complaints received 2 months earlier that it had broadcast "profane" language. (This station was a network outlet, also newspaper affiliated.) Investigation showed that the offending program had been Eugene O'Neill's Beyond the Horizon, a book used as a text in 200 public schools and a play 3 times presented, at Government expense, by the Federal Theater.

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS USE ITS POWERS SO THAT ITS FRIENDS MAY AIR THEIR VIEWS?

Since the F. C. C. was first set up by Congress, only four licenses have been taken away from specific individuals for cause. In each case the charge was that the radio station was being used as the mouthpiece of an individual's own personal views.

When Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, of New York, asked the consent of the Commission to have the municipal station WNYC operate at night, his application was denied on the grounds that this would infringe on the rights of Station WCCO, a "clear-channel" station on the same frequency, serving a very wide rural area. Three weeks later, and without hearings, Mr. LaGuardia was granted the right to use WNYC for night broadcasts; this was done by means of a "special authorization" from the Commission, a type of licensing never before granted for an unnamed period of time. This "special authorization" has not been withdrawn, in spite of the fact that Mr. LaGuardia, once a week, uses the facilities of WNYC for voicing his personal and political views, going so far, in the winter of 1943, as to blame James A. Farley for the victory of a Republican Lieutenant Governor in the State, and to state that Franklin Roosevelt could, if he ran, carry New York City.

DOES GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS USE EXTRA LEGAL MEASURES TO GET ITS WAY?

The only Government agency empowered to censor radio programs is the Office of Censorship, according to the United States Attorney General; the only wartime agency known as the authority with power to investigate individuals for subversive activities is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Public records show how the F. C. C. has apparently invaded these two fields.

Robert Richards, of the Office of Censorship, reported the technique to a congressional committee. He quoted a conversation with Sidney Spear, F. C. C. attorney, who said: "We worked it this way. If Lee (Falk, of the Office of War Information) found a fellow he thought was doing some funny business, he told me about it. Then we waited until the station applied for a renewal of license. Say the station was WBNX, and the broadcaster in question Leopold Hurdski. Well, when WBNX applied for a renewal we would tip off Lee and he would drop in on Mr. Alcorn, the station's manager. He would say, 'Mr. Alcorn, I believe you ought to fire Leopold Hurdski.' Then he would give Mr. Alcorn some time to think it over.

"After a couple of weeks Mr. Alcorn would begin to notice that he was having some trouble getting his license renewed. After a couple of more weeks of the same thing he would begin to put two and two together and get four. Then he would fire Leopold Hurdski and very shortly after that his license would be renewed by the Commission. We can cooperate in the same way with you."

Speaking of such railroading of a number of foreign-language broadcasters, to whose loyalty the F. B. I. and Office of Censorship agents had certified, one F. C. C. Commissioner said, "We gave them no fair hearing whatsoever." Reading that testimony, I doubted very much that this is America.

DOES GOVERNMENT (IN A BUSINESS DEALING WITH PUBLIC INFORMATION) THREATEN FREE SPEECH?

Both the first amendment and the Communications Act (sec. 326) prohibits the F. C. C. from censoring program content. In a Senate hearing in late July 1943 Commissioner Fly admitted the limitation.

In July 1941 Mr. Fly summoned to his office representatives of the three networks—Columbia, National, and Mutual—and of the press services which sell news to radio stations. He "suggested" that they should not use the phrase "Stalin line" on the air.

Joseph Lang, former head of the Foreign Language Radio Wartime Control Committee, has testified that Mrs. Hilda Shea, of F. C. C., visited him to urge that his station—WHOM, Detroit—make no mention, in its Polish-language broadcasts, of the alleged killing of 10,000 Polish officers by the Russians. At the time of the visit the power to recommend renewal of WHOM's license rested in the hands of Mrs. Shea.

Editor and Publisher has described the O. W. I.-F. C. C. tie-up to influence program content as near blackmail, and has said, "If one Government underling can assume and get away with the power of gagging a radio speaker, we can be sure that others will try the same schemes in other directions." The New York World-Telegram has commented, "In ordinary business dealings the squeeze play by the O. W. I. and F. C. C. would be regarded as a highly objectionable form of blackmail and the perpetrators of it would lay themselves open to criminal charges of conspiracy."

In spite of the acknowledged fact that the F. F. F. has no control over specific program content, the Yankee Network application for removal of Station WAAB (September 10, 1940, Docket 5640) states its plans "covering news, news comments, and political broadcasts" and adds that these policies are described "to conform to the wishes and request of Hon. J. L. Fly." In the hearings to discuss transfer of the Blue Network to Edward P. Noble, the president of Mr. Noble's company testified, at some length, his unwillingness to sell radio time to groups who wished to air controversial matters. Later in the hearings Mr. Fly told Mr. Noble that the Commission would insist upon a statement of policy on this matter before acting on the transfer. The statement, preceding the granting of the license, reversed Mr. Noble's avowed position as to the sale of time for controversial issues. Why?

Of the 191 notices for hearings on applications for expansion or new stations heard by the Commission since late 1939, in 98 of the cases the applicant was asked questions as to his type and character of program content.

Yet, the F. C. C., by law, cannot interfere with program content.

Commissioner Craven has said, "Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are, in simple terms, merely freedom from fear of Government reprisals for what is said or printed or for what is not said or printed * * * The real freedom of the press guaranteed by the Bill of Rights is freedom in the true sense to criticize the Government without fear of reprisals.

"If the Bill of Rights is to mean anything for radio it should mean freedom from Government reprisals or pressures administered by the radio licensing authority, namely the F. C. C."

There are other cases of Government in business—its wastefulness, its favoritism, its willingness to set itself up above the law of the land. There is the case in which WFTL was granted a license to increase its power by 10 times, and was awarded the necessary materials, in the face of a recognized shortage of materials. There is, in contrast, the case of the man who was not allowed to replace a worn, 13-year-old transmitter with new equipment, already in his possession, because of the "lack of critical materials."

But these things happen with monotonous regularity when the power to prevent a man from earning a living is granted a political appointee.

Is there any man big enough to resist the temptation such a situation offers him? Should any man—his authority dependent on keeping an administration in power—see dangled before him a dozen chances a month of forcing businessmen to operate to the benefit of that administration?

It is not the Federal Communications Commission (nor Fly) which is responsible for the shocking invasion of individual rights of which his department is accused. The real evil lies in giving too much power to government—in awarding to any single bureau the life-and-death power over any business. The threat is always sufficient to gag and control men who must come, hat in hand, and ask permission to earn their livelihoods.

Those in other lines may take warning from the broadcasters' plight: Government in business would be no boon to them in times of peace.

Mr. Speaker, with the story Mrs. Palmer furnished certain explanatory notes, which were as follows:

EXPLANATORY NOTES

This article was first suggested to me by Wendell Willkie, as Mr. WALLACE knows, and not by anybody connected with the select committee. Mr. Willkie sent me to Bill Paley, of C. B. S., with an introduction. I talked to Paley and Paul Hollister, of C. B. S.;

Niles Trammell, of N. B. C.; Lou Weiss, of the Don Lee Co.; Neville Miller, of N. A. B.; Sol Taishoff, of Broadcasting magazine; and Louis Caldwell, lawyer for the Mutual chain, before I ever approached Eugene Garey or any member of the select committee.

I have not taken Mr. Garey's word for anything, but have demanded documentary proof—letters, photostats of checks, bank statements—for every case cited. I have, besides, spent over 30 hours with the various staff members of Broadcasting and have checked specific cases with Commissioner T. A. M. Craven; John McKay, of N. B. C.; and Robert Bartley, of N. A. B.

I sincerely wish that I could have got the F. C. C. version of every case cited. On my first trip to Washington I called Fly's office and told his secretary I should like to meet him, at any convenient time; she was to call me at the Carlton and leave a message. When 3 days passed, with no message, I sent a telegram to Mr. Fly, repeating the request. This brought results. Mr. Fly's secretary called and said he'd talk to me, on the telephone, at exactly 5 p. m. The conversation was a peculiar one. He said the Reader's Digest had turned down an article he had submitted, and why should he help out another writer?—the insinuation was that we were working the same side of the street. I said, "Look; your rejection slip is not the point. I have been given what looks like damaging evidence against your Commission. I think you owe it to yourself to see me and explain these charges." He said he wouldn't—that he disapproved of our running anything on the F. C. C. until his own witnesses had all been heard. He told me to tell my editor my ears would be very red if I printed anything now. This I did.

I still thought Fly ought, in justice to himself, to be induced to see me so I unsuccessfully stalked him from the New York end, taking Morris Ernst to lunch. Morris is a White House supporter of Fly. The other day I also had a 4-hour session with Commissioner C. J. Durr, a Fly man, to whom I made every appeal short of cheesecake for cooperation from the F. C. C. in checking specific cases. He said, "No."

I wish it were possible to get the broadcasters to open up to me directly, but they are a timid lot and tell me they fear reprisals if they talk. Anyway, getting complete, lawyer-proof documents from them would take time and if we want to make the next issue we had better use data already cited in the hearings, even if this annoys Mr. Fly. I've done all I can to give him a fair break.

Some of my sources think Fly's strategy with us is one of delay, on any pretext, until new radio legislation is passed by Congress. He now urges that we shall print nothing until after all his own witnesses have been heard; he can arrange, I think, that this procedure lasts until the new law is in effect. Then he can reasonably protest against our printing an article by saying, "Why dig up what we did under a law no longer in effect?" Such tactics can effectively prevent our ever printing anything about the F. C C.

My job, of course, is to get the facts and print such of them as are of interest to the public, whose taxes support the F. C. C., and whose Congress granted this Bureau its powers. If the immense licensing powers of Fly are being used improperly, the public ought to know. Some broadcasters insist to me that a license to operate a radio is the Washington equivalent of a local politician's Thanksgiving turkey—that it is given out to reward the politically faithful and withheld from any businessman who has fought the administration. If that's true, it's a real threat to freedom of the press.

But of course we mustn't let ourselves be influenced by the prejudices of broadcasters who feel they are Mr. Fly's victims—that's one reason why I've been so insistent on documentary proof. Let the facts speak for themselves; if they eventually prove that Fly is the mugging artist of the radio industry, O. K. But I refuse to condemn this man in advance or to assume, with Garey, that he is a termite eating away at the Bill of Rights.

The great, unsolved puzzle—which I may be able to solve before the final draft—is how Mr. Fly has won to a position in which he can win arguments, in the military field, against Knox and Stimson—and can even refuse to give out fingerprints to the F. B. I. on request? Even if he were the business-hating, power-loving, table-thumping radical his enemies say, the central question remains unsolved. That question is: Is Fly really the Frank Sinatra of the inner circle New Deal?

Mr. Speaker, does further proof need to be offered to show what is happening to free speech, free radio, and free press at the hands of the man who heads the Federal Communications Commission?

Farm Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have received today a communication from the executive committee of the Dallas County Farm Labor Committee, under date of May 29, 1944, setting forth the farm-labor situation in Dallas County, and something with reference to the general situation. It sets forth a serious situation which should challenge the attention especially of committees of Congress and agencies of the Government responsible for dealing with the economic interests of agriculture and for preserving its productivity so that it may be able to meet the food requirements of our fighting forces and of our civilian population.

Agricultural production during this war period and its difficulties have been dramatized as has the production of the implements of war, though materials for food and clothing are as essential to the conduct of the war as are guns and ammunition. The achievement of agriculture last year, despite the decrease of farm labor, reduction of farm machinery and implements, is one of the most remarkable in the history of our production. From the beginning of the national-defense program in 1940 to the middle of the summer of 1943 over one and one-half million farm workers and potential farm workers left the farm, and probably another million remaining on the farm took other jobs. Between 1939 and 1943 there was an increase of 24 percent in farm production. In my section of the country excessive rains tremendously hindered planting this year. I was home for a few days last week. Much of the grain ready for harvest was falling in the fields.

This communication which I shall include herein sets forth a situation that has developed in no small degree as a result of governmental policy which permitted industry to outbid agriculture for labor required to cultivate and harvest this crop. I make that statement not in criticism but as indicating governmental responsibility and duty in the premises if we are to preserve a proper balance in our productivity. This communication states that the business people of the community are not able now to contribute labor for the harvesting of the crops, as they did last year.

I know there is a sort of general disposition on the part of the people to say that the farmer is always complaining; but when one considers their courage, their achievements, their continuation on the job in the face of hazards of the seasons, droughts, and excessive rains, hazards of the elements generally, hazards of insect pests, uncertainty of the volume of production and uncertainty of price, it must be conceded that probably no other group of our people would do more or complain less.

I happen to know each of the persons who signed this communication. They are high-class, patriotic people; men of sound judgment and public spirit. The communication is as follows:

FARM-LABOR SITUATION IN DALLAS COUNTY, MAY 29, 1944

Farmers are facing the most acute labor shortage in their history. In fact, labor is so short that there is a possibility that many Dallas County farm crops will not be cultivated and harvested in 1944.

Due to the heavy induction in the armed forces during the past year, there are far less farm boys on the farm now than there were a year ago. And labor was short a year ago. Able-bodied labor has been inducted into the armed forces from industry and other occupations at an increased rate during the past year, thereby leaving a much smaller percentage of labor for all occupations.

Dallas business concerns and public utilities who subsidized farm labor last year by sending their paid employees to the farms in this county for a period of from 1 day to 1 week at a time are not inclined to do the same thing again in 1944. Because these concerns point out that their regular employees have more work per man to do now than they did a year ago and they cannot replace or add to their labor supply because all sources of able-bodied labor is extremely limited. It seems to be the sentiment among the concerns who helped furnish agricultural labor last year that if farm labor is to be subsidized, the expense of such a subsidy should be borne by the Federal Government.

Recent action by certain employees of the United States Employment Service in Dallas suggesting and pointing the way whereby building contractors might pay above the wage scale in order to obtain more labor is, in effect, a Government subsidy for the building contractors. We understand that the building contractors by the subterfuge of classifying all common labor as semi-skilled labor were able to increase the rate of pay from 55 to 70 cents an hour. This practice, we have been advised, is in effect now. This office has been advised by able-bodied labor that worked on the farm last year that they would work on the farm this year if the farmers would pay them 75 cents an hour, the wage they are now receiving working as common laborers on construction work.

The practice of paying above the wage scale in order to get more labor when such contractors who are guaranteed by the Government a certain percent of profit has the

effect of draining all able-bodied labor away from the farmers.

The War Labor Board contends that they have nothing to do with setting the price of farm labor and that the prices of farm labor are set by the Secretary of Agriculture under the directives from the President. This is true. The War Labor Board has not set farm labor prices and neither has the Board mentioned farm wages in their recent discussions and interviews. Yet, the effect of the practice of the War Labor Board in permitting the building contractors to pay above the wage scale gives a decided advantage to these groups in hiring labor. The wage price is continually raised until it is attracted to the laborer irrespective of the cost to the contractor because the Government is paying the bill.

If it is good business for the Government to guarantee building contractors a certain profit and insure them against losses, it seems by the same process of reasoning, it would be good business for the Government to make it possible for the farmers through a direct grant or subsidy to pay a higher wage scale, thereby enabling the farmers to compete on the labor market for able-bodied labor.

Isn't it just as fair for the Government to subsidize the farmers in some manner in order that he might be able to pay an attractive farm wage to able-bodied laborers to help cultivate and harvest vital food and feed crops as it is for the Government to subsidize building contractors to build houses for war workers to live in.

Which is the most important, building houses for war workers to live in, or producing food, feed and fiber for all people to eat and wear?

The executive committee of the Dallas County Farm Labor Committee is desirous of calling this maladjusted practice to the attention of all people and putting them on notice that unless the farmers receive an adequate labor supply from some apparently unknown source, or receive a Government labor subsidy enabling them to compete on the labor market for able-bodied labor, then it is highly probable that much of the present grain crop that is already matured will not be harvested and farmers generally will have to curtail their farm operations and many of them may have to completely go out of business.

The foregoing, in the opinion of the labor committee, is definite proof that farm commodities should be on such a price level as to enable the farmer to compete in the general labor market on an equal basis with other industry, because the present prices for farm commodities are based on labor rates much lower than those now in affect.

Executive Committee, Dallas County Farm Labor Committee: Guy H. Bullock, chairman, Garland; Frank Gracey, Hutchins; B. F. Stufflebeme, Grand Prairie; Ben E. Cabell, Dallas; J. S. Hurst, Lancaster; G. W. Renfro, Wilmer; J. C. McEntee, Rowlett; A. L. Gracey, Lisbon; George Scott, Irving.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a radio address that I delivered on Memorial Day, May 30, 1944, over radio station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass. This program was sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Massachusetts, and directed by Mrs. Katherine E. Harty, of Methuen, Mass.:

On Memorial Day, May 30, 1922, in the city of Washington, a beautiful building was dedicated to the memory of a man, who brought hope and inspiration to millions of his fellowmen.

To visit this memorial is an unforgettable experience. One leaves the bright Washington sunshine to enter the silent shadow of a huge chamber. The babble of the city is left behind. One stands in awed reverence. For in this chamber there is but one object and the simplicity of it is overwhelming. Out of the shadows a light falls gently on the brooding, tragic figure of Abraham Lincoln, the martyred President.

On the marble wall behind is an inscription, reading: "In this Temple, as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

A temple wherein we commune with a great heart and a noble character. To ourselves we say: this is the faith that is America. This is the belief in freedom and justice and charity that will sacrifice life itself to promote the common welfare. This is the spirit of America immortalized in solemn beauty.

Abraham Lincoln did not die in vain. Nearly 80 years have passed; but any man, woman, or child who visits this memorial will feel the nearness of Lincoln and will be a better American because of it.

For this is the meaning of Memorial Day. Across time and space we touch in spirit with those who have traveled onward. And from this communion with the dead we draw renewed faith to go forward, as they once did, to build a better world.

As I journeyed from Washington to my home city, I could not help but think of the freedom that Americans enjoy, even in times of crisis. Not once was I stopped or questioned. No domestic passports or identifications were required. From my train window I saw freemen working in the factories and farmers tilling the soil. The streets of cities were filled with busy people, well-dressed people, and the countryside was green with life and hope. For a moment it did not seem that we were at war.

My eyes shifted back to the newspaper in my hands and to the news story of the shock experienced by veterans who have been transferred too suddenly from the battle fronts to the home front. From a fox hole to a night club. A bewildering, sometimes bitter reaction as the veteran compares the life he sees here—with the life of his buddies over there. Why this inequality of sacrifice?

Today, in the temple of our hearts, let us try—try to correct this inequality. Let us think and feel for our men out there. Let us be worthy of them.

On the streets and in the factories I have heard some men talk against our allies. I have listened, wondering when they would put first things first and speak out against our enemies Hitler and Tojo, and the evil that they symbolize. But they kept on talking against our allies.

I have heard men whisper, setting race against race, and religion against religion, here in America while our soldiers and sailors are fighting and, yes, even dying to save all of us.

It was then that I recalled the just and patient leadership of Lincoln. There were those in his day who spread hate and suspicion unwittingly serving the enemy's cause. But Lincoln, together with men and women of firm faith and high resolve, saw the Nation through to victory and unity and peace.

In that tradition, we too must back up our men and women on all our fighting fronts. To do that, let us on the home front keep faith with our American ideals. There is no place here for racism, there is no place for bigotry. In this stern test there is room only for righteous anger against the forces of brutality and enslavement. This solemn hour calls for singleness of purpose. Let us mobilize every resource of mind and spirit against the common enemy. Let us show him that even at this late hour he cannot divide us from without or within.

The morale of our men on the fighting fronts is affected by what we feel and say and do here in America. Let us fortify that morale by showing our soldiers and sailors that we are with them to the very limit of our capacity; with the work of our hands, the sincerity of our hearts, and the inspiration of our prayers.

Only in this way can we help to bring this war to a swift and victorious conclusion. By our unity of purpose we will help to save the lives of many thousands of our men and women.

And in the peace to follow, we must have unity of purpose to make certain that the peace is a true and lasting one.

Looking back to the years between the wars and to the words men spoke on this day of requiem, one finds, repeated over and over again, these words of complaint: "We fought in 1917 and 1918 to make the world safe for democracy. We won the war, but we were betrayed by the peace." And so America retired to her cynical shell of isolationism.

She would set herself apart from the world and its problems. She had oceans to protect her. She need not prepare. But that illusion died forever on the cold dawn of December 7, 1941.

Out of the present agony and the realistic lessons it has brought home to us we know that America, after the last war, failed to carry her share of the responsibility for maintaining the just peace.

That must never happen again!

America has come of age. Her irresponsible childhood has gone. And being of age, she must assume the responsibilities that go with it. She is no longer set apart by herself alone. Science has swept away the space and time that once separated her from her neighbors. Today she is a member of the community of nations. She and they must find some way to get along together. The family, the town, the State, the Nation—all of these have developed a system and a sense of community responsibility. Now, it is the world's turn.

If the sacrifices of the present are to have meaning, we must face this fact. I feel certain that the men who are dying for us would have it this way. If they could speak to us, they would say, "In the world of tomorrow, the great power of science must be used to free men, not to enslave them. Never again must these powers fall into the hands of gangsters, domestic or foreign, to be used for human exploitation. Decent men and women every here must develop the moral and spiritual qualities that will direct this power for the good of mankind. If this be done, we shall not have died in vain."

No matter how brief the hour, it is a rare privilege for you and me and all of us to be living in this time of crisis. The challenge is squarely put. It calls to the best that may be in us. In spite of the exertions and sacrifices, we know that we are living through one of America's finest hours. There is no time for pretense, no room for false values. Here we consecrate ourselves to devotion and sacrifice, in order that we may be worthy of them.

A great American philosopher once wrote on the subject entitled "The Moral Equivalent of War." He wondered, as you and I

must wonder today, why it takes a war to bring forth this spirit of devotion and sacrifice in men. And he wondered why we cannot mobilize and sustain those qualities for the great and constructive responsibilities of peace.

Our patient wounded do not cry, "Me first." The sailor whose companion has gone down with the ship; the soldier whose pal did not come back from patrol or from a bombing mission; he's not thinking of himself. He will glare at the man who wants to take his picture or to question him about "heroics." That soldier or sailor is interested only in his buddy, the buddy for whom he would have given his life to save. We bow our heads in all humility before this selfless devotion. And somehow we think of a child waking in terror in the night to be shielded and comforted by a mother's love. And then we think of the all-embracing love of God and feel the mystic pulse of eternity.

In the normal times a man dies and is mourned by a few friends and relatives. Today men are dying for our Nation and its cause. Today a nation mourns.

Our hearts go out in tender solace to the parents of our soldier dead. In the pain of their loss they are giving, many many times over. A grateful Nation dedicates itself to the task of carrying on for them.

As we raise our heads from requiem we know that the hour of decision is at hand. For this is not a routine Memorial Day. Great and tragic events are unfolding which will determine the course of life for millions of human beings. Even greater sacrifices lie just ahead.

If the dead could but speak, perhaps they would say, "Make this a living day. Remember us—and with us in your memory and because of us—consecrate yourselves to the urgent tasks before you. Part of us still lives in you to work and fight for the victory and the peace. With courage and justice go forth to save and develop your American civilization for the good of all mankind. In God you trust."

A Sharp Rebuke on Ward Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. PRATT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 27, 1944:

A SHARP REBUKE ON WARD SEIZURE

If a Senate judiciary subcommittee that has been investigating the Montgomery Ward case has its way, there's going to be an end to suspending the Constitution and ignoring the Bill of Rights in wartime.

For it's the subcommittee's opinion that President Roosevelt had "no constitutional or statutory authority" to issue the Executive order under which Ward's Chicago mail-order house was taken over by the Army.

Furthermore, the Judiciary Committee group takes a hearty slap at Attorney General Biddle, who assured the President he had authority to issue the order; at Secretary of Commerce Jones, who called for troops to take over the plant; at the conciliation services of Madam Perkins' Department of Labor; at the W. L. B. and the N. L. R. B.

The subcommittee's finding isn't a plot concocted by hide-bound, reactionary Republicans. The subcommittee's chairman is Senator MCCARRAN, Nevada Democrat. He was joined in his opinion by Senator REVERCOMB, Republican, of West Virginia. The other Democrat, Senator MCFARLAND, of Arizona, refused to sign the report because he didn't think the subcommittee, which hadn't held hearings, should have based its conclusions solely upon documentary evidence and the findings of investigators who had been sent to Chicago.

In all fairness, it seems to us that the subcommittee should have held hearings and that Attorney General Biddle and Secretary Jones should have been permitted to say their say. When the report goes before the full committee there should be direct testimony.

But the fact is that Attorney General Biddle, who, following the Ward seizure insisted that "no business or property is immune to Presidential order," already has appeared before the House Select Committee in its Ward case hearings. So has Chairman William H. Davis of the War Labor Board.

And did Mr. Biddle boldly defend against all comers his earlier position that the President had the right, not only under law but under vaguely defined wartime powers, to seize a retail, nonwar business? Well, hardly. He seemer to retreat.

Although defending his contention that the President had the power to act as he did in the Ward seizure, the Attorney General told the House committee headed by Representative RAMSPECK that it mightn't be a bad idea for Congress to change the War Labor Disputes Act to say precisely what a producer is, and that if Congress feels the President exceeded his powers under the law it should more clearly define his authority.

If that wasn't a tacit admission by Mr. Biddle of doubt about the Executive's asserted legal rights and about his own interpretation of the law, what was it? And isn't it just barely possible that the Attorney General had discovered that the totalitarian goings-on in Chicago were a pretty serious political blunder?

Whatever the curious workings of Mr. Biddle's mind in this affair, Chairman Davis, when before the Ramspeck committee appeared to have misgivings about the War Labor Board's role in the Ward case. He said that if Congress thought anybody's constitutional rights were in danger it should tell the W. L. B. what to do and it would obey.

It is now plainer than ever that Attorney General Biddle made a very grave error in advising the President that he had authority to take over the Ward plant and in not taking the matter to court before the Army was called in.

It is also plain that to prevent a civilian goods distributor from being mistaken for a war producer; to clarify the President's wartime rights and to define the War Labor Board's exact function, the War Labor Disputes Act should be promptly revised.

National War Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Cecil B. Dickson:

AS OF TODAY

(By Cecil B. Dickson)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly 5 months ago the Nation was warned by special committee of Congress of the activities of the National War Labor Board, and the members of the committee were not surprised when the Government seized Montgomery Ward.

In January, the special House committee, headed by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH Democrat, Virginia, submitted a report on its investigation of W. L. B., in which it said:

"The National War Labor Board has not confined itself to labor disputes in war industries but has assumed jurisdiction over all types of business, no matter how remotely they may be removed from any connection with the war effort.

"The War Labor Board has compelled employers and employees to agree to submit disputes to arbitration. Compulsory arbitration which requires the parties to abide by the arbitrator's decision is in violation of the constitutional rights of the parties and was so decided by the Supreme Court of the United States."

The committee then recommended that Congress enact a law limiting and defining the powers of the W. L. B. to prevent it from using almost any pretext for taking over plants, whether they are war-connected or not.

It pointed out the W. L. B. adopted the policy that "in the determination of a wage dispute the question of the financial status or ability to pay of the employer is irrelevant and immaterial and that any employer whose business does not justify the payment of what the Board in its judgment or generosity regards as a decent standard of wages is economically inefficient and ought not to be permitted to remain in business."

"The Board," the committee said, "takes the position that it has the right not only to fix future wages but to render a money award for back wages for services already rendered and paid for without affording the employer an effective right of judicial review."

The committee said the W. L. B. had placed no limitation upon itself in the exercise of this assumed power and that it was probable the W. L. B. could drive employers into bankruptcy under its policy.

The committee noted that the W. L. B. had promulgated and "enforced a new legal doctrine to the effect that it has the power and the authority to compel the parties to execute a contract to do anything that the parties might voluntarily do, irrespective of whether there is any legal or contractual obligation on the parties to do so."

The Smith committee charged the W. L. B. had engaged in devious reasoning to justify its conclusions in forcing firms like Montgomery Ward to insist that employees maintain their membership in the labor unions and submit to the check-off of union dues as a condition of employment.

The warning that the committee issued was this:

"If one Federal bureau can with impunity destroy the essential legal components of a contract; can, without review by the courts, render money awards for unlimited sums for past services rendered and already paid for; and can establish the principle that the ability of the employer to pay any wages that the fancy of the board may dictate is immaterial and not to be considered; it is obvious that such policy, if unrestrained and exercised by biased agencies not concerned with the judicial elements of a fair trial, may and probably will make serious inroads into our constitutional system of judicial determination and destroy the elementary rights of private property and private enterprise."

The committee had this to say about the W. L. B.'s action on the maintenance of unions, an issue in the Montgomary Ward case:

"In a large number of instances labor unions began to demand of employers contracts containing a provision for a closed shop

as well as check-off of union dues by the employers. In practically all instances the employers were opposed to both provisions being inserted in any contract which might otherwise be agreed upon. When disputes such as these began to reach the National War Labor Board, that Board conceived the idea of ordering and directing employers to insert in their labor contracts a clause providing its idea of a modified form of closed shop by what is termed 'maintenance of union' and providing also that the employer check off union dues."

The committee pointed out that until the enactment of the War Labor Disputes Act on June 25, 1943, when Congress overrode the President's veto on the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill, that the W. L. B. had no statutory authority but acted under orders and directives which were in violation of the Constitution, which provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States."

"It is the contention of the members of the War Labor Board that they are acting by direction of the President and that the President has delegated such authority to them by reason of his war powers under the Constitution," the committee said, adding:

"The President does not possess war powers which authorize him to compel an employer, whether engaged in war work or not, to release workers who do not maintain their membership in a private labor union. * * * The Constitution nowhere confers upon the Executive authority such as the National War Labor Board purports to exercise. The Constitution was not designed to subject to the arbitrary will of civil appointees of the President the liberties guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution."

The committee was well aware of the activities of the W. L. B. in the Montgomery Ward case long before the mail-order house was seized and occupied by soldiers at the direction of the Washington Government. As far back as January, the committee had this to say on the Montgomery Ward case:

"Since even the most capricious ruling of the National War Labor Board may be enforced by a plant seizure, there are but few employers who have not been subdued by even a mere threat of coercive measures. Thus Montgomery Ward & Co. ultimately complied with an order to accept a maintenance-of-membership clause when the President personally ordered it to do so. The National War Labor Board has assumed jurisdiction of this labor dispute in spite of the fact that this company's activities could in no sense be classified as necessary to the prosecution of the war. Nevertheless, Montgomery Ward complied because, on the one hand, further recalcitrance would have meant seizure, and on the other, refusal to obey an order of the President would have seemed unpatriotic, and consequently, would have damaged the public good will which the company had built up over a long period of years."

Fish and Wildlife in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, to be forewarned is to be forearmed. Approximately 30 years ago, during construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad along the Fraser River in British Columbia, the great salmon industry centered around Puget Sound was almost wiped out.

It happened this way: In excavating the right-of-way, huge boulders, rocks, and debris fell in the river and filled many of the deep pools. Salmon coming in from the Pacific Ocean and making the long, hard trip up the Fraser to spawning grounds in northern British Columbia, were accustomed to rest in the large pools in the lower Fraser. Workmen constructing the railroad noticed the salmon falling back, unable to find shelter in the pools. By heroic efforts, under supervision of the Province fishing authorities, the stream was partially cleared, and fortunately, a sufficient number of fish got through so as to preserve the industry.

In California, we have not for years been canning salmon commercially, but our citizens rely heavily on salmon as an important item of fresh fish. Exactly as in the Fraser, Columbia, Klamath, and other Pacific streams, millions of salmon return each year to the headwaters of the Sacramento to spawn.

Engineers in charge of the Central Valley project should constantly have this proposition in mind and protect the salmon spawning areas.

All the salmon reaching streams in the Central Valley come in from the Pacific Ocean through the Golden Gate, and all traverse the waters of San Francisco Bay.

Latest available statistics for salmon caught in San Francisco Bay show as follows:

	Pounds
1937	2,181,300
1938	1,778,300
1939	935,100
1940	2,692,700
1941	1,220,700

Quoting release signed by Dr. Robert Lorentz, chairman, Conservation Committee of the San Francisco Tyee Club:

The entire Central Valley project will affect the salmon runs adversely unless they are all planned with the idea in mind of conserving our fisheries resources. At the present time a new dam is planned for construction at an early date at Table Mountain, on the main Sacramento River, about 6 miles above Red Bluff.

Everyone should be interested in saving the Central Valley's salmon runs.

I also quote as part of my remarks, an article by Dr. Lorentz entitled "The Central Valley's Project and Salmon." In addition to the article, I also submit a letter dated, San Francisco, April 29, 1944, signed by Dr. Lorentz and addressed to Col. R. C. Hunter, Corps of Engineers, United States War Department, regarding the salmon proposition:

Unless the many dams and diversion canals now planned for post-war construction in the streams flowing through the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys are designed and constructed with honest and sincere planning for the welfare of the salmon, steelhead, and other anadromous fishes, it is highly probable that the runs of these species will be killed off in the Central Valleys area.

Two dams of the Central Valleys water project are now completed, or practically so: One at Shasta on the Sacramento, located about 10 miles north of Redding, the other at Friant on the San Joaquin River northeast of Fresno. Both of these dams block salmon runs from their former spawning grounds.

In the early stages of construction of Shasta Dam it was suddenly decided that some provisions might have to be made to care for a large run of salmon that would be blocked by such a structure. The upstream migrants counted at the A. C. I. Dam at Redding proved that from forty to sixty thousand adult salmon would have to be accommodated each year.

These salmon may be divided roughly into two groups according to the time of year they leave the ocean and run up into the rivers. The spring run enters the rivers and arrives in the neighborhood of Redding in May. This migration reaches its height in June, then tapers off until the fall-run fish begin coming upstream in late August and September to reach the peak of their run in October or November.

Under normal conditions the spring-run fish migrate through the lower valleys during the snow-run-off when the streams and rivers are still cool. They migrate into the upper reaches of the tributaries where they can find deep cool pools in which they spend the hot summer. In July and August the lower rivers are too warm for the salmon to survive unless they can move through quickly to cooler water. This is an important and troublesome fact which required the costliest part of the salvage program which was devised to care for these fish.

Because of the high temperature of the main river water during the summer, the spring-run Chinooks have to be moved out of the area below Shasta Dam and into cooler streams. A hatchery costing around one and one-quarter million dollars was constructed on Battle Creek above Red Bluff to take care of 90,000,000 eggs. This represents the spawning capacity of only 12,000 females.

Since the number of fish migrating into the river during and before the warmer temperatures occur could be expected to include more than this number of females, some other provision also had to be made. Moreover, the success of hatchery reared salmon in terms of adult fish has never been proven, and it was considered advisable to have an alternate plan to take care of part of the spring run in case the other failed. This alternate was the transfer of adult salmon from the main river into Deer Creek where cool water could be found in the headwaters throughout the year.

Seven trucks, each with a 1,000-gallon aerated and ice-cooled tank, were provided at a cost of $9,000 each. Traps were constructed at Keswick Dam below Shasta to catch all fish that got up that far; and another trap and rack were built at Balls Ferry near the mouth of Battle Creek to take fish there when the river was low enough to permit it.

The fall-run fish, arriving after the river temperature cools below 68° F., are easily accommodated by merely distributing them between racks in the main Sacramento River below Keswick Dam. The 35 miles of river between Keswick and Jellys Ferry holds plenty of good spawning gravel to accommodate these fish.

Last year the salvage program had its first real test in handling the fish. About six thousand salmon were trucked from Keswick Dam the 60-mile run to Deer Creek and dumped there. As might be expected some bugs had to be ironed out, but in general these transfers were a success. So were the transfers later made into the holding ponds at the Coleman Hatchery on Battle Creek. Later the fall run spawned very successfully in the main river. This success was proven by the wide distribution of the fish over the spawning riffles and by the healthy eggs and fry that were later dug out of sampled nests to determine the success of the spawning. Moreover, healthy young fry have been taken in fyke nets in the river near Balls Ferry Rack.

As far as handling the adult fish is concerned, the salmon-salvage program below Shasta may be considered successful. With experience and better equipment it should work efficiently. Its success in terms of returned salmon, or in terms of the fishermen's catch is yet to be determined. It looks very promising.

With the salvage operations just beginning to function, we find, however, that another dam is now projected for early construction at Table Mountain. This lies about 5 miles downstream from Jelly's Ferry, and about 10 miles below the mouth of Battle Creek.

As originally proposed, this is to be a dirt-filled structure, to be built in two stages. The first stage is a small dam about 100 feet high. This dam would block the salmon runs from their last remaining spawning areas in the main river. There would be no object in building ladders to get the adults over the dam; for even though 40 percent of the spawning riffles were left unflooded, the young salmon could not be taken downstream again safely. The $1,250,000 hatchery at Coleman would be rendered useless because fish could be brought in only by trucking, and the hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in racks and traps at Balls Ferry and Keswick would be useless.

To complete the destruction of the salvage programs, these original plans for Table Mountain specify that the first stage or low dam is only to be a foundation for a bigger structure to be built over the smaller one as soon as it becomes consolidated and settled. This final dam is to be 200 feet high, and will back water right up to the base of Keswick Dam. With water backed up to its normal pool level, behind this dam, Coleman hatchery would be covered by about 60 feet of water. The salmon salvage program would be finished, and so would the salmon of the up-river area.

There is no possibility of salvaging salmon below Table Mountain Dam. The few streams that would be available are not large enough to hold all the fish that would come up to the dam. The job would involve handling about twice the number of fish now accommodated in the main river spawning riffles and Coleman hatchery. Moreover, the temperature of the reservoir water would undoubtedly make things too hot for the fish, anyway. If this plan of tight dams is adopted, there is no hope for the salmon that now spawn in the upper Sacramento River.

Fortunately another proposal has been made to build a small dam at Table Mountain for flood-control purposes only. The plans for this dam are still not public, but as briefly described at a recent meeting of the State reclamation board in Sacramento they look hopeful. Everyone interested in the preservation of our salmon and steelhead runs in the Central Valley's area must urge that this plan be adopted if it can be proven that it will not harm the fish.

At the other end of the Central Valley's, Friant Dam on the San Joaquin has blocked the salmon run that formerly spawned in the headwaters of that river. No salvage program was developed here, and probably it is fortunate that it was not undertaken. With water flowing through the dam all summer, 10,000 spring-run Chinooks migrated up the San Joaquin River and spent the summer in excellent condition in the pools below the outlets. When they were ready to spawn, they dropped downstream and spawned very successfully in the 30 miles of good gravel below the dam. The success of this spawning is attested by the thousands of fry that have been netted on their downstream journey from these beds.

The results of this involuntary experiment in the care of salmon below impassable dams are really profoundly significant. They show that where adequate spawning grounds exist below the proposed dams, as they do in most streams in the Central Valleys area, if sufficient water is provided at the right time of year, the salmon will survive and spawn to produce succeeding generations of salmon. The basic problem is to leave enough good spawning gravel accessible to the adults where the young fish can get back downstream, and then to insure plenty of water at the right time of the year.

Adequate flows are not yet assured below Friant since the United States Bureau of Reclamation has not yet committed itself as to what the operating schedule of this dam will be when its two diversion canals are completed.

We can expect that the entire Central Valleys program of water development for flood control, power, and irrigation will eventually be completed. The dams proposed that will affect salmon include the 680-foot Bidwell Bar Dam blocking the middle and south forks of the Feather River, the enlarged upper Narrows Reservoir on the Yuba, the four proposed dams on the American River which will stop all salmon at Folsom, Nashville Dam on the Cosumnes, Tullock Reservoir Dam on the Stanislaus, and a higher Don Pedro Dam on the Tuolumne. If the Sacramento and San Joaquin salmon runs are to continue, these dams must be planned to provide water and spawning gravel for them. We must not allow them to be planned and construction started before the fish are even thought of. It is then far too late.

Moreover, the numerous diversion and connecting canals transferring water from one river to another and diverting it into storage reservoirs to be used later to supplement the supply in drier parts of the valley must be designed to go over or under the streams they cross.

The spawning beds below the main dams must be kept open to fish. They must not be made death traps for old or young fish.

Fishermen have no desire to hinder the fullest development of State's resources, but in this development they insist that proper foresight be used so as not to destroy the great fish runs which have existed since the beginning of time on the Central Valleys rivers. With intelligent planning these runs cannot only be saved, but may even be built back to somewhere near their former abundance.

SAN FRANCISCO TYEE CLUB,
April 29, 1944.

Col. R. C. HUNTER,
Corps of Engineers,
United States Engineer Office,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR SIR: The San Francisco Tyee Club, representing over 500 sportsmen interested in the conservation of salmon, for some time has been following the Central Valley irrigation, power, and flood-control developments. We view with alarm the plans now being considered for the construction of a multiple-purpose dam at the Table Mountain site. Construction of such a dam at this location without doubt would mean the end of the salmon runs into the upper Sacramento Valley.

The Federal Government already has spent over $2,000,000 in the salvage of salmon that were blocked from the upper reaches of the Sacramento River by Shasta Dam. These salvage operations are just now beginning to operate. While their success cannot be determined until the adults begin to return several years hence, reports of results of handling the adult salmon and the eggs and young in the Coleman hatchery indicate that the operations have been successful. The salvage of salmon that would be blocked by a multiple-purpose dam at Table Mountain would be practically impossible. Not only are there no streams or facilities available into which the fish can be transferred but there are no spawning grounds below this point in the main river. Moreover, approximately twice as many fish would have to be handled as are now handled below Shasta.

It was reported to our organization by one of our members who attended a recent hearing of the State reclamation board in Sacramento that a plan was discussed there for the building of a dam at Table Mountain which would be used only for flood control. From what little information has been obtained, it is our belief that such a structure is the only type that would have any chance of being adaptable to the needs of the farming communities in the lower valley. We urge you, therefore, to adopt the latter plan and to formulate it in cooperation with the various fisheries agencies concerned with salmon conservation in this State in such a manner that the salmon runs in the upper Sacramento Valley will be preserved. The San Francisco Tyee Club does not feel that destruction of this valuable resource is justified since it is apparent that the principle objective of a flood-control dam at Table Mountain can be attained without harm to the salmon.

Yours very truly,
ROBERT LORENTZ, M. D.,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.

Art of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 30, 1944:

ART OF POLITICS

Prompted by a University of Denver survey indicating that almost five out of seven Americans think it virtually impossible for a professional politician to remain honest, Mayor LaGuardia has sprung to the defense of "the art of politics." In a recent radio address, inspired by a New York Times editorial on the subject, he suggested that he might some day launch a campaign to bring politics into better repute as a profession or vocation. In our opinion there is no kind of publicity work that would pay higher dividends. Exaggerated ideas of the extent of political corruption have undoubtedly been fostered by the featuring of political scandals and attacks on dishonest politicians. The press and other organs of public opinion are to be praised rather than blamed for concentrating attention on political abuses with a view to exposing and expelling the scamps and scoundrels who hold public office. Nevertheless, this one-sided emphasis has resulted in too little attention being given to the valuable services performed by honest public servants.

The work of enlightenment might well begin by giving the people more information about the activities of Members of Congress. Most of the hard and grueling labor performed by our national legislators is transacted behind the scenes or in committee hearings, with only a handful of people present. Casual tourists visiting the Capitol listen to Congressmen and Senators delivering speeches from the floor to empty seats or amidst a conversational din. They go away believing that their Representatives are playboys, not even interested in the oratorical extravagances of their colleagues.

If these same tourists knew how many hours of mental labor and how much physical effort are expended by Members of Congress in attending committee meetings and holding hearings preliminary to reporting out countless bills, they would revise their opinion of the caliber of the National Legislature. For that matter anyone with the stamina to read without prejudice debates on important issues reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will almost certainly conclude that the art of politics, as practiced in this country, has brought into Congress many men of keen minds and public spirit.

The public often does injustice to professional politicians by failing to understand that willingness to compromise an issue does not necessarily imply lack of integrity. There is a vast difference between making concessions to secure needed support for a favored measure and bartering away one's principles for the sake of selfish political advantage. Minor compromises have to be made by any man who aspires to hold political office; indeed, compromises must be made to keep the legislative machinery from stalling.

Political reputations also suffer because the public is inclined to put a premium on show-off qualities that handicap the sober, conscientious man who may be inclined to hide his light under a bushel. As a result many politicians seek votes by trying to satisfy the public taste for the bizarre or the spectacular. The remedy for this situation lies obviously in elevating public standards of taste and education. That is a long-time process, but we can and should begin right now to give the public more information about the positive contributions that practitioners of the art of politics make to the national welfare. That is essential not alone in the interest of the unjustly maligned but as a means of preserving public respect for democratic institutions.

Message to Parents, Wives, Children, Brothers, and Sisters of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the matter of allotments and allowances for dependents of men and women in our armed forces is not as complicated as many people feel, and I sincerely hope that the citizens of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I represent, will not have any hesitancy in writing me should they encounter any unusual delays or have any problems in connection with the payments which they do not understand.

The immediate dependents of any enlisted man or woman, or aviation cadet, are entitled to dependency benefits if they are substantially dependent upon the soldier. I repeat, this applies to dependents of women in our service forces as well as those of the men.

I hope all dependents will read this article and save it for future use.

There are three principal classes of dependents to which this dependency benefit law applies and their allowances are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife with one child, $72; a divorced wife with each additional child, $20. Note: A wife separated or divorced from a man in service will get no more than the amount fixed in a court order or decree in case of alimony. If the divorce or separation order does not call for alimony or separate maintenance she will not receive any allowance.

Class B dependents: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. Note: Class B dependents, it must be clearly understood, are dependents who are only partially dependent upon service men and women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon men or women in service 50 percent or less, but are still substantially dependent, they come under Class B. Only $37 is allowed no matter if there are one or even four or five more partially dependent. Those who make application for family allowance, therefore, should be very careful to show the full degree of their dependency. This is important.

Class B–1 dependents: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $11. Two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79; two parents and each additional brother or sister, $11; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parent, $11.

HOW TO GET THE ALLOWANCE

Wherever possible, as soon as a man or woman enters service, application for the allowance should be made. They should do this immediately when they are inducted. The allowance payments do not go back. The payments begin with the first of the month in which the application is filed. Therefore, if the man or woman in service waits a month after induction before an application is filed—1 month's allowance is lost. The longer they wait to file an application the more money is lost. It is important that they file an application for this allowance within 15 days after they are inducted.

The man or woman in service should submit the application on a form which they can get from the commanding officer. In filling out this form it is good to be careful to spell all names correctly and give exact information as to marriage, dates of birth, and so forth. Many of the troubles dependents have in getting their allowance are due to the fact that the service man or woman is careless in filling out the blank. An extra minute in filling out the blank may save several months' time in getting the allowance approved. The application, after careful study and filling out, should then be handed to the commanding officer.

If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application, or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. If there is any question as to where or how to apply just drop a letter to your Congressman. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out. The Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children, dates of birth, and so forth. Therefore, if any class A dependent does not know for certain just how to apply, he or she could well write a Member of Congress and ask for instructions.

If the man or woman in service with class B or B–1 dependents declines to make an application for a family allowance for them, no other person can apply. Class B and B–1 allowances are granted and continued only at the will of the man or woman in service. They cannot be forced to make application. Wherever the service man or woman with class B or class B–1 dependents is overseas and fails to make application, and these dependents are reasonably sure that he will approve it, they can make application. However, the permission of the man or woman in service will have to be obtained before application for family allowance is approved for class B or B–1 dependents.

Family allowances are compulsory only when applied for for class A dependents.

PARENTS AND BROTHERS AND SISTERS CAN RECEIVE ALLOWANCES AT THE SAME TIME AS WIFE AND CHILDREN

It is also important to know that parents and brothers and sisters can get an allowance even if the serviceman's wife and children get one. In other words, if men or women in service have parents and brothers and/or sisters dependent upon them as well as a wife and children—all of these dependents can get a family allowance. For example: If there is a wife and child dependent on the man in service they get $80. If this same man in service has two parents and a sister, also dependent upon him for chief support, they, too, can get $79 a month also. This is important: To get this extra $79 only $5 more is taken out of the serviceman's pay. The balance of the $74 is paid by the Government. If the parents and brothers or sisters are only partially dependent, that is less than 50 percent dependent but still dependent to a substantial degree, they can get $37. Because a serviceman has a wife and children getting an allowance does not prevent his parents and brothers and sisters dependent on him from getting an allowance also. If you have any questions on this write your Congressman and he will explain how to go about it.

PARENTS CAN GET ALLOWANCES FROM MORE THAN ONE SON OR DAUGHTER IN SERVICE

If parents are dependent upon more than one son or daughter or both in service, they can get more allowance. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son in service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in service helped support these same two parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN OFTEN CAN HELP YOU

It is a Congressman's function to help with such matters. He is your Repre-

sentative in Washington. If you have any difficulty at all in this respect, your Congressman is the person to take it up with. Your Congressman has already cooperated and assisted in several hundred cases.

If any questions arise regarding where to get application blanks or how to make an application—or if for any reason any eligible dependent is not now receiving the allowance—or if for any reason you know of any dependent having any difficulty getting the allowance, write to Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Bill To Create Commission To Study Trade and Tax Barriers Among States and Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a joint resolution to create a committee on Federal and State relations. In the language of the resolution, "It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of the relations between the Federal Government and the governments of the several States and their political subdivisions with a view to determining what steps should be taken to bring about better coordination and cooperation among the various levels of government and thus eventually to solve, among other matters, such problems as interstate trade barriers and conflicting and multiple tax levies."

The problems of interstate barriers and conflicting and multiple tax levies are not academic ones. They are real, they obstruct the flow of trade from State to State; they stifle industrial development; they impede an honest union among 48 States. The trade barriers, particularly, are children of the depression of the 1930's. It was then that the various States raised trade barriers against each other primarily for the purpose of obtaining increased revenue. It, however, proved so harmful to domestic commerce that when the United States entered the war it became necessary to do something to erase them. It was then that the Council of State Governments arranged an agreement among all the States which became effective June 30, 1942, for uniformity in regulation having to do with trucks, but such agreement was to be for the duration only.

Does that mean that after the war we shall continue with such absurdities as I outline below?

First. Florida keeps out California oranges for fear of a long-vanished brown rat, and California retaliates by barring Florida oranges and lemons because of a nonexistent citrus canker.

Second. A truckload of lubricating oil headed for Baltimore where it was due aboard a ship transporting war materials, was detained 6 hours at Wilmington for violating a regulation peculiar to the State of Delaware.

Third. Many of the States had established "ports of entry" where motor trucks were stopped, measured, and inspected, weight registered and taxes as to gasoline mileage and weight of pay load. For example, Kansas had 66 of these so-called "ports of entry," Nebraska 31, Mexico 22, and California 14.

Fourth. At Medford Oregon, trucks from California were stopped and their loads shared with other trucks to conform with Oregon's lower load limit.

Such "Balkanizing process" has led to rivalries and jealousies that mar the structure of the Union. The petty bickering, the retaliatory gestures are not a pretty picture and, more than that constitute a menace to our commercial and domestic development. The post-war world which gives so much promise of accelerated production in consumers' goods must not be hampered by internal economic rivalry.

It has been our pride of many years to think of the United States as the greatest free-trade area in the world. We cannot afford to be otherwise. It is actually a war between States.

Thousands of pieces of idiotic legislation in the various States throwing up barriers at State borders against one product after another produced in neighboring or distant States have put commerce and industry into 48 kinds of straitjackets and divided the Nation into 48 unneighborly small countries.

This situation is further highlighted by a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court. It concerns itself with national aviation. The State of Minnesota levied a tangible personal property on a Northwest Airlines fleet in service between the Pacific Northwest and Chicago. The planes were constantly flying across State lines but only a few of them come down in Minnesota at any one time. The company paid a proportionate tax to each State on its equipment. The Supreme Court of the United States held that Minnesota could impose and collect a tax on the entire fleet, because the home company was in St. Paul. This despite the fact that all the ships of this company never at any one given time were in the hangars, or on the ground in St. Paul or any Minnesota airport.

The decision was a close one—5 to 4. Six other States are involved, because the planes of this company fly over their terrain. It is possible that these six other States will demand the same sort of tax. Suppose the six other States placed a proportionate tax in addition to the full tax validated for Minnesota. Whether the Minnesota tax is an exclusive tax is still debatable. Are the other six States free to impose a comparable tax on the same property? If so, an insuperable burden is placed on interstate commerce. Something must be done about it.

Furthermore, under the present conditions, each State could set up its own policing arrangement over aircraft flying overhead, just as they did concerning autos speeding along its roads.

Aviation should be fairly free at this present stage of development from throttling restrictions. Frankly, policing and taxing of airlines, it seems to me, should involve a far greater degree of national direction in the interest of uniformity. The powers to police and tax are the powers to destroy. Unless the solution is found, the aviation industry will die aborning.

The conflict between State and Federal Government likewise has troubled the calm that was supposed to exist among members of the United States Supreme Court. Three of these Justices have been insisting upon a more "harmonious" application of the laws in conflict involving Federal and State powers. They have clearly indicated that the interests of the individual States should be blended with those of the national wherever and whenever possible. Strangely enough, that demand for harmony has given rise to a considerable degree of feuding which has cropped out among the Justices of the Bench.

We are thus approaching a very dangerous situation. The Justices of the Supreme Court cannot generally agree thereon and the States cannot agree. It is high time for Congress to step into the breach.

All Small Business Needs and Wants Is Protection Against Private Monopolistic Encroachments, Destructive by Their Very Nature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter as published in the National Independent May 1944:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1944.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Publisher, National Independent,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BURGER: The National Independent and you should be congratulated upon your third anniversary because of the distinguished service rendered to the cause of independent and small business in America.

The future of small business in post-war America can be either brilliant and prosperous—or dull and declining, dependent entirely upon whether it is free or regimented.

War controls have caused many to contemplate the risk of compromising with some form of post-war regimentation or governmental supervision. This is dangerous to the future of small business. Small business, in my opinion, is the keystone in the arch of a free competitive enterprise—and the more units of small business operating in

America—the more secure is the American way of life.

If this be true, then it follows naturally that anything that tends to stifle free competition, chokes off the opportunity for small business to prosper.

There are two great dangers against which we must continually fight if small business is to prosper. First, the danger of private monopolistic encroachment. Against this danger, the Federal anti-trust laws should be strengthened, and in many cases State laws should be strengthened. Second, the danger of the paternalistic hand of government, which means eventually governmental supervision and regimentation.

We must guard carefully against the temptation to extend war controls for any period of time longer than necessary to taper off and liquidate such agencies. Governmental agencies which have been protective in their service to small business during war could serve no other purpose than to become regimental tools in peace time. A heavy paternal hand of government means eventual death to the prosperous free operation of small business.

All small business needs and wants, therefore, is protection against private monopolistic encroachments which are destructive by their very nature and freedom to operate.

Warm personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. PLOESER.

The Milk Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 30, 1944.

The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: I am writing in connection with your recent comments as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, May 22. You talked of the current temporarily flush milk supply and raised some questions about the dumping of milk by plants which allegedly were unable to obtain sugar for condensing purposes. I should like to give you a brief explanation of the way in which our program operates along these lines.

As you know, we do not handle any allocation of milk. We are, however, responsible for the rationing of sugar and, indirectly, through our sugar orders, may affect the ultimate course of milk processing operations. We are, therefore, greatly concerned that every step possible be taken to assure the complete use of all available supplies of milk. Consequently we have endeavored to make certain that adequate supplies of sugar can be obtained for milk condensing purposes.

Under our regulations most of these plants have already filed reports showing their total capacity in the manufacture of cheese, powdered milk, and other products which do not require the use of sugar. They already have established specific allotments of sugar for the manufacture of ice cream. In order to obtain additional sugar for condensing purposes a plant files with us an application giving its estimate of total milk receipts for the coming month. This figure is compared with the previously filed data showing capacity for using milk in the manufacture of ice cream and of non-sugar-consuming products. The balance which remains when this comparison is made is considered equal to the amount of milk available for condensing purposes. We then allot to the plant sufficient sugar to permit condensing of that quantity of milk.

From this explanation I think you will agree that the matter of obtaining sufficient sugar to permit condensing of any surplus of milk is a very simple one from the standpoint of the condenseries. There is no justification for any claim that surplus milk need be dumped because sugar is not available for processing.

I indicated above that most plants had already filed reports of their capacity for the manufacture of cheese, powdered milk, and other products of that type. There are a few, however, which had not done so for various reasons, and we have thought it necessary in these cases to grant liberal provisional allotments of sugar upon receipt of the initial request and pending the actual processing of the application. In this, I think, we have been extremely liberal, and we are, in fact, receiving a certain amount of criticism for making sugar so readily available for the condensing operation.

During the course of the discussion on the floor last Monday, a point was made about an O. P. A. order which restricts the plants processing milk to 75 percent of production during the base period. I think the reference here was intended to apply to an order which we issued affecting only the May allotment. Actually the situation was this: We were at that time reviewing the whole sugar-rationing program, and for the month of May we made an initial allotment of sugar equal to 75 percent of the full amount requested. Subsequently, on May 8, we granted the additional 25 percent so that at no time did this 75-percent limitation really amount to a limit on production.

I hope that these comments will give you some explanation of the actions of this Office along these lines. If you have any further questions, I should be glad to hear from you.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Mineral Leasing Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill I have introduced today entitled "A bill to extend the mineral leasing laws to lands acquired by the United States," which, in my opinion, is very important to the people of my district in Montana particularly, and to the country generally.

At this time in the history of our country when much genuine concern is being expressed over the amount of oil available for our future use it is of course of paramount importance that new fields should be continuously brought into operation. At the present time there is unusual activity throughout the Nation, and particularly in my own district, the Second Congressional District of Montana, among people who are interested in developing lands for oil and gas. By the act of February 15, 1920, commonly referred to as the Oil Leasing Act, Congress has encouraged the exploring of lands for the production of oil and gas.

When Congress enacted this statute and subsequent statutes, Congress assumed that all lands owned by the United States that may produce oil or gas or have prospective value for oil or gas should be administered by the Secretary of the Interior. However, this is not the case.

In pursuance of the Resettlement Administration program and also the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and some other acts, the Government purchased large acreages of submarginal lands. Some of these lands were purchased subject to preservation of mineral interests and particularly any oil or gas contained therein, and all lands purchased were committed to the Secretary of Agriculture for management and administration. My district in Montana has many thousands of acres of land purchased under the above acts.

Much confusion has arisen because of the two standards and requirements for obtaining oil leases on these lands. The Secretary of Agriculture on the one hand will only lease any of these lands for oil and gas after advertising for bids and then lease only to the highest and best bidder.

The Secretary of the Interior on the other hand leases unimproved oil or gas lands without competitive bidding to the first qualified applicant. Thus it is very easy to see that the procedure of the Secretary of Agriculture in leasing to the highest bidder gives large and powerful oil companies and individuals a virtual monopoly of the development of these lands for the oil and gas they contain. The Oil Leasing Act was enacted to promote the development of lands having possibilities of oil and gas without any intention to profit from the granting of permits or leases to develop them. Such a situation is not only retarding but is actually blocking development of lands having potential possibilities for the production of oil and gas. One seeking to acquire a solid block of acreage on a structure, so that drilling the test upon the structure will be more easily financed or inviting to captial, is not only faced with the difficulty but with the uncertainty of obtaining leasing of lands with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture claims jurisdiction.

I have therefore introduced a bill entitled "a bill to extend the mineral leasing laws to lands acquired by the United States" which would place the leasing of all these lands acquired by the Government under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior. I think that at this time when the Government very much desires to see the production of oil increased such a bill will tend to promote the exploration of lands, owned by the Government, not within a known oil producing structure. The rules and regulations and requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture, as they apply to the leasing of oil and gas lands, have not only discouraged exploring lands for oil and gas but without question prevent the ex-

ploration of lands for oil and gas or the development of structures in which they lie.

To the end that the law may be made certain and uniform it appears to me that a statute should be enacted whereby only one department is vested with the authority to lease lands owned by the United States for oil and gas and other minerals. The department I think best suited because of its experience and set-up to do this job is the Department of the Interior.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Fair Employment Practice Committee has no place in an orderly democratic government. It is doing nothing but stirring racial strife under the guise of effecting complete utilization of the Nation's manpower for the war effort. Furthermore, there is no authority, statutory or constitutional, for such a committee.

The F. E. P. C. has charged many employers with discriminatory practices in that they have inequitably distributed employment among the races. It was not so long ago that it endeavored to force certain southern railroads to dismiss many of their white conductors and engineers with seniority rights of long years' standing and replace them with Negroes. Of course, the railroads refused to comply with the order because it was none of the F. E. P. C.'s business who they employ. The racial personnel in your plant, shop, store, or office is none of the Government's business. It is your business and yours alone. This is no monarchy. It is a democracy. Oddly enough, the Fair Employment Practice Committee is the most flagrant violator of the principle it has laid down. On its pay rolls throughout the country are 61 negroes and 45 whites. In its Washington office it employs 35 negroes and 13 whites. The administrative office of its chairman is staffed with 11 negroes and no whites. Within this committee's own offices it fails to practice the principle which it so ardently embraces. While I do not know of any self-respecting white person who seeks employment within this crackpot organization, the fact remains that the F. E. P. C. is discriminating against the white man within its own offices. And now, of all things, it has the temerity to direct others to discontinue alleged racial employment discriminations while it most flagrantly violates the principle. Its general activities are not only an insult to the white people of the South but of the entire Nation.

A few weeks ago I learned that the Committee on Labor would soon conduct hearings on three identical bills to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. As a member of the Labor Committee, I let it be promptly known in no uncertain terms that I was opposed to hearings on the bills, which I believed to be asinine and undemocratic. I predicted that F. E. P. C., then a side show, would eventually replace the anti-poll-tax movement as the main attraction for the rabble-rousing race disturbers. Much sooner than expected the prediction has come true. I stated then and now repeat that the F. E. P. C. was conceived in sin and born in iniquity. I stated then and now repeat that it is a rotten, vile, and communistic infested Government agency. I stated then and now repeat that it was doing nothing but fanning the flame of race hatred, dividing our people when the very soul of this Nation is at stake in a colossal war. This committee is unnecessarily regulating our people, or attempting so to do, at a time when they are so superfluously regulated that their nerves have very nearly reached the revolting point. I confess, as a result of war, that many of the Government regulations have unquestionably served good purposes. On the contrary, many have not and those issued by the F. E. P. C. fall within that category. The American people, as a body, are sensible and patriotic. As free people they expect and demand democratic treatment. When the war effort necessitates the imposition of reasonable restrictions upon business, agriculture, or civilian standards of living, the best cooperation is obtainable by laying the hand on lightly. Big-stick methods, of which the F. E. P. C. is an example, are resented and revolting. I warn you again that the people are tired—very tired—of unnecessary regulations and Government meddling. The old mantel clock no longer beats a soothing, restful tick-tock, tick-tock, but a rapid regulate, regulate, regulate, regulate. And this business of the F. E. P. C. further regulating the people must be stopped.

If private enterprise, or even governmental agencies, can be forced to employ a certain percentage of negroes, or a certain percentage of any minority group, irrespective of seniority rights or qualifications, then in the not too distant future will we not be confronted with forced proportionate employment of minorities within a minority group, such as so many blacks, browns, tans, yellows, or so many half-bloods, or even quarter-bloods? If this is lawful, then those of the various religious faiths could demand equitable distribution of employment among their respective sects and there would follow the forced hire, in every business, shop, and office of a certain percentage of Protestants, Catholics, Hebrews, Mormons, Mohammedans, Buddhists, atheists, Sun Worshippers, Moon Gazers, and so on. Why even Communist Russia and Hitlerite Germany would bow in shame at such dictatorial orders.

I now direct my remarks to those of you, especially on the Republican side of the House, who have been rather vociferous and quite firm in your criticism of this administration. You have charged it to be a government by man rather than by law. I must confess that insofar as the origin, purposes, and activities of the Fair Employment Practice Committee are concerned, you are correct. It was given life by Executive Order on May 27, 1943. The Congress had nothing whatever to do with its creation. To it we have never appropriated one single dollar. It is not a child of Congress, and in view of its meddlesome, dictatorial and big-stick activities, Congress should refuse to nurture it. Its high-salaried employees are being paid from the executive emergency fund. Now, since it appears that restrictions may be imposed against the use of this fund for the F. E. P. C., it has called on Congress for the direct appropriation of one-half million dollars of the taxpayers' money that it may continue its nefarious activities.

Mr. Speaker, unity is desirable at all times, but more especially during time of war. The boys at the front are entitled to our best efforts. The best is unattainable without unity. The fact cannot be successfully disputed that the F. E. P. C. has engendered ill feeling, promoted race hatred, and bred disunity, as well as wasted thousands of dollars of Government funds. Its continuation would be a mistake. Its offices should be closed.

Native Sons of the Golden West Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions which have recently been adopted by the Native Sons of the Golden West at their annual convention in San Jose, Calif.

In view of their importance at the present time, I commend them to my colleagues for consideration:

Whereas the Native Sons Committee on Japanese Legislation has under consideration a proposed initiative measure to be submitted to the electors of 1944 to amend the alien land law of the State of California by making persons of Japanese ancestry or any other ancestry ineligible to citizenship under the laws of the United States who have dual citizenship, amenable to the provisions of said act, and from acquiring possession, leasing, chartering, enjoying, or transferring of any watercraft or interest therein by any such person; and

Whereas certain American-born Japanese have announced their allegiance to Japan and have demonstrated their disloyalty to this country; and

Whereas the War Relocation Authority has evidenced its incompetency in dealing with disloyal Japanese in Tule Lake war relocation center; and

Whereas the presence of Japanese in Tule Lake relocation center constitutes a menace

to the safety and welfare of the Pacific coast: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we pledge our support to the Native Sons Committee on Japanese Legislation in the furtherance of the initiative measure to be submitted to the electorate of the State of California; and be it

Resolved, That we ask our Representatives in Congress to enact legislation revoking the citizenship of disloyal Japanese and to exert their influence to aid in the deportation of these people; and be it

Resolved, That we request that the war relocation centers be placed under the control of the Army or the Department of Justice; and be it

Resolved, That we support an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment shall provide that persons born in this country of alien parents ineligible to citizenship shall not become citizens of the United States merely by virtue of their birth therein.

Resolved, That the Sixty-seventh Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West petition the President of the United States, Congress, the State Department, the Department of the Interior, and all other agencies or individuals having jurisdiction over any of the following to exert their influence and to strive diligently and without compromise toward the consummation of the following:

1. That there shall be no negotiated peace with Japan or the other Axis Powers except one based upon all of the following conditions:

(a) Unconditional surrender.

(b) Relinquishment by them of all mandated territory and other lands acquired by aggression; and

(c) Their complete and permanent demilitarization.

2. Vigorously to support the policy of the United States of exchanging civilian as well as military prisoners with Japan and other Axis Powers.

3. The immediate enactment of appropriate legislation for the deportation of:

(a) All enemy aliens not eligible to naturalization under our laws.

(b) American-born descendants of Japanese who have or shall refuse to disavow all allegiance to Japan or who have or shall in any manner show themselves to be disloyal to the United States.

4. The placing of the war relocation centers under the jurisdiction of the United States Army and the retention of all descendants of Japanese in said centers for the duration of the war.

5. The enactment of legislation to forbid the maintenance of the foreign-language schools where in the instruction causes or materially tends to cause either disloyalty to the United States or loyalty to a foreign country.

6. The enactment and strict enforcement of appropriate legislation to prevent the immigration of any person not eligible to naturalization into the United States or any of its territories or possessions.

7. The amendment of the first sentence of section 1, article 14, of the United States Constitution to read as follows: "All persons born of citizens of the United States or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

8. That any person of any extraction who has volunteered for military service in the United States forces shall be exempt from any of the provisions herein above provided.

Whereas the cession to Japan of the Marshall and Caroline Islands after the First World War created a grave menace to the security of the United States and its possessions, and made it possible for the treacherous attack by the Japs on Pearl Harbor, resulting in the death of thousands of Americans and the almost complete disabling of our Pacific Fleet; and

Whereas in the present war our forces have recaptured many of these mandated islands from the Japs and will eventually take possession of all the Japanese mandated islands; and

Whereas certain influences are now planning to deprive our country of the security of these islands by placing them under alien control; now, therefore be it

Resolved by this Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West:

1. That this Grand Parlor opposes the surrender of the Marshall and Caroline Islands taken by our forces from Japan, to any other power or combination of powers.

2. That the best interests of our country require that we retain exclusive control of these mandated islands and that any surrender would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States and constitute a perpetual menace to the Hawaiian Islands and our Pacific coast.

3. That the sentiment of the people of the United States is overwhelmingly against any surrender of our right to retain control of the Japanese mandated islands.

4. That we urge the President of the United States, the Department of State and the Congress to refrain from making any commitments with any foreign powers or group of powers by which our country may be deprived of the sole control of the Marshall and Caroline Islands.

5. That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, our Representatives in Congress, and the chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees.

Whereas the policy of the Federal Government in the acquisition of lands in the State of California and in other States of the United States is resulting in a marked decrease in the taxable lands of the various counties therein, thus denying to said counties the full property tax base; and

Whereas this national trend of the Federal Government in annually acquiring hundreds of thousands of acres of privately owned land, which, when so acquired, is exempt from taxation, reduces the property tax base and increases the tax rate on the remaining private property; and

Whereas for national forest purposes alone, the Federal Government has acquired over 16,000,000 acres of land, located in 31 States and in 335 counties, and contemplates the purchase or other acquisition of hundreds of millions of additional acres; and

Whereas for other purposes not purely governmental and not for local benefit, vast acreages are being acquired or withheld in the various States, to the distress of the local taxpayers of the counties in which such lands are situated; and

Whereas Federal ownership of lands within the State of California has increased in the past 5 years from 39 percent to over 43 percent of said State of California; and

Whereas this policy of Federal acquisition of the lands and resources of the States which necessarily reduces the tax base of the local counties will eventually wipe out many counties of California as political subdivisions of the said State of California unless such acquisitions cease or the Federal Government by appropriate congressional action provides for the payment of taxes on the lands held by the Federal Government in its proprietorial capacity; and

Whereas the destruction of counties in which the Federal land acquisitions are continuing will destroy the oldest and soundest type of American government, to wit, county government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Sixty-seventh Grand Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, That the Federal Government be urged to recognize the fundamental rights of the people of the State of California and of the other States in the United States to continue the county form of government and to this end that the Congress of the United States enact appropriate legislation providing for payment to the counties of taxes on the lands held by the Federal Government in its proprietorial capacity so that these lands so held by the Federal Government shall bear their fair share of the tax burden.

McKellar Amendments to T. V. A. Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZEBULON WEAVER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I trust most sincerely that the membership of this House will vote to defeat what are known as the McKellar amendments to the T. V. A. Act.

Both of these amendments, the one requiring all receipts from its operations shall be immediately deposited in the Treasury of the United States and that its operations shall depend entirely upon annual appropriations, as well as the one requiring confirmation of all employees to be confirmed by the Senate, will undoubtedly operate to slow down and hamper greatly the splendid work which this great enterprise has been performing.

I am especially interested because the district which I represent lies entirely within the jurisdiction of the T. V. A. As a matter of fact my district probably gives birth to more rivers than any one district in the United States. These rivers are born high up under the stretches of the Blue Ridge and within the great Unaka Range of the Appalachians, and contribute very largely to the waters of the Tennessee River.

The French Broad River on the eastern side of my district drains a number of counties and is a great river itself. The Pigeon, on the westward, and the Tuckaseegee, uniting with the Little Tennessee, contribute vast floods of water. To the extreme west, the Hiawassee and all of its tributaries again contribute a mighty flood to the Tennessee.

I wish, in this short statement, to call the attention of the House directly to some of the great things the T. V. A. has accomplished, and is now accomplishing, and especially in the splendid manner it has contributed to farming, soil conservation, schools, and hundreds of other enterprises of great value to our local interests.

High in the mountains of North Carolina a towering dam is being rushed to completion today. Within the next few months it will be finished, and a majestic barrier made by man will hold back the tumbling waters of the Little Tennessee. The power of the river will begin to work for men. It will go to war,

carried out on high transmission lines to keep great war-production plants going at accelerated speed.

Fontana Dam will be the highest dam east of the Rocky Mountains. The mountain lake behind it will provide a recreation area unmatched in beauty from coast to coast. It will be an asset to my State and to the Nation, as it takes its majestic place in the T. V. A. system. This is not the first dam T. V. A. has built in western North Carolina. It is the fourth and largest. Already Hiawassee and Apalachia Dams in Cherokee County and Chatuge in Clay County, all on the Hiawassee River, have been built as parts of the T. V. A. system which now controls the waters of the Tennessee and its tributaries. Fontana is the only one now under construction.

Almost 5,000 men are working up in the mountains to finish this vast structure. It is in a remote section. A town had to be built, living and recreation facilities and medical attention provided. T. V. A. builds its dams by "force account." They are not let out under contract. The Board of T. V. A. is responsible for every step of progress. They design the dams, buy the land, purchase the materials. They select and train the employees. They do the total job. Congress and the people can hold them responsible.

We do hold them responsible. They have met every test. That is why I want to add my voice to the mighty chorus saying "the McKellar amendments shall not pass." I am against these amendments; my people are against them; the country is against them, because they would destroy the magnificent organization of the T. V. A. It would no longer be administered down in the valley, close to the people, as it is now. It would be managed from up here in Washington. Its staff would no longer be chosen, as it is chosen now, solely on merit. Think of this result. If the McKellar amendments were adopted, on July 1 every single engineer working on Fontana Dam would be relieved of his responsibility if he earns more than $4,500 a year. His services would be terminated. And completion of one of the world's most spectacular feats of engineering, essential to the prosecution of the war, would be in jeopardy while the men who are running the job courted the favor on which patronage is granted. No such proposal will ever be agreed to by this House. It is outrageous that it is even presented for consideration of the conferees.

I do not know the States in which those men were born and reared, where they were educated, where they vote, or whom they vote for. I know the job those men are doing. They are doing it under enormous difficulties, and they are a credit to the Government service. They are responsible for the safety of the men who are engaged in this most hazardous undertaking. They are responsible for the future safety of the people living in the area below the dam. The way that job is done is very important. It is important that when the construction crews pull out of the district I represent, when the land buyers have finished their job, and the engineers have gone—it will be important then that the building of that dam shall have contributed to the well-being of the community and shall not have sapped its vitality and strength. We know what to expect from T. V. A. Local labor is always used where it is available.

When T. V. A. comes into a district to do any sort of job, the Member who represents that district can be assured that from the smallest unit upward there will be a resurgence of vitality in local government. The roots of democracy will be nourished. Let no man underestimate the importance of what I am saying. There is nothing more important for our Nation's future than to discover ways in which the National Government can so carry out its policies that local government is strengthened. Every Member knows that this is not always true of Federal projects—even of projects which are essential and in themselves of very great potential value. It is no uncommon thing that such confusion and irritation develops in connection with a Government program of land acquisition that the citizens immediately concerned are weary and disheartened. It is no uncommon thing to pay a price for Federal benefits by weakened muscles in local units of government.

That does not happen when T. V. A. goes in to do a job. Every Member from the Valley is proud of the imposing dams and beautiful lakes the T. V. A. has made. The whole Nation is proud of T. V. A.'s record in war production. But those dams might have been built and operated, the power system might have been created, and the agricultural program might have been carried out in such a way as to impair the fundamental basis of democracy—the participation of the people in the decisions of their Government. That is what excites my special pride in T. V. A. I am proud of the way this agency of Government has worked with the people. No wonder it has the people's support.

In 1933, in the basic act, Congress authorized the board of T. V. A. to cooperate with local agencies. That has been done with magnificent success. Let me use some of the activities in connection with the building of Fontana Dam to illustrate exactly what I mean. When T. V. A. had to recruit almost five thousand men to build this war project in a remote area, it had not only to provide living facilities, but to take care of their health and welfare in such a way as to guarantee sustained production and maximum efficiency.

No one would have criticized the Authority if it had done the job alone. Such services are a part of every construction job, a part of its cost. It is easier usually for the responsibility management to do those things alone. The difference between the way T. V. A. handles such problems and the way they are usually managed is because to T. V. A. the construction of a dam, no matter how magnificent, is never an end in itself. T. V. A. is not building dams. It is building a region. The dams are only one means to an end.

T. V. A. recognized that local health problems would be created by the building of Fontana, beyond the routine and emergency health problems of its resident employees. So they entered into a contract with the North Carolina Health Department. Our State and local health officials were not shut out. They are made a part of the Health and Sanitation program of T. V. A. When the dam is finished, they will be stronger, their services more efficient, than before the T. V. A. began its work.

Schools had to be built for the children of the men who came to work there. If T. V. A. had followed customary procedure, had built and operated a school while the dam was under construction, to tear it down when the job was done, it would have been a legitimate cost of construction. But it would not have helped our local institutions at all. This is what T. V. A. did. It built a building, just as any construction company would have had to do. It is a combination elementary and high school, and more than 800 children were in attendance this year. But that school is operated by the Graham County Board of Education and the State of North Carolina under a contract with T. V. A. Children from the immediate area attend. T. V. A. provides a supplement to the funds available from State and county sources for teacher salaries and improved instructional materials. State and local educational services will be improved when the men who built the dam pull out. The area will be stronger. The expense to the Federal Government is no more, and the benefit to our local institutions is incalculable.

Even the extensive program of employee training is conducted at Fontana Dam in cooperation with the Graham County Board of Education and the State department of education. It includes craft apprenticeship, by which unskilled workmen are trained for journeymen positions, and a variety of training activities for public safety officers, craft journeymen, clerical employees, engineering employees, typists and stenographers, waitresses, and other groups. It is a wonderful experience for that county board to have. Graham County will profit in the future.

T. V. A. proceeded the same way with library service. Instead of providing books for the men who work on the dam and taking them away when the men are gone, T. V. A. entered into a contract with the Nantahala Library Board, located at Murphy, N. C. Funds from Federal, from State, and local sources were pooled to provide library service not only at the site of construction, for which T. V. A. was solely responsible, but in the six county rural areas in which the employees are located. I am confident that when the dam is finished, this fine rural library service will continue to be maintained, supported by local funds alone. That has been the experience in other reservoir areas. Local public services have been improved, the lives of citizens have been permanently enriched because these dams are built the T. V. A. way.

This strengthening of local institutions goes all the way through the T. V. A.

program. Contracts have been entered into with the State department of conservation and development to assure the maximum development and full utilization for the people of the recreational potentialities of this great program. Joint surveys of mineral deposits have been undertaken with the same State agency. Roads have been relocated, trees planted, parks developed, and a great agricultural program has been undertaken, all in cooperation with State and local agencies.

In 64 North Carolina counties, 3,175 individual farmers are participating in the test-demonstration program inaugurated by T. V. A. In addition, 3,184 farmers are participating in area demonstrations. They are trying out the improved types of fertilizer produced by T. V. A. at Muscle Shoals. They are changing their whole farm management, adopting practices which will increase their food production, raise their incomes, and at the same time improve their soil. The program is sponsored jointly by T. V. A., the United States Department of Agriculture, and the North Carolina State College.

T. V. A. might have gone about this program in another way. It might have done it in such a way that soil fertility was improved but the responsibility of the people was diminished. They went about it the right way. All over the country farmers met together. The program was explained to them. One of their own number was selected to be the demonstrator. He took a risk. T. V. A. agreed to supply the fertilizer free, but the farmer had to pay the freight and to agree to purchase the other minerals recommended for his soil. The State and Federal agencies agreed to furnish him the best farm management advice available, to help him meet his individual problems. The farmer agreed on his part to follow that advice, to take some acres out of cotton and corn, to plant them to pasture. He had to build fences, buy livestock, borrow money sometimes. He had to agree to keep books, to let his neighbors use his farm as a schoolroom.

Such programs are going on now in 28 States. Members from Texas to Minnesota, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, have seen results in their district. Measured in increased land fertility, food production, and farm income, the program has been overwhelmingly successful. I want to measure it in other terms. I want to point out what it means to this democracy that State and local agencies had a full share of participation, that the cooperating farmers took responsibility for the job themselves.

This program could have been done another way. It could have been done for, not with and by, the farmers. The results to the land might have been the same. But the results to democracy would not have been alike. Every farmer who took the risk of participating in the program initially did it not only for himself but to benefit his neighbor and his Nation. He took public responsibility for so conducting his private business that his community and his country might be enriched. I think this is the greatest demonstration in democracy I have ever seen. Our sons and their sons will profit. A new sense of responsibility, a new sense of the relationship between an individual citizen, his neighbors, and his country as a whole has been developed.

This is a bigger dividend than any soil-conservation program has ever paid before, fine as those programs have been. T. V. A.'s unique contribution to our democratic history lies in this essential. It has given a demonstration of how the people and local institutions can be made stronger, and not weakened, when a Federal program is undertaken. Because I believe so deeply in democratic principles, I will fight these McKellar amendments. Of course, they will be defeated. If they were adopted, the keystone of the arch supporting T. V. A. would be gone, and this great experiment in decentralization would be destroyed.

We must never destroy it. We must study its methods and urge their application elsewhere. In the future, as at the present, I want the letters T. V. A. to stand as a symbol of honest, efficient Government administration, a symbol of what can be accomplished in a democracy when the Government and the people work together.

Servicemen Should Have Priority Rights in Securing Surplus Equipment of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to give returning servicemen priority rights in acquiring surplus equipment of the armed forces, such as jeeps, trucks, tractors, bulldozers, and other items of material which can well be adapted to civilian uses. In my judgment, such a measure will add materially to the practical readjustment in civilian life of those veterans whose occupations or pursuits require the use of such equipment. Heretofore, it has been the policy of our Government to dispose of excess equipment and supplies in large blocks to commercial bidders and dealers who would in turn peddle it to the public at a tremendous profit. None of us want that situation to develop after this war. Furthermore, we do not want such materials turned over to foreign governments for the use and benefit of the citizens of those countries. The boy who used a jeep in defense of his country ought to have first right to acquire it when he returns. That is the basic philosophy of this bill.

When the House World War Veterans Committee, of which I am a member, was considering the so-called G. I. bill for returning veterans, I proposed an amendment which would have accomplished this result. It was thought, however, that the subject matter could best be covered in separate legislation which is the reason I have taken it up in this manner. The benefits extended thereunder would be alternative to those provided under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The procedure necessary to carry out the provisions of this measure is comparatively simple. Each serviceman will be given a credit of $40 per month for each month of service in this country and $60 per month for each month of service outside the continental limits of the United States. The maximum credit in any case will be $1,500. As a practical matter it would work as follows: If a man served 10 months in this country, he would have a credit of $400 and could obtain equipment up to that amount by merely presenting his credit certificate. If the property he wanted cost more than that amount, he could obtain it by simply paying the difference.

It will be noted that credit and priority between veterans are given on the basis of length of service with additional credit for time spent overseas. This is the only fair method of computing such credit. It should be clearly stated at this point, however, that this is not a plan for adjusted compensation nor is it to be considered as a substitute for adjusted compensation. It is simply a sound and sensible arrangement to dispose of the excess equipment of the armed forces by giving the veterans who used such equipment during the war the first chance to use it after peace is declared. Furthermore, it protects the returning soldier from the profits of the dealer and the speculator, who would otherwise buy this material for resale knowing that the serviceman would be in the market to take it off his hands.

Mr. Speaker, there is hardly a farm boy in the services today who would not be tickled to death to take a jeep or a truck back home with him. It is something he can put to practical use the day he gets home if he so desires. There are thousands of servicemen who left businesses which they will want to reestablish when they get back and there are any number of items of material of this type which he can use advantageously in making a fresh start. The boys who use the equipment for business or agricultural pursuits should, of course, be given the first opportunity to get it. After that there is another class of serviceman who should not be overlooked, namely, the boy who simply wants an item of this equipment for his own personal use and enjoyment when he gets back home.

This legislation merely provides for one additional phase of the readjustment program which Congress ought to provide for veterans returning to civilian life. This program ought to be completed before the war is over so that immediately upon discharge a veteran will

be able to immediately adopt that part of such program which best fits his plans for the future.

Congress should have no hesitancy in passing this legislation at the earliest possible moment.

Freedom, a Priceless Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a Memorial Day address delivered by the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, at Ford's Theater, now known as the National Lincoln Museum, under the auspices of the National Capital Parks and the Lincoln Group, of Washington, D. C.:

The recognition accorded me to be your speaker on this memorable occasion in this historic place is acknowledged and greatly appreciated.

It is springtime again. The beauty of flowers fills the land. The flag is at half mast. It is Memorial Day—a day of memories. With heads bowed reverently and respectfully, Americans gather today to honor the Nation's dead and recall the unselfish devotion and sacrifice they rendered that the Nation might live.

Yonder on the inspiring dome of the Nation's Capitol, kissed by the sun of day and watched by the stars at night, floats the unconquered flag of the land our honored dead preserved for us. The real significance of Memorial Day is to remind us of the ideals and principles for which they gave their lives, and rededicate ourselves to those principles. They are sacred to us. They will remain so as long as each succeeding generation of Americans honor the supreme virtue of manhood.

It was the report of Mrs. John A. Logan to her husband General Logan, Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, of her visit to the battlefields near Richmond and Petersburg, Va., in 1868 from which Memorial Day originated. In the church yard near Petersburg she observed the graves of Confederate soldiers upon which were faded Confederate flags and withered flowers, placed there by loving hands in memory of their dead. She informed him that she had never been so touched as she was by that scene. General Logan said it was a beautiful revival of the custom of the ancients in thus preserving the memory of the dead, and thereafter issued the first order for decorating the graves of Union soldiers.

"If other eyes grow dull and other hands slack, and other hearts cold in the solemn trust, ours shall keep it well, as long as the light and warmth of life remain in us." So read the order for the first Memorial Day, May 5, 1868, and which has since become national policy by law.

It is most fitting and proper that we should hold a memorial service here in historic Ford's Theatre, a national shrine, where the immortal Lincoln gave his life that the Nation might live. More than four score years ago he posed a question at Gettysburg which prompts itself again to us today, in this day and generation. It wrung the hearts of men in his day, and they died willingly to answer it.

"Can a nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, long endure?"

A crucial test was at hand when that question was asked. More than 80 years have passed since then. It is 1944. A crucial test is again at hand. The destiny of our Republic and the future of the world may be hanging in the balance. D-day is awaited with anxiety, dread, apprehension, but with a feeling of ultimate victory.

We are now engaged in the most colossal struggle the world has ever seen. Our day is filled with momentous and stirring events, both at home and abroad. On every sea and every continent the wide world round our heroic fighting men and women are yielding the last full measure of devotion in the hope of answering the question that Lincoln asked at Gettysburg in 1863, namely, can a nation conceived and dedicated to freedom long endure?

When Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg I do not believe he thought this Nation would be destroyed from without. Could it endure from within must have prompted the question he asked. We may well wonder whether he foresaw down the corridor of time a day when certain people would band together in this country, under a political label, as they have, to overthrow the Government conceived in liberty by force, violence, and bloodshed, if necessary.

Here where the torch of liberty was ignited and lifted so high that its blessed ray spread over the earth and held out hope to the oppressed of all the world, it is incredible that people could enjoy its safety, protection, and opportunities, and at the same time plan its destruction from within. It is difficult to understand the human equation which can share the privileges, protection, and safety of a free government and at the same time work to overthrow the institutions that benefit them.

That the Nation may long endure, we are now laying upon the altar of freedom our entire resources. Everything we possess as a people has been pledged to the winning of the war. In our war effort labor and industry, agriculture and business have achieved results far beyond our expectations and to the amazement and consternation of our enemies. Every bond issue has been oversubscribed and the coming Fifth War loan will receive the same generous response from our people. Everything will be done that can be done to end this war quickly and successfully. We cannot do more. We shall not do less.

Today our Nation faces the gravest danger since it gained its independence. This is the greatest war in our history. Should Germany and Japan win and establish their "new order," our Republic will be but a memory and freedom will have vanished from this earth. In Hitler's dream, the rights of the individual and minorities do not exist. The state is supreme. The principles set forth in our Constitution are null and void and men are not endowed with certain inalienable rights and governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

This conception of power is not new. The enslavement of people was old in the reign of David, King of Israel. In the Book of Psalms will be found the following:

"The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his annointed, saying

"Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." (Psalms ii: 2–3.)

And the Lord spake unto David, saying:

"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

"Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." (Psalms ii: 8–9.)

"For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous; but the way of the ungodly shall perish." (Psalms i: 6.)

This scriptural reference should strengthen our faith, renew our courage and assist us in facing the great task remaining before us; and that task is answering Lincoln's question,

"Can a nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, long endure?"

Thus we renew our pledge today to our heroic fighting men wherever they may be, that this Nation under God shall long endure. America makes a solemn vow today that the Star Spangled Banner will be waving over the same institutions of freedom, justice, and opportunity when they return as it did when they marched away. Let us, like Lincoln, have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it. Let Americans pledge anew today that they will be on guard against any and all subversive groups within our gates by whatever name they are known in any attempt by them to change or destroy our heritage of freedom.

The underlying idea of our Government does not need change, for truth is always unchanging and eternal. This was so when the morning stars sang together and will be so when time shall be no more. Our form of government is a republic from the bottom up and not from the top down. We are witnessing a dangerous trend to forget that. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. the truism in that phrase has been applicable so many times in the history of this Nation that the frequency of its usage has made it trite. As a free people we must recognize and assume our responsibilities at all times in war and in peace. The people must not be complacent.

That we have a Government where the people rule is no guaranty that we will always have it unless the people so resolve and courageously defend it. Despite the fact that human freedom is guaranteed in our historic Bill of Rights, it is necessary today to remind our people again to be on guard against a growing threat to their liberties, a threat from within as well as the attack from without. To lose at home what our brave and heroic men are fighting and dying to preserve while struggling abroad would mean that this seventy-sixth Memorial Day celebration might be the last one. It would mean that the Nation's dead had died in vain. It would mean that a nation like ours, conceived in freedom, could not long endure. It would mean that government of the people would vanish from the earth. It would mean that we, the living, had broken faith with the dead.

To save our liberties and our homes, we, therefore, ask a just God to use us as his instrument in "trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored." Let this be the battle hymn of today.

May this Republic never forget the blood, tears, and suffering of those we remember today for preserving intact for us every principle of freedom and justice embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. If the time should ever come when we no longer remember what they did for us, in that day the Republic will no longer deserve preservation and the last and best hope of man—freedom to rule himself—will have perished from the earth.

We are living in dark days of great danger to our Republic. Peril still confronts us. We should be thankful that the present hour is not as black as it was. Our enemies have won battles, but the United Nations are winning the war. England has boasted that "the sun never sets on the British Empire."

That statement is true. It is also true that today and hereafter the sun will never set on the graves of our heroic dead. They sleep on every continent, on the islands of the sea, and beneath the waves—that we, the people, may enjoy freedom and govern ourselves.

I repeat, we are living in critical days. Generations before us also lived in critical days. The Nation has had other critical periods in its history. In more than 150 years that have passed since our beginning, we have met and mastered every crisis and national emergency. It is true we have had our Valley Forges, but Yorktowns always followed. In this global war we had our Pearl Harbor, but we are having our notable victories in Africa, Europe, and in the Pacific. Hours of national darkness have been followed by the dawn of triumph because our cause has been the cause of righteousness and unselfishness.

Although there have been times when the "plow stood still in the field of promise and the brave began to fear the power of man and the pious to doubt the favor of God," our heritage of liberty has thus far been preserved.

The first three words of the preamble to the Constitution of the United States are "We the people." Not only must we, the people, shoulder our duty and responsibility to the service men and women of the Nation in giving them united support in their efforts in the present colossal conflict but let we, the people, be ever alert and vigilant when this war ceases to bring about a peace which will insure to future generations their existence without the horrors and burdens of war.

We can well paraphrase Lincoln's Gettysburg Address with seeming fitness for this occasion:

Now we are engaged in a great global war; testing whether this Nation, or any nation, conceived and dedicated to the proposition that all men (and women) are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights that make them equal in the sight of a just God can long endure; testing, perhaps forever, whether representative government is but a pleasant dream or an enduring realism. Our meeting in this hallowed hall today is to pay tribute to the memory of our noble dead who suffered and died that you and I might live under that realism.

But in a larger sense it is for us the living to be dedicated anew to the unfinished task thus far so nobly advanced.

It is for us the living again on this Memorial Day to take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

It is for us, the living, to again highly resolve that these honored dead in every clime and country on earth shall not have died in vain.

Memorial Day is and should be a solemn occasion for all of us. We implore a merciful God that our hero dead shall not have died in vain; that this priceless legacy of liberty and self-government, inherited by us from those who have gone before, may in like manner be handed on by us to our posterity, neither weakened by neglect nor harmed by violence, in order that freedom's flag may wave forever

"O'er the land of the free
And the home of the brave."

Soldiers, living and dead, we shall keep faith with you in order that here on this Western Hemisphere liberty shall be preserved and the Constitution shall be revered. In God we trust.

God helping us, may our Republic bloom forever, the symbol of justice and equality, of honor and integrity, and of virtue and righteousness until time shall be no more.

"Go back to sleep, heroic men;
We shall keep faith with you."

Demonstrated Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Antigo Journal, of Antigo, Wis.:

DEMONSTRATED FITNESS

Perhaps some of us may have forgotten it, or even overlooked it, but it was not until our local vocational school began its program of retraining older workers and training younger ones that the problem of unemployment began to abate in this community. Up to that time the W. P. A. and N. Y. A. had their projects of various kinds, but the employment they could give was of the stopgap variety for the most part, and no progress was being made by them toward getting men and women into private employment. In their final phases these organizations did participate in financing the expenses of those taking training, but it was possible to continue it without their participation.

What we observed here in Antigo went on, to a greater or lesser degree, all over the country later on. It is now generally admitted that the vocational schools have done and are doing an excellent job, and one which contributes mightily toward victory. One could ask no better endorsement than the fact that the war industries themselves have entrusted a large part of their training program to these schools, paying the students while learning.

At the close of the war retraining of another kind, for employment in peacetime industries and occupations will be essential to solving the problem of demobilized soldiers and war industry workers. Here again the vocational schools are the best equipped for the task, not counting, of course, preparation for the professions and other callings requiring collegiate standards.

Their students will have to be not only those who have certain skills, but also those who have acquired none and "got by" in holding down jobs because of the labor shortages. After the war the labor market will again become competitive, and the inefficient, indifferently prepared worker will not be able to find any but the least desirable jobs. The public will not tolerate low standards in merchandise when they can get better, so the employer cannot afford to keep workers who produce only substandard goods.

Training of this kind should be offered and accepted before the day of demobilization. It should expand as rapidly as training for war work abates, and the vocational schools, not some new political plum-tree organization should be the ones to provide it.

This editorial offers a suggestion well worth considering. Schools must prepare now for a post-war training program. The vocational schools have contributed much toward our war production program by training men and women for skilled war work and these same institutions have the facilities available for training people to take their proper places in the post-war era. The importance of vocational training for business, industry, and security in the future merits the consideration of the Congress in connection with educational legislation.

Moorhead, Minn., Scene of Largest Output of Onion Sets in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, when thousands of victory gardeners in the United States plant their onion beds this spring, they will be using onion sets produced in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I am privileged to represent in Congress.

I say this because we boast of having in our district the largest individual growers of onion sets in the world. This big farm is just outside the city of Moorhead, Minn., and is operated by our fine citizens, Charles Peterson and his sons Henry and Robert, more affectionately known as Hank and Bob.

Because of the astounding production of onion sets on the Peterson farm, the press recently sent a writer there to look over this industry, since throughout the United States the people are not only crying with onions when they can get them, but because of the scarcity they are crying for onions.

The following article, describing this unusual enterprise, recently appeared in the Fargo (N. Dak.) Daily Forum:

Enough set onions to supply 175,000 Victory gardens have been shipped from Moorhead in the past 2 months. That's a lot of onions.

But there are that many left and they'll be distributed throughout the Red River Valley and the Northwest.

The product comes off the Charles Peterson and sons truck farm at the outskirts of Moorhead. They claim to be the largest individual growers of onion sets in the world.

HAVE THE RECORDS

That's covering a lot of territory, but the Petersons show you the records.

True, Moorhead isn't the largest shipping point in the world for set onions, but you'll not find any individual farm anywhere that can approach the 25 acres planted and harvested in 1943 by the Petersons, unless their records are in error.

The Dutch Valley Growers Association of South Holland, Ill., ships about 300 carloads a year. But the acreages of the individual member growers run from 3 to 10.

There are other areas in the United States, too, where set onions are grown, but these also comprise farms of relatively small acreage.

FIRST FROM MOORHEAD

Here's how the Petersons figure that the four carloads they have shipped (incidentally they were the first such shipments from Moorhead) will supply 175,000 Victory gardens.

The shipments totaled about 175,000 pounds and the average Victory gardener purchases about a pound for his needs. Those set onions are the ones that supply those tender young onions that grace your table in season.

On the 25 acres planted last year the Petersons harvested approximately 10,000 bushels, or an average yield of about 400 bushels to the acre. They are specialists in their line. The land is scientifically fertilized and a water system helps keep the soil in prime condition—that's the answer to the big yields.

Such a crop must be cared for scientifically, for the seed that goes into the ground isn't bought for nothing—it costs $4.50 a pound. Figuring about 40 pounds to the acre, that means an investment in seed alone of $4,500.

JOB NOT DONE

But the job doesn't end there. Some 200 to 250 toppers were employed in the field—they pull the onions from the ground and remove the tops—the harvest taking about 2 weeks. The onion sets are placed in bags and left in the field for a time to cure. Then they are trucked to the warehouse and spread thinly in trays, each tray containing from ¾ to 2 bushels. The trays are stacked and left to dry.

Beginning in January the job of cleaning and sacking the sets began.

The Petersons have a large seed cleaning machine, electrically operated, in the warehouse. The trays are dumped into a hopper and the onions are carried up a conveyor through a blower, where the dried skins, dirt, and other chaff are separated and the sets are dropped through small chutes into open-mesh 32-pound bags.

EIGHT MEN ON MACHINE

Eight men are employed in the crew operating the machine. Two of them, one on each side, fill the sacks. Then two others tie the tops of the bags, taking three stitches with a large needle. They must work fast, for the machine will fill two sacks every 15 seconds.

This job done, the sacks are piled in the warehouse awaiting shipment.

Many things can go wrong between planting time and the sacking operations—yes, even after the onions are on their way to their destination. But it has proven a profitable operation and the Petersons will expand the business 50 percent in 1944.

PLAN YEAP AHEAD

You've got to plan far ahead, too, for the right kind of seed is not easy to obtain. The Moorhead growers purchase their seed on contract a year ahead—they already have the 1945 supply on hand. Their seed comes from California and is composed of the Australian Brown and Ebenezer strains.

One carload of sets was shipped to Chicago earlier this year, another went to Billings, Mont., and two were dispatched to Kansas City, Mo. Another carload will be shipped soon.

And after the war the Petersons may try a new wrinkle. Then, when you buy your onion sets for your peace garden you'll probably find them packed in neat cellophane bags—1 pound to the bag.

Appropriation for Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. JEFFREY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 1944

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice should be approved.

Many of the practices of the present Committee have been of questionable value. Indeed, in many instances it is perhaps true that the activity of the Committee has been harmful rather than helpful.

Nevertheless, the principle involved is both fundamental and right. It is the function of this Government to promote the welfare of all of its citizens. Such activity must include the interests of every group, race, and creed within our population.

It is useless to blink the fact that a problem exists for members of the colored race. Political freedom cannot long exist without economic freedom, and freedom for the entire Nation is endangered so long as freedom for a few is denied or impaired.

The problem of full opportunity for employment is not serious at the present time. All of us hope that at the conclusion of the war, widespread opportunity to work will remain. But now is the time to plan for the post-war period and one important phase in such planning must be full and free opportunity to work for all of our people.

Legislation cannot cure all of the difficulties which exist. But legislation honestly and wisely administered can point the way and help to remove some of the difficulties which beset us today.

To help plan for the adjustments which necessarily will arise in the post-war period, I urge the appropriation of funds for this Committee.

General Logan's Order for Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of General Logan's order for Memorial Day as published in the Murphysboro Independent which sets out the fact that Carbondale, Ill., was one of the first towns to observe a Memorial Day:

GENERAL LOGAN'S ORDER FOR MEMORIAL DAY

The first informal Memorial Day exercises for the dead of the Civil War were held in Carbondale but many do not remember that the first official order for the Nation to honor the memory of its heroes was the order of the day that Gen. John A. Logan issued as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic.

General Logan issued the following order in 1868 to the departments of the organization:

HEADQUARTERS, GRAND ARMY
OF THE REPUBLIC,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1868.

GENERAL ORDER NO. 11.

I

The 30th day of May 1868 is designated for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country during the late rebellion and those bodies lie in almost every city, village, and hamlet churchyard in the land. In this observance no form or ceremony is prescribed, but posts and comrades will in their own way arrange such fitting services and testimonials of respect as circumstances may permit.

We are organized, comrades, as our regulations tell us, for the purpose among other things "of preserving and strengthening those kind fraternal feelings which have bound together soldiers, sailors, and marines, who united to suppress the late rebellion." What can add more to assure this result than by cherishing tenderly the memory of our heroic dead, who made their breasts a barricade between our country and its foes? Their soldier lives were the reveille of freedom to a race in chains and their deaths a tattoo of rebellious tyranny in arms. We should guard their graves with sacred vigilance. All that the concentrated wealth and taste of the Nation can add to their adornment and security is but a fitting tribute to the memory of her slain defenders. Let no wanton foot tread rudely on such hallowed grounds. Let pleasant paths invite the coming and going of reverent visitors and fond mourners. Let no vandalism of avarice or neglect, no ravages of time testify to the present or to the coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and undivided republic.

If our eyes grow dull and other hands slack, and other hearts cold in the solemn trust, ours shall keep it well as long as the light and warmth of life remains to us.

Let us then, at the time appointed, gather around their sacred remains and garland the passionless mounds above them with the choicest flowers of springtime; let us raise above them the dear old flag they saved from dishonor; let us in their solemn presence renew our pledges to aid and assist those whom they have left among us a sacred charge upon the Nation's gratitude—the soldier's and sailor's widow and orphan.

II

It is the purpose of the Commander in Chief to inaugurate this observance with the hope that it will be kept up from year to year, while a survivor of the war remains to honor the memory of his departed comrades. He earnestly desires the public to call attention to this order, and lend its friendly aid in bringing it to the notice of comrades in all parts of the country in time for simultaneous compliance therewith.

III

Department commanders will use every effort to make this order effective. By command of

JOHN A. LOGAN,
Commander in Chief.

America—1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. George J. Burger, publisher of the National Independent, I extend an editorial published in the third anniversary issue:

AMERICA—1944

A TRIBUTE TO THE NATION'S CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES ON SMALL BUSINESS AND A SALUTE TO SMALL BUSINESSMEN OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENT ENTERPRISE

For more than 150 years independent business enterprise has been serving and building and making America big and strong and great as a nation. Down through the years millions upon millions of American small

businessmen have struggled through and survived frequent wars and panics and catastrophic business upheavals. Independent enterprise has survived all the pitfalls of the past because America is free and independent. It will continue to survive all man-made disasters as long as America continues as a free and independent nation.

In the prosecution of America's cause, in the present world-wide struggle, every man, woman, and child has a duty to perform, and a stake in the war and the peace to come. Likewise, men and women of industry and business—big and small—have a stake in the wartime industry and business of America, and in the post-war opportunities.

The stress and strain of the present war have placed big business in virtual control of the Nation's production line. Without authority from the people—or the Government—big business has seized upon this wartime opportunity to confiscate the industry and the business of the country. Working behind the scenes, while serving in the war effort, big business is charting its own future course at the expense of the Nation's independent business enterprise, resulting in a state of confusion unprecedented in the entire history of the country.

On account of the tactics used by big business in manipulating the industry and business of the Nation while engaging in the war effort, fate is forcing small business to fight for survival, while it also is making generous contribution to the war's successful prosecution. Small business is doing this in an efficient, upright, and an honest manner. In fact, the straightforward way in which the Nation's small business is cooperating with all branches, all departments, and all agencies of the Federal Government is a genuine credit to the country's small businessmen—and a shining, clean-cut example of the will and the resourcefulness of American independent enterprise.

Millions of America's men and women are off to the four corners of the earth fighting to the death, fighting for the permanent preservation of America—"Land of the Free, Home of the Brave." Millions of men and women are fighting to save big business, fighting to save small business, fighting to save every man, woman, and child.

If the Nation is to come out of the war a winner, fair play all around is a prime necessity. It is the duty of big business, it is the duty of small business, it is the duty of every man, woman, and child in America to protect and preserve those American institutions which millions of men and women are now fighting and dying to protect and preserve. These are fundamentals that cannot be denied.

What is fundamental is one thing and what is practiced is quite another thing. It is true enough that big business is in virtual control of the Nation's production line. It is true enough that big business is helping in the war effort. And it is true enough that big business is helping itself at one and the same time.

On the other hand, it is evident that big business, instead of helping, is hurting small business; instead of protecting, is destroying American institutions such as it deems no longer necessary to its selfish scheme of things; destroying in particular the 150-year-old institution of American independent enterprise.

This is America-1944 on the home fronts of industry and business. At this very moment big business is planning gigantic post-war projects taking into account conquest of national markets in the America of tomorrow. The post-war plans of big business, as announced in the public press, openly declare its intention and determination to forge ahead along its own self-determined lines, regardless of what may happen to the stake of small business, regardless of what may happen to the stake of every man and woman of the Nation's armed services, regardless of what may happen to the stake of every man, woman, and child in America, the stake of "all for one and one for all," in the war and in the peace and in the future opportunities of life.

Although the wealth and power and resources of American independent enterprise greatly exceed the wealth and power and resources of big business, the small businessmen of the country cannot adequately cope with the existing situation because they are not adequately organized to combat such gigantic and unexpected onslaughts as big business is piling upon them. Therefore, the immediate hope of small business for its survival almost entirely lies in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice are both lawfully constituted agencies of the Federal Government—charged with the responsibility of protecting small business in the same manner they are obligated to protect big business—both of these Government agencies have decreed that nothing can be done (until peacetime conditions return) to halt the steady march of business concentration now being dictated to the people of the Nation and to the Federal Government by manipulators of big business.

If it were true that nothing can be done to stem the tide of big business concentration, and if it were true that there was nothing else to do, then American independent enterprise—really and truly—would be doomed to destruction forever. However, since Pearl Harbor enough has happened to the small businessmen of the tire industry, and to other independents of other industries—to make it clear that it isn't the war but the monopoly of war that is destroying American small business, and wiping out the Nation's independent enterprise.

Had it not been for the fact that the Senate and the House Committees on Small Business—with the help of America's tire independents—made an extensive study and investigation of the rubber situation resulting from the war (January-March 1942), the Nation's motor-transportation system might have collapsed completely and endangered the whole war effort, at great sacrifice of the Nation's armed forces.

Had it not been for the fact that the Senate and the House Committees on Small Business approved a resolution (February 1942) recommending the channeling of sales and repairs of tires through independent tire dealers and rebuilders, it is likely that the dominant factors of the tire industry would by now be in complete and absolute control of all the Nation's retail tire markets—north, south, east, west—throughout the length and the breath of the land.

Had it not been for the fact that the Senate and the House Committees on Small Business recommended remedial legislation for the tire industry and sponsored enactment of the rubber-tires bill (June 1942), it is probable that many of the independents of the tire industry still open for business would have been forced to close up shop long, long ago.

As defenders of American small business, the Senate and the House Committees on Small Business are performing a great work and service for the country in a grave emergency. On this, its third anniversary of publication, the National Independent takes occasion to pay high tribute to the ability, the efforts, and the accomplishments of all the Members of Congress who also are members of the Senate and the House committees and who are diligently laboring day in and out, under tremendous handicaps, for the protection and the preservation of American small business and a continuance of American independent enterprise.

At the same time, in starting with this issue on the fourth year of its life, National Independent salutes America's tire independents and all the independents of all industries who are giving their support to the Nation's congressional small business committees and who, in doing so, are likewise rendering a great service in a grave emergency to the 136,000,000 people of America, to millions of the Nation's fighting men and women, and to the fair and just cause of American independent enterprise. How long it may live all depends on how well all small businessmen of America support the Senate and the House Committees on Small Business and how thoroughly all men of American independent enterprise are able and willing to stand up and fight.

Servicemen's Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press statement:

WASHINGTON NEWS

(By Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON)

SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS—DEPENDENCY CLASS KEY TO PAYMENTS

Recently Congress voted an increase in allowances to be paid to veterans' dependents. Since there is considerable confusion as to how these payments are made and who is eligible, I want to help clarify some of the problems of the dependents of veterans.

In general any dependent of a man or woman in the service, being paid $138 a month or less, is eligible to receive a dependent's allotment or allowance from the Government. This act applies only to the dependents of men or women in the service whose base pay is $138 a month or less. Those who get more than $138 a month come under an other system. This new act provides for monthly allotments as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72; a divorced wife with each additional child, $20. In case of alimony, a wife separated or divorced from a serviceman will receive no more than the amount fixed in a court order or decree. If the divorce or separation order does not call for alimony or separate maintenance she will not receive any allotment.

Class B dependents or where the dependency on the serviceman is less than 50 percent: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. It is important to make mention that class B dependents are classified as such because they are only partially dependent upon the servicemen or women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon the servicemen or women, 50 percent or less, they come under class B. Only $37 is given in such cases and applicants have to prove that they are dependent upon the enlisted man or woman for support.

B-1 dependents or where the dependency on the serviceman is 50 percent or more: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother

or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother and sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

Here also it is necessary for the applicant to prove 50 percent or more dependency. If the proof given is not sufficient, the dependent comes automatically under class B and gets much less. Thus, the dividing line, above or below 50 percent dependency, has an important bearing as to the amount of the allotment.

Now that many of the married men are being called into service, it is important that they make application for all allotment upon induction. The allotment payments are not retroactive, but only begin on the date that the application is filed. As a result, if the enlisted man waits 1 or 2 months, or even more, before filing his application, his dependents automatically lose that many months' allotment money. It is highly desirable that the serviceman file for his dependents' allotment the day he is inducted so that his family can be properly provided for.

If any questions arise regarding where to get allotment blanks for allotment pay, or how to make application for allotments, or if for any reason any serviceman's dependents are not now receiving their allotment from the Government, or if you know of any dependents of a serviceman who are having trouble getting their allotment, have them see the county veterans' service officer, or write me, Congressman WILLIAM STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Next article: Further Discussion of Veterans' Dependents' Allowances.

Our Departed Colleagues

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, this is the second memorial service I have attended in this House. Both were impressive. I listened to the eloquent addresses of a year ago and of today, and I observed to myself, how fitting.

I knew our deceased colleagues for only a short time and cannot appraise them like those who have known them longer. I accept the appraisal of their worth, made by their people who sent them here on the mission to serve our common country.

On the surface, it sometimes seems, there is more strife than unity, and when one falls by the wayside his place is so quickly taken by another, we forget the comrade of yesterday, in greeting the one of today. But not so. The greatest thing, in this House, is the fellowship among its Members, and their respect for each other. The strife comes from the earnestness of each to serve his country in his own way. Such fellowship cannot exist in any body of 435 Members which does not have a common purpose. If all were melted into one mass, and poured into one mould, there would emerge the image of Uncle Sam—the symbol of our united country. We remember them day by day, and on this annual occasion, show to our fellow Americans we have not forgotten.

When Columbus discovered America, he saw a light burning on the shore. It was a signal from the New World to the Old, symbolical of the light of liberty that has burned here ever since. God had erected in our country His great lighthouse of freedom—ever more. It has sent its rays to all parts of the world. It has never lost its power, but has grown increasingly bright and strong as the years roll by.

Our deceased brothers, when alive, stood guard over this gift of God, and, with us, have kept the lamps trimmed and the lower lights burning along the shore. They must be kept here else freedom and liberty would be extinguished from the earth.

Address of Hon. Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, Before Arkansas Bankers' Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Arkansas Bankers' Association, Saturday, May 24, 1944, at Hot Springs, Ark.:

The invitation to speak at your annual convention was especially pleasing to me since it enables me to discuss with you the work of my legislative committee, in which you have such a vital interest.

I am aware that there was little justification in my background and experience for my selection as a member of this important committee, but I accepted the appointment as an opportunity for service to the financial institutions of the State, many of which are in my district, where banking and commercial interests converge. Always with recognition of the fact that I have no expert knowledge of banking problems and can hardly aspire to it, I have undertaken to be helpful to you and to the hundreds of thousands of citizens with whom you do business.

Trends in Federal legislation was chosen as my subject because it is broad enough to embrace all of the problems with which I wish to deal.

An expression which has rich significance to lawyers is that of "due process of law." Our confidence in government depends almost entirely upon the repect which those in authority manifest for this principle. It has come to have rather a limited and technical meaning in a judicial sense but has broader implications with which the country is becoming increasingly concerned.

Due process should include the making of laws, as well as their execution. The process by which laws are made has never received the attention that it deserves. If the procedure by which legislative proposals are advanced, considered, and acted upon is inadequate, the results cannot be satisfactory.

I am thinking not only of the parliamentary requirements in lawmaking, but of the ferment of ideas, the exchange of thoughts among the people themselves, which must precede legislative enactments. Statutory law is not really law without this preliminary process. Sir Henry Main must have had this in mind when he said, "Social opinion must always be in advance of law, and the greater or less happiness of the people depends upon the narrowness of the gulf between them." Genuine law—good law—evolves from the judgments of the people. We must be on the alert, and strive to eliminate any lag in the legislative declaration that a public judgment has been reached upon an issue.

But to get down to specific legislation—the Seventy-eighth Congress has enacted few measures directly affecting banking operations. Omitting the appropriations, less than a half dozen bills affecting banks and the agencies of government subject to our committee's jurisdiction were passed in 1943. From your standpoint, I assume that the bill relieving you of insurance assessments upon deposits resulting from the sale of Government bonds is most important. From the standpoint of our total economy I should say that legislation dealing with price control is of chief interest.

The Brown bill which would have the effect of nullifying regulation Q promulgated late last year by the Federal Reserve Board was recommended by our committee, was passed by the House and is now pending in the Senate. I shall make no predictions concerning possible action on the bill, but I am prepared to defend the House's action. Our approval of the measure illustrates that practical, as distinguished from theoretical, considerations often determine a decision. The effect of regulation Q upon country banks of the South and certain States in the West was graphically presented to the committee, and we were convinced that its enforcement would work extreme hardship upon hundreds of these institutions.

The committee members fully appreciate the place that the country bank occupies in the economic life of the communities. We know how important it is that the banks be given every possible assistance in maintaining their earnings, and it was evident from the testimony presented to us that enforcement of regulation Q would mean a reduction in earnings for these banks and, on the other hand, that the suspension would not prove a hardship to anyone. We cannot do for the country banks all that some might hope for, yet we are very desirous of helping in a material way. The almost unanimous approval of Mr. Brown's bill evidences a friendly and cooperative attitude toward the smaller banks.

Our committee's biggest responsibility is that of passing upon the extension of the Price Control Act. We have been conducting hearings for more than a month and have covered the entire subject of inflation controls and their impact upon our economy. No group appreciates more than you do the imperative necessity of continuing the price-control law without substantial change.

At the outset the committee assured everyone that opportunity would be given all groups to present their views. It can truly be said that we have fully explored the effects of the law and the O. P. A. regulations. While we do not feel that many changes should be made, many of us believe that some amendments are necessary and that it will be possible to improve and perfect this legislation as we proceed with the war program. The extension will probably not be for more than another year, although it is universally

agreed that price controls will be required for a period after the war.

We must be mindful that the peak of World War No. 1 inflation was not reached until 2 years after the armistice. However, periodical extensions will give Congress an opportunity to study administrative weaknesses and to investigate fully the agency's activities.

I think I can safely predict that this year we will make some improvements in court procedures authorized by the act and that some of the oppressive and unnecessary burdens will be eliminated. I want to make it clear, however, that many of us (a majority, I hope) are determined that the control shall not be weakened—that the line will be held—for the duration of the emergency

This will involve inconveniences and disappointments for some commodity interests which feel that administrators of O. P. A. have not been properly considerate of their problems. I do not doubt that some of these groups have just cause for complaint, but neither can I forget that their inconveniences are petty in comparison to the sacrifices of several millions of our citizens, who are risking lives and careers and families, as well as businesses, for the freedom that can only be realized in a world at peace.

In a program of the magnitude of O. P. A., it is impossible to avoid inequities. We would make a grave mistake, however, if we undertook to deal with these maladjustments legislatively. We can accomplish a great deal through our investigatory powers and our conferences with the administrative staff, but I am convinced that it would be impracticable to deal with specific commodity problems through direct Congressional action, that any attempt to do this will mean a breakdown in the whole program.

This is one of those situations that defy legislative treatment, it simply must be done administratively. Similar situations have developed in the field of tariff policy and transportation rates.

Congress in each such instance has had to delegate the authority to fix rates and schedules Real price control can be adjusted only by granting authority to the Administrator to deal with the problem. I cannot reiterate too strongly, if we fail to recognize this, if we undertake to make exceptions of specific commodities, price control will be a farce.

Bankers know, better than anyone else, of the threat of potential inflation. You are conscious of the increase in deposits in the Nation's banks from $68,225,000,000 on December 31, 1939, to $117,659,000,000 December 31, 1943. The deposits in Arkansas banks during that period went from $201,000,000 to $484,000,000.

The tremendous rise in farm income accounts for much of the growth in bank deposits. National farm cash income totaled $19,765,000,000 in 1943 compared with $11,742,000,000 in 1941. Arkansas's share in 1943 was $322,114,000—30 percent above the 1941 cash income Net income of farmers of the Nation has advanced at an even greater rate. It climbed 21 percent from 1914 to 1918, 82 percent from 1939 to 1943—this in spite of the fact that prices received by farmers went up 73 percent in World War No. 1 and only 71 percent between 1939 and 1943. Consider, too, that prices paid by farmers rose 46 percent in 1914–18, and only 21 percent in 1939–43.

This has been possible because of the phenomenal production by farmers. In World War No. 1, total farm production was off 1 percent between 1914 and 1918. It was up 19 percent between 1939 and 1943. Cotton production, down 24 percent in 1914–18, increased 12 percent in 1939–43; meat production, up 25 percent in 1914–18, rose 28 percent in 1939–43; dairy production, up a meager 4 percent in 1914–18, rose 14 percent in 1939–43; chicken and egg production did not increase in World War No. 1 but has been increased 20 percent during the present war.

An amazing record—but still a contributing factor to the inflation danger. It's an old story now that there is not sufficient civilian goods to absorb the spending surplus. This enormous oversupply of money will not bring on uncontrolled inflation unless we cause people to lose confidence that their savings will buy just as much, or more, in the future as they would today. If prices get out of line and engage in a race with wages, economic and political disaster will overtake us.

Congress cannot escape responsibility in this situation The history of disastrous inflation proves that the psychological factor is as real as other factors which produce this threat. If Congress should indicate by any one legislative act that we desire a general price rise, nothing can possibly stop a buying spree. All we could do would be to wait for the perilous consequences.

I don't think that will happen. It must not happen. Those in charge of price control have acted firmly and on the whole wisely. It is generally felt that Mr. Chester Bowles, the Administrator, is doing an excellent job. He has encouraged simplification (O. P. A. is using 14,000 tons less paper this year than last), and he believes in flexibility and in giving maximum authority to local offices.

There are some definitely encouraging symptoms in the current situation. Farmers—others, too, but I am using agricultural figures since they have greater significance for our State—farmers have been paying off their debts, and they have been borrowing less. They are getting in shape for the postwar era. For this, I think the wise counsel of their banker friends and associates is largely responsible.

Consider this contrast: In the middle of 1918, approximately the same stage in World War No. 1 as the present time in World War No. 2, agricultural loans of commercial banks, excluding loans on farm real estate, amounted to $2,507,000,000, just about three times what is now held by banks. Between December 31, 1942, and that date in 1943, such loans declined slightly. In Arkansas, commercial banks short term, or collateral agricultural loans, excluding those covered by repurchase agreement with the Commodity Credit Corporation, aggregated $10,986,000 at the start of 1944, compared with $11,391,000 a year earlier. This is only 15 percent of the $72,135,000 of such loans held by Arkansas banks in 1920.

This brings up the subject of Government agricultural credit. Government credit is intended for those to whom commercial loans are not available. Your American Bankers Association's able president, Mr. A. L. M. Wiggins, is authority for the heartening statement that 80 percent of agricultural lending is still by private institutions. If the trend were decidedly in favor of Government loans, that percentage might not give you much comfort, but my impression is that Government lending will not exceed the 20 percent—much of this not eligible for commercial loans—and that a proper balance can be maintained. That, assuredly, is a "consummation devoutly to be hoped for."

Some proposals pertaining to agricultural credit originate with the Committee on Agriculture but they are of vital interest to all Arkansas Congressmen. The Agriculture Committee at this time is struggling with the so-called Cooley bill to consolidate in the Farmers' Home Corporation credit facilities of the Farm Security Administration, Farm Credit Administration, and regional agricultural credit corporations, and to provide for closer congressional supervision. Out of this study, I am confident, will come a worthwhile piece of legislation. Mr. Wiggins and spokesmen for farm organizations recently were heard by the committee, and revision of the bill is under way.

It would leave the inflation picture incomplete to disregard the upward trend in farm real-estate prices. I shall not take up your time with suggestions for cautious granting of credit—I know they are not necessary, but we shall do well to watch the situation closely. A Department of Agriculture study up to March of this year revealed an increase of 52 percent above the 1935–39 average in the market price per acre of Arkansas farm land. For the Nation the average increase was 38 percent. During the year ending March 1 the increase was 15 percent for the United States, 18 percent for Arkansas. Our recollection of the financial wreckage that came in the wake of the last war's inflated land values is too fresh surely for us to permit another such catastrophe to fall upon us.

Arkansas farm operators reduced their mortgage indebtedness $900,000 in 1942, the total dropping to $78,405,000 from $79,305,000 the year before, this decrease being the first for Arkansas since 1937, although for the country as a whole a decline in mortgage debt has been shown each year since 1927. Between 1923 and 1943 the Nation's farm mortgage debt decreased 43.3 percent, Arkansas's 33.4 percent. It is probable that Arkansas's farm mortgage debt was reduced substantially more in 1943 than in 1942. Preliminary estimates for the United States place total farm mortgage indebtedness at $5,650,000,000, 8 percent below the January 1, 1943, figure, and the lowest of any year since 1917.

Do you acquiesce in the opinion that these figures indicate that farmers generally are putting their financial house in order, in preparation for whatever the end of the war may bring?

Let us assume that we shall have the foresight and fortitude to survive this period with our savings unimpaired in value. What then?

The answer is up to us—to business, to labor, to Government.

The perils are many but the opportunities are great. All over the Nation, communities are laying their plans for after-the-war activity. Bankers are among the leaders in these programs. They have a stake in the use to which wartime savings are put in the future. Unquestionably, there will be a great demand for credit in financing purchases of civilian goods not now available. At the same time, there will be the problem of maintaining a favorable balance of payment between out-of-county purchases and sales. You doubtless are already pondering ways and means of averting a sudden drain of your customers' reserves without compensation in the form of incoming funds.

Of one thing we can be certain. We shall stand or fall together—business, labor, and Government (note that I say Government, not administration).

If all bankers are of the disposition of you in Arkansas, I believe it can be said that your profession has recognized the possibilities of benefit from working with and through the Government. I don't think I am mistaken in regarding your relationship with the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation generally satisfactory and helpful. I daresay you don't have their personnel in mind when you speak, perhaps disdainfully, of "bureaucrats."

Frankly, I become disturbed at a tendency on the part of some elements in our economic life to wage a sort of war on Government, as though it were an enemy. It is far better that Government be accepted as a partner and utilized to aid business. Any who want to change administrations will have an opportunity in November to order it done. In the interim, it behooves us, as invasion day

draws nearer, to stand solidly behind the only Government we have, or can have, for carrying on the war. Regardless of the outcome of the forthcoming election, put political and personal animosities aside, accept the result in good spirit, and with faith in God and His creatures, our fellow men, and combine our efforts to safeguard freedom and to maintain peace.

I am a politician, conscious that the connotations of the word are not all good; you are bankers who can remember when the word "banker" was spoken with the sometimes more—sometimes less—good-humored contempt with which we hear "bureaucrat" uttered today. We all know that general condemnation of bankers was never deserved. And I am willing to vouch for the statement that not all bureaucrats are bad. I hasten to add that I agree we should have as little bureaucracy as we can get by with—in Government, in business, and in labor organizations.

Both as citizens and as bankers you can influence the trend toward or away from another war which, beyond question, would mean the end of the freedom we treasure. Don't think for a moment that your ideas and your votes don't contribute toward the Nation's decisions.

One phase of post-war planning has to do with the maintenance of an international bank, and our committee has begun work on this problem. Some of you have been kind enough to write me your ideas on the subject. We have had some preliminary conferences with Secretary Morgenthau and Dr. White, consultant to the Secretary, but plans are admittedly nebulous and conversations with other governments largely exploratory. The subject is highly technical and to some extent controversial and months or even years will be required to make a beginning; nevertheless, it is imperative that plans for a permanent peace must be accompanied by a sound program for currency stabilization and we must extend our fullest cooperation in this field.

The economic aspects of the peace problem have been fully exploited and, while I think sometimes that this phase has been overemphasized in analyses of the cause of war, it is, nevertheless, a very real source of national fears and rivalries upon which violence feeds.

You are doubtless familiar with the proposals to use the international banks for loans to member governments and private agencies both for rehabilitation and productive enterprise. Without some arrangements of this kind there will be stagnation in many parts of the world and this would be a great misfortune to regions like our own which produce exportable crops and are consequently interested to such a vital extent in world trade.

This is a subject upon which I would welcome advice and counsel by those of you who are in a position to study the details, and I will be grateful for your help as we undertake to develop a sound policy.

Our committee is also considering post-war legislation dealing with the disposition of surplus property and will have responsibility for many phases of the public works program.

I wish that I had been able to give preparation for this appearance before you, the time it merited. This is a first draft of remarks that I should have liked to go over more than once. But I am sure you will be as considerate of me here as you have been in Washington.

The attitude of your organization has been a source of extreme satisfaction to me. Your approach at all times has been reasonable and sympathetic. Yours has been a good example for business to follow. I have implicit trust in your intentions and your judgment, and hope that I have given you cause to believe in my sincerity of purpose.

Resolution of Holy Trinity Parish and the Association of American Polish Organizations of Hatfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago many Members of the House were privileged to pay tribute to the great Polish Nation by appropriate remarks on the floor of this Chamber on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the Polish Constitution, adopted on May 3, 1791.

At that time I called the attention of the Congress to the contributions which men and women of Polish extraction, in the Nation in general and in my district in particular, have made to the cultural, industrial, and agricultural progress of the United States, and to the heroic sacrifices which Poland's sons have made in the cause of liberty through service in the armed forces of the United States in all our wars.

In the lovely little town of Hatfield, Mass., rich in the traditions of the struggles of the first settlers of Massachusetts to found a new nation dedicated to liberty and freedom, many families of Polish extraction now live. They are honest, God-fearing, and industrious, and filled with a consuming love of America, a devotion which is characteristic of their people. They are, in fact, typical of the fine Americans of Polish descent everywhere in the United States.

I commend, therefore, to the Members of Congress the following resolution, adopted by the members of Holy Trinity Parish and the Association of American Polish Organizations at Hatfield, Mass., at their meeting on May 14. Let those who are charged with the negotiation of the peace which will follow this war be mindful of the sentiments expressed in this resolution, so that Poland, first to resist the Nazi tyrant in this war, may once again take its place among the nations of the world as a free and independent country.

Whereas 180 of our men and women are serving our country in the armed forces in the greatest conflict in all history; and

Whereas we at home are contributors to a full measure by the purchase of War bonds and unbridled production, both agricultural and industrial; and

Whereas this war is being waged to establish justice and economic survival for all peoples; and

Whereas Poland has stood first and always against the forces of tyranny; and

Whereas Poland stands today as the key to the future organization of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we Americans of Polish ancestry, representing the Holy Trinity Parish and the Association of American Polish Organizations of Hatfield, Mass, assembled in Memorial Town Hall this 14th day of May 1944, to pay tribute to mothers and to commemorate the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the constitution of May 3, 1791, unanimously and whole-heartedly pledge ourselves to greater efforts in order to assure a speedy victory for our beloved country, the United States of America, and our allies; and further, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter; and further be it

Resolved, That we stand without reserve with the Polish Government in London, and further be it

Resolved, That we sincerely implore our representatives in Government and our fellow Americans to give full consideration to Poland's stand in this war and take action to insure its sovereignty, thereby assuring a world based on democratic principles in which peace will reign and all peoples will know the true meaning of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Congressmen, our Senators, and to the Secretary of State.

HENRY M. KUGLER,
Chairman.
PETER S. ROGALESKI,
Secretary.
JOSEPH STANCZYK,
Pastor of Holy Trinity Church.

A Refutation of Charges in the Butler Report as to Our Expenditures in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Butler report, which was published in the Reader's Digest some time ago, and which has on numerous occasions been refuted as being inaccurate and incorrect, still continues to be used and quoted from.

Illustrative of this the East Texas Chamber of Commerce Tax Letter for March 21, 1944, quotes various excerpts from Senator HUGH BUTLER'S irresponsible and inaccurate article which appeared in the Reader's Digest for December 1943, under the sensational title of Our Deep Dark Secrets in Latin America. The Tax Letter also refers to the equally inaccurate second and third Butler reports, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but summarily dismisses the investigation made by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The Reader's Digest article captures attention by opening with the fantastic statement that:

Our good-neighbor policy—backed by 6,000,000,000 United States dollars—has widely become a hemispheric hand-out that is neither good nor neighborly.

The most simple and direct answer is that there is not one word of truth in that statement. Following its publication the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee immediately obtained reports from all branches of the Government operating in Latin America on their actual expenditures, which showed that Senator BUTLER'S absurd guess of $6,000,000,000 was 95 percent

wrong. The word "guess" is used advisedly. It was not until after the Digest article appeared that Senator BUTLER wrote to the various affected agencies requesting information on their expenditures. Although that very information was supplied to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator MCKELLAR, and the reports appear at pages 10572–10575, 10579–10594 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1943, Senator BUTLER nevertheless brushed the facts aside and 1 month later brought forth a supplemental report. This latest report differed from the prior ones in some details, but preserved the techniques of lumping unrelated items, repeating the same items several times, and using wholly inconclusive and unreliable sources in an effort to arrive at the original $6,000,000,000. It was topped off by the famous phoney "accountant's certification," which should not have fooled an average grade-school pupil. Translated into simple English that certification does little more than say that the 115 items selected and supplied by Senator BUTLER in fact add up to the total set forth in the report. A spokesman for the accounting firm admitted that no effort had been made to verify the accuracy of Senator BUTLER's items.

Before concluding these introductory remarks, attention is called to Senator BUTLER's statement on the floor of the Senate on February 2, 1944, that—

> I have said repeatedly that as to the bulk of the expenditures no criticism could be made. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1072.)

That from the man who launched the "malevolent fantasy"—to use the words of a prominent Habana newspaper—that our wartime expenditures in Latin America had widely become a hemispheric handout and boondoggle running into "six thousand million United States dollars."

A few examples selected at random from the Butler report of November 26, 1943, should suffice to demonstrate its wholly irresponsible, sensational, and inaccurate character.

First. Lend-lease is listed in the report at $800,000,000. This item is padded by Senator BUTLER by nearly $720,000,000. The facts are that the value of military supplies or supplies with a military end use—the only lend-lease shipments to Latin America—aggregated $93,646,000 for 1941, 1942, and 1943. Contrary to all other lend-lease agreements those with Latin American countries by their terms require certain partial cash payments for aid supplied. During the same period we received $6,193,000, and no country is in default on its agreement.

Moreover, this aid, which was and still is vital to the defense of the Panama Canal and essential sources of raw materials, is untruthfully made to appear as a gift by Senator BUTLER. In fact, in the text of the report he states that the United States Government "made a present of 12 subchasers to the Cuban Government." The facts, as reported by the Navy Department, are:

> These vessels were sent as a loan, not a gift. * * * These vessels have been actively engaged in patrolling and escorting convoys under the general direction of United States naval officers. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 13, 1943, at p. 10587.)

The report lists the same figure of $146,345,970 twice as alleged expenditures under the Sugar Act of 1937, making a total of $292,691,940. Entirely apart from the duplication, the Senator is 100 percent wrong in this connection. The fact is that not one cent is or can be spent in Latin America under the Sugar Act. See Seventh United States Code 1137; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1943, at pages 10593–10594.

Third. The report lists Export-Import Bank loans for an alleged 3-year period at over $800,000,000. The Senator's padding here runs to over $700,000,000. The facts are that as of November 30, 1943, the total amount outstanding on all loans made in connection with Latin America since the creation of the bank in 1934 was $104,898,571 15, no part of which was in default. The report further makes no reference to repayments on loans to that date amounting to $107,284,391.37 nor to the fact that the bank has realized net earnings of $30,000,000. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1943, at page 10581. In short, far from being a "boondoggle," the bank is a successful banking institution showing net earnings.

Fourth. The report lists expenditures in Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone aggregating some $136,968,169. Every cent of this is padding, since these are United States territory and no more a part of Latin America than the State of Texas is.

Fifth. The report lists expenditures of $881,755,711 in connection with purchases of sugar from Cuba. Over $840,000,000 of this is padding; $289,755,711 is duplication, and the balance has been or will be recovered when the sugar is sold to domestic refiners. By having the Government act as a broker and centralizing all foreign purchases, the price of sugar to housewives has been held down to an average of 6.8 cents per pound during this war, whereas it ranged from 9.3 cents in 1917 to 19.4 cents in 1920 as a result of the lack of control during World War No. 1 The only expense entailed in bringing about this favorable situation arises out of the Government absorbing a part of the increased transportation costs. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1943, at pages 10576, 10593–10594.

Five items alone out of a total of over 80 in the "recapitulation" to the Butler November 26, 1943, report show padding of over two and a half billion dollars. Can anyone take the report seriously in the face of such a showing?

One or two general comments, apart from the padding pointed out above, may be helpful.

First. The report is basically misleading in attempting to lump outright expenditures with items such as loans, lend-lease, purchases of strategic materials and other items upon which the Government is getting or will get a cash return.

Second. The report severely criticizes amounts spent for health and sanitation work essential to protect our own troops against malaria and other tropical diseases. Apparently the Senator has forgotten what happened on Bataan, and also that while the danger to the Canal is not as imminent as it was right after Pearl Harbor, it is still necessary for us to maintain these advanced bases.

Third. The report goes out of its way to insult friendly powers who have welcomed and quartered our troops on their soil, opened their ports to our transports and warships, devoted their energies and resources to making up the sources of supply we and the United Nations lost to the Axis in 1942, made land available without cost for bases and airports essential to us, cooperated in defending the Panama Canal and guarding convoys, broken up rings of Axis spies and saboteurs, closed up businesses important to their economy, and either declared war on or severed relations with the Axis. We should never forget for one minute that when most of these countries acted right after Pearl Harbor they were not climbing on any bandwagon, but were honoring prior international commitments to us at a time when our cause was anything but bright.

On December 13, 1943, after obtaining factual reports from the agencies accused of boondoggling by Senator BUTLER, the truth was brought out on the Senate floor by Senator MCKELLAR. Those reports showed total over-all disbursements for 1941, 1942, and 1943 in the amount of $1,426,822,000, of which $1,102,637,000 represented the cost of strategic and critical materials essential to our conduct of the war. Of the balance of $324,185,000 over $93,000,000 represents lend-lease transfers for a portion of which we will be repaid in cash, $158,000,000 represents essential military and naval expenditures, and over $7,000,000 represents the cost of health and sanitation work mainly around airports and bases to protect the lives and safety of our own troops.

These reports showed clearly that there was nothing deep, dark, or secret about our expenditures in Latin America, and moreover that the true amount was about 5 percent of Senator BUTLER's guess.

Thereafter, with the facts of record, Senator BUTLER willfully disregarded them and wrote a new report in which he says he was talking about a different 3-year period, 1942, 1943, and 1944—the tax letter referred to at the outset comments on the fact that what 3 years were involved was not clear until this latest Butler report—introduces a revised set of items in an attempt to justify his original guess of $6,000,000,000, and tops it all off with an illusory and meaningless "accountant's certification."

What 3 years are to be taken is not vitally important since that was covered in the agency reports placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator MCKELLAR on December 13, 1943. It is there stated on page 10571:

> It is estimated that the total expenditures and cash loans for the fiscal year 1944 will approximate $1,000,000,000 primarily for strategic materials, and subsequent expenditures under existing and possible future agreements are dependent upon the progress and duration of the war.

We will receive value in the form of these urgently needed strategic materials, which hardly puts such expenditures in the "hemisphere hand-out" category.

Turning to this trick accountant's certification, it reads:

> We hereby certify that the source material referred to in these lists (Senator BUTLER's figures) has been examined by us and that the amounts are correct according to the source information.

In short, the figures in Senator BUTLER's lists have been correctly transcribed from Senator BUTLER's sources. A spokesman for the accounting firm admitted under questioning that the sources had not been checked, that the firm had not dug out the figures and that no attempt whatever had been made to check Senator BUTLER's figures against the agency reports given to Senator MCKELLAR.

This certification is, therefore, utterly worthless and a palpable hoax if intended to lead anyone to believe that Government records of expenditures had been audited by these accountants. That apparently is exactly what Senator BUTLER intended.

We are, therefore, left with the question of the authenticity of Senator BUTLER's source material. This includes Budget requests, appropriation bills, committee hearings, news releases, annual reports, letters, corporation financial statements, magazine articles, and in one or two instances the reports of actual expenditures which Senator MCKELLAR had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Senator BUTLER's sources lead to an enormous amount of duplication and repetition of the same figure to be added up in order to arrive at the total of the certified report. For example, three items for the naval station at Guantanamo, Cuba, are repeated twice, once in a reference to the budget request to Congress for an appropriation, and again in identical form in a reference to the appropriation act, neither of which are expenditures but steps which must be taken before the money is even available for expenditure. As though this duplication were not enough, the Senator includes again in total expenditures of the Navy the amounts actually spent from the appropriation. Again he quotes from a news release an expenditure of a corporation created by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, then quotes the total capitalization of the corporation from a report required to be filed with the Treasury Department, and includes the original expenditure a third time in total expenditures of the Coordinator's Office. In connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, he quotes an over-all total amount for the Corporation and its subsidiaries from one letter, then quotes again from another letter individual items for subsidiaries already included in the over-all total, and repeats another three individual items already included in over-all total which items appear in an annual report.

Under such a system the same figure can be included as many times as it appears in print or in writing, and still an accountant could certify the laws, reports, news stories, letters, and so forth, in which it appears actually to exist and have been correctly quoted, which was all the accountant certified in this case. The total could just as well have been run up to twenty-five or fifty billion dollars under such a system, but all that the Senator apparently wanted was to get it up to his original guess.

Nor is this repeated petition of the same figure the only flaw. Large sums spent for military and naval bases located in British Colonies near the Panama Canal which have nothing to do with Latin America have been thrown in to swell the total. Also, although the report purports to cover a 3-year period, the Export-Import Bank figure covers nearly 10 years and then is incorrectly quoted in that it fails to take any account of loans repaid and includes loans authorized but later canceled before any money was ever lent.

Perhaps the most fantastic item of all is one of some $12,500,000 taken from the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Far from being an expenditure, this item is a cash payment to the United States, a receipt.

It would serve no useful purpose to cite further errors. What has been said is more than ample to show that this so-called "certified report" is really worse than the original one it was designed to bolster—worse because the true facts had already been made a matter of public record and were willfully ignored, and worse because of the use of a phoney certification to mislead the public.

Before concluding, brief reference will be made to one or two matters in the East Texas Chamber of Commerce tax letter.

First. It quotes Senator BUTLER as saying "In the Dominican Republic the prevailing wage—for common labor—is 70 cents a day. We pay the Dominican $3 to $5 a day." Just who the "we" refers to is not clear, but there have been three types of projects in the Dominican Republic: (a) Health and sanitation work near the airport and where our troops are stationed, (b) a short section of highway to transport vital freight overland when the waters were jammed with Axis submarines, and (c) airport construction as a part of the route by which planes were ferried to Africa, European, and Asiatic theaters of war. The best evidence is that the prevailing wage was paid on the first two, and the Engineer Corps of the Army has informally reported that whereas the prevailing wage for unskilled labor was 8 cents an hour it was necessary to pay 9 cents an hour to get the labor to rush this work to completion. The differential is thus 10 cents a day for a 10-hour day. For skilled labor, to which Senator BUTLER did not refer, the average differential was 50 cents a day for a 10-hour day.

Second. The tax letter quotes a statement that "we paid for a fish survey in the ocean adjacent to Panama." Following Pearl Harbor thousands of our troops were sent into the Caribbean area, and at the same time ocean-borne food supplies on which the region was dependent were cut off by the submarine war. It was necessary to find ways to feed the people, and offshore fishing was apparently one excellent way of providing animal proteins. To test this the survey was necessary, and its cost for the entire Caribbean area—not just Panama—was approximately one-millionth part of Senator BUTLER's $6,000,000,000 "guess."

Third. The tax letter also refers to a Honduran road project "designed to tide a banana-growing area over an unemployment crisis." This is a dangerous and misleading half-truth. Following the curtailment of banana exports due to lack of shipping, thousands of Hondurans were thrown out of work and Axis agents got busier than ever trying to foment political unrest in this area practically next door to the Panama Canal. At the urgent request of the American Embassy work on a badly needed link of road essential to communication between the Caribbean and the Pacific was undertaken.

Fourth. The broad general conclusions of Senator BUTLER quoted in the tax letter as "facts" do not stand up when compared with the actual facts reported by the State, War, and Navy Departments and other agencies, which appear at pages 10579–10594 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1943.

Fifth. The remarks of Charles Beard on our "irresponsible government" quoted in the tax letter show a total lack of comprehension. Within the remarkably short space of 3 weeks of Senator BUTLER's charge a complete record of expenditures by many branches of the Government in an area many times larger than the United States, parts of which are 5,000 and 6,000 miles away, was made available and made a matter of public record on the floor of the United States Senate. This job had to be fitted in with vital war work. That Senator BUTLER chose to disregard and ignore these facts is no reason to assail either the legislative or the executive branch of the Government.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address delivered by me at Veterans' Home, Rocky Hill, Conn.:

> It was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted Colonel Gates' invitation to participate in your observance of Memorial Day. What more fitting spot could be found to commemorate the services of generations of brave American men and women who have served in all of the wars in which the United States has engaged.
>
> Through the corridors of this home have walked veterans of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War No. 1, and men now serving in the present war. The beautiful buildings and grounds that make up this home stand as a memorial to the sons

and daughters of Connecticut who served their country in time of war, and they stand as a symbol of Connecticut's determination that no Connecticut veteran shall ever want.

Sunday afternoon I sat down to try to decide just what kind of a message I could bring to you today. Memorial Day is a day very dear to the hearts of all veterans, men and women. It won't mean as much to those who are now serving in our Army and Navy as it does to the veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War No. 1 but, as each year comes and goes, Memorial Day will mean more to each of you. It will mean more and more to you each year as your list of comrades who have passed on to their reward grows longer.

Undoubtedly every person in this hall has on previous Memorial Days heard the services of the men of 1861 to 1865, of 1898 to 1900, of 1917 and 1918 extolled as they should be. There is little I could add to the tributes that have been said year after year on each May 30. Stories of the valor displayed at Gettysburg, at Manila, at Belleau Woods, and in the Argonne, and it is fitting that these brave deeds should be recalled and related year after year. However, this Memorial Day when we find ourselves in the midst of the most terrible war in all history, it seems to me appropriate that as a part of this year's observance of Memorial Day, thought should be given the tremendous problems that must some day, and I hope soon, be faced by the more than 10,000,000 men and women now serving on the far-flung battle fronts all over the world.

Two weeks ago I was hopeful that today I might be able to tell you the details of the Federal Government's plan for the rehabilitation of the veterans of this war. Many of the provisions of this over-all plan are to be found in the so-called G. I. bill of rights recently passed unanimously by both the House and Senate. There are some differences in the bills as approved by the Senate and House. These differences are now being ironed out by a committee of conferees composed of Senators and Representatives, and I am sure this legislation will soon be ready for the President's signature.

Before discussing the details of the G. I. bill I would prefer to tell you something about laws now on our statute books providing benefits for those who have been or who will be disabled during this war. All agree that the care of the disabled, the widows, and orphans comes first. Perhaps I can best express it by telling you that with one or two minor exceptions the veterans of this war who suffer disability in line of duty are and will be entitled to every benefit from the Federal Government that has been granted to the disabled of World War No. 1. These benefits include hospitalization, compensation, and vocational training.

In addition to provisions for the disabled, Congress recently provided mustering-out pay for all service men and women. This mustering-out pay amounts to from one to three hundred dollars. Some citizens, as well as some Members of Congress, felt these amounts were too small. If this was all our Government intended to do for its veterans, they would be too small. It is my considered judgment that this mustering-out pay will save the taxpayers millions of dollars over a period of years. I was determined that if I could prevent it, no soldier or sailor would be discharged without money enough in his pocket to buy needed civilian clothes and have enough left to permit him to relax for at least a few weeks.

In 1919 men were discharged with hardly enough money to buy the necessary civilian clothing they needed. The result was that many were forced to go to work, if they could find work, the same week they were discharged. That was true if they intended to eat the next week. Such a short-sighted policy cost the Treasury millions of dollars. Thousands of men broke down nervously and physically who would not have collapsed if they could have had a reasonable time to make the necessary adjustments between civilian and military life. Except for those who have gone through the experience, few can realize what an adjustment must be made when the serviceman returns home. The human body, the human mind, our nervous systems were never intended to withstand the terrific strain of modern warfare. The effects of jungle fighting remain to be seen. Compared to Bougainville and Guadalcanal, Belleau Woods was a city park. Compared to a P-38 the Spad was a slow freight. If a man comes to the surface suddenly from the depth of the ocean, he dies. A human body just can't come from the hell of modern war to the quiet of Main Street without feeling the effects of the change. Mustering-out pay will permit a little time in which to make the necessary adjustments.

Now for the G. I. bill of rights. First of all title I provides for the building of all needed hospitals; it further provides that no disabled man shall be discharged to the Veterans' Administration until his Army or Navy records are all correct and complete.

Title I also provides something that we should have had years ago, an agency or commission empowered to correct mistakes made in issuing discharges from the Army or Navy. Too many veterans have been given discharges other than honorable who should have had honorable discharges. This new commission can correct the discharges issued to peacetime veterans, veterans of World War No. 1 as well as from the present war. Title I further provides that all those whose formal education was interrupted will be given a chance to go back to school and finish their course. If they were graduated from a medical school, a dental school, or a law school, they can take a 1 year refresher course and thus prepare for the examination they must take in order to practice their profession. All veterans will be entitled to a 1-year court of vocational training or schooling they may desire to take. If they do satisfactory work they may continue up to 4 years, 1 year for each year in the service. While taking such training a single veteran shall receive in addition to all tuition, books, supplies, etc., $50 a month. If he or she has a dependent the allowance will be $75 per month.

Title 3 provides loans for veterans up to $2,500 for the purchase of homes, farms, farm equipment, and small business property.

Title 4 sets forth the intent of Congress that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans.

Title 5 provides what amounts to unemployment compensation in the amount of $20 per week for 26 weeks. The Senate version provided these payments for 52 weeks, or 1 full year. It was felt in the House, however, that Congress would be in session during the 6 months following the war's end, and if conditions indicated the need of extending these payments, it could be done very quickly.

Title 6 provides improved administrative procedures to speed up adjudication of veterans claims.

There may be some changes in the legislation before it becomes law, but it will pretty much follow the outline I have given you.

A great deal has been said about the cost of this legislation. No one knows what it will cost. It may be six billion, it may be sixteen billion. Whatever the cost, it will be money well spent if the law is well administered, as I am sure it will be. The American people will insist on good administration of veterans' legislation. In all probability there will be 15,000,000 ex-service men and women by the time this war ends. If that be true, it is well to bear in mind that every time Congress approves a payment of $100 per veteran it will mean one and a half billion dollars added to our national debt. The cost of the G. I. bill depends on the conditions that exist in the United States following the war.

The returning soldier and sailor will not be satisfied with unemployment compensation. They will not be satisfied with vocational training unless there are to be jobs for them when they complete their training. As a matter of fact, all the post-war planning we do, all of the bills Congress passes that involve huge sums of money, are going to have a very real bearing on the final cost of the G. I. bill in that they will affect our future economy.

I have corresponded with a large number of servicemen during the past 15 months. I have corresponded with fathers and mothers of men who have died in action, with others whose sons or husbands are in enemy prison camps or perhaps missing in action. I think I know what these men and women are looking forward to when at last the war ends. They want a sound economy. They want to return to all the freedom guaranteed us in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. They want jobs at a decent wage. They want an opportunity to provide an education for their children. Most important of all they want to live in a world over which the threat of future wars has been greatly, yes very greatly, reduced.

Some day, God willing, I hope some day soon, there is going to be another armistice day. When that day comes I am sure the fighting men of this war will react about the same as the fighting men of 1918. Oh how well I remember November 11, 1918. What a day it was. What a night of celebration with each one celebrating according to his own desires. We had won the war that was to end all wars. The world was safe for democracy. But the next day it was different. By the evening of November 12 we were practically all thinking of the same thing. When were we going home? What did the future hold for us individually? In my squadron were represented just about every economic level from nothing to a million but each of us was thinking of home and a job; either the job we left or another that we hoped would be just as good. The less said about the heartaches and disappointments that followed, the better, but history must not be allowed to repeat itself.

The returning serviceman must have a job and every time the present Congress passes a bill, whether it be legislation or a tax bill, Congress must ask itself what effect this will have on our economy. Will it lessen or increase the likelihood of the returning serviceman's finding a job and security?

I that post-war era we are going to need unity just as much as we need it today. In addition to international unity which I hope to have time to touch on in a few minutes, we are going to want domestic unity. If there is to be unity of purpose here in the United States when our soldiers and sailors come home we, on the home front, must so conduct ourselves during the war that our actions will merit the approval of the returning veteran.

As has so often been said, this is a war of production. The industries and farms of America have produced the food and the materials of war in greater quantities and qualities than many of us ever thought possible. Both management and labor have done a marvelous job, yes, almost a miraculous job. Unhappily there have been a few minor exceptions. There have been a few glaring exceptions. There have been a few who have willfully profited unreasonably from our war effort. A few who for blood money have been willing to sell defective equipment to our Army and Navy. Some are now serving time in a traitor's cell. Others will follow them. There have been some who have walked away

from their benches, some who have been willing to leave their own sons and brothers without planes to fly or without ammunition to fire. The American people, yes the American Congress, have been lenient with those who have quit their important and vital jobs in war industries, in an effort to get more money for their labor. I am sure that the patience of an overwhelming majority of our citizens has come to an end. I think that your Congress is about ready to deal harshly with those who from now on quit their jobs and go on strike. We face the greatest military operation in all history, the invasion of Europe. Until this war is brought to its victorious conclusion there must not be, there cannot be any further stoppages in our war industries. We all know the penalty for running away from the battle front. There must be penalties for refusing to produce the material needed at the fighting front. Ninety-nine percent of those who labor in our war industries will approve of severe penalties. The 1 percent or less who object must be ignored. If there is to be domestic unity following the war all interruption in our wartime production must stop. Now just a few minutes to consider post-war international unity.

I was one of those who thought in 1919 that a league of nations could be made to work. Perhaps if we had been insistent enough the details could have been worked out to the satisfaction of all. That is all history today but we must soon make some very important decisions here in the United States. Our decisions are going to have a far-reaching effect on the future of this civilization.

A Member of the House, Congressman JUDD, of Minnesota, recently suggested that we are at the crossroads. There are four main paths before us, each being advocated by some as the way to security and peace.

The first way, of course, is to try to go back to isolationism. That has been tried and proven a failure. The separation by oceans is gone. The airplane has destroyed distances.

The second possible path is American imperialism. Some say we can't escape the world; we must run it. We must get control of the key air bases, the strategic islands, the main arteries of trade. We must build up such a huge Army, Navy, and air force that no group of nations will dare oppose us. Can we continue to spend $20,000,000,000 a year on our Army, Navy, and air force after this war? Maintaining American imperialism will not be easy. After all we are a nation of only 130,000,000 people. Remember there are 200,000,000 Russians, 450,000,000 Chinese, and they are aflame with the desire to be free. There are 375,000,000 awakening in India. There are 150,000,000 in South America, restless and uneasy. And some say America with 130,000,000 people should rule the world. That certainly is not the path to peace and security.

The third path is that urged by those who say if we can't escape the world, if we can't rule the world, maybe we can buy the world. We are to feed, clothe, and provide shelter for all the peoples of the world. Then surely, say some, the world will love us and we will be secure.

Well if we can't escape the world, if we can't rule the world, if we can't buy the world, what is there left for us to do? It seems reasonable to think we can cooperate with other nations of the world.

This is the path that appeals to me—an Association of Nations determined to live peacably with each other plus the creation of a World Court to pass on questions of international law.

We all know the answer to the question, What price war? We go to war and we give unselfishly of all we hold dear—our material wealth and the lives of our loved ones.

The people of the United States must now decide what price peace? What sacrifice are we willing to make for peace and security? The answer must be found and made soon. Let us hope and pray that by next Memorial Day the correct answer will be found and we will be going down the path toward peace and a happy, contented future. Only by so doing can we say, "Those honored dead whose memories we revere today have not died in vain."

Education of District of Columbia Children of Deceased Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the national legislative committee of the American Legion and the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion, I am today introducing a bill which will amend Public Law 435 of the Seventy-third Congress. This bill will extend and give to the District of Columbia children of deceased veterans the same educational opportunities they would enjoy if they resided in certain States of the Nation.

Gen. P. C. Harris, director of the committee on education of orphan veterans, has prepared an explanatory statement on this bill and I ask unanimous consent to insert the same in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. His statement is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT OF JUNE 19, 1934 (PUB. LAW 435, 73D CONG.)

The Act of June 19, 1934, authorizes the appropriation of $3,600 annually for the fiscal years 1935 to 1943, inclusive, from funds to the credit of the District of Columbia, for aid in the education of children (between the ages of 16 and 21, who have had their domicile in the District of Columbia for at least 5 years) of those who lost their lives during the World War. The act provides that not more than $200 shall be available for any one child in any 1 year.

The act of June 19, 1934, is substantially the same as the acts, generally known as war orphan scholarship acts, of 37 of the States, which were passed in response to appeals of the American Legion and in furtherance of a well-rounded program to provide educational opportunities for the sons and daughters of those who sacrificed their lives for the country during the World War.

Realizing that the children of those who were killed or died during the World War, would soon be too old to be eligible for the State scholarships, the American Legion in national convention at Cleveland in 1935, at Chicago in 1939, and at Boston in 1940, adopted resolutions requesting the legislatures of the State to extend the provisions of their war orphan scholarship acts to the children of those who have died since the World War of war service-connected disabilities.

Nineteen of the States—California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia—have to date amended their scholarship acts as requested in the American Legion convention resolutions, and others will no doubt fall in line when their legislatures meet again. The scholarship acts of 14 of these States—California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and West Virginia—were last year further amended so as to include orphans of veterans of the present war.

This bill extends the provisions of the act of June 19, 1934, to the children of veterans who have died since World War No. 1 of war service-connected disabilities and to orphans of the present war. It thus gives to the District of Columbia children of deceased veterans the same educational opportunities they would enjoy if they resided in one of the States named above or in any other State that may hereafter similarly liberalize its war orphans scholarship act.

MAY 1944.

In Memory of Vincent F. Harrington

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the annual memorial exercises of the House of Representatives held on yesterday, I rise today to pay my tribute of honor and respect to the late VINCENT F. HARRINGTON, of Iowa. After several years of service in this House he resigned from the Seventy-seventh Congress to enter the service of his country and was a major in the Army Air Corps when he died in England last November. Though his name is not listed among those of the Seventy-eighth Congress whose memory we honor on this occasion, it is only fitting and proper that we refer to his passing at this time.

It was my privilege to know VINCE HARRINGTON well. No man in these Halls was more devoted to his constituency. He was a man with many sterling qualifications and a man of the highest integrity. The respect and esteem which he deserved and enjoyed from his colleagues might well be the envy of any Member of the House. It was his general friendship and sincerity of purpose that won VINCE HARRINGTON his wide host of close friends in Congress.

He added much to a needed balance between liberals and conservatives and always cast his vote without fear or favor and in accordance with his convictions. He had his country at heart and the people of the State of Iowa and of his own congressional district quickly learned that he was a stanch and loyal friend in whom they could repose every confidence. In the untimely death of VINCENT F. HARRINGTON the State of Iowa has lost one of its finest citizens. All those who remember him will have cause to be grateful for having known such a wholesome American.

Cleveland O. P. A. and O. D. T.

REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of the Members in a general way, the extremely serious and fraudulent operations uncovered in the Cleveland offices of Office of Price Administration and Office of Defense Transportation wherein coupons for huge quantities of gasoline, food, and other rationed items were fraudulently being issued and placed on the black market. The inability of the enforcement agency of the Office of Price Administration, and the lack of any enforcement branch within the Office of Defense Transportation, have been recognized by the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Defense Transportation, who have made requests to Mr. Biddle and Mr. Hoover to have the Federal Bureau of Investigation enter the case and conduct a thorough and complete investigation.

At least two indications that the investigative staff of the Office of Price Administration is not competent to conduct an investigation of such breadth and scope, are that after coupons for 538,000 gallons of gasoline were found to be illegally issued, the Office of Price Administration did not broadcast serial numbers of the coupons until a month after the detection of the fraud. Also the investigative force of the Office of Price Administration is not well trained, as is pointed out in yesterday's article in the Cleveland Press, which I am inserting in the RECORD.

The successful prosecution of the war, and the maintenance of high standard of morale on the home front is of such great magnitude and importance that any formal policy of any agency not investigating another, which does not obtain with reference to the Office of Defense Transportation, should be dispensed with.

I have today introduced a bill to provide for the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of black-market operations in the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Defense Transportation in Cleveland, Ohio. The Department of Justice has so far refused to step into this entire situation, and I trust that the Members of Congress, zealous for the protection of members of the armed forces and those on the home front, will speedily enact this bill into law.

[From the Cleveland Press of May 26, 1944]

QUIT THIS BUCK PASSING—CLEAN UP THOSE GAS FRAUDS NOW

Most people are honest. Most people are patient. Most people understand that in war they can't have all they get in peace. Most people know the armed forces come first and what's left is to be rationed fairly among the rest of us.

Most people are patriotic. Most people will neither chisel nor cheat. Most people sacrifice and work. Most people respect the law and their country's emergency.

But, by the same token, most people—and among them count us—are sick, tired, and disgusted with the disgraceful negligence, ineptitude, indifference, buck-passing, and inertia which characterize this whole O. P. A. mess of graft and corruption stemming from downtown board No. 6 and which, we are convinced, involves a lot of others in this O. P. A.-O. D. T. set-up.

From the very start, the Press has vigorously supported O. P. A., recognizing the soundness of even-handed treatment of all citizens in time of limited supply. The Press has urged the people to respect it, uphold it, live under it. It does so today, because a system is not proved unsound by the dishonesty of some individuals.

Right now, however, this newspaper, in common with the vast majority of greater Clevelanders, is boiling about this whole O. P. A. mess, and boiling in particular over the lazy, stupid, inexcusable exhibition of intended or unintentional cover-up.

The O. P. A. is fast on its feet when some individual receives more gas than entitled, buys black market coupons, or when a station attendant dishes out gasoline he shouldn't.

Well, what's the matter now, with a real scandal on its hands—one involving not hundreds or thousands of gallons, but perhaps millions of gallons?

O. P. A. officials knew this for 6 weeks or more. Nothing happened. Not even closing of the board. Not until Police Inspector Frank Story, assisting them, arrested the board's chief clerk for theft did they move.

Why did O. P. A. move so slowly in this case, so speedily at other times—so speedily after the little fellow, so slowly after the big grafters?

Now, at this late date, Regional Director Birkett Williams is asking action. Both he and the public know O. P. A. enforcement officers are not trained detectives. The public wouldn't, and shouldn't, be satisfied with an O. P. A. investigation of itself.

O. P. A.'s supreme command at Washington, Chester Bowles, is asked help. He sends one man. This man probably is not much better qualified to do this job than the young attorneys and ex-businessmen in O. P. A. here.

In the last analysis, the crimes must finally be prosecuted by United States District Attorney Don Miller. His office has no detectives. It relies on other departments. It would expect in this case to get F. B. I.'s help.

But F. B. I. says "No." It won't act. Out of its jurisdiction, it says. Rationing, says F. B. I., is O. P. A. enforcement division's responsibility. F. B. I. ignores the fact that the people already arrested are not accused of rationing but of theft—of Federal property—a crime normally within F. B. I. jurisdiction.

As United States Attorney General, Francis Biddle, is F. B. I.'s head. He has not reversed F. B. I.'s stay-out attitude. Maybe he hasn't been asked.

But Mr. Biddle has been sounding off lately about his unlimited powers. We think Mr. Biddle has powers to order F. B. I. to find out whether two Government agencies are full of graft and corruption. Surely, this is not too much from a man who has been saying, "In time of war I can do anything."

F. B. I. might not want this job because it's tough, because it would be starting late, because all kinds of people have been trampling over and around it, because, figuratively, it is all messed up with irrelevant footprints and fingerprints. The criminals are being given time to destroy records and agree on lies.

Sure it's a tough case. That's why the best trained, most experienced, most disinterested corps of United States investigators should get on it.

Mayor Lausche has asked F. B. I. to get into it. District Attorney Miller, too, should bear down on Attorney General Biddle until he orders F. B. I. into it.

Right now the whole mess is where the grafters want it—in a morass of buck passing, twilight jurisdiction, official inertia, of unsightly ducking and dodging.

This newspaper holds no brief for O. P. A., O. D. T., F. B. I., District Attorney Miller, Attorney General Biddle, or anybody else.

What, however, it wants to know is, Who is going to clean up this mess? Who is going to ferret out the higher-ups, the master minds, the tie-up between the O. P. A. and the underworld?

Failure to clean up this mess seriously impairs O. P. A.'s prestige, and belief of people in it. Further, to the extent officials who ought to clean it up are not, it reflects directly upon them.

There is no law for rich and another for poor, no law for big grafter and another for little one—one law for the little fellow who is caught getting away with a couple gallons he wasn't entitled to and another to protect the big guy who gets away, with the help of crooked officials, with millions of gallons. For our part, the press part, we are going to help get this mess cleaned up, with all of the resources at our command, wherever it leads.

But what of these officials, these Government agencies, these people officially charged with the responsibility of protecting the public's interests?

What of them?

[From the Cleveland News of May 19, 1944]

ACTION NOW

The gasoline frauds at ration board 6 have shocked the community.

A greater shock is the lackadaisical attitude of Federal officials faced by the scandal.

There are no excuses good enough to explain why O. P. A., O. D. T., and the United States district attorney have not thrown every ounce of energy into swift and complete investigation.

If Attorney General Biddle eventually is reached decorously through proper channels, the F. B. I. may take over. It may be too late. In the meantime evidence will be disposed of and stories dovetailed.

If local officials were on the job, the F. B. I. would have been in here long since, even if they had to go to Washington and personally light a bonfire under Mr. Biddle.

The handling of this case has been a mess, leaving only two possible conclusions: That Federal agencies here do not want the truth to come out, or that they do not understand the seriousness of the fraud, and the indicated other frauds.

We dismiss the first possibility, because we believe the Federal administrators here are honorable men.

We conclude the second is fact, since nothing else can explain failure to slash away red tape and plunge into action.

If they do not know it, we say to them now that the evidences of cheating, carelessness, racketeering, and politics that appear on the mere surface of the investigation have done damage to community support of rationing that will be difficult to repair.

O. P. A. had better get going, and get going fast, to redeem itself. Detective Inspector Story so far has done all the work and uncovered everything that has been uncovered. The city has him to thank for prompt aggressive action as far as his authority extends—all the action, in fact, that there has been.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 29, 1944]

F. B. I. SHOULD ACCEPT

The Plain Dealer believes with Thomas Emerson, deputy administrator of the Office of Price Administration, that the Federal Bu-

reau of Investigation should make the Cleveland ration scandals its business.

Soon after irregularities at board No. 6 came to light the F. B. I. was invited to investigate them, first by Birkett L. Williams, regional O. P. A. administrator, and subsequently by Mayor Frank J. Lausche. On the representation that the matter was one of personnel and administration, the F. B. I. turned down the requests of Williams and the mayor. The F. B. I. took the position, furthermore, that inasmuch as the O. P. A. has facilities for investigation in its own office, the F. B. I. is without jurisdiction.

To the Plain Dealer Thomas Emerson's answer to the F. B. I.'s representation is a valid one, namely, that the public might be skeptical of the findings of an investigation of the O. P. A. by the O. P. A., and furthermore since the Office of Defense Transportation, which has no investigating facilities, is also involved, the F. B. I. ought to make a complete investigation.

Such an investigation by an authority, in which the public has full confidence, and which has the means at hand for bringing to light all the facts in this case, in our opinion, imperative. In the first instance the facts must be ascertained in order to punish the guilty and to protect the agencies concerned here and throughout the Nation against abuses in the future. But furthermore the facts must be ascertained and revealed because the impression is abroad that some persons in Government circles are afraid of them and of their possible political significance.

Fortunately, this is not true of the O. P. A. From the beginning the regional administrator here has sought by every means at his disposal to get to the bottom of the scandals. There is, however, everything to indicate that he has received full support of the head office of the O. P. A. in Washington and of Chester Bowles, its administrator.

It is clear, of course, to Bowles and his associates that a great deal more is involved in a proper disposition of these Cleveland scandals than the punishment of guilty persons and the plugging of leaks. Because the rationing of scarce commodities touches every family and, in fact, every individual, it must be done in a manner which commands the fullest public confidence if it is to win the public cooperation which is so vital to its success.

It goes without saying as a result of facts which have already come to light with respect to the operations of one Cleveland ration board that the public is skeptical and is saying that the revelations there may be only the beginning.

The Plain Dealer entertains no such opinion. It believes that rationing has been administered on the whole by men and women who are not only implicitly honest but conscientious at the same time, men and women who have sought to conform with the spirit of the regulations. But our point of view will be challenged, and properly so, if any basis in fact can be established for the charge that a superficial investigation would be more pleasing to certain important persons than an F. B. I. investigation which left no stone unturned.

Again we urge the F. B. I. to investigate the local ration scandals.

[From the Cleveland Press of June 1, 1944]

Failure of O. P. A. in tracing the distributors of the ration coupons that poured into the black market from ration board 6, O. D. T., frauds can be attributed to the almost complete lack of experienced investigators on the O. P. A. staff. It is known, however, that most of the sixty-odd investigators in the Cleveland district office were recruited from occupations having little or nothing to do with detection. William Derry, the chief investigator, who hires and instructs the others, was a bond salesman. The staff includes former insurance men, merchants, clerks, and as is the case throughout the O. P. A. organization here, a large sprinkling of automobile salesmen. Men from the automotive industry came into key and minor positions following Birkett L. Williams, regional administrator, and Clinton M. Fiske, district director, both auto dealers.

Congress, the Guardian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, Congress, the Guardian, which appeared in the May 30, 1944, edition of the Toledo Legal News:

CONGRESS, THE GUARDIAN

We have drifted into strange paths under pressure of war conditions, but basically ours is still a government of laws and not of men. The laws are made by Congress and administered by the executive department. In wartime we found it necessary to delegate certain powers in the interest of speed and flexibility, but there should be no weakening of the basic principle. Congress, representing the people, is still the guardian of all the powers it has delegated.

Veteran Reemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, something new in employment procedure, and this time for our returning service men and women has been set up in Glendale, Calif., by a gentleman who has long made it his hobby to counsel and guide people seeking jobs. He is giving his time and efforts at the present moment to the local selective-service system as reemployment chairman. He is concentrating on developing a simple plan where all people in the community can serve, to some extent, in helping our service men and women as they return home. These boys and girls need a lot of advice and counsel, and particularly do they need to feel the personal interest of the people at home in their welfare. They need to be taken back into the home community family, in order that they may reorient themselves into civilian life.

Mr. C. Vere Standiford, whose regular business is life insurance, has been making a genuine contribution to our returning veterans—and setting an example that might well be followed all over the country.

Following is an article by Mr. C. Vere Standiford, which appeared in Calivada March 1944, published by the California-Nevada District of Kiwanis International:

STANDIFORD'S HOBBY SERVICE

(By C. Vere Standiford, Kiwanis Club of Glendale)

The hobby started 11 years ago with a thought of giving 20 minutes a day for the other fellow without compensation.

Since my business is one that gives me contacts with the heads of business firms and I also contact the employees, I decided to use this 20 minutes a day to secure positions. We had millions of unemployed at that time, so it was a fertile field.

I counseled with the heads of business firms as to what they needed in employees and many times made suggestions of certain men and women whom I thought would be able to pay them a profit if employed, and calls started to come to my office for certain people.

The 20 minutes a day in a very short time drifted into hours per day, and later I set aside 1 day, Tuesday, as hobby day. As time marched on, the demand for people grew and thousands of people needed counsel and guidance to find their proper niche in the business world.

At the present time at least 65 percent of all my time is given to this hobby service. We are in war and we must all serve in our respective fields, and this is one endeavor that is so vital at this time.

We have placed over 8,000 people in this service, and positions range into the higher brackets, for outstanding businessmen need counsel just as do men seeking minor positions.

Our greatest problem and duty at present and in the post-war program is to assist our men in the United States armed services in securing positions and helping them adjust their lives. Counsel is needed more than anything else, and all good Kiwanians should appoint themselves a committee of one to serve in this worthy cause.

My own personal business? Larger than ever, for business firms and individuals direct it to my door.

The following article by James E. Dunne, is from the Insurance Index of April 1944, and concerns Mr. Standiford's work:

A THREE-REWARD HOBBY—IN 11 YEARS C. VERE STANDIFORD, OF GLENDALE, CALIF., HAS PLACED MORE THAN 8,000 PERSONS IN JOBS

(By James E. Dunne)

What happens to a job placement hobby when jobs are very easy to get? Is there some good use to which the hobby still can be put, or must it be laid away in moth balls?

C. Vere Standiford, general agent at Glendale, Calif., for the Midland National Life of Watertown, S. Dak., can answer the question.

About 11 years ago when jobs were on the scarce side, Mr. Standiford originated "Standiford's Hobby Service," whose function was the ferreting out of occupational vacancies and the placing of unemployed people in them.

This unusual pursuit—a free employment agency—eventually brought its designer a good bit of national attention. It also led to like undertakings by others, both in and out of life insurance, in other parts of the country.

To date the box score shows that Standiford's Hobby Service has placed more than 8,000 people in jobs. What had started out as a 20-minutes-a-day proposition, now takes about 65 percent of the service head's time.

An outstanding triumph was the guiding of a young man from Glendale into a $10,000 job.

The returning soldier is perhaps the principal beneficiary of the service's current efforts. Work Finder Standiford regards this activity in behalf of dischaged veterans as highly important. He has been named reemployment chairman of Glendale Draft Board No. 184.

Second on the list is that now prominent little individual, the juvenile. In the hobby service's view, a job for a youngster is an antidote to delinquency. So the service keeps going, performing in a purposeful manner even if idleness virtually has been wiped out by a high rate of wartime employment.

C. Vere Standiford was a stranger in a strange community when he first marketed his patent for the cure of idle hands. Somewhere on the road to Glendale, to which he was driving with his wife to make his stand for the Midland National Life, the thought occurred to him to give "20 minutes a day to the other fellow" without any compensation.

Once established in Glendale and calling in the capacity of general agent on business heads as well as employees, he was not long in settling on what to do with the daily 20 minutes. Knowing something of the problems of both management and workers, he decided that in doing for the other fellow he could best serve both by securing jobs for people.

In setting up shop Mr. Standiford spent considerable time in contacting the bosses at leading business concerns.

REACTIONS OF EMPLOYERS

"It was interesting," the Midland National's general agent recalls, "to see the reaction when I informed the president of some company that I wanted to talk to him about my hobby.

"In most cases, after the first shocks, the bosses seemed to realize that I had contacts with efficient people who perhaps could make him a profit. Many good jobs were created in this way, and I also made personal contacts with good businessmen that brought rewards as the years drifted by."

In the first few years all jobs had to be created, that is, what vacancies existed had to be found personally by the job hobbyist and people on his list put in the way of them. The "20 minutes a day" was short lived. Soon it was running into hours each day. Later Mr. Standiford called Tuesday "my hobby day" and spent the whole day interviewing people and directing them into jobs.

With a war on, Mr. Standiford has personally classified his avocational endeavor as "essential", and he now gives the aforementioned 65 percent of his time to its prosecution.

His hobby has been endorsed by the Kiwanis Club, the chamber of commerce, and the American Legion.

As a draft board reemployment chairman, he inherits soldiers returning to their home communities, mostly on medical discharges. They are not from his board alone, but from all over southern California. Mr. Standiford feels that this is a vital work and ventures the opinion that "everyone should serve to the best of his ability to assist our boys who have given up so much to fight for us."

According to the Standiford experience, it is not a job that is needed at first, but good counsel, as the mustered-out fighting man is frequently in a confused state and requires proper guidance. It is true, he needs a job, "but let it be a job where he has a future, and assist him in all the other things worth while."

Mr. Standiford is prone to urge affiliation with the American Legion, "which can help him," and directs applicants to their churches and proper young people's groups, etc.—"otherwise he may develop into a radical and another one of our problem boys."

On the question of the returning warrior, the father of the hobby service makes an appeal. "If a soldier or any other individual is directed to you for a job, do not give him the 'brush off' if you cannot use him. Take a little of that so-called valuable time to counsel with him and direct him with your card, after you've found out a little about his qualifications, to some man you know that may hire him.

"Call that friend up a little later and tell him what you are doing, and instruct him to direct the applicant to someone else if he can't hire him. This is the chain system, of course, but the fourth party needs him badly, is grateful to receive his services, and all have profited.

"It is just a little system that everybody can put into practice under the Golden Rule."

In exploring the whys and wherefores of hobbies, General Agent Standiford is open to three questions: (1) Is a hobby worth while? (2) What does it accomplish? and (3) What is the reward?

He answers categorically as follows:

"First. I think it is worth while because it helps you to make lifetime friends, and for some reason they all want to direct business your way, so you need have but little fear about your success in business.

"Second. What does it accomplish? We will just take a few illustrations, for I have boys—also men and women—in upper age brackets that have been worth money, but one bad business deal and they find they are broke. So your counsel, proper guidance, and a job put them bask on the upgrade, and they become good citizens and taxpayers. The juvenile situation alone is worth while, for when you let one boy in your community get away from you and start on the crime route he is a first-, second-, and third-time loser, and just from a taxpayer's standpoint it costs $30,000 before that individual lives out his life. Why not put him on the profit side instead of among the liabilities? The money matter is minor, though. Also to be considered are broken homes, disease, heartaches of all kinds left along his trail. Put that boy on a job that he likes, get him with good organizations, and you will have a winner. Just recently I placed a young man from Glendale in a $10,000 job. He is just a youth, but he took advantage of the other route. He has counseled with me for the past 9 years and we still have plans for his future. This is what is accomplished by your effort.

"Third. What is the reward? Through this hobby service in the past 11 years, we have placed more than 8,000 people in jobs. They are under no obligation to us and we make no charge, but our business continues to grow, and, although we give the company—the Midland National Life—our best efforts with the balance of the time, it is gratifying to know that in personal production I have been among the top 10 men in the United States for 11 years, and 6 of them at the top of the list. Reward? Good business, happiness in the knowledge of helping the other fellow—and a world of friends."

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, a considerable number of our service personnel who are being returned to civil life at this time are suffering various degrees of what we used to call shell shock. These lads need, above all, the careful personal guidance of a sympathetic and understanding man. They need the guidance of one who cannot only assist them in reorienting themselves, but who can also help in making sure that the jobs in which they are first placed will be jobs that are conducive to rehabilitation as well as giving employment. To place a shell-shocked young man abruptly into a job that of itself is in the midst of noise and confusion, might be just the wrong thing to do. The lad himself would likely become confused, distraught, and perhaps exhibit temperament. He will need encouragement and the feeling of fellowship. He might even need to be placed in a sort of transition position first, in order that he might begin to forget the sounds and sights of battle.

I know from my own experience following the last war that boys returning from the battle fronts to civil life have sounds and sights in their minds and hearts that are not easily forgotten. Visions return suddenly to them that they do not like to talk about. In the middle of the night, they will awaken from horrible dreams. In the daytime, sounds or circumstances may recall things they want to forget, but will not forget for years to come, although the nightmare of it all will soften in time.

They will not want to talk about these things—nor will they want to be questioned too closely. They will want to think happy thoughts and experience happy things to help them forget. Pleasant and friendly associations at home and at work, and the feeling that those at home are interested in them and love them, will do more to rehabilitate them than almost anything else.

To those who have offered their lives for our country on land and sea and in the air all over the world, we can do no less than hold them close to our hearts, and help them forget while they reestablish themselves. Mr. C. Vere Standiford is a real friend and a wise counselor to the returning veterans and to all who will help them.

Pilots and Instructors Getting Raw Deal From Army Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the American Aviation Daily, April 1944, and the Aero Digest of March 1944:

[From the American Aviation Daily of April 6, 1944]

INSTRUCTORS PROTEST ASSIGNMENT TO NON-FLYING JOBS

A telegram from 122 instructors in the civilian-contract primary-school program has been sent to the President, the Assistant Secretary of War, Senators, and Congressmen and from California and Nevada with the following message:

"We are among the civilian flying instructors who have trained the greater part of America's combat pilots in United States Army primary-contract flying schools. We have been informed that our services will no longer be needed in the Air Forces after a few weeks due to curtailment of the training of Army pilots.

"The majority of us are members of the Enlisted Reserve, Army of the United States. With our employment as flying instructors terminating we have been told that we will be

placed on active duty as nonflying enlisted men or we may choose to resign from the Enlisted Reserve as a result of the solicitation of the Army Air Forces. At the time of this solicitation we were told: 'If the occasion should arise when you would be placed on active duty it would only be as commissioned flying personnel.'

"We are cognizant of the fact that the United States Army is training thousands of women pilots. It is our claim that it is not only unfair to the men who have assisted in building the present Air Force but it will be very detrimental to the war effort to discard the talents of the finest American airmen and at the same time train inexperienced women to serve as commissioned pilots for the Air Forces. Our ages range from 20 years upward. Our flying experience ranges from several hundred hours to thousands of hours. We are desirous of Army flying activity of any type from instructing to combat.

"It is our recommendation that corrective measures be taken whereby our past experience and knowledge can be utitilized in the Army Air Forces. We earnestly solicit your interest and efforts to correct this situation.

"Respectfully submitted on behalf of the 122 civilian flying instructors employed by the Hancock College of Aeronautics, Santa Maria, Calif., U. W. Army Air Forces Primary Flight Training Contractors."

[From the Aero Digest of March 1944]

WASHINGTON IN FORMATION

One thing that is beginning to bother Congressmen who have sponsored aviation training is the spectacle of continuing the use of women as ferry pilots for military planes while there are plenty of experienced men pilots fairly itching for the jobs. As one Member summed up the situation, it seems downright stupid to train more than 1,000 young women a year at an estimated cost of $6,000,000 while there are 5,000 experienced men pilots looking for jobs as a result of the liquidation of the C. A. A.'s pilot-training program. Also it is pointed out that the C. A. P. has a force of 25,000 men pilots on tap, at least 10,000 of whom would be available for ferry work with very little transitional training.

When graduated, the girl flyers are scheduled to be enrolled in the WASP—Women Air Service Pilots—a civilian group organized by Jacqueline Cochran. There are rumblings that the Army is none too satisfied with this arrangement and would like to disband the organization. On the other hand, it has been revealed that a legislative attempt will be made to give the WASPS a flull-fledged rating as members of the A. A. F.

No one in Congress or elsewhere questions the pluck or ability of these girl pilots. It is conceded without stint that they are doing a wonderful job. Nevertheless, it is felt that it is wasteful to continue to train them when there are so many pilots already available. Another point about all this that is puzzling probing Congressmen is the dearth of information as to fatalities and accidents in the flying activities of the WASPS.

Voice of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Mrs. Ethel V. McWillians, wife of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN D. MCWILLIAMS, which appeared in the May 22 edition of the Washington Times-Herald:

QUESTION TIME

I am the wife of a freshman member of Congress from the Second District of Connecticut. The views I express here are my own, but I know my husband agrees with them in general, at least.

What I want to say is that I resent very deeply the fact that we and many other members of Congress are being made victims of a situation here in Washington not of our own making.

The whole country is angry and critical as it continues to read about high official parties and receptions in Washington, with foreign embassies lavishing champagne and caviar.

I don't blame anybody who criticizes such things. Tremendous amounts of American food and other lend-lease materials are being flown around the world. Our boys are streaming blood and sweat on every continent, and they not only lack champagne, but even beds.

It is only natural that people will want to know why our good neighbors, who need so much help from America, can still find the money to throw the kind of parties that continue to go on here.

But I think it is time the country also knows some of us in official life are against that sort of thing, too. When I came to Washington I was told to forget protocol and not to make formal calls on embassies, to help hold down useless social activities in wartime. I think that was a good rule, and I have obeyed it.

Now, because some of our good friends and allies are blowing in great sums of money on parties, we in congressional life who have tried to live as we should in these times are suffering criticism along with those who deserve it.

I think it is time the country knew the facts, and I intend to help give them.

ETHEL V. MCWILLIAMS.

Important Message to Next of Kin of Men and Women in Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, war casualties are an unpleasant subject, yet wars are not fought without bloodshed and as much as we dislike to discuss the topic, it is only fair to the families of all service men and women that they be made aware of the benefits Congress has provided for them in the event it should be necessary to change the blue star in the window to one of gold.

Overcome with sorrow, the next of kin frequently neglects to apply for certain benefits which after all are only a token payment by the Government for the great sacrifice the service men or women have made on the field of battle, or in the patriotic unselfish service of our Nation.

The next of kin might be eligible for one or more of four different monetary benefits that are available.

First. A 6-month gratuity payment: This payment is automatically paid to a wife or, if there is no wife, to a child or children. If there is no wife or child, this gratuity goes to dependent parents or other dependent relatives—grandchildren, brothers, sisters, or grandparents—who have been named by the soldier to receive this gratuity pay. If there is no wife or child or dependent relatives named by the soldier, this gratuity is paid to any dependent relative if they are shown to have been dependent upon the soldier before his death. The amount of this payment depends upon the amount of pay the soldier was receiving at the time of his death—not including rental and subsistence pay. The beneficiary receives six times this monthly payment.

Second. Monthly insurance payments: This insurance is not paid in a lump sum. It is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary. The older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy a beneficiary under 30 years of age will receive $55.21 a month for 240 months. A beneficiary over 30 years of age will get a guaranteed 120 equal installments—and if they survive beyond 120 months it is paid for life. The amount of monthly payment, if the beneficiary is over 30, depends on the age of the beneficiary. Under a $10,000 policy a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would do well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance policies are in order and a certificate in the hands of the beneficiaries. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check the insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen.

Third. A pension: This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, it is not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased soldier can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 (equally divided,

with $10 for each additional child (total divided). Total pension as to widow, child, or children not to exceed $100.

Note: The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect insurance and get a pension besides.

Fourth. Arrears of pay: When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. For instance, if the casualty occurs on the 27th of the month, he had 27 days' pay coming. If the casualty occurs on the 15th of the month, he had 15 days' back pay coming. Then, too, when soldiers are at the front in actual combat they may miss several pay days. All of this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. The nearest heir of the deceased serviceman should inquire about and collect this arrears of pay if the serviceman or woman becomes a casualty.

SUMMARY

Should there be a death casualty in your family, remember there are four payments due the dependents: First, 6 months' gratuity payment; second, insurance; third, a pension; and fourth, arrears of pay. If there are any questions, or should you know anyone having difficulty getting their payments from the Government, it would do them well to take it up with their Congressman. He will be glad to handle the case for them. Citizens of the Ninth District of Minnesota can write Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on May 27, at Julia Richman High School, Second Avenue and Sixty-seventh Street, New York City, at the celebration in honor of the sixtieth birthday of Dr. Edvard Benes, the President of the Czechoslovakia Republic:

Czechoslovakia was the first country to be invaded when Hitler went on the march. She was also the first country to bear the brunt of an appeasement policy by which the nations of Europe thought that they could avoid destruction if they allowed Czechoslovakia to perish.

In this year of 1944 the American public and the nations of the world know a great deal more about international affairs than they knew in 1938. In 1938 no one suspected that Hitler was only biding his time to pounce upon the other countries of Europe and destroy them one by one.

I feel very keenly about this matter because I cannot forget that it was my feeble voice which was raised in 1933 and 1934, warning the people of the United States of the schemes of conquest which Hitler had prepared.

I knew that Hitler's aim was not to unite the German people, because the German people had been united for many years before Hitler was ever thought of. I knew that Hitler did not criticize the Treaty of Versailles because of its unfairness to Germany, since all the unfair provisions of the treaty have been gradually eliminated by the powers which sought to preserve the peace of Europe.

I knew that Hitler did not begin his anti-Semitic career in order to destroy the small Jewish minority of Germany, but he did it for the purpose of uniting, in hatred, the people of Germany so that they should continue to hate all nations of the world and eventually destroy them one by one.

Czechoslovakia was situated in a peculiarly vulnerable position. She was surrounded by the Germans on all sides, on the north her neighbors were the Prussians and Saxons and on the south, Austria. As long as Austria was allowed to maintain itself as a Republic, no danger of any kind threatened Czechoslovakia from that quarter, but when Hitler overran Austria and compelled its government to surrender to him, Czechoslovakia was doomed unless the nations of Europe would band themselves together and fight for her continued existence.

But in Europe Czechoslovakia had really only one friend left, and that was Russia. Her immediate neighbors were watching their opportunity to grab for themselves slices of Czech territory whenever opportunity should present itself.

Nor were they long in waiting. Hitler knew that the best way to appropriate Czechoslovakia for himself would be by weakening her so that she would be unable to resist. He also knew that her neighbors were greedy and that they would sacrifice Czechoslovakia any time if offered slices of her territory.

Hitler established a fifth column in Czechoslovakia which operated very successfully both in the north and in the south of that country. In the north this fifth column was centered in the Sudetenland, which was inhabited by German-speaking individuals, and therefore legitimately German prey. In the south Hitler tried to build on the feeling by the Slovaks that they were different from the Czechs and should be made independent of them.

Czechoslovakia was made the first victim of the policy of appeasement which our western powers sought to follow, with the view of preventing a world war. No such thing happened or could have happened. Hitler's aims were not confined to the conquest of Czechoslovakia, and this was merely the first step in the career of the German Fuehrer, who used the resources of Czechoslovakia to arm Germany to an extent never rivaled before in the history of the world.

And, so, after Czechoslovakia came Poland, and after Poland came Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and France, and finally an attack was made upon Russia, and, due to the valor of Russian arms and the patriotism of its people, this is where Hitler was first made to taste defeat.

In December 1941 came Pearl Harbor, and then this country entered the World War, and we have now been engaged in this bloodiest of all conflicts, pouring out money and treasures and the lives of our sons and daughters on the field of battle.

Through it all the people of Czechoslovakia, even though staggering under the blow which was inflicted upon them by Germany, and which was more or less condoned by the complacency of the people of Europe, kept up their national spirit and the motto has become "We shall live again."

The President of Czechoslovakia, Edvard Benes, stood as a real pillar of devotion for his country and nation. Driven out of Czechoslovakia by Hitler's cohorts, he established a government in exile and the Government set itself for its aim the restoration of Czechoslovakia to its rightful place in the family of nations.

It was not an easy task for the people of Czechoslovakia to maintain its identity through the persecution to which they were subjected by their German masters. Every town and village of Czechoslovakia was conscripted to service for the German war machine and every place in Czechoslovakia was obliged to interfere with the German war machine in its own way and in its own manner, so that while all of them would work together for the Czech people by way of impeding and interfering with the German war machine, each had to do it in a different manner. In some places it was possible for the Czech patriots to sabotage Germany by turning out inferior weapons. In other places, suddenly one would find a dead German policeman or a Gestapo man.

Every Czech is fighting in some way to destroy the German military power and we on this side of the ocean, as well as the Czech Government in exile, wish to encourage the work of the Czech patriots at home until such time as Czechoslovakia will regain her independence and its Government will be restored on its own soil.

Czechoslovakia was a republic built on the same principles on which our republic is built—that is, life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Under the constitution of that country there never was any discrimination because of race or creed. The many racial units of Czechoslovakia lived side by side peacefully with one another and religious tolerance was a basic principle of its government.

When Czechoslovakia fell, the slogan of that country was "We shall live again," and on this occasion, the sixtieth birthday of the President of that Republic, I can think of no more fitting motto than that of devoting our energies to the task that Czechoslovakia should really live again.

Address of Ignatius Nurkiewicz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Ignatius Nurkiewicz, president, Federated Merchants Organization, Buffalo, N. Y., on May 30, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, reverend monsignori, members of the clergy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am pleased to accept the invitation of the chairman, to address the members of this congress this morning on behalf of the merchants and businessmen of Polish origin, who are members of the Federated Merchants Organization of America—composed of Polish-American industrialists, bankers, wholesalers, and tradesmen in America. Our organization could not allow this important congress of Poles in America to take place without giving it our wholehearted support. I am proud to say that our organization and the Polish businessmen in America are represented here by a number of delegates at this congress.

As president of the Federated Merchants Organization of America, I am speaking on behalf of all American businessmen and manufacturers of Polish descent. Our participation in the economic life of our country is of great importance, and is steadily increasing. A partial survey recently made shows that American Poles at the present time are

listed as owners of 318 factories, 87 banks and insurance companies, 324 wholesale corporations, 38,550 retail stores, and 7,640 trades.

During the last years we have noticed a considerable expansion of these Polish-American owned businesses—especially in the industrial field.

The retail and wholesale establishments which survived the last depression find themselves in somewhat difficult position at the present time. The shortage of material, as well as the small margin of profit allowed by the Government through O. P. A., etc., along with increasing overhead, costs, and steadily mounting transportation and distribution difficulties, cause financial hardships, against which retail and wholesale businessmen must fight in order not to liquidate their establishments.

Hard work and honest realization of his duties gives the Polish merchant courage to stay in business. By increased effort—he is able to contribute to the war effort by supplying all defense war workers and their families with necessary food and merchandise.

In the field of industry we have noticed an increase in the number of establishments organized and managed by Polish manufacturers. These factories, efficiently managed and properly operated, are turning out products for the Allied armed forces and receiving due recognition and citations from our Government.

As we witness the steady increase of the commercial and industrial establishments managed by Americans of Polish extraction we become aware of the necessity of organizing all of those concerned in order to enable them to play a more important part in the economic life of our country.

Thrifty because they are industrious and patriotic, our Polish merchants and manufacturers are doing much for the war effort. Due recognition and credit of this has been given to the Federated Merchants Organization of America by the Treasury Department, the American Red Cross, and other service organizations in the form of certificates of honor for their excellent cooperation. In this way we are contributing toward the goal of victory.

When we speak of victory we are aware of the uncertainty which post-war economic conditions may develop. We fully realize that winning the war alone will not bring about security and employment. Only victory with the assurance of a long and just peace will prevent another depression.

During this war America has increased her war production beyond all expectation. However, maintenance of the present level of business activity cannot be sustained by domestic markets alone. To maintain it we shall have to increase our pre-war foreign market exports by regaining all our old markets and promoting new ones. We shall have to find safe investments for our vast American capital. That only can be accomplished in a world of free, independent and democratic countries. Among foreign markets the European one is of most vital importance to America.

But the countries now under the heel of the Nazis must be organized on democratic principles which will allow the United States of America to enter with them into normal trade relations.

With this in mind the American Business World must become fully aware of the danger that the steadily increasing autocratic Soviet influence upon the foreign market will bring to our country. European nations subjected to this influence will undoubtedly cease to be markets for American trade.

The populations of the countries will not be in a position to become prospective consumers of our products. Nor can we safely invest our capital in these countries.

If this is true concerning Europe it is particularly true concerning Poland, where we warn our fellow Americans that any curtailment of her boundaries will have a definite detrimental effect on the economic life of the United States.

Poland has enjoyed increasing trade relations with us. Poland was buying 10 times more from America than she was selling to us. American capital had all the possibilities of safe investments on the Polish market. It is obvious, therefore, that should the eastern territory of Poland be annexed to Soviet Russia half of the Polish market will be lost to American trade. American cotton, for instance, will no longer be shipped there, as Russia would bring it from Turkestan. American capital would no longer be placed in Polish oil fields and all pre-war investments there would be lost. Millions of people, prospective consumers of American articles would not be in a position to buy from us.

Russian domination of any part of Poland would only enable the Soviet economic system to flood the world markets more effectively with products manufactured by forced labor and at prices which will disrupt American industry.

The United States would not be able to compete on these markets with Soviet goods, as the price of our products is based on the element of fair wages to labor and the Soviet methods are based on forced labor. We would never be able to cope with this competition. We would lose not only the European markets, but the Near East, Far East, and South American trade also.

That is why we are warning the American business leaders of the danger of Soviet expansion. Europe can again become the market for American economic expansion only if European countries—free of Soviet influences—can again freely improve their standards of living. Accomplishing the purposes of the Atlantic Charter, which guarantees "four freedoms," will secure this. By any other eventuality Europe will be lost to American business and will become a dangerous element in the world economy.

All we say is vital to the American businessman. It is vital because we must provide the millions of veterans of this war with proper employment. We cannot allow them to return from the battlefields to a lower standard of living.

We cannot allow this opportunity to pass to call to your attention as businessmen and women of this country that Poland needs not only spiritual help, food, and medical care for her people, but also financial and industrial rehabilitation.

We should take the lead among the United Nations in this respect. This is not so because there are 6,000,000 of us in this country but because the character, honesty, and integrity of the Polish Nation are a guaranty of the safety of American investments. Our organization is working on post-war planning in this respect, which will be submitted to our Government, and we shall at some future date ask your support in obtaining favorable action on it.

In closing, allow me to again thank you for this opportunity to address you. On behalf of the Federated Merchants Organization, I pledge our untiring energy in the war effort, so that this terrible world conflict will be brought to a speedier and victorious end for the Allied Nations, to be followed by a just, honorable, and enduring world peace for all our allies, with an independent Poland—the land of our forebears.

The Federated Merchants and Industrialists Organization wishes you every success in your deliberations, and hopes that your efforts will be fruitful of beneficial results for Poland.

Why Guam Was Not Fortified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comment by Raymond Lonergan from the editorial page of Labor of June 3, 1944:

WHY GUAM WASN'T FORTIFIED

A retired army officer of real distinction is authority for the following:

"Congress is frequently berated for its alleged failure to fortify Guam, a tiny dot of land way out in the Pacific. Lots of people believe the President urged an appropriation, but that isolationists and pacifists in Congress turned him down.

"Our military engineers have known for 50 years that it would be a waste of money to fortify Guam. The plain truth is the island can't be defended. It has a tiny harbor which doesn't cover more than a square mile. It would cost considerable money to dredge it, and when the job was finished, we wouldn't have anything worth possessing. An enemy could stand off shore and blast ships in the harbor.

"It's about the poorest place in the world to be when a typhoon comes along. Therefore, it isn't of much value in peacetime, except as a landing place for airplanes or a stop where passengers may stretch their legs when traveling between the United States and Asia.

"There are a good many other places in the Pacific we should have fortified, but not Guam. That's one 'crime' no one familiar with the facts will charge up against Congress."

Minnesota Norwegians Hope for New Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday June 2, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with heavy hearts that Minnesota's citizens of Norwegian birth or ancestry observed recently the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Norway's independence. It was not a joyous independence day, but through the clouds of Nazi oppression we all see bright hopes of an Allied victory ere another Norwegian independence day arrives.

Throughout the world and even in the prison camps of Norway under the watchful eye of the Gestapo were said prayers that soon another day of freedom will come when the Axis hordes who have overrun the land of these brave seafaring people will be routed so this peaceful democratic nation can again go about its honest pursuits.

Dr. Richard Beck, of the University of North Dakota, recently paid tribute to

Norway and his remarks appeared recently in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald. I am pleased to present them here to remind us of another of the great nations whose people are fighting with us to make us all free. His statement follows:

PAY TRIBUTE TO NORWAY ON INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Dr. Richard Beck, University of North Dakota)

This May 17 marks the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Norway's Independence Day. It was on that day in 1814 that the chosen representatives of the Norwegian people formally signed the constitution of Norway, thereby safeguarding the freedom of its people and laying the foundation for its remarkable progress in later years.

The Norwegian people at home will, to be sure, be denied the privilege of celebrating this historic anniversary officially; they will, nevertheless, commemorate the day in their hearts, silently, reverently, and gratefully.

And throughout the free world, wherever Norwegians are found in any numbers, the day will be fittingly observed, with friends and admirers of Norway among other nationalities joining in paying tribute to a brave people whose unswerving faith in democratic ideals and heroism have kindled the imagination of freedom-loving men everywhere.

Contemplating the significance of Norway's Independence Day, we recall with admiration the patriotism of those leaders of the Norwegian nation, who at that time fought fearlessly for its freedom and self-determination. The historic importance of their undertaking looms larger in the light of the tragic circumstance that the Norwegian people, through no fault of their own, has today been called upon to fight for its very existence as a nation, politically and culturally.

QUOTES POET

Or as the American poet Joseph Auslander puts it in a tribute to the people of Norway on this anniversary of its independence day:

"This day, as when your fathers stood
At Eidsvold on that fateful day,
You stand firm in your faith and blood
This sacred seventeenth of May
This seventeenth of May the same
You stand in bitter bonds, but still
Your spirit feeds an inner flame
No brutal enemy can kill."

And that is the glorious fact to record on this Norwegian anniversary—the undying spirit of the Norwegian people on the home front, where they keep on fighting passively and actively, according to the means at their disposal, against cruel persecution, fire and sword, literally speaking.

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Equally admirable is the great and many-sided contribution which the Norwegians are making to the common cause of the United Nations, far out of proportion to their numbers. Gallantly they are fighting the foe on land, in the air, and on the sea.

The example of the brave people of Norway, counting no cost too great in the fight for freedom, is an inspiration to others engaged in the same fight on far-flung battle fronts. Or to hark back to Auslander's tribute:

"To hunted men throughout the earth,
The starved, the beaten, the reviled,
Brave people whose unswerving faith
That is not free and undefiled."

It is the sincere prayer, hope, and belief of friends of Norway throughout the world that its brave men and women will be able to celebrate next May 17 once more in their free and democratic land of yesteryears.

Freedom of Speech Suppressed in Puerto Rico Under the Dictatorial Administration of Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2 1944

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a speech which was to be broadcast by the Honorable Cayetano Coll Cuchi, president of the board of commissioners of the city of San Juan, and former speaker of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico. This speech outlines the sort of centralized and autocratic government in Puerto Rico under the despotic administration of Governor Tugwell. The radio broadcast of this speech was prohibited. While thousands of Puerto Rican boys are fighting throughout the world, in all war fronts, for certain principles among which is the freedom of speech, in Puerto Rico, under Governor Tugwell, freedom of speech is arbitrarily suppressed. The speech is as follows:

During the last 3 years an anti-American system of government has been under organization in Puerto Rico, openly contradictory to all the fundamental principles upon which the Constitution and the Government of the United States rest with the knowledge and sufferance of all the people, who see it, who feel it, and who consent to it because of an inexplicable inertia, through an incomprehensible lack of civic firmness to prevent it. Among the less educated classes, who in Puerto Rico form the great mass, that government is justified by demagogical means, which carry with them promises of great generosities which later apparently are translated into reality by means of individual acts which do not affect, nor can ever affect, the great majority of our population. The rest of our people, the educated and conscientious, who, here as well as in all parts of the world, carry on their shoulders the responsibility of public life, by inexplicable cowardice consent and try to take advantage of the situation, when it directly touches their interests, limiting themselves to insubstantial protests or cries of pain when they see their money in danger. It is a spectacle which would dishonor our people if it were not because it has already been repeated in other much larger and more powerful peoples than ours.

The people of Puerto Rico enjoy a limited sovereignty by virtue of the provisions of the constitutional organic act but, after all, enjoy their sovereignty. That rickety Constitution of ours contains a series of principles and guaranties which are basic in the structure of every democracy. If, while we are striving for a more extensive sovereignty, we knew how to retain in all its purity what we already have, what has caused us so many struggles, such bitterness and such suffering in the past, in that past which our new redeemers unjustly and irreverently make sport of, our road would not be narrowed nor our horizon obscured by the unprecedented threats of slavery.

When the present Governor Tugwell was appointed to that position, I was present at the meeting of the committee of the Senate which considered his appointment and predicted what was going to occur in Puerto Rico. For me it was obvious because for the two previous days I had been carefully reading the books of Mr. Tugwell and penetrating his antidemocratic ideology of a purely Fascist character. There is nothing more absurd than to classify Tugwell as a Communist or Socialist. He is neither one nor the other. He is as much a socialist and of the same kind of ideology as Adolf Hitler. Reading the books of Mr. Tugwell and comparing them with the book of Hitler and his innumerable speeches, both the German Fuehrer and the Governor of Puerto Rico believe in the same ideology, that is to say: the centralization of the government in the hands of a strong power controlled by a single party, which carry on the functions of sovereignty with absolute independence of the popular will which is regimented and subjugated by the persecution of accumulated capital and the absorption by that central power of all the means of production. War to the death to private initiative, industrialization of the lands by the central government, fixing of all the corporate benefits in favor of the state, destruction of free commerce and indirect protection of labor and the farmer on the basis of a total repudiation by them of every vestige of political power. That is the program of the German National Socialist Party; and that is the ideology of Dr. Tugwell according to his books.

On arriving in Puerto Rico he found a propitious field for his experimentation and ventures, with a new party, with a party leader who was successful in inspiring, through many circumstances, an idolizing fanaticism in a great part of our proletariat; a leader of strong will, surrounded by men none of whom were capable of resisting him. In the last 3 years, through the so-called fundamental laws of the Popular Party, there has been created little by little a central system of government which despoils the people of all their democratic prerogatives.

That system began by dominating the insular legislature itself, a ridiculous and rickety copy of the German Reichstag during the first years of the Chancelorship of Adolf Hitler. As there, here in Puerto Rico laws were proposed which fundamentally altered our system, our economy, our traditions, and our principles of government without even having been prepared, studied, and analyzed by the legislators themselves; on the contrary they came from extraordinary brains, of the chosen group which acted and surrounded the Fuehrer. Submitted to the so-called legislators, these laws were approved after technical reference to committees of the house and senate, but in truthful reality without having been considered or studied by those committees. With a sarcasm which to me it is inexplicable that the Puerto Rican people have been able to stand without being ashamed of their cowardice, laws have been approved with an extreme and complicated machinery and of a character revolutionary to our economy, by 10 men in the senate, the majority of whom—and I am generous in saying the majority—never read them, and if they read them then or read them now, do not understand them. In this manner the legislature was robbed of their direct democratic intervention in the government.

The great fundamental and basic principle of democracy has consisted in the exclusive right on the part of the representatives of the people to vote and manage their income and taxes. Here, that privilege was made a joke of by means of a number of laws of the Popular Party, depriving the people and its legislature of that sacred right, the fount and origin of the liberty of the United States, to put it in the hands of the Governor of Puerto Rico and the political chiefs who

surround him, to the point where we have seen at the present moment that they pretend to dispose of the sum of $16,000,000 enormous for Puerto Rico, without the intervention of the legislature, by the simple ukase of the Governor and the submission of the attorney general, the auditor, and the treasurer of Puerto Rico In all the other activities of the government we have seen the displacement of the legislative will to place it in organism which the Governor of Puerto Rico exclusively controls. The famous development law is Fascist establishment through which the central power assumes without limits all the powers of the legislature in the administrative field. Naturally, that law has not been put entirely in force because it would have caused a commotion in our island; but little by little it is being instrumented and organized until the moment arrives in which it constitutes a true octopus which embraces and absorbs all the activities of our government

Now, thank God, a bomb which has exploded in the Popular camp itself may open the eyes of our people. Of all the destruction accomplished by the Popular Party there is none more prejudicial to the interests of Puerto Rico than the destruction of our municipal life. The municipalities are the bastions on which all democratic people defend their institutions. Free people of the world for hundreds and thousands of years have saved their liberty by the direct and heroic action of their municipalities. The burghers of the Nordic countries, the communities of medieval France, the Spanish towns were the institutions which resisted, combatted, and destroyed feudalism, gave life to the nations, and were able to impose their will on the governments. When one wants to become master through the exercise of a central power, whether he is gloriously called by the name of Napoleon I, or tragically Adolf Hitler, or comically Mussolini, or any other of their imitations in these countries of our America, the first thing which is thought of is the destructior of the municipal power. Already our municipalities do not have economic life because the central power has materially strangled them by seizing all the revenues which under a good administration are municipal revenues and they have been deprived of an infinity of attributes, and the last deprivation, in the trajectory of the roads which lead them to disappearance, is the law of aqueducts, that iniquitous despoil which today the Insular Commissioner of Sanitation, a prominent Popular leader, and the executive council, composed of other Popular leaders of equal prominence, are carrying out against Ponce. It is to be properly assumed that that is a Popular policy.

But the psychological phenomenon which arises among us is worthy of study so that we may cry aloud, because it takes us directly to a public crisis of horrible transcendence. The policy of Hitlerism in German, of fascism in Italy created in both countries a rickety mind of submission and humiliation which was hidden behind an apparent structure of grandiose discipline and order necessary in the coordination of the elements which composed those peoples. And that is occurring also among us.

When the law was approved creating the Authority of Aqueducts (water system), no municipality protested, except San Juan, because the majority of the municipalities which might be affected by the law were in the hands of the Popular Democratic Party, and because everyone believed, both in San Juan and in the island, that what that law was concerned with was the seizing of the water system of San Juan from the government of the capital. And because of that psychological phenomenon to which I referred above, this was a good thing; it was good for those who combat us politically without noting that they were destroying themselves, because in municipal life municipal acts should be united to be effective; and where the lifeblood is taken from a single municipality of Puerto Rico, it is taken from all, regardless of the party which dominates them. The central government has not dared to take the aqueduct of the capital from us because it knows that it cannot and because it knows that we are going to defend it with all the force of which we are capable; but to justify the action which they propose in the morning, or God knows with what other intentions, they carry out the abuse of robbing Ponce of its aqueduct without the consent of that community. Spitting at the sky, the saliva falls again on their own faces. The bomb exploded in the Popular camp.

As always happens in these cases, the cowardice, together with the irresponsibility was made patent. The phrase of Senator Barreto will remain in our political history as a monument of both things. To say that he voted for the law as a Popular Senator but repudiates it as a Ponceno is simply to confess that psychological condition which I am charging here tonight. But it still remains for our friends of Ponce and the other towns of the island, and for the mass of our people, to consider the degree of degeneration which implies in a community what I heard, with cheeks red with shame, exclaimed to one of a group of Popular youth who commented on the matter, "That about Ponce is celestial music. Now Luis takes the whip and 24 hours later Grillasca and all those people are under control."

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following address delivered by me at the I Am an American Day celebration in Pittsburgh, Pa., on Sunday, May 21, 1944, and the proclamation of Mayor Cornelius D. Scully, of Pittsburgh:

Reverend clergy, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, this is not an ordinary day providing shallow reason for ordinary observance. It is not a day for the tinsel trappings and cheap fanfare of hollow ceremony. This is a sacred day.

This is a day for particular and reverent recognition of the great privilege of free American citizenship.

Here in Allegheny County we participate in the celebration of this day with great enthusiasm and pride in the fact that Pittsburgh has the distinction of being the first municipal government to legally set aside a day on which the dignity and heritage of American citizenship should henceforth be annually recognized.

This was done in 1939 through an ordinance introduced by Councilman A. L. Wolk, and unanimously adopted by city council, directing that the mayor annually designate the third Sunday of May as Citizenship Day.

This wholesome and patriotic movement spread rapidly and a half dozen larger cities took similar action. A year later, on May 3, 1940, the Congress of the United States formally decreed that henceforth and annually the President be authorized and requested to set aside this day as I Am an American Day.

So much for the history of the day's celebration.

On this solemn day I would impress upon every listener that, in times like these, when our freedom is gravely imperiled, every day should be I Am an American Day.

Your Government expects and relies upon you to daily practice Americanism; to be ever conscious of your privileges and your responsibilities as a citizen. There are many ways to daily observe and demonstrate a living sense of Americanism.

We might leave the military problems to the military experts. Your opinion and my opinion in those matters is not worth the breath it takes for utterance.

Of course, as an American you have a right to be an armchair strategist. You have a right to express your opinion, to engage in foolish, and often vicious, back-fence or poolroom debate on the progress of the war and the efficiency of our military leadership.

But you also have the right and the duty to defend your home and your family. You'll never indulge in armchair strategy, in rumor spreading, in serving the purpose of Hitler and Hirohito by creating discontent among other uninformed and gullible people if you really love your country.

Instead of whispering opinions about where and when the United Nations should take the military offensive, about the strategic soundness of the Allied policy in either the European or Pacific theater, resolve this very day to take your own personal offensive on the home front, here in America.

Resolve this day to volunteer as a blood donor at the American Red Cross blood bank. Repeat this donation as a continuing act of patriotism and an expression of your Americanism.

Above all, resolve to have an unshakable faith in these United States of America.

Millions of our sons and daughters have marched on to war with that faith and with a song on their lips and in their hearts.

It's a typical American song of freedom—this is worth fighting for.

Just what does that mean? It doesn't mean alone the peaceful valley, the sun-baked street, the residential district of a great city. Those are physical things and places; they'll be here forever.

Our boys and girls march to battle with the inborn spirit which came down to them from their ancestors who fled to this great country to escape the tears, the toil, the oppression, and the heartaches of the Old World way of life.

Our boys and girls march to battle envisioning one thing above all which is worth fighting for. They fight for the right to enjoy a life of liberty in the peaceful valley, the sun-baked city street. They go to fight for the home they have left behind them.

They are bursting with the confidence of ultimate victory over our ferocious enemies, whose plight becomes more desperate daily.

They are filled with confidence and unquestionable loyalty to their commanding officers, from the lowest ranking corporal to our Commander in Chief Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

They left their homes with implacable faith in you and me. We are the custodians of the American home front, and ours is a solemn duty to protect it.

It is our sacred obligation to see that when our service men and women return home, they will return to a life of contentment, a life of opportunity, a life of freedom from fear and freedom from want; a life of economic security.

Our boys and girls must not return to the same grim and dreary prospect which faced the boys of 1917 when they were demobilized.

There is a way to avert that, but I shall not talk about it today, for this is not a political meeting.

However, in passing, it would seem logical to declare that the leadership which has brought this Nation, and our allies to the verge of victory, is the same experienced leadership which will facilitate a speedy end of the war, a just peace, and a post-war world of work, happiness, and prosperity.

Conversely it is just as logical to declare that an inexperienced leadership would prolong the war and guarantee a post-war world of depression, hunger and misery for the common man. And, worse than that such a leadership would lay the foundation for another world war within the next generation.

I will make one concluding observation on our immediate and continuing duties as custodians of the home front; and, all service men and women agree, so I am told by one of our honored guests, Commando Sgt. Charles E. Kelly, our Pittsburgh hero in this war and winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The majority of the residents of this greatest industrial center of the world work in our steel mills, our coal mines, or in other defense plants and industries.

Some are mechanical workers, others are office works. They all take special pride in skill with their hands; a skill, of course, which exists because of the intelligence of their brains.

Their special skills, your special skills, are more valuable today than ever in our Nation's history. If we are to survive as a free Nation, and we will; if we are to achieve post-war freedom from fear and want, and we will, then it naturally follows that we must employ our skills to the utmost; we must pledge ourselves to keep up the home front by giving all we have to the war effort.

We must work hard. We must remember that the battle front cannot be sustained without the home front. Our boys must have the finest equipment in the greatest quantity. It's up to you to give it to them. But, even that is not enough.

All of us must become more conscious of the terrific cost of this war; of our sacred duty not only to lend our skills and labor to the successful prosecution of the war, but to lend our very possessions, our treasures, our money to the Government by the regular purchase of War bonds.

Do these things. Have confidence in our military leadership, have confidence in your Government; remember that Lincoln had to contend with the carping criticism of unpatriotic Americans; remember that if you would keep the New World, the new America of today, you must fight and struggle and work for it today and tomorrow.

With these ideals, I am sure that our returning boys and girls will find that we have not let them down on the home front while they endured the agonies of hell on the battle front.

Thank you.

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by formal decree of May 3, 1940, designated that henceforth and annually the third Sunday of May be observed and celebrated as Citizenship Day; and authorized and requested that the President of the United States each year proclaim and set aside this day as I Am an American Day; and

Whereas it was expressly stipulated that this be done annually in special and public recognition of those who have attained citizenship by coming of age, or by naturalization; and in particular recognition of the great privilege of American citizenship; and

Whereas our beloved President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, by special proclamation, has complied with this congressional request, and urged that all civil and educational authorities make plans for the proper observance of citizenship or I Am an American Day, declaring, "That it is even more essential in time of war than in time of peace that a people should understand the form and genius of their government and the responsibilities of citizenship"; and

Whereas the city of Pittsburgh has the distinction of being among the first of the Nation's municipal governments to inaugurate this wholesome and patriotic recognition of American citizenship, even antedating congressional recognition thereof, by virtue of an empowering ordinance written and introduced in 1939 by the Honorable A. L. Wolk, and subsequently adopted unanimously; and

Whereas this ordinance did direct that henceforth and annually the mayor of the city of Pittsburgh be authorized and requested to publicly signalize the third Sunday of May as Citizenship Day,

Now, therefore, I, Cornelius D. Scully, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh and Federal regional coordinator of civilian defense for western Pennsylvania, by virtue of office and authority of the council of the city of Pittsburgh, and in consonance with a formal congressional decree and in obedience to Presidential proclamation, do now urge that our citizens observe Sunday, May 21, 1944, as Citizenship Day, or I Am an American Day, with full solemnity and in complete accordance with the aforesaid resolution and decree and Presidential proclamation; and

Further, I do herewith appoint Capt. Frederick L. Oliver, of the United States Navy, to the chairmanship and responsibility for our local observance, confident that the leadership and the patriotism which have so distinctly characterized his work, as the highest ranking naval official in the metropolitan Pittsburgh district, will insure the success of our public celebration; and I urge that our observance be city- and country-wide and not confined to the privacy of the home or the individual, so that the great public meeting to be held in Schenley Park will be greater in attendance and enthusiasm than ever before; and I further urge every man, woman, and child to avail themselves of this public opportunity to renew their allegiance to American democracy. Every defense council in my jurisdiction as Federal coordinator of civilian defense, every religious group and creed, every school and college, every business house and corporation, every veteran, fraternal and social group, every labor and trade or industrial association, every political or other organization should actively participate in this day of tribute to our sacred heritage of American citizenship.

So, therefore, let each of us, the clergy, the press, radio broadcasting companies, the aforesaid groups, and all others individually and collectively, demonstrate a continuing sense of patriotic citizenship as herein indicated; and exert every effort and lend full cooperation so as to insure that Greater Pittsburgh will maintain her enviable record of active and vigorous Americanism. Our great city and county must continue to be the leader in community and individual appreciation of the American way of life.

International Currency Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Times of May 29 and June 1, 1944:

[From the New York Times of May 29, 1944]

On the same day as President Roosevelt called a United Nations monetary conference the British Government published a white paper on post-war plans for maintaining employment. The connection between these two events is closer than it may seem at first sight, for the British post-war plans imply heavy government spending; heavy government spending puts a strain upon the stability of the national currency; and the recent proposal for an $8,000,000,000 international stabilization fund implied that the countries participating were under obligation to bolster the sinking currency of any one of them by pouring in loans in the form of purchases of that country's currency at par.

Under the post-war employment plan the British Government proposes to "pump money into the channels of consumption" by a wide variety of means, including planned spending on public works when depression threatens, concerted action between the treasury and the banks to influence the volume of capital expenditure by variations in the rate of interest so as to keep money cheap, and a system of benefits under social insurance designed to maintain the purchasing power of the community. "We must be ready," write the authors of the proposed policy, "to check and reverse a decline in expenditure on consumer goods which normally follows as a secondary reaction to a falling off in private investment."

We need not examine here the wisdom of the British white paper's proposals. It is sufficient to point out that they imply a policy of cheap money, currency expansion, and deficit spending—all of which must endanger any previously established parity for the British pound sterling. If there were no proposal for an international monetary fund supported by the treasuries of other countries, and particularly by our own, this might merely be dismissed as a matter for the British alone to settle. But the proposed $8,000,000,000 fund raises the question whether other nations can be expected to underwrite such plans and in effect to support such domestic policies.

The British case is simply one illustration of the basic problem raised by the proposed international stabilization fund. For we have invited 41 countries to the monetary conference; and if we are committed to support the currencies of China, Ethiopia, and Iraq, we are thereby committed to support the internal economic policies of China, Ethiopia, and Iraq. How long will we consent? How long could we afford to do this?

International cooperation with regard to stable monetary systems and stable exchanges after the war is imperative. But the proposed $8,000,000,000 stabilization fund wholly misconceives the nature of the problem to be solved. The primary need is sound economic, budgetary, and currency policies within each nation. If these exist, a huge international stabilization fund will be un-

necessary. If these do not exist, no international monetary fund, no matter how large, could in the end support an unsound currency. But in attempting to do so it could drain part of the resources of the nations with sound currencies and thereby endanger even their soundness.

[From the New York Times of June 1, 1944]

The United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, called by the President, will meet a month from today. Its purpose is the highly desirable one of securing stable exchange rates in the post-war world. But the recent proposal for an $8,000,000,000 international stabilization fund misconceives the nature of the problem and approaches it from the wrong end. Essentially it seeks to fix the value of each nation's currency unit in relation to the others by arranging to have the fund buy the weak currencies and to sell the strong currencies at the parities fixed. It is obvious that a weak currency will drop to its true market value as soon as such purchases cease. As long, however, as the purchases continue, the nations with strong currencies will be subsidizing the nations with weak currencies (or at least the private holders of those currencies), and thereby subsidizing also the internal economic policies, whatever they may happen to be, of the nations with weak currencies. The United States, as the chief contributor to the fund, would be the chief loser; but the money that it poured out in this way might not only fail to help world recovery but, by prolonging unsound policies within the nations whose currencies could only be held up by such purchases, might actually do harm.

The true solution of this problem would begin at the other end. It would seek to make currencies sound within each country. If each nation can maintain the integrity of its own currency, if each nation keeps its own monetary unit at par, then the problem of maintaining a stable relationship between different currencies will solve itself. The true object of the forthcoming monetary conference, therefore, should be to lay down the principles and explore the methods by which this can be done.

These broad principles should not be difficult to formulate. One requirement for a stable currency is that it be redeemable in something that is itself fixed and definite; for all practical purposes this means a return to the historic gold standard. Another requirement for a stable currency is a balanced budget. A third requirement is that government refrain from currency and credit inflation. A fourth is a removal of, or at least a great reduction in, the pre-war barriers to international trade—tariffs, quotas, exchange restrictions, and all the rest.

These requirements form a unit. If one of them is violated it will be difficult, if not impossible, to fulfill the others. Thus, if a nation's budget is chronically unbalanced it is practically compelled to resort to borrowing through currency or credit inflation to make up the difference. When it does this it undermines faith in its currency unit and cannot maintain gold payments. Officials of the government then say that the gold standard "has broken down," when they really mean that their own policies have broken it.

There will be grave problems after the war for almost every nation in fixing a new currency parity at a level where it can be held. But the belief that only a rich nation can afford a gold standard is a fallacy. As Viscount Goschen, one of England's ablest Chancellors of the Exchequer, once said: "Our powers of obtaining gold would only be exhausted when the country had nothing left to sell."

The greatest single contribution the United States could make to world currency stability after the war is to announce its determination to stabilize its own currency. It will, incidentally, help us, of course, if other nations as well return to the gold standard. They will do it, however, only to the extent that they recognize that they are doing it not primarily as a favor to us but to themselves.

A Letter From Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a letter I received from Ernie Pyle concerning my fight-pay bill, H. R. 4359, that is worthy of the attention of any Member of this House. Ernie Pyle, famous war correspondent, has lived with our boys since the invasion of north Africa and knows the temper of our boys:

ENGLAND, *May 21, 1944.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WEISS: I've wanted for some time to write and thank you for your active interest in the "fight pay" suggestion, but the pressure of events has been such that I just hadn't got around to it. And while I'm at it, thanks too for your very nice words about me and the column in your letter of March 4.

I hope, of course, that your bill passes. But there's a very fine point of distinction about who should be eligible for fight pay, and I'm afraid that's where you may run up against a nub.

I have a feeling that Congress, may be not quite getting the point of what the proposal was made for, will want to give it to anyone who is ever in danger from enemy action. If it is made that way, it will be so broad as to destroy the value in doing it at all. Our original motive was to give recognition to that poor old ——— who lies up there in the mud and cold and rain for weeks at a time, never dry, never warm, eating cold food out of cans, dirty and unshaven and sleepless, and constantly under mortar, artillery, or rifle fire. Usually he is an infantryman, although others do sometimes come into such sustained combat, such as rangers, paratroopers, and S. S. troops.

Lots of other people die too in war—but differently. The sailor lives well until he dies. So does the nurse, comparatively. And the wide fringe of other combat troops who do have casualties but who know nothing of the prolonged mental and physical misery of the old front-line rifle trooper who lives like an animal.

For instance, I suspect that the average person discussing this proposal would want to give fight pay to everyone who served on the Anzio beachhead, for they were all certainly in danger. Yet the bulk of our troops up there, the supply troops and reserves and what not, were living either in houses or dugouts, and were living comfortably.

I think a captain on the beachhead proposed the finest qualification for fight pay that would limit it to the people we mean—he suggested it be given only to those who served at least 4 days a month within small arms range of the enemy. That would automatically rule out all those except the poor old duffer up there in the mud.

I'm just throwing these things out to you as a suggestion to do anything with that you wish. I do feel that the whole point will be destroyed if too broad a definition is given and too many people taken in. Some of our medals have become almost valueless because we give them too freely.

Senator TOBEY has written me a nice letter, and I am making these same suggestions in a letter to him today. Thanks again for your interest, and good luck.

Sincerely,

ERNIE PYLE.

Accomplishments of the Robinson-Patman Act and How It Has Benefited Small Business Enterprises Against Unfair Competition and Price Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print, I submit herewith article which appeared in the National Independent anniversary number for May, outlining the benefits which have been derived from the Robinson-Patman Act since its enactment.

There have been far more results through this act in correcting discriminations in prices and other unfair competitive practices than is generally known. The article, which is of particular interest to small business, which law has not been used as freely as it should to correct trade abuses, is as follows:

Contrary to the opinion of some that the Robinson-Patman Act amending the Clayton law against unlawful restraints and monopolies has been ineffective in correcting abuses of discriminations in price and unfair acts of competition, there is abundant evidence that many abuses in business have been corrected.

More could and would be corrected if those affected would report infractions of this law. There has been too much hesitation, however, on the part of businessmen to report what are apparent violations. They fear being involved or having their identity disclosed, and that the complaint may be directed at a friendly competing company or a concern from whom supplies are obtained which may penalize them for reporting discriminations.

There is no justification for this fear since complaints to the Federal Trade Commission which has enforcement jurisdiction are strictly confidential. The Federal Trade Commission cannot proceed without some one making a complaint, hence the importance of cooperation from those affected by any unfair or discriminatory competitive practices. This cooperation from those injured is vital if there is to be further improvement in the competitive picture.

Complaints should be made as complete as possible to the Federal Trade Commission and forwarded to Washington. If there is any further data needed the Commission will contact the complainant, always with the understanding that the identity is strictly confidential. Any leads that will help clear

up the issues should be supplied. The Commission then proceeds with its own investigation to ascertain the facts.

WHAT ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT COVERS

The law is directed at correcting price discriminations between purchasers of commodities of "like grade and quality" and where the effect of such discrimination "may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination." Thus both buyer and seller are affected in the event of violation of the law.

Differentials in prices are permitted which "make only due allowance for difference in cost manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered." The Commission, however, may "fix and establish quantity limits and revise the same as it finds necessary, as to particular commodities or classes of commodities where it finds that available purchasers in greater quantities are so few as to render differentials on account thereof unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly in any line of commerce."

It is illegal also "to pay or grant, or to receive or accept, anything of value as a commission, brokerage, or other compensation, or any allowance or discount in lieu thereof, except for services rendered in connection with the sale or purchase of goods, wares, or merchandise, either to the other party to such transaction or to an agent, representative, or other intermediary therein where such intermediary is acting in fact or in behalf, or is subject to the direct or indirect control, of any party to such transaction other than the person by whom such compensation is so granted or paid."

It is also unlawful under this act "to pay or contract for the payment of anything of value to or for the benefit of a customer of such person—or in consideration for any service or facilities furnished by or through such customer in connection with processing, handling, sale or offering for sale of any products or commodities manufactured, sold or offered for sale by such person, unless such payment or consideration is available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers competing in the distribution of such products or commodities."

Moreover it is unlawful under this act to "discriminate in favor of one purchaser against another purchaser—by contracting to furnish or furnishing, or by contributing to the furnishing thereof, any services or facilities connected with the processing, handling, sale, or offering for sale of such commodity so purchased upon terms not accorded to all purchasers on proportionally equal terms."

In addition it is unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of commerce, knowingly to induce or receive a discrimination in price which is prohibited by this act.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVEN CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS

Since the enactment of this law 107 orders to cease and desist have been issued in Robinson-Patman cases. These cover 50 types of commodities or lines of business, 16 of the total number bearing in quantity discounts which have been prohibited or limited. There were 45 orders involving price discrimination, 59 unlawful brokerage allowances, 11 cover advertising and other allowances, and 5 referred to inducing and receiving price discriminations.

The lines of business affected include bakers' yeast, window glass, chicory, optical goods, ice cream, fresh fruits and vegetables, padlocks, rubber and rubber products, beds, springs, couches, mattresses, typographical numbering machines, paint, artificial teeth, and bakery packages and food products.

Cease-and-desist orders have been issued against the biggest concerns in their line, including United States Rubber Co., Standard Brands, Inc., The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., numerous buying organizations, Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., United States Fence Manufacturers Association, Atlantic Commission Co., Corn Products Refining Co., Lambert Pharmacal Co., Sherwin-Williams Co., Life Savers Corporation, and National Biscuit Co.

The accomplishments of the Robinson-Patman Act and its effect in the correction of unfair competition, discriminatory discounts, allowances, etc., have been of much greater effect than the issuance of cease-and-desist orders Following the passage of this act in June 1936 there was an almost universal effort made by members of industry in general to reexamine and revise their pricing schedules and policies to comply with its provisions.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN REBATES

Previous to the enactment of this law discriminations and unfair practices on the part of many companies were rampant as there was no restraint whatever on their operations. The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. for instance, received $7,105,000 in rebates and advertising allowances. Chain-store corporations of all types received concessions in lower prices, excessive quantity discounts, free goods to lower costs of products, which totaled many millions of dollars.

Some of these big distributors engaged in retailing threatened manufacturers that if they did not give them concessions under one guise or another they would refuse to buy any of their products and enter the production of such products in competition with them. These concessions have been demanded to obtain an undue advantage over their competitors and in numerous instances concerns have been forced out of business due to inability to make both ends meet because of the low prices exacted. In other cases these companies after failure have been taken over by some of these large operators.

With the passage of the Robinson-Patman antiprice discrimination law manufacturers had an effective instrument in their own hands against these powerful buyers whose chief aim had been to drive prices down for supplies. They now can resist all threats by pointing to this act as they are just as guilty to give concessions as those who receive them.

The war has helped considerably in overcoming chiseling by the big buyers, even among manufacturers whose entire output was taken over by chains, mail order houses and big department stores. Such manufacturing companies while they have a fairly steady output because of the mass buying of big distributors have been caught in the squeeze. Selling on an extremely close margin they were caught with advancing raw materials and wage increases and many of them have appealed to O. P. A. for relief.

MORE COULD BE ATTAINED

In the face of the many concessions of one type or another before the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act many wondered how the independent merchants were able to exist because of the cutthroat competition to which they were subjected due to the price discriminations in one form or another.

Much of these abuses of fair competition have been eliminated though some still exist which are being constantly corrected. More could be accomplished in this direction if businessmen injured would disclose bona fide instances of violation of Robinson-Patman Act to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Speaker, there is one vital point in connection with prosecution of this law that is not generally known to the trade. When a conviction is obtained through the Federal Trade Commission which is finally sustained, the injured company can file action for triple damages through their own attorneys, whose fees the offender must pay in addition.

Congress Looks at Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, June 1, 1944, in New York City:

Two points summarize the general attitude of Congress toward civil service: (1) We are for it, and (2) we think it should and must work efficiently.

The merit system in this country is now 61 years old and has achieved rather widespread approval. But there is nothing sacred or inevitable about the civil-service system. If it functions effectively and can justify itself, it will survive Victory Day and the postwar period. Regardless of the political party in power, however, the American citizens, through their elected representatives, will demand a discriminating tax dollar. Public personnel officials must be prepared to use a dollars-and-cents yardstick in measuring the value of their work. This can be done increasingly in connection with such matters as production records, absenteeism, accidents, and labor turn-over.

Financial standards in personnel work should supplement and not supplant the human touch. We should make every effort to eliminate unnecessary forms and records and to simplify our procedures. Paper work should be reduced to a minimum. This would save time, money, and materials and free personnel workers to deal more directly with down-to-earth problems and human equations.

CONGRESS HAS BEEN HELPFUL

Historically, Congress has been reasonably favorable to the principles of civil service. I think this is also true of most State legislatures and city councils. A look at the record shows this to be increasingly so since 1883, when the Pendleton Act became the legislative foundation for the merit system in our National Government. With few exceptions, the record shows a continuing rise in the proportion of Federal employees under civil-service coverage. This figure has reached approximately 95 percent—probably an all-time high.

In addition, Congress has broadened and strengthened the Federal personnel program through the adoption of the Retirement Act of 1920, the Classification Act of 1923, and similar laws, notably those sponsored by Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, able chairman of our House Civil Service Committee. This is a record of advance and not retreat, and clearly spells out the attitude of Congress.

In our personnel legislation there are still gaps to be filled. More definite authority should be provided for the carrying on of such important but neglected activities as: Employee training, health, and safety. This can and will be done, through closer work-

ing relationships between the legislative and executive branches.

While the legislative attitude is generally largely sympathetic there are, nevertheless, certain criticsms which should be openly discussed.

The House Civil Service Committee, for more than a year, has been investigating personnel administration in the Federal Government. One of the earliest findings was overstaffing, particularly in the new and expanding war agencies.

The committee's interim report sets forth the background of this undesirable situation as follows:

"In the summer and fall of 1942, the Federal Government's employment curve shot up with alarming rapidity. For the first 9 months of 1942, in fact, the Government was hiring 100,000 additional workers every 30 days. Confusion, duplication, and needless hiring followed inevitably in the wake of this enormous rate of employment. Workers themselves complained of idleness, which they attributed to a lack of coordination and responsible management. Members of Congress were swamped with demands for a halt to what their constituents believed to be unwarranted mass hiring."

IMPROVEMENTS ARE MADE

Since this first report, substantial improvements have been made. Not only was the upswing halted but an actual decline in Federal employment has occurred during the past year. This saving resulted partly from the committee's work and partly from the efforts of personnel and other administrative officials, including action in the Senate.

Another finding which disturbed our investigating committee was the apparent lack of management control in the executive branch of the Federal Government. The uncoordinated departments and agencies do not have an overall centralized authority with such powers of control. This is a basic cause not only of over-staffing but also of overlapping of functions—a broader problem than usually thought of in connection with personnel work.

According to the committee's first report: "Some students of the civil-service structure are of the opinion the Bureau of the Budget has wide, discretionary powers over Federal management. Others believe the Civil Service Commission has such authority. Still others are of the opinion that such authority is vested in the General Accounting Office. The 10-month study made by your committee leads to the inescapable conclusion that neither of these agencies has such authority, that no such authority exists anywhere in the Government today. The committee will study further the problem of over-all management. From time to time the committee will make further reports with specific recommendations for the improvement of the operations in the various Government agencies."

Other weaknesses were found in such matters as poor supervision, inequities in classification and pay, and overrapid promotions. However, the Congress, the Civil Service Commission, and the departments and agencies are all working to bring about needed corrections. The council of personnel administration is playing a useful role in all these endeavors.

Civil-service commissions have a necessary place in modern government. They have done a satisfactory though not a perfect job of wiping out the spoils system and other forms of favoritism. By providing an equal opportunity for citizens to compete for positions in the public service, they have increased confidence in our form of government.

By furnishing qualified eligibles to operating agencies, they have increased the efficiency of the government business. In such other personnel matters as promotions, transfers, classification, pay, and retirement, civil-service agencies have made some contributions. But central personnel agencies at best can do only a limited amount of the big job of public management.

Administrators, supervisors, and foremen in the operating departments have the greatest opportunity for attaining a high standard of employee performance and satisfaction. Unfortunately, these operating officials too seldom recognize and accept their personnel responsibilities. An important job yet to be accomplished by personnel specialists is that of getting administrative and supervisory officials to do the bulk of the personnel job.

HEALTH AND SAFETY NEGLECTED

Now I want to speak specifically of two areas of personnel administration which I think have been neglected in the public service. These are fields in which I have long taken a deep and personal interest—employee safety and employee health. In my judgment, personnel directors in the public service must give much more attention to these subjects than they have in the past. Unquestionably these are neglected matters, and one of the reasons why the accident experience and the provisions for medical care of workers in the Federal service is so unsatisfactory is because no one has had the specific responsibility for them. It's trite, but true, everybody's business is nobody's business. The personnel director in the public service must be equipped in the future to give leadership in these new fields. We know he must be broader than an expert in appointment and classification matters. Just as he has broadened his scope to cover training and personnel utilization as essentials of his day-to-day job, so in the future he must assume aggressive leadership for all the phases of employee relations and employee welfare, including safety and health.

I have seen in the coal industry of my own State of West Virginia what happens when employers begin taking a genuine interest in accident prevention. In 1941 the Federal mine-inspection bill was passed, as you may recall. This act requires more strict inspection of mine property and the setting up of modern safety programs. In order to meet the new standards it was necessary for mine operators, who had taken only an indifferent interest in accident prevention, to provide adequate and up-to-date safety organizations in their mines. What is the result? In the first year of operation the coal industry, which is producing at an all-time high, with new properties in operation and with tens of thousands of inexperienced miners, has been able actually to reduce accident rates.

While accident rates have been going upward—seemingly out of control—in other industries, in the coal industry, a booming, expanding industry, they have actually come down. I cite this case because it shows what can be done when management and labor take hold of the problem in earnest, and much of the credit for this improvement, of course, must be given to the workers themselves. Any bureau chief or operating official who does not enlist the interest, support, and initiative of workers in his accident prevention program is overlooking a good bet. This is certainly one endeavor in which management and labor can close ranks and go down the line together.

It is this human side of the personnel job which appeals to me and which after all is most important.

I have said that safety is neglected in the Federal service. Here are a few shocking facts: Almost as many Federal employees were injured last year in the conduct of the Federal business as were employed by the Departments of State, Justice, Treasury, and Interior combined. Of the 157,000 Federal workers injured in 1943, 90,000 lost time from work. This lost time accounts for a sizeable share of the absenteeism that retards the war efforts of the Federal Government. It represents 5,000,000 chargeable days lost from work. It adds up to a direct cost of almost $10,000,000—an indirect cost of $40,000,000 to $50,000,000. In this one year 617 Government employees—not fighters on the battle fronts—lost their lives in the business of the Government.

FEDERAL ACCIDENT RATE HIGH

When I tell you that the average accident record of the Federal Government is six times as high as that of du Pont's, a company engaged in particularly hazardous work, I submit that safety in the Federal service is a neglected field. Government, with only 50 percent of its workers in industrial operations, has a record only slightly better than the average of those reporting to the National Safety Council. Yet it is interesting to observe that some of the best industrial employers have a record only one-third or even one-fourth of the national average. This shows what can be done. Not for a moment should Government rest content until it is as careful of its manpower as any private employer, bar none. Certainly in these days of manpower shortage no employer should be hiring additional workers simply because he fails to conserve the ones on his rolls. Isn't safety a problem of utilization, of placement, of training, of knowing the accident proneness of workers, of knowing the ways to make them safety-minded? The personnel officer has a challenging role to play.

To be sure, the record of Government is not all bad. Where some attention has been given to safety, we find the same fine results that General Motors, U. S. Rubber, and other private employers have achieved. If the Government as a whole had as good a rate, for example, as the Alexandria, Va., Torpedo Station—an installation doing hazardous work, at that—the executive branch would have saved last year a total of more than 5,000,000 man-days in productive work, the full time of 17,000 workers.

The record of this and other units of the Federal Government shows as clearly as in private industry that safety is not due to chance alone. As President D. D. Fennell, of the National Safety Council has said, "Safety is actually purchasable—any city, State, or industry can determine its own accident rate." Safety must be planned for and paid for. With a few exceptions safety plans have not been made in the Federal service, and in many departments Congress has not been asked to appropriate adequate funds for afety promotion. Operating officials and personnel people alike are to blame. Neither the heads of agencies nor the Budget people, nor the personnel people have made clear to Congress the necessity for accident prevention. Neither the Civil Service Commission nor the Bureau of the Budget has shown aggressive leadership in this respect. All of those concerned in personnel and, in fact, in general management have a responsibility which they have not yet discharged. Personally, I feel sure that Congress will be willing to take an interest and play its part when the executive branch makes entirely clear the need for safety methods and safety funds.

On employee health I think the record is a bit different. Congress has received the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission for general legislation to permit the establishment of medical and health programs in the departments and agencies. The best thinking of both medical and personnel people was brought together in this proposal, which I have introduced as a bill.

In these times when the Government is employing thousands of the physically handicapped and a larger proportion of elderly people and women, it is self-evident to me that medical and health services are necessary tools in maintaining the health and efficiency of workers. Certainly industry has found that health programs pay in

reduced absenteeism and increased production. The National Association of Manufacturers reports that the installation of medical and health programs in 234 industrial establishments was accompanied by a 29.7 reduction in absences due to sickness. As the veterans come home and become reemployed in Government, we shall need the utmost of medical skill to make sure we are placing them effectively.

I realize that there are departments and agencies which are doing little or nothing because they believe congressional sanction is necessary. It is my intention to do all in my power to speed the passage of this health legislation. It is up to Congress to act now.

MERIT SYSTEM ENCOURAGED

On the credit side of the personnel ledger, there are some encouraging developments to report. One of the most important is the rising popular interest in the merit system. This is reflected by the action of numerous civic, professional, and employee groups which have endorsed the principle and given impetus to the adoption, extension, and strengthening of civil service laws throughout the country. As a result, we have witnessed phonomenal growth of the merit system in national, State, and local units of government; so that today more than one thousand of these jurisdictios are already under a civil-service system. It is, of course, up to the public personnel officials of the Nation to see that we have better management of the public business as a result of these laws which legislative bodies have adopted. For the most part, this challenge is being met with reasonable success.

Another bright spot observed during the past 10 years has been the creation of departmental personnel offices throughout the Federal Government and in many States and cities. This has resulted in far greater attention to the daily personnel problems which arise in the operating agencies where the real work of government is done. More effective personnel utilization is being achieved because of these personnel offices. Improved supervision and better placement have been attained. Employee training, health and safety work can be carried on more successfully when the departmental personnel offices are avaliable to supplement the necessary but limited work of civil-service commissions.

The whole country, in this war, has become training conscious in the armed forces, in industry, and in the Government. We have had to train people by millions to do new jobs, and our astonishing war production shows that we have succeeded. There was a time in government when it was thought sufficient just to take a person from a civil-service register and put him to work. There was no recognized need for job training. People learned by the pick-up method—often far too slowly.

TRAINING PROGRAM VALUABLE

Perhaps one of the biggest contributions Government has made to the war effort has been the training-within-industry program of the War Manpower Commission. The short intensive training courses developed by this unit of Government have been given to more than a million supervisors in industry and to more than 100,000 supervisors in the Federal service. Management has learned to use training as a tool. Never again can we go back to the horse-and-buggy days of just letting the worker finally discover for himself how to do his job. There can be no question that the business of Government will be carried on more efficiently in years to come as a result of our wartime experience with training.

After the war our number one placement problem will be the finding of jobs for returning veterans. Personnel officers in national, State, and local governments and in industry will carry a large share of responsibility for dealing with this problem successfully. In most units of government and in some industries, plans for restoring veterans to their old jobs are well advanced. But we must face and work out many difficulties—the disabled service veteran, the messenger of 4 years ago returning as a major, the so-called psychoneurotic, and those expecting to return to jobs or agencies which have been wiped out during the war.

Another question of serious concern to personnel administrators is that of the civilian employees to be displaced by returning veterans or to be laid off from liquidating war agencies. Employment stabilization on a nation-wide basis is a general responsibility of Government and industry. Within Government the legislative and executive branches must pull together if we are to avoid a reaction against formal merit systems in the clamor for jobs.

We should not forget, however, that the immediate and most urgent problem before us is that of winning the war. While we should think ahead, we should also place our major emphasis on doing a homefront job as thoroughly as possible. We must tap all possible sources of labor supply and utilize those now on the job more effectively than ever before.

LOYAL WORKERS PRAISED

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, there is a fallacy I desire to nail on the head. The luxury of constantly blasting the bureaucrat is one the Government and our people can ill afford. Morale is determined in a large measure by the confidence which workers have in their leaders, and the usefulness of programs. Federal employees have a right to react against carping criticisms in the press and on the radio. This unfair attack does not inspire the ablest people to seek Government as a place to work. Government will not conduct itself well if it must absorb the leftovers in personnel. These so-called bureaucrats who are running the Government include capable, conscientious, and courageous Donald Nelson, Ed. Stettinius, Bill Batt, Ralph Bard, Frank Yates, J. Edgar Hoover, and James Forrestal. Congratulations from my heart go to the engineers and the architects, the clerks and the laborers who are building our ships, and designing the guns for our battle wagons, and the engines for our fighting planes.

Washington News Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release appearing in the Sparta (Wis.) Herald of May 19, 1944, and other Wisconsin papers:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER

(By Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON)

Servicemen's Benefits—Dependents' Aid of Several Kinds—Not Only Wife, Children, But Parents, Brothers, Sisters May Be Eligible—

The application for veterans' dependents' allowance is important, and there is need for giving the matter prompt attention.

This application is made on special forms, available at the induction center from the enlisted man's commanding officer. In filling out the form the enlisted man should be careful to spell all names correctly and give exact information as to marriage, dates of birth, etc. Many of the difficulties concerning allotments are due to carelessness in filling out the forms.

In the event the enlisted man fails for some reason or other to make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. These forms may be obtained from the War or Navy Departments, from the County Veterans' Service officer, or you may obtain an application by writing your Congressman. I will be pleased to forward one to you and assist in every possible way. The Army requires that its regular application form be filled out, while the Navy simply requires a letter giving the name of the applicant's wife and children, date of birth, and service address of the enlisted man.

If the serviceman does not wish to make application for class B or B-1 dependents, no other person can apply. These allotments are granted and continue only at the will of the man or woman in the service. They cannot be forced to make application. However, whenever an enlisted man fails to make such application and the dependents are reasonably sure that he will approve it, they may make the application themselves. The permission of the enlisted man then will be obtained by the service; and if he gives permission, the allotment will be approved and payments started. Thus, it can be seen that only class A dependents can obtain allotments without the consent of the serviceman. All other dependents require his approval.

Other relatives—parents and brothers or sisters of servicemen—can receive an allotment even if the serviceman's wife and children are getting one. If the enlisted man also partially supported his parents and brothers or sisters prior to his entrance into the service, they are also eligible for an allotment. Application can be made in the usual manner and all that is necessary is proof of dependency, as though the enlisted man were single.

For example, if there is a wife and one child dependent upon the serviceman, they receive $80. If this same man has two parents and a sister also dependent upon him, they can receive a total of $79 also. To get this extra $79, all that is necessary is an additional $5 deduction from the serviceman's pay. The Government makes up the difference. If the parents and brothers or sisters are only partially dependent—that is, less than 50 percent—they can get $37.

Often your Congressman can help expedite allotment applications when there is real need for this money, so it is advisable that you write me when payments are slow in coming to you. Address your inquiry to Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In addition, if parents are dependent upon more than one son or daughter, who are both in the service, they are eligible for larger allotments. For example, if two parents are over 50 percent dependent upon a son in the service, they receive $68 a month. Now, if another son or daughter enters into the service, upon whom they depended also for support, these same two parents are eligible to receive another $37 from the second son or daughter. Although a serviceman has a wife and children receiving an allotment, that does not prevent his parents and brothers and sisters dependent on him from getting an allotment also.

International Politics at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Churchill, speaking before the British Dominion Prime Ministers in London early in May said:

It is right that the British Empire in its collective united aspect should put itself solidly on the map, and make all the watching world realize that it stands together.

Following Mr. Churchill at the same meeting was Mr. Mackenzie King, speaking for Canada, who said:

The Government of Canada is as anxious as the Prime Minister of Great Britain and his colleagues to display to the world the solidarity of the Commonwealth in loyalty to the cause for which we fight.

There is a striking contract between the reception given those words in the British Empire and the reception our administration forces would give similar words uttered concerning the United States by a citizen of this country. For any person in public life to insist that the United States "put itself solidly on the map" would bring down upon his head an official "hush-hush" and a barrage of left-wing smears charging him with being a Nationalist or Fascist; this latter being a popular term used against anyone who does not agree with the New Deal ideologies.

VOTES MAKE A DIFFERENCE

But when votes are involved, there is no such "hush-hush" in the United States. May 24, Churchill, addressing Commons, said:

For a long time past the Foreign Secretary and I have labored with all our strength to try to bring about a resumption of relations between the Soviet Government and the Polish Government, which we recognized and have always recognized since the days of General Sikorski. * * * Our efforts to bring about a renewal of relations between the Polish Government in London and the Soviet have not succeeded. We deeply regret that fact, and we must take care to say nothing that would make an agreement more difficult in the future.

POLES—POLITICIANS

The Polish-American Congress in Buffalo last week charged that "certain Americans are ready to push Poland and the Baltic countries into the Russian orbit and force them to live collectivism." There are slightly less than 3,000,000 persons of Polish descent in the United States. Politicians are now courting them. Ignoring Mr. Churchill's admonition, an administration politician told the Polish-American Congress that the consequence of imposing upon Poland a boundary that will expose her to her enemies and the reduction of her domain to a point where it will impair her growth and virility will prove disastrous and a threat to future peace.

On the other hand, there are votes among the Communist forces in the United States who have pledged themselves to go all out for the New Deal and reelection of the President, abandoning their name "Communist Party" and disguising under the name of "Communist Political Association." This group sympathetically supports Russia in her designs on Poland.

Mr. Churchill's House of Commons speech gives Americans an idea of the goal of British diplomacy for a four-power pact to rule the world. He referred to Britain, the United States, Russia, and China. These great powers are expected to never again quarrel but will rule the world in peace forever and a day. Many problems will have to be overcome if this be true. The Russian-Polish problem is only a start. The Russian-British rivalry in the Near East deeply involves Palestine, the Arabs, and the whole Mohammedan world. What about Hong Kong, claimed by China through natural rights and by the British who made it? Sitting at a four-power peace table, with whom will the United States cast its vote on controversial questions involving Britain and Russia, China and Britain, or Russia and China? Churchill said "In one place we support a king, in another a Communist." Will Russia agree to a king one place and China agree to a Communist in another? In this connection Churchill said further:

We do not include in our program of world renovation any forcible action against any government whose internal form of administration does not come up to our ideas, and any remarks I have made on that subject refer only to enemy powers and their satellites who will be struck down by the force of arms. They are the ones who have ventured into the open and they are the ones whom we shall not allow to become again an expression of those peculiar doctrines associated with fascism and nazi-ism, which undoubtedly have brought about the terrible struggle in which we are engaged. Surely anyone can see the difference. * * * Consultations always are proceeding between the three great powers and others and every effort is being made to explore the future to resolve difficulties and to obtain the greatest measure of common agreement. A few things have already become quite clear and were very prominent at the conference just concluded.

The Atlantic Charter has popped back into British-American happenings via the Roosevelts. Churchill noted in his speech that he was expected to set the Atlantic Charter in its exact and true relation to subsequent declarations and current events. He launched into this after the lengthy portion of his speech dealing with Spanish relations to the Allies and to the Axis, praising Franco's government for resistance to German pressure concerning Gibraltar, and concluded that part of his remarks by stating:

I have no sympathy with those who think it clever and even funny to insult and abuse the Government of Spain whenever the occasion arises.

BUT THE ROOSEVELTS DISSENT

Side by side in a Washington newspaper were two articles concerning separate press conferences held by the Roosevelts—F. D. and Eleanor. Reporting the President's press conference the one story says:

President Roosevelt said yesterday that in his judgment Spain had not yet sufficiently reduced the volume of its material aid to Germany. He added that he did not think any of us were satisfied with what the Government of Spain had been doing since we have been in the war.

In the next column of the same newspaper an article appears under the heading "Can't teach an old dog, etc., Mrs. Roosevelt says of Churchill."

The article says:

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, discussing Prime Minister Churchill's conciliatory policy toward the Franco Government of Spain, said yesterday: "Mr. Churchill has thought a certain way for 60 years and I don't think he wants to change the way he has thought for 60 years."

Commenting further, the article says:

Churchill's foreign policy speech of last week, which touched on Spain, she termed "very characteristic of Churchill," adding that he himself would be "shocked" if anyone suggested that by it he laid the Atlantic Charter on the shelf.

Do Mrs. Roosevelt's remarks concerning Churchill mean something has come between the two men who signed the Atlantic Charter—her husband and the Prime Minister? If so, will the British through their press and actions continue to plug for a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt? And how will these personal quarrels affect international relations and desired permanent peace?

Address of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an address made by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, United States Navy, retired, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administrator, before the Institute of Transportation, New York University School of Law and School of Commerce, Accounts and Finance, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City:

This week marks the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the sailing from Savannah, Ga., of the first steam-powered vessel to cross the Atlantic. It therefore seems appropriate and prudent as we recall this important event in the history of transportation to take stock of our present standing as a maritime power and, where possible, to relate that position to the future.

Today we are concentrating on the grim business of building and operating ships to win this war. However, we need not blind ourselves to the responsibilities of our maritime future.

Frankly, it is my opinion that we have the opportunity of making the American merchant marine of the post-war days as important a factor in the water-borne commerce of the world as it was a century ago when American clipper ships sailed all the seas, carrying a substantial portion of our foreign trade.

When the war is over world shipping will play an indispensable role in attempts to maintain permanent peace, so today we turn to the part which we, as a nation, may play in developing commercial operations with a vigorous American merchant fleet.

We will have ships second to none in quality, speed, and safety. We will have the trained personnel to man them and trained personnel and management to operate them.

Do we have the foresight and the will to make the best of the opportunity before us to establish a peacetime merchant marine adequate to meet our needs? Can we operate and maintain a fleet of modern, efficient vessels that will insure us against dependence upon foreign-flag shipping for the movement of a substantial portion of our foreign trade, both import and export?

I believe we can, and that we can insure ourselves against ever again having to expend billions of dollars in the hasty construction of a fleet to serve as auxiliaries to our fighting forces. The construction of a large fleet under wartime pressure requires expenditures far beyond normal costs and, in addition, takes time that should be devoted to getting on with the actual fighting.

In 1939 the world's merchant fleets ran to some 75,000,000 dead-weight tons divided approximately as follows: British, 27,000,000; American, 11,000,000; Japanese, 8,000,000; German, 5,000,000; Italian, 4,000,000; Norwegian, Dutch, Swedish, Greek, and others, 20,000,000.

It seems a reasonable assumption that when the war ends and peace terms are discussed, the question of shipping and particularly the future of Axis shipping, will receive a great deal of close attention. There has been much comment here and abroad as to limitation of Axis shipping to necessary coastwise and interisland vessels with the handling of all oceangoing tonnage under flags of the United Nations.

In view of the part we as a Nation are taking in world affairs, it is not likely that we will again withdraw into that self-satisfied attitude of isolationism which colored the thinking of many citizens not long ago. We must, therefore, consider the part we should have in handling world commerce when peace and reconstruction come.

To meet the statutory requirements of the Merchant Marine Act we must have a merchant fleet adequate "to carry our domestic water-borne commerce, and a substantial portion of our water-borne * * * foreign commerce." It must "provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times," and it must be "capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war and national emergency."

This means that we must have a larger merchant marine than existed before the war. There is a general feeling that this fleet should be somewhere between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000 dead-weight tons; and with the tremendous merchant marine construction during the war, there is every indication that we should have a sufficient number of vessels "of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types" for the purpose.

I have been accused of pulling a rabbit out of the hat when I indicated that our post-war merchant marine should be somewhere between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000 dead-weight tons. The rabbit is the Japanese merchant marine and the hat is Japan. If we take the combined dead-weight tonnage employed by the Axis Nations prior to the war and assign one-third to the United States and two-thirds to the other United Maritime Nations, the increment over 1939 to the American merchant marine could and should be employed primarily in handling the services where Japanese tonnage formerly was employed.

There is no thought in my mind that those members of the United Nations group whose very lives depend upon their merchant fleets should be deprived of their full rights because of an increase in the merchant fleet flying the Stars and Stripes. In fact, by assigning to them two-thirds of the tonnage operations formerly handled by the Axis Nations, their respective merchant fleets would be increased, just as we believe ours should be.

If we are to have such an expanded merchant marine, and expect to maintain it under private ownership and operation in successful commercial competition with others, we must clear away certain existing situations some of which place our vessels at a disadvantage with those operating under other flags. These can be resolved, I believe, so that all inequalities, except those based upon our higher standard of living, are removed.

The solution of these problems is not something which the shipping industry can leave to the Government. They concern the entire industry directly and indirectly, and many of them are international in character. We must, under the circumstances, strive to reach an agreement with the shipping industries in the other maritime nations, and to reap the advantages from the opportunities in foreign fields when the war is over, we should begin to resolve some of these difficulties now.

In mentioning them here, it is my hope that the attention of the entire industry will be directed to them, and that the industry collectively will accept the challenge to take these problems under consideration now, and clear them up without unnecessary delay.

Among the problems that must be solved to remove inequalities of operational costs, establish the utmost safety at sea, and allow us to maintain that adequate merchant marine which we are charged with fostering and encouraging are:

1. What are we going to do about conference rates and regulations? Do we favor them, and will membership in them be of advantage or disadvantage to the American merchant marine? Should they be regulated more closely by government or be left more completely under private operation?

2. Should there be a clearer understanding and more uniformity between the American and British groups on the classification of ships, including construction rules and regulations?

3. How far are we going to go in making international agreements on safety at sea, the number of lifeboats and their character, the placing of the Plimsoll marks, and fireproofing? Differences on these points can have considerable bearing upon the safety of the ship, and the passengers and cargoes that are carried, as well as on the relative earning power of the vessel.

4. Why should thereby differences in the canal tolls paid by vessels using the same route because of differences in the admeasurement rules of different countries? Canal transportation costs are not minor items, and all vessels should be treated on an equitable basis no matter what flags they fly.

5. Can there be agreement among the maritime nations as to the size, location, and character of crews' quarters? If our standards in this respect are maintained, and are so much higher than others, we are placed at a decided disadvantage in original cost and maintenance. If our standards are correct, how can we bring the other maritime nations into line? What part will the seamen's unions take in establishing uniformity?

6. Are we to be interested in international sanctions that will affect shipping, and are we to favor shipping pools? Without the existing United Nations shipping pool, which directs the use of the United Nations' merchant vessels to the best possible advantage, our present war efforts would be seriously hampered. Are we to favor an international committee on shipping in times of peace which will exercise some such control on the operation of ships, or do we want to go it alone?

7. What are we going to do about the possible revision of our navigation laws? Some of the present provisions date back to the days when navigation was quite a different problem than today, and there are undoubtedly conditions existing today which, for the sake of uniformity in navigation and safety, should be clearly defined and regulated.

8. Are the labor laws that apply to "the men who go down to the sea in ships" archaic in principle or application? The days when the dregs of the beach manned the ships are passed and we must have labor laws to meet present-day conditions at sea. Insofar as possible, there should be a uniformity among the maritime nations in this regard.

9. Will it be of advantage to the seamen and to the shipping industry to abandon the long-standing practice of signing on and signing off the crew for a round-trip voyage, and placing the contractural relations between the shipowner and the crew on a more permanent basis? Whether the present basis to which the unions have tied a rotation system of employment for a considerable number in normal times is better than steady employment for a smaller group, has many points of discussion. Whatever plan is adopted should apply to all.

In resuming normal trade relations with other nations when the war is over we might well profit by the example set by our great merchandising establishments in expanding and developing their business. They have proven an efficient delivery system of their own—in these cases, an adequate fleet of trucks—to be of prime importance in building and expanding their business. If we, as a great agricultural and industrial nation, support a merchant marine which can render that type of service to other nations, it stands to reason we can profit from the service we render.

The Clipper ships of a century ago proved that to be true; the trade and prestige resulting from this service made a great contribution to the rapid and healthy growth of a young nation, where free competitive enterprise was proving to be a dominant and constructive force.

If today and in the future we are to make that overseas delivery fleet felt in the further upbuilding and defense of our country, it is up to each one of us to see that our merchants, our exporters, our importers, and our travelers make use of that fleet. Our ships will not in themselves create trade. They are but the vehicle of delivery, and become effective only as those who have the goods to sell abroad, or who purchase products in the foreign markets make use of them.

Back in the early twenties the United States Shipping Board adopted the slogan, "Travel and ship on American-build ships." There is just as much a need for the application of that principle today; in fact, it will be of even more importance when peacetime commerce is resumed than it was then. We now have a far greater investment in merchant ships than we had when that slogan was adopted. That slogan still stands, but it can and should be amplified by stressing the importance of American exporters selling their

wares c. i. f. destination and American importers buying their needs f. o. b. shipping point, and in each case seeing that the shipments are made on American-flag ships.

It is important that the public be made aware of the national economic benefit derived from the maintenance and use of an adequate merchant marine. Twice in a quarter of a century we have been faced with the necessity of building a large fleet of vessels, on a wartime basis, to serve as an auxiliary of the Navy. To serve as such auxiliary in time of need, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provided for the development and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine which in normal times could serve as the delivery fleet for our domestic and foreign water-borne commerce.

To enable us to have the "best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of ships," that can compete on an even cost basis with foreign flag ships, Congress provided in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, that the Government should assume the difference in the cost of building the ships here and abroad. In consideration of this assumption of a part of the cost, the vessels became a part of the auxiliary reserve fleet of the Navy, and subject to requisition by the Government in time of need.

To place the owners of the vessels on a competitive operational basis with the owners of foreign flag vessels, Congress provided that the Government should pay to the shipowner in an amount sufficient to cover the actual difference in operating costs under the American flag. It further provided for the setting aside from the earnings of the vessels sufficient amounts to take care of the deferred payments on the purchase price, and the depreciation replacement funds. It also provided for setting aside a share of the earnings from which at stated periods reimbursement is made to the Government, insofar as possible of the amounts paid by it to the owner, to cover these differences in operating costs.

If the ships travel full to cubic capacity and down to the Plimsoll mark, they can and will earn sufficient to repay the Government for the amounts advanced to the owners to cover the difference in operating costs. If the travelers and shippers will see that the ships sail full and down, there should develop a situation where the recovery by the Government from net earnings will offset the amounts paid by it to cover operating differentials.

This country in normal times has produced approximately 10 percent more than is required for its own needs. If this surplus can be disposed of in the foreign market, it will not hang over the domestic market as a threat to lower prices with a corresponding reduction in wages and living standards; but will set up abroad a credit which we can use in purchasing such products as we may need or desire which will serve to keep our living standards on a high level.

In the days following the war when we anticipate an even greater market abroad for our products, the possibility of earnings from American flag vessels, if we as a nation will support and use them, should enable us to set our merchant marine on a firmly established basis and at a minimum cost to the public.

During the past few months, a great amount of misinformation has been published in reference to steel fractures on Liberty ships. The Maritime Commission has furnished all the details and all the facts in respect to such fractures to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Truman committee of the Senate, both of which have been making careful investigations of this subject. The entire subject has also been under careful study by the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, the Coast Guard, the Navy, and the American Bureau of Shipping.

The outstanding fact is that while six Liberty ships have broken in two, during the same period seven riveted-type ships have suffered like fractures, and the record on the riveted ship is in no way complete, whereas the current record on the Liberty ship is entirely complete.

Structural failures of ships at sea under the general heading of "Acts of God" have occurred since Noah built the Ark, and man has failed to design or build a ship which he can guarantee will pass through every storm or sea, and the Liberty is no exception.

During the past year, collision losses alone have been many times more serious along the Atlantic coast between New England and Florida, than have been the failures of any and all kinds in Liberty ships throughout the world.

The Liberty ship is the pack horse of the sea and nothing is gained by attempting to put a blot on its escutcheon. Intended and designed solely as a cargo carrier, the Liberty ship has already been converted into nine different types of auxiliaries for special uses in the all-out war effort. Beggars are not choosers, and we have found that necessity is truly the mother of invention in meeting the requirements of the military high command.

No one need offer apologies for the Liberty ship. It has performed wonders carrying essential war cargo to all parts of the world, and the fact that it could be built in such a short time has enabled us to erase the black cloud of "too little and too late" that marked our first efforts in the war. Furthermore, let me assure you there is no justification for the thought that the steel fractures which developed on Liberty ships were due to faulty work or haste in construction.

In the operation of commercial cargo and passenger vessels there has always been an element of venture or chance on the part of the operator, and there always will be. Under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, there arises the question of the expense involved which must be met by the taxpayer. In any determination of the number of ships that should be operated, full consideration must therefore be given to the economic value of such operations to the country as a whole, the pocketbook nerve of the operator and the expense to the taxpayer.

To compete successfully in the overseas trade requires a regular service with guaranteed sailings. No shipper is going to be content with a service which is haphazard, when at no additional cost he can obtain a dependable, service, and patriotism to the contrary notwithstanding cannot force him to ship on unreliable American-flag ships.

While striving in the post-war period to furnish a service under the American flag that is unsurpassed by others we should endeavor to avoid uneconomic competition. It has always been my judgment that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, could be reduced to one word—"parity." The act represents the "equalization" of opportunity for the American operator with its foreign-flag competitors. It also represents "stabilization," a consummation devoutly to be desired both at home and abroad. It is difficult to envision any legitimate objections that might be presented by any or all of our competitors to an adequate American Merchant Marine based upon the true principles of "parity," "equalization," and "stabilization."

Certainly consideration should be given to the investment that we have made in our merchant ships, and what this means in comparison to other values. Today this investment is between ten and twelve billion dollars, and at the end of the 1944 calendar year it appears probable this figure will be somewhere between seventeen and nineteen billion dollars. Assuming that between 35 and 40 percent of the cost of these ships to be emergency or war costs, the commercial value at the end of 1944 would be roughly between twelve and thirteen billion dollars. This tremendous sum approaches three-quarters the value of the vast network of railroads of the United States. Under no circumstances is this an investment that can be disregarded.

In considering the post-war problems of the merchant fleets of the world, we should recognize that an American merchant ship is 20 percent more valuable the day after the armistice. Just as soon as the reason for carrying them is removed, guns will go, degaussing, plastic armor, magazines, and all other national defense features will be removed; the ship promptly becomes 20 percent more efficient and therefore 20 percent more valuable as a unit. This situation does not follow with any other war product, as many of them will have only scrap value when peace comes. The merchant marine, therefore, becomes "the ace in the hole" whenever and wherever post-war planning is considered.

No one who gives the subject real consideration has any thought that every ship we have in operation when the war is over is to be permanently retained in active service. If we should set our sights with that objective in view, we would have to plan for a commercial warfare with the other United Nations which would be most bitter, and most expensive to the taxpayer and thoroughly indefensible.

By setting our goal at between fifteen and twenty million dead-weight tons, we will be keeping within a reasonable limit, and in doing so, we will make use of a fleet of modern, efficient vessels.

We will have to set up a reserve fleet that should be maintained in condition to respond to any emergency call in national defense, or for special cargo movements, such as occurred in 1926 when the strike of the coal miners in England resulted in a very heavy movement of coal from this country not only to England but to many other countries that had been obtaining their coal from the British. It has also been necessary to pull out of the then existing reserve fleet a number of ships to move to the foreign market the large grain crop which piled up from time to time.

What this reserve fleet will consist of is a question still undetermined, but a rough estimate has been prepared to show the cost of maintaining a merchant-marine reserve. This estimate runs between $3,000 and $4,000 per ship per year, or for a thousand ships, let us say, $4,000,000 per year.

How infinitesimally small is this maintenance cost of a reasonable reserve fleet as compared with the building of an emergency fleet in time of war can be understood by recalling the figures quoted above as to the cost of the present fleet, built mostly under wartime pressure. Four million dollars annual maintenance cost against $18,000,000,000 war cost does not have any very close relationship to my way of thinking. This maintenance cost could be properly called the annual insurance premium paid for the assurance that we would have the necessary number of vessels available, at once, in time of need. Figure it out and see what a very low rate this insurance costs. You will find very little insurance protection of any kind available at any such low rate.

This reserve fleet, no matter what its eventual size, must not, however, be allowed to hang over the shipping and shipbuilding industry like the sword of Damocles, but must be put in sanctuary so that it is definitely off the market, by statute, to come back in service only when Congress so wills and the emergency justifies such action.

Senator BAILEY, chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and Congressman BLAND, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, recently introduced a bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, which I call "the price-freezing bill

for the post-war fleet." It might be of interest to you if we take a few minutes to analyze this bill and its economic features.

Taking the Liberty ship as an example, and assuming it to cost $2,000,000 with the further assumption that the emergency wartime cost is 35 percent of the total, we have a peacetime cost of $1,200,000. Normal depreciation of 5 percent is then allowed plus an accelerated depreciation of not more than 2½ percent per annum due to the use and abuse arising from wartime operations.

In case the vessel is sold to an American operator in foreign trade and a construction-differential payment is allowed, the cost to that operator would be between five and six hundred thousand dollars.

The cost to a coastal or intercoastal operator would be at the same approximate figure, plus the payment of the balance of the peacetime cost of the ship out of the profits, which balance would be the equivalent of the construction-differential payment allowed the foreign-trade operator.

In case of sale of the vessel to a foreign-flag operator, the price would be the peacetime cost of the vessel, less the depreciation allowance.

By following this procedure we would avoid at least some of the errors of omission and commission that took place with the fleet of World War I.

Starting with the inception of the Maritime Commission construction program and up to the end of April 1944, there have been delivered into active service 3,308 vessels of which 1,151 are the long-range type—including 396 standard-type cargo ships, 267 large-type tankers—and 2,157 of the Liberty-emergency type. During this same period of a little over 4 years, more than 160 of the vessels of the long-range type were sold to private owners. These vessels have since been requisitioned by the Government for war use. I mention these figures as a clear indication that the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 are effective in carrying out the declared policy of Congress of fostering and encouraging the development of an adequate American merchant marine privately owned and operated.

The General Council of British Shipping has set down six points in respect to the future of the British shipping industry which, it seems to me, are both reasonable and fair, and which I believe could be followed by the American shipping industry with considerable advantage. "(1) Restoration and expansion of trade in cooperation with the United States and other United Nations. (2) (a) Reconstruction of the merchant marine in accordance with the white paper, August 1940, in which the government declared their intention of securing after the war the 'maintenance of the British mercantile marine in adequate strength and in a state of full competitive efficiency.' (b) Understanding with United States regarding tonnage position. (3) Maintenance of private enterprise. (4) Continuance of activities of National Maritime Board in progressive improvements of conditions of sea service and establishment of continuity of employment. (5) Equality of sacrifice of all nations in work of revictualing Europe. Release from control at appropriate time and order. (6) Effective cooperation and self-regulation of industry through liner conferences and international freight cooperation schemes where necessary."

The first and primary point is for the restoration and expansion of trade in cooperation with us and the other United Nations; and profitable commercial trade cannot be expanded except by cooperative action between the United Nations.

There can be no real advantage, other than national defense, in possessing a merchant fleet if there is no employment for it.

It depends upon governments whether trade shall be restricted or extended and whether tariff walls shall be erected or razed.

From the point of view of shipping, protective tariffs, dumping and exchange duties, import prohibitions, quotas, clearing agreements, and bilateral and barter agreements generally lead to closed markets and restrictions and less employment of shipping.

Let me repeat something I said not so long ago: "I hope after this war, we can get together with the other maritime powers and evolve an understanding which will satisfy the vital needs of everyone and at the same time prevent a recurrence of the mutually disastrous rivalries of the not-distant past. Commercial rivalry based upon free competition is a good thing, making for lower costs and increased efficiency. Commercial rivalry abetted by Government and manipulated for national advantage is not conductive either to amity or good business. Those of us who are responsible for the development of American shipping recognize these things, and we have no ambition to 'hog' the sea. We will play ball with anybody who is willing to play ball with us. All we ask is that our legitimate requirements, which, everything being considered, are not unduly large, be accepted by our friends abroad."

Students of history, particularly American history, will readily recognize the necessity of stiffening our backbone and steeling our minds when hostilities with the Axis powers are concluded.

There will be the usual flock of "sob sisters," some in long pants, some in short, who will have all too quickly forgotten the sweat, blood, and tears that our men and women have experienced prior to the cessation of hostilities. Not only will they want to give up all that is good and true that we will have won at great price, but they will want to coddle and pamper with gifts and blessings those who brought on the conflict. The surest way to precipitate World War No. 3 will be to pay serious attention to these "sob sisters."

When Capt. Moses Rogers conceived the idea of putting a steam engine into a sailing vessel for auxiliary power, he did not give up when those he first approached turned him down. On the contrary, he persevered and eventually obtained the backing of a group in Savannah.

It is my belief that the shipping industry can profit from the example of intestinal fortitude displayed by Captain Rogers a century and a quarter ago. The industry has been through many vicissitudes, and it should have learned much from those experiences.

Today it is a part of that great effort to win a lasting and a just peace. Tomorrow a great opportunity will be knocking at its door. It has in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, its Magna Carta. The question is: Will it seize the opportunity that will be before it? It is up to the shipping industry to do more than just hang up its shingle, and place its ships on a berth. It is up to that industry to spread its ability to serve far and wide, and to cooperate with others in fostering the development and expansion of our foreign trade so that American ships may always said "full and down."

Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include as part of my remarks a radio address delivered by Hon. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, Tuesday, May 30, 1944. It follows:

As you know, we in the O. P. A. have two major wartime responsibilities. First, it is our responsibility to see that every one of us gets a fair share of scarce products through rationing.

Our second wartime responsibility is to keep prices and rents from going upward.

For, as we all know, higher prices now mean a sharp and constantly growing increase in your present cost of living. They also mean an increase in the cost of fighting the war. Eventually higher prices would lead to a wild, skyrocketing inflation which would cause almost as much chaos and suffering as war itself.

Our O. P. A. authority to ration scarce commodies comes through the President's Second War Powers Act. Our O. P. A. authority to control prices and rents, however, comes directly from Congress. The act which gives us this authority must be renewed by June 30 of this year if the present program of price and rent control is to be continued.

Now the law under which prices and rents are controlled by the O. P. A. is known as the Emergency Price Control Act. Very wisely Congress passed it shortly after Pearl Harbor in an effort to head off the inflationary price rises that have taken place in every other war in which our country has ever fought.

The decision as to whether or not this act is to be renewed will, as I say, be made by Congress within the next 30 days. As far as I can see, it is practically certain that we shall continue to have a price and rent control law. The only question is what kind of a law. Will it be a law that allows us to maintain the present level of prices and rents, or will it be a law which allows prices and rents to go upward?

As Price Administrator, responsible for carrying out the price and rent control policy which Congress will lay down during the next 30 days, I would like to discuss this question with you in some detail both in this present broadcast and in the broadcast I am planning next week.

First of all, let's review the record of control made by the O. P. A. under the present law.

When Congress assigned the job of controlling prices and rents to the O. P. A. it was clear that the task would be a stupendous one. There are 3,000,000 business concerns in the United States which manufacture and sell hundreds of thousands of different products. There are 14,500,000 rented dwellings in the country in areas subject to rent control.

The task of controlling all prices and rents was new and unfamiliar. It had never been attempted in America.

In our effort to establish prices that were fair to the various manufacturers and farm groups and to the stores and wholesalers which sell the finished products, it was inevitable that many mistakes would be made. Lacking precedent, we in the O. P. A. have had to learn by the trial-and-error method.

As I look back on the job today, I believe we all have a right to feel proud of the accomplishment. As I have pointed out, in every other war in the history of this country—or any other country—war has brought with it skyrocketing prices on food, rents, clothing, and other necessities.

The inflationary forces in this war are far greater than in any war in world history. If it had not been for O. P. A. price control and rent control there is no reasonable basis to even guess the tremendous heights to which prices would have risen.

Under O. P. A. price control and rent control there have been some price increases during the past 2 years. But in comparison to what might have happened, they have been relatively small. And during the last 12 months the price level in general has been held stationary.

Of course, that doesn't mean that some prices haven't gone up. It simply means that for those prices that have gone up there have been others that have gone down, so that the average has remained level.

Today the United States Department of Labor tells us that the cost of living is 7 percent higher than 2 years ago, when the O. P. A. first put price control at retail into effect. Since April 1943 there has been no significant net increase. Rents have remained level and food has even gone down slightly.

Clothing, as I pointed out last week, has risen somewhat in price, and the quality has deteriorated. But when you average everything up for the low income and medium income family, the cost of living, according to the Department of Labor, has as a whole, item by item, averaged out just about what it did in April 1943.

The price level of industrial and wholesale products—products like petroleum, copper, steel, and aluminum—has risen only 2.9 percent in the last 2 years.

In the comparable period of the last World War, industrial prices, which eventually help determine the final cost of the war, rose more than twice as much. By preventing increases of that kind we have already saved billions upon billions of dollars in fighting the war—costs which would have been reflected in an increased national debt and higher taxes.

Under 2 years of O. P. A. price control we have seen for the first time during any war price increases held to an absolute minimum, both the prices of war goods and the prices which you pay at the stores. Has this been accomplished at the cost of production? Certainly there is nothing in the record to indicate this.

In the present war, under O. P. A. price control, farm production has increased more than four times as much and industrial production fully five times as much as they expanded during World War No. 1, when there was only moderate price controls in effect.

Has this control over prices and rents been accomplished at the expense of business profits or farm income? Again there is no sign in the record that this is true. Corporation profits, even after all taxes, are today more than double what they were in 1939. Net farm income in 1943, after all expenses, was 182 percent above the level of 1939.

That doesn't mean that all farmers and all businessmen have prospered to that extent or anything approaching that extent. But it does mean that today we have less economic hardship and fewer bankruptcies than in any other period in the modern history of this country.

Thus today, in the midst of the greatest war in history and under our present program of O. P. A. price and rent control, most people in the United States are making good money. Most businesses are making more profits than ever before in peacetime.

According to a recent survey, 19 out of 20 people in this country believe that prices should not rise higher than their present levels. Probably there is no other single phase of the war effort on which there is so complete and absolute agreement of all citizens in all income groups and all types of occupations.

But price and rent control are necessarily complex operations. The regulations which make these protective controls effective touch more than 3,000,000 business firms in all parts of the country. Some of these people reason that if there were no O. P. A. sitting on the price lid, or at least if the O. P. A. did not control prices in their particular field, they would be able to make higher profits.

As a result, Washington today is filled with hundreds of lobbyists sent here to secure special advantages for the pressure groups which they represent.

By well-organized efforts behind the scenes, these lobbyists are now vigorously concentrating their attacks on the price-control law. Most of them say: "Of course, we aren't really opposed to price or rent control. All we want is certain changes in the law." Usually they know full well that the changes they have suggested mean higher prices in the stores to you, the final consumer, as well as higher profits to the groups they represent.

But sometimes, it is only fair to say, these lobbyists seem honestly convinced that special concessions could be made to them without damaging the over-all program for which we are responsible.

In preparation for the debate on the new O. P. A. price and rent control law which will start within the next few days, two congressional committees, one in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate, have been interviewing witnesses and studying the price-control situation for the past 2 months.

These two committees have listened patiently to lobbyists pleading their special selfish interests, to businessmen and other officials who have sincere ideas on how price control may be improved, and to the members of my own O. P. A. staff.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee alone has collected more than 1,000 pages of testimony. The recommendations which these two committees will make to Congress will be thoroughly debated in both the Senate and House of Representatives. Some time in the next 30 days a final decision will be reached. A bill of some kind will be passed.

Now, naturally, I have some strong personal beliefs on the subject of this price-control bill. A person in my position, working with these problems hard, day in and day out, cannot help but have definite opinions.

You know that our main objective in price and rent control has been to hold the line—to keep the cost of living and prices in general from rising.

I believe personally that it would be a grave mistake if prices were allowed to go up. It isn't that a rise of 2 or 3 or 4 percent in prices would in itself upset our whole economy; but if those initial increases are allowed we could never hope to stop there. One price rise leads to another. It wouldn't take many before requests for wage increases become stronger and stronger. Wage increases on a broad scale invariably lead to other price increases, and still others, and inflation has begun.

When inflationary price increases begin, it is felt immediately by the quarter of the population who live on fixed incomes. There are nearly 30,000,000 of them altogether—older people on pensions, teachers, Government employees, white-collar workers—the wives and dependents of the men in the armed forces who are fighting this war for us. If your main source of income is a $50-a-month dependent allowance from your soldier husband, even a small initial increase in living costs is a very serious matter.

After this war I'd like to see us all set our sights high. Let's shoot at a high level of production, a high standard of living, with plenty of good jobs to go around. In my opinion this high level of production, this economy free of unemployment, can be best achieved if we continue to resist the selfish pressures which are now seeking to raise prices a little here and a little there.

In line with these beliefs, I have personally recommended to Congress, based on my practical experience as Price Administrator, that the present law be renewed in substantially its present form.

In spite of those strong opinions of my own, I'd like to emphasize that Congress is the group that must decide the over-all policies of our Government. Congress is, in fact, our board of directors. Congress must make the basic policy decisions, and I want to say that I shall always respect the decisions they make, whether or not I may personally agree with them.

As I see my responsibility as Price Administrator, however, it is up to me to see that the implications of any changes in the price control act which Congress is considering are to the best of my ability clear beyond all question—clear to the Members of Congress and clear to you people who make up the public.

If the present Price Control Act is continued in substantially its present form, we can continue to hold prices in general approximately where they are today. But if some of the amendments suggested actually become law, prices and rents will certainly go up, and go up fast, and there is nothing we in the O. P. A. can do to stop them. There is hardly a person in the country who won't feel the force of these increases. There are millions of us who will suffer directly and sharply as a result.

All told there are some 125 different amendments and changes in the Price Control Act already suggested to Congress. Only two of these, to my knowledge, will help to render price and rent control more effective. Most of the remainder will, in my considered opinion, clearly result in not only encouraging but actually in forcing higher prices.

Much of the largest proportion of these amendments are the result of direct recommendations of lobbyists and pressure groups. Some of these groups are obviously well intentioned. They may believe sincerely in the proposals which they are indorsing, unaware of the possible consequences to the Nation. But, to put it bluntly, a high percentage of these groups seem to feel that this critical war period is the time to reap large personal profits regardless of the consequences to the country as a whole. They seem to look on the present large volume of wartime business only as an opportunity to collect profits far higher than they ever enjoyed in peacetime.

The issue of whether the O. P. A. is to continue to hold the present level of prices and rents or whether prices and rents are to be forced upward * * * a little at first, then more and more * * * is in my opinion second in importance only to the actual winning of the war.

It is a critical question of national policy and solely for the Congress to decide. It is a policy question which will, in my opinion, deeply affect the economy of our country for 10, 15, or even 20 years to come.

I am sure that Congress will debate the issue thoroughly. I have every personal hope that the final decision will be such that we may continue to hold the line against the devastating forces of inflation and to protect you and your family against further increases in the cost of living. But whatever the final decision may be, it is my earnest hope that we make it with our eyes wide open.

Memorial Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a memorial address delivered by me on Sunday, May 28, 1944, at the annual memorial service

conducted by the Revere, Mass., veterans:

The crisis of this war is near. As we gather in tender tribute to those who have fallen in freedom's cause, we must realize that they who gave all for the Nation expect no less from us. They died to make men free. We must live and carry through to fulfillment the work which they so nobly began.

The men and women of our time have been singled out like the people of Washington's, Lincoln's, and Wilson's time to bear great responsibilities. From our founding fathers we inherit a great and human tradition. From them we hear the clear call to live beyond and above ourselves—that generations to come may draw strength and courage from the example we set before them.

From our past we have much to nourish us as we face the stern realities ahead. In our schoolboys, as we learned American history, we thought of those great men as a breed apart. Today, however, as we face trials no less severe than theirs we feel them nearer to us than they ever were before.

Here, on this very ground where we now stand, men faced the unknown without fear or favor, trusting in God and building the dignity of man in His image. From these humble and decent origins came the traditional faith of all Americans. From it developed the courageous leadership of Washington, the spiritual example of Lincoln, the forward-looking statesmanship of Wilson.

These are the symbols of our character, bringing into splendid focus the work and belief of the millions of unknown men and women who gave root to all we hold dear. From every land they came, to throw off the shackles of despotism, to walk upright in the new and inspiring climate of American fellowship.

From thees freemen developed a great and prosperous nation, devoted to the arts of peace. A busy, trusting nation that had little time for guile or intrigue. A hopeful nation that instinctively thought well of other peoples and so—was stunned by the infamy of December 7, 1941. When the smoke of that ambush cleared away, a tragic number of our battleships were twisted hulks of ruin. Others lay in the slime at the bottom of Pearl Harbor. The pride of the American Navy was gone. Taking immediate profit from its treachery, the Japanese Navy manned the far Pacific at will, spearheading the invasions that took Hong Kong, the Philippines, Singapore, and the Dutch East Indies in bewildering succession—Australia prepared for the worst. Even our Pacific coast was on the alert. America was rocked back on her heels.

Our enemies thought we could never rally from this paralyzing shock. But from the farms and pastures they came, these wisecracking young Americans, who had never handled a gun before in their lives; gave up the comfort and security of their homes to fight diseases and jungle and Jap—all at the same time. In a series of small though bitter campaigns they held the line.

With a courage of which we were unaware, these neighborhood kids we know saved us, gave us the time to recover our wind and set to work to strengthen ourselves for the day of reckoning. Today we have built most of that strength. Thanks to the men and women of America, we now have the greatest naval striking power in world history. We have the greatest air force and the security of knowing that our men are going into battle as the best-equipped fighting men in the world.

Burma Mission, Guadalcanal, Savo, Munda, Midway, Kassimir Pass, Salerno, Anzio, Cassino—these are the new names on the bright scroll of American manhood. Others are to come.

In the past some of us wondered if our children were being brought up the right way. This is the answer: Our boys have what it takes. Sure, we gave them everything, but now they are paying us back—tenfold. Our enemies thought we were weak, not only in arms but in spirit. They forgot that there is an American character—a character stronger than the difference of race or color or creed—the character of men fighting and dying, if need be, to help one another. Here, surely, is one aspect of eternal truth. Here man comes closer to his God.

Out of the blood and bone and human faith that have gone into the building of America something has to come down to us. It has not been lost, as some have feared. It is there in the skies over Germany. It is in the prayers of every woman whose love reaches out to give men the spiritual strength that never dies.

From thes things we know that we are on the right road. In spite of road blocks and detours, we know that America is going forward to fulfill her destiny, alive with the idealism of the individual man working fairly with other men. In this spirit of comradeship we are prepared to make sacrifices. For what is good and true there are times when we must sacrifics. In the long run such giving of ourselves is never lost.

Parents may leave no worldly goods to the child. But they leave something which is infinitely finer. The memory of the parents and the sacrifices they cheerfully made to bring opportunity and happiness to the child is a living value which remains when earthly props give way.

On this memorial occasion we grieve for the love and affection that we withheld now that it is too late to give. We try to break through the inscrutable mask of eternity to speak again with our loved ones who have gone. We seek for ways to atone for the mistakes we made. We try to bridge life and death for the fulfillment of all these things. We resolve to be better men and women and people as we extend our hand in mystic fellowship.

The delicate blossome we place on the graves of our dead will wither and fall away. But from this tender communion let us keep forever fresh in our hearts the beautiful and inspiring memories they have left with us.

Lest we forget, there are other graves far from home where our spirit must visit this day. And let us think of other men who stand poised this very minute to die that we may live.

D–Day is nearer than we realize. On this historic day will depend all that we are, all that we may be. Our men are ready. Are we? For one moment they look back to make certain that we are prepared to finish what they have been chosen to start. In every way we can, let us give them the assurance that we will complete the task. As the seconds tick off, they challenge all of us with the need for speed and effort. Our fighting men look to us for this. We must not, we cannot, fail them.

So, let us pledge that we will make each passing moment count. Today we are Americans, conscious of our responsibility to ourselves and to the world. Today and tomorrow we must keep that faith for the debt we owe to those who have died; for the promise we must hold forth to the children who will follow us.

We have pledged. Now, let us pray, with any words or thoughts our hearts may offer. Let us be with our men through every demanding hour that lies ahead. Though thousands of miles separate us, we will be with them in mind and heart and spirit. From us, to them, our prayers for a quick, decisive victory and a firm and lasting peace that America may soon have her children back home with her again.

For What Are We Fighting?—A Statement of the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days many men and women in public and private life, with equal justification, are giving serious thought to the objectives of this war. Failure of the administration to outline a proposed slate of peace aims or to develop a candid and clear-cut foreign policy has stimulated this discussion as citizens in and out of Washington grope around trying to find something definite to which to tie.

Mr. Speaker, the following article, entitled "A Statement of the Case," by a citizen of the State capital of South Dakota—Pierre—is worth-while reading, since it summarizes in language which all can understand some of the American ideals and objectives which we all hope will be preserved and projected both during and following this war. Unfortunately, some of them are not included in the highly touted "four freedoms"—which omit freedom of opportunity, despite the fact that it is the most typically American freedom of them all—but it is hoped that realistic peace makers will remember the freedom which Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill forgot on their ship on the ocean:

A STATEMENT OF THE CASE

What are we fighting for? is a question that is asked more often than it is answered. It may be that most of those who are doing the actual fighting understand what it is about and could, if called upon and desired to do so, put it into words that would be clear and plain. I have no authority to speak for anyone in the armed forces, but it might sound something like this:

"When the evil man started to oppress the people of the world and to attack all the forces of good, when he caused us to be murderously assaulted, there was nothing to do but fight, except for the craven soul who had neither love nor honor in his heart. 'Pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war' did not attract us; this was one war where the fife and drum corps could not have raised a corporal's guard. The average American warrior has killed in this trade of war as he would kill a rat or a rattlesnake to stop a destroying, poisonous, Godless foe who had for prototype the kidnaping racketeer. All of this is and was well known, and it is not what they mean when they ask the question. Only unthoughtedly can it be asked at all, as it implies an acquiescence in a slave world and an acceptance of things forced upon us rather than a chance to return to the life we lived before the evil man began to trouble this poor world's peace. I think we know what it means and that it means almost the same thing to each one of us a return to just like it used to be. We'll make it better if we can, sure, but like it used to be is so much better than anything we have seen since. Just now we are not asking for more."

For instance, in Pierre, S. Dak. (in the first place it is pronounced "Peer" and in residence of a year I have yet to hear it given the French

pronunciation a single time), hence there are in residence the only flock of wild Canadian geese ever to permanently inhabit a body of water inside the limits of a metropolitan city. Some 75 of them, depending on the visitors, feed on the shores of the lake which is on one side of the State capitol ground, fly over the city and up or down the river when the spirit moves them, hurling their cries of vengeance, perhaps, should anything go wrong while they are away. In the mating season the big party breaks up and by fours and fives, then threes and fours, and finely by twos and the matter is settled for the year; not, however, without the night and day being filled with discordant cries of love and denunciation for a month or more. The geese seem to be the special charge of the Governor, by virtue of his office, and it is hard to contemplate the punishment sure to be meted out to anyone who would harm one of these trusting wild birds. On some of their flights they are gone for a day and night and cover many miles, but they always return and it seems there is a note of gladness in their cry as they come near the city. Do you think a boy from Pierre could ever forget that? One of the Pierre boys was over Tokyo with Doolittle, and, thank God, he came back, he may have thought of the geese just as he dropped his sincere regards to Tojo. Some of the boys from Pierre will never come back. One day the courthouse was closed and the city and country went to the air field to hear a major general of the United States Army speak kindly and appreciatively of one of them and to present his mother a symbol of such appreciation by the Army and the country. When this boy made his supreme sacrifice he knew it would be his last and in the brilliant sun of a tropical island he may have seen the angels coming for him and thought of Pierre and the wild geese.

Pierre is a city of freemen. It is one of the few cities of the world where man can wear cowboy boots and hats and not look like they were taking part in a picture show. I have seen them in the Senate dining room of the Capitol at Washington where they were no more conspicuous than was Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, one of the group, and one of the best dressed men in the Senate. They not only wear this raiment in a natural and becoming manner, but can, if the occasion requires, live up to it. Boys who have grown up around this kind of men do not forget them. A boy who has lived near the Buffalo grass hills will never forget it and all of the beautiful lawns or fields of the east or the old world will make no picture in his mind to take the place of what he has known at home. He also has a comprehensive picture of the people of the world. In his State and city dwell Swedes, Finns, Scandinavians, Dutch, Jews, English, Danes, French, Indians, and very many others who have lived and gotten along together as well as though they had been of one race. They are Catholic, Baptist, Methodist, Episcopalian, Congregational, Lutheran, and many others including the worship of the Indian. In their daily intercourse it would be hard to tell one from the other by the treatment they either receive or bestow on others. A Finn may be the mayor, an Irishman the sheriff, the hotel man a Jew, a Dutchman has the lumber yard, an Italian the restaurant, a Greek the grocery store, a swede may be States attorney, and they all belong to the Kiwanis Club and religiously attend each week. The high school quartet, singing at one of these club luncheons, included a Negro boy, selected for his voice suitable for the part; he came in with the others, sat at the table with them, and did his part without comment from anyone as a matter of course.

You are wasting your time when you tell the boy from Pierre that the different races of people cannot get along in harmony and with perfect peace, for he knows better.

He remembers the winters in Pierre, with the mile-long street down the hill, after the first snow it is as slick as glass and instead of hauling cinders or gravel to give traction to cars, the city fathers rope off the street for the duration of the snow so that boys and girls may coast in safety and peace so far as the city traffic is concerned. There are some murmurs at this from those who are compelled to detour but custom is custom and it is not to be supposed that the boys and girls will forego a coasting right that has been respected for a generation, at least they will not forego it easily, not in Pierre.

The cosmopolitan character of the city is further exemplified by the flag man, Dr. Henry M. Reed; he makes flags of all countries of the world, knows more about flags, perhaps, and their particular history than anyone in America; he has supplied orders from all points of the compass, appeared on radio Hobby Lobby and appears on all occasions in the State where the colors of the world are being marshaled and his display of flags are a prominent feature. On gala days in Pierre the streets are lined with an assortment of all of the flags of our allies; the soldier or sailor going out from here is not a stranger to the flags of other nations.

The flesh pots of the East are not going to overwhelm the South Dakota boys to any colossal extent. A $15 dinner, a lot of fancy dishes, and subservient flunkies will not cause him to forget the fat roasted pheasants, fresh-river fish, home-grown or Belle Fourche vegetables his mother set out on frequent occasions, together with proper flagons of home-made wild-grape wine, having a tang and flavor that cannot be purchased, wherewith to wash it down; and beefsteaks—no doubt, there are other places where they have them, but to make comparison, to the South Dakota boy, is like telling a resident of Shasta or Portland how to grow roses. To get back and find it just like they left it, that is all the boy asks. Unconditional surrender and an end to mad-dog rule of any part of the world, then to get back.

When it is all over and he has had time to think things out, if there are changes to be made, he will have the experience of the war to aid him in the things he wants to do. He will be a hard man to fool—a hard man to influence—he will know the difference between the sound part of the body politic and the lunatic fringe, double talk, and evasiveness will not avail with him, and it may be well not to make too many plans, for he may have plans of his own about a lot of things, and after doing the things he has done any task ahead of him may not seem so difficult; action and not too much talk has been his method of procedure and he may adhere to this method until such time as the changes that seem necessary are made. What he wants now is to get it over with and to get home. He doesn't need "honor and country" emblazoned on an escutcheon to keep him reminded, for, though he may never speak them, these words are always in his heart; that is what he is fighting for.

FRED B. WOODARD.

PIERRE, S. DAK., *May 1, 1944.*

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to join with thousands of my constituents of Passaic, N. J., in this great defense city's observance of Memorial Day.

Standing alongside me as I spoke at Military Park close to the monument dedicated by Gen. John J. Pershing in 1924 was a hero of this war—Capt. Edwin Schneider of the Army Air Corps. Eddie, an employee of United States Rubber's Passaic plant before Pearl Harbor, recently came home after he had completed 262 missions over Jap territory in New Guinea and had been cited several times for extraordinary heroism.

The young captain was in the best of health and spirits. He was modest. He would not talk about his own daring military exploits but he did have praise for all our fighting forces in the South Pacific.

Sitting near able Allen Smith, city editor of the Passaic Herald-News, at a luncheon of Passaic Post No. 4, Blue and Gray Division, shortly after the ceremonies at Military Park, the captain said:

"Mr. Smith, I seek no acclaim and I want no publicity. I do have a big favor you might possibly grant me, however, although I hesitate to ask it."

Editor Smith, proud of his fellow-townsman who, with his ship's crew, had done so much to even up accounts for Pearl Harbor, quickly indicated his readiness to accord almost any accommodation.

"I am engaged to the loveliest girl in Australia," continued the captain. "She is really beautiful and I thought you might be willing to put her picture in the paper."

By the time these remarks are printed the picture of the future Mrs. Schneider will have appeared and Eddie Schneider's big favor will have been granted.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke at Passaic's memorial observance as follows:

Somehow, with me at least, the spirit of Abraham Lincoln seems to hover over our American Memorial Day. He loved his countrymen and he fought and died for their freedom.

To Abraham Lincoln mere words counted for little on such a day. The lives of our heoric dead spoke for themselves.

Mindful of these dead and their contributions to our free Republic and standing in the presence of our heroic living—those who have borne arms for our country in this war and those of '98 and '18—this at a time, possibly the very hour, when so many thousands of Passaic boys and their comrades from nearby communities await near the English Channel for the D-day signal which will start Liberty's greatest march against Europe's mighty fortress of aggression and oppression, I feel a deep sense of humility. Almost any words I might utter would be trite. We would do well just to turn our eyes to the heavens and thank Divine Providence that America was founded and is being maintained by liberty-loving men and women.

A 17-year-old boy came to my office in Paterson yesterday. He had his father's permission to enlist in our armed forces but he was having difficulty getting a release from his war-plant employer. I am trying to help the lad because he is now misassigned. He should be on the fighting, not the home front.

"Congressman," said this boy, "I love the flag and liberty more than life itself. My only brother felt the same way. The last word

we had from him told us how he had followed Old Glory in a victory parade in Tunisia. Shortly afterward there came a message to our home from General Ulio in Washington. It advised us that my brother had been killed in action in Sicily. I want to take his place."

He didn't realize it yesterday, but that 17-year-old boy made a memorial speech that will not be bettered today anywhere in our America. He, in fact, is America—that America which remembers, that America which has what it takes, that America which cannot be beaten.

No; America cannot be beaten, but it can be hurt. It can be sabotaged by the thoughtless, the indifferent, the careless right here at home.

I was glad to note this last week that the head of one of our largest labor unions, in castigating part of his membership for indulging in any unauthorized strike affecting war production, pointed out that public opinion was inflamed and the union itself would not survive if the men in uniform held it interfered with their job at the front.

The Chief of Navy Chaplains, recently returning to the Capital from an inspection abroad, emphasized that our fighting men were taking inventory. When they came home, he continued, men on the home front would be measured by their actions, not their words, in this hour of crisis.

This should be obvious to all and men in public life, men of industry, men in all walks of life, will be appraised and rated even as those in labor unions.

The sadness of Memorial Day in the years to come will be tempered if we can square conscience with this personal accounting.

I have only one other thought on this Memorial Day and it is this:

We owe the mothers of men a terrific debt in this hour. Go to Arlington, go to any cemetery, any bivouac of our heroic dead. Talk to the caretakers. They will tell you some forget, but not the mothers of men.

We owe the mothers of men more than victory. We must pledge them we will not lose the peace.

Fifty-four percent of the seniors in a New York university register their belief another world war will follow in less than 25 years.

"We orate on our valiant dead,
Then, willful-blind, we turn our head—
Repudiate their victory."

The mothers of America—yes, the mothers of the world—will not be safe unless there is a peace which will bring about world understanding and cooperation based on the universal standard which was expressed in the Sermon on the Mount.

Is this too much to ask of humanity on Memorial Day?

Hull Gives Pledge to Small Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the remarks of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, as made public by the State Department:

At his press and radio news conference today the Secretary of State made the following reply in answer to a question whether there was anything he could say that might be of reassurance to the small nations. The correspondent who asked the question pointed out that some of the small nations seemed to think that they would not be properly represented in the proposed international organization.

"That is a matter in which the small nations, and the large nations as well, should be at all times especially interested. It is a mutual affair. The future welfare of each nation depends upon the welfare of all. In view of that common interest and that self-interest in every mutual sense, I doubt whether there would be many nations, large or small, which would have any other purpose than to cooperate in all legitimate and practical international relationships that would be mutually advantageous and mutually profitable.

"As far as this Government is concerned, whenever I have said anything on this subject, it has always emphasized the all-inclusive nature of the world situation and our disposition and purpose to see that all nations, especially the small nations, are kept on a position of equality with all others and that, in every practicable way, there will be cooperation."

NO BLUEPRINT OF DETAILS

"Now, it is not possible at this stage for this Government or any government to give anybody a blueprint as to all of the details of how these relationships between all of the different nations will be gradually developed and perfected. There is no occasion to be especially concerned about the attitude of this Government in view of the declarations that the President, and I, and others have made.

"The truth is that even those declarations are not necessarily called for in the light of our entire history and our traditions. We have for 150 years preached liberty to all the nations of the earth, to all the peoples of the earth, and we have practiced it. We have encouraged all nations to aspire to liberty, and to enjoy it. Our attitude toward the Philippines is a striking example. Nobody had to put us on the witness stand to know what we were doing for them.

"Even back in our earlier days we preached the same spirit of liberty with which we, ourselves, were inspired in acquiring our own liberty, to all the nations, especially those that were in chains of despotism, as the South American countries were for centuries under Spanish rule. Nobody asked us to do it. That was our philosophy. That was our spirit, both at home and toward all peoples who might aspire to liberty. As soon as our American neighbors threw off the Spanish yoke, we proceeded to recognize them, right and left."

CHAMPIONSHIP OF LIBERTY

"We had the same spirit toward Greece and other countries desiring liberty as we demonstrated in the Philippines. That has been our consistent record, a record of championship of liberty for everybody, encouraging them at all times and in all places. I see no reason why this country, this great free people who, through generations, have dedicated themselves to this wonderful human cause and preserved it—I see no reason why they should be catechized every morning before breakfast as to their loyalty to liberty, or their consistent desire of liberty for everybody and freedom for aspiring peoples everywhere.

"I have spoken of this often in speeches and at other times before, during and after my trip to Europe. Here is an example from my address to the Congress:

" 'The principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, irrespective of size and strength, as partners in a future system of general security will be the foundation stone upon which the future international organization will be constructed.'

"That is our objective. I think I have indicated sufficiently to you the policy of this Nation and this Government representing it."

Our Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on May 31, 1944:

OUR MEMORIAL

Bravely and sincerely we paid tributes of devotion to our heroic dead. Memorial Day is particularly appropriate to bow our heads in prayer while our hearts are filled with gratitude to those whose sacrifices were so great that their very lives were offered for their fellow men.

Since the dawn of independence in our land 168 years ago, there must have been inherent good and basic virtues in the purposes and aims of our country for there has never been need of fear or any dearth of defenders. It is no great wonder that this is so for all of our founders well know the weight of oppression and, within them, strong and vivid, was the love of freedom and the will for independence.

How that independence was achieved; how the chains of slavery were broken forever; how the indivisibility of the Union was preserved and how greedy nations were kept at formerly safe distances was the work and achievement of those whose memories we cherish.

It is now only a generation ago that the flames of world war engaged almost every civilized nation to prevent an imperialistic effort to destroy all democracies and smother the rule of the people. We then joined the Allies to efface the danger of autocracy and dictatorship in its attempt to subdue and rule the peoples of the earth. Our cause was the cause of humanity, the success of our arms was glorious but the tremendous problems were not settled.

The majority of the nations of the entire world are now engaged in the most massive and widespread conflict in an effort to complete the work that was started in 1914. The Great Ruler of all destiny has willed that more than 10,000,000 of our sons and daughters are joined under wings and arms with the nations which have denied the right of one-man government. Our fighting men are in most parts of the world, protecting us, our cause, and our country. This in itself is a great tribute to our honored dead in that it confirms their purposes and ratifies all that they fought for.

Our gratitude to our heroic dead may probably be best reflected by adding to our words, our prayers, and our flowers, efforts and sacrifices more earnest and in greater measure

than those already made. May all that we do and all that we say reflect a purely unselfish desire to win, achieve, and establish a peace that will not only endure but one that will be commensurate with the cost in suffering, sacrifice, and human lives.

To all of our protectors, both living and dead, let us guarantee, to every extent of our ability, full cooperation, free from all envy, pride, and avarice to the end that all over this world there shall be governments similar to that of the United States of America.

The Christian Heritage of Poland, the Crucified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid and interesting sermon delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph F. Flannelly, entitled "The Christian Heritage of Poland, the Crucified," that appeared in the Polish Weekly, Sokol Polski, an official organ of the Polish Falcons of America, published in Pittsburgh, Pa.:

At the high mass celebrated on Sunday, February 27, in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, by the Right Reverend Monsignor J. Dworzak, of Yonkers, N. Y., presided over by Archbishop Spellman, the rector of St. Patrick's, the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph F. Flannelly, delivered the following sermon:

"After our blessed Lord had foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, He said:

" 'But he that shall persevere to the end, he shall be saved' (Matt. xxiv: 13).

"Dearly beloved, it was at Castelgondolfo that our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, wrote his first Encyclical Letter, on October 20, 1939. That was less than 2 months after the tragedy of September 1. In that letter the Holy Father referred to Poland's hour of darkness, and he declared that Poland has a right to the generous and brotherly sympathy of the whole world because of its fidelity to the church and its services in the defense of Christian civilization.

"Most willingly—yes; even anxiously—do we all, archbishop, priests, and people, acknowledge that right, and with a sympathy springing from our deepest heart of hearts do we offer with you of Polish blood this holy sacrifice of the mass for Poland and her people.

" 'Quis est homo qui non fieret?'

"Who is the man who would not weep when, while recalling the aspirations, the sacrifices, and the contributions of the Polish people during the past 1,000 years to make and preserve Poland a free and Christian country, he gazes upon Poland today—I will not say 'dead'; no, I will not say even 'dying'; but gasping for life and struggling for existence?

"Who is the man who would not weep, when, while recalling the Polish people as the Good Samaritan to all the oppressed peoples of Europe for over 500 years, he gazes today upon the Polish women and children, as well as men, lying along the roadside of the world, dying from the treacherous assaults of the robber nations. If weeping with Poland and her people will be a source of help and even consolation to them, then we weep generously and copiously.

"But even more do I feel that we can help Poland and her people by assuring them, here in the presence of our sacramental God, that we are in awe and admiration of their confidence in God and their perseverance in prayer to him. In their history, there has been many a day when the sun of justice did not shine upon Poland, and sorrow filled Polish hearts to overflowing. But on every one of those days Poland was lifted beyond the clouds and the sorrow was transformed into joy consummate, confidence in God, and persevering prayer to the crucified Saviour.

"Most unfortunately, another such day is at hand. While we offer this holy mass, I urge you all to beg for the Polish people, wherever they may be on the face of this earth, the grace to persevere with absolute confidence in their prayer to God. The very fact that they have persevered so long is proof that they are the elect of God. He loves them in a very special way, and in His own good time He will reward them both here and hereafter.

"You remember the parable of Our Lord in which He taught the necessity and the value of perseverance in prayer. He said that there was in a certain town a judge who neither feared God nor had regard for man. A poor widow went to him again and again saying 'Give me judgment against my adversary.' For a while he refused. But she continued to implore. Finally, the judge, fearing that he would be worn out by her incessant visits, gave judgment in her favor. From this parable our Lord drew this lesson: If even an unjust judge will give justice because of the perseverance of the just, how much more speedily will our kind and holy Father in Heaven hear and answer the unfaltering prayer of his faithful children. Like the widow, the Polish people have prayed unceasingly.

"I know that you of Polish blood and ancestry are suffering in heart, at least, with your people back home. I know that you would wish for the prayers of Poland to be answered at once and justice done speedily. That is most natural. But I beg of you to leave the time to God. Just pray, and pray that your countrymen will pray, pray, and pray.

"For almost 1,000 years the Polish people have followed Christ. They took up their cross and went after Him. Anyone who deserts Him on the road to Calvary is not a true Christian. Particularly during the past 175 years, Poland has been on that road to Calvary. With all due reverence, let me say that there is a very striking likeness between the Saviour's journey and Poland's. It is in this respect. While carrying the Cross our Saviour fell three times. Each time He arose and continued His journey. When He had reached Calvary, He was thrown down upon the Cross, never to rise again until He came from the tomb, glorious and immortal, on the day of resurrection.

"In 1773, 1793, and 1795 Poland fell, like her Master, each time—after each partition—she arose and followed Him.

"During the past 3 years she has arrived at the hill of Calvary. Stripped of everything except her Catholic faith, she has been thrown down upon her cross. Today she is being nailed to it.

"How truly is hers a Christian heritage. As she hangs on her cross I am sure she will ask forgiveness for those who have crucified her. With true Christian courage Poland will endure the physical torture and patiently suffer the jeers of her godless enemies.

"Then, to the eyes of the enemies of God, she will appear to die forever. But we know that it will not be forever. 'He who liveth and believeth in Me shall not die forever.' Like her Master, Poland will rise. Pray that Poland and her people will always understand that her resurrection will be the reward only for her perseverance in prayer and her confidence in God."

Protesting Against Two New O. P. A. Regulations

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. is not satisfied to let things alone. Just as everything is moving along smoothly and the people are becoming reconciled to its operation, some new plan or regulation is devised to arouse the wrath of the public and cause more headaches.

Corroborative of this, I cite two recent occurrences:

First, a new method by which they are establishing what is known as issuance centers located in the larger cities, many miles from the local boards, and these issuance centers and not the local boards will issue ration certificates in the future for gasoline, tires, and so forth.

The local boards have been satisfactorily and successfully handling the issuance of these ration certificates, and the public has become accustomed to such operation and thoroughly satisfied therewith, but in the future this power of issuance is to be taken away from the local boards and vested in these several issuance centers, causing additional expense, inconvenience, and extreme dissatisfaction, both on the part of the local boards and the public.

They seek to justify this change on the ground that they are afraid the certificates, if left with the local boards, may be stolen, and that they have to be issued from some safe centers at a long distance from the sites of the local boards. There may have been some thefts, but these are rare and constitute the exceptions, and, because this is so, they should not upset the local distribution of these certificates.

The public is much better satisfied when these matters are handled in their own local rationing boards, and the local boards feel that it is a reflection upon their honesty that this change has been made, and the public feels that it is another effort on the part of Washington to exercise a bureaucratic tendency to take away from the local boards the operation of rationing.

Those who compose the local rationing boards in my district are businessmen of the highest integrity, who are giving their time, without remuneration, in a patriotic way, to try to help the Government. They know how to deal with the

public and the public has confidence in them, and the O. P. A. should continue under the present system which has been successfully administered by these local boards, and not take away any power whatever from the local boards and vest it in some issuance center at some far distant point in the State.

I have received many letters and telegrams of protest from my district, from responsible people, who are patriotic and who have tried to cooperate, who are opposed and incensed at this new regulation.

I have registered these protests with the O. P. A. and urged that the proposed change be not made, but up to now I have secured no promise that the order will be rescinded, and I want publicly to protest and denounce this innovation and publicly urge that it not be done.

The other incident is the proposed ceiling price upon watermelons. No ceiling price has heretofore existed on watermelons, and the farmers in my district planted watermelons this year in the belief that there would be no ceiling price, as no notice had been given of an intention on the part of O. P. A. to place a ceiling price thereon, and, as a result, these farmers are going to suffer because of the increased price they have had to pay for fertilizer and labor in making and marketing the melon crop, and they are naturally incensed at the Government.

Another objection to the proposed ceiling price on melons is that a fairly good price is placed as a ceiling up to July 4, but after July 4, the ceiling price is cut in two, and since most of the melons in my section are marketed after July 4, my farmers will receive this very low ceiling price which, as I understand, is below the cost of production.

Why should a ceiling price be placed on watermelons? Watermelons are a luxury and not a necessity; and if the farmers make their prices too high, the public will not buy them. If a ceiling price is to be invoked, then certainly those producing the late crop should not be discriminated against.

Earnings of Oil Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, without comment, I ask consent to insert in the RECORD herewith the net earnings after taxes of the oil companies of the United States for 1942 and 1943. I believe the comparison of the earnings in the 2 years will be enlightening.

It is important to point out that the great majority of crude-oil producers are not represented in this table of earnings:

Oil company earnings—(Full calendar year)

Company	1943		1942	
	Dollars	Per share	Dollars	Per share
Barnsdall Oil Co.[1]	$3,602,764	$1.62	$2,801,846	$1.26
Pure Oil Co.[2]	13,874,000	2.50	13,761,000	2.47
The Atlantic Refining Co.[3]	10,688,000	3.79	6,800,000	2.33
Sunray Oil Corporation [1]	1,121,000	.48	818,000	.37
Root Petroleum Co.[4 9]	312,909	.82	310,135	.81
Quaker State Oil & Refining Co.[7]	1,143,303	1.23	1,298,000	1.40
Union Oil Company of California [3]	7,269,000	1.56	5,537,000	1.19
Lion Oil Refining Co.[4]	1,377,000	3.17	904,000	2.08
Standard Oil Co. of Ohio [3]	4,905,634	5.31	5,649,880	6.68
Union Tank Car Co.[10]	3,074,172	2.85	2,701,286	2.51
Deep Rock Oil Corporation [3]	1,319,164	3.30	1,693,466	4.24
Woodley Petroleum Co.[1]	273,159	.98	110,837	.40
The Texas Co.[3]	42,889,797	3.83	35,060,001	3.22
Phillips Petroleum Co.[3]	14,168,422	3.04	13,129,458	2.95
Midwest Oil Co.[6]	669,342	.66	702,279	.70
National Refining Co.[8]	610,151		983,266	
Buckeye Pipe Line Co.[10]	1,139,733	.86		
Shell Union Oil Corporation [3 11]	24,500,000	1.82	16,860,000	1.29
Continental Oil Co.[3]	14,080,000	3.00	14,924,000	3.19
Texas & Pacific Coal & Oil Co.[1]	1,309,899	1.48	860,668	.97
General American Transportation Co.[10]	4,003,381	3.84	3,405,368	3.27
Sun Oil Co.[3]	13,353,524	4.56	8,671,050	2.91
Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky [12]	3,056,366	1.17	2,677,170	1.03
Houston Oil Co.[1]	2,092,347	1.41	1,149,346	.56
Seaboard Oil Corporation of Delaware [6]	1,949,096	1.58	1,463,706	1.18
Savoy Oil Co.[1]	1,280		1,184	
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana [3]	50,591,371	3.31	44,183,894	2.89
Standard Oil Co. of California [3]		2.75		2.35
Darby Petroleum Corporation [1]	963,849	2.74	753,472	2.14
Ashland Oil & Refining Co.[4]	733,865	.71	1,103,605	1.09
Consolidation Royal Oil Corporation [1]	78,869	.14	69,266	.12
North American Consolidated Oil Shares Corporation [1]	262,504	.96	138,343	.50
National Oil Products Co.[2]	475,123	2.20	510,702	2.37
Plymouth Oil Co.[3]	2,237,597	2.16	1,774,145	1.69
National Transit Co.[10]	633,863	1.26	663,311	1.31
South Penn Oil Co.[6]	3,896,074	3.81	5,080,137	5.08
Cities Service Co.[3 13]	17,538,931	3.78	17,113,670	3.40
The Foster Wheeler Corporation [5]	15,377,652	8.85	8,647,793	4.27
Crown Central Petroleum Corporation [4]	467,413	.56	4,652	
Pacific Western Oil Co.[1]	1,071,041	1.07	789,666	.79
Panhandle Producing & Refining Co.[4]	390,465	.44	33,678	.04
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.[3]	14,902,640	1.98	10,663,930	1.32
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corporation [3]	6,566,618	3.53	6,112,158	3.29
Houston Oil Field Material Co.[8]	277,346	1.33	42,886	.04
Sinclair Oil Corporation [3 14]	23,083,709	1.85	18,060,598	1.43
Amerada Petroleum Corporation [1]	4,781,770	6.06	3,271,885	4.15
Humble Oil & Refining Co.[3 15]	45,711,511	5.08	29,243,303	3.25
Socony Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.[3]	35,944,983	1.15	30,808,397	.99
The Mission Corporation [3]	1,848,080	1.34	1,397,253	1.01
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) [3]	121,327,773	4.45	81,809,635	3.00
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.[10]	4,340,619	4.33	4,552,282	4.56
Union Carbide & Carbon Co.[16]	38,342,389	4.13	38,088,722	4.10
Kirby Petroleum Corporation [1]	316,199	.63	258,191	.52

[1] Crude production and sales only.
[2] Small marketing company in East.
[3] Major integrated company.
[4] Independent integrated company.
[5] Principal business is supplying producing and refining machinery.
[6] Owned by major oil companies.
[7] Independent lubricant manufacturer and distributor.
[8] Independent refining company with practically no crude production. After deducting losses for sale of assets.
[9] After deducting current and back dividends on 31,232 shares of preferred.
[10] Transportation companies.
[11] After deducting $10,000,000 for "contingencies of war."
[12] Nonintegrated major company.
[13] After deducting $2,000,000 for "post-war reserves."
[14] After deducting $1,126,512 for write-off of Mexican losses.
[15] Per share earnings for 1943 reported on 1942 capital stock outstanding before split-up for 2 for 1 in 1943.
[16] Company manufacturing synthetic rubber raw materials.

Address by Judge Chamberlin on Equal-Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a notable contribution to the discussion over the equal-rights amendment was an address delivered before the National Association of Women on May 23 by Judge Harry O. Chamberlin, of Indianapolis. Judge Chamberlin, one of the most outstanding jurists of Indiana and the Midwest, began his consideration of the equal rights proposal in a truly judicial manner, with impartial attention to arguments on both sides, but the further he got into the real merits of the subject the more he became convinced of the justness of the proposal, and the address as finally delivered was more "pro" than "con." His treatment of the subject was scholarly and illuminating, and I only regret that space limitations have precluded my requesting that the entire address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As this is a subject of lively and timely importance at the present time, I have asked and have secured unanimous

consent that salient points in Judge Chamberlin's address be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

There are several forms of the proposed equal rights amendment to the United States Constitution but the one I prefer, and the one engaging our attention at this time is in simple language and patterned after several other amendments touching the civil rights and liberties of our people. It is:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex," although good results might well flow from any other similarly worded text, provided always that its ultimate meaning is neither clouded nor ambiguous.

There are very few legislative proposals on the one hand or objections thereto on the other that do not each have some merit. The way to properly appraise the value of these opposite positions, however, is to weigh one against the other. Assuming that an affirmative proposal contains much good but that its operation might effect some inconvenience or practice hostile to a given public custom, isn't it rational and at least good sense to conclude that if the good outweighs the harm, the public would then be benefited by the change? It is axiomatic that legislation should be predicated upon the theory of the greatest good to the greatest number. It is no doubt true that the final ratification and operation of the equal rights amendment will produce some governmental as well as legal dislocations—not dislocations of right and justice but only those of custom and practice where readjustments can be readily made, and the way soon mapped out for a smooth-working program. Disarrangements have been many and varied during the recent war years but they have been accepted as subordinate in importance to the vastly greater factor of the country's protection and self-preservation.

Let's not appraise the value or the righteousness of equal rights on the basis of political strength, but rather upon the basis of its intrinsic justness.

One of the necessary and fundamental factors in the making and enforcement of a contract is the element of consideration. Without it, the contract fails. It is, therefore, the basis of all legal bargaining. Something must be given in return for consideration in whatever form that may take. Exactly so with the theory of equal rights for women. No undertaking, small or great, no accomplishment slight or important, no record, casual or imposing, has ever been made by this country of ours without the distinct aid, material and otherwise, of the women. Surely, then, human beings with a record of pinnacle performance are not less worthy of consideration than mere chattels, the bases of contracts.

We all recognize, with serious forebodings, the many and involved post-war problems which are bound to confront us in the near future. It will require the best and most far-sighted thought to cope with the intricate situations certain to arise, if we would avoid or even minimize the economic disruption almost surely to follow the great war through which we are now plodding slowly but successfully. Wars inevitably produce inflation of values; inflation brings economic injustices; economic injustice is only another name for depressions and governmental discontent; and these things all sum up to inequality before the law.

While equal rights for both men and women do not spell a panacea for all governmental ills it can and will remove one of the irritating disturbances to a very large section of our population. And while a fair and an honest administration of the theory of equal rights for women under the proposed amendment may not eliminate all the economic troubles of womanhood it will at least be conducive to such a degree of contentment as to render more efficient and more effective their already valuable and ever available services and cooperation in productiveness and the output of America's commerce of chattels, as well as America's output of mental development and advancement in educational training. For I say it is the women of this country who do most for the promotion of this educational development of tomorrow's men and women both in the homes and in the schools. No task is fraught with greater importance to the Republic than the training of our youth and this I repeat, is, generally speaking, the women's job.

The man of a family is usually designated as the breadwinner. He is thought to be the central or focal point around which the home is purchased and financed, and some investments are made, a bank account established, a business possibly is purchased and conducted. The wife perhaps is a mere incident to all those acquirements. But let's look at the picture a little more closely. The woman bears the children; she mends and makes their clothes; she is the purchasing agent for the family and she buys closely; she more often than otherwise inaugurates the savings or bank account; she does her own housework; she encourages the husband to start his own business; she keeps his books at the store or office; she does without a servant or a maid, even to the extent of washing, ironing, and cleaning the house; she coaches the children in their studies; she may even substitute as a teacher in the schools; in general she saves the pennies, the nickels, the dimes, and even the dollars, by the devotion to her family's interests.

In the course of years a substantial substance has been acquired—but usually in the name of the husband. And yet, it was the wife's ingenuity—her savings and sacrifices—her thrift and courageous industry in large measure that made possible the acquirement of the home property, or the piece of rental property or the savings account or the profitable investment in some good stock. Her interest in those tangible accomplishments should be legally recognized through some statutory expression such as the equal rights amendment.

Of course, every woman is not a wife, and the foregoing set of facts do not apply to all of the female sex, but I use this illustration to point out the inequality of the general situation in very many of the States. In Indiana the situation, while not the worst, is far from fair to women. The State either commercially or legislatively has done but little to equalize their economic and employment rights. Such benefits as they have received have come more through the force of public opinion than through legislative action.

A branch of statutory law governing property rights between husband and wife, called the law of community property, is in force with varying provisions in eight of the States. Louisiana retains, with modifications, the community law of France. Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Washington trace their community systems to Spanish or Mexican sources. This marital property law is thought to be of teutonic origin, though its early history is not fully known. In theory it subscribes to equal ownership by husband and wife in all property acquired by either of them during marriage, except such as is inherited, received as a gift, or purchased with separate funds owned before marriage. However, the actual control of much of this property is given to the husband. Due to varied statutory forms and interpretations of the law in several States using the system, it does not have uniform application among them. (U. S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, Bull. 157, January 1, 1938.)

The bulk of discriminations between men and women in American jurisprudence grew out of the feudal common-law fallacy that marriage destroyed a woman's separate identity. Discriminations against the unmarried woman were not so numerous, even under the English common law. As to these things Chancellor Kent, the great jurist and analyst, said among other things, more than a century ago:

"The law concerning husband and wife has always made a very prominent and extensive article in the codes of civilized nations. There are no regulations on any other branch of the law, which affect so many minute interests, and interfere so deeply with the prosperity, the honor, and happiness of private life."

Oklahoma's constitution excludes women from election to eight major State offices. Wisconsin's legislative employees must be men. One of the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia must be a member of the Engineer Corps of the Army.

Twenty-three States exclude women from jury service; thirteen States permit women to serve at their option; Utah excludes women from grand-jury service.

In 40 States property acquired after marriage by the joint efforts of husband and wife belongs to the husband and is subject to his control. In South Carolina a woman's clothes have been held to belong to the husband and it is said that a recent decision somewhere held that a wife's hair was the property of her husband. Several States hold that a minor child's (as well as the wife's) earnings belong to the husband. It is notoriously true that women are often paid less for their services in exactly the same work and rendered with equal or greater efficiency. Frequently there appears a legal ban against married women as school teachers. In 19 States women cannot serve on juries although a recent ruling by the Supreme Court holds that no State may deny jury service to a Negro man.

Owing to existing economic conditions and wartime emergencies, some gains have been made for women's civil rights. But they are strictly emergency and temporary gains. When the soldier returns home at the conclusion of the war when there is no manpower shortage then, it will still be a man's world outside the home castle. And may I venture the prediction that when the soldier does return home to his wife, his mother, his daughter, and his sister, and is shown the definite legal inequality existing against them, he will say in substance: "Why, this is one of the things I've been fighting against all around the world with bullets—now let's continue the fight here with ballots and with logic."

It is said that for certain periods in most women's lives they are preoccupied with the care of children, first in the bearing them and then in tending them during the limited time they are physically dependent upon their mothers. This special kind of care no father, regardless of his devotion to his paternal obligations, can supply. And after the brief period of physical dependence has passed, most mothers still want to stay close to their children at least during their very early formative years.

This theory is fallacious, not in fact, but in the implication that women are satisfied to have denied to them or withheld from them the justness of their civil rights solely because they have embarked upon the commendable job of raising a family.

Former Judge Dorothy Kenyon, of the New York municipal court, and a very vocal opponent of the equal rights amendment, summarizes in part her opposition in this statement. She says: "We should not have an equal rights amendment, because it would destroy our power to enact special legislation. It seems to me the height of folly to

destroy a power for good merely because it is capable of being used, and has in fact been used in the past both badly and unwisely. Why throw out the baby with the bath? That some of our protective laws are bad and should be abolished is my own opinion. Good in their day, some of them have now outlived their usefulness. For instance, I no longer see any justification for the flat prohibition against night work for women. Our support laws should also be changed to relieve men from the obligation to support childless wives in idleness."

Upon the strict basis of logic and analysis, I think Judge Kenyon has made, in that statement, a fairly good argument for rather than against the amendment. She apparently favors special legislation which in itself spells inequality, and is usually held repugnant to sound legal reasoning.

The general theory of the law everywhere is against special legislation, and the reports are filled with decisions annulling and voiding legislation because it is special, and gives rights and privileges to certain classes and groups not equally given to all classes of citizens. In fact both the Constitution of Indiana and the Constitution of the United States either explicitly or impliedly deny to their respective legislative bodies the right to pass special or local laws or laws violative of the theory of equal protection to all.

But Judge Kenyon admits that such good as has come from this special legislation is capable of being used and has been used both badly and unwisely. Surely we won't throw out the baby, but we can separate him from the bath of dirty water and throw out the latter just as the courts have repudiated much of these special enactments. If the truth really be faced, there are probably many statutes operating today in the various States, which are local and special but which are tolerated because they have never been attacked.

The opponents of equal rights seem to fear that the passage and ratification of the amendment will destroy our power to ever enact any laws either locally or nationally in aid of the establishment of the equal-rights theory.

In the first place the amendment would be only prohibitive of the creation of inequitable and unjust relationships whether they affect men or women. It could not, in any event, as I see it, prevent rational legislation in aid of the very purpose of the amendment.

A portion of the bill for its submission to the States for ratification and which becomes a part of the amendment itself, expressly states that:

"Congress and the several States shall have power within their several jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

So it seems to me that any act of any State, or of the Congress which may be held to be appropriate to the creation of an equal civil or economic status as between men and women generally would not only be valid and operative but probably needful in the final adjustment of the judicial problems which naturally will arise. But in the end, if the United States Supreme Court as at present constituted doesn't change its mind too frequently and doesn't upset too many well-established precedents, with no greater justification than political expediency the whole civil relationship between the sexes will be harmonized upon the adoption and operation of an equal-rights amendment.

Let us not be disturbed as to the possible unconstitutionality of certain laws affecting the so-called health of and hours of labor of women workers. They were originally conceived through the fallacy of the "weaker sex" idea and have little if any foundation in actual fact. Certainly this doctrine should be forever exploded since the women have carried on so well and so valiantly in many of the physical parallels necessary in an effective promotion of the war effort.

In Indiana when the husband or wife is a party to a suit, and incompetent to testify in his or her own behalf, the other is also excluded. However, in a suit for the seduction of a wife, the husband is a competent witness, but the wife is not. She is therefore precluded from voicing her own innocence in a charge usually affecting her chastity.

Under our laws of inheritance a second childless wife is limited in her husband's estate to one-third only of a life estate in his real estate if there be a surviving child by his previous marriage. She is thus penalized because in a natural course of events she happens to be wife number two instead of wife number one.

Dean Acheson of the United States Department of State, in voicing his opposition to the equal-rights amendment, says that its enactment would cause confusion. Why, of course, it would cause confusion. The rectifying of any wrong always causes confusion, but the confusion is generally at the expense of those who have been the beneficiaries of the wrongs committed. It is because they have been deprived of their ill-gotten advantages and this naturally promotes some confusion in the readjustment of things. But the pertinent inquiry should be, Does the gain for good outweigh the inconvenience of the confusion?

One of the first and most striking features of our great Declaration of Independence is the assertion that "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." I know of no interpretation that would limit the scope of the term "men" as used in this section of the Declaration of Independence to the narrow limitation of masculines alone. On the contrary, I believe it to embrace the generic or general and all-inclusive significance of both men and women, for the thought is not confined to suffrage of any kindred subject, notwithstanding the prejudiced attitude that many interpreters place upon the relationship of women as construed under the old English common law.

So, that, if our founding fathers conceived and caused to be perpetuated the idea that women, as well as men are endowed with the inalienable right to have life, liberty, and happiness, and that equality of rights is one of the things that will promote a just and righteous happiness, it is a far cry from a sensible analysis to say that equal rights cannot be secured because it would cause confusion.

The real test should be and is: Is the work produced by women, whether in office, shop, or factory, equivalent in efficiency and in the element of time required, to that turned out by men or vice versa? If so, then there should and must be no discrimination in the emoluments or earnings on account of sex.

Thus it will be seen that notwithstanding the merits advanced by either side of the controversy, there is definitely existing in this country a mixed, complex, involved, inconsistent, and at best a scrambled situation as to the legal status of women. A noted economic philosopher some years ago inquired, "How is it possible to unscramble eggs?" The same question might be asked as to this problem, but the answer to this is more practical and more possible: By the adoption of the equal-rights amendment!

International Trade as Viewed by American Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AS VIEWED BY AMERICAN LABOR

(Address of Matthew Woll,[1] vice president, American Federation of Labor, before Manufacturing Chemists Association, June 1, 1944)

The outstanding post-war problem, both national and international, is to find ways and means to meet in a spirit of justice and human kindness the proper economic aspirations of both nations and individuals in order that the temptation to international war may be removed.

Through bitter suffering the world has learned that no nation is free if its daily bread can be given or be withheld in war or in peace according to needs or pleasures of some other nation. The world has likewise learned that political liberty without economic liberty is but an empty shell.

Economic liberty need not necessarily mean privation. Gradually, almost imperceptibly, science has been drawing from Nature some of her essential secrets. Science, more than laws, has broken up one after another slavery, feudalism, absolutism, the 12-hour day, and other forms of human bondage. Science also has changed and will continue to change the relations of nations.

The question presented to every American is whether the United States will shape her life largely in her own way, and in accord with her ideals, or whether she will become inextricably involved in Old World interests, habits of thought, and economic affairs. In other words, America is called upon to decide whether international trade has a certain divinity which must be placed upon a permanent basis. Thereupon it will be the duty of a concert of powers to allocate to the nations of the earth their rights to import and export and at what prices and then set up an international standard of living and a superstate to assure that the world will stay pigeonholed.

Or will we choose to abandon attempts to regiment a world that refuses to be regimented and adopt the practical, diplomatic approach; that is, to recognize what are the realities of the economic interdependence of nations and try to achieve a formula by which nations can cooperate. Certainly, this is not isolationism, so called, but rationalism.

No one can predict with any degree of certainty what sort of world we will face when world hostilities come to an end. However, the past does not indicate the sort of thinking and planning that is more than likely largely to influence the judgment of nations in working out their destinies under conditions of peace. It is futile to discuss

[1] Mr. Woll is also chairman, A. F. of L. post-war planning committee; president, America's Wage Earners Protective Conference (the tariff group of the A. F. of L.); president, Union Labor Life Insurance Co.

post-war trade problems without a realistic examination of some of the leading factors involved.

Among these leading factors may be considered:

1. The agricultural and industrial revolution during the period 1933–34 and the resultant loss of former markets.

2. The strength of the system of state trading controls and preferential trade system after the war.

3. The predominance, in world trade, of giant state trading agencies, great international corporations, and cartels.

4. The critical position of the free trade-unions and free enterprise, under the circumstances both in foreign trade and in the domestic American market.

5. The possibly dangerous tendency of this country to discuss the merits of lofty principles of freedom of trade while ignoring the abolition of those principles in domestic and foreign trade.

It is not possible in a brief discussion to more than summarize some of the principal aspects of these outstanding problems. The following points are, however, essential considerations:

As during the World War of 1914–18, great changes in the structure of economic life have occurred throughout the world.

India, for example, is now a creditor country and one of the leading industrial nations of secondary rank.

South America has rapidly expanded not only its production capacity for consumer goods, as during 1914–18; it has also notably expanded production of minerals, some basic industry, and other primary commodities.

The United Kingdom now produces about one-half of its food requirements and has enormously increased the efficiency of its manufacturing plants. On the other hand, England has liquidated about half of its overseas investments and has amassed an enormous debt sterling balance.

POST-WAR FOREIGN TRADE—AMERICAN LABOR

Europe has undergone fundamental changes that may outlast the war. The synthetic production of textile fibers, rubber, gasoline, and plastics, the development of processed wood substitutes for metals, are only the better-known changes.

American organized labor in the North American continent seeks to maintain the independence of labor unions and business enterprises. In contrast, organized labor in Europe and in the United Kingdom seeks to nationalize basic industry and, by various so-called socialistic measures, tends to change and modify the character of an independent labor movement in the unfounded hope of capturing control of the state.

This increasing dependence upon the state on the part of organized labor in Europe and the United Kingdom is shared by organized European industry. To an extent not appreciated by either American business or American labor, European and British industry has become increasingly reconciled to dependence upon the state and guidance from the state in recent years.

The economic crisis of the early thirties was followed in Europe by revolutionary changes in the character of state intervention in business and of state economic administration. The gold standard was abandoned by its creator, the Bank of England, in 1930, and the British example was followed throughout most of the world during the following 5 years.

In Europe as a whole there gradually developed first a regulation of foreign trade and foreign exchange, as emergency measures, to meet the economic crisis. Thereafter followed the regulation of internal business activities, including production, prices, and distribution.

As Nazi Germany in 1933 inaugurated the German rearmament program and the German effort to create a "self-sufficient" war economy, other leading countries also strengthened state economic control over business in order to prepare for war.

In the late 1930's in Europe there ceased to be any genuine freedom of international trade as it was formerly understood. Most European countries had state regimes which controlled foreign trade channels in a manner that excluded freedom of competition by private firms and corporations without regard to country of origin or the manner of payment for imports. Most states insisted that their imports must be paid for in exports, not in foreign exchange; imports were prohibited or restricted where domestic production, even at very high cost, could supplant imports.

Practically every country in Europe developed a program of "tied trade" or balanced trade agreements with other countries and a program of subsidized expansion of domestic production of products formerly imported. The result was, for example, that Brazilian cotton of inferior quality and at higher prices was purchased by Germany in preference to cheaper and better grades of American cotton.

From the standpoint of the American farmer, worker, and businessman, the significance of the new European system of state control of domestic and foreign trade was that these new factors eliminated the normal freedom to buy and sell in open trade agreements. Competition was no longer between individual producers, sellers, and buyers in different countries; it changed in character to competition between state trading agencies, for which not only economic but also political interests of the contracting states were decisive elements.

The ability of the individual American producer to sell better products at a lower price than his foreign competitor ceased to be a decisive factor; the question was not the price or the quality of imports, it was the question whether payment for imports could be made in the products of the purchasing country.

ECONOMIC REVOLUTIONS

The World War of 1914–18 demonstrated how blockade conditions and sea warfare forced countries dependent upon imported food and industrial products to turn to domestic production. The cotton-textile industry of Lancashire, England, lost its Far Eastern markets to new competition in Japan and India. The German chemical industry lost most of its export markets to new producers in France, England, and the United States. The trend toward industrialization in colonial and rural countries was accompanied by a trend toward agricultural self-sufficiency in many industrial countries. These trends continued after the war.

France, Italy, Germany, and Sweden sharply increased their own grain and other food production during the interwar period. The United States had become a creditor nation and an outstanding factor in world trade.

The World War of 1939–44 has accelerated similar trends throughout the world. Industrialization in Latin America and in the Far East has proceeded at a remarkable rate. India has become an industrial nation of secondary rank, as well as a creditor nation. East Europe has been made a second Ruhr industrial district by the Nazi government, which has transferred a substantial part of industrial activity and armament production to the area comprised by southeast Poland, German Upper Silesia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary. Coal production in Upper Silesia, with coal fields slightly greater than those of the Ruhr, now compares with Ruhr coal production.

In Turkey, the Belgian Congo, South Africa, as well as nearer home in Canada, Brazil, Argentina, and elsewhere, additional production capacity has been created in minerals, heavy industry, finishing industries, and in some agricultural products such as Turkish and Brazilian cotton.

In addition, however, the war has comparatively impoverished some leading countries. The United Kingdom probably has left no more than half of its former investments abroad and has piled up debts to many countries of the world to a total of perhaps more than $4,000,000,000 in blocked sterling debts.

The small countries of Europe must undertake reconstruction with limited financial resources, even though their colonial possessions, such as the Belgian Congo, the Dutch East Indies, and Portuguese colonial possessions provide rich resources. France alone has a substantial amount of gold and foreign investments in comparison with its post-war needs.

TRADE TREATY BENEFITS SCRAPPED

These circumstances lead to certain conclusions:

It seems a foregone conclusion that Russia will exert a political and economical hegemony over east Europe, from Finland, through Poland and Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The almost inevitable result may be the creation of a counterbalancing bloc of western European states led by the United Kingdom. This would mean the creation of a bloc of states and colonial empires that cover the greater part of the world.

It is sometimes forgotten that in 1939 the beginning of such a bloc had been made. Financial and economic accords were concluded between the United Kingdom on the one hand and France, Belgium, and the Netherlands on the other in 1939 and early 1940.

The terms of the economic accord of December 4, 1939, between France and the United Kingdom, exemplify the character of the accords and give a picture of post-war possibilities which gains significance because of the view generally held in British and French official circles—then and now—that the accords should be maintained after the war.

The provisions, in brief, were:

1. The pegging of the pound sterling—French franc rate of exchange.

2. A clearing agreement covering exchanges of goods and services, with no limitation upon credit balances, until 6 months after the war.

3. Preferential buying in the other empire where possible rather than buying outside the British or the French Empires.

4. Pooling of the raw material resources of the French and British Empires.

5. Common purchasing agencies in third countries for the two empires to eliminate competitive buying.

6. No increase in the restrictions upon trade between the two countries, no matter what restrictions were placed upon imports from third countries.

It seems unnecessary to emphasize the effects upon American farmers, manufacturers and workers, dependent upon export markets and subject to import competition, which would follow the post-war creation of a trade cartel of this character between the British, French, Dutch, and Belgian empires, together with the participation of the Scandinavian states, dependent upon British markets, and possibly including Spain, Portugal, and Italy.

This state trading cartel, it should be recalled, was actually established in a tentative form during the early part of 1940. Its development was terminated only by the collapse of western Europe. After the war the emergence of Russian hegemony in east and southeast Europe may well impose some such combination as a measure of European self-defense.

In addition, the financial position of post-war England will be badly shaken by war expenditures; England will naturally tend to

finance its huge import surplus by preferential buying in countries that will accept payment in British goods and services. England's former revenues from foreign investments, shipping, banking, and trade will have declined once more as in 1914–18.

It would be a grave oversight to ignore the prospect that political and economic circumstances may necessitate the creation of this huge preferential bloc of nations, with the resultant adverse effects upon American trade at home and abroad.

STATE TRADING AGENCIES—PREFERENTIAL TARIFFS

International competition, under the State clearing systems, and exchange-control systems ceased to be conducted by private enterprise; buying and selling in open markets at competitive prices and costs were practically eliminated. The balanced clearing agreements, which determined, over long periods, the volume of goods exchanged and frequently also their prices, eliminated open markets and competition in them. Price, quality, and cost of production of individual producers competing in open markets ceased to be the basis of world trade.

States that suffered from a crisis in foreign exchange reserves permitted purchases so far as possible only from countries that accepted payment in goods. At the same time they subsidized exports to countries which still permitted payment in gold and in stable "free exchange" currencies.

There is no convincing evidence that after the war the principal countries of the world will have either the means or the desire to abandon State control of foreign trade and foreign exchange. Emergency conditions will remain for some years in the domestic fields of reconstruction and reemployment, as well as in international trade and financial relations.

Even the great resources of the United States are not sufficient to finance, on a long-term credit basis, the program of European and world reconstruction in such a manner that restrictions upon international trade and financial transactions could be generally abandoned.

Post-war discussion that presupposes the early or general abandonment of State economic controls of foreign and internal trade in Europe and elsewhere would not therefore seem to be realistic.

GIANT CORPORATIONS—CARTELS CONTROL EXPORTS

It seems almost a foregone conclusion that many nations, particularly in Europe, will maintain state agencies for the control and direction of foreign trade. Long before the present war international cartels and giant corporations dominated world trade in many products. Even as far back as 1915 it was calculated that 15 American corporations accounted for 75 percent of the value of industrial exports of the United States.

In most of the leading export and import commodities, such as petroleum, wool, cotton, certain fruits, metal, and other products, a few firms or corporations, and in some cases one or more joint sales agencies, accounted for well over half of total exports or imports of the product of the United States. Closer concentration of private control in the foreign trade of the United Kingdom, Japan, Germany, and other countries had existed for years.

In certain industries, giant national corporations in the leading countries have concluded a complicated series of agreements dividing up world markets and exchanging engineers, production processes, patents, sometimes organizing jointly owned producing or selling companies in various markets, and dictating in any event the terms of trade to independent distributors. In other cases a few producers have dominated the field of distribution.

The economic consequence of the resultant artificial restriction of production and sales have seriously contributed to the economic difficulties of many countries. The adverse effects upon industries and countries of the rapid disappearance of the small and medium-sized producer and distributor has been noticeable in Europe as well as in America.

FREE TRADE UNIONS—FREE ENTERPRISE

But the political power and effects of international interlocking corporate groups, syndicates, and cartels are perhaps far more significant than the economic effects. It would be difficult to recite the true history of the rise of the Fascist regime in Italy and the Nazi regime in Germany without noting the decisive support granted to these movements by international finance and industry, especially certain great corporations and cartels.

World trade after the war will be dominated by state foreign trade agencies and by great corporate and cartel groups. Gigantic corporations, with annual sales and expenditures in excess of the annual budgets of most nations in peacetime, cannot be termed "private" or free enterprise. Nor can such terms be applied to rigid international cartel groups which eliminate outside producers and frequently dictate their terms even to smaller nations.

The future of the small and medium-sized manufacturer, and, of the worker, in industries where competition still exists in vigorous forms, is endangered today to a greater extent than ever before in history. The great domestic market provided by the farmers is threatened first by the loss of foreign markets. The former export and domestic markets of competitive American industries are similarly threatened.

American exporters face the prospect of exclusion from former export markets, irrespective of their competitive prices and the superiority of their products.

American producers for the domestic market face the prospect of overexpanded foreign industries, mining companies, and agricultural producers seeking to unload, in the United States, war stocks and the products of excess production capacity by state subsidized export campaigns.

JOB SECURITY OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE

Faced with the huge problem of shifting aproximately 30,000,000 of war workers and servicemen into avenues of profitable employment in the post-war period, the question of unemployment in the period of transition is of transcendent importance.

After all, the whole life of the worker is pervaded and molded by his job, by the physical condition under which he works, by the length of his workingday; by the adequacy of his pay; by the extent to which he is protected against arbitrary discharge; and by the nature of the strains under which he works.

The harmful spiritual consequences of enforced unemployment are no less than its material deprivations. However keen and anxious we may be to help build up the economy of other nations and peoples, we must not attempt these efforts at the sacrifice and well-being of our people.

We are and have been living more or less under a protective philosophy. We have our trade unions and trade associations to look after our respective interests. We have our minimum-wage laws, our child-labor laws, our sanitation and compensation and security laws. We have their counterparts in other spheres of activity. We have our immigration laws, etc., all designed for protective purposes. It is therefore just and proper that we should protect our American standards of life and of work against destructive foreign competition.

There has been a tendency in the United States to discuss the advantages of freedom of trade and freedom of enterprise for farmer, worker, and businessman in general terms, which almost completely ignore the manner in which freedom of enterprise has been abolished in many branches of American economic life, as well as abroad.

It would be unquestionably a great victory for American principles of free enterprise if the rest of the world consented to adopt a revised international gold standard based upon American gold and Americar credit. Also, if the world agreed to discard state controls of domestic and foreign trade and to break up giant corporate groups and cartels that sprawl over the world markets. There is, however, no present prospect of the achievement of these laudable objectives. There is, therefore, every reason for this country to take intelligent and prompt measures to meet post-war realities.

It would be an invitation to disaster to permit foreign state-controlled industries to invade the American market with their war stocks and excess production capacity by means of state subsidies which could nullify superior American efficiency and destroy superior American living standards. European state-controlled trading systems of economy permit production cost and price to determine trade.

European systems of economy likewise permit the dumping of products in this market, whether or not their production costs are substantially higher than American costs. Under such circumstances the laudable academic theory of the international division of labor on the basis of production costs ceases to have relevance.

OTHER TRADE RESTRAINTS AND BARRIERS

In addition to the foregoing other considerations must be recognized in any serious discussion of post-war trade. Some of these considerations relate to—

(a) Lack of purchasing power on the part of the masses of the people of the world.

(b) Lack of price stability; instability of currencies, laws and regulations restricting the free flow of trade and currencies.

(c) Quota restrictions and prohibition of imports.

(d) Preferential tariffs.

(e) Government bartering; Government monopoly of trade.

(f) Government control of vital raw materials.

(g) Subsidized shipping and State industries.

(h) Patents.

All of these are more or less trade barriers. They do have an effect on foreign trade and act as trade restraints.

Submerged and low living and working standards of people abroad do restrict and limit and as well tend to degrade the markets of the world. This condition may rightfully be considered the most vicious of all our trade restraints. If standards of living and of work were increased everywhere to our American standards the increase of the purchasing power of the masses in all lands would be tremendous.

Even were such an additional purchasing power in existence, international trade as well as the masses would benefit little unless stability of prices was assured. The possibility of securing an assurance of the stability of the money of the peoples of the several nations will be one of the important problems in our post-war world. Depreciation in the value of currency is therefore closely associated, as a trade barrier, to the lack of purchasing power on the part of so many of the nations of the world.

Placing quota limitations on either imports or exports constitutes other grave trade barriers. These preclude an equal opportunity to all producers.

Preferential tariffs, such as are in effect among the nations of the British Common-

wealth, constitute effective trade barriers in that the countries comprising this group influence the trade of nearly 50 percent of the world's population, but a lesser percentage of the world's purchasing power.

Government barter, or monopoly control of a nation's import and export commerce, is another form of trade restraint in that such monopoly control precludes a free market in the purchase and sale of goods under such control. The same is true of government control of vital raw materials. This, too, constitutes an effective trade barrier and is a denial of a free and open market.

Government control and large investments of government funds in government-directed shipping combines indirectly constitute a barrier to free trade in that such shipping concerns and facilities lend themselves to favor the nation which controls or subsidizes those facilities or concerns. Shipping companies are often used to offset import restrictions in the form of tariff rates levied on competitive imports by such companies absorbing the import tax through lower freight charges.

In the field of patent laws we find the laws of other governments, that is, of all commercially important governments, including the colonies, dominions, and territorial possessions of such governments at variance with our own. In other lands a grant of patent is public property under limited restrictions. Unless sufficient articles protected by such patent are produced within that country to meet the domestic consumptive demands, the government may issue a license to others who may wish to produce such articles.

Our patent laws permit of citizens of a foreign government obtaining a patent registration, thus securing a monopoly on the right of production as well as of sale of such patented article.

This trade barrier is further aggravated in that no article, so registered in the Patent Office, can be imported here, though produced abroad, without the written consent of the patent registrant. The patent holder alone can have these patented articles, protected by an American patent, produced in a foreign country and shipped into America. This same privilege is not accorded by other governments to Americans.

With reference to the requirement that trade within a country be confined to citizens of the (foreign) country, our good-neighbor policy has not prevented some Central American countries, and possibly others, from putting into effect a most insidious trade barrier of denying noncitizens the right to engage in trade. This again constitutes an unfair and inequitable trade barrier.

TARIFF DUTIES LESSER TRADE BARRIERS

These and other trade barriers have been adopted by individual nations undoubtedly for different reasons. It is fair to presume they were enacted and adopted in the attempt to protect and promote the interests of the nations concerned. But, of the trade barriers cited, the United States has resorted to but one. We do subsidize shipping engaged in foreign trade. However these shipping companies are operated by private persons and corporations, and are uninfluenced by Government authorities in favoring American trade.

What is generally referred to as a trade barrier common to America as well as to every other commercial nation is the imposition of tariff duties on imports. Indeed, most foreign nations impose a tariff duty or customs duty, which in respect to the wholesale value of the article or commodity involved, when sold in the country which permits of importation, is higher than our own. Yet, our own Nation is unjustly accused of being the chief and sole offender in this regard. At the same time no reference whatever is made to the many other and more destructive trade barriers practiced and enforced by other countries which I have called to your attention.

DECLARATION OF THE A. F. OF L. ON TRADE BARRIERS

It is obvious that if we are to modify, alter, or eliminate these trade barriers and encourage a greater flow of international trade concerted and voluntary action is required on the part of all commercial nations of the world.

In this regard I would direct your attention to the declaration adopted at the post-war conference of the American Federation of Labor last month, and which in part provides—

"We have demonstrated during this war that a free economy can produce goods in unimagined abundance. In the years of peace a sustained high level of production and employment is also possible if there is assurance of economic justice within nations and between nations. To accomplish this, it will be necessary to get rid of that kind of exploitation which tends to concentrate income in the hands of the few and prevents the great mass of workers from having the purchasing power to buy the things they need for daily life. It also will be necessary to lessen the barriers between nations so that there may be a larger interchange of goods and services for all. The basic test of freedom is the welfare of the common man. We hold that under freedom society can be so organized that everyone will have an opportunity to earn his own livelihood."

The report further provides that—

"A certain number of international functional agencies will be necessary to insure the consistent development of sound economic policies in a world which will be increasingly responsive to the advances in technology due to scientific discovery and invention. The frontiers of the world of labor are those of economic as well as political geography, and the economic barriers to freedom of intercourse must not be permitted to block the pathway to prosperity. These problems by their very nature cannot be solved in any single set of laws or agreements because the conditions with which they deal are forever changing. It is, therefore, necessary to maintain and create the pertinent institutions for dealing with them."

In defining the institutions to deal with these subjects the report provides that—

"In the world of commerce and industry there should be agencies to deal with such problems as (1) the stabilization of foreign exchange, (2) communications and transport on land, sea, and in the air, (3) the commercial policy including cartels, (4) fiscal policies and foreign investments, (5) access to natural resources and raw material, (6) to coordinate these activities there should be a United Nations Economic Organization with consultative and advisory functions.

"In each case there should be provision for objective studies of the facts which should be made available to the general public."

TRADE TREATIES

Instead of the foregoing it has been suggested that entering into trade treaties is the proper method to be followed for the attainment of the results indicated. Fundamentally, trade treaties, as at present negotiated and entered into, disregard constitutional requirements under guise of trade agreements. Then, too, under the method adopted of negotiating trade agreements, sole power to determine matters relating to foreign trade are delegated exclusively to the executive branch of government.

Quite aside from the fact that trade agreements entered into have been negotiated under methods which do not provide ample opportunity for consultation and consideration of the domestic interests involved, including labor, experience has demonstrated that to make these trade agreements or trade treaties effective, there must be some automatic enforcement provision.

A prime provision of all trade agreements or treaties is that the other contracting parties shall not grant to imports of other countries a lower tariff rate or similar concession than that accorded to imports of the United States. These provisions have not been adhered to in all instances. To the contrary, we understand that complaints in this regard reached such proportions that certain high officials in our Department of State were impelled and did prepare a strong protest against the failure on the part of several nations to fulfill the terms of the trade treaties entered into. However, the protests were never transmitted, nor were the complaints manifested ever properly adjusted.

In this discussion I have dealt largely in a general way with the many barriers to an enlarged intercourse of foreign trade, the least harmful of which is the levying of tariff rates on competitive imports. I have not attempted to deal specifically with rates that govern under our laws and to the extent imports to this country are subject to tariff rates as compared to those on the free list; neither have I attempted to set forth comparative rates enforced on imports by other countries.

AMERICAN VALUATION JUSTIFIED

Suffice it to say that some two-thirds of the articles listed at this time in our tariff schedules are on the free list.

A discussion of the tariff rates themselves assumes increased importance when it is recognized that in the main our tariff duties are levied on foreign valuation—a system of valuation not alone unfair to American producers but equally discriminating as between competitive producers of our principal commercial nations. In fact, under our foreign-valuation system, those nations are favored whose people suffer the greatest submerged standards of life and work. They are the greatest beneficiaries under our present system, particularly the Japanese and peoples of other low standard and semienslaved nations.

All engaged in the American chemical industry should be grateful for the foresight, the patience, and energy of the late Frank Garvin, who, in 1920–22, realizing the unfair and discriminatory advantages which the German cartelized chemical industry had over its American competitors in the American market, prevailed on Congress to levy tariff rates on imports of chemical products on the value of competitive American products.

This system of levying duties on the American selling price, or American valuation, enabled the American chemical industry to be in a position to render to our Nation and its allies the valiant, patriotic, and all-important service so essential to our victory in this colossal and world-wide devastating war.

Trade in the post-war period we fear, will not be governed upon an individual and private basis, nor will it be governed by production costs or by prices, domestic or foreign. Instead it will be controlled by the political and economic objectives of each nation concerned with maintaining domestic employment. It is our further judgment that in time, when an expanded production capacity will again be realized by the leading industrial and commercial nations abroad, that the nations confronted with surpluses, and, for other considerations will be prepared for large scale export dumping wherever and whenever possible.

We should be prepared at all times and under all circumstances to protect our own market and our own people and be ready to

meet whatever emergency may arise. So far as lies within our power and influence, let us aid other nations and peoples to attain higher standards of life and of work, and enlarge and enrich the markets of the world. In so doing, let us not be unmindful that the interests of America are of foremost consideration. But regardless of whatever policy or relationship is to govern, let it be formulated and arrived at in open concert, by a democratic procedure, and not by bureaucratic methods or means.

Time Magazine Goes to Town With C. A. A.-A. A. F.-W. T. S.—Women—Gen. Hap Arnold and the WASPS—Says Some Congressmen Were Not Impressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Time Magazine of May 29, 1944:

WOMEN—UNNECESSARY AND UNDESIRABLE

ROBERT RAMSPECK is a sober, studious Congressman with an affable air which hides a bulldog's tenacity. As chairman of the powerful House Civil Service Committee, he recently took a look at a bill which another smiling, stubborn man, Gen. Henry Harley Arnold, has been trying to shove through Congress. What he saw made BOB RAMSPECK clamp his teeth on his pipe stem.

The bill would make the Women's Airforce Service Pilots a part of "Hap" Arnold's Army Air Forces. It would expand the whole WASP program to train and commission more women pilots. The bill would also give colonel's rank to handsome, energetic Jacqueline Cochran, now Chief of the WASPS and one of the ablest of United States air women.

RAMSPECK and his committee went ferreting. They found out that the WASPS, earnest, hard working, and rule abiding, are nevertheless an expensive experiment. Minimum cost of complete training for a WASP is $20,000—not $12,150, as the War Department once estimated. Of 1,313 women who have gone to WASP training schools, only 541 have graduated; 281 have flunked out; the rest are still in training. Only 3 WASPS (all of whom were seasoned pilots before they joined) are qualified to fly four-engine bombers. Nineteen WASPS have been killed, 11 in operational flights after graduation.

WASTED MANPOWER

Hap Arnold's argument has been that there is a serious aviation manpower shortage; the A. A. F. could use 2,000 to 2,500 WASPS. From unhappy C. A. A. flying instructors and C. A. A.-trained personnel came another story. They say they have found no place for their talents since the curtailment of the A. A. F. training program. They are available to ferry planes by the thousands. General Arnold waved their claims away, held fast for his WASPS.

The Ramspeck committee used A. A. F. figures to support the men's pleas, found that they are a sizable group—some 6,000 instructors alone—who could be trained for the work the WASPS are doing in about half the time and at half the cost.

Furthermore, the A. A. F. could utilize its returned combat pilots, as the Navy does, for noncombat flying. If a manpower deficit really exists, the committee found, it is "due largely to a failure to * * * utilize existing personnel."

STARTLING AND INVALID

Said the report acidly: the need "to recruit teen-aged schoolgirls, stenographers, clerks, beauticians, housewives, and factory workers to pilot the military planes of this Government is as startling as it is invalid"; the militarization of Cochran's WASPS is not necessary or desirable; the present program should be immediately and sharply curtailed.

Jackie Cochran maintained an anxious silence while Hap Arnold talked on. The committee kept its report in its desk. Ramspeck had not decided whether to release it officially or let the cold facts come out in debate when Cochran's WASPS are tossed onto the House floor.

The Stench—The Political Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the political situation has cleared up somewhat in 24 hours. Or has it?

The President asked Mr. LEMKE of North Dakota: "Bill, are you going to run against me or not?" This was—or was it—a slip of the tongue, but it was a slip not to be overlooked.

Up to date, then, it would seem that the President has decided to run. Since that is so, it follows that all those C. I. O. political committee activities stem directly for him and have his approval. Deny it as he may, he, through Hillman his anonymous representative, is responsible for the defeat of STARNES and COSTELLO and others. His cohorts glory too much to make a denial effective.

Some $7,000,000 dollars or more have been raised to support the Democratic nominee, who can be no other than the present occupant of the White House, and with the approval of the candidate-to-be.

So is the public morale to be debauched to make a Roman holiday to establish an autocracy and a personal monarchy with the political blessing of the man who seeks to succeed himself, plus the aid and help of one anonymous Hillman and an announced Hannegan in an endeavor to make a perpetual President. God save us.

None of us are so blind as those of us who will not see. It is really too bad, but too true that the President of the United States is responsible for such attacks on Congress as he has approved and as have been disseminated by those who love anonymity, to defeat many good men in Congress.

History will record that no such epidemic of purely political chicanery was encompassed in so short a time or ever was so disadvantageous to a country as that which has been perpetrated under the Roosevelt regime to the disadvantage of a democracy.

The multitude, who really are the Government, have been hypnotized, drugged, and numbed by the theory that they cannot even speak nor whisper nor gasp, for fear of losing the food from a paternal Government which is good enough for them to live on so long as they can live off it. What a story of 7 long years.

That is a horrible situation for us who pay the taxes for the support of this group to have to contemplate. How long are we going to take it?

The nonchalance of those who have spent and propose to spend our hard-earned dollars without a sign of acknowledgment of their responsibility to us from whom the revenue comes—so long as they can continue to soak us—is appalling. It should bring us all to a realizing sense of the situation in which we find ourselves by reason of our negligence of the responsibility which rests upon us. Are we dead to a realizing sense of what is being done to us?

Drunk with the intoxication of getting something for nothing, have we found ourselves in a catastrophe, breeding a revolution which would spell the end of a civilization? Who is to blame who will not fight to live.

What is the use of talking about what has happened? We are following along the highway traveled by those ancient civilizations which lie buried today if we know enough to profit by the experience of the ages.

In Mexico, piled one on top of the other, are to be found five civilizations, such as that of which we are so swelled-headedly proud today, all five of which, if history is to be read and understood, are buried there because of the complacance of the people toward problems of their day which are absolutely comparable to those which confront us.

Cannot we learn anything from experience?

The insidious methods employed by groups to seek paid loyalty, the deference to labor and to strikers and all unions for votes which have helped to delay victory by strikes, and the purely political purpose as so evidenced to continue a family fortune for personal power to keep the fortune intact if not the name makes every good American sick at heart as he wonders if we are on the way to join the buried civilizations. Are we?

Is a Huge Debt an Economic Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial appearing in the Pontiac Daily Press of

Pontiac, Mich., on June 1, 1944, which presents fair, logical, and sound reasoning on the subject of national debt. Let every sane American read this editorial with hope and encouragement:

IS A HUGE DEBT AN ECONOMIC AID?

Because this month's Fifth War Loan drive will increase the national debt by $16,000,000,000 to a level of $214,000,000,000, Congress must complete action before June 30 on a House approved bill to raise the Federal debt ceiling from $210,000,000,000 to $240,000,000,000. The Senate, by increasing the bill's limit to $260,000,000,000 has made a conference on it necessary.

The pending increase in the debt limit is the seventh since 1936 when the Treasury borrowings were limited by statute to $25,000,000,000. There has been a lift of the debt ceiling every year since the rearmament program was launched in 1940. Two previous increases were voted to cover relief and recovery expenditures arising from the depression early in the New Deal Administration.

Heretofore it has been the generally accepted American view that a small debt can be useful by providing a safe place for investment of private funds and that a large debt is never safe or desirable. In other words, the Federal debt could not be permitted to rise unless there were a corresponding increase in the national income. Without such increased income, the theory was, the interest burden would become too heavy and conditions favorable to inflation would be created.

The theory that there is no danger in a national debt since the money is owed to the people themselves, has been rejected as unsound by orthodox economists. This was the theory which comforted the leaders of Germany as they followed the lax fiscal policies which resulted in wild inflation and misery for their people.

It was during the depression of the early thirties that a new national debt philosophy was born in the United States. It resulted in the application of the theories of John Maynard Keynes, a British economist, to the fiscal problems of our Government, and it gave us the New Deal system of deficit financing so often assailed by critics of the administration.

In the view of subscribers to the Keynes theories a national debt of $300,000,000,000, which we are likely to have by the time peace is restored, will present no great problem if national income and employment remain at high levels.

The extremely broad scope of the implications in that big "if" should not be permitted to escape the attention of every taxpayer.

Stuart Chase is one economist who subscribes to the Keynes theories, but he concedes in part what Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, contends, namely, that the inflationary tendencies of a compensatory fiscal policy could not be held in check without a transfer of the powers of taxation and appropriation from the legislative to the executive branch of the Government. Such a transfer, of course, would violate the historic American conception of the checks and balances provided by legislative, executive, and judicial branches and increase Presidential powers already considered too great by millions of Americans. This has been President Roosevelt's burning desire since the day he entered office and is a tremendous leap toward dictatorship.

The average American businessman still looks askance at the deficit financing practiced by the administration. Conceding that war has left the Government no choice in the matter, he still believes, and he is supported by orthodox economic opinion, that carried to its ultimate extreme, it can result only in inflation, repudiation, and disaster.

Food as Related to U. N. R. R. A. and Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there has been some rather loose talk in this House about the United States being able to feed the rest of the world. I heard yesterday about the nearly 2,000,000,000 pounds of surplus wool in this country. It seems to me that the Members of the House and the country should know that most of this wool has been imported from other countries. The normal production of wool in the United States is about 650,000,000 pounds. We use, in normal times, approximately 750,000,000 pounds for domestic purposes. This country, because of the seeming necessity of having a large stock pile of wool, imported a great deal of wool from Australia, Africa, and South America. The sad part about the use of domestic wool revolves around the fact that importers are able to buy the domestic wool under the established or support price of wool in this country. It leaves the domestic producers of wool holding the bag. It is my understanding that the Surplus Commodities Corporation is now engaged in selling a certain amount of this wool on the open market.

The country should also remember that in 18 out of the last 19 years up to 1943 we were importing about a billion dollars' worth of agriculture products over what we exported. It has generally been supposed that this country raises an ample supply of food and that we exported more than we imported. This is not borne out by the facts and figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture.

The national income of this country has varied from $83,300,000,000 in 1929 to a low of $39,900,000,000 in 1932. In 1942 it was about $120,000,000,000. It is estimated to be more than $150,000,000,000 for 1943 and 1944. If this country is to ever pay off its national debt, we must keep a high plane of production and employment for our citizens. Agriculture is the key to the continued prosperity in this country.

Coming back to the food problem, let me remind you that the farm acreage under cultivation has not varied much in this country since 1919. Between 1919 and 1929, a period of 10 years, it averaged 355,000,000 acres. In 1942 we had about 343,000,00 acres in production. This does not mean that there has not been some increase in production. The last 2 years has seen favorable weather and a high production of crops. Scientific means of cultivation, fertilization, and the better use of seed have increased the yields on the farms. It should be remembered, however, that in 1896 we produced the largest corn crop ever produced until 1943, when the crop was larger. In 1896 we produced 2,671,000,000 bushels of corn. We normally produced about 875,000,000 bushels of wheat. The domestic demand calls for about 750,000,000 bushels of wheat. If this country was to have a serious drought for 2 years, we would be unable to feed ourselves, let alone other countries.

If we are to meet the needs and demands of our domestic users of agriculture products it is estimated we should bring into operation some 4,000,000 acres of new agriculture land each year. This means that irrigation projects should be encouraged because they produce the most food on the smallest acreage.

It is interesting to note that over a period of time when we were paying out something like a billion dollars a year to the farmers for not producing crops we were at the same time bringing into this country $10,000,000,000 worth of agricultural products. This, of course, just doesn't make sense.

It seems absolutely necessary that we bring more land into irrigation, that we spend more time and money in soil conservation and rebuilding practices of our soil if we are to increase production and meet our domestic demands. We should have manufacturing plants in this country to transform our raw products into synthetic products when surpluses do occur. Many of the surpluses which appear locally, be it potatoes in the Scottsbluff Valley in Nebraska or cabbages in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, are due to the improper distribution of the products.

I think this Congress should understand that these lend-lease agreements with other countries, if they are to be repaid by sending us agriculture products, means that the future existence of agricultural prosperity will be further depressed in this country.

It does not seem that the planners of other nations should rely upon the United States to feed the rest of the world. In the light of the known facts, it just cannot be done. It seems to me that if we are to have a period of prosperity in this country, then agriculture should be protected. When we gave the State Department the right to make trade agreements and adjustments with other nations, we placed with that Department the power, through legislation, to bring on a permanent depression, through tariff manipulations.

The Constitution provides that Congress should have the power to regulate and issue currency. In checking the tariff regulations it is interesting to note that about 65 percent of the trade agreements deal with agricultural products. Our country holds about 7 percent of the population of the world, but we control about 10 percent of the raw products of the world. If this Nation is to embark upon a program of tremendous industrial expansion, then we can expect to be at the mercy of other nations controlling our needed raw materials. If this is to be done at the expense of agriculture, then certainly we should not plan on feeding the rest of the world through such agreements as we might make under U. N. R. R. A. or lend-lease.

National Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, because in recent weeks I have witnessed an increase in the pressure being exerted in the attempt to put over national prohibition I am moved to call attention to the dangers which lie in this ill-conceived attempt to legislate the morals of Americans.

I was of the opinion that this legislation had been consigned to a peaceful death, but upon inquiry I am advised the committee plans to reopen hearings on the Bryson bill. It seems we are to be lulled into a false sense of security, then, when the time seems ripe, this measure will be rushed out here and an attempt will be made to secure its passage under the guise of hastening the conclusion of the war.

I know this is a subject that is not too popular. Political wisdom seems to advise that we restrain from broaching it in the House.

I cannot help feeling, however, that we are doing a dangerous thing when we allow the proponents of the measure to gain the impression that we are lowering our guard.

There are many splendid arguments for temperance, I know. I admire and commend those earnest persons who strive diligently, day in and day out, in the cause of promoting temperance. Moderation in all things is a praiseworthy and a mighty good slogan in all walks of life.

However, there is an irreconcilable difference between those who advocate temperance and those who by stealth and with the use of pressure tactics attempt to foist unwanted legislation which will give rebirth to the horrors which attended the last trial of the noble experiment.

Reams have been written about the gangsterism, the thievery, the murder of those days all of us would rather forget. The trail of broken homes, broken lives, and broken characters left scars on American life that are still visible. No greater tragedy ever occurred in any civilized nation than was our lot through the imposition of gangland rule which came with national prohibition.

Students of history in future generations will read with amazement the sordid stories of that and will doubt the evidence of their own eyes when they read that there were men and women who again sought to inflict on America this reign of terror and scandal.

If there were no greater argument than this—if the advocates of this measure are sincere in their belief that this time it will be different—then they certainly must subscribe to the democratic process. They certainly must not advocate another act of contempt for the men who are abroad fighting for the life of their country.

National prohibition was foisted on the country a generation ago, while America's sons were in foreign lands, fighting for the right of self-determination everywhere. These men fought for liberty and freedom and came home to find themselves saddled with this octopus of scandal, corruption, and death. We must determine that it shall not happen again. Let those who seek national prohibition lay aside their weapons until our fighting men have laid aside the weapons they are using to vanquish the Republic's enemies. When they have returned to their homes, and have had sufficient time to consider the matter fully—then will be the time to ask them if they wish national prohibition in the country they fought and bled for. We talk about our loyalty to our fighting men—don't let's sneak this underhanded deal over on them again.

Unreasonable O. P. A. Regulations Should Be Abandoned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given to me, I am including in these remarks a petition just received and signed by a large number of the leading farmers and citizens of the great agricultural district of Michigan which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. The petition is as follows:

To the Senators and Representatives of the United States of America:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States of America and legal voters, respectfully petition you to take such action as may be necessary to abolish immediately certain restrictions, imposed by the Office of Price Administration under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, on the following sales and transactions:

1. Public sales by a bona fide owner, directly or through an agent or auctioneer, of such owner's used furniture, household goods, and personal effects acquired by such owner for his own use or consumption and not acquired for the purpose of resale;

2. Public sales by a bona fide farmer, directly or through an agent or auctioneer, of such farmer's used tractors, machinery, implements, and tools acquired by such farmer for his own use in connection with his farming operations and activities and not acquired for the purpose of resale;

3. Public sales by an administrator, executor, guardian, or trustee, directly or through an agent or auctioneer, pursuant to an order of court, of any used personal property of the character enumerated in paragraphs numbered 1 and 2 above.

Your petitioners represent that the maximum price regulations, prescribed by the Office of Price Administration and popularly known as ceiling prices, when applied to sales of the character above described, are unjust, unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, un-American, and impracticable; that it was never intended or desired by Congress, or by the American people whom Congress represents, that the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or the maximum price regulations issued thereunder should apply to sales of the character above described, but on the contrary such act and regulations were intended to apply only to sales by merchants, dealers, retailers, and wholesalers engaged in the buying and selling of merchandise; that such regulations, when applied to sales of the character enumerated in paragraphs numbered 1, 2, and 3 above, tend to promote connivance and fraud on the part of sellers and buyers; and that such regulations impose such undue hardship and restraint on an American citizen in the liquidation or disposition of his own used personal property (acquired by him for his own use or consumption) and so hamper, impede, and interfere with the right of such owner to sell such property as to practically deny to him the right of such sale or auction.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete harmony with the sentiment expressed in this petition. The problem sought to be solved by these petitioners exists in every agricultural congressional district in the country. This petition does not express the complaint of a few local people only.

I think we all agree that the Office of Price Administration has been of benefit in many instances. On the other hand, only a prejudiced blind follower who has any practical knowledge of the facts will attempt to justify the practice which these petitioners seek to change.

The Emergency Price Control Act expires by limitation of time on June 30, 1944. The Committee on Banking and Currency, having jurisdiction over this legislation, has been wrestling with the problem for better than 2 months. A bill has been reported continuing the life of the agency until June 30, 1945. It is contemplated that on Tuesday next this bill will be taken up for consideration by the House of Representatives, and at this time I want to call the attention of the membership to the views of my constituents as expressed in their petition, and I express the hope that in legislation continuing the life of the O. P. A. for another year provision will be made to remedy the conditions herein complained of.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members will read this petition.

Montgomery Ward Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Sentinel Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

MONTGOMERY WARD CASE

If the Government of the United States can legally do what it has done to Montgomery Ward & Co., then, indeed, the boasted

liberty of America has been destroyed; and, like Nazi German, the people are the servants of the state and the state is not the servant of those who create it.

Make no mistake. The mail-order business of Montgomery Ward cannot be construed as being a necessary part of the war effort without "an indecent exposure of the intellect," as Sidney Smith declared a hundred years ago. The law giving the President the right to seize property essential to the war effort was surely never intended to apply to retail business but to such things as factories, mines, and transportation.

If the Government can seize Montgomery Ward's business, it can seize any business in Wood County if the proprietor protested the War Labor Board's demands. It could seize any farmer's land under such a condition. And in its statement Thursday Montgomery Ward declares that the Board itself had asked the courts to dismiss Ward's case testing its authority, the Board contending that its orders in a labor case were not "legally binding," but were only "advice" which Ward need not accept.

Make no mistake that the principle involved relates to the actual labor dispute between Ward and its employees and the War Labor Board. The American way of determining the legal questions involved was through the courts. The principle involved is whether or not a private company or an individual may have his property seized by military forces without an order by a court of justice.

Montgomery Ward has done the country a service by its refusal to give up its property without actual physical force compelling it to do so. It brings the question of individual rights squarely to the attention of Congress and to the people of the United States.

Opposing Continuance of Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, certain press reports recently concerning the action of the House on the passage of the national war agencies appropriation bill, left the erroneous impression that I favored the continuance of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

The reverse of that inference is true. I am opposed to the continuance of this agency, and when the bill was under consideration I denounced this agency and stated in the debate that I would vote for the Tarver amendment, which I did, to strike out the entire appropriation for the Fair Employment Practice Committee, since I thought this organization had committed violent abuses and had rendered a disservice and created disunity in time of war.

I cited in my statement on the floor of the House the incident of the Dallas News, wherein the Dallas News advertised, "Wanted: Colored man"; and the Fair Employment Practice Committee reprimanded the Dallas News for using the word "colored" in an advertisement, and said that it was discriminatory as to race, and I declared in my remarks to the House that an agency which has no more sense than this should be abolished, and I voted twice for the Tarver amendment to eliminate all appropriations for the F. E. P. C. and did all that I could to eliminate same from the bill.

I believe those who seek to stir up the race question now are rendering a disservice to their country and also making more difficult the solving of the race question in the United States, and I shall continue to do all I can toward the abolishment of this agency.

Under leave granted, I submit herewith copy of a letter which I wrote one of my constituents, Mr. J. E. Keever, of Ennis, Tex., explaining my position and my vote upon the bill:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1944.

Mr. J. E. KEEVER,
Ennis, Tex.

DEAR ED: I understand that recent press reports indicate that I favored the continuance of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and that I am being criticized therefor. The press report is misleading and erroneous.

I voted to abolish this Committee on Fair Employment Practice and denounced it in a speech in the House, specifically citing the Dallas News incident, and voted twice to eliminate it from the appropriation bill making appropriation for 16 war agencies.

The facts with reference to this matter are these: Last Friday, May 26, the House had under consideration H. R. 4879, known as the national war agencies appropriation bill for 1945, and which made appropriation in the same bill for 17 different war agencies, aggregating $1,030,858,367. Included among these was $500,000 for the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, but also included were a number of very vital war agencies, such as War Production Board, War Shipping Administration, Selective Service System, Office of Censorship, Office of War Information, Petroleum Administration for War, Office for Emergency Management, War Relocation Authority, and others. All of these items were in the same appropriation bill, and before it was taken up, I conferred with Congressman TARVER, of Georgia, a member of the Appropriations Committee, and he advised me that he was going to offer an amendment to strike from the bill the $500,000 for the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and I told him I would vote for such an amendment and assist him in every way possible in securing the elimination of this item from the bill. He offered the amendment and led the fight so to do, and made a very effective speech in the House condemning this activity, and toward the end of his speech he yielded to me for a statement which I made in the House, and which is contained on page 5029 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, and is as follows:

"Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

"Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a very excellent statement. I shall vote for his amendment to strike out the entire appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. I think this organization has committed ome violent abuses, and, as the gentleman says, has rendered a disservice and created a disunity in time of war. In addition to specific instances of meddling cited, I have in mind the instance of the Dallas News, wherein the Dallas News advertised: 'Wanted, colored man.' And this organization, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, took that up with the Dallas News and said they had no right to use the word 'colored' in an advertisement, that it was discriminatory as to race, and demanded that this ad should not be used. The News wanted a colored man, and not a white man, for a particular job; but they must not so advertise for fear of offending the colored race. An agency which has no more sense than that should be abolished."

The Tarver amendment to eliminate all appropriations for the F. E. P. C. was adopted by a vote of 141 to 103. A few minutes thereafter the Republicans demanded another vote on the Tarver amendment, and a number of them changed their votes, and on this second vote the Tarver amendment was defeated by only 4 votes, the vote being 119 for and 123 against.

I voted for the Tarver amendment both times, and through my efforts got a number of other Members to do likewise, as I was very much interested in eliminating all appropriations for this agency, of which I strongly disapprove and had condemned in my remarks in the House and was greatly chagrined and disappointed when the House rejected the Tarver amendment on the second vote.

Immediately thereafter came the vote upon the passage of the bill making appropriation for all of these 17 different agencies, all of which I considered vitally important to the conduct of the war, except the one for the F. E. P. C., and the defeat of this bill would have meant no funds for these vital war agencies for another year.

The largest item in the bill was for the War Shipping Administration, of $530,350,000, which was over half of the entire bill, and the smallest was the item for F. E. P. C. The F. E. P. C. appropriation was about one-tenth of 1 percent of the total amount of the bill, and I hesitated to vote against a bill when I approved of 99.9 percent of the items therein. Furthermore, my record has been 100 percent in voting for all appropriations for the conduct and prosecution of the war, and I hesitated to break this record, especially just as our important invasion of western Europe was about to be launched, and I therefore voted for the bill, in the hope that when it reaches the Senate, the item for the F. E. P. C. will be eliminated.

Congressman TARVER, of Georgia, who offered the amendment and led the fight to strike out the F. E. P. C. appropriation, also voted for the bill, as did many others who had supported the Tarver amendment, the vote on the final passage being 247 yeas to 58 nays.

I am violently opposed to the F. E. P. C. for, in my judgment it is not aiding the war effort, but hurting it by creating disunity in time of war. I believe those who seek to stir up the race question now are rendering a disservice to their country and also making more difficult the solving of the race question in the United States, and I shall continue to do all I can toward the abolishment of this agency.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

LUTHER A. JOHNSON.

Hon. Will Rogers, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago this House lost one of its most valuable Members when Bill Rogers went back into the armed services. Bill was

one of us who came here to Congress for the first time in 1942. His was a famous name, honored and loved by the American people, but Bill demonstrated very soon that he did not intend to sit back and rest on the name that was his. His own sincere convictions made it imperative that he work for and vote for and in all other ways express those convictions here on the floor of the House and elsewhere. The name of Bill Rogers was always among those out in the front leading liberal and progressive legislation which would tend toward a better Nation and a better world.

Some of us who realized especially how badly Bill was needed here in Washington tried to persuade him to remain in Congress. Bill believed, however, that his place was with the men in his tank destroyer company, and that argument was unanswerable. By this time he has probably rejoined those men, and is happy in the thought that he will soon be leading them into conflict against the forces of nazi-ism. Those of us remaining here will miss Bill, miss him badly, but we are glad that he is serving our country where he himself believes he can serve best.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Woodville State Bank, of Woodville, Ohio, concerning the Home Owners' Loan Corporation:

THE WOODVILLE STATE BANK,
Woodville, Ohio, May 24, 1944.

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEICHEL: We recently wrote the H. O. L. C. asking if they would be willing to submit a list of mortgages they hold in this community as we were interested in purchasing these mortgages. As is true of all bureaucrats, they are reluctant to release any of their holdings on a continuity of the bureau in which they are interested and did not hesitate to indicate that in replying to our letter. The letter received from Mr. Hager is enclosed herewith which clearly indicates the intention of the H. O. L. C. We felt that you would be interested in this since you have indicated a desire to liquidate this loaning agency.

With kind personal regards.

Yours very truly,

A. W. EMCH,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1944.

Mr. ARTHUR V. EMCH,
Executive Vice President,
The Woodville State Bank,
Woodville, Ohio.

DEAR MR. EMCH: This will acknowledge your letter of May 10, in which you ask that, if it is the Corporation's intention to dispose of its mortgages, we submit a list of H. O. L. C. loans in your locality for your consideration of the purchase of such of them as appear to be eligible bank loans.

The fact is, the Corporation is not endeavoring to sell its loans, nor can it furnish lists of its mortgages or give out confidential information concerning its borrowers' accounts.

There has been much misunderstanding regarding the Corporation's operations and the availability for purchase of its mortgages, most of it due to the discussions in Congress and elsewhere on the general subject of H. O. L. C. liquidation and to the conflicting publicity these discussions received. The act which created the Corporation, however, included no provision for the sale of its loans, and there was no suggestion of such a disposition of these accounts when this legislation was being considered. Moreover, no legislation has since been enacted which would require such sales.

It would not, as a matter of fact, serve the best interests of the Government or the taxpayer for the Corporation to put its loans on the market. The Government, through the agency of the H. O. L. C., has spent huge sums in bringing the Corporation's good loans to their present safe condition, where, though costing little to service, they provide the interest income needed to offset the costs and losses of servicing the slower loans and disposing of the acquired properties. If these good loans are to be taken over by prospective purchasers, who would naturally be interested in the better mortgages only, the Corporation will be deprived of this revenue and left with the residue of slow loans and properties. The inevitable result will be greatly increased Corporation losses, with a correspondingly increased Government debt, to be made good by the Treasury and the tax-paying public.

In view of your inquiry, I am enclosing a copy of the Commissioner's report to Congress, which I believe you will find interesting.

Very truly yours,

JOHN M. HAGER,
Executive Assistant to the Commissioner.

Good News for the Louisiana Sugarcane Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a very interesting, important, and far-reaching editorial which undoubtedly will cause tremendous interest and planning in all postwar proposals. The editorial, appearing in the May 20 edition of Collier's, one of America's leading weekly magazines, is entitled "Fuel for All?" as follows:

FUEL FOR ALL?

As sensational a piece of scientific news as we've seen in recent years is the story of Dr. E. Berl's announced discovery of a way to make gasoline, coal, and oil from various products of farm, forest, and ocean. If true (and we'd like to emphasize the "if" for the time being), the news has tremendous implications for industry and for the future course of world history.

What nature does, of course, in making coal and petroleum out of vegetation, is to change carbohydrates such as sugar and starch into hydrocarbons—coal, oil, lignite, peat, and so on. But nature takes several thousand years, while Dr. Berl says he can turn the trick in a few hours by internal combustion produced in a cheap, simple apparatus.

He says that from 100 long tons of Louisiana dry sugarcane he can get 2,980 gallons of gasoline, 3,430 gallons of middle oil, 1,210 gallons of lubricating oil, and the 8.45 long tons of sugar which the cane would have yielded anyway.

Sugarcane planted on 2.1 percent of the United States available crop lands, says Berl, could produce by his process as much gasoline as our 32,000,000 cars burned up in the year before the war. Other materials from which he claims to be able to produce gasoline or coal are sorghum, sweetpotatoes, cornstalks, grass, leaves, Irish moss, seaweed, algae, wood, and sawdust.

It sounds like wonderful stuff; but at least the Berl claims were revealed in the shape of a paper read at an American Chemical Society meeting, and Dr. Berl himself is a research professor at the eminently respectable Carnegie Institute of Technology.

If the process stands up and produces as promised, a lot of worry about eventual exhaustion of world oil and coal supplies can be dropped. Gone will be one potent cause of wars—the need for nations to assure themselves oil supplies wherever they can find them. Industries can make their own fuel, and so can a lot of farmers. The world's fuel supply will be safe until the sun cools off, and human life quits the earth along with plant life and all other animal life.

The Berl hopes may fade or the Berl process may never come into general use, or it may be forgotten until our grandchildren dig it up from the files. But at the very least, the news gives fresh promise that in time science will lick every problem of full, comfortable living that has bedeviled mankind from the beginning of mankind's tenancy on this planet.

The American Merchant Marine Attacked on Two Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the American people must be aroused to the tremendous importance of the American merchant marine. The American merchant marine is now under attack from two quarters—on the domestic front and on the foreign front. Our merchant marine is one of the Nation's greatest peacetime assets, as well as one of our most necessary national-defense assets, and it must be maintained at the highest level of tonnage and efficiency to meet our national requirements.

The action of the Civil Aeronautics Board in interpreting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the operation of trans-oceanic air lines by shipping companies is not only a grave threat to our post-war merchant marine, but it virtually emasculates it. The right to operate such transoceanic air lines as are

necessary to meet the competition created by similar operations of shipping companies of foreign nations must be given and the rulings of the Civil Aeronautics Board must be changed to bring that about.

No single factor will contribute so much to destroy the American merchant marine than the narrow-minded and short-sighted application of the problems of domestic transportation to the highly competitive field of international commerce carried on by our surface shipping companies. To repeat, the Civil Aeronautics Board ruling must be changed and Congress must act to overthrow its ham-stringing application of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The enemy from other maritime nations is that subtle propaganda being carried on to lay the groundwork for dismantling and reducing our Merchant Marine following this war from its position of supremacy.

For many years we have produced about 10 percent more than we have consumed. It has been necessary to develop foreign markets for this excess production. The continuance of a successful domestic economy largely depends upon our ability to sell our surplus products in other countries. American goods should and must be carried in American ships. Our merchant marine should be maintained at that level necessary to carry out this policy and purpose.

Simply because of past errors we permitted the American merchant marine to degenerate into fifth place in former years and following World War No. 1, we must not make those same errors again. Propaganda methods are already being developed and put forth to lull us into complacency on this vital matter. We must not be misled but must adhere rigidly to the principle that our merchant marine shall be second to none and that it shall carry American goods to American-found foreign markets.

The San Francisco Call-Bulletin in a recent editorial forcefully called attention to this propaganda which I include herewith, as follows:

HOLD OUR SHIPPING—AMERICAN MERCANTILE MARINE, NOW FIRST, SHOULD NOT BE "ADJUSTED" TO GIVE BRITAIN SUPREMACY

It is becoming increasingly evident that England has determined upon, and has put into operation, a program of propaganda aimed at softening the United States into a lull of post-war insecurity that will persuade us to dispose of much of our merchant shipping immediately after the war.

Britannia no longer rules the waves, and she gives unmistakable evidence of being resentful at that supremacy having passed to this Nation. More by indirection than by direction; more by innuendo, is she hammering away now in an effort to prepare us for reenactment of the idiotic role we accepted after the last war.

Then it was that we disposed of most of our merchant shipping, leaving our Navy without necessary auxiliary support for peacetime national defense. Further, by stripping our merchant marine to skeleton dimensions, we helped to hamstring American industry by making it dependent upon foreign shipping, largely.

Foreign shipping, naturally enough, served first the interests of its respective governments, putting America at a disadvantage—in some instances, eliminating us entirely from competition for foreign trade.

That is the role England is preparing now to assign us again. She has made dupes of us before. She thinks she can do it again. And she can, and will, unless this Nation becomes solidified in a determination to keep its own shipping.

Most recent evidence of what England is planning for us comes from the annual meeting in London of the Institution of Naval Architects. There, it was brought out that when the war ends, Britain will have only half her pre-war tonnage of merchant shipping, whereas the United States will have three times the tonnage we had in 1941.

And what does England propose to do about this? Mr. W. C. Warwick, director of some 40 British shipping companies, told the Institution of Naval Architects:

"After allowing for the restricted output of new ships in Great Britain, it seems probable that the British mercantile marine will approximate about one-half of the pre-war position, or, say, 10,000,000 gross register tons.

"The United States will probably have 30,000,000 gross register tons, or, say three times their pre-war tonnage.

"It is to be hoped that mutually fair and equitable means may be found for adjusting the post-war mercantile marine tonnage of the two countries."

They are preparing us for softening. It is time now that we adopt a national policy that will assure this Nation's peacetime protection. Our merchant fleet now ranks first. Let us keep it there.

Not Against Women Flyers, but for Fair Treatment by A. A. F. for W. T. S. Trainees and Instructors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 17, 1944:

THOUSANDS OF MALE PILOTS IDLE, WASPS FACE FIGHT FOR EXISTENCE

(By Mary Spargo)

A report condemning the expenditure of millions of dollars in training WASPS to ferry planes when there is a huge surplus of male pilots will be made to the House within the next few days by the Ramspeck Civil Service Investigating Committee.

The committee's findings will be released just before the House considers a measure introduced by Representative JOHN COSTELLO (Democrat, California) to make the WASPS a part of the Army Air Forces.

The Ramspeck committee, according to Capitol Hill reports, will ask that further training of WASPS be discontinued and may go so far as to request termination of the organization altogether.

BATTLE OF SEXES

The House will face a battle of the sexes when it considers the bill to militarize the WASPS next week.

The WASP bill struck a snag when some 11,000 C. A. A. pilots began to bombard their Congressmen about the discrimination against men. When the War Department was informed of the thousands of letters in congressional hands, it withdrew previous objections to commissioning the C. A. A. pilots and instructors, provided the WASPS could be commissioned.

Aviation authorities here are speculating as to how 11,000 more men pilots could be used, let alone a greatly increased WASP force.

Lined up in determined opposition are the American Legion and aviation interests. They have to contend, however, with the prestige and glamor of Miss Jacqueline Cochran, famed woman flyer, cosmetic manufacturer, and wife of Floyd B. Odlum, multimillionaire New York financier, and some 1,000 of her attractive WASPS.

A storm of male protests over commissioning WASPS at a time when the Army Air Forces have transferred 36,000 young men signed up for preliminary training into the infantry has resulted in two amendments to the Costello bill and another will be offered.

Under the first amendment 6,000 civilian instructor-trainees for the Army would be commissioned, and under the second the 5,000 pilot instructors also would get commissions.

Representative JOHN J. SPARKMAN (Democrat, Alabama) announced yesterday that he would introduce another amendment designed to prevent the Air Forces from refusing to commission the male pilots covered by the bill by setting standards which at the present time the men cannot meet.

His amendment extends the bill to include C. A. A.-W. T. S. instructors, as well as trainees, and provides that the men be given the additional training necessary to meet Army Air Force requirements for flying officers.

MADE MORE ACUTE

The problem has become more acute as combat pilots who have seen service abroad and are brought back because they are over combat age cast their eyes on the ferrying jobs held by women.

The women, now operating as civilians under civil service, receive $250 a month, plus $6 a day maintenance away from their base.

It is estimated that it costs about $18,000 to train a woman ferry pilot, and congressional investigators maintain that the whole sum, amouting in the aggregate to some six and a half milion dollars could be saved by using trained pilots already complaining of lack of flying hours.

SOME ALREADY ASSIGNED

Congressmen are also irked because, anticipating easy passage of the bill, the Army Air Forces already have assigned 45 or 50 civilian women to the Officer Candidate School at the Army Air Forces School of Applied Tactics at Orlando, Fla.

Exploring Vikings Visited Minnesota Area in Year 1362

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, out in Minnesota we lay claim for our State to having been inhabited by white men over a century before the arrival of Columbus in the Western Hemisphere. We back up our claim with the famous Kensington Runestone, whose story was related

again in a recent issue of the popular national magazine Pathfinder.

In order that my colleagues may know more about Minnesota and its record of the visit of those early Vikings I would direct your attention to the Pathfinder article, which follows:

RUNESTONE'S RECORD

If you have a friend who expresses doubt of the authenticity of the Minnesota runestone, you had better urge him to stay safely in the East. Out where the stone was discovered some 46 years ago, few apparently have heard the misgivings that pop up now and then. And Minnesota folk are liable to be reasonably resentful when they do hear. Take our friend, Peter Schramm, out in Garvin, Minn., for instance. Peter tells the story as well as any. He had no notion, until we told him, that anybody questioned the pre-Columbus relic. Then, when we explained—but you must hear the runestone tale first.

It was a century and 30 years before Columbus arrived, Peter Schramm tells, that a band of adventuring Norwegians and Swedes explored North America. This, Peter says, was established beyond question by finding, in 1898, near Kensington, Douglas County, Minn., a runestone left by these far-from-home travelers.

What's a runestone? It's a stone on which there are runic characters (i. e., the old Teutonic alphabet in which all the letters were made with straight lines). It seems there were 30 of these explorers in all, 8 Swedes and 22 Norwegians, who came more than 1,000 miles from Hudson Bay, via the Nelson River, Lake Winnipeg, and finally down Minnesota's Red River. Meanwhile, somewhere along the Canadian coast, awaiting their return, lay their sturdy windjammers.

No "private property—keep out" signs were on hand to warn the explorers. But Indians had rules. And the penalty for violating them was drastic. One day the red men caught 10 of the Vikings by surprise and massacred them. The survivors left the runestone behind to commemorate the tragedy. But it didn't turn up until 1898, when a farmer found it imbedded in the roots of a poplar tree near Kensington. Even then, the stone was used for a long while as a doorstep, with no one aware of either its significance or worth. Finally it came to the attention of a Norwegian scholar and historian. His translation reads like this: "Eight Goths and 22 Norwegians on exploration journey from Vinland over the West. We had camp by two skerries (rocky islands) and one day's journey north from this stone. We were there and fished one day. When we returned home found 10 men red with blood and dead. Ave Maria. Save us from evil."

On the stone's side is carved: "Have 10 men by the sea looking after our ships, 14 days' journey from this island, year 1362."

In addition to the stone, Peter told us, there are other proofs of the seafarers' visit, including 6 "mooring rocks" discovered on lake shores and river banks. More, he predicted, will turn up. "Their boats being exceedingly valuable," he said, "the explorers saw to their security at evening. With a stone drill, a 6-inch-deep hole was bored into the stone rock that served as an anchoring pier. In this hole a ringbolt, attached to the boats by a rope, was inserted and thus the craft were moored securely every night. This mooring method is of Scandinavian origin, and is still being used."

That was when we asked Peter Schramm about the rumor of the stone being "planted." The report, he said, was new to him, but he would run it down. He ran up, instead, to the University of Minnesota. There he obtained a better picture, and even greater certainty.

But the runestone's authenticity was questioned when it was first found, sure enough. "Somebody asked the farmer who found it if he himself had chiseled the characters," Peter said, "and that made him plenty sore. I ought to have remembered, because it was my mother-in-law, then residing on an adjoining farm, to whom he expressed his indignation. The farmer was Olaf Ohman, come to think of it. And the fellow who succeeded in translating the inscription was H. R. Holand, a Norwegian scholar and historian, residing in Wisconsin at the time."

For a while the runestone was in possession of the Minnesota Historical Society. Now when you go to the chamber of commerce in Alexandria to ask about Minnesota generally, they show you the stone—and tell you that Columbus was a little late.

Legislature of Louisiana Asks for Federal Aid in Necessary Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4, adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Whereas the United States of America is presently engaged in a global war; and

Whereas every effort must be made to bring about a speedy victory; and

Whereas many great industrial plants are located in the parish of East Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana; and

Whereas these plants employ thousands of workers who are contributing directly to the war efforts; and

Whereas there exist only two highways whereby these thousands of workers can use in getting to and from their work; and

Whereas Harding Field and Camp Van Dorn are located within a radius of 50 miles of the city of Baton Rouge; and

Whereas these two highways are used by the occupants of these camps;

Whereas these two highways are inadequate to carry this congested traffic; and

Whereas, as a result thereof, there exists in the third ward of the parish of East Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana, on the highway known as Plank Road and the highway known as Bayou Sara Road, the worst bottleneck and traffic congestion in the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas this traffic congestion and traffic bottleneck is materially and severely hindering the war efforts; and

Whereas the portion of the said highways herein described are in a terrible condition and are too narrow and are otherwise inadequate to carry the necessary traffic; and

Whereas it is necessary that these portions of the said highways be declared as essential to the war effort; and

Whereas these portions of the said highways herein described should be improved and widened in order to bring about immediate relief: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring therein):

That a traffic congestion and traffic bottleneck is hereby declared to exist on Highway No. 3 (U. S. 61 and 65) known as the Bayou Sara Road from its intersection with the Airline Highway No. C-1500 (U. S. 190) just east of the Mississippi River Bridge in the Parish of East Baton Rouge to the junction of said highway with Main Street in the city of Baton Rouge.

That a traffic congestion and traffic bottleneck is hereby declared to exist on Highway No. 36 known as the Plank Road from its intersection with the Airline Highway No. C-1500 (U. S. 190) east of the Mississippi River bridge in the Parish of East Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana, to the point where the highway intersects Florida Street or Highway No. 7 in the city of Baton Rouge.

That the two highways between the points hereinabove described serve as the only two arteries by which the thousands of employees use in going to and from their work at the many large indushtrial plants which are so magnificently contributing to the war efforts.

That the two highways between the points hereinabove described are used by the occupants of Harding Field and Camp Van Dorn.

That this traffic congestion and traffic bottleneck is materially hindering the war effort.

That the Secretary of War be and he is hereby memorialized to certify that the said portions of the said highways herein described are essential to the war effort.

That the secretary of state of the State of Louisiana be and he is hereby directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the Secretary of War of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Louisiana in the Halls of Congress.

J. E. VERRET,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.
R. NORMAN BAUER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Who Has Smeared Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Chicago Daily News of April 29 comes the following editorial:

A felicitous phrase dies hard, especially when the phrase reflects a combination of special interests in business and politics. It is no wonder, then, that labor's no-strike pledge is lugged into every discussion of war production, inflation, the closed shop, W. L. B. and N. L. R. B., not to mention politics. It's a warm generous phrase, liberal and gliberal, too.

But the no-strike pledge has meant next to nothing with respect to strikes. That is plain as a pike staff, in view of the Department of Labor's official report on strikes in 1943. That report, compiled by bureaus staffed by friends of organized labor, certainly did not fail to give the no-strike pledge makers, Messrs Green and Murray, every possible edge. Madame Perkins and her department are not in the business of labor baiting.

The report showed that there were more strikes last year than in any other year for which records have been kept except 1917, 1937, and 1941. More men walked off the job in 1943 than downed tools in either 1937 or 1917, but not quite so many as in 1941.

In view of these cold facts, the only possible thing that could be said in substantiation of claims that labor's no-strike pledge has been of appreciable value, would be to claim that if there had been no such pledge,

there would have been more strikes and more strikers than in any years of peace, except three or four.

But that is not to say that labor's no-strike pledge has been of no benefit whatsoever. As it has been made the justification of War Labor Board orders inserting union maintenance clauses into employment contracts, the pledge has reaped many millions of dues for union treasuries that would not otherwise have gone into them and also has brought about virtual closed-shop conditions in a greater part of American industry than ever functioned under that condition before.

None of this is said in disparagement either of the workers or of union labor as an institution. It is said merely to keep the record straight and to dispose of false claims made on behalf of some labor-union officials.

If labor has not performed 100 percent in this war, who has, outside the men at the front? We have previously printed the figures compiled by the Union Trust Co. of Cleveland that show factory workers to have contributed a larger percentage of their numbers to the Army and Navy than any other occupational group in the Nation. We take pleasure in printing today the calculations of the same sound institution on the productivity of labor in munitions industries. The bulletin of the trust company says: "Output per worker in the munitions industries is taken as being equal to 100 in January of 1943. By last April (1943) it had risen to 115, and then it moved sideways for 2 months. Then it advanced both rapidly and steadily until it had reached 136 by the end of last year. That was a remarkable achievement. It meant that by the close of 1943 three workers were turning out more munitions than four workers had been able to make at the beginning of the year."

Let's analyze that. Three workers at the end of 1943 were equivalent to four at the beginning of 1943. That is why our output of planes, guns, tanks, and other weapons and munitions rose month after month, even in a year when we had the fourth largest number of strikes on record.

In the long run, of course, improvement of output per man and man-hour is mostly due to inventors, engineers, and other technologists who empower labor and endow its toil with greater speed and precision. Much of the gain in efficiency in 1943 was undoubtedly due to the tuning in of new plants and the constant rearrangement of facilities—but in so short a time technology alone could not account for all the improvement made.

A large part of it was made because labor worked harder and more skillfully. No man can gainsay that.

And that greater will to work and improved output by the great majority, it seems to us, bring into even more stark contrast the mischief wrought by the minority who struck or who soldiered on the job. It was they who cast odium upon their fellows, not the professional labor baiters. Labor's good name has been badly treated in labor's own house.

The public has been more or less aware of this minority offense, and it has literally burned up many citizens and soldiers, too. Here is a sample out of scores or even hundreds of similar instances in which a minority have brought disrepute upon their fellows. Production of medium tanks at the Chrysler Detroit plant was halted for 4 days recently by 300 men indulging in small walkouts. Of these 300, some 38 were key men—crane operators. They kept 600 men who wanted to work in idleness, and after the strikes were off lack of key parts kept 1,000 idle for some time.

The interdependence of manufacturing operations has been growing throughout the war as line production and automatic processes have been increasingly installed. The result is that a strike of 100 men today may mean more in lost production than a strike of 200 men last year. That is why the conventional statistics of the Department of Labor on strikes (confined to its officially defined strikes, which excludes all malingering and slow-down sabotage and also strikes of very short duration) are inadequate yardsticks of lost production. But insufficient as those statistics may be, they constitute a most damaging record of how a relatively small minority have brought discredit upon millions of workers who have done an all-out war job every workingday.

Leading Aviation Magazines Say W. T. S. Instructors and Trainees Should Come Before WASPS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPPESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from Aviation News, April 1944, and Aero Digest magazine, May 1944:

[From Aviation News for April 1944]

THE WASP PROBLEM

As Representative RAMSPECK's House Civil Service Investigating Committee launched an inquiry into the WASP training project, a group of 122 instructors at one civilian contract primary school last week wired the President and other officials protesting the Army's failure to plan utilization of their flying ability and experience in the war effort, although the WASP training program continues, with 1,000 graduates planned by June.

Indignation is rising among experienced civilian airmen as they leave their instructor jobs at schools no longer being used by the Army and face selective-service induction. They point out these facts:

Civilian men pilots with thousands of hours of flying are ineligible for combat because of logical reasons, such as age, but they are also deemed unfit for the Air Transport Command if they do not have 200 hours' time in planes of 200 horsepower or more. Most of their work has been with power below this figure.

Yet civilian girl pilots are accepted for training with 25 hours. Upon completing a 6½-month flight training course paid for by the Army and taught by a civilian contract flight school, the WASPS are graduated with about 210 hours' instruction, plus the original 35 hours that made them eligible. These graduates are then given assignments denied men pilots with thousands of hours' flying time and years of experience.

The statement that all men pilots will be sent out of the country to fly and therefore necessitate use of women pilots to replace them is sound logic as far as it goes, airmen say. But those thousands of civilian men pilots who are ineligible for the A. T. C. are also ineligible for combat. Thus the argument of replacing all civilian pilots with women appears illogical.

One major example of inefficiency is in transitional training after the WASP has been graduated from her 6½ months' course by the civilian flight school. This transitional flying involves about 100 hours' training on heavy four-motored bomber equipment or high speed fighter aircraft. Thus the girls are given an additional 100 hours of flight training by regular A. A. F. pilot instructors, and each hour that the girl pilot receives this training from an Army pilot in Army planes she is taking the place of a combat pilot. Why not utilize more Army men pilots?

In addition to using the present backlog of civilian pilots, the Army might well assign 2 or 3 months of cross-country ferry flying within the United States to its young men pilot graduates. They could thus polish off their navigational cross-country techniques and at the same time deliver aircraft to domestic ferry points.

Furthermore, Army flyers returning from combat areas could ferry planes in the interval before their reassignment, keeping their flight techniques sharp without combat strain. Large numbers of these men are being made available for domestic ferry operations in the United States.

The evidence so far indicates someone has blundered. The costly and impractical WASP program deserves close scrutiny.

[From Aero Digest Magazine for May 1944]

As had been predicted by all who knew the inside story involved, those who tried to engineer a fast play for training additional WASPS—Women Airforce Service Pilots—while thousands of experienced men pilots are clamoring for work, have been caught off base.

A House civil-service investigating committee may soon light a fire under the Army Air Forces for spending millions on the WASPS under such circumstances, and for attempting to legitimatize and expand the organization by making it a regular part of the Army. The committee has not finished its investigation, but there are signs that it does not think too highly of what it is finding.

In discussing the situation Chairman RAMSPECK (Democrat), Georgia, of the House Civil Service Committee, has emphasized that he is not objecting to the WASPS because they are women. He simply thinks that it is wasteful to continue to train these women at what critics say is a cost of $6,540 per trainee, in view of the fact that there are already plenty of competent men flyers available for the various types of ferrying work—including the towing of targets.

Meanwhile, the House Military Affairs Committee which rushed through the Costello bill, making the WASPS a full-fledged military outfit, has been receiving plenty of protests over the nonemployment of qualified men flyers. The Costello bill has not yet reached the floor, and there appears to be some chance that it will be recalled for further hearings. At any rate, committee members in a more chastened mood are preparing an amendment for subsequent adoption either on the floor or during a possible redrafting of the Costello bill. This amendment would provide for the commissioning in the A. A. F. of all trainees under the C. A. A.'s war-training program who can meet the required standards.

Vegetable Oils Versus Animal Fats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for many years the oleo

interests have been trying to convince the public that oleo, a vegetable oil, is equal to the animal fat in butter. They have been particularly vociferous since 1938, when vitamin A was added to part of the national production of oleo. In fact, the oleo interests said that oleo was equal to butter before they even started to inject vitamin A into the concoction.

In the past 2 years the oleo interests have worked up a certain amount of public sentiment in favor of removing the one-quarter cent per pound Federal tax on uncolored oleo, the 10-cent tax on colored oleo, and the wholesaler and retailer tax.

It happens that vegetable oils are being subsidized twice as much as the Federal tax. This is shown by the following official table which shows only the direct subsidy paid to the vegetable oil refiners:

Commodity Credit Corporation vegetable oil program, Oct. 1, 1942, through Mar. 31, 1944

Refiner contracts (1942 crop)	Oct. 1, 1942, through Dec. 31, 1942		Jan. 1, 1943, through Dec. 31, 1943		Jan. 1, 1944, through Mar. 31, 1944		Total through Mar. 31, 1944	
	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
Cottonseed oil	475,127,686	2,375,638.41	865,294,472	4,326,473.23			1,340,422,158	6,702,111.64
Peanut oil	18,114,474	90,572.37	99,979,122	499,895.62			118,093,596	590,467.99
Soybean oil	112,186,209	560,931.09	973,122,379	4,865,611.90	1,071,502	5,357.51	1,086,380,090	5,431,900.50
Total	605,428,369	3,027,141.87	1,938,395,973	9,691,980.75	1,071,502	5,357.51	2,544,895,844	12,724,480.13

You will note that 2,554,895,844 pounds of vegetable oil were subsidized through the refineries by $12,724,480.13 or about one-half cent per pound. Additional sums are spent on the subsidy oil program in addition to the refiner subsidies as the over-all expenses and the producer subsidy to the crop must also be considered.

The following official table shows the receipts of the Bureau of Internal Revenue from oleo taxes from 1934 to 1943:

Receipts of internal revenue—Oleomargarine—Fiscal years 1934–43

Year	Commodity taxes		Special taxes			Special taxes—Retail dealers		Total from oleomargarine taxes
			Manufacturers	Wholesale dealers				
	Colored, per pound, 10 cents	Uncolored, per pound, ¼ cent	$600 per annum	Colored oleomargarine, $480 per annum	Uncolored oleomargarine, $200 per annum	Colored oleomargarine, $48 per annum	Uncolored oleomargarine, $6 per annum	
1934	$44,871.50	$603,398.25	$28,104.00	$10,097.95	$197,772.14	$4,757.80	$587,218.68	$1,476,230.32
1935	84,800.77	898,121.82	27,051.96	10,283.81	209,194.90	5,176.63	814,346.61	2,048,976.50
1936	56,307.20	915,641.03	24,507.50	7,850.89	248,601.69	2,370.37	948,475.68	2,203,804.01
1937	67,951.01	967,618.86	27,388.95	3,303.09	272,362.14	3,236.70	1,006,537.69	2,348,415.24
1938	65,450.35	1,033,045.37	24,888.15	2,137.17	315,509.50	3,812.66	1,021,082.43	2,465,925.63
1939	38,657.40	822,417.67	28,238.68	3,618.75	302,054.79	1,711.60	1,013,687.16	2,210,386.05
1940	30,758.77	759,463.51	24,681.21	5,441.82	283,425.41	1,315.00	908,514.31	2,013,600.03
1941	49,762.38	859,755.25	26,253.56	2,395.30	284,203.45	3,220.16	905,032.62	2,121,712.72
1942	87,106.73	888,755.49	28,315.89	1,233.49	267,721.30	1,670.30	969,448.86	2,244,252.06
1943	237,569.47	1,088,155.57	31,959.23	3,852.00	287,322.61	6,918.11	964,866.81	2,620,643.80
Total	763,235.58	8,827,372.82	271,389.13	50,214.27	2,668,257.93	34,189.33	9,139,210.85	21,753,946.36

In fact, on the basis of peanut oil, the subsidy would be several cents per pound if the governmental peanut monopoly did not show a profit on the peanuts diverted to the edible trade. This is shown in the following letter:

MAY 23, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REID: This is in reply to your letter of May 2 with reference to the cost of subsidies on soybean, peanut, and cottonseed oils.

Enclosed is a tabulation showing by calendar years to March 31, 1944, the actual number of pounds and cost of the subsidy for each oil on which a subsidy was paid from October 1, 1942, through March 31, 1944. This program applied only to oils produced from oilseeds of the 1942 crop. No subsidy payments are being made on soybean, cottonseed, or peanut oils from the 1943 crop. We should point out that the enclosed tabulation covers only the payments made on these vegetable oils as such. We have also had producer subsidies on soybeans of both the 1942 and 1943 crops.

The 1942 crop soybean program will show a total cost of approximately $5,670,000. The cost of our 1943 crop soybean program is estimated to come to approximately $12,000,000.

Under our 1943 peanut program we shall sell about 700,000 tons of peanuts to the edible trade. In order to stimulate the use of peanuts in the manufacture of peanut butter, peanuts are sold at lower prices for such use than for other edible purposes. It is estimated that this peanut butter program will cost approximately $14,000,000. On the sale of peanuts for other edible purposes it is estimated that there will be a profit of approximately $18,000,000, or a net gain on peanuts for edible use of $4,000,000. About 200,000 tons of peanuts will be crushed for oil and meal at a loss of approximately $11,000,000. The net loss of the entire 1943 peanut program will, therefore, be about $7,000,000. The administrative cost of this program will be very close to $500,000. The over-all net loss will, therefore, be about $7,500,000.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

The oleo interests are ever ready in their efforts to put through oleo legislation. They even tried to enact oleo legislation on the basis of the war but did not have much of a case when it was disclosed that all the oleo was being made that could be made from the oil allocated to the oleo industry by W. P. B.

There is one more fact in connection with the oleo situation which is difficult to understand. The same States which seem to support oleo legislation and have tried to emphasize its greatness have arranged it so that these States get a 50–60 percent greater Federal subsidy on milk per hundredweight they produce than is paid by the Federal Government in the areas which appreciate the food value of this great product. It would appear, if they wish to be logical, that they would use filled milk and not insist upon a subsidy 50–60 percent greater than is paid in the real-dairy sections of our Nation.

The nonagri groups that send emissaries to Washington to appear before congressional committees extol the value of oleo and depreciate the value of butter are not deceiving as many people as they may think they are deceiving. Their testimony wherein they say that butter should be 25 cents a pound and that the farmer would still make 12 cents per pound on it is so ridiculously in error that no further comment is needed.

The dairy industry should think in terms of the industry and not in terms of the various products made from milk. In the past as much as 40 percent of the national butterfat production has been made into butter. Butter has been the real foundation of the dairy business. If the diary interests do not unite as an industry and protect itself from inferior substitutes like oleo versus butter; as filled milk versus normal evaporated and natural milk; as high moisture low fat content cheese versus the normal fat and moisture cheese, we can expect to see great damage done to the dairy industry. The fluid milk market man should be as interested in protecting the butter industry as the butter industry itself, because the whole industry is based on the milk as produced. There is not much in a hundred pounds of milk that is not to be found in 10 pounds of cheese; 50 cans of evaporated milk; or in 5 pounds of butter plus 8 pounds of powdered skim milk. The sooner the industry recognizes this fact the sooner the industry will be in a position to fight the interests that are undermining the dairy industry. For example, the appearance of a fluid milk producer before the Agriculture Committee endorsing oleo. This procedure will ultimately harm the dairy industry as a whole and should not be followed.

On the Road Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, back in 1942, when, from the well of the House I bitterly denounced Federal Union, Inc., and World Fellowship, Inc., which advocated the repudiation of our Declaration of Independence, the hauling down of our flag, the surrender of our sovereignty, and the formation of a United States of the World, a campaign of vilification was started and ever since has been continued by New Deal, pink, red, and the Marshall Field press against all those who insisted that, while cooperating with foreign nations, we should at all times, in all things, first give consideration to America's interests. Members of America First were falsely accused of being pro-Nazi.

Isolationists or nationalists, whichever you prefer, who hated war; who opposed war; who did not wish to see the United States become involved in a foreign war, were labeled as disloyal, unpatriotic. But this past week saw President Roosevelt announcing that, in our dealings with foreign nations, no part of our sovereignty should be surrendered. That was an adoption of the Republican declaration of foreign policy made last September at the Mackinac Conference.

We know that Earl Browder, the Communist who was released from jail by President Roosevelt before the expiration of his term, recently officially buried the Communist Party, but resurrected in its stead the same old group, with the same objectives, under the name of the Communist Political Association, and both are now all-out for a fourth term for Roosevelt.

So we know where the Communists stand—back of Roosevelt—and their purpose is the same as always—the establishment of communistic doctrine. We also know that Roosevelt is accepting that support, although in his 1936 campaign he said:

> I have not sought, I do not seek, I repudiate the support of any advocate of communism. That is my position. It always has been my position. It always will be my position.

Today he accepts that support, which comes under the banner of the Communist Political Association.

It will be interesting to note whether the Marshall Field press, PM and the Chicago Sun, and the Luce publications and the New Republic, now that Roosevelt has declared for the preservation of our sovereignty, will continue to abuse his fellow isolationists. Or will they take the position that, inasmuch as Roosevelt has now declared that no part of our sovereignty shall be surrendered in our negotiations with foreign nations, we may be permitted to follow the example of Stalin and of Churchill, who unwaveringly have always insisted that the interests of their respective countries be given first consideration?

As Churchill is a British firster, Stalin is a Russia firster; as they think, speak, and act for their respective countries, can we not once more, without fear of a campaign of false charges, be permitted to think, speak, and act first for our own country, for the men and women who are fighting in this World War and of their safety and their speedy return to their own homes when victory has been won? Can we not insist that, when this war is over, our boys be brought home instead of remaining abroad to police the world?

It matters not at all whether the politically astute Mr. Roosevelt, seeking a fourth term, was induced to make this declaration by the election returns from Wisconsin and Illinois and the thought that, by so doing, he would secure the support of the Midwest at the coming election. Nor should we concern ourselves overmuch with whether he really meant what he said, or whether this statement, like so many of his other statements—as, for example, his unequivocal promise that our boys should never be sent to fight on foreign soil—was merely campaign oratory.

The important thing is that he should have at least reached the conclusion that, after all has been said, this country, its institutions and its servicemen, are first in the hearts of our people; that the overwhelming majority are determined that our republican, constitutional form of government shall not be destroyed by international power politicians seeking the advancement of their own national interests.

Thank God that at last there comes from the President an acknowledgment that, in our cooperation and collaboration with other countries, our sovereignty will not be surrendered. Let us hope that he means it and that his statement is not just another political campaign promise.

U. N. R. R. A. Needs Money Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 2, 1944:

U. N. R. R. A. NEEDS MONEY NOW

The United States appropriation for U. N. R. R. A.—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—for the coming year still waits final action in Congress. The President asked for a total of $800,000,000, to be expended up to June 30, 1945—$450,000,000 in cash and authority to allocate $350,000,000 as lend-lease. Congress has not yet made these sums available. In the meantime 500,000,000 people in 30 Axis-occupied countries, according to estimates of Deputy Director General Roy F. Hendrickson, of U. N. R. R. A., will need relief as fast as United Nations troops set them free. We are not asked to shoulder the whole burden. We are asked, and have agreed, to carry the larger part because of our proportionately large resources.

We don't know how soon U. N. R. R. A. will have to meet major demands. The signs are that it will have work to do in western Europe and in the Balkans before the summer is over. But it cannot improvise the needed supplies. To give concrete instances, clothing, repair materials for water and sewerage systems, farming supplies, food processing equipment, all take a long time to make, assemble, and transport. U. N. R. R. A. can't start till it has money in the bank. Nor can it, without funds, take advantage of seasonal supplies of food or military surpluses. It will not be a going concern until it has money in its pocket.

There is no majority opposition in Congress, for the U. N. R. R. A. resolution passed the House by about 6 to 1 and the Senate by about 3 to 1 last winter. But haste is needed. Congress should appropriate the money at once. Such an action would say again to all concerned that the United States is willing to spend a few million dollars to save Axis victims as well as many billions to smash the oppressors.

WASPS May Oust 5,000 Instructors of Army Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of May 21, 1944:

WASPS MAY OUST 5,000 INSTRUCTORS OF ARMY PILOTS

Some 5,000 highly skilled instructors in the Army pilot-training program will be discarded in favor of women with 35 hours in the air unless Congress comes to their rescue.

The fantastic story of the run-around given to the flying teachers of America's aces by the War Department was unfolded yesterday by Representative MORRISON (Democrat) of Louisiana.

REPRESENTATIVE MORRISON WILL TELL

MORRISON declared that he will tell the full story this week of how the House Military Committee was high-pressured into reporting the Costello bill commissioning members of the WASPS on the plea of a manpower shortage.

The Brooks bill, designed to make some use of the hundreds and thousands of hours of flight experience of the topnotch instructors, will be offered as an amendment to the Costello bill, MORRISON said.

Under a strange parliamentary situation MORRISON said the Brooks bill has become the "tail" that is wagging the Costello bill "dog." He expressed doubt about the passage of the WASPS commissioning bill, despite the interest of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, without the bolstering support of the Brooks bill.

SUPPORT FOR BROOKS BILL

MORRISON declared that support for the Brooks bill has grown rapidly since the story of the injustice to the Army pilot-training veterans has spread on Capitol Hill.

The Brooks bill could not even get a hearing before the House Military Committee. Yet the Costello bill, in which Mrs. Roosevelt had

enlisted the support of Lt. Gen. Henry H. (Hap) Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Force, got the green light after a 30-minute session, MORRISON said.

MORRISON declared that General Arnold was in the "fix" of Br'er Rabbit of the Uncle Remus stories—he just had to climb the tree. He explained that Arnold had started the WASPS' program without any specific authority from Congress on the expectation that authority would be forthcoming since Congress had never turned down any of his requests.

SAME PRIVILEGES AS MEN

MORRISON cited the report on the Costello bill by Chairman MAY as the strongest argument that could be made in behalf of commissioning the instructors in the Army pilot-training program. The May report, arguing in favor of giving the WASPS "the same rights, privileges, and benefits as male members of the Army of the United States with the same grade and length of service," states:

"There is no controversy over the fact that there exists in this country an acute shortage of manpower necessary for the armed forces and essential industry. This shortage requires every economy in the use of available manpower and the substitution of women wherever possible, both in industry and in the armed forces, thereby releasing men for combat military service."

"The only difference," said MORRISON, "is that the male instructors, who are highly trained and available would be tossed into the ash can if the Army had its way, to make room for women whose hours in the air do not even approach the number held by the men."

Lend-Lease for Comrades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two editorials from the Christian Science Monitor of May 23, 1944, and the Boston Herald of May 24, 1944:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 23, 1944]

LEND-LEASE FOR COMRADES

The American soldier who finds himself fighting beside a Briton perhaps, or a Frenchman, in the invasion of Europe will be glad to note that his comrade has as good equipment as his own. A well-armed comrade looks like a walking life-insurance policy at a moment like that. Some of that comrade's equipment may be lend-lease equipment.

As President Roosevelt's letter accompanying the fifteenth lend-lease report has underlined, this great venture is no longer simply a means of providing other nations with the matériel to save themselves from a rapacious enemy. It is now a method of making sure that the "combined operations" of many allied forces are carried out with a maximum of striking power and a minimum of weak links.

There may even be some lend-lease weapons in the hands of the various undergrounds. Certainly when the enslaved peoples rise we shall want them to be as effective allies as we can make them.

Fourteen cents of each war dollar is all that has gone into lend-lease. It is not too much to have paid for the assurance that Britain and Russia would be in the fight to the end. It is not too much to have paid for the destruction of Nazi resources which these allies have accomplished with lend-lease equipment.

When this war is over it will be possible to figure a certain ratio between the cost of victory as stated in goods expended and as stated in lives expended. The cost in American lives will be lower because 14 percent of American supplies needed to win the war were used by men and women of other nations.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of May 24, 1944]

LEND-LEASE, AGED 3

Just a year before Pearl Harbor President Roosevelt left on a Caribbean cruise and worked out the broad aims of a radical new step in interally relationship. The day after his return, on December 17, 1940, he broke on a startled Nation the conception of lend-lease. He filled in some further details in a fireside chat on December 31, and a week later the plan was incorporated in his message to Congress.

On January 10, 1941, the historic bill, H. R. 1776, was introduced. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, by a vote of 17 to 8, sent it to the floor, where it was adopted February 8 by 260 to 165. The Senate discussed it from February 17, when the Foreign Relations Committee reported it by 15 to 8, until March 8, when it was passed 60 to 31. The House acceded to minor amendments on March 11, and it was signed that day.

From the time that the proposal was first advanced to the people until it became law was thus a period of 84 days. There was unlimited debate in and out of Congress, yet the American democracy moved with remarkable speed, all the more notable because we were not then at war and a large section of the population did not believe we ever should be. While still nonbelligerent and hoping to stay so, we agreed to turn over to our unofficial allies unlimited material and services without the slightest quibble over payment.

The President has now made a report on lend-lease through March 31 of 1944, showing that we have supplied aid totaling $24,224,806,000 to the various nations whose defense he has deemed vital to the defense of the United States. Into the vast pool of anti-Axis guns and planes and ships and information and men's blood and lives, we have poured this share of victory. Some time the accounts will have to be cast up, and our contribution measured against Russia's dead, China's exhaustion, and England's suffering. It will not be easy. "There is no way by which a statistical balance sheet can be drawn up," the President notes. But the twenty-five billions has been well spent and the Nation's 84-day judgment well justified.

Funds for U. N. R. R. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 2, 1944:

FUNDS FOR U. N. R. R. A.

The first concrete test of our readiness to collaborate with our allies in meeting post-war problems is now at hand. The mechanism which has been established for this collaboration is the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Although Congress has authorized an American contribution of $1,300,000,000 to this agency, it has not yet actually appropriated any portion of this sum. The initial appropriation of $800,000,000 requested by President Roosevelt seems far from excessive in view of the gigantic needs which will confront U. N. R. R. A. when the liberating armies of the Allies have cleared the road for its healing efforts.

U. N. R. R. A. must undertake the tremendous task of reconstituting the civilian economy of Europe so that our invasion will be, in truth, a liberation and so that the liberated peoples can once more be self-sustaining. Millions of displaced human beings must be fed, clothed, sheltered, and transported back to their homes. The spread of disease must be checked and controlled by adequate medical measures. Farm and factory equipment must be furnished for areas systematically devastated by the retreating Germans. As Allied armies have occupied industrial towns in Italy, they have found the factories in ruins—not a machine in working order, no power, light, gas, or trains. In rural regions, the very basis of the farmer's livelihood, his tools and livestock as well as his crops, have been stolen or destroyed. U. N. R. R. A. must help the people of Europe to help themselves.

There is no time to be lost in getting to work on this job. The preliminaries cannot be left until U. N. R. R. A. is actually installed in a liberated area. Clothing and shoes take at least 6 months to procure; if they are not on hand when U. N. R. R. A. is called upon to take charge, thousands of lives may needlessly be lost through exposure. Farm implements and food-processing equipment must be ordered and assembled long in advance; if they are not available when needed, a whole year's produce may be lost. Repair materials for water and sewage and power systems cannot be improvised; delay in making such repairs may spread disease and seriously affect the safety even of our own troops. If this liberation is not linked with resuscitation, its whole significance for the future may be destroyed.

The eyes of Europe's millions are focused upon us. If we prune and haggle now over what we are to give in the way of relief, their faith in us will ebb. And that faith is a part of our fighting strength. It is one of the foundations of the world's future. Twenty-five nations have already made their contributions to U. N. R. R. A. They are waiting for the contribution of the wealthiest and greatest nation of the earth. We must not default.

The Future of American Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed to include with my remarks herewith a recent speech delivered by Mr. Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, entitled "The Future of American Capitalism."

In my judgment the things Mr. Berge has to say in this speech should be carefully digested by every Member of Congress and should be a guide to our action

if we are really interested in the preservation of truly free enterprise in our country.

The speech follows:

America's industrial future will be determined largely by the type of measures which we adopt in the post-war period to achieve an expanding economy. Accomplishment will depend upon general understanding of our objective, and a clear grasp of the means necessary to make a capitalistic economy function successfully in the modern world. Attainment of lasting prosperity without drastic alteration of our way of life cannot be expected unless we have a firm conception of the capitalistic principles on which our economy is based.

American capitalism today faces a challenge. The American people are fighting in this war not only to preserve their own freedom; they are also fighting for a future in which there must be full employment, full production, and the assurance that all people shall have opportunity to build for themselves and their children a more abundant society.

Other systems have been held forth as a better way of life. It is claimed that a managed economy would offer stability and security. We may ask at what price. It can only be answered that a managed economy would ultimately be forced to deny businessmen the right to invest according to their own best judgment. It would have to direct businessmen what goods or service to produce, what quantity they should market, and what price they should charge. It would force labor to be tied to its status in a particular job. No Thomas Edison or Andrew Higgins or Henry Kaiser would emerge.

We have seen what has happened in other quarters of the world. Let us not delude ourselves. If American capitalism in the post-war world is prevented from fulfilling its promise of full production and full employment, the danger that we shall have a rigidly controlled economic life forced upon us will become very real.

What is capitalism? Capitalism is the theory and práctice of competitive production in a free market. The right to enter an occupation or to start a business, to invent and develop new products and new devices is the heart of economic democracy, and the essence of capitalism. When the arteries of enterprise are constricted by monopoly, private enterprise cannot function, and the entire economy falls victim to a series of maladjustments that cannot be solved short of vigorous Government control. Over an extended period this control is inconsistent with the maintenance of what we think of as capitalism.

Capitalism is a system of reward for enterprise and a promise of return for risk. It is a system of profit, but it is also a system of loss. Those who enjoy the opportunity for gain are expected to assume their rightful responsibility; in other words to take a chance, and to accept the occasional penalty of loss in the spirit of enterprise. Capitalism means equal opportunity and the guarantee that none shall be barred from the market place.

Monopoly is the greatest threat to the survival of true capitalism. For this reason it is important to affirm that capitalism does not mean—in fact, it rejects—the right of private monopoly to stifle enterprise. Vested monopoly interests must not bar the emergence of new businesses. It is not, in fact, consistent with the maintenance of a capitalistic system for either Government or private monopoly to prevent the development of new industries in order to protect the old. Nor will our system work if we permit combinations to dominate the market, to fix prices, or to restrict production. Basing-point systems, restrictive patent pools, closed-market agreements, cartel agreements which cut off free trade among nations, tariffs which cater to special privilege, feather-bedding rules by labor unions—all of these are anticapitalistic devices. They represent the most serious threat to a free capitalist economy. No other system for organizing production places such a premium on flexibility or provides such stimulus to the introduction of new ideas, new industries, new goods, and services. No other system offers such incentives to efficiency or emphasizes so completely the concept of service to the public.

The scope and magnitude of America's achievement in war production is an unmistakable index of our capacity for growth. The tremendous energy and determination which inspired and made possible the fulfillment of our war needs are equally available for the tasks of peace. It is the joint problem of government, industry, and labor to unleash the incentives and to keep clearly in sight the goals which will maintain the levels of employment and production attained during war. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that this Nation can surpass in time of peace its accomplishments under the pressure of grim necessity.

In the United States the choice we make between economic philosophies may well decide the future of democracy. If we extend governmental planning to all branches of economic life, or if we permit private planning to freeze the pattern of industrial concentration and control, we shall surrender the chance to attain economic democracy. Once economic freedom has been eliminated, there is no turning back, and democracy itself becomes a shadow without substance.

We stand on the threshold of some of the greater technical and scientific developments of modern history. Light metals, plastics, vitamins, television, new chemical and electrical techniques are all in their infancy. Air transport, housing developments, and the improvement of national health will provide an insistent demand for the output of these new materials. The slums of country and of city alike can become an unpleasant memory if new materials for housing are made available in a competitive market. The most provincial area can possess the advantages of the great metropolis through radio, television, and electric power.

This future will not be won without effort. If scientific development and economic progress is nullified by a system of cartels and moncpolies or by rigid Government control, we shall delay and may lose the opportunities which will be opened to us at the end of the war. If discovery is to be translated into a more abundant life, the way to enterprise must be guarded as we guard our civil liberties.

How does it come about that business, or Government, or labor in a supposedly free economy becomes afraid of change, fearful of any alteration of the status quo? To some extent, short-sightedness, a trait common to all of us, is responsible. Fundamentally, however, it is the all-too-human desire to escape the risks of enterprise without giving up its rewards. It is the quest for relief from the trials and dangers of competition. But thus to limit and hedge around the right to enterprise affords only a deceptive security, an illusory safety. The periodic depressions and the social shortcomings which critics emphasize as the inevitable products of capitalism are not at all inevitable. They are the result not of the system but of its abuses. They are the consequences of attempts to escape the responsibilities which freedom of enterprise imposes.

If we examine closely the instruments of capitalism, we find that they are designed primarily to initiate experimentation, to spur efficiency, and to promote progress. They are not designed to entrench vested interest, to stabilize control of the market, or to safeguard the status quo. Like every other instrument or institution, they can be abused, as they have been abused, to defeat the purposes for which they were intended.

Thus the modern corporation in its origin was intended to facilitate enterprise by dividing risks, limiting liability, and encouraging the introduction of new capital into the market. As an instrument, the corporation may be used or misused. In its proper orbit, the corporation has served this country well. Too often, however, the corporation has been diverted from its original purpose, and as a consequence we have witnessed in recent years the increasing concentration of ownership and control of vast sectors of industry through the corporate device.

Similarly, the patent system was designed to promote progress, to encourage invention, and to protect and reward the inventor. Yet through patent pools and cartel agreements we have seen the stifling of research, the delay of new industries, and the suppression of the small inventor and businessman. It is not enough to say that such abuses are illegal and should be penalized. Business itself should aid in the elimination of these abuses.

The price system is the keystone of a competitive market. It is upon the free and flexible adjustment of prices that the effective operation of an enterprise economy primarily depends. Here again the frequency and the extent of abuse, the degree to which many prices and price levels are fixed or administered by monopoly, create an almost insurmountable obstacle to the working of a free market. It is basic to the concept of a free economy that there shall be no domination of the market regardless of the means by which such domination is achieved. In this respect, there is no question that the growth of moncpoly and the acceptance of restrictive practices have jeopardized the foundations of our economic way of life.

American capitalism must, if it is to go forward in the post-war world, meet with resolute courage, initiative, and resourcefulness the changed conditions with which it will be faced. In the early years of this country, American enterprise accepted the challenge of undeveloped resources and created the strongest productive system of any country in the world. The mainspring of the growth of the American economy was freedom of enterprise. America was in the vanguard of the movement to release industry from the shackles of feudalism. Men did not need permission from the Crown or from a paternalistic government to move from one corner of the nation to another, or to enter one trade or another. Products, too, could be bought and sold wherever there was the most advantage. Coal mined in Pennsylvania could be transported to any point in the country where it could compete in quality and price with the output of local mines. The oil of Texas could furnish power, light, and lubricants to the industry of the East. It was a cardinal tenet of American capitalism that there must be no obstacles erected to the movement of trade within our borders. Industry grew with the national market, and the wealth of our Nation increased correspondingly. No governmental agencies determined the production and allocation of goods. No permission was required to risk one's capital. America overcame the threats of sectionalism and as a consequence developed into a united economy and a united country.

At the end of the present war, American capitalism will face the greatest opportunity as well as some of the greatest difficulties which it has had to encounter in its history.

What are the conditions which capitalism will find at the war's end? The conclusion of the war will find an enormous productive

plant. The enlarged capacity to make thousands of products, such as aluminum, magnesium, plastics synthetic rubber, steel, medicines, airplanes, electrical equipment, now staggers the imagination. Hitherto backward areas have now become industrialized. Opportunities inherent in the rebuilding of a war-torn world will beckon to our businessmen.

But we will also emerge from the war with a national debt unprecedented in history, bringing with it a tremendous problem of taxation. Small businessmen will find themselves with inadequate financial reserves to cope with their post-war difficulties. There will be reluctance on the part of certain groups seeking special privilege to abandon the practices of a controlled economy once the need has disappeared. There is a possibility that certain portions of the world will remain under the influence of cartel groups posing problems for American businessmen anxious for world trade. It may be too much to expect a world free from the obstructive influence of tariffs.

What can be done to keep our economy from following the twin mirages of self-governing monopoly and Government control of business? Considered as a question of policy and as a program, certain principles emerge from the confusion which surrounds our current economic thinking. It seems to me that we should move in the following directions:

1. The present controls of Government which have regimented and welded us into a wartime economy must be removed as soon as possible after the peace. To delay beyond the period of necessity is to invite their perpetuation.

The American people are well aware of the danger represented by a cartelized economy in which monopoly and power-hungry groups seek to control economic and political life on a basis of privilege. The experience of Germany in recent decades demonstrates all too clearly the vicious results of a union between cartels and paternalistic government. The keynote of a monopolized economy and a feudalistic political regime becomes suppression. No competition is permitted. Those who exercise their initiative are considered bootleggers, chiselers, and, finally, become outlaws. Once competition is eliminated, there is only a short step to the suppression of free speech and the right to criticize. A society so constituted can endure only by a reign of force. The Nazis achieved power by terrorism and could maintain themselves in power only by military aggression.

It is in the post-war world that American capitalism—in fact, democracy itself—will meet its most serious challenge. To win this war we have had to suspend many of our fundamental economic liberties. We must make sure that they are merely suspended, not lost; otherwise the dead hand of priority, allocation, and price control will reach beyond the peace. To remove its grip will require the combined strength of Government, business, and the public. If it is not broken, paternalism will follow. Paternalism of any brand, be it public or private, would in turn give us a rigid economy, which in time would crack wide open under the stress of social change. Like the monopolist, the bureaucrat cannot afford to take risks. Both must play safe, which, economically, leads to stagnation.

It is recognized, of course, that some controls during the transitional period are necessary. In general, it seems that necessity continues only as long as there are vital shortages and only in the fields where shortage exists. When scarce materials cease to be scarce, there would seem, as a general rule, to be no further need for transitional controls.

2. The new technology developed by this war must be made available to peacetime industry. A free technology is a key to progress. Inventions developed by public funds in this war must not become the private preserves of monopoly groups. The results of this research must be made available to returning servicemen and to youth generally, so that free enterprise can be more than a pious hope to them. If necessary, the Government should develop its own industrial research facilities, as it has done so extensively and so fruitfully for agriculture, and make the results available to all, including small and large businessmen.

3. Plants constructed in wartime must not be ploughed under in peacetime. The large productive capacities which we have created must be utilized to advance our standard of living and maintain our national income. This will be absolutely necessary if we are to maintain a national income which can carry a national-debt load of from two to three hundred billion dollars, if we are to find jobs for the returning servicemen, and if unemployment and sectional dislocation is to be avoided in the transition from war to peace. The small businessman must receive primary consideration in the disposition of Government plants and surplus war materials.

4. Credit must be made available to small business. Small business unavoidably has found the going rough during this war. The post-war period will find it without the reserves available to larger units. Since small business is in many respects the most vital part of our economy, we must see that credit is made available to it on liberal terms.

5. Taxation incentives should be given for the launching of new enterprises and fo the expansion of existing plants. Taxation must not discourage venture capital and productive investment. We must recognize that a steady stream of new investment is necessary to an expanding economy.

6. Internal trade barriers among the States and between sections must be removed. The discriminatory freight rates which have burdened the South and the West and hampered their development, must be eliminated, as must other restrictive transportation practices, and also certain State legislation which thwarts the policy of Congress in fostering the freest passage of goods in interstate commerce.

7. International trade should be encouraged. The reciprocal trade-agreements policy of our Government should be promoted. Tariff barriers should be lowered or removed wherever possible. Cartels, which are in effect privately erected tariff barriers, are illegal, and must be completely abolished. World-wide trade will not only make people in every corner of the earth richer, but will give the people everywhere a vested interest in maintaining peace.

8. Patents must be made to promote the advance of science and the useful arts. We cannot tolerate the use of patents to block off and fence in whole sectors of our technology. At the same time patent protection must remain as an incentive to the individual inventor and the businessman. The patent system should remain, but its abuses should be uprooted. Research developed in Germany for the purpose of making war on us should be made available for general use by the people of the United States.

9. Labor must have the right to collective bargaining. In its own interest it should not attempt to prevent the development and introduction of new inventions and techniques or to join with industrial groups to fix prices and production quotas. In the long run, labor is the principal beneficiary of technological progress because as its productivity increases its standard of living rises. Social-security and unemployment-insurance programs, if wisely conceived and administered, are not only consistent with capitalism but will promote and assist its successful functioning. They should be encouraged.

10. The Government should properly develop public works and projects of the T. V. A. variety, not only as emergency measures, but to provide additional opportunities for free private enterprise. The T V. A. has opened up an entire region for industrial investment and development. Business ventures of every type are now flourishing in that area. The continuation of the policy represented by T. V. A. and similar long-range public works projects offers constructive support by Government to private initiative and full employment.

Finally, there should be vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. It is equally to the interest of the buisinessman, the worker, and the consumer to see that these acts are applied, no matter what political party is in power. This series of acts reflect the free enterprise spirit of America. This support should be more than lip service. In its own interests, business should insist on the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The foregoing is not presented as a complete or exclusive program for preserving the essentials of economic freedom, but I think it represents some of the principal aspects on which we should concentrate. If we fail in such a program, then inevitably Government direction of all major phases of economic life will become the order of the day. Much as we dislike it, there is no apparent alternative to permanent government control if private enterprise fails.

What I have heretofore said is not directed against necessary Government action in times of crisis. We have all seen instances of necessary Government intervention during emergencies such as the depression a decade ago. Such intervention, of course, is inevitable and appropriate if capitalism fails to meet its responsibilities. People cannot be allowed to starve or go homeless. But the crises that call for drastic Government intervention can be avoided in most cases if we will cultivate the policies that make for the broadest measure of economic freedom. Private enterprise should not fail if it really is given a chance.

What might seem strange is the fact that the pressure for continued Government control after the war will come from monopolistic business itself. And yet it is not so hard to understand. The monopolist wants an ordered and a secured market. He wants to know with certainty the amount of goods he can sell, where he can sell it, and the price. He wants to know that he will be protected against the competition of new processes and new enterprises. In other words, he wants to be protected against risk. Much of this protection he seeks to acquire through private agreements; but to the extent that he can get government to rationalize and guarantee his position, the monopolist feels that he is additionally secured. Many monopolists would prefer the protection of government to the perils of competition. They would prefer to take their chances on the outcome of conferences with Government officials, to what they might get in the rough and tumble of the free market place, where they would have to pit their strength against vigorous competition.

Hence, many of these monopolists today are urging what they call a continued partnership between Government and business after the war. What they really hope for is a policy that will result in Government approving and condoning monopolistic practices. But what they should know is that in the long run such a program will inevitably mean strict Government regimentation of all business—Government direction of business

in the minutest detail by a mammoth bureaucracy. And this will signalize the permanent disappearance of our economic and political freedom.

If we see to it that the rules of a free economy, which are also the rules of capitalism, are permitted to operate, the position of the United States in the world economy and the welfare of its people will most certainly exceed the performance of the past and justify the sacrifices of the present.

Farm Machinery Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, for months we have been arguing back and forth here in the House and elsewhere about the critical farm-machinery shortage, and all we have to show for it as far as I can see is pages of printing in the RECORD. I think it is high time we stopped talking and began investigating this situation carefully. The confusion surrounding the entire farm-machinery program, the charges and countercharges, and, most important of all, the acute shortage of farm implements make it imperative that action be taken to clear up this doubt and the maladjustment in farm machinery production schedules.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard charges here in the House that the Government is promoting a farm-machinery monopoly since the War Production Board division which sets up farm-machinery quotas is staffed by representatives of some of the largest implement companies, and that therefore allocation of farm-machinery quotas is dominated by the large firms.

The charge has been made that "a farm-machinery shortage so serious that War Food Administrator Marvin Jones has refused to bring it out into the open for fear of the consequences to President Roosevelt's fourth-term ambitions was threatening to become one of the major scandals of the war." Farm leaders are quoted as claiming that when farm-machinery quotas were being established last fall the big manufacturers, in an attempt to hold their competitive market positions, asked W. P. B. for larger quotas than they could fill, taking the business from the smaller manufacturers that could have produced the tools.

On the other hand, evidence has been submitted to the House by one of the large implement manufacturers showing that they are filling their quotas almost 100 percent. It is reported also that during the early part of the war period, the large manufacturers were cut almost entirely out of the implement program and only the smaller firms were given most of the quotas, but that this program was a failure and it was found necessary to give the large manufacturers more generous consideration in the establishment of quotas. We have heard that farm machinery production cannot fill our farmers' needs because the Army and Navy has need of the materials that go into such farm implements. If that be so, why is it that there are farm implements available for allocation to foreign countries when our own farmers so desperately need this equipment. Our foreign farm machinery commitments are another phase of our farm machinery problem which I believe could and should bear open investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, believe we have had enough debate here on this subject which is of such vital importance to the war effort and to the domestic welfare, and I am, therefore, asking that immediate action be taken on the following resolution which I have introduced in the House:

Whereas an acute shortage in farm implements exists in the agricultural sections of the United States; and

Whereas certain farm organizations contend that farm-implement production figures have been written in a misleading manner; and

Whereas it is represented that there has been a maladjustment in quotas and production schedules for farm implements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House Committee on Agriculture or any duly designated subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized and directed to immediately institute an investigation of the shortage of agricultural implements, incuding an inquiry into the quotas established therefor, the production schedules therefor, whether smaller companies can increase or could have increased production of implements of which there is now a shortage through a shift in quotas to them from large manufacturers, whether the best interests of the United States and its allies could best be served by providing for an immediate increase in production of implements of which there is a shortage, and by rescheduling for use in the United States certain implements now scheduled for shipments to foreign countries which the Allied armies now occupy or expect to occupy.

The House Committee on Agriculture or any subcommittee thereof acting under this resolution shall file its report with the House not later than 30 days after adoption of this resolution.

This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption by the House.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to say that the Louisiana delegation in Congress is in receipt of concurrent resolution from the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, which is now in session, and wherein we are memorialized to vote against any future appropriations for the Office of Price Administration unless Congress direct and fix higher ceiling prices on rough rice, strawberries, watermelons, livestock, milk and dairy products, cotton, and corn.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the industries and products mentioned in this concurrent resolution, there should have been included oil. Petroleum is one of the most important products of Louisiana and the rest of the United States, and while the Members of Congress have pleaded with the O. P. A., and all of the high officials who have to do with price fixing, the oil industry is about to be ruined, not only in the State of Louisiana, but all the other oil-producing States, and this in the face of the fact that oil is one of the most necessary products in the prosecution and winning of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the concurrent resolution of the legislature be included in these remarks. The resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Members of Congress from this State not to support any further appropriation to the Office of Price Administration, unless the Office of Price Administration fixes higher ceilings on rough rice and strawberries, watermelons, and all livestock, milk and dairy products, cotton, and corn

Whereas the farmers of the State of Louisiana are doing all within their power to assist in the prosecution of the war against our enemies, but that the producers of rice and strawberries are handicapped by the existing ceiling prices on rough rice and strawberries, watermelons, and all livestock, milk and dairy products, cotton, and corn: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana concurring), That this legislature do request and recommend to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the State of Louisiana that they vote against any further appropriation for the continuance of the Office of Price Administration, unless Congress direct and provide, as to such appropriation, that the Office of Price Administration fix higher ceiling prices on rough rice and strawberries, watermelons, and all livestock, milk and dairy products, cotton, and corn; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to forward official copies of this resolution to each Senator and Representative of the State of Louisiana in the Congress of the United States.

J. E. VERRET,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.
R. NORMAN BAUER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Our Dutiful Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

OUR DUTIFUL DEAD

On the thirtieth day of the mild month of May,
When the flowers abundantly bloom,
And the soft, sifting air is replete everywhere
With the sweetness of their rich perfume,
We, Americans, meet—where the shadows retreat—
Where the tears of remembrance are shed—
And, as tokens of love, lay fresh flowers above
The still graves of our dutiful dead.

Tho the Father Divine on us sends rain or shine—
Tho the skies above be foul or fair—
Tho the flowers we lay on their tombs fade away,
And the dead never know they were there—
The Creator on high, in the sweet bye-and-bye,
Will remember the prayers that we said,
As in sorrow and pride we knelt there by the side
Of the graves of our dutiful dead.

As the centuries roll toward their coveted goal—
Toward the eternal end of it all—
May this custom sublime grow sweeter with time,
Until death makes its great final call.
At the end of the way, God's Memorial Day
Will exterminate death, with its dread,
As, beyond the Great Dome, He calls lovingly home
From their graves all our dutiful dead.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

General Gellette, Believed Last Confederate Officer, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the address which we have heard today, I desire to announce the death of an outstanding figure in the cause of the Confederacy, Gen. O. R. Gellette, of Shreveport, La. General Gellette is believed to be the last remaining commissioned officer of the Confederacy, and his death marks the end of an historic era in America.

General Gellette lived a long and useful life. He was always active in causes for the upbuilding of his State and his community. It is more than significant that at the very moment this historic man passed into eternity, he was talking to World War veterans in the American Legion office, where he was much beloved and which he frequented.

General Gellette's son is a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States. He was a commissioned officer in the Confederate Armies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the newspaper account of the death be printed in the RECORD:

GENERAL GELLETTE, BELIEVED LAST CONFEDERATE OFFICER, DIES

SHREVEPORT, LA., June 2.—Gen. O. R. Gellette, 99, reputedly last surviving commissioned officer of the Confederate Army, who during his life refused to take the oath of allegiance to the United States because he considered the War between the States unfinished, died here yesterday.

Death came quietly as he sat in the American Legion service office of Caddo Parish courthouse. Heart disease was blamed.

Active to the end, General Gellette in his nineties danced, ate sirloin steaks, drank beer, and roared rebel sentiments. Enlisting as a private in the Second Mississippi Regiment April 30, 1861, he rose to become a brigadier general at conclusion of the war. He served on the staff of General Stonewall Jackson, and when Jackson was mortally wounded by a Confederate sentry at Chancellorsville, it was General Gellette who helped carry him away.

He was a native of Iuka, Miss., and fought in 14 major battles, including Gettysburg and Antietam, without suffering serious wounds before being captured by Federal troops in North Carolina in April 1865.

Besides his Confederate rank of brigadier general, he bore the honorary title of major general as past commander of the United Confederate Veterans in Louisiana.

What Is Tax Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter written by myself to the president of the National Tax Equality Association will, I am certain, speak for itself. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed with my remarks herewith:

MAY 29, 1944.

Mr. BEN C. MCCABE,
President National Tax Equality Association, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. MCCABE: Tax equalization which will help toward realization of the sound objective of making our tax system one where taxes will be levied in accordance with ability to pay and benefits received is a cause in which I believe all earnest people can serve with enthusiasm and earnestness.

In this connection I am prompted to write to you in response to some of the literature which I have seen coming from your organization and which to my surprise seems to me concerned almost entirely with what you refer to as "tax-exempt cooperatives." I have heard a number of people refer to your organization as the "anticooperative association" and I have heard them insist that your purpose is really to destroy cooperative organizations and their ability to continue to protect the farmers of America and many other groups of our citizens in their right to attempt to solve their economic problems through their own efforts. I am sorry to say that the manner in which you have carried on your propaganda in my opinion justifies the contention that you should abandon the name "National Tax Equality Association" if the work of your organization is to continue along the lines so far pursued and that some of the names given to it by its critics might be more appropriate.

There may be a portion of the receipts of farm cooperative organizations which can properly be regarded as income under the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution and which receipts therefore are actually dependent upon action by Congress in exempting them from income taxation. I emphasize "may be," because there are legal questions involved in this discussion. I readily agree that those questions should be discussed fully and have no objection whatsoever to this being done. But I am reliably informed by people well qualified to speak on the subject that if every legal question were decided against the cooperatives and as your organization apparently would like to have them decided, the Government nevertheless would stand to collect barely $200,000 per year in additional revenue.

Let us assume for the sake of argument, however, that the amount would be 10 times $200,000, or $2,000,000. Taking this figure as a basis of comparison, let me point out to you some of the other opportunities to attack tax inequalities if a well-balanced job is to be done. In doing so, I am frank to say that my purpose is to attempt to show why I am compelled to agree with the people who call your organization an anticooperative association.

First, then, there is the percentage depletion allowance granted to corporations engaged in the exploitation of natural resources. Competent officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue estimate that something in the nature of a tax subsidy of $500,000,000 per year is given to these natural-resource industries. I am not referring to the perfectly legitimate granting of percentage depletion up to the point where it becomes equal to the cost of development of the mine, oil well, or other extractive enterprise. I am speaking here only about that portion of percentage depletion deductions which are in excess of the total amount of development cost. It will be seen that this subsidy is 200 times the maximum amount which you think might be collected from the cooperatives. It seems reasonable that any National Tax Equality Association, in order to justify its name and banner, would have to devote considerably more of its time to saving $500,000,000 than it would devote to recovering a dubious $2,000,000 from the cooperatives.

In the second place, there is the matter of tax-exempt securities, admittedly an old and thorny subject. But if your organization is determined to bring about true tax equality and to serve the public interest in an impartial fashion, it would seem that at the very least it should help to do the work of educating the public about this issue. Nearly $20,000,000,000 of tax-exempt public securities are now outstanding and interest in the amount of about three-quarters of a billion dollars is annually received upon this. The Treasury estimates that nearly $220,000,000 of the income received from these tax-exempt bonds would constitute tax liability if these bonds were not exempt.

In the third place, it would seem that study should at least be given to the operation of our tax laws with regard to capital gains and losses in order to bring these provisions into such shape that mere speculators would not be benefited by them.

Amendments recently passed by Congress in the bill which was enacted over the President's veto provided certain special provisions with regard to the taxation of lumber companies which will operate to greatly favor a few of the largest of such companies in our country in a manner for which there can be no justification.

And, finally, there is section 722—the so-called relief section of the excess-profits-tax laws. I am told that more than $3,000,000,000 of claims have already been filed under this section. And while some of these claims are undoubtedly legitimate, I think it important in the interest of true tax equality that we be extremely vigilant to prevent the very great possibility of something resembling a raid upon the Treasury as excess-profit industries under the very broad provisions of this section.

It is my opinion that there is a strong, though so far rather well concealed, movement going on throughout the country not only for the legitimate objective of seeing that taxes upon active business in the post-war period are not too burdensome but also for the completely indefensible purpose of attempting to lift a portion of their fair share of the tax burden from the shoulders of those who have profited most in recent years. Should such a move succeed it would, of course, be necessary to impose corresponding tax burdens on the people generally and even upon the poor. I know of no one who has openly espoused the movement I describe and I doubt that any honorable man would do so, but nonetheless, we should be able to learn from past experiences and should, I think, be alive to this danger.

Indeed, I am convinced, and this is, of course, the main point of my letter, that such a movement, and the other tax factors which I have briefly described in this letter should concern far more deeply any true tax equality association than should attacks upon the cooperatives which in so many instances have stood between our farmers, as well as other groups in our population, and sheer economic ruin and destitution.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Francis Dugan Culkin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANCIS DUGAN CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, FRANCIS D. CULKIN was elected to the House of Representatives in November 1928. He became a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

As a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee he was largely responsible for the development of the Oswego Harbor and fitted it for the real service it has been in wartime.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee he was outstanding in the efforts that he made for the development of the American Merchant Marine and for the correction of abuses that grew up in connection with the Maritime Commission and its operations. In the work of that committee he brought to bear his great ability as a cross-examining lawyer.

One of my earliest recollections of Judge CULKIN was a controversy of a rather involved legal question on the floor of the House and in the press with the late Samuel Untermeyer, one of the leaders of the New York State bar. Judge CULKIN was so clear and so convincing that in everyone's opinion he had the best of the argument.

FRANCIS CULKIN was my own and my wife's personal friend. His family and my family were very close. We shall never forget our fine friendship with them and it will be our privilege to continue that friendship with his family. Our sincerest sympathy goes out to all of them.

Senator Clarence D. Becker, of Lebanon, Explains Pennsylvania Military Ballot Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the privilege of hearing a speech by the Honorable Clarence D. Becker, State senator from the seventeenth district of Pennsylvania, representing Lebanon County and part of Lancaster County, in which he discussed the new Military Ballot Law of Pennsylvania. Senator Becker covered this subject so completely and yet so concisely that I requested him to send me a copy of his speech for insertion in the RECORD. I know every citizen of Pennsylvania will find this exposition of our ballot law of interest and value to him, and no doubt citizens of other States will want to know what Pennsylvania has done.

Senator Becker has made a most distinguished record in the Pennsylvania State Senate and is recognized as one of the outstanding members of that body. Senator Becker has also volunteered to do everything he can in the way of explanations at all places throughout his senatorial district so as to make the knowledge of the ballot law well known to every voter in that area.

Senator Becker's speech follows:

The Pennsylvania military ballot law has been acclaimed the most liberal in the Nation.

The provisions of the law were developed under the direction and sponsorship of Pennsylvania's war Governor, Gen. Edward Martin, and the statute was enacted at an extraordinary session of the Pennsylvania Legislature convened upon his special call recently and now down in history as one of the shortest and most harmonious sessions in the annals of Pennsylvania. The measure was adopted upon a strictly nonpartisan basis and the session is reputed to be the only one in the history of Pennsylvania in which not a single "nay" vote was cast on the floor of the House or the Senate against any bill on final passage.

The statute as enacted provides that any qualified elector serving in the Army, Navy, Merchant Marine of the United States, American Red Cross, Society of Friends, Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the U. S. O. attached to and serving with the United States armed forces, may vote under its provisions, for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

The only requisites are that the person desiring to vote is in the actual military service as above defined and that he or she is a qualified elector. A qualified elector, under the Constitution and the election code, is a person 21 years of age, a citizen of the United States for 1 month, a resident of the State for 1 year (unless having formerly resided here, has returned and resided here 6 months) and resides in the election district 2 months preceding the election.

It is not necessary that the voter be registered or enrolled, as is required in the case of civilians.

Under the provisions of the statute, the Governor is authorized to designate a Military Ballot Day upon which local election boards will keep polling places open from 7 a. m. to 8 p. m. to enroll names of qualified voters.

Governor Martin has designated and proclaimed Friday, July 7, as Military Ballot Day.

Prior to Military Ballot Day, the State council of defense, through the local and district councils, will supervise and conduct a house to house canvas to obtain names and addresses of eligible voters in the services with the armed forces and the allied agencies above designated.

This canvas will begin on Flag Day, Wednesday, June 14, and extend through Wednesday, June 28.

In addition to the canvas of the State Council of Defense any individual, anybody, may furnish such additional names and addresses of qualified voters as may have escaped the general canvas.

All of these names will be submitted to the local election boards between the specified hours on Military Ballot Day and compiled into an alphabetical list.

Anybody may furnish the name and address of a qualified voter to a local election board on Military Ballot Day. Thus, if I am a resident of the first ward middle in the city of Lebanon, Lebanon County, and know the name of a qualified voter in the service and entitled to vote in Millcreek Township, Lebanon County, I can appear in person and furnish the name and address of the voter and other necessary information to that election board, nor does it make any difference whether I am of age or otherwise a qualified elector.

The sole purpose of Military Ballot Day is to obtain the names and addresses of all qualified electors entitled to vote, and this information may be furnished to the local election boards in any legitimate way by anyone on Military Ballot Day, in addition to the report of the house-to-house canvas of the local defense councils.

An alphabetical list of qualified electors, as compiled by the local election boards on military ballot day, will be posted in a conspicuous public place by the county board of elections 45 days before election day.

Additional names and addresses of qualified electors entitled to vote may be furnished to the county board of elections at any time following Military Ballot Day and a supplemental list will be posted 5 days before election day.

The official military ballot will be mailed to the absentee in the service at least 65 days before election by the county board of elections. Provision is made for subsequently mailing official military ballots to those qualified electors whose names and addresses are furnished up to the time of election.

The simplicity of the enrollment and the thoroughness of the canvass will insure with certainty that a military ballot will be in the hands of substantially every Pennsylvania elector in the service entitled to vote.

Actual voting is likewise simple. The official military ballot, in the same form and color as the civilian ballot, together with a small flyer bearing sentence paragraphs of instructions, and two envelopes will be contained in the package mailed to the voter.

The smaller envelope will carry the legend "Official Military Ballot." The larger envelope will carry an affidavit with the name and address of the local county board of elections.

The voter will present himself to an officer authorized to administer an oath and in his presence, will secretly mark the ballot by crayon, ink, pencil, or any legible way. He will place the marked ballot in the smaller envelope and seal it. He will then place the smaller envelope in the larger envelope and seal it. The officer will fill out the affidavit on the back of the envelope, and the voter will drop the envelope in the mail in the regular way and the voting is complete.

A commissioned officer, any member of the merchant marine designated by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, or any person of any State or territory of the United States authorized to administer oaths, may take the oath of electors voting by military ballot.

The county board of elections, upon receipt of the military ballot will safely keep it, without opening it, until the third Wednesday after election. Inasmuch as election day always falls on a Tuesday, the third Wednesday after election day is the equivalent of 15 days.

At 10 o'clock on the third Wednesday following the election, the county board of elections shall meet and open the military ballots and tabulate the vote. Each candidate for nomination or election shall be entitled to appoint one watcher, and each political party which has nominated candidates shall be entitled to appoint three watchers. Watchers shall be allowed to be present when military ballots are opened and when such ballots are counted and recorded.

Any ballot bearing a jurat dated on or before election day, November 7, 1944, and reaching the county board of elections at or before 10 a. m. of the third Wednesday following election day will be counted if otherwise valid.

An elector receiving an official military ballot happening to be present in person at his precinct voting place on election day may vote in the same manner as if he were away.

The several counties will be reimbursed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the actual expenses of preparing, handling, mailing, delivering, counting, and safely keeping official military ballots.

The penalty for any unlawful tampering with the military ballot procedure or other violation of the statute carries a $1,000 fine or imprisonment not exceeding 2 years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, soon after I came to the House, SAMUEL GUYER came into the House from the Kansas City district of Kansas, and continued there until his death a year ago.

He was a man of high courage, an indefatigable worker of sound judgment, and one who could always be depended upon to vote and talk his convictions. He was an orator of rare ability and on many public occasions he was called upon to deliver the oration.

The loss of such a man results in a void which is always hard to fill.

John William Ditter

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER came to Congress first in 1932. He was a great lawyer and a wonderful orator. I think it goes without saying that he was the ablest Member of the House of Representatives in a joint running debate at the time of his death.

He early became a member of the Appropriations Committee and served on that committee for nearly 10 years. His service there was varied. He served upon the District of Columbia Committee, the Interior Subcommittee, the Treasury Subcommittee, the Navy Subcommittee, and the Deficiency Subcommittee. For 5 or 6 years he had been upon the Navy Committee and Treasury Subcommittee, and had carried a great deal of the load of each committee. I think he was the leading authority in the House upon the Navy and was of tremendous value on the Deficiency Committee.

He could always be counted on to carry a fight to the floor upon any matter in the public interest, and was always vigorous and effective.

We all loved BILL DITTER. We all regret most sincerely his untimely end in an airplane crash. One of the finest characters who served in the House of Representatives in my day is gone.

Russia and the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think every American is greatly disturbed at the course of relations between Finland and the Soviet Union, particularly as to the alleged offers of peace on the part of the Soviets. The fact that Russia has ignored and disregarded every basic concept of the Atlantic Charter and subsequent declarations by the United Nations, is naturally a cause for considerable alarm. Our State Department has repeatedly said that the sovereignty of small nations would be fully protected at the peace table. Yet in the case of the current Finnish-Russian negotiations, our principal contribution toward carrying out this pledge is utter and complete silence.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter on this subject written to the President of the United States by four outstanding Finnish Americans representing approximately 500,000 of our citizens:

MAY 22, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Representing the overwhelming majority of Americans of Finnish stock, may we further petition your aid in bringing to an end the hostilities existing between Russia and the Republic of Finland.

Heretofore our committee has made representations in person and by letter to Secretary of State Hull, and has been received by Assistant Secretary of State Long and Mr. Cumming of the Department. We have endeavored to point out the great moral cause of American participation in the war and how it would be served at this juncture by an amicable settlement of the existing hostilities between Soviet Russia and Finland.

There can't be any doubt—and this has been officially recognized—that in the case of the Finnish-Russian fight, the winter war of 1939–40, as well as the present conflict, Finland has been the victim of Russian attacks. Whatever may be the social and official taboos of the present day in this regard, the fact remains that Finland, with a population of less than 4,000,000, has not attacked Russia, has not joined the Axis, has at no time fought for aggrandizement, has been motivated purely by purposes of defense of her homeland and the right to govern it according to the will of her own people, and in the main the people of America so recognize the situation between Finland and Soviet Russia.

May we not petition you today, Mr. President, to intercede in this matter, in true accord with the spirit of the second article of the Atlantic Charter, remembering that of the post-war democracies founded in Europe after the last war, Finland is the only one that survives today with its original constitution. We choose to believe that this is due to the fact that it is founded on the identical principles of our own Government and the basic tenets of true representative government of justice, peace, and democracy.

And may we reiterate what we have previously maintained, that:

1. Democratic, peace-loving, and progressive Finland is entitled to continue its existence as a free and independent nation for, as Lincoln pointed out in his first inaugural address, a country and its institutions belong to the people who inhabit it. From the birth of our Nation the traditional policy of the United States has been one of friendship and help to the small democratic countries.

2. Finland is entitled in all fairness to know the terms on which peace is made. Unless Finland is advised beforehand of those terms, its powerful and ruthless enemy may later demand conditions which mean Finland's complete annihilation as a nation. To accept the present Russian terms would be tantamount to committing national suicide. Finland is not dominated by Nazi Germany, for if she were, how could she even have begun to discuss the conditions presented by Russia, especially when the conditions include the demand for internment of German troops.

3. The present war in which Finland is involved is a continuation of the war which began with the invasion of Finland in 1939 and for which aggression Russia was expelled from the League of Nations.

4. Finland has given evidence of her good faith in seeking peace by welcoming territorial and governmental security guaranteed by Great Britain and the United States. Her sole threat to permanent peace and maintenance of genuine autonomy and independence is from the side of Soviet Russia.

5. Deep-rooted attitudes of a people do not change overnight. Finland continues to want peace, and wants only the freedom to continue to govern herself. Accusations of atrocities on the part of the Finnish Army and suggestions that Finland has committed herself to the Axis do not ring true.

6. Finland's outstanding record of honest dealing with the United States, as well as her record as a democracy from the beginning of her independence, are the proper criteria from which to judge her present dilemma. It is our earnest plea that she will not be deprived of the sustaining friendship of our great Nation at this crucial moment.

7. The recent exchange of notes between the Finnish and Soviet Governments, as to possible peace terms, plainly states the reasons why the Republic of Finland cannot accept the terms and conditions laid down by the Russians. Neutral circles which laid the foundation for the conversations between the two countries have likewise been shocked by the severity of the Russian terms. Translated into realities, the size of the indemnity and the insistence of the Russians upon retaining the fruits of her former war of conquest over Finland will mean the utter extinguishment of national life and independence in the republic of Finland.

In submitting this plea to you, Mr. President, we voice the sentiment of Finnish American religious and other groups representing a membership and affiliates of approximately 500,000 people. Among these are the following: The Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, also two large Finnish Apostolic Lutheran bodies, the Knights and Ladies of Kaleva Lodges, temperance groups, the Finnish American League for Democracy, and the cooperative groups, both farmers' and consumers' cooperatives, and all the noncommunistic fraternal organizations, all of which have a nationwide membership. Eight Finnish language newspapers in our country, whose patriotism and loyalty to our country are unquestionable, are of the view we are voicing.

Very respectfully yours,

O. J. LARSON,
Former Congressman from Minnesota.
Rev. FRED A. HEIDEMAN,
The Finnish Apostolic Lutheran Church of America.
HENRY PURANEN,
Finnish-American League for Democracy.
V. K. NIKANDER,
President, Suomi College and Theological Seminary, the Finnish Lutheran Church of America.

Thomas Henry Cullen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, TOM CULLEN was a veteran in the House of Representatives when I first arrived here 22 years ago. I will always remember his exceeding courtesy and kindness to all the younger Members on the New York delegation.

He was a man of character, exceeding industry, and great ability. Seldom does a man have such a long record of public service as was his lot to have, extending over a span of nearly 50 years.

Our sincerest sympathy goes out to his family.

William Howard Wheat

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT came to Congress from the Nineteenth District of Illinois in November 1940.

He had a fine service here upon the Naval Affairs Committee and did all that he could to help build up our naval forces for the war.

He was a man of the highest character and finest instincts and the sincerest devotion to duty. We all regret his passing.

Patriotism at a Price

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by Walter Winchell, who seems to think it necessary to advertise that he is patriotic, indicates that he thinks some people's loyalty must be purchased.

Winchell, you may recall, prides himself upon the fact that he holds the rank of a lieutenant commander in the Navy, even though he is not in uniform, has no duties as an officer, and receives no pay from the Navy. Insofar as a real contribution to the Navy's war effort is concerned, he is on the inactive list. As a creator of ill feeling, the originator and distributor of vilification, he has been and is a past master.

Winchell, a lieutenant commander in the Navy, although not speaking as such, recently threatened that, unless Congress took certain action reducing the tax on night clubs, the actors' union would forbid members from participating in bond rallies. Coming from an officer in the Navy, that statement made by anyone other than Winchell, would seem rather startling.

Note what the Omaha World Herald, of Omaha, Nebr., had to say on that particular broadcast. Let me quote:

From his own particular "beat," and concerning his dear friends of the gigglewater set, Columnist Walter Winchell writes:

"If Congress fails to act on Congressman KNUTSON'S bill to reduce the 30-percent tax on night spots (which is making too many entertainers jobless), the night-club actors' union will forbid members from participating in bond rallies."

In other words:

Hooray for the war (provided it doesn't interfere with my racket).

Down with Hitler (if it doesn't cost me anything).

Buy bonds. Buy bonds. (But if anybody tries to tax me—bye-bye, bonds.)

It is an intriguing philosophy, and one which might produce interesting results if adopted outside Mr. Winchell's circle of superheated patriots. For example, suppose the investment banker were to say: "If you don't take me out of the 95-percent bracket, I'll buy no more bonds." Or suppose the magazine or newspaper publisher were to say: "You'll get no publicity for the war drives from me unless you restore the newsprint cuts."

We hope the Members of Congress read Mr. Winchell's paragraph, and we hope it inspired them to stand pat.

Veterans' Rights to Reemployment Under Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress passed the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 it enacted certain provisions to assure the reemployment of veterans in their old jobs when they were honorably mustered out of the service. Recently, the national headquarters of Selective Service issued a memorandum stating the general rules and regulations which Selective Service will put into effect in order to carry out the congressional will. Naturally these rules and regulations may be changed slightly from time to time, and the veteran should consult with his local draft board in order to get more specific information at a later date. Nevertheless, I feel that the summary given by the Selective Service will be of great use as a general guide to all those in the armed service and to their friends and relatives. If the veterans in my congressional district want more particulars or detailed information, I will be glad to take the matter up with Selective Service and furnish it to them.

There are two points which I wish to emphasize particularly:

First. Every person who entered the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard—male or female—subsequent to May 1, 1940 and who has satisfactorily completed his service in the armed forces has rights under this provision. It makes no difference whether he or she enlisted or was drafted.

Second. The act requires the veteran to make application for reemployment "within 40 days after he is relieved from" training and service. Every veteran

should keep this in mind and not take any chance on losing his rights through the lapse of time. The specific provision from the memorandum itself is as follows:

TIME FOR APPLICATION

(a) The act requires the veteran to make application for reemployment "within 40 days after he is relieved from" training and service. This is mandatory. Compliance is essential if the veteran is to claim his reemployment rights against the objection of the employer.

(b) While the employer cannot, strictly speaking, extend the 40-day period, he can voluntarily reemploy the veteran thereafter and he may as a part of the employment contract agree that the veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of section 8 of the act. Such an agreement to be enforceable would have to be clear and explicit; otherwise, while the veteran may be employed it is doubtful that he would be entitled to the additional benefits conferred by the act for seniority, pay and employment for 1 year.

The summary given by the Selective Service follows:

Seniority rights accumulate during the veteran's period of active service in the armed forces in the same manner as they would have accumulated had he remained continuously at work in his civilian occupation

A veteran, in order to claim reinstatement in a position, must be qualified to perform the duties and functions of that position. If unable to qualify for an upgraded job, he is, nevertheless, entitled to a position equal in seniority, status, and pay to the one which he left.

A veteran is entitled to reinstatement in his former position or one of like seniority, status, and pay, even though such reinstatement necessitates the discharge of a nonveteran with greater seniority.

A veteran is entitled to his former position or one of like seniority, status, and pay, and may refuse another, even though the pay is greater and offers other advantages.

Conscientious objectors have no reemployment rights under the law and the Selective Service System has no responsibility to aid them in regaining former positions or obtaining new positions.

Eligible for benefits under the act are persons who enter the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard (male or female) subsequent to May 1, 1940, but the veterans seeking benefits must have a certificate indicating satisfactory completion of service in the armed forces.

Members of the Coast Guard auxiliary are not eligible, nor do the reemployment provisions apply to employees of States, although the act declares it to be the sense of Congress that such persons should be restored to their former positions or to positions of like seniority, status, and pay. The policy of the Selective Service System is to render all possible aid to such persons. Many States have passed laws granting their employees substantially the same reemployment rights as are granted to Federal employees by the act.

The act requires the veteran to make application for reemployment "within 40 days after he is relieved from" training and service. This is mandatory, and compliance is essential if the veteran is to enforce his reemployment rights over the objection of the employer.

In the case of jobs created by war expansion, the permanent or temporary character of the job likewise depends upon the facts and circumstances in each individual case.

The memorandum further points out that:

A veteran entitled to reemployment rights has recourse in the courts to recover back pay, even after reinstatement if it was improperly delayed or postponed by the employer.

A veteran entitled to reemployment may not be discharged from his restored position "without cause within 1 year after such restoration." The question of what constitutes cause is to be determined by standards of common sense and is to be measured by "practices and customs generally acceptable in industry or practices and customs in common and accepted use in the particular place of employment."

A veteran who has been reinstated to his former position cannot within 1 year be displaced by another on the ground that the latter has greater seniority rights.

A soldier who is placed in an inactive status and transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps, at his own request, on the condition that he will engage in essential industry, loses his reemployment rights if he does not apply to his former employer for reinstatement within 40 days after his transfer.

The functions of the Veterans' Personnel Division of Selective Service are confined to assistance to veterans in obtaining reemployment in their former positions. The responsibility for assistance in obtaining new positions is being exercised by the Director of Selective Service through the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission.

The Director of Selective Service discharges his responsibilities for reinstatement of veterans in old jobs through a Veterans Personnel Division at national headquarters with decentralized responsibility to State directors and authority to set up necessary machinery within the States to carry out the program at local and State levels.

General Grant—Soldier and Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address delivered at Grant's Tomb, New York, on May 30, 1944, by Charles J. Zinn, commander of Lafayette Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War:

In keeping with a generation-old custom it is my privilege, as commander of Lafayette Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, again to make these brief remarks in commemoration of our great civil war leader, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. At the close of the last century the Ulysses S. Grant Post, No. 327, Grand Army of the Republic, instituted this splendid tradition. Now, with the recent death of Robert G. Summers, the last surviving member of that post, whose passing we deeply mourn, we are more than ever conscious of our prerogative and its accompanying responsibility to carry on these memorial services as successors of that post. Today for the first time in the history of New York's Memorial Day parades no member of the Grand Army of the Republic took his place in line as it passed below this tomb and it has fallen to us as sons of veterans to carry on.

We must see to it that the memory of Grant is perpetuated in the hearts and minds of America by holding these services as long as the tomb remains. Here may patriotic Americans continue to come on future Memorial Days to pay tribute and to give testimony of their devotion to those high principles of which General Grant was the great exemplar.

At the time of Grant's death Sherman is said to have told his friends, "It will be a thousand years before his character is fully appreciated." Our presence here today is evidence of our appreciation of that sterling character whose worth is yearly becoming more and more apparent.

We Americans have every right to be proud of our generals, both in the Civil War and in the present great conflict. However quickly are forgotten what words of praise we say here today, we can well be thankful that never will any speaker at this tomb have occasion to echo the thoughts of Ingersoll expressed at the Tomb of Napoleon. His words though uttered many years ago are remembered still as a scathing indictment of the war lords of the world when he said: "I would rather have been a French peasant and worn wooden shoes. I would rather have lived in a hut with a vine growing over the door and the grapes growing purple in the kisses of the Autumn sun. I would rather have been that poor peasant with my loving wife by my side, knitting as the day died out of the sky, with my children upon my knee and their arms about me. I would rather have been that man and gone down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust than to nave been that imperial impersonation of force and murder known as Napoleon the Great."

No. In General Grant we are fortunate in having a hero who is the personification of the military genius combined with the humble humanitarian. It has been well said that he was a soldier of perfect symmetry in character, judgment, performance, and humanity, whose inspiration was found in the cause for which he fought.

So today, when we are engaged in a terrible struggle with the cruelest enemies of civilized times, we are fortunate in having faithful disciples of Grant leading our armies in Italy and on the other battlefields over the world. Just a few hours ago in a military cemetery on the edge of the battlefield in Italy, Gen. Mark Clark, that outstanding exponent of Grant's principles, took time out from war to remember our fallen heroes, and voiced the hope that within a few days the first European capital to be taken from the enemy, would be liberated. Let us join in that hope and breathe a prayer for his success and the speedy victorious termination of this awful conflict.

A war correspondent is recently reported to have deplored the fact that our soldiers at Cassino, who had been engaged for 25 days in some of the fiercest fighting of the war, do not hate our enemies enough. As for me, I thank our merciful and just God that those boys, who take second place to no one in their zeal to attain victory for our cause, have not had their souls seared by the awful cancer of hatred. How true to the ideals and nobility of character of Grant are they proving themselves, and how that great general would have gloried to be their leader in battle.

They know, as he did, that the natural law recognizes the right to kill in a just war.

They know, as he did, that it is the soldier's duty to make the most effective use of his weapons and to take advantage of every military opportunity.

They know that the war criminals must be brought to justice.

But they, as he, have no room in their hearts for hatred of their enemies no matter how much they may abhor the ideologies and tactics of those enemies.

On one familiar occasion Grant, the soldier, said, "We will fight it out on this line if it

takes all summer," while on an equally famous occasion, after the unconditional surrender of General Buckner, Grant, the humanitarian, entered Buckner's tent at night and taking out his pocketbook said: "General Buckner, you are a prisoner and will be sent north. I presume you have no money that is current with us, and I wish to share mine with you." Other examples of both these traits are too numerous and well known for me to burden you with their repetition now, but in closing I wish to leave one thought with you. Consider, if you will, what would have happened to this beloved land of ours—yes, what would have happened to the entire world—had not the victor at Appomattox displayed to the vanquished a Christian spirit of forbearance and charity. Will those among us who foster hatred tell us how a divided America could have twice within 25 years been mobilized to rescue a world whose existence was periled. I say to you that if, after achieving a wonderful military victory as a soldier, General Grant had not won over the South through his great heartedness we and the rest of the world today would be at the mercy of the Nazis and their partners. Truly is the motto of the Sons of Veterans of the Civil War equally applicable today to the entire world, "Preserved through the grace of God."

Religious and Racial Intolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Dr. Jacob Hochman, rabbi of the Jersey Homesteads Jewish Community and president of the Jersey Homesteads-Hightstown Interfaith Council, reports a synopsis of talks delivered over Station WTTM, Trenton, N. J. This broadcast was sponsored by the Jersey Homesteads-Hightstown Interfaith Council:

"Intolerance is so common and so alien to the doctrines of democracy and Christianity. Americans everywhere are urged to practice democracy. A warning followed in the words of Lincoln, that 'United we stand, divided we fall.' Remember the verse from the Bible 'The Lord hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth.'

"The need for religious, racial, and international tolerance in the world today is self-evident. Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism were promulgated by Semites, and the faiths venerate the same God. The similarity shows that one's prejudice against another's belief goes against his own, and the ignorance is the cause of such emotions. Education is the cure.

"False propaganda created prejudice against the Negroes. In order to become a nation of equal opportunity, we must be tolerant with the races of her vast union; so should we acquire this tolerance.

"Tolerance toward nations reduces extreme nationalism by educating the superior groups. Here we forget that people of different creeds and customs have come from other countries, giving each other their knowledge and experience and have melted into one great people.

"The state of mind becomes tolerant as the emotions and prejudices diminish, and the answer to the problem of religion, race, and international relationships is tolerance."

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address over Station WNBF on May 27, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, I wish to correct an announcement I made last week in reference to the Endicott flood-control meeting. I mentioned the affair would be held on Thursday, June 1. Actually, it will take place the next evening, Friday, June 2 at the Endicott Municipal Building. I look forward to an interesting discussion with the affected residents of the Greater Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City area.

During this week of Memorial Day which by the way is next week, I am stealing a few days away from official duties at Washington in order to keep several long-standing appointments. On Memorial Day, May 30, I will speak at the annual exercises on the Courthouse Square, in Binghamton, at 3 o'clock, and will look forward to seeing my friends there.

On the following day, Wednesday, May 31, in the evening, I will address an assembly at the Nimmonsburg Fire Hall.

June 1, Thursday, I am scheduled to be in Endicott at the Air Raid Wardens' Association to talk at the Endicott Legion clubhouse.

As I mentioned first, the Endicott flood-control meeting will come Friday June 2.

Sunday, June 4, will wind up six speeches in as many days and find me at Ross Park, Binghamton, attending the eighth annual Townsend Day celebration. My Townsend friends tell me they will hold a basket picnic at noon which is going to be good.

Ever since I have been in public life, I have always anticipated these Townsend Day gatherings. It is so nice to get back to see one's old friends. After all, no matter where you go, old friends are best.

I look forward, therefore, to this Townsend Day at Ross Park. I look forward to seeing the faces of my many friends and shaking hands with them.

I will have to return to Washington immediately after my Townsend Day speech.

While on the subject of speaking engagements, I wish to say that in all probability Congress will recess late in June for at least part of the summer. My plans are therefore extensive for getting around the Triple Cities and the district.

You will recall that last summer I spoke during June, July, and August at 112 meetings of church, Republican, civic, Grange, and Townsend origin. I also visited most of our war plants. I expect to do even better this summer if I am able to reach all the places and dates I have already put on my calendar.

It is so refreshing to return to my district after nearly a year away from home. It gives me a much better grasp on things in Washington. By meeting and talking with folks at home, I obtain a much broader outlook and am able to reflect more accurately than otherwise the true representation to which I believe the American people are entitled.

I hope my friends will make it a point to attend these meetings which take place in their neighborhoods. I will reach practically every nook and corner of the counties of Broome, Chenango, and Madison in my summer speaking itinerary. I hope they will feel free to bring their problems and their troubles to me for whatever solution I am able to give them. I will do my best for one and all.

"THE ROAD

"Life is a road that we all must travel—
It's rough and dusty with many a bend
Some are soon lost in its darkest shadow
Some find the road all sun to the end.
I trod this road alone and in sorrow
Till I met one who called me 'a friend',
So, holding his hand, I started anew
And saw not the shadows that we passed thru
Nor feared not the land at the roadway's end
For the road had given to me a friend!"

—*By "Post Script."*

The Seat of the Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Apollo News-Record, Apollo, Pa.:

THE SEAT OF THE BLACK MARKET

Washington's O. P. A. is flooding the mails with appeals to the people to help crush the black market. Mr. Ickes says the black market is responsible for the folks not getting more gas on the home front. This black market is an evil thing. It can only be crushed by our citizens.

But where does it head? It is our studied opinion, as well as that of a good many others, that its chief source and center is in the Government bureaucracy known as O. P. A. at Washington, the fount of all wisdom, knowledge, and understanding.

No other opinion can be reached when it is known that a truck driver must drive his truck 36 miles to Kittanning and return to get a renewal of his ration. He must use an average of 3 gallons of gas for the trip, not to mention wear and tear on irreplaceable tires. Then he finds the hours of the ration board are such that he must leave his work for possibly half a day. Six cents postage and whatever paper it took to write a letter would suffice.

Then a soldier comes home on a precious and rare furlough. He has a lot of folks he would like to see before going back, perhaps to leave home for the last time or for a period of years. He is allowed the princely privilege of 3 whole gallons of gas, if he uses at least one of them to apply in person at Kittanning. Any local veterans' organization would be glad to handle the matter, but they couldn't be trusted by the O. P. A.

And a dear relative has the good fortune or misfortune, however you happen to view it, to leave this vale of tears. You can't go and see this relative's remains or comfort other survivors by your presence unless you have saved enough A rations for the trip.

That is only one side of the picture, of course. The Government can let millions of pounds of butter spoil because some wise dictator misjudged the needs. So butter disappears. Then it comes back, and it still takes 16 points to get a pound. Salesmen of wholesalers come to local merchants and beg

them to take sugar so they can relieve the shortage of storage space. But the local grocer knows he can't get rid of the sugar—it's rationed, you know.

The people go to the stores or the filling stations to get supplies, but find their points won't stretch. They have tried to be sparing in use of critical materials. The local ration boards struggle heroically with the regulations and try to put some reasonable human interpretation into them, but the bureaucrats won't let them.

There, my friends, is the real source of the black market. If one-half the effort put forth by these blistering bureaucrats to enforce their ideas on the people had been put into constructive effort to relieve critical shortage there wouldn't be any great need for rationing, nor any market for the black market. Nor for dictators of the Ickes stripe.

There is the real rub. These dictators like their jobs. They never want to see them ended, for when the need for rationing disappears, the need for their services also disappears. So when there is no need for rationing they simply create one, and insist on a shortage where there is no excuse for a shortage.

Civilians Help to Smash Axis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lester Allen from the Boston Post:

CIVILIANS HELP TO SMASH AXIS—ROLE OF NONCOMBATANT BRINGS NO PUBLIC ACCLAIM BUT IS VITALLY IMPORTANT TO VICTORY

(By Lester Allen)

While the bombs rip Europe into unlovely shreds and the men of our fighting forces hammer atolls and islands into dusty rinds of crushed coral, and victory is in the making—the noncombatants who are in there taking what we dish out with the enemy are given very little thought, but there are heroes there—men, women and children who have lost everything they possess through the pulverizing effect of our arms and are still ready to help lick the enemy when we come to them.

A colonel in the Army Medical Corps just back from New Guinea had something to say about noncombatants which is food for thought, and a good place to begin to have a different viewpoint about the people of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Poland, and even Italy.

"I am most grateful," said the colonel, "to a certain little tribe of black men—the fuzzy-wuzzies of New Guinea—for giving a meaning to the word resistance as applied to noncombatants. These men had everything to lose and nothing to gain in helping us. They could very easily have gone into the hills and built new villages and left us and the Japs, too, severely alone to fight it out. We had destroyed their villages with shell fire—killed some of them, too—but they knew the difference between what we were trying to do and what the Japs had done.

"As stretcher bearers carrying wounded out to airfields beaten out of the kunai grass, they saved the lives of countless Americans. They would endure the most appalling hardships and wouldn't complain, just to carry a wounded soldier back from the hospitals at the front to the airfields."

When Americans went ashore on Pacific atolls after bombardments which had smashed everything into rubble, leveling palm groves which were the source of a living for natives and destroying their villages—the natives still alive greeted our men with prayers of thanksgiving and went to work as soon as they were permitted to help.

It was that way on Guadalcanal, Bougainville, New Guinea, Tarawa, Kwajalein—everywhere the Japs were ousted from the Pacific.

The smallest Italian child knows the great difference between the "Tedeschi," as they call the Germans, and the Allied soldiers. The general experience of officers in A. M. G. has been that all the Italian people in the liberated areas, with the exception of a few—and very few—die-hard Fascists, have been profoundly relieved when the Allied armies take over.

Examined from the standpoint of the Italians, this is a strange thing. The Germans did not destroy their homes when they first came. They didn't treat them badly, as a matter of fact. But they were prisoners, nevertheless. And they didn't like it.

HOMELESS BUT LOYAL

When the American and British and French forces came to wrest Italy from the Germans, whole towns were destroyed by German and Allied shell fire and bombing. The people were homeless, and still are without shelter. But they are generally reported to be ready and eager to aid the Allies.

The controversy over the attitude of the French people since the fall of France in 1940 has been raging ever since then. It has been held by some that the French people are reaping the reward of 25 years of disregard of the kind of government they had. Some went as far as saying that they got just what they deserved.

But let the average American citizen ask himself what he would do, as a civilian, if Boston were invaded and seized by an enemy.

Lacking arms or other means of fighting the enemy, what would the average civilian do? They certainly wouldn't cooperate with the enemy willingly. But if it is a case of work or starve, they would probably work, getting as much as they could for as little work as possible.

They would resist secretly, and only a few renegades would openly go over to the enemy. By and large, all classes of people would give lip service of a kind and hang on, in hope that the day would soon come when they could actively fight the enemy.

No doubt there would be controversies in our midst and savage differences of opinion about who was responsible for our plight, just as we have savage differences of opinion about what party should run the Government. The blame would be placed on this group or that group—and it would be difficult, lacking a free press and free speech, to come quickly to a general agreement about who was at fault.

That is exactly what has happened in all the occupied countries. There is general agreement in hatred of the enemy and determination to see them defeated. Anyone who comes to help get rid of the enemy will get their help.

NOT ALL IN UNDERGROUND

Not all Frenchmen, Hollanders, Norwegians, Danes, Poles, Greeks, Yugoslavs and other nationalities under the heel of the Nazis have been working in the underground. It would be folly to believe that they have been. And not all so-called collaborators have gone over completely to the enemy.

A large percentage of those called collaborators, according to the information services of the various occupied nations, are what missionaries in China used to call "rice Christians." That is, as long as they needed the rice the missionaries would give them, they were Christians. When the need ended, they went back to their old faiths.

The Dutch underground reports that members of the Dutch Nazi party, many of whom joined after the Netherlands was overwhelmed, are no longer wearing their party badges. They are trying desperately to rid themselves of the Nazi stigma, because they are certain the Nazis have lost the war and will soon be driven out.

But these rice Christians are a minority in all the occupied countries. The large majority of people have been concerned for over 4 years keeping body and soul together against the day when they will be liberated.

They have looked to the hardy men and women in the underground, who have risked death 24 hours a day, for leadership, although they have taken no active part in sabotage, intelligence work, or aiding escaping prisoners of war.

The damage inflicted upon cities and towns all along the European coast facing Great Britain has been enormous. What the Nazis haven't torn down to create clear fields of fire for defense against invasion ha been bombed into rubble. The air fleets have literally worn paths of ruin across the Netherlands, France, and Belgium. It means that hundreds of thousands of noncombatants have had to endure the peril and loss of bombing with the Nazis.

One of the thrilling untold stories of the war is that of the operations of the underground in Europe giving protection to Allied airmen.

A large proportion of the Allied planes lost on raids go down over occupied territory, and the flyers and air crew bailing out land by parachuting. If they reach the hands of the underground organization they are smuggled out of France, Netherlands, and Belgium and sent back to England. Hundreds have done this. Indeed, there are tales of our airmen who have spent some very pleasant weeks in France as guests of the underground, and at least one case of an airman who received a severe reprimand because he did not avail himself of the earliest possible escape from occupied territory.

This bespeaks the efficiency of the noncombatants ready to rise against their Nazi taskmasters the instant the invasion forces reach their home localities.

And these noncombatants should not be judged too harshly if they have failed to participate in underground activities. It requires a special kind of talent and bravery and special circumstances. For example, underground workers are more efficient when they have few or no family responsibilities. The care of a family in semistarved occupied Europe is a full-time job, leaving small time for taking risks.

Resolution of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Polish-American Congress, Buffalo, N. Y., May 28, 29, 30, 1944:

Resolved, That this congress of American citizens of Polish descent affirms the loyalty of all of its members and their devotion to the fundamental principles of liberty set

forth in the Constitution of the United States of America and the Declaration of Independence. We pledge our support to the Government of the United States in maintaining and carrying out those principles in this country. We ask our United States Government to use its influence in international affairs to secure a restoration of the Republic of Poland in accordance with those principles; and we ask all our fellow citizens to consider the devotion of the Polish people throughout the centuries to the ideas of liberty and justice, their suffering under subjection to foreign rule, and the great desirability to the entire world of reestablishment of a strong, free, and independent Poland.

When the civilization of western Europe was threatened by the Turks in the early part of the seventeenth century, the Polish Army under King Jan III Sobieski bore the brunt of their attack and successfully turned back the hordes who would have checked the progress of Europe toward higher cultural and living standards. At that time, although in area and population smaller than the greater and more powerful countries of Europe, the Polish people had a national pride and consciousness which developed leaders in the realms of science, art, and culture generally. Among early notable contributors to progress were Copernicus and Ladislaus Jagiello.

In 1772, about 4 years before the Declaration of Independence, while the American Colonies were suffering under the rule of England which forced them into revolution, Poland's stronger neighbors, Germany, Austria, and Russia, divided the country between them; and for nearly 150 years, until the reestablishment of Poland in 1918, after the First World War, the people of Poland were separated into three parts, each subject to a foreign power insisting on the use of its own language in the schools; and notwithstanding this, the loyalty and tradition to national ideals and culture persisted in the people and their contributions to the thought and progress of he world were evidenced by the development of such masters as Chopin and others.

The struggle of the American Colonies appealed to the statesmen and patriots of Poland as a new star of liberty arising in the west as the star of Poland was passing into the shadow of an eclipse. Thaddeus Kosciusko was one patriot who came to America and offered the engineering skill of which George Washington took advantage in designing the fortifications of West Point. Those fortifications insured Washington the control of the Hudson River throughout the war and were a vital link in the chain of events which finally secured the liberty of this country. Another patriot whose love of liberty led him to volunteer for American service was Casimer Pulaski, who was made a general in the Revolutionary Army and was killed in action while leading his regiment in an attack against the British at Savannah. His service to the country has been recognized and commemorated in the giving of his name to the elevated roadway from Jersey City to the Newark Airfield, which is known as the Pulaski Skyway.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the tide of immigration began flowing from Poland to the United States and continued until restrictive limits were placed on immigration from all European countries. By that time, the number of people living in this country who had come from Poland or were descendants of Polish immigrants had reached the total of 5,000,000 in our total population of 130,000,000. In the First World War, Americans of Polish descent furnished their full quota of men serving in the armed forces of this country. In the present war, men of Polish descent are serving in our armed forces to an even larger percentage; and reports from the European battlefields show, especially recently, the valiant exploits of Polish soldiers who have escaped from home and joined the armies of the United Nations.

In peaceful pursuits, the cultural progress of the Polish people gave to the world the work of Paderewski and Mme. Curie, who was Marie Sklodowska, of Poland, prior to her marriage. Students of the careers of Mme. Curie and her husband agree that her genius had much to do with the discovery and development of the use of radium, and that her carrying on of the research and development in that field since her husband's death has been of great benefit to humanity.

A new era for the Polish people offering opportuinties for development of their highest aspirations opened with the reestablishment of the Republic, pursuant to the treaty of peace which ended the World War in 1918.

The boundaries of the state thus established were not as large as those of Poland in 1772 when the first partition of the country occurred; and the new republic made a prompt attempt to recover from Russia the territory which had been Poland in 1772 but had not been included in the reestablishment of the Nation. This controversy with Russia was ended by the Treaty of Riga, signed by both countries in 1921, which established the boundaries of Poland as they were recognized by all of the nations of the world and questioned by nobody until Hitler marched into Poland on September 1, 1939. In the 20 years from 1918 to 1939, Poland achieved an amount of progress under republican form of government which is remarkable and unique in the history of the world for a people who had lived for a century and a half, split into three different parts, each under the rule of a different foreign government insisting on the use of that government's language in the schools of the country. In education, the Republic modeled its system of schools on that of the United States. In the national parliament there was proportional representation of all minority groups and equal treatment of all before the law.

The only sure foundation for world peace is a friendly feeling of nations for one another. A feeling based on any reasonable grounds by any nation that it has been unjustly treated is bound to produce friction and disharmony. Premier Stalin has publicly expressed the Russian desire for a strong, free, and independent Poland; and Poland needs the friendship of its most powerful neighbor.

Justice requires that the boundaries of Poland should be established now as they were before the invasion by Hitler on September 1, 1939. If this is done, Russia can feel sure of a friendly feeling on the part of all the Polish people. This friendship is far more important to Russia than the addition of any territory to its already enormous expanse; and this result would lead naturally to constantly increasingly friendly relations between the two countries.

On the other hand, separation of any part of old Poland from the rest of the country would inevitably embitter the people of both the portion taken away and the remainder of the nation. Indeed, the whole world would be shocked by the obvious injustice of such action.

The suggestion to add East Prussia or a portion of it in place of territory which Russia has proposed to take would only aggravate the situation and make more trouble. Everybody knows that the Prussians are the hardest people in the world to get along with and East Prussia would be a continual thorn in the side of Poland, intensifying the soreness and sense of injustice caused by separating a part of its people from the rest of them. East Prussia, like the rest of Germany, should be controlled by the united action of all the Allied Nations.

For these reasons, we appeal to the sense of justice, of humanity and government throughout the world to see that the boundaries of Poland are reestablished on the same lines which all countries recognized by treaties which were signed in 1920 and observed by all countries without question or any complaints up to the time of the German invasion.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States with the request that this Government use all reasonable and proper means to secure to all the people of Poland the benefit of those principles of liberty and justice embodied in our Constitution and in the Declaration of Independence.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Niagara Frontier Industrial Traffic League of Buffalo, N. Y., in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT, S. 1385

The Niagara Frontier Industrial Traffic League is an organization of traffic managers representing approximately 130 industries in the Niagara frontier. Many of these industries have water-front locations and are vitally interested in water transportation. The league members are practical traffic men whose duties require expert knowledge of all of the problems incidental to the movement of their raw materials and finished products and, as such, feel competent to evaluate the proposed seaway project from the standpoint of transportation.

The league contends that there are already ample water transportation facilities between the Great Lakes and salt water, and the statement credited to the author of this bill to the effect that the Great Lakes are now landlocked comes as a shock to our members who have used the present St. Lawrence canals and the new State barge canal in the movement of commodities to and from the North Atlantic and the Mississippi waterway to and from the Gulf of Mexico.

Prior to the war some of our members have used, although to a relatively small extent, the foreign vessels which operated between the Great Lakes and foreign ports via the present St. Lawrence canals in the movement of both in-bound and out-bound commodities. It is their considered opinion, however, that the proposed seaway would not attract any greater quantity of traffic to or from this area than has heretofore moved through the existing canals.

The members of this league have studied the proposed St. Lawrence project as practical transportation men and have concluded that it offers little of value to the industries which they represent and in many cases would prove exceedingly harmful. They desire to emphasize that the proposed seaway as an additional medium of transportation is absolutely unnecessary. In the prewar years, there has been and unquestionably in the post-war years there will be,

an excess of transportation facilities. The unhealthy and unsatisfactory financial condition of many of our transportation companies in the past decade is a matter of record and instead of fostering additional unneeded projects such as the St. Lawrence seaway, we feel that Congress should address itself to methods of strengthening our present transportation companies, and thereby assure our existing carriers of a more solvent condition in the post-war period.

The return of normal shipping on the lakes and in the coastwise and intercoastal trades together with the ability of the trucking companies to repair, replace, and augment their present equipment will provide this Nation with more means of transportation in the post-war period than will be necessary.

The manner in which the unprecedented amount of traffic has been moved during these war years without any serious difficulty is more than ample proof that our only concern with post-war transportation will be how to utilize all of the facilities that will then be available, not to add more.

Our carriers have earned the praise and gratitude of everyone for their splendid contribution to the war effort and it would be a rank injustice to make them face the loss of traffic that will accompany the cessation of hostilities with the further loss of revenue tonnage that would be diverted, to the proposed seaway.

Theoretically, the aspect of cheaper transportation that would be afforded by the completion of the seaway is attended by a certain amount of plausibility, but when analyzed in the light of a cold practical inspection of all of the facts this theoretical appeal is eclipsed by the more practical considerations which prove that the advantages plus over-all cost are more than offset by the damage and over-all loss.

The very existence of the Great Lakes, the present St. Lawrence canals, the New York State Barge Canal and the Mississippi waterway already provides communities on and adjacent to the Great Lakes with cheaper transportation facilities than are available to areas not so fortunately situated and the completion of the seaway would widen this disparity.

Any student of freight-rate adjustments knows that it is not without precedent nor without reason that the loss of revenue to the existing carriers resulting from loss of tonnage would be offset by increased rates on the remaining noncompetitive traffic. The proposed seaway would not reduce the over-all cost of moving this Nation's business and while it might be of some value to a relatively small section, this would be more than offset by the cost of the project and the loss to those who would be adversely affected.

It is conservatively estimated that the total cost to the United States, if amortized over a 50-year period, will be $600,000,000, or $12,000,000 a year. While the eventual cost may very well exceed this figure, it nevertheless affords a basis for calculating the cost to any given quantity of tonnage that might use the seaway.

For instance, using a conservative estimate of 4,000,000 tons a year of United States freight, the cost would be equal to $3 a ton. On a liberal estimate of 6,000,000 tons, the cost would be equal to $2 a ton.

One of the most-discussed commodities which, it is claimed, would use the seaway extensively is grain, and converting these tonnage figures of $3 and $2 to cents per bushel of wheat, we find that the cost would equal 9 cents and 6 cents per bushel, respectively. The pre-war rate on wheat from the head of the Lakes to Montreal was less than either of these figures. From this illustration it is clear that the proposed seaway will not result in any economy, but, on the contrary, will be a profligate waste.

There are other reasons why the seaway would be detrimental to our national economy, but we rest our opposition on those features with which our experience as traffic managers fully qualifies our conclusions. We respectfully submit that this proposed legislation should be defeated.

Respectfully submitted.

E. A. MOMBERGER,
J. B. EDWARDS,
W. B. FAULKNER,
Special St. Lawrence Committee.

Fourteen Minnesota Men Graduate From Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as the Silver Anniversary class of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy moves into its midterm activities this week, I believe it appropriate that mention be made of the splendid accomplishments of the school which in its early days trained State, municipal, and county law-enforcement officers in the latest methods of combating the underworld menace and more recently specializing in antisabotage activities.

When this present class of 38 members finishes its work about the first of August, it will bring to 892 the number of law-enforcement officers from every State in the union and from several foreign countries who have trained in this "West Point" of law enforcement.

I am proud that among this number is Capt. Walter H. Hall, formerly of the police department of Bemidji, in the congressional district I represent. Captain Hall is now on war duty. Thirteen other Minnesota officers have graduated from the F. B. I. National Police Academy, and I shall mention them later. Torkel Knutson, sheriff of my home county, Polk, also attended the school for a time.

Director J. Edgar Hoover, head of the F. B. I., inaugurated the academy on July 29, 1935, in order that the army of 150,000 local, county, and State police officers in the United States might be properly trained to meet the problems of maintaining the internal security of the Nation. It has been the purpose of the F. B. I. National Academy to train police instructors in the latest techniques of crime detection and prevention, police administration, and training methods. As a result, the graduates of the academy have returned to their departments and established training schools, making the F. B. I.'s training available to more than 100,000 of their fellow officers.

The members of each class of the F. B. I. National Academy are carefully selected from representatives of police departments throughout the Nation whose applications have been received by the F. B. I. They must be outstanding men in their communities, of unimpeachable moral character, and in good physical condition.

The F. B. I. National Academy represents a major step forward in the raising of law enforcement to the status of a profession, and its faculty reads like a page from Who's Who. Leaders from every field generously give their time and experience to the students. Listed among its faculty, in addition to many F. B. I. instructors, are Prof. Albert Coates, director, Institute of Government, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Bruce Smith, Institute of Public Administration, New York City; Arthur T. Vanderbilt, chairman, National Conference of Judicial Council, Newark, N. J.; and Wilbur S. Smith, Bureau of Street Traffic Research, Yale University.

Recently added emphasis has been placed upon the control of juvenile delinquency and several prominent authorities in the field of sociology and crime prevention have lectured to the class, including Rev. E. A. Walsh, S. J., of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.; Associate Justice Matthew F. McGuire, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.; Dr. William Healy, director of the Judge Baker Guidance Center, Boston, Mass.; and Dr. Arthur L. Beeley, director of the department of sociology, University of Utah.

The F. B. I. National Academy has been a potent force in the effective mobilization of law enforcement for the wartime emergency. It has been the means of training literally thousands of police officers in the proper discharge of their wartime responsibilities. Graduates of the academy, located in every State in the Union, have become the leaders of the united army of law enforcement on the home front, battling not only against the criminal but against all of the subversive forces that have sought, and are seeking, to undermine the internal security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the Nation is indebted to Mr. Hoover for instituting this very fine National Police Academy. Through it he has placed the very latest developments in combating crime and sabotage at the disposal of thousands of our local police officers who otherwise would not have had access to this training. Its operation during peacetime resulted in the training facilities being available when war came to our shores and with the war a new menace to national security. Sabotage activities have been minimized in many, many American communities because of the training the local police officers received here at this school.

Minnesota is proud to have had 14 graduates from the F. B. I. National Police Academy. Besides Captain Hall, they are:

Marvin W. Mitchell, Coleraine, patrolman, police department; Roy M. Carlson, Duluth, sergeant-detective, police department; Theodore O. Perrault, Duluth, chief criminal investigator, St. Louis County sheriff's office; Elmer Otto Stovern, Duluth, chief of police, police depart-

ment; Fred Odegard, Hibbing, captain, police department; Edward B. Hansen, Minneapolis, chief of police, police department; William Edwin Ryan, Minneapolis, detective, police department; Harry N. Tompkins, Rochester, chief of police, Police Department; Joseph G. Himsl, St. Cloud, identification officer, Stearns County sheriff's office; John W. Fahey, St. Paul, deputy sheriff, Ramsey County sheriff's office; Dewey M. Schaible, St. Paul, assistant chief of police, police department; Wesley Paul Glewwe, South St. Paul, superintendent of identification, police department; August J. Bingold, Winona, chief of police, police department.

Golden Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, to the graduating class of Stratford College, Danville, Va., on May 31, 1944:

This is a D-day for many of us. First, to you of the graduating class, gowned as you are in the garments of graduation, soon to realize your once far-off dream of becoming a college graduate. Next, to the parents here and at home who see the little girl of yesterday, today a young lady graduate; then it is an hour of happiness to you of the faculty of this good institution as you behold your finished handiwork. Finally, it is a happy hour for me as I speak your final message. I shall ever hold this occasion as a priceless pearl in my rosary of happy recollections.

My theme today is Golden Goals. I shall speak simply and briefly. The hour calls for a serious message. To you, much has been given; from you, much will be expected, since she who takes out of life more than she puts into it has not dealt fairly with life. I am sure I am speaking to future great women, women whose eyes, are on the stars, for "too low they build, who build beneath the stars."

The first goal toward which I hope you will ever strive is the goal of physical perfection. Every man and woman should strive for the highest physical perfection. The Greek ideal was a lofty one. The days ahead will require of both men and women strong bodies as well as brilliant brains. The Helen of tomorrow, like her brother, must have a steady nerve and healthy body. That means that all habits which do not make for physical perfection should be avoided. Apart from culture and refinement, the one-time habits of the harlot, so prevalent today, do not make for a healthy womanhood, and what is even more serious, portend an unhealthy future generation. The average American woman of today lives 3 years longer than the average American man. The ratio will change if woman continues to copy the doubtful habits of man. The glory of woman has been that she was a person apart from man, finer in her feelings, more delicate in her devotions, and far more lofty in her living experiences. May that glory never fade. Beauty of soul is the soul of beauty. Character is the choicest of cosmetics. If you would be beautiful without, be beautiful within. A healthy mind and heart make for physical perfection. A leading physician recently declared that a majority of our bodily ills could be traced to defective thinking. We suffer from sinful stomachs as well as from dizzy heads. Inferior complexions may produce inferior complexes.

I suggest as your second goal, mental alertness. It has been said that the average individual cultivates only 10 percent of his mental capacity. That means that in most of us there are great areas of mentality unexplored and untilled. Minds vary more in the degree of cultivation than they do in native strength. Wide reading, all travel possible, and contact with great spirits will sharpen your wits and give you the mental axe necessary to fell the trees which thwart your pathway to success and happiness. The future will fall to the keenest in mind and mental alertness. "The survival of the brightest" will keynote the tense era upon which you are soon to enter.

Then comes the goal of social understanding. I frankly warn you now that failure awaits you if you do not know or learn the art of human understanding. Investigations reveal that men and women lose out in life more on account of their inability to adjust themselves socially to others than for any other one reason. If you cannot make and hold friends, woe unto your future!

Tolerance and human understanding make for success. Keep before you Markham's lines:

> "He drew a circle that shut me out,
> Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout:
> But love and I had the wit to win,
> We drew a circle and took him in."

Lack of these heavenly virtues leads to failure. A great philosopher has said that there is more of tragedy and pathose in the inner life of the humblest man than in the outer life of the greatest among us. A modern Chinese philosopher has declared that our degree of being civilized may be gaged by the extent of our respect for the feelings of others. The popular person has no secret formula. We get back what we give.

> "Give to the world the best you have,
> And the best will come back to you."

Finally, let me emphasize spiritual awareness as a lifetime goal. By that I mean an appreciation and reverence for all that is beautiful and fine and good in life. Our hearts, like the poet's, should leap up when we behold the rainbow in the sky. You should be lifted to regions of lofty living by the sight of great paintings, and the sound of great music. Ideals distinguish individuals: one visitor to a mountain top saw the leafless trees at the timber line; another, the broken rocks and crags at its peak; the third visitor was thrilled by the sight of the distant sea.

Take time to commune with nature and nature's God. There is an unseen world of strength of wisdom and goodness to which the human soul may be attuned. Seneca, a Roman Stoic, cried, "Oh, Neptune, save me if you will, sink me if you will, but whatever else may happen, help me to hold my rudder true." Jenny Lind, the Swedish nightingale, as she began her programs, prayed this prayer: "God help me to ring true tonight." Like a tree planted by rivers of waters, your soul may grow into the full stature of heaven-blessed human beings. Like the open bay, fed by the endless sea, you, too, may have all heaven at your command. Remember that spiritual values are as real as material ones; faith is as real as the fragrance of flowers, hope is as eternal as the everlasting hills, and love is as luminous as the light from sun and stars.

You will find your highest lives in simple service. No one attains real greatness until he has lost himself in some cause greater than any cause of his own. It was said of one girl whose name was Edith, that her life was bounded on the north, south, east, and west by Edith only. Those of you who will receive in the future, life's richest rewards, will be those among you who serve most and love longest a broken and distressed world.

Self-centered lives are like peacocks that parade in pride and splendor but sing no songs; like orchids expensive but emit no sweet fragrance; like Japanese cherry trees which delight us with their beauty of bud and blossom but furnish no food for the hungry or shelter for the shelterless. "Only the actions of the just smell sweet and blossom in the dust."

You have my message. May you ever keep before you as Golden Goals, Physical Perfection, Mental Alertness, Social Understanding, and Spiritual Awareness.

Blessings on you as you go forth today. May Heaven hold you and guide you safely to the city of your highest dreams!

A Message to and Information for Mother Whose Husband Is in Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, information coming to me through the O. W. I. and other sources indicating the number of wives of servicemen who have endured financial hardships and made unusual monetary sacrifices prior to and immediately after the birth of a serviceman's child prompts me to urge service organization auxiliaries, women's clubs, church ladies' societies, and so forth, to become acquainted with the benefits which we have provided through congressional enactments and pass that information along to the mothers and expectant mothers.

Congress has appropriated $24,200,000 for this maternity care for wives of servicemen of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. We have made possible through legislation we have passed, for the wife of the man in service in these lower four grades to receive medical, nursing, and infant care without cost during that maternity period. In Minnesota, our State department of health, State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn., cooperating with the Federal Government's program, directs and administers this service through the division of child hygiene.

Inquiries relative to these benefits and this program may be directed to division of child hygiene, Minnesota Department of Health, University Campus, Minneapolis, Minn.

Under this plan the wife of the man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her

baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

IMPORTANT TO FOLLOW RULES

Wives of servicemen should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the rules set down for this free medical attention. The rules set down in Minnesota are clearly stated and must be met in order to receive this care and service. The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to the division of child hygiene, Minnesota Department of Health, University Campus, Minneapolis, Minn., and ask them to send a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's Army serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once, and rush it to St. Paul, Minn., for approval.

APPLY EARLY

It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy. The State board of health will not approve payment of the doctor, hospital, or any service before the application is made out. It is important that the application be made out by the wife at the first sign of pregnancy. In case of an emergency be sure that the doctor makes application for you immediately. It is most important to get the application filled out and sent in at the earliest possible time. See your doctor at the first sign of pregnancy and apply for this free service.

Wives can see their regular family doctor for this. It is not necessary to go to a special or certain doctor to get this aid. It is most important that wives of servicemen remember that no payment for any such service will be made prior to the filing of an application. In other words, no application—no aid. Should you know of any wife of any serviceman who needs this aid, be sure to warn her that she should see her doctor at once and make application for this free medical and hospital and infant-care financial aid.

CHARGES PAID THROUGH STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

The charges for this medical, hospital, and surgical attention are paid through the division of child hygiene, Minnesota Department of Health, University Campus, Minneapolis, Minn. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse. No money is given to the wife. No serviceman's wife need worry about proper medical, infant, care, or hospital care in the event of a birth if she acquaints herself with this free service and makes proper application before the event rather than after. Pregnant wives can get prenatal care as well. No wife of a man in service, therefore, should fear seeing a doctor at once because of running up a bill. The sooner she sees her doctor the more free medical service she will get.

WHAT SERVICE WIVES CAN EXPECT

Complete medical service for maternity patients during the prenatal period, childbirth, and 6 weeks thereafter—including care of complications, operations, post-partum examination—and to the newborn infant.

Health supervision for infants, usually provided in childbirth conferences.

Nursing care, in the home, through the local health department including bedside nursing care as necessary—for the mother, before, during, and after childbirth, and for the baby during the first year of life.

Hospital care, in wards or at ward rates, for maternity patients and infants. Funds cannot be used in part payment for more expensive hospital accommodations. A minimum stay in the hospital of 10 days after childbirth is arranged if possible. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospital, including Army and Navy hospitals, where the maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State health agency.

CONGRESS SET UP THIS SERVICE

The money for this service is available by acts of Congress passed last year, 1943. Your present Congress has appropriated a total of $24,200,000 for this service. I would like to see servicemen's wives learn about this help and make use of it. Should any question arise regarding any phase of this aid, or should any wives of servicemen be unable to secure this aid—it will do you well to write your Congressman about it. Address your letter: Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

1940 Edition of the Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the 1940 edition of the census as put out by the Bureau of Census in the Department of Commerce and printed in the United States Government Printing Office is a most amazing mess of jumbled-up inaccuracy, if the "facts" relating to Cleveland are any indication.

The following are a few samples of the "information" contained in this book. All of them are found in volume 3, part 4, and refer to people 14 years of age and up:

It would be interesting to know how the count was made in certain instances and how the totals were arrived at. In many cases the classified section of the telephone directory would have been much more accurate. For anyone seeking quick, definite, and accurate information relative to various workers' groups, it would be almost useless as so many of them are so obviously incorrect as to make one doubt them all.

Page 695: Dancers, showmen, and athletes, 155. These are all classed under one group or heading. Why?

Page 696: Fishermen and oystermen, 13. A check with the fish companies revealed there were 42 active fishermen at that time and—strangely—no oystermen.

Page 696: Workers in wholesale and retail trade, 1,721. Any one of the big department stores employs more than that.

Page 696: For food and kindred products there are two listings on this page for 1940; in one place 1,676 and in another place 461.

Which is right, one or both?

Well, Fisher Bros. Co. employs over 3,000 people, the A. & P. over 1,800, and there are 4 other large grocery chains besides the 1,092 independent groceries and 378 delicatessens that have an average of 3 people working. Besides these there are hundreds of people working in the production of food and kindred products.

Thus, instead of 1,676 people working in food and kindred products, there are over 10,000 in Cleveland in this important industry.

Page 696: Textiles, textile products, and apparel, 299.

There are 12 manufacturers and 65 retail outlets besides all the big department stores that employ hundreds and thousands of people. Just 1 of the above manufacturers employs 2,100 people and another 1,550, and, from the opinion of men in the industry that should know, there are about 10,000 people employed under this heading.

Page 742: Osteopaths, 10. All anyone had to do to get the right number would be to take the classified directory and count them—all 69 of them.

Page 742: Teachers, 766. The clerk of the Cleveland school board reports there are 3,587 school teachers in Cleveland proper. This does not include those in the parochial schools.

Page 742: Trained nurses and student nurses, 57. This is probably the most ridiculous notation in the whole book.

According to the Bureau of Nursing Service, district No. 4, 1220 Huron Road, there are over 3,000 nurses registered there, and that includes only about 65 percent of the actual number.

Page 742: Listed under "Professional and semiprofessional workers" are hucksters and peddlers, 553; newsboys, 552; mail carriers, 936.

One would wonder how hucksters, peddlers, or newsboys could come under either heading. If one were trying to find out how many hucksters there were in Cleveland, I do not think anyone would think of looking for them under the heading of "Professional and semiprofessional workers."

Page 742: College presidents, professors, and instructors, 180. The College Blue Book, 1939 edition, to which the above figures refer, lists 705 at Western

Reserve alone. There are 7 other major colleges and universities in Cleveland, all with large teaching staffs.

Page 780: Coal mining, 30; metal mining, 7. Just where these people mine would be interesting to know.

Conduct of Recent Senatorial Primaries in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement of further observations relative to the outrageous methods and apparently limitless financial expenditures used to defeat me in the recent—May 19—nominating or primary election in Oregon. I request unanimous consent to have this statement published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a newspaper article to which reference is made in my statement.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in the hope that the knowledge may be helpful to other loyal American Members of the Congress who face reelection at this time, I desire to demonstrate the kind of unfair, deceitful, and dishonest campaign which was waged successfully against me in the recent primary election in Oregon, by the "smear artists" of the international group and their associates in underhanded political tactics, the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, headed by the internationalist, Sidney Hillman, who are undermining our constitutional government. I submit the text of a letter which is similar to many others received by me from Oregon voters. Every phase of Federal policy, religious belief, or personal bias was similarly handled by my unprincipled opponent and the subversive groups which promoted his candidacy. This letter read as follows:

"There is a statement regarding yourself I would like some enlightenment on. Friday I voted for you; then returning home, I met a neighbor who informed me that you had been chumming around with both Nazi and Jap agents. I asked this party who told her. Her answer was, 'Everybody knows it.' If this statement can be traced to its source, it seems as if a suit for libel could be started, for it is a serious charge in wartime to be dealing with the enemy."

The Members of the Senate, I am sure, know that these charges are false and that a denial of them is not required. Yet the fact is that I was foremost in preparing our country for war with Hitler and the other dictators of the powers of aggression, so that our Nation was better prepared to defend itself when war came than it otherwise would have been. Moreover, I have been the chairman of that bi-partisan group of the Members of both Houses of the Congress from the States of California, Oregon, and Washington which addressed itself to Federal and defensive problems peculiar to the exposed Pacific coastal area of the United States. It was upon the findings and recommendations of this group that the directive was founded whereby the Japanese were removed from the strategic Pacific coastal area.

However, it appears that if false assertions are continuously made and reiterated, they soon are accepted by presumably intelligent voters as factual. In the recent Oregon election all the for-hire hangers-on as well as the prostituted writers and the purchasable publications were employed in this deceitful work by those handling the apparently unlimited funds made available to them, and I was unable to get fair or adequate publicity for any factual statement of mine, so uniformly, with a few notable exceptions, was the press of the State controlled.

Among these writers was one, Palmer Hoyt, managing editor of the Oregonian, once a great newspaper in Oregon, but now, under his management, little more than a house-organ catering to the advertising account of Aaron Frank's department store in Portland. Aaron travels with his fellow-internationalists. His store dominates the retail business of the Portland trade area and its advertising account is of vital importance to the revenues of the newspapers published in Portland.

Palmer Hoyt and his fellows who write for hire designate me as an isolationist but refuse to define the meaning of the term "isolationist"; although repeatedly I have asked for a definition of this tricky word.

There is another tricky word used by the "smear artists" and that word is "labor."

I was represented as being against labor, whereas in truth and in fact the man who really labors has never had a more sympathetic and loyal friend than I have been and am. The record of my public activities and of my private operations verify this statement. Yet he who preys upon those who labor for their daily bread, whether he be a hard taskmaster or a labor racketeer, has no more inveterate foe than myself.

I deplore strikes in war industries in war time. However, by the constant repetition of the assertion that I am "against labor," the morons and dupes who read and believe all they read in the controlled publications, and the victims of the racketeering C. I. O. Political Action Committee, were persuaded to vote against me.

That there may be no uncertainty of my meaning of "Internationalist," I want it understood that I so designate anyone who holds his racial, religious, or country-of-orgin group as supreme in his political allegiance and that his loyalty to the country in which he holds citizenship is to him of secondary or of minor importance, if any; or anyone who sets himself and his peculiar group apart in all countries and demands for himself special consideration in political and personal matters as an extraordinary kind of citizen, entitled to persecute others while demanding mercy for himself and his kind. His trade weapon is secret, but effective, mass boycott.

A difference with him on any subject is immediately assigned as based upon persecution of his racial, religious or country-of-origin group with the result that his entire group unites to destroy politically and to boycott commercally anyone who cannot be intimidated by their un-American practices.

In America, the Internationalists conspire to evade and would nullify and repeal the immigration laws of the Congress while their national spokesman appears to be the despicable Walter Winchell and apparently the discredited book Under Cover is their bible. Right up to Pearl Harbor their international traders were shipping scrap iron and other essential war supplies to our obvious enemies.

It seems to me that the time has come when the preservation of the Republic and the safety of the American people and of their sons in the combat forces of our country all over the world, demand that all truly, patriotic Americans regardless of their political party affiliations unite to suppress these sinister internationalists and to defeat their subversive and disturbing practices.

It is of vital importance now to the efficiency of our war efforts and to the economy of our federal operations that all Americans strive for unity in every patriotic purpose of national interest.

Mr. President, supplemental to my remarks and as part of them, I request that the article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of last Saturday under the caption "White House guard linked with C. I. O. group," be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 3, 1944]

WHITE HOUSE "GUARD" LINKED TO C. I. O. GROUP

(By Willard Edwards)

Evidence linking the White House Palace Guard with the operations of the Communist-dominated C. I. O. Political Action Committee, which has been attacked in Congress as a violator of the Corrupt Practices Act, was uncovered yesterday by congressional investigators.

Daily messages have been exchanged between Sidney Hillman, in his New York City headquarters of the C. I. O. group, and David K. Niles and Jonathan W. Daniels, confidential aides to the President, in their White House offices, the probers found.

KINGDON REPRESENTS F. D.

The rather astounding information was also gathered that Dr. Frank Kingdon, former president of the Union for Democratic Action, which is helping finance a congressional purge of anti-new dealers, is attending C. I. O. meetings as personal representative of President Roosevelt.

The U. D. A. is closely associated with the Hillman group in the fourth-term campaign. Like the C. I. O. committee, it has been found by the Dies Committee on un-American Activities to be controlled by Communist elements.

KINGDON IN PICTURE

Among the exhibits to be presented at the expected congressional investigation of Hillman's lavish expenditures in the current campaign will be a photograph which appeared recently in the U. A. W.-C. I. O. union paper of the Wright Aeronautical Co. at Paterson, N. J.

Richard Frankensteen, director of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and vice president of the United Automobile Workers, appeared as speaker before a C. I. O. meeting in this picture. Seated behind him was Dr. Kingdon, listed in the caption as President Roosevelt's personal representative." He recently authored an effusive biography of the President.

The message between the White House and Hillman indicated constant conferences on the course of the C. I. O. group's political campaign, the investigators said.

These revelations lent impetus to the demands in both Houses that Attorney General Biddle be called upon to explain why he refuses to prosecute the Hillman organization for violations of the law against excessive expenditures in congressional and Presidential campaigns. Hillman and Philip Murray, head of the C. I. O., have admitted the collection of $750,000 for political purposes and have announced that a fund of several millions will be assembled.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of the President, is listed on the honorary sponsoring

committee of the U. D. A. which is conducting a campaign for sale of the new congressional purge list," issued by the New Republic, a radical publication. The C. I. O. committee is using this list in its campaign to drive out of Congress all those whose voting records are not considered progressive.

Post-War Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE MURDOCK
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, because of its timely interest, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], entitled "The Air Must Be Free," which appeared in the May 1944 issue of the magazine Flying.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AIR MUST BE FREE

MAINTENANCE OF UNRESTRICTED AIRWAYS IN THE POST-WAR WORLD IS URGED AS A WAR BARRIER BY AN AUTHORITY ON INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah, former professor of political science at the University of Utah, the author is a recognized authority on international affairs. He has served as vice president of the American Society of International Law, vice president of the American Political Science Association. Born in Salt Lake City in 1883, he has represented his native State in the United States Senate since 1932)

The airplane can, given the opportunity, contribute as much to lasting peace as it is contributing today to winning the war. But I am writing with the conviction that this peacetime contribution will not be possible if we hamper aviation with a pre-post-war balloon barrage of oratory, excessive regulations, and dog-in-the-manger nationalistic taboos.

In this war, the airplane has been freed from red tape, from outworn military ideas, from snail-like production schedules. Magnificent work by hundreds of thousands of Americans—civilian and military—is behind this achievement. Now it appears imperative that we begin to establish a parallel post-war freedom for aviation, else it is endangered of returning to its former role of a troublesome stepchild. If it does, it will be denied one of the golden opportunities of this or any age to build an aerial highway toward permanent peace.

More can be contributed to better international understanding by proper regulation and experimentation with the air than in any other single medium.

I have said that it is imperative we do something about this, and you need only read your newspaper to understand the urgency. We are on the eve of a great international conference on post-war aviation. It has been a-building since last July, when Secretary of State Cordell Hull notified Senator BENNETT C. CLARK of Missouri, chairman of the aviation subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, that such a conference was contemplated but would not be called until the committee could voice its opinions.

Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle was put in charge of the liaison work with the Congress. This work went forward slowly until recently, when Lord Beaverbrook, Britain's spokesman for post-war aviation, announced that England was ready for a conference and awaited word from the United States.

Further stimulus to hold the meeting has come from United States air lines, who have already done a magnificent wartime transportation job throughout the world—and who are divided sharply on the post-war international issue of whether we should face the world with one air line (a so-called "chosen instrument") or should permit more than one, or many, United States lines to enter the post-war world arena as competitive private enterprises.

The impending international conference and the air line debates have raised another—and most important—question. Shall the air be free? Shall our nationals be permitted to fly at will over foreign territory, with or even without reciprocal privileges going to foreign planes flying over the United States?

It seems to me that the answer should be worked out before any other questions are raised. Unless this vital question is answered satisfactorily, we may find ourselves building, not for peace, but for another war.

I am not alone in underlining the importance of this aspect of the world transport aviation problem. The British already have indicated how vital they consider it. They have gone on record favoring freedom of the air—with reservations. It is the chief of four main topics they propose be discussed at the coming conferences.

"His Majesty's government," said a recent official statement, "would welcome a greater measure of freedom of the air than existed before the war, but * * * the extent to which freedom of the air can be realized must depend on general acceptance of an enlightened international settlement."

Jointly operated United Nations lines "in particular areas * * * now operated by enemy airlines and routes passing through areas of vital security interest" are also recommended.

It is precisely this type of generalized recommendation that must be avoided if we are to nail down air freedom as the main plank in a platform on which may stand a permanent peace. I do not believe the British answer is specific enough, nor sufficiently inclusive; nor does it outline a pattern for permanent peace.

To put it more constructively, I believe that, first of all, there should be established in the world certain free-air cities, or free-air islands.

This should not be difficult to do. War victors can reach a decision themselves about enough free air to give all the nations free access to the air. Wide distribution of "free" cities will make it possible to allow nationalistic jurisdiction and control over the air, to be established in those places where the nations want to maintain that control. It also is reasonable to assume that every nation, no matter how strictly it adheres to national jurisdiction of the air over its own land, will want to have a free city or two, according to the size of the nation, for entrance of planes of all powers. Indeed, I believe that the more the free city idea is developed, the more free cities will appear in the world community.

By "free" cities I mean cities which permit entrance and exit of planes of all nations without any reference to reduction of restrictions in regard to trade or immigration. I am purposely avoiding the question of freedom of trade or free entrance of persons. Air over the oceans and the high seas, of course, should remain free. This freedom should be maintained by international agreement and by policing, if necessary, by the United Nations planes.

It follows that those nations which control the air over the poles should grant free air in those areas to all other nations of the world. Nor can I emphasize too strongly my feeling that the air over each one of the Axis powers—Germany, Italy, Japan, and all their satellites—should be made free.

This would have two advantages. In the first place, much of the need for a United Nations peace force or an international police force to curb aggression will be accomplished because free air over the former enemies will eliminate the necessity for constant patrols. Second, after a time we would know the advantages or disadvantages afforded to nations whose air is free—and I believe that free air will prove a distinct advantage over a period of years.

Other free areas should be specified at the conference table. The air over such rivers as the Rhine and Danube—already internationalized—should be free. Similarly, the air over all of the mandated territories—whether mandated as a result of the Versailles Treaty or as a result of treaties growing out of the present war—should be free for United Nations planes, if not the planes of all the world.

Other widespread free areas seem to be in order in those countries now occupied by the enemy. They should be willing to allow freedom of the air to much of their territory in return for the freedom which will be given them as a result of the Allied war effort. Air over land taken from the enemy countries and restored to their former owners also should be in this category. For example, if out of this war a nation like China has restored to her an island such as Formosa, it would seem only logical that she grant air freedom to the world so far as Formosa is concerned.

The world pattern of such a program takes significant form. Mark off a globe with all the free areas I have suggested, all of which can be brought about as a result of the war and without doing an injustice to anyone, and you will find that the problem of free air can be solved for most of the world. You will have free air over the seas and other important bodies of water and rivers, free air over the poles, and free-air cities or islands at close enough intervals across the continents of the world to be within easy hopping distance for the average transport of today or even the below-average transport of tomorrow.

Nor will those nations which want nationalistic control and absolute jurisdiction be left out in the cold. They will have gained their two major objectives: freedom for their planes anywhere they want to fly in the world, plus jurisdiction for themselves over their own territory.

Or put it in terms of the United States only. When one realizes the extent of the earth which we ourselves will insist upon having left open to us—even if air control is recognized as being nationalistic and air jurisdiction over a given land as it is today—it is clear that our interests are so extensive that we must keep in mind both the national and the international aspects of the whole question.

Consider one example among possible thousands. Assume that the present international law of the air prevails; that strictly internationalistic selfish ideas control; that every nation keeps absolute control over the air above its territory—but wants access to all other territory excepting over similar nationalistic jurisdictions. If these rules prevailed, the United States would need free air between the State of Washington and Alaska, even though it be over Canada. We need free air over anything which is in the way between continental United States and the Philippines. And so on around the world.

All types of air transport, in a peacetime world, may benefit from such an arrangement. Transports can link the world markets. Lighter-than-air ships, aided by world control of helium now held by Russia and the United States, should stage a dramatic

come-back. Private planes can operate without fear of changing international regulations.

In summary, we must not, in the international conferences to come, give only lip service to what the British so appropriately spell in capital letters. This "Freedom of the Air" should become more than a phrase. It should become an international slogan, the basis for a program. It should be given meaning in terms of concrete proposals. Countries, cities, territories, islands, and areas should be named. Mileages should be measured, concessions drawn up by all the nations participating. Only by such a practical, realistic approach can we expect to get anywhere at all.

With proper foresight, with careful planning, such a program can by the same token lead to a foundation, built by the United Nations, upon which will arise a permanent and workable peace.

Philippine Freeedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Philippine Freedom," published in the Washington Post of yesterday. This is a very comprehensive editorial, which takes into account our relationship both before and during the war with the Philippines. I think it is worthy of reading by everyone who is interested in the problem.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILIPPINE FREEDOM

Our relations with the invaded Philippine Islands are once more coming to the fore because of the desire to hasten the date of the islands' independence once the Japs are driven out and the necessity of opening negotiations on economic ties between the two countries. As the Tydings-MacDuffie Act now stands, the President is required to call a United States-Philippines conference on future trade relations on or before July 4. Since the war has given rise to much broader economic problems, however, the Senate has passed a resolution creating a Filipino Rehabilitation Commission to "investigate all matters affecting post-war economy, trade, finance, economic stability, and rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands * * *." This advisory body would be composed of nine Philippine representatives and nine Americans—three each representing the Senate, House and White House. It is obviously desirable that the House complete action on the bill before the end of the month so that the Rehabilitation Commission can take the place of the narrower trade conference.

Pending also before the House is the important Tydings resolution to open the way for advancement of the independence date if the invaders are expelled from the Philippines before July 4, 1946. It declares a policy of driving out the treacherous, invading Japanese, of restoring as quickly as possible the orderly and free democratic processes of government to the Filipino people and then establishing complete independence of the Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation. In this respect it is sharply at variance with the previous ill-advised resolution which would have empowered the President, after negotiations with the Commonwealth government-in-exile, to proclaim Philippine ndependence within 30 days.

We could scarcely have done worse by our wards in the Pacific than to have cut them loose while their homeland is occupied by the enemy and the government is in exile and consequently operating in impaired fashion. Before we can grant them real independence we must see that their constitutional system is once more fully operative. The current resolution assures the Filipinos a free country at the earliest practicable time instead of offering them only the husk of independence. Means of keeping the Philippines free would also be strengthened. The resolution would extend the present authority for the United States to retain naval bases in the islands to include bases of all types.

The chief question that has been raised as to enactment of this resolution is that it makes no direct reference to the act of last November by which the term of President Quezon was continued until the White House proclaims that "constitutional processes" have been restored in the Philippines. That act also contemplates that Vice President Osmena shall become President as soon as the government is reestablished at Manila and serve until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified under the Philippine Constitution. No doubt this act would stand if the current resolution should be passed without reference to it. But it is obviously desirable to leave no doubt about the matter. It would be tragic indeed to have a contest over governing authority in the hour of the Filipinos' liberation.

Address by Hon. Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, to Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at a banquet of the fourth-degree assemblies of the Knights of Columbus of Connecticut, at the Bond Hotel, in Hartford on May 28.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The enduring qualities of our order are best demonstrated, it always has seemed to me, by the revived inspiration that comes from the conferring of degrees.

On an occasion like this the oldest members present, as well as the candidates themselves, are moved to a rededication to the high principles and noble purposes which membership in this order implies.

It matters not how often we may have attended degree celebrations in the past; each succeeding time we are drawn into the ritual with rekindled fervor. That ritual never becomes hollow or hackneyed. It never has the false ring of artificial theatrics. It never is witnessed as empty ceremony. Underlying the beautiful language is the ever-burning spirit that binds us together in seeking to achieve the high purposes of our religion and country for which men have marched under the banner of this society for 3 generations.

The history of our organization during the past half century has been the story of men, humble in the sight of God, and proud in the citizenship of the United States, banding together in a determination to adhere to the teachings of God and strengthen a natural liberty-loving patriotism.

It has been our duty to demonstrate by our own activities, and in denouncing the insidious operations of evil groups within our country, that true Americanism is based upon charity and justice, and that an essential obligation of citizenship in this great democracy is to live among one's fellowmen with tolerance and mutual respect.

As the years have passed, and this order has grown stronger and more influential throughout the land, it has been to our everlasting glory that we have fought, not only for our own rights, but also against persecution or calumny directed at any group of Americans.

Recently the noble mission of this splendid organization has been directed against the spreading waves of pernicious anti-Semitism. Our instinctive reaction against intolerance was born of the sufferings of our own forefathers. We abhor the cruelties of racial and religious discrimination because we are bound together in this society by an unqualified adherence to liberties proclaimed in the Constitution of the United States. We reject unholy and unworthy attacks upon any fellow man, and upon our fellow men who are Jews, because such attacks are sinful; because they violate the unalterable doctrine of Christian charity; because they enthrone injustice and degrade the human soul.

Our activity against intolerance in America must be continued. Indeed, it must be proclaimed from the mountaintops. War galvanizes good citizens into patriotic action, but the emotions which war unleashes may be seized upon by evil groups to arouse passion against minorities. Therefore, we must continue our vigilance. Along with all other groups of good Americans we must be alert to prevent the turning of war psychology into vicious attack upon any race or religion. This vigilance canot be confined to the joint action we may take through the official channels of our society. It must be accepted as the responsibility of every one of our members as an individual of his own community. Tolerance is cultivated by example. The Good Samaritan was a person who went out of his way to help a neighbor.

The influence of the Knights of Columbus as a Nationwide organization is powerful because its effect is found not only in the collective action of the order, but also in the separate but consistent examples of its individual members. No member of this society is true to his pledge unless he, himself lives the principles for which the fraternity stands. And I am glad to be able to say that on the issue of racial and religious tolerance, our individual members, in their daily intercourse with the people of their own cities and towns, are living up to the ideals we foster.

Our country's need is that it look forward to an era of good feeling among all the people of America, and the world. God knows we shall come out of this war with scars and with many a heartache. Let us hope that out of this common suffering there will also come a common understanding, a sense of mutual trust and respect, and a feeling of neighborliness, which are the great blessings of a tolerant and charitable people.

But our mission as an organization dedicated to enlightened American citizenship is not limited to counteracting intolerance. We have been, and must continue to be,

deeply concerned with the eroding effect of materialism upon culture in the United States. Intolerance may be the product of ignorance and insularity. It may be a symptom of maladjustment, or may represent a wave of mass emotion, but materialism is more dangerous because its doctrines are articulated in many circles by those who fancy themselves leaders of thought.

Materialism in its various forms—and oftentimes it is subtly clothed in seemingly innocuous coverings—is at war with everything we stand for, and everything that America should stand for.

The basis of materialism is in its denial of God and of the human soul. It rejects anything of the spirit in human affairs. It considers that man is nothing more than a corporeal creature whose destiny is to merely be made comfortable during a short and pointless span of life on this earth.

Every true Christian is bound in conscience to war against materialism in whatever form it may take. We of this fraternity are united in the performance of that sacred obligation, and we have done much to combat the forces of materialism in America. But as with the crusade against intolerance, the war against materialism must be continuous and unrelenting. And that war must be expertly waged. Those who would enthrone materialism in America are sly and resourceful. They have at their command all of the tricks of perverted minds and wicked hearts. Against them must at all times be marshaled the full strength of the spiritual legions of America.

The most dangerous attack of materialism is that which is made under the guise of political or social reform. Proposals to transfer to bureaucratic agencies of government the direction of family life, the control of education, and the supervised care of individuals often have the poisonous germ of materialism.

One of the most deadening efforts of so-called social advances in recent years, not only in other parts of the world but even in our own country, has been the growing assumption that the chief aim of government should be the material welfare of the people.

No true Christian—no one who has in him a spark of charity or the slightest sense of justice—will dispute that the hungry should be fed; the naked clothed, and the sick and infirm cared for. These are corporal works of mercy which our Lord himself enjoined upon all men. And, in the complicated society of the modern world, the aid and assistance of government in the performance of these acts of mercy and justice are both necessary and, if properly administered, highly desirable. But the danger arises when the spiritual basis of social aid is ignored; or deliberately abandoned. That danger exists when the sponsors of particular projects, the administrators of government aid, the leaders, so-called, of social reform, are proclaimed agnostics, free thinkers, or people who consider that the mark of intellectual emancipation is disbelief in the reality of a divinely created human soul.

To such people, religion, the church, the integrity of the family, and the majesty of the individual man, are considered obstacles in the path of efficient materialists progress. When such people actually have the power of government there is the beginning of an atheistic state. We have witnessed in other parts of the world the ruinous consequences of this triumph of materialism—and we must be ever vigilant in America that a similar victory of the forces of evil does not happen here.

To the extent that materialism has been held at bay in our own country, much credit must be given to good citizens who have supported the work of courageous and outspoken societies such as our own.

Oftentimes in the past, the voices of America has first been heard in the Knights of Columbus. We have not hesitated to condemn the vice of atheism in the seats of foreign government. We have not hesitated to prod our own Government into action against alien doctrines of materialism. We have not been silent when insidious and destructive plans have been proposed within our own borders. This work must be continued. Many think that out of this World War will come a resurgence of spiritual forces. I hope so—for that certainly is one of the objectives for which good men go into battle. But we cannot assume that such a revival will be spontaneous. War brings fatigue—and fatigue begets unwariness. A tired world may want a rebirth of spirituality in government and institutions, but it may be too tired to reach for it. That is why the leadership of such societies as ours will be needed in the years ahead more than ever before.

Thus far I have discussed the mission of this great American organization in combatting intolerance and materialism. This is a mission of charity, and justice, and truth. It is a mission that must go in peace and war. It is a mission which we undertake because we want our country to lead in keeping light in the world.

But because we are a society of American citizens, and because love of country is a foundation stone of our fraternity, we are dedicated first and foremost, without reservation, and without hesitation, to the defense of our Nation in time of danger. In this critical hour all of our resources, the full strength of our joint endeavors, are irrevocably pledged to victory for our flag on the great fields where battle now rages.

Because we have taught our members, during the entire existence of our fraternity, the principles of American freedom, and the necessity for fighting to preserve that freedom, we are able to give to our country in this decisive struggle not only the aroused aid of patriotic citizens; but also the inexhaustible strength that comes from a profound conviction that the cause for which we fight is just.

To me the final proof of the value of the Knights of Columbus as an American institution is its stalwart stand in time of war. Our members need no prodding; they need no morale builders; no dispensers of propaganda. Every council of the society in every city of the land is immediately transformed into a corps of militant Americans.

I need not recall that in the early days of our fraternity there were those who looked askance upon us. It was thought in some quarters that this might be the beginning of some kind of mysterious clan of a religious group which would live within itself and apart from other Americans. But the record of the Knights of Columbus in the First World War dispelled for all time that early suspicion. To our great glory, official representatives of our organization went into every trench with the doughboys, and sailed the seas with our Navy. Where the fighting was, there they were. The only credential that was needed to receive our help was a uniform of the United States of America. And long after the war we kept faith with the men who had fought for America. Every cent of our war fund was turned into educational and recreational assistance for veterans.

Right here in Connecticut we conducted one of the most comprehensive educational projects the country ever has known. For more than 10 years after the last war we offered to every soldier and sailor who had an honorable discharge free education by correspondence in practically every subject in vocational and classical secondary curricula. We organized schools for regular instruction in every important metropolitan center of the country and we enlisted in this great post-war tribute to the fighting men of America the services of qualified scholars from colleges and universities. All this was done in grateful recognition of a nation's debt to its warriors.

In similar ways we shall remember all of the American men who fight for their country today.

There is a special bond between an organization like this and men who live and fight in battle units. The men on an aircraft carrier, the men in a company of infantry, men thrown together on an island outpost, become a fraternity, and know the strong ties of common effort and common sacrifice out of which brotherhood is born. We who have cherished that kind of unity, as we have gathered in our council halls throughout the years, developed an instinctive understanding of the soldiers' and the sailors' hearts. We can serve them and help them because we talk their language. We know their worries, and we apprehend their hopes. We shall not fail them in the years to come.

On an occasion like this, representing as it does the most solemn commemoration of our society, it is fitting that we should pay special tribute to our brothers now in the armed forces of their country. It is natural that we should hold them in special affection, and that we should feel proud of them as our own. Our council rooms and club houses are quieter and less spirited in their absence. The older members are carrying on; but we know now, more than ever before, that the verve and enthusiasm of our younger brothers is an indispensable element of strength for our fraternity.

But even though we miss them, we would not want them back until the last shot for victory had been fired—and because we have deemed them worthy of the obligations which membership in our society imposes, we know that they, themselves, will not ask to come back until they can bring to us and to their native land, the precious tokens of glorious triumph.

It is inspiring to picture where these fine young men of America may be at this moment, when we, their fathers, are assembled to observe the traditional ceremonies of Columbianism. One no doubt stands rigidly at watch as an American man-of-war plows steadily through the seas of night. Surely, as his eyes pierce the darkness and the solitude of a vast ocean, he finds strength and courage in the kind of Americanism that was strengthened in our circles. Another of these warriors is sweeping through the skies, intent upon his objective, intrepid in the dangers that surround him. He, too, must have greater insight and a fuller understanding of the high purpose for which he fights, because we helped to teach him the ideals of American freedom. Then there are those sturdy men of the land forces—some huddled together on new beachheads; others pushing forward to the Holy City of Rome, and others poised for the momentous onslaught against the European bulwarks of nazi-ism. In them, too, we are confident there is the firm resolve, the unflinching determination, to go ever forward for victory—victory for the kind of world we Americans want—victory for tolerance—victory for the spiritual uplifting of all mankind—victory for peace under God.

On land, on sea, and under the sea, and in the air—to these, our fighting sons and brothers—to all the sons of America who this night, and every night until the final triumphant hour is reached, stand embattled for their country's freedom, we send the salute of a proud and grateful nation.

To those brave men whose blood anoints the battlefields of liberty, and whose deaths forever sanctify the cause for which they fight, we consecrate the country they have loved. For them and their eternal salvation we send forth fervent prayers to Almighty God.

Isolationism—Foreign and Domestic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by our colleague the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] at the opening of the National Wartime Conference, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on June 2, 1944. The address is entitled "Isolationism—Foreign and Domestic."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Wartime Conference, and fellow citizens, it is a privilege to take part in this significant conference. I have listened with intense interest to the points of view set forth by the distinguished speakers who have already addressed you. The most significant feature of the conference, it seems to me, is that the workers in the so-called "learned professions," in the sciences, in the arts, and so-called "white-collar fields" generally, are realizing that they are but parts of a greater whole. This is indeed a promising sign, for the special knowledge and skills here represented will be needed in full measure in shaping both the post-war world and post-war America. If we, in our several capacities, are keenly aware of what is going on in the world around us, outside of the narrower sphere of our professional interests, the outlook for world peace, for national security, and for individual prosperity and happiness will certainly be brighter.

We are meeting at a time of storm when the flash and the thunder of modern warfare reaches into every home and into every heart in America. At this very moment the massed might of our armies is poised for what will be the greatest assault in all military history for the crushing blow planned to knock out the enemy and restore order to the war-ridden world.

Defeat of the enemy is, of course, our immediate objective, but beyond that we have another aim. That is to guarantee that neither Germany nor Japan nor any other aggressive nation or combination of nations will ever again attempt to dominate the world by force.

There are three ways in which we can attempt to bring this about and protect our Nation against future aggression.

One way is the way of complete isolation. This would require that we build up our armed might to such an extent that we would be confident no nation or combination of nations would dare attack us. It would mean transforming our country into an arsenal from behind the walls of which we might view the alarums and excursions of power-bent coalitions without fear for our ultimate safety. There are two important disadvantages in this method. First, it would be disastrously expensive. It would mean diverting a major share of our national resources to armaments and war machinery and saddling our people with a tax burden which is frightful to contemplate. But, more important than this, such a plan would not justify our confidence in this method as a guaranty of peace. Unbridled armament by any nation necessarily begets armament by other nations. It would only be a limited time until the disposition of national armed forces became such that another world conflict would be inevitable.

The second way is that of power alliances with other nations. Undoubtedly this would be a better method than the first, because it would not be necessary for America to bear the entire burden alone. Yet history teaches us that such alliances do not guarantee peace. Instead, they beget counteralliances which eventually set up a balance of power that cannot be resolved except by war. Moreover, history bears testimony to the impermanence and instability of such alliances. Secret treaties and double dealing have frustrated the purposes of the strongest coalitions. When a showdown comes, one or more of the so-called "allies" often turns up in the enemy camp.

No; if we are sincere in our desire for enduring peace, we cannot choose either of these costly and uncertain methods. Isolation will not do. Power politics will not do.

There is, however, a third way—a way that we as a Nation have never tried. When the world was sickened by fresh recollection of the last wholesale slaughter, other nations, however, did try this method. Unfortunately they failed. Whether or not their failure was due entirely to our unwillingness to participate in their effort, that unwillingness doubtless contributed greatly to that failure. It is not too much to say that any League of Nations or any similar organization for the promotion of peace—call it what you will—which does not number among its members the richest and strongest of the freedom-loving nations in the world is foredoomed to failure. Without the full moral and material cooperation of the United States of America there will always be an imponderable factor which will work to the disadvantage of the peace seekers and introduce just that element of doubt which will permit aggressors to gamble again for domination of the world.

A majority of the American people today recognize these facts. The American people are expecting from their leaders action. In response to the will of the people, both Houses of Congress have passed resolutions favoring post-war international collaboration with other nations for maintenance of peace.

It is therefore a source of satisfaction to us that under the leadership of our President our country has already traveled some distance along the path of international amity and cooperation. Long ago our good-neighbor policy toward our neighboring American republics began to bear fruit. Secretary of State Hull's program of reciprocal trade agreements bears witness to an enlightened and far-sighted foreign policy. Despite severe criticism, it was decided to enter into friendly relations with the Government of the Soviet Union, a policy which events have since proved was both fortunate and wise. More recently, both the military and political aims and strategy of this country and her leading allies have been taken up in joint conference at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran, at which opposing points of view have been discussed frankly, compromises have been effected, and a program for realization of common aims has been evolved.

Post-war problems have also been taken up, not only with the leading allies already mentioned, but also with all our other allies. I refer especially to the epoch-making agreement of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, commonly known as U. N. R. R. A. Although this is a temporary relief organization, designed to provide the victims of Axis aggression with the basic necessities of life, yet it is an inspiring illustration of cooperation on the part of the 44 member governments. Having had a large part in the drafting of this international agreement, I was thrilled at the significance of the formal ceremony in the White House, when the representatives of these governments formally signed the agreement. The agreement is also significant in that it represented cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of our Government, since the Senate and House joined the President in providing the necessary funds called for in payment of our share of the expenses.

Similarly, an international conference on currency stabilization is about to be held for the purpose of establishing monetary policies which will help keep the world on a more even economic keel. Finally, only a few days ago, Secretary Hull announced that our Government is ready to begin informal discussions with Great Britain, Russia, and China on establishment of an international peace and security organization.

I said a majority of our countrymen approve these measures of international cooperation. There are, however, some who do not approve them.

First, there is a small but noisy minority whom we might call "the obstreperous isolationists." They are the America Firsters, the ranting, hating, 110-percent superpatriots who believe that America was made to rule the world, and that they were made to rule America. This element is in direct control of some powerful newspapers, and therefore they wield a greater influence than they are rightly entitled to. They are dangerous, because they would plunge America into a senseless course of empire abroad and exploitation at home. But fortunately their obstreperousness makes them easy to recognize, and as long as the public can be kept correctly informed about the issues it is not likely that they will succeed.

Secondly, there is another kind of isolationists who at the present time are more dangerous. These are the insidious isolationists. They are quite the opposite in all outward attributes from their more obstreperous coworkers. For one thing, they have better manners. They are less vocal—in fact, they are almost silence personified. They realize that isolationism is not in public favor, so they do not advocate it. Indeed, when forced to do so they may even give lip service to some kind of general international cooperation. On specific issues they will hedge, first skirting one side of the question, then the other, and ending up somewhere between the two. Some people say that isolationism is dead. That is not true. It is a fact that it is no longer popular. Few of those who cling to it do so openly. But some of those who were formerly outspoken isolationists are still determined, in one way or another, to block any program which will commit this country to active and effective cooperation in a world organization for securing the peace. They hope to succeed after this war as they succeeded after the First World War. These obstructionists, though they be few in number wield strong political influence. The candidate who would have their support must appease them at the same time that he throws out phrases calculated to win the public. The result, when analyzed, is nothing but double talk. We in Washington hear so much of it that I want to warn you against it.

The nature and extent of our international commitments to insure world peace will be the primary issue to be decided by the people and Congress during the next year. The decision we reach must be forthright, clear-cut; the methods we adopt must be practical, and such as to secure results: for only insofar as it contributes to the future peace of the world can this war have any real meaning. The men who are doing the fighting and dying in this war do not want, and do not deserve, weasel words or high-flown sentiments devoid of substantial content. There is nothing equivocal about the sacrifices being demanded of them. There is nothing equivocal about the way they are making

these sacrifices. These men do not want equivocation from those upon whom the responsibility for the Nation's future policy will rest.

There are in our fighting forces today men who fought in the bloody conflict that came to an end in 1918, "the war to end wars." These men remember the pattern of evasion, double talk, and political chicanery resorted to after the last war by the opponents of international cooperation. There are also in the present conflict sons of those men to whom the wedding of caution and evasion was a revolting spectacle. These younger men witnessed the birth of the offspring of that wedding, umbrella diplomacy, appeasement, Munichism. They saw the misbegotten brat grow and become strong on a diet of indecision and vacillation, and finally they saw the monster strut forth and plunge the world into the holocaust in which they are now giving their lives.

These men do not want to see a repetition of such fatal mistakes. They will recognize for what they really are hesitation, equivocation, lack of frankness in framing foreign policy. They are the seeds of new wars planted in the torn earth of the present conflict.

There are also long memories among our allies. Well do they remember our desertion of the cause of peace after the last World War. It is only natural, perhaps, that among them there should still be doubts concerning the extent to which we are prepared to go to maintain peace after this war is won. Recent evidences of our desire and intention to cooperate fully have done much to dispel such doubts. If we should back track, change our policy, or modify it so as to restrict with qualifications and reservations our collaboration, these doubts would again assert themselves. In that case those nations would have no other choice than again to seek such means of national and world security as they think they can achieve without our participation.

It is not only our allies who will be watching with deep concern the forthcoming debates and discussions in Congress, in convention halls, and on the stump regarding our foreign policies. We can rest assured that the rulers of Germany and Japan and their satellites will also be keenly interested.

Our enemies now realize that their dreams of present conquest are not going to materialize out of the present struggle. The war machines which they turned loose upon the world and which overran a large part of two continents have at last been stopped dead and are now being hurled back along every front on which they are engaged. It is only a question of time before they will go down in utter defeat before the combined might of the United Nations' forces. Hitler and Hirohito know this, and the predatory groups they serve know it, too. But they are shrewd men, and the fact that there is no chance of victory for them now does not necessarily mean that all their hopes are shattered. Let them have the kind of peace that followed the last war and the kind of disunity that wrecked the League of Nations, and eventually they or their successors will again embark upon a third attempt to subjugate the world. Yes—the ears of Berlin and Tokio will be listening very carefully to what our leaders and our people say during the next year about international collaboration.

I have been interested to note how some writers, especially newspaper columnists, and some speakers, especially radio commentators, draw a definite line of distinction between American foreign policies and American domestic policies. It seems to me that they are closely related, and that the alignment of forces on both foreign and domestic policies shows a striking similarity. For example, those who oppose effective collaboration with our allies in international affairs through some association of nations, usually oppose also effective collaboration between the States of the Union in domestic affairs through the Congress. In both cases they advocate isolationism.

Everyone agrees that it will be highly desirable for us as a Nation to maintain our present high levels of employment and production after the war. Unless we achieve something like success in this we must look for another depression and all of its miserable consequences. If we succeed in keeping people on the job we shall experience a level of prosperity beyond anything even dreamed of by previous generations. To do this, however, will require national planning and some national financing. An all-out economic effort—which is what will be required—can no more be carried on without centralized planning and credit than can an all-out military effort.

Yet the exponents of isolationism between States will have none of this. They prefer to have each State find its own way out of the economic tangle which will be left as soon as war production ceases. Although they place great store by "States' rights," they have little to say about human rights. They set up a straw man called Federal encroachment, and claim that it is destroying State autonomy and undermining the moral fiber of the people by such insidious devices as grants-in-aid to States for needed public works, for health services, and for aid to dependent children, the aged, and the blind.

This economic tangle faces all the States of the Union and all the nations of the world It is largely the product of the machine age. The war has temporarily sidetracked the question, but after the war it will be back with us again. The question of what we are going to do with the men no longer needed because of the development of the machine will be no longer merely an academic one to be discussed in the classroom by college professors. It will be a practical one put to us every day by hungry men and women out of work and out of money and whose hope of relief is almost dead. If that hope should die, how tragic would be its funeral. Millions of poverty-stricken in this the richest country in the world, millions of economic slaves in this the land of the free, millions of hopeless in this the promised land would file by in the funeral procession. No tradition of the past, no appeal to moderation or to reason might hold in check an attack on our social and economic system or even on our form of government. Men crying for bread for themselves or their families do not stop to discuss economic systems and forms of government. They take what they can get, destroying everything which stands in their way.

Machinery made possible much greater production with less human labor and in less time. This meant great savings in the cost of production and consequently greater profits. By far the greater share of these profits was taken by the capitalists who furnished this investment. A moderate share was given the consumer in the form of reduced prices and a very small share was paid over to those who furnished the labor or skill.

Whatever the exact figures may be, no one can deny that there has been a very great increase in wealth and also in the disparity between the very rich and the very poor. Almost all our attention has been given to the production of wealth and very little to its fair distribution. The great capitalists have overreached themselves in their efforts. They have not only by the application of economic laws but also by the manipulation of man-made laws added to their colossal fortunes. No one begrudges them their wealth except to the extent that it was accumulated at the expense of their fellow men. But now, if the game is to go on, the rules must be made fairer so as to give the ordinary consuming citizen a better chance. Efforts of those who make and of those who administer our laws should be directed primarily to a modification of the capitalistic system rather than to a restoration and retention of this system unchanged. Those who would undo what has already been accomplished by those efforts, and those who would oppose any extension of those efforts, are essentially advocates of isolationism at home, just as those who oppose collaboration between the nations are isolationists abroad.

Just as a policy of international laissez-faire results in international anarchy and war, so a policy of laissez-faire here at home results in unemployment, class strife, and economic chaos.

During the past 10 or 12 years the Federal Congress has enacted many laws which were absolutely necessary to maintain and raise the standard of living of the vast majority of the American people. Those who make a fetish of States' rights label these laws "Government interference" and claim that they "regiment" the people whom they are designed to benefit.

To say that this country should avoid forthright international commitments is to invite international power politics and the rise of totalitarian rule on the international scene. Likewise, to say that the Federal Government should not exert itself to protect the basic human rights of its citizens is to invite power politics and rule by the few on the domestic scene. It is worth while noting again that those who would thus leave the way open for totalitarianism either here or abroad are, on the whole, the same groups.

Furthermore, it is hard to argue with the members of these groups, because lack of logic does not interfere with the vehemence of their argument. For example, the same groups who complain most bitterly of red tape in domestic wartime regulations have succeeded in fashioning a tremendous quantity of red tape with which to prevent our soldiers from voting in the coming national election. When Senator LUCAS and I introduced the Federal soldiers' vote bill, they succeeded in encumbering it with so many technicalities and so much red tape that relatively few soldiers will be able to cast a ballot in November. To these people, red tape is reprehensible if restricting their freedom of action, but acceptable if it can be stuffed down our citizen-soldiers' throats.

But let us not despair because of these isolationists—foreign and domestic. Gatherings such as this increase our confidence in an enduring peace and a prosperous America, a confidence which must be no less intense than our belief in an immediate victory. We must have a clear-cut, far-seeing foreign policy directed toward strengthening and deepening of the coalition of the United Nations to provide the basis for a stable and democratic world, ruled not by power-politics but by genuine collaboration of all nations, and especially of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

We must also have a similar domestic policy. The permanent conversion of swords into plow shares has been a vision of mankind for many centuries. The conversion of our modern instruments of warfare, of radar and similar electronic devices, of aircraft, and so forth, from instruments of war to instruments of peace, can and should raise the standard of living for all our people. In doing this, nothing is more important than unity here at home. Selfishness, class interests, and partisan politics must be subordinated to the Nation's over-all welfare.

But a peaceful and prosperous post-war world will not spring full-grown out of our minds; it must be planned for and worked for. Labor, capital, and the professions must all have an equal part in this planning. They must learn how to work together to solve the many difficult problems which will perplex us, but they must do this within the

framework of international and national unity.

Let us not after victory is won forget the lessons we have learned in the bitterness of battle! Let us keep before us the memory of the men we have lost, and the reasons why we had to lose them! We can discharge our debt to them only if we provide now the groundwork for plans which will insure prompt and united action against every form of aggression, foreign or domestic. Then they will not have died in vain.

The Second Largest Bank in the United States Views Morgenthau's Monetary Stabilization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 3, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, ever since National Bank paper currency was invented in the emergency of the Civil War and used to replace hard money to increase the control of money and the interest yield of the issuing banks, our financiers have tried one experiment after another in their effort to make their kind of currency perform the money functions of this country and at the same time preserve their money-creating privilege with disastrous consequence to business and the American people. First they procured the demonetization of silver and then gold and now when the world is staggering under the greatest debt load ever known these financiers would have us abandon every principle of sound money and try a new financial experiment in an effort to supply the money function and tighten their control of money and credit while they retain their precious interest yield to be wrung from the business of a world already loaded down with an unbearable interest burden.

Their latest money-control plan is analyzed in the monthly bulletin of the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York inserted herewith for the information of my colleagues:

A NEW CURRENCY STABILIZATION PLAN

A revised program for world currency stabilization has been drawn up by experts representing about 30 Allied and Associated Nations, and the terms of the proposal have been made public by the several governments. President Roosevelt announced on May 26 that the plan will be discussed at an international conference to be held in this country, beginning July 1, with 41 nations participating.

The new proposal is obviously an outgrowth of the plans made public last year by the British and United States Governments (the so-called Keynes and White plans) and the program later proposed by Canada. In general it follows the lines of the original American program, providing for an international fund rather than a clearing union, and places strong emphasis on gold as a standard of value and a means of payment.

In some respects the revised plan is less ambitious and more flexible than its predecessors. Besides being based on a more explicit recognition of gold as the only acceptable measure of stability, it omits the unnecessary and complicating feature of the international currency—the "unitas" or the "bancor." It provides that any member of the proposed international fund may withdraw at will. It would permit members to determine the post-war gold values of their respective currencies, subject to the approval of the fund, and would allow subsequent revaluation, within limits, in the light of unforeseen developments. It designates the early post-war years as a transition period and otherwise takes account of the extremely unsettled conditions that will necessarily exist in the international monetary field for some time after the war. It contains no provision for outright loans by the fund and specifically forbids the use of the fund's resources to meet large or sustained outflows of capital.

NATURE OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposed fund would amount to $8,000,000,000 if all the United and Associated Nations were members, or $10,000,000,000 if all nations participated. The basis on which the quotas, or contributions, of the various members would be determined is not specified; but it appears that the amounts would depend partly on the proportion of each country's trade to world trade, partly on gold holdings and partly on gold production. Under such a formula the United States would apparently contribute between two and one-half and two and three-fourths billion dollars, Great Britain about one and one-fourth billion dollars, Russia about one billion dollars, and other countries small amounts. One-fourth of each member's quota would be payable in gold, unless that amount were equal to more than 10 percent of the member's holdings of gold and gold-convertible exchange, in which case the gold contribution would be fixed at the 10-percent figure. Members would deal with the fund only through their treasuries, central banks, stabilization funds, or other fiscal agencies.

The fund would be governed by a board on which each member would be represented and by an executive committee of at least nine members, including the representatives of the five countries with the largest quotas. The distribution of voting power is not stated, except that it would be closely related to the quotas and that in no event would the United States have fewer votes than the British Empire. All questions would be settled by majority vote, except changes in quotas, which would require a four-fifths vote (including the consent of any member whose quota was increased), and uniform changes in the gold values of member currencies, which would require the consent of every member having 10 percent or more of the total amount of the quotas.

PARITY OF CURRENCIES

The par value of each member's currency would be expressed in terms of gold and would be agreed upon when the country was admitted to membership. All transactions with the fund would be at par, subject to a certain fixed charge, and all transactions in member currencies would be within an agreed percentage of parity. No change in the par value of any member's currency could be made by the fund without the member's approval, except the agreed uniform change in gold value, mentioned above, which would require the approval of every member that had contributed 10 percent or more of the total amount of the quotas.

A member would be allowed to change the established parity of its currency by as much as 10 percent, but no further change could be made without the approval of the fund. The fund would be required, however, to approve a requested change that was essential to the correction of a "fundamental disequilibrium," to take into consideration the "extreme uncertainties" prevailing at the time the initial parities were agreed upon, and not to reject a requested change because of domestic social or political policies within a country.

Members would agree not to carry on or permit transactions in gold or in other member currencies except within a prescribed range above and below the established parities. They would also agree not to impose restrictions on exchange transactions with other members (except those involving capital transfers and the apportionment of scarce currencies) or to engage in discriminatory arrangements or multiple-currency practices (such as the bilateral clearing agreements and the blocked marks of the pre-war period) without the approval of the fund. These agreements would be subject to the recognition of the early post-war years as a transition period during which members could temporarily retain existing restrictions not consistent with the long-term purposes of the fund.

The primary purpose of the fund, apparently, would be to facilitate current rather than capital transactions. Members would be allowed, however, to use the resources of the fund for capital transactions of "reasonable" amount, required for the expansion of exports or in the "ordinary course" of trade, banking, or other business.

OPERATION OF THE FUND

Members would be entitled to buy from the fund the currencies of other members subject to certain conditions and limitations. One condition would be that the currency demanded was needed for making payments consistent with the purposes of the fund. If the fund's holdings of the currency demanded had become scarce (that is, if the member whose currency was demanded had accumulated an unduly large credit balance of international payments over a period of time), the scarce currency would be subject to apportionment by the fund, and members would be authorized to restrict the freedom of exchange operations in the scarce currency and to ration the supply among their nationals at their own discretion. At the same time the fund would issue a report setting forth the causes of the scarcity and recommending steps to bring it to an end.

If, on the other hand, the fund's holdings of the currency offered were too large, or were increasing too rapidly (that is, if the member offering its currency had been running an unduly large debit balance of international payments), then that member would not be entitled to buy the currencies of other members. A member found to be making improper use of the fund's resources could be suspended from further dealings with the fund.

The fund could, in its discretion and on terms that safeguarded its interests, waive any of these conditions.

Operations on the fund's account would be limited to transactions for the purpose of supplying member countries, on the latter's initiative, with other members' currencies in exchange for their own currencies or for gold, with the important exception that the fund would be entitled, at its own option, in order to prevent a member's currency from becoming scarce, to borrow such currency or offer gold in exchange for it; or a member could sell gold to the fund in exchange for its own currency. The fund could also acquire gold by requiring members holding gold and exchange in excess of their quotas to pay for half of their net purchases of exchange with gold, and by requiring members whose holdings of gold and exchange had increased, to sell half of the increase to the fund in exchange for their own currencies, provided this did not unduly reduce the fund's holdings of the members' currencies or the members' holdings of gold and exchange.

A member entitled to buy another member's currency from the fund in exchange for its own would have to be prepared to sell such currency, or gold, to that member in exchange for its own currency, unless the other member's currency had been placed under the restrictions permitted in connection with capital transfers and apportionment of scarce currencies, or unless such currency had been acquired during the transition period before the removal of restrictions on multilateral clearing.

A member desiring to obtain the currency of another for gold would be expected to obtain it from the fund, provided it could do so with equal advantage. This rule, however, would not affect the right of gold-producing countries to sell newly mined gold in any market.

DANGEROUS FEATURES

The revisions that have limited the scope of the plan have made it less dangerous than the original proposals, but they have not made it an effective instrument for the promotion of currency stability. No international organization with anything short of dictatorial powers could achieve that aim. Stability in any country comes not from without but from within. It is a result of balanced budgets, sensible tariffs, and sound monetary and credit practices. As long as nations retain their sovereignty, the stability of their currencies must depend on their ability and willingness to keep their own financial houses in order, not on the artificial freezing of exchange rates or the operations of an international fund. The most that any international body could do in this direction would be to encourage its individual members to follow sound policies at home.

A fund of the type that is proposed would find itself in a position somewhat similar to that of a price-control agency attempting to maintain a certain price level without any assurance of support from fiscal measures calculated to equalize supply and demand at that level. Even with such support, plus autocratic powers, large enforcement staffs, and the patriotic fervor of wartime, price-control authorities in most countries have found the temporary stabilization of price levels a difficult task and have been forced to invoke the aid of subsidies. An international fund with only very limited powers of compulsion would find the task of permanent currency stabilization impossible without the voluntary cooperation of its members. With such cooperation, the problem would solve itself, and no fund would be required.

The entire plan, therefore, is a case of misplaced emphasis. It represents an attempt to operate at the level of effect, not of cause; to treat the symptoms, not the disease.

Such reassurance as might otherwise be drawn from the apparent emphasis placed on gold in the plan is reduced by the tendency on the part of some of its sponsors to belittle this feature. Lord Keynes, author of the original British plan, is reported to have expressed the opinion recently that the revised proposal represents the exact opposite of a return to the gold standard.

THE PENALTY OF FAILURE

As long as members retained the right to withdraw from the fund at any time, it might appear to a superficial view that the project, however experimental and uncertain in its outcome, could do no serious harm. Experience with other unsuccessful ventures gives little support to this view. The false sense of security, the unwillingness to admit failure, the fear of stigma from premature withdrawal, the throwing of good money after bad in the effort to avoid loss—these and other factors tend to perpetuate discredited institutions and to prolong the pretense of success long after failure should have become apparent. It is safe to assume that, if the nations of the world embark upon a scheme of currency stabilization, and if the scheme fails, the last state of those nations will be worse than the first. If the experiment does not offer strong prospects of success, it had much better not be tried.

The central problem in world currency stabilization is not to hold exchange rates in line by direct control but to remove the causes of instability. This can be done only by inducing the individual nations—and particularly the leading commercial nations, to balance their budgets, promote the stability and prosperity of their internal economies, and avoid such harmful devices as competitive currency depreciation, prohibitive tariffs, and trade and exchange restrictions. It is possible that cooperative action, as by the creation of a permanent international consultative body, the dedication of some existing organization to that aim, or even the negotiation of a multilateral agreement, might aid in the achievement of such a goal. But, whether by agreement or individually, the nations whose stability is essential to the world's economic welfare must attain that stability by the simple but perhaps arduous course of avoiding the practices that have destroyed it.

GOLD STANDARD PREFERABLE

No single step would go so far toward the world-wide restoration of confidence and the removal of the inducements to unsound practices as the return of the principal nations to the gold standard as promptly as possible after the war. Because of the very uneven distribution of the world's gold, it might be necessary for some nations to resort to the gold exchange standard, tying their currencies to those with strong gold backing. This first step should be followed by the adoption of policies designed to promote the redistribution of gold—a course that would obviously require the full cooperation of the United States.

These steps would not achieve the millennium, but they would lay the firmest possible foundation for future stability and prosperity. If they can be promoted by cooperative action, then such action should be taken. But cooperation that is intended to provide substitutes for soundness is doomed to failure.

Meaning of the Recent Primary Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting address delivered by Dr. Frank Kingdon, over Station WMCA, on May 10, 1944, in which he discussed the meaning of the recent primary elections held in various States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The same political winds that blew away a lot of fog and gossip in the Democratic primaries of Florida and Alabama have swept other primaries today. Rush Holt, the former baby Senator who wandered into the ranks of the conservatives and the isolationists during his term of office, was decisively beaten in the West Virginia polls as he attempted a political come-back. Frank Lausche, mayor of Cleveland and a consistent supporter of President Roosevelt, who ran an independent campaign without the support of even his home county organization, but with the support of organized labor, captured the Democratic nomination for Governor in Ohio.

Let nobody mistake these signs. They mean that there is a strong and effective progressive opinion in all parts of the Nation that will make itself felt decisively in the coming election. The most misleading diagnosis of popular opinion in this generation is the one to which we have been submitted in recent months. We have been told that there is a swing to reaction, that people are tired of the social policies of this administration, that the President has lost his grip upon the people, and that we are sure to see a swing to the right in politics this fall. This has been based on the fact that the newspapers and the radio are predominantly conservative, and their opinions are taken to represent their readers and listeners. The truth is that these organs of information and opinion are generally in the hands of entrenched economic groups, and they speak for the opinions of these groups and not those of the rank and file of our people. There is a deep realization among the masses of the benefits, both economic and social, that they have gained in the past 12 years, and, if these are threatened, the people will rise to defeat any candidate or party that tries to take them away or to weaken them. This has been registered in the past 10 days in States as diverse as Florida, Alabama, West Virginia, and Ohio. And Texas seems to be rolling up its sleeves to put on its own demonstration.

If political observers are hunting for a trend, I submit that they have it in the one that is setting the course for the Democratic Party. It points to a vigorus and courageous espousal of the social policies of the Roosevelt adiministration. I think that we have to recognize that this situation arises out of more than surface politics. There are two social philosophies that are in conflict in our country, and the decisive result of this year's election will be the choice between them. Just now the hero of those who believe in the underlying philosophy that is opposed to that of Franklin Roosevelt, is Sewell Avery, the president of Montgomery Ward, who is fighting our present labor policy with all the force and venom of which he is capable. I want, therefore, to bring to you a statement of his. I do this, not because I think it is an unusual damning one, but because it expresses a basic point of view. I take it from the Chicago Sun, which says: "On March 2, 1944, Avery attacked the pholosophy that the chief responsibility of business after the war is to provide jobs for everyone." Now here is a direct quotation of his words, and I hope that you will listen to them carefully. He said: "A corporation's efficiency is indicated by the number of men it can release from a job, not by the number of men hired." That is a revealing sentence because it puts into a few words the reactionary idea that a business exists to exploit its workers.

Its only aim is all the profit possible, and so, if it can make more profit by throwing people out of work, that is its policy. The operation of an industry is aimed, according to Mr. Avery, at the one annual meeting of the stockholders.

If the president of the company can arise on that occasion and say: "I am happy to report that we have made more money this year than we have ever made," then it has been a good year, even though some stockholder should rise to ask: "How have we been able to do it?" and the company president should reply: "By cutting down employment." If some thoughtful second stockholder should say: "What has become of the men and women we have fired?" Mr. Avery

would say: "We are sorry for them, but they are none of our business. Our corporation proves its efficiency by the number of people it can throw out of work." It is little wonder that such a man finds himself at odds with our present social policies, for they are directed at giving the workers protection against this kind of cold-blooded thinking. The President's social philosophy is based on the idea that society and industry have a responsibility for the people, and that, therefore, workers have a right to share in industrial gains. In technological means can be found for doing a certain amount of work in a shorter time, the workers should share in the saving by having to work shorter hours. If a given number of employees can produce higher profits, the workers should share in the extra money by getting higher wages. Moreover, part of the earnings of the company, as well as savings of the employees, should be set aside for insurance against old age, unemployment, and sickness. It does not take a genius to see the fundamental conflict between these two approaches to industry and human relations within it.

It is the conflict which underlies all the bitterness of the current debate about our domestic policies. And it is what colors the whole Montgomery Ward incident. Mr. Avery is protecting a corporation, that is, the profits of the stockholders who own it, while the Government is insisting on protection for the workers also. In spite of the decisive victory of the C. I. O. in the collective bargaining election yesterday, Mr. Avery is still breathing fire and brimstone, and announcing that he will not submit to the maintenance of membership clause which the War Labor Board orders into all union contracts. Accordingly, the War Labor Board has had to announce today that it is forwarding to the White House for the President's action the dispute at the Hummer Manufacturing Co., in Springfield, Ill., a subsidiary of the Montgomery Ward Co. It has also decreed that a maintenance of membership clause shall be inserted in the collective-bargaining agreement involving the Montgomery Ward plant in St. Paul, Minn. Mr. Avery is bringing the old charge that maintenance of membership means a closed shop. It means nothing of the kind. It simply means that all the present members of the union who want to resign from it must do so within 15 days, or else stay in for the term of the contract. There is no compulsion. Anyone can get out of the union within that time, and nobody can be compelled to join it. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Avery is the old-style type of employer who wants to run his business in the old way, with the right to fix wages and to hire and fire as he alone chooses. This is the issue, and no legal legerdemain or sensational posturing can hide it. We have to reduce cases like this to their simplest terms or else we get so heated over incidental aspects that we miss the main point. Because I believe that the rank and file of our people brush aside the complications and think of the true issue in such cases, I have no fear of how they will size it up.

Before I close, I want to remind you that this is an anniversary that I hope we shall never forget. The Nazi burning of the books took place on May 10, 1933. This was the overt defiance of humanism by nihilism. It disclosed in one eerie scene the true nature of nazi-ism. The men who stood around that fire and stoked its flames with the books of the most enlightened minds of humanity stood revealed as priests of the irrational. They were denying the reason. They were announcing for themselves the abdication of the mind through the assassination of the word. They were declaring that men exist only to be manipulated for the ends of power. They were disclosing that they knew that their great enemy was the intelligence, and they were symbolically reducing it to ashes. The very extravagance of the gesture was the projection of their fear, for even those who deny the reason know in their hearts that it is greater than they and will ultimately return upon them like a consuming fire. They had already mobilized the millions of their countrymen into the goose-stepping ranks of faceless men. They hoped to make them also mindless men. But their very symbolic act was its own condemnation, for they were doing nothing but to destroy, and the mission of falsehood is to destroy. It is truth that makes alive. But it is also the truth that makes men free, and they hoped to put truth to flight so that men might accept their chains. The fire was too small, though it raged from one end of the country to the other. All such fires are too small. They cannot reach out to kill the beating heart and the questioning brain. When such fires are kindled, history has its own way of forgetting the men who laid the torch and remembering only those who were seemingly destroyed.

Nobody knows the name of the man who poured the cup of hemlock, but all men know the name of Socrates. The hand that hammered the nails into the cross belonged to one of whom memory has no record, but the Man on the cross moves tangibly in all the circling years. The men who burned the books will be the forgotten. The men who wrote them are the remembered—the immortals. It was a little fire to destroy books. It has become a great fire to destroy humanity. The fire will die. Humanity will live. One thing outlines all the bonfires of tyranny—the daylight of freedom—and men will live and work and love in that.

The New Monetary Stabilization Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on June 1 I delivered a radio address over radio stations in Washington, Baltimore, New York, and Philadelphia, dealing with the new monetary stabilization proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On April 21, 1944, the Treasury Department released the latest version of the new monetary stabilization proposal which had been developed by the financial technicians of the United Nations. In effect it provides for a world-wide return to the gold bullion standard. A monetary conference of the representatives of the United Nations has been called to meet on July 1 to study and consider its far-reaching and involved provisions.

For the convenience and benefit of member countries it is planned to set up a fund aggregating eight or ten billion dollars for the stabilization of currencies and the promotion of foreign trade. Under the plan the subscriptions to be made by member countries would be on the basis of 25 percent in gold and 75 percent in paper currencies. No new monetary unit is to be introduced and all currencies are to be valued in terms of gold.

Too it is desirable that nations enjoying a favorable credit balance in international payments consult with nations whose equilibrium has been temporarily disturbed. Therefore if the currencies of member countries get out of balance and are under pressure, relief may be sought through international consultation.

Also if currencies of certain countries should become scarce, authority within certain limitations will be given to correct the acute situation. The fund retains foreign exchange controls and the power to alter parity values up to 10 percent of member countries' currencies. It cannot be expected, of course, that foreign exchanges could be stabilized over a long period of time unless the fund has enormous resources.

No one can prophesy with accuracy whether the aggregate contributions will be sufficient. But assuming that 8 or 10 billion dollars will be adequate and that 25 percent of the fund's contributions are comprised of gold, it is conceivable that with honest and efficient management the plan might be successful. The plan would be particularly helpful to a nation with an adverse balance of payments since such a nation might receive aid from the fund without having to part with its gold. In such event the fund could increase its holdings of that nation's currency up to a maximum of 200 percent of its quota. Beyond that point the fund could not be of assistance to the distressed member nation. The nation with such an adverse balance would then have to call upon its gold reserve in order to maintain its position as a member of the fund.

It is probable that the latest version of the plan will not be entirely acceptable to Great Britain as it is not regarded as sufficiently flexible to permit that country to profit sufficiently from fluctuations in the exchange values of other currencies and other devices resorted to by her in the past to offset her large import balance. Great Britain's unfavorable trade balance after the war will be a constant challenge to the fund's ability to function equitably and advantageously to debtor and creditor nations. If her exports, foreign investments, and maritime revenues continue to be insufficient to meet her import demands, and her credit with the fund becomes depleted, it will necessary (after exhausting the other means provided) either to raise the exchange value of the pound, deposit more gold, or raise the price of gold.

While the plan does not contemplate ending the restrictions of capital movements immediately following the war, such restrictions are temporarily imposed subject to the efforts of member countries to gradually relax them. All foreign-exchange restrictions would be gradually eliminated, and thus one of the obstacles to the free flow of foreign trade and capital movements would be removed.

The members agree to prevent the use of the fund's resources to finance a large flow of capital out of a country. There appears, therefore, to be no ground for apprehension with regard to losing gold now owned by the United States. On the contrary, it is more likely that additional gold will flow to the United States through the fund. Our export balance will more likely increase than diminish in the post-war period. If so, it is probable that gold will continue to be more acceptable in the settlement of our trade balances than the currencies of other nations.

I want to urge with all the force at my command that the plan should include silver along with gold in order to be more acceptable to many countries in the Western Hemisphere, Asia, and other parts of the

world. Such a provision would enable countries that have insufficient gold to utilize silver in the payment of their subscriptions, in the settlement of trade balances, and in providing currency backing and coinage. The fund should be in a position to supply whatever amount of silver is desired by member countries.

Believe it or not, the demonetization of gold is more complete than the demonetization of silver. Theoretically, the United States and other nations utilize gold as backing for paper currencies, but gold has been denied its right as a circulating medium of exchange. Silver, on the other hand, circulates widely as coinage throughout the world, and reserves are maintained and used not only in the United States but in other countries as well. If a proper world price were supported by the fund, silver would prove just as useful to all of the member countries in accomplishing the splendid objectives of the plan as would gold.

It cannot be disputed that the United States is in a position to maintain the supremacy of the dollar; and to peg and maintain the price of both gold and silver at appropriate levels throughout the world by offering freely to buy and sell these metals at fixed prices. England has proved that it can be done. England established and maintained the supremacy of the pound sterling in relation to gold from 1816 to 1910 by offering to buy or sell gold at any time or place at a price of $20.67 per fine ounce.

Silver is used more generally as currency through the world today than gold and its use will no doubt increase in the post-war period. The fund would render a greater service to world trade and the rehabilitation and relief of oppresesd peoples everywhere if it provided additional buying power abroad to the nations which possess and are dependent upon silver for their money at home. There has been entirely too little consideration given to the utilization of silver as a money metal. The subject has been dealt with impulsively, especially by the advocates of managed currency and opponents of metallic money and by some nations that produce little or no silver. A managed currrency is nothing more than printing-press money, and printing-press money can never mean security for the country whose fate rests in unfriendly hands; whereas the precious metals, gold and silver, provide adequate backing in the form of intrinsic value. Have-not nations cannot participate in international trade without heavy discounts to cover whatever risks are involved unless they are on a metallic standard.

It seems to me that the proponents of establishing a system for the management of currencies on a paper basis are trying to hasten the day of an economic millennium. Perhaps their motive should not be questioned, but they are not dealing realistically with conditions as they exist. They would have us believe that the man on the street has implicit confidence in their ability to devise and manage a system of establishing values for the transaction of domestic business and foreign trade. Civilization is still in its infancy, but is sufficiently matured to realize the frailties of humanity and to sense the insecurity that inevitably results from the inability of strong nations to deal fairly with the weaker.

I heartily approve the objectives of the proposals made by the Secretary of the Treasury, but in my judgment the conference scheduled to convene on July 1 will do well to revise some of the provisions in the proposed plan before the President may expect the Congress of the United States to ratify it. It will be a tragic mistake if the Congress is bypassed by this conference. Congress alone is entrusted with the constitutional power to coin money and the constitutional power to regulate the value thereof.

Address of Representative Albert Gore, of Tennessee, Before Young Democratic Club of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and challenging address which the Honorable ALBERT GORE, Representative from the Fourth District of Tennessee, delivered before the Young Democratic Club of Pennsylvania at its State convention at Harrisburg, Pa., on May 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is both an honor and a privilege to address this assemblage of Pennsylvania Democrats. I am glad, indeed, to have the opportunity to lend my voice to the cause of the Democratic Party in a State where you have a struggle to overcome the stand-pattism of the Republican Party. From where I come we have but little trouble in beating the Republicans. I must confess, however, that we do sometimes have a hell of a time beating each other.

In some ways it may be quite unfortunate that the time for a national election comes when we are involved in a great war—indeed, in the very midst of the greatest military effort the world has ever known. In such a crisis perhaps no other great nation would risk the internal strife and political disunity inevitable in a national election.

But, on the other hand, an election in 1944 offers, if not unprecedented, at least far-reaching opportunities to the American people. For one thing, it gives to the United States of America a chance to prove to the world the efficacy of self-government under the most trying circumstances. The fact that we can undergo the rigors of a Presidential and national legislative election preserving our essential constitutional processes and, at the same time, cast our mighty force against the enemy constitutes the best and most concrete evidence that free men can govern themselves even in the severest of crises.

Another thing—an election this year will afford the American people an opportunity to make some fundamental decisions in the most Democratic way at the ballot box on the conduct of the war and the course of our foreign policy. I think it may be singularly fortunate that these decisions can be made by the people, not after the immediate danger has passed, as was the case in 1920, but while the cruel necessities and the awful price of war are yet upon us.

In this critical time each political party has a serious responsibility of offering to the people the one man within each party who is best qualified for the tremendous job of national leadership as President and as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. Failure to do this would constitute a serious indictment against the two-party system. For any man to refuse such a call would be to shirk the call of duty.

Make no mistake about it. An election in wartime is deadly serious business. Perhaps no decision rendered by the popular franchise has ever been fraught with so much meaning as will be the case next November. The length of the war and the course of the coming peace may well rest upon that decision. Being fully conscious of this, it is my guess that the American people will take the measure of each party and each party's standard bearer more meticulously and more nonpartisanly than ever before in our history.

THE YARDSTICK OF FITNESS FOR THE JOB

By what standard will the American people measure the candidates and the parties? By the yardstick of fitness for the job. Instead of 3 feet I think this yardstick of fitness for the job will have three questions.

The first and paramount question which most free men and women of America will ask when they take free ballots in their hands on election day will be: "Who is best qualified to lead us to victory?"

The next question, and truly second only to the first, will be: "Who is best qualified to sit as the American leader in the councils of the world's great to formulate a lasting peace?"

The third question, for those few who have not determined their choice by answering for themselves the first two, will be: "What party and what leader can we best trust to handle the complicated domestic problems both during and immediately after the war?"

I would like to stand this yardstick of fitness beside the two men who are already the obvious choices of their respective parties as condidates for President—Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In measuring Governor Dewey with the yardstick of fitness for the job of national leadership in this hour of crisis, I do not mean, of course, to use such superficial standards as age or physical stature. In the realm of statesmanship, which he seeks to enter, those are not standards at all. For a wartime President, the American people are altogether interested in another kind of stature—the stature of statesmanship. The units of measure on this yardstick, therefore, will not be inches nor feet nor even years. It is rather a measure of intellectual, moral, and spiritual height, of vision and understanding, of foresight in the realm of international affairs, of ability to foresee pitfalls for America as well as opportunities. I think it was this kind of measurement that one of my good Tennessee constituents must have had in mind when he gave me his own peculiar appraisal of Governor Dewey. He was a farmer and he had that typically Tennessee salty habit of speaking in the language of his own world of soil, animals, and hills. "It's never a good idea," he said, "to change horses in the middle of the stream. But if I ever come to that pass where I've got to consider doing it, I will sure draw the line at changing to a Shetland pony."

This was not a reference to physical dimensions but it was his own characteristically shrewd way of expressing the measure of Governor Dewey's achievement, of what the man has said, of what he has done to qualify him for the Presidency at this critical time. These are the things that make men big or little in the high field that Governor Dewey wishes to enter, and these are things with which the ordinary people of America will measure the fitness of candidates for President this year.

FITNESS TO CONDUCT WAR

My constituent must have been thinking of Governor Dewey as a possible war leader. Who is there to say that he would make a good Commander in Chief? Who will say that he has an intimate knowledge of the make-up and disposition of our naval forces or that he has a broad conception of naval strategy? Has anyone said that Governor

Dewey is conversant with the strategy mapped out months ago for the impending offensives in Europe and in the Pacific, or that, without the experience of having participated in mapping that strategy with not only our own high naval and military officers but with Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek, he could be on equal terms with those chiefs of state in further meetings on world military strategy?

It is no answer to these questions merely to say that our trained generals and admirals will run the war. It cannot be dismissed so lightly. True, we have good admirals and four-star generals, but there has always been and there always must be a directing hand, a Commander in Chief. Good or bad, he will be the man we elect as President next November. That choice involves the chance of an earlier victory and fewer lives lost as well as the prestige, place, and best interest of the United States at the world's council tables.

Maybe Governor Dewey would be a good leader. We do not know. What the people do know is that he, like any other man new to the job, would be tremendously handicapped by a lack of experience and a lack of knowledge of what has gone before. To say the very least of it, it would take Governor Dewey, however great his capacity, a long period of time merely to gain an intimate knowledge of the organization, problems, and strategy of our own forces, to say nothing of either our allies or our enemies. It is, therefore, self-evident that selection of Governor Dewey as Commander in Chief would inevitably create a time lag in the march to victory.

FITNESS FOR LEADERSHIP IN WORLD PEACE MAKING

As a leader in foreign policy, though inexperienced, Governor Dewey has something in his favor. He recently made a speech on foreign policy which deserves careful consideration. Even though a bit hazy in spots, the address was commendable in at least two respects: First, it was, in effect, a candid admission that he had been wrong in some of his previous statements and attitudes; and, second, that the Roosevelt-Hull program is correct in its essential parts. I say this is commendable because it takes a man of no small caliber to admit not only his own error but also to acknowledge the rightness of the program of his opposition—something which a large number of Republican Congressmen have not yet done. For this conversion and public candor, Governor Dewey is entitled to compliment.

One cannot but wonder, though, what evidence there is to show that he has more foresight now than before. There is some considerable evidence that his foresight has not heretofore been up to the par of discerning statesmanship. For example, some half dozen years after the Roosevelt administration had given diplomatic recognition to Russia, Governor Dewey put his mental processes to work on that question and when he had given it what he undoubtedly considered sufficient thought, he pronounced the recognition of Russia as one of the greatest mistakes the Roosevelt administration had ever made. He solemnly announced his verdict in a public address to the American people.

In 1941 Governor Dewey applied his fullest caliber of statesmanship to the question of lend-lease. It was in January of that year that he announced to a group of newspaper men the result of his thinking on lend-lease, which has since been hailed as a magnificent success by the American people, and has been hailed around the world as a great instrument for victory and freedom. What did Governor Dewey foresee for the lend-lease program? He said that it would, and I quote, "bring an end to free government in the United States." Some prophecy! He said further that it would, and I again quote, "abolish Congress for all practical purposes." Some foresight!

I certainly do not wish to be unkind about this, for I am genuinely glad that Governor Dewey is trying to set himself right on foreign policy. After all, if there's a possibility of his being our President, then it is extremely important that he be on the right course on foreign policy because mistakes in foreign policy are tremendously costly in American life, blood, and substance.

I would wholeheartedly welcome any earnest effort to lift foreign policy above partisan politics. We Americans are proud to consider ourselves a preeminent Nation in world affairs. We are a grown-up Nation; there is no doubt about it. And it's high time we were acting like a grown-up in the world family of nations. What we need is not a partisanly Democratic or Republican foreign policy but a national foreign policy based on an intelligent and farsighted self-interest, the general course of which bears the endorsement of both of our great political parties. Then we could have our partisan fights over who had or could best actuate and project that policy. Perhaps this would be a pertinent question now.

Even though Governor Dewey may now be a sincere advocate of an enlightened foreign policy and even though he gives evidence of a new-found foresight, a very serious question arises as to the ability of the Republican Party or any leader of the Republican Party to put such a program into actual effect.

And let me warn, lip service would do no more good after this war than it did before.

I know that in Congress there are Republican Congressmen who would give wholehearted support to such a program. But I know, too, that there is a large block of Republicans who are yet unconverted, who are yet isolationists to the core. For instance, do you think that Mr. HAM FISH or Senator HIRAM JOHNSON would support a realistic program of international collaboration, Dewey or no Dewey? And, mind you, if the Republicans should take the reins of government, Congressman HAM FISH would be chairman of the all-important House Rules Committee and Senator HIRAM JOHNSON would be chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Do you believe that Republican Members of Congress, who even now continue to say that if we had stayed at home and minded our own business we would not have incurred the wrath of Tojo and Hitler and, therefore, would not have been drawn into World War No. 2, would suddenly, upon the election of a Republican President, bury their convictions and prejudices, which have become deep-seated through the years since the League of Nations fight? Would they overnight become intelligent supporters of a sensible and practical program of economic and political cooperation with other nations of the world? Or do you think that they would continue in their efforts to beguile the American people with such catch phrases as America First, meanwhile opposing even such helpful and practical measures of international cooperation as reciprocal trade agreements?

The fact is the Republican Party is so sharply divided on the question of any form of international collaboration that Republican leadership of the country in this field is hopeless. The schism runs deep throughout the party—from Senator CURLEY BROOKS and Representative HOFFMAN to Senator AUSTIN and Representative EATON within Congress and from Wendell Willkie to Colonel McCormick without. Any program on which all these elements within the party could agree would at best be an inadequate, milk-toast compromise.

The prospect of Republican leadership in his field appears no more acceptable when we undertake to judge their future performance by their past record. The record of the Republican Party between the two wars is awful. By defeating the great Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations, the Republican leadership succeeded in steering us into a rut going the wrong way. Unfortunately, a lot of people kept going that way. Some are still trying to.

Oh, how different the history of the world might have been if the American people had not committed the folly of following the between-wars Republican philosophy of isolationism and shortsightedness. I hope this is one time when history will not repeat itself.

FITNESS FOR DOMESTIC LEADERSHIP

As to how we might measure Governor Dewey's fitness as a President to deal with domestic affairs, I am somewhat at a loss to know unless we judge him by the past performance of his party when it was last entrusted with our National Government, or by the company he keeps. Again the record of his party is not very pleasant to contemplate. In fact, they led America on to the skids and what we skidded into will never be forgotten by those who lived through it—Teapot Dome, post-war inflation, synthetic boom and the awful bust-up, depression days when men were selling apples on the streets of America, four stands to a corner, with prosperity and employment, a chance for millions of ordinary people to live a decent American life, nowhere to be found—not even around the corner.

Former President Herbert Hoover is reputedly one of Governor Dewey's closest advisers. I do not think the country wants any more of Herbert Hoover—not even a Tom Thumb facsimile. We do not want to turn again our great American cities into Hoovervilles. We do not want our factories converted into post-war production of cobwebs, nor our farms into mortgage foreclosures.

My Republican colleagues in Congress seem to think that Governor Dewey could do better. I am sure he could not do worse. They are predicting that on next November 7 there will be a cloudburst of Republican votes, but my weather prediction for that day is that it will only be a little Dewey.

ROOSEVELT MEASURES UP

It is only when we stand this yardstick of fitness for the job beside President Roosevelt that we can truly appreciate the bigness and quality of the man as well as the urgent need to continue his leadership.

I do not have to draw for this audience a contrast between those 12 years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover and the 12 years of the Roosevelt administration. You saw the rising of a leader equal to the task of rebuilding a Nation which had been economically debauched. You saw millions of American homes and farms saved from mortgage foreclosures; you saw American businesses, many of which seem now to have forgotten it, saved from bankruptcy; you saw the scourge of closing banks stopped and peoples' savings made secure; you saw human rights given precedence over property rights. Disagree with this or that as you will, over-all it is a record of unsurpassed achievement of which we are justly proud.

About Roosevelt's leadership in the field of foreign relations, volumes could be written but the American people do not have to read volumes to be convinced of his stature as a statesman. Every day confirms the rectitude of Roosevelt's position and our good fortune to have his leadership. America and the world need his vision, his understanding, his wisdom at the conference table where we hope and pray world peace will be made secure. How can we afford to change? In my opinion we won't.

The drums of an awful world war began to beat and soon they roared. Freedom in

the world and our very existence as a free nation was threatened. If there was ever a time when this Nation needed great leadership it was then. If there was ever a time when America has had great leadership it was then—and since.

You have seen what America—America under great leadership—could do. The strength of a great nation has been mobilized quickly and effectively. Production goals which our enemies, and the President's critics, incidentally, said were impossible have been reached and bettered. We have supplied not only our own forces with the best war equipment the world has ever known, but have supplied, too, millions of our allies. The greatest navy, the mightiest air force, and the most stupendous mechanized military strength the world has ever known is now poised for the attack. Today the enemy is cringing with his back to his homeland. The light of victory begins to dawn.

All of this did not just happen so. Somebody had to plan it, somebody had to direct, somebody had to lead and inspire, somebody had to coordinate and command. Do you think it could have been President Roosevelt?

America, Wake Up!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "America, Wake Up!" delivered by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker before the War Dads Association, at Kansas City, Mo., on May 30, 1944. I commend its reading to the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For more than three-quarters of a century Americans have observed Memorial Day by placing flags and flowers on the graves of their loved ones who gave their lives for their country.

The thin, blue ranks and the fading, gray files of our Civil War veterans, in whose memory this day was originated, have almost vanished. And soon the familiar lines—

"Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day;
Love and tears for the Blue,
Tears and love for the Gray"—

will be as much of a memory as the men in blue and gray, who served in the war between the North and the South.

But I have not come here tonight to make a traditional Memorial Day speech to this gathering of American war dads, their families, and their friends.

I have not come to talk about the past and its glories. I have come to talk about the present and its sacrifices—the future and its dangers.

Today, from Cape Cop to the Golden Gate, millions of Americans made sad pilgrimages to tens of thousands of cemeteries. They bowed their heads in prayer and placed flags and flowers on the graves of relatives and friends.

But while millions made this pilgrimages, tens of thousands of mothers, wives, and children of World War No. 2 were denied the privilege of placing flags and flowers on the graves of sons, husbands, and fathers who went off to war—never to return. Men, whose only tangible memorials are gold-star flags on window panes.

The golden constellation of American heroes who died in this war, up to now, makes up a firmament of more than 50,000 stars—for we have lost more than 50,000 men.

This Memorial Day of 1944 is not dedicated to gentle reminiscence into the history of the past. On the contrary, it is and it must be dedicated to history in the making—dedicated to history that is as recent as the latest radio news flash—history as current as the front page of tomorrow morning's newspapers.

It is a grim task to stand here tonight and urge America to wake up to the full realization that war is a grim business—because most of us, unfortunately, are not awake to our obligations and responsibilities.

When speaking of history in the making, our thoughts immediately revert to that section of the news printed in small type in our daily newspapers and known as the casualty list. It is there we find the high price that is being paid, day by day, for the winning of the war—the lives of the finest manhood of America.

Whenever I read that roster of patriots who have made the supreme sacrifice, I never fail to recall the sight of their resting places while visiting all our theaters of war—quiet cemeteries where crosses cast their peaceful shadows over the graves of men who so willingly gave their lives that we on the home front might continue to enjoy the American way of life.

Never have I passed, nor will I ever pass such a resting place without thinking of the hungry hearts of wives, mothers, and sweethearts at home who would give anything just to touch one single cross for just one single second.

But not all our war dead rest in peaceful cemeteries in the many theaters of war. Thousands of them have found oblivion in the ocean deep—thousands more in the slime, mud, and entangling jungles of the South Seas—still more thousands in the shifting sands of the African desert—in the ruin and rubble of Italian towns—or in the hinterlands of India and China, as well as the frozen wastes of Alaska and the Aleutians.

Some of those men died when their ships went down—some in tanks that were stopped by shells—some in planes that were shot from the skies—some in pillboxes, fox holes, or trenches—some on sun-drenched beaches—and some on open battlefields. But, no matter how they died—or where—those men are gone—more than 50,000 of them. That is tragic—but more tragedy is yet to come. More than 50,000 men have made the supreme sacrifice and, yet, many, many thousands more will give their all.

As a Nation, we must be prepared for even greater burdens of sorrow as greater casualties will come. We do not know what sorrow means yet. And our only haven will be our Heavenly Father. If we put our trust in Him, He will not fail us.

The road to victory will be long and hard. It will be red with blood and its markers will be the crosses on the graves of our loved ones.

I present this grim and realistic picture because from now, until the end of this bitter conflict, we of America, as well as our allies, must armor ourselves with fortitude against our losses.

I make the sad prediction that before this war is over, virtually every person in the United States will have some relative or friend on whom the god of war will have left his crimson mark. These are brutal facts, but war is a brutal business, and today our love, tears, and prayers should go not only to the dead, but also to the living, in the hope that they may be spared and come home to us.

So far, this war, on our part, has mainly been a battle of machines—planes, tanks, ships—and the casualties, therefore, have been comparatively light. But, as invasion starts in many parts of the world, it becomes a battle of men—we must be prepared for greater losses.

And yet, on the home front, there are people who fail to realize that what they fail to do, toward the speedy and victorious ending of the war, spells death for men who otherwise would live. To that segment of our Nation I plead, "Americans, wake up, you are shirking your duty"!

With greater feeling than I can find words to express, I sympathize with the wives and mothers of men in our combat forces. They carry a great burden of suspense—the agony of waiting—of endless worry.

And yet, the same strength of character and discipline of spirit that enabled the pioneer women of yesterday to carry their burdens with level heads and stout hearts are fortifying the women of today during these days of turmoil. No nation is greater than its women, and the fortitude American women have shown in facing the emotional stress of war and, at the same time, doing their share in the war effort, is truly monumental.

The quantity and quality of the sacrifice of the women of America are found in the fact that nearly all of the flower of our youth have been or are being transplanted to the theaters of war in the four corners of the world. I have seen them. I know how young most of the men are in our combat forces today.

Just think, few of our servicemen had seen the light of day when the foundation for this war was laid a quarter of a century ago by selfish peace planning at the close of World War No. 1. Up to now more than 50,000 of our young men have made the supreme sacrifice.

And why? What is there in this world that deprives youth of the right to live? Why should war deprive mothers of their sons? Why should wives become war widows? Why should children become orphans? Why? Why? Why? This is the reason why:

Because at the end of World War No. 1, we did not build a fortress of peace. We compromised with those who had nothing to lose. We were blinded by our ideals and mistook dreams for realities. We thought we saw, in the unsound peace terms, eternal proof that there would never be another World War.

Today that eternal proof of lasting peace is scattered in trillions of fragments all over the globe. A far more destructive war is sweeping the world with flames of violence. Could it have been avoided? Yes; it could.

It could have been avoided if those who had the opportunity to build the fortress of peace had also had the foresight to design and build the fortress on a firm foundation. But failure to do this cannot be placed on any single party, on any given group, on any individual. We are all to blame. In a democracy the people are responsible for its leadership.

Just think back—take a little self-inventory—and you will find that not so long ago most of us thought Mussolini was only a strutting clown; Hitler we regarded as a low comedian; and the Japs were funny little monkeys without tails. We either could not or would not permit ourselves to believe that any human beings could be so treacherous and dastardly.

What did we do during those years when the Japs, the Fascists, and Nazis were planning and preparing for conquest and control? For one thing, we almost scuttled our Navy—demobilized our Army—and clipped the wings of our military aviation.

What did we do when Hitler took the Rhineland—when Mussolini stole Ethiopia—and the Japs invaded China? We did nothing. Did we make ready and prepare when Europe erupted into war? We did not.

As recently as 1940 none of our major political parties or national leaders had the vision or the valor to read aloud the handwriting of Mars on the global wall. Sure, we sold destroyers to England, but we also sold scrap iron and oil to Japan. It was 1915–16 all over again. Let's wait! Let's watch! It can't happen here!

Now it is V for Victory. But in those days—4 short years ago—it was D for Delay and—at long last—D for Defense.

What the future held was as plain to see as a dive bomber over your roof, but those of us who sounded the alarm were met by boos of derision. And I firmly believe that many of the men who have given their lives might be alive today if we had not been caught with too little—too late.

We poured billions into the bottomless pit of the stock market in 1929, but we could not afford a decent Army, Navy, and Air Corps. We spent billions priming the depression pump, but we were too indifferent to prime our muskets. Militarism of any kind was frowned upon. Preparedness was unpatriotic.

Why, some were shocked at the very thought of exposing the boys in C. C. C. camps to the horrors of military training—not even small arms for drilling—just broomsticks. It is impossible to conceive in terms of human life what even that limited training would have meant in preparing inexperienced youth for battle.

Finally, when we did flounder out of our day dreams, we did not develop striking power. We concentrated on D again. D for Defense bonds—Defense stamps—Defense production—Defense training—Defense this and Defense that—until the bombs, shells, and torpedoes struck at Pearl Harbor. Then it was D for Defeat, Destruction, and Death.

Now we are talking V for Victory—but too many of us are talking in our sleep—indifferently.

To you, I say again—"America, wake up! You are shirking your duty."

For almost a quarter of a century, we permitted ourselves to be lulled into a world of false security. We were willing to believe anything but the truth, ready to see anything but the facts. And, even at this hour, many people lull themselves into the belief that victory can be won without greater costs and efforts than those we have already made.

They say the war is almost over, that rationing is nonsense, price control bosh, inflation a scarecrow, taxes too high, wages too low dividends too few, work too hard, hours too long, strikes too short. Why buy bonds, why give blood, why tend Victory gardens? There is too much thrift, not enough fun. They want to go back to the good old days when they got something for nothing.

Well, in the name of countless servicemen to whom I have talked in the four corners of the world, I can tell those who think along those lines, that they are in for a rude awakening when our fighting men again step out of uniform.

Speaking of what our men overseas talk and think about, let me take this opportunity to correct the widespread, but wrong, impression that they are a bunch of homesick kids whose only consolation is a pin-up girl.

Men who face death have other things to think about—and that includes politics. And, speaking of politics, the campaign platform they are interested in has only three planks:

1. Every American must help in producing the material and equipment that will bring victory at the earliest possible moment.

2. Full opportunity for all to make a decent living in the post-war world.

3. A sound and workable plan for lasting world peace that will mean freedom and justice for all.

There has been some talk that the men overseas believe there is not enough patriotism on the home front. That talk is well founded for that belief is widespread throughout all theaters of war and, in my opinion, there is justification for it.

Some of the men—whether right or wrong—even go so far as saying that the alarm clock America needs to wake it up is a first-class bombing raid. Be that as it may, the fact remains that there is considerable bitterness among men in combat over strikes, black markets, and political skullduggery on the home front. They fail to understand why such things should exist. And, frankly, what is wrong with that viewpoint?

Certainly, it is not right that one group of Americans is called upon to give their all, including life itself, while another group of American do only that which they think they should for profit, or for higher pay, or more power.

It is impossible for ayone who has not visited the battle fronts to know the danger, the filth, the suffering, the drabness, the boredom of combat living and to fully appreciate why it is that stories of the great sacrifices being made on the home front make the men on the combat front gag.

Not that the rank and file of soldiers believe that we are a nation of slackers on the home front, but they have no illusions about the job that lies ahead and they have deep contempt—and justly so—for anyone on the home front who fails to put his shoulder to the wheel.

Lately there has been a fear—a feeling that this attitude on the part of servicemen toward civilians may build up a wall between them when the war is over. And I regret to admit that there is a very real danger on this score. Therefore, we must do everything within our power to prevent such a wall from being erected. The only way to avert it is for everyone to do his or her share to speed the day of victory and at the same time to plan a post-war world in which our veterans will have freedom of opportunity for individual enterprise.

Most of our servicemen will not want to return to the good old days they left behind, for the simple reason that the good old days will not be good enough. The men who come home will not be the boys who left. I am now speaking of veterans in the late teens and early twenties.

They are intelligent. They are tough. They are hard. They know what they want. They have learned a lot. They have worked a lot. They have dared a lot. They have sacrificed a lot. They want to get on in the world when the war is over. And they justly deserve our help and assistance.

It is not enough to have Congress pass a G. I. bill of rights—though it is better than handing out coffee, doughnuts, and beggarly bonuses—or giving veterans apple boxes on selected street corners. The veterans will not want to take over America, but they will demand their proper share of opportunity and place in every council. Our veterans will want opportunity to use their new skills—opportunity to educate themselves—opportunity to live peaceful lives in a peaceful and prosperous world.

They will demand the right to work at any job for which the service has given them expert technological or mechanical skills, and they will resent having to pay a tax to union racketeers for the right to work and the chance to make a living. Some unions have taken a realistic and cooperative attitude toward this problem. They are to be congratulated. They show an encouraging awakening.

To provide opportunity for our servicemen—as well as peacetime employment for war workers—it is essential that our post-war plans must be better than the pre-Pearl Harbor levels. Capital and labor—lawmakers and executives must unite to provide and maintain mass production for mass buying power at reasonable price levels. This must be done now. We can't wait for peace, because even now servicemen are being mustered out at the rate of 75,000 per month.

We must provide rehabilitation for the disabled, employment for those who want work, college courses or vocational training for those who want to learn. Unless we take steps to plan for the proper care of our servicemen, America will indeed have a lost generation on its hands—a handicap, an overload that will leave us hopelessly behind in the world competition, which will begin even before the war is over.

Our military manpower for victory today is our brain and brawn power for progress and production tomorrow.

Americans, wake up to the fact that on the home front there are only two major groups of men left—those too old to fight—and those too young. Soon, those too old to fight will be too old to work. The young will still be too young to lead.

Therefore, the burden of the immediate future falls squarely on those who are carrying the burden of the war—our men and women in the military services. To make that load less burdensome, it will be our duty on the home front to build our fortress of peace so strong that no nation or nations would ever dare to assault it again.

The plan for this fortress of peace must be drawn now. We want to see it in black and white. We must avoid the pitfalls of personal foreign policies that undermined the peace efforts at the end of World War No. 1. Let us wake up to the dangers of being fooled by fancy phrases and glittering generalities.

We must have an all-out guaranty that there will be no more world conflicts. We must demand a foreign policy of intelligent self-interest. We cannot bring liberty and happiness to the world by giving up our own freedoms and opportunities for momentary advantage.

Let us wake up to our responsibilities. If we perform the duties that face us now and which must not be delayed, we will have made more than a hollow axiom out of the phrase—"they did not die in vain."

To the members of the American War Dads I say it is your God-given duty to assume the leadership of building a worthy memorial to our dead through the creation of a world of peace and progress for the living. You can do that by continuing your fight to have everyone work for victory—by demanding a realistic and workable blue print for our domestic and foreign plans for the future and the perpetuation of American ideals.

This Memorial Day of 1944 should be dedicated to a firm resolve rather than a sad reflection.

And in our quest for strength we must find it in the crucible of sorrow. Even as an alloy puts added strength in steel, so let our sorrow and tears for our loved ones put new force in our desire to support our fighting men with all the energy and determination at our command, for, with the return of these veterans, we will find that this Nation has been matured 100 years through the knowledge gained by them.

They will be the power of revitalization that this Nation so sadly needs. We must learn to think of the welfare of these United States in terms, not of 1 year or 10 but of 100 years.

It is our duty and obligation to try and understand all peoples of the world through having faith in America and ourselves first. We cannot hope to save all the peoples of the world with idle words or thoughtless promises, but by example create in them the desire to save themselves.

Many do not love us, but they do trust us, and they look to our statesmen as the only possible solution of many of their problems. We must revitalize our Diplomatic Corps scattered throughout the world and at home by starting to inject new and younger men with soldiering experience. I say a diplomatic corps with a soldier diplomacy because we shall be confronted by soldier diplomacy from all other leading nations of the world for the next 50 years.

For to our statesmen will fall the duty to see that there is not a repetition of this horrible catastrophe. They will have the opportunity to bring about a better understanding between the nations and thereby insure permanent peace.

Posterity will judge the statesmen of our time by the courage and intelligence with which they face this task. To meet this test, our representatives must cease to be mere politicians and prove themselves statesmen indeed. Undying fame will be the reward of those who lend their energies and influence to bring about a new dispensation in world affairs. Contempt, followed by complete oblivion, will be the portion of petty ones who will continue to play politics with this tremendous problem or use for party purposes the stupendous forces involved.

We must rededicate ourselves to the service of our country in a spirit worthy of the service and the suffering of our men and women in uniform. Within the next few years we shall face the greatest opportunity ever presented to any nation in history, the opportunity to make sure that the youth of all nations, who have shed their blood on every far-flung battlefield of the world, shall not have died in vain.

America, wake up. Let us unite, shoulder to shoulder to win the war as soon as we can and make the peace everlasting.

America, wake up. Let us plan with imagination and execute our plans with intelligence.

America, wake up. Let us fully realize that to have external strength in world affairs, we must have unity and internal strength in our domestic affairs.

America, wake up. Let us plan a future of preparedness, for a real peace can only be insured through a world order based on faith in a Supreme Being, justice, and confidence. Never again, too little, too late.

America, wake up.

Famous Polar Bear Association Whose Members Served With Fame in Russia in World War No. 1 Vote 625 to 1 to Support W. T. S.-C. P. T. Instructors and Trainees and Calls Upon War Department for Fair Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Polar Bear Association at reunion in Detroit, Mich., on May 29, 1944:

Whereas the War Department of the United States did authorize the Civil Aeronautics Administration to enlist and encouraged the training of 25,000 aviation cadets and offered inducements that such cadets upon completion of their training course would be appointed staff sergeants, flight officers, or commissioned second lieutenants; and

Whereas documentary evidence exists that cadets enlisted in the Civil Aeronautics Administration program were given good reason to believe that opportunity was being afforded them to obtain aviation cadet training, and upon graduation to receive commissions in the Army Air Forces of the United States; and

Whereas the War Department has now canceled the C. P. T.-W. T. S. program after many thousands of students had devoted their time as cadets in training for a period ranging from 12 to 18 months and that no provision has been made to fulfill the obligations of the War Department and the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce; and

Whereas under date of March 13, 1942, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, by order of the Secretary of War, did issue Circular No. 75, amending Circular No. 204, War Department, 1941, providing for the enlistments to the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve Corps of students in the pilot-training course conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and for the appointment of aviation cadets who met requirements as cadets of the United States Army, also that persons enlisted in the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve Corps, would be called into active service at the termination of the course; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce, under date of June 19, 1942, through its Acting Administrator, did address Mr. Lynn U. Stambaugh, national commander, American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., advising that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is highly grateful that the American Legion will assist in recruiting 13,350 candidates for specialist pilots which the Army Air Forces have asked us (the Department of Commerce) to train, and further advised that it would be most helpful if the 12,000 posts of the Legion would spread the word, giving candidates proper information and assist in making applications; and

Whereas under date of October 8, 1942, the Headquarters Army Air Forces did issue a routing and record sheet on the subject of additional training for C. P. T. students, stating that graduates of C. P. T. instructors course will be called to active duty and receive instructions at schools under the jurisdiction of the commanding general, Flight Training Command, and upon completion they would be rated as service pilots, appointed flight officers or commissioned second lieutenants, A. U. S., and, further, it was definitely stated that commissions will be given to those outstanding graduates with performance in Air Force schools and in the Air Force units in which they may serve upon completion of training; and

Whereas under date of October 2, 1942, P. H. Walton, major, Air Corps, Assistant Chief, Aviation Cadet Section, Military Personnel Division, O. D. T., addressed the Adjutant General on the subject of promotion and ultimate rank of trainees who entered the Enlisted Reserve to take civilian pilot training, stating that cross-country, link-instrument courses, are classified as advance C. P. T. courses and that graduates of these courses will be assigned to air lines through the Air Transport Command as copilots, and to the Flight Training Command as instructor material. These reservists will receive further flight training and that those best qualified under this training will be rated service pilots and be commissioned as second lieutenants, A. U. S.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Polar Bear Association does hereby call upon the War Department to make suitable provisions for fulfilling its obligations and promises to students in the cadet program, now being disregarded, which, in our opinion, is unfair and not in accord with the best interests of the United States and the war effort; be it further

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to immediately enact suitable legislation providing commissions for those who have completed the primary, secondary, and cross-country flight courses and either the elementary instructor course or link trainer course; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senator VANDENBERG, Senator FERGUSON, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and Senator WILEY, and to all Members of the Congress from Michigan and Wisconsin with a plea to them that they support and encourage prompt passage of legislation that has been introduced for the correction of the problem resulting from the recital herein and that this be done at once before the Congress adjourns, and that the President of the Polar Bear Association appoint a committee to see that this work is done.

BRADLEY R. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.
BOB GUNNIS.
HARRY COSTELLO.
LARRY SALTER.

South Carolina's National Guard Artillery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Crack Carolina Artillery Outfit Backs Up French at Hitler Line," published in the Baltimore Sun for May 20, 1944. The article was written by War Correspondent Price Day and refers to the excellent and heroic work done by the former National Guard of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRACK CAROLINA ARTILLERY OUTFIT BACKS UP FRENCH AT HITLER LINE—4,000 ROUNDS ARE FIRED IN SUPPORT OF INFANTRY ATTACK AT SANT' OLIVA, NAZI DEFENSE ANCHOR

(By Price Day)

WITH THE FIFTH ARMY IN ITALY, May 19.—From new gun positions high in the mountains, this crack South Carolina artillery outfit today has fired 4,000 rounds in support of infantry attacks on Sant' Oliva, one of the anchors of the Hitler line.

One hundred and fives and 155's are forward of the point where, by the book, light artillery should be, and are getting ready to move up again.

These guns have been firing steadily since H hour at 11 p. m., May 11, one unit leapfrogging another to set up advanced positions and then the batteries of the rear unit moving forward in their own turn.

Following the French, to whom they are attached, they have in the past week undergone the change from field to mountain artillery, and the men are eager to make any other adaptations that may be required.

WATCHED BARRAGE

They want to go wherever the French go, and the French are traveling.

On Wednesday, from a point near Esperia, I watched a wonderfully coordinated barrage laid on German positions on the slope of Mount d'Oo. I thought at the time it was French firing, but today I learned it was this outfit under French command.

These are also the guns which in the battle's opening barrage battered the slopes of Mount Faito so severely that the Germans fled into their own mine fields. The enemy had its strong points, up the slope from its living quarters, threaded by marked paths between mine fields. The barrage caught many of them in the bivouac area. Others ran into mined ground.

The work of burial was too great for the resources of the French, who themselves had many killed, and German prisoners are still on Faito burying their own dead.

V-MAIL BLANKS ARRIVE

Ammunition trains have been working day and night toiling over jagged mountain roads to supply the guns. Other supplies have also come forward. A package of V-mail blanks arrived today—next in priority after ammunition, incoming mail, and food.

Food has been plentiful, but until supper time tonight there had been no time to cook it, and men had been eating "charley" or C rations. Tonight the cooks prepared pork chops and new potatoes and apologized for being out of peas.

Men here would like a little sleep—"we've been moving too damn fast to get any damn sleep," they say cheerfully—but this is the way they like to live and travel.

SUPPORTED MANY TROOPS

They're used to it. They've fired their guns in support of many troops in many places. They've fought in Africa and Sicily and Italy. They assisted the British Eighth Army at Messina and took part in the winter's missions against Cassino, helping to make it look as it does today, like a mass of splintered bones and rotted teeth.

They've been attached to the Forty-fifth, Thirty-sixth, and Third American divisions and now the French of the Fifth Army.

"We just go with the one that's going," says Maj. Paul Godbey, of Columbia, S. C. "That's all we ask."

"It's fine being with the French," says Lt. Col. Ansel B. Godfrey, the outfit's commander, who comes from Clinton, S. C.

"Their officers know their business and their staffs are well organized. They worm up a hell of a lot of traffic jams, but when it comes to fighting nobody can beat 'em."

RESULT OF EAGERNESS

Everyone agrees that French traffic jams in the mountains—it is not unusual to sit for an hour in one spot—are the result of their eagerness to get everything they've got as far forward as possible in the shortest possible time. Everyone agrees, too, that they're doing it.

"They're magnificient fighters, those boys," says Godbey.

American guns aren't the only artillery in this area. Captured German howitzers and Skoda light field guns dot the roadsides to the rear, and at the outfit's last place of pausing it found batteries of German horse-drawn artillery.

Mules which had been hitched and ready to move when the Germans decided the guns couldn't be saved were shot in their harness.

One of today's missions from here called for 100 rounds on a road beyond Pontecorvo.

CYCLIST ASTONISHED

A spotter in a cub plane watched results and reported that one motorcyclist, astonished at so much personal attention, "slewed" his bike around and fled for his life up the road.

That most of the outfit's fire finds more important targets is attested by the fact that German prisoners, veterans of the fighting in Russia, say artillery fire here is more terrible than that at Stalingrad.

All men here, except a few replacements, are South Carolinians, and many have been in the unit for 6 to 8 years. They refuse to be detached. One man, First Sgt. William B. Dawson, of Abbeville, S. C., was left behind in England in the fall of 1942, because of illness. The next his company heard of him he had got a ride on a converted banana boat carrying TNT and was back.

Another man, a "kid" of 20, was wounded in Sicily and sent back to Africa. Scheduled to go into the manpower pool at a replacement center, instead he got to the Bizerte docks and "wangled" a passage to Italy on a PT boat. Another man walked for 3 days through a desert to catch up with his guns, arriving in rags and near starvation.

PICKS NEW HOME TOWN

Some of the men, who by ill luck aren't from South Carolina, have taken steps to remedy the fault. One, a dentist, has already picked his town and lined up his clients.

They're all a long way from home now and intend to go farther before they start back. Even on this bleak, wet afternoon—the first time since the start of the offensive when the mood of the weather has jibed with the mood of the war—their spirits are high.

Through his French connections, Colonel Godfrey has come into possession of a bottle of fine brandy. While the guns roar and crash on all sides he fills liquor glasses and proposes a toast:

"Here's how. On to Rome—and the beachhead."

A Better America—Not a New One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of an address convincingly outlining the America of tomorrow and splendidly evidencing the contribution made by a great industry to the welfare of our country. This address was made by Mr. John M. Thomas, president of the National Board of Fire Underwriters, on the occasion of the seventy-eighth annual meeting held in New York City May 25, 1944:

Again we meet in anxious moments in the life of our Nation and the world. * * * To those whose hearts are troubled for the safety of their loved ones on the fighting fronts, these are dark days that can be lighted again only by their safe return. To others, and even to those whose boys have fought and died, these days can be great days of historic opportunity—great because, under Divine guidance, the sacrifices shall not have been in vain, and we shall have a better world secure against mass madness, wholesale murder, man-made conflagrations, and the whole mess of war's evils.

The worst has not occurred. The worst would be for us to show less courage in preserving at home what they are fighting for abroad.

Fundamentally, a stable and enduring peace stands on a spiritual concept.

We are all united in a common cause to save three great principles, three great freedoms that stand as a tripod supporting the structure of our Americanism.

AMERICA'S THREE ESSENTIAL FREEDOMS

First, is the spiritual concept proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence—that freedom to worship one's Creator as his own heart dictates. It marked the sunrise of liberty won through sacrifice and maintained by faith and courage.

Second, political freedom stemming from those God-given unalienable rights.

Third, economic freedom rooted in the same priceless heritage.

* * * * *

Next to spiritual freedom is economic freedom. If the citizen is not economically free, his political freedom is worthless. Enduring peace and the preservation of our country are as much a problem of economics as of statesmanship. No statesmanship resting on an unsound, unstable economic base can long preserve the peace.

* * * * *

It must be so sound and strong that it may bear the debt burden of the war's cost; care tenderly for the maimed and crippled to whom the titanic struggle will have brought years of suffering less merciful than death; produce food and creature comforts and give us spiritual as well as material and cultural progress for all of our people. Want can be abolished only by producing more to divide in the continuous exchange of goods and services, not by meticulous and mathematical dividing of what we already have.

To all of us these new days offer a challenge. Our great business has been a stabilizer of industrial progress and of higher standards of living of our people for more than 150 years, or nearly the whole life of the Republic.

When fire snatched away a man's factory and the livelihood of his workers, we made it possible for him to restore their productivity quickly. When new means of comfort and convenience were offered to the home, our ingenuity, research, and foresight found ways of making the new household safer than ever.

New processes of manufacturing, wider use of chemicals and other inflammables in creating new products, the more general use in the home of apparatus that can be dangerous without proper safeguards and testing in manufacture and design—all these problems of this new age of tomorrow give us new opportunities for serving the needs of the people in all walks of life, and for helping to create and maintain a sounder and safer America.

Already the war has created new wonders in the laboratories—wonders that properly tested and protected will ultimately add still more to the comfort and convenience of the American home. New products will need new instructions in handling for home owners, new lessons of safety installation for suppliers and service concerns. May of these now used exclusively on the military and naval war fronts will be utilized in factory, school, and home in our post-war history.

Thanks to the foresight and energy of our business in creating Underwriters' Laboratories, Inc., just 50 years ago, in setting and maintaining higher standards for protection from loss of life or personal injury hazards and from fire damage all over the Nation, the American people may use these new devices and new methods, secure in the knowledge that they are as safe to use as scientific planning and inspection can make them. * * *

Fire insurance is perhaps closer to the American householder than any other business in the Nation, and we want to make

that relationship as serviceable, economical, and wholesome as possible. In millions of households we have a financial interest which we can lose, and a sentimental interest which we must never lose. * * * Just as we have an interest in virtually every home in the land, so, too, does every home in the land have an interest in us, in our continued stability, soundness, and solvency under the kind of public regulation that has been developed through generations of America's traditional regard for the nature of this business and its peculiarly local character.

The very nature of our business compels us to think both practically and sentimentally in terms of the entire fabric of our economic and social life. We are trustees pledged to safeguard the savings of the American people as they are invested in plants and machinery and homes and chattels. * * *

Throughout our history * * * capital-stock-company fire insurance has helped to stabilize national progress by reducing the risk to invested capital from all insurable hazards. * * * In the years to come its role will reach an unprecedented importance because jobs will be the immediate need when war production ceases, reconversion begins, and peacetime production looms ahead, because fire insurance is a great job giver and job preserver.

* * * * *

A burned-out factory produces no wages and no income for stockholders, and without the protection of fire insurance few businesses, and especially small businesses, would have funds for rebuilding.

* * * * *

Capital stock fire insurance, giving its protective and fire-preventive service to the small as well as the large business enterprise on the basis of the hazard at risk, helps to maintain employment in the large and small fields where jobs are found.

* * * * *

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau said last fall that people with annual incomes under $5,000 are getting seven-eighths of the gross payments. That means wages and salary earners drawing $5,000 or less receive a total of one hundred and twenty-seven billion and those earning above that figure receive $18,000,000,000. The figures show the importance of jobs and the jobs, as already noted, spring from physical plants that capital stock fire insurance guards against fire and explosion and indemnifies if loss comes.

* * * * *

This guarding of capital investments of small business has a greater and deeper significance in the post-war period than ever before. Economists in the Department of Commerce have estimated that American business will have from eleven to twenty-two billion dollars left over for plant and employment expansion after financing reconversion to peacetime production. However accurate or inaccurate the ultimate facts may prove that estimate to be, only a small percentage of the total will be in the coffers of small business. The very nature of their set-up makes this a certainty.

Thousands of small enterprises impaired their working capital when they went all-out for war production. Additional thousands, unable to qualify as subcontractors on war work or unable to secure the business, watched reserves and working capital dwindle as they struggled desperately to keep going and keep their wage earners at work. For those in the latter class who still struggle bravely on complete refinancing will be necessary. For those in the first-named group working capital will be largely what they are paid when war subcontracts are terminated.

Security for loans rests on the protective guaranties of capital-stock fire insurance back of existing plant or planned extensions. It is likewise the ultimate protection of such capital investments as can be made to keep jobs and pay rolls going. So the duty and obligation upon our companies to maintain solvency and extend both coverage and service to the limit of maintaining that solvency are greater than ever in all our long and outstanding record of obligations met and promises fulfilled. This promise is a foundation of the economy of peace in our country on which a united people can build—and build well and enduringly.

In the midst of formulating what we hope may prove to be a farsighted program in meeting new public obligations and rendering new public services in the years to come, the Board is performing work of the utmost importance and usefulness in the war effort, in cooperation with the Navy, the Army, the Coast Guard and many other war and Government agencies. As it should be, this is all done as a patriotic war duty which we are happy to be able to do.

Our war record cannot yet be revealed in all its details, but when it can be told I am certain that all will agree that it ranks with the finest achievements in our long history and with the best records of all American business in cooperation with the war agencies.

We have the distinguished honor of formal recognition of our services in citations from both the Navy and the Coast Guard, extended not only to the Board but to our companies and the various organizations with which we are affiliated and who are giving their full share of assistance.

The Navy commended the Board for outstanding services rendered to the Bureau of Yards and Docks in furtherance of the Navy war-construction program. In the words of Vice Admiral Ben Moreell:

"It must be a feeling of great satisfaction to those connected with the National Board of Fire Underwriters of being able to point with pride to its long and enviable record of public usefulness in the interest of fire prevention and fire protection so that it now merits recognition as an institution of public service.

"The work of the National Board of Fire Underwriters should be encouraged, and the Navy Department is fortunate in having its services so generously contributed for the fire defense of naval shore establishments.

"Under its contract, the National Board of Fire Underwriters, together with its affiliated organizations, undertook to survey and advise on the adequacy of the fire-protection facilities of not only naval establishments, but shipyards and other firms supplying the Government with the supplies and implements of war.

"The contract provided the Government with this service for $1. Without any Government compensation whatever, some 112 field engineers have surveyed 431 properties in 25 States. These included 202 naval shore establishments, 197 shipyards, 3 hotels, and 29 schools.

"As a result of these surveys the Navy was enabled to remove or correct any fire hazards which were found."

The United States Coast Guard Security Shield of Honor, the first given to any agency assisting in the post-security program, was awarded to the board with the following inscription on the shield:

"For important contributions to the port-security program of the United States Coast Guard * * * thus making possible the safe and uninterrupted flow of our country's manpower and war materials to the battle fronts of the world and the hastening of the day of victory for the United Nations."

A citation from the Coast Guard, signed by Vice Admiral R. R. Waesche, reads as follows:

"Since the inception of this program, the National Board of Fire Underwriters has voluntarily placed the services of its trained personnel at the disposal of the Coast Guard in the development and operation of adequate fire-prevention and fire-protection measures for water-front facilities and vessels in port. As a result of the assistance so rendered, the incidence of fires in such facilities and vessels has been substantially reduced, thus assisting and facilitating the safe and uninterrupted flow of our country's manpower and war materials to the battle fronts of the world."

Cooperation with all branches of the Government in preventing fire from sabotaging the war effort has been carried on under a well-defined plan laid down in 1940 when the board first offered the expert knowledge of its engineering staffs.

Safeguarding Government property and war equipment from destruction by fire is a distinctive aid to victory. * * *

The very fact that, despite everything that could be done, losses in 1943 soared to $373,000,000—the highest since the $401,000,000 of 1932—shows what a crippling blow could have fallen on war production without this fire-prevention work. There has been no sweeping conflagration notwithstanding the accumulation of unprecedented values, the added hazard of new war construction in many instances, and large increases in employment of new people who had to be trained to new kinds of work with machines and materials they never handled before.

The fire-insurance business also inspected and reported upon the industrial plants throughout the country that had been converted to the production of war materials of every kind. It was an expert service without cost to the Government, and not available immediately from any other source, at any cost. In fact, in the long 78 years of the board's history, it has never made any finer record of devotion and achievement for our country than in the trying year since last we met in annual session. There is no glamour in this essential work, but its valuable aid in the war is inestimable. * * *

We do not claim any unique distinction for the war record to which I have referred. Such is expected of every good citizen. It is a curious anomaly, however, that in the midst of our war service, to say nothing of our long record of a civilian job well done, the fire insurance business should find itself today harassed by the greatest uncertainty it has faced in 75 years. Needlessly so.

Many of us in this room, leaders in the fire insurance business, were attacked 18 months ago under the anti-trust act although judicial decisions for 75 years have held that what we were doing in the interests of the policyholders themselves, in the interest of protecting the solvency of the companies insuring their risks, was not only lawful but in many instances required by law. We have been advised all these years that neither fire insurance itself nor the business of fire insurance was commerce. Never before in a half century of the anti-trust act, which is directed at monopolies and restraints of trade, has an Attorney General attempted to apply that act to fire insurance. By Supreme Court decisions and precedent upon precedent, the regulation of fire insurance was delegated to the States. A sound, effective, and workable system of State regulation has been built up over the decades.

Then suddenly we are confronted with a new theory applied to our business. The whole structure of State regulation is threatened and chaos knocks at our doors and the doors of business and householder alike.

As you know, the Antitrust Division lost in the lower court and appealed to the Supreme Court where the case has been argued, and a decision is awaited. Meanwhile, Con-

gress now has under consideration legislation specifically declaring that the Antitrust Act does not apply to the business of insurance. The fire insurance business favors that legislation because it would settle this new and unexpected crisis so hastily created by a view of law directly contrary to generations of decision and precedent.

* * * * * *

It should be noted by our policyholders and our citizens generally that if the present system of State regulation of fire insurance which has the sanction of generations of legal precedent were set aside, the policyholders and the public at large would be the losers thereby. Certainly the experience of recent years with the activities of Federal bureaucracy does not encourage anyone to believe that this business would be as efficiently or economically regulated as it is today by the States. If the present system of State regulation were to have superimposed on it a system of Federal regulation, the additional expense which would necessarily accompany such a duplication of regulation would not only force a reversal of the present trend of broader coverage at lower cost, but also place an additional tax burden on our policyholders and the American public. * * *

The national board faces the challenge of its new oportunities for public service with a confidence born of our own history and achievements. We came into being to fill the need of a stabilizing factor in the chaos of insurance in the economic upheaval following the Civil War. * * *

To give stability to economic progress, to thwart the catastrophe of financial and industrial chaos, is still our role. * * * The problems of today and tomorrow are infinitely greater and more complex than those of the sixties that called us into being, but we come to grips with them not as a new force in the field. We, as a board, face it with the accumulated experience of 78 years of high service in peace and war to the Republic and all its citizens.

We seek a better America, not a new one. We plan and prepare to fight for a standard of living higher than even any we have known. We know that this better America can come only through a multitude of plans worked out in the brains and hearts of a multitude of Americans, each giving of his talents, be they few or many, to the common goal of a great and united people.

It is not in the plans that the menace to our country lies. It is in the controls. No super plan worked out by any theorist, however able, by any committee, public or private, however earnest and however honestly motivated, can do the tremendous constructive task of building that lies ahead.

It cannot be done now any more than it could have been done in crisis after crisis that has come and been conquered in the years that have gone since we emerged from the War for Independence, debt-ridden but determined that the vision of a nation of men free and equal should be transmuted into enduring reality.

This has been the land of the free citizen—free before his God and endowed with those "certain unalienable rights"—free from the interfering hand of government in the exercise of his liberties under law—free to work and earn and own—free to venture and to win or lose, serenely conscious that equality of opportunity necessarily implies inequality of reward and not a dead level of socialistic mediocrity.

To government, definite bounds and limits; to the honest achievement of the free citizen, none. This is the essence of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. It was kept there by toil and sacrifice. We, God helping us, shall keep it there for the generations yet to come.

The Problem of the Retail Food Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk that I delivered at the banquet of the Associated Food Stores of Milwaukee at the Schroeder Hotel, on May 7, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak to you this evening with pleasure. It is good to be back in Milwaukee. It is good to be back in Wisconsin. You know, a Senator to get elected must be quite human, and to look after the duties of his office he has to be almost superhuman, but if he fails in the slightest degree, then he is inhuman.

Tonight I am required, because of the occasion, to be very brief. You remember the incident of the teacher telling the young lad to write a biography of Benjamin Franklin, but make it brief. So he said: "Benjamin Franklin was born in Boston; took a ship to Philadelphia; walked up the street eating a loaf of bread; saw a woman who laughed at him; he married her and discovered electricity."

I believe there is no other group in America more concerned with the future of America than are the retail merchants. From their daily contact with the people they know America, its traditions, the feelings of the people. These retailers believe in the equality of opportunity, in justice administered impartially. They believe in the American way of life. They want to live and let live in an atmosphere of freedom, and they want to return as quickly as possible to the old days when they were not regimented and interfered with by a bureaucratic government. The retailers of America will spare no effort to win the war and to restore and reassert the principles and the philosophy of life and government that have made America great.

You know that the National Association of Retail Grocers recommends the continuation of the Price Control Act as a matter of necessity. Difficut as has been the experience under O. P. A., it is recognized by practically everybody that it is a war necessity. However, it could have been better administered. There were too many square-peg administrators, too many sophomoric brains on the job in the beginning. They were well-meaning, well-intentioned, but they had no experience in the practical affairs of life. We know that many asinine regulations were brought into being, followed by amendments and adjustments and new regulations, and before the ink was dry on the new regulations there would be more amendments. All this meant the retailer was harassed in refiguring of prices and remarking, their salespeople had to be re-educated, and the consumer became bewildered and angry.

I have spoken many times on the subject. I have contended for an over-all food administrator who should have complete control of prices at the source and all the way up the line. However, in spite of missing the boat, we have a lot for which to be grateful.

You know that retail food stores increased sales 1,320,000,000 in 1943—a 9-percent rise.

Food prices averaged 11.4 percent higher.

The total sales in 1943 were 16,620,000,000—the highest in history—and doubled 1933 sales.

Independent sales increased 18 percent. Chain sales declined 7 percent.

Number of food stores declined 48,000.

Forty-seven percent of hired employees were women.

Of course, there was shortage of merchandise, shortage of help. There was the problem many places of the migration of population, drafting of store owners and employees. There were rationing and war regulations; but we were at war, and the retailers of America did a great job, as great in their line as the farmers in their line, as the food processors in their line.

In spite of mistakes, interference, everyone knew this was war, and they rallied to the call of country to do a job. The result was there was no let down—food was distributed the morale of the people of America was kept high, and I know that no matter what crises we have to face in the future that the retailer of America will carry on gallantly.

You know that the average American eats better and buys more goods than before the war. Factory workers' pay has gone up between 70 and 80 percent since 1939, and living costs have gone up not over 25 percent. With family incomes in many millions of American homes having doubled since 1939 the people will continue to buy at present prices far more of the high-priced foods if they can get them.

In relation to meat, as you know, while some people are eating less meat than before the war, others are eating more. Many persons who before the war had low incomes are now eating more because they have more money.

Here is a little side light on food. Biscuit munching and cracker crunching, normally a side-line activity of the country, are coming to a top place on the national bill of fare. Wholesale business of biscuit industry has risen from 207,000,000 in 1939 to an estimated 400,000,000 annual volume this year. Per capita consumption of crackers and cookies has just about doubled in the past 5 years.

What about the war? you ask. You know that members of the armed forces are eating about one-fourth more food per day than they did as civilians. If we get into Europe, and I expect we will, we Americans this year will not get as much food, or as appetizing food, as we did in 1943. Our butter supply, our cheese supply will be limited. We will be turning more and more to eggs and starchy foods, and we may get sick of eating chicken, but in spite of all this, ours will continue to be the best fed stomach in the world.

You ask, "Why will food be less?" Well, when we get into Europe we will have to contribute toward sustaining the populations of the freed peoples. It will be far less expensive for us to feed those who have been under the control of the Axis than to police them. We have promised these poor, undernourished brothers and sisters of ours in Europe food, and we are going to keep that promise; and the best food they can get will be food like cheese and dried milk, which have more balanced food value per cubic foot of shipping space than any other food we could send.

Now let me spend a few moments on the subject of small business and its place and problems involving the subject of post-war readjustments.

The small businessman, like the farmer, constitutes the backbone of America. You are what Aristotle called the middle class, and he said the best political community

is formed by the citizens of the middle class, and it is the middle class, he suggests, that prevents "either of the extremes from being dominant."

Therefore, it is most important that small business be kept healthy, prosperous, and expanding. In Congress we have been concerned about the growth and survival of the small businessman. I introduced a bill calling for the creation of an assistant secretary of commerce for small business; and by small business, of course, we include the family-operated farm, the rural bank, the grocery, the drug store, the machine shop, the filling station, the manufacturing establishment, with a relatively few employees.

In a free society there is what we call free consumers' choice. That means that the consumer isn't told by Government or anyone else where he shall go and what he shall buy, but he can go where he wants to and buy, and he can buy according to his means and his tastes. This is part of the equality of opportunity that has made America great.

Small business has indeed a fundamental place in the life of this Republic, and we must see to it that in the economic field, as well as in the political field no Hitlers arise that would paralyze our political vision or our economic vision.

As soon as the war ceases, and probably before, governmental restrictions and interference must be reduced to a minimum. As you know, in Congress we have committees studying the broader problem of determining the best way of constructively aiding small business and making sure that it is preserved as part of our economic life. We know that Government controls, regulations, and rules have weighed more heavily upon small business than on larger units. However, it is pretty difficult to prescribe any simple remedy in midst of a war where we are fighting for our very existence.

In the post-war period, it is for all Americans, farmers and villagers, management and labor, small business and big business, to meet the problems of that day with the same united front that we are meeting the challenges of the enemy today. We are all in the same boat. If we don't learn to pull together we may find that we will go on the rocks together. As Americans we have so much in common, so many great values that we own together, so many great inherent rights that we enjoy together, that we should apply the rule of unity we have learned to know and demonstrate together in this war period. I believe we will, and I will tell you why. In Europe, which has been the festering sore of war for centuries, those peoples we stem from apparently have not learned the art of living together, except in Switzerland and Scandinavia. And unless they learn it out of the suffering of this war we will not see the millennium for which so many pray.

But in this land we are not Germans, or Poles, or Britishers, or Scandinavians—we are Americans, a new breed. Our fathers came here and dug their roots deep down into the soil of America, and you and I are the result. In this very city of Milwaukee I have two grandchildren in whom flow the blood of old Norway, England, Wales, Germany, and perhaps Scotland. But they belong to the new breed called the American. And that breed stands for certain things.

1. It does not want to war with other peoples, but if attacked it will finish the fight.

2. It wants to live in peace and harmony with its neighbors and build a better world.

3. It wants to help other peoples so they can become self-sufficient.

4. It preaches by word and deed the doctrine that hard work and thrift and honesty and decency pay.

5. It believes in the republican form of government—a government of checks and balances where neither political nor economic tyranny can gain sway.

6. It believes in freedom of enterprise, in the rights of the individual, in the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights.

7. It believes in work because it was work that built America.

That calls to my mind the story of the old darky, and with the telling of that story I conclude.

The darky was old and decrepit. He had lost his wife, his children were gone, his little home was taken away from him, and he started out a wanderer through the southland. Wherever he went there was no one who had a place for him. He ambled into one village. No one could do anything for him. Finally someone, seeing his forlorn condition, said there was an old shack and a half acre of land he could have. He looked it over. The windows were broken, the roof staved in, the doors were off their hinges, the half acre of land was filled with poison ivy, weeds, and stones. But the old darky went to work, fixed up the shack, shingled the roof, painted it, cleaned out the half acre of weeds and ivy and planted flower seeds and rosebuds—and then when spring came around his little plot of ground blossomed like the roses. One day the darky preacher came up to him and said, "Well, Mose, the Lord and you sure have done a great job here"—because it was a beautiful place to look at, it smiled in its beauty. And old Mose said, "Yes; but you should have seen it when the Lord had it alone."

I believe in this little tale there is the challenge to all of us not to become downhearted no matter what we have to face. We have so much for which to be grateful. It is for us to rejoice always, for we have a great deal to rejoice about.

Chattanooga Airport—Necessity for Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the conference report on the Commerce appropriation bill, H. R. 4204, will be considered. Since time for debate is considerably limited, I set forth here some of the facts about an item of much importance to me and my district.

In the Senate the sum of $800,000 was added to the appropriation for Civil Aeronautics Authority. This sum was to be used to begin construction of landing strips at a new airport at Chattanooga, Tenn. The total cost to the Federal Government would be $1,422,000, the city furnishing the land, buildings, etc. The appropriation was agreed to by the Senate without a dissenting voice. The House conferees have refused to concur and now move to further insist on their disagreement. A motion will be made to recede and concur in the Senate amendment when the conference report is considered on Tuesday, June 6. This motion should be sustained for the following good reasons:

STRATEGIC LOCATION OF CHATTANOOGA

Chattanooga is located midway between Atlanta and Nashville, midway between Knoxville and Birmingham and also is on the line from Memphis to Greenville and Spartanburg, S. C. There is no other airport in the vicinity of Chattanooga to serve traffic between these points. Chattanooga is a rapidly expanding city of nearly 200,000 people and the airport there not only serves the city but the area within a 60-mile radius.

A usable airport at Chattanooga is of great importance from a military viewpoint. The control tower at the present field has been operated since April 17, 1943. Listed below are the number of aircraft using the field from then down to the present time.

Aircraft using Lovell Field from Apr. 17, 1943, to May 28, 1944 (from C. A. A. records)

	Commercial air carrier	Army, Navy, and other services	Transient, civil	Total for month
Apr. 17-31, 1943	90	1,691	85	1,866
May 1943	332	6,334	287	6,953
June 1943	298	5,865	259	6,422
July 1943	304	1,347	242	1,893
August 1943	308	4,196	238	4,742
September 1943	278	3,369	203	3,850
October 1943	306	3,908	159	4,373
November 1943	291	3,245	115	3,651
December 1943	271	3,790	86	4,147
January 1944	220	4,252	107	4,579
February 1944	162	5,025	100	5,287
March 1944	210	6,650	158	7,018
April 1944	230	6,715	191	7,136
May 28, 1944	218	7,774	183	8,175

It will be noted that during the month of May 1944, 7,774 military aircraft landed on the present field. The average each month is about 5,000. These aircraft consist of airplanes from the training command, aircraft engaged in maneuvers near Chattanooga, aircraft from the Army and Navy Transport Service and aircraft from other services of the Army and Navy. It is important to reiterate that approximately 5,000 Army or Navy aircraft have landed on the present field monthly during the past year.

Efforts have been made to secure certification by the Army or Navy of necessity of this project. One may wonder why, with so many military aircraft coming through Chattanooga, it has not been possible to get one of the services to sponsor this undertaking. The reason is that practically all of the air services of the Army and Navy use this field to a certain extent but no single one of them uses it sufficiently to convince it of the necessity of taking over and operating the airport. For instance a letter from the Army Air Forces pilot school at Smyrna, Tenn., has this to say:

"The establishment of a municipal airport at Chattanooga, Tenn., by that community, would be of value for training purposes if this station was allowed the use of same. (For the commanding officer.)"

However, the pilot school at Smyrna didn't feel justified in going all the way. The same situation is true of the rest of the services.

PRESENT AIRPORT INADEQUATE—NEW LOCATION DESIRABLE

The runways on the present airport have been practically demolished and are almost unusable because of the many heavy, four-motor bombers which have used the field. A telegram from the Honorable Ed Bass, mayor of the city of Chattanooga, about the condition of the runways is as follows:

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *May 30, 1944.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building:

Lovell Field has been used constantly, as you know, by the Army and Navy and other services since the very beginning of the present emergency, and because of this very heavy

traffic, especially heavy bombers, the runways have been broken up so badly that they are now unsafe for this traffic. This field, because of the unsafe condition, has been closed to all military aircraft except for emergency landings. The citizens of Chattanooga are up in arms and urge that you do everything possible to obtain favorable action on the bill which is now pending in the House in the amount of $800,000.

ED BASS, *Mayor.*

The present airport is on low ground, which is subject to flood. A ridge to the west of the airport and a hill nearby makes it impossible to secure the necessary and required 40-1 glide angle for landing on the field. Furthermore, the runways are entirely too short and in order to lengthen them to the present requirements of C. A. A. it would be necessary to divert the course of Chickamauga Creek, which is a sizable stream. Several accidents, which include the loss of an Army bomber and its crew of three, have occurred because of the difficulty in landing on the present field.

The cost of rebuilding the runways on the present field and of diverting the creek would be greater than the cost of building landing strips on the new site secured by the city of Chattanooga. This is clearly shown in the testimony of Charles I. Stanton, Administrator of C. A. A. before the Senate committee; see page 205. Mr. Stanton there said in part:

"It is our opinion, based on engineering studies, that it would not cost more to develop this new field which would be better, once completed, than to enlarge the existing field, which would never be as satisfactory. The enlargement of the existing field would require some very expensive stream diversion."

A letter from Mr. Stanton, dated May 23, 1944, had this to say:

"As a result of studies made by the airport engineers from our Atlanta regional office, it was determined to be more feasible to construct a new airport than to attempt to reconstruct the existing airport. There follows an extract from a letter from our regional superintendent of airports, Mr. H. Harvie Perkins, to the commanding officer of the Southeast Training Command, Maxwell Field, dated October 26, 1943:

"'A new site has been selected because of the fact that the existing airport is very low resulting in a very high water table and being subject to floodwaters, all of which would make its development into an adequate airport very costly, if not impracticable.'"

The cost of putting the old field in usable shape and the cost of building landing strips on the new site was thoroughly surveyed by Mr. William B. Todd, district airport engineer, C. A. A., Atlanta. A summary of Mr. Todd's report is attached hereto as an exhibit. It will be noted that he estimated the cost of putting the old field in usable shape as $1,615,000 and the cost of building landing strips on the new site would be $1,185,000.

In discussing the two sites Mr. Todd, in a letter of August 17, 1943, wrote as follows:

"It is the writer's opinion that the airport is rapidly becoming unsafe, and it is recommended that immediate steps be taken to make emergency repairs if the airport is to be kept open for traffic. These repairs, however, should only be considered temporary because it will be necessary to completely reconstruct the airport to serve all types of aircraft adequately and safely."

And:

"The proposed new airport site located south of the U. S. Highway No. 41 and approximately 4.4 miles south of Lovell Field is considered to have excellent possibilities for development. It has the advantage of being from 20 to 40 feet higher than Lovell Field, which will permit satisfactory drainage and at the same time would probably be freer from low-lying ground fogs. The site is located in a section of the valley between Missionary Ridge and East Ridge where it is much wider than the section where Lovell Field is located, and it appears that it will be possible to construct three runways 5,000 feet for instrument operations; that is, that there be no obstructions having a height exceeding one-fortieth their distance from the nearest end of the runways. This site is comparatively level and has expansion possibilities limited only to the extent that approaches over the ridges on the east and west meeting the minimum requirements can be provided."

The C. A. A. is anxious for the new site to be developed. From every consideration the new site should be developed. It is apparent from a military viewpoint there must be a good usable airport at Chattanooga.

ECONOMY REQUIRES AGREEING TO SENATE AMENDMENT

If the present airport is put in usable shape it would cost the Federal Government more than it would to build landing strips on the new site. Even then the field would not be satisfactory because of the ridge and the hill near it and because it is subject to floods. From the economical standpoint, it would certainly be wise to spend the money appropriated for the development of the new site which would be of great value now and in the future rather than spend more money for repair of the present field which would not be satisfactory now or in the future.

The city is to furnish the site and to build the buildings. From the viewpoint of the city and the section surrounding it, the money now spent should be on a site which will fill its needs in the future. From this viewpoint, money spent on the present site would be practically thrown away.

The same amount of materials will be used in repairing the old site as would be used in building the new one. A great deal more grading would have to be done in removing the hill and diverting the creek at the old site than would have to be done at the new site. So from the viewpoint of the materials to be used, the manpower involved, the money expended, the use to the armed services, and the use to the city of Chattanooga, the new site should be developed rather than the old one being repaired.

This is undoubtedly a case in which economy and good judgment should impel the Members of the House to agree to the Senate amendment.

Let us remember that 5,000 military aircraft have been using the field at Chattanooga each month, the runways are now torn up, accidents happen because of the unsuitable location of the present field, it would cost less to build the landing strips at the new site than to repair the old one, the Nation and the city would have an airport usable during the war and of great value during the future.

The following is a condensed report of a letter received from Mr. William B. Todd, district airport engineer, Civil Aeronautic Administration, Atlanta, Ga., under date of August 17, 1943, which was made after his inspection several days ago, also his estimate of cost for the reconstruction of Lovell Field and the cost of constructing a new field which lies partly in Georgia. Mr. Todd reports the following deficiencies existing at Lovell Field at this time:

(a) That all of the approaches to the present runways have bad approaches which make it dangerous for heavy aircraft to land.

(b) That because of inadequate drainage and high water table the subgrade under the runways has become thoroughly saturated which is causing much detrioration of runways. A great deal of this deterioration has been accelerated by the traffic of very heavy aircraft.

(c) That the airport is rapidly becoming unsafe and that immediate steps should be taken to make emergency repairs, if it is to be kept open to traffic.

(d) That it is necessary to completely reconstruct the airport to serve all types of aircraft adequately and safely.

Mr. Todd's estimate on reconstructing Lovell Field is as follows:

Clearing and grubbing	$10,000
Grading, 1,500,000 cubic yards	375,000
Blanket course underfill	100,000
Drainage	100,000
Paving	675,000
Lighting	20,000
Fencing	10,000
Total	1,290,000
To the above figures it will be necessary to add the cost of relocating the creek, estimated at	250,000
Plus cost of land, estimated at	75,000
Making a total of	1,615,000

Mr. Todd's estimate of cost on the proposed new site is as follows:

Clearing and grubbing	$25,000
Grading, 1,500,000 cubic yards	375,000
Drainage	75,000
Paving	675,000
Lighting	25,000
Fencing	10,000
Total	1,185,000

City of Chattanooga to furnish site and buildings.

Power Versus Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there appeared in the issue of June 5 of Life an editorial entitled "Power versus Conscience." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER VERSUS CONSCIENCE—A SPOKESMAN OF THE ONE IS CHURCHILL, OF THE OTHER SENATOR LA FOLLETTE—WE NEED BOTH

In his speech to Parliament on British foreign policy last week, Mr. Churchill made the most cynical remark recorded of any Allied leader in this war. His only guides through the subject, said he, are "singleness of purpose and a good, or at any rate, well-trained conscience."

It would be unfair to single out this remark if the rest of his speech were not one long substantiation of it. It was one of Churchill's very best speeches, full of candor, eloquence, and news. But the news and the candor seemed deliberately chosen to blast away any wisps of idealism that may still cling around Allied war aims.

"In one place (Greece) we support a King, in another (Yugoslavia) a Communist. There is no attempt by us to enforce particular ideologies," said Mr. Churchill. To prove it he appealed outright for kindlier feelings toward Franco, the Fascist dictator

of Spain, in whose internal affairs "it is not for us to meddle."

Power, naked and unashamed

It will not surprise Life readers to learn that expediency is the favorite tool, and national power the prime post-victory objective, of British, Russian, and American leaders in this war. Nor is this necessarily a crime. As was pointed out on this page last week, nationalism can be an instrument for progress toward internationalism, and at the present juncture of human affairs it is probably the best possible instrument. Mr. Churchill, however, exceeded the most realistic expectations of his American admirers. He not only offered small comfort to believers in the four freedoms; he went out of his way to discourage them. His war aim, he made clear, is not so much permanent peace as permanent victory. The world is to be dominated by Russia, Britain, and the United States. If lesser nations have a voice, it is to be as members of an assembly whose relations to the "controlling power" Mr. Churchill is "in no position to define." He hopes for "fraternal association" with America, but his 20-year alliance with Russia "is the foundation of our policy." If war, as Clausewitz said, is the continuation of politics by other means, Mr. Churchill sees peace as the continuation of victory by the same means—i. e., armed might.

Now it is quite true that peace cannot be maintained without power. Practically all Americans realize by now that they are in the game of international-power politics for good, and that joint action with Britain and Russia is the best way for them to play it. America, whether Republican or Democratic, is not likely to shrink from this game. We have been a bit Mortimer Snerdish about it in the past, but we can take care of ourselves and we have an almost unlimited stack of chips.

However, there is more to world peace than power. Even if Americans could not reason this out, they would feel it in their bones. For the American conscience, whether better or worse than Mr. Churchill's, is not well trained.

By chasing ideology out of the United Nations' cause, Mr. Churchill did not dispel the world's ideological confusion. One would expect some political party or other, at least in America, to display an outraged conscience at the Churchill cynicism. Well, what party? Not the Democrats; Mr. Roosevelt is playing too much the same game. Not the Republicans; they are reluctant to seem anti-British.

Not the Communists. Some radical party, then? Radicals are supposed to respect conscience more than power. They took exception to Churchill's Franco line, but in general, said the Daily Worker admiringly, "it is clear that the spirit of Teheran is working." The major liberal and internationalist groups felt the same way. The labor leaders intent on reelecting Roosevelt paid no attention. Indeed, few Americans of any party, radical or conservative, seemed greatly perturbed. Perhaps, bemused by the new power game, the American conscience is asleep.

A free-minded radical

Yet there is in America a deep, old strain of radicalism which neither the Communists, nor the internationalists, nor the liberal and labor leaders really represent. It is the indigenous radicalism of the frontier, whose goal is not merely peace, prosperity and slum clearance, but economic justice and individual freedom. For evidence that this kind of radicalism still exists, turn to Wisconsin. Politically, Wisconsin is confused, but not ideologically.

There Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE'S Progressive Party, which has run Wisconsin off and on for years and still holds some shreds of power in Wisconsin, recently came out with a new 1944 platform. It is an old Progressive boast that practically all the planks in its platforms, beginning in 1908, get adopted by a major party and turned into national legislation sooner or later. That is the true function of a radical party: to discern reforms which are in the main stream of American progress, and to start fighting for them before they are practical. On the very good chance that the Progressives are still performing this function, their 1944 platform is worth looking at. They may be what President Conant of Harvard asked for in his plea for a native American radicalism last year: "* * * the missing political link between the past and the future of this great democratic land."

The Progressive's platform favors the prosecution of all monopolies, the reform of the patent system, a rebirth of small and independent enterprise, a program of planned public works and the use of Government power to secure "full production and full employment" and "equality of opportunity for all." It is against regimentation "of right or left." LA FOLLETTE thinks the Roosevelt administration, which he has supported in the past, has been practically taken over by "the forces of monopoly and reaction."

In foreign policy, Progressives oppose any compromise with fascism, and take bows for having warned against Pearl Harbor. Quite wrongly, they opposed the President's prewar aid-to-Britain policy, hence earning the label of isolationist; but their reason was neither cowardly nor ignoble; they suspected a diversion from the New Deal's domestic reforms. They now fear another Peace of Versailles, which "betrayed the common people" of all countries. They still favor self-determination for small nations. They hate and fear imperialism and cartels. They favor a federated Europe and an attack on what they regard as the causes of war. They also favor international cooperation "with the forces which share their ideals for political freedom and economic opportunity." And by such forces, they don't mean Churchill.

This platform has been called a rebirth of Midwestern isolationism. To read it is to know that it is nothing of the kind. Impractical? Just now, yes. Too morally ambitious for a sinful world? Sure. The Progressives are a radical party.

Our "ideology" is freedom

As such, they will never come to power. That is one of the merits of our two-party system. In power, the Progressives might indeed lead us into isolationism, of the dangerous monastic kind that fears to sully American ideals by contact with the Churchills and Stalins of this world. But transmuted into the practical politics of a major party, the Progressive ideals will be heard from yet. When the American conscience reawakens, and power without "ideology" turns out to be not good enough, we will be able to thank the Progressives for keeping alive and uncorrupted an American "ideology"—belief in universal freedom.

Meanwhile, of course, the Republican or Democratic United States Government will cooperate with Mr. Churchill. We can even go along with him in keeping hands off, if necessary, on the fine old grounds of "nonintervention," a cornerstone of international law. Yet neither Franco, nor Britain's rule in India, nor our own many shortcomings, nor any form of tyranny is permanently safe so long as America harbors her La Follettes, her democracy and her beliefs. Said Oliver Wendell Holmes, "Not by aggression, but by the naked fact of existence we are an eternal danger and an unsleeping threat to every government that found itself on anything but the will of the governed."

Eighty-seventh Birthday Anniversary of Timothy W. Crowley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on May 20 of this year Mr. Timothy W. Crowley, of Hartford, Conn., celebrated his eighty-seventh birthday anniversary. I wish to make note of the fact, for I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of the birthday celebration which was published in the Hartford Times of May 20, 1944.

Mr. Crowley is not known to many present Members of the Senate, but there was a time when he was well known here. He was one of the labor leaders of the United States when many of the Johnny-come-latelys were not even in existence. More than 52 years ago he was president of the Connecticut Federation of Labor. He was a friend of my father all his life, and I wish to take special note of the occasion to the end that I may notify Mr. Crowley that there are some of us who still have very great regard and affection for him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TIM" CROWLEY, VETERAN LABOR LEADER, AT 87 ALL READY TO DUPLICATE BIRTHDAY CAKE FEAT

Those who remember the "Night of the Big Wind," when Tim Crowley blew out 86 candles with one breath on his birthday cake a year ago tonight, are expecting him to duplicate the feat tonight with an extra candle.

Timothy W. Crowley, 303 Sigourney Street, says he won't disappoint anybody when the cake comes in tonight at the celebration in his honor given by the Patriotic Irish-American Societies of Greater Hartford, of which he is president.

Hale and hearty and rarin' to go, Tim got out his fiddle today to see whether he can still play a tune. He can. Once a well-known musician around Connecticut, the old master hasn't lost his touch.

Crowley has been the most active union and labor man in the State since almost anyone can remember. While he was playing the violin he organized musicians' unions in Meriden and Bridgeport. Samuel Gompers recognized his good work here and appointed him an official organizer for the American Federation of Labor. He was president of the Connecticut Federation of Labor 52 years ago.

Tim is particularly proud of a gold-headed cane presented to him by the Central Labor Union of Meriden when he was president of that body. He also has twice been elected president of the Hartford Central Labor Union, the last time only 4 years ago. He is still its most active member, giving speeches throughout the State.

An ardent politician, Tim reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD religiously every day, "keeping tabs," he says, "on what's going on in Washington."

Small Business Plank for Political Platforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter by George J. Burger, publisher of the magazine National Independent, and a proposed 1944 plank on small business as suggested for endorsement by the national conventions of the Democratic and Republican Parties, all of which appear on the frontispiece of the May 1944 issue of the National Independent.

There being no objection, the letter and proposed plank were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL INDEPENDENT PROPOSES A SMALL-BUSINESS "PLANK"

To Leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties—Anticipating Their June and July 1944 National Conventions:

Respectfully, we submit for earnest consideration a small-business plank for insertion in each party's 1944 platform.

We can think of no other step of an economic character that is more important at this precarious moment in the history of our country.

The special committees of the Senate and House of Representatives respectfully, have performed yeoman's service for small business. By what they have done, they probably have actually saved the day for American small business.

These worthy Senate and House committees on small business require more power and authority in their endeavors to protect and preserve the American small-business system.

The 1944 National Conventions of the Democratic and Republican parties can render prompt and valuable aid to American small business—if their leaders have the will to do so—by adopting a small-business plank recommending the permanent establishment of the existing small business committees of the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Publisher.

A 1944 "PLANK" ON SMALL BUSINESS PROPOSED FOR ENDORSEMENT BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES

RECOGNITION OF A CONSTANT, VITAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND THE AMERICAN SYSTEM OF SMALL BUSINESS

We recognize the existence of a constant, vital relationship between democracy and the American system of small business. The two are coincident and coextensive. Neither can survive without the other. Small business is fighting for its life. Centralization, anathema to small business and to democracy alike, stalks the land as never before. Therefore, we earnestly recommend to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States that proper steps be taken at the earliest possible moment to establish the existing special committees on small business of the Senate and the House, respectively, as permanent, standing committees with full privilege of making reports directly to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Hon. James V. McClintic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting excerpts from a letter written by our distinguished former colleague, Hon. James V. McClintic, of Oklahoma, which is in line with some of the statements of President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and other leading Americans.

Mr. McClintic's letter reads, in part, as follows:

TRUTH CRUSHED TO EARTH WILL RISE AGAIN

Washington, D. C., May 10, 1944.

Mr. DREW PEARSON,
Care of the Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: My attention has been called to the following statement emanating from your journalistic bureau:

"McClintic served in a chair-warming job as Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior and, after 9 years, Ickes proposed transferring him to work outside Washington, to which he was better suited. But McClintic refused to go, whereupon Ickes let him out."

As a matter of fact I was with the Interior Department a little over 2½ years instead of 9 years, and the records will so show. The work outside of Washington related to the mining of anthracite coal in Pennsylvania concerning which I knew nothing. Therefore, I advised the office of Mr. Dan H. Wheeler, Director of the Division of Coal Mines, that I would secure a transfer to another department of the Government. As to your statement that "Ickes let him out," this is one of those "circulating lies" that Senator MCKELLAR branded you recently with in the Senate. If you had checked the records of the War Department as Congressman JED JOHNSON and I asked your office to do, you would have found that they showed that a requisition had been approved by the War Department for my transfer before any person in the Interior Department knew about it. Further, on January 22, 1944, I personally advised Secretary Ickes that I was leaving his Department to accept a position in the War Department.

Since the President of the United States has already described you as a "chronic liar" and the Secretary of State has called you a "purveyor of monstrous falsehoods," naturally I am not surprised at the above falsehood which you have manufactured out of whole cloth. Your excursions into the field of mendacity and exaggeration * * * are so well known to the people of Washington and the country, that even your attempted character assassination of the Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States occasioned little surprise.

I do not have the misfortune of personal acquaintanceship with you but occasionally I do hear you and a "diploma mill" quack nauseating the American people over the air by extolling the virtues of a cathartic whose all-purpose efficacy the Federal Trade Commission is now investigating.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the sentiments of all the Members of this House who served with him when I say there is not a more loyal, a more sincere, or a more patriotic man connected with this Government than our distinguished former colleague, James V. McClintic of Oklahoma.

Our Way Still the Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while New Dealers, like WALLACE and Tugwell, talk and write about remaking America, about a coming revolution; while Sidney Hillman, the new political dictator, and the labor racketeers functioning under the name of committee for political action, and Earl Browder, the ex-convict released from prison by the President to campaign for a fourth term, and now heading the Communist political association, are attempting to take over and remake constitutional government into a form of dictatorship, here at home the cold, hard facts of the war demonstrate that our way, the way of the forefathers, the way which prevailed until the coming of the New Deal, is still the best; still will produce the most in the shortest possible time; still bring more of all desirable things to the people of a country.

If you do not believe it, read the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 3, 1944, and check with your own knowledge of the facts:

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN WAR

The Anglo-Russian parliamentary committee is circulating in London reprints of an article from the Russian journal, Bolshevik, praising the Soviet's war machine, with particular emphasis on war industry and agriculture. The article, written by M. Kalinin, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, extols the Soviet system and discounts the contributions of the United States to Russia. It says nothing about the great number of superior weapons that Russia got from us and declares that lend-lease food is "only auxiliary—nothing more," adding that Soviet agriculture is "the foremost in Europe."

The collectivists obviously are out to prove that their system of economy is the best, and it would be most difficult for them to complete that proof if they had to start off by attributing to a capitalistic power a large part of the credit for their successes.

Sensible people certainly will not deny the might of Soviet Russia's armies as shown in their 3-year struggle with the best that Hitler has had to offer. Nor will anyone be inclined to detract from the valor of the Red fighting men, their tenacity, courage, and skill, and the brilliant Soviet generalship which resisted the siege at Stalingrad, has driven the Germany Army back into old Poland, and has freed the greater part of Russia from the invader.

If the apologists for the communistic and socialistic systems are going to take credit, they would be wise to confine it to that type of success. When they start shouting about the might of the Soviet war industries and Soviet agriculture, they are exposing their chins.

Soviet Russia has a population of nearly 193,000,000 persons, as against a population of about 132,000,000 in the United States. It has an area of nearly 9,000,000 square miles as against less than 4,000,000 square miles in the United States and possessions. The Bolsheviks have had more than 25 years to perfect their system of economy and have been able to draw upon the experience of the capitalistic countries liberally in developing industrial procedure.

With these facts acknowledged, anyone would think that Russia, if communism is so superior, would have produced at least as much in war material and services as the United States, where the system of private enterprise still operates, much to the disgust of the American Communists.

The Royal Institute of International Affairs, a British association, has published during the last few months a series of statistical accounts on the economic war effort of the principal nations of the world. Statistics of this type are extremely difficult to assemble for purposes of comparison because of the different systems of bookkeeping in the various countries, because of differences in exchange and purchasing power, and because a good deal of information has been kept secret.

Certainly the statistics in the Royal Institute bulletin are not loaded in favor of the United States. The British author, for instance, declares that the standard market basket, an economist's measure of food costs, sells for 75 percent more in the United States than it does in England; American shipbuilding costs are known to be 60 to 100 percent higher than English, and American book costs probably exceed those of the British by 50 percent. Therefore, he sets the English pound sterling as between $6.50 and $10, instead of $4, the current rate of exchange. This may or may not be factually accurate, but it surely does not lead to any exaggeration of American achievement.

With due apologies for educated guesses and estimates where figures are lacking, the British author says that expenditures for war goods and services during 1943, at British prices, stack up about as follows (in millions of British pounds sterling):

Russia	5,000
Greater Germany	9,000
United States	11,500
United Kingdom	4,000
British dominions	1,500
Japan	1,600 to 1,700

This means that the "war effort" of Russia is considerably less than half that of the United States, measured according to a British denominator which also places capitalist England and her dominions together about on an equal footing with Communist Russia. The figures do not, in any case, credit lend-lease goods to the production of the country receiving them. In other words, Russia's figure is what she has done for herself in the war during 1943, which is what the Communists are talking about.

With a lot fewer citizens to do the work, and less than half the land area to draw upon, the United States produced more than twice the war supplies during 1943 than the Russians did under communism, and we had not yet reached our peak.

There is no doubt that Russia has done well by her standards, but America has done twice the job under an economic and political system which preserves rights and freedoms for the citizens found nowhere else on earth.

Mayo and A. D. Canulette, Jr., Establish Record as World's Youngest Boat Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Canulette Shipbuilding Co., of Slidell, has demonstrated its ability and distinguished itself in the construction of one of the most important naval vessels that is needed in the war effort at this time. Several days ago it was my pleasure, opportunity, and good fortune to be present at the launching of what is known as a submarine boom net tender. At this launching Navy officials, Army officials, Canulette Shipbuilding Co. officials, and the workmen who produced this necessary and marvelous instrument for our part in the war were present. The boat is an unusual-looking boat and is perhaps one of the most powerful ships of its size that was ever designed. This vessel is one of the most important ships that are utilized in this war, as it is used for laying submarine nets, mines, and other extremely important work.

The Canulette Shipbuilding Co., which is owned by two distinguished families of Canulettes, demonstrated long before the war as builders of some of the finest marine equipment and dredge boats that were ever constructed.

A. D. Canulette, Jr., and Mayo Canulette are not only the principal operators of this company, but they constitute perhaps the two youngest boat builders in America, A. D. Canulette being 27 and Mayo Canulette 25. With their limited water facilities they have done not only an outstanding job, but have practically done the impossible, as many experts predicted that they could never build, launch, and float these vessels with the water facilities that were available to their yard. Several of these boats have been constructed and commissioned, and several more are under construction. These boats cost over $1,000,000 and are as powerfully equipped as any boat of their class in the world. Perhaps one of the most inspiring spectacles at the launching of this boat was the honor as sponsor given to the wife of the chief mechanic of the yard, Mrs. John Panks, Jr. She was assisted by her daughter, Mrs. Robert Rugan.

To be present at this launching ceremony was truly a great inspiration, especially when you saw the multitude of workmen who had constructed that great vessel, the Army and Navy officials, the Canulettes, and the sponsor start the boat sliding briskly down the ways with the traditional breaking of the bottle of champagne. Naturally it was a proud moment for myself as this shipyard is located in my district, and to be present was indeed a signal honor. I am proud of those who produce such ships by their hours of sweat and toil, of the Canulettes, who have demonstrated their genius as boat builders, and of all those who worked so hard to produce another vast instrumentality that we know will lead us to total victory in this great world struggle and conflict.

The Atlantic Charter as It Relates to Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Hon. O. J. Larson, former Congressman from Minnesota, a resident of Duluth; Rev. Paul A. Heideman, of the Finnish Apostolic Lutheran Church of America, at Calumet, Mich.; Henry Puranen, of the Finnish American League for Democracy, Fitchburg, Mass.; and V. K. Nikander, president of Suomi College and Theological Seminary, the Finnish Lutheran Church of America, at Hancock, Mich., on May 20, 1944, addressed a letter to the President of the United States. The writers of this letter and those whom they represent are sincere in their desire to help preserve the principles of the Atlantic Charter as it relates to Finland and other small independent states. Therefore, I feel that their thoughts should be known to all Members of this body, and for that reason I ask to have a copy of this letter inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 20, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Representing the overwhelming majority of Americans of Finnish stock may we further petition your aid in bringing to an end the hostilities existing between Russia and the Republic of Finland?

Heretofore our committee has made representations in person and by letter to Secretary of State Hull and has been received by Assistant Secretary of State Long and Mr. Cumming, of the Department. We have endeavored to point out the great moral cause of American participation in the war and how it would be served at this juncture by an amicable settlement of the existing hostilities between Soviet Russia and Finland.

There can't be any doubt—and this has been officially recognized—that in the case of the Finnish-Russian fight, the winter war of 1939–40 as well as the present conflict, Finland has been the victim of Russian attacks. Whatever may be the social and official taboos of the present day in this regard, the fact remains that Finland, with a population of less than 4,000,000, has not attacked Russia, has not joined the Axis, has at no time fought for aggrandizement, has been motivated purely by purposes of defense of her homeland and the right to govern it according to the will of her own people, and in the main the people of America so recognize the situation between Finland and Soviet Russia.

May we not petition you today, Mr. President, to intercede in this matter, in true ac-

cord with the spirit of the second article of the Atlantic Charter, remembering that of the post-war democracies founded in Europe after the last war, Finland is the only one that survives today with its original constitution. We choose to believe that this is due to the fact that it is founded on the identical principles of our own Government and the basic tenets of true representative government of justice, peace and democracy.

And may we reiterate what we have previously maintained, that:

1. Democratic, peace-loving, and progressive Finland is entitled to continue its existence as a free and independent nation for, as Lincoln pointed out in his first inaugural address, a country and its institutions belong to the people who inhabit it. From the birth of our Nation the traditional policy of the United States has been one of friendship and help to the small democratic countries.

2. Finland is entitled in all fairness to know the terms on which peace is made. Unless Finland is advised beforehand of those terms, its powerful and ruthless enemy may later demand conditions which mean Finland's complete annihilation as a nation. To accept the present Russian terms would be tantamount to committing national suicide. Finland is not dominated by Nazi Germany, for if she were, how could she even have begun to discuss the conditions presented by Russia, especially when the conditions include the demand for internment of German troops.

3. The present war in which Finland is involved is a continuation of the war which began with the invasion of Finland in 1939 and for which aggression Russia was expelled from the League of Nations.

4. Finland has given evidence of her good faith in seeking peace by welcoming territorial and governmental security guaranteed by Great Britain and the United States. Her sole threat to permanent peace and maintenance of genuine autonomy and independence is from the side of Soviet Russia.

5. Deep-rooted attitudes of a people do not change overnight. Filand continues to want peace, and wants only the freedom to continue to govern herself. Accusations of atrocities on the part of the Finnish Army and suggestions that Finland has committed herself to the Axis do not ring true.

6. Finland's outstanding record of honest dealing with the United States, as well as her record as a democracy from the beginning of her independence, are the proper criteria from which to judge her present dilemma. It is our earnest plea that she will not be deprived of the sustaining friendship of our great Nation at this crucial moment.

7. The recent exchange of notes between the Finnish and Soviet Governments, as to possible peace terms, plainly states the reasons why the Republic of Finland cannot accept the terms and conditions laid down by the Russians. Neutral circles which laid the foundation for the conversations between the two countries have likewise been shocked by the severity of the Russian terms. Translated into realities, the size of the indemnity and the insistence of the Russians upon retaining the fruits of her former war of conquest over Finland will mean the utter extinguishment of national life and independence in the Republic of Finland.

In submitting this plea to you, Mr. President, we voice the sentiment of Finnish American religious and other groups representing a membership and affiliates of approximately 500,000 people. Among these are the following: The Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, also two large Finnish Apostolic Lutheran bodies, the Knights and Ladies of Kaleva Lodges, temperance groups, the Finnish American League for Democracy, and the coperative groups, both farmers' and consumers' cooperatives, and all the noncommunistic fraternal organizations, all of which have a Nation-wide membership. Eight Finnish-language newspapers in our country, whose patriotism and loyalty to our country are unquestionable, are of the view we are voicing.

Very respectfully yours,

O. J. LARSON,
Former Congressman from Minnesota.
REV. PAUL A. HEIDEMAN,
The Finnish Apostolic Lutheran Church of America, Calumet, Mich.
HENRY PURANEN,
Finnish American League for Democracy, Fitchburg, Mass.
V. K. NIKANDER,
President Suomi College and Theological Seminary; The Finnish Lutheran Church of America, Hancock, Mich.

A Plea for the Faith of Our Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a timely article written by Mr. E. J. Landor, of Canton, Ohio, who during a long and useful life has been an outstanding example of a true American; and an exponent of the principles upon which our country was founded, developed and will continue to stand. The following message by Mr. Landor in connection with I am an American Day is an inspiration to all of us in these dark days when Americans are fighting to preserve and perpetuate the faith of our fathers:

A PLEA FOR THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS
(By E. J. Landor)

We need to remember our history, to read again of that God-inspired man whom we call the Father of our Country. We need to note, on every occasion when success comes to our armies in the fight for freedom, how George Washington gave the credit to an allwise Providence, and when defeat came again and again he ascribed the result to his belief that Providence withheld victory for good reason.

We need to turn to the noble Lincoln, with his love and trust of the common people, of whom he said, "God must love them since He made so many of them." Time and again the common brotherhood of man was revealed to us by Lincoln who walked humbly, yet confidently, trusting the people as no one before had done—completely, anticipating their desires, but pointing out what had to be done to secure them and, withal, seeking guidance from the Creator of us all.

We need to turn to our own beloved citizen, William McKinley. When he realized that the Philippines had dropped into our lap, he confessed he did not know what to do with them. He sought counsel from all sides, but got little help. He walked the floor of the White House night after night. At last he got down on his knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance, and one night it came to him that we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable—we could not turn them over to France or Germany—they were our commercial rivals in the Orient—we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government. There was nothing left for us to do but take them and educate the Filipinos, uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the best we could. And McKinley tells us how he then went to bed, went to sleep and slept soundly.

The next morning he sent for the chief engineer of the War Department (our map maker) and told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States. "There can be no imperialism," said William McKinley. "Those who fear it are against it, so that there is universal abhorrence for it, and unanimous opposition to it. Our only difference is that those who do not agree with us have no confidence in the virtue or capacity or high purpose or good faith of this free people as a civilizing agency, while we believe that the century of free government which the American people have enjoyed has not rendered them irresolute and faithless, but has fitted them for the great task of lifting and assisting to better condition and larger liberty those distant peoples who through the issue of battle have become our wards. A self-governing people will never permit despotism in any government they foster and defend. The burden is our opportunity; the opportunity is greater than the burden."

Again, the American people will be faced with an issue not unlike that faced by President McKinley: Shall we retreat into our isolationist shell, or shall we, realizing how gracious God has been to us as a Nation do our best "to educate, uplift, civilize, and Christianize" the backward races and by our example lead the more forward ones to do likewise; in other words, to realize "the burden is our opportunity and that the opportunity is greater than the burden"?

Let us not forget it was the labor of missionaries, 70 years or more before Pearl Harbor, who so influenced the Papuan race of New Guinea that our boys lost in the jungles of that wild country found not savages but friendly people who aided them.

We may not reach the heights that George Meredith outlined but we can aim to do so, aspire to do so. He is quoted as saying: He who looks for a future which he himself will not enjoy reaches the height of nobility and valor. This is the supreme achievement of self-mastery, self-discipline, and self-sacrifice, and the finest magnanimity we may have upon earth."

After the fall of France, a workman of France sent us a warning, in part as follows: "We persisted in our errors * * * we persisted in leveling the nation down, in imagining that the state would prove an everlasting milch cow. Our awakening has been rude * * * we old men do all we can to help, morally and materially, the nation. We shall have to bow our heads but no force on earth will be able to break our hearts. Tell this to the Americans, warn them at the same time of the perils that may befall democracy when it forgets free men have duties as well as rights."

As an aid toward this high ideal, let me suggest that when we pray we first ask to be given grace so as to deserve to be heard; then let us pray for courage, the royal gift of courage, that we may do each disagreeable duty at once.

We should follow this with a prayer for a keen sense of honor; that we may never give ourselves the benefit of the doubt; that we may be especially just to those we find it hard to like, and that we may own up manfully when we have done wrong.

Then let us ask for a true sense of humor, that its kindly light and healing power may rule life's tension; and further let us ask for a restrained and well-ordered ambition that we may not miss things that are noble and beautiful.

But above all, let us ask that we may be true and loyal to the best and highest we know and that we may show this truth and loyalty in every activity of our common life, and so live to the glory of our Creator.

Keeping Promises to Our Flying Instructors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think it imperative that the Army Air Forces of the War Department keep their promises to thousands of our boys who signed up in good faith for a certain branch of service. To give a clear picture of what is taking place I insert a resolution and other tables and statements:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT REUNION OF POLAR BEAR ASSOCIATION, DETROIT, MICH.

Whereas the War Department of the United States did authorize the Civil Aeronautics Administration to enlist and encourage the training of 25,000 aviation cadets and offered inducements that such cadets upon completion of their training course would be appointed staff sergeants, flight officers, or commissioned second lieutenants; and

Whereas documentary evidence exists that cadets enlisted in the Civil Aeronautics Administration program were given good reason to believe that opportunity was being afforded them to obtain aviation cadet training, and upon graduation to receive commissions in the Army Air Forces of the United States, and

Whereas the War Department has now canceled the CPT-WTS program after many thousands of students had devoted their time as cadets in training for a period ranging rom 12 to 18 months and that no provision has been made to fulfill the obligations of the War Department and the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce; and

Whereas under date of March 13, 1942, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, by order of the Secretary of War, did issue circular No. 75 amending Circular 204, War Department 1941, providing for the enlistments to the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve Corps, of students in the pilot training course conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and for the appointment of aviation cadets who met requirements as cadets of the United States Army, also that persons enlisted in the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve Corps would be called into active service at the termination of the course; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce under date of June 19, 1942, through its Acting Administrator, did address Mr. Lynn U. Stambaugh, National Commander, American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., advising that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is highly grateful that the American Legion will assist in recruiting 13,350 candidates for specialist pilots which the Army Air Forces have asked us (the Department of Commerce) to train, and further advised that it would be most helpful if the 12,000 posts of the Legion would spread the word, giving candidates proper information and assist in making applications; and

Whereas under date of October 8, 1942, the Headquarters Army Air Forces did issue a routing and record sheet on the subject of additional training for C. P. T. students, stating that graduates of C. P. T. instructors course will be called to active duty and receive instructions at schools under the jurisdiction of the Commanding General, Flight Training Command, and upon completion they would be rated as service pilots, appointed flight officers or commissioned second lieutenants A. U. S., and further it was definitely stated that commissions will be given to those outstanding graduates with performance in air force schools and in the Air Force units in which they may serve upon completion of training; and

Whereas under date of October 2, 1942, P. H. Walton, major, Air Corps, assistant chief Aviation Cadet Section, Military Personnel Division, O. D. T., addressed The Adjutant General on the subject of promotion and ultimate rank of trainees who entered the Enlisted Reserve to take civilian pilot training, stating that cross-country link instrument courses are classified as advance C. P. T. courses and that graduates of these courses will be assigned to air lines through the Air Transport Command as copilots and to the Flight Training Command as instructor material. These reservists will receive further flight training and that those best qualified under this training will be rated service pilots and be commissioned as second lieutenants, Army of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Polar Bear Association does hereby call upon the War Department to make suitable provisions for fulfilling its obligations and promises to students in the cadet program, now being disregarded, which, in our opinion, is unfair and not in accord with the best interests of the United States and the war effort; be it further

Resolved, That we request the Congress of the United States to immediately enact suitable legislation providing commissions for those who have completed the primary, secondary, and cross-country flight courses and either the elementary-instructor course or link-trainer course; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senator VANDENBERG, Senator FERGUSON, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and Senator WILEY and to all Members of the Congress from Michigan and Wisconsin with a plea to them that they support and encourage prompt passage of legislation that has been introduced for the correction of the problem resulting from the recital herein and that this be done at once before the Congress adjourns, and that the president of the Polar Bear Association appoint a committee to see that this work is done.

BRADLEY R. TAYLOR,
Chairman,
BOB GUNNIS,
HARRY COSTELLO,
LARRY SALTER,
Resolutions Committee.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, October 2, 1942.

Subject. Promotion and ultimate rank of those trainees who enter the enlisted reserve to take civilian pilot training.

To The Adjutant General.

1. It has been brought to the attention of this directorate that C. P. T. regional directors are not in all cases well informed as to the changes of promotion and ultimate rank of those trainees who enter the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve to take civilian pilot training.

2. Accordingly, it is requested that the Adjutant General recommend to the commanding generals of the Service Commands that they coordinate their recruiting efforts with the regional directors of the Civilian Pilot Training and advise them that under present policy:

a. All students meeting the requirements for liaison pilot, whether they be assigned for duty with the Army Air Forces or with the Field Artillery, will be appointed Staff Sergents with liaison pilot rating.

b. All class A glider pilot students obtained from the C. A. A. program will be promoted to Staff Sergeants upon graduation from an Advanced Army Glider Pilot School.

The length of the Army glider pilot course is:

Elementary, 4 weeks, 30 hours.
Basic, 4 weeks, 30 hours.
Advanced, 2 weeks, 15 hours.

c. Cross country link instrument, and instructor courses: These are classified as advance C. P. T. courses. Graduates of these courses will be assigned to the air lines through the Air Transport Command as copilots, and to the Flying Training Command as instructor material. These reservists will receive further flight training. Of those assigned to Flying Training Command as instructor material, only those who become best qualified under this further training will be rated service pilots, commissioned second lieutenants, Army of the United States, and assigned as instructors in basic Army schools. Those among the instructor material who do not qualify as above indicated, but who do qualify to instruct in elementary schools, will be assigned to civil contract schools. All reservists who do not qualify as indicated above will be assigned to duty in a capacity for which they are best qualified.

d. Graduates of the C. P. T. flight officer schools at Burlington, Vt., and Houston, Tex., will be transferred through the Air Transport Command to air lines. They will remain on an inactive status in the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve and will be assigned on a civil contract basis.

e. Eliminations: Reservists who are eliminated from any of the higher groups of training as measured in flying time requirements will be given opportunity to qualify for an appropriate lower group as measured in flying time requirements as follows:

(1) In addition to assigning washouts from the instructor, link instrument course, and cross country course to training as control tower operators, many may be appointed staff sergeants with liaison rating or made available for glider pilot training.

(2) Washouts from elementary C. P. T. will be called to active duty as privates and assigned to appropriate training in an enlisted capacity.

For the commanding general, Army Air Forces.

J. M. BEVANS,
Colonel, Air Corps, Director of Personnel.
By P. H. WALTON,
Major, Air Corps, Assistant Chief, Aviation Cadet Section, Military Personnel Division, O. D. P.

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 11, 1942.*
VANS AIR SERVICE,
Municipal Airport, St. Cloud, Minn.:

Authority granted to continue enlistment of flight instructors mechanics and apprentice mechanics in accordance 3CPT-484 up to midnight December 15 in case of individuals actually employed on CPT work on December 5. Letter must be furnished by CPT representative certifying such employment. Release forms 190 not needed from draft boards. Physical examinations will be given at enlistment center War Department instruction enlistment stations to give priority such enlistment applicants. Men so enlisted not to be called for minimum 6 months and will be commissioned immediately upon being ordered active duty. Procedure for temporary deferment such employees who are not enlisted by December 15 will be in Accordance Bulletin 3WTS-4 being issued today.

W. E. BARTON,
Civil Aeronautics Administration.

This is a true copy of what these men have been promised at the time they enlisted. These men are all volunteers. They should be given what they were promised as follows:

The former trainees of War Training Service who have completed certain courses satis-

factorily, should be put on flying status and receive the grade which was indicated they would receive upon successful completion, as outlined in the War Department memorandum of October 2, 1942, signed by Col. J. M. Bevans for the commanding general, Army Air Forces. The instructors in the War Training Service program should be given equivalent grades on flight status for which they are qualified.

The men have kept their promise—will the Congress keep the faith with these men who only want to serve in the capacity for which they were trained?

Edward Wester Creal

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character and public service of Hon. EDWARD WESTER CREAL, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the opinion of everyone attending the memorial exercises on last Wednesday, May 31, that they were beautiful and very impressive.

It is very timely and appropriate that the Congress should at least once a year conduct memorial exercises, engaging in prayer and song in paying honor and respect to our colleagues who have been called to answer the last roll call here on earth.

I cannot let this occasion pass without paying a brief tribute to my beloved colleague and friend, who was an important member of the Agriculture Committee of the House, of which I am chairman. I refer to the late EDWARD W. CREAL, of Kentucky.

He was a man of ability, conscientious, and deeply interested in his people and his country. He was the type of Congressman who did not play politics. He preferred rendering service, advocating and working for constructive legislation.

For many months prior to his death he was a sick man, but he did not shirk from doing his full duty. It might well be said that he truly gave his life for his people and his country.

We so often speak of the casualties of war. The passing of EDWARD W. CREAL was one of these casualties, for he gave his life in service for his country.

I prized very highly his work on my committee as well as his personal friendship, and shall miss him.

There is one thought which I would like to pass on to his loved ones and his friends, that is, in his passing he has been relieved of sickness and all pain, and, while his body is resting beneath the soil of his beloved State, Kentucky, his soul is basking in the beautiful sunshine of peace and rest, awaiting an abundant entrance into that beautiful home prepared for those who love the Lord.

Discharge of a House Employee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by me to the press today:

Certain charges were made in morning newspapers today and over the radio last night concerning the firing by me of a boy on my patronage list, because he complained of deductions being made in his salary. I have investigated the case of this boy and the following are the facts:

The boy was placed on the pay roll under my patronage by my late secretary, Bill Elliott, who died of a heart attack some weeks ago. Bill Elliott had my implicit faith and confidence and he was in complete charge of the running of my office and the making of my congressional patronage appointments. I do not know what arrangements, if any, Bill Elliott might have made with this boy when he was placed on the pay roll.

I now find that deductions were made in his salary that went to defray office expenditures for duties which he could not perform. This arrangement operated from the time of his employment on February 4, 1944. The boy was not fired by me and my office has given no instructions to anyone to remove him from the pay roll. In pursuing my investigation of his case, I was informed this afternoon by Mr. R. R. Roberts, doorkeeper of the House, that he, Mr. Roberts, had fired the boy for failure to report for duty.

This is all I know of this case and these are the facts.

Address by the President on the Capture of Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the radio address delivered by the President of the United States on last evening be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday, June 4, 1944, Rome fell to American and Allied troops. The first of the Axis capitals is now in our hands. One up and two to go.

It is perhaps significant that the first of these capitals to fall should have the longest history of all of them. The story of Rome goes back to the time of the foundations of our civilization. We can still see there monuments of the time when Rome and the Romans controlled the whole of the then known world. That, too, is significant, for the United Nations are determined that in the future no one city and no one race will be able to control the whole of the world.

In addition to the monuments of the older times, we also see in Rome the great symbol of Christianity, which has reached into almost every part of the world. There are other shrines and other churches in many places, but the churches and shrines of Rome are visible symbols of the faith and determination of the early saints and martyrs that Christianity should live and become universal. And now it will be a source of deep satisfaction that the freedom of the Pope and of Vatican City is assured by the armies of the United Nations.

It is also significant that Rome has been liberated by the armed forces of many nations. The American and British Armies who bore the chief burdens of battle found at their sides our own North American neighbors, the gallant Canadians. The fighting New Zealanders from the far South Pacific, the courageous French and the French Moroccans, the South Africans, the Poles, and the East Indians—all of them fought with us on the bloody approaches to Rome.

The Italians, too, forswearing a partnership in the Axis which they never desired, have sent their troops to join us in our battles against the German trespassers on their soil.

The prospect of the liberation of Rome meant enough to Hitler and his generals to induce them to fight desperately at great cost of men and materials and with great sacrifice to their crumbling eastern line and to their western front. No thanks are due to them if Rome was spared the devastation which the Germans wreaked on Naples and other Italian cities. The Allied generals maneuvered so skillfully that the Nazis could only have stayed long enough to damage Rome at the risk of losing their armies.

But Rome is, of course, more than a military objective.

Ever since before the days of the Caesars, Rome has stood as a symbol of authority. Rome was the republic. Rome was the empire. Rome was the Catholic Church, and Rome was the capital of a united Italy. Later, unfortunately, Rome became the seat of fascism—one of the three capitals of the Axis.

For a quarter century the Italian people were enslaved and degraded by the rule of Mussolini from Rome. They will mark its liberation with deep emotion. In the north of Italy, the people are still dominated and threatened by the Nazi overlords and their Fascist puppets.

Our victory comes at an excellent time, while our Allied forces are poised for another strike at western Europe—and while armies of other Nazi soldiers nervously await our assault. And our gallant Russian allies continue to make their power felt more and more.

From a strictly military standpoint, we had long ago accomplished certain of the main objectives of our Italian campaign—the control of the sea lanes of the Mediterranean to shorten our combat and supply lines, and the capture of the airports of Foggia from which we have struck telling blows on the continent.

I would be unwise to inflate in our own minds the military importance of the capture of Rome. We shall have to push through a long period of greater effort and fiercer fighting before we get into Germany itself. The Germans have retreated thousands of miles, all the way from the gates of Cairo, through Libya and Tunisia and Sicily and southern Italy. They have suffered heavy

losses, but not great enough yet to cause collapse.

Germany has not yet been driven to surrender. Germany has not yet been driven to the point where she will be unable to recommence world conquest a generation hence.

Therefore the victory still lies some distance ahead. That distance will be covered in due time—have no fear of that. But it will be tough and it will be costly.

In Italy the people had lived so long under the corrupt rule of Mussolini that, in spite of the tinsel at the top, their economic condition had grown steadily worse. Our troops have found starvation, malnutrition, disease, a deteriorating education, and lowered public health—all byproducts of the Fascist misrule.

The task of the Allies in occupation has been stupendous. We have had to start at the very bottom, assisting local governments to reform on democratic lines. We have had to give them bread to replace that which was stolen out of their mouths by the Germans. We have had to make it possible for the Italians to raise and use their own local crops. We have to help them cleanse their schools of Fascist trappings.

The American people as a whole approve the salvage of these human beings, who are only now learning to walk in a new atmosphere of freedom.

Some of us may let our thoughts run to the financial cost of it. Essentially it is what we can call a form of relief. At the same time we hope that this relief will be an investment for the future—an investment that will pay dividends by eliminating fascism and ending any Italian desires to start another war of aggression in the future. They are dividends which justify such an investment, because they are additional supports for world peace.

The Italian people are capable of self-government. We do not lose sight of their virtues as a peace-loving nation.

We remember the many centuries in which the Italians were leaders in the arts and sciences, enriching the lives of all mankind.

We remember the great sons of the Italian people—Galileo and Marconi, Michelangelo and Dante—and that fearless discoverer who typifies the courage of Italy, Christopher Columbus

Italy cannot grow in stature by seeking to build up a great militaristic empire. Italians have been overcrowded within their own territories, but they do not need to try to conquer the lands of other peoples in order to find the breath of life. Other peoples may not want to be conquered.

In the past, Italians have come by the millions to the United States. They have been welcomed, they have prospered, they have become good citizens, community and governmental leaders. They are not Italian-Americans. They are Americans—Americans of Italian descent.

Italians have gone in great numbers to the other Americas—Brazil and the Argentine, for example—and to many other nations in every continent of the world, giving of their industry and their talents, and achieving success and the comfort of good living.

Italy should go on as a great mother nation, contributing to the culture and progress and good will of all minkind—and developing her special talents in the arts, crafts, and sciences and preserving her historic and cultural heritage for the benefit of all peoples.

We want and expect the help of the future Italy toward lasting peace. All the other nations opposed to fascism and nazi-ism should help give Italy a chance.

The Germans, after years of domination in Rome, left the people in the Eternal City on the verge of starvation. We and the British will do everything we can to bring them relief. Anticipating the fall of Rome, we made preparations to ship food supplies to the city, but it should be borne in mind that the needs are so great and the transportation requirements of our armies so heavy that improvement must be gradual. We have already begun to save the lives of the men, women, and children of Rome.

This is an example of the efficiency of your machinery of war. The magnificent ability and energy of the American people in growing the crops, building the merchant ships, making and collecting the cargoes, getting the supplies over thousands of miles of water, and thinking ahead to meet emergencies—all this spells, I think, an amazing efficiency on the part of our armed forces, all the various agencies working with them, and American industry and labor as a whole.

No great effort like this can be a hundred percent perfect, but the batting average is very, very high.

I extend the congratulations and thanks of the American people to General Alexander, who has been in command of the whole Italian operation; to General Clark and General Leese, of the Fifth and the Eighth Armies; to General Wilson, the supreme allied commander of the Mediterranean theater, and General Devers, his American deputy; to General Eaker; to Admirals Cunningham and Hewitt; and to all their brave officers and men.

May God bless them and watch over them and over all of our gallant fighting men.

They Are Not Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following introductory remarks of Hon. W. Nelson Page, of Winchester, Va., as well as the remarks made by me at the Confederate Memorial Day exercises in Winchester, Va., on June 6, 1944:

REMARKS OF W. NELSON PAGE, INTRODUCING A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL DAY, JUNE 6, 1944

We are gathered here on this morning of June 6 for the seventy-ninth celebration of Confederate Memorial Day, and sad it would be for the traditions of Winchester if its observance was ever discontinued. However, I feel that as long as we have citizens with such spirit and loyalty as Miss Lucy Kurtz and the other members of the Stonewall Association, the memory of those who lie beneath this hallowed ground will never be forgotten.

Time flies fast, for it seems to me that it was only a few years ago when the streets of Winchester, on the morning of the 6th of June, were as crowded as on the days of our recent apple blossom festival, waiting for the parade to pass by. The outstanding feature of this parade was the Turner Ashby Camp of Confederate Veterans, which was largely made up of the fathers or grandfathers of many of those present today. Today not one is left. Only their memory remains.

It has always been the custom to hold these exercises on this same spot, within the shadow of that impressive shaft standing there as guard over the 829 unknown and unrecorded Confederate soldiers who lost their lives on the battlefields around Winchester, with its inscription, "Who they were, none know; what they were, all know." At these exercises distinguished speakers have always given us inspiring speeches. Today will be no exception to this rule.

It is not necessary for me to introduce the speaker to this audience, for to most of us he is well known, having served you faithfully and well for many years as your Congressman in Washington. Having known him intimately for over 30 years, I have a few things I would like to tell you about him which you probably do not know and which I think especially qualifies him for your speaker at these exercises. Major ROBERTSON is a member of the Jamestown Society. Such memberships are extended only to those whose ancestors either lived or owned land on Jamestown Island prior to 1700. Major Robertson's forebears fought in the Revolutionary War and in the War of 1812. His great great grandfather, Isaac Willis, served with distinction as a captain. His son, while too old to serve in the Civil War, sent 10 of his sons as his contribution to the Army of the Confederacy. Capt. Archie Robertson, the grandfather of Major Robertson, was killed at Cold Harbor, while leading Company I of the Nineteenth Virginia Infantry.

During the First World War Major ROBERTSON and I attended the second officers' training camp together at Fort Myer, Va. He served throughout the war with distinction and rose to the rank of major. He has taken an active part in the Sons of Confederate Veterans and served as commander of the army of northern Virginia in this organization. He was awarded the Confederate cross of honor at a meeting of the Virginia Daughters of the Confederacy held in Norfolk in 1940.

Major ROBERTSON since his childhood has always had a warm spot in his heart for Winchester, for it was here that his mother, who is now 86 years of age, attended school which was operated by her uncle, Edward Willis. With this background I believe you will agree with me that Major ROBERTSON is well qualified to make the address for us today.

I take pleasure in presenting Maj. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Member of Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia; Major ROBERTSON.

THEY ARE NOT DEAD

(Address of A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the Memorial Day exercises in Stonewall Cemetery, Winchester, Va., June 6, 1944, under the auspices of the Stonewall Memorial Association and the Turner Ashby Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy)

Eighteen months after the close of a bitter, unfortunate, and unnecessary struggle in which the Valley of Virginia was one of the major battlegrounds, this cemetery was dedicated to the memory of those who had died in defense of the principle of self-government. On that day, October 25, 1866, was interred here the mortal remains of a great cavalry leader, Turner Ashby, who fell on June 6, 82 years ago, while leading on foot a charge against Federal troops after his horse had been shot from under him. Previously, there had been interred in the cemetery the bodies of 2,494 Confederate veterans who had fallen in numerous battles around Winchester, in which the city gained the unique, if undesired, distinction of having changed hands in the period of one war more often than any other city in the world. Not even Jerusalem, before whose walls more armies have contended than before any other city in the world, can claim the distinction of having changed hands 87 times in all of recorded history, much less in the period of 1 war.

The people of Winchester felt deeply on the subject of States' rights before the armed conflict of 1861-65 commenced and much more deeply before that conflict ended. The great English military writer, Lt. Col. G. F. R. Henderson, said of Winchester, in his monumental work on Stonewall Jackson:

"In Winchester itself the feeling against the North was exceptionally bitter. The town was no mushroom settlement; its history

stretched back to the old colonial days; the grass-grown entrenchments on the surrounding hills had been raised by Washington during the Indian wars, and the traditions of the first struggle for independence were not yet forgotten. No single section of the South was more conservative. Although the citizens had been strong Unionists, nowhere were the principles which their fathers had respected, the sovereignty of the individual State and the right of secession, more strongly held, and nowhere had the hereditary spirit of resistance to coercive legislation blazed up more fiercely."

As I read that description of the people of Winchester, written nearly half a century ago but just as true today as it was then, my thoughts reverted to that first struggle for independence to which Colonel Henderson had referred, and to that incomparable Revolutionary leader, Daniel Morgan, whose ashes repose in the adjoining cemetery of Mount Hebron. Unlike Gen. Turner Ashby, General Morgan did not spring from an aristocratic family, but like Ashby, he was a natural leader of men. General Morgan came to Winchester as a 16-year-old runaway boy escaping from the severe apprenticeship of a Welsh ironmaster. Like Ashby, he did not attend any college nor receive previous training in any school of military science, but, like Ashby, when the call came to take up arms in defense of a principle in which he believed, he promptly raised a company of volunteers and was selected as its captain. Both leaders were men of great personal charm, both were men of exceptional vitality, personal courage and driving force, although in stature Morgan was built on the lines of the broadsword, while Ashby on those of the rapier. Both were known far and abroad for their superb horsemanship. In a service of a little more than a year Turner Ashby rose from the rank of captain to that of brigadier general, while in a service of nearly 7 years in the Revolutionary War Morgan rose from the rank of captain to that of major general. Morgan's victory in the battle of the Cowpens was possibly the most brilliant victory won by the American forces during the entire Revolutionary War. Stonewall Jackson's valley campaign is considered by all military writers to have been the most brilliant handling of a small body of troops against greatly superior numbers in the annals of modern warfare. While the fame for the strategy of the valley campaign justly belongs to Jackson, the trained soldier and the great tactician, historians are agreed that it was the bold dashing operations of his cavalry leader Ashby, skillfully screening Jackson's turning movements and his utilitization of strategic interior lines against greatly superior forces that made Jackson's success possible.

After the Revolutionary War had ended a committee of the new Congress decided to send out questionnaires to all who had played an important part in winning the war, including, of course, General Morgan. Whereupon, the General in great disgust, did what a lot of businessmen today would like to do, turned the questionnaire over and endorsed on the back: "Fought everywhere, defeated nowhere." Had it been the pleasure of Him who governs in the affairs of men to have permitted Turner Ashby to have survived his leader, Jackson, and to have ridden with the immortal Lee at Appomattox, he could still have made the same endorsement upon a similar questionnaire, because, as Gov. Henry A. Wise said when he dedicated this cemetery: "A lost cause! If lost it was false; if true it was not lost."

The Daughters of the Confederacy, whose inspiring motto is "Love makes memory eternal," have proven it is not a lost cause. And while keeping alive through these annual memorial exercises the memory of those who have died in order that we might live in a democracy, have likewise proven the eternal truth of Pericles' statement that "the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives." Over the graves of 815 unknown soldiers, the first monument in this country ever erected to an unknown soldier, they caused to be inscribed on that magnificent monument of marble the words: "Who they were none know, what they were all know." Knowing what they were, as well as the principles for which they fought and died, has been the motivating spirit of the people of Winchester through succeeding generations.

I am glad Colonel Henderson saw fit to record in his life of Stonewall Jackson, which is a standard textbook in the English military schools and has been read by the military leaders of all nations, Mrs. Jackson's tribute to the women of Winchester, in which she said:

"The Winchester ladies were amongst the most famous of Virginia housekeepers, and lived in a good deal of old-fashioned elegance and profusion. The old border town had not then changed hands with the conflicting armies, as it was destined to do so many times during the war. Under the rose-coloured light in which I viewed everything that winter, it seemed to me that no people could have been more cultivated, attractive, and noble-hearted. Winchester was rich in happy homes and pleasant people; and the extreme kindness and appreciation shown to General Jackson by all bound us to them so closely and warmly that ever after that winter he called the place our 'war home.'"

Everyone who has ever visited in Winchester knows how well merited that tribute was in the winter of 1861 and how well merited it is today. But that is but a part of the contribution of the ladies of Winchester to Virginia and American history. In the Revolutionary War, when there were only some 300 families, they gathered together the gear of the longriflemen who followed fighting Dan Morgan of the Long Rifles; like Spartan mothers, they sent their boys into the wilderness with hearts that were unafraid and with memories of a hearthstone worth fighting for. In the spring of 1861 the women of Winchester helped equip the members of the old Second Virginia Regiment, quartered at Halltown, near Harpers Ferry, then serving without benefit of commissary or quartermasters department. At the head of that women's organization was a distinguished and patriotic woman, Mrs. Philip Williams, ably assisted by her sister-in-law, Mrs. A. H. H. Boyd, who soon gathered around her an army of earnest workers who from that time until the close of the war devoted themselves to feeding, clothing, and nursing Confederate soldiers. And shortly after the war (as I have previously indicated) the Memorial Association was organized with Mrs. Philip Williams as president; Mrs. Boyd, Miss Mary Kurtz, Miss Tillie Russell as vice presidents; and Miss Lucy Williams, secretary.

In World War No. 1 the patriotic women of Winchester joined Red Cross units to make dressings and bandages for the boys overseas and contributed in many ways to the victory we won on the battlefield and lost at the peace table. True to their inherited traditions, the women of Winchester and the citizens generally of Winchester have nobly responded to every demand that has been made upon them in World War No. 2, and have gone over the top in every drive for the sale of War bonds and in contributions to the Red Cross and other service agencies.

When, in the spring of 1917, the call came again to take up arms in the defense of a principle of Government, we had another illustration of the meaning of those words "woven into the stuff of other men's lives." Winchester sent into World War No. 1 some of the bravest men who ever died that others might live. On the roll of fame was written high another Winchester name, Capt. Robert Y. Conrad, who fell on October 8, 1918, while leading his company to victory on the Meuse-Argonne battlefield. No one yet knows who the outstanding hero from Winchester in World War No. 2 will be, but there are plenty of boys from Winchester in the service in whom the qualities of heroism are bred in the bone. Typical of the Winchester spirit was the action of young Beverley Byrd in securing a transfer from the Field Artillery to the Paratroop Service, the most hazardous service of this or any other war. When the invasion of Fortress Europe commences I can think of a lot of places I would rather be than floating down behind the German lines. All paratroopers are volunteers. Of all who successfully complete the paratrooper precombat training the world can stand up and say, "Here is a man." But that was the spirit of Morgan and Ashby—always happiest when most exposed to danger.

We told those who fought in World War No. 1 that we would make secure our democracy at home by making the whole world safe for democracy. The bodies of some of those who fell in that struggle are sleeping in Stonewall Cemetery. If today their spirits could speak to us from the pearly parapets of paradise, they would express their pride in the fact that the torch they flung us from their falling hands we have again held on high; but they undoubtedly would also express the hope that after victory this time on the battlefield we will not again permit the forces of evil to recover from their defeat and to commence another world war for the slaughter of the innocent and the destruction of personal freedom. In the "Life of Turner Ashby" by his biographer, Dr. Thomas A. Ashby, the author said:

"The Civil War will probably be the last great struggle the people of this Nation will ever see, and it is not probable that great international wars will ever again occur among the civilized powers of the world. The war between Russia and Japan and the recent struggle between the Turks and Balkan powers teach the lesson of more peaceful solutions of international differences."

After those lines were penned but before the book in which they were included left the printing presses, World War No. 1 had commenced. The War between the States was a war between gentlemen in which the rights of noncombatants were recognized, and the lives of women and children were protected. That fundamental fact was indubitably proven by the treatment of Lee and his generals by Grant and his generals at Appomattox, and further reflected in the treatment of a Union officer by the Confederates of Winchester shortly after Appomattox. Capt. William McKinley, of an Ohio regiment, was visiting in a Winchester hospital with the regimental surgeon and observed the unusually friendly relations between the surgeon and certain wounded Confederate prisoners of war. When he inquired of the surgeon the basis of those friendships, the surgeon replied, "It is because we are brother Masons." Whereupon Capt. William McKinley exhibited one of the qualities that later caused him to be elected President of the United States, when he said: "I would like to be a member of such a fraternal organization." Winchester Masonic Lodge, Hiram No. 21, made Capt. William McKinley an entered apprentice, passed him to the fellowcraft degree, and on May 3, 1865, raised him to the exalted degree of Master Mason, Worshipful Master J. B. T. Reed conferring the degree. But World War No. 1 was not a war fought between gentlemen, and its present sequel is not that kind of a war. We are fighting tyrants who exult in brutality, unrestrained by any principles of humanity or common decency. And if we have the misfortune to be involved in another global war, it will undoubtedly be

fought on the basis of complete extermination.

It is idle to speculate upon when scientists will learn the secret of splitting the atom and the development of an explosive force 10 times, perhaps a hundred times, more destructive than any explosive now used in warfare. We give thanks, of course, that German scientists have not so far discovered the secret ahead of us, although a few months ago there was a rumor to the effect that they had and would disclose to us their new and secret weapon when we invaded Hitler's Fortress Europe. We already know enough about the destructive power of the modern engines of war to know that this global war must be the last global war. To the veterans of World War No. 1, who justly feel that their comrades died in vain, I express the hope that the Recording Angel will blot out with a tear the black page of our history when we stumbled in our march toward the goal of a lasting peace.

As I stand here today on the ground hallowed by the ashes of those who were true to their trusts and who were unafraid to die in defense of their principles, I promise the veterans of World War No. 2 that we realize the price they are paying for our failure to win the peace after World War No. 1 and that we will not fail again. In the words of our distinguished Secretary of State, we shall "dedicate ourselves to the great task yet remaining before us." My earnest prayer is that the women of the Nation unite with the patriotic and Christian women of Winchester and Virginia in demanding a peace after victory on the battlefield which will be lasting as well as just. Throughout recorded history no empire founded by a ruthless dictator has survived. George Washington could have been a king; George Washington could have been a dictator. The empire founded by him survived because he had no ambition save to excel in the service of his fellow men, and the torch of personal liberty he lifted in 1776 has for a century and a half been the hope of oppressed people throughout the world.

Those who sleep in these two cemeteries—heroes of three great struggles—would be glad to know that we have again lifted high the torch of personal freedom. In the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man, in which was guaranteed constitutional liberty in a representative democracy, and a system of private enterprise under which a penniless boy like Daniel Morgan could die seized and possessed of 250,000 acres of land, our ancestors laid the foundation, not only for our peace, happiness, and prosperity but likewise the foundation for world leadership in the cause of world peace, based on equality, justice, and freedom. They measured up to their opportunities. We will be untrue to their memories if in this crisis we fail to measure up to ours. The American boys on the fighting fronts have been true to a glorious heritage. On the fighting front they will win for us this war. On the home front we must win for them the peace.

Observer Sees Fourth-Term Issue as Independence Versus C. I. O. Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent from the Washington Star:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—OBSERVER SEES FOURTH-TERM ISSUE AS INDEPENDENCE VERSUS C. I. O. CONTROL

(By Frank R. Kent)

From the confusion of the preliminary Presidential campaign there is now emerging an issue of such vital importance that it should be made clear to every voter. Particularly, it should be understood by those in the armed services, here and abroad, who will cast their ballots by mail.

But, it is unlikely this can be done, as the politicians in one party are interested in not having it made clear and those in the other apparently lack the courage to do so.

However, if some way is not found to bring the facts home to the Nation as a whole, it may wake up next year to find a form of government riveted upon it wholly foreign to the American idea and entirely unpalatable to the American taste.

The essence of this issue is whether the people of the United States are ready to have the country run by the radical bosses of one labor faction—to wit, the C. I. O. That is really the question.

This is no partisan exaggeration. It is a simple statement of fact, which neither the war nor the administration propagandists should be allowed to obscure.

EVIDENCE OF DOMINATION

Evidence that C. I. O. domination of the next administration is bound up in the success of the Roosevelt fourth-term attempt is sufficient to convince almost any detached observer. As a matter of fact, few would deny that the C. I. O. has highly flavored this administration in the past 8 years.

The point is that under existing conditions another Roosevelt reelection will enhance its power far beyond any previous conception, will, in fact, place it in a controlling position.

Before stating the case, it is worth recalling that since its inception in 1935 Mr. Roosevelt and the C. I. O. have consistently operated as a political unit.

From the sit-down strikes of his first administration on up to the recent national-service proposal which, though he recommended it on the insistence of his military heads, he has allowed to languish following C. I. O. opposition, there has been no public question upon which they have been divided. The C. I. O. supports the President on every domestic policy; the President supports the C. I. O. on all labor matters.

Again and again, since the war began, he has complimented the C. I. O. upon its "magnificent record" at a time when many war contracts were being held up by C. I. O. strikes, and the C. I. O. has exuded fulsome eulogies of Mr. Roosevelt's management both abroad and at home.

The link between the C. I. O. and Mr. Roosevelt is strong beyond dispute. It has existed for more than 8 years and has been mutually beneficial. Mrs. Roosevelt is a member of the C. I. O., and it was the C. I. O. which Attorney General Biddle meant when he proclaimed the New Deal "a political party tied in with the labor movement under an able political leader."

He certainly did not mean the A. F. of L., which does not endorse candidates and contains many Republicans opposed to the fourth term. It is the C. I. O., with which the "tie-up" was made before the 1936 election and, except in 1940, when Mr. Lewis broke personally with Mr. Roosevelt, but failed to carry his following into the Willkie camp, there has been nothing to mar the complete political cooperation.

IN THE LIGHT OF THE RECORD

To appreciate its true significance, the present situation must be viewed in the light of the above record. The facts about the 1944 campaign to reelect Mr. Roosevelt are clear.

The fourth-term movement was inaugurated by the C. I. O. leaders and is being managed by them. The demand for his reelection has come from them; and their unions, claiming 5,000,000 members, have been unanimous in his endorsement.

A fund, the lowest estimate of which is $750,000, has been raised for the preconvention work, and the active agency is known as the Committee on Political Action. It is headed by two former members of the administration and close friends of the President—Sidney Hillman, the director, and C. A. Baldwin, deputy director.

In every part of the country this committee is active in Mr. Roosevelt's behalf. It is far bigger, much better financed, much better directed, and with much better publicity facilities than the Democratic National Committee, which it seems to be completely overshadowing

True, it is saturated with communism, filled with radicals and racketeers, but it is 100 percent for Mr. Roosevelt. In other words, if Mr. Roosevelt is reelected he will owe it to the C. I. O. The war, the Negro vote, the Federal job holders, and other elements will contribute, but the C. I. O. is his basic and indispensable asset. Without it he cannot win.

If he wins, the C. I. O. will have a right to claim it elected him. He is its candidate. He will, if elected, be its President, and its influence in the administration—and the Democratic Party—will be controlling. That is the logic of the situation and the only possible deduction from the record.

The question is whether the American people—especially the American soldiers—are ready to turn their Government over to this particular labor union through continuing in office a President under that kind of obligation and with that kind of hook-up. As a result of this election, either the C. I. O. will have its heel heavily on our neck or we will have declared our independence.

Servicemen's Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker:

There sometimes arise cases of extreme hardship involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need.

These two agencies have many branches over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund at the special offices set up in each Army camp in the United States and overseas or through the Red Cross if he is not in camp, for needed immediate financial assistance, and he will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is open to all dependents of men and women in the Army. Should anyone know of any servicemen's dependents at home or any serviceman in immediate need of financial assistance, advise them to get in touch at once with the

Army Emergency Relief Fund direct or through the local Red Cross office.

Another agency is the Navy Relief Society. Any dependent of a man or woman in the naval forces can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. Any member of our naval forces in urgent need of financial help can appeal to this agency, and his needs will be taken care of. To get immediate action from the Navy Relief Society, it is advisable to take up the case through the local chapter of the Red Cross. The Red Cross is in a position to expedite these matters.

ONLY FOR SERVICEMEN

These two agencies were set up to take care of the urgent critical cases of men in the service who are in need of immediate financial aid. This service is available only to men actually in the armed forces and is not available to servicemen who have been discharged. Likewise, the service is available only to dependents of men in our armed forces, and not to dependents of a discharged soldier or sailor.

If urgent need actually exists, it should not take more than a few hours to get financial help for anyone who is in financial distress. The Army and Navy emergency relief funds reach out into every community in the country. This emergency help is available at all times, and our service men and women and their dependents should have no hesitation in making application for it when in real need.

Should you know of any critical case in your neighborhood, you will perform a real act of kindness by calling on that person and advising him that this service is available. Have them get in touch with the Army Relief Fund officer, 1360 Civic Opera Building, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago 6, Ill., or contact your local Red Cross. Should any further question arise on what to do in cases for emergency aid for members of the armed forces or any of their dependents, see your county veterans' service officer, or write to me, Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Townsend National Recovery Plan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, as of this hour, 188 Members of this House have attached their signatures to discharge petition 17 which would bring H. R. 1649 out of the Ways and Means Committee and on to this floor for debate and a vote.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that we need, all told, 218 signatures to accomplish this step, which means, in turn, that we now lack 30. Nor do I think it is necessary for me to add that H. R. 1649 is commonly known as the Townsend National Recovery plan bill, sponsored by a national organization of some 10,000 organized clubs and with a 10-year history behind it of consistent, progressive, constructive effort.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to stand here and plead with anyone to join me and the other 188 Members of this House who have signed discharge petition 17. I wish only to say that those who have not signed this petition, regardless of their personal sentiments on this legislation, are denying us for no sound reason the right to debate the issue. If there is something wrong with H. R. 1649, let us find it out on the floor; if there is something good about it, let that be known, too. A pigeonhole is no place for a bill which I can safely state affects, under its provisions, every citizen of this country and is ardently desired by millions of them.

If the facts were known about H. R. 1649, there would be practically no limit to its supporters. I can safely state that it is only because we have not been permitted to make the facts known that I find any need to limit myself at all.

Mr. Speaker, there are Members of this House who, I know, sincerely, for one reason or another, are not inclined to indicate their support of H. R. 1649. I am not asking them to support it. I am not asking them to say one word for it. I am not asking them to vote for it. I insist, however, that by signing discharge petition 17 they are not lending support to the bill itself. They are merely giving us an opportunity to be heard.

H. R. 1649 is not an old age pension bill except in that it does provide for annuities to citizens over the age of 60. But when one stops to consider that millions of those beneficiaries will be stepping out of the pay rolls on which their names are now to be found—in most cases at the risk of their lives and certainly at the risk of their health and give way to jobs for returning veterans, this measure ceases to be an old-age pension bill and becomes, as it really is, a national post-war recovery plan.

It is even more a national recovery plan in the sense that every dollar thus expended in the form of annuities must be spent within 30 days of receipt by the beneficiary. We are worried about purchasing power in the post-war years. H. R. 1649 has the answer. We are worried about unemployment in the post-war years. H. R. 1649 has the answer. We are fretting because the present clumsy, inadequate social security set-up does not include farmers and farm workers, small businessmen and domestic help, professional men and a host of others—well—H. R. 1649 includes them all as any adequate social security system should and includes them as a matter of right.

In my considered opinion, no Member of this House has a right to deny us a hearing on this matter by refusing his signature on discharge petition 17. He can vote as he pleases. I do not care about that. That is none of my concern. It is my concern to do everything I can to insure that full discussion and an actual vote is taken on H. R. 1649.

Let that be remembered. Congress, these last many years, has lost ground in public respect, because Congress, in some degree at least, has ceased to be the inspiration of legislation and has become, in too large measure, the passive "yes man" to somebody else's suggestions.

As I understand my history and my Constitution, the basic job of Congress is to legislate the will of the people. I can assure you that H. R. 1649 sprung directly from the people. The least we can do is to give them a chance to have their day in court.

Invasion Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Gene Chloupek, has written several poems during this war emergency which have received favorable attention. His best known poem, My Neighbor's Boy, has appeared in publications all over this country, and has been broadcast a number of times over the radio.

Gene Chloupek loves the young folks and writes to 200 boys and girls in our armed forces. Like all of us he was deeply affected by the news of the invasion and wrote this prayer during this solemn hour:

IN HUMBLE PRAYER

We come in humble prayer, this day,
For liberation we all pray.
We ask, oh God, Your helping hands,
To rescue those on ravaged lands.

We ask Your help for all the weak
Throughout the world, for whom we speak.
And even those who have been strong,
The battle has been much too long.

We millions, Lord, raise anguished cry,
As tortured thousands daily die,
And souls of children suffocate
Within the walls of cruel hate.

When trumpet calls proclaim D-day,
We're pleading that You'll lead the way
As Christian soldiers march to war,
To vanquish evils we abhor.

Oh God, protect our valiant men,
And bring them safely home again,
Our banners soaring in the sky,
The cross of Jesus ever high.

In the Midst of War, Prepare for a Just and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the greatest war known to history and on the day of the invasion of the Continent of Europe we gird ourselves for the sacrifice that faces us. On December 7, 1941, our Nation was attacked by the stealthy and merciless aggressor, Japan. War in all its terror struck an incredulous people without warning, and a peace-loving Nation realized that in order to live in future peace we must engage in a period of war. It is not my purpose to engage in theoretical arguments with

anyone who takes the position of absolute pacifism. I do not condemn the conscientious objector to war. I realize the horror, the loss of life and limb, the sorrow of those bereft of loved ones, and the suffering of the innocent caused by war. With all my heart and soul, with every fiber of my spiritual being, I abhor war.

We who believe in the teachings of our great spiritual leaders, who in all good conscience strive to follow the law of the spirit, find it hard to wage the war of the flesh. We realize that world peace will never be established unless it be established on the spiritual principles as set forth by the Prince of Peace, the lowly Nazarene. We further believe that some day those principles which we believe in will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. But we are confronted with the forces of evil—not in a spiritual way—trying to convince us with logic or persuasion, but with all the misdirected force and ingenuity which the devil in carnal flesh can wield. As a Christian nation, we are faced with powerful antagonists who make no pretense of a belief in a God of mercy and love. They openly disavow the principle of universal brotherhood which we espouse. The Japanese worship as their diety the person of their Emperor as well as multitudinous Shinto idols. The German-Nazi state not only denies the divinity of the Christian God but advocates the idolatrous worship of the mythical pagan gods and idols of German antiquity.

Although we disagree with these philosophies, we still, as a tolerant people, have made no move toward restraining the Japanese and German nations from their worship of the philosophy of their choice. This spirit of Christian tolerance was neither appreciated nor understood by our enemies, for the philosophy which they espouse does not contain either the corresponding quality of tolerance or the fundamental concept of the equality and brotherhood of man. They look upon tolerance and mercy as decadent weaknesses and their supreme Fascist state religion is founded on the theory of the master race—applied to themselves—and the classification of the balance of mankind to the status of an inferior race. To these people, logic and peaceful indoctrination or persuasion has no place. Might makes right, and physical force is the answer to all argument. They revile the God we worship, deny the spiritual principles we espouse, and kill and torture our people. I ask the pacifist: Is it God's will that we submit without a struggle to the forces of evil? Shall we stand with abject mien and unprotesting arms while the light of civilization is extinguished and the cross of Christianity burned on the sacrificial altar of paganism? Shall we stand supinely by and meekly bow before the armies of the devil as they despoil our homes and loved ones, and consign humanity again to Dark Age centuries? As one who has studied theosophy and in the full knowledge of spiritual teachings, I cannot answer "Yes" to these questions.

Abhorring war as I do with all my strength, I still make no apology for our part in this unwanted war we are engaged in. As Jehovah of old led the armies of the children of Israel against the idolatrous nations which threatened to engulf them, I believe that we have the power of God behind the armies of the United Nations. I believe there is an inherent strength in the cause of righteousness. We fight for the freedom and dignity of the individual soul, without which spiritual strength and growth is denied and without which true worship of God is impossible. We fight for the recognition of the brotherhood of all men everywhere, even those who are now our enemies, and unless the brotherhood of man is established universally, we can only pay lip tribute to the fatherhood of God. We fight for a better world than we've had before—a world "wherein dwelleth righteousness"; where an environment can be established in a physical and material way that will encourage spiritual growth among the children of men. These are the things we fight for, whether consciously or unknowingly.

In my opinion only a goal which includes these great spiritual aims justifies the travail which humanity is presently enduring. It is only through securing such a world for the men and women in our armed forces, to come back to, that we can justify the sacrifices of those who fail to return.

We who have on our shoulders the responsibility of waging this war also have the responsibility of formulating the peace. Future generations will evaluate our contribution to world stability; for weal or woe. We cannot escape the judgment of posterity. The decisions made by the United Nations after victory will determine the destiny of untold millions living and yet to be born.

Only a knave would approach this monumental task lightly. All the frailty, selfishness, and prejudices of human beings are handicaps we must overcome. I am confident we will win this war, because we fight in harmony with and for spiritual principles. I am confident that we will win the peace if we harmonize our approach to the peace table with those same spiritual ideals we fight for.

By recognizing the principle of the universal brotherhood of man, we establish a basis broad enough in scope to encompass every person living upon the globe. There are many specific peace plans and types of world organizations which are at present being advocated. It is not my present purpose to advocate any specific plan or order. I wish to comment along general lines, however, regarding certain broad principles I believe to be practical.

The United Nations must take the initiative in forming an international organization to function as a parliamentary, judicial, and executive body on global questions. Because of the present preponderant contribution in the war of liberation of the United States, British Empire, and Russia, these three nations must take the lead in establishing such an international organization. It is my opinion that China, because of her long fight against aggression and her potential strength in Asia, should also be given prime recognition. Before someone questions the scope of this international organization, let me state that I do not advocate limiting the membership to the four nations named. I believe that all the members of the United Nations and nations now considered neutral should be invited to join with the Big Four. I realize, however, that from a practical point of view the Big Four are contributing the most toward United Nations victory and, therefore, they will be in a position to contribute most toward world peace.

It is my opinion that world nuclear organization should be formed before victory, if possible, and that the present unity which exists primarily because of military pressure, should be utilized before the reason for this unity is weakened by victory. I advocate this reason for present action, in view of the almost immediate collapse of allied unity following the armistice of World War No. 1.

The first steps toward an international order is mutual agreement on broad principles of international procedure during the balance of this war. Many of these principles will extend into the post-war period. The various conferences between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, either together or through emissaries, have, I believe, established many of these fundamental, broad understandings. I refer specifically to the Atlantic Charter, the Casablanca, Teheran, and Moscow Declarations of intent. A close study of these documents will give many of us who desire a just and lasting peace, cause for hope and encouragement. The impractical person or the person who does not realize the tremendous complications involved in a permanent peace, is inclined to pass over these preliminary steps too lightly, but the student of international relations appreciates their importance. I consider these declarations as the first important steps toward international agreement in the post-war world.

In my opinion, the people of the world are entitled to ask their leaders to embody in their plans for an international order three great principles in order that we may have global peace. The principles I suggest are: International security, international justice, and international welfare of peoples. If these principles are embodied in the formulation of an international world order, we can have a permanent and lasting peace. If they are ignored, in part or together, world peace will be impossible. Volumes can be written on this subject. Space forbids proper elaboration on these three principles, but before I close these remarks, I wish to explain briefly my understanding of these terms in the order of their mention.

First, what do I mean by international security? By international security I mean that freedom from fear of military aggression shall be the universal possession of the people of every nation or race regardless of size or geographical location. This can only be accomplished through complete demilitarization of the aggressor nations on a permanent basis. It means that the international world order shall have control of all military

power through conjunctive action, for power is as necessary for law and order among nations as it has been within the state since the beginning of domestic order. The belief that the public opinion of mankind, without organized power or force at its disposal, could restrain or prevent aggressor nations from crimes against their neighbors was the greatest fallacy embodied in the League of Nations. Power is and must be the final argument among nations for many centuries, I believe. The international organization must control and direct, through joint action of the "big four," adequate military power to preserve international law and order and to stamp out at their inception aggressive crimes of violence between member or nonmember nations. As the community of nations becomes more secure, the problem of international military policing will recede as it does in our domestic communities.

The second principle I wish to speak about is the principle of international justice. During the centuries we have evolved a tremendous and valuable dossier of international laws. Fifty-three nations have signified approval by becoming parties to these statutes. The Permanent Court of International Justice exercises judiciary function on international disputes. To preserve the cumulative procedures and experience of this great body is most important. Its continuity must be preserved. Its scope must be broadened to include all phases of international relations, whether they be problems resulting from war or commerce. As our domestic societies became more civilized and our commercial and social activities more complex, we have developed a more extensive system of legislative and judicial procedure. The same conditions of complexity in international relations has occurred and we must enlarge and expand international law and procedure to a commensurate standard. The development of such international machinery for mediation, arbitration, and enforcement of decrees will provide a just and fair alternative to war between nations, even as our legislative, judicial, and executive machinery has outlawed personal violence and established peaceful procedure in our domestic society.

The third principle I wish to explain is the one I call "international welfare of the peoples." More powerful than armies for the preservation of peace is the contentment of peoples. The policeman's club is a reminder of the need for maintaining law and order, but it does not replace the necessity for a successfully organized domestic economy. The problem of law enforcement in a well-organized and well-balanced community is a minor one. A community with basic strength in its economic, educational, and social relations, is a peaceful community. This is fundamentally true of a nation and by all the rules of reason and spiritual conception, it would be true internationally. Welfare and contentment of all peoples then, should be our goal. Development of backward and economically deficient nations is an imperative if we desire global peace. Can we attain this goal immediately? Even the most hopeful among us would say "No." However, we must publicly set the goal before the hopeless millions now in bondage—and work toward its achievement. Each advance, each improvement in the welfare of peoples, brings global peace nearer and eliminates the basic cause of war.

As the welfare of the people increases through full development of their domestic economies, conforming as nations to fair and just international laws in their relations one to the other—as they move toward a higher standard of living, free from the necessity of carrying the burden of oppressive armament programs, and free from fear of aggression—a new feeling of international security will be born in the hearts of men. When mankind turns toward God and starts practicing the principles of love, mercy, and brotherhood, then indeed will come true the prophecy of Isaiah the prophet:

They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: Nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more.

Personal Affairs of Dependents of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there are in existence agencies to which persons in our armed and naval forces and their dependents, former members of these forces and the dependents of deceased members may go to secure information and advice on personal problems. I am sure most Members of Congress have had experience wherein they learned of a serviceman being bewildered and worried, due to some emergency, or where the dependents encountered difficulties which could have been averted had they known where to turn for help in the solution of their problems.

I refer to the fine jobs being accomplished by the Personal Affairs Divisions of the Army and the Welfare Division of the Navy.

These agencies, like good counsel, analyze the problems presented and then determine the appropriate action to be taken. When funds are required they make arrangements through the American Red Cross or Army Emergency Relief or the Navy Relief Society to meet the needs. Such funds are secured without interest or service charges and, in many cases, outright grants are made. Liberal arrangements are provided for the repayment of the money borrowed.

My experience with cases involving personal problems has led me to believe that many dependents and members of our armed forces are at a loss as to where to turn in emergencies. The multiplicity of agencies administering rights or benefits to which the individual may be entitled has created a complicated maze almost unsolvable to the serviceman and his dependent. These Army and Navy agencies are doing a marvelous job in offering the much-needed counsel to which our men in uniform and their dependents are so richly deserving. These agencies are available all ver America, and it would do well for all people to become acquainted with their services so that they might advise bewildered dependents and members of our armed forces just where and how they can get the needed information.

ARMY PERSONAL AFFAIRS

Any member of our armed forces in the Army can contact his personal-affairs officer who is stationed at service command headquarters, Army posts, camps, stations, and air forces installations and he will receive individual attention as respects his or his dependents' personal problems.

The personal affairs officer is also available to the dependents of military personnel. The dependents will receive courteous and sympathetic attention. Should anyone know of any dependent at home or any member of the Army who needs help concerning his personal problems, whether it be financial assistance, family allowances, allotments of pay, insurance, legal advice, medical care, maternity care, and so forth, advise him to communicate with or see the personal affairs officer as soon as possible. In northwestern Minnesota for immediate action contact the personal affairs officer, Fort Snelling, St. Paul, Minn., the local chapter of the Red Cross, or Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

NAVY PERSONAL AFFAIRS

Any dependent of a man or woman in our naval forces can go to the nearest naval station for information and advice on personal problems. Any member of our naval forces who finds himself in need of assistance or advice can contact the naval officer designated at his station to handle such matters. Should anyone know of any dependent of our naval forces in dire circumstances advise him to take it up with the Navy Relief Society. Should anyone know of any member of our naval forces needing assistance advise him or her to contact the Navy Relief Society. To get immediate action from the Navy Relief Society it is best to take it up through your local Red Cross. The local Red Cross will best handle the request for aid if the dependents concerned are connected with our naval forces.

NO NEED FOR MISERY

These agencies were set up to take care of urgent and critical cases in need of immediate advice and assistance. Should you know of any such critical case in your neighborhood, you would perform a real service by calling on that person and advising her or him that this service is available. This service is available to persons actually in our armed and naval forces and to their dependents, to former members of these forces and their dependents and to the dependents of deceased members. Prompt consideration is given all problems presented and the

solution of the problem is speedily accomplished. There is no reason why any dependent or member of our military or naval forces should be confused and worried because of unsolved personal problems.

For information and advice, if connected with the Army, contact the personal-affairs officer, Fort Snelling, St. Paul, Minn., or the local chapter of the Red Cross.

If connected with the Navy, contact the nearest naval station or the local chapter of the Red Cross.

If you know of any case of a member of our military or naval forces or their dependents in need of information or advice concerning his personal problems, these suggestions should be helpful. Should any question arise concerning these services, contact Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

PAY SCHEDULE OF MEN AND WOMEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. Speaker, questions are frequently asked about the rate of pay for men and women in our armed forces. I have prepared a pay schedule which many service families will desire to retain for the duration of the war because the occasion might come when knowledge of the rates would be helpful in connection with handling a matter for the service man or woman or his dependents.

This information is valuable to the people back home in the collection of gratuity-payment and arrears of pay in the event of a death casualty. For that reason I wish to place in the RECORD, summarized pay schedule of the men and women in our armed forces. Women in service receive the same pay as men in each of their ranks. The pay schedule follows:

Annual pay of commissioned officers

Navy	Army	Salary per year
Admiral	General	$8,000
Vice admiral	Lieutenant general	8,000
Rear admiral (upper half)	Major general	8,000
Rear admiral (lower half)	Brigadier general	6,000
Captain	Colonel	4,000
Commander	Lieutenant colonel	3,500
Lieutenant commander	Major	3,000
Lieutenant	Captain	2,400
Lieutenant (junior grade)	First lieutenant	2,000
Ensign	Second lieutenant	1,800

NOTE.—This is the base pay only. Subsistence is not included in the base pay schedule.

Monthly pay of other men and women in our armed forces

Navy	Army	Salary per month
First-grade petty officers (chief)	Master sergeant	$138
Second-grade petty officers (first class)	Technical sergeant	114
Third-grade petty officers (second class)	Staff sergeant	96
Fourth-grade petty officers (third class)	Sergeant	78
Fifth-grade nonrated men (first class)	Corporal	66
Sixth-grade nonrated men (second class)	Private, first class	54
Seventh-grade nonrated men (third class)	Private	50

NOTE.—This is base pay only.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN OFTEN CAN ASSIST IN FEDERAL MATTERS

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Office of Dependency Benefits is handling in excess of 300,000 cases every week, is evidence of the many problems involved in the administration of this, the broadest program of its type ever undertaken by any nation. The war effort on the home front has become so involved in rules, regulations, and orders that many of our citizens are reluctant to even participate in any of the benefits fearing the red tape and effort necessary.

If any of the citizens of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota have any fears of this nature, I should like to allay them now, for I will gladly cooperate with them and represent them at the offices of the Office of Dependency Benefits, if necessary or desirable.

One of the main problems has been for our service families to ascertain just to what benefits they are entitled.

In this respect, I would like to call the attention of my people to the fact that a Congressman's office is the best and surest way of getting help in straightening out Federal matters.

It is a Congressman's duty to help in difficult matters confronting his people. A Congressman is the people's representative in Washington. He is their agent. If undue delay or effort results from collecting the allotment or any benefit due, a Congressman is the best bet to contact to help take care of it and speed up consideration.

In my long experience here I have already helped in the adjustment of hundreds of dependency allowance cases and in other veterans matters. In my 10 years of time in congressional work I have helped to straighten out hundreds of insurance claims, and other problems of the veteran or his family of both First and Second World Wars.

FINANCIAL CLAIMS MAY BE HANDLED THROUGH A CONGRESSMAN'S OFFICE

Should anyone have a claim against the Government for a family allowance or any war benefit, it is best to first ask for help from the local Red Cross, local veterans' service office, or the service officer of your local veterans' post.

These local agencies will do everything they can. Sometimes, however, something goes wrong and the claims are not settled, or it takes too much time to get it completed. If that happens, it is suggested that you write to your Congressman and explain everything to him in detail. Your Congressman often can find out what is wrong and can help in getting settlement.

Should you know of any person whose claim is unduly long in being settled—remind that person that a Congressman's office is a most effective clearing house. Your Congressman has a direct connection with all offices in Washington. He can serve his people very effectively.

Your Congressman has received splendid cooperation from the offices here in settling claims and cases of various kinds. He can help you just as he has helped hundreds of others. Whether it be a claim for labor or service, an insurance claim, a dependency claim, a pension claim, or any other claim or Federal matter, use your Congressman if your previous efforts and contacts have not resulted in satisfactory action and results. Your Congressman will be glad to help you, as he has helped others.

For the people of this Ninth District of Minnesota the name and address is Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, 1620 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Investigation of Farm Credit Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago this House adopted a resolution (H. Res. 119) creating a select committee of seven members to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration. These seven members were all members of the Committe on Agriculture. They are Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman; Mr. FLANNAGAN, of Virginia; Mr. ZIMMERMAN, of Missouri; Mr. PACE, of Georgia; Mr. HOPE, of Kansas; Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON, of Illinois; and Mr. RIZLEY, of Oklahoma. These gentlemen have done a capable piece of work. They have recommended legislation which is now before the Committee on Agriculture. While very few, if any, Members will agree with every detail of the proposed legislation, the chief objection that has been leveled against it has been the fact that it does not attempt to reorganize the entire farm-credit program.

There are undoubtedly many features of the Farm Credit Administration that need attention. This committee is in a position where it can do this work promptly and efficiently. There is now pending a resolution—House Resolution 525—which, if adopted, would authorize this select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Credit Administration with a view of determining what, if any, amendments to the laws administered by such administration are necessary or desirable. I hope the Rules Committee will report this resolution to the floor and that the House will adopt it without delay.

Yesterday the Committee on Agriculture of this House passed by a unanimous vote the following resolution:

Be it resolved by the House Committee on Agriculture, That we appreciate the splendid and diligent work of the special committee investigating the Farm Security Administration, that the Committee on Agriculture recognizes that this special committee has done an excellent piece of work and deserves the thanks of the Congress and of the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture that it is desirable and essential that a thorough and prompt investigation be made of the entire Farm Credit Administration, and that since this work is so closely associated with the work already done by this special committee, that

this further investigation should be conducted by the same special committee that has conducted the investigation of the Farm Security Administration; therefore be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture endorses House Resolution 525, authorizing this special committee to make further investigation of the Farm Credit Administration, and that we ask the Rules Committee to favorably report such House Resolution 525.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this a remarkable tribute to the services of this select committee. I hope that its members will be authorized to do another needed job for this House.

Liberation Day Is Here, a Prayer for Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the long-awaited moment has arrived. We were all electrified by the announcement this morning of the invasion of the Continent of Europe. This is undoubtedly the greatest military venture in the annals of history. The years of preparation, the mass production of military equipment and its transportation to the embarkation ports, the drilling and training of over 10,000,000 of our military personnel has pointed toward this day's venture. The impatience of the uninformed, the criticism of the misinformed is now a thing of the past. Action is the order of the day.

The bridge of ships and planes is now in operation across the channel which Hitler could not pass. The losses of Dunkerque and Dieppe will be avenged. This time we are assured by our military leaders that we have the men and equipment to smash the vaunted west wall of Hitler's Europe. Great pressure has been exerted during the past 3 years for the opening of the second front as applied to continental invasion from the west. England and the United States have been criticized because of their refusal to invade before we were properly prepared to invade, successfully. This pressure was withstood by our leaders, because they knew the futility of an invasion which lacked sustaining power. Our leaders knew that such an invasion meant the sacrifice of millions of our men and women.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared. Today we have the concentrated power in the air and on the ground to sustain our invasion properly. We know that our armies are the best equipped and best trained troops in the world. We know that their morale is at the highest. They are anxious to get on with the job of eliminating nazi-ism from the face of the earth. As this mighty avalanche of military power moves forward toward Berlin, we who are at home join with the liberated millions of Europe in the prayer that victory will crown our efforts quickly. We earnestly pray that the sacrifice of the precious lives of our loved ones be as few as possible. May God crown our efforts with speedy victory and bring our loved ones in the armed forces home to us soon.

Aged Citizens Become Victims of Higher Prices as Assistance Payments Remain Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago the attention of the Nation was on the plight of the forgotten man.

Today I want to talk about the abandoned man.

He has been left beside the road to eke out his existence under high wartime prices, and he cannot even sell apples on a street corner lest he fall victim of some bureaucratic regulation of which he is not aware.

The "abandoned man," Mr. Speaker, is symbolic of the venerable aged citizen, both men and women, of this Nation. A few years ago we started out to do so much for them. We planned a social-security program. A start was made. Small payments to them were begun in the various States. Then along came the war and all went blank—there was no further program nor increased payments. Their distress, their needs that accompany old age and medical relief for their aches and pains were no longer considered. The war program swept all that aside.

Soon industrial workers were realizing a good income from the sweat of their honest brow. Manufacturers of defense supplies were at last realizing a good margin of profit—even if it was under Government surveillance. Domestic servants realized substantial increases in wages as they literally went on the wage auction block as the manpower shortage forced housewives to bid against each other for help.

Despite price control, clothing prices went up. The price of medicine advanced. Other items increased in price.

Realizing that there were certain advances in living costs, despite the efforts to "hold the line," Congress began to authorize certain pay increases. Properly it increased the salaries of its Federal employees. Certain veteran benefits were somewhat liberalized—though not wholly adequate. Other steps were taken to raise wages of certain groups.

But through it all the recipients of benefits under the old-age assistance program continued to receive the same amount. These persons are extremely hard hit by the war. Their age or physical condition in many instances prevent them from participating in good wages paid in defense plants. Yet nothing has been done to adjust their allowance in line with wartime increases in prices.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a legislative measure, H. R. 4167, on February 10, 1944, providing a 20-percent increase in the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance to the States, with the thought in mind that this be passed on directly to the recipients in the amount of 20 percent more of the Federal portion they now receive.

The text of my bill follows:

A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase for the duration of the war in the amount of the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and in the amount of Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits under the Social Security Act

Be it enacted, etc., That during the period beginning on the 1st day of the quarter following the date of enactment of this act and ending on the last day of the quarter following the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President—

(a) The amount which the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay to each State having an approved plan for old-age assistance pursuant to section 3 (a) (1) of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be increased 20 percent and shall be calculated by not counting so much of the sum expended under the State plan with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $48; and

(b) All Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be increased 20 percent.

The Minnesota Delegation in the House of Representatives recently unanimously signed an urgent communication to the Ways and Means Committee of the House asking early action on H. R. 4167. Under the unanimous-consent privilege accorded me, I desire to read that letter into the RECORD. It follows:

MAY 4, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Truly the forgotten men and women of this war are those venerable aged folks whose better years were spent in building up this Republic and its standard of living, and who now must rely on a meager Federal old-age assistance check for support because they are unable to participate in high war wages due to age, infirmity or disability.

Congress has seen fit to help Federal employees meet the high cost of living by wage increases. For the laboring man's wages there is the Little Steel formula, etc., and we have had roll-backs, rent control, and price control, and other aids for many other employed people.

But for these fine elderly people, their income has been frozen at the pre-war level because Congress has not authorized any increase in the grants to the States, but their rent, food, and other essentials are paid for at Government established war prices. They, along with many wage-frozen white-collar workers are the forgotten group in our country today.

There is pending before your committee, H. R. 4167 (introduced by a member of our delegation) which would provide an emergency 20 percent increase for the duration of the war in the amount of the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and in the amount of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act.

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Ways and Means Committee to hold

hearings on H. R. 4167, with a view to reporting it to the Congress for consideration at an early date.

(Signed by all House Members of the Minnesota Delegation in Congress.)

Persons in many States of the Union have written me concerning this legislation. They feel that these worthy elder citizens should have their assistance benefits adjusted to meet the wartime increases in their living expenses. It should be borne in mind that there are still items not covered by price control and among these are the services utilized by these folks.

From one State I have received a letter saying:

We have to pay as much as anybody else—and they had their wages raised—for food when we go to the store, and do you know that the poor old people are begging for money to buy food at the offices for the aid of the aged.

Another person in still another State writes:

Thanks for advocating a 20 percent Federal increase in old-age allotments. We sure need it.

And another said:

With the increases in living costs and not living costs alone, but shoes, clothing, and everything you need is sky high. I should think other Representatives would be willing to go along with you and get that bill passed as soon as possible.

A man in a seaboard State writes me that he received $20 a month and is badly in need of eyeglasses. He was told by his case worker he would have to purchase these out of his monthly allotment of $20.

I am sure everyone here in Congress has in his file cases revealing the distress of these older citizens who are the abandoned folk, along with white-collar workers of the war period.

The pressure of events has caused some discord on the home front, which is also reflected in the morale of the men on the battle fronts. This is due largely to the inequality of sacrifice of different groups and individuals. Some of our leaders have offered solutions to some phases of the problems, but none of them seem able to offer a solution of the over-all problem.

This is a great challenge to Congress and this issue must be considered and solved.

I sincerely hope that we may have an opportunity at an early date to give this matter serious consideration on the floor, and I do not believe we should recess until we have taken action of some sort to adjust upward the monthly allotments for our aged citizens.

National Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

Tucked away in two congressional committees is a bill which, we believe, merits early consideration of our convention-minded legislators. It is a bill appropriating $10,000,000 to the United States Public Health Service for investigation and control of tuberculosis.

This country has done a good job on tuberculosis, but it could do better. Through research and treatment, through State-built sanitariums and the yearly purchase of Christmas seals by millions of Americans, tuberculosis mortality has been reduced by more than half in the past 30 years.

Meanwhile, however, the Public Health Service has been able to do little. It has never been able to afford a separate tuberculosis control division, and it is only since the war began that its tuberculosis budget has been raised from $150,000 to $250,000 a year.

This is obviously insufficient to help check the spread of a prevalent disease which generally strikes those least able to pay for treatment. It is much more prevalent in wartime.

Thus far, fortunately, there has been no notable rise among civilians except in three industrial States. But as the war continues it is likely that the rise may come, through the long hours of heavy work that millions of Americans are doing, even though our nutritional level remains high.

Even with its limited budget, the Public Health Service has X-rayed about three-quarters of a million war workers in the past year. It was found that 1.3 percent of them had tuberculosis. Of that 1.3 percent, 60 percent had minimal cases, 30 percent were moderately advanced, and 7 percent were far advanced.

Before these tests were taken, only 10 percent of patients presenting themselves at sanitariums had minimal cases. The rest were advanced. The contrast clearly shows that there is much tuberculosis that can be detected and cured early, if facilities for diagnosis and treatment are available.

Such facilities can save many lives, forestall untold anxiety, and prevent an economic loss of millions of dollars. The bill now before Congress would be a long step in that direction. Even at a time of political absorption, it should be given a hearing and a favorable vote before the strain of war work begins to undo the splendid anti-tuberculosis work so valiantly begun.

Conservation of Our Timber Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on May 31 at the Governors' Conference held at Hershey, Pa., Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, delivered a most timely and interesting address entitled "Conservation of Our Timber Resources." I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The forestry problem presents a challenge to the States that demands action now. If the States fail to meet that challenge we may expect to see further power and authority over our forests lodged with bureaus and departments of a Government centralized in Washington, D. C.

At the present time there are approximately 500,000,000 acres of commercial forest lands remaining, which is about 60 percent of the original acreage in the United States. The present acreage of standing saw timber is only about one-third of the original stand. Of the remaining stand of saw timber, 90 percent is of the softwood varieties; 80 percent of these are in the West.

In the early years of our country agriculture was the main, if not practically the sole pursuit or activity. The trees were considered a hindrance. The ever-present cry was: "Get rid of the trees." That philosophy of destruction of a never-ending and inexhaustible supply of timber marked the first step in our methods of handling this important resource. We have passed through three cycles or eras in the handling of our forest lands and are now entering the fourth: (1) Destruction, (2) exploitation, (3) conservation, and now (4) planned-forest management.

The fourth—planned-forest management—includes not only the adoption of the necessary safeguards of protection and conservation but also adoption of polices and a program that will insure full utilization of this valuable and important resource on the basis that timber is a crop.

The two chief reasons for the early exploitation of forests are no longer valid. In colonial times the forest was a menace which harbored enemies and encumbered the land needed for crops. These conditions no longer obtain, the more forest land now reverts to forest use annually than is cleared for fresh agricultural use. Secondly, there was an enormous demand for a cheap, universal construction material during the period of rapid national expansion.

A relatively steady use of forest products can now be forecast in place of past unpredictable expanding use. In normal times plans can be made for the orderly harvesting of timber as a crop.

It is true that current drain on the forests exceeds current forest growth, which would seem to challenge the crop concept. That is one of the problems to be solved by the adoption of modern forestry practices. The barriers to successful forest management are well known. Forthright action by individual States to surmount these barriers will keep local forest lands productive, and in the aggregate will protect and enhance the national forest resource.

The public policy of one of the forward-looking forested States is declared to be "the preservation of the forest and the conservation of forest resources for the equal and guaranteed use of future generations * * * the protection of forest and water resources and the continuous growth of timber on lands suitable therefor." If this policy is implemented with intelligence and integrity in State legislation and administration, and proper Federal-State relations, there need be no concern for the future of forestry in America.

CURRENT SITUATION

Of the nearly 500,000,000 acres of commercial forest land there are 214,000,000 acres in saw timber. Given adequate management this area will produce annually more timber than has ever been cut in the United States in a single year.

The Federal Government owns or manages 60,000,000 acres of saw timber; States, counties, and municipalities, 4,000,000 acres; and in private ownership there are some 150,000,000 acres. It is with the latter two classes of ownership that state forestry programs are particularly concerned. There are no figures available on the present status of State, county, and municipally owned

lands, but a recent survey of privately owned industrial forest land discloses these facts:

1. 16.6 percent is managed in line with modern forest practices and is 80–100 percent stocked.

2. 29.6 percent is managed for continuous production and is 40–80 percent stocked.

3. 47.5 percent is less than adequately managed and less than 40 percent stocked.

4. 6.3 percent is nonproductive.

This is pretty largely the balance sheet of the forest industry as a whole, because publicly owned forests have made but a negligible contribution to forest production thus far. For the decade 1933–42 the cut of saw timber on national forests averaged slightly over a billion board feet while the total cut for the industry averaged over 25,000,000,000 board-feet. Production on public forests must of necessity become more important as private forests are increasingly cut over, but it is still the private forest land which produces the bulk of America's lumber.

The timber industry in normal times has provided as much as 50 percent of the industrial employment in some States, and the value of forest products at the mill nationally has exceeded $1,000,000,000 annually in recent years. Thus the continued productivity of the private forest will continue to be a significant factor in the economy of many States, and a matter of concern to all States.

OWNERSHIP

Casting policy aside, the ownership of forest lands, in a sense, is relatively unimportant if they are all properly managed and conserved and the benefits are available to the citizenry in general. It is important that minimum forest practices be required on all ownerships in order to protect the stability of the industry.

There are two legitimate fields of public forest ownership: (1) Noncommercial lands of greater service for other uses than for forest products, and not necessarily self-sustaining. In this category would fall watershed forests, research and demonstration forests, recreational areas, and wildlife refuges. (2) lands bearing commercial timber in certain quantities for demonstration or industry stability; and those on poor sites, inaccessible or fire-denuded areas. In general, private ownership should be encouraged when and where it is possible to carry on long-term operations at a profit, and in such a manner as will insure sustained production on the area.

TAXATION

The problem of forest taxation is one which deserves special consideration because of the long period required to produce merchantable timber. Property taxation has been the principal source of revenue for local Government in rural America and is based on the annual cropping of agricultural lands. The annual taxing of a crop which requires many years to produce has done much to discourage sound forest management on private lands. In Western States the tax problem is also very much complicated by the vast public ownership of forest lands. In my State of Oregon the Federal Government owns 53 percent of our total area and acquisition is continuing at an average rate of more than 100,000 acres per year. At least partial solution can be found by giving consideration to the following:

(a) Privately owned lands should bear their fair share of the cost of local government. The valuation for property-tax purposes might well be based on the productive capacity of the forest land.

(b) Taxes—Federal and State—should be applied in such a manner as to equalize the payments between the operator who grows trees and the one who purchases mature timber. Progress along this line has been made.

(c) Equitable and reasonable payments in lieu of taxes should be made on publicly owned forest lands.

(d) State and Federal inheritance taxes should receive consideration in the light of their effect upon sustained production.

FIRE AND INSECTS

In recent years we have multiplied public opportunity to set fire without equally multiplying public responsibility for such fires. Improved transportation and roads have made private forest lands available to the public with a resultant increase in fire hazards. In some sections of the country smokers and incendiarists set more than 50 percent of the forest fires. The public's attention should be called to this critical condition to the end that more adequate measures are put into effect by State and local governments.

Forests are at times extremely vulnerable to both insects and disease, attacks of which may completely liquidate holdings. It is not feasible for private forest landowners unaided to undertake sanitation measures for the prevention of epidemic diseases or infestations. This is, however, largely a province of public forest agencies—a project in the general public interest akin to flood-control work and similar public works.

Forestry is a long-time enterprise, subject to unusual hazards, yielding only modest returns on the investment. Commercial credit rates present some difficulty for the operators who prefer to work on a sustained production basis. Because of prevailing hazards, insurance premium rates are disproportionately high for the coverage obtained, and financial risks are added to the physical difficulties of private forestry.

Present standards of utilization do not permit full realization of all timber values and impose severe restrictions on the development of private forestry. Present limited markets for wood, and long-established market practices force the logging and sawmill operators to leave 30 percent of the wood in the forest, and 43 percent of the log in the mill. Wood technology has not kept pace with the advance in the utilization of metals, plastics and other wood substitutes.

FEDERAL APPROACH TO PRIVATE FORESTRY

I. The history of Federal action in respect to forestry in the States is about as follows:

1. Development of national forest system beginning in 1891 which set aside unappropriated areas of the public domain within the States as Federal forests.

2. The Weeks Act of 1911 initiated programs of Federal land purchases and cooperation with the States in forest fire control.

3. The Clarke-McNary Act of 1924, among other things, authorized Federal financial aid to the States on a matching basis for organized forest fire protection on State and private forest lands.

4. The Norris-Doxey Act which authorizes Federal expenditures for farm forestry in cooperation with the States was enacted in 1937.

5. The amendment to the Internal Revenue Act in 1944 provides tax relief by classifying some forest revenues as long-term capital gains rather than annual income.

II. What the Federal Government should do:

1. Recognize that private ownership of forest land is a keystone in the economy of many forest areas; and aid in the development of sound and permanent private ownership (a) through the operation of the Sustained Yield Act of 1944; (b) by the release from Federal ownership through exchanges or other means of conveyance of such lands as can and will be operated under sound forest management principles.

2. Recognize the very great public responsibility in the occurrence of forest fires, and provide a fair share of public funds for fire control in each State. Forest fires do not respect State boundaries.

3. Forest insects and diseases also respect no State boundaries and national efforts at control are logical. Adequate continuing appropriations should be made so that the gains of one year are not lost by inadequate appropriations in following years.

4. Problems of forest utilization likewise transcend State lines, and forest-products research should continue on a national scale, particularly as it pertains to products of national scope. This will require continued support of the Federal forest-products laboratory at Madison, Wis.

5. As part of the post-war program, the Federal Government should provide cooperative funds with which State forestry departments could rehabilitate State, local, and private forest lands. Provisions of such funds should be contingent upon (1) the proven technical ability of the State department, and (2) financial backing of that department by the State government adequate to assure success of the program.

6. Federal forestry agencies should correlate their activities.

7. It is recommended that State approval be first obtained before extension of Federal ownership within the State of lands of any character.

8. Congress should give immediate consideration to forestry measures designed to promote the national welfare. Particular attention is called to pending legislation providing for an annual payment in lieu of taxes on federally owned lands.

STATE APPROACH TO PRIVATE FORESTRY

I. What the States have done:

Compared to the needs the States have done relatively little in the protection, development, and utilization of the forest resources.

In general, the States have not made adequate appropriations for forestry. Chiefly by default, this important field of State sovereignty or responsibility has largely drifted into Federal ownership and under Federal jurisdiction; and, what was not acquired by default in the past seems certain to be acquired by other means in the future, unless prompt and effective measures are undertaken to counteract this movement.

A few States have been active in one or more phases of forestry, but by no means have the forested States met their forestry responsibilities. No State has a comprehensive, entirely satisfactory, adequately financed forestry program. The greatest advances have been made in forest protection, generally in cooperation with the Federal Government under the Clarke-McNary Act; but even in this instance there is a wide disparity in the standards of protection prevailing in different States.

II. What the States should do:

1. The States should finance their forestry departments on a basis which will permit the competent performance of essential forestry functions.

2. Enact legislation adopting modern forestry practices. If the States do not do so, the Federal Government will.

3. Revise taxation inequities which restrain private forestry.

4. Support research in local forestry problems not covered by the Federal forest experiment stations.

5. Improve personnel standards and provide compensation adequate to attract able men to State forestry.

6. Acquire forest lands where and when advisable. Rehabilitate forest areas. Retain certain State forest lands for demonstration, research, recreation, and watershed forests and other essential uses.

7. All forestry States should consider the forest resource in all plans for the development of the State as a whole, particularly in respect to public works post-war planning.

The Sixth General Assembly of the Council of State Governments, at its meeting in Baltimore, January 1943, adopted a resolution instructing its president to appoint a committee of five to study the timberland problem and to make recommendations at the next conference of the council as to the

most effective course that may be pursued to promote the highest utilization of the timber resources of the Nation.

Pursuant to the provisions of that resolution President Herbert R. O'Conor, Governor of Maryland, appointed as members of the Forestry Committee the following: State Treasurer D. Hale Brake, of Michigan; State Senator William T. Dean, of Georgia; State Forester Perry H. Merrill, of Vermont; State Senator Ed. Fletcher, of California, and your speaker as chairman of the committee. Mr. Hugh Gallagher of the Council of State Governments is doing an efficient job as secretary. This committee has made a rather exhaustive study of the various problems affecting forestry throughout the Nation and will have a definite recommendation to make to the Council of State Governments at its next annual session. However, I know that I reflect the unanimous opinion of the committee when I say to you that the preservation of the sovereign rights and authority of the states and definite encouragement to competitive enterprise and individual initiative are important and essential to the future economic and social welfare of our Nation.

We hear much discussion about the question of States' rights. However, we must do far more than just talk about it. The States must become active, virile political subdivisions and really do something about these forestry problems as well as other problems wherein States' rights are involved. And, if we do not do something about it we may expect further encroachment—may expect more government by orders and directives emanating from bureaus and departments centralized in Washington, D. C.

The challenge is before us and in my opinion the States will not be found wanting.

Regulation of Radio Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of the regulation of radio broadcasting, published in the newspaper Labor of June 3, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEELER-WHITE BILL IS A GOOD THING—PROPAGANDISTS WHO HAVE BEEN POISONING THE NEWS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THEIR SPONSORS SHOULD BE DRIVEN OFF AIRWAYS

Senator WHEELER (Democrat, Montana) and Senator WHITE (Republican, Maine)—two gentlemen whose economic views are sometimes as far apart as the poles—are sponsoring a measure to eliminate some of the obvious evils of radio broadcasting. Among other things, they propose to end the control of news broadcasts by big corporations and other concerns.

They insist that if broadcasting companies desire to supply listeners-in with a summary of the day's events they should hire their own broadcasters, confine them to reports of outstanding events, and cut out all editorial comment.

In a word, the Senators would ban the flood of vicious propaganda which has been pouring over the airways for years, and give the American people a chance to hear all sides of controversial questions and then form their own opinions.

There are many other excellent provisions in the proposed legislation, but the opposition has concentrated its fire on the one mentioned.

Practically every big paper we have seen cries that the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech is menaced by the Wheeler-White proposal. There is no foundation for that argument.

The owner of every newspaper claims the right to print anything he sees fit in his columns. He calls that freedom of the press. He hires columnists whose writings are agreeable to him.

If he hates labor unions, then he never, by any chance, engages a columnist who has a good word to say for collective bargaining. He pursues the same policy in reference to other outstanding public issues.

He denies his readers the right to get both sides, and he sternly denounces anyone who would interfere with his dictatorship.

Now, the airways belong to the people of the United States. Radio might be described as their newspaper, for through that channel, if they exercise their right of ownership, they can get the facts which will enable them to form intelligent opinions concerning what is going on in the world.

Being the owners of radio, they have the undoubted right, through their chosen representatives in Congress, to say to the broadcasting companies: "We are permitting you to temporarily use our property. We are not charging you anything for the privilege. Possession of the airways enables you to reap rich profits. In return, we demand that you give us clean and accurate reports of domestic and international events."

What's wrong with that propcsition? There is nothing wrong with it from the people's point of view. Of course, there is a great deal wrong with it from the point of view of those influential interests which desire to control public thinking. They hire radio commentators to twist the news—to suppress this fact and to exaggerate that fact. They use the people's radio to confuse the people's thinking.

In the judgment of this newspaper, the commentators now talking over the air—with a mighty few exceptions—have done more to mislead the American people—and particularly during this war emergency—than any other single influence.

Among these commentators are men who never hesitate to broadcast the most fantastic and demoralizing falsehoods. They have been exposed and denounced on innumerable occasions, but they continue to poison the public mind because certain rich "sponsors" profit from the lies and half-truths which they are constantly pouring into the ears of the American people. Only on the rarest occasions is anyone permitted to reply.

Senators WHEELER and WHITE are to be commended for at least making a start toward cleaning up this intolerable situation. Their bill is really very conservative. To the north of us in Canada, where the people own a Nation-wide broadcasting system, the Government is going much farther.

In Canadian regulations just issued, news commentators are told they must present the facts without "strong personal bias or expression of opinion."

If the commentator wishes to interpret the news, then the broadcasting company must set up a balanced panel of commentators of contrasting views.

Canada will no longer tolerate such vicious propaganda as Herr von Kaltenborn, who may be taken as a fair example of all that is bad in news broadcasting, is constantly giving the radio audience.

It would be a good thing if every Member of the American Congress would study the Canadian regulations. Such a study would probably result in strengthening the Wheeler-White bill, and in any event, it would go a long way toward assuring the passage of that measure.

Prayers for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this day marking the invasion of Europe, brings to every home in America prayerful and anxious moments. In many communities the citizens today assemble in churches of all denominations for prayer. They assemble with troubled and fearful hearts. They are praying for the safety of loved ones fighting on many fronts in this terrible war. It is well that the Nation pause in prayer and seek the guidance from the Master of us all. There is a power in prayer which is comforting to the soul of mankind. In this Nation today there are tears of joy, and there are tears of fear and tears of sorrow. We have all been fearful of the invasion. We all hesitate to face a climax in life which may well mean the turning point in the history of our own individual life or that of our Nation. That crisis has been reached. The hearts and homes of America today are apprehensive and are praying that across the channel there may be few lives sacrificed and that our victories may be large and complete. Because the days are dark and anxious and apprehensive is the reason that we seek divine guidance from our Creator.

While our flesh and blood may be sacrificed in this tremendous undertaking, we find some comfort in the fact that our soldiers are well equipped. They possess the indomitable courage and faith that the undertaking will succeed. The Nation's industry has given the invading forces the finest of equipment. No expense will be spared for equipment and for their safety. No effort will be left undone which may provide relief for the wounded and for their rehabilitation. This is as it should be.

The radios and presses of the Nation now attract the attention of the world. Millions will listen hopefully for each encouraging word. They will cheer our boys in victory. They will pray for an early victory and a permanent peace.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the American people in this crucial hour and in the days ahead should be given the unvarnished truth about our military successes or reverses if that must be. Our boys have been steeled and tempered for this test. They have had long months of training. The people at home are also ready and they should know the truth at all times.

That our successes will be assured, no one doubts. The results of the next few days or weeks may well tell just how long this war will last. I personally feel it will be swift, hard, and not too long.

The American people, after this successful invasion, will look to the leadership of our country to write a peace which will be just. If this is not done then the war will have been fought in vain. So, it is well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there are millions of prayers on this day for the success of our military operations.

The House stood in silence a few minutes ago. Their prayers, united with the fervent prayers and pleas of millions more, will have a far-reaching effect. We ought to pray not only for an early victory but for a permanent peace. I believe that no peace can be permanent unless it embodies some of the teachings of the Christ Man, who, more than 2,000 years ago said, It is better to give than to receive, and to love thy neighbor as thy self.

May the vision of the prophets unite with the prayers of the multitude and guide not only our armies in this crucial hour but the statesmen of the world in writing a peace which will be honorable and lasting.

Evasion of Hog Marketing Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas we, the undersigned, local representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture and others, acting under instructions from our superior officers, in 1943 urged farmers to maintain a high rate of pork production as a patriotic duty, assured that they would at least receive the Federal W. F. A. floor price for their hogs, and

Whereas farmers did respond by producing for the 1943–44 market one of the county's largest hog crops; and

Whereas farmers, in marketing their crop, have been forced to accept prices much below the floor price established for the area and promised them by the Government; and

Whereas farmers have been obliged to submit to unusual, unorthodox and unethical practices on the part of buyers in their (buyers') effort to bypass the intent of the floor regulations; and

Whereas pork products are retailed to consumers on the basis of O. P. A. ceiling prices independent of prices paid to the farmer; and

Whereas packers are subsidized $1.30 per hundredweight on all pork products slaughtered (regardless of weights) to enable them to pay floor prices or better for live hogs: Be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board for Whitley County, Ind., petition the respective Federal authorities in charge—

1. To keep faith with hog producers by making the support prices apply to all weights of hogs, thereby eliminating "floor dodging."

2. To provide that packers who resort to unusual practices not common prior to floor regulations, thereby securing unusual shrink in weight or otherwise evading the intent of the floor's objective, be made to disqualify themselves for subsidy payments in so doing;

3. To investigate the hog marketing system in this area; to withhold subsidies past due from all packers who have in any way evaded, or colluded with others to evade, the intent and purpose of the floor; and to make the withholding retroactive on all such evasion purchases; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, the United States Senator and Representative in Congress for this county, the national and State U. S. D. A. war boards, the U. S. D. A. war boards of other counties in this marketing area, and to the press.

WILSON BENNETT,
Chairman, County Agricultural Adjustment Association.

A. LEIGH BOWEN,
Field Supervisor, Farm Security Administration.

H. K. WAUGH,
Manager, County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.

WOODWARD ENGLE,
Field Agent, Albion Production Credit Association.

LEROY HARTMAN,
Chairman, Whitley County Cooperative Association.

CARL THOMSON,
Chairman, County Extension Committee.

B. V. WIDNEY,
County Agent, Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.

James F. Scoggin, Jr., Mississippi Cadet, Wins 11 of 17 Awards at West Point

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, from every home in America prayers are going up today for victory and for the preservation of our young men who are fighting on the various battle fronts of the world. Heroes are being made, or I should say, being revealed, at this hour. Out of the fiery furnace of this war will come the great leaders of the future.

Ella Wheeler Wilcox once said:

Weep not for the vanished ages
With their great, heroic men,
Who live on history's pages
Or dwell in the poet's pen;

For the grandest times are before us,
And the world is yet to see
The noblest worth of this old earth
In the men that are to be.

If you will bear with me, I should like to call your attention to the recent achievements of one of our young military leaders of the future.

Some years ago I appointed a young man to West Point by the name of James F. Scoggin, Jr. A few days ago I received a letter from him with reference to his graduation, which contained the most profound expressions of gratitude I have ever read. I find under an Associated Press item date-lined yesterday, the following article:

MISSISSIPPI CADET WINS 11 OF 17 AWARDS AT WEST POINT

WEST POINT, N. Y., June 5.—Eleven of 17 academic awards presented at the third day of commencement week activities of the United States Military Academy yesterday went to Cadet James F. Scoggin, Jr., State College, Miss., honor man of the graduating class.

Cadet Scoggin received 10 War-bond awards for standing first in general order of merit for 4 years; for having the highest ratings in economics, mechanics, English, mathematics, chemistry and electricity, physics, law, and military hygiene, and for standing first in graduation merit. His eleventh award was a set of books for the highest rating in military engineering and military history.

This is indeed gratifying news to me, and to all the rest of the people of Mississippi, who are justly proud of this young man, and tends to assure us that the traditions of the great leaders of this country will be carried on.

Resolution To Welcome the People of Italy to the Family of Liberated Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the tramp, tramp, tramp of American soldiers is heard in the streets of the Eternal City. The forces of righteousness are on the march. The allied armies have attained the first great goal toward the liberation of the human spirit from Axis tyranny and oppression.

The fall of Rome makes it especially appropriate at this time that Congress should adopt House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 which I have introduced. That resolution proposes that the Congress speaking for and in the name of the people of the United States, shall extend a welcome to the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations.

Nothing that Congress could do would be more stimulating and encouraging not only to the long-enslaved people of Italy but the peoples of all of the countries under Axis domination than the adoption of this resolution at this time. It would have an immediate and electrical effect in bolstering the morale and fighting spirit of the nations we are trying to help and on whom we depend for cooperation. Congress, being the body closest to the people, speaks directly for the Nation and the adoption of this resolution would make those unfortunate peoples, who are low in spirit and morale, feel that America really cares for them. It would be people speaking unto people, in the language of the heart.

The State Department and the Office of War Information have endorsed this

resolution. It has been broadcast to the people of Italy and the effect has been to arouse keen interest, although of course it as yet has no official sanction. The Italian-language newspapers of the United States, expressing the sentiments of the millions of our people of Italian ancestry, have endorsed it with great unanimity and have printed editorials urging its adoption.

The resolution has been pending in committee nearly 9 months. It is too important a resolution to be allowed to die in a committee pigeonhole. The great Committee on Foreign Affairs, for which I have profound respect, at least owes to the millions who believe in this resolution the courtesy of acting on it.

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, democratically elected by the people, is in a position to convey to the people of Italy, the victims of Fascist rule, and to downtrodden oppressed peoples everywhere, our Nation's sympathy and friendship for them; therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States, speaking in behalf of the people who elected it, welcomes the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. We congratulate them on the overthrow of the horrors and slavery of fascism. We sympathize with them in the struggle that is before them in reclaiming their country from the Nazi invader and in reconstructing their nation. In the cosmic evolution that is going on the might of America is pledged to support by all reasonable and constitutional means the freedom, peace, and security of all right-thinking and right-doing men. We hail the overthrow of fascism in Italy as the dawn of freedom for all of the Axis-ridden countries and as pointing the way to the final consummation of a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

Price Discrimination Against Northeastern Indiana Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas W. F. A. hog price ceilings for the northeastern Indiana area are 10 cents per hundredweight lower than are the ceilings for the central Indiana area; and

Whereas the hogs from the two areas are consigned largely to the same Eastern packers; and

Whereas the hogs from the two areas are believed to be of the same grade and quality; and

Whereas the freight rates from the two areas to slaughterers are practically identical; and

Whereas W. F. A. ceilings are said to have been determined on the market histories of the respective areas, indicating a long time discrimination against the northeastern Indiana area: Be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board, for Whitley County, Ind., petition the Federal Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the director of the Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station, to (1) establish the cause or causes for discrimination in price against hogs marketed from the northeastern Indiana area and (2) that State and Federal agencies with authority take the necessary action to correct and eliminate said discrimination in price ceilings and market practices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be submitted to all Federal and State agencies concerned, to other county U. S. D. A. War Boards of the area and to the press.

Wilson Bennett, Chairman, County Agriculture Adjustment Association; A. Leigh Bowen, Field Supervisor, Farm Security Administration; H. K. Waugh, Manager, County Rural Electric Membership Corporation; Woodward Engle, Field Agent, Albion Production Credit Association; LeRoy Hartman, Chairman, Whitley County Cooperative Association; Carl Thomson, Chairman, County Extension Committee; B. V. Widney, County Agent, Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.

Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cotton," by Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON

(By Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia)

I have before me eight samples of cotton goods from a department store in Atlanta, Ga.

Each sample is a different pattern and a different weight.

The heaviest sample weighs 6 ounces to the yard. The lightest sample weighs 3 ounces to the yard.

The 3-ounce goods is marked $4.98 a yard. This is $1.66 an ounce, or $26.56 a pound—$26.56 for 1 pound of cotton goods out of cotton that sold for 20 cents.

The heaviest of these samples weighs 6 ounces to the yard and the price is $2.50 a yard. This is 41 cents an ounce, or $6.56 for a pound.

In these goods, you pay $6.56 for a pound of cotton goods out of cotton that sold for 20 cents.

The other samples vary in between these two extreme figures.

If we average these figures, we find that these eight different kinds of cotton goods are selling for $16.56 a pound.

At this rate one bale of cotton cost $8,280—82 times as much as the farmer received for growing, picking, ginning, and hauling the bale of cotton.

Forty years ago the general rule was that a farmer received 1 yard of cotton goods for a pound of cotton.

That, of course, meant common, ordinary cotton goods, such as gingham, calico, homespun, and the like.

Nice dress goods cost two or three times that much. When cotton was 10 cents a pound you could buy practically any cotton goods from 10 to 40 cents a yard.

For the sake of argument, let's say that all these eight samples were worth 40 cents a yard when cotton was 10 cents a pound.

That meant that the farmer would have to give 4 pounds of cotton for 1 yard of this kind of cotton goods.

The average price per yard of these eight samples now is $3.75 a yard.

If the farmer purchased 1 yard of these goods with 4 pounds of cotton, he would have to get 94 cents a pound for the cotton.

In other words, if the farmer today was getting 94 cents a pound for cotton, he would only be receiving parity, insofar as these eight samples of cotton goods are concerned.

RAYON

We very often read in newspapers and hear great men in Congress and New York talk about rayon supplanting cotton as a textile.

They say that the farmer will have to produce cotton cheaper in order to keep rayon from taking the cotton market.

We hear a lot of talk about labor-saving machinery. We hear that labor-saving machinery has made the cost of production of industrial goods much cheaper. But the fact of the matter is that the farmer is producing today cheaper than anyone else.

If the farmers were paid as much to cover cost of production as industrial cost of production, the world would be hungry and naked within 12 months. Yet, they say the farmer is not producing cheap enough.

Well, let's see. If a yard of cloth contains 6 ounces of 20-cent cotton, that is 7½ cents worth of cotton in a yard of cloth. The 7½ cents worth of cotton in the form of a yard of cloth sells for $3.75.

If the farmer actually gave away the 7½ cents worth of cotton and did not get anything for it, it could not reduce the price of the yard of cloth more than 7½ cents. The yard of cloth would cost $3.67½ made out of free cotton, where it now costs $3.75 made out of 20-cent cotton.

The fact of the matter is that it is high prices of cotton goods that make rayon manufacture possible.

If the price of cotton goods were in line with the price of raw cotton the rayon mills would close down. They couldn't operate.

If the prices of cotton goods were in line with the price of raw cotton the demand for cotton goods would be so great that the Cotton Belt could not produce enough cotton to supply the domestic demand here in America. We would not have to worry about foreign markets.

The white-collar man, the merchant, the banker, the lawyer, and the doctor has just as big a stake in this as the farmer.

In the Cotton Belt, the farmers' income determines the income of all other groups.

The earnings of the banker, the merchant, the store clerk, the lawyer, the doctor, and the blacksmith are no better and no worse than the income of the farmers.

CHANGE OF LABELS

If you will go into the stores, you will see that the brands and labels in many cases have been changed from what they were before the creation of the O. P. A.

If you will take the catalog of mail order houses, you will see that in many cases the identical articles cannot be purchased. Many labels and brands have been changed.

This is because the manufacturers are smart enough to outwit the O. P. A.

When the O. P. A. fixes a ceiling on one brand or one label, the manufacturers simply quit making that particular brand and put out a new brand at a higher price.

The farmer cannot change his brands. The farmer still sells cotton. Everybody knows it's cotton. There is no way that the farmer can increase the price that he receives for his cotton. He is helpless in the hands of Government agencies and the cotton exchanges.

The O. P. A. was created for one purpose only. That purpose was to hold farm prices down. All the balance of the O. P. A. is 95 percent camouflage. If there were no farmers, there would be no O. P. A. The O. P. A. is the child of Bernard Baruch, Leon Henderson, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and Ginsburg.

Cotton—God's gift to America—has been crucified on a cross of gold.

Cotton, the greatest food crop and the greatest clothing crop on earth, lies prone in the defiling clutches of the internationalists.

The men and women who till the land through the long grinding hours of the hot summer sun, are merely pawns in the hands of international forces who build their golden calves on the miseries of these toilers.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WBNF on June 3, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, tomorrow is Townsend Day at Ross Park. It is the eighth year this gala occasion has come about.

This day has always been significant to me because it brings out people in all walks of life who are interested in our republican form of government. This day has always meant a lot to me because many of my best friends gather for the purpose of hearing the personal message I bring back home from the Nation's Capital.

As your Representative in Congress I am expected to remain in Washington practically all the time during the session. That means I cannot keep in as close touch with the home folks as I could if I were in Binghamton all the time.

I miss seeing my friends. That is one of the prices I pay for the honor of serving this most patriotic district in Congress. That is why I enjoy so much getting back for events like Townsend Day.

At this time I wish to extend the invitation to all my countless friends in the Triple Cities to come to Ross Park tomorrow afternoon. There will be a tremendous crowd present. The message I have to give you will prove most interesting.

Therefore, I urge you one and all to join with us in the celebration tomorrow. Let's make it, in addition to Townsend Day, an American Day. Let's renew our faith in what our boys are fighting for. Let's talk about America, think about America's future, and determine to preserve America.

Remember now, I will be looking for you tomorrow afternoon at Ross Park, Binghamton, at 2 o'clock.

This time of year, when everybody is paying tribute to the heroes of America's wars, past and present, I always think about the future. A few days ago Congress passed the G. I. bill, known as the Magna Carta of veterans' rights. I voted for this bill because I saw in it a step in the right direction.

Of course the success of the G. I. bill depends upon future legislation. Congress has chartered a bold, new course. It is the first time the future of our veterans has been assured.

But the real work has not yet been accomplished. Great hospitals and adequate medical care for the maimed and the wounded must yet be built. New laws must be passed guaranteeing the details in a most general plan.

Then, again, what about reeducation of the veteran? The G. I. bill has done a good job in telling us what to expect. But it does not dare to contemplate the endless work which must be done in setting up the thousands of facilities which veterans must have to complete their interrupted learning by trade, by vocational and by specialized guidance.

If the returning soldier wants to be a bricklayer, or a sheetmetal worker or an electrician, I think he should be allowed to be one. If he wants to be a farmer, or a doctor or a lawyer, I think he should be allowed to be one, provided he makes the grade.

There should be no ceiling put on how high our war heroes can go when they come back. There should be no fixing of limits on their opportunities to equip themselves for a better America and a better world.

Rehabilitation, reeducation, reemployment, those are the things our new veterans will want. Those things they must have, if we are to continue to be a great Nation, and a great force for good in the world.

Unity on the Fighting Front Should Bring Unity at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the invasion has begun. We await its outcome in breathless and prayerful expectation.

However, the success of the Allied Armies on the Italian front in recent weeks, now climaxed by the liberation of Rome from the clutches of the Nazis, occasions great rejoicing. It is an epic moment in the course of the war, and as we contemplate the military triumphs in Italy, we cannot fail to be impressed by the fact that it was achieved by the combined and unified operations of brave fighting men of many nationalities and of divergent races and creeds. The French forces, embracing units of African tribesmen, the British Eighth Army, embracing regiments of natives of British India, brigades of Poles, Canadian divisions, New Zealanders, and our own Fifth Army, Americans of every color and creed, fought side by side in a common cause, facing a common danger, to a common victory.

It seems to me that this affords a great moral lesson. It demonstrates that under the stress of great peril and common danger men will sink all personal differences and prejudices and join hands as comrades.

We, here in America, should take this lesson to heart and resolve to make it equally possible for men and women of differing races and creeds to live and work side by side in harmony and with complete racial and religious tolerance after the present common peril is ended and we return to peace and security.

I am firmly convinced that unless we do maintain racial and religious tolerance the peace and security and restoration of freedom for which we are now making such heavy sacrifices will be shadow without substance.

Unfortunately, there are some persons here in America—some persons in private life and some persons in public life—who seek to capitalize on the racial and religious differences among our people. Instead of striving for tolerance and harmony, they deliberately attempt to foment intolerance and strife.

Just as the Nazis picked on the Jews and persecuted them on account of race and forced other governments under Nazi domination to do likewise, so today we find in our own land persons of narrow and bigoted minds who seem to feel that it is smart to attack the Jews or to attack the Catholics or to attack the Negroes solely because of race or religion or color—persons who by their shouting and loose charges try to create prejudice while at the same time attracting public notice to themselves. This is not the American way. In fact, it is intolerable in any free country and enlightened society, whether these loose charges and appeals to prejudice emanate from private citizens or from public officials.

Let us have an end to this kind of demagoguery based on anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, Jim Crowism, or any other racial or religious difference. It is doing immense damage. It is sowing seeds of future trouble. It is weakening America when every effort should be exerted to strengthening America. Let us put out of office and silence those who cater to prejudice and who try to capitalize on racial discrimination. Let us be tolerant and fair both in word and in deed.

Republican Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, although in the minority in this House today Republicans have a responsibility to the Nation equally as great as the party in power. We should assume that responsibility without shirking or pussyfooting. We realize, and the Nation realizes, that there is a definite rift today between the so-called New Deal Democrats and the old-line Jeffersonian Democrats, and because of that rift the Republicans hold the balance of power in this House today. Holding the balance of power places a

responsibility upon our party that must not be shirked.

The following article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star, Monday, June 5, 1944, expresses the thoughts I have in mind much better than I can, so I include the article in my remarks. It is peculiarly pertinent at this time because we begin a 4-day debate on the continuation of the O. P. A. The article calls attention to the great need today to preserve our civil rights and states that this can only be done by providing for court review of all "edicts or decrees" issued in the form of "directives." The Republicans should take the initiative in this fight to protect the civil rights of the American people.

G. O. P. SEEN FAILING TO GUARD CIVIL RIGHTS—CONGRESS MINORITY COULD ACT TO FORCE ISSUE IS BELIEF

(By David Lawrence)

Many people are going to be asked soon to decide whether the country will be any better off under Republican than Democratic rule. If the record as a whole of the Republican Party in Congress, therefore, is to be taken as a criterion, maybe the country will decide to settle down to a continuation of the Democrats.

For the Republicans have stood idly by while civil rights have been taken from the citizen. They have failed to use their power as a minority to secure the liberties which their campaign speeches will soon tell the people the Democrats are taking away.

There is, for instance, the simple matter of court review of acts of the executive agencies. Here is an issue of transcendent importance. It's an issue any child who has studied our form of government can understand. The Democrats, of course, don't want court review. They are subservient to the Executive and wish to give him a free hand. Their Attorney General has already defied Congress by saying that irrespective of specific statutes on seizure of industrial plants, there is an aggregate of powers in the Commander in Chief enabling him to do as he pleases. Certainly the country cannot expect the preservation of civil rights by the Democrats in Congress, especially in an election year when so many of the Members must hang on to the President's coat-tails to win their own seats.

COULD MAKE IT AN ISSUE

There is a majority in both Houses for civil rights if the Republican Party cares to make it an issue. There are enough Democrats from the South who would vote with the Republicans if the latter asserted themselves. But it begins to appear that the Republicans, too, are going to play pussyfoot politics this year. It is said they don't want to offend anybody—and the possibility of offending the C. I. O. or the labor vote is beginning to be considered by some Republicans.

There's a piece of legislation pending, however, to which amendments on court review can be offered. It's the bill to extend price stabilization and wage control. The whole system of price control comes to an end June 30 unless extended by Congress, and if such amendments imperil the extension of this measure there are some who think the risk is worth taking. For if civil rights are abolished, price and wage control is of little avail. Arbitrary edicts and decrees can then be added at will by executive regulations without a chance for court review.

What seems most surprising is that union labor allows this reactionary trend to go on without a protest. Thus the other day the United States Circuit Court of Appeals rightly decided that there was no provision in the law for court review of the War Labor Board's orders. The fact is court review was omitted from the Smith-Connally law by direct pressure from the War Labor Board Chairman and by the administration. A threat of a veto is said to have been sent to Capitol Hill while the measure was in conference, so court review was omitted. But the bill was later vetoed, anyhow, even with court review omitted, and was passe over the veto.

LABOR SHORT-SIGHTED

For many months the War Labor Board operated without any legislative sanction at all, and the Smith-Connally bill gave the Board its first real authority. The omission of court review was a deliberate step to put over compulsory arbitration in America.

Labor unions may be the temporary beneficiaries of administration favor, but they are short-sighted if they oppose court review. For if the precedent is once established that no action of the War Labor Board is subject to court review, the way is opened to the complete control and domination of labor unions by governmental agencies.

Incidentally, it has been mistakenly reported in the press that the decision by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals here vindicated the Attorney General's claim in the Ward seizure case in Chicago. The issue settled was only that the War Labor Board orders are not reviewable. The seizure of property by the President can still be passed on by the courts in specific cases to determine whether any arbitrary act has been committed. For court review in seizure cases is derived from the Constitution itself, which specifically prohibits "unreasonable searches and seizures."

Comparison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Citizen-News of Los Angeles, Calif., which compares the C. I. O. political-action movement in America with that of the Fascists in Germany:

COMPARISON

A prominent Tennessee Democrat and lawyer, Malcolm McDermott, visited Germany in 1936 and 1937 to study national socialism.

He came to the conclusion that national socialism, "stripped of all fanfare, simply means a system of government that readily enables those who gain control to exploit the entire nation for their particular purposes."

He wondered how an intelligent people, such as the Germans were, would let themselves be duped. His studies led him to an outline of some of the steps taken in Germany and then to the conclusion that there is a deadly parallel between the national socialism of Germany and the poltical trend in the United States.

The lawyer outlined some of steps which he believes leads to the exploitation of a whole nation by a few people, as follows:

1. The people are made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems and to turn to a leader and his bureaucracy for the cure of all their ills.

2. The principle of local self-government is wiped out.

3. Constitutional guaranties are swept aside.

4. The lawmaking body is intimidated.

5. Economically the people are kept under the burden of a great public debt.

6. A general distrust of private business and industry is kept alive.

7. Governmental bureaus are set up to control different phases of the citizen's life.

8. The education of the youth of the Nation is taken under control.

9. A steady stream of Government propaganda is kept flowing to the people.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee that will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars this year for the election of President Roosevelt to a fourth term and the election of Congressmen favorable to their cause could bring a Hitlerian type of dictatorship to this country if a majority of the people accepted a steady flow of propaganda.

That propaganda would not extol the virtues of state socialism or those of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. That propaganda would be designed to cause voters to turn against many trusted public servants and to accept the unknown and the untried.

Appeals would be made to religious and racial prejudices. Hatreds would be stirred. The truth would be forgotten and facts would be twisted to appear in false forms.

Freedom of the press could be destroyed in a few months by sending in the Army to carry out the publishers who fail to respond to the dictates of the Government.

Freedom of speech could be destroyed by imposing governmental penalties on those who express themselves contrary to the will of the Government.

But 95 percent of the people of the United States are opposed to a dictatorial form of government regardless of whether it is called liberalism or socialism or communism. Only if 51 percent of the people can be led through false propaganda into turning their Government over to those seeking to execute a master plan for power can the real sentiments of the people go for naught.

If the principle is right that the Army can be ordered to take over a retail establishment the same principle can be used to take over newspapers and thus control the reading matter of a people.

But we are not as worried as is the Tennessee lawyer. We think that the people would wake up before it is too late.

Germans have always liked regimentation. Americans dislike it. Germans were regimented into following a program until they had lost all their liberties.

Americans can be regimented only so far, we think, before they will revolt.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee may be able to control the next Congress and the next President of the United States, but not for long enough to completely direct all governmental power into the hands of a few men.

Save Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the start of the European invasion draws immediate attention to pending legislation that must be speedily enacted by Congress if we are to be fully prepared to meet the obvious results of

a successful invasion drive. Undoubtedly many bitter and costly battles lie ahead, and I am sure that the American people join in the prayer that the sacrifices our men are making will not have been made in vain.

We are going to win the war and in order to win and preserve the peace we must begin to take the steps that are necessary to preserve our national economy at home. We want to insure the fact that our returning veterans will come back to a country that has maintained the system of free enterprise which will guarantee them jobs, security, and freedom.

Of primary importance, therefore, is the necessity for immediate passage by the Congress of legislation providing for an orderly system of contract termination, as the demand for military equipment and supplies decreases, as well as the prompt enactment of statutory authority for vesting the control over the disposal of surplus Government supplies and commodities under one head.

The need for such action was very ably and forcibly called to our attention last February by the Baruch committee report on war and post-war adjustment policies. Various congressional committees have had the necessary legislation under consideration for months but, so far, nothing has been approved. We have already waited too long and to delay further is to invite economic chaos.

The recent sudden termination by the Navy of the Brewster contract is a case in point. A wave of such unexpected and unannounced terminations can only lead to disaster. Let us not repeat the mistakes made after the last war. We do not want to throw millions of American men and women out of work, we do not want to see business enterprises forced to close their doors while waiting for slow-moving Government wheels to grind out contract payments piecemeal.

If we do not move at once to do the things that are necessary to guarantee the life of free enterprise and free employment we shall be faced with the grim specter of national socialism, or worse. Let us wake up.

Over the First Hump—November Is Next

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial taken from the Plane Facts, which is the west coast U. A. W.-C. I. O. weekly newspaper. This will not only show what the political-action group has done, or has taken credit for doing, but its intentions for the future:

OVER THE FIRST HUMP—NOVEMBER'S NEXT

The pattern for a people's victory in political action has been cut.

It was cut last Tuesday when the C. I. O., organized labor, and the people generally scored impressive victories in the primary elections.

All labor-endorsed candidates swept in as their party's nominees for the final elections in November. Several, meaning Representative CECIL KING and District Attorney Fred N. Howser, won their elections in the primaries and won't have to face a run-off in November.

On the whole, last Tuesday's elections were gratifying. But gratifying is not enough. We know how to win.

The pattern for a people's political victory was cut very sharply in the Fifteenth Congressional District.

There JOHN M. COSTELLO had held sway. For 10 years COSTELLO had misrepresented the people of his district. For 10 years he had insolently thwarted their wishes. For 10 years he had said, "Labor doesn't count. I don't care what the people think."

Today he knows—and does care—what the people think. JOHN COSTELLO is now a lame-duck Congressman. He has been dumped. By 10,000 votes he lost the Democratic nomination to Hal Styles, and, as a Democrat, it was necessary for him to win the Democratic nomination in order to run for office again.

That he won the Republican nomination while losing his own party's nomination was only final proof of labor's contention that Costello was a Republican parading under a Democratic tag. May his political epitaph be: "Dead—One Good Republican."

But what was more significant in the Fifteenth Congressional District than that John Costello was dumped and Hal Styles elected to represent the Democratic Party in the November elections was the manner in which that victory was accomplished.

The Styles campaign offers many lessons to those of us who still have to do a job for Clyde Doyle, for Ned Healy, for Helen Gahagan Douglas, for Arch Young, for Chet Holifield, for Ellis Patterson, for Jerry Voorhis.

Chief lesson to be drawn from the Styles campaign is that intensive neighborhood work can elect any support-the-war, support-the-President, plan-the-peace candidates.

In no other district, perhaps, was there the amount of good old-fashioned neighborhood work through Democratic clubs and political action clubs than there was in the Fifteenth Congressional District.

Out of the neighborhood clubs came persons who canvassed their precincts with Styles literature, who talked to their neighbors, and who went out on election day and brought Styles voters into the polls.

Ward-heelers, who, on the whole, have been mighty successful in politics for a heluva long time, have always followed the same technique. And it's always paid off for them. It paid off for us last Tuesday.

In the Fifteenth Congressional District members of organized labor put most of their efforts into neighborhood work rather than shop work.

That doesn't mean there's anything wrong with shop work. But people vote where they live. Similarly with political action. You do it where you live.

So the pattern for victory has been cut. Now let's use it.

In the pre-election registration campaign labor did another tremendous job. It set a new record for registrations in Los Angeles County. While we were carrying the ball we did all right. But we kind of dropped the ball election day. Only about 50 percent of the registered voters turned out to the polls last Tuesday.

Come November, when a President will be elected also, we're going to have to turn out the complete pro-war, pro-Roosevelt vote. Using the primary vote as a basis, it's quite obvious that we're going to need every vote we can get.

But it's just as obvious that if we get all the pro-war, pro-Roosevelt votes we will win hands down.

We've got a big job in front of us. But we've got 5 months or more to do it in. If we start today we can do it.

Sugar Industry of Puerto Rico on Verge of Collapse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I include a resolution recently adopted by the Puerto Rico Farmers' Association. This resolution outlines the handicaps and difficulties of the sugar industry in Puerto Rico, which is the backbone of the island's economy. I support fullheartedly said resolution. I expect that the action requested will be taken by the proper committees of Congress, to help our sugar industry which, with its related products, constitutes the source of over 70 percent of the total income of Puerto Rico and which provides the source of living for the great bulk of our workingmen. I hope that the main industry of that American Territory, inhabited by approximately 2,000,000 American citizens, will deserve the attention and protection of Congress. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolution requesting of the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ and JASPER C. BELL, as chairmen of their respective committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eight Congress of the United States of America, that an immediate and thorough investigation be made to determine the causes responsible for the present ruin of the sugar industry of Puerto Rico, its effect on the economy of the island, and to recommend ways and means for its rehabilitation

Whereas as of 1939 the total world sugar production was approximately 30,000,000 tons and at present 40 percent of the sugar-producing area of the world with a total normal production of approximately 12,000,000 tons of sugar is either under domination of the Axis Powers or has been crippled or destroyed to such an extent by acts of war, thereby reducing the available supply of this essential commodity and its byproducts for the United Nations and neutral countries; and

Whereas as of July 2, 1943, the Honorable President Franklin D. Roosevelt expressed:

"When I talk of important key commodities I do not mean fur coats or tailored suits or caviar. I mean the necessities of life, things like bread, milk, butter, sugar, coffee, ordinary meats, fats, and canned foods. Things the plain working folks must have"; and

Whereas a direct request has been made by the Government of the United States of the producers of sugar of the island of Puerto Rico for an increase in production of such a vital commodity; and

Whereas sugar and its related products constitute the source of over 70 percent of the total income of Puerto Rico, providing employment for nearly 150,000 family heads

and the main source of income of 13,000 small farms; and

Whereas in normal years $100,000,000 worth of American goods, manufactured or grown in the continental United States by American labor are purchased by Puerto Rico, and due to the present condition of our main industry the island is on the verge of losing the greater part of its purchasing power for these same American goods; and

Whereas the majority of the 13,000 independent producers of sugarcane in Puerto Rico operate under adverse conditions due to poorness of the soil, lack of equipment, lack of irrigations, small-scale operation, lack of capital reserves to meet contingencies, and other factors not affecting the largest operator; and

Whereas the Federal Government is deeply involved in the sugar industry of Puerto Rico through (1) P. R. R. A. control of 2 cooperative mills with over 1,500 grower members supplying the cane they grind and being for the most part heavily mortgaged to the P. R. R. A., (2) F. S. A. development of several projects in which the lands were purchased and divided among the growers with the F. S. A. taking mortgages on the land, and (3) the Federal land bank through the Intermediate Credit Bank, the Bank for Cooperatives, the Production Credit Corporation, the Emergency Crops and Seed Loan Agency, has loaned millions of dollars to sugarcane farmers in Puerto Rico for the purchase of land, seed, and cultivation expenses; and

Whereas the Government of Puerto Rico, through the land authority, is carrying on several programs connected with the operation of sugar lands for the benefit of workers; and

Whereas unless the present conditions of the industry are corrected the financial structure of all the above-mentioned enterprises and programs are bound to crumble with the consequent misery to countless thousands of small farmers and workers and their families, and the loss to the Federal Government of millions of dollars of taxpayers' moneys; and

Whereas while the Puerto Rican sugar industry is on the verge of a complete collapse, the sugar industries of Cuba and Santo Domingo, foreign countries, are thriving in an era of expansion and prosperity largely due to concessions, grants, and prerogatives granted them; and

Whereas Puerto Rico as part of the United States is naturally influenced, and has a right to aspire to a standard of living for its people in accordance with American standards prevalent in the United States; and

Whereas price ceiling for all farm products in the continental United States have been fixed, maintained, and adjusted taking into consideration the cost of production plus a reasonable margin for the farmer; and

Whereas the adjustments in prices of commodities that the island buys have been adjusted upward from time to time and sugar prices have been maintained at fixed levels with the effect of reducing Puerto Rico's purchasing power; and

Whereas it is an accepted fact by all in Puerto Rico that if the sugar industry is to continue to exist, it is essential that labor receive a just wage in accordance with the cost of living, that the colonos receive a just and equitable price for their sugar cane sufficient to meet costs of production and leave a reasonable return on the capital invested, that the mills must be able to operate under similar conditions, that the maximum of balance is necessary for the proper functioning of the industry as a whole, and that adequate capital reserves should be created to meet contingencies for market fluctuations, weather conditions, disaster, etc.; and

Whereas irrespective of certain local actions of the insular government which have impeded the functioning of the sugar industry; its stability, progress, and development have been seriously disturbed by actions of Federal Government agencies and commissions which have increased the cost of production far in excess of the value of the product and therefore to a large extent have brought about a reduction in the production of sugar in Puerto Rico, as well as the present disastrous condition in the industry; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration on January 3, 1942, by the issuance of Maximum Price Schedule No. 16—Raw Cane Sugar, set a ceiling price of 3.74 cents a pound for raw sugar, duty paid basis, which ceiling price continues to be in effect as of the present time and therefore limits the price which the grower of sugarcane in Puerto Rico can receive for his cane and the price that the mill can receive for its raw sugar; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has not been able to hold the line on the prices of the items that the sugarcane growers and sugar mills must buy for the operation of their business as it has on the price of raw sugar, the increases in the prices of fertilizer over the levels prevailing at the time the present ceiling price was set alone amounting to approximately 30 cents per ton of cane; and

Whereas Federal agencies, such as the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, controlling shipping and ocean freight rates, on January 3, February 17, and March 30, 1942, after the present ceiling price was set on raw sugar, raised the ocean freight rate on raw sugar shipped from Puerto Rico from 20 to 35 cents per 100 pounds; only 7 cents of this 15-cent increase having been absorbed by Federal agencies; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administration provided for substantial increases in wage rates to sugarcane labor above the rates established pursuant to the sliding-scale arrangement contained in the local collective-bargaining agreement between the sugarcane growers and labor at the ceiling price of 3.74 cents a pound, these increases being made to compensate labor for the higher cost of living resulting from rising prices and being of such an extent that the labor cost in growing sugarcane has been raised $1.66 per ton of cane since 1942; and

Whereas, the War Food Administration in its determinations of farming practices with which sugar can growers must comply to be eligible for payments under the Sugar Act of 1937 has required such growers in Puerto Rico to plant from 7 to 20 percent of their sugar cane acreage in food crops, an interpretation of the powers granted in the act that never was intended by legislators, and the growth of these crops has caused increases in cost in 1943 and 1944 amounting to approximately 10 cents per ton of cane grown, such losses not being entailed at the time the present ceiling price was set; and

Whereas, the Navy Department through the Commandant of the Tenth Naval District, by an order issued around the middle of March 1942, closed all of the ports of Puerto Rico except San Juan, Guañica, Jobos, Mayaguez, and Ponce as a security measure, thereby forcing the sugar industry to ship much of its sugar from one of the closed ports to one of those remaining open and increasing the expenses of shipping and selling sugar and thereby reducing the income of the sugarcane growers from the level when the 3.74-cent ceiling price was originally set; and

Whereas, the Government of the United States, through the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission, reached an arrangement with the Government of the United Kingdom that had the effect of withholding fertilizer from sugarcane growers in Puerto Rico, even that fertilizer on hand in the island, so that the combined effects of the lack of fertilization and the drought, conditions that had a much more detrimental effect than they would have had if there had been fertilizer and the cane had got off to its usual vigorous start, and reduced the island's sugar crop from 1,148,000 tons in 1942 and 1,039,000 tons in 1943 to a low of about 725,000 tons in 1944; and

Whereas the increase in the cost of producing sugar and marketing it resulting principally from these actions amounts to 1.2 cents a pound of which only .07 cents of the excess ocean freight and .04 cents of the excess intra-island shipping expenses having been absorbed by Federal agencies, leaving an increase of 1.1 cents a pound to be borne by the industry or nearly 30 percent over the total market value of the product; and

Whereas as a result of these cost increases and fixed prices, both the growing and processing branches of the industry, as a whole, are sustaining substantial losses; and

Whereas appeals have been made to the Office of Price Administration for adjustments in the ceiling price on raw sugar without avail; and

Whereas in the negotiation with Commodity Credit Corporation for the sale of the 1944 Puerto Rico sugar crop, assistance was asked by the industry and treatment in line with that accorded to other areas by the same agency was requested and was denied on the grounds that Commodity Credit Corporation could not cushion for the industry the impacts of war conditions; and

Whereas it seems that the industry has exhausted the administrative possibilities for relief from the burdensome conditions that are rapidly bankrupting it: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Puerto Rico Farmers Association, meeting in general assembly in San Juan, P. R., May 21, 1944, That Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ and Hon. JASPER C. BELL, as chairman of the subcommittee of the United States Congress appointed to study economic and social conditions in Puerto Rico, be requested, to make a thorough investigation of the facts recited herein to ascertain the reasons for discriminatory treatment to Puerto Rico on the part of Federal agencies and to recommend that due action be taken which will protect the backbone of the island's economy and preserve the large-scale employment and wages that the industry has provided in the past.

I certify that the above is a true copy of the resolution approved unanimously at the general convention of the Puerto Rico Farmers' Association held at San Juan, Puerto Rico, on May 21, 1944.

MIGUEL MARTORELL,
President.
VICTOR FUSTÉ,
Secretary of the Assembly.

Address of Rupert Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Rupert Hughes delivered on May 20, 1944:

There is intense suspense while we wait for the invasion news to break, but the home front resembles a civil war and mutual denunciations are filling the air as if the D-

day of election were at hand, though the rehearsals of the nominating conventions are still some weeks away.

For many years now certain factions have been telling us in no uncertain terms that anybody who runs a business and pays salaries or wages to anybody else is a public enemy, and a dangerous criminal who must be heavily shackled if allowed at large at all. The bigger his business and the more men he employs, the more vicious and untrustworthy he is. Freedom of spech belonged to all but the employer He could not even indulge in repartee. He must himself finance open rebellion against his business and his business judgment.

To plead with his employees not to take steps against their own interests and not to endanger the very existence of their jobs—that privilege was denied him.

Then last week a court decided that an employer who criticized certain elements trying to take over and conscript his own employees was not necessarily in contempt of court. A judge actually ruled that an employer might still be an American citizen and talk frankly to his employees without going to jail—provided he did not seem to intimidate or threaten.

Granting employers a certain modicum of free speech is not the only boon conferred on them lately. A judge has actually apologized to businessmen for unjust slander heaped on them.

In Denver this week, United States District Judge Symes actually threw a case against employers out of court and rebuked the Government for branding as conspirators and criminals a group of 10 meat-packing concerns and 22 individuals, though none of them had broken any law or done anybody any harm or violated in any respect the Anti-trust Act.

In his dismissal, Judge Symes expressed his regret that the men and firms accused had been driven to years of delay at great expense to save themselves. In his own words, they were "branded as criminals, and we cannot now fully restore their good names."

After this judicial protest, the assistant to the United States Attorney General said he agreed whole-heartedly with the judge's criticism and was withdrawing the charges.

But the harm has been done, the smear still sticks to the innocent victims, and they can, as we say, pocket their losses and thank heaven they were not added to a jail sentence.

We have gone a long way from the harsh old times when employers had all the rights and employees had none. Hours and conditions were cruel and the wage slaves were at the mercy of their employers. The pendulum swung slowly for a century almost to the opposite extreme, and now wage slaves are wage masters and employers have few rights.

The pendulum seems to be dropping back toward the center where both sides have rights and work together in harmony. But, alas, a pendulum never rests at the center. It seems to be a law of nature and of human nature that mankind forever rushes from extreme to extreme. Everything pendulates. If the pendulum sticks at the center, the clock also stops.

The ideal thing would be to narrow the pendulations, avoid a swing too far either to the right or to the left. But there is an inevitable tug-of-war between the wage payer and the wage receivers. It is human nature for each to strive to get the better of the other. Yet it should be a friendly contest, not a life-and-death struggle, for worker and manager cannot exist without each other.

People have always been fighting and dying for words and slogans and imaginary inherited mottoes without really understanding of caring much about meanings. Thus the words "capital" and "capitalist" have taken on a false color from an association with wealth ill gotten, by oppression of the poor. But that is not their true scientific and practical meaning.

The American Economic Foundation is trying to reduce things and ideas to their simplest and most real meanings in simple and direct words. Clouds and fogs are shapeless and bewildering. Condense them to rain drops and they are clear, understandable, and life saving. So, in a scientific view of human life, capital means nothing but tools, things to make things with, things that may be exchanged for other things made with other tools. Thereby the man with leather and a knife and needles can make enough shoes to trade some of them with the man who has flour and an oven and can make more bread than his family needs. So the shoemaker does not have to eat leather and the baker does not have to go barefoot.

Tools are capital, and the man who owns them and uses them or rents them is a capitalist. That is all there is to it. But almost nobody understands it or acts on it.

Furthermore, as the American Economic Foundation makes plain, the man we call employer is really only a middleman, an agent, go-between between the worker and the customer. The customer is the real employer and sets the wage scale and the volume of sales. If there are no customers or few, the so-called employer is as much out of luck and out of a job as the wage earner with nobody to pay his wages.

If the worker or the agent puts the price beyond the reach or the whim of the customer, there is no sale, the so-called employer gets no rent for his tools, or capital, and the worker gets nothing for his toil. Most important of all, and therefore most ignored of all, the workers are themselves customers. We are all customers of one another, employers of one another. Unless we cooperate and keep the markets humming, we all suffer. It is not merely a matter of cutting off our noses to spite our faces; it is cutting off our hands to starve our teeth.

The great railroad magnate is the hireling of the people who pay their pennies to ride in his cars. If the fare is too high, he goes "broke" and they go afoot, but not very far or fast.

Wisdom and experience proclaim that we are all customers, and so we are all employers and can harm others only by wrecking ourselves. Ambition, ingenuity, assiduity, courage, and freedom of thought and debate will always be necessary if progress is made. The inventor and the adventurer and the explorer must be free, or the pendulum swings the proudest and most prosperous nation back into poverty and impotence.

It was never so important as now that we should recognize the true truth about the people we call employers and grant them freedom and encouragement to speak their minds and use their wits for our sakes as well as their own. For we are drawing nearer and nearer to the most critical peace that ever followed a war. The plants will close or try to shift their products with the release of millions of workers at the same time when millions are released from the armed forces.

It will be all too easy to find labor free—all too free. But it will not be easy to find capital. We owe a vast part of our conquest of this continent and of our leading place in the industrial world to the courage of what is called venture capital and to the ingenuity of it. But adventurers will not risk all without hope of profit and venture capital will not venture forth if it is promised only its own destruction and enslavement for its reward.

Bitter feelings have been aroused and will continue bitter because of another lost battle against the Constitution. That was the matter of the poll tax. Its defeat is another victory for the restoration of State rights. In the early days of our Republic there were many restrictions on the ballot. Certain property requirements were made in all the States. In many States officeholders had to belong to a State church. It was not till about 1836 that anything approaching a universal white suffrage was attained. In a few States this was long delayed.

For nearly a hundred years women appealed for the ballot, but did not gain it till nearly 80 years after a constitutional amendment gave the franchise to the Negroes with the end of slavery.

The proper way to remove the poll tax is by amendment or by action within the State, not by congressional vote. You cannot build liberty by destroying its safeguards. The latest attempt to force the Senate into this illegal deed was defeated by the determination of its opponents to talk it to death, by filibuster, which could be prevented only by a vote to limit debate by what they call cloture.

The cloture bill would have required a two-thirds majority to pass, and it barely reached a one-third minority.

In these lively preconvention battles each party will inevitably try to shift the blame for everything evil to the other party and claim for itself all the good. The leftists, whose chief endeavor is to spread discord while howling for unity, their brand of unity, naturally shout that the Republicans are to blame for the defeat of the anti-poll-tax bill, yet more Republicans voted for it than against it, and more Democrats voted against it than for it.

It is reassuring to read that steps will now be taken to attack the poll tax legitimately by constitutional amendment. It would have been a quicker way than the long, vain, and improper effort to persuade Congress to step in where it has no right to tread.

Meanwhile, Congress continues to refuse to call out of committee the equal rights amendment granting women the equality they have earned by inherent human rights and by their magnificent work in every field of the war effort.

The poll tax affects only the Negro voters in a handful of States. The failure to submit the equal rights amendment to the Nation affects every woman voter, Negro or white, in the whole Nation—that is to say, more than half the voters of the whole country. Yet, strangely enough, the leftists and extremists, who are shrieking to high heaven for the repeal of the poll tax, are opposed to removing from women the last legal inequality under which they suffer.

Speaking of women and their amazing emergence into practically equal rights with men to every hard and dangerous task in the war, I have been bowled over by certain very recent items in the so-called society columns—the ones devoted to brides and bridegrooms.

None of the front-page banners concerning the war has given me such a start and such a pop-eye of amazement as one smallish headline over a brief item in a New York paper last week.

Take a firm grip on your chair and don't sue N. B. C. if you fall out of it. I actually read in a reputable newspaper this incredible line: "Marine officer is a bride."

That's right. You heard it the first time; but for the benefit of anyone who may have come in late or tuned in by mistake—that's the only way I get any listeners—I repeat. I read in the paper this line:

"Marine officer is a bride."

We used to say of a tall story too tall to be believed: "Tell it to the marines." Of late the marines have been telling us how tough they are, and proving it. But really now, for a marine to become a bride.

And of all things, the marine officer is named "Georgette."

Oh, wait a minute. I've just read on and I find that the bride is a member of the

Marine Corps Women's Reserves. My apologies to her and my congratulations to the major in the Marine Air Corps who won her.

On the same page is a picture of a handsome lady who is a lieutenant commander in the WAVES, and she is marrying a mere captain in the Army.

The Army has its scandal, too, and furnishes this dumfounding dispatch from Algiers:

"Colonel weds a colonel in Army bridal."

The story goes on: "Two lieutenant colonels of the United States Army were married today in a colorful ceremony. The bride was Lt. Col. Bernice M. Wilbur, director of nurses in the Mediterranean theater, and the bridegroom was Lt. Col. Stewart F. Alexander, chief of chemical warfare medicine."

Here is a picture of a nurse at the battle front laughingly washing her underclothes in her helmet. Here is the story of a shattered soldier having his wounds dressed by a nurse and seeing Japanese bombers coming over. He begs the girl to dive for a foxhole but she goes on calmly with her bandaging while the shells crash.

This sort of thing indicates a revolution far more profound and lasting than any that is likely to come from the mad chaos of this war. In our Revolutionary War tough old Molly Pitcher won immortality by loading a cannon, and there were a few women who passed for a while as soldiers till they were discovered by being wounded.

Today we read without a tremor, "Colonel Marries Colonel" and "Marine Is a Bride." The armed forces are screaming for more women to come out of the homes and help them fight. The factories are wailing for women to come to the machines.

But the equal-rights amendment languishes in committee because we must protect the weaker sex. At that we may be doing it, for in shackling women we are protecting, and confessing ourselves, the weaker sex.

Bible Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the June 2, 1944, issue of the Bee, Lawrence, Mass.:

BIBLE SHORTAGE

We appreciate the fact that the Government hasn't attempted to define what publications and what types of books are "important" in issuing regulations for the rationing of paper. We realize that if paper was rationed on the basis of what a few men in Washington considered worth-while reading matter a form of censorship would be created which would be objectionable to everyone.

In general, therefore, we agree that the plan to allot paper on an equal basis to publishers of all kinds, regardless of text matter, is the safest method. But even a good rule must have exceptions, as was proved to us by a recent story about a shortage of Bibles.

The demand for Bibles has been reaching new records since the war started, but because of paper and printing problems the supply has not kept pace with the demand. When we think of all the cheap so-called comic magazines that glut the newsstands, plus the tons of trashy novels which swamp the bookstores, we realize that the paper-rationing rule needs some hasty revision. We don't care how it is done, but we do know that there should be no excuse for people not be able to buy Bibles when they can buy worthless reading matter by the ton.

Good Luck, Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by William Rose Benét:

GOOD LUCK, SOLDIER!

(By William Rose Benét)

To you on the day of invasion,
Written by one not worthy,
Now of your waiting,
Now of your meeting the moment of culmination,
The fiery instant,
The day, the hour, the time of terror and God,
Of the things we can imagine and cannot imagine,
Of the thousand clocks on the tick of the world's destiny,
Turn of the world's history:
In this hour,
Now and forever,
Good luck, Soldier!

To graduates of Howard or of Harvard,
Men from Stanford, V. M. I., Ann Arbor,
City College, Tuskegee, Sacred Heart,
Groton, The Hill, P. S. Such-and-Such-a-Number:
Boys from no school at all;
The lad from the cold-water flat in West Manhattan,
The Southern sharecropper's or the Okie's son:
To men of every description from Everywhere:
Government Issue, clad in waterproof suits
In the assault-boat: doughboys tensely waiting
For the bows to drop like a drawbridge: guys swarming
Down cargo-nets into the landing-barges,
Spurning the sand on the beach-head, flopping to cover
On the Channel coast at any likely spot;
Facing emplacement, battery, redoubt,
Massive concrete, guns imbedded in hills—
Under smoke screen, aircraft high or low,
Hedge-hopping Mustangs, high-up Flying Forts,
Naval gunfire: these and the paratroopers
Hitting the silk: the air-borne, those in gliders:
Light and heavy platoons with the drifted weapons,
Looking for ground signs, ready to seize the junction,
Corral the airfield: engineers with explosive,
Dodging from shell crater to shell crater,
Wire men, walkie-talkies, radio men,
Bars, Bazookas, Bren-gun carriers,
Flame throwers, mine detectors, those with grenades and torpedoes,
Through the tornado of shells and machine-gun bullets,
The demon shriek and crump,
The ping like piano wire suddenly severed:
Roar and concussion, concussion and roar continuous,
As the advance goes forward, as counter-attack
Gathers, looms, and thunders—
This is not written—
No, it is not writing, not even a scrawl!
You will write it in letters of blood and fire,
In fountains of earth and a canopy of cordite,
In wounds and shock and death—
In that mortal hour
Good luck, Soldier!

You in the battle dress, with Garand and carbine,
With axe and garrote of the scout, feeling the land,
Sighting along the azimuth, clinging earth
And your other mother, Darkness: you in the scrabbled foxhole,
Behind brush, in the slit trench, under barrage,
Flattened by the bombardment, creeping, crawling,
Worming forward, getting beneath the wire:
You in the tank attack, under the eighty-eights,
Stunned; on fire and bloody; twisting the tourniquet,
Finding the sulfa drugs, inching on digging elbows
Back through the din, teeth clinched, lips bitten,
In the flare and the black, between the black and the flare—
Good luck, Soldier!

It came. It was met. The threat, the inconceivable
Unfolding of their huge elaborate scheme
That seemed a dream at first, something we scoffed
Till that was aloft which blotted out the sun,
Afoot which shook a continent,
Done which stunned.
For the earth sprang suddenly armed, and we
Who thought to be free, tasted terror and pain,
Felt iron rain—who now, by land and sea,
Bring them their war again.
That is why. And because mankind
Was deaf and dumb and blind,
Not caring how close we all are bound, how men
May never pass by on the other side again;
How the world is knit, the whole world, however wide
The distance seem.
Soldier, our G. I. Joe,
Now, if you dream
In barrack or tent the old familiar thing:
The leggy colt in the pasture; the path through the wood to the spring;
The girl under apple blossoms; the screen door flapping
To the fragrant kitchen; the old dog twitching and napping
On the scuffed steps; the slack mule leaning
Black at the skyline furrow on a sun-red sky—
All the simple things of home that once had meaning,
Seeming completely to go
On this hurricane that still is shrieking by—
Why, in spite of danger, death, or doom,
They are the things you go to bring to bloom
Now, everywhere on earth: Man's simple right,
To know his home and loved ones safe at night,
To sleep at night by his helpmate's side
In peace, to know his children and his dear
Free from such mortal fear
As grips all Europe, in blood of Asia dyed
And shuddering to its core:
The creed of the sword, the red morass of war.
So this is written for you
By one unworthy, but the words are true.

Now, on the tick of the watch, as the sands fall,
Forward in multitude you go for all
Our hope, our faith, our fixed and furious will;
Therefore, with all the human love they coldly thought to kill,
Good luck, Soldier.

A Trainee of W. T. S.–C. A. C. Program Explains in Detail How the A. A. F. Failed to Keep Their Word and Double-Crossed Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reply to testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee from a former C. P. T.–W. T. S. trainee:

The writer is an authority on neither military affairs nor aviation, but he does possess one very important qualification for commenting upon this testimony: He was a trainee of the C. A. A. war training service from November 15, 1942 until January 16, 1944. He participated in four of the W. T. S. courses and knew intimately a great many of the other trainees with whom he flew, lived, and received military training at seven different posts and colleges. As an intelligent observer with 8 years of college and university training, three university degrees, and a college teacher's background, he gathered a fairly comprehensive idea of the caliber of W. T. S. men and the general outlines of the W. T. S. program. For these reasons he feels prepared to point out some very fundamental errors and misunderstandings relative to the hearing.

MEASURING UP TO AIR FORCE STANDARDS

A great deal was said at the hearing about the alleged failure of the W. T. S. trainees and instructors to measure up to Army standards. We wonder just how and where, specifically, they fell short.

Was it physically? Then reflect that every one of these 4,687 W. T. S. men had passed their Army 64 physical examination shortly after being inducted. And every one of the C. A. A. instructors had met the rigid physical requirements for the commercial license and instructor's rating. (It is true that very minor physical defects existed among some of the men who first entered the C. A. A., war training service program. But these men were eliminated from further training at the time of their activation and these men are not among the 4,687 or the instructors.) Now, if these pilots have passed the identical examination given flying cadets of the A. A. F. or if they have met the C. A. A. instructor's physical standards, it can hardly be physical qualifications to which the testimony referred.

Was it mental? It was not idle thinking that prompted Major Booth, commanding officer of the Twenty-third Training Group of Jefferson Barracks to address a thousand of these W. T. S. men as "the most intelligent and best educated" group of men ever sent to that post for training. Major Booth knew something of our original C. A. A. screening examination scores, our Army general classification test scores, our Army mechanical aptitude test scores, the grades that we made during a thousand hours of W. T. S. ground schooling, and our scores on other Army and C. A. A. examinations. If the 201 files of these men could be consulted they would disclose a surprising number of men who had been lawyers, teachers, students in professional schools, and owners of successful businesses in civilian life. Compare their annual earnings in civilian life with the Army average. Far from being an inferior group they will be found exceptionally qualified mentally. Finally consult such Army Air Forces officials as Lt. Col. Robert D. Moser (3321 Old Dominion Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.), as to his opinion of the W. T. S. men. Colonel Moser interviewed and studied the records of hundreds of us at Keesler Field in September and October, 1943. His opinion would throw considerable light upon any question as to our mental capacity. Now that leaves the matter of age to be considered.

Was it our age? We had the misfortune of being born prior to 1917, those 3,713 of us who could not transfer to Aviation Cadets Training. The instructors are pretty largely over cadet age limits also. But, since the proposed WASP program will take married women with young children, mothers who are as old as 38, we fail to see why our age should discriminate against us. None of us is beyond that age. That leaves but one category to be considered:

Was it our flying ability? And at this point it is necessary to clear up a matter that is generally and completely confused. No one is proposing that either these former W. T. S. trainees who were cut off in the various—but generally advanced—stages of their training, or these thousands of instructors—for all their hundreds of hours—be put to ferrying fast and heavy aircraft immediately. But it is proposed that both groups of these men be given just a small fraction of the training that WASPS receive and that they then be checked against Army methods and flying procedures. (Standards is the wrong word. Army and C. A. A. flying do not differ in fundamentals or quality but only in standardized procedures and practices where it differs at all. Let anyone compare the C. A. A. and Army requirements for an instrument rating, for example. They will be found virtually identical Of course, one must not compare the civilian standards of years ago against present-day Army standards. We are speaking of men who learned to fly according to today's C. A. A. rulings and standards, men whom it was supposed from the first would go into Army flying within a few months.)

It is true, of course, that C. A. A. men have flown as a rule the lighter and slower types of aircraft (there are notable exceptions, such as the Beechcraft C–43), but the point is this: Insofar as our courses have taken us, we are flying as ably as any group anywhere, WASPS not excepted. Our safety record will testify to that. Bear in mind that Sam Foss and 700 other men who have been decorated for flying in the armed services "bear the C. A. A. brand on them in some way or another."

If, then, it is our flying ability that is questioned, keep clearly in mind that we are not completely trained. Many of us could fly many of the Army's planes with complete satisfaction to all at once but we make no pretense of being able to handle the most advanced trainers and fighters and bombers without additional instruction. But give us just the final 20 percent of the training that the WASPS receive, and we will meet every standard that the Army can demand.

Summary: We have failed to find evidence of any lack of physical or mental qualifications on the part of the C. A. A. W. T. S. men. Their age is acceptable by the Army Air Forces. Their flying will be second to none if they are permitted to complete their training with relatively few hours of instruction in Army aircraft by Army instructors. Many are immediately prepared to fly many of the Air Force planes.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AIR FORCES FOR C. A. A. TRAINEES

On page 10 of the report of the hearing, in reply to the question: "You are not responsible for them (the W. T. S. trainees) coming into this training program initially?" the testimony reads: "We were probably indirectly responsible because we announced to the public our need for additional personnel, directly no."

Here is unmistakable inference that the Air Forces had no working agreement with the C. A. A. in this matter. Yet every man among us, when he took the oath of enlistment at the Army recruiting offices, thought that he was entering a jointly sponsored program. Evidently the C. A. A. thought likewise for they wrote in their official publication, the Civil Aeronautics Authority Journal, April 1, 1942, of the new plan for training pilots full time and of its plans being worked out by cooperation between the C. A. A. and the Army Air Forces.

Senator MCCARRAN likewise thought that an agreement existed for he said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 26, 1943, p. 3796):

"The Army called upon the Civil Aeronautics Authority to train a group of men, and, pursuant to the request of the Army, the Civil Aeronautics Authority is now in fact training those who are going into pilot training for the Army. The Authority promised this group of men that when their training was completed they would be given employment."

Senator Lodge had the same understanding of the situation (ibid, p. 3794):

"The Army * * * entered into an agreement with the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the training of service pilots, transport pilots, and glider pilots."

These two Senators were members of the committee which had just received testimony as to the status of W. T. S. trainees, at the time these statements were made. At the same discussion on the floor of the Senate, General Harper, Assistant Chief of Air Staff Training of the Army Air Forces was quoted:

"They (the W. T. S. trainees) have been training under an agreement with the Army Air Forces, so that we receive their product."

We read the documents that we signed when we joined up for this training. We were not misled. An agreement did exist. But the A. A. F. has apparently repudiated its end of that agreement.

Moreover we were told definitely in the agreements that we signed that, upon successful completion of the courses offered by the C. A. A., we would be either (1) taken over by the Army for further flight training or (2) commissioned by the Army and given flying status, or (3) employed as a flight instructor by the Army and retained on an enlisted reserve basis.

These promises were in black and white. Let C. A. A. forms be consulted in proof thereof. The alternate promise of a commission was stated just as definitely as it is to anyone in the Army Air Forces. These promises were tendered by the C. A. A. We had every reason to believe that they were made in good faith and with full Army cognizance. But the promises were not kept and in view of the proposed expansion of W. A. S. P. training, the excuse "exigencies of war" carries no weight.

Summary: Although the testimony denies direct responsibility of the A. A. F. toward former W. T. S. trainees, the testimony of the official C. A. A. publication, two Senators, and the Assistant Chief of Air Staff Training stands to the contrary. C. A. A. forms will show that the promises made to the men who

enlisted in the W. T. S. program were more than implied.

THE MANPOWER SHORTAGE

The testimony included a great deal about the manpower shortage and the need for putting round pegs into round holes. Now it is presumed that these potential women pilots are not unemployed prior to their enlistment in the WASPS. The type of woman who can free herself sufficiently from home responsibilities to enter military service is probably already working at some reasonably useful work if she possesses any patriotic sentiment whatever. Moreover she can—if she has a mind to—do what is expected of her in a defense factory. (What psychologist would subscribe to the existence of a type of woman who possesses the strength, endurance, coordination, and intelligence to fly Army aircraft but is incapable of doing a simple factory job?) The question becomes then: Shall these women be taken from their present work, put into many long months of training at great expense to the Government, and finally emerge able to do the flying jobs which were promised to thousands of highly qualified men whose training is almost complete? And shall those same men be put into the status of privates in the ground forces and forced to begin some other long course of training which has nothing whatever to do with flying? Where could one find better examples of the use of square pegs in round holes than in such a proposal?

FAVORITISM

It is one thing to be chivalrous; it is another thing to display outright favoritism. These WASP trainees are "professional women," we are told, "like nurses." Are they professional with but 35 hours of flying time? (Let us be realistic. No great number of already-qualified women pilots will be brought to the service by this bill; it is the training aspects of the bill that are important.) Does the Army classify as nurses women who have completed 15 percent of their hospital training?

Those women who do not complete the WASP program of training should be returned to civilian life, we are told. Not since the end of Volunteer Officer's Training School has that sort of generosity been proffered as a policy. If a WAC fails to make the grade in WAC Officer's Candidate School, is she returned to civilian life? By such a policy any girl who finds the training a little too rough for her or who is bored of the routine, needs only to skid a few turns and overshoot a few landings and she will be en route to her civilian status. The recent WASP publicity such as the movie, Ladies Courageous, and the article in the March issue of the Ladies Home Journal is calculated to bring that very "fly-by night," glamour-seeking, just-out-of-high-school type of child into the WASP training program.

CONCLUSION

The complete story of the W. T. S. program is long and complex but the essential facts are these:

1. The C. A. A. trainees and instructors are a highly qualified group of men, physically and mentally.

2. The average age of these men is well below that of the top limit for women pilots and only a few years above that for combat pilots.

3. The training of these men is well advanced and could be completed with a small fraction of the time and expense required to train sufficient women pilots.

4. The Army Air Forces has a responsibility toward the men who enlisted, sacrificed, and were dropped from training through no fault of their own.

5. The proposal to fill with women who are as yet untrained the jobs which were promised these men from their day of enlistment would be a grossly inefficient utilization of manpower.

6. The WASP program, smacking of favoritism, extra concessions and glamor, is utterly unfair to the taxpayers because it forces them to pay for training that has already been paid for and delivered but never utilized.

7. Former C. A. A. W. T. S. trainees and instructors should have their present flying skill carefully and fairly assessed, their training should be continued by the Army from that point, and each man should be utilized in the various noncombatant flying duties just as quickly as he qualifies for a given type of flying assignment.

A Year of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a copy of a speech entitled "A Year of Decision" made by my colleague the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois. This talk was delivered last night at the Mayflower Hotel at a banquet tendered Congressman DIRKSEN by many of his colleagues of the House in recognition of his outstanding ability and service to his Nation over the 12 years that he has been a Member of the House of Representatives. I place this speech in the RECORD so that those who were not privileged to hear this splendid talk will have the opportunity to read it:

My colleagues and friends, this is both a happy and a solemn occasion.

It is solemn because since early morning we have taken account of what is happening on the invasion front and the progress of young Americans far afield who are moving in the direction of victory.

Grim as the thought may be, we cannot escape the feeling that these are the last days on earth for many young men.

In the deathless language of Colonel McCrae who left for us the touching and poetic legacy of Flanders' Fields, we think of young soldiers who were nurtured and suckled on the bosom of this Republic as living, throbbing vital young men who short days ago, lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved, and were loved, and now they are engaged in grim and undramatic business to which they freely give their all.

Where they are on the battle front is but an extension of the home front where we are.

We cannot ponder their absence today on a mission of victory and freedom without breathing a gracious prayer that they may manfully endure the hard tasks which lie ahead.

We cannot ponder their absence today without experiencing a new burst of faith, a new hope for the future of this world, and a new reverence for the obligations which are ours on the home front.

It is for us to invest the victory that they will soon achieve with a durable purpose by a complete and moral worthiness for the sacrifices which they now make.

Let there be devotion and humility in our hearts this day.

II

This is also a happy occasion. I could not be other than humble by the fellowship which is so abundant here because it reaches to the heart.

I am so grateful for that measure of esteem and good will on your part which months ago, prompted you to urge me to seek some recognition on our Republican national ticket.

Perhaps it is not immodest to hope and believe that you were moved by the conviction that one who has served for substantial period in the Congress and who may have developed some familiarity with the highways and byways of a complex and sensitive government structure, might add strength to the Republican cause in the days ahead and because of your action, I felt an obligation to make a campaign and visit in many sections of our blessed land.

There has been opportunity to journey into more than one-half of the States of the Union, and I can report to you that it has been an enriching and stimulating adventure.

It gave me a chance to visit with your people back home and to give them an appraisal of the diligence, the earnestness and the loyalty which you have brought to your task and to the problems with which we have wrestled.

It supplied a chance to audit the thoughts, the hopes, and the reflections of your people and to find inspiration in the resolve and quiet courage with which they keep the vigil on the home front.

It offered an opportunity to see and to find new hope in the incredible genius and versatility of this Republic.

Above all else, it afforded a chance to enjoy a rich fellowship with Americans everywhere who in their hearts and souls still keep step with the music of the Union. Many of them were the fathers and mothers of young men who are this very da landing upon the shores of the Old World to combat the brutal idea that might makes right and to restore peace, serenity, good living, and sweetness to a world which for a generation has been steeped in bitterness and unrest.

What an adventure of the spirit that really was, for in them one finds no dreamy despair nor the dross of defeatism.

The refining fires of war have burned away whatever of dross there might have been and left only a quiet resolve that calls for audacious action, for victory, for the crown of peace, for a new spirit of amity in the world, and for a maintenance of that freedom for which young men are this day being bruised in body and mind.

Truly, my colleagues and friends, there was about all this a majestic adventure like the stars whispering to the soul, and to you, who made it possible, I shall be ever grateful.

III

Let us go back to these good people in every section of the land.

What do they say and for what do they hope in the days ahead.

In their questions, one could easily trace a common pattern which is a gracious testimony to the fact that to know our country, we must look into the common heart.

When will the war end?

When will peace come?

When will our boys come back?

It's not just, When will the boys come back?

It's when will our boys come back? In that one pronoun, you see the kinship of Main Street to the struggle which engrosses the attention of the whole world.

Will we achieve a peace this time which will have a chance to endure?

What are they fighting for and when its over, what will be the effect upon our future.

These are the thoughts and hopes with which we must deal as we prepare to make a bid for the trusteeship of power for the next 4 years.

It should suggest to us that the spirit in which we seek responsibility and power is everything.

It suggests that as we frame policies and select leaders, that we be moved by a constant courage which is worthy of the millions of young Americans who are this day on freedom's frontier.

It suggests that the danger and jeopardy to which they are exposed shall have a value and that if the way to the stars is hard, let us go the hard way if it is right.

It suggests that the course which we chart for the future can become a pin-up charter in every American heart.

IV

But let's go back to these good people in all parts of the land who think, who hope, who ask questions, and whose hearts are prayerfully attuned to the undramatic business now at hand.

"When will our boys come home?" they ask.

That blessed day will come.

A telegram or telephone call will one day announce to a proud father and anxious mother that a soldier son is back in the land of his birth and soon he will be home.

What preparations there will be to give him a welcome that befits a hero and what anxious hours and days must be endured until familiar steps upon the stoop will unmistakably declare that he surely is back home.

Then the joys of homecoming will be complete.

A mother in the hard and vigorous embrace of a soldier son. A son encircled by the loving arms of a mother who day in and day out prayed for his safe return but also that he manfully perform the tasks that were assigned by the cause of freedom.

What a recital it will be. What adventures he experienced from the day he enlisted or was inducted until that glad day when a deafening stillness was heard round the world and peace had returned to assuage the long and engulfing and costly bitterness which afflicted mankind.

With drama and gesture, he will tell where he was and what he did.

Then, of course, comes the inevitable $64 question. What's been going on back home while I was gone?

Then comes the time for us on the home front to give an accounting of our stewardship.

V

It is the key to the real issue before us and it can be phrased in the form of a question: "What will he find over here when it's over over there."

From the statements and speeches which one encounters from time to time that unity and morale are in issue. They are not issues. They are duties which every American gladly embraces. Morale is the spiritual reserve upon which we must draw as the casualty lists throw their lengthening shadows upon the land.

It will be said and is being said that victory is the issue. It is a bit strange that such an issue should even be suggested because victory is the grim unfinished business of the whole Nation.

It is said that peace and cooperation are in issue. How can there be an issue in the great spiritual hope which moves every thinking person to seek a workable pattern which carries with it the assurance that peace will have a full and fair opportunity to endure and that young men will not again be bruised and broken upon the altar of war.

All these are not issues. They are tasks for the task force on the home front.

The real issue will be "What will he find over here when it's over over there?"

Will the hopes and prayers which are uttered in the fox holes on the battle front be rendered into ashes by the ideologies and policies which come from the fox holes in the home front?

Will the American system which rests upon the morals of individualism become the victim of a pious collectivism and will freedom be just a word or a way of life?

When we find the answer to that question we shall know whether victory had a durable purpose.

VI

Conflict today is in the realm of ideas as much as in the field of parties and personalities.

You who have labored so long and so earnestly in the national scene and have had a chance to see and to assess the forces which are at work are fully familiar with the fact that collectivism is on the march. It is more than a mere footnote to economic discussion. It is no longer hearsay but accepted gospel in high places.

More and more we see the effort to chain the individual and individual rights to collective and group action, and when it becomes complete, what happens to freedom and the moral basis of the American system.

Collectivism in which the individual is considered as but a part of the mass or group is but another name for totalitarianism and if that should be the destiny of our Nation, what a mass frustration we would see in days to come as bewildered young men, inspired by the pride which will be justly theirs for having achieved victory, peace, and freedom for other peoples of the earth, should find that freedom forclosed at home.

In the record of the immediate past one may easily read the march of collectivism, control, and management by Government and one may also read the tragic impairment of those institutions which have always been regarded as the safeguards of freedom and it will be none too reassuring as we re-echo the question, "What will they find over here when it's over over there?"

VII

That record needs but brief highlighting on this occasion because it is so familiar to you all.

People have been rendered dependent and submissive.

The Constitution gets rough treatment and much lip service.

The Price Control Act bears living witness to the fact that the jurisdiction of the courts has been destroyed to achieve an economic purpose and the amazing thing is that many groups clamor for the continuation of this destruction of the power of the courts.

Amazing interpretations of the commerce clause are gradually reducing the States to the obscurity of governing units and after a while the very grass roots of democracy will have been destroyed.

The independence of Congress has been assailed from time to time and it remained for no less a personage than the majority leader of the Senate to state with vehemence and vigor upon the Senate floor that the veto message of February 22, 1944, was "A calculated and deliberate assault upon the integrity of every Member of the Congress."

Blank checks and broad Executive powers are envisioned as the very hope of our economic future, and we see such distinguished men as Dr. Alvin Hansen, adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, prophesying that Congress will surrender its power to tax and to direct the spending of public funds and that most if not all of the present extraordinary powers will be retained by the Executive.

The gospel of defeatism, maturity, and despair is being preached in high places and is being used to condition the people for that day when all social and economic decisions are made by Government.

More and more power has been lodged in administrative hands, and today we see a steady flood of directives and decisions, some of which are capricious and arbitrary, and which carry us further and further along the road of total action.

Thousands of men and women are manning the propaganda mill of the Federal Government today, issuing releases, speeches, lectures, movies, and radio scripts to make control and management palatable.

Nearly 3,000,000 men and women, more than 80 percent of whom are scattered throughout the 48 States bear witness to the growth of bureaus, boards and commissions.

Here are but some of the weapons which have been steadily forged in the fires of a collective philosophy and as he appraises their potency and the determination of those who would force a collective way of life upon the land, he can but re-echo what has been asked countless times, "what will they find over here when it's over over there."

VIII

Sometime ago, Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, wrote an article which was widely publicized and which bore this challenging title "America Is Being Made Over—And We Won't Like It."

We know the American system is being made over and we won't like it.

It is being recast in the image of what in 1935, Dr. Rexford Tugwell called disciplined democracy.

Control is the essence of discipline.

When people learn to dislike it enough, the soul will stir and then we must again go through the agony of recapturing freedom no matter what the price.

The spread of collectivism can be arrested and we can again return to the high road of freedom and individualism at the end of which there lies the greater glory of this Republic.

It is for the people to make that determination. They shall have a chance on November 7, 1944.

That will be a day and this is a year of decision.

IX

Now permit a personal word.

At your suggestion, I made myself available for such national service as the party might determine.

If in the wisdom of the party leaders, they see fit to accord me the honor of a place on the national ticket, I can only say that I shall bend what light I have to the task of converting a growing hope into a victory.

If it be otherwise, I shall still have found a rich and abiding reward in the service which the people have privileged me to render and in such further service as they shall command in the days to come.

X

In this solemn moment could we do better than out of humble and contrite hearts offer not one prayer but two. Let our first prayer be for them and may it give them strength to manufully pursue that grim task that destiny has assigned. Let our second prayer be that when they return from over there, they will find us practicing the very freedom and justice for which they fight.

Business Failures in 1943 Decline to 21 Percent of 50-Year Average, Lowest on Record—Liabilities to 16 Percent—Small Businesses Show Substantial Progress

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, business failures via the bankruptcy route in 1943

were not only the lowest on record in the past 50 years but were 21 percent of the average for this half century. Liabilities were also the lowest in this same period and but 16 percent of the average. In 1944, for the first 4 months, the number of failures are even less, being 26.7 percent of last year, while liabilities are running at the rate this year of 39 percent below 1943. These figures prove the high financial condition of business in general and small business in particular.

The total number of failures in 1943 were only 3,221 while the commercial and industrial liabilities were but $45,339,000, according to Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., noted authority on such facts. These failures include manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, construction and commercial service and are an accurate cross-section from large to small businesses. As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, I consider this data of vital importance.

For the first 4 months of 1944, the total number of failures are just a fraction over any one month of last year numbering 479, whereas in the same period in 1943 they were 1,652. With respect to liabilities the total loss in 1943 for 4 months was $22,465,000 as compared with only $8,800,000 for the same 4 months of this year.

From these figures it is apparent that business as a whole is in a most prosperous condition. This is emphasized by the fact that from 1894 to 1943, inclusive, failures in the 5 groups of businesses averaged 15,190 per year compared with 3,221 in 1943. On the other hand, liabilities in the same 50 years averaged $284,880,000 per year, yet in 1943 they were reduced to $45,339,000. Thus the number of failures last year were but 21 percent of the 50-year average, and liabilities only 16 percent in comparison.

SMALL-BUSINESS FAILURES 26 PERCENT UNDER 10-YEAR AVERAGE

A break-down of the failures and liabilities of each of the five classifications is only available for the past 10 years, or from 1934 to 1943, inclusive. The retail trade and commercial service groups of businesses afford the most striking evidence that "little business" has not suffered through failures.

In the 10 years, the total number of retail merchants of all types who failed numbered 67,249, giving them a 10-year average of 6,725. In 1943, the failures among every type of retail merchant were 1,761, or but 26.2 percent of the 10-year average.

The liabilities of these failures over the period of 10 years were $599,011,000, which means an average per year of $59,901,100. The 1943 liability loss for retail merchants was $12,722,000 or but 21.2 percent in comparison with the 10-year average.

The next smallest type of business activity is the commercial service trades. These represent dry cleaning, laundries, barbers, and so forth. The total number of failures in this classification in 10 years was 5,531 and an average for each year of 553. In 1943 the failures were but 237, or a percentage of 43 of the 10-year average.

With respect to liabilities the total was $152,476,000 for 10 years, giving an average of $15,247,600 per year, whereas in 1943, they were $4,995,000. Thus liability losses were only 32.7 percent of the last decade. The service trades to a large extent are extremely small concerns and a high rate of failure might be expected yet they have not suffered when failures are so much under the average.

As previously pointed out, the total number of failures the first 4 months of this year was 479. Of these 128 were among manufacturers, 37 were wholesalers, 198 retail merchants, 63 engaged in construction, and 53 representing the commercial-service trade. These total a little more than any one month of last year.

The 1943 decline in number of failures and liability losses would be even less than these figures if it were not for the fact that since 1939 Dun & Bradstreet expanded its system. In addition to bankruptcy court cases it has included voluntary liquidation with recorded loss to creditors. This automatically increased the number of failures and losses through liabilities.

A business failure, as defined by Dun & Bradstreet, occurs when a commercial or industrial enterprise is involved in a court proceeding or a voluntary action which is likely to end in a loss to creditors. Specifically, the Dun & Bradstreet record of failures includes discontinuances following assignment, voluntary or involuntary petition in bankruptcy, attachment, execution, foreclosure, and so forth; voluntary withdrawals from business with known loss to creditors; also enterprises involved in court action, such as receivership, and since June 1934 reorganization, or arrangement, which may or may not lead to discontinuances; as well as businesses making voluntary compromises with creditors out of court.

Prior to 1939, the Dun & Bradstreet explanation says:

> Some branches were not reporting all voluntary discontinuances with loss to creditors or all small concerns forced out of business by attachments, executions, foreclosures, etc., with insufficient assets to cover all claims. Efforts to obtain complete coverage of such cases resulted in the addition of 3,360 failures with liabilities of $14,316,000 to the record for 1939. Two sets of figures for 1939 are presented, the original for comparison with previous years and the revised set comparable with subsequent years. In the calculations and subsequent ones the higher figures for 1939 are taken into consideration.

MANUFACTURER LOSSES 75 PERCENT UNDER AVERAGE

In the manufacturing field the same results are disclosed as to the decrease in number of failures in 1943 as compared with the 10-year average, which also applies to liabilities. The failures in the 10 years were 20,574, with an average of 2,057. This represents 27.5 under the 10-year period. The liabilities totaled $759,193,000, the average yearly loss was $75,918,000 while the decrease is 25.1 percent of the average for 10 years.

There is no exception to this trend of lower failures and liabilities in the wholesale trade due to the improved condition in business. Failures in this industry for 10 years were 10,293, meaning an average of 1,029. The failures in 1943 were 257, or an average of but 25 percent under the 10-year basis. Liabilities were $249,074,000, or $24,907,400 yearly average. The losses in 1943 were $3,108,000, or but 12.5 percent of the average 10-year losses.

In the construction trade in 10 years there were 6,382 failures and a yearly average of 638. This 62.8 percent of the 10-year average, with 1943 failures of 399. With respect to liabilities they were $149,126,000, thus an average per year of $14,912,600. In 1943 the liability loss was $5,455,000, or 36.6 percent under the 10-year average. This industry appears to have suffered most due largely to the fact that construction business declined except for the war effort and urgent housing necessities. All unessential building has been banned for the duration.

In the 10 years, therefore, the total failures for manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, construction, and servicing industries, the failures amounted to 109,131, making the average 10,913 a year. Since there were but 3,221 failures in 1943 the overall percentage shows but 29.5 of all such failures in the entire period of 10 years.

Liabilities over the past 10 years were $1,908,880,000, and the yearly average $190,888,000. The losses through bankruptcy and otherwise were but $45,339,000 in 1943. In other words, losses have decreased to the extent of 23.9 percent in 1943 of the 10-year average.

FIFTY YEARS' COMPARISON

Considering the 50 years' figures, the lowest previous record of failures occurred in 1919, with 6,461. The lowest commercial and industrial liabilities took place in 1899, and totaled $90,881,000. The highest number of failures were in 1932, of 31,822, and the heaviest liabilities were in the same year, consisting of $928,313,000.

As to total 50 years' figures there were 759,517 failures, for an average of 15,190. This compares with only 3,221 in 1943, or 21 percent of the half-century average. Commercial and industrial liability losses in the same 50 years amounted to $14,244,417,000, which represents a yearly average of $284,880,340 and a percentage of 16 percent in 1943 in comparison with $45,339,000 liabilities.

The heaviest failures, both in number and losses, occurred between 1921 and 1933. In these 13 years the number of failures was 302,314, an average of 23,255, or a little less than half of the 50-year period. The liabilities were $7,515,537,000. This provides a yearly average of $578,119,231 and is more than half of the 50-year total of $14,244,417,000. In comparison with 1943 this is only

0.0032 percent. Year by year for these 13 years the figures are as follows:

	Number of failures	Liabilities
1921	19, 652	$627, 401, 000
1922	23, 676	623, 895, 000
1923	18, 718	539, 387, 000
1924	20, 615	543, 226, 000
1925	21, 214	443, 744, 000
1926	21, 773	409, 233, 000
1927	23, 146	520, 105, 000
1928	23, 842	489, 559, 000
1929	22, 909	483, 252, 000
1930	26, 355	668, 282, 000
1931	28, 285	736, 310, 000
1932	31, 822	928, 313, 000
1933	20, 307	502, 330, 000

FAILURES AND LOSSES DECLINE SHARPLY

For the succeeding 11 years since 1933 there has been a steady decrease with a few exceptions and culminating in 1943 with the extremely low number of 3,221 failures and $45,339,000 liability losses. The average of failures for these 11 years was reduced 11,465 and the losses to an average of only $217,945,000.

	Number of failures	Liabilities
1934	12, 091	$333, 959, 000
1935	12, 244	310, 580, 000
1936	9, 607	203, 173, 000
1937	9, 490	183, 253, 000
1938	12, 836	246, 505, 000
1939	11, 408	168, 204, 000
1940	13, 619	166, 684, 000
1941	11, 848	136, 104, 000
1942	9, 445	100, 763, 000
1943	3, 221	45, 339, 000

Failures, Mr. Speaker, represent the state of business of the Nation. It cannot be said, therefore, that business has been injured except where the war effort interfered. Business as a whole has been prosperous as earning statements prove.

It should be remarked here, however, that there have been retirements from business which do not enter into this picture as there are no records of an authentic nature available. The fact that the number of failures and losses in business have declined so perceptibly as these figures show demonstrates beyond question that business, and especially small business, has been going forward instead of backward.

As a consequence creditor losses have been substantially to where last year they amounted to only $871,135 per week whereas when compared with the 50-year average, the losses to creditors were $5,476,539 per week.

The American Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Oscar Johnston, president of the National Cotton Council, at a meeting held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., June 6, 1944.

I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing the article, which is $190.67.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, the National Cotton Council of America appreciates deeply and sincerely your interest in the problems confronting our industry, as manifested by your presence here tonight.

Tonight we hope to outline some of the problems confronting one of the Nation's major industries. We are doing this to the end that we may have the benefit of your advice and your aid in our efforts to solve them. We also want you to know something of the National Cotton Council of America, its composition, its aims, its ideals, its policies, and its methods.

First, let me call your attention to a fact already known to many of you, namely, that the raw cotton industry is one of America's major interests and activities. Cotton is produced in substantial quantities in 18 of our 48 States. It is a major economic factor in 14 of our 48 States. More than two and one-fourth million farm families consisting of between ten and twelve million persons—or more than 8 percent of the citizenship of America—live on cotton farms and depend primarily upon the production of cotton as the major item contributing to their support. Some 40 percent of our population are persons residing upon the farms and dependent upon farm production for a livelihood. Approximately 25 percent of these farm people are producers of cotton. More than 2,000,000 other citizens of the United States make their living from handling, transporting, processing, and merchandising cotton, cottonseed, and its products. Tonight, in using the word "cotton," I shall use it, unless otherwise indicated, in its generic sense as including fiber and seed and the thousands of products manufactured from the fiber and seed. Manufacturing indeed is an important part of the cotton industry in peacetime; more workers are employed in the mills engaged in spinning and otherwise processing raw cotton than are employed in any other single industrial activity in America. As you undoubtedly know, cotton has made a most important contribution to the war effort. I shall not take your time to emphasize this contribution other than to quote from Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, whose statement in substance is that, second alone to metal, cotton is the most important and essential war material.

The raw cotton industry consists of 6 branches: The producers or farmers; the cotton ginners—who operate the 11,000 gins at which the fiber and seed are separated; cotton warehousemen, who concentrate, store, compress, and make cotton ready for the market; cottonseed crushers, who first process and divide the seed into their constituent elements of linters, hulls, meal, and oil; the cotton merchants or shippers, whose function is to merchandise or market cotton fiber; the spinners or textile manufacturers, at whose plants the fiber is initially processed and spun into yarn. These 6 interests make up the raw-cotton industry.

The National Cotton Council of America represents the raw cotton industry as a whole. The council consists of 244 delegate-members. Forty-six represent the producer or farmer interest. Forty-two delegate-members represent each of the ginner, warehousemen, shipper, and crusher interests; and 30 represent the spinner or manufacturing interest.

For administrative purposes the Cotton Belt is divided into 14 State units for the selection of delegates from the first 5 interests named, and into 5 districts for the selection of spinner delegates. We shall not attempt here to go into a detailed discussion of the structural set-up of the Council except to mention two fundamental provisions of the by-laws that insure complete cotton industry representation by the council.

In the first place, the delegates who represent each of the six branches of the industry are selected at the State level by the organizations or associations representing that particular branch of the industry in that particular State. Thus, in each of the 14 State units, the producer delegates are selected by the one or more recognized producer organizations in the State, the ginner delegates are selected by the ginner association, the crusher delegates by the crusher association, and so on with each branch of the industry. Thus the council is an over-all cotton interest organization, its delegate membership composed of representatives of all the recognized organizations and associations operating for the benefit of any one or more branches of the cotton industry in all the areas of production from California to Virginia.

The second fundamental provision of the bylaws is that the council cannot take a position on any matter unless a two-thirds majority of the delegates representing each of the six interests, voting separately, approve that position. This means that at least a two-thirds majority of the producers must approve a proposal, that at least two-thirds of the ginners must approve, and so on with each of the four other interests. On the other hand, if more than one-third of any one of the six branches dissents even though the other five groups approve unanimously, a proposal before the council would not carry. Thus, when the council does take a position on a matter we can all rest assured that the position meets with the approval of a vast majority of the leadership of each of the six branches of the raw cotton industry in all areas of production.

We believe these provisions in the council's bylaws are unique and that they make for the most democratic and representative organization possible.

The council was established for a sole purpose and with a single objective, namely, to expand throughout the world the consumption of American cotton, cottonseed, and their products, at price levels that will give to each branch of the industry a fair return on its services and investment. The Council has no other purpose, no other objective, and no other reason for existence. The council is entirely nonpolitical and certainly nonpartisan. The council, however, will support any legislation, Federal or State, which, in the judgment of the council, will promote the consumption of cotton and its products. The council will oppose any proposed legislation which, in its considered judgment, will interfere with the consumption of cotton and its products for legitimate and economically sound purposes. The council, likewise, will favor the repeal of any legislation, Federal or State, which, in its considered judgment, is believed to exert a depressing or retarding influence upon consumption of cotton or cotton products.

Before we begin discussing the problems of cotton and other problems, I want to emphasize one thing. We do not come before you tonight with any specific plan or program requiring governmental action, although some of these problems will certainly require governmental action in the future. Nor are we here to discuss several matters of vital concern to the cotton industry which are now pending before Congress and some of the administrative agencies of the Government. Our thought is that tonight

we should review the broad, fundamental problems that will confront cotton in the post-war period and try to look at the facts involved in those problems. It is our feeling that if these facts are known, the first great stride toward a solution of the problems of cotton has been made.

With us tonight we have some of the best informed men in the country on all phases of cotton. I am going to single one of them out for mention. He is our presiding officer, Senator JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD, of Alabama. He is without doubt one of the great agricultural statesmen of the country. The cotton farmers and all phases of the cotton industry own him a debt of gratitude. There are other congressional leaders here from cotton-growing States who, like Senator BANKHEAD, have taken an intelligent interest in the problems of cotton and other fundamental economic questions. We are depending upon these men to help, not only with cotton, but with the other multitudinous problems that will come with peace.

As we are here assembled tonight, millions of our men and women are fighting and dying on far-flung battle fronts all over the globe. Our Nation is engaged in a titanic struggle, not for territorial gain or economic aggrandizement, but for the continued existence of the fundamental principles of democracy upon which our Nation was founded and has been built.

Our consciousness of the justice of our cause, our knowledge of our own might, of our own power, and of the power of our allies fully justifies our absolute confidence that we and our allies will triumph; that we shall destroy the agencies of oppression and aggrandizement; and that we shall participate in the restoration of peace on earth and good will to all men. When this goal which we are so confident of achieving shall have been attained we shall have only crossed the threshold leading into responsibility perhaps even more serious and grave than we face in wartime. The victorious nations shall then be faced with the necessity of demonstrating to the world that we are equal to the occasion; that we are strong enough to bear the burden, and courageous enough to discharge the obligation which we shall have assumed toward all mankind.

Most of us here tonight will agree that one of the big reasons for fighting this war is to maintain our traditional American economic system. Our reaction against Germany arose not only from the ugly and oppressive character of the Nazi regime, but the threat to free enterprise which it contained. Let us assume, for the sake of discussion, that a victorious Germany would not have attacked the United States. Just the same, Nazi trade methods, regimenting business and labor toward one end, would have put us at a hopeless disadvantage in world markets. The United States could have overcome this disadvantage in only one of two ways. The first would have been to adopt the Nazi trade system. The other would have been to become more and more isolationist. This, in turn, would have required more and more regimentation to keep our economic system going. One of the reasons for the growth of the totalitarianism in the world has been the dwindling stream of world trade and the series of economic crises that have resulted.

Let us examine briefly the position of the United States as it will be when the threat of German and Japanese aggrandizement shall have been removed. We will emerge from this war one of the strongest, if not the strongest, of world powers. We will be the only power whose productive capacity, both industrial and agricultural, will not have been seriously crippled by the war. If future world peace is to be maintained, we of the United States of America must work day in and day out at the specific and particular business of maintaining peace. This effort will be expensive. The war is expensive. This war will cost us several hundred billion dollars. Our children and our children's children for many generations will be called upon to contribute from their earnings substantial sums to liquidate the indebtedness incurred by reason of this war. In time the debt will be paid, but neither time nor money will restore sight to men and women who shall have lost their vision from wounds inflicted by the war. Neither time nor money will restore the maimed and crippled to full health and vigor and physical capability. Neither time nor money will restore the victims of this war to their families. Neither time nor money will ever efface all the ugly scars resulting from this war. These things being true, it will behoove us to make whatever contribution may be necessary in the way of goods, merchandise, and money toward the establishment of the world upon such a basis as will guarantee a peace which will endure for many years—may we hope, for many generations.

The surest and safest guaranty of peace will be an adequate military force. At the same time one of the most dangerous and serious threats to a democratic life is the existence of an enormous military force. We, as a senior partner in the copartnership of nations, will have to recognize our responsibility, realize our strength, and, at the same time, avoid even the appearance of being, or desiring to be, a dictator or a bully. Unless the nations, upon whose shoulders devolves the responsibility for restoring democratic principles to the peoples of the world discharge their duties and obligations fearlessly and unselfishly, we shall soon find that the war we are now fighting will have been fought in vain. While it is important that we take a place in the world commensurate with our power and our responsibilities, it is equally important that we preserve our national rights and provileges. Our participation as a copartner with other national powers must be one that is mutually profitable—profitable to us and profitable to our associates.

In this connection, my idea of isolationism is failure on our part to develop to its fullest extent in the immediate post-war period, international trade on a scale sufficient to keep our traditional capitalist economy functioning.

This war will, we believe, soon be over. Belligerent dictatorship will have been defeated and its leaders brought to justice. The end of the war and the meting out of appropriate punishment to Tojo, Hirohito, Hitler, and—if he survives so long—to poor old Mussolini, will not obviate the threat or the possibility of a dictatorship either abroad or at home. If we are to preserve what we call the American way of life, we must insure a tremendous revival in world trade. Hitler gained power and developed his Nazi theory in Germany, at least in part, because of the inability of the German people to find markets for their products. So I repeat, if we are to avoid a dictator, either from the left or from the right, we must insure a tremendous revival of world trade. This is not only essential to the maintenance of a measure of economic and political freedom at home, but it is also the way to peace.

What has all this to do with the problems of cotton? It has everything to do with them. An enduring peace is not built upon a foundation of generalities. The solid stones for such a peace are practicable settlements for our many specific problems; the problems of cotton, both fiber and seed; of wheat; of livestock; of dairying; and of our many industrial commodities. More than any other one thing, the duration of the peace will depend upon economic arrangements and the extent to which these arrangements will insure world prosperity. Assurance of world prosperity, a general lifting of world living standards through the years ahead would be assurance of a lasting world peace.

Now let us talk about cotton for a while. Cotton faces, and must solve, a number of problems. First, let us deal for a moment with cottonseed and its products. There is, and probably will continue to be for some time to come, a very substantial demand for cottonseed products, both at home and abroad. To be sure, the products of cottonseed—oil, meal, hulls, and linters—each have aggressive competitors. But, if this country and the rest of the world have anything approaching an adequate diet after the war, the highly nutritious food and food products of cottonseed should be in great demand; and cotton linters, which are the purest source of alpha cellulose, should have a ready market in the great chemical industries of the post-war world. It is, of course, a matter of serious concern to our industry that certain cottonseed oil food products are barred from a large portion of our domestic market by Federal and State trade barriers right here in our own country. We have no doubt, however, that, in due course, when the consciousness of the Nation has been awakened to the injustice done by these restrictions, they will be removed.

The future of cotton fiber is not quite so bright. It is here that we meet our major difficulties, and it is those difficulties that we shall try to face realistically tonight.

While the problems of cotton are many, virtually all of them spring from one great need—the need for greater cotton consumption; the need for more and bigger markets to consume our fiber. Therefore, the first thing we should examine is cotton's markets, both present and potential.

In the past, we have generalized entirely too much about our cotton markets. We have talked about them as if there were only two—the domestic market and the foreign market. Actually, there are, of course, hundreds of cotton markets and they must be appraised not so much by where they are as what they are. Cotton's markets are the literally thousands of end-use products into which cotton goes and which the consumer buys—bags, sheets, shirts, dresses, overalls, tire cord, bedspreads, fish nets, oilcloth, underwear, window shades, tents, sewing thread, and so on down the list.

If we are to know anything about where cotton stands, we cannot look at these markets as a whole; we must consider each one of them separately. We must analyze cotton's position in each because it is in these individual end-use markets that cotton must meet the competition of other materials. There are three points on which this competition must be met in every market if cotton is to get the business.

It must be met on quality; it must be met on price; and it must be met on sales effort.

The relative importance of each of these three factors varies greatly in the different end-use markets. For example, in the automobile tire cord market quality is the most important factor. Here cotton must meet certain exacting specifications on quality or it will not be used. Price is only of secondary importance after the quality specifications have been met and sales effort is of practically no consequence.

In the bag market, however, price is the all-important item. Sales effort is of considerable help and quality plays a minor part, but, in the final analysis, the price of cotton is the biggest item in the cost of a bag. If cotton bags cost much more than other kinds of bags, people simply will not buy them.

In the women's dress market, particularly in the better types of dresses, we find that sales effort is the principal factor. The quality of the fabric, of course, plays an important part. The price of the raw material in a finished dress is of virtually no importance. However, smart styling and aggressive sales promotion are effective weapons in this field and cotton must have them to get the business.

It is clear then, that, if we are to increase or even hold our present consumption of cotton, we must meet and better cotton's competitors on the points that count most in each of the many end-use markets.

Now, what are these competitors and how do they compare with cotton on quality, price, and sales effort? The major competitors are (1) the coarse natural fibers, such as jute, hemp, sisal, etc.; (2) paper; and (3) the synthetic fibers such as rayon, nylon, and a number of others that are just coming into existence.

Least formidable of these are the coarse natural fibers. Produced largely in the Orient by the cheapest coolie labor, they sell for less than a third of the present parity price of United States cotton. However, the nature of these fibers limits their use principally to such markets as bags, bagging, cordage, twine, and allied products. These markets are very important to cotton, but the coarse fibers may not give us much more competition for them in the future than they have in the past.

Paper is an entirely different story. It is already in direct competition with cotton in scores of important markets, ranging from bags to tablecloths, and each year brings a host of new paper products. It isn't directly competitive with cotton from such quality standpoints as service and durability, but it makes up for this by being so cheap it can be discarded after one use. In those markets where sales effort is effective, paper uses it to the limit, far exceeding anything cotton has ever done in the past.

Most dangerous of all cotton competitors, however, are the synthetics—foremost among which at present is rayon. In the case of the coarse fibers and paper, cotton feels the competition only in the end-product market. A burlap bag is substituted for a cotton bag or a paper towel is used in place of a cotton towel. With rayon it is entirely different. Here the competition strikes cotton in the first raw fiber stage. A rayon fiber is made in the image of the cotton fiber, is substituted for cotton on the same cotton-spinning frame that formerly spun cotton, and is woven on a cotton loom. Cotton is cut before the first ball crosses the plate.

In 1920, rayon consumption in the United States was the equivalent of only a few thousand bales of cotton; by last year it had grown to the equivalent of almost 1½ million bales of cotton. Over the same period the price of filament rayon declined from above $6 per pound to 55 cents per pound. Rayon staple fiber, which is most directly competitive with cotton, is down to 24 cents per pound. Rayon at 24 cents is highly competitive with cotton at 2[illegible] cents because of the waste in cleaning the cotton. Futhermore, it is reliably reported that rayon manufacturers plan to make substantial price reductions after the war—even to as low as 15 cents per pound.

From the standpoint of quality, rayon has undergone a complete transformation. A notoriously poor quality fiber a few years ago, rayon is now chief competitor in quality markets.

On sales effort, rayon heads the list of all fibers. The millions of dollars spent annually by the rayon industry on advertising and promotion, pale into insignificance the sales efforts put forth in the past by cotton and all the other fibers combined.

The tremendous advances made by rayon are merely an example of what can be expected from the other synthetics, especially nylon which, even in its infancy, is showing amazing potentialities.

Thus far, we have been dealing with the competitive position of cotton as compared with those other materials. What has been said applies to all cotton regardless of the country in which it is grown or in which it is consumed.

Unfortunately, however, the problem of our United States cotton does not stop here. In addition to the competition of these other materials in our man[illegible] markets, both in this country and in the foreign countries, we also face in the foreign countries the competition of foreign-grown cottons. Here, again, we must examine our position not only from the standpoints of quality, price, and sales effort, but also from the effect international trade barriers are having in reducing the dollar exchange available to foreign countries for the purchase of American products.

On quality and sales effort our American cotton is certainly the equal and, in most instances, better than the foreign cottons. When we come to price, however, we again find ourselves at a competitive disadvantage. Brazilian and other foreign cottons are now selling at about 8 to 10 cents per pound under American cotton.

On the matter of exchange we are also at a great disadvantage. The high tariffs, import quotas, and other trade barriers adopted by the United States of America and other countries have greatly restricted the volume of world trade and correspondingly reduced the dollar exchange of our potential foreign customers. This is a vital point in securing consumption of United States cotton in foreign markets. For, even if our cotton were fully competitive with foreign cottons and the other materials in all other respects, foreign customers cannot buy our cotton if they cannot obtain the exchange with which to pay for it.

The facts which I have presented to you certainly are not encouraging. However, I do not think they need be particularly discouraging if we will face them realistically and adopt a sound course of action to meet the issue confronting us. Briefly summing up these issues, we are going to have to improve the quality of American cotton; we are going to have to reduce its cost; we are going to have to intensify our efforts to sell it; and we are going to have to scale down the international trade barriers that are blocking us out of important foreign markets.

Now, how can these things be done? They can be done, and they can only be done, by the United States cotton industry applying with intelligence and determination the same sound business principles and practices that have produced results in every successful industry throughout the world.

To improve the quality of American cotton we are going to have to expand tremendously our cotton research activities. We must not only grow better cottons, we must gin them better, handle them better, and process them better into their many end-use products. Only through research can these things be done. The cotton industry, through the research programs of the National Cotton Council and a number of private research groups, has made a good start. The Federal Government and a number of the cotton States likewise have substantial cotton research programs under way. All of these efforts must be greatly expanded.

To reduce the cost of American cotton we are going to have to reduce the cost of producing it. And here I wish to especially emphasize one point. I am not talking about reducing the cost of producing cotton by reducing the net income of the cotton producer. If, in order to meet the price competition of foreign cottons and other competing materials, it should be necessary for the American cotton farmer to return to the low standard of living which he has had to endure in years past or to lower his standard of living to the level endured by cotton producers in many of the other cotton producing countries, then, speaking as a cotton producer, I say to you definitely that the farmers of this country will not do it. They will withdraw their lands from cotton and plant other crops that will give them a return more commensurate with our American standard of living. I do not feel that this alternative is necessary, however. Cotton producers will not necessarily insist upon any set price. If they can make money out of a price that will enable them to undersell their competitors, provided, of course, that it gives them a decent return for their efforts, they will accept that price gladly. If the cost of cotton production can be substantially lowered, cotton prices can be lowered proportionately. What the farmer is interested in is his net return from cotton production; a high price means nothing if it is eaten up by high production costs. And while we are trying to cheapen production costs let us not forget that the cotton farmer has received too little for his efforts in the past and that one of our primary objectives should be to improve the net incomes of cotton producers.

The other great crops of America have reduced their production costs substantially by developing higher-yielding varieties, by lowering their labor costs through the mechanization of their farming operations, and by increasing the efficiency of their production generally. The same thing can be done for cotton not only in the production field but also in the subsequent stages of ginning, handling, and processing. All this, in the aggregate, would greatly improve cotton's position from a competitive standpoint in the end-product markets of the world. Again, research is one of the primary ways by which this must be done.

Obviously, cheapening the production costs for cotton is something that cannot be done overnight. After the war there will be a period when the demand for both textiles and raw cotton will be very great. I doubt, however, whether this demand will be sufficient to use the surplus world supply of cotton which will exist when the war is over. The situation which existed before the war is likely to return comparatively soon. Cheaper foreign growths will be competing actively for world markets that cannot absorb all the cotton the world has to sell. The transition process that I am trying to outline will take time even if all goes well. The cotton industry must depend upon the Government not only to help work out a sensible long-time program, but to help it through the difficult years that lie immediately ahead. I do not think this country wants to give up its export markets for cotton. I do not think it can afford to give up its export markets for cotton. I hope to see the day in the not-too-distant future when American cotton can compete freely on a price basis with all foreign growths. Pending that time, American cotton may need some assistance to compete. The nature and extent of that assistance will be something which the Congress of the United States probably will decide.

The industry's reliance upon Government, however, does not extend to an aggressive and effective sales effort. This is the industry's responsibility and the industry must not shirk it. For a long time we have assumed that cotton did not need selling. It was the story of the old established and conservative firm going ahead complacently while the younger and more active competitors overtook it. Not only do we need

competent research to find new uses for cotton and improve old ones, the cotton industry needs to tell the country and the world about the virtues of its products. We have been overly modest and we are finding that modesty, so far as the cotton industry is concerned, does not pay. There are many fields where cotton is definitely superior for many reasons. The customers and prospective customers of cotton need to be told about that superiority. The National Cotton Council has embarked upon a thorough sales-promotion program to do this job and that program is being expanded rapidly.

As I stated earlier, cotton's problem of meeting the competition of other materials is by no means confined to the United States alone. Other countries growing cotton are just as interested as we are in meeting this competition in all of the world's markets. I am certain that other cotton-producing countries will be glad to join the United States in research and sales programs that will put cotton's best foot forward on a world-wide basis.

Of course, world-wide consumption of cotton after the war is inextricably bound up with the future of world trade. If we remove trade barriers and world trade expands vigorously, our task will be relatively easy. The cotton problem in world terms definitely is underconsumption and not overproduction. For example, just before the war the United States was consuming cotton at the rate of 32 pounds per capita annually. In the balance of the world the rate was about 6 pounds per capita. If the per capita cotton consumption of the world were brought only one-fourth of the distance between its present standard and that of America the world would require 56,800,000 bales, or 26,000,000 bales more than it required in the years immediately preceding the war. An increase of even 1 pound per capita throughout the world would wipe out the average surplus of world production over world consumption and would leave orders for 2,800,000 bales unfilled.

I do not need to tell you that the principal reason for low cotton consumption outside the United States was low incomes, resultant low living standards, and the inability of the average person to buy cotton goods that he needed and wanted. As a nation, one of our post-war responsibilities will be to do all we can to improve world living standards. To some this may seem impracticable. To some it may even smack of international boondoggling. When examined, however, this proposal will be found to be both realistic and practicable. We may quarrel over the means to achieve the objective, but we certainly cannot quarrel over the objective itself.

Our efforts to increase the world standard of living does not mean that we should not increase our own living standards and consequently our own consumption of cotton. Even though our per capita consumption averaged more than five times the consumption of the world, literally millions of our own people did not have enough cotton clothing, or enough towels, sheets, and other household goods made from cotton. One of the paradoxes of the age was the cotton grower clothed in rags.

The effort to improve world living standards goes back, in my opinion, to world trade. There are other ways of raising the world standard of living than by an increase in world trade. It is, however, to my way of thinking the most fundamental and most important step of all. The methods to be used in promoting international cooperation and international trade rest primarily with government. In the last analysis, Congress probably will decide our foreign policy. It is our feeling that the time has come when the United States will take its place in a world whose primary concern will be the maintenance of peace, and toward that end, the attainment of the prosperity upon which peace and stability must rest. I have confidence that we will have learned enough from two great and destructive wars to see the imperative necessity of taking the steps required to keep the peace. One of these steps, let me emphasize, will be a sensible and workable plan for restoring world trade.

The National Cotton Council will be glad to help all that it can toward this end and in any other ways that may develop as time goes on. We have established two special committees to work on some of the main problems we have been discussing here tonight. One of these committees deals with cotton exports and the other with increased efficiency in cotton production, processing and marketing. These committees are meeting here in Washington this week to confer with various governmental agencies concerned. They will undoubtedly be calling on many of you from time to time and we shall appreciate any courtesies and assistance you may give them.

I need not emphasize what will happen to the cotton industry unless it faces its problems in a practical, realistic and adequate fashion. At the last annual meeting of the Council, there was ample evidence that the industry has begun to do this. The very fact, however, that the Government is furnishing the farmer price protection could prove a narcotic. So long as the Government takes the cotton under loan at a relatively high price, the producers may not understand the extent of the potential disaster ahead. One thing is certain. The Government will not continue indefinitely to pile up cotton for which there is no market. The adjustment to the realities of the situation can come gradually or abruptly. All of us together will decide whether the transition that lies ahead is gradual and orderly, or whether it is sudden and calamitous. The future of cotton will be reckoned by the future of cotton consumption. In turn, the future of cotton consumption will depend upon the ability of cotton to meet competition both at home and abroad.

This raises another question which might as well be faced frankly. Should the raw-cotton industry abruptly cease to be a factor in our national economy, the Nation will undergo an economic revolution. Lands now utilized in the production of cotton will not lie idle. These lands will be put to other agricultural uses. They will enter into competition with lands in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and other States in the production of dairy products. They will enter into competition with Kansas and the West in the production of wheat, oats, barley, and rye. This is in no sense a threat. It is a calm and deliberate statement of fact. Other sections have a stake in the future of cotton. It is to their interest to keep the industry flourishing and strong. It is to their interest to see that any adjustments come gradually and that we avoid vicious, uneconomic, intersectional competition.

It is in the national interests, therefore, to work out a sensible and adequate program for cotton. It is our duty toward this end to keep the Government informed of our needs. I think it is our duty to work with the legislative and executive departments as closely as possible. It is our duty to work closely with the representatives of agriculture from other areas. Cotton will get nowhere by itself.

While we may not always agree on each successive step toward the goal, all of us want a prosperous world as a prerequisite to an enduring peace. I see no way to assure this prosperity other than the friendly and intelligent cooperation of Government and business. Together, we may be able to make a contribution toward a more prosperous and peaceful world. If this is true, the sacrifices that are being made in this war will not have been in vain.

Keynote Speech at South Dakota Republican State Convention by Hon. Harlan J. Bushfield, of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on May 29 last I delivered an address at the Republican convention at Watertown, S. Dak., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, delegates, and friends, it is with a feeling of homecoming that I come to Watertown today, homecoming to the State I love and the State where all my hopes and interests are. Truly the grass seems a little greener, the landscape a little more lovely, the air a little purer, and the handclasp a little warmer in South Dakota than anywhere else in the world.

You have honored me by inviting me to give the keynote speech to this convention. I am grateful for this high honor and I hope I may say something worth while for your deliberation.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "A wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government."

Have we in this Nation today either a wise or frugal government? With your permission I want to discuss that question today.

But, first, I want to say a word in appreciation and in praise of your congressional delegation. Their cooperation with each other could not have been better. It has been a pleasure to work with them.

KARL MUNDT, Congressman from the First District, is rapidly achieving prominence and leadership in his chosen field in the House of Representatives.

FRANCIS CASE, Congressman from the Second District, is one of the leaders in the House and an authority upon appropriation matters.

Senator GURNEY has been most cooperative and I want to express public appreciation for that.

This does not mean that the members of the delegation have always seen eye to eye in legislation or that we have agreed upon all things, but in every case where the welfare of our State was concerned we have been a unit working together for the best interests of South Dakota.

In my inaugural address in 1939, I said in part:

"Our program should promote water conservation. Countless instances in the history of the world show migration of people from one territory to another because of the failure of water. We in South Dakota have had a taste of what the failure of water may mean. Let us, therefore, promote a program for the building of dams."

Throughout my terms as Governor I was deeply interested in a program of Missouri River improvement. That program was started by our State Historian Doane Robinson almost a generation ago. Governor Nor-

beck devoted much time and effort to furthering it. It was he who caused a complete survey of the river to be undertaken. Nationally known engineers, Mead and Seastone, made this survey. Because of the inability of the State to shoulder the burden of such a tremendous undertaking, further steps had to be delayed. But in 1941, because of the imminence of war, it appeared to those of us who were interested in this matter that an opportune time had arrived to start promotion of river improvement, with irrigation, flood control, power, and navigation as the objectives of a new program.

With the cooperation, assistance and advice of M. Q. Sharpe and the Missouri River Improvement Association, I began the preparation of an application to the Federal Power Commission to consider the immediate development of the river and the construction of dams thereon for the multiple purposes just mentioned.

In November 1941 I went to Washington with a comprehensive brief and application for presentation of the cause of South Dakota in Missouri River improvement. With Senator GURNEY'S, Congressmen CASE'S and MUNDT'S assistance we presented our case to the Federal Power Commission, to the Reclamation Service, the War Department and other Federal agencies interested in this project.

Since his advent into office Governor Sharpe has made the carrying out of this program one of the major activities of his administration. Now, by his wise direction, by his insistence upon the main issue, we have before the Congress a new flood-control bill in which Missouri River improvement is incorporated. For the first time in our history we approach the culmination of our labor and hopes of many years and I believe that this Congress will enact legislation authorizing construction of a flood-control plan for the Missouri River Valley, which will incorporate the multiple purposes heretofore mentioned.

Under thhe present plans of the Army and the Reclamation Service, South Dakota is the most benefited State in the valley. Upward of a million acres of land, if those plans are approved, will be brought under irrigation. Power projects will be developed from three or four dams, which will give power and light to all the people of our State.

It is a rosy picture for the future of South Dakota which this plan presents. I know that South Dakotans generally favor it, but let us exert just a little more effort, a little more pressure to see that this golden opportunity for South Dakota is not passed by.

I congratulate Governor Sharpe upon his work and I believe the people of South Dakota approve and will return him and his administration to office this fall by overwhelming majorities.

Nationally every indication points to 1944 as a Republican year. I believe that we will control both Houses of Congress and the Presidency, together with a majority of State administrations after next January, but I want to express a word of warning that in our feeling of confidence we do not let down in the continuous and forthright work that has been carried on in party administrations for the past 10 years. Catastrophe often follows over-confidence. Let us not be overconfident. Let us continue the united effort that has yielded such rich dividends in party success. I want to remind Republicans of this convention that the year 1932 was such a year of over-confidence in State affairs. By no seeming possibility, or so we thought, could the Democrats unseat our beloved Governor Green, and yet by a political landslide of unheard proportions the Governor was removed from public office and the entire State administration was defeated.

When I was placed in charge of the party activities in 1935 we held no State offices, the party was in debt and many of our precinct committeemen were afraid to acknowledge their membership in the Republican Party. The turn-over which began the next year and was completed in 1938 was not the result of accident nor of wishful thinking. It was the result of hard, continuous work by hundreds of loyal patriotic South Dakota citizens, who were determined to rescue our State from the clutches of those who then held control. Political victories, my friends, are not won by wishful thinking, nor retained through an overweening confidence that defeat cannot come to us.

I am sure we all want a continuation of the excellent party machinery that we have built in the past 10 years. I hope that no let-down will occur in that party work between now and election day. I hope that South Dakota, which was the first State west of the Allegheny Mountains to regain her sanity and return to the Republican column, will continue as the most Republican State in the Union.

I know that the delegates to this convention are deeply concerned with the national picture and I am, therefore, going to give you a brief review of some of the things that I have observed since I went to Washington.

In the spring of 1934 Dr. William A. Wirt, superintendent of the Gary, Ind., city schools, startled the country with a statement that the Roosevelt administration was planning to destroy our Government and to substitute in its place a Fascist state with complete power over the lives and activities and property of the American people.

A special committee to investigate this charge was selected by the House of Representatives and Professor Wirt was summoned to appear and tell his story.

It was at a time when the New Deal was riding high. They were in complete possession of the Government. Nothing could be denied them. They occupied all the offices, their doings filled the newspapers from coast to coast. Their demands and Washington-prepared legislation dominated the State capitols of the country. The power of the new President was almost unlimited.

As always, in the exercise of power, this top-heavy New Deal majority was careless of the rights of individuals and of minorities.

The Indiana school teacher when called as a witness before the committee, was denied the right of counsel. He appeared alone with his wife to tell his story, but was not even allowed to tell that without interrupation, ridicule, and abuse.

He testified that he had heard the plan for remaking our Government discussed at a dinner party given for New Deal officials by one of them. He had been a guest at the dinner, but his testimony of the conversation that had been had at this dinner party was denied by each one of the guests attending as well as by the hostess. Mr. Wirt was made to appear ridiculous, unworthy of belief, and before they were through he was completely discredited. The impression was created by those desiring it, that he was not a very clever liar and he had imagined the whole story.

But the story was not a figment of his imagination. It was not a dream. If we may judge by what has happened since, there is little doubt that Dr. Wirt told exactly what he had heard and that the New Dealers who flocked to Washington with Mr. Roosevelt planned to remake this country just as he said they did. Fortunately, the Supreme Court, before it was revolutionized by new appointments, threw out as unconstitutional many of the plans of this group.

Today, after 11 years, the President says that the New Deal is dead; that he wants it respectfully buried with flowers, and that he does not want it mentioned again. His new slogan is "Win the war."

Most Americans have believed that this was not a New Deal war but was an American war, fought by all of us for the survival of the American way of life. The New Deal does not have any patent right upon this war. Your son and my son are in this conflict not because they are Republicans, or Democrats, or New Dealers, but because they are Americans, and they hope to come back to the America they knew when they left home.

There are those within the President's own group who do not agree with him that the New Deal is dead. The Vice President is one of those. The New Deal has followed a certain pattern from the very beginning. In spite of the President's wishes, in spite of the very evident fact that the New Deal is sick and will be buried next November, those of the inner circle of this unique organization of parlor economists are still at work charting and planning our future for us.

The people are tired of and disgusted with the kind of government we have been getting during the last 10 years. Totalitarianism, for that is what it is, represents a philosophy of government as alien to our shores as that administered by the Japanese Emperor or Adolf Hitler. Our constitutional form of government is a government of the people, by the people, and responsible to the people.

A totalitarian government is the complete opposite. It assures the people that what it is doing is for their good, that the regulations and restrictions are imposed for the welfare of all the people, but these regulations are never released when once imposed. From the cradle to the grave we are under its paternalistic care. The individual as such disappears. He becomes dependent upon government. His initiative is gone. His will to work, to progress, to acquire, his purpose in life disappears. He drifts along with the tide rudderless and helpless, waiting for orders

Such is the course of every totalitarian state in history. Such is the pattern of government through which we are now traveling.

For proof turn to the record of the last 10 years showing the demand for and assumption of emergency power year after year. None of those powers has ever been surrendered and every attempt on the part of Congress to repeal them is fought bitterly.

I have a letter from a soldier in which he discusses the new pattern for America. In this letter he says:

"What do they mean fussing around about what kind of an America we servicemen want when we get home? Do they value America as something that can be changed with the seasons, the same as women's hats and clothes?

"We can't escape the notion here that some people back home are trying to fashion new patterns for America, running around with tape measures, shears, chalk, and things, and quarreling among themselves as to what style of a tailor-made country will please us after the war.

"You tell these self-appointed designers to let Uncle Sam alone. When we get back we want to see his swallow-tail coat still there and his boot straps, tall hat, and everything else that's familiar. His way of dressing has been all right for a long time. It's what we're fighting to keep all right for a long time to come. Leave him be. Just have him there to say 'Hello' when we return, dressed the way we know him.

"When that period is over all that we want is to be free to work at what we can do best."

Maybe it is just as well if we do not undertake to revolutionize this country while 11,000,000 soldiers are tied up in a war. Maybe it is just as well if the planners let nature take its course until the boys come home. I, for one, believe so. I see no necessity for rushing into plans for the future before the future has disclosed itself and before the boys most concerned can take part in it.

We have another job today far more important than planning what we will do next year or next decade, and that job is to defeat the enemy, for all our plans and hopes will be useless if we fail.

Personal power is a heady wine and if imbibed too freely or too long causes the victim to lose all sense of responsibility to the people who first granted this power. The intoxication which comes from drinking this wine will in time bring a feeling of invincibility and indispensability. It causes the victim to lose his sense of proportion so that he views other people as though looking through a reverse telescope—distantly and reduced in size and importance. Far worse than the evil of alcohol, it creates an insatiable craving for more and more power until in the end he becomes subject to his own delusions of grandeur and authority.

The Chicago case of Montgomery Ward & Co. illustrates what I mean.

In this day of military display on every hand we become accustomed to the sight of generals, but we have just witnessed something new and different in generals—something novel and ludicrous, something shocking and vicious. We have seen Attorney General Biddle, a member of the President's Cabinet, put aside the dignity of his high office and assume the character of a police court prosecutor leading a bawdy house raid.

Acting under authority of and by the direct order of his Chief, the General flew to Chicago from the National Capital. In the city made famous by the Hinky Dink and Bathhouse John type of politics, one of the highest officials of our Government ordered United States troops to seize the property of a mercantile concern that was not connected in the slightest degree with war work. Into the store charged Mr. Biddle's troopers with fixed bayonets and rifles. In the office of Montgomery Ward & Co. they found, seated in a swivel chair, quietly attending to the business of the store, an elderly man of nearly 70 years, Sewell Avery. Biddle ordered his soldiers to seize Mr. Avery bodily and throw his out of the store. This was done. This elderly, harmless, and certainly not violent old man was carried to the sidewalk, ejected from the property which he had been chosen to manage and protect, and Montgomery Ward & Co. ceased to be a free enterprise operated by free American citizens.

The majesty of force was exemplified by Attorney General Biddle when he declared:

"The President does not need any law to seize private property. His power rests in the fact that he is Commander in Chief."

And then Mr. Biddle made the astounding statement:

"In time of war the courts should not set up their opinions against that of the President."

Thus is dictatorship established and government overthrown.

And to climax this outrageous and unlawful procedure we have an opinion by Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, in which he says:

"The notion that because the words of a statute are plain, its meaning also is plain is merely pernicious oversimplification."

Not until Americans realize the enormity of this lawless act and throw out of office the administration that perpetrated it will our liberties be safe from further acts of violence. Until that is done no one is secure. The corner grocery, the farmer, the druggist, the milkman, every business in America may be seized just as Montgomery Ward was seized. If the Roosevelt administration has done nothing else—even if we forget its 11 years of usurpation of power, its wastage of the people's earnings, its wrecking of popular government, its arraying of class against class—this one act of lawless seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. is sufficient reason for removing these men from office.

Popular government has been sadly damaged during the last 11 years. Laws have been set aside by misinterpretation and new laws issued by Executive order. Congress has been smeared, belittled, and flouted. We will be blind, indeed, if we fail to realize and understand what has been going on. Public officials who should be our strongest supporters have deliberately planned the overthrow of our Government.

Congress, under our Constitution, enacts all legislation. The executive department enforces the laws. But this administration has created boards and Government corporations, each with the power to issue orders, rules and regulations having the force and effect of law without either consultation with Congress or approval by it. The Members of Congress receive their commissions direct from the people. These bureaucrats, who now run the Government, are responsible to no one except the President.

Between January 1941 and April 1942, the President issued 500 Executive orders, all having the full force and effect of law. They were not written by Congress. Congress was not given an opportunity to study them or debate them or to approve them. They were issued by the President on his own responsibility. And during that same period of time more than 4,000 regulations and orders, each with the full force and effect of duly enacted law have been issued by the various bureaus and agencies created by the President. Since 1933, 195 new Federal agencies have been created.

In this new and constantly growing bureaucracy we are astounded when we learn that in 1933 the executive branch of the Government had 572,000 civil employees, but in 1943 the pay roll had increased to 3,286,000—1 jobholder for every 40 of our population. During 1942 the jobholders were being hired at the rate of 4,000 a day.

To assist in building public approval for these expanding bureaus, a publicity bureau, employing 8,000 people and spending $70,000,000 a year, was created without authority from Congress. This propaganda mill occupies 33 acres of floor space.

According to the Department of Labor statistics, not including the Army, Navy, or Air Force, the State of New York has 275,000 Federal employees and right here in South Dakota we have 9,200 Federal employees.

With the national debt fast approaching $300,000,000,000, one may be forgiven for wondering what the outcome will be. Personal income taxes have increased 1,800 percent since the year 1939. The national debt is more than twice the total assessed valuation of all the property in the United States. Did you ever stop to think what a billion dollars is? If we were to start counting now and count one hundred every minute, we would count one thousand in 10 minutes, six thousand in 1 hour, forty-eight thousand in an 8-hour day, two hundred and forty thousand in a 40-hour week, twelve million four hundred and eighty thousand in a year, but it would take us 80 years, 6 weeks, 3 days, 2 hours and 40 minutes to count one billion. If we were to count at the same rate until we reached the amount of our national debt which this administration has placed upon our shoulders, we would be counting for more than 20,000 years. The individual share of this enormous public debt due from every man, woman, and child in America is upward of $5,000.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, one of the outstanding Democratic leaders of the United States Senate, recently said:

"The President attempted to pack the Supreme Court. He failed.

"He next attempted to purge Members of the Senate who disagreed with him. In this, too, he failed.

"He then proposed to reorganize the departments of government so that by Executive order he could consolidate, destroy, or move any department or official according to his whim of the moment. He failed again.

"Balked in these attempts, he next conceived the scheme of creating Government corporations. There are 57 of these corporations today and they have spent $30,000,000,000. They have never been authorized by Congress. They have never been audited by the Comptroller General, but they carry out the President's plans without law.

"His second step was the control of business, of industry, and of free enterprise. This was carried out by Government competition with private business, by senseless and unnecessary regimentation, by excessive and exorbitant taxation. In the Department of Agriculture alone there are 20 loaning agencies which could be and should be consolidated in one. Each agency has a complete staff of employees and each agency is competing with private loaning agencies, with this difference—the agencies' administration expense is all paid by the Government. Private loaning agencies pay their own expenses.

"There is a bill before Congress today that will regiment all the doctors in America, abolish private practice by instituting public medicine and place doctors, dentists, and nurses under direct control of a Federal-appointed official. If passed it will cost $3,000,000,000 a year to maintain.

"Then, too, we have the senseless and annoying procedure of Government bureaus issuing questionnaires and reports and idiotic forms. This was done to the amazing total of 7,715,000 in the last year.

"Branching out from business the Government has gone into the field of buying real estate, and today owns the stupendous total of 43,000,000 acres of land, one-fifth of all the land in the United States, all purchased within the last 5 years. This comprises an area as large as Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, and one-half of Maine. Since the war started the War Department has acquired 557 hotels, many of them purchased outright. Some of them were never used. Some of them were returned to their owners and some of them were sold at a stupendous loss to the Government.

"Every field of private endeavor in America has been invaded by this administration.

"We are still paying for 151 Roosevelt-sponsored resettlement projects started in 1935 under the notorious Rexford Tugwell. Every single one of them has failed utterly and has cost the Government $137,000,000."

We no longer stand at the crossroads—with the choice as to which highway to travel. We have long since passed the crossroads. We have gone down the wrong road, the road that leads to destruction of Government and eventually to anarchy. The choice that we must make next November is whether or not we will keep on going down that wrong road, or retrace our steps until we get back to the right road. There is nothing basically wrong with America. There is nothing wrong with our people. With 531 Members of Congress on the job we need have little fear that all of them will go wrong. With a Supreme Court of nine members there is little fear that they will all go wrong, but it is mighty easy for one man running a one-man government to go wrong. That is the danger in our situation today. Until we remove that one man, until we remove the communists and the crackpots and the stargazers, who fill all government offices by appointment by that one man, there isn't a chance for us to succeed.

We are being told by administration supporters that the President is our Commander in Chief and we must follow him, but he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy only, not of the civil population. Modern wars are fought by experts trained and skilled in the art of military science. Our armies are in capable hands with men guiding them who have spent a lifetime in the study of the art of war. Let us hope those military leaders will continue to handle the war without interference from civilian officials.

One again, as was heard 4 years ago, we hear that old saw that we cannot change horses in the middle of the stream, but did you ever ask yourself why we are in the middle of the stream after 11 years of New Deal failure? If the President is ever going to get us across, 12 years should be sufficient to cross most any stream. Or putting it another way, if our horse goes lame or falls down in the middle of the stream as this one has done, are we so foolish that we will sit in the ater waiting for him to get up, or will we get a new horse that can and will deliver us to our destination?

The indispensable man! That, too, is being used again.

A vast flood of publicity is pouring out of Washington to make the people think Mr. Roosevelt is indispensable. Perhaps he has come to think so himself, but any man who has the record he has of 11 years of administrative failure needs a vacation.

Too, there is a growing conflict between the Chief Executive and Congress, irrespective of party. Hardly a day passes that the executive department is not assailed by individual Members of Congress. Hardly a week passes that the President or some of has appointees do not assault Congress with a verbal barrage of mud slinging. The President's influence in Congress is shrinking daily. There is no possibility of winning it back. Why, then, should the American people want to retain in office a man who has lost the confidence and the support of the legislative body of the Government, whose reelection can only mean the continuation of squabble and turmoil and bitterness. Again I say, the President needs a vacation.

But when we do change Presidents next January, what do we Republicans propose to do? Of necessity our program must contain the following proposals:

Funds voted to the Executive for war purposes and unexpended should be returned immediately following the war to the Treasury.

Our monetary system must be placed on a sound basis. It can neither be left to star-gazing theorists, nor to any financial group for private exploitation.

Labor, industry, and agriculture require sympathetic understanding by Congress.

Wartime government regulations must be promptly repealed.

The emergency powers of the President must be repealed.

War agencies must be demolished lock, stock, and barrel.

Utopian plans should be forgotten.

America should be made self-supporting so far as possible.

Our rubber plants must be maintained at full capacity.

Industry must be retooled and remachined and the war plants of the country reconverted to peacetime work to supply domestic needs and to provide jobs for our soldiers.

Internationally our program should be a declaration by the President now of our peace terms.

The necessary and fundamental requirements of peace are few and can be quickly named. They are:

Complete disarmament and demobilization of the Axis countries.

Trial of those responsible for the war.

Return of or payment for all loot taken by them.

Complete demobilization of all plane, gun and munition factories in enemy countries.

Commercial air lines and radios in the Axis countries should be under Allied supervision.

Feeding the people of the war-ravished countries must be by joint contribution, not America alone.

Adjustment and terms of final settlement of our lend-lease accounts with other governments should be completed.

Complete restoration of the pre-Pearl Harbor status of the Philippine Islands or immediate independence.

Sufficient air bases, American owned and controlled, throughout the world to insure our own defense.

An organization of nations working together in cooperation to insure peace. The Pan American Union was organized in 1890. It has functioned well for 54 years. Why not a similar union of European and Asiatic countries?

A world court to settle international disputes.

An army, navy, and air force of sufficient power to protect us against any aggressor.

There are those who say we should not talk politics while the war is going on, but the things for which politics stand are the things for which we fight. Destroy or suppress that right of discussion and we have lost the incentive to fight. We have cheated the men who are away from home doing our fighting.

Under such a plea, tyranny enters and civil liberties disappear. Republicans, those are specious please cloaking an attempt to thwart the people in their constitutional right to choose their President in open, free, and unhampered elections.

Whether intended or not, it will defeat and cheat not only the men in our armies, but men and women everywhere, who are in war to preserve the things we most desire. Those things are of supreme importance to us.

We fight for the right to own our own homes, to raise and nourish our children in their innocence and gayety and trust.

We fight for the right to hold public meetings, free from Government interference.

We fight for the right to public schools undominated and uninstructed by alien philosophies.

We fight for the right of worship whether it be in church, cathedral, or synagogue.

We fight for our right to sow and reap in our fields, to buy and sell in our shops, to pursue the profession or trade of our liking without dictation from Washington.

We fight for the right to publish our newspaper or make a speech without censorship.

We fight for the right to join the Grange or the Farm Union, the Masons, the Odd Fellows, or the Elks, the Ladies' Aid, the chamber of commerce, or the Rotary Club without interference from any source whatsoever.

We fight for the right to attend dances and steal the other fellow's girl, to go to a baseball game and cuss the umpire, to turn on our free radio or turn it off for fireside chats, to condemn the New Deal and criticize Eleanor—in fact, to do any damn thing we please without taking orders from any man on earth.

These are the things we fight for, and be they great or small, important or inconsequential, they are America. They are things our boys are longing to return to.

It is for you and me—for every last one of us who is worth his salt, to see that those boys come home to just that. And the way to do our job is to change horses now and clean out of Washington every vestige of communistic New Dealism.

That is the job for South Dakota Republicans. Are we equal to the task?

Christ and the Unity of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered at the Pan-American Day celebration in Philadelphia recently by the Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Code, director of the Inter-American Institute of Kansas City, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The current crisis in inter-American affairs demonstrates the necessity of a permanent long-range policy in bringing the countries of the Western Hemisphere closer together. Many of those who are the enthusiastic supporters of the good-neighbor policy, as it is envisioned by the present administration, as well as those who have been critical of the activities of certain Government agencies endeavoring to promote better hemispheric relations, seem to feel that something has gone amiss or rather that the result of so much effort, such great expenditures, is slightly discouraging. On the other hand, there are those who insist that wastefulness, boondoggling, lack of the most elemental understanding of our southern neighbors, and a starry-eyed philosophy of what should be done has characterized our activities, with one result—that Latin Americans regard us as amateurs in much which they believe themselves to be experts in, and meddlers, both annoying and dangerous, who mistake the cooperation of governments for public opinion. It is a problem which calls for solution, for much of the future, not only of the Americas but of the world, depends upon the unity and peace of the Western Hemisphere. Certain European countries realized the importance of Latin America a long time ago and they acted accordingly. It is not too late for us to exert every effort, employ every means at our command, to unite the countries of America.

But when I say us I mean the people of the United States, since it is the people of Latin America we must deal with. As I stated in my address from Havana, given over the C. B. S. network, after my visit to Latin America, the unity of the Americas cannot be achieved unless there is a better understanding among the peoples of our hemisphere. Much has been accomplished to bring the governments together, but much has yet to be done to influence public opinion.

Of course, there may arise the question as to how far we have influenced even the governments of Latin America. Recent developments in Chile and Paraguay, to say nothing of those in Bolivia and the Argentine, seem to indicate that there is a challenge in Latin America to the "good-neighbor" policy. And this in spite of the sincere desire of the United States to collaborate and assist, to dispel the idea of the Colossus of the North, to improve trade relations and sanitary conditions. Since Pearl Harbor we have worked hard for hemispheric unity. We have kept war away from the western hemisphere. Yet many feel that the success of our program with regard to the governments of Latin America is as debatable as the efficacy of our efforts in influencing public opinion. And

this in spite of the very great personal popularity of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull in our neighboring republics.

Be that as it may, there are two facts which one should keep in mind in dealing with this subject: (1) That the unity of the Americas is not an impossible task, but (2) that certain factors make it extremely difficult.

The unity of the Americas is not an impossible task because of what the countries of the western hemisphere have in common: Their heritage of freedom, their civilization, their basic need of regional security. Added to this is the desire of Latin Americans to know the United States, their admiration of much we have achieved in scientific and material development, their desire to cooperate in terms of interchange of ideas, economics, trade, and cultural advancement. Differences of opinion, even regarding fundamentals, exist, it is true; but this constitutes no insurmountable barrier where so much good will is evident.

However, there is a regrettable tendency to ignore certain factors which divide the peoples of America. It is unbelievable that this should continue to exist since it is recognized that these factors loom large in the failure or success of the "good neighbor" policy.

The first and most important of these factors is religion and morality. To expect to achieve even the minimum of success in understanding our southern neighbors without taking the religious and moral elements into consideration is the sheerest kind of folly. Any agency which for any reason whatsoever approaches the subject without a realization that the differences which exist between the two peoples are largely the result of differences of culture and mentality is wasting its funds and energy. An understanding, and a sympathetic understanding at that, of the culture and mentality of Latin America is fundamental to the cooperation of the two hemispheres.

The culture and the mentality of Latin America is Catholic. Not that every Cuban or every Chilean or every Brazilian is a Catholic. There are those who take no part in the life of the church or are even religious. Yet to understand even them—their presence in a Catholic milieu—we must understand the church, Catholicism's collective institution, in the making of America.

One of the first steps in this direction is to discover the true relationships of church and state in Latin America, and to be fully conscious of the differences of development between the church in the United States and that in our neighboring republics. Thus will it be possible to underline and, let us hope, correct the many misconceptions which are at the basis of so much of what is being written and said about Latin America. For instance, there are those who are of the opinion that because peoples of Latin America are predominantly Catholic that church and state are on the friendliest of terms; others that the church dominates the state, while others think that because certain governments are not in sympathy with the church or are even hostile to it, Catholicism has ceased to be a force worth reckoning with in Latin America.

All of these notions are equally false, due no doubt to the common mistake of identifying governments with public opinion. This is a particularly dangerous thing to do in the case of Latin America. The brand of democracy which obtains in certain sections of Latin America is not the democracy we know in the United States and Canada. But this is not surprising to one who knows the story of the evolution of government among our southern neighbors. Once that the colonies had separated from Spain and Portugal, the efficiency and competency of the vice regal rule came to an end and the people had to manufacture statesmen. They took ideas and forms of government from other democracies, which in turn were still young and inexperienced. They merely borrowed the language of freedom without putting into practice some of its principles. Their lack of wisdom was lamented by the really two great leaders of independence in Latin America, San Martin and Bolivar.

One institution in particular fell victim to these statesmen. This was the church. Unfortunately Latin America had been participating in the patronato real, or royal patronage, a privilege first accorded the kings of Portugal and Spain for their defense of both religious and civil liberty. But the privilege had led to abuses of all sorts and for some time the people of Latin America had been engaged in freeing the church from what was in reality secular bondage. As a matter of fact, the abuses of the patronage was one of the causes of the revolution. But when independence was gained, the new rulers held fast to the patronage. Thus the rift continued between the governments on one hand and the people and the church on the other, until in some countries it widened into persecution, such as in Guatemala, Venezuela, and Mexico.

Such was the setting for other elements inimical to the church—the anticlericals who labeled everything opposed to them as reactionary, the atheistic philosophy of nineteenth-century "liberalism," and the anti-Catholic forces from the outside—to which the politicians gave support in the name of liberty. It was but natural that the people's deeper sympathy was with the despoiled and often persecuted church rather than with governments which were anything but democratic.

Today there is a resurrection of catholicism in Latin America. Today, also, the people are assuming a new importance in the long-range policy of inter-Americanism.

Thus is it particularly necessary that the position of the people in relation to the governments be seen in its true perspective and that the position of the church in relation to both be fully appreciated. If this is done, many pitfalls will be avoided in promoting hemispheric unity, and an end will be put to that part of the black legend which has been an attack upon the position of the church in the history of education, social welfare, politics, and economics for over a century.

It is heartening to note that the recent report of the committee of the American Council on Education recommends the elimination of the falsehoods regarding Latin America from the teaching materials on inter-American subjects. Such a report focuses attention on the jaundiced eye with which the majority of North American writers on Latin America approach their subject. This is true especially of the popular writers, the textbook compilers, the magazine contributors, and, most unfortunately of all, those professors of history who see another culture through protesting eyes, not yet participating in the new research, nor benefiting by it, but following in the footsteps of those responsible to a great extent for the amazing and erroneous idea which so many North Americans have toward their southern neighbors.

When Bancroft wrote his history he put into it some of the deep prejudices of the typical nineteenth century New England mentality. Prescott was only better informed regarding the church in Latin America. It was only when such men as Bourne of Harvard and Bolton of California—both Protestants—began their work in the Latin-American field that the first real step toward a better understanding of Latin America was taken by American scholars. They have been followed by others, many of them their students. But as yet their researches and their fairness have not taken hold of the professors, or of the writers of popular books and magazine articles. Hence this latest development to clear the textbooks of the rubbish which has encumbered them, and which as a result has encumbered the minds of so many North Americans, even those particularly interested in Latin-American affairs, is indeed what the report terms it, "A milestone in the adjustment of American education to the international requirements of our era."

It is more than that. It is a milestone in the adjustment of North American mentality to the intellectual requirements of the good-neighbor policy.

When this adjustment is made, when the assumption of superiority and hypercriticism gives way to intelligent understanding, then may we expect a change of attitude toward the United States by our southern neighbors. Unfortunately there is a widespread feeling in Latin America that the United States is trying to modify, if not to change, the fundamental structure of its mentality. In other words, that through the press, the screen, and other agencies an attempt is being made to destroy what is essentially Latin American, which is all a part of the larger scheme of the United States to dominate the two Americas.

Whether we like to acknowledge it or not, it is true that the average Latin American looks upon the United States as a Nation of materialists, agnostics, scoffers of religion, intent upon sewing religious disunity throughout the hemisphere. He has been misled by the inadequacies and distortions of the press of North America, its radio and its movies and by the kind of Americans—including many of the so-called good-will ambassadors—with whom he has come in contact. The millions of dollars which we have poured into Latin America has been accompanied with little or no concern of the damage which certain Americans have been doing to the spiritual and moral welfare of the people of those countries.

The situation is critical, for as yet there appears to be no general awakening on the part of those engaged in promoting hemispheric unity of the spiritual implications of the good-neighbor policy. When I say spiritual implications I mean the realization on the part of North Americans that the culture and religion of Latin America is something to be reckoned with. To continue to ignore, to say nothing of attack, either directly or indirectly, these two important elements is fatal to cooperation, unity and regional security.

When those engaged in promoting the good-neighbor policy, and those who write and talk on matters dealing with our southern neighbors, begin to realize that Catholicism is the greatest unifying principle in the Western Hemisphere then may we be sure that we are on the road which will lead us into the hearts of Latin Americans. Then may we hope to change the attitude of many toward North America. Then, through the common tongue of faith, may we be able to convince them that the majority of North Americans, despite their differences in religion, condemn that which would destroy morality or spirituality among their fellowmen; that although there is separation of church and state in the United States, there is no official attempt to separate the people from religion; that on the contrary more than ever before do those in authority pay tribute to the value of fixed religious principles in the lives of the people. They need also to be assured that this country is not a nation of materialists, simply because of its material advancement, but rather, that this advancement is but an indication of what has been achieved in the past through cooperative action, and as a signpost of what might be expected, even in a material way, through a closer cooperation among the nations of this hemisphere.

Nor should Latin Americans be allowed to think that the United States believes in encouraging the undermining of the spiritual forces of another nation, or of turning into a market place of contending religious groups any nation which for centuries has had religious unity within its boundaries. They should be assured that those who might be engaged in such activities, if they be Americans, are not representative of that which is solid or respectable in their own country, and because of whatever resentment they arouse among those who have given them hospitality they do irreparable harm to the cause of religion, as well as to the cause of unity. It should be made quite clear to our neighbors to the south that the United States has had sufficient experience of its own of what division among religious groups can do to national unity without being unmindful of the danger to international unity should this unfortunate commodity be exported; that she encourages every effort to unite men of good will for the sake of civilization.

Finally our neighbors should be informed that the United States is not a country of agnostics, of scoffers of religion, or of frivolous men and women impervious to morality; on the contrary, that it is a nation much different from that which is presented to Latin Americans. Unfortunately, the real United States is scarcely known to the south of us: Our institutions of learning, of charity, of social welfare; our love of fellow man, often for the sake of God, which inspires thousands of men and women to sacrifice time and income for things which will be paid back only in eternity. Indeed, the United States may provide examples of heroic sacrifice—heroic holiness—unsurpassed elsewhere in America. Yes; much is to be seen beyond the smoke-screened skylines of northern cities: An America of little towns and simple living; of honest, hard-working men and women; of simple pleasures and much liberty; of all those homely things dear to man everywhere.

In order to bring this message to the people of Latin America through the common tongue of faith, the Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, bishop of Kansas City, founded in March of 1943, the Inter-American Institute. The growth which, under God, it has seen and the enthusiastic reception it has received, not only in this country but through all of Latin America, is sufficient proof that religion even more than language determines the attitude of one people, toward another. From Mexico to Chile, and from Argentina to the countries of the Caribbean, men and women in every walk of life welcomed the institute as the long sought solution to the problems of correcting mutually false impressions, of bringing men otherwise so widely separated into mutual respect and understanding. They were of the opinion, also, that it is not sufficient to strike upon a working policy with the governments of the Americas but that the people must be convinced that in working for a united hemisphere the culture and the religion of Latin America will not be endangered from the north, where Catholics may also be found in numbers and importance who worship the same God before the same altar, and who partake of the same sacraments.

This is where the Catholics of the United States can play an important role. Above all others can they reach the heart of Latin Americans. They possess the same philosophy and the same faith; they talk the same language with regard to that important relationship of man with God. Indeed, they hold in their hands much of the future of the Good Neighbor policy.

Unfortunately there are those who say that it is not feasible to solve the problem through the Catholic church—that is to draw the peoples of Americas together by the common ties of faith—because of the reaction it might cause among certain non-Catholic groups and individuals. This is indeed a short-sighted policy and one that reveals insufficient appreciation of the seriousness of the problem. If the same crisis were to obtain with regard to the predominately Lutheran countries of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, or to predominately Calvinistic Holland, American Catholics would be lacking in patriotism, to say the least, were they to object to an organization directed by American Lutherans or Calvinists which might effectively reach the peoples of these countries through either Lutheranism or Calvinism. Because the vital role which America will assume in our post-war economy it is high time that prejudices and specious reasoning be eliminated from inter-American activities.

A few days ago I received a letter from a distinguished scholar of the Argentine and a true friend of this country, who wrote with great concern:

"Feeling between this country and the United States is hardening down into a settled sulky dislike from this angle. The war will pass by, but that feeling will long outlast it. That is why your institute is destined to do a great service to both our nations. Spadework is needed for a solid friendship which will stand outside and apart from momentary political issues; the best hope lies, it seems to me, in the intellectual contact and understanding."

The Argentine situation brings to the surface all that is artificial in the inter-American set-up, all that, by being artificial, helps to poison the strong elements of genuineness in it. This artificiality is obscuring the chasm which divides the peoples of North and South America, a chasm which must be bridged as quickly as possible. But to bridge this chasm one must know how wide it really is. All one needs to do is to go to Panama or Puerto Rico, where the two cultures meet, perhaps for us the two best observation posts in Latin America. Here may be seen how necessary it is to begin immediately to bridge the chasm, by making use of the abutments already in place on either side—the Catholic Church in the United States and Canada and in every country of Latin America.

The Inter-American Institute has chosen as its motto, "Unum in Christo," and Our Lady of the Americas, its special patron. Under these we work, convinced that just as love of freedom and democracy has bound the countries of the Western Hemisphere in a destiny which must not be shattered by separation or disaffection, the spiritual forces of the Americas must be utilized to defend these principles. As Pope Pius XII has pointed out in his encyclical, Darkness Over the Earth, "the loss of faith in God is followed by a loss of moral principles and finally by the loss of all that binds man to man in spiritual brotherhood."

America still has faith in God and in what binds man to man in spiritual brotherhood. That is why she intends to erect her great lighthouse cross in the Dominican Republic, as an act of gratitude to her Christian discoverer, and as a sign of the only true basis for unity in the Western Hemisphere; furthermore, as a challenge to the New Barabarians of Europe and Asia that the cross which Columbus planted has taken on a new significance; that through a united America it will redeem those held in bondage and once more save man and civilization.

The cornerstone of this great lighthouse cross is a stone from the ruins of La Isabela, the first town founded in the Western Hemisphere. Four centuries ago above this very stone the cross first rose on this side of the Atlantic; the stone itself served as the base of the altar on which, on that glorious epiphany of 1494, the incense of the first known eucharistic sacrifice rose to the skies of the Americas. "O Crux Christi, in quo est salus, vita et resurrectio Americae," O cross of Christ, in which is the salvation, the life and the resurrection of America.

The night before I left Rio, a member of the Brazilian Academy of Letters and a great intellectual said to me: "Carry in your heart, Father, with our friendship, our southern cross. And may the cross once more illumine the world and guide poor men."

This is the farewell of a poet. Brazil is full of poets and so is all of Latin America. But a poet's soul cannot be touched by money; nor a warm sentimental heart won with a cold 20-year contract. Twenty years mean nothing in Latin America; only manana is real. But in the depths of their Catholic souls, drenched with centuries of timeless truths, they understand eternity. And so we, their brothers in Christ, can couch the terms of our contract of fellowship in the common tongue of faith, sign it with the cross of Christ, and bind it in eternity.

This is the contribution of the Inter-American Institute to the unity of America.

Brand Name Manufacturers Face a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, with the eyes of the world today on our great mass production system, which is causing serious concern to our enemies on the fighting fronts, it seems proper from time to time to remind those on the home front that this tremendous production is possible because in America we have built well.

There has come to my attention a very interesting article in the Apparel Manufacturer magazine, written by A. O. Buckingham, vice president of Cluett, Peabody & Co. This article is a most forceful expression by an outstanding manufacturer regarding the responsibilities faced by all manufacturers during the war days and in the post-war period. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As our fighting forces come to a death grip with their enemies on the battle fronts of the world, manufacturers, perhaps more than any other group, face a threefold challenge and responsibility at home.

First, and foremost, they face the challenge and responsibility of assuring arms and equipment for our ever-swelling supply lines to our fighting men.

Second, they face the challenge and responsibility of assuring the maximum quantity of goods and commodities possible for our civilian population as they back the attack.

Third, they face the challenge and responsibility of assuring that, when victory comes, there will be jobs for the men and women now in the armed forces, war plants, factories, shops, and offices, to the end that our country will continue to prosper and move forward in its traditional way.

It should be a great source of pride to everyone on the manufacturing front that

this threefold challenge and responsibility is being met. It is being met solely because over a long period of years we built a solid foundation for mass production. Without this mass production we could never turn back the dictators' surging hordes on the wide rims of the earth.

The keystone in this arch of mass production has been, and must continue to be, brand-name manufacturing, brand-name merchandising, and brand-name buying. In other words, production with the incentive always to make something better and consequently pay high wages to workers; selling with satisfaction and reasonable profit and buying with confidence and protection.

Here it might be pointed out that war conditions always have testing governments, ideals, and institutions. War periods are times when people everywhere become alert and take stock. History is replete with instances where war years provided opportunities for the advocates of change. We have such advocates with us today. They advocate grade standardization of goods and commodities, with a ceiling on the American standards of living. It is this challenge that manufacturers must face, and face courageously.

The way to face it is for manufacturers to realize that they are not merely the medium whereby raw commodities are turned into usable products but are the trustees of a system that has provided the American people with necessities that are considered to be luxuries most everywhere else in the world. This system is based on the principle of brand names.

The benefits of the brand name system can be summarized quickly. It has meant better products at constantly lowered prices. It has afforded the highest assurance of quality. It has offered freedom of choice for buyers. It has assured new products, because they could be brought very quickly into popular demand. It has given the highest standard of living ever attained by any people. It has created safeness in investments. It has stabilized markets and employment. It has assured high wages for workers. It has afforded the highest degree of all-around security for everyone. It has brought forth minimum regimentation and regulation over a long period of years. And finally, the brand name system has conceived the greatest opportunity for progress through merit and service—the very basis of constitutional guaranties.

All this does not mean, however, that all is well. Here again comes responsibility. I refer to the practice whereby manufacturers make brand-name goods and commodities and then sell virtually the same product under a nonbrand name at a much lower price. These manufacturers must realize that they are providing a vulnerable and focal point for the advocates of standardization and change. They already well know that this two-way practice could not exist if it were not for the prestige behind brand name advertising.

The very lifeblood of brand-name production and merchandising is advertising. The $2,000,000,000 advertising industry upon which radio, periodicals, and the press depend for their existence, and the ability to give our people a free press, would not exist long without brand names. Over a period of years advertising constantly has cleaned house and won a high degree of public confidence. Wartime advertising, in particular, has been a real help in winning the war, a real service to the country, and has built new respect for its sponsor. It must continue to go for its sponsor. It must continue to go forward with our country, and it will go forward.

Another phase of the problem is regulation. We must always expect reasonable and sound regulation of any and all enterprises in the interest of the people. But as we accept this regulation we must resist, to the very limit, unwise and unsound regulation conceived in the name, but not in the interest of the people. The brand-name system simply is an outgrowth of the creative ability of individuals who have won a name for themselves and their goods.

This system cannot and will not be destroyed by any group or combination of groups if manufacturers face the challenge and their responsibility.

Address by Hon. Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island, to Postal Employees of Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable AIME J. FORAND before the employees of the Buffalo, N. Y., post office in the Hotel Buffalo, June 4, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy, indeed, to be with you this morning. I am glad to have this opportunity to meet so many of Senator MEAD's friends because, like yourself, I admire and respect him. Jim, in my opinion, is an outstanding example of what a public official should be—he is honest, energetic, efficient, and democratic.

I congratulate the people of Buffalo for giving to the Nation a man of his type, and I am proud, indeed, to have him as my friend.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES ARE GRAND PEOPLE

I served for 4 years as a member of the Post Office Committee of the House, the first 2 years under JIM MEAD as chairman, and during that time I learned that postal employees are grand people.

Yours is one group that is not only fair in the demands it makes of Congress, but also very understanding of the problems that have to be faced by your employer, the Government of the United States.

I enjoyed working with those fine national representatives you have in Washington and it was with a great deal of reluctance that I left the Post Office Committee last year to take membership on the Ways and Means Committee.

However, when the leadership of the House suggested that I seek election to this most important and hard-working committee of the Congress, I realized that next to the majority leader I was the ranking Democrat from New England in the House and that it was my duty to accept the responsibility of representing that section of our country on that committee. Therefore, I would not shirk my duty.

I realized also that I could perhaps do more for the postal employees in that post than as an individual member of the Post Office Committee because I would have a part in selecting those who were to serve on the Post Office Committee, and I think you will agree that we have assigned some pretty good men to look after your welfare.

Both the House and Senate Post Office Committees have been very active during the present Congress and have brought out what I consider to be a well-rounded program of legislation for the benefit of all classes of postal employees. You are aware, I am sure, that there are still many important bills on the calendars of both committees that all of us feel should be acted upon, but we must admit that the record of postal legislation in the Seventy-eighth Congress is a good one. To name only a partial list of postal legislation, I might mention the so-called Mead-O'Brien war-bonus bill, providing a $300 increase in pay for the duration; additional pay for maintenance of equipment of rural carriers; extending the provisions of the Civil Service Reclassification Act to custodial employees and bringing them into the postal service; increase of compensation for substitutes, and, to aid the war effort, legislation was enacted permitting postmasters to assign clerks and carriers interchangeably during the emergency and also providing clerical assistance to post offices, branches, and stations serving military and naval personnel, and only this past week general agreement was reached on the Fay bill, providing overtime pay for postmasters and supervisory personnel. No group or class of postal workers has been forgotten by the Seventy-eighth Congress

All the friends of the postal workers realize that the $300 increase is a war measure, and they feel that postal employees are entitled to a permanent increase in pay. It seems queer to me that while no one questions the loyalty and efficiency of postal workers, there are always obstacles placed in the way of granting them an increase in pay.

Senator MEAD and Congressman O'BRIEN of Michigan have taken the initiative to correct this situation. They have introduced companion bills providing a permanent increase of $400 in your basic pay to take the place of the so-called war bonus.

Of course, there will be opposition to these bills on the ground that postal workers are already enjoying a $300 increase and that this proposal should wait until the war is over. When that time comes the cry will be for reductions in Government expenditures or some other excuse will be found by the opponents of these measures. It's going to be an uphill fight, but I am confident that we will win it. All fair-minded people will admit the proposal is fair and that it deserves serious consideration at this time. If its enactment cannot be had during the war the matter should at least be studied now and be ready for enactment before the so-called war-bonus law expires.

MISSED CONTACTS

Do you know I miss the intimate contacts I used to have with your national representatives. I used to look forward to their visits just as the businessman, the doctor, the lawyer, and the housewife look forward to the daily visit of the letter carrier. Although he has to bring messages of sorrow, as well as messages of happiness and cheer, the letter carrier is one person whose visit we all look to with anticipation.

The mailman in civilian life is everybody's friend. He is loved and respected by the people on his route, and is always most welcome. I know of only one group more welcome, and that is the mailmen in the armed services. You have nearly 37,000 of your former coworkers who are today handling mail in our armed forces, and they are doing a swell job.

They say a soldier has three first needs: 1. Good mail service; 2, movies, radios, and phonographs; and 3, cigarettes and candy. Note well that item number one on the list is mail, and they are getting it.

That your former coworkers are living up to the high traditions of the Postal Service is well exemplified by the recent award of the medal designated as the "Mailbag Cluster" to Corp. Max Wendroff, of Passaic, N. J.

Maj Gen. Howard Davidson, commander of the Tenth Army Air Forces fighter-bomber group in India, personally pinned the decoration on Wendroff and read the following citation:

"Corporal Wendroff as a message-center clerk made 100 missions to and from the post-

office, accomplishing them with great distinction. These missions, involving extreme operational hazards such as rough roads, cattle, goats, chickens, children, and adverse weather, were carried out with courage, coolness and determination, despite the expectation, probability, and eventuality of long, fruitless waits for mail. On several occasions he encountered delays ranging up to hours, sorely testing his patience, endurance, and fortitude. As a result of the courage, ability, and persistence of Wendroff, much benefit was brought to the morale of his organization and various other correspondents of military importance."

CONGRATULATIONS

I want, also, to congratulate you, the postal employees here in Buffalo, for your turn-out this morning. It was a most impressive sight to witness your public profession of faith in Almighty God.

To see a group of men and women marching is always an attraction, but to see such a group marching in a body from a Government building to a church and to see them lining up at the altar rail to partake of the body and blood of the Savior of Mankind is an inspiration and gives encouragement to the American people.

It matters not whether one is a Catholic or a non-Catholic, one cannot help feeling that it is because of men and women like you that America is the best country in the world. God-fearing folks lead a model life and set an example for all whose ideals are high and worth while. Again, I say to you, congratulations.

Your profession of faith in God and your performance today as Catholics reflect the fine religious training you received in your childhood. It reflects the spirit of religion which you have inculcated in the minds and hearts of your children, many of whom are today in service uniforms and scattered all over the world fighting and conquering the most brutal warriors the world has ever known.

While our enemies are turning from God, American servicemen, many of whom neglected their religion in civil life, are returning to their faith under the stress of battle.

Recently I heard over the radio of a young German soldier, wounded at Cassino, who was brought to a dressing station by American medical corpsmen. The doctor, realizing the seriousness of the soldier's condition, asked him if he would like to see a minister or a priest. "Hitler is my priest," the wounded German snapped back. "All right," replied the American doctor, "if you will hold out long enough we'll get him."

This made me curious as to just what our boys were doing in a religious way, so I asked the Chiefs of Chaplains of both the Army and the Navy, about it. Both of them pulled from their files hundreds of cases and gave them to me. Here are just a few which I picked at random:

An Army Chaplain while visiting wounded men at an evacuation hospital in the South Pacific noticed a soldier very much bandaged up and asked him what had happened.

The soldier replied: "Chaplain, today I became a humble man. All I can say is, thanks to God."

Further questioning brought out that the wounded man was a pilot who had returned to his base with 185 bullet and shrapnel holes in his plane. He had 9 Zeroes on his tail at one time, but in spite of that fact he successfully protected a torpedo plane, the safety of which was his particular responsibility. This pilot was wounded in the head, wrist, leg and foot. Upon safely landing his craft, he collapsed.

Here are two excerpts from a letter written by Chaplain Willard, of Pennsylvania, to his wife, after the marines landed on the Solomon Islands.

"I took part in the landing operations, and saw friends brought in dead and wounded. Also men right beside me were shot down. But God was good to me and spared my life.

"* * * The night before the battle a group of men came voluntarily to my room for prayer. You should have heard some of those prayers, such as that of a lad who said, 'Dear Lord, if anyone falls in the battle tomorrow, may it be me. Because I know Christ is my Savior and Lord. Give some of those poor fellows who do not know Christ another chance, and take me if it be Thy will, oh Lord.' As far as I know, none of that group who came to my room to pray were killed or wounded."

Father Gehring, of Brooklyn, N. Y., a Navy chaplain, who was awarded the Legion of Merit for services with the marines at Guadalcanal in September 1942, says in an article he wrote for the Sunday Observer:

"If there is one single good thing about this terrible war it is the realization of religion."

Further in this article he says:

"One would not think of looking for religion at the battle front of today's war but that is where we find it. Ask any chaplain; he'll tell you the boys are flocking to him for consolation, help, prayer books; for a better understanding of what religion means. The prayers boys learned at their mothers' knees now come to the fore."

I was given hundreds of examples like these, but these suffice to prove what I have said, that the enemy turns from God while our boys turn to God.

I want to pay my humble tribute to the chaplains in our armed forces.

It may interest you to know that as of March 31, 1944, there were 7,291 Army chaplains; 1,997 Catholics, 5,090 Protestants, and 204 Jewish.

In the Navy there are 2,024 chaplains; 1,310 Protestants, 681 Catholics, and 32 Jewish.

Thirty-seven Army chaplains have died in service of illness or accident, and 23 were killed in action.

Navy figures show 4 chaplains killed in action, 3 died from accidents, 4 from illness, 1 is missing in action in the Pacific theater, and 5 are prisoners of war.

These men of God are doing a fine job not only by keeping up the morale of our fighting men by providing recreation and diversion for them but also by providing them with facilities to practice their religion.

These self-sacrificing chaplains can be found wherever our soldiers and sailors are. Under the most arduous battle conditions, right in the front lines, chaplains are on the spot to cheer those who are discouraged, to aid the wounded, and to conduct services for the dead.

I am sure it is gratifying for you to know that in these days of tribulation our boys are fortified by the religious training they received at home and the constant companionship of the chaplains.

PROOF WE ARE WORTHY OF IDEALS AND PRINCIPLES

While our men in uniform have to engage in the ugly business of kill or be killed, we at home must work harder and longer to make sure they have all they need to win the war and hasten their return to us. If ever in the history of our country we were given an opportunity to prove worthy of the ideals and principles of our forefathers, that time is now.

We are proud to be Catholics. We are proud to be Americans. We are proud to live in a democracy. The principles of catholicism are the principles of democracy and free men, and it remains for us to fight, both abroad and at home, to defend these principles if we want to remain free men. We have to fight on two fronts because, as our declared enemies abroad are striking in the open, so also, the hidden enemies of America, here at home, by deceitful and clever propaganda, are boring at the very vitals of our Government. We must ever be on the alert against them. We cannot relax for even a moment.

On the battle fronts in every part of the world, our fighting men—in the air, on the ground, on the sea, and below the surface of the sea, are rendering a good account of themselves. The newsreels and the press bear testimony to that fact.

On the home front, although there has been some griping and grumbling about restrictions brought on by the war, we have, nevertheless, performed miracles of production.

We are indeed proud of our accomplishments. We boast of our greatness as a people. We publicize and advertise our achievements. We tell the world that we, the American people, a great peace-loving nation, do not start wars, but that we finish them—that we have never lost a war and that we will not lose this one.

PRICE TO PAY

All that is true, my friends. We have really done wonders. We are going to continue our effort, I am sure, and victory will, in the end, be ours. But for that victory we will pay dearly in tears, in blood, in limbs, in life and in treasure.

Whatever the cost may be, we will have to pay it, and we will pay it, but let us hope and pray that when victory is won we will not lose the peace.

Let us be well prepared to go to the peace table with terms that can be agreed to and which will insure a lasting peace so that our grandchildren, the children of those boys fighting today's battles, will not have to take up arms 25 years from now.

Our peace terms must be fair and just, but they must also be stern and enforced. To those who advocate a negotiated peace and urge that we be not too harsh on Germany and Japan, I say: Listen to this:

American battle casualties up to May 6 last, were 206,227.

The Army reports 161,113 and the Navy 45,114, divided as follows:

	Army	*Navy*
Killed	28,059	19,546
Wounded	65,779	12,089
Missing	35,496	9,026
Prisoners	31,779	4,453

That is the price in lives, blood, and suffering we have paid to date. With little hope that the war will be over soon, and considering the impending invasion of Europe and the obstacles still barring our way to Tokyo, this terrible price is sure to increase greatly. Let us keep this in mind when we consider the cries for a negotiated peace.

To the advocates of peace at any price, I say further: Read the Associated Press dispatch from Stockholm, dated May 26, just a few days ago. Here's what it says:

"NAZI ARMY MANUAL LOOKING TO NEXT WAR

"A new instruction manual issued by the German high command, a copy of which was received here yesterday, gives evidence that the German high command already is preparing for the next war.

"Conscious that it now is fighting a losing battle, the Prussian military clique expresses concern about Germany's declining birthrate as a factor which could dangerously weaken the nation.

"Called 'Merkblatt Fuer Den Kompanie Unterricht,' the manual declared 'every stout boy born in 1943 can become a brave soldier in 1963.'

" 'Every new-born healthy boy is one strong soldier more in 20 years,' the book said. 'But if the 1-to-19-year-olds in Germany are totalled one establishes that recruits will drop steadily from 750,000 20-year-olds in 1942 to 500,000 in 1953. In 10 years that means a loss of 1,750,000 men subject to military service.'

"The booklet said 'the more Germans there are in the world the more stable the new great Reich will stand and the more certain is peace in the world.' "

I ask you in the face of our casualty lists—not considering the billions in tax dollars this war is costing America—and in the face of information that Germany is already preparing for another war 25 years hence, can we afford to negotiate peace with the Axis nations or even to impose upon them peace terms they can soon forget? I hold to the theory that nothing but unconditional surrender will suffice.

It is my considered judgment that while we should be fair and just in our peace terms we must be stern and unbending in enforcing them if we intend to insure a lasting peace.

United States Navy Avengers—Navy's TBF's Proved Effectiveness of Torpedo Bombing and Reaped Revenge for Torpedo 8 in Thrilling Action in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1944

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the second anniversary of the performances of Torpedo 8 Squadron led by Harold ("Swede") Larsen of the United States Navy. The story of that great service is well written in the July issue of Skyways by M. LeFevre Smith. By leave granted me, I include in my remarks a part of that narrative for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

It was Tuesday morning, June 2, 1942, a clear, bright morning, which meant the flight would take off as scheduled. The sun was coming up over Pearl Harbor, and the wind that blew across the airfield was electrified by the nervous tension of the men waiting there. Six Grumman Avengers stood by for the take-off—six deadly weapons of war, ready at last for their first try at striking the enemy. The pilots and gunners who were to fly the ships to Midway and to battle were grouped in a tense knot around their commanding officer—tough, hard-hitting Lt. Harold ("Swede") Larsen.

"There's going to be a battle," he told them, "and a lot of it. I wish to blazes I was going with you, but they won't let me this time. It's up to you fellows to do the job for us. So give 'em hell."

Eighteen eager men of Torpedo 8 climbed into their ships, waved a last good-bye to the several dozen officers and men who had come to see them off, and headed their sturdy new ships toward the sea and an island which was a pinpoint on their maps. Their nervousness was gone now. As they droned on toward their unknown destiny Lieutenant Larsen's "Give 'em hell" kept going through their minds. They could do it—they had been trained for it, and their planes had been built for it. They were proud of their TBF's, as the Navy called them, Grumman Avengers, as their manufacturer named them. The Avengers handled so well and so fast they packed such certain death to the enemy in their torpedo tubes that the men who flew them didn't like to think of the rest of Torpedo 8, still aboard the *Hornet*, having to make an attack on the Japs at Midway with the slower, less powerful Douglas.

Because Larsen's group had arrived at Pearl Harbor too late for them to rejoin their old outfit on the *Hornet*, these 18 men would operate instead from Midway. They would do it alone without support, but they were glad that Larsen had chosen them from among the many who had volunteered. That night 18 men landed at Midway full of confidence that they would "give 'em hell."

Two days later all that remained of Torpedo 8 were the pilot and gunner of one of six Avengers, a pilot of one of the *Hornet's* TBD's, and Larsen's group left behind at Pearl Harbor.

The Japs were ready for the six TBF's with heavy antiaircraft fire and from twenty to thirty Zeros. The weather was on their side—a heavy overcast gave the planes of Torpedo 8 a gulley less than a mile wide through which to fly for their attack. They were an easy target as they plunged seaward and they knew it, but they didn't think of their own safety. They were separated from other Navy squadrons and had no dive bombers to help their attack, and no fighter planes to clear away the Zeros from around them. They were doing it alone, their only thought to release their torpedoes and hit the ships below. Down they raced—8,000 yards—4,000 yards—2,000 yards—1,000 yards—right into the Jap guns. Only one came through—a TBF, piloted by Lt. Albert K. Earnest.

Earnest got his plane home to Midway. He had been hit in the face by antiaircraft fire, and all his controls had been shot away. He flew home on his tabs, too tired and too let-down to care whether he made it or not, but fighting hard to get there because his instinct told him to. He had no instruments left to show him the way, but he made it with dead-reckoning navigation that was his specialty, guided the last 25 miles by the fires and columns of smoke the Japs had left at Midway. No one, seeing the plane he brought back, knew how he did it.

The 45 dead of Torpedo 8 had not died in vain. The official tally of Japanese losses, more than 12 times greater than those suffered by the United States, testified to that. And, what was more important, Midway was still in our hands. After one day of trying to capture her, the Japanese Fleet turned tail and ran.

Back at Pearl Harbor Lieutenant Larsen stayed close to the command center, awaiting news of his men. When he heard, he had but one thought, to attack and avenge Midway.

But was he to use the planes, so appropriately named for such a mission, in which he and the rest of Torpedo 8 had placed such faith and trust? Many said he wouldn't, that the TBF's were no good, that torpedo bombing was impractical because the losses would outweigh the gains. It was too dangerous and too difficult, the skeptics claimed, and only a handful of men could be trained to handle the many intricate and complex problems that go into making the fast, high-powered Avenger an effective weapon. Such talk was everywhere, in the newspapers, over the radio, and in the Navy itself. It looked as if torpedo bombing, off to a bad start, was to become a wartime experiment that failed.

With some of the arguments against it, the advocates of torpedo bombing had to agree. They knew that the torpedo, which, when launched from the Avenger's belly (much to the astonishment of the Japs at Midway) was the plane's deadliest piece of fire power, was hard to handle. It will hit its mark only if the pilot has accurately calculated the influence that the wind, the waves, the height, and the distance will have on its course. He must aim not at where the ship is but where it will be when the torpedo hits. And because the torpedo should have as short a solo flight as possible—to give the target less opportunity to maneuver out of its path—the pilot must take his plane in not only low but very close. He does this in a steep glide, almost as steep as the dive of a dive bomber, leveling off to drop his deadly fish at the end of his run. He is, of course, interrupted in his mathematical exercises, as he travels earthward at a terrific rate of speed, by the antiaircraft fire from ships below and the bullets from fighter planes attacking him. His defense is the high speed of his plane, plus his ability to maneuver in a twisting, flipping motion as he comes in for the attack. If he kept on an even keel, he'd be as easy to hit as a sitting duck.

Yes; anyone would agree that the torpedo-bomber pilot is a very busy man in combat, but, as it happened, there were many people who did not agree that only a handful could be trained or that losses would be greater than the gains. The torpedo might be a difficult weapon to handle, but handled properly it could, with its terrific destructive power, break a ship's back. Add to the torpedo the Avenger's alternate bomb load plus its forward guns, its top-turret brace of guns, and its belly-gun position, and you have a formidable menace to both sea and land forces that carries its own protection.

Fortunately for the war in the Pacific, the advocates of torpedo bombing won out. Lieutenant Larsen was given the go-ahead to form a new Torpedo 8 with replacements to fill the gaps left by the dead of Midway. A month later two more torpedo-bomber squadrons were commissioned. Torpedo 8 and the other squadrons set out to sea aboard the U. S. S. *Saratoga* in search of vengeance. In nearly every battle since Midway the enemy has felt the Avenger's deadly sting. In both the Atlantic and Pacific scores of enemy subs have fallen prey to Grumman's flying dynamite.

Reports taken from their record of combat only tell the story in part of how the Avenger has sought the enemy, found him, and smashed him. It is a record of inspiring achievement beginning on that dismal June day when Lieutenant Larsen read the terse message ending, "One ship returned," and continuing in spite of the initial set-back to the current, almost daily communiques reading, "During the morning a large force of Marine and Navy Avengers, escorted by fighter planes, bombed enemy positions at Rabaul. Hits were made on enemy warships and ground positions. Enemy opposition was encountered, but all United States planes returned."

South Pacific, August 7, 1942: There were no ships to torpedo, so they were carrying bombs that day. Before the pilots had swallowed their coffee they were off into the black morning, headed for Guadalcanal. The offensive war against the Japs had begun.

The new Torpedo 8's objective was the eastern end of Florida Island, across the basin from Guadalcanal. They were nervous because this wasn't practice, but as the morning advanced and they smashed one enemy installation after another their nervousness wore off. They worked all day, returning to the *Saratoga* only long enough for a sandwich and a cup of coffee at noon. It was a day of victory and one long to be remembered in aircraft carrier history, for the *Saratoga* that day launched more planes than had ever before been attempted by a single ship.

Guadalcanal, August 23, 1942: Larsen was leading the torpedo bombers' attack. Japan had massed a fleet of 80 ships—a far larger number than she had hurled against Singapore and the whole Malay Peninsula—and was converging with it on Guadalcanal in a desperate attempt to recapture that vital link in her lifeline. The second battle for the Solomons was under way. The *Saratoga*, learning this, had raced to the scene with her horde of planes. Torpedo 8 took off, on the morning of August 22, and flew through a terrific storm in search of the oncoming enemy force.

Down below and 15 miles away Larsen's flight spotted their target: four heavy cruisers, four light cruisers and six destroyers. They would have preferred a carrier but didn't want to waste time and gas looking for one. Above and to the northwest of the task force hung a tiny purple cloud, just large enough to hide five TBF's as they tensed for their plunge. It was in just the right position and the Avengers headed for it as if it were the lights of home, clung to its protection for a moment, and then let loose in a screaming, piercing dive.

The ships' gunfire lashed up at them, but the aim was poorly calculated. The cloud had given the five planes the advantage and, once gained, they didn't intend to lose it. Down they dove, twisting, flipping, aiming straight at the ships dead ahead. The ack-ack was getting closer now and five Zeros were on their tails, riding in on the anti-aircraft fire with them. Five TBF's were doing it alone again. This was another Midway. .

But the end wasn't like Midway. Each of the Avengers let loose its torpedo and a heavy cruiser was completely destroyed. Another foot lower and they would probably have felt the heat from the muzzles of the guns firing on them. Five Avengers swung up from the ships and back into the quiet of the sky. They landed at Henderson Field, where most of them were to stay during the next three months of operations, thereby using the field for the purpose for which it was intended; as an unsinkable aircraft carrier.

This is the story, in part, of the combat record of the gallant Avenger. It is by no means complete. The whole story is housed in rows and rows of Navy and Marine Corps files, in daily communiques from the war zones, in personal experience stories of the men who fly the TBF's, every one of them a hero, whether he wears a ribbon to show it or not. There will be more stories for every day that the war continues, for the Grumman Avenger will see the war through, improving with age as its manufacturer increases its fighting power. It has justified the faith those 18 brave and eager men placed in it as they flew to the Battle of Midway full of confidence that they would "give 'em hell."

Following officers and men manned 15 TBD's from U. S. S. *Hornet* detachment of VT-8 in the Battle of Midway. Only Ensign George Gay survived.

Abercrombie, William W., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Campbell, George M., lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy.

Creamer, William W., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Ellison, Harold J., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Evans, William R., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Gay, George H., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Gray, John Porter, ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Kenyon, Henry R., Jr., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Moore, Ulbert M., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Owens, James Charles, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve.

Teats, Grant W., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Waldron, John C., lieutenant commander, United States Navy.

Woodson, Jeff Davis, lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy.

Bibb, Ross H., Jr., aviation radioman, second class.

Calkins, Max A., aviation radioman, third class.

Clark, Darwin L., aviation radioman, second class.

Creasy, Otway D., Jr., aviation radioman, second class.

Dobbs, Horace F., chief radioman, aviation pilot.

Field, George A., aviation radioman, third class.

Fisher, Ronald J., aviation radioman, second class.

Huntington, Robert K., aviation radioman, third class.

Maffei, Amelio, aviation radioman, first class.

Martin, Hollis, aviation radioman, second class.

Miles, Robert B., aviation pilot, first class.

Pettry, Tom H., aviation radioman, first class.

Phelps, Benerd P., aviation radioman, second class.

Picou, Aswell Lovelace, seaman, second class.

Polston, Francis Samuel, seaman, second class.

Sawhill, William F., aviation radioman, third class.

Following officers and men manned six TBF's in VT-8, which set out from Midway to engage enemy at Battle of Midway, June 4, 1942. Only two survived.

Brannon, Charles E., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Earnest,[1] Albert K., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Fieberling, Langdon K., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Gaynier, Oswald J., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Hissem, Joseph Metcalf, ensign, United States Naval Reserve of VP24 (navigator).

Lewis, Victor A., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Wilkie, Jack Winton, ensign, United States Naval Reserve of VP24 (navigator).

Carr, Nelson Leo, aviation metalsmith, third class, United States Naval Reserve.

Fair, Charles E., aviation ordnanceman, third class, United States Navy.

Ferrier,[1] Harry H., radioman, third class, United States Navy.

Lawe, William Clare, aviation metalsmith, third class, United States Navy.

Manning, Jay D., seaman, first class, United States Navy.

Mehtretter, John W., electrician's mate, third class, United States Navy.

Meuers, Arnold T., painter, second class, United States Navy.

Orgeron, Lyonal J., aviation ordnanceman, third class, United States Navy.

Osborn, Arthur R., radioman, second class, United States Navy.

Pitt, Howard W., seaman, first class, United States Navy.

Woodside, Darrel "D", aviation machinist's mate, first class, NAP, United States Navy.

[1] Survivors.

The Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in view of the possibilities of a very severe coal shortage during the forthcoming winter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Indiana Farmer's Guide of June 1, 1944, entitled "What About Your Coal?"

In this connection, Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the coal supply of the country is being depleted very rapidly, the stock piles are dwindling, and from all indications, unless there is a scientific educational program sponsored by the industry and by the Government, the Northern States will be in severe plight next winter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT YOUR COAL?—COMMERCE OFFICIAL POINTS OUT THE DANGERS OF A SHORTAGE NEXT WINTER

(By Robert M. Weidenhammer, Metals and Minerals Unit, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce)

It will be the coal consumers, not the coal producers, who will decide this summer whether this country will have enough coal next winter or face a serious shortage.

During the winters of 1941–42 and 1942–43 coal was in such ample supply that not only were many fuel-oil installations converted to coal but railroads, public utilities, industry, and retail dealers were able to increase their stock piles from 60,000,000 tons to 90,000,000 at the beginning of the 1943–44 heating season. But this spring finds us with stock piles reduced to 53,000,000 tons, and now, with the young miners under 26 years being drafted and with export demands greatly increased, the prospects for the winter of 1944–45 naturally bear close study.

The total coal tonnage used up for American consumption and for exports during 1943 was in excess of 680,000,000 tons, or some 30,000,000 tons in excess of production, the difference coming, as we have seen, from stock piles. So far in 1944 we have further reduced stock piles by some 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons.

In the first quarter of 1944 the bituminous coal industry produced around 160,000,000 tons of coal. This would be at the rate of 640,000,000 tons annually if production could be maintained at this level throughout the year.

In the week ended March 18, however, production had fallen to 11,920,000 tons, or 1,030,000 tons less than the 12,950,000 produced in the week ended February 12, which was the best week for the first quarter of 1944. Likewise, the anthracite industry is now below last year.

If production had continued at the rate of the first quarter of 1944, output of 640,000,000 tons of bituminous coal and 60,000,000 to 65,000,000 tons of anthracite or a total of 700,000,000 to 705,000,000 tons, would have more than restored the stock piles to their peak figure reached in 1942. The recent downward trend in production, however, unless checked and reversed, might well result in a shortage of some 25,000,000 to 40,000,000 tons. This amount could, it is true, be once more taken out of stock piles, but that would leave us at the end of the winter of 1944–45 with only 30,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons on hand, a figure much too low for the efficient functioning of the national economy.

TWO DANGEROUS FACTORS

The two factors that would bring about a serious coal shortage during the winter of 1944–45 have become clearly visible during the last few weeks. They are: (1) The loss of miners to the armed forces, and (2) the hand-to-mouth buying of many coal consumers during the slack season.

Manpower in the mines is becoming more and more of a problem in this country. Employment in the anthracite industry has declined from 88,000 men to 78,000 since Pearl Harbor, and in the bituminous-coal industry the number of miners has fallen from some 450,000 to 390,000. The average age of miners

is now over 40 years, as compared with 32 only 2 years ago. Loss through superannuation this year is estimated by the War Manpower Commission to be as high as 20,000 to 25,000 men.

It may be debatable whether for the war effort a coal miner is more important in the mine than as a buck private, but there can be no debate that coal buyers, by not stocking as much as possible during the slack summer season, are endangering their own interests as well as their country's.

DIFFERENCE IN YEARS

Last year at this time buyers were anxious to store all the coal that could be mined because they were afraid of a possible immediate shortage that would occur if the miners went on strike over the question of the biennial renewal of their union contract, which expired on April 1, 1943. This year, with no strike threat overhanging and now that winter is over, some coal buyers are just covering their immediate needs. They are delaying the replenishment of their stock piles until later in the summer, when they expect that the particular brand of coal they prefer to use may be available. Such a drop in buying, of course, is being reflected in a drop in output.

If coal production in this country had continued throughout 1944 at the level it reached during the first 7 weeks of this year, we could have looked with confidence to the winter of 1944–45. But if the coal buyer continues to hesitate to stock-pile unfamiliar coals—and present indications are that he may—production will fall during the summer and a critical shortage may develop during the winter.

It is highly desirable that coal consumers be persuaded to stock up during the summer even on unfamiliar coals. The extent of this stock piling will decide the success or failure of the national fuel supply for next winter.

Soviet Expansionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the translation of a signed article entitled "Soviet Expansionism," by the editor of the Journal de Genève, S. Stelling-Michaud, published in the issue of February 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The war aims of the Soviet Union and the foreign policy of the Kremlin constitute, for the majority of Europeans, a mystery rendered more than obscure in consequence of the numerous sudden reversals of Stalinist diplomacy. Does this mean that there is no continuity in this apparently chaotic policy? Does this policy operate under the influence of certain laws of its own, or does it, after a revolutionary detour, come back to the underlying constants which govern the history of Russia? These are problems which deserve a more searching analysis than is possible in a newspaper article.

In the writer's view, it is a mistake to identify Soviet policy with the imperialism of the czars, although there is unquestionably an analogy in certain respects, as for example, in the case of the Kremlin's policy in the Balkans. But the difference between the two Russian policies—that of the czars and that of Stalin—is basic. The novelty in the policy of the Soviet Government, in fact, is to be found less in those characteristics which relate it to the past than in those which distinguish it from the past. Perhaps the mental structure of the Russians has not changed, but the very concept of their foreign policy has changed, and their methods are different.

In order to understand those modifications which have a special bearing upon international relations, one must keep certain facts in mind. First of all, the Soviet Union is not merely Russia, because the old Muscovite state is but one of the republics (although the most important) of a vast federation widespread over Asia, and desirous of being widespread in Europe. If each of the federated states rests upon the principle of the cohesion of a given race, no such preoccupation concerns the union, the expansion of which, consequently, is illimitable, in contrast to Pan Slavic Imperialism in the nineteenth century.

It is thanks to this idea of federation that the Soviet authorities manage to reconcile internationalism with the nationalist principle. The paradox of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union consists in being at one and the same time nationalist and revolutionary. Cleverly playing upon both stages so as to dismay his adversaries, tranquillize his current friends, consolidate his domestic lines and build some support in the outside world, Stalin has been able, in 20 years, to convert a Russia sunk in a quarantine of scorn, into one of the decisive factors of world policy.

In drawing a parallel between the Napoleonic period and our own times people often compare the Russia of Alexander I and the Russia of Stalin. The Soviet authorities disavow any such comparison and denounce the methods of traditional diplomacy as practiced at the Congress of Vienna. The difference between the classical diplomacy, and that of the Soviet Union was already abundantly clear in the negotiations of Brest-Litovsk, December 1917 to March 1918. While the representatives of the central empires were guided by the old objectives of strategic frontiers, territorial transfers, and economic concessions, the Bolshevik ignored the old military-geographic vocabulary, and spoke of social revolution, the freeing of peoples, and the welfare of workers. The diplomacy of the Soviet Union rejects the notion of compromise, and resorts to it only under the pressure of necessity. The reason is simple. The governments of Europe as a rule have come to war over territorial or economic controversies; but the Soviet Union is always focused upon an alteration of the social order. Although it is relatively easy to find a basis for settlement between two territorial claims, no compromise is possible when it is a question of the political or social order. That is why we might have expected the rejection by the Soviet Union of the offer of mediation submitted by the United States in the conflict between the Soviet Union and the Polish Government in London. Had it merely been a question of the route of the Curzon Line, this offer of mediation would probably have been accepted; but it was destined to fail so long as, in the eyes of the Soviet Union, what really was at issue was the substitution of the governing class of Poland by a new element drawn from the people, and, because of political conviction and economic interest alike, friendly to Russia.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the executive committee of the Communist Party has just laid before the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union, a proposal to give the Soviet Republics greater autonomy in military affairs and international policy. This unexpected decision can signify but one thing: The Kremlin is already preparing the grounds for future movements "a la Tito" in Poland and the Baltic States. At the opportune moment, plebiscites, inspired by the right of self-determination of peoples, would back up these measures; and thus the Soviet Union expects to realize its policy of expansion. The formula is new, and what one can learn of this program from the underground press, which gets its inspiration from Moscow, enables us to define the new objective of Soviet policy.

The idea of a proletarian revolution throughout the world, vainly hoped for by Lenin, after 1917, seems to have been definitively abandoned. Stalin's pragmatism goes around obstacles, and tries to turn to its own account the resistance of the populations of occupied territory, by grafting upon this living reality of Europe its own program of a social and political order. By encouraging these national movements, the Soviets expect to create governments which will group all the elements opposed to fascism—which means those opposed to capitalism—the democratic elements in the etymological sense of the word, elements whose unification is hammered together in the struggle against the occupying power, and the collaborationists who work with that power, and who are for the most part the governing class.

These governments would not necessarily be collectivist or communist, but they ought, according to the Soviet ideas, begin their operations by nationalizing public services and industries, and dividing up the land in parcels of 30 hectares, in line with the idea of private property permitted by the new Soviet constitution. However, this program would not be at all definitive inasmuch as, according to Stalin's own view, the Marxist-Leninist thought "should constantly undergo development and improvement." "In the course of its development," as Stalin states in his history of the Communist Party in the U. S. S. R., which appeared in 1938, the "science of revolution is necessarily enriched by new experiences and new information, and some of its principles and conclusions change with the times, and are replaced by new principles and conclusions which fit the requirements of the day." This doctrinal position which may be described as pragmatic, this idea of a constant process of becoming, inspired evidently by the dialectic of Hegel, is one of the keys to the foreign policy of the Soviets, and explains its apparent vagaries, its abrupt changes in direction, and its reversals of alliances.

S. STELLING-MICHAUD.

New Reconstruction Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

NEW RECONSTRUCTION ERA

Those citizens of the South who are old enough to recall the reconstruction days that followed the War Between the States, realize with something of a shock that a new reconstruction era is being framed, and that there is every prospect the administration at Washington is presently planning to effect its enforcement as soon as the 1944 Presidential election is out of the way. "If any-

one believes there will not be a new army of scalawags in every Southern State to assist the carpetbaggers and give them support," suggests the Southern Weekly, published at Dallas, "let him behold the present antics of certain party politicians in the South who are interested in nothing but their own political careers and who are willing to palliate and excuse all acts of the administration against the South in order to increase their own influence at Washington.

The instrument charged with responsibility for bringing this new reconstruction era into existence is the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. Recently there appeared in the Dallas News a half-inch advertisement offering employment to a "colored man to work at night as a paper handler." This brought promptly from the regional office of the C. F. E. P. at Dallas a request that such advertisement be discontinued, as it was "discriminatory as to race, creed, color, or national origin." The need for using all available manpower during wartime was set up as the excuse for the request—or demand—but when the manager of the regional office was asked to answer some questions about the matter, he refused, saying that he was under strict orders from Washington to refrain from giving newspaper interviews.

The Committee on Fair Employment Practice has no authority in law, but is something that originated in the mind of President Roosevelt. Its membership looks to him, and to him alone, for instructions, and these are passed along to all sections of the country, and particularly to the south, where the purpose is to break down all segregation laws. On this point the Dallas News said editorially:

"The Fair Employment Practice Committee, through its local office, presumes to enforce its demands throughout the war industries of Dallas which now constitute employment of about four-fifths of the community's 85,000 industrial workers. In doing so it is guilty of (1) running counter to the whole spirit of our southern State laws establishing segregation and the Supreme Court decisions that have supported them; (2) gross misrepresentation of its opportunity to serve in the role of attaining fair employment practices; and (3) an attempt to enforce a procedure that can result only in inefficiency and loss of effort in the adjustment of labor supply and demand

"If white and colored people can be segregated in schools, on streetcars, and elsewhere on the basis of our State laws, sustained by a United States Supreme Court decision, it is absurd for a Federal agency, having no more authority than Presidential ukase, to transcend the theory held by the Supreme Court, in its directives to employers in their private business. For, certainly, under any theory of law more liberty in the choice of associates is permitted in private than in public service. It would be easily possible for the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee to perform its legitimate function in seeing that Negroes get a fair deal in war-industry employment, yet without attempting to break down the time-honored southern tradition of segregation. With such a policy the News would be in entire sympathy.

"Not only does the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee attempt to abolish segregation, it ignores the fact that, in the long-standing traditions and practices of the South a considerable difference has been established in the actual skills of white and colored people. To the extent that it would abolish precise advertising, it would create confusion and bring about wastage of manpower.

"The President's Fair Employment Practice Committee, in its arbitrary and unwarranted orders, is inadvertently adding to an issue in which there is already enough bitterness. The local office of the Committee is undoubtedly cognizant of this, but it is taking its orders from Washington. The Committee should resurvey its field of constructive opportunity and devote its energies to promotion of fair employment practices within the bounds of the spirit of southern laws and Supreme Court decisions upholding them. Otherwise the inevitable result will be more harm than good. And patently there would be no reason for the continued existence of such an agency."

As a matter of fact there is no excuse for the existence of this presidentially appointed committee in wartime. Let one pursue the Dallas situation to the logical end. There is no more reason for the C. F. E. P. orders in this case than in hundreds of others. Suppose the advertiser wanted to employ a stenographer; would it be necessary to include the words "white" or "colored" in his advertisement? There are certain employments in this part of the country that are reserved for the Negro population—it has been that way from the beginning, and it will remain that way until the end, regardless of the Committee of Fair Employment Practices, Congress, or the President himself. It is one of those things which cannot be changed, and the sooner the Roosevelts recognize this truth, the better for all concerned.

In regard to the political aspects of the matter, there is nothing more certain than this: If a presidentially selected committee, acting under no other authority than that conferred by a White House directive, undertakes to force upon the South the dangerous and foolish doctrines that are being preached by the C. F. E. P., inspired by the President of the United States, the Democratic Party as now constituted will ultimately find itself without support. If Mr. Roosevelt and the other northern leaders cannot see this, they are, indeed, as blind as bats.

(Since the above was put in type we have read the statement of Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of this district, in which he declares that "the C. F. E. P. is doing a terrible job of helping the war effort and a magnificent job of disuniting the American people." We heartily agree with the Representative's appraisal.)

Poor Cotton Farmer—For a Bale of Cotton the Farmer Gets $100, the Consumer Pays $22,560—Who Gets the Difference?—Not the Cotton Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Commissioner of Agriculture Tom Linder, of Georgia:

"Then the Lord said unto Moses, Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharoah: for with a strong hand shall he let them go, and with a strong hand shall he drive them out of his land." (Exodus 6:1.)

This is the story of cotton to the consuming public.

This is a story just as vital to the sidewalks of New York, to Michigan Avenue of Chicago, to those of the Golden Gate of California, and to those of the great farm belts of the West and Middle West as it is to those who grow cotton in the Southlands.

If you buy cotton clothes of any kind, anywhere, this is your story. This is your problem.

To the people of the South, whether you farm, whether you are a white-collar worker or in a profession, whether you labor at the cotton spindles, in an iron mill, in a coal mine, or wherever you may be, this is the story that concerns you and your children.

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

COTTON DRESSES

On the last page of this Bulletin, you will find a table showing the weight and price of cotton dresses of many kinds.

When you have finished reading this article, be sure and turn to the last page and study the lesson which this table of figures carries.

These are prices of ladies' dresses—not children's—in Atlanta department stores, ladies' ready-to-wear stores, and ladies' shops.

The first seven dresses—No. 1 to 7—listed are the cheapest cotton dresses to be found in Atlanta. These seven dresses are priced from $1.69 to $4.98 each.

These seven dresses weigh from 3 ounces to 11 ounces each. The combined weight of the seven dresses is 45½ ounces. The combined price of the seven dresses is $25.58. This is 56 cents for each ounce, or $8.99 for each pound, of cotton dress.

One bale of cotton weighing 500 pounds at $8.99 per pound is $4,495.

The farmer who grew this bale of cotton received somewhere between $60 and $100 for the whole bale.

Assuming that the farmer received $100, or 20 cents a pound, then the farmer would have received only 2½ cents out of each dollar that the consumer paid for these cheap dresses—the cheapest cotton dresses on the market.

The next six dresses (No. 8 to 13) listed on the last page are priced from $5.98 to $7.99 each.

These six dresses are selling at prices that will bring $5,125 for dresses equal in weight to one 500-pound bale of cotton.

Remember, you are still reading about cheap dresses.

LET'S SEE ABOUT SOME HIGHER-PRICED DRESSES

The next six dresses listed in the table on the last page (No. 14 to 19) have a combined weight of 64 ounces. The combined price of these six dresses is $58.85. The average weight is 11 ounces, and the average price is $9.80. This is an average of 89 cents an ounce, or $14.70 a pound. A 500-pound bale of cotton at $14.70 a pound would bring $7,350.

The farmer who produced the bale of cotton received less than $100. The farmer received less than 20 cents per pound.

The consumer who wears these dresses pays $14.70 per pound.

Remember, you are still reading about cheap cotton dresses.

The next six dresses listed in the table on the last page (No. 20 to 25) run in price from $12.98 to $35.

The combined weight of these six dresses is 48 ounces. The combined price of these six dresses is $111.88. The average weight per dress is 8 ounces, and the average price per dress is $16.98. This is $2.89 per ounce, or $45.12 per pound.

One bale of cotton weighing 500 pounds at $45.12 per pound would bring $22,560.

The farmer received 20 cents per pound for the cotton in these six dresses. The consumer is paying $45.12 per pound for these six dresses.

If the farmer had received 2½ cents out of the consumer's dollar on these dresses, he would have received $564 per bale, or $1.12 per pound.

Think of that.

If the farmer had received 2½ cents out of the consumer's dollar, he would have received more than four times as much as he actually received.

Actually the farmer only received five-eighths of 1 cent out of each dollar that the consumer paid.

Turn it around the other way.

If the price the consumer paid had been based on what the farmer received for the cotton, these six dresses (Nos. 20 to 25) instead of costing the consumer $111.88, it would have actually cost $25.45 for the six dresses, or $4.24 each.

We have been talking about cheap cotton dresses and medium-priced cotton dresses. Now let's see about some high-priced cotton dresses.

HIGH-PRICED COTTON DRESSES

The last 13 classes of dresses listed in the table on the last page (Nos. 26 to 38) cover hundreds of dresses of varying prices as shown in the table.

The average price of the dresses of each of these materials is used.

If you bought 1 each of the average dresses listed under Nos. 26 to 38, the 13 dresses would cost $302.98. The total weight of the 13 dresses is 108 ounces. You would pay $2.89 for each ounce, or $45.12 for each pound.

A 500-pound bale of cotton at $45.12 per pound would bring $22,560.

COTTON DRESSES HIGHER THAN WHEN HAND SPUN AND HAND WOVEN

On a basis of weight and price these higher priced dresses cost more today than they did when there wasn't a power spindle or a sewing machine.

When the women of old, spun their thread with a spinning wheel, made cloth on a home-made loom, fashioned them by hand and sewed them with a needle and thread, a cotton dress did not cost money like this.

The farmer and his wife and children today would make more money with a hand loom and spinning wheel than they could possibly make growing cotton on the best cotton land in the world.

THE COTTON BELT THE NATION'S NO. 1 ECONOMIC PROBLEM

President Roosevelt has said, "The South is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem." No wonder the Cotton Belt is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. How could it be otherwise.

On May 30, 1944, President Roosevelt also said that he objected to the Bankhead amendment to O. P. A. which would tie the ceiling on the farmer's cotton to the ceiling on manufactured cotton.

The President thereby goes on record as being in favor of perpetuating the South as the Nation's economic problem No. 1.

The President has also said he is determined for the Negro to have economic equality. He is asking Congress for $500,000 to support a committee that he created called "Fair Economic Practice Committee." The purpose of this committee is to see that the Negro gets economic equality in the South.

I would like to know how anybody, white or black, can ever get economic equality under conditions now existing in the Cotton Belt.

The President in opposing the Bankhead amendment said that any increase in price of cotton would cause inflation.

Each of these dresses have from 5 to 20 cents worth of cotton in them. If the price of the farmer's cotton was raised from 20 cents a pound to 30 cents a pound then each of these dresses would have from 7½ cents to 30 cents worth of cotton.

The increase in the cost of the raw cotton would amount to an average of 5½ cents on each dress.

Can you imagine anyone saying that 5½ cents more to the farmer would cause inflation? Can you imagine anyone saying that five-eighths of 1 cent out of each of the consumer's dollars is enough for the farmer who produced the raw cotton to receive?

Today I talked to a lady who lives in Atlanta and who is one of the most substantial and reliable ladies in Georgia. She gave me the following facts regarding dresses that she now has. Just prior to the passage of the law creating O. P. A. this lady purchased five dresses in Atlanta at prices ranging from $2.98 to $3.98 each. Today in the same store the identical dresses are priced from $8.98 to $14.98 each.

During the life of O. P. A. the prices of these dresses have increased more than 300 percent. This lady also told me of another dress that had increased in price during the same period from $5.98 to $29.98. This is an increase of 500 percent for the same dress under O. P. A.

WHO IS GETTING ALL THIS MONEY?

It is evident that a terrific amount of money is being garnered by somebody. Who is getting all this increased spread between the farmer and the consumer?

Contrary to the opinion of many people, all this increased cost is not going to the cotton-mill labor.

I have before me United States Government figures which show that the average hourly earnings of all cotton-mill workers in January 1941 was 41.9 cents. In January 1944 this had increased to 59.4 cents per hour.

The increased cost of cotton-mill labor amounts to about 40 percent, while the increased cost of cotton dresses amounts to at least 300 percent.

It is obvious that the cotton-mill workers are not responsible for this terrific increase in the cost of cotton dresses.

It is equally obvious that the farmer who grows the cotton is getting no part of this wild increase.

It is equally obvious that the consumers are paying this increase.

Let's follow this through and find out where the trouble lies.

Cotton dresses

No.	Type material	Size	Weight	Price
			Ounces	
1	Gingham	14	4	$1.69
2	do	14	9	2.98
3	Dotted Swiss	44	9	2.98
4	Seersucker	15	11	3.98
5	Voile	9	4½	3.99
6	do	18	5	4.98
7	do	13	3	4.98
	Total for 7 dresses		45½	25.58
	Cost per pound			8.99
	Cost for 500 pounds			4,495.00
8	Chambray	14	11	5.98
9	Seersucker	16	12	6.98
10	Poplin	16	14	7.98
11	Shantung	16	9	7.98
12	Chambray	11	11	7.98
13	Gabardine	15	13	7.99
	Total for 6 dresses		70	44.89
	Cost per pound			10.25
	Cost for 500 pounds			5,125.00
14	Gingham	14	4	7.98
15	Cotton lace		14	8.98
16	All-over embroidery	16	14	8.98
17	Plain print	16	10½	8.98
18	Chambray	11	11	10.98
19	Pique eyelet embroidery	11	10½	12.95
	Total for 6 dresses		64	58.85
	Cost per pound			14.70
	Cost for 500 pounds			7,350.00
20	Voile-dotted Swiss	9	4	12.98
21	Seersucker	15	11	12.98
22	Cotton crash	16	16	12.99
23	Gingham	14	4	14.98
24	Cotton mesh	20	9	22.95
25	Eyelet	14	4	35.00
	Total for 6 dresses		48	111.88
	Cost per pound			37.29
	Cost for 500 pounds			18,645.00

Kind of material	Price	Weight
	Average	*Ounces*
Voile, $6.98 to $19.98	$13.48	4
Gingham, $4.98 to $40	22.49	6
Eyelet batiste, $12.95 to $35	23.98	4
Pique eyelet embroidery, $10.98 to $39.98	30.48	10½
Pique, plain, $3.50 to $22.98	13.24	9
Cotton linen, $7.98 to $69.98	38.98	12
Seersucker, $3.98 to $40	21.99	11
Voile embroidery, $19.98	19.98	9
Batiste, $4.98 to $22.98	13.98	4
Balbriggan cloth, $17.98	17.98	4
Chambray, $10.98 to $22.95	16.97	11
Dotted Swiss	18.96	9
Cotton lace, $10.98 to $89.95	50.47	14
Total for 13 dresses	302.98	107½
Cost per pound	45.12	
Cost one 500-pound bale	22,560.00	

The Beginning of the End for the Loan Sharks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that a Federal grand jury at San Antonio, Tex., has returned an indictment against 13 high-rate small-loan chains, charging them with violating the antitrust laws by conspiring to put a floor under interest rates. These companies charge from 60 to 240 percent per year, by agreement, on loans ranging from $5 to $60 per loan.

I have long been pressing for investigation of the nefarious activities of loan sharks, and I urged the Department of Justice to undertake this particular investigation.

At the hearing on appropriations for the Antitrust Division for the fiscal years 1943, 1944, and 1945, before the House subcommittee, of which I am chairman, I expressed a deep interest and a desire that the high-rate small-loan industry be investigated under the antitrust laws. In our recommendation to the full Committee on Appropriations for the fiscal year 1943, we said, with respect to this matter:

Another field of activity which the Antitrust Division may well investigate is the loan-shark business. It was represented to the committee that there is $5,000,000,000 of small-loan credit in the United States on which interest ranging from 20 to 240 percent annually is paid. If any of the activity in this field runs counter to the antitrust laws, the offending parties should be brought to the bar of justice.

Again, in reporting our recommendations to the full committee on the appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1945, we again expressed ourselves as follows:

The committee wishes to reiterate its thoughts, expressed in the report on the report on the 1944 bill, in connection with the work of the Antitrust Division, with particular reference to the investigation and prosecution of the small-loan organizations, commonly known as loan sharks. * * * It is hoped that during the ensuing year the Division will exert every effort to curb the unfair practices of some of these organiza-

tions which adversely affect many of our citizens who are in the least position to cope with the effects of a constantly changing economy.

I am glad to see that the Antitrust Division has obtained this indictment, and I am going to continue to urge that the defendants be prosecuted to the fullest extent permitted by law. The persons indicted are not "small fry" in any sense of the word. They are owners of large interstate loan chains, with incomes in the millions of dollars annually. These chains operate in approximately 23 States through over 400 offices, and through a network of holding companies, corporations, and fictitious trade names.

Of almost equal importance to the high rates charged are the methods used to assure continuance of the loan shark's illegal business. To put it bluntly, the Department's investigation has disclosed that huge slush funds are raised for the purpose of influencing State legislators and other public officials against passage of legislation curbing such extortion.

It is my considered opinion that these vermin should be exterminated by every legal means available. I consider that the money spent by the Antitrust Division in ferreting out and finally indicting the leaders of the small-loan business has been well spent. No other activity in the country needs a public airing as much as the high-rate small-loans field. This so-called business is a racket. It preys like a vulture upon those least able to stand its extortion. Injustice to the weak and impoverished cries for vengeance. It is organized and regimented theft, and I, for one, will hail the day when all types of this exploitation of the poor shall be driven from this land. America in its humanity and its progress has crossed the bridge that tolerates the ilk of the loan shark.

Administrator of O. P. A. Delivers Address to Iowa Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, the Honorable Chester Bowles delivered an address in Des Moines, Iowa, which discusses the role of the farmer in the years to come. Mr. Bowles draws on the age-old principle of Biblical wisdom as evidenced by Joseph and his farsighted policies of many years ago, to show that things that were fundamental then are still highly applicable today.

Because of the earthy wisdom contained in Mr. Bowles' speech, which is particularly addressed to the farmers in respect to their post-war duties and problems, I insert herewith a copy of his entire speech and commend it to all thoughtful persons who are now giving study to this great problem:

AS OUR FARMERS FACE THE CHALLENGE OF PEACE

As the prospects of victory grow brighter, people all over the country are thinking more and more of the conditions and problems which we will face after the war. Whether it be the dairyman in my own State of Connecticut, or the Texas cattleman, the Seattle shipyard worker, or the small businessman of New York City, they all ask the same questions. Wil there be work and prosperity when the guns are silenced, when the soldiers return home? What do we need to do to maintain the same level of prosperity and peace as we have had during these tense years of war?

As Price Administrator I hear as much of this questioning as anyone and possibly from a wider variety of sources. For the simple reason that our economy runs on a system of prices, a man in my job has a unique opportunity to learn at first hand what men and women of every economic group—whether on the farm or in the factory or in the home—are thinking, what they are hoping for, what they fear, and what plans they are making for the future.

What I have to say today about the challenge of peace, has in considerable degree, been shaped by my experience in office. It represents, however, purely my own personal views. I offer them in full realization that they are only gropings toward an answer, not the final answer itself. This is too vast and strange a field for any man or any group accurately to call the turn.

No one asks these questions about the future with greater anxiety than the farmers and the businessmen like yourselves whose prosperity is so directly identified with the prosperity of our farms. This anxiety is easy to understand. In the past, the farmers have taken a beating at the end of every war.

They took a beating after the Revolutionary War, after the War of 1812, after the Civil War, and after the last war. The beating they took after the last war is still so fresh in all of our minds that there is little need to dig up the statistics about the crash of farm prices and farm income which took place in 1920 and 1921, or to retell the story of the terrible toll of foreclosures and country-bank failures which followed the collapse of farm prices. We know only too well that the post-war farm collapse in the early twenties left its mark on our farmers for nearly a generation.

Of course, other groups have suffered during the post-war depressions. But their suffering has never proved quite as prolonged as that inflicted upon our farmers. It was for this reason that farsighted farm leaders and the leaders of public policy have sought from the outset of this war to direct the war program so as to minimize, as far as possible, the dangers our farmers will face when the war is finally won.

If you study the congressional debates in the summer of 1941 prior to the passage of the Emergency Price Control Act, you will see that one of the most important objectives of that legislation was to prevent post-war collapse. To be sure, the immediate purposes of wartime stabilization are to avoid skyrocketing prices and rents which would impose cruel suffering on most of our people, to protect the value of our savings and our insurance, and to secure some semblance of equality of sacrifice for the war effort. But looking beyond the war, the stabilization program was designed to prevent the ruinous deflation or collapse of prices which has in the past inevitably followed every price inflation.

Because the farmer takes such a beating in periods of deflation—since he produces raw materials and since he is never able to control his production as easily as the industrialist—the Congress and the executive agencies of the Government have rightly felt that the steps taken to maintain a stable economy during the war represent an enormous contribution toward meeting the farmer's post-war problems.

In the Economic Stabilization Act of October 1942, our Government took a further step to help insure post-war farm prosperity. It pledged itself to support prices of many crops at 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the end of the war. This, it seems to me, was an act of great wisdom and far-reaching importance. But I think you will agree that these measures by themselves—the wartime control of inflation and the commitment to hold up farm prices after the war—are not enough to solve our post-war farm problems. They have made the solution possible, but the actual solution still remains to be achieved.

If we had allowed farm prices and industrial prices to go through the roof, our economic structure would be headed for catastrophe after the armistice—a catastrophe that would pull down our farmers, our industrial workers, and our businessmen alike into general ruin. If we had allowed prices to go through the roof, our post-war task would have been to pick up the maimed and the mangled parts of our economy and somehow to piece them together again. But having stabilized our economy, we can today lay the plans to maintain the prosperity of both industry and agriculture with real hope of success.

American farmers have, as a group, today attained an unprecedented level of prosperity. I do not mean that every farmer in every part of the country has achieved this prosperity. And I am acutely aware that our farmers during the 1920's and 1930's were indeed a forgotten element in our entire economy.

During the 1920's our industrial workers, for the most part, had fairly regular employment at reasonably good wages. Most of our businessmen were making good profits. But the prosperity that came to our farmers was meager at best, and millions of them still operated under hardship conditions.

During the crash of the early 1930's all groups of our economy suffered greatly. But just consider what happened to the farmer. In 1932, here in Iowa, you still remember how hogs sold at the heartbreaking price of $2.40 and corn dropped to 12 cents. For the country as a whole the farm price of milk was $1.11. Eggs sold at 10 cents a dozen. Cotton brought less than 5 cents a pound.

When the crisis was at its peak, certain moves were finally taken by the Government to rescue the farm from complete disaster. These moves broke the back of the depression and started the farmers on the road to recovery. But the fact remains that in spite of all that was done, farm prices and farm incomes were still pitifully low in 1939. Let us not forget that in spite of everything that had been done, three-fourths of our farms in 1939 still lacked electricity. More than four-fifths still lacked running water. Adequate medical care was still lacking in many farm communities.

It was the war and only the war that brought the farmer real prosperity, the first real prosperity since the last war. Gross farm income today stands at an all-time high of almost $20,000,000,000 a year. This represents an increase of 128 percent over 1939. Net farm income has risen even more sharply. In 1943, it totaled 12.8 billion dollars of 182 percent above 1939.

Now, how has that prosperity been achieved? You will agree that we must know the answer to that question if we are to sustain real farm prosperity when the war is over. Part of the answer lies in the fact that farm prices have been brought back into balance with the prices of things that farmers buy. Part of the answer is that farm

prices have been raised in relation to farm costs. But what was it that made these things possible?

The real answer lies in the almost unlimited demands of our Nation at war—demands which are backed by purchasing power which is today at all-time record levels. Today farmers are producing for the immense requirements of the armed forces and of lend-lease. And they are producing for the demand of more than 10,000,000 city breadwinners who were unemployed or worked part time in 1939, but who are working full time and overtime today—and working for good wages. There, it seems to me, lies the heart of our story. It is the prosperity in our cities that is the key to prosperity on the farms.

This simple but solid fact should dispose once and for all the false propaganda which has sought to persuade our farmers that they have a conflict of interest with labor and industry. This propaganda of dividing the Nation into conflicting groups is not only bad patriotism—it is bad economics as well. The American farmer should never forget that he can produce at a profit only if there are customers who can afford to pay prices that yield that profit. When farmers see our city workers make more money, they should rejoice because that means a greater demand for the products of their farms. Don't forget that 40 percent of the average city worker's budget is spent for food alone, and a large additional slice is spent for clothing made from farm products.

The other day I had occasion to glance at a chart tracking the movement of factory wages and the cash income of farmers over the past 30 years. I noticed that the two curves hugged one another very closely. They went up together in periods of boom and they went down together when times were hard. That chart is the best testimonial I have seen to the absolute solidarity of economic interest between the farmer and the city worker.

During the past 20 or 30 years farmers have organized to promote national policies necessary for a prosperious and sound agriculture. This, we will agree, is a healthy and proper development. But it seems to me that it would be self-defeating for our farmers to interpret farm policies and farm programs in a narrow and short-sighted fashion. To concentrate on the raising of farm prices without doing anything to raise the national income of the entire country is, in my opinion, a short-sighted policy which in the long run can never succeed. It is only through a high national income—the income that goes to all of us—that farmers can be sure of the purchasing power—the demand—which is necessary to sustain farm prices and income.

The Government has, to be sure, pledged itself to maintain a floor under many farm prices after the war. But how long could the Government maintain such a floor if industry in the cities collapsed and tens of millions of men were walking the streets in search of nonexistent jobs? In the absence of post-war industrial prosperity, the farm price floor program would be doomed to repeating the inglorious failure of the Farm Board in 1931.

We should also remember that the price floor guaranties on farm products, as written in the law, are expressed in parity terms—that is to say, in ratios of farm prices to industrial prices. If industrial prices and wages drop, parity prices drop with them. If industrial prices drop far enough, parity prices for farm crops could be so low as to break the farmer's back—even though they were at the 100-percent parity level.

The history of the past 10 years, and particularly that of the last 4 years, bears out the folly of relying exclusively on price and parity objectives to secure farm prosperity. In August 1939 before the war broke out, the index of farm-price parity stood only at 72 and farm income was quite depressed. notwithstanding all the Government programs directed to achieving price and income parity.

The explanation, it seems to me, is simple. As long as the national income as a whole was depressed, and as long as there were some ten-odd-millions of unemployed in the cities, there wasn't much money available to buy food or clothing made from farm products. And therefore all our efforts to increase farm prices were unavailing. The demand at the higher prices needed to give our farmers a proper income, just wasn't there.

On the other hand, once wartime demands restored prosperity in the cities, the parity ratio of all farm prices quickly rose and today stands at 14 percent above parity. It has been above parity now for nearly 2½ years. No lesson could be clearer than this. Bustling prosperity in the cities has not only brought farm prices into balance, but has yielded farmers the highest prosperity in our history.

In my judgment it simply isn't possible to overemphasize the community of interest of farmers, workers, and businessmen. Many of our farmers, however, are reluctant to accept it because they fail to understand the economic stresses and strains with which our industrial workers are faced.

Two generations ago most of our workers still had a father or a brother on the farm. High wages had drawn them to the city—often over the protest of their parents. When hard times came and factories closed they simply went home to the farm, and there found work to do, three square meals a day, and a sense of personal security and self-respect.

Today our industrial workers can't go back to the farm. In depression the farmer has a hard enough time of it on his own. He can't be expected to make a place for the unemployed. But the worker in the city, when he loses his job still has to meet the rent and find some means of paying his grocery and doctor bills. He must find some means of caring for his wife and children.

So it's not so hard to understand why the workers in the cities should demand and organize to get jobs and good wages and self-respect and security. Far from being frightened by the efforts of our city workers to find the economic answers to their own dilemma, our farmers should offer them their understanding and support. Wherever we live, wherever we work, we are the same people—we have the same ambitions, the same needs, the same hopes. What is good in ourselves can't be bad in the other fellow. And what is bad in the other fellow can't be good in ourselves.

What I am really saying is that our farmers, in their own interest as well as in the interest of all the rest of us, should take an active part in the development of over-all national policies looking toward the maintenance of a high national income and prosperity for the Nation as a whole. I have strong views myself on what sort of policy is called for.

I believe that depressions can and should be eliminated. I believe that through teamwork of industry, agriculture, labor, and government, the national income can be held up after the war. With over 10,000,000 soldiers and sailors back on the job, I believe it can be increased even above present levels, with markets for everything we can produce and with jobs for all who seek them.

As I see it, the essential role of government in this team is to underwrite the level of the national income and of business activity. It must therefore be prepared at all times—through public works, through adjustment of taxes and public expenditure, through stimulation of exports—to step in at the first sign of recession. And I believe that the more firmly government is committed to such a policy, the more effective the machinery it sets up to make good on its commitment, the less government will actually have to do. For I am convinced that once businessmen and farmers can invest and consumers can spend without fear of periodic waves of bankruptcy, foreclosure, and unemployment, they can and will provide a market for everything we are able to produce.

But this is not the occasion to develop these particular views. All I am trying to say is that farmers should take an active, vigorous interest in the development of such national policies. For without them our economy is doomed to continued turmoil and instability; without them all of us, farmers as well as city workers and businessmen, are doomed to a continuation of the ridiculous situation in which we have lived in the past—economic hardship and widespread unemployment in a land of unlimited resources and high-productive capacity.

There is one other issue, closely affecting our farmers, which I would like to discuss briefly, namely the need for food exports to the liberated countries both during and immediately following the war. I can think of no more important weapon than food to speed the day of victory and to lay the basis for a sound and lasting peace. I am dismayed, literally dismayed, by some of the questions—thoughtless at best—about "why should we take any food out of mouths of our own children to feed starving Europe." Believe me that kind of talk can lose battles even if it doesn't lose us the war.

In producing munitions we have not merely matched the enemy—we have swamped and overwhelmed him. This policy has not only brought us smashing victories—it has saved American soldiers' lives, no one can say how many. What is sound policy for planes and guns is sound policy for food as well.

But the real test will come when the fighting is ended. The children of Europe—and let's always remember that they are the Europeans of the future with whom our own children must live in peace or in war—will need food from us until their own continent is brought back into production. There will be those, then, who will say, "We have done enough. Let Europe fend for itself." I sincerely hope that this counsel will not prevail. I hope America will prove true to her generous traditions.

Having brought liberation through war, let us not refuse the helping hand that will lift Europe to her feet when the guns have ceased firing. This is counsel not of the heart alone but also of the head. It makes moral sense, it makes political sense, and it makes economic sense as well.

I do not want to give you the idea that I regard the maintenance of a high national income as the complete answer to the problems of the farmer. While these problems cannot be solved unless the national income is sustained, there will remain the concrete, specific problems which affect agriculture as such.

Perhaps you will agree with me that most of these specific problems hinge on removing or minimizing the terrific risks which affect agricultural production. I don't have to tell you people here in Des Moines that farming is one of the most hazardous of all economic activities. Although the farmer works harder than most other people, his long hours are no guaranty of reward. Accidents of unfavorable weather, variations of rainfall, can destroy the results of the hardest work and the most careful planning. Moreover, while the farmer frequently suffers from bad weather, he can suffer as much from unusually good weather. Bad weather destroys his crops, but unusually good weather may destroy his income by creating such a glut as to force prices down below the cost of production.

Of course, we can't control the weather. But we can control the economic results of

the weather. We can carry over surpluses to time of scarcity, thereby helping both the producer on the farm and the consumer in the city. This is the principle of the ever-normal granary, which was worked out on an experimental basis in the late thirties, and which, I believe, should be extended and improved after the war.

The principle is as old as the Bible. It is the story of Joseph with his 7 fat years and 7 lean years. It is a pity that we had to wait so long before putting this piece of Biblical wisdom into operation for the protection of our farmers, and indeed for the protection of all of us. I rea ize that here in Iowa farmers get good crops practically every year, but other parts of the country are not so fortunate. And you can't have prosperity in Iowa if there is depression in Florida or Texas or California.

The ever-normal granary was designed to remove some of the risks of farmers as a group. But it obviously does not remove the risks as they affect the individual farmer. When crops are destroyed by drought or storm, the individual farmer can get no protection from the ever-normal granary. Protection to the individual farmer can be secured only through the insurance principle.

I deeply believe in crop insurance, just as I believe in insurance for business and for labor and for all of us. There are few things that have contributed more to our economic well-being and to our peace of mind and to the strength of our entire social fabric than the insurance principle. Congress, a year ago, refused an appropriation which called for the application of the insurance principle to agriculture. I sincerely hope that this action will be reversed. It seems to me that the farmer is entitled to be protected through insurance against the risk of weather destroying his income, at least to the same extent that the industrial worker is already protected against accidents which destroy his ability to work or against unemployment which cuts off his wages.

Another risk factor which I believe needs to be removed in the immediate post-war period is that resulting from the seasonal character of farm production and farm marketing. During periods when many crops are harvested and thrown on the market prices are depressed and consumption is abnormally stimulated. During off-season months, on the other hand, prices are high, supplies are scarce, and consumption is abnormally contracted.

It is the old fable of the grasshopper and the ant. The ant is wise enough to realize that the abundance of food in the summer months should not be recklessly consumed, but should be stored away for the bleak winter months. Strange as it may seem, we as a Nation have tended through our marketing habits, to imitate the grasshopper instead of going to the ant for wisdom. Obviously, it is to the advantage both of the farm producer and the city consumer to regularize our marketing of farm products and our consumption of seasonal crops.

The basis of such a policy has already been developed in the price support and purchasing programs instituted by the Department of Agriculture. But these programs, I believe, should be extended after the war and should take as their objective steadier farm prices and more even consumption of all farm products the whole year around. There is no reason why, with the range of crop seasons we have in this country, with rapid development of modern methods of preserving and storing food, and with governmentally supported food marketing arrangements, seasonal fluctuations in farm prices could not be largely ironed out. The farmer could then have the benefit of stable prices, while the consumer would be assured of adequate supplies of all kinds of food the whole year around.

Let me develop for a moment what I have said about the preserving and storing of foods. During the war, vast technological progress has been made which awaits only the release of materials and facilities to blossom into a great new industry. I believe we will see in the near future quick freezing and storage equipment in every community, available to every farmer. This equipment will go a long way toward preventing the heartbreaking gluts that every farmer knows. It will also bring to the consumer, in all seasons of the year, foods almost as fresh as the day they came from the field. And just consider the jobs that will be created in making the equipment, constructing the plants, and maintaining and operating them.

I may say in this connection that, to the extent that we decrease seasonal price fluctuations, I believe we shall remove a considerable source of friction between the farmer and the middleman. It is when prices fluctuate sharply that the farmer feels he is being taken advantage of by the middleman. Actually, it is not the middleman who personally takes advantage of him, but the anarchy of current marketing arrangements.

In addition to insuring against the risks and ironing out the price and supply fluctuations which affect all farmers, we must, after the war, pay special attention to the risks and handicaps which affect the small farmers. The neglect of the small farmers—the sharecroppers, the tenant farmers, and the poorly equipped small owner farmers—is a shocking commentary on our past history. It is shocking because we all know that the family farms are the backbone of our democracy, just as they are of any democracy.

Some thoughtless and cynical people used to say that there was no use fighting for the cause of the family farm—that there is an inevitable trend toward concentration of farm ownership and mass farm production. We know today that this is not so. With the present production trends away from staple crops and toward flexible diversified farming, there are no real obstacles to the survival and the prosperity of family farms. On the contrary, the basic agricultural trends seem to be favorable to their prosperity.

But in order to flourish, the family farm must be given the help of sympathetic public policies. Credit must be extended on terms adapted to farm needs. The family farm must have access to the latest scientific farm knowledge. It must have access to electric power, without which it is not possible to secure the advantages of modern technology. It must be given the protection of well planned marketing arrangements set up through farm group cooperation, assisted where necessary by the Government.

One of the most encouraging trends of the past 10 or 15 years has been the growth of cooperatives and the work they have done for the farmer. Equally encouraging have been the loan and grant programs of the Farm Security Administration and the tenant purchase program of the Bankhead Act. Through these measures we have made a good start in fighting the problem of farm poverty. But we have a great distance to go. How far we have to go is indicated by the fact that even today, in full war prosperity, the lowest third of our farmers have to subsist on a pitifully small income. The gross annual income of this lowest third, including Government payments and the value of their home-used produce, still averages only $300 a year per farm. Even in this era of wartime prosperity, that's all the money they have to pay their farming costs and to meet the living expenses of their families.

Obviously, farm families living on this scale provide a slim market for cars, building materials, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, or furniture. If their income is raised, as it must be, the added purchasing power would provide more employment in our cities, as well as more business for the country merchants. This increased income would eventually be returned to the farms in the form of a higher and more sustained demand for farm products.

The end of the war is going to present us with both a challenge and an opportunity to take a long stride in strengthening the position of family farming. The challenge will come from those of our veterans who will want to build for themselves on the land. The opportunity will be provided by the huge public holdings of land acquired in connection with Army camps, proving grounds, and for other wartime uses. It would be the best kind of statesmanship to see to it that this public land did not go to large holders but instead was reserved for veterans and offered to them on generous terms. With the loans which the pending G. I. bill would authorize the veterans could purchase farm machinery and equipment and get off to a good start.

You will have noted, I am sure, that most of the points which I have brought forward in my discussion here today are not essentially new. All the specific farm programs I have mentioned have either been tried or are in the process of being tried. I have simply asked that they be prosecuted with more vigor and more faith.

The one additional point that I have attempted to emphasize is the vital need of an aggressive program immediately after the armistice to raise and maintain the overall national income—the income that goes to all of us. Let me repeat that without that high level of national income, there can be no real solution to our farmers' problem.

It seems to me that this has been the one factor missing in our pre-war plans to create increased security and incomes for our farmers. The contrast between our pre-war and wartime experience has shown that. In peacetime, when we used the specific farm remedies that I have described without the general tonic of a high national income, we succeeded only in removing the acute distress that prevailed in 1932. We did not by any means restore American agriculture to vigorous health. In wartime, on the other hand, when the demands of our war economy forced us to put all our manpower to work and to produce a high national income, then and then only did we achieve a high level of farm prosperity.

In a word, the war has shown that our farmers need more than a mere opportunity to share equitably in the national income, however low that income may be. They need an opportunity to get their fair share of the high national income which we can so easily produce when we are all working.

It is in the light of this lesson, I believe, that we must plan for post-war agriculture. We must revise our traditional farm slogans and objectives. We dare not go back to restricting farm production to match the restriction of industrial output. We must go forward to expanded production on farm and in factory alike. And above all we must remember that this job of creating national prosperity belongs to all of us, and that no one group can hope to succeed without the others.

After the war is over our task should be clear. All of us, farmers, city workers, and businessmen, must stop fighting each other for a frugal share of national economic scarcity. Together, side by side, we must work to create and to share the national wealth and prosperity which our farms and our factories are so fully capable of producing.

Regulatory and Tax Problems of Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I propose for insertion in the RECORD an address by Mr. Oswald Ryan, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, given before the Boston Aeronautical Association on May 22, 1944. In this statement Mr. Ryan discusses the extremely difficult problems involved in any attempt to impose State regulation upon air transportation and the dangers to the air transport industry which may result from the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Northwest Airlines, Inc., against the State of Minnesota. Mr. Ryan takes the position that air transportation should be regulated exclusively by the Federal Government and that the matter of burdensome multiple taxation upon air lines should be dealt with by congressional action.

The address follows:

It seems certain that air transportation is destined for great and rapid development in the post-war period. During the decade of the 1930's the volume of civil air transportation doubled every 2 years. America's entry into the war halted this growth temporarily. The air transport industry went to war completely and effectively. Within 6 months after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor the greater part of the air transport facilities, equipment, and personnel was in the armed services. The remainder was called upon to handle a huge flow of wartime traffic which blocked off all ordinary civilian travel.

War temporarily halted all transportation over the air lines excepting that of the most urgent character. But it did not halt the growing civilian demand for such transportation. And it contributed greatly to aircraft design, the art of air navigation, and other developments which will speed the growth of post-war air transportation. So, when victory comes it seems certain that civil air transportation will resume growth at a greatly accelerated pace.

Boston is in a particularly favorable position to participate in this development. With the single exception of the Nation's Capital, Boston was, prior to the war, the leading air transport city of the United States in proportion to its population. During 1941 one air traveler embarked or debarked at Boston for each three and one-half persons in its population. More air passengers normally travel between New York and Boston than between any other two cities in the world.

Air traffic surveys conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Board indicate that immediately prior to the present war the domestic air travel in and out of the Boston airport had reached a level of approximately 270,000 passengers a year. On the basis of the more conservative estimates of air traffic growth, this figure should be trebled during the first decade after the war.

Boston is, of course, the air traffic center for all New England. It is the central terminal for air traffic between New England and all other parts of the United States. Also, it is the logical central terminal for all air traffic which may be interchanged between New England and all transocean areas.

Boston stands squarely astride all the great circle routes between the population centers of the United States and those of the European-Mediterranean areas. Of all the great American cities Boston lies the shortest distance from the entire European and West African coasts. It shares with other Atlantic seaboard points the advantage of equal distance to Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires and other populous centers of South America. And, strange as it may seem, the distance from Boston to the Orient by air is less than it is from most of our other great cities. We have all grown accustomed to having our notions of geography upset by those great circle maps which have been appearing of late. But it may surprise many of you to learn that the great circle distance by air between Boston and Calcutta is only 8,000 miles substantially the same as the great circle distance between San Francisco and Calcutta.

Entirely aside from its strategic geographic location, with respect to international air transportation Boston has a great additional advantage in being the center of one of the most travel-minded regions in the world. New England's land area is only 2.2 percent of the total land area of the United States. Its population is 6.4 percent of the Nation's population and its income as measured by Federal tax collections comprises 8.1 percent of the Nation's income. However, the share of trans-Atlantic travel contributed by New England has been historically 12 percent of the national total.

New England provided the origin or destination for approximately 50,000 first- and cabin-class overseas travelers annually prior to the war. It is estimated that within the next few years overseas air transportation will capture one-half of the historic sea-borne first- and cabin-class passengers and that with the addition of new travel which will be generated overseas air travel within a few years will equal the historic sea travel. On a basis of these estimates Boston should serve as the terminal for some 50,000 air passengers annually traveling to or arriving from overseas areas.

And this calls to mind also the importance of a new factor in our national economy which has not heretofore been rated as a factor of primary importance in the minds of most Americans. I refer to the significance of our foreign trade and the need for its maximum expansion.

I come from a section of the United States where public opinion upon this question of our foreign trade is, I think, more typical of the general American attitude than is the attitude of the people of the Atlantic seaboard. The great majority of our people in the past, particularly those living in the interior, have not been foreign-trade-minded.

We have now reached the time when our foreign trade and the development of foreign markets became a matter of greater concern to our national economy and the well-being of our people than ever before. We shall not be able to depend in the future to the extent that we have in the past upon our domestic market to solve our economic problems. One of the most important economic facts of our time has been the enormous productivity of American industry and agriculture, and that productive capacity is being further multiplied by the extraordinary technical improvements and additional plant capacity born of the present war.

Now, if we are to keep our great industrial machine operating, we must either find foreign markets or we must dismantle a large part of that capacity. Thus, the expansion of our foreign trade and commerce will become more essential than ever before to the absorption of a substantial part of the products of our factories, mills, and farms and to the useful employment of millions of Americans for whom places must be found in our national economy.

I should like to call your attention now to another question which vitally concerns the future development of air transportation in the domestic field. That is the question whether air transportation in the United States shall develop under the regulatory control of the National Government or whether it shall be subjected to the divided control of the Federal Government and the 48 States. As a lawyer engaged for more than two decades in the field of public utility and transportation law, I was witness to the epoch-making conflict between the Federal Government and the States in the regulation of public utilities and rail transportation. I saw two systems of regulation—one Federal and one State—grow up side by side, and I saw the great public-service industries that were regulated by them many times burdened by wasteful duplication of regulatory activity and by interminable conflict and litigation over jurisdictional conflicts. I do not want to see such a fate befall air transportation in this country.

What is the sound approach to this question of Federal or State control of air transportation? The approach quite generally has been a legal approach. It has been involved in a controversy over the question whether the Federal Government has the right under the Constitution to exercise the regulatory power or whether the Constitution reserves to the State power over the subject. But this question of air transportation is one of deep concern to the people of this Nation, and I would rather see the question settled not upon the basis of legalism and controversy over a constitutional doctrine, but upon the simple basis of what is best for the people of the State and Nation. If the facts show that air transportation is local in character and can best be regulated by both the State and the Federal Government, then by all means let us have it that way. If, on the other hand, air transportation is found to be inherently national and not local in character, then both common sense and sound policy call for a uniform regulation by national action.

I do not know of any sounder approach to this question of Federal or State jurisdiction than that which was expressed by one of the great Justices of this Nation in handing down the opinion of the high Court in a celebrated case. It was the so-called migratory bird case in which the State of Missouri challenged an act of Congress in the Supreme Court of the United States as an unconstitutional interference with the rights of the States as they are reserved by the tenth amendment. The tenth amendment, you will recall, declares that those powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the respective States. Missouri contended that that amendment reserved the regulatory power to the State, and Justice Holmes in his opinion said: "We must consider what this country has become in deciding what that amendment has reserved."

Now, if we consider what this country has become in the field of aviation in deciding the question of State regulation of air transportation, we shall be able to reach a sound conclusion as to the best governmental policy. We shall find that air transportation has been national rather than local in character. By reason of its great speed and mobility and the fact that it was not limited by mountain barriers or the barriers of oceans air transportation has not been local in operation. There are probably not more than five States in the Union today which cannot be traversed in a couple of hours' flying time. The average passenger trip by air is nearly 400 miles in length, while the average passenger trip by rail is less than 50 miles. Thus air transportation is a long-distance transportation. That is one reason why there is not today a single air line operating whose operations are confined to a single State.

So you see air transportation by its very nature is national in character and it will be more so in the post-war period which is ahead of us.

I submit that air transportation is a national problem and requires a single unified national regulation. And I predict that if this new transportation is to be subjected to the varying regulations of 49 different governments, we shall not be able to achieve that air transport development in the future which this war has proved to be so essential to our national security. For the economic burdens which might be expected from such multiple regulation could be so great as to effectively prevent the essential progress of this important public-service industry.

The economic burden of multiple regulation is not the only potential barrier to air-transport development in the post-war future. There are also those economic barriers that flow from the unwise exercise of the State taxing power. We have had one example of that recently in a case which has within the past week been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. The State of Minnesota imposed a tangible personal property tax on the entire fleet of plans operated by Northwest Airlines in its service from the Pacific Northwest to the city of Chicago. This tax was laid notwithstanding the fact that Northwest Airlines' planes were constantly moving from one State to another, notwithstanding the fact that only a part of the company's air fleet was ever in the State of Minnesota at one time and notwithstanding the fact that Northwest Airlines had paid a proportionate tax on the same planes in all the other States through which the company operates. In spite of these facts the Supreme Court of Minnesota upheld the power of the State to impose the tax in question, and the Supreme Court of the United States has now, by a five to four decision also upheld the right of the State to impose the tax.

Now there can be no question of the right of Minnesota to lay an equitable tax upon Northwest Airlines. But Minnesota in this instance laid a full tax upon the entire airline fleet, a part of which had likewise been taxed in the six other States through which the planes were flown in interstate commerce.

The majority in the Supreme Court upheld the power of Minnesota to assess the tax upon the entire fleet of the airline, but refused to decide the question whether the other States through which the airline operated these planes had the right to tax any part of the fleet, saying that this question was not before the court. Justice Jackson concurred in the majority decision but thought the court should have gone further and held that Minnesota's right to tax the fleet was exclusive. The Chief Justice dissented from the majority decision on the ground that the taxing of Northwest Airlines' fleet for their full value by Minnesota constituted an unconstitutional burden upon interstate commerce.

The Minnesota decision leaves unsettled the question of burdensome multiple taxation. It is, nevertheless, as significant decision. The majority decision makes reference to the power of Congress to control the taxation of interstate airlines. Justice Jackson, in a concurring opinion, points to the power of Congress to control this field of taxation, adding that Congress has not exercised its power to do so. Justice Black in a separate opinion says that "these problems call for congressional consideration and action." Thus, the various opinions strongly suggest that Congress can supply the answer to a problem which, unless it is taken under control, may create a situation which many feel will make it impossible for our airlines to survive economically.

May God Bless Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

MAY GOD BLESS THEM

The time for speculation is over now. The waiting, the anxious suspense, the taut expectancy of the armed young men who for so long have been poised to strike—all that is at an end. For though they constitute but the opening phase, the landings of our British, Canadian, and American forces in France herald with thunder and flame the invasion of western Europe, the great, the terrible, the awe-inspiring event which for the past 4 years—ever since the surrender of Pétain—has been anticipated by the free world as the indispensable precondition of liberation from one of the blackest tyrannies in history.

The days ahead—to be marked perhaps by other landings elsewhere—will be critical ones. The task given our Allied forces—men fighting at sea, men winging through the air, men parachuting through the skies, men storming ashore and reducing fixed fortifications—call for far more than the courage it takes to establish beachheads. It calls for the resolution, the fortitude, the sacrifice, and the skilled leadership required to beat back the violent counterattacks of our desperate enemy. And as we know from Salerno and Anzio, these may not come for the next 2 or 3 weeks, and not until they do come, and are surmounted, will it be safe to say that success has been achieved.

Here on the home front, moreover, we must steel ourselves to the possibility that the casualties will be heavier than those of any battle heretofore fought by Americans. For as President Roosevelt declared last night, "victory still lies some distance ahead," and the winning of it "will be tough and it will be costly." But as he also made clear, it will be surely won. We can be confident of that. Four years of painstaking planning, begun almost at the time of Dunkerque, are in back of this project. Thousands of ships, scores of thousands of planes, millions of superbly trained men are in back of it. We outnumber and excel the enemy in virtually every human and matériel category, and our invading forces enter the battle fresh, whereas Hitler's legions are half numb with the battering they have received in the East and the South, and half mesmerized with the prospect of what the Red Army is now likely to do in synchronization with our tremendous assault in the West.

Over and above all this, there are the oppressed millions of Europe. This is their day as much as it is ours; and in some respects even more so, for upon the success of our Allied troops depends the end of the night that has been upon them for four long years. Now they can look forward to being freed and of having their chance, as President Roosevelt has just said of Italy, to work with us toward a new happiness and a new era in which "no one city and no one race will be able to control the whole of the world."

There is not much that any of us here can say or do now to change the course of events that have been set in motion in France under the supreme command of our own General Eisenhower and his brilliant British deputy, General Montgomery. The die has been cast. With confidence in the outcome, it remains for us at home merely to do our jobs better than ever before, to maintain a sense of calm and perspective, and to say with President Roosevelt of those engaged in this fateful struggle, "May God bless them and watch over them and over all our gallant fighting men."

The President's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "Our President's Prayer Dismantles Despair," written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PRESIDENT'S PRAYER DISMANTLES DESPAIR

O dear God, we pray Thee, guide
Our brave sons, the Nation's pride—
This day, they have set upon
Daring tasks that must be done,
'Neath the Stars and Stripes unfurled,
To preserve our Father's world.

Lead them straight and lead them true,
In the tasks they're sent to do—
Thine own blessing will they need,
For their road is rough indeed—
And the enemy is strong—
And the battle's fierce and long.

Not for conquest is our prayer,
But for Freedom, everywhere,
Have we sent our sons afar,
To end this world-wrecking war,
Whose despotic tyrants hate
All that's right and truly great.

Our brave sons, for whom we yearn,
Some of them will not return—
Father, bear them in Thine arms
Past the deadline of alarms—
To the end, peace may be won,
Hear our prayer, "Thy will be done."

In these times of near-despair,
We set no one day for prayer,
But for those that sacrifice
All, for us, our prayers arise
Every hour of every day—
O God, hear us when we pray.

O dear God, the strength renew
Of our sons, while passing through
These baptisms, yea, of blood
For the sake of humanhood—
Let our hearts be stout and brave
Till they win the peace we crave.

Give us faith, O God, in Thee,
That our sons, across the sea,
May have faith, for this crusade,
As they, in Thy strength, invade
These lands dominated by
Those whose mandates we defy.

With Thy blessings, we can't fail—
In Thy strength, we shall prevail—
We are trusting Thee to lead,
In this war 'gainst crushing greed—
Grant, Lord, that we may not cease
Fighting, till we've won the peace.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

(Tune—Rock of Ages.)

General Mihailovich's Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of General Mihailovich, to the Allied public:

I deny with indignation all news of the German and Quisling propaganda affirming the collaboration of some units under my command with the occupator and Quisling troops fighting against the Partisans. I energetically protest against these lies.

Whoever knows at all the circumstances in which the Yugoslav Army was created will easily understand that this collaboration is a repugnant and stupid fiction. This army, formed in the spirit of resistance to the occupator and which has been engaged in fighting against his forces for 3 full years, suffering and inflicting great losses, whose friends, sympathizers, and collaborators have been and are being persecuted, arrested, tortured, and killed—this army would fall apart upon the slightest attempt of collaboration with the occupator and his servants. Anyone having a different opinion does not know the spirit of our Yugoslav Army.

If this truth is understood with difficulty by some of our friends in the Allied countries, it is very well known to the Germans and Quislings in Belgrade as well as in Zagreb and Ljubljana. It is because they know that the tactics of collaboration would disrupt the Yugoslav Army, that enemy propaganda does not cease repeating that collaboration exists, now of National Chetniks, now of Serbian Chetniks, with the German and Quisling troops.

German and Quisling propaganda are very anxious to draw advantage both from the confusion caused in our people by Allied propaganda in favor of the partisans, and from the strong animadversion, especially of the Serbian people for this movement which undoubtedly represents a small minority of the Nation and which undoubtedly is preparing a dictatorship of this minority, which our people will not have at any cost. Both the Germans and Quislings hope that in case of disruption of the Yugoslav Army the greater part of its units would join the Quisling Nedich, who wishes to be considered by the Serbian people as their leader against the partisans and against the London radio propaganda in favor of this movement. We therefore find with amazement that both the Allied and enemy propaganda, each in its own way and for its own particular reasons and aims, are working on the disruptance of our military organization and the breaking up of its spirit and the fundamental conceptions on which it is based, and all this to the advantage of our mutual enemy, the Germans.

Enemy and Allied propaganda has not succeeded nor will succeed to disrupt the unity of our heroic army. But this propaganda has induced many unorganized and disappointed men to join the Quisling ranks, because they had lived through and survived partisan methods. These men are joined by partisans who are surrendering either to the Quislings or to the Germans. With such units which are being formed here and there, and which often give themselves the name of Chetniks, the Yugoslav Army under my command has no relations whatsoever nor has ever had.

We are fully conscious of our duty both to our people and to their future as well as to our great allies. That is why we are fighting against the German and Bulgarian troops of occupation. We are fighting against the Quislings from Belgrade and against the Quislings from Zagreb and Ljubljana. But we are also fighting in self-defense against the Partisans who are attacking us on the entire territory of our country, whenever and wherever they can seize the opportunity to do so. The civil war, raging in our country under the enemy occupation, causing terrific devastation beside that caused and still being caused by the occupators and their collaborators, especially the Croatian Ustashis, has been provoked by the Partisans movement. After a short collaboration in the autumn of 1941-42, they abandoned the common front of resistance and attacked our units from the rear with the intention of liquidating us once and for all. And what the Partisans began then, they have never ceased doing, in this year more than ever. There is no propaganda that can do away with this truth and force the democratic elements of our people, namely at least nine-tenths, to accept and endure the dictatorship of a movement of violence, because it is directed against their conception of life.

If the allied public wishes to have precise information of the actual state of affairs in our country, it would be advisable for a certain number of American correspondents to come to my general headquarters where they would be cordially received and enabled to see everything, to go everywhere and to send reports as they wish.

Invasion Day Prayer for Victory and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following invasion day prayer for victory and peace by the Most Reverend Francis Spellman, Catholic bishop of the city of New York:

O God, Father of America:
Thou hast formed this union of States, sealing it with high destiny,
That our Nation be light to all peoples in their dark despair,
Life to all peoples in their fear of death,
Love to all peoples under their yoke of hate.
For this destiny Thou dost teach us to fly as the eagle,
Girding us with lightning and thunder,
Enriching us with treasures in field and fold.

O God, bless America with Thy shielding graces,
Lest we become a Nation without light, our eyes turned from Thee,
A Nation without life, our souls sundered from Thee,
A Nation without love, our hearts forgetting Thee.

O God, give us victory that is just, merciful and wise,
For Thou hast chosen America to be the soul of Thy justice,
The medium of Thy mercy,
The instrument of Thy wisdom.
Let all nations know that our justice comes from Thy spirit,
Our mercy from Thy heart,
Our wisdom from Thy mind,
Our victory from Thy strength.

Bless us, O God, with manifold graces,
To give freely of what we have,
To give fully of what we are,
In victory to give ourselves alone to Thee.

O God, the Father of all nations:
Hear our prayer for our united peoples,
Grant guidance to our leaders, protection to our sons,
And teach all of us Thy way of life in good will and peace.

Liberate the Jewish Victims of Hitler Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a copy of a letter I addressed President Roosevelt yesterday urging the establishment of a war-refugee camp in the United States where refugees of the war might find sanctuary, at least for the duration of the present struggle. I call the attention of the House to this problem with the confidence that many of my colleagues will join with me in urging this humanitarian action by President Roosevelt. My letter is as follows:

JUNE 6, 1944.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: In this hour of the liberation of the Continent of Europe from the ravaging hand of Hitler and Hitlerism, I join with all Americans in the expression of the deepest appreciation for your leadership in this most critical period in the life of our Nation.

It seems fitting to me that on this significant day I should address you about the problem of the Jewish people now prisoners in Hitler Europe. For on this day the signal for the struggle for their liberation was given. Now at last it is possible for America to offer the long-oppressed Jewish people the aid and succor we have long been prevented from giving them because of the conquest of Europe by Hitler.

As you know there is the prospect that in the wake of the successful invasion of Europe by the gallant men of the United Nations armed forces, there will be tens of thousands of Jewish war refugees from every section of Europe, who have hitherto been ruthlessly uprooted from their homes. The long period of famine and oppression experienced by these people under Hitler makes it imperative that America extend to them a helping hand. They were the first to feel the heel of Hitler tyranny and should be the first to be freed from Nazi oppression.

Because I know full well that you share my sentiments in this regard, I am writing to urge that you direct the War Refugee Board to establish in the United States a refugee rescue camp or "free port" where these refugees may find sanctuary from the horrors of war at least for its duration. By

this practical step we may save the lives of thousands of refugees, who might otherwise perish. May I further urge that this problem be presented to others of the United Nations to the end that such refugee rescue camps may be established elsewhere and to the end that aid in the transit of the refugees to America be afforded.

It is my fervent prayer that our first act of mercy in liberated Europe may be extended to the Jewish people; first victims of Hitlerite slavery.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

Report of Extension Work in Gasconade County, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report of the agricultural extension work in Gasconade County, Mo., for 1943, as follows:

REPORT OF EXTENSION WORK IN GASCONADE COUNTY

Ganconade County farm families responded to the Nation's need for more beef, pork, poultry and eggs, dairy and other food products in 1943, despite handicaps such as less labor, less machinery, floods, and other production problems. One thousand four hundred and twenty, or nearly 90 percent of the farm families in the county received assistance from the Agricultural Extension Program in solving these wartime problems.

Five hundred and four volunteer local leaders devoted 1,816 days of their time in helping their neighbors in producing and conserving more food, making their own clothing, keeping better informed, using more efficient farm and home practices, and contributed to other war activities such as bond sales, scrap drives, etc.

One hundred and sixty-eight homemakers and 4-H girls acting as canning aides assisted with a county-wide food preservation and conservation program.

Three hundred women and 4-H girls received assistance from 60 clothing and home management leaders trained in converting old garments and new materials into useful clothing and furnishings for their homes.

Seventy-five farmers were provided with 90 farm workers through the farm-labor program. In addition, 100 townspeople assisted with the havesting of crops.

Three hundred and seventy-four 4-H boys and girls were mobilized for service with the assistance of 75 men and women leaders. Eighty and six-tenths percent completed production and other projects.

Farmers continued to conserve their soil with 997 farmers using 12,000 tons of lime, 34 farmers terracing 225 acres of cropland and 406 farmers planting 5,000 acres of crops on the contour. Five thousand trees were planted for erosion control.

The County Soil Improvement Association, composed of over 200 members, contributed to the war-food program by providing the limestone, lime spreaders, terracing, and contour equipment.

More than 600 farmers used supplemental pastures to increase their livestock production. Henry W. Meyer of Owensville reports that 33 acres of small-grain lespedeza pasture produced 12,000 pounds of beef on his farm.

All 16 home economics clubs in Gasconade County planned Victory programs for the entire year. Emphasis was placed on better wartime nutrition, clothing extension, home improvement, and family health problems. Four new clubs were organized during the year.

Two hundred and twenty 4-H members, leaders, parents, and friends attended two county round-ups at Hermann and Owensville. Twenty-two county awards were received when 40 persons attended the district 4-H round-up at Jefferson City. Five hundred and fifty attended county-wide programs during National 4-H Achievement and Reorganization Week, in Gasconade County.

Seventy farmers improved their quality of livestock through the use of pure-bred breeding stock. Nearly 2,000 pounds of wool were added to the wool clip by dipping 1,000 sheep.

Ninety share-the-meat leaders trained and assisted 2,700 families who cooperated with this program. Ninety-one leaders assisted their neighbors with planning, preparing, and serving wartime meals.

Thirty-two child development and health leaders aided 624 families in using wartime measures to protect family health and build up morale.

Fifty-eight county women received the benefifts of home study through enrollment in the State extension course, Helps for Mother.

Lumber dealers cooperated by providing labor-saving equipment, such as hog houses, hog feeders, range shelters, and poultry feeders. The machinery dealers also cooperated with the program to encourage machinery repairing during the winter months.

One hundred and sixty-nine club members, parents, and leaders observed 4-H mobilization week by attending a county-wide rally in Owensville, February 9. Food production and conservation projects were emphasized.

Over 600 farmers used outlook information as a basis for planning their livestock and crop production.

Four hundred farmers were assisted with their income-tax reports by the county extension agent and leaders trained by the agent.

One hundred and sixty-two farm homes were checked for fire hazards during fire-prevention week. Sixteen community meetings were held to discuss fire hazards, through the cooperation of the Extension Service and farm forester.

Nearly 200 farmers attended meetings designed to assist them in the preserving of their metal roofs. Material for the demonstrations was provided by the American Zinc Institute.

Over 500 persons attended the mobilization-day program held in January, and 240 farm men and women representing each school district in the county attended the annual soils and crops conferences held in Owensville and Hermann.

Mr. Speaker, this exceptional record was made under Mr. C. E. Klingner and Miss Myrtle G. Gohike, extension agent and home demonstration agent, respectively, of Gasconade County. It is a record of accomplishment equaled in few counties in the Nation and necessarily reflects in its bare statistical summaries only a small part of the great advantages accruing to the farmers of the county and through them to the businessmen of the county and adjoining communities.

The report is submitted through the cooperation of Mr. Benjamin Held, of Morrison, Mo., a member of the extension board of Gasconade County. The results secured in Gasconade County are typical of the work of the Extension Service throughout the State.

Graduation Exercises at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell at West Point, N. Y., on June 6, 1944:

When you came to West Point, when you entered the Military Academy, this Nation was still at peace. But it was a restless peace. We had begun earnestly and seriously our preparations against war. Yet, you and all thinking men knew that war could not indefinitely be averted. We did not want war. We strove with long patience to escape it. We went to great limits to avoid it. When war did come, striking treacherously out of the morning sky, you cadets must have chafed at having to remain behind while other men marched off to fight. I know from my own experience the impatience and the despair at having to remain here, with which you have watched the march of events.

But we must all remember that all can't go at once, that prior to actual combat there must be this long period of intensive training to fit us for the fray. Remember that training is essential to victory, and it is victory that counts.

This is an historic hour. Today these walls, these hills, the very shadows of battle monument take on a new meaning and a deeper significance. Only a few hours ago the mightiest undertaking ever attempted by our Army was launched against enemy entrenched along the shores of France. Today our forces began that grim, tough, and bloody march from the shores of the Atlantic to Berlin. Many of you will join in that march. Many of you will become a part of the sweep in the Pacific which will lead eventually to the destruction of Japan.

How much it will take to achieve victory no one can predict. Of one fact and one only may we be sure. We are going to win. Some of us have been impatient over the slowness of our start but every minute of delay was a minute devoted to preparation. We wisely chose to sacrifice speed to thoroughness.

I can tell you now that our armies in Europe have enough of everything and everything is the best obtainable.

The mass of power of American genius and American production is in the hands of our troops. They have more guns and better guns, more ammunition and better ammunition, more tanks and better tanks, more planes and better planes, more bombs and better bombs than our enemies. The overwhelming weight of firepower is in our hands. To that add leadership and the result will be victory. We do have that leadership. We cannot fail.

On all fronts you will need all of the stamina, moral and physical, with which you are endowed and all of the knowledge which you have acquired here. Paramount among the qualities which you must display in the role which falls to your lot is what we call leadership. It has long been the tradition of West Point that the men who came from here are leaders of men. I want to talk to you about leadership, not because it is new, for you have studied it in manuals, in histories, and in the biographies of the great. This place is steeped in the tradition of leadership. West Point has furnished leaders in every business and profession. But now, as you are leaving to take your places in the

field, it is appropriate that you should be reminded of the many responsibilities that go with you in your new duties.

You are soldiers by profession and you will be officers in a citizen Army. Your fellow officers and the men who serve under you will expect that you have been well trained in military subjects. You must prove to them that you possess the art of leadership. For the two things are not the same. The first is knowledge and the other is character.

Among the men with whom you are going to live there will be both leaders and followers. You may be sure, wherever you are, that you are in what General Marshall has called "fast company." Some have developed leadership in this war, others led in civilian life before they were called to arms. They have been tested either in actual operations or at least in the field. When you join your organization, you will have to demonstrate to leaders and followers alike those qualities which inspire confidence in superiors and loyalty in subordinates. It won't be long before they will say "he has it" or "he hasn't it."

As graduates of this great institution you will be marked men from whom your fellows will expect great achievements. Among them you will find not only those younger than you and less prepared than you, but also those of more mature years, at least your peers in wisdom and experience and already tested and marked by successful achievement. Every minute will carry the ringing challenge to you to measure up to expectations. Human nature is the most fascinating, the most promising, the most powerful, but the most unpredictable element or force in the world. The extent to which you can understand it will be the measure of your success, as a military career above all others requires constant intimate handling of the human element under all conceivable conditions of stress and emotion.

To what extent leadership is inborn or acquired we do not know. In considering the quality of leadership, Marshal Foch said: "These are natural gifts in a man of genius, in a born general; in an average man such advantages may be secured by work and reflection." The mere fact that we see our fellow officers acquire leadership in operations as you have done in your cadet years is, in itself, proof that it is worth the work and reflection to which Foch referred.

Don't make the usual error of thinking that leadership depends merely upon courage, though ccurage is a first essential. Don't believe that leadership will come with a parade-ground voice and a soldierly carriage. These are only the trappings, the outer aspects, of leadership. True leadership which comes from within may be displayed at the desk as well as under fire, in civil as well as military life.

We can discern successful leadership not so much by the study of the leader as by examining the spirit of the organization he heads and the results it obtains. The spirit of a unit is a true measure of effective leadership. Given good leadership there need be no morale problems. Without it, all the training, all the equipment, all the planning of the higher command is wasted. The faith of men in their leader inspires mutual confidence which sustains the collective effort of the group. It is an indispensable attribute of command. It takes more than knowledge, more even than success, to build up that feeling of confidence. The loyalty of the Confederate soldiers to General Lee, or of the grand army to Napoleon, were not lessened by defeat. When a unit begins to identify itself by the name of its commander it has become something more than a random number in the order of battle, and in these days when the proud regiments of the Regular Army are few besides those which must make their history as they go, group pride must be built by present-day leadership. To achieve this identification of the unit with the leader, the leader must identify himself with his unit, and both with the cause. Cromwell said, "Give me men who know for what they fight and love what they know." We can add the paraphrase, "Give me men who know for whom they fight and love whom they know." The sense of mission, of purpose, of a country worth working, fighting, dying for, this is the first great element of leadership. The leader must first be inspired himself; then he can inspire others. His job is to develop this habit of thought in himself and in his men.

Second to this sense of personal mission he must put a feeling of confidence in self, a confidence that should arise in the belief of having done everything possible to prepare for any possible demand. You men have worked and worked hard to win our commissions. Don't forget that this is only the beginning of your labors. From the flood of publications from the War Department and the major commands, you must pick and master those that bear on your mission. You must continually study the course of the war and not only the operations in which your own unit is concerned, but the larger picture as well. For your men want to know about those things as well as the immediate task ahead and if you are to maintain your leadership you must be yourself informed. You must study your own leaders and your brother officers. What have they that you must develop, and always, always, you must study your men. For what is leadership without a well-trained smoothly running team of confident followers?

In a sense the leader must know his men as they are required to know their weapons. And by knowledge, I mean personal knowledge. I would not have a platoon leader in my command if he did not know the name of every man in his platoon, could not give me a thumbnail sketch of his character as well as his military skill, and had not decided how to use him in certain probable contingencies. This is no easy task in these days when personnel is changing so rapidly, but it is one that must be mastered to achieve leadership.

In the third place, I should put a feeling of personal responsibility for the unit and the individuals of which it is composed. In the manual for company officers of the German Army it is explicitly stated that the company commander must be "the father of the company". This may appear a strange assignment to a young lieutenant commanding men his own age or older, but the principle is correct and recognized by the men themselves. In a study made of soldier opinion, it was learned that second only to confidence in the competence of their officers, soldiers esteem an interest in their personal welfare. You should have this interest naturally. If not, you must force yourself to develop and to demonstrate that interest. No officer worthy of his commission can feel that his responsibilities end with the training schedule and company administration and that the rest of the day is his. Leadership cannot be turned on and turned off like that.

These then, are three ideals I ask you to set before yourselves, a sense of mission; a feeling of self-confidence based on exhaustive study and activity, and an interest in the personal welfare of your men. There are ways in which you may assist yourself to achieve them. Let us turn back to the study of soldier attitudes of which I have just spoken. What attributes does the American soldier prize most highly in their officers?

The one mentioned by most of them is ability. This is an all-embracing term. The soldier must have faith in the competence of the leader. Certainly the success of the operation depends upon the know-how back of the leader's decision, and in battle men know that life or death, victory or defeat, may hinge on the leader's commands. No bungler will have achieved leadership.

Then comes interest in the welfare of the men. They say they want an officer whom they can trust in time of need, to whom they can go when they need advice about their personal affairs. It is a good outfit when men say, "My lieutenant told me what to do about it," or "You had better ask the lieutenant, he'll know."

Another thing they want is promptness in making decisions. You can't tell a soldier "I will have to sleep on that." The leader has to think and think fast. That does not mean bluff. If you don't know, say so, but set a definite time for your decision and meet it.

Ability to give instruction comes next in the soldier's list. A soldier values the officer who explains things clearly, simply, and briefly. His own training depends upon his ability to learn, and he respects the man who can teach him easily. Of course, that goes back to knowing the subject and knowing the kind of men to whom you are talking. Patience and understanding are required for the successful army instructor.

Judgment is another quality that is highly valued by the men. We are inclined to associate this quality with maturity and experience, but it can be developed early. The conscious effort to weigh both sides of a problem promptly and fairly before making a decision, and then acting promptly and decisively, should be cultivated until the habit becomes second nature.

Remember Field Marshal Lord Wavell's statement, "At the same time there is no doubt that a good young general will usually beat a good old one."

Common sense is put high on the scale of things that count by the soldier. Some leaders have consciously or unconsciously developed eccentricities. While these may attract attention, and even imitation, it is in spite of them, rather than because of them, that these men have won the confidence of their troops. Shun them as you would the plague.

The ability to get things done is another mark of the leader in the eyes of his men. Once you have started something, you can't afford not to finish it, if not by one way, then by another. Results are what count, not only in the eyes of your superior but also of your own outfit. They need to brag a little about the outfit and "the old man."

Soldiers—American soldiers—or any soldiers for that matter—don't like to be bossed around needlessly. Once they mark an officer as "rank heavy," he has two strikes against him. They intuitively feel that he is not sure of himself and has to fall back on the authority of rank. The fussy, bossy lieutenant who is always telling his men off about little things isn't apt to get them to do the big things right. They like to be noticed and commended when they think they deserve it. Citations and medals are the rewards of outstanding achievement, but a few words of appreciation from the immediate commander at the appropriate time do wonders to build up self-esteem in the soldier and loyalty to the commander. On the other hand, commendation must be judicious and based on real merit, for the soldier is quick to discover and resent insincere or supercilious words.

Soldiers have an innate respect for soldierly carriage and physical strength. Like everyone else, they admire a fine-looking soldier, but, curiously enough, these qualities are rated by them only slightly more highly than good education, sense of humor, and courage, in the order named.

The position of courage in their list is a curious one. By all odds, it is the first attribute of a soldier. It is not as common as we would like to believe it to be. The possessor of moral courage is a rare individual. Perhaps, though they have no right to do so, they have assumed courage as a matter of course. Soldiers want their leaders to be fair, to play no favorites, to harbor no grudges.

Without this confidence in their commander, there can be no real loyalty or teamwork.

Another trait which men mention as desirable is industry. They admire a hard-working officer and even if they do a little gold bricking themselves they soon lose respect for the officers who do as little work as they can get away with.

There are more characteristics listed by enlisted men as desirable in the officers they would like to serve under, but those I have mentioned appear most frequently. The young officer who strives to earn the confidence of his men by developing the traits which they admire in their leaders will have come a long way in developing qualities of leadership. The test of leadership comes in the performance of duty by the organization. Your efficiency as a leader will be rated by your superiors on your unit's success in whatever task may be assigned to it. That efficiency depends upon training, administration, and spirit. None of these factors may be neglected, and this is true whether your command is a combat platoon, a bomber crew, or clerks in an office.

In this graduating class before me there are men who as the years pass by will develop and who, tried in the acid test of war, will attain positions of prominence in this country. Some will achieve international fame as leaders of men. There are others whose accomplishments will be few and whose names will be concealed in the War Department files. Yet you all have had the same course of instruction. You have lived under identical conditions, you have been imbued with the same ideas and ideals. Why should not the products of this uniform system rise to the same level 20 or 30 years hence? The answer lies in the fact that the estimate that your superiors will make periodically of your efficiency will be based primarily on the impression that they form of your ability as a leader. This impression will be based on their observations and analysis of that quality in a man we know as character. It is the inner force which develops within a man and grows with the years. It is the governor of his actions, the pattern of his life. It is the result of years of contemplation and of action. We judge a man's character by his reactions. Is he brave or cowardly, firm or vacillating, considerate or arbitrary, open-minded or narrow-minded, wise or foolish, honest or dishonest? Does he profit by his errors or is he licked by them? Can he make a decision for the common good that is adverse to his own interest? Above all, can he be depended upon, under the severest of temptation, to hold his honor above all possible rewards? Does he hold himself above the hypocrisies and little affectations which serve to mark a man, even though honest, as small rather than a man of real character? The answers to these questions are the tests by which a man's character is appraised. The questions are those which every man should ask of himself.

Self-criticism is an aid to character development. Criticism by others is a test of character. Great leaders are men who can stand criticism, who can bear up under heavy losses. They have learned to accept responsibility early in life and to accept the consequences of their decisions with fortitude. You will find that no matter how high your principles, how unselfish your decisions, what advantages result from your actions, there will be those who will criticize them. Your subordinates may resent them, your superiors may disapprove. The great voice of public opinion may be lifted against you.

Theodore Roosevelt was a man of strong convictions, high character, and endowed with outstanding qualities of leadership. Listen to his words: "It is not the critic who counts, nor the man who points out how the strong man stumbled, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause; who, at the best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement; and who, at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

This is not to say that criticism is not often deserved. No man is wise enough to avoid errors and none of our great leaders has failed to make them. But their greatness is shown in the way they have made use of their errors and profited by their experiences. They were not defeated in the long run by their mistakes. Theirs was the ability to improve by restudy of the problems, by arriving at new and correct solutions for use in future emergencies.

When you are confronted by your errors, face them. There is no use in attempting to cover them up, nor in taking refuge in apologies. The best course of action and one which is essential to your dignity and self-respect is to admit the error and profit by it. You are expected to make decisions and take action. The man who has made no mistake has neither decided nor acted. The Army needs men who have ideas and believe in them, even if some are wrong, more than it does men who either have no ideas or are too timid to act upon them for fear of making mistakes.

Honest criticism by others, if met intelligently, is not to be feared. But I must caution you against your indulging in criticism of others. There will be times when you are expected to criticize, may even be ordered to do so, but remember when you do criticize others' decisions, you must be prepared to recommend corrective action, and, if required, to take corrective action. It might not be amiss to quote Abraham Lincoln's letter to General Hooker on his appointment to command the Army of the Potomac. It brings out on the one hand the qualities which made Lincoln a great leader and on the other, the weaknesses which led to Hooker's failure. Lincoln wrote:

"I have placed you at the head of the Army of the Potomac. Of course I have done this upon what appears to me sufficient reason, and yet I think it best for you to know that there are some things in regard to which I am not quite satisfied with you. I believe you to be a brave and skillful soldier, which, of course, I like. I also believe you do not mix politics with your profession, in which you are right. You have confidence in yourself, which is a valuable, if not an indispensable quality. You are ambitious, which within reasonable bounds, does good rather than harm; I think that during General Burnside's command of the Army you have taken counsel of your ambition and thwarted him as much as you could, in which you did a great wrong to the country and to a most meritorious and honorable brother officer. I have heard, in such a way as to believe it, of your recently saying that both the Army and the Government needed a dictator. Of course it was not for this, but in spite of it, that I have given you the command. Only those generals who gain successes can set up as dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship. The Government will support you to the utmost of its ability, which is neither more nor less than it has done and will do for all commanders. I much fear that the spirit which you have decided to infuse into the Army of criticizing their commander and withholding confidence from him will now turn upon you. I shall assist you as far as I can to put it down. Neither you nor Napoleon, if he were alive again, could get any good out of any army while such a spirit prevails in it; and now beware of rashness. Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories."

It has been an exceptional privilege to be with you today. No graduate of West Point can return for even a fleeting moment and not obtain fresh inspiration from the spirit of service so evident here. No one may stand before the corps of cadets, particularly on graduation day, and not respond to its high resolve.

The record of the graduates of West Point in past wars has been engraved in the history of our country. The record of its graduates in this war is now being written in that same history. A part of it is in your hands. Those who will examine that record now in the making will find once more that West Point has fulfilled its task. Its graduates will have strived to achieve the high traditions of service inculcated at West Point; duty, honor, and country. Serving alongside their comrades from the Regular Army and from civilian life, they have worked together, learning from each other to weld into a fighting unit a great citizen army. That army has confidence in its leadership and determination to achieve full and early victory. It has proven itself on every field of battle. It will prove itself in the battles to come.

Gentlemen of the graduating class, you leave the Academy as officers in the United States Army during the very hours when that Army is making the greatest effort in all its history.

And now in Lincoln's words, "Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories." But victories or no victories, be men of character and high purpose—be true sons of West Point.

Crippling U. N. R. R. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington Post of June 6, 1944. This editorial is entitled "Crippling U. N. R. R. A.," and I hope that it will be read thoughtfully by the Members of this Congress:

CRIPPLING U. N. R. R. A.

The Republican members of the House on Saturday showed an alarming spirit of partisanship in respect to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. By what Representative WOODRUM referred to as "a strict party vote," they lopped $350,000,000 from the $800,000,000 appropriation sought for that agency by the President. The curtailment can in no sense be considered an economy. The three hundred and fifty million had already been appropriated to lend-lease and would merely have been transferred for U. N. R. R. A.'s use as needed. Besides, Congress is already on record as having authorized an American contribution of $1,350,000,000 to U. N. R. R. A. The effect of the action, therefore, can only be, as Mr. WOODRUM put it, "to cripple U. N. R. R. A."—and to do so as it stands on the very threshold of its tremendous undertaking. The liberation of Rome indicates how near at hand may be the need for its healing efforts. The American people, as the President declared last night, had approved "the salvage of these human beings, who are only now learning to walk in a new atmosphere of freedom."

U. N. R. R. A. cannot do its job with promises—or with promised but unappropriated funds. It must have money with which to purchase the great quantities of food, clothing, farm equipment, and repair materials which will be needed to succor the homeless and the hungry and to set the wheels of devastated Europe's economy back in motion. It cannot wait to order these things until liberation is actually achieved. Recognizing this, the British have already appropriated the whole amount of their pledged contribution. So has the little Republic of Iceland. But the United States, the wealthiest and most powerful of the member nations, holds back—and for reasons of partisan politics. To the anguished peoples of Europe whose hopes have been kindled by our promises, this parsimony can bring only dismay and a dangerous disillusionment.

U. N. R. R. A. is the first concrete mechanism for interallied cooperation in the solution of post-war problems. Our adherence to it ought to be wholly divorced from domestic political divisions. The action of the House Republicans is a sorry commentary indeed upon the meaning of the Mackinac declaration to which their party subscribed: "We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world." It cannot fail to suggest that this declaration was mere lip service to the principle of international collaboration. Clearly the House Republicans have defaulted before the first practical test of their intentions. We hope that the members of their party in the Senate will set aside this sort of partisanship. They must do so if they are to sustain the faith of the world in America's post-war leadership.

Lafayette, We Are Here—Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a copy of a publication in the New Orleans Times-Picayune, on D-day sponsored by Holmes, of New Orleans, La., as follows:

LAFAYETTE, WE ARE HERE—AGAIN

"Lafayette, we are here." Remember these immortal words spoken in 1917? Remember the high resolve they bespoke, the eagerness to repay the old debt America always remembered?

Had you thought, Lafayette, that this time America would forget—this time America would fail one of the most beloved of her sister nations, her benefactress, her friend?

That America would forget the cause of freedom, as sacred to herself as it is to you?

You should have known, Lafayette, we could not stand idly by. That sooner or later our wrath would rise, that one day we would come roaring to your beaches, with flaming guns and freedom's banners flying. Come, as we have come today, determined that the oppressor shall pay dearly for every insult, every theft, every murder perpetrated against the beloved folk and upon the beloved soil of France.

Come determined to restore the laughter and the lights, the gayety and glamour, the wit and zest for life that are our vision of eternal France.

It has been harder this time. We have had to fight our way. This time we know, too, what difficulties still lie ahead. But this time, with your help, we will finish the job.

Lafayette, we are here—again.

Commencement Day Address by Secretary of the Navy Forrestal at United States Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very interesting and impressive address delivered by the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. James Forrestal, to the one hundred and fourth graduating class of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., on June 7, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have subjected my speech which I had originally proposed to deliver this morning to substantial abridgment because of my feeling that the events which began yesterday on the coast of France transcend any commencement rhetoric of which I am capable.

I do, however, want to make one reference to military operations which have been launched against the fortress of Europe. As Admiral Royal Ingersoll, Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, said yesterday, the tremendous massed power which is now launched by sea, by air, and by land against Hitler's armies is a vivid and convincing demonstration of what he called the silent power of the Navy. Without subtracting one iota from the initial success of General Eisenhower's armies and the vast air and sea fleets which provided the covering forces for his soldiers, it is obvious that this accumulation of force could not have occurred without the control of the Atlantic sea lanes. This control was achieved by the American and British Navies over a period of 2½ years. It was accomplished through constant and unremitting study of enemy tactics and through the most extraordinary coordination of surface vessels, land-based air, and the baby flat tops.

The success it attained is stated more strikingly by these statistics than by any superlative of language. Since January 1, 1942, a total of 7,400 vessels have been convoyed across the Atlantic by the American Navy, with a loss of 10. And in this list of casualties there is not a single troop transport.

In the last analysis the defeat of Germany, as well as of Japan, will be effected by the Army on land, and the main part of that burden will be borne, as it always has been, by the queen of battle, by the infantry, by the men on foot, in trenches, with rifle fire and bayonet expelling the enemy from his positions. But these men and the supplies which sustain them can only get to the point of attack if we have command of the sea. Let us write that fact in unforgettable language in our memories.

You begin your careers today in a service whose infinite variety challenges the most active imagination.

A hundred years ago when George Bancroft, Secretary of the Navy and historian, conceived the idea of a school to provide academic training for naval officers our Navy consisted of 76 vessels with a total displacement of about 79,000 tons. Today it consists of over a thousand combatant ships of three and a third million tons, with millions of tons more of auxiliaries, landing craft, and small vessels, and with additional ships still building which would constitute in themselves a formidable Navy.

In the development of its new power the American Navy has produced a balanced fleet. The thinking which preceded the construction of the vast forces which we have at sea today rested on the concept that no one weapon or class or kind of vessel alone can win a war. We did not discard the battleship but we built faster, heavier battleships, ships capable of aggressive defense against air attacks, although still needing the protection of air to meet such attacks in volume.

Unlike the Germans, we did not count on any single weapon, such as the submarine. The Germans made mighty boasts that the U-boat alone would be able to deny us the Atlantic lanes for the carrying of troops and supplies to Europe. They have had their answer. It is an answer which has been forged by ourselves and our British associates in harsh and destructive reality.

The American Navy long before the start of this war recognized the tremendous impact that the airplane would have on sea power. The Navy kept its naval service for the Navy, and it meshed air power into the fighting power of the fleet. The dive bomber, the torpedo plane, the coordinated use of the dive bomber with the torpedo plane—these were conceptions and developments of American naval tactics.

I should like to touch briefly upon the course of the war and upon the problems that will come with its conclusion. As for the first, I want to speak to you in terms of your experience in competitive games. In every such struggle, whether it is on the football field, in the prize ring, or in a foot race there comes a moment when the tide of victory swings sharply to one of the participants. That is the moment of danger for the competitor who leads at the moment. If having got the upper hand he continues hard and concentrated pressure upon his opponent, he sweeps to victory, but if he thinks the match is won, that he can relax, he may find an apparently beaten foe, suddenly revitalized, returning to the fight with vigor and confidence. In sports that let-down has proved fatal to many an apparent winner, and it can be equally fatal in war.

We have come a long way on the road to victory and we are on the eve of great and historic events. But the rhythm and tempo of victory which is ours now must not be lost, against neither the Japs nor the Germans. We cannot afford for a moment to relax the iron pressure which we are applying with steady and inexorable power.

As for the problems of peace, many and wiser men have talked to better effect on these. I would only venture to express agreement with the general statement that we shall emerge from the war with great problems, with a national debt that will be staggering by any orthodox criteria of Government finance, with sensitive international relationships to be ajusted, and with a tremendous responsibility on the part of both government and industry to provide as nearly as may be an economy of full employment for the men who return from the war. But these problems are not insoluble. They can and must be dealt with just as we have dealt with the great problems of the war. Even our enemies have discovered that we were able to make war on a scale and at a pace which they never considered possible. We shall face the troubles of peace with no less courage.

I have denied myself that usual indulgence of the commencement orator: Gratuitous and extended advice to the young. I shall allow myself only one fragment, and that is this: The very character of your profession makes for insulation from the outside world. Changing tours of duty in different parts of the country and cruises in remote parts of

the world will separate you from the roots of your original homes, but by the same token, if you take your opportunities, they will give you broader contacts and wider interests than it is given to the average man to obtain.

You will need to take full advantage of such opportunities because the military services as a whole, and the Navy in particular, will need to have a wider knowledge of political and social problems than ever before in the past. The traditions of the service proscribes political activity but it does proscribe knowledge of political and economic questions, nor of social questions. We have learned in this war that there is no such thing as international isolation, and I believe it will be equally apparent that there is no such thing as isolation for any class of individuals in our national life. The pace of modern life runs at too high a tempo and it is too interrelated for any of us to indulge the luxury of separation. The Navy must not be permitted to relapse into one of its periods of neglect. That means the people must realize that it is an instrument of national policy, an instrument usable and to be used for the purpose of peace rather than war. If that point of view is to obtain and retain currency, you will have to do your part in the creation and retention of public confidence in the Navy.

You have come from every State in the Union, from every kind of social and economic background. One hundred and sixty of you have come from the enlisted personnel of the Navy to achieve commissioned rank. You have been measured here on your own attributes of mind and character. It did not matter where you came from, how much money you had, or what country clubs you belonged to. There is no caste so far as naval officers are concerned, except that high caste of competence, efficiency, and devotion to one's country. You are the custodians of honor—the honor of the Navy and the honor of your country.

Will Farm Depression Come After This War as After the Last War?

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the honor and privilege to represent in the United States Congress, is largely agricultural. I have met and talked with hundreds of hard working, patriotic farmers in the past several years, and almost invariably the conversation gets around to what is uppermost in their minds, and it is summed up in these words: "Will farm depression and low crop prices return after World War No. 2 as it did after World War No. 1?" These farmers have suffered through 20 years of ruinous depression prior to this war, and their concern lest those conditions return is certainly worthy of consideration and action by the United States Congress at an early date.

We in Congress will share in the responsibility of seeing that farm prosperity is not sabotaged at the conclusion of this conflict. In order to bear this responsibility well, we should be able to analyze what happened to farm prosperity in the past, and have a constructive solution for the present and future.

With all the talk about post-war planning for this and for that, I have yet to hear a voice raised for a comprehensive and workable post-war plan for agriculture.

Historians now record that the deflationary policy instituted by the Federal Reserve Board in 1920 coincided with the beginning of the farm depression in the United States.

The passage of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act in 1922 and the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930 deprived our farmers of about a billion dollars a year in export trade, according to statistics compiled by the Department of Commerce.

Nations which depended upon foreign exchange secured by selling manufactured goods to us with which to secure our farm products, could no longer sell to us because of these high tariffs. Therefore as a result they did not have the wherewithal with which to buy agricultural products from us in return. As a result, most of these nations transferred their business to the farmers of South America and elsewhere—and our farm surpluses grew to mountainous proportions.

The tariff on farm products was entirely ineffective due to our peacetime crop surpluses. Farm prices dropped so low that corn was burned in furnaces instead of coal, and this at a time when dictators were preparing to grab in Europe and Asia what we were destroying in America.

PLANS THAT HAVE FAILED

The handling and disposal of surpluses comprise the basic peacetime farm problem. Attempts have been made to solve this problem, as we all know, but for one reason or another, they have generally failed.

First. The vetoed McNary-Haugen bill in 1928 was a good plan, but it didn't go far enough.

Second. The next attempt at solution was tried in the late twenties when the Government instituted the Federal Farm Board plan and bought grain and stored it in granaries. This stored grain was a drug on the market and a constant menace and depressant to domestic farm prices.

Third. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration plan has been a necessary and homewhat effective stop-gap but it had cost our taxpayers over $5,000,000,000 up to 1941 and did not solve the surplus problem of the farmer's full production efforts. Farm produce cannot be plowed under nor can production be curtailed without entailing a financial loss to both the producer and the taxpayer. Farmers want parity, not charity! However, a drowning man accepts any kind of help and because our farmers were going under, financially speaking, through no fault of their own, they felt compelled to accept Government assistance, and would have to do so again under similar circumstances.

Fourth. Reciprocal trade agreements have failed to help the farmer primarily because virtually all of the countries with whom we traded on this basis were agricultural countries, which sent to the United States their own agricultural products in exchange for United States industrial commodities, thus in practice often actually injuring the American farmer. At the same time, the highly industrialized and heavily populated countries needing our foodstuffs were ignored.

So much for the various attempts at solving the problem.

What, then, is the solution?

It is obvious that we cannot store our surpluses, nor can we destroy or curtail our production without financial loss to someone. Reciprocal trade agreements in the main have further impoverished the American farmer.

That leaves but one alternative—that of getting our surpluses out of the country in peacetime as well as in wartime. In wartime, our surpluses are purchased by lend-lease funds. We must find the equivalent of lend-lease for the purchases of surpluses in peacetime, but it must not come out of the taxpayers' pockets. Foreign nations must use the wealth they create themselves with which to buy surplus American food. Prior to World War No. 1, American crop surpluses were annually exchanged abroad for foreign products. Though some new factors have entered the picture, economically sound international trade—such as the reciprocal trade treaties never achieved—can be built up again.

The McNary-Haugen bill introduced in 1928 proposed that we dump our surpluses on the world market for whatever price they would bring. This no doubt would have invited retaliatory tariffs from other countries, and the bill was vetoed by the President.

In 1941, a similar bill (S. 1442) was introduced by Senators SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, and CAPPER, of Kansas, which would have eliminated the bad feature. I quote from a speech made by Senator CAPPER on May 5, 1941, which graphically outlines the purposes of this meritorious measure:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The agricultural surplus exchange bill, introduced today by Senator SHIPSTEAD and myself, and which will be introduced in the House, I understand, by Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, is based on the principle of the McNary-Haugen bills of the 1920's plus an added provision for the importation of an equivalent amount of foreign-produced goods in exchange for farm surpluses exported.

Based on the belief that the old McNary-Haugen export bill was "warmer" to the real solution of the farm problem than anything which has been tried since, this new bill meets two drawbacks of the old McNary-Haugen bill by the addition of a new principle.

The first of these draw-backs was the necessity of setting up a complicated two-price system, whereby the share of every farmer's crop that was sold abroad brought him one price and the share that was consumed in America brought another price. The second drawback was the fact that the foreign nation who wanted our surpluses could not buy them at any price unless we took manufactured goods from them in payment, since they had no gold. Could a way of taking in manufactured goods from abroad in sufficient quantity to balance up the value of crop surpluses have been found, the farm problem would have been solved long ago.

This new bill attempts to do that. By a workable trade principle, it renders the relatively small amount of foreign goods needed to effect surplus export literally noncompetitive with American manufactured goods.

This principle can best be explained by an illustration: Exportable crop surpluses in a year may equal $1,000,000,000 in value. One billion dollars of foreign manufactured goods will therefore have to be imported in return. Compared to the $40,00,000,000 value of American factory output, the $1,000,000,000 of foreign manufactured goods will be only 2½ percent. Since the American crop surpluses cannot be converted into dollar buying power in America—but rather depress rural cash buying power—there is no cash loss to American manufacturers in allowing the import of foreign manufactured goods up to the extent to which they can be paid for by crop surpluses. The 2½ percent really represents increased buying power for the American public over and above a 100 percent cash buying power which is left undisturbed.

But if the 2½ percent—$1,000,000,000—were spent wholly for foreign textiles, for instance, it would be hard on the American textile market. It is necessary that this extra buying power be spent proportionately for all manufactured products. Hence, by a principle known as prorated import quotas, only 2½ percent of each kind of manufactured goods is allowed to be imported into America that year in exchange for farm surpluses. Thus every American manufacturer's American market represented by the 100 percent is practically undisturbed and the 2½ percent of imports are extra in every case and represent pure gain for the farmer and no loss to the American manufacturer.

But the American manufacturer gains, too. When the crop surpluses are out of America, crop prices will go up to parity. American farmers will be able to buy $4,000,000,000 more of American automobiles, American textiles, American paint, etc.

Although the tariff is lowered slightly on the incoming goods involved in this special stratum of trade, most of the present duties are collected. These duties are segregated into a special fund known as the Agricultural Export Compensation Fund. The American crop exporters, who will have to sell the surplus abroad at low world prices, will be allowed to take enough additional out of this fund to be able to pay the American farmers the full American crop prices on the crops bought from them for export.

Thus the American farmer gets the full parity price on both that part of his crop which is consumed at home and that part which is exported. It is therefore a one-price system—on the full parity price level—with no red tape involved as in a two-price system. Our surpluses are continuously eliminated by export with no cost to Uncle Sam and with benefit instead of loss to our manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that the abolition of all tariffs would reduce the farmer and the laborer to the status of peasants because of low wages and prices prevailing in European and oriental countries.

However, without repeating our high tariff mistakes of the past, the plan introduced by Senators SHIPSTEAD and CAPPER would have preserved the tariff protection that is necessary because of wage differentials in different countries, and at the same time would have put a gate in the tariff wall through which our farm surpluses could flow and not remain here to depress the domestic farm price levels as they did during most of the period between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

I have made these remarks for the purpose of encouraging discussion and study of the provisions in a bill, H. R. 4979, which I introduced in the House today. It is my hope and strong desire that this Congress will adopt post-war farm legislation which will encourage the exportation of peacetime farm surpluses and at the same time improve the American market for both American manufactured products and American farm products.

When the Ninth District farmer of Minnesota prospers and the American farmer has money to buy goods, America prospers and our citizens will reach that goal of security and Christian happiness for which we all strive:

Our Minnesota farmers and others interested in the welfare of agriculture have some excellent ideas and suggestions. I invite them to give me their reactions to this post-war farm program. I'll need their help in the fight for a stable adequate price program for the American farmer. I invite those who read this to write me and say you will join me in my efforts to bring agriculture to its rightful place in American economy and life.

Sale of Army Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON, made a speech in reference to army shoes being ground up for fertilizer. Of course, that attracted attention.

I have been interested in the disposition of surplus property and when Mr. JOHNSON made his speech I immediately took the matter up with General Somervell, and I also addressed a communication to Mr. Clayton, Surplus War Property Administrator. I have received a letter from each in reply to my inquiry.

I was informed at the outset that the Army had a contract with the International Shoe Co., of Hannibal, Mo., to rebuild army shoes. It seems that the shoes Mr. JOHNSON referred to were used by the armed forces in the Aleutians. They were sent home to the International Shoe Co., where some of them were rebuilt. After they were rebuilt they failed to pass inspection, and under the policy were sold to a dealer in Chicago to be resold to the trade. However, they stated that when the shoes reached Chicago the board of health of that city insisted that they be condemned, because there was a terrible odor to the shoes, and I assume that the board of health took the position that anyone who wore them might be subject to infection. I was further informed that the dealer in Chicago did not destroy the shoes as instructed, but, on the contrary, sold them to a company in Granite City, Ill., which is in Mr. JOHNSON's district to be destroyed. Of course, no one wants either members of the armed forces or our citizens to be wearing shoes that might cause infection. I am sure Mr. JOHNSON himself would not want that.

It is my opinion that under the set-up provided by the President's Executive order we will not experience, in the disposition of surplus property that accrues during the present war, what we did as a result of the sale of surplus property during World War No. 1. It is a gigantic task to dispose of surplus property.

As I have previously stated, the House in the first session of this Congress passed a surplus-property bill. It has been in the Senate since that time. I have urged that the Senate take action. If it so desires, let the Senate strike out all language after the enacting clause and substitute whatever language it desires and pass the bill. If that is done, we can then take the bill to conference and write a real law with plenty of teeth in it. I feel that this is a responsibility of the Congress, and I know positively that the President delayed the issuing of the Executive order with the hope that the Congress would take some action. I again appeal to the Senate to consider this most important subject without any further delay.

Under the leave granted me I include as part of my remarks the two letters I have received to which I referred. They follow:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: This is in reply to your request for information regarding a reported sale of army shoes for processing into fertilizer.

The procedure has been to ship to shoe reconstruction factories operated for the Army all shoes which could not be repaired for return to the original user. It is normal practice to sell to fertilizer manufacturers old scrap leather removed from shoes being torn down for rebuilding, and also pieces of new scrap leather which cannot be sold for such purposes as lifts for heels on women's shoes.

Complete shoes which are determined to be not suitable for rebuilding when sorting is accomplished at the factories are sold to used shoe dealers as shoes unserviceable for Army use. These dealers retrieve any which they believe can be reconditioned and sold as used shoes and sell the culls which cannot be so marketed to fertilizer manufacturers. It would appear most unlikely that these dealers would have disposed of any shoes to fertilizer factories which appeared to offer any reasonable return for sale as shoes.

The possibility of utilizing used army shoes for relief purposes has been under consideration for some time, and, during the past several months, experimental quantities have been shipped to approximately 20 State prisons and shoe factories who had been conducting experiments for U. N. R. R. A. The Buford Shoe Reconstruction Factory at Buford, Ga., was taken over for this program by Procurement Division, Treasury Department, as of May 1, 1944, and on May 22, 1944, arrangements were made to ship to that factory two cars per week of army shoes for rebuilding for relief purposes.

The preliminary investigation which has been made indicates that no complete shoes have been sold by the Army to fertilizer manufacturers. It is possible that some resoled shoes may have been included in the shoes

rejected by dealers purchasing shoes not suitable for rebuilding. A complete and detailed investigation is being made to determine if any action is necessary. Please be assured that you will be informed promptly of the full results of this investigation.

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,
Lieutenant General, Commanding.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION,
SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Immediately on receipt of your letter of the third instant on yesterday, I referred to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the statement by Congressman CALVIN D. JOHNSON to which you made reference.

I then called up Colonel Hauseman of the War Department and he told me that a careful investigation was being made of the report that army shoes were being sold as scrap to be ground up as fertilizer and that he would make me a full report on the matter just as soon as possible.

I have very strongly impressed on both the Army and Navy, not once but several times, that we must all be extremely careful in disposing of this property and must particularly avoid letting any stuff go as scrap which has a useful value. To this end, committees are being set up in various areas to review decisions to scrap any article or articles which represent a substantial cost to the Government.

Mr. Mack is correct. All surplus property must now be reported for disposal to the disposal agency named in Executive Order 9425—the Procurement Division of the Treasury for consumer's goods and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for capital goods.

Contract termination property is not surplus property within the meaning of the Executive order and is dealt with in a special manner which is described briefly in the enclosed copy of our release of April 29.

While there have been some extremely unfortunate actions in the past, such as the incident of the dry batteries, etc., nevertheless, I have made sufficient investigation to enable me to assure you that, in my opinion, the Army has, on the whole, done a good job of disposal up to the time that the problem came under my jurisdiction. I am informed that on the average they have recovered 90 percent of the cost of the goods disposed of which is, everything considered, I think, a good job.

The whole matter is now under the jurisdiction of the Surplus War Property Administration and, I am convinced, is being handled strictly in accordance with the regulations.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON,
Administrator.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram of June 2, 1944:

GERMAN ATROCITIES

To get at the truth regarding the latest German atrocity stories probably will be impossible until after the war. It is unusually difficult in these cases because there is suspicion of reverse propaganda by Goebbels—that is, official statements about crimes, which may or may not have occurred, for the dual purpose of intimidating the Allies and of provoking German civilians. So far nothing is clear as to the reported mass shooting of Allied aviators trying to escape from a Nazi prison camp, or as to the alleged lynching by civilians of Allied flyers who bailed out over Germany.

The best evidence in the first case comes from an R. A. F. officer who was at the prison camp and who has now been repatriated to London. He says that 76 prisoners originally escaped by tunnel, and that 14 were never captured. Among those caught and returned, 47 later were manacled and taken from jail by the Gestapo. What happened to them is not known. The Germans say they were shot while trying to resist or to organize another escape—the familiar Nazi excuse. They may have been executed deliberately by Gestapo orders, or they may have been shot by crazed guards, or they may be imprisoned elsewhere.

Significantly, however, the Berlin government wanted and got large publicity on the shooting story. Presumably it hopes to frighten other Allied fliers and to undermine morale in the Allied countries. The diseased minds of Berlin are so warped they do not understand that Allied reaction to Nazi crime is not fright, but deeper determination to wipe out Nazis and nazi-ism.

In the alleged lynching case, the signs of official German provocation and propaganda are more numerous. First, Goebbels told the German people that Allied fliers were deliberately killing innocent German women and children and that they deserved to be treated as "murderers" rather than as soldiers. Then he added it was too much to expect German troops and police to restrain the enraged populace. The next day American fliers coming down in parachutes were reported lynched—according to one story eight fliers, according to another five and still another stated only one.

Whether any Allied flier has been lynched, or is lynched in the future, Goebbels has deliberately inspired such acts. His story that Allied fliers fly low to butcher women and children is the kind of lie which might be expected of the Germans, who did that very thing on the roads of Poland, Russia, the Low Countries, France, and the Balkans.

When Nazi airpower ruled the skies—bombing Warsaw, Rotterdam, Belgrade, and London—the world wondered whether the Germans could take it when their time came. Well, they are beginning to whine. It is not the nonexistent Allied terror bombing that is getting them, but the actual destruction of their military fortifications, communications, and factories.

Statement of Jan Stanczyk, Polish Minister of Labor and Social Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Jan Stanczyk, Polish Minister of Labor and Social Welfare, head of the Polish delegation to the International Labor Office conference in Philadelphia, given to press conference in Philadelphia on Thursday, May 11, 1944:

As a member of Polish Cabinet I would like to take this opportunity of giving the American public the Polish viewpoint on a number of vital current issues.

First of all, as this is my second visit to the United States, I desire to pay tribute to the American war effort, particularly to American production, which is fulfilling the hard task of your country's and other United Nations' war needs. I would like to pay tribute, as well, to the tremendous contribution of American labor to the success of your war program. I was last here in October 1941, at a previous I. L. O. conference, just before the Japanese, acting in line with a long-prepared Axis conspiracy, made their attack on Pearl Harbor. Coming here now from Great Britain—the fortress of the impending invasion—I have been able to observe changes during the few weeks I have been here, which are truly remarkable, and convince me still more profoundly about the greatness of America's contribution toward the triumph of democracy and freedom. The suffering people of Nazi-occupied Europe will be everlastingly grateful to the United States.

Poland has always looked upon the United States as an examplar of democracy. The Polish Nation has great admiration for the American people led by one of the major figures of world history—your President, Mr. Roosevelt. The Polish Nation is deeply grateful to Mr. Roosevelt for his inspiring encouragement to Poland in its struggle for liberation.

I want to emphasize that the Polish Nation today is continuing its struggle against the invader as indomitably and with the same spirit of sacrifice as at the beginning of the war. There is no power which is able to divert our people from the objective of driving the Germans from Polish soil. Neither the German nor any other anti-Russian propaganda, nor German threats, and mass terror will have any effect. The Polish people cannot beturned from the task of defeating the common enemy of all the United Nations.

The most recent proof of this is the order of the Polish Government to its underground army to collaborate with the Soviet forces. I believe not only in Russian-Polish collaboration in the military field but in a permanent understanding between Russia and Poland in the interest of both nations. The Russian-Polish problem is an intricate one, requiring understanding and good will on both sides, and an application of principles which will guarantee the security of both nations and enable them to enjoy the friendliest collaboration. This is my own, my Government's, and Polish Nation's deep conviction.

The Polish Government and people are united on what kind of Poland we will build after the war. We will have a genuine democratic system of government. The war has made us even more conscious of the real meaning of democracy in a nation's life.

As a member of the Polish Government, I unreservedly condemn anti-Semitism. I consider anti-Semitism a crime against humanity. During the horrible years of Nazi occupation, all Poles—Jews and gentiles—have become brothers in suffering and in the common fight for liberation. These ties are stronger than any old prejudices, which may still be latent among a few fanatics. The Polish masses have never been, and under no circumstances will ever be, anti-Semitic. We are united on the principle of full equality of all men, regardless of race or creed.

Today we are already preparing a comprehensive program for the economic reconstruction of our devastated country.

The Polish people will be deeply interested in the work of the present I. L. O. conference. Poland was one of the few countries which adopted the social and economic measures, recommended by the first I. L. O. conference held in Washington, D. C., in 1919. We also adopted measures recommended by succeeding I. L. O. conventions. Today we are ready to apply the I. L. O. Philadelphia charter and all accompanying recommendations worked out here.

We have submitted a resolution for the betterment of agricultural countries, as it is impossible in our time to guarantee the well-being of the community of nations while some are impoverished.

We have also submitted a resolution calling upon the conference to condemn the mass murder of Jews and Poles. These annihilations are unprecedented in modern history.

I look forward to the new post-war world that will be born after this war as a world established on the principles of the Atlantic Charter and on the practice of the "four freedoms"—and which will guarantee all nations, great and small, poor and rich, full rights to enjoy freedom and well-being.

Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a copy of a petition protesting against the enactment of prohibition legislation, signed by various and sundry citizens in the State of Arizona and submitted to me by Mr. J. F. Lanser, president of the Arizona Brewing Co., Inc.:

PETITION PROTESTING AGAINST THE ENACTMENT OF ANY AND ALL PROHIBITION LEGISLATION

Whereas professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force passage of the Bryson bill and other legislation which would bring back prohibition through one pretext or another; and

Whereas the object of such legislative bills is to establish national prohibition in the United States during the absence from their homes of more than 10,000,000 citizens in the military service of their country; and

Whereas national prohibition during its 13-year test brought upon the people the disgusting evils of the speakeasy and bootlegger, an increase in crime and official corruption, and poisonous liquor:

Therefore we the undersigned citizens, protest against the consideration of all prohibition measures by Congress for the duration of the war, and request our Senators and Representatives to vote against all such proposed legislation. We request that this petition be referred to the proper congressional committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is an example of the petitions of many companies and individuals in Arizona, which petitions were signed by 4,568 persons.

Following is the letter of Mr. J. F. Lanser, who requested that these petitions be filed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ARIZONA BREWING CO., INC.,
Phoenix, Ariz., May 24, 1944.

Hon. RICHARD F. HARLESS,
Representative, State of Arizona,
Old Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are sending to you today by express under separate cover, a file containing 4,568 names which come from every corner of the State. By and large these petitions are made up of the Elk's Club, American Legion, various union affiliations and individual citizens. These names are all signed in protest against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation.

I respectfully request as per conversations with you by Sid Moeur and Irving Diamond, that these be offered for registry, on the floor, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The reason for wanting these registered is that many Congressmen are so busy with their various duties and committee assignments that they cannot always stay aware of public opinion on various issues. The drys have succeeded in getting a certain number of petitions for enactment of legislation registered, and we respectfully request that you register these. If any help is needed I request that you see the United States Brewers' Association, to whom we are writing today, advising that we are sending this list of names.

I am also advising our two honorable Senators and honorable Congressman MURDOCK that this petition has been sent to you and I will appreciate advices from you when this has been done, and if you care for national publicity in connection with your request that these be registered, please advise and we will arrange the same.

We anticipate we will have an additional six to ten thousand names on petitions such as these, which will be tendered later for registration.

In the meantime, with my best personal good wishes and regards, I remain,

Respectfully,

J. F. LANSER,
President.

The Republican Party of Prosperity Has Been Very Good for Big Business But Very Bad for Small Business as Facts Prove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has been shouting from the housetops that it is the party of prosperity, yet authentic figures show the reverse is true since there have been over 50 percent more failures in business during the administrations of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover in their 12 years of occupancy of the White House than in the 11 years since President Roosevelt has directed the destinies of this country, with financial losses over 62 percent more.

This is not based upon any idle statement of a Democrat, but is proven by no less than the generally accepted authority of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., recognized throughout this country as an authority on statistics of business failures. This agency is not political in any sense of the word. It caters to businessmen generally of all political faiths and has no interest in politics. It is engaged solely in gathering statistical facts for the guidance of business. It cannot, therefore, be accused of political bias.

Nevertheless, its figures on business failures and losses through liabilities are mute evidence that there have been far more failures and financial losses during Republican administrations—though not intended for that purpose—than under Democratic rule. But let the cold figures tell their own story of the truth that small businesses have suffered to a far greater extent while Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover were in control of the National Government from 1921 through 1932 than from 1933 to 1943 inclusive, when President Roosevelt has directed Federal Government affairs.

Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., cannot be charged with collecting these figures by way of deadly comparison for any political reasons as between Republican and Democratic rule. Nevertheless, they tell a convincing story how varied businesses have suffered under Republican rule. These data demonstrate that it is the smaller companies engaged in manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, construction and servicing types of activities that have been forced into bankruptcy.

COMPARATIVE FAILURES UNDER REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC RULE

The following figures represent the number of failures between 1921 and 1932, inclusive, or during the 12 years of the administrations of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and from 1933 to 1943, or 11 years during which period Mr. Roosevelt has been President:

Number of failures

	Harding, Coolidge, Hoover		President Roosevelt
1921	19,652	1933	20,307
1922	23,676	1934	12,091
1923	18,718	1935	12,244
1924	20,615	1936	9,607
1925	21,214	1937	9,490
1926	21,773	1938	12,836
1927	23,146	1939	11,408
1928	23,842	1940	13,619
1929	22,909	1941	11,848
1930	26,355	1942	9,445
1931	28,285	1943	3,221
1932	31,822		
Total	282,007	Total	126,116
Average	23,500	Average	11,427
	11,427		
Difference	12,073		

It will be observed from these figures that there were 51 percent more failures during the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regimes than under the administration of President Roosevelt. There is the further fact, too, that under Harding-Coolidge-Hoover control of Government policies the number of failures increased progressively year after year from 1921 to 1932, inclusive, excepting for a few slight variations, climaxing with the greatest number in 1932, when there were 31,822 failures through bankruptcies.

On the contrary, during the three terms of 11 years of President Roosevelt just the opposite is true. The greatest number was in 1933 when the President took over the reins of Government when business was in chaos, banks were closed, and heroic efforts of the Roosevelt administration decreased the number of failures to 20,307, or 11,515 less than 1932. These failures declined in his 11 years as they increased under the three administrations of President Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. In a few years there were increases but the minimum of failures occurred in 1943 with but 3,221. This is a most interesting comparison as showing the complete reversal brought about by President Roosevelt.

REPUBLICAN LOSSES 62.7 PERCENT GREATER

The story is no different when liabilities of industrial and commercial concerns are considered. In the same comparison of years for Republican and Democratic rule, the losses shown by Dun & Bradstreet statistics show the following deadly parallel:

Total liabilities

	Harding, Coolidge, Hoover		President Roosevelt
1921	$627,401,000	1933	$502,830,000
1922	623,895,000	1934	333,959,000
1923	539,387,000	1935	310,580,000
1924	543,226,000	1936	203,173,000
1925	443,744,000	1937	183,253,000
1926	409,233,000	1938	246,505,000
1927	520,105,000	1939	168,204,000
1928	489,559,000	1940	166,684,000
1929	483,252,000	1941	136,104,000
1930	668,282,000	1942	100,763,000
1931	736,310,000	1943	45,339,000
1932	928,313,000		
Total	7,012,707,000	Total	2,397,394,000
Average	584,392,000	Average	217,945,000
	217,945,000		
Difference	366,447,000		

Here is further concrete proof from a disinterested and unbiased source that under 12 years of Republican control of the Federal Government the average yearly losses were 62.7 percent greater than under the present 11 years of President Roosevelt. Again the losses by business, most of them generally small enterprises, increased almost yearly from 1921 to 1932 when the tremendous peak of $928,313,000 was reached, whereas just the counterpart is true with respect to the 11 years that President Roosevelt has been in power. And the peak of decrease was reached in 1943, with but $45,399,000 losses throughout the entire year.

FOUR BILLION MORE LOSSES BY REPUBLICANS

The deduction to be made from these figures of failures and liability losses is that it has been small businesses which have been penalized under Republican domination, whereas big business has prospered under that control. This is shown by the fact that of the 262,007 failures during Republican rule the average loss was $26,765. Moreover, aside from the injury to small business through these failures, the creditors have lost $7,012,707,000 as compared with only $2,397,394,000, or $4,615,313,000 more than during Mr. Roosevelt's regime.

The fact that small business has prospered more under Democratic than Republican rule with less failures and smaller losses proves conclusively that the prosperity under Republicans has been beneficial to the big interests and harmful to small business. Little business, we have been told for years, is the backbone of the Nation, but its back has been systematically bent if not broken by the Republican policy as evidenced from these undeniable facts.

It is the encroachment of big business that is responsible for the heavier number of failures and money losses. It cannot be said that the decline in these losses is due entirely to the war. The failures from 1933—before the war started—to 1940, inclusive, averaged 12,700 while the liabilities were $264,398,000. During the previous Republican administrations, however, the failures averaged 123,500 and the liabilities $584,392,000. It cannot be said, therefore, that the war had helped the Roosevelt administration during these 8 years since it was nonexistent in this period insofar as this country is concerned. Under these administrations failures were a trifle under 50 percent more and liabilities 55 percent more.

Many people and especially businessmen have been bamboozled by the Republican speech makers that the Republican Party has been the party of prosperity. Yes; it has been the party of prosperity for big business, but it has also been the party of depression for small business.

Let's Get Together and Finish the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, before the Economic Club of Detroit at the Book-Cadillac Hotel on June 5, 1944:

Making a speech these days, even to such good friends as I know I have in this room, is a risky undertaking. The air is charged with suspense—with a feeling of tremendous military events about to burst forth in headlines, writing a new chapter in world history. When those events occur, when the great liberation of Europe actually gets under way, everything else will seem petty by comparison. What we have to say here can be of interest only as it relates to the tremendous climax of the war that looms ahead.

Ever since Pearl Harbor, American management and labor have for the most part given wholehearted support to the war effort. They have for the most part worked hard and long under conditions of strain and fatigue to make possible America's tremendous outpouring of armed power. Their splendid contribution to the war effort can be read in the figures of war production and in the superb quality of our weapons and equipment.

But in spite of the excellent over-all achievement of management and labor, all of us are aware that here and there shortsighted elements in both groups have defaulted on their obligations to the all-out war effort. Too frequently, narrow group interests have been allowed to overshadow the war needs of the Nation. Although these defaults are not representative of labor and management as a whole, nevertheless they are serious and deplorable. And unless they are stopped, they will do a grave injury, not only to the Nation's production and morale during the war, but also to our chances of a prosperous post-war future.

ISSUES MAGNIFIED

I want to say to you frankly that too many of these defaults by labor and management on wartime obligations have come from this very region, the Detroit area, the heart of industrial America. The very name Detroit in a headline today has begun to suggest labor disputes and strikes, which injure war production and spread confusion and irritation among the people and among our armed forces.

Now, I know only too well that the economic issues underlying the troubles between management and labor in this region are real and serious. But those issues are being magnified and aggravated out of all proportion by hot emotion on both sides.

The experience of the country as a whole shows that economic disagreements between labor and management can be solved by reasonable methods, without strikes and prolonged friction, if tackled in the right spirit. The major labor problems have all been solved, in one place or another, by reasonable methods, and to the long-range benefit of both parties. I think it is fair to say that the reason why such methods have not worked better in the Detroit area is that they have been too often blocked by an unhealthy attitude of mind.

This attitude is found both among workers and among managers. Powerful elements in both groups have taken a grim, die-hard position. They have forgotten that they are on the same team. Instead, they regard themselves as being in a fight against each other. Psychologically they have dug themselves in for that fight. Now they want to stay in the trenches and slug it out, instead of working for a practical adjustment of their differences, like reasonable men of affairs, and like good Americans.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT NEGLECTED

In recent weeks there has been dramatic evidence of this bad attitude of mind. I refer to the foremen's strike which caused so much concern here, and, for that matter, throughout the Nation. Traditionally, the foremen and supervisors of American industry have always been on the side of management. They have always identified themselves with management. When they go on strike, they have lost that sense of identification with the managers. The reasons they give for their strike are economic but those reasons could never have loomed so large had it not been for lack of mutual understanding.

Another symptom of the same bad psychological condition can be seen in the relatively small number of labor-management committees in the Detroit area. Throughout the United States there are nearly 5,000 such committees, developed under the sponsorship of the War Production Board. In most industrial centers these committees play an extremely important part in stimulating war production, and in creating a better basis for understanding between management and labor. In the Detroit area, too, a few such

committees have been established by some concerns, and they are doing excellent work. But the great bulk of managements in Detroit have consistently drawn back from the labor-management committee plan. They are unwilling to give the committee plan a fair trial, or even careful study. This fact plainly reveals the extent to which Detroit management and labor have lost touch.

I am shocked by some of the reckless and irresponsible ideas that I have heard voiced by men on both sides from this area—men who seem more intent on teaching the other fellow a lesson than in getting the war job done. There is too much dangerous talk and too much dangerous thinking in this city. Business has everything to lose, and labor has everything to lose, by assuming responsibility before the people either for an injury to war production now, or for a post-war condition that would imperil the welfare of the country. The people of the Nation as a whole and their Government have no desire to intervene in any local problem. Matters must not be allowed to reach the point where the welfare of the people demands Government intervention.

ASKS STATESMANSHIP

The need now in Detroit, as in every other industrial city where there have been prolonged labor disputes, is for industrial statesmanship that is big enough to bridge the gap that now exists between labor and management. And I would point out that when you start to build a bridge you make best progress if you begin at the same time on both sides and meet in the middle. You cannot establish orderly labor relations if labor insists that management first make concessions, or if management insists that labor first make concessions. There is no use waiting for one-sided action. You will not get it. Labor and management must be prepared to move simultaneously, and to work patiently, in order to arrive at a reasonable settlement of economic issues.

The people of the United States expect management and labor in Detroit to set an example of patriotism and good judgment to the country. Neither side has any right to demand that its own problems be considered while it refuses to give genuine consideration to the problems of the other side.

The industries in Detroit are noted for doing a great job once that job is clearly defined. Detroit's war production record alone is proof of the ability to achieve technical wonders almost overnight. This is because Detroit's engineers know how to bring their ingenuity to bear constructively on their technical problems, without emotional bias or preconceived ideas. Today your main problem is a problem in human engineering. And like any technical problem, it needs to be approached with a sound grasp of the facts, and without fear or animosity or preconceived ideas.

One fundamental fact which is sometimes overlooked is that the workers you are dealing with are human beings, with all the virtues and failings of the species. Men and women of the Detroit war factories are as patriotic as anyone. But they are also as human as anyone. Under conditions of wartime pressure it is natural to become temperamental and irritable and suspicious. When people are worried about the future, they want reassurance. They want the knowledge that their leaders, both in labor and management, are planning in cooperation, doing everything possible to assure their jobs and their livelihood. Lacking reassurance, it is easy to develop a profound attack of "cut-back jitters." All this has to be recognized and understood, even sympathetically understood. With such an understanding, it is posisble to approach the problem of establishing orderly relations between management and labor in a way that will satisfy the needs of both groups.

CALM APPRAISAL

Let me say it again: You cannot hope to adjust your problems in an atmosphere of resentment, suspicion, and animosity. Human dignity and pride being what they are, conferences which begin in such an atmosphere are generally doomed beforehand to break up in an even worse state of mind. All our experience shows that the men who sit at such conferences, and who are empowered to speak for their groups, need to be selected for their calm good sense and reasonableness, rather than for their ability to pound a table. A favorable psychological atmosphere can be of the greatest value in the effort to resolve the economic issues which confront you. If Government participation can help provide such an atmosphere then Government participation should be invoked. Conferences called under the right auspices, and in an atmosphere of calm factual appraisal, could, in my judgment, rapidly reach working agreements on the most serious of the problems now outstanding between Detroit labor and management.

OUTPUT MUST RISE

Sound working agreements between management and labor are as essential to the war effort now as they were a year ago. A big war-production job still remains ahead. There is so much post-war talk going around that many people seem to have got the impression that war-production schedules are being reduced. I want to correct that impression. I want to make it clear that at the present time the rate of munitions production is nearly 14 percent higher than the average 1943 monthly rate. The April 1 schedules call for nearly $69,000,000,000 worth of munitions production in 1944. This represents an average monthly rate of nearly five and three-fourths billion, 20 percent above the average monthly rate for 1943. The magnitude of the 1944 production job is made plain by the fact that output must rise still further over the high current rate to meet the production peak planned for next November.

This year has already seen new peaks of achievement in many war programs. True, some programs have been cut back substantially. Others will be cut back in the future. But the over-all war-production schedules for 1944 call for the full energies of management and labor, working together. The Nation cannot now afford any diversion of energy to group agitation or to peacetime activities at the expense of war output.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Y. M. C. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, June 6, 1944, was D-day on the continent of Europe.

As the world's greatest battle for the greatest stake in the world's history was in progress, the Paterson and Passaic, N. J., Y. M. C. A.'s were joining their brother institutions in 68 countries in commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of this organization in a small London room by George Williams and a group of friends.

George Williams' room has been destroyed by Nazi bombs in this war and speakers at these birthday parties in my district emphasized that while war may do away with human shrines it cannot obliterate the values for which they stand. This is an inspiring thought as the Y. M. C. A. begins its second century of service for the mind, body, and spirit of our young manhood while aiding them as they take part in a major war for the fourth time.

Vincent Vandervoort, president of the Paterson Y, called upon Walter Lindell, general executive secretary, to make presentations to three of his assistants who had served the organization a combined total of 80 years. They were Alfred M. Chilson, membership and public relations secretary, 28 years; Martha Hausaman, dormitory matron, 27 years; and William H. Stanley, service department, 25 years.

In Passaic, where Amos H. Morrison is general executive secretary, Carl Helfrich, vice president, had John Baker, Metropolitan Opera Co. baritone, sing in the gymnasium in which he played basketball and volley ball as a boy.

I have always been a believer in and a supporter of the Y. M. C. A. I have lived in the dormitories of the New Haven, Conn., Brooklyn, N. Y., and Passaic Y buildings. It was the first dormitory occupant of the Passaic Y, moving into the building some few weeks before it was formally opened.

When I was a lad I fulfilled my ambition to join the Y as soon as my age permitted. I want my boys to do likewise.

Congratulations and best wishes go out to the Y. M. C. A.'s in my district for their contributions to the good and welfare of community, State, Nation, and all mankind.

Address by Hon. Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, to West Virginia Bankers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at the anniversary meeting of the West Virginia Bankers' Association held in Charleston, W. Va., on the evening of June 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I am fully conscious of the high honor paid me by your invitation to address you this evening. It is pleasant to get away from the arduous life of Washington occasionally, and most helpful to meet with such organizations as yours, composed of people who carry on the business of this country and help support our Government.

In this greatest of all World Wars our National Capital has become the nerve cen-

ter of the war effort of all the United Nations. It is true that there is confusion and bewilderment aplenty in Washington, but history is being made there daily. I shall not, however, talk to you tonight about what is transpiring in Washington. I shall eschew politics or mention of pending legislation. If I were capable of doing so, I would not talk shop by attempting to discuss banking problems with you.

Nearly every American citizen has some loved one or close friend who tonight is far from home taking part in this gigantic contest. Our hopes, our hearts, and our minds are with them in their daily tasks on the far-flung fronts of this global struggle for our existence as a free people. I have had unusual opportunities to observe how the men and women who are fighting this war for us are living, thinking, and serving. It was my privilege to act as chairman of the only congressional committee which has visited our fighting men of every branch of the service in every section of the world where the Stars and Stripes fly. The trip entailed 45,000 miles of airplane travel. We circled the globe and twice crossed the Equator.

Ever flying eastward, we traveled from Washington to the remote forested fastnesses of Newfoundland, across the towering peaks and icecap of Greenland to Iceland, over the North Sea to England, and, skirting the Iberian Peninsula and Gibraltar, on down to north Africa. After visiting with the men of the Army who have recently broken the Hitler line in Italy and the men of the Navy who transport and supply them across the Mediterranean, we flew from that theater across the Pyramids of Egypt and the Bible lands of the middle east down to Basra and Abadan on the Persian Gulf.

We are really fighting two wars—one European and the other Asiatic. When we left Abadan we moved from the European theater, where all of the effort is directed against the Germans, into the Asiatic theater, where our enemy is the hated Jap. We flew entirely across India to the Province of Assam, where tea plantations have given way to airdromes and warehouses. Flying at 22,000 feet over the Himalayas, we negotiated the famed Burma Hump into ancient China. Returning from China in another flight over the hump, we went by Calcutta to Ceylon.

From Ceylon we flew 3,300 miles over the Jap infested waters of the Indian Ocean to Australia. This flight was a great adventure, for it was the first time that a land-based plane had ever traversed this route. We flew over much of the vast continent of Australia and to New Guinea and the other jungle-covered islands of the Pacific to Hawaii, and then home.

Time will not permit me to give you my impressions of the leaders of our allies with whom I was privileged to talk. Among others we were received by the King and Queen of England, visited with Mr. Churchill at 10 Downing Street, and had dinner with the Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek in their home at Chungking.

Our first interest was in the life and welfare of G. I. Joe and the men commanding him. It was the experience of a lifetime to see these American boys and girls, the product of our democratic institutions, waging war in every clime and under every conceivable condition. We talked to men of every rank and every branch of the service. We ate with them at their mess, and observed them in the field. We visited the hospitals and the Red Cross canteens. We undertook to make a thorough investigation of the provisions made for the health and well-being of our men and the suitability of the weapons provided them.

I do not pose as any expert in military strategy, but no one could have seen and heard the things which came to our attention on this trip without having come comprehension of the tremendous job still to be done before our men can return home. The single problem of transportation involved in this war would tax our resources even if we did not have the additional task of destroying a well-armed, well-equipped, and well-trained enemy. Thousands of tons of food, clothing, ammunition, and motorized equipment must be at the point it is needed at the moment of need if our men are not to suffer. It has not only involved the construction of millions of tons of ocean shipping and the use of thousands of transport planes, but the building of airfields, railroads, highways, and jungle trails.

We often hear that this is a mechanized war. That this is true is attested by the tens of thousands of trucks, tanks, planes, and ships involved. But there are fronts where our men are still dependent upon supplies and ammunition transported by mules, camels, and, indeed, by human carriers. The difficulty of supplying General Chennault and General Stilwell in China is perhaps the greatest of those involved anywhere. Every gallon of gasoline, every bomb, every pound of supplies going to our forces stationed in China must not only be carried by steamship for many thousands of miles to Calcutta, but after reaching there must be loaded and unloaded nine different times and flown by our heroic transport pilots over the towering peaks of the Burma hump before they can be used against the enemy.

There are remote and lonely outposts, far removed from civilization or from threat of enemy action, which must be maintained to assure the successful prosecution of the war. Most men would prefer actual battle duty to long months of drudgery at the isolated bases in Newfoundland, Labrador, Iceland, and many of the stepping stones of the Pacific. There will be many real heroes of this war who have never heard a gun fired by an enemy. Down on the scorching rim of the Persian Gulf at Basra in Persia, thousands of Americans are engaged in handling and assembling the planes, tanks, trucks, and other war equipment which is being transferred under lend-lease to our Russian allies. The day that we arrived there the temperature was 152 at the airport. It is so unbelievably hot that a wrench left out in the midday sun for a short while cannot be picked up without heavy gloves. The living conditions of the inhabitants of that section are incredibly primitive, and our men have practically no recreation except an occasional moving picture show. They are doing so well that instead of the Russians urging us to supply them the tools, we are compelled to insist that they get the guns and tanks and planes out of the way.

Veritable factories and foundries have been established in other out-of-the-way places where unsung heroes toil day and night to keep the tools of war functioning for those who are to handle them in battle. In the South Pacific an airfield that was essential to the attack on Bougainville Island was constructed by Navy Seabees in 4 days by working 20 hours a day. Those men, however, had plenty of excitement, because the Japs bombed them two or three times during the progress of the work.

The resourcefulness and unfailing good humor of our boys—whether in the ice and snow of the Arctic Circle or the indescribable heat of the tropics or in the constant rains of the monsoon season in Burma and Assam—are most inspiring. No one could see it without being proud that he too is an American. Almost every unit has the counterpart of the corner drug store wit known to every small town, and the wisecracks of these company jesters will become a part of the history of this war.

The performance of our men in battle is all that could be asked. They are living up to the best traditions of our armed forces. We spent some time in England with the bombardment and fighter groups that are over Germany and the Continent almost daily. This is a grim business, and it does not take many sorties to make men out of boys. It is noteworthy that not since we began bombing the military installations of Europe has a single one of our air bombardment groups ever turned back on account of enemy action until after the bombs had been dropped on the target. I shall never forget the emotion I experienced on seeing bombers briefed out for attack, both from England and the South Pacific. It tears the heartstrings to see the tragedy in the eyes of boys who return to lift the body of a comrade who has lived with them for months out of a plane filled with flak or rocket holes.

Every branch of the service has its full share of heroes. I talked to dozens of them, and [illegible] word of braggadocio. It was difficult to believe that these mere boys, as soft-spoken and modest as a country maid, could have performed the feats of daring attributed to them.

Here would be one who had had his PT boat shot to pieces under him in the Solomons, but who had landed on a Jap-held island where he waged a one-man war for days until rescued. Another, a marine, had arisen from his fox hole as a Jap tank passed over and placed a grenade in the tread, immobilizing that instrument of destruction within a few feet of him. In a hospital we talked to a cheerful lad still in his teens who, with his comrades all killed or wounded and himself shot through both legs, had continued to operate a machine gun against three German counterattacks on an important strong point until relief came. These are but samples of hundreds that I could recite to you to demonstrate beyond peradventure the high courage of our fighting men.

It will be reassuring to those whose sons are overseas to know that our armed forces are the best equipped, the best clothed, and the best fed fighting organization that the world has ever seen. American production and ingenuity have justified our proudest boasts by turning out tools of war of the highest quality. Except in some of the more remote areas and during actual fighting operations, where there is not much variety of food, the mess served to G. I. Joe contains plenty of substantial food that is usually well prepared.

The medical service which is available to our sick and wounded is infinitely superior to that which can be had by the average citizen at home. I never cease to marvel at the miracles performed by our doctors and nurses, not only in the base hospitals but in the medical units that accompany the troops during operations. The nurses are entitled to especial credit, and many of the wounded were loud in their praise of the so-called flying angels who accompany the transport planes and take care of the men as they are flown back from the front to medical centers. The use of blood plasma, penicillin, sulfa drugs, and other new methods are saving the lives of thousands who would have perished in any other war.

On the whole, we have been very fortunate in our selection of the men who command. General Chennault in China is a great military genius. MacArthur in the Pacific has done more than he was asked to do. He was expected only to hold the Japanese, but he successfully took the offensive with very limited resources. Eisenhower is an able leader, and Halsey and Nimitz are true fighting men of the sea.

Mistakes have been made, but they have not been repeated. If the civilian population at home will support our armed forces with the same zeal and determination displayed by the men in the field, they will win this war for us quicker than we really have any right to expect.

The greatest American Army ever assembled is poised tonight in the British Isles awaiting orders for the invasion of the Continent. The hopes and prayers of all our people are with them as they prepare to embark upon the greatest military operation of all time. Our air blows are increasing in intensity and in numbers of planes and bombs. On some days the number of men in the air over Germany is equal to a full division.

There is some difference of opinion as to the value of aerial bombardment. We know that however severe it may be, a strongly fortified position cannot be wrested from the enemy by bombing alone. However, it has a profound effect on the course of war. From what I saw of the reconnaissance photographs taken of such cities as Hamburg and Frankfurt after devastating raids, I can but feel that these attacks have done much to soften up the enemy for the invasion, in addition to the great destruction of his factories and transportation. The fact that the Germans now have from eight to ten million people who have been driven from their homes to the fields and roads and into unbelievably crowded quarters cannot inspire any love of nazi-ism or increase their confidence and faith in the promises of Hitler and Goering.

Absolute command of the skies will be of tremendous importance on D-day. I do not know the day and hour of invasion, and I am glad that I do not. From what I saw of the men who are to make this great attack, I am convinced that they do not have the "invasion jitters" nearly so badly as do we who are here at home. These men have spent long hours in arduous training for the task before them. They are ready for the test. In fact, they are impatient for the order to move. They have confidence in themselves, in their weapons, and in their leaders. They want to go in and get the job over. Europe may be one strong fortress, just as Hitler claims, but I have faith that General Eisenhower and his staff will not strike until they are ready, even to the last button on the last man's shirt, and are fully confident that they will break through.

Despite all of the innovations of this war, with its 60-ton tanks and fleets of bombing planes, our experience in Italy and against the Japanese has shown us that in the last analysis victory will depend upon the man with the gun in his hands. The infantry is still the queen of battles. Without detracting one iota from the heroic accomplishments of our airmen or the thrilling exploits of PT boat and submarine crews and those who handle the tanks and half tracks, the final decision depends on the foot soldier, just as has been the case in all other wars. There is not much glamor attached to freezing in a foxhole or fighting insects in the incredible jungles of the Pacific islands, but we should never lose sight of the load that is being carried by the men who take their weapons along with them as they slog through dust and mud.

This war has brought out more new and spectacular weapons and rumors of others even more deadly than has any other war of history. Large bodies of air-borne troops are now an essential part of any attack. Complete divisions with all equipment except the heaviest artillery can now be transported far beyond the enemy's lines. Tanks of new and unusual size, speed, and fire power have been developed. Early in the war when the Germans smashed the French armies and forced the British evacuation at Dunkerque, it seemed that the tanks were almost unstoppable. However, something has always developed to offset any new innovation. The rocket gun and new artillery now turn tanks into blazing funeral pyres for the occupants. The Stuka dive bomber that was so much feared in the early days of the war is now almost obsolete. Our fast fighter planes shoot them down like clay pigeons. It seemed for a time that mine fields would be a better defense than the strongest fortifications. The invention of the mine detector enables engineers to remove those instruments of death without loss. I repeat that the infantry is still the backbone of any offensive army, and while all of the other branches are essential, the roads into Berlin and Tokyo will be carved by the bayonets of the foot soldiers.

Hitler and Hirohito have made many mistakes in this war, but the one that proved their undoing was the illusion that the American people had grown too soft and luxury loving to wage war successfully. It was inconceivable to them that a people with our high standard of living—people who enjoyed peace and who did not love war for the sake of war's brutality and destruction—could become so transformed by attack that we would produce the toughest and most efficient fighting machine that the world has ever seen. It must be difficult even with the evidence before their very eyes for them to realize that the youth of this land, the product of the hated institutions of democracy, are proving themselves more than a match for soldiers who, as wards of the State, have been taught to goose-step since infancy, and have been trained all their lives in the art of war.

Indeed, there were many patriotic Americans who had serious misgivings as to the ability of this generation to meet the test of war's crucible. The magnificent performance of our armed forces under every conceivable condition has satisfied the most skeptical. The dictators see their empires falling in ruins under the sledgehammer blows of men who were born free—men who hate war, but fight with reckless fury to destroy the forces that threaten their way of life.

There are now those who say that military training has so instilled the desire to kill and the instincts of brutality in our millions of fighting men that they will pose an almost insoluble problem on their return after the victory is won. I have read a number of articles which stressed the difficulties foreseen by the authors to reintegrate these men into our civilian life.

In my opinion, all of these fears are sheer tommyrot. I have talked to any number of the heroes of this war—men who have shot down numbers of enemy planes, boys who have killed 25 or 30 Japs, those who have been severely wounded, and men who have seen their closest friends fall by their sides. Their hatred of the enemy and their determination to destroy them is in some cases almost terrifying, but I have yet to see any man in our armed forces who is not anxious to get this thing over as soon as possible and return to the normal pursuits of civilian life. Fighting and killing are distasteful to all of them. It is but a means to an end. Even as they fight they dream of returning to work on the farm or in the shop or the bank in the old home town as soon as the danger which threatened a free life there has been completely destroyed. We all love the things for which we sacrifice. These men who have done so much for this Nation will be better citizens for their experiences. They will protect our institutions of Government and our individual rights as American citizens as well in the peaceful days to come as they have done upon the fields of battle.

The men who are actually fighting this war do not believe that it is nearly over. They cannot understand the queer feeling on the part of so many American people that the victory is almost in our grasp. These men know that although there are now 50,000 gold stars in the windows of American homes, all that has taken place heretofore in this war is in the nature of a skirmish preparatory to the real battle. The idea that any considerable number of our people are complacent or overoptimistic is infuriating to the G. I. Joe who has been pinned down by machine gun and mortar fire for 3 or 4 days and has had nothing to eat but K rations during that period. We are unworthy of the sacrifices that are being made by the flower of our youth if we relax for 1 second in our support of our armed forces. We at home have merely suffered petty inconveniences as a result of this war. No civilian population of any nation has made fewer sacrifices. The men at the front should certainly have the right to expect that so long as they are risking their lives daily we should, for the emergency at least, be willing to forego any idea of business as usual, politics as usual, and strikes as usual.

Even when Germany finally crumbles and the European war is done, we cannot afford to relax our efforts for one moment. Indeed, the Japs lay great store in the hope that the war in Europe will be so exhausting that the American people will not be willing to make the sacrifices that will be necessary to beat the Japanese finally to their knees. We must bear in mind that within the area which they have conquered the Japs have every resource that is necessary for making war. They are a nation of fanatical brutes who do not recognize any of the rules of war, and who generally die rather than surrender. I doubt that we can knock them out of the war by bombing any more than we can force Germany to surrender through the same process. We are a long way from bases which will permit the operation of heavy bombers against them.

The situation in China is very critical. The people are war-weary, and but for the firm hand of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would have doubtless abandoned the struggle. I must say in all frankness that the Chinese troops that I saw, with the exception of the divisions trained and equipped in India by American officers, do not constitute armies in the sense that we generally use that word. They are poorly equipped and more poorly fed. We need not deceive ourselves with any idea that we will be able to supply and equip the millions of potential soldiers in China, even if the Burma Road be opened or the Ledo Road be completed. It is going to be necessary for us to establish ourselves firmly on the coast of China and drive the Japanese out before this can be accomplished. Our military leaders have recently admitted this.

However long and hard may be the road to final and complete victory, we have no option but to travel it. We cannot hope to have an enduring peace if we are unwilling to make any sacrifice which complete victory may require. The men in uniform are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to bring this victory to our country if the American people will support them.

Make no mistake about it. These men are thinking about the post-war world. Men who face death think of the future. The desire to live is strong. They have invested their sweat and blood in preserving America, and they have definite convictions about the world of tomorrow. They will have seen the prodigal expenditure of human life and suffering which has been poured out all over the world. In the grim struggle to survive they have learned to think straight. If they make mistakes they cease to live. They are determined that as a nation we shall not repeat the mistakes which brought about this holocaust. They are just as determined to win the peace after the war is over as they are to secure victory by arms in the field. They are fighting for the way of life they know, and when the war is over they will demand that all of the rights and powers which the American people have willingly surrendered in time of war be restored to them.

They have seen the natural resources of America poured out with prodigal hand all over the world, and they realize the neces-

sity for a long period of peace. We may not have the natural resources left to fight another war in the next generation. They realize that there is a limit somewhere in the amount of the national debt that the American people can assume for purposes of destruction. They are willing to assume their part of the responsibility for the repayment of the $300,000,000,000 or more dollars that we will owe when this war is over, but they do not intend either in their lifetime or in the next generation that a similar or greater debt shall be saddled upon the American people to pay for war.

The men that I talked to all over the world believe that America must assume her full share of international responsibility to keep the peace, and that our Nation must cooperate with the other peoples of the earth to see that madmen are not again permitted to set the world in flames. These men will demand a strong America, and I do not believe that they will permit us to sink the great Navy that we have assembled at such great cost when this war is over. They will insist that we maintain a navy and air establishment sufficient to defend us against any foe and to discharge our obligations to keep the peace.

They know from first-hand experience all about the real horrors of war. They have seen their comrades bleed and die. In the Pacific area particularly there is unspeakable bitterness in their minds and hearts at the ruthless brutality which has been shown by the Japanese in their treatment of those so unfortunate as to fall into their hands. They have heard the story of the "march of death," and they have seen the forms of those who, despite the fact they were wounded and helpless, had been horribly mangled by the Japanese. They will not tolerate a peace that does not assure that the criminals who started this war and those who have waged it in an inhuman manner shall receive full punishment for their crimes. The cry for vengeance for the beheading of the Tokyo fliers and those who fell in the "march of death" or as helpless prisoners were disemboweled in the islands of the Pacific will not still until this be done.

For my part, I agree with them that one of the surest ways to prevent war and such acts of brutality in the future is to make an example of these unspeakable criminals that will serve to deter any potential Hitlers and Hirohitos for the next thousand years.

Pay-as-We-Go Amendment to the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able article contained in the latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and written by Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, respecting a pay-as-we-go amendment to the Constitution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I PROPOSED A PAY-AS-WE-GO AMENDMENT

(By MILLARD E. TYDINGS, United States Senator from Maryland)

How the United States Government can pay its bills and maintain its credit is certain to be at the forefront of our post-war problems. Although there are some people described as economists who think we can get along without ever paying our expenses or decreasing our debt, the average citizen has not gone along with this extraordinary notion. The Saturday Evening Post has asked me, as the author of a proposed amendment to the Constitution requiring a pay-as-we-go policy in time of peace, to enlarge upon my reasons for believing that such a change in fiscal policy is imperative. With this request I am glad to comply.

For 96 of its 155 years of existence, our National Government has lived within its income. Only for 59 years has it gone into debt by spending more than it took in. For 17 out of these 59 years, the United States was engaged in a major war and, understandably, could not balance its Budget.

So, when we look back over the record, we find that, in time of peace, our National Government lived within its income for 96 years, and beyond it for only 42 years of our life as a nation.

From the time that Washington became our first President and until the commencement of World War No. 1—except for the 4 years of our own Civil War—there was never an annual deficit greater than $90,000,000. Even during World War No. 1, we went into debt only $853,000,000 in 1917, $9,000,000,000 in 1918, and $13,000,000,000 in 1919. A part of this debt was incurred through the huge war loan we then made to our allies. From 1920 to 1930, because the National Government spent less than it took in, the national debt created by World War No. 1 was substantially reduced. But beginning with the year 1930, the Government has been spending much more each year than it has received. Little effort, if any, has been made to balance the National Budget. In the 10-year period from 1930 to 1940, the Government's debt was increased approximately $27,000,000,000, an average deficit of $2,700,000,000 a year.

Superimposed on this peacetime debt are the unprecedented borrowings by our Government during the present war. It is estimated that when peace comes the Government of the United States will owe $300,000,000,000—an average of $8,500 against every family in this Nation, rich and poor, high and low, black and white. Never before have we been confronted with a national debt of such stupendous proportions. The interest alone on that debt in the post-war period, figured at 2½ percent, will consume revenues of $7,500,000,000 a year. Up to 1940, our Government never had revenues in any year of more than $7,000,000,000, so we see that in the post-war period the interest charge alone will require more money than our national Government took in in any one year before 1940.

When we consider that, by next July, two-thirds of the total deposits of all the banks of every kind in the United States will have been lent to our Government and $15,000,000,000 of the cash reserves and assets of the life-insurance companies will likewise have been lent to our Government, it seems apparent that a sound program for governmental finance in the post-war period is imperative. If we continue, as a Nation, to live upon the future, to spend more than we take in, we are likely to undermine the confidence of everyone in the financial stability of our Government. Plainly, that would bring on a tremendous depression, with extremely widespread distress. Not only would it threaten the safety of every bank deposit and life-insurance policy but business stagnation, great unemployment and the loss of farms and homes would be highly probable.

This condition should and can be avoided. It can be done only if, as a general policy, the national Government is compelled to live within its means in peacetime. If such a policy is adopted, there will be no loss of confidence in the conduct of our national Government. No one need worry about the safety of his bank deposit or life-insurance policy. In those circumstances, the debt need not cause depression, distress, or unemployment.

At present, few realize there is no restriction on the President or the Congress requiring them to live within the Government's income. With the privilege to appropriate money, the Constitution provides no accompanying restraint or even responsibility on Congress or the President to raise the money which is appropriated. The Government is not required in peacetime to cut its coat according to its cloth. If Congress appropriates and the President approves an appropriation in excess of the Government's revenues, under the present system the Secretary of the Treasury simply goes out and borrows the needed money. This policy worked well enough most of the time, for the Government has generally lived within its means—at any rate, in time of peace. Our national debt never soared above $26,000,000,000 before 1933 even in time of war.

But now we cannot take for granted the future fiscal policy of our National Government. There is too much danger in such a course. There is too much potential disaster and distress inherent in a policy of chance. Henceforth, in peacetime, such contingencies as a mounting debt must be avoided if the general welfare of the Nation is to be promoted and preserved.

To accomplish this result, I have introduced in the United States Senate, and Congressman DISNEY, of Oklahoma, has introduced in the House, an amendment to our National Constitution. It reads as follows:

"On the first day of each regular session, the President shall transmit to the Congress his estimates of the receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws existing on such date, together with his recommendations as to the purposes for which such receipts shall be expended, and, except in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of 1 full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the Congress shall not appropriate money for expenditure during such fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, as transmitted or as modified or revised by the President, except by a vote of three-fifths of each House taken by yeas and nays, unless prior to the making of such appropriation the Congress shall have imposed such taxes, duties, imports, or excises as will raise additional revenues equal to the amount by which such appropriation exceeds such estimated receipts, or unles such appropriation be for the purpose of paying the expenses and contingencies of the Congress or the courts, or for the payment of claims against the United States, the justice of which shall have been judicially declared by such tribunal as may be established by the Congress for the investigation of claims against the Government."

The amendment speaks for itself. In time of war the Government can borrow. In any other national emergency so severe that Congress believes it wiser for it to borrow rather than to levy additional taxes, it can do so, provided three-fifths of the Members of each of the two Houses formally vote so to do.

Otherwise, Congress must live within its means. The country must be run on a pay-as-you-go basis in peacetime. If this amendment is adopted, every businessman, banker,

labor leader, planner, Utopian, realist, theorist, and State and local official who comes before the appropriations committees to ask for billions for pet projects, for which the United States Government does not have the money, can be asked by Congress: "Where do you suggest that we raise this money in new taxes?" Congress and the President can point out that the Government cannot appropriate money in peacetime unless it raises the money through new taxes in such amounts as will keep its budget balanced.

Thus, all who ask for money will have to state where the money is to be obtained.

And any new tax plan suggested will put every taxpayer, from millionaire to wage earner, on notice. Appropriations, therefore, will be more carefully scrutinized. Only those apparently necessary are likely to be made. Congress is not a happy body when it is forced to levy new taxes.

The constitutional amendment will prohibit any President or Congress in the future from doing what has been done in the past: taking the easy road of borrowing instead of taxing to raise needed funds in peacetime. The war debt and the peacetime debt should by now have taught each wage earner that governmental borrowings mean higher taxes for him. Henceforth, in peacetime, under the Tydings-Disney amendment, Congress will have to put up the cash before it appropriates. The amendment forbids Congress to continue its live-easy, give-away-what-you-have-not-got policy into the post-war period. It prevents one Congress from passing the buck of paying for its appropriations on to the next Congress.

The amendment also has the virtue of compelling the President and the Congress to consider the relative merits of propositions for which appropriations are to be made. In his annual message to Congress the President would be required to estimate the receipts of the Government and to make recommendations as to how these receipts shall be allocated to meet the Nation's needs. Congress likewise would have to weigh carefully how the money it raises in taxes can best be spent in the interest of the Nation. Heretofore, appropriations have been made with little effort to weigh their relative merits. Under our our amendment, the President and Congress would have to decide, for example, what part of the expected revenues should be allocated to each department and agency of the Government. If the President and the Congress wanted to appropriate more than the estimated receipts, then they would have to raise the additional money and have it available for such purpose.

THE SAFETY VALVE

Furthermore, this constitutional amendment provides a good safety valve for dealing with unorthodox and highly critical emergencies. If the crisis is unforeseen, Congress could borrow and spend instead of raising new taxes, but only if three-fifths of the Members of each House of Congress, on formal roll call, deemed it wise to adopt such a policy for 1 year at a time. In all other cases, a pay-as-you-go policy would be mandatory in time of peace.

If Congress can be required to live on a pay-as-you-go basis in peacetime, the small owners of savings-bank accounts and life-insurance policies can breathe easily. More than that, every person in America will pay less taxes. Industry and business, large and small, will have unquestioned confidence in the financial integrity of the Government. Such confidence means for business a green light to go ahead, and for the people the best prospects for more jobs and good pay. All these things will be needed to meet the impact of the post-war period.

There is no way that Congress can be forced to adopt a pay-as-you-go basis except by constitutional amendment. A mere act of Congress requiring the Government to live within its means will not accomplish this result. In any appropriation bill Congress can circumvent the purpose of such a congressional law simply by using the words: "Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, the Congress hereby appropriates blank dollars."

THE NEED FOR AN AMENDMENT

Nor will a new congressionally created Budget law or Bureau keep Congress on a pay-as-you-go basis. We have a Budget law now, but Congress has been living beyond its means ever since 1930. A congressional Budget law, too, can be evaded whenever Congress wants to do so by the use of the magic words, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any law," at the beginning of an appropriation bill. The constitutional amendment outlined above is the only certain way to keep Congress on a pay-as-you-go basis in peacetime. Congress could not pass a valid law making an appropriation, no matter what words it used, if the appropriation violated a constitutional amendment.

When one considers the probable size of our national debt at the war's end, the sick world in which we shall then be living, the hard readjustment from war to peace in our governmental, industrial, and business life, and all the other dark clouds looming on the horizon, does not the Nation's welfare and safety depend upon a discontinuance in peacetime of a policy of borrow and spend? Does not the welfare of every working man and woman in America require a post-war policy of pay-as-you-go? I believe it does, and I believe the constitutional amendment set forth above is the only certain means to achieve such a policy.

The alternatives to pay as you go after the war are not pleasant to contemplate. Among them certainly are continued higher taxes; a constant threat to the value of our currency and to the savings of the people in savings accounts and life insurance; the repeated postponement of any effort to put our house in order; and, finally and only too probably, economic and political disaster and ruin. If there are any valid arguments against setting up now an adequate protection against such catastrophes, I do not know what they are.

As Voluntary as Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have discussed the rules and regulations of the War Manpower Commission. Now that "controlled hiring" is to be made effective throughout the United States, Members of the House may be interested in knowing how newspaper editorial writers, in cities where the "controlled hiring" has been in use for months, feel about the War Manpower Commission plan.

As a part of my remarks I include an editorial from the Hartford Courant and one from the Hartford Times. The Courant is a Republican paper while the Times represents the Democratic school of thought.

These papers seem to be trying to outdo each other in expressing their disapproval of the War Manpower Commission's rules and regulations:

[From the Hartford Times]

FORCED LABOR IN DISGUISE

One important purpose of the War Manpower Commission in taking control of the full-time employment of all males under 17 in the Nation and establishing labor ceilings for all employers, is to facilitate the speedy transfer of idle manpower in labor surplus areas to areas where shortages have become critical.

That is a glib way of describing a plan of regimentation, whereby men will work where they are ordered to, even, conceivably, being shifted from one part of the country to another whether they are willing to go or not.

That could not be done directly, of course. We have not quite reached the point where forced labor is acceptable. It will be done by indirection. The idea is that men will be forced into labor shortage areas by the simple process of not letting them obtain employment elsewhere, a sort of work-where-we-tell-you-or-starve arrangement.

Even if any such plan is legal—Congressman MILLER contends it isn't—it is sure to cause a furor.

Chairman McNutt of the Manpower Commission apparently recognizes that for he embroiders the plant with modifications, designed to make it palatable. He intimates plans to use other approved arrangements, besides simply channeling all employment through the United States Employment Service.

This apparently includes a program which appears to have approval already in this area where the system now proposed for the Nation has been in effect. Some union men who apply to the U. S. E. S. instead of being referred to jobs, have been referred back to their unions, which have placed them in situations of which they were cognizant. Industrial leaders have contended that if labor unions are thus to have the privileges of finding employment for their own members, employers should not be held rigidly to use of the U. S. E. S. The Mayor's Manpower Committee has suggested that employers, operating under their ceilings, be permitted to hire applicants directly, subject to the approval by the U. S. E. S. of their procedure.

Mr. McNutt apparently contemplates something of that sort in connection with the national plan, for he concedes that U. S. E. S. may "delegate employment to local placement committees under suitable safeguards, to employers with good records, or to unions," etc.

Obviously it is desirable that some such modification should be adopted if the plan is to go through.

The whole idea seems ill-advised, at a time when flexibility rather than rigidity employment-wise appears to be the need. In many lines the problem may soon be one of finding employment rather than of finding workers. Communities may have to deal with unemployment rather than labor shortage. There should be a better way of meeting immediate needs than the arbitrary one Mr. McNutt proposes.

[From the Hartford Courant]

M'NUTT'S LABOR DRAFT

When Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt was asked if his order extending to the whole Nation the hiring controls with which Hartford is now familiar was made necessary by the lack of national service legislation, he replied that it had "no relation to any legislation." Where, then, does he or the War Manpower Commission derive its authority to require that all labor, except farm labor and persons in establishments employing 8 or fewer, apply for jobs through, and be assigned to them by, the United States Employment Service? To state that the plan, effective July 1, is voluntary on the part of management and labor is grossly to misrepresent it. The rules are presented by

the W. M. C. and so are the penalties for violating those rules. It is no more "voluntary" than is slavery.

The most charitable description that can be applied to Mr. McNutt's order is that it is a labor draft, irrespectively of the honeyed phraseology employed to defend it. "The successful conduct of the war," says Mr. McNutt, "now requires the channeling of all available male labor in the Nation to jobs of greatest war production urgency and the retention of such labor in those jobs." If that is a fair presentation of the situation, why the pampering policy toward the sit-in strikers at the Brewster Aeronautical Co.?

To emphasize how indefensible is this plan of the Federal Government to provide work for the Brewster employees because the Navy Department had unexpectedly canceled contracts for planes, observe what Mr. McNutt offers in extenuation of his manpower draft order: "Workers who may be released in such conditions (referring to cut-backs and contract cancelations) are sorely needed in other plants or other areas where war production schedules are being increased. Experience in the past has shown that this easing of manpower does not result in the filling of all labor demands in critical war industries."

If another sit-in occurs, will the U. S. E. S. "channel" the laborers into other industries at some distant point from the laborers affected by a cut-back or contract termination? Such a course cannot be followed until the employees themselves apply to U. S. E. S. for work. Mr. McNutt's order may be wholly ineffectual in meeting situations similar to that at the Brewster plant early this week.

This compulsory labor policy promulgated by Mr. McNutt marks, within less than 2 years, at least the sixth shift in his position on that issue. As recently as 8 weeks ago he opposed the proposal to enact a compromise National Service Act because, in his judgment, it would be "little less than tragic" to displace "voluntary cooperation with military or bureaucratic processes." The blunt truth is that Mr. McNutt's order is an excellent example of bureaucratic processes in government. He admits that it has "no relation to any legislation." It is bureaucracy characteristically attempting to do what the legislative power has refused to approve.

Domestic Issues in Aviation Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Rotary Club of New York City at a meeting held at the Commodore Hotel on June 1, 1944:

Much of the recent public discussion of civil aviation has centered around the problems of international air transport and the place the United States is to have in that field. One of the most important subjects discussed is the extent to which nations will permit aircraft of other countries to fly through the air space above their territories.

The effect of present international law requires any international commercial operator or his government to secure the approval of every country through which a proposed new route lies even for the flight of aircraft through its air space and the landing of the aircraft for purely technical purposes. This has always resulted in time-consuming and difficult negotiations and often has prevented the establishment of needed services. Even more protracted international bargaining must precede the granting of authority by one country for the aircraft of another country to engage in commercial operations within its borders.

Many of us interested in the development of international aviation have been greatly concerned lest the continuation of this system result in impairing substantially the great strides of international air transportation anticipated after the war. Proposals have been made that new international arrangements be established by which the aircraft of any country would be permitted to fly through the air space of any other and stop at its airports for technical purposes, such as refueling, repairs, and so forth. Others have involved even more radical departures from the present law. It is indeed important that this tremendous international problem be given adequate consideration and that obstacles to the development of this new means of communication, with all the nations of the world, be eliminated to the extent consistent with the protection of our national interests.

But equally important and equally serious in its implications is the similar problem affecting operations solely within the United States. If precedents in a surface-carrier field are followed, conflicting State regulation imposed upon aircraft flying within their borders will obstruct the development of aviation within our borders just as seriously as the adoption of highly nationalistic policies will impede the conquest of international aviation.

The conflicts in State legislation with respect to the operations of trucks is a familiar story now, but specific examples will indicate how far these conflicts have gone. Most States have passed laws or regulations dealing with the maximum length and the maximum weights of trucks and the type of night lights they must display. In Illinois a truck may be 50 feet long and carry a maximum weight of 72,000 pounds. In Indiana, the adjoining State, a truck may be only 40 feet long and carry 40,000 pounds. In Kentucky the length is reduced still further to 30 feet and the gross weight to 18,000 pounds. In Tennessee a truck can be 35 feet long and carry 30,000 pounds. Georgia is nearly as liberal as Illinois and permits the truck to be 45 feet long and carry a gross weight of 56,000 pounds. As to lights, Illinois requires three green lights on the front and three red ones on the rear. Indiana requires three amber lights on the front and two red lights on the rear. Kentucky requires one white or green light in front and one red light on the rear. Tennessee requires one white and one red or yellow light. Georgia merely requires that two lights be placed on front and rear. As can be readily recognized from that short statement of the laws of these five States a truck driver operating between Chicago and Atlanta has many difficult problems to face.

Aviation cannot progress under this type of conflicting regulations. Indeed, it would be surprising if the industry could even survive under such conditions. Aviation's greatest contribution to the public good has been the ability it has given us to move from place to place at high speeds and without hindrance from surface obstacles. Its major attribute would be lost if the flier would have to proceed haltingly across the country, being met at each State line with a new and different set of regulations. I have often been impressed with that fact as I have flown. Only last week I flew from Morgantown, W. Va., to Washington in 55 minutes. During that time we crossed portions of four States and the District of Columbia. Flying from Washington to New York, a trip of approximately 1½ hours, carries you over 6 States and the District of Columbia. Rules and practices which have grown up in governing surface means of transport cannot be adapted unthinkingly to the air.

Aviation, until now, has been permitted to develop for the most part under completely uniform regulations prescribed by the Federal Government. The States have done little in the regulatory field, although State agencies have done a really magnificent job in promoting aviation through the establishment of airports, air marking, promotion of flying schools, flying clubs, and the like. However, in anticipation of a large increase in flying, both private and commercial, many States are giving consideration to the exercise of regulatory powers over this form of transportation. Several State legislatures have recently passed new regulatory laws, and I understand that many others anticipate doing so within the next 2 years. The enactment of such laws by the States can have extremely serious consequences if they are not prepared after due consideration for the vital need for the establishment of and maintenance of a uniform national policy for aviation. They can result in striking down the freedom of the air space over the United States and turning it into a patchwork of small sovereignties, each one with its regulatory code which must be complied with by the air line, the charter operator, and the private flier.

In thinking about this problem I was greatly impressed by reading a recent report of the British Labor Party. That party made a study of European air transportation prior to the war, and the findings contain an excellent analysis of European operations during that time. The report is quite critical of the European system and emphasizes particularly the high subsidies required to keep even that inadequate system in operation. On the other hand, the report praises our national air-transport system highly and attributes its success to the fact that we are a United States in which aviation has been permitted to grow under a uniform national policy. I take the liberty of reading one short quotation from that report because it represents the objective views of an extremely important part of British public opinion. The quotation follows:

"Turn now for comparison to the United States. There, the mileage flown was far higher than anywhere else in the world; standards of efficiency, comfort for passengers were much higher than elsewhere; an air-mail service began as early as 1918; and a network of air lines lighted for flying by night covered the whole vast area. A passenger could board an airplane one evening in New York and alight next morning in San Francisco, 3,000 miles away.

"Why was America ahead of Europe in this respect? One reason was the geography and climate of the country; another was the high ability of American designers and technicians and the vast industrial resources available to them. But the chief reason was that the United States is the United States. A single Federal authority could organize and finance the ground organization on a uniform basis, right across the continent; which meant that no part of a chain of airports, beacons, etc., would be left out because of a local lack of resources. Controlling the ground organization, the Federal authority was in a key position, enabling it to secure a measure of unity in the system and a measure of protection for the public interest. In Europe no such authority existed."

This passage expresses my thought exactly. In planning for the future of our national system we must be extremely careful that through independent and uncoordinated action of the States we do not lose the tremendous advantage pointed out by the British. I am not conjuring up ghosts. This is not an idle fear.

There came to my desk only recently certain regulations proposed to be issued by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission for application to air carriers operating in that State. These regulations are over 100 pages long and cover the operations of both interstate and intrastate air carriers in the greatest of detail even down to the ash containers in the passenger cabins. The Colorado Public Utilities Commission proposes to designate the routes to be followed by interstate air carriers operating across that State. The Federal Government now designates such routes and the possibilities of conflicts between the two agencies are obvious. The regulations also provide that the Public Utilities Commission of Colorado will determine that the air carriers' aircraft are safe. This is also done by the Federal Government at the present time.

The most elaborate precautions are taken by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration to see to it that aircraft are fully airworthy before the public is permitted to ride in them. Federal aeronautical engineers observe every step in the design and construction of new aircraft and elaborate tests are made to make sure that it is strucutrally sound and its performance characteristics are satisfactory. Colorado, under its proposed regulations, would do this also and it is impossible to determine what effect such stringent State regulations would have upon the development of interstate flying. Numerous similar possibilities of conflict could be drawn from this lengthy and detailed set of regulations, but these are sufficient to illustrate the seriousness of the problem which faces aviation today.

Many people have spoken to me despairingly of the possibility of doing anything to anticipate and avoid the creation of these barriers to interstate flying. This is a completely defeatist position because there should be no conflict in objectives between the Federal Government and the State governments in the development of this important means of communication. If its progress is impaired we will all be adversely affected.

It behooves the Congress and the officials of Federal and State Governments to cooperate among themselves to see to it that a really workable solution to the problem is worked out. Many feel that it can only be solved by vesting exclusive regulatory power in the Federal Government. Others take the position that such a proposal would unduly impair the rights of the States. My position is that both can and must cooperate for the final answer to this problem. Steps must be taken immediately to bring it to a conclusion.

Address of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, Delivered to Graduating Class of Southwestern College, May 23, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Southwestern College is located at Memphis, Tenn.

On May 23, 1944, this outstanding institution celebrated its ninety-fifth commencement. There was a popular demand that our colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, deliver the commencement address.

Walter Armstrong, former president of the American Bar Association, a resident of my city, and Walter Chandler, now mayor of Memphis, who served on the Judiciary Committee while a Member of Congress, joined with me and others in persuading Judge SUMNERS to take time out of his busy life to make this contribution to this university, with a long history of accomplishments.

His address was so well received and so like Judge SUMNERS that I have asked leave to extend my remarks and to include this address in order that the membership of the House may be privileged to read it:

Especially because I am a native Tennessean and deeply concerned in everything which is of interest to the people of the State of my birth, I am deeply grateful for this privilege and this opportunity.

I am not going to try to deliver an orthodox commencement address of big words used to unsimplify practical things.

You are going out into a world of great confusion. You will confront the greatest difficulties which in centuries have come to challenge the genius and the fitness of any generation to survive. You are going to have tough going. There is one consolation in that you are going to have the opportunity and the necessity to do great things. Only great difficulties ever make a great man or a great woman. The greatest ages in the world are those in which a people with courage and a purpose which would not yield fought their way through great difficulties. Perhaps your greatest difficulty is going to be in the field of government, economic and political. I am quite sure of that.

Notwithstanding the physical scars which this war will leave on the surface of the earth and upon the bodies of people, the earth will still be here. But the question will be whether or not the problems of government which will follow this war will be greater than the capacity of democratic government to deal with. A great many people are insisting that they will be greater than the capacity of democratic government. As a matter of fact, there are many people in this country who have lost faith in democratic governments. Some do not want it. There is tremendous confusion about the whole matter. I am one of those who feel absolutely certain that we in America at least can continue to operate and successfully deal with our problems through the machinery of democratic government. But I am certain that, in order for that to be possible, we must understand the nature of democratic government and must recognize that government is not the one hiatus in all nature where natural laws do not limit human discretion and determine sound policy. We must discover those natural laws and bring governmental policy into harmony with them.

When I was a country boy living on my father's farm over here in Lincoln County I heard him say one day that "there is no result without corresponding antecedent, adequate cause." I had him explain what he meant. As soon as I got the explanation I began to make an examination in the fields and the woods. I found his statement to be true. That discovery opened a great big door into a great big world. On our farm I discovered convincing evidence of design and system and execution; a great intelligence, a great power; a system of laws of nature, laws of God, permeating the universe governing everywhere, from the smallest particle of the atom up through all creation, up through the great systems of worlds that light up the skies on a clear night.

I looked at the trees, really looked at them. I knew they were not making themselves. They were being built. The rosebush in our yard was not making the rose blossom. It could not do it. It could not get exactly the right amount of sunshine, soil, air, and water, and build them into the living flower. I knew the stars did not know where they were going, nor when to turn over.

As I went away from the farm and broadened my contacts and began to examine other things, I discovered that as we had gone from the log house to the skyscraper, from the wagon road to the road of steel, from the oxcart to the airplane, as we had moved into this highly developed scientific age of ours, it had been accomplished by discovering the natural laws which govern in these various fields of endeavor and bringing human skill into harmony with them. By that method we had made great progress in developing formulas and in devising instrumentalities such as machinery, which makes it possible for human beings to work in harmony with these discovered laws.

The initial step and every succeeding step in what we designate as the progress of this age has been achieved by familiarizing ourselves with natural law and doing things according to that law which inheres in the nature of things, which indicates the plans of nature and compels its execution, that law which human beings may not question and may not disregard.

Nowhere in all the fields of human endeavor, human responsibility and human necessity, except one, is there now in this age an attempt among intelligent human beings to go forward except as directed and guided by natural law, and that is the field of human government. There we are governed by the theories of man.

In our constitutional conventions they talked about the plan of nature, the laws of nature, operating in the field of government. Their discussions clearly show they recognized that free governments are not accidents, that they are provided for in the big economy, that they originate, develop, and operate under natural laws, and that it is fixed in human nature, in the difficulties of social life the absolute necessity that there shall be government.

It is not an accident that there is in the human heart an aspiration to be free. It is God-implanted, just as it is fixed in the human system that there shall be hunger for food. Nature could have created human beings so there would have been no necessity for government and no necessity for food; no necessity for anything. Everything would already have been provided. But that is not the plan of nature. People long to be free that they may struggle to gain liberty and be vigilant, thoughtful, patriotic, and brave, to preserve their liberty; that they may do their thinking and gain development by the effort, and then that they shall render in civic service that which is required to preserve their capacity to govern.

A democracy is a government by the people. It is a group of private citizens got together for the purpose of engaging in common enterprise of governing themselves. When they shall have taken that initial step nature begins to operate upon that which they have initiated, just as it begins to operate upon that which the farmer has initiated when he puts the seed in the seed bed. That which human beings do in the copartnership between them and nature is relatively small, but it is important.

The surgeon does not heal the broken bone. Nature does that. The surgeon does an important part in the common undertaking, but he does that important part well only when he has first discovered the natural laws which determine how he ought to do his part

of the job. His skill and his success depend upon how well he conforms to those laws.

That is equally true with regard to operating systems of democratic government. The point I want to make now is that democratic government in a highly developed scientific age, where men are making great progress and doing great things because they discover and are obedient to natural law, creates a complexity and difficulties which makes it impossible for democratic government to survive unless it too is made to conform to the laws of nature provided for the guidance and assistance of people engaged in the common enterprise of governing themselves.

The natural laws which govern the body governmental, the governmental entity, are strikingly similar to the natural laws which govern the bodies of the individuals who make up the governmental organization. The difficulties which the operation of a system of free government provide, like all other difficulties which people confront, make up a part of the gymnastic paraphernalia designed by nature for the development of human beings. If we will bear this in mind it will guide us in the search for an understanding of the natural laws which govern democratic government. The central objective of nature is the development of people. That is what this struggle is for down here on this earth. It is not an easy thing for people to remain free. It is a difficult thing, which is just another way of saying that it is a developing thing. Progress is uphill, not downhill. It is slow, not fast. It is difficult, not easy. It is the road of struggle, but it is the road of life. Along that road lies the thrill of victory.

We have been under the spell of a false philosophy teaching that the right way is the easy way and the quick way. There was never a thing more false than that. The road of progress is not quick, not fast. It is not easy. It is uphill. There is climbing and effort and struggle, but it is the road of strength. The road downhill may be alluring, but it is the lure of death insofar as our democracy is concerned. The road of democratic progress, therefore, is in that direction which puts the opportunity to govern and the necessity to govern, the necessity to think and work and sacrifice, closer and closer to the people. Nature does not give something for nothing. It has a double-entry system of bookkeeping.

In these facts we find the philosophy of what used to be known as States' rights. But the right of the States to govern was never important. The necessity of the States to govern in matters within their governmental capacity was always of fundamental natural importance, because it is in their governmental organizations made up in the main of small units of governments like cities, counties, etc., that the individual has the most to do, and a chance to do it; a machinery which he can operate.

Many people who seem honestly to feel themselves to be progressive and have claimed for themselves the designation of Progressives, as a matter of fact have been great reactionaries. They have favored moving governmental power away from the people, out of the units of government susceptible of popular control, into the central Government at Washington where these powers can be exercised only through bureaucratic organizations impossible of popular control.

Local government is the foundation of organized democratic government. The individual is the unit of democratic government. No local government can be any stronger or more efficient than the individual citizens who constitute it. The State government can be no stronger nor better than the local units of government, the aggregate of which make up the government of the States. The Federal Government can be no better nor stronger as a democracy than the States, which constitute the foundation upon which the Federal organization rests.

These things are not controlled by the theories of men. They are controlled by natural laws which determine the structure, the character, and the source of strength and power of a democratic government.

History shows conclusively that no people except by conquest ever lost their opportunity to be free until they had first lost their capacity to govern themselves, and that no people who had lost the capacity and the will to govern themselves were ever able to remain free. The explanation is a very simple one. There has to be government. It is fixed in human necessity there shall be government, and whenever the people are no longer able to tender themselves as instrumentalities to do the business of government, government of necessity lays its hand on a Hitler or a Mussolini, or shifts its power and responsibility to a bureaucracy or some other nondemocratic form of government.

If you will examine the history of the experiences of people in the field of government you will find no exceptions. The important question, therefore, that confronts all peoples who aspire to be free is what policy of government is most calculated to preserve and develop governmental capacity of the citizen and hold the powers of government in the units of government which they can best operate.

If the States in our system, which constitute our organized democracies, shift the powers of government which they possess to the Federal Government, the power to do the things which they have surrendered departs from those States and they are left with less and less total power to discharge their remaining responsibilities.

The same sort of thing is true of the counties, and cities, and towns, and the individual citizen. These things are determined by natural law. The people are punished for disregarding nature's plan. That plan is effectuated as much by the limitations imposed upon individual human capacity as by the capacity given to human beings. It is perfectly clear that nature, God, the Big Boss, has provided in His plan for a democracy in opportunity of people to develop by exercising their capacity to govern so that they may be free, instead of having an arrangement under which a few individuals hunger for power and place may dominate and dwarf the great mass of people because that great mass of people are denied the necessity to do the things for themselves, to discharged the difficulties which nature has designed for their development. The evidence is conclusive that democratic government is in harmony with the workaday plan of the Big Boss. There is no irreverence in that.

I recognize that the individual is not in a position to have an independent dependable judgment with reference to many separate matters of legislation or governmental policy. Often they are interrelated with many other matters.

But nature has so arranged that the average citizen may be guided to sound judgment with reference to basic governmental policies by what is taught by his own observation and experience. If Uncle Sam could do everything for everybody, life would not be worth living.

You know what makes a football team the champion? It is not playing against weak opposition, nor having somebody else carry the ball. It is difficulties. Even from the standpoint of fun and interest there would be mighty few thrills in the game either for the players or the spectators if the rules of the game were such that each team could have a pleasant march across the field to each other's goal. If you want to know why we have to have an independent judiciary, you can see it right there. There is a man out on the field; I believe he is called a referee. As a matter of fact he is a judge, as much a judge as any judge on the bench. If you watch you can see the operation of a natural law that governs the business of judging. It operates everywhere. The referee must know the rules of the game. That requirement runs all the way up the line, to the highest court in the world. He has got to be able to see the plays as they are played. He must call them as he sees them. These make up judicial qualification and judicial integrity for all judges just the same. It is a law which inheres in the nature of things. If this referee has in his mind that he would like for either of the teams to win, he is not fit to referee the game. That same thing runs all the way up the line to the highest judge in the world. If that referee shades his decisions or attempts to modify the rules of the game while the game is being played, in order to throw the decision where he wants it to go, that is judicial dishonesty, all the way up the line.

I realize this is a rather heavy talk for a commencement exercise. But you have heavy going ahead of you. The mightiest issues of the ages are pending now. The philosophers of government are coming under reexamination. Only a level-headed, clear-thinking, patriotic people who understand the nature of democratic government and what policies tend toward its preservation and what policies tend toward its destruction have a chance to survive as a free people. If you will make an independent examination of these things which I have brought to your attention, you will have no difficulty in determining that democratic government is the sort of government designed by Nature for human beings. You will discover that the difficulties for the individual connected with the operation of democratic government does not indicate that it ought to be abandoned, but quite to the contrary. They constitute, as I have stated, the gymnastic paraphernalia provided by God for the development of His creatures. Human beings are not given the aspiration to be free and then denied the opportunity and capacity to attain to this Nature-implanted aspiration.

You will find that those who in the name of progress favor relieving the States, the small units of Government, and the individual of the necessity to do the things—difficult things—which are within their capacity, instead of being progressives are reactionaries of the rankest type. They presume to be wiser than God.

The whole history of democratic progress has been away from the central government back toward the people. Every great document, every great monument, along the road of democratic progress marks the occasion where decentralization of governmental power took place. This going to Washington in the name of progress, this bartering away the reserve rights of the States in order to get money, this accepting of Federal money loaded down with Federal power borrowed by the Federal Government and secured by mortgaging the taxpaying power of unborn generations, has weakened our States, weakened the self-respect of our people—the most deadly things that can be done in a democracy.

In conclusion, may I suggest that examination will disclose there are two things indispensable to the operation of democratic government. First, a people capable of operating such a system of government. Second, the location of general governmental power in a governmental machinery which the people can operate. Let us not forget that. Fortunately for us, our States, made up of

the smaller units of government, are peculiarly adapted to the governmental necessity of a people operating democratic government.

The people of the States created the Federal organization to do for them as their common agent, specified things which the States felt they could not so well do acting separately. They reserved all other powers, which include the powers of general government, to themselves and to the people.

We have got to get over this attack of federalitis from which we have been suffering for a long time, and get the States and the Federal Government back on their respective jobs. The States will regain their vigor through exercising their governmental muscles and the Federal organization stripped down to Federal duties can then properly attend to its Federal business under laws enacted by the Federal Congress.

The most fascinating thing which I have discovered from an examination of the nature of democratic government is public opinion. Nature makes it the supreme law. It is the only safe guide for a democracy. As nearly as I can find a figure to illustrate it, it is like the gold which comes from low-grade ore. In the heat of discussion, earnestness of purpose among a people patriotic and free enough to operate a democracy, that which is truth is melted away from the dross of ignorance and selfishness. There is no substitute for it in a democracy. I do not minimize the great duty and responsibility of public officials, but it is from the people, as it is planned by nature, that free government may draw its strength, capable of protesting against the betrayal of public trust. The strength that renews a democracy never comes from the top down. It always comes up, as the strength that renews a tree comes up from its roots. That strength is coming up now. Our democracy is being revitalized. It is a great thing to see a great people rising to meet the challenge of a great hour.

I congratulate you members of this graduating class that you are to have the chance to be a part of a generation which must be the greatest which has been on this earth since history began to be written, because its difficulties will be the greatest.

There are two things we must do. Win this war as soon as possible, that we may bring back as quickly as possible as many men as possible from the battlefields of the world and our women who serve—bring them back to a government, to a free democracy, worthy of their sacrifice.

Invasion Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. MALONEY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my own remarks, I include therein the radio addresses delivered by Senators OVERTON and ELLENDER, and Congressman HÉBERT, and myself on June 6 from radio station WOL, Washington, D. C., through radio station WNOE, New Orleans, La.:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN F. EDWARD HÉBERT

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. This is your Congressman, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, from the First Congressional District of Louisiana, speaking to you directly from Washington, D. C.

As you know, for the past several weeks I have made a report directly to you from Washington on Tuesday evenings at 9:15 o'clock, and had planned to make the usual weekly report at the same time tonight.

However, in the past 24 hours things have happened fast. The day that not only America but the world has waited for has arrived. While I am speaking to you some of your own boys, your own flesh and blood, are now landing on the shores of France in the fight for the liberation of the world. It's invasion day, the most momentous day, perhaps, in the history of the world. This day will only be surpassed by the day of total victory when the arms of America and her allies will triumph over the forces of Hitler and evil.

Instead of making my regular weekly report at 9:15 I am coming to you at this hour a few minutes before you will hear the President of the United States on this same station. WNOE in New Orleans has, as a public service and in an endeavor to bring to you people of New Orleans and Louisiana first-hand reports from your Congressman and Senators here in Washington, made available this time directly from Station WOL in Washington to Station WNOE in New Orleans.

Tonight I am privileged and honored to have with me at the microphone Louisiana's distinguished United States Senators, JOHN H. OVERTON and ALLEN J. ELLENDER, as well as the Congressman from the Second Congressional District, PAUL H. MALONEY. In a few minutes it will be my pleasure to present them to you in order that you may hear from them directly their reaction to this historical event.

I want to take this opportunity to thank WNOE in New Orleans for this opportunity of your representatives here in Washington to bring you a first-hand report direct from the Nation's Capital.

It has been a day of excitement and tenseness here in Washington. The air bristled with uncertainty and in the minds of a sober Congress there was a feeling of humility and apprehension such as I have never witnessed before in a body of men.

On that black day in American history when the news was flashed over the wires that Pearl Harbor had been bombed and our fleet almost destroyed, I felt depressed and angered like all other Americans. I yearned for the day when America would accept the challenge of retaliation and strike with full force against the common enemy. For over 2 years America has waited for the realization of what has happened today.

Now that it has happened I await the outcome with confidence in ultimate victory, but await that outcome fully apprehensive and cognizant of the sacrifices which must and will be made before victory is achieved.

I must tell you of the reaction of Congress today. I am sure it is indicative of the reaction of every American. This morning when I arrived on Capitol Hill I had the feeling that the Stars and Stripes flying from the Capitol, and the House, and the Senate buildings waved with a greater defiance than they had waved in many days. There was something about those flags flying in the breeze which made me proud that today I am an American, that today I am a Member of the Congress of the United States, the symbol of a Government of the people, by the people and for the people. The symbol of democracy, the symbol of the right of a people to govern themselves.

It is most significant that Congress, instead of presenting a scene of jubilation and celebration, presented a scene of humility and trust in God. Congress as a body stood in silent prayer today that God may smile on those who at this moment are advancing in the face of the enemy, willing to die in order that we might live. I shall never forget my experience in the House today as it rose and stood silently in prayer and heard Member after Member, from the well of the House ask God's blessing on those valiant boys who have left their homes and their native shores to fight in order that an ideal might live.

Here with me tonight are men who represent you in Washington. Because the ideals for which these men fight today has been handed to us by those who fought for the same ideals on yesterday. We are your elected representatives here in Washington, because you are a free people, able to send to Washington those whom you think represent you best in Louisiana.

Louisiana's senior Senator has served you in Washington both in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. JOHN OVERTON has served Louisiana well and has brought honor and dignity and glory to the State he loves so well. His influence in Washington is widespread, his respect among his colleagues is unanimous. He is a representative that Louisiana can well be proud of. Senator OVERTON, will you please say a few words to the people of your State, your beloved Louisiana?

ADDRESS OF SENATOR JOHN H. OVERTON

Fellow Louisianians, all of us appearing upon this program are indebted to the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT for the opportunity to speak direct to you on the most engrossing event in perhaps all the martial history of our Nation. I thank the Congressman for his courtesy.

The long-expected and long-awaited invasion of western Europe is now under way. The news reaching us shows that the assault upon the French frontier is proceeding according to plan—and, in the language of Winston Churchill, "What a plan." The tottering despotism of Adolf Hitler now finds itself besieged on the east by the Russians, on the south by the Allies in Italy, and along the western coast of Europe. Americans, Russians, Britons are gathering for the kill. Hitler and Hitlerism are doomed; and I pray to God that, with the fall of the German tyranny all tyrannies will be wiped from the face of the earth.

We must pay the sacrifice, and no small sacrifice will it be. Germany still fights on foreign and conquered soil. Except over the air, the forces of the Allies have not invaded Germany proper. The Russians have driven the Huns from most of the territory conquered by them on their eastern frontier. The Germans have been ousted from Africa, Sicily, Sardinia, the southern part of Italy, and Rome is in the hands of the Allies. But the enemy is yet to be cast out of Norway, the Netherlands, France, the Balkans, and the Baltics. All of us here in Washington, however, look forward with confidence to the ultimate outcome. America has never lost a war. It's not going to lose this fight. Aided by the courage, determination, and mighty prowess of Russia, Great Britain and her dominions, and by the fervor and gallantry of the patriots of the nations which have come under the ruthless domination of Hitler, and, above all, strengthened by our reliance upon divine guidance, we shall again carry the American flag to a decisive and lasting victory.

And promptly after that we shall be able quickly to dispose of the dirty, sneaking, treacherous little Japs.

Mr. HÉBERT. Thank you very much, Senator OVERTON.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, may I present to you another of your elected officials another man who has done so much in the United States Senate to distinguish himself and the State he represents. ALLEN J. ELLENDER is in the second year of his second term of his service in the United States Senate. During his 7½ years his devotion to duty has made him an alert, attentive, and

responsible representative of the people from Louisiana. Senator ELLENDER, I am sure many are waiting to hear your voice at this time.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Ladies and gentlemen, D-day has come, and it has brought with it, many heartaches and much anxiety to millions of our people. Here in Washington, we have been expecting the momentous event for many weeks, and the announcement of its actual occurrence has been received with deep emotion. I pray to God that success and a speedy victory will be ours.

Never in all history has there been a more impressive and effective aggregation of ships, planes, tanks, and other implements of war as is now engaged in battle on the beaches of France. The men and women involved in that struggle have been well trained. They are operating in accordance with superbly laid plans prepared under the direction of peerless military strategists. The Congress has enacted all of the necessary measures that were advocated by our Commander in Chief, so as to properly and adequately round out these operations.

It should therefore be comforting to the parents of those who are actually engaged in battle that their Government has done all in its power to protect and prepare them for this gigantic encounter. It should be comforting to them that their sons and daughters are engaged in a noble struggle. Upon its outcome will depend whether the people of the world will be bound in chains or be able to hold up a brighter torch of freedom.

I have no fear of the result. I am confident that we will win and those who will make the supreme sacrifice will not have died in vain. I hope and pray to God that the blow that is now in progress will be accelerated to such a momentum that Berlin will be reached and captured within a few weeks.

As one of your lawmakers in Congress, I, along with others, have cooperated and done all in my power to help prepare our Nation for war. When one considers that less than 90 days before Pearl Harbor our powder-making facilities could hardly supply an army of a hundred thousand men, that we had fewer planes in the Army and Navy than we are now able to manufacture in 1 month, that our merchant tonnage has increased manyfold, so that we now almost bridge the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with our cargo ships, that our Navy today is more powerful that the combined navies of the whole world, and that we have been able to provide airplanes, tanks, and other implements of war in amounts that stagger the imagination, he is forced to the conclusion that a good job has been well done. We have been able to accomplish in months, in preparing for war, what it has taken our enemies years to perform. Full credit for this performance is due to you, the men and women of Louisiana, and to those of the rest of our country. I urge you with all the force at my command to keep your shoulders to the wheel, and not to slacken your efforts until Berlin and Tokio are captured and until all of the depraved and cruel men who have been responsible for this global catastrophe are put to death.

We are on the road to victory. Rome, the Eternal City, is now in our hands, and its fall has brought new hope to millions of people all over the world. Its capture has spread consternation in the camps of our enemies and will no doubt spur our victorious troops to new and decisive victories.

Let me again remind you to keep on doing your part and not to relax in your efforts until our enemies surrender unconditionally. We now need implements of war in greater quantities than ever before, and upon our continued efforts of more and more production will depend the safety and early return of our fighting forces.

Mr. HÉBERT. And now, ladies and gentlemen, it is certainly a privilege for me to present to you still another of your elected officials. As you know, the city of New Orleans has two Members of the House of Representatives here in Washington. It has been a source of pleasure to have the privilege to serve with PAUL MALONEY in the Congress.

For many years he has had the enviable confidence of the leaders of that great body, and the many times he has been returned to office bespeaks the confidence which the people of his district have in him. This is his sixth term in the House of Representatives. He is the dean of the Louisiana delegation. Congressman MALONEY, your people in New Orleans are waiting to hear from you.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL H. MALONEY

Thank you, Congressman HÉBERT; we are indeed indebted to you for this opportunity to speak to our home folks from Washington on a subject that reaches the very heart of all of our citizens.

My fellow citizens, today is D-day, and it will be long remembered in our Nation's history, not only as one of the greatest military achievements of all time, but as one that will symbolize the spirit of a free people, whose resourcefulness and ingenuity to keep themselves free will not ever perish from this earth.

Since the sneak and cowardly attack on this country at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the people of this Nation have pledged their lives and fortunes toward liberating the oppressed people, and avenge the dastardly attack, that justice and freedom may prevail, and the people of this world may enjoy the rights bestowed upon them by their Creator, to live in peace and happiness.

I wish to pay tribute to the splendid young men who make up the combatant forces, who, with their allies, have so valiantly made the first major step on the road to Berlin by invading France this day, which marks the beginning of the end of this global war.

I want to pay tribute to the mothers and fathers, wives, sisters, and brothers of this Christian Nation, who are making the supreme contribution by giving their sons, brothers, and husbands to this gigantic struggle for justice and freedom, and to insure to their children's children a proper and safe place within which to live.

I also wish to pay tribute to every man, woman, and child who has contributed in so many ways for the support and the equipping of these splendid young men and women with every need to carry forward the battle to subdue these Axis leaders that have brought so much misery to their followers and have upset the peace of the world.

While there are classifications of essential employment for the war effort, in my humble opinion, I believe that all who are living an industrious life, whether he milks a cow, or plants a seed, or runs a lathe, or drives a truck, or directs a train, or gives medical aid, or teaches a child, or cooks a meal, or makes a bed, all these and many thousand other little things that we do are equally important so that the home front can move in keeping with the battle front, is all necessary and part of the war effort, and all are essential.

We all are in this war together, each with a part to play, and we cannot fail.

We must plan and prepare for a long war, but pray for a short war.

While today is so-called D-day, and we look upon it as a great day, there is still another day that will be a much greater day, and that one we all pray so fervently for, and that day is V-day—Victory Day—the day that bloodshed will cease, and the day we earnestly hope that everlasting peace may begin, and our loved ones will come home safe and sound, where peace and human happiness reigns—a job well done—this, ladies and gentlemen, is my prayer.

Mr. HÉBERT. Thank you, Congressman MALONEY, and thank you again, Senator OVERTON and Senator ELLENDER, for appearing with me tonight in this special broadcast which radio station WNOE in New Orleans has made available as a public service through a direct wire from Washington to New Orleans on this all-important day in order that the people we represent may hear from us directly.

Dimples and Glamour Evidently Have Devastating Effect Even on Generals of A. A. F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Idaho Statesman, May 12, 1944:

PRIORITY ON WOMEN

Several times we have heard servicemen, usually back on furlough, complain about women in the service. Sometimes we felt that they were merely prejudiced, but sometimes it seemed to us that they had a valid gripe. A recent happening supports the latter position.

Some weeks ago thousands of experienced male pilots were grounded, presumably because we had trained more pilots than we shall need. Nevertheless, Jacqueline Cochran's WASPS are getting a priority of a very special kind. There is a bill before Congress to commission women pilots, and some have already completed their first weeks of schooling. General Arnold told Congressmen the women pilots will be needed for ferrying because all male pilots will be needed for combat. That's a strange statement to make when thousands of men pilots are now out of jobs, or soon will be.

The men are angry about it, and they seem to have additional reasons. For instance, WASPS qualify for transport training after 35 hours of flying time, whereas men must have 1,000, including 200 in heavy craft. We don't know what the explanation is. Probably it is the sentimental softness of American men in regard to their women. In colleges the smooth, good-looking gals can get A's without a lick of work; and in the armed services it may be that dimples have a devastating effect even on the generals.

Bank Suspensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has furnished me a list of the bank suspensions since 1920. In view of the fact that so many uninformed people are claiming that this administration has been an enemy of the banks, when it really saved the banks, it is certainly of interest to note that there have been so few bank failures during this administration.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt came into power March 4, 1933. I believe it can safely be said that all failures for that year should be charged to the preceding administration. That being true, there have been very, very few failures of banks during this administration. In fact, I doubt that there is any other period in the history of our country when banking has been so secure.

The statement is as follows:

Number of bank suspensions by years ended Dec. 31, 1920 to 1944

Year ended Dec. 31—	All banks	National banks	State banks	Private banks
1920	14	14	(1)	(1)
1921	490	37	409	44
1922	350	32	295	23
1923	629	73	533	23
1924	763	110	616	37
1925	606	106	461	39
1926	958	105	801	52
1927	662	84	545	33
1928	499	57	423	19
1929	658	63	564	31
1930	1,339	148	1,133	58
1931	2,265	380	1,805	80
1932	1,445	[2] 269	1,139	37
1933 (Jan. 1 to Mar. 4)	449	[3] 66	361	22
1933 (Mar. 13, 14, and 15) [4]	2,630	290	2,263	77
1933 (Mar. 16 to Dec. 31)	174	3	161	10
1934	57	1	43	13
1935	34	4	30	-------
1936	44	1	42	1
1937	58	3	53	2
1938	56	1	53	2
1939	42	4	37	1
1940	22	1	21	-------
1941	8	4	4	-------
1942	9	-------	9	-------
1943	4	2	2	-------
1944 (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31)	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total	14,265	1,858	11,803	604

[1] Data unavailable.

[2] Includes 4 banks other than national in the District of Columbia, receivers for which were appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency.

[3] Includes 2 national banks for which receivers were appointed between Mar. 6 and Mar. 12, inclusive the banking holiday.

[4] Figures for State and private banks comprise (a) banks not licensed following the banking holiday and later placed in liquidation or receivership, and (b) unlicensed banks granted licenses after June 30, 1933. In the case of national banks the figures shown represent only 290 (288 national banks and 2 banks other than national in the District of Columbia) of the 1,417 unlicensed banks (1,407 national and 10 other than national in the District of Columbia) at the close of the banking holiday, which were placed in receivership because plans submitted for reorganization had been disapproved. The remaining 1,127 unlicensed banks (1,119 national and 8 other than national in the District of Columbia) which are not included with bank suspensions, were disposed of through having been licensed to reopen, reorganized through waiver, rehabilitation or sales of assets and through having been placed in voluntary liquidation.

NOTE.—Figures for State and private banks compiled by Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and represent associations closed to the public, either temporarily or permanently, by supervisory authorities or directors of the banks on account of financial difficulties. In the case of national bank suspensions, these represent actual failures for which receivers were appointed.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, you are thinking mostly of the invasion and so are we all.

Finally, at long last, after 3 months or more of taunting we have the extension of the O. P. A. before us.

Barbed-wire entanglement would best describe the 2,500-word instructions from O. P. A. on how to bake a fruit cake.

We just cannot think of the invasion as a Gettysburg or Belleau Wood, but certainly history will record it as even more.

The most thrilling event of the Spanish-American War to me was our naval battle with the Spanish Fleet off Santiago Harbor, Cuba.

Major Johnson, our No. 1 hero from Europe hated himself today as he lunched in the House dining room because he was missing the big show.

It took two Yankees, our two floor leaders, to escort General Howell, 98, Confederate commander, to the Speaker's chair. He stood for it.

My father talked most of the battles of Lookout Mountain and before Atlanta of the Civil War—part of the former battle was above the clouds.

When one of our major generals was "broken" for talking too much about the invasion at a London cocktail party and was sent home, it furnished prohibition a point.

The last general supply bill, the Army bill, came from the whole Appropriations Committee yesterday—will be in Committee of the Whole next week—it is for billions but no Member will blink an eye.

Yesterday, exactly 2½ years after Pearl Harbor and in the midst of the invasion, we took final possible action to get the facts about Kimmel and Short. "Truth, the imperial virtue" at times is a difficult fort to conquer.

Outstanding Work of the House Committee on Small Business—Its Unity of Purpose and Nonpartisan Character of Its Work on Behalf of All Types of Small Business Enterprises Known Nation-Wide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have served for the past year and a half as a member of a select committee of this House whose record of performance and devotion to its assignment is praiseworthy. I refer to the Select Committee on Small Business.

This committee of nine members, assisted by a relatively small staff, has performed a prodigious amount of constructive work on behalf of the small business interests of this Nation; has gone about its work with a minimum of fanfare and publicity. It has exhibited a unity of purpose and a single-minded, nonpartisan approach to its assignment, and constitutes a body of men in the Congress today well informed on the subject of small business and its present and postwar problems.

Because I feel that the public should know of the volume of work and the diversity of subjects which have been covered by the Small Business Committee since its creation 2½ years ago, I want to submit for the record a recapitulation of the studies, reports, and hearings, and other achievements of the committee, which I feel go to make up a very worth-while and impressive record.

In 1942 the committee held 40 public hearings, during which a total of 663 witnesses were heard. The following subjects were investigated in 1942: Problems of the automobile dealers, problems of the tire dealers, the scrap metals shortage, problems of the retail druggists, the fire-insurance industry, the sugar shortage, the refrigerated locker industry, the distribution of war contracts to small business.

In 1943 the committee held 30 public hearings and 1 hearing in executive session, at which 445 witnesses were heard. The following subjects were investigated in 1943: problems of the small meat packers, problems of the small oil-well drillers and operators, effect of O. P. A. rulings on various retail groups, problems of the lumber industry, disposal of surplus Government-owned property and its relation to the problems of small businesses, operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, problems of the trailer-coach industry, problems of the smaller freight forwarders.

In 1944, to date, the committee has held seven public hearings, at which 129 witnesses have been heard. The following subjects have thus far been investigated in 1944: Disposal of Government-Owned Surplus Property (continued), Operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation (continued), Problems of Small Manufacturers on the Pacific Coast.

To date, the committee has issued five interim reports to the House, as follows:

I. Operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

II. Petroleum Supply Situation in the United States.

III. The Control, Disposition and Sale of Government-Owned Surplus Property.

IV. Current Lumber Industry Problems: Part 1. The National Lumber Situation as of January 1, 1944; Part 2. Problems of the Southern Pine Industry.

V. The Surplus Property Problem from the Viewpoint of Small Business.

The individual members of the committee have introduced 92 bills, the majority of which were designed to aid small business. A number of these bills were adopted by the Congress. Among those which became law were: The Federal Reports Act, Smaller War Plants Corporation Act, act authorizing loans on frozen goods.

Among those now pending are H. R. 4420—the Patman-Halleck bill—to pro-

vide for the orderly disposal of surplus Government-owned property in such a manner as to protect small business, and a bill designed to protect the independent tire dealers from the competition of manufacturer-owned stores.

The committee is now proceeding with its study of the need and type of legislation designed to assist small business in such matters as tax relief, amortization of cost-of-plant facilities acquired for war or peacetime purposes, and other kindred matters. In lieu of holding public hearings, our committee is now endeavoring to secure the views of small businessmen on these and other vital problems by mail, so that a cross-section of national small-businessman opinion on these subjects may be made available to the committee during the summer months.

The committee has a record for economy and efficiency for which I feel the Congress should well give praise.

It maintains a staff of only five regular employees, including stenographic help. In my opinion, the volume and value of the work turned out by this committee and its staff compares very favorably with the total of that produced by the similarly designated committee of the Senate with its staff of 27 paid employees and its much larger appropriation.

An examination of the committee's records shows that a total of 537 individual firms were referred to the committee and its staff for assistance by other Members of the Congress, or through direct petition. Assistance was given to all of these firms in the following manner:

Priorities assistance, 326 firms; contract explanation assistance, 11 firms; financial direction assistance, 67 firms; O. P. A. regulations assistance, 122 firms; miscellaneous assistance, 11 firms; total number firms aided, 537.

It was felt by the committee that such work was in line with its instructions from the Congress, and also provided the most practical way of studying firsthand the various and sundry problems which came the way of small business firms, especially those firms who were unable to employ Washington representatives for their own use.

In these days of partisan politics, the cooperative working relationship which has existed between the various members of this particular committee, when engaged in the work specifically assigned to the committee, has been of such a nonpartisan and inspiring nature that I have felt it appropriate to call this to the attention of the House at this time.

Small business is not the exclusive charge of either the Republican or the Democratic Parties. It is the charge of the entire Congress whichever party shall be in power politically. The work of this committee has served as an inspiration to me personally, and I am hopeful that the next Congress will see fit to continue the committee in existence in view of the splendid record already made by the committee.

The Evening Star, One of the Leading Washington Papers, Says WASP Program Is Wasted Money and Wasted Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of June 7, 1944:

THE WASP REPORT

The restrained temper of its reports and the thoroughness of its investigations have given the House Civil Service Committee, under Chairman RAMSPECK, a deserved prestige which adds strength to its findings. That is one reason why its report on the program of the Women's Air Service Pilots (WASP) becomes so devastating an indictment of wasted money and wasted effort involved in the experiment

That program has failed to win public confidence because it is filled with contradictions. It undertakes, at extravagant expense, the training of young women as pilots while ignoring the availability of thousands of experienced men. It proposes to do things that the Navy has shunned, and it bases its claim of necessity on a condition which, in the words of the report, would mean, if true, that "this Nation, insofar as manpower is concerned, is in worse position than any of its allies and apparently any of our enemies." The report finds evidence that "the implied condition is neither actual nor probable," and recommends that recruiting and training be terminated. Evidently as a compromise, the report suggests continued use of those already trained, but the findings closely question the value even of that.

O. P. A. Regulations Affecting the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications from the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, Milton H. Button, director:

WISCONSIN STATE DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., June 7, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: The dairy industry of Wisconsin is daily becoming more confused because of lack of clarity of O. P. A. regulations. Penalties totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars have been assessed against dairymen and dairy plants of Wisconsin that have been making every effort to abide by O. P. A. regulations.

In an effort to correct this situation, the Wisconsin State board of agriculture has called a conference of the representatives of the various branches of the dairy industry on Wednesday, June 14.

We wired Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, requesting him to have representatives of the O. P. A. present at this conference authorized to make decisions. Copy of our wire to Mr. Bowles is attached. I am also attaching a supplementary wire sent to Mr. Bowles today.

Inasmuch as War Food Administration duties frequently overlap with those of O. P. A., we asked Marvin Jones, Administrator, War Food Administration, to have an able representative of that bureau in attendance. Copy of our wire to Marvin Jones is attached.

At the suggestion of the Wisconsin State board of agriculture I am requesting the Senators and Congressmen of Wisconsin to urge upon Chester Bowles the necessity of sending responsible and qualified representatives who are authorized to make decisions.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON H. BUTTON,
Director.

MADISON, WIS., *June 6, 1944.*

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.:

The dairy industry of Wisconsin finds itself in a state of confusion as the result of the orders of the Office of Price Administration relating to the various branches of this industry. The confusion is also evident in the local and regional offices of your administration in as much as it is difficult to obtain definite and accurate information from them.

The lack of clarity of the provisions of your orders leads to prosecutions and penalties which are imposing a heavy burden on our agriculture. The industry is particularly disturbed about what it feels are arbitrary methods of assessing and collecting penalties. We feel that this could be avoided if your orders were made clear and understandable to the industry.

The State board of agriculture has therefor decided to call a conference of the representatives of the various branches of the dairy industry for the purpose of conferring with your representatives and discussing in a frank and open manner the provisions of your orders and to determine what should be done to render them sufficiently clear to eliminate prosecutions, which we feel are unwarranted because of the apparently confusing nature of your orders.

We request you to send responsible and qualified representatives, who are authorized to make decisions, to this conference which will take place in the offices of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture at the State Capitol in Madison on Wednesday, June 14, at 10 a. m.

WISCONSIN BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON H. BUTTON, *Director.*

MADISON, WIS., *June 7, 1944.*

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing our wire of June 6 it is probable representatives of dairy industry will make definite recommendations concerning revisions of O. P. A. orders. It is our request that your representatives be prepared to give consideration to the revision of orders now in effect.

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON H. BUTTON, *Director.*

MADISON, WIS., *June 6, 1944.*

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator,
War Food Administration,
Washington, D. C.:

The State board of agriculture has called a conference of representatives of the dairy industry and of the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of discussing problems resulting from orders of O. P. A. Lack of clarity of provisions of orders and methods employed in assessing and collecting penalties are included in these problems. Because the duties of your Administration sometimes overlap we request you to send responsible and qualified representatives, who are authorized to make decisions, to this conference which will take place in the offices of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture at the State Capitol in Madison on Wednesday June 14 at 10 a. m.

WISCONSIN BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON H. BUTTON, *Director.*

Keynote Address of Hon. Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, Chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, as Temporary Chairman, Republican State Convention of Indiana Before the Convention at Indianapolis, Friday, June 2, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

I am proud to be a Congressman, particularly a Congressman from the great State of Indiana. I am proud of the awakening that has aroused my State in the years that have passed since 1935 when I was elected as your sole Republican Representative in Washington. I look with pride upon the record of Indiana, its intelligence, wisdom, hard common sense, and patriotism which have turned its feet away from the New Deal road which was leading to chaos, and set them firmly upon the Republican road that leads to sane and honest government, and thus to a prosperous, happy, and secure future.

I am happy that I no longer am the sole Republican Representative as I was in 1935, but that I am now joined by eight Republican Congressmen, working side by side with a Republican Senator, a Republican State legislature, and Republican State officers. I am glad to know that the sturdy people of this State are not content even with this progress, but intent, in the elections of 1944, to make a clean sweep—to give us a Republican Governor, another Republican Senator, and two more Republican Congressmen, and to join with the rest of the outraged United States in abolishing the New Deal and placing in the White House a Republican President.

The people of Indiana owe a debt of gratitude to the Republican State officers and legislators who have served them well. They have established high records of efficiency, economy, and statesmanship. Along with Republican administrations in 26 of our sovereign States, they have given proof of what we can do when entrusted with government. These accomplishments have been Republican accomplishments, inspired by Republican ideals, made facts by Republican efficiency. Of course, we shall do a better job, a completely good job, when there shall be in the Governor's chair a man of the same Republican ideals, efficiency, and statesmanship. And we all know when that will be and who it will be. It will be after this November when Ralph Gates is elected our Governor.

Nothing would please me more than to speak at length of the Republican record in Indiana. I defer to my very good friend, our estimable speaker of the house, Hobart Creighton, who will follow me on the convention program.

May I also humbly suggest that the citizens of Indiana may well be grateful to your own Republican Senator and Congressmen, and to the Republican Members of Congress from our sister States. They have not failed you in these perilous days. They have not failed to understand the vital problems that confront us, and to act with informed courage. They have allowed no mere political considerations to warp their judgment, nor partisan ambitions to sway them. When it has been for the good of our country, they have granted what the administration asked. When they saw that what the administration asked was to the detriment of this country, they have withheld their consent. The Congress of the United States, with Republicans taking the lead, has interposed itself as an impregnable wall against administration raids upon our civil liberties and rights. It has been the shield of the people. It has stood between them and those who would change our form of government, undermine our economy, sap the strength from our Constitution and Bill of Rights, and make an all-powerful State the master of the people instead of the people the master of a republican State.

We have labored to bring order out of administrative chaos. We have fought valiantly to bring sanity and efficiency back to our Government; but never, not for one instant, not in one minute particular, have we hampered our Government in its Herculean efforts to win this war in which we find ourselves engaged.

We in Congress have realized that the one great demand of the American people is to crush our enemies, to shorten this war by giving all they have to give to insure speedy victory and a just and lasting peace. What every mother, every father, every wife, every child desires is a quick, an overwhelming victory over our enemies, and to get our boys back home as quickly as possible. It shall and will be the foremost purpose of the Republican Party to give them their heart's desire.

For the accomplishment of this high purpose, Republicans have been determined in one thing, and that is that this war, in every department of it, shall be fought as a military and not as a political campaign.

We are upon the eve of the most important election in the history of this Nation. We are about to choose, as the Constitution requires of us, the men who are to conduct the affairs of our country for the next 4 crucial years. There are men of small understanding who will say that it is a bad thing to hold an election in time of war, and to carry on those political activities which are a necessary part of elections in a republic.

Of such men can be said two things: Either they are woefully ignorant, or they are deliberately and maliciously seeking to mislead.

Politics is the machinery through which the common man may see to it that he is properly governed. Politics is the voice by which he may express his will. Politics is the shield and buckler of free men. It is our weapon for the defense of human liberties, and for offense against any encroachment upon human liberties. Without politics this country of ours could not exist, and without politics all that mankind has striven and fought and suffered and bled for down through the centuries would cease to be.

Politics is good in time of peace; in time of war politics is indispensable.

The only check upon any administration is a strong, decent, patriotic opposition party. An opposition party, a party striving to win an election, has imposed upon it an important duty. That duty is to watch and to police the party in power. That duty is to instruct and to educate the voters of the land, to tell them the truths which would be concealed by the party in power. It has a duty to bring out into the light of day the errors and misdoings of the party in power in order that the people may know whether they have been served well or ill. It is the duty of the opposition party to argue principles in the hearing of the people so the voters will be equipped to decide between what is right and what is wrong. No political party can perform a higher service than this.

If this is true in safe and happy times of peace, it is trebly so in times of war, when hysteria is so apt to undermine reason. It is the duty of the opposition party to present the facts so the voters may make up their minds if they party in power is doing a good job or a bad job, and if it would not be wise to turn that job over to other people who would do it more honestly and efficiently and speedily. And the more crucial the issues the more imperative it is that they shall be discussed. The more important the work to be done the more imperative that it be placed in different hands if it is being done badly.

They have no elections in Germany or Japan, the countries of our enemies. That is one reason why they are our enemies. Because they have no elections, they have within their borders, no liberty, no freedom, no happiness for the individual, and no hope for the future.

Our hope for the future is always bright because, always, by an election, we can bring good out of evil, change from what perils our liberties to what will protect and preserve them.

May God help America, if, in any emergency, it shall deprive its citizens of the right to impose their will.

You will hear much in this campaign of another thing, of a catch phrase. It is the one point upon which the New Deal relies, the one argument it hopes will return it to power in spite of their knowledge that the people of this land are weary of its inefficiency and blundering. And that is the catch phrase that you mustn't change horses in the middle of a stream.

Let us answer that with a question: Which would you rather do, change to a fresh horse that will get you across safely or stick to a foundered horse and drown in the middle of the river?

The New Deal party in its national convention is going to ratify the action of the Communist Party and nominate Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term in the White House. This can mean only that the Communist Party agrees with Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal, and is willing to accept his program as their program. It can mean only that they expect Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal party to ratify in the future the program and the philosophy of the Communist Party. Mr. Browder is a skillful politician and his followers are skillful politicians. They know what they want and they believe the best way to get it is by alliance with the New Deal.

All the evidence at hand points to the correctness of their judgment.

But before we discuss the domestic achievements of the New Deal which have endeared it to Mr. Browder, let us turn for a moment to look at the question of the indispensable man in foreign affairs and statesmanship. Let us ask a few pertinent questions about our foreign policy during the incumbency of the coalition fourth-term candidate.

What is the object of decent statesmanship and foreign policy? It is first the preservation of peace, and secondly the building up of friendship with the other independent nations of the earth. Has Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy achieved either of these objectives?

Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal administration came into complete power in 1933 with complete control over the Federal Government and its sources of information. It had exclusive information from sure sources as to what was brewing in the world. It had the facts, which it declined to impart either to Congress or the people. It was completely informed of the growth of sinister forces in Germany, Italy, and Japan. From this information, administration experts, if really expert, were well able to figure to what tragic purpose these sinister forces were traveling.

In the light of this condition, let us ask a few pertinent questions which the American people can answer for themselves, and so determine if the fourth term candidate and his advisers are indispensable statesmen who should be permitted to dictate and to carry out the foreign policy of America in the post-war world.

If the knowledge of Mr. Roosevelt and his alleged statesmen of world movements and conditions from 1933 to the date of Pearl Harbor were such as to force them to the conclusion that war was inevitable, why did they keep it a secret from the American people?

If they knew war was inevitable, why did they devote their time to raking leaves, and to other useless things, instead of informing an intelligent, patriotic people of the facts, and educating our citizens to the necessity of preparing to defend ourselves, whatever might occur?

Why did they boondoggle and foment class antagonism instead of facing the facts and building with the enthusiastic approval of an informed people, our national defenses to a point where no enemy would dare to attack us?

Why did they devote themselves to the creating of a staggering bureaucracy costing billions of dollars instead of devoting those billions to the erection of air and naval bases, the building of battleships and bombers, and the creation of an army of defense?

Why, being fully aware of the facts and of the character of Japan did they continue to appease Japan, supply her with oil and scrap iron to be used against our friend China, and eventually against ourselves?

Why, being repeatedly warned by our Ambassador to Japan, did they persist in this suicidal course, blindfold their eyes and our eyes to the certainty of treacherous attack, and let Pearl Harbor drowse instead of being on the alert to repel and defeat attack? Why were elementary precautions neglected, thus subjecting America to the disgrace of the most tragic naval disaster in our history?

Why dare they not bring to trial the Army and Navy officers charged with the guilty responsibility for that disaster?

Why, knowing the certainties as they claim they knew them, did they fail to strengthen and to reinforce the Philippine Islands? Why, when something could have been done, did they sit by with idle hands and so permit the martyrdom of thousands of our sons on Corregidor and Bataan? Why did they not take the "stitch in time" that would have averted the humiliation of the invasion of our territories by a foreign enemy?

Why did they permit the congregation in a single spot of our naval forces in the Pacific instead of ordering them to battle stations which they should have occupied with war coming at dawn?

Why did the President help to lull our people into a sense of false security by assuring us that not one of our sons would be sent to fight on foreign soil?

Finally, let me pose this question: If, after Pearl Harbor our western coast was open to invasion, our unprotected merchant vessels with their crews were being sunk within sight of our eastern coast, whose far-seeing statesmanship must assume the responsibility? If our splendid industrial system had to prepare itself after war came to produce the necessities of war, whose is the responsibility for the delay? Would it have been possible to avert the war if the United States had been prepared for war? If so, whose responsibility is that? It may be that war was inevitable, but a strong, informed, resolute, armed, and equipped United States would have been a powerful deterrent against war. Whose responsibility was it that no such deterrent existed?

It certainly was not the responsibility of the tiny handful of Republican Representatives and Senators then in Congress. The guilt must be placed upon the shoulders of those who wielded complete and absolute authority—Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal.

Is this indispensable statesmanship?

Is this indispensable handling of foreign affairs?

These are questions which our intelligent voters will be well able to answer, and I have no doubt how they will answer them.

They will answer them by turning the conduct of our foreign affairs over to an able, far-sighted President belonging to that party which alone has announced a foreign policy and a post-war plan. To that party whose leaders have pointed the way into the future. To that party which will not appease, which will act upon known facts, which will look with practical sympathy upon a stricken world, which will push this war to a speedy victory, and which will see to it that in winning the war we do not lose the peace. It will entrust its foreign affairs to a party eager to collaborate, willing to impose its will for peace, but unwilling to purchase uncertain peace by making itself the almshouse for the world. And that party is the party under whose emblem we have met here today. The Republican Party.

I say again, in this war America has made, is making, and will continue to make the greatest investment in all history. It is investing millions of its sons and billions of its dollars. It is investing everything, tangible and intangible, that it possesses.

It is only right that the American people should realize on their investment. The Republican Party proposes to assure this realization.

The American people do not want a profit in lands to be conquered; they do not want a profit in spheres of influence, or in peoples to be exploited. They do want and will insist upon having a profit paid in the coin of lasting peace. They will insist that the things that forced America into this war shall not arise again.

We have already made known our position in that regard. We spoke at Mackinac. We there adopted a set of principles of which these were the three outstanding declarations:

1. We must preserve and protect all our national interests.

2. We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

3. We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

It is essential that we consider what effect a change in administration would have upon the successful prosecution of the war. And first, it seems wise that we should dispel the Commander in Chief myth.

Let us recall that the first President of the United States was George Washington. Prior to taking that office he had been in fact commander in chief of the forces of the Thirteen Colonies. His was a splendid record of victory. He was one of the first military geniuses of the age. When he assumed the wider duties of President of the United States, what could have been more natural than that the framers of our Constitution, in their veneration for the Father of his Country, should have ordained that he should, ex officio, become commander of its armies?

In that day, war was a far different business than it is today. It was fought by small armies who went out to hunt for each other until they blundered together in some farmyard and turned it into a field of battle. War was not a matter of entire nations in arms, of armies that numbered millions of soldiers in their ranks, of uncounted mobile cannon and tanks, of skies darkened by the flight of airplanes. At best, war in Washington's day was a more or less amateur business, and any competent civilian might find himself the equal in military skill of any general opposing him.

Today, war is a far different and vastly most complicated and specialized business than this. The making of war is a profession, requiring years of special training as rigorous as the training of a lawyer or a doctor. No civilian, lacking such training, can succeed in the command of armies. Today, war can be waged only by trained warriors. And Mr. Roosevelt is no trained warrior, no military genius.

The actual commander in chief of the armies of this Republic must make a full-time job of it. He must make an overtime job of it. His mind must never be absent from his task. The regular duties of a President are so numerous, so far-reaching that at best he could hope to devote but a fraction of his time to actual military affairs. In times of peace the labors of a President are arduous. The burdens of civil affairs do not diminish in wartime. They multiply. No human being, no matter how vast his powers, could administer the civil affairs of this country, and devise and carry out its military plans as well. To state the contrary is an absurdity. Mr. Roosevelt, the commander in chief, is a myth.

Our war is being fought by specialists—splendid, able, efficient specialists who have been trained for years in the profession of arms. These men have been trained by the United States—not by one political party in the United States. Our generals, our admirals, our officers are not Republican officers or Democratic officers or New Deal officers. They belong to the Nation. They are not transient incumbents of civil office, but permanent military employees who have no right nor place in the world of politics, as politics has no right nor place in the conduct of war. The changing of one mythical commander in chief for another would not change the identities of the men who are winning this war. So long as they continue to be efficient or victorious they would remain in command, unhampered. They would command. They would carry out their task untouched by political or civil change. The Republican Party pledges itself that it will leave the conduct of this war to the trained men who can lead us to victory.

One thing the Republican Party can do and will do. It will give such civilian support to our armies as they never before have received. We know how to bring to bear the

full genius of the American people to produce and to deliver. We will not hamper American production with the meddling of a busy-body bureaucracy nor by revolutionary devices whose object is to destroy our system of free enterprise. We will foster decent industry to the end that it may produce to the utmost gun and ship and airplane, and not harry, nor punish, nor hamstring that industry in the malignant hope of bringing about a social revolution. We can and will shorten the war.

Our brief occupation today is to win the war, but only second to that purpose is to see to it that we do not lose our republic at home.

We are trustees with a solemn responsibility. The youth of America have gone away from home leaving the house in our care. We must see to it that this home they love is not permitted to fall into disrepair, and that its precious contents are preserved intact. That home is America, broad, rich, incredibly beautiful and comfortable to live in. It is furnished as no other home in the world is furnished with all that is essential to the happiness of mankind. In this home of ours we find splendid material things, available to all according to his industry and his ability. We find vast, fertile farm lands, unbelievably rich mines. We find broad rivers and spacious lakes to carry our commerce. We find miraculous factories which transform our natural products into articles of utility. We find illimitable forests and grazing lands. We find every material element necessary to the happiness and prosperity of a people.

But most important we find our home to be furnished with those intangible things which enable us to derive from our material possessions the most that human beings can hope to derive. It is these intangible furnishings that we must be vigilant to preserve and which we must turn over to our returning sons and daughters undiminished, unspoiled, intact for them to use and to enjoy.

These intangible furnishings are the freedom of the individual within the framework of just laws. They are the right to work, the right to earn, the right to save, and the right to invest. They include the right to receive a resonable and honest return upon investment. The most valuable of all these furnishings is the right of opportunity—the right of every man to choose his calling or his profession, and to improve his position in the world by individual industry, integrity, intelligence. They include the right to work for and to achieve financial independence and security in old age. There are other precious privileges to which we have become so accustomed through long enjoyment that we have become unconscious of their existence, but which we would find more precious than life itself if they were stolen away from us.

These things have been entrusted to us and we must preserve them. In this time of war, for the common good, it has been necessary to curtail our privileges and restrict our rights and remove some of our freedom. As we view the future, we have justified fears that the New Deal administration under which we have lived for 12 years does not mean to return these things to us.

We are not misled. Regimentation did not begin with the war. The New Dealers have always liked it. They traveled far along the road with it under the N. R. A. until it was outlawed both by public opinion and the Supreme Court. Many recent programs on the home front are merely an extension and development of what was already in progress before the war under the New Deal. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights have always irked them.

The Republican Party says that the American system of individual liberty and free enterprise must and shall be retained. The Republican Party promises that every right, every privilege necessary to the life of a free man shall be returned to free men the instant it becomes possible. The restrictions that have been imposed upon you shall be removed; the regimentation to which you have been subjected shall be abolished.

The Republican Party makes to you the solemn promise that it will not permit this war to be made an excuse for the distorting of the American way of life. It will not tolerate New Deal intentions to make permanent the temporary tyrannies under which we cheerfully suffer because war demands it of us. On the instant that any restriction becomes unnecessary, it shall be removed; on the instant that meddling with our lives and businesses shall not be a military necessity, that meddling shall cease.

The Republican Party solemnly pledges itself that you shall again be free, as your freedom was conceived by the authors of the Declaration of Independence, the authors of the Constitution, and the framers of the Bill of Rights.

On the calendar of the future, the Republican Party marks a day that shall be R-day. It shall be no vague, distant day. That day shall come, with the help of God, immediately upon the crushing of our enemies.

On Independence Day in 1776, our independence was declared; on R-day, under a Republican administration, we shall begin the process of restoring your freedoms.

This task stands first in the post-war program of the party whose first President was Abraham Lincoln, whose name is synonymous with human freedom.

The party of which we have the honor to be members, has definite intentions and a definite program. It will not be content merely to undo the tragic blunders of the New Deal, or to heal the wounds to our country inflicted by malignant New Deal revolutionists. It will not merely be content to halt the New Deal march toward state socialism or communism, or fascism. It will take concrete, definite, positive steps to build and to insure a happier, more prosperous, more serene future.

Numbered among the rungs of the Republican ladder by which we shall climb to a better day will be these:

First, an eradication of bureaucracy, or snoopers and meddlers and little men strutting their petty authority. It will prune from the public pay roll hundreds of thousands of unnecessary officials who today make our life burdensome and vexatious, whose unearned salaries multiply our taxes, and whose officious interference hampers us on our farms, in our shops, in our factories, and in our homes.

Second, the Republican Party will reform the taxation of this Nation so that it shall foster initiative, industry, production, invention, instead of throttling them. It will tax for necessary revenue, never to destroy, never for revolution. It will abolish punitive taxes. It will impose only such taxes as will foster industry, large and small, as will make it possible for the farmer to till the soil with profit to himself, and the working man, the laborer, the professional man, to prosper in his calling.

Third, it will so reorganize the administration of this Government that it shall be economical, eliminating waste, extravagance, foolhardy social experiments, and, perhaps most important of all, the lavishing of our money for partisan political purposes and the purchasing of votes. It will spend less in order that it may save more and apply the saving to the payment of the bonds which you have patriotically purchased to finance the war.

Fourth, it will see to it that private industry and agriculture shall be able, through expansion of its plants and prosperity of its business, to provide jobs with futures. Vast unemployment must and shall be averted. Our returning soldiers and sailors must and shall be assured employment in private business as speedily as they shall be discharged from service. They must be gainfully employed, not pauperized. Our farms, our mines, our forests, our transportation facilities, our industrial plants can supply good jobs for all who are able and willing to work. This can be brought about only under the constructive principles of the Republican Party. It never can be brought about under the destructive principles of artificial scarcity which are the backbone of the New Deal. The Republican Party must and will plan for wider production, for more customers to consume that production, and for the natural consequence of more jobs at generous pay for each honest day of toil.

Fifth, the Republican Party will institute and maintain honorable and scientific fiscal policies. It will take the road that faces away from national bankruptcy through continued deficit spending. We hold that an American dollar must always be worth 100 American cents, not a fraction of that sum, and shall be able to purchase for you 100 cents worth of merchandise. The Republican Party will tolerate no destruction of savings by repudiation or inflation.

These are five necessary things which the Republican Party promises you it will labor to do. These are not all, but if we can succeed in these we will have laid a foundation for a happier home for every man, woman, and child in America.

The foregoing, I think you will agree, constitute a fine outstanding set of principles. But more than principles are required to meet and solve the present situation. Men and women of high character, ability, and purpose are vitally needed to put into effect such a program as I have outlined.

The Republican Party is going to put this program into effect under the guidance of the most capable persons to be found in the Nation. Its candidate for President will be outstanding. Its candidate for Vice President will be fully qualified to take over the presidential duties in case of an emergency. Its Cabinet will be selected from men and women of high character and capacity. Its departmental heads will be selected on a basis of ability and that alone. Its candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives now being chosen are persons of high type. The 26 splendid Republican Governors are typical of the men Republicans are naming for Governors everywhere.

In contrast with the New Dealers, these Republican officeholders will be men and women with a genuine zeal for public service under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The filling of offices with capable persons, however, will not be the end of the Republican program. The party will call to the aid of the Nation patriotic citizens of every race and creed, and of all stations in life. The great task before us can only be accomplished by a united people. That is why a call to service will go out to all under a Republican administration. Ours shall not be a one-man government nor a government by cliques.

Today I feel it is wiser to tell you what the Republican Party can do and will strive to do, rather than to criticize the failures, blunders, poltical chicanery, intellectual dishonesty, wastefulness, and administrative inefficiency of the New Deal. To me it seems better to achieve than merely to erase. We will clear away the rubbish; we will carry out and burn the refuse, we will make the house livable again. But we will not exhaust our strength merely in abating the nuisances caused by our New Deal predecessors.

We mean to build, to build anew, not merely to repair the house. We mean to erect a new and splendid structure upon the foundation of our Constitution and within the framework of our republican laws that shall insure to all of us citizens who dwell under its roof a new era of peace, prosperity, happiness, and security. And over the door of the new edifice we shall set a creed—the historic Republican creed—a word of promise to the young and of solace to the old. That creed, printed indelibly as a guarantee to our children and to their children and grandchildren until time shall be no more, that message of assurance shall be:

Americans, make of yourselves what you will, for within these boundaries fair opportunity is guaranteed to all!

Music for the Boys in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to place therein an article by Elizabeth Henney from Liberty Magazine, about one of the most gifted and talented women in the United States, namely, Mrs. Stuart Godfrey, wife of Brigadier General Godfrey, of the United States Army Engineer Corps. General Godfrey is on active foreign duty and while he is away Mrs. Godfrey carries on here, doing everything she can to further music for members of the armed forces. She is a remarkable woman and deserves a world of praise for her unselfish work.

The following is the article:

PATRIOTS WITHOUT UNIFORM—MUSIC FOR THE SERVICES

(By Elizabeth Henney)

He was whistling gaily as he took her parking-lot ticket. As she turned to get into the car, she suddenly realized that he was giving out with Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.

"You must be mighty fond of good music," she said, and the boy in blue dungarees smiled back and said, "Yes, ma'am. I'm going in the Army next week, and I'm going to save every cent of my pay during the war, and when it's over I'm going to get me the finest grand piano there is."

A few evenings later she herself was giving out with good music at the piano in the Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines Club in Washington. She had started with Grieg's Concerto and gone on from there to request numbers.

Suddenly a young sailor stepped up and said, "Please, ma'am, can you play the tenor aria from Manon?" She said yes, of course—then discovered she didn't have the score of it with her and couldn't play it from memory.

Her embarrassment was heightened by the realization that this was one of the favorite songs of all tenors, and that she had failed a serviceman in so slight a request.

Out of those two incidents came the determination of Mrs. Stuart Godfrey to provide, as her contribution to the war effort, music for the services whenever and wherever required.

Mrs. Godfrey, wife of Brigadier General Godfrey of the United States Army Engineer Corps, is a concert player and a composer; she has recently written the music for That's the Infantry, the stirring words of which were written by Maj. Gen. Edwin F. Harding, who was her husband's classmate and roommate at West Point. She has always had a soft spot in her heart for anyone who was fond of music—so, once the idea of Music for the Services had taken hold, she did not let it rest.

First she went over to Bolling Field and spoke to the women's club there, on the invitation of Mrs. Henry H. Arnold, wife of General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces. The members of the club, wives of air officers, listened with interest, and at the end of her talk one of them stepped up and said, "I haven't any musical talent, but I'd like to help, and maybe this dollar will get you started."

It did. Knowing there was a need for a piano in a nearby Army camp, Mrs. Godfrey put a whole dollar's worth of classified ad in the papers, asking for the donation of a piano. She got four pianos for that dollar.

Next she got in touch with Clara Herbert, the District of Columbia librarian, who put space in the public libraries at her disposal and made them all collection centers for donations. And the donations flowed in. To date, Music for the Services has placed more than 75 pianos in Army camps; has collected, mended, and distributed more than 20,000 pieces of sheet music; has distributed more than 75 phonographs with records, and innumerable other instruments.

A surprising request for "a string quartet" came from the naval station at Patuxent, Md. The four instruments were promptly sent, with an assortment of music for quartet or trio. They were acknowledged with fervent thanks; a whole cluster of the sailors at Patuxent were genuine musicians who had been eating their hearts out. A piano has been sent to Greenland and a phonograph, by airplane, to Nome, Alaska. The Stitch Club, a group of wives of engineer officers at Fort Belvoir, Va., had heard of the need of a phonograph in Nome, taken up a collection, and gotten in touch with Mrs. Godfrey. The piano for Greenland was donated by the New England Conservatory of Music in Boston, and the Juillard School of Music in New York has donated 7 phonographs with 25 records for each, to be sent where needed.

There is no formality about music for the services, though because of its rapid growth there has had to be some assistance. Quinta Frey is in charge of a group of volunteers who mend, bundle, and catalogue the sheet-music donations. Mrs. Eugene Byrnes, president of the Friday Morning Music Club, is the honorary chairman, Mrs. Godfrey the acting one. Mildred Frame, whose husband (now in the service) was a member of the National Symphony, is the secretary, and Adela Paine, who has worked with the National Symphony for years, is the treasurer in charge of such financial donations as come in. Publicity is handled by Marian McGregor of the United States Air Forces.

Recently the crew of the *Kennabeet*, a Coast Guard cutter that operates off the coast of Avon, N. C., sent a plaintive note. They couldn't have any radio aboard their cutter, and life was too rocky for a piano or a phonograph, but they sure would like a little tunefulness of some kind now and then.

They got it. Mrs. Godfrey sent them four harmonicas, four ocarinas, and a ukulele, with instruction booklets and a variety of selections.

The Propaganda Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial comment appearing under the heading "The propaganda problem," published in the Catholic World for June 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPAGANDA PROBLEM

EVERY MAN A LIAR?

William L. Shirer, in his column Propaganda Front on May 7, expressed the fear that when we have defeated Hitler and his Nazi gang the German people may still rely upon our political naïveté, ignorance, tremendous conservatism, and our outlandish fear of chaos and socialism in Europe to "spare them the awful consequences of the lost war they so blithely started." He complains that while we read his books (and those of other experts on international affairs) we do not believe what we read. He knows of a class at New York University which "reacts to domestic propaganda with apathy and utter cynicism." They are "so convinced of the amount of lying that appears in newspapers, advertising, and radio that most of them do not believe in anything." He refers also to recent private polls which tend to show the incredulity not only of callow youth but of the Nation at large in regard to news and news comment. He mentions the inquiring reporter of the Detroit Free Press who discovered that the man in the street doesn't for a moment believe the stories of Nazi atrocities. He quotes Fortune magazine which reports that 44 percent of those it interviewed in 1942 still believe that the German people are "essentially peace-loving and kindly." The percentage of those who cherish that dangerous myth is, however, declining, and in that decline Mr. Shirer sees a glimmer of hope. Still there remain apathy and cynicism, the inclination to discount tales of atrocity, and skepticism about anything found in the newspapers or heard on the radio.

With Mr. Shirer's desire that we should think harshly of the Germans as a people I am not now concerned, except to say that I find it difficult to reconcile with the Gospel. On the presumption that we are fighting this war for Christian civilization, I suppose we should still make some slight obeisance toward the Founder of that civilization. Christ our Savior commands us to love our enemies; Mr. Shirer asks us to treat them harshly even after we have defeated them. Oddly enough, Mr. Shirer's view seems to contradict not only that of Christ but that of Stalin. The Soviet dictator, for reasons best known to himself, has repeatedly insisted that he wants a strong Germany when hostilities have ceased. He wants Germany not dismembered but rehabilitated. Mr. Shirer, on the other hand, argues against a "soft peace." I wonder if he would include among softies the man of steel who murdered millions in the Ukraine.

IS THERE A TOUCHSTONE?

But we were speaking of propaganda. I have read with some regularity Mr. Shirer's

column Propaganda Front, and I do not recall that he has laid down rules as to how to distinguish what is propaganda from what is written bona fide. There is indeed an old familiar formula that would make our task easy; "orthodoxy is my doxy, heterodoxy is your doxy." Similarly, what I say is true; what the other fellow says is propaganda. Simple enough and helpful, but hardly to be recommended as a norm and criterion. Still we must have some touchstone to enable us to determine the gold of truth from the base metal of propaganda. Is there any?

QUEER SHAPE, BUT WHY?

Speaking for myself, I confess that I have become so discouraged in the attempt to find truth in the news and in comment upon the news that I have all but given up the attempt. Some of my friends complain that I am too skeptical. But on the other hand, Mr. Shirer accuses my kind of "political naïveté." Can a man be at the same time skeptical and naive? I do not say that he cannot. I remember G. K. C.'s observation that a man may be too fat and too thin, too fat in one place and too thin in another. But, says Chesterton, he would be a "queer shape." Aren't we all, mentally if not physically? The question is, What has made us intellectually lopsided? The answer is—dear Mr. Shirer—propaganda. Take those students at N. Y. U. those who voted in the Gallup poll, those who answered the Fortune questionnaire, and those who were buttonholed by the reporter in Detroit. Why do they believe so little? Why are they tempted to believe nothing at all? Why do they shrug their shoulders when they read atrocity stories or see atrocity pictures in the papers or at the movies? When the long withheld story of the Corregidor horror was suddenly sprung upon the people, why did they exclaim "It's for the War-bond drive"? When the announcement is made that meat may now be obtained without a ration card why do they say "It is election year"? Why have adolescents normally so credulous become hard-boiled? Why have the American people who in Barnum's day liked to be humbugged, fallen into the habit of saying "Oh yeah?" to almost everything? Again the answer is propaganda.

Let us have a few examples to illustrate the difficulty of determining what is propaganda and what is not.

Rev. Stanislaus Orlemanski, of Springfield, Mass., goes A. W. O. L. from his diocese to—of all places—Moscow, to have a chat with—of all people—Stalin. He comes back with the information that Stalin is friendly to Roman Catholics. Monsignor Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, declares the incident to be "political burlesque" and "phoniest propaganda." What say, Mr. Shirer? Is it propaganda? Yes? No? How do you know? In a spirited comeback, Father Orlemanski rebukes Monsignor Ready for using "such vulgar words" and for "trying to undermine [his] priestly and Christly life by innuendos." Skipping the question as to how a vulgar word can be an innuendo, will Mr. Shirer give us some rule of thumb by which we may determine which of the two clergymen is the propagandist? As far as we ourselves are concerned, we feel that we know, but is there some infallible standard of determination? Something that would convince others as we are convinced?

Father Orlemanski reports Stalin as calling himself "an advocate of freedom of conscience and of worship." Was the wily Georgian merely ribbing Father Orlemanski, or was he handing out propaganda which he expected Americans to swallow? And will they swallow it? They will unless we can prove it to be propaganda. How would you go about it, Mr. Shirer? Or would you go about it?

THOSE GRANDIOSE COMMUNIQUES

Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times, says, "The small operations of Marshal Tito and of Gen. Draja Mihailovitch have been exaggerated into great campaigns. To read some of the grandiose communiques issued in Marshal Tito's name one would think—quite inaccurately—that the Nazis were being driven from Yugoslavia." What say, Mr. Shirer? Is Baldwin right? Is this Tito stuff propaganda? How shall we know? How do you know? By way of good measure, while you are on the subject, could you tell us why we Americans switched from Mihailovitch to Tito? Was it because Tito is Stalin's man? Or is that propaganda?

Speaking of "grandiose communiques," how about those astronomical computations of German dead in the Russian reports? If all those Germans are really dead there can remain precious few to meet our attack on the western front. But, of course, those staggering figures of German casualties are only propaganda.

ATROCITIES A LA WORLD WAR NO. 1

The Australian Department of Information announced on May 11 that Sikhs liberated by the American advance at Hollandia reported seeing "a number of Chinese who had been nailed to palm trees with iron spikes driven through their foreheads." True or false, Mr. Shirer? Propaganda or fact? In the other war Sir Philip Gibbs ran down the story of the Canadian soldier crucified on a barn door in Belgium. He labeled it "propaganda." Is this the same story? Sikh for Canadian, spike through the head in place of nails through the hands and feet, palm tree instead of barn door? Same story, Mr. Shirer? Same propaganda?

Only one more atrocity story out of thousands. Edward Morgan in a special radio message to the Louisville Times says: "Allied and Italian authorities today are trying to obtain further information on the so-called Rome massacre during which the Nazi allegedly slaughtered between 300 and 500 civilians. But verification of that sort of news is always difficult to get. * * * Reports printed here * * * generally quoted Swiss border sources to the effect that the Germans staged a massacre in the Coliseum in reprisal for an incident in which bombs were thrown into a column of Gestapo and Fascist officers during the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Fascism."

It sounds like 1914–1915. But things are different now? Newspaper correspondents are more conscientious and newspaper editors more exacting? Oh, yeah? In the other war investigating committees looked into these things. They were fooled. How do we know we are not being fooled again? The truth is that the confidence of us old fellows who remember details of the other war has been undermined. If someone could give us that infallible test of propaganda for which we are clamoring, he might reestablish our confidence even in atrocity stories. As things are we believe or disbelieve according to temperament. If we are "easy marks" for rumors, we believe; if we are what our critics call "skeptical," that is to say judicious, we withhold assent.

On April 3 Raymond Daniell cabled the New York Times from London: "Mr. Molotov's statement that the social structure of Rumania will be retained as it is at present has gone a long way toward reassuring doubters that the Atlantic Charter is still the guiding star of all the major Allies." Propaganda or fact, Mr. Shirer? Honest Injun now, do you believe that the Atlantic Charter remains the guilding star of Britain, the U. S. A., and the U. S. S. R.?

In that same dispatch to the New York Times Mr. Daniell went on to say that it was agreed at Teheran that Russia would soon reassure Poland as she has reassured Rumania. In support of that prophecy, Mr. Daniell quotes certain "quarters" and "informants." Do you believe them, Mr. Shirer? Or is all this prophecy about Poland and Rumania just more propaganda?

THE BRITISH ALSO DOUBT

By the way, would you like to know one of the lesser reasons why newspaper readers become skeptical? It is because of that trick of correspondents who quote vague anonymous "quarters" and "informants." Large daily doses of that particular sort of propaganda have paralyzed our power to believe.

Over those dispatches of Mr. Daniell's there is a subheading, "British doubts largely dispelled." Were they indeed? I had not noticed it in reading the English papers. As far as I can see the British are as cynical as Americans about the Atlantic Charter.

To give but one sample of British opinion, the Catholic Herald, of London, says: "In the early stages when Hitler was rampaging about Europe and enjoying the benefits of a pact with bolshevism, there was no reluctance to exploit the moral situation for all it was worth. We were told the war was a crusade. We were constantly informed of the enormities of the enemy and of the pledges for a new and better world for which we were standing fast. Days of national prayer succeeded one another. * * *

"And now in the fifty-fifth month of the war (as the Prime Minister has reminded us), with victory at length in sight, the people of Britain can be spoken to for three-quarters of an hour without a single reference to what may be called the vision of the war, the vision of a new social deal at home, a new set of values, as it were, and the vision once expressed in the Atlantic Charter."

TRAGIC DISILLUSION

Over there apparently they are as much disillusioned as we here at home. In fact, I rather think more so. As far as the moral character of the war is concerned, the Herald goes on to say: "Abroad the picture is increasingly dismal for all but the minority, which sees salvation in the emergence of a new power whose outlook is totally alien to the Christian tradition. At home there is but the prospect of the enforcement of a handful of elementary social needs by an army of religiously, morally, and culturally blind state planners."

The fate of the Atlantic Charter is one of the chief reasons why we who would dearly love to be optimistic about international affairs have been driven reluctantly into skepticism if not pessimism. It was a splendid document, and our reaction to it was one of great delight. After the first gust of enthusiasm, more deliberate scrutiny gave rise to the question "Do they really mean it?" For example, that fourth clause: "They (the signatories) will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment of all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

THE CHARTER WAS A CHEAT

There you have a principle that might have revolutionized the dealings of the nations with one another, abolished the grievances of the "have nots" against the "haves," and thus have prevented wars in the future. But staring at us out of the midst of the idealism and altruism of clause 4 were the weasel words "with due respect for their existing obligations." We said to one another "So there it is; same old dodge, same old duplicity." The world was to be made over anew, but it was to be the same as of old. Disabilities were to be removed but they were to remain. The causes of war were wiped clean off the slate, but by some infernal magic there they were again after the sponge had been applied.

Such were our doubts and fears in August 1941, when the Charter was published. In April 1944 Winston Churchill explained in the House of Commons that the weasel words "with due respect for their existing obligations" were inserted because of his insistence.

Then, too, there was in the Charter that clause about no territorial aggrandizement. We didn't exactly like the wording "They (the signatories) do not seek." We would have preferred "They will not accept." Sure enough it was another dodge. Stalin went serenely ahead annexing three whole countries and declaring that he would annex 40 percent of a fourth.

The Atlantic Charter, therefore, was a piece of propaganda. It was devised to produce a certain effect. The effect was produced. The Charter, having served its purpose, was torn up and thrown back into the sea whence it had emerged. Yet William L. Shirer wonders why we common folk have grown suspicious and skeptical. "Once bitten twice shy." We have been a hundred times bitten; shall we never grow shy?

On the editorial page of the New York Times is a daily column which I, for one (I know of many others) find particularly pleasing. It is called Topics of the Times. On April 2 it contained this paragraph: "Half the time we puzzle about the foreign policy of our own Government, American or British, as the case may be. The other half of the time we puzzle over Soviet foreign policy. How soon people will be fully enlightened about their own policy-makers at home we will not pretend to say. But upon Soviet foreign policy the last few days have brought a flood of light. This comes in the form of startling news about the wholesale revision of economic theory in the Soviet Union. Marxian thinking in Soviet Russia is out. The capitalist system, better described as the competitive system, is back."

STARTLING NEWS? NOT NEWS, BUT PROPAGANDA

In Moscow articles and editorials to the same purport were quoted in a bulletin published by Ambassador Averell Harriman. But by the 14th of the month, back from Moscow came this sockdolager signed by Maurice Hindus: "When American correspondents at Moscow first read these articles they rubbed their eyes and wondered if they had slept through one of the most epochal news stories about Russia. * * * Russian authorities on economics were as surprised as we were to hear that there is capitalism in Russia, or that capitalism—old or new—is being contemplated. One authority snapped out, perhaps in amusement or perhaps in anger: 'Our ideological enemies seem still determined to defeat us with their pens. Early in the war they annihilated our armies with their pens as often as Goebbels did. Now that our armies are still fighting and our fatherland has been saved, they are out to beat us again—this time they are annihilating our socialism with their pens.' " So once again, propaganda. On which side? Probably on both sides. Who can tell?

FRANCE TOO

One Martin Wilson writes a letter to the New York Sun in which he complains that on the day that Washington correspondents were told "there is no news," newspapers carried the item of the removal of General Giraud, whom we had backed, and the advancement of General de Gaulle, "whose position we had tried for months to weaken." Why was Giraud set up and then thrust down, while De Gaulle was first thrust down and then set up? We didn't know. We don't know yet. All the news we got and still get about Giraud and De Gaulle is pure propaganda.

EIRE ALSO

Mr. Robert Brennan, Minister from Eire to Washington, declares that the American Government is grossly misinformed about Axis espionage in Ireland. "The German legation," he said, "has no means of transmitting to Germany any information they may obtain. No diplomatic couriers travel between Germany and Ireland; no telephonic communication exists; no German wireless transmitter is operating and all cables must pass through British censorship * * * The operation of German submarines from Irish coastal points is impossible in view of the vigilance of our coast-watching service. The suspicion of espionage presupposes an efficient, widespread organization, which we know does not exist."

Mr. Brennan's explanation sounds reasonable. Nevertheless Britain seems to have persuaded our State Department that Eire's neutrality is dangerous. How shall we judge between Eire and Britain? How can we judge if we don't get the facts? How can we get the facts when we have no means of distinguishing propaganda from truth?

Let's drop international affairs and take up something domestic. On May 2 the executive committee of the American Legion labeled as "unjustifiable" the criticism heaped upon Representative HAMILTON FISH, the America First Committee, and congressional isolationists at the Legion convention last year. The committee said: "We have no right, directly or by inference or innuendo, to impugn the good faith or ascribe any subversive or un-American tendencies to such persons, their point of view, or their program. It is unfortunate that we should not have kept our escutcheon untarnished."

"Open confession is good for the soul." But a year is a long time to wait before going to confession, when one has committed the mortal sin of calumny. Personally I didn't need any exoneration of HAMILTON FISH; I know him. Or of the America First Committee; I was a member of it. But if I had not known the Congressman and the committee, how would I have been aware that what seemed to be a resolution was really propaganda? Particularly vicious propaganda.

CHOKED, DROWNED, IN PROPAGANDA

Propaganda is flooding over us every day like the Mississippi on a rampage. We are choked, steeped, saturated with it, engulfed in it. Even if we manage to escape the swirling flood, we still breathe in propaganda with the air. I have—as a kind of sorry jest—asked Mr. Shirer to communicate to us his method of discerning propaganda from truth. Of course he has no such method. Nor has any man.

WE KNOW OUR WEAKNESS

It is therefore only common sense that makes us Americans suspicious of what is being fed to us as news. Neither Mr. Shirer nor anyone else should affect to be surprised, still less scandalized, if even our young people "react to domestic propaganda with apathy and utter cynicism," and are "so convinced of the amount of lying * * * that most of them don't believe in anything." They say to the propagandists, "You made me what I am today; you seem not to be satisfied."

Amendments to the Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Chester Bowles with reference to H. R. 4941, together with comments by Mr. Bowles accompanying the same:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1944.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: You have asked me to make a statement as to my opinion of the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee. I am glad to comply with that request.

Of course, my responsibility is to administer the act, not to set broad price control policy, which is the responsibility of Congress. I do believe, however, that, while the Congress is considering changes, I should do my best to inform its Members what I think would be the consequences of the changes under consideration. In so doing I shall try to draw on the practical experience which I have had in administering O. P. A. price and rationing regulations ever since, soon after Pearl Harbor, I set up the first local boards in my State.

Some of the amendments suggested for the bill are constructive. For example, I think no step could be taken which would do more to aid effective enforcement than enacting the provision permitting the Administrator to sue for damages in cases of overcharges to consumers who fail to take action themselves within 30 days. This would let us enforce our regulations against careless retailers without having to indict them for violating the criminal law, the penalty which thus far we have been obliged to use. I think it also would be advantageous—and I know that the Economic Stabilization Director agrees—to provide for the publication of policy directives in the Federal Register. These are documents of public interest and importance; they clearly merit official publication.

A number of the other amendments do not change what we have considered to be the meaning of the law but they do make clear what that meaning is. Thus, we have always believed that it was O. P. A.'s duty, as well as its policy, to give consideration to the recommendations of industry representatives and advisory committees, even though the necessities of price control might make it impossible on occasion to follow specific proposals. It should be advantageous to have that obligation stated clearly in the statute. Again, it should be helpful to make clear that, when the Administrator makes an area adjustment in maximum rents under Section 2 (b), he must take into consideration general increases in costs and taxes for the particular area involved rather than for the Nation as a whole.

Unfortunately, there are some amendments which are confusing rather than clarifying in effect. Thus, a little change in a basic provision, such as the substitution of "shall" for "may" in the second sentence of the Stabilization Act which now gives the President authority to adjust prices and wages, would open up a succession of major questions as to the effect of the change on outstanding regulations. The result would be to stimulate demands for higher prices and wages and to create uncertainty both for O. P. A. and for industry.

Finally, there are certain amendments which, if enacted, would be disastrous to effective price control. Because I think that at this stage my criticisms of amendments can be more helpful to the Congress than my commendations, I have dealt with these dangerous amendments in greater detail than I have considered those which are helpful or at least not hurtful. I have brought all my comments together in an appendix to this letter, but here I wish to comment briefly on the proposed procedural provisions. These provisions are technical in

character, on their face they do not reveal that their enactment would cause the following consequences:

1. By flooding O. P. A. with protests intended, not to raise genuine issues, but to delay enforcement proceedings, they would prevent industry from getting prompt and full consideration of important cases by the board of review which is proposed to be created.

2. By swamping the staffs of our operating departments these protests designed for delay purposes would undo the progress we have made in meeting industry's demand that we speed up our regular work.

3. Complaints designed for delay purposes would make it impossible for the Emergency Court of Appeals to keep abreast of its docket.

4. The freedom to attack regulations at any time would make for continuing instability in price and rent ceilings and uncertainty as to industry's rights and duties.

5. The proposed provisions would give most defendants an easy way to delay trial from 8 months to a year or more, thus assuring widespread acquittals because evidence had become stale or witnesses were missing.

6. The ability of law violators to secure stays, avoid trial for many months, and thus secure acquittals would undermine, if not destroy, voluntary compliance.

What these add up to is widespread industry confusion, a great stimulus to the black market, and inflationary prices to the consumer. I am sure that neither the committee nor the House wants to cause the collapse of price control in an effort to relax existing procedural safeguards. I am confident that a full consideration of the problem will result in agreement that justice to defendants in O. P. A. criminal cases will be fully assured if they are afforded an opportunity to complain after judgment to the Emergency Court of Appeals.

It is heartening to see that the House committee has beaten off the frontal attacks on stabilization by resisting the pressures of special interests to secure favored treatment for particular industries. I know well the force of these pressures because we in O. P. A. are subjected to them every day. I cannot believe that the committee would now sacrifice, by unwise procedural change, what it has gained for price control by its steadfast opposition to demands for special privilege.

Still more dangerous to price control than the procedural amendments proposed by the House committee are those which the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies is sponsoring. Moreover, the changes in the fundamental principles governing the determination of maximum prices and rents which the latter committee advocates amount to a directive to O. P. A. to scrap all the work which it has done and to start issuing a new set of rules calling for higher prices.

While I am sure that if we were able to begin afresh on this job of price control we could do it better because of the experience we have gained, I know that we cannot begin our work anew. Even if it were possible, it would be unfair to American industry to demand that it start to master a new and different set of regulations. Moreover, most of the select committee's proposals do not reflect what we have learned; in fact, quite the reverse is true.

We have succeeded for a year in keeping back inflationary pressures which, if uncontrolled, would have shot the cost of living and wages up the inflationary spiral. We have saved the people of the United States $85,000,000,000 in the cost of the war alone. We have done this without serious injury to any group in the Nation and without impeding the greatest expansion in production in the Nation's history. We think this record should be an adequate answer to those who want us now to turn aside to experiment with a new set of rules.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

COMMENTS BY CHESTER BOWLES, PRICE ADMINISTRATOR, ON THE AMENDMENTS TO THE EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS RECOMMENDED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

EXTENDING THE ACT

Although, as I have said elsewhere, I believe the need for price control will continue after June 30, 1945, the question whether the acts should be renewed beyond that date is a matter for the consideration of Congress on which I think it inappropriate to comment.

PRICE, RENTS, AND MARKER AND RENTING PRACTICES

1. The accounting methods proviso

This proviso amending section 2 (a) forbids any regulation from requiring costs to be determined "otherwise than by established accounting methods." Actually, we do our best to adhere to such methods, and no instance to the contrary has been disclosed. However, in giving directions for calculating maximum prices, especially for new articles, we often specify the use of certain cost factors without including all those which an accountant might use for the quite different purpose of calculating operating income. If, for that reason, this amendment should be stretched by construction to invalidate those pricing formulas, a total of 169 maximum price regulations would have to be rewritten, and, while few price increases would, I hope, result, the new provisions would call for constant revision. It seems unfair to place upon war-burdened industries the job of recalculating myriads of ceiling prices according to the substitute formulas we should have to devise—all for no perceptible gain either to industry or to price control.

2. The profit control proviso

This proviso amending section 2 (a) forbids any construction of the act which would give the Administrator the right to do what I for one have no intention of ever doing, that is, of fixing profits "where such action has no relation to price control."

3. Consideration of industry recommendations

Two amendments to section 2 (a) require the Administrator in consulting with industry representatives and with industry advisory committees, to give consideration to their respective recommendations. These amendments wisely would make explicit a duty which I have considered as implicit in the existing law and which it is the declared policy of the office to observe.

4. Adjustments of maximum rents for factors within defense rental areas

Here again an amendment would clarify the law by making explicit what heretofore has been implicit. This amendment makes it plain that, when the Administrator considers general factors such as "increases or decreases in property taxes or other costs," he must consider those factors for the particular area whose rent ceilings he is adjusting.

5. Individual adjustments in certain cases of abnormally high or low maximum rents

The committee has resolutely opposed efforts to require the individual adjustment of rents wherever hardship might be shown since it has recognized that, in a nation of 14,000,000 landlords, such a provision would simply mean the collapse of rent control under a crushing administrative burden. In requiring instead that provision be made for the adjustment of individual rent ceilings where on the maximum rent date, due to peculiar circumstances, rents were abnormally high or low, the committee's proposed amendment to section 2 (c) would impose about as heavy a load as we can hope to carry. Our existing regulations have already gone far in this direction; even if this amendment were not adopted, we should revise them further to carry out the principle it declares as fully as possible.

6. Decontrol of rental areas

This amendment to require the removal of rent control whenever the Administrator finds the need for it to have gone (and to permit its restoration if needed) would make clear the fact that under the present law the Administrator is subject to such a duty. I have already ordered the decontrol of certain areas, and I look forward to decontrolling others just as soon as—and whenever—the governing standards are satisfied.

7. Limitation on subsidies

The committee's proposal to amend section 2 (e) by forbidding future definitions of food commodities as strategic or critical materials and thus to exclude R. F. C. financing of new subsidy programs in the future has the outstanding merit of permitting the continuation of the existing R. F. C. programs which I consider basic to stabilization at present levels. Frankly, I should much prefer to see the R. F. C.'s power untrammeled in the future, but, if the amendment is adopted and if the need requiring the exercise of that power should arise, I hope that the Congress will meet that need by prompt and adequate legislation.

8. The "business-practices" amendment

One of the most troublesome of the proposed amendments is that revising of section 2 (h) which forbids O. P. A. to compel changes in business practices. This revision would strike out the exception which has permitted such changes where they were necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion. It would place the stamp of congressional approval on circumvention and evasion of the law, provided only the method used involved a business practice or the remedy required would compel a change in one.

We have often been accused of changing business practices when all that we had changed was, not a business practice protected by section 2 (h), but a pricing practice falling clearly within the Administrator's authority to establish maximum prices under section 2 (a). However, the business of setting up a comprehensive system of price control has required the change of a good many business practices which, though innocent in themselves, would lead readily to circumvention or evasion. To give a homely illustration, we have set one ceiling for hamburger and a higher ceiling for ground steak. Since, once it is ground, the housewife can no longer tell ground steak from hamburger, it is obvious that a great deal of hamburger would be sold at the higher ground-steak ceiling if O. P. A. allowed steak to be ground in advance of sale. Consequently, to protect the housewife (and also the honest butcher), O. P. A. has had to require that, except for telephone orders, ground steak, if sold at the higher ceiling, must be ground in her presence. Since in peacetime that had not been the business practice of certain types of stores, doubtless, if the committee proposal were adopted, some of these stores would soon deny O. P. A.'s authority to compel them to grind steak in the presence of their customers..

This typifies the sort of problem which I, as Administrator, would be up against in literally hundreds of industries if the proposed amendment were enacted. Surely the

American businessman does not want to see O. P. A. powerless to close the loopholes which less scrupulous competitors may find in the law.

9. Protection of fresh fruits and vegetables from unusual hazards

This proposed amendment adds a new subsection (g) to section 3, requiring the Administrator to adjust maximum prices of fresh fruits or vegetables to make appropriate allowances for major unexpected losses occurring in connection with the production and marketing of such commodities. This proposal is open to an objection which my experience convinces me is both valid and important; it makes mandatory a policy of the sort which can be wisely administered only on a discretionary basis. We have recognized the propriety of some adjustments in cases of the sort contemplated by the proposed amendment, but we are also aware of the practical difficulties arising out of the industry's production and marketing problems which often stand in the way of a satisfactory solution. Without wishing to oppose the objective of the amendment, I do wish to suggest to the House the desirability of a further amendment which would expressly recognize that the exercise of good administrative judgment is required in the handling of situations of the kind here involved.

10. Publication of policy directives

The committee's proposal to require that action exercising supervisory policy-making powers over O. P. A., W. F. A., and W. P. B. be taken by formal order published in the Federal Register, embodies a sound principle and will, I am sure, meet no objection on the part of any of the agencies affected by it. The present proposal eliminates certain technical difficulties which I had criticized in an earlier version.

PROCEDURE

1. Removing the time limit on filing protests

By amending section 203 (a) the committee would permit a protest to be filed against a regulation at any time instead of within 60 days from the date of its issuance or after new grounds of protest, such as increases in costs, had arisen. This would compel the abandonment of an objective of the existing law, the wisdom of which has been demonstrated in experience, namely, that legal questions which go to the basic validity of a regulation should be raised and settled as quickly as possible. The alternative is continuing instability both in our regulations and in the price and trade relationships which are dependent upon them.

There is another and still more serious difficulty in doing away with the 60-day limitation. Once it were removed, O. P. A. would be exposed to an uninterrupted stream of protests: Under a pending Senate amendment, providing a special 60-day period, beginning July 1, 1944, in which all regulations would be open to protest, O. P. A. would have to handle what might prove for a time to be a heavy volume of protests. But most of these protests would be protests based on genuine dissatisfaction with the operation of some regulation or some provision in a regulation. They would not be filed simply as part of a lawyer's maneuver to keep his client from going to trial. The full seriousness of the proposed removal of the present 60-day limitation cannot be appreciated until it is considered in connection with the provisions for the stay of enforcement proceedings, discussed under point 5, below.

2. Creating an administrative board of review

By a proviso to section 203 (c) the committee would provide for the creation within O. P. A. of a board or boards of review to consider protests to regulations filed after September 1. I do not object to this provision; indeed, I can see some very real advantages which should accrue from it once we can get the machinery properly set up and in operation. However, I think it must be recognized that this machinery will slow down the handling of protests. We have acted on protests much more rapidly than has been generally realized. The importance of this factor of added delay will become all the more evident in connection with the next three proposals.

3. Requiring action on protests within a reasonable time

The committee proposes to amend paragraph (a) of section 203 to cut the time for preliminary action on protests by denying the special 90-day period previously allowed for such action after the issuance of regulations. This will often compel piecemeal action on related protests which are filed one by one over the course of the 60 days after issuance.

Another change proposed by the committee would allow a protestant who thinks the Administrator has failed to grant or deny his protest promptly enough, to move in the Emergency Court of Appeals for an order requiring the action to be taken within a reasonable time. This amendment which provides a flexible procedure for handling a knotty problem is, I am told, substantially the same as the existing law. I think its enactment well worth while, however, for it will clearly inform protestants of their rights.

4. Permitting defendants to seek leave to file complaints against regulations with the Emergency Court of Appeals

What I am compelled to say about this and the succeeding provision may seem extreme, but it represents my sober, considered judgment. I do not believe effective price control is possible under these provisions, especially when coupled with the provision, discussed under point 1 above, allowing protests to be filed at all times.

The first of these provisions represents a revision of the provision which was carefully worked out after discussions with members of both the Senate and House committees. The original provision, which was adopted by the Senate committee, was designed to meet what the hearings indicated to be the one major defect in the existing procedure; the chance that a man might be convicted criminally of violating a regulation which he was barred from attacking, because he had failed to do so earlier, even though he had a reasonable excuse for that failure.

What the provision did was to allow, in criminal cases, a defendant to apply after conviction, for leave to file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals that the regulation under which he had been convicted was invalid. In effect, the complaint to the Emergency Court would amount to an appeal from conviction. It would be granted only to defendants acting in good faith who had a reasonable excuse for having failed to protest within the regular 60-day period.

What the House committee has done is to make the complaint procedure apply in all cases, civil as well as criminal, despite the fact that an amendment allowing the courts to reduce damages from three times to one and one-half times the overcharge, effectively removed the danger that the damage suit might be oppressive to a nonwillful violator. The House committee then will allow the application for leave to be made at any stage of the proceeding. How dangerous this can be becomes evident when the next provision is considered.

5. Authorizing stays of all enforcement proceedings when protests or complaints against regulations are pending

Unlike the Senate provisions which entirely removes the protest and complaint as a means of delaying trial, the House committee amendment invites the collapse of our enforcement activities by requiring a court to stay any enforcement proceeding if it finds that a protest filed in good faith is pending or if it grants leave to a defendant to file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals attacking the validity of a regulation.

The only protection which O. P. A. would have against the manipulation of the protest and complaint procedures would be the courts' ability to detect bad faith on the part of protestants and the courts' willingness to deny to such protestants the stays which they request. We know too well how plausible are the tales of misfortune and inadvertence, which any resourceful protestant can tell, to have confidence in the protection which the "good faith" finding would actually accord us.

It is impossible to overestimate the incentive which these House committee provisions would give for protests and complaints against regulations. Given a protestant who has every reason to wish for delay, it would be difficult—especially with the new board of review procedure—to close protest proceedings in less than from 4 to 6 months. Then would come an appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals. Although, for an appellate court, its procedure is unusually expeditious, the case would require at least 4 months and, again, delay-minded counsel could readily stretch this period a month or two longer. Then could come a petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court. In other words, the House committee amendments place at the disposal of defendants a ready means of delaying trial from 8 months to a year, or even longer.

Consider what that means to this office which has been doing one of the biggest enforcement jobs that any governmental agency has ever been called upon to handle. From five to seven hundred rent and price proceedings are started every month. It is a herculean task to carry them through to a successful conclusion—and we have been successful in 94 percent of our cases. With evidence growing stale, with business records being lost, with witnesses leaving the district, and with the usual turn-over in enforcement staff, 8 to 12 months delay would be tantamount to an acquittal in a great many cases, and, of course, defense lawyers would be well aware of this fact.

They would also know that the Emergency Price Control Act is, after al, emergency legislation, and that, if cases were delayed sufficiently long and conditions changed, repeal of the act might allow their clients to escape.

As the flood of protests in the O. P. A. began to mount, the capacity of the O. P. A. operating staffs to handle the problems presented to the review board would steadily deteriorate. Moreover, delay in the regular operation of the Price and Rent Departments would be the inevitable consequence of absorption in protest and review proceedings. This would hurt the effectiveness of price control almost as much as the break-down in compliance and enforcement, which would inevitably come when people began to notice how notorious violators were escaping trial and how readily defense counsel could tie up O. P. A. cases.

Not only would this undo much of the progress which has been made toward getting O. P. A. running on a businesslike basis, the Emergency Court's docket would soon be clogged with cases filed only for purposes of delay. The court's opportunity to give due attention to the important cases justifiably before it would be correspondingly impaired.

There are many ways to destroy price control. The method I have just described is one of the most painful and the most certain.

6. Authorization of damages at one and one-half times the overcharge

The committee proposes to amend section 205 (e) to permit the damages recoverable

against a defendant found to have made an overcharge to be fixed by the court at less than the treble damages required by the existing law. The minimum amount recoverable would be one and one-half times the overcharge or $50, whichever is higher. This relaxation would, of course, reduce the deterrent effect of the present law and discourage the settlement of cases.

7. Protection against the cumulation of $50 damages

In a few cases we have learned that advantage has been taken of the $50 minimum damages provision to recover that amount for every day a daily maximum rent was exceeded or for every transaction in a series of small related sales. I approve the proposed amendment to section 205 (e) to prevent the recurrence of this abuse.

AMENDMENTS TO THE STABILIZATION ACT

1. Change of "may" to "shall" in section 1

The committee proposes to amend the second sentence in the Stabilization Act by substituting the word "shall" for "may" so that the sentence would read:

"The President shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities."

This amendment appears to make price adjustments mandatory where before they were discretionary. It does not apply to rents. If adopted, it would be taken as a finding by the Congress that there have not been enough price and wage increases. In effect, the Congress would be understood as saying to the Price Administrator and the Economic Stabilization Director: You have abused your discretion by denying too many price increases, where you had authority to grant them, so that now your discretion to deny must be taken away.

Any such announcement by the Congress could not fail to do damage to the stabilization program. Nor would it be saved from doing damage by the fact that, on close reading, the amendment turns out not to create any clear obligation to authorize a price increase in any specific type of situation. The vagueness of the language would not prevent it from being made the basis for new demands for price increases. The apparent expression of Congress of disapproval of present policies would inevitably weaken O. P. A.'s ability to resist these demands in situations in which they plainly ought to be resisted.

In the Stabilization Act the Congress made stabilization the rule and price and wage increases the exception. In this crucial stage of the effort to keep prices and wages stable it ought to avoid even the appearance of reversing this policy and turning the exceptions into rules.

2. Change of "may" to "shall" in section 3

The committee proposes a similar amendment to the first proviso in section 3, which applies to agricultural commodities, so that the proviso would read: *"Provided,* That the President shall, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust any such maximum price to the extent that he finds necessary to correct gross inequities."

The comments made under point 1 above would be pertinent here but for the fact that this proviso has been utilized as a justification for reducing maximum prices of agricultural commodities which otherwise would be raised to grossly inequitable levels by clause (2) of section 3. Increases in maximum prices of such commodities to correct gross inequities can, of course, be made under section 1 without recourse to this proviso in section 3. I doubt that the committee feels that the Price Administrator and Economic Stabilization Director have reduced too few agricultural prices for gross inequities, yet so the committee's change would imply.

3. Authorization to investigations of stabilization activities

The committee has proposed the addition of a new section 12 which would authorize investigations by both House and Senate Committees on Banking and Currency into the effectiveness of stabilization activities and their effect upon industry, production, renting and housing, and distribution. If, as I hope, this provision is adopted, I shall be glad to cooperate fully with either committee in any investigation it may undertake. I believe the thorough consideration given by both committees to our experience to date should greatly facilitate any future inquiry.

Summary of Postal Legislation Enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress Up to This Date

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, few departments of the Federal Government have felt the impact of the war more than the postal service and its several branches. The war has created new problems both for those who administer the postal service from the Postmaster General down to the postmaster in a crossroads or inland town, and also for the postal employees ranging from supervisory employees and clerks down to custodians and watchmen.

The duties of all postal employees have increased. War has created serious shortages of manpower in a great many offices. Many postal employees were drafted before the seriousness of the situation was realized and a deferment policy established. Other employees were attracted by the fine wages paid in defense plants and they abandoned the postal jobs with their comparatively low wage for better jobs in industry.

Yet essentially the postal workers are defense workers. Without their faithful and efficient service there really would be a bottleneck in the war effort. These experienced and capable postal employees keep speeding on their way highly important mail relative to defense work, priorities, plans, blueprints, and hundreds of other items. Influx of workers in defense or war plant areas have complicated the problems of the city carriers. Priorities have harassed the rural and star route carriers as they have had difficulty in keeping their mail service vehicles in operation.

The House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, a major committee, on which it has been my privilege to serve since coming to Congress, has had referred to it during the two sessions of this Congress, considerable legislation affecting the Postal Service.

Many persons serving the Nation in wartime under the Post Office Department have written me relative to some of the laws concerning post offices, postal employees, and postal service. That those interested in the subject may have a report of legislation on these important subjects, I have prepared the following summary of measures which have been enacted into law during this Congress up to June 7, 1944:

PUBLIC LAW 271 (H. R. 324) BY MR. BURCH OF VIRGINIA

To place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to change the method of determining the amount of making payment of compensation to postmasters of the fourth class. Under the old system postmasters of the fourth class are compensated upon the stamp cancelations of their respective offices. They are their own accountants, count the cancelations on mail dispatched from their offices, and calculate their commissions on such cancelations. The system is quite complicated and subject to many errors. The increase in cost will be eliminated because of the efficiency of the system over the one now in use.

PUBLIC LAW 124 (H. R. 1004) BY MR. HAGEN OF MINNESOTA

To relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication.

PUBLIC LAW 25 (H. R. 1366) BY MR. O'BRIEN OF MICHIGAN

To provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the postal service. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to make appropriate provision for a temporary increase in compensation of postal employees, in recognition of the fact that the cost of living has increased so that under present conditions the compensation received by postal employees is inadequate. The increase in compensation provided for will apply to all employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

PUBLIC LAW 306 (H. R. 1565) BY MR. ALLEN OF LOUISIANA

Relating to the appointment of postmasters.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to obviate the requirement that postmasters in offices of the fourth class shall take an examination when such office is advanced to third class, or shall take an examination when a third-class office is relegated to the fourth class. Since the discontinuance of such examinations would result in a saving of time to the Civil Service Commission and expense to the Government, the enactment of this bill will be advantageous both to the Postal Service and to the public, as well as to the morale of the postmasters affected.

PUBLIC LAW 205 (H. R. 2080) BY MR. COLE OF MISSOURI

To provide additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service.

The purpose of this legislation is to assist the rural carriers toward meeting the rapidly increasing cost of maintaining their equipment which, in keeping with all other necessities during the war emergency, has constantly advanced in price. It provides that each rural carrier shall be paid 1 cent per mile per day for equipment maintenance in addition to the 5 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled as now provided by law. According to

a recent survey by the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association through their membership in 44 States, the maintenance rate for 1942 averaged 0.08269 cents per mile. It was stated that this survey showed that in some cases the maintenance cost was in excess of 10 cents per mile. Attention was called also to the fact that prices of new automobiles have risen more than 30 percent since 1941, when available, and trade-in values have become lower; also that repair costs have increased not less than 50 percent since the beginning of 1942. Attention is called to statement in the report of the Postmaster General on this bill, as follows: "* * * from inquiries made and data examined, we are satisfied that it is costing the rural carriers well above 6 cents per mile per day for equipment maintenance."

PUBLIC LAW 161 (H. R. 2250) BY MR. MURRAY, OF TENNESSEE

To extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees into the Postal Service.

The purpose of this legislation is to bring the custodial employees of the Post Office Department under the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, and thus secure for them a permanent and more equitable status. As the situation now exists, custodial employees are paid under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 763), whereas regular Postal Service employees are paid in accordance with the act of March 4, 1911 (ch. 241, sec. 4, 36 Stat. 1339), which makes it necessary for the Department to pay employees under two different laws and to compute salaries from two different sets of salary tables.

PUBLIC LAW NO. 259 (H. R. 2419) BY MR. HOLIFIELD, OF CALIFORNIA

To change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "assistant clerk."

The purpose of this legislation is to change the designation of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler," without change of duties or compensation. This bill is endorsed by the National Association of Post Office and Railway Mail Laborers and the New York City branch of American Post-Office Employees. These groups feel that the term "mail handler" more accurately and properly designates their duties. It is also approved by the president of the National Association of Post Office Mechanics.

PUBLIC LAW 181 (S. 970) (H. R. 2437), BY MR. PRICE, OF FLORIDA

Authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably. The purpose of this legislation is to provide more efficient use of manpower during the war emergency by authorizing the assignment of post-office employees interchangeably.

PUBLIC LAW 266 (H. R. 2836), BY MR. WHELCHEL, OF GEORGIA

To grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes. The purpose of this legislation is to improve the condition of substitute employees in the Postal Service. It is felt by the Post Office Department that the substitute employee is entitled to successive increases as provided for other Government employees, based upon length of service, which would not only improve the morale of the postal worker, but would result in better service to the Department.

PUBLIC LAW —— (H. R. 2928), BY MR. FAY, OF NEW YORK

To amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to correct inequalities in the case of certain employees in the Postal Service not included in existing law by providing for the payment of overtime. It includes postmasters and supervisory employees, who may not, under the law, receive payment for overtime. Considerable dissatisfaction exists among postmasters and supervisory employees because of the fact that in many instances clerks, who may receive daily overtime, now receive as much, or more, pay than such officials.

PUBLIC LAW 128 (S. 1316) (H. R. 3129), BY MR. BURCH, OF VIRGINIA

To provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

The action of Congress in enacting these important pieces of legislation is very much appreciated by the public and various postal employees involved as indicated by communications received by members of our Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

I have received a number of such letters.

One is from the president of the National Association of Postmasters and it states as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS,
Woburn, Mass., May 11, 1944.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Congressman, Ninth District of Minnesota, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: In behalf of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, I extend you and the committee our sincere thanks for your cooperation and assistance in the matter of H. R. 324, fourth-class postmasters' bill—H. R. 1565, bill to eliminate the necessity of fourth class postmasters taking examinations when their offices advance from the fourth to the third class; also your recent most helpful support of H. R. 2928, affecting postmasters of the first, second, and third classes.

In fact we have always found you to be a stanch friend of all the postmasters and favorably disposed to legislation seeking to improve the postal service.

We want you to know that we are appreciative of your continued interest in the cause of the postal service and the postmasters.

With kind personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

PHILIP J. GALLAGHER,
National President.

The National League of District Postmasters has similarly expressed its appreciation of the action of this Congress on a measure in which it was particularly interested. They have written as follows:

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF DISTRICT POSTMASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1944.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: I am taking this opportunity to express to you on behalf of the district postmasters our sincere thanks and appreciation for your support and sympathetic cooperation in obtaining the passage of legislation in the present Congress, benefiting the postmasters and postal workers.

Our success in securing the passage of the pay-increase measure and the recent fourth-class salary act was due largely to the manner in which these bills were handled by the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, of which you are a member, and we are deeply appreciative of the assistance given.

With every good wish for your continued success, I am,

Very truly yours,

E. A. MEEKS,
National Secretary.

The National Association of Letter Carriers, with headquarters in the American Federation of Labor Building here, viewed our accomplishments in the following manner:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1944.

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Allow me to congratulate you as a member of the House Post Office Committee, on the splendid accomplishment of your committee on May 2, when the House of Representatives unanimously passed five bills which had previously been reported out by your committee and placed on the consent calendar. The action of the House indicates the respect which the average Member has for the work by your group, for they know that when a bill has been reported out by your committee that it not alone has merit but it also has been thoroughly considered.

While congratulating you on the work of the committee, we desire to take advantage of this opportunity to express our personal appreciation for the splendid work that you have done for the postal employees ever since you assumed membership on the committee. The committee has given consideration to a large number of bills affecting the welfare of the postal employees and all of these bills have received your wholehearted support and approval.

We especially wish to thank you for the support and assistance which you rendered in having the $300 temporary salary increase and the measure increasing the salary of substitutes enacted into law, and we want you to know that your interest is appreciated by every letter carrier in the country and particularly by those in your own district who should be and are proud of having such a splendid Representative in Congress.

Again thanking you for your interest in behalf of the men I have the honor to represent and wishing you success in all of your undertakings, I am

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE F. STIMSON.
Assistant Secretary.

A letter, dated May 3, 1944, which I have received from Mr. Frank Russell, president of the National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, says, in part, as follows:

It has been most gratifying to have had your cooperation in every way in our star-route carrier problems. You have given all the help possible and I am sure from my contacts here in our legislative program that if reelected you will continue to aid us and the general public.

I call attention that you have an already established standing on the House Post Office Committee. The taxpayers have an investment in every conscientious and hard working Congressman and their committees.

Yes, the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has done a grand job and it has been a pleasure for me to attend its numerous committee meetings and participate in its deliberations.

Persons desiring copies of any of the laws referred to in the summary may secure them by writing to their own United States Representative in Congress or one of their two United States Senators.

In Memory of Hon. Ulysses Samuel Guyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the splendid tribute to the memory of the late Ulysses Samuel Guyer, of Kansas, by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas:

The memory of the late Ulysses Samuel Guyer, of Kansas City, Kans., Representative in Congress from the Second District of Kansas, will remain a pleasant, sustaining and inspiring memory to all who knew him. Judge Guyer, as he was respectfully and affectionately known to his colleagues in Congress, and to the people of Kansas, was one of those who serve without ostentation, without trumpeting, with honor and with integrity.

My own memory of Judge Guyer goes back nearly a half-century, when he was a young lawyer, getting his start in Kansas City, Kans.; where he was soon in demand as an orator at civic and political meetings; when he was judge of the municipal court in that city; when he became mayor of this largest city in Kansas. Later he came to Washington representing the Second District of Kansas, which he represented ably and with distinction continuously since 1926, after previously filling the unexpired term of the Honorable Ed C. Little.

Before taking his law course in law, Judge Guyer taught school for 4 years at St. John, Kans., where he was superintendent of schools and principal of the city high school. We who knew him well, and had heard him talk of St. John, in western Kansas, and his associations there in the days of his early youth, were not surprised at his request that he be buried in the St. John cemetery.

Throughout his long and useful life, and in the public offices he held, I believe Judge Guyer remained the educator, though he served with honor and distinction in the municipal offices he held, and in the Congress. He was a student of history, a reader of biographies; a devout believer in the American form of government; jealous of any infringement of the constitutional rights of the States and the citizen; a zealous and able defender of the Constitution against encroachment from any source.

Judge Guyer was a true and trusted friend of the ordinary man. During all his life he worked and fought for the rights of the Negro. He was a strong believer in prohibition, and held to his course without ever yielding an inch in his beliefs and ideals. He was a kindly man, an able man, a learned man, a just man, but with him justice was tempered with kindness and mercy; a man who did his duty as he saw it, but with never a trace of intolerance for those who did not agree with his own views or follow his own practices.

I think I speak for Kansas when I say to his colleagues in the House that Kansas mourns his passing, and at the same time rejoices that he lived and served his State and Nation through a long and illustrious career. May those of us, his friends and colleagues, who are left to carry on with the same high courage and high ideals that characterized Ulysses Samuel Guyer of Kansas.

The world is the better for his having lived in it, and contributed to its progress. We know that he faced the end—he knew it was coming months before the Grim Reaper cut the final tie—with the same cheerful and quiet fortitude he evinced through all his life. Eight years ago Judge Guyer delivered what I believe to have been one of the notable memorial addresses delivered in the Hall of Representatives. He closed that address with these lines from a great dramatic critic, William Winter, written while he was facing eternity:

"One other bitter drop to drink,
And then—no more!
One little pause upon the brink,
And then—go o'er!
One sigh—and then the lib'rant morn
Of perfect day,
When my free spirit, newly born,
Shall soar away.

"One pang—and I shall rend the thrall
Where grief abides,
And generous Death shall show me all
That now he hides;
And lucid in that second birth,
I shall discern
What all the ages of the earth
Have died to learn.

"One motion and the stream is crost,
So dark, so deep!
And I shall triumph, or be lost,
In endless sleep.
Then onward whatso'er my fate,
I shall not care!
Nor sin nor sorrow, love nor hate
Can touch me there."

Henry Bascom Steagall

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, during the year that has passed since our last memorial exercises the Grim Reaper has taken a heavy toll of the membership of the Congress of the United States—3 Senators and 10 Representatives having been called by the Great Master of the Universe from their labor among us to their eternal home in that country—

"From whose bourne
No traveler e'er returns."

The loss of these colaborers is being keenly realized each passing day as we feel the need of their wise counsel and words of encouragement, but especially do we mourn the loss of our leaders, tried and true.

Outstanding among the leaders of the Congress when I first took my seat here was HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, of Alabama, chairman of the great Committee on Banking and Currency. He was as strong as an oak, a stalwart member of the Old Guard, fully informed on the great questions confronting this country, and unwavering in his devotion to duty. No man here had more dignity and power, and no man had a greater part in shaping and molding the beneficial legislation of the past decade of his life. He was the ideal committee chairman, studied the legislation before him, and gave to it the imprint of his keen and practical mind. The economy of this country, the banking and financial interests of our people, and the established position of America in world affairs all are stronger and richer by reason of the labor of HENRY STEAGALL.

No son of Alabama has shed more luster on her honored banner. No son of America was more of a patriot.

Although busy with important affairs at all times, he took time to encourage and advise younger Members and no one misses him more than I do.

He loved us all; he loved everybody. Scion of one of the oldest and best families of the Old South, he fraternized with men of high and low estate, saw their best qualities, shared their joys and sorrows. He enjoyed wholesome recreation. He was a true nobleman, noble in thought, in purpose and action, and appreciated that quality in others as few men can do.

His conception of nobility has been exactly expressed by these words:

"Howe'er it be, it seems to me
'Tis only noble to be good,
Kind hearts are more than coronets
And simple faith than Norman blood."

Thomas Henry Cullen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the sorrow we experience in the passing of a friend is the sorrow from which the heart fails to find real surcease. It is a sorrow measured by our love for them, and when we learned, on March 1, 1944, that the Great Father had called our kind hearted, generous, distinguished and beloved colleague, THOMAS H. CULLEN, home to rest, we were so overcome in grief that Time, though a great healer, refuses to palliate.

Although I had known Mr. CULLEN since I became a Member of Congress in 1939, it was not until my election to the Ways and Means Committee, of which he was our ranking member, that I became closely asociated with him and learned to love him.

He was an elder statesman whose example and advice we cherished. I have never seen anyone who possessed more dignity, and patriotism. He was tolerant and sympathetic, and always conscious of his duties and responsibilities as a legislator.

His long service as a Member of this House is proof of his abundant ability and popularity among his fellow Members and constituents as well.

His death was a personal loss to me, and I extend to his bereaved family my heartfelt sympathy.

C. I. O. Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bay City (Mich.) Times of June 6, 1944:

C. I. O. POLITICS
(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—Some idea of the huge campaign kitty which will be made available by the C. I. O. political action committee for the reelection of President Roosevelt was revealed in a hearing before the War Labor Board. Thomas E. Patton, counsel for the Republic Steel Corporation, asserted that companies representing four-fifths of the industry had turned over to the steel workers union $3,709,975 in dues checked off from wages of 301,417 workers.

"A substantial portion," he asserted, "is to be poured into the funds of the political action committee which will use its political influence in the coming national elections. The result will be to place potent financial backing behind some political party, based on forced contributions, to a previously unheard of extent. No citizen should be forced against his will to contribute, directly or indirectly, to any political party or movement."

The C. I. O. group, committed to the reelection of President Roosevelt, as of today has a kitty of nearly $700,000, of which $189,000 already has been spent in electioneering. This fund would not be possible except for the check-off system. That system was established by order of the President soon after the New Deal came into existence in 1933.

The first huge contribution out of the check-off union funds to a political campaign was made in 1936 for the election of Roosevelt. The check-off came about in this way: The old N. R. A. made a deal with the mine owners under which they were allowed to fix prices without regard to the antitrust laws with the understanding that they would also withhold union dues from the workers' pay envelopes. The pay-off came when John L. Lewis contributed $500,000 out of union funds to the campaign.

Iniquity of the use of check-off funds for campaign purposes arises from two facts: First, it is illegal for labor unions as such to make contributions to political campaign funds the Corrupt Practices Act for years has forbidden under severe penalties. When the Smith-Connally Antistrike Act was passed more than a year ago it extended this prohibition to labor unions. Yet, Attorney General Biddle has ruled that the contributors of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee do not violate the law.

Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, chairman of the committee which is supposed to keep a current check on campaign contributions and practices, defended the action of the Attorney General. He said that the C. I. O. group was working to educate the voters and concentrated on "issues rather than candidates."

The second objection to contributions from funds obtained by labor unions through the check-off system is that they may be and frequently are a forced contribution from workers. Many workers, if they knew their dues were to be used partly for political purposes, would refuse to pay dues. But under the check-off system they have no alternative. Their dues payment is automatic and goes with their job.

More recently a modification of the check-off system has been instituted by the Roosevelt administration. It is quite as effective in forcing workers to pay union dues which may be used for political purposes. This is the maintenance-of-membership system. Under this practice union members must pay their union dues or lose their jobs.

It will be interesting as the campaign develops to see whether the Senate committee headed by Senator GREEN will do a real job of exposing illegal practices. The effectiveness of this committee has varied from campaign to campaign.

In 1938, under the chairmanship of the late Senator Sheppard, Democrat, of Texas, it was a powerful influence in disclosing campaign irregularities in Kentucky, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and other States. Its findings contributed to the passage of the Hatch clean-politics law. Among other things, it revealed that W. P. B. employees were being forced, on penalty of loss of their jobs, to vote for Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

Resolution Providing for an Hour of Prayer on D-Day

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I presented House Resolution 536 dealing with certain activities for D-day. I feel it was a mistake that the Committee on Rules did not consider this resolution, because I am sure it would have met with the unanimous approval of the House.

On May 8 I addressed the House as follows:

Mr. Speaker, ever since the world began, men have turned to God for guidance when they realize their greatest needs. Never have they been disappointed. He has been pointed to as a mighty fortress by the great spiritual leaders of all time. He gives us strength for our bodies, rest for our weary spirits, and peace to our troubled minds. He can and will give us strength, grace, and courage to carry on now. His Son said the earnest prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Holy Writ records many incidents of mighty things accomplished by the united prayers and efforts of the people.

Apparently D-day is drawing nigh, and the hour of invasion may be any hour. Many communities have set aside the invasion hour to assemble in their churches to implore divine guidance and strength of arms to accomplish an early victory and bring about a lasting peace. Inasmuch as the Nation rightfully looks to this House for leadership, I am today introducing a resolution for the House to take appropriate action when the news of the invasion comes.

House Resolution 536, which I introduced is as follows:

Whereas we are engaged in a global war; and

Whereas the freedom of mankind throughout the world is at stake; and

Whereas nearly every home in America has loved ones in places of great danger; and

Whereas we believe in God and recognize His mighty power as well as believing in the justice of our cause; and

Whereas D-day or the hour of invasion draws near, and realizing the great sacrifice it will take; and since the Nation rightfully looks to the House of Representatives for leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved, That when the news comes that the invasion has begun if the House of Representatives be in session that an immediate recess be declared; the roll called to assemble the membership; and a period of 15 minutes be spent in prayer under the direction of the House Chaplain in order to have grace, courage, and strength to carry on in that trying and solemn hour for ourselves and our armed forces everywhere, as well as for an early victory and a lasting peace; and be it further

Resolved, That if the House of Representatives be not in session, then the House of Representatives shall convene on that day at the accustomed hour for the purpose of carrying out this resolution.

Jackson Hole National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a very controversial issue has developed in reference to a bill, H. R. 2241, that has been introduced which would set aside the President's Executive order creating the Jackson Hole National Monument in Wyoming.

As a member of the Committee on Wildlife Conservation of the House naturally I am interested in this legislation. Recently our committee met to discuss the effect of the bill if it ever came up. It, of course, sets a precedent. Congress heretofore never passed legislation to abrogate any Executive order issued under the Antiquities Act of 1906 or the Historical Site Act.

In order to properly be advised so that I could meet the issue intelligently if the bill is presented to the House for consideration, I called upon the Department of the Interior for information, asking numerous questions. I have received an answer to my query, and under the permission granted me I include it as a part of my remarks. The statement follows:

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT, WYO.

1. What is Jackson Hole National Monument?

Jackson Hole National Monument is a Federal reservation comprising 173,065 acres of Federal land in the northern portion of Jackson Hole, a spectacular valley on the headwaters of the Snake River in northwestern Wyoming. The national monument adjoins Grand Teton National Park. In addition to the Federal lands, the boundaries established for the monument contain 33,560 acres purchased by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for donation to the Federal Government, and 16,304 acres of other private or State lands. The total acreage within the boundaries is 222,929.

2. Under what authority was this national monument created?

On March 15, 1943, the President issued a proclamation reserving these lands under the

authority of section 2 of the act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), which is as follows:

"That the President of the United States is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected: *Provided*, That when such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership, the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept the relinquishment of such tracts in behalf of the Government of the United States."

3. Why was Jackson Hole National Monument established?

"To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." (The purpose of national monuments as defined by Congress in the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535).)

Jackson Hole is well known as one of the most beautiful valleys in America. Its abundant plant and animal life, as well as its geological formations, give it great scientific interest. It is an important part of the wintering grounds of the largest elk herd in the United States. It has been an historic landmark since the era of the fur trappers a century ago.

The monument includes the minimum necessary for the proper care and management of the northern portion of Jackson Hole, which is to be preserved in its natural and unspoiled condition. The southern portion, where the best ranch lands are situated, is not included in the monument.

4. Was the creation of Jackson Hole National Monument in accordance with established precedent?

Every President since the passage of the act of June 8, 1906, known as the Antiquities Act, has established national monuments under the authority of that act, a total of 82 having been thus created.

President Theodore Roosevelt in 8 years created 18 national monuments totaling 1,534,329 acres.

President Taft in 4 years created 10 national monuments totaling 2,300 acres.

President Wilson in 8 years created 13 national monuments totaling 1,121,996 acres.

President Harding in 2 years created 8 national monuments totaling 8,937 acres.

President Coolidge in 6 years created 13 national monuments totaling 1,243,063 acres.

President Hoover in 4 years created 9 national monuments totaling 2,147,640 acres.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 11 years has created 11 national monuments totaling 1,494,767 acres.

Seven of the 82 national monuments thus established were larger than Jackson Hole National Monument. These were:

(1) Grand Canyon National Monument in Arizona, established in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt, 806,400 acres.

(2) Mount Olympus National Monument in Washington established in 1909 by President Theodore Roosevelt, 633,600 acres.

(3) Katmai National Monument in Alaska established in 1918 by President Wilson, 1,087,990 acres.

(4) Glacier Bay National Monument in Alaska established in 1925 by President Coolidge, 1,164,000 acres.

(5) Death Valley National Monument in California established in 1933 by President Hoover, 1,601,800 acres.

(6) Joshua Tree National Monument in California established in 1936 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 838,258 acres.

(7) Oregon Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona established in 1937 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 330,690 acres.

5. Has the Supreme Court ever rendered an opinion concerning the establishment of a national monument under the authority of the act of June 8, 1906?

Yes. After President Theodore Roosevelt created the first Grand Canyon National Monument in Arizona, containing 806,400 acres, the legality of the monument was contested on the grounds that the area did not qualify for monument status under the Antiquities Act, and that the President had acted without authority in setting it apart as a national monument. In 1920, the Court rendered its opinion (252 U. S. 450):

"The defendants insist that the monument reserve should be disregarded on the ground that there was no authority for its creation. To this we cannot assent. The act under which the President proceeded empowered him to establish reserves embracing 'objects of historic or scientific interest.' The Grand Canyon, as stated in his proclamation 'is an object of unusual scientific interest'."

6. Was the creation of this national monument an infringement upon the rights of the State, the county, or any individual?

The proclamation establishing the monument reserved only the Federal lands within the described boundaries and it was issued subject to all valid existing rights. Certain private and State lands are also within the described boundaries, but these lands are still in private and State ownership, and the rights of the owners are the same as they were before the proclamation was issued. The private lands can be acquired only by donation or by purchase with funds appropriated by the Congress. They cannot be acquired by condemnation unless Congress appropriates the funds therefor. The State lands may be exchanged for Federal lands of equal value outside the monument, if the State so wishes. No lands have been confiscated, no citizens have been dispossessed, and private property and income within the monument is subject to taxation as it was before the monument was established.

7. Who owns the lands within the described boundaries?

Federal land and water, 173,064.62 acres, 77.6 percent; land purchased by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to donate to the Federal Government, 33,559.89 acres, 15.1 percent; remaining private lands, 14,937.16 acres, 6.7 percent; State school lands, 1,367.32 acres, 0.6 percent; total lands, 222,928.99 acres, 100 percent.

The Federal land and the land purchased by Mr. Rockefeller to donate to the Federal Government comprise more than 92 percent of the total area within the described boundaries.

8. For what have these lands been used?

About 8,000 acres within the monument boundaries are under cultivation, of which 2,500 acres are irrigated. About 54,000 acres are subject to grazing by about 6,300 head of cattle during varying portions of the year, of which 4,000 head of cattle require summer range on the adjoining national forest. The timber within the monument has certain local uses but is not considered to be of commercial significance. The area has been used principally for recreation and wildlife conservation. There are 241 people living in the monument.

9. How does the creation of the monument affect livestock grazing?

On April 8, 1943, the Secretary of the Interior, who is charged with the administration of the monument, issued an administrative policy statement from which the following is quoted:

"All permits issued by the Forest Service or other Federal agencies for use of lands now within the national monument will be honored by the National Park Service during the lifetime of the present holders, and the members of their immediate family."

When the Secretary of the Interior testified before the House Public Lands Committee, he amplified his position concerning grazing within the monument, as follows:

"In order to show how completely we desire to protect the interests of those few individuals who have some 6,300 head of cattle and horses grazing in this area, I am willing * * * to support a measure which has been suggested to me whereby those who own lands within the monument, appurtenant to which are grazing rights on public lands within the monument, can be assured that they and their heirs and assigns will be protected in those rights so long as they own lands within the monument. * * *

"The rights of those cattlemen who have ranches outside of the monument but who have crossed the area for years to reach their present summer range in the national forest will be continued."

10. How does the creation of the monument affect the county tax structure?

The Teton County treasurer reports that the county's average annual income for the years 1940, 1941, and 1942 was $132,052. The average annual county tax revenue from Mr. Rockefeller's land is a little less than $10,000, which he has paid ever since he bought these lands 15 years ago to donate to the public and is still paying, pending the enactment of legislation by Congress to authorize some suitable compensation to Teton County when these lands are transferred to the Federal Government and are removed from the local tax rolls. The President and the Secretary of the Interior have both indicated that they would favor such a solution of the county tax problem.

Congress has already authorized annual payments to counties from the income from national forests, grazing districts, wildlife refuges, and other Federal conservation lands. The proposed legislation would authorize the counties to share similarly from the national parks and monuments.

11. What is the origin of the Jackson Hole National Monument project?

Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., was encouraged by the Federal Government, beginning in the Coolidge administration, to acquire private lands in the northern part of Jackson Hole so that they might be donated to the American public for recreation purposes, together with the public domain and other Federal lands in the area. This was in response to the pleas of Jackson Hole residents that a portion of that great scenic valley be preserved for public enjoyment. The boundaries of the monument are essentially those presented to a special wildlife committee of the Senate by a group of Jackson Hole citizens in 1930, except that the monument comprises less land than the plan presented in 1930. Since the time of President Coolidge, each succeeding President has approved the project, and Mr. Rockefeller has continued to hold them and pay taxes upon them. His investment in these lands is approximately $1,500,000.

12. What action has Congress previously taken regarding the Jackson Hole project?

Prior to the consideration of the Barrett bill (H. R. 2241), this project has been investigated on the ground by numerous congressional committees and none of those committees had rendered adverse reports. In 1934, a bill to add the Jackson Hole area to Grand Teton National Park passed the Senate, and was reported favorably from the House Public Lands Committee on the last

day of that session. The House committee report contained a provision requested by the Bureau of the Budget that precluded the possibility of compensating Teton County for the loss of taxes which would result from the removal of private lands in the monument from the local tax rolls.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT A CHRONOLOGY

1923: Jackson Hole citizens invited the Superintendent of Yellowstone to confer with them in Jackson Hole and they proposed that the essential private lands in the northern part of Jackson Hole be purchased and that that part of the Hole and the Grand Teton range, which consisted largely of federally owned lands, be added to Yellowstone National Park.

1926: Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., visited Jackson Hole and became interested in the plan to preserve a part of it in its natural condition. He was encouraged to invest $1,500,000 in the purchase of private lands necessary to round out Federal holdings.

1927: President Coolidge withdrew from entry the public lands in Jackson Hole.

1927-28: Mr. Rockefeller conferred with the elected officials of Wyoming, Members of Congress, Secretary of the Interior Work, and President Calvin Coolidge, concerning his intention of purchasing the essential private lands in Jackson Hole.

1928: Mr. Rockefeller's land-purchase program got under way.

1929: Grand Teton National Park was established, and it comprised practically a solid block of Federal lands. Meanwhile, Mr. Rockefeller's land-purchasing program to effect an adequate unit of public lands in Jackson Hole continued.

1929: Secretary of the Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur visited Jackson Hole, approved of the plan to preserve a representative portion of the Hole, and reported to President Hoover, who also expressed his approval.

1930: The Special Wildlife Committee of the Senate visited Jackson Hole. A group of Jackson Hole citizens presented their proposal for the boundaries of the project, which was favorably received by the committee. Those recommended boundaries included a larger area than is contained in the Jackson Hole National Monument.

1933: The Senate Public Lands Committee investigated the Jackson Hole project. Senator Carey, of Wyoming, took a principal part in this investigation.

1934: The Senate passed the Carey bill to add the area to Grand Teton National Park and the House Public Lands Committee reported the bill favorably on the last day of that session of Congress.

1938: The Senate Public Lands Committee held a hearing on Jackson Hole project. The committee made no recommendations.

1943: Jackson Hole National Monument was established.

Gannett-Pettengill-Rumely-McClure's Millionaires' Amendment to Oppress the Poor and Benefit the Rich

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 weeks, I have made several speeches calling attention to the vicious and un-American activities of the Gannett-Pettengill political action committee—alias the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Because our liberties would be almost immediately placed in jeopardy by the passage of the proposed twenty-second amendment which is sponsored by this Fascist group, I have had printed a 16-page booklet containing my speeches to date on this subject. The booklet is entitled "Most Sinister Lobby Ever Organized." I shall be glad to furnish copies upon request to interested persons.

In those speeches, I endeavored to show the following facts:

First. This proposed twenty-second amendment is a millionaires' amendment, designed to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Second. It is sponsored by a Fascist group, headed by a convicted German agent, Edward A. Rumely; a millionaire publisher, Frank E. Gannett; a former chairman of the Republican National Finance Committee, Samuel B. Pettengill; and a Fascist instructor by the name of McClure.

Third. It is designed to impoverish the Federal Government and to make impossible the payment of the national debt, the veterans' benefits, and social security benefits to the unemployed, the aged and other dependents.

Fourth. It will wreck small business.

Fifth. It is being vigorously and openly advocated through a national publicity campaign, but when placed before the respective State legislatures is handled in an under cover manner without benefit of public hearings before the proper committees of the various State legislatures.

Sixth. It is being offered by means of a hitherto unused clause in the Federal Constitution and has already been adopted by the legislatures of 16 States. In 1 State, Pennsylvania, the resolution was vetoed by the Governor.

Seventh. When 32 States have passed such a resolution, Congress will have no recourse but to call a constitutional convention upon this proposed amendment.

Eighth. This Fascist group is now forming its own local political committees in all congressional districts and has ample finances to carry on its campaign of misrepresentation and intimidation.

Ninth. Attempts were made in 10 other States, including my own State of Texas, to pass one of these resolutions in the last session of the State legislature. Texas is also among the States where local political committees are being formed by this vicious group.

Tenth. Despite the opposition of responsible small business and labor interests, the campaign to put this amendment across is making steady progress. We can assume that the effort will continue.

The time has come for us to wake up. We must, as Mr. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, says, "Smoke out the reactionaries that are trying to put over this stupid proposal," and, as he also so excellently puts it, "In this war against world fascism battles must be won on the home front as well as on the battle front."

TEXARKANA MEETING

Recently this group, following the same procedure as in other congressional districts, went to my own congressional district at Texarkana to organize a unit of the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government. On April 19, 1944, a letter was sent out from Texarkana in which it was stated:

> A limited number of business and professional leaders whom we know to be interested in the American way of life, as we have known it heretofore, are being invited to hear an address by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, head of the National Committee for Constitutional Government, at an informal dinner meeting, Hotel Grim, in Texarkana, at 6:30 p. m., next Wednesday, April 26.
>
> Mr. Pettengill is an authority on constitutional government, and is well informed upon what is now being done through Government bureaus. He is a forceful speaker, and we are confident that you will find his message to be filled with worth-while information.
>
> At the conclusion of Mr. Pettengill's address, consideration will be given to an organized effort to promote and maintain constitutional government in these United States. Methods of financing an educational campaign will be discussed. An opportunity will be given to our guests to participate in financing this work if they should wish to do so, but no high pressure methods of raising money will be used. The primary object of the meeting will be to organize the First Congressional District of Texas as a unit of the Texas division of the Committee for Constitutional Government.
>
> For your convenience we have enclosed a postal card on which you may indicate your acceptance or nonacceptance so that the hotel may prepare for the number of guests expected.

It will be noticed that only a select group was being invited and confined principally to those who they hope have been misled by such statements that the American way of life is being jeopardized.

It will also be noticed that money was to be raised at the meeting and that the primary object of the meeting was to organize the First Congressional District of Texas as a unit of the Texas division of the Committee for Constitutional Government.

It occurs to me that the intentions of this group are very plain. They desire to destroy anyone whom they cannot control.

Mr. Pettengill's speech at that meeting was worthy of his tutor, Dr. Rumely. It was in the best German propaganda tradition. Following the precept of that other master propagandist, Herr Goebbels, Pettengill uttered several prophetic statements designed to throw fear into the hearts of his listeners. Pettengill said:

> Complete control of all important business in America, the goal sought, would make the condition in this country not much different from that now existing in Nazi Germany.

Of course, in saying that, Pettengill was not talking about the goal sought by the Committee for Constitutional Government. Or, was he inadvertently pulling back the smoke screen his type so expertly uses? Was he letting a small group see behind the scenes the road

which he and Dr. Rumely want them to follow?

Quoting from the newspaper which reported Pettengill's speech, it says:

Speaking about the possibilities of a financial crash, Pettengill recalled that, after the First World War, United States bonds went down to $83, or 17 points. After this war, he said, if Government bonds go off 10 points it would ruin every bank in the country.

That state of affairs which Mr. Pettengill spoke of in alarmist fashion is just exactly what would happen if the proposed twenty-second amendment to the Constitution should become law. I quote no less an authority than the Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury Department which has been making some study of the amendment in question and its possible effects upon the Nation and its economy. I quote from the Treasury Department analysis of this amendment, dated June 6, 1944:

The credit of the Federal Government rests on its power to levy taxes to discharge debts—and on the fact that several times in the Nation's history this power has been used to bring about a rapid reduction of the National debt. Under the proposed 25 percent limitation * * * the Federal tax powers would not permit getting revenues much at all above the level of expenditures in a year of prosperity. In fact, the limitation would have very much the effect of a constitutional prohibition on reducing the national debt. For emergencies, unless they involved active participation in war (so that the limitation would be suspended), there would be no tax powers in reserve. In such a situation as that of 1940, for example—when rearmament became necessary but we were not actively at war—it would be necessary to increase borrowings without taking steps to increase revenue.

In other words, we would have a perpetual debt if Pettengill's and Gannett's amendment were adopted.

Now let us see what would happen to the market value of Government bonds under Pettengill's amendment. The Treasury Department report has this additional comment to offer in that connection as follows:

It is well known that when municipal governments operate under tax limitations and have no further tax powers in reserve, their bonds commonly are regarded as second grade or lower, and in such cases emergencies may bring a sudden and sharp decline in their credit standing. To put hobbles on Federal taxing power would likewise weaken Federal credit and expose it to shocks. Since we have been through two great wars and a great depression without Federal credit being called in question, it is easy to forget that such a thing is possible. But there have been times in the past when Federal credit deteriorated and if we sacrificed the Federal Government's reserve of taxing power it might happen again (as in the instance of the "run" on the Treasury during the silver difficulties of the 1890's).

If Federal credit suffers, State and local credit will suffer with it. Any real shock to public faith in Federal securities would undoubtedly involve State and local securities sympathetically. Furthermore, any such shock would weaken the banks and other credit institutions and hinder them in assisting State and local governments. It must not be forgotten, either, that the support of the Federal Government was very valuable to State and local governments in the depths of the depression of the thirties and that Federal credit stood back of State and local credit in this emergency. Could a Federal Government with impaired credit have rescued mortgage debtors through H. O. L. C. and F. C. A. in 1933–34, and enabled them to pay up their back taxes? Could it have rescued the shaky bank system through R. F. C., the mortgage agencies, and F. D. I. C.? Could it have financed needed local public works through R. F. C. and P. W. A.? The confidence of investors in State and local securities rests partly on the knowledge that in a major depression emergency Federal credit would always be in reserve.

Note carefully that the Treasury report says that it is not what Mr. Pettengill and his cohorts allege to fear which will bring about a decline in War bond values and market but, on the contrary, the very plan which these people advocate which would do the very thing which they are so piously and hypocritically raising as a possible event.

WAR INTENSIFIES THEIR CAMPAIGN

You may choose to say that I am possessed of an unusual imagination and am seeing ghosts instead of real enemies of this Nation, but I say to you that it is a very strange circumstance indeed which prompted this propaganda syndicate to allow its scheme to lie relatively dormant during peacetime and to only commence its aggressive campaigning about the time that the war commenced in Europe.

No one has ever accused those who hold to the German viewpoint of not being farsighted. The planning and the preparation which went into the German scheme for the conquest of Europe in this war admittedly was bulletproof except for one thing—the failure to believe that this Nation would ever enter another European war. Hitler and his minions never thought that we would go so far. They never foresaw June 6, 1944.

When they did finally realize that this Nation meant business again in this war, they immediately brought up their Quisling reserves and issued the instructions which culminated in the greater activation of their plans to sap the power and strength of this Government at its tenderest spot, its purse strings.

POLL PARROT PETTENGILL

When Poll Parrott Pettengill tells us that his amendment will raise more, not less, funds for the Government, he is once again dealing in misinformation and is relying on making his argument effective through repetition rather than through fact. The cold facts on this point are also contained in the Treasury Department analysis, above referred to. On that point, the report says as follows:

Even with a high level of employment, income payments after the war will be less than under wartime conditions. With lower income payments all the tax bases and so the revenue will be lower. The income payments will necessarily decline as overtime work paid at time and a half ceases and the highly paid war industries are demobilized. Inflation would offset the factors making for a reduction in income payments, but inflation would also push up expenditures.

With present prices and assumed income payments of $125,000,000,000 to $130,000,000,000, the present tax system (with the excess profits tax eliminated and with automatic post-war excise tax rate reductions), the $40,000,000,000 wartime revenue figure points to post-war revenue somewhere in the neighborhood of $25,000,000,000, not including social security taxes.

On the expenditure side, many items will greatly exceed their pre-war levels. The cost of interest on the public debt, the military establishment, the veterans and other war-caused items will be enormously enlarged. When allowance is made for the inevitable increase in other expenditures of Government, it is clear that the leeway for tax reduction from wartime rates is insufficient to permit a 25-percent maximum rate on incomes and estates without serious danger of continuing deficits.

If the proposed limitation were adopted, it would mean reducing to a 25-percent level the bracket rates that now exceed 25 percent. It would mean lowering the 40-percent corporate normal and surtax, sharply reducing the estate tax, and reducing all individual income tax rates to about the present first-bracket level of 23 percent. If no other adjustments were made, such cuts would involve revenue losses in the neighborhood of $6,000,000,000 a year. This would eliminate the prospect of a budget surplus and make a deficit probable even in a prosperous year.

Of course, it can be said that this loss of revenue might be made up in other ways. Let us examine that idea a moment. On that point, the Treasury report has this to offer:

Part of the revenue loss from rate reductions brought about by the (proposed) limitation could conceivably be made up by measures designed to increase the tax base. In the corporation field, the carry-forward and carry-back of losses could be abandoned, percentage depletion could be eliminated, and deductions for contributions denied, along with pension trust and perhaps other deductions.

In the individual income field, deductions (for State and local taxes, contributions, interest, and similar items) could be disallowed; forms of income not now included as taxable (for example, interest on State and local bonds and some forms of annuities) could be included in taxable income; personal exemptions could be lowered; and the especially favorable treatment of capital gains could be abandoned.

I cannot imagine that many of us would wax enthusiastic over all these proposed substitute measures. Nor can I visualize the average businessman or consumer waxing enthusiastic over the only other available substitute measure, the commodity tax. Here is what the Treasury report has to say briefly on that last resort:

It would be possible also to make some tax increases outside the restricted field. But since the (proposed) restriction covers estates and all kinds of incomes and the Constitution already stands in the way of Federal property taxes, the only major unrestricted field is that of commodity taxes—i. e., sales taxes and excises. If one disregards considerations of equity, the repressive effects of commodity taxes on business activity and employment and competition with State taxes, substantial revenues can be raised from these sources. Under war conditions, a 5-percent Federal retail sales tax would have yielded about $3,000,000,000; under post-war conditions, with shortages of goods relieved, the figure would be somewhat higher. But in view of the necessity to avoid seriously repressive effects of commodity taxes and of the many other considerations that point toward reducing war excises below the levels provided in the Revenue Act of 1943, a net gain

of more than $1,000,000,000 or so in the commodity tax field would imply drastic use of commodity taxes. Congress might prefer instead to make adjustments involving a reduction of revenue in this field.

I confess that the precise and technical language employed by the analysts of the Treasury Department does not necessarily highlight in one or two sentences the dangers inherent in this proposed amendment. However, just because their language is precise and technical and just because it is the considered opinion of experts, made only after careful computations leading to these conclusions, for those reasons, I place a higher value upon their statements and their conclusions than I otherwise would.

DR. EDWARD A. RUMELY, A CONVICTED CRIMINAL, OFFICIAL OF COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.

I have been accused of having said some unkind and unwarranted things about this political-action committee, the Gannett-Rumely-Pettengill-McClure gang—alias the Committee for Constitutional Government. I have been accused of being a little too harsh in my criticisms of certain of the individuals who founded and who still run this highly efficient and Fascist-inspired propaganda machine.

Today I should like to place in the RECORD certain factual information taken from the official court records and the final decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, wherein the conviction of one Edward A. Rumely in the lower court was upheld and the judgment of the lower court was affirmed which sentenced this man to a year and a day in the Federal penitentiary for concealing his connections with the Imperial German Government at a time when this Nation was at war with Germany.

In summarizing the testimony the court paid attention to Dr. Rumely's splendid educational background which included study at Notre Dame University in this country, Oxford University in England, and, later, four and a half years at the German universities of Heidelberg and Freiburg. The court says:

During his sojourn in Germany he appears to have lived on terms of intimacy with some of its leading men. He has been a man of affairs. In 1915 he began negotiations for the purchase of the Evening Mail, an old and well-established newspaper in New York.

At the time he purchased the Mail there was a feeling on the part of many German-Americans that the news from Europe was put over in a one-sided way. As he (Rumely) expressed it:

"There was a great deal of resentment against biased reports that were coming and that bias I had recognized was due to the absence of a news flow from the Central Powers."

And—

the court goes on to say:

He says that he saw in that "a very great public opportunity." He thought he could get strong financial support for his proposed purchase of the Mail, as he "intended in that paper to fight the British blockade" which he regarded as unwarranted and illegal.

The court record says:

It appears that on March 18, 1915, defendant Rumely and Samuel S. McClure obtained an option to purchase the New York Evening Mail.

For this record, it should be noted that Samuel S. McClure is still associated with Dr. Rumely in his present work and is still listed as a member of the board of advisers of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

The court testimony shows that Rumely, in his defense, maintained that the funds he had used for the purchase of the Evening Mail came from two wealthy German-Americans who were residents in Germany at the time of the last war. The prosecution proved, to the obvious satisfaction of the court and the jury, that this allegation of Rumely's was untrue. One of the parties from whom Rumely said that he secured this vast sum of $1,200,000 made deposition that she, at no time, furnished to anyone any money, by subscription, loan, or otherwise, for the purchase of the New York Evening Mail, or any interest in it.

The other party from whom Rumely alleged he secured these funds for use in buying the newspaper died in Germany while we were still at war with that country. His widow, who was with him during that time, and his partners, who resided in the United States, all testified that he, Herman Siecklen, had never supplied Rumely with any funds for any purpose, either directly or indirectly.

To make the prosecution's case complete, the Government established through deposition of one Dr. Heinrich Albert, agent for the Imperial German Government in this country prior to World War No. 1, that Rumely had received his funds from Albert from funds which were the property of the Imperial German Government. Albert also testified that he paid an additional $200,000 to Rumely for an advertisement which appeared in the foreign-language press of the United States, which was entitled, "An Appeal to the American People." From the testimony of Dr. Albert which is quite lengthy, it was obvious that the entire deal through which Rumely acquired the Evening Mail was cooked up during many long conferences which Rumely and Albert had in that connection. Furthermore, it was his admitted intention and purpose in acquiring said paper to use it for the avowed purpose of propagandizing the American people and "selling" to us the cause of Germany and the Central Powers.

Now, this admitted Goebbels of a generation ago, is here with us again in the midst of this great international conflict, brazenly grinding out the insidious propaganda and pulling the strings of one of the most efficient and diabolical un-American organizations which has ever been permitted to remain in existence in this country, either in peace or in war time.

With the greedy Gannett in the background, supplying cash and introductions to other men of wealth in the country who may be enticed into supporting this foul scheme on the grounds that their own pocketbooks will grow fatter if this millionaires' amendment to the Constitution is permitted to pass; with "Poll Parrot" Pettengill preaching the little hypocritical sermons that Rumely grinds out for him and later prints in book and pamphlet form for him on the press, America's Future, Inc., located in the same building from which the committee itself operates; with the venerable-appearing Mr. McClure to front for him on other occasions when "Poll Parrot" and his other henchmen are far afield at their Quislinglike work, Rumely sits at the center of the web, playing on the weaknesses of the rich and the would-be rich and works toward the day when, through the passage of his amendment, he will have finished paving the road which can only lead to poverty, disaster, and revolution in this country.

That, gentlemen, is Dr. Edward A. Rumely, convicted criminal, German-trained, admitted German sympathizer, the great brain and master mind behind the most insidious and pro-Nazi scheme yet to be offered to the American people.

I have faith in the average American citizen and his sound and sane outlook on life which will reject any scheme offered to him personally which would make the lot of his family and his fellow workers a harder one in years to come, as would this nefarious millionaires' amendment. That average American citizen, however, is being given no voice and no choice in this particular matter. He is not being consulted.

Instead, only a few of his fellow citizens are given any voice in deciding as to the wisdom of this revolutionary and feudalistic plan. These are his duly-elected representatives in the various State legislatures of the country, men who were not selected so much for their knowledge of constitutional law and national financial problems as they were to do the bidding of their constituents at home who entrusted their local problems to them for disposition.

These legislators are approached quietly and through the medium of the wealthier citizens in their respective districts who have been convinced, in all good faith, by Dr. Rumely's minions that this proposed amendment is a stepping-stone to more freedom of enterprise and more prosperity for themselves as individuals, at least. If these local legislators could only see the dangers truly inherent in this wicked scheme and could see the pitfall they are automatically digging for themselves and their own fellow citizens, the average white-collar worker or laboring man, I know that they would never cast their votes for this Fascist plan. In the absence of information to the contrary, they do not see this future danger and they cheerfully accede to the request or the suggestion of their local rich men who have received the guidance to that end which Dr. Rumely has so cleverly provided for them.

We must wake up and put an end to this unholy crusade which has already prevailed upon two-thirds of all of the State legislatures it has yet invaded to do its will. It is not too late yet, but next year it may be too late, and then will come the hour of triumph for which Rumely and his hidden backers are pointing.

Legal language is dry. People prefer the Pollyanna language of change and like to read the attractive brochures issued by the sonorous pamphleteers and look at their pretty pictures of national heroes, patriotic shrines and other Americana they have been taught to love and respect—the kind of attractive booklets put out by this Committee for Constitutional Government, Incorporated (alias Fascism in America).

Just once, however, I commend for our reading the cold, dry language of the Circuit Court of Appeals in its final judgment in the case of Rumely et al. versus the United States. In that plain, factual story of justice wending its slow, but steady way, lies the history of one stage in the career of this evil character. It portrays one relatively small setback received by him before he had perfected the use of the Goebbels technique for wartime use in this country. In our failure to ignore its implications, we may well be preparing for a debacle to come.

Appended herewith are several excerpts taken from the official decision of the court in that case which temporarily removed from public circulation the Dr. Rumely of 25 years ago. Has he changed his beliefs? Has he joined our side? I, for one, do not believe so.

[From Federal Reporter, vol. 293]

NO. 135—RUMELY ET AL. V. UNITED STATES (CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, SECOND CIRCUIT. JULY 27, 1923.)

(Certiorari denied, 44 Sup. Ct. 38, 68 L. ed. —)

Rogers, circuit judge. The plaintiffs in error have been convicted under an indictment which charged them with having conspired to defraud the United States by obstructing and preventing the United States from seizing and administering a certain indebtedness of the defendant Rumely to the Imperial German government. It was alleged as part of the conspiracy that the defendants should conceal the fact of such indebtedness to the German Government, and should make false and misleading reports to the Alien Property Custodian of the United States, and so obstruct and prevent the transfer and payment of that indebtedness to such Custodian. The defendants were acquitted on the first three counts, but convicted on the fourth and fifth. The jury accompanied their verdict with a strong recommendation for mercy.

* * * * *

The trial began on November 3, 1920, and occupied 30 court days. During the trial 166 witnesses were examined, 670 exhibits were received in evidence, and the record fills 4 volumes, of 2,139 printed pages. There are 249 assignments of error, which occupy 116 printed pages. Of these assignments of error, 206 relate to the admission or exclusion of evidence, 24 to the charge to the jury, 7 to the denial of motions to set aside the verdict, 8 to the denial of motions to dismiss the indictment, and 3 to the denial of motions requiring the Government to elect on which counts it would go to trial. We have on several occasions condemned the practice of taking so numerous assignments of error. The practice is not conducive to the administration of justice in appellate courts. Many such assignments of error are inconsequential, and of so little importance that the court should not be asked to review them.

* * * * *

It appears that on March 18, 1915, defendant Rumely and Samuel S. McClure obtained an option to purchase the New York Evening Mail, a paper published in the city of New York.

* * * * *

The fourth count of the indictment, after reciting various matters not necessary now to refer to, and that Edward A. Rumely, at the times specified, then and there being within the United States, was indebted in the sum of $1,301,700 to an enemy of the United States, the Imperial German Government, and that the three defendants, each well knowing all the matters and things alleged, "unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, feloniously, and corruptly did conspire and agree with each other, and with divers other persons whose names are to the grand jurors unknown, to defraud the United States, by obstructing, impeding, hindering, and delaying the United States in, and preventing the United States from seizing, capturing, receiving, holding, administering, assuming the control of and title to said indebtedness of the said Edward A. Rumely in the sum of $1,301,700 as aforesaid, to the said Imperial German Government, an enemy of the United States as aforesaid."

"That it was a part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendants should conceal from the Alien Property Custodian the fact that the said Edward A. Rumely was indebted as aforesaid to said Imperial German Government; that it was part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendant, S. Walter Kaufmann, on behalf of the firm of Hays, Kaufmann & Lindheim, should make and render to said Alien Property Custodian a misleading, false, and fraudulent report and statement with respect to said indebtedness; that it was a part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendants, Norvin R. Lindheim and Edward A. Rumely, should make a misleading, false, and fraudulent report and statement to said Alien Property Custodian with respect to said indebtedness; that it was a part of said conspiracy that the defendants should withhold and conceal from the United States and from the Alien Property Custodian the true facts with respect to said indebtedness; and that it was further a part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendants should obstruct, impede, hinder, delay, and prevent the transfer, assignment, and payment of said indebtedness to the said Alien Property Custodian."

The fifth count of the indictment, after reciting various matters not necessary now to consider, and that by virtue of the Trading with the Enemy Act, passed by Congress and approved on October 6, 1917, it became and was the duty of every person in the United States who was indebted in any way to an enemy of the United States to report the fact to the official of the Government of the United States known as the Alien Property Custodian, and setting forth the time within which such report had to be filed, and after stating that at the times specified the defendant, Rumely, then and there being within the United States, was indebted in the sum of $1,451,700 to an enemy of the United States, to wit, the Imperial German Government, continued as follows:

"That on October 6, 1917, and continuously thereafter to and including December 20, 1917, the said Edward A. Rumely, S. Walter Kaufmann, and Norvin P. Lindheim, herein indicted and hereinafter called the defendants; and the said S. S. McClure Newspaper Corporation, which is not herein indicted, each well knowing all the matters and things hereinabove alleged, at the southern district of New York and within the jurisdiction of this court, unlawfully, knowingly, willfully, feloniously, and corruptly did conspire and agree with each other, and with divers other persons whose names are to the grand jurors unknown, to commit an offense against the United States; that is to say, the said persons did conspire and agree that the said Edward A. Rumely, being indebted as aforesaid to the said enemy, should fail, neglect, and omit to report to said Alien Property Custodian within the period prescribed by law as aforesaid, and the extension thereof by the President as hereinbefore set forth, the fact that he was indebted as aforesaid to said enemy."

It becomes necessary, therefore, to consider whether the omission to charge that the defendants conspired that defendant Rumely should willfully fail, neglect, and omit to report to the Alien Property Custodian made the indictments invalid.

* * * * *

4. It is objected that the fifth count is insufficient, because it failed to allege that the debt due to the enemy of the United States, and which it was necessary to report to the Alien Property Custodian, had become due. It is said that section 7 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act did not require the report as to a debt until 30 days after such debt shall become due. That portion of the act herein involved may be found in the margin. The allegation in the count is that Rumely was indebted in the sum of $1,451,700 to an enemy of the United States. And the contention is that the word "due" means "matured," and that under the statute it was not necessary that fixed obligations payable in futuro should be reported. We are not able to concur in this view. The word "due" signifies a simple indebtedness, without reference to the time of payment. This is the primary meaning of the word, and we think that it was used in this sense in the section of the act under consideration. It appears to us that Congress intended that the Alien Property Custodian should be given information as to all debts to alien enemies whether they had or had not matured. Such a construction of the act promotes efficiency in the collection of the debts owing to enemies, and the statute must be construed with reference to the object which it was intended to accomplish, and given that construction which is best calculated to advance its object. We see no sufficient reason for supposing, as the plaintiffs in error contend, that it was the intention of Congress that an indebtedness need not be reported until 30 days after its maturity.

* * * * *

It is evident "due" and "owed" have been used as equivalents.

* * * * *

The omission of comment upon all the errors assigned must not be construed as due to the failure of the court to consider them. We have examined this case carefully, the indictment, the admission and exclusion of evidence, the charge of the court, and whatever errors have been assigned. We have found no sufficient reason, in any of the errors assigned, which would justify this court in setting the judgment aside. The defendants had a fair trial under a valid indictment. The jury has found them guilty, and we cannot say that there was no evidence which could justify the verdict which has been rendered.

Judgment affirmed.

QUIETLY AND WITHOUT PUBLICITY

I should also like to insert in the RECORD the following editorials and a letter taken from the press of recent weeks. The first is a letter from a Delaware taxpayer to the editor of the Wilmington, Del., Sunday Star, of May 28. It is obvious that the first news that this taxpayer had of this vicious amendment was at the time that I first called it to the attention of the Congress a few weeks ago. You will

note that this correspondent is even now still unaware that the legislature of his own State, Delaware, has already adopted one of these resolutions and that his own Governor approved the resolution as long ago as April 22, 1943. That is how these alleged defenders of the Constitution work—quietly and without publicity.

The other two inserts are editorials from the New Republic of May 1, and the Nation of April 8. I commend them to your consideration:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Star of May 28, 1944]

BRAND NEW TAX SAVING SCHEME

EDITOR, SUNDAY STAR: The new tax bill which Congress sent to the President, said to be simplified for the taxpayer, may be an improvement over the old tax measure but we may well be suspicious of tax measures that are offered under a promise to make taxes easier.

If they take the load off in one place they are most sure to put it on in another, and we may find it harder to meet, as in the final analysis the average taxable will pay more tax. There must be something slick about this one as it slipped through Congress in almost no time at all; consequently it must surely need watching.

Now it seems there is another taxation scheme in the making, supported by a powful lobby in Congress, with oodles of money backing it. It seems to be of the Gannett and Pettengill type. It is a foregone conclusion that anything sponsored by Frank Gannett and Samuel Pettengill has nothing to appeal to the average American. This scheme is a plan to change the Constitution, so as to limit the tax that may be placed against large incomes with the limit on those upper brackets at 35 percent. What this would do to the lower income class need not be left to anyone's imagination. This scheme, as I understand it, has been aired before the Congress but the public pays little attention to what Congress does until it is sometimes too late.

Sixteen States, it is said by Congressmen PATMAN, of Texas, and SABATH, of Illinois, have passed resolutions to have Congress submit this proposed amendment to a constitutional convention. The campaign has been waged on the quiet but with considerable success as far as funds are concerned, as the very wealthy readily come across with a few thousands to speculate with some ready cash on a prospect of saving many thousands for themselves in income taxes, if this plan is successful which, as a matter of course, they expect it to be.

This time it is the Government that is being attacked through the Constitution of the United States and the people's interest is at stake, to be sacrificed for the benefit of a privileged class. It is possible that more than one powerful chain of newspapers as well as other powerful influences ready to be lined up with this sinister movement as they scheme in every possible way to fasten their treacherous tentacles on the United States Congress, and then on the lives and fortunes of the American people.

L. G.

MAY 24, 1944.

[From the New Republic of May 1, 1944]

A NEW TAX DODGE

Would you believe that during a great war a modern democracy would sanction a strong movement to end income taxes?

There is now an organization bent on this purpose called the American Taxpayers Association, supported by the Hearst press. Under its influence, 14 State legislatures have passed a resolution to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution (which grants the Congress the power to levy income taxes) and to restrict the taxing power of the Federal Government to a maximum of 25 percent not only on incomes but on gifts and inheritances as well. So has the New Jersey Senate and the proponents are hard at work in many other States.

The association in its official bulletin deplores the fact that in the view of States that have turned the plan down "practical and realistic methods" were not employed to obtain a favorable vote and believes the results would have been different "if the program had been carried on as in the past in a quiet and effective way."

Enactment of the proposed measure would mean the virtual end of the progressive taxation of incomes or estates which adjusts the burden to the capacity to bear it. A man with a net income of $5,000, paying a 25 percent tax, would have $4,000 left while a man with an income of $1,000,000, who could not be taxed at a higher rate, would have $750,000.

Still worse, the measure would prevent any substantial curb on the accumulation of great wealth passed on from generation to generation. In view of the cost of war and the size of the national debt after it, the gentlemen who are trying to dodge their obligations in this way should be made to assume public responsibility by a congressional investigation of the financing and methods of the American Taxpayers Association.

[From the Nation of April 8, 1944]

A millionaire's lobby is quietly but successfully peddling to State legislatures a constitutional amendment designed to give upper-bracket taxpayers permanent relief from bearing their due share of national taxes. Already some 15 States have adopted a resolution asking Congress to summon a convention for the purpose of repealing the sixteenth amendment, which gave the Federal Government power to levy progressive income taxes. In its place, the resolution calls for a constitutional provision limiting income and inheritance-tax rates to a maximum of 25 percent, save in a national emergency.

This resolution was introduced in the New York Assembly in February and was narrowly defeated. Now it is before the New Jersey Legislature. Among its advocates one finds the New York Daily Mirror—the limitation would be a godsend to the Hearst family—which declares: "There is no conceivable crisis in time of peace which would require taxing more than 25 percent of the people's income."

This is the choice example of the misleading propaganda being used to foster the new amendment which is concerned with limiting not the proportion of the national income taken in taxes but the amount taken from any one person's income. If the amendment were passed, a Henry Ford, who, on an income of $1,000,000 must now pay upwards of $800,000, would be charged at most $250,000. And, with the contribution of the Henry Fords limited, it would be necessary to jack up that of the John Does who would hardly be consoled by a constitutional limitation of the tax on $1,000 per year to $250.

It is not surprising to find that the Committee for Constitutional Government, headed by Frank Gannett, the millionaire publisher, is the organization trying to slip over this measure while public attention is fixed on the fighting fronts.

THE RICH WOULD GROW RICHER—NO REDUCTION POSSIBLE IN LOWER CLASS TAX BRACKET

The Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department has supplied me with an analysis of the effect that this proposed amendment would have on persons in the various income brackets.

Under the Gannett tax-limitation amendment, the 49,200,000 persons whose net annual incomes are now $5,000 or less—persons who now pay nearly 25 percent under the Individual Income Tax Act of 1944—would receive no benefits whatsoever. They would be obliged to pay at least their present tax bill, and probably more. Even if they did so, the over-all revenue from individual income-tax returns, not considering corporate returns, would be approximately $3,000,000,000 less than it is at present.

The greatest benefit, however, would accrue to the 38,000 persons whose annual net incomes are in excess of $50,000 a year, the millionaire class. This class of fortunate persons would find themselves only paying an average tax under this proposed amendment of approximately one-third of their present individual tax bill. Under present laws, these 38,000 persons will pay $2,618,000,000 this year in income taxes, whereas, if the 25-percent limitation is adopted, they will only pay $921,000,000, which would save them an average of almost $50,000.

According to the Treasury Department's experts, the 49,200,000 low-income taxpayers who now pay 54.15 percent of the present individual income levy would have to assume liability for 65.8 percent of that levy under the Gannett plan.

Mr. Gannett and his fellow millionaires, however, who are even today only held liable for 23 percent of that levy, could only be held liable for 9 percent of the total individual income levy under their plan. Small wonder that this scheme is characterized by some as the "millionaires' amendment."

What Position Will Best Promote Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Foreign Policy Will Best Promote Peace?" delivered by me over the Blue Network on June 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, this week American armies have carried through the greatest military landing operation in history. American boys are fighting bravely, bitterly, and victoriously on the beaches and on the fields of France. The prayers and the sympathy and the deep concern of our entire people go with these men thousands of miles from their homes. We are so concerned above all with their safety and with their success that little else has much significance for the moment. We all believe that this mighty

effort will bring the war to an overwhelmingly successful conclusion.

For the very reason, however, that our interest is so great and victory seems so sure, it it an appropriate time to think through clearly the reasons why for the second time in 27 years we invade the continent of Europe. It is right that we should be completely convinced of the reasons for the tremendous sacrifice we are asking our boys to make.

Obviously, the invasion is undertaken because the military authorities believe it is the best way to inflict an overwhelming defeat on Hitler and Nazi Germany. That defeat it now essential to our own future safety. As I see it, our purpose in this war is to assure the future freedom of the people of the United States and bring about a condition in which they may work out, without invasion or threats of invasion by foreign nations, the destiny of the American Republic here at home. We are not fighting to spread the Four Freedoms through the world, although we hope that national and individual freedom may be promoted by our victory. We are not fighting to establish democracy throughout the world, though we hope that a victory over Germany may show the strength of democratic government and establish nations less likely to disturb the peace of the world. We cannot undertake a crusade to spread the ideals which we approve without admitting the right of others to crusade for their ideals. A world of crusaders would be a world perpetually at war. We fight this war for the same reason we fought the Revolutionary War: "To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

To accomplish that purpose the first step is to inflict overwhelming defeat on the aggressor nations which set out to conquer the world. Nothing will discourage aggression in the future so much as the complete punishment inflicted by modern war on a defeated nation. After the present bombing campaign and the occupation of Germany it will be many years before any nation can again convince itself that it is worth while to defy the world. We invade Europe to inflict a crushing defeat on Germany because that is the best way to prevent the recurrence of German aggression. I believe, myself, that it is two-thirds of the job. Even if we should fail temporarily in our plans for a future peace organization, it will be long before anyone again would dare to challenge the United States of America.

The second step, however, is just as essential for complete success. I believe that military victory over Germany is a necessary prerequisite to any hope of setting up an association of nations with any chance of succeeding. We can only hope to assure permanent peace and liberty in this country by the formation of some kind of association of nations to maintain the peace of the world. There has been tremendous debate on this issue but there is also substantial agreement. The Republican Post-war Advisory Council at Mackinac pledged our party to "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world." The Moscow Declaration approved by Secretary Hull and the Connally resolution adopted by the votes of an overwhelming majority of Republican and Democratic Senators both "recognize the necessity of a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Governor Bricker of Ohio and Governor Dewey of New York, the two leading candidates for the Presidency, have endorsed the Mackinac resolution and have stated their belief in the general principles of such a cooperative organization; that it shall not be a world state, that it shall not be based on exclusive alliances, but that it shall be based on the sovereign equality of all states with definite commitments to check aggressors.

There is not much use in debating this question further until we can discuss the details. There is too much tendency on the part of our newspapers and commentators to belabor the issue, test every public man by his method of expressing his approval of the general idea, and so concentrating the spotlight on this one issue, that we can't see what is going on in the dark field of foreign negotiation. The danger to the accomplishment of an association of nations to preserve the peace does not come today from so-called isolationists or any unwillingness on the part of our people to go ahead. It comes from the current policy of Mr. Churchill, from the current policy of Mr. Stalin, and the failure of this country to have any definite foreign policy at all.

The most revealing picture of the minds of Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin was contained in the two articles by Forrest Davis in the Saturday Evening Post. The material was evidently obtained directly from the President According to those articles, the President's foreign policy up to this time, his "great design," is "to secure the goodwill of Russia as a sincere and willing collaborator in post-war settlements." To accomplish this purpose he concentrated on personal charm and avoided all issues which might bring about a difference of opinion. He seems prepared to sacrifice all principles of foreign policy to appease Russia. He "avoided the slightest cause of offense to the Kremlin," and avoided any statement of fundamental principles, such as Wilson insisted on in the World War. He feared to renew our offer of good offices in the Russo-Polish controversy. He promptly came to the support of the Communist, Tito, in Yugoslavia. He made an immediate and generous response to Stalin's demand for a share in the surrendered Italian fleet, or its equivalent. Its equivalent is now said to include one of our own cruisers. He urges the Finns to quit the war at once, without reference to Soviet terms. He "quipped and yarned, relieving tension" suggesting compromises between Churchill and Stalin. No agreement was reached at Teheran on the disposition of a defeated Germany "or in truth on any other major post-war issue." Yet on most of these issues Mr. Stalin stated his own policy "pushing his claims, directly and indirectly, in the vast areas of Europe which he has staked out as his sphere of influence. Stalin had a hearing on his point of view regarding Poland, and expressed his view that since the British hadn't done so well in managing the Balkans, Russia should have a whirl at it. When the three leaders got around to the Baltic States, Stalin upheld his contention as to the legality of the Soviet controlled plebiscites in Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania so the President thought there was little point in pressing his own principles that a plebiscite be held under impartial auspices, because the subject was "touchy with reference to Russia." The week before these articles appeared I stated in Cleveland that I had every hope the Russians would agree to conditions on which permanent peace might be founded, but that Mr. Roosevelt did nothing whatever at Teheran even to suggest restraint to Mr. Stalin. I did not imagine, however, that Stalin had reaffirmed so many Russian policies without serious dissent. A man like Stalin certainly assumes that silence gives consent.

From these Davis articles it is clear that our policy is based on the delightful theory that Mr. Stalin in the end will turn out to have an angelic nature and do of his own accord those things which we should have insisted upon at the beginning before supplying $4,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies.

Forrest Davis' articles do not contain any clear statement of Mr. Churchill's attitude, but from his public statements it is reasonably certain that he intends to urge at every point the interests of the British Empire. In his speech of May 24 he discussed the proposed organization of nations, and spoke of a "world-controlling council * * * comprising the greatest states which emerge victorious from this war." As an afterthought he says that there must also be a world assembly of powers whose relations to the world executive or controlling power he is in no position to define. No doubt Mr. Roosevelt also listened to this conception of a league of nations bossed by England, Russia, and America, without expressing any dissent that might produce a conflict of opinion.

Nor has there been any effort, as far as one can see, to suggest to the British a more liberal policy in the Far East to carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and make a sounder basis for peace. It is rumored that when Chiang Kai-shek raised the question of Hong Kong at the Cairo Conference, he was promptly slapped down by Mr. Churchill. Yet, to the layman, Hong Kong would appear to be a Chinese island, appropriately a part of a restored China. Apparently we are about to restore the Dutch East Indies to the Dutch without any conditions as to the freedom of any of those islands, or any arrangement for their determining for themselves their form of government. I believe a successful league of nations can probably be based on the former status of India and the Indies, if there is some assurance of gradual independence or autonomy, but I cannot see that we are doing anything to urge even that policy upon our allies.

I do not wish to judge finally any of the problems I have discussed, but I do want to suggest that they are far more important and far more difficult than the theoretical discussion of the terms of a covenant of an association of nations; and their solution along present lines would make the association a mere shell.

The policies which thus seem to be gaining in strength would destroy the idea expressed in the Connally resolution of a "general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States." While Mr. Hull discusses with the senatorial committee the terms of a league of nations, the President abandons the principles upon which alone we can hope to attain permanent peace.

For there are three essentials, as I see it, for the setting up of such an organization, and all three are threatened by our present policy

1. There is not much use in talking about an organization based on the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, unless we can be sure at the beginning that boundaries are drawn so that each people is in fact equality sovereign and independent. We can't expect success in protecting the freedom of independent nations unless we are certain that that freedom exists from the start to be protected. The failure of the Treaty of Versailles resulted largely from the unwise terms relating to boundaries.

The Atlantic Charter definitely recognizes the essential nature of national freedom as a basis of hopes for a better future for the world. It says "First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; second, they desire to seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored

to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

It is hard for many to see how the conditions of the Atlantic Charter are met unless we start with the freedom, for instance, of Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Of course, this is not a time to determine exact boundaries, but up to this time we have not established the principle of the freedom and sovereignty of these states. England went to war to protect Poland against Germany. Certainly the war becomes a grim farce if we are unable to protect the essential integrity of Poland against Russia.

Our attitude toward Finland is strangely inconsistent with our general professions for national freedom. We are apparently insisting that Finland accept a peace with Russia based on the transfer to Russia of large sections of completely Finnish territory, with the implied threat that if they do not do so, they will get much worse treatment.

An association of nations to be successful must eliminate political sore spots throughout the world, and not create a new rash even more numerous than those created by the Treaty of Versailles. The policy pursued at Tehran not only scuttles the Atlantic Charter but I believe that it may prevent one of the essential conditions to make an association of nations an instrument to secure permanent peace.

2. There are other questions whose sound solution is just as important for ultimate peace. Economic sore spots are as likely to bring about war as are political sore spots. There is general agreement on the principle that every nation shall have access on equal terms to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity. It is furthermore necessary that in some way countries requiring raw materials have markets for their own goods by whose sale they may pay fo these materials. Freedom from want for nations is a desirable and perhaps attainable goal, even though it is not attainable for individuals throughout the entire world. Here, again, we must base the whole plan on freedom and equality of treatment for every nation.

This whole problem is very complicated and difficult to work out, but, as far as I know, no steps have been taken in that direction at all. As usual with the New Deal, there is in substance only one solution suggested up to this time. That is that American money and American charity shall solve every problem. The proposed international stabilization fund and the proposed international bank are based on that fallacy.

At the recent session in London of the commonwealths of the British Empire, Mr. Churchill's policy of Empire preference has been made very clear. We cannot object to most features of that policy, but a peaceful world will depend on equal access to raw materials, and our Government should be making every effort to establish that principle. We should also be willing to sit down in a conference to determine what kind of modification of tariffs through reciprocity treaties should be negotiated in order to give the poorer nations a better market to which to export the specific goods on which their life depends. The Federation of British Industries has proposed a whole series of quotas, preferential tariffs, import and export controls. Surely there should be in progress today an international trade conference, designed not to increase our trade or British trade but to remove economic discrimination which might threaten to prevent the success of any organization for peace.

The real difficulty in Washington is the philosophy of spending which dominates our Government. The only policy we can see clearly is one of loaning money, directly and indirectly, and indiscriminately to any foreign nation that desires it in a fervor of international love, and with the idea that it will create a tremendous demand for our exportable goods. Of course, this policy amount to giving away the products of our farms and our labor, for the loans will never be repaid. It means inflation and more debt. It is a grand form of international W. P. A. hidden behind the jargon of reciprocal exchange and international cooperation. The sad thing about it is that charity is even more demoralizing to nations that receive it than it is to individuals who receive it. It discourages the aided nation from measures which are absolutely essential if ultimately it is to stand on its own feet. In the end, instead of creating gratitude to the United States, it brings abuse and hard feeling for Uncle Shylock. Of course, it is vitally important to develop foreign trade, but it is of no value unless based on the sound foundation of reciprocal exchange and advantage.

3. The greatest danger to an organization for permanent peace seems to me to lie in the new idea that England and Russia and the United States shall rule the world. I have quoted Mr. Churchill's reference to a world-controlling council. It is this idea which seems to have made tremendous headway in Tehran. The plan recently announced for the occupation of Germany by England, Russia, and the United States in three separate zones, sounds much more permanent than a military occupation. Mr. Churchill has suggested that Europe's problems be solved entirely by England and Russia, and a 20-year alliance has been made looking in that direction. The idea is current in Washington among well-informed circles that Europe is to be divided into spheres of influence, Russian to the east and British to the west. Certainly, the attitude of both England and Russia looks more in that direction today than it does toward any bona fide league of equal and sovereign nations. Both England and Russia would like to have the United States in a triparty alliance. Churchill on May 24 spoke of a "fraternal association of the British Commonwealth and the United States" and made it sound a good deal more like an alliance than any vague ideal of "hands across the sea." He spoke of these American and Russian alliances as being within the framework of an association of nations.

My own view is that such an alliance policy absolutely destroys the hope for a real or a successful association of nations. The idea of such an alliance is to make it so strong that no one can challenge it successfully. It becomes, therefore, the old balance of power policy. That policy was not a successful insurer of peace.

The very existence of an alliance inevitably creates another alliance. It would cut us from our Latin-American good neighbors. Certainly England and Russia and the United States will have the most powerful military forces in the world for many years to come. Their support of a league as individual members is essential to its success; but the moment they make an alliance they subordinate the league to their interests, and relegate it to a secondary position. They substitute an ideal of force for a rule of law. In effect, a world dominated by a three- or four-power alliance is not a free world. We cannot maintain our freedom permanently by destroying the freedom of others. We must guard against the tendency to continue the arbitrary power of the three great nations which is necessarily acquired during wartime. There is some indication that even now we are inclined to use this power arbitrarily and selfishly. I believe that we are engaged in bullying the neutrals to an extent which we would bitterly resent if we were neutrals, and the same methods were used on us. In refusing to take any measures toward the relief of starving children in the occupied countries, we have shown little indication of our ability to use power unselfishly. History shows that power once acquired is reluctantly relinquished.

The strange thing about this development is that it is at complete variance with the views of Secretary Hull. He made it clear in his speech of April 9 that no conclusions of the large nations would be accomplished without the participation of the other United Nations. He has repeatedly used language which excludes the idea of alliances. Thus, in the strange manner of the present administration, we have two conflicting policies carried on by different departments of the same Government. Surely the people are entitled to know what our real foreign policy is.

Beside the President's acquiescence in the Stalin-Churchill intentions, the New Deal philosophy which animates so many Government officials today looks with great favor on the idea of regulating the affairs of the world and of other nations, just as it favors the regulation of the farms and the homes and the businesses of the American people. The world is too dumb to understand, and a small group of brain trusters must manage its affairs. We have seen little glimpses of this tendency in the Arabian pipe line and various plans for somewhat distant military bases. The twentieth century, they say, is the American century and it is our manifest destiny to rule the world.

I do not believe the American people will ever stand for such a policy. They want this war won, and they want the boys home again just as soon as they can get home. They don't want to run the world, and the boys don't want to run the world. They see no reason for occupying Germany after every military weapon has been destroyed. If any policing job is to be done in the future, it should be done by a volunteer force recruited for that purpose.

Incidentally, I don't see any basis for universal military service. The very purpose of this war, and of the peace to be made hereafter, is to prevent a condition in which America shall become an armed camp and be diverted from the progress, the liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for which this war is being fought on six continents. I see no reason why all the men required to carry out our defense and our share in enforcing peace should not be recruited on a voluntary basis if adequate pay and advantages are given. I believe it is important that the President make it perfectly clear that when this war ends it really does end and that we give up any idea of ruling the world or telling other countries how to manage their own affairs. We do not propose to make the United States part of any world state and have our laws made for us by others. Nor do we intend to make their laws for them. Our plan is founded on the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states. We believe that a successful peace can only be based on that foundation. If England and Russia are to divide Europe between them, I see no choice for us except to let those two countries attempt by force to insure the peace of Europe, while we confine ourselves to associations of sovereign nations in North and South America and the Far East banded together to insure peace.

Many efforts have been made in the past to insure permanent peace in the world. There is no lack of desire or determination to bring that about. The day for propaganda and pious declarations in favor of international cooperation is over. What we need now is:

1. Definite steps to persuade England and Russia to join in making a political settlement which will give freedom to those peoples who are capable of self government and desire freedom.

2. A definite plan for world trade which will eliminate economic injustice.

3. A determined stand against those who propose that the United States, with or without allies, shall dominate the world under

perpetual New Deal dictatorship with steamlined W. P. A., and deficit spending.

The time has come when the American people should insist on these principles. There isn't much hope for permanent peace as long as the administration rejects them. Apparently the President's method of preventing a third world war is to satisfy, at all costs, the demands and self-interest of the large and powerful nations. If that is the foreign policy of the United States, there will be no permanent peace. Neither will there be, in the meantime, any freedom in the world.

The Growth of Administrative Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith calling to the attention of the Congress and the country a discussion which should be read by every thoughtful American.

This article appears in the July issue of the Women Lawyers Journal. Its author, Adele I. Springer, is a member of the New York Bar and is chairman of the Committee on Administrative Law of the National Association of Women Lawyers.

In the final paragraph of this article is found the following words which I hope will stimulate careful study of the entire article by citizens interested in preserving our Republic and its formula of self-government which has served us so well for so long:

The very survival of our institutions, including political democracy and private enterprise, depends, in the post-war period, upon our regulation of the Federal administrative agencies, a restoration of the checks and balances of the Constitution, and the preservation of a rule by law instead of a rule of men.

The article follows:

THE GROWTH OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

(By Adele I. Springer, member of New York bar; chairman, committee on administrative law, National Association of Women Lawyers)

When the American Bar Association first proposed legislation to regulate the procedure before administrative agencies of the Government,[1] an article in support at that time [2] quoted a decision of the court of appeals at Breslau, Germany, as follows,[3] with an admonition against it happening here:

"The courts have no right to decide on the political acts of the administration. Today's constitution is governed by the principle of political leadership."

Those significant words are here repeated in the light of a parallel statement made recently by the Attorney General of the United States [4] that:

"In time of war no court should attempt to substitute its judgment for that of the Executive."

A reminder is therefore timely that a similar declaration by an autocratic state was made, not only as aforesaid but also as follows by the Reich Commissioner for Justice in his statement on the extinction of the principle of separation of powers:[5]

"There is today only a single power in Germany. That is the power of the leader."

To accept such definition of wartime law, as proposed by our own Attorney General, would be tantamount to adopting the principle declared by the Reich law leader, Dr. Hans Frank, when he laid down as the new commandment for lawyers and judges, in 1936, the following test: [6]

"The party program is a guiding line for decision. Say to yourself at every decision which you make, 'How would the leader decide in my place?' Then you will have a firm, iron foundation."

Has it begun to happen here?

The aforementioned remark of our Attorney General has stirred the public mind as never before to a realization of the dangers inherent in the growth of bureaucracy and notably intensified the public demand for administrative reform.

The limitation of Executive powers was strongly urged at the Constitutional Convention in 1787 by Gouverneur Morris, a delegate, with the following warning:

"The mind of man is fond of power; increase his prospects and you enlarge his desires."

Other great charters, Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights, had placed limits upon the power of kings.

The exercise of increased powers by the Executive in recent years, as administered by the numerous boards, departments, authorities, and commissions, gives rise to a reminder that the framers of our Constitution believed liberty depended upon the separation of powers. The declaration by James Madison, father of the Constitution, bears reiteration:

"You must first enable the government to control the governed, and in the next place oblige it to control itself."

Today the governed are conscious of Government control in the daily administration of their personal and business affairs, exercised by Federal agencies to an unprecedented extent never visualized by the framers of the Constitution. The administrative process, in its direct impact, now reaches far more people more intimately and more vitally, than do the judicial and legislative branches of our Government. As such regulation expands into wider fields of economic activity, public interest in administrative operation multiplies. Not many decades ago the average citizen scarcely was aware of the functioning of our Federal Government. We are now a long way from Jefferson's doctrine, "That government is best which governs least."

The development of modern administrative regulation can be traced through the evolution of the past century. The past decade witnessed its more rapid growth, as the result of economic reforms occasioned by the depression. Many economic and social concepts may change, however. The granting of such all-inclusive power to the executive branch of the Government established a precedent which, it must be recognized, may eventually be used for reactionary as for liberal purposes. The Supreme Court of the United States had occasion to remind an agency,[7] that:

"The philosophy that constitutional limitations and legal restraints upon official action may be brushed aside upon the plea that good, perchance, may follow, finds no countenance in the American system of government."

The great issue, therefore, is the danger of this new absolutism of administrative expediency as against the historic experience which lies behind the tripartite division of power, fundamental in American constitutional law, and which has served as the bulwark of our liberties.

The question and answer are found in Jefferson's admonition:

"What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all powers into one body."

The situation thus calls for a restoration of balance.

The number and variety of administrative agencies now in existence and their different procedures, can best be realized by a review of their development.

For a period of 143 years from 1789 to 1932, such Government agencies totaled about 15, excluding the emergency agencies of the First World War. For the 7 years from 1932 to 1939, at least 51 new Government agencies emerged. The years from 1939 to the present time witnessed the addition of many more agencies, necessitated by the period of war emergency.

The first major regulatory agency of the Federal Government was the Interstate Commerce Commission, created in the year 1887. Then followed the Food and Drug Administration in 1906, Postal Savings System in 1910, Federal Reserve System in 1913, Federal Trade Commission in 1914, National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics in 1915, United States Tariff Commission in 1916, also the Shipping Board in 1916, predecessor of the present Maritime Commission, Federal Power Commission in 1920, Federal Intermediate Credit Bank in 1923, War Finance Corporation in 1924, also in 1924 the Inland Waterways Corporation and the Board of Tax Appeals, and in 1926 the Railroad Adjustment Board and the Federal Radio Commission.

During the ensuing period, from 1932 to 1939, there was, first, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932. The following year, 1933, witnessed the addition of fourteen: the Farm Credit Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Public Works Administration, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Export-mport Bank of Washington, Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Executive Committee on Commercial Policy, National Emergency Council, and Central Bank for Cooperatives. In 1934 an equal number of 14 were added: Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commission on Trade Agreements, Foreign Trade Zones Board, Federal Communications Commission, National Mediation Board, the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Federal Housing Administration, Federal Committee on Apprentice Training, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, National Power and Policy Committee, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Federal Savings and Loan System and Railroad Adjustment Board. In 1935 an almost similar number, 13, were created RFC Mortgage Company, Resettlement Administration, Works Progress Administration, National Resources Committee, National Youth Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, National Park Trust Fund Board, National Labor Relations Board, Social Security Board, Electric Home and Farm Authority, Prison Industries Reorganization Administration, Federal Alcohol Administration, and National Munitions Control Board.

[1] Logan-Walter bill, 76th Cong., 1st sess., S. 915, H. R. 6324.

[2] Adele I. Springer, The American Bar's Administrative Law Bill, Women Lawyers Journal, November 1939, pp. 4–9, 37–41.

[3] The New Germany, Fritz Ermarth (Washington 1936), p. 54.

[4] Attorney General Biddle, New York Times, May 4, 1944, re Montgomery Ward case.

[5] Id., note (3), supra.

[6] Political Science Quarterly, December 1937, Charles H. Wilson, The Separation of Powers Under Democracy and Fascism.

[7] *Jones* v. *S. E. C.*, 298 U. S. 1 (1936), p. 27.

In 1936 the United States Maritime Commission was established. In 1937 there were 2 added: Disaster Loan Corporation and Railroad Retirement Board. In 1938, 6 more were created: Civil Aeronautics Authority, Maritime Labor Board, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Federal National Mortgage Association, United States Film Service, and the Radio Division of the National Emergency Council.

All the foregoing regulatory agencies emerged before the critical state of international affairs introduced the defense program and war agencies, such as the subsequently established War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, and the many other agencies directing wartime production, allocating scarce resources, or regulating prices. These latter, being of a temporary nature, are segregated, in a consideration of this subject, from the previously entrenched agencies of permanent form. The extensiveness of control by the war agencies necessarily surpasses the pre-war controls. These war agencies have enveloped almost all business affairs in a net of complex administrative regulation. Such wartime control has left virtually no aspect of economic affairs unaffected. Many of these new controls may be retained in the post-war period, however. The widespread character of Government regulation, therefore, constitutes the public's greatest problem.

Today, such regulation is accepted as inevitable. The current public attack upon bureaucracy is not upon its necessity or feasibility but upon its procedural aspects.

The procedure followed by these various agencies differs widely. It ranges from an adjudication by the single head of an executive department, who may act with or without a hearing in his discretion, to formal hearings on notice before a commission or board, with or without a preliminary investigation. Ordinarily, the courts may review any final administrative action in some prescribed way, and may not review the facts if the agency has offered "substantial" evidence to support its findings. Some agencies are not subject to any judicial review whatever. Of the 49 regulatory agencies appraised by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure in 1940, 33 operated within the framework of a department or agency, their activities differing from those of independent commissions.

A simple illustration of unnecessary chaotic Federal administrative procedure is the matter of admissions to practice before the various agencies. A committee of the District of Columbia Bar Association reported in 1938 that about 30 administrative agencies each regulated for itself admissions to practice and the disciplining of attorneys appearing before it.

No less a consideration is the cost to taxpayers of maintaining the administrative hierarchy with millions on the Federal pay roll whose wages total more than $5,000,000,000 a year. The cost of bureaucracy cannot be measured by Government pay rolls and taxes alone, but embraces also a stupendous invisible tax. The cost to business is enormous in the value of the time of executives and hire of clerical and professional help to fill out the numerous Federal forms annually returned to many different Federal agencies.

A review of the operation of such administrative agencies discloses generally an increasing assumption of unlimited powers and of unhampered discretion, a continued tendency to impose and enforce their own policies irrespective of the legislation creating the agency, with a frequent disregard of the citizen's rights, without adequate notice or full hearing, and little opportunity to meet the charges.

Although from earliest times our common law has denounced the performance of a multiple role in a case as judge, jury, investigator, prosecutor, and executioner, we find the same administrative tribunal not only making the complaint, investigating its own complaint, conducting a hearing by its own prosecutors before its own trial examiner or its own hearing commissioner, and rendering its own adjudication of the case and its enforcement measures. Such proceeding would not be tolerated in a court of law, yet, such variance from the constitutional guaranties of due process have become an established part of our administrative process. A high-ranking representative of the executive branch of our Government has even gone on record that, "We have overemphasized what might be called political or Bill of Rights democracy."[8] This, notwithstanding Jefferson's specific incorporation of a Bill of Rights into the Constitution. The warning of Woodrow Wilson may well be heeded, that—

"The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

The great need for administrative reform in recent years was recognized by Congress when it passed by a large majority vote the Logan-Walter Administrative Law bill,[9] sponsored by the American Bar Association and supported by the National Association of Women Lawyers, among others, and endorsed by various business, labor, farm, and civic organizations and by numerous State, city, and local bar associations, but which was vetoed by President Roosevelt. The Logan-Walter bill, drafted by the then Special Committee on Administrative Law of the American Bar Association under the chairmanship of Col. O. R. McGuire, represented an attempt to standardize procedures and to augment the opportunities to litigate against governmental action.[10] As described by the Senate Judiciary Committee,[11] it provided "means and methods whereby the Governors may be governed and the regulators regulated." Although vetoed, it blazed the trail for such future legislation. It also gave rise to the appointment by the President of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, which, after intensive study for 2 years, reported that further study of existing practices was essential for the welfare of both the Government and the public.[12] The Attorney General, after admitting many of the evils, concluded: "The house of administrative justice must be set in order now, not when the problems have run beyond us."[13]

During the last few years State legislative bodies, as well as national, have displayed an active interest in the procedures of regulatory agencies. Laws regulating practice before commissions have been passed or proposed in several States. In New York the Association of the Bar of the City of New York recently adopted unanimously a resolution recommended by its special committee on administrative law, calling for the establishment in the executive department of a division of administrative procedure, as an aid in the continuous improvement of the administrative process in this State. Such recommendation has also received the formal approval of the New York State Bar Association.

The problem now confronting us is the extent and form of simplifications and procedural improvements in the Federal administrative process.

Among the many recommendations made in recent years is the proposal for an office of Federal administrative procedure, patterned after the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, as headquarters for the correlation of the procedural experience of all the administrative agencies. The Attorney General's committee was impressed with the need for a clearing house of information concerning administrative procedure, to accomplish greater uniformity.

In the interim, a new bill to prescribe fair standards of administrative procedure has been drafted by the present special committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association[14] and unanimously approved by the house of delegates at its mid-year meeting. The basic purpose is the same, to crystallize administrative regulation.

There is not space here to enter into a discussion of the particular provisions of this new proposal for legislation. Generally, it provides for the right to a full hearing to all parties before any determination is made; that hearings and decisions be conducted in such manner as to preclude any secret reception of evidence or argument; that nothing to be used against a party's interest be withheld from his inspection and that an opportunity be given him to answer charges and that nothing to be used in arriving at the determination be withheld from the record for review; that specific findings of fact and a record showing the evidence upon which the findings are based be required; and that the foregoing be fostered by requiring an intra-agency segregation of deciding and prosecuting functions and functionaries. All war agencies are excluded. A number of these reforms were in substance recommended also in the reports by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure. The proposed legislation, however, restates but does not expand the right of and procedures for judicial review. It is hoped that measures be taken to broaden the scope of judicial review.

The full text of the revised bill is set forth in the American Bar Association Journal, issue of April 1944. It is urged that all lawyers give it proper study and cooperate in the enactment of remedial legislation.

The very survival of our institutions, including political democracy and private enterprise, depends, in the post-war period, upon our restoration of the checks and balances of the Constitution, and the preservation of a rule by law instead of a rule of men.

[8] Vice President WALLACE, address before the Congress of American Soviet Friendship, New York, Nov. 9, 1942.

[9] Id., note (2), supra.

[10] See Colonel McGuire's outstanding book on the subject, Americans on Guard.

[11] Senate Rept. No. 442.

[12] Report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, Washington, 1941

[13] Biddle, Administrative Procedure Legislation, American Bar Association Journal, XXVII (1941), p. 664.

[14] Chairman, Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., Members: Roscoe Pound, Julius C. Smith, Ralph M. Hoyt, Carl McFarland, William Clarke Mason, Felix T. Smith, Richard Joyce Smith.

Tonnage Output Under Maritime Commission Shipbuilding Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter from Admiral Vickery, of the Maritime

Commission, showing tonnage output under the Maritime Commission's program through May 31, 1944:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1944.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it may be of interest to you, I am enclosing a tabulation showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through May 31, 1944.

During May American merchant shipyards completed 155 vessels, totaling 1,537,915 tons deadweight. As of the end of the month, deliveries aggregated 719 ships of 7,247,557 tons since January 1, and 3,370 ships of 34,668,090 tons since Pearl Harbor. New tonnage completed since the United States' entry into the war now is more than triple that of the entire pre-war American Merchant Marine.

In view of the manpower shortage, coupled with the fact that a larger portion of the 1944 tonnage is comprised of fast ships with more complex machinery, it has been anticipated for some time that monthly shipyard output would level-off below the peaks attained last year, and this has been borne out by the April and May deliveries. Nevertheless, the tonnage completed since the beginning of the year is still greater than deliveries during the first 5 months of 1943.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
January	----------	30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691
May	34,240	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	----------
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	----------
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	----------
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	----------
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	----------
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	----------
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	----------
Total dead-weight tonnage	341,219	637,800	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	----------
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	----------

Floods in the Missouri River as a Threat to Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Threat to Irrigation" published in the Nebraska Farmer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THREAT TO IRRIGATION

Another spring of serious floods in the Missouri River Valley and its tributaries—the second in as many years—has emphasized again the importance of a Federal flood control program for the river basin to impound the surplus waters in the upper regions and make them available for irrigation where needed. The much-talked-of Pick plan for Missouri River development seeks to do this, giving first consideration to flood control and irrigation; Missouri River navigation below Sioux City would be of secondary importance. This project has been estimated to cost as high as $1,000,000,000 and would require several years to construct after the close of the war.

Since the details of the Pick plan became known, there has sprung up among Lower Valley groups a determined effort to place navigation ahead of irrigation by specifying that sufficient water must be released from storage reservoirs to provide a 9-foot channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the river. Such a provision is contained in House roll 3961, the rivers and harbors bill.

The Upper Valley people are dead against any plan to make irrigation secondary, claiming that moisture limitation in the Upper Great Plains will always make irrigation paramount to any other objective. There is not enough water for irrigation and a 9-foot channel, they say. States in which water originates should determine the use of that water, they point out, so long as the Lower Valley areas are adequately protected by flood control. But they are unalterably opposed to sending needed irrigation water down the stream to sail a battleship.

The clash between irrigation and navigation groups has been carried by their respective Congressmen to the floors of Congress in the numerous and heated debates and hearings on the Pick plan and the rivers and harbors bill. In the meantime the National Reclamation Service has espoused the claims for irrigation of the upper-valley people, while Army engineers and on-river interests of the lower valley are definitely on record for navigation and a 9-foot channel.

Nebraska Congressmen for the most part have alined themselves on the side of the irrigation-first group since several Nebraska streams and some contemplated irrigation projects within the State are involved and would benefit from irrigation. Senator BUTLER, who operates farms in the Great Plains area of southwest Nebraska along the Republican River and therefore knows the needs of both irrigation and flood control from actual experience, and who is a high-ranking member of the Senate Irrigation Committee, has backed the Pick plan to give flood control and irrigation first consideration, on the grounds that there may not be enough water for both. A 9-foot channel would mean releasing water from storage reservoirs even at the expense of irrigation. Congressman CURTIS, also a member of the Flood Control and Irrigation Committee in the House, has taken a similar stand, as has Congressman MILLER.

In the light of Nebraska's serious need for more irrigation to stabilize and increase agricultural production and to protect the State's valuable livestock resources, Senator BUTLER and Congressmen CURTIS and MILLER are right in their contention that flood control and irrigation should come first in the development program for the Missouri River and its tributaries. Expanded irrigation facilities will add more wealth and income from increased crop and livestock production than will come from any prospective navigation development on the Missouri River. Farming opportunities for returned soldiers, more factories to process agricultural products, greater industrial employment, would all result from the maximum use of our water resources for irrigation. We must first produce the products before there is need of any kind of transportation.

There is another phase of river navigation that deserves serious consideration. For nearly 25 years the Nation has been spending millions of dollars in deepening the Missouri River channel below Sioux City. A 6-foot channel for navigation has been the goal of the Army engineers in charge of the project. They have sought to obtain this by a series of bank revetments to narrow and deepen the channel. Although we have such a channel now, the residents of Missouri Valley from Sioux City south have not been thrilled by the resonant whistle of steamboats coming around the bend or by the chug-chug of gasoline-driven boats. There has been some barge traffic, it is true, as far as Omaha, but so far of minor importance.

Some critics of this project contend that the narrowing of the channel has been responsible for the serious floods of 1943 and 1944, because it has reduced the water-carrying capacity of the stream.

Would a 9-foot channel mean extensive and profitable Missouri River navigation? It could be, but the odds are against it. The trend of transportation in the future will be toward faster service by rail, by air, by truck, and by water. There may be some exceptions such as heavy bulky products like coal, ore, and some grains. However, the increased use of electric power in the Midwest is likely to reduce this section's needs for coal; oil and gasoline are already being transported in considerable quantities through pipe lines. We don't have the ore to ship, and increased local uses of grain for feed, for alcohol manufacture, and food processing will curtail their shipment to outside points.

In any event, the claim that lower freight rates by water would add to the value of agricultural products in an amount equal to the total production times the saving is faulty. These products could not all move by water, and if the railroads were forced to meet such competitive rates, it would cause rate disturbances elsewhere that would offset any savings. For example, farm and livestock interests have been seeking for some time a needed reduction in dressed meat freight rates from Nebraska to the Pacific coast, in order that our livestock producers could share in the Pacific-coast market and more labor would be employed within the State in processing this meat. Difficulty in obtaining this and similar readjustments in freight rate would increase with the railroads facing greater competition from inland waterways.

Finally, the railroads of the Nation are facing a critical situation in the post-war competition of air and highway transportation. Their problem won't be made easier by further inland waterway developments that may take away more of their freight tonnage. They can and should lower rates if assured enough tonnage to make it profitable, but they can't lose tonnage, lower their rates, and survive.

The Nation needs a healthy railroad transportation system and therefore Congress should ponder seriously whether we can have

it by subsidized water transportation to compete with rails.

At least let's make sure that flood control and irrigation receive first consideration in the Missouri River program. If it develops that there is enough water for both irrigation and deeper channel, it will then be in good time to consider the latter.

Unity at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

UNITY AT HOME

In a moral sense, D-day found most of us at home shamefully unprepared. Perhaps the slackness was inevitable. We have been at war for 2½ years—a long, long time for human nature to sustain selflessness and exaltation. The unity welded by Pearl Harbor has been wrenched and weakened. The sense of national devotion has been thinned. We have lapsed, if not back into a business-as-usual point of view, then into something which might be termed a war-as-usual attitude. All the customary strain and struggling for personal, sectional, group advantage were in progress when the great ordeal of our time suddenly came upon us. We had adjusted to war as a more or less normal condition of existence. Now a new adjustment is demanded of us—an adjustment to the greatest and most terrible challenge of our history.

In the fact of this challenge our domestic discords, however grandiloquently we may have related them to matters of principle, seem trivial and inglorious. Men who were out on strike when D-day came, whether they were wage earners or wage payers, cannot have escaped a desperate sense of shame. A Sewell Avery striking against the Government of the United States by means of litigation, no less than a coal miner or a factory worker holding up production, is wholly out of harmony with what is going forward now upon the coast of France. So, too, of course, is the politician who seeks partisan advantage at a time when the sole test of any proposition must be its serviceability for the great undertaking in which we are engaged.

We are a people who live by competition. The basis of our political system is open rivalry and contest between groups of men espousing different courses. Our freedom is rooted in the opportunity available to all of us to join with our like-minded fellows in voluntary associations and press for the advancement of our common interests. This is, moreover, an election year, and we neither can nor should set aside the orderly processes by which we determine the character of our own Government. Our major political parties are soon to hold their national conventions. The will extol or condemn the present administration and seek the suffrage of the public on such bases as they see fit. This is our way of life and we cannot abandon it.

It is a way of life, however, which must be tempered to the times. And the times call for the sharpest possible focusing of our loyalties. They impose upon each of us, individually, an immense moral responsibility to forego self-seeking, to match, insofar as it is possible for any who are secure and comfortable at home, the devotion of those Americans who have been selected to storm the fortress of Europe. We shall not escape this responsibility either by glib rationalization of our own desires or by eloquent professions of patriotism. There is a noise of wrangling on Capitol Hill which has a discordant, ugly sound today. There is a jostling among us for preference which is incongruous in comparison with the unity among those safeguarding us overseas. Like them, we need to remember now how much unites us, and again to draw together.

We have paid the men who landed on the coast of France the tribute of a minute's silent prayer. Let us hearten them, and ourselves as well, with a somewhat longer silence—a silence which will encompass all those issues, conflicts, and dissensions which are not directly germane to the great business now at hand. There is a world dying and a new world being born. Let us attend the pangs of death and rebirth with reverence.

Kimmel and Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 8, 1944:

KIMMEL AND SHORT

It has hitherto been our view that the blame for Pearl Harbor belongs to our system of divided command. Granted the system, as Gen. Billy Mitchell declared a generation ago, there was bound to be a Kimmel and Short at Hawaii when the crisis happened. But only in a classroom can you crucify a system. Mudslingers and political campaigners are not interested at all in such an exercise. They believe in men, not measures. In a campaign year they believe in the crucifixion of men, not in the formulation of measures. These are the "reformers" who have succeeded in prevailing upon the House to vote a resolution directing the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to bring Admiral Kimmel and General Short to trial immediately. The court martial which hangs over these officers had been postponed till after the war. If the sponsors of the vote weren't interested in making a circus out of the trial, they would have directed the two Secretaries to drop the trial altogether. For there was something anachronistic in the decision when it was made. What Pearl Harbor displayed in sunken ships and blazing material and lost lives and damaged national prestige was the epitaph of a system. Congress has it in its power to get rid of the system and so to expiate Pearl Harbor.

But, assuming that the court-martial order will remain, there are three reasons, as we see it, why the trial should be postponed. First, at a time when all the national energies should be consecrated to the prosecution of the war, this Nation cannot afford to divert time and industry to this court martial. Secondly, the jurors and witnesses cannot be spared from active duty. For instance, since Kimmel is a rear admiral, there would have to be no fewer than 13 rear admirals detached from their posts in order that Kimmel might be tried by a "jury of his peers." These admirals, not to mention some of the witnesses, are now holding positions of vast responsibility, with the lives of many thousands of men committed to their charge. Thirdly, the sponsorship of immediate court martial, as is plain from the House debate, and as we have already intimated, is only secondarily due to a concern that justice shall be meted out to Admiral Kimmel and General Short. It is the Republicans who are calling for the trial. In present circumstances they are hell-bent upon making a political circus out of the court martial. With the elections close at hand, the object is evidently to pin the responsibility for Pearl Harbor upon the administration, and thus to try to prevent the return to office either of Mr. Roosevelt or his nominee.

We come to these conclusions reluctantly. Constitutionally every American is entitled to a speedy trial when charges have been preferred against him. Admiral Kimmel and General Short are Americans. For 2½ years they have been living under a cloud of undetermined charges, and they and their families have every reason to feel victimized. Moreover, a court martial would do a great service in clearing the atmosphere of rumor and whispered charge, it would expose the truth in a matter on which the truth must one day be told, it would pave the way for reforms which tradition and vested interest are in cahoots to frustrate. Yet, in spite of these weighty arguments for a court-martial now, the scale tips over very heavily in favor of postponement till after the war. That there is no legal impediment to postponement is indicated by the waiver of the statute of limitations which has been signed by the affected officers.

There is no desire on our part to exculpate the political higher-ups for the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. No doubt some of the dirt which has been flying around since December 7, 1941, will find lodgment on them when the principals are haled to court. However, there is no question that the ultimate responsibility for the miscalled day of infamy will be attached to the system of divided command which governs our national defense. That must be wound up. Even in wartime we have made only slight improvements upon it, such as a Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is an impermanent committee system. A committee such as we have today throws up only the lowest common denominator of the brains composing it. For its decisions are of necessity compromises. In this case they are also vitiated by the fact that they are hortatory; that is to say, recommendations of action to the actual decision makers in the field.

As soon as this war is over, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if left to themselves, will fly apart, and we shall be back where we were. There is nothing sure in this unsure world. So we say that only at its peril will this Nation let the armed services revert to their prewar organization. What is needed is unity of command on the German model. At present a study of this requirement is in progress in both the War and Navy Departments at the direction of the respective chiefs. It is as if a dispute at law were handed over to the litigants themselves to settle. The new organization of our armed services after this war is a problem which rightfully belongs to Congress. Army, Navy, foreign policy—they should all be brought into a single pattern of organization. This is what Pearl Harbor proved, and no court martial is needed to make the demonstration.

Office of Price Administration and the Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the National Petroleum News of June 7, 1944:

JUDGE FOR YOURSELF! DO YOU AGREE THAT O. P. A. HAS PUT THE OIL INDUSTRY ON A SOUND OPERATING BASIS?

The price of oil, as well as many other things in this country, is so mixed up with screw-ball thinking, misinformation, fourth-term politics and down-right falsehoods, that it is difficult to figure out how to make a dent against it all. The mixture just flows from Washington as an avalanche. About all one can do is to pick out a point and with it, try to illustrate the oil industry's unfair predicament.

O. P. A. Chief Chester Bowles, after his recent appearance before a congressional investigating committee, sent over to Congress a letter and a folder of some alleged facts about oil supply and the refusal of O. P. A. to increase that supply by permitting an increase in price. Under the circumstances, Bowles escaped cross-examination on this information.

General Counsel Brown, of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, has made several critical comments to Congress and the press on these latest Bowles statements, to show how inaccurate and unfair they are. N. P. N. will take only the last paragraph of Bowles letter in which in large all-embracing sentences, he says:

"We feel sure you (the Congress) will agree that the policies followed by O. P. A. in controlling prices will prove and is proving of lasting benefit to the industry and the country as a whole. Besides saving the public as consumers and taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, price control has placed the industry upon a sound operating basis which has virtually eliminated the possibility of drastic post-war readjustments."

Here are some of the things O. P. A.'s oil policy has bestowed upon the country and the taxpayers, the car owners:

It imposed an oil shortage on this country so severe that supply for our absolutely essential needs is seriously threatened.

It deprived the taxpayer and motorist of the few gallons of gasoline he needs in his daily living, on two false assumptions:

(a) That the motorist, for some unknown reason, would rather save a few cents a week in his gasoline expenditure than use his car.

(b) That the 10 or 20 cents or so a week more that the average motorist might pay for a reasonable advance in crude prices that would get more drilling done, would bring inflation, whereas the few cents additional for gasoline is but an infinitesimal part of the average car owner's increased income, and many of them are spending hundreds of times that for more whisky.

(Incidentally, neither O. P. A. nor the new dealers have ever indicated any willingness to let the people decide whether they would prefer to pay a few more cents per week and have more gasoline.)

O. P. A., through its stringent and uncalled-for price policy on oil, has found it necessary, or perhaps has created the shortage as an excuse, to impose on the American motorist one of the greatest and most inefficient Government controls in history, a control which is giving thousands of radical reformers unnecessary, unconstitutional, and un-American power over American business, and particularly over small business.

O. P. A.'s price and shortage-of-supply policy is hitting with increasing severity at the body of greatest competition in the oil business, the independents, as if O. P. A., or its bosses in the White House, are determined to drive the strong army of independent competitors out of the oil industry.

O. P. A. Chief Bowles says in his letter he is "saving hundreds of millions of dollars." In a folder of charts that he also gave to the Congressmen he claims a "saving" to the Government of $175,000,000 and to the public of $350,000,000 more. How these figures are arrived at he does not say. But as offsetting figures we might suggest the $134,000,000 the Army is spending—or wasting—on the Canol project, the $30,000,000 Secretary of the Interior Ickes wants to spend to put the Bureau of Mines into the gasoline-from-coal business, and the $175,000,000 President Ickes of the P. R. C. wants to spend on an Arabian pipe line, to say nothing of almost as much more, reportedly, on a Mediterranean refinery. Add this up and it comes close to a half billion dollars, all of which the oil industry was and is only too glad to keep from loading onto the public. The White House backers of the schemes are the same backers of O. P. A.'s oil shortage policy.

But the greatest misstatement of all by Bowles is that "price control has placed the industry upon a sound operating basis which has virtually eliminated the possibility of drastic post-war readjustments."

That misstatement alone shows the abysmal ignorance of Bowles and his White House supervisors concerning the oil industry. A sound operating oil industry is not one with idle refining capacity as at present, thanks to O. P. A.'s price policy, and with idle distributing facilities, as at present, also thanks to that same price policy. A sound industry is not one with a price structure based on the large percent of big volume of Government business done practically exclusively by the major oil companies. A sound oil industry is not one that is drawing its below-ground and above-ground stocks of oil down to unprecedentedly dangerous levels, so that the oil authorities are constantly hedging every statement concerning the doling out of supplies to the private consumer with the qualification "subject to local shortages" which are nothing but shortages of needed working stocks. Nor is a sound American oil industry one subjected to a domestic oil shortage policy that forces the diversion of more and more much needed tankers to South American oil supplies and the carrying out of an alleged good neighbor policy that might far better be foregone in favor of a good American policy.

One thing certain is that if and when the administration takes its heavy hand off price, the leaping post-war demand will jump the price, undoubtedly higher than any needed price today, in order to bring in the direly needed additional supplies of crude. Another thing that is certain, is that when that higher price brings in the almost certain flood of new crude, the price will fall, perhaps to present levels, maybe even lower.

Maybe one thing the New Deal's economists do understand, is that shortages bring higher prices and higher prices bring additional supplies and additional supplies mean the end of the shortage and should mean the end of rationing and price fixing and the end of a lot of soft jobs for many tens of thousands of incompetent officeholders. In the oil industry there is certainly a long, long series of floods of crude oil that followed the public's bidding higher prices for what it wants, and which floods always brought lower prices. That price for crude oil, as bid by the oil industry on behalf of the public, is as free and sensitive a price as that of any commodity, we believe, and there are 85 years of history to back it up.

But then, we, and many others, also hold the opinion that neither Bowles, the rest of O. P. A., the administration, nor all their economists want anything but an oil shortage because such a shortage fits their political and reform aims.

Price Ceiling on Watermelons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I think it appropriate, especially in view of the fact that we are considering the extension of O. P. A., to have the views of a typical country editor in a typical rural community, with reference to some of the silly things that the O. P. A. is doing.

Watermelons are generally classified as a luxury, and if people who can afford to buy a watermelon want to pay a little extra for this luxury and thus encourage, or may I say, give the farmers who raise watermelons a decent price for their effort so that they can buy an extra War bond to help out their boy or girl in the armed forces, why should anyone who thinks straight take the position that watermelons should have a ceiling price?

The editorial is timely and to the point, and I believe reflects the sentiment of 99.9 percent of the farmers and others in Oklahoma, with respect to a ceiling price on watermelons:

COUNTRY IS SAVED—THERE'S A CEILING ON WATERMELONS

What a sigh of relief went up all over the country when the news went out from O. P. A. headquarters a few days ago that there would be a ceiling on watermelons this year. Just think, we have fought this war now for nearly 3 years without a watermelon ceiling. Maybe the Italian campaign bogged down in its beginning because the O. P. A. had not put a ceiling on watermelons. Until history is written nobody will know how the war effort has suffered just because the bureaucrats that run the O. P. A didn't think about putting a ceiling on the watermelon crop until now.

The farmers of Grady County thought that maybe they could raise one crop that the starry-eyed bunch that runs the O. P A. wouldn't get their fingers on but they are doomed to disappointment, the ceiling is on. It will probably take a whole office full of bureaucrats at Washington several weeks to figure out how many millions they saved the poor defense workers by putting the ceiling on watermelons. But this is campaign year, probably the members of C. I. O. in the big centers of the country can increase their campaign fund for the fourth term now that they will be saved at least a dime on their watermelons.

We can really look for our war effort to get in high. Maybe the fourth-termers put the ceiling on watermelons just so the plutocratic melon growers down in the sand hills around Rush Springs would come to realize that there is a war on. Henry Mileur, of Rush Springs, who always puts on the "rousins" when Franklin D's name is mentioned, can really go to town now. Franklin D. has once more come to the help of the poor folks. Yes, the country is saved; long live the O. P. A. With a ceiling on watermelons, it will never be forgotten in south Grady County, at least.

The ceiling on watermelons along with no cuffs on trousers and no gasoline bought on credit will be the three outstanding accomplishments of the O. P. A. on the home war front.

Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter delivered to the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, today.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1944.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write this letter to you to solicit the help of yourself and your committee, that the people of the United States might learn the facts, and the truth regarding the real situation in Yugoslavia.

Please be assured that I can readily appreciate our Government's desire to cooperate with any individual or group of individuals who can bring about an early defeat of Hitler and everything he stands for, but I still believe that the people are entitled to the facts and the truth.

From the attitude taken by the high commands of our allied forces in regard to our Yugoslav situation, one might think that the Chetniks were a group of bandits trying to do everything possible to hinder the war effort. This, I am sure, is not the case.

Regardless of any appreciation that might be shown toward Tito for his fighting on the side of the Allies at this particular time, I do not believe that the Congress should stand by and let misrepresentations continue. We have men and materials involved in Yugoslavia, and in all fairness we should allow impartial newspaper reporters to be assigned to the headquarters of General Mihailovich, as well as those of Tito.

For almost a year the United States has had two experienced competent observers in Yugoslavia; namely, Lt. Col. John F. R. Seitz, of the United States Army, and Capt. Walter R. Mansfield of the United States Marine Corps. These men have recently returned to the United States to make their report to high Government officials, but have been muzzled and thereby prevented from making any statements that would bring the true situation to public attention.

The policy of withholding facts from the public and Congress by the present administration is nothing new. All too often it remains for some newspaper commentator to find them out by accident, and smoke out the various departments of our Government until the facts are released.

To be more explicit, I call to the attention of your committee the text of the radio broadcast made at 6:30 p. m., May 15, 1944, over WWDC, a local Washington station, by the well-known commentator, Leon Pearson. The text I here quote:

"Now sit back a minute, and let me give you an inside story about Jugoslavia. This is an inside story in perfectly literal sense. It is the story of what two American officers think, who have just returned from inside Yugoslavia.

"You know all about the controversy between the factions over there—Marshal Tito, leader of the Partisans, against General Mihailovich, leader of the Chetniks. And also that this Government, like the British Government, is throwing its weight behind Tito and letting Michailovich languish without assistance.

"Yet the story I have tonight is that the two American observers who spent some weeks with Mihailovich forces have come back with a report highly favorable to that faction, and refuting the claims that Mihailovich is a collaborator with the Germans.

"That report is being kept from the American people—which is natural enough, since it is a confidential military report. But what seems strange is that the two officers are also being kept from contact with the press. They are not allowed to see anybody, and even their names are withheld.

"But I have learned their names. Here they are: Lt. Col. John F. R. Seitz, of the United States Army, and Capt. Walter R. Mansfield, of the Marine Corps.

"The muffling of these men has aroused considerable opposition even within the Office of Strategic Services—which has charge of them. I have talked with two officers of O. S. S., who said, 'Don't quote me, but'—and then they went on to say what they really felt about the matter.

"One man, when I asked to see Colonel Seitz or Captain Mansfield, said: 'They have orders not to see anybody. Personally, I have definite views in the matter, and I am partial to the cause of Mihailovich. Frankly, nothing would give me more pleasure than to let Mihailovich be defended.'

" 'Mihailovich,' he continued, 'is accused of collaborating with the Germans and of getting arms and ammunition from them. But it may be that he has simply penetrated the German lines and seized German arms for his own use. When you fight as they have to fight in Yugoslavia—guerrilla warfare—you dive beneath the surface and employ whatever means you can.'

"Then this officer of O. S. S.—I cannot reveal his name, because in Strategic Services they are not supposed to talk to the press—brought the question right home by saying:

" 'Suppose, for example, that Washington and Virginia were overrun with Germans. We might be very ingratiating to the occupying forces—not because we favor them, but because we want to work from within and get arms for our own defense. Yet this does not justify our being called collaborators or traitors.'

" 'And, then,' he added, 'My sympathies being what they are, I would be delighted if the story could be told.'

"Well, that is the story. There can be no doubt that the other faction, under Marshal Tito, is doing an amazing and successful job, but I fail to see why a good word cannot be permitted to be said for Mihailovich, if he deserves it.

"This is Leon Pearson. I'll be back in a minute."

I believe in the sincerity of the commentator in his broadcast. Further information which I have and believe to be authentic, is that the two military observers, Lieutenant Colonel Seitz and Captain Mansfield, are about to be ordered out of the country, thereby making them unavailable to appear before any committee of Congress. These reasons impel me to make this urgent request of you and your committee to hold a meeting immediately, for the specific purpose of hearing the testimony of these two men.

No one will deny that Congress should know all the truth; and certainly one way to obtain the truth is that your committee within its own prerogatives should hold a session to receive first-hand statements which these two military men can present. They are the men who can give you the truth about the Yugoslav situation, and it is urgent that this information be given to all of the Congress, the press and the public. We should know the whole truth.

I have personally kept closely in touch with the Yugoslav situation for many months. We have had so much drivel, bunk and misrepresentation about this setup in Yugoslavia, that I cannot impress upon you too strongly the urgency of this request.

Respectfully yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY.

Our War Aims in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our War Aims in Europe," published in the Washington Times-Herald of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WAR AIMS IN EUROPE

We're talking about our war aims in Europe, not in Asia. The two sets of war aims are different and distinct.

Our first war aim in Europe is to defeat the German enemy. We've made an encouraging beginning, with the seizure of beachheads along the 60-mile section of the French coast between Cherbourg and Le Havre—though, as Allied supreme headquarters in Britain keeps emphasizing, the real fight has just begun and the Germans have yet to show what they can do in the way of counterattacks.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH GERMANY?

But that Germany is going to be defeated seems no longer in serious doubt. The main question appears to be how long it will take the Allies to do the job.

The next war aim should come into focus as the job of beating Germany proceeds. Just now it is pretty foggy, pretty obscure. This next war aim is the post-war treatment of Germany so as to make that nation incapable of disturbing the peace of the world for a long time to come.

There are several things that could be done, once we catch the bear.

Germany might be cut up into a number of small, weak nations, as was done by the treaty of Westphalia in 1648, winding up the Thirty Years' War. That kept the Germans weak and divided for quite a while—through it also kept many of them determined to reunite for revenge.

Or we could conceivably destroy the German people. The Romans destroyed the Carthaginian people, their long-time mortal enemies across the Mediterranean from Italy; and though Rome made plenty more enemies as time went on, Carthage was never again a threat.

One school of thought feels that it will be well enough to wipe out Hitler and the body and bones of his National Socialist Party. Another thinks we ought to wipe out the Prussian militarists as well as the Nazis. These views remind one of the prevailing belief in World War No. 1 that if the Allies could only throw the Hohenzollern dynasty the rest of the Germans would promptly go back to making toys and reading Goethe and Schiller and Heine. We overthrow the Hohenzollerns, but Hitler grew up in their stead.

Still another plan is to let Russia dominate eastern Europe, to force on Germany a government subservient to Russia, and restore the status quo ante in western Europe. That would mean to reestablish Norway, Holland, Belgium and France as they were before September 1939, with the British backing them up, and with us backing up the British.

Of one thing we feel sure—that this second war aim is a matter for our Congress to formulate as far as the United States is concerned.

It should not be worked out by one or more great brains in secret, then flashed on Americans as an accomplished fact. We all have a big stake in this war aim, and our elected Representatives in Washington should figure out for us, publicly what this war aim is.

WHAT SHALL WE DO FOR OURSELVES?

Which leads us to our third war aim, at present, the remotest but also the most important of our war aims. That one would be to stay out of future wars in Europe. The main problem connected with it would be how to do it.

It seems doubtful that the majority of Americans will care for a post-war set-up under which we shall periodically have to send our best young men and heavy slices of our real wealth overseas to protect or restore the European status quo ante. We have now done that twice in a generation. It seems likely that a lot of Americans will have wearied of it by the time this second performance is over.

We may not return to old-time, out-and-out isolationism after this war. And it may be better not to, if we are to realize the war aim of staying out of future European wars.

It may be better for us to try some businesslike internationalism with Canada—meaning to try to get together with Canada on plans to keep the peace in the Western Hemisphere and look out for ourselves first. Most Canadians already know that Canadian and United States defense problems are identical, because geographically we are a unit.

A defensive and offensive United States-Canada alliance, with a joint general staff, joint defense plans, and all the trimmings, would at least make the North American Continent by far the most powerful influence for peace or war in the Western Hemisphere. Canada and ourselves would be about as safe as we could hope to be in this uncertain world, as long as we kept our guard up.

And this arrangement might even keep the world at peace a long time. If Europe could get it into its head that North America really did not intend to throw its immense wealth and power into any war which it considered none of its business, European politicians might be a good deal more hesitant about starting another European war than they were about starting World Wars Nos. 1 and 2.

Wages of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to discuss for a few minutes the case of the white-collar worker, or more specifically the post-office employees in Los Angeles, Calif., during wartime. In normal times post-office employees' wages are only fair in comparison to skilled-labor crafts, but the men stick to their jobs for security reasons. Since the outbreak of the war, and despite rationing and price control, the economic situation of post-office employees has become deplorable. While they received a wage bonus of $25 a month in March 1943, which is almost 15 percent of their regular pay, the living costs have gone up no less than 43.5 percent since 1941.

The post-office employee must buy commodities at inflated and speculative prices. He must clothe, feed, and shelter his family on a pre-war 1926 dollar. He must compete with highly paid war workers who receive swollen pay checks and care not for the future.

While skilled craftsmen throughout the labor world are receiving time and one-half and double time for Sunday work, postal employees are working day and night to move the mail. Sundays, holidays, every minute around the clock, many hours of overtime, for a wage of 86 cents an hour. H. R. 4501 provides that these employees receive time and one-half for overtime. I respectfully urge the passage of this legislation for these most deserving men.

Price Control by O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Price Control and Stabilization Act being considered by this House will undoubtedly be considered thoroughly because both the proponents and opponents to certain amendments will present their arguments to the House. It is hoped that when the arguments are presented that the House will have as much information as is humanly possible. Too frequently on the floor of this House we permit bitterness, partisanship, and emotion to sway our thinking and judgment.

I believe it should be clear to the majority Members of the House that it is necessary to continue some form of price control and stabilization during the continuance of this war. If this House were to absolutely destroy the act at this time it might lead to some serious economic disturbances.

It does seem, however, Mr. Speaker, that since the birth of the Emergency Price Control Act on January 20, 1942, that we have had certain experiences with the trial by error method which indicates that certain amendments are in order if we expect the act to be administered to the best interests of this country.

I do believe that under the present Administrator we are finding there is a much better handling of the problem than under the Henderson regime. Much of this credit is due Congress, who insisted a year ago that the long-haired professors, experimenters, and social reformers devoid of business experience and yet holding key positions must be replaced by experienced businessmen. This has been accomplished in part.

The O. P. A. was established to prevent uncontrolled wartime inflation. They have failed in many instances to control inflation. The best success they have had to date is in controlling those articles which are plentiful. We all know that they need no control. Many of the rules and regulations by the O. P. A. has discouraged production, which in turn causes inflation. Let me refer to their attempt to put into operation price ceilings for fresh fruits and vegetables. Their regulations have resulted in a confusion and chaotic condition which has seriously affected the production and distribution of these commodities. Price ceilings have not been flexible enough to meet situations of the growers and of conditions which affect their crops. I refer to floods, frosts, droughts, and crop hazards which continually beset the producer. Fruits and vegetables are highly perishable. They cannot be stored for any length of time. They are seasonable. They must be moved quickly. Sometimes at a loss. The O. P. A. has failed to recognize these problems. Whenever an article becomes scarce it goes through the black market. This is true on many articles besides fruits and vegetables. The black marketers pay no taxes. They force the legitimate dealer who does pay taxes out of business. Much food has been permitted to spoil because of the inflexible rules and regulations laid down by the O. P. A. The O. P. A. appears to have been much more concerned with keeping prices down than it has been interested in maintaining a proper supply of food.

If we are to control inflation in this country, we must have ample production. The O. P. A. has attempted to force, control, and regulate far too many articles. I would like to refer to the food trade alone, where we find some 7,800 pages, which means millions of words, of code and regulations issued by a bunch of individuals who are trying to regiment and control the will of the American people. The O. P. A. has had difficulty in construing its own regulations. It has meant confusion, dis-

couragement, and the breaking of many rules and regulations. The Congress must insist that the Administrator simplify the rules so that all can understand. There should be no cracking down and prosecutions on rules and regulations of which the individual has not had proper knowledge of their being put into effect.

Certainly one amendment which we should adopt is that of making it possible for the individual to have some recourse to the regularly constituted courts after he has been convicted by a court set up by the O. P. A. In the past they have acted as the policeman, the prosecutor, the judge, and the executioner. The individual has had no opportunity to appeal to the properly constituted courts of this land.

The regulations set up under the O. P. A. permitting triple damages to be assessed should be changed at once. Congress should spell out in no uncertain terms just what they meant when this part of the law was passed.

The Congress should set a limit upon the paying of subsidies and roll-backs and should set a definite time for their discontinuance. They should prohibit all future subsidies. Congress has spoken on this occasion twice and has been overruled by the President. It can only be effectively ended by writing into the law future prohibition against new subsidies. The use of subsidies are controls which try to create and freeze excessive cash balances. Their elimination, if long continued, will be difficult. The longer we tolerate subsidies the more difficult they will be to eliminate. Special interests who are getting some supposed assistance will ask for their continuance. The elimination of not only subsidies, but war controls, will be a difficult task for their continuance will be supported by the bureaucracies and their personnel whose jobs depend upon the continuance of government regimentation. It will require sacrifice, patience with determined and persistent efforts to rid ourselves of these wartime controls and regain our individual initiative and freedom of American enterprise.

The subsidies and roll-backs forced upon the livestock growers and dairy industry has been most discouraging to the ample production of meat and dairy products. When the roll-back was established and benefits paid to the packer it did not reach down to the producer of livestock. It is my honest belief that the scarcity of many articles, particularly meat, can be traced to the direct door of the O. P. A. and the regulations set up to govern the industry. The shortage of meat has been caused by directives which change the rules of feeding cattle and the sale of meat. These rules have been changed in the middle of the feed lot which caused uncertainty and confusion among the producers of meat.

The Congress should insist and write into the law a provision which will force the Administrator of the O. P. A. to take the considered judgment and advice of the men in industry and business upon rules and regulations affecting their business.

Mr. Bowles, the Administrator, is a supersalesman. One is convinced of this fact when he reads and looks over the charts which he inserted in the hearings in both the Senate and the House. A careful examination of many of the charts shows that they are full of flaws and fallacies and will not stand the full light of a critical examination. Take, for instance, the chart in which he indicates the cost of living has not advanced. He takes a 52-month period of the last war and of this war. The last war for this country did not last 52 months nor has this war lasted that long. He does not take into consideration that the 20-percent withholding tax is a part of the living cost. He does not take into consideration that many articles on the market are of lower quality and at a higher price. He fails to take into consideration the articles upon which no price control has been established, like second-hand automobiles. The prices of these have skyrocketed. He fails to take into consideration the black-market operations.

The bill also deals with the Stabilization Act.

I think the Members of the House and the people of the country should realize that the Office of Economic Stabilization which was created by an Executive order and is a preconceived brain child of the inner cabinet, has the right to nullify the acts of other agencies which were created by Congress. This agency is superior and above the Secretary of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, and the Price Administrator. The acts of Congress which establishes and outlines the law can be superseded by edicts from this Office. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we expect our democracy to survive that we should let no man, not even the President or his inner cabinet, have the power to supersede by directives the acts of Congress. The President never had the power to transfer the duties and functions established under the First War Powers Act. He nevertheless has proceeded to do just that.

Much of the opposition to the Price Control Act comes from the way it has been administered. The O. P. A. attempts to enforce the mysterious, theoretical freeze and hold the line order issued in 1942. This was an order of the President. Only one end of the line is being held. It is true, prices were frozen for the retailer. The price of labor and many other articles going into the production of goods was not frozen. Margins of profits were wiped out. In fact, it seems that this Office is more concerned with the control of profits than it is in ample production. This freeze-the-line order has forced many articles off the market. Articles from cigars to pancake flour disappears from the trade. In their place the public finds many new brands of inferior grade and at a higher price. This procedure is permitted under the Price Control Act. In the matter of the production of meat, the ceiling price of a cow and hog is pretty well fixed. We did not have the cost of production, such as proteins, hay, labor, salt, and taxes fixed. The producers of meats and farm products have not been permitted to reflect any of these increases in their selling price.

I repeat, again, Mr. Speaker, that the only way to control inflation and to get rid of rationing and price control is to have ample production of instead of controls. There are too many individuals in the several agencies of Government that would like to control and regiment everything from your shoe strings to your hair tonic.

It is my honest belief that with the conclusion of this war we must make every effort to abandon at once those controls which are not necessary. We must restore the American tradition of private enterprise and personal freedom. Our Government must encourage production and employment which will insure our citizens full freedom and the right to enjoy the fruits of their toil. We must remember that private enterprise can live and flourish only in freedom. We must have freedom from Government regulations, freedom from authority lodged in Washington. Peacetime functioning cannot be efficiently combined with wartime controls. The O. P. A. and the Office of Economic Stabilization should recognize these fundamental principles. The citizens must be freed from the plague of unexplainable, dogmatic attitudes frequently adopted by minor Government officials. Some one has said that "no law, rule, or regulation will work well unless we permit a little play at the joints." This is certainly true of the Government and man-made edicts now flooding the country.

American Youth Looks Toward New Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a young University of Chicago student delivered a remarkable address some months ago entitled "Toward New Horizons," at the graduation exercises of the Sullivan High School in Chicago.

In this speech, young Sheldon Newberger appraises the world and its problems, as he sees it, and makes certain keen and penetrating observations relative to current international developments.

This young man reveals a perceptive mind and exhibits a militantly liberal viewpoint.

I commend the reading of this address to those who would be interested in modern youth's reaction to the world today.

Here is his speech:

We have considered this evening some of the primary requisites for a lasting and just peace. We have discussed the Atlantic Charter with its idealistic statements about

the future, and we have talked about the "four freedoms" which when put into effect will guarantee the very principles stated by Roosevelt and Churchill in August of the year 1941. Yet, we have merely touched the great book that tells of the future of America and the world.

I have emphasized the word "world," because it is the whole world that we must think of if we plan now for future peace. We cannot any longer hide behind the cloak of normalcy—the shades of isolationism and declare that the affaors of China and India—and even little Luxemburg do not affect us. Starving natives in the East Indies affect the peace and security of the people of Chicago in the same way as did the Touhy gang when they escaped from Stateville a few months ago; and a depression-ridden Germany threatens the prosperity of the United States as much as, say, a flood striking the cotton lands of the deep South.

We have had a tendency this evening to be idealistic. We have visioned the coming world in glowing phrases quoting glorious statements from world leaders. There are some people who protest against this. They call themselves the practical realists; they think we must win the war first and then bother about the peace; they feel that the sooner American boys get back from Africa and Guadalcanal and we get out of European affairs, the better off we'll be. Yet, these so-called realists are not realists at all; they are pessimists. They cannot see this war for what it is. They do not understand that winning on the battlefield and failing at the peace table is just the same as losing the war—that no longer can the American people say that the affairs of Asia and Africa and Europe do not concern them.

We, the youth of this world, are in the process of fighting a war. It is a horrible war, deadly in all its aspects, yet I may honestly say that the thought that inspires all our efforts is the hope that our children and our children's children may live in peace. Without this hope, what is there to fight for?

The future of this world will depend upon the genius of the peoples who inhabit it. It will depend upon a spirit of internationalism blessed with feelings of brotherhood and resolve. We are pioneers in the creation of peace, much as our forefathers were pioneers in the opening of the West. We will obliterate hate and greed and want in much the same way as they conquered the forests, the mountains, and the streams. We in truth are twentieth-century crusaders, striving valiantly for justice and the "four freedoms."

Specific plans have been presented for a post-war world. Our job, the job of youth, will be to consider them, to debate them, to make preparations now for the time when the last shot will be fired and the last bomb will be dropped.

This war must be a war without revenge. As much as the slaughtered Poles will want to kill the plundering Hun, and the American father avenge the death of his son—this war must be one to set the Germans, the Japanese, and the Italians on the right track rather than to destroy them. For if we force the peoples of the Axis to pay reparations, if we treat them as conquered nations, then we will merely find the whole world economy ruined, and future peace will be merely a passing dream. This is not a popular thing to say. Yet our first step must be one of charity and kindness, of firm resolve never to let this catastrophe take place again.

It might mean an international police force, whose job it will be to keep the defeated countries disarmed until they can once again join a council of nations. It could mean a system of education, of reopening the minds of the peoples of the Axis to the arts and the humanities, to showing them that a new world is beckoning for creative genius in the fields of technology and production. International committees to rule the defeated countries until their citizens are once again ready for self leadership may very well be one of the steps we must take. A world federation, of all nations, in which each state will sacrifice a little of its sovereignty in return for economic and political security is another suggestion that deserves discussion and comment. A code and a court for international justice, a policy to educate and prepare the backward countries for independence, free world trade, all these are prospects for a glorious and free future. But, this future can only come to men with open minds—minds intellectually free to understand the changing world, and meet these changes with vigor and foresight.

We, sitting here tonight, cannot remain naive about the world to come. We cannot hide behind the parental blanket and hope to avoid the realities of the world. For the future of this country and all other countries will depend upon youth—on our sense of international responsibility and our determination to establish a society where everyone has the opportunity to work—not to make one man or one country wealthy—but to add to the enjoyment and prosperity of all men everywhere.

We are entering a great technological age. Soon there will be modern air-conditioned cars with high-compression engines able to go 50 miles on a gallon of gas. There will be streamlined family cruisers, boats as plentiful as autos are today. There will be air flivvers, helicopters, capable of landing everywhere, and taking one to Norway to spend the evening with some friends. There will be plastic factories and glass houses, in fact, things that today seem like dreams will be realities tomorrow. These will be the products of the inventive genius of the peoples of the world.

But, along with these great products will come social problems that must be solved. This will be the role of a dynamic, conscientious youth. Fresh from the battlefields of the world, we must make it so that the common man will have the security and income to enjoy these inventions, that a heretofore nonconsumptive population will become the great buyers of all the miracles of the coming age. We can only do this through the establishment of freedom from want, where man can eat and live in decent homes and have proper clothing; freedom from fear, where man can be secure from loss of work, where from the cradle to the grave, they can depend upon having the basic necessities of life.

If I were a dramatist recording the history of the present times, perhaps I would do it this way. The first act consists of those horrible years after World War No. 1; of the failure of the United States to accept the League of Nations, of false prosperity and the havocs of depression; of the rise of the Fascist States; of the failure in Ethiopia; in Spain; in Munich; to stop the Nazi hordes.

The second act would include this war; the courageous British at Dunkerque, the valiant Russians at Stalingrad; a fighting America that overcame the perils of a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and began fighting, working, manning and arming the armies of democracy.

And, in the final act, I foresee the future—a glorious victory by the United Nations, because ultimately right always conquers the forces of evil. And then, the peoples of the world, led by an inspired youth, will begin their march.

This will be the heroic march of peoples bent on freedom, the march not only for political democracy, but for economic and social democracy as well. This will be the march that will lead to full employment, to an adequate diet for all, to security from the threats of illness, old age, and sudden depression. This will be the march that will mean for the sharecropper of California and the coolie of China, a decent home with proper clothing and a chance to work as freemen. This will be the march of the youthful chemist and scientist toward creating products that will not benefit one man nor one class, but will aid all humanity. This will be the march of the industrialist who will recognize the rights of the laboring man and cooperate in producing goods for all. This will be the march toward world government, toward free trade, and a policy of enlightenment toward all the backward nations.

Yes, this will be the march, the inevitable march of the common man toward new horizons full of peace and justice and hope.

Andresen Amendments to Price Control Bill, H. R. 4941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, and for the information of the Members of the House, I am listing herewith five amendments which I will offer to H. R. 4941, the price-control bill, when I receive recognition by the Chair:

NO. 1

Page 3, line 5, after the colon, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That when the Administrator establishes a wholesale price on any commodity or article to be sold at retail, all retail distributors shall have the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price so established, and nothing in this act or otherwise shall be construed as authorizing the Administrator to issue any regulation or order which does not allow all retail distributors to compete freely in all commodities and articles of merchandise available for sale in every price line."

NO. 2

Page 11, line 6, after the last comma, insert the following: "nor to deny the allowance of a fair and equitable margin of profit for any given commodity, product, or class of a commodity or product."

NO. 3

Page 18, after line 22, insert:

"SEC. 7. Effective with respect to proceedings instituted after June 30, 1944, section 205 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Except as provided in subsection (f), the courts of the several States and Territories shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of section 4 of this act, to the extent, in the case of any such court, that such court would have jurisdiction if such violation constituted an offense against the State or Territory, and also have jurisdiction of all other proceedings under this section. In any case in which under the laws of a State or Territory, there is no court of such State or Territory which can exercise the jurisdiction of criminal proceedings or other proceedings, as the case may be, conferred by this section, then the appropriate district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of such criminal proceedings or such other proceedings, as the case may be. Except as provided in this subsection and in subsection (f) the district courts of the United States shall not have jurisdiction of any proceeding under this act instituted after June 30, 1944. No right, benefit, or privilege, the granting of which is under the control of the Admin-

istrator pursuant to this act, or otherwise, shall be denied, suspended, or revoked by reason of a violation of any law or regulation, unless such person has been convicted of such violation, or has been found to have violated such law or regulation in some other court proceeding to which such person is a party.'"

Renumber the remaining sections of the bill accordingly.

NO. 4

Page 21, strike out line 23 and insert:

"following new paragraphs:

" 'No action shall be taken under authority of this act with respect to an increase in any wages or salaries in any case in which such increase has been agreed upon by the employer and employee and will not result in the payment of wages or salaries at a rate greater than $37.50 per week. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, if the employee ordinarily works overtime and extra compensation is paid therefor, such extra compensation shall be included in determining the rate of wages or salaries paid.' "

NO. 5

Page 22, after line 14, insert:

"SEC.—. Section 5 (a) of such Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Effective with respect to wage and salary payments made after June 30, 1944, the President shall prescribe the extent to which the excess of any wage or salary payment made in contravention of such regulations over the portion thereof which would not be in contravention of such regulations shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other governmental agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any law or regulation. In the case of a wage or salary payment made after October 1, 1942, and prior to July 1, 1944, the portion thereof which was not in contravention of regulations issued under this act shall not be disregarded or disallowed in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation, and, if already disregarded or disallowed, shall be allowed notwithstanding the previous disallowance.' "

Make Mediation Decisions Final

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Banking and Currency Committee for writing into this price control bill section 10, in which the committee provides that the decisions by the Railway Mediation Board, or such agencies settling matters of dispute between railroad management and railway employees, shall be final when rendered.

If this amendment is approved by this Congress it will prevent the playing of politics and the shameful practices by those high in official authority here in Washington who, by their buck passing and delay, caused a strike to be called by the railway labor men of the Nation which hurt the cause of railway labor organizations unjustly, during the latter part of last year and which brought about a situation which gave the President of the United States an opportunity to seize the railroads all of which could and should have been avoided and which will be made impossible in the future if this amendment is approved by the Congress.

Members of this House will remember that for a year prior to the calling of the railway strike in December of last year through the Board set up for the hearing of such disputes every legal step had been taken as between the railway employees and railway management. The facts are the railway management recognized the railway employees were entitled to more money and the two groups had agreed upon the amount. At that point through the operation and on the advice of O. P. A. the matter was appealed to Director of Stabilization, Mr. Fred Vinson. He ruled against it on the theory that it might increase the cost of living. The President came into the picture and set up a new Board to make a restudy and a recanvass of the entire matter which had been restudied and recanvassed for an entire year and when the facts were brought in again Mr. Vinson offered some increases but wanted it done in his particular way which was inequitable to the men involved. It was at this juncture that the President seized the railroads, apparently in order to prevent a Nation-wide tie-up of transportation. After the railroads were seized and held for 48 hours they were turned back to the companies and a settlement was made with the men involved at as much or more costs than would have resulted from their contract had the matter never been appealed to Mr. Vinson, to Mr. Byrnes, or the President.

This amendment provides for the using of the Railway Mediation Board and other well thought-out plans for arriving at just decisions between railway employees and railway management growing out of collective bargaining.

It removes the possibility of delay in the future and the possibility of playing politics at the expense of the railway workers and railway management. It compels such disputes to be adjudicated and settled in an impartial way and in a way that has proven satisfactory in the past.

It is the right step in the right direction to settle labor and management controversies by sound principles of mediation which is so necessary to the economy of this country.

Organization of World War No. 2 Veterans, as Proposed by Charles G. Bolte

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by the eminent radio commentator and newspaper correspondent, William L. Shirer, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1944, discusses the status of the veterans of World War No. 2 and an attempt by one Charles G. Bolte to organize these veterans and, through such organization, to promulgate a liberal program.

Mr. Bolte is organizing a group of young veterans, who have an agenda which has wide appeal.

Mr. Shirer discusses the efforts of Mr. Bolte and his associates at some length in the article which I am appending herein below:

PROPAGANDA FRONT

(By William L. Shirer)

I am going to toss in a little propaganda today concerning the seven or eight million citizens fighting, or about to fight, or who have fought overseas and who will be coming home one fine day to make this country and possibly this world either better or worse, either secure for peace and a decent living or ripe for more wars and more idiotic chaos.

One of them, only 3 years out of college but already minus a leg he lost on an African battlefield, came in to see me last week. And because I have a feeling he may be representative of an American generation of which the Nation knows very little, not having shared its bloody experiences at the front, or ever paid much attention to its hopes and fears, I would like to tell you about him and what he and some of the young veterans are up to.

EDITED HIS COLLEGE PAPER

His name is Charles G. Bolte. Three years ago he was editor of his college paper, the Daily Dartmouth. A year or so later he was a young lieutenant at El Alamein. In the holocaust there he lasted for 3 days and the terrible distance of 1½ miles. Then the Germans shot a leg off.

He did not mention these things. I learned of them from another only after he had left. He merely presented himself as an honorably discharged veteran who had been in touch with other American servicemen about the kind of a world they would like to fight for, peacefully and democratically, after the war.

In view of the widespread reports that Americans in the armed services do not know what they are fighting for and care only about getting home as quickly as possible to ma's apple pie, this young man's ideas and present activities may be of some interest to the rest of us.

MEN EXCHANGED LETTERS

In January 1943 a group of men in the service or recently discharged, of whom Mr. Bolte was one, began exchanging letters about the attitude of the veterans after the war. They agreed that any attempt to organize formally or to devise a final program before complete demobilization would be futile. Mr. Bolte himself has joined the American Legion, of which his father is a member, though he does not rule out the possibility of a separate organization of the veterans of this war if the returning soldiers and sailors want it.

But in the meantime, so this group thought, it might be useful to try to crystallize the ideas of the men fighting the war and also to keep them reliably informed of what was going on at home, something the official Army publications, because of a peculiar fear of mixing in partisan issues, cannot do too well.

STATEMENT OF INTENTIONS

One of the first products of the group was a statement of intentions, the joint work of servicemen scattered around the world. It is a preliminary statement, but the group sincerely believes it honestly represents the thinking of the overwhelming majority of the fighting men. Here it is:

"We look forward to becoming civilians; making a decent living raising a family and living in freedom from the threat of another war. But that was what most Americans wanted from the last war. They found that military victory does not automatically bring peace, jobs, or freedom. To guarantee our interests, which are those of our country, we must work for what we want.

"Therefore, we are associating ourselves with American men and women, regardless of race, creed, or color, who are serving with, or have been honorably discharged from, our armed forces, merchant marine, civilian agencies in the field or Allied forces. When we are demobilized it will be up to us to decide what action can best further our aims.

"These will include:

"Aid for every veteran and his family during demobilization.

"A job for every veteran with private enterprise and Government working together to provide full employment for the Nation.

"Thorough social security.

"Free speech, press, worship, assembly, and ballot.

"Disarmament of Germany and Japan and the elimination of the power of their militarist classes.

"Continuance of the United Nations as partners, acting together to stop any threat to peace."

There were many drafts of this statement of intentions before the young soldiers could agree on a final one. Some of the ideas expressed in the earlier drafts are instructive as showing at least what some of the members of the war generation think about certain national issues.

In regard to aid for veterans, for instance, one draft stated: "For American veterans our Government will provide mustering-out pay, benefits for those who will have suffered illness or injury through their service and special aid to veterans who wish to resume their education. These measures are just. We shall strongly oppose any grab-bag attempts to secure unnecessary and undeserved benefits."

These sentiments did not represent the thinking of all of the men and were left out of the final draft. But that they were advanced at all is interesting.

Since, as Russell Hill pointed out in a recent dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune from Algiers, the Army newspaper in the field, Stars and Stripes, avoids controversial subjects, apparently partly because of the Army's fear of congressional wrath. Mr. Bolte's young veterans publish a monthly bulletin whose purpose is to inform the men overseas of the real goings-on at home and also to serve as a forum for the G. I.'s.

The May number will give you an idea. It contains a résumé of Mr. Hull's speech and the local and foreign reaction thereto. It gives the lowdown on the recent mutinies of Greek soldiers and sailors in Egypt.

It tells the soldiers the sad truth about their chances of voting this fall: "You have been deprived of your part in the election, unless you write now to your State election board. If you're from the right State and have good mail connections, your vote may count." And it advises that a Washington bet is that if 25,000 soldier votes are counted it will be surprising; if 50,000, a miracle.

Judging from these items it is not so easy to fool the American war generation as some of our politicians seem to have imagined. A biting cynicism runs through most of the letters sent in.

Take this letter: "We want to stay alive; we want to get home. * * * We want to do work we're trained for and enjoy doing. We want to be paid enough for that work to have a car, a decent place to live, and decent food. If we're going to have kids we'd like them to find the world in less of a mess than we found it. Above all, we want no more wars!"

Now, the author of this letter is not naive, for he continues: "But the hell of it is that we're very likely to find after a while that the things we thought we won the hard way weren't won at all. We're likely to find the same old cut-throat competition for the under-paid, dirty job, the same old empty pants pockets we wrapped our fingers in during the thirties and a new war all set to tip us over the edge again. These things will happen * * * if we let them * * * We can prevent wars by stepping on any nation trying to start them. The best way to get another war is to listen to the boys who told us this time we could keep out of war by pretending the world didn't concern us."

I get the impression that Mr. Bolte and his fellow veterans, despite their youth and what they've been through, are both intelligent and adult about the problems of their generation. Maybe they are too cynical but maybe they have reason to be. The kind of America they will make after the war may be even a little better than the one they left to defend.

The Pope's Remonstrance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Boston Post:

THE POPE'S REMONSTRANCE

The phrase "unconditional surrender" has, during the past year, been the source from which great controversy has arisen and, now that Pope Pius XII has so brilliantly analyzed the effect of the phrase upon the prolongation of the war, the Allies should draft more concise peace terms.

What the Supreme Pontiff has said about those who would harm Rome being matricides is a solemn warning which must be heeded by the Nazis, who have imperiled Rome, and by the Allies, who must for reasons of strategy and military necessity, wrest the Eternal City from the grasp of the Germans.

The term "unconditional surrender" imperils not only Rome, but many other fair cities of Italy, France, and the whole European continent. Actually, of course, there is no such thing as unconditional surrender. Every surrender has conditions of some sort. If there is no surrender there is only annihilation.

Pope Pius XII is a saintly man, and more skilled in the arts of diplomacy than many recent Popes. He knows the Germans well, and is aware of all their tricks of propaganda and guile. But, he is also aware of the great agony of soul of the Italian people and of the city of Rome.

A little something of the best of all the world, and of all races, has filtered into Rome during the centuries of propagation of the Christian faith. To make a battleground of the Holy City is a crime against all humanity.

His Holiness knows that the decision to destroy Cassino came only as a last resort, when Allied commanders had seen frightful sacrifices among their men because of the existence of German arms on the peak. But there is small comfort in that.

He is the guardian of Rome, the father of its people. It is not Rome, the city, which is of such world-wide importance, but Rome, the spiritual fountainhead of all that is best in men's nature.

The time has come when an eloquent plea by the Pope might be heeded by the combatants, when the enormous influence for good of the church may be thrown into the balance, and an endeavor made to search out the roads to peace.

If there is to be a surrender it must have conditions. And, if there is to be peace, the conditions must be made known to the enemy, in such manner and in time, to permit the peace terms to filter through the obscuring shield of propaganda and censorship flung around the Third Reich.

It has been known all along by the United States and our allies, that when the time was ripe, conditions for surrender must be enunciated. The Germans have not yet acceded to any demand for surrender Nor have they yet acceded to a request to save historic places or shrines from destruction. But, if they contemplate the crime of making Rome a battlefield, the words of the Pope will give them reason to pause and reflect upon the guilt which will rest upon the German people for centuries afterward.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating the price-control bill. The purpose of this bill is to control prices, prevent run-away inflation, and consequential bankruptcy. We know we must have these controls or at least some of them. We also know that they should be administered with common sense and justice. They should be so administered as to regulate prices, prices to the ultimate consumer, but they were never intended to be used as a means of regulating business. It was never intended that a Federal bureau should set up its own "kangaroo courts" to support its own gestapo methods of coercion and regimentation

It was never intended that the small-town merchant, the country store, or the little one-man operated mercantile business handling low-priced merchandise should be told what price goods or merchandise he can sell, and prevented by these dictator-inclined administrators from handling a higher-priced line of merchandise, which, because the lower-priced goods are not now available automatically puts him out of business while his larger, richer, and more influential competitor a few blocks down the street, and in some instances right next door, is permitted to sell this merchandise, because he never did specialize in low-priced merchandise that the poor man and his family can buy. Why, right today, Mr. Speaker, with the price of cotton to the farmer $15 per bale below its parity of 23,37 cents per pound the price of cotton dresses is up 100 percent to 200 percent over what they were last

year and the year before. But the farmer who produced that cotton gets no more for it than he has gotten for the last 2 years, yet he has to pay from two to three times as much for the same cotton dress or pair of overalls or cotton pants. He pays half to twice as much again for a shirt. And he cannot buy them from the merchant who has been his friend and neighbor for years because the O. P. A. says that merchant has never handled any other than a $2 dress and now the $2 dress costs $3.98, therefore it is above the "price limitation" which has been arbitrarily set by the O. P. A. and so the little merchant must lose that part of his business and if he cannot make it up on something else—then he must go out of business. Who makes these rules? Why? Why cannot this little merchant sell these dresses? Why do they cost any more than they used to cost. The farmer is getting no more for his cotton than he got last year.

And speaking of cotton. There is supposed to be a surplus of some 10,000,000 bales carried over—at least, that is what they tell the farmer when he asks for a better price—when he asks for just the parity that the Government itself has set—the parity of 23.37 cents per pound, still and yet this same little businessman and his friends and neighbors cannot buy half the cotton goods they need. They cannot buy piece goods to make their dresses and shirts out of; they cannot buy towels; they cannot buy sheets; they find there is a shortage of denims and work clothes and yet there is a surplus of cotton. When you inquire about these shortages they tell you that the Army is using up all the cotton. That is only partly true. If the Army was using it all there would be no surplus, so while the Army and Navy is using a considerable quantity, there is by no means a shortage of raw cotton. Witness the surplus in warehouses. Witness the price nearly 3 cents below parity. So what is the squeeze play? Is it the rayon manufacturers? Is it the fast moving broker or job salesman? Why are not they regulated as well as the little merchant?

And, Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that I would like to know. Why is it that when the Navy and the Marine Corps overbought on seersucker, the very finest quality available, why did they not turn this seersucker back to the trade so American men and women could have the privilege of buying it and making it up into dresses and suits? Why did they turn it over to lend-lease to be sent to foreign countries and given away, while American men and women had to content themselves with the inferior qualities? Are not the folks at home just as good as the people in foreign lands? Mr. Speaker, the people of the South need more cotton goods; they need more cheap dresses and work clothes; and they need to be put on a par with the manufacturers and jobbers and tradesmen of the East. They should be paid parity for their cotton and they should be given an opportunity to buy that cotton back in the form of manufactured goods or clothing. They should not be penalized by any group for the benefit of any other group. The production of raw cotton is one of the greatest industries in this Nation. Eighteen States grow cotton and in 14 of those 18 States cotton is the principal industry and money crop. As long as the cotton farmer is held down or throttled by O. P. A., or any other agency, you are stopping progress in one-third of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge careful consideration of each amendment to the price-control bill so that we may see that we get a fair and just price control act, without regimentation or discrimination against any of our people.

Juan March—Power Behind Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been familiar with the activities and career of Sr. Juan March, the richest man in Spain, whose activities in World War No. 1 were a stench in the nostrils of international decency and whose movements as of this moment are such as to provoke the wonderment of the students of international affairs.

In frequent speeches made by me, Mr. Speaker, on this floor and on public platforms throughout the United States, I have attempted to arouse the American people to the dangers of our continuing to collaborate with Franco Fascist Spain and the behind-the-scenes lackeys and flunkeys of fascism—the satraps and courtiers who have encouraged, cajoled, and flirted with fascism.

Spain is appeasement's child. We have a long and sorry record for which to apologize to lovers of liberty throughout the world because of our illogical policy toward Spain.

We embargoed the export of munitions and arms to the legitimate and established Government of Spain in 1937—a policy dictated by expediency and, perhaps, induced by influences from the British Foreign Office. As a result, the Spanish Republican Government fell, after a long and bloody and heroic conflict, in which thousands of Americans and British volunteers participated.

Had France, Great Britain, and the United States supplied adequate arms to the Spanish Government, the Franco revolution would have been crushed and World War No. 2 might well have been postponed or indefinitely held in abeyance.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to appease Spain. The Prime Minister of Great Britain rebukes those of us who have had the audacity to suggest that, in a war, which we are told is a world uprising against fascism, we are only concerned with one kind of fascism, and that, in fact, other forms of fascism should be endured, if not actually aided and abetted. Thus, for the sake of expediency, we have justified our partnership with Badoglia and the King of Italy, with King George of Greece, with King Peter of Yugoslavia, with Vichy, France, for 30 months after the Republic of France collapsed. We accept Finland as a neutral, recognize her legation and Minister in our National Capital, though she is engaged in bloody conflict with our most powerful ally, the U. S. S. R.

We continue to allow Thailand to operate in the National Capital, through diplomatic representatives, though General Chennault's air forces are bombarding the capital of Thailand, Bangkok, constantly; and, unhappily, that country is used by Japan as the jumping-off place and outfitting point for expeditions against our own armed forces.

Furthermore, we grant visas to Americans to travel in Europe and participate in international banks, the majority of whose directors are Nazis. We are about to participate in an international exhibition in Barcelona, sponsored by the Fascist, Franco.

We pretend to believe that Franco is sincere and honest in his promise to reduce drastically his export of war matériel to the Nazis and Italian Fascists. I recall that the Japanese made similar promises before Pearl Harbor and that we were justifying our sale of vast quantities of war matériel to the Japanese by the argument that we must appease Japan and keep them from fighting us, the very same argument we now advance in an attempt to convince people of the logic of our sale of war matériel to a Fascist enemy of the United States, which is using us solely for its own purposes.

Here is an interesting article by Walter Winchell, which discusses the career of Juan March. This article is syndicated by the New York Daily Mirror and appears in hundreds of daily newspapers this week throughout the United States.

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

THE LAST OF THE KING MAKERS—JUAN MARCH

Next to A. Hitler, Senor Juan March is the most dangerous man in Europe today. If his name means nothing to you now, it is only because his talent for keeping himself out of the papers is as great as his knack of picking up a dishonest million dollars and his genius for spreading misery in the world. More than any other man—not excepting his pal, Hitler—Juan March was responsible for touching off the explosion called World War No. 2.

Today Juan March, the richest man in Spain, shares control of the Iberian Peninsula with the big boys who own the Nazi cartels. His old, greedy fingers are in the mines and factories that supply Spanish coal, iron, copper, wolfram and mercury to the German war machine. He controls a big chunk of the "neutral" Spanish merchant fleet, which carries Nazi agents and Falangist propaganda to South America and returns with oil and gas for the planes and tanks of the Nazi Wehrmacht. He leases scores of water-front properties to the Nazis for use as secret submarine and refueling bases. March now lives in Lisbon—trying to make London and Washington believe he is a poor, helpless exile.

Juan March's agents and stooges, however, are in Spain—and other places. His lawyer, Tomas Peire, still has an office in Madrid. And one of Peire's partners in this Madrid firm is young Rafael de Jordana, son of

Franco's foreign minister. Early in January, Peire and young Jordana arrived in New York on a mission for Juan March. Peire proceeded to hold a number of secret conferences with Gen. Juan Beigbeder, of the Spanish Army. Beigbeder, an old pal of March, worked with the Germans against the French in Morocco in World War No. 1. A year ago Beigbeder came here as a Franco official. Now he claims to have broken with Franco, says he is working for the restoration of the Spanish monarchy. By a peculiar coincidence, this is March's plan.

Peire and Jordana returned to Spain in March, but another old pal of Juan March reached Washington at about that time. He is Luis Garcia Guijarro, the new commercial attaché of the Spanish Fascist Embassy. During the last war, his defense of the German submarines, which were sinking the Spanish ships carrying food to the Allies, got him expelled from the diplomatic service.

Juan March also has a permanent financial agent in Wall Street, one Jose Mayorga. Mayorga made the headlines 8 days after Pearl Harbor was bombed when Federal agents seized the Isla de Tenerife, one of Juan March's freighters, just as it was about to sneak out of New York Harbor with an unlicensed cargo of lubricating oil, airplane silk, and enough radio parts to build 50 military short-wave transmitters. The cargo was confiscated.

The Juan March who is working so hard to bring the Bourbons back to the empty throne of Spain was not born an aristocrat. His love for the monarchial principle was born in 1931 when the people of Spain voted to end the Bourbon monarchy. The first act of the new Spanish republic was to throw Juan March into the clink for wholesale thievery, corruption, and bribery.

Under the monarchy, Juan March had done all right. A bootblack at 12, he became a smuggler while still in his teens. By the time World War No. 1 broke out, March was king of the smugglers in the Mediterranean. He sold oil to the German submarine fleet and peddled a little oil to the British, too. He also sold secrets about the movements of undersea fleets to both sides.

The Last Pirate of the Mediterranean, as a great Spanish writer dubbed him, now began to really expand * * * He became a large-scale shipping magnate, financiar, banker, chain newspaper publisher, textile mill and mine operator, and a great landowner With King Alfonso's backing March became the economic overlord of Spain. March's power to flout all laws came to a halt when the Republicans jugged him. But they neglected to jail every key man in the March empire. Had they taken this drastic step, World War No. 2 might have been averted

Juan March's money was able to stuff enough ballot boxes in Valencia to guarantee the "election" of the jailbird to the Cortes, Spain's Congress. Cortes members enjoyed immunity from arrest. Would have been a nice trick, if it had worked But the Republic proved the election was a fraud—and kept him behind bars. A million peseta bribe to the warden finally got March out on November 3, 1933. He shipped to Paris, where he arranged a coup which put his protege, Gil Robles, in as Premier of Spain. The Gil Robles government in 1934 declared March had been legally elected to the Cortes. As a deputy, March went back to Spain

While March was in jail, the man he admired most in Europe, A. Hitler, became Fuehrer. The Germans needed the raw materials and the military control of Spain as part of their plan of world domination. The Spanish Republic barred their way In February 1936, the people of the Republic voted Gil Robles and his gang out of office. Juan March promptly elected to call the Nazis into Spain—as his partners. The deal was consummated on July 18, 1936—when German and Italian troops invaded Spain and installed the puppet Franco in Madrid. Madrid finally fell to the Axis in April 1939. By September the Nazis moved on Poland, France, and England. At the start the Axis idea had been to keep Spain officially neutral—to keep it from becoming a battlefield But when they realized that Hitler was going to lose this war, March knew that eventually fascism would have to wear a false face in Spain

March and Gil Robles became exiles and enemies of Franco in Lisbon. And now March and his German boy friends are preparing for the return of the monarchy in Spain—a new government supposed to fool the world. The Nazi carteleers plan to set up an Iberno-American federation after the war, with Spain as the heart of a Fascist empire to include Argentina, Bolivia, and other Latin American countries. And March will be their partner.

March today is chuckling over the way characters like Beigbeder are convincing innocents in North and South America that the return of the Spanish monarchy would be a good thing for the United Nations. He feels confident of his chances. But if the master plan March and his German partners have drawn up does succeed, it is an automatic guaranty of world war No. 3 within a decade—with the Western Hemisphere as its battlefield. And there are still some cheerful idiots at large who insist what happens in Spain is none of our business.

Amendment of the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, of which I am chairman, consisting of 44 Members of the House, has for the past year been giving extensive study to all the problems relating to the production, processing, distribution, and consumption of food. Acting under instruction of this committee I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which at that time had under consideration the matter of extending the life of the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, which is under consideration in the House of Representatives at this time.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has recommended that the Price Control Act be amended in several particulars. I wish to discuss these proposed amendments briefly.

Several months ago it clearly appeared that the food situation was being seriously bungled by reason of the fact that there were so many agencies vieing with each other in an attempt to control certain phases of the food problem. The Republican congressional food study committee took the position that the only way to relieve this muddled situation was for the establishment of one central agency with full authority to control all food activities from production to consumption.

The committee had prepared and introduced into the House of Representatives a bill numbered H. H. 2739 which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Later by reason of the efforts of this food study committee, H. R. 2837 was introduced and it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. That bill, with some amendments, was recommended for passage by the Committee on Agriculture and has been pending before the Rules Committee for several months.

The following is in effect one of the amendments that the Republican congressional food study committee thinks should be adopted as a part of the pending bill now under discussion in the House of Representatives:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS, of Ohio: On page 12 after the word "emergency" in line 2, add the following:

"(k) That in order to provide full responsibility for and control over the Nation's food program there is hereby established in the Department of Agriculture a War Food Administration which shall be under the direction and supervision of a War Food Administrator appointed by the President and who shall be directly responsible to the President. Notwithstanding any provision of any other law, no functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion transferred to, vested in, or imposed upon, the War Food Administration or the War Food Administrator by this act shall be transferred to any other officer or agency of the Government, except as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. The War Food Administrator is authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941), exclusively and finally to exercise on behalf of the United States, either directly or through such other officers or agencies as he may designate, all powers, functions, and duties conferred or imposed upon any officer or agency of the United States by any law, order, regulation, or directive with respect to the Nation's food program in the United States and its Territories, including the production, processing, distribution, rationing, procurement, requisitioning, allocation of, priorities, storage, exportation, and importation of, provisions of labor and facilities for, and the establishment, maintenance, and adjustment of prices for food and food facilities.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of every rule, regulation, license, and order prescribed or issued prior to the enactment of this act which were included in such rules, regulation, license, or order in the exercise of any power, function, or duty which this act authorizes and directs the War Food Administrator to exercise shall continue in full force and effect until amended or rescinded by him.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect upon the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or upon such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate. Upon the termination of this act all powers, functions, and duties which this act authorizes and directs the War Food Administrator to exercise and which have not otherwise expired shall be exercised by the officers or agencies of the United States from which transferred or upon which they are otherwise conferred or imposed by law."

Another amendment proposed by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee is as follows:

SEC. 3. Nothing in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or in such act of October 2, 1942, as amended, or in any other provision of law, shall authorize the establishment of any maximum price in the case of any of the following perishable fresh fruits

and vegetables: grapes, berries, cherries, peaches, pears, plums, apricots, melons, lettuce, and tomatoes. And any maximum price heretofore established in the case of any such fruit or vegetable shall cease to be in effect on the day following the date of enactment of this act.

The third amendment offered by the committee is as follows:

Provided further, That should the President adjust wages or salaries upward in accordance with the above proviso, the Administrator shall at once revise all pertinent regulations or orders issued under authority of the Price Control Act of 1942 in order that said adjusted wages or salaries shall be properly reflected in maximum prices or rentals.

Our committee further recommends an amendment to be placed in the proper place in the bill to the effect that the Administrator shall, when he issues orders, regulations, and so forth, accompany the same by a statement as to whether said regulations, orders, and so forth, have received the approval of his industry advisory committee, and if not, he must state the reason for his failure to receive said committee's recommendation.

The language of said amendment, if applicable to the present law, would be to insert the following after the word "Chairman" in the fifth line from the bottom of page 2 as the Emergency Price Control Act is printed in Public Law 421 of the Seventy-seventh Congress:

The Administrator shall, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classifications, differentiations, and adjustments therein, or any amendments thereto. The committee shall make such recommendations to the Administrator with respect to such regulation or order or amendment thereto as it deems advisable, and all regulations, or orders, or amendments thereto shall, in addition to the "statement of considerations involved" referred to herein, be accompanied by a statement as to whether said regulations or orders or amendments thereto have received the approval of said committee, and if at variance with the recommendations of the committee, the reasons therefor.

Our committee also offers an amendment as follows:

That Public Law No. 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, be amended by adding paragraph (j) to section 2, as follows:

"No maximum price shall be established, or continued in effect, after June 30, 1944, on any food product not included in the list of food products making up the cost of living commodities as published in the Cost of Living Index of the United States Department of Labor."

Price and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a set of resolutions adopted on June 2, 1944, by Local No. 1116, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America at Newton, Iowa, on the subject of price control and rent control, and I ask to include this set of resolutions in my remarks in order that all Members of Congress may be advised of the action of this large labor organization:

RESOLUTION DEALING WITH PRICE CONTROL

Whereas we firmly believe in the principles set forth in the Price Control Act as sound and the only sure way to prevent inflation; and

Whereas we believe that those who propose to change such act are bent on a problem of uncontrolled inflation in which a few gain at the expense of the rest of the citizens of our country; and

Whereas sacrifices are being made by the men and women in the service of their country, even to the extent of giving their lives; and

Whereas such sacrifices by persons in active service calls for sacrifices on the part of those on the home front to protect the Nation from economic chaos so that those who are fighting may return to civilian life free from the threat of a post-war depression; and

Whereas we believe the present Price Control Act has to a large extent prevented runaway prices and stabilized our economy and therefore should be extended without any crippling amendments and with adequate appropriations for its enforcement: Therefore be it

Resolved, That local 1116 U. E. R. M. W. A., representing 3,000 war production workers, goes on record in support of the present Price Control Act and urge our representatives in both Houses of Congress to support same without the pending amendments and see that appropriations sufficient to enforce the act are provided; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be sent to our Representatives and Senators and to the press.

RESOLUTION DEALING WITH RENT CONTROL

Whereas the findings of the committee investigating rent control deals primarily with a few outstanding cases of seeming injustices and fails to give facts on the entire situation of housing, rent, and property values; and

Whereas the committee as set up by the Newton Chamber of Commerce was composed primarily of lumber dealers, real estate men, and not individuals as property owners, and failed to give any recognition to the workers and low-income groups in the community; and

Whereas the report indicates a desire on the part of some individuals to raise rents in the community from $10 to $15 per month on dwellings without regards to the ability of the renter to pay; and

Whereas such report fails to give consideration to the fact that large groups of workers have had no increase in wages, particularly white-collared workers, and that many workers are working at wages below the 50 cents which is considered substandard; and

Whereas many industrial workers have had no increase in hourly rates and the increased income comes from an abnormal condition of employment for which overtime pay is received. Such overtime pay may be discontinued by a reduction in working hours thereby decreasing the income of these workers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Local 1116 goes on record endorsing the present program of rent control; and be it further

Resolved, That we firmly believe that the adoption of the recommendations of the committee representing the chamber of commerce would bring undue hardship on those in the lower-income groups of our community; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Congressmen from our State or district.

A Suggested Post-War Employment Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. John Geissler, has promulgated a permanent thrift plan and post-war employment recommendation, which, I believe, will be of interest to my colleagues. At the request of several friends, I am asking unanimous consent that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Here it is:

A POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT PLAN

(By John Geissler)

FOREWORD

The United States of America may well be classed as a progressive and thrifty nation. In general, we have ascended to a noble and good standard of living. The majority of employed people and farmers are able to have substantial food and comfortable clothing, as well as many of the comforts of life, which only a minority of people in other countries can afford. However, we are confronted with many problems of a very serious nature which require solution. History has told us that the course of progress since the very early days of the previous century has been somewhat wavy with ever-recurring depressions at almost regular intervals. Naturally, as we are constantly picking up speed in every phase of activity, owing to the continual introduction of improved speedy and labor-cutting machinery, depressions come to us at shorter periods. Whether prosperous or depression periods, we have at all times a large army of workable unemployed people ranging from five or six millions in prosperous times to fifteen or twenty millions during the depressed periods. It is safe to say that the average unemployed would be from seven to nine million workers receiving little or no compensation for existence or the support of their dependents. Obviously this army of the people must be cared for somehow. The cost is tremendous; every man, woman, and child is taxed for this cost. It is not only the expense of keeping the unemployed and their dependents in existence, but also the consequence of deprivations. This immense army of people will continue to live. Evil results are many. It is one of the sources that fill our public institutions—penitentiaries, asylums, hospitals, etc.

I heartily approve the efforts of the administration since 1932 in introducing measures to combat the unemployment problem. Much is being done to increase our markets. Consumption and buying power is the base of manufacturing and keeping the manpower busy. Could every family have compensation sufficient to buy the necessities at all times, our markets could be held at top level, and our recurring depressions would be nil. However, this achievement is still a serious puzzle.

By intelligent cooperation between business and Government, business may be promoted to a point where the majority of our workable people will be employed. (Possibly bringing the number of unemployed down to one or two million.) This would be termed "prosperity." Having accomplished this, another question would be how to hold it that way. Now, I wish to define a plan that should it receive recognition and be adopted, would prove a favorable solution to

the many problems afore-mentioned. This plan had its inception in 1932 and was rewritten in 1934, then revised March 1, 1939.

THE PERMANENT THRIFT PLAN

THE WORKING MATERIAL

No. 1. The manpower, the army of unemployed. The major factor. An inestimable treasure, now a heavy liability which must be converted into a working asset.

REAL ESTATE

No. 2. In every town, city, and community in the United States we have innumerable parcels of real estate which are either entirely dormant or perhaps at one time have been occupied but now dilapidated and in ruin. The same is true in the counties of every State in the Union. Many farms, by mismanagement, overcropping, without proper treatment, were allowed to deteriorate to such an extent that an individual family is unable to provide a living for themselves. Such farm lands require scientific methods for redemption to normal productivity. There are also virgin tracts, large and small, which are possible to be made into small farms, or where practicable into small homes. All such dormant properties as mentioned form a tremendous acreage. It would be equal to the area of several of our largest States. Putting these properties into habitable shape, would absorb an unlimited volume of the unemployed, thereby returning a good revenue from the investment and giving lucrative income to those employed.

FINANCES

No. 3. Statistics tell us there are huge amounts of capital in bank-deposit boxes or hoarded elsewhere. Also, accumulation of savings invested in long-time bonds or other low-rate interest institutions. Some of these money-holding methods may be safe for the individual holder, but prove to be of no aid for a community.

It is imperative we have adequate ways for people to keep their money safe. But such, or, rather, all moneys, should be kept alive and doing some good publicly. To have a 100-percent loaf of nutritious, healthy bread, we must first have the proper ingredients. Then it must be properly combined to meet with the proper success. The same is also true of a plan of this kind. Now that we have the factors of resource, they are to be so composed as to form an auxiliary to national activities as they prevail.

The first vital feature is to have a head—this, however, is to be in our National Capital—and there originate and maintain a bureau, similar to the F. B. I. These men are to be trained for field work as organizers for local community associations. Such properly established, the following procedure is to prevail.

Capitalizing each association will depend upon what is practical for each individual locality. This may be from ten thousand to ten million dollars. All subscriptions to come from local or otherwise individual investors. The Federal administration to have general jurisdiction over all local associations established. Organizing of each will be governed by rules and regulations as directed by the official field men from headquarters. Each local to have the necessary officers and may draw up by-laws to conform with the basic rules from the head bureau. Investors to have Federal guaranty equal to prevailing rules of banks and loan companies now under such ruling. Locals to establish their own interest rates. Investments also subject to dividend earnings. However, caution must be adhered to, so investment will conform with conditions as they prevail.

REAL ESTATE

Real estate used in this system, as the purpose of this entire plan indicates, is that which is dormant and not marketable, privately. Which would be—dormant city lots, dilapidated premises, also tracts large or small in city or country. Efficient engineers to be engaged to determine how such properties can be utilized to the best advantage.

PURCHASING

Actual values of such properties should be ascertained by the advice of engineers and an appointed committee of each local. Idle properties that cannot be bought at a price that is right a limit of time should be agreed upon as to how long such properties were dormant, then be subject to condemnation and the owners forced to relinquish. Thus, properties in possession of these associations are to be improved with homes and small farms. Homes should vary from two-room houses graduating in size and value not to exceed a total value including premises of more than $8,000. Mostly to be of the smaller cozy type as much as possible. Garden and lawn space should be provided so any members of family with spare time may keep busy and provide table supplies, flowers, etc. Value of farm should be limited to $10,000 equipped.

This plan is not meant to give people out-and-out material presents. Just a grand, most valuable present, which is vital to everyone. That is opportunity. An opportunity to have something to do. Earn his livelihood, a chance to progress and be a member of the revenue producer.

CONDITIONS

As stated there will be homes to fit the condition of everyone. A couple just married, a small family, a large family, an ageing couple, also single persons. The smallest home may consist of a combination living room and kitchen, a bedroom, a bathroom, and basement or woodshed; also, ground for garden and lawns. This type should rent at a rate that a man starting to work at common labor could easily afford to pay.

Homes from this class up to value of $8,000. Homes or farms provided by the association are not to be sold on contracts. All revenues must come from rentals or cash sales. This is to avoid anyone's loss by foreclosures.

One starting employment with association may select a home appropriate for him. He would be entitled to occupancy as long as rent and care of premises are kept up to standard requirements as to rules of association. Should he acquire a growing family and be able to maintain a larger home he would be entitled to exchange his option to a home that would fit his need at that time. The same would apply to a family having occupied a larger home and the family having diminished to a lesser number he could exchange for a smaller place. Sales of homes to be in cash only. One wishing to buy, could accumulate his savings a sufficient amount to acquire a contract from outside interests that would be O. K. Association to have both male and female instructors to help train tenants keep house and premises in the best of condition, also help all members of the family as to planting seeds and taking care of garden. A good book of housekeeping rules should be in every tenant's home.

RULES OF EMPLOYMENT

It is quite natural that the adoption of this plan would require considerable time to reach the ultimate capacity of potential achievement. But from inception it would be of tremendous help in each community as soon as a local association is established. All idle men would be put to work. After associations are in full operation, all unemployed in the community would be absorbed, provided that a moderate amount of public projects were used to take up slack.

In operation of this plan there will be classification of workers, tradesmen of all kinds. Common laborers work for young men just from school or college, also women and girls. The motive is to keep them busy until they can find their place outside. Fairly good wages should prevail but would have to be kept under outside prevailing rates, so as to leave an incentive to find positions in the normal economic life of the community.

Employees of associations, and occupants of association homes would not have to vacate when finding positions elsewhere.

GENERAL REMARKS FOR THIS PLAN

No. 1. Several million people in the United States, now indigents, will earn their keep, being able to buy the necessary food, clothing and other comforts, thus creating markets running into the billions in addition to what is furnished by the normal economic life.

No. 2. It will answer the much needed question of giving ex-convicts a chance so as to reestablish their integrity.

No. 3. It will allow young people to marry at the appropriate time, as to age and other conditions without facing poverty and economic distress.

No. 4. It will provide means of keeping young people busy, and put thousands on the road to success, who would otherwise drift to the degrading and criminal class.

No. 5. With the discipline necessary in caretaking of these association homes, it would raise the general morale of those boys and girls, and add new accomplishments for many generations.

No. 6. Federal cost will be amply reimbursed with the revenues from the additional workers.

JOHN GEISSLER.

TACOMA, WASH.

He Prayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most infamous articles I ever read appeared in the Times-Herald of yesterday, June 8, 1944, and came from the pen of John O'Donnell. Under the title, "Capitol Stuff," O'Donnell has for months, by means fair or foul, been devoting his talents to discrediting our Commander in Chief. Yesterday, it seems to me, he overstepped the bounds of just common, ordinary decency; and, in my opinion, if his years are extended beyond those lived by Methuselah, will never live down the infamy that the article, in the minds of all God-fearing men and women, will attach to his name.

The article follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Three things have hurt and sorely wounded the fourth-term board of strategy. They have even raised mutterings among the F. D. R. faithful that the once sure and adroit political touch of the President has become fumbling and awkward.

What has alarmed the White House palace guard are these three political errors, each treading on the heels of the other:

1. The President's Monday night radio broadcast on the occasion of the entry of American troops into Rome.

2. The President's prayer, supposedly composed by F. D. R. early Tuesday morning and recited by him over the radio that night.

3. The decision on D-day, in the face of all the emotion of the long-awaited invasion of Europe, of the voters in the ancient Democratic New York City stronghold of the Eleventh Congressional District to reject the New Deal Democratic-American Labor candidate and elect a Republican.

The trouncing handed the Roosevelt candidate in New York City was a simple political fact—significant so far as it reveals the deep anti-Roosevelt bitterness of the voters once they are free to express their opinions in the safety and privacy of the polling booth.

But the resentment created by the two Roosevelt political addresses of Monday and Tuesday has been swift, deadly, and Nation-wide. Lesson No. 1 in the bright lexicon of all politicians is to steer clear of issues of race and religion.

For months one of the worries of the fourth-term candidate is that Roosevelt strength has been drained away from those ancient reservoirs of New Deal political support, the voting power of American Catholics and the political strength in great cities of Americans of Italian descent.

The White House address to be delivered on the evacuation of Rome by the Germans was timed and aimed at the political target of winning back this former Roosevelt support. The White House palace guards are frankly confessing that they have lost the all-out support of Americans of Irish, Polish, French-Canadian, Latin-American, Scandinavian, Finnish descent, along with those from the Baltic republics. But the Italian vote they insisted they could win back.

But from reports now coming back to the Capital, the President's June 5 address was worse than a dud. It backfired right in Franklin's political face.

As a journeyman reporter, we have never felt qualified to read copy on a formal prayer—particularly one which was industriously composed, mimeographed at public expense, and then broadcast on highly valuable radio time. And so yesterday we sought the advice of professionals—Protestant and Catholic clergymen.

They didn't like the spiritual qualities of the Roosevelt prayer. All declared that better and more appropriate prayers had already been written—plain, simple words that best suit the ear of grief and call upon the spirit with the welcome familiarity of old friends. Above all, they objected to the note of grating arrogance in the plea of supplicants—and they didn't like the overtone of politics—even when it was spread out on a global scene.

But if the Roosevelt address on the fall of Rome was a political bloomer, his prayer on the night of D-day was complete disaster. This really has hit F. D. R. where it hurt.

After all, there are going to be more American women voting for President next November than men. The reaction of the mothers, wives, sisters, and sweethearts to the Roosevelt personally composed prayer, with all its bland and smug overtones (probably quite unconscious) indicating that F. D. R. and the Supreme Being were partners in these days of death, was an immediate and shocking feeling of revulsion toward the Big Brain and Golden Voice in the White House.

The gentlest criticism that we heard yesterday from one distinguished Washington clergyman was the observation:

"After all, I thought after listening that perhaps the President was being a bit dictatorial toward God."

Another, reaching back to his memories of Shakespeare, said that the radio voice of Roosevelt reciting his prayer called up memories of a politically minded uncle of Prince Hamlet—a gentleman who had also been a bit ruthless in his efforts to perpetuate ruling power. He quoted:

"My words fly up, my thoughts remain below;
"Words without thoughts, never to Heaven go."

The Washington Post has been a sturdy supporter of the Roosevelt brace-new-world foreign policy and the spiritual spur with which the Lord Franklin furrows the flanks of his political backers.

Both the role of Roosevelt as a self-anointed apostle of the Prince of Peace, the emergence of a political messiah from the mountebank, was too much for the editorial stomach of that journal. Gently, they utter the soft impeachment:

"Perhaps there are some who think the President's prayer might have been still more moving and eloquent had he protested less about the righteousness of our cause and the inflexibility of our purpose—since it is, after all, God who judges causes and disposes of the purposes of men—or had he been content merely to repeat some ancient and hallowed formulary, such as the Lord's Prayer. But doubtless the President was obliged to speak as a statesman as well as an humble suppliant.

"And doubtless, too, there are few of us whose prayers would not be the better for some amendment in the attitude of heart, if not in the form of language, in which they are uttered. * * * One of these days we may discover in ourselves those things which are necessary to all real prayer—humility, contrition, and the sense of dependence upon God, with whom, it is said, all things are possible, and without whom nothing is possible."

Scoffers still scoff; those with faults still throw stones; and to the hirelings of partisan politicians in an election year not even holy prayer, it would seem, is sacred.

Let the scoffers scoff on; the stone throwers keep on hurling their poisonous missiles; and the hirelings of partisan politicians continue to receive their 30 pieces of silver to crucify the political opponents of their masters even though the crucifixion calls for belittling and desecrating holy prayer; and yet, in spite of all the scoffing, the stone throwing, the belittling, the desecration, honesty prompts me to admit that the prayer touched me deeply, and I still thank God that he prayed.

In the House of Representatives, the morning of the invasion, I first heard the President's prayer. It was sent to the House as a message from the President. When the Clerk read the opening sentence of the message, "In this poignant hour I ask you to join me in prayer," I did that very thing, and I am not ashamed of the faith, the need, that prompted me to the act. That night in the quietness of my own room, all alone, I again joined the President in his prayer, and I am not ashamed of the faith, the need, that again prompted me to repeat the act. And, somehow, I am persuaded that the faith, the need, of the American people as a whole, led them, as it did me, to join with the President that night as he prayed for our boys in combat, their mothers, their fathers, their wives, their children, their loved ones, for a speedy victory over our enemies, for the preservation of our Nation, and for a just and lasting peace, until the prayer literally became the voice of this Nation going up in humble supplication to a just and righteous God.

The skeptics, the political assassins, to the contrary, the great majority of our people still believe in prayer, and I rejoice that our present President, like the first President of this Republic, is among the number that so believe. Prayer with our President is nothing new. I remember that fateful day back in March 1933 when our people knew not which way to turn, our President, before assuming leadership attended divine services and prayed. No one questioned his sincerity then. No one thought that his spiritual attitude was that of the Pharisee. With hunger abroad, with millions idle, with banks crashing, we all stood in need of prayer. And, my colleagues, today, with vacant chairs in every home, with millions of our boys meeting in deadly combat the greatest force the gods of evil ever assembled, with the wires and mails daily bringing death messages to further stricken our people, we stand in need of prayer as never before in the history of this Republic. Shame upon those who in this grave hour are so devoid of charity, yea, of just common ordinary decency, that, in order to further their political ends, they will call in question the President's sincerity in leading our Nation in prayer. There are still some things that are so sacred that they are above and beyond politics. From now on I hope that the tongue of the politician may remain silent and the pen of his hireling still when our Commander in Chief seeks divine help and guidance for the people, for the Nation, over which he presides.

Government by Subterfuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a revolution in the United States. No; it is not one of bloodshed. Nevertheless, what is being done today by the New Deal, under auspices and through the medium of foreign ideologies, is a violation of the very spirit of the American Constitution. The words of that great document are left intact, yet they are cunningly being deprived of their meaning and intent by misconstruction of its provisions by both the courts and the bureaucrats.

Plato 2,000 years ago said:

The States are as the men are; they grow out of human characters.

The United States were founded and grew great and prosperous under the banner of our Constitution which so magnificently reflected the character of the founding fathers and the character of the American people. For a century and a half Americans could proudly claim that the States were as the men were. And all the world looked toward our shores in admiration and with a

measure of envy. Our American way of life, our principles of liberty, of free opportunity, of tolerance, became the inspiration that advanced the cause of democratic and constitutional government in distant lands. Our American Constitution, as conceded by every student of events, marks one of the great milestones in human history and in individual liberty.

A quarter century ago we had an agonizing experience in this country. We won a World War and came out of our victory defeated on every major issue of ideals. Wilson's Fourteen Points were scrapped. The Atlantic Charter is being scrapped today. In fact, it is already scrapped. So instead of the peace that seemed within reach, we get a renewed outburst of power politics which will lead us straight into another and still more terrible World War. After the peace of Versailles the American people were thoroughly disillusioned and promised themselves never to be entangled in another European war. They did not look kindly upon internationalism when the strong American economy in the late twenties was wrecked by the economic follies of the peace settlement in Europe. The great depression proved to be more than the American people could overcome. Our attempts to bring back normal conditions were even less effective than those of any of the other 16 more important nations of the world, and as late as 1937 we were seventeenth in point of economic recovery of all those 17 more important nations. This was in spite of the fact that we had greater resources, greater initiative, greater productive capacity. We made the mistake of believing a regimented America could do a job in a way which no other supposedly intelligent nation would even attempt. We are paying and will continue to pay for generations for the folly of trying to lift ourselves out of our misery by methods which have failed whenever and wherever they have been tried. The net result has been more misery.

In times of misery and distress, new prophets arise. They have always arisen when the breadlines formed and the tragedies of unemployment were spreading. It was thus with our people in 1932. It is under such conditions that the revolutionists thrive, and, in fact, get the upper hand. It was due to this that Lenin and his Bolsheviks let loose the bloody orgy in Russia. In Italy, Mussolini marched on Rome. Adolph Hitler seized power in Germany first, and, later, by cunning and force, in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Luxembourg, Belgium, France, Yugoslavia, Greece, Hungary, and Romania.

In this country, the New Dealers appeared on the stage with their new gospel, which in reality was an imported old doctrine propounded by the German, Karl Marx, radical advocate of socialism and communism. In such days of intense social and political stress, it is a strange fact, known by all countries which have passed through this horrible experience, that a certain type of upper-class revolutionaries appear on the stage, as did Kerenski in Russia, Count Karolyi in Hungary, the Communist, or Nazi lords and university professors of England, etc.; men called "idealists" by their friends, "degenerates" by their enemies; men who deliver the society, of which they themselves form a part, to destruction by the mob in the streets, whether that destruction was accomplished by brutal force or by less painful but just as effective means. Vice President WALLACE has chosen to call this war a revolution rather than a war. As far as constitutional government in the United States is concerned, it must be admitted that he and his revolutionary friends have achieved amazing results from which the American people will suffer greatly.

Plato, who was a very wise man, had this to say about the rise of one governmental system out of another:

> All political changes originate in divisions of the actual governing power.

Twenty-four hundred years ago, a Greek genius could see the truth of a principle and warn his contemporaries against the very same development that is happening today in our own country. Constitutional government is being systematically destroyed and a foreign pattern of government, aping the vicious methods of the great dictators and their bureaucracies, is being substituted. If the majority of the people acquiesce, perhaps under the influence of excitement, the result will be that which James Bryce predicted in 1888:

> Then it matters little whether what is really a revolution be accomplished by openly violating or by merely distorting the forms of law.

The New Dealers have chosen to proceed as far as possible along the latter path and with conspicuous success.

Our domestic revolutionaries violently resent any suggestion that what they are doing to this country is destructive and harmful to the people. On the contrary, they claim their only intention is to help the common man, though they profess little interest in the uncommon man who, by his vision, his enterprise, his untiring energy and indomitable willpower, created the very basis for an American standard of life—a standard such as has been known to no other people in all human existence.

Daniel Webster a century ago knew the fallacy of that kind of argument and warned against those false prophets:

> It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions, real or pretended. * * * There are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully—but who mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well—but they mean to govern. They promise to be kind masters—but they mean to be masters. They think they need but little restraint upon themselves. Their notion of the public interest is apt to be quite closely connected with their own exercise of authority. They may not, indeed, always understand their own motives. The love of power may sink too deep in their own hearts even for their own security and may pass with themselves for mere patriotism and benevolence.

Judge T. M. Cooley, writing in the International Review for January 1875, and quoting Edward Livingston, pointed out:

> The gloss of zeal for public service is always spread over acts of oppression, and the people are sometimes made to consider that zeal as a brilliant exertion of energy in their favor which, when viewed in its true light, would be found a fatal blow to their rights. In no government is this effect so easily produced as in a free republic; party spirit, inseparable from its existence, aids the illusion, and a popular leader is allowed in many instances impunity—and sometimes is rewarded with applause—for acts which would make a tyrant tremble on his throne.

Thomas Jefferson saw a particular danger to good government in a concentration of power. He said:

> A single consolidated government would become the most corrupt government on earth. * * * What has destroyed the liberty and the rights of men in every government which has existed under the sun? the generalizing and concentrating all cares into one body. * * * It is not by consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution that good government is effected. * * * I like the organization of the government into legislative, judiciary, and executive.

So did the author of a passage that appeared in John C. Hamilton's The Federalist in 1866, who said:

> The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

Roscoe L. Ashley has in the American Federal State described the intentions of the framers of the Constitution in this way:

> The eighteenth century ideal of good government was one of checks and balances. This was undoubtedly due to the belief of the people that individual liberty should be the prime object of government. * * * In order, therefore, to keep the government from harming the individual, an attempt was made to separate the legislative, executive and judicial departments with the intention of balancing them against each other, and making them serve as checks upon one another. * * * The Central Government created by the Constitution of 1787 was the nearest approach to this eighteenth century ideal that ever existed.

Elihu Root, finally, had this to say as a solemn warning to guard the distribution of power to the different departments of government and the limitations upon the officers invested with authority in each department.

> If whatever great officer of State happens to be most forceful, skillful, and ambitious, is permitted to overrun and absorb to himself the powers of all other officers and to control their actions, there ensues that concentration of power which destroys the working of free institutions, enables the holder to continue himself in power, and leaves no opportunity to the people for a change except through revolution.

The preceding series of quotations I have deliberately selected from authors who knew nothing of the New Deal and the Roosevelt administration, but who were wise men with a profound knowledge of human nature and its innate weaknesses. That is the true reason why those old statements now seem to us

to reveal almost uncanny prophetic gifts. The truths they spoke then are the guide posts for us now. We must still exercise that eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty or we will risk losing our liberty. That must never be.

Guarding Veterans' Families Against Eviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release which appeared in the Sparta (Wis.) Herald and other Wisconsin newspapers:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER

(By Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON)

GUARDING VETERANS' FAMILIES AGAINST EVICTION

There are other benefits arranged by the Federal Government for the war veterans.

Other servicemen's benefits I desire to mention include protection against eviction of servicemen's dependents for nonpayment of rent under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. Under this law, evictions for rentals not exceeding $80 a month may be made only on court order and may be stayed for 3 months by the court.

In addition, stays of judgments, attachments, garnishees, in the discretion of the courts, on actions against men during their service or within 90 days thereafter, may be granted. Further information concerning this legal protection is available at the local courthouse or soldiers' relief agent in your town.

The Seventy-eighth Congress during its first session has already enacted several sweeping and vital measures extending liberal benefits and rights to servicemen and women. Those include Public Law No. 10, providing hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to World War No. 2 veterans on a parity with World War No. 1 veterans; Public Law No. 13, authorizing renewal of the expiring 5-year level premium term insurance policies by the agent or beneficiary of an insured serviceman who is outside the continental United States; Public Law No. 16, providing for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans, mentioned earlier in this article.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Of very direct interest to all discharged veterans in certain categories is the so-called mustering-out pay bill, which provides for payments ranging from $100 to $300, depending on the length and character of service of the veteran. Now that this legislation has become law by virtually the unanimous vote of Congress, veterans eligible for mustering-out pay receive such payments as they are discharged from the service without making the special application required of the 1,300,000 or more veterans discharged prior to the enactment of this bill. Of this number, about 700,000 are believed eligible for mustering-out pay. I desire to make some brief observations for the benefit of these men and women which may help them to expedite their respective applications.

Discharged veterans desiring to apply for mustering-out pay may obtain application forms from your county veterans' service officer. These same forms may be used by Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine veterans. In addition, local veterans' organizations also have a supply of forms, and newspapers throughout the country have printed the official blanks, which are readily procurable.

CERTIFICATE NEEDED

Let me emphasize here that the serviceman must return this application with his original service discharge certificate. Under regulations photostatic copies will not serve the purpose inasmuch as the original certificate itself must be marked with appropriate notations that the serviceman has applied for and has been granted mustering-out pay. This ruling was made in order to minimize duplicate or fraudulent claims, and at the same time expedite payment to the veteran, inasmuch as centralized discharge records will not be consulted for some time following actual payment of these benefits. The applications of all discharged veterans who were inducted from this area must be returned to the Army finance officer, and payment will be made from that office. Veterans should not become concerned if they receive their first check without their discharge certificate returned in the same envelope. The certificate will be sent in a day or two as an added protection against theft. These safeguards were deemed necessary to prevent fraud and misrepresentation.

Status of the Premedical Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, from all theaters of war have come glorious reports from supreme commanding officers and the men in the ranks of all military services, covering the efficient, courageous, and patriotic ministrations of medical officers.

No single group in this country has exceeded the medical profession in the proportionate withdrawal of men from normal pursuits to active military duty; in fact, some communities are now without competent medical men.

In the future, when our country will be called upon to care for increasing medical needs in occupied countries and when the sick and wounded are returned to our shores and the danger of tropical and unusual diseases must be met in our own country, as a result of the war, there will be imposed upon this already overtaxed medical profession, increased responsibilities and demands.

The medical fraternity is rightfully giving serious and intelligent thought to this problem.

In order that the membership of the House may recognize the steps already taken, I have asked permission to extend my remarks and to include an editorial which will appear in the next issue of the American Medical Journal.

It is interesting, challenging, and must be considered by the people of the countries, and by the Congress.

STATUS OF THE PREMEDICAL STUDENT

Under Medicine and the War in this issue of the Journal appears an official statement by the directing board of the Procurement and Assignment Service relative to the present status of the effort to secure a continuous supply of physicians. The condition seems to have reached a stalemate. Apparently the responsibility for action lies now with the Director of the Selective Service System, General Hershey. Several high officials of our Government have indicated their complete sympathy with the necessity for maintaining continuity of medical education on a high standard. Apparently, however, the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, and the Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, are not sympathetic to this need. They have said in a joint communication that the proposal to place premedical and predental students on an inactive status in the enlisted reserve corps so that they may continue their studies would provide immunity from military service for 5 or more years to a selected group of young men. They suggest, moreover, that the essential in the selection would be the ability of the parents to finance the education, together with the ability of the student to complete the premedical or predental courses and thereafter to qualify for entrance into approved medical or dental colleges.

Apparently the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy oppose granting deferment to premedical students, notwithstanding the fact that it will lower tremendously the number of graduates in medicine and dentistry in the years 1948 and 1949, on the grounds that the armed forces need young men of intelligence with the proper physical qualifications and that the immediate needs of the war for their services ought not to yield to the prospective use of these young men as doctors at a later date. They support this contention with the argument that many doctors at present in the military service will be released by 1948 and 1949.

An alternative suggestion has been that the Army agree to supply qualified premedical students by selecting from young men now in the armed forces those who had previously been engaged in a course of study in the premedical years and who had already completed at least a year of military service. This would, of course, involve selection of medical students by the Army, rather than by the medical schools. It would involve picking out young men from remote areas like the Aleutians, North Africa, and the South Pacific, and transporting them back home.

Up to now, Government officials have apparently comprehended the need for maintaining continuous medical education of a high standard in the United States. Evidently the pressures on them have caused them to abandon this point of view and to gamble on the future of health in this country. The available statistics indicate that persistence in the policy now prevailing will mean disastrous conditions in the years to come. About 3,500 doctors die each year in the United States. If the armed forces are to take 3,330 out of 6,440 in each medical class, leaving the balance of 3,110 to be filled by women and physically defective men, the situation 5 years from now will be hazardous. There will be an actual deficit of physicians coming into the profession each year.

The statement that men will be released from the armed forces by that time sufficient to compensate for the deficit in new graduates shows a complete lack of comprehension of the needs of medical service. Where will our hospitals secure interns and residents? Where will the specialist branches in medicine secure the men who will be willing to undergo 3 to 5 years of additional training to qualify? Who will take care of the veterans in the greatly expanded medical care program of the Veterans' Administration? Who will supply the needs of our allies and, particularly, the people of the liberated countries, where medical schools have been closed and physicians taken as prisoners to take care of the laborers from their

own countries deported into Germany? What about the great program of extension of advanced medical education to our neighbors in South America? What about the tremendous needs of China for modern medical aid, which is so strongly emphasized by all of the leaders of our Government? At a time when the whole world is confronted with a need for well-trained physicians as never before, American officialdom is apparently willing to cut off the supply at its very source.

By June, young men now engaged in premedical education will begin to be inducted into the service. Letters pour into the headquarters office of the American Medical Association from leaders in education, from physicians and from citizens everywhere urging that everything possible be done to halt this folly.

The situation has been complicated by the fact that a committee representing the Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges and another representing the American Dental Association have agreed with the Director of the Selective Service System that the taking of young men from the armed forces after they have completed at least a year of military service will be a satisfactory solution to the problem. From this agreement the directing board of the Procurement and Assignment Service, the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals and many leaders in medical education strongly dissent. The statement of the directing board appears in this issue.

The Council on Medical Education and Hospitals is convinced that the plan cannot insure an adequate supply of qualified medical students. The argument has been offered that the Selective Service System was able to carry out a similar program successfully for the supplying of coal miners and copper miners. Anyone familiar with the requirements in the field of premedical education will realize that there can be no analogy between these two situations. The continuing production of physicians of a high standard of education should have precedence because of the fundamental demand for such services at all times by the armed forces and because the needs of our civilian population now and in the future cannot be met by the education of men who are physically substandard and of women. It is, to say the least, uneconomical to spend the time, the effort, and the money necessary to put a boy through a premedical course, a medical course, and an internship when his physical condition is such as to indicate a lessened life expectancy and the possibility of invalidism in the future. Ten years of service to the people at the end of his career will be of far more value from every possible point of view than 10 years at the beginning.

Certainly, this problem is one to which the house of delegates of the American Medical Association should give most careful and serious consideration at the forthcoming session in Chicago. Certainly, it is of sufficient importance to demand that it be taken, if necessary, directly to the Congress of the United States and to the President.

Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address before the Kiwanis Club of Baton Rouge, La., June 1, 1944, by Lewis I. Bourgeois:

Transportation is with us just as sure as death and taxes—not however as negative as that but as definitely necessary as it was to early man who used his back to transport to his cave the fruits of his hunt; as sure as we see it today in the movement of man and material in war or in peace.

We probably rarely think of it but transportation is a commodity which we use more of than anything else in the world. Take the clothes we wear or the food we eat. All of it has been transported some time or other from somewhere to somewhere. Your suit of woolens; it started out as wool on the back of some sheep on the western slopes of the Rockies or the far-off plains of Australia or the pampas of the Argentine. From there many things have taken place. After shearing, first the wool was sorted and baled and transported by cart or truck to rail siding or river port or ocean terminal and again transported for grading, processing, cleaning, weaving, dyeing, cutting, tailoring and selling; then it on your back. During that time it was moved, and pushed and pulled and carried and carted and trucked and railed and shipped and barged around numerous times. Between your movements in your travels, and between home and laundry, it continues to be transported, until it is carried in that last journey from which there is no return.

A good deal of your money is used for transportation—as a matter of fact—you are a big buyer of transportation. Most of the energy of this great country is expended just moving things around.

I was on an inspection tour of one of our large defense plants the other day and I dare say that half of the men and machines within the plant were busy transporting or moving things around. And it took thousands of items moving to that plant to make an implement of war which itself will be moved by derrick, by rail, by barge lighter, by ship, again by lighter and then perhaps by air, to its ultimate destination of destruction of the enemy.

But the normal course of peacetime commerce seeks the cheapest mode of transportation and finds the answer in inland waterway transportation.

In the last half of the nineteenth century we found the rivers dotted with steamboats of every size and description—stern-wheelers, side-wheelers, regular floating palaces, the interior of which rivaled the appointments of any hotel lobby of our great cities. Romance, glamour, tradition lived with the steamboat. In addition, we saw towboats pushing wooden scows filled with coal down to the cities of the lower valley and again slowly winding their way back to the coal-loading ports of the North and the East.

Then came the iron horse, with its highways of steel, following the course of the rivers and tapping the great river cities which the steamboat had helped to build, and gradually the boats disappeared. First, the passenger and then the freighter, so that by the time we first heard the cannons roar over the European Continent in 1914 we could only find a small steamboat here and there, probably hauling apples in the Ohio Valley, and a few towboats and barges moving coal and steel on the Monongahela.

And then the Kaiser sank just one too many of our ships and we were plunged into war. The wheels of industry turned and as they turned materials of war moved; and materials moved so fast that they actually poured toward our embarkation ports; and soon our railroads could not handle all. The yards clogged up with loaded cars from the seaboard to the Mississippi; the ports congested faster than the ocean vessels could load and clear. And so the Government took over transportation. In looking around for every means possible to clear the jam, it was discovered that the river was there all the time waiting to do its share of the job. Rivers that had been idle when all the nations of the world were developing and using their rivers and canals and coordinating them with rail and highway.

Worn-out towboats were bought and corrugated iron and wooden barges were taken over and a barge line was established on the Mississippi between St. Louis and New Orleans, and thus the Federal barge lines of today had its origin. Its first sailing was but a few months before the armistice, and it handled during those few months of that year about 18,000 tons of freight. When the war was over it had a variety of river craft on its hands which seemed well ready for the scrap heap.

However, the leaders of this Mississippi Valley seemed to sense an opportunity for a return of inland-waterway commerce; a commerce which our forefathers developed to make this a great valley, and this river equipment seemed to be just what was needed for a start. And from that start we have seen a quarter of a century of river traffic which has surpassed in volume all of the river-tonnage figures of the century previous.

Down through the years we have seen a constant development of inland water-borne traffic and when the figures are eventually released we will find that the total tonnage has reached proportions far beyond the predictions of those valley leaders whose vision and courage made this commerce possible.

Barge lines are operating today throughout the Mississippi Valley. From the Great Lakes through Chicago, down the Illinois waterway to meet the Mississippi; from the Twin Cities on the upper Mississippi; from the grain metropolis of Kansis City, on the Missouri to its confluence with the Mississippi; from the great industrial cities of the Ohio Valley down that stream to Cairo; all forming a network with the Mississippi, and tapping the Intracoastal Canal which borders Texas and Louisiana, and which reaches to Florida, and on its way connecting at Mobile with the Warrior in Alabama up into the Birmingham steel and coal areas.

The variety of commodities on inland waters covers great numbers; some are peacetime domestic consumer goods, but in the beginning of this great war-preparedness program the river tonnage encountered a drop, and perhaps understandingly so. Material was needed and needed badly and fast movement became a necessity. But soon stock piles began to grow and warehouses started bulging with material and yet those directing the movement of material continued to employ the quicker deliveries of land transportation until there came a realization that the river was there to be used—that the river was there waiting to take its share of the burden of war transportation. Gradually war commodities found their way by inland waters to factory and base and camp and embarkation port and now the importance of inland waterways in time of war as well as in peace is being fully realized and demonstrated again.

Modern towboats, Diesel-powered, twin screw, high horsepower, today push tows of from 8 to 12 barges in 1 tow; some of these barges have capacity as high as 2,240 net tons, so that a tow today may have a total tonnage of as much as 10,000 to 12,000 tons.

Before we opened the intracoastal canal in Texas and Louisiana, it was my experience in 1933 to participate in a traffic survey of potential tonnage to move on that canal. By fairly conservative research we found approximately a half million tons which could be developed. Today, recent figures divulged by the authorities show that over 21,000,000 tons have moved in 1942 on that waterway alone.

Inland waterway tonnage figures announced for the first time since the outbreak of war show that the inland waterways of the

Mississippi Valley handled in 1942 over 125,000,000 net tons, an increase of 29 percent over 1940.

The combined traffic moving on all inland waterways, river and canal, was over 146,000,000 tons, and this I am informed does not include that tonnage embracing strategic materials of war or lend-lease.

But probably the two most unexpected developments of inland waterway transportation came about during this war.

This is a war of transportation. This is a war of motorized and mechanized movement. Modern weapons on land, on sea, and in the air consequently must use fuel and the most strategic material of the war today is petroleum and its products. No sooner had the ink dried on the war proclamation, than we began to hear the explosions of torpedoes up and down our Atlantic seaboard and in the Gulf. Enemy subs were sending our freighters and tankers to the bottom at a terrific rate.

Our great industrial eastern seaboard is served greatly by coastwise tankers. It seemed that the subs were concentrating on our tankers and slowly but surely our oil supply in that area began to dwindle and rationing became severe. Not only the motorist suffered but home and fireside suffered, too.

With tankers needed to bring fuel to our far-flung battle fronts, it was inevitable that the service of the coastwise tanker would soon disappear. And so all the tank cars and tank trucks of the Nation were mobilized and thrown into the breach but still that proved insufficient. But the rivers and canals were there—safe from submarine warfare—safe from air attack. Government agencies awoke to this realization and quickly hundreds of dry cargo barges were taken over, converted to oil carriage, and promptly assigned to oil transportation. Immediately contracts were let for new barges and towboats and they were built and are in use now in the movement of oil.

Today petroleum is king of the water-borne commodities and every day we see tows after tows moving from the oil fields and refineries of Louisiana and Texas, moving east on the Intracoastal Canal to the Florida tanks and pipe lines, north to the Birmingham district, up the Mississippi to St. Louis and Minneapolis; up the Illinois to Chicago; over the Ohio to the eastern territory, hardest hit by the scarcity of oil tankers. No other individual commodity has grown in volume as this waterway petroleum traffic. The river filled a need; the river again proved the answer in the emergency. Oil is moving with dispatch, and efficiency, and with economy; oil movement by barge is second only to the ocean oil tanker in economy in the transportation of this comodity.

Another surprising development of water transportation during this war, and in which the river again was the answer, was the construction of floating equipment for war purposes on the upper Mississippi and on the Great Lakes, and the moving of such equipment down the Mississippi to the open sea. Before the war, no one would have dared to predict the building of submarines on the Great Lakes and their subsequent movement to the Gulf. Far removed from coastal attack and even token air raids, shipyards built over a thousand military and naval vessels of considerable size, and river towboats brought them down the river without interruption of channel obstruction by sand bars or ice; brought them down past your city on their way to the Gulf, where they were placed in commission and sent on to the theaters of war in the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Yes; the river is serving the Nation today, and at a time when its need is greater than ever before.

And when the conflict is over and the peace is written, inland waterways transportation will continue to serve the peoples of this great valley, attracting to itself those commodities which are natural to slow but economical transportation; and coordinating and cooperating with all other forms of transportation it will then, as now, always be a potent factor in the growth of agriculture and industry, which ultimately will make of this Mississippi Valley the largest area of prosperity in the entire world.

Extension of the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a unique sensation to receive a communication which approaches the problem of extension of the price-control law objectively and without any selfish motives whatsoever. As a part of this extension of remarks I should like to include the following statement, which represents the position on this matter of some of the most outstanding organizations in America:

We, the undersigned representatives of organizations, call upon the Congress to extend the price-control statutes as they are—without any weakening amendment—and to provide the O. P. A. with the funds that are necessary to do the job laid upon it.

For the past 2 months witness after witness has appeared before committees of the Congress, professing support for price control but demanding that the law be amended to give his industry or his product special consideration.

One hundred and twenty-five amendments have been proposed, each one intended to force the O. P. A. to raise prices. While some of these proposals have been submitted sincerely, for the most part it has been a shocking exhibition of greed.

We repudiate these proposals. These men do not speak for us. They do not speak for our men at the front and they do not speak for many businessmen and farmers of this country.

We know many businessmen and farmers in our communities. They are our neighbors. We know they do not wish to profiteer from the war. We know that, like us, they want the line held.

The claim that these amendments will not weaken, but will strengthen, price control, misleads no one. Under the existing law the line has been held for a solid year. What has been done under the statutes during the past year can be done under the same statutes in the year ahead.

And if the law is amended and the line bends and breaks, no amount of talk will stand against the record. The American people will know what did it and who was responsible for doing it.

The Congress acted wisely 2 years ago in enacting the price control law. We call upon the Congress today to reaffirm its wisdom—so completely demonstrated by the record—by extending this law without weakening amendment and by providing the O. P. A. with the funds necessary to do its job.

American Association of University Women, Dr. Kathryn McHale, general director; American Home Economics Association, Miss Gladys Wyckoff, executive secretary; Congregational-Christian Churches, Council for Social Action, Rev. Francis McPeek, chairman, legislative committee; Methodist Church, Women's Society for Christian Service, Mrs. M. E. Tilly, chairman, southeastern jurisdiction; National Council of Catholic Women, Mrs. Robert Angelo, president; National Council of Jewish Women, Mrs. Gerson Levi, national chairman of Social Welfare and War Activities; National Education Association, Mr. Willard Givens, executive secretary; National Farmers' Union, Mr. James G. Patton, president; National Federation of Settlements, Miss Mildred Gutwillig, chairman, Consumers' Interest Committee; National League of Women Shoppers, Miss Katherine Armatage, chairman, board of directors; National Women's Trade Union League, Miss Elizabeth Christman, executive secretary; National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, president.

The Eternal City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the New York Evening Sun:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE ETERNAL CITY

The fact that Rome is intact, that its historic magnificence has not been reduced to rubble, that the symbols of western civilization blossoming in the religion of our various peoples still stand—that is a triumph that speaks of the miracles that for thousands of years have saved the city on the Tiber. And today this city is important to us not for its Caesars, ancient or modern, but for its association with the religion of God.

One need not be a Roman Catholic to appreciate the importance of Rome. We live in an age of ugly, base materialism, an age in which morals have been debased to the principle that if you can get away with it, it is right. We live at a time when even the ideal of God has been subjected to a degenerative whittling away from a glorious leadership toward the heavenly life to a doctrine that there is no absolute truth at all and that what is one day provable is on that day right, and that what is right today may be everlastingly wrong tomorrow. The industrialization of vast multitudes, the shifting of population from one part of the earth to another, the swiftness of transportation are a few of the causes for the uprooting of individuals from their traditional moorings. But even more, these and other forces have almost succeeded in destroying the one instrument of civilization which is wholly conceived in love, the family as the central unit of society, the core of everything we are and everything we have.

FORCE FOR FOOD

Against these destructive forces making for the enslavement of the spirit of man, poisoning the wells of civilization, reducing man to a statistical entity, a dot on a chart, a thing to be used and moved about and even destroyed in the interest of force and power, stands the symbol of the instrument of

God's good. It matters not at all whether one is a Jew or a Protestant, or even if one is utterly without religious affiliation—to all who love God and who recognize that it is the force of religion that moved the western people from the degeneracy of paganism, from the savagery of Thor and Wotan and the droolings of the Druids and a life of murder and rapine to this day when even those who make and fight wars swear that they hate war—all those who recognize the progress of man since Europe has come to know God, must respect and cherish the force for good, even when it has erred, that has come out of the City of God. Rome—the Rome of Christianity—stands as the beacon light against the heavens for that ideal, for the dreams of Micah and Isaiah and Jesus of Nazareth, Jews, it is true, but Jews whose dreams are still unfulfilled by a world that yearns toward their realization.

AVOIDED EASIER VICTORY

I am proud, as an American, that it was my people and my flag that marched into Rome to liberate it. And I am prouder still that those who commanded our troops restrained an impulse to an easier victory by bombing the Eternal City into a mass of unidentifiable rubbish. Perhaps we shall save Paris and Vienna from destruction, and even Berlin, for say what one will of the need for speedy victory, it cannot ever be won if nothing remains of Europe but a desert of destroyed cities and homeless, broken people.

The instruments with which this war is being fought are so horrible in their effectiveness that one cannot be human who does not dread in each day's news the accounts not of what is being conquered but of the irreplaceable that is being destroyed. Only the railroad yards in Rome were completely demolished, and they can be built anew in little time. But who could begin to dream of restoring the walls upon which Raphael and Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo spent their souls to the glory of God and man. The Eternal City stands—to remind the erring sons of this earth that their wisdom and genius in this age of efficiency and statistics have yet to reach the beauty and truth of its spirit.

Crippling U. N. R. R. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 6, 1944:

CRIPPLING U. N. R. R. A.

The Republican Members of the House on Saturday showed an alarming spirit of partisanship in respect to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. By what Representative WOODRUM referred to as a strict party vote, they lopped $350,000,000 from the $800,000,000 appropriation sought for that agency by the President. The curtailment can in no sense be considered an economy. The three hundred and fifty million had already been appropriated to lend-lease and would merely have been transferred for U. N. R. R. A.'s use as needed. Besides, Congress is already on record as having authorized an American contribution of $1,350,000,000 to U. N. R. R. A. The effect of the action, therefore, can only be, as Mr. WOODRUM put it, "to cripple U. N. R. R. A."—and to do so as it stands on the very threshold of its tremendous undertaking. The liberation of Rome indicates how near at hand may be the need for its healing efforts.

U. N. R. R. A. cannot do its job with promises—or with promised but unappropriated funds. It must have money with which to purchase the great quantities of food, clothing, farm equipment and repair materials which will be needed to succor the homeless and the hungry and to set the wheels of devastated Europe's economy back in motion. It cannot wait to order these things until liberation is actually achieved. Recognizing this, the British have already appropriated the whole amount of their pledged contribution. So has the little Republic of Iceland. But the United States, the wealthiest and most powerful of the member nations, holds back—and for reasons of partisan politics. To the anguished peoples of Europe whose hopes have been kindled by our promises, this parsimony can bring only dismay and a dangerous disillusionment.

U. N. R. R. A. is the first concrete mechanism for interallied cooperation in the solution of post-war problems. Our adherence to it ought to be wholly divorced from domestic political divisions. The action of the House Republicans is a sorry commentary indeed upon the meaning of the Mackinac declaration to which their party subscribed: "We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world." It cannot fail to suggest that this declaration was mere lip service to the principle of international collaboration. Clearly the House Republicans have defaulted before the first practical test of their intentions. We hope that the members of their party in the Senate will set aside this sort of partisanship. They must do so if they are to sustain the faith of the world in America's post-war leadership.

General Federation of Women's Clubs Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday June 8, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which is doing an outstanding work in promoting the welfare of our country, recently held its annual convention at St. Louis, and adopted a number of resolutions which are of much interest, not only to us in the Congress but to the Nation at large. I include these resolutions as a part of my remarks, which are as follows:

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS—RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT ANNUAL CONVENTION, APRIL 25–28, 1944, ST. LOUIS, MO.

NEW RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO AND ADOPTED BY CONVENTION

Alaska

Whereas Alaska has been a part of the United States since 1867 and is a land of great economic potentialities as well as an important link in global transportation; and

Whereas its strategic position is of vital importance in the defense of the continental United States; and

Whereas the people of Alaska are making a magnificent contribution to the war effort; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, urges upon Congress the speedy enactment of legislation that will admit Alaska as the forty-ninth State of the Union.

Presented by:

Mrs. JEFFERSON D. ATWOOD,
Chairman, American Citizenship Department.

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

Japanese in western coastal area

Whereas powerful groups in the United States have been fighting for the release of Japanese and the abolishment of the evacuation order; and

Whereas if the war with Japan were to cease tomorrow many Japanese would be free to return to the western coastal area without any legislative control: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled April 1944 goes on record as favoring the prevention of the return of any Japanese or Japanese-Americans to the coastal area for the duration and the transfer of control of all Japanese in America from civilian authority to the United States Army; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges upon the Congress of the United States the expatriation of all convicted, disloyal Japanese-Americans, and that Congress make an exhaustive study, with conclusive action, of every phase of the Japanese problem in America before the close of the war in order to safeguard the future security of the United States.

Presented by:

Mrs. JEFFERSON D. ATWOOD,
Chairman, American Citizenship Department.

Metric system

Whereas the irregular, numerous, unwieldy, and complicated units of weights and measures used in the United States and Great Britain are a hindrance to the teaching of arithmetic, everyday commercial transactions, and world trade; and

Whereas the metric system of weights and measures has only three units—meter, liter, and gram—interrelated and decimally divided like our dollar; and

Whereas the metric system is now used in the United States in science, some factories, jewelry and optical industries, all electrical and radio measurements, athletic events, some hospitals and Government departments, and especially at present in the manufacture of ammunition; and

Whereas the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association has recently decided that henceforth it will use only the metric system; and

Whereas the gradual introduction of the metric system in this country (exactly as it has been introduced in 55 other countries) is feasible; and

Whereas the full adoption of the metric system by the United States would be of great benefit to this country in post-war reconstruction, in promoting international commercial relations, particularly with the countries of Latin America, continental Europe, and Asia; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, endorses legislation in Congress for the Nation-wide adoption of the metric system of weights and measures.

Presented by:

Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

Nursery schools

Whereas there are approximately five million women in industrial plants today, many of whom have children at home inadequately provided for; and

Whereas the health, habits, and mental attitude of children are developed in the early formative years of their existence: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, earnestly requests the establishment of nursery schools with recreational and handicraft programs, for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, and that these nursery schools have qualified teachers and become a part of the educational system of the community and State—provided that, if Federal aid is extended, it will be administered by the States.

Presented by:

Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.

School-lunch program

Whereas the Congress of the United States has made a vital contribution to the health and well-being of the Nation's children through successive allocations of customs duties to move farm surpluses to be used for school luncheon programs; and

Whereas under this program thousands of children have been assured a hot, nourishing mid-day meal at nominal cost, which has been reflected in the improved mental and physical condition of the children as shown by their attendance and scholastic records; and

Whereas Congress in the first deficiency act cut out the $50,000,000 to continue the school lunch program because farm surpluses have all but vanished, and the time has come for direct legislation to take care of the luncheons of the Nation's children, our most valuable national asset: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, petitions Congress to appropriate not more than $50,000,000 annually for a school luncheon program, the administration of such fund to be left to the State departments of education.

Presented by:

Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.
Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, Legislation Department.

General international organization

Resolevd, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled April 1944 urges the Government of the United States:

To take definite steps to accomplish the codification of international law;

To further necessary procedure to obtain international commitments to include collective force to prevent or stop aggression;

To cooperate immediately with other United Nations in setting up a United Nations Council now to proceed with the formation of the general international organization in accordance with the principles of the Moscow declaration and the Connally resolution—to the end that important decisions affecting world security and international policies, many of which now seem to be made independently, shall be concerted decisions of the United Nations.

Presented by:

Mrs. NANCY RUPLEY ARMSTRONG,
Chairman, International Relations Department.

Federal expenditures

Whereas Federal expenditures and the growing Federal debt are in such volume as to challenge the financial status of the American people; and

Whereas the ability of our citizens to carry the heavy taxes which are inevitable in the future depends on the healthy, courageous expansion of our system of individual enterprise; and

Whereas the impact of taxation must now directly reach all scales of living and income groups; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, requests the Congress to practice more economy in planning future Federal expenditures, in order to preserve our representative form of government and our American way of life; and be it futher

Resolved, That the Congress employ financial experts to make recommendations for reductions in the most intelligent manner.

Presented by:

Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, Legislation Department.

Children's Bureau

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has fostered and supported throughout the years the aims and purposes of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor; and

Whereas bill H. R. 4663 would remove services to the health mothers and children from the Children's Bureau, which is now constituted for services to the whole child: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, protests any effort which would interfere with the continuation of service to the whole child.

Presented by:

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.

Policewomen

Whereas the employment of policewomen has shown its value in those communities where the system has been given a fair trial; and

Whereas the point of particular value in the use of policewomen has been in the treatment of women and children who are in conflict with the law; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, expresses its approval of the system of employing policewomen and its support of plans to extend the system to all municipalities where there are cases involving any considerable number of women and children.

Presented by:

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.

Commissioned rank for women in United States Army Nurse Corps

Whereas the Army Nurse Corps has been a part of the United States Army since 1901 and is the only corps without commissioned rank, relative rank having been granted in the last war to meet specific needs; and

Whereas although relative rank has served its purpose of demonstrating that women nurses can fulfill the great responsibilities placed upon them, the time has now come to recognize women nurses on the same basis as women serving in the other branches of the armed forces; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention assembled, April 1944, goes on record as favoring legislation to give regular commissioned rank to members of the Army Nurse Corps.

Presented by:

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

Crude oil

Whereas it is a well known fact that the citizens of the United States are faced with a definite crude-oil shortage which will become increasingly acute; and

Whereas the present price of crude oil offers no incentive to the discovery and development of new fields, but an increase of 35 cents for barrel in trade would provide this incentive, increasing the price of gasoline to the consumer 1 cent per gallon; and

Whereas statistics show that raw material prices increased 35 percent from June 1940 to September 1943, while crude oil prices remained stationary, and since crude oil is an important commodity in winning the war; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, hereby expresses its conviction that international machinery must be created for the establishment of a just and lasting peace and the prevention of future aggression, and that the United States in its own self-interest must participate therein.

Presented by:

WAR SERVICE DEPARTMENT AND STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron

Whereas the Women's Army Corps, the Reserves in the United States Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps, are official in the United States service; and

Whereas women are serving in the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron, which at the present time has no official status; and

Whereas their contribution to the war effort is of inestimable value; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would establish the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron on the same status as the other organized women's armed forces.

Presented by:

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

Conservation of natural resources

Whereas natural resources are indispensable during times of war and peace; and

Whereas emphasis upon judicious use and fullest development of renewable and nonrenewable natural resources will assume greater importance in new and widened horizons in the maintenance of a just and durable peace; and

Whereas there is danger of many nonrenewable natural resources being depleted; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Womens Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, reaffirms its convictions that a comprehensive program for the conservation of our natural resources is necessary through the study of the evaluation of the status of our natural resources of soil, water, forests, wildlife, minerals, metals, gases, fuels, helium, and other renewable and nonrenewable basic raw materials; through work for remedial action that will keep our renewable resources in continuous production, and promotion of measures to safeguard the prolonging of the life of nonrenewable natural resources; and through continued efforts to promote conservation education of adults and school children.

Presented by:

Mrs. T. M. FRANCIS,
Chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.

RESOLUTIONS PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED AND REAFFIRMED BY CONVENTION

Restricted immigration

Whereas the most serious problem which will confront this Nation in the post-war period will be to provide gainful occupations for war veterans; and

Whereas it has been conservatively estimated that the United States must provide 10,000,000 more jobs than it had in 1940 if the disillusionment and want occasioned by large-scale unemployment are to be avoided; and

Whereas there are indications that efforts will be made to liberalize our immigration laws; and

Whereas the admission of wage-earning immigrants will add to the complexities of our labor problems; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, reaffirms its belief in the principle of restricted immigration and urges the continuation of such a policy.

Presented by:

Mrs. JEFFERSON D. ATWOOD,
Chairman, American Citizenship Department.

Uniform marriage and divorce

Whereas a condition of conflicting, varying laws governing marriage and divorce in the several States has challenged the attention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs for many years; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, supports the principle of uniform regulation of marriage and divorce through uniform State laws throughout the United States.

Presented by:

Mrs. EDWIN I. POSTON,
Chairman, American Home Department.

Character building and crime prevention

Whereas the American home is the keystone of the Nation in the preservation of moral, ethical, and spiritual values; and

Whereas, American women can and must assume the challenge presented by the alarming increase of juvenile delinquency to safeguard American youth, upon whom the future of the Nation depends; and

Whereas a well-coordinated and thoroughly integrated crime-prevention program demands the whole-hearted cooperation of the home, the churches of all denominations, the schools, as well as the social, civic, and commercial agencies in the community with the full participation and assumption of responsibility by youth itself: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, calls upon the national, State, and local agencies to make available on the community level, practical assistance in the form of school character-building programs; sex and marriage counseling courses; vocational guidance; psychiatric and psychological clinics; properly supervised recreational facilities for all age groups, including adult and youth forums for the development of civic responsibility and patriotism; proper control over commercial enterprises which are harmful to youth; adequately staffed socialized juvenile and adolescent courts and socially trained police and probationary officers; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs requests its membership to use every available means at its command to secure the adoption and implementation of this program throughout the Nation for the protection of American youth.

Presented by:

Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.
Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.

Federal Communications Commission

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court of May 10, 1943, confers upon the Federal Communications Commission broad and expansive powers, including the right to control business policy and program content of radio stations; and

Whereas the very existence of such power and the constant threat of its exercise constitutes a form of censorship which may interfere with the freedom of speech over the radio and marks a distinct step toward Government control of this great medium of communication; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, asks that Congress thoroughly review the legislation governing the regulation of radio, and specifically limit the power of the Commission to regulate the physical aspects of communication by radio; and that specific provisions be written into the law, to the end that no Government agency shall be clothed with any power whatsoever, over the program content of this greatest of all systems of mass communication.

Presented by,

Mrs. J. WARREN BURGESS,
Chairman, Fine Arts Department.

Pure Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act

Whereas the Pure Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act, passed in 1906 and amended in 1938, has proved of inestimable value to the American people in safeguarding their health by protecting them against adulteration and misbranding; and

Whereas from time to time efforts are made to evade or violate these principles: therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which helped enact this legislation, goes on record in convention assembled, April 1944, as endorsing its principles and upholding its enforcement from attack in every way possible.

Presented by,

Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, Legislative Department.

Black markets

Whereas the health and welfare of the people of the United States would be threatened by the breakdown in the national attempt to secure for all our people their just share of the available consumer goods; and

Whereas black markets are now an alarming evidence of a possible breakdown; and

Whereas these black markets constitute also a menace to the legitimate business of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, condemns the disloyal practice on the part of citizens in seeking advantage by patronizing such black markets: and, be it further

Resolved, That all persons and agencies possessing powers of enforcement be urged to use all diligence possible in investigation and prosecution of infractions of these laws by consumers and dealers.

Presented by:

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.
Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.
Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.
Mrs. R. I. C. PROUT,
Chairman, Nutrition Committee, War Service Department.
Mrs. PATRICK HENRY ADAMS,
Chairman, Consumer Problems Committee, War Service Department.
Mrs. F. EARLE MAGEE,
Chairman, Conservation of War Products Committee, War Service Department.

Juvenile delinquency.

Whereas the problem of the rapidly mounting rate of juvenile delinquency is confronting every community in the United States; and

Whereas this condition is a responsibility of the forces of the home, the school, the church, and the community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, urges the formation of committees within the individual clubs, districts, and States of the federation, which shall work toward the coordination of effort of all organizations and agencies of the community interested in the welfare of children and youth, to combat juvenile delinquency through the establishment of such community services as a survey shall prove to be necessary in the local communities.

Presented by:

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.
Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.
Mrs. EDWIN I. POSTON,
Chairman, American Home Department.
Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

Strikes and riots

Whereas this Nation and its Allies in the present world struggle have been shocked and dismayed by the strikes and riots which have occurred in this country; and

Whereas serious delays in production of war materials have resulted which threaten the success of the war effort; and

Whereas organized labor has outlawed strikes during the war emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, condemns selfishness of purpose and failure to cooperate in the war effort, in accord with this agreement of organized labor, as unpatriotic and regards inflammatory agitations as sabotage; and be it further

Resolved, That it urges its member clubs to foster a public opinion which will not tolerate such attitudes and practices on the part of any person or groups of persons, but will demand that prompt, consistent and impartial execution of the punishments now prescribed by law be meted out to those proved guilty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be given to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the members of Congress, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National War Labor Board, the American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and United Mine Workers of America

Presented by:

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.
Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.
Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.

International cooperation for peace and post-war planning

Whereas two world wars in a single generation have brought upon humanity immeasurable death and destruction and have demonstrated the urgent necessity of international collaboration for the maintenance of peace and justice among the nations; and

Whereas the United States, after attempting to remain apart from each of these wars, has, in defense of its own security and freedom, been drawn into them at heavy cost in human lives and material wealth; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, requests the President of the United States, the Governors of the several States, and each Member of Congress to use their best efforts to advance the present price of crude oil 35 cents per barrel, and thereby create an incentive for drilling an adequate number of exploratory wells, which will increase our rapidly dwindling crude-oil reserves; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Secretary Harold Ickes, Ralph K.

Davies, and the chairman of the committee on production.

Presented by:

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.
Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, Legislation Department.
Mrs. T. M. FRANCIS,
Chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.
Miss ETHEL FOSTER,
President, Texas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Establishment of an Independence Hall National Historical Park

Whereas the Independence Hall Association, formed as a nonprofit organization, was founded July 4, 1942, by local, State, and National services and civic-minded individuals for the purpose of saving historical structures in old Philadelphia and improving their surroundings; among these being the outstanding shrine of America, Independence Hall, where the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were signed, and where rests the Liberty Bell; and

Whereas Independence Hall and its flanking buildings—old City Hall and old Congress Hall—have been maintained by the city of Philadelphia, not only for the benefit of that city but for the Nation and all the peoples of the world; and

Whereas these famous buildings and the historic square in which they stand have been recently designated by the Federal Government as a national and historical site, and further cooperation from the Government should now be secured: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, heartily endorses the purpose of the Independence Hall Association to safeguard this American shrine, to improve its surroundings by demolition of dangerous and unsightly buildings, and to develop in their places landscaped areas and proper accessories, affording dignified approaches to the hallowed grounds on which are located these and other notable historical buildings, thus enshrining the symbol of freedom and liberty for the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges its members and all citizens to do everything in their power to assist in bringing about this desirable result, and request the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to give favorable consideration to the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of preserving the historical buildings therein.

Presented by:

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

Community school forests

Whereas conservation education of adults and youth is more necessary than ever before in order to insure the judicious use and fullest development of indispensable natural resources to keep renewable resources continuously productive and to prolong the life of irreplaceable natural resources; and

Whereas war, the great destroyer, has levied heavy tolls upon our rich heritage of natural resources, creating new technologies which often substitute wood and fiber for such products as steel and iron; and

Whereas new concepts of the relationships of natural resources to human welfare are viewed with increasing concern due to the serious depletion and devastating waste of indispensable basic resources: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention assembled, April 1944, favors the establishment of more community forests in addition to the various federation forests being sponsored as demonstration projects in good forestry, such as school forests, town forests, county forests, and freedom forests, for the development of intelligent citizenship in conserving trees, wildlife areas, recreational parks, watershed protection, and other accruing advantages for economic and aesthetic living; and be it further

Resolved, That we work for the establishment, wherever needed, of school forests which shall be used as conservation laboratories where the pupils may learn not only conservation principles through actual participation in conservation work, but through pride of ownership, the exercise of their personal skills, and participation in community development, may also be imbued with attitudes of civic service and good citizenship.

Presented by:

Mrs. T. M. FRANCIS,
Chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, JUNE 1943, AND RATIFIED BY THE CONVENTION

Teaching profession and liberal arts colleges

Whereas the teachers in many public schools are leaving the school system to join the armed services, the Federal Government, and private industry; and

Whereas curtailment of the teaching staff is causing overcrowding of classrooms, elimination of subjects from the curriculum, and the employment of teachers without adequate professional training; and

Whereas the education of future teachers is being disrupted by the discontinuance of many liberal arts colleges: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, reaffirms its stand relative to the maintenance of public education as an essential function of democratic government; and that the educational authorities throughout the country be urged to maintain salaries sufficient to obtain and retain competent teachers; uphold high professional and personal standards for teachers; recognize the teaching profession as essential to the winning of the war and the liberal arts colleges as essential to the winning of the peace as well as the war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, and all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Presented by:

Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.

Kindergartens

Whereas the kindergarten is an effective means of promoting democracy since, under the guidance of the trained kindergartner, many young children receive their first opportunities to learn to work and play harmoniously together with others of their own age group; and

Whereas the early formation of right habits and attitudes, as practiced in the kindergarten, is a recognized means of reducing delinquency and retardation; and

Whereas work to secure kindergartens in the public schools of many communities throughout our Nation is still needed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention assembled, April 1944, reaffirms its belief in the extension of kindergartens and urges its member clubs to petition their school authorities to provide this educational advantage for the children of their respective communities.

Presented by:

Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.

Official Pan-American policy

Whereas events of recent years have demonstrated the value and efficacy of the system of international relations that has been developed on the American Continent; and

Whereas the principles that now govern our relations with the other American republics constitute the national policy of the United States, to which both major political parties have contributed; and

Whereas the maintenance of the present system of inter-American relations is essential to the future peace and security of the Western Hemisphere: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, urges the maintenance of the existing machinery and the strengthening of the bonds of friendship and understanding that now prevail between the United States and the other American republics and the preservation of those basic principles of mutual respect, cooperation, and reciprocal assistance that now characterize the system of international relations on the American Continent.

Presented by:

Mrs. NANCY R. ARMSTRONG,
Chairman, International Relations Department.

Reciprocal trade-agreements program

Whereas international trade is an essential element in the intercourse between nations, and satisfactory international economic ties are an important factor in promoting the well-being of peoples and friendly relations among nations; and

Whereas to achieve these ends it is indispensable that artificial barriers to trade be reduced or eliminated, and that economic transactions be conducted with a proper regard for the interests of each party, as well as for the effect on the international community as a whole; and

Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program of the United States is based on these principles and should contribute to the realization of these economic objectives in the period following the war; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944,

1. Recommends the continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements program by the Government of the United States.

2. Expresses the hope that other governments will adopt these same principles in their international economic relations not only with this country but with other nations of the world.

Presented by,

Mrs. NANCY R. ARMSTRONG,
Chairman, International Relations Department.

National parks

Whereas the conservation and scenic standards of our national-parks system have been maintained by the United States Government for more than half a century for the inspiration, education, enjoyment, and general welfare of all generations; and

Whereas the necessary standards under which these areas have been selected and administered have been assailed again and again by commercial and selfish interests that lower and break down the national values; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs throughout the years has stanchly upheld the excellent standards under which the national parks were established, defending them against encroachment and commercial exploitation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, reaffirms its unqualified support of the absolute maintenance of high standards, ideals, and purposes, under which our national-parks system was created in order that the integrity of the national parks may

be preserved for all time, not only for ourselves, but for future generations; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the enactment of legislation which will reserve to Congress the exclusive right to create national monuments and national parks.

Presented by:

MRS. T. M. FRANCIS,
Chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.

House Approves Numerous Postal Bills—Further Action Expected in Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I placed in the RECORD a summary of the legislation which has been approved by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and which has become law so far during the two sessions of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

My today's statement concerns a number of other bills of interest to the general public and of particular interest, perhaps, to postmasters and postal employees have been considered by our Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, reported out favorably, and passed by the House. They are now pending in the Senate.

Pending postal legislation passed by the House includes the following bills:

H. R. 2922, BY MR. M'KENZIE, OF LOUISIANA; PASSED HOUSE JULY 5, 1943

To further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize the Postmaster General to grant leave of absence without pay to postmasters relinquishing their positions to engage in activities which shall have been defined by the lawfully constituted authorities as essential to the war effort, as well as for service in the armed forces of the United States. It would also permit postmasters 38 years of age and over, who are eligible for discharge from the armed forces at their own request, to accept employment in essential work, to be considered, upon assuming such activities, as on leave from their duties as postmaster and eligible for reinstatement thereto, upon application within 40 days after the termination of such essential activities.

H. R. 3688, BY MR. FAY, OF NEW YORK; PASSED HOUSE MAY 2, 1944

To change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard."

H. R. 3870, BY MR. BURCH, OF VIRGINIA; PASSED HOUSE FEBRUARY 7, 1944

To amend section 214 of the act of February 28, 1925.

The purpose of this bill is to facilitate the administration of cost-ascertainment studies and simplify the accounting for the funds expended therefor by authorizing the inclusion in the regular salary appropriations for the several bureaus of the Department supervising or conducting these studies, sufficient funds to meet the requirements for the work, thus obviating the necessity of making allotments from the appropriation for railroad transportation as provided in the act mentioned. The major portion of the expenses thus incurred are for personal services and not properly chargeable to railroad transportation or other transportation items.

H. R. 3998, BY MR. MADDEN, OF INDIANA; PASSED HOUSE JANUARY 18, 1944

Authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to encourage inventions and suggestions by employees which result in improvements and economies in the Postal Service, and to provide for the payment of suitable rewards for same.

H. R. 4033 (SUPERSEDES H. R. 2001), BY MR. BURCH, OF VIRGINIA; PASSED HOUSE FEBRUARY 7, 1944

Relating to the use of the penalty-mail privilege.

The object of this legislation is to establish a method to control the penalty-mail privilege by the executive departments and agencies and the independent establishments of the Government, which has increased over the years to such an extent that it appears necessary that action be taken to prevent its abuse and to exercise control over the volume of such mail in order to restrict it to purposes necessary to essential functions and effective operations of the Government. It is provided that these executive departments and agencies and independent establishments shall receive appropriations for their use of the penalty-mail privilege. Because of the war conditions and the heavy use of mail by the agencies incident thereto, the War and Navy Departments are exempted from the principal provisions of the bill.

H. R. 4517, BY MR. HOLIFIELD, OF CALIFORNIA; PASSED HOUSE MAY 15, 1944

To remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations.

H. R. 4680, BY MR. BURCH, OF VIRGINIA; PASSED HOUSE MAY 2, 1944

To amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to correct an unforeseen result in the operation of Public Law 266, H. R. 2836—an act amending an act granting increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service—whereby the compensation of certain substitute village carriers—approximately 200—would be reduced.

H. R. 4687, BY MR. BURCH, OF VIRGINIA; PASSED HOUSE MAY 2, 1944

RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF POSTAL NOTES

This measure provides for the establishment of a United States postal-note system. Its purpose is to place in operation an inexpensive and safe method for the transmission in the mails of small amounts of money up to $10. Approximately 70 percent of the postal money-order business is for amounts of $10 and less. The postal-note system will be advantageous to those persons who do not have banking and other convenient facilities to transmit money, and will eliminate to a large extent the necessity for transmitting postage stamps, currency, and coins in the mails. They may be sold at a flat fee of 5 cents for any amount up to $10. They are not negotiable. The bill provides that the Postmaster General may fix the fees for such notes at not less than 3 nor more than 6 cents, upon reporting proposed changes to Congress 60 days before effective date thereof.

H. R. 4215, BY MR. MURRAY, OF TENNESSEE; PASSED HOUSE MAY 15, 1944

To extend to the custodial service employees of the Post Office Department certain benefits applicable to postal employees. The purpose of this legislation is to extend to the custodial employees of the Post Office Department—other than charmen and charwomen working part time—certain benefits and privileges now received by other postal employees.

In conclusion, as a member of the committee, and I am sure the others will join in with me, I want to pay tribute to the staff of our able chairman, the Honorable THOMAS G. BURCH. The folks in his office have been on the job steadily and have given us efficient and valuable services at all times.

Anyone interested in knowing the further status of these legislative proposals can secure the information from their own Member of Congress or one of the two United States Senators in their own State.

Address by Walter White, Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Walter White, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, over the Columbia Broadcasting System network, Sunday, April 30, 1944:

It has been my good fortune during the past three and a half months to travel more than 20,000 miles and to talk with many officers, soldiers, and civilians of our own

and other countries in Great Britain, north Africa, Italy, and the Middle East. I have seen the European theater of operations as it prepared for invasion of the Continent. My capacity to observe and absorb has been taxed almost beyond belief by the immensity of production of American factories of war materials, their transportation through submarine-infested waters, and their efficient distribution in preparation for D-day. As Americans one cannot help but be proud of the job done, which belies much of the carping criticism here at home.

It has been permitted me also to see the north African theater of operations over which the war has passed. I have seen the desperate fighting in the hills around Cassino in Italy, where our troops have been momentarily checked by the enemy. And I have seen a little of the fabulous Middle East, where the fighting is not with planes and guns, but intrigue over the prizes of oil and human destinies.

Many disturbing rumors had come from these war theaters and from the Pacific, which I hope later to visit, of friction between white and Negro American soldiers. Both as a war correspondent and as Secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I was charged with the responsibility of investigating these rumors and recommending corrective action where the rumors were found to be true. Here is what I found:

The majority of American soldiers abroad have been decent Americans interested in but one objective—winning the war as speedily as possible and returning home. A surprisingly large percentage of them—both officers and enlisted personnel—are concerned over the bad name being given to the United States by the friction which some of their number have caused. A gratifying large percentage manifest deep concern about the world problem of race and the necessity of working out a solution to it. Many of these are from the South. But, unfortunately, a highly aggressive and vocal minority has sought to transplant patterns of racial behavior like that of the most backward States of the South to the countries where they have been sent as soldiers to fight a war against Nazi racial theories.

Some of them have sought to poison the minds of British, Italian, north African, and other peoples against Negro Americans. They have told such stories as these: That Negroes are inferior, illiterate, diseased, and savage. Some of them have even used physical violence to prevent the association of Negro soldiers with British, Italian, and other people. They have objected to the use of places of public accommodation such as pubs and restaurants by Negro soldiers.

Such behavior has puzzled and antagonized many of the people of these countries. They have found it difficult to understand why some American soldiers should be so violent in their hatred of other American soldiers, especially when all of them are fighting in a common cause. They have resented the action of visitors presuming to dictate to them who they should or should not invite into their homes or associate with. Many of our allies are puzzled, too, by the American pattern of segregation. Repeatedly I was asked why the United States, fighting a war for freedom, should send abroad two armies—one white and one Negro.

It is particularly unfortunate for America that brawls and other disturbances created by Americans of this type should overshadow the decent behaviour and attitude of the far larger percentage of Americans who did not create scenes. As one American officer phrased it, "Two men having a friendly drink together is not news; while one man objecting to another having a drink in the same pub is news." Col. Carlos P. Romulo, one of the great heroes of the battle for the Philippines, recently wrote of similar repercussions in the Pacific: "When race riots broke out in Detroit and Harlem, Tokyo for days thereafter gave the Orient a lurid picture of racial war being waged in the United States. Such rioting plays beautifully into the hands of Jap propagandists, because they use it to prove what they have been telling the Orientals—that the white people have nothing but hatred for the yellow and brown."

It is difficult to appraise how far-reaching is the combined effect of the episodes overseas of racial friction and what is going on here at home. The news we have received abroad during the past 4 months has been almost universally depressing. It has been of certain Members of Congress pouring forth hate-filled tirades against the Commander in Chief of our Nation, and against racial and religious minorities, as vicious and intenperate in content and tone as any sent out by Goebbels from Berlin. It has been of politics being played on the soldiers' vote bill, and of blatant boasts of filibusters against the anti-poll tax bill. It has been of amazing statements by Governors, Congressmen, and professional hate-mongers against the United States Supreme Court because it outlawed disfranchisement by means of a so-called "white" Democratic primary. It has been of predictions of post-war strife against racial and religious minorities in the United States.

Many American soldiers with whom I talked—both white and Negro—are gravely concerned both by the conduct of some of their fellow soldiers abroad and by the news from back home. Many of them are becoming aware of the need for more information. But when they try to get objective information, they are not permitted to do so. Recently ANDREW J. MAY, Kentucky Congressman and chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, threatened a fight against the War Department if it distributed a factual, nonpropaganda pamphlet on The Races of Mankind, written by two of America's most distinguished anthropologists, Profs. Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish. The War Department revoked its plan to distribute the pamphlet.

Fortunately, there are brighter aspects of the picture. In the European theater of operations Gens. Dwight Eisenhower and John C. H. Lee, supreme Allied commander and deputy theater commander, respectively, have issued unequivocal directives and have taken other steps to eliminate the causes of this kind of trouble. They have acted on specific recommendations made to them after exhaustive investigation, and are considering further steps to be taken. Among the latter is the remedying of the condition when I was in England where the overwhelming majority of the Negro troops there were assigned to service units. The importance of this may be seen by contrasting the situation in England with that in an active theater of operations like Italy.

Among the units now fighting in Italy is the Negro Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron, which has made an enviable record in dive bombing enemy targets. Three other Negro squadrons, recently arrived on the Italian front, are beginning to demonstrate their effectiveness. One of the most courageous feats now being performed on any battle front is the running of supplies into the Anzio beachhead by quartermaster and trucking units, about 70 percent of them being Negroes, according to Ernie Pyle. The record being made by these Negro soldiers has earned for them respect as fighters. It is also interesting to note that as men approach actual battle and face the dangers of combat, they tend to discard many of the prejudices and preconceived notions they formerly held.

It is startling to find upon returning from war zones that there are still many Americans who believe that the war in Europe is virtually over, and that victory is certain. I found no such illusions overseas. We face a resourceful and fanatical enemy, both in Europe and in the Pacific. The division in our ranks and the fomenting of racial or other antagonisms are postponing the day of victory. They are creating doubt among our allies as to our sincerity when we assert that we are fighting a war for freedom for all peoples. Whoever causes the war to last 1 single day longer than necessary is as much a traitor to our country as one who sinks a troop ship or reveals military secrets to the enemy. If for no other reason than to win the war as soon as is humanly possible and to save the lives of American men—perhaps among them the life of your son—it is imperative that any person, whatever his race, who causes trouble should be stopped. That will be done only if the people of America and their Government stop evading or temporizing with this fundamental question whose solution is imperative if we are ever to have a world of peace.

Electricity Great Help to Farmers During Manpower Shortage and Hereafter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, with farm manpower drastically depleted because of war needs, one thing which greatly has helped the farmer is electricity. Extension of electric power lines to farms in northwestern Minnesota has enabled the farmers to install many pieces of labor-saving equipment and lessened the shock of the labor shortage.

It has been my pleasure to cooperate with the farmers in my district in this respect, and often to assist them in obtaining service through the rural electrification associations or from private or publicly owned companies in the Ninth Congressional District, as well as help them with priority problems involved in getting equipment and material.

At the present time, there are 7 R. E. A. co-ops operating in the Ninth Congressional District area, which I represent, and in the entire State of Minnesota there are 51 associations. Those in the Ninth District are the North Star Electric Cooperative at Baudette, the Roseau Electric Cooperative at Roseau, the P. K. M. Electric Cooperative at Warren, the Red River Valley Cooperative Power Association at Halstad, the Wild Rice Electric Cooperative at Mahnomen, the Lake Region Cooperative Electrical Association at Pelican Rapids, and the Itasca-Mantrap Cooperative Electrical Association at Park Rapids.

A few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Avery C. Moore, secretary of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, with headquarters here in Washington, and because of the important information it contains relative to the R. E. A. program I desire to call it to the attention of the House, readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and especially to

farmers of northwestern Minnesota. It follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 8, 1944.*

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We appreciate having your letter of the 2d and, of course, we recognize your interest in and support of the rural-electrification program.

The agricultural appropriation bill in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, H. R. 2481, provided $22,558,000 for the Rural Electrification Administration. The agricultural appropriation bill in the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, H. R. 4443, provided $22,550,000 in the form the bill passed the House, but this amount was increased to $42,750,000 by the Senate. The bill is now before the House and Senate conferees and we are hopeful the House will accept the Senate figures. You will recall that delegates to our second annual meeting at Chicago in March adopted a resolution requesting $60,000,000 for the use of R. E. A. in carrying forward the rural electrification program, and also asked for "sufficient funds to enable R. E. A. to proceed at once with the development of a post-war program."

The Revenue Act of 1943, H. R. 3687, provided for the filing of income-tax reports by the co-ops. It was enacted in the first session and its passage was opposed by some of the co-ops.

The Rankin-Russell bills, H. R. 878 and S. 742, introduced in the first session, are still pending in committee in the two bodies.

Of outstanding importance is the Pace bill, H. R. 4278, which has now passed both the House and Senate. Title V of this bill deals with R. E. A. and will—

1. Extend authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to R. E. A. Present authority expires June 30, 1946.

2. Amend sections 4 and 5 of the R. E. A. Act, providing for interest at the rate of 2 percent on new and existing loans.

3. Extend from 25 to 35 years the period of loans under section 4 of the act.

4. Amend section 3 (b) to authorize the appropriation of such sums as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of the act.

The R. E. A. cooperatives all over the country have supported the Pace bill vigorously and regard title V as a real victory. The bill is now in conference to iron out differences in other sections, but title V remains as passed by the House.

You may be interested in the fact that there are 51 R. E. A. cooperatives in Minnesota. Of these, 35—with 34,797 connected consumer—are members of our national association, Harry Edmunds, of Cedar, Minn., is our director for region 6, consisting of Minnesota and North and South Dakota. Our records show the following R. E. A. co-ops in your congressional district:

North Star Electric Cooperative, Baudette.
Roseau Electric Cooperative, Roseau.
P. K. M. Electric Cooperative, Warren.
Red River Valley Cooperative Power Association, Halstad.
Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Mahnomen.
Lake Region Cooperative Electrical Association, Pelican Rapids.
Itasca-Mantrap Cooperative Electrical Association, Park Rapids.

You are on our mailing list to receive our monthly bulletin and we assume it is reaching you regularly.

If there is any additional information we can give you, please do not hesitate to call on us for same.

With cordial personal regards, we are

Sincerely yours,

AVERY C. MOORE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Address by James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting and illuminating address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at French Lick, Ind., last Monday, as follows:

As I travel throughout the country it is my good fortune to enjoy continually, valuable, and enlightening contacts with men of the business world. Naturally, they are thinking about how future developments will affect the interests they are charged with protecting. Their unquestioning support of the war effort is rivaled only by their questioning doubts concerning post-war developments, and uppermost in their minds is a deep concern over the survival of free enterprise.

Their interest in this very foundation of our American system of economy sources from their realistic appraisal of definite trends that have been manifest during the past two decades. Since the close of the last war, ideologies, previously repugnant to American ideas, have found fertile fields for development within our boundaries and the seedlings have grown fast under the unrealistic encouragement derived from the surface indications of the workability of these planned economies.

The depression also forced this Government to devise instrumentalities to meet that emergency, which devices, when once set into motion, were difficult to terminate. These activities, in the sequence of events, had to be followed by the inevitable regimentation necessary to fight a war. Hence the question which years ago might have been academic and one for solution by the deliberate processes of Government, has taken on serious import as a result of the developments of the last two decades. Thus simple interest has been twice compounded.

I find, too, that when the private-enterprise system is discussed, there is no clear understanding of what is meant. Hardly any group of businessmen can be found in agreement when it comes to setting down a definition. Therefore with those most concerned so much at variance in their understanding of either the scope or limitation of what is encompassed in the term free enterprise, it is not surprising that various other segments of our population, such as agriculture and labor, should find it difficult to think clearly on the subject.

Since we live in a democracy where the majority controls, it is imperative that all members of our population have an understanding of what is meant. To many laboring people, the term private enterprise means that business remains what it was 20 years ago. To many of them it indicates that business is to be privately owned, privately run, and privately operated, solely and wholly for the benefit of the owners and management. The mere mention of the term arouses a suspicion in the minds of the workers that all the gains they have made during the past 20 years, through legislation, court interpretations, and organizations are to be discarded and a return made to the status quo ante.

To many farmers who have likewise made progress and gained certain rights, privileges, and advantages in recent years, the private-enterprise system means the oppressing of the farmer for the rights of labor and business.

To the businessman himself, the meaning of this term runs all the way from the old autocratic czarlike capitalistic system to the more progressive liberality that forward-looking executives have found desirable.

It thus must be apparent that the lack of any uniformity of understanding as to what the terms "free enterprise" or "private enterprise" encompass, aggravates the fear so prevalent today in the ranks of those most concerned with future developments in the commercial world.

The American democracy was deliberately built on a foundation of powers delegated to the Federal Government. So conscious were the citizens of the various States of the importance of protecting the rights of the individual that, 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution, amendments were proposed, and ratified within 30 months thereafter, specifically designating these inalienable privileges of our citizenry.

Thus did our forefathers guarantee to the free people of these United States freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and the right of petition; the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures; the right of trial by jury; and the right that protects private property against seizure without just compensation.

At the time these inherent rights of the individual were specifically reserved the various associations of persons for mutual profit, protection, or advancement, such as partnerships, corporations, trade associations, labor unions, agricultural cooperatives, either were of minor importance or did not exist at all. Indeed, most of the generally accepted organizaions so important in our present-day society have come into being because of the economic and technical developments that could not have been within the vision of those creators of our fundamental law.

But despite the many changes that have taken place in the century and a half of our development from a struggling group of little frontier colonies to a great empire of States, there has been maintained in the warp of our complex weave of Federal, State, and local laws, a bulwark of protection against the infringement of those basic rights of the individual citizen, the surrender of which no real American will even contemplate.

To briefly define what we are ever ready to fight to protect, I can think of no better phrase than "the American way of life." True, the meaning of these oft repeated words do not connote the same thing to every citizen but they do have a real significance in their every interpretation that is predicated on the pride of those enjoying the privileges they indicate.

These privileges in their essential elements are what make us a free people. They compose the very basis of our liberties. They are the distinguishing factors that set us apart as Americans. Their meaning can best be demonstrated in the simple declaration that under our system of a free government for a free people, every American has a right to live his or her life in any way he or she pleases, so long as any citizen's action does not infringe on the rights of his or her fellow citizens.

Consequently, since the American way of life is predicated on these basic individual liberties, it can only continue to prevail if these liberties are secure.

No inconsistency is involved if some wish to voluntarily surrender the exercise of these rights to an association of mutual benefit, while others, within the limitations of laws enacted by majorities, wish to work out as individuals their own economic situations. Some there are who prefer to have the protection of groups. Others prefer to select their own mode of working and individually make their own terms of employment. Both must be protected in their choice of method.

There are surely in our complex economy opportunities sufficient to make successful the operation of legitimate trade unions without infringing on the heritage of liberty possessed by those individuals who prefer to go it alone.

In business also there is ample opportunity for associated capital to gain the benefits that may accrue from cooperative management without shutting out the opportunities of others who, as individuals, can profit from the fruits of their energy and intelligence. To insist on complete control of any segment of our economy along any single path would be regimentation. To keep open all roads of advancement multiplies opportunities, promotes industry, and encourages incentive in the true American way.

Economic problems, which at the close of this war will be as great, if not greater than, the political problems, the continuation, stimulation, and assistance of business by government will become a prerequisite to our recovery. The fixed charges of government plus the carrying charges of the war debts will necessitate our striving to produce an annual national income approaching $150,000,000,000. Such an achievement can only result from full-time employment. As all are customers, there can be no customers without jobs, and no jobs without customers.

It therefore is necessary that business create jobs, that men will have pay, that the pay may be expended for goods, which will insure the making and the distribution of goods. No group has ever shown greater power, greater capability, and greater skill in the furnishing of jobs, than American business, sourcing from our system of free enterprise.

It is already set up. It only needs for the track to be cleared, the brakes which have been applied during the war to be gradually relaxed, the tax burden to be lightened, international trade barriers to be leveled and world credit and finance to be provided. Then business, lightened of these burdens, can move in the realm of the American way of life as it always has.

I would not have you think for one moment that what I have said here does not mean that business, as well as all other parts of our population, will not be afflicted constantly and continually with problems. They always have and always will be. Problems are ever the rash that irritates the surfaces as a result of the internal forces of progress.

Progress is inevitable. Sometimes it seems to be the one propelling force, placed in man by the Creator, which pushes ever forward and ever upward to bigger and better things. This force, moving within an individual, and within the body politic, constantly calls for adjustment. This adjustment cannot be made easily and speedily. It is a trying and tortuous process but its very irritations are indicative of the approaching solutions, and the passing of each upheaval has always been followed by a compensating calm.

It is erroneous to lay all the problems of business at the feet of government. You have, in your own business, competitive problems where industries chafe each other. You have labor problems within business that call for constant adjustments. You have cycles of depression and prosperity which come and go. You have the changes in taste and style. These all call for patience, thought, and adjustment. These problems, if met head-on, like two locomotives rushing toward each other on the same track, neither giving an inch, will produce disaster. Astute and forward-looking businessmen will accept them as inevitable, and will adjust and compromise, and give and take, and strive to strike a harmonious and reasonable balance for all parties concerned.

There has always been a demand for this type and kind of man. To meet the problems of the impending future, this demand will be greater than ever. The businessman of the future must see clearly, think profoundly, and act wisely. His adeptness in conciliation must be seasoned by good will. Thus motivated, his accomplishments will be limited only by his resources. This Nation composes three groups: The laborer, who works and makes things; the farmer, who works and produces things; and the financiers, the managers, the distributors, and the members of the professions. The first duty of the businessman is to remember that all are customers all the time. It is only after they are customers that they are workers, farmers, teachers, bankers, doctors, lawyers, salesmen, stenographers, clerks, engineers, and so on. The attitude of all toward a customer, actual or prospective, is wholly different from the attitude displayed toward the employee by the boss or toward the boss by the employee. Therein lies a great part of the problem. Let all acquire the attitude of equality toward each other and recognize the interdependence of all on one another, and our problems will be well on the way to solution.

The tastes of a hundred and thirty million Americans vary in scope and degree as do their capabilities. Each is an individualist and wishes to remain so. That is the mark of liberty.

But the very right to be an individualist implies a duty to recognize the individualism of all fellow citizens. The protection of that basic right necessitates respect for law and order. Sourcing from the desire for mutual advancement and mutual protection, and guided by the experience of the century and a half of progress that has marked our country's growth, surely we Americans have no fear of the future.

The darkest days of the present world upheaval have been successfully weathered. The impending victory draws ever closer. No matter how tremendous has been its cost, how great the sacrifices it has entailed, the war has proven the soundness of our American way of doing things. Again free enterprise has met the demands of the holocaust. Again our way of life has been vindicated.

We at home—labor, agriculture, and management—have been proud to have had the opportunity of backing up the supreme fight for the preservation of our Nation being made by the 11,000,000 men and women serving where death stalks and sacrifice prevails. We shall be equally as proud if, when they return, our wartime cooperation shall have developed a pattern that will insure their immediate assimilation into peacetime pursuits that will result in all of us enjoying together the fruits less would be tragic. To achieve the goal, and of victory in prosperous contentment. To do I am confident of its accomplishments, will be truly in keeping with the best traditions of the ideals of a free America.

Increased Postal Money Order and Parcel-Post Rates Provided in Recent Tax Bill Are Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, increased justification for the position of Members of the House who opposed the Revenue Act of 1943 is to be found in the results of the sharp increase which that bill put into effect in the rates charged by the Post Office Department for postal money orders and parcel post. Postal money orders have for years been the poor man's banking facility and billions of dollars of the country's business has been transacted by this means. Just as the establishment of parcel post under the administration of President Taft was opposed by the vested interests and the express business, so the financial interests have continuously tried to find an opportunity to undermine the use of postal money orders in any way they could. Changes in money-order rates provided in the Revenue Act of 1943 are roughly as follows:

Money orders	Before Mar. 26	Effective Mar. 26
	Cents	*Cents*
From $0.01 to $2.50	6	10
From $2.51 to $5	8	14
From $5.01 to $10	11	19
From $10.01 to $20	13	22
From $20.01 to $40	15	25
From $40.01 to $60	18	30
From $60.01 to $80	20	34
From $80.01 to $100	22	37

Even sharper increases were put into effect on c. o. d. mailing and insured mail. Completely accurate figures are not yet available from the Post Office Department, but I have been informed by the Department that reports up to the present indicate a substantial reduction in the amount of business being done by the Department in both parcel post and money-order business. There are some post offices where this reduction has been as great as 40 percent. It is, I think, inevitable that the upshot of the whole matter will be to create a very considerable falling off in revenue of the Post Office Department at the very time during this great war when it is important for all Government revenue to be kept at a maximum. A most illuminating commentary on this situation is to be found in the following advertisement published in a local newspaper by a banking house:

With post-office money-order rates increased you save even more when you pay by check. Why not pay bills with your own check? Open a special checking account in this bank. Eight cents for each check issued covers the entire cost. We also sell bank money orders at a great saving to you. Consult the schedule below for costs and savings.

Money order, amount of—	Old cost	Increase	New cost	Money order, bank	Saving
$0.01 to $2.50	$0.06	$0.04	$0.10	$0.10	------
$2.51 to $5	.08	.06	.14	.10	$0.04
$5.01 to $10	.11	.08	.19	.10	.09
$10.01 to $20	.13	.09	.22	.10	.12
$20.01 to $40	.15	.10	.25	.10	.15
$40.01 to $60	.18	.12	.30	.10	.20
$60.01 to $80	.20	.14	.34	.10	.24
$80.01 to $100	.22	.15	.37	.10	.27

I do not think any particular comment on my part is necessary in connection with this advertisement. It more than speaks for itself. In the light of these

facts, Mr. Speaker, I am more than ever glad that I voted against the Revenue Act of 1943 and also that I voted to sustain the President's veto of it.

Recent action by the House and its Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads indicates recognition by that committee and by the House itself of the seriousness of this situation, for on May 2 the House passed a bill reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads providing for the issuance of what will be known as U. S. Postal Notes in amounts up to $10 at an original cost of 5 cents for any amount up to $10, which cost may be varied by action of the Postmaster General between the limitations of 3 cents and 6 cents, providing he informs Congress of his action. As I understand it, the purpose of this bill is to fill the gap left by the increase in money order rates and to attempt to restore to the people the opportunities for the use of postal services for transmittal of small amounts of money which has been impaired by the increased money order rates. The Senate has not yet acted upon this bill, but it is my earnest hope that it will do so at an early date.

Appropriations for the Naval Service

REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to read the body of a letter directed by the Bureau of Naval Personnel to the heads of all naval shore activities under date of May 24, 1944. The letter reads:

1. Attention is invited to the substantial reduction in appropriations under the cognizance of this Bureau for the fiscal year 1945. The statements made by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in its report on the bill and the statements made individually by members of the committee and others on the floor of the House when the bill was introduced should also be noted. Pertinent extracts from the report of the committee (reference (a)) and from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (reference (b)) are contained in enclosure (A).

2. The total amount appropriated for this Bureau for the coming fiscal year is $24,000,000 below estimated requirements. Furthermore, the amount of field funds that may be used for printing and binding (previously unrestricted) is now not only limited, but to an amount which is about two and one quarter million dollars less than the estimated requirements for the Navy as a whole.

3. The Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House have consistently displayed a sympathetic understanding of the requirements of the naval service. During the period of the building up of the Navy and the Naval Establishment, the Appropriations Committees have recommended and the Congress has appropriated sufficient funds to meet all essential needs. In this period it has not always been possible accurately to estimate the cost of projects. The fluid military situation frequently made accurate estimates very difficult.

4. In the fiscal year 1945, the Navy will reach its full strength, and consequently the period of unprecedented expansion will end. As the use of personnel within the continental United States is thereafter reduced and cut back, many elements of expense can be eliminated or reduced. Furthermore, further financial economies can be effected by the addressees if they make a more careful attempt to economize in the use of personnel. It is incumbent upon this Bureau now to foresee and plan for diminishing activity just as carefully as it foresaw and planned to meet, during a period of inactivity, the demands for expansion and increased activity.

5. The House committee which initiates legislation on appropriations is determined to keep appropriations within the bounds of necessity. It is the committee's belief, concurred in by this Bureau, that this can be done without impeding the successful prosecution of the war. This is evident from the testimony of the hearings and furthermore, the committee has expressed its belief that it has appropriated sufficient funds for fiscal year 1945.

6. This Bureau will cooperate fully in keeping financial requirements at a minimum. It is not contemplated at this time that any supplemental funds will be requested during the coming fiscal year.

7. In order to effect these purposes, it is directed that no new project be undertaken until it is determined that—

(a) The new project will not duplicate another already established.

(b) Personnel and facilities already on hand cannot be used to meet the need.

(c) The new need cannot be met by discontinuing or reducing an existing project no longer vitally needed.

(d) Approval of the Bureau has been obtained and specific funds have been allocated from a definite appropriation for the new project.

Responsible officers must be alert to reduce maintenance demands, to eliminate projects, to close out facilities and to release personnel both civil and naval as the work load permits.

8. Addressees are directed to survey the maintenance cost of each activity within his jurisdiction and to recommend prior to July 1, 1944, any activity that in his opinion is not necessary in whole or in part and thereafter to advise this Bureau as the situation may change during the coming year. He should also assure himself that the maintenance charges are not only reduced to necessary expenditures but also that they are proper charges against the appropriations of this Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, that indicates a spirit which should make all of us proud of Navy's purpose to cooperate in saving dollars not essential to the conduct of the war.

D-Day Checks Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

D-DAY CHECKS STRIKES—W. L. B. SAYS INVASION HAS PUT END TO LABOR DISPUTES

WASHINGTON, June 9.—The War Labor Board said today the European invasion had resulted in a general clearing up of strikes in this country.

For the first time since the Board was created in January 1942, not a single strike was before it today. The slates of regional boards over the country were also reported clean, with a few possible exceptions.

The Conciliation Service has only seven cases under consideration, affecting only about 4,000 workers. Normally the service handles 20 cases daily.

Seven cases were before the W. L. B. on D-day, but they have been disposed of. Since June 6 only a few flare-ups have occurred and they quickly died down.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, today called Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower at supreme Allied headquarters:

"National War Labor Board informs me that its docket shows not a single strike in the Nation involving American Federation of Labor unions as of this day.

"Our 7,000,000 members are on the job supporting you to the limit."

Free Ports

REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was, indeed, gratifying to learn of the steps the President has taken in authorizing the admission into this country of at least 1,000 victims of Hitler and his band of gangsters. In granting this haven of refuge to a small number of the suffering victims of our common enemy, I feel sure we have acted in accordance with the principles upon which this great country of ours was based. In extending a helping hand to our downtrodden brethren abroad we are again demonstrating that this country firmly believes in the sanctity and dignity of human lives.

Knowing the vast resources of this country and the great suffering abroad, I very much regret that the President did not see fit to authorize the admission of a greater number of refugees so as to save these women and children, who are doomed to die abroad; and to set an example for other Allied nations to do likewise. However, there seems to be a growing sentiment throughout the country to have Congress take the leadership in providing for the establishment of free ports to allow bona fide political and religious refugees to enter this country for the duration of the war only.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman feel that that should be done by a Presidential directive or by the Congress?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It can be done by both. At this point I would like to insert an editorial on this subject matter from the New York Times of June 10. Many organizations, labor, fraternal, and religious, have come out in support of free ports and I hope and pray that Congress will take the necessary steps to save as many people as possible:

PORT OF REFUGE

We believe that there will be prompt and generous approval of the President's plan to establish at Fort Ontario, near Oswego, a temporary haven for refugees who may escape from the European nations which are still under Hitler's domination. There is nothing in this proposal that seeks to evade the immigration laws or to disturb existing quotas. It is planned to provide food and shelter for approximately a thousand persons. This is only a tiny fraction of the great mass of homeless and helpless people, of many faiths and many races, who have been victims of the Nazi terror. We hope, ourselves, that more than a mere thousand can be sheltered under an expansion of the present program. But neither those who come now nor the others who may be enabled to come later will come as permanent residents of this country, in excess of the immigration quotas. They will come merely on a temporary basis—as war prisoners come, in fact, or as goods in crates are permitted to enter our "free ports," without payment of customs, if they are simply in transit from one foreign country to another. All that the plan involves is an overnight shelter, so to speak, until it becomes possible either to return these distressed people to their native lands or to find permanent homes for them elsewhere.

This is all that the plan involves, but it is enough to be helpful. For it will encourage other nations to take similar steps and, to the extent that it is generally adopted, it will remove one of the great barriers—a lack of places of even temporary refuge—which have been blocking the escape of Hitler's victims. This is a work of mercy. The President believes it important that the United States should share in it, not through words but through deeds. Every warm-hearted American will agree with him and approve his action.

The plan has nothing to do with unrestricted and uncontrolled immigration. It is simply a proposal to save the lives of innocent people.

Gov. John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked leave to extend an editorial about Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe it is a fair statement of Mr. Bricker's stature as a Presidential candidate and a brief picture of the estimable character of the man as shown by his public record and speeches:

[From the Chicago Daily Times of June 3, 1944]

GOVERNOR BRICKER IN THE EAST

Governor Bricker grows in stature as he discusses the issues of the coming Presidential campaign.

One distinction between a politician and a statesman is that the latter has informed ideas and the courage to state them and fight for them. Such a man is bound to benefit by the test of a campaign. It is the candidate who is uncertain about his own principles who is guided by expediency and seeks to trim his sails to the winds of local opinion who has reason to fear open campaigning. Such a man is deflated by the test. His trimming is exposed and the voters are discouraged instead of inspired by his ideas.

The sound political maxim not to waste effort on territory that is hopelessly lost lay behind Jim Farley's famous remarks in 1936, when Alf Landon invaded California, then strongly pro-New Deal, that the opposition was throwing forward passes in the fourth quarter. Governor Bricker might have made this maxim an excuse to stay out of New Jersey. That State was supposed to be in Willkie's vest pocket until Willkie collapsed and, more recently, in the ironic words of the Tribune's Miss Winn, it has been reputed to be pulsating for Governor Dewey.

Governor Bricker did venture into the State, however, and his reception gave further proof of what has been apparent to anyone who has troubled to look beneath the froth of a few international newspapers and a noisy minority of social climbers. Americans in the East are no different from Americans in the Middle West, the South, or the Far West.

Governor Bricker did not pull his punches to fit the toadying internationalism that has been erroneously imputed to the majority of easterners. He told the voters in New Jersey the same thing that he has told the voters of the Middle West—that if there is to be an international police force capable of maintaining world order the majority of the policemen will be American boys; that while America must cooperate with other nations, we likewise have the power and right to insist that other nations cooperate with us. Cooperation cannot be one-sided.

The primary purpose of a national political convention is to select the best candidate that the party can offer for the Presidency. The Presidential candidate is often, and accurately, referred to as the standard bearer of the party. Not only does control of the national administration depend upon his leadership in the campaign but to a great extent victory in the thousands of other contests for State and local office. The delegates to the convention are the leaders of the State and local organizations of their party. They are interested, and properly so, not only in winning in the Nation but also in winning in their own areas.

The Republican delegates who gather in Chicago cannot fail to be aware of the leadership that Governor Bricker promises through his demonstrated ability to discuss the campaign issues honestly and courageously. Since the Governor has increased the tempo of his speaking engagements, Mr. Roosevelt has attempted to assure the country that he will refrain from committing the United States to any scheme of extreme internationalism or supergovernment. The value of any such assurance is naturally questionable, but there can be little doubt that the President was forced to it by the progress that Governor Bricker has been making as the only avowed candidate for the Republican nomination.

Louisiana's General Chennault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is proud of Gen. Claire Lee Chennault. As leader of the Flying Tigers in China, Chennault has spread the story of American flying skill and valor across the flaming skies of China. As head of the Fourteenth Air Force, he has made known to discouraged and war-worn peoples of China the full meaning of the efficiency and power and protection of the Army Air Forces.

General Chennault is a native of north Louisiana where he still retains his home. He is the father of seven children, and is true to the spirit and courage of his native State.

I ask permission to reprint below, a short article appearing in the May 27, 1944, issue of Life magazine:

LOUISIANA'S GENERAL CHENNAULT

The final tragic side of an airman in wartime is the fight. Having mastered his plane and all weathers, he must learn to kill and fly home again. Killing in the air is an intricate skill, and there is no greater student of it than Claire Lee Chennault.

There is little of the spit-and-polish soldier in Claire Chennault. If he struts, it is because he has a tense spine, bowed legs, and a bitter spirit. During the Flying Tigers' early battles, when he was both studying and teaching tactics, he would go up into the control tower at Toungoo field dressed in a pair of shorts, a short-sleeved white shirt, and a battered felt hat, and he would dictate to a stenographer his comments on each pilot's way of fighting. Later he would sit down with each man, like a colleague rather than a commander, and would rub out the soft spots and help make another perfect fighter.

This informal soldier is bitter because he has always had to fight for what he believed. As a young man he was appointed teacher in the toughest school in backwoods Louisiana. He believed in discipline and whenever the big Athens boys got obstreperous, Chennault asked them to step out into the yard. Soon order came to the school.

When he first applied for flight training, he was turned down with the comment: "Does not possess necessary qualifications to be a successful aviator." But within 3 months he had fought his way to acceptance.

As a military man, he has consistently gone to bat for the men of his command, but he has also fought against them when it seemed right. When 30 of his 34 A. V. G. pilots handed in resignations in April 1942, because they felt they were being expended needlessly by Chennault, he called them in and said: "Under the Articles of War, the punishment for desertion in the face of the enemy is death. Think it over." They did.

His great work has been his fight for fighters, as opposed to bombers. He was the Billy Mitchell of pursuit. But his deafness made him resign from the Army in 1937, and it was not till he went to China as aviation adviser to the Chiangs and later formed the A. V. G. that his theories proved themselves. Now the Army has taken him back, and whether they know it or not, fighter pilots all over

the world learn Claire Chennault's bitter lessons. They learn the three basic Chennault rules:

Be flexible: Chennault taught his Flying Tigers one set of tactics when they opposed the Zero with the heavy P–40—essentially dive, squirt, pass, run. But he said, "If we had Zeros, we would change our tactics and beat the Japs flying P–40's." And he would.

Be a team: Chennault's men on a flying trapeze were such a team that they could tie their planes together with short lengths of string, take off, go through brazen maneuvers, and land with the strings unbroken. In war Chennault devised the two-plane element rather than the V of three as the most efficient team.

Know your strength. In the bamboo barracks at Toungoo he would say: "Each type of plane has its strong points and weaknesses. The pilot who can turn his advantages against the enemy's weakness will win every time." Chennault used pencil and paper, blackboard and chalk, persuasion and the graceful hand movements of a pilot talking about planes to show his men their peculiar strengths and the enemy's weaknesses.

He fought the Army to put increased firepower in their two-gun fighters, but they would not give way until the Russians came out in Spain with four fixed guns firing synchronously through the whirring propeller. He fought for fighters dropping "frag" bombs on bombers. He fought for paratroopers, for more emphasis on markmanship, for better warning systems in days before radar.

Like all really good fighters, Claire Chennault has a warm, gentle core. There was no rank in his A. V. G.'s; there is no authority except excellence in his Fourteenth Air Force. He has seven children of his own, but Chinese poverty so moved him that he adopted several Chinese orphans. He is a good teacher because, having had a bitter fight in life himself, he is sensitive to other people's troubles.

But he is pugnacious, too, and he certainly looks it. One of his men was asked one day to describe his face. "He looks," the flyer said, "as if he'd been holding his face out of a cockpit into a storm for years." The flyer should have added that he was holding it out there to look for someone in the storm to fight with.

Extension of the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the preamble of a petition for the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act containing approximately 22,000 signatures. The petition has been filed with the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, believe that the Emergency Price Control Act, which expires June 30, 1944, has been effective in preventing runaway prices. In the light of what happened during and after the last war—rising prices and collapse, we are determined that the present law be renewed.

We are aware that major threats are being made to the price-control program. Casualty lists cast shadows over all of us. More and more of our sons, husbands, and friends will see active duty in the dangerous months' ahead. Our worries increase. It is unfortunate that in such critical times it is necessary for the citizens of this country to dissipate energy in this fight to renew a program that is so obviously essential for the general welfare.

Price control, like total war, is beyond party. We urge you who represent us in Congress to work aggressively to prevent inflation, and thus strengthen the morale at home and on the battlefront as well. Therefore, we petition you—our representatives—to continue and extend the price-control law without crippling amendments and with provision for adequate funds to strengthen its enforcement.

Back the Invasion—Produce for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the official statement of the Evansville Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., upon the invasion of Europe which has been sent to me as the Representative of the Eighth District of Indiana, and which reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF EVANSVILLE INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, C. I. O., TO THE PEOPLE OF EVANSVILLE—BACK THE INVASION—PRODUCE FOR VICTORY

Allied invasion of Hitler Europe hastens the day of unconditional surrender and victory over fascism. The men and women of our fighting forces are making the supreme sacrifice to insure that the "four freedoms" will conquer the bloody oppression of Hitler's hordes. America proudly witnesses the triumphant march of her sons in their mission of liberation. Freemen of all lands are fighting today in France against the barbarians. From west, from east, and from the south, Europe is being liberated.

No American will hesitate to make his greatest effort in order to produce and speed the weapons of war to the fighting fronts. The people of Evansville are engaged 100 percent in war production. We want to supply the guns, tanks, ships, and planes to our soldiers in such great numbers that the enemy will be crushed speedily and our sons and brothers will have an early, victorious homecoming. Labor and industry in Evansville will produce without halt the weapons of war. We will not hesitate, we will not slow down or stop our work until victory is ours and the boys are home.

The C. I. O. is urging all of its members to support to the last dollar the Fifth War Bond drive; our members are marching down to the Red Cross blood banks in the hundreds of thousands to give vitally needed blood to our armed forces. The C. I. O. is backing the President in his program of price control and rationing to guarantee that the hardships of war will be distributed fairly among all the people. We have pledged our fullest support to all and any measures our Commander in Chief deems necessary for the successful prosecution of the invasion. Labor is ready to unite with all American organizations to produce for victory.

Men and women of Evansville, no sacrifice is too great, no task too heavy, to back the invasion and help destroy Hitler's gang. In the words of our President:

"Germany has not yet been driven to surrender. Germany has not yet been driven to the point where she will be unable to recommence world conquest a generation hence. Therefore, the victory still lies some distance ahead. That distance will be covered in due time—have no fear of that. But it will be tough and it will be costly."

Back the invasion. Produce for victory.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the immediate need for this legislation arises from the fact that the present Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act will expire on June 30, 1944.

It is essential that these two acts continue in force. The bill now under consideration provides for continuance of their operation for a period of 1 year. By limiting the extension of 1 year, it is not to be assumed that the continuance of the stabilization program after the expiration of that time will not be necessary. During the year of continued operation not only will consumers be insured against an inflationary rise in the cost of living, but Congress will also have an opportunity to observe the operation of the act and its effects and the necessity of its continuance a year hence.

No one will deny that in some particulars the regulations and requirements of the Office of Price Administration in its administration of the act have produced hardships and conditions that justified complaints. However, most of such complaints were based upon conditions arising from administration of the act. Some of the conditions represented, in my opinion, mistakes in administration that should not have occurred. Some have been corrected and promises made for suitable remedy as to others.

Notwithstanding all the complaints made, some justified and others not, the fact remains that without price control the resultant conditions would have been intolerable. Consumers, especially of the low-income group, would have been caught in an upward inflationary swirl that would have caused the cost of living to have gone far beyond the ability of the average family to meet. It is bad enough now, but what would it have been had there been no price control? It is unpleasant to even contemplate the misery and distress that would have resulted?

I am not in accord with the effort being made by selfish interests to break down effective price control by weakening amendments to the act, and thereby permit profit gains through price increases

at the expense of consumers—workers in industry and trade, white-collar workers, farm workers, the aged living on meager allotments or pensions, the wives and dependents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who are serving their country, and those dependent upon the limited death benefits received as a result of husband or father having given his life in this or some previous war, and those servicemen and their dependents compelled to exist on the meager allotments or compensation allowed in case of injury in war service. The duty to protect these and others from the ravages of uncontrolled inflation and an ever-rising cost of living would justify measures to strengthen the Price Control Act instead of weakening it.

Furthermore control of prices on materials and equipment produced for the use of our armed forces means control of the cost of the war to the American people. According to Price Administrator Chester Bowles, operation of price control has meant a saving to our procurement agencies on munitions and other war contracts of nearly $65,000,000,000. This means that where between July 1940 and December 1943 we spent $136,000,000,000, we would have spent, in the absence of price control, at least $201,000,000,000. This is people's money. It is the money of holders of War bonds. It is the hard-earned money of the taxpayers of today and of the taxpayers of tomorrow.

Thus, whether the matter of price control is considered from the standpoint of the individual citizen or that of the Government, both being consumers, they are each deeply interested and their welfare requires adequate and effective price control. It is the duty and responsibility of Congress to provide such.

I shall vote to extend the Price Control Act, against weakening amendments, and to provide the funds that are necessary for adequate and efficient administration of the act.

The Curtain Rises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have recently finished reading one of the most worth-while books it has ever been my pleasure to read. I refer to Quentin Reynolds' the Curtain Rises, published by Random House, Inc. The entire book is well worth calling to the attention of Members of this House as well as to the American people as a whole, but on pages 350 to 352 is contained one of the most enlightening statements concerning our war effort that I have ever read. Random House, Inc., has given me permission to quote this material, and I include it here as part of my extension of remarks. May I say, that I commend it heartily as an antidote for partisanship and prejudice.

I've been home for a month now, and for the first time in 7 months I'm completely bewildered. It was a shock to pick up the papers and read columns of criticism of our war effort. Everything I saw in the war zone led me to believe that our matériel was the best in the world; that a military miracle had been achieved in the rapid training of our troops; that our war effort was being handled with a minimum of red tape, lost effort, and inefficiency. I knew that neither General Marshall nor General Eisenhower could wave magic wands and have the ships arrive in the Mediterranean right on time, loaded with just what we needed for combat. I felt that somebody back home must be doing a wonderful job of organization and administration to effect this result. I knew that when an American soldier set foot on an enemy beach he had the best equipment possible. He had everything that human ingenuity could give him to protect himself and to minimize his danger. He even had two ampoules of morphine and a package of sulfa powder in his pocket. His emergency rations were the best ever devised, and they even included something which, to the G. I., is more important than food—cigarettes and matches. Somebody back home must have been responsible for all this. The Army could not do it alone. Yet, from the papers, one would think that Washington was a madhouse, inhabited by certified lunatics, crooks, or shady politicians. It was disheartening, because when you first come home you're so filled with pride at the great job America has done and is doing that you feel like waving a flag. You get so impatient with the snide, petty criticism of our leaders that you end up by diving into the sports pages. You read the most senseless, absurd speeches by some of our duly elected Members of Congress, and you shudder and wonder why they don't inform themselves about conditions before they spout preconceived political convictions. When you return you are laboring under the apparently absurd delusion that we are at war with Japan and Germany. Reading some newspapers, you might be pardoned for thinking that we are at war with Britain and the President of the United States.

I arrived home and immediately went to a quiet resort for a week to catch my breath and to get accustomed to the fact that when you are awakened at night by the sound of an airplane engine you don't have to freeze with terror or look for a slit trench. It takes some time to realize that any plane you hear back home is a friendly one. I tolerated the lovely country resort for a week. Elderly gentlemen dressed each night for dinner and then dozed off in comfortable chairs in the hotel lobby. I felt that every now and then one of them would wake up and stop a passing bellboy to ask, "Is Roosevelt dead yet?" When the bellboy said "No," the elderly, black-tied gentleman would look disappointed and then go back to sleep.

At the resort a man asked me where I lived. I told him I lived in New York City. "How awful!" he said, looking at me sympathetically. "All you see there are Jews."

"I'm used to being with Jews," I told him. "Where I've been lately the place is full of them."

"Where have you been?" he asked.

"I've been with the First Division in Sicily," I said. "Full of Jews. It'll please you to know a hell of a lot of them were killed."

He looked at me and blinked, not understanding, and I walked away because I was afraid that I might get sick or slug him.

This was the America I returned to. Our men abroad deserve something better than a country which is still stupid with reaction and prejudice. There are no Democrats, no Republicans at the front. There are no Protestants, no Catholics, no Jews at the front. There are men in uniform who, at the very best, are giving up a year or 2 of their lives to serve a country they believe in. To paraphrase Tolstoy again, those maggots who continually gnaw at the healthy body of America perhaps can do no permanent harm, but we would be fools to allow them to go too far.

I know no one in America—except the parents and wives and children of the dead—who has as yet been called upon to make any real sacrifice. We suffer some minor inconveniences, but actually the war hasn't touched us yet. It hasn't touched us as it has touched the people of Britain or Russia. I am sure that if we were called upon to make the sacrifices they have made we, as a people, would be equal to our destiny. Whether that time will ever come, I don't know. I doubt it very much. But if the time does come, it may find us unprepared—mentally.

Twenty Million Forgotten Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by John Hanberg for the Daily Calumet of Chicago, Ill., of May 31, 1944:

TWENTY MILLION FORGOTTEN AMERICANS

The great mass of war poor, obscured beneath a flashy layer of war rich, has found a champion in United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. In an article in the June Reader's Digest, condensed from 'the American magazine, Senator THOMAS cites evidence that more than 20,000,000 Americans are living on incomes that have not risen appreciably since Pearl Harbor, while their taxes have increased and the cost of their food, clothing, and shelter has gone up, leaving them, in effect, with a cut in income of from 25 to 50 percent.

Most of these people whom the Senator calls the forgotten men and women are salaried workers who ordinarily belong to no union, and have no experienced negotiators plead their cases. One group, he says, consists of 900,000 school teachers whose salaries average less than $1,550 a year. Then, he finds, there are more than 4,500,000 white-collar workers on public pay rolls, from the tiniest towns up to the Nation's Capital, whose earnings, in spite of an over-all increase, average up to only $118 per month. He also points out that 136,000 clergymen have received little, if any, increase in salary; and nearly a million employees of hospitals are notoriously underpaid.

In the Senator's opinion, the largest group paying more than its share of the cost of the war, however, is made up of workers in offices and stores, and salesmen. He says that a 1943 survey of 351 companies found that salaries for file clerks, typists, switchboard operators, and stenographers averaged $22, $23, $25, and $30, respectively, while the average wage for clerks in department stores in New York is $23. This average, he explains, combines the salaries of workers who are being paid a living wage with the salaries of multitudes who are not, which means that many an office worker is faced with the problem of buying food and clothing on $16.50 a week.

One of the ways in which Congress can help the white-collar worker, the Senator writes, is to increase the take-home pay of those who are suffering real privation by increasing their tax exemption. The take-home pay is what the worker actually has left after 20 percent has been taken out of his salary for withholding tax, 10 percent for War bonds, 1 percent for social security, and perhaps another percentage for a company retirement fund.

Most important of all, Congress should ease the War Labor Board restrictions on salaries in the lower brackets. But it should be made clear that the W. L. B. usually does not oppose raises that bring wages up to 50 cents an hour, and that most employers of 8 or fewer employees are exempt from W. L. B. rulings. Nor has the Board authority over State, county, or municipal employees, or nonprofit hospitals.

Lessening slightly the restrictions on raises will not bring more inflation, he insists. Inflation, writes the Senator, is brought by uncontrolled wasters squandering on luxuries, not by giving a shabbily dressed typist $2.50 more a week, or by increasing the wages of a bank clerk so that he and his family can keep up the payments on their home.

Lidice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Yorské Listy, Czech daily paper:

LIDICE

(By Stanislav Budín)

We were never there. And yet, we see them clearly.

A typical mining town. A long main street, bordered with snug, miners' cottages. The seventeenth century church. A cheerful garden at the parsonage. An elementary school from which have graduated many generations. During the Republic, a new school was built, a light, beautiful, clean building. Two or three taverns where in the evening, it was so gay and where workers from the Bustehrad railway gathered, and card players played their games. Two tobacco stores where were sold the cheapest cigarettes, and where a legless invalid at about 11 o'clock received from Prague the evening papers, and, a few years ago, the workers' paper, too. At the end of the village was a large estate with a large garden. A mill at the brook. A herd of geese on the village square. In the quiet summer afternoon one could hear the little train thundering into the distant station. Behind the village a little forest, not full of hundred-year-old oaks, but a growth of underbrush on marshy soil.

We don't know anyone from Lidice. And yet, we see them clearly.

Miners. Before sunrise they go to work in the mines, carrying jugs of rye coffee. They have labored in the underground long now and the black dust has settled in their lungs. They return home from work, dirty, soiled, worn-out, but they slowly go their way, discussing events in a worldwise fashion. Nowhere in the world is there a more aristocratic worker. Nowhere in the world are there people who burn more passionately for truth, for justice. Nowhere in the world are there a people who more stubbornly fight for honor. Miners, miners for generations, proud of their proletariat state, haughty, informed, who above everything else in the world, despise treachery.

The miners. Mothers, who bring up their children strictly, who keep their small homes in shining cleanliness, who feed a thousand hungry mouths with one poor slice of bread. The girls, alert, sprightly, who work all day in the factories and in the evening, can dance so gaily. The children, grimy boys, lads and girls with hair like flax, playing on the village square.

And then came the night of the 9th to the 10th of June.

It was a pleasantly cool evening in Lidice, with the smell of the forest and fields in the air. Neighbors were sitting on the porches, talking of the laborious work in the mines, of the small starvation rations, of executions in Prague, remembered old times when a Czech was lord in his own home, whispered the latest news from London, and went to sleep. In Lidice, everyone always went to bed early. Especially today when hunger can be forgotten in sleep.

It was a quiet and silent night. And from the clean and clear sky a hurricane descended on the village.

On the road from Bustehrad automobiles, the panzer armored cars, and tanks clamored. The dogs in the village began to howl anxiously. A hundred and thousand murderers in black uniforms, with the death's head on their caps, surrounded the village, dashed to the mayor's home, dragged him from bed, fired a few rounds from the machine gun at the village square, divided into groups, raided the homes, and with the butt ends of their rifles chased the sleepy, confused people into the streets, with pocket flashlights looked under beds and into the sheds, whether anyone had hidden there, stuffed their pockets with watches, money, and with the butt ends of their rifles broke furniture, with bayonets tore the feather beds.

The cry of the drunken murderers, the wails of women and the weeping of children hung like a pall above the village.

In the light of floodlamps the killers divided the men from the women, the women from the children. Bloody from wounds, the men staggered to one side of the village square. The chin of the old priest shook. The children clutched at their mothers' skirts, but notwithstanding the terrible din, their heartbreaking cries, the murderers with vulgar curses tore them away and pushed them aside.

Horror descended upon Lidice. Machine guns barked. Blood splashed on the ground. The weeping and crying of maddened women and children only stimulated the fury of the murderers.

And then the killers shoved the wailing and fainting women into freight cars and threw the children into others. Again they ransacked the village, chased the livestock from the barns, threw straw around each cottage, poured on kerosene, and set fire to it.

On the morning of the 10th of June, the year 1940, Lidice burned like a torch. The police of the murderers surrounded the village so that no one from the neighboring villages could come near. The bodies of the murdered martyrs smoldered on the village square. Cars full of women and children disappeared in the direction of the German frontiers.

In the castle in Prague, the chief murderer dictated a message which the radio carried to the whole world: "The people of Lidice sheltered murderers, a subversive press, radio stations, large food stores; it is an established fact that the population of the village was in the active service of the exiled enemy. The village was leveled to the ground. Its name erased from the map."

Yesterday, even in Czechoslovakia, very few people knew the name of the village of Lidice. Today it is known all over the world.

Someone said that a day will come and Lidice will again be rebuilt from the ashes and that it will be better and more beautifully built than before. Oh, no. This the Czechoslovak nation will not permit. Adolf Hitler dreamt of a thousand-year German Reich. Thus, here, on the ruins and ashes of the mining town of Lidice, on an earth soaked with the blood of Czech miners and the tears of Czech mothers and children, here on this holy ground will for a thousand years stand a monument to Hitler's Third Reich. Centuries will pass, and perhaps people will want to forget that here at one time a nation of murderers and pyromaniacs stood, that here at one time hangmen and cutthroats ruled. It must not be forgotten. Lidice will stay just as it is today, as an undying monument to the glory and greatness of the German nation. Not Weimar, the seat of Goethe, nor Munich, the seat of Hitler, nor Berlin, the seat of emperors, nor the castles on the Rhine, the seat of thieving knights—no, Lidice will become forever the symbol of the German nation.

So, as sure as there is a God on high, this night of the tenth of June in the mining village of Lidice, must never be forgotten by men.

Unfair Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith a petition received from a number of responsible constituents and merchants in Cheboygan County, Mich., in my district, who resent the unfair competition which they are receiving from cooperatives subsidized by the Government which are seriously threatening the successful continuation of their own business, which in many instances represents their life work and the accumulation of their life's savings. It is a matter which merits the most careful consideration on the part of this Congress because if we dry up the source of revenue from the taxes which these small businessmen of America pay, we will not only seriously jeopardize any possible continued support for this type of unfair competition, but indeed will jeopardize the continuation of our form of Government under private initiative and private enterprise.

The petition follows:

CHEBOYGAN, MICH., *June 1, 1944.*

HON. FRED BRADLEY,
Member of Congress,
Eleventh District, Michigan,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: We realize that under presently prevailing conditions you are deluged with complaints of every type, both real and fancied. However, we do believe that the following is of sufficient importance to justify your consideration:

We refer to an apparently specially privileged group, whose ranks have shown a tre-

mendous increase throughout the country during the past few years. We speak of the cooperatives. It does seem that this increase has been at the expense of private business of the same nature with whom they are in direct competition.

Their path has been smoothed by the preference accorded them in their dealings with governmental agencies. A case in point: A local milling company, privately operated, obtained during the period of August 1943 to January 1944 five cars of Government wheat. Since then no more has been made available to them, nor do they have any assurance that any will be available. This wheat, purchased through the Commodity Credit Corporation, is being delivered regularly to the local cooperative.

The position in which this situation places a private firm with their customers is readily understandable. If this condition continues to exist in one type of business, there seems to be nothing to deter any other group purchasers from going into the same set-up regardless of what the commodity might be.

The local cooperative was set up and organized by two men who are on the Government pay roll, namely, the A. A. A. county chairman and the F. S. A. county supervisor. These men spent considerable amount of time on the proposition the year previous to their commencing business and are also spending a good share of their time at the local co-op plant since opening last September. Also, while organizing, they sent their literature out to the farmers in franked envelopes which, we understand, are to be used for Government business only; and are operating on money loaned from the Government which is, after all, the taxpayers' money. Frankly, we believe this type of organizing should be investigated.

Further, the Federal tax exemptions enjoyed by these associations, particularly now when the tax burden is greatest on private business, adds tremendous advantage. Undoubtedly the Nation cannot exist without a strong and dependable tax structure, but the load must be borne in proportion by all.

The argument avanced by the Cooperatives that they have no taxable profits is weak when it is realized that whether it be a profit to some or a saving to others, the dollar is still there and somebody is not paying their proper share of tax. It would, therefore, appear that private enterprise is being made to pay the cost of subsidization of these associations.

There has been recently set-up in Chicago the National Tax Equality Association whose avowed purpose is to endeavor to correct inequality in taxes, particularly those concerning the Cooperatives. They intend to bring this matter to the attention of Congress, and we strongly urge that you give this your most careful consideration in order that it may be brought before our fellow members at the earliest possible date.

Yours very truly.

Fred J. Stencil, grocer; F. J. Dougherty, Dougherty Milling Co.; Al. Bonsecours, Al. Bonsecours & Sons; Harold K. Werner, Werner's Friendly Service; Guy A. Thompson, retired merchant; Charles C. Culliton, Culliton Drug Co.; C. J. O'Toole, plant manager, clothing; J. L. Louisignau, merchant; Mrs. J. A. Boulanger, meats and groceries; Duffin & Durand, Dry Goods Co.; James Lites, Cheboygan Candy Co.; F. J. Haletunson, Ice Cream Manufacturing Co.; H. E. Schulz, appliances; Al. H. Weber, editor and publisher; A. E. Rogers, hardware; Harold Leeland, Gamble Store; M. M. Riggs, publishing, all of Cheboygan, Mich.; LeRoy J. Ormsbee, hardware store, of Afton, Mich.; Raymond McMullen, farmer; Al. Merritt, dairy; Fred Leslie, cream buyer; C. T. Strominger, store manager; L. I. Parks, retail grocer; Louis O. Burgtorf, farmer; Albert J. LaLonde, hotel; R. W. Lund, machine shop; Marvin McNitt, Lakeland creamery; Vern R. Wight, jeweler; J. C. Rittenhouse, manufacturer; Joseph M. Buerger, retailer; John J. Meyer, bowling alley; Victor Hansen, farmer; Robert Wylie, farming, all of Cheboygan, Mich.; Herbert C. Hutchinson, farmer, of Afton, Mich.; Edward Douglas, nursery; Claude Wheelock, wholesale gasoline; John A. Thompson, retail lumber company; C. M. Morrison, gasoline, wholesale and retail automobile sales and service; William Woiderski, Jr., farmer; J. B. Cook, manufacturer of bakery products; J. M. Mankovich, gasoline distributor; Arthur L. Martin, taxpayer; R. A. Hugill, wood turning; G. G. Atchison, retail coal merchant; K. A. Boucher, automobile dealer; W. B. Green, coal and dock; C. A. Leonall, drugs; Lewis E. Berry, attorney; Otto Beasgalle, farmer; Margaret Jewell, grocer; Richard Jewell, retired farmer; Eugene Woodmansee, farmer; Amiel Carlson, farmer, all of Cheboygan, Mich.

Fair Employment Practice Committee and Picketing of the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1944.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Following you will find, and I hope read in full, two speeches I made on the floor of the House this week.

These speeches deal briefly, but frankly, with a matter that is of great concern to every person who has instilled in him an appreciation of the principles and heritages of the Old South, and should be of momentous concern to every person who has enjoyed the blessings and protection of this great democracy of ours.

I know so well where the efforts of this un-American bunch of hoodlums are going to carry us unless they are stopped that I have dedicated myself, so long as I am able to speak, to fight them to the bitter end.

In the capacity I am serving you, I realize I am your spokesman, and after reading these speeches, if you think I am wrong in my convictions and efforts, then I want you to write me and give me your views. If you think I am right, then I want you to give me your full support from time to time as these issues arise.

With every good wish to you and your family, and pledging you to continue a relentless fight against these foes of our Government and the traditions of the Old South, I am

Your friend,

JOHN S. GIBSON,
Member of Congress,
Eighth District of Georgia.

While They Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2½ years some of the finest young men of America have been fighting, suffering, and dying in the uttermost parts of the earth. Now the invasion of Europe has started. Hundreds of thousands of our young men have been wounded and thousands have been killed. Many of them were boys who had never lived as you and I have lived. To those of us who have passed the half-century mark, they were just children. They did not want war. They had no part in deciding whether we should have war. Many just fight, suffer, and die.

More than 5,000,000 of the future citizens of this country, upon whom the very existence of our Nation, to say nothing of its welfare, depended, have been sent abroad and, before this cruel war is over, all too many of them will have been sacrificed to the war god; all too many will lie buried abroad and many—yes, many—will have been utterly destroyed, even their resting places unmarked and unknown. We here at home should be humble, thankful, forgetful of self and selfish ambition.

This invasion means that almost every minute, every hour, of every day, somewhere in this war a life is snuffed out. It means that some mother's son, some brother or some husband, will be wounded, lose a limb, suffer physical or mental injury.

As we contemplate the sacrifices which have been made, which are to be made, upon us should come a deep sense of humiliation, of grim determination, that, while they fight, we will not in thought, word or act, in any manner, fail them, neglect thoughtlessly to do our utmost here to support and sustain them.

No one has ever clearly stated just why humanity must sacrifice itself on the altar of war. All know that greed, selfishness, desire for gain and power, are among the causes of war; that many of the reasons advanced for going to war are not reasons at all, but just excuses which govern and obscure the real reasons. Once committed to war, a people, a nation, find it difficult, if not impossible, to turn back, but all wars end.

We here at home can do no less, as we bow our heads in humble prayer for the success and the safety of those who have gone, who will go, into battle, than search our hearts and minds for some remedy which in the centuries to come will prevent future generations of young Americans being thrown by the hundreds of thousands—yes; by the millions—into wars abroad. We can forget our fancied, personal hardships and complaints, keep in mind what they are doing and let nothing—no; nothing—interfere with our support.

If, when this war is over, we will expend a fraction of the effort which we have put forth to fight and win this war in making ourselves strong, independent, and self-reliant, the sacrifices of those who have given their lives, who will pay the penalty may not have been in vain.

In the meantime, the very least that we can do is to every hour, by our considered action, aid by giving the things they need; by seeing to it that here at home, when the survivors return to their homeland—to them the most blessed spot on earth—they will find not only a welcome but material advantages and privileges which will aid them to forget their suffering, their losses; to go back to homes of their own, where, with wives, children, and friends, they can live as did their forefathers, in peace and prosperity, the memories of this war but as an unpleasant dream.

Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Lew Hahn, general manager of the National Retail Dry Goods Association:

NATIONAL RETAIL DRY GOODS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., June 7, 1944.

Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMAS: In response to the Office of Defense Transportation's call for a reduction in passenger transportation the National Retail Dry Goods Association recently, by voluntary action, postponed three important conventions which it had scheduled for this summer.

Instead the president of this association, Edward N. Allen, of Hartford, Conn., and the writer, have just completed a trip of nearly 10,000 miles and personally discussed conditions in many of the cities of the West, the Pacific Northwest, and the Pacific coast with the merchants of those regions.

It is our idea that you will be interested in the following statement which is based upon our direct contacts with several thousand retail merchants.

We found that retailers are doing an excellent job of supplying public demands up to the limit of their facilities during this war period. The difficulties they face in nowise discourages them. The high taxes they are paying they regard as necessary. As one man they are patriotically supporting all of the various war agencies and in most cases their advertising and other facilities are devoted chiefly to the sale of War bonds. Some outstanding stores have advertised no merchandise at all for a period of as long as 6 months. All the advertising space of such stores has been devoted to the Red Cross, the U. S. O., War bonds, and similar objects.

One thing, however, does distress these merchants. That is the unnecessary and unreasonable interference with business caused by the Office of Price Administration's stubborn insistence upon maintaining the restriction of price lines in three important price regulations.

Retailers favor a strong and effective system of Government price control during this war emergency. It is a matter of record that the National Retail Dry Goods Association, and its member merchants, began a voluntary control of prices before the war in Europe was 2 weeks old. To be specific, this campaign was started on September 12, 1939, and was carried on without any help from Government for 2 years. No group would suffer more from a serious inflation than the retailers who must carry costly stocks of merchandise at all times and whose losses at the end of an inflationary period would be prodigious.

Consequently, retailers do not desire any lessening of effectiveness in Government price control. They hold that O. P. A. has been authorized by the Congress to control the prices at which they may sell merchandise and they do not object. In the case of the restriction on price lines, however, O. P. A. presumes to say that one retailer may carry and sell a certain article of merchandise while his competitor shall not be allowed the same right.

Not only is this unreasonable but it actually is contrary to the public interest. Attached hereto you will find a small chart which shows that in those lines of merchandise to which the restriction on price lines applies the advance in prices has been much more rapid and acute than in other lines where this provision does not apply. The chart, however, does not presume to indicate the extent to which, in addition to the advance in price, deterioration of quality also has occurred.

Please bear in mind that this price line restriction applies only to women's and girls' ready-to-wear garments, men's and boys' clothing, and furs. If therefore O. P. A. is to be considered justified in holding that such a provision is a necessary part of price control, it would be difficult to explain why the same provision does not appear in regulations controlling all other lines of goods.

Retailers, as you know, do not produce merchandise. They buy it from the manufacturer and resell it to consumers. Unless the manufacturer who makes the goods is confined to certain price lines and required to produce goods of undiminished quality in those price lines, the retailers cannot have such goods to offer to the public. And unless the public wishes to buy such merchandise, it is wasteful to require manufacturers to make it and to confine retailers to such price lines. In short, the retailer cannot be bracketed unless producers and consumers are similarly bracketed.

The recent efforts of Administrator Bowles to provide relief from the unnecessary exactions of the price line restrictions are in no sense a solution of the problem. They can do nothing at best except to transfer the point of difficulty from one group of retailers to another. As retailers down the scale may be afforded some little relief, such relief can be had only at the expense of retailers a little higher up the scale. There is no solution to the problem except to do away with the provision completely.

Indeed, Mr. Bowles' latest effort to simplify the problem will only make it worse.

Because the O. P. A. folks are so stubborn in their persistence in maintaining this price line restriction provision, retail merchants can do nothing except to petition their representatives in Congress to amend the Price Control Act in such a way as to make this type of regulation impossible.

In view of the extremely earnest way in which retailers have sought to comply with the price regulations, we believe you will see the justice of Congressional action at this time.

It has been suggested that the situation could be adequately met with the following simple amendment:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to sell any commodity or to require any person to limit his stock of goods or sales to the highest price line offered for sale at any one time, and any rule, regulation, or order inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection shall have no further legal effect."

You will recognize, of course, that not even the Government of the United States could ever hope to control an economy so great and complicated as that of the United States without the sincere and complete cooperation of the men of business. This cooperation retail merchants have gladly given and will continue to give, and we hope you will see the wisdom of requiring O. P. A. to remove this unnecessary and useless barrier to the fair conduct of retail distribution.

In this spirit we invite your support for some such amendment as is suggested above. May we have a reply from you?

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

LEW HAHN,
General Manager.

D-Day Puts Sea Power in Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James B. Hutchison:

D-DAY PUTS SEA POWER IN FOCUS
(By James B. Hutchison)

WASHINGTON.—The role of sea power in deciding the ultimate income of wars once again has been clearly demonstrated in the allied invasion of France.

There can be no longer any doubt that sea power is winning World War No. 2 for the United Nations. It was Hitler's reliance solely on a big air force, and well-trained army that cost him victory in the early days of the conflict.

At the Navy Department on D-day, Secretary James V. Forrestal, Admiral Ernest J. King, Navy commander in chief, and Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, commander of the Atlantic fleet, tersely agreed that the invasion was "a perfect example of the silent working of seapower, and the airpower that goes with it."

The American Navy's Atlantic squadrons, in the past 2 years, have taken more than 7,000 ships across the ocean to England. Only 10 ships were lost, none of which were troop ships.

Without this astounding display of sea power, the Allies now would not have the millions of men and countless materials of war that make the liberation of Europe possible.

However, the war has made it clear, finally, that a nation can control the air, as the Germans did during the early part of the war, and still be unable to control the seas.

In the last analysis, it is ships that hold the seas, just as the land forces—infantry, artillery, and armored forces—must take and hold the land. But, in modern war, both land and sea services must have aid of the air arm, to soften up the enemy, find out

what he is doing, and give protection from enemy air attack.

When the war started in 1939, and the Germans had an air force that completely dwarfed numerically, those of the French and British, adherents of air power were quick to assume that airplanes were the determining factor in getting control of land and sea areas.

But they were thinking principally of specific battles between airplanes and individual ships, or individual cities. Alfred Trayer Mahan, the world's greatest naval historian, back in 1889 wrote that:

"Naval historians have troubled themselves little about the connection between general history and their own particular topic, limiting themselves generally to the duty of simple chroniclers of naval occurrences."

What he said then applies precisely to the statements of those who came out overwhelmingly in suport of air power as the determining factor of modern war. Sea power alone cannot win a war. Land power alone cannot win a war. Air power alone cannot win a war. A nation must possess all three services, in great force, to win.

In every war in history, from the time of Hannibal's unsuccessful attack on the old Roman Empire, the country with the victorious land force has always also had mastery of the sea. It was true in Napoleon's time, in the American Civil War, and even in the American Revolution, after France threw her navy against the British Fleet operating off the Atlantic coast.

It has been true in this war. Hitler was stopped from invading Britain, after the defeat of France, not by the small but excellent Royal Air Force, but by England's Fleet.

Hitler had no navy to challenge the British fleet. He even had a difficult time assembling small craft for his one futile attempt at invasion.

A Royal Air Force pilot, who has been flying bombers ever since Britain entered the war, told the writer that it was the Royal Navy that broke up an attempt, about which little has ever been made public, by the Nazis to storm England.

The flyer said that some 60,000 German troops set sail from the Lowlands in assorted craft. The R. A. F., he said, had comparatively little to do with breaking up this attack. The Royal Navy, he said, sent large forces to sea. These ships intercepted the invasion barges, laid down a gigantic sea of oil around the Nazis, set it afire and wrecked the enemy forces.

Reports from Allied headquarters in London show that Hitler's lack of sea power, plus a diminishing air force, prevented him from challenging the Allied invasion fleet, either at sea or before the fleet left the coastal ports of England.

The WASP Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the bill H. R. 4219, commonly known as the WASP bill, will be called up for consideration before the House in the near future, I feel that I should make some comments thereon. More particularly is this so in view of House Report No. 1600, which has recently been presented by the House Committee on the Civil Service following their inquiry into the expansion and proposed change in the civil-service status of the WASPS.

A study of this report, consisting of 14 pages, can be summed up briefly as a charge against the Army Air Forces for the continuance of the training of women pilots where there exists a large reservoir of trained, expert pilots ready and available to serve their country's cause. Having made this assumption, which is not justified by the facts, the report proceeds to criticize the entire WASP program.

It is unnecessary, I feel, to discuss paragraph by paragraph the discrepancies of this report. However, it is desired to call attention to the conclusions and recommendations contained therein. These conclusions and recommendations I would like to take the liberty of reading. They are:

1. The proposal to expand the WASPS has not been justified. Therefore, it is recommended that the recruiting of inexperienced personnel and their training for the WASPS be immediately terminated.

2. That the use of the WASPS already trained and in training be continued and provision be made for hospitalization and insurance.

3. There exist several surpluses of experienced pilot personnel available for utilization as service pilots.

Therefore, it is recommended that the service of these several groups of experienced air personnel be immediately utilized.

It is worthy to note that these conclusions and recommendations were not the opinion of at least five of the members of this committee who have reported as follows:

We, the undersigned, disagree with the report of the Committee on the Civil Service, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, concerning inquiries made of certain proposals for the expansion of the WASP, pursuant to House Resolution 16, feeling that the termination, the continuation, or the further development of a woman's flying program is a matter for the Army Air Force to determine.

CLARENCE E. KILBURN.
RICHARD P. GALE.
GRAHAM A. BARDEN.
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.
WINIFRED C. STANLEY.

As I have indicated, the most astounding part of this report is the assumption that there does exist a vast pool of well-trained pilots ready to serve the Army Air Forces at a moment's notice. This is an error that I would like to correct now.

This report calls attention to the fact that there are 4,689 pilot instructor-trainees available to the Army Air Forces to be used as pilot material. This unfortunately is not true.

On January 15, 1944, there were 4,687 trainees of the C. A. A.-War Training Service program called to active duty by the Army Air Forces at which time they were examined physically, mentally, and professionally as every other individual has been examined with the same standards applied. At this time I might point out that this was the first uniform examination that had ever been given this group. Your attention is invited to the fact that these physical and mental examinations revealed that many of these men were physically unfit to pursue flying training in the Army Air Forces, and that professionally, many of them did not have sufficient ability to warrant additional training for duty with the Air Transport Command.

The results of these examinations found 974 qualified to take aviation cadet training to become combat pilots; 651 were found qualified to take glider pilot training; 2,618 were assigned to technical training in order to fit them for the many and necessarily essential positions in the Army Air Forces; 310 were assigned as specialists when it was found that they had already perfected themselves and had practiced an occupation whereby their service could be immediately utilized by the Army Air Forces—I am speaking of laboratory technicians, radio operators, Chinese interpreters, and so forth; 128 were not assigned due to hospitalization, emergency furloughs, and so forth; 5 were discharged for miscellaneous causes; and 1 died.

From a study of this utilization by the Army Air Forces of this 4,687 trainees, it is very apparent that they have been utilized in a manner best suited for the problem of pursuing successfully our war effort.

The report further points out that there are a total of 5,882 civil instructors at present unemployed who are anxious and willing to assume the duties of a pilot officer in the Army Air Forces. Actual facts, again, reveal this to be untrue.

The truth of the matter is as follows: That with the termination of civilian contract schools and the C. A. A. war training service program on January 15, 1944, there were released a total of 904 pilot instructors. Of this number, 339 have already been certified by the C. A. A. and were employed by the Air Transport Command; 38 were certified to the Army Air Forces by the C. A. A. but were rejected on physical and general classification scores and were therefore reported to the Military Personnel Division of the Army Air Forces for disposition; 168 were not certified to the Army Air Forces by the C. A. A. and were also reported to the Military Personnel Division for disposition; a total of 104 are being employed in other programs and 255, all nonreservists and on whom the Army Air Forces have no records, are at this time awaiting examination by the Army Air Forces. I fail to see how by any trick of mathematics the Army Air Forces may utilize this group in any other manner than I have just indicated.

Between June 30, 1944, and August 4, 1944, there will be approximately 5,882 additional civilian instructors available, as the result of closing the college indoctrination program and other civilian contract schools. It is obvious that to date these instructors have not been available to the Army Air Forces. However, they will become available between the dates mentioned above, and I have been advised by the Army Air Forces that

those who can pass the physical examination for flying and who are under the age of 27 will be given aviation cadet training, fitting them for combat duty; all who are under 38 years of age and capable of passing a class 2 physical examination will be given employment with the Air Transport Command or with the glider pilot training program; those who are unable to pass this examination will be given the opportunity of technical or gunnery training.

I would like to further point out that this report states that the qualifications are discriminatory between the girl trainees and these "expert" pilots. If there has been any discrimination indicated at all, it, in my opinion, has certainly been discrimination in favor of these pilot instructors. It is apparently not understood that every girl trainee must pass a physical examination in every way equal to that of a combat pilot. These girls must also be between the ages of 18 and 27. On the other hand, in order to qualify for duty with the Air Transport Command these "expert" instructors need only physically be qualified to pass a class 2 noncombat examination and be under 38 years of age.

Assuming for the moment that there are 8,000 well-trained pilots available and ready at this moment within the United States to be called to duty with the Army Air Forces, the entire 8,000 would merely fill the replacement losses of the Army Air Forces for approximately 2 months and after those 2 months have passed, we would of necessity again have to turn to the 17-year-olds or female pilots. I defy any man to produce for the Army Air Forces a single youth between the ages of 18 and 27, physically qualified to take aviation cadet training, who is not already utilized either in the Army, Navy, or vital industry. If we are to force the Army Air Forces to utilize these physically unqualified individuals we have merely furnished them with between 1 and 2 months of inferior material, leaving them at the expiration of that time in the same position in which they now find themselves, to wit, to militarize female pilots as necessary replacements.

On Tuesday, 11,000 airplanes covered our invasion assault on Europe. What replacements will be necessary as the result of the air battles to be waged over France none of you know, nor do I know. I am, however, firmly convinced that those men responsible for the placing of those 11,000 airplanes over our invading forces are somewhat more familiar with the problems of organization, training, administrative handling, and tactical employment of our aerial weapons than any group of individuals, no matter how well-meaning their intentions, can possibly be who wrote this report.

We have placed General Arnold, with perfect confidence, at the head of the 16 air forces now functioning throughout the world. The records of these forces speak for themselves. General Arnold himself has requested the passage of the WASP bill in order that the civilian women pilots now serving with our air forces and those hereafter to be trained might be removed from their civilian status and placed in a full military status. The desirability of this change cannot be questioned by anyone. Even the report of the Civil Service Committee urges in their second recommendation that "provision be made for hospitalization and insurance." The effective utilization of these women pilots can only be accomplished if they are made a part of the military organization. Having seen the development of the WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and MARINES, I know no reason why this group of women pilots alone of the various military-service organizations should not be given the same status as had been accorded those other groups.

In conclusion, let me explain that the sole effect of the WASP bill is to bring these civilian women completely under military jurisdiction as they should be. Likewise, let me point out that the Army Air Forces have been more than pleased with the splendid success of the WASP program and its accomplishments, and this program shall be continued whether it remains in a civilian status or becomes a military organization. It will be continued because the Army leaders are satisfied as to the necessity for the organization and because it will aid materially in benefiting our aviation activities in this country and likewise relieving many pilots qualified for combat activities and enabling them to hasten our day of victory in this war.

School Teachers Deserve Our Praise and Thanks for Their Efforts on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is one group of unsung warriors on the home front that has been entirely overlooked as we have from time to time praised various groups and awarded others the Army-Navy E banner for efficiency.

I refer to the teachers in the schools of our Nation who are now waging a great campaign—a campaign which will to a great extent contribute to the kind of a post-war world in which we will live. These folk are helping the next generation get ready for tomorrow. And they are doing a fine job.

I know of the unpleasantries of teaching and of the difficulties and inconveniences and sacrifices, for I was once a school teacher myself. I believe it is a distinct credit to the profession that these loyal American citizens have remained at their post, spurning higher wages of the defense plants, in order that our school-age children might continue to receive a good education.

It would be only natural for persons in the salary category of these people to grasp the opportunity to earn higher wages which the war brought. Instead, the majority of them have turned their backs to this temptation and have remained on the job in the true American way and with unfailing devotion, helping boys and girls climb to greater heights. The contribution of our teachers to the greatness of America is beyond measure. To the institution of education, I say, should also go an E award.

We are all interested in the post-war program, and as a former teacher, I was particularly interested in the Federal portion of the program of the National Education Association of the United States. It is sufficiently important that I feel all Members of the House should study it. It follows:

1. Make the United States Office of Education an independent Federal agency under the general direction and control of a national lay board of education. Have this national board of education appointed by the President, with approval by the Senate, in such a way as to secure a high level of competence and minimize the danger of partisan political influence in Office of Education activities. Authorize the national board to appoint the United States Commissioner of Education and let it determine, within the framework of Federal law, the basic policies and plans which the Commissioner is to administer as head of the Office of Education.

2. Strengthen the Office of Education further with additional funds and personnel. Gradually make it the one Federal agency having direct contacts with State and local school systems. Let the Office of Education administer the distribution of all Federal money appropriated for State and local school purposes.

3. Establish a coordinating council of all Federal agencies having educational activities, with the United States Commissioner of Education as chairman. Let this council undertake to harmonize the educational activities of the several agencies and prevent unnecessary duplication of effort among them.

4. Let special needs for schooling be cared for, as a rule, by State and local educational institutions. Refrain from establishing Federal schools or classes except as they are necessary for children and youth on remote Federal properties or reservations, for persons in training for various branches of the Federal service, and for the development of a national university.

5. Invite the chief state school officers and other educational leaders of the several States to meet annually or oftener with the United States Office of Education staff to discuss problems of mutual concern.

6. Arrange to carry on all Federal business with the educational institutions of each State through, or by agreement with, the central State agency having jurisdiction—preferably an all-inclusive State board or department of education.

7. Provide financial aid for public education in general on an equalization basis, without any Federal control of the school curriculum and with only the barest minimum of Federal regulations to insure honest and impartial State administration of the funds. As the amount of such aid is increased, gradually eliminate Federal grants of money to the States for specific school purposes. During the early post-war period, however, provide funds for school building construction as part of a federally-supported program of public works.

8. Provide Federal funds through State welfare agencies to help the States and local

communities keep economically handicapped persons in school as long as may be individually and socially desirable.

9. Provide Federal funds through the appropriate State educational agencies for necessary training and guidance of nondisabled war veterans and released civilian workers.

A Report on Efforts to Maintain a Continuing Supply of Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained leave to insert an editorial which will appear in the next issue of the American Medical Journal.

For your further attention, I am now authorized to include a report on efforts to maintain a continuing supply of physicians, made by the directing board Procurement and Assignment Service for physicians, dentists, veterinanians, sanitary engineers and nurses.

This problem is by no means a local one. It concerns every congressional district in this country.

I am hopeful that those in authority may soon recognize that attention must be given this serious matter.

The report follows:

In December 1942 it was agreed by the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy and the directing board of the Procurement and Assignment Service that classes admitted to medical schools for the duration of the war should be made up of the following groups: Army specialized training program students 55 percent, Navy V-12 students 25 percent, and civilian students 20 percent; the latter group to be made up of women and men physically disqualified or otherwise ineligible for military service.

The curtailment of the Army specialized training program in April 1944 provided that medical students and premedical students in the Army specialized training program should continue in training, but that no more students should be admitted to the program.

It is estimated that the number of premedical students remaining in the Army specialized training program is sufficient to fill only 28 percent of the places in the classes to be admitted to medical schools in 1945. The Navy will continue to fill 25 to 31 percent of the places.

The reduction in the Army specialized training program had the effect of increasing the number of places which must be filled by civilian medical students by 27 percent. This situation gave concern to the directing board of the Procurement and Assignment Service lest it be found impossible to secure an adequate number of properly qualified candidates for medical schools to fill the classes in the future and to keep the supply of doctors constant and adequate.

Early in April Selective Service, after conference with the Inter-Agency Committee on Occupational Deferment, ruled that premedical students acceptable to the armed services, unless accepted for admission and matriculated and entered into actual classroom work in recognized school of medicine on or before July 1, 1944, will no longer be deferred. The Procurement and Assignment Service wishes to record the following developments which have taken place since that time:

At a joint meeting of the directing board of the Procurement and Assignment Service with the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service these problems were discussed, and it was mutually agreed that the effect of these two policies on medical education would be dangerous in terms of production of physicians, continued existence of the medical schools, and the effects on public health.

On April 12, at the suggestion of the Procurement and Assignment Service, recommendations were made by Mr. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, embodying the objections and apprehensions of the Procurement and Assignment Service to this program.

On April 15 a reply from General Hershey indicated that "No exceptions will be made as respects the date of July 1. We shall, as in the past, give full faith and credit to the certificates of professional colleges as to the status of students matriculated therein and engaged in actual classroom work within the school or under its immediate supervision."

On April 26 a communication was forwarded by Mr. McNutt to the Secretary of War and to the Secretary of the Navy, urging the armed services to provide some status for a sufficient number of students to fill the entering classes in medical schools.

On April 28 discussions were held by the directing board at one of its regular meetings with representatives of the War Department, and these apprehensions were stated to them and discussed with them.

On May 8 a discussion was held with Mr. James V. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, concerning this whole situation, and it was his opinion that since this matter under the law was entirely in the hands of Selective Service it was not within his province to take any action in this matter.

On May 16 the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy jointly advised the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission that it seemed to them "that the immediate needs of the war for their [students'] services ought not to yield to the prospective use of them as doctors in 1949 or thereafter, particularly when it is to be expected that the course of the war will by then make it possible to release many doctors at present in the military service. The action of the Director of Selective Service in refusing these deferments was, therefore, in accord with the recommendations of the departments, and for them now to put these students into inactive reserve status would, in effect, be to defer them and so nullify the action of the Director of Selective Service, which we supported."

This now brings the matter up to date and in the accompanying table is submitted an estimate of what the status of medical classes will be under the program as it now exists.

Estimates of medical students for 1945

Total number of places in entering classes	6,440
Army students, 28 percent	1,790
Navy students, 25 percent	1,540
	3,330
Balance to be filled by women and by men disqualified for general military service	3,110

Past experience suggests that it should be possible to fill 400 to 500 of these places with women students. This leaves approximately 2,600 places which, under current policies of Selective Service, can be filled only by men who are disqualified for general military service.

It is impossible at this time to predict how many of these places the medical schools will be able to fill without lowering their standards of admission. Less than 10 percent of present medical students are physically disqualified for military service. The liberalization of deferments for men classified by Selective Service, and the discharge of increasing numbers of men by the Army and Navy, should make it possible to augment somewhat this proportion. Only time will demonstrate whether this situation will improve or deteriorate. No predictions are justified at this time for classes to be admitted in 1946 and thereafter.

At the present time the directing board of the Procurement and Assignment Service feels that it has exhausted all possibilities to secure more satisfactory arrangements to maintain medical enrollment. It presents this statement in order that the medical public may be made aware of the facts. Throughout these communications and conferences the directing board has constantly emphasized to all agencies concerned, in its opinion, the dangers of the situation. It will continue to do so.

Proposed Post-War Unemployment Compensation Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a proposed post-war unemployment compensation plan, prepared by Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board, Timken-Detroit Axle Co., and Standard Steel Spring Co., and chairman of the board and president, Pittsburgh Equitable Meter Co. I am of the opinion that the information contained in this proposed post-war plan will be of much interest to Members of Congress, as well as the general public:

This program is presented as a contribution to post-war planning. It is designed to promote a measure of security for both labor and industry in the economic upheaval that will follow contract terminations.

Industry has already experienced cut-backs, or readjustments in the war-production program. The disruptions these produce are indicative. Probably sooner than is realized, readjustments will become everyday practice as military requirements diminish. The period between a whole or substantial cancelation of war contracts and the resumption of production for civilian use is fraught with danger for both labor and industry. Millions of employees will be thrown out of work for varying periods of time.

Under the present method of excess-profit controls, it is made exceedingly difficult to establish reserves for maintenance of employment during the period of reconversion. Nor has there been any practical provision set up to enable industry to absorb returning military personnel and at the same time continue to employ those now on the pay roll.

It is absolutely imperative that we recognize this problem and take some immediate

steps if we are to avoid the disastrous consequences that must follow our failure to provide a workable solution before the actuality is upon both labor and industry.

The following program is submitted with the thought that it is at least based upon considerations of practicality.

1. Every company engaged in whole or substantial part with war production, be permitted to withhold from 1943, 1944, and 1945 gross income after taxes and normal profit, and before renegotiation, a sum up to the equal of one average week's wage or salary for each month of continuous employment of each person on the pay roll, with a maximum total equal to 24 weeks' wage or salary for employees who have worked 2 years or more.

2. Based upon the same formula, an equal sum to be withheld for each ex-employee now serving in the armed forces, with the same maximum and minimum withholdings operative.

3. These funds shall be held by each company. A complete record of such withholdings, together with the record of each active employee, plus those serving in the armed forces, shall be sent to the Social Security Board. Payments out of the fund shall also be recorded with the Social Security Board. These records shall be available to the public.

4. Disbursements of these funds to unemployed workers will start at the time of complete cancellation of war contracts. Or in the instance of graduated contract cancellations due to readjustments in the war production program, a joint labor-management committee in each plant shall determine the mutually satisfactory point at which disbursements shall start. In the case of ex-employees returning from the armed forces, payment shall start upon personal application of each ex-employee.

5. Disbursements are to be made at a rate in conformity with the maximum and minimum established by State or Federal Governments for unemployment compensation, until—

(a) a job of comparable skill and compensation as last held shall be made available to each person entitled to these benefits, or

(b) until such time as the total benefits accruing to each individual employee are completely disbursed, or

(c) until other employment is obtained by each person entitled to these benefits.

6. At the end of 2 years after complete settlement of all terminated war contracts, all withheld funds not disbursed by the companies operating under this plan shall be paid to the Federal Government.

In addition to the foregoing, and because it bears a definite relationship to the problems inherent in reconversion, the following recommendation is made:

"The Government shall apoint a joint board of labor leaders and qualified business experts to examine at once the present inventories of materials, commodities, semi- and finished goods, and production facilities in the possession or control of each claimant agency and to recommend to the Government immediate steps to readjust any production program, either up or down, where it is shown that threatening surpluses are clearly indicated. Such information can, if deemed advisable, be kept confidential. However, the admission by Government officials of a minimum of $50,000,000,000 surplus of raw materials and finished goods which will be on hand at the end of the war makes it evident that planning in advance of the time when such a condition can wreck whole industries must be started at once."

Unless some such action as the foregoing is undertaken at once, there can be no assurance that the period of reconversion will not find either the national or State Governments faced with mountainous unemployment compensation expenditures—expenditures so heavy in some instances that the financial structure of certain States may be imperiled.

If, however, the remedy is attempted by means of added national taxation to implement present State unemployment compensation funds, the termination of contracts will find industry saddled with a continuing and intolerable burden. This plan provides a definite termination point for the accumulation of reserves for this use.

This formula is presented as being equitable to all companies, large and small, and to the employees thereof, who have converted, in whole or in part, their normal production for peace to that of production for war.

To Mr. Avery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Samuel Wolchok, president, United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America:

For us at home, this is going to intensify the crisis in manpower. This crisis has already reached staggering proportions requiring heroic measures to control all hiring of male workers, beginning July 1.

Your labor policies have interfered and are still interfering with the efficient use of manpower in the Chicago district and elsewhere.

You yourself reported to your stockholders that, in order to maintain a working staff of 78,000 for all the Montgomery Ward establishments, the company had to employ 151,000 people in 1943. This turnover of 193 percent is directly due to your policies of intimidating and underpaying your workers.

Montgomery Ward's methods of terrorizing employees are a matter of court record and have been described and condemned by the courts in a number of cases. Here is one instance out of many—the case of *Hornin* v. *Montgomery Ward*, 120 F. (2d) 500 (decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth District), concerning the Ward's store at McKeesport, Pa. The facts, as recited in the court's decision, were:

Store manager, seeking to stop theft, forced culprit caught with stolen goods to implicate an innocent employee by threatening to fire the culprit's girl friend who worked in the store. The manager had innocent employee taken out of his home at night, locked up and held incommunicado, not being permitted to communicate or tell his family till the next day.

Said the court: "Stark (the manager) by threats forced Kasmareck (the thief) to give false testimony which, had it been unrepudiated, would have been sufficient to convict Hornin. This Stark did with a wantonness and disregard of the rights of others which plainly indicates that the want of probable cause was wholly unimportant to him. He apparently felt the need of an example for disciplinary purposes at the store, and the means by which he obtained his victim mattered not at all. * * *

"And there is also evidence that the defendant company's principal or main office knew of Stark's (the manager's) action with respect to the institution and maintenance of the criminal proceedings almost from the outset and never made any objection thereto."

Judgment for employee sustained.

Mr. Avery, did you remember this when you were gently carried from your offices April 27?

The American way of providing for fair and stable labor relations is embodied in the National Labor Relations Act. This law requires that employers must bargain collectively with representatives of the workers' own choosing.

Upholding this act, Chief Justice Hughes declared:

"Long ago we stated the reason for labor organizations. We said that they were organized out of the necessities of the situation; that a single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer; that he was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family; that if the employer refused to pay him the wages he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and resistant arbitrary and unfair treatment; that union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer. * * * Fully recognizing the legality of collective action on the part of employees in order to safeguard their proper interests, we said that Congress was not required to ignore this right, but could safeguard it. Congress could seek to make appropriate collective action of employees an instrument of peace rather than of strife."

In a big advertising campaign—paid for to the extent of 81 cents on the dollar by the people of the United States through loss of excess profits taxes—you have repeatedly stated that you have "no quarrel with the principle of unionism, no quarrel with the principle of collective bargaining," and that "Ward's stands ready at all times to bargain collectively with any union which has been selected by a majority of the employees in any appropriate bargaining unit."

But you did not tell the public that Ward's has been twice convicted by Federal circuit courts of appeals for spying on the activities of workers. (The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals issued an order in 1939 directing the Montgomery Ward plant at Portland, Oreg., to stop the practice of using undercover agents to observe and report upon the union activities of the employees. In 1941, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals issued a similar order involving the St. Paul, Minn., plant. Both these court orders required the company to cease using labor spies.) You cannot bargain sincerely unless you give up your use of labor spies and abandon your efforts to break up the union.

Even when you failed to break up the unions of your workers and met with them for the purpose of collective bargaining, you have failed to show an attitude of good faith. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals denounced your attitude as a "hypertechnical approach" and as involving "stalling tactics." "Throughout the conferences," said the court, "there is apparent a studied design of aloofness, of disinterestedness, of unwillingness to go forward, upon the part of Ward's."

The New York State Labor Board also declared in 1942 that Ward's did not bargain collectively in good faith. This finding was sustained by the New York Supreme Court. The court declared that the position taken by the company did not constitute good faith in bargaining. The judgment of the New York Supreme Court was affirmed by the appellate division, to which you insisted on carrying the case.

Mr. Avery, we challenge you—

To quit stalling.

To quit your private war against labor.

To join the war effort.

To bargain in good faith with our Local 20, and with every other union of your employees, and sign contracts that will elimi-

nate turn-over, waste of manpower, help the workers to spur production, and win the only war which the American people is interested in winning—the people's war of liberation against the Nazi and Jap tyrants.

SAMUEL WOLCHOK,
United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees of America.

SEWELL AVERY'S OPERATING MANAGER TELLS THE FACTS ON TURN-OVER

In a letter written on June 8, 1942, Mr. Odorizzi, mail order operating manager, wrote:

"Our labor turn-over problem is becoming increasingly serious. If we continue to replace employees that leave us at today's rate, if we permit our current high rate of turnover to continue during the next 12 months, we will employ approximately 25,000 new employees to replace an equal number that will leave our employment. The fact that we are able to replace those that leave us indicates that Ward's as a company can and does attract employees who come with us expecting opportunity and progress.

"Why do new employees become dissatisfied? Why does a large percentage leave us during the first 2 or 3 months of their employment? When you find the answers to these questions, you will find the reasons for your labor relations problem. Some employees become dissatisfied and leave—others become dissatisfied and stay with us, but reflect their dissatisfaction in the performance of their jobs. One is as bad as the other.

"Why are we anxious to reduce our labor turn-over? All of you have had occasion to witness the unfavorable effects of labor turnovers on the performance within your respective departments. The reasons we are anxious to reduce our labor turn-over can be summarized briefly as follows:

"1. Good employees are becoming increasingly difficult to find.

"2. New employees produce less work and make more mistakes during their training period—our mistakes displease our customers.

"3. At the current rate of turn-over we will spend more than a million dollars to train new employees during the next year.

"Is there anything that you personally can do to retain our good employees? People come to work for Wards because they believe Wards is a good place to work and because they believe they see opportunity. Only a small percentage of the employees that leave us do so to enter military service. A large percentage of the employees leave for reasons that are largely within the control of our department heads and supervisors. It is important that each one of you clearly understand not only the reasons why employees leave us, but specifically those things that each one of you can do to improve the company's relationship with its employees to the extent that our labor turnover will be reduced. For your guidance, I am attaching a summary of the most important factors that affect not only our turn-over but your day-to-day relationships with your employees. The company's personnel policies are simple. The fact that I am carrying this message personally to every department head and to every supervisor in all of our mail-order houses indicates the importance that our management places on these policies."

Mr. Odorizzi's memorandum accompanying the letter listed as "the most important factors that affect not only our turn-over but your day-to-day relationships with your employees," the following:

1. Reclassification of pay rolls (referring to the fact that in many instances employees are kept on temporary or part-time payroll classifications even though they are getting full-time employment).

2. Proper administration of Wards wage policy.

3. Our wage-increase policy (referring to the periodical moving of employees in each classification along a scale between given minimum and maximum rates).

4. Appraisal of employees' performance (stating in part that the success or failure of our wage plan depends entirely on the fairness of your appraisals).

5. Promotions (stating in part that in the case of promotions, employees are sometimes transferred at a rate considerably lower than the rate for the job, and there is hesitancy to bring the employee's rate up to what is justified by the new responsibility).

6. Assist your employees to improve their performance "in reviewing and appraising employees, and in handling wage increase, instances will be brought to light where employees are not making satisfactory progress. The unsatisfactory employee should be recognized quickly within a maximum of 60 days. He should not be permitted to continue to turn in an unsatisfactory performance that will not enable him to progress as he had hoped when he came with Wards. Not all employees whose work is rated as unsatisfactory are actually unsatisfactory employees." Then Mr. Odorizzi stated that an employee's failure might be due to lack of proper training, improper application of production control, not suiting him to his job, and real or imaginary grievances.

7. Know and understand your employees.

8. Don't be a "big shot."

9. Talk to the employees that leave us.

Commenting on this letter a panel of the War Labor Board wrote on August 1, 1942: "It will be observed that six of these nine items had to do entirely or predominantly with wage matters, and the remainder with personal attitudes of supervisors affecting the employees' feeling of security. Thus in this letter are reflected some of the reasons for the union's demands for increased wages and increased job security."

Ration Board Chairman Makes Practical Suggestions for O. P. A. Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of one of the Minnesota rationing boards in the Ninth Congressional District, has made some very practical suggestions relative to the rationing program and at the same time his letter points out the very fine work being done by these boards in some of the rural areas.

Hoping that this letter, which is from Mr. James A. Baikie, of Bemidji, to Chester A. Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, will lead to some clarification of this matter for the farmers and since it, at the same time, shows the fine spirit of the members of one of our boards, I submit it for the consideration of the House.

The letter follows:

BEMIDJI, MINN., *March 20, 1944.*

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: This is in reply to your letter of March 13 requesting that I comment on specific problems encountered by the local board, of which I am chairman.

First, let me assure you that the men and women of Beltrami County are supporting the rationing and price-control programs, and are willing to sacrifice further in order to win the war in the shortest time possible.

Beltrami County has a population of 26,000 people and is a diversified county, in that we have farming, logging, manufacturing, and a large tourist business. Due to the war the tourist industry has naturally been below normal because of the gasoline rationing program.

Because of my own line of work, which is insurance and income-tax consultant work, I have had many opportunities since my appointment as board chairman to have conferences with farmers and other groups relative to all phases of rationing and price control. I think we can establish better relationship with the farmers if O. P. A. would make available to the farmer more information which shows relationship of farmers as consumers in the price-control programs and its relation between farm income and stable prices. Farmers, generally speaking, are unfriendly to the O. P. A. program in this area because as a group they feel they are receiving no consideration of their problems. O. P. A. is constantly being a victim for other agencies dealing with farmers. On several occasions, farmers have come to me and requested information relative to the rationing of lumber, farm machinery, etc., which is not a function of O. P. A. However, they feel we are responsible for them not being able to purchase farm machinery that they need.

It would also be my recommendation that every effort should be made to simplify rationing forms for farmers. Many farmers also resent the fact that they are, at present, being placed in the category as "black-market operators" with their nonhighway gasoline allowances. Speaking for the farmers in Beltrami County, I know they are very sensitive in applying for a B or C book allowance, and in a great many cases the farmer is getting along with an A mileage ration, which is not sufficient, and his farm activity is curtailed. As a group, I think they have used more of their nonessential gas for occupational driving than any other group of individuals. There is considerable doubt in mind whether or not the present plan of nonhighway gas allowance, whereby the community committee men, county committee men, and a member of the local War Price and Rationing Board gasoline panel must approve Mr. Farmer's nonhighway gasoline allowance will produce the desired results. This plan is having a tendency to further irritate the farmer. Personally, I feel that the gasoline station operators are the backbone of the successful operation of the gasoline rationing program in every community. Without their cooperation, a great deal of the excellent and conscientious work that has been done by the panels has been nullified and panels have been subjected to undue criticism.

This board has recently been notified by the district office that all local boards will soon be relieved of the responsibility of storing gasoline coupons, through establishment of an issuing center. We have handled this very efficiently and honestly through our excellent panel, which meets every day. The panel takes a great deal of interest, and they also have a certain amount of satisfaction when they are able to give good service to everyone without much delay. Personally, I am very willing to cooperate in every way to eliminate black-market operation of gasoline because of stolen coupons, but I know the gasoline panel at our board does not approve of such a plan feeling that they are going to be held responsible for any delay, of which they have no control. At the present time our report of storage of ration currency places us in group A, and we are willing to take whatever steps that the district office requires to further protect rationing currency in this office.

As rationing problems become more acute, I am of the opinion distribution centers, of which we will have two in this county, will become more valuable to the local board, and I sincerely hope sufficient funds can be provided to employ full-time board employees at these centers. Better public relations will result as such centers can be information centers with properly trained employees.

Our recent price survey in this county, of which we are very proud, in that we can report 100-percent coverage, indicates that rural stores are doing a better job than the city stores. Trade meetings and group meetings are being held, but I do not think they reach everyone and they do not accomplish the results they should. If price clerks could have price-clerk assistants, making the price clerk available for personal contact with the consumer and retailer, I am sure greater results can be obtained and better public relations will exist.

This board is completely organized, representing a true cross section of the community. All panels are meeting regularly and doing a mighty good job for the Office of Price Administration. We all appreciate the assistance and cooperation we are receiving from the district office. A regular contact with this office has been very helpful to us in our many problems. Our entire organization is loyal and willing to do their part to help win the war, and sincerely hope that you will further guide us in our work and will continue to simplify as much as possible the work at the local board level. We also ask you to do everything in your power to give us more authority at the board level to deal with our own people in making decisions as to the rationing and price-control programs.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. BAIKIE,
Chairman, War Price and Rationing Board.

A Congressman Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the fifty-second annual meeting and war conference of the National-American Wholesale Lumber Association held at Chicago, Ill., on June 6, 1944:

I am delighted with this opportunity to talk with a group of businessmen, especially businessmen who are engaged in handling building materials. Every businessman, no matter what line of endeavor he is in, is a part of our free enterprise economy in America. You gentlemen are not only in the business of handling raw materials for building purposes produced out of the trees which grow in this country. You are also in the business of helping to build and maintain the economy of your Nation. When this war is ended you will be in the business of helping rebuild the free-enterprise economy of this Nation, if we are to continue to have a free-enterprise economy.

It is my understanding that the member firms of your association in normal peacetimes distribute more lumber and lumber products than any other similar group in the Nation. You are the men to whom all the little mills, and many of the big integrated operators, have looked for a market in past years; you are the men upon whom these same producers, both large and small, will have to rely in the days after the war.

I have been told that the majority of you have aided in the sales of lumber incident to the war program, and that most of you have also been accorded the more dubious privilege of submitting your books to the Government for renegotiation, with results that are not always too happy.

Some of you favored the Committee on Small Business, of the House of Representatives, with the benefit of your views on this and kindred subjects. In New Orleans last November with the committee, I was privileged to hear your able spokesman, Mr. Darling, when he submitted several of his ideas to the committee.

I, of course, do not presume to know all the problems of the lumber industry, or the solutions to those problems. However, two problems, which Mr. Darling and others have called to my attention, seem worthy of comment. The first is the subject of renegotiation. While none of us are for excessive profits, I think we will have to exercise very great caution in carrying out the principle of renegotiation, to be sure we do not cripple American business and American industry, and disable it for a very vital task. When this war is over it will be the job of American industry to readjust itself to a peacetime basis; to open up new avenues of production, and even complete new industries; to provide the plant, the tools, the capital, and the management by which and with which jobs, purchasing power, goods, and services, can all be provided for all of our people. Therefore, I believe that we must guard against any overzealousness on the part of Government officials to make what might seem, in the narrow view, to be a saving for the taxpayers, but which might, in the long pull, prove to be of very great disadvantage to the Nation through the crippling of business and industry to a point where it might be unable to provide the plant, tools, capital, and management by which the American people could be provided with jobs, purchasing power, goods, and services.

You can be reassured on this point, however, by the fact that thinking in this direction is being evidenced. A member of the House Committee on Small Business, Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, a very able and distinguished colleague and friend of mine, has, in his capacity of acting chairman of the lumber subcommittee, introduced a bill in the Congress designed to exempt the lumber industry from renegotiation for the balance of the war period.

This is a subject which will require very grave consideration and careful study from many angles in order that all of the effects and influences which may be exerted by renegotiation may be foreseen in every case, so that evils which might spring up may be avoided.

The second subject which, it seems to me, deserves comment, is that of the Government in the lumber business.

At New Orleans and at other public hearings the House Small Business Committee had the advantage of the testimony of our good friend, Col. Fred G. Sherrill. As you all know, Colonel Sherrill was until recently the Chief of the Central Procuring Agency, and is now the Chief of the Procurement Division of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

Most of you know Colonel Sherrill. He is a fine gentleman and a good officer in the United States Army.

In his official capacity Colonel Sherrill was assigned the very difficult task of supervising the acquisition of lumber vitally needed in the war effort. With military directness, the colonel proceeded to secure lumber in the only way he was permitted—to buy it himself. The colonel went to the source of lumber—the mills, both large and small—and bypassed Nation-wide organizations such as yours and others of similar capacity. This procedure raised some objections.

I would not presume to speak here in criticism of Colonel Sherrill, or to try to treat the subject of trade discounts, or added fees of 4 or 6 percent which were developed by the Office of Price Administration at the suggestion of the War Department.

Rather, I shall confine my comments to the basic theory which seems to have guided most of our Federal agencies during wartime in handling matters which normally are left to businessmen in peacetime.

Sympathetic as I am with the problems which beset a great procurement agency in time of war, when speed and volume are of the essence, I still say that I wish no Government agency would follow a policy which causes the Government to perform functions which properly are the province of established business and which could be just as well, or better, performed by business for the war effort.

I believe Colonel Sherrill himself was among the first to pose a question as to such a policy in his department, although it may have been that some of the authorities higher up, perhaps not even in the War Department, urged the adoption and continuance of such a policy of direct mill-to-consumer distribution. This policy appears to indicate a philosophy in Government which causes me to be disquieted. It is a problem which we must in the future be sure we keep within proper bounds.

So far as the O. P. A. is concerned, the question of its continuance is before the Congress now. I thought price control necessary when I voted for the bill creating the O. P. A., and I still think so. I do not believe there was very much wrong with the original price control bill. I think whatever trouble has arisen has been largely through the errors of inexperienced and inefficient administrators or the result of maladministration of the act. I think there may be a necessity for some clarifying amendments to tighten up the act, and if possible, plug some of the loopholes through which maladministration can find its way.

I now want to discuss with you some general principles which, it seems to me, we must keep very clearly before us as a people and a Nation if we expect to come out of this war with our American system of constitutional government, free private enterprise economy, and our free society intact. There is still an enormous amount of work in this country for everybody to do. There are still many privations for us to endure. There are still many griefs for us to suffer. There are still many burdens for all of us to bear before we have completed the terrible struggle in which we are engaged and before we have accomplished our readjustment to a basis of peace and prosperity.

Let me say to you at the outset that American businessmen of every character and in every line have distinguished themselves by the wonderful way in which they, together with labor and agriculture, combined and cooperated with the armed forces to meet the issues and the needs of this war. A modern miracle of production and distribution has been achieved by these combined forces in America. It is a fact of which you and other businessmen may well be proud. It is an achievement which, in the sunset years of your life, when it is well for you to spend much of your time in your easy chairs sitting on the sunny side of your homes, you can recount with pride to your children and your grandchildren and your great-grandchildren.

History will record the fact that for 40 years, under the lash and spur of the war

lords, the Japanese people worked and slaved at intensive production, getting ready for the war with America which was planned.

History will record that for 20 years under Mussolini the Italian people drove intensively toward preparation for war. You will recall how Mussolini used to beat his breast and shout arrogant defiance at the world, and boast of the naval might and of the military power of the Fascist Italian state.

History will record that for 12 years, under the lash of Adolf Hitler and his ruthless Gestapo, the German people were driven and goaded into the most intensive preparations for war.

History will record that for 20 years under Joseph Stalin the Russian people worked at top speed relentlessly to prepare their war machine.

And history will record another fact: A fact that will stand out as a great, glowing feat which nobody but Americans believed could be achieved, and that feat was this: In 3 short years American industry, American industrial management, American business management, American labor and American agriculture, cooperating and working together as freemen, under a free economy and a free Government, equaled and surpassed the 40-year war preparations of the Japanese, the 20-year war preparations of the Italians, and the 12-year war preparation of the Nazis.

We are fighting an offensive war, and our Axis enemies know they are on the defensive. They are staring utter defeat straight in the face. No matter how far away it may seem to be in this hour; no matter how many battles may stand between now and that fateful day of defeat; no matter what rivers of blood may have to flow between now and the day of their collapse; that day of defeat inexorably comes closer, and closer, and closer.

We ought, here in America, to thank divine providence every hour in the day because that awful experience of seeing utter, complete, and crushing defeat, marching inevitably closer and closer, moving nearer and nearer, is not our experience, but the unhappy experience of our Axis enemies.

Our war effort is pretty well organized. Business knows its place pretty well in the scheme of things, in spite of confusion and contradictory policies. But there is another battle which we must be constantly fighting on the home front, while our heroic men and women across the seven seas are fighting on the battle fronts. That battle is to preserve our American way. This is not a partisan fight. Like the war itself, it is a struggle in which every man, woman, and child who wants to live under a free Government of laws, who wants to enjoy the opportunities of a free competitive enterprise system of economy, who wants to enjoy the priceless privileges which are the possession of people living in a free society, has a vital stake.

In the transition of the Nation from a basis of intense war effort to a basis of peace, the readjustment will be almost as difficult—sometimes, I think, perhaps more so—than was the shift from a peace basis to a war effort. The disruptions of business will be vast and serious. The chances for inflation will be uncomfortably numerous. The danger of too long continuance of governmental competition and control in business is ever present and grave.

I recognize that there could be a danger in relinquishing governmental controls too rapidly and that there must be a very close and skillful coordination between the process of readjustment to peacetime activities and the lifting of wartime controls over business and over the lives and activities of the citizens generally. This process is bound to be accomplished by the customary—and entirely wholesome—American system of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise.

No good American citizen wants any form of dictatorship in this country, whether it be political, military, a dictatorship of an individual, a clique, a party, or even of the majority with a ruthless disregard for the rights of the minority. Therefore I wish to point out to you this fact, which seems so often to be lost sight of in the hurry to get something done, or in the rush of some high official to put some pet theory into practice. There are but two ways of conducting a government. One is by the American system of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. The other is by decree, or manifesto, or executive directive, or military order, or by some combination of autocratic powers that does not permit of disagreement, discussion, and compromise. Now, let's be perfectly honest with ourselves. No matter by what name we may call such a process of compulsion, it is dictatorship.

To a great extent in time of war, particularly a war of such magnitude as that we are now engaged in, much arbitrary control has to be delegated by the Congress to the Chief Executive. Such powers are not delegated to a Commander in Chief as such. They are delegated to the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, for the purpose of coordinating the plans and the efforts of the trained and experienced generals and admirals of the Army and the Navy. We should keep in mind that the Commander in Chief has no more power in wartime than he has in peacetime. The President has just as much more power in wartime than in peacetime as your Congress may give him.

The point I wish to make is that if these war controls, these arbitrary powers, which permit some official designated by the President to impose his will upon businessmen, and upon the people, and to deny, if he chooses, any right or privilege of disagreement or discussion, are carried too far over into the period of readjustment from a war to a peace basis, we could very easily slip into a condition where such wartime instruments of power might easily become shackles for the liberties of the people, hobbles upon business, and a fatal brake upon our postwar recovery under a constantly expanding economy.

In every case in our history when extraordinary powers have been granted to the President by the Congress, the people have promptly recaptured those powers through their Congress as soon as the necessity for their use had ended. We must do so when the conflict has ceased this time.

In time of war the Government becomes the principal employer in the Nation. In time of peace private enterprise must resume its functions of providing the capital, the plant, and the tools necessary to make jobs, and to create purchasing power, as well as goods and services, for everybody.

It is imperative that the Congress, through its committees and its individual members as well, and the officials in the Executive Department, have the benefit and advantage of the advice of experienced managers of business in the very difficult and hazardous effort to readjust ourselves into a peacetime economy and activity.

If business should fail, if industry and agriculture should be unable to provide jobs at good wages and salaries for the American people, under an economy producing more goods and services for the people at decreasing prices without wage reductions, we will have fought this war against totalitarianism in vain, because the Government, in such case, would have to continue to be the principal employer of labor. That would lead straight to a totalitarian form of government. It is not possible for a free government to survive in a controlled economy, any more than it is possible for a free economy to survive under a totalitarian government. American industry can expand and prosper, and make profits through our genius for mass production efficiency, under intelligent and reasonable governmental regulation; but it will wither and die under governmental domination and competition.

Without reference either to individuals or political philosophies, it must be said that power feeds on itself; it always strives to entrench itself; it never knows when to diminish itself, or to terminate itself. The great lesson of history is that power corrupts, and, to the extent that the power is absolute, the corruption becomes absolute.

The founding fathers, aware of this strange effect which the possession of power exerts upon individuals and governments, sought by a very clever system of governmental checks and balances to prevent any individual or any one or two branches of the Government overcoming another branch and rendering it impotent. The founding fathers were unwilling to trust absolute unchecked power to any branch of the Government because they believed that the long-continued possession of such power by any branch of the Government would lead to abuse and corruption as surely as it would in the individual or the group.

As I have said, the Government must have the advantage of advice from experienced business men and women if it is to be able to direct the Nation's transition from a war basis to a peace basis. You can see clearly why the Congress must have such advice when you stop to consider some of the questions which confront us. There will be contract termination; readjustment of small business; termination of wartime controls after cessation of hostilities; question of governmental financing of private business; methods of financing governmental operation; aviation; communications; reciprocal trade agreements; economy in government; social security, United States aid to other peoples; stabilization of foreign currencies; demobilization of our troops; demobilization of our defense workers; reemployment; foreign policy in the post-war world, together with the new unpredictable problems which will arise in connection therewith. This list of problems—and these are not all—presents the most stupendous array of major problems ever confronting Congress in the history of this Nation.

I have been very greatly amazed, and concerned over the attacks which are made from time to time against business leaders because they come to Washington in response to requests from committees of the Congress, or officials in the executive department of the Government, to contribute their advice, and give the Government the benefits of their experience. Some people are prone to regard such efforts of businessmen to aid their Government as something to be condemned rather than commended. Not only is that a serious mistake; not only is it grossly unjust; it is a grave disservice to this Nation. No political party can fight or win this war alone. No group, no class, no section can do the job. Victory can be won only by all the American people, united and working together. There never was a truer statement made than the old adage that "United we stand; divided we fall."

I want, then, as a Member of Congress, to urge you not to be deterred by slanders or assaults on your motives when you come to Washington to give your Government the benefits of your advice. In most cases those who assail you for so doing have never been in business; they have never managed an industry; they have never had to plan to meet a pay roll, or to put goods into the market. It has been well said by some wise man that he is first to criticize most bitterly who knows the least about the subject.

It is in line with the confused thinking which seems so prevalent today, for some people to imagine that businessmen, the managers of great and small industries, would be ready to ruin the country for selfish

reasons. Most managers of industries, particularly the larger ones, are administering properties owned by thousands of stockholders scattered throughout the United States. The employees of many great corporations, such as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., are stockholders in the company for which they work. I cannot see how anyone could imagine that the managers of industry, big or little, could ruin the country for their own selfish purposes when by so doing they would inevitably ruin their own stockholders, the businesses which they manage, and their own positions as well. To me, such reasoning simply does not make sense.

I understand just as well as you do that there is a small fringe, possibly 1 percent, of businessmen who are stupid, greedy, and short-sighted enough to do things which might injure their country and their own businesses. But I am convinced that probably 99 percent of American businessmen are sound, earnest, level-headed, patriotic citizens who are just as much concerned in preserving their country and its economy as any citizens possibly could be. It has been difficult, therefore, for me to understand the vicious attacks which are so frequently made on businessmen because they have the patriotism and the patience to try to help their Government, and try to give public officials and Members of Congress the benefit of their advice.

We must all recognize, and I believe you businessmen do recognize, that in the United States of America we will sink or swim together. In this great Nation we will survive or perish, not as a class, nor as a political party, nor as a section, nor as a clique or group. We will survive or perish together. If we lose our liberties, it will not be one class, or one section, or one group; it will be all of us together. If we lose our opportunity for individual progress according to individual capacity and initiative and energy, under a system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity, it will not be one group, or one class, or one political party, or one section which will lose that opportunity for progress and reward. It will be all of us—manager and workingman, farmer and city man—together.

I have a very valid reason for my intense and deep allegiance to a free-enterprise system of economy. I believe there must be both compulsions and incentives to induce men to work and plan and invent and progress. I believe, with Abraham Lincoln, that: "Few can be induced to labor exclusively for posterity, and none will do it enthusiastically. I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here. I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free, to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So, while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

I am convinced that the compulsions and incentives of a free private enterprise are vastly more efficient and preferable than the compulsions or incentives of governmental domination or competition or operation.

We Americans are all devoted to Lincoln's government of, by, and for the people. When we stop to analyze our economy we find that free private enterprise constitutes an economy of, by, and for the people. Under free private enterprise, properly and reasonably regulated by the Government as the umpire, the people are constantly voting for or against the products of the various producers. Every time the housewife goes to the market she votes for or against one product as against another. Quality, packaging, and price all enter into the reasons which cause her to prefer one product above another. The compulsions of that free competition force the manufacturers of all products continually to seek to better their goods and lower the price, in order to command a share of the market and reap the rewards of profit. The automobile was a shining example of the compulsions and the rewards of free private competitive enterprise. The man who produced the cheapest car in his time, and placed the automobile within the pocketbook range of even the poorest citizen, reaped a vast fortune as his reward for his inventive genius and his managerial ability. But he also provided a good automobile for the masses. He provided good jobs for thousands of people. He provided recreation for millions of people. He provided a new prosperity in a great segment of our economy. Good roads followed in the wake of the automobile, and the benefits generated by the vision, the inventive genius, and the managerial ability of one man have never ceased to this day.

Over and over again in a free enterprise economy it is the same old story of "a better mouse trap."

It is not conceivable that any government could find for its service officials who could be wise enough, and unselfish enough, to direct and control business, and to compel and direct the purchasing power and opportunities of the people a tenth as efficiently as can the people themselves.

I am reminded at this point of a declaration which was a profound fact when it was uttered, and which is just as profound a fact today. Let me quote it to you:

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by 'master minds,' in whose judgment and will the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during the last 10 years. Were it possible to find 'master minds' so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country, but there are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history." That profound statement was made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, on March 2, 1930.

That philosophy applies just as much to our free enterprise economy as it does to our free society or to our Government.

Fellow citizens, we are confronted with the grim necessity of saving our Nation from assaults from without which would destroy us, and from dangers within which could destroy us. We, of this generation, have the choice and the task of saving this great, wonderful, free Nation of ours, or of losing it; of preserving or losing our Bill of Rights; of preserving or losing our free enterprise economy; of preserving or losing our free society; of preserving or losing those precious privileges and priceless liberties which make life in the United States of America the finest, richest, most beautiful, and most worth while of any human existence anywhere on this earth.

Our forefathers bled and died, sweated and sacrificed, to give to us this wonderful heritage of a free government and a free country and a free way of life.

The job of saving this country, the job of preserving the priceless heritage which is ours, to be held in trust for our posterity, as well as to be used by us in our day and generation, is the job of every man, woman, and child in this Nation. Patriotism is not a matter of party, it is of the heart and the soul. Love of liberty bears the label of no clique or section; it is common to all of us.

So, then, in conclusion, let me say to you that the businessmen of this Nation can and must contribute an immeasurable service to their Nation by their advice and experience brought to their Congress and to their public officials. In the fervor of this public service, in the fires of your patriotism, in the courage of your freedom, let the carping of narrow-minded critics be consumed and forgotten.

Idaho's Best Known Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, few States in the Union are better known for the excellence of a great agricultural crop than Idaho for the excellence of its potatoes, an accomplishment that can be credited in a large measure to the enterprise of its people and the support of the Idaho Advertising Commission by the State government. It is my privilege to submit herewith a report of the commission:

[From the Idaho Granger for June 1944]

A REPORT TO THE POTATO GROWERS OF IDAHO

In reviewing the 1943–44 Idaho potato season, one fact stands head and shoulders above all others: Idaho potatoes sold at or near ceiling price the entire season and cleaned up early and easily.

This occurred in the face of the largest crop ever produced in Idaho and the United States plus the yield from 20,000,000 victory gardens. The largest Idaho crop previously marketed was 33,808 carloads. This season will exceed 47,000 pre-war minimum cars.

Another fact to consider is that every major production area except Idaho sought Government aid at support prices.

Many factors influenced this favorable movement of Idaho potatoes, including dehydration and Army purchases. But since all potato States participated in this extra demand, it appears that Idaho's success may be justly attributed to:

1. A superior potato.
2. Dependable grades.
3. Aggressive dealers.
4. Consistent advertising.

Advertising revenue this year will approximate $86,000. Of this amount, $73,000 was budgeted for direct advertising expenditure exclusive of administrative costs, which average about 10 percent.

Here's how Idaho's advertising assisted in moving the 1943–44 crop:

Because early shipments were large and might easily have caused an oversupply in terminal markets, Idaho joined with other potato-producing States in encouraging home storage wherever facilities were available. In this promotion, the country's most important retail stores joined forces with Idaho and other potato-producing States to sell thousands of extra carloads of potatoes in an orderly manner.

Accounting for some 42 percent of the $73,700 used for advertising during the 1943–44 season, Idaho's newspaper advertisements reached a total of 3,415,000 newspaper readers with some 62,000,000 individual messages. These messages were carried in 26 of the country's leading metropolitan newspapers, week after week throughout the selling season. These advertisements not only pointed

out the superior qualities, but in addition promoted the use of Idahos to save ration points and conserve scarce foods.

More than 250,000 pieces of display material were printed in Idaho and distributed to retail stores throughout the country. Like the newspaper messages, these banners promoted the use of Idahos to save ration points and to conserve scarce foods; helped to put over the idea of buying larger quantities for home storage.

The hotel and restaurant operator, whose business has jumped more than 25 percent since the beginning of the war, was not overlooked. Idaho Russets and point-saving recipes were featured in a series of six full-page advertisements in magazines which are read by the hotel and restaurant trade.

More than 125,000 folders containing recipe and nutritional information were distributed to dietitians, home economics teachers, and students.

As a part of Idaho's publicity program, photographs, recipes, and stories appeared on newspaper food pages throughout the country at no space cost to the State.

Each year has shown the value of employing a man to represent the Idaho potato industry in the markets of the Middle West, East, and South. Main purpose is to advise wholesale and retail grocery stores and markets of the Idaho advertising program, to encourage purchase of Idaho potatoes, to promote store and window displays, educate produce clerks concerning Idahos and to report to the commission on crop outlook and competitive sales conditions in each section.

During the past season, in addition to doing this type of work in over 40 cities, C. G. Rice, Idaho's field representative, was assigned to many important potato-industry problems in Washington, D. C. Working under the direction of the Idaho Advertising Commission, Mr. Rice conferred with the War Production Board, War Food Administration, Office of Price Administration, Senators, Representatives, and many other individuals and agencies on behalf of Idaho farmers. This resulted in—

1. Price adjustments favoring Idaho growers. It was felt the original ceiling prices were unfair to Idaho and reasons were advanced to the proper authorities by Mr. Rice and others. Subsequent adjustment brought an estimated $3,500,000 extra revenue to Idaho on U. S. No. 1 potatoes alone.

2. Obtaining diggers and motors for the Idaho potato industry.

3. Securing additional allotments of fertilizer.

Idaho's advertising fund is small compared to those of other agricultural and industrial commodities, yet it is felt that it has clearly demonstrated its effectiveness this year.

Idaho Advertising Commission, R. H. Young, Chairman, State Commission of Agriculture, Boise; Chas. W. Barlow, Hazelton; H. M. Chase, Nampa; I. J. Longetieig, Craigmont; Joe Marshall, Twin Falls; H. G. Peckham, Wilder; Frank Westfall, Aberdeen; Lem Cook, Idaho Falls.

Prosecution of Insurance Companies Under the Sherman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to the Attorney General of the United States:

JUNE 9, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the Unted States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIDDLE: In connection with Monday's Supreme Court decision, on yesterday the press quoted you as follows: "Insurance companies now will be given a chance to change those rate-fixing and other practices which may be in conflict with the Sherman Act." A Justice Department spokesman was quoted in the same article as saying that the pending cases against 198 fire-insurance companies located in Atlanta would be called up for trial.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House may I call your attention to the fact that the Walter bill, H. R. 3270, providing exemption for insurance companies specifically under the Sherman Act, and leaving to the States the control of insurance, has been favorably recommended by the Judiciary Committee and a rule was granted by the Rules Committee on January 27, 1944, for its consideration by the House. Before this measure could be brought up on the floor, arguments on the Atlanta case had been concluded before seven of the nine Justices of the United States Supreme Court. Sponsors of the Walter bill very properly refrained from asking that the bill be called up pending the deliberations of the Court.

Now that the decision of the Supreme Court, shocking in its implications and upsetting legal precedent of 75 years, has been handed down it seems to me that fairness and legal perception must lead you to the conclusion that the pending prosecution against the insurance companies in Atlanta should be held in abeyance until the people of this country, speaking through their Representatives in the Congress, decide this issue one way or the other but certainly beyond the pale of interpretative decision. To prosecute the Atlanta companies and to excuse or grant a grace period to all other insurance companies in the country who under the Supreme Court decision are equally guilty seems to me a very unfair procedure on the part of the Attorney General of the United States.

May I not suggest that all prospective prosecutions under this decision be held up until the Congress clarifies the legal situation. Surely, if members of the Court are of the opinion that, "Congress has not written one line of legislation deliberately designed to take over Federal responsibility for this important and complicated enterprise," and that nothing in the legislative history of the Congress suggests that the Sherman Act was intended to apply to the business of insurance, these defendants in Atlanta, with such distinguished persons in accord, ought not to be made scapegoats in the contemplated prosecutions.

Sincerely yours,

DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, Jr.

Handicapped Workers Used Many Years by St. Louis Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an article in the June 7 issue of a publication known as the St. Louis Commerce which tells of the activities of the American Fixture & Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, in the employment of handicapped workers.

This policy dates back, according to this article, 15 or 20 years, and at the present time 5 percent of their 400 workers are classified as handicapped. I am sure everyone will commend this company for rehabilitating handicapped citizens, granting them employment, and making them self-sustaining.

It is my hope that corporations all over the United States will follow this policy.

Under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the article referred to:

Hiring handicapped workers is not a new policy with the American Fixture Manufacturing Co., although the number of these workers in our plant has increased somewhat since the manpower situation became acute.

We have been hiring such workers for a number of years—a few having been with us 15 or 20 years. And on the whole, we have found that they are dependable and excellent workmen. I do not mean to imply that some are not undependable and erratic. But I do believe that the percentage of undependables has not been any higher among these handicapped persons than it is among workers not suffering handicaps.

Approximately 5 percent of our 400 workers are handicapped in one way or another. They have lost hands, legs, eyes, or are deaf and dumb. One is almost blind and performs his work by touch and feel. In general, however, the type of work done in our industry does not lend itself to the hiring of blind persons.

These handicapped workmen receive the same wages for the same type of work as others in our plant. They work as bench hands, molding machine operators, carpenters, and maintenance men. Several earn nice bonuses each week because of their efficiency and ability. We will keep all who wish to remain with us after the war. Despite their handicaps, they are just as valuable to our organization as unhandicapped workers for they can do the same amount of work—and some can do more. They are happy to have jobs. Many have gone through the discouraging experience of tramping from one company to another searching work and they realize, even in these times, what it means to have a job. They do not take their responsibilities lightly.

Our most important task in hiring handicapped people is to sell them to the foremen under whom they will work. Unless the foreman is willing to work with them sympathetically, they may become discouraged. But we have found that most of our foremen, after seeing the enthusiasm which these people put into their work, and discovering that actually they can work as well as unhandicapped workers, will lose their objections quickly.

We intend to continue hiring handicapped workers, wherever practical, in cooperation with the United States Employment Service and the Red Cross. We have found that they make a valuable contribution to our plant.

Gasoline for Party Boat Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD and include an editorial, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the decision of the Administrator of the O. P. A. in the matter of allotting extra gasoline for party boat fishermen who sell their catch in the commercial market. This request presented recently by 10 Congressmen from the eastern seaboard was denied on the grounds that the "amateur catch" turned in to the commercial market would be inconsequential. Conclusive evidence was submitted that this catch would total a considerable amount and would be a long way in making up the billion pounds' deficit for this year estimated by the Bureau of Fisheries.

The following editorial written by Bob Pierpont in the Wildwood Leader correctly expresses the feelings of the people in New Jersey on this short-sighted ruling. I plan to speak at length on this matter in the near future and explain the situation in detail.

CHESTER BOWLES NEVER WENT FISHING WITH US

In denying the request for more fuel for the operation of party fishing boats Chester Bowles made the statement that party-boat fishing was purely in the amateur class and that the catch of fish was quite negligible as a food factor. That is substantially as the report reached us. If the report is correct and Mr. Bowles actually said that, then Mr. Bowles' education in fishing has been most sadly neglected. Certainly he was never out fishing with us.

In the fishing season of 1941 party boats running from Wildwood brought in 1,625 tons, or 3,250,000 pounds, of fish. Party boats from Cape May in the same season brought in 1,350 tons, or 2,700,000 pounds, of fish. To catch those 2,975 tons of fish 89,000 gallons of fuel were consumed. Figure it out and you will see that each gallon of fuel brought in 67 pounds of fish. Reports from other fishing centers along the coast are in keeping with these figures. Long Island reports 50 pounds of fish per gallon of fuel.

When Mr. Bowles says party fishermen are in the amateur class and the fish caught are negligible as a food factor then indeed is Bowles talking through his bowler. A gallon of fuel for 67 pounds of food. That's a much better figure than farms can show. At a recent hearing on the matter in Washington figures were shown that a farmer requires and gets quite a few gallons for every 67 pounds of foodstuff he grows, and part of that stuff is spinach. Ugh!

But Mr. Bowles says party boats cannot have more than 125 gallons of fuel for the season. In a bureaucratic form of government the head of a bureau is a virtual dictator making his own rules according to his own opinions and understanding, or lack of it. So there is not much we can do about it now. But, perhaps, there'll come a time.

Barriers to Development of Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, now that the invasion has actually begun I can speak out on a subject with which I have been greatly concerned. Everyone who has followed the news of the invasion of Europe, and I am sure we all have, must recognize the crucial role air-borne troops and equipment are playing in that operation. The Members must also realize that the transport airplane that is carrying those troops back of the enemy lines is not some newly designed military airplane but is the old familiar DC–3, which was developed as a result of the demands of our air-transport industry. That airplane, which has filled such a tremendous need in the most complicated and difficult military operation of all time, would never have been built if we had not been wise enough to see to it that a vigorous air-transport system was established and maintained. In the face of this conclusive proof of the wisdom of our previous policy with respect to air transportation it looks as if we are going to change it. It looks as if the airlines are to be subjected to State as well as Federal regulation. Thus, Congress, with ample power to prevent it, would permit the air-transport system to be engulfed in a sea of red tape and regulations so that its development will be impeded at every step of the way.

I have given long study to the unfortunate situation in which our interstate motor carriers find themselves because the Congress failed in its responsibility to protect them against burdensome and duplicating State regulation. I have been appalled at the effect these regulations have had upon their ability to do their share in the transportation of war materials. Their accomplishments have been heroic but they have been impeded on every hand with duplicating and unnecessary regulations.

Our air-transport industry up to this time has been relatively free of State regulation but unless Congress takes action to protect this means of transportation from burdensome State regulation, history will repeat itself and air transportation will never again be able to make its rightful contribution to the national interest. These fears of mine are not based upon imagination. I am not seeing ghosts.

On Tuesday, May 23, the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado began hearings on a proposal for the State of Colorado to regulate all aviation in Colorado—both intrastate and interstate. Every Member of Congress will be interested in the fact that the Colorado proposal for the regulation of aviation covered 43 typewritten pages. Even the Federal Government could hardly write such a complicated epistle—and has not done so. Colorado even seeks to regulate the ashtrays within airplanes.

I recommend that each Member of Congress, both House and Senate, read the able speech by the Honorable A. L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, on this subject. It will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23. Here is one more attempt to regulate, by duplication and confusion, American aviation out of the air. Today, our country stands first in the air; both in peace and in war. If each of the States should adopt a conflicting set of regulations in addition to the Federal Government, there would be 49 sets of rules. After carrying 49 rule books and a lawyer from each of the 48 States and the Federal Government, a pilot on a cross-country trip would have no room for cargo or passengers or even for his friends.

Recently a compilation was made as to the number of minutes that would be spent by T. W. A.'s *Constellation* over each of the States in a cross-country flight from New York to California. I am sure you will be interested in the figures. They are as follows:

	Time in minutes
New York	3
New Jersey	13
Pennsylvania	59
Ohio	47
Indiana	31
Illinois	30
Missouri	48
Kansas	54
Oklahoma	21
Texas	41
New Mexico	79
Arizona	72
California	54
Total	552

Hours, 9; minutes, 12.

Apparently there is a movement under way to hamstring aviation by having the States pass conflicting and confusing regulations against airplanes just as was done against trucks. If the Federal Government does not step into the picture and regulate this situation freedom of the air for the private flyer will not exist any more than it will for the pilot engaged in commercial activities. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with foresight anticipated this situation as far back as 1942 and advised the world that hearings on this subject would be held. Hearings before that committee did begin early in 1943 and resulted in H. R. 3420, which has been pigeonholed in the House Rules Committee since last October. Thus, a few Members of the House, without particular study of all the facts are, in effect, whether they realize it or not, standing in the way of freedom of the air for the private flyer and permitting the origin of conflicting regulations against commercial aviation. The answer to all this is to take the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, out of the Rules Committee and pass it at this session of Congress. Otherwise, aircraft manufacturers, the backbone of our national security, will be greatly hurt, private flying will be hamstrung, and our air-transport system, which should be fit and ready for the protection of our national security, will not be permitted to grow.

What may happen to aviation, unless Congress acts, is well set forth in the parallel case cited on page 41 of the United States News of June 2, 1944, in an advertisement by Fruehauf Trailers which reads, in part, as follows:

A STORY OF CONFUSION RUNNING HALFWAY ACROSS THE CONTINENT

A passenger car is about to leave New York City—destination Des Moines. The automobile owner, with his driver's license and State license tag, knows that he can travel unmolested over the highways of the 7 States en route. A truck-trailer operator hauling a load of fresh ocean fish consigned to

Des Moines is also ready to leave New York. His route is through the same States as the passenger car. But here is the difference: New York permits him to use a 50-foot truck-and-trailer unit, with a gross weight of 50,000 pounds, including vehicle and load. He starts out. Upon entering New Jersey he is permitted a length of only 45 feet and a gross weight of 60,000 pounds—his equipment is 5 feet too long, but 10,000 pounds underloaded. Pennsylvania presents a bigger problem—a 45-foot length limit and only 45,000 pounds gross weight—5,000 pounds less than New York, 15,000 pounds less than New Jersey. That's not all, for he must also pay the State of Pennsylvania an 8 mills-per-dollar gross receipts tax on that part of his total mileage traveled in the State. Assuming that he were permitted to travel on to the Ohio line—again his truck-trailer is 5 feet overlength, while his vehicle is 6,000 pounds underloaded. And here he has to register with the public utilities commission and pay a fee of $72. In Indiana the length restriction is still 5 feet less than in New York, but the weight allowance is 3,900 pounds more. However, another payment is to be met, this time a $24 charge for obtaining operating authority from the Indiana Public Service Commission. Now, into Illinois—and serious trouble—the gross weight must be cut 10,000 pounds and the vehicle length slashed 15 feet, one-third less than the majority of States. And he must pay a special gross weight tax of approximately $245. Upon arriving at the border of Iowa he is 5 feet overlength, but underweight 3,900 pounds. Here he discovers that if he is to make regular runs he must buy an annual Iowa compensation tag, costing $250.

All of these restrictions and conflicting requirements take dollars out of your pocket. You eat the food and use the goods brought to you by trucks and trailers from all over the country. And the higher delivery cost resulting from unfair State taxes and lack of uniformity in State laws is in the price you pay.

Art of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Washington Post has printed an excellent editorial on the art of politics. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD. I feel sure Members of this body will approve the views expressed therein.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART OF POLITICS

Prompted by a University of Denver survey indicating that almost five out of seven Americans think it virtually impossible for a professional politician to remain honest, Mayor LaGuardia has sprung to the defense of "the art of politics." In a recent radio address, inspired by a New York Times editorial on the subject, he suggested that he might some day launch a campaign to bring politics into better repute as a profession or vocation. In our opinion, there is no kind of publicity work that would pay higher dividends. Exaggerated ideas of the extent of political corruption have undoubtedly been fostered by the featuring of political scandals and attacks on dishonest politicians. The press and other organs of public opinion are to be praised rather than blamed for concentrating attention on political abuses with a view to exposing and expelling the scamps and scoundrels who hold public office. Nevertheless, this one-sided emphasis has resulted in too little attention being given to the valuable services performed by honest public servants.

The work of enlightenment might well begin by giving the people more information about the activities of Members of Congress. Most of the hard and grueling labor performed by our national legislators is transacted behind the scenes or in committee hearings, with only a handful of people present. Casual tourists visiting the Capitol listen to Congressmen and Senators delivering speeches from the floor to empty seats or amidst a conversational din. They go away believing that their representatives are playboys, not even interested in the oratorical extravagances of their colleagues. If these same tourists knew how many hours of mental labor and how much physical effort are expended by Members of Congress in attending committee meetings and holding hearings preliminary to reporting out countless bills, they would revise their opinion of the caliber of the National Legislature. For that matter, anyone with the stamina to read without prejudice debates on important issues reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will almost certainly conclude that the art of politics, as practiced in this country, has brought into Congress many men of keen minds and public spirit.

The public often does injustice to professional politicians by failing to understand that willingness to compromise an issue does not necessarily imply lack of integrity. There is a vast difference between making concessions to secure needed support for a favored measure and bartering away one's principles for the sake of selfish political advantage. Minor compromises have to be made by any man who aspires to hold political office; indeed, compromises must be made to keep the legislative machinery from stalling.

Political reputations also suffer because the public is inclined to put a premium on show-off qualities that handicap the sober, conscientious man who may be inclined to hide his light under a bushel. As a result many politicians seek votes by trying to satisfy the public taste for the bizarre or the spectacular. The remedy for this situation lies obviously in elevating public standards of taste and education. That is a long-time process, but we can and should begin right now to give the public more information about the positive contributions that practitioners of the art of politics make to the national welfare. That is essential not alone in the interest of the unjustly maligned but as a means of preserving public respect for democratic institutions.

WASPS Want Fair Play for WTS-CAA Men First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of June 12, 1944:

MANY WASPS REPORTED QUITTING IF THEY ARE GIVEN ARMY STATUS

WASPS themselves question their essentiality to the war effort and a sizable number may resign if Congress gives them Army status, according to Mrs. Jeanne Robertson, 26, Los Angeles, Calif., a WASP who resigned recently for "personal reasons" after piling up 400 hours flying time.

In Washington en route to her home, she said:

"Twenty-five percent if not more would resign, in my opinion, if they are militarized," commenting on the bill to commission the WASPS scheduled for House debate this week. She made clear that she was basing her opinion on conversations with WASPS she knew.

"All these reports of thousands of trained civilian pilots released and now grounded make them wonder how necessary they are," she said. "And there's a reluctance to fly the heavy, fast planes because they're a challenge, particularly on the part of those who have husbands and children."

It's the girls who went into the WASPS from patriotic motives, some of them at considerable sacrifice, who would resign if they thought they weren't needed, Mrs. Robertson said.

Mrs. Robertson's report of the question about WASP essentially was backed up by another resigned WASP, in a letter recently received by a friend in Washington.

"Ever since we arrived at our ferry bases after graduation, and were promptly disillusioned as to their need of our services, the situation has been a source of discussion among the members of our class. There seemed to be no need to train women for ferry pilots as the bases were apparently overstocked with capable men who sometimes begged for a chance to fly just 4 hours in the month to keep on flight pay.

"As we saw it, the only possible reason why they might need us would be that a sudden, terrific (but unlikely) reversal in the war's progress would drain the country of men pilots. Since the program did exist, however, we were darn glad to have had the opportunity to receive the training, and hoped we would be able to fly."

The Upper Basin Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD two editorials from the Miles City Star, of Miles City, Mont. I strongly urge the membership of the House to read the fighting words contained therein, because they express our feelings in the use of the Missouri's waters in no uncertain tones.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike taking up so much of the House's time with this particular subject, but I feel it is necessary to do so. Our water is our lifeblood and our dependence on it is far greater than most people outside our area imagine. We know that if you study this problem that you will agree with our viewpoint

and realize the difficulties which will confront us if our water is taken away from us.

The editorials follow:

[From the Miles City (Mont.) Star of June 4, 1944]

THE KANSAS CITY GENTRY

We apply the term "gentry" to the Kansas City pirates, who would rob us of the waters of the Missouri River Basin, with due regard for its meaning and not that it applies to them in its true sense. But according to the Kansas City Star (the mouthpiece of these super-de luxe pork barrel artists) the water filchers are a high class type of God's appointed children, while we of the upper basin States are "provincial," "selfish," and "local." A couple of their editorials on the matter of the Missouri River development abound with those terms, as well as "provincial," "selfishness," "sectional," "regional," and "dangerous proposal." All are applied to us who live in Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota.

If we did not know that the editorial writer of the Kansas City Star was a highly paid individual, well trained to do the bidding of his overlord, we would be appalled at the ignorance of the man. However, we fully understand that editorials such as the Kansas City Star is putting out at the present time, vilifying the upper basin States and their inhabitants, are written for the purpose of putting us in a bad light. The writer of those editorials is a little haywire on some of his geography and the Fort Peck Dam, but, by and large, he is writing for the purpose of throwing the unthinking people of the lower States off the trial. You see, the water pirates of the lower Missouri aren't the least bit interested in irrigation and only slightly more in flood control. Oh, yes, they shout from the house tops about "flood control," which they could easily have by cooperating with the upper States. But they want cheap navigation for the transportation rackets which they carry on at the expense of the taxpayers. The Government subsidy for water-borne freight has been going on for a long time. But now it is out in the open because of the greediness of the Kansas City, Omaha, Sioux City, and Mississippi Valley gangs. The Federal Government has been subsidizing river transportation to the tune of millions of dollars. One disgusted resident of the State of Missouri says that the Government would be money ahead if it stopped subsidizing these navigation filchers and carried all the river freight on the Missouri by mail at first-class rates.

Those fellows in and around Kansas City, and their lesser counterparts at Sioux City, know full well that they can have the flood control they prattle about by going along with the irrigationists. It is as simple as A, B. C. If we build dams in the upper reaches of the Big Horn, Yellowstone, and Missouri Rivers in Wyoming and Montana and if additional storage dams are built in North and South Dakota, won't the run-off waters that flood the boys out of house and home down Kansas City way be controlled?

That is exactly what the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to do. But in that kind of a plan the navigationists do not fare well, and that is what the Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City boys are kicking up all the ruckus about. They want more water for a 9-foot channel in the Missouri River from Sioux City to the Mississippi. They have a 6-foot channel authorized now, but shucks, if you can carry on piracy on a 6-foot channel, you can carry on 50 percent more on a 9-foot one and twice as much on a 12-foot Government subsidized waterway. Don't let anyone kid you that the "cheap" transportation boys down there are not thinking of a 12-foot channel. That will be the next rabbit to come out of the hat.

At this point we address a few words to our friends in Sioux City. For years the livestock commission merchants of your city have been after the cattle and sheep marketing of this territory. The newspapers of this section have cooperated with you in many ways, not the least of which was seeing that your market quotations were before our people. All in all, a very friendly relationship has been built up for you, at the expense of such other points as Chicago and South St. Paul. In this present fight against the water pirates of your section we find the St. Paul and Minneapolis fellows on our side of the fence. Your business associates are lined up against us. Now then, which do you want most—our cattle and sheep or the water we need for irrigation to raise crops to feed those cattle and sheep? You can't have both and you may end up without either. Whatever else happens, we still control our cattle and sheep and when the smoke of this battle clears away, we will deal with our friends. The people of your territory who are trying to steal the water of our rivers are not our friends. Neither is the highly paid propagandizing head of the Mississippi Valley Association (who maintains his home in California, we are told) or your competitors, the Kansas City commission houses.

When this issue has been settled, are you going to have any friends left in the Wyoming-Montana-North Dakota territory? Certainly you are not if you don't get your water pirates in and around Sioux City straightened out. The Kansas City lay-out will write you off their calling list as soon as the final whistle has blown.

We hope you will see to it that your section ceases its opposition to a plan which is good for everybody except the cheap transportation addicts of Kansas City and Omaha.

And now a word to the lad who writes the Kansas City editorials on the subject under discussion herein. You, my friend, in your issue of May 8, refer to the free water for irrigating lands coming into production under the proposed Missouri River development. We can understand that having been associated with the predatory navigation interests of your section so long you cannot think of anything unless it is free. For your enlightenment (and you could have learned this by reading the Bureau of Reclamation plan instead of that of the Army engineers) the total cost of the Bureau of Reclamation plan is set at $1,257,645,700. Of this amount, $516,545,700 is charged off as a gift to the needs of flood control and navigation. This is the free stuff you don't talk about, but nevertheless it is free to you and your cohorts. Not a thin dime of that amount will ever be returned to the Federal Treasury, which is, of course, the taxpayers of the Nation. But the same plan does call for repayment by the lands irrigated under this expansion of the enormous sum of $298,000,000. Does that strike your intelligence as being free water? In addition to that, by the proper location of the dams, an additional recovery of $423,100,000 can be made from the sale of power generated. That is more than the entire amount of $419,300.70, allocated for flood control alone, and which will not be repaid. Who is going to use that power? Well, it's dollars to doughnuts that the revenue from it will come from the consuming population that will grow up on the irrigated lands; from the sugar factories, the packing plants, the railways and the processors of the unlimited natural resources of the upper Missouri States. There is nothing free about providing water for the reclaiming of lands of this vast empire and if you, the editorial writer of the Kansas City Star, would point your nose foursquare with the rest of the world, instead of hiking it up to look at the moon, you would be as well aware of that fact as are the people who really do know something about irrigation.

Instead of being bound down by their narrow navigation viewpoint, the owners of the Kansas City Star could do this Nation a great service by getting behind the Bureau of Reclamation plan for the development of the Missouri River. For out of that development will come flood control and a vast new empire as well; a land in which the underfed and underclothed of the industrial sections of the Nation can become producers of sufficient food and fiber to maintain themselves on a happy and healthy basis. An industrial center like Kansas City cannot help but profit immensely from such an empire and we are surprised at the shortsightedness of a great newspaper such as the Kansas City Star in the stand they have taken.

We hope they will see the light and join up with the progressive forces who are moving to stabilize the economy of the Missouri River Basin.

[From the Miles City (Mont.) Star of June 7, 1944]

SO THE OMAHA BOYS WILL ALSO UNDERSTAND

There appears in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World of May 15 an editorial entitled "The Aimless Fight," wherein the Missouri River development is discussed. The conclusion of the editorial is that "it is a dismal picture" because the plans of the Army engineers as expressed in the Pick plan are not supinely and at once accepted by all of the interests on the river. The Bureau of Reclamation, charged by law with the primary obligation of reclamation development in the 17 reclamation States, is smeared by the editor as merely an agency seeking projects. The irrigation interests are pictured as having no more laudatory objectives than to support the designs of railroad carriers. The conflict between uses of water for navigation and irrigation are belittled by a "stroke of the pen" without any supporting evidence and contrary to the showings made before the Commerce Committee.

Thus the editor places the controversy on the narrow basis of a conflict between two Federal agencies and not on the fundamental basis of working out a broad framework of future economic development. He apparently has little patience with those who would create new agricultural wealth to supplement the future growth of such cities as Omaha and Kansas City. In the narrow confines of an editorial observation, he would decry and wholly disregard the conclusions of the agricultural interests and the agencies, Federal and State, which have long studied the water requirement for future irrigation development. He would leave all this to the engineering judgment and discretion of the agency primarily concerned with flood control and navigation. He is oblivious to the great need for flood control and the part upper basin storage for both irrigation and flood control will play in river basin project adjustments.

This editor, too, does not seem to appreciate the fact that the whole controversy was precipitated by a headlong effort to obtain authorization of the Pick plan without any reasonable effort being made to coordinate the plan of the Army and that of the Bureau. This hurried endeavor for congressional authorization was made in the face of the availability of the Bureau of Reclamation report on May 1, 1944. The Pick plan was rushed to the Halls of Congress in disregard of any final action by a Basin States' committee set up to deal with the problem; and this plan was submitted for action by Congress in aid of navigation which would have the effect of

establishing the primacy of water use on the river in favor of navigation. Such authorization was sought on the expressed view that if present and future irrigation needed water not the law but the good will and discretion of the Army engineers would determine whether such uses would be met. This view is supported by the theory that irrigation interests should not seek the protection of the law which is fundamental to our form of government, but should become supplicants at the feet of a Federal agency, the Corps of Army Engineers. That the Army engineers and not the law should become the masters of the situation is the central theme of this position.

The Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers and nearly all of the proponents of the navigation improvements in the Pick plan asserted in the hearings before the Commerce Committee of the Senate that irrigation uses should be accorded primacy over navigation requirements and yet they did not want this principle written into law. If these men are sincere in this opinion, then there should be no objection that the principle should be expressed by a congressional act. If there is doubt of their sincerity, then there is surely abundant reason for such a congressional declaration.

Aside from all this, the amendment proposed by the irrigation interests provides the machinery to bring about a coordinated plan which all advocate as the constructive approach for the protection of maximum uses of the Missouri River water for all purposes. But this proposal was labeled a crazy amendment by one of the Army engineers at the Commerce Committee hearings.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Editor it is a dismal picture so long as one interest insists upon navigation by project authorization, being placed in a position to control the situation. It is not only dismal but disheartening so long as constructive efforts to encourage cooperation of the Federal agencies with the States, cooperation among Federal agencies and integration of project planning is so blindly opposed.

Six to One Is Average Ratio Federal to State Civilian Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Washington Close-up for May 1944, issued by the Citizens National Committee of the District of Columbia:

SIX TO ONE IS AVERAGE RATIO OF FEDERAL TO STATE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

About 5 percent of the working population of the United States works in the executive branch of the Federal Government, approximately three million people. Ten percent of them are in the Washington, D. C., area, 10 percent are in the State of New York, 9 percent in California, and the remainder are scattered across the other 46 States.

Some interesting comparisons of the extent and detail of this distribution are available from the figures below, based on Department of Labor statistics as of October 1943, and Department of Commerce figures for State government employment. Broad variations appear. In one State only, West Virginia, State employees exceed Federal, 9,383 to 8,000. Connecticut with 9,704 state employees to 10,700 Federal and New Hampshire with 3,250 State employees to 3,700 Federal are close to even. Preponderance of Federal employees graduates proportionately to those of States like Florida and Georgia, where the proportion of Federal to State is 12 and 13 to 1, respectively.

Much of this excess is due to the war agencies. Navy yards, arsenals, camps, airfields, shipping centers use large numbers of Federal workers. But with the elimination of all activities of this sort, Federal workers in admittedly nonwar agencies exceed State workers in all but 10 States. The figures include Federal employees within United States continental limits. State figures with symbol (*) are for closest available date:

State	Federal						State	
	Total	War agencies			Post Office Department	All other agencies	Population in 1940	Nonschool employment total
		War Department	Navy Department	Other war agencies				
All areas	2,796,900	1,211,100	619,600	186,700	325,400	454,100	136,015,000	454,828*
Washington metropolitan area	265,600	50,600	49,600	35,500	8,000	121,900		
Other areas	2,531,300	1,160,500	570,000	151,200	317,400	332,200		
Alabama	62,700	47,900	200	1,900	3,500	9,200	2,833,000	5,539
Arizona	16,700	10,100		600	900	5,100	499,000	2,846
Arkansas*	24,300	16,500		1,200	3,000	3,600	1,949,000	4,349
California	251,400	113,400	87,500	12,300	18,000	20,200	6,907,000	26,500
Colorado	24,500	14,500	100	1,700	2,900	5,300	1,123,000	4,217
Connecticut	10,700	1,700	1,800	1,500	3,800	1,900	1,709,000	9,704
Delaware	2,500	1,200	200	300	600	200	267,000	1,879
Florida	65,700	31,400	23,200	3,400	3,700	4,000	1,897,000	5,447
Georgia	69,000	50,200	1,200	3,500	6,600	7,500	3,124,000	5,325
Idaho	9,800	2,800	2,000	400	1,100	3,500	525,000	2,600
Illinois	118,500	59,100	7,100	8,300	27,700	16,300	7,897,000	23,126
Indiana	33,400	14,500	5,700	2,200	7,100	3,900	3,428,000	9,419
Iowa	13,500	3,300	200	1,400	5,800	2,800	2,538,000	7,550
Kansas	26,600	17,200	100	1,100	4,500	3,700	1,801,000	6,286
Kentucky	31,400	17,800	100	1,600	5,400	6,500	2,846,000	8,597
Louisiana	37,500	21,000	4,100	2,700	3,800	5,900	2,364,000	11,249
Maine	28,800	2,700	21,200	900	2,300	1,700	847,000	5,526
Maryland	49,900	22,400	11,400	1,800	3,500	10,800	1,821,000	9,000
Massachusetts	121,200	41,300	53,900	5,200	14,100	6,700	4,317,000	13,918
Michigan	48,500	24,700	2,200	4,600	10,600	6,400	5,256,000	14,710
Minnesota	19,200	2,200	300	2,800	8,900	5,000	2,792,000	10,606
Mississippi	25,300	18,400		1,300	2,600	3,000	2,184,000	4,762
Missouri	48,600	23,100	800	3,300	12,200	9,200	3,785,000	10,784
Montana	8,300	2,600		500	1,400	3,800	559,000	3,650
Nebraska	23,800	13,000	2,200	1,000	4,500	3,100	1,316,000	3,642
Nevada	4,800	1,200	1,400	200	300	1,700	110,000	952
New Hampshire*	3,700	1,100	100	500	1,300	700	492,000	3,250
New Jersey	75,500	55,500	5,000	2,900	7,900	4,200	4,160,000	11,834
New Mexico	14,900	9,400		400	1,000	4,100	532,000	2,066
New York	275,600	89,400	87,400	18,100	49,700	31,000	13,479,000	49,574
North Carolina*	43,600	19,900	4,800	2,200	4,600	12,100	3,572,000	11,652
North Dakota	4,000			500	1,800	1,700	642,000	2,676
Ohio*	108,700	67,900	4,400	8,100	19,000	9,300	6,908,000	19,500
Oklahoma*	38,200	25,100	2,900	1,400	4,100	4,700	2,336,000	10,298
Oregon	17,400	7,700	600	1,400	2,700	5,000	1,099,000	5,382
Pennsylvania	197,700	76,700	74,800	8,900	22,300	15,000	9,900,000	43,407
Rhode Island	24,700	2,100	19,800	900	1,400	500	713,000	3,940
South Carolina	49,600	15,700	27,700	1,200	2,200	2,800	1,900,000	5,836
South Dakota	9,200	4,600		500	1,700	2,400	643,000	2,449
Tennessee	42,600	18,900	700	1,900	4,800	16,300	2,916,000	6,310
Texas*	141,900	98,300	9,100	7,300	12,300	14,900	6,415,000	19,600
Utah	31,800	25,700	1,700	500	1,100	2,800	550,000	2,590
Vermont	2,900	300		400	1,100	1,100	359,000	2,130
Virginia*	107,800	25,800	66,600	4,300	5,300	5,800	2,678,000	12,966
Washington	86,500	33,700	36,400	2,200	4,400	9,800	1,736,000	8,962
West Virginia	8,000	1,700	100	1,100	3,400	1,700	1,902,000	9,383
Wisconsin	18,800	5,000	1,000	2,000	5,800	5,000	3,138,000	7,509
Wyoming	4,600	1,800		300	700	1,800	251,000	1,301
Undistributed	47,000			18,500		28,500		

Contribution of Polish-Americans to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a speech recently made by me:

Speaking at the dedication of the honor roll at the Polish Hall, Green Street, Clinton, Mass., tonight, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN of Clinton, vehemently attacked the organized communistic minority, which, he asserted, was carrying out well-laid plans to undermine basic American institutions while the war is on and the boys are away.

Praising the great contribution of Polish-Americans to our war effort, and the upbuilding of the Nation and pledging his continued support of efforts to preserve Poland from both Nazi and Russian domination, the Clinton Congressman warned that unless the American people, acting as a whole and without regard to party, class, or racial distinction, make a determined drive to smash the present and ever-widening influence of avowed radicals in the Government and our industrial and social life, the American form of government will, in the not too distant future, be uprooted and replaced with Marxian Communistic bureaucracy, similar to that which prevails in Russia.

Congressman PHILBIN said in part: "Commingled tonight with profoundest feelings of sympathy for the parents and families of those of this brave band who have paid the supreme sacrifice and whom we here honor, are sentiments of heartfelt pride and gratitude for the valor and heroism of our noble Polish-American sons who are serving our country in this greatest crisis. Their efforts and their sacrifices are but additional evidence of the devotion and loyalty that has marked the history of Polish-Americans since the time they first set foot upon our shores.

"We can never give adequate acknowledgment to the contributions of this group to America, her upbuilding and welfare, nor to the unexcelled patriotism of these noble sons.

"But we can and must make sure that the great and stirring sacrifices of these boys shall not be in vain. We must strive to effect self-determination for all nations, great and small, and the very early and certain liberation of valiant little Poland, whose centuries of struggles for liberty has been an inspiration to the whole world, above all, to the freedom-loving people of America. I pledge my continued and utmost efforts toward these ends in the Congress of the United States.

"Another subject should command our attention on this sacred occasion, namely, the ominous spread of communism throughout the world, and more particularly in our own country. Most of us never thought we would 'see it happen here,' but the fact is that strongly organized, well-financed, skillfully directed Marxian communism has reared its head in our own congressional district. Hiding behind the war effort, taking advantage of the concentration of our people on the course of our arms and the well-being of our boys fighting on global fronts, these dangerous groups, once working surreptitiously, have now brazenly come out in the open and are seeking to dominate in behalf of the world-wide Red colossus of communism our industrial and social, our business and political life.

"I warn you, my friends, tonight, as we gather here with bowed heads to laud and pray for our brave young war heroes, both the living and the dead, that unless the American people shall soon awaken to this creeping, sinister menace which has crawled into our midst, and smash once and for all the power and influence of radical schemers and crackpots in government, the industrial and the political affairs of our Nation, the free America that we have known in the past, all our liberties and most cherished institutions will be undermined and replaced with a minority-organized radical bureaucracy, modeled after the fashion of Russia which will sound the death knell of human freedom in this country.

"Having firm faith in the ultimate wisdom and soundness of our citizens, I have supreme confidence that the American people will not let these heroes down while they are away in distant lands engaged in foreign wars. As true believers in Americanism—the greatest ism of all times—we must and will break the power of organized communism in this district and in the Nation, whatever banner under which it masquerades, and thus recapture and forever sustain our rights as free men and women under the Constitution of the United States."

Six-Year Limit Urged for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me by the House of Representatives, I extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the Washington Star, Sunday, June 11, 1944. I respectfully submit the article to attention of the Congress and the country:

SIX-YEAR LIMIT URGED FOR CONGRESS—REPRESENTATIVE WAT ARNOLD CITES BENEFITS HE SEES IN PROPOSAL HE ADVANCES

(By Gould Lincoln)

WAT ARNOLD, of Missouri, is a rara avis. A Representative of the First Missouri Congressional District, he is seeking to put a 6-year limitation upon tenure of office, not only of the President and Vice President, but also of Members of the Senate and House.

"I am," said Mr. ARNOLD, "a political heretic. The dubious distinction is perhaps more real than apparent, for the subject of my heresy is one which must be trod upon lightly by my congressional colleagues, for fear of public reaction.

"I favor a limitation of the terms of office of all elected representatives of the people of the United States of America, and such an attitude seems to border closely upon betrayal of the sacred trust of political office-holding."

The Missourian, who holds these unusual views about the number of terms Senator and Representative shall have—he limits a Senator to one term of 6 years and a Member of the House to three terms of 2 years each—is a successful businessman in Kirksville, a small city of 10,000 population in the very heart of the district which he represents. For 40 years he has operated a lumber business there.

PROPOSES AMENDMENT

Mr. ARNOLD has introduced in the House a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to carry out his tenure of office ideas. It is before the House Judiciary Committee. A Republican, Mr. ARNOLD plans to go before the resolutions committee of the Republican National Convention when it gets down to work on the G. O. P. platform in Chicago in the next week or two.

Discussing further his hobby, tenure of office, Mr. ARNOLD said: "Perhaps my background and admitted political innocence as a freshman Member of Congress are partially responsible for my unorthodox views. I am happy to plead guilty to the charge of viewing the problems of the National Legislature from the standpoint of a small businessman, from a small town in the Middle West, and I am equally eager to admit that I am a political neophyte, for I am now serving my first term of public office of any description or kind as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

"However, I am not in the least convinced that my views are rendered the less intelligent or progressive by reason of the nature of their conception. Rather do I feel that a fresh approach to the whole structure of our political economy is the crying need of the moment.

"I find that I am, by virtue of my election, enrolled as a Member of the strongest pseudo union in the world. The rights of protective employment, seniority, and the innumerable privileges of office are mine to use as I will; and the payment of my dues, in the form of periodic reelection by my constituents, promises to become increasingly painless with the passing years. By careful tending of political fences, I find that representation is expected to blossom from the promising bud of popular service to the full flower of professionalism in the art of purveying legislation by the years."

SENSE OF PERSPECTIVE LESSENS

"To me, such a metamorphosis is a crime committed in the name of democracy. No American should aspire to a career as a President, or as a Congressman. Industries, institutions, and ideas change too swiftly. Overlong exposure to the impersonal glare of the public spotlight focused upon Capitol Hill causes the sense of perspective which guides a public servant to diminish or even disappear entirely."

Mr. ARNOLD has another distinction. He is a Republican in a district which has gone Democratic except in the Hoover landslide of 1928, for three generations. He is a candidate for reelection this year and has no opposition for the nomination. Two years ago he won the Republican nomination against two opponents. Then, without making a speech during the entire campaign, he took the veteran former Representative Romjue to town. He defeated the Democrat who had represented the district for a score of years by 8,300 votes. Since he has been in the House, Mr. ARNOLD has confined himself to being on the job and voting. He has made no speeches. During the coming campaign, however, he does intend to make a few addresses in his district.

"A public officer, in my opinion," said Mr. ARNOLD, continuing his comments, "should be so restricted in his tenure of office that his efforts as a legislator would not have the opportunity to become completely unhinged from everyday realities, as calculated from the standpoint of John Q. Public.

"His period of service to his country should be spent in complete freedom from the aggravating responsibility of continuously building toward reelection. A Congressman should serve his term of office and then return to his district to see if he could earn a decent moral living under the laws which he had

been instrumental in enacting. No Congressman who cannot demonstrate his usefulness to his constituents in a practical enough way to justify his continuance in office for three terms should expect to be returned to Congress indefinitely. Such a down-to-earth approach to the problem should be a forever effective bar to the overloading of the statute books with legislation as ill-conceived as is its effect upon a red tape-ensnarled citizenry."

WOULD INFUSE NEW BLOOD

I asked Mr. ARNOLD what would be the effect and the benefit from his plan of limiting tenure of office should it be adopted. He replied:

"The infusion of new blood into the Nation's Legislature, which would be the direct result of limiting the eligibility of a public servant to reelection, should produce the immediate benefit of breaking up congressional and administrative cliques—those instruments of perversion whereby the popular mandate and the true functions of the republican form of government are so viciously inverted.

"No legislator needs to be reminded of the archaic procedure by which standing committee chairmanships pass to the senior member in point of service. There is no qualification, other than endurance, which a Congressman need possess to inherit the tremendous burden of power and responsibility inherent in the administration of committee activities.

"Such practices will cease, to the ultimate good of the Nation, if my resolution is enacted into law. This resolution, which I introduced in the House on October 14, 1943, provides for a 6-year limitation of the office of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Members of the House. The Representatives may, if my bill is enacted into law, have three terms of 2 years each so that the idea of the framers of the Constitution can still be carried out, that of a change in the House every 2 years.

"It was not my intention, in introducing the bill, to question the wisdom of the framers of the Constitution. The stipulated 2-year term of office will stand, but with the added qualification that no more than three such terms may be served by any one person."

Mr. ARNOLD said that another benefit, if his plan became law, "will be to sponsor a much more progressive approach to the entire legislative program.

"It should foster the growth of such sorely needed innovations as the staffing of all full committees with legislative experts whose duty it would be to analyze critically all projected legislation. The aid of such impartial advisers would tend to increase the effectiveness of committee functions tremendously. No legislator under existing circumstances, can do full justice to every official decision which he is forced to make. His public life is so full of extraneous matters, mainly in the interest of reelection, that he has scant time to explore the extensive ramifications of the State affairs which come within his purview."

BUREAUCRACY IN LEGISLATURE

The Missouri Representative at this point advanced a new idea—that bureaucracy may exist in the legislative as well as in the executive. He said:

"It seemed to me, in framing the resolution, that the manifest evils of bureaucracy are as well entrenched in the legislative branch of government as they are in executive. I could see no reason for limting the tenure of the one department and yet allowing the other to remain a snug harbor for career politicians and the domineering cliques which impose their selfish will upon the Congress and the country at large.

"It is a humiliating commentary upon the native intelligence of America to consider that we must have a ruling class of legislators. This Nation was born to demonstrate the antiquity and inadequacy of monarchy as a form of government for free men. Yet our democratic process, by its occasionally overweening liberality, has spawned a school of chosen rulers who acquire their right to regulate the conduct of their peers by a system as morally unwholesome as the 'divine rights of kings' theory.

"There is no elected representative of this people who is so superior intellectually or so faultlessly correct in his judgments as to deserve an exclusive monopoly upon the right of government. When a servant of the public comes to regard himself as an indispensable asset to his constituency, then the warning signal of fascism is flying. When the notion runs rampant that the people serve the state—in the form of its elected leaders—then the time has come for a more diligent exercise of the right of independent choice and self-determination by the individual citizen. It is by virtue of these functions alone that our Nation remains unassailable in strength and stability."

CITES AGE OF LEADERS

Mr. ARNOLD pointed out that long tenure of office inevitably resulted in the holding of important positions by men of advanced age. In this connection he said:

"These revealing facts were published recently. The ages of committee chairmen of Senate Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, Post Offices, Privileges and Elections, Commerce, Reclamation, and Naval Affairs are 86, 80, 75, 77, and 71, respectively. In the House the chairman of the important Ways and Means Committee is 80; Foreign Affairs, 74; Rules, 78; Rivers and Harbors, 83.

"The public functions of government should be given the benefit of mature wisdom in their administrations. There is, however, no reason why Washington should become the happy hunting ground for senility.

"Contrast the ages of these present Members of Congress with those of the men who served in our Republic's first administration and the reasons for the all-too-frequent ineptitude of our current Congress and Cabinet will be plainly revealed. Thomas Jefferson was 46; Alexander Hamilton, 32; Henry Knox, 29; Samuel Osgood, 41; Edmond Randolph, 36.

"The fruitful years of a legislator's public life too often becomes the laurel wreath of acclaim upon which he pins a monotonous sequence of public acts. Gradually, as term succeeds term, the affairs of the Congressman's district become more remote to him. He becomes a part of the Washington scene. The details of organization and maintenance of the machinery of election are left to his henchmen back home. To all intents and purposes, he becomes a Capitolite in fact, and the State or Territory which granted him his seat continues to be his home and center of interest only as necessity and convenience dictate."

FEARS PROLONGED STAY

"The exigencies of war make it imperative that the Congress remain in almost continuous session. Until the moment of victory comes, and well into the period of reconstruction following the conflict, it will be necessary to follow the same legislative schedule in the interest of the Nation's welfare.

"Naturally, such a condition tends to expand tremendously the dangerous policy of increased centralization of government in Washington. The issue of State's rights may become irrevocably lost in the complex maze of bureaucracy and government by directive, unless a substantial bulwark is established against further encroachment.

"To guarantee a regular infusion of new blood into the ranks of Congress would provide an excellent means of anticentralization control."

The fact that many Members of Congress after they have been retired remain in Washington and open offices here brought from Mr. Arnold the following comment:

"The shores of the pond of Washington society are littered with an accumulation of humanity deposited there by reason of the presence of public servants in various stages of activity—mostly defunct. Like the college football star who loves to play football and hates to quit his playing and go to work, they are victims of the system which produces them. Once they have gotten a taste of the undeniable glamor which attends the position of an elected official of the United States Government, they are forevermore grandstand players. Their sense of value becomes distorted. They lose interest in their former pursuits as a rule, and willingly adopt the profession of staying in Washington."

WOULD LIMIT NEPOTISM

"Congestion in the metropolitan area has passed the point of being merely humorous. It has become a civic necessity to relieve the pressure wherever possible, and there could be no better place to commence than in the ranks of congressional entourages whose official status has been liquidated."

A limitation of office tenure, Mr. ARNOLD contended, would have the effect of limiting nepotism in Washington.

"Despite the unfavorable publicity which has always attended the practice," Mr. ARNOLD said, "nepotism flourishes in official Washington, particularly on Capitol Hill. To limit the tenure of office of public servants would force healthful purgation of the process of hanging an assortment of relatives on the public pay roll. If such political et ceteras were placed on notice that they could expect no more than 6 years at the most as beneficiaries of the United States Treasury, it is certain that there would be much less enthusiasm displayed by them for the plums of patronage which are the present just due of every Congressman."

Referring to the crisis through which the Nation is passing, Mr. ARNOLD continued: "No one will attempt to minimize the terrible urgency of the tasks facing the Congress today. As the physical strife of battle ceases, the moral and spiritual strife of the search for a just peace will begin.

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-THREE LAWYERS IN CONGRESS

"It is a time when the voice of the people—all of the people—must be heard. It is not an occasion for a lawyer's convention, of whom there are 57 in the Senate and 233 in the House; nor should it be the occasion for a private council of career politicians. We must have as broad as possible, a cross-section of American opinion in the solution of our problem. We shall not have it unless and until we take steps to introduce into the legislature a new and politically untrammeled group of elected representatives; men who will be solely dedicated to the task of impersonal judgment and the enacting of legislation with neither fear nor favor designed to benefit the Nation as a whole.

"So long as there is no restriction, however, upon tenure of office, there will be an unabated continuation of all the old evils. The aggravating political conspiracies and boondoggling practices will continue to plague the Nation. The ancient compromise between electoral sin and saintliness will rule, as it always has.

"An adult nation deserves something better than these immature modes of conduct. The age of idealism in political affairs is upon us. To demonstrate our worthiness to act as a leader in the world community to come, we should hasten to eradicate some of the ugly stains which mar the perfection of our fundamental concept of government of, by, and for the people."

D-Day Statement of R. J. Thomas, President of the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. R. J. Thomas, president of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., addressed on June 6, 1944, to the union's members employed in war plants:

R. J. Thomas, president of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., today issued the following statement addressed to the union's 1,200,000 members employed in war plants:

"Our 'negotiations' in Europe have entered their final stage. It is the kind of "negotiation' that is being carried on with cannon and machine gun, with naval batteries and with bombers. General Eisenhower is our chief negotiator.

"For years before 1939 the forces of freedom tried to negotiate peacefully with persuasion. The Nazis and Fascists could not be persuaded. They preferred the force of arms. Taking peace-loving peoples unaware, they won the first rounds in the battle.

"Today the tide has turned. The negotiators of the United Nations have carried the war into Hitler's front yard. Before long they will be giving Germany a bitter taste of warfare on their home grounds.

"Union men and women will understand when I say that General Eisenhower is our chief spokesman, the general staff of the United Nations is our top negotiating committee, and the millions of men in allied uniforms our rank and file.

"We in the war plants of the Nation are the second formations of the rank and file who are today invading the European continent. We must apply ourselves as never before to the tasks of producing weapons of warfare. Every man, every woman, every minute of manpower counts. Every shell and bullet we turn out today is scheduled for delivery and explosion in the heart of nazidom.

"It may be a U. A. W.-made shell or bullet that will find Hitler cowering in some hideaway and smash his miserable carcass into perdition, a U. A. W.-made gun or plane that blasts Goering and Goebbels into pulp.

"On the outcome of this final stage of our campaign rests the future of freedom and labor. If we match the courage of our men of war—and we shall do that—we cannot fail. Our objective is a collective agreement, a contract whose first clause will call for the total elimination of nazi-ism and fascism, and the destruction of the leaders of these twin scourges.

"I call on the rank and file in the U. A. W. shops to join with our rank and file in uniform to help make invasion day the day of freedom for Europe and for the world. We want a closed shop for freedom; a shop, a world, that will be closed forever to totalitarianism, dictatorship, and the barbarism of Hitlerism.

"General Eisenhower, we greet you with a pledge: Every man, every women, every possible hour of production for victory."

If You Have Tears To Shed for Chain Stores, Prepare to Shed Them Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the question "When a corner grocery store is not a corner grocery store" is answered in the Little Businessman, a newspaper which carries at its masthead the Voice of Small Business. The following article appeared in a recent issue of that publication:

IF YOU HAVE TEARS TO SHED FOR CHAIN STORES, PREPARE TO SHED THEM NOW

A few of our small businessmen have been moved to tears because the people's government has been compelled to take over the Montgomery Ward chain business. Their emotions have run with bitter tears when they saw in the press a picture of the chairman of that large corporation being hoisted out of his business by men in military uniform, and they even protested that our President was making a grave mistake—that the end of free enterprise had come—and from now on we will be under a terrible dictator.

These few folish little businessmen should open their eyes and begin to do a little thinking. Does not the chain system of business represent the greatest threat to the life of independent enterprise? Is not our President in office because the majority of Americans have put him there? Is not our Government a government of the majority? There can be no dictator in a land where the people have a vote. When the majority of our people decide that we want a change in leadership, we will have it.

Our President, due to the war, has been given enough power to enable him, not only to raise an Army to fight, but to keep the country working to furnish the needs of war and to keep all business operating to achieve a quick victory over our enemies.

We are in the midst of the most devastating conflict the world has ever seen. We will lose more lives in this war than in any war heretofore. We must bring it to a successful conclusion as rapidly as possible. War is costly, and men in business or in any other position who do things which will delay the winning of the war quickly must be dealt with in a manner that will leave no doubt in their minds that the people's government in this critical period will not stand for anything which will delay a quick victory. If some of our chain corporations believe that they are bigger than our Government, let them take care. The American people will not think that way. And the few small businessmen who have been shedding tears for Montgomery Ward's chairman, should stop their crying and take a look back to the twenties when the chain system of business threw thousands of little fellows out of business by their sharp business practices, loss leader selling and tricky advertising. These small businessmen had families and homes. It was they who made up a large part of the million and a half unemployed during that period.

If the Montgomery Ward workers want a union shop and the majority have voted for it, they are entitled to have it under our democratic form of government. To deny them their rights is to confess that our democracy is a failure. Their employers are not questioned about their rights to belong to merchants' associations or other forms of business unions. Why then should there be a denial of the rights of workers to belong to unions and to enjoy the union shop?

The large corporations of America cannot overlook the fact that if we are to win the war quickly and to enjoy a lasting peace that will bring prosperity not only to big business but to little business as well, we must all be united in our effort to make our democracy work in the common good. The concentration of business through chain enterprise creates an unhealthy state not only for individual enterprise but also threatens the very existence of our economy of free enterprise.

Coalition Seemed Doomed By G. O. P. Labor Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of David Lawrence, as expressed in the following article, the Republican Party "missed the boat" when they refused to go along with the Jeffersonian Democrats in support of the rule granted by the Rules Committee on the O. P. A. bill. In view of the fact that the Republican Party now holds the balance of power in the House and therefore is in reality responsible for the type and character of legislation considered and approved, we cannot and should not shirk our responsibility. I therefore submit the article by Lawrence for the serious consideration of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 9, 1944]

COALITION SEEN DOOMED BY G. O. P. LABOR VOTE—RESULTS MAY BE FAR REACHING AS RESULT OF PARTY FAILURE

(By David Lawrence)

Within the last 24 hours the Republican Party in the House made an important decision. It was overshadowed by the war news and hence attracted very little attention. The results, however, may be far reaching.

The Republicans had a chance to maintain a coalition with the southern Democrats and compel the House to vote on various amendments to the pending Wage and Price Control Act—amendments that are designed to require court review for War Labor Board orders and also to prohibit maintenance-of-membership decrees.

Although the House Rules Committee, by coalition of Democrats and Republicans, had recommended to the House that the Wage and Price Control Act be opened to amendment from the floor under a special rule, the House Republicans joined with the Democrats to vote down such a rule. This remarkable performance, which was denounced by southern Democrats as hypocrisy, means that for all practical purposes the chances for legislation restrictive of the War Labor Board or banning maintenance-of-membership contracts is lost for this session of Congress.

The defense by Republican leaders was that the labor legislation should not be tacked on to the Price Control Act because

it was not "germane." This is the first time the Republicans have appeared solicitous about the use of the parliamentary method of attaching amendments to current bills on subjects that are not really related to the bill.

POWERFUL LEVER

The practice, however, has long been a powerful lever in the hands of the minority, especially since the majority party has the veto power through the Executive. Congress has again and again put legislation on extraneous subjects in a piece of legislation. Thus, the Smith-Connally Act contains amendments to the Federal corrupt practices law. It is surprising to find the Republicans arguing that the amendments relating to the War Labor Board's activities were not "germane" to legislation that relates to wage stabilization—a function exercised by the War Labor Board itself with respect to practically all employees earning less than $3,000 a year.

The excuse that the proposals were not "germane" is not taken seriously by the southern Democrats, who argue that the real truth is the Republicans became fearful of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee and the labor union vote. Certainly there was much talk in the cloakrooms of Capitol Hill that the Republicans did not wish to get messed up in a controversy with labor unions on the eve of an election.

But the worst feature of the Republican behavior is that no record vote was taken on the proposed rule which a majority of the House Rules Committee had favored. Thus it is impossible to know just which Republicans had recorded themselves along with New Deal Democrats in killing the rule proposed by the House Rules Committee.

THEIR DEFENSE

In defense of the action of the Republican leaders, it is argued that attaching the amendments on the War Labor Board would not have meant anything because the Senate would not have passed them, or that the President might have vetoed them. This is in contrast to the attitude in minority parties before, which have been content to make a record of their convictions and principles, leaving it to the country to decide at the polls whether a minority should be transformed into a majority.

The Republican Party is soon to go on the stump to tell the country that the Democrats have taken away important rights of the people. The Montgomery Ward case, for example, will be used as an issue, but the Democrats can now point to the action of the Republican Party. When it had an opportunity to insist upon legislation compelling court review of War Labor Board orders and prohibiting the maintenance-of-membership clause in union contracts under Government compulsion, the Republicans, although possessing nearly half the membership of the House and assured of the support of a sufficient number of Southern Democrats to make a majority, refused to stand up against the pressure groups that have been supporting the New Deal.

A Labor Leader's Analysis of Motor Transportation Industry Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently the eminent labor leader, Mr. Dave Beck, of Seattle, Wash., made an outstanding and notable address entitled "The Problem Before Us," in which he analyzed the situation confronting the motor transportation industry, the effect of the war thereon, and the future prospects thereof.

Mr. Beck is one of the leading labor statesmen of the United States. He is vice president of, and international representative for, the 11 Western States of the Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, a great international union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, of which Mr. Dan Tobin, another distinguished, able, and courageous labor statesman, is international president.

My friend, Mr. Dave Beck, enjoys the respect and friendship alike of trade unionists and of management, capitalists, and employers generally. Mr. Beck possesses an affable and engaging personality. He is a remarkably efficient organizer. He has that rare gift which marks successful men—drive.

There is no man in America more qualified to discuss the difficult problem besetting the motor transportation industry than Mr. Dave Beck. Mr. Speaker, as one who has, throughout his congressional service, befriended and fought militantly for the motor transportation industry, I regard Mr. Beck's suggestions, observations, and recommendations relative thereto, in the form of a speech I am inserting herewith in the RECORD, as worthy of careful scrutiny and intense study. But let Mr. Beck's address be its own witness. Here it is:

TRUCK OPERATORS URGED TO SUPPORT THEIR ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my associates in the trucking industry, gentlemen, I am pleased to be with you this morning and again to have the privilege of addressing the operators of the trucking industry of the State of Washington. I am glad that Ted V. Rodgers, president of the American Trucking Association, is here. I want to assure you men, representatives of the trucking business of this State, that he is doing a splendid job as your national spokesman. Our international union, and its representatives, have found Mr. Rodgers ever anxious to cooperate and to help solve our common problems. I trust that his long journey to the western slope of our country will be rewarded by a finer allegiance on your part to your own association, for that will strengthen the national association, as well. This would be the greatest compliment you could pay him.

I listened with keen interest to the remarks of Harold C. Arnot, Director of the Division of Motor Transport of the Office of Defense Transportation, as he unfolded to you the intricacies of every-day work in our National Capital and described to you the tremendously important problems that must be solved. I was also impressed by his tribute to the earnest men who labor to meet your common problems. I want to commend especially the fine tribute he paid to our friend, the late Joseph B. Eastman, who, for so many years, served his country well as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, since the beginning of the war emergency, had directed the O. D. T. It is worthy of Harold Arnot that he was engulfed with emotion when he mentioned our departed friend.

It is easy to see this this great man left his imprint on the character of Mr. Arnot.

EASTMAN WAS ABLE, COURAGEOUS; IDEAL SERVANT OF NATION

I, too, wish to pay my respects to the memory of Mr. Eastman. My experience, and the experience of our people, with him was always pleasant. We found him to be eminently fair, extremely courageous, and a great administrator. He was a deep student of the problems of all types of transportation. He was sound and logical in his opposition to waste; he was a hard worker, a constructive worker. In my judgment, he was unquestionably the ideal Government servant. His memory will long be recalled by those who had the privilege to know him. His directives and his achievements undoubtedly will chart a pathway for future I. C. C. procedure and for the Office of Defense Transportation during this great war emergency.

INDUSTRY IS PLAYING STRATEGIC PART IN COUNTRY'S WAR EFFORT

There are so many problems confronting our industry, in performing our wartime duty to our country, that it will require every ounce of our vitality, our keenest vision, and our best judgment, to bring us through the trying days of the struggle and to measure up to our responsibility to the Nation.

We must understand our responsibilities; we must realize the strategic part that we will play in promoting the welfare of our country. We must discharge that responsibility in such a manner that, in the performance of our serious work we will not only strengthen our industry, but also bring a full realization of its value into every community in America. We must shape the conduct of our everyday work on the highways so that we can transport the war materials, the implements of destruction, and the lifesaving medicines and life-sustaining foods, by the millions of tons.

We will deliver these precious cargoes in freezing weather and in boiling sun. We will traverse roads decked in ice, as well as those which plunge through dangerous, fog-bound lowlands. Our trucks and their drivers must struggle over mountain passes, brave torrential rainstorms and sun-baked deserts, to pour a gigantic flood of freight into the ports of embarkation. We must haul the raw materials from mill and mine, and, when they are shaped into the completed products to further our war effort, we must deliver them to railhead, shipside, and training camp.

We must explore every avenue of sound business procedure, while performing this all-important task for our Government, to the end that we may earn our rightful reward of public confidence and that America will understand that our industry is a great national asset in time of war as well as in time of peace.

ARBITRARY BARRIERS PREVENT FREE AND FAIR COMPETITION

We must awaken our State legislators and our Congressmen to the essential part that this industry is playing in the development of America. They must be made to understand the necessity to protect it; they must grant it the right to compete, under fair rules, with all other forms of transportation. Government generally must be made to see this industry as a potent national servant; Government must remove the arbitrary and artificial barriers that have been erected selfishly to stifle its growth and prevent it from giving its full service to the country.

RAILROAD PRACTICES ARE DETRIMENTAL TO PUBLIC WELFARE

Competing types of transportation must stop appealing to the ignorance and prejudice of uninformed legislators and Congressmen to injure our industry; they must be prevented from using chicanery to erect barriers that impede the free flow of commerce

on the Nation's highways. The barriers that have been erected must be removed, for they do not permit fair and open competition; they do not serve the public interest; they are detrimental to public welfare. There is no legitimate excuse for the destructive practices that the representatives of the railroads have adopted to block honest competition.

There is a place in our country for every form of transportation. They must compete with each other in the public interest, they must survive and prosper or fail and be forgotten, according to their value, or lack of value, to the public. No form of transportation must be retarded by schemes hatched in the minds of selfish competitors, and selfishly enacted into law, at the expense of the public welfare. Our industry must solve this problem.

We must develop the kind of administrative policy, by our common efforts, that will stop such nefarious proceedings in our legislative halls. We must carry our story to the great industries whose products we purchase. We are the customers of the motor-car industry. We buy millions of tires from the rubber manufacturers. We buy billions of gallons of gasoline and millions of gallons of lubricating oil from the petroleum industry. We must arouse these industries, which we support in part by our purchases, to the danger of the destructive competitive practices now being used against their best customers. We must point out to these industries that this unfair competition comes from those to whom they pay a tremendous revenue every year.

We must tell the true story of the stifling of our industry to all of our employees across America. Our drivers, helpers, checkers, office help, dockmen, traffic personnel, managers—and the bankers and merchants, the corner grocers, and the druggists in thousands of communities, that depend entirely on truck transportation—must be given the facts.

TELL PUBLIC TRUTH ABOUT TRUCKS AND SHACKLES WILL GO

When we make this possible, when we intelligently present our case to the American people, the shackles which now prevent our rightful progress will be stricken off. The result will be a greater expansion of service to the public, greater employment, and purchasing power. The benefits will flow back to business and industry, and will serve the public welfare.

THERE IS NO PLACE FOR CHISELERS IN OUR INDUSTRY

We must eliminate the chiseler from our industry. Individuals who own no trucks, operate no terminals, employ no traffic personnel, but who are simply brokers playing one company against another as they grab the lion's share of hauling revenue by their chiseling tactics—with destructive results to the whole motor-freight industry—must go. They have no place in the scheme of things.

We must compel the establishment of fair rates, and, in harmony with the best interests of the public and of industry, we must enforce these rates. Not only must these rates provide a fair return on the investment of the operator; they must also be sufficient to pay good wages and maintain good conditions of employment for those who work in our industry. These employees, too, invest their only capital in the industry; that capital is their labor.

We must participate in the work of tested and well established agencies that have helped develop the business life of America. We must advertise in the newspapers in our various communities. We must be represented, as an industry, in the pages of our national periodicals. We must be in the forefront of those who support projects beneficial to our communities.

We must place our most competent leadership in community service, so that their ability and activities may reflect dignity and standing on our industry and hasten the realization of our industry's value to all communities.

We must use the radio to inform the public. We must support financially our own association work in a manner that will permit it to function in our best interests.

We must, in every phase of our industry, stop driving a horse and really operate a modern truck.

We must educate our drivers on every highway in the land to be salesmen for the trucking industry. They must be leaders in courtesy. They must observe every rule of the road. By their consideration for the motorist they can build public confidence and friendliness. Each driver must be encouraged to stop and aid those who are in trouble along the road—to repair a tire or help start a balky motor. The time and effort thus consumed will bring a tremendous reward in public good will to the industry, far in excess of the cost. It is our duty to observe fair standards of employment on our trucks.

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING SERVICE

We must establish division points that represent an honest day's work at a driving speed in concert with observance of the speed laws.

ANALYZE FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES IN AIR COMMERCE

We should, as our contribution toward the solution of post-war problems, study carefully every opportunity for our industry to give additional service. Thus, we will aid in creating more employment. We should analyze carefully the possibilities of air commerce. We should foster it as a progressive development for the public good, and take every advantage of the opportunity it affords our industry to render a feeder and delivery to and from the air terminals. It is, moreover, the duty of our industry to see that no monopoly is created in rendering this service. It must be kept open to all trucking companies. The development of this new service should be expedited by the establishment of the lowest possible rates that will provide us with a fair return on investment and service.

The representatives of the industry should keep in daily contact with such important problems as the preservation of fair and equitable competitive practices. We must not have a repetition of the incident that occurred a few weeks ago, when a trailer company from the Middle West drove equipment 2,500 miles across country, at great waste of gasoline and rubber, and in violation of both the I. C. C. and the State safety regulations. Thank the teamsters for stopping it this time, but let the industry see that it does not happen again.

I ask you why trucking companies will bid on a haul when the rates are established by Government regulatory bodies. If such a haul were to be made by railroad, service alone would be the determining factor. Railroad rates are established and published, and are not subject to arbitrary or frivolous change. Yet, in this particular case, the trucking companies were asked to sharpen their pencils and bid. Would the same procedure be followed if it were a question of which railroad would get the business? No. The Army, or the Navy, or the industry would ascertain the established tariff and award the haul solely on the basis of service.

CONFISCATION NOT JUSTIFIED NOW BY ABUSES OF PAST

I am a great believer in free enterprise, in the generally accepted meaning of that term. I believe in competitive industry and I am unalterably opposed to monopoly and cartels. I believe in our system of capital investment in private industry. I believe in a minimum of Government regulation and Government competition. I look with doubt on too much public ownership.

I do not agree that past abuses justify confiscation now. I recognize the fact that many power companies have in the past developed unsound practices that are detrimental to the public interest. I am not ready to admit, however, that this justifies socialization of the industry.

NATIONAL WELFARE IS BEST SERVED BY CAPITAL SYSTEM

It is my firm belief that the future of America will be best served by encouraging incentives and stimulating the initiative of its citizens, by providing opportunity for personal reward through our capital system. In my judgment, this is for the best interest of our country. It offers the best approach to the future for both capital and labor.

I believe in recognizing sound and constructive leadership in the families of both capital and labor. I do not believe labor's interests are well served by destroying good leadership in industry. Neither do I believe that it is good judgment for industry to destroy sound labor leadership.

It is a crime against the public interest to use the press, the radio, or other agencies of public expression, with trained and experienced personnel, deliberately to misrepresent either labor or industry, for the selfish purpose either of promoting collective bargaining or preventing it.

I am opposed to rascals in labor just as I am opposed to rascals in business, in the professions, or in the church. In all fairness, however, when we focus attention on Bioff and Scalise, we should also remember Whitney and Insull. Doctors have committed crimes, and men of the church have forgotten their vows to their church and to their God. Attorneys have dishonored their profession and robbed their clients; bankers have swindled widows. But, by far the greatest percentage of men in these walks of life are fundamentally sound and basically honest.

It is with sincere pleasure that I commend the fine work and liberal expressions of Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. I think he has rendered a tremendously valuable service, not only to business but also to labor, and, above all—more important than either—to our country. I cannot approve his every thought, but I can publicly attest my belief in his sincerity and his desire to be fair.

OUR WAR VETERANS WILL WANT GOOD JOBS AND SECURITY

More than 200,000 members of our international union—your employees and the employees of your associates—have gone into military service. What are we going to do to get them back in gainful civilian positions in the life of our country when they return? They want, above everything else, the kind of good jobs that spell security for the future. It is our duty to devise ways of adjusting our economy so that we can assure them such jobs.

CHANGE FROM WAR TO PEACE ECONOMY REQUIRES SACRIFICE

Some of our returning veterans, having learned in the bitter school of experience what a handicap the lack of education can be, will seek opportunities for more schooling. Everyone who enters school will make easier our adjustment to peacetime employment and, in addition, will equip himself or herself to be of greater future value to the country.

It is my opinion that we must envision the problem of readjustment from war to peace, just as we do the continuing struggle for victory, insofar as it pertains to cost.

We do not shudder today at the loss of a great battleship, or an airplane, or guns, or tanks, or other costly material of war. We are concerned only at the loss of human life and the maiming of human bodies and minds. All of us here today, who have sons, brothers, sisters, or sweethearts in the armed services, would give all that we possess in money and other physical assets for their safe return. What father or mother would hestitate to sacrifice his earthly possessions if the life or welfare of a son or daughter were in the balance?

If we will accept this philosophy, we will not fail the returning veteran. If we are prepared to pour out our wealth for the rehabilitation of America to the same degree that we support this war, we will have no difficulty in finding the solution of our post-war problems. By this means we will prevent the crackpot and the visionary, who develop under the stimulus of suffering and privation, from getting a serious start. There is no short cut to Utopia; the panacea of the crackpot and the schemes of the visionary merely retard the solving of our problems and delay national progress.

We must realize that it will require billions of dollars to rehabilitate our national economy. We must realize that the old days and the old ways are gone, forever. The American people will not give up Social Security, the guarantee of bank deposits, or protection from unregulated investment sales agencies.

I am not going to violate the hospitality you have shown in asking me to speak here, by discussing politics. I only regret that there is a possibility of injuring our war effort because this is an election year.

SUPPORT MEN ON BASIS OF ABILITY AND AVOID PERSONALITIES

Let us avoid personalities, wherever possible, in the interest of our common welfare. Let us support men on the basis of ability and without reference to political party. As a representative of labor, I applaud those men and women in both parties who are progressive and who are abreast of the problems that are presented by changing conditions in the world.

No fair man in labor can stamp his approval on many southern Democrats and northern Republicans, simply because of party.

MUST NOT PERMIT CAPITAL TO REPEAT MISTAKES OF PAST

Let us not forget that the frailties of our American democracy are far outweighed by its benefits and advantages; no government in the world has so well served the common man.

We must not, in the future, give Government sanction for private capital to repeat the abuses of the past. The destruction of the resources of other countries must not be permitted, their wealth must not be taken away, or their native labor abused. Private industry, with the consent and assistance of Government, must never again be permitted to repeat the history of the Dutch East Indies, or Malaya, or other similarly dominated regions. Private capital, for private gain, must not, when invested in other countries, do those things that breed hatred against our country. That is in direct opposition to sound national policy.

I trust that the doctor, who opposes the principle of the union shop, will not attempt to justify his insistence that all members of his profession belong to the local medical association. If he argues against labor's right to observe a picket line, will he refuse to practice beside a physician, or in a hospital, that his association has designated as unethical?

I trust that no attorney will contend against the principle of the union shop, and yet demand that his fellows at the bar pay dues into the lawyers' association. Certainly he should not have the legislature write it into the laws of the State that all lawyers must be paid-up association members, simply because the economic strength of his association is not sufficient to require it, or is not as efficiently exercised as that of labor.

By the same line of reasoning, I trust that labor will recognize the right of members of the professions to protect their economic interests by the adoption of union shop principles. In short, all of us will benefit if we are more tolerant of the things that affect the welfare of our fellows.

TRUCK SPEED LIMIT TO SAVE RUBBER MUST BE OBEYED

I am of the opinion that this industry must conform to the directives of authorized Government agencies that do not violate our constitutional rights. I do not care if Bradley Dewey, the United States Rubber Director, sets our speed limit at 35, 40, or 50 miles an hour, provided that his decision is based on the need of our country to solve the rubber problem. If constituted Government authority insists upon the observance of a maximum speed of 35 miles an hour, as necessary to the national welfare, it is the duty of both capital and labor, in this great trucking industry, to observe this speed limit until such time as they are able to convince the authorities that it should be changed. The fact that your profit may be disturbed, or that our wages, in cases where we are on a mileage basis, are affected adversely, does not justify violation of the speed regulations.

GET READY TO LOSE MEN UNDER 30 TO ARMY AND NAVY

What is our duty in connection with the manpower problem and the selective service? In my judgment, every man under 26 years of age should be in the military service and out of our industry. We should also exert every effort to see that, as soon as possible, every man under 30 years can be released to military service, when, in the opinion of the Army and Navy, the national welfare requires such action. To make this possible, we must adopt training programs and put up with less skill and ability on our trucks. I say this with the keen realization that our industry is most essential to the war effort.

That great skill is required to operate our powerful equipment, that weather and highway conditions as well as public safety require us to get the most competent personnel we can, and that transportation by truck is just as essential as transportation by rail or air—neither can do the job alone—is evident to all who have any knowledge of our country's transport problems.

I wish at this time to pay my respects to the leaders of our military services. It has been my duty to be in Washington D. C., nearly every month since Pearl Harbor. I am the chairman of the national rubber committee of our international union. It has been my privilege to meet with leaders of the American Trucking Association almost every month, and with officials of the O. D. T. We have passed through crisi. after crisis; we have shouldered the responsibility of helping to solve the problems presented by the rubber shortage, the gasoline shortage and the manpower shortage. We have tackled many issues involving grave national emergencies, and we are still doing business.

LEADERS OF ARMY'S TRANSPORT CORPS ARE MEN OF ABILITY

It has been my pleasure to meet the high-ranking officers of the various branches of the military, and I can attest that they know their jobs. Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, Col. W. J. Williamson, Lt. Col. Charles E. Martin, and Lt. Col. John J. Lane, of the Army Transport Corps, are leaders of outstanding ability. They have a complete understanding of the problems of this industry, and they know its value to the war effort. These men have always given courteous and sympathetic consideration to our industry representatives.

BRIGADIER GENERAL DENSON'S WORK OUTSTANDING AT SEATTLE PORT

The late Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the O. D. T.; Interstate Commerce Commissioner John Rogers, Assistant O. D. T. Director; Harold C. Arnot, Director of the Motor Transport Division of O. D. T.; Otto Beyer Director of the Personnel Division of O. D. T. and many others have rendered valiant service, though we have not always agreed with them.

William Jeffers, who resigned as United States Rubber Director a few months ago to resume his duties as president of the Union Pacific, and his successor, Bradley Dewey, have kept their doors open to us. They, and their competent staffs, have listened to our problems and kept us advised of developments.

Paul McNutt, Manpower Director; Donald Nelson, Chairman, and Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman, of the War Production Board, and their assistants, have been helpful in meeting our emergencies.

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey and Brig. Gen Edward G. Greenbaum, and the high officers of the Navy, with whom we have met, have always been desirous of cooperating with us and with the trucking industry.

In the course of my work it has also been my duty to travel into every important port of embarkation in the country. I have observed that nowhere is a better, more efficient job being done than in Seattle by Brig. Gen Ely P. Denson and his staff. It is a pleasure to tell you this well recognized fact. Surely, General Denson and his able assistants have a right to be proud of the record they are making. Both labor and businessmen of the entire Northwest are proud of their splendid accomplishments here.

It is my firm conviction that our military leadership is well qualified and that we can rely on its judgment and decisions. There will, of course, be curbstone generals and bath-tub admirals to offer solutions for all of our military problems, but I am certain that you, in this industry, who have been privileged to meet our national leaders in Washington, D. C., and in our own Northwest area, will agree with me when I say that they are doing a splendid job.

WORK, SACRIFICE TO WIN WAR; PRESERVE OUR WAY OF LIFE

In concluding, I have this last appeal to make to you:

Let us pledge anew our allegiance to our Government and its institutions. May we continue to work and to fight beside our allies, making our sacrifices without complaint. May we accord our associates in this war the right to their own philosophy of government. And, when this war is over, let us preserve our own form of government with an affection and a love that transcends even life itself.

We Must Stop Snarling Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following

article by Elizabeth Hawes, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, June 11, 1944:

WE MUST STOP SNARLING HERE, MISS HAWES SAYS

(By Elizabeth Hawes)

"A union is only as strong as its weakest link. A minority, even a handful, can do a union irreparable harm, even destroy it * * *. If you value your union, if you want it to live and serve us after the war—we must restrain ourselves and our hot-headed brothers today."

All over the country people have hailed the appeal to cease striking which President R. J. Thomas, of the U. A. W. (C. I. O.), made to the union members on May 27; the frank admission that there have been too many wildcat strikes; that some union members are behaving like anarchists rather than disciplined union members or disciplined citizens in wartime.

The U. A. W. has already proven its sincerity in saying that strikes will not be tolerated, by suspending the union leadership of a large local here and ordering a new election.

When is someone on the management side in this dynamic Detroit going to speak out with equal clarity? It is not only some women in this town who are a bit backward, not only a handful of U. A. W.-C. I. O. dissidents who create trouble.

Everyone in Detroit seems to agree that a primary occupation of a portion of the population here is simply opposing someone or some idea. When this behavior enters into the relationship between labor and management * * * where it endangers the production of the materials with which our husbands and sons and brothers and friends are fighting Fascists in the Pacific, in Italy—and now, in France * * * then things have reached a point where laughingly remarking that "everyone in Detroit just loves to go chop, chop, chop" must change into everyone in Detroit stopping the chopping.

WHY NO CHAIRS?

In this day and age no management which wasn't primarily occupied with thwarting people could possibly refuse to provide chairs where a worker can sit down for a few minutes.

This is not the early days of the industrial revolution, and normal managements do not expect their employees to seize a little rest on the stone-cold floor of a lavatory. It's even the law that women shall have chairs.

Wouldn't it seem natural to you that a worker should have a place where he or she could have a smoke twice a day?

Would you expect any well-balanced employer to allow just 20 minutes for lunch and then make it so hard to get lunch that starvation is preferable to indigestion from hurried eating? And the Government has offered to pay for adequate eating facilities.

Would you believe that any management would employ women who go into rest rooms and deliberately pick up newspapers and wet them and drop them all dripping and mushy into refuse cans so nobody will be able to read them?

NINETY-NINE PERCENT

Well, I wouldn't have believed any of this until I came to Detroit and found it to be true.

Over 99 percent of U. A. W. members don't believe in strikes in wartime and don't strike in wartime—because the records show that over 99 percent of U. A. W. man-hours have been worked. And certainly 99 percent of managements in the United States of America do not believe in deliberately depriving the workers of a few simple and humane comforts.

As Donald Nelson suggested, it's about time a spokesman for management in Detroit came out flatfootedly and called a halt to work of the anarchists on the company side. If the managements want to live and serve the populace after the war they better restrain themselves and their hot-headed brothers today.

Striking in wartime is a foul business which, as Thomas pointed out, cannot be tolerated under any circumstances, nor have the approbation of any union member.

Of course, strikes are not directly provoked by such small things as I have mentioned. However, the hell with which a lot of industrial Detroit is paved—out of which strikes rise—is made up of the blocks of small actions by all those who constantly, individualistically, sometimes thoughtlessly, go about thwarting other people. Some in management as well as a handful of union members lay those blocks. For months we have prayed that the final knockout blow to Hitler, the invasion of Europe, would start. Now we pray for a quick victory.

Cannot all of us who are engaged in producing the goods that make victory possible—management and labor—subordinate our past hatred of one another, wipe out the things which constantly give rise to irritation with one another, to the end that the home front may stand solid and united behind the Allied troops who are in reality going through the hell of death and destruction in our behalf?

A Mother Prays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

A MOTHER PRAYS

A PRAYER ON INVASION DAY

Somewhere, Dear God, within this tragic world of Thine,
There is a boy, a precious lad—protect him, please, he's mine.
To some, perhaps, he may appear to be a boy like all the rest,
But they can never know the things I've planted in his breast.

Why, You remember Jimmy, God, he knelt here at my knee,
And bowed his sleepy little head and lisped his prayers to Thee;
I never trained the boy to fight, I taught him only good,
And why he wanted so to go just can't be understood.

The evil men who planned this war must feel ashamed tonight,
As they look out upon the world—blood-stained—a sorry sight.
I hear they bombed your churches, too, where Christians used to kneel,
And so—when Jimmy marches off—You know just how I feel.

I'm awfully anxious 'bout him, God, and yet, "Thy will be done"—
You understand my feelings, for You gave Your only Son;
My hands are tied by distances, o'er land and 'cross the sea,
I can but bow my head and pray, "Watch o'er my boy for me."

—*George Z. Keller, from Along Life's Highway.*

The Nation's Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Times of June 9, 1944:

THE NATION'S MISSOURI RIVER

From the beginning the American people have regarded navigable streams as a trust of the Federal Government, to be protected against the inroads of special interests and maintained for the good of all.

The special interests' attack on the omnibus flood-control bill asks Congress to reverse that fundamental policy. These interests would set up a precedent that would make one of the greatest of the navigable streams, the Missouri River, primarily a huge irrigation ditch clutched by a few States.

This is the one thing that Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, says Congress has no right to do. "Congress can't vest any rights in irrigation or in any other class of users," he pointed out to a Senate Commerce Subcommittee.

Now Governor Sharpe represents a State that has a deep interest in the development of irrigation in the Missouri River Basin. It is quite willing to trust to the legitimate supervision of river uses that can and must be exercised by Congress in the future. But that is quite a different matter from attempting to tie up the whole future of the Missouri River with a priority for irrigation, no matter how remote or uneconomic the irrigation projects may be. It is very different from one Congress attempting to say that the Missouri River is no longer to be regarded as a navigable stream. Governor Sharpe speaks reasonably when he says only a constitutional amendment could make such a grant of power.

The attack on the omnibus flood-control bill must be interpreted as a blocking move to gain an unprecedented commitment from Congress. Otherwise it simply doesn't make sense.

The bill backing the Pick plan for the development of the whole river basin contains nothing to jeopardize legitimate irrigation interests. It is an over-all Army engineers' plan. It attempts no commitments of any kind.

The authorization of post-war lakes on the tributaries of the Missouri River is a step forward to serve irrigation as well as flood control and the impounding of water to assure an even flow of the river. Irrigation interests certainly can have no objection to the lakes. South Dakota leaders assume that the existence of the lakes should be a boon to irrigation in South Dakota. They have a legitimate claim and they are ready to trust Congress to make good on it when the supply of impounded water and the proper demands on it are known.

One point of attack is the $6,000,000 that the bill provides for the completion of the 9-foot channel between the mouth of the Missouri River and Sioux City. This sets up no new policy. The Federal Government is already committed to the 9-foot channel and has spent $170,000,000 virtually completing it. The additional 6 million would only fill in the few short gaps where construction was held back by engineering problems. To

oppose removing the last remaining obstacles to river navigation is pure obstruction that can only be motivated by aggressive special interests, either extremist irrigation interests or competing transportation interests (railroads), or both.

The spearhead of the irrigation opposition comes from the Red River Valley of North Dakota, which is entirely outside the Missouri River basin. Apparently that group has the backing of the Reclamation Bureau and Secretary Ickes. In order to move the Missouri River water out of its own basin across the divide to the Red River Valley basin would require a perpendicular lift of 250 feet, a tremendously expensive undertaking. Once that is accomplished, the Reclamation Bureau reports that Red River Valley farmers could use all the water that now flows from the Upper Missouri. Follow such a precedent for unlimited irrigation priority and the Missouri could be drained off for irrigation projects anywhere and everywhere, all the way down to its mouth. Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa have their drought years when they, too, could use every last drop of water in the river and leave nothing but mud banks.

In recent months, various charities and hospitals of Kansas City have received some 10 carloads of excellent potatoes from the Red River Valley of North Dakota—the gift of the Federal Government. It is part of a program to hold down surpluses and maintain prices. They are excellent potatoes and gratefully received; but they hardly argue for a desperate plight that would warrant lifting the Upper Missouri River from its basin to grow still more potatoes at any cost.

The Pick plan was built on the American conception of navigable streams that stands to this day. It represents years of careful engineering study. In no way is it hostile to legitimate irrigation demands. The omnibus bill follows through on the Pick plan to develop the Missouri River and its tributaries. It would leave to future Congresses the allocation of water when the supply and the need will be known. No one has a right to ask more.

Amendment of the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the people should know the truth about the O. P. A. They are being told that this is merely a war measure; that possibly it may be necessary to continue its operations for a short period following the war, after which it is to be abandoned.

From what I can see I am convinced that the administration forces in control of the O. P. A. intend to make the program of price and wage fixing, as well as rationing, permanent. The intention is to fasten this bureaucracy permanently upon the Nation. If it has its way hereafter—war or no war—you and I are to be told by it how much our day's toil shall fetch, how much and what we may eat.

The O. P. A. is using its powers to destroy what is left of free economy and private ownership of property. Although the Price Control Act contains provisions which strictly prohibit it from doing this, it disregards the law and arbitrarily sets up schemes of its own to take the place of long established practices and procedures. With these new devices the O. P. A. has harassed business, agriculture, manufacturing and has driven many concerns to the wall, especially small ones. Nor is this agency sparing labor, as it would have us believe, as witness what happened in the railway employees wage dispute.

My record is already made on the need of price control. Having got ourselves into this fix, some control of prices and some rationing are necessary. That is one thing, but when the O. P. A. uses its powers to build itself up into a perpetual governmental bureau where it can permanently boss us around, that is quite another thing.

Champing at the Bit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of May 25, 1944:

CHAMPING AT THE BIT

Without question Democratic and Republican voters will welcome the test of the political power of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, which has injected into the coming State primaries, July 11, a candidate who will contest for the Democratic nomination for Congress in the Third Massachusetts District, now represented by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Without question the Democratic voters of this district, once given the opportunity, will register their emphatic disapproval of the tactics of the C. I. O. in the coming primaries.

The committee, which calls itself the Political Arm of the C. I. O., expects to stage the biggest registration drive in history, has one additional step in its program.

Members of the committee, headed by Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, believes that the larger the registration for the November election the greater will be the chances of changing the present political complexion of Congress.

For these tasks the committee has a fund of $700,000, contributed largely by a group of the largest C. I. O. affiliates. Nearly $500,000 of this fund remains in the hands of the committee, the remainder having been spent on organization work and in primary elections held since the committee's formation, July 7, 1943.

Together with funds which C. I. O. affiliates plan to spend for political purposes this year on a local level in their respective communities, it is estimated that the total which may be thrown into the Presidential campaign and the congressional contests by the C. I. O., will be well over $2,000,000.

Apart from its plans for this year's electoral contest, the C. I. O. Political Action Committee will seek to demonstrate on a national scale the effectiveness of concerted political action by C. I. O. labor.

Basically, the C. I. O. Political Action Committee believes in organization of labor as a political pressure group and in evaluating candidates for office not only on the criterion of their stand on labor problems, but also of their policies on social, political, and international problems.

Friends of Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN are already champing at the bits for an opportunity to register their approval of his service in the lower House.

No man has gone from Massachusetts who, in the short space of time that he has served, has taken so prominent a place in the lower House as the Clinton Congressman.

The political writers in Washington serving the Boston daily newspapers are unanimous that he has gained a position in the House that stamps him as one of the most aggressive, forceful, militant, and conscientious legislators that the Bay State has sent there in a generation.

Federal Aid for Readjustment of Veterans in Civil Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The G. I. Bill of Rights," written by my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and published in the Democratic Digest of May 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Senator BENNETT C. CLARK of Missouri)

(The servicemen's aid bill—known popularly as the G. I. bill of rights—has passed both houses of Congress and is now in conference. Senator CLARK, who as chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Finance Committee, introduced and piloted the bill through the Senate, tells here about this important measure to assist our fighting men and women in their readjustment to civilian life.)

In the course of the last year the President has sent to the Congress several messages making recommendations which, taken together, constitute a comprehensive plan for the restoration of the veterans of the present war to a civilian status under the most favorable condition.

As chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Finance Committee, it has been my privilege to draft and introduce legislation to implement and make effective the program outlined in the President's messages. On March 18 I reported to the Senate the Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944, more familiarly known as the omnibus G. I. bill of rights for the returning veterans of this war.

In the last week of March this fundamental bill of rights to facilitate the reintegration of our fighting men into civilian life passed the Senate unanimously.

Since that time a substantially different version of the bill has passed the House and

the matter is now in conference between the two Houses. All who are interested in the subject hope and believe that an agreement may be speedily reached.

In completing legislative action upon the G. I. bill of rights, we felt that the Senate did a common justice for the men and women who are offering their lives for the preservation of our Republic. But it has done more than that. It has struck a powerful blow for the preservation of the very future of our Nation.

THE BARE BONES OF WAR COSTS

The bill of rights will be costly—yet its cost is trivial compared to the billion of dollars that we have spent upon the shooting end of the war and we view the cost of the veterans' bill of rights as true economy. None can deny that it forms a part of the bare bones of cost of the war itself.

We regard it as the best money that can be spent for the future welfare of this Nation. The men and women who compose our armed forces not only hold the safety of our Republic in their hands on the battle fronts today—they will hold its destiny for a generation to come.

The consummation of all of our hopes and our prayers for national security, stability and prosperity depend on the extent to which these men and women can be speedily reintegrated into the civilian population.

B. the time this war is over, we are told, more than 13,000,000 of our finest men and women will have seen service in our armed forces. They represent the cream of our human resources, the very backbone of our Nation. This Republic can ill afford to lose their skills and their leadership.

Yet that leadership and those skills have been rudely interrupted by war. Education has been halted, the men to whom we must look for the future of business, commerce, industry, and agriculture have been torn from their civilian posts at the formative time—at the time when they were beginning to assume the characteristiss that have made America great.

WE'RE MAKING OUR FUTURE TODAY

We must recapture those skills and their leadership. If the trained and disciplined efficiency and valor of these men and women of our armed forces can be directed into proper channels, we shall have a better country to live in than the world has ever seen. If we should fail, disaster and chaos are inevitable.

These men will be a potent force for good or evil in the years to come. They can make our country or break it. They can promote permanent world order or World War No. 3. But in a very real sense, the responsibility rests not on their shoulders, but on ours. If we do not fail them, they will not fail us.

And that is why I regard the G. I. bill of rights, passed by the Senate in March and now in conference between the Houses as one of the most important measures that has ever come before Congress. This bill—which is in all respects in line with the President's program—will go far to solve this very pressing and immediate problem. I do not contend that it is the last word on the subject. But I do assert that it is a fundamental bill of rights for service men and women in facilitating their return to civilian life. And I assert that it represents as little as we can properly do, both in justice to the veterans and in enlightened self-interest for the remainder of the country.

In this measure, we have attempted to state comprehensively and clearly the rights and benefits to which our veterans will be entitled, and to state clearly and simply the way in which these rights may be obtained.

THESE ARE THE G. I. GOALS

As I see it, there have been two basic goals which we have achieved in this bill.

The first has been to throw every possible protection about the veteran, to bridge the awkward gap between the release from the armed services and reintegration into civilian life. We recognize that the burden of war falls heavily upon the citizen soldier.

We seek to preserve his rights, to see that he gets a square deal, that he is not imposed upon; to protect him against the injustices which result from errors and human failures inherent in a large-scale, mass demobilization; and to protect the community as well, insuring its stability, which widespread confusion and dissatisfaction would destroy.

And the second goal is to see that the veteran is not penalized by reason of his services; that he is given a fair break, winning for himself those traditional American opportunities which he has defended and preserved for all of us here at home.

His most immediate need, perhaps, is the first classification, the "bridge the gap" part of the program. He must be guided as he leaves the service. He must be apprised of his rights, and aided in obtaining them. He may need hospitalization. He most certainly needs money to carry him until he can find suitable employment. And he needs a single place, one concentrated agency, to which he can go for the solution of his problems.

And in the G. I. bill of rights we have provided all this for him. We have, first, declared the Veterans' Administration to be an essential war agency, and armed it with the priorities in personnel and material so badly needed to enable it to meet all of the veterans' needs.

ONE AGENCY FOR ALL BENEFITS

And, having strengthened the Veterans' Administration, we have given it over-all control of all the activities and benefits affecting the veteran. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will channel through existing agencies in administering the program; but his will be the responsibility for its success both to the veteran and to the Congress.

We have authorized and directed the Veterans' Administration to construct $500,000,000 in additional hospital beds, which will be badly needed when the flood of human casualties flows back home. We have provided that he may use suitable Army and Navy hospitals when they become available.

As I have said, this bill does not represent the last word on the veterans subject, but it is certainly as little as can be done at this time, and America may well congratulate herself when this measure of justice to our fighting men and women has been accomplished.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

A conference committee is now working to compromise the differences between the House and Senate versions of the G. I. bill of rights. This is what the two bills provide:

SENATE VERSION

Education

All honorably discharged veterans with 6 months' duty may apply for grants of from 1 to 4 years (depending on length of service) of schooling. Grants range up to $500 a year for tuition for full-time students, with $50 a month for subsistence.

Unemployment Compensation

Allows payments of $15 to $25 weekly for 52 weeks out of a 24-month period for all honorably discharged veterans.

Loans

Guarantees loans up to $1,000, free of interest the first year, and at 3 percent thereafter for the purchase of homes, farms, or small businesses.

HOUSE VERSION

Education

Grants available only to veterans inducted before they were 24, but provides that veterans who were over 24 may secure grants if they can prove war service interfered with schooling or that they need a refresher course.

Unemployment Compensation

Allows payment of a flat sum of $20 a week for 26 weeks out of 24-month period.

Loans

Guarantees loans up to $2,500.

Both versions of the bill provide for a new Veterans' Placement Bureau devoted to finding jobs for veterans, aided by the facilities of the United States Employment Service.

Both versions also recognize the Veterans' Administration as second only to the War and Navy Departments in priority rights, and give it the job of supervising relief and other veterans' benefits, including disability payments and hospitalization.

Both versions appropriate $500,000,000 for additional hospital facilities.

In the messages he has sent to Congress asking for legislation to help take care of the special problems of service men and women, President Roosevelt has emphasized strongly the Nation's debt to these men and women. In his message of November 23, 1943, he said:

"All of us are concentrating now on the one primary objective of winning this war. But even as we devote our energy and resources to that purpose, we cannot neglect to plan for things to come after victory is won.

"The problem of reconverting wartime America to a peacetime basis ie one for which we are now laying plans to be submitted to the Congress for action. As I said last July:

" 'The returning soldier and sailor and marine are a part of the problem of demobilizing the rest of the millions of Americans who have been working and living in a war economy since 1941. * * * But the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.'

"At that time I outlined what seemed to me to be a minimum of action to which the members of our armed forces are entitled over and above that taken for other citizens."

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBI on June 10, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, many mothers and wives of servicemen have asked me during the past few months to find out why they did not hear from their sons and husbands. I have endeavored to find out in each case where the trouble was.

I think that in the future it will work out better if you will first make absolutely certain that there is no chance of your loved one's letter being mislaid. I have discovered most cases of the boys seeming failure to write home were brought about by delay in

mail deliveries. This, of course, is unavoidable and no one is to blame.

So, in order not to involve the young man with his commanding officer for something he is not to blame for, will you please write to me and ask me to get in touch directly with the soldier himself. I will, in turn, ask him why he has failed to write you. We will not go to his superiors until we are sure he is not available. That will speed up things and save a roundabout course.

Last week another Hall Furlough Club was organized. This event was a real milestone. Mrs. Dominick Virgilio, chairman of the Central Council of Hall Furlough Clubs tells me she has long wanted to see a club in Binghamton's first ward. She had her wish come true when Club No. 6 was formed by an enthusiastic young lady, Miss Sally Pragac, 41 Sowden Street, Binghamton.

I wish to congratulate Miss Pragac and her fellow officers, Miss Mary Fiala, 8 Longview Avenue, who was elected vice president and Miss Pearl Bocinski, 55 Sowden Street, elected treasurer. I wish them every success in their patriotic work and feel sure they will have a splendid group in the first, Binghamton's largest ward.

A few days ago I sent out a number of petitions to Republican county committees and several hundred posters to loyal friends in the counties of Broome, Chenango, and Madison. These petitions are beginning to come back filled out and signed by ever-increasing numbers.

To the Republican committee men and women as well as other friends who are so kindly getting signatures for me, I give my sincere thanks. I want to file several thousand names with the secretary of state in Albany before the dead line, June 27. So I urge you all to mail me your petition as soon as it is filled or leave it with County Clerk Bill Flook at the Broome County Court House.

Naturally, it helps a man get reelected when people see a lot of his friends displaying his poster in their front windows. When I was home Memorial Day weekend, I saw many of these posters all over the triple cities. This constitutes a tremendous boost for me when I start to campaign. So if you received my poster, won't you please put it in your window or on your property somewhere. Remember you are helping me so much when you do this. It will encourage others to do the same.

Write me if you want me to send you more posters. Perhaps you know some others who will display them likewise. Let me know and I will see they get one. Thank you again.

Since I talked to you last on this program, the Allied invasion has started. At the moment, things seem to be going according to plan. What the future will bring only time can tell. We hope, we pray that those heroes struggling on the shores of France for a foothold in Europe will push on to victory. We are confident of the ultimate result and our prayers go out for the welfare of our boys.

I know you join with me in approval of the following appropriate lines by Miss Fannie Pendleton, instructress at Union-Endicott High School, entitled "A Tribute":

"To you who bear the Stars and Stripes
In many foreign lands, and far;
To you who serve, nor count the cost
That peace may reign instead of war.

"To you whose memories homeward turn
As prison days go slowly by,
To keep alive within your hearts
That spirits that shall never die.

"To you who gave the greatest gift,
In sky, on battleground, or sea,
That brotherhood may rule the world,
And men may everywhere be free.

"Your footsteps echo through these halls,
As we a solemn tribute pay;
And, for you all, our grateful hearts
We lift in silent prayer today."

We Have Less Instead of More Milk Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation at their meeting June 5 and 6, 1944:

Whereas there are indications on the horizon that certain self-seeking interests having the welfare neither of agriculture, the consuming public nor the Nation as a whole at heart are developing propaganda to the effect that a surplus exists or is approaching in dairy products; and

Whereas we are aware that any surplus which does or might exist or be created would be wholly artificial, caused by a combination of seasonal production increases and governmental restrictions in the form of ration points, marketing quotas, and lower quality restrictions, which prohibit the consuming public from absorbing anywhere near its actual wants; and

Whereas similarly artificially induced surpluses brought about a market glut in other agricultural commodities, such as pork, eggs, grain, and so forth, and consequent chaos, which can be avoided by the use of a little ordinary foresightedness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, for the benefit of all, the consuming public as well as agriculture, that the responsible governmental agencies be requested to take such steps as will preclude the possibility of a repetition of the above-mentioned market obstacles by such actions as reducing the ration-point values on butter and cheese, eliminating marketing quotas on fluid milk, cream, and ice cream to the consumer, etc., which will immediately absorb any surpluses and at the same time give the consumer the opportunity to purchase in more nearly adequate amounts these vital health-giving dairy products which he both needs and wants.

The Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation: Curtis Hatch, president, Spring Green; Ralph E. Peterson, vice president, Berlin; Ed Brewin, Jefferson; John Budzien, Milwaukee; Carl Doeringsfeld, Fennimore; R. J. Douglas, Juda; A. C. Murphy, Chilton; L. E. Jewett, La Crosse; Henry Wieland, Beloit.

Mr. Speaker, the national production figures for the first 5 months of 1944 in comparison to the corresponding months of 1943 and 1942 show that the total national milk production is less in 1944 than in either of the 2 previous years. This is shown by the following figures obtained from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

National milk production by months

[Million pounds]

	1942	1943	1944
January	8,739	8,773	8,634
February	8,299	8,380	[1]8,288
March	9,641	9,734	9,780
April	10,305	10,245	10,230
May	12,124	11,873	[2]11,904
Total	49,108	49,005	48,836

[1] For first 28 days of February 1944.
[2] Estimated.

There are two facts to be taken into consideration in regard to this milk situation: One, production is not being maintained in spite of the subsidies paid and, two, there is no evident abnormal seasonal surplus to contend with at this time. Propaganda which pictures great milk surpluses, whether issued by one of the 2,800 New Deal propaganda agents or whether issued by some commercial milk company, is not giving a true and factual picture of the situation.

One more fact is very evident and that is that the War Food Administration should not allow milk to be poured down sewers after the War Food Administration has paid a subsidy to get it produced. This applies to a cooperative in Georgia as well as a corporation in any other part of the country. These Georgia producers received 60 percent greater subsidy than the producers in the natural milk-producing areas.

Let us not be misled by any individual, or by any group that does not lend every energy to a successful war-food program. The dairymen of our country should be complimented for their efforts in maintaining milk production as well as they have in the face of the ever-increasing handicaps.

From Bad to Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., of June 12, 1944:

FROM BAD TO WORSE

From present indications the House is going to follow the bad example set by the Senate and pass an amendment to the price-control bill tying textile ceiling prices to parity prices for raw cotton. The House has already displayed a reckless disregard of warnings not to upset price-control balances by accepting amendments that favor particular classes of producers. It has, for example, passed an amendment prohibiting O. P. A. from requiring retailers to limit stocks and sales to the highest priced lines offered during a given period. It has also approved an amendment requiring recomputation upward of price ceilings on oil and oil products, allegedly for the benefit of small independent producers. This is the type of special-interest legislation that encourages other groups to demand concessions. If incorporated in the price-control measure, such amendments would constitute a dangerous precedent likely to wreck the entire structure.

For many weeks both House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees held hearings on the bill to extend the life of the O. P. A. Both in the committees and in Congress there appears to be strong support for continuance of price control as well as a widespread conviction that Price Administrator Bowles is doing a very hard job unusually well. Nevertheless, the prospects for securing acceptable legislation empowering Mr. Bowles to carry on the good work have

steadily deteriorated since acceptance of the Bankhead cotton amendment by the Senate. Between them the Senate and House appear to be bent on sabotaging the present system of price control by yielding to pressure groups that complain about the hardships of O. P. A. rulings.

There is no denying that many such complaints are justified. Moreover, excellent arguments can be advanced in support of some of the controversial amendments that O. P. A. officials consider destructive in their ultimate effects. Notwithstanding these facts, Congress shows poor judgment in trying to set up legislative safeguards to meet special situations, without considering the consequences to the country as a whole. If it really trusts Administrator Bowles and desires to give him a fair chance to do a good job, it must not tie his hands by throwing his program out of balance through raising the prices of specified commodities and giving preferred treatment to specified classes of producers.

Chairman SPENCE, of the House Banking and Currency Committee, warned his colleagues of the consequences of passing this kind of particularistic legislation. Complaints, though often just, he pointed out, are incident to the enforcement of emergency price-control laws. In considering the O. P. A. extension bill, therefore, Congress should view it in the light of the great national emergency that now confronts us. And Mr. SPENCE added a warning against acting upon the "complaints or desires of every individual who wants relief." The result would be, he prophesied, that the President would veto the bill. The House seems bent on inviting that veto by ignoring Mr. SPENCE'S sound advice.

The States Can Handle This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 11, 1944:

THE STATES CAN HANDLE THIS

Should the Federal Government furnish subsidies or supplements for State unemployment insurance systems as part of its post-war program?

Directors of the unemployment compensation systems of New York, Wisconsin, and Nevada, appearing before a Senate committee, say "No." They point to the fact that State unemployment compensation reserves now total nearly five and a half billions of dollars. They assert that no State will have any difficulty meeting its obligations to workers thrown out of employment by post-war upheaval. They suggest that Federal supplementation of State programs might well lead to a class of industrial pensioners drawing "rocking chair money."

Congress should weigh well the arguments of these admitted experts in the unemployment compensation field. The places where Federal money will be needed in the adjustments which will follow this war are legion; surely it would be folly to throw unneeded money into the State systems if these are fully prepared to meet the load which will fall on them.

There has been a persistent effort on the part of some to federalize unemployment compensation through one excuse or another. It may be supposed that the present idea of Federal subsidy to the States is another step by these partisans.

The Federal Social Security Board people have always preferred the pooled-fund system which some of the less fortunate States now have. That is the kind of system federalization would force on us. Director Paul R. Raushenbush is working for the interests of every Wisconsin worker when he combats such federalization movements.

The Wisconsin plan pays those who lose employment on quite as generous standards as does the pooled fund plan, but it has an advantage which the other system does not possess. Our system makes it profitable for the employer to keep workers steadily employed and so encourages employment stability. It has a double rather than a single social purpose.

The other system—the system which federalization would make universal—is not interested primarily in keeping workers employed; its only interest is in indemnifying them when jobs are lost. It is a system with a minimum of constructive elements. As such, its encroachments should be fought by those States that have a better plan.

Post-War Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, some time ago a very interesting article by Al Williams, relating to post-war air power, appeared in the public press. I believe the views of this author on this subject are worthy of serious consideration by those who are interested in post-war international aviation.

I believe the policy of appropriating billions of dollars in aid of foreign nations without a definite understanding with reference to some of the more acute post-war problems is a short-sighted policy on the part of the Roosevelt administration, and one which, in due time, can easily furnish provocation for another war.

To furnish a vast fleet of ships, an air armada such as the world has never before seen, and property of all kinds involving billions of dollars, and millions of the finest of young men to be sacrificed on the world's battlefields to preserve or establish—what? This can be answered later when the smoke of battle clears and the motives of men and nations have been revealed!

But to permit the nations which have cried out for help to now serve notice on the American people that they may build airports on foreign soil but with the distinct understanding that under no condition shall these American financed airports be used for commercial purposes by the United States is an affront to every citizen of this country who believes in a square deal.

It is about time for the United States, even though somewhat late, to insist upon some of its post-war rights in consideration for the sacrifices it has already made and will have to continue to make before this war is concluded.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the article by Al Williams, as follows:

POST-WAR AIR POWER

(By Al Williams)

The future of American air power in the post-war era is a vital question.

Whether this Nation will have adequate air bases, in strategic places, for the development and growth of air power should not be left to chance.

The time to consider this problem is now. Others of our allies have not failed to take the long-range view of this subject. Russia has told us what land she is going to liberate. If liberation means control of these areas for her protection or development, that is something else again. Recently Mr. Churchill reassured Parliament that no British lands would be ceded and that England specifically would not relinquish air bases to the United States.

So, the question arises, What about the future and preservation of the United States?

Air power, like sea power, is limited in its scope of action by bases for refueling.

How did England become the world's No. 1 sea power? Did she just build excellent warships and keep them near the British Isles? Certainly not.

British sea-power planners saw the strategic value of the eastern entrance to the Mediterranean—and took Gibraltar. They did the same thing with the Suez Canal. It is also true of Aden, the eastern bottleneck of the Red Sea. They took Bathurst, on the western coast of Africa, and Capetown, at the southern tip of that continent.

The Straits of Malacca—controlled from Singapore—govern the passageway between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific. And let's not miss the Falkland Islands, which control shipping around Cape Horn, South America's southern tip, or South Georgia, supporting the Falklands. And, going up north, we find control points in British Guiana, then Trinidad, and even farther north to Barbados and Santa Lucia. Next come Jamaica, the Bahamas, and the strong sea-power control point of Bermuda.

Control of such bottlenecks of the sea's highways means sea-power control. And control of strategic air bases means air-power control—which for the United States may mean safety and preservation from aggression.

To those people who told us that if the British Fleet fell into the hands of an enemy America's fate would be sealed, I ask: "What if those islands close to the United States fall into some strong air-power aggressor's hands?"

Now is the time to settle the vital question of air bases. Those who stall on it are gambling with America's security.

"Water" Is a Fighting Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to note the fine and impartial attitude of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch concerning the problem of the Missouri. We, of the upper Mis-

souri States, owe this newspaper our sincere thanks for its efforts to bring about an equitable solution of the use of the resources of a great river, a resource which belongs, not to one State, but to all States through which the Missouri flows.

This is a time for clear thinking, and while naturally we will seek to protect our sectional interests we can, I believe, recognize the rights of other areas along the river, and then, through logic and necessity, evolve a plan which will work for the benefit of all.

It is time for all of us to act together and to trust one another.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a fine editorial concerning this matter from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 4, 1944:

BARRIER TO A UNIFIED VALLEY

The Army engineers, the Mississippi Valley Association, and the Missouri River States Committee may be able to jam the inequitable flood-control bill through Congress in the final testing which will begin with Senate Commerce Committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday. But if they do it, the price of the victory will be the Upper Valley people's anger and suspicion and flaming sense of wrong.

"Water" is a fighting word in the great plains of the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming, and it is a word which in the present struggle has just begun to fight. If the partisans of navigation succeed in grabbing the bulk of the Missouri River's water by act of Congress, they need not suppose that the issue will be settled. Only one thing would perhaps be settled, and that would be the animosity and distrust of the Upper Valley toward the Lower Valley forever.

The presumption to priority would by no manner of means be settled. The irrigation States would still possess many devices in their constitutions, ratified by Congress, reserving to them the control of streams within their borders.

It needs to be said that the Pick plan has become the very symbol by which a real unification of the aspirations, the thoughts and the efforts of this vast valley will either rise or fall. If it is steamrollered through Congress, all hopes that the Missouri Valley may some day be able to function as a whole, for its infinitely greater future, will very likely be crushed beneath it.

It seems altogether probable that we are now at a turning point at which what is done will decide whether we can act together, whether we can deserve one another's trust—and decide it for some important time to come.

Let us face the inevitable fact: If, to gain a navigation channel, the people of the Lower Valley permit special interests, purporting to represent them, to preempt water which should be irrigation's, it will be a channel costing far and away above its worth; costing our future.

Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much spoken and printed about the shortage of farm machinery that, perhaps, a statement by the head of one of the greatest farm equipment producing concerns of the Nation would be interesting at this time. Subjoined is a statement entitled "Both jobs have been done" by Fowler McCormick, president of the International Harvester Co.:

BOTH JOBS HAVE BEEN DONE—A STATEMENT CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.'S FARM EQUIPMENT PRODUCTION

(By Fowler McCormick, president)

Everyone knows of the tough problems American industry had to meet in converting from normal production to war production. The record industry made speaks for itself.

Everyone hears much these days of the tough problems industry will have to face in reconverting from war production to normal production.

This is the record of one company, International Harvester, which has already had to do both these tough jobs since Pearl Harbor; a company which was largely converted to war work, which is now partly reconverted to normal work; which is carrying both loads, meeting the difficulties of each. Despite obstacles, it is a record which we are proud of, and we want our friends to know about it.

Told at full length the story would be long and complicated. But a few facts are outstanding:

Since Pearl Harbor we have furnished to farmers $326,000,000 worth of farm equipment and service parts despite the fact that Government restrictions practically put us out of the farm equipment business for months. That total includes the highest volume of service parts ever built. The figure is on the basis of prices which are frozen, most of them at the pre-war level.

Since Pearl Harbor we have built $550,000,000 worth of war products for the fighting services.

Three of our tractor plants have won the Army-Navy E, and our oldest and largest implement factory, McCormick Works, has just been awarded the Army-Navy E for outstanding achievement in the delicate and extremely precise production required by the Navy's aircraft torpedo.

In the first 6 months of our 1944 fiscal year we have built approximately the same amount of farm tractors and parts, as we produced in all of 1943.

In the first 6 months of 1944 we have provided for American farmers more farm equipment—tractors, implements, and parts—than we did in the same period of 1940; almost as much as we did in the same period of 1941; and more than twice as much as we did in the same period of last year.

We are not getting rich out of the war. In 1943 our total sales were $83,400,000 more than in 1941. But our 1943 profit was $4,921,000 less than our 1941 profit. Our 1944 profit will be still smaller.

The history of our war production and our farm-equipment production is closely interwoven. In 1942, the first year of the war, the Government permitted farm-equipment production at about 80 percent of the 1940 levels. Farmers generally did not feel that reduction much, for we had large inventories of machines manufactured in earlier years, which were sold along with current production. Our farm-equipment plants remained fairly busy on farm equipment. War work was undertaken in our motor-truck plants and in available areas of tractor plants. Implement plants generally were not suited to war work, either in type of buildings or equipment, but did do their part when they could.

Then in the fall of 1942 the Government issued Farm Equipment Limitation Order L–170, governing production for the year from November 1, 1942, to October 31, 1943. Under the terms of L–170, our company was cut back to about 14 percent of 1940 production. On more than half the items we normally make, we were allowed no quotas.

This took place simultaneously with the period of greatest need by the armed services for new sources of war production. Naturally, this company, and other large companies of the farm equipment industry, undertook extensive war contracts in those plants which could handle the type of manufacture required. Since many implement factories could not handle a great amount of the work, they were almost shut down, except for minor war production jobs and except for production of farm equipment service parts. In our implement plants, thousands of trained employees had to be laid off. The great majority immediately sought and obtained work elsewhere.

The situation in late 1942 and early 1943, therefore, was that large manufacturers were practically out of production on farm equipment. Inventories of finished machines no longer existed. They had been sold out during 1942. The food production program imposed greater demands on farmers and the attractions of war industry and the inroads of the draft had stripped farms of labor.

The protest of farmers against order L-170 was immediate and vigorous, since their need for farm equipment was enormous. Farm equipment producers, who had protested against the order before its issuance, continued to present their views to the Government. In March 1943 the War Production Board issued an amendment, enlarging the quotas for some machines. Finally, in June 1943 the War Production Board issued a new order, L-257, which replaced L-170 and covered the period from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944.

Order L-257 contained greatly increased quotas for farm equipment, the quotas being different for different machines. The War Production Board, appreciating farmers' large needs, allotted to the industry an amount of materials estimated by the War Production Board to be about 80 percent of the amount used in 1940. In addition, the industry was told to carry on along with L–257 production, the remainder of L–170 production which had been planned for the period between July 1 and October 31, 1943. This had to be done with no interference with production of much-needed war materials.

In July 1943, therefore, less than a year ago, our situation was that farm-equipment production was very low, the normal flow of materials and purchased parts and supplies had been broken. Plants or parts of plants had been converted to other production. Many trained employees had scattered to the four winds. Yet we had suddenly received orders to greatly increase farm-equipment production and to do it right away.

The flow of materials and parts had to be reestablished. Plant rearrangement had to be carried out. Employees had to be recalled and many new employees had to be trained. In addition, it was the period of greatest scarcity in the supply of manufacturing materials and parts. Between the placing of an order on a steel mill and the actual receipt of steel at a plant, months had to intervene.

This company and the others of the industry nevertheless bent every effort to the reestablishment of farm-equipment production, realizing at the same time our obligation not to take steps which would damage the flow of war production which we had promised the armed services. As always in manufacturing, progress was slow at first and we were criticized for "failing to meet schedules." But materials finally began to flow, production lines were reestablished, employees were trained and production began to move upward, slowly at first, then with a rush. By early 1944 machines were moving out to hard-pressed farmers in real quantities.

A job has been done, and the figures show it. The figures below represent daily production of certain important machines, as between the low point under Order L–170 and the situation in May of 1944:

Daily production

	L–170 low	Present
Tractors	46	511
Hay loaders	23	50
Hay rakes	29	76
Mowers	122	289
Hammer mills	0	45
Peg harrows	32	377
Corn planters	31	117
Grain drills	8	55
Combines	51	59

Several facts should be noted about the figures shown. In the first place, the hammer mill is typical of the many machines which we were not allowed to produce at all under L–170 as first issued. The combine represents the other extreme. There were higher combine quotas under the low period of L–170 than was the case with other machines. Finally, practically all the figures in the column showing our present situation would be higher if it were not for the shortage of labor.

We have already noted that when we started to increase production of farm equipment materials presented the most pressing problem. That situation changed for the better as time went on, partly due to cutbacks in war production and partly due to assistance rendered our industry by the W. P. B. Unfortunately, as the materials situation grew brighter, the manpower situation grew steadily worse.

The manpower problem comes in two forms: First, the difficulty of getting enough employees to man plants adequately and achieve all the production that machinery and facilities make possible; second, the problem of keeping the employees who are hired. The most acute of all our employment problems has been that of trying to find adequate foundry labor, both for gray-iron foundries and malleable-iron foundries. This particularly affects production of farm implements, which require large supplies of both types of iron castings.

What do we mean by a manpower problem? Some figures will show:

In the 4 weeks ending April 15, 1944, our company hired a total of 3,259 new employees, but our total employment went down by 702 persons. For in that same 4 weeks 3,961 had left. Or take some specific plants. In the period ending April 15 our East Moline works, which makes combines and corn pickers, hired 123 persons and lost 143. Our most important farm-tractor plant, Farmall works, hired 301 new employees, but lost 390.

Part of this manpower problem is due to the requirements of the armed forces, for there are 16,500 Harvester men in military service. (Our total employment now is about 72,000.) And a very large part of it is due to the restlessness of employees who are new to industry, who get a job, work a month or two, hear of another job they would like to try, and drift on.

We are doing everything we can think of to meet this problem and our production is still going up. Despite lack of manpower, we have completed or will complete within the period scheduled by order L–257 our full quotas of all but 3 of the 60 general classifications of farm machines which we build. These 3 classifications are grain drills, corn pickers, and combines.

By July 31, when our W. P. B. authorization to manufacture grain drills expires, we expect to have built 92 percent of our grain drill quota. By September 30, when our authorization to make corn pickers expire, we expect to have built 96 percent of our corn picker quota. The lag will affect only one model, the one-row mounted picker. By September 30, when our combine authorizations expire, we expect to have built 84 percent of our combine quota. The lag in combine production represents a shortage of self-propelled models (a new type, never in production before) and also represents our inability to make a number of combines which were not part of our original L–257 quota but were authorized later as a supplemental quota.

One thing we have done that we are pretty proud of. We have balanced our production of farm equipment. We have not been shipping out tractors with no implements to work with them. Generally speaking, we have been able to see that the implements went along with the tractor.

Recently the Government issued the quotas for farm equipment for the year beginning July 1, 1944. These are known as schedule B of order L–257. Schedule B provides quotas somewhat larger than those we have been operating under. And unless the manpower situation gets even worse than it is now that will mean considerably more farm equipment for farmers.

Even more important, however, is the fact that schedule B gives us a running start on production for the first time since the Government began to limit production. The W. P. B., War Food Administration, and other interested Government agencies have told us what the quotas are, and have told us far enough ahead of time so that production can be planned intelligently instead of being a wild scramble for materials. This will be particularly helpful in the production of highly seasonal machines.

At present our war production is diminishing, because of cancelations of contracts, cutbacks in schedules, and completion of contracts which are not renewed. This reflects the general cutting back of most types of war production. If that trend continues, and our information at present indicates that it will, we should be able to transfer more employees and more manufacturing facilities to farm equipment production.

Meantime, we will keep on doing what we have done from the first day of the war, making both war products and farm equipment products, doing both jobs, and doing them both the best we know how.

The Livestock Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave granted me to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared on June 6, 1944, in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram:

REDUCTION IN OPERATIONS

There are so many conflicting factors holding sway in the livestock and meat-packing industries these days that no matter what way the farmer turns to figure his way in planning future operations of his feed lots he runs into a blank wall.

Should he buy replacement stock and forget about the 15 to 20 percent rise in costs since January and give more consideration to the fact that there has been a persistent upturn in the prices paid for slaughter stock? The farmers' answer to date is mostly not in favor of buying replacement stock. When uncertain, do nothing. This seems to be the policy of many cattle feeders struggling with the problem of future feeding.

During the month of April farmers of 8 Corn Belt States purchased only 84,000 replacement cattle, one of the smallest April purchases in many years. This was a reduction of 40 percent, compared with the 142,000 cattle bought in April of 1943, and a reduction of 45 percent from the 154,000 purchased 2 years ago. In April 1941 farmers in the 8 States bought 138,000 cattle.

This restricted buying has gone on a long time, in face of lower costs than in 1943, when replacement cattle brought the highest prices on record.

During the first 4 months of 1944 farmers of the 8 States bought a total of 320,000 head, compared with 468,000 in 1943, with 459,000 in 1942, and 468,000 in 1941.

Cattle feeders are not alone in this urge to temporarily get out of an industry so important to the war. It needs no telling of how important such products as hides and wool are to supporting an army on the move. Yet their production is being discouraged one way or another.

Lamb feeders of the 8 States bought during April only 66,000 sheep and lambs, less than half the 139,000 they purchased in the same month of 1943. Two years ago their purchases totaled 159,000.

The 4 months' buy was one of the smallest in many years, at 386,000 head, which compared with 729,000 in 1943 and 502,000 in 1942.

The same feeling extends into the hog raising business. Feeding pigs in some parts of the country are worth less than half what they were bringing at this time last year.

Of primary importance, of course, is the feed shortage. This in itself would limit production. However, it is not this alone which has turned the production trend. Under it all is that feeling of uncertainty and discouragement, and in almost all instances the causes are traceable to the unfortunate experiment in price control by inexperienced administrators.

A feeder asked how one can have confidence when Federal bureaus are putting out so many conflicting reports and rules that they confuse each other. Another makes the point that while the Government can change its collective mind overnight, the farmer, once he plants a field of corn, has to stick to that decision for at least a year.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the George Lafbury Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., in regard to the reenactment of the Price Control Act:

GEORGE LAFBURY CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 23, 1944.

The Honorable HOWARD J. McMURRAY,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was a very interested listener to your radio talk last Saturday evening

on the subject of price control. I agree with you as to your conclusions but do not agree with your remarks which had reference to fruits and vegetables and, by implication, the representations of the trade organizations presumably representing the fruit and vegetables industry. However, the statements submitted to your committee on behalf of the fruit and vegetable industry do not fairly represent the fruit and vegetable industry, as there are numerous members of our industry who favor price control of our products.

The purpose of this letter is to let you know that the fresh fruit and vegetable receivers and distributors of western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and West Virginia favor price control of fresh fruits and vegetables, and we are taking this means of placing ourselves on record with the House of Representatives.

Your remarks on the radio with reference to our industry were no doubt based on the statement submitted to your committee by Harold M. Buzek, president of the National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, a copy of which is in my possession. This statement was misrepresentative in many particulars and contained many distortions and gross exaggerations. To read Mr. Buzek's statement, one would conclude that the respectable elements in the industry were out of business and that nearly all the trading was in the hands of the "black marketeers." This is far from the truth. The great bulk of the business is transacted by the legitimate factors and according to law. True, there has been "black marketing," but even so, the ceilings were there all the time, acting as an estoppel, and the prices realized by the "bootleggers" were far short of the prices that would have been realized under unrestrained competitive conditions.

I have been in trade organization work for many years, having been elected to every office of the National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, twice serving as national president. Naturally, it is with some hesitancy that I now criticize its present position, but in all fairness I feel impelled to submit the following proof that Mr. Buzek's statement was not the unanimous opinion of the members of the fruit and vegetable industry.

The Pittsburgh branch of the National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors is the largest branch in the league; its 97 members includes nearly every important receiver and jobber in western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and West Virginia. Under date of April 14, 1944, Mr. Chester Franzell, II, president of the Pittsburgh branch, wrote Mr. Buzek as follows:

"We have your circular of April 12 asking for ideas and suggestions as to the attitude you should take when appearing before congressional committees regarding Government agencies.

"I know very well that you will be disappointed in the small response you will get to your request for ideas and suggestions. However, as president of the Pittsburgh branch, I feel that you should know the consensus of opinion from our territory. This has not changed in the least from our attitude at French Lick in January. At that time I believe we made it rather clear that we were for cooperation with the Government agencies, which we honestly felt were trying to do a job. We realize that price control is just as necessary in our business as in any other, and are not antagonistic toward the idea. Naturally, we are for simplification of regulations as well as absolute fairness in the distribution of mark-ups.

"If you will read the resolution which emanated from the French Lick convention again, you will have a clear expression of Pittsburgh's attitude and recommendations in the whole matter."

Apparently the opinion of wholesale factors representing some 3,000,000 consumers was totally ignored.

In explanation of the French Lick convention resolution, the executive committee submitted a resolution calling for elimination of price control of fruits and vegetables. After considerable discussion and debate, the "elimination" clause was deleted, and the resolution as passed called for cooperation of the trade with O. P. A. on enforcement of its regulations.

Last fall I was asked to serve as special consultant to the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Division of the O. P. A. without salary. I entered upon this work with pronounced inhibitions, mostly antagonistic. After attending many conferences in Washington, I want to go on record here and now with the statement that the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Division is ably managed by experienced and practical men; that every effort is being made to write and issue practical directives affording full protection and reasonable profit to the producer, distributor, jobber, and fair prices to the consumer. Practically every request and recommendation submitted by the consultants were accepted and made a part of the directives, with consequent and lasting benefit to the fruit and vegetable industry. On the other hand, a number of impractical or burdensome regulations were eliminated when consultants submitted adequate proof of their impracticability. Summarizing, I am absolutely "sold" on the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Division of the O. P. A.

In conclusion, I call your attention to an editorial appearing in the May 13 issue of the Packer, the national weekly trade paper of the fresh fruit and vegetable industry. The Packer has a very large circulation in every commercial production section and read by almost 100 percent of the receivers, jobbers, brokers, etc. The editorial is captioned "Price stabilization must continue." Probably the last paragraph is controlling, as it is the considered opinion of the editors who are in intimate contact with the industry over these many months of price control, and which reads as follows:

"The measure is again before Congress. It should be continued, with amendments to the end that every factor in the industry be treated fairly and black markets in fresh fruit and produce made an impossibility. Price stabilization must continue, and every measure necessary to bring this about must be extended if America is to plow to the end of the row and achieve victory."

Yours very truly,

GEORGE LAFBURY CO.,
GEO. LAFBURY, *President.*

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 12 and 15, 1944

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, since Pearl Harbor it has become evident that the developed water-power sources in northeastern United States are not sufficient to supply either the demands of the war or the demands which will follow the war. Proof of that statement is furnished by the fact that it was necessary to transport hydroelectric power all the way from New York City to Massena, N. Y., in order to operate the aluminum plants, which were so vital to our war effort. It is clearly evident that industry in the post-war era will migrate to that section of the country which can provide cheap power. Proof of this can be shown by the action of the Government in closing aluminum plants where such cheap power is not available, while those plants located near a source of cheap power have been continued.

The war has brought the United States and the Dominion of Canada very closely together, and it has further demonstrated that the interests of the two nations, particularly along industrial and economic lines, are identical. I, therefore, believe that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and the development of the St. Lawrence power would accomplish, so far as our post-war economy is concerned, the very thing that close cooperation between the two nations has already accomplished in our joint war effort.

The war has changed many of our opinions with regard to international affairs, and the part America must play in the world from now on, and, along with that, viewpoints with respect to the necessity for international cooperation in the fields of economics and commerce and industry will likewise change.

The matter of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development will probably be an issue during the present session of Congress, but, if not, certainly during the next session. For that reason I feel that I should make clear my stand on this important issue.

Prior to Pearl Harbor I was opposed to this project, as I did not feel that the expenditure necessary to complete it would be warranted by the results obtained. However, the present war has caused many changes in our economic structure, and I now believe that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway as an international project, the expense to be shared by the United States and Canada, should go forward to completion. I am in favor of the development of the St. Lawrence power as a public project and for the benefit of the people of the State of New York.

The St. Lawrence seaway proposal is not a New Deal project, as some people have erroneously assumed. It has been endorsed by every Republican President since and including President Taft. Its leading advocates throughout the years have been Republican Members of Congress. It has been endorsed on several occasions by the United States Board of Army Engineers. Governor Dewey of this State is on record in favor of it and the New York State Legislature at its last session unanimously went on record in favor of the St. Lawrence power development. The pending St. Lawrence seaway bill is sponsored by a Republican Senator, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont.

New York's industrial prosperity in the post-war era depends in large measure on the ability of this State to furnish the cheap hydroelectric power to attract industries. Such cheap power is available already in the Tennessee Valley and it is available in the Pacific Northwest, which accounts in no small measure for the migration of industry to those sections.

The development of the St. Lawrence power and the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway should be a fundamental phase of New York State postwar planning. Not only will the successful completion of this great undertaking provide the cheap hydroelectric power to attract and to retain industry in New York State, but it will likewise provide cheap power for the municipalities of New York State and for the host of rural residents who are now denied the benefits of electricity because of high cost.

All northeastern United States will benefit materially from the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and the development of the St. Lawrence power. The benefit will particularly be felt, however, in central New York because of its nearness to the development itself. No post-war project which has been so far proposed will result in greater value to a greater number of people than the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. For that reason I am heartily in favor of it and will do everything in my power to see that the seaway measure passes the House of Representatives.

Tribute to Members of Draft Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, at a thankless, unpleasant task, members of hundreds of selective service, or more commonly called draft, boards are distinguishing themselves as real patriots in this great time of crisis. It is no pleasant task to sit on these boards and make decisions as to the induction of one boy and the deferment of another—both in the same community, both from the same school, and perhaps both from the same church. The task is made doubly hard because these draft-board members are from the community whose boys they are sending into the armed forces. Theirs is the job of hearing the heart-rending pleas of those about to be left at home.

These members, as you know, serve without remuneration in any form. Yet there is seldom praise for them. But there is occasional criticism on their decisions.

An editorial in one of our newspapers very well expresses the honor and respect which I feel is due these fine, patriotic, unselfish people. It follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 31, 1944]

TRIBUTE TO DRAFT BOARDS

(The Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette)

A Wisconsin Senator's proposal that local draft board members throughout the country be remunerated for their services has elicited the observation from an Arizona board that "there is not enough gold in Fort Knox to hire us to do the unpleasant tasks we are doing today."

That statement, in a telegram to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, probably expresses pretty well the attitude of selective service board members everywhere. The pride they derive from performance of a vital patriotic service is the only remuneration they want.

Few persons outside the draft boards realize the arduousness of the task confronting the men responsible for filling the manpower needs of the armed forces. It isn't altogether a matter of spending long hours on a thankless job and sacrificing personal interests. The knowledge that their acts—even when equitably performed—inevitably cause heartaches in many homes, makes it a depressing job. Yet thousands of men have served since the establishment of the selective service boards.

As the Arizona board suggested, "To offer these men cash compensation, no matter how well intended, constitutes the prostitution of patriotism and is far more insulting than flattering."

If You Would Ever Be Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a poem written by my friend, E. R. Robinson, of Lonoke, Ark., brother of the late Senator Joe T. Robinson, of Arkansas, which I feel my colleagues will appreciate as much as I do.

IF YOU WOULD EVER BE ALERT

If you would keep your mind alert,
Would constant vigilance exert,
Calm when emergencies arise,
Unmoved by perils or surprise;
If you would watch the road ahead
And keep a skillful, level head
With threatened death on ev'ry side,
You would through dangers safely ride.

If you would stay so wide awake
That accidents could never shake
And so no obstacles could daunt
Or ghosts of failures ever haunt,
Would keep your nerve at sudden curve,
Ready to stop or safely swerve,
With steady mind on wheel and brake,
No fatal errors would you make.

If you would heed the warning calls
And thus avoid the dire pitfalls
Where others who have passed this way
Found death in lanes that led astray,
Noting each signal warning sign
To guard and guide you on the line,
Scan your guidebook and comprehend,
You'd safely reach your journey's end.

If you would calmly—quickly think
When you come on impending brink,
Would have presence of mind and tact
When crossed by rash or brutal act,
Well poised, you'd never be alarmed,
You'd cross the narrow bridge unharmed
And in ev'ry crisis you would stand
The one who holds the mast'ring hand.

If you were only free
From hatred of alien race,
Had the philanthropy to see
God's image in each stranger's face
And love him just the same
No matter what his color be,
How low his tribe or name,
Nor yet how wide and deep the sea
Between your tribe or state,
You would be great—you would be free.

If you could cast away
The superstitious myths and shams
That blight your faith today
So you could crush the false that damns
And find a saner way
To search for truth amid false creed
And cults long in decay,
You would be great and free indeed.

Office of Dependency Benefits Doing Outstanding Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take advantage of this occasion to call to the attention of Members of Congress the fine work being done at the present time by the Office of Dependency Benefits of the War Department.

When we enacted the various laws affording benefits to members of the families of men and women in our armed forces, I am sure few of us realized the tremendous proportions of the undertaking. It is without question the broadest program of its type ever undertaken in the history of the world.

You will appreciate the scope of this undertaking when I tell you that at the close of business last Saturday, the total pieces of work received by this section of the War Department since the start of the program amounted to 30,070,323. This includes allotment and allowance applications and authorizations, letters from the soldier or WAC, or from their family or from Members of Congress regarding a case.

Last week, for example, the Office of Dependency Benefits received a total of 290,170 pieces of work and during the same period of time the office had acted upon and returned to the file a total of 354,665 cases. Many of us were concerned, some months ago, because of delays we were experiencing in the processing of cases for our constituents.

The opening of a liaison office here on Capitol Hill has proved a distinct service to Members of Congress and to our constituents. I am sure that any Member of the House who has presented a case

to Maj. Charles S. Solit and his staff is convinced that they lose no time attempting to get action. Of course the outcome of that action is governed wholly by the laws we have made and due to circumstances not all applications can be approved because we have not provided benefits in all cases.

For those who are unacquainted with the splendid services of this office, I might say that Major Solit and his staff are located in room 1727, the seventh floor of the New House Office Building, and all of the employees there are thoroughly trained for this special work and are highly competent and courteous.

The main headquarters of the Office of Dependency Benefits is located at Newark and is under the direction of Brig. Gen. Harold N. Gilbert. I feel that they have made a remarkable record in tackling this Herculean task.

For your information I desire to present a few statistics concerning the work that has been accomplished since we first put this dependency-benefit program into operation and also concerning the amount of work done each week.

As I previously stated, as of May 26 the Office of Dependency Benefits had handled a total of 30,070,323 pieces of work between that date and the date the program started July 31, 1942. Of these 4,825,368 have been family-allowance applications, 2,753,065 class E allotment authorizations, 202,076 matters relative to dependency allotment, and 22,289,814 pieces of correspondence relative to changes of status and documentary evidence.

Since December 19, 1942, the Office of Dependency Benefits has acted upon 35,679,599 cases and of these 18,057,361 were family allowances including changes in status, 1,629,099 class E allotments, 200,792 dependency allotments and all involving 5,792,167 pieces of correspondence.

You will be interested in knowing, I am sure, the amount of money involved in the program to date. Since July 31, 1942, a total of 75,654,380 checks have been issued for a total of $4,348,493,678. Of this, $2,637,577,995 represents family allowances and $1,710,915,683 is class E allotments.

I should probably state at this point that these class E allotments that I have referred to on two or three occasions are voluntary allotments made by the soldier to some member of his family. It is an outright contribution on his part and is over and above the family allotment he may have made under the dependency benefit provisions. I am advised that there is a total of 2,501,999 of these in effect. This speaks well for our armed forces in providing this additional amount out of their Army pay check to some member of the family.

The Office of Dependency Benefits has approved 4,323,642 family allowance applications, has disapproved only 81,200, and has temporarily disallowed 192,924 because of incomplete or insufficient evidence. The office has 48,405 applications for family allowance applications in progress but considering the number being taken into the armed forces each week and the fact that in one week alone the agency processed 28,683 of this type application, the work appears to be about current.

Last week alone, the Office of Dependency Benefits received 290,170 letters concerning cases and sent out 317,462 letters relative to allotments and allowances. These letters went to soldiers, their dependents, and to many Members of Congress. I know several of them came to my own office and I am very well pleased with the manner in which these matters are now expedited.

If you could see a copy of the weekly work sheet together with its cumulative total of work, you would readily realize the strides this agency has made in getting its work current and I congratulate those in charge on the fine job they are doing.

Political Conventions in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal, Wisconsin's largest and most independent newspaper, on the subject of the political conventions recently held within the State.

The titles and dates of these editorials are as follows: May 4, 1944, "An Awful Republican Speech"; May 5, 1944, "The Dead Convention" and "Wisconsin Republicans Afraid"; May 8, 1944, "Progressives Go Isolationist"; and May 9, 1944, "The Democrats Stand Up."

These editorials accurately reflect the attitude of the great mass of patriotic Wisconsin voters in all political parties:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 4, 1944]

AN AWFUL REPUBLICAN SPEECH

If Wisconsin Republicans meeting in convention in Milwaukee want to redeem themselves, they will find some way of repudiating the speech made to them at their dinner Wednesday night.

For if the name of Charles F. Smith, of Wausau, be remembered at all in connection with the Republican Party, it will be because of the speech he made attacking the President of the United States in language which affronted not political opponents only but which should affront every loyal, decent American.

No one would mind, and few take note of, Mr. Smith's long account of his grievances with the New Deal. The convention had listened in the afternoon to the bellowing voice of Congressman HALLECK, saying much the same things. No one should pay much attention even to Mr. Smith's designation of all who are not Republicans as "the pinks and the punks." It is an old dodge to lump political opponents with villians and nitwits.

But Mr. Smith turned in apostrophe to the President. He said:

"No, Mr. President, we are not satisfied with you as either President or Commander in Chief. We aren't satisfied with your conduct of the war.

"You lost the Philippines. You caused our boys to be murdered there and at Pearl Harbor through your bungling as Commander in Chief.

"You have made a fizzle in the Italian campaign through your bungling as Commander in Chief. * * *

"Although the country as a whole, agriculture, labor, and industry, have done a wonderful job and have given you billions of dollars more than ever before, have given you a stupendous production of war materials, have given you over 10,000,000 of our boys * * * yet in 2½ years you haven't begun to equal what was done in the First World War in half that time."

And further fixing exact blame, Mr. Smith said the generals and admirals "have and will do a good job, much better though if the commander on the home front would do his job and stop thinking about buying votes."

So Mr. Roosevelt is accused of destroying the lives of our boys to buy votes. Republicans of Wisconsin are asked to applaud that statement, as Adolf Hitler surely would applaud it if he could hear of it.

An answer to the indecency of this attack would go beyond printable words. If untruthfulness and scurrility can win a campaign, this ought to win. But what about Republicans who do not like falsity and scurrility?

Of little importance as it is, something must be said about Mr. Charles F. Smith's absurdity as a supermilitary critic. All the people at home have done a good job. The generals and admirals have done a good job. Yet the job done has been very bad, proceeding from "murder" to a "fizzle."

For all this only one man, the Commander in Chief, is to blame. How did the generals and admirals get in position to do their good job? How did it happen that supplies and reinforcements were sent? Did someone bypass the President? If so, the President cannot be blamed.

But it dignifies a man to speak of his misstatements, his absurdities, his self-contradictions, when his greater offense is against the loyalty, the patriotism, the decency of every true American father and mother.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 5, 1944]

THE DEAD CONVENTION

Why did Wisconsin Republicans have a convention? All a party convention can do is name candidates and State principles. This convention ducked both jobs.

Is any Wisconsin Republican or independent wiser as a result of the convention? Better able to decide his vote?

Small attention was given to the need or the interests of Wisconsin. The speakers were intent on talking about the Nation, not about the State. The keynote by Congressman HALLECK fell flat; it was old Landon stuff. The speech of C. F. Smith of Wausau, if spoken by a man of national reputation, would have reelected Mr. Roosevelt in every State of the Union.

There was still the platform. As is to be shown below, that opportunity, too, was muffed.

"We're on Easy Street" was the keynote of the convention. Like the wise monkeys of Nippon, it saw nothing, heard nothing, and said nothing. It had no convictions on candidates. It had none on principles.

Otherwise the convention was notable for the lack of youth. Young men are away at war. Young women are too busy to come to a talkfest.

Why did Wisconsin Republicans hold a convention? They endorsed no candidates. They committed their party to no principles. Confident of success this year, they invited disgust and humiliation hereafter.

A small group of men met at Ripon in 1854 and sounded a keynote which fired the Nation. A smug group of comfortable, well-fed men and women met in Milwaukee 90 years later and said: "We'll carry Wisconsin in 1944 and what the hell do we care after that?"

WISCONSIN REPUBLICANS AFRAID

The platform committee of the Wisconsin Republican convention had before it this plank submitted by the subcommittee on platform of the State executive committee:

"The Republican Party favors a clear-cut, realistic foreign policy which will promote world peace and protect the American ideals. We do not believe in isolating America from the rest of the world to the detriment of permanent peace and a firm relationship between nations. We believe that the American people should be informed as to what our foreign policy and commitments are. We do believe that any negotiations with other powers should be conducted by realistic Americans who believe that our principles of government are sound and that they must be preserved for us. On such a basis America can enter world negotiations with assurance that the result will be beneficial to all concerned."

What did the platform committee do with this? It cut out the two sentences indicated above in bold-faced type. It cut out the only sentences which said something. It left the plank as nearly meaningless as it could be. If the committee members had not had these sentences before them, the case would not have been so damning. But they read the sentences and perhaps feared some isolationist might not like them. They preferred the isolationist's vote to that of fathers and mothers who do not want another war.

After that, perhaps by way of showing that a platform didn't mean much to them anyhow, they said:

"We affirm that plank adopted at our State convention held in Wausau in July of 1942, as follows: 'We Republicans of Wisconsin also declare our belief that when the victory is won and the Axis Powers are utterly crushed and their military power destroyed, there should be set up some kind of an international organization that shall provide a just method of settling international disputes and shall have the power to preserve the peace of the world.'"

They thus achieved by their meaningless resolution of this week and the reaffirmation of their wishy-washy resolution of 2 years ago a position almost as strong and manly as that of the Republican national convention of 1920—the convention that nominated Warren G. Harding. But they are not as strong as Harding himself when he was on the stump. He declared for "a society of free nations or an association of free nations or a league of free nations." Neither Harding nor his party did anything about it.

Why did the Wisconsin Republicans shy away from their shadows? To woo isolationists? But the isolationists have nowhere else to go. They'll vote Republican because they won't vote for Rooseveit. Because the platform committee was isolationist? That may or may not be true. The more reasonable interpretation is that it didn't have any heart or sincerity in what it was saying, and the more meaningless it could make the thing the better.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 8, 1944]

PROGRESSIVES GO ISOLATIONIST

Senator LA FOLLETTE tied his party to the dead horse of "isolationism" in his speech at the Progressive convention. And the tragedy is that the party stayed tied.

We know that it will be subtly argued that the La Follette speech and the Progressive platform were not utterly isolationist. But in the convention were scores of men and women who could not avoid the thought that they were.

It is a peculiar property of truth that when you mean a thing you don't need a thousand words to say what you mean. Mr. LA FOLLETTE's speech was long enough for a simple sentence saying that isolationism is out and American fathers and mothers want assurance against another war in another 25 years. He didn't say it.

The 5,000 word Progressive platform didn't have space enough to include the simple sentence offered by Assemblyman Mullen: "We favor an international organization dedicated to carry out these principles of peace." Mr. Mullen was backed by State Senator Risser and by Norris E. Maloney, district attorney of Dane County. It couldn't go in because it didn't get the green light from Senator LA FOLLETTE and Herman Ekern.

And the party was still the LA FOLLETTE personal party. That is the tragedy of it. It never has become a Wisconsin party or a national party.

In the convention were hundreds of men and women, as good citizens, as good Americans as can be found anywhere in the country, more earnest delegates than can be found at most conventions. But they were afraid of something. The real hero of the day was Roy Samb, of La Crosse, who voted "No" to the platform because it was isolationist. And if anyone doesn't think it takes courage to vote "No" with 600 yes men crying "Yes," let him try it sometime.

Why Senator LA FOLLETTE takes the reactionary road, we do not know. It should not be from any sense of loyalty to his late father, who in 1919 opposed the League of Nations, as did HIRAM JOHNSON and Senator Borah, along with the reactionary Republicans they formerly had so bitterly opposed. A man might honestly think in 1919 that isolation was our proper course. But ask fathers and mothers who have seen their boys leave for war if they think what we did in 1919 was right.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 9, 1944]

THE DEMOCRATS STAND UP

Wisconsin Democrats meeting at Wausau challenged the isolationism which is so thinly veneered in the State Republican platform and so thinly disguised in the Progressive platform. They said:

"We thoroughly condemn the principle of isolationism and demand that the United States of America assume a position in world affairs equal to its importance and greatness as a nation."

This is an answer to the formula invented recently that Stalin fights for Russia, Churchill fights for Britain—and why shouldn't the American Government stand for America? This formula has been eagerly parroted both by partisan politicians who have given no real thought to prevention of war and by isolationists who want to pose as American.

Further the Democrats declared:

"We condemn the pre-war isolationism as dangerous and detrimental to the welfare of this country.

"We favor the joining of an international organization of nations backed by organized force with power to keep the peace, and the creation of such control against the aggressor nations of the world as will compel peace and guarantee, insofar as our responsibility goes, safety of Americans, their property and lives wherever they may be.

"In the name of liberals we condemn the stand taken by Senator LA FOLLETTE yesterday in Milkaukee as a reversion to isolationism."

The Democratic delegates also endorsed a slate of candidates.

Voters of Wisconsin who put the prevention of future war first thus have an opportunity of expressing themselves. That some may not do this because of the feeling that the Democratic Party has not been strong in Wisconsin in recent years is likely. But its convention, alone of the three Wisconsin conventions held, went on record firmly.

President Roosevelt has himself to thank that the only convention which endorses his record and his candidacy is the smallest of the three and that the party ran a poor third in the elections of 1942. He did not help build the party in Wisconsin; he showed plainly his preference for the LA FOLLETTE family party, which was still clinging to his coattails as late as the election of 1940, but now turns from him to go its own way.

The Democrats stood up for something important to this Nation. They stood up for the President, too. And they stood against the charge brought against Wisconsin that it is an "isolationist" center.

The Control of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal of February 26, 1944:

THE CONTROL OF BUREAUCRACY

One of the most popular whipping boys in Government, particularly on the Federal level, is bureaucracy, but few critics make constructive proposals for lessening the evil.

Congressman HERTER, of Massachusetts, is a welcome exception. He admits that the octopus of Federal bureaucracy is here to stay, but says we can improve and control it. Here are his recommendations:

Prohibit Executive orders which create administrative agencies and commission administrative agents with autocratic authority.

Permit existence of bureaus or bureaucrats only under specific congressional mandate and on a statutory basis.

Insist that every act of Congress creating an administrative or regulatory agency of the Federal Government precisely define and limit the area of authority and the means of its exercise, and contain specific yardsticks that permit no uncertainty.

Require that members of every board and commission and every bureau chief be appointed for a specified term of years and that the appointments be subject to Senate confirmation.

Stop the present practice of putting administration and enforcement into the hands of the same agencies and permitting them to be their own judges and juries with respect to alleged violations of their own decrees.

Provide for appeal to the courts and judicial review of all bureaucratic orders and decrees if they pertain to personal or property rights.

Congressman HERTER is more realistic in his approach to the problem than those who

talk about "eliminating Federal bureaucracy" as if there could be government without bureaucracy. He realizes Federal controls have grown up over a period of many years, largel, in response to public demand, and never can be, nor should be, eliminated.

Even in 1776, the founding fathers were worried about bureaucracy. They lashed out at the bureaucrats of King George, declaring: "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat their substance. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution and unacknowledge by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation."

Despite those words of defiance, bureaucracy continued to flourish. The early bureaus and commissions—like the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, etc.—were established to meet specific needs.

Under the New Deal, a multitude of new bureaus and commissions was founded to relieve the distressed, promote social security, regulate business and labor, etc. And after the war broke out, new and further controls over production, prices, commodities, etc., brought dozens of new Federal bureaus into being.

When the war ends, production and price control will have to be exercised for some time to come. Social security, post-war public works, Federal aid to education, etc., will necessitate continuance of many bureaus.

Wartime controls, like those of peacetime, are onerous, but are recognized to be the lesser of two evils; without them, we would be in more serious troubles than those caused by the controls in question. Some peacetime regulations, like those imposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, are highly popular. So the chances of elimination of controls are slim indeed.

Whether we agree with all of Congressman HERTER'S conclusions or not, his approach is the only realistic one; we must get along with bureaucracy, but we must restrict its authority and make it satisfy present needs. That would end the paradox of the public demanding services and controls and then calling for abolition of the very bureaus which perform them.

Churchill and Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, our policy of appeasement, with respect to Spain, has depressed intelligent Americans. For years I have been attempting to arouse my colleagues in Congress and the country generally to an appreciation of the need for a realistic attitude toward fascism everywhere and particularly toward Fascist Spain.

Our diplomatic flirtation with fascism in Spain has discouraged the underground residents of occupied Europe, who believe in democracy, despite their observation of what they regard as two-timing, double-dealing deception, and hypocrisy.

On the part of those democratic nations, who profess to believe in democracy and to oppose fascism, millions of potential friends of the United States, living in Latin America, are questioning the good faith of our devotion to democracy and our ostensible idealism, hurt by the way we deal with Fascist Spain.

It is of the utmost importance to the future of our policy in Latin America and to the future of our friendship and good relations with these republics to the south of us that we sever diplomatic relations with Fascist Spain.

One of the Nation's eminent commentators on national affairs is the distinguished correspondent, editorial writer, and essayist, Mr. Barnet Nover. On May 27, in the Washington (D. C.) Daily Post appeared a column by Mr. Nover in which he discussed Spain and the foreign policy of Great Britain and the United States.

I commend its reading to my colleagues and to the country:

CHURCHILL AND SPAIN

(By Barnet Nover)

REJOICING OVER ONE SINNER SAVED

Many of Winston Churchill's admirers, and they are legion, will find it more than a little difficult to swallow his kindly words about Spain.

Those words were decidedly out of character with the Churchill the world has come to know since 1940. They seem to be the echo of another and different Churchill—the Churchill who once proclaimed Mussolini a great man, the Churchill whose normally acute vision was so blinded by surface appearances and class prejudices as to lead him, at the outset of the Spanish civil war, to proclaim his approval of the Mussolini-inspired and Axis-aided rebellion in the peninsula.

Churchill changed his mind about Mussolini and he changed his mind about the Spanish civil war. He may change his mind on Spain again. In casting up the balance of the contributions the Franco regime has made to the Allies as against those it has made to the Axis he may reach a very different conclusion from what he reached in his last speech.

The British Prime Minister went completely overboard in expressing his gratitude to Spain. But except for the recently concluded agreement regarding wolfram shipments to Germany and the closing of the German consulate at Tangier, the Spanish acts of good will which he cited were negative rather than positive.

Spain did not go to war with the Allies. She did not permit a German occupation. She remained "tranquil and friendly" during the days when the north African landings were being planned and Gibraltar was crowded with ships and planes.

These items are written in black ink in the Spanish ledger of the United Nations. But there are many red-ink entries about which Mr. Churchill says nothing.

He says nothing about the seizure of Tangier in violation of Spain's treaty commitments. He says nothing about the Blue Legion through which Franco actively participated in the war against Russia and added to the overwhelming difficulties which the Red Army had to contend with during the most critical period of the war on the eastern front.

Furthermore, Mr. Churchill turns a Nelson eye on the continuous campaign of abuse, inspired by the Spanish Government and directed against the Allies. He says nothing about the German agents who, until only just the other day were permitted to use Spanish Morocco as a base of espionage. He says nothing about the pro-Axis, anti-American, and anti-United States activities of the Falange in Latin America.

These actions constitute a far truer reflection of the Franco government's attitude than those for which Mr. Churchill is so warmly grateful. And some credit for what Spain did not do when the going was hard for the Allies, certainly belongs not to Franco but to the Spanish people.

Mr. Churchill gives his case away when he says that Spain's entry into the war against the Allies would have been accompanied by the German occupation of Spain. It is possible, although the British statesman does not once suggest the possibility that it was the unwillingness of the Spanish people to have their nation overrun by the Nazis far more than the generalissimo's objections that made Hitler think twice before crossing the Pyrenees.

Secretary Hull recently said that Fascism and free government cannot exist together in the world.

One would have imagined, in view of what happened in the world, that this was axiomatic. Certainly if this war is not a struggle against fascism it is purposeless.

But the menace, if Mr. Churchill is to be believed, is not against fascism as such but against German and Italian and Japanese fascism. We are determined to extirpate the wolves but intend to feed the cubs. They are so little, so friendly, so harmless. Yet cubs have a way of growing up.

Mr. Churchill also expressed the hope that "she (Spain) will be a strong influence for the peace of the Mediterranean after the war." With all due respects, this sounds like the late unlamented Neville Chamberlain speaking of the Fascist Italy that was.

If Spain becomes a strong influence for peace in the Mediterranean, and one can only hope that she will, it will not be the Spain of Francisco Franco. It will be a Spain of free men.

Inflation Is More Than a Bogey-Man To Frighten Little Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as we today consider the extension of the price-control legislation in this House, it is well to hold in mind the danger confronting the Nation. I find it difficult to convince myself of the frightful consequences of inflation. Perhaps I am much like the average American citizen in regard to inflation as in regard to war, I have not actually seen enough of either one to understand thoroughly their ravages. Maybe that is because I have too much the feeling "It can't happen here." What I need—and I wonder how many others need the same thing—is a greater awareness of the consequences of war and of

inflation in order to fear them sufficiently.

At the opening of the session today, in the customary 1-minute periods allowed the Members, I spoke of having received a letter from a young man of Arizona, Arthur E. Way, now in Istanbul, Turkey, who wrote concerning inflation in that and other neutral countries where he has recently resided. Below I wish to quote paragraphs from his letter and follow the quotations by some index numbers showing comparative prices of 1938 and 1944 on twenty articles in common usage:

Regarding inflation, I am attaching, for your information, a copy of an excerpt from the Turkische Post of May 10, which gives you some idea of the comparative prices between 1938 and 1944. The index figure gives you some idea of the percent of increase. In the States we grumbled a great deal about our Office of Price Adjustment, without realizing what a wonderful job they did, in comparison with what one sees in other countries. There is no question that some of the prices at home are a little out of line, but just a quick glance at this table—and the folks at home can appreciate what has been done for them. Prices are high here, about five or six times as high as the States at present; for example, a pair of ordinary shoes will cost about $30; a pair of socks, from $5 to $7; a suit of clothes, $200 to $300; a hat, approximately $20. This is not only true here, but I found similar conditions in Leban, Syria, Egypt, and some of the South American countries.

The excerpt follows:

COST OF LIVING IN ISTANBUL

In the economic section figures are cited from a report of the Chamber of Commerce of Istanbul for cost of living up to the end of March 1944.

The report says: If the food prices of March of this year are compared with 1938, they show an increase of about four and a half times the peacetime prices. A family with a low standard of living which would have required £T39.73 for their food in March of the last year of peace, today for the same purpose would require £T170.98 a month. The cost of heating and light has not changed substantially in recent months. Their prices today approximate three times the prices of 1938. The other groups do not show considerable changes recently. Prices for clothing and shoes are still extremely high. The following is a table of comparative figures:

Goods	Prices		Index figure, March 1944
	1938	March 1944	
Soap	£T34.76	£T172.50	496.3
Bread	10.05	30.00	298.5
Mutton	45.52	229.00	503.1
Fish	10.30	60.00	582.5
Fresh vegetables	7.51	30.00	399.5
Beans	18.61	85.00	456.7
Peas	17.62	91.00	516.5
Cooking butter	98.82	450.00	455.4
Olive oil	51.85	287.00	553.5
Sugar	28.00	208.00	742.9
Rice	26.64	148.00	555.6
Potatoes	8.32	32.00	384.6
Cheese	48.78	182.00	373.1
Olives	39.57	92.50	233.8
Eggs	1.71	7.25	424
Milk	14.79	60.00	405.7
Yogurt	20.00	96.00	480
Coffee	120.49	600.00	497.9
Coal	5.33	14.75	258
Wood for fuel	370.08	1,400.00	378.8

As more detailed comparisons have shown, the minimum prices have been listed in the above statistics, so that the prices for products of better quality will be substantially higher.

Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 10 entitled "Against Tinkering With O. P. A." and an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times entitled "Tampering With O. P. A." They follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

AGAINST TINKERING WITH O. P. A.

Price control would be seriously weakened if two amendments, passed by the Senate, were actually made into law.

The amendment proposed by Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, to increase prices on some cotton textiles, would, if made law, be only the entering wedge for a host of exceptions to price control. Many persons are inclined to favor control for everything except the few items in which their personal interests call for increases. Since these exceptions, en masse, would probably cover the entire field of price control, the way to them should be kept firmly closed.

Another amendment adopted by the Senate, making it an adequate defense against consumer suits for merchants to prove that their price violations were unintentional, is persuasive in theory. But it would do material harm to price control, in the opinion of Majority Leader BARKLEY and Senator TAFT, of Ohio.

The price-control laws are working, on the whole, not too badly. Now is a good time for Congress to give them its support and to avoid dangerous tinkering.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

TAMPERING WITH O. P. A.

There is grave danger to the entire price-control system in the type of amendment which the Senate yesterday patched into the fabric of the Control Act at the behest of Alabama's BANKHEAD. It is to be hoped that House opposition to this scheme prevails.

Its surface purpose, to lower the excessive cost of cotton goods, seems laudatory enough, even though the obvious real intent is to raise the price of raw cotton by increasing the demand for it. But the fact is that all measures attempting to set the ceilings for specific articles by congressional action should be rejected flatly as an interference with the flexibility essential to good legislation and sound administration.

Set the price of cotton in the law, and you open the way to setting the price on carpets, cabbages, calsomine, and corn—all in the same rigidity of a statute dictated by conflicting interests. You destroy completely the possibility of month-by-month adjustments in ceilings that permit the erasures of mistakes, the balancing of specific items against the changing Nation-wide need, the spurs to production that experience reveals are necessary.

The whole system of our administration much as it has been berated by those who fancy there is a bogey in every bureau, rests on a sound, efficient, logical principle that business itself constantly applies: The board of directors shall determine broad policy, and the most competent manager it is possible to select will devise the means of putting that policy into effect.

No business in the world could function if its board had to sit in on the momentous decision of whether the janitor in plant B should have red hair or black, should be paid $17.50 a week or $18. Yet it is precisely this procedure that is suggested by the Bankhead amendments.

Taken in conjunction with the open hostility of many Congressmen to the whole system of the O. P. A., almost every one of the amendments suggested so far to improve the Office is revealed as actually designed to produce in it the paralysis and atrophy akin to death.

Virgin Islanders Ask Larger Share of Self-Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a resolution adopted May 11, 1944, by the Fourth Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands, petitioning for a larger share of self-government for these islands. As we look to the post-war period it seems only fair that now we should be setting in motion those programs designed to bring maximum well-being for the people in all of our territorial possessions. A vital part of such planning must include the largest use of the natives of these territories in the management of their own affairs. It is for this reason that the accompanying resolution deserves the prompt and favorable consideration of all to whom it is addressed:

Resolution petitioning the President of the United States and the Secertary of the Department of the Interior to appoint natives to important positions in the government of the Virgin Islands.

Whereas the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, approved by His Excellency, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America on June 22, 1936, is the basic law of the American Virgin Islands, conferring on the people of those islands certain duties, responsibilities, and privileges as American citizens; and

Whereas the people of the Virgin Islands are, and will always be, grateful to the Congress and President of the United States for the noble and democratic attitude displayed in the adoption and approval of this act; and

Whereas section 23 of said act indicates that natives are qualified to hold important positions in the government of the Virgin Islands, where it states that the Secretary of the Interior "shall give due consideration to natives of the Virgin Islands" when making appointments; and

Whereas in section 21 of said act the President of the United States is given the authority and responsibility to appoint a Government Secretary; while in sections 22 and 23, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to appoint Administrators for St. Croix and St. John and "such other executive and adminis-

trative officers as may, in his discretion, be required"; and

Whereas it is indisputable that qualified natives of the Virgin Islands who have lived in the islands and are acquainted with the people and their needs, if appointed to important positions in the Government by the President or the Secretary of the Interior, will make good and capable officials thus improving the status of the government of the Islands; and

Whereas there is evidence of the ability of natives to fill responsible positions as characterized by the outstanding achievements of natives now in the service of the government of the Virgin Islands, which achievements have redounded to the credit and astuteness of the President and Secretary of the Interior in displaying their ability to choose competent and efficient officials; and

Whereas it is believed that official positions in the government of the Virgin Islands are not lucrative enough to be controlled by national politics and thus disastrously affect the economic and social well-being of approximately 30,000 patriotic and loyal American citizens; and

Whereas it is also believed that even if the positions were controlled by national politics, the President and the Secretary of the Interior have a record of selecting only capable and qualified persons for official positions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, and it is hereby resolved by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John in session assembled, That the President and the Secretary of the Interior be, and are hereby petitioned, to have made a review of the executive and administrative positions in the government of the Virgin Islands, with the view of giving "due consideration to the natives of the Virgin Islands"; and it is further

Resolved, That the President and the Secretary of the Interior be, and are hereby, petitioned to appoint natives to fill whatever executive and administrative positions are now vacant in the government of the Virgin Islands; and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Chairman of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, the President of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the President of the Civil Liberties Union, the President of the Virgin Islands Civic Association, and all insular business, labor, civic and political organizations, with the request that these officials and organizations grant whatever aid possible to carry through the policy advocated by this resolution.

Growth of San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Richmond Banner of San Francisco publishes interesting data regarding San Francisco's outstanding growth. Our city is second only to New York among the Nation's financial centers. The article as appearing in the Richmond Banner is quoted in full as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE COLLECTS FIGURES ON WARTIME BOOM IN SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco is the Nation's second largest financial center based upon a study of the 1943 deposits of the 100 largest commercial banks. Seven of the banks in San Francisco, including the Bank of America, American Trust Co., Wells Fargo Bank, Anglo California National Bank, Crocker First National Bank, Bank of California, and San Francisco Bank (order according to bank deposits), rank among the first 100 banks of the Nation with total deposits amounting to $5,598,187,000, or 10.1 percent of the total deposits. Only New York exceeded this figure. Among the first 10 banking centers following San Francisco in order were Chicago, Detroit, Boston, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis. During the past year the west coast section continued to lead other sections of the Nation in bank deposit gains reflecting the great industrial expansion taking place in this section of the Nation.

The study further revealed that the Bank of America, N. T. & S. A. of San Francisco made a spectacular gain of $912,000,000 in deposits during the year 1943, carrying its totat deposits to $3,498,153,210, jumping it from fourth into third place among the Nation's 100 largest banks.

The study revealed that the Bank of America has also another distinction, ranking highest among the first 10 banks of the Nation in ratio of deposits to capital, which amounted to 24.1 times; the First National Bank of Chicago was second with 19.4 times, while the Nation's largest, the Chase National Bank, showed a ratio of 16 times.

The expeditious handling of financial transactions of all kinds has helped to maintain sound industrial and trade relations between San Francisco and the western region markets. The trend of big money interests in the Hawaiian Islands, Philippines, and East Indies which started in the pre-war period in the late '30's to utilize the local financial resources and facilities, including the San Francisco Stock Exchange, for marketing their securities, will in all probability continue in the post-war period when normal trade relations are re-established in these markets.

The Bay area population reservoir on April 1, 1944, was remarkably near the same level as on November 1, 1943, 5 months earlier, according to the official census reports for these dates. Presumably, the number of inductions and voluntary outbound migrants has been about equaled by the number of inbound migrants.

Currently, however, there is reported a shortage of about 27,500 workers in critical war industries, indicating that Bay area activity is operating at near capacity for the manpower available. Shipbuilding, ship repairing, and shipping activities' manpower needs are greatest.

Local housing centers indicate a steady flow of requests for housing, but only a small percent can be placed under existing regulations. The importance of the "civilian backstop" to the Bay area war economy and his housing needs have not received any official recognition, although prominent groups in the Bay area initiated a movement to gain official approval for a private building program privately financed as a practical approch to the housing shortage which is handicapping the labor supply.

General business activity in San Francisco in April measured by our index at 171.1 settled seasonably compared to the March level. April business was 10.5 percent below the preceding month, but 3.1 percent above last April. Activity during the first 4 months was 13.2 percent above last year. Placements during April in San Francisco totaled 10,361 persons, of which 9,248 were industrial and 1,113 commercial. This is a slight gain over the total March placements and an increase of 32.6 percent over April last year with the 4 months' cumulative up 11 percent.

April living costs represented by the index for San Francisco-Oakland at 128.1 were up 0.5 percent above March, but were 0.3 percent under April last year. Food costs showed a 5.0 percent drop compared to last year, while clothing costs rose 5.4 percent. Living costs average for the first 4 months was up 1.3 perent above the same period last year, but food costs were off 0.8 percent, while clothing costs rose 5.7.

H. R. 4617 and H. R. 4990—Providing for the Sale of Certain Surplus Military Vehicles and Equipment to Farmers and to Servicemen Who Intend to Engage in or Resume Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, following World War No. 1 our surplus war supplies were bought up by large, well-organized and well-financed groups of the country in large quantities at ridiculously low prices for the sole purpose of taking care of their own interest in the way of unreasonable profits at the expense of the consuming public.

This should not happen following World War No. 2.

I am inserting herewith a statement issued by the Sumter County U. S. D. A. War Board signed by Mr. J. M. Eleazer concerning this important matter.

On April 17th, I introduced H. R. 4617 and on June 9, H. R. 4990, copies of which I am inserting herewith, which if passed by Congress will take care of same in line with the statement issued by the Sumter County U. S. D. A. War Board.

I agree with Mr. Eleazer that the farmers of this country have done the greatest job on the home front of any group in connection with our war effort.

They, including their families, have had to work long hours, being short of labor and farm implements.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRCULTURE,
U. S. D. A. DEFENSE BOARD,
Sumter, S. C., May 29, 1944.

PLANS FOR DISPOSING OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS TO FARMERS

To CONGRESSMAN FULMER: The Sumter U. S. D. A. War Board at its meeting today instructed that I write you and others on the above subject as follows:

That a movement be started now toward perfecting plans for disposing of surplus war materials in such manner as to make it possible for a farmer to get a needed truck, ditcher, jeep, or the like direct from the Government rather than pay several times what the Government gets for it after it passes through some salvage man's hands.

We have just been told by a farmer of his experience. The Army advertised and sold a lot of used trucks in a nearby town. No one except a large dealer could bid on that

many trucks, and he got them for an average of $150 each. This farmer went there to see if he could get a badly needed truck, and they priced him one of the average ones for $1,600. And, we know from past experience, that this is the way that present methods of disposing of such materials work. No farmer can use a thousand trucks or a hundred ditchers, but maybe he could use one to mighty good advantage.

The farmer has done the greatest job on the home front of any group in this war. He alone has through "spirit, skill, and hard work" produced more and more with less and less, and he will continue to do so. This being a fact, it would be showing a bit of gratitude if our Government could arrange for him to get these needed machines and equipment at the rock-bottom price that the Government gets, anyway. This will avoid making some new millionaires, and at the same time it will make the Nation infinitely richer with the improved agricultural plant it will help create.

We see no great difficulty in handling this. The equipment could be assembled at convenient points, as it will be, anyway. Instead of making one man rich by letting him have all of it at the low price at which such things go, why not mark them with that same low price and let farmers get what they need? This could be easily controlled by a permit system similar to that used for getting rationed farm machinery at this time.

The Sumter County United States Department of Agriculture War Board earnestly asks that the United States Department of Agriculture war boards and other leaders who receive this do their part to impress our authorities with the righteousness of this thing. It will result in a securer nation, with more drainage, terraces, cleared swamp and pasture lands, better hauling facilities, greater productive power, and so on.

Respectfully submitted.

SUMTER COUNTY U. S. D. A. WAR BOARD,
By J. M. ELEAZER.

H. R. 4617

A bill to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts, and to distribute such materials, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to requisition from the War Department and from the Navy Department and from any other Government agency, any war materials, equipment, and supplies that are or may hereafter be surplus and not required for the prosecution of war and for the national defense but are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil and water-conservation works and operations in furtherance of the act approved April 27, 1935, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes." Upon receipt of such requisition from the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the head of any other Government agency shall transfer without reimbursement any and all such surplus material, equipment, and supplies as may be requested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. Such material, equipment, and supplies shall be distributed, through the Soil Conservation Service, by grant or loan, to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized under State laws with powers to promote and carry out soil- and water-conservation operations and related public purposes. Such distribution shall be made in accordance with such standards, conditions, rules, and regulations as to use and disposition as may be recommended by the Soil Conservation Service and may be established for such purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture.

H. R. 4990

A bill providing for the sale of certain surplus military vehicles and equipment to farmers and to servicemen who intend to engage in or resume farming

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy declares any military vehicles, bulldozers, tractors, jeeps, Army wagons, graders, ditchers, or other similar vehicles or equipment, surplus to the needs of the Department of War or the Department of the Navy, as the case may be, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to requisition from the War Department and from the Navy Department and from any other Government agency, such war materials, equipment, and supplies that are or may hereafter be surplus and not required for the prosecution of war and for the national defense but are suitable for use in carrying out farming operations. Such vehicles shall, before being transferred to other agencies of the Government or being sold or otherwise disposed of in quantity lots at public auction, be offered for sale singly to persons having purchase preference rights, as provided in section 2. The price at which any such vehicle or item of equipment shall be so offered for sale shall be fixed on the basis of its cost to the United States less a reasonable allowance for depreciation.

SEC. 2. (a) The following persons shall have purchase preference rights with respect to vehicles and equipment described in section 1:

(1) Persons who are regularly engaged in farming operations.

(2) Persons who served for not less than ninety days in the military or naval forces of the United States during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending with the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, have been discharged therefrom or released from active duty therein under conditions not dishonorable, and intended to become regularly engaged in farming operations. The manner of evidencing a purchase preference right shall be prescribed by regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) In order to carry out the provisions of section 1, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide for the concentration of vehicles and equipment described in section 1 in the various rural areas of the United States, may utilize the services of local merchants in the sale of such vehicles and equipment, and pay a reasonable commission for such services.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.